Appendix

The Shape of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made by the Honorable Frank D. O'Connor, district attorney of Queens County, N.Y., at a social science forum at Siena College in Albany, N.Y., on December 5, 1962.

After reading this speech, I certainly want to commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The address follows:

THE SHAPE OF THE FUTURE

(An address by Queens District Attorney Frank D. O'Connor at a social science forum at Siena College, Albany, N.Y., on Wednesday, December 5, 1962)

The shape of the future is in every young generation. Like every young generation you have ideals and hopes and dreams. You have places to go and promises to keep and many miles to go before you sleep, to paraphrase Robert Frost badly.

There are people who suggest that you are the worst generation which has ever come down the pike—they are few but vocal.

There are others who suggest that you are the best and these are many and they are not vocal enough.

In a sense, both of them are looking not at you now so much as at what you are exposed to and what they think you can become. And in that sense they are both right.

The situation is complicated by the fact that you are being rushed to maturity by a group of forces never present before in human history from early dating, driving, drinking, the service, to TV, to space, to atomic energy, to the cold war, yes even to the twist. You are taller and faster and brighter and fresher, perhaps, than anything that has come before. You are also less patriotic if the polls are correct and having some experience with polls recently, I would not take that authority as absolutely final.

You are going to live longer, perhaps work less and earn more and you have it in your power to change this world or destroy it as never before. More than anyone else you are both the new future or the dead end of humanity and you better be prepared for the future or you'll be consigned to that end.

In that future you have a better chance than ever before.

You can aspire to high position in government and business without personally sacrificing your religion. And you will have to play a greater part in your church as laymen.

The point of this talk is that you have a choice not only about what you want to be and how good at it you will be, but where you will stand philosophically or more especially politically in the broad sense.

In an oversimplified but nonetheless real sense, you have two broad philosophical or political paths stretching before you in achieving this great future or this dead end—one is liberal and the other is conservative. Oh, there are variations of both and a road in between called moderate but that road is seldom walked without tending one way or the other at one time or other.

There are some observers who profess to seeing a danger that your generation—perhaps the best—educated lay generation in history—may pull against the growing trend toward what has been loosely described as liberalism in the church here and abroad.

There are others inside and outside the church of which you are members that contend that you cannot be a liberal now or ever and be a Catholic; that the two concepts are mutually exclusive. To hear Mr. BUCKLEY or Mr. GOLDWATER talk, Catholics are not alone in being committed to conservatism. To hear them speak, and both of them are impressive, there is a huge, irreversible ever-increasing wave of conservatism rising out of the colleges ready to crash upon the shores of America's, indeed, the world's economic, religious, political, etc., life.

And to hear the conservatives talk it's going to be the wave that will bring peace and security and a better life to these troubled times. In foreign policy they feel that President Kennedy merely stole their thunder on Cuba just as he should on several other problems; that it is conservatism, not liberalism that has a clearer view not only of communism but of life in general.

Now I neither have the wit nor the learning nor the gall to take such worthy adversaries on together on this general proposition. But I do have some experience and it tells me that I seem to recall hearing pretty much the same claim laid by the Communists and the ultra-Socialists a generation ago.

It tells me too that much of history is like a pendulum swing sometimes in larger and larger arcs and sometimes in smaller and smaller ones depending on the push, once liberal, once conservative, and that the wave of the future may be the opposite of the past in some ways but never too opposite.

Experience tells us something else. Man individually may not live on, but some of his works do. And while all change, few of them die.

What, then, can the shape of the future be when there is a premium on change and its effects, when much of recent history in the West has been a liberal triumph?

Granted, as of today, the future seems mixed. Our strong stand on Cuba may well usher in a new era in the cold war. At home, however, Mr. Nixon has lost, and with him has gone an era that is itself a curious contradiction in American life marked by internal suspicion and external trust or, at least, reluctance to face up to the many challenges to our way of life in the hope that some would change or go away.

Mrs. Roosevelt has died, and with her has gone a still older era in American life, an era of great crisis and great recovery, of great war and great victory, of social change and social progress, but with a difference; the rhythms of the age of Roosevelt will occur and reoccur, at least domestically.

On the other hand, a conservative force of considerable personal, intellectual, and even emotional attractiveness has come into more respect if not more power.

With all of this, internal suspicion has yielded place to a relatively friendly but nonetheless heated debate; giving some suggestion of a different era from the one immediately previous, an era to be marked by greater internal trust and a growing realism abroad in international action.

Could it be that BUCKLEY and GOLDWATER are mistaking this stronger line in Cuba, this quieter and more confident dialog within America—this acceptance of a specifically emergent conservatism, as a trend?

Even if it were, are there many who would want to roll back the waves of time and discover the old shores before social security, the SEC, the Bank Act, the Marshall plan, the integration decisions, etc?

These and their effects are here to stay and be expanded. What hopes can conservatives have? There are indeed some areas of dispute like education, medicare, prayer in the schools, Sunday laws, gambling, birth control laws, and there are many others where there is a growing clash of opinion—but not only between liberals and conservatives but among the two camps themselves.

And regardless of the differences among liberals on some of these questions, conservatism has not shown that impact on domestic issues it may claim on communism and it hasn't much time before there may be a new liberal resurgence.

Granted, the future may seem mixed now and that sometimes the answer to a specific problem can be claimed by either liberal or conservative.

Indeed, Mr. Rockefeller built part of his campaign on that chance, on the theme that it really did not matter if you were a liberal or a conservative you could vote for him because he was presumably both on occasion. It was interesting that both the New York Post and the conservative party disagreed with him. It is also interesting that he won but not by quite as large a margin as before.

Granted that victory is not on one side all the time or goodness or the best of commonsense, along which path does the future lie—Where are we going?

What will the shape of the future be? I for one believe that it will be more liberal than conservative, more liberal in the true sense, however, than in a specious sense.

Indeed the very emergence of a new conservatism may help liberalism define itself with more clarity and realism.

Let us begin by admitting one thing—the image of the conservative has been very bad until quite recently. A conservative evoked the image of a man dressed in a high starched collar and a ramrod posture who regarded the past as sacred and the future secure only when it closely resembled the past—a man one wag described as willing to move America—indeed the whole world—smartly back into the 19th century.

The liberal? Even the word is a little better; although his image gyrated crazily between a beatnik and a retired ad man neither of whom have any great feeling for the past or for its institutions. The difference was and is between the rigid and the relaxed.

Of course, these were only images but they really had an impact and they did reflect a certain truth about the more substantial differences which existed in reality.

While the conservative, in a word, stands for the status quo and the liberal stands for change, a really more basic difference seems

to be the degree that they care about individuals; what happens to them as individuals and why. Their concepts of the individual differ in many respects.

Now admittedly some of the following illustrations will be overdrawn but they are made more to stress than to prove a point. The conservative often seems to look at people less fortunate than himself and says, "I got where I am without too much help, certainly not from any government; why can't they?"

The liberal seems more liable to say, "There but for a better chance go I, let us give of what we have."

The conservative is against big government; the liberal is for it, in most instances as a way of helping the individual.

The conservative accents responsibility; the liberal pushes the heavy pedal for freedom from things like poverty, prejudice, fear, et cetera, as well as for things.

Yet there are many contradictions and some misconceptions that both share.

Liberty and responsibility are often but one side of the same coin.

And the conservative, not the liberal, may stand for freedom of big business, that is, and say in effect with the steel companies, we will be responsible if you let us alone in a free market. In this instance, the liberals retort in effect * * * everyone will be protected and free if the people through the government help you stay responsible. And big business may retort with some justification, "Yes, but why cannot you be as tough with big labor?"

Welfare and foreign aid are other examples where the differences between conservative and liberal can be seen, perhaps, too easily in caricature.

Does not the conservative often talk as if a goodly number, if not an overwhelming majority, of those on welfare rolls were freeloaders without giving too much thought to whether this has been proven or not, or whether any of these people have been given a real chance at getting a job?

The liberal on the other hand may err the other way (toward charity?) by asking that they be given every opportunity to prove themselves before branding them "lazy" or "frauds."

The liberal may be too trusting, perhaps, naive on occasion; but the conservative is often not trusting enough.

On foreign aid, the conservative has usually leaned to the attitude: let me live and I'll let them live.

The liberal toward the attitude: we shall not only let them live, we shall help them live.

This is not meant to be an indictment of the conservative and a paean of praise for the liberal for this would be an oversimplification of the problem.

But it is to indicate that being a liberal is not new and difficult for a Catholic.

It should not have to take the President differing with the church on Federal aid to education or the spectacle of cardinals differing with each other on almost every topic at the council to disturb the false equation that has been set up between Catholicism and conservatism.

Catholics are not machine-tooled conservatives. The recent history of the church in America is proof alone of that. The litany of Cardinal Gibbons, Monsignor Ryan who worked so closely with President Roosevelt, Senator Eugene McCarthy, Dorothy Day, Father LaFarge, S.J., Courtney Murray, America, Commonwealth, and Cardinals Mundelein and Cushing testify to a strong liberal current in the Catholic Church in America.

And I suggest that this current is not new to the church. It is as old as the church itself and what's more, I suggest it is closer to the spirit of the church than critics outside and inside realize. The real question is how strong it has been and will be in the future.

The grave misconception that Catholicism from top to bottom is equatable with conservatism has arisen historically from a consideration of the church as a material institution not a spiritual force; this despite a great body of evidence that would incline one to the belief that the saints were the very opposite of conservative, that they were liberal reformers in the realistic sense not in the specious and unrealistic sense.

Saints were true liberals and reformers who reformed themselves first and then tried to do something with the world about them.

They did not start first with the world about them for they knew that was the long way around.

Unfortunately, the saints were often voices crying in the wilderness, ignored by the main stream of humanity and history clogged as they are by mediocre men and outright knaves—who misrepresented institutions, including the church, and used them often for their own ends.

St. Francis himself who is probably the most popular saint of the church to those outside, indeed a saint for Christian unity and world cooperation, was a revolutionary. He saw the status quo of his time leading to the defeat not only of the church but of all mankind.

His prayer, a universal favorite, was incidentally Eleanor Roosevelt's favorite prayer: "Lord, let me be an instrument of Thy peace," etc. This is the mission of the Catholic, indeed, of all mankind in the politics of this age.

It is not an easy politics no more than it is an easy moral or religious road to follow. For we have many angry men, young and old; and even those of us who are not angry by nature or avocation can be aroused by the injustice and misunderstanding of our time.

Why else does the conservative who often has religious roots judge so harshly on occasion while the liberal who often has no religious roots may judge more humanely?

Is it because the conservative whose central preoccupation has been communism in all its shapes regards the liberal for a fool, while the liberal who sees communism as only one of many problems and perhaps too trustingly regarded it until recently as being exaggerated, sees the conservative as a fanatic?

Is it because men like Buckley can often make a good case out for the indefiniteness of liberal thinking, its seeming failure to be able to follow through logically?

I suggest that one of our basic troubles has been that the self-appointed and sometimes shallow guardians of liberal orthodoxy have often excluded their potential friends and repelled overly much their enemies who could be more friendly and trusting.

And I think there are two reasons for this tension between the exclusive liberal who may be unrealistic at times and his more realistic friends and enemies. The unrealistic liberal sees the challenges of our times often in terms of comfort, convenience, and security, at one time economic, at another time political, etc., while the more realistic liberal sees the challenge of our times as essentially moral, involving man's free will qualified by temperament, experience, environment, and training but free, nonetheless.

There is another difference. While the unrealistic liberal often holds for freedom as much as possible, his position on occasion involves a restriction of freedom, not alone in terms of big government but as regards an individual's complete freedom. This may be true in terms of Federal aid to the education of all youth. But it is another topic for another time.

Suffice it to say that I really did not come here to try to convert you to voting Democratic from top to bottom.

I hope you are not that easy to convince.

Your education as American Catholics is not designed broadly to turn you out as liberals or conservatives in overwhelming numbers, but to have you think behind the labels that liberal and conservative often are and to think deeply, to know there is a choice, to make it not in anger but in love; not for a program but a philosophy, not for a label but for life.

That is the spirit of St. Francis, the spirit of John XXIII, the spirit of the new age of Christian unity and religious understanding and international cooperation, which will lead man not back but forward to a promised land, if not now or soon, at least someday in that future for which all of us were created and which the mind of God and man seek at all times to realize; a future where we shall not be afraid of our differences for being surer of our basic agreement, where we shall transmute the accidentals of color and nationality into a universal essential of respect and love of the many-faceted creation of which we are all small but important parts.

But the future will not belong to American democracy or to a new religious understanding, in short, to free associations of freemen who may differ but cooperate, unless these men are informed, discriminating, educated and disciplined, unless they are, in short, responsible. "To thine ownself be true and * * * thou canst not be false to any man."

You must draw the line for yourselves now, just as surely as the President drew the line in Cuba for the Communists.

Drawing the line means to seek the truth, to speak the truth, to live the truth, and spread the truth with understanding, with respect, with love. In this connection, have any of you thought about the Peace Corps?

You cannot live in a ghetto religiously, intellectually, politically, economically, socially, or racially.

You must, in turn, insist on truth and justice in your society; in the papers you read, in the TV, movies, and radio you see and hear; in the schools you attend; in the businesses you work for and in the government you elect.

You must seek the truth and live it confident with Christopher Dawson that it is the essence of your faith as Americans and Catholics to find new answers to new questions.

But you must also seek the truth and live it knowing with Arthur Miller in this month's Harper's that "the world in which comfort rules is a delusion."

Patriotic Public Affairs Broadcasting Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in support of the Federal Communications Commission's desire to encourage all radio and television networks to feature more public affairs programing of a positive, stimulating nature, I include the following remarks concerning the well qualified American Freedom Network:

Back in the days when television made its first appearance on the American

scene, the major radio networks understandably focused attention on this new and important communications medium.

Unfortunately, with the concentration on TV, the radio networks suffered, but that, happily, is being corrected. America's AM and FM stations are rapidly regaining lost ground as many discerning broadcasters concentrate their efforts on strong, stimulating, public affairs programing. This is in keeping with FCC admonitions to feature more presentations of this nature.

While serving my former—30th—Congressional District, I was extremely pleased to accept an invitation to serve as a member of the advisory council of the recently formed American Freedom Network—America's independent, nonprofit, nonpolitical, but informational public affairs broadcasting service.

This is an organization—staffed by dedicated, veteran broadcasters—who believe, in the words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, that our Nation's security is nothing at all unless we "have an uncorrupted public opinion to give life to our Constitution, to give vitality to our statutes, and to make efficient our Government machinery."

The American Freedom Network—not associated with any other group or organization—was founded more than 6 months ago in Bonita, Calif.

I have known Morris C. Allen, chairman of the American Freedom Network's board of directors, for many years. At 73, he remains active as a Bonita real estate broker, as well as in civic and patriotic affairs.

For more than three-quarters of a century, the Allens have been a prominent and highly respected family in San Diego County, tracing their history to the Bradfords of *Mayflower* fame. A Bonita elementary school is named after Mr. Allen's mother—Ella Bradford Allen.

In discussing his participation in the American Freedom Network, Mr. Allen has stated:

> I have watched my sons grow into manhood; we have been blessed with eight grandchildren * * * and it is for them, and for all of America's young people, tomorrow's leaders, that I count it a privilege to have been instrumental in making this informational service a reality.

"A little bit of information can be a dangerous thing, and I trust you will concur that Americans must be informed and kept abreast of all sides of important public opinion. I am convinced that radio is the most effective instrument in achieving this end."

I would add there are few Americans like Morris Allen. A man without great financial means, he has mortgaged everything he owns to get this essential project underway. I believe the American Freedom Network is deserving of financial support from all interested citizens.

In addition to Mr. Allen, others associated with the American Freedom Network are—

Jonathon Kirby, vice president and executive director, who founded the organization. Mr. Kirby is an experienced radio-TV news commentator with more than 15 years of service in the broadcasting field. Only recently, Mr. Kirby was the recipient of the American Legion's Americanism Award and Silver Medal "in recognition of his constant efforts to preserve America and our way of life for future Americans."

Richard Lewis Venturino, director of programing and production, whose long experience in the programing and production aspect of broadcasting, assures the network of a high professional standard for its taped presentations.

Serving on the American Freedom Network's board of directors, in addition to Messrs. Allen and Kirby, are William R. Richards, well-known San Diego attorney; H. L. Michael, Jr., Bonita real estate broker; and James S. Duberg, city attorney for Chula Vista, Calif.

The American Freedom Network, for a minimal charge, provides a complete, varied informational service to America's broadcasters offering, whenever possible, both sides of an issue, in keeping with the FCC's "doctrine of fairness."

In its dedication to the radio industry, the American Freedom Network supplies its member stations with the "tools" to assist them in earning their FCC public affairs credits.

Every week, subscribing stations receive dynamic taped programs and features designed to enhance listener interest. This taped service consists of provocative talks, discussions, interviews, debates, and commentaries by prominent personalities in the various fields of politics, science, business, and entertainment.

The policy of the American Freedom Network follows a positive approach, as opposed to irresponsible denunciations.

In addition to serving commercial radio stations, American Freedom Network programs are made available, upon request, without charge, to college and university radio stations, as well as to schools, both public and private, and to all service, civic clubs, and church groups throughout America.

In these days, when charges of mismanagement of news in high Government circles are being made, I am delighted to publicly commend the American Freedom Network to wish it Godspeed in its determination to present both sides of all issues—free speech in a free country—and I urge all of our fellow citizens to get behind this effort to further enlighten our people concerning America's precious heritage, and to the problems facing our Nation and the free world.

U.N. Intervention in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many words are being written today of the continuing atrocities in the Congo. Outstanding among these reports is the column of William S. White as it appeared in the Washington Star of January 7, 1963:

U.N. INTERVENTION IS CONDEMNED

(By William S. White)

The United Nations has assumed a frightful responsibility before history—assuming that history will not be rewritten to suit the wishes of its ruling Afro-Asian clique as current facts already have been a hundred times suppressed or distorted—in the Congo.

For the first time in an organization supposedly devoted to peace, United Nations troops and tanks and bombers have moved with crushing military force to settle an internal dispute in a supposedly independent country. This is the unarguable meaning of the United Nations offensive to drive the breakaway province of Katanga back into the central Congo government and to destroy that province's elected leader, Moise Tshombe.

No less terrible a responsibility has been assumed by the United States of America. For against the advice of our three best allies—Britain, France, and Belgium—we have directly assisted this military adventure by a United Nations whose imperious Asian leader, Secretary General U Thant, may yet disturb even our own most eager apologists for this fatefully crude thrust in power politics.

For if the United Nations without the slightest right except the sanction of force backed by a massive propaganda, can intervene in the internal affairs of the Congo today, it can intervene tomorrow in the internal affairs of any country in this world—in theory not excluding the United States.

SOVIET ROLE QUESTIONED

In some other time and in some other atmosphere of whipped up emotionalism, any other state or province can be described as secessionist, and U.N. troops can go in there, too, so long as the power of effective resistance is absent.

Repeatedly, the motivation of the United States in this wretched affair has been described in the State Department as a desire to force Katanga's return to the Central Congo Government to strengthen it against a possible Soviet takeover.

Men who really do not enjoy feeling that their own Government has taken up an indefensible policy have tried to accept this explanation. If it is true it could at least help justify by way of harsh expediency what cannot possibly be justified on any higher ground.

But even the argument of expediency is open to grave question. At the very moment the State Department was speaking of its fears of Soviet intrusion in the Congo, our Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, was casting great doubt on that line. On December 21 Stevenson—who is surely no enemy of the Afro-Asian clique—was thus quoted by United Press International: "As to Soviet interference, or intervention, in the Congo, so far as I know at the moment there isn't any whatever. I hope I am properly informed on that subject."

U.N. DECEIT CHARGED

The ugly truth is that deceit and evasiveness and incredible arrogance have marked the U.N.'s course in the Congo, from first to last. Men of good will toward the U.N. have been compelled to conclude, long since, that its word in this affair could not be trusted. A few illustrations:

Impartial war correspondents have formally protested the U.N. "censorship and duplicity" in the field. A score of U.N. disavowals of any intention to force the military submission of Katanga have been followed by the use of force for just such a submis-

sion. Heated U.N. denials of atrocities by U.N. troops have been proved false by the eyewitness testimony of independent correspondents.

Thant, in an ultimatum to Katanga on December 31, implied that attacking U.N. forces would halt after seizing Elisabethville to give Tshombe time to submit decently. Instead, on the U.N.'s own account, they went forward to assault another town, Jadotville. This was explained by the U.N. as a "breakdown in coordination." So sorry, we'll investigate.

Maybe a victory has been won. But not all the power of the U.N. to force conformity can hide the dark implications, for the future, of this campaign.

A Reminder of Grassroots Sentiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the time that has passed since the sine die adjournment of the 87th Congress, events have continued to move in a rapid and complicated manner.

It has been my consistent belief that we in positions of responsibility in government have an obligation to provide leadership based on sound American concepts that have been the basis for the development of our Nation's greatness.

Grassroots public opinion and the inherent commonsense of the American public are too often disregarded by Government bureaucracy. Good, old-fashioned American horsesense is completely ignored by the present administration.

As a reminder of grassroots sentiment, under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD three editorials, dealing with a variety of subjects, which appeared in community newspapers in my district.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Heights Star, Dec. 2, 1962]

AS WE SEE IT: FOR HALL OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Proposed for the New York World's Fair of 1964–65 is a hall of free enterprise. It would, according to the American Economic Foundation, contain graphic examples of what free enterprise accomplishes.

It is a sound plan, not only for the New York World's Fair, but for continuing display to persons throughout the country.

Since 1932, says a spokesman for the Economic Foundation, "witch doctors" have been prophesying the death of the free enterprise system.

You can expect the prophecies, and the attacks on the system, to continue, despite the fact that even Russia is now taking a look at capitalism in hope that an incentive here and an incentive there will help cure her economic ills.

To be sure, you can expect no great frontal assault; that would be too much for even the most naive to digest. Instead there will continue the sniping at the system's limbs. It may be fine, the welfare state advocates will say in effect, but each of its component parts is bad and has to go.

This is not to say that actual faults of our way of life or any other should be ignored. We have many agencies charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that they are not ignored.

There is room for fair criticism, too, but we must insist on keeping it fair, lest we chance losing not only the system but the right to criticize.

The hall of free enterprise idea is a good one. It might serve to correct a natural tendency to overstress the faults while taking the myriad virtues for granted.

[From the Palos Regional, Jan. 3, 1963]

GOVERNMENT MANIPULATION OF NEWS

The continual attack of newspapers on the Federal Government's use of the news mediums as "weaponry" is based on the premise that newspapers are not weapons of the Government.

They are independent sources of information and opinion. Their existence is dependent upon the confidence of readers in their ability to report accurately events as they occur. Any attempt to misinform reporters or to withhold news must be regarded as an attempt to undermine the public's confidence in the press and as a threat to its existence.

If the Government is given the right to manipulate news, for whatever purpose, the freedom of the press—the people's right to know what their representatives are doing—will be extinguished.

Although the outcry against the Federal Government was intensified during the Cuban crisis, the shout has been heard since the first American newspaper was published in the 17th century. It has been directed at officials on all levels of government.

At the Federal level, secrecy has become increasingly popular under the guise of executive privilege. Congressional committees, as well as reporters, have been confronted with executive department officials who refused to divulge information. By claiming executive privilege, they have been able to leave unanswered the questions of Congressmen and reporters on the expenditure of billions of dollars. Executive privilege is a term devised by the executive branch and there is no law or court decision which governs its use. In practice its use is almost unlimited.

Executive session is the phrase which arouses the ire of reporters covering government on the local level. It is the euphemism applied to a secret session of a city council or school board. It sometimes is discarded for the pretentious term, "meeting of the committee of the whole."

It is at these sessions that debate on issues is held, a debate which will never reach the public. The decision is made before the public meeting, where the formal vote will be taken.

In theory there should be no reason for secrecy in government. Both the press and the government represent the public. Each has a responsibility toward the other—the government to allow the press to report those decisions and events objectively.

If either ignores its responsibility, one aspect of democracy has been threatened.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 29, 1962]

CUBANS TO HONOR KENNEDY

The title of this editorial is copied from the banner headline over our final edition yesterday. The story related that President Kennedy is to be honored today by the Cuban prisoners recently released. He is to review their brigade and to receive from them, as a mark of their gratitude, the flag they carried into the unfortunate engagement at the Bay of Pigs.

There has been the usual crop of preposterous events in 1962 but we submit this is the prize item.

Of course, you can't blame the freed Cubans for feeling grateful to someone. They spent many long months in semi-starvation in Castro's miserable jails and now are at liberty in the United States. American money ransomed them. Mr. Kennedy has become the symbol to them of their liberation.

Mr. Kennedy is not the symbol but the very man who got them into trouble in the first place. He gave the go-ahead for their descent on the Bay of Pigs and then, at the last minute, withheld the air cover that they needed to secure their beachhead.

What President Kennedy may have done or may not have done to arrange the ransom is in dispute. Mr. Donovan, who unquestionably was the negotiator who closed the deal with Castro, says the President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, had almost nothing to do with it. On the other hand there have been circumstantial accounts of the tax interpretations that were put forward by the Internal Revenue Service and the Attorney General with a view to persuading drug manufacturers and others to come across. Mr. Donovan could hardly have made these commitments without going to one Kennedy or another, and probably both. Did the Kennedys promise to stop feuding with the drug industry? Did they pledge to muzzle Senator KEFAUVER?

There is no need and no justification for secrecy in these matters. Congress should get the facts. While they are about it, the investigating committee might also look into the allegation by one of the Cubans that all the missile sites have not been dismantled. The statement was made to our correspondent in Miami, Jules Dubois, together with a good deal of circumstantial detail.

The Dubois interview raises once again the question whether Castro's refusal to permit inspection of the missile sites from the ground constitutes a menace to American safety. The Russians agreed to a thoroughgoing verification on the spot but Castro has refused to cooperate.

Congress has the means to confirm these charges or disprove them. The sooner the inquiry is begun the better.

Our American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James B. DeMasters, of Overland Park, Kans., is an able commentator on our American heritage. He has written patriotic and informative pieces to help illustrate the significance of much of our history and tradition. In the last session I inserted in the RECORD his article, "The Story on the One Dollar Bill."

Some time ago Mr. DeMasters became aware of the need for a brief interpretation of our American flag. On the basis of research and consultation with authorities on the subject of the flag, Mr. DeMasters has devised an interpretation which, under the leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD:

OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By James B. DeMasters)

The stars are States, united in our Nation.
The stripes represent the Thirteen States.
The Red signifies blood, shed by our brave.
The white denotes virtue, forever our aim.
The blue is our faith—in God we trust.

A Peace Corps Volunteer in Malaya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter written by Miss Margaret M. Balfe, a Peace Corps volunteer in Malaya, to her aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Robert N. Angus, of New York City. Miss Balfe is the daughter of Mrs. Lydia Balfe and the late Fergus A. Balfe of 109 Ridgewood Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

I think her letter is a fascinating description of the kind of work being done by individual Peace Corps members under difficult conditions.

In her letter, which was written in early December, she said that she would like to have some surgical gloves and hemostats for Christmas to use in her work. I think it should be noted that she got her wish. Her request came to the attention of the American Hospital Supply Corp. of Evanston, Ill. The firm immediately dispatched a shipment of surgical gloves, hemostats, and other items for Miss Balfe's use in the village where she serves as a nurse. She went to Malaya last September and was assigned to work in the rural health clinic in the village of Remban, about 200 miles north of Singapore. As she notes in her letter, she is the only American who has ever been in the village of some 350 persons.

Miss Balfe typifies the work of the fine young people who have volunteered for Peace Corps duty abroad. She is, as I am sure most Members of this body know, one of nearly 3,500 Peace Corps volunteers working in 38 countries at this time. She was trained for the Peace Corps at Northern Illinois University in De Kalb, Ill. She is a graduate of the Mercy Hospital School of Nursing in Pittsburgh, and before going to Malaya worked in the Washington, D.C., Hospital Center. Miss Balfe is 24 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring her letter to the attention of my colleagues:

REMBAN, *December 2, 1962.*

DEAR AUNT SHEILA AND BOB: Thank you for your letter and for the birthday card. Probably the only one I'll get this time.

I'm living in the village of Remban about 200 miles north of Singapore. The population is 350, the town is surrounded by lush green padi fields and palm trees. There are buffalos, goats, and chickens everywhere, including right outside my door and occasionally in my living room. In the not too distant horizon (about 10 miles) we can see the hills rising, covered with jungle. After a good rain the haze rises out of those hills like steam, colored here and there by rainbows.

I'm writing this by kerosene lamp (we have electricity but only dim ceiling lights—no outlets) and I cook on a kerosene stove. I'm the first American and the only one to ever live here.

I work in a rural health clinic and know enough Malay now—however poorly—to run the clinic, see all the patients, examine and assess the children as to growth and development, and advise as to diet, etc. We travel 3 days a week to subcenters, really in the "Ulee" just on the edge of the jungle, and set up our little clinic. We see a good bit of malaria and plenty of deficiency diseases—bleeding gums and night blindness. Also most of them have worms. We stop at lunch time and drink tea out of a flask and eat rice off banana leaves (our plates) with our fingers. The other days of the week we visit kampong homes (like the ones you've seen in pictures—up on stilts). The most delightful ones are way, way, back in. We take the van (a gift from UNICEF) as far as we can over dirt roads just wide enough between the padi fields which are full of water. Then we get out and walk along footpaths among the palm trees, fern bushes, and cocoanut trees. There are beautiful streams which we cross (over logs) that are filled with algae (the greenest green you've ever seen) and trees growing out of the water. Here and there, there are waterfalls. All the trees have vegetation growing up and down the bark and vines hanging from them. The women are washing clothes, dressed in sarongs, barefooted. Young boys are fishing in the streams, catching the fish with their hands. There are all kinds of animals running around, including monkeys swinging through the trees. When we reach the house we go up (not in; they're on stilts). It's most difficult to walk on the bamboo poles that make up their floors, while barefoot; they're round and poorly tied together and roll under your feet. Then we sit and just visit, while observing their health status. Then when we go back the next time, we venture to advise.

Last week I delivered a baby in a kampong house—the mother lying on the floor and I in a squat position.

Today I went to a Malay wedding. A grand affair, the like of which one doesn't see often. They carried out age-old rituals that are fast dying out. There were 1,000 guests. I was on the reception committee and wore Malay dress—the only non-Malayan there.

I know this is sketchy, but I hope it will give you some kind of an idea of my world. I feel as though I've been reincarnated into a different planet.

You asked what I would like for Christmas. If you could get your hands on some surgical gloves and hemostats, that would make a most useful gift. Not expensive ones because they will probably get some rough treatment.

Hope this finds you both well and happy.

Love and God bless you.

MARGIE.

Tax Rate Reforms for Growth and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the gentleman from Tennessee, HOWARD H. BAKER, and myself, upon introduction of new bills for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates:

TAX RATE REFORM FOR GROWTH AND JOBS

(Statement of Hon. A. S. HERLONG, Jr., Democrat, of Florida and Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, January 10, 1963)

It is our hope that 1963 will witness the reversal of Federal tax policy which for so long has been stacked against capital formation, economic growth, and job creation. To this end, we have introduced new bills for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates over a 5-year period. The principle that lower tax rates mean more vigor and growth in the private economy is generally recognized by the average citizen. While this principle provides the basic guidance for reforming a rate structure, there are complex fiscal problems and sophisticated economic questions which tax specialists and policymakers, including Members of the Congress, must consider before agreement on specific legislation. To make it useful in policy deliberations, this statement in explanation and support of our bills is more of a technical than a popular exposition.

This legislative program is not designed to apportion tax relief among disputing claimants, but to serve the general public interest in greater growth and more jobs.

It is not designed to stimulate an inherently weak economy, but to release the world's strongest economy from the tax rates which bind it.

The critical test which we believe should be applied to any tax program at this time is not how much economic activity it might stir up in the next year or two, but is how much economic growth it will give us by the end of the decade. We believe our program meets this test; that it would produce maximum results in growth and jobs with a minimum of inflationary danger.

This is the third Congress in which we have proposed such legislation. Since the tax rate drags on the economy became a top public issue last summer, there has been a tremendous surge of interest in the key procedure of our bills; namely, spaced-out rate reform. Many new voices have been raised in support of our bills as a whole. Some others, however, seem to view the rate reform goals which we have set as unrealistic. Assuming that the purpose of tax action is to release the economy for optimum achievement in long-term growth and jobs, and without quibbling over negotiable details, we believe our bills encompass the only workable, realistic and adequate program now in being.

RATE REFORMS

This legislative program places the great emphasis on reduction of the range of graduation of the personal tax. The graduated rates now top out at 91 percent and reach 53 percent at the $18,000 to $20,000 bracket of taxable income.

Over a 5-year period, our bills would reduce the top rate of personal tax to 42 percent, and the 53-percent rate to 24 percent, with other graduated rates lowered in a consistent pattern. The first bracket rate of 20 percent would be lowered to 15 percent, assuring a minimum reduction of 25 percent to every personal taxpayer. The graduated rates from 22 to 34 percent would be reduced to a new range of 16 to 19 percent. The 38-percent rate would come down to 20 percent (see tables I and II).

The rate of withholding on wages and salaries would come down from the present 18 percent to 13.5 percent at the end of 5 years.

The combined top rate of corporate tax would be reduced from 52 to 42 percent over the 5-year period (see table III). The new top rate of 42 percent would still be more than 10 percent higher than the 38-percent top rate of corporate tax between World War II and the Korean war.

Our earlier bills contemplated that all rates would be put into effect as of January 1, with enactment coming in advance of the date for the first scheduled rate cuts. The current bills contemplate enactment

after January, but in time to make the first reduction in the withholding rate effective July 1, 1963.

Because taxpayer returns are on a calendar year basis, the actual 1963 tax rate cuts apply to the entire year, i.e., be effective as of January 1, but the percentage amount is only one-half of that which would have resulted from enactment in advance of January 1. The reduced withholding rate however, from July to December, is the same as it would have been if it had been effective from January 1 to reflect tax cuts for a full year. As regards the average taxpayer whose tax liability is satisfied by withholding, the practical effect is tax reduction beginning as of July 1.

This procedure enables a further reduction in the withholding rate effective January 1, 1964, as the second year's tax rate cuts go into effect on that date. There would be telescoped into these cuts the one-half year's cuts which were not made effective in 1963. Consistently, the corporate cut for 1963 is held to 1 percentage point, with the deferred percentage point added to the annual reduction of 2 percentage points effective January 1, 1964.

TAX SAVINGS, REVENUE EFFECT AND REVENUE GAIN FROM ECONOMIC GROWTH

The average annual tax savings under our bills would be approximately $3.85 billion. These savings relate to the calendar year of tax liability. Of the average annual savings, $2.85 billion would go to individuals and $1 billion to corporations. Over the life of the legislation, the personal tax cuts would provide approximately $14.25 billion in tax savings and the corporate cuts $5 billion, or a total of $19.25 billion. These data are based on 1962 income levels, because it would unnecessarily complicate this statement to assign different values to the tax cuts applying to the separate years.

Of the personal tax savings, about $6.15 billion, or 43.1 percent of the total, would result from the cut to 15 percent of the 20-percent rate now applying to the first bracket of taxable income; $2.1 billion, or 15.1 percent of the total, would result from the cut to 16 percent of the 22-percent graduate rate now applying to the second bracket of taxable income. The remaining tax savings, $6 billion, or 41.8 percent of the total, would result from the cuts in the graduated rates which now range from 26 percent upward, but only 14.3 percent, or $2.04 billion, from reducing the graduated rates now over 50 percent, ranging from 53 to 91 percent at the top. (See table IV.)

While tax savings are computed for calendar or taxpaying years, the Government calculates the effect on revenue of tax cuts to accord with its fiscal year (June 30) budget. The delay of cut in the 1963 withholding rate until July 1 means that the only revenue effect in fiscal year 1963 would come from revised declarations and payments of estimated tax and would involve only a nominal sum. The remaining revenue effect of the legislation would be spread over the 5 fiscal years ending with June 30, 1968. Because of the overlap of fiscal and calendar years, there is some bunching of revenue effect (as contrasted to calendar year tax savings) in fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Because of this bunching, the revenue effect in fiscal 1964 would be $4.81 billion, followed by an additional $4.81 billion in fiscal 1965, or a total for the 2 years of $9.6 billion. The additional revenue effect would be $3.85 billion in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, followed by $1.93 billion in fiscal year 1968, when the total for the 5 years would correspond to the total tax savings of $19.25 billion. None of these data take into account the return flow of revenue from a better performing and growing economy.

There is an alternate procedure for putting into effect tax cuts over a series of years which would eliminate the bunching of revenue effect in the early years. An explanation of how the procedure would work is given in the final section of this statement.

At this point, the critical question is: To what extent would the revenue gain from economic growth compensate for the revenue effects of the tax cuts? Administration reports and statements, and other material which will be presented in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, may throw light on this subject which is not available to us at this writing. However, in addition to laying the basis for an adequate long-term growth rate (in the range of 4 percent as compared with the average of about 2½ percent over recent years), it is generally agreed that a goal of tax rate reform or reduction is to make up for the gap created by the past inadequate performance of the economy (7 to 8 percent of gross national product, or about $40 billion). If the loss were to be made up over a 5-year period, an average growth rate of about 5½ percent would be required.

For purposes of illustration, it is assumed—if our proposed legislation is enacted—that after a growth build-up in the first year, the average growth rate throughout the decade would be in the order of 5 percent annually; and that such a growth rate would produce annual additions to revenues in the order of $4.5 billion—computed on the basis of 1962 income levels. These assumptions are incorporated in the following table, showing the calendar year of tax cuts under our bills, the estimated annual and cumulative revenue effect in the ensuing fiscal years, and the estimated gain in revenue from economic growth—annual and cumulative—for the same fiscal years:

[In billions]

Calendar year	Steps in cuts		Revenue effect, fiscal years ending June 30		Revenue gains from economic growth, years ending June 30	
			Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative
1963	1st	½	(1)	(1)		
1964	2d	1½	$4.81	$4.81	$3.5	$3.5
1965	3d	1	4.81	9.62	4.5	8.0
1966	4th	1	3.85	13.47	4.5	12.5
1967	5th	1	3.85	17.32	4.5	17.0
1968			1.93	19.25	4.5	21.5
1969				19.25	4.5	26.0

[1] Nominal.

In considering the implications of this table, the impact of the rate of growth on Government spending must be kept in mind. In the absence of an average growth rate in the order of 5 percent until the lost growth is recovered, economists generally agree that unemployment will not be brought down to reasonable levels. Contemporary attitudes do not admit of Government inactivity in face of excessive unemployment levels.

The options are clear. Either the Government provides the private economy through tax-rate reform with the opportunity to resolve the chronic unemployment problem, or the Government will compound the fiscal crisis caused by too much spending and too little revenue. The option of tax-rate reform offers promise of a stronger and freer America and in the long term, enough revenue to cover all necessary spending of the Government.

The option of more domestic programs and spending to solve the unemployment problem is a barren one. It inevitably would mean larger deficits carrying with them the possibility of a new, serious inflationary surge.

THE ECONOMICS OF TAX CUTTING

There are strong, respected dissenting voices mingled with what seems to be majority agreement on the economic need for tax cutting. By and large dissent is based on the proposal of tax cuts without expenditure reduction or control. Opposition is inflamed by loose statements attributing virtue to deficits. Question is raised as to the credibility of the general statement that lower taxes mean more revenue.

Unfortunately, among those who give full or qualified support to tax cutting, there is wide disagreement as to what tax rates should be cut, how much, and how tax cuts would bring about desirable economic results. Some place the great emphasis on removal or modification of the deterrent or drag effect of the present steeply graduated rates of personal tax, and the high combined rate of corporate tax, on capital formation, greater growth, and more jobs. Others place the emphasis on using tax-cut dollars for stimulation of private consumption, relying on secondary effects for greater capital formation and long-term growth. Some walk down the middle, giving credence to both approaches.

Our bills are oriented to the release of investment funds and incentives. Nevertheless, our estimate is that only about one-half of the tax savings under our bills would be employed as new capital, with the remaining one-half being used for current consumption spending. We believe it would be a serious economic mistake to enact legislation designed to channel the bulk of the tax savings into current consumption. This is a question which should be resolved on the basis of how tax cutting at different income levels affects the economy, and not on the basis of who gets the direct tax relief. The following explanations may be helpful in this respect.

The release of tax rate deterrents or drags. All taxation takes out of the private economy some income which otherwise would have been transformed into capital for growth. Large amounts of such income are taken by the steeply graduated rates of personal tax, and the excessive top rate of corporate tax. These rates also reduce the incentives of individuals to earn additional income, and to invest in risk-taking ventures, and the incentives of business to expand existing plant and the production of existing products and services, to add new products and services, and to employ more people.

In short, it is these uneconomic tax rates which restrict economic growth, limit the number of new jobs, and provide too little revenue for the support of government. Removal or modification of these tax rate deterrents or drags not only would be good business for the country; it also would be good business for the government. A chronically, artifically repressed economy simply cannot be relied upon to provide the revenues to meet the needs of contemporary government.

Tax cutting to stimulate consumption. There is a significant contrast between tax rate reform for the purpose of removing tax rate drags and disincentives, and the conception of tax cutting as a form of government help or aid designed to stimulate the economy. Tax cutting which would increase private consumption without corresponding reduction in government spending would fall in the latter category.

When the Government takes and spends income which otherwise would have been used for private consumption, there is no direct effect on the rate of economic activity or of economic growth. The Government, including its employees and the beneficiaries of its programs, simply spends more, and unsubsidized private citizens spend less. Conversely, when the Government reduces its spending and its taxes bearing on consumption in equal amount, private citizens spend more while the Government, and its employees and beneficiaries, spend less. There

is no direct effect on the rate of economic activity.

Thus, the stimulation of private consumption through tax cutting comes about only when the cutting is not matched by a comparable reduction in Government expenditures. In this situation, tax cutting creates $2 of income where only $1 existed before, because in effect, the Government borrows and spends an amount equivalent to the tax cuts.

An increase of private consumption through this means will add to the current rate of economic activity, and provide some return revenue flow. It is questionable, however, whether this process would have much significance for economic growth. The improvement in business volume would result in some increase in profits, and some increase in savings from personal incomes. As a general proposition, however, it would seem grossly inefficient to attempt to influence investment for growth and jobs in this roundabout manner. For any given number of tax reduction dollars, it is certain that a much greater result would be achieved by cutting the steeply graduated personal tax rates and the top corporate rate.

Moreover, whatever the immediate effect on private consumption of tax cuts financed by deficits, there would be no effect whatsoever as regards either total economic activity or economic growth when and if the budget is brought into balance. From that time on, the process would be substitution of private consumption, in itself highly desirable, for consumption brought about by government spending. It seems like an economic contradiction therefore to associate tax cutting to stimulate private consumption with long-term economic growth and job creation.

EASIER TAXES VERSUS TIGHTER MONEY AND CREDIT

In current discussions on tax cutting to increase private consumption, it is sometimes stated or implied that there may have to be a tightening up of the use of money and credit in the private economy to prevent the tax cuts from having inflationary effect.

Such a prospect seems wholly inconsistent with the goal of improved long-term growth and job creation. The inadequate growth of recent years has been accompanied by inadequate expansion in private use of money and credit. More growth inevitably will increase the private demand for money and credit. In fact, a fundamental purpose of tax rate reform is to improve the business climate, which in and of itself would create greater private demand for money and credit. It would be a most unfortunate thing if this demand went unsatisfied because too much tax cutting to increase private consumption had built up potential inflationary pressures.

A program of rate reform oriented to releasing capital and incentives for growth and making healthy but not excessive tax cuts over a number of years, would provide the best set of conditions for a much-needed expansion of money and credit without inflationary consequences. By contrast, any tax cutting program involving substantial revenue effect, and heavily oriented to the increase of private consumption instead of releasing savings for investment and growth, would carry grave danger of a return to tight control on the use of money and credit in the private economy.

HOW MUCH TAX CUTTING?

We believe our bills incorporate a program which is balanced from the standpoint of the fiscal realities and of the economic goals of tax rate reform. Economists generally agree that the key factor in the lag in growth and employment over the past 5 years has been the failure of business investment spending to expand. As set forth in the statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 6, 1962, pages A7377–A7378, business expenditures for plant and equipment, in constant 1961 dollars, are some $12 billion short of the level which would have been achieved under an average annual growth rate of 4 percent since 1951. We assume that about one-half of the tax savings under our bills, or $9 to $10 billion, would be saved and invested, instead of being used for current consumption. This would be on the short side of the indicated deficiency in business capital spending. Moreover, as new family formation moves up sharply after the mid-1960's, a considerable volume of new savings will be channeled into residential buildings, thus reducing the new savings available for use in business expansion. An offsetting factor, however, will be the business savings released by the depreciation reforms put into effect by the administration in 1962, and the investment tax credit enacted as part of the Revenue Act of 1962—the two together valued by the administration at approximately $2.5 billion annually. To some extent these savings are nullified by provisions of the 1962 act which directly or indirectly reduce business or personal savings or adversely affect incentives. Relating all of these factors, it would be difficult to see how anyone could argue that our bills would release more income for capital formation, residential and business, than will be needed in the 1960's and beyond.

Nevertheless, our program involves a substantially larger total of tax cuts, over its proposed legislative life, than is contemplated by other programs under contemporary discussion. There is a tendency in many quarters to rely on the simple principle that tax cutting means more business and more revenues in the short future without facing up to the question of what is needed to turn our economy loose for optimum performance over the long term.

As a frame of reference in regard to size of tax cuts, it may be well to recall the aggregate tax reductions of 1954 which—at income levels then existing—involved tax savings estimated at about $7.5 billion. Except for repeal of the Korean war excess profits tax, and the inauguration of the 4-percent dividend credit and $50 exclusion, the 1954 cuts were not especially oriented toward capital formation and economic growth. The depreciation reforms provided in the 1954 act were of major importance, but in terms of depreciation speedup they did not provide for major key industries as much relief as had been available under the Korean war rapid amortization provision.

After the 1954 reductions, business activity expanded sharply in 1955 and 1956, with revenues increasing to the point of transforming deficits of $3.1 billion in fiscal 1954 and $4.2 billion in fiscal 1955 into surpluses of $1.6 billion in both fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Thereafter, however, the economy turned downward and into the period of too slow growth and too much chronic unemployment resulting in repetitive Federal deficits.

To us, the moral of this experience is that the tax rate reform necessary to pull down the blocks to adequate long-term growth and jobs must be more sweeping than other tax cuts in our history.

The economy is still laboring under a tax rate philosophy and structure which was conceived in the gloom of the 1930 depression and implemented by the revenue requirements of World War II and subsequent years. Only a sweeping reform of rates can reverse this philosophy and change the tax structure so that capital formation and business and human incentives can play their full role in creating a stronger and more bountiful economy.

If further evidence is needed in support of a program cutting and reforming taxes as deeply as our bills would, it is provided by the fact that the 1954 tax cuts, related to 1962 income levels, would have a current value in the order of $12 billion. If we are to serve the objectives of growth and employment to which all groups and persons in our Nation are committed, it seems apparent that a much larger tax cutting package, much better distributed from the standpoint of capital formation, must be enacted in 1963.

After substantial tax cuts have been enacted in 1963, it is not likely that there will be further significant tax cutting in this decade or at least before the end of it. This means that if the purposes of growth and jobs in this decade are to be served by tax rate reform, the 1963 legislation must do the job.

Any question of doubt as to distribution of tax cuts, or as to total amount, should be resolved on the side of turning the economy loose from capital incentive destroying tax rates.

Looking ahead for a number of years, the prospect for further tax cutting will certainly depend on how fast the economy grows, unless there is a real easing of the cold war. From this benchmark, what is done now in cutting the growth-retarding rates will determine whether there can be future tax cuts to serve any purpose. By contrast, emphasis now on cutting taxes to stimulate consumption would leave little prospect of further tax cutting for any purpose in the foreseeable future.

THE MOST CRITICAL TAX RATES

While we are convinced of the economic necessity for enactment of legislation incorporating at least the full sweep of rate reform of our bills, we cannot ignore the fact of current proposals involving much smaller total tax cuts. In considering these less sweeping programs, we believe it important that the priorities in terms of long-range growth and jobs be recognized.

As against the potential for growth of a fully free economy, we believe that the steeply graduated rates of personal tax, as much through the middle brackets as beyond, constitute the most inhibiting and retarding force. Here are the rates which strike most directly at incentives, both business and personal. These steeply climbing rates discourage risk-taking, choke off venture capital at its source, curtail business starts and expansion, and thus prevent the creation of new jobs. They are the bane of small business and of the man on the ladder. In placing stiff penalties on hard work and long hours, such rates are a contradiction of the compensation principle of extra reward for extra effort and achievement.

It is these baneful effects of graduation which led us to the conclusion that, under a reformed tax rate structure, no unincorporated business or other individual should be required to pay a higher rate of tax than a corporation. Proposals for higher top rates of tax inevitably carry with them higher rates through the critical middle brackets. Similar top rates of personal tax would—

1. Give the unincorporated business roughly the same opportunity as a corporation to retain earnings for growth.

2. Relieve greatly the burden of double taxation on corporate income which is paid out in dividends.

3. Minimize the tax penalty on hard work, long hours, and achievement.

4. Maximize the release of incentives for venturesome investment, the creation of new products and services, the starting of new businesses, and the expansion of old.

Despite these objectives which would so well serve the general public interest, we recognize there is a reluctance to release from tax as much income of wealthy people as would result from our bills. We do not share this reluctance, because similar top

rates of tax would mean the most in growth and jobs in the future. However, we recognize the difference in economic consequences to be expected from maximum moderation in rates which may be generally associated with the earned income potential of unincorporated business and other personal endeavor as compared with very large incomes derived from large aggregations of wealth. The greatest tragedy of our present tax rate structure is that those with high earned income potential, on whom we depend the most for economic building for the future, have so little opportunity to accumulate savings out of their current incomes. Our bills would release incentives to men and women with the greatest capacity for personal contribution to the Nation's economic future, and also the capital which would free them to make the maximum contribution. For a free, dynamic economy, these are inseparable attributes.

A top personal tax rate similar to the top corporate tax rate would be a small concession to make in order to turn our high-powered people loose to lead the way to high-level growth. However, too much damage would not be done as regards the "earned income" group if one or two higher rates of tax were set at very high income levels. Such higher rates of tax could not be justified at any income levels from the economic standpoint, but they would not be as growth-retarding as such rates applied within the existing taxable income brackets. Above all, however, the No. 1 priority in tax rate reform is to minimize the tax restraint on the energetic, creative, and far-sighted people who must accumulate their capital out of current income, and who inevitably would use the capital so accumulated—plus savings of others in much greater amount—to lead the way in building for the Nation's future.

Below the priority which should be given in any tax legislation to reforming the middle-through-high graduated rates of tax, we believe that the following priorities—in serving the objective of growth and jobs—should be recognized:

Second priority—lower graduated rates.

Third priority—top 5 percentage points of corporate tax.

Fourth priority—next 5 percentage points of corporate tax.

Fifth priority—base rate of personal tax.

We are hopeful that this statement of priorities will influence those who have espoused tax cutting programs less sweeping than the rate reforms of our bills to reconsider their stand. Actually, substantial reduction in the first rate of personal tax can be afforded at this time only if it is part of a rate reform program promising increase in growth and income totals which could be expected to so expand the tax base as to lead to a balanced budget in the not too distant future. We believe that the first rate should be reduced as provided in our bills, it is obvious that reduction in this area should not be traded against the rate reforms which would assure dynamic growth over the years ahead.

RATE REFORM VERSUS RATE REDUCTION

Although the general pattern of spaced-out rate reform provided in our bills is well known, the significance of our use of the words rate reform as contrasted to the words rate reduction may not be. The effects of the personal tax in restricting economic growth and employment result largely from steeply graduated rates and not from the basic rate. Our bills are designed to drastically reduce the range of graduation, thus internally changing or reforming the rates in relation to each other. In a lesser sense, the corporate tax cuts provided in our bills would constitute reform, in changing the relation of the normal and surtax rates to each other.

Personal tax rate reform is fiscally feasible because the entire graduated superstructure provides only about 15 percent of the revenue from the tax, or $6.7 billion out of a total of $45.3 billion. The remaining 85 percent, or $38.6 billion, comes from the basic 20 percent rate on the first bracket of taxable income and the first 20 percentage points of all the graduated rates. The lack of revenue productivity of the present graduation is further indicated by the fact that a flat rate of 22.4 percent would produce as much revenue as the present rates.

In contrast with rate reform, rate reduction has no particular implication in regard to the pattern of reduction. However, for comparative purposes it will be assumed here that rate reduction means a uniform percentage cut in rates, generally known as an across-the-board cut.

A valid question is: How much reduction in the most critical graduated rates, and how much potential high-velocity venture capital, would be lost if an across-the-board or uniform cut were substituted for reform of rates as provided in our bills?

The personal tax savings under our bills of $14.25 billion equal 31.4 percent of revenue from the tax, based on 1962 income levels. If there should be a uniform cut of 31.4 percent in all rates, the rate cuts in the middle-through-higher brackets would be substantially less than under rate reform, without very significant increase in the first bracket cut. For example, there would be a loss of 20.4 percentage points in rate reduction as regards the present top rate of 91 percent, and a top loss of 23.7 percentage points as regards the present 87 percent rate. But there would be a gain of only 1.3 percentage points of reduction in the first bracket rate. In addition, the present 22 percent first graduated rate would be reduced more, by 9 percentage points, under a uniform cut as compared with rate reform. All higher graduated rates would be reduced more under rate reform.

In terms of tax savings, the substitution of a 31.4 percent uniform cut for the rate reforms provided in our bills would transfer about $1.9 billion from the taxable income brackets now carrying graduated rates from 26 percent upwards to the first two brackets. The rate reductions and tax savings effects from a uniform cut, as compared with rate reform, are set forth below for the same tax rate groupings which appear at the bottom of table IV:

Present rates	New rates			Tax savings (millions)			
	Rate reform	Uniform cut	Point differences	Rate reform	Uniform cut	Differences	
Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Percent*
20	15	13.7	−1.3	6,145	7,729	1,584	+25.6
22	16	15.1	−.9	2,416	2,474	328	+15.1
26–34	17–19	17.8–23.3	+.8–4.3	2,351	1,945	406	−17.4
38–50	20–23	26.1–34.3	+6.1–11.3	1,567	967	600	−38.4
53–91	24–42	36.4–62.4	[1] +12.4–20.4	2,039	1,133	906	−44.5
Total				14,248	14,248		

[1] The percentage point differences regarding present rates from 78 to 90 percent would be greater than 20.4.

In relation to consumption totals, $1.9 billion in tax savings has little significance for the present or the future.

But, $1.9 billion of tax savings used as "lead" money—the dynamic, venture capital which pulls in other savings—would provide an ever increasing return in growth and jobs.

Some of the $1.9 billion, if diverted to tax relief in the low taxable brackets, would be saved and invested. Some of it, if granted as tax relief in the middle-through-high brackets, would be used for current consumption.

On balance, however, distributing the $1.9 billion through tax rate reform would reflect a decision to maximize economic growth and new job opportunities. To distribute it through a uniform cut would reflect a decision to maximize current economic activity at the expense of long-term growth and jobs.

POSTPONEMENT AND THE TAX CLIMATE

Unfortunately, widespread recognition of the need for tax rate reform did not come until lagging growth and revenue, and too much domestic spending, had put the budget in the red by some $8 billion. Our military and space commitments require further increase in spending in these areas during the next fiscal year.

In our earlier bills, a provision required postponement of prescheduled rate reductions, after the first reduction, when the budget was out of balance. The provision included procedure by use of which Congress could limit postponements to 6 months without disturbing future reductions. However, if the postponement procedure were used fully, it would have meant that the reductions would have been spread out over 9 instead of 5 years.

This postponement provision was developed at a time when inflationary pressures were very great, when the budget was in balance, and when the twin problems of a lagging rate of economic growth and chronic unemployment, though foreseeable, had not yet emerged. The problem now is how to adapt this provision in light of current and prospective conditions.

In forward scheduling tax cuts, a major objective is to improve the business climate and the public psychology, creating optimism for the future; to induce forward business planning in anticipation of steady relief from growth-retarding income tax rates. Such an environment inevitably would be accompanied by greater private use of money and credit, multiplying the benefits of the tax cuts in the early years. Over the long pull, of course, money and credit serve only as the lubricant of the economic system. The economy as a whole can prosper and grow without inflation only as current savings of business and individuals are adequate to the task. But, until the economy has recouped the ground lost during the inadequate growth of the past 5 years, expansion in private use of money and credit must be greater than would be appropriate thereafter. If such expansion does not take place in the private sector of the economy, we may be sure that it will take place through greater Federal spending and larger deficits.

To serve the purpose of expenditure control, without thwarting the objective of permitting forward planning on the basis of regularly scheduled lower tax rates, we have made two changes in the postponement provision:

The first change is to make postponement effective only as regards the rate cuts scheduled for the third and later years under our bills, as contrasted to the second and later years under earlier versions of our bills.

The second change is to add to the test of budget unbalance a new test, in regard to

expenditure control. Postponement would be applied only if the budget is out of balance and if what we call subordinate expenditures are higher in the current fiscal year than in the preceding year. Subordinate expenditures are defined as all expenditures of the Government except those related to military preparedness, space research and technology, and interest on the public debt. As a general positive description, subordinate expenditures cover those generally known as domestic spending programs and foreign economic assistance.

We believe that this addition to the postponement procedure makes our program entirely realistic, not just for enactment, but for expected effectuation over the 5 years. We are convinced that the executive branch and the Congress working in harmony can control the total of domestic spending without harm to any vital public program or segment of the public. Groups who are the beneficiaries of separate Federal spending programs also share the common general public interest in greater economic growth and economic strength. Actually, the unemployed and the underemployed, and the sections of the country which lag behind national economic achievements, will benefit the most from the release of capital and incentives under our bills. It makes much more human, as well as economic sense, to let the private economy provide new and greater opportunities to these people and sections of the country than to rely further on "dole-type" spending programs.

NEW WORKERS AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

In addition to the problem of the currently underemployed and unemployed, during the remainder of the 1960's there will be an accelerating buildup in our working force—or of the number of young people who will need and want work, and who will expect good work opportunities. Over recent years, the "labor force" as it is technically known has increased by an average of only about 800,000 annually. Over the last 5 years of this decade, the average increase is expected to reach close to 1.5 million annually.

The excessive use of tax cutting at this time to increase consumption of people now fully employed is not going to solve the problem of good jobs for these new workers who are just around the corner in point of time. It will take a rebirth of business and individual incentives, and tremendous amounts of new capital, to provide those jobs.

EXPANSION OF THE TAX BASE

Our bills do not contemplate incorporation therein of structural tax reforms associated with base broadening. We believe that the objectives of tax rate reform are too important to be submerged and obscured, and further delayed, by time-consuming discussion over what if any provisions of the tax law should be eliminated, modified, or revised. Moreover, whatever may be the merit of individual reforms or the overall case for structural reform of the tax law, we do not believe that this is a significantly productive route to broadening the base for taxation. On any extensive basis, such reform inevitably would reduce the potential of business and private savings, and thus tend to offset the release of incentives and capital formation provided by rate reform.

This is not to deny the need for base broadening. Aside from the system of exemptions, credits, exclusions, and deductions of general value to all taxpayers, the too small tax base of the current period is a product of inadequate growth over the past 5 years. Stated differently, if the economy had grown adequately over the past 5 years, the Federal tax base would be large enough to support all necessary spending out of current revenue. Looking ahead, the greatest opportunity for expansion of the tax base is found not in structural reform but in the enlargement of the economy which provides the tax base.

As a specific illustration, if the economy should not grow any more rapidly on the average over the remainder of this decade than it has over the past 5 years, the personal tax base under the law as it now stands would only be about $259 billion in 1970, as compared to about $193 billion in 1962. On the other hand, if the economy should grow at an average of 5 percent over the years ahead, the personal tax base in 1970 would be about $337 billion. An $80 billion addition to the personal tax base would be much greater than could be expected from any impact on base broadening of structural tax reform.

THE BOUNTY FROM GREATER GROWTH

The return from greater growth (5 percent as compared with the recent average of 2½ percent) over the remainder of this decade is indicated for gross national product, personal income, and personal income per capita, in table V, attached hereto. Regardless of judgment as to whether such goals will be achieved, we believe the Government has the obligation to adjust its policies to provide the best promise of achievement. Experience provides ample documentation that more Government spending will hurt rather than help accomplish such goals. In our opinion, a "mixed" policy of somewhat more spending, and somewhat less taxing, would offer little promise of much improvement over recent history. We believe the time is here when the Government must turn the private economy loose from an oppressive tax rate structure; to let it develop its own head of steam and find out where it will take us. Halfway measures at the best can be expected to produce no more than halfway results. At the worst, they could keep the door open to return to the barren philosophy of greater growth in Government spending. The opportunity is present for a national decision for greater growth in the private economy over more growth in Federal spending (except as may be required for our military security and space effort). A positive declaration that our Nation is committed to restoring the full vitality and potential of our free economy, and the corroboration of that commitment through greater growth starting in 1963, could soon pave the way to forcing the Communist world to recognize that it had better collaborate in reducing the burden of military preparation so that it too can do more toward improving the everyday life of its citizens.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR SPACING OUT RATE REFORMS

If the one-half year's personal tax cut for 1963 provided in our bills were followed by only a one-half year cut as of January 1964, there would be no bunching of revenue effect in fiscal year 1964. Specifically, the revenue effect would be $2.85 billion compared with $4.31 billion under our bills as drafted.

If this process were repeated over 5 years—reduction in the withholding rate as of July 1 for a one-half year's tax cut, followed by another automatic one-half year's cut as of next January 1—there would be equal revenue effect, $2.85 billion, in each of the 5 fiscal years. Combined with a 2 percentage point cut in the top corporate rate each calendar year, the annual revenue effect in each fiscal year would be $3.85 billion.

This procedure might have further attraction as regards the working of a postponement provision. It would permit the provision to become an inherent part of the President's budget submitted to Congress each January covering the next fiscal year. The provision would, if the postponement test required, hold in abeyance the next sequence of tax cuts beginning with reduction in the withholding rate on July 1 for the first half year's cut and completed by another half year's cut on January 1 following. The Congress could put the sequence back into effect if it so decided in time to reduce the withholding rate on July 1. If Congress failed to act, the sequence would be postponed 1 year, thus moving ahead all following sequences provided in the legislation. The corporate tax cuts for the current calendar year would be held in abeyance, and then put back into effect or postponed for 1 year, by the same series of events.

TABLE I.—*Reform of individual tax rates*

Taxable income bracket [1] (thousands)	Present rates	Original rates Jan. 1, 1963	Amended actual rates Jan. 1, 1963	Jan. 1, 1964	Jan. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	Jan. 1, 1967
$0 to $2	20	19.0	19.5	18.0	17.0	16.0	15
$2 to $4	22	20.5	21.25	19.5	18.5	17.5	16
$4 to $6	26	24.5	25.25	23.0	21.5	20.0	17
$6 to $8	30	28.0	29	26.0	24.0	21.0	18
$8 to $10	34	31.0	32.5	28.0	25.0	22.0	19
$10 to $12	38	35.0	36.5	32.0	28.0	24.0	20
$12 to $14	43	39.0	41	35.0	31.0	26.0	21
$14 to $16	47	42.0	44.5	37.0	32.0	27.0	22
$16 to $18	50	45.0	47.5	40.0	35.0	29.0	23
$18 to $20	53	48.0	50.5	42.0	36.0	30.0	24
$20 to $22	56	50.0	53	44.0	38.0	32.0	25
$22 to $26	59	53.0	56	47.0	40.0	33.0	26
$26 to $32	62	55.0	58.5	48.0	41.0	34.0	27
$32 to $38	65	58.0	61.5	51.0	43.0	36.0	28
$38 to $44	69	61.0	65.0	53.0	45.0	37.0	29
$44 to $50	72	64.0	68.0	56.0	47.0	38.0	30
$50 to $60	75	66.0	70.5	57.0	48.0	39.0	31
$60 to $70	78	69.0	73.5	60.0	51.0	40.0	32
$70 to $80	81	71.0	76.0	62.0	52.0	41.0	33
$80 to $90	84	74.0	79.0	64.0	54.0	44.0	34
$90 to $100	87	76.0	82.0	66.0	56.0	46.0	36
$100 to $150	89	78.0	83.5	68.0	58.0	48.0	38
$150 to $200	90	80.0	85.0	70.0	60.0	50.0	40
$200 and over	91	82.0	86.5	72.0	62.0	52.0	42

[1] After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, married persons filing separate returns, and "split income" of husbands and wives filing joint returns.

TABLE II.—*Tax computation table—Individuals*

If the taxable income [1] is: Not over $2,000		The tax			
		Is: Present Law 20% of the taxable income		Would be: Year 1967 15% of the taxable income	
Over	*But not over*	*Of excess over*		*Of excess over*	
$2,000	$4,000	$400 plus 22%	$2,000	$300 plus 16%	$2,000
$4,000	$6,000	$840 plus 26%	4,000	$620 plus 17%	4,000
$6,000	$8,000	$1,360 plus 30%	6,000	$960 plus 18%	6,000
$8,000	$10,000	$1,960 plus 34%	8,000	$1,320 plus 19%	8,000
$10,000	$12,000	$2,640 plus 38%	10,000	$1,700 plus 20%	10,000
$12,000	$14,000	$3,400 plus 43%	12,000	$2,100 plus 21%	12,000
$14,000	$16,000	$4,260 plus 47%	14,000	$2,520 plus 22%	14,000
$16,000	$18,000	$5,200 plus 50%	16,000	$2,960 plus 23%	16,000
$18,000	$20,000	$6,200 plus 53%	18,000	$3,420 plus 24%	18,000
$20,000	$22,000	$7,260 plus 56%	20,000	$3,900 plus 25%	20,000
$22,000	$26,000	$8,380 plus 59%	22,000	$4,400 plus 26%	22,000
$26,000	$32,000	$10,740 plus 62%	26,000	$5,440 plus 27%	26,000
$32,000	$38,000	$14,460 plus 65%	32,000	$7,060 plus 28%	32,000
$38,000	$44,000	$18,360 plus 69%	38,000	$8,740 plus 29%	38,000
$44,000	$50,000	$22,500 plus 72%	44,000	$10,480 plus 30%	44,000
$50,000	$60,000	$26,820 plus 75%	50,000	$12,280 plus 31%	50,000
$60,000	$70,000	$34,320 plus 78%	60,000	$15,380 plus 32%	60,000
$70,000	$80,000	$42,120 plus 81%	70,000	$18,580 plus 33%	70,000
$80,000	$90,000	$50,220 plus 84%	80,000	$21,880 plus 34%	80,000
$90,000	$100,000	$58,620 plus 87%	90,000	$25,280 plus 36%	90,000
$100,000	$150,000	$67,320 plus 89%	100,000	$28,880 plus 38%	100,000
$150,000	$200,000	$111,820 plus 90%	150,000	$47,880 plus 40%	150,000
$200,000 and over		$156,820 plus 91%	200,000	$67,880 plus 42%	200,000

[1] After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, and married persons filing separate returns. Joint return taxpayers can find their tax savings by taking the tax on half their taxable income and multiplying by 2.

TABLE III.—*Corporate tax rate reductions*

	Present rates	Jan. 1, 1963	Jan. 1, 1964	Jan. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	Jan. 1, 1967
Normal tax [1]	30	29	26	24	23	21
Surtax [2]	22	22	22	22	21	21
Combined tax rate [1]	52	51	48	46	44	42

[1] On all net income.
[2] On net income exceeding $25,000.

TABLE IV

TAX SAVINGS BY TAXABLE BRACKETS BASED ON 1962 INCOME LEVELS

Taxable income brackets	Taxable income	Present rates	Tax under present rates	Rates under Herlong-Baker end of 5 years	Tax under Herlong Baker rates	Tax savings	Tax saving percent of total savings
	Millions	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Millions*	
0 to $2,000	$122,889	20	$24,578	15	$18,433	$6,145	43.1
$2,000 to $4,000	35,759	22	7,867	16	5,721	2,146	15.1
$4,000 to $6,000	12,262	26	3,188	17	2,085	1,103	7.7
$6,000 to $8,000	5,976	30	1,793	18	1,076	717	5.0
$8,000 to $10,000	3,545	34	1,205	19	674	531	3.7
$10,000 to $12,000	2,549	38	969	20	510	459	3.2
$12,000 to $14,000	1,952	43	839	21	410	429	3.0
$14,000 to $16,000	1,470	47	691	22	323	368	2.6
$16,000 to $18,000	1,151	50	576	23	265	311	2.2
$18,000 to $20,000	784	53	416	24	188	228	1.6
$20,000 to $22,000	627	56	351	25	157	194	1.4
$22,000 to $26,000	935	59	552	26	243	309	2.2
$26,000 to $32,000	913	62	566	27	247	319	2.2
$32,000 to $38,000	560	65	364	28	157	207	1.5
$38,000 to $44,000	361	69	249	29	105	144	1.0
$44,000 to $50,000	255	72	184	30	76	108	.8
$50,000 to $60,000	282	75	212	31	87	125	.9
$60,000 to $70,000	164	78	128	32	52	76	.5
$70,000 to $80,000	116	81	94	33	38	56	.4
$80,000 to $90,000	79	84	66	34	27	39	.3
$90,000 to $100,000	55	87	48	36	20	28	.2
$100,000 to $150,000	152	89	135	38	58	77	.5
$150,000 to $200,000	67	90	60	40	27	33	.2
$200,000 and over	196	91	178	42	82	96	.7
Total	193,100		45,309		31,061	14,248	100.0

TABLE IV—Continued

TAX SAVINGS BY TAX RATE GROUPS

Taxable income brackets	Present rates	Herlong-Baker rates	Tax savings	Percent of total
	Percent	*Percent*	*Millions*	
$18,000 to $200,000 and over	53–91	24–42	$2,039	14.3
$10,000 to $18,000	38–50	20–23	1,567	11.0
$4,000 to $10,000	26–34	17–19	2,351	16.5
$2,000 to $4,000	22	16	2,146	15.1
0 to $2,000	20	15	6,145	43.1

TABLE V

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

[In billions of dollars]

	Calendar years							
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
From 5-percent growth	575	604	634	665	699	734	770	809
From 2½-percent growth	568	582	597	612	627	643	659	675
Additional GNP	7	22	37	53	72	91	111	134
Cumulative additional GNP	7	29	66	119	191	282	393	527

PERSONAL INCOME

[In billions of dollars]

From 5-percent growth	452	475	499	524	550	577	606	637
From 2½-percent growth	447	458	470	481	493	506	518	531
Additional personal income	5	17	29	43	57	71	88	106
Cumulative additional personal income	5	22	51	94	151	222	310	416

PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

[Dollars]

From 5-percent growth	2,385	2,468	2,552	2,638	2,725	2,815	2,909	3,012
From 2½-percent growth	2,359	2,379	2,404	2,422	2,443	2,468	2,487	2,511
Additional personal income per capita	26	89	148	216	282	347	422	501
Cumulative additional personal income per capita	26	115	263	479	761	1,108	1,530	2,031

My Brother Made a Mistake—Not Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry J. Taylor:

MY BROTHER MADE A MISTAKE—NOT AGAIN?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The yellow mountain of morphine Premier Castro demanded for his prisoner ransom deal dealt our fine Narcotics Bureau heroes an unspoken reverse.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's Crime Committee long ago identified Cuba as an international hub in the fiendish traffic. Much of this free delivery to Castro, highest quality, will come right smack back to the dope peddlers in the United States.

Shortly before I left Switzerland our American Embassy, in cooperation with the superb Swiss police, impounded more than $2 million in morphine in transit, carried in a single suitcase. This is how morphine money multiplies, in the cut form Castro will cut it.

The whole ransom affair typifies Washington's news manipulation, culminating even in the President's Miami eulogy to the survivors themselves on December 29. Speaking there, not only words were used as weaponry, hearts were used as well.

President Kennedy repeatedly stated. "This is being done by a private committee," while our Government was as much in it as in the Bay of Pigs affair itself. This is now a secret everybody knows.

But inside his office the determined Attorney General had—from the beginning—what he called the wish list from Castro.

The Cuban drew up a crazy compilation. In totaling it to $53 million he used mostly obsolete drug house catalogs. He specified some drugs unobtainable here, many scientifically obsolete, and even dreamed up others that never existed. His morphine feature, however, was the final clincher Castro demanded in his American blackmail. The Attorney General's opening explanation in soliciting each contribution was: "My brother made a mistake."

Why didn't our public servants simply perform on the straightforward basis required by their official position?

Congress specifically prohibited the use of taxpayers' money for ransom during the tractors-for-prisoners uproar.

To date the administration has even refused a list of items, quantities, and costs, making all assessment by our public impossible. Congress should at least expose the tax gimmicks and inside bait authorized overnight after the Attorney General's reported, "Fella, get busy," word to Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, by a Government which is about to challenge every citizen's nickel and Christmas cigar.

Moreover, impeccable Cuban underground sources as close to Castro as his beard (for Castro's inner circle has been well penetrated) insist Castro's real win was not the $53 million ransom at all. His eye was entirely on a reaffirmation of a noninvasion pledge.

Knowing negotiator James B. Donovan spoke for President Kennedy and his brother, Castro required and received this pledge as the basic requirment before allowing the invasion prisoners to leave. Castro asked Donovan, "What if President Kennedy repudiates you?" Donovan replied, "He won't.".

In short, Castro has achieved his ambition as the Communist leader of Latin America under a U.S. guarantee not to molest, or permit any neighbor to molest, Red Cuba's sovereignty.

This reaffirmed President Kennedy's guarantee through U.N. Secretary General U Thant if the missiles were removed, still never admitted by Washington but extracted from the secret U.N. minutes of the initial U Thant-Castro meeting in Havana which U Thant's office confirmed to me as accurate.

Nevertheless, the news manipulation continues unabashed. What did the President pledge in Miami, December 29, that brought the vast, tear-ladened cheers from the very hearts and souls of the Cuban refugees? Accepting the banner of the Bay of Pigs survivors, Mr. Kennedy stated, "I can assure you this flag will be returned to your brigade in a free Cuba." How?

The blockade has been lifted, the dependents sent back to Guantanamo, and, to top it off, the Justice Department is in the process of arresting freedom fighters bound for Cuba for sabotage. The Attorney General claims the mere attempt violates our neutrality act. In addition, all suspected freedom fighters' boats, and even many of their personal automobiles, are being impounded in Florida.

First our President, then his brother, gave the nonmolestation guarantee to Castro himself, as well as to Khrushchev. That's the fact; all the rest, including the Miami speech, belongs to the moon and to the realm of manipulated news.

From the San Francisco Chronicle, Columns by Arthur Hoppe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, to bring the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers up to date on the columns written by Arthur Hoppe in the San Francisco Chronicle, I insert, under unanimous consent, his articles which appeared on December 5, 6, 7, and 12, 1962:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 5, 1962]

NO NUDES IS BAD NUDES

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We're going to have a $30 million National Cultural Center in Washington. Thanks to the warm support of Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy, Mr. and Mrs. Eisenhower, and all the little defense contractors everywhere. If they know what's good for them. I'm against it.

I know Mr. Kennedy says we need one because of the Russians. "Of course, we do not have to point to them to indicate the importance of this work," he said, "but it is of significance that they have made a major effort in this field." So I'm against it.

Look where it got the Russians. Mr. Khrushchev says let's have a little freedom of expression around here. And all the artists happily dash off to splatter up their canvases. Mr. Khrushchev views the results and blows his stack. "Such pictures," he snorts. "You cannot tell if they have been painted by a man or have been daubed by the tail of a donkey."

And the artists, says Moscow radio, warmly thanked Mr. Khrushchev for his "valuable advice and critical comments." Honest.

Now I know, as Mr. Kennedy implies, that we've got to have more national culture than the Russians to win the cold war. But, frankly, I don't think we've got the right kind of artists.

Take J. Artimedes Springbourne, a neo-abstract Dadaist with inner cubistic leanings. He is just proudly hanging his latest work, "Some Second Thoughts on the Aspirations of Man," in our new National Cultural Center. And along comes Senator Hogfriar (Snappin' Sam) Headbone on his annual inspection of our national culture.

"What's that, son?" says the Senator suspiciously. "I think you got it upside down."

"I can't tell you," says Mr. Springbourne, blushing with pleasure as he tries inverting his painting, "how much I appreciate your valuable advice."

"Still don't look like national culture to me, boy," says the Senator, cocking his head. "Looks more like a fried egg painted by the hind quarters of an old drunken nanny goat. With the d.t.'s. And, anyway, the yolk's busted."

"I wish to thank you warmly for your most constructive critical comments," cries Mr. Springbourne happily as he removes his work and jumps up and down on it. "I shall go home to try again."

"You do that, son. And this time get some national culture in it. Like maybe a flag. Or a little barefoot tad with freckles a-going fishing. We got a cold war to win, boy."

No sir. It's not only unbelievable, it's frightening. I figure if Washington tries to mobilize art to win the cold war, as do the Russians, we may well lose both.

Oh, I can see the catalog of our 1984 National Culture Exhibition now: 32 American flags, 16 views of the Statue of Liberty, and the blueprints of a tractor factory. With not a nude in the lot. It could destroy our will to resist.

Personally, I like our national culture just the way it is now: We haven't got any. We've got what I like and we've got what you like. And my culture is none of the Government's business. Let's keep it that way. Because, after all, culture is only a question of taste. Which, in a democracy, is what the other person hasn't got any of.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1962]

WASHINGTON, WHERE THE RITE PREVAILS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

A few people seem a mite confused by the rumpus over Mr. Adlai Stevenson. I can't see why. The facts are clear:

(1) The Saturday Evening Post says Mr. Stevenson felt the Cuba blockade might be going too far. (2) Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Stevenson both issued outraged, horrified, indignant denials of this absurd falsehood. (3) Everybody in Washington said this meant Mr. Stevenson was going to be fired.

I suppose the confusion stems from the fact a few people haven't read the book I'm not writing entitled: "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." Allow me to quote from chapter —VI, "Disagreeing With Policy as Compared to Hara-kiri Among the Japanese."

The natives of Washington, unlike other backward areas, convoke meetings only to agree with each other. This rite is called "ironing out our differences." And the rare native with differences is ironed out.

This does not mean, however, that natives summoned to high-level ironing out conferences cannot disagree with their leaders. They can. Indeed, it often earns them the title of "independent thinker." Which, within limits, is an accolade. But they must be careful to disagree only in one direction and only by the well-established ritual of "not far enoughing."

For example, should the leader of a small tribe like the Hog Advisory Board suggest advising all hogs to bathe their feet in purple ink, an independent thinker might well arise to say: "I disagree, chief. It's a great idea, but it doesn't go far enough. Let's go whole hog."

The key words are "far enough." The leader, by rejecting this extremism, earns himself a reputation for restraint and middle-of-the-roadism, a highly worshipped cult. But should the independent thinker contend that purple ink for hogs is hogwash, he will create disunity; which is awful. He is the automatically declared "not a member of the team" and stripped of his touch football. In extreme cases, he suffers banishment.

Banishment is accomplished in three steps. First, the leader leaks the story that the independent thinker is creating disunity by disagreeing the wrong way. Second, when the story hits the streets, the leader vigorously denies it. The reason he denies it is that he must stand behind his subordinates, a complex native art analyzed briefly in the next six chapters.

The denial also serves to increase the furor. This, in turn, solidifies the independent thinker's image as that of a grumbling malcontent. Evenutally, of course, the leader has no choice but to banish this grumbling malcontent "for the common good," with deep regret.

The natives themselves never protest the banishment of one of their fellows. They are far too busy guessing who will replace the man who will replace the man who will re-

place the man who was banished. This ranks as a major native sport, second only to throat cutting.

I assume this clears up the confusion. If not, do purchase my other unwritten book, "Understanding Washington." It's currently being offered as a bonus with "Six Ways to Square the Circle." I trust you will find them both equally profitable.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 7, 1962]

JUST PLAIN JACK, THE HOPE OF PEACE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time for another episode of "Just Plain Jack," the heart-warming story of a young man's struggle to make a place in the world for his family. Each of them.

As we join "Just Plain Jack" today we find him in the midst of a homey family scene. He is reading "Profiles in Courage." As usual. And the Beautiful Society Girl he married is waxing her water skis while leafing through a stack of movie magazines. Between them, a 70-piece jazz combo accompanies poet Robert Freeze in a recital of his latest ode, "Democrats I have Loved." And John Junior is wailing loudly from the staircase.

JACK (irritably). Why are you crying, John Junior? We must never cry.

JOHN JUNIOR. If Uncle Teddy can have a State, why can't I have a State?

JACK. Shut up and do your pushups.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL (whispering). Couldn't we surprise him with one for Christmas, dear? Just a little one. Like maybe Rhode Island. Think how happy it would make him.

JACK. You'll spoil him rotten. Besides, it wouldn't help your image. And speaking of images, I see you're on the cover of "Romantic Romances" again. What's that headline? "My Secret Sex Life."

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Yes; it's just too horrible.

JACK. Dammit, we'll sue. They can't print articles like that about you.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Oh, it isn't about me. It's about Bernard Baruch. I was speaking of the picture. Look how it shows up that freckle under my eye. How much shall we sue for, Bunny?

(The jazz combo hits a crescendo of dramatic dissonance as Mr. Freeze cries, "Ah, Democrats! Party of the common man!" And three dogs scramble through the melee chasing a hamster, followed by a little girl on a galloping pony.)

JACK (hands over ears). Great balls of fire.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Don't shout, dear. You must relax. After all, the only duty I care about is to provide a little warm nook in your life where you can relax from the cares of the day in the bosom of your family amidst an esthetic atmosphere.

JACK. You said that in last month's issue of Well-Groomed Ladies Companion.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Did I? That reminds me. Why can't my groom, Will, be Ambassador to England? He's been so good with the horses. And he does speak English.

Fairly well. And * * *

PORTLY PIERRE, the faithful family retainer (bursting in with a thick volume): Here it is, Chief. The first report of your new Domestic Peace Corps.

JACK (excitedly). Great. What do they recommend?

PORTLY PIERRE. Sending your entire family on a good will tour. To Cuba.

JACK (hand over heart). My only regret is that I have but one wife to give for my country.

Will the Domestic Peace Corps achieve domestic peace? Even for those of us who can't afford to send our wives abroad? Are you out of your mind?

Tune in to our next heart-warming episode. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, folks, remember: when you think of man's eternal struggle for a little domestic peace, pin your hopes on just plain Jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 12, 1962]

POPULAR MECHANICS IN THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Life, the weekly magazine of news analysis for people who can't read, has issued its inside report on the Saturday Evening Post's inside report that Mr. Stevenson had independent thoughts during the Cuba crisis. A nasty charge which everybody's denied. And Life implies the whole episode was a trial balloon.

To clarify things further, I promptly began work on a piece for Popular Mechanics entitled: "How To Build a Trial Balloon With Simple Tools." To check facts, I called first on the U.S. bureau of trial balloons, a little heralded agency in the cupola of the White House.

I caught the director, Mr. John F. (Irish Jack) Mafia, huffing and puffing at a large red model on his desk. "Work, work, work," he said, pausing for breath. "I am blowing my brains out."

Busy, eh? "Under this administration," he said proudly, "we are becoming the most important agency in Washington. Nowadays, nothing's done around here without first running a trial balloon up the flagpole to see who shoots it down. Like this one to test reaction to a summit conference."

And he showed me the legend on the red one saying; "Khrushchev's Got Tertiary Psoriasis and Wants To Spend His Last Christmas in the United States." He then launched it out the window and ducked as it exploded. "You don't want to stand too close," he said, brushing himself off.

An aid hustled in, carrying a huge carton stamped: "One gross—'Adlai's usefulness is now ruined'—for immediate release."

Was that true about Adlai? "Trueshmue," said Mr. Mafia, tossing a dozen out the window in a batch. "My name's not on it. Your name's not on it. Who are people going to argue with?"

"Amazing," I said. But to business. How do you make a trial balloon? "Well, first," he said, "you got to have a leak. High-placed leaks are best. They save stooping. Luckily, this place is lousy with them. The leak inflates the balloon, usually with hot air. Then, by observing how quickly it's shot down, we know precisely how angry it makes the public. If no one shoots it down, the idea it bears aloft automatically becomes official policy."

"An ingenious system," I said. "It's not all beer and skittles," he said. "The heart-rending part comes when the public clamor is very loud and the leak must shoot down his own balloon to show he had no part in launching it."

Outside, the anti-Adlai balloons began exploding. "See?" said Mr. Mafia, shaking his head sadly. I said that was a shame. "Oh," he said, releasing another dozen, "if we send up enough, the clamor gets weaker each time. And it becomes official policy anyway. But it takes a lot more work. And we're on three shifts now."

The heck with that article. Like most devices in Washington this one's too complicated for Popular Mechanics. They'll just have to be the only magazine in the country without an inside story on the Cuba crisis.

Instead, I've decided to launch my own trial balloon. It says: "Government by Trial Balloon Is Devious, Cowardly and Undemocratic." I can't wait to see who shoots it down.

Birmingham's Frank Brooks Yeilding Heads U.S. Savings & Loan League

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding businessmen and civic leaders in Birmingham has recently been elected president of the U.S. Savings & Loan League. He is Frank Brooks Yeilding, whose skill and business acumen have made his Jefferson Federal Savings & Loan Association the largest in the State of Alabama.

All of us in Alabama are proud of Frank Yeilding and want to share the following article about him which appeared in South on November 26, 1962.

FORMULA FOR GROWTH: SOUNDNESS AT THE TOP

In increasing numbers financial writers and business observers have been seeking to explain the unprecedented growth of the savings and loan industry. Their trail following has led them to certain more obvious factors: Heavy post-war housing demand; rising personal incomes; new office quarters and stepped-up advertising and promotion.

While all these reasons fill vital segments of the whole answer, one of the frequently overlooked but most basic clues is that in almost every major area where rapid expansion attends the savings and loan business there'll be a couple of men who are outstanding executives. They are the men who set the pace.

Such is Alabama's Frank Brooks Yeilding, Jr., this month the new president of far-reaching U.S. Savings & Loan League. Personable, easy to meet, Yeilding is president of Birmingham's Jefferson Federal Savings & Loan Association, the State's largest such enterprise and one of the top institutions in the Southeast.

Drive, determination, and persistence combined with personal warmth are a natural mixture drawn from Yeilding's family background. His grandmother was a widow a year after her ninth child was born, yet managed to run a farm and keep the family together. Her ninth child, Francis B. Yeilding, came to young Birmingham after a farm boyhood, arrived penniless, and obtained a job in a small variety store. Eventually he became part owner and then full owner, founding what is now areawide Yeilding department store chain.

Born in 1904, Frank Yeilding was the fourth son among a family of six boys and one girl, jokes that the size of his family put him in the savings and loan field. "By the time I finished college (Birmingham-Southern)," he recalls "three older brothers were already ahead of me in the family store and I doubted there was room for another brother."

His availability took a fortuitous turn through college friendship with Ervin Jackson, now one of the city's leading businessmen. Jackson's father was majority owner of Jefferson County Building & Loan Association, a stock savings and loan enterprise. The elder Jackson offered Yeilding a job and the 21-year-old began the career he's followed ever since.

In the mid-1920's the savings and loan business was surging in the throes of a real estate boom. With assets of more than $3½ million, Jefferson County Building & Loan was thriving. Interest rates were high, profits excellent. Common stock in the

business was eagerly sought because of generous dividends. Common stock was such a good investment that by 1929, the year Yeilding was given the treasurer's title to attach to secretary which he'd held since 1926, that Internal Revenue stepped in. The IRS ruling was that because stock dividends were larger than those paid to holders of optional savings accounts that the association should forfeit its tax-exempt status then permitted all savings and loan groups and pay 5 years' back taxes. IRS finally offered an alternative: Convert the association to a mutual institution. Stockholders grumbled but management accepted and common stock was paid off at par. As things turned out the stockholders got a break. Depression and losses were near.

Because of bountiful post-War II business, some are prone to forget depression. But not Yeilding, who vividly remembers the problems faced in weathering "those grim days." He was to hold the secretary-treasurer's joint responsibilities for a decade and a half. After the elder Jackson's death in 1945, Ervin Jackson became president for a year and moved up to chairman. Yeilding was elected president. The two men are also partners in an insurance agency and both have other business interests.

Because of population trends and other factors, Yeilding believes that conventional savings and loan associations are in somewhat better shape than FHA, now beginning to face the problem of disposing of repossessions. "We're in better shape because most of our borrowers have bigger equities," he says. While he doesn't delude himself into thinking his and Jefferson Federal's policies have built-in protection against mortgage losses, "We try to make good loans and we try to make sure the loans are paid on time." Company policy runs heavily to medium-priced homes loans. "Houses are a lot like autos," he observes, pointing out that medium-priced cars are more readily marketable than luxury models.

A conspicuous element of Yeilding's conservatism is his insistence for a relatively high degree of liquidity. At the end of 1961, for example, his firm's savings accounts totaled $58,360,000 and loans in process $1,020,142. Cash was at $2,213,000 and Government securities stood at $10,131,000. This figures at a ratio of 21 percent to savings, well above of the national 12 to 13 percent average. Why does his company follow this policy of higher liquidity? "Because it helps me sleep nights," he says. The Jefferson Federal enterprise now stands in the $70 million area.

In 1950, assets were nearing $6 million. By that time business was making phenomenal strides and in the next 12 years was to grow in excess of 1,000 percent. Yeilding doesn't believe that rate will continue but that future progress will be quite respectable.

Behind a calm and relaxed professional exterior, Yeilding is a man of restless energy.

The Continuing Problem of Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the face of America's continuing economic dynamism, the persistent high level of unemployment among this country's workers is a serious problem. Each year the American economy hits new highs; even in the slump years we achieve new records of income, gross national product and in the other economic indicators that point to great national prosperity. Yet, even in the peak years we find a disturbing percentage of our labor force out of work.

The New York Times commented on this situation editorially in its December 8 edition. Along with its comments, the editorial pointed out areas in which our country can work to help overcome this problem, expansion of our retraining programs, improved opportunities and apprenticeships for young workers just entering the labor force, reforms of the unemployment compensation program.

No area of public policy deserves closer attention by the Congress than this matter of unemployment. I commend my colleagues who have taken the lead in this field, especially in the enactment of the Manpower Retraining and Development Act of the last Congress. This is an excellent start, but more remains to be done. I shall soon offer some legislative ideas in this field which I believe will help bring our labor force into better position to overcome the unemployment problem and help America meet its potential.

The New York Times editorial follows:

THE SPECIFICS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

There is fresh disappointment in the unemployment figures. Despite a somewhat better business picture, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for mid-November rose to 5.8 percent of the labor force compared to 5.5 percent a month ago. The Labor Department attributes the increase to a sharper than seasonal rise in the number of teenagers joining the labor force. Last month's improvement was due to a drop in unemployed women, presumably because they had left the labor force.

Although employment has increased, the number of jobless continues to pose a major economic—and human—problem. Unemployment has hit hardest at those least able to cope with it: the unskilled, the older worker, the Negroes, those whose experience is in depressed industries (like coal mining) or caught in depressed areas, or displaced by machines. There has been only 1 month during the last 5 years when unemployment registered less than 5 percent of the work force, while at present there are almost 400,000 who are listed as hard-core unemployed, without jobs for 27 weeks or longer.

The administration has been counting on a much faster rate of economic growth to absorb the unemployed. Though deficit spending and the Federal Reserve's easy money policies have helped to provide growth, unemployment has remained high. In fact, unemployment has itself been a drag on growth.

Paradoxically, there are jobs going begging in many industries. For the most part, they require skills that the unemployed do not possess. The increasing lack of mobility in the work force makes it especially hard on those in depressed areas who for one reason or another are tied to their homes, for these are the sites least attractive to new industry.

Given these barriers, it is doubtful that resort to general economic policies, whether through deficit spending or easy money or tax reductions, can solve the unemployment problem. A faster rate of economic growth can ameliorate the situation, but specific policies are needed to deal with the specific problems of the jobless. Expanding the manpower retraining is one essential step; providing greater opportunities to the young, especially in apprenticeship programs, is another. Meanwhile, extension of unemployment benefits is essential to alleviate hardship, particularly among those who are chronically unemployed.

"I'm Fed Up to Here"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Adm. Ben Moreell, retired, should receive widespread circulation.

That is why I insert it, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"I'M FED UP TO HERE"

(Keynote address by Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, USN (retired) chairman, board of trustees, Americans for Constitutional Action, Fifth Human Events Political Action Conference, January 10–12, 1963 Washington, D.C.)

In the idiom of the New Frontier, I am called an ultraconservative. I accept the nomination—provided the title denotes one who tries humbly to follow the trail leading from tyranny to freedom, which was hewed through Government oppression by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and the other pioneers of our Republic. They raised a "standard to which the wise and honest can repair," a standard which retains its integrity because it is rooted deeply in religious faith and eternal principles.

The elements of this standard are: First, man derives, directly from the Creator, his rights to life, to liberty and to the unhampered use of his honestly acquired property and, thus, he is not beholden for them to any human agency; second, to protect his rights he joins with others to establish a government, whose powers are carefully limited and clearly defined in order that they may not be used to usurp the rights they are designed to defend; and third, for man to grow in wisdom and worldly possessions, he must have freedom of choice, a free exchange for ideas as well as for material goods. These rights are to be used without hindrance, so long as the possessor does not interfere with the similar rights of others.

Transcending all is the conviction that for every God-given right there is a collateral responsibility to use that right in strict conformity with the moral law, as revealed in such statements as the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule. When man's appetites are disciplined by such inner restraints, he can establish a society which will require a minimum of external police power to maintain public order, and this, in turn, leads to a maximum of individual freedom.

On this solid foundation, our Founding Fathers erected the social order which became a haven for the oppressed and downtrodden of the earth and a beacon of hope for those who could not escape to our shores. While there was never a dearth of compassion and material help for the needy in our land, the major emphasis was always on opportunity, rather than on relief.

In this climate of freedom, our Nation became the world's cornucopia of spiritual and

material blessings. Over the years it has poured out its abundance for the needy everywhere.

But, in recent decades, our people have been subjected to an unceasing barrage of allegedly "new" ideas. With increasing frequency, and most recently by our President, we have been told that the ideals of the Founding Fathers are "outmoded," their admonitions are "incantations from the forgotten past, worn out slogans, myths and illusions." Individual moral responsibility to God and to one's neighbor has been called a "cliche of our forebears," and we are instructed that this generation must "disenthrall itself from an inheritance of truism and stereotype." We are urged to discard the accumulated wisdom of our ancestors and the time-tested traditions of Western civilization as useless impediments because the state now assumes full responsibility for the welfare of its subjects.

Unfortunately, many of us have yielded to these seductions. We have surrendered the solid substance of freedom for the illusory promise of security. In doing so, we have permitted the structure of our free society to be weakened and its foundations eroded to the point where there is grave danger of collapse.

All of us must share the blame for this debacle. Over the past 50 years we have participated in the propogation of a misplaced faith in the ability of government to accomplish any material, economic, social or moral purpose. Implementing this faith, we have thrust enormous powers on government, or we have stood by meekly while government has seized authority at an ever increasing pace and has centralized it in Washington, far removed from the control of those from whom it was obtained. Such enhancement of political power at the expense of individual rights is correctly labeled "socialism."

The tendency of citizens in all walks of life is to be complacent about government intrusion that does not encroach upon what each one believes is his own domain. We are apathetic about the general socialist drift. Frequently, we support collectivist measures which, it is claimed will "promote the general welfare," or will "stimulate the economy of the community" where we live. But we should now be aware that we are threatened by total state socialism, an ancient tyranny under a modern disguise. If we are to survive as a Nation of free men, we must oppose socialism with all our vigor wherever it appears. If our sole concern is that aspect of socialism which affects directly our own business, our own industry or our own community, we will contribute to the advance of State Socialism on other fronts by our neglect, and thus weaken the entire structure of freedom.

It is said that the people never give up their liberties except under some delusion. We have been surrendering our liberties under the delusion that government has some superior competence in the realm of economics, some magic multiplier of wealth, some ready access to a huge store of economic goods which may be had without working for them—merely by voting for them.

None of us is completely immune to these delusions or to the human passions aroused by the four horsemen of our own apocalypse, ignorance, fear, apathy and greed. Nevertheless, those who see the inevitable end of this progression are dutybound to sound the alarm. I will, therefore, present my thoughts on some specific aspects of our current situation.

The great iniquity of our times is that so many are trying to tell others how to live their lives. They ask, plaintively, "How can we do good for the people if we just let them alone?" As for me, "I'm fed up to here" woth so-called masterminds, with statesmen, clergymen, schoolmasters and politicians who, though frequently unable to administer the affairs of their own small households, have no doubt of their ability to spell out, in detail, what, when, where and how 188 million Americans and countless other millions throughout the world must do to have a more abundant life.

"I'm fed up to here" with pseudo statesmen, whose wishbones are where their backbones ought to be, who are past masters of surrender, compromise, appeasement and accommodation, who believe we can buy friends like sacks of potatoes, who fawn upon, cajole and pamper our enemies and the so-called unalined nations while they kick our time-tested friends in the teeth, who shiver and shake when "world opinion" is mentioned, who would depend upon U.N. mercenaries to protect the security of these United States, who never become surfeited with Soviet lies and deceit, who believe that the next time Khrushchev will surely honor his commitment, and who hold that the Russian Bear will soon change his claws and fangs for olive branches and rose petals.

"I'm fed up to here" with the wiser-than-thou, self-anointed oracles who insist that differences of opinion on foreign policy should stop at the water's edge and that free Americans must not criticize programs conceived and implemented by our "no-win diplomats" who, over the past 30 years, have racked up an almost unbroken string of losses to communism throughout the world; with those who would trade American lives, limbs, goods and services for Communist promises; with those who believe that the Castro Communist cancer has now been excised from the body politic of the Western Hemisphere; with those who are determined to democratize the Katangans even if necessary to kill them and destroy their property in the process; and with those who insist that we must subsidize, with massive foreign aid, arrogant Socialist and Communist governments all over the world though, while doing so, we help their dictators enslave their peoples.

"I'm fed up to here" with Robin Hood government that promises to rob the rich to pay the poor (in return for votes) and, when there are not enough rich left to pay the bills, robs both rich and poor alike to pay Robin Hood; with those who would tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect in the expectation that the day of reckoning will come after they are gone; with candidates who run on a platform of "I can get more from the Government for you," without reminder of what the Government must take from you; with officials who use defense contracts as instruments of political advantage; with politicians who think that a relief check means as much to an American as a decent job; with Government agencies which harass our industries with antitrust suits, threaten them with loss of Government contracts, dictate their economic decisions on costs and prices, resort to biased interference with their labor relations, burden them with punitive taxation and regulation, or tempt them to conform by promising lucrative contracts. What do you think Khrushchev would give to have General Motors, Dupont, General Electric, United States Steel, and Lockheed on his team?

"I'm fed up to here" with businessmen who are so busy making and selling widgets at a steadily decreasing profit, that they have no time or energy left to fight for preserving the system that makes their business possible; who do not protest Government intimidation and interference; who support socialist projects of short-range advantage to themselves; who finance foundations, schools, churches, cultural activities, news media and political parties which expound and promote socialist doctrine; or who "play ball" with the political apparatus in power when there is a potential payoff in the form of subsidies, loans or contracts.

"I'm fed up to here" with farmers who boast of their rugged individualism but demand guaranteed incomes, public power and irrigation; with doctors who oppose socialized medicine but plug for subsidized medical education, research and hospitals; with educators who profess a belief in personal responsibility as a builder of character but insist that Government aid to education is essential for national survival; with scientists who demand freedom of inquiry, but favor Government-financed (and controlled) research; and with union officials who demand special laws which exempt them from the responsibilities of other citizens and give them exclusive power to regiment their members, to dictate their political allegiance and to practice physical violence on persons and property when they deem this necessary "to conserve labor's gains."

I could go on, reciting the things we have left undone that we ought to have done and the things we have done that we ought not to have done. But I have said enough to support the charge that all of us must share the blame for our present predicament.

Where do we go from here? Perhaps the first thing each one should do is look into a mirror to see "what manner of man he is" and keep looking, until he knows the principles for which he stands and which he will not compromise. Once this is done, he can seek out those in Government who share his views, as well as others of like mind who are willing to serve in similar posts. We must sustain and support them with every resource at our command, for they are fighting our battles. And we must try with might and main to increase their numbers. This should be our target for 1963 and 1964. The hour is late. This may well be our last chance.

We can have the kind of Government we demand. Let us demand what history has taught us is right for us. Our fighting men and women in legislative halls throughout the land will win, provided we give them the support they must have to regain our lost freedoms.

Let Congress Take Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of January 4, 1963:

LET CONGRESS TAKE NOTE

The lobby for Federal aid to the schools is as active as ever as the time for convening Congress nears. As usual, it is pointing out how vital to the educational system such aid would be. But it is saying nothing at all about the opinion expressed in a recent testing of opinion about Federal school aid.

This poll was taken by the National School Boards Association. It showed that 55 percent of 90,000 school board members queried across the Nation were opposed to Federal aid. Only 30 percent of those replying to a questionnaire said they believed such aid was necessary.

School board members are most directly concerned with raising money with which to operate the schools. They must do the worrying when funds are not sufficient to keep the schools going. But they are un-

willing to take the easy way of relying on the Federal Government for supplementary revenues.

School board members are not only close to school operations, they are close to the people. The majority of them seem to think that if local communities ever turn over to the Federal Government the responsibility for keeping the schools open the schools will suffer. The best school systems are in communities where the citizens are interested enough to see that they have enough money to operate at a high level. If the people are relieved of this worry, they are apt to cease being concerned with what goes on in their schools. Local responsibility is the cornerstone of the American system of public education.

The new Congress should note the results of the poll of school boards on Federal aid to the school system.

A Christmas Prayer, 1962, by Hon. Dewey Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose herewith the "Christmas Prayer, 1962," by the Honorable Dewey Short, of Missouri.

The writer is an ordained minister and served 24 years in this House and 4 years as Assistant Secretary of the Army. Many of us recall him as the silver-tongued orator of the Ozarks. Although we received this deep-rooted and thoughtful prayer individually, it is my desire that it be preserved in the RECORD and made available to all because of its universal application and acceptability to those of us who believe in trust in Divine guidance. I commend it to all with respect and humility:

MY CHRISTMAS PRAYER, 1962

Our Heavenly Father, safely Thou hast brought us through another year. Thou hast spared us the ravages of fire, flood, and famine. Thou hast saved us from the horrors and destruction of devastating war.

For Thy countless blessings on this day and every day we give Thee our endless and sincere thanks. For the majesty of mountains, the silence of silver stars, the bountiful fruits of fields, forests, and streams, the understanding, sympathy, and help of families and friends we express our undying gratitude. Bless Thou especially those who have lost loved ones; comfort, strengthen, and sustain them which only Thy great love can do.

God of truth, beauty, and goodness, we are not worthy of Thy gifts but we want to emulate Thee and with humble minds and contrite hearts walk in Thy way. Help us, we beseech Thee, to preserve this Republic of ours, to keep it a land of freedom, opportunity, and justice and to strive constantly and untiringly to make it a kingdom of Heaven on earth.

O Lord, save us from idle gossip, from small and petty talk. May we never envy those who have more but always help those who have less. Teach us the relativity of things and give us a true sense of values. Let courtesy, consideration, kindness, and generosity rule in our hearts and guide our lives. We do not want to think of ourselves "more highly than we ought to think." Help us to keep our sense of humor and add to the sum of human joy. Let us walk with God and go about doing good.

And now, our Father God, may our faith in Thee and in one another never wane; may we hope even "when hope is out of sight," and may we love each other as Thou hast loved us, that through sacrifice and service we can bring to a wretched, distraught, and divided world a united, just, and lasting peace. May we live or even die for it as the Master did. In His name we pray. Amen.

You will always be in my thoughts and prayers. Happy New Year.

DEWEY SHORT.

U.N. Atrocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the two following editorials appeared in the Washington Star of January 5 and 7, respectively.

They bring to our attention the very sad state of things in the Congo and the deplorable part that both the United States and the United Nations have played in this whole catastrophe.

Atrocities have been committed by U.N. troops, but these are lightly brushed aside, and an Indian officer says:

It should never have happened.

Shades of Gandhi.

Yes, we have traveled a long way from nonresistance, and a still longer way since Great Britain submitted to it. Maybe India would still be a part of the British Empire if England had been able to call on the U.N. troops for support.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 5, 1963]

U.N. ATROCITY

The senseless murder of two women by U.N. troops in Jadotville is a shocking thing. But it is not wholly surprising. It is, rather, a culminating horror in the U.N. war to destroy secessionist Katanga and the political power of its president, Moise Tshombe.

The U.N., of course, does not admit that it is waging war to crush Katanga's secession. On the contrary, it denies it. It says its wants peace, not war, and that it has no intention of trying to impose a political settlement on Katanga by force of arms. These sentiments were piously echoed by our own highest officials as far back as a year ago. But the facts speak for themselves.

Last week Katangese soldiers, apparently beyond Tshombe's control, started firing at U.N. forces in Elisabethville. On December 29, after his palace had been surrounded, Tshombe fled from the city, and on that same day a grim-faced U.N. official in New York said: "This time there will be no stopping short of total victory."

The trigger-happy Katangans were quickly routed in Elisabethville, and U.N. Secretary-General U Thant said on January 1 that "all firing and fighting had ceased" as of December 30. He renewed his assurance that the U.N. would not use force for political ends, and, on January 2, gave assurance that "the U.N. forces will resort to fire only when fired upon."

The U.N. troops in Katanga, however, chose to ignore all of this. Apparently in pursuit of the promised "total victory," they fought their way into Jadotville, miles away, which had been abandoned by retreating Katangese forces. And there, 2 days after Mr. U Thant's assurance, a detachment of U.N. Indian troops opened fire with machineguns and rifles on a passing Volkswagen. The driver, a cement worker who had been urged to return to Jadotville, was shot in the face. His wife and a woman companion were killed. An Indian officer on the scene said: "It should never have happened."

But it did happen. And the most dedicated apologist for the U.N. cannot deny this or attribute it to bad reporting. The memory of the bleeding, anguished husband, crouched by his bullet-shattered car with upraised hands and asking: "Why, Why, Why?", will linger on.

His answer should come from those who try to justify what has been happening in the Congo by painting Tshombe as the "bad guy" and Cyrille Adoula as the "good guy."

Our State Department officials, or at least most of them, do not offer any such simple and simple-minded justification. Nevertheless, the United States is backing the U.N. in its biased effort to do what it has repeatedly said it is not doing, and what it lacks authority to do. It may succeed in the sense that Tshombe will be destroyed. When the last chapter is written, however, we doubt that many Americans will take pride in the story.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 7, 1963]

CONGO SETTLEMENT

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is said to believe that there is now "a real chance" for a quick settlement of the "Katangan problem." If this means that the United Nations, by force of arms, has smashed Katanga's resistance and can now proceed to impose a political settlement, it probably is correct.

The price will be high—not in a military sense, for casualties in the superior U.N. force have been insignificant. It will be expensive, however, in terms of morality. For the U.N. with our active support, is doing what it has no authority to do under its charter, and what it has repeatedly pledged that it would not do.

The rationale is that Premier Adoula of the central government in Leopoldville must be effectively supported, and that this can be done only by crushing Katanga's secession and forcing the President of that province, Moise Tshombe, to split its revenues with the national government. Unless this is done, it is argued, Adoula will fall, his successor probably would be more Communist-oriented, and the Reds would regain their foothold in the Congo. It is argued further that the "Katangan problem" must be dealt with promptly, since the Indian troops, the best combat unit in the U.N. command, soon will be withdrawn, and the U.N. funds are running low.

Even if one accepts all this as being factual, it still is an utterly cynical attempt to justify what is being done. The U Thant plan, to cite but one example, calls for adoption of a new constitution for the Congo, under which Katanga would enjoy a considerable measure of autonomy. This constitution was submitted to the Leopoldville Parliament last September, but it has never been brought up for a vote. Why not? Because Premier Adoula is afraid that his Parliament, which has been "recessed" until March, might vote down the proposed constitution and vote him out of office at the same time. So the U.N., with American support, is in the unadmirable positon of using

armed force in violation of its charter to compel Tshombe to submit to a proposed constitution which has never been voted upon and which may never be ratified.

Whatever the expedient arguments for this course, we do not think history's judgment will be flattering.

Problem Arising From the Two-Price Cotton System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. Cannon, a leading textile executive of my neighboring State of North Carolina, who has plants and employees in my district, recently made a statement before the Cotton Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee, U.S. House of Representatives.

While the testimony of Mr. Cannon will be included in the printed hearings of that subcommittee, I believe the Nation as a whole, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, should be familiarized with his excellent summation of the problems arising from the two-price cotton system presently in effect in this country as we deal with our domestic and foreign problems in cotton textiles.

His testimony is so well prepared that any comment from others would be entirely superfluous and, under unanimous consent, I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF C. A. CANNON, CHAIRMAN, COTTON POLICY COMMITTEE, AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, IN SUPPORT OF THE OBJECTIVE TO ELIMINATE TWO-PRICE COTTON BEFORE THE COTTON SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 13, 1962

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before this committee in support of the objective to eliminate the two-price cotton system.

I am C.A. Cannon, chairman of the board of the Cannon Mills Co., of Kannapolis, N.C. At present I am serving as chairman of the Cotton Policy Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, the national trade association which represents approximately 90 percent of the spinners and weavers of textiles from cotton, man-made fibers and silk in the United States. I appear before you today in this capacity as well as in my individual capacity as a textile manufacturer interested in the elimination of the two-price cotton system.

The testimony which I will present to you has been approved and authorized by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, and I assure you that I wholeheartedly subscribe to it personally.

A cotton policy resolution which expresses the desire of the American textile industry to have the two-price cotton system eliminated completely was adopted by the ATMI on October 12, 1962. This resolution reads in part:

"(1) As early as possible, a return to a one-price system for American cotton, whether sold at home or abroad.

"(2) The exclusion of any form of processing tax on manufactured cotton products.

"(3) Movement of cotton through normal trade channels rather than Government hands.

"(4) A fair procedure in respect to the net income position of the cotton farmer.

"(5) An increase in cotton acreage realistically geared to the increase in the demand for U.S. cotton that will result from a sound long-range cotton program."

BACKGROUND

There are two separate historical developments which bear upon this subject which I wish to summarize briefly for you: first, the import trend of cotton textiles into the United States and, second, the history of two-price cotton.

I. The import picture

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of foreign-made cotton products from all over the world have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952, to 225,000 bales in 1956, to 526,000 bales in 1960, and it now appears that imports of cotton products during 1962 will reach nearly 700,000-bale equivalents or more than 1,200 million-square-yard equivalents of cotton textiles. These imports are not only disrupting the markets for American-made textiles but they are rapidly taking away the farmers' market for American-grown cotton.

American textile mills in 1952 used approximately 150 bales of American-grown cotton for one bale equivalent of imported cotton textiles. In 1962 U.S. mills will consume only 13 bales for each imported bale equivalent. A return to a one-price cotton system can reverse this trend which, if continued, will be disasterous to the American cotton economy.

The Geneva Short-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement was designed to hold imports at the fiscal year 1961 level of 812 million-square-yard equivalents for the 12 month period ending September 30, 1962. The record is now complete and total imports for the short-term arrangement year reached 1,113-million-square-yard equivalents, an excess of 37 percent.

Preliminary figures on imports of cotton cloth alone (excluding all yarn, apparel, and other textiles) show that the October 1962 import rate of 46 million square yards is more than double the October 1961 imports of 21 million square yards. For the 10-month January-October 1962 period, these cotton cloth imports have reached 399 million square yards compared to only 198 million in the similar January–October 1961 period and 10 months at the October 1962 rate would reach 460 million square yards.

A significant factor in these excessive imports is the cost advantage that foreign textile producing nations have over domestic mills in the purchase of raw cotton.

The rising trend in imports of cotton yarn and heavy constructions of cotton cloth is clearly the result of the raw cotton cost advantage that foreign mills have over domestic mills because of the two-price cotton system. Imports of cotton yarn alone have jumped 117 times since the beginning of the two-price system in 1956—from only 865,000 square yard equivalents to an estimated 102 million square yards for 1962.

II. History of two-price cotton

American cotton textile mills have been prohibited by law since 1939 from buying foreign grown upland cotton in excess of about 30,000 bales a year—less than the amount of cotton consumed in 1 day by U.S. mills.

The Federal Government, to stabilize cotton production and farm income, has embraced a policy of price supports which has resulted in American cotton being priced higher than foreign grown cotton.

Since 1956, the Government has subsidized the export of American raw cotton at a rate equal to the difference between the U.S. and world prices; since August 1, 1961, by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, this difference and subsidy has been at the rate of 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 a bale.

The upward import trend of cotton products for the most part has occurred since 1956, when the raw cotton export subsidy program was initiated creating the two-price system.

Foreign mills have been able to buy cotton—either American or foreign grown—at prices far below those at which American mills are required to pay by law.

Obviously these conditions—all Government imposed—have created a patently unfair circumstance which serves to throttle an essential American industry and prevent it from realizing its full potential to consume cotton, to contribute to the empolyment of American labor and the Nation's economic strength.

THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

On September 6, 1962, the Tariff Commission, by a vote of 3 to 2 rejected the Department of Agriculture's request that an equalization fee be put on the cotton content of textile imports.

On this same day, the President in commenting upon the Tariff Commission finding, stated in part:

"Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future.

"I am, therefore, requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end."

The President observed, in addition, that because the objective undoubtedly could be achieved only through legislative action, he would ask the next session of Congress to enact legislation, "designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system."

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that we are privileged to participate in these hearings which have been called as a consequence of this expressed desire of the President.

The domestic textile industry enthusiastically agrees with the President that "the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs * * *" is "a unique burden upon the American textile industry * * *" and requires "immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity."

It is the considered judgment of the industry that this inequity should be abolished completely and at once.

The idea has been advanced that the inequity can be eliminated by something less than a return to a clear-cut one-price system for cotton, under which the American-grown product would be available to domestic mills and for export at the same price. This idea is both irrelevant and erroneous.

It is irrelevant because the President has directed that the two-price cotton system be abolished.

It is erroneous because the idea is apparently predicated on the belief that it costs foreign mills more to take cotton from the United States and send goods back than it

costs domestic mills to bring cotton to the mill and ship goods to the consuming centers.

The differences in the cost of marketing and distribution of cotton and cotton textiles prior to 1956 before the advent of the two-price cotton system, are present today, and anything less than a complete return to a one-price system will perpetuate that portion of the inequity which is allowed to remain.

Since the advent of two-price cotton, active cotton system spindles have dropped 9.1 percent of the remaining spindles formerly running on cottons, 11.8 percent, or 2,217,000, are consuming manmade or other fibers.

Furthermore, textile employment has decreased by 180,000 workers; per capita mill consumption of cotton has dropped by 3.7 pounds; and imports of cotton textiles continue their relentless upward surge.

Beyond question the import experience of the past few years demonstrates that the devastating impact of these imports cannot and will not be brought under reasonable control until American mills can buy American cotton at the same price foreign mills can purchase it.

The difficulties encountered in the administration of the 1-year International Cotton Textile Arrangement because of the two-price cotton program are carried over into the 5-Year International Cotton Textile Arrangement (October 1, 1962–September 30, 1967), and will continue unless corrected by the establishment of one-price cotton.

To allow these imports to continue at their present rate is to cause a further deterioration in the American textile industry, with its inevitable adverse impact on the entire cotton economy and the millions dependent upon it for livelihood.

U.S. mills must use only American-grown uplands-type cotton, purchased at the U.S. Government-supported price, except for an amount equal to less than 1 day's supply per year. In the 1962–63 cotton season an estimated 34.7 million bales, produced outside the United States, will be available to foreign mills at whatever prices they can bargain for. The result is that the foreigners can and will buy 85 percent of their requirements at prices even lower than the subsidized U.S. export price.

The price of foreign cotton is to 1 to 1½ cents per pound less than the price of U.S. cotton in foreign markets. This is in spite of the requirement in section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 that U.S. cotton be competitively priced abroad. Thus, the inequity for the American mill in many instances is not restricted to the current 8½-cent differential—it is in the neighborhood of 9½ to 10 cents per pound or something more. When adjustments are made for the manufacturing waste losses involved in the higher priced cotton, the inequity is even greater.

The United States is rapidly losing its position as the most important cotton-producing nation in the world. Over the years, the domestic textile industry has proven to be the principal and most dependable outlet for this production.

Notwithstanding these facts, as a nation, we have been pursuing policies which penalize our textile industry and which work against the interest of our farmers. We have been favoring our foreign competitors by making cotton available to them on more favorable terms than it is made available to domestic mills. Primarily, as a result of this policy, we have a shrinking textile industry; the domestic use of cotton is declining; the number of cotton spindles is being constantly reduced; and the incentive for investment in new plants and equipment is weakened. Under these circumstances, the cotton industry as a whole cannot contribute to the fullest extent of its capability to the Nation's economic growth.

What does this mean to American cotton farmers? What does this mean to our national economy? It means loss of markets for cotton. It means loss of employment for workers.

The system under which we have been operating is destined to destroy the American cotton farmer because it is constantly weakening the textile industry upon which the cotton farmer must depend to process and market his crop.

A bale of cotton is virtually worthless until it moves through cotton textile spindles and is further processed. Thus, except for an uncertain export market, the strength of our Nation's raw cotton economy cannot possibly be any greater than that of the industry through which the product moves to market.

A healthy expanding textile industry with maximum employment and increasing cotton consumption is important not only to millions of those engaged in producing and handling cotton, but it is also vital to the growth and strength of the U.S. economy. The loss of cotton spindles is the loss of the potential to provide a reliable market for American cotton.

The U.S. textile industry is at the forefront in the effort to modernize its plants and equipment and maintain the capacity to spin American grown cotton. In 1962 the textile industry will spend for modernization an estimated $1.78 for each $1 of allowed depreciation compared to an all manufacturing industry average of only $1.19. In 1960 the textile industry spent an average of 30 percent more, and in 1961, 29 percent more for plant modernization than did all manufacturing industries.

Since the President and the administration have recognized the existence of the undesirability of the two-price cotton system, and have resolved to abolish it, the sooner it is forthrightly and completely accomplished, the better it will be for all concerned.

Section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 requires that we make cotton competitive to world prices in order to reestablish and maintain our fair historical share of the world market for cotton. The United States continues to be the residual supplier of cotton for the world market and an export of 5 million bales cannot continue to constitute a fair percentage share of a rising level of cotton production and consumption throughout the world.

Expanding cotton exports for dollars is important to cotton farmers and to the industry. It is also vital to the maintenance of a favorable international balance of payments and our gold reserves and, hence, to the maintenance of our military posture abroad and our fiscal soundness at home.

Cotton is losing markets here at home to a wide variety of competing fibers and other products. Highly detailed studies by the Department of Agriculture, the National Cotton Council, and the textile industry itself demonstrate beyond question that current price levels are destroying markets.

For example, rayon staple fiber production, with an increasing price advantage, continues to advance in the United States. From 1955, when production of rayon staple fiber was 9.9 percent o f U.S. cotton consumption, it had increased to 11.6 percent in 1961. The increased production and use of other manmade fibers, not only replaces cotton at the mill door but also displaces farm jobs and related cotton processing facilities.

It is the considered judgment of textile manufacturers who consume millions of bales of cotton annually, and who are constantly exploring every conceivable market outlet, that a return to a one-price system for cotton would give cotton an opportunity to share equitably in market expansion and regain some of its losses.

Over the past decade the U.S. population has increased by nearly 30 million persons, yet cotton consumption has shown no growth and has remained relative constant.

Over and beyond the cold competitive impact involved, a forthright one-price policy would have a tremendous psychological effect on both users and competitors of cotton. To the users it would provide new hope and confidence, with consequent investment incentives, where a lack of confidence now exists; to the competitors it would serve as a warning not to develop or expand competitive products based entirely on an artificially high cotton cost.

The U.S. Government backed by a broad cross section of public opinion, apparently is committed to a policy of removing barriers and freeing trade throughout the world. Passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 opens the door for severe changes in trade patterns. Although the policy has not yet been applied to most major agricultural products, there is no guarantee that this situation is permanent.

Cotton enjoys (1) a supported price substantially above the world level, (2) a virtually complete embargo on competitive raw cotton imports—therefore, a monopoly on domestic consumption, and (3) a legislated provision that export sales must be subsidized to whatever extent is necessary to insure export sales abroad at historic levels.

Everything considered, raw cotton enjoys what is probably the most complete protection of any important American product, either agricultural or manufactured.

However, this preferred position is jeopardized so long as foreign mills can buy U.S. produced cotton at a price below that which U.S. mills are required to pay.

CONCLUSION

The need for a return to one-price cotton is clear. The President has recognized this need and directed that it be met by the cooperation of all relevant interests in the executive branch of Government. The cotton industry supports the decision of the President and is eager to assist in designing the most desirable method of correcting the situation.

We appear here today representing an industry that uses and knows cotton and cotton's problems but even as the cotton producer must look to us to spin his bales, we must look to the market to consume our cotton textiles.

We have a tremendous investment in plants and equipment to process cotton and the American cotton farmer has a tremendous stake in the future of cotton.

If we look ahead under the two-price system we can see the rising trend of foreign-made cotton textile imports, inactive cotton spindles, bales of cotton piling up in warehouses and domestic consumption dropping to 7 million bales annually. When domestic mill consumption of cotton falls to 7 million bales we will need only 14 million acres to produce the cotton crop.

On the other hand, we can see a return to a one-price system, fewer cotton textile imports, more spindles active on cotton, and domestic cotton consumption rising with benefits of a healthy cotton economy spread all the way from farm to consumer.

A complete return to a one-price system for cotton in the United States could mean an annual cost saving to the consuming public of a probable $600 to $800 million when the initial cotton cost reduction is carried all the way through the textile pipeline to the retail counter.

Textile markets already reflect uncertainty and hesitation attendant the timetable of carrying out the President's decision to abolish two-price cotton. Delay in getting the job done will continue to paralyze the market. Foreign mills will continue

to buy cotton at an unfair price advantage compared to American mills.

Over and beyond the considerations we have been discussing, which obviously are important to all elements of the cotton industry, is the relationship of this subject to the national security of our country.

The military cannot function in hot climates without hot weather clothing; it cannot function in cold climates without cold weather clothing.

The work force of this Nation that must support a military effort cannot function without work clothing.

In addition, there are hundreds and hundreds of items involving textile products that are absolutely essential to the success of a military operation.

In 1941 and 1942 the stocks of cotton we had on hand in this country became a tremendous blessing, a lifesaver without which our military effort would have been seriously impaired. During the Korean conflict our stocks of cotton were so low that embargoes were placed on export shipments, and prices in the rest of the world rose to 80 or 90 cents per pound.

In 1942, during the peak of World War II, we consumed 11.2 million bales of cotton in this country; for the past 5 years consumption has reached 9 million bales only once. In 1942 our cotton system spindles in place were 23,971,000; today they number 19,609,000, and for the past 3 years have been decreasing at the rate of about 40,000 monthly.

An announcement has been made that cotton acreage will be reduced by 2 million acres next year because offtake is not equalling production.

Knowing as we do the absolute essentiality of cotton products in time of a national emergency, having learned from experience that we can depend only upon our own raw cotton supplies and our own textile industry when the chips are down, it is inconceivable that we can sit here—irrespective of all other considerations—and permit a continuation of policies that are having the twofold effect of killing off cotton markets and cotton production, and, at the same time, drying up the industry through which the raw material is transformed into items essential to the preservation of our people and our country.

Again, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before you in support of the President of the United States in his desire to abolish two-price cotton.

I thank you.

Outlaw Political Extortion of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation making it a criminal offense to threaten Federal employees with the loss of their jobs in the event they do not contribute to a political party.

This legislation is made necessary by the refusal of the Justice Department to use laws now on the books to prosecute party fund solicitors who coerce Federal employees into party contributions under threat of being fired.

In the last Congress I was unable to get any action by the Justice Department in such a case involving alleged threats of a Democratic fund solicitor against postal employees in my district. By a strange interpretation of the law, the Department maintains that it is legal for anyone, who is not a Federal employee, to threaten Federal employees with job loss as a means of coercing contributions to the party in power.

It is regrettable that Congress is forced to restate a law which clearly prohibits such pernicious activity. It is regrettable that Federal employees will be without the protection of the law until Congress is able to act. It is regrettable that the civil rights of those employees can still be violated with impunity.

I urge prompt passage of the bill. It reads as follows:

Whoever, directly or indirectly, deprives, attempts to deprive, or threatens to deprive any person of any employment, position, work, compensation or other benefit provided for or made possibe by any Act of Congress, in an effort to force participation in any political activity, or support or opposition to any candidate or political party, or financial contributions to any candidate or political party, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Clare E. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 28 years Clare Hoffman is not in Congress to represent the people of the Fourth District of Michigan.

The Holland Evening Sentinal published in my congressional district but also circulating in Mr. Hoffman's former district commented on Clare's absence in an editorial Friday, January 4, 1963.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

Congressman Clare E. Hoffman has finished his career as our Congressman from the Fourth District of six counties—Allegan, Barry, Berrien, Cass, St. Joseph, and Van Buren after 28 years.

Millions of people over the country will remember Clare as a fighting Congressman and one that stood up for what he believed. There is no doubt in our mind that our country is much better for having Clare represent the Fourth District for so many years. As long as Clare wanted to represent the district in Washington we, the people, were more than glad to get out and work for him.

We have talked with lots of people who did not always agree with Clare but he was a power in Congress and was always looking for ways to save the taxpayers' dollars. He had the courage to speak out. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD holds many of his speeches defending the principles for which he stood.

Clare had the courage of his convictions and was not afraid to stand up and tell the Congress where he stood.

Twenty-eight years is a long time to represent the people of the district in Congress. We wish Clare much leisure time to reflect on the service to his country.

Lucky America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in the December 31 issue of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence, the distinguished editor of that magazine, wrote a brilliant recapitulation of the sorry sequence of events which has led us into our present, perilous position. I hope that every Member of Congress will take the time to read Mr. Lawrence's article:

LUCKY AMERICA?

(By David Lawrence)

"I think we ought to be rather pleased with ourselves this Christmas."

So spoke President Kennedy at the end of a television interview on December 17. But wouldn't it be more realistic to say that maybe it was by the grace of God the American people were saved from a horrible calamity? Indeed, the facts now show there was a dangerous delay in decisionmaking by the President.

For Mr. Kennedy has just made an unwitting confession of how a confused and risky system of policymaking preceded the action he finally took to protect the people of the United States against a nuclear attack from Soviet bases in Cuba.

The President made some amazing revelations in that interview. The full text of it is printed in 10 pages of this issue. Unfortunately, the American people heard only one side of the story, and the same TV and radio audience may never get the facts in rebuttal. Nor were the listeners reminded of certain statements made in October by the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara which have a direct bearing on the latest explanation of what happened in the Cuban crisis.

Thus, the President made a rather startling disclosure when he said: "I don't think that we expected that he [Khrushchev] would put the missiles in Cuba, because it would have seemed such an imprudent action for him to take, as it was later proved. Now, he obviously must have thought that he could do it in secret and that the United States would accept it. So that he did not judge our intentions accurately."

But did we judge Mr. Khrushchev's intentions opportunely and accurately? Or did we fumble for several weeks, and were we just lucky in the end?

Our vacillating course was revealed when the President replied to a question as to whether he was tempted to show Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko at the White House our photographs of the missile bases in Cuba. Mr. Kennedy said: "No, because our information was incomplete and we had not completely determined what our policy would be. The information came in Tuesday (October 16). Our conversation was on Thursday. We were carrying out intensive reconnaissance. We were still considering the advisability of another course of action. And therefore it would have been very unwise for us to inform him [Gromyko] in detail of what we knew. We did not want to give him the satisfaction of announcing what he was doing. I think it was very im-

portant that the United States announced it before he did."

What kind of game was being played? Who was deceiving whom? The security of the United States was at stake. Yet as late as October 18, the President had made no decision. A month earlier—on September 11—the Soviet Government had announced publicly that the military weapons being sent to Cuba were "designed exclusively for defensive purposes," and that "there is no need for the Soviet Government to shift its weapons for a retaliatory blow to any other country, for instance, Cuba."

Did the President in September really believe these statements from the Kremlin? Was there no military man in the councils of the White House able to persuade the President that you must never assume the enemy is telling the truth about his intentions or the location and nature of his weapons?

The U.S. Government knew in August, through reliable intelligence sources, that the Soviet Government had landed armament in Cuba. There were reports even then about possible missile bases. Why didn't the President impose a blockade in August so that we could see for ourselves what weapons were being carried on ships into Cuba?

Why, on September 11, did the President accept a theoretical distinction between "offensive" and "defensive" weapons instead of verifying at once what kind of weapons were being landed? Why did he wait?

In his October 22 address to the American people, the President said: "The size of this [Soviet] undertaking makes clear it has been planned for some months."

Actually, beginning in late August, warnings were given on the floor of the Senate by Republicans and Democrats that the Soviets had made Cuba a military base and that Castro was being given missiles by the Soviet Union. But the President was traveling around the country making political speeches. Even on October 19—the day after the important meeting with Gromyko—Mr. Kennedy set out for 3 days of political campaigning that would have taken him to the Pacific Coast. He spoke in Ohio and Illinois and then returned to Washington on Saturday, the 20th.

On Monday, October 22, moreover—the night of the announcement of our belated blockade—Secretary of Defense McNamara revealed in a news conference that actual photographs of the missiles in place had been given to the President on Tuesday morning, October 16. This was a few hours before Mr. Kennedy left Washington to campaign in Connecticut.

Mr. McNamara told of the IL-28 bombers which had been introduced during the previous 10 days in Cuba. He said they were capable of carrying nuclear weapons and pointed out that the range of both the bombers and the ballistic missiles covered a large part of the United States, including the city of Washington.

Do we, in a missile age, wait several days to make up our minds? Haven't we been told that decisions in this atomic era have to be made in a matter of minutes?

The President, in his December 17 interview, described the process of policymaking today in the White House, but did not explain why the decision to blockade Cuba wasn't taken 2 months earlier—before the missiles were landed. He was asked, "How does a President go about making a decision, like Cuba, for example?" In his reply, Mr. Kennedy said:

"The most recent one was hammered out, really, as policy and decision over a period of 5 or 6 days. During that period, the 15 people, more or less, who were directly consulted frequently changed their view, because whatever action we took had so many disadvantages to it, and each action we took raised the prospect that it might escalate with the Soviet Union into a nuclear war. Finally, however, I think a general consensus developed, and it certainly seemed after all alternatives were examined that the course of action that we finally adopted was the right one."

Is it going to take 6 days of conferences to reach a consensus on a course of action every time the Soviets initiate a military threat that could affect us directly? How many of the 15 advisers who sit in on these policymaking sessions are subject to confirmation by the Senate? What is the responsibility of such unofficial advisers directly to the American people? It is easy to say that the President has to make the final decision, but do such advisers exert undue influence on him? On this point, the President said: "So that, in my opinion, the majority came to accept the course we finally took. It made it much easier. In the Cuba of 1961, the advice of those who were brought in on the executive branch was also unanimous, and the advice was wrong. And I was responsible. So that, finally, it comes down that, no matter how many advisers you have, frequently they are divided, and the President must finally choose."

But what about the basic principle of safety first—when war threatens the security of a people? Is it a time to consult fears? Must we speculate at length on the ambiguous purposes of an enemy and guess at his course? Should we not have taken at once steps to thwart the enemy—such as ridding the Caribbean area in August and September of Soviet weapons of any kind and coincidentally imposing a blockade to keep any more weapons from being landed in Cuba?

In his December 17 interview, the President still speculates on Soviet intentions. It is to be hoped that the administration has learned a lesson and will never again confuse military security with the game of international propaganda.

Mr. Kennedy said: "I think in that speech this week he [Khrushchev] showed his awareness of the nuclear age. But, of course, the Cuban effort has made it more difficult for us to carry out any successful negotiation, because this was an effort to materially change the balance of power. It was done in secret, steps were taken really to deceive us by every means they could, and they were planning in November to open to the world the fact that they had these missiles so close to the United States; not that they were intending to fire them, because if they were going to get into a nuclear struggle, they have their own missiles in the Soviet Union.

"But it would have politically changed the balance of power. It would have appeared to, and appearances contribute to reality."

But we did gamble with our national safety. We allowed a group of 15 advisers—mostly civilians—to formulate military policy. The grim fact is that we waited while the Russians were allowed to place missiles in Cuba which an irresponsible Castro might have fired into the Southeast region of the United States. The crafty Khrushchev would have disclaimed all responsibility, thus delaying, if not frustrating, any retaliatory blow against Soviet territory.

England and France twice waited, appeased, and took the "first blow" in two world wars. We ourselves waited for the enemy to strike at Pearl Harbor. But we didn't wait to repel the sudden invasion of South Korea—for which aggression the Soviets later admitted they had supplied the armament.

Despite our public insistence on the right to make on-site inspections in Cuba, the President reveals now that he has given up that demand. Apparently we are to take a chance that no missiles have been concealed and that none will be reintroduced. Yet guns, tanks and Mig planes were still coming into Cuba last week. Several thousand Soviet troops remain there.

Maybe we should reread Mr. Kennedy's book of 1940, "While England Slept." May we hope that subsequent events do not justify a book on the fateful months of 1962 entitled "While America Slept." Let us pray that we shall continue to be a lucky America.

Mona Lisa Cracks Her Smile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the times that try men's souls are not always those of grave international crisis nor serious domestic issue. Like the Buchwalds, the Minshalls attended the unveiling of the Mona Lisa. We can testify as to the veracity of his account of the affair in the January 10 Washington Post.

OUR FIRST OFFICIAL FUNCTION

(By Art Buchwald)

We went to our first official Washington function Tuesday night and it's something we'll remember for the rest of our lives. It was the black-tie, long-evening-dress opening of the Mona Lisa at the National Gallery, and our wife couldn't have been more excited if she had been invited to go water skiing with John Glenn at Hyannis Port.

When the invitation arrived she couldn't believe it.

She was waiting for us when we came home from the office and she threw her arms around us. "We've been invited to something," she cried. "And after only 4 months in Washington. It's hard to believe."

"What have we been invited to?"

"The unveiling of the Mona Lisa and the invitation says the President is going to be there and Andre Malraux and probably all of the Cabinet and the Supreme Court and the diplomatic corps and the Members of Congress and everything. Isn't it exciting?"

MOMENT OF WONDER

We held her close. "Our first Washington function. I wonder if we're up to it."

"I'll have to buy a new dress," she said.

"Spend, spend," we chortled. "These things don't happen every day."

"And I'll need new shoes, and gloves, and I'll have to have my hair changed and my nails done. I just don't know where to start."

"Just don't look more beautiful than Jackie," we chided. "I guess it wouldn't hurt to buy a new tuxedo. This will probably be the first of many White House functions. After all, once they put you on the list, they can hardly take you off."

"I have to call my mother," our wife said. "And my sister Pat, and my sister Joanie, and my sister Sue."

"Call, call. That is what long distance is for."

For the next 2 weeks we could talk of nothing else. Would the President speak to us? Would Malraux ask us to say a few words about the Mona Lisa? Would Vice President JOHNSON insist on introducing us to his wife?

Our wife read up on every protocol manual she could get her hands on.

"It doesn't say anything in any of them about what to do at the unveiling of a painting," she said.

"Just be yourself," we told her. "The Kennedys are not particular about protocol."

THE NIGHT OF NIGHTS

The big night finally came. Our wife had spent $500 on a dress, $30 on the hairdresser, $100 for accessories. But she could hardly have spent less for such an important social engagement. Paul Young, of the restaurant, lent us his Rolls Royce so we could arrive in style. Our new tux do was cut straight from the cloth of the New Frontier.

At the door of the National Gallery, U.S. marines stood at attention under a long canvas archway. It was all we had dreamed it would be. We squeezed our wife's hand as we entered the gallery.

After checking our coats, we rode up in the elevator to the second floor with two admirals, three Senators and four Ambassadors, and their wives. Both of us were starry-eyed. Then we stepped out of the elevator into the beautiful rotunda.

We couldn't see anything except a mob of people standing facing a bunch of arclights way off in the distance. We stood patiently in the crowd staring at the lights. Obviously they were going to let the crowd in all at once. A half-hour passed. We were now hemmed in from behind. Another half-hour passed. Nothing happened.

STATIC AND APPLAUSE

We heard some static over a loudspeaker and some applause. The arclights were blinding us. Another half-hour passed. Nobody moved. Bodies were pressed tightly together. Ambassadors perspired, Congressmen muttered. More static, then more applause and then suddenly everyone turned around.

"That's it," said someone.

"What's it?" we asked.

"It's all over."

"What happened?" we asked him.

"How the hell do I know?"

"What do we do now?"

"You go home."

"Where's the President?"

"He went home too."

"But we haven't even seen the Mona Lisa."

"You can see it on television tomorrow morning at 8:30."

Our wife was heartbroken and was crying in the cloakroom.

An old experienced Washington hand tried to comfort her.

"It's all right, dear," the lady said. You'll get over it. The first function is always the worst. After a while you get used to it. What a pretty dress you're wearing."

This last remark made our wife cry even more.

Wollaston Alloys, Inc., New Foundry in Braintree, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 4, 1963, it was my privilege to attend the opening day ceremonies of the opening of the Wollaston Alloys, Inc., new foundry in Braintree, Mass. I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress the program and also a brief history of this growing firm which is located in my congressional district:

PROGRAM

Chairman and Mrs. Edward H. Tibbetts, President and Mrs. Richard C. Tibbetts, Vice President and Mrs. E. F. Tibbetts, Mr. Richard C. Tibbetts, Jr., Mr. Binney E. Tibbetts, Mrs. Ruth A. Lescoe, Mrs. Louise V. Meredith.

Master of ceremonies: Mr. William G. Brooks, chairman, Braintree Industrial Commission.

Invocation: Rev. Francis A. Curley, St. Elizabeth Parish.

Speakers: Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, Washington, D.C.; Capt. Gerald Duffy, USN, Inspector of Naval Material, First Naval District.

GUESTS

Mr. Matthew Cushing, South Shore National Bank.

Mr. Robert H. Fay, Quincy Savings Bank.

Mr. Arthur I. Burgess, Quincy Savings Bank.

Mr. John W. Bettes, Norfolk County Trust Co.

Mr. Elmer O. Cappers, Norfolk County Trust Co.

Mr. Peter Murphy, Massachusetts Engineering Co.

Mr. William J. Richards, Quincy Steel Casting Co.

Mr. Donald Kane, Walworth Co.

Mr. Leo Darr, Quincy Motor Co., Inc.

Mr. P. F. Williams, Boston Gas Co.

Mr. James E. Coveney.

Mr. Henry W. Bosworth, Jr., Boston Traveler.

Mr. James J. Collins, Boston Globe.

Mr. Robert Plaisted, Patriot Ledger.

Mr. Donald Wilder, Patriot Ledger.

Mr. Herbert Fontaine, Radio Station WJDA.

Mr. James D. Asher, Radio Station WJDA.

Mr. Chester W. Nelson, Braintree Observer.

Mr. Donald R. Dickinson, Braintree Tab.

Mr. John C. Donahue, Jr., Braintree Sunday News.

TOWN OF BRAINTREE

Mr. Harrison T. Smiley, chairman of board of selectmen.

Mr. Fred A. Tenney, selectman.

Mr. Joseph M. Magaldi, planning board.

Mr. Warren J. Cuff, board of assessors.

Mr. Aaron P. Whitcomb, highway department.

Mr. Daniel A. Maloney, building inspector.

Mr. Harold C. Pearl, town engineer.

Mr. Carl W. Johnson, electric light board.

Mr. Alban G. Spurrell, manager—electric light.

Mr. Carl R. Johnson, Jr., town clerk and representative.

Chief John V. Polio, chief of police.

Chief Harry T. Sears, chief of fire department.

Mr. Thomas A. Matthews, water commissioner.

Mr. Donato T. Richardi, water department.

Mr. William G. Dyer, sewerage department.

Mr. Charles R. Furlong, industrial commission.

Mr. Frederick J. Klay, industrial commission.

Mr. Calvin E. Young, industrial commission.

Mr. William B. Webber, industrial commission.

Mr. John O. Holden, industrial commission.

Mr. Richard McNealy, assessor.

WOLLASTON ALLOYS, INC.—A BRIEF HISTORY

Wollaston Alloys, Inc., formerly Wollaston Brass & Aluminum Foundry, Inc., of North Quincy, Mass., is the first industrial firm to commence production at the new Braintree Industrial Plaza located at the junction of Route 128 and the Southeast Expressway in Braintree, Mass. Coincidental with the move to its modern foundry, Wollaston Alloys has changed its name to give a more accurate picture of what it has offered for the past 36 years—a variety of alloy castings, in addition to brass and aluminum.

The move to the new plant was made in order to meet the increased demand for the company's stainless steel, copper-nickel, monel, aluminum, and bronze castings. Wollaston Alloys is a pioneer in casting copper-nickel, an alloy which is continually finding new uses in industry. Some of the company's first castings were made for Regal shoe measuring machines, but today they range from measuring devices for finger holes in bowling balls to specialized castings for the Nation's newest submarines and other nuclear applications.

The firm was founded in 1926 by Mr. Edward H. Tibbetts, who is now chairman of the board of directors. Mr. Tibbetts started the business with $1,000 capital which he borrowed on his life insurance policy. The original foundry, which still stands in North Quincy, is a 20- by 40-foot structure which Mr. Tibbetts personally erected.

In contrast to eight modern electric induction furnaces at the new foundry, which have a capacity of 500 kilowatts and are capable of melting 75,000 pounds of metal per day, Mr. Tibbetts made his first castings with metal he melted in his hand-built pit furnace.

In 1926 Wollaston Brass & Aluminum Foundry was a two-man operation, Mr. Tibbetts and one helper. Today the firm employs 65 people and expects to employ over 100 within a year from opening day at its new foundry, which was January 4, 1963.

The new foundry, although a great deal more complex than the original 20- by 40-structure, was completely designed and planned by Mr. Tibbetts and his two sons, Richard C. and Frank. Richard C. Tibbetts, now president of the firm, joined his father's business in 1935 and supervised the construction of the new plant and the installation of the equipment. Frank Tibbetts, vice president, is a graduate metallurgist from MIT and joined the company in 1950. Carrying on the father-son tradition at Wollaston Alloys is Frank's son, Binney Tibbetts, quality control manager. Richard Tibbetts, Jr., will join the firm upon his graduation from Northeastern University in June 1963.

Wollaston Alloys' new foundry is the most modern and one of the largest of its type in the country. The building is situated on Wollaston's 5-acre tract of land and has 40,000 square feet devoted to production. A pattern shop occupies 3,000 square feet, and 3,000 square feet are devoted to office space.

Modern casting equipment at the new foundry includes a new shell molding department, a mechanized green sand molding system which includes a conveyor fed sand slinger for large molds, two new automatic induction furnaces, core ovens, and new cleaning equipment. Wollaston Alloys is also installing its own cobalt source and radiographic laboratory to supplement its physical testing facilities.

Shame in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the

Evening News of Newburg, in my congressional district, on January 7.

I have put several similar editorials from other newspapers in the RECORD, and I am adding this to that number because I believe that we should be aware of the fact that in many parts of the country today there is great indignation over the atrocities perpetrated by the United Nations, and over the fact that they have stepped way beyond the limits of their own chatter.

Incidentally, these same people are indignant that our own country is the power behind the United Nations, which is committing these offenses:

SHAME IN KATANGA

Once again the troops of the United Nations, supported by the U.S. Government, are advancing in Katanga and once again there are misgivings in the hearts of many Americans who, like Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, feel we may be on the wrong side again.

Certainly, the conduct of the soldiers of the Central Congolese Government and the United Nations was repugnant enough in the events which ended for a time last September in further negotiations. Widespread atrocities were committed, not by the Katangans and the Belgian nationals who serve the mining industry there, but by those serving under the U.N.-Congolese aegis.

The Associated Press photograph of a Belgian civilian crawling from his compact car, leaving behind the bodies of his wife and another woman passenger, cannot be a credit to the U.N. forces. These were not combatants, any more than the missionaries, nurses, and other innocent victims of last summer's atrocities. Yet the women were shot dead in what could not have been a warlike maneuver. They were innocent victims.

The U.N. may be able to crush the Tshombe regime, but it can't conceal the fact that under Tshombe the Katangan Government has been the most civilized and responsible to date in the Congo. If the Katangans chose to keep this war going by guerilla tactics, destroying the mineral production of Katanga's mines, and leaving the U.N. with a destitute Congo and a government dependent upon U.N. troops for its authority, how can we hold up our heads again? Right now there is a sense of shame and misery which must temper the enthusiasm of our strongest supporters of the United Nations as a force for peace and right.

In its brief lifetime the United Nations has proved no stranger to the use of force, and it is not without victories of a sort. It seems to be winning another famous one in the Congo. Little Peterkin, however, might raise the same question he asked about the Battle of Blenheim. What good will come of it?

For this kind of force is quite different from that used in other U.N. military expeditions. Though the Korean war was largely a U.S. undertaking, it was nonetheless sanctioned by the U.N. as a means of keeping the Communists from grabbing another piece of territory, and it was at least a limited victory in that it did accomplish that objective. In other cases the U.N. has intervened in an effort to make people stop shooting at each other.

But now, in its third war against the secessionist Katanga Province of the Congo, the U.N.'s objectives are the opposite. Instead of keeping peace, it is waging war to force a people into a form of unity they do not so far find acceptable. To put it another way, the U.N. is fighting to extend the rule of the Central Congo Government over an area that doesn't want it.

In an age which pays so much lipservice to self-determination, that is a remarkable set of circumstances. No less remarkable is the fact that the United States not only condones but actively supports this policy.

We are quite aware of the "good" that is supposed to come of it. According to the official reasoning, the Central Congo Government in Léopoldville may not be able to last unless it gets hold of the income from Katanga's copper resources, though why Léopoldville's financial distress is the fault of Katanga is more than a little hard to fathom.

If the Central Government falls, the reasoning continues, then the way may be opened for all sorts of new troubles, including even a Communist victory in the Congo. Whether this would in fact happen is guess, but smashing a people's attempt at independence does seem a strange way of combating world communism, which is constantly trying to do the same thing.

In a word, it is an ugly spectacle for the United States to be supporting this U.N. war. Even more disturbing is the precedent being set for the future. With or without the Communists, the world has no lack of trouble spots, and Africa alone, with the fragmentation and political weakness of many of the new states, boasts other potential Congos.

Is the U.N. to intervene everywhere it finds a situation not to its liking for whatever reason? And is the United States in effect to give it the power to do so, regardless of all the considerations of fairness and human rights which it otherwise champions?

If so, U.N. and U.S. leadership would do well to heed the warning addressed to them by Albert Schweitzer. The medical missionary, who has spent nearly half a century in tropical Africa, said that in this war without juridical foundation they risk "losing the well-deserved respect which they enjoy in the world."

The United States has just enhanced that respect with its resolute defense of vital security interests in the Caribbean—without any help from the U.N. It is a shame to risk throwing it away on this U.N. performance in the Congo.

As for the U.N., its prestige and even future may depend on the Congo precedent. That is what the U.N. leaders themselves fear, and which is why they are so eager to finish their conquest of Katanga. But victory won at the expense of principle can hardly bring lasting good.

A Famous Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of January 3, 1963:

A FAMOUS VICTORY

"But what good came of it at last?"
Quoth little Peterkin.
"Why that I cannot tell," said he:
"But 'twas a famous victory."

The American Citizen-Soldier, 1861–65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the speech delivered before the National Conclave of Civil War Roundtables September 16, 1962, at Hagerstown, Md., and the reenactment of the Battle of Antietam, by Dr. Richard Nunn Lanier, executive director of the Richard Kirkland Memorial Foundation:

THE AMERICAN CITIZEN-SOLDIER, 1861–65

She stood on the top steps of her father's white columned portico and kissed her sweetheart goodbye. This beautiful girl of 15 summers, Miss Susan Evilina Kirkland, was the lovely daughter of Maj. Daniel D. Kirkland, a descendant of an old colonial family who had emigrated to Kershaw County, S.C., before the Revolution and whose ancestors had fought brilliantly at the Battle of Camden. Her sweetheart was an American citizen-soldier, likened in appearance to thousands of other American citizens who had answered the call to arms in defense of their country in 1861. This young soldier led no charge, won no thrilling victory, but the men who wore the Blue and the men who wore the Gray honor his memory because, in the midst of slaughter, he dared death to bring solace to his wounded foes. The fighting men on both sides of the lines called him "The Angel of Marye's Heights." Richard Kirkland was his name.

Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, general of all the Federal Armies and the 18th President of the United States, said to his friend John Russell Young, a few years after the war, "I would like to see truthful history written. Such history will do full credit to the courage, endurance, and ability of the American citizen-soldier—no matter what section he hailed from or in what rank."

The Civil War Centennial Committee of Fredericksburg, South Carolina, and Virginia, decided not to reenact any part of the Battle of Fredericksburg, but to present to the people of the United States and all foreign countries, the American citizen-soldier, 1861–65.

We believe we chose wisely when we selected Sgt. Richard Rowland Kirkland of Company D, 2d South Carolina Volunteers as symbolizing the ideal American citizen-soldier.

The late Judge Alvin T. Embrey in his book, "Historic Fredericksburg," summaries his account of the brave and humane deed done by Sgt. Richard Kirkland in these words:

"History will record as a sublime example of that courage and faith which do honor to the human race, and evince its possession still of that spark of Fire Celestial communicated to mankind, when in the Garden of Eden, God breathed into the nostrils of Adam the Breath of Life and he became a Living Soul."

Maj. General U.S. Grant III, grandson of "the general" and chairman of the National Civil War Centennial Committee, as an Army Engineer, supervised the building of the Arlington Memorial Bridge at Washington, D.C. This bridge symbolizing the unity of the North and the South and spans the Potomac River between the Lincoln Memorial and

Gen. Robert E. Lee's home at Arlington, General Grant III, in the National Geographic, volume 119, No. 4, April 1961, had this to say:

"Cruelty is the handmaid of war, and outrages war the records of both northern and southern soldiers, but the Civil War was also replete with instances of mutual consideration, knightly courtesy, and nobility. At Fredericksburg, Confederate Sgt. Richard Kirkland heard wounded Union soldiers calling for water. He vaulted across a stone wall with as many canteens as he could gather and relieved their suffering at the risk of his own life."

Richard Rowland Kirkland was a tall, slender youth with dark eyes and hair, gentle in nature, with pleasing manners, good English and perfect penmanship. He was also a devout Christian and learned his lesson well from the great pulpit Bible of the Flat Rock Baptist Church in Kershaw County, S.C. This Bible was bought in 1833 and from it he would read in the quiet of a summer's evening that "It is more blessed to give than to receive," "Greater love hath no man than he lay down his life for another," and "If thine enemy thirst, give him drink." This great Bible is now a part of the Richard Kirkland collection, as is also his rifle and other interesting relics belonging to this American soldier and are to be found in the Lancaster (S.C.) Museum in Kershaw County.

When the great Battle of Fredericksburg was fought December 13–14, 1862, Dick Kirkland had been with Lee's army from 1861 when he went with Kershaw's brigade through the Seven Days Battle before Richmond, Second Manassas, Harpers Ferry, and Antietam. He was a seasoned soldier, but had never become hardened to the cruelties of war.

Today, I give you a poem written by Walter A. Clark of Augusta, Ga., one of Cobb's men who fought by the side of Sergeant Kirkland in that great trench behind the stone wall on the sunken road, at Fredericksburg. I wish to dedicate this poem to the gallant men in blue and the brave men in gray who, that day, gave their lives for their country—locked in deadly combat 100 years ago:

"THE ANGEL OF MARYE'S HEIGHTS

"(By Walter A. Clarke, of Georgia)

"A sunken road and a wall of stone
And Cobb's grim line of gray
Lay still at the base of Marye's Heights
On the morn of a winter's day.

On the plains below, the blue lines glow,
And the bugle rings out clear.
As with bated breath they march to death
And a soldier's honored bier.

And then from out of the battle smoke
There falls on the lead-swept air.
From the whitening lips that are ready to die
The piteous moan and the plaintive cry
For 'water'—everywhere.

And into the presence of Kershaw brave
There comes a fair-faced lad,
With quivering lips,
As his cap he tips,
'I can't stand this sir,' he said.

'Stand what?' the general sternly said,
As he looked on the field of slaughter;
'To see those poor boys dying out there,
With no one to help them, no one to care
And crying for "water! water!".'

'If you'll let me go, I'll give them some.'
'Why boy, you're simply mad;
They'll kill you as soon as you scale the wall
In this terrible storm of shell and ball,'
The general kindly said.

'Please let me go,' the lad replied;
'May the Lord protect you, then,'
And over the wall in the hissing air
He carried comfort to grim despair,
And balm to the stricken men.

Like Daniel of old in the Lion's den
He walked through the murderous air,
With never a breath of the leaden storm
To touch or to tear his gray-clad form,
For the hand of God was there.

And I am sure in the Book of Gold
Where the blessed Angel writes,
The names that are blest of God and men,
He wrote that day with his shining pen,
Then smiled and lovingly wrote again:
'The Angel of Marye's Heights.'"

Little remains to be told. After the battle and in the winter of 1863 Kirkland was furloughed home by General Lee to recruit more men for the harvest of war. It was at this time when he was returning to the Army of Northern Virginia at Fredericksburg that he kissed his sweetheart goodbye. The lovely Susan was never to see her hero again.

He was with Lee and Jackson at Chancellorsville. Then Gettysburg. Here, again, he distinguished himself in battle. For this act, beyond the call of duty, he was promoted to first lieutenant.

He was with Longstreet at Chickamaugua in September 1863. Here, in the hour of victory, he fell mortally wounded. He gave his life to save his comrades for in the last few moments of mortal life his thoughts and words as ever were for the safety of his comrades: "Save yourselves men, let me be. I am done for. Tell my Pa I died right."

In the Episcopal Church, the Prince of Peace, at Gettysburg, Pa., erected in 1880 as a thank offering and a memorial to our reunited country following the War Between the States, there is appropriately inscribed on a white marble tablet on the north wall of the front northex, this tribute to an American soldier who wore the gray:

"Lt. Richard Rowland Kirkland, Company E, Reg. 2, South Carolina Volunteers, a hero of benevolence; at the risk of life, he gave his enemy drink, at Fredericksburg."

In Camden, S.C., a massive boulder, given by the Kershaw County United Daughters of the Confederacy, marks the last bivouac of Richard Kirkland, American Citizen Soldier. His earthly remains rest in the old Quaker Cemetery, near the graves of his beloved leaders, Maj. Gen. Joseph Benjamin Kershaw and Brig. Gen. John D. Kennedy. And there Richard Kirkland sleeps. His name unknown to most of his countrymen of the North and the South, to whom for a few hours on a long past December afternoon he demonstrated what it was like to be "an American."

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur wrote: "I am deeply moved by the story of Sgt. Richard Kirkland. As a soldier myself it is a gratification to do honor to another."

Alexander Bielaski, of Springfield, Ill., close friend and adviser to Abraham Lincoln, was trained in the War College of the Czars. He was in the Federal Cavalry from Illinois and on Grant's staff. He was great-grandfather of Mrs. Angelique Bielaski whose message to the youth of America follows:

"Richard Kirkland's heroism at Marye's Heights, when he risked his life to carry canteens of water to the Federals, brought cheers from the men on both sides of the wall, and he was acclaimed the "Angel of Marye's Heights."

"Our youth of today badly need heroes to emulate—daily headlines are not conducive to inspire them with the patriotism of George Washington or Patrick Henry or Robert E. Lee. They read of corruption in places, politicians whose corrupt practices fill them with disgust, clergymen who have disavowed the old principles of their faith and by their irreverent conduct have given aid and comfort to the Communists who are hopeful that the anti-Christ doctrine which they so fervently espouse is making progress—Is it any wonder that youth is confused?

"It is important that the monument which will be erected at Marye's Heights be an impressive one—one that will evoke the praise of the thousands of visitors, who, each year are attracted to the places of historic interest in Fredericksburg."

Mrs. Robert Bachman, president general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, writes:

"I do not know when I have been so deeply touched by anything * * *. This is the kind of commemoration of such acts of valor that will bring our Nation together * * *. Thanking you and wishing you a thrilling dedication of a most courageous deed * * *.

The memorial to Sergeant Kirkland will be completed and dedicated in the spring of 1964, on the battlefield in front of the stone wall where he performed his brave deed of mercy. Those wishing to help in the erection of this memorial to an American soldier may send their building stones to the Richard Kirkland Memorial, care of Postmaster, Fredericksburg, Va.

Numerical Composition of the Rules Committee

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, despite the admonitions of some that a freshman Congressman should be seen and not heard, I am compelled to speak out on this vitally important matter. We are not debating a temporary change of the numerical composition of the Rules Committee as was done during the last Congress, but what is done today will result in a permanent change in the organization of this important committee.

As the distinguished gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has so eloquently said, this proposed change in the rules is not designed to give a broader representation on the committee so that bills might be more carefully considered, but the move appears to be prompted to suit the purpose of the moment. Very well a movement so motivated to serve the hour could rise up to haunt this august body in the years ahead as we strive to save our country from bankruptcy and prevent further usurpation of our individual freedoms.

It is passing strange that the sage advice of Judge SMITH, the wise and experienced chairman of the Rules Committee, could be so blindly ignored in reaching a decision on the issue. I wholeheartedly concur in his remarks, and if in taking this position I am labeled as a southern Democrat or a conservative, I shall accept the label and be proud of the name.

In conclusion, may I say that in my humble opinion the effort being made today to pack the Rules Committee will ultimately destroy the effectiveness of this committee in determining the orderly consideration of legislation by this body. As I have said before, rather than attempt to pass a measure by manipulating the membership of a committee, may I respectfully suggest that the authors of this resolution attempt to have their legislation conform to the majority wishes of the Rules Committee and the House of Representatives.

Independence Day of Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the seventh anniversary of her independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces, Ibrahim Abboud; and His Excellency, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Osman al-Hadari, on the occasion of the anniversary of Sudan's independence.

Seven years have elapsed since the Sudan was declared independent, years of continued progress that have made the Sudan a nation to consider, to applaud. From the time of its independence ceremonies on January 1, 1956, the Sudan has achieved a unique position of self-reliance, rapid economic transformation, and political stability. It is with great pleasure that we in America extend greetings to honor the Sudan's independence anniversary.

On Independence Day, 57 years of Anglo-Egyptian rule came to an end. Colonialism had been imposed upon a proud people. Several attempts to overthrow the oppressive yoke had ended in failure. But through perseverance and peaceful constitutional means, colonial rule was at last expelled.

Seven years of economic development have been the greatest achievement of the Sudan as an independent nation. During those short years, over 4,000 acres of irrigated cotton was added; 750 miles of rail track now binds the far-reaching corners of the nation to its capital and port city; electrification of hydraulic plants promoted industrial expansion; and healthy foreign trade was realized, with cotton being the prime motivator in most transactions. These are milestones in the economic development of a new nation.

As a new nation, it has and will continue to suffer setbacks. Because of political ineffectuality and dismemberment, a bloodless coup overthrew the old regime and established a ruling junta, generally supported and praised, though, by all save the Communists.

While dissimilarities of culture, religion, and race between the north and south have brought about eruptive disorder, the Sudanese Government is determined to obliterate the differences between these sections of the country so that the entire nation may progress in harmony and unity.

I salute these achievements and hopes of the Sudan. I am certain that the next 7 years will bring even greater advancement. We hope that in the forthcoming years the Sudan will set an example for the world community to emulate. We are proud to claim the Sudan as a friend and to share with the Sudanese people the celebration of their independence anniversary.

Brooklyn Women on the Frontier of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, at the Brooklyn Young Women's Christian Association campaign dinner on Thursday, November 1, 1962:

BROOKLYN WOMEN ON THE FRONTIER OF FREEDOM

Madam Chairman, Madam President, distinguished members of the board of directors, board of trustees, and the campaign committee, my ladies, I feel highly complimented by the invitation of your gracious cochairman, Mrs. J. Victor Herd, to enjoy this nice visit with you, and I am thankful to Mrs. R. Whitney Gosnell, president, and Mrs. Ernest Tutino, campaign chairman, for their hospitality. But I warn you that when I get up steam, I am like the preacher who announces the theme of his sermon, then goes off on a tangent and speaks about everything else. My topic is "Brooklyn Women on the Frontier of Freedom," and I approach my assignment in the spirit of gratitude that all of you so well merit.

Gratitude is the greatest of all commandments; gratitude to you and gratitude to the splendid Young Women's Christian Association.

Let me, please, at this point record my appreciation to Mrs. Herd who, accompanied by Miss Kintner, so kindly briefed me on the history, program, and manifold accomplishments of the YWCA. I learned that I am meeting with you tonight after 74 years of glorious service by the Y to our young women—after 74 years of rich life. But life is a quality, not a quantity, and it cannot be measured entirely by clock or calendar. Time is but a system through which we measure the passing of the future, through the present, into the past. For there are organizations, whose value is such that to measure them by clock or calendar, might be trivial and meaningless. Their power is such that we cannot tell how long they will last or have lasted, for they give inspiration and direction to their whole generation and community and will always stand out as a source of strength and hope for posterity. Certainly, the YWCA stands out front as one of these organizations. The YWCA was founded 74 years ago and there must be many here in Brooklyn who recall with great reverence and appreciation what their grandmothers achieved two generations ago. They may not have occupied a seat next to their husbands on the covered wagon but they were pioneers in the very sense of the word. They builded well, these pioneers.

As we approach our greater community, not for alms or charity, but for continued support, broader support, and increased support of the program of the "Y," we can say that a contribution to the YWCA is a great American investment. The program was developed during the past three-quarters of a century by the very best brains of a dedicated leadership. It consists of varied services directed to the preservation and the enhancement of the position of our American women in whose hands, I say, lies the fulfillment of America's hopes.

Your program, in offering residences to young women without family ties in our greater community, represents immense moral, social, and economic benefits for these young people. Your clubs and affiliated services, providing a congenial and dignified annex to that home lacking such facilities, serve as an encouragement and a source of hope for a better life. A home away from home is a typical American institution.

Your program of health education, personnel counseling, and food services, attests to the ingenuity of your planners because from a practical point of view in this and other areas, women are at a disadvantage, the 19th amendment notwithstanding. Your participation in that great Robin Hood camp, is exposing many of our young ladies to the beauties of mother nature of which our women are a conspicuous part.

Your school of practical nursing—this phase of your service is a heartwarming subject with me. I recall, rather vividly, that after Pearl Harbor, one of my responsibilities as a member of the nurse recruitment group of the American Red Cross obligated me to enlist all the registered nurses we could to join the Armed Forces, because at one point we had only one nurse for hundreds of servicemen in the Pacific theater. The practical nurses were there to fill the great vacuum left on the homefront. They are sorely needed today. Your school of practical nursing is "another jewel" in the crown of your attainments.

I could devote many hours to the analysis of your manifold services and to an interpretation of the impact of these services on our community at the present time, and on the future of Brooklyn. However, father time must be respected.

I said that the founders of the YWCA planned a great effort. Your distinguished officers and all those who labored for this great organization ought to be remembered and congratulated. Your dedication and devotion to the YWCA has earned the gratitude of the community and of America. You have built, and are building, a foundation with ever-increasing strength under the status of our American women, and, the future of America lies in their hands. We are very fortunate, and we are very grateful, for that 19th amendment to our Constitution because it assured America and the world that our human society can be preserved in a form consistent with the will of God and for the benefit of mankind.

I could devote much time to a discussion of the immense contribution that our American women have made to our economy, to our political pattern, and to our social structure. Their integrity, ingenuity, resourcefulness, and effectiveness, are unquestioned.

We select a few people, vest them with coercive power, and depending upon the area, we call them government, corporate management, or a board of a social welfare organization. The question on the ethical side is, what is the moral basis for their power and their authority? The answer is, obviously, general welfare, community welfare, and if we extend this philosophy to the "Y," your very presence here indicates that you have accepted a responsibility in this field of social action, and that you are blessed with that high degree of morality upon which our American women have always had, and always will have, an A-1 priority.

You are seeking the modest sum of $90,000 to service 5,000 young women. It is indeed a modest sum considering this great frontier town of ours, which for three centuries has welcomed more new citizens to our shores than any other community. These groups include men and women, young and old—requiring social services, the provision of which, at times, exacts superhuman effort. But our $90,000 is a small sum for the values created through the molding and the development of American womanhood, the firmest pillar of our great Republic.

Forty-some-odd years ago, I heard a story from one of my fellow seamen. On one of the islands of the seven seas, there was carved, by Nature, on the side of a coral hill, the head of a woman. Under certain atmospheric conditions, prior to a storm, when the sun's rays were reflected upon this object which otherwise was enshadowed, brilliant roses appeared around that head. This beautiful phenomenon was a warning signal to youngsters on the beach to seek shelter in anticipation of destructive tidal waves. The natives called this great work of Nature, the Goddess of the Roses.

You and I know that in this troubled world, we view the horizon many times with anxiety, particularly on ethical and moral issues. It is simply wonderful as I look around here to see dedicated women, each of whom has much in common with that Goddess of the Roses. I know that with your effort, fully aware of the warning signals, you will continue to provide the kind of support that the "Y" and your leadership merits, preserving for this community, and the Nation, the status of the American women, the greatest ideal on our frontier of freedom.

Truth-in-Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to accelerate the stabilization of the Nation's economy by assuring equitable relationships that will result from the full disclosure of financing costs in connection with extensions of credit. In recent years an increasing number of complaints of widespread extortion, arising from presently accepted business practices, has been disclosed by witnesses before congressional committees, revealed in reports of the public press and related by individuals personally victimized by the flourishing credit racket. An abundance of relevant testimony, clearly establishing the viciousness of the system, has been recounted by witnesses before the House District Committee and the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

I, therefore, have presented the bill both to stabilize the economy and to promote individual justice. I am deeply concerned over the fact that from both the quantity of substantial evidence presented to committees and secured through personal sources it is conclusively indicated that countless Negroes have been robbed and cheated by unscrupulous business people who willfully exact exorbitant interest through subtle means unrevealed to them. As a consequence of such practices the full cost of articles to the trusting purchaser is withheld while the seller is realizing profits as great as 100 percent or more. Moreover, through such criminal practices there are thousands of well-known instances pointing out that it is a common policy of dishonest sellers to resell the same articles several times over with the identical built-in interest charges to other unsuspecting Negroes further compounding, thereby, big profits for such businessmen. And, the sum total of the tragedy of this unconscionable condition has been that consumers who have suffered most are those in the lowest economic group and, thus, least able to pay.

Full disclosure of financing costs incident to consumer credit could prevent or at least restrain abuses of the helpless imposed as is now the case through the concealment of true rates, the manipulation of charges by the use of fees, and the failure to rebate amounts taken in advance. These considerations, Mr. Speaker, are so compelling that I have presented this legislation and am now appealing to the leadership to join me in its passage.

The Brotherhood of Free Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following "Greeting to Our Christian Neighbors," which appeared in the December 24, 1962, edition of the Washington Post.

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld here gives the response of the Jewish community to the expressions of spiritual brotherhood given them by their Christian neighbors. The unity of Christian and Jew as Americans is one of the finest expressions of a free society.

The holiday season has passed, but brotherhood in freedom remains.

Rabbi Gerstenfeld's greetings follow:

A GREETING TO OUR CHRISTIAN NEIGHBORS

On the eve of the high holydays of the faith of Israel many faithful Christians have tendered to me some profound expression of their spiritual comradeship. In the same spirit I now extend to the devout Christians of our city these prayerful greetings.

This week the children of the faith of Israel celebrate Hanukkah, the festival of light, to remember the heroism of the Maccabees, who, more than 2,000 years ago, fought for religious liberty against Hellenist tyranny. It was their struggle against the forces of cruel darkness that made it possible for our sages to keep burning the flame of our ancient faith on the altar of Israel. It was the torch raised high by these stalwart Maccabees of ages past that blazed the trail of light for the coming of Christianity. If not for their spiritual strength and sacrificial struggle and rededication, as they faced the forces of religious decadence within and intolerance without, the vision of the democratic state of freemen would never have been born.

As you gather this Christmas Day to turn your souls in prayer before the altar of Almighty God our hearts are joined with yours in the quest for peace on earth for men of good will; and our lives are reconsecrated with the fellow citizens of this blessed land in the will for the good that makes possible a world of good will. We pray for God's blessing to the Christian churches of our community and to all of the Christian faith everywhere; who have faced the oppressor without appeasement; who have befriended the innocent from mankind's malevolence; who have truly shared the world's sorrow and who have been the living witness of our common faith: "To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

May our prayers unite us, Christian and Jew, in this festival season of light, so that we will stand together, as free citizens of this good land, the hope of the world, to raise high a sacred torch to dispel the darkness. Now that God in His wisdom has swept mankind into the orbit of a tiny community, so that even the blind can see that all men on the face of the earth are neighbors, we pray that He shall give us the strength to rise to a great covenant of righteousness; so that the individual man everywhere shall have his divinely endowed, inalienable rights, guarded by neighbors who will live as brothers.

Rabbi NORMAN GERSTENFELD,
Minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.

Congressman Philbin's Unique Tribute to Speaker John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 8, 1963, in the House Democratic caucus held here, it was the privilege of the Members on this side to hear the distinguished gentleman from the Third Massachusetts Congressional District, Mr. PHILBIN, deliver one of the most eloquent addresses and tributes ever uttered on such occasion when he nominated, for the continuing speakership of this House, our beloved and revered colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Of course, the nomination was unanimously approved and that afternoon we wisely and formally reelected Speaker MCCORMACK.

All of us agree with and share in the sentiments so ably expressed by Congressman PHILBIN as he summarily traced the patriotic public service of our great Speaker and reviewed the remarkable talents of his brilliant mind and courageous heart, which have endeared him to all who have ever served with him and which assure that the name of Speaker MCCORMACK will be, forever, an inspiring byword in the legislative history of this Nation.

A great many Members, on both sides of the aisle here, asked me to intercede with my very dear and esteemed friend and colleague from the Third Massachusetts District for the purpose of having his eloquent address included in the permanent record. He graciously consented to permit me to introduce it into the RECORD and Congressman PHILBIN's nominating speech follows:

CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN'S SPEECH NOMINATING SPEAKER MCCORMACK

Mr. Chairman and members of the caucus, I have a very delightful duty to perform this

morning and it comes to me as a very great honor and privilege indeed.

Our dear and highly esteemed and illustrious friend, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, is one of the greatest Americans who has ever served in the Congress.

He enjoys the highest respect and warmest affection of each and every one of us.

He enjoys the confidence, esteem, and respect of the American people, indeed of the people of the world. To talk of his magnificent qualities and accomplishments seems almost like carrying coals to New Castle.

His service in the House, as we well know, can be measured only in superlative terms. During the time he has been here he has served his district, State, party, and country with a great ability, fidelity to duty, and humanitarian impulse that certainly has never been exceeded in the history of this great Government.

I hardly need, before this distinguished group, comprised of so many warm friends, admirers and supporters, to recount the prolific abundance of natural gifts, talents, characteristics and services that have distinguished the inspiring career of this great American from the colorful and patriotic community of South Boston in my home State of Massachusetts, as he forged his way from the humble precincts of his historic city to the third highest position of trust, honor, and responsibility in the great Government of the United States.

Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK is admittedly endowed with all the attributes of personality, character, leadership, and capacity that make for greatness.

Time and time again, in and out of this great body, the renowned House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body of its kind in the world, he has demonstrated his true worth as an unsurpassed public servant.

A fearless, articulate, and inspiring leader, a gifted and effective debater, a respected and admired political strategist, a skilled diagnostician of the public will, a truly great heart and great mind, devoted to lofty concepts and objectives of statesmanship, JOHN MCCORMACK is commended and beloved by all of us.

A patriot of the top-most rank, a lawyer and counselor of recognized skill and experience, an eminent parliamentarian, known everywhere for his knowledge, fairness and impartiality, and, above all, a man whose vigorous, determined work in promoting the well-being and welfare of the great rank and file of the American people, the oppressed, the lowly, the exploited, the helpless and inarticulate, wherever they may be, has known no bounds.

Born with a great fighting heart and a buoyant spirit of uplift and regeneration, JOHN MCCORMACK has always been in the vanguard of forward-looking leadership, philosophically, politically, socially, economically, spiritually, and in every other way.

Resolutely committed to the doctrine that our political and parliamentary institutions are valid instruments for promoting the liberty, stability and progress of the Nation, no man has ever labored more ably, diligently, and effectively to further the general well-being of the Nation, protect the rights of those who struggle and toil under our free enterprise system and enlarge and elevate the advantages and opportunities of the American people.

To succeed our late, lamented, dear friend and memorable leader, that great statesman and ever to be esteemed and remembered former Speaker, the great Sam Rayburn, was indeed a task of monumental proportions.

Yet, in a comparatively short time of JOHN MCCORMACK'S noteworthy service as Speaker, our membership, the Nation, and the world recognize the mettle and the high worthiness of the present great Speaker of the House.

In his characteristic way of deep humility, devout dedication to principle and conviction, Speaker MCCORMACK has been something more than the leader of this body. He has been our warm friend, our ready counsellor, our unselfish guide and adviser, our constant sustaining strength.

Confidant and adviser of our Presidents since the 1930's, he has labored with vigor, loyalty, and marked success to implement the legislative program of our cherished former colleague and great President and friend, John F. Kennedy.

As we know, he can be trusted and relied upon to carry out these great tasks of leadership in this session of Congress and in the time to come.

And as in the past, he will carry them out with dispatch, efficiency and a great driving force of sagacious statesmanship that will make for success and victory for the great cause we represent.

To touch a personal note, JOHN MCCORMACK has been my friend since before I came to this body. Just as many of you, I have seen and known him at close range. He is a great man, a great leader, a great American, a great Speaker, and he is a true and loyal friend.

We as Members of the House and the people of the Nation are fortunate indeed, especially in this time of uncertainty and peril, when surging movements of conspiracy and unrest are assailing the pillars of free government throughout the world, as well as in our own Nation, and when we must unite as we will, in an invincible, resolute force against these evils and dangers, to have a truly outstanding, well-poised, experienced, humane leader like JOHN MCCORMACK to guide and counsel us and to join so wholeheatedly with our beloved and esteemed friend, our great President Kennedy, in preserving, protecting, and strengthening the rich heritage of our freedom and seeking peace, understanding, and amity for the world.

Man of deep faith and high destiny, man of profound spiritual beliefs and trust in his Divine Maker, who proudly bears the shield of justice and fair dealing and carries in his big heart an inspirational love of country and humanity, sprung from the people and devoted to their welfare, a true, dedicated, demonstrated believer in the American way of life, a great credit to our great party, the House of Representatives, the Congress, and our Nation, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK is destined to go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen and leaders of the Nation.

The reelection of Speaker MCCORMACK is a foregone conclusion. But I want to say to my valued colleagues that Massachusetts is very proud of our great native son, the distinguished Speaker of the House.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I place in nomination in the Democratic caucus for Speaker of the House the name of our great, esteemed, and beloved friend, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

A Salute to Homer Capehart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as this 88th Congress gets underway, we find on both sides of the Hill that many familiar faces are missing. We in the Indiana delegation particularly will miss Homer E. Capehart, who has represented the Hoosier State in the Senate for the past 18 years. He is, incidentally, the only man from Indiana ever to be elected to three full terms in the Senate.

As we all know, Homer's bid for a fourth term was a little short of being successful—and in this business there is no prize for second place. But our country today is a better place because Homer served here so long and well.

We wish Homer many years of health to enjoy the prize he has already won—the love and respect of so many, many Hoosiers which is reflected in this editorial from the Martinsville Daily Reporter of November 9, 1962:

HOMER ENTITLED TO RESPECT

In defeat, as in victory, Homer Capehart is the same man, entitled to respect.

By his own effort, without benefit of higher education or inherited wealth, he became a powerful man. Powerful, and respected because of his ability and his integrity.

He is an unashamed admirer of the "American system" which has made the United States the land of opportunity for those willing to work.

People either work for the Government or they work in private enterprise. "It is that simple," he has said. He held to the sound idea that it is better to encourage private business than to add to the Government payroll.

Even his friends and intimates in his party have had quiet fun at some of the Senator's little boo-boos. Once, in reading a speech someone had written for him, Homer is reported to have mispronounced "naive" as "nave." A former Indiana Governor, according to report, audibly corrected him, to the amusement of many.

These minor slips, which all must make occasionally, did not detract from, but rather added to, his personality. The old boy was not always right, but he has too much native good sense to be wrong most of the time. He is the salesman type, not a timeclock puncher. We choose to believe he was always thinking, striving to find answers to questions that have no apparent answer, as the farm problem.

The figure of Dempsey, the greatest of the heavyweights of our time, comes to mind. Fast footwork by his opponent and the inroads of time toppled Dempsey, as they did Homer. But honor remains.

Still of championship frame, Capehart is a symbol of individual effort, which our country must never lose if she is to progress.

"I want to retain that form of government under which the farm boy of today becomes the farmowner of tomorrow; under which the worker of today becomes the successful businessman of tomorrow; under which any citizen is free to become a leader in civil affairs, business, or government."

At the time of its greatest weakness, Capehart, originally a Democrat, rallied the forces of private enterprise and individual freedom as represented by the Republican Party, with his famous "cornfield conference."

So the party owes a lot to Capehart. Maybe all citizens, whether they acknowledge it or not, also owe him something. At the very least, respect.

In the Army, when a Regular retires, he is honored with an appropriate ceremony.

As a solid, loyal soldier of the Republic, Homer Capehart, on his retirement, is entitled to the true honor accorded those who have given loyal, faithful service to their country.

So, a salute to Homer Capehart.

Problems of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sadness that I announce to the House of Representatives that the problems of the textile industry have not been solved. I had hoped that we could make such progress on the seven-point program of President Kennedy that I could on this, the second day of Congress, make a statement that our problems were on the way to solution.

We have made progress, and we have every hope of progress in the future; meanwhile, the situation steadily degenerates from bad to worse, and, if not corrected, I fear, to desperate.

Typical, and exemplary, of conditions that are existing, and the abuses the Japanese textile people are making of our largess, and the Geneva agreements, is the plight of the narrow fabrics industry. Many of the plants which have employed good, red-blooded Americans, have had to go out of business and others are being threatened. A plant in my district is being threatened, if not with extinction, with such changes or curtailment that many people will be out of work. This is not in keeping with the American democratic idea of full employment, and if this is the result of our foreign policies, or trade policies of the United States, then these policies should be changed.

A chronology of what is happening has been brilliantly cataloged by Mr. Arthur R. Hutchinson, president of J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., part of whose operations are located in my district. I include that letter as part of my remarks and I commend this to the thinking of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and to the American people, neither of whom, I am sure, wish for conditions such as this to exist within the textile industry or any other because of harmful promises, policies or agreements made by or on the part of our own governmental bureaus. These policies have been in existence too many debilitating years now, and need quick and sure revision.

The letter is as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO ANY INTERESTED PARTY

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
November 28, 1962.

Re importation of Japanese component parts of zippers, zipper tape, and zipper chain.

Our companies, J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., of Philadelphia, Pa., founded in 1853, and our affiliate Sullivan-Southern, Inc., of York S.C., incorporated in 1949, are the largest producers in America of sales tape for the slide fastener or zipper industry.

Since early in 1961 we have been in constant touch with the excess imports of Japanese zipper tape and recently to the start of the importation of Japanese zipper chain.

The U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 24, 1962, No. 9, on pages 715 to 727, carried a portion of our fight against this increasing menace to our industry.

My letter to Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of South Carolina, dated October 7, 1961, was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in full.

I quote from this letter as follows: "In my opinion the increased voluntary quota of Japan, standing at 900,000 pounds in 1961, represents approximately 30 percent of all the zipper tape that all of the narrow fabric manufacturers made in 1960, which explains the reason why prices are becoming depressed and unemployment in the zipper tape portion of the narrow fabric industry is increasing.

"At the present time Sullivan-Southern, Inc., in York, S.C., has not fully felt the impact of these imports, and inasmuch as they have not, neither have our employees in Philadelphia, but if the voluntary quota of 300,000 pounds in 1961, which was voluntarily increased to 900,000 pounds, is further increased or not decreased back to where it was, I feel sure that come 1962 our companies will certainly have to curtail production both in Pennsylvania and South Carolina."

Well, this has happened. Three months ago we reduced production by curtailing the number of hours worked daily. On October 1 we further curtailed our production by full days off for many employees. We now plan further cuts in production starting December 3.

This curtailment in working hours is made in the face of statistics given us by our customers, the zipper industry, that sales of zippers have materially increased during 1962 over 1961, which gives our industry the answer—increased Japanese imports.

Other facts given and statements made in my letter to Congressman HEMPHILL have not changed since that date. A manufacturer of zipper tapes in North Carolina shut down as reported, and has, for the past year, been producing narrow fabrics other than zipper tape.

Another narrow fabric manufacturer has, I believe, found it more advantageous to purchase Japanese woven zipper tape for resale than to produce it in America as they have done in the past. Employees of this company are now looking for work.

In a letter writter to our accountants on January 5, 1961, I quote, "We have a customer who purchases over $750,000 worth of zipper tape per year at approximately $10.50 per thousand yards average. A better grade we manufacture sells for $12 per thousand yards. He has been offered a tape as good as, or better than our best, at $7.02 per thousand yards delivered in New York, all charges and duty paid. I suppose this customer will be the next one of ours to defect."

Well, he has, in an effort to compete with his competitors who import both Japanese zipper tape and Japanese zipper chain.

Furthermore, our price of approximately $10.50 per thousand yards is now approximately $9.35 per thousand yards and we, of course, cannot compete with the Japanese quotations. Neither yarns, dyeing, nor labor has decreased for us nor have we been given any Government subsidy. This customer does not want to purchase Japanese tape but has been forced to in order to compete in the New York market.

The Japanese manufacturers have various ways and means of flooding our market with their products:

No. 1. They ship in to zipper manufacturers or chain manufacturers dyed flat zipper tape.

No. 2. They ship in to zipper manufacturers or chain manufacturers dyed zipper tape on which two cords have either been woven or sewed.

No. 3. They ship in to zipper manufacturers, chain manufacturers, or narrow fabric manufacturers flat tape or beaded tape in unbleached skeins, ready for dyeing.

No. 4. They ship in to zipper manufacturers or assemblers dyed zipper tape to which the metal element has been attached to the beaded tape.

As to No. 1: Zipper tape is, in our opinion, a component part of a zipper. In fact it is one of the most important component parts and when dyed flat zipper tape is imported with a 17½-percent duty it hurts the narrow fabric industry and the dye houses that would ordinarily dye this item in America.

As to No. 2: Dyed corded zipper tape, also in our opinion a component part of a zipper, is also imported with a 17½-percent duty and hurts the narrow fabric industry, the dye industry, the thread and bobbin industry, the cord industry, and the zipper or chain industry that previously sewed this cord on in America.

As to No. 3: Unbleached zipper tape either flat or beaded is imported in skeins, again at 17½-percent duty. This importation does not hurt our dye industry but certainly hurts the narrow fabric industry, if flat tape, and the zipper and chain industry, as well as the cord, thread, and bobbin industry, if it is a beaded tape.

As to No. 4: Dyed corded zipper tape made up into continuous or gap chain all ready to make into zippers with a duty of only 19 percent, it not being considered a component part of a zipper, although you and I could, within a few seconds, make a zipper from it with a top and bottom stop, a slider, and a small hammer.

Zippers are duty assessed at a rate between 40 and 50 percent. Component parts are supposed to be assessed at 50 percent.

However, tape, cord, thread, bobbins, and chain are not considered by the customs department as component parts of zippers, which we in our industry feel they are.

Up until a few months ago the zipper industry and the chain industry were not too much exercised about the plight of the zipper tape division of the narrow fabric industry.

Under date of December 5, 1961, the New York Daily News Record carried this headline "Slide Fastener Producers See Sales Zipping Along" and in the article "Although there has been much talk about slide fastener imports, particularly in the new nylon tape, most U.S. manufacturers are not unduly concerned. These U.S. producers feel that the quality and service they can deliver will more than offset any price advantage expected to be gained by a foreign producer. Moreover, they enjoy a sturdy tariff protection of 50–60 percent ad valorem."

Now that chain is coming into America by the thousands of pounds and hundreds of thousands of yards at a duty of only 19 percent, I wonder what will be the report this December in regard to the sturdy tariff protection of 50–60 percent they enjoyed a year ago. I feel that there is available the protection the narrow fabric industry, the chain industry and the zipper industry need in our custom's regulations. What we all need is an enforcement of its provisions.

The reported increase in the business of the zipper manufacturers during 1962 has been opposite to trend in the zipper tape division of the narrow fabric industry, where production has been curtailed because of Japanese imports and will have to be further curtailed because of the importation of zipper chain.

Quotes from Daily News Record of November 20, 1962: "Spinners have expressed disappointment in the weaving season. Weavers have not come through with the yarn business as was expected. They continue buying close to the vest, and the outlook for any improvement in this situation is dim" and "American cotton textile mills are in the most competitive industry in the Nation but still they cannot successfully compete with imports."

I feel that there are three ways to solve our problems and the problems of the narrow fabric industry, which in turn will help the zipper industry, the chain industry, the thread and bobbin industry, the cord indus-

try and the dye industry and furthermore help the cotton yarn industry in America, who up to the present time do not realize how badly they have been hurt but who I am sure must know that recently a cord manufacturer threw in the sponge.

1. By the proper application of the duty on all zippers and component parts, as already in the books.

2. By the enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission of their rules and regulations as to the proper marking of imported tape and chain.

3. By the adjustments of quotas as being worked on by the State Department with the cooperation of the Commerce Department.

In 1961, when we started to bring the Japanese tape situation before the eyes of our suppliers, our customers and our competitors, I stated that our company was running full and was not hurting but that some of our competitors had gotten out and others are hurting. Now, we are starting to hurt and we find as a result—

1. Decreased yarn purchases.
2. Decreased cord purchases or production.
3. Decreased commission dyeing.
4. Elimination of premium wages.
5. Curtailment of work week.
6. Many other curtailments in cash outlays.
7. Depressed selling prices.

We cannot compete with a tape manufacturer who gets his cotton with a subsidy, has his yarn made with 25-cent-per-our labor and follows through all weaving, warping, winding, dyeing, and finishing operations with substandard wage rates, even though our equipment is just about the newest and best equipment available in the world.

Respectfully submitted.

J. SULLIVAN & SONS MANUFACTURING CO.,
ARTHUR R. HUTCHINSON,
President.

Alabama's Economy Hits New Peaks in 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the year just ended was a good year for business all over this country. We in Alabama's economy is a healthy growity of the Nation and in so doing reached new heights of economic growth and advancement.

Alabama's economy is a healthy growing one, and all of us are hopeful that in 1963 there will be further advances. In addition to this we will all be working to eliminate the pockets of poverty and unemployment through improvements in the structure of the economy.

I think all of the members of the House will be interested in the article by Irving Beiman which appeared in the January 6 edition of the Birmingham News, which I insert herewith in the RECORD:

STATE'S ECONOMY HITS NEW PEAK IN 1962

(By Irving Beiman)

Business in general reached an alltime high point in Alabama during 1962.

Figures from the U.S. Department of Commerce showed the State's economy made important gains in many fields during the past year.

For example, deposits in 238 banks over the State totaled $2¼ billion, 11 percent more than at the end of 1961. So Alabamians have more money than ever before, money with which to buy things, to invest or to hold on deposit.

Banks are lending more than ever also. Loans in Federal Reserve member banks in Alabama were at the $1 billion level at the end of 1962, a rise of almost 10 percent over loans at the end of 1961.

That is a healthy business indicator, because when banks lend money, that money is put to use somewhere in the State's economy.

In the retail trade field, department store sales showed an increase of 9 percent over the State during 1962. Birmingham department stores had a 2 percent decline for the year, approximately.

PHONE INCREASES

More telephones were in service than ever before over the State, Southern Bell reported. More than 800,000 phones were in place in homes and business establishments in the State, a record high.

More than 12,000 permits were issued to build new homes valued at more than $100 million. This was a better record than for 1961.

Airlines and railroads had notable increases in their respective operations during 1962 in Alabama. The airlines counted 7 million revenue passengers and more than 5 million ton-miles of cargo carried. Railroads serving the region realized around $1 billion in freight revenue and close to $100 million in passenger fares.

EMPLOYMENT UP

Employment figures furnished a real bright spot for Alabama in 1962.

The State had more than 750,000 workers engaged in nonagricultural jobs, including around 250,000 in manufacturing. This was an increase in both categories over 1961.

It also was a source of satisfaction to know there were 10 percent fewer persons drawing unemployment compensation in Alabama during 1962 than in 1961.

Alabama's share of the world trade market also rose in 1962. The Mobile customs district recorded around $275 million in total trading done with countries of the world during 1962. This included increased activity in both exports and imports.

FARM PROFITS

Another good spot in an otherwise fine business picture was in the agricultural field. Farmers in the State collected more than half a billion dollars in the cash market for their crop and livestock products. Alabama held firmly to third place in the Nation in commercial production of chickens, its hatcheries turning out around 275 million baby chicks, and slaughtering houses handling more than a million beef cattle and calves and hogs in the production of red meat for the tables.

ON OTHER FRONTS

In addition to all this, the year brought some other good encouragement for Alabama business by recording progress the State had made in different fields of economic activity.

It saw Alabama, for instance, advance from 24th to 23d among all States in homebuilding progress.

Pick up 48,000 residents between 1960 and 1961.

Go from 18th 15th place among all States in total expenditures for new plant and equipment by manufacturers between 1959 and 1960.

Record one of the Nation's lowest rates of business failures in 1961, only 1 out of every 328 closing their doors, 33d down the list of 48 States.

Stood 14 among all States in rate of increase in dollar volume of goods and services sold to the Federal Government between fiscal years 1961 and 1962.

Counted nearly $3 billion put into all forms of construction from 1956 to 1961, inclusive.

Manufactured $16½ billion worth of goods from 1950 to 1960, inclusive, doubling, trebling, quadrupling, and quintupling the value of output in various lines, employing an average of 225,000 workers in the process each year, and paying them around $800 million in wages and salaries annually.

Saw the number of motor vehicles registered in the State pass the 1.3 million mark.

Experienced the Nation's third greatest rate of increase in median family income between 1950 and 1960, with a rise of 116.3 percent in the decade.

Pointed to the fact that the average monthly earnings of its Government workers between 1950 and 1961 were third in the United States in rate of advance.

Go from 19th to 11th place among all States in production of paper and paperboard between 1950 and 1961, and land in 6th position in output of woodpulp in 1961.

Finally, 1962 produced the good tidings that Alabama was among only 9 States in the Nation to show an increase in number of commercial and industrial firms between 1960 and 1961, and among 21 to reflect a gain between 1950 and 1961, winding up 1961 with 37,777.

Young Men, Young Women, Wake Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Chronicle, of Detroit, Mich., on Saturday, December 15, 1962, by the distinguished scholar and educator, Dr. Broadus N. Butler, of Wayne State University.

As a vigorous and diligent civil libertarian, and as a courageous leader in the battle of equality, Dr. Butler expresses some thoughts which issue a challenge worthy of our consideration.

While his editorial by no means suggests that the real battle for equality is yet ended in this great land of ours, it nevertheless indicates a remarkable awareness on the part of this great American of a new phase of the problem of equality of opportunity which is entering the American way of life.

The editorial follows:

YOUNG MEN, YOUNG WOMEN, WAKE UP

(By Dr. Broadus N. Butler)

We are deeply impressed by two facts about the present employment and career horizon for young Negro men and women. One of them is bold and encouraging. The other should be a matter of grave concern to us all. The bold fact is that the dedicated labors of the many organizations and people who have striven for equal employment opportunity have begun to come to harvest—and opportunity is real now. The fact about which there should be grave concern is that neither the young people, nor their parents, nor their counselors, with few

exceptions, have achieved a full appreciation and realization of what this means.

It can be said with complete justification and validity that until the past year, equal opportunity, or even opportunity itself in any genuine sense, was a kind of nebulous thing that made good platitudes, but did not really exist for young Negro men and women in the important sectors of our national and economic life. It is no wonder that they could not be easily motivated to engage the strenuous effort of high preparation for careers which they were, at the same time, being impressed that they would be denied.

However, it can now be said with equal validity that so radical a change has taken place over the past year that the mantle is upon our shoulders now to produce young men and women to assume the responsible roles that now cry for them and now find them neither sufficiently motivated nor yet fully prepared (in the sense of discipline, not in the sense of capacity) to gird themselves to assume.

We are so rapidly approaching the dream and the hope expressed by Langston Hughes when he said:

"O, let my land be a land where liberty
Is crowned with no patriotic wreath,
But opportunity is real, and life is free,
Equality is in the air we breathe."

The most degrading and depressing consequences of employment discrimination have been that it has made the potential man look down and has sunk that potential man's aspirations and achievements so far below the level of his inherent capacities, that it not only demeaned and degraded the man, but it deprived society of the full measure of what would have been that fully developed man. Any person tends to see things at his own eye level. So if our youth do not raise their sights or have their sights elevated, they will not even now see the real opportunities and concomitant responsibilities there are for competent, confident, responsible, and adequate young men and women in this day.

Industry is calling for young executives. Where are they? Skilled trades are calling for young Negro men to return to them. Where are they? Technology is calling for men of science and research. Where are they? Government is calling for civil service executives for classifications G-12 and above. Where are they? Cities, States, and our Nation are looking for capable and responsible office holders. Where are they? Agencies of stock exchanges and banking and finance are looking for brokers and analysts. Where are they? Educational institutions and boards of education need able and visionary policymakers who will avoid the inadequacies of the past and have the courage to build an educational foundation adequate to the needs of the future. Where are they? Houses and communities which are not yet homes and neighborhoods are calling for young men and young women who can make houses homes in the real sense of family life and make communities neighborhoods in the positive reciprocity of neighborliness. Where are they?

They are in our schools and colleges—some of them. They have dropped out of school and are not working at all—some of them. (A relatively recent report showed that almost half of the best students in high school still do not enter college.) They are working odd part-time jobs—some of them. They are working jobs out of proper classification—some of them. They have resigned themselves to jobs that are well below their performance capacities—some of them. They are confused and discouraged—some of them. Wherever they are, they must be found and counseled and encouraged. They must have the confidence in themselves to explore and to keep exploring. Above all, they must quickly acquire that added measure of competence, qualification, and confidence that transforms a youth to a man.

To this end we need more organized efforts to bring promising young people together under an entirely different definition of purpose. Frankly, we have had the day of massive mobilization of resources for annual dances. We need less social club emphasis and more preprofessional and prebusiness club emphasis. We need fewer social fraternities and more career-oriented fraternities and sororities. Among such clubs and fraternities, we must get well beyond future teachers clubs to add future engineers clubs, future architects clubs, future diplomats clubs, future executives clubs, future politicians clubs, future writers clubs, future poets clubs, future businessmen clubs, and so on.

Young men, young women, I tell you opportunity is real now. The mantle is upon your shoulders now, and the call is for you to hear and heed—and wake up to the opportunities that are now real.

H.R. 71: Restore Economic Freedom to Automobile Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I introduced H.R. 71, a bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing automobile manufacturers from financing and insuring the sales of their products. I have introduced again the same measure, bearing the same number.

I presented this bill—and another like it 4 years ago—because I was convinced that such action was essential to stop monopolistic powers and trends in the automobile industry and related businesses. I was convinced that automobile manufacturing should be separated from auto financing and insurance in order to restore free competition to vast segments of our economy and to prevent captive market patterns from totally engulfing the sale of autos and related goods and services.

Events of the past 2 years have strengthened these convictions. Six days of public hearings in 1961 and voluminous statements, documents, and letters established such a strong case that the House Antitrust Subcommittee reported the bill favorably to the Committee on the Judiciary in 1962. With the press of an extremely heavy agenda in the 87th Congress, the full committee did not vote on it. This measure deserves to advance further toward passage in the 88th Congress, and I am confident that it shall.

All of us are gratified that automobile production and sales proved to be one of the highlights in our economy in 1962. But we should not let our satisfaction obscure underlying shackles on economic freedom which endanger us all.

In this past year, the world's largest manufacturer, General Motors Corp., has tightened its hold on the American automobile market, to claim well over 50 percent of sales, and at times nearly 60 percent. Some 80 percent of the U.S. auto market is controlled by only two manufacturers.

Such concentration is not healthy for our economy—neither for business nor consumers. In large part, this concentration has been a fruit of coercion of auto dealers and restraint of trade of sales financing. These abuses led long ago to antitrust indictments of the largest three auto manufacturers and their finance companies, conviction of General Motors and subsidiaries, and consent decress enjoining certain coercive and discriminatory practices.

Injunctive consent decrees have failed as a substitute for the real remedy of divestiture which the Government originally sought, and to which Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Corp, agreed if it would apply to all.

Captive markets in auto sales financing have surged, with the control which the dominant manufacturers wield over there dealers. Captive financing is both cause and effect in the manufacturer control over dealers and their sales.

General Motors dealers turned over 67 percent of their new-car sales financing to General Motors Acceptance Corp. in 1960—up sharply from a heavy 56 percent in 1956. These are GMAC's own estimates, prepared at the request of the House Antitrust Subcommittee.

The captive market pattern is equally clear in the dramatically abnormal growth of Ford Motor Credit Co. in its second and third full years of operation. In 1961, this fledgling finance company more than doubled its business with Ford dealers. FMCC apparently more than doubled its business again in 1962, almost reaching that stage in 9 months. It now holds well over $200 million in sales finance contracts.

To appreciate the abnormalcy of this quadrupling of business by one auto finance company, consider that auto sales financing for all financial institutions together declined somewhat in 1961 and will have increased something like 10 percent in 1962.

What sets two finance companies apart from the hundreds of independent finance companies and thousands of banks and other financial institutions? A parent that is the dealer's only supplier of new cars—the source of his livelihood.

Under the GM pattern, now being copied swiftly by Ford, the car manufacturer is the fount for all the dealer's needs—new cars, financing, insurance, parts, and accessories. Another way to express it is "putting all his eggs in one basket."

This is an expression which Ford Motor credit circulated to Ford dealers last March. It quoted a dealer as saying: "A dealer may be reluctant to put all his eggs in one basket. But if FMCC helps him become financially stronger—as I am sure it can—is this so bad? I, for one, that it is fine."

From reports which have come to me, most Ford dealers have indeed remained reluctant to put all their eggs in one

basket, but they cannot afford to offend the factory when their turn comes to start using the factory finance services. Most, I am sure, would gladly trade the real financial strength of real independence for any advantages, apparent or real, of dependence on one source for everything.

The trouble for auto dealers in putting all their eggs in one basket is that someone else gets a tighter grip on the handle.

There are other troubles too. The captive auto financing and insurance pattern poses unfair handicaps for those manufacturers, and wholesalers of auto without such means. Moreover, when dealers must put all their eggs in the manufacturer's basket, monopolistic conditions result in various related markets.

Independent businessmen—insurers, manufacturers, and wholesalers of auto parts and accessories, repair garages, as well as sales finance companies and banks—have told the House Antitrust Subcommittee of being denied the right to compete in GM-controlled markets on their merits—all because of captive financing and insurance controls. If Ford keeps racing in the same direction, thousands more of independent businesses will become casualties.

I should like to make clear that H.R. 71 applies only to the automobile industry. It deals with specific and demonstrated restraints of trade which have been subject of much antitrust criminal and civil court action. It would provide an antitrust remedy at least 25 years overdue. I should like to point out also that divested companies can, and do, survive.

No other industry, to my knowledge, has a comparable economic and legal history to that of the auto industry and related markets. Our concern is not bigness as such, nor finance or other subsidiaries as such. Rather our concern is subversion of free competitive processes.

Businesses which have not misused finance or other subsidiaries to monopolistic ends have no need to fear either new laws nor the long-established antitrust laws under which the automotive giants were indicted and convicted.

In view of the clear need for relief, surely Congress will not stand by and let the free marketplace suffer further restraint by the two automotive giants. Consumers and all businessmen thrive best when goods and services are judged on merit in a free marketplace.

If competition is extinguished in any one sector of our economy, its survival is endangered in all commerce. Suppression of competition means suppression of economic freedom, and political and social freedoms as well.

Passage of H.R. 71 will be a great victory for the free enterprise system.

Congress Must Control REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, most of us will recall the debate in this Chamber late in the last session when the House had under consideration the appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture, and several pertinent questions were raised concerning operations of the Rural Electrification Administration. At that time due credit was given to REA for its gratifying accomplishments in the pursuit of its assigned objective—the transmission of electric current into rural areas where the standard of living had been held to minimum levels because of the lack of an electric power supply.

At the same time many Members indicated that they were disturbed by the growing tendencies exhibited by REA to branch out into other fields, without any directive to do so by the Congress, and to thereby enter into direct competition with private industry while holding an insuperable advantage through REA use of low-interest Federal funds. In this connection Congressman ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, has recently published in the Public Utilities Fortnightly an outspoken and discerning article which underscores a fundamental issue yet to be resolved satisfactorily. I commend this statement to your attention because I am firmly convinced that, sooner or later, we must grapple with this problem realistically, and determine by congressional action the ground rules within which REA must operate.

The article follows:

A student of government once made this wise observation: "Irresponsible bureaucracy can be made responsible most quickly through financial control. The legislature is the logical agency to exercise it and thereby restore democracy in administration."[1]

The Rural Electrification Administration today is an outstanding example of "irresponsible bureaucracy." Although some of this irresponsibility may be attributed indirectly to the failure of Congress to exercise sufficient supervisory control over this agency, it is Congress and Congress only, as the legislature, that is "the logical agency" to "restore democracy" in the Rural Electrification Administration.

What has gone wrong? Essentially, Congress has not adequately exercised its constitutionally granted "financial control." But there is much more to it. As long as REA was doing what it was suposed to do, according to the law as it was drafted in 1936 and according to the intent and purpose of the founders of REA, Congress could rightly delegate its "financial control" to the Administrator. But this is 1962, not 1936. Conditions and circumstances have changed. Above all, by a steady process of pyramiding one twisted interpretation of its basic statute upon another, REA is now headed in a direction never intended by its creators, the Congress.

Today REA is basically a Federal power agency. The words "rural" and "farm" have little meaning in terms of its program. It is even using Federal funds—the public's money—to help Federal power agencies bypass Congress in their efforts to build a nationwide public power system. In the absence of the "financial control" that Congress should exercise and does not, REA has taken upon itself the task of attempting to direct national power policy, and, even more disturbing, to actually establish national economic philosophy. This is not, and can never be, the function of bureaucracy. REA today is violating virtually every precept of its founders. The need, therefore, has become pressing for Congress to step in and take control.

Look back for a moment. In 1936, American agriculture had been in a depressed condition for nearly two decades. Farm income was low, farms were widely scattered and, in some cases, relatively inaccessible. Despite the fact that land-grant colleges, national farm organizations, electrical manufacturers, and many of the Nation's power companies had been engaged in serious research programs, and positive efforts toward extending central station electric service to farms for over a decade only, about 11 percent of the farms were actually electrified. Under these conditions, and in an effort to stimulate the overall national economy, there was ample justification for the Congress to approve a program to promote farm and rural electrification.

Under the REA program, rural electric systems are 100 percent debt financed by the Federal Government. In the early years, borrowers had little or no equity in their systems. (These same cooperatives now have total assets of over $3.5 billion and an equity of nearly $700 million—or 20 percent—in their systems.)

Over the intervening years the REA grew largely with little or no congressional direction or supervision. At the same time, a radical change was taking place in the farm economy. Income improved steadily. Today, the whole farm economy is generally up as the capacity of American agriculture to produce has expanded. And, according to the latest available statistics from the REA, almost 98 percent of the Nation's farms are electrified. The task of bringing electricity to rural America is virtually complete.

INITIALLY FOR DISTRIBUTION

A cardinal fact to remember is that Congress originally intended rural electric cooperatives to secure their electric power, wherever possible, from existing power sources. They were to be primarily distributors of power. They were not to build generating plants unnecessarily. This was clearly understood by REA. Early in 1936, Morris Cooke, the first Administrator of the REA program, stated before a committee of the House of Representatives that "in 99 instances out of 100, they (REA cooperatives), are going to buy current from existing plants." The late Honorable Sam Rayburn, who introduced the bill in the House, had this to say: "By this bill we hope to bring electrification to people who do not now have it. This bill was not written on the

[1] Prof. Harvey Walker in "The Legislative Process."

theory that we were going to punish somebody or parallel their lines and go into competition with them."

These comments indicate that there was some concern even then that the REA program might become a means of using Federal financing to compete unfairly with existing free enterprise and to do a job that others are ready, willing, and able to do. It is clear from the record that Congress was assured that this type of activity would not be carried on. So, with the belief that REA would be a noncompetitive type of program designed to supplement the activities of others in their efforts to electrify the rural areas of our country, support for the program was widespread.

Apparently in keeping with the promise of obtaining power from existing sources wherever possible, loans for generation and transmission, as against loans for distribution, constituted only about 3 percent of total REA loans over the period 1936–41. By 1950, however, this had risen to 18 percent. By 1961, the percentage of generation and transmission loans made up to that year had risen to 35 percent. In fiscal year 1962, a new record for G. & T. loans was set with more than 59 percent of all REA electric loans for the year being approved for this purpose; and, for fiscal 1963, it is estimated that between 65 and 70 percent of the electric loans will be for generation and transmission purposes.

The obviously changing character of the REA has not gone unnoticed. Because the very thing that the original founders tried to guard against was happening, attention has been focused on the problem.

Widespread controversy has been evoked by (1) new administrative policies of REA concerning the granting of generation and transmission loans, (2) the cloak of secrecy surrounding loan applications, and (3) the subsidizing of industry through rural electric cooperatives.

Increasingly, REA loans are financing generating facilities of giant "super cooperatives" so that they can create an autonomous, nontaxpaying, and generally unregulated electric supply system to compete with private power sources, contrary to the coauthor of the original act, the late Mr. Rayburn, who said they did not intend to go into competition with anybody.

Prior to last year, it was REA policy to award generation and transmission loans only (1) where no adequate dependable source of power was available in the area to meet the borrower's needs, or (2) where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than the cost from facilities financed by REA. This was based on the announced policy of the first REA Administrator to Congress when the question of generating loans was discussed during debate on the 1936 act.

The present Administrator of REA, Norman M. Clapp, has stated, however, that it is not enough to judge the desirability of generation and transmission loans on the basis of adequacy, dependability, and low cost of power. On April 21, 1961, Mr. Clapp, in a speech before a Louisiana electric cooperative, said, "We must be certain that cooperatives enjoy a supply of power which will guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry."

On May 31, 1961, the Administrator announced a third criterion for G. & T. loans apparently aimed at enabling him to accomplish his previously stated goal. This new third criterion provides that, in addition to the two original criteria, loans for generation and transmission can be made "where generation and transmission facilities are necessary to protect the security and effectiveness of REA-financed systems." This completely nullifies the two above criteria which, if administered fairly, carry out congressional understanding and approval of REA G. & T. policy.

EXISTING SUPPLIERS PROTEST

Under this new philosophy abuses of the REA program have been mounting. At least 10 large loans totaling over $215 million have been approved in recent months for cooperative generating plants which will not fill any power shortage. All these loans were made over the protests of existing power suppliers that all present and anticipated future cooperative power needs would be provided and at a price cheaper than it would cost the cooperatives to generate it themselves.

A $60 million loan to an Indiana generating cooperative, heralded by REA as the largest loan in its history, was approved on June 15, 1961. When it became evident that the Indiana Public Service Commission might disapprove this loan as unnecessary, the cooperative switched the loan to another cooperative in an obvious and blatant circumvention of the rights and powers of the State commission.

Last November a loan of over $20 million was made to the Alabama Electric Cooperative to build a 66,000-kilowatt steamplant. This loan was made although REA's own published figures show that the local electric company is supplying power of the G. & T.'s member co-ops at a cost to them less than that G. & T. is now selling power to its members.

Not only is the total amount being loaned for generation and transmission facilities increasing each year, but the size of the individual loans is, on the average, becoming larger. With individual loans now running into the multimillion-dollar figures, Congress needs to take a closer look at the G. & T. program to make certain that loans of this size are necessary and in the public interest. A loan application has been filed by REA borrowers in Louisiana totaling $53 million for the construction of two 100-megawatt generating plants and nearly 1,800 miles of transmission line. This is enough transmission mileage to crisscross the State from north to south and from east to west five times. If this loan is approved out of funds made available by the 1963 appropriations bill, it will require one-eighth of all the money Congress approved for REA loans for 1963. Certainly, under such circumstances the Appropriations Committees of Congress should review a loan of this magnitude.

It has also become evident that REA loans under section 5 of the act, intended primarily to assist farmers to utilize the electricity the REA program was bringing to them, are now being made to subsidize industry.

Section 5 of the 1936 act authorized the REA to make loans to finance electrical and plumbing equipment for persons in rural areas. During recent years, REA limited loans under this section to facilities for rural households and farmsteads. But the present administration has made section 5 loans for such diverse purposes as the purchase and installation of gravel-crushing and washing machinery, for the purchase of a snowmaking machine for a ski resort, and for the purchase of textile machinery for a private textile mill. Incidents such as these force one to view the House Agriculture Committee's statement that it "feels that REA's present interpretation of section 5 of the 1936 act is inconsistent with the original intent of Congress" as a gross understatement.

LOW INTEREST RATE

The public money that REA is using to finance such industrial electrical machinery through section 5 loans is, of course, loaned to borrowers at the below-cost, taxpayer-subsidized interest rate of 2 percent.

With the aid of this public money REA is therefore subsidizing industry, not to help the farmer, but merely to expand its own bureaucratic activities.

The Administrator also states that section 5 funds will not be used for financing industrial machinery until an industry has exhausted all other sources of credit. This may be the Administrator's policy, but the REA staff apparently is more interested in making loans than checking out the efforts of prospective borrowers to first obtain alternative borrowing sources. A case in point is the loan to finance snowmaking machinery for a ski jump. An official of the REA borrower making the loan testified before the House Agriculture Committee on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962:

"Chestnut Hills [the ski resort] is our biggest load, and it promises to grow bigger every year. That is one impotrant reason why our co-op agreed to make a loan [under sec. 5] to the company when the company could not get financing for snow-making equipment from any other source, including the Small Business Administration." (Pt. 2, p. 968.)

In reply to my query to the Small Business Administration as to whether the ski resort had applied to SBA for a loan, the Small Business Administrator wrote on March 22, 1962:

"This will confirm advice given to * * * your staff concerning the status of the loan inquiry made by Chestnut Hills Resort, Hanover, Ill. No loan application has been filed with this agency."

In short, if I could obtain such information by merely addressing a letter to SBA, why wasn't REA able to ascertain this fact? Obviously, REA made no real effort to verify the extent of other efforts to obtain financing when processing this section 5 loan. REA was apparently too interested in loaning its subsidized money and building up its own bureaucracy to check out all the facts it needed. If this is an example of REA efficiency in processing a relatively small loan amounting to only $30,000, how can REA be trusted to handle the many millions of dollars made available to it by Congress each year and process the more complex G. & T. loans amounting in some cases to $50 and $60 million? As a banker entrusted with the taxpayers' money, REA standards appear to be slipshod. This provides a good reason why Congress through the Appropriations Committee should start taking more control over the activities of this agency.

The secrecy surrounding REA generation and transmission loan applications has also evoked criticism of the House Committee on Agriculture. In its report accompanying the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the committee admonished the REA, as follows:

"Testimony revealed a growing concern over the failure of REA to disclose information on various phases of its operation. The public is entitled to know how public funds are being used, and the REA should approach the consideration of loans for generating facilities in a manner designed to provide as full public information as possible. * * * Certainly, interested parties should be notified and their views obtained before such loans are approved. Secrecy tends to kindle doubt, whereas public knowledge of the reasons for and justification of loans would go far toward dispelling criticism which could bring the program into disrepute."

Last April, under pressure of increasing criticism from Members of Congress, congressional committees, as well as from the press and the public, REA issued an administrative bulletin on the release of information and availability of records relating to loan applications. REA supporters hailed this bulletin as a major departure from its previous policy of secrecy. A careful study of the bulletin failed to reveal any basic major policy change. In fact, rather than lowering the iron curtain of secrecy, the bulletin,

with minor exceptions, merely implemented existing REA practices in writing.

Perhaps the most determining argument in support of tighter congressional control over REA through the Appropriations Committee is the secrecy which surrounds the program. Today, secrecy stands between REA and what should be effective congressional financial control. Once having received its annual appropriation from Congress, REA conducts its lending activities in complete secrecy—not only from the Congress, but from the public and other interested parties who may be directly affected by its activities.

QUESTION OF CRITERIA

Two of the criteria which REA uses in approving G. & T. loans are the cost of power and adequacy of service. To ascertain the necessary facts upon which to base a decision, REA needs the best possible alternative offer from existing suppliers, public or private, in the area of a proposed G. & T. system. Unless existing power suppliers know what they are bidding on—i.e., the future plans and needs of the borrower—they cannot adequately present their own case for providing additional facilities to serve borrowers' needs. If the best alternatives cannot be presented by existing suppliers because of their inability to obtain enough facts to prepare their offer, then REA may be guilty of making an unnecessary loan as it is not comparing the proposed generating loan with the best alternative.

This raises the entire question of how the Administrator can honestly and accurately comply with his own criteria to measure the need for a G. & T. loan unless adequate information is made available to existing suppliers so they can make their best offer based on up-to-date, accurate information on their customers' needs. How can the Administrator in all candor approve a G. & T. loan application and spend the taxpayers' money when he is comparing a G. & T. application with alternatives drafted without knowledge of all the facts?

This raises further questions as to why REA conducts its program in secrecy from Congress and the public, the answers to which are not too difficult. Once secrecy is removed from REA's operations, it would become obvious both to Congress and the public that REA's generation and transmission program is, for the most part, wholly unnecessary and, in many cases, uneconomic and unsound.

Our Nation today is served by a power system unmatched and unparalleled anywhere in the world. There is an abundance of power available to meet the country's present and future needs. The average cost of electricity to the electric consumer has been steadily decreasing over the years.

In view of these accomplished facts, there is little or no excuse for REA to spend tax money for financing separate power systems for its borrowers. This is an uneconomic approach from the standpoint of both the REA borrowers and the public and, therefore, contrary to the best interests of the people.

REA is now in its 27th year. As local distribution borrowers repay their 35-year loans to the Federal Government, REA loses the control over their activities which is embodied in its mortgage and loan contract with its borrowers. As long as a local borrower is in debt to the Federal Government, the REA Administrator maintains such rights as the veto power over a borrower's choice of manager and attorney, and the right to maintain an exclusive banker's position by refusing to permit the borrower to obtain expansion funds elsewhere. Once the Federal debt has been retired, however, the borrower is free to conduct his business independently as a cooperative should.

Thus, when REA approves a G. & T. loan for a group of distribution borrowers, these cooperatives become indebted to the Federal Government and come under the Federal Government's control for another 35 years. Once a group of cooperatives construct their own G. & T. system and take on a utility responsibility for their own power supply, normal load growth (a co-op doubles its load every 7 years) requires periodic expansion of facilities, thereby increasing the borrower's debt to REA. Thus, borrowers soon find themselves indebted to the Federal Government for an indefinite future. REA's strict contractual control over its borrowers makes this agency as much of a Federal power agency as TVA or the Interior Department.

CONGRESS CONTROLS ONLY FUNDS

This is another important reason why Congress should take greater control over the REA program. As an elected body, Congress represents the best interest of the people themselves, while REA, as a Federal bureaucracy, is primarily motivated by its own selfish interests—those of agency growth, prestige, and self-perpetuation of its existence.

Congress today has virtually no control over the REA program with the exception that it makes a lump sum appropriation available to this agency for loans each year. Under the Constitution, Congress is given responsibility to maintain control over the Government purse strings. When Congress authorizes expenditures for an executive agency without knowledge of how the money is to be used, Congress, in effect, is automatically transferring its responsibility to the executive branch of the Government.

There is no question that the REA Administrator, under the law, should and does have the authority to study, recommend, and approve REA loans, but this does not supersede Congress' authority to decide how Federal funds—including REA's—should be spent. The Bureau of Reclamation, for example, has blanket authority to construct projects which it finds financially feasible. Congress, however, will not permit the Bureau to spend money except on projects that it specifically approves each year in appropriation acts. Reclamation also gets lump sum appropriations, but how the money is to be used is specifically set forth by Congress in the reports of the Appropriations Committees.

A further reason that Congress, through the Appropriations Committees, should have the authority of approving the use of REA funds—at least for major G. & T. projects costing over a certain amount—is that the purpose of the REA program is no longer one of constructing distribution systems to provide electricity to farms and other rural customers in unserved areas. The major share of REA's money is now being loaned to put REA permanently and completely in the power business—by constructing generating plants and transmission systems to serve customers and areas that are already receiving central station electric service in adequate amounts at reasonable prices.

Because of this changed policy the REA power program is becoming the largest spender of all the Federal power programs financed by the taxpayers. In fiscal year 1963, REA estimates it will be spending more money for generation and transmission system ($260 to $275 million) than either the Corps of Engineers ($238.8 million) or the Bureau of Reclamation ($185.2 million) have requested for their multiple-purpose power programs.

For many years REA has been a sort of "sacred cow" in Congress. Each time legislation has been introduced which would, in any way, limit the powers of REA, those brave enough to introduce or support such legislation have been denounced by cooperative lobbyists as "antifarmer" and even "anti-American." But this is changing rapidly. Events during the latest session of Congress have indicated an increasing awareness and concern of Members over REA actions in recent months. An amendment which I introduced to the agriculture appropriations bill this year to limit the amount of funds to be loaned for generation and transmission facilities received bipartisan support even though it lost by a vote of 133–94. The fact that Members would actively oppose REA's present administration of this program and stand up and be counted is, to me, a real step toward finding a solution to this problem.

Prior to this vote, during consideration of the REA appropriations request before the House Appropriations Committee, I proposed an amendment that would require the Budget Bureau in presenting REA's program for fiscal year 1964 to itemize and justify in detail all G. & T. projects costing more than $5 million. This would have given the Appropriations Committee an opoprtunity to consider the REA construction program in the same way that it considers the power programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. The voting on this suggestion of mine, although defeated by a narrow margin of three votes in the House Appropriations Committee, indicated an increased willingness on the part of members to recognize the seriousness of the present trend in REA's policy.

A requirement of this nature would not deprive one single cooperative, or one single rural consumer, of electric power, nor would it create in any way a power shortage among cooperatives. It would not increase the cost of power to any cooperative. It would not in any manner reduce the amount of loan funds available to rural electric cooperatives. It would not impair the security of a single cooperative.

What such a requirement would do is to bring the REA program more closely into line with the intent and purpose of the Rural Electrification Act and to give Congress some semblance of control over this agency. In addition, the REA Administrator might be a little more careful of the manner in which he conducts some of his activities. Without any checks and balances, he has a clear field.

Presentation of this information to the Appropriations Committees of Congress would in no way infringe upon the authority of the Administrator to make loans. It would, however, give Congress the needed information to specifically approve appropriations for this agency. Congress has a right to this information and it has a responsibility to the taxpayers of assuring them that their elected Representatives still have control over Government spending. At present, insofar as REA is concerned, Congress has the responsibility, but not the control.

"Irresponsible bureaucracy can be made responsible most quickly through financial control. The legislature is the logical agency to exercise it."

The Budgetary Outlook and Its Meaning for Federal Expenditure and Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, since the House will be confronted with the new budget and recommendations for tax cuts early in the session, it seems to me that the advice of Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard

College, Columbia University, who also served as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers for President Eisenhower, is worth studying.

His article on the budgetary outlook and its meaning for Federal expenditure and tax policy as published in the December issue of Tax Foundation's Tax Review are as follows:

THE BUDGETARY OUTLOOK AND ITS MEANING FOR FEDERAL EXPENDITURE AND TAX POLICY

(By Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University)

There is a considerable body of opinion which holds that neither the current position of the budget nor budget prospects for the next few fiscal periods ahead should have any material bearing on tax policy or on expenditure policy, either. But I do not share this deficits-don't-really-matter theory of fiscal policy.

My preference is for an earlier but still not wholly extinct point of view that the Federal budget should be brought into balance over the cycle; with surpluses in the expansion phase offsetting deficits in recession and early recovery. The strategy of Federal policy which I think would serve us best at this time and for the implementation of which I propose to make several suggestions, derives from this underlying fiscal policy preference.

We may begin with the budget outlook for fiscal 1963. In the official statement issued only a few weeks ago it was estimated that the administrative budget for that period would show a deficit of $7.8 billion. The new estimate came as no great surprise and has evoked remarkably little comment, but there is a sense in which this outlook is both novel and important. Its novelty does not lie in the size of the prospective deficit. It has become commonplace in political exchanges to point out that a deficit of $7.8 billion isn't as large as the $12.4 billion deficit incurred in fiscal 1959. This is perfectly true. The novelty of the fiscal 1963 deficit lies in the fact that it comes at an advanced stage of a business cycle expansion. The $12.4 billion deficit in fiscal 1959 was a deficit incurred in the first full fiscal year following the trough of the 1958–59 recession. The $7.8 billion deficit in fiscal 1963, on the other hand, is occuring in the second full fiscal year following the trough of the 1960–61 recession.

The prospective fiscal 1963 budget deficit has a second significant feature, namely, that it is larger than that incurred in fiscal 1962. Thus, what it lacks in size relative to the fiscal 1959 deficit, it is more than making up in successiveness and in its capacity to grow. This suggests that we may be in a more or less chronic deficit situation. Far from a cyclically compensatory budget, what we may be confronting is the prospect of deficits in periods of expansion and growth as well as in periods of recession and early recovery. If this is the road we are traveling, we had better recognize it as such as soon as possible.

Much will depend on the budgetary outcome in fiscal 1964, which in turn will depend on developments in the economy over the next year and a half. Accordingly, let me state my views on the economic outlook.

EFFECTS OF CUBAN SITUATION

After a so-so kind of spring and summer, during which the economy made very little advance and in some important ways was losing ground, a new momentum developed at or just before the time of the Cuban crisis. There is evidence that some strengthening developed in the economy just prior to the Cuban incident. So far as I can see, this resulted mainly from the unusually heavy volume of defense and space contracts awarded in the third quarter of the year. Additionally, there was mild help from tax changes, legislative and administrative, and considerable benefit from a heavy volume of early automobile production. The economy was still in a distinctly precarious position in mid-October, but these factors prevented a decline and appear even to have produced a mild upward movement.

In this atmosphere, the Cuban crisis had a clearly stimulative effect on the economy. I would not want to make too much use of this point, but I do believe that Chairman Khrushchev should realize that in recent years some of his major moves have been timed to earn him the right to be regarded as one of our most important economic stabilization aids, though this could hardly be a deliberate aim of Soviet policy.

The Russian reversal on Cuba was also a help to our economy. It evoked a sense of relief that seems to have strengthened psychology generally: consumers, financial investors and businessmen reacted positively, with good effects on the economy. There is something somehow precarious about all of this, but for the moment at least we have taken a turn for the better. What the Cuban developments means for the outlook is that our chances of navigating a difficult passage in the business cycle without overall decline in the near future have been very considerably improved. Given a reasonably favorable atmosphere, the momentum now developing will of course carry us through the yearend season and I would expect it to carry us well into 1963. Many of the indicators are still giving out warnings of a recessionary trend and these must be respected; but I would read them at this date, supplemented by what we know about developments in November, primarily as a warning against excessive optimism.

LOOKS FOR INCREASE UNTIL MID-1963

There are those who believe that the present momentum will carry well beyond mid-1963 and accelerate in the second half of the year. But the evidence for this is as yet visible only to the eyes of faith. I regard the momentum as still of modest proportions and there are still many obstacles in our path, notably the handling of tax legislation in 1963. For the moment, therefore, I look for an increase until around mid-1963 and then a situation much like what we had to cope with through the summer of 1962, namely, a kind of stalemate in which little overall advance is scored.

The next step we must take is to translate this view of the business outlook into terms that are meaningful for the estimation of budget receipts. To do this, we have to project gross national product from the third quarter of 1962 to the second quarter of 1964. I have made three such projections which we may identify as models A, B, and C.

Model A comes directly from the business outlook estimate I have just described. It extends gross national product at a rate which gives an overall growth for 1963 over 1962, in current prices, of about 3½ percent. With an allowance of 1 percent for price inflation, this would be a 2½-percent increase in real gross national product. This seems to me like a fairly optimistic projection but I am never quite sure of such things. What seems optimistic to me frequently seems pessimistic to my friends in government. So I will simply say that of all the models I have constructed this seems the most plausible.

Model B contemplates an increase in current price GNP of around 4.5 percent, with a constant price growth of around 3 percent.

Model C, which I regard as wildly extravagant, pictures a current price gross national product growth of around 6 percent and a constant price growth rate of 4 percent.

POSSIBILITY OF $15 BILLION DEFICIT

Employing assumptions drawn from budgetary experience since 1954, I have derived estimates of budget receipts for fiscal 1964 for each of these three models of gross national product growth. What I find is that receipts in fiscal 1964 would be $90.8 billion on model A; $93 billion on model B; and $95.8 billion on model C.

From these estimates of receipts we can derive some ideas as to budgetary outcome for fiscal 1964. What they tell us is that the deficit would be reduced to a relatively small figure if, with no reduction in tax rates from present levels and with fiscal 1964 expenditures at the same level as in fiscal 1963, we were to grow between 1962 and 1963 on a model A or model B pattern. And they suggest that economic growth in 1963 at the rapid rate pictured in model C would produce a surplus of around $2 billion in the fiscal 1964 budget.

These are the results one gets if rates of economic growth ranging from 2½ to 4 percent in real terms are assumed to be achieved at the same time that Federal expenditures are held at the fiscal 1963 level of $93.7 billion and if tax rates remain as they are. One may say that it would be impossible to achieve growth at these rates, even at a 2½-percent (constant price) rate, with this fiscal policy. This may be so; certainly, in view of what has been said officially about the prospect for substantial tax reduction in 1963–64, a good many people would be disappointed, with a generally dampening effect on the economy, if they were to be told now that there was to be no tax reduction for the present. Accordingly, let us consider the budget implications of a fiscal policy that would reduce taxes for the fiscal year 1964 by $5 billion over what they would otherwise be and raise Federal expenditures by $5 billion above the $93.7 billion fiscal 1963 level.

What seems to be implied by such a fiscal policy is a very substantial deficit, as large or larger than the currently projected fiscal 1963 deficit of $7.8 billion. Specifically, the deficit would be held close to the fiscal 1963 level if the economy were to grow by 6 percent on a current price basis (model C) and would be between $10 and $15 billion if the economy were to grow by 3½ to 4½ percent [rate] on the same basis (model A or B).

In other words, if a $5 billion tax cut is effective in fiscal 1964 and if Federal expenditures are higher by another $5 billion, we face a substantial and very likely enlarged budgetary deficit. This would mean an unbroken succession of deficits, each one larger than the one before, extending through the third full year following a trough in the business cycle. I leave it for reflection over the budgetary outcome if, sometime between now and mid-1964, or indeed at any time in 1964 or 1965, we should slide into a recession.

BROAD POLICY IMPLICATIONS SEEN

In my judgment, there are two broad policy implications in this fiscal outlook. The first is that there is an urgent need for control over the increase of Federal expenditures. What we should do is put a ceiling on expenditures for, say, 2 years, at the fiscal 1963 level, that is, at about $94 billion. Considering built-in increases and additional new program requirements that must be met, such as those growing out of the present tensions in international relations, this means that substantial reductions in some expenditures are necessary.

The second policy implication of the fiscal 1964 budget outlook is that there is need for caution in the amount and character of tax reduction. As it is developing, the fiscal situation does not justify a reduction of more than $2.5 billion on anything but an emergency basis, and the economic outlook

at this time does not spell emergency. Furthermore, such tax reduction as is legislated should be designed to promote a higher level of private investment expenditure. This would be done best, for a $2.5 billion revenue loss, by a reduction in the corporate income tax rate to 47 percent. We are not now in a position to indulge ourselves in a large, across-the-board reduction of the tax burden. Under the right expenditure control conditions we could, however, take a first step in this direction, hoping to take additional steps at a later date.

Interestingly enough, however, the whole tenor of public discussion at this time contemplates a policy that is exactly the opposite of this. Very large increases in expenditure are being discussed for existing programs and last summer it was disclosed that our national goal for the next few years would be to land a man on the moon. At the same time that we contemplate these enormously exciting though also enormously expensive undertakings the air is full of official trial balloons and numberless unofficial proposals for large tax reductions. The mood is one of competitive venturesomeness and generosity in which there seems to be some thought that the prize should be allotted to whomever is prepared to make the boldest and most magnanimous offer. I trust I will be forgiven if I say that to me all of this has a distinctly bizarre quality.

Turning to the first of these policy implications, what about the possibilities of expenditure control?

CUTBACK ON CREDIT PROGRAMS

There is developing, I woud judge, a kind of defeatism on this subject. I would be among the first to concede the political difficulties involved in a program of expenditure control if it lacked administration support, and even more so if it conflicted with administration policy. But given administration support, a program for restraining the powerful tendency for Federal spending to increase would, in my judgment, be entirely feasible. The question, therefore, is whether there are practical possibilities of achieving economies that would be economically desirable.

There are such opportunities. To illustrate, let us take the case of Federal credit programs. There is a grossly inadequate public understanding of the magnitude, let alone the character, of the Federal Government's lending activities, but for anyone interested in learning more about these the budget message for a number of years has carried a special appendix of factual information. From this source we learn that in the current fiscal year all Federal credit programs combined will be a charge on the budget to the extent of $1.8 billion, which is the difference between the amount of disbursements made under the programs and the amount of repayments received and certain other offsets. However, this net figure tells little about the size of the programs. Currently, total disbursements under them are estimated for fiscal 1963 at something over $8 billion. About half of this is accounted for by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Agency for International Development, but other agencies also account individually for considerable sums. Thus, the Export-Import Bank will disburse an estimated $800 million in fiscal 1963; the Small Business Administration, something over $400 million; the Farmers' Home Administration, more than $500 million; the Rural Electrification Administration, $360 million; the Community Facilities Administration, close to $500 million; and the Federal Natitonal Mortgage Asssociation, more than $400 million.

SELL LOANS AND SECURITIES

Since we are dealing with a very large deficit, economies must be of substantial size to be significantly helpful. In this respect, Federal credit programs would be a good place to start. It is never a wise budgetary policy to undertake flat, across-the-board budget cuts, because existing programs have such widely different degrees of merit, but it is interesting to observe that a reduction in disbursements averaging 10 percent would produce an expenditure reduction of around $800 million. And such a program could hardly be regarded as a severely austere one. Astonishing as this may seem, a 10-percent overall reduction would leave disbursements for Federal credit programs as a whole still as large as they were in fiscal 1962, and $3 billion higher than they were in fiscal 1961.

To do this would require a searching reappraisal of credit programs and techniques. Some of the programs, certainly those represented by the Agency for International Development, have been designed to accomplish purposes that could in no way be achieved except through governmental effort; but others are in part, at least, competitive with private effort and have assumed their present size mainly because they make credit, often of a long-term variety, available at interest rates significantly below the market. For such programs, an interest rate policy more closely attuned to market realities would direct a larger proportion of the financing to the private financial system and thereby reduce budget expenditures. Administrative limitations would do the same thing. Economies could be effected in other programs by requiring greater reliance on loan participations with private lenders, a more determined search for available private financing before public credit is offered, or the substitution of loan insurance or guarantees for direct lending. In still other cases, all that would be necessary would be for the Federal agencies involved to relax their currently aggressive search for loans.

Still in the area of Federal credit programs, let me mention another possibility for helping to offset budgetary deficits. This could be done through the sale to the public of loans and securities accumulated under Federal credit programs. The January 1962 budget message estimated that Treasury holdings of these financial assets will reach $29 billion by the end of the fiscal year 1963. Only direct loans are included in this amount; insured or guaranteed loans or securities are excluded.

This $29 billion fund constitutes what I believe is our least well-understood stockpile. It includes over $3.5 billion of mortgage loans held by FNMA; nearly $4 billion of loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration; $1.8 billion of loans made by the Community Facilities Administration; $1.4 billion of credits extended by the Farmers Home Administration; and nearly $15 billion of loans growing out of various international lending activities.

Many of these financial assets would be ineligible for sale; others would be unsalable under any practicable arrangement. But there is reason to believe that some of them could be sold publicly and to make a market distribution of even a small fraction of the total would produce a very large volume of budget receipts. And to do so would not be a novel move. The Federal National Mortgage Association was established in the first instance on the theory that it would sell mortgages as well as buy them. The Veterans' Administration has marketed some of its holdings of direct loans. Recently the Export-Import Bank did the same abroad and some years ago loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were liquidated in this country under a carefully designed and executed program.

Of course, sales would have to be made subject to two major conditions: first, the terms of the sale would have to be fully protective of the public interest; second, sales would have to be made in a manner and on a schedule that would avoid depressing the economy by forcing a significantly higher level of long-term interest rates.

As regards the first of these two conditions: because most of the loans were made in the first instance at below-market interest rates it would be necessary to sell them at prices below par. But when one considers the difference between the income being earned by the Federal Government on the assets in question and the rate of interest the Treasury must pay on the public debt in order to continue holding them, it is by no means certain that a net loss to the Federal Government would be involved in a sales program. In any case, so long as sales were made on terms that provided no more than a reasonable compensation and return for underwriters and private investors, such capital loss as there might be could properly be regarded as a payment in advance of future subsidies, and this obligation would be discharged without imposing a current burden on the budget.

HOLD DOWN PUBLIC WORKS SPENDING

As regards the second of the two conditions, namely, that public sales of financial assets might raise long-term interest rates and exert a restrictive effect on the economy, this would depend on the timing and volume of sales and on the availability of investment funds. Actually, there has been a surplus of funds seeking investment of late, not a shortage, and there is accordingly a good chance that a properly administered sales program would have little effect on the prices of long-term securities. Also, whether sales tended to raise long-term interest rates would depend on monetary policy. But it seems reasonable to expect that monetary policy would actually assist a program aimed at helping to reduce the budget deficit. Of course, the budget assistance one would get from sales would be only temporary but it would come at an opportune time and it could be an ingredient of a fiscal policy that would hold promise of reversing the trend to larger and larger deficits.

Let me mention only one more expenditure program in which economies might be found, namely, the programs of Federal construction and grants to the States for civil public works. These have been increasing by leaps and bounds of late.

There is about a 50-50 distribution of expenditures for civil public works as between budget accounts and trust fund accounts, with each accounting in fiscal 1963 for about $3¼ billion. But the budget accounts alone have increased by about $1 billion in the last 2 fiscal years. As a group, their increase is exceeded by the ballooning of expenditures under the Federal credit programs, but it has been very rapid, all the same. A program under which civil public works expenditures would be held in fiscal 1964 to the level prevailing in fiscal 1962 would produce a budget economy of close to $500 million, but it would still mean a level of spending $500 million higher than obtained in fiscal 1961. This, again, would be no austerity program.

Other possibilities could be mentioned. What is really needed is a thorough reexamination of Federal expenditures. A Presidentially appointed commission of private citizens who would approach the problem in terms of what is good for all Americans and not of what is good for particular interest groups could do this.

To undertake such a budget reappraisal in order to prevent our being engulfed by Federal spending that is growing so fast and is getting so large and so complex that no one really comprehends it would be reason enough. An additional reason derives from the budgetary outlook I have sketched in these remarks. It is this:

We need to restructure our tax system and lighten the burden of taxation in ways

will improve the burden of taxation in ways that will improve the performance of our economy, but the budget outlook tells us that unless we exert a much more effective discipline over the volume of Federal spending we cannot undertake these needed measures of tax relief without courting larger and larger deficits. All the evidence points to the need for a searching scrutiny of expenditure priorities.

Great Lady From Ohio: Mrs. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there are 67 new Members in this Congress. They have not had the privilege many of us enjoy of having worked and counseled with a charming and remarkable colleague, Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am indebted to her tenfold for the benefit of her wisdom and for the courtesies she has consistently extended to me and my office ever since I came to Washington as a freshman in 1955. I can think of no better way to introduce her than through an excellent article written recently by Alvin Silverman, chief of the Washington bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. There is, of course, one of the 67 new Members who needs no introduction to Mrs. BOLTON—and that is her son, Congressman OLIVER BOLTON, whom we are delighted to welcome back to Capitol Hill.

The article follows:

GREAT LADY FROM OHIO: MRS. BOLTON

(By Alvin Silverman)

WASHINGTON.—The passing last week of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and the resulting effusion of tributes to her character and achievements brought to mind the lamentable fact that not until death occurs is very much laudatory ever said about any individual.

Judged by any except the most illiberal of critics, Mrs. Roosevelt was a great woman. There are not many great women around. Their total only slightly exceeds the number of great men.

There is, however, a great woman who is a Clevelander. Since she is very much alive and very much disinclined to toot her own horn, this might be an appropriate time to discuss her.

Her name is FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Congresswoman from Ohio's 22d District since 1940, Mrs. BOLTON comes from a distinguished family long associated with public service. Both of her grandfathers served in the Ohio General Assembly and one of them, Henry B. Payne, became a U.S. Representative and then a Senator.

Mrs. BOLTON and her son, OLIVER, just elected to the House for another term after sitting on the sidelines for several years while recovering his health, comprise the only mother-son team ever to serve together in the Congress.

Mrs. BOLTON is regarded as an authority on legislation dealing with U.S. foreign policy, particularly Africa and France.

In 1955 she made a 20,000-mile study tour of Africa. Her visit to 24 countries south and east of the Sahara Desert was the first extensive mission to Africa by a Member of Congress.

Two years later, she returned to Africa as an official delegate to the Ghana independence ceremonies, and later in 1957 she made an official report on United Nation refugee camps in the Middle East.

There is not a single important official of any of the new African nations who does not consider Mrs. BOLTON a close friend and adviser. Her Washington home is virtually a headquarters for them when they are in the capital.

Far beyond her contributions in the field of foreign affairs, however, have been Mrs. BOLTON'S activities in health and nursing.

The first Army school of nursing in World War I was largely the result of the pressure she personally applied on her friend from Cleveland, Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. During World War II, her Bolton bill created the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps, an orgainzation that graduated 125,000 nurses for the Nation's war effort. Western Reserve University's School of Nursing, named for her, eloquently bespeaks her efforts.

A friend recently was feeling pretty proud that he had been chosen to receive an honorary doctorate degree from a university. Mrs. BOLTON acted as if she could not have been more thrilled if she had received one herself. If she had, it would have been No. 15 for her.

France awarded her membership in the French Legion of Honor officer class for her work during and after World War II.

Her other awards include "Churchwoman of the Year," and the American Social Hygiene Association's award for distinguished service to humanity.

Mrs. BOLTON is vice regent for Ohio of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, possibly the most exclusive organization in the Nation. For more than a century, it has been in charge of the George Washington National Shrine. Only recently, Mrs. BOLTON bought a large tract of land across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon so that the view would remain unchanged.

There is probably not a church or a hospital in northern Ohio that has not been saved in a major crisis by Mrs. BOLTON'S financial help or other assistance.

All this, of course, does not make her a great woman.

Her greatness comes also from her character and personality and—well, you get the general idea by now.

Pay Increase for the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been extremely concerned at the delay of the Kennedy administration in pushing for a pay increase for the military, despite the fact that other governmental employees have benefited from pay raises on two occasions since the last general military pay increase in 1958.

Last fall I pledged to introduce, if necessary, and support legislation calling for a substantial pay increase. Included was to be a section correcting the inequities in the pay scales for those retired personnel who left the service prior to July 1958. These retired persons were discriminated against and a great inequity has existed for over 4 years as a result.

A few weeks ago I was heartened to learn that the Defense Department was supporting a pay increase measure amounting to as much as 14 percent in some categories and also correcting the inequities I mentioned previously.

Rather than introduce my version of a pay bill I have decided to defer such action until the administration's measure comes before the Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. As a member of the subcommittee, I recognize that legislation as introduced by the administration is merely the raw material from which a truly effective and meaningful pay bill can be molded by our subcommittee and subsequently by the Congress.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to act with dispatch on a substantial and constructive pay bill for active duty and retired personnel of our military service and I am looking forward to helping to expedite this much-needed legislation.

Current Communist Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Patricia Nordman of De Land, Fla., is an ardent and articulate opponent of communism, and until recently published the De Land Courier, which she dedicated to the purpose of alerting the public to the dangers of communism in America.

At Mrs. Nordman's request, I include in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, the following "Current Communist Goals," which she identifies as an excerpt from "The Naked Communist," by Cleon Skousen:

[From "The Naked Communist," by Cleon Skousen]

CURRENT COMMUNIST GOALS

1. U.S. acceptance of coexistence as the only alternative to atomic war.
2. U.S. willingness to capitulate in preference to engaging in atomic war.
3. Develop the illusion that total disarmament by the United States would be a demonstration of moral strength.
4. Permit free trade between all nations regardless of Communist affiliation and regardless of whether or not items could be used for war.
5. Extension of long-term loans to Russia and Soviet satellites.
6. Provide American aid to all nations regardless of Communist domination.
7. Grant recognition of Red China. Admission of Red China to the U.N.
8. Set up East and West Germany as separate states in spite of Khrushchev's promise in 1955 to settle the German question by free elections under supervision of the U.N.
9. Prolong the conferences to ban atomic tests because the United States has agreed to suspend tests as long as negotiations are in progress.
10. Allow all Soviet satellites individual representation in the U.N.

11. Promote the U.N. as the only hope for mankind. If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world government with its own independent armed forces. (Some Communist leaders believe the world can be taken over as easily by the U.N. as by Moscow. Sometimes these two centers compete with each other as they are now doing in the Congo.)

12. Resist any attempt to outlaw the Communist Party.

13. Do away with all loyalty oaths.

14. Continue giving Russia access to the U.S. Patent Office.

15. Capture one or both of the political parties in the United States.

16. Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic American institutions by claiming their activities violate civil rights.

17. Get control of the schools. Use them as transmission belts for socialism and current Communist propaganda. Soften the curriculum. Get control of teachers' associations. Put the party line in textbooks.

18. Gain control of all student newspapers.

19. Use student riots to foment public protests against programs or organizations which are under Communist attack.

20. Infiltrate the press. Get control of book-review assignments, editorial writing, policymaking positions.

21. Gain control of key positions in radio, TV, and motion pictures.

22. Continue discrediting American culture by degrading all forms of artistic expression. An American Communist cell was told to "eliminate all good sculpture from parks and buildings, substitute shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms."

23. Control art critics and directors of art museums. "Our plan is to promote ugliness, repulsive, meaningless art."

24. Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them "censorship" and a violation of free speech and free press.

25. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio, and TV.

26. Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity, as "normal, natural, healthy."

27. Infiltrate the churches and replace revealed religion with "social" religion. Discredit the Bible and emphasize the need for intellectual maturity which does not need a "religious crutch."

28. Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principle of "separation of church and state."

29. Discredit the America Constitution by calling it inadequate, old-fashioned, out of step with modern needs, a hindrance to cooperation between nations on a worldwide basis.

30. Discredit the American Founding Fathers. Present them as selfish aristocrats who had no concern for the "common man."

31. Belittle all forms of American culture and discourage the teaching of American history on the ground that it was only a minor part of the "big picture." Give more emphasis to Russian history since the Communists took over.

32. Support any socialist movement to give centralized control over any part of the culture—education, social agencies, welfare programs, mental health clinics, etc.

33. Eliminate all laws or procedures which interfere with the operation of the Communist apparatus.

34. Eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

35. Discredit and eventually dismantle the FBI.

36. Infiltrate and gain control of more unions.

37. Infiltrate and gain control of big business.

38. Transfer some of the powers of arrest from the police to social agencies. Treat all behavioral problems as psychiatric disorders which no one but psychiatrists can understand or treat.

39. Dominate the psychiatric profession and use mental health laws as a means of gaining coercive control over those who oppose Communist goals.

40. Discredit the family as an institution. Encourage promiscuity and easy divorce.

41. Emphasize the need to raise children away from the negative influence of parents. Attribute prejudices, mental blocks and retarding of children to suppressive influence of parents.

42. Create the impression that violence and insurrection are legitimate aspects of the American tradition; that students and special-interest groups should rise up and use united force to solve economic, political or social problems.

43. Overthrow all colonial governments before native populations are ready for self-government.

44. Internationalize the Panama Canal.

45. Repeal the Connally reservation so the United States cannot prevent the World Court from seizing jurisdiction over nations and individuals alike.

American Jewry Meets the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Louis H. Solomon on September 28, 1961, at a dinner meeting of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation, marking the beginning of the campaign to erect a Center for Jewish Culture at New York University.

Mr. Solomon, a trustee of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation, is a distinguished attorney. He is a graduate of New York University and a noted leader in many civic activities. He is well known among business and community leaders as the head of the Greenwich Village Chamber of Commerce.

His tribute to American Jewish leadership follows:

AMERICAN JEWRY MEETS THE CHALLENGE

(Address presented by Louis H. Solomon on September 28, 1961)

There has been a great deal of provocative discussion of late on the subject of the role of Judaism and the Jew in Judeo-Christian world society. Too much of the discussion is a veiled attack upon the devotion of the Jew to the heritage and traditions that define his status as an identifiable, ethnic personality in a Christian-dominated world and his resistance to pressure for assimilation.

The discussions acknowledge, sometimes with evident reluctance, frequently with extravagant generosity, the importance of Judaism in world culture, as the source of the Judeo-Christian religions, and the essence of Judeo-Christian ethical philosophy. Yes, they say, the Jew has given to mankind the Judeo-Christian religions. He has given Jesus to Christianity. He has provided the concept of justice and the sense of social responsibility which make up the meaning of Judeo-Christian ethical philosophy. But the whole mood of the discussion radiates the sentimental regret that the Jew remains unchanged in his determined status as a Jew, as a separate, identifiable creature, loyal to Judaism in defiance of centuries of pressure for assimilation.

Toynbee, the English historian, reflects the pronounced assimilationist viewpoint. He projects the argument that the resistance of the Jew to assimilation is responsible in a large measure for the anti-Semitic posture of the world.

In a recent discourse by Toynbee, he acknowledges generous recognition of the Jew for fundamental contributions to world society. He even ventures the regret that the strong traits of the Jew, the character responsible for the miracle of survival and so much of the world culture, that this strain is not available to enrich the other segments of human society. The underlying tone of the Toynbee creed is the covert annoyance of the historian, that in spite of centuries of history, in defiance of the sword and the pen, this remains the heritage of the Jew, a relatively small identifiable group, immune to absorption. On the other hand, is the frustrating regret of the historian, that society as a whole is denied the special strain of character values that persist in the Jew and would be made available to the rest of society by intermarriage and full assimilation.

Sometimes one wonders what prompts the persistence of the Toynbee followers to argue for the assimilation of the Jew. What is it that pushes the endeavors of this historian and his disciples so vigorously to bury centuries of sacred traditions, to subvert loyalties to faith, to destroy the spiritual potential that has given so much to so many? There is persuasive authority for the premise that all anti-Semitism is a psychoneurosis. To the psychologist, "anti-Semitism," so-called, to conceal specific Jew hatred (Judenhass), is not explainable as a rational drive. One is tempted to ask—is the pressure for the assimilation of the Jew but an unrestrained sprout from the same sprig? Is it a symptom of the same complex?

THE "INTELLECTUALS"

Contemporaneously with the Toynbee discourse, an article appeared in a recent issue of the magazine Commentary, under the title "Intellectuals" which poses the problem, but with a wide difference in motivation. This article purports to review the attitude on assimilation of the Jew on the college campus. It emphasizes a seeming indifference to heritage and tradition among budding intellectuals.

The intellectuals, so called, are not by any means the sages of our day. Nor do they reflect the mature community judgment. These are students, budding scholars perhaps, living in an environment of challenge, of abstraction and speculation. This is not the climate conducive to respect for tradition or heritage. To them heritage and tradition are related to the dead past. History is important more for its dates than for its monuments. They present a pose of pride in sophistication, a sense of revolt against the authority of yesterday. This is a passing phase in the pursuit of wisdom. Sober assessment of spiritual values will come with maturity. They will learn that man does not live by bread alone. Then shall they claim their kinship to the people of the Bible and the treasured heritage of the Torah.

The infamous Nauman group of pre-Hitler Germany is the prototype for a small segment of American Jewish life emphasizing a pose of sophistication, ready to trade heritage and tradition. They do not want to be counted out of the fold, yet they cannot endure minority status, and they spurn affiliation with the "common herd." Devoid of intellectual insight, of moral vigor, of loyalty to tradition, and the capacity to

evaluate the validity of their great heritage, they are content to separate, to be exclusive, to sit on the sidelines, seemingly in smug complacency, or to vaunt their separateness.

THE POSITIVE REALITIES—MEANINGFUL PLUS VALUES

There has never been a period in the long history of the Diaspora in which the Jew was altogether free from enmities and pressures from without and from within. But the Jew has moved far forward from the cringing, crawling figure of ghetto days. The American Jew has emerged. He stands with head high. He worships openly. He speaks freely. He defends his cultural status vigorously. He manifests openly and freely the enthusiasm and inspiration of a true pride in his great heritage.

In advancing the theme that American Jewry meets the challenge posed by the pressures for assimilation from without and from within, I am not unmindful of the lessons of history—the collapse of the gains made in France following the Dreyfus case, the horrors of the Hitler rule that descended even upon the optimistic and seemingly assimilated, proud German Jew, who compromised heritage and tradition for acceptance, in Germany. Nor am I unmindful of the threat of Nasser and his United Arab Republic, nor of the pose of Rockwell and pseudo-Hitlers of his ilk in America. These are the realities that the Jewish community must never forget or overlook. The frontiers of freedom must never be left unguarded. But in the same context, it must not be forgotten that this is America; that the principle of religious freedom is woven into the very fabric of our basic law and government; that every assault upon religious freedom here has been repulsed. As a lawyer, I have some knowledge of the difference between man rule and government by law. In the tradition of Judaic teaching, in America we "do not rely on princes and the sons of man."

The last 25 years for the Jew in America have been years of incalculable progress, probably the highest in the achievement of integrated community status for the Jew in America, in all of American history.

(a) Israel: Within this period has come the rebirth of Israel and the attainment of its place in the council of nations. Of course, the rebirth of Israel is not an American phenomenon, but the resources for economic and industrial status, for domestic well-being came from America. The response of the American Jew to the event was electric. American Jewish leaders arose. They came from everywhere and from nowhere. It is to the everlasting glory of American Jewish leadership, to the inspired men that led the drive to enlist American resources, to the dedicated leaders of United Jewish Appeal, then and now, that American Jewish millions poured into the little State of Israel, and the glory of Israel was served. This chapter of American Jewish history will ever remain a monument attesting to the realness of the loyalties of the Diaspora in America, to ties of kinship and heritage, as Jews, without dilution of loyalty to America, as Americans.

(b) In the area of higher education: During the last 25 years also, the American Jew has seen the emergence of Brandeis University, of Yeshiva University, and of institutions of learning not so well known, under Jewish sponsorship and supported by the American Jew. Of no less significance is the awakening responsibility of the Jew for sharing in the support of nonsectarian private institutions of learning within the American domain. The growth in the contributions of the American Jew to the support of our colleges and universities and the greater participation of the Jew in executive and administrative departments of American private colleges and universities is writing another important chapter in the history of the developing integrated status of the Jew in American community life.

(c) The breakthrough in higher education: But the greatest gain in the status of the Jew in America, the vital step forward in the area of higher education, may be recorded here in New York, and specifically in developments at New York University.

Twenty-five years ago, not one secular institution of higher learning in America, not one American secular college or university had a department of Hebrew culture. In the early colonial history of America scholarship in Hebrew was an element of culture. The people who came to America and settled in New England were revolting against religious restraints. They sought religious freedom. The first settlement in America was part of a religious revolution. The Old Testament was respected as the source of Western religions. Classical Hebrew was a requirement of the cultured gentleman when Harvard was founded in 1636. Early colonial literature is replete with classical Hebrew.

Then came the impact of politics. Immigration increased. In the political environment that followed, cultural values suffered. Classical Hebrew became but a memory. It was just tolerated as a dead language in the department of Semitics. Then, in the first half of the 20th century, came an unique development.

Twenty-seven years ago there was born at New York University the first curriculum of studies that grew into the Department of Hebrew Culture at New York University. It was the first department devoted to a comprehensive course in Hebrew culture, in any major secular college or university in America. This event was destined to make history.

The factors that led to the founding of the Department of Hebrew Culture at New York University are details of history available to the student of American culture at the university level. Prof. Abraham I. Katsh, head of the Department of Hebrew Studies at New York University, will ever remain the pioneer in the movement, which blazed the way for the scholars who followed.

The significant fact is that this achievement at New York University was a breakthrough, an opening in the hard crust of conventional, American, educational procedures. This was indeed a historic milestone that integrated Hebrew culture into the curriculums of the secular colleges and universities of America.

Today, the top 50 universities in America, including the group known as the Ivy League, boast a department of Hebrew culture and civilization. This is in the pattern set up at New York University, embracing the cultural contributions of the Jewish people, over the entire span of world civilization.

(d) New York University Jewish Culture Foundation: In the academic curriculum of New York University is a chair of Hebrew culture and education, established in perpetuity by generous, farsighted men and women in the community who comprehended the meaning of this historic event.

A full-fledged undergraduate and graduate department of Hebrew culture and education was established. Forty subjects of study in the area of Jewish culture and civilization are now part of the New York University curriculum, leading to all three degrees in Hebrew language and civilization, the baccalaureate, the masters and doctorate. This is the positive, dramatic reality of today.

The now famous New York University Library of Hebraica and Judaica is also a fact. It grew in this great university. It includes priceless volumes and manuscripts, among them the private collection of the late Dr. Mitchell M. Kaplan, poet and bibliophile, containing rare editions, rare manuscripts, and important incunabula. It includes the valuable collection of the late Solomon Rosenthal, presented by his son, the late William Rosenthal; also the invaluable Israel Matz collection of current Judaica and Hebraica and the Semitic collection of rare volumes from the famous Lagarde Library. This proud collection has been augmented by the rare Hebrew and Judaeo-Arabic manuscripts and microfilm uncovered from the unique Hebraica treasures within the Soviet Union, assembled and contributed by Dr. Katsh. This discovery from the archives of Soviet Russia was heretofore unknown to Western scholars.

The campus population of New York University has now reached 20,000 Jewish students, the largest population of Jewish students on the campus of any university in the world. More than 50 percent of the total student enrollment at this university are Jewish students.

This, too, is a significant reality and points up the climate at New York University, referred to in the evaluation made by the great educator, Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, president of the university, as he assessed cultural integration as the factor in true freedom in the following words: "giving reality to the only concept that can make this earth the kind of place we really want for ourselves, for our children, and for our children's children."

This is the living reality at New York University.

Sober scholars speculate that the integration of the study of Hebrew culture and civilization into the curricula of the universities of America, is the most important event in the annals of Judaism in America. Integration of Jewish culture and civilization into the curricula of the universities of America is now a significant reality.

THE GOLDEN ERA IN PROSPECT—A CENTER FOR JEWISH CULTURE

It is difficult even for the student of Jewish history, with a sincere interest in contemporary human progress, to evaluate the contributions of New York University in broadening the academic horizon in American institutions of learning to make a place for Jewish culture and education, in the study program. It is difficult to acknowledge in sober prose the influence of this progressive outlook in the general area of academic life in America. The influence of the Jewish Culture Foundation of New York University and especially of Dr. Katsh in this meaningful result may better be conjectured than explained.

The work of the New York University Jewish Cultural Foundation has moved quietly, with little fanfare, with no attention to publicity. The magnitude of its achievement is not generally known. Its mission to implement and to advance the academic curriculum of the Department of Hebrew culture tells but part of the story. It serves New York University's 20,000 Jewish students. Its extracurricular service encompasses forums, public lectures, books and other publications, workshops to Israel, study groups, exchange students, interfaith relations.

For me, the last 25 years in America have produced meaningful plus values for American Judaism, historically important beyond present measurement. These gains represent the labors and the heroic achievements of American Jewish leaders. History will record to the memory of the men and women who shared in these achievements a tribute as enduring as time.

As significant as is the emergence of Brandeis University and Yeshiva University on the American scene as institutions of higher learning, as awe inspiring as is this great achievement, it is important that we evaluate the net result for the Jewish community. It must be considered for its service potential in the area of higher education by these institutions. This net result must be assessed in the light of the magnitude of the effort and the cost.

This towering achievement but pales in the light of the monumental developments at New York University in the last 25 years and in the foreseeable future. Here, at New York University, the lives of 20,000 Jewish students are being fashioned for the role of leadership in every field of human endeavor, to take their places in the living community of man. This is the unparalleled, living, functioning reality.

This equation must not be withheld from the American Jewish leaders. Its purpose is not to lessen interest in Brandeis and Yeshiva, of course, but to avoid obscuring the growth, the potentials, the true portion in the promise of tomorrow.

There is now in the making at New York University a program for the articulation of interfaith relations of such scope as to bypass every frontier thus far explored in that area. I refer to the program projected at New York University for a triangular University Religious Center.

The project embraces three centers of culture, the Catholic, the Protestant, and the Jewish, each independent, each wholly autonomous, all united in function and in motive, for better interfaith relations. These three units represent the three sides of the triangle that makes up the Religious Center of New York University.

The thesis underlying the united program is the premise that religious freedom as a theory is not enough. It must be made a way of life in America. It affirms that meaningful integration in community life among peoples of different faiths is attainable only with uncompromising religious freedom. It aims for a broader and better exposure to religious culture and its disciplines and a better climate of understanding among peoples of different faiths.

The New York University Center for Jewish Culture is the first structure of its kind in any secular institution of learning in America. The importance given by American Jewish scholars to the achievement of the integration of Hebrew culture, into the curriculums of institutions of higher learning in America is exceeded only by the magnitude of what is to come in the plan of the triangular Religious Center of New York University, now within reach.

The three centers that make up the New York University Religious Center and the operating fund for each are being financed by public contributions, each group relying primarily on the members of its own faith for support. The campaign for the Catholic Center was organized first, and has raised well over $1 million and is working toward the budgeted requirement of $2 million for building and operating costs.

The Center for Jewish Culture is the responsibility of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation. The campaign is now in progress. Last October, a member of its board of trustees, aroused by the prospect of a Center for Jewish Culture in this meaningful triangle, acquired and donated to the Jewish Culture Foundation, as the site for the center, a 10-story building and the adjoining 7-story building, on the Washington Square campus of New York University within the area designated for the New York University Religious Center.

The $2 million goal is the problem of a committee of Jewish community leaders which include such names as Mr. Irvin A. Edelman, president of the Jewish Culture Foundation, Mr. Benjamin Hornstein, its honorary president, Mr. Jack A. Goldfarb, its vice president, Mr. Charles Frost, head of the building committee, Hon. Maximilian Moss, Surrogate of Kings County, chairman of the executive committee, and trustee, and others equally identified with the major Jewish philanthropies in contemporary America. They look to the awakening of Jewish leaders in America to the magnitude of the event.

The building is to be the first on the campus of any secular college or university in America, to serve as a center for Jewish culture. It will have the stature and the functioning organization equal to the great responsibility.

The building will house the now famous New York University Library of Judaica and Hebraica available to students of the university and to scholars and researchers from everywhere.

It will serve the 20,000 Jewish students of New York University, many of them away from home and without affiliation for spiritual guidance and influence.

It will provide a center of culture with generous facilities for study and research, within the academic climate of New York University. Its facilities will be available to scholars and study groups from every part of the world.

It will have an auditorium for lectures, for seminars, for the dissemination of ethnical values and disciplines implicit in religious culture, with emphasis on interfaith relations for the community.

It will provide the stimulus to implement the thesis underlying the entire interfaith program at New York University—religious freedom as a way of life in all America.

It will consolidate the gains of yesterday; it will broaden and perpetuate these gains. It will transmit the basic truths beyond the realm of the scholar into the broad avenues of community life.

The program of a Center for Jewish Culture at New York University is so big in meaning, so large in opportunity, so important in fortifying the advances made by the community of Jews in America over preceding generations that its potential must be studied to sense its full significance.

The terms "assimilation" and "integration" are frequently used interchangeably in common speech, with consequent misunderstanding and confusion. To assimilate is to absorb, to destroy identity. To integrate is just the opposite—it means to preserve identity.

When the early Roman Empire prohibited religious worship to the Jew, after the destruction of the second temple, it aimed to destroy the identity of the Jew. When misguided churchmen ordered the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition to end Jewish worship, it amied to destroy Jewish worship and the identity of the Jew. All the cruelties to purge the Jew over 2,000 years of history—all of this aimed at assimilation. The miracle of the survival of the Jew, as a phenomenon of history, attests to the long, successful struggle of Jewish leadership to resist assimilation.

Th recognition of Judaism as on American culture; the introduction of a department of Hebrew Culture and Education into the curricula of studies of American colleges and universities, that is integration. Integration preserves identity.

The freedom to live as you are in a world of diverse cultures is the final test of freedom. That is integration.

The integration of the culture and education of a people, into the curriculum of American life is the American ideal. It was the formula adopted for America when America defined freedom in its Constitution and opened its doors to immigration as the free world.

In that climate of integration a great civilization, a culture evolved out of 3,500 years of discipline, of the wisdom of its prophets and its sages; a culture that has provided the basic religious principle for all of western society and the ethical philosophy for all of contemporary civilization, may serve to enrich the present and be preserved inviolate for posterity.

A TRIBUTE TO JEWISH LEADERS

In the advances of the last 25 years American Jewry has met the challange. American Jewish leaders have served heroically and with inspiration. Never in the history of the Diaspora has leadership given so much and so nobly.

But the golden era lies yet ahead. It will encompass the great gains already here. It will preserve the roots of these gains and cultivate them for posterity. It will open the gates to new understandings and greater freedoms. In the next decades is fulfillment. Opportunity was never more promising.

The leaders of Jewry in America know the achievements of yesterday. They will not fail to evaluate what lies ahead. Let me quote from our sages:

"Men of vision and mercy whose righteous deeds have not been forgotten
Their heritage shall continually remain,
And their names live on unto all generations,
Men will declare their wisdom and continually speak their praises."

This is the tribute. Here also is the prophecy.

Copyright—New Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my remarks before the American Guild of Authors and Composers on November 14, 1962, at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City:

Now that the American people have chosen their Representatives and we are on the threshold of the 88th Congress, it seems peculiarly appropriate to review with the distinguished members of this guild the strengths and weaknesses of the Nation's copyright laws and the immediate prospects for their improvement as a protection for the authors and composers of music. What are the new frontiers in copyright?

Both as a private citizen and as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have long been interested in the drama and musical arts—as a musician, a devotee of opera, a student, and a champion of the rights of all creators of American music, whether serious or popular. The jurisdiction of our committee includes measures affecting copyrights, but it is not merely concerned with the technical aspects of copyright legislation. The committee has the solemn duty of guarding the intellectual property of composers and authors, and of making sure that as our civilization grows more complex, American native talent will continue to be encouraged by receiving a just return from the commercial exploitation of its works.

For it must be recalled that the copyright law of the United States is founded on the constitutional provision (art. I, sec. 8) which empowers Congress "* * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

The Constitution thus envisages two purposes in providing for copyright. It wishes to foster the useful arts and it proposes to do so by rewarding authors for their contribution to society. Obviously these two purposes are closely related.

The last general revision of the copyright laws occurred in 1909. We have gone from

a horse-and-buggy day to a nuclear age. Tremendous changes in technology have taken place in the intervening half century. These have fostered entire new industries and new methods for the reproduction and dissemination of literary and artistic works. In consequence the 1909 statute is no longer adequate in its application to present-day conditions. It is like measuring the tail of a pig with the tail of a comet. Among the respects in which the copyright laws fail to achieve the constitutional objectives are a number of shortcomings which peculiarly affect songwriters and composers—notably the present inadequate term of copyright protection, the outmoded jukebox exemption, insufficient sanctions against the counterfeiting and piracy of phonograph records, the compulsory license for the recording of music, and the awkward and unsatisfactory provisions governing renewal and reversion of copyrights.

Past efforts to bring the copyright laws up to date have failed, largely, according to the Register of Copyrights, because of controversy among various private interest groups having a stake in the matter. In 1955, however, Congress provided funds for a comprehensive study by the Copyright Office as the groundwork for a general revision and in 1961, after much study, the Register issued a tentative report containing detailed recommendations.

These recommendations in large measure meet the proposals of your own group as to major matters, though varying in some areas and in particular details. Widespread discussions of the Register's report were undertaken and are still in progress, with your organization taking a leading part. What is more, the Copyright Office has now turned its efforts to the drafting of a comprehensive bill which, in turn, will be the subject of extensive study by interested parties before it is submitted to Congress. It is hoped that, with the genuine cooperation of organizations interested in the project, such submission will take place during the forthcoming 88th Congress.

While waiting for the legislative proposals of the Register, the 87th Congress has not been idle in this field. With respect to the term of copyright, for example, Congress was called upon, as an emergency measure, to take steps to prevent the expiration of renewal terms of copyright during the period which still must elapse before the enactment of overall legislation. The present term of copyrights, as you know, is 28 years from first publication or registration, renewable during the 28th year by certain persons for a second period of 28 years. One criticism of existing law is that today the United States is the only important Western power in which it is possible for a copyright to expire during the life of the author. The Register's 1961 report recommends that the maximum term be increased from 56 to 76 years. Under this recommendation the basic term would continue to run for 28 years, and would be renewable for a second term of 48 years. Although some groups, including your own, prefer a term of protection that would endure for the life of the author and for 50 years thereafter, as is the rule in many European countries, all interested parties appear to agree that the present term of copyright is unduly short. Meanwhile, existing renewal terms were continuing to expire and would be lost forever.

In this context, I introduced House Joint Resolution 627, which extends the duration of copyright protection temporarily. As enacted, this measure continues until the end of 1965 the renewal terms of all copyrights subsisting on September 19, 1962, the date on which President Kennedy approved my measure. It thus provides an interim suspension of copyright expirations pending the enactment of detailed overall copyright legislation. Originally this bill proposed to extend copyright terms until the end of 1967, but the subcommittee accepted the argument of the Register of Copyright that a temporary extension of that length might unduly impair the incentive of interested parties for achieving agreement on an overall revision.

Another significant congressional achievement of the 87th Congress in this area was the enactment of my bill outlawing the vicious traffic in counterfeiting phonograph records. Hearings before the Copyright Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary elicited testimony from representatives of phonograph record manufacturers, music publishers, and composers and performers of music to the effect that there exists a widespread practice of counterfeiting phonograph records, including labels, produced by reputable phonograph record manufacturers and selling them in interstate commerce in competition with the genuine articles. In 1960, alone, it was estimated, this practice drained more than $20 million from the legitimate music industry. Typically, the counterfeiter takes hold of a legitimate phonograph record manufactured by a reputable concern and containing a popular song or arrangement. He makes copies of the recording and of the label as well. Then he palms off his counterfeit copies as the genuine products of the manufacturer whose label and recording he has appropriated.

Because the counterfeiter operates outside the law, paying no compensation to artists, no arrangers' fees, no copyright royalties, and no excise taxes, he is able to sell his illegitimate and often mechanically inferior records to jobbers and dealers at prices far below those charged by the legitimate manufacturers whose work has been forged.

The victims of this unconscionable practice are many. They include songwriters and publishers; record manufacturers, distributors, and dealers; recording artists and musicians; manufacturers of phonographs; and the U.S. Government. The songwriters, publishers, artists, and musicians are deprived of their royalties. The record industry is denied its legitimate profits. The Federal Government is robbed of its excise and other taxes. And the music-loving public, often as not, receives a mechanically imperfect product. This in turn injures the reputation of the artists and of the manufacturers of records and sound equipment, because the public naturally attributes the mechanical defects of the counterfeit record to the producers of the real thing.

The few State laws which attempt to deal with the problem impose relatively ineffective fines. Counterfeiters are happy to pay such fines, regarding them as in the nature of licenses.

Inasmuch as counterfeit records are being shipped in interstate commerce across State lines, I believe it essential to the proper administration of justice that Congress should enact a Federal criminal statute that would add the power and weight of the Federal Government to State and county law enforcement agencies. Accordingly, I introduced and Congress enacted H.R. 11793, a bill that amends the Federal Criminal Code by declaring the traffic in counterfeit records to be a criminal act, subject to fine and imprisonment.

I believe that it is significant that both of these measures—the copyright extension bill and the counterfeit record bill—underwent amendment before they were enacted. I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for flexibility and compromise in the area of copyright legislation. In the copyright extension bill, as I have said, Congress accommodated the need of copyright owners to be saved from unnecessary extinction of their right to the equally urgent need of the Register to avoid a flagging of interest in a final agreement in overall revision. I believe the accommodation was a wise one.

Similarly, the counterfeit record bill underwent revision by the Senate, which sharply reduced the penalties provided by the House bill. This took place near the end of the session. Our House Committee was faced with the alternatives of accepting the Senate amendments and the greatly reduced penalties, or asking the Senate for a conference. In the second alternative, it is possible that we might have come out with a stronger deterrent; on the other hand, we might have come out with nothing at all. In this context committee staff consulted the principal proponents of the measure, representatives of phonograph record manufacturers. These persons wisely expressed their preference for a bird in the hand. I think this was much to their credit. One must stretch one's feet according to one's blanket. The measure, as amended by the Senate, was enacted; trafficking in counterfeit records is now a Federal offense; and the investigative agencies of the Federal Government can be enlisted to stamp it out. A new deterrent has been placed on the books and, should the penalties prove inadequate, they can easily be revised upward.

There is one area, however, in which the spirit of compromise and accommodation has not yet borne fruit. I refer to my unceasing efforts to bring about the repeal of the anachronistic and outmoded jukebox exemption.

Through the years, Congress has amended the provisions of the copyright law to protect authors and composers in the commercial exploitation of their creative works by requiring users to pay reasonable fees to copyright owners for the sale or use of their property. Radio and television broadcasters, concert halls, movies, hotels, cabarets, wired music—all these industries pay composers of copyrighted music for the right of commercial performance. The sole exception is the coin machine operator—the corporation that owns and leases coin machine phonographs to taverns and restaurants. To quote the Register of Copyrights, "Jukebox operators are the only users of music for profit who are not obliged to pay royalties, and there is no special reason for their exemption. The jukebox exemption should be repealed or at least replaced by a provision requiring jukebox operators to pay reasonable license fees for public performance for music or profit." With this statement I agree. The use of copyrighted music on jukeboxes for profit without so much as a by-your-leave to the composers of such works is nothing less than legalized piracy.

In the 85th and 86th Congresses, I introduced bills to repeal the jukebox exemption. In June 1959 the Copyright Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings on my bill, H.R. 5931. Witness after witness testified to the injustice and inequity of the out-of-date copyright law which was enacted in 1909, 21 years before the modern machine phonograph made its appearance. Helen Sousa Abert, daughter of the late John Philip Sousa, told the subcommittee; "A songwriter is entitled to compensation during the short term of his copyright from all sources which perform his work publicly for profit. The jukebox is certainly performing copyrighted music for profit."

The subcommittee also heard from qualified witnesses that the jukebox industry is today a $500 million industry—purchasing popular works at wholesale prices and selling renditions of the music at 10 cents a play. Coin machine performances of recordings are clearly performances for profit; but under existing law the composer receives no royalties for them.

On the other hand, the coin machine operators make the plea that they cannot afford to pay such royalties, that they fear that outright repeal of the present exemption would leave them at the mercy of the copyright owners who might charge them unconscionable fees.

Thus, embraced in controversy, the antiquated 1909 jukebox exemption remains unchanged. But it should be changed, and Congress must act responsibly to find a path of justice in this matter.

In August 1958 a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably a bill to repeal the jukebox exemption. In the report on this measure there were several references to a possible compromise solution of the problem, offered by the National Beverage Association. This proposal envisaged the payment of between $15 and $25 per annum per coin-operated machine, depending upon size. Even Mr. George Miller, president of the Music Operators of America, Inc., originally expressed interest in this proposal and the House Judiciary Committee staff attempted to schedule a conference for the purpose of discussing it. This conference, however, could not be arranged, the operators having apparently lost all interest in discussing a possible area of agreement.

In the 87th Congress I again introduced a bill to repeal the jukebox exemption, H.R. 70. Along with the Register of Copyrights, many public-spirited citizens—authors, newspaper columnists, actors—have endorsed H.R. 70. The Department of State supports it. The American Bar Association, the American Patent Association support it. But because of the controversy that surrounds this matter, some Members of Congress may feel that a blanket repeal of the exemption is not the best answer, because the coin machine operators and the music copyright owners might not be able to agree on fair and equitable royalty in negotiations. Accordingly I introduced, as an alternative to H.R. 70, a new bill, H.R. 12450, which would not only provide for the payment of royalties by jukebox operators but would also establish trustees with an obligation to provide for the fair and orderly determination of the amount and the proper distribution of such royalties. Hearings were scheduled on these bills but had to be canceled because of the unavailability of necessary witnesses.

In the new Congress I shall again introduce legislation for the purpose of eliminating this grossly unfair provision of existing law and I shall do everything in my power to see to it that this legislation is given a very high priority.

In appraising the reasons for the failure of Congress thus far to remedy this unconscionable situation, I believe that the members of your guild—as well as all members and friends of the songwriting profession—have an indispensable role to play. Because of the inability to foresee the development and popularity of the coin-operated phonograph, the jukebox industry has been able to reap large profits from the exploitation of music and at the same time to deprive the songwriters of their just share. The songwriters must bring the justice of their position to the attention of the Members of Congress, not only in the large urban centers but also the less populated areas. I am confident that when the issue is thoroughly understood remedial action will inevitably follow.

I believe that all auguries are peculiarly favorable for substantial progress in copyright law reform. The Federal administration has uniquely manifested its interest in cultural affairs, having for the first time appointed a Special Presidential Consultant on the Arts, the Honorable August Heckscher. The President and the First Lady have manifested great zeal in fostering the arts in this country. They have in many ways shown that we do not live by bread alone. The Congress will be increasingly alert and sympathetic to these problems, having worked with them, and it is your job to make us wholly conversant with your needs and problems. The Copyright Office is diligently tackling the challenging task of drafting legislation. Last, but not least, distinguished organizations like your own with specific stakes in copyright legislation are lending their expert assistance to the Register in attempting to accommodate competing interests and minimize conflicts among groups. It is hoped the new Congress will see the introduction of a general revision bill supported by the greatest possible consensus. In this work, no less than in the work of legislators, patience, statesmanship, recognition of th other fellow's needs, and an eye to the public interest are indispensable. Above all you must learn patience. Patience is bitter but it bears sweet fruit. From what I have seen of their work, I am happy to say that your own president, Burton Lane, your counsel, Mr. Kellman, as well as the members of your copyright committee, admirably combine these qualities and seem uniquely fitted to represent the interests of your guild in this vital area. I am confident, also, that the public interest will be furthered by their continued efforts.

American Memorial to Churchill To Be Established at Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include a report on the American Memorial to Sir Winston Churchill to be established at Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.:

AMERICAN MEMORIAL TO CHURCHILL TO BE ESTABLISHED AT WESTMINSTER

As a memorial to Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain speech a long-vacant Christopher Wren church, blitzed by enemy air raids over London in 1941, will rise again on the campus of Westminster College in Fulton, if the request made by the college board of trustees of the Bishop of London is granted. Westminster is the scene of the famous and prophetic speech, made at the college March 5, 1946.

Permission is being sought from the church, civil and arts authorities to dismantle St. Mary Aldermanbury, or at least the outside shell of it, transport it to Fulton, and rebuild it and rededicate it as the chapel of Westminster College. In honor of Sir Winston's visit to the campus it will bear the name of the British wartime prime minister. In response to a letter from Westminster officials, Sir Winston said:

"I am honored that Westminster College should wish to commemorate the speech I made at Fulton on March 5, 1946. The removal of a ruined Christopher Wren church, largely destroyed by enemy action in London in 1941, and its reconstruction and rededication at Fulton, is an imaginative concept. It may symbolize in the eyes of the English-speaking peoples the ideals of Anglo-American association on which rest, now as before, so many of our hopes for peace and the future of mankind."

Located in the heart of the city of London, not far from St. Paul's Cathedral, the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury, was erected by Sir Christopher Wren on the site of an earlier church which was destroyed by the great fire. The year of its completion is believed to be 1677. In the adjoining churchyard are the tombs of Henry Condell and John Heminge, associates of William Shakespeare who are generally credited with the preservation of many of his plays by arranging for their printing from his original manuscripts. No tombs or other local memorials will be disturbed when the outer shell of the church is taken down.

Once it is located on the campus of Westminister College, the Wren church will serve not only as the College Prayer Chapel, but, attached to it, will be a repository of Churchill memorabilia, of which the college already has a sizable collection. It will in fact become the Churchill memorial in the United States. The present chapel, though built only in 1917, is slated for razing, due to foundation weaknesses which developed during a long series of droughts.

It is estimated that it will cost about $200,000 to complete the first step, namely, dismantling the church, packing it in numbered pieces and transporting the stonework overseas and by inland waterways to Fulton. Final estimates on the total costs of reconstruction have not yet been completed. The project's completion is contingent upon the ability of the college to raise the necessary funds.

S-s-s-sh!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[Editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 9, 1963]

S-S-S-SH!

If participation in the Kerr-Mills program of old-age medical assistance had dropped last year, or even stood still, we can't help wondering what the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have had to say about that in its roundup progress report on Government help for the aged.

As it turned out, the 16-page HEW report devoted a single brief paragraph to Kerr-Mills, concentrating almost entirely on the point that average payments declined under the program. It avoided entirely the facts that the actual number of Kerr-Mills beneficiaries during the year ending last June more than doubled, from 46,247 to 101,634, and that monthly payments around the country in that period increased from $9,311,027 to $17,415,814.

Why? Well, according to Miss Ruth Lauder, a spokesman for the HEW staff, the omission of any reference to gains in the program was not deliberate. For one thing,

she said, the report concentrated on newer and more dramatic programs—including, presumably, the President's bill for medical care for the aged through social security, which the report called the most important legislative proposal of 1962. And anyway, Miss Lauder added, the Kerr-Mills program is really an income maintenance program, which doesn't have anything to do with the health of old people, except indirectly.

This must be a surprise to those Members of Congress who passed the Kerr-Mills program, who think it has not been given a fair shake, and who believe it is at least a partial answer to the administration bill One who is not surprised, however, is Representative BYRNES, of Wisconsin, the ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. BYRNES says the HEW has deliberately kept the program in a vacuum, that it has not only been dragging its feet on encouraging State participation in Kerr-Mills but has actually put stumbling blocks in the way of its success.

Whether that statement is accurate or not it is certainly true that the public at large has only the fuzziest idea about the Kerr-Mills program and how it is working. And from this viewpoint alone, the congressional investigation of the matter which Mr. BYRNES has advocated is clearly merited.

Independence Day of Libya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, 1962, Libya celebrated the anniversary of her independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Idris I of Libya; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of Libya to the United States, Dr. Mohieddine Fekini, on the occasion of the eleventh anniversary of Libya's independence.

Eleven years have passed since the nations of the world were witness to a modern Christmas story; for on December 24, 1951, a new nation was born for all the world to proclaim and honor. Libya, so long a pawn and conquered territory of militant powers, became a new member of the world community.

Successive waves of conquest comprise Libyan history, from Phoenician times through Greek, Roman, Vandal, Arab, Turk and Italian, to German and British forces during World War II. All have imparted an important lesson where Libya is concerned—its strategic importance as a crossroads between Europe and Asia.

Libya is primarily a desert. And unfortunately this desert, until the present, has been a deterrent for economic stability and independence. The Romans had built vast irrigation systems to support the large cities which they built in Libya. But through the years, these cisterns and water aqueducts fell into ruin. The newly independent country was in poor straights at its birth. The desert, though, became the succor for the nation when oil was discovered. The discovery of oil in other desert nations in the Mediterranean area led geologists to suspect the presence of oil in the South of Libya, but its production is above and beyond the expectation of any specialist. "Oil" is now the keyword to the country. Its entire economic system is being geared toward an oil economy. As one writer so aptly proclaimed:

> Only 5 years ago, Libya was regarded as little more than a vast empty tract of the Sahara's rock and sand. * * * Within that brief half decade, Libya underwent an economic metamorphosis that has already transformed it into a viable State possessing a dynamic and expanding economy.[1]

By 1965 oil royalties will amount to $500 million. Twenty-one oil companies have established headquarters in the country, with more expected. Development possibilities are unlimited.

Each year, as the world helps the Libyans to celebrate their independence, one and all can review with pleasure the progress that has occurred. Expansion of agriculture and water projects will enable the Libyans once more to call their country a granary as the Romans did during their reign. Confidence in the government is establishing greater unity throughout the three semi-autonomous provinces and will enable the Central Government to carry out without discord its development projects.

The United States has interested itself in Libyan affairs since the Barbary Pirates pillaged American shipping. Today the United States has in Libya, Wheelus Field, a tremendous air base. There are approximately 10,000 Americans stationed or living in Libya. The policies of Libya and the United States are, therefore, closely allied. Recently the Crown Prince visited the United States on a good will tour, solidifying the amity of the two nations. It is with great pleasure that we in America recognize the anniversary of the establishment of Libyan independence.

[1] Stephen Duncan-Peters, Foreign Commerce Weekly, Feb. 5, 1962, p. 208.

Is Venezuela Changing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted in the RECORD a history of the seizure and confiscation of the properties of American citizens and investors in Venezuela. Subsequent to the seizure and confiscation of some $20 million of property, the U.S. Government gave aid and loaned millions of dollars to Venezuela.

I cannot understand this and have opposed it with all the vigor at my command. American taxpayers cannot understand it and, certainly, investors are not going to put more money in these Latin American and South American countries and then have it taken away from them. This, to me, is utterly ridiculous, and I sincerely hope that our State Department and the President will take some steps to see to it that the Government of Venezuela or any other country first reimburses the American investors the money they have put into businesses in Venezuela, or return the properties to the rightful owners who operate under the agreements made.

I am inserting herewith an article entitled, "Is Venezuela Changing?" This gives a reasonable history of the present situation and the seizure of one property that cost millions of dollars of investors' money:

IS VENEZUELA CHANGING?

Is Venezuela moving, and in which direction, forward or backward. Nothing remains still, as it is a world of faction, one of movement. Which way is Venezuela going?

It is a question asked by many. To arrive at an intelligent answer we must look at what has happened in the immediate past—not what has been said, or will be be said. Actions speak for themselves and are easily understood, while volumes are written that well may be meaningless.

In this present 13th annual conference on the Carribbean much has been expressed about various roles—that of the private investor at home—that of the foreign investor—the role of the Government, both fiscal and taxwise—and the role of the Government in aiding business—and how such roles are activated—promoted—and influenced. Much has also been said of projects of the past. We must look at the present and to the future.

The main foundation upon which all such roles must be supported is confidence.

Confidence is an element that is created and nurtured over a long period before it arrives at its full maturity. It then must be protected from any sudden impacts, or shocks, as it always remains delicate. It can be destroyed overnight.

We now look at the record of the immediate past in Venezuela. It is again emphasized—actions speak louder than words—they speak for themselves. A single incident is chosen from the record.

In 1952 a small group of U.S. investors, having among its members, leading bankers and industrial leaders, obtained large concessions to explore for minerals in Venezuela. This group put up its own money and started a vast exploration program on its area in northeastern Venezuela. It was first necessary to build many miles of roads through dense jungle and mountainous terrain in order to have access. This initial stage of exploration took several years. It was during this part of the program after the drilling equipment had been brought in that geothermal energy (superheated natural steam) was discovered at depth. This continues to blow off with great force. This steam is also laden with minerals, making it most economical to extract them directly from the steam. The best known scientists were engaged to continue the studies.

As more money was needed this original group was greatly enlarged and the work was continued. This superheated natural steam (geothermal energy) had lain under the earth's surface in the jungles of northeastern Venezuela for over 20,000 years according to scientists prior to our discovery.

The volume of the geothermal heat source is, of course, millions of times greater than all the known resources of fossil fuels and will endure for millions of years. In other words, it is inexhaustible. Of the 4,000 miles from the surface of the earth to the center

of the earth, some 20 miles of this surface cap has been cooled off, and has taken millions of years. Therefore, the remaining heat source has practically eternal life expectancy. The only problem is to find the vent flues bringing this heat to within accessible distance from the surface. These have been found in Italy, New Zealand, California, and lastly on these concessions in northeastern Venezuela.

This great and important discovery was made by these private investors from the United States. It would have added much to the economy of Venezuela in many respects, in addition to generating cheap electricity. How were these investors rewarded—the following is the story.

A contract was made with the Venezuelan Government in April 1959 who were to purchase electric power that was produced by this geothermal energy. On the strength of such contract and the future plans for the project arrangements were made for a credit of $25 million. These were also private funds.

At this time after 8 years of work and without any discussion this geothermal energy, which had been our property since its discovery in 1955, was nationalized by decree No. 126 dated August 28, 1959. These private investors were given a choice by their Venezuelan attorneys, either to sue then for damages, or to attempt to negotiate an equitable contract. They were assured that no harm would come from this act of nationalization by the Ministry of Mines, Juan Pablo Perez Alfonso, on November 17, 1959. Negotiations were then started.

The results of this no harm guarantee was that after 3 years of useless negotiations, and just 3 months ago, the company was given an ultimatum by the Minister of Mines, on a take it or leave it basis to produce and sell electricity, to the Venezuelan Government at a rate that in itself was confiscatory.

No compensation was ever offered the company for the confiscation of its property rights, or for the unilateral cancellation of the original purchase power contract, or the losses sustained by the 3 years of paralyzation of the project since the nationalization.

The effects of such crude and ruthless treatment to U.S. investors has had wide and distinctly unfavorable repercussions toward Venezuela, having been denounced in the Senate of the United States, as well as on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States.

This incident is cited from the record as an aid to future planning, and in an effort toward possibly creating a more favorable investment climate in Venezuela for private investment funds.

Let us all learn from such actions. Let such wrongs be corrected, so that, the important element called confidence may again be created and nurtured in Venezuela.

As we are one large hemispheric family, it is only by such frankness and open discussion an understanding of fundamentals can be reached.

The Spirit of the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Dan Arteaga of Richmond, Calif., has written such an inspiring tribute—"The Spirit of the Unknown Soldier"—that I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may receive the widest possible distribution:

THE SPIRIT OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

I am the spirit of the Unknown Soldier, my name, rank, or place of origin is of no importance. I am an American.

I died for you to obtain and preserve freedom and independence, the pursuit of happiness, peace and security.

I died all over the world by the struggle of war between nations and among brothers.

I died for good causes, also for appeasement, miscalculations, and blunder.

To obtain the independence of this Nation, I fought and died at Lexington and Bunker Hill. To maintain the Union and abolish slavery, I gave my life at Fort Sumter, at Gettysburg, and Richmond, Va. At the Alamo I died to repel the invasion of the imperialist Santa Ana.

In the two World Wars I died to stop the arrogance of the Kaiser, Hitler, and Hirohito. In Korea, I died to appease the Communist hordes.

I died in Verdun and St. Mihiel, at Pearl Harbor, Manila, and Corregidor, in the sands of Iwo Jima, in the Pacific and in the Atlantic, at Tunis, Cologne, Essen, and Dusseldorf.

I died in the battlefields, in the air and on land, in the swamps, and jungles, in the hot sands of Africa, or froze and drowned in the cold waters of the ocean; by the treacherous air raids at Pearl, or by the tropical diseases of the Pacific. I died of malnutrition, weather exposure, or mistreated as a prisoner of war. I died as the result of war, at home and abroad, in war and peace. I died for you, for my country, and for liberty.

By an act of Congress, a day has been set aside to commemorate the event on Memorial Day. Flowers were spread over the ocean, wreaths placed over my tomb, speeches delivered, special events performed; I saw you at the parks and beaches, at home and on the road; I was awakened by the event.

While awake, my spirit went back to the places and times where I died. I want to recapitulate, to observe and ask: What have I died for? Has freedom, the pursuit of happiness been maintained? Has the fear of war ceased all over the world? Has the stain of my blood been washed off from my flag, with peace, tranquillity, and respect for my country? If that is the case, let me accept your honor and I will rest in peace; if not, permit me to suggest how I should be honored:

Honor me by preserving the things for which I died; liberty and freedom from want, the independence and respect for my country. Honor me at the Executive decisions and congressional legislation, at the foreign conference table, when the common enemy of democracy would try to take something for nothing, when the lives and welfare of my fellow men are at stake. At the United Nations, when the property and dignity of the free nations are in jeopardy, then honor me.

Honor my wife with enthusiasm and the chance to maintain a home and raise my family. Put the Congressional Medal of Honor on the chest of my children by giving them the protection that I cannot give them, the proper education and opportunity to become worthy citizens; teach them the principles for which I died, tell them of the genuine glory and pride of this country, keep them from falling into the lies and treachery of totalitarian doctrines. Place a wreath of laurel leaves on the head of my elderly mother, help her if she is in need, reward my father in his older days.

With all these things, tell me that I did not die in vain, show me that you meant to honor me.

Conservatives Are Justified in Hard Foreign Aid Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Ypsilanti, Mich., Daily Press of January 8, 1963:

CONSERVATIVES ARE JUSTIFIED IN HARD FOREIGN AID STAND

(By John Chamberlain)

It is often said of conservatives that they are mean, curmudgeonly fellows who like to see babies starve to death. And when a conservative—or an old-fashioned liberal like myself—opposes an extension of foreign aid, the common retort is that men on the right wing of contemporary politics have no feeling for the needs of less fortunate countries.

In the arguments, pro and con, over foreign aid, the fact that it is generally unsuccessful when it passes through the hands of governments is pretty much overlooked. Yet even liberals such as J. Kenneth Galbraith, our Ambassador to India, are coming to see that intergovernmental grants and loans tend to get short-circuited. They are wasted, so to speak, on Cadillacs for potentates, and the common people, far from benefiting from the money, cower in the alleyways.

When foreign aid follows voluntary patterns, however, it is seldom wasted. And the fact is that some of our most effective foreign aid comes as a reflex of programs developed by farsighted businessmen.

There is Mr. J. Paul Austin, the new president of the Coca-Cola Co., for example. With a long background of experience in Africa and Europe, Mr. Austin is a mine of information about the unintended local benefits of American business activity in foreign parts. Coca-Cola went into foreign countries for a reason that was eminently acceptable to its stockholders: it was looking to make more money. But that, as Mr. Austin points out, proved to be only half of the tale.

In the Middle East, even as late as the 1950's thirsty people drank germ-infested water out of community tincups that were dipped, unwashed, into malodorous goatskins. For a short period the appearance of Coca-Cola in the Middle East seemed to be helping only that segment of the population that could afford the local equivalent of a nickel for a drink. But soon a number of secondary—and unidentified—effects became apparent.

It so happens that Coca-Cola depends on an absolutely pure water supply. To provide enough water to mix with concentrate, local bottlers had to import the latest and most efficient methods of water purification. Local politicos, watching sewerage water being transformed by running it through modern filters, suddenly saw a bright light.

The example spread to southeastern Asia; Singapore, for instance, gave itself a modern water system after looking at a Coke bottling plant. And in distant San Salvador in Central America, where Coca-Cola had an early program the Government used the local Coke bottling works to supply water for the town when an earthquake disrupted the municipal mains.

In its dealings with foreign countries, Coca-Cola is careful to avoid the taunts of "coca colonization" by letting local entrepreneurs build and own the bottling plants, the glassworks, the metalworking establishments, and the lithographic industries,

that are needed to bring the product to the customer.

But the benefits deriving from the diffusion of ownership among the local populations were not limited to indigenous capitalists. A metalworking industry, formed to produce, bottle caps, soon branched out in many countries to provide other types of metal products. Glassworks created to make soft drink containers found themselves taking orders for medicine bottles.

Local truck services, using Coca-Cola maintenance manuals, were quickly plunged into a general garage business, with the result that the lifetime of a truck in the Middle East or Africa has been extended to 5 years instead of the traditional 1.

To its establishments in Atlanta, Ga., and elsewhere in the United States and Canada, Coca-Cola brings hundreds of young native foreign executives every year on its own version of the Fulbright scholarships. Turbaned Indians mingle with Chinese from Malaya and Latins from South America as they go about the United States for 3-month capsule courses in modern management techniques.

And the hundreds who go back to Africa and Asia carry advanced management know-how with them to indoctrinate thousands of their countrymen who never leave home.

Thus the benefits from a voluntary foreign aid program are spread like seeds from a bursting milkweed pod. It beats anything that Washington has been able to dream up.

The Words and Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major legislative actions of the 87th Congress was the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The administration made a strong request for support on this bill and members on both sides of the aisle responded. It was sought by the administration as a way of freeing up trade, of promoting the freer and fairer interchange of goods among the nations of the world.

At the time this proposal was under discussion, however, the administration was in the process of arranging an international cartel in the textile industry, setting quotas on the amount of textile products which would be received in each country from abroad. Very quietly, unlike the vocal proclamation of its free trade policies, the administration came to the Congress to get additional, after the fact, increase in power to be sure its trade limitation agreement would be valid. This act on the part of the administration, evincing so different a philosophy from its policy declarations on the Trade Expansion Act, is noted along with other suspected trade limiting "deals" by the administration in an editorial comment in the New Republic of December 8, 1962.

I think the administration owes the American people an honest statement of its beliefs in the area of foreign trade. Are we to believe the words or the deeds?

Especially disheartening to me is the fact, as noted in the New Republic's statement, that these under-the-table deals are far more restrictive of trade than are tariffs. The marketplace loses its function when decisions on how much of a particular item shall be imported falls within the discretion of an administrator with power to set quotas, issue licenses, control exchange rates, or whatever one of the broad range of trade restrictions is chosen in a particular case. The first real step to making trade more free is assuring that it is fair. The Trade Expansion Act did this by establishing a forum to which complaints of unfair trade practices might be brought and in which the interests of those affected might be aired. This is an excellent provision, yet through the acts of the administration the value of this forum, and the chance for an open resolution of the competing interests, is in jeopardy.

The New Republic's editorial is a serious indictment of the duplicity of the administration in this matter. I believe it deserves the attention and consideration of the Congress. It follows:

FREE TRADE, BUT—

The administration's most acclaimed legislative victory in the 87th Congress—the trade bill—was won at some cost. Protectionist pledges were made, and these presumably will have to be given consideration by Christian Herter as he administers the Trade Expansion Act. The cotton textile industry was assuaged by a worldwide system of quotas which will probably limit the imports into this and other industrial countries of cotton textiles to annual increases of between 3 and 5 percent. A high official in the Department of Commerce has even suggested that the administration is committed to trade limitation agreements for each textile commodity. The oil industry seems to have been promised that quotas on crude petroleum imports would continue, the coal industry that residual fuel oil imports would remain under control, the lumber industry that it will be saved from Canadian competition.

Last week, five senior Japanese Cabinet Ministers visited Washington to discuss trade, aid and international finance. The Japanese have done well in the U.S. market—imports from Japan went from $182 million in 1950 to $1.1 billion in 1961, and rose another 35 percent in the first 8 months of 1962. A few U.S. industries have been arguing since 1956, however, that these imports were seriously hurting profits and employment. They have been pressuring the administration to establish import quotas. That has not been done, but by threatening the Japanese with the possibility, the administration has persuaded them to impose a comprehensive system of "voluntary export quotas" on about 30 Japanese commodities, ranging from baseball gloves to Christmas light bulbs, which account for between 25 and 35 percent of Japanese sales in the United States.

Unlike tariffs, "voluntary" quotas are worked out under the table; the number and size of the quotas, and the ways of setting them up, remain obscure. The future of these quotas will be a significant index of how far the administration is prepared to go in supporting a policy of freer trade which, harmful as it inevitably is to some domestic industries, benefits both American exporters and consumers.

Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred To Push Hard for New Business and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred was a pioneer effort of local business leaders to attract new industry to our area. Its efforts have been singularly successful. Part of the explanation for its success lies in the advantages that Birmingham has for plants and firms that are expanding their operations. However, part of the explanation lies in the dynamic and public-spirited leadership of men who have headed the committee in years past.

This year Caldwell Marks is chairman of the Committee of One Hundred and the following is an account of talk to local business and professional people which indicates that Birmingham's growth industrially will continue:

COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED WILL USE BIG SELL TECHNIQUES IN 1963

Birmingham has the stuff of which great cities are made.

Take a look around you and start assessing the resources, natural and man made, that abound in this Birmingham district; in other words, start counting your local blessings.

These hard-hitting words came today from Caldwell Marks, newly named chairman of Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred, the industry-seeking organization of local business and professional people that set a pattern the world over for this type of agency.

"No salesman ever sold a product by knocking it," Chairman Marks said cryptically, foretelling the manner in which he will seek to mold the committee's activities during the coming 12 months.

What I mean is, we can sell Birmingham to the Nation and world at large by stressing the many fine things that already exist here.

In that way, we create an image of Birmingham that is true, factual, and salable."

MEDICAL AND RESEARCH

Then, enumerating some of the city's and district's advantages, Marks pointed to:

"We have a wonderful medical center right here in Birmingham. Can you point to another city in the South with such a center?

"We have great research facilities right here in Birmingham. Southern Research Institute is the finest institution of its kind in the entire Southland, and it is growing daily.

"How about our climate? Isn't it wonderful? You can work, play, do anything you want virtually the year round, right here in the Birmingham district. Our climate is a great asset.

"WATER RESOURCES

"Look at our water resources. We just cut into a new industrial water supply, which adds 75 million gallons of water daily to what we previously have been able to offer industry. We can offer industry in America today what few other cities can offer, and that is an abundance of water that is the best for industrial purposes."

The committee chairman then swerved over to Birmingham's cultural resources, pointing to:

"Our wonderful art museum; our grand symphony orchestra; our splendid little theater groups; our civic ballet; our varied recreational facilities here and within a 50- or 100-mile radius of the city.

"We have everything in or near Birmingham to provide the good life, the best life available in America."

Marks then pointed to a little-known fact about municipal airport. "It's closed down by weather factors less than any airport in the entire country, except for Miami, Fla., and Phoenix, Ariz."

FINE TRANSPORTATION

Marks also praised the district's "fine bus transportation system, its fine truck facilities for transporting goods and commodities, the excellent railroad facilities that connect Birmingham with all parts of the Nation."

Then this industrialist, with years of strictly industrial work in his background, expounded on Birmingham's "excellent labor supply."

"People are productive in this area," he declared. "They are easily trained. They adapt easily and well to new jobs, and in certain areas we have a large supply of highly skilled labor.

"Our labor climate has improved tremendously, and it's now better than that of most cities in the country. That is a great and salable asset for Birmingham today."

NO ORGANIZED CRIME

People for too long have taken Birmingham for granted in the realm of the way its governments operate locally, Marks stated. He explained what he meant this way:

"Our city is relatively free of vice, of organized crime, of corruption in government," he said. "You can read in your daily paper of vice, gambling, corruption in official circles, etc., in other cities over the Nation. It's not so in Birmingham."

Marks said the committee of 100 solicits the help of all Birmingham district citizens in its task of attracting new industry, new people, to Birmingham. "Everyone should be a salesman for his city," he declared, "particularly when he goes on a trip to other parts of the country. Tell them elsewhere what we have in Birmingham. Brag about your city, because you have the stuff to brag about."

Textile and Related Industries in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, 1962, I was privileged to be a guest of the Rock Hill, S.C., Rotary Club. The speaker on that occasion was the Honorable Robert S. Small, president of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association. Mr. Small made a very fine and timely speech and I was so impressed that I immediately asked him if I could take his speech and put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the enlightenment of all who may be interested, and for the purpose of continuing to record for all to see. I hope this will also enable our posterity to study the problems of the textile industry in this decade, and the efforts that are being made to solve those problems.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions, spoken before the membership of the U.S. House of Representatives on this subject and I shall continue to do so with all the vigor at my command.

My purpose today is to use the fine testimony of one who is eminently acquainted with the industry to supplement the information we already have.

The speech is attached:

ADDRESS BY R. S. SMALL, ROCK HILL ROTARY CLUB, NOVEMBER 8, 1962

Industrial South Carolina is largely textiles and related industries.

(a) We are the largest textile-producing area in the world.

(b) Out of 260,000 industrial workers in South Carolina, 165,000 are directly associated with the textile industry. Textile wages alone amount to nearly $700 million annually.

(c) It is not generally known, but the average textile wage paid in South Carolina is higher than the textile wage paid in any other State—or the world, for that matter; and, it is higher than the average industrial wage in South Carolina.

(d) Many fine, new associated industries have located in our State since the war, due primarily to the proximity of this major textile market—plants like Du Pont in Camden and Florence; Allied Chemical in Lexington; Chemstrand in Greenwood and now Blacksburg; Saco-Lowell in Easley; Eastman has purchased a huge tract of land near Columbia; Draper in Spartanburg and Marion; Crompton-Knowles in Greenville; and, of course, the fine Celanese plant here.

We should really add Fibre Industries just across the line in North Carolina.

I tell you these things to emphasize the importance of textiles to all of us, in all phases of life here in South Carolina—whether we are a textile worker, doctor, schoolteacher, or merchant.

What then is the status of our industry today?

Assets: Our industry here in South Carolina, indeed in the United States, has many assets. I'm tired of hearing us classified as a "sick or ailing industry." We are actually vigorous, competitive, and an example of what one industry can accomplish through modernization and competition, to hold the price of its product down.

Our industry has many assets. I will deal with these rapidly for they are obvious and well known but have not received the publicity they deserve.

1. We have the greatest mass markets of any country in the world.

2. We have the greatest styling in the world.

3. Although we have been slow in our machinery research and development, in recent years we have taken advantage of many technological improvements.

4. Our technical schools are superior to and more advanced than comparable educational facilities.

5. We have the geratest group of skilled workers—men and women who through their free inheritance and native ability can outperform his or her counterpart in any country in the world. And they are proud of it.

Like nearly every industry, however, we too have our problems. Our basic problems are twofold and are Government made. Since this is the case, we are forced to work with any administration in order to have our position understood and acted upon.

The first of our problems is imports. I would like to bring you up to date on what has been and is being done in this regard.

(a) I speak of cotton imports. Cotton still comprises 65 percent of our textile manufacturing. And, too, although the President on May 2, 1961, directed the Interagency Textile Advisory Committee to restrain imports of all fibers, only cotton has been acted upon—and poorly—thus far.

(b) Let us see what has been done on cotton imports. 1. August 1961: Short-term Geneva agreement with 19 nations. 2. Bilateral agreement with Japan.

(c) Country by country, category by category. Imports to be limited by categories (64) and by country of origin, to the amount imported in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(d) By March 1962, some obvious overshipments, mainly Hong Kong.

(e) By June, the fat was in the fire—over 100 items embargoed in more than 12 of 19 countries.

(f) As a result, the short-term Geneva arrangement has resulted in a colossal failure. One hundred thirty-three percent of the base quota was imported—with a quota of 567 million yards, 754 million yards were imported. Categories were largely ignored. Concentration of imports were, to a great extent, made in the heavier weight fabrics such as sheetings, where the raw cotton differential created such a windfall profit. Many categories were overshipped 200 percent and more. Concentration of imports crippled certain segments of our industry.

What about the bilateral agreement with Japan?

We had increased Japan's quota voluntarily from 247 to 275 million, to run concurrent with the calendar year 1962. For the first 9 months, through September, we have imported 285 million yards from Japan—already 3½ percent over its quota. For the 12 months ending September 30, 1962, Japan shipped in 359 million yards.

Isn't it obvious that the exporting nations consider these agreements a floor, not a ceiling; a minimum, not a maximum—and our governmental committees, supposedly implementing these agreements while paying lip-service to our textile industry, have done little to protect the interest of our textile workingman.

Our total cotton imports for 1962 will exceed 1,100 million yards. Just realize that for every 1,000 yards imported, one American textile worker loses 1 week's pay—1,100,000 weeks' pay will be lost this year. At $80 per week, $90 million of pay lost—but more important, this year 21,000 American textile workers will lose a year's pay—on their jobs.

LONG-TERM AGREEMENT

(a) Five years based on imports during 12 months ending June 1952. This will result in a substantially higher base than the short-term agreement due to the gross overshipment under the short-term agreement.

(b) Increase in fourth and fifth years are to be granted under the long-term agreement.

(c) No rollback agreement or short-shipment agreement.

(d) Assets:

1. Year's experience.

2. Better reporting from census.

3. Still have 64 categories.

4. No longer have to prove market disruption.

5. Will call countries on a monthly basis. But we are now told that this is subject to political significances as determined by the State Department.

Best we can hope for is a tighter control which will at best allow modest increases. We have to continuously fight for reasonable treatment.

Our governmental problem No. 2 and our major problem is the so-called two-price cotton system. We, the American textile industry, are forced to pay $0.085 more per pound for American cotton than our foreign textile counterparts have to pay for American cotton.

Why?

(a) This is why—we are the victim of the Government's agricultural problem.

We grow in this country an average of 15 million bales annually. The Government support price is roughly $0.335 per pound. The world price is $0.25. Our industry consumes 8,500,000 bales, so 6,500,000 bales have to be sold for export. In order to sell this surplus American cotton, our merchants have to compete with $0.25 foreign grown cotton. So, the American Government subsidizes the exporting mechant $0.085 per pound for any American cotton sold out of the United States.

(b) Why don't we buy world cotton at world prices? We are not allowed to, 60,000 bales only; it would upset the farm program—and that it would.

(c) What have we done?

First, section 22 case brought by the Secretary of Agriculture. It would have imposed an offset fee of $0.085, or equivalent to the subsidy, on cotton content of cotton cloth coming back to into the United States. By a 3-to-2 decision, this was turned down by the Tariff Commission on September 11, of this year.

(d) President Kennedy on September 7, 1962, commenting on the tariff decision, said, "The inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

"I am therefore requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end."

Secretary Hodges, recently speaking in Charlotte, termed the Nation's two-price cotton system, "The most foolish thing any government has ever done."

(e) As a result, efforts are now being made to formulate a program to satisfy the farmers, merchants, mills, the Agriculture Department, and bring about a competitive one-price for cotton. This will be submitted by the administration early in the new session of Congress; hopefully, to be effective with the new crop year, August 1, 1963.

(f) We should know the details of this new proposed cotton legislation within the next 2 weeks. It will be well publicized. You can help by writing your Congressmen. I cannot think of a more important piece of legislation for our section of the country.

IN SUMMARY

Given a reasonable and controlled import quota, given the opportunity to compete equally for our raw material, South Carolina mills will enjoy their greatest period of prosperity. Our mills are the most modern, our employees the most skilled, and management is willing to risk the capital to keep South Carolina the leading textile-producing area in the world.

Independence Day of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Cameroon celebrated her third independence day anniversary, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Cameroon, Ahmadou Ahidjo; and His Excellency, the Cameroon Ambassador to the United States, Jacques Kuoh, on this memorable occasion.

CAMEROONS: A COUNTRY REUNITED

New Year's Day 1960 was a joyous occasion for the thousands of Africans whose home was the French Cameroons. On that day the U.N. trust territory under French administration became the sovereign Republic of Cameroon, the 11th nation on the African continent to achieve independence. Thus ended a 75-year period of foreign occupation. Germany had declared Cameroon a protectorate in 1884. After World War I the territory was divided between the British and the French as League of Nations mandates. Then in 1946 the Cameroons became U.N. trust territories.

October 1, 1961, was another day for rejoicing in Cameroon, when the British Southern Cameroons joined the former French trust territory to form a federal republic. This event marked the fruition of the Kamerun idea which had emerged with political consciousness in the Southern Cameroons and had gained momentum as the British territory moved toward self-government. Kamerun became the political ideal of the reunification of the two Cameroons. The formation of the Federal Republic was an important event not only from the standpoint of the Cameroons themselves, but also from the larger perspective of continental African political development, for it was the first African experiment in the union of a British territory and a French territory. The educational, linguistic, and legal adjustments of the new union are gradually and most satisfactorily being worked out under the skillful leadership of Vice President Foncha and President Ahidjo.

The successful development of Cameroon is all the more spectacular because of the enormity of the difficulties, pointed out by observers of all kinds, facing the new nation. Ethnologists reminded us that Cameroon, lying at an ethnic crossroads of Africa, contained a "bewildering hodgepodge" of races from Islamic stock breeders in the north to Bantus and Pygmies in the south. Political scientists noted that as of independence day there were some 382 legally registered political parties. Geographers pointed out that the northern and southern sections were divided by a central plateau which effectively discouraged communication. Economists said that the primary crop economy was extremely vulnerable to climatic change and price fluctuations. The pessimists predicted that President Ahidjo would have considerable difficulty in holding together his newly independent country.

But the pessimists were wrong. The republic has been stabilized. The economy is advancing. Substantial improvements are being made in education. Communications development is under way, and industrialization is being speeded up. When President Ahidjo made a 5-day visit to the United States as the guest of President Kennedy in March 1962, the President of the United States congratulated President Ahidjo for his successful efforts in the progressive development of his country. The two Presidents agreed to encourage commerce and investment between their countries and expressed confidence that the visit had strengthened relations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Cameroon.

The American people add their voice to the congratulations of President Kennedy. To President Ahidjo, Vice President Foncha, and the people of the Federal Republic of Cameroon we express our faith in, and best wishes for, the continued successful development of their nation.

The Current Attitude Toward the Monroe Doctrine and Our Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the International Section of the Commonwealth Club of California spent almost a year studying the background and current attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine and our relations with Latin America. Following the study a secret ballot was taken among the members of the club on 12 selected questions.

The results of the voting are as follows:

VOTE OF THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA ON MONROE DOCTRINE AND LATIN AMERICA

(Results of the secret mail ballot submitted to all members of the Commonwealth Club of California immediately following distribution of the transaction, "Monroe Doctrine and Communist Threat to Americas")

I. After 30 years of the "good neighbor policy"—

A. Is the United States in general more popular in Latin America, 506; or less popular in Latin America, 1,371; or no change? 306.

B. Has the United States more or fewer Latin American nations on whom it can depend for support in our efforts to defend this hemisphere against communism? More, 932; fewer, 1,250.

C. Are the international policies and practices of the U.S. Government largely responsible for whatever may be your answer to B? Yes, 1,681; no, 446.

II. Do Latin Americans in general regard the United States as a so-called paper tiger (meaning a nation which will not effectively support its friends)? Yes, 872; no, 1,237.

III. Should it be U.S. policy, generally, to support any form of Latin American government which is anti-Communist? Yes, 1,275; no, 956.

IV. Should it be U.S. policy, generally, to achieve the replacement of any pro-Communist Latin American government? Yes, 1856; no, 369.

V. Should the United States act to prevent expropriation by Latin American countries of property of U.S. citizens—

When fair and dependable compensation is assured? 474; or when fair and dependable compensation is not assured? 1665.

VI. Should the United States continue its present policy of cooperation with Latin

American military forces? Yes, 2009; no, 158.

VII. Should the United States—

Consider the Russian intervention in Cuba's affairs a violation of the Monroe Doctrine? Yes, 2061; no, 171; at an appropriate time take whatever action may be necessary to overthrow Castro's government? Yes, 1751; no, 412.

VIII. Should the Alliance for Progress Charter be amended specifically to forbid employment of Communists in the Alliance organization? Yes, 1830; no, 349.

IX. Should specific provision now be inserted in the Alliance Charter, so as to provide a definite opportunity for private business to aid development of Latin American nations? Yes, 2070; no, 131.

X. Should at least semiannual reports to our Congress, and to the legislative bodies of other supporting nations, be made on progress or no progress achieved by Alliance nations toward conforming with Alliance standards as pledged in August 1961 at Punta del Este? Yes, 2123; no, 57.

XI. Is the Monroe Doctrine dead? Yes, 397; no, 1781.

XII. Is the Theodore Roosevelt Corollary dead? Yes, 715; no, 1192.

America's Day of Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, countless Americans have been shocked by news from the Congo where the United Nations has again ground its heel upon the hopes of the Katanganese who seek independence. We have still not received full reports on happenings there, but from what we know already it is a very distressing spectacle—a shame which may linger for many decades.

Summing up the reactions of many Americans is the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of January 1, 1963:

AMERICA'S DAY OF INFAMY

For the first time in our history the United States has deliberately set out to destroy the liberty and independence of another people.

By our outright support of the savage colonial policy of the United Nations in Katanga, the American Government has made itself a party to one of the most vicious attacks on a free people since the Soviet Union smashed the victorious revolt of the people of Hungary.

Without U.S. support and direction, this brutal destruction of the rights of the people of Katanga could never have occurred. Succumbing to the pressures of the so-called neutralist states in the U.N., and to the Soviet-dominated Secretary General U Thant, our Government has turned its back upon its own historical principles.

We have abandoned our traditions and our principles.

To please the primitive and dictatorial regimes of Africa and Asia, to satisfy the ambitions of neutralist leaders who neither understand nor acknowledge the principles of self-determination and personal freedom, we have helped to destroy one of the few African states whose leaders understand the necessity for cooperation between the races and mutual tolerance and common effort for progress.

This despicable action flies in the face of everything Americans have always been taught to hold dear. We, who liberated Cuba from Spain, who gave the Philippines their independence, who fought three great wars to help preserve the independence and freedom of peoples from Europe to Korea and are still doing so in far off Vietnam—we Americans—have now joined the motley crew of self serving wreckers in the U.N. who want to destroy, not build; to colonize, not liberate.

Why was this thing done? What possible good can come of joining with these unlettered and unprincipled nations with their mercenary troops in stamping out one of the most hopeful and progressive African regimes to emerge from the welter of dictatorships and mismanaged police states on the Dark Continent?

No wonder the United States quietly agreed to drop the Hungarian suppression from the U.N. agenda in recent weeks. The administration was already planning to do the same thing to Katanga. We have copied the Soviet Union's bloody action in Hungary by mounting and directing the same sort of mercenary attack against the freely chosen government of Katanga.

We the people of the United States through our representatives at the United Nations supported and applauded a victory in Elisabethville where U.N. troops entered a hospital and shot to death hopeless, helpless, innocent patients.

This is indeed the climax of the gradual erosion of principle that has sickened the United States in the last few decades. This is the final abandonment by our Government of our long-held belief in the rights of people to determine their own destiny in their own way, in freedom.

This is the final abandonment of the ideals of our country to the expediency of the conscienceless United Nations.

This is America's first day of infamy.

Let us pray it is our last. It will be hard enough to explain this betrayal of principle to the rest of the world. How will we explain it to our own consciences?

American Battle Monuments Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate and commend the American Battle Monuments Commission for its devotion and concern for the men who died in defense of our country during World Wars I and II.

I have received a communication from Mr. Roy D. Hollingsworth, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., a former first sergeant with the 125th Infantry, 32d Division of Michigan and Wisconsin, during World War I, who visited Romange Sous Montfaucon and American Luxembourg cemeteries.

Under permission granted, I include the letter I have received from Mr. Hollingsworth as part of my remarks:

SOO MACHINE & AUTO CO.,
Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., December 10, 1962.

Hon. VICTOR A. KNOX,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: I recently returned from Europe where I visited my son, a captain in the U.S. Army. He had obtained a 14-day absence from duty and he and his wife drove Mrs. Hollingsworth and me to the Argonne in the vicinity of Romange Sous Montfaucon.

I enjoyed the old battlefield in that my division, 32d of Michigan and Wisconsin, served in this well-known battle for 21 days ending the operation with my regiment, 125th Infantry, playing an important part in the occupation of Romange, beyond which there were no trenches or defensive works.

Now, VIC, my main reason for commenting on this trip is to bring to your attention just what I observed with regard to the activities of the Monuments Commission.

VICTOR, I wish that every mother and father could see the consideration given to our fallen heroes in the beautiful cemeteries where they now rest.

The cemetery at Romange Sous Montfaucon is most beautifully maintained, the masonry of the buildings and monument is outstanding.

At one time, more than 16,000 of our boys from homes in the United States of America were buried here. Actually, after 44 years, I could, with satisfaction, remain on the site for days, if time would permit.

My son drove us to the American Luxembourg Cemetery. This is one of the beauty spots of the Old World.

Every detail of care and original thinking is also evident here. I photographed my son, who proudly stood by the grave marker of General Patton. Nearby, 3,700 American boys are laid to rest in well-marked graves. Visiting relatives with whom I talked were strong in their praise of those responsible for the care and maintenance of our cemeteries in Europe.

Let me add that the authorities in France also never forget those who gave their lives for their Nation.

VICTOR, please forward my letter to the proper authorities in Washington.

Merry Christmas.

ROY D. HOLLINGSWORTH,
First Sergeant, Sy Co.,
125th Infantry, 32d Division, AEF.

From a Meager Grubstake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Valley National Bank, one of this Nation's 40 largest banking institutions and the largest in Arizona, celebrated its 63d anniversary. On that occasion the Arizona Weekly Gazette in Phoenix published an excellent history of this pioneer enterprise. All Arizona takes pride in this success story, so typical of the accomplishments made possible by our democratic system. The article follows:

[From the Arizona Weekly Gazette, Dec. 18, 1962]

VALLEY BANK CELEBRATES 63D ANNIVERSARY—A MEAGER GRUBSTAKE, A DUSTY CATTLETOWN, STARTED A GREAT BANK

PHOENIX.—Valley National Bank celebrated its 63d birthday this week with an outlook as bright and cheerful as the candleglow on its anniversary cake.

On December 15, 1899, articles of incorporation were signed and the Gila Valley Bank, forerunner of today's statewide Valley Bank, became a legal entity.

The bank was launched in the dusty little mining-cattle town of Solomonville (in what today is known as Graham County) at

a time when Arizona was only a territory and banking laws were virtually nonexistent. It was destined to become the most colorful of Arizona's prestatehood financial institutions.

Situated 5 miles east of Safford and roughly 180 miles east of Phoenix, the town of Solomonville was founded in 1876 by I. E. Solomon, pioneer merchant, who by the turn of the century had built (and owned) most of the buildings flanking the community's main street.

German-born Solomon had emigrated to New York in 1860 at the age of 16, then gradually worked his way West until he settled in eastern Arizona in 1876 with a contract in his pocket to supply charcoal to the Clifton copper mines.

The business prospered despite the threats of marauding Indians and white outlaws. Solomon branched out into sheepraising (the Apaches made a number of successful raids on this enterprise), freighting, hotelkeeping and general merchandising.

Headquarters for his various activities was a large brick building housing his general store in the center of town. It was in a corner of that crammed structure that the Gila Valley Bank officially opened for business on January 16, 1900.

Solomon's fellow incorporators—merchants and cattlemen for the most part—included many colorful personalities. Among them were George A. Olney and Phoebus Fruedenthal, the latter a brother-in-law of Solomon's.

Olney was an ex-Texas Ranger who resided in nearby Safford and was a wealthy cattleman of great influence. At the time of the bank's incorporation he lived in the area's biggest house and was its senator in the Territorial Legislature.

Fruedenthal, a merchant, later became a delegate to the 1912 Republican National Convention. Solomonville also was the home of a hearty storekeeper named Pete Bolan who had fought under Parnell in his native Ireland. Known for his fierce bouts with the bottle, Bolan was reputed to have caused the adjournment of a pre-1900 Democratic National Convention in Chicago with his stentorian shout: "Let's all recess for a drink."

There was some justification for Bolan's affinity for liquor—at least in Solomonville Territorial Gov. Benjamin Franklin visited the town in 1896 and pronounced its drinking water unfit for man or beast.

"It's terrible," he remarked but, after noting the community's many busy saloons, added: "I doubt if most citizens realize it, however."

Charles L. Rawlins, who later became one of the territory's best known attorneys, drew up the original charter. When he died in 1954, he was the only surviving depositor listed on the bank's opening day customer record. Valley Bank still retains Rawlins' law firm—now headed by his son George—continuing without interruption a 63-year-old association.

The Gila Valley Bank opened with capital funds of $25,000. At its first annual meeting it reported $64,284 in deposits and a net profit for the year of $1,546.55. The directors promptly voted themselves a dividend of $1,500—leaving a surplus of $46.55.

By 1912—the year Arizona achieved statehood—the Gila Valley Bank & Trust Co. (as it was then called) had climbed into second place among Arizona financial institutions.

It had survived the panic of 1907, had increased its deposits to $1.6 million, and was now operating branch offices in California, Morenci, Globe, Stafford, Miami, Ray Winkelman, and Hayden—all thriving copper-producing towns.

In June 1912, a fire which started in a Chinese laundry completely leveled the picturesque community of Ray—with the sole exception of the bank's concrete vault and the office's bare walls.

The next morning, while the town's ashes were still smoking, enterprising manager Jim Houston opened the fire-scarred vault's iron door, placed a board counter in the doorway, and painted a sign announcing the bank was ready to do business. His action brought cheers from the homeless miners and their families.

By 1912 the two dominant personalities in Gila Bank's management were mining executives Charles E. Mills and Dr. Louis D. Ricketts. A taciturn, hard-driving individual, Mills vanished in 1888 from Harvard University, where he had been enrolled as a student, and turned up in Arizona as a laborer in a railroad construction gang near Bisbee. By the time he was 25, he was a mine superintendent for the Phelps Dodge Corp. and at the age of 30 he was in charge of the famed Detroit Copper Mining Co. at Morenci.

Mills was elected a Gila Valley Bank director in 1912 and, until his death in 1929, was its principal policy shaper. He served for many years as president and, on two occasions, as president of the Valley Bank of Phoenix with which it merged in 1922. Prior to the merger he held the presidencies of both banks simultaneously, no small feat even in the freewheeling West.

Ricketts, a genial man of many talents, won his doctorate at Princeton University with a thesis on Colorado ore formations, then rejected a post on the Princeton faculty for a career in mining which ultimately gained him international renown.

In Sonora, Mexico, in 1897, for example, he built the industry's first all steel and concrete centrally driven ore mill which became the model for the larger concentrator erected at Morenci in 1900.

His brilliant career spanned three widely separated fields of interest: mining, education, and banking. As a mining engineer he became consultant to several of the world's largest companies. As an educator he served 8 years as a regent in Arizona and many more as a trustee of both Princeton and California Institute of Technology.

As a banker he worked closely with Mills in fostering the growth of both the Gila Valley Bank and its successor, Valley Bank. He was chairman of the latter's board of directors when he died in 1940 at the age of 80, mourned by countless thousands as one of his adopted State's best known and best loved citizens.

The Gila Valley Bank & Trust Co. merged with the Valley Bank of Phoenix in 1922, dropped the "Gila" from its title and became known as the Valley Bank & Trust Co. Thirteen years later it purchased the Consolidated National Bank of Tucson and changed its name to Valley National Bank.

But it was 2 years earlier—in 1933—that Valley Bank began taking the giant strides that were to transform it from a relatively obscure southwestern institution into one of the Nation's largest and most enterprising banks.

Responsible for this last surge of growth, which has continued unabated ever since, was Walter R. Bimson who took over the presidential reins in January 1933 at the nadir of the depression.

Bimson was no stranger to Arizona. For several years prior to 1933 he had been making trips here, servicing agricultural loans for the large Chicago bank he represented as a vice president. He was delighted to settle in Arizona; equally important, he wanted to test a number of progressive and often unorthodox banking services he felt were sorely needed in modern day banking.

When Walter Bimson was named president in 1933, Valley Bank listed less than $7 million in deposits, resources of only $8.6 million, a bare $3 million in loans outstanding, 11 offices, 15,000 customers, and a handful of stockholders.

Today it lists in excess of $700 million in deposits and approximately $800 million in resources. Loans outstanding are close to $500 million, offices add up to 78 (at this writing), and customers total around 400,000.

Stockholders now number over 10,000, and dividend checks are mailed to addresses in all 50 States and several foreign nations. Bulk of V.N.B.'s shareowners reside in Arizona, however. Capital funds are knocking on the door of $55 million—more than 2,000 times the original $25,000 posted in 1899.

Under the leadership of Walter Bimson and his brother, Carl, who succeeded him as president in 1953, Valley National's growth was termed "as dazzling a banking achievement as the country has seen" by the Saturday Evening Post.

The Bimson philosophy of banking was succinctly summed up by Carl a few years ago:

"Although we are a private enterprise, we try never to lose sight of the fact we are primarily an instrument of public service; we firmly believe the best way to build Valley Bank is by helping to build Arizona; we regard Valley Bank as 'a financial department store' which must be ready to offer every feasible service needed by its customers."

The Bimsons implemented this philosophy by introducing a number of "firsts" to the Arizona banking scene. Among them were the first installment loan department, first drive-in bank, first small business loan department, first "community room," first bank employees' profit-sharing plan under a new Treasury ruling, first "assured education" plan, and scores of other precedent-shattering innovations.

Result of the bank's public-oriented philosophy is history. By 1945 Valley National had forged into first place among all other banks in the eight-State Rocky Mountain area. Today it is among "the top 40" in size on the rollcall of the Nation's 14,000 commercial banks, guards half of all Arizona bank deposits in its vaults, and is the State's primary source of credit.

Highest honor in U.S. banking circles—presidency of the American Bankers Association—was conferred upon Carl Bimson in 1960–61. Editorially, it was hailed as a tribute to his banking acumen, Valley Bank's policies, and Arizona's remarkable economic expansion.

In January of this year, James E. Patrick succeeded Carl Bimson as president of Valley National. Carl moved up to vice chairman of the board and chairman of the executive committee. Walter continued as board chairman.

The three are unanimous in their belief that Valley National and Arizona have yet to witness their greatest growth. Their judgment is underscored by one of the Nation's largest brokerage firms which recently commented:

"Valley National has far outshone the U.S. banking industry over the postwar years, and this record is expected to continue over the years ahead." Another investment house plotted the expansion of both bank and State and noted "their growth lines are virtually parallel."

Community-minded Patrick summed up the bank's outlook this week as it looked ahead to its 64th year. "Arizona's future prosperity is inevitable. Barring the unexpected, it will continue to lead the Nation in most economic indixes in the foreseeable years ahead. And we at the bank are convinced that as Arizona goes, so will Valley National."

Governor Lawrence Addresses Pennsylvania Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of attending the opening session of the Pennsylvania General Assembly in Harrisburg on New Year's Day. As a former member, I was very interested in the remarks which were presented by the Governor of the Commonwealth, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, in his final address to the new general assembly.

He called to the attention of the legislators a number of very important projects which should receive their attention in the coming session. One of these was the subject of education, which should not only receive the attention of the Pennsylvania General Assembly and of other legislative bodies in the country but should also receive the attention of the 88th Congress.

I am sure that members will read this speech, which I have attached to my remarks with great interest and benefit.

FINAL MESSAGE OF DAVID L. LAWRENCE, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA, TUESDAY, JANUARY 1, 1963

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, almost three centuries ago, William Penn set forth the frame of government for his new colony and preceded it with a preface which has been described as the best expression of his ideas of government.

In that preface he makes the point that "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them," adding "Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad; if it be ill, they will cure it."

I come before you today to report on the movement of Pennsylvania's government, on the direction it has taken, on the advances it has made during these past 4 years—years which have been difficult and challenging but which, also, have been rewarding and productive.

Fortunately, I entered this office with no illusions and I approached its duties realistically. I came to this beautiful capital city in a spirit of humility, in the hope that God might give me the power and the ability to help Pennsylvania and its people.

I leave, in a few short days, with the earnest hope in my heart that the beginning we have made, together, will be continued and improved upon and completed.

I have used the word "we" in the preceding paragraph with careful deliberation. Those of you who know me well, know also that I am a man who believes, with strong conviction, in the value of cooperation—cooperation among individuals in private effort and cooperation between the various elements and branches of a governmental organization.

I hope you will forgive the note of pride in my voice when I say that, during this administration, the cooperative spirit between the legislative and executive branches has been both healthy and productive for this Commonwealth's government and its people.

Pennsylvania is in far better condition, today, because of that spirit.

Having said this, I must say, also, that much remains to be done.

Pennsylvania stands, at this moment in her history, on the threshold of a great move toward recovery. The foundation has been set in place; the building materials are ready; the plans and blueprints have been drawn and the basic course is charted.

Pennsylvania's problems are many—but they are not new problems. They were not born overnight through the oversight of one administration or one assembly—and they will not be solved by a simple wave of a magic wand.

The greatest of those problems is Pennsylvania's economic growth, how to keep it going and make it stable. That problem has been with us since the turn of the century; unfortunately, it is not likely to disappear tomorrow.

A few people recognized the problem when it was still in its embryonic state, 50 years ago. They saw, then, that Pennsylvania should be looking for other economic foundations than those it had cut out of the heart of the forests or dug out of the western hills or the anthracite mountains. Their warnings fell on deaf ears.

A quarter of a century later, the number of those cognizant of the difficulty our economy faced had grown even larger—but we were in the heart of a national depression and, because of this, our situation was not unique and, once again, little was done to prevent the downward plunge.

From the domestic tragedy of economic depression, America moved through the superficial boom of two wars—one a global conflict, the second a determined effort to prevent a worldwide holocaust.

Both those wars provided a burst of speed for Pennsylvania's economy; we had been, by tradition, the Arsenal of Democracy and we remained so in World War II and the Korean conflict.

Despite the significance of our wartime effort, however, the surge did not survive and the private and public forces which mold our future were lulled, once again, into complacency.

Not until the midfifties was there general agreement that we were not only slipping backward while other States moved ahead of us in economic growth, but that we had been gradually and inexorably falling behind for many years.

We began, then, to look around us—and the shock of recognition shook the giant that is Pennsylvania into awakening.

The evidence was there, ready to be seen and analyzed by any objective observer who cared to look. It provided conclusive proof that Pennsylvania's government had neglected many of its responsibilities—and that it would take many painful months and even more painful decisions to remedy that neglect.

Our resources had been squandered and the majectic beauty of our countryside had been scarred and despoiled by those who took from it and gave little or nothing in return.

Our schools had been ignored and the goals of our educational system had been allowed to settle down in the comfortable platitudes of another time.

We patched narrow roads of limited usefulness rather than building the modern, high-speed traffic arteries that had become the lifeblood of growth industry.

We had discouraged new industries from coming in, often out of fear that they would compete too easily and too effectively for the labor market we had available.

Our industrial climate was not the most attractive in the Nation, and we had failed to keep our economy viable and diversified.

There were countless new industries abroad in the land—industries devoted to the conquest of space, the development of advanced electronics, and nuclear power.

They were searching for homes, for skilled workers, and community resources. They may have considered Pennsylvania, but they did not settle here. They went, instead, to Massachusetts where a great technical institute had established a concentrated center of brainpower and academic scholarship, or they turned to California with its plentitude of power, its enlightened tax structure, and a growing higher education system.

When the problems were, at long last, recognized, it took only a short while longer for us to realize that a large part of the responsibility for reversing Pennsylvania's downward economic spiral rested with government itself.

My predecessor in this office, Governor Leader, determined to accept that responsibility—and with the help of enlightened legislators, he was able to make a beginning. It has been my privilege to build upon that beginning and strengthen it these past 4 years.

At the same time, the first fact of life that became obvious to me was that the State's own governmental affairs were in deplorable condition, financially.

While this administration was faced with many things which should have been done long before, it was, at the same time, confronted with an appalling condition brought about by appropriation of State funds when there was no money available to foot the bill.

The disease had lingered for many years, sapping the strength of the patient and preventing its recovery. Skilled treatment was not only desirable, but mandatory as well.

When I took the oath of office on the 20th of January 1959, it was calculated that Pennsylvania's State government had a deficit of $177 million. Five months later, at the end of June, it had been reduced to $144 million—still a staggering amount. We succeeded in cutting it back further until last year when we ended the fiscal period with a surplus. The deficit has been eliminated and I hope and pray that it is never again permitted to accumulate.

The dilemma of the new administration on that cold and stormy day 4 years ago was a real one. We knew there were bills to be paid, that there were programs to continue and improve upon. We wanted, also, to give the people of this State new programs and new services where they were needed and wherever it was feasible to do so.

The administration had an obligation to restore fiscal integrity and responsibility to the management of State government affairs. That obligation was not only mandated by the constitution; it was, more than anything else, the moral duty of a government devoted to the citizens it serves.

Unglamorous though budget balancing may be, it is the cornerstone of good State government. It is, also, the cardinal requirement of a forward-looking program to attract industry, for the plain fact is that modern industries are not interested in a State that does not know how to operate its own business.

Granted, then, that the first challenge I saw confronting this administration was to restore fiscal responsibility, I feel a strong sense of pride in the fact that the budget, this year, is balanced and that several million dollars of the surplus have been distributed to public schools and Pennsylvania State University in accordance with the wishes of the general assembly.

I am happy to report, moreover, that revenues at this point are substantially in accord with our original estimates, and we

have now been able to lapse thus far more than $10 million in unused funds from various State agencies.

We not only balanced the budget last year but we leave to the incoming administration a fiscal condition which should assure balance for this year as well.

I should be less pleased with this report if it were necessary to say, at the same time, that the services of State government have been cut back or curtailed. But there has been no cutback and there has been no curtailment.

We have continued the valued and valuable programs of State government at peak levels. We have improved upon them and expanded them. In urban renewal, in education, in public health and mental health, in building a stronger, more effective State police force, in human rights, in recreation and conservation and industrial development, we have made far greater progress, relatively speaking, during the past 4 years than during any comparable time in Pennsylvania history.

More importantly, we have been able to initiate new programs for the development of Pennsylvania libraries and the encouragement of tourism that are the first of their kind in the Nation.

The odds against these achievements have been enormous, for Pennsylvania has been, traditionally, lacking in the stable financial resources that are necessary for governmental improvement.

Not until 1953 did our State have a broad-based tax to finance the operation of State government services—and not until 1956 did that tax, which many of us had not agreed with, become the major source of revenue for the State.

Not until 1955 did we see that the State had a direct and unavoidable role to play in the development of new industry. And it has been only during this administration that Pennsylvania has been given a forward-looking, adequately-financed program for highway construction designed to meet the industrial and travel demands of modern times.

Not until 1955 did we recognize the desperate need for a new approach to the treatment of mental illness—an approach that now results in cure and release, wherever possible, rather than senseless and inhuman perpetual imprisonment.

I have not come here, today, to present either a blueprint or a program for your consideration. My duties, in this regard, are nearing their official termination.

It remains for a new Governor and a new administration to map the next 4 years—and I pray, with you, that they will have far more than moderate success in that venture, for the sake of Pennsylvania.

There are certain areas, however, which I cannot ignore; they are too close to my heart and too much in my thoughts to be left out of these remarks today.

The first of these is the education of Pennsylvania's children, for this is a field in which you have also been intensely interested and it is the frontier upon which the destiny of our State, its people, and the entire free world will be decided.

I want to say, once again, that there has never been a better blueprint for the advancement of Pennsylvania education than the one now available through the report and recommendations of the Governor's committee so ably chaired by Lieutenant Governor Davis. It is a comprehensive, practical, and studiously realistic report and I am proud to give it my fervent and heartfelt endorsement.

Within the realm of public education—and higher education, also—it is imperative that we take steps to improve teachers' salaries and continue to provide the physical plants they need to perform their duties.

We must do far more than we have done in the field of higher education and in this respect I am delighted to report that Pennsylvania's State-aided colleges and universities have now come up with a formula for equitable assistance which is both sound and realistic and which I urge as a pattern for the new administration and this legislature.

I earnestly hope that this general assembly will give its approval to the constitutional amendment which would legalize scholarships and loans to deserving students. It is essential that we make it possible for good students to continue to advance their education and this is one of the most practical and reasonable methods available. Another, needless to say, is establishing a system of community colleges in the State—an action long overdue.

These are all constructive and creative measures; they deserve your support and your active interest.

At the same time, I feel it is necessary to warn against the potential destructiveness involved in the emasculation or possible repeal of Act 561 calling for school district reorganization.

Let's be frank about it. This law has been more flagrantly misrepresented—either through deliberate partisanship or ignorance of its provisions—than any other law ever passed in the halls of this assembly and signed into effect by a governor. The campaign against it has been a campaign or distortion and deception and demoralization—and that campaign has done an immense injustice, not only to this legislative body but to this administration as well.

Worse still, it has been completely unjust to our children, themselves—and that is what really matters.

Now that the rattling drums of political oratory have died away, I hope that the members of this legislative assembly will look upon Act 561 with the detached and sober minds of men who place the best interests of their State far above any small gain they might make otherwise.

The act is not a perfect one, for there are no perfect laws.

Perhaps the law can be amended; I reject the hypothesis that it should be hamstrung or repealed.

Act 561 was the greatest forward-step Pennsylvania education had taken in 50 years. It remains a good law and it deserves far better than the calumny and criticism it has thus far received.

There are numerous other fields in which I hope and trust this assembly will show its enlightened concern.

Although in practice it will not apply to our State, I hope that Pennsylvania will hastily ratify the amendment to the Federal Constitution which will abolish the use of the poll tax.

The Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority—which is already the most effective of its kind in the country—must be continued and expanded. The present rate of loan activity is at a record level, so much so, in fact, that additional money must be provided if the industry authority is to function at its maximum effectiveness for the remainder of this fiscal year. This, of course, is money we cannot afford not to spend.

Beyond this, the authority's work must become both preventive and remedial; its aid must be offered to communities which now seem prosperous and stable in their economy so that they may continue so. Aid to the chronically distressed areas of our State should be—and must be—maintained at its present pace, at least, and, if possible, strengthened in the future.

In the continued struggle to encourage industrial development, we must not lose sight of the need for improved transportation facilities and rates and the provision of feasible power rates for industrial uses.

Along this line, I want to express my pleasure at the recent announcement of Pennsylvania utility companies that they will build and operate power-producing plants at the mouths of mines. Such a move, it seems to me, could make Pennsylvania the foremost power-producing State in the northeastern part of the Nation.

We must move forward with the highway construction program that is already far ahead of original expectations. The plans have already been drawn; the money is available and there is no reason, whatever, that Pennsylvania cannot set the pace for the rest of the Nation in completing its interstate highways program.

The department of highways now has $1,600 million worth of plans in process—70 percent of that total already in final design, and all of it scheduled to be ready for advertising for bids within the next 4 years.

While we are building our highways and our schools, we must do everything in our power to insure the preservation of open space. We have too little of it, now, and we must make certain that the supply for recreation and scenic value is not further depleted.

This assembly will have the opportunity to vote upon—I hope, favorably, once more—the finest plan to guarantee open space of any State in the Nation. That plan, of course, is Project 70 and I earnestly hope that you will make it possible for the people, themselves, to vote on it in the next general election.

We must also make certain that we preserve and protect our precious water supply, and continue to pioneer in developing master plans for our great river basins, as we have done so successfully on the Delaware.

Although we now have the best and strongest strip mining legislation in America on Pennsylvania's law books, we must strengthen the effort to eliminate the further destruction of our natural beauty. I hope, also, that the assembly will give its support to the creation of a new agency, using both private and public funds, for the reclamation of land that has been scarred by workings prior to enactment of the present legislation.

There are many other areas which require attention—a list too long and too involved for me to recite here. Both parties have made promises and it is up to the party in power to implement those promises by legislation. It is the responsibility of the opposition to prod that action if it is not otherwise forthcoming.

But I must mention the necessity to push forward in such vital human fields as public welfare and public health. We must also zealously advance and protect the human and civil rights of all peoples.

I hope, too, that Pennsylvania will soon join its sister State of New York in developing a State arts council, which can bring to every section of the Commonwealth the great cultural attractions which are now available in the larger communities. I am pleased to note that a task force of the joint State government commission plans to recommend assistance for Philadelphia's University Museum so a mobile museum can be put into operation bringing great treasures to every section of the State. This, certainly, is a step in the right direction, and I hope it comes about.

There is one personal project, on which we have been working, that I would urge upon you. For many, many years, I have been closely associated with the deaf—a group of handicapped people whose problems have been generally neglected and misunderstood. A special study committee, which I appointed last June, has now recommended

that an office for the deaf be established in the department of labor and industry. Knowing the problems of the deaf as intimately as I do, I strongly recommend that this office be created as an imperative part of our overall work to aid the handicapped. I hope also that the Governor's committee on the handicapped, which has been chaired so effectively these past years by Pearl Buck, will be made a statutory agency and given the powers it needs to carry forward its exciting and far-reaching program.

Finally—but by no means least important—there is the desperate need to recruit the finest available talent to work in State government—not only in our mental hospitals, our libraries and health and welfare agencies, but equally in the management of the State's fiscal affairs.

We must have inspired and imaginative governmental leadership, for the complex and diversified functions of State government must have it if we are to hope to attract the kind of competent, professional workers we need.

We have made the transition from the day of the quill pen to electronic data processing rapidly—not only in private industry, but, as of now, in government also.

But new methods and new equipment require new talents and skills. We must, therefore, be able to recruit the kind of able, highly trained, technically skilled personnel that modern government demands.

Having said this much, I want to assure you that my remarks are nearing an end.

Speeches, like courtships, should not be overlong for the longer they are the greater the risk of disenchantment.

I want to say only this, in conclusion:

No Governor in Pennsylvania history has ever had the services of a finer, more dedicated or more effective cabinet than I.

To these men and women, I owe a great and everlasting debt of gratitude—and to the thousands of State employes who have worked with efficiency and dedication to make this a better State for the future.

To each of them—and to each of you—I offer my thanks and my fervent prayer for a provident and progressive future.

The incoming Governor and his administration have my best wishes and my prayers, also.

I ask that you give them the same measure of devotion, the same enlightened and selfless determination to do what is right for all of Pennsylvania that you have given me.

If you do that—and I know that you will—the beginning we have made these past 8 years under Governor Leader and under this administration, will result in a noble and prosperous new order for this great State and its people.

Thank you. And God bless each of you in your deliberations in this assembly.

Certainly There Is No Freedom To Be Indecent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, herewith, an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet of December 8, 1962, treating with the television program of Howard K. Smith and the vilification of former Vice President Richard Nixon by none other than the perjurer and traitor, Alger Hiss.

As this article states, the program was defended by Jim Hagerty on the grounds of "freedom of the press." This, as everyone knows, was a specious argument and an attempt to apologize for one of the worst programs ever put on the air and to which the American people were exposed against their will.

The so-called freedom of the press is an abuse in this and other instances. What is meant is "freedom for the press" for no one else would have the same opportunity as was given to Alger Hiss. It is a sorry day in America when convicted perjurers and, far worse, traitors, are given free time on our television to vilify good Americans, sound Americans, and courageous Americans, through whose diligence and untiring efforts culprits are exposed to the point of sending them to jail.

During the past year, I said on numerous occasions that there is a strange philosophy, entertained by some people in our country, that extends a great freedom to Communists, fellow travelers, and "pinkos" that is never extended to sound, honest-to-God, patriotic Americans. I believe it is time that the American people who believe in justice and fair play see to it that the channel putting on this program be thoroughly denounced thereby letting them know that Americans do not agree with them. The article follows:

CERTAINLY THERE IS NO FREEDOM TO BE INDECENT

One would not be out of line in surmising that the American Broadcasting Co. is having difficulty getting the public to accept the argument advanced by James Hagerty, ABC official, and echoed by others, that the appearance of Alger Hiss on the Howard K. Smith program is to be excused on the grounds of an omnipotent "freedom of the press."

The argument, of course, of those who objected to a TV bit role for a man convicted of perjury concerning not land fraud or illegal whisky but the giving of his country's secret documents to her sworn enemy, a man who has evinced no contrition or remorse for his actions, was voiced on the ground of bad taste and in violation of decency. The protesting public and sponsors, insulted and beaten down by Mr. Hagerty's and others' counterattack with a strawman, are still making their objections known.

Two letters appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of November 30 are typical of those appearing in the daily press and which spell out the real issue so earnestly befogged by ABC and a host of well-meaning, mischievous people in high places:

"I have no newspaper or advertising affiliations and think that any advertiser is justified in leaving any medium that he thinks has lowered its standards. ABC's reputation is downgraded if the network shows poor judgment, and nothing has been as low as the Hiss presentation.

"B. N. HARRELL."

"The editorial, 'Mr. Hagerty and Mr. Hiss,' caused me great displeasure. Public opinion is subjected to every kind of pressure and propaganda by people with power. We have the right to accept it or reject it. There seems to be a double standard for those who attack and assassinate characters but describe as reprehensible and irresponsible those who protest this assassination.

"MARY KEARFOTT."

In the diocesan press there were those who correctly saw that the issue was not "censorship by the political Right" or the need for "balanced programming" or that a "tragedy" was incurred by the not altogether unique situation of a sponsor seeking to withdraw from a station.

In an editorial entitled "Time To Hiss Mr. Hagerty," the Providence Visitor, while agreeing on the perjurer's right to a TV appearance, said: "For the life of us we cannot understand how anyone can square with the minimum canons of decency and good taste placing a perjurer in judgment on a man whom 49 percent of the U.S. citizens believed worthy of the highest office in the land. We did not relish at all how Mr. Nixon made his political exit on television, but we can only admire his restraint in commenting on this humiliating treatment in a particularly bitter hour."

Msgr. John Kelly, editor of the Chicago archidocese's New World, asserted: "If gloating over the political defeat of a former Vice President of the United States comes into the area of good taste, I fail to see how. Mr. Nixon, whether you like him or not, is a man with a fine record of courage and diligence in serving the American public. The taste that makes you want to rinse your mouth is the employment of a convicted perjurer and traitor to vilify before millions the man who worked so courageously to expose his treachery.

"No doubt many will rise to defend ABC, Howard K. Smith, the sponsors Nationwide Insurance, and even Hiss, on the badly abused grounds of 'freedom of speech.' I would say they all deserve each other. Let's hope they're happy together."

We wonder why it is that when, using as a standard not decency but a system of ratings placed godlike on a pedestal as sole indicator of a program's value, a network unceremoniously dumps—read censors—a program, there are none to mount the battlements waving the tattered ensign of "freedom of the press"? Is it just that where cost per thousand is concerned, decency has nothing to do with it?

Salute for B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the world's oldest Jewish service organization, B'nai B'rith, on the occasion of its 120th anniversary. This venerable organization, founded in New York City in 1843, is now worldwide in scope. It has played a major role in promoting understanding and tolerance throughout the United States and the 41 nations in which it has expanded its activities.

In this connection, I would like to include an excellent and appropriate editorial from a newspaper in my congressional district, the Washington Examiner.

The editorial reads:

MILESTONE FOR B'NAI B'RITH

B'nai B'rith is 119 years old. As it enters its 120th year, a venerable age even by Biblical standards, the world's oldest Jewish service organization carries its years well and remains a perennially zestful and energetic force in Jewish life throughout the free world.

B'nai B'rith's elixir has been its ability to meet history head on and become a force for good in the midst of turbulent human

events. Thus, it established the first Jewish library in America, and the first Jewish community center, opened the first free employment office for immigrants, fought anti-Semitism here and abroad before that word was coined, and was the first national organization to undertake disaster relief.

Its 119 years are studded with many rich and enduring contributions to community enlightenment and human progress. Since its inception in 1843 on New York's East Side, it has expanded to 41 nations throughout the world embracing some 470,000 members.

B'nai B'rith stays healthy and young because it continually meets the challenges and opportunities of contemporary events.

And so, hearty congratulations to B'nai B'rith on this significant anniversary. May it endure.

Women Strike for Peace and the HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during December 1962, while Congress was not in session, the American public was treated to a sorry spectacle by a committee of Congress. The House Un-American Activities Committee decision to investigate the Women Strike for Peace and the subsequent hearings again demonstrated that this committee serves no useful legislative function and is antithetical to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. At the time of the hearings I issued a statement which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. I regret that on the first day of this session there was no opportunity to offer an amendment to the resolution on the rules of the 88th Congress which would repeal clause 1(r) of rule X and clause 18 of rule XI which provide for this committee. The House will have an opportunity to vote on this issue when the 1963 appropriation for the committee is before it.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN CONCERNING THE ACTION OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE IN HOLDING HEARINGS ON THE WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

The announcement by the House Un-American Activities Committee of public hearings with reference to the Women Strike for Peace is another example of the misuse and abuse of legislative power.

The hearings apparently are intended to discredit the Women Strike for Peace and to cast doubt upon the loyalty of those active in it. The action of the committee induces conformity of thought and action and intimidates citizens who are seeking to express their concern for peace.

The spontaneous peace movement in the United States is dramatic evidence of the strength of our democracy. Even at the height of an international crisis, citizens exercised their constitutional rights of petition, assembly, and free speech. However, the committee consistently opposes the spirit of independent inquiry and humane protest. By intimidation and innuendo the committee spreads fear and stifles dissent. The committee has a habit of using its power to expose and punish groups and individuals whose programs and ideas the committee disapproves of.

Disarmament under effective international control and a strong United Nations, imperatives of our time, are stated goals of Women Strike for Peace. A group of citizens working for these goals within our constitutional framework should be commended, not condemned.

The first amendment explicitly protects all ideas and expressions. The framers of the Bill of Rights asserted their belief in freedom of speech and the right to nonconformity at a time when our Nation was new and insecure. We should do no less today.

The committee has said one purpose of the hearings is to determine "whether existing Federal laws are being violated." As Dean Erwin Griswold, of Howard Law School, has pointed out, "a legislative investigation is improper when its sole or basic purpose is to expose people or to develop evidence for use in criminal prosecution" ("The Fifth Amendment Today," Harvard University Press, 1955, p. 48). If the committee has any evidence of violations of Federal law, it should turn it over to the proper law enforcement agencies and not usurp the function of the Department of Justice.

We should be mindful of the words of Supreme Court Justice Black:

"History should teach us, then, that in times of high emotional excitement minority parties and groups which advocate extremely unpopular social or governmental innovations will always be typed as criminal gangs and attempts always made to drive them out. It was knowledge of this fact, and of great dangers, that caused the founders of our land to enact the first amendment as a guarantee that neither Congress nor the people would do anything to hinder or destroy the capacity of individuals and groups to seek converts and votes for any cause, however radical or unpalatable their principles might seem under the accepted notions of the times" (*Barenblatt* v. *U.S.*, 360 U.S. 109, 150–1).

The House Un-American Activities Committee is antithetical to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Its latest action demonstrates again the need for its abolition.

Open Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial excerpt which appeared in the January 1963 issue of the IAA Record. It was written by William J. Kuhfuss, president, Illinois Agricultural Association:

EXCERPT FROM ARTICLE ENTITLED "OPEN SEASON"

Our Government was set up with checks and balances to insure the preservation of the rights of people. The legislative branch of Government was to set the policies and determine the course this country would follow. The executive branch was to administer those policies. The judicial branch was to check the validity of legislation. When any one branch begins to dominate the other, there is cause for concern.

When the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a part of the executive branch, begins to assume the role, not only of administrative responsibilities, but of policymaking and legislation, then our checks and balances have lost effectivenss. The USDA now has staff in every county in every State in the United States to administer legislative programs.

Legistlation drafted and proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1961 would have reduced these legislative responsibilities of Congress to a veto power. This year the USDA has solicited information from the county ASC (agricultural stabilization and conservation service) offices asking for opinions and ideas from farmers, at taxpayers' expense, to be interpreted by employees of the USDA and presumedly to be presented to Congress in support of newly proposed legislation. This effort to assume both legislative and administrative responsibilities is evident not only in agriculture, but in many other fields.

Real concern has been expressed by many people in the electric power field. Many feel that the concentration of authority and the buildup of a Government-directed public utility, providing electrical service for all of America, is definitely within the realm of possibility. This is the real issue that is being camouflaged with promises of lower cost, better service, and public benefit. This drive for centralized power and authority may be the real issue behind medicare, Federal aid to education, and all of the other Government-directed bonanzas.

Today, many discussions and proposals for legislation are heard that politicians would not have dared suggest or discuss a few years ago. It is time people became concerned for what lies ahead for America. If we get this centralized, supply management, Government-controlled operation all over America—and there isn't a way of isolating it in any one place—it can easily mean the end of the marketplace as a guide for future production. It can mean the end of private ownership and the inducements and incentives involved. It can mean the end of the rights of individuals to live and to operate as they see fit and to enjoy the benefits resulting from their good judgment, thrift, and hard work. It could mean the end of the extension service directed by dedicated scientists guided by the truth as they find it. It could mean there would be no place for a general farm organization to be active in the fields of legislation, education, commercial services, and public relations.

We have traveled far down this path of centralized authority in the past 15 or 20 years. We could some day be awakened and find that the ship of freedom has already left our shores.

Farm Bureau must not sidestep this issue. The future, not only of America, but of freedom-loving people everywhere may well depend on what we do.

The 100th Birthday of Billy Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One hundred years ago, on January 10, 1863, there was born at Tinesty, Pa., on the banks of the Allegheny River, an American citizen who was named Billy Frost by his proud parents. At 14 years of age this

new citizen started pumping oil wells at Oil Creek, Pa., when this business was in its infancy. Some of it must have gotten into his blood, because he has stayed with it through the years and as the great oil fields were discovered and developed, Billy Frost moved from one to the other—from Pennsylvania to Ohio, to Kansas, to Oklahoma, and to Texas.

In 1885 Billy Frost married Miss Effie Jane Thompson, the daughter of a minister. To this union were born two fine sons and two fine daughters. Billy Frost continued his work in the oil game and found his way with his fine family to Texas, in 1927. This was the beginning of the famous Panhandle oil field, which is located in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

His kindness, good nature, and willingness to help others at all times had won for him the popular name "Uncle Billy," which has stayed with him through the years. As time began to takes its toll, as it does with all of us, "Uncle Billy's" walk became a little slower and his eyesight began to dim, but his great personality remains unchanged and the reasons for continued loving reference to him as "Uncle Billy" have become more pronounced with each year. His host of friends will pay honor to him at the Coronado Inn, in Pampa, Tex., on this, his 100th birthday. All America recognizes the great contribution that he has made to our country and to our way of life, in the exemplary leadership he has furnished in his chosen work.

Cathedral Club Man of the Year, Joseph P. Hoey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1963, the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn will honor as its man of the year the Honorable Joseph P. Hoey, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York. A dedicated public official, Joe Hoey is richly entitled to the respect and admiration of his fellow New Yorkers.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 5, 1963, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle upon the occasion of Joe Hoey being chosen as that newspaper's man of the week:

MAN OF THE WEEK—U.S. ATTORNEY'S STORY FAME WITHOUT FANFARE

(By Steve Solomon)

Joseph P. Hoey is an enigma.

He has risen to the position of U.S. attorney for the eastern district without fanfare.

He is a man who could be in the public eye a great deal more if he chose to.

In an age when a dynamic personality tops all requisites for climbing the ladder of success in politics, he has risen on dedication and merit.

He has wanted it that way.

From 1940 until World War II interrupted his career as assistant Brooklyn district attorney in 1942, his office was one of the most efficient in the administration of William O'Dwyer as district attorney.

In the Navy, he served 3 years as an intelligence officer aboard a squadron of PT boats (Motor Torpedo Squadron 30) assigned to Europe and took part in the invasion of Normandy.

Reinstated as assistant district attorney in 1945, a position which he held until his current appointment on April 18, 1961, Hoey handled many outstanding cases.

He conducted the Mergenthaler Linotype Corp. larceny investigation. He also investigated tieup between bookmakers and the police in the Harry Gross case.

He participated in the inquiry into the operation of New York City departments which resulted in many important operational changes.

Hoey was born in Flatbush, not far from where he now resides, on October 21, 1912, to Patrick and Margaret Hoey.

He made a better than average record in public school.

It was not until he had been graduated from Brooklyn Preparatory School in 1931 and entered Fordham University, that he began to think seriously about a career in law.

"The law suddenly began to fascinate me during my early college years," Hoey said recently in his office at the Brooklyn District Court.

He went on to St. John's School of Law where he received his degree in 1937.

"Of course, the law is in my blood now," he said, "but what always made it so interesting for me is that it's always changing, always being modified.

"You can't really know the law unless you keep abreast of the latest court decisions being handed down."

Law was not the only subject that fascinated Hoey while at college.

A pretty little girl from Forest Hills named Kathryn Daley also caught his attention.

"I still maintain that I met my wife while at college," he said smiling, "but she insists we met at a party. We haven't come to a decision yet."

The Hoeys have been married 19 years and have four children—Anna Maria, 14; Joseph P., Jr., 12; Patrick T., 10; and Kathryn Marie, 9.

The transition from assistant district attorney to head of the eastern district attorney's office is not an easy one and Hoey is the first to admit it.

Into the jurisdiction of his department falls almost every type of criminal and civil Federal case.

"I used to work mostly on criminal cases when I was an assistant. As the U.S. attorney I have to be an expert on both criminal and civil law.

"I hate to say it, but I had to go back and learn the civil law all over again."

One of Hoey's prime tasks is reviewing every case his 32 assistant district attorneys have been assigned to.

He advises them and determines whether or not they are prepared properly.

The decision on whether he tries a case personally or assigns an assistant is his alone.

The list of organizations in which Hoey is active would fill a page in "Who's Who." He belongs to 14 organizations and is presently vice chairman of the criminal law and procedure committee of the Brooklyn Bar Association. He is a former president of the Emerald Association of Long Island and the St. Patrick's Society of Brooklyn.

On January 24, the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn will honor him as Man of the Year. It is a deserving award to a man who doesn't look for the limelight.

The limelight looks for Joseph P. Hoey.

O'Neill: Politician's Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress an excellent article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on December 16, 1962, written by C. R. Owens, one of the ablest political writers in the Nation. Mr. Owens here made a clear and concise report on the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., my colleague and yours, and his efforts in behalf of the newly elected Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Endicott Peabody.

It has been my privilege to know Congressman O'NEILL for many years. I served for 8 years with him as a member of the Massachusetts General Court; 4 of which he was speaker of the house. Gov. Endicott Peabody was very fortunate to have a man of the ability of Congressman O'NEILL at the helm of his campaign and we in Massachusetts are very proud of him.

The article reads as follows:

O'NEILL: POLITICIAN'S POLITICIAN

(By C. R. Owens)

Each art, profession or trade—and politics can be all three—develops men who are looked upon by their peers as a master of his calling.

Among those who seek or hold public office in the Commonwealth such a man is Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., campaign chairman of Governor-elect Peabody in the election and recount.

The word "politician," so often used to defame, disparage or deprecate, has a brighter meaning when used to describe public servants of O'NEILL'S training.

"Politics is not a black art carried on in secrecy," according to "TIP" O'NEILL. "Nor is it a way of life to be ashamed of, but it must be studied and carefully cultivated by one who would practice it if the people are to receive the full benefit of a democracy."

For more than half of his 50 years, TIP O'NEILL has devoted his efforts toward fulfilling his duty, as he sees it, as an elected public official.

A native of Cambridge, the Congressman was raised in a family with firm ties in the Democratic Party. His father, the senior Thomas P. O'Neill, served in the Cambridge City Council in the early years of the century. TIP took to Democratic politics as naturally as a thoroughbred to racing.

Before O'NEILL was graduated from Boston College, he was holding party office.

Except for a single failure, he has been holding political offices since, as a State representative (he rose to be the first Democratic speaker of the Massachusetts House), as a school committeeman, and as a Member of Congress.

One of O'Neill's earliest supporters, Robert J. O'Hayre, currently a member of the State ballot law commission, recalls the one defeat for elective office, which occurred while "TIP" was a college junior.

"'TIP' was an at-large candidate for the Cambridge City Council and we were driving to a finish when he committed a faux pas and learned a lesson," O'Hayre said.

The youthful candidate had planned to destroy some of his opponents by reading

from a Cambridge Chronicle editorial at a Central Square rally, but when he reached into his pocket for the newsclip, it had disappeared.

He decided to improvise, pretending a letterhead was the clipping when a youngster standing at the tailgate of the truck shouted, "That's no newspaper."

When the boy repeated the accusation, O'NEILL, in what he thought was a stage whisper, told an aide, "Get that brat the blazes out of here."

"Unfortunately," recalled O'Hayre, "'TIP' was speaking over a microphone and his comment on the youngster was heard by hundreds. He lost that fight by only 276 votes, citywide."

A gregarious man, O'NEILL was happiest during his years at St. John's High School and Boston College when engaged in group efforts—basketball, baseball, debating. He was never any great shakes as an athlete—"I couldn't play marbles"—but he tried, and enjoyed the associations.

His classmates were his supporters when in the spring of his senior year he sought and won a seat on the Cambridge Democratic city committee, and, later that year, backed him in his first successful bid for the House of Representatives. The Congressman remained in the House from 1937 through 1952.

Between 1944 and 1952, O'NEILL also served on the Democratic State committee, and in 1946 and 1947 was a member of the Cambridge school committee.

O'NEILL said both these offices came his way under unusual circumstances. Referring to his election to the party organization, he remembered, "I was at Ogunquit with Millie (his wife, the former Mildred Ann Miller, of Somerville) on vacation when early one afternoon I got a call from Sonny McDonough. Sonny was looking for the chairmanship of the State committee and he told me nobody was running from my district and that the deadline for filing was 5 that afternoon.

"I approved, so Sonny and my father took out papers for me and a week later I signed them. There was no opposition."

His election to the Cambridge school board also came about through the absence of candidates. "The only reason I ran," he said, "was that there was no one from our end of town on the school committee. Jerry Sullivan, that is, Judge Sullivan of the Nantucket probate court, and I were asked to run and hold a position until the boys came back from the war.

"So we flipped a coin to see who would run. I lost the toss and had to make the run, and won."

O'NEILL was a lean, gangling young man, well over 6 feet tall, when he entered politics. He has enjoyed elective office and it obviously agreed with him. By the time he reached his thirties—he observed his 50th birthday last Sunday—the Congressman's appearance was pretty much what it is today, a stocky build, heavy facial features, and topped by a shock of coarse, straight, gray hair.

Well liked by Representatives on both sides of the aisle, O'NEILL moved ahead fast in the House and was chosen minority leader at a Democratic caucus in 1947. Looking back, O'NEILL remembers the years when his party was in the ascendancy and the Republicans in the House were splitting between the old and the new guard.

Speaker at the time was Frederick B. Willis, now House counsel. "Freddie and I have been very good friends throughout the years, but once he ordered me 'seated,' which was perhaps the only time that the leader of the opposition was ordered to refrain from participating in a debate," said O'NEILL. "The debate was over a Republican highway bond issue and Freddie objected to my complaints as to the number of corners he was cutting."

Democratic legislators felt they were carrying the party in the 1947–48 period—"we were making the snowballs for Paul Dever and Maurice Tobin to throw"—and in the latter year, O'NEILL led a rebellion against the mossbacks in the party, headed by Boston's Mayor James M. Curley.

"I was only 34 at the time, but I had been in the House 12 years. Strangely, the man who has become my best friend in Washington, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and I had never met when we decided to fight city hall and elect our own slate of delegates to the Democratic National Convention that year," O'NEILL related.

"Well, our slate carried 38 of the 39 cities, but it was James Michael and MCCORMACK who went to the convention. Curley would have accepted myself and Representative Jerry Crowley as members of his team, but when we declined, he replaced us with Dr. Silas Taylor and Frank Goon.

"After it was over, Congressman MCCORMACK called me down to his office and we talked over the future of the Democratic Party. He asked me if I had ever considered that Massachusetts was a Democratic State and that with a little extra effort, the House, which had been in Republican hands since the Civil War, would go Democratic.

"It seemed like a wild dream. When I got back to the statehouse, I sat down with Tom Mullen, then and now my top assistant, and we reviewed every House contest of recent years. We found 25 districts which had been carried by Tobin 4 years earlier, yet the incumbent Republican Representatives had had no opposition.

"One district, around Athol, hadn't had a Democratic candidate for 45 years. We decided this called for a fight and we raised $14,000 for it. A second-year Congressman heard about our dream and he asked if he could help. We accepted the $1,000 contribution offered by John F. Kennedy.

"We handpicked the candidates in the districts, ran their campaigns even to paying for their campaign literature and addressing envelopes. The effort paid off and that November the House went Democratic 122 to 118."

The shift in power in the House also brought O'NEILL in as speaker. Modestly, O'NEILL today credits Congressman MCCORMACK, Mullen, and a group of representatives, including MDC Commissioner Robert F. Murphy, Representative John J. Toomey, of Cambridge, and Thomas F. Riley, now assistant clerk of the Dorchester District Court, for the upheaval.

"I can't conceive of the Democrats ever losing the house again," said O'NEILL.

During the 4 years Paul A. Dever was Governor, O'NEILL, a fellow Cantabrigian, was speaker and managed to make the Governnor's lot an easier one.

In the fall of 1952, Dever sought a third term, and Congressman John F. Kennedy moved up the ladder to the U.S. Senate. O'NEILL moved into the congressional seat vacated by Kennedy.

The move wasn't an easy one. O'NEILL said his primary fight with the then Senator Michael LoPresti "was the only real fight of my life." LoPresti's senate seat represented about half of the congressional district, while O'NEILL's house seat represented only one-sixth.

O'NEILL graciously gives others credit for his successes, and his victory over LoPresti in 1952 he awards to Charles H. McGlue, former Democratic State committee chairman.

"We had 22,200 Democrats registered in Cambridge and it was Charlie who directed the drive for independents to vote in the Democratic primary. Mike must have wondered for a long time how 26,000 voted that primary day in Cambridge."

A lesson learned in his first congressional contest, according to "TIP" O'NEILL, is that there is no relationship between campaign expenditures and the vote a candidate receives. "Mike was spending money in my part of the district and I spent some $10,000 wooing support in east Boston. We had some of the biggest rallies and pizza parties in the district, but all I received was about 900 votes. The reverse was happening in Cambridge."

O'NEILL has been reelected to Congress with little opposition. Twice, he put aside his own campaigning to head campaign committees for nominees for Governor, Foster Furcolo and, this year, Endicott Peabody.

He has been particularly close to Peabody politically for many years. O'NEILL is confident that Peabody will make a good Governor and one in whom the Democrats will take considerable pride.

Peabody, he is willing to agree, is a new type of Democrat. "I hope his relationship with the legislature will be harmonious. He is a good Democrat and I am confident in the program he will present," added the Congressman.

"I am not helping Chub draft his State program," O'NEILL said, "I will be in Washington working along with the New Frontiersmen.

"But I have let Chub know in no uncertain terms that if he comes up with a program which runs counter to my views as a Democrat, I will let him know in no uncertain terms. He was amazed, but I wanted him to know in advance that if that day comes, I will not be turning my back on him, but he will be deserting party principles."

When he accepted the task of serving as Peabody's campaign manager, O'NEILL said, it was as one Democrat assisting another. "I told him, 'if you have to offer me something for me to be campaign manager, I'd be of no use to you, if I asked for something to be campaign manager, the same would be true.'"

O'NEILL has assisted Peabody through the recent recount. "It is interesting to see the number of persons who were with Peabody all along and fought to work for him on the recount," observed "TIP." "A couple of months ago, they wouldn't answer their telephones when we needed help."

Persons have turned to O'NEILL seeking his help with the Governor-elect. "Most of these requests," according to O'NEILL, come from State troopers who would like to be assigned to the Governor's office and from candidates for the State racing commission."

Party loyalty and party regularity are important elements in O'NEILL's makeup. The late Speaker Sam Rayburn, probably with a nudge from JOHN MCCORMACK, recognized this back in 1954 when he tapped O'NEILL for membership on the Rules Committee of Congress. TIP became the second Congressman in history to go on this committee after a single term.

At the time, Rayburn told O'NEILL that the new job had been offered him because he had served as speaker of the Massachusetts House, but more particularly, because he recognized the need for party discipline. O'NEILL is No. 8 man on the Rules Committee, which determines when and how legislation will reach the House floor. Five of those with higher rank have passed the 70-year mark.

"TIP O'NEILL enjoys politics as a way of life. He regrets, however, that being a Congressman often takes him away from his family. In any conversation with the Congressman, he makes continual reference to Mrs. O'Neill and her reactions to politics. The O'Neills are the parents of five children, Rosemary, now 19; Thomas 3d, 17; Susan, 14; Christopher, 12, and Michael Tolan, 10.

O'NEILL in the next 2 years may be the chief political catalyst in Massachusetts. His frendship with MCCORMACK and his position on the Rules Committee has made him a liaison man with the White House, where he is welcomed by his predecessor in Congress, President Kennedy. Now he will also have entree into the office of Governor-elect Peabody.

Independence Day of Western Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, Western Samoa celebrated her first independence day, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to Their Excellencies, Tupua Tamasese Mea'ole and Malietoa Tanumafili II, the heads of state of this Republic, on the occasion of the first anniversary of Western Samoan independence.

January the first is a symbol throughout the world for the birth of a new year; to the people of Western Samoa, this date has a special meaning. One year ago, on New Year's Day, Western Samoa was proclaimed sovereign and independent. It is this accomplishment that I wish to commemorate today.

Since its discovery by the Dutch in 1722, the Samoan Islands have played an important part in the history of the South Pacific. Strategically located as a naval station and a crossroads for trading ships, the islands were soon coveted by many nations. The United States sent its first expedition to the islands in 1839 and the first American consul was appointed in 1856. The climax of this particular struggle for possessions abroad occurred in 1889 when the United States, Germany, and Great Britain successfully checkmated each others forces. This led to a partitioning of the islands. The large islands of Opolu and Savaii, with several lesser islands, were awarded to Germany. These became Western Samoa.

As a result of World War I, Western Samoa was wrested from Germany by a New Zealand expeditionary force. Since then, New Zealand has held mandate over these islands, first through the League of Nations, then more recently through the United Nations.

New Zealand recognized the right of sovereignty for her trust territories and a constitution was promulgated in October 1960. Independence was proclaimed on January 1, 1962, thus ending 46 years of New Zealand administration and 70 years of foreign rule.

Samoa today has an approximate population of 113,500, mainly Polynesian, with a birth rate among the world's highest. Its complex constitutional system of government, headed by a dual chiefship and a prime minister, govern Western Samoa with wisdom and caution. Americans, visiting the country, will be able to pay their respects to Robert Louis Stevenson, who is buried near the capital, and who is revered and loved by the Samoans, his adopted people.

The Samoans, who are proud of the fact that they are the first independent Polynesian nation, look forward to a continuous and productive life under their own rule. The able Prime Minister Fiame Mata'afa summarized the sentiments of the Samoans when he said:

> Rooted and responding to the invigorating influences of the modern world, the independent state of Western Samoa will grow and flourish to become an ornament—if only a minor one—to the world community.

It is to this spirit and this nation that I salute the people of Western Samoa on their first independence anniversary.

Report of an Interview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to receive permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with these brief remarks a report of an interview held by Jane Katims, an undergraduate of the Red Bank, N.J., High School which appeared in the school paper, the Buccaneer, a monthly newspaper published by the students of Red Bank High School, on Wednesday, November 21, 1962. Jane Katims was very objective in her interview and asked pertinent questions which showed thought and study. I was very much impressed with her knowledge of public affairs and commend the Red Bank High School highly for stimulating the interest of their pupils in such matters. The published interview appeared, as follows:

VETERAN CONGRESSMAN STRESSES VALUE OF BROAD SOCIAL STUDIES BACKGROUND

(By Jane Katims)

Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS is one critic who thinks the American schools are far superior to the European educational systems. However, he believes that there is a lack of training in American history in our schools.

He feels that it is imperative for students of today to study American history thoroughly before fully understanding the growth, industry, philosophy, liberty, and freedom of our great country.

It isn't easy to catch the Congressman at his home, 25 Waterman Avenue, Rumson. Most of his time is spent in Washington, D.C. But talking to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS is a real treat.

A veteran of 20 years in the House of Representatives, Congressman AUCHINCLOSS was reelected early this month to serve his 11th term. He has always been interested in civic affairs and considers service to the people as his reward. He believes that you must enjoy people before you can consider yourself qualified for a career in politics.

REMEMBERS ROOSEVELT

In his interesting public life Mr. AUCHINCLOSS went to school with Franklin D. Roosevelt and campaigned with Harry S. Truman. He is well acquainted with ex-President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. He remembers Douglas MacArthur's famous speech as a great thrill.

An unusual incident in the Congressman's life is the time when he interrupted his busy schedule to play cupid. A young man was called for special duty due to the Cuban situation a week before his wedding day. The girl he was to marry was frantic because she was unable to locate her fiance out at sea. Congressman AUCHINCLOSS received a call from her minister asking for his help. Although much classified information was withheld, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS was able to contact the ship and bring that boy home. The couple was happily married, November 10.

Congressman AUCHINCLOSS has firm ideas about American youth and education of today. He is much in favor of the high school system of student council and he believes that its aims are not only to guide students but to guide teachers as well.

EDUCATION STATE RESPONSIBILITY

The Congressman stated that he always voted for Federal aid to school buildings but holds education a state responsibility.

When asked if President Kennedy's physical fitness program is a good one, the Congressman replied, "Why, that's like asking me if sin is bad. Of course, everyone should be physically fit."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS would enjoy an opportunity to visit Red Bank High School and speak to the student body and faculty. He feels that most Americans do not completely understand the complicated procedure involved in preparing a bill before it becomes a law. He is anxious to explain this procedure.

Cooperation for Progress: Israel and the Afro-Asian Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Congress Biweekly of November 26, 1962.

Israel has shown and is showing in Africa and Asia that freedom works. The suspicious attitude toward democracy by some governments will undoubtedy be changed by association in economic cooperation with the dynamic young society of Israel.

The article follows:

ISRAEL AND THE AFRO-ASIAN NATIONS

(By Elias Cooper)

The past 2 years, filled as they were with international crises, also witnessed an expansion of trade and cooperation between Israel and more than 40 African and Asian countries, thus continuing a trend in international relations that began in 1955. Although Nasser is still able to force anti-Israel declarations into the communiques of Afro-Asian political conferences, the continuing practical relations between Israel and the developing nations of those two continents provide concrete evidence of Nasser's failure to attain his dearest objective—the political and economic isolation of Israel.

Considering Israel's limitations in terms of population and economic capacity, the extent to which Afro-Asian countries are mak-

ing use of Israel know-how is truly remarkable. Israel's Department of International Cooperation is conducting an imaginative technical assistance program in Asia and Africa. Students from these continents are trained at Israeli institutions, while Israeli instructors and experts are sent out to the students' home countries to train additional personnel and to initiate complex undertakings. Israeli commercial and industrial firms have pioneered in a novel form of assistance by establishing joint enterprises, in which the host governments always retain a 60-percent interest. The avowed purpose of these arrangements is to have the Israeli establish the enterprise, train local personnel in all phases of the operation, and then allow the local government to purchase the Israeli share on a predetermined equitable rate of return. The exchanges of students, experts, trade and state delegations between Israel and the new nations have been so voluminous as to necessitate reciprocal state visits during the current year by President Ben Zvi, Premier Ben-Gurion, and Foreign Minister Golda Meir.

The outstanding features of the Israeli technical assistance program have been the training of students and civil servants in Israel, and the sending of Israeli instructors and survey missions to countries requesting them. Currently over 1,000 African and Asian students are receiving training in Israel; their tuition costs are covered by scholarships provided by the Israel Government. In addition, there are several nongovernmental programs. The Histadrut (General Federation of Labor) is operating an Afro-Asian Institute for Labor Studies and Cooperation, which opened its doors in 1960. Half of the 120 annual scholarships of the institute are provided by the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization. The Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical School is training students from Africa and Asia in special classes conducted in English and French for the convenience of students from former English and French colonies. The Technion (Israel Institute of Technology) has inaugurated a similar program for graduated students from the same areas. Unparalleled anywhere is the opportunity provided by ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training), which has made available annual space for 40 African students at its renowned technical high school in Natanya. Israel's major radio station, Kol Israel, is currently training broadcasters from Togo, Dahomey, and Niger.

The bulk of the African and Asian students study the varied branches of agriculture and agricultural marketing. The remainder are distributed in the fields of education, public adminstration, finance, housing, tourism, medicine, sanitation, and the academic disciplines. At the present time there are students in Israel from Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Burma, India, the Congo (both Brazzaville and Leopoldville), Togo, Liberia, Tanganyika, and the Central African Republic. Israel's pioneering youth groups, Gadna and Nahal, have appealed to some leaders of African and Asian countries. Ghana has fashioned a Builders Corps patterned on and trained by its Israel antecedent, Gadna. Seventy-four young men and women from 11 other African countries attended a 4-month course in 1961 to prepare themselves as youth leaders in their own countries. In 1962, police officers from the Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Malagasy, and Niger attended an Israel course for senior law enforcement officers.

No less impressive is the roster of Israel experts sent to developing countries; during the current year they number over 900. This aspect of the assistance program stresses specific projects, which are given their start by Israel experts and are taken over by staffs trained in Israel. Israel medical experts have served in Ghana, Ethiopia, Liberia, and the Congo (Leopoldville). An Israel engineer and doctor are currently planning a 200-bed hospital in Sierra Leone. An Israel medical team is operating a clinic for eye diseases in Liberia, while training Liberians to take over. Other Liberians are studying medicine in Israel. An Israeli is serving as director of the Technical College in Ethiopa. Over 100 Israel technicians are directing the construction of 13 roads totaling 250 miles in the Abidan area of West Nigeria. Staff members of the Hebrew University and the Technion have been sent on missions to Liberia, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Nigeria. Administrators from the Egged bus cooperative are now establishing a similar cooperative in Nepal. Israel agricultural experts are now serving in more than 20 African and Asian countries. The same countries have also received Israel experts under the auspices of the various United Nations specialized agencies. In the initial phase of the Congo crisis the majority of doctors provided by the United Nations to Leopoldville were Israelis.

The joint enterprise of Israel companies and Afro-Asian government partners have provided another avenue for technical assistance. The undertakings are numerous and include construction companies and merchant marine flotillas. In all cases the Israel partner undertakes to train local personnel to take complete control. The joint companies have increased trade between Israel and the countries involved. The trade has expanded the market for Israel's manufactured goods, drugs, chemicals, and tires, while providing her with sources of raw materials. The investments have also increased employment opportunities for the Israel labor force. In order to spur trade Israel has extended several short-term loans, which are usually applied toward the purchase of equipment from Israel. Impressive as it is, the investments field cannot constitute a major aspect of Israel aid in the foreseeable future. Israel can, however, continue to provide needed expert aid and study facilities in fields wherein she has met with enviable success in the eyes of developing countries.

The factors that led to a flowering of Israel-Burmese relations are representative of the reasons for Israel's successful relations with developing countries. On his 1955 visit to Israel, Premier U Nu was most impressed with the Government's successful efforts to turn arid areas into cultivable land, and with practical Israel improvizations. He wrote: "The people of Israel are hard working and intelligent. * * * Without forests they import African lumber, and export furniture, as they export tires after importing rubber." U Nu was also attracted by the "privilege of choosing any mode of life that one prefers" in Israel; although there are the various cooperative forms of settlements, no one in Israel is forced into communal life as in China, Burma's neighbor. U Thant, the present Secretary General of the United Nations, accompanied U Nu in the capacity of Director General of the Burmese Prime Minister's office. He subsequently noted that he was impressed with the speed that characterized the development of Israel's industry, cooperative agriculture, and the high level of education in the country.

The 1955 visit of the Burmese leaders greatly spurred cooperation between the two countries. To date Israel experts have advised Burma on irrigation, cultivation, the use of agricultural machinery, and the manufacture of products ranging from tires to pencils. Their services were also used to plan an interurban telephone system, a public health system, rice market, and the building of housing projects. The total of Israel specialists in Burma exceeds the number sent by any other country. Israel military personnel have also aided in training the Burmese Army and Air Force. Several groups of Burmese officers and their families underwent training in Israel and have returned to their country to build the first four in a series of Israel-type border settlements in the Shan States, where Burma is vulnerably exposed to Communist China along a 450-mile frontier.

Israel has from the very outset of the African independence movement cultivated relations with the African countries. The development of friendly Israel-African relations followed the pattern set by Ghana. An Israel delegation was sent to the Ghana independence day ceremonies in order to initiate contracts. The following year (1958), a trade agreement was signed between the two countries, and Ghana requested a number of Israel experts in the fields of agriculture, banking, marketing, and road construction. Israelis have also assisted in establishing a pilots' school and a central training camp for the Ghanaian Army. Nearly 100 Ghanaian students enroll annually in Israel study programs. A joint construction company was established in Ghana by Solel Boneh, the Israel building cooperative. Zim, Israel's navigation company, and the Ghanaian Government jointly established the Black Star Line, a merchant marine company that operated four freight ships at its inception. In 1960, as part of Premier Nkrumah's general nationalization program, Ghana bought out Zim's 40-percent investment 2 years prior to the date stipulated in the original agreement. Zim will nevertheless continue as managing agent of the concern until 1967 in order to train local personnel.

There can be no doubt that Israel has gained an imposing array of friends on the international scene as a result of her policies in Asia and Africa. There have been setbacks, but they came from only a few of the more than 40 nations involved. Israel's ties with Burma have caused other Southeast Asian nations (Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos) to pursue similar relations. Burma has remained Israel's stanchest friend in Asia (the ouster of U Nu by the Burmese Army has apparently not resulted in any change in the country's Israeli policy). Burma tried, though in vain, to gain Israel's invitation to the Bandung Conference in 1954, and at last year's Belgrade meeting of neutral leaders, U Nu prevented Nasser from blasting Israel in the final resolutions.

Some setbacks in Israel's relations with Africa and Asia are inevitable since neither Israel nor the Afro-Asian countries are immune from the cold war. Israel's Western connections are undisputable and they are underscored by Egyptian and Soviet propaganda whenever possible. The Soviet Union has officially made known its displeasure over Israel's technical assistance program. On December 12, 1960, Izvestia, the official organ of the Soviet Government, characterized Israel as "fulfilling the role of a Trojan horse for NATO," and accused her of attempting to undermine the new African governments and rendering their armies ineffective by selling them outmoded weapons. Guinea is the only African country that has accepted Moscow's line, but Guinea's Sékou Touré has long ago decided to turn to the Eastern bloc for aid. More forboding for Israel is the neutralist path followed by Ghana and Mali because, as neutrals, these countries are at times forced into a tactical alliance with Nasser. Yet both Ghana and Mali continue their normal relations with Israel.

Israel does have friends in Africa who support her as strongly as does Burma. The most influential of these are Tanganyika and Nigeria. The vast majority of African nations reject the Soviet and Arab conten-

tions and do not view Israel as an imperialist appendage. In the long run Israel's policy in Africa may offset Nasser's ambitions on that continent. In his "Philosophy of the Revolution," Nasser clearly sees Africa as Egypt's burden," just as 19th century imperialists saw it as the "white man's burden." This outlook is not likely to escape the attention of African leaders.

A Deepwater Port for Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to authorize the construction of an Indiana port on Lake Michigan. Ever since I began my political life in Indiana, I have been talking to people all over our great State about the potential for development which such a port would present. The people of Indiana know the benefits which can be gained by the development of this deepwater port, and they share my enthusiasm for an Indiana port.

The road by which progress travels is always a hard one. There are always many obstacles, there are always delays, there are always disappointments and the path followed by this progressive proposal has provided no exception. Discussion of the Indiana public port predates concrete development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. A full 80 years before the congressional Deepwater Seaways Commission report of 1896 suggested the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the statesmen of early Indiana recognized and protected Indiana's right to a harbor. By having the Indiana State boundary moved 10 miles north of the line established by the Northwest Ordinance, these early leaders laid the groundwork for our port development today.

By the establishment of the 36-mile coastline on Lake Michigan the political leaders of Indiana established our claim to a water access at the time of our introduction to statehood. Now, after years of bipartisan effort on the part of leaders of the State, our plans are formulated, our authority is developing, and we look forward to the early construction of our deepwater port.

The economic feasibility of the operation of a port at Burns Waterway is well substantiated. Scholarly economic presentations developed by Indiana University, various State agencies and private sources indicate that the Indiana deepwater port can become an important transportation center and an economic success. Preliminary work by the Indiana Port Commission indicates, without doubt, that previous estimates as to the economic potential of the port have been very conservative.

The navigational plan developed for this harbor is not only adequate but quite attractive. The approach and entry pattern, I am told, is one of simplicity and ease of management. For example, in tug service alone, a grain-carrying vessel would save $1.055 per trip, for tugs will not be needed at the proposed Indiana Waterway Harbor.

I am proposing the development of an additional transportation facility for my State and for the Nation. History has shown that the access to water routes has, since the advent of recorded history, been a primary determinent in the economic progress of nations. Those nations and states and cities with access to this most economical form of transportation have prospered and have become the trade, population, and cultural centers of the world. Certainly, areas without such water commerce facility have also developed successfully but they have prospered in spite of transportation hardships.

Indiana is a State which has developed richly in both industrial and agricultural productivity. The richness of our soil and the skill of our farmers has combined to make Indiana an important part of America's food-producing Midwest. The industrial ingenuity and the quality of our workmen have contributed to our industrial progress.

Located as we are, at the crossroads of America, Indiana's industrial and agricultural capacity is important to the entire Nation. The food we produce is easily available to feed the people of the country. The goods we manufacture are easily available to fill the needs and wants of all Americans because we are located in the very population center of the continental United States. But to expand our industrial development, to provide further markets for our agricultural abundance and our rich natural resources, Indiana needs access to inexpensive water transportation which can be provided by the Burns Waterway Harbor.

The development of the harbor is consistent with the national transportation policy. Indeed, the national transportation policy dictates its development because the needs of commerce cry out for the development of this additional transportation facility in our State.

Indiana is the only State bordering on the Great Lakes which has no public deepwater port; no door to the trade routes of the world. Since the St. Lawrence Seaway has provided Great Lakes ports with access to the world's great commercial centers, the importance of our harbor has taken on added significance. We now have the opportunity of making the industrial goods, the natural resources and the agricultural products, in which our State so abundantly abounds, available to the markets of the world. The key, of course, is the Indiana public deepwater port.

Let us look for a minute into the world of the future. We are discussing today the potential of the needs of commerce in Indiana and the benefits which an additional transportation facility can contribute to this commercial development.

I believe the greatest hindrance to our clear analysis of this problem lies in the inadequacy of our standards of judgment. I do not question the analyses made by so many learned and competent men, but I question the accuracy of any one of us to completely comprehend the potential for future growth and development of our area.

Who of us will predict, with any confidence in its accuracy, how much the population of our State and its environs will grow in the life of this project? Who will estimate the gross commercial product of our area for the next 50 years, and rest comfortably on that estimate? Who will suggest the maximum agricultural productivity of the great Midwest after the production explosion of the last decade and a half? We are incompetent judges of tomorrow's world because we are tied to the standards of today in making our analyses. We cannot fully comprehend the wonders of tomorrow's life because the frailty of our nature forces us to depend, for our premises, upon sensations which we have experienced.

Our Nation is built on growth and our society, our economy, and our future is geared to grow. Change is the only constant value in our society and the change pattern is one of growth.

Economic need for the Burns Waterway Harbor is clearly established in the world of today. Certainly the unlimited potential for the commercial development of the area adds further impetus to the favorable report on these navigation improvements.

There is clear and evident need for the development of the public harbor at Burns Waterway. The State of Indiana is determined to carry through its development of the facilities which are its responsibility. I trust that the Federal Government will move forward in good faith to initiate action on the navigational improvements which are its responsibility. There are 53 federally improved harbors in the 8 States on the Great Lakes waterways in the United States today. Construction of a second Indiana project to allow the State to develop its only deepwater public harbor seems fair and just.

Mr. Speaker, my State is a great State but its greatness cannot always be measured by its proud history. Its greatness must also be measured by its willingness to meet and accept the challenges offered by the hope of an even greater future. I personally look upon this dream and this endeavor as a step by the people of Indiana to justify our heritage of greatness. It is a real and challenging expression of a progressive spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that, in the very near future, this proposal might receive the approval of this House. Indiana will be very grateful.

Independence Day of the Republic of Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1962, Tanganyika celebrated

her first independence day, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency Mwalimu, Julius K. Nyerere, President of the Republic of Tanganyika, on this memorable occasion.

TANGANYIKA: FROM COLONY TO REPUBLIC

On December 9, 1961, Tanganyika, a United Nations trust territory under the administration of the United Kingdom, became a sovereign member of the British Commonwealth and the 29th African state to achieve independence. The hoisting of the new green, black, and gold Tanganyikan flag marked the emergence of the first multiracial nation in Africa under African government. As such, it aroused considerable interest in a continent where racial problems have taken their place among the difficulties facing governments. The general optimism that the nation's 9 million Africans, 20,000 Europeans, 80,000 Asians, and 20,000 Arabs could live together in peace and order and in dedication to common goals was engendered to a large extent by the leadership qualities of Tanganyika's first Prime Minister, and now President, Julius Nyerere. Prior to independence British officials had called Nyerere "the key to everything in Tanganyika." The American press stated that "the personality, skill, and absolute dedication of Mr. Nyerere to nonviolence and antidiscrimination against Africans and non-Africans alike" was a key factor which would make a multiracial nation possible. In the not always smooth year since independence we have seen Mr. Nyerere's influence at work both in office and behind the scenes to mold Tanganyika into a democratic republic and a model of nonracialism for the rest of the African Continent to follow.

What is this country over which Mr. Nyerere has become President? Located just to the south of the equator on the Nile-Congo-Zambezi divide, Tanganyika stretches for more than 450 miles along the Indian Ocean. It borders on Kenya in the north and on Mozambique in the south. It is comparable in size to Nigeria and is larger than Texas and Oklahoma combined. Substantial portions of 2 of Africa's "great lakes"—Lake Tanganyika and Lake Victoria—lie within the country's boundaries. It is a land of plains and plateaus, with a humid coastal belt. It is the land where Stanley met Livingstone and where, on the Kenya border, the summit of Mount Kilimanjaro, permanently covered with snow, rises over 19,000 feet from sea level to make it the highest mountain peak in Africa.

When Tanganyika became independent under the leadership of Julius Nyerere and his party, the Tanganyika African National Union—TANU—the government pledged, in Nyerere's words, to lead the people in an all-out fight against poverty, ignorance, and disease. "Uhuru na Kazi," TANU's slogan in the campaign for independence, has increasingly become used as a greeting throughout the country. "Uhuru na Kazi," meaning freedom and work, expresses Tanganyika's faith in the future and determination to fulfill the expectations of her people.

The world was momentarily stunned when Mr. Nyerere resigned from his post as prime minister only 6 weeks after independence to devote himself more fully to the chairmanship of the Tanganyika African National Union. Then, in late May the government announced plans to turn the country into a republic, with a president elected by universal suffrage as the head of state. It became clear that Mr. Nyerere's resignation from office had not been an abdication of power but rather the prologue to his reemergence as president of the republic of Tanganyika. On December 9, 1962, 1 year after its accession to independence, Tanganyika became a republic with Julius Nyerere its first President.

In commemorating the anniversary of Tanganyika's independence we commend President Nyerere and the people of Tanganyika for their untiring efforts in transforming Tanganyika from a colony to a republic. We wish them every success for the future.

Our Heritage of Boldness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article "Our Heritage of Boldness" by Catherine Drinker Bowen, was published in the "Sports Illustrated" December 24, 1962, issue, and I believe sets forth in very dramatic fashion the accomplishments under our system which does encourage the boldness of our citizens in their quest for the common good:

[From the Sports Illustrated magazine, Dec. 24, 1962]

OUR HERITAGE OF BOLDNESS

(By Catherine Drinker Bowen)

("We are the heirs of all time," wrote Herman Melville a century ago, "and with all nations we divide our inheritance." In this essay the distinguished historian and biographer, Catherine Drinker Bowen, has analyzed the intangible elements in the heritage of every American—handed on from the circumstances of the discovery of the New World and the perils and opportunities of mastering a continent. It is a heritage of boldness, which has powered the magnificent American accomplishments. Yet it includes something light-hearted and carefree as well, and in the paragraphs that follow there are pictured a few of the innumerable expressions of our native gift: the disciplined endurance of champions, the daring exploits of sky divers and white-watered canoeists, the imaginative audacity of designers and architects—a part of that boldness in the pursuit of happiness that gives enduring meaning to the transient excitements of sport.)

They were bold from the first. Bold in dreaming, bold in persistence. It is no mere boast, because they made their dreams come true. A man stood on the shores of Portugal and looked westward, nearly five centuries ago. From the way the winds blew, from the seasonal steadines of them and the direction, the man conjectured there might be land behind these winds. A mariner might sail, and by dead reckoning—by the log, by the compass—he might find this land.

A wild thought, a bold dream, yet it came true; the land was found. Spain, all Europe, England heard of it. "The breath of hope," said Francis Bacon, "which blows on us from that new continent * * *," adding that Columbus had made hope reasonable. In these beginnings is something symbolic, something the American mind leaps to meet. The ships embarked, captained by freemen, adventurers. At the end of voyage, at the end of hazard, struggle, endurance and high gamble, our country was found. On a perilous horizon America took shape and was realized.

The years passed, and the generations. Not Columbus now but America herself made hope reasonable. Put it in terms of government—1787: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Europe laughed. "We, the people." What kind of a phrase was that? Nowhere had so big a federation been attempted, nowhere so bold a vision entertained. In high good spirits and in deadly earnest, John Adams, of Massachusetts, wrote to the Virginians: "When, before the present epocha, had 3 millions of people full power and a fair opportunity to form and establish the wisest and happiest government that human wisdom can contrive?"

Europe watched and waited. A government had been erected on the proposition that all men are by nature equally free and independent. Preposterous statement, subverting the established order. Nor did the Americans pause to argue their statement or bolster it decently with citation of ancient authority, after the fashion of the times. They simply declared certain "truths" to be "self-evident." "Novus Ordo Seclorum," they wrote on the Great Seal of the United States: "A New Order for the Ages."

Was ever a country, young or old, so brash? How serious, asked Europe, were these Americans? More importantly, how powerful were they and how long could they sustain this impudent program, which by its mere existence threatened ruling classes everywhere? Europe laid traps, offered bribes, threats, inducements, hoping to divide these United States and bring them low. A federation so large, embracing such diversified regions and interests, would surely fail, disintegrate, slip and slide of its own weight in one quarter or another. In the Old World only an occasional statesman saw into the future, as Edmund Burke in the House of Commons. "America," he said, "which at this day serves for little more than to amuse you with stories of savages and uncouth manners, yet shall, before you taste of death, show itself equal to the whole of that [British] commerce which now attracts the envy of the world."

It is a story often told, yet to Americans it does not grow stale. Threats from without only helped to solidify the Union. It was from within the real danger came. Ours was a country founded in a religious era by men of fierce fighting piety and dogma. Religion could have divided us; we had seen the religious wars of Europe and we were forewarned. From the first, Americans made a separation of church and state that was to remain profoundly significant, giving citizens a scope and a hope which nowhere else was entertained. "There is no argument," announced the Presbytery of Hanover, Va. (1776), "in favour of establishing the Christian religion, but what may be pleaded with equal propriety, for establishing the tenets of Mahomed by those who believe the Alcoran."

A bland statement, satisfied with merely setting forth. Thomas Jefferson, writing the Virginia "Statute of Religious Liberty," said

it more urgently—but this was a man who could not put pen to paper without leaving a trace of fire down the page: "Whereas Alighty God hath created the mind free * * * our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, any more than our opinions in physics and geometry."

What did these statements, these documents and declarations do for Americans individually, and how were men, singly, motivated thereby? Nowhere had these documents mentioned "the individual" or addressed themselves to him. Yet by this government and this system the American individual was freed exactly as if fetters had been struck from him. In Europe since time immemorial men had been divided into classes, "some to toil and earn, others to seize and enjoy." The U.S. Constitution provided for neither class nor privilege. All was mobile, a man could move up or he could slip down. It was a wholly unprecedented departure, and to Americans, both immigrant and native born, it gave extraordinary scope. Neither the Declaration of Independence nor the Constitution claimed to make timid men courageous, lazy men active or stupid men bright. But these documents allowed bold men to be bold; they unlocked doors, let Americans walk through, each one to his destiny.

Take it in terms of those men who opened up our western territory. In 1804 President Jefferson dispatched the Captains Lewis and Clark westward to map out a land route to the Pacific. For some 16 months the two traveled the wilderness, rode turbulent river waters, broke trail—careful always to draw their maps, record their meticulous pictured reports of birds, fishes, wild animals. On a rainy November morning of 1805 Clark looked westward from his mountain camp above the Columbia River and wrote, in his own phonetic spelling, "Ocian in view! O! the Joy."

Trappers, fur traders, the long hunters and the mountain men. The Mormons carried fiddles across the plains, and there was dancing within the circle of wagons below the dry Western mountains. Bold men and women; scared, hungry, sick, yet surmounting. Daniel Boone with his yellow eyebrows and sharp blue eyes ran the forest trails in Kentucky, fast as an Indian. A quiet man, serene and easy, who ended up with an appalling series of debts paid, 50 cents left over, and a reputation for rifle shooting that would inspire American boys for a century.

These were Americans, the American type. And they developed not alone because the frontier stretched before them, limitless and inviting. Other countries possessed virgin lands, timber, rivers, mines, rich plains. Yet could Daniel Boone be imagined anywhere but in America? "All power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people." The impact of such ideas, entered upon unitedly, set down on paper, signed and sealed, can send a man on a very far journey.

But political ideals, like law, are of no use unless implemented. It was union which gave us power; it was the Federal idea which gave us scope. Nevertheless, even in America the doubters still spoke out. National federation on such a scale was impossible, they said; it was impracticable altogether. The country had grown too big for union. In 1828, an election year, Harvard College had a debate: "How can one man be President of the United States when it is eventually settled from Atlantic to Pacific?" The noes were victorious. The Nation would have to be cut up into republic, each with its separate president. Andrew Jackson could be president of Tennessee, John Quincy Adams of New England.

Thirteen States became twenty, became thirty-four. Through the terrible years, 1861–65, the Union held. When Richmond fell and the Civil War was over, citizens celebrated. In Boston, New York, Philadelphia, men stood on soapboxes, stood in pulpits to orate. But it was not the word victory that stirred them. "The United States," they said, life a refrain. At the word united, the crowds went crazy. Tears poured down men's faces. "Yes, sir!" they shouted. "Yes, sir, you bet! The United States of America!"

"I have often inquired of myself," said Lincoln, "what great principle or idea it was that kept this [federation] so long together. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all would have an equal chance." To Americans an equal chance means a chance to excel, get ahead, win the race, beat the other fellow to the prize. Consider the year 1865, and a transcontinental railway to be laid. The scheme had been authorized by Congress. Two companies contracted for the work: Central Pacific, Union Pacific, the one to start laying tract at Ohama, the other in California, and the tracks to meet eventually at Promontory Point, Utah. (A federation needs, above all, communication, interchange of commerce.) The railway has been called a work of giants; it was sparked and spurred by giants; Leland Stanford, Collis P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins, Charles Crocker, the engineer.

In whatever spirit the project had been conceived, before 2 years were out it had become a race and a competition, unequaled for magnitude in sporting circles or business circles before or since. It was a game, an epic, an American legend:

"At the head of great Echo,
The railway's begun.
The Mormons are cutting
And grading like fun."

Thousands of Chinese laborers from the West, Irish laborers from the East, competed under their bosses as to which gang could lay the most track, matched skill and endurance, or even fought it out on occasion with charges of dynamite and killed each other in the doing. Snow in the Sierras, higher than a man's head. Night storms in the hot Nebraska plains, the water foul to drink. By May 1869 the two companies were within a dozen miles of meeting. The whole country watched, getting the news by telegraph where it could. On May 10 the tracks came together, the last spike was hammered. In the cities cannon boomed, firebells rang, citizens paraded. Nobody remembered who had won, they only knew the goal was reached.

There was a joyousness about it, a shouting, lusty braggadocio. Competition. The great reckless, expensive American game had begun. Followed now the captains of industry: steel kings, oil kings, railroad manipulators. In their day they were called promoters, and the word did not bear a pretty connotation. A rich land lay ready to their hand and they took it over: Astors, Vanderbilts, Rockefellers, men who founded dynasties that are powerful today. Choose the names as you will: Gould, Jay Cooke, Carnegie, Schwab, E. H. Harriman, J. J. Hill, J. P. Morgan. Bold men who, for the most part, came from plain beginnings, men whose imagination was limitless, who worked the country for what it was worth, using and discarding human material as they chose, and who built America into the greatest industrial productive system the world has ever seen. Pause for a moment on only one of them: Cornelius Vanderbilt, of New York Central and Hudson Railroads, who made himself an empire. Observe him at 73, still powerful, erect, pink checked, with an opulent spread of whiskers, and boasting a young southern bride and a stable of fine trotting horses. "Law?" said Commodore Vanderbilt. "What do I care about law? Hain't I got the power?"

These men seized opportunity and used it; such a chance would never recur. Over against them rose the labor leaders, Americans made bold in their turn by desperation. Uriah S. Stephens and Terence V. Powderly of the Knights of Labor, Samuel Gompers and, much later, the towering, scowling, well-nigh symbolic figure of John L. Lewis. Pushing along with them on the road came the bold men and women of moral protestation, fighting corruption in business and politics, fighting the evils of a too rapidly expanding industrialization. Ida Minerva Tarbell attacked the princes of Standard Oil, drove her lance against giants and lost the fight, but made her voice heard. Governor Altgeld, of Illinois, dared to pardon the anarchists after the Chicago Haymarket riots. Henry George, the visionary, promoted his single tax, ran for mayor of New York, and polled more votes than Theodore Roosevelt. Jane Addams, Jacob Riis fought the city slums. The suffragettes and the temperance ladies marched with their banners: Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, Anna Howard Shaw, Frances Willard, Carrie C. Catt, and Carrie Nation.

Saints or crackpots, America had room for them all. In so vast a country, so polyglot a population there is always a powder keg somewhere, in our own time the grave problem of racism. James Meredith in 1962 walks into the University of Mississippi through a hostile mob. (Can anybody say young Meredith lacks the essential quality of an American, and the essential boldness?) "If Governor Barnett keeps this up," says Meredith, "I may not vote for him." A beautiful understatement, wry, hard as Vermont granite.

Wrote Walt Whitman:

"I swear I begin to see the meaning of these things.
It is not the earth, it is not America, who is so great,
It is I who am great, or to be great—it is you up there; or any one;
It is to walk rapidly through civilizations, governments, theories,
Through poems, pageants, shows, to form great individuals."

The quiet men, the thinkers, writers, philosophers who knew how to express the American spirit—these also proved bold in their time. Emerson, Thoreau, Mark Twain; William James, John Dewey, Hemingway, Faulkner, Robert Frost; each name conveys an American era. Consider also the builders, the innovators who altered the face of our cities: Louis Henry Sullivan, father of the skyscraper. We see him as a youth step from an eastern train to the open shed of the Chicago station after the great fire of 1871. He looks toward the city, ruined and in ashes. He raises a hand, stamps his foot among the crowd and cries out loud, "This is the place for me." We remember, too, the Roeblings, father and son, engineers for the Brooklyn Bridge. Washington Augustus Roebling, the son, at 35 was carried out unconscious from the caissons beneath the East River, suffering from the bends. He did not recover and suffered constant pain. Yet for 10 years he directed work from his room overlooking the river, struggling not only against illness but against the corruption of contractors and city politicians who sought to defeat him and the bridge. Roebling saw his work completed, saw the cables swing from tower to tower and fireworks zoom across the sky on the night the bridge was opened.

Since the first American beginnings, bold men have been allowed to build, to invent, to roam the country at will. No passport, no redtape halts them from State to State. Through two world wars the system has held; the Union has held, and the vision. Under it our country has grown so great that we find ourselves embarrassed, apologetic. We stoop our head like a man too tall for a doorway; we talk ourselves down and experience twinges of guilt at our own size and power. We are materialistic, we say further,

and look embarrassed. We want to be comfortable, live well—and not only the rich want it and claim it, but everybody. And is that then evil, is that a betrayal of trust, the final American irony? Impossible to believe it. True, we have betrayed the fathers more than once. In fear, in greed or mere human cussedness we betray them every day. But still we know the dream is there, the vision and the opportunity. We would fight for it, die for it.

And what a springboard to rise from, this notion of government by consent of the governed. It is like a trampoline. Jump, and you are in the air. A distinguished American physicist, director of a radiation laboratory in California, lately expressed it in his own way, succinctly, as becomes a scientist. "There are very few things in this country that really can't be figured out," said Dr. John Stuart Foster, Jr., "You can excel. You just can."

America's role is global, now. The United States has won to a sophistication the world finds surprising; we are a little surprised by it ourselves. Not Paris, not London or Rome or Berlin or Madrid is today the center of the world's art and music—but New York. When astronauts compete they compete not with Californians or Nevadans but with the world. The great steel companies look over their shoulders not to see if Pittsburgh or Bethlehem is overtaking them but if Japan or Germany is catching up. Thirteen States have become fifty. At each new domestic crisis we ask ourselves in momentary panic if among these diverse sovereign interests our Union can hold, and if our constitutional democracy is equal to such a strain. Yet we know that it is equal and will hold.

America's role is global. Yet we have not lost our good provinciality, the qualities which make our strength and which define the genius of our independence. The bold men still go their way. Europe knows it. Even while expressing contempt (or is it envy?) of our material welfare, from time to time Europe perforce acknowledges the American quality. In 1958–60 the United States sent an exhibition of paintings to Europe. "The New American Painting," the show was called; it went to eight countries. Comments ranged from Berlin to Barcelona to London. And the critics might have been writing not of painting but of skyscrapers or of Charles Lindbergh or Henry Ford I, or the launching of space rockets. "Americans are world travelers and conquerors. They possess an enormous daring." "The quality of adventure is here, a pioneering sense of independence and vitality." "The exhibition offers that climate of unconstraint which never fails to strike anyone traveling to the United States for the first time." "These," said a final critic, "are other myths, other gods, other ideas, different from those prevailing in Europe."

Long ago, Americans found these gods, these myths and made them their own. Surely it is these myths and these gods which still propel us, still inspire and send us on our journeys? Commander Schirra in his space capsule; Scott Carpenter, the onetime hot rodder, problem boy from Colorado who was given his American chance and grew to heroism—these are bold men indeed. Yet without the "climate of unconstraint" that Europe speaks of, they might never have found their opportunity. Two hundred years ago this climate was deliberately created and confirmed by men brave enough to launch a revolutionary government, men wise enough to create a constitution expedient, workable, elastic—a government under which the bold American still finds scope.

A Bill To Eliminate Labor Union Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to eliminate labor union monopolies. This legislation embodies amendments to the Sherman, Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, and National Labor-Management Relations Acts. This is the identical bill which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

Under existing court interpretations, antitrust statutes apply only to industry—prohibiting monopolies; prohibiting price fixing; and prohibiting collusion, but only on the part of management.

We do have monopolies in the field of labor. For instance, the United Automobile Workers Union represents all organized labor in the manufacture of cars, trucks, and farm implements, and so forth, a monopoly in this industry. One union bargains with all of the firms in this field—a monopoly. The same thing applies to steel—the United Steel Workers; coal—the United Mine Workers, and so forth.

Jimmy Hoffa has stated that he intends to have all teamster contracts end on a common date beginning in 1964. Do you realize the power which would be vested in the hands of this one man? He could tie up the economy of this country within a matter of hours. Metropolitan areas would be without perishable foodstuffs, in addition to necessities too numerous to mention. He could bring every city in the country to its knees at his command.

We now have a costly maritime strike in progress which covers the entire Atlantic and gulf coasts. This strike is preventing the shipment of goods to foreign countries, lowering the prestige of the United States in the eyes of other governments; causing American industry to lose business because it cannot make deliveries—leading perhaps to permanent loss of our customers to other countries. With an already serious imbalance of trade, this further complicates the entire situation.

My proposal, for instance, would put an end to this longshoremen's strike which is having such a catastrophic impact on the Nation's economy. Under my bill, bargaining between the parties would have to be conducted by a single employer and the representative of the employer's employees, or as provided in some cases, group bargaining where not more than 25 percent of an industry is involved in the labor negotiation. Also, the featherbedding demands by unions as indicated in the dockworker's strike could never become a labor issue since such restrictive practices are prohibited by my bill.

I wish to emphasize that my bill still allows strikes. It restores union power to the local labor unions and takes it out of the hands of the international unions. I repeat—this bill does not interfere with any legitimate labor objectives but only eliminates those activities not in the public interest. Industrywide bargaining would be eliminated. It would be illegal for two unions to confer with one another in regard to the settlement of a wage dispute; and, likewise, it would be illegal for the management of two companies to confer with one another in regard to a settlement. You have to treat both sides fairly.

The evil of present industrywide bargaining is that identical labor costs throughout the industry further lessen competition and increase the chances for similar pricing. Bargaining increases costs of production which further place the American manufacturer at a disadvantage in competition with foreign firms.

Recent Department of Labor statistics on strikes and man-days idled in 1962 vividly demonstrate the need for legislation which would eliminate national labor disputes. Figures released for 1962 show that there were about 3,550 strikes, involving some 1,250,000 workers. About 19 million man-days were lost, compared with 16.3 million in 1961.

The Nation can ill afford a continuance of these labor disputes. The passage of my moderate approach to curbing union monopoly power and the abuses resulting from this power would, in most cases, eliminate the ever-growing chaos in the labor relations field. Yet, the remedy would not interfere with any legitimate union activity nor destroy unions or their welfare and pension programs. My bill will put an end to only those abuses we have been facing daily in our Nation; it will maintain collective bargaining without granting further authority to the executive branch of the Government to dictate the terms of a labor contract through such weapons as compulsory arbitration and seizure, which, in my opinion, lead this Nation down a dangerous path of socialism.

Is there a demand for this type of legislation over the country? Yes. The Institute of Public Opinion of Princeton, N.J., in a recent survey found that 62 percent of the people throughout the Nation favored this type of legislation. In a recent questionnaire circulated in my district, 84 percent replied in favor of curbing union monopolies. The average American citizen, the man and woman on the street, wants this legislation passed—the voice of America without a lobby. Who would like to see this legislation defeated? The heads of the international labor unions whose monopolistic powers would be checked by the passage of this bill.

I can think of no better recommendation than that which appeared in the International Teamsters magazine for September 1962, in which it was stated that my bill was the worst of the lot on this subject; to me, that means it is the best.

Appendix

Society of Magazine Writers Honors Editor of Harper's Magazine With Annual Richard L. Neuberger Award—Plaque Presented to John Fischer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, each year the Society of Magazine Writers selects from the world of journalism the publisher or editor who, in the society's judgment, has done most to raise the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication. This worthy individual is chosen from among distinguished nominees by a panel of society presidents, past and present, and the choice is made known at a pre-Christmas gathering.

Known as the Richard L. Neuberger Award, this honor is named in memory of our late colleague from Oregon, and in a short span has become a nationally respected recognition of excellence and dedication in the field of magazine publishing.

We here in the Senate who knew and loved Dick Neuberger are indeed gratified that this meaningful presentation carries his name. We recall vividly the steadfastness and integrity which were the hallmarks of Senator Neuberger's energetic efforts in behalf of conservation and improved health facilities. And, we recall that his cause was ever ably served by the keen perceptions and facile expression of the professional writer, a calling which was his first love. It is noteworthy that Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER now serves in the Senate. She shared with her late husband a unity of purpose.

As a member of the Society of Magazine Writers it was my privilege to be present on December 21, 1962, at their annual Christmas gathering, and to present to John Fischer of Harper's magazine the Richard L. Neuberger Award.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks in presenting the Society of Magazine Writers Richard L. Neuberger Award to John Fischer of Harper's magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, PRESENTING THE SOCIETY OF MAGAZINE WRITERS' RICHARD L. NEUBERGER AWARD TO JOHN FISCHER OF HARPER'S MAGAZINE, HOTEL ASTOR, NEW YORK, N.Y., DECEMBER 21, 1962

The invitation of our president Gerald Walker, to share in the second annual presentation of the Richard L. Neuberger Award of the Society of Magazine Writers has provided me a most pleasant assignment. Participation is especially meaningful, not only because of my cherished membership in this society and 40 years of dedication to journalism, but also because of my personal admiration and understanding friendship for Dick Neuberger.

You have acted wisely in naming this significant recognition of excellence in the magazine editing and publishing field for an American who contributed so much to broadening the base of thought and conscience in this country and the world. A career as an author brought real satisfaction and merited achievement to Senator Neuberger. As his seat mate in the Senate we often talked of his years as a writer, and of the incisive and purposeful journalists with whom he labored.

Throughout his service in public life Dick fought for the integrity of the individual, for preservation of our vast natural resources, and for improved health facilities for our citizens—and ever was his cause ably served by the keen mind and facile expression of the professional writer.

It is extremely appropriate therefore, that this coveted honor of the Society of Magazine Writers be conferred in his memory, and as a memorial to the courageous contributions he made to the better way of life.

We recognize this evening the magazine editor or publisher who, during this year, has done most to strengthen the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication.

The selection of the award recipient has been committed to a panel of SMW presidents, past and present, and the decision has been difficult. The choice is a man known to all of you and one whose beneficial influence has long been identified in the world of magazine production.

As editor of Harper's he has been instrumental in bringing forth in this publication a rare combination of readability and candor which has insured it a position of eminence among our sprightly and yet serious magazines. When John Fischer has needled with words the net result has been affirmative. If he has sometimes seemed to accent the negative it was not intended to be in reverse. Criticism has never been a capricious or carping instrument in his hand or heart.

He is an exponent of noncliche thinking. He has been conscientious in fashioning a forthright forum in which major problems of our Nation and the world can be discussed by men of experience and knowledge.

Among the merits of this monthly magazine is its penchant for attacking current and familiar controversies from wholly unexpected angles. Another objective has been to intelligently define what is fundamentally at issue in various current questions. And, governed by these admirable and remarkably well achieved goals, Harper's and its editor have amassed a truly enviable record of articles which have contributed substantially to the awareness and understanding of the reading public, and which have stimulated wholesome original thinking.

America has faced problems of a material nature often in the past, and being blessed with the natural resources, physical wealth, initiative, and strong economy with which to surmount them, we have survived. However, it is in the area of creative thinking that our most far reaching challenges now exist.

And so, for his cogent and courageous contributions to Harper's magazine, and to its stature as a leader in American thought we honor the editor and that which he has wrought.

Acting as your intermediary I present the 1962 Richard L. Neuberger Award of the Society of Magazine Writers, to the distinguished editor of Harper's magazine, Mr. John Fischer.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson Tours His Native State of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the speeches delivered over a 3-day period by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, in his native State of Texas.

I was privileged to be in attendance at several of the meetings, and I was happy to witness the acclaim given his appearances and the reaction to his remarks.

The speeches referred to are as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AUSTIN ROTARY CLUB LUNCHEON, AUSTIN, TEX., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1962

If you look at a globe of the world, you will see that the 30th parallel passes Austin and San Antonio. I suggest that some time you put your finger on that parallel and spin the globe—to see the others of the people on earth who live in climates much like our own.

The 30th parallel crosses the Pacific slightly to the north of the Midway Islands, passes south of Shanghai, over Chungking, north of New Delhi, near Tehran, over Kuwait, and south of Jerusalem. It crosses the Suez Canal and Cairo, runs on through Algeria, across the Atlantic, near Jacksonville, Fla., south of Mobile, through New Orleans and back across central Texas.

Over the past 2 years, at the request of the President of the United States, I have traveled to many of the lands traversed by that parallel; and I have been impressed many times by the similarities of climate and topography of those faraway places and our own country here in central Texas and the Southwest.

But there is another similarity which is even more impressive. In all those lands—as here in our own State—the free peoples who live along that line share a common determination to build a better, more prosperous and more rewarding life for themselves and those who come after them.

In each of the free world countries along that parallel efforts are being made—as such efforts are being made in Texas—to secure new industry, create new jobs, bring in new payrolls. It is not difficult to understand why. Of all the peoples who live within that line, including those of other States in the United States, the people of

Texas enjoy by far the highest standards of living, of income, and of opportunity.

Our per capita income in Texas last year was $1,972. In most of the countries along the 30th parallel per capita income would not exceed—and usually not even approach—$360 a year, $30 a month.

Compared with our fellow men—who share this latitude with us—we are rich. But we in Texas are not content. We know that our per capita income is still only 85 percent of the average for all Americans. We understand that there is a gap to be crossed. We are making that effort today—as we have never made it before—in Texas.

If our motivation is as great as it is to cross the gap of 15 percent, the realization of this helps us to understand how great are the motivations—and how intense are the desires—for those who face the challenge of crossing a gap of 500 percent or more.

What is happening in this world—in which you and I live—is that billions of people no longer accept the fate of living at the bottom rung of the economic ladder. They aspire to a better way of life, a better standard of living, a floor under their feet, a roof over their heads, milk for their babies, a cupful of water they can drink without fear of disease, schools their children can attend to learn to read, and some kind of a job which frees them from tilling the soil.

This explosion of aspirations, as it is sometimes called, is a great and awesome thing, it has unloosed a powerful force in the world, a force which is bound to reshape the world into a better, freer, more just place for men to live out their years on earth.

But in saying this to you it is not my purpose merely to talk about other lands and other places. The underdeveloped world is not exclusively a foreign world. Here at home—in our own vast United States—we have our own areas, our own regions, our own States which are still underdeveloped.

I believe that the greatest single force at work in the United States today is the gathering momentum for growth and development in these long underdeveloped areas, of which our own State of Texas is one. Throughout the world, in this last half of the 20th century, there has appeared a new momentum—a shift of population and of economic development to the warmer latitudes. This is occurring in Asia, in the Middle East, in Europe and Africa, and in our own United States.

Today in the United States the major growth States are those in the warmer climates which, until now, have been passed by in terms of full development—Florida, Arizona, California, and Texas. Population is shifting this way at an accelerated rate. Economic investment is shifting this way at an accelerated rate. For our own immediate area it is clear that during the next several decades the States which rim the gulf coast will experience expansion, new activity, and growing industrial importance on a scale never achieved in the past.

There are many developments of importance to this trend. The single most significant such development is the laying of foundations in this region for the technology and industry associated with the age of space. In Texas the location at Houston of the Manned Spacecraft Center is the most important business development since Spindletop.

I wish it were within my capabilities and purview to foresee fully and accurately for you the eventual meaning of this installation. Certainly it will mean growth of business activity in all of the conventional sectors. But there is a more important meaning. Because of the nature of the industries which will grow around space technology, the next 20, 30, or even 50 years will bring to Texas and the Southwest a new kind of industrial force.

Unlike the past, space technology requires employees with advanced college education. Strong backs and stout arms are not enough—one degree is a necessity, two or more college degrees are commonplace. This means higher income levels, higher social standards, higher living standards on the part of the working force of the principal industry.

We cannot foresee exactly what this means because nowhere else on earth has a major industrial force had these characteristics. But there are certain responsibilities we can foresee.

The chief of these is in the realm of education. Make no mistake about it: the NASA Center at Houston was not located there because Houston is Houston or Texas is Texas. The decisive force attracting the choice of the Manned Spacecraft Center site was the public support of higher education of the first class in the public institutions of this State.

If the space industry is to grow and expand in Texas continued steadfast public support of higher education—and of public education at all levels—will be required. The standards of public services of all kinds must be maintained at a high level. The quality of municipal and county government—as well as State government—must measure up to new expectations on the part of the people served.

The challenges facing our State will be great and demanding. The requirements for public leadership and for civic-mindedness on the part of this generation of Texans will be the highest any generation has ever known. As Texans in the past have been concerned with the rights of States, Texans henceforward must be especially concerned with the responsibilities of States.

I say these things to you in a spirit of hope and confidence. Over the years, it has been my high honor to work for you and with you in the many tasks in developing the resources of central Texas—and all of Texas. Much has been accomplished. Good and strong foundations have been laid.

We now come to the time in history at which we stand to realize the fruits of those labors. The foundation developed over the last 125 years—and especially in the last 25 years—is the foundation on which we can complete the development and fulfillment of the Texas potential.

In doing what we can do—and are privileged to do—here, we must remember the millions of human beings who live along the parallels of the world aspiring to achieve for themselves and their children even a small measure of what we ourselves have already achieved. Our Nation is strong and great. But neither our strength nor our greatness lies in our military might, nor in our plants and factories. Nor in the productivity of our farms. The strength and might of the United States is that of leadership—moral leadership—for a world of peace and freedom and justice.

If we are to hold what we have, if we are to enjoy more in the future than we have in the past, we must continue as a responsible Nation to uphold the pursuits of peace as we adhere to the necessities of power.

As Winston Churchill once said, "The first victory we have to win is to avoid a battle. The second, if we cannot avoid it, is to win it."

The United States stands strong, firm, and steadfast in its role in the world today. Where we have drawn the line of freedom—and pledged ourselves to its defense—we shall remain firm. We are determined that line shall never be crossed.

But the very purpose of our firmness is our determination to maintain peace with honor. As we shall always stand up to those who threaten the peace, we shall never refuse to sit down with those who seek sincerely to assure peace for mankind.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, ANNUAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BANQUET, FORT WORTH, TEX., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1962

When the U.S. Constitution was adopted in 1789, there was a king in Paris, a sultan of the Turkish Empire in Constantinople, a czar in St. Petersburg, an emperor with the mandate of "heaven" in Peiping, and a mikado on the throne of Japan.

Today, neither those royal offices nor royal empires exist. But the Office of President of the United States remains the same Office—presiding over the same form of government—as George Washington knew 173 years ago. The revolution of freedom which began on these shores at that time has swept the globe, touched every continent, and brought liberty, independence, and self-determination to tens of millions of people everywhere.

Among us, there are many who—easily, casually, and critically—make statements about how communism is winning everywhere, and that we are ineffective and impotent in checking its spread.

This is simply not so. For us to poison ourselves—to blight our own pride in our own country—with such fearful fatalism is one of the greatest disservices we can render to ourselves, our country, or our cause.

As long as there have been nations on earth there have been totalitarians and aggressors. As long as there have been totalitarians and aggressors the weak and small have lived in fear and danger of armies of the forces of evil among mankind. Fifteen years ago, in the wake of World War II, all of the civilized world seemed to lay at the feet of the greatest tyranny and strongest aggressor the world has ever seen.

The Soviet Union added to its empire the brave Republic of Czechoslovakia. Nothing of consequence stood between the Soviets and the English Channel or the western shores of Europe. At the eastern edge of the Mediterranean the brave people of the barren lands of Greece and Turkey saw the bear of the north threatening their borders. In the south of Asia the vast land of Iran likewise lay exposed.

As Winston Churchill described it, in one of his historic speeches, thousands of years ago the Mongol hordes of Genghis Khan had come across the steppes of what is now Russia into the heart of Europe. On the same day, decisive battles were fought near Vienna and Poland, and the most able defenders of Western civilization were vanquished. Nothing stood in the path of the conquerors. But then the aging Khan died. The tribesmen turned eastward to their homes to choose a successor. And, as Churchill put it 12 years ago, "They have not returned until now."

Twelve years have passed and not an inch has been added to the perimeter of the Soviet domain. Three months ago, at the request of President Kennedy, I visited those lands where—beginning in 1947—the United States began a great experiment and a great gamble on the belief that men who want to be free will stand up for their freedom if they know the strong stand with them.

In Iran, in Turkey, in Greece, only a line drawn on a map separates those people from the Russian armies. But that line—through all these years—has not been breached. It was my proud privilege to take to those peoples and to their leaders a solemn reaffirmation of the determination of the leaders and the people of the United States that those lines will never be breached.

What I am describing is one of the most noble achievements in the history of the human race. It is an achievement in which each of you has had a part—and of which every member of this generation should be proud: proud of his country, proud of his country's leadership under administrations of both parties, and proud of his own individual participation in this achievement.

This generation of Americans drew a line in the path of the great aggressor and made it clear that line could not be crossed without the aggressor paying a fearful price. For ourselves, for our families, and our businesses, the price of courage has not been cheap—in dollars and cents.

From 1949 through 1961, Americans have paid $498 billion for defense and security. We have paid $47.5 billion in foreign economic aid. What have we gotten for our money?

On Sunday morning, October 28, the answer was provided when the message came from Moscow that Khrushchev had, in the face of unmistakable American determination and might, agreed to the withdrawal of his missiles and bombers from the island of Cuba.

Only 10 days before, when the intelligence photographs had first confirmed the Soviet installations, I was looking over maps in the meeting room of the National Security Council. On these maps had been plotted the range and possible targets of the missile installations under construction in Cuba. Various distances and times were being cited. I pointed my finger to Fort Worth, knowing the strategic importance of the installations here. A military expert at my side anticipated my question and answered it before I asked: "Less than 5 minutes, sir."

Less than 5 minutes. Except for the $500 billion spent to keep America strong, Fort Worth—like most of our cities—would be living under that threat tonight, instead of living as we do in a world at peace from which this grave threat has been removed.

America got its money's worth from the B-24 Liberator bombers built here in Fort Worth. America got its money's worth from the B-36. America will get its money's worth from the TFX.

And the world—and the cause of freedom—has gotten full value from faith in America.

I do not know—no man on earth knows, on either side of the Iron Curtain—what the meaning of recent events will ultimately be. We can believe, however, that a time of turning has come in the destiny of this century. The recent events leave no doubt about two crucial points.

First, there is no doubt that the assumptions of Communist strategy—about the eventual collapse of ability or will in the West—have been proved failures.

Secondly, at the same time, the concept, purposes, and conduct of the policies of the West—initiated by the United States—have been proved correct.

Communism has been contained. It has been contained in Europe. It has been kept from establishing a land frontier with the Arab world. It has been repulsed and rejected by Africa. Six guerrilla wars in southeast Asia and the far Pacific have ended in five defeats for communism and, with the support of the United States, the tide has been turned in the sixth such war in Vietnam.

Unlike Khrushchev, we of America—and we of the free world—seek to bury no one. Our purpose is peace—a peace in which the hopes of man may rise from the graves of poverty, illiteracy, disease, and injustice, to common aspirations and expectations of a life of freedom.

This year of 1962 is a year in history of which all Americans can be proud and can feel new pride in themselves and their associations with the cause for which their country stands.

Where the Communist bloc is surrounded by enemies, we of the United States can count as our blessing that we are surrounded by friends. We can believe, at this moment of history, that the revolution of freedom which began in this land is the tide of the future—a tide still running, a tide which will bring the ultimate triumph of freedom everywhere before this century ends.

It has been our lot and our fortune to become the richest people in the richest nation the earth has ever known. In only five other nations does the per capita national income exceed $1,000 per year—for most of the nations and peoples on earth, annual income is less than $40 per month and some only $60 a year. For us the average is $2,800.

As, in the writings of the ancient Greeks, the Corinthian ambassador told the mighty Spartans, "Supremacy has its duties—leaders are required to show a special care for the common welfare in return for the special honors accorded to them by all, in other ways."

We enjoy what we have today, at home and in the world, because we have applied the precepts of our moral teachings and beliefs to the policies by which we conduct our Nation's affairs. We have shared with others. We have cast our bread upon the waters—to the humble and the lowly at home, to the exhausted and vanquished abroad. From 1949 through 1961 we sent to Europe $18.7 billion in economic aid. In just the last 4 years the prosperous Europe of today has bought from us $23.2 billion of our goods, products and services, and will soon be purchasing from us each year as much or more than the total of the aid we have sent.

The bread we have cast upon the waters is coming back manyfold.

I say these things to you in a spirit of optimism based on the practical realities of confidence. Ours is a strong and mighty land. Our might lies not in our arms and armor but in the character of the American soul and in the determination of the American will that men everywhere shall have the right to live as we live in freedom, justice and equality.

The first Americans to reach the moon will, when they return to earth, land at Houston—although, I suppose, they might land in this vicinity if Fort Worth and Dallas ever got together on an airport.

This region—reaching from the Atlantic coast of Georgia to the far edge of the Arizona desert—will be a principal center of growth for the technology of the age of space.

What older sections of the United States have been to our national development in the past two centuries, this region will grow to be during the next century to come.

If it seems far-fetched to describe such potential for the State we know now, I remind you that you live and attend school now amid one of the great wonders of the Western World. In the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan complex, there is the greatest concentration of population—anywhere in the world—not located either at the edge of the ocean or on a navigable stream. It is not so wild a dream to envision Texans of your generation working even greater wonders in the future which lies ahead.

Since the beginning of this century, one of the great problems of this portion of the United States has been the annual loss of talent and skills on the part of the most able graduates of our public institutions of higher learning. Between 1900 and 1930, 3.5 million persons left the Southern States—including Texas. Sociologists have estimated that the economic loss—even in terms of the prices of that era—amounted to between $5 and $10 billion.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, ARLINGTON STATE COLLEGE, ARLINGTON, TEX., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1962

I realize that most nonacademic visitors to college campuses these days come in the role of recruiters—if not for major corporations, seeking talent for their jobs, then, at least, as recruiters for the Young Republican League. Needless to say, I am not here in either role.

I would, however, like to do some recruiting—the recruiting of your talents, or if not your talents then your faith, for the great opportunity which faces you and your generation. For where other generations of Americans have met their destiny—and their opportunity—in winning wars on the battle fields of the world, it is your destiny and the opportunity of your generation to win the battles of peace on the battle grounds of the world today.

Among my duties, at present, I serve as Chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Peace Corps. One of the great satisfactions I have had in my public life has been the chance to see your generation disprove the libels and dispel the doubt that has been cast upon the idealism of young Americans today.

Too many people have the habit of equating idealism of youth with political labels of their elders. If young people on college campuses adopt for themselves the label of conservative, there are cries raised that "the college generation is not idealistic." This I refuse to accept. The division of political sentiment on our campuses today—the debates between factions labeling themselves conservative or liberal—reflects, I believe, a healthy interest in the directions of our national policy and it reflects, also, a necessary sense of protest on the part of the young for the way in which their elders are running the affairs of the country.

At Peace Corps camps around the world, I feel that these views have been confirmed. In the training camp at Puerto Rico—out in the jungles of the island there—I have seen young men and women who were both Goldwater Republicans and Kennedy Democrats up before 6 in the morning, running up and down jungle hills, swimming a river with their hands tied behind their back, living 3 nights on the land carrying only compasses, pocket knives, and canteens.

I don't worry about the politics of the college generation when I see such evidence of idealism motivating young Americans to prepare themselves for the work of building a better world.

But, in saying this about one of my favorite subjects—the Peace Corps—I do not mean to overemphasize the world abroad. There is work to be done here at home. There is work to be done in the Southwest—and here in Texas.

The moving finger of history is writing large on the future of this part of the United States. In the past 50 years, a strong and stable foundation has been put in place. In the next 50 years, there is every indication that Texas—and the other States of the gulf coast and Southwest—will emerge as one of the major centers of industrial, economic, and social leadership in the world.

The first Americans to reach the Moon will, when they return to Earth, land at Houston—although, I suppose, they might land in this vicinity if Fort Worth and Dallas ever got together on an airport.

This region—reaching from the Atlantic coast of Georgia to the far edge of the Arizona desert—will be a principal center of growth for the technology of the age of space.

What older sections of the United States have been to our national development in the past two centuries, this region will grow to be during the next century to come.

It it seems farfetched to describe such potential for the State we know now, I remind you that you live and attend school now amid one of the great wonders of the Western World. In the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan complex, there is the greatest concentration of population—anywhere in the world—not located either at the edge of the ocean or on a navigable stream. It is not so wild a dream to envision Texans of your generation working even greater wonders in the future which lies ahead.

In this context, I think it can be said to you as it could not be said to any generation before you: Your greatest future and

opportunity is in Texas—and in the cities of our State where you may now live.

Since the beginning of this century one of the great problems of this portion of the United States has been the annual loss of talent and skills on the part of the most able graduates of our public institutions of higher learning. Between 1900 and 1930, 3.5 million persons left the Southern States—including Texas. Sociologists have estimated that the economic loss—even in terms of the prices of that era—amounted to between $5 billion and $10 billion.

Today many of our leading industrial corporations, financial institutions, educational establishments, and other major centers are headed by people who were born in this region, but who have lived their lives since college outside the region. For you there is ahead the special promise and opportunity that the major opportunities in the Nation will be here in this region.

To say this is not to speak provincially but to speak factually. But it helps in maintaining perspective to remember this: much of the future for this region will lie in trade, commerce, and travel in other lands.

The largest single trading market in the free world in the latter half of this century will be the world of Latin America. This will be a major outlet for your energies and talents whatever line you may pursue.

But the enterprise of Texas in the future will not concentrate solely on the Latin region. Already airlines are flying from Texas points to Europe. In the not too distant future, we may anticipate sufficient speed in the air for such flights to Europe to be completed round trip in a single day. Africa and Asia will neither be a day's travel away.

You will live and you will work from a Texas base, but the world itself will be yours to help develop, to help lead, to help bring to its feet.

No generation has ever had such broad horizons or such great promise. Because of this, no generation has ever needed stronger ideals or a more fixed determination to right what is wrong, give attention to what has been neglected, to give heed to directions which ought not to be followed and to define new goals and new directions for the future.

Whether you label yourself "conservative" or "liberal"—whether "Democratic" or "Republican"—the proudest label you can bear is that of "American."

In the world for which you are preparing yourselves now, there is a warm and friendly reception for those who bear that honored name. Many generations of Americans—much effort, much toil, much sacrifice—have gone into the image which the world bears of us and what we stand for. But the essence of the favorable image that the world holds of us is the belief among men in every land that Americans are, in some special way, people who are at heart idealistic.

From what I have seen of your generation—from the many fine and inspiring visits that I have with many of you from time to time—I know that you are heirs of that tradition.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, STUDENT CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS, TEXAS A. & M., BRYAN, TEX., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1962.

In the world of undergraduates, and in the world at large, one of the chronic sources of tension is speeches. This is especially true of speeches by public figures on topics covered by your agenda for this eighth Student Conference on National Affairs.

The 20th century has brought explosions of population, of aspirations, and of nationalism. But the impact of these has been equalled, if not exceeded, by the monumental explosion of statistics—about those explosions. As a results, in our speeches—and, perhaps, in our policies, as well—statistics are sometimes substituted for substance.

In these remarks this afternoon, I hope to keep statistics in their place, remembering Mr. Dooley's comment on a public figure of his day who over-used facts and figures. "All he needs," Mr. Dooley said, "is an index and few illustrations to make himself a bicyclopedia of useless information."

I make this point about statistics for a purpose. On your agenda for the study of "Sources of World Tension," there are listed the four most commonly accepted topics for such discussions: the population explosion, economic problems, nationalistic aspirations, and the arms race.

Our solution of a problem will be no better than our definition of it. In this context, I would like to begin by raising what may seem to be a surprising question: are these forces the real sources of world tensions?

Are these the real problems? Or do these merely happen to be the problems which are easiest to measure with our statistics—and, hence, most convenient to discuss and debate? Frankly, certain personal observations and reflections have led me to question whether our accepted diagnosis of the causes of world tensions is as precisely accurate—or as fully comprehensive—as we have thought it to be. Over the past 2 years I have traveled nearly 100,000 miles on official missions to Asia, to Africa, to Latin America—to the places where the forces you are discussing are now at work. I have gone to the emerging nations, to the centers of population explosion and poverty, to the lands where undeclared wars and counter-insurgency actions are in progress to the nations and the headquarters of the anti-Communist alliances—NATO, CENTO, and SEATO.

Generalizations are hazardous. But if I were to list the sources of tension identifiable in those lands, the listing would differ in both details and emphasis from what our computers and many of our commentators tell us. This is not to say that population, economics, nationalism and the arms race are unimportant or overrated. But it is to say that relief for these tensions involves more than providing the underdeveloped nations with pills, payrolls, prestige, and peace talks.

If, our perspective is to be realistic—and if our efforts are to be fruitful—we need to include certain additional realities in our list of sources of world tension.

First, we must recognize that many of the most explosive tensions worldwide are generated by local issues, rather than global forces.

Second, we must recognize that in most areas, animosities of race, religion, caste, and inequality are central sources of tension.

Third, another source of tension is the restriction on free movement of peoples. This is not only a problem of geographical movement but is also a problem of movement, up or down, within traditional social structures.

Fourth, in most of the emerging portions of the world, a very real source of tension—with many ramifications—is created by a lack of tradition and experience in organizing for mutual effort on a basis of mutual trust.

These factors are often overlooked by peoples of the developed nations—especially Americans. We concentrate on the conspicuous. We neglect those sources of world tension which are not conveniently measured by statistics. Hence, we know the impact of south Asia's birth rate, but not the impact of the area's border disputes. We concentrate on Africa's nationalism and miss the significance of its localism. We identify Latin America's poverty but we fail to identify its problems of class and resistance to social mobility. The world over we predicate both our efforts and expectations on the assumption of a capacity for social and structural organization which is, in fact, absent from and alien to the traditions of many peoples.

In our approach to the tensions of our times, we tend to treat the 20th century as an entity—as though human history were the sum and substance of our achievements and our failures since the year 1900. This is not realistic. In many instances, the tensions most dangerous for our 20th century world today date back to the 12th century—or earlier. The emerging nations have been bypassed by the industrial revolution. But many of their problems result at least as much from having been bypassed by the political revolutions of and since the 18th century.

We have recognized the necessity for what is called the infrastructure of a modern economy—the necessity for roads, communications, sanitation facilities, hospitals, and all else. The developed nations of the West have committed themselves to long-term programs to provide such facilities. But the question we need to ask—and to answer candidly—is whether these measures are genuine first steps or intermediate steps? Are we beginning at the beginning, so to speak, or have we begun at a point of economic development in our programs somewhere beyond the actual point of social readiness or political capabilities?

The world today has—by economic reckoning—a major, capital deficit. If a 5-percent annual increase in the income of emerging nations is to be sustained throughout this decade of the 1960's—the decade of development—it is estimated that $70 billion of capital investment will be required from the capital-producing countries of the world. On the basis of performance thus far, this means about $8 billion each year from 1963 to 1970.

The present annual capital investment in such development is $5 billion. The annual deficit is, thus, $3 billion. How and where that deficit is to be overcome would lead us into a discussion far longer than the time allotted.

The particular point I wish to emphasize is the existence not of a capital deficit, but of a political deficit. Technically, we have the solutions to the world's development problems—the engineers, the scientists, the economists, and all the other technical people, have done their jobs. The gap that remains open measures our failure in the political realm.

If the capital investment of this decade of development is to take root and flower into a full harvest, there must be more attention concentrated on these neglected political deficits. In terms of human population, for example, the world has a carrying capacity of possibly as many as 16 billion people. Our political systems, however, are doing a poor job of providing for the needs of only 3 billion people.

If we are seriously to undertake the relieving of world tensions, a greater degree of political courage, political imagination, and political innovation will be required—in both the developed and underdeveloped worlds.

This begins at home—in our own country and in other developed countries. We, too, are experiencing population explosions. We, too, have our underdeveloped regions and resources. We, too, have poverty, changing social structures, shifting populations, and much else which requires political courage today as much as 30 or 50 years ago.

The Western nations—including the United States—are not so far advanced, not so free internally of sources of tension in their own society, that the permanent necessity for reform, for progress, for responsible change can be ignored.

We of the capital-producing industrial nations of the West must not permit the burdens of security to stifle either our initiative or capacity for internal innovation

and reform in our domestic political responsibilities.

The same is true with regard to the assistance we offer emerging sections of the world. If material objectives are to be reached, moral objectives cannot be left behind; 20th century technology simply will not function or serve its intended purpose when imposed upon 20th century or 17th century or even 19th century values about human life or the worth of human labor. In fact, such conditions might only produce greater tensions for the world—not fewer.

We have, I believe, a responsibility to be certain that we define the sources of the world's tensions correctly and fully.

The population explosion, the aspirations explosion, the nationalism explosion—and all the other forces of our times—may intrigue us and occupy us. But tensions of the world will not be relieved until the world experiences a genuine explosion of human justice and recognition of individual rights. We must have the political courage and imagination to work for and achieve this objective at home and abroad.

The tensions of our world result not because couples are having too many babies but because political leaders are having too few new ideas for answering the world's ancient problems with the capabilities of today's modern technology.

I speak as I have because my assessment of the future is one of optimism and confidence—confidence inspired in no small degree by the high sense of responsibility being shown on campuses everywhere by your generation. You are concerned—as no generation has ever been concerned—about building a better world, and the capabilities at your command permit such a world to be built. Your talents are great, and they are needed. That is why I would like to conclude with a question to you, from the writings of the contemporary philosopher, Will Durant:

"Why should not every man, rich or poor, give 2 years of his life to the state, not for the purpose of killing other people, but to conquer the plagues, and drain the marshes, and irrigate the deserts, and dig the canals, and democratically do the physical and social engineering which builds up so slowly and painfully what war so quickly destroys?"

Remarks by Mayor James H. J. Tate, Emancipation Proclamation Centenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to participate in a luncheon in the city of Philadelphia at the Bellevue Stratford Hotel in connection with the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The main speaker was the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate. His talk was very inspiring and his suggestion that the children of the city participate in acknowledging the centenary of this outstanding American document is so interesting that I feel the Members of the House will read it with great profit.

I, therefore, have included the address of our distinguished mayor in my remarks:

REMARKS BY MAYOR JAMES H. J. TATE, EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION CENTENARY, JANUARY 2, 1963

One of the peculiarities of American life in this day and age is the fondness we seem to have for celebrating all sorts of occasions—some of which are profoundly important.

It's a fine thing to celebrate the historical events. It's a healthy thing that we can draw sustenance from our own inspiring history.

As we consider our national history and observe its anniversaries, as we give a measure of remembrance to those chronological landmarks along our pathway to greatness—there is usually no burden of obligation to be found in them. To be sure, history has its moral lessons, but from most of these commemorations, we elicit no new responsibilities, we derive no new obligations or challenges. The acts have been accomplished. The dead have been buried. The specific issues have altered. The objectives have, for the most part, been achieved.

But today, we here acknowledge a historical anniversary that does call out to our public and private conscience. This is an anniversary we celebrate which cried out loud and clear across the years for action.

On September 23, 1862, the newspapers of the United States carried a draft of a proclamation that the then President of our country had drafted. It was an amazing proclamation—a powerful proclamation. It stated that on January 1, 1863—almost exactly 100 years ago—all slaves held in a State or part of a State which was in rebellion should be "then, thenceforward and forever free."

With the drafting and signing of this proclamation, which we now know as the Emancipation Proclamation, President Abraham Lincoln had brought a new dimension into the terrible grinding war that was consuming so much of the vital substance of this Nation. Instead of being merely a war for the preservation of the Federal Union—which was certainly a just and mighty cause in itself—the war became a struggle for human freedom. In taking a resolute and public stand on the slavery issue, the Government, in a sense, sanctified the war by harnessing to it one of man's noblest aspirations—the desire for freedom.

The Emancipation Proclamation, though it rang out across the land in 1863, has still to be fully implemented in this great country of ours. The chain that has shackled human dignity has been only partly broken. The link has been only partly cut. There remains a great deal of unfinished business still to be done.

We live in an incredible age—an age of such enormous complexity that our forefathers of recent generations would be completely shattered if they were here today.

And yet, my fellow citizens, we are still haunted by the same ghost that Mr. Lincoln sought to kill in 1863 with the silver bullet of the law. It is a sad but inescapable fact that we have not yet put the ideals of the Emancipation Proclamation fully into practice. The chains must still be struck from the legs of 1 in every 10 of our fellow citizens.

It seems strange—even sad—that civil rights should still be spoken of in terms of "the question of civil rights." Going back even further in our Nation's history, the Declaration of Independence—written right here in Philadelphia—should have resolved things adequately and taken civil rights out of the "question" category. The Emancipation Proclamation should have completed the job.

Those documents were merely good beginnings. They were the sign posts to show us the way. Their letters should be splashed in great characters across the horizon. They should be emblazoned on our public buildings for all to see. Most importantly, they should be written—indeed carved—on our hearts.

We in Philadelphia should draw particular inspiration from the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, for it was here that freedom to those of every race, and creed, and place of national origin, was implemented from the very beginning. Our city has always been a place of refuge for those who fled persecution. In the dreams of William Penn, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia would stand always as beacons of inspiration for all the land to see. And so it has gone down from Penn's day.

Philadelphia was the first municipality in the Nation to include an official human relations agency in its fundamental law, the home rule charter. It has been a trail blazer in working toward equal opportunities in employment, in housing, in education, in public accommodations, in civil service. Our great commonwealth has also been in the forefront of this struggle to bring real meaning to Lincoln's great ideal.

But partial success is not enough. Self-congratulations must not be allowed to strangle the great challenge of that which must still be done. And more than legislation is required. We also need to educate ourselves to the significance of emancipation. We need to learn to take Lincoln's Executive order to heart, to make it a conscious part of our daily lives.

With this in mind, I would like to propose that we mark this centenary observance with something more specific than words and sentiments. It has been said with great truth that only in giving do we receive—that the physical act of giving carries with it a spiritual symbolism that is deep and everlasting.

I propose that a suitable monument be erected to the Emancipation Proclamation—a monument that will be paid for not by the stroke of a pen from some philanthropist, or by a public or private subsidy of funds. Rather, it should be paid for by the children of our public, private and parochial schools here in Philadelphia. They can in a great and moving campaign donate one modest Lincoln's head penny each, and thus make this monument possible.

That this single tiny act of good will and brotherhood—this single act of giving something of value, however small—will carry with it a sense of the great spiritual message of the Emancipation Proclamation. I believe this modest contribution to a physical monument can help to bring about, within each child, an awareness of the even greater spiritual monument that will finally enable our Nation to dispose of this unfinished business.

And surely it cannot be said that this is too much. In this modest way our debt to history can be acknowledged by the schoolchildren of Philadelphia who are now learning of the importance of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The Civil War snuffed out hundreds of thousands of lives—soldiers, sailors, civilians of the North and of the South. It ruined millions more, and destroyed an incredible amount of private and public property.

Was it all for nothing? The Union was preserved, and happily so. But what of the work of emancipation that Lincoln incorporated into the very hardest years of that war? Is this to remain half done? Can we allow this to go to waste from our safe vantage point in the 20th century?

And what of the toll of human suffering since then? What of the unfortunate consequences of slavery—watered down to unfair employment practices, inequitable housing, and the millions of little humbling, discourteous acts that have separated races, one from the other despite common citizenship?

What will we do in the next 100 years? Will we have to mark the second centenary with these same thoughts, the admission of these same half successes?

Perhaps the pennies of our schoolchildren, and the acts of good will to flow from our own hearts, will make the next centenary observance of Lincoln's great executive act just an appreciative memory. I trust we will be able, within the next generation, to finally close the books and lay this volume to rest, along with the other great events of our Nation's history.

Let us resolve to finish, once and for all, the great work which Lincoln started 100 years ago. We here in Philadelphia have shown, by our enormous progress of the past decade, that it is possible to solve many problems once thought to be insoluble. That progress, and those solutions, were made possible because we had the wholehearted support of all the diverse elements of our community. With your continued cooperation, I believe this additional great challenge is also capable of solution.

We owe it to ourselves, as well as to generations yet unborn.

The 50–50 Picture in TV and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner contains an interesting and informative discussion by its noted columnist, George Todt, on the ever-present problem of how privately owned and federally authorized radio and TV outlets can best serve the public interest.

Since it is obvious that a news and information medium which enjoys a Federal franchise to protect it against excessive or destructive competition requires a somewhat different approach in the development of appropriate policies of objectivity and equity from those of a newspaper which is not only privately owned but also required to provide its own protection against potential or actual competitors, it is important that the Congress continue to concern itself with the evolvement of optimum laws and regulations relative to the radio-TV industry. In this connection, I believe George Todt's comments merit careful reading.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the column written by Mr. Todt on this significant subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: THE 50–50 PICTURE

"Noisy commercials really are not louder—they just sound that way."—Newton Minow, Town Hall address, December 18, 1962.

One of the best of Bill Miller's consistently good programs at Town Hall took place last Tuesday noon when Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, was guest speaker.

He is bright, intelligent, and seems dedicated to turning TV into something besides the "vast wasteland" he called it a year ago.

The FCC headman is only in his mid-30's, but don't let that fool you. His mind is a storehouse of factual information and he knows what he is talking about. I liked him very much. He is on the ball.

In the first portion of his well-received address, Minow told of the tremendous advances now being achieved in the field of satellite communications. Much more is to come. Bodes well for our future.

The second part of his informative remarks concerned the new educational TV station in Los Angeles which Dr. Lee DuBridge, of Caltech, and his group have been quietly working on for some time. Very commendable objective.

In the regular question-and-answer period which followed, I asked Minow this basic question: "In the interest of fairness and impartiality, what are you doing to guarantee that conservative and liberal voices will balance out on a 50–50 basis in the areas where FCC has control?"

Minow replied that the FCC, by law, has been given a very difficult but necessary job. When controversial issues are before the public, it tries to see that a fair share of time is allotted both sides.

"The FCC does not monitor programs," Minow told us. "It only listens to complaints from the public—then acts on them.

"If complaints come in to us, we call them to the attention of the concerned station. Whenever the public believes it is only getting one ideological side of the picture, we want to know about it.

"As long as both sides are heard, then there should be no complaint. But if both sides are not being heard, then the FCC can step in and require fair treatment.

"If the American people think they are not getting fair balance between liberal and conservative ideological viewpoints, please let us know."

I talked with this fine young man for a few moments afterward. Would he welcome letters from my readers who had views on this subject? By all means, he told me. Just address your letters to him in care of the FCC, Washington, D.C.

He is anxious to give the pubilc what it really wants.

We agreed that what our Nation needs is balance between the liberal and conservative viewpoints. Just as a human needs a right and left hand, our Republic requires 50–50 opposition for best results.

Thanksgiving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the true meaning of Thanksgiving was written by Yolanda Clegorne, a junior at Crestview High School, and read at the annual Thanksgiving banquet of the Wesleyan Service Guild of the Crestview (Fla.) First Methodist Church.

Because of the timeliness of the theme, and the excellence of the thoughts which it contains, the article is reprinted here. I am very much impressed with the excellence of this article. I have known Yolanda all of her life. She is a very fine young lady whose parents are my very good friends of long years.

The article follows:

THANKSGIVING

(By Yolanda Clegorne)

Thanksgiving is an American holiday. There is nothing like it elsewhere in the world. It does not commemorate a great battle, or the birthday of a great leader.

Thanksgiving is the expression of a deep feeling of gratitude by our people. It is a day set aside to recognize God for all His goodness He has bestowed upon us.

We should try to recognize that Thanksgiving should be a way of life, not a once-a-year occasion.

HUMILITY

Humility. This Thanksgiving Day, as in years past, the Americans are enjoying it in a marvelous state of prosperity.

The Americans are creating it an ugly image abroad. People in other countries think of America as a puffed-up capitalistic country.

Americans must learn humility. Humility is a virtue. Humiliation is an evil. Those who are on the giving end must be humble so that those who are on the receiving end are not humiliated.

Americans are to often prone to say, "Those foreigners should be glad to get that." We should be thankful for the opportunity to give. One day the tables will be turned, if by nothing but time itself, and America will be on the receiving end.

GRATITUDE

Gratitude. A Catholic has a string of beads called a rosary to keep count of his prayers, so each of us should keep a mental rosary of his blessings.

The beauty he has seen, the fellowship he has enjoyed, his life and the gifts it has brought him. These are but a few. Look back into your memories, and think of the many forgotten reasons for gatitude.

The times your mother sat up with you when you were ill, and so many things we think about that we received in our homes.

BLESSINGS

When we start thinking about our many blessings, do you recognize the rights we take for granted in the free countries like the United States—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, press, public schools? Americans never think of what it would be like to live under a dictator.

A noted Christian teacher suffered much at the hands of the Nazis in Czechoslovakia. Finally, he was able to flee with his family to the United States, leaving all his possessions behind. Many times he would stop during his lectures to American students and say with tears in his eyes, "I love your country."

That man could appreciate freedom and he gave genuine thanks for it because he knew what it was like when freedom was taken away.

FREEDOM

Freedom led to the first Thanksgiving. In England many of the people desired a simple church service. A service different from the service of the Church of England. They were treated terribly and many were imprisoned and fined.

Finally, unhappy and restless, they banded together and came to the new land of America. No one would be able to say when the first Thanksgiving took place. Ancient Greeks and Romans had days to give thanks for harvest, but the Pilgrims are usually given credit for the Thanksgiving as we know it today.

The settlers (especially in Virginia) had several days per year for giving thanks. The first Presidential proclamation of a National Thanksgiving Day was made by a Virginian, George Washington, in 1783, and the matter bobbed up irregularly for the next 10 years.

Finally, in 1863, President Abraham Lincoln urged that all work be suspended so that everyone might give thanks to God.

Not all of Lincoln's Thanksgivings were in November, although his last official proclamation placed the date as the last Thursday of that month, and this became more or less official.

At last in 1941, by congressional action, the fourth Thursday in November was made official.

As we might think of our blessings, our thoughts should go all the way back to Calvary. Here our hearts should fill with an unexpressable gratitude. We should realize that we are all on the receiving end. No one of us is paying his full way through life.

GIVERS AND GETTERS

People could roughly be divided into two groups.

The first are those who think they are giving more than they get.

The second are the people who feel they are getting more than they give. The first group are restless and discontended, no matter what they have. The last group have peace of mind, and contentment with whatever they have.

How much do we have? Thanksgiving as many other things has become commercialized. It has become associated with the familiar scene of a family sitting around a table filled with turkey, cranberry sauce, hot rolls and mincemeat pie.

This is a season of personal thanksgiving not a time of physical indulgence.

THANKSGIVING PSALM

"I love the Lord, because He hath heard my voice and my supplications. Because He hath inclined His ear unto me, therefore will I call upon Him as long as I live. The sorrow of death compassed me, and the pain of hell got hold of me; I found trouble and sorrow. Then called I upon the name of the Lord: O Lord, I beseech Thee; deliver my soul. Gracious is the Lord, and righteous; yea, our God is merciful. The Lord preserveth the simple; I was brought low, and He helped me. Return unto Thee. For Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling. I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living. I believe, therefore have I spoken; I was greatly afflicted; I said in my haste, all men are liars. What shall I render unto the Lord for all His benefits toward me? I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people. Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints. O Lord, truly I am Thy servant, and the son of Thine handmaid: Thou hast loosed my bonds. I will offer to Thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and will call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people. In the courts of the Lord's house, in the midst of Thee, O Jersusalem. Praise ye the Lord."—Psalms 116.

PERSONAL MESSAGE

This is a psalm of personal thanksgiving. It tells two things. First the story of the psalmists own experience, giving the circumstances that brought this thanksgiving. And second, the account of how he paid the vow he made to the Lord in the moment of his deep distress.

The story is told of an ancient Isrealite (poor, family dead) who offered his "sacrifice of thanksgiving." During an illness the dark and dismal abode of death became very real to him. Now, he sang his hymn of praise for restored life. Christ by his coming freed us from the disgrace of sin and took away the sting of death. In its place he gave us eternal life in him. What is our sacrifice of thanksgiving?

LOVE

Love. The greatest gift of love was that of Christ. This is the greatest reason anyone could have for being thankful. A small boy is a country school daily shared his lunch with a little boy who had none. One day the giver found a note on his desk which said in childish simplicity and sincerity, "I love you." That was an expression of thanksgiving from the heart. When it comes to expressing true appreciation and thankfulness a small child often puts us to shame. When a little child suddenly looks up into his mother's face and says right out of his heart, "Mother, I love you," you know it is sincere.

We all do extol Thee, Thou leader triumphant and pray that Thou still our Defender wilt be, let Thy congregation escape tribulation, Thy name be every praise! O Lord, make us free!

HISTORY MESSAGE

America is a strong and powerful nation, but she must not forget God in her struggle to remain first. The path of history is strewn with nations who forgot God. One of the books of the Bible tells the story of God's children, His nation. Because they forgot him, they were captured and placed in bondage. Don't think that He does not have the power to do it again.

Every day is a new page in the book of life and it is our duty as a nation and as a person to put something new and beautiful there.

George Washington summed up this day as a time for "Devotion to the service of that great and glorious Being who is the most beneficent author of all that is good, of all that was good, and all the good that will be."

"GOD IS THERE

"When thy heart, with joy overflowing,
Sings a thankful prayer,
In thy joy, O let thy brother,
With thee share.
When the harvest sheaves ingathered
Fill thy barns with store.
To thy God, and to thy brother,
Give the more.
If thy soul with power uplifted
Yearns for glorious deed.
Give thy strength to serve thy
Brother in his need.
Share with him thy bread of blessing,
Sorrow's burdens share.
When thy heart enfolds a brother;
God is there."

THEODORE C. WILLIAMS.

U.N. Action in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, persons across the Nation are very disturbed by the action of the United Nations in the Congo and the role of the United States in backing this policy. This is expressed clearly in the following editorial from the January 8, 1963, Monterey Peninsula Herald. I know that the editor speaks for many and therefore include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

As the efficient, well led, superbly equipped United Nations soldiers, all of them professionals, shot their way through Katanga—

U Thant held his court and did his business in the United Nations building in New York;

President John F. Kennedy rocked in a chair as he discussed world affairs with his viziers as they were called from Washington to Palm Beach;

Nikita Khrushchev watched from the Kremlin with smug satisfaction as the only stronghold of independence, productivity and anticommunism in the Congo was bludgeoned to its knees.

So far as the U.N. military action was concerned, it may be summarized by the expression: "Like shooting fish in a bucket." The number of casualties will never be known, because neither the U.N. nor the United States, chief Western sponsor of the U.N. in Katanga, will let the truth be known.

The truth is that the highly trained professionals of the U.N. forces—Indians (mostly Ghurkas), Ethiopians, Ghanians, Irish, and Swedes—ran through the raw Katanga troops like a hot knife through butter. They had plenty of tanks, plenty of modern planes, plenty of artillery, and plenty of food, ammunition, and transportation.

Behind these fine troops were many millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayers' money.

These troops should have done well. They killed hundreds, more likely thousands of black people. They killed an unknown number of whites. They riddled two white women in a small automobile because unfortunately the car was caught in a crossfire. That, of course, is not true. There was no crossfire. A picture taken at the time proves that there was no crossfire. U.N. troops were simply shooting at everything that moved. Callous troops that don't give a damn for human life, especially where most human life is black, do that sort of thing.

The American people should feel deeply disturbed at this tragedy in Katanga.

Why do the people of Katanga hate Americans more than they hate the people who have been shooting them? Because they know that American policy and American money have uprooted their lives. For principle? That's for the funnypapers. It has been for loot.

Moise Tshombe could truthfully say this at an MPC forum in Monterey: "Gentle readers of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, you have been shooting a lot of people in Katanga by proxy, all of them innocent of having done any harm to you or to any Congolese outside of their borders. You've killed women and children with the fine weapons you have given the civilized troops that had already invaded my country and that had wanted to occupy all of it. You killed those Belgian women in a 'crossfire' that wasn't any crossfire because no one was firing back at the U.N. troops. You were urged by the great missionary, Albert Schweitzer, to let us alone. Why didn't you let us alone? * * *"

The reason why the U.N. did not let Katanga alone was that it wanted to loot Katanga.

The U.N. said that Katanga seceded, and U.S. State Department equivocators inferred that this was like the secession of States that marked the beginning of the U.S. Civil War.

Unfortunately for the American side, that is untruthful. Katanga was a province of the Belgian Congo, which was not at any time a state or an independent state, but which was a grouping of tribes put together by the Belgians for administrative purposes.

When the Belgians quit the country as colonial rulers rather than face civil disorders directed and financed by Soviet Russia, they turned the reins of government over to a pseudogovernment in which anarchy almost immediately prevailed.

The Katangan leaders refused to put their lives and the wealth of their province under the direction of the Leopoldville politicians, and their land under occupation by the troops of Leopoldville.

It is ridiculous to consider the tribes of the Stanleyville and Leopoldville areas to be

the fellow countrymen of the black tribes of Elisabethville. In fact it is unheard of.

Unfortunately for the Katangans, they had skills, jobs and resources. The U.N. wants these things incorporated into the Congo to make that sad country viable. And U Thant, Director General of the U.N. by virtue of the satisfaction he renders Soviet Russia, doesn't care how many blacks are killed to force the surrender of Katanga to the looters.

All of this wretched, morally degrading operation has been approved and egged on by the United States in order, it is said, "to keep the Russians out of the Congo." How many black people will we have to kill in order to keep the Russians out?

This folly, smeared with the blood of innocent people, is American folly. That is why the name American is the most hated name in Katanga; and Americans supporting such policies are hell-bent to make America the most hated name in Africa.

How do we get that way? Because we let ourselves be conditioned by the Soviets. Because we are playing like amateurs for the Afro-Asian vote in the U.N. Because our policy has been influenced by men like Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams, Presidential Adviser Chester Bowles, by half-ditched Adlai Stevenson, and by U Thant, whose most recent formal, prepared speech was an apology for the Communists and an attack on the free world.

What becomes of the character of a great country that tolerates, let alone supports, such an outrage?

A. G.

"Low-Road" Literature in Our Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appears in the present edition of Variety magazine. It was written by Mr. Lawrence J. Quirk, a nephew of Mr. James R. Quirk, the founder and editor of Photoplay. He is also the nephew of our late and beloved colleagues, William P. Connery, Jr., and Lawrence J. Connery who successively served so ably in the House from 1923 to 1941.

The Members of this body who so fondly recall the high principles upheld by both Billy and Larry Connery will be pleased to detect that the same moral characteristics and values of our former colleagues are manifested by their nephew. It gives credence to that old adage that "the fruit does not fall far from the tree".

The article is timely and its essence born of experience. The lesson is vital and revealing. Its challenge is great. Its commentary is alarming. Are we really exercising our duties as parents when we permit "low-road" literature to enter our homes.

The article follows:

Fan magazines have been under considerable fire in the last year or two. National magazines, newspaper columnists, the trade press, recent books on Hollywood—all have had a go at them.

The gist of the accusations seems to be that the fan magazines revel in rehashing current scandals about prominent film and television personalities, lending to their treatments a saccharinely mendacious and circusy tone.

Religious publications denounce them. Studio publicity executives hold them in contempt. Stars, allegedly unhappy over distorted quotes and tasteless story slants, duck interviews with them.

What is behind all this journalistic sound and fury?

There are currently some two dozen movie and television fan magazines with an estimated total circulation of 8 million. Motion Picture, Modern Screen, and Photoplay—the so-called big three, claim circulations of well over a million each. The remainder, some of them bimonthlies and quarterlies, trail with circulations averaging 250,000.

In the 1920's and early 1930's (some readers may be surprised to learn) the better fan magazines were highly respected and influential journalistic mediums with a predominantly adult readership. Today's readers are chiefly teenagers.

Thirty years ago, Photoplay, whose then editor-publisher, the late James R. Quirk, was known as the inventor of the fan magazine, led a field of about a dozen publications. Photoplay's then circulation, quite respectable for its time, was 500,000. Its nearest rival, Motion Picture, boasted a readership of several hundred thousand. The others, led by Picture Play, New Movie, and after 1930, Modern Screen, averaged 150,000 copies each per month. The total circulation of the fan magazines in 1932 hovered at about 3 million.

These 3 million constituted, however, a quality readership, an eager, adult public enthralled by the then fresh, novel and vital film medium. This public, especially that of Photoplay, sought information about all phases of movies, and tended to concern itself more with clean romance than with morbid sexual experience. Certainly it was at that time more enthralled by wholesome dreams and fine ideals than the later generation of readers, who sought sensational revelations and vicarious eroticism.

STRICTLY AURAL

There was no TV, of course, in those days, and radio had the drawback of being strictly an auditory medium. Movies, accordingly, enjoyed a monopoly on the attention of the entertainment-seeking public. The movie magazines of that time monopolized the field journalistically, for the newspapers and magazines on the national level were slow to accord space to a medium that was just beginning to develop its own peculiar literature and was only just commencing to engage the attention and respect of more intellectual folk.

As the 1930's advanced, however, the nationals and review weeklies began giving the movies more and more coverage, the adult film public began turning, especially after the tasteful James R. Quirk's death, from Photoplay to the metropolitan newspaper critics and review weeklies for advice as to what films were worth seeing, and for intelligent, informed information about picture people in general.

The fan magazines, which up to the midthirties had been feeding the public equal doses of romance and information content, found themselves accordingly at an impasse.

Photoplay and its rivals resolved this by lowering their cultural sights and aiming at younger, more impressionable audiences. They proceeded to cultivate the readership allegiance of these youngsters by providing them with romantic escapism and soapy, semifictionalized articles on stairs—to the gradual exclusion of more informational, analytical and documentary type material covering every aspect of films, and which Photoplay, especially, had formerly stressed.

The transformation was dramatic. Photoplay within a few years had regressed from a highly respected journal of the screen to a plaything for teenage girls. The other magazines followed suit. This debasement continued, with minor variations, from the midthirties to the midfifties when Confidential's gaudy success forced the fan magazines into still another "agonizing appraisal" based strictly on the dollar sign. For fan magazine editors and managers found to their consternation that the hitherto moneymaking saccharinities and escapist pipedreams were beginning to pall on their young readers.

In a desperate effort to retrieve a declining circulation and tap some of Confidential's ever-growing audience, the fan magazines began aping that publication's scandalous format, with, however, somewhat more caution and restraint than their high-flying model.

NATIONALS COMPETE

Once engaged on this cycle, however, they shortly found themselves vying with some of the franker, more incisive national magazines when it came to collecting their fair share of libel suits brought by enraged stars. In late 1960, Elizabeth Taylor and Eddie Fisher brought suit against seven fan books, the total damages asked being some $7 million.

In justice to the fan magazines, it must be stated that certain stars proceeded to forfeit popular sympathy by public carryings-on, leading to the suspicion that they secretly relished the lurid publicity that they sometimes publicly deplored.

Incongruously enough, the stars often rap the fan magazines for intensively briefing the public on scandals that these undisciplined, mercurial personalities bring on themselves becaus of untidy personal lives, which, being exhibitionists by nature, they have a compulsion to project on the public.

Some of these personalities, especially the ones who are slipping or have slipped, have even carried their essential hypocrisy to the point of instituting unjustified libel suits against fan magazines as a publicity gimmick, later quietly droping, or eeling out of, suits they know they can't win, once their specious publicity aims have been achieved.

Without unduly whitewashing the questionable taste of the fan magazines in some instances, it must be pointed out that they have often been treated with rank ingratitude by stars they helped to fame—stars who, once arrived, scorned the lowly fan magazines whose coverage they had once eagerly sought, and which had made them national names. Deploring highly personalized stories that they themselves had once eagerly cooperated in preparing, they belatedly found expedient to seek a dignified public image—often losing public favor in the process.

Most glaring current example of fan magazine bad taste, of course, is the frequent use of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy on fan covers, accompanied by often tasteless cover lines. The White House is reported increasingly irritated over the exploitation of the President's wife in this crass and infantile manner. The misuse of a noncinematic personality of exalted background and exemplary private life smacks of execrable taste and editorial desperation, and has caused a number of observers to ask if circulation chasing is superseding commonsense along fan mag row these days.

The current scene finds these 2 dozen fan magazines serving an audience that has changed vastly over the past three decades—an audience which they helped cultivate and whose tastes and intelligence they have often underestimated and insulted. But it

is also true that most of the teenagers who read these magazines are more concerned with romance and glamor and self-indulgence than with the culture and artistry of films.

The attempts of the fan magazine editors to mix the scented water of romantic mendacity with the murky oil of confidential-type (albeit watered-down) scandal has currently produced an uneasy, tightrope-walking editorial compromise between the two once successful formats. Still, as their healthy circulations attest, they have retained the loyalty and interest of their young readers. Chief reason: their constant and detailed and highly personalized coverage of young personalities that teenagers want to read about.

Studios consequently owe the fan magazines a considerable debt. For there is no denying that they have been more responsible than any other journalistic medium for the emergence of new young stars like Troy Donahue, Connie Stevens, and Vince Edwards.

Fan publications have invested these personalities with a glamorized, personalized (albeit often phony and overblown) public relations gloss that has no parallel since the old days when studio contract lists (now largely nonexistent) sustained mammoth publicity staffs who kept the public star conscious. The fan magazines are serving this function today—and doing no mean job of it.

Some analytical observers feel, however, that if this same loving attention and image fashioning were accorded more intelligent and talented younger players coming up, that the fan magazines would really be a first-class publicity outlet.

Since adult readers have now, it seems, permanently turned to other publications for their entertainment news, criticisms and personality profiles, and since the fan magazines still engage their young readers heavily, what, then, should their function be henceforth if they are to grope their way to some sensible medium between healthy circulations and editorial self-respect?

As one shrewd observer put it: "They can point a good moral for immature minds, sugar-coating it to order. They can subtly uphold right values for courtship, marriage, and later family life. And if you add to a basically moral content (and by "moral content" I don't mean preachy, antiseptic, puritanical Pollyannaism) the values of literacy, taste, originality, and liveliness (all geared, and stirred in, for teenage palates)—and above all, truth and commonsense, then fanmag editors might feel a greater sense of fulfillment and creativity than they have for 30 years now."

Will the fan maggers follow such wise advice? It is possible they may have to, and soon, for young people of the sixties are less easily hoodwinked.

Interview With Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark Over NBC Radio Network

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a portion of the transcript of an interview broadcast Sunday, January 6, on the NBC "Monitor" program, in which correspondent Russ Ward questioned Mr. Justice Tom Clark regarding the founding of our judicial system as we know it today. This was the first in a series of programs the NBC radio network is carrying, in cooperation with the Federal Bar Association, to help promote respect for the law and those who enforce it.

The interview, in part, follows:

Mr. WARD. Mr. Justice, we are often referred to as a nation of laws, not of men. Could you tell us what this means?

Mr. Justice CLARK. Well, that comes from the politics of Aristotle, which was simply that in any well-ordered community it is not man who should govern but law that should govern. Now, you notice I did not say laws, I said law, the singular law. And that is because, as they conceived it, and as we carry it out, man, once he has power, is apt to abuse that power. "Power begets power" is a phrase that is used. While the law is usually immutable.

Now, of course, there are those who say that the law is but, well, words and paper. That you have to have some hand, some sword in that hand, in order to carry it out. And that is true. But that hand and that sword are under the law, and that is the beauty of that phrase and of our system. As Theodore Roosevelt said: "No man is over the law; no man is below the law." And we ask no man when we come to enforce the law; we enforce it as it is written.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Justice, if the Bill of Rights were being drawn up today rather than 200 years ago would it include anything new or different? Is the Bill of Rights still the keystone to individual freedom in this country?

Mr. Justice CLARK. Well, I would say that the Bill of Rights is the primary source, the primary source of our freedoms. But in the body of the Constitution there are quite a few rights and privileges that are created that are most important. For example, the right of habeas corpus, one of our most sacred rights. Also the right of a jury in criminal cases. Separation of the powers of the Government. The dual federalism that we have between our State and our Federal system. But as far as changing the Bill of Rights, or whether it would be the same today if it were rewritten, I think that depends on the draftsmen.

Now the Chief Justice several years ago said that from the sources that came to him there was some doubt as to whether the Bill of Rights would be adopted if it were put to a popular vote today. And he said that because so few people had an understanding, a complete understanding, of just what is in the Bill of Rights or what the conception of the founders of our Government had when they wrote those words.

Now I think myself that there would not be too much change if they were rewritten today. Of course, there would be some, in order to get away from some of the concepts that they had at that time, such as every person has to be charged by indictment. Now we charge by information, and things like that, formal matters.

But I think where we fall down is in the improvement and development of public understanding of just what the Bill of Rights is and what it stands for, and just what our responsibilities are under it.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Justice, in the weeks ahead "Monitor" will be exploring in greater detail such Government departments as Treasury, Defense, Post Office, and others, to see how individual rights are protected. Would you say that we as individuals are overly dependent on the Federal Government? Or is this Federal regulation necessary in our increasingly complicated world?

Mr. Justice CLARK. Well, I rather think the former. I believe we are becoming more dependent upon our central or national government, and that is something that President Adams way back there abhorred. He said that that would possibly be a tendency, and he was prophetic when he said that.

I think it's been brought about possibly because of the great change that has come about in our national formation of our beliefs and our transportation and our communication and things like that.

Way back there, you know, we put more power, you might say, in rural communities. And, for example, the case that we handed down last year on reapportionment, you remember, out of Tennessee. It was shown there that for many years, over 60, these small communities had controlled, in fact had more power in legislative assemblies, than did the larger cities. And I think that the reason for this, you might say more control in Washington, is because the cities and the States have not taken advantage of their opportunities in grasping a problem and trying to solve it.

Now some of it is being caused by the fact that this failure at apportionment, their vision has not been as clear. The necessities of a large urban population have not been seen by the man who is representing a small community and who has a larger vote you might say than the urban community.

So I think as an answer to the problem is that the States and the cities have not sometimes had the money, sometimes they have not had the foresight. Sometimes they have not carried on their plans and programs as well, and so some of them would suggest why don't we get the Federal Government to help us out. And the first thing you know the Federal Government is in housing and all sorts of things of that type.

Now I am not saying that it should not be there at all. I think it has been a very healthful evolution. However, I am a firm believer in having as much government as possible at the local level, and that the National Government should only come in where it is necessary in order to make a cohesive whole of our national association that we have.

Award to Ronald Staffieri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the greatest natural resources of our Nation today are the youth of our country. As has been said many times before the young men and women now in our schools and colleges will be the future leaders of another era and upon their proper development depends the welfare of this great Nation of ours.

Thus I am extremely pleased to report to you on the activities of a young man; a constituent of mine; a resident of Bronx County and an outstanding student. His name is Ronald Staffieri and he resides at 1019 East 179th Street, Bronx, N.Y. This young man is an advanced-class student at the School of Visual Arts in New York City. He is to graduate this June. In addition to this, he is active in community affairs so that he is now a captain in the Washington Grey's Cadets whose headquarters are in the King's Bridge Armory, also in my district. He has risen from a cadet in

8 years to the position of captain. This group of young men drill weekly and learn not only the discipline of the military but how to become good citizens for the future.

Last November Ronald was the recipient of an award from the National Committee on Employment of Youth for his outstanding cover design for that organization's magazine American Child. I congratulate Ronald for his accomplishments to date and I extend my congratulations to his fine family as well. I am certain that in future years Ronald Staffieri will make an excellent contribution to the well-being of his community, his State and his country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the press release wherein Ronald was named the winner of the National Committee on Employment of Youth contest:

Nineteen-year-old Ronald Staffieri shows his award-winning cover design to Eli E. Cohen, executive secretary of the National Committee on Employment of Youth. The cover is for National Committee on Employment of Youth's magazine, American Child. It was judged best of a selection submitted by advanced-class students at the School of Visual Arts in New York City. Ronald hails from the Bronx, where he majored in commercial art at Dodge Vocational High School.

Interestingly, the first issue of American Child using Ronald's cover is on the theme "Automation: Outlook for Youth." According to Mr. Cohen, Ronald is in the rare group of young people today whose working future will not be complicated by advancing technology. No machine has yet been invented that can design a cover, write a poem, or take over any of the creative arts. "But," said Mr. Cohen, "most other youngsters will indeed have to consider the dynamic changes ahead in planning their futures." To help them keep pace, Mr. Cohen urged an immediate and vast improvement in counseling and vocational training programs, as well as increased research and information on the occupations and training needs of tomorrow's labor market.

Honorary Citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 the opening day of the 88th Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 109, authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America. As the son of an American mother and an English father, Winston Churchill, more than any other, truly epitomizes the union between the two great English-speaking peoples. His courage and devotion to the cause of freedom and human dignity have served to challenge and inspire our Nation as well as his own to victory in war and to achievement in peace.

The gift of honorary citizenship of the United States of America is one honor, one token of rare esteem and love which is within this Nation's power to bestow, and which is worthy of Winston Churchill's place in history. It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will move swiftly to get the joint resolution to the floor where I believe it will meet with unanimous approval.

The Washington Post carried an editorial on January 9 endorsing citizenship for Sir Winston and also a letter to the editor from Miss Kay Halle of Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, to whom much credit must be given for making the suggestion that we honor Sir Winston Churchill in this way. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial and Miss Halle's letter as part of my remarks. The editorial and letter follow:

CITIZEN CHURCHILL

The Congress of the United States, which gathers in Washington today, can demonstrate in a thousand ways and by a hundred legislative acts, the power and wisdom and virtue of what has become beyond all doubt the world's greatest legislative body. These demonstrations will not startle or amaze a world grown accustomed to the might and authority of this august assembly of the chosen representatives of the world's foremost republic.

There is one way, which all may hope it will not neglect, of demonstrating besides, its subtle, sensitive and perceptive appreciation of those mysterious forces above the ordinary objects of legislation. There is one action by which it can show how truly it reflects the sentiment, the gratitude, and the understanding of the American people. There is one way of demonstrating to the world that representative government is moved by impulses rising in the hearts of common people, springing from their instincts of generosity and affection, and having nothing to do with the expectation of future gain. There is one means by which it can stir in our minds old memories and in our hearts new hopes.

This Congress should swiftly move, by appropriate legislation, to confer American citizenship upon the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill. Such legislation, to be sure, will only affirm in the law what already prevails in the essence of things, but it will be an affirmation that will brighten the twilight that slowly gathers about the aged man whose inspired union of noble words and great deeds was our salvation and solace in dreadful days.

Only once before, in the case of Lafayette, has Congress been moved to this unique expression of national sentiment. It is the most appropriate gift and token that it is within its power to convey and the one that more than any other symbolizes the warmth and affection and reverence that a grateful people feels toward a noble friend.

It is such a gift as we may safely think will inspire the aged hero to turn once more toward the West, to murmur again the magic lines of Arthur Hugh Clough with which he lifted Great Britain from despair in the darkest days of the war:

"And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright."

ONE OF US

When Sir Winston Churchill cut into his 15-pound birthday cake last November celebrating his 88 years, he found the most heartfelt of his memorable utterances inscribed on its icing. "I am an English speaking union." One of his proudest boasts is, "Among Englishmen I have a special qualification, I am directly descended through my mother from an officer who served in Washington's Army. And as such I have been made a member of your strictly selected Society of the Cincinnati. I have my pedigree supported by affidavits at every stage if it is challenged * * * I feel on both sides of the Atlantic. In my mother's birth city of Rochester, N.Y., I hold the latch key to American hearts."

Not long ago I spent a day with Sir Winston at his beloved Chartwell in the beautiful countryside of Kent. During lunch I watched him rise from the anesthesia of his great age, lift his glass of hock and propose a "toast to the good health of your leader and ours." He spoke often that day of "undying fraternal association of your great country and mine." He said that if we are together nothing is impossible as a special relationship exists between the British Commonwealth and the United States. He mused on the eventuality of common citizenship but was "content to leave that to destiny whose outstretched arm so many of us can clearly see. I feel eventually this will come."

The 88th Congress has just begun. It could perform no more rewarding or auspicious first act than to pass with unanimity Senate Joint Resolution 215 already introduced into the Senate by Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat, and House Joint Resolution 866 by Congresswoman FRANCES BOLTON, Republican, into the House proposing honorary American citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill.

Some might consider this setting a precedent. If it were anyone but Sir Winston the point could be argued. Sir Winston is a precedent. Once before we so honored a Frenchman, the Marquis de Lafayette who fought by our side to help us win freedom. There is little time to lose if we are to make one of the greatest of our blood brothers, Sir Winston Churchill, truly one of us.

KAY HALLE.

WASHINGTON.

Another U.S. Installation Goes South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that the State of Illinois has something of everythng, yet it ranks 50th among the States in return of money from the Federal Government. Federal funds Federal projects, and Federal installations have an amazing habit of going over, under and around to everybody but us. The biggest economic barrier this State faces is the draining off of its wealth by the Federal Government while such funds go pouring into the economies of other States.

The Government is about to launch a new rocket test center costing $500 million for construction alone, not to mention the sums that will continue to go for its operation. Once again, the funds are not going to Illinois, but from Illinois, and not borrowed money but real cash. Where is it going? Right smack in the same State where the Federal

Government has been defied and the Governor himself is under Federal charges. We no not believe in pork-barrel politics. We do not believe in doling out projects on the basis of political favoritism. But when folks in Illinois are good for nothing except paying more taxes than almost anybody else, it is time something was done by way of self-protection.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star under date of January 11, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ANOTHER U.S. INSTALLATION GOES SOUTH

The United States is about to launch a whole new rocket test center. It will involve pouring into the State concerned $500 million for construction alone, not to mention the sums of Federal money that will flow there constantly for its operation.

Where is this money going do you suppose? To the great State of Mississippi.

Here in the North, the Federal Government makes a big to-do about forcing integration in the South by means of troops, contract rules, housing moneys, and so on. By golly, you can't borrow Federal money to build segregated housing. This sounds good to the Negro vote districts of Chicago and New York, presumably.

But when it comes to pouring in real money, not borrowed, on a fantastic scale, where does Uncle put it? Right smack in the same State where Federal marshals and Federal troops and Federal courts have been defied, and the Governor himself is under Federal charges.

All the strokes of the pen made to bring economic pressure on the State of Mississippi are wiped out and more by bestowing upon them half a billion of our dollars, outright—for a start.

It looks as if somebody is playing both ends against the middle.

And you know who is in the middle—we folks in Illinois, who Washington obviously figures are good for nothing except paying more taxes than almost anybody else.

National Bargain: The FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, if any reminder is needed with respect to the efficient operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the distinguished leadership of its Director, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, such a reminder is provided by issuance of the Bureau's latest annual report.

A well-merited tribute is paid to the FBI and Mr. Hoover in connection with this annual report in an editorial appearing in the January 2 Detroit Free Press.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the editorial:

NATIONAL BARGAIN: THE FBI

The annual report of the FBI has come along and, as in previous years, leads us to conclude that the agents who work under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover put out more energy than anybody else on the Federal payroll.

There is the never ceasing war against the Communists, whose endeavors in this country have been augmented in the past year by the Cuban situation.

As Mr. Hoover puts it in his report, "During even the most critical moments of the Cuban crisis, the party openly proved its loyalty to the international Communist cause. Its members stood unwaveringly opposed to our country's efforts to stop the Soviet Union's buildup of offensive military equipment in Cuba and to assure the removal of weapons already there."

Then there was the need to inquire into civil rights violations aimed at dissuading southern Negroes from voting. Identification work had to be done at scenes of disaster, including one airliner tragedy in France. FBI men assisted at more than 3,600 police schools, and gave instruction to police officers at the FBI's academy.

Felonies in violation of the Federal bank robbery and incidental crimes statute had a boom year, with 25 percent more investigated than in 1961.

With all this work to be done, and with the job done so well, the United States can well afford to lay out the money it costs to keep the FBI running.

But the fact is that the FBI costs American society nothing. Instead, it brings in a profit. The organization's operating appropriation is considerably less than the fines and recoveries its work produces.

This year the FBI's getback was over $200 million, which is even higher than the figure we hailed a year ago. In 1961 it was $148,421,690.

With a government so open to accusations of waste and inefficiency, it's greatly satisfying to read Mr. Hoover's report. The taxpayer gets his money's worth from the FBI, and no doubt about it.

A Resolution To Establish a House Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in reintroducing my resolution to establish a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, I must point out that one more country has been added to the list of captive nations since I introduced similar legislation a year and a half ago.

Cuba must be regarded as a captive nation. We have seen firsthand what has happened to the Cuban people under Communist tyranny—the heartache, the loss of liberty and property. Some have even sacrificed their lives. It should serve to remind us of the obligations we have to them and to enslaved peoples everywhere to aid in all practicable ways in their quest for freedom.

The Congress has a special responsibility to provide leadership in this vital freedom movement. And it must be more than mere lipservice in the form of resolutions and declarations and observances. It must take the form of action.

The purpose of a Committee on the Captive Nations would be to conduct inquiry into and to study satellite countries and captive non-Russian nations to help them to regain their national and individual freedoms.

In faith the people of the captive nations of the world are looking to the United States for guidance. In giving it, let us never forget that the future of the free world is linked with the future of these captive nations.

It is my conviction that a congressional committee devoting itself to the study and recommendation of ways to further promote a peaceful offensive in the cold war would contribute tremendously to the prosecution of the cold war and to ultimate—and necessary—victory.

REA Mailing Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Glasford Gazette, one of the many rural weeklies in my district, can always be counted upon to have an excellent editorial in each issue.

In the December 6, 1962, issue, the front page of the paper contained an outspoken editorial on one aspect of the REA program which has not received a great deal of attention to date.

Along with many other critical comments concerning this power hungry agency which will be forthcoming in this session, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to this article. The editorial follows:

UNJUSTIFIED KID GLOVES

One of the difficult domestic problems with which the last Congress wrestled was the huge post-office deficit. The result was a postal service bill creating increases in various classifications of mail rates. Newspapers, for example, will pay three 10-percent increases with the first to take effect on the first day of the coming year.

However, Congress wore kid gloves when it came to publications of the rural electric cooperatives. Formerly, according to Editor and Publisher, these publications paid a one-half-cent rate. The new bill gives them a special rate of about one-eighth of 1 cent per copy.

The general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association states that there is "no justification for this special privilege." Another comment says, "so REA groups will now be able to enjoy a financial advantage which for propagandizing against their prime target, the investor-owned private power industry. Meanwhile, the publications of the private power industry will be compelled to pay the regular rates to tell their side of the story."

There are 28 REA publications. Their circulation is about 3 million. They carry advertising. They are all actually engaged in attempting to extend the REA scheme. And no one can say the REA co-ops, or anything connected with them, are poor and struggling enterprises in need of special help. The REA movement is big business—and it is a big business conducted with Government loans at below-cost interest rates, plus other special privileges, including tax

advantages, which are denied to private enterprise.

The least one can ask is that the REA co-ops operate on precisely the same basis as do comparable utilities in the production and distribution of electric power. This means paying the same costs—whether those costs be taxes, interest rates on borrowed money, or the mail charges on their publications. This country's rural electrification problem was solved long ago—more than 95 percent of all farms are using central station power or have it available. There once was but is no longer an excuse for giving the co-ops special privileges.

Asbury Theological Seminary Inaugurates New President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I wish to incorporate herein an editorial appearing in the Lexington Herald, under date of October 19, 1962, relating to the inauguration of a new president at the Asbury Theological Seminary, which is located in my congressional district.

The growth which the institution has enjoyed over the years speaks for the ability and dedication of its leaders.

Under Mr. Frank Bateman Stanger, Sr., the new president, I have no hesitancy in stating that the seminary may look forward to a continuation of the outstanding leadership which it has enjoyed over the years.

The editorial follows:

GROWING THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY INAUGURATES ITS NEW PRESIDENT

Asbury Theological Seminary, which in its 39 years has sent its graduates to pulpits throughout the country and mission fields around the world, has inaugurated a new president. Dr. Frank Bateman Stanger, Sr., who has filled the presidency since last May, was formally inaugurated the seminary's third president last week. He succeeded Dr. Julian C. McPheeters, who now is heading the school's 5-year expansion program.

Founded in 1923 by the late Dr. Henry Clay Morrison, Asbury Theological Seminary by 1942 had 89 students, four professors and one building. It now has grown to a student body of 300, a faculty of 22, five major buildings, an annual budget of more than a half million dollars and an endowment of $5 million, and the expansion program already has made possible the planning of other buildings.

Dr. Stanger, a graduate of Asbury College, Princeton University, and Temple University and for 25 years a Methodist pastor, called attention in his inaugural address to the theological tenets of the interdenominational seminary he heads.

"This is a seminary with a confessional theology," he said. "We hold firmly to the basic beliefs of historical evangelical Christianity. We believe in the full inspiration and absolute authority of the Word of God. We affirm a trinitarian view of God."

He spoke, too, to the necessity for training the ministers of today for the "new society," the modern world in which they serve. "Theology, to be useful, must speak to the contemporary situation," he stated. "But even then, theology is not the chief thing. Jesus Christ is. Therefore, theology must interpret Jesus Christ to each generation."

The Leader extends its congratulations to Dr. Stanger and its sincere wishes for his success and his school's continued growth.

The New Bronx Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 last, in Bronx County, there was officially dedicated the new Bronx post office, a completely separate facility for the use of the citizens of Bronx County. I was a participant at these dedication ceremonies and took pardonable pride in the fact that the creation of this post office was in a large measure due to my efforts over the years to obtain this badly needed public facility for the residents of Bronx County. The dedication ceremonies were impressive and among those present were such distinguished citizens as the former Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable James A. Farley, the present Assistant Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Frederick C. Belen, along with the Honorable Sean P. Keating, regional director of the New York region of the Post Office Department. In addition to these present and former postal officials there was also present the president of the Bronx Board of Trade and an outstanding Bronxite, Donald Darcy. The invocation was delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Bernard J. Fleming, principal of Cardinal Hayes High School and the benediction was pronounced by Rev. William J. Kalaidjian, pastor of the Bedford Park Congregational Church. The present postmaster for the new Bronx County post office, the Honorable Louis Cohen, pointed out in a few short sentences how important and how needed this new agency would be when in the course of his remarks he stated that this office would handle over 2 million pieces of mail daily and do more than $12 million worth of business a year.

I have always been proud of the fact that I have been a lifelong resident of one of the finest communities in the country, Bronx County, and I was deeply proud to participate in these ceremonies on January 5, both as a citizen of that community and as a Representative in Congress from Bronx County.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an excellent editorial from the Bronx Press-Review, of January 10, 1963.

THE BRONX POST OFFICE IS ESTABLISHED

An important and historic move was celebrated on Saturday, when the establishment of a Bronx general post office was celebrated in the former Bronx Central Annex post office.

Ceremonies signaled the start of a separate post office for the Bronx, which formerly had been serviced through the New York, N.Y., general post office in Manhattan.

Under the direction of Postmaster Louis Cohen, the Bronx post office will manage its own affairs, routing 2 million pieces of mail a day, at a total business level of $12 million annually.

The dignity and importance of the Bronx deserved such a move. Even more, it made good commonsense in terms of service and economies, to have the Bronx handle its own mail directly instead of transshipping it through the downtown general post office.

This piece of status building of the Bronx comes at a time when the whole direction of government is toward a centralization that has some objectionable features. The office of the borough president just last week suffered certain diminutions under charter reform. Added efficiency and administrative shortcuts are good in metropolitan and megapolitan areas, to be sure, but the sustenance of local pride and identity is being overlooked in the process.

We're glad that the new post office for the Bronx not only brings to us an activity that rightfully belongs here, but that in the midst of all of the talk of centralization it is recognized that this exception in decentralization is recognized as being impelled by indices of efficiency.

Pay of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from L. R. Heron, commander, U.S. Navy, retired, clearly, unselfishly, and objectively sets forth pay and related problems of the military. I commend it to my colleagues:

VENTURA, CALIF.,
January 2, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention, my views on the matter of proposed increases in military pay, which I understand will be considered during the forthcoming session of the Congress, together with the related matter of military exchanges and commissaries, the continuation of which is again being attacked by powerful nonmilitary pressure groups.

Although the Department of Defense recommendations to the Congress have not been made public, considerable data in this connection has been printed in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, which is normally both accurate and authoritative.

With respect to the pay measure, it is understood that the traditional tie-in between active duty and retired pay may be ignored in the recommendations. With respect to the issue of exchanges and commissaries, it is understood that the Department of Defense is not unsympathetic to the idea of imposing further stringent restrictions on the operation of these.

I must emphasize at the outset that my protests are not generated because of selfish reasons. As a highly trained engineering specialist in the Navy, I found it not too difficult to obtain a very satisfying and lucrative engineering position in industry upon my retirement. Consequently, the 1 percent per annum cost-of-living increase which

may be suggested by DOD, amounting to $4 per month in my own case, would have little effect on my standard of living, neither would the $95 per month realizable if my retired pay were based on the to-be-suggested active duty scale for an officer of my grade make substantial difference, however pleasant the increase might be.

I am vitally concerned for those of my colleagues possessing no such technical skills, for those who retire at an age when a transition into a civilian position is difficult, if not impossible, and, equally important, to the effect on young career officers now in service, or the future recruitment of such officers, in the face of the ever-continuing whittling away of service fringe benefits.

It is a matter of practical fact that reasonable increases in military pay are essential to the national security, to insure retention of the type of people necessary to operate and maintain the incredibly complex weapons in use today, and the services are not altogether successful in retaining, let alone obtaining, such personnel. I am not amused when I reflect that junior civilian engineers now working for me earn about 10 percent more than I did as an active duty commander in charge of 2 200 personnel at the time of my retirement in 1958. Company paid health and life insurance benefits, plus noncontributory retirements benefits equal, or in most cases exceed, those offered by the service. Per diem, payment of actual movement costs and realistic relocation allowances, and similar benefits, more than offset the lack of exchange and commissary privilges which accrue only to the military.

As a consequence, the armed services today attract two types of personnel, the highly dedicated and the mediocre or incompetent.

We do, fortunately, have many, many dedicated personnel in the services, who, as one senior officer said a few years ago, "live on in genteel poverty, moderately indifferent to money."

The many inconveniences and the general instability in family life experienced by service families are too well known to recount them. Their income is in the middle to low group, so along with the instability, they must forgo many of the conveniences available to their civilian contemporaries. In spite of this, most prefer to stay with the services, although many weaken in the face of the constant whittling away at fringe benefits and most particularly, as the result of broken promises.

The tangible values of fringe benefits are highly touted by officer and enlisted procurement officers, and equally acclaimed, if not overstated by officials of the Department of Defense. Typical examples of benefits which are fast disappearing are:

1. Post exchanges and commissary stores: These are now no more than simple conveniences as a result of restrictions imposed in recent years. Severe limitations are placed on the type of item that may be stocked, and in many areas, chainstore operators actually provide such items to the civilian population at substantially lower costs. Only on such staples as fresh milk, bread, and the like, are any real savings realized. To impose further restrictions at the bidding of selfish pressure groups would be tragic.

2. Medical care: Despite medicare, the medical care available to military personnel, more particularly to their dependents, is very poor, except in certain selected areas, simply because facilities and medical officers are lacking or do not exist. Retired personnel are in a few cases treated very well, but only at the expense of active-duty personnel, but in most cases, receive very shabby treatment because of the shortages which exist. (In our area, Port Mugu has only 4 medical officers for some 5,000 military and civilian personnel, and for 7,500 military, civilian, and dependent personnel, Port Hueneme has only twice that number.) As a result of this, many active-duty and retired personnel are literally forced into paying for medical care out of pocket. Thus, promised medical care during active duty and upon retirement is a paper promise which often cannot be met.

3. Retirement opportunities: In the case of officers, conflict-of-interest legislation, interpretations by the Comptroller General, and so forth, impose serious restrictions on employment of retirees. As the result of accusations by certain Members of Congress, action by the executive department at the behest of pressure groups, individuals with years of service in honorable careers find themselves accused of perfidious conduct, and many employers discourage hiring them out of concern for the possible trouble their presence will generate. Employment opportunities are decreasing as the number of retirees increase. The real estate, securities, and insurance fields are glutted, and few qualify to be teachers. As a result, more and more retirees are forced to live primarily off retired income, supplementing this as best they can. Failure of the pre-1958 retirees to receive pay equalization that year is now to be further complicated by the offensively low suggestion of 1 percent per annum cost-of-living increase, although it is hoped that there will be an adjustment for some to the 1958 scale.

Realistically, substantial pay increases for the ever-increasing number of retirees could be fiscally unsound for the Nation—yet all concerned were promised the tie-in between active-duty and retired pay. Some form of contributory retirement may be desirable for the future to insure economically sound programs. Resorting to a 1-percent-a-year increase is not the answer, and may have retirees looking forward to the drab existence of pensioners.

I would like to believe my statements are truly representative of the situation which exists today. Although retired, I am based at Port Mugu for my company, live with the military, understand their problems, and of course, as a retiree, have firsthand experience with the problems in this area. The local commands do all they can to help, but they have limitations imposed by higher authority.

After reviewing the foregoing, I hope you may find it possible to support all or part of my viewpoint in the Congress, and to call the contents of this letter to the attention of your colleagues.

Your consideration and cooperation will be much appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

L. R. HERON,
Commander, U.S. Navy (Retired).

The Seeds of Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the moves toward greater government domination of our lives are the seeds of fascism, Curtis Boeder, editor of the Arlington (Minn.) Enterprise warns us in an editorial which so impressed me that I include it, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the RECORD. Truly we must be on guard if our free institutions are to survive.

The editorial follows:

THE SEEDS OF FASCISM

Some thoughtful people have expressed a fear that a form of fascism may, in time, reach power in this country. If it ever does, it will be the evolutionary consummation of a trend which has been subtly and insidiously undermining free institutions for many years.

The matter is not an easy one to discuss with any precision. For one thing, the meaning of words often tends to blur, and the problems and situations they are intended to describe often lose contrast. One totalitarian state—whether it be called Fascist, Communist, or anything else—is very much like another in its fundamentals.

That aside, the causes of fascism, and the tools which are used to create it, are spotlighted by history. The technique is to bring about a marriage of the instruments of power in a nation—its government, its industries, and its labor in cases where the unions are strong and yield vast influence. The ambitious leader uses these instruments with utmost care—and the utmost cynicism—to achieve his purposes. He woos industry, by convincing it that by going along with him it will achieve an advantage over labor. And he woos labor with precisely the same siren song in reverse.

The stage is set for fascism—or totalitarianism of any kind—when the resources of a nation become overly dependent on its government. And, certainly, we have moved far in that direction. The Government is the principal customer of many huge companies. Beyond that, Government, by its laws and regulations, its bureaucracies, its thousand and one departments and agencies, and its own business operations, plays a dominant role in the life of the Nation that would have seemed both impossible and intolerable even half a century ago.

Wars—hot and cold, past, present, and possible—have been enormous forces in producing this trend. A $50-odd-billion defense budget alone is a continuing threat to fundamental liberties. All we can do about this is to minimize that threat in every way possible, by working to prevent government domination of our lives in every area where the national security does not clearly demand it.

Beyond this, the Fascist danger lies in areas which have no connection with our safety in a chaotic world. These areas we describe with a general term—the welfare state. This, carried to its logical conclusion, is a state in which government is all things to all men, offering a dubious cradle-to-the-grave security. The cost in dollars—tax dollars—is exceeded only by the costs in loss of liberty, self-reliance, and individual pride and responsibility.

So the seeds of totalitarianism exist. Only an informed and determined public, dedicated like its forebears to the principles of freedom, can make sure that they will not sprout into choking weeds.

The FBI: Where Would We Be Without It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has an enviable record in its service to the citizens of the United

States. The Hartford Courant, of January 4, 1963, has pointed this out in an editorial that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. I submit it herewith:

THE FBI REPORTS

Among the more interesting recapitulations of the old year is the statistical statement of the FBI showing an increased activity in almost every phase of its work. J. Edgar Hoover calls particular attention to the sharp increase in bank robberies. "An average of 100 robberies, burglaries, and larcenies of banks and other financial institutions covered by statute have been reported to the FBI each month this year," Mr. Hoover reports. This represents better than three a day, and is an increase of more than 25 percent over the previous year.

As usual the FBI has during the year dealt with a wide variety of malefactors ranging from murderers to spies and saboteurs. One of the more spectacular feats was the arrest of the Cuban gang, complete with their arsenal, before they set out on their mission of destruction and terror. The FBI has assumed an extra load because of the civil-rights conflict in the South, and has spent much time and energy tracking down the church burners in that section.

The figures of the report are staggering. More than 1,400 fugitives were apprehended, and 12,700 convictions were obtained. Fines amounting to more than $200,000 were assessed, compared with $148,000 last year. Another feat was the recovery of 19,000 stolen automobiles under the Interstate Transportation Act.

This, of course, represents only the highlights. The day in and out work of laboratory testing, identification in tragedy as well as crime, the local and regional police schools are all integral parts of this picture. Perhaps Mr. Hoover's greatest achievement is the fact that he has built up this tremendous organization without ever letting it become one that treads on civil rights. Instead the FBI is respected and admired, as a matter of national pride and satisfaction. Don't know what we could do without it.

America's Basic Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of our former colleague, Hon. John H. Ray of New York, I am pleased to present an address delivered by a distinguished rabbi, who has been a faithful shepherd of his flock and who, by his wisdom and erudition, educated parishioners in his temple in the ways of peace and righteousness. This message, delivered by Rabbi Charles E. Shulman, of the Riverdale Temple, New York City, before the covenant breakfast at Staten Island, N.Y., on December 9, 1962, is as inspiring as it is appealing to the human heart. The address follows:

AMERICA'S BASIC RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, this breakfast attended by hundreds of men and women of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths is a significant testimony to the validity of the process of American democracy. It could not happen on the scale manifest here in other lands because the United States, being an amalgamation of different racial stocks, religions, and nationalities under one flag, has long pointed the way to countries more rigid in social living than this country and far less spontaneous in friendly recognition and respect for differences than societies in other parts of the world. This is the 17th year that these breakfasts have been held in the Staten Island community, and in that time awards have been given impartially to Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish citizens, colored and white alike, who served this community with distinction. On this occasion you are honoring Thomas Ryan, an outstanding Catholic layman who has contributed unselfishly and nobly to the welfare of your borough on so many occasions with his heart, his spirit, and his means. He richly deserves the honor you are bestowing upon him, and his family gathered together with us this morning may be justly proud of him as we all are for his meritorious display of citizenship in your midst.

I might add that I would consider it a great compliment if his little daughter Gina applauded my remarks as vigorously as she did her daddy's just a few minutes ago when he acknowledged the B'nai B'rith Award to him for the year 1962. It is this type of citizenship embracing a total community rather than a particular sect or church or organization which makes America a unique nation among the nations of the world. We have our faults. We have our unsolved problems. But when we Americans live up to our potentialities as a free people we display the human values that ofttimes bring us the admiration and the envy of those not so fortunate as we are to breathe the air of freedom daily.

There are lands in our contemporary international society where people would gladly change their vaunted material possessions for the intangible values under freedom which are ours—inalienable and enduringly so as long as this Republic lasts.

Communist dictatorships in Russia, China, and the satellite countries never tire of boasting that the future belongs to them, and not to the democratic lands. But nothing in their program—neither their achievements in space nor their efficiency in controlling the channels of public communication—substantiate their claims. In fact, we have many stories that seem to indicate the reverse of their public boasts and show that they are far less secure in their hold on the people than they would have the world believe. One of those stories concerns the party boss of one of the Communist satellite countries who was making a tour of the State institutions with his secretary. They came to an orphanage. The secretary asked the head of the institution how much was allocated daily for the care of each child. "Ten zlotys," was the reply. "Cut the amount in half," the secretary ordered the official. They visited a prison. The secretary asked the warden how much was allocated daily for the prisoners. "Six zlotys per prisoner," was the reply. "Make it 25 zlotys," he secretary ordered. The party boss called the secretary aside and whispered to him: "Are you insane? You reduce the care of each child in the orphanage and you raise enormously the sum for each prisoner. Why do you do this?" "I know what I'm doing," the secretary answered, "I'm looking out for our future. And it isn't going to be spent in an orphanage."

America is still growing despite our shortcomings. Next year is the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address recalling to his fellowmen the dignity of their heritage stemming from the American Declaration of Independence. The unfinished tasks of our democracy will be fulfilled as we grow to a greater understanding of the basic rights inherent in our citizenship. These rights have never been absent in our national existence. Were they ever to be lost sight of by Americans, serious harm would befall our way of life. It is good on such civic occasions as these to recall the principles which draw the allegiance and respect of every generation of Americans.

I. THE RIGHT TO BE DIFFERENT

America is essentially a nation of differences, differences of religion and ethnic patterns, differences of sectional thinking as reflected in the Halls of our Congress in Washington, differences in economic views and social views and educational views. Yet it is a remarkable fact that all these differences are harmonized in both war and peace in our land. In war the call to the colors to protect and defend our Nation from external foes brings every stratum of our society into uniform. But the differences in background and culture are not lost even in the military organizations in time of war. I recall my service as chaplain in the U.S. Navy in the Second World War. Both here in this country and in the far reaches of the South Pacific Islands where I was on the staff of the commander of our 7th Fleet, religious services for every religious denomination proceeded apace on the sacred days of worship without let or hindrance. Through them each American boy was enabled to find his own social and religious outlet in company with his own. And in peacetime life of our Nation it would be difficult to match the example of differences of origin and nationality with those say of a Notre Dame football team whose names cover ancestries from many lands of the world.

II. THE RIGHT OF OPPORTUNITY

One of the wonderful gifts which America offers its people is the chance to advance in life. The Horatio Alger society which represents every section of our country is an interesting illustration of the march from rags to riches. Here in this very audience in Staten Island citizens are many examples of people who have climbed the ladder of life from humble beginnings. Your guest of honor today and his family earned their present status not through inheritance but through taking advantage of the American opportunity and working hard to achieve the rewards of honest industry. In contrast to people in other countries, each individual here has the equality of opportunity. Each can make his life what he wishes it to be. The stories of our immigrants are legendary in the unfolding of their accomplishments. A refugee from European tyranny comes to our country only 25 years ago, and in that short span develops a sewing machine industry to fantastic proportions.

A Jew by the name of Albert Einstein, forced to leave the European continent by German intolerance, finds a new home here and gives America the secret of atomic energy. The illustrations can be multiplied indefinitely to cover every walk of life. Few have expressed the quality of American opportunity better than a former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, who said:

"I have traveled the world over. Every homecoming was for me a reaffirmation of the glory of America.

"Each time my soul was washed away from the relief of grinding poverty of other nations by the greater kindliness and frankness which comes from the acceptance of equality and the wide-open opportunity to all who want a chance. It's more than that. It's a land of self-respect born of free men. I have had every honor to which any man could aspire. There is no place this whole earth except here in America where the sons of man can have their chance in life that has come to him * * * The mention of the word 'America' flows from one perfect source. Within the soul of America is freedom of mind and spirit. They alone are the open windows through which pours the sunlight

of human spirit. Here alone is human dignity, not a dream but an accomplishment. Perhaps it is not perfect. But it is more full of its realization here than in any other place in the world."

III. THE RIGHT TO DIGNITY

The greatest value of American citizenship is its dignity. No matter how great the wealth or power, how comfortable the existence, how successful the enterprise, if a man is not granted his dignity as a human being, as a child of God, he is incomplete and he suffers the status of inferiority of both position in life and citizenship. Our problem with regard to opportunity for the Negro is difficult because we fail to measure it in terms of human dignity. This is why we often lack understanding of what the Negro wants. He is not satisfied solely with opportunity to be on a material footing with his neighbors. Nor is he satisfied with equal but separate facilities for his growing children in the schools. He knows that money cannot buy respect. And he has long realized what the U.S. Supreme Court enunciated so clearly in 1954 that when children are educated under conditions which keep them apart from their neighbors' children they grow up strangers in their own environment. When a member of the Senate of the United States expresses a personal opinion while on a visit to Africa that no black person on the African continent has made progress in terms of Western civilization except under the guidance of Europeans he conveniently overlooks the fact that for over three-quarters of a century when the Belgians ruled over the Congo they never permitted a black person, no matter what his education and intelligence, to hold a higher officer rating than a sergeant in the Congolese Army.

Given the opportunity there is no reason why colored people cannot achieve any status in life comparable to white people. The trouble is that we are often blinded by a priori judgments which render us incapable of granting others the capacities we own. The Negro poet, James Weldon Johnson, in his lines "We to America" challenged us to answer his questions:

"How would you have us? As we are
Or sinking neath the load we bear?
Our eyes forward on a star?
Or gazing empty at despair?

"Rising or falling? Men or things?
With dragging pace? Or footsteps fleet?
Strong, wiling sinews in your wings?
Or tightening chains about your feet?"

The colored people in our country are, in essence, saying to us: For over 300 years we helped to light the fire of American life. All we wish is to be permitted to warm our hands beside that fire.

Here in this audience representing a cross-section of an American community we rehearse the American values as they are demonstrated in the respect we show for the basic rights which distinguish American life and give it such a high position among the peoples of the world—the right to be different, the right of equality of opportunity to make our lives worthy of our years and the right to the dignity of a human being, Jew or Christian, black or white, as a child of God. We have not always shown our capacity to advance these rights. But as citizens we are conscious of their presence or absence in our lives because they are the foundations of our national life. With them democracy flourishes. Without them democracy dies. No matter how far we may be from our goal we have never lost sight of it. As the Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy, has told us:

"It is an unfinished society that we offer the world, a society that is forever committed to change, to improvement and to growth, that will never stagnate in the certitudes of ideologies, or the finalities of dogma. A hundred years from now there will be new ways of making life better or giving man fuller opportunity to fulfill his hopes. We have no infallible party, no infallible creed, no all-purpose blueprint. We do not propose to chain mankind to a system of false logic. We have instead faith in human intelligence, human will and human decency. And we know that in the long run these are the forces which will make history."

Urban Mass Transportation Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that the 88th Congress enact the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. This day I have introduced legislation providing Federal grants and loans for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems. This measure will authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide additional assistance for mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas in the Nation.

It is my firm belief that if our urban areas, both large and small, are to escape strangulation by traffic congestion, the efforts of all levels of government are needed to solve the critical transportation problems now confronting them.

The transportation problems of the urban areas are of true national concern. Seventy percent of the Nation's population live in urban areas and it is here that the highest rate of population growth is occurring. It is evident that because our Nation is predominantly an urban nation, the solution of urban problems is very much a part of the current worldwide race for economic, scientific, and cultural leadership. The strength of our very Nation will be demonstrated in the cities. These core cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding urban and suburban territory have been the fastest growing sections of the country since the start of the century. Over two-thirds of the population of the Nation today resides in urban areas.

One of the key and unique pressures that faces the city today is the burden of handling a daytime population 30 to 50 percent greater than the residential population. The continuing decline in the use of mass transit facilities is making this task enormously more difficult. Within recent years heavy emphasis has been placed on building or planning freeways to the central cities and by adding to the supply of parking spaces. It strikes me as apparent that a highway program alone will fail to solve the problem of accessibility for many cities as they are constituted today. The question of accessibility has a great deal to do with the decision of the businessman to stay downtown or the decision of the shopper to go there. In fact, the very question of accessibility to the modern city is closely tied to the question of the survival of the central city.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be a fact that the movement of the great masses of people into and out of the central city can be accomplished only by a mass rapid transit program. Nationally, it makes little difference what form this transport takes—elevated trains, subways, surface trains, buses, or a combination of any or all of them. What is clear is that the fact of galloping congestion in our urban areas must be met—and with dispatch.

Our highway programs, our urban renewal projects, and all urban planning assistance programs will become more effective with the enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. Under this act Federal aid will be given to State and local government agencies. They are in the best position to keep abreast of the trends which indicate need for specific transportation facilities and the best ways to meet local problems.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we have come to a point in the development of our Nation at which neither the Federal Government nor the American economy as a whole can afford the expense and damage if metropolitan areas fail in their productive function. Enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act will do much to insure the good health of the American city.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the issue of medical care for the aged financed through the social security system will confront the 88th Congress during the ensuing months.

Undoubtedly, the majority of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives have formed an opinion on the controversial program after much study of the issue.

Likewise, many millions of Americans have strong sentiments, either pro or con, on the proposal offered by the administration.

One of the most thorough and well-documented studies of the entire compulsory health insurance program brought to my attention is a 40-page research paper authored by Mr. John B. Moody, a college preparatory senior student at Waveland High School in Montgomery County, Ind.

This outstanding Indiana student has managed to grasp all facets of the controversy and presents a brilliant study of the dangers and pitfalls in such a program, together with a detailed list of alternatives to the Socialist approach.

It is a privilege to present Mr. Moody's conclusions and general summary, which follow:

MEDICARE SUMMARY BY MR. JOHN B. MOODY

U.S. medicine matches any in the world. With all of our medical advances we can see where we have gotten a rise in the cost of medical care. Our people over 65 have twice as many medical expenses, with two to three times as much chronic illness. Yet, they have less income a year.

Compulsory health insurance is a possible solution, and may be the easiest answer. This would be in the form under social security. It would cause a rise in social security taxes of one-half of 1 percent of the first $5,200. This would cover 14.25 million of the aged. This insurance would cover hospital bills and would leave the other medical expenses to the patient. Under this insurance, we would have 3 million of our aged still not receiving benefits.

Every European country, with the exception of Finland, provides health protection for all its people. But Britain's NHS cost $2,520 million in 1961. To put it another way, they are living in a welfare state which costs them one-half of all taxes, or one-sixth of the nation's output. This is penalizing enterprise and initiative. These countries are truly socialistic, and I think most Americans don't want this type of government in our country.

One thing which is developing very fast is our prepayment medical plans. This can be less expensive with even better medical care. Several plans are being opened to people over 65, which can be a helping factor to them. Voluntary health insurance is growing faster than ever before and covering 135 million Americans. Health insurance plans are now open to all age groups with no physical examination. Our American aged can get complete medical care coverage for about $15 a month. With still other plans, the aged can get coverage for those in the very low-income group.

Doctors fear compulsory health insurance because it will be a form of socialized medicine, and will take the power in providing medical care for Americans away from the doctor. They also fear it will lessen the quality of the world's best medical care. Federal legislation and intervention cannot educate people to practice preventive medicine. Persons with imaginary ills, lining up to receive their "free" Government-prescribed medical care will not result in a healthier nation. Rather, it will make us have a shortage of hospital beds such as happened in Britain and Canada. Doctors have introduced a new health-insurance plan which covers doctors fees and hospital fees for $13 a month, and much more than the administration's plan does. The AMA has urged its physicians to adjust their fees not only in relation to the proposed Blue Shield plan, but also in relation to any proposed health-insurance coverage for people over 65. It is also been a custom of our doctors to treat patients who cannot pay. They take care of these patients just like any others.

The compulsory health-insurance plan has many things wrong with it. It would cost millions in payroll taxes to pay for medical care for a few who do need it and for millions who could be self-reliant. What would keep it from being made to cover all people under social security, such as widows and dependent children? Why stop at the age 65? Why not 50 or 40? Under this plan the road is wide open to socialized medicine.

Doctors are doing all that's possible to provide for the best medical care coverage. Voluntary health-insurance companies have also been working hard to provide low-cost plans with complete coverage. There are several aged who cannot afford even these. For them let's use the Kerr-Mills law, which is now in effect in 38 States and completely under State control.

For many aged they would have to skimp to pay for this insurance. But that is what our country is built upon, free enterprise and freedom. If they can't afford this small amount, the children should help out. If 1 mother can support 12 children, surely 12 children can help support 1 mother. Let's keep our freedom in American medicine; even better, let's keep out freedom in all things. Millions don't want compulsory health insurance for the medical care for our aged, but are they willing to fight against it to save medical freedom and theirs? As Michael B. Petrovish said:

"Most people don't want freedom, or at least find it very painful. A freedom which becomes too easy and ceases to demand loses its value. Freedom is not at all easy. Freedom is difficult."

Hon. Robert S. Kerr

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the profound shock which came to all of us on learning of the sudden and tragic passing of ROBERT S. KERR cannot be expressed in words. This sad and distressing news reached us as the new year was dawning, but the impact of the tragic event will be felt for years to come.

From the wellsprings of the earth of the Oklahoma frontier a towering oak arose. This giant of the forest was BOB KERR. He arose from humble beginnings to great heights. From the log cabin of the western frontier to the highest councils of State and Nation ROBERT S. KERR blazed a trail of leadership which few have ever matched. In conflict and in peace, on the battlefields of World War I and during the cold war of these last decades, he rendered devoted service to his Nation.

BOB KERR's passing is a profound personal loss to me. He was my close friend. I came to know him quite intimately, particularly so in recent years. I have worked with him on literally hundreds of legislative projects, both large and small. The most recent of these was the Revenue Act of 1962. The extent of his contributions to the public interest cannot be described here today. Who can, in the metes and bounds of a few words, show how this great man labored over the minute details of legislation and refused to face even the possibility of defeat? I can with sincerity and vigor offer my testimony wholeheartedly to all those qualities and characteristics which have been associated with him by those who have spoken before me. Above all, I can testify to his character, his complete dedication and singleness of purpose in accomplishing great objectives, and the enormous capacity for successful leadership which was his.

The tremendous power of his intellect and innate brilliance of mind, combined with his driving energy, his diligence and great strength of character, propelled him to the forefront of every endeavor which he ever undertook. His legislative talents and his enormous capacity for reaching solutions in the public interest—matters to which he had devoted himself especially since coming upon the national legislative scene in 1948—are known to all his colleagues and especially those of us who were privileged to work with him on particular projects of great significance and importance to the Nation.

The loss to the Nation in the passing of BOB KERR can only inadequately be described by those of us who speak today. Historians will, I am confident, accord him a very large place and high stature in the account of these years in the life of our great Nation.

To his family I offer sincere and heartfelt condolences. They can take solace from the abiding knowledge that his life and works contributed great and good gifts to the lasting service of mankind.

Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, now that the vote has been taken, I take this opportunity to make a brief résumé of and express my deep disappointment in the vote on the House Rules Committee for the millions of Americans who voted for the Republicans in this last congressional election. It is impossible for me to comprehend the principles upon which the majority party has voted, for it was the majority party which usually voices its desire for the right of the minority. Now most of them have voted against giving to the minority in this House equitable representation. The Republican conference on Tuesday, January 8, 1962 adopted a series of three fair play amendments which were presented by the Honorable Mr. FORD.

First. An increase in the size of the House Rules Committee to 15 members based upon numerical apportionment of the House of Representatives, which in the 88th Congress, controlled 3 to 2 by the Democrats would mean a committee of 9 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

Second. An increase in minority staffs of House committees to a total also proportional with overall House minority membership thus giving Republicans 40 percent of committee staffs in contrast to the current overwhelming and unjust control of the staffs of a number of important committees by the majority.

Third. A guarantee of equal time for the minority in debate or consideration of the joint House-Senate conference committee reports on the House floor. The majority party in the House now has the power to completely dominate time in this regard and has in the past abused

this power. The amendment did not ask for 48 percent, but just 40 percent based on the actual number of Republicans in the House and they have now denied our request and given us the unjust 33 percent. The fact remains now that the Rules Committee will be nothing more than an open door for the liberals in the National Capital without proper representation for the millions of American people who voted for the Republican congressional Members. The theory that without the enlargement of the Rules Committee the majority would be unable to obtain their wishes in the House is a fact unfounded since everyone knows that by the use of the discharge petition, a simple majority of the House can bring a bill to the floor.

Remarks by B. M. McKelway, Citizens' Crime Commission Dinner, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., December 10, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in the past year I have been fighting for the passage of legislation necessary to correct the ever-increasing crime in the District of Columbia. This matter is well known to every Member of Congress.

I am inserting herewith, a speech made by Mr. B. M. McKelway at the Citizens' Crime Commission dinner on December 10, 1962.

The statements contained in this speech need no elaboration by me but it certainly lends impetus to the necessity for immediate action by the Congress and hope that it will help speed necessary and far-reaching legislation.

No one knows better than I, that we do not stop this ever increasing wave of crime by merely enacting legislation to punish lawbreakers and that other steps must be taken to cure the cause, and create a decent atmosphere in which law-abiding citizens can live without fear. But until such time, legislation to punish the evildoers is vitally necessary and Mr. McKelway's speech points up without a doubt the urgency:

I am not a spokesman for the public. I am here merely as a humble member of at least that portion of the Washington public which is becoming conscious of the frightening loss of certain rights hitherto regarded as unalienable—the right to walk in safety on the public streets of this city and the right to security in our homes or places of business.

These rights are being constantly violated in Washington. And one of the most insidious dangers accompanying the loss of these rights is that the loss may become taken for granted as inevitable, and regarded merely as the symptom of the diseases of poverty, ignorance, and environment.

It may be true that alarming forms of singularly depraved, vicious and even sadistic crimes against the public are merely the symptom of a disease that afflicts our urban society. It may be true that it is more important to attack the disease than to become too much concerned with the symptoms.

But if this philosophy becomes widely accepted; if the commission of vicious crime against innocent people is rationalized and even condoned as merely the symptom of a disease, and that it is futile to attack the symptom as long as the disease remains, we face yet another danger, for the symptom may become more fatal to our society than the disease diagnosed as producing it.

In fighting disease, the medical profession does not fail to treat the symptoms with all available knowledge and vigor merely because the prevention or cure of the disease is yet to be discovered.

But in crime we are sometimes advised to take the opposite course. We are told, in connection with some outrageous crime, that its commission is not really the fault of the criminal but the fault of society, or of the community. I doubt the wisdom of this generalization, or that it is supported by the truth. It is a negative and self-defeating approach to the problem of violent crime. It implies a readiness to condone crime as long as others among the numerous ills that beset mankind remain unremedied.

The logical fruit of this tacit condonation of crime is acceptance of the idea that crime is the unavoidable product of conditions for which the criminal is not responsible. That idea encourages crime, by persuading those inclined to commit crime that they are, in effect, blameless, having been forced by society to go out on the streets and rob or maim the first person who comes along.

At any rate, the doctrine of public responsibility for violent and unprovoked crime produces an interesting anomaly.

We are members of a society which has seen fit to compensate the victims of destitution and unemployment; to lighten, by provision of cash, the burdens of the blind and unemployable; to recompense the worker who through no fault of his employer is injured on the job; to pay the disabled veteran for his sacrifice; to reimburse the farmer who sticks to assigned allotments and refrains from planting more than his Government tells him to plant. We spend substantial sums (as Mr. Clemmer has indicated) in attempts to rehabilitate criminals and return them to normal life. Much of the time of our civil courts is occupied in fixing damages due to the victims of mishaps, in which provable negligence by somebody else has played a part.

The really forgotten men and women of this same society are those innocent and law-abiding citizens who, through no fault of their own, are robbed, raped, beaten, or murdered in cold blood on the streets, in their homes—or even in church. If they survive, sometimes carrying their injuries to the grave, they must get along as best they can. If financially able to do so they must pay the hospital expense for treatment of their injuries. After brief notice in the press of what happened to them, they drop from public notice and are forgotten.

But if the community, rather than the criminal, is held responsibe for their misfortune, should not the community be held financially liable for its negligence?

The question is rhetorical. Yet the discrimination against victims of unprovoked attack is a realistic condition. The existence of this condition is leading to a growing belief, by laymen as well as able lawyers and judges, that something seems to have gone awry in adjusting the delicate balance of justice, and that a growing preoccupation with the rights of the criminal has been accompanied by a growing neglect of the rights of the public.

Now I suppose that at this point I should offer the trite observation that the rights of the criminal are rights that also extend to decent, law-abiding citizens, and that to ignore the rights of the criminal is to endanger as well the rights of decent citizens.

The observation is true and I do not debate it.

It may also be necessary to remind ourselves that this question of balancing the rights of the accused as against the rights of the public has been under debate for at least 2 centuries by able and conscientious judges, all of them searching for the truth that must support the administration of even-handed justice.

It is dangerous for a layman to trespass too far into these sacred precincts reserved for learned men of the law, such as our able U.S. attorney.

But while laymen may be incompetent to join in discussion of those philosophical and legal concepts and principles which are the root of this continuing debate over the balancing of rights, some of the immediate conclusions reached by judicial majorities in the District of Columbia should be challenged by the laymen who must live with those conclusions. One of those conclusions appears to be, to use an old expression, that we should punish the constable for what some judges may regard as the constable's misconduct in the investigation of crime, leaving the misconduct of the criminal as a secondary consideration.

It is high time that more laymen got down to cases on what is taking place here in the District of Columbia, and indignantly echo the classic pronouncement of Mr. Bumble that "if the law supposes that, the law is an ass, an idiot."

We find our upright judges hopelessly split among themselves. They stop at the edge of name calling. But some of them accuse their brethren of such grave offenses as striking "a grievous blow at the administration of criminal justice"; of rendering futile, by their decisions, the rights of society to protect itself; of going beyond what the Supreme Court or the statutes have ever meant or said, and of writing new law to conform to their personal predilections.

If this acrimonious dispute between our highly placed judges were merely academic, if the judges were only indulging in some rarefied form of intellectual recreation such as trying to decide which ought to have come first, the hen or the egg, the public could go happily about its own business and leave the judges to stew in a juice of their own making.

But the dispute is not academic. It involves hard realities affecting law enforcement. An indirect, or perhaps a direct result, is that one of the cleanest police departments in the country finds itself on the defensive.

It is condemned by implication as practicing methods associated with the inquisition, of persecuting citizens on whimsical suspicion, of deliberately trampling on the individual rights of defenseless people.

Is it any wonder that there is thus created a public psychology, or state of mind, which regards the Metropolitan Police Department as public enemy No. 1, rather than as the thin blue line of courageous men who stand between the public and the depredations of vicious desperadoes?

The confusion of the police under conflicting opinions as to what constitutes legal and illegal procedure is shared to a lesser if more sophisticated extent by some of the trial judges and the prosecutors. If you doubt that, ask them. The precise location of the line dividing legal and illegal investigation of crime seems not to depend, as it should, upon the circumstances in each par-

ticular case, but upon the identity of the judges assigned to survey it.

This unhappy condition is not conducive to good law enforcement at a time when failure or inability to enforce the law has become an intolerable menace to public safety. Nor is it conducive to respect for the courts, an element that is essential in an orderly society.

Some of the confusion stems from broadened interpretations of a rule of evidence or procedure in the Federal courts—rule 5(a). It was recommended to the Supreme Court by an advisory committee some 16 years ago and approved by Congress.

The need for its clarification became evident several years ago and an attempt to amend the rule in Congress failed—not because the votes were lacking to amend it. The votes were there. A lone Senator's threat to filibuster, in the closing hours of a Congress ready to adjourn, prevented completion of congressional action.

The Citizens' Crime Commission should take the lead in mustering community support for two undertakings in the next Congress.

One is to amend rule 5(a), to clarify its intent and its meaning. Mr. Acheson may be against this. He may be right. But rule 5(a) has been interpreted by the courts to an extent that was never contemplated by those who drafted it.

Whatever the remedy for existing conditions—we need the accommodation that Mr. Acheson so correctly says is needed.

The other is to be sure that when the Horsky committee recommendations to abolish the practice of arrest for investigation are adopted, the abolition of the practice be accompanied by more precise laws or regulations, spelling out the valid procedures available to police investigation of crime.

Attainment of these objectives is desirable, even if there is no guarantee that any substantial decrease in crime would quickly follow.

But something else seems to be needed, which, if supplied, might reduce crime. The overwhelming majority of citizens of Washington are law abiding. They are frightened and dismayed by ugly crime. They share a common danger. What seems to be lacking is a spirit that will bind this majority together as a whole; a spirit which finds us all united in awareness of the fact that this is our community, and that beset as it may be by various forms of distress, including the rancor of old grievances and injustice, it is still our community and our community is now threatened by anarchy that finds expression in violent crime.

If that spirit is lacking, if we must delay a greatly needed, all-out war on crime until we can perfect a society that is agreeable to everybody, we are sunk.

West Virginians Gather for Emancipation Proclamation Centennial Anniversary Banquet in Charleston—Governor Barron, Other Leaders Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the citizens of West Virginia have long been justly proud of their State's record in the area of civil rights and human relations. Our aims have ever been to recognize the worth and dignity of the individual and toward securing for one and all equal rights and responsibilities under the law.

In keeping with these traditions, a banquet was held at the First Baptist Church, of Charleston, W. Va., on Friday, January 4, 1963, as a part of the yearlong observances of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. A large and distinguished audience gathered for this meaningful program. West Virginia's Governor, the Honorable William Wallace Barron, spoke of the State's commendable record in school desegregation and equal employment opportunity.

Also speaking to those assembled were former Governor Cecil H. Underwood, and the executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Roy Wilkins. The latter told of legislative goals and stressed national problems.

Instrumental in the success of this observance was Rev. C. Anderson Davis, chairman of the West Virginia Emancipation Proclamation Committee. Dr. Davis and his coworkers are to be commended for their energetic efforts in bringing about this memorable evening.

Mr. President, originally scheduled to take part, I was necessarily absent due to the passing of our late colleague, the Honorable Robert S. Kerr, at whose funeral I served as a member of the official Senate delegation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Charleston Gazette of January 5, reporting on the Emancipation Proclamation Centennial anniversary banquet be printed in the Appendix, along with excerpts from my own message prepared for delivery on that occasion.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Jan. 5, 1963]

IN RACE RELATIONS: BARRON CITES STATE HARMONY

Governor Barron said Friday that "West Virginia is a prime example of the harmony that can be achieved" when race relations are handled in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

Speaking in Charleston, Barron said the State firmly believes in the principle that "all men are born free and each is deserving in his own right of an opportunity equal to that of any other person."

Barron spoke at a dinner in the First Baptist Church which was held as part of observances of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Other speakers were Roy Wilkins, executive secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and former Governor Cecil Underwood.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, originally scheduled to appear, was unable to attend because he was a member of a Senate delegation at the funeral of Senator Robert Kerr in Oklahoma. Excerpts from his prepared text were read.

Barron said the State is particularly proud of "our fine record in the desegregation of schools," and that the total number of Negroes working in State government probably is at an all time high.

In his prepared remarks, Senator RANDOLPH said the future task of emancipation is extending the scope of freedom to white as well as Negro Americans.

"For when the American Negro has full equality of education—when color no longer bars him from equal opportunity and when he becomes a full participant in the American community—then also will all Americans be emancipated from the foreboding, fear, anxiety and misundertanging which yet block the fuller realization of the American dream," RANDOLPH said.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, PREPARED FOR THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 4, 1963

Reverend Davis, members of the Emancipation Proclamation Committee, and ladies and gentlemen, perhaps no other action in the history of the American Presidency serves better to illuminate the nature of American history itself, than does the Emancipation Proclamation.

For this action, which President Lincoln exercised as a "military necessity" to save the Union, has in the balance of history become his greatest claim on the affections and respect of his countrymen. And in the eyes of much of the world, President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation outshines the original justification of preserving the Union itself.

Lincoln's first and last concern was to save the Union. As he wrote to Horace Greeley shortly before the publication of the preliminary proclamation in September, 1862, "If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

The Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 took the last of these three alternatives. It limited its application only to the secession States and expressly excluding from its provisions those "48 counties designed as West Virginia," as well as other sections of Virginia held by Union forces.

However, it detracts neither from the significance of the Emancipation Proclamation nor from the greatness of Lincoln to acknowledge that in its inception the Proclamation was issued on the grounds of political and military expediency. For this covenant was committed to ideals and values of the English-speaking world which were much older than the conflict between the North and the South—ideals which achieved their most noble expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

The Proclamation was a successful measure of expediency because it reached into enduring and ultimate values which extended beyond the civil strife of the Nation at that time. For, though active abolitionists were in a minority even in the Northern States, probably no adult or civilized person in any section of the country was entirely free from guilt concerning the enforced bondage of his fellowman. Jefferson, perhaps saw more truly than Lincoln in this respect, when he questioned, "Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; this His justice cannot sleep forever * * *."

The Proclamation thus succeeded in its aim because it turned again the soil of liberty which had been cultivated in the Anglo-American world since the Magna Carta. It provided—for adherents to the Union—a moral cause deeper than that of State pride or regional loyalties or even preservation of the Union itself.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, the leading philosopher of that day, spoke for this cause when he wrote, regarding the proclamation, that

"The force of the act is that it commits the country to justice, that it compels the innumerable officers, civil, military, naval, of the Republic to range themselves on the line of this equity * * *. The first condition of success is secured in putting ourselves right. We have recovered ourselves from our false position and planted ourselves on a law of nature."

Thus, Lincoln, who campaigned for the Presidency largely on the issue of preventing the spread of slavery to the new States and territories, became the agent for a force greater than himself in the act of abolishing slavery from the established States.

Jefferson spoke of this force as a "gift of God," Emerson, as a "law of nature," and Justice Learned Hand, as the "spirit of liberty." But by whatever name we call it, whatever the theological or philosophic foundation we ascribe to it, it is this thrust that has given direction and meaning to American life for more than three centuries.

And it is this spirit of liberty—dedicated to the unfinished task of emancipation—that gives meaning to our gathering here. In this regard, we do not celebrate—we commemorate the centennial anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. We commemorate Lincoln's action by rededicating ourselves to the goal of emancipation—emancipation of all Americans—not only those of color—in body, mind and spirit.

The enforcement of the original Proclamation not only freed the slave from physical bondage. It also freed the master from the bondage of his own despotism. Very often he did not realize his transgression.

Thus, the future task of emancipation is further to extend the scope of freedom for white as well as Negro Americans. For when the American Negro has full equality of education, when color no longer bars him from equal employment, and when he becomes a full participant in the American community, then also will all Americans be emancipated from the forebodings, fear, anxiety and misunderstanding which yet block the fuller realization of the American dream.

Our progress during the 100 years has been stumbling and faltering. But progress there has been; and it is safe to say that no other race has equaled the advancements of the American Negro in the past 50 years. And if a clear view of history reveals to us certain facts, it also provides us with the vision of an ideal which illuminates the way and will help us to achieve a better and brighter future for all Americans.

Farm Bureau Policy for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. Representative of the 18th District of Illinois, which includes a large rural population, I am naturally interested in the Farm Bureau which is very active in my district.

Listed below is the official text of the Farm Bureau's policy for 1963 on rural electrification and telephones as adopted by the delegates at their 44th annual meeting in Atlanta in December.

I have studied carefully all of the Farm Bureau resolutions adopted at that meeting, but due to many disturbing developments which have been brought out in the hearings before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, I made particular note of their REA policy.

In view of the interest that was focused upon this problem during the last session by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the following statement will be keenly scrutinized by my colleagues.

The text follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONES

We support rural electric and telephone cooperatives organized and operated in accordance with accepted cooperative principles and practices. Further development and growth of these cooperatives call for the active and loyal support of member patrons who understand their responsibilities for supporting and helping finance them. Local ownership by well informed members is the best safeguard for true cooperative principles.

It is time to make certain that the members of rural electric cooperatives can obtain full and complete member ownership and control. Ownership and control should be clearly secured in the hands of the patrons. We recommend that member equities be made transferable to eligible persons on the books of the cooperative at any time.

We urge members of rural electric cooperatives to study the bylaws of their associations and to make certain that they contain provisions that make it mandatory to (1) allocate annually the equities of individual members and inform each member of the amount in his equity account and (2) require approval by a majority of patrons before the principle assets and business of the cooperative can be sold.

Power shortages and inadequate grids or transmission lines continue to be a major problem in supplying adequate power to farmers in some areas. We support sound and economic developments to assure farm people adequate electric service.

We urge power companies to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand of farm people at reasonable cost. We urge efforts on the part of the rural electric cooperatives and other private power companies to reach agreements that will be in the best long-time interest of all concerned.

If satisfactory agreements cannot be reached for necessary amounts of energy for farm use at competitive rates, we support the use of Rural Electrification Administration funds to finance the generation and transmission facilities farmers need. We oppose any efforts to change the present law which makes this possible.

Where further expansion or improvement of power production is contemplated, serious consideration should be given to the possibility of seeking funds for the program on an investment basis from members of the cooperatives. If revisions in legislation or regulations are needed in order to permit such procedures, we will support the necessary changes.

Rural electric cooperatives have performed a valuable service for rural America, but many factors affecting their operations have changed materially since Congress authorized their establishment. Any future loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration to established rural electric or telephone cooperatives and other borrowers should be made at not less than the cost of money to the Federal Government.

We oppose any plan or effort to convert rural electric cooperatives into a public power system.

Rural electric cooperatives should not participate in financing the rural areas development program. We recommend that they confine their activities to the purposes for which they were organized.

Let's Balance the Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Webster says a pendulum is a device used to regulate the machinery of clockwork and other machinery. There are times when adjustments become necessary.

For many years the labor-management pendulum was swinging too far in one direction. Adjustments were made and the machinery appeared to be operating reasonably well.

Gradually and imperceptably, foreign matter accumulated, causing that same machinery to malfunction to a greater degree than it had previously. The newspaper and longshoremen strikes furnish ample evidence to support that statement.

The President of the United States has been defied. Irresponsible action is threatening our entire economy, including our national defense. The machinery of collective bargaining is threatened. The public welfare is completely ignored by certain leaders. The patience of the public is wearing extremely thin.

Repercussions of the strikes are being felt in the 19th District of Pennsylvania. This has been attested to by communications from district residents, in the past few days. Some means must be found to again regulate that pendulum so that it may again swing in the interest of the masses rather than for a few irresponsible leaders.

The following editorial from the January 6 edition of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot expresses similar concern:

WE NEED A BALANCING ACT

By warning that the dock strike "is bound to have an effect on the future of collective bargaining," Labor Secretary Wirtz has lent weight to reports that President Kennedy, angered by the flat union rebuff to his personal plea to head off that strike, is considering some form of antistrike legislation.

But even before the President became disturbed about this, it was apparent that the new Congress would be considering legislation to curb what some Members believe to be excessive union powers that are against the national interest.

One reason is that the years ahead promise to be extremely difficult ones in labor-management relations. The resulting strikes could have wide national impact, like the current dock strike.

Currently, Lockheed workers are under a Taft-Hartley injunction that will keep them on their jobs until sometime in March. A strike after that, which is not unlikely, would stall vital defense production. Then there's the danger of a crippling nationwide railroad strike over the featherbed issue, a dispute that almost has exhausted legal appeals.

Whatever the administration finally does, Senator McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, already has said he'll resubmit a bill to put unions in the transportation industry under the same restrictions as the antitrust legislation for business.

"There is too much unrestrained and uncontrolled power vested in the transportation unions across the country," he claims.

This ability of a single union to close down an entire industry, or cripple all the ports and transportation facilities of the country, concerns many Americans these days. It's time for Congress to consider again where labor's power has gone beyond the bounds of reason and what can be done to curb the excesses.

Whether the answer is some form of antitrust law against labor monopolies or legislation giving the Government broader power to intervene in major labor-management disputes, or something else, it won't come easily in the 88th Congress. All of the passions and pressures on both sides will be brought into play. They always are when labor legislation is considered.

But there's one important reason why the issue should not be put off. A grave imbalance in labor-management strength can harm the entire Nation.

That was true earlier in this century when management's power was so lopsided that workers didn't have a chance to make their weight felt on such subjects as wages and working conditions. But business has no monopoly on the ability to grow ever larger. Unions today no longer are underdogs. They are every bit as widespread and powerful as the industries with which they negotiate. And the relative freedom from Government controls makes many of them even stronger. Unchecked, this union power can prove as bad for the country as the excesses of management decades ago. In some instances, it already has reached that stage.

There is a third force to be considered today—the public interest—when it comes to labor negotiations in defense industries, in transportation, in any field where long, nationwide strikes can cause serious inconvenience.

Congress has a responsibility to make sure that this interest is protected, whether the threat comes from the excesses of business or of labor.

The President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a reader's letter which appeared in the January 8, 1963, edition of the Baltimore Sun. This well-thought-out letter is one of the best statements I have seen regarding the attempt of the administration to take over the rights and prerogatives of the Congress:

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SIR: How much do we, the American people, expect of a President? As he is head of the executive department of the Government we hold him responsible for the management of all the branches of the Government except the legislative and judiciary. This would seem enough for one man to be responsible for. But our Presidents are not satisfied with this, they put pressure on our legislators in Congress to bow to their wills and legislate as they, the Presidents, want them to.

Members of Congress have always welcomed the opinions and suggestions of Presidents. Almost as soon as Congress convenes the so-called President's message is presented.

Formerly the Presidents merely sent their messages which were read to Congress by clerks. Now the President appears in person and tries to impress his wishes on Congress by force of argument and by his eloquence and personal appeal. There is nothing wrong in this, even though it represents a change from what used to be.

However, Presidents no longer limit their attempts to influence Congress by eloquence and argument. Members or the executive branch of the Government, the President's political family, spend much time on Capitol Hill subjecting our legislators to many types of pressure. An example of this is the fight now being waged by President Kennedy to change the number of members on the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

The number of members on this committee which will give this country the best service may be 12 or 15 or even 10 or 20, but this is something for the Members of the House of Representatives to decide for themselves. It is their decision to make.

Except for Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, President Kennedy has control over the lives and happiness of more millions of people than any man living today. In view of this it seems only right for him to permit the Members of the House of Representatives to decide for themselves the number of their Members who should be on a committee which is theirs, not one appointed by the President.

The American people did not elect President Kennedy head of the legislative branch of their Government. To limit his activities to running the executive branch is something the American people have a right to expect of a President.

LEO BRADY.

BALTIMORE, *January 6.*

Future of the ROTC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks it has become evident that a move is underway in the Department of Defense to reorganize the ROTC program in our Nation's high schools and colleges. Although the details of the plan have not yet been made public, the effect of previous reorganized plans such as the one involving the Nation's National Guard forces causes one to be uneasy about the possibility that this program will be scuttled for all intents and purposes. Many high schools of the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri which I am privileged to represent have felt the ROTC program a vital force for good citizenship. I call the attention of the House to the following editorials from the Carthage Missouri Press:

A FORCE FOR GOOD CITIZENSHIP

Pentagon plans to eliminate the high school ROTC program are a step in the wrong direction.

The program in the Carthage schools, consistently one of the finest in the Nation, has proved highly beneficial not only to the young men who participate but to the schools, the community, and the Nation's Armed Forces.

Graduates of the Carthage ROTC program repeatedly have indicated the experience stands them in good stead when they formally enter the armed services. It provides them with the basic essentials of military organization, respect for authority, and ability to understand and obey military orders. This in itself is a matter of extreme importance to the maintenance of an adequate protective force for the Nation at all times.

It also provides these young men with a definite sense of involvement in the affairs of their Nation at an age when they otherwise might be devoting their energies and thoughts to the escapades of the black-jacket, motorcycle set.

It is a force within the community for good citizenship and this in itself is reason enough to continue it.

The ROTC program here has proved its worth. The results are evident on all sides.

The Press firmly opposes any attempt to eliminate this valuable program and urges all citizens join in a loud protest.

You can help by writing your expression of opposition to the Pentagon proposals to Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, and Senator EDWARD LONG.

Early action is desirable. Otherwise we might lose, never to regain, one of our most significant community and national assets.

CARTHAGE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS OPPOSE POSSIBLE ROTC ELIMINATION

A Defense Department proposal to drastically revise and cut back the Reserve Officers Training Corps program in colleges and high schools was met by strong opposition today from Carthage Senior High School administrators.

Carthage is one of the smallest high schools in the Nation to support an ROTC program.

"We'd hate very much to lose the ROTC program," Supt. Lester Gillman said today. "It is an important part of our school, both in the curricular schedule and extracurricular activities.

"The training offered is beneficial to boys. Many of our graduates who have gone into college ROTC or into service have told us it has been very helpful."

Edward L. Rogers, Carthage Senior High principal, voiced Gillman's sentiments. "It's a fine program and the association of the school with the ROTC personnel has been of great benefit. I'm strongly in favor of ROTC and hope it will be retained."

Defense officials said the revised program will eliminate all high school ROTC programs, compulsory ROTC programs in all land-grant colleges, and reduce the 4-year courses in most colleges and universities to 2 years.

There are 183 boys enrolled at present in ROTC at Carthage Senior High. One-half credit toward graduation requirements are offered each of the first 2 years of the program and a full credit for the final year.

Railroads Need Help—Diversification Would Be Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President called to the attention of the 87th Congress the "chaotic patchwork of in-

consistent and often obsolete legislation" which has become the framework of this Nation's transportation policy. His April 5, 1962, transportation message made the flat statement that this patchwork policy "does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition."

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, and the appropriate committee of the other body, conducted extensive hearings in the last Congress on the recommendations made in this important domestic legislative message. They gave particular attention to proposed deregulation of certain minimum freight and passenger rates. Undoubtedly there will be further hearings in the current session of the 88th Congress. I am confident, too, that this new Congress will act once its committees have finished their work and brought transportation legislation to the floor.

Yet there is an anachronism in U.S. transportation today, Mr. Speaker, which rivals or surpasses the most threadbare of the statutory patches to which Mr. Kennedy directly referred. Since hearings in 1960 before the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, Congress has heard relatively little about it. In short, it is this:

The American railroad industry, recognized by all of us as both economically vital and economically ailing, is being forbidden by the fears of a past era the tools it needs to build a healthy future.

When every signpost in transportation points toward freer flow of traffic by whatever transport mode is most economic and offers best service, U.S. railroads remain pinned down by Federal regulatory restrictions that sprang from the 19th century of transportation.

An unmistakable promise of future rejuvenation lies in a railroad's ability to offer a shipper the transportation service which best fits his needs and his budget, whether it be by rail, truck, ship, or aircraft. Yet under existing Federal regulation the railroad is barred from acquiring the surface facilities—by road or water—it would require to offer the service of a true transportation system to its customer.

Current public policy on single ownership of multiple transportation modes stems from the Interstate Commerce Commission Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. In effect, this policy today bars a railroad from acquiring other forms of surface transportation without severe restrictions, while leaving all other surface transport modes free to diversify as they choose.

It is significant to note in passing, Mr. Speaker, that none of the statutes involved contains language specifically prohibiting transportation diversification as such. The rules which now operate to deny railroads equal opportunity among surface modes to own and operate other forms of transportation largely are interpretations of the statutes by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the courts.

Thus it can be said that even with so fundamental a question of national transportation policy, the answer has been supplied more by the judiciary and by the Congress' independent agencies than by the Congress itself.

In virtually all of existing and prior statutes and in the history of their application, the single dominant theme has been the real or imagined fear of railroad monopoly. This fear was the cumulative result of the explosive 19th century growth of America's railroads, of the trustbusting of the early 1900's, of the industry's relatively giant proportions in the early 20th century, and of the childlike strengths of the motor, water, and air carriers as new legislation sought to nurture their early development in the 1920's and 1930's.

But this is 1963.

In 1926, railroads carried more than four-fifths of all ticketed intercity passengers. The rail share of intercity freight tonnage exceeded 75 percent.

Today, best estimates place railroads' share of ticketed intercity passenger traffic at 26.4 percent for 1961, the last full year statistically available. Rail freight for 1961 is estimated at 43.4 percent of the total. This means, Mr. Speaker, that the railroad share of the passenger and freight markets has shrunk from three-quarters and more to well under one-half.

On a year-by-year basis, World War II distorted the picture of relative strengths of various modes in the U.S. transport market. But the trend of postwar years is quite plain. In 1947, railroads accounted for 58 5 percent of all U.S. intercity passenger service, but in 1961 it could claim only the estimated 26.4 percent share of this market. Similarly, railroads' 1947 portion of the intercity freight business—excluding coastwise and intercoastal traffic—was 65.3 percent, but in 1961 this had shrunk to the estimated 43.4-percent figure.

Throughout this period of dwindling railroad strength in the transportation market, competing modes which had been the infant enterprises of the 1920's and 1930's were showing sometimes phenomenal growth. In terms of relative share of the intercity ticketed passenger market, airlines were exploding from an insignificant 7.8 percent in 1947 to a full 45 percent in 1961. In intercity freight traffic, trucking grew from a 10-percent share of the 1947 market to an estimated 23 percent of the 1961 market. Inland water carriers' share of this traffic nearly trebled, and pipelines' share nearly doubled.

Among all forms of passenger transportation, of course, the private automobile remained the unchallenged favorite. It has carried upwards of 90 percent of all intercity passengers for the past three decades, and was second only to the commercial airliner in rate of postwar growth as an intercity carrier.

Looking over this picture, the so-called Doyle report—a special transportation study reported to the Senate Commerce Committee early in the last Congress and one of the most comprehensive available surveys of the modern transportation scene—concluded:

> It is clear that the era of the railroad as a dominant monopolistic industry in transportation has long since ended, and that most of the growth of passenger traffic has gone to the private automobile and of freight traffic to other surface carriers.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics which paint this picture of a railroad industry sliding steadily back down the competitive hill are vivid ones. Certainly they should lay at rest any lingering fears of a 20th century railroad monopoly in transportation in the sixties—possibly the one most compelling reason for action to ease the restrictions on some sort of railroad diversification.

The common carrier, backbone of America's concept of Government-regulated but privately owned transportation, is losing out to the private carrier. Industry after industry has turned away from the common carrier because it cannot offer the service the shipper believes he must have to meet his own precise needs. So he contracts privately with a for-hire carrier, or he buys wheels and does his own transportation job.

Evidence of the trend is unmistakable and rarely contested. The Doyle report predicted that by 1975, regulated carriers will represent barely more than 60 percent of all transportation. If the report's projection of postwar private carriage growth proves accurate, "a rapid deterioration of regulated carriage could be expected under the competition of unregulated carriage."

The report said:

> The base of our transportation of freight in the last quarter of the century may be expected to be unregulated private and exempt carriers rather than public carriers if present trends continue.

The report also noted:

> The impact on the railroads as the principal public carrier is much more serious than on public carriage as a whole.

Even after making allowances for short-term factors it said:

> The recent 5-year trend of railroad freight appears to offer substantial cause for alarm.

Under any such long-term decline in public carriage as is forecast, "it is entirely unlikely that private ownership of public carriers could survive," the Doyle report concluded.

I should like to point out here, Mr. Speaker, that impending dominance by private carriage is much more than a vague exercise in transportation academics for me and for every one of my colleagues in this Chamber. When public carriage declines, the big shipper shifts to private contract carriage—or decides to haul his own goods—with relative ease.

But the small shipper often cannot afford this. As public carriers are forced to retrench, the service they can offer the small shipper steadily deteriorates—in convenience and quality as well as in frequency. As do-it-yourself carriage siphons off more and more of the most profitable traffic, the public carrier is forced to charge more for hauling the remainder. Thus it is the small shipper who in turn is forced to pay a higher transportation bill.

How is this fundamental problem to be solved? Certainly not just through tug-

ging and hauling within the transportation industry to see how common carriers are to divide a steadily decreasing share of total traffic among themselves. Rather we must help common carriers find means to retain existing traffic, and to win back business they have lost.

Joint services and rates among the various transport modes has been put forward as one answer. Yet these are of little interest to the private shipper who has purchased barges or trucks or airplanes to handle his own transportation requirements. Private shippers will turn to common carriers only when they are assured of getting the kind of coordinated transportation service they want for less—or at least no more—than the cost of providing it themselves.

The only real answer is to permit the establishment of true transportation companies that can perform service by a variety of modes or combination of modes. And for conclusive evidence of this, need we look any further than at the mushrooming growth in recent years of piggyback service that carries truck trailers by rail or water between their doorstep pickups and deliveries?

The twists and turns which our so-called national transportation policy has taken in fashioning today's chaotic patchwork sometimes is wondrous to behold. With few exceptions—where grandfather clauses have permitted already established, rail-owned trucking companies to continue their operations—our rail carriers are handcuffed in turning to the truck as an alternative transportation vehicle. In general, the railroad today can truck its freight only in supplementing its regular rail service. It is sharply limited to certain key points along its routes, and must truck only freight that was originated with or is destined for rail haul.

Yet, in literally hundreds of these very key points, Mr. Speaker, public tax and transportation policies create this remarkable distortion: The independent trucking company, with no roadbed to build or maintain, pays the key point's municipal government nothing for the highway rights-of-way its trucks roll on, and nothing for the police and fire protection they receive. It pays little or no property taxes; the shippers own and pay local taxes on most of its loading and unloading facilities. And the trucking company thrives.

The railroad, however, pays often excessive property taxes on roadbeds, tracks, yards, and terminals—facilities which it financed entirely with its own private funds. In hundreds of smaller U.S. communities, the railroad is the town or city's largest single taxpayer, and has been for years. Its unenviable tax position, it should be noted here, prompted the Doyle report authors to recommend exemption of common carrier rights-of-way from property taxes—a plan which, whatever its merits, certainly reflects a basic tax problem. And in addition to contending with this, the railroad finds the Federal Government effectively limiting its trucking operations to a virtual neighborhood delivery service, and meanwhile the railroad flounders.

Can even a rich and prosperous Uncle Sam afford to impose on its transportation system so wasteful a handicap? We need look no further than our northern neighbor, Mr. Speaker, so see the benefits of diversification. Both the Government-owned Canadian National Railways and the privately owned Canadian Pacific have been permitted to broaden their transportation services, and both own and operate airliners, ships, and trucks. And when rail revenues sagged so badly in 1960 throughout North America as well as in the United States, Canadian railroads were that much better prepared to adapt to the changing revenue picture and to fit their services to it.

I do not advocate for the present or immediate future any mergers, consolidations, common stock ownerships, or mutual affiliations of railroads and airlines. I peer into the dim periods ahead. If it be for the well-being of airlines and railroads to come together and the public welfare be served and public transportation be bettered and cheapened, then so be it. I emphasize that I do not speak of the present. Railroads are in difficulties and many airlines are not without trouble. Numbers of them seek and have sought surcease of their difficulties by mergers. United absorbed Capital Airlines, American seeks to merge with Eastern Airlines, Colonial was swallowed by Northeastern, Pan American would unite with TWA. I doubt whether marriages of railroads and airlines at present would be successful. The frustrations and embarrassments of both do not and cannot be blended together happily. Two plus two cannot make five. In other words, presently such marriage would be disastrous and end in tragic divorce.

However, whether it be diversification rights, an end to tax inequities or relaxed rate regulation, the record shows that American railroads have asked us not for favored treatment but for fair and equal treatment.

They seek equal rights with their competitors to quote rates that will win them business.

They seek equal tax treatment with other property owners and other forms of transportation so they may be in a financial position to quote more competitive rates.

And they ask elimination of artificial diversification barriers not to invade competitive modes purely for the sake of expansion; rather they seek equal opportunity to offer a varied transportation service which always would be required to meet the basic statutory test of public convenience and necessity.

They seek, Mr. Speaker, equal opportunity to render better service at lower cost to the shipper.

Fairplay in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we considered a basic change in the permanent rules under which the House of Representatives will function in the future. Our decision is an indication of the attitude with which the House will approach the tasks it faces.

Some people, both inside and outside of this body, have made the claim that the Rules Committee has come to hold too powerful a position with the House of Representatives. These people conclude that the Rules Committee has the power to prevent the entire House from making decisions on various important issues. It is the so-called power to "block" legislation.

The solution which these same people advocated was to permanently expand the membership of the Rules Committee from 12 to 15. This solution was adopted and is simply a power play to control the committee. It is not an attempt to correct any present weakness in the committee.

If it is true that the committee has the ability to block legislation it does not like, having more members will not change that fact. Indeed, a new group will simply have the right to stop legislation which it finds undesirable.

The House has always had a formal written guarantee that the Rules Committee cannot permanently act contrary to the wishes of the majority of the House. That guarantee is the discharge petition. It was used successfully on a major bill as recently as 1960 when a discharge petition for the Federal employees pay raise bill was adopted by the majority of the House.

Whenever we discuss the desirability of any legislation, it is important to know who is determining the desirability. Does the majority of the House make that decision or do most of the members of the majority party of the House? When the Speaker was prohibited during the early part of this century from serving on the committee, it was assumed that such action was intended to make the committee a tool of the majority of the House Members rather than only of the leadership of the majority party.

Increasing the committee size from 12 to 15 members increases the Democratic majority from 4 to 5. Yet, proportionate representation would give the Democrats a majority of only 3 members on a 15-man committee.

Fair representation of the minority party should always be maintained in any committee. Such should certainly be the case in a committee as powerful as the Rules Committee as was pictured yesterday.

I would have been favorable to considering reviving the 21-day rule. By prohibiting the Rules Committee from holding any bill for more than 21 days this change would correct the situation in which the Rules Committee could block legislation. At the same time, fair representation would be maintained on the committee.

If our concern is to insure that the majority of the House be given the opportunity to express its will on the important issues which come before this body, we should not simply give the power to determine desirable legislation to another group. That is what the present makeup of the Rules Committee does.

In the future, changes should be guided by three factors:

First. Congress should decide whether the Rules Committee should have the power to stop legislation.

Second. If the decision is affirmative, the minority party should be given representative strength on the committee.

Third. If the decision is negative, some means such as the 21-day rule will be necessary to weaken the power of the committee.

This is the only way fairplay in the House of Representatives will be secured.

J. P. Stevens & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Chester Reporter, Chester, S.C., of January 9, 1963:

J. P. STEVENS & CO. BEGINS 150TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., began the official observance of its 150th anniversary year Friday. Founded in 1813, just 37 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the company history of 150 years of continuous operation is unique in the annals of American industry. From modest beginnings, the business has grown into one of the leading textile companies in America, employing 35,000 people. Fifty-five manufacturing plants produce over 800 million yards of fabrics annually.

In 1813, Nathaniel Stevens began the manufacture of woolen broadcloth in North Andover, Mass. The business acquired additional mill properties in New England and, following his death in 1865, continued to prosper under the guidance of his son and grandsons in the years that followed. In 1899, John P. Stevens, a grandson of the founder, formed a partnership, J. P. Stevens & Co., to sell the product of M. T. Stevens & Sons. During the next few years, J. P. Stevens & Co. expanded its cotton goods business through participation in the building of plants in the South and by acting as selling agent for additional cotton mills.

The partnership was incorporated in 1923 and, upon the death of John P. Stevens in 1929, his sons, John P. Stevens, Jr., and Robert T. Stevens, who had been actively identified with management, assumed greater responsibilities in the conduct of the business. A strong and aggressive management team included such men as William O. Fraser, an original member of the firm, and its treasurer, who occupied a position of leadership in the credit world and whose achievements in the prevention of commercial fraud won him widespread recognition; William J. Gillon, whose dynamic pearsonality and vigorous leadership were a constant inspiration to all who knew him; Thomas W. Estes, a man of extraordinary creative and merchandising ability; Horace N. Stevens, a grandson of the founder; and Joseph H. Sutherland, who was first a salesman in the Boston office before being called to New York in 1935 where he later became largely responsible for the growth of the company's synthetic goods business.

In 1930, the company established a connection with 10 additional mills and from 1936 to 1939, achieved further penetration of the steadily growing market for synthetic fabrics through financial participation in the building of 2 plants and by becoming sales agent for 2 additional concerns. One of these the present Slater Plant at Slater, S.C., was part of a business conducted by the descendants of Samuel Slater who founded America's first cotton mill at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790.

In 1946, the Stevens selling organization merged with 9 textile companies which operated 29 manufacturing plants. As a result of his reorganization, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. emerged as a publicly owned corporation and its shares were admitted to trading on the New York Stock Exchange on August 28, 1947.

John P. Stevens, Jr. reached the company's retirement age in February and retired as chairman of the board of directors and chairman of the executive committee on March 1, 1962. He had served the company approximately 40 years in many important capacities, including 11 years as president and more than 9 years as chairman of the board. He played a major part in the development of the business, Mr. Stevens continues as a director.

Robert T. Stevens was elected president in 1929 and has held the office of president or chairman of the board since that time except for the years he spent in the service of our Government, an artillery lieutenant in World War I. He served as Deputy of Purchases in World War II with the rank of colonel. In 1952, he was named Secretary of the Army by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He returned to the company as president in 1955. He has also held the office of chairman of the board since the retirement of John P. Stevens, Jr., in March 1962.

In commenting upon the occasion of the company's 150th anniversary, Mr. Robert T. Stevens said, "The progress of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., symbolizes the spirit of American free enterprise—the spirit we hope future generations will strive constantly to preserve. Whatever success our company has achieved has been due to the combined abilities and spirit of the 35,000 people of Stevens who produce and merchandise its products. Although our industry is threatened by a serious import situation, I believe that President Kennedy's seven-point textile program, if fully implemented, would be most helpful in assisting the American textile and apparel industries to deal with cheap imports."

The Stevens Co. will have many events throughout 1963 to commemorate the anniversary. On the 27th of December, an unprecedented salute from the city of New York took place, when a 30 by 40 foot banner was unfurled across Broadway at the Stevens building, one-half block south of the crossroads of the world, Broadway and 42d Street.

An event of singular importance will take place on January 8 when the company will have a special 150th anniversary dinner in the ballroom of the Hotel Plaza. Industry and Government leaders will attend this event. The dinner is a salute to free enterprise in America.

A special Stevens anniversary movie, "The Exciting World of Stevens Fabric," has just been released as a part of the anniversary program. A local spokesman said that the movie is available to be shown in both 35 millimeter for theater showing, and in 16 millimeter for smaller groups. "Anyone interested in seeing the film need only call the Stevens plant in his community," he said.

Special displays of Stevens fabrics and products have been scheduled in communities where Stevens has plants and offices. A comprehensive schedule of advertising will appear throughout the year in national magazines and newspapers.

Later on, New York City will further hail Stevens when famous Times Square will temporarily be renamed "Stevens Square" in honor of the 150th anniversary of the famous textile company.

The Future Is Not Ours To See—But Our Attitude Will Determine It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed by a very timely statement from the pen of John C. Malone, Jr., president of the First National Bank in Milton, Fla. I feel that his statement is something which carries a message of importance for the Congress and for the Nation.

THE FUTURE IS NOT OURS TO SEE—BUT OUR ATTITUDE WILL DETERMINE IT

This is the time of the year that our national interest seems to center on how good business was in the old year and what is the outlook for the new year. This is not my intention. I am more interested in bringing to your attention the key figure in your prosperity in any year, your employer.

In the last 80 years ending in 1957, our Nation's population has quadrupled, our total output of goods and services has multiplied 21 times, personal output has increased 2 percent each year and living standards have doubled each 35 years. This phenominal growth in general has been due to the traditions, attitudes, and aspirations to growth of the American people. The strength of our country is that this growth is shared by all our people, our family incomes have steadily increased. We are not plagued by multitudes of the underprivileged. Our growth has been shared by all. Our government at all levels is keyed to listen to the voice of the people, not vice versa.

We have more than 4 million businesses in our country, large and small, corporate or otherwise. These businesses are young. Some of our largest corporations are less than 50 years old. The heads of these businesses are men of imagination. It is their competence, managerial ability, farsightedness, and financial risk that makes your employment possible. It is these men that provide the wages with which we have established our standard of living, the highest in the world. Their wages keep us in the position also of being consumers. Our use of consumer goods is the largest of any people of any nation. We own more automobiles, electrical appliances, have better roads, public buildings, schools, colleges, than all the rest of the world together. All 'is made possible by the wages we earn from our employer. He translates the demand into products through your employment and the necessary equipment.

There is keen competition between businesses. Three hundred thousand to four hundred thousand turn over each year out of the total number of over 4 million. Managerial ability and competence of the employer seems to be the key factor. Your employer is an "uncommon man."

He is also a taxpayer. His business, corporate or otherwise, pays taxes at all levels of government—Federal, State, county, and perhaps municipal. He is generous in contributions to the many funds for public

good. He fosters education at all levels because he uses it in his enterprise.

To do all this your employer must make profits, high profits, to satisfy you, the wage earner, the tax structure, to replace equipment, to build new factories, and through research to improve his product and find new ones. Contrary to popular belief high profits mean all of this plus high wages and more jobs for you and yours, more banking business for me. Low profits mean a declining business, a poor job future for you, inefficiency, lack of ability to create, or the presence of artificial pressures which create conditions under which business cannot grow. Low profits mean declining employment and if persisted in can only end in the loss of the business or industry and all of the employment it provided. The old parable of the goose that laid the golden egg is more true today than ever before. The greater Milton-Pensacola area has been very fortunate. Our economy has been climbing slowly but steadily throughout the years. We have seen an agricultural, timber, naval stores economy gradually change to an agricultural, industrial, forestry and military supported one. We have made this transition in the memory of most of us.

What would constitute catastrophe for the Greater Milton-Pensacola area short of natural disaster or war damage? The answer is simple. The loss of one of our larger payrolls would cause a local depression such as we have never experienced. We would gain national headlines by being declared a disaster area. The industrial and military payroll of ths area is the lifeblood of our way of life. It flows through you to the storekeepers, shops, banks, taxes, recreation, hard goods, and back again into more business which means more and bigger payrolls at better wages. This is our economic life cycle in which each shares his own part, and contributes that for which he is compensated, his very best.

The employer, be he small or large, independent or corporate, is the key to our economic prosperity. Treat him well and grow with him. Kill him in the search for the golden egg and depart with him. In our drive for "improved everything" in late years we have forgotten to improve the lot of he who provides all through the utilization of knowhow, capital, and your services.

In the years gone by the panacea for poor business was "Go west, young man, go west." Today that west has gone also. We must achieve success where our services or attainments can be utilized. Let's keep business in business by cooperation with our employer, giving him the imaginative creative work, faithfulness and loyalty that he pays for. In so doing our own lot will continue to improve and our economic area will prosper. Let the people of the greater Milton-Pensacola area be known for their appreciation of their employers.

I propose that the year of 1963 be known as "employer appreciation year" when we contemplate the workings of the system that provides us so much and identify the key figure therein—the employer. It is in our personal interest to keep him in business and making plenty of profit.

Hon. Ernesto Ramos Antonini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved by the death of the very able speaker of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, the late Ernesto Ramos Antonini.

It was my privilege to meet the distinguished speaker when I visited Puerto Rico, and I was deeply impressed by his high degree of intelligence, his brilliant mind, his love for the people of Puerto Rico, and his high ideals and strong faith in democracy.

The record shows that he was an outstanding public servant, closely associated with the people, untiring in his efforts in their behalf and largely responsible for the great success of Operation Bootstrap and the economic development of Puerto Rico; he worked in close cooperation with Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín and Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso to insure the splendid achievements realized in the remarkable development of the island in recent years.

Ernesto Ramos Antonini will be greatly missed and wee deeply mourn his loss as a noble leader in the Western Hemisphere.

U.S. Retaliatory Punch Being Reduced by 80 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to current figures U.S. missile strength now includes 126 Atlas, 54 Titan, and 20 Minuteman intercontinental ballistics missiles, plus approximately 144 Polaris missiles and some 100 Jupiters and Thors. This force of about 444 missiles has approximately a 1,000-megaton nuclear punch.

Also according to current figures we have in our strategic manned bomber force approximately 1,600 B-52's, B-58's, and B-47's. This manned strategic bomber force has approximately a 10,000-megaton nuclear punch on its first run, plus such force as might be delivered on reruns to strategic targets since potential enemy defenses cannot be estimated as perfect.

An estimated 10,000 missiles yet unbuilt, yet unemplaced, not even contemplated, would be needed to replace this manned strategic aircraft retaliatory capacity which now deters Kremlin masterminds from pushing their surprise attack button. This is assuming the Soviet Union's massive effort to erect ICBM defenses ends in a semitotal failure.

Should the U.S. retaliatory force wind up around about 2,000 missiles, which seems to be the present thinking of administration planners, and should manned strategic aircraft fleets be allowed to phase out, which seems to be the present thinking of administration planners witnessed by statements and inferences out of the Skybolt controversy, then our retaliatory capacity shrinks by approximately four-fifths, 80 percent, to around 2,000 megatons with no backup rerun capability whatever.

Phasing out the manned strategic aircraft surrenders weapons systems which are genuinely maneuverable, which can carry defensive armament and which are usable in coordination with ground-to-ground and air-to-ground missiles capable of reducing an enemy's offensive and defensive missile and aircraft interceptor bases. The replacement missile weapons systems are generally unable to identify and pinpoint targets, attack moving targets or destroy very hard targets. Thus unable to function without cooperating aircraft, they would be unable to knock out enemy offensive forces and stop an invasion of Western Europe.

Neither would the missile weapons systems be capable of being held on airborne alert. With only the capabilities of an all missile deterrent system, a U.S. President could only choose between pressing the button or sitting out an attack. But with manned aircraft in the deterrent system in proper proportion, he would have the additional alternative of foregoing irreversible action on ambiguous warnings and delay a fatal decision until the facts are established.

All of the foregoing is the burden of an excellent and most perceptive letter to the editor of the San Francisco Examiner published December 26, 1962.

The letter was written by one of the keenest minds in the United States which is devoted to the philosophy and strategy of U.S. national defense. He is Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University

Dr. Possony has been adviser to the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Department of the Air Force. Born in Vienna, he received his Ph. D. from the University of Vienna and subsequently studied in Rome and Paris. From 1947 until joining the Hoover Institution he was professor of international politics in the Graduate School, Georgetown University. He is an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, and lectured at the first National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers.

The following is the text of Dr. Possony's letter:

MISSILES, BOMBER FLEET

To the EXAMINER:

On December 20, 1962, Peter Andrews wrote: "The 200-missile U.S. missile right arm now includes 126 Atlases, 54 Titans, and 20 Minutemen. This growing missile strength is one more sign that the manned bomber fleet is dead. All that is needed is a dignified funeral."

This missile force presents a firepower of approximately 600 metagons. If you add the firepower of 144 Polaris missiles, and 100-odd Jupiters and Thors, our present missile force has a 1,000 metagon punch. Approximately 1,600 B-52's, B-58's, and B-47's are able to drop in excess of 10,000 megatons. This is their single mission punch. Remember that even if the Soviet defenses were perfect, many of those planes would fly several missions. (These figures do not take into account carrier aricraft, fighter bombers, and tactical missiles.)

Hence if we desire to replace our bombers with missiles, we would need a minimum of some 10,000 missiles—but no one has yet talked about a U.S. force even approaching

this size. But if we reduce our strategic force to 2,000-odd missiles, as seems to be the present plan, our deterrent and retaliatory power would be cut by four-fifths or more. Hence if the manned aircraft fleet is dead, perhaps it is the United States which should prepare for its diginfied funeral.

Khrushchev recently stated that the effort which the Soviet Union has put into defense against ballistic missiles equals that invested in the missile itself. Hence the present invulnerability of our ICBM's won't last. In the offense-defense race the aircraft ultimately will come out on top, because (a) it is manned and, therefore, genuinely maneuverable, (b) it can carry defensive armament, and (c) it would be used jointly with ground-to-ground and air-to-ground missiles which would be aimed at the enemy's missile and aircraft interceptor bases.

The missile is unable, by itself, to identify and pinpoint targets; attack moving targets; and destroy very hard targets. Hence a missile force cannot function without aircraft and cannot be the main element of a strategy designed to knock out the enemy offensive force and stop the invasion of Western Europe.

Moreover, the missile force cannot be held on airborne alert. If warning is received, we have but an all-missile force, the President has only one choice: to press the button or sit out the attack. Bombers on air alert allow him to forego taking irreversible action on ambiguous warning and delay the fatal decision until the facts are established.

STEFAN T. POSSONY,
Hoover Institution,
Stanford University.

Editorials of Interest to Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials in the Repository, of Canton, Ohio, will be of interest to Members of the House and under unanimous consent I include them with my remarks:

WE LOST THE ARGUMENT TOO

Everything possible will be done to build up the illusion that the United States came out ahead in the Cuban showdown. The truth is, the United States will be whistling in the dark.

Once more there has been a tardy reaction after a harsh provocation. Once more it has been shown why the side that seizes the initiative and holds it in a cold war gets the breaks and the other side does the bumbling.

The Soviet Union seized the initiative in Cuba and held it.

It moved in on what appeared to be a genuine revolution against an oppressive dictatorship that had been shored up with U.S. assistance. It snatched Cuba from under Uncle Sam's nose.

It then added injury to insult by changing Cuba into a Communist state and in turn added insult to injury by fortifying it as a Communist bastion in the New World—a studied and insolent challenge to the Monroe Doctrine.

When the U.S. reaction to this was violent, the Soviet Union scored still another cold war triumph by withdrawing missiles and bombers on its own terms and in its own time and refusing to permit inspection of Cuba to see what might have been left there.

Meanwhile, it seized President Kennedy's ill-advised offer not to invade Cuba if the missiles and bombers were withdrawn and built this into a commitment. It will do no good for the United States to explain that it despairs of inspecting Cuba to find out if Russia acted in good faith and therefore withdraws its promise not to invade Cuba.

If it became necessary to invade the island to eliminate a submarine base that might be deadlier than a missile base or a bomber base, the United States would be beaten over the head with its no-invasion promise by every Latin American diplomat.

It has never been grasped by U.S. critics of United Nations intervention in the Congo that Latin Americans have strong convictions about U.S. intervention in Cuba. Latin Americans believe as firmly in self-determination for Cubans as critics of the United Nations believe in self-determination for the Congolese.

There has been a reversal for the United States in Cuban policy—if the absence of a policy can be referred to as "policy."

With formal termination of discussions between Washington and Moscow in the United Nations, the issue is officially closed.

We lost the ideological issue after six decades of relations with Cuba that gave free enterprise a black eye.

We lost the military issue. Cuba is now a heavily armed offshore island manned by thousands of unfriendly troops, and this fact has not been altered an iota by a show of U.S. military strength in the Caribbean and in the air over Cuba. The Russians are still there.

And on top of everything else we lost the argument. We had to back down on the Monroe Doctrine.

There must be days in the Kremlin when Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and their pals are so busy laughing they can't find time to pick out another strategic place to make Uncle Sam bleed a little.

BUT DON'T BLAME REPUBLICANS

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee, John M. Bailey, is the author of a remarkable communication that has been sent to newspapers.

It deals with the Democratic Party's complications over its reactionary majority on the House Rules Committee—the dilemma dissolved temporarily 2 years ago by the late Sam Rayburn's determined and successful fight to weaken the majority's domination by adding three new members to the committee.

Chairman Bailey, who is understandably concerned because the same dilemma now must be dealt with at the beginning of the 88th Congress without the matchless influence of a Sam Rayburn, has come up with a remarkable point of view.

He blames the whole thing on Republicans.

He uses the same inverted reasoning that has been applied to Democratic inability to muster majorities in the House and Senate on key votes, though the Democrats are an overwhelming majority in both houses—Republicans are to blame for not voting with Kennedy Democrats against non-Kennedy Democrats.

Continuing this inverted reasoning, the Democratic chairman argues that it somehow has become the responsibility of Republicans to rescue Democrats from the consequences of the North-South schism that has made many southern Democrats the opponents of Democratic Presidents starting with Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is not a Republican responsibility to help the majority party in Congress or a Democratic regime in the White House.

Every committee in the House of Representatives and the Senate is affected by it to some extent. The Rules Committee is especially affected because its chairman, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, is a crusty reactionary who thinks it is his personal duty to block every bill he personally dislikes.

Moreover, he thinks it is his legislative duty to use his chairmanship and his committee to block bills objected to by his southern associates.

This is not surprising, nor is it exceptional. Key committees in both the House and Senate are dominated by southern Democrats and chairmen who hold their posts because, as southerners, they built up seniority. Only in the Democratic South with its one-party system can a legislator be reasonably sure of winning reelection long enough to qualify for the chairmanship of key committees.

It's a party problem, particularly acute in the Rules Committee, where abuse of power can cause bills to be held up with only a scant chance for a House vote. The Democrats can't be blamed for getting into a stew over this weakness in their political situation.

But blaming it all on the Republicans because the Democratic Party is split wide open over civil rights—aw come on.

That's ridiculous. Even for Chairman Bailey, who is paid for being 150 percent Democratic, it's silly.

Compliment to President Kennedy on His State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the minority party who believes in responsible and constructive comment on the words and deeds of the administration in power, I wish to compliment our Chief Executive, President John F. Kennedy, for his cogent state of the Union message.

The President's analysis and constructive comments with respect to the Atlantic Alliance, and his cautious approach to the presumed rift in the Communist camp should serve notice to all that America and her allies have not relaxed their vigil. I must admit, however, that I am somewhat skeptical at the vision of the unalined countries painted for us by the President, as a result of the Russian-Cuban missile scheme and the Chinese invasion of India. The so-called neutrals have shown a notable lack of response to moral force, as witness the silence accompanying the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviets and even this very same aggression against India. There has been an equally remarkable tendency to respect apparent physical power, or their own internal political needs. A more critical analysis of past foreign aid programs would have been welcomed as well.

Until the full details of the President's tax proposals are made available to us, I believe it behooves the Congress to speak

with some reserve with respect to the plan outlined in the state of the Union message. Certainly, a more equitable sharing of the tax burden is called for, and the recognition of the role played by business expansion in the economy by the President is heartening. Present indications for new expenditures for plants and equipment do not pose quite the optimistic picture included in the state of the Union message for last year's investment tax credit plan, however.

The most encouraging news of all is the President's pledge to submit a budget which will, in his words, "hold total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level," although anticipating increases for defense, space, and fixed interest charges. This is, at least, a favorable start toward a fiscally sound budget policy. I would suggest that the next step is to critically consider the new proposals proferred by the President, since he himself has indicated the need to reduce or postpone many desirable programs.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can all join together, regardless of party, in welcoming the constructive suggestions by the President, in complimenting him on a forceful presentation of America's worldwide goals and achievements, and in assuring him of the most careful examination of this and subsequent messages in light of the national interest.

Commendation of Volunteer Firemen From the Villages of Franklin Square, West Hempstead, South Hempstead, Uniondale, Roosevelt, Elmont, Lakeview, Garden City, and Hempstead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this august body a feat of daring, bravery, and courage performed by a group of my constituents: the volunteer firemen from the villages of Franklin Square, West Hempstead, South Hempstead, Uniondale, Roosevelt, Elmont, Lakeview, Garden City, and Hempstead.

On the morning of December 31, 1962, a blaze broke out in a warehouse in the village of Hempstead which eventually destroyed Long Island Railroad station there and caused over $1 million worth of damages. During its course, several homes were threatened.

The temperature was at near zero throughout many hours these brave men spent fighting the blaze. In a short time after they arrived at the scene, each man resembled a ghostly apparition; each was covered with a cake of ice. The cold was bitter; the fire raged. Despite these obstacles, these wonderful men fought on, eventually bringing the fire under control—a fire that had all the earmarks of being the most devastating Long Island had ever experienced.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House of Representatives to these men because they are volunteer firemen—they receive no pay for their labors—they are dedicated to the preservation of life and property in the community. Through the years they have performed their duties with courtesy, kindness, and efficiency. They are on call 24 hours a day. And when the siren sounds, they are on the go immediately without regard for personal comfort or safety.

These men deserve the undying admiration of the people of their communities. The same admiration is due their wives and families who keep the fearful vigil, many of whom have formed auxiliary units which, like the male groups, travel to the scene of the fire and provide these hardworking men with coffee and doughnuts and aid during the critical firefighting time.

I commend to your consideration all volunteer firefighting units, but especially, at this time, the brave men of the villages I have cited who performed so well in the recent, critical Hempstead blaze.

These are men I suggest, who do not ask what their country can do for them, but in the tradition of the minutemen of Concord and Lexington, are actually doing right now. They are to be applauded as examples of the finest in Americanism.

Another Year of Service by FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Columbus Enquirer entitled "Another Year of Service by FBI."

This editorial does an excellent job in pointing out the outstanding record of service that is being rendered the American taxpayers by J. Edgar Hoover and his dedicated agents:

ANOTHER YEAR OF SERVICE BY FBI

Another successful year in its relentless war against crime has been reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The annual report of Director J. Edgar Hoover, made last week to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, shows marked increases were recorded in all major categories of FBI accomplishment in the past year.

More wanted persons were apprehended, more convictions were recorded in cases made and fines and recoveries gained.

The 12,700 convictions obtained in FBI cases exceeded the 12,418 of a year ago by more than 200. It was a like story on the number of fugitives apprehended—11,400 as compared to 10,668 in 1961.

Fines imposed and recoveries made totaled well above $200 million. The figure was $148,421,690 for 1961. Taxpayers will be pleased to learn the figure far exceeds the funds it takes to finance FBI operation.

The statistics cited above are only the highlight of Mr. Hoover's annual report. Careful reading of the full outline of accomplishments causes one to realize how much Americans depend upon FBI agents to protect them and how much assistance the FBI gives to law-enforcement officers at the local level.

Accomplishments of the FBI in 1962 are a tribute to the leadership of Mr. Hoover, which has spanned a period of more than 38 years. Under his direction the FBI has established and maintained a high level of service to the Nation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Conserving America's Agricultural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of Mr. Edward M. Dwyer, of the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture, during a panel discussion entitled "Action Today for Tomorrow's Growth." Mr. Dwyer presents in capsule form some of the very real problems we face in the field of conservation, especially as they relate to the American farmer. This is a particular area of American agriculture in which the Federal Government can and should be of greater assistance to our farmers if for no other reason than a consideration for the future needs of our people. Though Government's massive intervention into agriculture has not cured any of its ills, we must be extremely careful in any withdrawal that such a vital area as conservation is not left floundering.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Edward M. Dwyer, director of the Division of Livestock Disease Control of the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture:

REMARKS OF EDWARD M. DWYER

Farming today is far different from what it was 2,000 years ago, 100 years ago, yes, 10 years ago. Credit for the constructive change must be given to many brilliant minds, to many different chemists, to many different engineers, to many different industries, to our national leaders starting with George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and continuing with our present leaders in the Department of Agriculture in Washington and the departments of agriculture in our States. But most of all we must praise our dirt farmer himself who has adopted the new found basic rules of nature in the production of food and fiber. One farmer suffices today to supply the needs of 26 whose labors have been used by our widespread system of industry.

The soil releases its food to the plant more abundantly, the seed resists its natural enemies, the drought is still a hazard, but it is not a bugaboo; the swarms of destructive pests are kept in place, and the fungus and rot are being conquered. As a result, we have more food for man and animal, a greater variety for our national diet and all this at a lowered price as measured by the percentage of the consumer dollar spent for food.

The task before us in the next 10 minutes is to discuss "Action Today for Tomorrow's Growth." If we are satisfied that everything possible is being done and that we are handing on to posterity our natural inherited assets at interest, then this talk is unnecessary. But if you are not satisfied, as I am not, that with our progress we are not replacing each year the essential elements in the soil eaten up by the harvest, then this talk is apropos.

Responsible officials estimate that our topsoil has been depleted from a national average of 9 inches at the time of the founding of this country to a present day average of 6 inches. This is a truly alarming rate of depletion in a period of 250 years, but more alarming still is the fact that our agricultural lands, west of the Mississippi, were tenanted by the Indians a mere 100 years ago.

Before the breaking of the land, our forests and ground cover protected the soil against movement by wind and water. Leaving the soil without cover after the harvest created the situation whereby the howling and roaring winds from the frozen north picked up the topsoil and deposited it in far off spots where it was not wanted. Traces have been found thousands of miles away after being blown from west of the Mississippi. Added to the wide open spaces were the areas denuded of trees by our rapacious settlers to provide lumber for homesteads and ground for crops. The lands lost much of the natural barriers to keep the winds in check. And when we denuded the forests and left the soil without ground cover, the rains gushed into our unprotected fertile areas and carried with the torrents, thousands of tons of topsoil to the brooks and streams, to the rivers and to the sea. No scientist is needed to prove this statement as any common man can witness the color of the waters, all murky with soil and wade in the silt piled high at the mouths of the rivers.

All this is manmade conditioning for destruction.

What about the nutrient values of our soils today as compared with 50 years ago? Every soil needs calcium, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potash among other trace minerals for normal growth of crops. Over cropping without replenishing the soil nutrients and humus has created a situation where one-half-a-million acres of crop land is being removed from agricultural production. (Some of this land is going into housing developments and business pursuits.)

The consuming public is diet conscious and insists on balances for proper human growth and survival. If our crops lack the proper elements because the soil has been drained of them, the public will be forced to survive on capsules and eat only for bulk. This statement may have more merit than a casual reading may warrant. If we have the means at hand to maintain fertility, can we justify handing on to posterity the barren land that we have robbed of its riches when we at best are only tenants of the soil? And what does this malpractice do to the economy of the present day farmer? He will increase his time and expense to get from the soil a poorer product chemically, and a much poorer product marketably. Let us not forget that the soil produces food for our nourishment, clothing for our warmth, and shelter for our protection.

Our suggested program for the present and for the future is a logical one.

1. First and foremost is the job of informing our Representatives and Senators of the basic farm problem affecting the health of our citizens and the citizens of the future. The solution to the problem is for our own economic welfare and, in addition, for our own health. An abundant food supply maintains a healthy body politic and substitution of concentrated forms of health-supplying additives is a far cry from the real proven product.

Supplying the essential facts to our elective body will condition them for the time when the appropriation for the several projects comes before them for a vote.

2. Administration:

The most important factor for the correction of the existing evil, as I have presented it, is the administration of the agricultural laws that are now on the books.

Any correction of the basic conditions is beyond any individual efforts or any one-group effort. The social body must meet the challenge.

There are programs operating under present laws. These programs are good in themselves, but powerful when joined in a concerted and coordinated effort. Each program must have maximum funds to successfully operate.

I will review some of these programs briefly and in outline, with suggested improvements.

A. First: The ACP program:

Some of the practices administered by the agricultural stabilization and conservation committee in the Northeast area through the local and State committees are the following:

1. Soil protection and replenishment through (a) cover cropping—for protection of the topsoil; through (b) permanent reseeding of certain lands which will replace the organic matter of the soil (lost through several causes); through (c) liming to correct the acidity of the soil to foster growth of legumes; through (d) adding minerals for plant growth such as phosphates, potash, nitrogen, and trace minerals.

2. Reforestation: This work involves the thinning and replanting of trees cut for harvest.

3. Watersheds and farm ponds: This project conserves our rainfall for useful purposes by holding it until the time is most useful and most necessary and prevents loss by erosion.

4. Incentives: Much of the above could not be done through the efforts of the individual farmer unless a tangible token reward was dangled before his eyes. The reward is recognition of a job well done. Of course, some of the services performed by ACP could not be done by the individual because of the cost factor, but when the services are performed on an area basis, the individual cost is reasonable and economic.

SUMMARY

The above work by the ACP is a national effort at a present outlay of $250 million. The legislation as originally passed contemplated a budget of $500 million. With the accumulated experience of the personnel for the past 25 years, it is my humble opinion that the budget for ACP should be increased so that the program can be expanded to our economic advantage.

I mention here, and more is to be said about the committee system for the operation of the ACP program. Suffice for now to say that this system is democracy at the grassroot level.

I am quoting the agronomists when I say that the application of lime to the soil is but 15 to 20 percent of the recommended

annual application, and the addition of minerals is but 20 to 25 percent.

B. The Extension Service Program: The personnel attached to this service carry to the farmers the message of the results of research and its practical application. Let us give our need of praise to these dedicated men who have helped the farmer to produce more of a better crop and channeled the product into marts of the world.

C. Soil Conservation Service: This Service offers great financial assistance through their technicians, to carry out major farm programs. These programs protect and extend croplands and develop other lands for recreation, for wildlife, and for forestry. The Service is invaluable and the plans should be carried out by each individual producer involved.

D. Forest Service: This Service is widely known through publicity in all forms. What child does not recognize Smokey, the bear, and the forest warden at the top of the tower, alone in the depths of the woods? This picture stirs the imagination of everyone. The Service is widely acclaimed for its work in protection, education, and in development of our great national resource: forests.

E. Farmers Home Administration: This service provides money when needed, under controlled auspices, to our farmers, through the constituted farm banks. The lending of money to an individual is coordinated with the services described above. Its greatest asset is the personnel who understand the meaning of money and who understand the work of the farmer. The city banks slant their programs to the needs of our industrial communities.

3. Education:

When the public gets the facts on agricultural needs, repeated for emphasis, and without scare headlines, great strides will have been made. The exposure of the facts depends upon artists trained in the art of communication. Our federally aided schools and colleges must rise to the opportunities in this field, but talent must be seized wherever available.

Our farmers must be trained and developed in the art of soil conservation. The Extension Service has performed notably, but the goals must be set higher. Let us take note of the classic studies made in industry by Taylor and Galbraith with their works on industrial management and individual effort.

Our programs on television, slanted to propagandize the farm problem, should carry the spirit of adventure which Telstar and the rockets so superbly exhibit.

And to close with one of my own personal experiences, not a great accomplishment, but an effort which can be multiplied many times to advantage.

I acquired 290 acres of farmland in the 1930's. The soil was depleted by malpractice that the acreage would not pasture 40 head of cattle. Using every available service and help, the fertility and quality of the soil was developed by application of tons of lime, hundreds of pounds of nitrogen and phosphorus, and the cover crop was plowed in for humus. Today these fields support nearly 300 head of cattle, with 800 tons of grass silage and 300 to 400 tons of hay. This is a long way from the days in the 1930's when the acreage would not support a farmer.

My experience with these programs has convinced me that the local committeemen are in the best position to help solve the problems of the local farmer, and these solutions fit into the national picture. To suggest a substitution of the local committeemen for committeemen ruling from a seat in Washington would be a tragic error. Such a substitution could allow a corn belt man or a cotton plantation man to make rulings for agriculture in our Northeast section of the country. Our problems are local and the character of the farmers are peculiar to our section. Local men understand our needs and our oddities and have made, and can continue to make, this democracy of ours work.

Our farmers are individualists and hate rule by dictation. So let us keep our programs operating through the local committees.

I emphasize my firm convictions in the strength of our free enterprise system of government. We are great and strong and resourceful, all because we are allowed freedom of choice with a minimum of regulation. But this does not justify subsidizing the inefficient in the name of a support program.

I take this moment to express my appreciation for your kindness in listening to me and to those responsible for the invitation to be a panel member.

Russian Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 15, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with Russian agriculture by Dr. Paul Sanders, which was published in the December issue of Rural Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Russian agriculture is fully 50 years behind that of the United States, and shortage of food is their biggest problem. They are making fantastic progress, though, on farms and in factories; but lack of incentive for extra effort is plaguing them.

These are among the major impressions of agriculture that I brought back from a 3-week, 15,000-mile tour with 34 other Virginians in Central Europe. Most of the time on the tour last summer was behind the Iron Curtain, studying farming methods and country life deep in the heart of the Soviet Union.

Our tour group was handpicked by Parke C. Brinkley, then Virginia's commissioner of agriculture, to represent every phase of the industry of agriculture.

There were dairymen and milk handlers, stockmen, and meatpackers; fruitgrowers, truck farmers, and canners; poultrymen, grain growers, and nurserymen; county agents, vocational agriculture teachers, and farm journalists. Two outstanding farm machinery men made the trip.

Everyone paid his own way. Not a dime of State or Federal money went into the undertaking. It was a people-to-people project made possible under a treaty between our Government and Russia which permits the exchange of cultural and scientific knowledge. Our route was carefully planned in advance and arranged to permit us to see every facet of Russia farming.

Nearly everyone in the tour group had a camera or two. When we compared notes in the evening after a long day on a farm or in a factory the group came up with a pretty good picture of its operation.

To begin with, Russian farms are too big for efficient operation. Their state farms average 58,000 acres; the collective farms, 14,000 acres each. Compare this with the U.S. average of 220 acres per farm and you see one big difference between the democratic and the Soviet systems. Our people own family farms, and work hard and intelligently to make land and labor profitable in order to enjoy a high standard of living. In Russia, the Government owns all the land, and everybody works for the Government. The standard of living of all Russians is alike as "two peas in a pod." There is no incentive to achieve. Result: low production.

On Russian collective farms, the workers draw a very low wage but share in returns from production over and above a quota or norm set by the Communist Party. The surplus is sold to the state and the proceeds divided among the workers. This type of operation is on the decline because the norm is being constantly inched up and there is little surplus to divide.

On state farms, wages are higher, and there is no participation in the proceeds. Everybody trades at the state stores. It is the Russian feudal system without compassion.

Farming methods in Russia are a paradox, a study in contrasts. On the same farm one sees practices used since the days of the Pharaohs and others as modern as tomorrow. I saw tractors pulling four-row cultivators alongside 129 women with short-handled hoes weeding hybrid corn; oxen supplying farm power in the shadow of a dozen huge combines being readied for the grain harvest; women gleaning fields, as did Ruth in Biblical times, and others in a nearby modern milking parlor milking 1,000 cows with electric milking machines. This strange mixture of the old and the new is Russia's agriculture today.

This clash between the old and the new stems in part from the Kremlin's frantic effort to adopt the scientific farming methods that have brought the United States the most abundant food supply at the lowest cost mankind has ever known. The Russians apparently have access to all of the technical knowledge in the experiment station bulletins of our land-grant colleges, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and commercial concerns. But the Soviets have failed to allocate enough machinery, chemicals, and scientific know-how to agriculture.

The best trained manpower in Russia has been moved into official functions, defense work, and propaganda agencies, leaving illiterate and poorly skilled labor on the land. This type of farm worker might be satisfactory for the peasant agriculture that characterized Russia for 1,000 years, but as the country moves into an industrial complex with a large percentage of the population living off the farm a highly technical agriculture is essential. Russia still has 45 percent of the labor force in farming, and the average consumer spends 50 percent of his income for a drab, starchy diet that is woefully weak in meat, milk, and eggs.

Contrast this with the United States, where less than 9 percent of the labor force is engaged in farming and the consumer spends only 20 percent of his income for the best diet on earth. The competitive free enterprise system of our country has channeled essential machinery, chemicals, and professional manpower into food production that all of our people may eat well at low cost. Farm research and universal education have made American agriculture the marvel of the world.

There is nothing Mr. Khrushchev wouldn't give for our farflung system of land-grant colleges with their research, teacher training and extension work, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture with its multiplicity of programs designed to meet every inequity in American agriculture. Such a system behind the Iron Curtain might well be the difference between success and failure of the Soviet system.

Soviet peasants are still permitted to farm small garden plots of ground around their homes—one-half to 2 acres. This production can be sold in the market places for a profit. These small garden plots were the best-

farmed areas we saw in all Russia, showing that private initiative and profit attain production. From these small private, plots which constitute only 3 to 4 percent of the total sown acreage in the Soviet Union, come 47 percent of the meat, 80 percent of the eggs, 60 percent of the potatoes, and 50 percent of the green vegetables.

Drought is another thorn in the side of Soviet agriculture. The deep, rich soils of the Ukraine—the "bread basket" of Russia—look like Iowa and Illinois land. But shortage of rainfall cuts deep into crop yields.

Average rainfall in much of the Ukraine is 20 inches a year—less than half Virginia's annual precipitation. Some irrigation is used for vegetables, berries, and other high acre value crops. But as one travels east, the climate grows dry and the population sparse. It is in this arid country that 5 million of some 90 million acres have been plowed and seeded to grain. Many soil experts feel the Russians may be unwittingly opening up what could become another "dust bowl."

What holds Russia together? They have little to eat—mostly brown bread and potatoes. Yet the people appeared healthy and well fed. The clothing is inadequate—ill fitting, loud and ugly. There is a noticeable dearth of consumer goods, recreational facilities, and luxuries. Wages are low and prices are high. Housing is substandard. Life is cheap. Safety devices of all sorts were conspicuous by their absence. Everyone wears a serious, deadpan expression. There is little laughter.

Communists are all cast in the same mold. While some of the people were pulled down to fit the pattern, others were pulled up. Unquestionably, the average Russian is better off today than ever before. They never knew freedom and, therefore, they don't miss it.

Three things are holding Russia together: work—everybody works in order to eat; fear—of atomic bomb attack, famine, or someone squealing on them; promise—of more food, consumer goods, and free housing, medicines, and no taxes in the future.

I would summarize my 3-week trip by saying Russia is making great progress. To deny this is to kid ourselves. The average American has been badly victimized by propaganda on Soviet agriculture. The Communist threat to the free world is genuine. It's real. It may be later than many Americans believe.

Communism is more than a form of government. It's a new economic and social order—a religion. They have abolished God by public decree and substituted the Soviet system as the supreme power. The state owns all enterprises, housing and land. Everybody works for the Government. It's a political paradise—every able-bodied person has a government job.

The free world can thwart communism only by a healthy economy where the private ownership of property is profitable, greater dedication to the basic precepts of democracy, and a deeper religious and moral consciousness among our people.

Success Story Spiced by Horseradish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, my colleagues in the House had the opportunity to sample an outstanding product from my home district in Wisconsin. The House of Representatives dining room was serving zippy Wisconsin horseradish, compliments of Ed Bartusch, general manager of Silver Spring Gardens, Inc., Eau Claire, Wis.

I have had the pleasure of visiting Silver Spring Gardens, which began as a home operation during the depression and which has since grown into the largest horseradish producer in America. The success story of this enterprise is told in a story which appeared recently in the Milwaukee Journal, Milwaukee, Wis. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have this article printed in the RECORD:

HORSERADISH: WISCONSIN'S SNAPPY HARVEST

(By Clarice Rowlands)

EAU CLAIRE, WIS.—Snow flurries were in the air; the temperature was 13 above zero. Even horseradish harvesting was at a temporary standstill as the ground started to freeze. This was the state of late autumn weather in northwestern Wisconsin as a horseradish grower and processor became concerned about digging roots. Last of the State's crops harvested from mid-October into November, there is a concentrated rush of activity before winter sets in.

Familiar to most people in its grated, creamy form as it comes from the bottle, zippy horseradish starts its existence as a root cutting in the ground, according to Ed Bartusch, vice president and general manager of Silver Spring Gardens, Inc., largest producer in America. Located near here, the 360-acre farm is part of a 2,500 acre operation which also grows melons and potatoes.

RESULT OF DEPRESSION

Credit for the development of the nippy condiment goes to Ellis Huntsinger, president of the concern and father-in-law of Bartusch. When the depression deprived him of his sales job in 1929 he recalled his earlier farm life. With this inspiration he started growing melons, berries, and horseradish. He began with half an acre of the latter and produced three-fourths of a ton of horseradish. Today production is 1,500 tons.

Although he admits he's taking it easier now he still has his eye on the business. While others worry about the advent of winter, he contemplates leaving shortly for Florida to spend about 5 months.

RECALLS FIRST PACKING

"The first time I grated horseradish, there was no ventilation," he recalled. "There was nothing. We packed bottles by hand and we worked 16 hours a day, 6 or 7 days a week. I started the present operation in the milkhouse on this site."

His daughter, Mrs. Ed. Bartusch, remembers how she used to apply labels by hand on top of a board over a box. Mrs. Huntsinger, she said, did all the bookkeeping and anything else necessary to get the job done.

The present processing and bottling facilities at the plant are quite a contrast. They are the most modern available with sanitary stainless steel equipment handling the 48,000-bottle capacity per day.

Because Huntsinger is modest about his pioneer work in the horseradish business, Bartusch, who joined the concern in 1945, speaks proudly of it.

"It takes a cold climate to mature horseradish roots properly," he pointed out. "They become nice and white once the tops are frozen. The "R" months are the best for harvesting. We harvest about two-thirds of the crop now but leave some in the ground over winter for our spring harvest which accounts for about one-third."

Lush horseradish plants with their broad leaves look like Swiss chard during the growing season. Once frost hits they start turning brown, he explained. The main root is used for grinding stock while the best shoots or sets which branch from it are cut off and saved for future plants. It requires about 8,000 plants per acre and these are planted in rows.

AREA IS RECLAIMED

Bartusch drove us to a 1,000-acre area 5 miles west of Mondovi which his company started reclaiming from swampland in 1954 and is now an excellent productive area. While harvesters were digging roots in one section, other employees were planting cuttings in another area. The mechanical planter is capable of planting four rows at a time as eight employees sit on seats and feed the cuttings.

"The hills are worked off in the spring," he said. "We worry about a fast thaw. It should be gradual to insure our plants."

The St. Louis area, particularly in southern Illinois, is the center of horseradish growing in the United States, according to Bartusch. Approximately 3,000 acres are grown throughout the country and from this comes the horseradish supply for the Nation. Because of a shortage in the St. Louis region in 1952 and 1953, some was imported from Sweden and Japan at that time. No foreign horseradish, however, is now coming into this country, he added.

Bartusch is an authority, too, on who likes horseradish best. He's in a position to know because his concern distributes from coast to coast in 30 States and also in Canada.

"The North is the best market, although we do sell in Los Angeles and Miami. We think the liking for horseradish can be traced directly to European heritage. Polish people seem to be the best horseradish eaters, with those of Jewish and German heritage next. The French think it isn't subtle enough, and Italians never seem to use it. Wherever the climate is warm they don't know what it is. Argentinians do use it," he explained.

He also mentioned that Huntsinger worked closely for many years with the Univesity of Wisconsin college of agriculture in development of roots to produce a better yield, color, and strength. Wisconsin was the first to produce a hybrid horseradish.

The greatest advancement for the consumer came in 1941 when Huntsinger mixed some cream with horseradish and discovered that it prevented horseradish from turning brown and deteriorating. Butterfat coats horseradish and prevents oxidation. As a result this cream style stays fresh several times longer than the old vinegar pack.

In addition to the cream style, the firm turns out a shrimp and seafood sauce, hot dog relish, and beet horseradish, all incorporating horseradish. A rabbi from the Twin Cities regularly visits the plant prior to Passover to supervise the packing of horseradish for Jewish consumption. Labels are applied while he is there.

Bartusch has a strong word of advice for consumers. "Horseradish has to be kept cold. The colder, the better," he cautioned.

Like other packers, he is behind the label which appears now on shipments. It says, "Horseradish is a fresh food and to taste best must be refrigerated at all times."

"It is discouraging for us to find stale brown horseradish in restaurants, institutions, and even on grocery store shelves. Obviously, someone did not take care of it—the shipper, the warehouse, stock clerk, the restaurant, or the institution manager," he said in behalf of all packers.

In tracing the steps of horseradish roots from the field to the grated product available to the consumer, Bartusch explained that the roots dug by a mechanical digger are hauled

directly to a sorting shed. Here some 200 women working on conveyor belts separate the main root for grinding from other attached roots which are cut and bunched as cuttings for future plantings.

The grinding roots are then transported to coolers and the processing plant. A temperature of 32° is maintained in the huge cooler building where as many as 100 tons of roots can be stored when it is filled to capacity. From here the roots go to the processing plant where they enter revolving stainless steel churns. They undergo the washing process in a constant tumbling action.

Roots are then hauled in carts to the peeling room where women trim most of the blemishes by hand as roots move down a conveyor belt. A gentle spray of water washes them again and they are taken in carts from which they are dumped into two huge grinders. After the grinding, vinegar, sugar and cream are added. The completed mixture then moves on in stainless steel pipes to the bottling room where automatic machinery fills 5 ounce, 10 ounce, 1 pint, quart, and gallon containers. Labeling and packing into cartons complete the process.

The uses of this finished product are much more numerous than most homemakers think, the Huntsinger and Bartusch families believe. Huntsinger's favorite use is a sauce in which he combines one-third portion tartar sauce, one-third portion sweet or sour cream, one-third portion horseradish, a little lemon juice and sugar to taste. He mixes the ingredients and likes to serve it on baked potatoes, with meat or fish. A homemaker, he said, might prefer to use sour cream because it makes the sauce thicker.

John P. Duncan, Jr.: Man of the Year in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 15, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, John P. Duncan, Jr., a fellow Georgian and friend of farmers throughout the Nation, has been selected by the Progressive Farmer magazine as a Man of the Year for 1963 for his dedicated service to agriculture.

I congratulate Mr. Duncan on this honor, and know that my pride is shared by all those who know the outstanding contributions he has made toward improving agriculture and the life and welfare of the farmer.

Mr. Duncan served with distinction as president of the Georgia Farm Bureau before coming to Washington to become Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. His splendid work has drawn praise from all of his associates, including Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the citation given Mr. Duncan be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN P. DUNCAN, JR., GEORGIA, A SUCCESSFUL DIRT FARMER SERVING THE NATION WITH GREAT DISTINCTION

As a boy and as a young man, John Duncan trained for a career in farming and farm leadership. He grew up as an active worker on his father's farm—that of Master Farmer John P. Duncan, Sr., Brooks County, Ga. He gained more than usual training as a student at the University of Georgia College of Agriculture and at Emory University.

These years were followed by experience in the old Triple A State office in Athens, as a southern regional AAA representative in Washington, and then as a successful dirt farmer back in Brooks County. All these prepared him for the superior work he did as Georgia Farm Bureau president, and is now doing as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman says, "John Duncan is well known from one end of Georgia to the other as a dedicated, tireless worker for the farmer. His work in Washington may not be as well known to his friends in Georgia, but it is equally outstanding. He carries a heavy burden in the Department of Agriculture and commands both the affection and respect of all his associates. I am privileged to join the Progressive Farmer in saluting John Duncan as Georgia's Man of the Year."

Under Secretary Charles S. Murphy added, "John Duncan's rare combination of ability, courage, and integrity, coupled with his thorough and practical knowledge of agriculture, qualify him to a unique degree for the position he now holds. The farmers of the Nation owe him an immeasurable debt of gratitude."

Few, except those who know intimately his Washington activities from week to week, can appreciate the tremendous job he has done for cotton, poultry, peanut, tobacco, and all other farm families of the South. In present cash dollars, it would run into multiplied millions; in contributions to a permanently stronger and brighter agriculture, his worth cannot be easily measured.

The Taxpayers' Friend: Comptroller General Joseph Campbell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 15, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Chicago Daily News, very ably written by James McCartney, praising the extraordinary efficiency and public spirit of the Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXPAYERS' DEDICATED "WATCHDOG" NIPS AWAY AT WASTE IN WASHINGTON

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—In the vast administrative jungle that is Washington, Joseph Campbell, 62, may be the taxpayer's best friend.

He is a man sworn, purely and simply, to fight waste in Government spending.

He is a modern "David" in a David versus Goliath struggle to prevent inefficiency, extravagance, and downright crookedness in the spending of the people's money.

Campbell is the Comptroller General of the United States, head of the Government's General Accounting Office.

As such, he works for Congress with the express role of keeping an accountant's eye on the mushrooming Federal bureaucracy.

Consider the odds:

The executive branch of the Government has more than 2,500,000 employees. Campbell has 4,700 in the GAO.

The Federal budget next year will approach $100 billion. Campbell's operating budget at the GAO is about $43 million.

It is an unequal struggle at best, but, amazingly enough, Campbell—unlike almost every other agency boss in Washington—is not in the business of trying to boost his own budget or enlarge his empire.

In fact, in fiscal 1962 the GAO, because of Campbell's tight administration, didn't spend all of its appropriation.

It didn't draw $2,100,000 of its legally appropriated funds because Campbell figured he could get along without the money.

And, rather than growing in size in recent years, the GAO payroll has been sharply cut.

When Campbell took over 8 years ago the agency had 5,800 employees—1,100 more than it has now.

AN UNUSUAL BREED OF PUBLIC SERVANT

These actions, needless to say, violate every rule of Washington empire building and, in themselves, single out Joseph Campbell as an unusual breed of public servant.

Perhaps even more remarkable is the fact that Campbell believes his small force is doing a better job than the larger force he inherited.

When it comes to running an agency, Campbell is a believer in quality rather than quantity.

"A smaller number of more efficient, more professional men can do a better job than a larger number of voucher clerks without professional training," he says.

It's not that he doesn't think he could use more people to perform his assigned job. If he could get good people, he'd want them.

But he is not currently asking for more help because professionally trained accountants of the quality he would like to have are in short supply, and he doesn't want to load up with second-class men.

The pipe-smoking Campbell, a deep-voiced, soft-spoken man with bright, penetrating blue eyes, was brought into the Government by President Eisenhower.

Campbell was treasurer of Columbia University when Mr. Eisenhower was Columbia's president. When Mr. Eisenhower became President of the United States he appointed Campbell to the Atomic Energy Commission and then, later, moved him to GAO.

Campbell still carries the aura of the campus with him.

He wears informal blue shirts, a vest, dark brown horn-rimmed glasses and thick, rubber-soled shoes. He might be mistaken for a professor at almost any university.

"He can call hundreds of GAO employees in offices throughout the world by name," says an aid.

MAKES SPOT CHECKS ON U.S. SPENDING

The GAO's job is to spot check Government spending through independent audits.

On one occasion an audit turned up the fact that some Army officers at Fort Lee, Va., had spent more than $500,000 for an airfield—when they were officially limited to $25,000 for the project.

When the cat was out of the bag, Congress clamped down quickly.

Another time the GAO discovered an administrative maze in the Weather Bureau.

It seems that supplies bought by the bureau were delivered to a storeroom where they were counted and inspected for breakage, then reshipped to another location 2 miles away where they were counted again and tested.

The crowning touch, however, was the discovery that the supplies were then shipped back to the original storeroom—where they were counted again.

The Weather Bureau has revamped its procedures since.

These are but isolated samples, however, of hundreds of reports issued by the GAO. At any one time the GAO is involved in about 200 to 250 investigations.

By its own estimate, measurable potential savings to the taxpayers as a result of GAO recommendations came to about $95 million last year. That is well more than twice the GAO's own budget.

Campbell believes the biggest problems in trying to prevent waste lie not so much in outright thievery or dishonesty as in honest mistakes or bad judgment.

He says the biggest areas of waste are in procurement of government supplies, particularly in defense supplies, and he is sharply critical of lack of competition for many defense contracts.

There are many areas of "inadequate controls" and "inadequate management" in governmental administration, he says.

In brief, Campbell would like to see the government operated like a taut, well-run ship, with the best possible personnel. He knows it can be done. He has done it in his own agency.

Wisconsin Author Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the town of Pepin in my home district of Wisconsin is known across the Nation as the birthplace and childhood home of the noted author, Laura Ingalls Wilder. Countless readers have become familiar with pioneer life in the area surrounding beautiful Lake Pepin by reading Mrs. Wilder's book, "Little House in the Big Woods." It is a well-written and fascinating account of her childhood in a frontier community.

Although Mrs. Wilder's books were written primarily for children, the stories have a universal appeal. The philosophy which they express is basic:

> It is still best to be honest and truthful; to make the most of what we have; to be happy with simple pleasures; and to be cheerful and have courage when things go wrong.

Last fall, a historical marker honoring Mrs. Wilder was unveiled in Pepin's village park, which has been renamed Laura Ingalls Wilder Park. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Courier-Wedge, Durand, Wis., concerning this event:

NEW PEPIN MEMORIAL

Late last fall, residents of Pepin staged an unveiling ceremony at a new historical marker in their village park. The marker honors Laura Ingalls Wilder, whose book, "Little House in the Big Woods," created national interest in the Pepin community. Many people who learn about Pepin through the book have visited this area; countless others send inquiries by letter.

Mrs. Wilder was born 7 miles north of Pepin in a little log house surrounded by a crooked rail fence. Today, the house and fence are gone. The big woods are gone, too. State Highway 183 passes through the former Ingalls farm, apparently following a wagon track described in the book.

Records in the courthouse at Durand show that Charles Ingalls acquired his farm in 1863. His famous daughter, Laura, was born February 7, 1867. The philosophy expressed in her books is basic: "It is still best to be honest and truthful; to make the most of what we have; to be happy with simple pleasures; and to be cheerful and have courage when things go wrong."

During the final years of her life, Mrs. Wilder and husband, Alamanzo, resided on a farm near Mansfield, Mo. After Mr. Wilder died in 1949, she lived alone until she succumbed February 10, 1957.

The wolves, bears, and panthers Mrs. Wilder described in her writings are gone from this area. One thing which still remains is the beautiful lake. It is just as beautiful as the first time Laura saw it on a trip to town. People catch fish in the lake just like her father did in 1870. Through the years, Lake Pepin has been a source of fish both for the sportsman and the commercial fisherman. Many fish are sold in eastern markets.

With respect to the noted author, Pepin Park has been renamed Laura Ingalls Wilder Park. People who pass through Pipin cannot miss the historical marker along Highway 35. Visitors are not disappointed to find the Ingalls house and the woods gone. As the author noted: "Now is now. It can never be a long time ago."

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Kremlin Can't Kill Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 16, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a highly interesting article from the December 23, 1962, issue of Family Weekly by Ernest Conine, entitled "The Kremlin Can't Kill Christmas." Mr. Conine, one of McGraw-Hill's leading writers, spent 2 years in Moscow, Russia, as chief of McGraw-Hill's publication bureau. He is at present chief of their bureau in Boston, Mass., and editor of Business Week.

In these days it is encouraging and refreshing to me, as I am sure it is to the other Members of the Senate, to know that the spirit of Christmas still lives in the hearts of the Russian people.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KREMLIN CAN'T KILL CHRISTMAS

(By Ernest Conine)

For more than 45 years, the Kremlin's propaganda machine has hammered away at the theme that Christmas is a fraud.

Yet one day next week hundreds of Soviet children will troop into the Great Kremlin Palace, the very citadel of Red atheism. There they will stare wide-eyed at a towering fir tree festooned with lights and bright baubles, and accept gifts from Grandfather Frost—a benign old gentleman who looks suspiciously like Santa Claus.

To be sure, the word "Christmas" will never be uttered, certainly not by the Kremlin sponsors. The gathering is calculated to instill in the children a devotion not to God but to the state.

Undoubtedly, the regime succeeds at least partially in this aim. But as a news correspondent who lived 2 years in Moscow, I can testify that the occasion also stands as a monument to the Kremlin's failure to erase Christmas from the hearts of the Soviet people.

Shortly after my arrival in Moscow, I stood shivering one day on Gorky Street, one of the capital's major thoroughfares. While waiting for a taxi, I pondered the sadness of the holiday season in Russia. It was Christmas morning, and I thought of the Nativity scenes in the store windows back home in America, the streets overhung with holly, the soft peal of church bells.

In Moscow, it appeared to be just another workday. Just one touch of color showed in the great, drab street—a huge red banner urging: "Onward to the Victory of Communism."

Anyone who lives in the U.S.S.R. learns, however, that beneath the dreary surface the Spirit of Bethlehem survives after all the years of propaganda, pressure, and persecution.

Small gifts, even crude Christmas cards, are exchanged among friends. And when I visited the home of one Russian during the holidays, I was surprised to see a Christmas tree; I knew they were unobtainable in the markets, "I cut it myself in the forests near Moscow," he explained. "Many of our people do so."

But more worrisome to the Kremlin is the fact that millions of professed atheists who never go to church any other time—even Communist Party members—attend the special Christmas services which are held on the evening of December 24 in Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches and on January 7 in the Russian Orthodox churches.

Take the case of Vasily, a Soviet journalist who once told me mockingly that: "Our cosmonauts found no God in space." One Christmas Eve I visited Moscow's St. Louis Cathedral, where attendance usually is light for normal services. But on this occasion, I could barely crowd in. As I surveyed the faces, I was struck by the number of young people there—including Vasily, who stood silent with his head bowed.

Although galled by the persistence of the Christian faith, Khrushchev and company cannot afford to return to the harsh persecutions of the Stalin era; the resulting discontent might dangerously impair industrial production.

The regime's current tactic is a flank attack. A clever campaign is underway to take Christ out of Christmas—to preserve the festive trappings while removing the religious content and turning the holiday to Communist purposes.

Christmas is not forbidden; it is simply ignored. But on New Year's Day, celebrations are held in workers' clubs and Young Pioneer Palaces all over Russia. The traditional Christmas tree is there, with all the trimmings. But it is called a New Year's tree, and the accent is on the glorious victories to be won by communism.

The children's party at the Kremlin is the most glittering of all, with admittance reserved for those who have especially distinguished themselves in Young Pioneer work for the Soviet state. Grandfather Frost, a rotund, white-bearded fellow with a sparkling suit, plays the traditional role of Saint Nicholas.

The authorities go all out to make the celebration a truly happy and memorable one. They hope the youngsters will grow up identifying this occasion with the party, not the church.

At home, most Russian families now have a tiny tree of their own. Again, it is called a New Year's tree, at least in the presence of foreigners. But it is significant that the tree usually stays in place until January 8, the day after the Russian Orthodox Christmas—even in the homes of my godless Soviet acquaintances.

Erosion of American Fishing Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, joint House-Senate hearings are scheduled to be held in Seattle, February 13–14, in connection with North Pacific halibut conservation. The purpose of such hearings is to review results of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission which meets in Tokyo on February 5 and to obtain information as to the effect on American fishermen of the recent opening of the East Bering Sea halibut fishery to Japanese fishermen by this Commission.

Meanwhile, a recent issue of the Fishermen's News contains a guest editorial by George Johansen, secretary of the Alaska Fishermen's Union. This editorial which expresses great concern over the erosion of American fishing rights, follows:

UNITED STATES CHALLENGED IN HALIBUT CONTROVERSY

(By George Johansen)

Considering the efforts made by the United States and the long uphill struggle we had to rebuild the halibut fishery, it is our opinion that we have a special and preferential right because, without our efforts, the halibut would not be found in commercial quantities on the open ocean today.

Moreover, through research conducted by the Halibut Commission, a pattern of migration from Bering Sea to the Gulf of Alaska as been established. On the basis of that research, we can consider that eastern Bering Sea is, in fact, a nursery ground for part of the halibut caught south of the Aleutian Islands. The reports of the Halibut Commission show that when heavy catches were made north of the Aleutians, a decline in catches was experienced south of the Aleutians The relationship between Bering Sea and other districts of Alaska has definitely been established.

By the terms of the tripartite treaty, any of the participating nations can open up the treaty for negotiations as of June 1963. In accordance with expressions made in Japanese newspapers and fishery periodicals, the Japanese will go all out for abolishment of the abstention principle, and this is a fact which we must face in forthcoming negotiations. The only hope of adequate protection for the American fisheries in the new treaty, lies in full and complete support from our Government. Appeasement and soft talk are not going to accomplish desired results.

In our previous discussions with the Departments of State and Interior, we have received their assurances they will support the abstention principle. We hope those assurances mean that the United States will provide the necessary pressure to implement the promise of support which they have made to the fishing industry.

WORD "ABSTENTION" NEEDED

There already has been some talk of finding language which would substitute some other word for "abstention"—a word which would be less objectionable to the Japanese. In our opinion, this would be disastrous and would not give us the protection we seek; in fact, it could be a circumvention of the abstention principle.

I would respectfully call to your attention that the present treaty has not granted the Japanese any historical fishing rights on North American stocks of salmon on the open ocean. It has specifically stated that the Japanese should abstain from the taking

of North American stocks of salmon. In spite of this and due to what we term "an erosion of the principle of the treaty," the Japanese have taken millions upon millions of North American salmon west of the provisional line. They have been given the red carpet treatment, and while we must and should maintain good relations with the Japanese, we should not appease them to a point where our salmon resource will be destroyed for all time to come.

We note that the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has stated that the recommendation of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission on eastern Bering Sea halibut will be referred to and given most careful study by the Departments of State and Interior. In the first place, the action taken by the Commission was strongly recommended by the advisors of the State and Interior Departments, so it would be very unlikely that those advisors would now comment unfavorably in any way on the Commission's decision. If such review of the decision is conducted by the same representatives who attended the ninth annual meeting of the Commission, then we should discount such review as having little merit under the circumstances.

The salmon, halibut, king crab and other fisheries on the Pacific coast are of utmost importance to the Pacific Northwest, including Alaska. The fishermen on this coast are not unreasonable—they believe in following orderly and lawful procedures, but, in this instance, they feel their rights have been compromised. We had a fuller utilization of halibut in Bering Sea in 1962 than in any previous years, but still, in 1962, we are told to give up rights which we had earned over a period of 40 years.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

We think there are three considerations embodied in our fishery problems, namely: political, economic, and scientific. In the case of eastern Bering Sea halibut, it is our view that the only aspect which was given any consideration was on the scientific side. Recognition should be given to the economic impact upon the fishermen who have to catch those fish to make a living. Down through the years, we have supported all appropriations for scientific fishery research because we believe that in order to successfully manage our fisheries, we must have scientific knowledge. On the other hand, we would not want theorists and biologists to completely dominate the fisheries, and it appears to us that the trend is in that direction.

I believe a treaty is necessary for our future protection. All of us have a responsibility to recognize that fact. I do not believe we can achieve worthwhile results by retreating and appeasement. I would recommend the immediate charter of one or two vessels to conduct necessary research work in the Bering Sea area, to provide additional information needed.

The reaction and opposition to the decision shown by the many hundreds of people who attended the Seattle meeting on December 7, was a clear indication of the tremendous interest and concern the fishing industry has in regard to Government policies pertaining to our fisheries.

The Committee To Save Halibut, composed of various segments of the fishing industry, has forwarded a resolution which we believe should be seriously considered and should constitute policies to be followed in the future.

We must stop the erosion of American rights. As a nation, we have sincerely strived for sound conservation of our fisheries—we have sacrificed to make that program possible and we believe we have a right to enjoy the fruits of our labors.

Mists of the Deep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 16, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Davis Y. Paschall, president, College of William and Mary, entitled "Mists of the Deep" which was made at the launching of the *Henry Clay* at Newport News on November 30, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISTS OF THE DEEP

(By David Y. Paschall)

It is pertinent to ask why a naval craft, outfitted with the most powerful striking force of the atomic age, should bear the name of one of American history's most effective men of peace. The answer is not difficult, of course, when we recall the historic mission of America itself, which has always been to preserve a just peace among men and nations. The answer is amplified when we consider the main features in the life of Henry Clay himself, and consider again some of his great pronouncements on the destiny of the Nation he loved and served so well.

Henry Clay was born in Hanover County, Va., on April 12, 1777. He grew up in the shadow of the great Virginians of the Revolutionary era—men like Jefferson, Pendleton, and Wythe. It was under Chancellor Wythe—as it had been with Jefferson and John Marshall—that Clay studied law. During his period of study he also served as Mr. Wythe's secretary, and under his inspiring personality Henry Clay grasped the fundamentals not only of the law but of the classics of Western literature and political philosophy that were to characterize his great papers throughout his public life.

At the age of 26, as a resident of the new frontier State of Kentucky, Mr. Clay was elected to the State legislature—and 2 years later to an unexpired term of a U.S. Senator, thus beginning that public career which covered the first half of the 19th century, until his death in 1852. For more than a dozen years in the House of Representatives, and for almost 20 years in the Senate, Henry Clay steered the young United States through the crisis of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and in his dying years helped shape the Compromise of 1850, by which in two different generations he sought to save the country from the perils of civil war.

As a member of the U.S. Peace Commission in 1814 he witnessed the satisfactory conclusion of the War of 1812, while as Secretary of State under John Quincy Adams he helped effectively to dispose of some of the lingering contentions over trade and national rights which had been fomented by the Napoleonic period. In the compromise of 1832, involving the furious domestic quarrel over tariffs and nullification, he again demonstrated the ruling philosophy of his life—let all parties be prepared to make reasonable sacrifices in the interest of the national peace and harmony. Twenty years later, at the end of his long life of service, the eulogies of onetime political opponents aptly quoted the poet's lines:

"Born when freedom her stars and stripes unfurl'd,
When revolution shook the startled world—
Heroes and sages taught his brilliant mind
To know and love the rights of all mankind."

This is the man we honor on this occasion—Virginian, Kentuckian, American—the man of whom the attribution, "I'd rather be right than be President," has become part of our political heritage—the man whose reputation as "the Great Compromiser" has been universally recognized not as a yielding to any pressure to abandon principles but a constant desire to sacrifice the personal interest where the national interest required it. As a practicing lawyer he always chose to represent the defense against the State. As a diplomat he supported the South American wars of independence and the Greek revolt against the Turks. As an expansionist he stated a characteristic policy with regard to Texas—that its annexation should be only under conditions "without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms." If it is true that this creed cost him his last chance for the Presidency, it gave this country something much more valuable in his legacy.

On this occasion it might be interesting to quote an early comment from Henry Clay—made in Congress in 1812, during a debate on the expansion of the U.S. Navy. While many contemporary emotions and factors entered into the debate, Mr. Clay accurately foresaw the role that the young country must assume if it were truly to have a voice in the councils of the great nations. He spoke against a motion to reduce the naval forces, and in the process made this prophetic observation:

"But the source of alarm is in ourselves. Gentlemen fear, that if we provide a marine, it will produce collisions with foreign nations; plunge us into war, and ultimately overturn the Constitution of the country. Sir, if you wish to avoid foreign collision, you had better abandon the ocean; surrender all your commerce; give up all your prosperity. It is the thing protected, not the instrument of protection, that involves you in war. Commerce engenders collision, collision war, and war, the argument supposes, leads to despotism. Would the counsels of that statesman be deemed wise, who would recommend that the nation should be unarmed; that the art of war, the martial spirit, and martial exercises, should be prohibited; who should declare, in the language of Othello, that the nation must bid farewell to the neighing steed, and the shrill trump, the spirit-stirring drum, the ear-piercing fife, and all the pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war; and that the great body of the people should be taught, that national happiness was to be found in perpetual peace alone? No, sir. And yet, every argument in favor of a power of protection on land, applies, in some degree, to a power of protection on the sea. Undoubtedly a commerce void of naval protection is more exposed to rapacity than a guarded commerce; and if we wish to invite the continuance of the old, or the enactment of new edicts, let us refrain from all exertion upon that element where we must operate, and where, in the end, they must be resisted."

In 1818, Henry Clay again voiced an American creed in his support of the independence movements in Latin America. Again, what he said in that creed has a striking pertinence to our present situation:

"Our Revolution was mainly directed against the mere theory of tyranny. We had suffered comparatively but little; we had, in

some respects, been kindly treated; but our intrepid and intelligent fathers saw, in the usurpation of the power to levy an inconsiderable tax, the long train of oppressive acts that were to follow. They rose; they breasted the storm; they achieved our freedom. Spanish America for centuries has been doomed to the practical effects of an odious tyranny. If we were justified, she is more than justified.

"I am no propagandist. I would not seek to force upon other nations our principles and our liberty, if they do not want them. I would not disturb the repose even of a detestable despotism. But, if an abused and oppressed people will their freedom; if they seek to establish it; if, in truth, they have established it; we have a right, as a sovereign power, to notice the fact, and to act as circumstances and our interest require. I will say, in the language of the venerated father of my country, 'born in a land of liberty, my anxious recollections, my sympathetic feelings, and my best wishes, are irresistibly excited, whensoever, in any country, I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banners of freedom.' "

Again may I quote to you from Henry Clay, in a passage full of import for our own time. Here he speaks in support of a resolution to authorize steps leading to recognition of the Greek revolutionaries in their fight against the Turks, and in his speech he deals with the charge that bold action on a matter of principle may bring the United States face to face with grave international dangers:

"This Government, you, Mr. Chairman, and the body over which you preside, are the living and cutting reproach to allied despotism. If we are to offend them, it is not by passing this resolution. We are daily and hourly giving them cause of war. It is here, and in our free institutions, that they will assail us. They will attack us because you sit beneath that canopy, and we are freely debating and deliberating upon the great interests of freemen, and dispensing the blessings of free government. They will strike, because we pass one of those bills on your table. The passage of the least of them, by our free authority, is more galling to despotic powers, than would be the adoption of this so much dreaded resolution. Pass it, and what do you do? You exercise an indisputable attribute of sovereignty, for which you are responsible to none of them."

This is the man whose name most fittingly is now to be identified with a powerful instrument of peace and the enforcement of right dealing among nations. Henry Clay was a man of peace—but of peace which was reconciled with principle. He shared with Plato the conviction that with nations as with individuals, it is not death, but the failure to attain the just life, which is most to be feared. He lived in a time when the idea of freedom was threatened by different forces, but with as much sinister power, as it is today. He was born during one conflict, and was just beginning his public career when a second was fought on his native soil.

And now we prepare to dedicate another mission in the name of Henry Clay, in our own time. How striking are some of the parallels between his day and ours, and between the issues on which he spoke and those which now confront us.

There are—today as in 1812—those who question whether, with forces of destruction in the hands of those who hate everything democracy stands for, we should not constantly look to our own capacity to strike back.

There are—today as in 1818—forces at work for freedom and forces at work to destroy freedom among our great sister states of Latin America. Can anyone question what our course should be, today, as when the Monroe Doctrine was first in the process of evolution?

There are—today as in 1824—threats to independent nations around the borders of the great Eurasian land mass which represents the unhappy fortress of totalitarianism. Henry Clay saw the support of the Greek patriots as a duty we owed to our own concept of freedom; we are committed to the same viewpoint, essentially, in our decision to resist infiltration and aggression seeking to destroy the free governments of southeast Asia.

The chief difference between our world and that of Henry Clay is simply one of magnitude. The threat to freedom is now worldwide. The capacity for destruction is now a thousandfold greater in the atomic age. Can there be any question but that our response to these challenges must be in proportion?

It is a rather striking coincidence that when Henry Clay spoke in support of an expanded Navy in 1812, he was urging the construction of a number of frigates not quite as large as the number of nuclear submarines now being augmented by his namesake. The modern U.S.S. *Henry Clay* will be the 15th nuclear submarine launched in the national program to guard the frontiers of freedom throughout the world. It gives a proper pride to Virginians to note that so many of the submarines in the Navy's ballistic missile or Polaris system have taken their names from the sons of this Commonwealth who helped launch this great Nation—the *George Washington*, which deployed on her first patrol 2 years ago this month; the *Patrick Henry* and the *Robert E. Lee*, the *John Marshall*, the *Thomas Jefferson* and the *James Monroe*, with the keel already laid for the *James Madison*. A salute of pride is, also, the earned accolade of this great shipyard—the builder of so powerful a deterrent to aggression and so striking a protector of the peace.

It is the happy and solemn responsibility of this generation to preserve what our great forefathers handed down to us. In this century, it has sometimes been an unfortunate practice to treat our heritage as something we have outgrown. The truth is, not only that it is inescapable because it is part of us, but that heritage is our only justification for continued existence as a free people. "Let us now praise famous men"—the early Americans who are living characters in our own living history. Let me assess them in the words of a leading modern American historian:

"Whom did the American revere, whom did he condemn? Who were the models held up to the emulation of the young? Every child carried with him a number of images of the father of his country: The boy George with his hatchet—'Father, I cannot tell a lie'; the young Washington on Braddock's field; Washington crossing the Delaware; kneeling in prayer at Valley Forge; adjusting his spectacles as he addresses his comrades in arms—'I have grown not only gray but almost blind in the service of my country'; retiring in the end to Mount Vernon. He was clearly first in war and first in peace, yet too remote and formidable to be first in the hearts of his countrymen. That place in the affections of Americans was long held rather by Benjamin Franklin, who was recalled more familiarly munching his loaf of bread, trundling his wheelbarrow through the streets of Philadelphia, flying his kite, compiling the homey ophorisms that adorned a hundred readers, and flaunting his fur cap at the court of Versailles. When Poor Richard seemed too tame, there was the fiery Patrick Henry, and every schoolboy knew that Caesar had his Brutus, and echoed, with appropriate gestures, the invitation to 'Give me liberty or give me death.' Besides these, there was a splendid gallery of lesser heroes: John Smith saved by the beautiful Pocahontas; Roger Williams trekking through the snow to Narragansett Bay; Daniel Boone hewing out the wilderness trail; Paul Revere on his midnight ride; Jefferson penning the Declaration; Marion the Swamp Fox; Nathan Hale with but one life to lose for his country; Ethan Allen to whom profanity was permitted; * * * Perry who met the enemy at Put-in-Bay; Decatur who burned the *Philadelphia* in Tripoli Harbor; Jackson who went straight from New Orleans to the White House. All of them, in the end, made way for Lincoln, the very apotheosis of the American, too homely for idolatry, too inscrutable for mere history, a legend before the lilacs bloomed again. These were his heroes: A people could have worse."

In the perspective of time, we can honor men who in their day were often violently opposed to each other—Clay and Andrew Jackson, Jefferson and Marshall, Lee and Lincoln. We honor them because they all exercised the two basic responsibilities of freemen—first, to arrive at a conviction of national welfare based upon honest judgment and integrity; second, to accept the consequences of standing by that conviction.

It is to protect such a heritage that we send forth our armed naval forces to patrol. Because the international waters of the world cover about 70 percent of the world's surface, this is the tactical area in which the patrol should operate. Contemporary need and our own historic policy has settled the question of whether we should choose this course of action—in the words of Henry Clay, "If you wish to avoid foreign collision, you had better abandon the ocean." Rather, we have chosen to use that ocean for protective purposes, and to equip our underwater forces with the facilities of the atomic age—almost unlimited cruising range and endurance limited only by the human capacities of the crew; mobility, secret deployment, constant readiness for action, or carefully considered delayed action.

The American of 1962 does not shrink from the task of following where his fathers walked. He sees again in his mind's eye the "mists of the deep" which slowly and fatefully unfolded over Fort McHenry to show that "our flag was still there," unyielding against the most powerful forces hurled against it. He remembers the Confederates who died on Little Round Top at Gettysburg, and the Union soldiers who died in the Crater at Petersburg. He remembers John Paul Jones who had just begun to fight when he seemed about to be overwhelmed, and the GI's caught in the Battle of the Bulge and their one-word answer to a demand to surrender.

This is the heritage whose preservation we trust to the American of 1962, and which the new U.S.S. *Henry Clay* carries in the armor of the Polaris missile. It is now to be launched, with the dedication of another sailor whose life mission was described by the poet:

"Though much is taken, much abides; and though
We are not now that strength which in old days
Moved earth and heavn; that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

Texas Loses Distinguished Citizen in Death of Former Representative Joe H. Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 16, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texas has lost a champion of the people, a distinguished citizen in the death of the Honorable Joe H. Eagle, who served his State in Congress from 1913 to 1921 and from 1933 to 1936.

He was a man of exceptional brilliance, who was superintendent of schools in Vernon, Tex., before he was 20 years old and had served as city attorney in Wichita Falls, Tex., before he was 25—having passed the State bar examination while holding the school administrative job.

Mr. Eagle was a close friend of President Woodrow Wilson. He was a leader in legislative action setting up the Federal Reserve bank law and in farm loan legislation that enabled so many landless farmworkers to acquire their own property.

I ask unanimous consent that an article and an editorial from the Houston Press of Friday, January 11, captioned "Joe H. Eagle" and "Joe Eagle, Scholar and Congressman," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE EAGLE, SCHOLAR AND CONGRESSMAN

Joe H. Eagle, scholar, ex-Congressman, statesman, attorney, philosopher and poet, died Thursday at the age of 92 at his home at 3424 Wickersham.

A Houston resident for 67 years, the man who cracked jokes in Greek with President Woodrow Wilson succumbed after a 3-day illness.

Mr. Eagle had been confined to a wheelchair following leg injuries when he fell under a bus in 1958.

Born in Tompkinsville, Ky., January 23, 1870, he finished all courses in the little town's school and obtained his first-grade teacher's certificate when he was only 14.

HIGH MAN IN CLASS

Three years later, in 1887, he completed a 5-year course at Burritt College in Spencer, Tenn. He was high man and valedictorian of his class.

Mr. Eagle once told a Press reporter:

"I was 9 years old when my mother told me to be honest and truthful, to work at every task, never to touch liquor.

MOVED TO TEXAS

"She wanted me to become a scholar, a lawyer, an orator, a Congressman—like Henry Clay. That became the program of my life."

He never tasted alcoholic beverage.

In 1887, Kentucky's loss became Texas' gain when Mr. Eagle moved to Vernon, where he was superintendent of schools when he was only 19.

On Sundays and holidays he studied the University of Virginia law course by correspondence. After passing the Texas bar examination he became a lawyer.

He moved to Wichita Falls and was elected city attorney at 24.

CAME HERE IN 1895

Houston was a city of 40,000 in 1895 when he moved his law offices here. Recently, his offices were in the First City National Bank Building.

In 1900, by then a prosperous attorney, Mr. Eagle married pretty Mary Hamman of Houston. Mrs. Eagle died in 1939.

Twice in his lifetime, Mr. Eagle gave unstintingly of himself to his Nation.

SERVED IN CONGRESS

He served 8 years in Congress from 1913 to 1921. Then again, starting in 1933, he was elected for two more terms. Both times he retired voluntarily.

It was during his earlier term, as a Member of the House of Representatives, that Mr. Eagle and President Woodrow Wilson became close friends.

Both men spoke Greek and often exchanged jokes in that language.

FOUGHT THE KLAN

Mr. Eagle was a champion of free silver, a bitter opponent of the Ku Klux Klan, and argued against women's suffrage, explaining he believed the latter to be a States right matter.

For the same reason he fought prohibition.

He helped write the Federal Reserve bank law and was the author of the farm loan bill, which enabled hundreds of thousands of tenant farmers to acquire their own homesteads.

JOE H. EAGLE

The death of Joe H. Eagle at 92 years—and so long retired from public life—will send many an oldtime Houstonian's memory shuttling back 25, 50, perhaps even more years.

Elected to Congress here from 1913 to 1921 and again from 1933–36, Mr. Eagle was by far one of earlier-day Houston's most popular political figures.

Self-taught scholar, philosopher, poet, and gifted storyteller, he was even more popular with those who knew him personally.

Mr. Eagle was born in a small Kentucky town, finished all the schooling offered when 14, and at that tender age won a teacher's certificate.

He completed a 5-year college course in Tennessee in 3 years. At only 19, he came to Texas to be superintendent of schools in Vernon.

While in that position, he studied law and passed the Texas bar examination, served as city attorney in Wichita Falls then came to Houston to practice law—all by the time he was 25.

That is a formal picture of the young Joe H. Eagle but even the recital of these accomplishments do him scant justice.

Joe Eagle would fight a circle saw if he thought he was right and the saw was wrong. He proved it many, many times—as a public official and as a private attorney.

When it was almost official suicide to do so, he opposed women's suffrage on a national basis. The right to say who voted belonged only the the States, he believed. No pressures swayed him. When Ku Klux Klan fever swept Texas around 1920, he was among the first to denounce it as mob rule. When the Nation wracked itself with the pains of-pro- and anti-prohibition, Joe Eagle, a personal teetotaler, fought prohibition, again as an invasion of States rights.

With all his firm views and his largely self-acquired erudition (he was famed for cracking jokes in ancient Greek with scholarly President Woodrow Wilson), Joe Eagle was a fairminded, friendly, and modest man unusually tolerant of and courteous to others.

Joe H. Eagle was a fine gentleman who lived a long, useful life, highly respected and admired even by those who differed with him.

American Success Story Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 16, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on December 11, 1962, the American Success Story Awards were presented by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc. Receiving the awards were two women and eight men whose accomplishments symbolize the success possible to all under America's free enterprise system. Each of the award recipients rose from humble jobs to head or own large industries.

I am particularly proud that my own State was represented at the proceedings in the person of Mr. Talbot T. Speer, Free Enterprise Awards Association awards chairman. Mr. Speer is himself an example of the American success story.

Mr. President, we often lose sight of the fact that our country continues to offer opportunities for success to all who are willing to strive for it. To emphasize this, I ask unanimous consent that an article included in the December 11 issue of the Annapolis Evening Capital, together with brief statements made by the award recipients, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARDS CHAIRMAN SPEER SYMBOLIZES TRAITS OF AWARDEES

Of the many words of praise written about FEAA Awards Chairman Talbot T. Speer, none more succiently summarized his character, fighting spirit and service to his community than those of Charles P. Crane, former president and chairman of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., who now is the firm's executive committee chairman.

Said Crane, in introducing Speer as he was to be honored by the Newcomen Society in North America:

"He has carried energy and determination with him through his business career. His drive and will to succeed have never diminished. A man of action, he often has stepped into difficult and patriotic chores because of his belief in the cause they represented. And I'm happy to say, he has been instrumental in leading them to successful goals."

Speer has, indeed, been a fighter all of his life.

Following great athletic achievements at the University of Maryland and the University of Virginia in football and track, he became an officer of the famous U.S. Army 1st Division which so highly distinguished itself in France.

His leadership and courage with field artillery won for him one of the few Silver Stars that were awarded for heroism.

Captain Speer also returned to the United States at the close of the war wearing, in addition to the U.S. Silver Star Medal, the French Fourragere, Croix de Guerre Medal, and the right to wear the Purple Heart ribbon.

At stages throughout his more recent life, the Government has continued to cite Speer for his service on commissions. A number of certificates have been presented to him for Federal service rendered in connection

with our country's war and economic efforts.

Since 1922, Speer has been president, general manager, and chairman of the board of the Baltimore Salesbook Co., and more recently also of Baltimore Business Forms Co. These huge printing firms have offices in all sections of the United States. Like the newspapers, these companies have expanded many times under Speer's leadership.

He also is president-publisher of the Capital-Gazette Press, Inc., of Annapolis, Md., which publishes the Maryland Gazette—America's oldest newspaper—the daily Evening Capital, the weekly Brooklyn (Md.) News, and the County News.

And in 1951, he created the philanthropic Talbot T. Speer Foundation.

Speer was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., and was educated at the Brennens and Bradshaw Schools, Pittsburgh, the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland.

TOOK OVER REINS IN 1921

He was a salesman for the Daniel Miller Co., of Baltimore, from 1919 to 1921, became the assistant to the president of the Baltimore Salesbook Co. in 1921 and that same year became president and chairman of the board of the company.

He is the founder and president of National Education Fund, Inc., of Baltimore.

Speer lives at Friendship Hill, in Baltimore County, and also owns a large estate directly on the ocean at Delray Beach, Fla. He and Mrs. Speer have three sons, Talbot T. Speer, Jr., J. L. Dawson Speer 3d, and Ramsey Speer, and a daughter, Jane Alexander Speer.

Speer has been a director of the Union Trust Co. of Maryland since 1947 and was a director of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, 1935–40, Baltimore Convention Bureau, 1946–48, the County Taxpayers League of Baltimore County since 1945, and a director of the U.S. Naval Academy Foundation, 1950–54.

He has been a member of the Higher Education Commission of Maryland since 1945, and was on the prison board, 1948–50, the War Production Board, 1940–45, the Industrial Mobilization Commission since 1950 and the U.S. Army Advisory Commission since 1947.

LONG ACTIVE IN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

A member of the National Association of Manufacturers, he was a senior director representing Maryland from 1947 to 1950. He is a member of the Accounting Supply Manufacturers Association, a director of the Associated Industries of Maryland, being president in 1951; president of the Salesbook Manufacturers Association, and was president of the alumni association, the University of Maryland for two years starting in 1950.

Speer also is a member of the Newcomen Society, the Navy League, the Society of the First Division, AEF; American Legion, Purple Heart, and Delta Psi. He is an Episcopalian, being member of the lay council, procathedral of Maryland, 1925–54.

He was director, Baltimore Association of Commerce, 1935–39; director, Keystone Automobile Club, 1943–51; director, the Campaign for the 48 States, 1953–59; director, the Defenders of the Constitution of the United States, 1953–59; director, the alumni fund, University of Virginia, for the class of 1915, from 1930 to 1959; director, the alumni fund for the University of Maryland, 1957–59.

Also, director, the Eastern Business Forms Co., 1957; first president, director, and organizer, the Associated Industries of Maryland, 1949–51; president and founder, National Educational Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, Md., 1951–59.

He was general chairman, the Gen. Douglas MacArthur celebration in the State of Maryland, 1952. Member of the Society of the First Division, AEF, the American Legion, the Purple Heart, the Delta Psi Fraternity.

Also, member the lay council of the Episcopal procathedral of Maryland from 1925 to 1954. Member of the vestry of the Episcopal Cathedral Church of the Incarnation, Baltimore, Md., 1924–56, chairman of the Consolidation of the Church of the Incarnation and Emanuel Protestant Episcopal Churches, 1953. Member, vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Delray Beach, Fla., 1952–53.

ACTIVE IN MANY ORGANIZATIONS

He belongs to the following clubs: Rotary, Bachelors Cotillion, Elkridge Kennels, Greenspring Valley Hunt, president, Carrollton Hounds; president, Wythmore Hounds; Baltimore Country Club, Annapolis Yacht Club, Annapolitan Club.

Also, St. Anthony Club, Lake Placid Club, Everglades Club, National Press Club, the Gulf Stream Golf Club, Newcomen Society; president, alumni association, University of Virginia, of Maryland, 1925–27.

Also, member, Higher Education Committee of the State of Maryland, 1945–53; chairman of the Community Fund, publishers committee, 1936–39; member of the prison board of the State of Maryland, 1948–49.

Also, chairman, the business and industry sections of the American Red Cross, 1936–39. Member, NRA, representing the business forms industry, 1933–35. Member, the War Production Board, representing the Business forms industry, 1940–45.

He was cited by U.S. Government, and awarded a certificate of merit for services to the national war effort. Member, the Industrial Mobilization Committee, 1949–58.

He was chairman, the committee to run the National Amateur Golf Championship, 1932.

He was nominated Man of the Year for 1950 in the South by the southern newspapers as announced in Publishers Auxiliary and the editors of Dixie Business magazine. Served on War Manpower Commission as judge of labor management problems, 1944–45.

Chairman, the committee celebrating (in protest of the enormous taxes of 1957) the burning of the Peggy Stewart (burned in protest of the taxes of 1775).

Trustee the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., 1930–33. Chairman of the building campaign committee for the Episcopal Cathedral of the Incarnation in Baltimore, 1930–32. General chairman, Cathedral Church of the Incarnation building campaign committee, 1954.

Donated a room in the parish house at St. Anne's Episcopal Church, Annapolis, Md., 1956. Second largest contributor to rebuilding program of the Episcopal High School, 1945–46.

Second largest contributor in the 1953 rebuilding drive for the Episcopal High School, and served on campaign committee. Donated new chapel to Sunday school, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Delray Beach, Fla., 1953.

Donated two adjoining building lots to St. Paul's Episcopal Church in 1955, an air conditioner and heating unit for the rectory in 1958. Donated wing to the young people's building, Episcopal Church of the Incarnation, Baltimore, Md., 1954.

Donated room to the Women's Building of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 1953. Donates yearly to the pay of the underpaid clergy of the Episcopal Church Diocese of Maryland. Chairman of board of advisers for Maryland, Western Tax Council, Inc., 1954–55. Selected frequently, including 1960–61, to present the American success story awards for the Free Enterprise Awards Association. Advisory board, U.S. Air Patrol, 1954–55.

STATEMENTS MADE BY FEAA 1962 AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARDS RECIPIENTS PRAISING AMERICA'S FREE ENTERPRISE DEMOCRACY AND ADVICE TO THOSE SEEKING SUCCESS

Walter J. Tuohy, president, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway: "A company's success, as does a nation's, depends on the loyalty and dedication of its people. Teamwork, sharing of problems and freedom of opinion, assures the success of any endeavor. Just as despotism in government or business crushes the human spirit, so does democracy bring out the dignity of the individual—the best in citizen or worker."

John D. MacArthur, president, Bankers Life & Casualty Co.: "In our democracy any person can reach for the rainbow. Don't stop if you come up with a fistful of air. If you stop trying you start dying."

J. Donovan Forney, owner, Forney Industries, Inc.: "In our free enterprise democracy workers have the best working conditions, benefits and own shares in industries. Yet don't be too 'chicken' to go into business for yourself or you might end up with nothing to crow about. Faith in God, your Nation and your ability will bring peace and success."

Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls, president, The William Bonnell Co.: "Free enterprise is the only economic system that gives each of us the right to be what we want to be, including the right a woman has to make business or homemaking her career."

Mrs. Zella Ritz-Woller, president, King Bee Manufacturing Co.: "America gives equal opportunity to men and women. Success in a man's world is not always through pleasing his palate. Give him a good product and you will succeed. If men can make ladies' dresses why can't a woman make safety lighting and products for truck-drivers?"

Dudley D. Sherman, president, National Chemical & Manufacturing Co.: "I am just one of the thousands of Russian and other immigrants who achieved success and freedom in America. Our success is a tribute to America's free enterprise democracy and proof that it works for all."

Harold F. Coffey, president, Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co.: "In our democracy you are free to build your own business. You can make it last forever—like the work of the Old Masters, if you put beauty, durability, and craftsmanship into any product you make."

Dr. Charles D. Bradley, president, Bradley Semiconductor Corp.: "America's free enterprise gives incentive to original research. Anyone is free to develop new and better products and enrich himself and his fellow men. Our competitive system insures success for better 'traps.'"

James Ralph Riley, president, Suburban Motor Freight, Inc.: "Success in America's democracy is assured if you give unselfish service to your customers and your community. Help improve the areas you serve and you will prosper in material and spiritual values."

Lilburn S. Barksdale, president, Barksdale Valves: "In our democracy one can achieve personal and business fulfillment if he couples determination to succeed with personal integrity in his dealings with employees and customers and has a sincere desire to be of service to his fellow men."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Tax Cutting Without Expenditure Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a comment on the December 1962 report on tax reduction issued by the Committee for Economic Development, Mr. Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago and a member of the Committee for Economic Development's Fiscal, Monetary and Debt Management Subcommittee, has made a highly useful contribution to our thinking about the subject of tax reduction and reform.

Mr. Freeman takes the position that tax reduction must be accompanied by an offsetting increase in revenues or a reduction in expenditures. He points to the seriously adverse effects which increased budget deficits might have on our gold and balance-of-payments position. Essentially, he takes the position that expenditure and rate reform must accompany rate reduction because of the imperative necessity for maintaining world confidence in the dollar.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Freeman's remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF COMMENT, RESERVATION OR DISSENT BY GAYLORD A. FREEMAN, JR., IN COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, REDUCING TAX RATES FOR PRODUCTION AND GROWTH

I cannot join in the recommendations for a massive tax cut unless accompanied by an offsetting increase in revenues or reduction in expenditures. While the objectives which the committee's proposal is designed to obtain, namely, economic growth and reduced unemployment, are highly desirable, the necessity to maintain world confidence in the dollar is imperative, more important, in my view, than even an increase in the rate of economic growth.

If one assumes that the Federal budget at fiscal 1964 will result in a deficit in the administrative budget of about the present magnitude, $8 billion, in the absence of a tax cut, the loss of the first step cut of about $6 billion would (without allowance for the additional revenue that would be collected on the resulting increase of national income) result in a total administrative budget deficit of $14 billion. If we make the highly optimistic assumption that in the first year, as much as one-half of the cut would be recovered (through the tax on increased national income), that would mean perhaps an $11 billion administrative budget deficit in 1964. Such deficits may well persist in subsequent years.

Foreign governments and central banks now have $24.2 billion of short-term claims against us, for which we promise to pay gold if the creditors ask for it. But we have only $15.9 billion of gold. If we adjust for the fluctuations caused by Canada's recent payments difficulties and for the nonrecurring repayments of foreign aid loans, our balance-of-payments deficit this year will be about $2.5 billion—no gain over last year despite considerable effort. There is little reason to expect significant improvement immediately ahead. Under such circumstances, a wise debtor would pursue a course calculated to enhance the creditor's confidence. He would make every effort to operate at a surplus and reduce his indebtedness. But we propose to do just the contrary, to operate at a deeper deficit and to increase our indebtedness.

If our foreign creditors think they see the recurrence of inflationary pressures here, they may prefer to repatriate their funds. We are tempted to ignore this risk on the basis that even a massive deficit will not cause price increases when there is high unemployment and excess capacity. But as recently as 1954 to 1958 with unemployment averaging over 5 percent for the period, and with extensive idle plant capacity, the wholesale price index rose 8.1 percent and the consumer price index 7.6 percent—and this in a period when the annual deficit for the 5 years averaged only a little over $1 billion.

Continued budget deficits of the order of $10 billion or more (particularly if accompanied by an easy-money policy) may well cause our foreign creditors to prefer gold to dollars. Once they make that choice, their knowledge that we do not have enough gold for all may aggravate their withdrawal. We may find our country faced with the unhappy choice of refusal to pay in gold or devaluation. This we should not risk.

It is because of the imperative necessity for maintaining world confidence in the dollar, more important in my view than even an increase in the rate of economic growth, that I cannot join in the recommendations for a massive tax cut without some offset—either a comparable reduction in expenditures, which is desirable, but perhaps politically unrealistic, or an equivalent increase in other taxes which is difficult but in my judgment attainable.

U.S. Naval Academy Class of 1966: Profile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, I know the concern of its members for the well-being of that important educational institution. As a Member of the Congress, I also realize the efforts made to select candidates of quality, which is a basic first step in the making of a high-grade officer corps.

It was, therefore, with the keenest interest that I read in the November 1962 issue of Shipmate, the magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, a most illuminating analysis of the backgrounds and qualifications of the midshipmen entering the Naval Academy in 1962 (class of 1966).

As the information therein contained will be helpful to all Members of the Congress and others charged with responsibility in the making of future appointments to all the service academies, I quote the indicated article as part of my remarks:

PROFILE—U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY CLASS OF 1966

This profile of the entering Naval Academy class of 1966 has been prepared as a guide to prospective candidates, school authorities, and interested persons. The characteristics noted will aid guidance counselors in determining the representative backgrounds and qualifications of young men entering the Academy, and it is hoped that this information will prove of assistance in advising prospective candidates.

Each candidate for the Naval Academy must meet general eligibility requirements as to citizenship, age, character, and marital status. He must obtain a nomination either from a Member of Congress or from one of the competitive sources. In addition to presenting an acceptable secondary school record, he must score acceptably on specified college board tests or, if he holds a congressional non-competitive nomination, he may present a satisfactory 1-year college record. He must also qualify physically. It is in most of these respects that the Naval Academy's admissions procedures and requirements differ from those of civilian institutions. Detailed information on the above matters is contained in the "Regulations Governing the Admission of Candidates," which may be obtained from the Admissions Office, U.S. Naval Academy.

In the selection of candidates who are competing for appointments, the Naval Academy takes into account the quality of the secondary school record, additional study, the college board scores, extracurricular activities, athletics, honors and awards, employment outside school hours, recommendations of teachers, guidance counselors, principals, coaches, and others who know firsthand the candidate's accomplishments, his potential and his motivation for a career in the naval service.

The prospective candidate should be informed that, while admission to the Naval Academy is highly selective and competition during the 4 years is keen, the associations and experience of these 4 years are rich indeed. The highest ideals of duty, honor, and loyalty are characteristic of the brigade; the 160-semester-hour curriculum is supplemented by a broad elective course program; a comprehensive extracurricular program is maintained; and physical fitness is developed to a high degree. The graduate receives his bachelor of science degree and his commission as an ensign in the U.S. Navy and joins his fellow officers in a rewarding life of service to his country.

COLLEGE BOARD SCORES

The Naval Academy requires that all candidates attempting to quality for admission by the examination method (94 percent of the class of 1966) take the scolastic aptitude test and the achievement tests in English and either intermediate or advanced mathematics. The following table covering the class of 1966 shows the percent within score

ranges of those qualifying for entrance by examination:

	Sat. V	Sat. M	English composition	Mathematics
Score range (percent):				
750 to 800		4	2	10
700 to 749	3	17	5	20
650 to 699	13	35	14	25
600 to 649	24	28	24	26
550 to 599	30	15	24	14
500 to 549	25	1	23	5
450 to 499	5		8	
Mean scores	586	655	594	661

VOLUME OF APPLICANTS

Nominated	6,219
Examined	4,606
Qualified scholastically	2,133
Admitted	1,307

DISTRIBUTION OF CLASS BY SCHOOLS

	Percent
Admitted from public schools	78.2
Admitted from independent schools	21.8

Twenty-seven and nine-tenths percent of the class of 1966 had some college preparation (one-half year or more) prior to admission.

RANK IN HIGH SCHOOL CLASS

	Percent
1st quarter	68.3
2d quarter	21.0
3d quarter	7.6
4th quarter	3.1

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES AND HONORS

	Percent
Honors:	
Valedictorians	3.5
Salutatorians	2.7
National honor society	34.1
Other honor society	18.8
Academic awards and medals	19.2
Scholarship winners	32.7
Science fair award	9.1
Activities:	
Class president or student body president	11.8
Other class officer or student body officer	35.3
School publication staff	28.3
Varsity athletics	71.7
Intramural athletics	45.0
Subject clubs (Latin, French, mathematics, etc.)	44.5
Dramatics	24.0
Debating	11.0
Musical groups	29.9
Service clubs	31.1
Eagle Scout	8.8

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

Midshipmen were admitted from every State in the Union and the District of Columbia. Additionally, the class of 1966 included one midshipman from the Philippine Islands, one from Chile, one from Peru, and one from Venezuela to fill quotas authorized the Republic of the Philippines, and the American Republics (other than the United States).

SONS OF ALUMNI

The class of 1966 included 55 sons of Naval Academy graduates (4.2 percent of the class).

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian residents of the First Congressional District of Indiana have unanimously adopted the following resolution pertaining to the Communist enslavement of their native land. Resolutions calling for a congressional investigation of the enslavement of captive nations have been pending in Congress during the last two sessions.

Along with other Members sponsoring these resolutions, I do hope that we can get favorable action on the same in this session of Congress. If this legislation comes to the floor of the House, it no doubt will be passed by a large vote. A special congressional committee can again call the attention of the world to the Soviet enslavement of these freedom-loving nations.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanains, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Sovets (1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia; (2) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 257th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, whose statesmanship contributed so much to our heritage of liberty and independence.

Although Franklin was born in Boston, he spent the major part of his adult life in Philadelphia, and we of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are proud to claim him as our first citizen.

Of humble origin, he rose to a position of affluence and renown, honored throughout the civilized world. I need not discuss at length his illustrious career as an author, publisher, scientist, inventor, diplomat, and statesman. Countless pages have been written in his praise. I should like, however, to point out that there is guidance in the precepts of Franklin that will help us to meet the difficulties that confront our Nation and the free world today.

Franklin's philosophy was based upon his unfailing devotion to the cardinal virtues of integrity, industry, and thrift. Such a philosophy, which might otherwise have been stern and demanding, was relieved by tolerance, serenity, zest, and humor. The homely wisdom of Poor Richard is timeless. To many of our present problems Franklin, if again in our midst, would apply his well-poised judgment, his unfailing humor, and his love of constructive achievement. He might urge that many of these problems could be solved by more working and less talking.

It is often unfair to evaluate an individual's political philosophy in the light of the knowledge of a much later date. But Franklin's ideas of democracy have more than held their own with the passage of time. Throughout the world his principles of an extended franchise and proportional representation have been steadily gaining ground. Even his proposal of a unicameral legislature has been coming into increased favor with the passing years.

However, it is in the field of international relations that Franklin's vision has had its most dramatic vindication. The need for closer international cooperation, which he was among the first to see clearly, is now apparent to all. In his conception of the duties and responsibilities of nation to nation, his political theories attain their loftiest and most progressive form. In his faith in the application of united effort to the common problems of human society, he was consistently in advance of contemporary thought. No system which has been consciously evolved to further this ideal will become obsolete as long s human society itself endures.

Few philosophers have exerted a more wholesome influence upon the development of political thought than did Franklin, or have equaled him in transforming abstract theories into living realities of government. The record of his long life of public service endures in the imperishable annals of our Nation.

In these days of world crisis, every American can find inspiration in the words and deeds of Benjamin Franklin. It is appropriate on this anniversary of his birth that we pay tribute to a great champion of human freedom and a great American.

New Light on the Michigan Study of the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, most of the major American newspapers carried, shortly before the last election, articles on the report of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center on its study of the condition of America's elderly. A great deal of information is to be gained from a careful reading of this report, just as a great deal of information could be gained from a careful reading of the House Ways and Means Committee's hearings on the King-Anderson proposal, H.R. 4222, of the last Congress. Unfortunately, these articles did not reflect a careful reading and a careful reporting job.

I was contacted by one of my constituents who, on the basis of the newspaper coverage given this report, took issue with earlier statements I had made about the financial position of our senior citizens. I am placing a copy of my reply to my constituent in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for two purposes: First, to set the record straight factually, giving a more accurate presentation of the position of our elderly, and second, to show how distortion can be used to prevent the real facts of an issue from getting through to the people:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1962.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of November 1, 1962, calling to my attention an Associated Press story appearing in the October 31 St. Louis Globe-Democrat, page 9C, on the report from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, "Oldsters Worse Off Financially." I not only read this Associated Press story which the Globe-Democrat printed; I have read the Michigan University report itself. Far from disputing the point I made, that 80 percent of those 65 years of age and over are well able to take care of themselves and do not need financial assistance for their medical costs, the report actually substantiates the point.

The Associated Press story deceives the casual and already somewhat prejudiced reader.

Let me quote the lead sentence. "Older people are worse off financially than other groups on several counts, reports the University of Michigan Survey Research Center." The phrase which keeps the sentence from being a whole cloth lie is "on several counts," but this phrase is buried in the sentence structure and so glossed over by the quick reader. The headline writer fell for the trap and the headline reads, with no qualifying phrase, "Oldsters Worse Off Financially." Later in the article it is pointed up that the report said on other counts the oldsters are better off financially. The real question we are seeking the answer to is, What is the total financial condition of the oldsters balancing off the various counts? The total picture of oldsters today is that—

1. They are better off financially than they have ever been before, as are other groups.
2. They are better off in the total financial balance than any other age group in our society.

The only areas in which they are worse off are the two listed:

1. Yearly income, which is to be expected because they generally receive pensions rather than salaries, and pensions are less than salaries.
2. Their health costs average more than the health costs of any other group.

Balancing off are these counts, among others:

1. They have more assets, both liquid and in total, than any other age group. (Almost 80 percent own their own homes, and this free of mortgage—their average equity is over $9,000.) This is to be expected because they have been accumulating property and savings during their working years which the younger age groups are only in the process of doing.
2. Their budgets for food, clothes, rent, dependents, travel, recreation, and insurance (except health insurance) are considerably less than that of any other age group and the total budget, including the one higher cost for health insurance, is considerably less than for that of any other age group.

All the statistical studies adduced by the Ways and Means Committee in its public hearings on the subject of health care for the aged point out the same thing. One item that tends to prove this point is the statistical studies which consistently reveal that the oldsters are the best paying of any age group when it comes to medical or any other kind of cost.

Our problem is with the less than 20-percent oldsters who are having problems, not just for health costs, but many of them for other living costs. There is little sense, in my judgment, for establishing compulsory governmental system which covers the 80 percent simply to get at the problems of the 20 percent unless there is no other practical way of doing it. Fortunately, there are practical ways of meeting the problem of the 20 percent without interfering at all with the 80 percent—the Kerr-Mills Act and the golden-age 65 plans, health insurance for people over 65 without medical examination and noncancelable, which Connecticut started just a year ago, and New York, Massachusetts, and other States are imitating. The prospects in the future are even better for our oldsters because of the health insurance programs contained in most of our labor-management contracts which now carry over into retirement and the availability of prepaid noncancelable insurance on an individual basis or group basis paid up at 65. The 20-percent oldsters with health cost problems will dwindle in the future until they are less than 10 percent of our older people.

I appreciate your writing to me on this important subject. I would be glad to receive your further comments.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Tragedy at Robena No. 3 Mine in Greene County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1962, the people of southwestern Pennsylvania heard the tragic news that an explosion had occurred at the Frosty Run shaft of Robena No. 3 Mine in Greene County trapping 37 miners. Rescue teams began to work immediately to try to reach the miners and worked untiringly day and night. The families and friends of the trapped miners kept vigil day and night just waiting and hoping. But as the search went on the feeling of despair increased and after 5 days of agony, those who waited heard the news that the rescue teams had reached the trapped miners only to find them all dead.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the scene of the accident and it was indeed heartbreaking to watch the families of the trapped miners who waited with mixed feelings of hope and despair. I know that they had the sympathy not only of the people of southwestern Pennsylvania, but of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation for the past three or four Congresses to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. I am confident that Federal inspection of all coal mines, regardless of size, will save lives. I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will take early action on my bill, H.R. 1666, or on similar legislation so that we can try to put an end to the tragic loss of lives in coal mines.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the United Mine Workers of America, together with resolution adopted by the international executive board during its recent meeting held here in Washington:

UNITED MINE WORKERS
OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1963.

To the Members of the 88th Congress

DEAR SIR: The terrible tragedy occurring on December 6, 1962, at the Frosty Run shaft, Robena No. 3 Mine, of the United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners lost their lives was before the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America during its meeting in Washington, D.C., December 12–15, 1962.

During this meeting, the board adopted the enclosed resolution, which is self-explanatory.

We again urge earnest consideration by the Members of the 88th Congress to enact enforcement legislation to bring all employees in the coal industry under the provisions of the Federal Mine Safety Act.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS,
President Emeritus.
THOMAS KENNEDY,
President.
W. A. BOYLE,
Acting President.
JOHN OWENS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

"Whereas this board is horrified and appalled at the explosion which occurred December 6 at the Frosty Run shaft, Robena No. 3 Mine, United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners were killed violently; and

"Whereas 31 of those who died were members of United Mine Workers of America,

Local Union 6321, District 4, Masontown, Pa.; and

"Whereas this pre-Christmas tragedy also symbolizes a growing trend in the industry toward placing production of coal ahead of human lives; and

"Whereas many American coal miners who work in small underground mines do not now receive full protection under Federal law because of an arbitrary exemption granted their employers by the Congress: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this international executive board and all officers of this organization including local union officers and mine safety committeemen press with renewed vigor for strict compliance by coal operators with all Federal and State mine safety laws and with the Federal Mine Safety Code which is written into the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the U.S. Bureau of Mines and mining departments in the various States be informed that this organization will insist on their strict and to-the-letter enforcement of existing mine safety regulations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the international union, labor's nonpartisan league and district officers urge with renewed vigor that the 88th Congress pass an amendment to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act that would extend enforcement provisions of that act to all employees of underground coal mines regardless of size; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Local Union 6321, each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and directors of mining departments in coal mining States, and that it be printed in the United Mine Workers Journal."

Unanimously adopted by the international executive board, United Mine Workers of America, this 14th day of December 1962.

Sincerely yours,

John L. Lewis, President Emeritus; Thomas Kennedy, President; W. A. Boyle, Acting President; John Owens, Secretary-Treasurer; International Executive Board; John T. Kmetz, John Ghizzoni, Ewing Watt, W. J. Hynes, Joseph Yablonski, Peter Phillippi, Mart F. Brennan, Wilbert Killion, Joseph T. Kershetsky, Sam Nicholls, Louis Austin, Joseph Shannon, John A. Hupton, Henry Allai, John L. Mayo, R. O. Lewis, Edward Boyd, James W. Ridings, William Mitch, David Fowler, Arthur Biggs, John H. Delaney, R. J. Boyle, Carson Hibbitts, George J. Titler, C. J. Urbaniak.

Washington: City Hall of Nation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard Wilson which appeared in the January 13, 1963, issue of the Des Moines Sunday Register:

WASHINGTON: CITY HALL OF NATION?

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Kennedy is about to propose a domestic Peace Corps, a force of social workers and well-doers who would carry the light from Washington, D.C., to the slums and depressed areas of America.

This venture would cost only $20 million, employ up to 5,000 young people in its earliest stages, and doubtless expand later on as do all such Government undertakings.

It is hard to find out where and why the idea of a domestic Peace Corps originated. However the idea was originated, it was heartily welcomed by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, campaign manager for John F. Kennedy in the 1960 presidential election.

SPREADERS OF LIGHT

Bobby Kennedy is entranced by the idea. What could be more rewarding than having ardent young Kennedy people, clear-eyed idealists, braving the dangers of the urban jungles, spreading the gospel and serving the cause selflessly and without pay?

At last a New Frontier concept emerges which is as wide in scope, and with the same promise of success, as the early concepts of the New Deal for the creation of new communities to give homes and the good life to the ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed. Only a few surviving today can remember the fate of those communities.

Some of the difficulties—and this is not historical exaggeration—were that housewives tore out the screens the easier to throw the dishwater into the front yard, and the gleaming new bathtubs were found to be convenient places to store coal. These were projects which the now snow-maned Rexford G. Tugwell and the late Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt were glad to forget, and they have gone down in history unsung and abandoned.

BETTER LIFE

But nevertheless the spirit lives on, and could have been dimly perceived when John Kennedy announced during the 1960 presidential campaign the still unconfirmed information that 17 million Americans go to bed hungry every night.

The currently used figure is that 32 million persons in the United States live at a lower level than America is capable of providing for its citizens.

This is a variation on Franklin D. Roosevelt's phrase, "One-third of the Nation ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed" in the great depression of the early 1930's, a condition which in somewhat different form the Kennedys seem to imagine still exists.

If Congress in a careless moment should approve this venture some good will no doubt result. The harm that will be done will be to shift to Washington in still another field responsibilities and costs that should lie with local communities. The success of a domestic Peace Corps would be its undoing. Mayors and welfare boards would demand as a political right an equal share of free welfare help at a steadily rising cost to the Federal Government. In many areas, of course, local communities would not welcome the intrusion of outsiders in their welfare problems.

Fully in step with the program for sending Washington-trained volunteers to fight the good fight in the Nation's slums is a new proposal by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to expand the food stamp plan and make it national in scope.

This former New Deal program has been on a trial basis in eight depressed areas and will soon be expanded to 40 new localities. It is being projected on a basis to give 4 million people surplus food at an annual cost of $375 million a few years hence.

THE NEW SOCIETY

As these programs and plans emerge, and fall into a pattern with other projects, the true significance of the New Frontier in its domestic phases becomes a good deal clearer. From the evidence now available the shadowy shape of the new society can be seen. It amounts to Federal responsibility for local affairs on an ever-widening scale:

Local schools with Federal support which will surely have to meet Federal standards; if not now, then before very long.

Federally financed hospital and medical care on an ascending scale heading toward the nationalization of all medical services.

Local welfare activities supplemented and possibly in the end controlled by Washington standards.

Financing and control of local projects for mass transportation, sewage disposal, public services.

And Federal responsibility for enforcing social standards.

Washington would then become truly the city hall of the Nation.

Watching Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Kranish which appeared in the January 1963 issue of Western Aerospace:

WATCHING WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Kranish)

Twice in its 2 years of existence the Kennedy administration came within a breadth of liberating Cuba, the Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere of Soviet imperialism. Twice the President and his close advisers retreated from the brink. Only history will decide whether these events represent caution, wisdom, or cowardice.

But in the brief time we have for reflection before another crisis robs us of our complacency or our will, an assessment of the lessons of Cuba might be instructive. This assessment may be contrary to almost everything publicly proclaimed by the administration. In a sense it is an argument, an attempt to stir debate and perhaps to shake the widespread conviction that we have achieved victory and peace in our time.

We can first of all deduce from the little we have been told that the widely heralded shakeup of our intelligence system in the first year of the Kennedy administration was a failure. The professionals apparently scoffed at refugee reports of a Soviet missile and military buildup. The repeated questioning by opposition Congressmen served to place a political cast over the pros and cons and clues, and an intelligence-gathering machinery badly shaken by the events at the Bay of Pigs was in no mood to gather facts or reach conclusions which would obviously find no favor at the White House. We can ask, therefore, whether the new concept of unified intelligence best serves the Nation, or whether information is being tailored to meet the measurements of expediency.

Fortunately, no political filters are being supplied with our aerial reconnaissance cameras. And so the evidence in the now-famous photographs could not be explained away. If the administration kept those cameras flying on a constant basis during the months preceding the second Cuban crisis, it deserves full credit for seeing to it that these missions were carried out with skill, tact, and thoroughness. But if these missions were on a reduced, catch-as-catch-can

schedule, and vital early clues to a missile buildup were missed as a result, then an explanation is certainly in order. We have no information to support either theory, but there are many who refuse to believe that the delivery, preparation, and installation of so many missiles and aircraft was as sudden and secretive as the administration would have us believe.

If it was sudden and secretive, we have a superb argument against those who believe that space reconnaissance, spies in the sky, black boxes, and inspection teams can guard us against another massive buildup elsewhere in the world.

If it was not sudden and secretive, if it was as brazen and open to observation as later photographs would have us believe, then we can rightly ask whether or not the administration knew, while it was issuing frequent public denials, that the Soviets were engaged in creating a vast nuclear arsenal 90 miles from our shores.

For a brief period, it seemed as though our national response to the events in Cuba was unmistakable. Mr. Kennedy, with superb courage and control, made it abundantly clear to the Soviets and to a shocked world that the newly discovered buildup would not be tolerated and that we were as prepared as Mr. Khrushchev to play the nuclear blackmail game.

It is obvious now that Khrushchev—through caution, wisdom, or cowardice—was unwilling to enter that kind of contest. And so the missiles and aircraft, or most of them, were withdrawn, and the West, we are told, won its first major victory against Communist expansion since the days following World War II. And Mr. Kennedy and his administration won the stunned admiration of the free world.

These breathtaking events were followed by a pleasant rift in the Sino-Soviet ranks and perhaps even by a major loss of initiative by the entire Communist bloc. We may well have lived through one of these periods in history when tides turn, foundations crumble, and cliches collapse.

For if we have truly won peace in our time, we may have also paid a price for that victory. One fee is the further erosion of a treasured American freedom—the right of the press to find and print the truth, in the belief that it is the truth that will keep us free. Those who manage the truth (a word that approximates the news) have decided for themselves that there are times of expediency when the weapons of tyranny can be superimposed upon a system that has weathered revolution, civil war, economic disaster and two wars for world survival.

And if we have won peace for ourselves, have we not mortgaged away the liberties of our neighbors? Have we not consented—at the price of peace—to the enslavement of the Cuban people? Have we not acknowledged something that just a few months ago any American would have regarded as unthinkable—the firm establishment of a Soviet colony, armed and apparently invincible, almost at our border? Americans in uniform die each day, as they died at Corregidor and on the fields of France and the hills of Korea—to reclaim an inch of foreign soil for freedom. Yet twice, in our own hemisphere, we have decided that we are not our brothers' keepers. Is life that dear? Is peace that sweet?

If we have won the victory that the Cuban events represent to many, we may have future opportunities to ask such questions. As the strongest nation in the world, we will someday have to accept the moral obligations of strength. In the Cuban crisis, despite our strength and our will, we permitted the Soviets to enslave still another mass of humanity. We must ask ourselves whether our national mission in the world is to preserve our safety or to extend the blessings of liberty to our fellow man. If the Communist bloc is weakening, will there be other Berlin riots, other Hungarian revolts, other opportunities to light the spark and feed the flames of freedom? Can a strong nation, conceived in liberty, be dedicated only to its own peace and safety and security? Is that our message to a neighbor in chains?

Pennsylvania Has a New Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker. On Tuesday, January 15, at 12:08 p.m., our friend and former colleague, William Warren Scranton, became the 103d chief executive of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In a brief, dynamic inaugural address he made a sincere plea for unity toward progress. He is not unmindful of the grave responsibilities he has assumed nor does he approach the challenges fearfully. Those of us who know him best are confident he will meet each problem conscientiously and solve it to the best of his ability.

I know his host of friends on both sides of the aisle wish him well, and Godspeed in his new and responsible position.

Following is the text of his inaugural address:

My fellow Pennsylvanians, nearly 300 years ago a God-fearing man carved the first bits of civilization out of the land that lay west of the Delaware. His name was William Penn. He had an idea. It took root in our soil. His idea was that men and women are resourceful and imaginative. He believed that, given a chance, they could turn back a wilderness, chisel out a monument to human dignity, and live in peace and prosperity. In an age rife with human hatred—with religious bigotry, with political persecution—he had the wisdom, and the courage, to launch a holy experiment.

He made Pennsylvania the bastion of freedom—the temple of tolerance, the showcase of economic enterprise. He believed freedom is more than a cliche. He believed courage is more than a slogan. He believed human willpower more than a match for all the obstacles of nature or economics. He believed human ingenuity capable of solving human problems. He believed indifference and despair can be put to rout by human hope.

But, most of all he believed in himself; he believed in his fellow men; he believed in Pennsylvania. That was three centuries ago.

Three months ago I was campaigning through a Pennsylvania town. The day was dreary. A cold rain had drizzled down all morning. A young man with tired eyes, a sad voice and a scared handshake told me: "Pennsylvania is no place for me."

And, a day later, I campaigned through a sun-drenched suburb. Other people with other, quite different, problems.

Another young man, this one with a kind of "I'm going places" look about him grasped my hand. He looked me in the eye. He said: "I can't for the life of me figure out why anybody would want to be Governor of this State." And he explained, "Pennsylvania is going nowhere." That was 3 months ago.

Three days ago I pondered what to say on the day that I became Governor of this State. I thought of William Penn 300 years ago. But I remembered the young man of 3 months ago.

With this memory the vim and vigor of the campaign seemed to sour. The flush of election victory paled. The brave hopes of just yesterday seemed puny. The awful responsibility seemed to dwarf the high honor of the office I was about to assume.

But then more of Pennsylvania came to mind. More of what we have been taught and know of Pennsylvania. More of her heritage. More of her people—and their pride and their faith—the hands I had clasped, the warmth of their welcome.

I remembered the face of the woman. Woman of a town blasted by industrial migration. Plants closed. Gates locked. Menfolk idle. I remembered the courage in the face of the woman.

I remembered the eyes of the man. Man out of work. Tiny worry lines around those eyes. The haunting fear that self-respect might flee, but even stronger, the challenge: "Give me a chance, and you'll see what I can do." I remembered the hope in the eyes of the man.

I remembered the hands of the farmer. A sower of seeds. A cultivator of life. A man close to God. Hands flecked with soil, so the tan of the skin seemed almost one with the tan of the earth. Hands that make things grow. I remembered the pride of those hands.

I remembered the arms that swung a lunch pail. Skilled arms. Strong sinews. A cadence to his walk that said: "I do a day's work. I do it well." Perhaps the proudest boast of man. I remembered the fresh, pungent smell of independence.

I remembered the frown of the young college student. Inquisitive. Prove it or I won't believe it. Why can't Pennsylvania move ahead? Who says my only opportunities lie elsewhere? Is it wrong to care? What are you going to do about it? Yes, I remembered the anxious student.

And, I remembered the brow of a businessman. Furrowed? Yes, but perhaps even more accurately, concerned. "I have a duty here. A role to perform. I want Pennsylvania to climb to the top. I'm busy and it's easy to find excuses, but point the way and I'll do my share." Yes, I remember the concern, the willingness, in that face.

And, suddenly, I knew that Pennsylvania today is not really very different than the Pennsylvania of three centuries ago.

Yes, the challenges wear different faces. Problems assume different guises. But truly, we hold the same trump cards.

Resourcefulness, imagination, fortitude. And one more—faith.

The Pennsylvania that responded to the 17th-century promise of William Penn's holy experiment.

The Pennsylvania that nurtured an 18th-century Ben Franklin and became the cradle of liberty.

The Pennsylvania that was strengthened by a 19th-century influx of brave, stout hearts from the Old World.

The Pennsylvania that in the 20th century has remained basically strong and vital, despite a buffeting from history's greatest technological revolution.

That Pennsylvania—don't tell me that Pennsylvania can't lick its problems, because I know it can.

We still have the same God-given natural resources, the same advantages for commerce and industry, the same progressive spirit that brought us greatness in other years, in other ages.

But, these things must be tapped. Resources and advantages and spirit must be put to work. Human courage and human

hope must drive the motors of human effort and human toil.

Some of Pennsylvania's problems can be solved soon, others can only be solved in time. But nothing will happen, nothing will move, unless the labor begins today.

The State government has an obvious and vital role in that labor. As a Pennsylvanian, no one can convince me that our State is incapable of that labor. No one can convince me that other States and other governments are more capable.

Of course, there are those who would prefer to dwell more on our fears than on our hopes.

There are those who would prefer to curse the darkness, rather than light a candle. Blame the past, rather than work to assure the future.

There are those who would prefer to gossip of yesterday's divisions, rather than work on today's need for unity.

Show me a Democrat who was wrong or shortsighted, I will show you a Republican who was. And vice versa.

Show me a businessman who was selfish, I will show you a labor leader who was. And vice versa.

Show me a citizen in Pennsylvania who has suffered by someone's lack of concern, and I will show you another citizen who has caused suffering by his lack of concern.

But let us hope that in the showing, both you and I will grow wiser and learn that today's opportunities are far more important than yesterday's mistakes.

With these opportunities, Pennsylvania is on the march. Toward greatness for herself. Toward progress, for her people.

Our Commonwealth has the resources, the human strength, the get-up-and-go from which greatness is made. There is work to do, lots of it, but Pennsylvanians have never shirked from that prospect.

In both the executive branch and in the legislature, all of us must vow today to do our part to bring about a new era in Pennsylvania progress. We must have the wisdom to keep what should be kept; the courage to change what should be changed.

With the help of God let us embrace the challenge, let us welcome the labor.

Let us stand tall—as Pennsylvanians.

Let us walk proudly—as Pennsylvanians.

Going Now and Paying Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones is a humorous picture of the modern philosophy well pictured by the slogan "Go now, pay for it later."

In the meantime we are still floating in a sea of red ink supported by barrels stuffed with paper dollars.

The article follows:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first-class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the Big Rock Candy Mountains via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionaly, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paintbrushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals, and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts. He makes the point (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low-cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our "druthers."

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gage may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You'd never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business braintrusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the Happy Isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigarette holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose war-wrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by United States funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steel makers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grows softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock:

"Go Now, Pay Later."

Richard L. Maher Knighted in the Order of St. Gregory the Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard L. Maher, one of Cleveland's outstanding citizens and an eminent journalist of long standing, was recently honored by His Holiness Pope John XXIII, as a Knight of St. Gregory. This high honor was conferred on Mr. Maher because of his many years of outstanding service in charity work and service to youth in the Greater Cleveland area.

Under leave granted, I include an article apeparing in January 15 issue of the Cleveland Counselor:

RICHARD L. MAHER KNIGHTED IN THE ORDER OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT

A past grand knight and former district deputy from Cleveland Council has received the honors of papal knighthood from Pope John XXIII.

Richard L. Maher, who served as grand knight of Cleveland council from 1934 to 1936 and was district deputy for the East Side of Cleveland in the mid-1940's, has been designated a Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

Announcement of the honor which came to Brother Maher along with 16 other laymen of the Cleveland diocese was made in mid-December by Archbishop Edward F. Hoban.

For Maher this is the third of a series of honors that he received this year. Last spring he was named by the Catholic Youth Organization to receive the Duo Decum Award for his work among youths of the diocese.

In June, he was chosen by the Ripon Club as the recipient of its first annual Good Government Award.

Maher, who is politics editor of the Press, is treasurer of the Catholic Charities Corp.

He has served as a member of the board of trustees of the Catholic Charities for nearly 10 years—the last year as treasurer.

His elevation to the Order of St. Gregory came, it is understood, because of his charity

work. In addition to his service with the Charities Corp., Maher has been a member of the Catholic Youth Service Advisory Board for years and served three terms as its chairman.

His work for Catholic Charities was recognized earlier when he was invited to address one of the section meetings of the Golden Jubilee Convention of Catholic Charities in New York City in 1960.

Other honors have been heaped upon him. In 1948 he was designated Catholic Man of the Year. A few years ago Xavier University at Cincinnati named him an honorary alumnus because of his work for the university. Two of his sons attended Xavier.

Maher has served as a councilman of St. Raphael's Parish, Bay Village, since its founding in 1946.

In his newspaper work, Maher has received many honors. Several times he was cited by the Cleveland Newspaper Guild for his work, winning the best reporting award for several years. He also only recently was reelected a director of the Press Club of Cleveland.

Maher joined Cleveland Council in 1926—and was elected grand knight when he was scarcely 30 years old. Under his direction Cleveland Council paid off much of the debt it had accumulated in the early depression days, and was launched on its period of progress.

When he became head of the council, after serving as chancellor and deputy grand knight, the council had just over 1,100 members. In 2 years he lifted the membership to 1,586—more than half of them insurance members.

In 1959 Maher was designated dean of the Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association, having covered sessions of the general assembly for 25 years.

With his wife and family, Maher lives at 28626 Bruce Road, Bay Village.

Two of his sons, Francis R., and Thomas P., are members of the council. A third son, Edward J., is a law student at Georgetown University. His daughter, Lucile Helen, is a school nurse in Las Vegas, Nev.

Flights Over Heavily Populated Areas Should Be Held to Minimum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Jefferson Park Press, which is published in my district by Mrs. Morton Steinman, recently carried an excellent editorial regarding flights of jet aircraft over heavily congested areas. The editorial was written by this fine newspaper's public affairs editor, Miss Sally Swanson, who, like myself, has followed the problem of jet operations out of O'Hare Field over my district for some time.

Miss Swanson is indeed an authority on this entire subject of jet operations and the tremendous problems which these jets are creating for hundreds of thousands of people in my district.

This editorial appeared a few days after a privately owned propeller-driven airplane encountered heavy icing conditions while on its final approach to O'Hare Field and crashed into a house in my district. The tragedy brought death to four passengers of the aircraft, which was demolished, and only through a miracle spared the occupants of the private residential dwelling in my district into which the plane crashed.

This tragedy points up again the absolute folly of the Federal Aviation Agency in permitting aircraft coming in on instruments during bad weather to fly across the entire length of Chicago and its 3½ million population to get into the landing pattern for a southeast approach to O'Hare Field when these very same airplanes could just as easily fly into proper position along the lake shore out over Lake Michigan.

At the time I said it is absolutely illogical—and even tragic—to compound the incident of air fatalities by directing these airplanes over the city during inclement weather. Unfortunately, my ardent appeals to the FAA seem to fall on deaf ears, and the entrenched bureaucracy continues to do business as usual, using approach and landing patterns that were developed a decade ago when jets were still on the drawing board.

It is my sincere hope that perhaps an aroused press in this country will be able to finally impress upon the FAA that while no one is suggesting any reduction in safety standards, nor is anyone suggesting flight operations that would make it impossible for the airlines to keep up with progress, the fact of the matter is that there are better ways of flight operations than permitted at present by the Federal Aviation Agency.

I hope this editorial will serve as a basis for arousing the FAA out of its apparent apathy. There are more than 1 million people in the vicinity of O'Hare Field who are entitled to more consideration than they have been getting heretofore from the FAA.

It would appear to me that if the people who are now in charge of the FAA are incapable of doing an adequate job, they should be replaced forthwith by FAA Administrator Halaby; and they should continue to be replaced until he finds a team of people who can give the residents of my district the kind of safety standards in heavy jet operations to which they are rightfully entitled.

Miss Swanson's excellent editorial follows:

WHAT IF A JETPLANE CRASHED ON NORTHWEST SIDE?

(By Sally Swanson)

Although it occurred out of the Press papers' territory, the crash last Wednesday of a light plane into a Portage Park house focuses attention on a threat to the entire Northwest Side. A threat too grim to put into words.

Bad as last week's accident was—taking lives of four of the plane's passengers and critically injuring the other two—the tragedy would have been compounded manifold had persons on the ground been in the path of the crashing plane.

And this was a relatively small craft. Imagine, if you can, the devastation that would result if one of the giant commercial jets that roar over our area plowed through a local neighborhood.

The Northwest Side's Congressman, Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, who flew here from Washington Thursday, called the flight pattern of the ill-fated plane "totally illogical," and asked that all planes landing at O'Hare from east or southeast follow the lake shore north of the North Shore suburbs before turning west.

A letter this week from the Bryn Mawr-Higgins Community Club says that the crash points up the club's objections to air traffic over thickly populated city neighborhoods.

We realize that planning approach routes for the world's busiest airport is not uncomplicated, but we feel that safety of thousands of people in their homes should be a first consideration.

And thus we wish success to both Congressman PUCINSKI and the Bryn Mawr-Higgins Club in efforts that may spare the Northwest Side a major disaster.

What Next in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, since the talks between the United States and Russia on Cuba have been officially closed, many people are inclined to settle back with a feeling of well-being, contemplating what appears to them to have been a victory for the United States. Many of us, however, are cognizant of the fact that the situation which existed prior to the discovery of Russian missies on the island of Cuba, is still very much in existence. The public pronouncements of Dictator Castro, both in Cuba and East Berlin, certainly do not indicate any cessation of the Communist drive to take over South and Central America.

An editorial printed in the Arizona Republic on Saturday, January 12, 1963, outlines the problem so well that it should be read by every Member.

The article follows:

WHAT NEXT IN CUBA?

When President Kennedy lifted the naval blockade of Cuba, he did so only after receiving Khrushchev's assurance of onsite verification of the removal of Soviet weapons.

The other day, with onsite inspection seemingly as remote as ever, Adlai Stevenson agreed with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov that "the time has come for the (U.N.) Security Council to close its book on the case."

Despite this obvious backdown in the American position, many editorialists througnout the Western World are hailing the unresolved Cuba crisis as a victory for the United States. But is it?

Is it a victory for the United States that some 17,000 Russian troops remain in Cuba? Is it a victory for the United States that 25,000 political foes are languishing in Castro's jails? Is it a victory for the United States that some 7 million Cubans remain as inexorably under Communist control as they were before the October blockade announcement? Is it a victory for the United States that our primary condition for removing the blockade has been denied? Is it a victory for the United States when its Government in effect repudiates the Monroe Doctrine and its several expanded compacts? Is it a victory for the United States that

a communized Cuba continues exporting revolution throughout the Americas?

Long before the October blockade announcement, President Kennedy pledged, "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere." Yet he did in fact negotiate with communism in the Western Hemisphere by promising Khrushchev that, in return for onsite inspection, the United States would not invade Cuba or sanction an invasion by our allies or by Cuban exile groups. The fact that the no-invasion pledge no longer remains in effect, inasmuch as Russia has chosen not to permit onsite inspection in her Cuban satellite, does nothing to refurbish the national honor tarnished by the original no-invasion pledge.

Within days after his emotional, fighting speech to Cuban refugees in Miami's Orange Bowl, President Kennedy disclosed to reporters at Palm Beach his true feelings about Castro's Cuba—a disclosure which a New York Times columnist said means that the U.S. Government fully "accepts the status quo" of having Castro rule Cuba.

No wonder Guatemala's anti-Communist President, Miguel Ydigoras, recently announced his country's retirement from "the front line of the fight against Castro communism." Why, he asked angrily, with an eye toward the U.S.A., should his small nation be constantly in conflict with Cuba, while other countries "receive the Ambassadors of Russia, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Poland, Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia"?

The remainder of the anti-Communist world can only await answers to President Ydigoras' question.

Schacht's Decision a Matter of Regret in City Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1963, the Alameda Times-Star, Alameda, Calif., carried an editorial expressing regret on the retirement of Vice Mayor Richard P. Schacht from the City Council of Alameda.

Mr. Schacht has been a great public servant and, during 6 years on the Alameda City Council, has contributed much to his community through the use of his time and energy and the ideas which he offered.

His dedicated service should be an inspiration to others who might aspire to public office.

I believe that the editorial in my hometown newspaper is a fitting tribute to this distinguished Californian, and under unanimous consent, I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

SCHACHT'S DECISION A MATTER OF REGRET IN CITY POLITICS

The announcement yesterday by Vice Mayor Richard P. Schacht that he will not seek reelection is a matter of regret.

His decision, resulting from the "steadily increasing demands of his law practice," is one that has been duplicated countless times in the history of the country, but it is not for that reason made any more palatable. On the contrary, it offers merely another example of how difficult it is for able men to stay in office once the public is fortunate enough to get them there.

Schacht, through his 6 years of experience on the council, is a man who has a valuable fund of knowledge of the city, its problems and how to meet them. He has shown that in a variety of ways in his official capacity.

Furthermore, he is a stanch member of the Democratic Party, one of a minority on the council and one with a more than usual dedication to the principles of the Democratic Party. That, too, he has evidenced in many ways as many of those acquainted with him know, and it is of especial interest to us in this respect that he showed that dedication again this week in his remarks during consideration of the proposed charter revision apropos both an elective mayor and the division of the city into districts so as to assure a fair representation to the entire population on the city's governing body.

Though Schacht did not wholly agree with the stand taken by the Times-Star on these points, he did let it most emphatically be known that he was for both having the mayor of the city elected by all the citizens, rather than by the members of the council, and also for the districting of the city in such a way as to assure the maximum benefit of the democratic process—two points that are truly fundamental to the democratic process here.

Origin of "The Star-Spangled Banner"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the many things for which Marylanders can be proud is that "The Star-Spangled Banner" was composed in Maryland by a Marylander as a result of a battle in Maryland between American and British forces in 1814. Following is an excerpt from the 1941 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica giving the origin of "The Star-Spangled Banner":

EXCERPT OF THE ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA 1941 EDITION

The origin of the "Star-Spangled Banner" is well known and agreed upon by historians even to smaller details. Francis Scott Key, an American lawyer, had been delegated to negotiate the release of a prominent physician, Dr. William Beans, who had been captured by the British fleet in Chesapeake Bay in 1814. He secured the physician's freedom but was detained aboard the British flagship during the projected bombardment of Baltimore. On the night of September 13–14 the British opened fire upon Fort McHenry, one of the forts defending Baltimore at the mouth of the Patapsco. Under the cover of night, Key could not determine the issue of the battle but at dawn he was overjoyed to see the American flag still flying over the fortress. He then composed the poem, apparently having in mind a tune often employed before in American patriotic songs, that of "Anacreon in Heaven" composed by John Stafford Smith (1750–1836) as the club song of the Anacreontic Society, an association of musicians in London. After Key's return to shore "The Star-Spangled Banner" was set up in type and distributed throughout Baltimore, where it attained an almost instantaneous popularity. Less than a week afterward it was published with an account of its authorship in a Baltimore newspaper, and soon the song was known and sung throughout the Nation. The main facts about its origin and adoption have been set forth in detail by O. G. T. Sonneck in his "Report on the 'Star-Spangled Banner,'" issued by the U.S. Library of Congress in 1914. Among other published reports may be mentioned P. H. Magruder's description of the first and the final text in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute, June 1927. In 1933 the original manuscript of the verse was sold for $24,000.

Can President Deliver the Hoped-for Tax Cut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, having been told of our great prosperity and bright future by the President of the United States, and then, in the same message, that the economy is "sluggish" and that we need a lot of pump priming—$10½ billion over the next 3 years—to get the country moving, it is perhaps well to read the following article. This was written by Mr. J. A. Livingston and appeared in the Washington Post of January 16. It brings us down to earth and to the facts of life. We need to be reminded of both.

The question is one of finances and it cannot be dealt with and solved by campaign oratory.

CAN PRESIDENT DELIVER HOPED-FOR TAX CUT?

(By J. A. Livingston)

To examine President Kennedy's state of the Union message politically is to conclude that he's a confident optimist. He expects to be around in 1965 to push his tax program through. The $10 billion net reduction is phased over 3 years.

In the first year, there'll be a $6 billion cut—enough to whet appetites for the second bite.

This reduction ought to give the economy a boost sufficient to ease the President into 1964 with a prosperity slogan for the November election:

"We got the country moving again."

And then if he's elected, the third phase should be readily attainable. In planning so far ahead, the President profits from the recent past.

The 1960 recession contributed much to Richard Nixon's defeat. President Kennedy made much of the economic malaise during the campaign and overemphasized it in his first state of the Union message saying:

"The present state of the economy is disturbing. We take office in the wake of 7 months of recession, 3½ years of slack, 7 years of diminished growth, and 9 years of falling farm income.

"Business bankruptcies have reached their highest level since the great depression. Since 1951 farm income has been squeezed down by 25 percent. Save for the brief period in 1958, insured unemployment is at the highest peak in history. Of some 5½ million Americans without jobs, more than 1 million have been searching for work for more than 4 months."

Those are words to rue—first, because they were ill timed and much too dolorous. Such a catalog of ills, coming from the President, was not conducive to cheer and confidence. Hardly were the words said than the bottom of the recession was reached. The upturn began—and with little or no impetus from the new administration.

They are words to rue—also because, fundamentally, conditions hardly have changed. In arguing for a tax cut, the President noted that we are "on the side of the hill, not the top. * * * America has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery, but recovery is not enough. * * * Persistent slack * * * has kept unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 out of 62 months."

The President is treating a condition with a theory. After the postwar boom, the rate of economic expansion slowed—as pent-up wants were satisfied. This was natural, expectable. Meanwhile, other countries—able to profit from our industrial leadership, know-how, and aid—moved faster than we. This also was natural.

Now we have before us this theory: Our tax structure is a drag on industrial activity, on consumption. As prosperity increases, the tax collector skims more and more of the income stream. Recovery spending—is cropped off at the top.

Whether this theory is sound, I don't know. We have had top-offs of recoveries recurrently in the United States. The industrial cycle is to business what "The Children's Hour" is to Longfellow—"a pause in the day's occupation." Will changing the tax structure change that?

But this is clear to me. The top rates—both corporate and individual—have been far too high. Getting them down will add zest to the profit motive—to risk taking, experimentation, and innovation.

Thus, the state of the Union message raises economic hopes. But it also raises problems.

Piling an immediate loss of $6 billion in revenues on a deficit of about $7 billion will not meet unanimous approval in Congress. Hearings will be protracted. Getting the legislation out of committee will be a tedious process. And the form the legislation takes is likely to differ drastically from what the President has proposed.

All the while, Wall Street and businessmen will be watching—worriedly. Will the President be able to deliver? Anticipation, which encourages expansion and investment, will be adulterated by anxiety which palsies initiative.

Private Versus Public Power Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the January 14, 1963, issue of the Roanoke-World-News, entitled, "Private Versus Public Power Again."

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC POWER AGAIN

The objections now being raised by the U.S. Department of Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers to the Appalachian Power Co.'s power dam projects on the New River in Grayson County furnish glaring proof of the lengths to which bureaucracy will go to outmaneuver and supplant private enterprise.

Appalachian applied to the Federal Power Commission for license to erect hydroelectric facilities at Boyer Ferry and near Fries, a dual dam arrangement similar to the Smith Mountain and Leesville Dams on the Roanoke River.

The Interior Department has asked that Appalachian Power Co. be denied license because the project would nullify an Army Engineer's plan for a dam on the New River near Galax, study for which supposedly was authorized in 1941. Further, say the objectors, the FPC is without authority to issue a license.

The question at once arises: If private enterprise is willing and able to put up the money for investment to create such a great hydroelectric facility why should Federal agencies object? Certainly this would save vast sums for the taxpayers.

The answer, of course, is bureaucracy and the insatiable desire of public power supporters. The battle with state socialism is never ending. The spenders want the Government in the power business without regard to the cost or the lack of efficiency.

To begin with, the Appalachian's two proposed dams would be far more efficient as a flood control and conservation measure than the single dam desired by the Army Engineers.

Secondly, such a facility, built, owned, and operated by private industry, would yield considerable tax revenue to the county in which it is located. The Federal facility would pay nothing. Only by removing land from local taxation and building at public cost can Federal power deliver what it calls cheaper power to consumers.

Another question which automatically suggests itself is this: How long does a congressional authorization for Federal study preempt a field of operation? Surely not forever. It seems rather evident from the failure of Congress to appropriate money for the Army Engineers project that Congress doesn't think much of it.

What about the Interior Department-Army Engineers argument that FPC lacks authority to issue a license to Appalachian Power Co.?

Turn back to 1940. After a lengthy case, first tried in the U.S. District Court for Western Virginia, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled: (1) The New River is navigable and therefore (2) Appalachian must get its license from the FPC. The Power Commission thereupon issued a license for erecting the Claytor Dam near Dublin.

It would seem that the Supreme Court's opinion is still the rule-of-thumb unless the present Court members feel like overturning the verdict of their predecessors on the Bench.

It is not without significance that Representative TUCK, in whose district Grayson County lies, is in favor of the Appalachian plan. So is Representative RICHARD H. POFF in the Sixth. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON has restated his backing for the company and it is our recollection that Senator HARRY F. BYRD also is on record in that direction.

Here, then, is a readymade opportunity for business and industry to go to bat for private, revenue-producing enterprise. We trust that they will waste no time in making themselves heard.

Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative article dealing with the question of freedom of the seas, by Rear Adm. John D. Hayes, U.S. Navy, retired, was published in the December 1962 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association.

The article follows:

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS—SENSELESS SLOGAN OR MEANING TOOL FOR THE COLD WAR?

(By Rear Adm. John D. Hayes)

In November 1960, the following appeared in my column, "With a Round Turn," under the heading, "Freedom of the Seas in a Cold War. Why?"

"Has it occurred to any of us who are supposed to understand sea power that the inroads which the Soviets have made into the free world in the past few years has been possible only because we have granted them the freedom of the seas which we control.

"How do arms get to Egypt and Syria? How does oil get to Cuba? Where does the gasoline come from that fuels Soviet aircraft in the Congo operating independently of the United Nations? How did Khrushchev get to the last United Nations meeting?

"Freedom of the seas is a Western idea, conceived for an entirely different world from that in which we live today. Is it realistic to continue such a concept in a continued cold war, waged by a closed society?

"It does seem time that the whole idea of freedom of the seas be reviewed by the Nation and the Navy that is alone able to control the sea."

Two years later the American people suddenly discovered that they had allowed the Soviet Union to extend this freedom into a license unmatched since the days of piracy, with nuclear bombers and IBEM missiles imported into Cuba. This bold attempt at either destruction or blackmail came within days of success. The American people faced the threat by exercising their control of the seas. A blockade was established and the aggressive weapons declared absolute contraband (although neither of these terms, recognized in international law, were used). The exercise of control of the seas, even in this mild form, was enough to bring about the most abject retreat that the Soviets have so far made in the cold war.

The perceptive Cat Brown, 1921, at the time of the Lebanon crisis, stated to a television interviewer that Premier Khrushchev did not understand seapower. Perhaps so, but this wily realist must have decided that the American people did not know much about it either. Otherwise they would have used their powerful Navy as a diplomatic persuader rather than massive retaliation, brinkmanship, and the "big bang."

The several situations mentioned above indicate how we allowed the Soviets to use the seas against our own best interests. In another case we failed to use it to our own advantage. During the Korean war we did not interdict supplies brought in by sea to support the Chinese Communists through invoking the doctrine of continuous voyage as was done in World War I. I have no idea how much the Soviets used this means of logistic support, but whatever it was, it relieved the Trans-Siberian Railroad. The inability of that railroad to support a Pacific war—a repeat of 1904–5—eventually forced a truce on the Chinese.

On May 25, 1962, it was announced on a television program that at least one Soviet ship was in the area of our nuclear tests in the central Pacific. The commentator added: "There is nothing that we can do about it." He was referring to a sea area that the Japanese had successfully kept closed for 20 years and for whose control the American people had spent both blood and treasure. Yet, with the strongest Navy in the world, they were told "there was nothing that we

could do about" this Soviet violation of our strictest security at sea.

"FREEDOM OF THE SEAS," THE SLOGAN THAT ALMOST DESTROYED US

Cases such as these must have induced Premier Khrushchev to make the trial in Cuba. Our lack of action he attributed to a reluctance to face hard issues but my belief is that it was a slavish and misunderstood devotion to a slogan. Sir Julian Corbett, able historian of the British Navy, wrote almost a half century ago: "Freedom of the seas," is one of those ringing phrases that haunt the ear and continue to confuse the judgment.[1]

Freedom of the seas cannot exist so long as naval warfare is allowed to exist, since without substantial permission to command the seas, navies, except as mere adjuncts to armies, cease to have meaning.

The seas are free in peace but they never have been free in war. We are told today almost constantly that we are in a cold war. *Ipso facto*, the seas should not be free today.

The seas have been free in peace only because the British Navy kept them so. Actually the concept that no individual nation has the right of domination of the high seas is of comparatively recent origin. The trend now is the other way with various nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, claiming rights to certain sea areas outside their territorial limits. Nevertheless, Great Britain has never used her naval power to restrict commerce to her own advantage and neither has the United States. There is certainly no assurance that this will still be the case if naval power should fall into other hands.

In time of war, however, the British have never hesitated to close the seas to her enemies. The United States, as a neutral, gave lip service to the doctrine that private property in the form of ships and cargo should be free to use the seas in time of war but when the chips were down we followed British practice, in the Civil War, and in World Wars I and II.

Julian Corbett again succinctly stated the case: "In time of peace freedom of the seas exists already; in time of war it does not exist, never has existed, and at no time has it ever been put forward in its entirety by serious authority as an ideal of international politics."

In summary, freedom of the seas is a free world gift in time of peace but subject to control in time of war. In the age in which we live, peace and war are no longer distinguishable. What can be sharply defined in this cold war condition is who belongs to the free world and who does not.

In modern times, threats to the free world have come from land power. In every case it has been turned back by control of the seas. On the other hand, this control of the sea, by itself alone, cannot threaten the existence of any state.

NAVAL POWER CAN KEEP COMMUNIST AGGRESSION LOCKED WITHIN THE LITTORAL OF EURASIA

Geographically, communism is land power while the free world is a great sea state. The natural boundary between them is the littoral where the land mass of Eurasia meets the sea. The free world has the advantage of a salient into Communist land power in the form of the peninsula of Europe which has been successfully supported from the sea twice in our century. In today's cold war, naval power, using the belligerent rights granted it by international law, can keep communism from again breaking out of that littoral as it was allowed to do for the first time in the case of Cuba.

At the same time, land transportation being what it is, naval power cannot impose an effective blockade on the Soviet Union and its contiguous satellites. The failure of the attempt to do so on the Korean Peninsula, 1951–53, proves this. Naval power can only be used offensively in conjunction with the power of the other two armed services. Used alone it is restricted to the defensive and in this manner contributes in a large degree to the stalemate of the cold war which is about all we can hope to accomplish by military means. The permanent stopping of the dynamic Communist ideology must be done in some other way.

Today with no real peace but only a spectrum of wars—cold war, limited war, general war, total war and the grades between—our aim is to keep the situation in the cold war stage, on our terms. The most logical way of doing this, now that the Soviets refused to face the test, is to exercise our control of the seas as we see fit, employing such belligerent rights allowed by international law as we care to use.

When wars were limited to the armed forces, a merchant could go about his business at sea without becoming involved unless he wanted to. The principle of immunity of private property which we call freedom of the seas was a byproduct of the limited wars of the 18th and 19th centuries. Such immunity became a casualty of the 20th-century total wars. Cold war is milder in form than limited war so there is no reason why the doctrine of immunity of private property cannot be applied in this form of conflict.

The U.S. policy with regard to Cuba at present is consistent with this doctrine as it was propounded by John Adams and Woodrow Wilson. Private property, whether ship or cargo, is exempt. Contraband, that is whatever can be used to disturb the delicate balance of power, is not. We, who possess naval power, must alone determine what is contraband and whether it is absolute or conditional as defined by the early writers on international law and by our own Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase. We should decide when blockade will be resorted to and in what form.

NAVAL METHODS OF STOPPING COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Wherever communism has succeeded, it has been in the shadow of armed might. Naval power can easily stop inroads of communism into the sea state of the free world by stopping the shipment of its arms beyond the littoral of the continent of Eurasia. The methods used can be the conventional visit and search such as the recent boarding of the Lebanese freighter under Soviet charter. There is always the danger in such procedure of submarine attack and there is no need to keep ships on this arduous duty at high cost and to the detriment of their training. Air surveillance and diversion to an inspecting port, the modification of the visit and search procedure adopted in World War I, will accomplish the same thing. Another means available, which also had its precedent in World War I, is the issuing of written documents, called "navicerts" at the port of departure, certifying to the contents of the cargo.

One saving feature of the laws of war at sea is that the actions of naval officers are reviewed by civilian judges in prize courts. Nothing parallels this in martial law. It may be necessary some day to again invoke prize courts but such courts must, as always, be those of the naval power itself. For the time being, the prospect of delay and inconvenience may be sufficient to deter shipping owners from chartering their vessels for purposes of Communist aggression. If not, there is still another tool which the British used effectively during World War I—bunker control. Except in the Black Sea, oil fuel is everywhere under the control of the free world.

The Soviets retreated when we confronted them at sea. It is in this area where we should patiently press our advantage and not be exasperated into an invasion or a "surgical"[2] air strike on missile or airbases in Cuba. The blackmail is over now, to regain the initiative the Soviets must employ the force they have in that country and this force has to be supported from overseas. A blockade can therefore keep the situation in the realm of cold war. If for this purpose, the blockade has to be made more extensive, it will still be less cruel on the Cuban people and more deflating to Castro than other military action.

A CODE FOR SEA LAW AGAINST AGGRESSION

What is needed now is a code for the law of the sea in a cold war, and it is ready and waiting. It may be found in a draft convention on the "Rights and Duties of States in Case of Aggression" prepared by the Research in International Law of the Harvard Law School and published in the American Journal of International Law, October 1939. (Note the date.) This document defines aggressor states, defending and codefending states and supporting states, and outlines measures that may be taken at sea against the aggressor state.

It also states: "Nothing in this convention shall be deemed to entitle any state to deprive the aggressor of territory or to impair the political independence of the aggressor, as a penalty for aggression."

SOME LITERATURE ON FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

One of the important facts of the Cuban situation which naval people should not overlook is the failure of the experts who have been writing about strategy and defense in the nuclear age to foresee what actually did happen and to provide any guide for action in handling it. Such best sellers as Henry A. Kissinger's "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy" (1957) and Hahn and Neff, "American Strategy in the Nuclear Age," do not have a word on the kind of confrontation that actually took place. Neither does the newest work, Waskow, "The Limits of Defense" (1962). These books, it would now appear, are to be the only casualties of the crisis.

For any enlightenment of the subject of control of belligerent shipping in the cold war of the nuclear age, a reader must go back to a political scientist of more than a generation ago, Pitman B. Potter. His short but definitive "Freedom of the Seas, in History, Law, and Politics," traces this doctrine in international law, treats its modern interpretation in World War I, and offers some solutions which might stand the test of our time. He alone of the many writers on the subject then did not fall into the trap of finding an easy solution in the League of Nations.

No Navy man will go wrong who searches for guidance on any maritime question in the writings of Alfred T. Mahan. In this case it can be found in one of his little known works, "Some Neglected Aspects of War." This compilation of essays contains one by Julian Corbett, "Capture of Private Property at Sea," in which this writer in his incisive style lays bare the whole problem. Another by Mahan himself, "Belligerent Merchant Shipping," indicates why his associate at the Hague Conference, Alfred D. White, wrote of him: "When he speaks, the millennium fades, and the strong, severe actual world appears."

McGeorge Bundy, the President's adviser on national defense, in his biography of

[1] Corbett no doubt felt that "seapower" was another of these phrases as he did not use the term in his extensive writing on the history of the British Navy.

[2] It is frightening that in such serious situations, our planners still communicate in Madison Avenue slogans whose purpose is to hide reality.

Henry M. Stimson, published in 1947, wrote of "the peculiar psychology of the Navy Department, which frequently seemed to retire from the realm of logic into a dim religious world in which Neptune was God, Mahan his prophet, and the U.S. Navy the only true church." What he now thinks of Mahan and sea power is not known.

Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, of Colorado, Discusses Need for Public Land Law Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 12, and 13, 1962, the National Association of Counties held a conference on matters relating to grazing, water, and revenue in conjunction with the meeting of the association's western regional district. Many thought-provoking papers were presented.

One of the outstanding presentations was made at a general session by the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Because of the importance of this paper, I bring it to the attention of the Members by setting it forth in full as part of my remarks.

Not only does the message that follows outline some of the important work to be undertaken by your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during this Congress, it also sets forth the philosophy and principle underlying the chairman's approach:

A WESTERN LEGISLATOR VIEWS THE 88TH CONGRESS

(By Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado)

The President has said that we are living in climactic times. This is true, not only in the specific areas to which he was referring, but also in the fields of public land law and the development of public land areas with which this western regional district of the National Association of Counties should be, and I think is, vitally concerned.

Actions taken in the 88th Congress that will convene on January 9, 1963, may well shape the future patterns into which western communities will be required to mold themselves for years, and possibly decades, to come. I believe that the development of a revised, revitalized, and possibly brandnew public land policy will be one of the major accomplishments of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in the next Congress. For my part I intend, within the limits of our physical capabilities, to assign to the Public Lands Subcommittee sufficient time in the months ahead to assure adequate review and study of existing processes and proposed modifications. In this work we shall cooperate with the administration and thoroughly examine any and all proposals that may be submitted for our consideration.

In discussing our physical capability to handle legislation, I would like you to keep in mind a few factual details: In the 87th Congress, 909 pieces of legislation were referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the full committee met 67 times and the six subcommittees met a total of 283 times in Washington. The 87th Congress was, as we all know, a long one and despite this, although we scheduled meetings every working day until the very end of the session, an equal division of the 283 meetings would have given the six subcommittees approximately 47 meetings each which, at 2 hours each, would provide 94 hours for both hearings and deliberation. (Actually in the 87th Congress the Public Lands Subcommittee, which is the one with which I am most concerned today, met 57 times in Washington.)

Local government and county commissioners should be interested in substantial portions of our work in addition to that of the Subcommittee on Public Lands. The Subcommittee on National Parks, for example, reported favorably in the last Congress, and there were enacted, 12 bills authorizing the establishment of new units of the National Park System of which 3 were major and 9 smaller elements; the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation passes on projects that have a lasting effect on local affairs; the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs considers legislation involving Indian lands which form such a large portion of the land mass of some of the Western States; and the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining has jurisdiction over the mining and mineral leasing laws as well as mineral resources of the public generally, all of which are of vital and immediate interest to local governments.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs must not only consider legislation referred to it, but, in addition, it has the responsibility for legislative oversight of the Department of the Interior and the exercise of surveillance over the administration of statutes authorizing current activities. The importance of this legislative oversight responsibility can best be judged by a few examples of areas in which we can expect the committee to be active during the next Congress.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its staff are keenly aware of the interest of county officials in these various matters. We not only welcome but solicit your views and recommendations. But, remember you and your counties, like everybody else, cannot have your cake and eat it. You cannot pick and choose those instances in which you want the law followed and those instances in which you would rather wink at the law. This is part of the reason that we examine the operation of existing law to determine compliance on the one hand or the need for revision on the other hand.

We know, for example, that there are revenue-sharing formulas that make it inviting in some areas to continue the management of public land areas by either the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, that is management and retention in Federal ownership instead of placing the property in a position where it could be sold even though after sale property developed for private use would be placed on the tax rolls. At this point let us acknowledge that there are important differences between revenue sharing and payments-in-lieu of taxes, and that, particularly where construction has been emplaced, the shared revenue is sometimes paid to a county that has not suffered and may have even benefited from a Federal project.

Many of us have become deeply concerned by the fact that the Bureau of Land Management seems to lose sight at times of the opening sentence of the Taylor Grazing Act which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to do certain things "in order to promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal." The attempt to designate these public lands as a "national land reserve" implies retention rather than preparation for disposal. In addition we have noted the Bureau's applications for funds to enter the recreation field on a large scale on public lands where the construction of recreation facilities would certainly be inconsistent with plans for the final disposal of the land contemplated by the Taylor Grazing Act. We shall therefore be concerned in the immediate future with a review of the proposed Bureau of Land Management recreation program to see, first, whether it is consistent with existing legislation and, second, to what extent it is proposed to establish duplicate administrative machinery by failing to utilize the services of the National Park Service as a management agency of these new proposed recreation areas.

I am sure you are all aware of the fact that the last Congress enacted a law making it possible to bring certain Federal district court actions outside the District of Columbia against government officials and agencies. Suits can now be brought in the specified instances within the judicial district in which, among other things, real property involved in an action is situated. I supported this legislation and am gratified that after years of effort it has been enacted. However, unless administrative remedies are first exhausted one cannot sustain any law suit. It therefore becomes imperative that we remove roadblocks to administrative consideration of cases as a necessary ingredient of full operation of this new law.

Many of us in the last year have become increasingly concerned with the extensive backlog of appeals before the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the Secretary of the Interior. We have, accordingly, been pursuing an analysis of present procedures to determine whether the committee should initiate legislation to facilitate consideration of cases on administrative appeal. I am sure you all realize that a 2 to 3 year lag between appeal and decision not only frustrates the individual's rights but can have a direct impact on the availability, use, and development of public lands which are matters of great concern to county commissioners trying to plan ahead.

I do want to acknowledge the efforts made by the Department and the cooperation that has been given to the committee and its staff by the Department of the Interior Solicitor, Mr. Frank Barry, who shares the platform with me this morning. Some progress has been made. However, in a report 2 weeks ago from Assistant Secretary Carver, who informed me of the introduction of new procedures designed to expedite appeals, it was pointed out that the backlog of appeals to the Secretary had been reduced between July 1, and October 1, 1962, from 793 to 726 cases. (At this rate it would still take 2½ years to clear up the existing backlog; but, it is definite progress.)

The Department had been requested to either institute positive procedures to assure reduced appeal time or to recommend to the 88th Congress legislation to accomplish the purpose. But, whether or not the Department makes significant inroads in its current backlog, the committee must look to the long-range program. I hope, therefore, that we will have time to hold hearings looking toward a constructive solution.

Another matter that the committee has been studying in one phase of the operation of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926. A special Public Lands Subcommittee, at my request, looked into a specific transaction in the adjacent town of Henderson, Nev., where a land area was made available for private recreational use as a so-called public golf course without any formal notification or hearing by Department officials. The examination of this one

case led to a general review of the law as it applies to nonpublic bodies and groups; but no hearings could be held because of the lack of time. I understand that the subcommittee is presently completing its report and I expect that this matter will be pursued in the next Congress.

You, as county officials are, I know, very much concerned that public lands be devoted to some use, whether it be recreational or for intensive development and occupancy for residence or business. Our committee has in the last 5 years reviewed all proposed withdrawals over 5,000 acres and considered legislation for those involving defense utilization. In addition to continuing these procedures during the next Congress I have the assurance of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman that the Forest Service will cooperate with us in an effort to enact new-type statutory withdrawals in those instances where it will be possible to protect the public interest while providing for multiple use through a partial withdrawal that cannot be effected administratively.

The principle of multiple use is part of the history of our basic public land policies. Traditional policy, which I vigorouosly support and which I take every opportunity to espouse, has always equated conservation with wise use. What makes our proposed approach different is that we plan to apply this idea of multiple use of tracts of land required for governmental use.

In the past, wherever an agency of Government required the use of a parcel of land, it was withdrawn from appropriation under the public land laws under an express or implied executive authority. As a result of our coordination of proposed withdrawal actions we know now that there are areas in which it will be possible to withdraw the land for surface use but permit subsurface exploration and development. In addition to the National Forests, we have determined that this approach will be feasible in connection with Corps of Engineers reservoir projects.

A partial withdrawal, however, cannot be effected administratively. The general laws do not contemplate that type of action. Accordingly, it will be necessary to consider individual withdrawal bills while, at the same time, the committee studies the practicability of establishing general guidelines to meet the modern requirements.

The obvious reason for the current emphasis on developing new means of assuring multiple use is the growing scarcity of usable land for the various programs, purposes, and uses for which the people of the United States have legitimate demands. Those of us who are familiar with the development of the West know that it could not have taken place without the use of public lands. This city of Las Vegas has grown through the use and development of public lands and their transformation into privately held lands. Likewise, I know that many of your counties rely for your revenues on taxes levied on real property that once was nontaxable because it was public land; and I can see you looking eagerly and hopefully for new additions to the tax rolls.

Here our responsibilites for legislative oversight and for consideration of bills will probably merge again. We know that our land laws generally need modernizing; and, in recent years, recommendations for modification have been made by both the previous Republican administration and the present Democratic administration. Our committee has held hearings on several proposals and heard conflicting views. The bills before the committee last year ranged from the relatively minor proposal to repeal the Pittman Act, which establishes special procedures for land grants for agricultural development in the State of Nevada, to full-scale major revision of the nonmineral public land laws.

As I indicated at the outset, the most important business for the West that I foresee in the 88th Congress will probably see the climax of these and other studies leading toward revision of the basic public land laws. In order to put this projected action in focus I would like to review with you a few salient background factors, including the fundamentals of our land laws.

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution imposes on Congress the responsibility and authority for the disposal of all Government property. When Congress fails to act it creates a vacuum into which the Executive may—no, I will say must—move to assure effective, efficient management. Congress did fail to enact general legislation designed to govern the use of public lands; and the executive branch has accordingly made its own rules as to which areas should be preserved as wilderness, which areas should be open for disposal, and which areas should be retained for recreational use.

In the consideration of legislation to dispose of reserved minerals, in proposals to make lands available for urban and business development, in bills to set aside wilderness areas, and in the several measures that have been introduced governing the withdrawal and reservation for specialized use of lands in excess of 5,000 acres, the central problem has revolved around the executive-legislative relationship in the management and disposal of our public lands. I submit that this will emerge as the clear-cut issue early in the 88th Congress. I promise you that we will meet this issue squarely and that I, for one, will insist that Congress shall not shirk the responsibility that it has under the Constitution.

This group knows, I am sure, that our committee reported a bill that in effect would have required an act of Congress for most future withdrawals and changes in use designations of public land areas in excess of 5,000 acres; and would also have set aside 6.8 million acres of land for wilderness preservation, with provision for additional areas to be safeguarded in the future. Incidentally, in this bill we adopted an amendment that was so ably recommended by your new president of the western regional district, Jim Stearns, who appeared before the Public Lands Subcommittee in his capacities, at that time, as vice chairman of the district and chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the California County Supervisors Association. The amendment to which I refer, of course, is the one that would require the views of local governments to be obtained before additional areas could be set aside and preserved as wilderness. I congratulate you on having elevated Mr. Stearns to the presidency of this body.

The bill we reported out, which I sponsored as a substitute for the wilderness bill, was, I am pleased to note, received with satisfaction by this organization and its many components including my own State of Colorado county commissioners whose voice, in the person of Fritz Schneider, is heard so clearly. The wilderness preservation advocates did not like the bill and some of the executive departments objected to the proposed limitation on their powers. This opposition was not unique in the recent history of related legislation. Many different proposals have been made in individual areas as well as for general application concerning the guidelines for the future management and disposal of public lands. None has met with universal approval nor has any met with sufficient approval to permit enactment without controversy. Accordingly, on October 15, 1962, I wrote to the President and invited him to use his offices to submit to the Congress when it reconvenes in January an administration proposal for the enactment of legislation to define once and for all the executive-legislative relationship. I have been assured by the White House that this matter is being given serious consideration and I look forward to working with the administration in the 88th Congress to obtain mutually acceptable legislation.

The constitutional provision I cited a moment ago is explicit. Nonetheless, we have areas of misunderstanding. For example, I find some of my good friends in the conservation movement completely missing the point of my objectives in this area in which I have been supported by recent committee actions. First, I hasten to assure you that I know of nobody on our committee motivated by any preconceived conclusion to obtain the use of public lands for any specific purpose.

There is a big difference between evaluating all uses and advocating particular uses. I would like to keep the record straight on a few things: I do not advocate any particular use—as a general proposition—as having any higher priority for allocation of public land areas than any other use; I believe that it is imperative that added areas be set aside for recreational use; I believe that we should preserve some wilderness areas; and finally I think that, after considering all possible uses, it is proper, if found to be in the national interest, that areas of public lands be reserved for limited or even single purpose use.

The important ingredient, that even some of my friends overlook, is that this procedure must place the responsibility for authorizing less than full multiple use in the hands of the Congress, the entity of the Federal Government closest to the people, and therefore most capable of acting as the landlord for the people themselves. In general enactments Congress has repeatedly, in words and substance, provided for the broadest possible multiple use; in specific bills we have set aside national parks for the enjoyment of all the people as recreational havens. We must now move on and either enunciate specific policy guidelines for the executive to carry out, or, in some way, pass on each specific major set-aside of public lands for limited or single purpose use.

The failure of Congress to act has permitted the Executive to set aside within national forests, exclusive of the Minnesota canoe areas, almost 14 million acres of land for wilderness preservation. If we fail to act and the Bureau of Land Management likewise sets aside for preservation of recreational development large units of public domain lands, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves if we later disagree with that action.

The 88th Congress will, I expect, bring these matters into focus for decision. Bearing in mind that the Homestead Act was enacted 100 years ago, the basic mining law 90 years ago, and the Taylor Grazing Act almost 30 years ago, I think we can all agree that the tremendous expansion of the country since the end of World War II requires some modernization of our public land laws. I think it is imperative that county commissioners individually and collectively, through organizations such as this, let us have your views. You, the commissioners, are closest to the people whose areas are being affected. In the final analysis we in Congress must legislate in the overall national interest; but, in doing so, we, at least, will give every consideration possible to local and regional needs before overriding them for the greater good of the greater number.

The only limtation that we will have on the extent to which the Committee delves into these various subjects that I have mentioned, as well as others such as my own bill to permit local taxation of personal property within Federal areas, will be the physical limitations of time. We should devote whatever time is necessary to each of these matters; and yet, as I demonstrated earlier, we

will be fortunate if the Public Lands Subcommittee has a total of between 90 and 100 hours in which to consider all of the matters within its jurisdiction.

I hope that these remarks will serve to bring about among you, as well as others, a little better understanding of my own approach and some of our problems. Possibly you will be able to help when someone criticizes us for failing to act more quickly.

A Brilliant Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pomona, Calif., is an outstanding and progressive American city. It possesses citizens with wonderful community spirit and ability, and unusual natural resources. As a result Pomona has made great strides. I feel honored to represent this community in the Congress.

Pomona this year observes its diamond jubilee. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 6, 1963, Pomona Progress-Bulletin outlining Pomona's rich and interesting history:

A BRILLIANT MILESTONE

Just as the diamond is the most highly valued of stones, so a diamond anniversary is a brilliant and precious milestone for any community.

As Pomona begins observance of such an anniversary with its diamond jubilee, a look back over the years shows a record of accelerating growth and progress that assures an even brighter future for the city and the area it serves.

Blessed with unusual natural resources—a wonderful climate, beautiful scenery, rich soil, abundant pure water, and a strategic location—this valley was a land of opportunity to the early day residents and has continued to be through the years.

Its greatest wealth, however, has always been found in the men and women whose vision, character, courage, and devotion has given the community aggressive and successful leadership.

In its earliest pioneer days, this was a land of big cattle ranches. They went out of the picture with the drought of the early 1860's. Hay and grain were giving way to vineyards and deciduous fruit orchards in the late 1880's when Pomona was incorporated, and development of citrus groves was on its way.

By the turn of the century, Pomona Valley was the very center of the southern California citrus industry. The Richards Ranch in north Pomona was said to be the largest navel orange grove in the world, and for a time the packinghouse in San Dimas was the largest lemon-shipping house in the country.

So the valley excelled in citrus as it had in raising cattle and horses and subsequently in building an enviable reputation for its canned deciduous fruit.

Pomona citrus growers were among the first to ship their fruit cooperatively, and took a leading part in the founding of the California Fruit Growers Exchange—now Sunkist, Inc.—which was at one time the largest cooperative shipping organization in the world. It played a major part in making the southern California citrus industry world famous.

In the early 1920's the desire of the people of Pomona to provide a showcase for agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry prompted chamber of commerce and other leaders to launch the Los Angeles County Fair. Today the fair is, as it has been for many years, the largest and most beautiful county fair in America.

Pomona early became known as a city of fine homes, schools and churches. At one time the per capita giving for missionary work exceeded that of any other community in the West. Pomona churches through the years have sent and maintained missionaries in many parts of the world including Africa, India, China, Japan, Central and South America.

From the city's early days its residents wanted the best in education for their children, and were willing to make sacrifices to provide it. They established a splendid system of public schools from kindergarten through college.

Pomona College, founded during the same year as the city's incorporation, is today the outstanding liberal arts college of the West. But Pomona was only the first college. Now there are 12 fine schools on the college level in the Pomona Valley area.

As the schools were developed, special attention was given to music and art. Today Pomona takes pride, with its neighbor communities, in being a well rounded cultural center.

In the field of medicine, too, Pomona has developed steadily. The multimillion-dollar Pomona Valley Community Hospital, for example, is the heart of one of southern California's outstanding medical centers.

Pomona people have had visions in other fields as well. Before Pomona College was scarcely a year old, its president, the late Dr. Cyrus G. Baldwin, had secured the cooperation of electrical engineers in the building of a hydroelectric powerplant in San Antonio Canyon. The powerline that brought electric energy from that plant to Pomona pioneered the vast electrical industry of today.

First recognition in the industrial world came to this city with the organization of the Pomona Manufacturing Co., later named the Pomona Pump Co., and now the Pomona works of Fairbanks, Morse & Co. Its deep-well pump, the Pomona pump, became known over much of the world.

Today, Pomona industries are supplying products to meet a broad field of needs, including those of the space age. Its electronic, missile, and other plants are being supplemented rapidly. They will provide employment for many new residents, thus further fortifying Pomona Valley's stable economy.

Pomona has made rapid strides in recent months, so rapid that some persons describe its development as explosive.

Wishing to develop an outstanding core business district, Pomona businessmen inaugurated a revitalization program which included building offstreet parking lots and the Pomona Mall. This program has attracted nationwide attention.

With the construction of a $4½ million superior courts building, Pomona's importance as a judicial center will be fully realized. This and many other assured developments in the civic center area and elsewhere are giving Pomona increasing momentum. This community has been building the foundations for a bright future that should offer great new opportunities for its citizens.

A great statesman might have been thinking of a community such as Pomona when he said, "The past is but a prolog for the future."

The Fiscal Problems of Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal problems of our country are paramount. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include the following three editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Jounal, Dec. 17, 1962]

THE POSSIBLE AND THE PERFECT

Every criticism President Kennedy directed at the tax structure Friday night is absolutely right. If it were simply a question of lowering rates to get the economy going faster, there would be no quarrel instead of the angry national argument that is in fact developing.

As Mr. Kennedy said, the present tax system "siphons out of the private economy too large a share of personal and business purchasing power * * * it reduces the financial incentives for personal effort, investment, and risktaking." Those are exactly the incentives that could spell greater growth.

In addition, the endless tinkering with taxes in an effort to make them somewhat less burdensome has created a patchwork that distorts private economic judgments and makes certain types of activity more profitable than other and more valuable undertakings. All this, the President wisely said, "inhibits our growth and efficiency."

The President is probably correct, too, when he says that as a practical matter Federal spending is going to continue rising. He had hoped to propose tax cuts in the frame of a balanced budget; instead he will do so in a swirling sea of red ink. Yet to defer tax cuts until spending is reduced and budgets balanced might be, to borrow a phrase of his, to force the possible to wait on the perfect.

He may even be right when he argues that lower tax rates might not seriously augment the deficit for very long. Certainly increased economic activity could produce more revenue for the Government from lower rates.

Unfortunately it is right there that some of the trouble begins. While higher spending is as sure as Mr. Kennedy and his advisers can make it, the economic impact of lower taxes is a guess at best. And Government planners are notoriously poor guessers.

They estimated a modest surplus for fiscal 1959 under President Eisenhower and they got a $12.5 billion deficit. For the current period they estimated a small surplus and they are getting a deficit now calculated at nearly $8 billion. What the figure will be in the budget Mr. Kennedy proposes next month is not known, but nobody denies it will be another deficit.

This seemingly perpetual round of deficits in good times and bad, for any excuse or none, is what gives so many Americans the jitters about tax cuts that could aggravate the already unbalanced arithmetic. People simply cannot understand why it is that, even if defense and space spending must rise, the Government is so unwilling to pull back on obviously less essential projects. The President's promise to hold the line on such projects in the forthcoming budget is not going to reassure them—not with all experience to the contrary.

For that reason we believe the President's refusal to base tax cuts on lower spending

is not only a drastic economic error but may be a political mistake as well. Such a skilled political practitioner must be aware of the mood of the country. You would think he would want to capitalize on it by going before Congress with recommendations for both tax and spending reductions. If he would do that, he could stop worrying about the polls, his legislative program, Nelson Rockefeller, or just about anything else.

That is not demanding an unattainable perfection but only common economic sense. The honest truth is that we can and should have both lower taxes and lower spending. If politics is the art of the possible, the President is overlooking a magnificent possibility.

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News]

DON'T SPEND IT—YET

Information on the administration's forthcoming tax program, leaked to the press in advance of the President's message to Congress on that subject, indicates a contemplated gross reduction of $8 billion to $10 billion in tax receipts, but to be offset by $3.5 billion of increased revenue that is now seeping through those so-called loopholes.

Furthermore, it has been revealed that reductions are to prevail over all tax brackets, from the poor man's 20 percent to the millionaire's 91 percent and including the 52-percent corporate income tax.

The avowed purpose is to stimulate business so as to relieve unemployment. But it is difficult to see how a cut of these overall proportions and spread so thin can offer significant relief in any quarter.

Speculation on the effects of a proposal yet to be presented are rather idle, of course.

But it now seems plain that there will be strong resistance in Congress to tax-cutting without similar reductions in spending, especially when the current fiscal year that ends next June 30 is expected to show a deficit of around $8 billion—and perhaps even more.

Representative JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin, for one, has declared that if the President will cut nonemergency spending, taxes can be cut, too. And he is expected to have plenty of company in both Houses among Congressmen and Senators who have been listening to constituents who are far more concerned about the welfare of this Nation than of that of others on which we have been spending huge sums—and who are not as happy about all those costly Federal "help" programs on the domestic level as some politicians like to think.

The thought of adding even a few billions of dollars to a national debt of $300 billion is disturbing to those of us who are naive enough to cling to the idea that nations should pay their bills as well as people—and who remember enough history to recall that a score of once-great nations have perished because they didn't.

[From the Greenfield (Ind.) News, Jan. 10, 1963]

TAX CUT ALREADY EARNED

Most prominent subject for action in the new session of the U.S. Congress, just now beginning, as seen by the political prognosticators in Washington, is the Presidential proposal for a cut in income taxes, more or less "across the board" and irrespective of whether or not the cut is accompanied by a reduction in spending.

There is by no means unanimity of opinion as to the exact details of this reduction, but if any action by the new Congress seems fairly sure, it would be that some sort of a reduction in income tax is in the cards. The reason or excuse for such a cut at this time is as a means of speeding growth, employment, prosperity, by providing more money for investment in business and industry and, therefore jobs, and by permitting the people to retain a greater portion of their incomes to spend in obtaining what they desire.

It all seems very kind and charitable on the face of it and is a tacit admission that income taxes for the last 25 years have been far too high. With that we heartily agree and include that spending has also been allowed to be maintained at too-high a level. The very fact that tax collections have been allowed to remain at such a high level, year after year, was in itself an invitation to high spending and extravagant waste in public business.

And the fact that a cut in taxes is looked upon as a sure-fire remedy for an insufficient rate of growth is, in itself, an admission that taxes at present levels are not good and have contributed to a dwarfing of virility, ambition, and growth.

But, when we look the whole field over; not just focusing on Federal income levies alone, we see that there is a certain amount of deception and sham in the tax-cutting proposals.

For instance: Just as of this present month, substantial new drains have been put upon the pocketbook of the consuming public by the Federal Government and it will take a considerable cut in income tax rates to merely even up to the citizen and make his position as tenable as it was even last year.

The social security tax against all payrolls and the earnings of the self-employed, was substantially increased as of January 1. It will place in the Treasury hundreds of millions of additional dollars each year, and two further increases in coming years has also been provided in the statutes. In addition the "medicare" proposal if it should be passed, would up the rate still further, at a rate of nearly $2 billion a year.

Also, as of January 7, every postal rate in the book was raised substantially. First-class postage was raised 25 percent. Second class was raised 10 percent this year, with two additional 10-percent raises to go on next year and the next. So on through all postal categories. This will raise annually added hundreds of millions. When there is a postal deficit it is made up out of tax collections, so the manipulation of postal rates is directly tied to the income tax. Therefore, it can be easily seen that it will take a relatively large cut in the income tax to put the average taxpayer on balance so that he will actually be paying less than he was in 1962 to the Government in all forms of assessment. In other words, we have here a considerable bit of hocus-pocus.

We bet a lot of you hadn't even thought of that.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, news reports speculate that Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis E. LeMay will not be reappointed at the end of his term in July. This would be a great loss to the Air Force and to the country.

It would also be positive indication that along the New Frontier, you must muzzle your dissenting comments or look for another line of work. This administration has, through press releases, told Federal employees to speak out on matters within their jurisdiction. With fanfare, State Department officers are told to try something new, be imaginative.

Yet in General LeMay we have a man whose strong convictions and honest beliefs caused him to speak out against the proposed abandonment of manned bombers. Apparently his reward will be an end to his services.

This would be most unfortunate. There are few men more dedicated to the security of this Nation than General LeMay. All of us know him for his outstanding performance as head of our first line of defense—the Strategic Air Command. His high sense of duty and his complete devotion to the Air Force and the defense of this country have won him a place in the ranks of our greatest military leaders.

It would be a grave loss indeed to have the country deprived of his services, knowledge, and abilities because he had the courage to speak out for what he believes we need for our own defense.

A forceful editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of January 11 deals directly with this matter, and I include it at this point.

DISPOSING OF LEMAY

This newspaper's Washington Bureau says it now seems almost certain that Gen. Curtis LeMay will not be reappointed as Air Force Chief of Staff when his term ends in July.

Admirers of General LeMay—and we believe that this includes almost all of his countrymen—should have been prepared for this shock.

The man who commanded SAC in its formative years and who, perhaps more than any other man, is responsible for creating America's bomber force, has all but been shoved out the door of the Pentagon.

He was overruled on the Skybolt missile. The fate of the proposed RS-70 hangs by a slender thread. The whole concept of the manned bomber is being thrown overboard by the Kennedy administration. If the "whiz kid" civilians in the Pentagon have their way, they may scuttle the U.S. Air Force as we have known it.

Civilian supporters of the Air Force are bitter about this treatment of Curtis LeMay. We surmise that the officers and men of the Air Force are even more disturbed. For if the ideas, the knowledge, the lifelong experience of General LeMay can be cast aside in such cavalier fashion, how much attention will be paid to the views of other airmen?

The day General LeMay is thrown to the wolves may prove the sorriest day for American airpower since other so-called "bright boys" in another era court-martialed Billy Mitchell.

Progress and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD an excellent address delivered by Mr. Kenneth H. Klipstein, president of the American Cyana-

mid Co., before the Society of Chemical Industry on October 19, 1962. On that date, Mr. Klipstein received the coveted 1962 Chemical Industry Medal of the American Section of the Society of Chemical Industry.

Mr. Klipstein is an outstanding leader in the chemical industry and his remarks should be read by all who are interested in the achievements of the American chemical industry and the preservation of the free enterprise system:

PROGRESS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Remarks by Kenneth H. Klipstein, president, American Cyanamid Co.)

No recognition that may come to a man is more gratifying, more to be cherished than that which his peers and lifelong colleagues may choose to bestow upon him. This is a day unlike any other in my life. Through me, you have also highly honored all of my associates, past and present at American Cyanamid Co., and on their behalf, as well as my own, I thank you with all sincerity.

It has been good to spend my life in the chemical industry, seeing it grow and taking part in one of the high adventures of all time. My fervent wish is that this adventure never cease for others—that men never run out of opportunities to be uncovered, problems to be solved, frontiers to be explored.

One of the purposes of the founders of the Society of Chemical Industry was to provide for "the discussion of all matters bearing upon the practice of applied chemistry."

I would like to invoke that purpose tonight. The matter I mean to discuss has considerable bearing upon the practice of applied chemistry. It is not exaggeration to say that it may even determine whether the practice of applied chemistry as we know it today shall continue to exist.

MANY ATTACKS ON INDUSTRY

The chemical industry is under attack—on many fronts.

We see a challenge posed to our patent system—at the very time when other nations are taking steps to strengthen protection for their own inventors.

We see mounting alarm over possible pollution of our air and water, without recognition of the preventive steps being taken by industry.

We see a concerted attack on the pharmaceutical industry by critics who seem to forget what has happened to life expectancy in recent years.

We see the public being frightened over the use of agricultural chemicals, despite their enormous benefit to our food supply.

We see new trade and tariff provisions which, depending on how they are applied, might undermine whole segments of the chemical industry.

At a time when images are often considered more important than the very things they portray, there are many who see us only as contaminators and polluters.

All these problems stem largely from the same root: namely, the deplorable lack of public understanding.

People don't know enough about what we are, about what we do, and why we do it. To us here tonight, the development of synthetic organic pesticides is one of the major accomplishments of the chemical industry. We are proud to have been able to place these amazing tools into the hands of those charged with providing our food and protecting our health.

To the readers of the book, "Silent Spring"—and there are many because it is the current book of the month—synthetic organic pesticides would appear to be a national hazard, and their makers eager to tamper with the balance of life itself in order to turn a profit.

The author writes that "for the first time in history virtually every human being is subjected to contact with dangerous chemicals from birth to death." The fact is that all life is biochemical and all matter is chemical. We have always been—and will be—exposed to chemicals from birth to death. A few are dangerous; most of them are harmless; others, many of them created by man, are beneficial; some are indispensable to sustain life.

OTHERS DANGERS ALSO EXIST

Air, salt, and water are all chemicals and can all be dangerous, but without them, no living thing could survive. Burning is a chemical reaction; it is a process of oxidation. Fire can bring about fearful destruction. The loss of life and property which it can cause may be terrible. Yet we would not want to do without flame for cooking and heat and power and we could not live without respiration.

There is always another side, but unfortunately, rebuttals never have the force or persuasiveness of the original charge.

It is small wonder then, lacking the necessary understanding, that many people are trying to impose tighter controls on us. They seem to feel we must be prodded into rectitude and legislated into virtue.

My concern over what the public knows and thinks about us is occasioned by the fact that the public can, if it chooses to do so, prevent us from effectively doing our job.

They can do so by giving tacit approval to policies and regulations which will ultimately stifle our enterprise. From the start, the great lifeline of applied chemistry has been the freedom to innovate—the freedom to set our own research goals and pursue them in the light of our own knowledge.

RESEARCH MAY BE AFFECTED

To carry on research and not only to carry it on but expand it proportionately to the growth of knowledge, complexity of industry and diversity of application, entails a need for more and more scientific personnel and more funds to support their activities. If our critics are successful in prosecuting their cases, inevitably we will see the effect creep into our balance sheets. Cost of plant investment, cost of raw materials and conversion costs are not subject to arbitrary cuts, but if profits disappear, something will have to give. Reluctantly, it may have to be research. There have been instances in the past when this has happened and we know the demoralizing results. Not only for self-preservation must we gain public support but also in order to discharge our obligations to the public in its very own interest. To secure public support, we will first need public understanding.

People mistrust the unknown. In many primitive languages, the word for "enemy" is the word for "stranger". Despite its explosive growth and the important position it occupies in our economy, the chemical industry is a relative stranger. Perhaps we are too diverse, too complex, too interrelated, too technical, and too ever changing.

We do, however, have one common denominator. Unseen and unrecognized, we are at man's service in countless different ways. We are a silent servant of mankind.

I think the time has come for us to speak out.

First, however, let us make certain that all we do is truly in the public interest. By this I do not mean a cursory check to reassure ourselves that we are acting within the letter of the law. What I do mean is a sincere, searching appraisal of our actions and of their probable consequences on the society which we inhabit and which nurtures us.

This we must do not through charity and benevolence, not through gratitude, not through a sudden desire for popularity. We must do it for the most hardheaded, realistic business considerations, born of the clear knowledge that a free society does not long tolerate harmful or undesirable elements in its midst.

We must do it for the very simple reason that if we fail to, someone else will most assuredly do it for us. We have seen in our lifetime the growth of the assumption that of all social and economic institutions, only government can be trusted to be guardian of the public interest. Yet there are many things which the individual, acting singly or in variously organized groups, can do for himself that the government cannot do better.

FOR THE PUBLIC INTEREST

I do not want to leave the impression that the chemical industry is in any special need of self-scrutiny, or that such scrutiny will uncover shameful evils. Rather, I suggest that a continuous appraisal of the social impact of our policies and actions—a public interest audit, if you will—is essential if we are to discharge one of our most pressing and important responsibilities.

This is the responsibility to explain to the public what we are trying to do.

The consuming public tends to think of the chemical industry in terms of test tubes and fumes without realizing what a giant we really are. Everybody is familiar with aluminum and copper, but ammonia means little more to the man on the street than a household cleansing agent. He would be astonished to learn that more ammonia is produced each year in America than aluminum and copper combined, with zinc, lead, and magnesium thrown in for good measure. The production of sulfuric acid is three times that of ammonia. Our industry's dollar sales are about twice as large as those of the steel industry.

OPEN HOUSE IS NEEDED

There are more than 12,500 chemical plants in the United States, in every kind of community and in every corner of the country. Let the people see what we are doing. Let us proclaim open house and extend a cordial welcome to all so that they can begin to appreciate how much what we do means to them. Let us prove to them that chemicals are what they eat, what shelters them from the elements, what protects their health, what guarantees our national safety, what provides both the necessities and the bountiful luxuries of the good life. Let us help them come to the realization that the word "chemical" is not just an abstract noun, but rather refers to thousands of articles of everyday use in every home.

Let us enlist the help of our own employees. They should all be supporters of our cause, along with their families, their friends, and their neighbors. They have a vested interest in the welfare and continued success of our industry. More than that, they should be proud of the contributions they are making to the general welfare. They should be knowledgeable and enthusiastic ambassadors. They should be, and they can be.

We never hesitate to appropriate time, creative energy, management skills, and adequate funds for those projects which are directed toward generating greater sales and increasing profitability. After all, the primary responsibility of a business enterprise is to create a profitable return on investment in plant, property, and equipment. If we recognize, and I belive we are beginning to, that lack of public understanding of the chemical industry may result in a serious potential hazard to our continued growth and well-being, then we must devote the same serious attention to solving this problem as we would to a decision involving a major expansion program.

You all remember the little rhyme about—

"When in trouble,
When in doubt
Run in circles,
Scream and shout."

This we have no need to do. It is fortunate that we have a good story to tell, an honest story and an interesting and exciting one.

OUR PRODUCTS HELP ALL

Let us tell it in terms of our products. The chemical industry is so varied that it defies definition. Together, we make so many different things that no single classification has been devised to encompass them all adequately. All the better. We can tell people that our products contribute to every waking and sleeping moment of their lives. We are important to them for as many reasons and and in as many ways as the multitude of products we produce.

Let us tell our story in terms of their interest, not ours. What we are asking for—what we need—is their consent. Public permission to carry on our affairs free from unreasonable restrictions and legislative or regulatory harassment. The easiest, surest way to gain this consent and to keep it, is to demonstrate to the public that what we do it useful, is beneficial, even indispensible to them. What could be more convincing?

Let us tell our story in terms of what we have already done, of the contributions we have made to the growth and creation of our industries which in turn have provided jobs and wealth; of the contributions we have made to better health and a longer, richer lifespan; of the contributions we have made to our national security.

MAN HAS BENEFITED

Let us, to show what more we can do, tell our story in terms of technology. A century ago, man was obliged to devote a major part of his time and energy struggling against his environment. Today, he can confidently penetrate every corner of his planet, establish himself, and prevail. He can communicate instantly anywhere on earth; he can change the face of his lands and harness the primary energy of matter; he has already smashed the chains that bind him to the earth and now calmly prepares for the voyage that will soon take him up and into the limitless arch of space itself.

The instrument which made all this possible is science, conceived as abstraction and converted into fruitfulness by our great industrial establishment.

Let us, in telling our story, by all means talk about research. We can say to the public: we ask your consent and your support for the sake of all the new things which we want to provide for you, and which we will provide for you if you will only allow us to.

Let us tell our story in the schools, to the citizens and the voters of tomorrow.

Let us tell it to women of our land, in their many clubs and organizations. They may not be interested in industrial trends or technological breakthroughs, but they are interested—to the point of militancy—in the welfare of their families, the purity of the food they prepare, the safety and quality of the thousand and one inanimate objects which touch their lives and to which—largely unbeknownst to them—the chemical industry makes important contributions.

Let us tell our story to our elected officials; it is important that they should be informed about our programs and our problems, because information is the material out of which they fashion their legislative judgments. Let us remember that ultimately elected officials only mirror the desires of their constituents. As astute an observer as Abraham Lincoln recognized this when he pointed out that "public opinion is everything. With public opinion nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed."

Let us tell our story through every means at our command—through our sales and technical service forces, through the advertising we do, through trade associations and through community groups. The effort must be massive to achieve its objective.

CONTROLS ARE ON INCREASE

Unless we take the initiative, both in word and deed, tighter controls will surely follow. This trend is already evident in our national economy. Every year, more and more goods and services are bought and paid for by the Government; every year, Federal regulation expands in scope and direction; every year, Government enlarges its field of activities; increasingly, Government assumes responsibility for protecting those it claims cannot protect themselves; and Federal expenditures for research and development have far outstripped those of private research and now total nearly $12 billion as compared with $4 billion for private research.

It would be absurd to suggest that there exists a basic, irreconcilable conflict between Government and the business community. It is in fact one of the paradoxes of our times that business—and especially big business—should be the very instrument which Government has chosen to achieve the national goals. Business is expected to provide the impetus for continued growth and prosperity; it is expected to maintain America's ability to compete in the world's markets; it is expected to provide employment to keep pace with our expanding population.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

Obviously, a serious, permanent breach between business and Government is unthinkable. But while both can agree on major objectives, it would be less than realistic to ignore the divergence of opinion on how these objectives can best be reached.

In our democratic process, divergent opinions are subjected to the test of the ballot box. This is why it is essential for us to tell our story; why it is essential to think through carefully the consequences of all our actions; both in long-term effect and in immediate impact.

Our chemical industry is still a growth industry. Today, the opportunities before it are as great as ever before.

And so too are the problems it faces.

But we have had problems before, and have learned to deal with them.

I am convinced that the chemical industry can continue to solve its problems and can continue to grow—provided only that it is given the freedom to act.

Let us all do whatever is necessary to make sure that it continues to enjoy that freedom.

Target Date: January 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an item entitled "Target Date: January 9, 1963" by Mr. Maurice Ries, an authority on the Committee on Un-American Activities. The article deals with the attack that was supposed to have been made on the opening day of Congress to eliminate this important committee.

The article follows:

TARGET DATE: JANUARY 9, 1963

Let's understand each other. Your Committee on Un-American Activities in the U.S. House of Representatives is an absolutely legal, absolutely constitutional arm of the U.S. Government. If it weren't, would the Congress have kept the committee in existence for a quarter of a century? In August 1963, you see, the Committee on Un-American Activities will be 25 years old.

And experience will make it more effective with every passing year.

Listen to the objectors and you'd never learn that everything the Committee on Un-American Activities does has one basic purpose: legislation. Under orders from the Congress, it works to ascertain what old laws need to be revised, what new laws need to be passed, in order to control those who menace the United States of America—whether by penetration, persuasion, or propaganda; by sabotage, subversion, or spying. Thus its hearings, public and private: so information may be collected under oath. Thus the publication of its findings: so Congress and public may be kept informed.

These activities are not intended to harass but to place facts on the record. If such operations reveal disloyal organizations and expose traitors, why, a nation not only has the right, but the obligation to protect itself.

In its time, the committee has investigated Nazis, Fascists, Japanese imperialists, and Communists. Significantly, when it was looking into totalitarianism of the right, the Committee on Un-American Activities almost never was accused of being unconstitutional or of acting illegally. But when it turned the spotlight on the totalitarian left, a withering fire erupted from every sector of American opinionmaking, from the topmost levels of Government down through education, press and pulpit, to the Communist Party itself.

Identified Communists—which is to say, identified traitors—are leading vicious nationwide onslaughts upon the Committee on Un-American Activities (being careful always to mislabel it "the un-American Committee," and its members "the un-Americans." One prong of their attack seeks to slash the committee's congressional appropriation. They say this investigative unit of the House of Representatives costs far too much money. Yet in truth the committee's appropriation is one of the tiniest droplets in the roaring cataract of the Federal budget. The funds allocated to the committee have been estimated to cost each man, woman and child in the United States the enormous sum of eighteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per year.

In the Communist-led offensive, January 9, 1963, is being termed the target date for smashing the House Committee on Un-American Activities. On that red-letter day, say Moscow's American puppets, they will flood the Congress with petitions. Heavy with leftwing signatures, these documents will demand that the House abolish the committee.

It would be no more brazen if the Kremlin announced that January 9, 1963, is to see an all-out Soviet atomic attack on the United States.

If nuclear aggression actually were being announced, no citizen in his right mind would do nothing. That's why Americans should be rallying to the defense of the Committee on Un-American Activities—now, before the bombs begin to fall.

It is heartening to know that good citizens already have been rallying. For example, at the last national convention of the American Legion, in October 1962, the representatives of three and a half million members of the Legion voted unanimously to support

the committee. This means that not just this number of American Legionnaires, but three and a half million American families threw in behind the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Such support for America's first line of domestic defense promises hope for America itself. If Americans can save the Committee on Un-American Activities, they have it in their power to save America.

And make no mistake about it—the committee is at the top of the Communists' hate list. The most recent (October 1962) issue of the World Marxist Review, a behind-the-Iron-Curtain publication which admits it is the global "Theoretical and Information Journal of Communist and Workers' Parties," reaches across an ocean to hack at the House Committee on UnAmerican Activities. It slashes at the committee, by name, on pages 69, 70, and 72. In fact, on the latter page all Communists, and particularly those in the United States, are given their newest instructions from Moscow: (1) fight anti-communism; (2) make Americans believe that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not run by the Kremlin; (3) force Washington to adopt a hands-off Cuba attitude; and (4) "struggle against the ultraright and against the reactionary policies of the Kennedy administration, and for restoring the Bill of Rights, abolition of the House Un-American Committee, repeal of the anti-Communist laws, particularly the McCarran Act, lifting the ban on Communists in industry, in the unions, and in other popular organizations, for a ban on the fascist organizations, prohibiting their hate literature, and removing the fascists from the Armed Forces."

Abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Those are orders, comrade—Moscow's orders. And Moscow intends to see that they are obeyed.

Sure, let our foes strip the United States of her internal defenses. Let them leave her naked before the domestic assault. That way, we'll find out whether the internal danger really exists.

Tragically, however, by the time we have found out, it will be too late.

The Five Future Wonders of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of Reader's Digest is an article by Mr. Don Wharton entitled "The Five Future Wonders of the World." The first "wonder" described is the Snowy Mountains Scheme in Australia, which is of special interest to me because many of the major features of this great undertaking—which will make possible the development of a vast desert into a fertile, productive area of rich farmland and pasture—were designed in my home State of Colorado, in the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Bureau worked on this gigantic project, not as a part of our foreign aid program, but simply under a straight contract at the invitation of the Australian Government and with Australian financing. Bureau experts have been making their technical knowledge and skill available to foreign countries for many years. The in-service training program of the Bureau's Engineering Center in Denver has foreign alumni all over the world who are now leaders in the resource development of their own countries.

More than a hundred Australian engineers came to Denver to be trained for planning and construction of the Snowy Mountain Scheme, and we have had consultants cooperating down under during the entire job, which is now half completed. These reclamation technicians are still there and probably will remain in Australia until the project is finished in 1975.

We hear a great deal lately about the superior accomplishments of Soviet engineers and of our lagging in scientific fields. I think it is time we take a good look at some of the achievements of our own Government engineers. For example, I recall that several years ago, out of seven projects designated by the American Society of Civil Engineers as "modern civil engineering wonders of the United States," two were built by the Bureau of Reclamation—Hoover Dam and the Columbia Basin Project—both internationally known engineering developments. And today the vision and technical skills of engineers from this same Federal Government agency are being translated into reality in Australia, an achievement that author Don Wharton says "will go a long way toward transforming the face of the 'land with the big thirst.' "

It is highly significant to me that practically all the projects designated by Mr. Wharton as "modern wonders" relate to water conservation. This points up the burgeoning importance of water development not only here in America, but also throughout the world.

We in the West have always been poignantly aware of the necessity for conserving our meager water resources. We have shuddered at the awful waste of letting untold billions of gallons of this precious commodity flow through arid areas, unused, to return to the sea—gallons we so desperately need to irrigate our fields, to bring a water supply and electric power to mountain valleys and broad barren plains so that families may establish homes and communities and industries can move in to build the economy and utilize our great wealth of natural resources.

The face of this continent, as well as that of the Australian Continent, is being changed by great engineering marvels that divert and store water and put it to beneficial use. I am proud of the part our engineers in Denver and elsewhere are doing to realize the long-held dream of converting deserts into gardens.

Mr. Wharton's article follows:

The 1960's may well become the greatest construction decade in history. All around the globe man is at work on mammoth projects, turning engineers' dreams and blueprints into concrete-and-steel wonders that will soon affect the lives of countless millions.

Though experts cannot say of a single undertaking, "This is the most important civil-engineering project now under construction in the free world," there is agreement that the projects described here[1] can suitably be referred to as "The Five Future Wonders of the World."

Australia—Snowy Mountains Scheme: The Snowy Mountains, highest land mass in Australia, located almost 300 miles from Sydney, are drained by three rivers. Two of them, the Murray and the Murrumbidgee, catch the water on the inland side of the divide and carry it 500 miles westward to convert semidesert country into lush pastures and farms. But never have these two river basins provided enough water to irrigate more than a fraction of the good land.

Meanwhile, the Snowy River gathers even more water on the eastern side of the divide and carries it southeast through a narrow coastal strip which has ample rainfall. By one of the largest individual engineering undertakings ever attempted, this water, pouring in waste into the Tasman Sea, is going to be forced through the main dividing range in long tunnels to provide an additional 650 billion gallons of irrigation water per year for the desert country. As the waters are switched from east to west, they will be rammed into a series of shafts that will drop them through power stations to generate 2,500,000 kilowatts of peakload electric power.

The Snowy Mountains scheme will cost about a billion dollars, and will involve construction of 9 major dams and several smaller ones, 10 power stations, some 100 miles of tunnels and more than 80 miles of aqueducts. Just to open up the deserted area for construction forces has required 300 miles of roads, over 400 miles of tracks, 150 miles of powerlines. A complete radio network was established to link construction sites, and parachute drops were used for regular delivery of supplies to remote camps. The project is so immense that the Australian Government established a special immigration program to attract technicians and skilled workers. Eventually, people from 30 nations were employed.

Last spring, Snowy construction reached the halfway mark—well ahead of schedule. For instance, the huge Eucumbene Dam was built in 2 years instead of the 4 allowed by the contract. It creates Lake Eucumbene, which holds nine times the amount of water in Sydney harbor. From this lake, the heart of the project, runs a 14-mile tunnel, the interior of which is 21 feet in diameter. Much of the work was done 1,800 feet underground. In the process, the world's speed record for comparable tunneling was broken; yet, on breakthrough, the alinement error was only three-eighths of an inch.

One power station is located 1,200 feet underground, in an L-shaped excavation 568 feet long. For a year excavation and construction had to go on simultaneously, with 28,000 cubic yards of concrete moving in as 66,000 cubic yards of rock debris moved out.

Scheduled for completion in 1975, the Snowy scheme will go a long way toward transforming the face of the "land with the big thirst."

United States—Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel: At the mouth of Chesapeake Bay a crossing 17.6 miles long is scheduled to open early in 1964. It is being built in what amounts to open ocean, where there are high waves, tricky currents, huge tides and occasional hurricanes.

Never before has man spanned such a long stretch of exposed navigable ocean water. How to do it? To tunnel the whole distance was too expensive and impractical. To use

---

[1] Selected from 107 projects in 26 countries, with the evaluation and counsel of the American Society of Civil Engineers after its consultation with national engineering societies in other countries. Military construction is excluded.

high bridges over the ship channels was not advisable—the Navy feared that a bomb-wrecked bridge span would block the channel to Hampton Roads, which contains the world's largest concentration of naval installations. So the answer was a novel combination of tunnels beneath the main channels, medium-height bridges over minor channels, and low-level trestles over the rest. Cost: approximately $140 million.

The crossing starts from the Norfolk side as a 3½-mile trestle carrying the highway 28 feet above average high water. Then it encounters an island, dips into a mile-long tunnel 98 feet below average low water, climbs out onto another island, becomes a trestle again for 3¾ more miles. It crosses a third island, dips into another mile-long tunnel, climbs out onto a fourth island. Then it runs along 4½ miles of trestle, rises into a steel bridge clearing average high water by 75 feet, drops down onto 2 more miles of trestle and causeway, climbs up into another bridge with 40 feet of clearance, then glides down onto a short trestle to the shore of the Delmarva (Delaware-Maryland-Virginia) Peninsula.

Wasn't it fortunate that those four islands were there to anchor the tunnel-ends and to link them with the bridge sections? They weren't—they are completely man-made. Each is constructed in water 30 to 40 feet deep, rises another 30 feet above the surface, covers some 8 acres at the top, is made of 1½ million tons of sand and 300,000 tons of rock.

Many tunnels are bored, but the 2 for this crossing are being built out of sections prefabricated on shore—a series of 37 huge double-walled steel tubes, each nearly as long as a football field and as wide as a street. Each tube shell is constructed on a shipway in Texas, launched like a ship, and towed 1,700 miles to Norfolk, Va., where it is outfitted. Then it is taken to the tunnel site, where a deep trench has been dredged in the bay bottom. As concrete from a floating mix plant is pumped between each tube's inner and outer shells, the tube gently sinks to the bottom. Once all the tubes are in and connected, crews with torches will cut successively through the watertight bulkheads at the ends—and when the gaps between the sections are filed in and a ceiling is added, there will be a mile-long tunnel ready for finishing touches of tile walls and fluorescent lighting.

The Netherlands—delta plan: In February 1953 the worst storm since 1421 struck the Netherlands, tearing huge breaches in the dikes, inundating 1 out of every 22 acres of the country's land area, destroying or damaging 47,300 houses, farms, and schools, and drowning nearly 1,800 persons. In 1952 the Dutch had begun to draw up a plan for the prevention of further salting of fertile land and for reclamation of land by the closing of some river estuaries. After the 1953 storm the matter became much more urgent; recurrence of such a disaster had to be prevented. The result is the delta plan, the most ambitious, costly, and comprehensive program to hold back the sea ever undertaken anywhere. Work on it began in 1955, will continue at least through 1978, entailing expenditures estimated at more than $750 million.

The target is the southwestern part of the Netherlands, where five arms of the sea (four wide and one narrow) reach far inland. Through them roll heavy seas and high, powerful tides. The delta plan will close four of these sea arms and one river with massive dams at their funnellike mouths, and three of the closures will be further reinforced by secondary dams deeper inland. One sea arm and one canal will be left open so ships will still be able to reach Antwerp and Rotterdam.

One dam has been completed, across the Veersche Gat; another is well underway, a third just started. Work on the fourth, closing the Eastern Scheldt, will begin in 1965. All are being built facing the open sea in depths and against tidal currents greater than ever before dealt with.

The Veersche Gat dam is almost 2 miles long, deliberately located right where the arm joins the North Sea. It could have been built farther back, but the Dutch engineers wanted to get the most experience possible in preparation for tougher jobs on other sea arms. For example, the tide used to jam 20 billion gallons of water through the Veersche Gat before the dam was built. But at the Eastern Scheldt engineers will be confronting a tide of 290 billion gallons. The dam there must be 5 miles long.

The most intriguing dam is the one being built across the Haringvliet, a 13-year job now more than half done. The three other dams are solid, to create large inland lakes. But the Havingvliet must carry water from the Maas and Rhine Rivers to the sea, plus a huge discharge of winter ice. So the three-mile dam includes two-thirds of a mile of concrete-and-steel sluiceways: two rows of 17 steel gates, each weighing 425 tons, each 185 feet wide. Hydraulic machinery will open and close the flaps.

In addition to providing flood protection, the delta plan, by shortening the coastline 500 miles, will reduce seawall maintenance. And by keeping the sea water out of the river estuaries it will check the increasing soil saltiness, which is now impairing agricultural production in the southeastern Netherlands, and bring better distribution and control of badly needed fresh river water.

United States—New York Narrows Bridge: Now being thrown across the Narrows at the entrance to New York Harbor, this bridge will have the world's longest main suspension span—4,260 feet from tower to tower. That means that more than four-fifths of a mile of steel will hang in the sky 238 feet above the ship channel between Brooklyn and Staten Island.

Engineering News-Record has observed that "everything about the Narrows Bridge is big, bigegr, or biggest." The double-decked central span, containing 12 traffic lanes, will be the heaviest ever built. The four steel cables must hold up a suspended deadweight of 84,000 tons, plus their own weight of 39,000 tons, plus a potential live weight, from traffic, of over 10,000 more tons. This requires huge anchorages at the two ends, solid monoliths of concrete and embedded steel faced with granite above water, as high as an 18-story building, shaped and weighted so that the weight of the bridge will not tip them over or pull them bodily into the water. One block weighs 410,000 tons—that's heavier than the Empire State Building. Each of the two bridge towers, rising 690 feet above average high water, with foundations reaching down 105 feet on one, 170 feet on the other, has two legs—each leg is big enough to squeeze in the Washington Monument with room left over for most of the Statue of Liberty.

One startling aspect of all this immencity: Because of the curvature of the earth, the towers, though perfectly perpendicular to the earth's surface, are 5 inches farther apart at their summits than at their bases.

This bridge is destined to become a spectacular landmark. A ship's captain informed me that when one of the towers had been built up to only half its full height he had sighted it from 20 miles at sea. Everyone coming to New York by ocean liner will pass under the span; plane passengers will spot it easily; motorists will drive out of their way just to cross it. When completed in 1965, this engineearing marvel will be the world's costliest bridge—$325 million.

France-Italy—Mont Blanc Tunnel: For nearly 4 years French and Italian teams have been working on the world's longest vehicular tunnel—the Mont Blanc Tunnel under the Alps. Motorists have long been able to cross the Alps easily in summer. But through the snowy winter, traffic bound for Italy from France, Britain, the low countries, and much of Switzerland has run into a formidable broadblock. Motorists had either to ship their autos on flatcars through the Alpine rail tunnels, or to detour eastward to the Brenner Pass, or to skirt the Alps by heading south to the French Riviera. By mid-1964, autos, trucks, and buses will be able to roll through this new 7¼-mile shortcut whose midpoint will be almost 6,000 feet below ground surface. The tunnel will provide the first straight-line all-year route from Paris to Rome, speeding the trip in summer, and cutting the distance 140 miles in winter. It will put Geneva and Turin only 172 miles apart, as against today's 596 in winter.

The more-than-$40-million tunnel is being financed mainly by France and Italy, with extra money from both the canton and city of Geneva. It will be operated as a toll road by the construction companies that drilled shafts from the two ends that met last August 14. Both teams ran into difficulties, which delayed the opening a year. One blast broke open a glacier-fed stream, which spurted icy water at the rate of more than 11,000 gallons a minute. The French were beset with 29 serious accidents, with 5 fatalities. The Italians, slowed by troublesome rock, also lost five men in the digging operation. Then, one night last spring, a huge avalanche swept down on the workers' quarters, killing three more men.

The Mont Blanc Tunnel (it does not go under Mont Blanc itself, but slightly to the northeast under two peaks of the Mont Blanc massif) will carry a two-lane highway with narrow walkways on either side. Every 1,000 feet there will be an emergency bay for repairs—long enough for large truck-and-trailer units. The tunnel is expected to handle 40,000 trucks and buses and some 400,000 cars a year, all covering in 15 minutes what now sometimes takes as long as a day.

America Nears the Waterfall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have heard many speakers telling us where the United States is "going in a handbasket," but now for the first time a talented writer tells us where we are going on a steamboat. I commend to the attention of this House the logbook of this frighteningly delightful cruise as kept by Jenkin Lloyd Jones in the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1963:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first-class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the "Big Rock Candy Mountains" via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionally, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have

thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paint brushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low-cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our druthers.

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gage may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You would never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business braintrusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the happy isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigaret holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose warwrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by U.S. funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steelmakers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grow softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock:

"Go now, pay later."

"Flights of Angels Sing Thee to Thy Rest"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on the day after Christmas, the American theater lost one of its greatest and most productive figures when Lawrence Langner died at the age of 72.

Variety notes that:

Langner was best known as a cofounder, codirector and, in recent years, coadministrator of the Theatre Guild, and in that capacity he was influential in the production of early works of George Bernard Shaw, Eugene O'Neill, Robert E. Sherwood, Sidney Howard, Maxwell Anderson, S. N. Behrman, William Saroyan and William Inge. He was the motivating energizing force of the Guild. In a practical sense he was the Guild.

It is with deep regret that I inform this House of his passing. In tribute to him, I offer the following editorial from the Westport Town Crier, which expresses far better than I can the immense sense of loss that is felt by the community in which he lived:

"FLIGHTS OF ANGELS SING THEE TO THY REST"

When one wakes up to his morning newspaper to find that a great and disinguished national figure in one of the useful fields of human endeavor has died, there is an understandable feeling of regret and loss. But when a neighbor dies—a neighbor whom you know as a dedicated, talented, and sensitive human being—there is a sense of personal loss that cannot but outweigh the distant regrets at a lost talent.

It's that way with Lawrence Langner.

The obituaries have recorded that Mr. Langner was the architect of one of the most distinguished theatrical enterprises in our generation, that he was more than a passing playwright, that he was responsible for discovering and promoting literally dozens of the brightest lights of the theater world, and, on top of it all, was a highly successful and authoritative lawyer. But within this cold recital, there was a sense of dedication and a variety of drive that are rarely come upon.

Mr. Langner's tastes in the theater were catholic. All he demanded of a theatrical performance was that it be a good one. He relished good comedy as much as he did good Shakespeare. He saw nothing inconsistent between the most serious dramatic work of Eugene O'Neill—one of the Theatre Guild playwrights—and the lilting gaiety of Rodgers and Hammerstein's "Oklahoma." He was no theatrical "nice Nellie," but his taste was impeccable.

Lawrence Langner was a man of strong feelings about his beloved theater. He believed, of all things, that actors should be able to act, not just to imagine themselves a pomegranate or a pumpkin. And even more startling, he felt that they should be able to enunciate their lines with the clarity—if not the exaggerated emphasis—of an earlier day. He had little sympathy for the faddish avant garde in the theater; he could be indignant about the obscenities of an Albee.

His aversion to the self-conscious and the precious in the theater was no deeper than his distaste for the deliberately tinselly and overcommercial. During his last years he took a dimmer and dimmer view of the state of the Broadway theater, asserting that technical costs were far out of hand and that a sheeplike public would support only the big brassy musicals and the most pat of sex comedies. He admitted to exceptions to this rule, but could prove with dollars and cents that the critical success could seldom attract a large enough audience to pay its costs.

His enthusiasm for an American Shakespeare Theater, and recently for an American theater of comedy, was largely based on his conviction that this country was not offering enough opportunity for a new crop of actors to learn their trade—and that both the stylism of Shakespeare and the subtleties of comic playing might well be lost in a shuffle of formless plays and playing.

Our community has known Mr. Langner for many years. We have been favored by having his Westport County Playhouse here, which for so long has represented the standard in summer playhouses. While he and his wife, the talented Armina Marshall, had retired from direct participation in the playhouse for the last few years, there was never an opening night that did not see them there to keep an eye on things. Mr. Langner also tried to bring his Shakespeare Theater to our community, and moved it elsewhere only when he was deeply hurt by stupid and unjustified criticism on the part of a few.

Mr. Langner had not been well during the last several years, but he made few concessions to his infirmities. He found time not only to direct the guild, to watch over the playhouse, and to keep the Shakespeare Theater moving ahead; in addition, he organized the enormously successful international tour, designed under State Department auspices, to show the rest of the world some of the finest in American drama and performance. And just so there were no idle moments, he was actively advancing his dream for a year-round theater far off Broadway—one of the ways he saw through which the theater might escape the overpowering mechanics that is frustrating its originality and vigor in midtown Manhattan.

Mr. Langner is one more of those immigrant Americans (he came from New South Wales) to whom this country owes so much and who have done so much to shape its developing culture. Anyone who enjoys the theater, and recognizes it as an integral part of the Nation's life and culture, must be grateful to Mr. Langner both for advancing its cause and for working to maintain a standard of taste and excellence that has so often been ignored both by tyros and get-rich-quick invaders. We will all miss him. But we can take some satisfaction in the conviction that the fine things that he built will continue to flourish as a living memorial to his contributions.

The Just and the Unjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the new regulations of the Internal Revenue Service with respect to entertainment expense allowances. But, one of the finest treatments of the subject is contained in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 8, 1963. It points out with statements and cases some of the absurd consequences of these regulations.

Some administration officials refer to these new rules as the end of the expense account era. For the vast majority of American taxpayers who honestly report their tax liabilities, the allegation of expense account living is unwarranted. But these honest taxpayers will find the new expense account regulations to be unduly burdensome on them. This, of course, constitutes a significant change of an accepted way of doing business, and for that reason, I feel that every comment on the subject should be given wide publicity. Every businessman, and especially the small businessman, should have the opportunity to learn the full impact of these rules. At the same time it might be appropriate for Congress to review this portion of the tax law passed at the last session since these rules go beyond the original congressional intent.

The editorial follows:

THE JUST AND THE UNJUST

We guess we don't run in the right social circles.

For years we have been reading those books about wild living in the suburbs and wondering somewhat plaintively why the excitement seems to pass us by. In years of suburban living the wildest shock to the even tenor of our domesticity was the day the dog drank up the cocktails and bit the mayor. It was weeks before we were forgiven.

For almost as long, we've been reading about all this notorious high living on the expense account, boats and all that, and groaning over what we seem to have missed. After a quarter century in that den of iniquity, Wall Street, no one has tempted our journalistic virtue with even so much as a night at a hunting lodge, much less a seagoing voyage. Where, indeed, are all those expense-account yachts?

True, we aren't without sin, as defined in the new dogma of the Internal Revenue Service. We suffer business luncheons dreadfully often and when we turn in the voucher we don't deduct the $1.25 we would have spent anyway for the blue plate special. A man is entitled to some recompense for punishment in line of duty.

When business takes us to Peoria or Dubuque, as it does all too often, we take an aperitif before dinner, choose the steak over the chicken-a-la-king and sometimes splurge on the movies, charging the lot to the stockholders. If it weren't for their business we wouldn't be there at all, and frankly we have better steaks at home.

Moreover, the children being more or less at the age of discretion, we have lately taken our wife along on some trips. We haven't persuaded the curmudgeonly auditor to okay her expenses, but not long ago we drove to Washington on legitimate business (if talking to a Senator is legitimate) and our wife rode along in the car. Even that baleful auditor didn't ask us to reimburse the company for the equivalent price of her bus ticket.

Give or take a few details, this is not unlike the situation of thousands of businessmen in a country where men at work are ceaselessly traveling to and fro. The door-to-door salesman and the flying corporate executive are brothers under the skin; they are working also when they pass the time of day with the lady at the door or the business acquaintance across the luncheon table. Sometimes the smartest business is not to talk business at all but to be friendly, interested; to listen and to learn. Only ignorant and petty minds could imagine that the free lunch is all beer and skittles.

But now it turns out that all this is under the suspicion of undermining the public morality and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury. In any event the Government is going to treat all the people as crooks until proven otherwise.

This suspicion of malefaction flows from every word of the new regulations on record-keeping, pedantic in language and picayune in detail, drawn up by the Internal Revenue Service.

Hereafter you must account to the Government not only for your yacht but the beer you buy a business acquaintance. The documents for any entertainment, no matter how trivial, must include the amount, date, place by name and address, type (martini or ham sandwich), explanation of the benefit to be returned for this bounty, the name of the recipient, and sufficient documentation to explain your extravagance to the satisfaction of any revenue agent who subsequently examines your tax report.

And if perchance on a trip you spend more than $25 in any day you must itemize everything else too—the day you left home, day you got back, every telephone call, meal, cup of coffee, taxicab and bus fare. If you want your books to balance, you'd better even keep track of the postage stamps for the letters to the home office.

The sheer absurdity of this avalanche of paperwork is only the beginning. The metaphysicians of Mr. Mortimer Caplin's bureaucracy have now gone off to mull such esoteric questions as: What, precisely, constitutes a "business meal"? What is the allowable difference in cost between a lunch for a life insurance prospect ($5,000 policy) and the prospect for an electric dynamo ($5 million sale)? Can you also buy lunch for the prospect's wife, or do you suggest she go eat in the drugstore? What if your own wife is along too—do you leave her back in the hotel room to munch a hamburger and watch television?

As ridiculous as these questions sound, they are precisely the sort of thing that must now be decided upon at the highest levels, and Mr. Caplin confesses—quite understandably, we think—that it will be some weeks before we can expect any official enlightenment. It has never been easy to decide how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Yet it is neither the absurdity of the paperwork nor the ridiculousness of the metaphysics that is the true evil.

Here is a situation in which the Government is, no doubt about it, confronted with a problem. Some people do hide yachts in expense accounts, just as some do hide misbehavior in the suburbs, and the Government has power to deal with the real tax cheaters. But the vast majority of the people everywhere lead quiet, placid, and upright lives, and the vast majority of those whose taxes support the Government give an honest accounting of their affairs.

Yet here we use the majesty of the law to treat every taxpayer as a potential cheater, because pinhead minds can think of no other way; the integrity of all must be insulted, and the conduct of their affairs made insufferable, because of the sins of the few.

Now completely apart from this question of expense accounts, this is a philosophy of Government which is evil in itself. We once had an example of this when, to stop a few people from drinking too much, we adopted prohibition which treated all men as potential alcoholics. Surely the results have not left our memory.

The results of this noble experiment can also be foreseen. These new rules will give trouble only to honest men. The real operator—the man who is really out to cheat on his taxes—can drive a truck through them.

The smart lawyers are already figuring out the perfectly legal loopholes; beyond that, those with larceny in their hearts will not be disturbed, because they will show records, receipts, and paper accounts by the carload. As sure as the sun rises tomorrow, today's rules will have to be followed tomorrow by new rules upon new rules tightening the rules.

And while all this is going on, the honest man—the man who takes a business trip to do an honest job for his company and with no desire to cheat either his company or his country—that man will see himself not merely laden with burdensome paperwork but with the fear that everything he does is under suspicion.

Because he honestly tries to keep honest records, all the records will be there, and he can be called up a year later, 2 years later, and find that what he did in good faith is adjudged wrong by some petty bureaucrat imbued with the idea that any expense account must conceal some wickedness. The smart operator will have his lawyers; the little taxpayer will be helpless against the insolence of office.

We submit that to order the public affairs in this manner is an affront to the public morality, just as it would be for the State to require of every citizen a detailed accounting of his home coming and going, because some men cheat. That Government governs illy which can find no other way to deal with malefactors than to maltreat all of its citizens, the just and the unjust alike.

A Moratorium on New Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the need for sound fiscal policies in the Federal Government has always been a matter of prime importance to the welfare of the Nation.

During these times of mounting costs and in view of the proposed tax reduction this problem has been magnified even more.

In an editorial on January 6, 1963, the Los Angeles Times discusses this matter and comments favorably on a recommendation by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative JOHN BYRNES, calling for a moratorium

on new spending projects that do not deal with actual emergencies.

I believe the Times editorial will be of interest to many Members of Congress:

A MORATORIUM ON NEW SPENDING

The skirmishing in the battle over Federal tax reductions sought by President Kennedy has produced a sound suggestion from Representative JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin.

BYRNES, ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, says that an administration moratorium on all new spending projects "not designed to deal with actual emergencies" would advance the cause of tax reduction.

It is pretty generally agreed that a reduction in Federal taxes is desirable. Some pressure groups are hoorahing for limiting the tax cut to personal incomes in the lower brackets, but such demagoguery is to be expected. This would not accomplish the stimulus to industry on which the hoped-for reduction in unemployment depends.

Any tax reduction proposal should include substantial corporate and personal income tax cuts in all brackets.

However, there is opposition among practical men, truly concerned with the national welfare, to any tax reduction without some balancing reduction in Federal spending.

They fear, with reason, that the reduction would cause a budget imbalance estimated at between $12 billion and $20 billion. Such a deficit, they argue, would adversely affect our shaky balance-of-payments position in world trade as well as the national credit. Our Fort Knox gold reserve could evaporate if the world lost confidence in our fiscal policies.

Mr. Kennedy's in group advisers are all for bulling ahead with the tax cut, without much thought to reduction in the spending program. It is fairly obvious that the prudent bloc in Congress will resist.

However, Representative BYRNES' plan for a nonemergency spending moratorium offers some hope that the national benefits of a broad tax cut can be salvaged.

It is probable, as he says, that it would be impractical to demand a dollar-for-dollar matching of reduced spending and reduced taxes. But it is practical and logical to suggest that nonemergency programs for siphoning off Treasury funds be abandoned until the tax reduction program has a chance to stimulate industry and increase revenues. This would keep the budget deficit within reason.

If the administration can see its way clear to forgo some of its medicare and other New Frontier proposals, which are largely 1964 vote bait anyway, there is a chance for a sound tax reduction program that will benefit the country.

Going Now and Paying Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, as Congress considers the budget for fiscal 1964 which will contain an apparent deficit in excess of $10 billion, the following article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones appearing in the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1963, seems to me to be very pertinent:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER—GOVERNMENT SPENDERS CANNOT TELL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NEEDS AND WANTS

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first-class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the Big Rock Candy Mountains via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionally, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paint brushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts. He makes the point (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our druthers.

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gage may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You'd never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business braintrusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the Happy Isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigaret-holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose war-wrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by U.S. funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steelmakers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grows softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock: "Go now, pay later."

China and India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over many months there have been millions of words published concerning relations between China and India but very little by writers whose qualifications include both study and long residence in the area discussed. One notable exception was the late George Sokolsky, whose lifetime of study and stay of many years in the Far East enabled him to make notable contributions in our understanding of the Orient, especially China.

In his article on "China and India," published in the Washington Post of November 19, 1962, there is a most perceptive treatment emphasizing that the history of China is the bloody story of periodic losses of territory and subsequent irredentism.

The article follows:

CHINA AND INDIA

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Before it is possible to understand the war between Red China and India, it is necessary to realize that Nationalist China on Formosa remains silent.

Prior to 1925, the flag of China consisted of five bars: one for each of the component people of the country—the Chinese, the Manchus, the Mongols, the Tibetans, and the Moslems. More realistically than either the later Kuomintang or the Communists, the early revolutionists particularly recognized the racial complexity of China.

In a book I wrote in 1932, "The Tinder Box of Asia," is a map of China which includes parts of India but also areas that are now in Russia. I then wrote:

It must be noted that China does not politically recognize the loss of Mongolia and Tibet or the lessening of its authority in Sinkiang, Turkestan, and were China today sufficiently powerful to regain these territories by warfare, she would fight for them. But in every moment of dynastic weakness in Chinese history, the periphery of the empire was reduced, large areas becoming either wholly independent or colonies of other countries. China's long and bloody history is a recital of just such losses of territory and subsequent irredentism.

This was written in 1932; the irredentism is taking place today. That is normal to every Chinese, whether Nationalist or Communist. Nehru surely knew all about that, because he can read maps as well as anyone. It is possible that as early as the Bandung Conference (1955) Krishna Menon realized that sooner or later, India would have to fight for a boundary between China and India which the British delineated and protected. Without the British to do the job, India had to depend upon the United Nations or very clever diplomacy. The Communists did not give him enough time.

The Chinese never forget Chinese cultural unity even when they fight each other. Sun Yat-sen's revolution was originally designed to drive the Manchus from China. They were then ruling the country. The Ming Dynasty, which had been defeated by the Manchus, had attempted to erect a vestigial government on Formosa. This failed.

There was no successor Chinese dynasty, so a Republic was established.

The Republic did not work out because it could not establish a center of power. What is not recalled these days is that the early revolutionary movement of Sun Yat-sen was profoundly influenced by the Black Dragon Society of Japan. Neither India nor Indian philosophy played any role in the development of the revolutionary party, called the Tungmenhui.

The last Ming Emperor was conquered by the Manchus in 1644; the Manchus were overthrown in 1912. To the Chinese, this is just a moment in history and China can always wait.

This must be understood if one is to realize that China is now going back to about 1795, to the Chienlung Line, which not only must take China to the Bay of Bengal, but includes, in Turkestan, territory now Russian and the maritime provinces of Siberia. And China will seek to take it all, sooner or later.

The races in eastern Siberia are numerous. What in the West are called Tatars at one time or another were among the peoples of China. These races are not Russian by any scientific measurement.

Khrushchev apparently cannot defeat the principle of location which is so dear to the Oriental conception of life—the family, the clan, the village are realities; Peking and Moscow are far away. To the latter one offers obedience until it becomes unnecessary. The West seeks complicated explanations; in the East, it is simple.

National Accident Prevention Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when Congress reconvened last week I introduced H.R. 133, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Accident Prevention Center.

The Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, held hearings on this legislation last year and I was very pleased to find that it received favorable comments, not only from some executive departments, but from the various organizations that are directly concerned with matters of accident prevention.

Having received so much encouragement, I again introduced this bill on the opening day of this Congress and I am hopeful that we will be able to report it to the floor of the House at an early date and that it will have the support of this body at that time.

Mr. Speaker, to indicate some of the favorable reaction to this legislation I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Association of Municipal Judges at their convention in Miami, Fla., during November 25 and December 1, 1962:

Whereas automobile accidents continue to inflict untold tragedy in rising numbers on our streets and highways; and

Whereas expanded research into human factors and accident prevention motivation of drivers would immeasurably aid further understanding of the driver, driving characteristics and accident causation, and potentially prompt positive safety and licensing approaches and provide direction to those having responsibility in these areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Municipal Judges, in convention assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., representing judges from 45 States and every Canadian province, approve in principle the aims, objectives, and purposes of the establishment of an Accident Prevention Research Center, national in scope, and under the Accident Prevention Division of the U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and construction of facilities, necessary staffing and budgeting incidental thereto.

The Just and the Unjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 8, 1963:

THE JUST AND THE UNJUST

We guess we don't run in the right social circles.

For years we have been reading those books about wild living in the suburbs and wondering somewhat plaintively why the excitement seems to pass us by. In years of suburban living the wildest shock to the even tenor of our domesticity was the day the dog drank up the cocktails and bit the mayor. It was weeks before we were forgiven.

For almost as long, we've been reading about all this notorious high-living on the expense account, boats and all that, and groaning over what we seem to have missed. After a quarter century in that den of inequity, Wall Street, no one has tempted our journalistic virtue with even so much as a night at a hunting lodge, much less a seagoing voyage. Where, indeed, are all those expense-account yachts?

True, we aren't without sin, as defined in the new dogma of the Internal Revenue Service. We suffer business luncheons dreadfully often and when we turn in the voucher we don't deduct the $1.25 we would have spent anyway for the Blue Plate special. A man is entitled to some recompense for punishment in line of duty.

When business takes us to Peoria or Dubuque, as it does all too often, we take an aperitif before dinner, choose the steak over the chicken-a-la-king and sometimes splurge on the movies, charging the lot to the stockholders. If it weren't for their business we wouldn't be there at all, and frankly we have better steaks at home.

Moreover, the children being more or less at the age of discretion, we have lately taken our wife along on some trips. We haven't persuaded the curmudgeonly auditor to okay her expenses, but not long ago we drove to Washington on legitimate business (if talking to a Senator is legitimate) and our wife rode along in the car. Even that baleful auditor didn't ask us to reimburse the company for the equivalent price of her bus ticket.

Give or take a few details, this is not unlike the situation of thousands of businessmen in a country where men at work are ceaselessly traveling to and fro. The door-to-door salesman and the flying corporate executive are brothers under the skin; they are working also when they pass the time of day with the lady at the door or the business acquaintance across the luncheon table. Sometimes the smartest business is not to talk business at all but to be friendly, interested; to listen and to learn. Only ignorant and petty minds could imagine that the free lunch is all beer and skittles.

But now it turns out that all this is under the suspicion of undermining the public morality and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury. In any event the Government is going to treat all the people as crooks until proven otherwise.

This suspicion of malefaction flows from every word of the new regulations on record-keeping, pedantic in language and picayune in detail, drawn up by the Internal Revenue Service.

Hereafter you must account to the Government not only for your yacht but the beer you buy a business acquaintance. The documents for any entertainment, no matter how trivial, must include the amount, date, place by name, and address, type (martini or ham sandwich?), explanation of the benefit to be returned for this bounty, the name of the recipient and sufficient documentation to explain your extravagance to the satisfaction

of any revenue agent who subsequently examines your tax report.

And if perchance on a trip you spend more than $25 in any day you must itemize everything else too—the day you left home, day you got back, every telephone call, meal, cup of coffee, taxicab, and bus fare. If you want your books to balance, you'd better even keep track of the postage stamps for the letters to the home office.

The sheer absurdity of this avalanche of paperwork is only the beginning. The meta physicians of Mr. Mortimer Caplan's bureaucracy have now gone off to mull such esoteric questions as: What, precisely, constitutes a business meal? What is the allowable difference in cost between a lunch for a life insurance prospect ($5,000 policy) and the prospect for an electric dynamo ($5 million sale)? Can you also buy lunch for the prospect's wife, or do you suggest she go eat in the drug store? What if your own wife is along too—do you leave her back in the hotel room to munch a hamburger and watch television?

As ridiculous as these questions sound, they are precisely the sort of thing that must now be decided upon at the highest levels, and Mr. Caplin confesses—quite understandably, we think—that it will be some weeks before we can expect any official enlightenment. It has never been easy to decide how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Yet it is neither the absurdity of the paperwork nor the ridiculousness of the metaphysics that is the true evil.

Here is a situation in which the Government is, no doubt about it, confronted with a problem. Some people do hide yachts in expense accounts, just as some do hide misbehavior in the suburbs, and the Government has power to deal with the real tax cheaters. But the vast majority of the people everywhere lead quiet, placid, and upright lives, and the vast majority of those whose taxes support the Government give an honest accounting of their affairs.

Yet here we use the majesty of the law to treat every taxpayer as a potential cheater because pinhead minds can think of no other way; the integrity of all must be insulted, and the conduct of their affairs made insufferable because of the sins of the few.

Now completely apart from this question of expense accounts, this is a philosophy of Government which is evil in itself. We once had an example of this when, to stop a few people from drinking too much, we adopted prohibition which treated all men as potential alcoholics. Surely the results have not left our memory.

The results of this noble experiment can also be foreseen. These new rules will give trouble only to honest men. The real "operator"—the man who is really out to cheat on his taxes—can drive a truck through them.

The smart lawyers are already figuring out the perfectly legal loopholes; beyond that, those with larceny in their hearts will not be disturbed because they will show records, receipts, and paper accounts by the carload. As sure as the sun rises tomorrow, today's rules will have to be followed tomorrow by new rules upon new rules tightening the rules.

And while all this is going on, the honest man—the man who takes a business trip to do an honest job for his company and with no desire to cheat either his company or his country—that man will see himself not merely laden with burdensome paperwork but with the fear that everything he does is under suspicion.

Because he honestly tries to keep honest records, all the records will be there and he can be called up a year later, 2 years later, and find that what he did in good faith is adjudged wrong by some petty bureaucrat imbued with the idea that any expense account must conceal some wickedness. The smart operator will have his lawyers; the little taxpayer will be helpless against the insolence of office.

We submit that to order the public affairs in this manner is an affront to the public morality, just as it would be for the State to require of every citizen a detailed accounting of his home-coming-and-going because some men cheat. That government governs illy which can find no other way to deal with malefactors than to maltreat all of its citizens, the just and the unjust alike.

Timely Remarks by Arthur Hoppe of the San Francisco Chronicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have shown continued and avid interest in the timely remarks and witticisms of Arthur Hoppe who writes for the San Francisco Chronicle.

It is my pleasure to bring to their attention the following articles which appeared during the later part of December 1962 and early January 1963:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 9, 1962]

WE MUST KEEP CALM! (GULP)

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Everybody is now hitting the streets with inside reports of how the White House solved the Cuba crisis. And everybody commends our leaders for keeping cool. Through sheer grit. Everybody, that is, but Mr. Eugene Burdick, the author. Washington, says Mr. Burdick suspiciously, boasts "an abnormally high consumption" of tranquilizers.

"And no one," he says, "can say these drugs help in achieving wisdom in the vital decisions made there." No one but me and my friend, Mr. Glenn Dorenbush. For we have pieced together our own inside report from other inside reports, a pharmacopoeia and two racing forms. Help? These drugs merely saved the world, that's all.

Precisely at 10:32:27½ a.m., a familiar figure strode into the Cabinet room, took his place at the table's head, swallowed two blue pills and said: "Gentlemen; bad news. Those are missile sites in Cuba. We have already ordered a blockade. We must now consider what other stringent steps we should—hohum—take. If (yawn) any. What do you think, LYNDON? LYNDON? Dean, he's overdone it. Give him a pep pill. Meanwhile, you can talk for awhile, Adlai."

A balding, sad-eyed man gulped down three magenta and two puce pills and said firmly: "A blockade is immoral and illegal. Little Cuba is no threat to us. We are a great and prosperous nation and * * *"

"Adlai," interrupted the familiar figure. "You're going to have to start taking the same brand we take. Your euphoria level is too high. What do you say, McGeorge?"

A bespectacled man leaped to his feet, swallowed two reds, three whites, and a blue from the pillbox at his place and delivered a 28-minute harangue on how we must blow up Cuba, Russia, the Common Market, and Basutoland, winding up shouting: "I can't stand it any more. Bombs. Rockets. Incredible tensions. Press the button, Chief. For Pete's sakes, let's get it over with."

"Bobby," said the familiar figure with a frown, "hand me McGeorge's pillbox." He took a pill from it, tasted it, and shook his head. "Just as I thought," he said. "Jellybeans. McGeorge, you can no longer sit in on our meetings until you learn to take your medicine like a man. And now (yawn) who's for a nap? LYNDON? Dean, give him some black coffee."

Right. This is a clear-cut issue and I disagree wholeheartedly with Mr. BURDICK. If there's anything I consider wise these days, it's tranquillity in government. Have you ever heard of a shot fired in tranquility? Nonsense. Will the world be blown to smithereens by the tranquil? Hardly likely.

No, sir, what all these disputed inside reports prove is that our leaders weren't tranquil enough. Except maybe Mr. Stevenson. As Mr. Lincoln said of Mr. Grant: "Tell me what brand he's eating; I want to send the prescription to Mr. Kennedy."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 13, 1962]

WHY THE WHITE HOUSE WON'T HOLD WATER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

In trying to become an ace White Houseologist, I've meticulously explained the whole device of trial balloons. But, oddly, there's still some confusion. "How," inquires and indignant lady, "is a trial balloon filled with a leak?"

I thought everybody knew that. But, if not, best we go back and review.

Leaks, as you know from reading the papers, come from either administration sources, high administration sources, sources close to the White House, sources inside the White House, or inside White House sources. In that order of importance.

Let's start at the bottom. You get a job as an administration source, of which there are thousands. The rating (GS–13) and the pay ($12,500) aren't bad, but you have to eat in the cafeteria. So you start issuing leaks to all your friends and passing strangers. Like who in personnel stole Miss Pope's potted philodendron. Through diligence you get several people fired. Your work is noticed by your supervisors and you are promoted to high administrative source (GS–18, $17,250 and a seat in the junior executives dining room).

This entitles you to leak the inside story to the Peoria Weekly Foghorn and other lesser media. But only the inside story which will appear on the inside pages. Such as the oversupply of graphite in the bureau of locks and bugles. It is, however, a gay, ego-rewarding position and most would be wise to stop here.

Not so. The dedicated go on to become sources close to the White House, hanging around the South Lawn buttonholing passing newsmen to issue leaks. This is a very arduous job. Especially in winter.

But, with luck, your work may catch the eye of the President. "Son," he will say, "your work has caught my eye. We need more men like you. Come inside where it's warmer." Thus you reach the pinnacle: becoming an inside White House source. Issuing leaks about who issued the leak that sunk you-know-who.

Inside White House sources, unfortunately, are often confused with sources inside the White House. The latter means newsmen in the pressroom, to whom inside White House sources leak, and the maids, staff antique dealers and the like, who just write books.

Now while newsmen are known as sources inside the White House and constantly leak to each other, they are also leaked to by inside White House sources. This is because the pressroom is near the door. And news-

men are thus also known as sources close to the outside world.

In practice, of course, there are vague areas between these clear-cut distinctions. While newsmen agree all gardeners are unofficial sources close to the White House, what about the doorman? Sometimes he is a source inside the White House; sometimes a source close to it. Depending on whether it's cold outside.

But, actually, all that's necessary to understand the news these days is to form the proper picture of our White House. Sort of like a giant sieve. A giant sieve leaking balloons which cut throats.

I'm sure this answers the lady's question. If not, don't bother me. I've decided not to become a White Houseologist. I've decided to become a Kremlinologist. It's simpler.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 2, 1963]

CAN NIKITA SURVIVE THE BIG YURT CRISIS?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

As you may recall, I've decided to become a Kremlinologist. But, like butterfly collecting, there's not much money in it. So, in hopes of a little spare change, I'm writing a pamphlet entitled: "How To Become a Kremlinologist in Your Basement in Your Spare Time."

The first step, of course, is to analyze brief news items from Russia. I have one here by Associated Press which definitely throws light on the mysterious power struggle in the Kremlin. All of them do.

"B. Mambetov, Premier of the Republic of Kirghizia," reports A.P. from Moscow, "told the Supreme Soviet today that the old-fashioned yurts are overcrowded and 'do not correspond to the needs of modern-day living.'"

Now, it is immediately apparent to any Kremlinologist that Mr. B. Mambetov is anti-party and is clearly using yurts in an attempt to discredit, if not overthrow, Mr. Khrushchev. But, before rushing in, we must ask ourselves some serious questions. Not: "Who is B. Mambetov?" Nor: "Where is Kirghizia?" True, such questions have merit. But they are the sign of the overeager amateur. The question we must first ask ourselves is: "What are yurts?"

I'm glad you asked. Yurts, says Webster's, are tents made of skin "used by the Kirghiz and other nomadic tribes of Siberia." This is important, as it spares us talking about "the gross failure of the 1962 yurt crop" or "the long lines of housewives in front of the State-run butcher shops hoping to purchase a few kilos of yurts."

Thus armed, we are now prepared to turn to the mysterious power struggle in the Kremlin and ask ourselves the crucial key question: "Will yurts put B. Mambetov in the driver's seat?"

The way we go about it is this:

"The proven failure of the much-heralded 5-year yurts plan has given rise to speculation that Khruschev is on the way out. Desperate attempts are now being made inside the Kremlin, insiders report, to design a split-level yurt with picture windows for gracious indoor-outdoor living. But production would put a serious strain on the Soviet economy.

"Thus far, the great yurts crisis shapes up this way: The military, hitherto cooly warm to Khrushchev, are militantly proyurt. But the young intelligentsia, previously warmly cool, are intelligently antiyurt. As for the Khirghiz, on whom it blows both hot and cold, they are, it is widely known, sulking in their yurts.

"Waiting in the wings is the shadowy figure of B. Mambetov, a shadowy figure little known in the West. Long recognized by experts as the No. 2 man in many places, Mambetov may be in excellent position to seize the reins of power should the reins of power be seized. First of all, it cannot be gainsaid that Mambetov knows his yurts. And, secondly, as Khirghizia goes, so goes Azerbaijan. On the other hand."

But that should give you the idea. That should give you the idea anybody can be a Kremlinologist. All you need is my handy pamphlet and a dictionary. It's good for your ego and nobody ever proves you wrong.

In fact, you don't need a dictionary. Should you be asked, "What's a yurt?" just think like a Kremlinologist, always alert for tension and intrigue. And you will invariably find that a yurt, in the final analysis, is a hot potato.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 11, 1963]

THE DIFFICULT ART OF APPRECIATING ART

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—As you may recall, I came back to Washington to find out whose Peace Corps is being sent into our American communities. And I will. But Washington is no place to get information. So, in the interim, I'm working on my book, "Strange Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." And already I've got a whole new chapter: "Culture and Other Taboos."

In Washington, the natives all worship culture. The more important the native, the more he worships culture. Worship is performed through a strange rite known as appreciating art.

While all the native tribes appreciate art, the numerous and important Kennedy tribe appreciates art most often. They are considered very devout in appreciating art and many lesser chieftains now attempt to emulate them.

Fortunately, I was able to attend an authentic native appreciating art ritual—a rare opportunity for an anthropologist. So I'm quickly setting forth my notes while I can. I only hope they reach the outside world.

This ritual was held for the painting of a dead Italian lady named Mrs. Mona Lisa. The Kennedy tribe borrowed Mrs. Lisa from France (which is a real country) so that all the other tribes could join with them in a mass appreciating art ceremony.

Unfortunately, when Mrs. Lisa arrived, the Kennedys, the solons, and the heads of many other tribes were out of town on various foraging expeditions. So Mrs. Lisa was locked up in a sealed vault for 3 weeks. But all the lesser natives said they appreciated it was here.

At last, however, the tribal chieftains returned and the rite began. It was held in the National Gallery, which the natives always speak of as a shrine. The male natives arrived in their traditional appreciating art costumes (black tie). And the female natives wore their traditional appreciating art expressions (arched eyebrows).

Mrs. Lisa was hung at one end of a small nave where, in Christian ceremonies, the altar would stand. The nave was crowded with lesser natives, each saying, "I never have enjoyed the painting much since the French put the glass over it."

Which is apparently some sort of dogma.

The more important natives, however, circulated in a rotunda just outside to perform a separate rite called, "Who's that with." For example, the man chatting with Senator HUMPHREY would say: "Who's that with George Ball?"

And the man next to Mr. Ball would be saying, "Who's that with HUGH HUMPHREY?" The reasons for this ritual are obscure.

Several very high chieftains delivered sermons from the altar. Some in English, some in French. Due to the acoustics, they were understood to say, "Rowwowwow." Except those who spoke in French. They said, "Renhrenhrenhrenh." All sounded most sincere.

When it was over, a few lesser natives went up to look at Mrs. Lisa. But most went home to tell their friends where they'd been. Which is the main purpose of appreciating art. As it is practiced in Washington.

A Great and Honest Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of November 15, 1962:

A GREAT AND HONEST POLITICIAN

(By Gould Lincoln)

"There will always be a Democratic Party and there will always be a Republican Party, and frankly I think the best interests of the country are served by two great parties." This is the unqualified prediction of a great and skillfull politician—one who has given the lie by his own career to the oft-repeated statement that "all politicians are dishonest," and by one who has rendered great public service—James A. (Big Jim) Farley, of New York, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General during the first two terms of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His prediction was made during the National Broadcasting Co.'s television program, "Meet the Press," last Sunday. Mr. Farley had been asked whether he saw any time in the future when we might have a Liberal Party as opposed to a Conservative Party in this country.

Mr. Farley's whole life experience—he was born a Democrat and began his work in Democratic politics 52 years ago—has been an exemplification of his statement. He has been called a liberal, particularly when he was playing an important part in the Roosevelt New Deal, and he has been called a conservative. But he has always been a Democrat, loyal to the Democratic Party. He never has scratched a Democratic ticket. When he broke with President Roosevelt over the third term issue in 1940 and opposed the President's renomination, he still declared his support of Roosevelt in the election campaign that followed and voted for him. Just as he has supported every Democratic nominee for President and for State office in New York.

A PRACTICAL REPLY

The question put to Mr. Farley during the "Meet the Press" program was actuated by the strong divergence of the southern conservatives and the northern liberals in the Democratic Party of today, and a similar divergence in the Republican Party over the Rockefeller Republicans and the Goldwater Repubilcans. He was asked specifically: "Do you think that the liberal Democrats and the southern conservative Democrats belong in the same Democratic Party?"

Mr. Farley, ever practical, replied: "Well, it is not that they belong—there is nothing that you and I can do about it." And when he was pressed still further to say whether the southern conservatives and the northern liberals in the Democratic Party have much in common, he answered: "They have much in common in the different direction," which

sounds enigmatic, but after all is very practical. Up to now both wings of the party have desired victory at the polls, and they have had it.

Mr. Farley once told this writer that the Democrats "will continue to win as long as they hold the labor vote and the Negro vote." At that time, the solid South was taken for granted—as it still is, particularly in congressional elections, if not presidential.

PREDICTS KENNEDY REELECTION

Mr. Farley still sticks to this political estimate of Democratic strength. In his interview he made a number of predictions for the future. Principal among them was a forecast that President Kennedy will be reelected in 1964; that Governor Rockefeller of New York will be Mr. Kennedy's opponent, and that in another 2 years much of the Kennedy program will be enacted into law. Mr. Farley, ever frank, admitted that the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in April 1961 had been a fiasco. But he insisted President Kennedy's recent strong stand against the Communist military buildup in Cuba would be maintained.

As a forecaster of election results he does not have to yield to any professional pollster. His most famous prediction was on the outcome of the 1936 presidential election. He said President Roosevelt would carry all the States except two and he did—all except Maine and Vermont.

Because of his break with F.D.R. over a third-term nomination, Mr. Farley has never been the choice of New York State Democratic conventions for Governor or Senator. It was then the conservative label was pasted on him by New Dealers and by members of the Liberal Party. Mr. Farley, however, then chairman of the Democratic State Committee, retained great political power, so great that he defeated F.D.R. on his own ground. In the 1942 Democratic State Convention he succeeded in nominating his candidate for Governor, although Mr. Roosevelt backed the late Senator James M. Mead. Mr. Farley commanded deep devotion and loyalty among the party leaders. His word was as good as his bond, and he always kept his promises to the leaders and to the rank and file. He remained State chairman until 1944.

Mr. Farley made it clear in his interview that he believes strongly in party organization. Today he remains one of the best loved and respected politicians in the country, although he has held no office since he gave up the State chairmanship. The one thing which cut him to the quick was President Roosevelt's failure to use him in any way in the great war effort this country made from 1941 to 1945. With his organizing ability and experience his services could have been of great value.

Accident and Health Insurance Tax Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 453—to provide a 20-percent tax credit for premiums paid by the taxpayer for health and accident insurance. The 20-percent credit is the equivalent of allowing a full deduction for insurance costs for a taxpayer in the first tax bracket. I first introduced this bill in July of 1962—H.R. 12693, 87th Congress, 2d session—and am reintroducing it in this Congress because I feel it is a sound and practical approach to the problem of encouraging voluntary health insurance.

This bill is intended to serve a twofold purpose: First, it remedies an inequity in the provision of existing tax law providing for a medical deduction; second, it will encourage more persons to obtain accident and health insurance.

The medical expense deduction presently available is confined to expenses in excess of 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This penalizes the taxpayer who insures himself and his family through accident and health insurance.

For example, taxpayer A, whose income consists of wages of $5,000 per year, purchases a medical insurance plan at a cost of $150 per year. Since $150 is not in excess of 3 percent of $5,000, he would not be allowed a medical deduction in any year for the cost of his medical plan. Taxpayer A continues the plan for 5 years at a total cost of $750. In none of the years was he able to deduct this as a medical expense. In the fifth year, he incurs $750 of medical expenses. This $750 of medical expenses is covered by his insurance. He gets no deduction because his medical expense was covered by insurance, although he has paid out a total of $750 over the 5 years for the coverage.

On the other hand, taxpayer B, who has the same $5,000 income as our first taxpayer, has no medical insurance. Taxpayer B deposits $150 a year in a savings account, on which he earns interest. In the fifth year, taxpayer B also incurs $750 of medical expenses. He uses $750 which he has saved to pay his medical bill. The first $150—3 percent of his income—is not includible as a medical deduction. Taxpayer B subtracts this $150 from his $750 medical bill, and takes a medical deduction for the balance—$600.

Thus, while both taxpayer A and taxpayer B had identical annual incomes and medical costs, B gets the benefit of the interest earned while his $750 was invested, plus a tax deduction of $600. From this simple illustration it is apparent that the present medical deduction favors the uninsured taxpayer, to the detriment of the insured taxpayer.

While I have taken taxpayers with an income of $5,000 for purpose of comparison, the effect is the same irrespective of the taxpayer's income. The taxpayers who carry medical insurance are penalized under the Federal tax laws because those taxpayers will not obtain any benefit from the medical deduction, while the taxpayers who do not carry medical insurance will have the benefit of a tax deduction if their medical expense in any year exceeds 3 percent of their income. Taxpayer A is, in effect, penalized for protecting the Government's revenues against the risk of a medical deduction.

In providing a tax credit for medical insurance for the taxpayer, the bill includes amounts paid by the individual for himself, his spouse, his parents, his spouse's parents, and his dependents. Thus, whether or not his, or his spouse's parents qualify as dependents within the meaning of our tax laws, the taxpayer would be permitted to claim the 20 percent credit. This will act as an incentive for children to adequately insure their parents against a major illness.

The effect of this will be to encourage individuals to provide for adequate medical protection: First, for themselves; second, for those dependent upon them; third, for those who might later become dependent upon them; and fourth, beyond this, it will encourage individuals to provide for adequate medical insurance in advance of their old age.

Some may find that if they waited until age 65 or over to take out medical insurance, the cost would be such that adequate coverage is not within their means. This credit would apply to the purchase of level-premium policies or paid-up policies during their younger years which would provide health insurance coverage for their later years.

In providing for a credit instead of a deduction, the bill would still permit the taxpayer to use the tax tables or to take advantage of the standard deduction. The standard deduction—which is reflected in the tax tables—is the equivalent of a deduction of 10 percent of the adjusted gross income. This use of the tables makes it unnecessary for the taxpayer to itemize all his personal deductions. It is in lieu of any other deductions permitted under our tax laws—such as charitable deductions, interest payments, personal taxes, and nonbusiness casualty losses. If medical insurance premiums are treated as an additioinal personal deduction, the 37 million taxpayers who today elect to use the standard deduction and the tax tables would either lose the benefit of the insurance deduction or the simplicity of the standard deduction and the use of the tax tables. They would have to account for each and every item of personal expense allowable as a deduction. This would materially complicate the filing of returns, particularly for those in the lower tax brackets.

On the other hand, with a 20-percent tax credit for medical insurance, the taxpayer who had an income of $5,000 would still be entitled to the $500 standard deduction. The tax credit provided by my bill would be taken in addition to—not in lieu of—the standard deduction. In other words, the medical insurance credit would be treated in the same manner as the 4-percent credit for dividends received and the $1,200 retirement income credit, both of which are taken in addition to the standard deduction.

Medical care is not solely a problem for those under the social security system, or those 65 years of age. A major illness can befall both young and old. Legislation which limits relief to a segment of the population is deficient. A young father may be just as hard pressed to meet the expense of illness in his family as would the retired person who himself became ill. The bill I have introduced provides tax relief for meeting

the medical expenses of both through private insurance. It does not attempt to socialize medical insurance as the Kennedy administration would do.

This bill makes no attempt to regiment our elderly citizens into a Government-conceived, adopted and controlled system of compulsory health insurance. It does not require that the taxpayer's insurance conform to certain standards set by the Federal Government before favorable tax treatment can be obtained. Many of our elderly citizens are at present adequately providing for themselves through private plans of their own choosing, and prefer to continue to do so. This bill recognizes that it is the right of the individual—young and old—to select the type of insurance program which best meets his needs—and to select it in a free and competitive marketplace.

The bill approaches the problem through the encouragement of private insurance—without Government interference and control. Unlike other concepts, it realizes that it is not only the role of the Government to encourage adequate health protection among those age 65 and over, but that our Nation is faced with a problem which transcends both age and economic standards. The bill would encourage individuals of all ages and income levels to provide health and accident insurance as a means of protecting themselves against catastrophic and prolonged illnesses.

We have made tremendous gains in public acceptance of health and accident insurance over the past decade. The problem is that medical expenses are so treated under existing law that the taxpayer, instead of being given an incentive to enroll himself or his family in a medical plan, is penalized for doing so. Recognition in the tax laws of the desirability of private health insurance is long overdue. The tax credit I propose, by correcting this inequity, would build on the gains we have made in the field of private health insurance.

Best Stories of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: There will be a flood of stories and articles about the "Best Stories of 1962." My vote for the best is Art Buchwald's column, "Best Stories of 1962." It reads as follows:

(By Art Buchwald)

BEST STORIES OF 1962

Every year we pick the best news stories of the year. Many of them have never been reported before; others have been lost among the classified and real estate ads.

The first has to do with a stamp collector named Jonathan Kincaid, who used to buy sheets of newly issued stamps as soon as they were put on sale by the U.S. Post Office.

Mr. Kincaid, who made $80 a week as a contact man for a contact lens company, went down to the post office one day and bought a sheet of a new stamp that was honoring the aborted Bay of Pigs landing in Cuba. But when Kincaid got home he noticed there were American airplanes printed on the stamp, and since there were no airplanes at the Bay of Pigs, Kincaid realized that someone in the printing office had made a grave error.

He called up the newspapers and told them that he had a sheet of misprinted stamps that were worth $200,000.

The newspapers immediately called Postmaster General J. Edward Day and informed him of the printing error. They asked him what he intended to do about it.

Mr. Day was adamant. "When the U.S. Post Office makes a mistake, we should pay for it. We shall give Mr. Kincaid the $200,000 he is asking, and we will pay anybody else $200,000 for a similar misprinted sheet. To do otherwise would make a mockery of stamp collecting throughout the world."

PROBLEMS OF A STUDENT

The second story has to do with Abraham Lincoln Roosevelt, a Negro student who wanted to enroll at the University of Mississippi.

Mr. Roosevelt, a straight "A" student in high school, made his application to the admissions office, and was immediately accepted by the university. On his first day of school he was asked to join a fraternity, and several students invited him to the freshman prom. He was elected class president and cheerleader and a member of the exclusive Knife and Fork Club.

In a couple of weeks Mr. Roosevelt was editing the college humor magazine, was active in the dramatic society, chairman of the blood bank, member of the student council, manager of the football team, and captain of the debating squad.

By the end of the first term, Mr. Roosevelt flunked all his courses and was thrown out of the school.

"They made me do so many extracurricular activities," Mr. Roosevelt said bitterly, "I didn't have time to do any studying."

HAPPY ASTRONAUT

Maj. Carl Lemuel was selected as one of the original U.S. astronauts to go into space. Major Lemuel went through all the training and it was his turn to go up next. But a week before he was to be shot into space the doctors discovered he had a bad kidney, and said he couldn't possibly go into orbit.

In an interview after the medical examination Major Lemuel said, "I couldn't be happier. I was wondering how I was going to get out of it. I think anyone who goes up in one of those capsules is nuts, and it doesn't prove anything anyway."

NOTHING ELSE TO DO

EDWARD KENNEDY, a 30-year-old citizen of Massachusetts, decided to run for U.S. Senator on the Democratic ticket. A group of citizens came to him and said "TEDDY, your brother is President of the United States, your other brother is Attorney General, your brother-in-law is head of the Peace Corps. It will look awfully bad if there is another Kennedy in Washington. Why don't you give up the idea of running for Senator so that you don't embarrass the party?"

"But what else can I do?" Mr. KENNEDY asked.

The citizens thought and thought, but no one could come up with an answer.

The Just and the Unjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks, I wish to call attention to the reaction of the Wall Street Journal of January 8, 1963, to the proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service in handling expense accounts.

I think the observations made in the following article are very meritorious:

THE JUST AND THE UNJUST

We guess we don't run in the right social circles.

For years we have been reading those books about wild living in the suburbs and wondering somewhat plaintively why the excitement seems to pass us by. In years of suburban living the wildest shock to the even tenor of our domesticity was the day the dog drank up the cocktails and bit the mayor. It was weeks before we were forgiven.

For almost as long, we've been reading about all this notorious high living on the expense account, boats and all that, and groaning over what we seem to have missed. After a quarter century in that den of iniquity, Wall Street, no one has tempted our journalistic virtue with even so much as a night at a hunting lodge, much less a seagoing voyage. Where, indeed, are all those expense-account yachts?

True, we aren't without sin, as defined in the new dogma of the Internal Revenue Service. We suffer business luncheons dreadfully often and when we turn in the voucher we don't deduct the $1.25 we would have spent anyway for the blue plate special. A man is entitled to some recompense for punishment in line of duty.

When business takes us to Peoria or Dubuque, as it does all too often, we take an aperitif before dinner, choose the steak over the chicken-a-la-king and sometimes splurge on the movies, charging the lot to the stockholders. If it weren't for their business we wouldn't be there at all, and frankly we have better steaks at home.

Moreover, the children being more or less at the age of discretion, we have lately taken our wife along on some trips. We haven't persuaded the curmudgeonly auditor to okay her expenses, but not long ago we drove to Washington on legitimate business (if talking to a Senator is legitimate) and our wife rode along in the car. Even that baleful auditor didn't ask us to reimburse the company for the equivalent price of her bus ticket.

Give or take a few details, this is not unlike the situation of thousands of businessmen in a country where men at work are ceaselessly traveling to and fro. The door-to-door salesman and the flying corporate executive are brothers under the skin; they are working also when they pass the time of day with the lady at the door or the business acquaintance across the luncheon table. Sometimes the smartest business is not to talk business at all but to be friendly, interested; to listen and to learn. Only ignorant and petty minds could imagine that the free lunch is all beer and skittles.

But now it turns out that all this is under the suspicion of undermining the public

morality and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury. In any event the Government is going to treat all the people as crooks until proven otherwise.

This suspicion of malefaction flows from every word of the new regulations on record-keeping, pedantic in language and picayune in detail, drawn up by the Internal Revenue Service.

Hereafter you must account to the Government not only for your yacht but the beer you buy a business acquaintance. The documents for any entertainment, no matter how trivial, must include the amount, date, place by name and address, type (martini or ham sandwich?), explanation of the benefit to be returned for this bounty, the name of the recipient and sufficient documentation to explain your extravagance to the satisfaction of any revenue agent who subsequently examines your tax report.

And if perchance on a trip you spend more than $25 in any day you must itemize everything else too—the day you left home, day you got back, every telephone call, meal, cup of coffee, taxicab and bus fare. If you want your books to balance, you'd better even keep track of the postage stamps for the letters to the home office.

The sheer absurdity of this avalanche of paperwork is only the beginning. The metaphysicians of Mr. Mortimer Caplin's bureaucracy have now gone off to mull such esoteric questions as: What, precisely, constitutes a business meal? What is the allowable difference in cost between a lunch for a life insurance prospect ($5,000 policy) and the prospect for an electric dynamo ($5 million sale)? Can you also buy lunch for the prospect's wife, or do you suggest she go eat in the drug store? What if your own wife is along too—do you leave her back in the hotel room to munch a hamburger and watch television?

As ridiculous as these questions sound, they are precisely the sort of thing that must now be decided upon at the highest levels, and Mr. Caplin confesses—quite understandably, we think—that it will be some weeks before we can expect any official enlightenment. It has never been easy to decide how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Yet it is neither the absurdity of the paperwork nor the ridiculousness of the metaphysics that is the true evil.

Here is a situation in which the Government is, no doubt about it, confronted with a problem. Some people do hide yachts in expense accounts, just as some do hide misbehavior in the suburbs, and the Government has the power to deal with the real tax cheaters. But the vast majority of the people everywhere lead quiet, placid, and upright lives, and the vast majority of those whose taxes support the Government give an honest accounting of their affairs.

Yet here we use the majesty of the law to treat every taxpayer as a potential cheater because pinhead minds can think of no other way; the integrity of all must be insulted, and the conduct of their affairs made insufferable, because of the sins of the few.

Now completely apart from this question of expense accounts, this is a philosophy of Government which is evil in itself. We once had an example of this when, to stop a few people from drinking too much, we adopted prohibition which treated all men as potential alcoholics. Surely the results have not left our memory.

The results of this noble experiment can also be foreseen. These new rules will give trouble only to honest men. The real operator—the man who is really out to cheat on his taxes—can drive a truck through them.

The smart lawyers are already figuring out the perfectly legal loopholes; beyond that, those with larceny in their hearts will not be disturbed because they will show records, receipts and paper accounts by the carload. As sure as the sun rises tomorrow, today's rules will have to be followed tomorrow by new rules upon new rules tightening the rules.

And while all this is going on, the honest man—the man who takes a business trip to do an honest job for his company and with no desire to cheat either his company or his country—that man will see himself not merely laden with burdensome paperwork but with the fear that everything he does is under suspicion.

Because he honestly tries to keep honest records, all the records will be there and he can be called up a year later, 2 years later, and find that what he did in good faith is adjudged wrong by some petty bureaucrat imbued with the idea that any expense account must conceal some wickedness. The smart operator will have his lawyers; the little taxpayer will be helpless against the insolence of office.

We submit that to order the public affairs in this manner is an affront to the public morality, just as it would be for the State to require of every citizen a detailed accounting of his home-coming-and-going because some men cheat. That Government governs idly which can find no other way to deal with malefactors than to maltreat all of its citizens, the just and the unjust alike.

The Vast New Factor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following editorial by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post under date of January 14, 1963, entitled "The Vast New Factor":

THE VAST NEW FACTOR

(By Joseph Alsop)

"Heavy, heavy, what hangs over?" was the beginning of an old children's game like 20 questions. "Communist China" would be the winning answer, in the case of the new round of Soviet-American talks about a nuclear test ban, which will soon begin in New York.

The thought of Communist China naturally haunts the Soviets. The flat Chinese refusal to abide by a test ban was one of the two main factors—the other being Soviet military pressure to resume testing—which caused Khrushchev to torpedo the Geneva negotiations in 1961, when President Kennedy went so far to secure an agreement.

Today, the simmering discords of 1961 have boiled up to the point where an open, avowed, and final rupture between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung appears to be almost unavoidable. And the seemingly inevitable break between Moscow and Peiping is, in itself, a vast new factor in the Soviet-American negotiations.

This is true because of the effect of a Sino-Soviet break on the problems of cheating. In 1961, it was out of the question for the United States to accept a test ban without some provision for inspecting inside China, since the Chinese would then have aided the Soviets to cheat despite their many disagreements.

If there is a final Sino-Soviet break, however, a test ban may seem a reasonable calculated risk despite its rejection by China; since the main danger of China-sheltered Soviet cheating will then have disappeared. In fact, China-sheltered Soviet cheating is already almost unimaginable, in the present embittered state of Sino-Soviet relations, even though the rupture is not formal and avowed.

This very great change in the contours of the test ban problem has of course been even more carefully weighed by the American policymakers than by the Soviet policymakers. The United States, after all, is the party to the bargain that will have to accept the calculated risk, if and when a test ban agreement is reached—which is still highly doubtful.

But there is another, perhaps even more important reason why the thought of Communist China haunts the American policymakers quite as powerfully as it haunts the Soviets. The President and those around him have lately been hard at work calculating the future effect on the general world balance of power of a Communist China divorced from Russia, on its feet again, and possessing atomic weapons.

There are two reasons why these fairly gruesome calculations are now being made at the White House. On the one hand, the time is at hand which was long ago named by the American forecasters as the first moment when the Chinese Communists might test their own atomic bomb. After that lower limit has been passed, there will be no telling when the first Chinese test may occur.

To be sure, the immediate effect of a Chinese test will be purely psychological. More time will be needed, after a test, before the Chinese can be said to have an atomic arsenal. But the Chinese problem, curiously enough, is rather simpler than the French problem.

The French nuclear program will only succeed if France creates an effective nuclear deterrent vis-a-vis the Soviets. The Chinese program will be successful, at least in part, if China merely has enough atomic weapons to overawe southeast Asia. Fewer weapons, and much less sophisticated weapons, will do for this purpose.

This is a real danger, if you accept as valid the other reason for the White House calculations about China. In brief, the President and a good many of those around him incline to take quite literally all that the Chinese have said, in their war of words with Moscow, about the United States being a paper tiger, about the Communist duty to use military power to bring about the Communist millenium, and so on and on.

If the Chinese really mean all that they have said on these topics, then the final Sino-Soviet rupture, if and when it comes, will mean that an aggressive China has cast off the last shred of moderating influence. The possibility that a Sino-Soviet rupture will produce this kind of aftereffect certainly needs to be weighed.

But there are other points to weigh as well. In the first place, the Chinese have been sounding very warlike, but the only country they have attacked is India, a self-announced paper tiger, and they have left even Chiang Kai-shek's offshore island severely alone.

In the second place, the picture of Communist China on its feet again and armed with atomic weapons is something of a scarecrow if Communist China has little chance of getting on its feet again. The moderate improvement in this year's harvest does not mean that Communist China is again a healthy country. The problem needs much more careful investigation.

Yet this new White House preoccupation, even if not entirely justified, is another proof that the Sino-Soviet row is changing everything.

A Graduated Income Tax—Graduated Downward, That Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, are deeply and genuinely concerned with the sluggish state of the Nation's economy, and in the weeks to come will be preoccupied with the increasing perplexity of what form of tax reduction will most effectively restore us to prosperity.

In the January 12 issue of the New Yorker magazine, the editor not only has grasped the lesson to be learned from a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal, but he rephrases the lesson with such a clarity and lightness of touch that I would like to have it reprinted here for the enlightenment and amusement of those of my colleagues whose attention it may have escaped:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

In the absence of other New York newspapers, we have been reading the Wall Street Journal more faithfully than usual, and learning quite a bit about economics. We are consequently becoming more conservative and apprehensive 5 days a week, and have only Saturday and Sunday, when the Journal does not appear, left in which to defrighten ourself. Just the other day, for example, the Journal warned the readers of its editorial page of what, it conceded, has been a hitherto unnoticed "especially adverse effect of the corporation profits tax as a drag against more efficient economic activity." Under the present fiscal scheme, the corporations that make the most money—and therefore, in Journal language, are the most "efficient"—pay the highest taxes. "The marginal producer pays less; nothing if he is sufficiently inefficient as to make no profits," the editorialist pointed out. This astonished us; we had always opposed the creation of a privileged fiscal class, but the danger of the anomaly had escaped us, "The effect of this * * * is to slowly shift the control of more of the Nation's resources into the hands of the less efficient producers and managers." (A trivial question, undoubtedly frivolous, momentarily crossed our mind: What would a man with no income eat while the control of the Nation's resources slowly shifted in his direction? Long acquaintance with the Journal's thought processes enable us to formulate the answer without posting a query to the editor: He would disguise himself as a native of an undeveloped country and live on surplus powdered milk wastefully distributed by the Agency for International Development.) What the Journal was advocating, in the interim before the income tax could be "replaced by some sort of expenditure tax," was relief for the big income. "Income taxes discourage savings because they treat consumption and savings equally—that is, your tax is the same whether you spend the money in riotous living or whether you save and make a contribution to the future economic growth of the country," it noted. "Moreover, the highly progressive rates especially restrict the amount of savings by falling most heavily on those incomes from which come the greatest savings." Since earners of low incomes indubitably spend a higher proportion of what they get than earners of high incomes—their pitiful irrelevant excuses for this can be ignored—the obvious remedy is a graduated income tax made progressive downward, or upside-downward, from no tax on incomes of a hundred thousand dollars and up (which furnish the most funds for investment) to a hundred percent on incomes of a thousand dollars and down (which are probably wasted on riotous living, since those earning them own few corporate shares). This would not eliminate the favored position of the man who makes no money at all, since even if he were taxed a hundred percent he would still pay nothing, but it would at least temper the injustice to his most efficient competitors, since they would pay nothing also.

A Legal Lottery Helps Solve Some Pressing Social Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the American Zionist of December 1962.

It is interesting to see how Israel has turned the desire to gamble to the benefit of the nation. It makes one wonder what the revenue would be if such a lottery were instituted in this country. I suspect that the expectation of a direct financial return would be of greater interest to the average American than the more abstract and indirect return he now receives from his tax dollar.

The article follows:

GAMBLING OR SOCIAL SERVICE?

(By Helen Fried)

An American visitor to Israel scarcely expects to find a lottery operating openly. He comes from a country in which such enterprise is generally taboo.

Hence, when my host Simon and I were walking through a business district in Haifa and came upon a lottery booth, I was shocked. When I saw that Simon was ready to buy a ticket, I said, "Wait—is gambling considered respectable in Israel?

"Our lottery is not like American horse-racing," Simon explained. "Israel's national lottery is legal, and the money that comes in through it we use for developing some of our most needed institutions. The lottery was established in 1951, when Israel was tragically short of hospitals and clinics for the chronically ill among the escapees from Hitler's death camps. After sufficient health institutions had been built, the lottery income went to building schools. More than 4,000 classrooms with facilities for over 200,000 children, have been built since the program has been in effect. How respectable does this sound to you?"

"Does that mean that the ends justify the means?"

"Let me tell you some more. Then you can judge for yourself. The 1,500 persons engaged in selling lottery tickets are elderly and handicapped. For nearly all, the earnings—which are only a little more than 6 percent of the gross sales—are their only income. Otherwise, most of them would be on the welfare rolls." There were warmth and pride in Simon's voice.

A memory of elderly men and women, still well-preserved physically, sitting around in the parks and squares of New York City with nothing to do, came to my mind. Perhaps they would welcome a chance to be useful, as Israel has made many of her aged citizens functioning parts of the society.

Slowly I began to feel that not all games of chance deserve to be condemned. Israel's national lottery hurts no one, and helps solve many social problems throughout the country. "I have to admit," I said to Simon, "your lottery provides jobs for those who are considered unemployable. And it is wise of the Government to restrict such jobs to the elderly."

That something like a national lottery would interest me, I never dreamed. But this socially useful device was new to me. "How much does a ticket cost, and how often are the drawings?" I asked.

"Each ticket costs 2 pounds, and the drawings are once a week. But as high as 58 percent of the income goes back to the customers, since the prizes include many for small amounts. No Israeli has ever become a millionaire overnight." Simon sat back and lit a cigarette.

"How do the ordinary wage earners respond to betting even as little as 2 pounds?"

"Well, I can see that you have never bet," Simon laughed. "Israelis, whether they are workers, managers or professional people, hardly ever squander money on lottery tickets. As few as three percent buy more than one ticket. By the way, most of the winners in Israel do not permit their name to be mentioned in the newspapers. Well, what do you think of our lottery now? Do you still think it's something that takes money away from widows and orphans?"

I pondered the question as we left the Technion for home. My first disapproving response to the lottery had not been changed by our talk. That attitude was too deeply ingrained by my living in a country where games of chance are regarded as morally wrong. But it had opened my mind to the possibility that a lottery managed as it is in Israel could be socially useful, providing jobs for needy men and women.

As we approached a lottery booth, I said to Simon, "Go ahead, buy yourself a ticket. I see no wrong in it now, and maybe this time you'll be lucky!"

Actions of the Government in the Congo-Katanga Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, many letters are being received by Members of this House relative to the actions of this Government in the Congo-Katanga controversy. These come from traveling Americans and those whose businesses keep them in various parts of the world. I give you one only at this time because of its concise language. It reads:

S.O.S. Please send me some explanation of why the United States is fighting and backing the U.N. decision to fight Katanga. Everyone here believes it is only so U.S. financiers can get control of the copper mines. Opinion here unanimous that present U.N. policy means chaos and bloodshed. Tshombe considered the only one with any idea of civilization. Russia expected to

step in when chaos arrives and United States cast as the real villain in the drama. Difficult to stand up for one's country when everything one reads or hears is contrary to our State Department pronouncements.

Mr. Speaker, when are these matters going to be brought before this House?

Virginia Poultry and the European Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the unwarranted and discriminatory import duty and so-called gate-price restrictions which the nations of the European Economic Community have placed on our poultry is causing cruel damage to a domestic industry which, without price supports or other subsidies, has made a remarkable self-help record in developing a European market.

The effects are particularly serious in Virginia, a major poultry producer.

In a conference attended by representatives of virtually all segments of the economy of the Commonwealth, held in Richmond, Va., on January 11, 1963, Hon. Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, set forth the scope of the problem in a notable address.

Because of the importance of this problem to other poultry-producing States—and, indeed, to American agriculture generally—I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a summary of Governor Harrison's remarks:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY GOV. ALBERTIS S. HARRISON, JR., POULTRY FEDERATION BREAKFAST, RICHMOND HOTEL, JANUARY 11, 1963

All of you who are in attendance here today—members of the poultry industry, bankers, manufacturers, businessmen from many fields—are aware of the purpose for which we gather. By your attendance here, you also indicate the urgency and the scope of the problem before us.

Our immediate concern is that the governing directorate of the European Common Market has more than doubled its tariff on importations of poultry. The obvious reason for this action is to protect the poultry industry in the member nations. The immediate effect has been to bar the door against more than 28 million pounds of Virginia poultry, representing a substantial portion of our total production and projecting a loss to our total economy of approximately $30 million.

This has been a unilateral action on the part of the Common Market. It amounts to a penalty for the superlative efficiency of the Virginia poultry industry, which is able to deliver an attractive, tasty, ready-to-cook bird to West Germany and other points at a price well below that offered for local, farm-grown chickens.

The broad impact of this action was presented to me in detail on Wednesday by representatives of the Virginia State Poultry Federation and the Virginia Department of Agriculture, and I commend both of these organizations for their prompt and detailed response to this challenge.

Obviously this is a problem which warrants the wholehearted support of the Governor, and that I freely and gladly give. I have urged the necessity for both immediate and permanent relief upon the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the members of Virginia's congressional delegation, and upon other southern Governors who will be similarly affected.

The economic aspects of this action present particular difficulties for an industry already beset with narrowing margins and intense competition, yet it has other implications.

This is a major preliminary move in the evolution of the Common Market and in the development of trade patterns which will form the basis of that agency's future relations with our entire Nation. The outcome has many implications for Virginia's future relationship with this growing economic entity.

Along with Great Britain, the 6 nations of the Common Market represent a market of 200 million people, many of them just beginning to acquire the beginnings of the infinite variety of consumer goods that make up our American standard of living.

Many of them have already been introduced to Virginia poultry, and have indicated they want more.

The large truth hovering in the background is that the Common Market has been fabulously successful, and that it has become a reality that our own economy must reckon with and with which we must establish a fair but firm basis of trade.

But our immediate and overriding concern is Virginia's poultry industry. A vigorous attempt to bring about adjustments in these tariffs is indicated, first, in order to allow our poultry industry to resume serving the market its products have created abroad, and second to demonstrate that Virginians and Americans mean business when they set out to do business.

I am delighted that the poultry industry has permitted me to take part in this session and to lend my personal support and the support of my office to this endeavor. I am confident that the caliber of the support assembled here lends assurance of eventual success.

Judge Patrick T. Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 13, 1963, death brought an end to the career of one of our Nation's most eminent and able jurists. Patrick T. Stone succumbed to cancer at his home in Wausau, Wis. He was 73 years old. For 30 years he had served the people of Wisconsin as judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin.

He served the people well. For him, the speedy and impartial administration of justice was not just an ideal to which our judicial system should aspire—it was the basic and necessary principle of his daily courtroom conduct.

Despite a schedule that would have staggered the most ambitious of men, Judge Stone was always up to date in his work. His court was a model of efficiency, impartiality and dignity.

At the same time, his deep compassion for people was well known and greatly appreciated by all who had the privilege of working with him.

Judge Stone was born in Ontario, Canada, but moved with his family to Tomahawk, Wis., when he was 2. He attended Tomahawk's public schools and received his law degree from Marquette University Law School. During World War I, Judge Stone served in the U.S. Navy. After practicing law and serving as Wausau city attorney for 8 years, Judge Stone was appointed to the Federal bench in 1933 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His was the first judicial appointment made by the new President.

Judge Stone presided over many important cases in his long career on the bench. In 1937 and 1938 he sat during the trial of 23 major oil companies charged with price fixing. He presided over the famous bankers trial in Detroit, the trial of two assistant U.S. attorneys in Chicago, and an historic counterfeiting case in New York. Just last year Judge Stone was one of three Federal judges named to hear the Wisconsin reapportionment suit.

His great respect for the traditions of our law did not keep Judge Stone from urging reform when he thought it necessary. He was a pioneer in the use of presentence investigations, which were instituted in his court in 1938.

Both on the bench and off Judge Stone had the respect and affection of lawyers and laymen alike. His firmness and businesslike conduct in his courtroom was matched by his warmth and affability during his rare leisure hours, when he enjoyed a good game of bridge with some of his many friends.

We of Wisconsin are proud of Judge Stone. His record of service to his community, the incisiveness and humanity of his judicial opinions will long be remembered. He has left an indelible mark on the law and on the lives of the people of the western district of Wisconsin. He will be missed, not only by those of us who knew him and felt the power and warmth of his personality, but by all who respected him as a judge among judges, as a man among men.

Progress Is Not a Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this new session of Congress with the certain knowledge that we will be pressured from all quarters for more and more Federal programs to solve all of mankind's ills, it may be well for us to ponder on the wisdom contained in the text of the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in U.S. News & World Report of December 31, 1962. Many of our

current problems will be solved if we return to the old-fashioned American idea for success—individual hustle and sweat. Only then can we earn the sweet rewards for tomorrow or as so aptly put in the following statement, "Tomorrow must be earned—not appropriated":

TOMORROW MUST BE EARNED—NOT APPROPRIATED

Voting more money for schools doesn't make this an educated Nation. It isn't billions for more veterans' hospitals that will make America healthy. It is honest production, not shorter hours, that protects jobs. It takes more than costly playgrounds to cure juvenile delinquency. Pouring our billions all over the world doesn't buy security nor peace.

Nothing worth having or worth being is ever reached except by honest hard work, but it is becoming the tragic fashion to think we can shortcut the work, and have everything we want if we only spend enough Federal dollars. And then we mistakenly feel "the Government has taken care of it," so we can sit back and relax.

Another once-great nation withered and died when its people were drugged with that same fatal poison. (Perhaps "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" should be required reading in many places today.)

Everything government offers free is obviously and always paid for by all of us in higher taxes or a worsening deficit—both of them deficits of dollars but, even more tragically, deficits in national character and self-respect. What would ever be worth that?

Our Traditional Christian Christmas Must Forever Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a Christmas message written by Mr. Charles Wilson, principal of Wakeham Elementary School in Orange County, Calif. This message was delivered to the 700 students of that school. Mr. Wilson is to be congratulated for having the courage to extend this message at a time in our national history when anything connected with religion is under attack.

The message follows:

OUR TRADITIONAL CHRISTIAN CHRISTMAS MUST FOREVER BE PRESERVED

(By Charles Wilson)

The world is in a state of confusion, turmoil and crisis upon crisis. It is divided a battleground between two ideologies striving to capture the mind, the heart, and the very soul of mankind. Country after country has disappeared behind the Iron Curtain, and these unfortunate people have been engulfed—swallowed up—by a political philosophy that is atheistic, denies the existence of a Divine Being and destroys by every means of dictatorial suppression and oppression the religious freedom of the subjugated citizens.

Change—change has become the modern panacea, the shot of penicillin, the magic cure-all for too many people in this land of Constitutional guarantees that actually had its founding in the Mayflower Compact of November 11, 1620. However, change for the sake of change itself is not necessarily good or constructive. Change is desirable only if it produces progress beneficial to mankind and the future of civilization.

Customs, traditions and mores have too often been considered obsolete, old-fashioned, and hence, discarded or minimized by a powerful faction of sincere but misguided Americans who have attempted to indoctrinate the American public through every possible media of communications and weapons of propaganda to the benefits of change and modernism without analyzing the ultimate consequences of these actions or the values of an appreciation and understanding of the basic foundations of our country.

There is one belief that has defied change. Time has not been able to erase it or tarnish its perfection. Numerous emperors, kings, and dictators, be they called Fuehrer, Il Duce, or premier, have not been able to eradicate by propaganda, physical and mental torture, or even death this faith. It has remained because it is an eternal truth, defying the powers of man to pervert or time to diminish its message.

"For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." Nineteen hundred and sixty-two years later this is still the symbol, the significance, the very soul, the everlasting spirit of Christmas, and the message it joyously sings out for all peoples of the world of faith to hear can never be changed by mortal man although an attempt has been made in the past years in the United States for a changed celebration of Christmas.

Let us analyze, after scrutinizing carefully, the concepts of this changed version of Christmas we are asked to accept.

Christmas cards replete with galloping horses; ships in full sail upon a pastel sea; talking animals that deliver the holiday message; a martinied, jolly old Santa Claus that delivers a package of bottled cheer instead of a doll for Laura or a chemistry set for Charles are all an integral part of the changed new version of season's greetings.

Christmas songs that describe our children catching Santa Claus kissing mother with implications that are, at the best, questionable; the total commercialization with the only green being the color of money; music that has deliberately lost the true spirit of why we celebrate December 25 is repetitiously heard on radio and television before the Thanksgiving turkey has been eaten.

The changed colors of Christmas are exemplified in an abundance of yellows and pastels of various shades; turquoises, powder blues, pale pinks, fuschias, and avocado greens that dominate cards, the lights on the tree, wrapping paper, and ribbons on the gifts for those we love.

Christmas presents must be expensive, fancily wrapped in pastel colors and purchased at a store with a famous name that represents status and prestige. There must be a huge quantity of pastel wrapped presents under the pastel tree for each member of the family—including the dog and cat.

The basic belief of a Christian Christmas has been questioned, challenged, and threatened by a segment of our society. Christmas has become controversial. This is difficult to believe or understand because our country was, is, and must always be a God-centered nation. The Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the pledge of allegiance to the flag of our country, the motto on our coins, and the oath of office of elected officials all give evidence that we are a land that does base our faith and trust in a divine being. Are these obsolete? Does the changed image of Christmas offer us more?

What is a traditional Christian Christmas?

Christmas cards must have the ancient and true symbols of Christmas—the Nativity scene, the star and the candle that shed light upon darkness, the wreath and the holly, the Three Wise Men, home scenes that portray abundant evidence of family love and loyalty with the warmth of the hearth permeating and adding to the blessings and joys of the yuletide season. These pictorial representations of Christmas must never vanish from our way of life but must continue to spread the deeper values of why we celebrate that 25th day in December each year.

Christmas songs must ring out in the voices of children at school, carolers in the streets, choirs in the churches carrying the hope of the world in the significance of the words of "Silent Night," "Away in the Manger," "O Come, All Ye Faithful," and the multitudinous hymns of Christmas that have come to stand for the richer thoughts of this season over hundreds of years.

Christmas colors have traditionally been red as the blood that Jesus Christ shed upon the cross for the forgiveness and salvation of all mankind; green as the everlasting life of nature as represented by the evergreen of the tree and the holly. Can we exchange these for pastels?

Christmas gifts stated so clearly by their intrinsic value that the "gift without the giver is bare," as children and adults made through perspiration and inspiration the presents for their loved ones—grandmother and grandfather, mother and father, sister and brother, friend and relative. Quality of present was the objective, not quantity. Time and effort, signifying love of the giver, was represented in each and every gift. The only brand name was the name of the giver.

And yet, we have missed the true and deeper implications of Christmas unless we devoutly and fondly remember the purpose of the home and the family at this season of the year. The family planned the presents together amidst great hustle and bustle and small huddles of secrecy and giggling; gifts were wrapped at home by hand and hidden with the greatest of care in every possible nook and cranny; cookies were baked in the shapes of stars, crosses, trees and plump Santa Clauses; taffy was pulled, fudge was boiled and fondant was made; popcorn was popped to be threaded and hung on the tree (all that was not eaten by the busy hands); gifts were so often made by hand—an embroidered apron or pillowcase; the button boxes or jewel boxes made out of coffee cans, cigar boxes and plenty of creative imagination. They represented love and unselfishness because they were the creations and efforts of the giver. Christmas carols rang throughout the home, and traditional songs were sung by the entire family on Christmas Eve before the cracking fireplace or gathered closely around the battered piano or organ. Fireplace, piano or organ, or just a home full of family love, Christmas carols were sung with an inner and spiritual feeling. The family that harmonized together these songs of devotion and hope of the world were united by a spiritual and intellectual bond that could never be broken.

Christmas belongs not only to the children of the free world but also to the adults. Childhood believes in the magical powers of Santa Claus and Frosty the Snowman. No gift, no wish is impossible as long as the child believes. No gift, no wish is impossible as long as the adult truly believes. We only have to witness the miracles performed by Jesus Christ as he made the lame to walk and the blind to see because they had faith, truly believed.

Childhood pathetically and tragically comes to an abrupt climax when the child discovers that Santa Claus is only a figment of the imagination and the magic powers of Frosty vanish with the sunlight, but for-

tunately the richer and deeper significance of Christmas replaces this loss if we as parents and adults have taught our children the religious connotation of Christmas. Santa Claus is replaced by the love and redemption of Jesus Christ.

Brotherly love seems to express itself in all the young at heart from 2 to 102 at this joyous season of the year. Miracles do still happen as in the days of Christ. People smile that have frowned and scowled for 11 months of the year and greet you with a warm, cheery and sincere "Merry Christmas." Hearts and purses that have been closed too long open generously to help those less fortunate. Even Scrooge found the joy of giving. Stockings will continue to be hung by the chimney with the greatest of care as long as the United States remains free. People who have forgotten to worship in God's house will return to his abode as long as Americans continue to have the guarantee of freedom of religion.

The world is a better place, people display their more noble emotions for a few short days as they consider unselfishly the welfare and happiness of others, rather than themselves. The Golden Rule prevails for an all too brief moment of the 365 days of the year. It seems so tragic, so futile that this spirit of love and unselfishness cannot shine throughout the world for the entire year, every year.

The church has not been overlooked in this homage, this tribute to Christmas, but each individual must honor his God as he believes. The school, the home, the Government must never usurp the privileges and right of each person to worship his God in his own manner. This right is guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments, to our Constitution. The makers of our Constitution were so firm in their belief of freedom of religion that they made this right a basic part of the law of our country.

The 25th of December is the day that Christians throughout the world honor the birth of Jesus Christ. But be we Christians or not, Christmas is a vital part of our American culture, our American way of life, and has been since the Pilgrims from the Mayflower landed at Cape Cod in 1620 and signed the Mayflower Compact, commencing with these words of faith, "In the Name of God."

Our American system of free enterprise that rewards initiative and risk has given us the greatest materialistic wealth of any nation since the creation of the earth. Our standard of living surpasses that of any people that have existed. And yet, we are not a materialistic people; we are a people that still believe in Santa Claus.

And what, then, is a Christian Christmas? It is the second chance for the people of the world. It is the eternal hope for peace on earth, good will to men.

"And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

An Answer to Ole Miss Chaplain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that public attention is presently focused on the high crime rate in the District of Columbia and the recent race riot at District of Columbia Stadium, I feel that the following newspaper article written by able columnist Tom Ethridge, of the Clarion Ledger, merits your reading and consideration. The Clarion Ledger is published at Jackson, Miss., and this article apeared in his column titled "Mississippi Notebook" on January 9, 1963. I find it to be most appropriate and timely:

MISSISSIPPI NOTEBOOK

(By Tom Ethridge)

AN ANSWER TO OLE MISS CHAPLAIN

Our text today is based on the following letter which appeared in this newspaper's "Voice of the People" yesterday, January 8:

"DEAR EDITOR: The people of Mississippi have been shamed by the presence of soldiers in our midst sent to keep the peace.

"Our politicians hope to win votes by loudly denouncing the Army's presence. Even Ole Miss officialdom has now joined in the popular hue and cry.

"Yet not a single one of these leaders has offered to guarantee that peace and order will be maintained if the troops are withdrawn.

"Sincerely,

"The Reverend WOFFORD K. SMITH,
"Episcopal Chaplain,
"University of Mississippi."

Well now, must a State or city be occupied by Federal troops simply because it cannot provide ironclad guarantees against violence or unpleasantness? If so, Federal troops should occupy every big city in America, including Washington.

Why should our State be expected to guarantee absolute protection for agitators and troublemakers, some seeking to provoke friction—when the President and Congress are not able to guarantee protection for citizens in our Nation's Capital?

Washington, as everyone knows, has become a jungle of violence and terror. Many of its streets are not safe, even in broad daylight.

The official bulletin of the U.S. Supreme Court recently warned women workers to take full advantage of the police escort service provided for them by police, due to numerous sex crimes on Washington streets—some within the very shadow of the Capitol and Supreme Court Building.

POLICE UNABLE TO STOP RACE RIOTS

If any place on earth is to be a model of law and order, it should be the Nation's capital city, but the opposite is true. Washington has one of the worst crime records of any metropolis in the world. By comparison, the African Congo is a safer place to work, visit, and live.

A race riot broke out in Washington this past Thanksgiving Day, after a white team defeated a colored team for the city high school championship. Of the 50,000 spectators, two-thirds were colored.

Negroes mobbed white men, women and children indiscriminately. This wild disorder was the fourth that has marked such championship games in the last 5 years.

As a result, the District of Columbia Board voted to deny use of the Muncipal Stadium for future city title games.

The Right Reverend John S. Spence, director of education for the archdiocese of Washington, has suspended participation of Catholic high school teams, not only in championship football games but also in championship basketball games with the city's public high schools whose student bodies are fast becoming all colored.

Even the city's "liberal" press has gone along with this unprecedented action.

Why? Simply because the Washington police and Federal Government cannot guarantee protection for players and spectators.

Over 200 policemen were on duty at the stadium but a police official said the rioting could not have been prevented if there had been 2,000 officers on hand.

NEW YORK CAN'T PROTECT ITS MAYOR

New York City is another notorious hotspot of crime and violence. Despite its large and efficient police force, protection cannot be guaranteed for the citizenry. In fact, vicious street gangs often mob officers on their beats. Students are robbed, raped, and beaten on the campus and even in the halls of Columbia University, the neighborhood of which is a criminal's paradise.

Many New York churches no longer hold night services, because the streets are unsafe for Christian people.

New York can't even protect its own mayor from roving gangs of human packwolves.

Not long ago, dedication ceremonies were scheduled at a new housing project on West 94th Street, Mayor Robert Wagner was slated to officiate.

The ceremony was canceled. Why? The reason, as given by the New York Times, was that police could not guarantee either the mayor's safety or the safety of other dignitaries invited to attend.

This, mind you, in broad daylight, in the middle of the biggest city of a nation which claims to be a world leader and a model for other nations to follow.

The Federal Government, taking cognizance of this ugly situation, has assigned 80 members of the Peace Corps to work among the Negroes and colored Puerto Rican imports causing the trouble in that crime-ridden neighborhood. The liberal New York Times ventured this angry comment:

"How many more such reminders does this city's administration need to develop a sense of outrage? Our parks are a no man's land after dusk; muggings throughout the city are common. Is it the hope of city hall that, if things get bad enough, we will eventually qualify for grants under the Alliance for Progress?"

Big cities of progressive States have become crime jungles but no such horrible conditions exist here in peaceful law-abiding Mississippi. The FBI's latest annual crime report showed Mississippi's crime rate was less than half the national average and the fourth lowest crime rate in the entire United States.

Thus, the Federal troops allegedly upholding law and order in Mississippi are needed more badly in America's metropolitan areas where vicious and pampered minorities wage a steadily worsening reign of terror. By comparison, Mississippi is a model of law and order.

President Kennedy's First 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as everyone is interested in accertaining how knowledgeable journalists have evaluated the first 2 years of President Kennedy's administration, I wish to invite my colleagues' attention to an illuminating article written by Mr. Thomas O'Neill, a brilliant columnist of a regular feature of the Baltimore Sun, "Politics and People." This particular article, entitled "After 2 Years," appeared in that highly respected news-

paper on January 16, 1963, and contains this very significant sentence:

As the legislative rebuffs accumulated, the popularity polls disclosed Mr. Kennedy winning public support surpassing that given General Eisenhower, who is customarily described as the most popular of modern Presidents.

The entire article is as follows:

POLITICS AND PEOPLE

(By Thomas O'Neill)

AFTER 2 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy arrives midway in his first elective White House tenancy high in the favor of his countrymen, with whom rests the question of an extension of his lease for a further 4 years, and encouraged by a wisp of congeniality in a previously stiff and indifferent Congress. Quite plainly, the Chief Executive has grown on the Nation since it entrusted him with a grudging and barely visible mandate 2 years ago.

The most persuasive explanation that appears is that the vigorous young President reflects in person and performance the mood of the times, concerned but confident.

In retrospect, the first 2 Kennedy years were a get-acquainted period during which the country learned a lot that had been largely unguessed about the all but total stranger to whom it turned in preference to a better known opponent on election day, 1960.

Surprises have been apparent at frequent intervals as the familiarization between public and President took its course. A Democratic President who is also an economic conservative, for example, was provided for in few of the abundant postelection scripts undertaking to predict the course of the new administration, especially in those sketched by romantics anticipating a return to the heady days of their youth in the early New Deal. Left similarly dismayed were those in the opposition who misread the Kennedy career to mean that he was a purely political animal and were undone when their bellicose shafts aroused no strenuous partisanship at the White House and the President, bent on leading a united nation in a difficult time, steadfastly abstained from what he himself calls highly charged political positions.

Mr. Kennedy adhered to his chosen course, which can now be recognized as innate, while a disdainful Congress, whose Members generally had run better at the polls than the President, denied him even the customary Presidential honeymoon. His proposals were scuttled mercilessly by a Congress more negative than any of those that had confronted his predecessor.

At this stage a revealing phenomenon appeared. As the legislative rebuffs accumulated, the popularity polls disclosed Mr. Kennedy winning public support surpassing that given General Eisenhower, who is customarily described as the most popular of modern Presidents.

Some degree of support in such soundings goes to any President simply because he is the President. Beyond that, the test is the popular appraisal of the Presidential manner and character. Here Mr. Kennedy scored high. Surely it was more than coincidence that concurrently the President was quietly demonstrating that he had no taste for repining or for self-excuses when things went wrong, either on Capitol Hill or at the Bay of Pigs. He neither sulks nor rants, and accepts that buckpassing ends at the President's desk.

Victories, when they occur, have been accepted with corresponding restraint.

Roger Blough learned last April that the President can be a dangerous adversary when aroused, but he was spared Presidential crowing when Big Steel pulled in its horns. The expected criticism was raised in the expected places at the time—Mr. Kennedy lost four points on Dr. Gallup's popularity thermometer—but the rest of the populace applauded, recognizing a doublecross when it saw one.

Nor was there any flamboyance when Mr. Kennedy brought off the premier triumph of the cold war, the facing down of Khrushchev over the Cuban missiles. Restraint and understatement are habitual to the urbane and patrician President. A smile of contentment playing about the Kennedy lips when the Russian retreat is the topic offers the only evidence that anything out of the ordinary has occurred.

Mr. Kennedy presents a knotty problem for his political opposition, principally by his firm preemption of the political center. It is plain in the awkward readjustment occupying his presumptive 1964 challenger, Governor Rockefeller, as the New Yorker studiously moves in a direction designed to please Senator GOLDWATER. The Rockefeller campaign for 1964 has begun—his pronouncements in New York are now conscientiously distributed in advance to the national political writers in the Washington press corps—and obviously he regards the Republican nomination as worth the effort.

Most opinion is that, in the absence of calamitous events in the remainder of his present term, Mr. Kennedy is assured of reelection. A dissenter from this view, along with Governor Rockefeller, is the President himself.

At his leaky Palm Beach background session with correspondents the President talked of second-term prospects and was pointedly bearish. Except for Franklin D. Roosevelt, he observed, Democratic Presidents since the Civil War have faced rough going as second-term candidates—Cleveland, defeated (he then ran a third time, and won); Wilson and Truman barely successful.

President Kennedy's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this was my first experience as a new Member of Congress to hear the President deliver in person his state of the Union message to the Congress and the people of the United States. It was not only a most exhilarating but also a most sobering experience.

I could not help but think, as I sat and listened to our Chief Executive, that here was a man who is very serious minded, who has deep understanding of our Nation's problems, and who possesses the leadership and the ability to cope with these problems in this very crucial period in world history.

The program he presented to Congress today is a sensible one. I am in agreement with most of the proposals contained in that program, because they are in the best interests of the American people. I am very much encouraged by the President's assurance that "we have every reason to believe that our tide's running strong."

I believe the President deserves the full support of the people. I shall do all I can to help in the enactment of his program.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of the Republic of Latvia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and statement received by me from Mr. Sigurds Rudzitis, president of the Latvian Association in Detroit, in observance of the 44th anniversary of the Republic of Latvia, which has, since its founding, to the sorrow of all freemen, lost its independence and liberty and been dragged behind the Iron Curtain.

The letter and statement follow:

LATVIAN ASSOCIATION IN DETROIT,
HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.,
November 24, 1962.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find a copy of a statement issued by the Latvian-American of Metropolitan Detroit commemorating the 44th anniversary of the Independence of Latvia.

Any assistance that you can give to carry out the spirit of this statement will be deeply appreciated by the Latvians in the United States and Latvia.

Very truly yours,

SIGURDS RUDZITIS,
President.

STATEMENT

The Latvian-Americans of Metropolitan Detroit, assembled at the Detroit Institute of Arts, 5200 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on 18th day of November 1962, to commemorate the 44th anniversary of independence of the Republic of Latvia, unanimously agreed to issue the following statement:

"1. As we pause today to observe the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia, we again thank the U.S. Government for refusing to recognize the forcible seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. We urge that this policy be continued.

"2. As Latvians, who witnessed the Communist brutality of Soviet occupation of our country, we know the true meaning of communism. With this thought in mind we heartily endorse President Kennedy's action in Cuba as a step toward what we hope is the eventual liberation of enslaved peoples. We hope for equal firmness in other threatened areas, such as Berlin and southeast Asia.

"3. We urge all Americans to stand behind the Government in a courageous reaffirmation of America's leadership in the struggle against tyranny. We urge that the leaders of the other free world powers recognize that the threat posed by international com-

munism is as dangerous to them as to the United States.

"4. Blinded by cries of 'colonialism' many neutral nations have failed to distinguish between Western traditions of freedom and Communist propaganda. The mistake in this attitude is demonstrated in Communist China's invasion of India. We hope this lesson will not be lost on the new African and Asian states.

"5. If there are to be any negotiations with the Soviet Union, the free world should constantly remind the Communists and neutral states of their opposition to the subjugation of the Baltic States and press for their liberation. There can be no peace in the world unless the principle of self-determination is applied universally for the small states as well as the large.

"6. We request the U.S. Government to bring the question of Latvia and other Baltic States to the attention of the United Nations and to take whatever other steps it may consider appropriate to reestablish freedom and independence of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, which were destroyed by the criminal acts of the Soviet Union.

"7. Despite 22 years of Communist persecution, the continued deportations, attempted extinction of the church and the people's national heritage, the Latvians still proudly hold their head high and look to the day they will be free again. They see the United States their only hope. This country must not fail them.

"8. This statement is the expression of the entire Latvian-American community of Metropolitan Detroit and this assemblage directs that copies of this statement be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, Senators and Congressmen from Michigan, Governor of the State of Michigan and mayor of the city of Detroit."

Done in Detroit, Mich., this 18th day of November A.D. 1962.

Castro Fooled Nearly Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William R. Mathews has written an editorial on the advent of Castroism in Cuba. Since Mr. Mathews is one of the few people who interviewed Castro before he assumed power, this editorial is one which will be of interest to all the Members.

The editorial follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Nov. 16, 1962]

CASTRO FOOLED NEARLY EVERYONE

(By William R. Mathews)

When President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico, told James Reston, of the New York Times, in a recent interview, that blunders made by the United States pushed Castro into the Communist camp, he spoke an alibi that is most popular in Latin America.

This is a subject on which I can speak in the first person, because I was one of a small group that interviewed Castro in a home near Havana on February 28, 1959, 2 months after he assumed power. None of us knew that Castro had a Communist background, and that he had participated as a rebel in the Bogota incident of 1948. Jules Du Bois, of the Chicago Tribune, insisted he was not a Communist.

My first alarm about Castro began when, after winning power, he instituted a program of terror and extermination that reflected pure Stalin Communist tactics. Stalinism might be defined as the maintenance of power by the deliberate extermination of all persons who can be suspected of opposition.

That program was just getting under way, when we interviewed Castro. He is a man of powerful physical and intellectual character. To us he was the soul of reason. All he wanted to do, he pleaded, was to establish an honest democratic government, and make many vested interests pay their back taxes. There would have to be agrarian reform, but that program would be worked out with respect to all who owned land. He wanted to break up only the big estates.

He was most plausible, except for one slip that he made, which did not impress any of us at the time. He spoke bitterly about how the United States had intervened needlessly in the freeing of Cuba in 1898. His hand should have been called by me and others right then, but we were gracious and sympathetic to his general program.

So were most of the Cubans. They saw him as the leader of a government that would restore full civil liberties and eliminate the corruption of the Batista regime. Castro won his most effective support from the middle class, which had been growing steadily in strength and influence. His revolt was not an agrarian or workers' rebellion. Cuba at that time had one of the highest standards of living in the whole Latin-American world. It was these people whom we saw about him as his assistants and public champions.

I wrote favorably about him, despite the increasing terror he instituted. My previous visit in Cuba was in 1956, when the country was thriving, and a high degree of freedom prevailed. We went all through the great Cabana fortress and prison, in which there was not a soul. When news came that it was being filled with prisoners by Castro, it sounded an alarm.

When Castro went to Washington and spoke before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, my question to him was the last one in a long session. It was, "What is your attitude toward the future and present investments of American capital?" Immediately he shot back, "We will treat American capital fairly; we need more captial to make our revolution a success."

On the other hand, the White House and Department of State remained aloof, because they knew of Castro's record, and the records of some of his new assistants. Washington could get no assurance from him that would justify either economic or political help. Washington acted wisely. The United States would have been a plain sucker to have given him aid which he would use promptly to transform and strengthen his obviously growing Communist society. The terror was intensified. Those fine men—and women—who had supported him soon found they had to flee for their lives, or suffer imprisonment and death.

Can this record by the United States be called one that pushed Castro into the Communist camp? Rather it represents an overly patient and correct attitude.

President Lopez Mateos blames the American press for the wide publicity Castro received before he won power. The New York Times did start the ball rolling with the interview and picture of its correspondent, Herbert Matthews, in Castro's hiding place in Cuba. Other papers, radio, TV and magazines chimed in. Castro seemed like a benevolent Robin Hood, while Batista was the cruel bad man. The Department of State continued its hands-off policy of noninterference in a Latin-American rebellion, which at that time was considered quite correct by the people of the country.

But the Mexican papers and radio chimed in, also. Throughout Latin America, Castro won initially warm sympathy. He was a modern David who had slain a modern Goliath. Not until Castro actually confessed his communism publicly, did these admirers change their tune.

Official Mexico didn't change until the October revelation of offensive missiles being installed and prepared to fire on the United States.

The irony of this whole matter is that if the United States had announced public support of Batista, Castro would have been squelched. He would not have won the support of the middle class, who saw in him the promise of a free, honest democratic government. But, if the Eisenhower administration had done that, it quickly would have been called upon by Congress to account for such an unpopular policy.

At that particular time, most Americans were living in the dreamland that confidently assumed that all people everywhere were capable of democratic—parliamentary—self-government. That the Kennedy administration, shortly after it came into power, tried to achieve that very thing in Africa, confirms how deep seated that belief was.

It will be many, many years before Cuba can develop among its people the ability and morality to accomplish that difficult task of restoring democratic, parliamentary government.

The Origins of a Human Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the December 1962 edition of the National Jewish Monthly.

This article reminds us of the facts of this human tragedy: That the Arabs are refugees because their own leaders insisted that they leave their homes. The passage of years should not obscure this and it should not be ignored in attempting to reach an early solution to the problem.

The article follows:

THE ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM: HOW IT ALL BEGAN

(By Edward E. Grusd)

The origin of the Arab refugee problem, which plays so large a part in the tension between Israel and the Arab States, has become obscured in recent years by both the passage of time and the intensification of the cold war in so many other parts of the world. But the problem itself remains; its solution has been blocked by the Arab States, which continue to use it to keep the pot boiling against Israel, while their victims languish in refugee camps. However, there is a growing disposition on the part of influential figures and governments to reach a just solution, and the subject is once more being debated on the floor of the United Nations.

It is now 15 years since the first of the refugees fled from Israel, and their original number—about a half million—has grown considerably in two ways: through births,

and the failure of the Arab host countries to report large numbers of deaths. Dr. John H. Davis, Commissioner-General of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, in a recent report to the U.N. General Assembly, admitted there were at least 100,000 dead on the UNRWA relief rolls. Their ration cards are not turned in, as they should be, but are used unlawfully to enrich those Arab functionaries who control them. In addition, many Arabs from neighboring countries have infiltrated the camps, preferring public support there to unemployment at home.

During the past 15 years, Israel and its Arab neighbors have traded arguments and demands on the refugee issue. But the public memory is short, and the origins of the problem have become either forgotten or distorted. We feel it will be useful to refresh that memory with a summary of facts.

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations voted overwhelmingly to partition Palestine into two states—one Arab, one Jewish. But the Arab States rejected the vote and declared they would resist it with force. The Jews of Palestine, although disappointed at the area allotted to them, accepted the U.N. decision, and began to prepare for statehood.

Many people today, their memories dulled by time, may think that nothing further happened until May 14, 1948, when Israel officially proclaimed its independence, and that immediately thereafter the armies of five Arab States attacked Israel and the Palestine Arabs began to flee. It did not happen that way.

Egypt, Jordan, and other Arab States made armed incursions into Palestine and used internal subversion there long before May 14. At the same time, the Arab Higher Committee applied utmost pressure upon the Palestine Arabs to leave the country temporarily until Arab armies could conquer it. This pressure was not only in the form of persuasion and promises of loot, but also in the form of threats and violent terrorism: Arabs who remained in the Jewish State were called traitors to the Arab cause, and were warned they would be treated accordingly by the Arab Higher Committee, which was headed by the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, who had helped the Nazis during World War II.

On the other hand, immediately after the U.N. partition decision, the leaders of Israel-to-be strongly urged Palestine Arabs to remain as peaceful citizens, promising them protection and security in a Jewish state. This was done by Haganah in all Arab villages and by Histadrut in the cities where Arab workers lived.

But the first thing that happened after November 29, 1947, was the mass departure of some 30,000 wealthy Arabs, organized by the Arab higher committee. They can hardly be called refugees; they responded to organized pressure, took their property, and moved to neighboring Arab countries. Tens of thousands of propertyless Arabs then began to leave as the Arab higher committee flooded their press and radio with warnings that there was going to be a war, and that all Arabs who remained in Palestine would be considered traitors. Thus, even before Israel officially proclaimed its statehood, vast numbers of Arabs—estimated at close to 200,000—fled the country.

After Independence Day, May 14, 1948, this movement increased, because the armies of five Arab States actually crossed the borders into the new state and the war was on officially. Arab military commanders and political leaders again sternly warned Palestine's Arabs to leave so as not to be destroyed by the invading armies. They assured the refugees they could soon return, since the Arab armies would sweep the Jews into the Mediterranean and then the emigres could come back and divide all the Jewish property among themselves.

This is not "Israel propaganda." Al Hoda, a Lebanese newspaper in New York, 3 years later published an article quoting the secretary general of the Arab League as having assured Palestine's Arabs in 1948 that the Arab armies were "already on the frontiers and that all the millions the Jews had spent on land and economic development would be easy booty, for it would be a simple matter to throw the Jews into the Mediterranean." The newspaper added: "Brotherly advice was given to the Arabs of Palestine to leave their land, homes, and property and stay temporarily in neighboring, fraternal states, lest the guns of the invading Arab armies mow them down."

About the same time, the Beirut Moslem weekly, Kul-Shay, in an extraordinary confession, declared: "Who brought the Palestinians to Lebanon as refugees * * * in dire straits and penniless, after they lost their honor? The Arab States, and Lebanon amongst them, did it."

One of the refugees himself, Mahmoud Seif ed-Din Irani, writing in 1956, also confessed: "We left the country of our own free will, believing we were going on a short visit, a trip, and soon we would return as if nothing had happened." Nimer Al-Hawari, ex-commander of the Palestine Arab Youth Organization, wrote: "We shall smash the country with our guns. * * * The Arabs should conduct their wives and children to safety until the fighting has died down."

BRITISH CONFIRM THE FACTS

During the fighting, Haganah seized a number of British files. One of them, a British district police report in Haifa, dated April 26, 1948 (3 weeks before Israel independence) declared: "Every effort is being made by the Jews to persuade the Arab populace to stay and carry on with their normal lives, and to be assured that their lives and interests will be safe."

There are many documented expressions like these. Yet to this day the Arab contention is that it was the Jews who terrorized the Palestine Arabs and forced them to flee and who are therefore responsible for the tragedy. But in spite of all the Arab pressures, about 160,000 Palestine Arabs remained in the new Jewish state, and their number has now grown to 220,000 through natural increase and the reunion of separated families, which Israel has permitted. There are several Arab representatives in Israel's Parliament.

Altogether, 587,000 Arabs fled from Palestine, and became refugees, mostly in Lebanon, the Gaza strip and in the part of Jordan west of the Jordan River. During the same period, almost as many Jewish refugees (476,000) from Arab countries came into Israel, which welcomed them and integrated them, at a stunning economic cost, since practically all the newcomers had to leave their property behind. In effect, therefore, there was a kind of exchange of Jewish and Arab populations.

It is not the purpose of this brief survey to examine the fate and future of the Arab refugees, or to decribe their misery and despair (as well as their often gratifying U.N.-aided progress) or to go into the arguments and counter-arguments between Israel and the Arab nations on the subject. Its purpose is solely to set forth, as factually as documentary evidence permits, the origin of the problem.

However, the U.N. has wrestled with that problem for 15 years and has still not found a solution. The Arab States have done little to help their refugee brethren, who have been supported in the camps by a U.N. fund, with a large portion of the millions of dollars contributed by the United States. The Arab leaders demand that Israel take back all the refugees and restore their property to them. Israel answers that it is ready to discuss the refugee problem as part of a general peace settlement (it must be remembered that the Arab States still proclaim themselves formally at war with Israel).

Israel has already paid out a huge sum to individual refugees in compensation for deserted property, and has permitted many of them to return in the case of split families. But Israel has said it cannot permit hundreds of thousands of Arabs to pour into the country—especially after they have absorbed 15 years of the bitterest kind of anti-Israel indoctrination. Israel has also pointed out that it consists of 8,000 densely populated square miles as against nearly 3 million sparsely populated and underdeveloped square miles of Arab lands; that the refugees would be bewildered strangers in the new Israel of today whereas they share the language, religion, and customs of the Arab States; that the U.N. and many individual countries stand ready to appropriate large sums for big-scale rehabilitation and development projects in Arab nations which would not only make the refugees self-supporting but also enrich the host countries.

To all of which the present Arab rulers adamantly repeat the Israel drove the refugees out, and must take them all back.

And so the problem remains on the world's agenda.

Effects of Imports of Zipper Tape on American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter sent to me by Mr. J. K. Benfield, of the Sullivan-Southern, Inc., Narrow Fabrics Manufacturing Co., York, S.C., which will supplement my remarks of January 10. This is just another example of what is happening to the textile industry in this country:

SULLIVAN-SOUTHERN, INC.,
York, S.C., January 9, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: You are familiar with the difficulties we have had and are having regarding the importation of zipper tape from Japan by U.S. companies. We in the zipper tape manufacturing of narrow fabrics became aware in 1960 that the Japanese were increasing shipments of this item into this country by a great percentage each year, starting in 1959.

In 1958, imports of Japanese zipper tape in this country were 171,000 pounds. In 1959, imports were 274,000 pounds, and in 1960, imports were 319,000 pounds. Since 319,000 pounds is approximately 10 percent of the total zipper tape sales in this country, we became alarmed, and in December 1960, we obtained samples of the Japanese tape to check for quality, thinking that it might be substandard. It was not.

During the early and middle part of 1961, we tracked down information regarding increased imports, which we felt must surely be increasing, since we were advised by some of our customers that our prices were out of line. Further customer resistance to our prices has increased to this present day. For instance, a standard construction in zipper tape is 42 ends 30/2 K.P. and 40 picks 20/2

K.P. Our cost to make this in natural is $8.18 per thousand yards. The Japanese price, delivered in New York, all customs and other costs paid, is $6.76 per thousand, or a difference of $1.42 per thousand. I have had people in Washington tell me that we would have to get more modern machinery, or adopt more economical methods of manufacturing. Let me say that we have the most modern machinery in the world, and our operation is very efficient. The difference in price lies in cotton at 8½ cents per pound cheaper than we can buy it, and in labor that is 25 cents per hour against our $1.50 per hour.

Since we did feel the increase in Japanese zipper tape imports, and since there was no way to compete pricewise with their cheap cotton and labor costs, we in this industry thought it would be the first line of approach to go to the U.S. Tariff Commission and ask them to raise the duty on zipper tapes to a point where our selling prices with the Japanese tape would be somewhat equal. After all, zipper tape is a component part of a zipper—the zipper cannot be made without the tape. It was at this time that we received a rude awakening about the intricacies of government.

We made an appointment with Mr. Donn H. Bent, Secretary, U.S. Tariff Commission for February 27, 1962. By this time, we knew that the Japanese were flooding the U.S. market with zipper tape. We later learned that in November and December 1961, alone, the Japanese shipped 282,564 pounds to this country. That was more than the entire year 1960.

We arrived for this appointment with Mr. Bent and found that he was away. However, he had made proper arrangements for us to have a conference with Mr. Roland L. Lee and other gentlemen of the Commission. These gentlemen were very nice but told us that they could do nothing. Although zipper tape is a component part of a zipper, it is also listed as "chief value cotton with fast edges not over 12 inches wide." This had a rate of duty of 17½ percent, whereas a component part would be 40 percent to 50 percent as interpreted. It seems that Tariff Commission chooses to call zipper tape the item calling for 17½ duty. This was amazing to me as a country boy being more familiar with an actuality rather than an interpretation of a section of the tariff regulation. At that time, our first thought was to ask Congress to correct this mistake, but felt that this would be a minor business to Congress, however major it was and is to us.

At the suggestion of Mr. Lee, we asked for and got an appointment at the Commerce Department with Mr. Jackson Spears, who had with him Mr. Thomas McMullen, of Commerce. Remember at this time, we were being flooded with Japanese tape and we could find no way to turn.

Arthur Hutchinson of J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., and I talked with Mr. Spears on 27 February, 1962, and after what I consider a waste of time in a further discussion, Mr. Spears advised he would "look into the matter." I felt at that time exactly like an innocent man who was sentenced to die for murder, was sitting in the electric chair with the current ready to be applied, yelling for all he was worth that he didn't do it and nobody would believe him. Nobody believed us at this time and the hour of reckoning had passed, although we were not sure of it at that time.

We waited for Mr. Spears to look into the situation, but had no reply. On March, 1962, you replied that you contacted Mr. Spears, who told you that he would get the information. On April 5, 1962, having heard nothing, I again wrote to you asking what were the results from Mr. Spears. He still had given no information. On April 18, 1962, with the situation getting worse by the week, I again wrote to you asking what information Mr. Spears had given. Still no information from Mr. Spears.

It was then that we asked you to set up another appointment at Commerce Department and from your arrangements and those of Honorable Hugh Alexander, Arthur Hutchinson, Garner Bagnal from Statesville Narrow Fabrics, Statesville, N.C., a competitor, you two Congressmen and writer went to see Mr. Jefferson Davis of Commerce Department. This was on May 22, 1962. Mr. McMullen, previously mentioned, was also at this meeting.

This was another meeting that looked to me as if we had to start the entire procedure over, for we seemed to be getting nowhere. Mr. Davis and Mr. McMullen were very kind and courteous but did not seem to have proper power for what we needed—a restraint on Japanese tape under the then existing bilateral agreement with Japan. We couldn't find the proper party or parties to put into effect a restraint of a product that was ruining an industry.

It was then that you suggested going to Department of State and on May 22, we met with Mr. Michael Blumenthal and Mr. Stanley Nehmer of Department of State. It was then, as you recall, that Mr. Blumenthal advised that they would indeed consult with the Japanese Government regarding a restraint on zipper tape, and in a letter of June 2, 1962, Mr. Blumenthal advised you that consultation between the two Governments on the zipper tape question had begun on May 31, 1962. At this consultation, the Japanese Government was requested to hold exports during consultation at the level of, or 110 percent of, the exports of zipper tape during the period May 1961 to April 1962.

The results of this consultation would be a setting of a level for exports from Japan for 1962. To this date, I do not know what has been agreed, however, we are now under the long-term cotton textile agreement. The Japanese shipped to us 822,727 pounds of tape during the period mentioned above, i.e., May 1961 to April 1962. This meant that 110 percent of this would be 905,000 pounds that could be shipped to this country by the Japanese in 1962 calendar year. I wrote to you on July 31, 1962, that this amount was ridiculous and would hurt us badly in the industry in this country. It has. We have been on slow time for some 4 months and other manufacturers have been on slow time and/or sold part of their production to other types of tape users. I also advised you then that the quota was approximately 30 percent of all the sales zipper tape used in this country and asked if there were not some way to reduce the amount coming in to 10 percent of usage, or 300,000 pounds per year, which would be fair to the Japanese and we could live with, even with the difficulty with their cheap prices. I don't know what can be done about this, but there is somebody somewhere who can make this right. I obviously haven't been in contact with that person. I still believe that a country as great and as good as ours is, will not let an industry die needlessly. Some way, and it must be soon, we must correct this situation.

You see, all the time we told these people what was happening, nothing happened until too late, as far as zipper tape is concerned.

Now something else has happened and this must be corrected at once. When the Japanese were restrained at the too-high export quota, they were not satisfied and more and more tape is now coming into this country from Japan as zipper chain. To make zipper chain, one takes tape, sews a cord on either side of one edge, then by a special machine, metal elements are attached to the cord and tape, and this is called a zipper stringer. Two stringers joined together make zipper chain. A zipper, as we know it, can be made by taking this chain, cutting it to length desired and attaching to this length a bottom stop, slider, and top stop. You see, then, this chain coming in is a way to bypass the tape quota, for chain is not restrained as of this date and the duty is only 19 percent, whereas a component part of a zipper is 50-percent of duty.

Chain is the most valuable component part of a zipper, but by someone's interpretation, zipper chain is classed as a metal product, but with chief value not being metal. The Japanese have been smart on this, for if chief value were metal, it would be 50-percent duty. This takes us back to the point where Tariff Commission does not classify zipper tape as a component part of a zipper; however, it is and a zipper cannot be made without it.

With our industry seriously damaged by the high tape quota, which is approximately 30 percent of U.S. sales zipper tape, the Japanese are now sending in zipper chain. We first noted this as a sample lot of 280,000 yards of chain in May 1962; 280,000 yards of chain contains 560,000 yards of zipper tape or approximately 3,500 pounds of tape. This sample must have proven satisfactory, for in August 1962 it started on the same course that tape had followed 4 years earlier, only with the chain they will build it up faster so that if and when a quota is put on, the quota will be very high, as in tape. Let me reemphasize that the chain coming in that contains tape is just adding insult to injury up and above the extremely high tape quota.

From August 1962 to December 31, 1962, we have records of one company in the United States receiving 102,900 pounds of chain, as against nothing in prior years and only a small amount in May 1962.

This 102,900 pounds of chain, most of it in late 1962, is 3,430,000 yards and it contains 6,860,000 yards of tape. This tape would weigh 42,867 pounds, plus 13,720 pounds of cotton cord. This, you see, is in addition to the quota on tape and if chain would continue to come in at this rate that it is now coming, it would include 195,000 pounds of tape, plus 62,400 pounds of cotton cord. This item does not even have a quota and in addition to pushing our zipper tape industry further in the grave, it also hurts the man in this country who makes metal for teeth on the zipper, the man who makes the yarn for the cord, the man who makes the cord, the man who puts the metal teeth on the cord and tape, the dye house that would dye the tape, and other auxiliary industries.

This is bad enough. But again, let me remind you that we are on the same path as on zipper tape. I have learned from reliable sources that just one U.S. customer expects to import this chain at the rate of 2 million yards per month beginning July 1963 and 4 million yards per month beginning January 1964; 2 million yards of chain per month is 4 million yards or 25,000 pounds per month of tape as well as 8,000 pounds of cord. This is at the rate of 300,000 pounds of tape per year. This again would be in addition to the zipper tape quota. If the imports rise to 4 million yards of chain per month as expected, this would be 8 million yards or 50,000 pounds of tape per month plus 16,000 pounds of cord per month. In tape per year on the chain, this woud be 60,000 pounds. Add any of these figures of tape on chain to the tape quota and you can readily see that within 12 months the Japanese will have 50 percent of the U.S. sales tape. Of course, we in the zipper tape industry will be bankrupt or have to go out of business before then, as well as cord manufacturers and zipper tape dyers.

The zipper tape division of the narrow fabric industry is not expendable. Now we

and the failure of the Arab host countries to report large numbers of deaths. Dr. John H. Davis, Commissioner-General of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, in a recent report to the U.N. General Assembly, admitted there were at least 100,000 dead on the UNRWA relief rolls. Their ration cards are not turned in, as they should be, but are used unlawfully to enrich those Arab functionaries who control them. In addition, many Arabs from neighboring countries have infiltrated the camps, preferring public support there to unemployment at home.

During the past 15 years, Israel and its Arab neighbors have traded arguments and demands on the refugee issue. But the public memory is short, and the origins of the problem have become either forgotten or distorted. We feel it will be useful to refresh that memory with a summary of facts.

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations voted overwhelmingly to partition Palestine into two states—one Arab, one Jewish. But the Arab States rejected the vote and declared they would resist it with force. The Jews of Palestine, although disappointed at the area allotted to them, accepted the U.N. decision, and began to prepare for statehood.

Many people today, their memories dulled by time, may think that nothing further happened until May 14, 1948, when Israel officially proclaimed its independence, and that immediately thereafter the armies of five Arab States attacked Israel and the Palestine Arabs began to flee. It did not happen that way.

Egypt, Jordan, and other Arab States made armed incursions into Palestine and used internal subversion there long before May 14. At the same time, the Arab Higher Committee applied utmost pressure upon the Palestine Arabs to leave the country temporarily until Arab armies could conquer it. This pressure was not only in the form of persuasion and promises of loot, but also in the form of threats and violent terrorism: Arabs who remained in the Jewish State were called traitors to the Arab cause, and were warned they would be treated accordingly by the Arab Higher Committee, which was headed by the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, who had helped the Nazis during World War II.

On the other hand, immediately after the U.N. partition decision, the leaders of Israel-to-be strongly urged Palestine Arabs to remain as peaceful citizens, promising them protection and security in a Jewish state. This was done by Haganah in all Arab villages and by Histadrut in the cities where Arab workers lived.

But the first thing that happened after November 29, 1947, was the mass departure of some 30,000 wealthy Arabs, organized by the Arab higher committee. They can hardly be called refugees; they responded to organized pressure, took their property, and moved to neighboring Arab countries. Tens of thousands of propertyless Arabs then began to leave as the Arab higher committee flooded their press and radio with warnings that there was going to be a war, and that all Arabs who remained in Palestine would be considered traitors. Thus, even before Israel officially proclaimed its statehood, vast numbers of Arabs—estimated at close to 200,000—fled the country.

After Independence Day, May 14, 1948, this movement increased, because the armies of five Arab States actually crossed the borders into the new state and the war was on officially. Arab military commanders and political leaders again sternly warned Palestine's Arabs to leave so as not to be destroyed by the invading armies. They assured the refugees they could soon return, since the Arab armies would sweep the Jews into the Mediterranean and then the emigres could come back and divide all the Jewish property among themselves.

This is not "Israel propaganda." Al Hoda, a Lebanese newspaper in New York, 3 years later published an article quoting the secretary general of the Arab League as having assured Palestine's Arabs in 1948 that the Arab armies were "already on the frontiers and that all the millions the Jews had spent on land and economic development would be easy booty, for it would be a simple matter to throw the Jews into the Mediterranean." The newspaper added: "Brotherly advice was given to the Arabs of Palestine to leave their land, homes, and property and stay temporarily in neighboring, fraternal states, lest the guns of the invading Arab armies mow them down."

About the same time, the Beirut Moslem weekly, Kul-Shay, in an extraordinary confession, declared: "Who brought the Palestinians to Lebanon as refugees * * * in dire straits and penniless, after they lost their honor? The Arab States, and Lebanon amongst them, did it."

One of the refugees himself, Mahmoud Seif ed-Din Irani, writing in 1956, also confessed: "We left the country of our own free will, believing we were going on a short visit, a trip, and soon we would return as if nothing had happened." Nimer Al-Hawari, ex-commander of the Palestine Arab Youth Organization, wrote: "We shall smash the country with our guns. * * * The Arabs should conduct their wives and children to safety until the fighting has died down."

BRITISH CONFIRM THE FACTS

During the fighting, Haganah seized a number of British files. One of them, a British district police report in Haifa, dated April 26, 1948 (3 weeks before Israel independence) declared: "Every effort is being made by the Jews to persuade the Arab populace to stay and carry on with their normal lives, and to be assured that their lives and interests will be safe."

There are many documented expressions like these. Yet to this day the Arab contention is that it was the Jews who terrorized the Palestine Arabs and forced them to flee and who are therefore responsible for the tragedy. But in spite of all the Arab pressures, about 160,000 Palestine Arabs remained in the new Jewish state, and their number has now grown to 220,000 through natural increase and the reunion of separated families, which Israel has permitted. There are several Arab representatives in Israel's Parliament.

Altogether, 587,000 Arabs fled from Palestine, and became refugees, mostly in Lebanon, the Gaza strip and in the part of Jordan west of the Jordan River. During the same period, almost as many Jewish refugees (476,000) from Arab countries came into Israel, which welcomed them and integrated them, at a stunning economic cost, since practically all the newcomers had to leave their property behind. In effect, therefore, there was a kind of exchange of Jewish and Arab populations.

It is not the purpose of this brief survey to examine the fate and future of the Arab refugees, or to decribe their misery and despair (as well as their often gratifying U.N.-aided progress) or to go into the arguments and counter-arguments between Israel and the Arab nations on the subject. Its purpose is solely to set forth, as factually as documentary evidence permits, the origin of the problem.

However, the U.N. has wrestled with that problem for 15 years and has still not found a solution. The Arab States have done little to help their refugee brethren, who have been supported in the camps by a U.N. fund, with a large portion of the millions of dollars contributed by the United States. The Arab leaders demand that Israel take back all the refugees and restore their property to them. Israel answers that it is ready to discuss the refugee problem as part of a general peace settlement (it must be remembered that the Arab States still proclaim themselves formally at war with Israel).

Israel has already paid out a huge sum to individual refugees in compensation for deserted property, and has permitted many of them to return in the case of split families. But Israel has said it cannot permit hundreds of thousands of Arabs to pour into the country—especially after they have absorbed 15 years of the bitterest kind of anti-Israel indoctrination. Israel has also pointed out that it consists of 8,000 densely populated square miles as against nearly 3 million sparsely populated and underdeveloped square miles of Arab lands; that the refugees would be bewildered strangers in the new Israel of today whereas they share the language, religion, and customs of the Arab States; that the U.N. and many individual countries stand ready to appropriate large sums for big-scale rehabilitation and development projects in Arab nations which would not only make the refugees self-supporting but also enrich the host countries.

To all of which the present Arab rulers adamantly repeat the Israel drove the refugees out, and must take them all back.

And so the problem remains on the world's agenda.

Effects of Imports of Zipper Tape on American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter sent to me by Mr. J. K. Benfield, of the Sullivan-Southern, Inc., Narrow Fabrics Manufacturing Co., York, S.C., which will supplement my remarks of January 10. This is just another example of what is happening to the textile industry in this country:

SULLIVAN-SOUTHERN, INC.,
York, S.C., January 9, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: You are familiar with the difficulties we have had and are having regarding the importation of zipper tape from Japan by U.S. companies. We in the zipper tape manufacturing of narrow fabrics became aware in 1960 that the Japanese were increasing shipments of this item into this country by a great percentage each year, starting in 1959.

In 1958, imports of Japanese zipper tape in this country were 171,000 pounds. In 1959, imports were 274,000 pounds, and in 1960, imports were 319,000 pounds. Since 319,000 pounds is approximately 10 percent of the total zipper tape sales in this country, we became alarmed, and in December 1960, we obtained samples of the Japanese tape to check for quality, thinking that it might be substandard. It was not.

During the early and middle part of 1961, we tracked down information regarding increased imports, which we felt must surely be increasing, since we were advised by some of our customers that our prices were out of line. Further customer resistance to our prices has increased to this present day. For instance, a standard construction in zipper tape is 42 ends 30/2 K.P. and 40 picks 20/2

K.P. Our cost to make this in natural is $8.18 per thousand yards. The Japanese price, delivered in New York, all customs and other costs paid, is $6.76 per thousand, or a difference of $1.42 per thousand. I have had people in Washington tell me that we would have to get more modern machinery, or adopt more economical methods of manufacturing. Let me say that we have the most modern machinery in the world, and our operation is very efficient. The difference in price lies in cotton at 8½ cents per pound cheaper than we can buy it, and in labor that is 25 cents per hour against our $1.50 per hour.

Since we did feel the increase in Japanese zipper tape imports, and since there was no way to compete pricewise with their cheap cotton and labor costs, we in this industry thought it would be the first line of approach to go to the U.S. Tariff Commission and ask them to raise the duty on zipper tapes to a point where our selling prices with the Japanese tape would be somewhat equal. After all, zipper tape is a component part of a zipper—the zipper cannot be made without the tape. It was at this time that we received a rude awakening about the intricacies of government.

We made an appointment with Mr. Donn H. Bent, Secretary, U.S. Tariff Commission for February 27, 1962. By this time, we knew that the Japanese were flooding the U.S. market with zipper tape. We later learned that in November and December 1961, alone, the Japanese shipped 282,564 pounds to this country. That was more than the entire year 1960.

We arrived for this appointment with Mr. Bent and found that he was away. However, he had made proper arrangements for us to have a conference with Mr. Roland L. Lee and other gentlemen of the Commission. These gentlemen were very nice but told us that they could do nothing. Although zipper tape is a component part of a zipper, it is also listed as "chief value cotton with fast edges not over 12 inches wide." This had a rate of duty of 17½ percent, whereas a component part would be 40 percent to 50 percent as interpreted. It seems that Tariff Commission chooses to call zipper tape the item calling for 17½ duty. This was amazing to me as a country boy being more familiar with an actuality rather than an interpretation of a section of the tariff regulation. At that time, our first thought was to ask Congress to correct this mistake, but felt that this would be a minor business to Congress, however major it was and is to us.

At the suggestion of Mr. Lee, we asked for and got an appointment at the Commerce Department with Mr. Jackson Spears, who had with him Mr. Thomas McMullen, of Commerce. Remember at this time, we were being flooded with Japanese tape and we could find no way to turn.

Arthur Hutchinson of J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., and I talked with Mr. Spears on 27 February, 1962, and after what I consider a waste of time in a further discussion, Mr. Spears advised he would "look into the matter." I felt at that time exactly like an innocent man who was sentenced to die for murder, was sitting in the electric chair with the current ready to be applied, yelling for all he was worth that he didn't do it and nobody would believe him. Nobody believed us at this time and the hour of reckoning had passed, although we were not sure of it at that time.

We waited for Mr. Spears to look into the situation, but had no reply. On March, 1962, you replied that you contacted Mr. Spears, who told you that he would get the information. On April 5, 1962, having heard nothing, I again wrote to you asking what were the results from Mr. Spears. He still had given no information. On April 18, 1962, with the situation getting worse by the week, I again wrote to you asking what information Mr. Spears had given. Still no information from Mr. Spears.

It was then that we asked you to set up another appointment at Commerce Department and from your arrangements and those of Honorable Hugh Alexander, Arthur Hutchinson, Garner Bagnal from Statesville Narrow Fabrics, Statesville, N.C., a competitor, you two Congressmen and writer went to see Mr. Jefferson Davis of Commerce Department. This was on May 22, 1962. Mr. McMullen, previously mentioned, was also at this meeting.

This was another meeting that looked to me as if we had to start the entire procedure over, for we seemed to be getting nowhere. Mr. Davis and Mr. McMullen were very kind and courteous but did not seem to have proper power for what we needed—a restraint on Japanese tape under the then existing bilateral agreement with Japan. We couldn't find the proper party or parties to put into effect a restraint of a product that was ruining an industry.

It was then that you suggested going to Department of State and on May 22, we met with Mr. Michael Blumenthal and Mr. Stanley Nehmer of Department of State. It was then, as you recall, that Mr. Blumenthal advised that they would indeed consult with the Japanese Government regarding a restraint on zipper tape, and in a letter of June 2, 1962, Mr. Blumenthal advised you that consultation between the two Governments on the zipper tape question had begun on May 31, 1962. At this consultation, the Japanese Government was requested to hold exports during consultation at the level of, or 110 percent of, the exports of zipper tape during the period May 1961 to April 1962.

The results of this consultation would be a setting of a level for exports from Japan for 1962. To this date, I do not know what has been agreed, however, we are now under the long-term cotton textile agreement. The Japanese shipped to us 822,727 pounds of tape during the period mentioned above, i.e., May 1961 to April 1962. This meant that 110 percent of this would be 905,000 pounds that could be shipped to this country by the Japanese in 1962 calendar year. I wrote to you on July 31, 1962, that this amount was ridiculous and would hurt us badly in the industry in this country. It has. We have been on slow time for some 4 months and other manufacturers have been on slow time and/or sold part of their production to other types of tape users. I also advised you then that the quota was approximately 30 percent of all the sales zipper tape used in this country and asked if there were not some way to reduce the amount coming in to 10 percent of usage, or 300,000 pounds per year, which would be fair to the Japanese and we could live with, even with the difficulty with their cheap prices. I don't know what can be done about this, but there is somebody somewhere who can make this right. I obviously haven't been in contact with that person. I still believe that a country as great and as good as ours is, will not let an industry die needlessly. Some way, and it must be soon, we must correct this situation.

You see, all the time we told these people what was happening, nothing happened until too late, as far as zipper tape is concerned.

Now something else has happened and this must be corrected at once. When the Japanese were restrained at the too-high export quota, they were not satisfied and more and more tape is now coming into this country from Japan as zipper chain. To make zipper chain, one takes tape, sews a cord on either side of one edge, then by a special machine, metal elements are attached to the cord and tape, and this is called a zipper stringer. Two stringers joined together make zipper chain. A zipper, as we know it, can be made by taking this chain, cutting it to length desired and attaching to this length a bottom stop, slider, and top stop. You see, then, this chain coming in is a way to bypass the tape quota, for chain is not restrained as of this date and the duty is only 19 percent, whereas a component part of a zipper is 50-percent of duty.

Chain is the most valuable component part of a zipper, but by someone's interpretation, zipper chain is classed as a metal product, but with chief value not being metal. The Japanese have been smart on this, for if chief value were metal, it would be 50-percent duty. This takes us back to the point where Tariff Commission does not classify zipper tape as a component part of a zipper; however, it is and a zipper cannot be made without it.

With our industry seriously damaged by the high tape quota, which is approximately 30 percent of U.S. sales zipper tape, the Japanese are now sending in zipper chain. We first noted this as a sample lot of 280,000 yards of chain in May 1962; 280,000 yards of chain contains 560,000 yards of zipper tape or approximately 3,500 pounds of tape. This sample must have proven satisfactory, for in August 1962 it started on the same course that tape had followed 4 years earlier, only with the chain they will build it up faster so that if and when a quota is put on, the quota will be very high, as in tape. Let me reemphasize that the chain coming in that contains tape is just adding insult to injury up and above the extremely high tape quota.

From August 1962 to December 31, 1962, we have records of one company in the United States receiving 102,900 pounds of chain, as against nothing in prior years and only a small amount in May 1962.

This 102,900 pounds of chain, most of it in late 1962, is 3,430,000 yards and it contains 6,860,000 yards of tape. This tape would weigh 42,867 pounds, plus 13,720 pounds of cotton cord. This, you see, is in addition to the quota on tape and if chain would continue to come in at this rate that it is now coming, it would include 195,000 pounds of tape, plus 62,400 pounds of cotton cord. This item does not even have a quota and in addition to pushing our zipper tape industry further in the grave, it also hurts the man in this country who makes metal for teeth on the zipper, the man who makes the yarn for the cord, the man who makes the cord, the man who puts the metal teeth on the cord and tape, the dye house that would dye the tape, and other auxiliary industries.

This is bad enough. But again, let me remind you that we are on the same path as on zipper tape. I have learned from reliable sources that just one U.S. customer expects to import this chain at the rate of 2 million yards per month beginning July 1963 and 4 million yards per month beginning January 1964; 2 million yards of chain per month is 4 million yards or 25,000 pounds per month of tape as well as 8,000 pounds of cord. This is at the rate of 300,000 pounds of tape per year. This again would be in addition to the zipper tape quota. If the imports rise to 4 million yards of chain per month as expected, this would be 8 million yards or 50,000 pounds of tape per month plus 16,000 pounds of cord per month. In tape per year on the chain, this woud be 60,000 pounds. Add any of these figures of tape on chain to the tape quota and you can readily see that within 12 months the Japanese will have 50 percent of the U.S. sales tape. Of course, we in the zipper tape industry will be bankrupt or have to go out of business before then, as well as cord manufacturers and zipper tape dyers.

The zipper tape division of the narrow fabric industry is not expendable. Now we

are making the tapes for zippers for all military and Government uniforms, as well as all the special tapes for special zippers for the space agencies. In times of national emergency, we make all types of necessary webbings and tapes for our Government, as we did in World Wars I and II, and in the Korean war. In World War II, our company was 100 percent on webbings and tapes for our Government. Should this import situation with the Japanese continue, you know that we will not be available if needed again because the industry will not exist.

Please understand that this matter is of utmost urgency and time is very, very limited. If we have to go through the same procedure on chain as we did on tape, we will be out of business before the end of this year.

I recommend as an immediate measure to restrain the Japanese at once on zipper chain exports under the long-term cotton agreement since zipper chain is in chief weight cotton and this can be done at once under the long-term agreement. This must be immediate and no evasion of the question as last time. By immediate, I mean within 10 days at the latest.

After that, we must do two things:

1. Classify zipper chain as a component part of a zipper at 50-perecnt duty, where it should be in the first place.

2. Reduce the Japanese quota on zipper tape from the present approximately 900,000 pounds per year to a reasonable 300,000 pounds per year (10 percent of U.S. sales zipper tape), and if this is not possible due to law or agreement, then we must have zipper tape properly classified as a component part of a zipper at a higher tariff to protect our zipper tape industry in the United States.

I hope that I have made it clear what has gone on, what is going on, and what must happen if we wish to save this U.S. industry. I shall expect you to make appointments for representatives of our industry to meet with the proper parties in Washington in the immediate future. I shall anxiously await your advice.

Kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN K. BENFIELD, Jr.

Resolution, Charles Trumbull Hayden Chapter, DAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Charles Trumbull Hayden chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Tempe, Ariz. The resolution follows:

Whereas the U.S. State Department has been and is continuing to support in every manner, including financially the unmerciful, unwarranted action of the United Nations against the anti-Communist, freedom-loving government of Moise Tshombe, of Katanga.

Therefore, by resolution, passed unanimously, on January 7, 1963, the members of the Charles Trumbull Hayden chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Tempe, Ariz., request that a complete investigation of this action be demanded by the U.S. Congress, and those persons in our Government responsible for this action, regardless of their status or high position, be removed from their positions of influence. This wanton action is in complete violation of that which all true Americans hold inviolate, Freedom for all, and in addition is illegal under the terms of the United Nations Charter; be it further

Resolved, That because of this illegal action of the United Nations, the United States is justified in withdrawing its membership and support from the United Nations, which since its inception has become a tool of the Communists and not the best hope of peace for the world as it was originally represented to be.

(MRS. E. J.) FLORENCE ROTH,
Regent, Charles Trumbull Hayden Chapter, DAR.

Cuban Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following speech delivered by Mrs. Harold B. Chait, president of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, on October 18, 1962:

SPEECH BY MRS. HAROLD B. CHAIT, PRESIDENT OF BALTIMORE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE FOR CUBAN FREEDOM, MONTHLY LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE TOWSON INNER WHEEL, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1962

Thomas Jefferson once said that an informed, alert American people were vital if our liberties and our Nation itself were to survive. That is why it is so desperately important that women like you, community leaders, thoughtful citizens, keep constantly aware of developments affecting our security. Our very survival hinges upon it. To paraphrase Clemenceau, America is much too important to be trusted blindly to bureaucrats.

Cuba is the most dramatic example of that danger—and I mean the Cuba of 4 years ago as well as the Cuba of today. Cuba is now a Soviet stronghold because in 1957 and 1958 there was a systematic campaign by powerful groups in and out of our Government to whitewash Fidel Castro from flaming Red to pale pink.

Ladies, I have seen documentation prepared as far back as 1948 citing Castro's Communist affiliations and citing specific acts he had performed in the services of communism. Long before Castro launched his revolution from Mexico, Robert C. Hill, our Ambassador to that country warned, bluntly, that Castro had surrounded himself with Communists and that Communist aid and direction was paramount in his movement.

Despite massive evidence compiled to prove unmistakably that Castro's revolution was a monstrous Red hoax, a combination of official policy and unofficial propaganda permitted the Marxist-Leninists to conquer Cuba. Few people realize the extent to which Florida was privileged sanctuary for Castro's forces during his revolution. I have heard former Castro gunrunners laughingly describe how they were sometimes given official escorts when they wheeled Castro's munitions through the streets of Miami. The FBI was forbidden to intervene against the swarms of illegal Castro agents openly operating throughout the United States.

Today, I might add, some of those same erstwhile agents complain that it is more difficult to slip arms out of the United States—arms destined for Cuban freedom fighters—than it is to slip them in Red Cuba itself.

The question of how Castro came to power might seem ancient history—but for one strange fact. History seems to have an odd way of repeating itself regarding Cuba these past few years: We make the same mistakes again and again. The same people are trying to impose the mantle of silence and acquiescence which imposed communsim on Cuba in the first place.

Did you realize, for instance, that the massive Soviet buildup in Cuba—now getting so much publicity—actually began many months ago? And for many months it was systematically swathed in silence by the people charged with guiding our struggle for survival. Do you realize that the arrival of those shiploads of munitions and troops was common knowledge in Cuban exile circles in Miami long before they were known to the American people? Do you realize that exile spokesmen who attempted to alert the American people were threatened by U.S. agents? They were told to keep silence or else. And do you realize that it was those same exile spokesmen who, refusing to bow to threats, finally succeeded in piercing that curtain of silence and alerting the American people to what was going on 90 miles from their country? It would appear that we are dependent on those Cuban exiles for knowledge of what is happening along our southern flank. It is significant that as late as August 30 the State Department was still dogedly insisting that it had no knowledge of Russian troops in Cuba—and that the new arrivals were merely agricultural and industrial technicians.

From these repeatedly compounded errors have sprung new fallacies. The most misleading is that Cuba confronts us with only two alternatives: Do nothing or face nuclear war. Cuban freedom fighters are said to be too disunited to accomplish anything. To fill the gap between the two main poles a third view is now being leaked in Washington: That is that our intelligence services have the capacity to vastly increase secret anti-Castro operations inside Cuba. Let us examine this situation more closely.

The great weakness of both the U.S. services and the Cuban liberation movement is the Bay of Pigs debacle in April 1961. Not only was it a crushing defeat for the cause of Cuban freedom—it was also the beginning of a disastrous new policy orientation toward Cuba. Responsible officials panicked and began to act along lines unrelated to reality. The end result was that Washington in practice reversed its sponsorship of Cuban liberation and systematically torpedoed exile-underground operations against Castro.

One of the more fascinating aspects of CIA operations in Cuba is its method of supplying arms and ammunition to Cuban liberation groups. Time and again, CIA cutters make their dash to Cuba and deliver such items as .45-caliber Thompson submachineguns and .30-caliber ammunition. On other occasions, CIA provides the patriots with .57-millimeter recoilless rifles and .75-millimeter rounds. One boat will run to Oriente Province with C-4 explosives; the needed detonators will be landed 700 miles to the west in Pinar del Rio Province.

This sort of thing, done consistently, used to baffle the anti-Castro freedom fighters to the point of hysteria. But eventually, CIA's reasoning became clear. The policy of deliberately separating weapons from ammunition and explosives from their fuses serves two purposes: (1) The munition will be stockpiled until a given signal, at which time

the underground will unite and wed bomb to fuse, rifle to bullet, and (2) until then, the munitions can't be used.

Trouble is, the shattered Cuban underground is in no shape to coordinate with anything or anybody. Where the clandestine fighters survive at all it is as a tiny, isolated fragment. It was, in fact, this insistence on coordination that really destroyed the Cuban underground. Maintaining secret liaison between a swarm of underground groups and between those groups and abroad is always a desperately risky business. In Cuba, it proved fatal.

From my own limited contact with the CIA, I would say that the Florida agents are perfectly well aware that the present system of arms delivery is nonsensical. However, it is also plain that this policy is primarily political. The agency is under orders to restrain Cuban freedom fighters at any cost—hence all the deactivated munitions. On the other hand, the CIA is charged with gathering intelligence, keeping underground groups alive—barely—and be in a position to renew major operations should the word ever be passed.

But by so doing, the CIA is bankrupting its potential for the future. Some Cuban commandos, who man the boats, wonder out loud if their bosses aren't slightly mad. Other crewmen are resigning, claiming that they are being asked to risk their lives in order to keep up a pretence that something is being done. They suspect, as one exile leader said, that all the CIA activity is designed to keep the exiles occupied and entertained.

"I made more than 20 trips," a former commando told me, "but it finally got to the point that we were delivering fuseless bombs to people we didn't know, who didn't know us, and didn't know what to do with what we gave them. I decided it was time to quit."

The fact is the 400,000 Cuban exiles and their underground supporters are quite capable of freeing their island on their own. They need only a minimum of moral and material encouragement from Washington—plus protection from interference by certain U.S. officials and agencies. If anything, the arrival of foreign Communist troops—hated by even pro-Castro Cubans—has served to actually increase chances of triggering a mass upheaval. Cuban freedom fighters are aware of this. They are determined that neither Washington nor Moscow shall have the last word in deciding Cuba's fate. They are shifting their bases from Florida to a number of points in the Caribbean. Certain Caribbean governments are now quietly extending aid and facilities to those freedom fighters—despite the opposition of the State Department. Attacks against Cuba and against ships supplying Red Cuba can be expected not only to continue but to actually expand in scope and intensity. Nor can the United States be held responsible for those acts. Who can declare war on underground freedom fighters and exiles scattered through 20 nations?

Now for the question of Cuban disunity, so often advanced as an argument for shrugging off the potential power of the Cuban liberation movement. Ladies, I can tell you that much of what has been said about Cuban disunity is mostly nonsense. Superficially, yes, there is disunity. There is squabbling between so-called exile leaders. But the vast majority of Cuban freedom fighters are fed up with the powerless exile politicians and their bickering. The issue of "batistiano" and "ex-fidelista" means far less to them than it apparently does to American reporters and officials. I have visited guerrilla training camps in Florida. I have seen young men who had lost relatives and friends to Castro firing squads. I have seen those young men training alongside other youths who had served on those same firing squads. Neither of the two now care about past issues or allegiances. They scorn those who talk of postwar plans and shadow cabinets. These men have one purpose, one burning desire: they want to fight. They want to free Cuba.

Ladies, I suggest to you that there is great power which could be unleashed against Soviet Cuba. I also suggest that unless that power is freed from its shackles that Communist power radiating from Cuba will eventually crumble the weak and trembling governments of other Caribbean states. The future of Central America now hangs in the balance. Haiti and the Dominican Republic are in mortal danger. Venezuela is convulsed by Castro Communist subversion. Even great Brazil is being shaken to its foundations by Cuba-based subversion.

The facts bear out the contention of many thoughtful Latins that the Alliance for Progress program is no answer to this massive subversive offensive. Do you realize, for instance, that more capital has already fled Venezuela for New York and Switzerland than all the Alliance for Progress aid that is to be allocated to that country for the next 10 years? In far less than 10 years, at the present rate of deterioration, there will be no Alliance and no free Venezuela.

But the implications of Cuban liberation extend far beyond this hemisphere. It has been said, for instance, that the day the West initiates successful political warfare operations in a Communist-captured land is the day the cold war will shift in our favor. To put it another way, if and when the West successfully implements a strategy of victory which does not require nuclear weapons, it is then that the global balance of power will tip to the West.

We now have that opportunity in Cuba. Remote from the Eurasian land mass, Cuba is the Achilles' heel of communism. Victory in Cuba might well trigger a chain reaction of liberation throughout the Communist world. The power potential to free Cuba by political warfare exists. It remains for us to resolve that freemen have the right to fight against alien imperialism and oppression. Their fight is ours. With all my heart, I urge you to support the Cuban freedom fighters in their great struggle. Thank you.

More Than a Doorkeeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, a new Member of this House is awed and humble and grateful for the friendly word of counsel and the helping hand. He learns early to appreciate the generous guidance of the Doorkeeper.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an informal sketch of this valued aid and Mississippi gentleman, William M. Miller, as seen by The Rambler of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star in its issue of January 7, 1963, as follows:

THE RAMBLER FINDS FISHBAIT

(By John McKelway)

One of the great characters in the world today is a man named William M. Miller.

He is 53, a skilled politician, a round man who weighs about 200 pounds. He is the superintendent of a Sunday school at a Baptist church in Arlington, a successful trashman, a Democrat, the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, and a native of a place called Pascagoula, Miss.

He can move fast, in spurts, at speeds approaching 10 miles an hour. His legs appear to be rather rubbery but the upper part of his body remains steady in flight. He always knows exactly where he is going.

His hair is coal black and parted in the middle. His face is moon shaped and friendly.

One of his chores is to announce the arrival of distinguished visitors in the Chamber of the House such as the President of the United States or the President of Pakistan. He does this magnificently after a struggle to pull in his stomach and puff out his chest. In a ringing cry, from the Deep South, he says, "Mistah Speakaaah, the President of——"

Yet he has never been known by any name other than "Fishbait."

This started in 1933 when he arrived on the Hill with Representative COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi. Mr. COLMER introduced Fishbait as "Fishbait" to the young man's boss in the House Post Office.

Before that, in Pascagoula, he had been called a variety of other names because at the age of 15 he weighed only 75 pounds, having been smitten in childhood by a collection of illnesses (which probably toughened him up for the rough-and-tumble of the House). In those days, he was called "Alligatorbait," "Shrimpbait," "Garbait," and "Crabbait."

Fishbait once received a letter from Pascagoula from a constituent of Mr. COLMER's. It was addressed only to "Fishbait, Washington, D.C." The letterwriter could not think of his Representative's name. He remembered Fishbait and so did the local post office.

As Doorkeeper, Fishbait commands around 300 employees on a payroll of $1.3 million. His domain includes all the other doormen, the pages while on the floor, the Document Room, the Folding Room, two cloakroom snackbars, three barbershops, and, in his words, "six ladies' retiring rooms."

It is also his responsibility to station a man outside the Prayer Room of the Capitol to prevent any interruption if it is occupied by a Member of Congress.

He also runs a trash collection service. Under his supervision, since 1956, 13 million pounds of wastepaper on the House side of the Capitol has been picked up and baled and sold. A total of $92,000 has been returned to the Treasury and President Kennedy recently told Fishbait it was the sort of thing he liked to see.

Ol' Fishbait, he sharp. His is an elected office. Within a week, a newly elected Congressman gets a letter from Fishbait. Fishbait announces he is ready to serve him in any way. He signs his letters, "Yours for Service."

Since the election, he has been memorizing the names of the 67 new Congressmen. He has a picture of each pasted in a notebook. Within 2 or 3 hours after the start of the first session on Wednesday, he says he will have every name and face cold.

He tells new Members where to sit, how to get the floor, how to get something printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He knows everything that's going on.

He was first elected Doorkeeper in the 81st Congress by the Democratic majority. He was minority Doorkeeper in the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, and then got his old job back which he's held ever since. He's up for reelection tomorrow, by the Democratic caucus. Fishbait is unopposed.

"A good Congressman," says Fishbait, "has got to work at his mail, be on time, do his committee work, get to the floor in time for the opening prayer.

"You find out about people in the House. And they don't fool the people back home."

Or Fishbait.

Philosophy of Democrats Lights Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) News of November 24, 1962, which speaks for itself.

The article by Mr. Ralph McGill is perhaps one of the clearest and most concise statements of why the people of this country return again and again to support the Democratic Party.

The article follows:

PHILOSOPHY OF DEMOCRATS LIGHTS WAY

(By Ralph McGill)

Driving up from Alabama, and cutting across to Warm Springs, Ga., one sees the relics of a South that was—the one which stirred Franklin D. Roosevelt to anger and to action in behalf of a depressed people, whose cotton economy was ended.

There are the lonely chimneys in the fields. Once a tenant or sharecropper house was there. There are still old shacks, cabins and barns, dilapidated, vine-grown, windowless, weather-stained, and broken.

The faded men and women in faded denim, the children who played in the swept yard or picked cotton and chopped weeds, are a part of a past unknown to today's generation.

There was no tenure. There was a surplus of croppers and tenants. They were, with few exceptions, ruthlessly exploited by landlords and stores.

In the Cotton South's depression years that began with the boll weevil in the 1920's, these persons were a cloud of witnesses testifying that for many thousands of Americans the misery, squalor, and hopelessness of the human condition was as bad in the rural slums as in the cities.

They witnessed, too, another fact. The country was so lost in fear and grief, so bedeviled was it with unemployment and the tears of the thousands whose farms and homes were sold because mortgages went unpaid, that there was no mechanism by which the Nation could help human beings in trouble. And to many it seemed no one cared.

They walked the roads—husband, wife, children. They piled their pitiful goods on a mule-drawn wagon—a stained and dirty mattress, sagging springs, a few old quilts, a pot-bellied stove, a straight chair or so and moved on, hungry, holloweyed and defeated. (John Steinbeck wrote about their midwestern counterparts in "The Grapes of Wrath.")

Today, as one drives the roads one sees the remaining evidences of a time that was—the shacks, barns, chimneys—and the new, prefab houses dotting the edges of fields where once cotton grew and the mules and croppers moved.

One notes, too, the electric wires that run to the farmhouses and the bright new prefabs of those who work in town, but have enough land for a pig, some chickens, a garden.

There is always the electric wiring, the TV aerials, the washing machines on the front porch, the pump in the well. (To the young generation "the ole days" are those that existed before TV.) To young executives in their late twenties and thirties, the depression years are something that dad or granddad talks about.

It was in the simple, plainly beautiful cottage at Warm Springs that Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the REA bill—the Rural Eelectrification Act. The signing took place in the cheerful little combination living room. The date was May 11, 1935.

Roosevelt had become interested in electric power when he paid the cottage bills. They were about four times the rates charged in New York. He saw that none of the farms on the roads he drove had electric power.

He thought of installing a small generator at a suitable place on a nearby stream. The site was under lease—but unused. A sort of rage grew in his mind. When it cooled he set into motion the forces which drew the REA Act and made it law.

In that year 1 farm in 10 in the United States had electric power. And in the South there were large areas where no farm at all had lights. The ratio was roughly one in a hundred.

There are men today who are Democrats because they remember the day "the lights were turned on."

There are older men and women who, when the city demagogs rant and rave about the Kennedys, the Trumans, the Roosevelts, quietly and patiently vote the Democratic ticket because they recall when the pump went in a well, when running water came to the kitchen, when a man could sit at night before his fire and read his Bible or his newspaper.

There are those today who say, glibly, that there really is very little difference between the two parties. Superficially this is true.

But there is a constant thread of philosophy that pushed through REA—and the forces of greed were not easily displaced.

It is the philosophy which brought about the Soil Conservation Act, the conservation legislation, the TVA, which established a power yardstick, made fertilizer available, and provided progress in a long valley dying of floods and erosion.

It is the philosophy which guaranteed savings accounts, made farm- and home-owning credit plentiful—the story runs on.

One thinks of this—remembering the depression years—riding through REA-F.D.R country.

Bulwark of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the Ontario, Calif., Daily Report of January 3, 1963, commenting on a recent statement by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in the FBI bulletin with regard to the role of law enforcement today and containing the always timely warning of the threat of communism to the security of the United States:

BULWARK OF FREEDOM

"Communism remains a constant threat to world peace and a threat to the priceless heritage of freedom."

These observations are made by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the January issue of the FBI Bulletin. And observations by Director Hoover merit the close attention of every citizen of the United States.

Most of Mr. Hoover's statement in the Bulletin is in regard to the role of law enforcement in times of crises.

"The year 1963 dawns on a deeply troubled world," Mr. Hoover writes. Communism jeopardizes world peace and the posterity of mankind. Communists continue to push forward aggressively in many areas seeking new lands to rule and additional people to regiment.

Man—the fallible being that he is—now holds in his hands a destructive force of such great potential that its very existence poses the question of whether or not mankind is to have a future. It is no wonder that people everywhere fear the worst, knowing as they do that a militant force dedicated to world rule possesses such destructive power.

In this country, Americans are justifiably alarmed at the ever-present threat of communism to the priceless heritage of our great land. They view with grave concern the tactics of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to undermine our system of justice. They recognize the imminent danger of communism's encroachment, and they deplore the dogma of Communist dictators to rule all men and all nations.

In times of peril, the rallying strength of our country stems from its democratic safeguards. Our faith and trust are anchored in the God-inspired hallmarks of Americanism—truth, liberty, and justice. From these ideals springs the determination to protect and preserve our way of life from tyrants near and far. From these ideals comes the will of a united, free, and righteous people to stand firm against godless despotism.

Law and order are bulwarks of freedom. Law enforcement must relentlessly promote the perpetual existence of this honored axiom. In this new year, we must labor with unswerving devotion and we must be firm and resolute in the face of adversity. Let us keep fully appraised of our country's needs and fully informed as to our individual and collective responsibilities.

International tension should not for a moment divert our attention from vigorous and effective law enforcement. Not only must we shoulder additional burdens or hardships, but we must also be sure the operations of criminals and lawbreakers are detected and the perpetrators apprehended. There can be no breakdown in the respect for law.

In the past, law enforcement has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to serve our Nation above and beyond the call of duty. In the fight against crime and subversion, we cannot afford to do less.

Let all officers resolve to make this a distinctive year in the annals of law enforcement. Let no community of our land become a haven for enemies of society. Rather, let 1963 come to be known as the year in which this Nation made marked progress toward its goals of freedom, abundance, and equal justice for all.

No-Show Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1962 the Civil Aeronautics Board put into effect a program penalizing passengers who missed their plane connections. Under the no-show plan, passengers who failed to fulfill their reservations were fined from $5 to $40. As I have stated on several occasions,

this plan is loaded in favor of the airlines and is unfair to the traveling public.

I am happy to inform my colleagues that the no-show plan will expire on February 1 of this year. Although I commend the dropping of the passenger penalties by the airlines, it is indeed regrettable that the Civil Aeronautics Board did not end the fines at the end of the original 6-month experimental period. It is significant to note that most airlines found the passenger ill will with the plan worse than the no-show problem itself.

The sole benefit to come out of this notable experiment was the fact that much of the reservation problems of the airlines were found to stem from the internal practices of the airlines themselves. A recent Wall Street Journal account estimated that 90 percent of the no-show problem was caused by the airlines, not the passengers. I urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue to investigate this problem.

It is a warning signal that this plan which hurt the individual passenger was dropped only after pressures exerted on the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is charged with protecting the public interest, by the airlines who understandably are interested in the private interests of their owners and shareholders.

The Futility of a Third Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the editor appearing in the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register, which was written by Mr. Robert A. Geier, my former administrative assistant.

At a time when there is a great deal of talk about forming a third party, I believe this letter analyzes the futility of such a move:

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Anyone who heard me speak during the recent campaign knows that I believe in the conservative principles espoused by the proposed conservative party in California. Those who call these principles extreme are either seeking votes or other evidence of public approbation, or are ignorant of what made the United States the greatest nation on earth. And yet there are some who believe in America who are extreme, not in what they espouse but in the manner in which they defend it.

One may present facts and do it accurately, but if the conclusions reached on the basis of those facts are not logical, then the charge of extremism might be well justified and this then becomes harmful to the cause for which we fight.

It is true that both parties have promoted the welfare state, and without thinking in practical terms one might feel that the only solution is to form a third party. The argument is made that both the Republican and Democrat Parties were once third parties. However, the first and second parties at that time were not as well organized and as strong as they are today, and communications were extremely slow.

There is a difference between the parties' members. Republican Members of Congress, when they controlled the Congress in 1948, produced the largest budgetary surplus in U.S. history, $8.4 billion. Democrats, when they controlled Congress, ran up 93.4 percent of the national debt. Democrat Congresses approved deficit spending budgets or deficiency appropriations which resulted in deficits during 20 of the last 27 years.

There were of course some Republicans who voted for some of these spending sprees, just as there were some Democrats who voted against them, but the majority of Democrats by far voted for them and the great majority of Republicans voted against them.

The ratings given by the Americans for Constitutional Action prove without any doubt that Republicans in Congress are much more conservative than the Democrats.

To me this proves that there is a chance of conservatives taking over the Republican Party but only if we use our heads and quit fighting among ourselves.

The best way to win is to form a conservative group as is being done, but stay registered in the Republican Party and get the conservative Democrats to register in the Republican Party. And before anyone gets his mind closed, let me explain.

In the primary in 1962, liberal Republicans were nominated for some offices and then in the general election there was no choice for the voters. These liberal Republicans were nominated because too many conservative Democrats could not vote for a conservative in the primary and neither could conservative independents. In the congressional race, conservative Democrats had the chance to vote for Sam Campbell but the independent's didn't. And too few conservatives like Sam run for office on the Democrat ticket.

Now if all the conservatives join the third party and register therein, they will not be able to vote for either a conservative Democrat or a conservative Republican, and this will assure that a liberal will be nominated on both tickets.

Sure, I know that the conservatives can then nominate one of their own—but they can't elect him. So what's going to happen to Jimmy Utt, H. Allen Smith, Glen Lipscomb, and, if they run, Johnny Rousselot and Eck Hiestand? They will be defeated in the primary by liberals.

One might say that these conservative office holders should join the conservative party so that they can get the conservative votes in the primary. Now that would be rather foolish, wouldn't it? It would be a noble gesture but ineffective as far as having conservatives in office because in the general the liberals on the Democrat ticket would be opposed by a Republican and a conservative which would split the vote and enable the liberal Democrat to be elected.

On the other hand, the formation of a conservative group, all registered in the Republican Party, will give that group a tremendous amount of power—a real balance of power—to assure that conservatives are candidates and get nominated. Then they can all really get together and work to make them win in the general election.

It is only the primary that makes any difference as to registration. In the general any registered voter can vote for any candidate, but if the conservative isn't nominated, he surely can't win the general.

Freeman Forges Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the international thunderheads seem to be hiding the glow of the New Frontier dawn over agricultural trade with the Common Market.

A year ago today, the New Frontier cowboys were riding around the Nation telling the American people that if an unwilling Congress were only forced to turn the tariffmaking power over to the President, he would increase our exports many times over.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was telling the farmers that the Trade Expansion Act was necessary if the American farmer expected to increase his sales to the Common Market countries.

The New Frontiersmen, who have been able to sell their program of centralization of all legislative, executive, and judicial power in the hands of the President, sold this nefarious plan to the Nation and to the Congress. Now, less than 6 months later, we find them talking out of the other side of their mouths.

In his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee last year, the Secretary of Agriculture, on page 840 of the committee report, testified:

The potential for expanding foreign trade is of vital importance in the years ahead. It is especially apparent in Western Europe, particularly in the six countries of the Common Market. We have had a taste of what prosperity can do to our export sales in that area, and would like more of it. During the past 5 years, our sales of farm products to EEC countries have expanded 29 percent. In fiscal year, 1961, our agricultural exports to EEC came to $1.1 billion, which was about one-third of our total dollar exports.

Again, on page 842, the Secretary is reported as having testified, "From most of these commodities, which account for about 70 percent of our agricultural export trade to the community, we can expect our exports to expand in the years ahead."

On page 843, the Secretary, still attempting to sell the so-called Trade Expansion Act to the Congress, testified as follows:

The legislation before this committee would give us a splendid opportunity to do some swapping of concessions. But we must try to make certain that any swap with them includes assurance that reasonable terms of access will be provided for our agricultural products.

Later, he said:

Our ability to support these forces and to help direct the path of the Common Market trade policies in the liberal direction will depend to a large extent on the new authority of the proposed Trade Expansion Act.

Later, he said:

Furthermore, we have ample evidence that a liberal trade policy helps American farmers

to capitalize on their export market potential.

That, Mr. Speaker, was before the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, when they were putting the heat on Congress to pass the bill. Now, less than 6 months later, when they have their so-called liberal trade policy to help the American farmer to capitalize on his export market potential, what is this great exponent of freewheeling and free trade saying? I would like to quote to you from a speech he made at the annual meeting of Farm Cooperatives in Miami Beach, on January 8, 1963.

In that speech, he said:

The vital nature of our export trade in farm products causes us to be deeply concerned that protectionist tendencies are appearing today in the common agricultural policy of the European Common Market.

He said further:

Protective devices, adopted or proposed by the Common Market center, around the use of a varying levy fee are a serious threat to as much as $600 million in our annual agricultural exports to present and prospective members of the Common Market.

It must be just a little embarrassing to the great and wise planners of all political and economic programs, both nationally and internationally, to find that in less than 6 months, the bubble they painted as a gold nugget has blown up in their face. Instead of doubling our agricultural exports, as Mr. Freeman predicted 9 months ago, these exports for cash to the Common Market countries are actually being slashed in half, while the farmers of America are paying the price for another New Frontier experiment.

The thing the planners downtown cannot understand is that whenever a country wants to protect their industries or farmers they will do so without asking us. After it is too late our planners will probably discover that the people of these countries are not a bunch of Boy Scouts.

Order Out of Chaos in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Americans are seeking an understanding of events taking place in the Congo, the editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star has written a profound editorial, based on his personal observations in the Congo, worthy of the attention of all of us. The editorial follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 6, 1963]

AMERICA, THE CONGO, AND KATANGA

(By William R. Mathews)

Recently the Arizona Republic of Phoenix published an editorial headed, "America's Day of Infamy," in which it took to task our Washington administration for its official conduct in the Congo and Katanga.

It makes almost hysterical charges when it writes, "For the first time in our history the United States has deliberately set out to destroy the liberty and independence of another people.

"Without U.S. support and direction, this brutal destruction of the rights of the people of Katanga could never have occurred. We have abandoned our traditions and our principles. We have copied the Soviet Union's bloody action in Hungary by mounting and directing the same sort of a mercenary attack against the freely chosen Government of Katanga. This is the final abandonment of the ideals of our country to the expediency of the conscienceless United Nations."

These heated charges bring back memories of my brief stay in the Congo, including at Leopoldville and Elisabethville, in 1961. When our group of editors was there, the astoundingly beautiful and modern city of Leopoldville was policed by United Nations troops. At that time the Katanga issue was getting hotter, but the biggest danger came from Stanleyville, where a Communist sympathizer by the name of Gizenga held forth. It was impossible to go outside of Leopoldville save by plane. The American Embassy was trying its best to bring the warring factions together. We talked for an hour with President Kasavubu, and took a military briefing from General Motuba.

When we flew south we stopped at Elisabethville, where Tshombe maintained order. While we were there we saw Pan-American planes come in with troops from India to add to the U.N. forces.

It was quite evident that the former Belgian Congo was in chaos, and that the only force capable of maintaining order outside of Katanga was the United Nations force. It was also quite evident much of the prosperity of this former Belgian colony has its roots in the mineral wealth of Katanga. Unless the Congo included Katanga, with its superior leadership of whites and blacks, as well as its mineral revenue, the Congo would collapse into a state of anarchy, which would require the authority and funds of a great power to restore law and order.

The success of Katanga in maintaining law and order has been made possible not merely by its wealth, but by the good relations that always have existed there between the whites and the blacks. Tshombe could not be a success without the excellent advice he has received from the whites, who, in turn, have kept the mines operating.

Leopoldville, on the other hand, had endured a reign of terror deliberately precipitated by a tiny group of Belgian Communists, three of whom belonged to the Belgian Parliament. Most of the whites had fled from it and from other cities in the interior. It was quite evident that the blacks lacked the ability, prestige, and knowledge to run their government alone. The American Embassy was trying to fill the gap, while United Nations troops maintained order.

All of this American effort was indispensable, if the Congo was to be kept from going Communist. If it were not for the presence of American authority, supported by United Nations troops, some other great power would have had to step in the breach. The Soviet Union was ready and anxious to do the job. We broke the power of their stooge, Gizenga of Stanleyville. We furnished the money to pay the expenses of the United Nations troops, which have acted as an instrument of American power.

Evidently progress has been made. We Americans have been paying the bill. We have found out that we will have to continue to pay the bill, unless Katanga remains under the authority of the Leopoldville government, as it was before when Belgian authority was in power.

Katanga has no more right to secede from the Congo than Mississippi has from the United States of America; no more right than the South had the right to secede from the Union in 1861. The Leopoldville government has the right, indeed the duty, to see that Katanga does not secede. That cannot help involving the United States and the United Nations.

Unless a viable self-supporting nation is developed out of this Congo mess, the United States is the party that will have to pay the bill for its deficits and its chaos. If United Nations troops are not used, then American troops must be used. The minute we flunk out, the Communists will take over, because they will be the only authority to whom the black people of the Congo can look for help.

This is a matter of American self-interest. Things will not be changed by pulling out the crying towel and shedding tears over our mistaken policy of wrecking the empires of our allies. A situation, not a theory, confronts us. We have to make the best out of what has been a tragic mistake.

As to the shocking charges the Republic makes, the only thing true in them is that, after exhausting all peaceful means, we have, and should have, taken what measures are necessary to bring Katanga under the authority of the Léopoldville government. We have not abandoned the ideals of our country; we have not sought this brutal destruction of the rights of the people of Katanga. I repeat, if we had not used U.N. troops, we would have had to use American troops. The fact that President Kennedy has sent an American military mission there within the past 10 days gives some indication of that.

The casualties have been trival. No American principles have been violated. We might remember that when we took over the Philippines, we had to wage a long guerrilla war, before we could restore law and order, and finally make possible an independent government of the Phillipines. That is all we are trying to do in the former Belgian Congo. If we do not do it, someone else will; and that power will do as we are trying to do—keep rich Katanga within whatever government is established in Léopoldville.

U.S.S. "Maryland": Diplomatic Cruises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 29, 1962, I quoted a most interesting article by Harry W. Frantz of the United Press International, which described the 1922 centennial mission to Brazil headed by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes. The naval unit accompanying Secretary Hughes during his historic visit at Rio de Janeiro consisted of the U.S.S. *Maryland*, flagship, and the U.S.S. *Nevada*.

In a sequel to the story mentioned above, Mr. Frantz at Christmas 1962 tells of some of the subsequent cruises of the *Maryland*.

The news story follows:

U.S.S. "MARYLAND": DIPLOMATIC CRUISES

(By Harry W. Frantz)

In the 1920's, the battleship *Maryland*, flagship of the U.S. Fleet, made goodwill cruises

to South America which gave it a memorable importance in the evolution of inter-American relations.

The *Maryland* did the honors for the United States at the international naval review in Rio de Janeiro harbor in September 1922, on the occasion of the Brazilian centennial celebration.

A week later it carried Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes from Rio to New York, simultaneously making record speed tests of new electric turbine engines. A United States-Brazil naval agreement soon followed.

In December 1928 the *Maryland* took President-elect Herbert Hoover from San Pedro, Calif., to Valparaiso, Chile, on the Pacific leg of Hoover's goodwill tour of Central and South America.

During that voyage Lt. Comdr. Harry W. Hill, a gunnery officer, served as liaison to the 20 newsmen and 7 cameramen aboard. He edited a book logging the cruise to which each of the press party contributed chapters or photos.

This Christmas Adm. Harry W. Hill, now retired, has sent to his shipmates of 1928 an illustrated booklet about the battleship *Maryland* which revives memories of those long past events.

Although the booklet does not say so, Hill after the 1928 cruise gradually became one of the Navy's greatest experts in the evolution of amphibian warfare, and he was in the top echelon of naval commanders in decisive engagements at Tarawa, Iwo Jima, and other Pacific islands which wrested control of the Western Pacific from Japan.

He also served for a time as Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy, and was host to many Latin American naval visitors.

Hill recounts that an armored cruiser named for the State of Maryland was commissioned in 1905, renamed the *Frederick* (a Maryland city) in 1916, and served with the cruiser and transport service during World War I.

The battleship *Maryland*, which was to become well known in South American ports, was commissioned on July 21, 1921, served with outstanding distinction in the Pacific during World War II; was decommissioned in 1946, and scrapped in 1959.

The *Maryland's* length was 624 feet, beam 97½ feet, displacement 31,500 tons, speed 21 knots. Its armament was eight 16-inch, twelve 5-inch, and eight 5-inch antiaircraft guns.

Considered a masterpiece of advanced naval construction in its day, battleships of the *Maryland* type have become entirely obsolete since World War II.

Among the 20 newsmen who were shipmates of Hill and President-elect Hoover on the 1928 cruise to Valparaiso were some of the most distinguished writers in North American journalistic annals.

Preeminent, perhaps, were Edward Price Bell, of the Chicago Daily News, Will Irwin, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, William Phillip Simms, of the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, L. C. Speers, of the New York Times, and Mark Sullivan, of the New York Herald Tribune service.

Bell had probably interviewed more chiefs of state than any other newsman in the world, and had recently published "World Chancelleries."

Will Irwin was the star reporter, second to none, of World War I. He contributed to Hill's *Maryland* cruise book a story about the Neptune ceremonies at the equator which is probably the best documented account of King Neptune's court ever written.

Speers had already worked 18 years for the New York Times, and was famed for his coverage of the Teapot Dome and other oil scandals of the early twenties, and his reviews of United States-Mexican relations.

Simms had been the first U.S. correspondent accredited to British Army headquarters during World War I, manager of the United Press office in Paris, and a worldwide traveler on special news assignments.

Mark Sullivan is still remembered as the ablest political analyst of his time, and a writer of brilliant books on the political and social history of the United States.

Merl Lavoy of Pathe News, dean of the cameramen, had covered every European front in World War I, and before his disappearance in Africa a few years ago filmed innumerable scenic spots from Aconcagua to Mount McKinley, the Yangtze Gorge to the South African national parks.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 12, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS OPENS

In one of the most critical periods in the history of mankind the 88th Congress convened on Wednesday. Once again 435 elected Representatives of the people to the House of Representatives swore to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same." Within minutes of taking this oath the Members engaged in the first debate and vote testing our allegiance to the Constitution in letter and spirit—the administration-backed proposal to pack the Rules Committee. The resolution passed 235 for (207 Democrats, 28 Republicans) to 196 against (148 Republicans, 48 Democrats). I voted against the proposal because it violates the constitutional conception of the separation of powers. The President, in my opinion, exerted undue influence on Congress to get his way and he will now control the Rules Committee whose primary function is to determine the rules under which legislation is brought to the floor. Past history shows us that when the radical-liberals have had such control all the welfare state and social legislation is sent to the House under gag rules with debate strictly limited and all amendments prohibited. The Rules Committee cannot block legislation. House rules contain adequate provisions for bringing to the floor any measure the leadership wants to bring out.

Preceding the rules votes the House was organized and every Democratic Member voted for liberal leadership which insures that all important House committees will again be headed by the most liberal Members in Congress. Just to remind you what Democratic organization of the House means and for which every Democrat votes on this first vote, the key committees of Education and Labor, Judiciary, Government Operations, and Public Works, among others, will again be headed by chairmen who have 100-percent Americans for Democratic Action voting records.

Big battles ahead will concern tax legislation, medical aid under social security, raising the debt limit, Federal aid to education, and expanded Federal programs and control. The President will begin a series of messages on Monday with his state of the Union message. Most of the bills embracing the President's program will come before my Committee on Ways and Means, emphasizing again the importance of this powerful committee on which I represent the people of Dallas County.

TEXAS REPUBLICAN DELEGATION

The Texas Republican delegation in Congress, consisting of Senator JOHN TOWER, Congressman ED FOREMAN, and me, held our first meeting, luncheon with the press representatives of Texas newspapers and wire service. ED FOREMAN is going to be a great Congressman and I appreciate the honor and privilege of serving with him in the House. He was my first guest on my 1963 television series, the first of which will be telecast on WFAA, Sunday, January 20 at 1:15 p.m. Congressman FOREMAN and I divided the two Republican Committee appointments with ED serving on the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee and giving me the responsibility of continuing service on the Committee on Committees. At the moment I am doing my level best to get Congressman FOREMAN appointed to the Armed Services Committee, the committee of his choice.

ALGER LEGISLATION

The Alger yardstick, "Is it a function of the Federal Government—can we afford it?" formed the basis of the 11 bills and resolutions I introduced on the first day of the session. This is my way of doing my part as your Representative to preserve your freedoms and the free enterprise system. My bills are: H.R. 263, to rescind and revoke membership in the United Nations; H.R. 264, to make labor unions subject to antitrust laws; H.R. 737, to provide for a flat percentage tax instead of present income tax rates; H.R. 738, tax reduction and reform (Alger-Baker-Herlong bill); H.R. 739, to eliminate withholding of income tax from wages and salaries; House Joint Resolution 5, to prevent treaties and international agreements from superceding the Constitution (Bricker amendment); House Joint Resolution 6, to prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; House Joint Resolution 7, enforced balanced budget; House Joint Resolution 8, expressing the will of the American people and their Government in winning complete victory over the worldwide Communist conspiracy (the victory resolution); House Concurrent Resolution 4, emphasizing the sovereignty of the United States by protecting American lives and property anywhere in the world; House Resolution 26 to establish proper representation for the minority party in House committee staff appointments.

Legislation in these fields is basic to reestablish responsible, constitutional limited Government of, by, and for the people. My bills may not be the complete answer, but they form the groundwork for discussion. If the committees will schedule hearings the best brains in the Nation within and without Congress, could use my proposals as a basis for discussion. I hope these proposals will receive widespread publicity across the Nation so the people will express themselves on the importance of action on these matters. My conservative creed: the Government cannot successfully nor constitutionally, feed, clothe, house, provide jobs, medical care and basic necessities for the people.

CURRENT EVENTS

Why? Why? Why? The world was horrified at news stories of innocent women shot down by U.N. troops in Jadotville in the Congo. The pitiful picture of a husband of one of the murdered women asking "Why?" aroused in all of us deepest sympathy and stirred in our minds the same question. Why are U.N. troops, an organization dedi-

cated to peace, forcing war on Katanga? Why does U.S. policy permit us to support such action? Adequate answers have not been given by the U.N. or the Kennedy administration. U.S. foreign policy is being tailored to meet U.N. approval and the U.N. is packed against us with the Communist nations and the so-called neutrals who invariably vote with the Communists, in the majority. While we, the American taxpayers, almost alone finance the U.N., it is being used as a propaganda forum for the Soviet Union and its stooge nations, and millions of dollars of our tax money is actually being channeled to Cuba whose Government is doing its level best to involve us in a war with the rest of the world. The U.N. influence has never been used in the interest of self-determination of people, a must in the cause of freedom. The U.N., as it is presently constituted, does not serve the self-interest of the United States, is a threat to our sovereignty, and its heavy financial demands upon us endanger our solvency and could be a contributing factor to bankrupting the United States. For these reasons, I introduced H.R. 263 to withdraw from the U.N. and to strengthen our alliances with those nations determined to stand with us in the cause of freedom.

God-fearing Americans were heartsick at the news of 30 Christian peasants in Russia being refused asylum by our Embassy in Moscow. Unfortunately, there was nothing we could do to help these unfortunate people who are being denied the right to worship God by the anti-God Government of the Soviet Union. We cannot dictate to that Government how it shall operate in Russia. We can, as I have suggested, encourage and assist satellite nations which have been enslaved by the Soviet to revolt which, in turn may inspire the Russian people themselves to throw off the yoke of Communist slavery. We can, as I have advocated, break off diplomatic relations with a nation which denies its people the right to worship freely and which is attempting to spread its antireligious doctrine to the whole world. If we refused to recognize the Communist Soviet Union, we would take away from that ruthless dictatorship the respectability we have given it through recognition and its acts of violence, murder, and suppression of the rights of man, would be exposed in all clarity.

"The spirit of truth and the spirit of freedom—they are the pillars of society"—from "Pillars of Society" by Henrik Ibsen.

Equal Pay for Equal Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which will go far toward insuring that the women of America will receive equal pay when they are doing work which is equal to that which is performed by male employees. The concept of lower wages for female employees is both antiquated and ridiculous in this day and age. Today, the women of America, thanks to our splendid educational system and the increasing trend toward automation and laborsaving devices, are just as capable of performing the bulk of the office and industrial tasks as are the men. Thus, many of the logical reasons for a differential in pay have been narrowed and in many cases they have even disappeared.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, an equal pay bill, H.R. 11677, was passed by the House of Representatives on July 25 of last year. Thanks to a number of amendments which were offered by my Republican colleagues and accepted by the House, the bill as enacted was basically a good bill. It was then considered by the Senate on October 3, 1962. Unfortunately, it was considered and passed as an amendment to an embassy construction bill, H.R. 11880. As a result, it could not go to the appropriate conference so that the differences between the House and Senate version could be ironed out.

The bill which I have introduced today is basically the same bill which was passed by the House last year. It contains the safeguards with respect to the investigative authority of the Secretary of Labor. It also provides for the trial of all violations in a U.S. District Court rather than before an administrative tribunal. Finally, the provision that there shall be equal pay for equal work is retained.

I believe that the modifications which I have made in the bill, although minor in nature, will both strengthen it and help it to receive favorable consideration.

For example, I have substituted the word "establishment" for the term "place of employment." This change nails down once and for all the often-expressed congressional intent that the provisions of this bill will apply only within and on an individual plant or store basis. Jobs in one plant or store will not be compared to jobs in another store or plant.

In section 4 I have also added the phrase, "or where such payment is attributable to other reasonable differentiation based on a factor or factors other than sex." This phrase appears in a number of State equal-pay statutes. By adding this phrase it is then no longer necessary to list in detail each and every valid reason that would justify a disparity in wage payments. For whenever an attempt is made to list exceptions, there is also the danger that subsequent statutory interpretation will construe the partial listing to mean that those exceptions and only those exceptions that are listed will be considered valid.

Section 5(b) has also been reworked so that it is absolutely clear that the Secretary's investigative authority is limited to those facts, conditions, practices, and matters that are specified in and directly relate to the charge. I am sure that no one wants to arm the Secretary of Labor with a wandering-ministrel type of investigative authority. One of the touchstones of our present legal system is that the accused is advised in advance of the charge that has been made against him. We do not permit the police or the FBI to move in on a citizen, or to invade his place of residence or business; there to stay until such time as an exhaustive and never-ending investigation discloses some type of violation. This smacks far too much of the police state. Certainly this concept should not be applied in the name of equal pay for women.

I have also established a 6-month statute of limitations. This corresponds with the statute of limitations in the Taft-Hartley Act. The National Labor Relations Board has not experienced any difficulty in operating under this rule. In fact, it has proven to be a blessing for it automatically weeds out all stale claims.

In section 6(d) I have eliminated the reference to double pay and have substituted a provision which calls for the payment of back wages plus 6 percent interest. Assessing double pay can be only construed as a penalty or a fine whereas the concept of backpay is instituted in an effort to make the employee whole for any loss that she may have suffered. The addition of a reasonable amount of interest along with the award of backpay further implements this policy of complete restitution without moving into the field of a penalty or a fine.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have completely eliminated section 8 from the bill. This section provided special blacklisting penalties for any employer who does business with the Government. I am sure that we have all been troubled by the recent trend which some have characterized as an antibusiness trend. All too often a concept of special and exceedingly harsh penalties has been applied to business. Business has been treated as if it is some type of "Peck's Bad Boy." It is unnecessary and unwise to permit this special-treatment concept to creep into this bill. Moreover, it is an exercise in forensic vindictiveness for under the related provisions of this bill, an employer cannot be penalized in this fashion unless he has been found guilty of a violation by a U.S. court and then refused to comply with an appropriate court order. In other words, he would have to be in contempt of court. We all know that the courts can take care of themselves if and when an individual or a company has the poor judgment to become contemptuous.

It is my sincere hope that the bill that I have introduced will be speedily considered by the Education and Labor Committee. As a member of that committee I will do everything that I can to see that this is done. I urge my colleagues to vote in the affirmative when it is brought before the House for approval.

Transmission of Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to allow transmission

of electrical energy in interstate commerce at normal voltages in excess of 230,000 volts. A similar bill has been introduced today also by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from California, Hon. CLAIR ENGLE.

The new bill, similar to one offered in the 2d session, 87th Congress, would amend the Federal Power Act so as to require Federal Power Commission authority for the construction, extension, or operation of certain facilities for electrical energy transmission in interstate commerce.

The old bill, H.R. 12181, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but was not taken up before the end of the session.

In recent years, there have been great advances in the techniques of transmitting electric power. Until recently, the longest economical transmission distance ranged from 200 to 400 miles at maximum voltages of 230,000. For several years, there have been lines operating in Europe and Russia at greater distances and higher voltages. An Interior Department task force which recently studied the posibility of an intertie between the Pacific Northwest, where power can be produced economically in hydroelectric plants, and the Pacific Southwest, where the need for more electric energy at low cost is acute. The Interior Department study points out that electricity now can be transmitted for more than 1,000 miles at 750,000 volts.

Construction of such lines would have a tremendous impact upon the power utilization and economic growth of our country. Experiments have been conducted in the United States on transmission of extra-high-voltage power. Recently it was announced that such a line will be built in northern California and southern Oregon to interconnect the systems of Pacific Power & Light Co. and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The Federal Power Commission has ruled by split vote that the terms of the Federal Power Act do not authorize the Commission to determine whether such extra-high-voltage lines are compatible with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The tremendous effect of such extra-high-voltage lines demands regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The bill provides that a certificate of convenience and necessity must be obtained from the Federal Power Comission before any person or company may construct, extend, operate or maintain any facilities for transmission of electricity at normal voltages in excess of 230,000 volts. Anyone who, at the time this bill is enacted, is already then engaged in the transmission of electricity at a normal voltage in excess of 230,000 volts will automatically receive such a certificate if he files for it within 90 days. Our proposal will require all applicants, except those who already have existing extra-high-voltage lines in operation at the time this bill is enacted, to show that their operations are required by present or future public convenience and necessity, and to observe such reasonable terms and conditions as the Federal Power Commission requires for the public convenience and necessity. In addition, no public utility would be permitted to abandon or curtail such extra-high-voltage transmission lines unless the Commission finds that such abandonment or curtailment would be consistent with the public interest and then grants permission for such abandonment or curtailment. The abandonment provision in our bill is identical with the provision in S. 1607 which was approved by the Senate August 14, 1961.

This bill also provides that any such extra-high-voltage transmission facilities authorized, but not required for the applicant's own use in power transmission, shall be made available on a common carrier basis for other electric energy. The Federal Power Commission will have authority to attach other reasonable conditions to granting permission for extra-high-voltage transmission facilities.

Governor Hollings' Farewell Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the great Palmetto State has just inaugurated as Governor an intelligent, articulate, and extremely capable gentleman, Donald S. Russell. Under his leadership, South Carolina will continue to ascend the ladder of State superiority.

Today it is my privilege to present for the RECORD the outstanding farewell address of our esteemed former Governor, Ernest F. Hollings, which in itself exemplifies a man mature, intelligent, and progressive thinking. Although only 37 years of age when he assumed the governorship we are proud of his 4-year record as our chief executive.

As he so eloquently pointed out, 100 years ago our State lay bleeding under the heel of a punitive Reconstruction era but today South Carolina is America's No. 1 opportunity State.

Mr. Speaker, it is a long, hard, and expensive road from poverty to prosperity, from ruin to recovery, but the Palmetto State has both the people and the will to travel that road successfully. Governor Hollings' complete address follows:

GOVERNOR HOLLINGS' FAREWELL ADDRESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the complete text of the farewell address of Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, delivered to the general assembly on Wednesday, January 9.)

I'm very much at home here—and regret leaving you. This ends 16 years in these halls as page, house member, speaker pro tempore, Lieutenant Governor, and Governor. The friendships, the experiences make me an oldtimer. The wonderful advice, cooperation, and assistance you have given me will again and again give me new inspiration. Pat and I are genuinely grateful.

I wish the best for Governor Russell. In short time, he will make important decisions for our State. I have tried to prepare our people for these times. The State's institutions and all law enforcement agencies have been charged with their responsibilities. I know you will give Governor Russell the same fine cooperation you gave me. I gladly offer him my support.

CONTROVERSY

The general assembly, unfortunately, leads a life similar to a football referee. You are seldom noticed until you make a controversial decision. I have never served with men of more courage and resolve. You took a $23 million deficit, and in 4 years turned it into a $19 million surplus. Meanwhile, the counties have received $18 million added assistance. For the first time in decades the incoming Governor begins operating in the black.

You took an insurance mess and created a strong department. A penitentiary with inadequate provisions is now being turned into a modern penal system. We have a securities law. The Attorney General of the United States says there is no organized crime in South Carolina. The law-enforcement officers now have a reliable retirement fund. Long needed State office building facilities are being built. We lead the Nation in TV education. A nuclear space commission points forward.

A commission on higher education tells how. A magnificent technical training program prepares the people for jobs. And the country's best development program brings jobs for our people. Thousands, tens of thousands of jobs. Over a billion dollars in new and expanded industry in 4 years. This is at the rate of over a half million dollars a day each and every day for 4 years.

The Advisory Council for Agriculture is working. The "50 to first" education program has been launched. Teachers' pay is up 34 percent, and personal income is up 25 percent. Tax seminars, insurance seminars, safety conferences, conferences on business, industry agriculture and education—people from the different sections of our State have joined hands for the common good. We are working together. You have every reason to be proud.

TRAVEL

I am honored to have worked with you on these projects. But there must be more than a rollcall of accomplishments. You have given me more. You have traveled me over 200,000 miles—to four countries in Latin America, seven countries in Europe, to Hawaii, Canada, Puerto Rico, and up and down, crisscrossing this Nation. I've met with the industrial giants, the labor leaders, talked with the university presidents, served in Washington at the appointment of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, headed up the nuclear-space effort of our Governors' conference, talked constantly to fellow Governors and public leaders, both Republican and Democratic. And today, you who have supported me so loyally, you who have given me this vast experience, want to know about South Carolina. Have we a chance? Where are we headed?

As I visited in these foreign lands and talked with their people; as I traveled over this great country of ours, I began to realize that South Carolina really has a chance—an opportunity to succeed, to pull away from the hangover of 100 years of poverty, to climb to the top of the ladder of States.

This is my valedictory. In short time, South Carolina can reach the top and stay there.

Some foreign languages have no words for English words. Some have words with plural or different meanings. The Chinese language has the word "chuangi-chi" which possesses the plural meaning of "crisis," or "opportunity," depending on its use.

South Carolina, this year, has much the same characteristic. We are in chuangi-chi, crisis and opportunity. We need, must have, a time machine to compress 100 years into

1 year to speed with precision South Carolina into the age of space.

AT BOTTOM

This region, nearing 100 years ago, lay bleeding under the heel of a punitive Reconstruction era. Seventy-five years later the South was still the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. Even now, we have not recovered. This very day, any ranking of regions or States, for any purpose, finds the South and her States wearily clinging to the bottom rungs.

Why? Because the Northeast section of the Nation experienced an industrial revolution, prospered from it, and went on to enjoy its riches, while we struggled to feed our hungry children, and broke the spirit of our men and women who grew the fields of cotton that suddenly no one wanted.

Why? Because the Nation pushed West. The manifest destiny of exploitation drew the daring and the brave to draw from the land in the West the gold and the oil, the wheat and the corn, and to raise the great cattle herds that filled their wallets with money and their people with plenty.

And of us? We built our textile mills and gave our people jobs and hope. But again we were 50 years too late. International considerations had risen in America's mind and the textile industry is now expendable—and the jobs of our people with it.

Always too late with too little—that was the demon that plagued the South. Well, my friends, we still have too little, but this time we don't have to be too late. History has given us one more chance.

Just as the frontier's marksman with his single-shot muzzle loader had to hit the target with his first shot because he couldn't reload in time if he missed, we have to be accurate now. We have one shot. We must not miss.

LIMITED

With limited ammunition, we should understand and appreciate the forest in which we're hunting. This is the space age forest. It's deceiving. Many think this is just Buck Rogers fantasy. But this is real. This is not reaching to the moon or some particular planet. What creates the forest are the things we learn on the way. The study of extreme temperatures has given the housewife a coffee pot she can take out of an icebox and put on an open flame. The telemetry system of satellites is now being used in surgery to track blood temperature and blood flow, cutting a 90-minute operation down to 10 minutes. From a rocket propellant, we have developed a drug to treat mental illness. The satellite itself has brought international TV. And on and on it goes. With this age's dynamic technology, we wander into a wonderland of near magic. Science fiction is now scientific fact. Devices scoffed at 10 years ago, even 5 years ago, are exciting the research men of America today.

Scientifically, then, the space age means the reaching for outer space, and all the new scientific knowledge that is gained therefrom. Militarily, the space age means the determination of who shall control the space above us. But for the 95th general assembly, the space age means turning this crisis into opportunity. It means equipping our people for this new era. It means preparing our State so that she can compete with other States for space-age facilities. It means taking a tremendous leap forward now to prevent forever being relegated to the 50th of States.

YEAR 1970 TOO LATE

To prepare, some will think of a 3-year program, a 5-year program, or a goal to be attained by 1970—1970 will be too late. Knowledge of man recently has been calibrated to determine its rapidity of growth. From 4000 B.C. to the 16th century, man's knowledge was constant. With the invention of the printing press, the communication curtain was broken and by the 18th century the knowledge of man was doubling every 50 years. In the 20th century the doubling time dropped to every 20 years, with the space age now man's knowledge doubles every 10 years. In the next 10 years then, there will be twice as much to be taught in our universities than there is today. Veritably, we are in the midst of an education explosion.

This space-age forest is growing like wildfire and this general assembly must understand this problem; it must appreciate this problem; and it must legislate for it—now.

The question before South Carolina is not whether this explosion is good or bad, necessary or not. The question is simply, can we equip ourselves to utilize it before the rest of the Nation leaves us behind. The current of history is more swift than ever. Those who float will shortly be left in the eddies of the stream.

HOW TO AIM

In an age where bullets to shoot down bullets are being designed, how do we aim so that the target is not out of date when we hit it? This sounds impossible—but is it? Space's dynamic technology allows us to accomplish something never before possible by a State or area. We can catch up. We can condense time and leap from today all the way over to the day after tomorrow, without pausing, even for an instant—in tomorrow. This is no pipedream or wild theory.

Nor will it be for a first time in history. For it has just been done by another people in another land. In 1917, Russia was distraught. There was no industry, no education, no science, no arts or culture. There were only 47,000 Communists, and as a nation the Soviet was only to be found in the geography book. But they took good aim. They didn't frustrate over trivia—over what was nice and who had to be kept happy. They were determined to pack 100 years into a few short years. And while we disagree with the bullet they used, they hit the target.

They skipped the 100 years of the industrial age and went from oxcart to space vehicle. They caught up and passed the United States, Britain, and other great powers. Instead of 47,000—today there are over a billion people in the world now controlled by Communists—the fastest growing political development in the history of man. With no culture and arts—the Bolshoi ballet. Of many sports they never knew, but they have just won the olympics. With no power, today a world power. Russia and the United States are the only ones in space, and admittedly, today, the Soviet is 2 years ahead. And 5 years ahead in oceanography.

The Soviet saw the way the world was headed and they took a shortcut. They saw what day after tomorrow would be and they went straight for it. They ignored the middle ground—they avoided trivia. The Russian science, culture, and technology hurdled from American Civil War levels to the level of the day after tomorrow. They didn't have much to work with, but they used it all for one purpose. And it worked. This is the type aim South Carolina must take. We must unflinchingly avoid the temptation to restrict our goal—to aim merely at catching up. Our ultimate goal has to be nothing less than to forge ahead—and stay ahead.

NOISES

In taking aim let's become accustomed to the noises of the forest. We must not be distracted. These noises are trivia. The problem of South Carolina—the problem of this general assembly, is trivia. Trivia means cussing and knocking each other out all year long about two parties, when the choice is Kennedy or Rockefeller. Trivia means holding alerts all over the place when there are by last count two Communists in the State. We all know that teachers' pay should be increased, but trivia means the long palavering each year in this hall whether to give the teachers 10, 12, or 15 percent when any one would be inadequate, and all together would not give us quality education. Trivia means trying to legislate loyalty—or trying to regulate politics by law. These noises of the legislative forest must be recognized and given their position of unimportance if our one shot is to score.

Now we are set. We know the forest. We know the noises of the forest. We know how to aim. We know the target. But what is this one shot we are to use? A college professor. You say we have lots of those, and we do have many good ones. But we don't have one with a National Aeronautics Space Agency grant. We don't have one with a space science grant. We don't have one internationally famous who will attract leading scholars and professors. You say that's Harvard thinking. South Carolina can't afford it. Any money available should go to the teachers, and not these ivory tower professors. But I disagree. We can't afford not to do it.

Let's talk money. Suppose we had a faculty budget of $60,000 for 5 professors. The ordinary way, the South Carolina way, is to hire 5 good professors at $12,000 each. But the space age approach is to retain an outstanding one at $20,000 and hire the other 4 at $10,000 apiece.

ATTRACTION

The $10,000 ones are just as good, perhaps better than the original $12,000 professors, for this type will sacrifice to associate with the outstanding. And you haven't spent any more money. In fact, you've made money. For the grants and contracts that the outstanding professor can attract will bring a fortune to the campus. You see, the national effort in space has released from the Ivy League campuses the brains of the country. For those that can qualify, money for research is available anywhere—on every campus. Last year our country devoted $18 billion to various research and development projects. In this one year, we spent more for research than was expended by this country for research from the Revolution up to and including World War II.

In 1957, internationally famous Prof. John Gibson came to Purdue, a State university. After a year, he finally secured $300 to start on a program with a few German scientists and students. Today, his research team consists of 7 other professors and 60 graduate students—all involved in teaching of research. Funded by grants and contracts John Gibson works on a budget of $300,000 a year. None of this money comes from Purdue.

Recently, his team's work on computers has received national fame—and further grants. Purdue and Indiana have taken a position of leadership because of the seed corn planted by John Gibson. This one shot—the outstanding professor—has a snowballing effect. First, you have the professor, then his associates, then talented students, then contracts, then grants, then quality education, then leadership. Multiply this by 5 or 10 professors and it's easy to see the effect.

PALO ALTO

And it's not all Government money. The great percentage by far is private capital under the free enterprise system. Recently, I saw this in Palo Alto, Calif., on the campus of Stanford University. Over 35 great names in American industry, with million dollar research centers. Think of the investment, the brains, the talent, the leadership—and new industry. In 1955, Lockheed had its 1 division of space in Palo Alto with 450 em-

ployees. Today, this same division has over 30,000 employees. And the talented become more talented. Lookheed has a program that pays 75 percent of the cost of a course at Stanford for any of their employees—and presently, there are more employees in attendance at Stanford than we have students enrolled at the University of South Carolina.

This division has 279 doctorates on its staff. You begin to see—and feel the impact of the space age. Similar endeavors are underway in Alabama, Texas, Florida, Virginia, and Georgia. And the place to start is with that one nationally prominent professor.

It also gives us the quality we've been looking for. Raising the pay of the incompetent teacher will not make him competent. But raising the level of higher education elevates all levels of education. The professor will be more talented, his associates brighter, the students more challenged, the graduating teacher better trained and more inspired. And your children and mine, when they graduate from high school can get into college and compete in society.

STIMULATE

When you bring in the best men from outside—when you encourage and free the best men we have now on our faculties—when you do these things, you stimulate our students, you stimulate our society. Nothing is more urgent than for our State's now splendid array of brainpower and leadership, across the board, to be supplemented, infused and even cross-pollinated and inspired by an inflow of genius, spirited enterprise, and topmost talent.

This assembly must look at South Carolina's role in the Nation if it is to do its job well. Whether it realizes it or not, it is a part of the space age. And if we are to compete—if our people are to have a chance at good jobs—if the communities are to continue to attract new industry—if our children are to be educated and skilled, and if we are to retain these children as useful leaders for the State—then it will be because this assembly had courage. A call on this courage is imminent.

FACT OF LAND

We have all argued that the Supreme Court decision of May 1954 is not the law of the land. But everyone must agree that it is the fact of the land. Interposition, sovereignty, legal motions, personal defiance have all been applied to constitutionalize the law of the land. And all attempts have failed. As we meet, South Carolina is running out of courts. If and when every legal remedy has been exhausted, this general assembly must make clear South Carolina's choice, a government of laws rather than a government of men. As determined as we are, we of today must realize the lesson of 100 years ago, and move on for the good of South Carolina and our United States. This should be done with dignity. It must be done with law and order. It is a hurdle that brings little progress to either side. But the failure to clear it will do us irreparable harm.

THE ANSWER?

In the intriguing swirl of supernewness—with limitless mother lodes of progress, advancement and betterment in many forms becoming ripe for exploitation by the wise and the pioneering of this age—South Carolina should be, and I believe is, America's No. 1 opportunity State. Our ability to turn the crises into opportunities is beyond question. The real question is our willingness.

My serving with so many of you over the years confirms my confidence in your courage. But, years of public service have proved to me that we have to prove ourselves again and again. The space age is on us—the only question is—does it smother us or save us? This general assembly will give South Carolina's answer.

Business Leader Supports President's Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James F. Oates, Jr., president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, has just sent to Members of the House a copy of a letter addressed to the President, strongly supporting the President's recommendation for a cut in personal and corporate income taxes. In a message to Members of the House which accompanied his letter to the President, Mr. Oates states that he believes the tax reduction is "the main issue," and "contrary to earlier views I now strongly believe that we should not insist on concurrent enactment of tax reforms."

Significantly, the insurance company executive expresses the opinion that—

We should hold off on demands for concurrent expenditure reductions as an offset to tax reduction.

Controversy over these matters, however meritorious, will only serve to delay or defeat achievement of the essential goal.

We should instead join together to support vigorously the proposal for an across-the-board substantial tax reduction now. Here is a rare opportunity for all Americans to reaffirm their faith in free enterprise and to demonstrate once again its mighty capabilities.

Because of the high priority which this issue has been given by President Kennedy in his state of the Union message, and because of Mr. Oates' prominence in the business world, I believe the Oates letter to President Kennedy is one which will interest many people. On the assumption that this letter has already been made available to many by its author, and further publication should serve a similar constructive purpose, the text of the letter is made a part of these remarks at this point:

THE EQUITABLE LIFE
ASSURANCE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N.Y., December 20, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The tax program outlined in general terms in your speech to the Economic Club of New York on December 14 deserves the support of the Nation. In addressing yourself, as you made clear, not to the possibility of recession in the near future, but to the basic necessity of growth and employment during the longer term, you went to the heart of the matter. Your solution, an across-the-board cut in individual and corporate tax levels to increase demand for production and investment and thereby release the private sector of the economy to go to work, seems to be the right one. It should appeal alike to business, labor, and the consuming public.

On reading the full text of your remarks, it was a gratifying experience, if you will permit me to say so, to note the similarity in principle between your views and the position presented in a speech delivered by me before the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards on December 6 last, a copy of which is attached.

You have offered the choice before us in these words: "Our practical choice is not between a tax cut deficit and a budgetary surplus. It is between two kinds of deficits; a chronic deficit of inertia, as the unwanted result of inadequate revenues and a restricted economy, or a temporary deficit of transition, resulting from a tax cut designed to boost the economy, increase tax revenue and achieve * * * a future budget surplus."

Business, in my opinion, should endorse wholeheartedly your statement that "the Federal Government's most useful role is not to rush into a program of excessive increases in public expenditures, but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures."

Business should also welcome your decision, in line with the suggestion of Chairman MILLS, of the House Ways and Means Committee, to accompany tax reduction by "increased control of the rises in expenditures." Although one would prefer to have nondefense and nonspace expenditures cut back so as to hold total governmental expenditures constant in fiscal year 1964 at the fiscal year 1963 level, the main issue of prompt tax reduction should not be jeopardized by the inevitable controversy over the extent and incidence of budget reductions. In my judgment, therefore, the public—in furtherance of the long-term objective—should accept your statement that "defense and space expenditures will necessarily rise * * * but * * * that * * * all other expenditures combined will be held approximately at its current level."

Similar considerations should apply to proposed tax reforms other than the structural reform needed to change the level and degree of progression of our tax rates. Other reforms, such as so-called loophole reforms, the elimination of special privileges and tax simplifications, whatever their merits, are highly controversial and, as you have so well indicated, difficult to enact into law. There is every reason to believe that insistence on the enactment of such loophole reforms at this time would frustrate the achievement of the basic structural reform of tax reduction, with its far greater potential for furthering material growth. The detailed controversial issues should be left to the Congress for later debate and resolution. As you stated in answer to an Economic Club question: "Well, the purpose of reform really is directed to the encouraging of growth, and employment. I quite agree that to launch into a full-scale battle on general reform for academic reasons would be unwise."

It is my intention to support the broad principles of your tax reduction program. The views expressed in the attached December 6 remarks and in this letter will be given circulation among my friends within and without the business community and made known to the Members of the Congress. I hope that these steps will take place in what I confidently believe will be a broad-based and enthusiastic response to your tax program.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES F. OATES, JR.

Records Show Most Crime by Repeaters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for

inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the January 2, 1963, issue of the Livingston Enterprise, Livingston, Mont., citing the accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and commenting on causes for the rising crime rate:

RECORDS SHOW MOST CRIME BY REPEATERS

In his yearend report to the U.S. Attorney General, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reported marked increases in all major categories of FBI accomplishments in the past year. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's final tabulations particularly will show marked increases in the number of criminal convictions, number of criminals apprehended, and well over 200 million in fines, savings, and recoveries this past year, compared with $148,421,000 in 1961. All this emphasizes the importance of a tightly coordinated, experienced organization, such as the FBI with its extensive and complete record on hundreds of thousands of individuals, in the endless war against U.S. crime.

In citing individual crime problems confronting the Bureau, Director Hoover called particular attention to a sharp increase in violations of the Federal Bank Robbery and Incidental Crimes Statutes, as the antibank holdup law is titled. Bank holdups showed "an increase of approximately 25 percent over the number committed in 1961," Hoover reported.

In short, there has been more crime, but the FBI has been keeping pace with it in stepped up results. The answer lies not in well-trained personnel and a well-run field organization alone, however, important as those factors have been. Much of the FBI's success rests in the hands of the unknown technicians who work deep in the Bureau's files and laboratories of its central offices across the country as well as in Washington.

Every day the FBI receives literally thousands of fingerprints of people all over the United States who have been newly arrested for some crime. In its criminal files today are fingerprints of more than 14 million individuals. In addition the Bureau has vast numbers of fingerprints of persons involved in purely civil matters, such as security clearance.

The striking fact standing out in this flood of fingerprints from criminal arrests arriving in Washington daily is that 8 out of 10 of them results in a "make." That means 8 out of 10 of the persons involved in today's arrests already have been arrested on a criminal charge at least once before. Clearly the bulk of the Nation's crime is the work of repeaters.

This is something to think about, for this evidence shows plainly that law enforcement is not the root problem in America's rising crime rate. The problem stems from what is done with these individuals after they have been arrested and convicted. There is the area where real study and tightening up are needed if this zoom in the U.S. crime rate is to be checked.

Wanted: Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Costa Mesa Pilot, Costa Mesa, Calif. This editorial points up the dangers threatening the freedom of the press as guaranteed in the first amendment. The present administration not only is covering up the truth, but has actually adopted the policy of false reporting to the American people, and every newspaper in the country should rise up to defend the freedom of the press.

The editorial follows:

WANTED: MATURITY

Robert F. Kennedy continues to disturb even his friends in Government with his uses of power.

Less than a year ago, in the United States Steel case, he ordered the FBI to roust Washington reporters out of bed to reveal what Big Steel's president had said to them.

More recently he used the implied threat of the Department of Justice's big stick to bludgeon money, food, and medical supplies out of individuals and companies in the Castro blackmail case.

Although never elected to office, he is wielding more power at the top level—thanks to his brother—than any Attorney General in history. His influence extends far beyond the limits of Federal law enforcement. He is a key figure, even more so than the Secretary of State, in determining foreign policy.

Now he has pressured a great newspaper to suppress a story. Without publishing this particular story, the newspaper's proud 86-year old reputation for honesty and integrity would have been severely tarnished.

The incident involved the James Hoffa conspiracy trial, which ended in a mistrial with a deadlocked jury December 23.

Someone pretending to be a reporter for the Nashville Banner talked to prospective jurors. Some of these had said in court that they had received such calls.

The newspaper promptly reported the incident, branded the caller an imposter and offered a $5,000 reward for the arrest and conviction of the person who made the false statements.

Last Thursday the Banner published the transcript of a telephone conversation between James G. Stahlman, publisher of the Banner, and Bobby Kennedy last October 23, the second day of the Teamster union boss's trial.

Kennedy, the transcript revealed, called Stahlman from Washington. The Attorney General said he understood the newspaper was planning a story on the incident and said Government attorneys felt that "if a detailed story in connection with the matter were made, it might very well lead to a mistrial."

Stahlman replied that he hoped the Government could get both a jury and a conviction in the case, and that the newspaper was "just as anxious to see a successful case against this fellow as you are."

However, he said he felt he should protect the Banner against this reprehensible stuff and therefore had published an offer of a $5,000 reward. He said he felt this did not jeopardize the Government's case or its effort to get a jury.

When Stahlman told Kennedy he could not leave his newspaper or its staff in a position of having false statements made about them, Kennedy replied, "These matters require sacrifices by many people."

To which Stahlman replied, "Attorney General Kennedy, I have made as many sacrifices for the Department of Justice as any man in middle Tennessee. I am suggesting to you that what has happened has made it necessary for me to defend the reputation of my newspaper, which has existed for 36 years, and I don't intend to have it sacrificed for Jimmy Hoffa, the Federal Government, or anybody else."

In publishing the transcript last Thursday, Stahlman said he did so with Kennedy's knowledge and because he felt nothing in it reflected on him, the Attorney General, or the newspaper.

With this we cannot agree. The fact that Kennedy would seek to suppress a story which involved the reputation of the Banner and its employees reflects on his judgment.

Bobby Kennedy has been too prone to act impulsively. Perhaps flat refusals to knuckle under—such as those by Dr. Arnold O. Beckman, of Corona del Mar, in the Castro blackmail case and by Publisher Stahlman—will help to make a mature executive of him.

The Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the more dramatic and effective programs of the late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was the Civilian Conservation Corps. Not only did the work of the corps bring improvement and beauty to much of our Nation's countryside, but by their enlistment in the corps, many of the otherwise unemployable youth of the day were gainfully employed and thereby diverted from the danger of collective idleness.

There is not today the economic depression that then gripped the Nation. But there is the danger of idleness and wasted energies for many of our young men. There is also the need, as always in any nation, for public works to improve the appearance of our urban and nonurban areas. To meet that need, I now propose that we establish a Youth Conservation Corps.

Today, I have introduced such a bill. From talking with many of the community leaders of my own and other districts, and from my own studies of the proposal over the past few years, I believe that the corps can and will make important contributions to the well-being, the appearance, and the economic strength of the Nation.

I am not alone in this belief, I know. I recognized that others in the Congress share it with me. I know, too, from talks within and outside my district, many civic officials and private citizens share the belief, also. One of the more succinct comments on the proposal appeared this week in the major afternoon daily in my district, the Newark Evening News. And I would like at this time to bring it to the attention of my colleagues to assist their consideration of the legislation that I hope soon will come before this body:

IT WORKED BEFORE

The Nation's three-quarters of a million jobless youth, the apparent nonexistence of jobs for them and the ominous prospect for trouble thier idleness offers are eloquent arguments in favor of the youth employment corps proposed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY's bill—promised vigorous administration support—would offer youths in the 16-to-21-age group a useful role much as the Civilian Conservation Corps offered during the depression of the 1930's.

The CCC, it will be recalled, discharged its program with credit. The Nation's parks, forest lands, farms, and streams were lastingly improved by the young men who responded to the call.

Even more valuable than conservation of land, forests, and streams was the CCC's conservation of youth. There is no way of knowing how many lives were enriched for idle city boys, but it doesn't take much imagination to picture what might have happened to many of them if left to drift in idleness during that trying period.

There is much to be done today in the cities as well as on the countryside. And there is a growing pool of young unemployed capable of doing it. Senator HUMPHREY's plan offers the framework for a useful harnessing of otherwise wasted and potentially troublesome manpower. The history of the old CCC is all in its favor.

Thomas J. Quirk Dies, Retired Hartford Public High School Principal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no one can leave a greater impression upon a community and its youth than an outstanding teacher or principal. Hartford lost an outstanding educator this week when Thomas J. Quirk, retired principal of Hartford Public High School, died in an untimely accident which, through a strange coincidence, occurred in front of the school where he had governed for nearly a quarter century.

A graduate of Holy Cross College, from which he later received an honorary doctorate as an alumnus of distinguished career in the field of secular education, he taught in Providence and was principal in his native Milford, Mass., before coming to Hartford.

I knew him personally and feel his loss keenly. He had entered recently upon a new venture in education and he looked forward to it with zest. The State and the community mourns him, but he has left behind him thousands of living memorials in the lives of the many pupils he taught and he saw graduated. In their accomplishments and achievements he always took his greatest satisfaction.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a news account of his life from the Hartford Courant and editorials from the Courant and the Hartford Times noting his passing:

[From the Hartford Courant, Jan. 15, 1963]

THOMAS J. QUIRK DIES, RETIRED HARTFORD PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

A half-century career in education ended Monday when Thomas J. Quirk, retired principal of Hartford Public High School, died in front of the school he had headed for 24 years.

The 70-year-old educator was stricken with a heart attack as he drove up Broad Street, past Hartford High about 8 a.m.

He was on his way to Fairfield University where he became director of the teacher training program when he retired from Hartford Public High School on November 1.

COLLAPSES AT WHEEL

When Dr. Quirk collapsed at the wheel of his car, it swerved across the street and struck a tree in front of the Broad Street YWCA, directly opposite Hartford Public High School. He was pronounced dead on arrival at Hartford Hospital.

In his memory, Hartford Public High School will be closed all day Thursday.

For nearly a quarter of a century he, more than anyone else probably, personified Hartford High and its traditions and authority to those who went through the school.

He devoted himself to the school almost around the clock; the lights often burned late in the old high-ceiling office in the Hopkins Street wing where he kept his roll-topped desk.

Dr. Quirk entered into his new position at Fairfield University with zest and enthusiasm. But he was always eager for news of activities at Hartford High.

FIRM BUT GENIAL

A firm disciplinarian, he had the assets of a booming voice and imposing stature—but these were combined with geniality and a humorous twinkle that would often break through.

Interviewed at the time of his retirement 2½ months ago, Dr. Quirk said with a smile, "It's as easy to run a high school today as it ever was. But then, I've been at it so long it should be easy."

Dr. Quirk came to Hartford in 1932 as superintendent of the old Washington School District; when the city's school system was reorganized he became principal of Burr Junior High School in 1934. He was appointed to head Hartford Public High School in 1938.

Before coming to Hartford, Dr. Quirk taught at LaSalle Academy in Providence, R.I., for 2 years and served as principal of the junior and senior high schools in his native Milford, Mass., for 15 years.

He was born in Milford November 29, 1892, and was graduated from Holy Cross College in 1915. He received a master of arts degree there in 1919.

GIVEN HONORARY DOCTORATE

Holy Cross awarded him an honorary doctorate of laws in 1938, citing him as "an alumnus of distinguished career in the field of secular education * * * a man whose exemplary character is the living reflection of honor, justice, truth and charity."

He was also honored frequently by the students of Hartford Public High School, most recently at his final assembly as principal, with two scholarships bearing his name.

Although he never attended the school, Dr. Quirk headed its alumni association for many years. He also maintained a solicitous interest in the Hartford Public High School faculty and its retired members.

During his long career he has served as chairman of the State teachers retirement board, president of the Hartford Principals Club; president of the 2,800-member Worcester County, Mass., Teachers Association; president of the Hartford Holy Cross Alumni Association, and vice president of the Massachusetts Teachers Federation.

Dr. Quirk leaves his wife, Mrs. Marcella Quirk; and a brother, James F. Quirk of West Dennis, Mass.

THOMAS J. QUIRK

It was a queer trick of fate that had Thomas J. Quirk die in front of the building in which he had labored so long, and which he left in retirement just a few weeks ago. He had been principal of Hartford High School since 1938, and he left his imprint on the thousands of young men and women who walked its corridors during the years since then.

During his lifetime Mr. Quirk got the kind of recognition he wanted most—from the graduates of his school. Even though he was a stern disciplinarian he was fair and just, holding the interest of his boys and girls above all else. They sensed it, and they returned his affectionate interest with both respect and love.

A man who spends his life with young people usually stays young. And even until the day of his death Tom Quirk had that quality of youthful zest, of keen interest in the world around him, so that it was difficult to realize that he was 70 years old. In all, this man devoted 48 years of his life to teaching. Only a little more than 2 months ago he retired from Hartford High School not to rest, but to embark on a wholly new career at Fairfield University.

This kind of man does not quickly fade from memory. For many years to come his name will be synonomous with the best in education. Although people thought of him as an old-fashioned educator because of his basic virtues, he was neither old nor new. He was the timeless educator, dedicated and tireless in his job of educating the young.

MR. QUIRK'S DEATH WIDELY MOURNED

When it was announced last October that Thomas J. Quirk was to retire as principal of the Hartford Public High School in November there were widespread expressions of regret.

Dr. Quirk died suddenly Monday in his car in front of the school that he headed for nearly a quarter century.

In that span Dr. Quirk became an example of wisdom, tolerance, and good nature. He was greatly admired and beloved by students, graduates, and his fellow townsmen.

Dr. Quirk was one of a long line of distinguished educators who have filled the principal's post at Hartford High. He added luster and distinction to the office.

His untimely death so soon after retirement will sadden all who knew him because everybody liked him whether they knew him casually or intimately.

An Integration Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the November 1962 issue of the Bulletin of the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith.

All of us owe a debt of gratitude to James C. Evans. He is a public servant of the highest caliber; the success of integration in the Armed Forces is a fitting tribute to a fine man.

The article follows:

THE ARMED FORCES: AN INTEGRATION SUCCESS STORY

(By Morton Puner)

"Certainly my Air Force days were the most influential time of my life. I served in nothing but integrated units. It seems to me the integration of the Armed Forces is one of the most important things that has happened to the Negro in the United States."—James H. Meredith (quoted in the Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 10, 1962).

Earlier this year, the ADL Bulletin featured a special issue on "The Administration and Civil Rights" with an introduction by President Kennedy and articles by Federal officials on their current activities in the field. All the authors of the articles were under 40; all but one had gone into Government service in 1961 as part of the New Frontier.

"It's a good thing to let the young fellows have their say," said James C. Evans, counselor to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, when he saw the issue. He looks with approval and hope at the efforts of the young men of Washington to bring equal rights to all Americans. He knows their frustrations and problems—and the hope of a better America which stimulates and goads them. He's seen it all before—and worked at it constantly for more than a quarter of a century. Evans' own entry to Government work, together with an earlier group of dedicated young men, is recorded in the book, "The Negro Vanguard," by Historian Richard Bardolph:

"When the New Deal brought its trainloads of bright young men into Government service, a few colored members came with them, recruited like the whites with scant regard for party affiliation or political obligation, and in most cases drawn fresh from college faculties. Men like Robert Weaver, James C. Evans, William H. Hastie, Frank S. Horne, and Ralph Bunche."

The office of James C. Evans in the Pentagon is today concerned with anything having to do with race and other minority group relations in the Armed Forces. The area is a huge one—more than 5 million Americans, servicemen, civilians, and their dependents, are directly involved. It is also a fascinating, encouraging area: Among the many types of American communities, it is in the Armed Forces that integration has been implemented must fully and has worked out best—offering substantial proof that racial harmony is workable on the job, in schools, and in everyday living.

And soft-spoken, 62-year-old James C. Evans, Tennessee born and MIT trained, is the man most responsible for carrying it out.

Integration in the Armed Forces, true, took a long time in coming. During much of World War II, Negroes were allowed to serve only in the steward's branch in the Navy, and as truckdrivers or heavy manual laborers in the Army. Sometimes they were sent into battle ill prepared, with disastrous results. Such incidents nourished the myth, "Negroes can't fight."

This was simply not true. At the height of the war in Europe, 50 Army researchers interviewed thousands of soldiers about their attitudes toward Negro platoons fighting experimentally within their white divisions. The findings: Negroes, fighting within an integrated framework, could do just as well as whites. But these findings were never made public during the war. Segregation generally remained the rule.

It was the lessons of the war, plus postwar drives for more democracy, that brought the change. In 1948 President Harry S. Truman's Executive Order 9981 set the policy for equal treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Armed Forces without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin." It took 7 years, under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, to implement that order.

Negroes have flourished under integration in the Armed Forces to such a degree that they are now a crucial factor in America's defense. They constitute 15 percent of all non-commissioned officers in the Army, even though they make up only 10 percent of Army personnel. In the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, 14.5 percent of all noncoms are Negroes, though they represent only 7.5 percent of enlisted men—a testament to what Negroes can do given equal opportunity and training.

The number of Negro officers is expanding too, although not at the same rate. Now, 3 percent of all Army officers are Negro, compared to less than 1 percent at the end of World War II. Of Air Force officers, 1.1 percent are Negroes. Only about 0.1 percent of Navy and Marine Corps officers are Negroes; but there were none at all at the beginning of World War II. And 34 of the 8,500 cadets at the various service academies are Negroes.

The highest ranking Negro officer in the services is Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations at USAFE headquarters in Germany. The Army and Air Force have more than 100 Negro colonels and lieutenant colonels. There are about 200 Negro officers on active duty in the Regular Navy and among the Reserves.

Above all, since Korea—the first war in which whites and Negroes fought in genuinely integrated units—no one in authority seriously questions the military value of integration.

There are still a number of problem areas. Pockets of resistance to the Federal policy of integration exist, mainly in the Southern States, in the National Guard, military Reserve units, and the Reserve officers training camps. But the overall picture is a heartening one. Evans, who is an electrical engineer as well as manpower specialist, uses an engineer's analogy to explain: "If there is a lag in a magnetic circuit, we change it, improve it, and it never snaps back. We've done the same thing for a cultural lag in our society; through integration we have changed it, improved it. It cannot easily snap back."

Despite his years at the job, Evans and his functions are largely unknown to the general public (but not unknown to the Negro community). His methods of work are quiet but effective and its consequences are far ranging. One of his jobs is monitor of the progress of Armed Forces integration, making sure that improvements in the cultural lag don't snap back. The force of Presidential orders supports Evans in his efforts to see that integration is in force and maintained in Federal military installations—in housing, training, educational facilities, for dependent children, in all aspects of the lives of military personnel and their families.

But there are other, less clear-cut areas. For example, Evans may learn that someone at a military post has decided to put on an oldtime minstrel show, complete with burnt-cork makeup and "mammy" songs. Minstrel shows are about as offensive to Negroes as Mike and Ike jokes are to Jews. Evans will act discreetly, writing to the post commander or other persons involved, explaining to them precisely why such stereotypes are insulting to Negroes—and damaging to American unity generally. His reasoned statements of principle are usually persuasive enough; his Pentagon position and prestige give him the authority to make his advice stick.

Or else, a much-decorated Negro officer, stationed at the air base near El Paso, Tex., may drop into Evans' Pentagon office with a problem. Suitable off-base housing is unavailable to a Negro family in El Paso; the officer, his wife, and children have had to take up residence across the Mexican border in Juarez, from where he daily commutes.

Such problems are grist for the mill of the Evans office. Because of his years of service—he started with the military in 1942 as assistant civilian aide to the Secretary of War—Evans has developed a formidable complement of friends and allies serving throughout the world. They are both white and Negro, from the North and South, eager to work with him to further compliance with integration orders.

For most servicemen—particularly those making a career of it—integration has now become a normal way of life. No matter how strong their preservice prejudices they seem to suspend them for the balance of their military careers. Mr. Evans tells the story of a white officer who was raised in Greenwood, Miss., attended the University of Mississippi, and became a lawyer. After several years of Army service in various parts of the world, the officer faced a dilemma. Army integration had given him new insights and attitudes. He did not know how he could ever return to Greenwood—a fountainhead of the White Citizens Council movement—"where 95 percent of my friends are council members."

"As a matter of conscience, I can no longer tolerate and live with their prejudice," he told Mr. Evans. The officer's wife agreed and suggested a solution: Don't go back to Greenwood. But a man's roots, spiritual and economic, are strong. The dilemma still faces the white couple.

Paradoxically, through Armed Forces integration, our mighty defense machinery, with all its potential for destruction, is sowing seeds of brotherly love and understanding among Americans. It has, as witnessed by the opening words of this article, contributed to the education and determination of James H. Meredith, Negro Air Force veteran now attending the University of Mississippi. It has produced such attitudes as that expressed by Negro Navy Lt. (jg.) L. E. Jenkins: "After a while you start thinking of whites as people." And the attitude of hundreds of military leaders who have seen integrated units in action, an attitude summed up in the words of Maj. Gen. Harvey Fisher, a West Pointer and Korean veteran: "Heart is heart, blood is blood, muscle is muscle. * * * What difference does color make?"

James C. Evans has seen all these changes come about in his years of service. In the late thirties, he was administrative assistant to the president of West Virginia State College, then one of the highest ranking Negro colleges in the Nation. War Department policy at the time prevented Negroes from becoming pilots or air crewmen in the Army Air Corps. Evans managed to start at West Virginia the first federally sponsored civilian pilot training unit to accept Negroes. Soon there were eight such units at Negro colleges; these formed the basis for the training program at the all-Negro Tuskegee Army Air Corps Airfield. Two of the first five Negro youths to receive their commissions and wings as pilots were Evans' former students. (One of the graduates is now Maj. Gen. Davis.) This was the pioneering effort leading to Air Force integration, and also served as a lever for further integration in all the services.

Recognition for his years of achievement has now started to roll in. The Defense Department cited him in 1956 for outstanding contributions in the field of racial relations. In 1959 he was given the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League in recognition of his distinguished service to the U.S. Government. He also holds the Harmon Award in Science, the Dorie Miller Award in Human Relations and a host of honorary degrees. Most recently he was awarded the distinguished service citation of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains in Philadelphia.

His concern for intergroup understanding is reflected in many ways. He talks with reticence but deep pride about his forebears and his family. His wife, Rose McGoodwin Evans, is a New York University graduate and mathematics teacher; his daughter, Evangeline, is a Stanford University senior. His 21-year-old son, James Carmichael Evans, Jr., was the first Negro to be elected president of one of the 28 on-campus fraternities at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, from which his father graduated in 1926. Young Evans is an Episcopalian who attends services at Boston's Christ Church. But the fraternity which elected (and a year later reelected) him, Pi Lambda Phi, is composed mainly of Jewish youth. When its members gather for dinner, James C. Evans, Jr., as president, recites the blessings—in Hebrew.

Appendix

State of the U.S. Lead-Zinc Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have had brought to my attention the remarks made by Mr. Lindsay Johnson, vice president, New Jersey Zinc Co., before the American Mining Congress at San Francisco, on September 27, 1962. Mr. Johnson has given a fine outline of the state of the lead-zinc industry and suggested some things that could be done to solve some of the industry's problems. This is a fine speech and I recommend it for the attention of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE U.S. LEAD-ZINC MINING INDUSTRY

(By Lindsay F. Johnson)

It is most appropriate that this report on the state of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry has been scheduled for the afternoon of the last day of these sessions, right at the bottom of the program.

This is entirely consistent with the current position of lead and zinc in the politico-metal series—right at the bottom.

In this series the combined weight of the two metals appears to be zero.

This is a dismal subject, because such part of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry that has not already expired is leading a dim existence, deep under the shadows cast over it by many things.

There has been no change for the better in the state of the industry since the last report to the mining congress a year ago. In fact, some of the shadows have deepened, and one or two additional ones have further clouded the lead-zinc horizon in recent months.

None of these overhanging and depressing shadows is the creation of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry itself. But the industry is compelled to take the primary and secondary adverse effects of them because it is a captive of circumstances, with little apparent ability to influence or combat them.

First, there is the shadow of continued overproduction with its consequent depression of metal prices, resulting in turn in gross devaluation of the real worth of U.S. lead-zinc mine products.

Statistics show that there is overproduction of lead and zinc metal in the United States as well as the rest of the free world, as evidenced by mounting stocks in the hands of producers, both here and abroad. They show also a continued and growing aggravation of this condition by net exports of the metals to the free world markets from Russia and other centrally-planned economies, with West Germany and Great Britain receiving the bulk of them.

It took a long time to convince some people in the international lead-zinc study group of this fact, but it is fundamental that there can be no surplus production of lead and zinc metal without surplus mine production.

The U.S. lead-zinc mining industry is not contributing to surplus mine production, but it is a victim of the depressing effects of surplus created elsewhere finding its way to our shores.

Let us examine the facts behind that statement.

Because it has been reduced by external economic forces, for several years, the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry has been limping along on a bare existence basis. In the case of lead it has been producing at less than 65 percent of demonstrated potential, and in the case of zinc, at about 70 percent. Conversely, mine production of lead and zinc elsewhere has increased.

Of raw materials involved in primary lead products consumed in the United States, less than 40 percent now originates in U.S. mines. Of raw materials involved in primary zinc products consumed in the United States, but little more than 40 percent originates in U.S. mines.

Because it is caught in the web of inflation, with no compensating value of its products, the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry is captive within its own borders. It cannot profitably put 1 pound of its products into the world markets.

In summary these are the facts:

The decline of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry has been seen. Its current economic distress is known. It is bound to its own national borders and has difficulty holding a place against foreign competition in our own markets let alone having any ability to compete in foreign markets.

In the face of these facts, I submit to you that to refer, as was done here on Monday, to the industry's plight and its inability to compete with foreign competiton at home or abroad as a myth is an affront to the intelligence of the Members of this Congress. This is cavalier thinking of the highest order.

We must face up to the facts that U.S. lead-zinc mines cannot possibly exist without U.S. smelters, but that U.S. smelters can, and in large part do, get along without U.S. mines. There are few, if any, smelters in the United States that do not operate to some degree on imported materials, and it is by this route and by metal imports that surplus mine production outside the United States finds its way in to create surpluses here.

Unless and until it is recognized that a healthy lead-zinc mining industry is a national necessity and asset and the will or the means are provided that will close off the influx of surplus foreign mine production into the United States, be it in the form of ores or metal or other manufactured products, the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry must live under this shadow, and the longer it stays under the shadow, the more it will languish.

By far the greatest shadow enshrouding the lead-zinc mining industry is the trade policy of our Government. This is not a new thing but is a continuation of what has been with us for some time.

It is a policy that seems sometimes to admit on the one hand that we need to preserve a strong lead-zinc mining industry but then proceeds to submerge the interests of such an industry so deep in foreign policy considerations that it becomes increasingly difficult to bring them to the surface.

This is a policy that has failed to come to grips with the problem of protecting a vital natural resource industry that has demonstrated beyond doubt that it has been seriously injured by the impact of imports.

It is a policy that has gone to great lengths to avoid facing up to the question.

It has involved us in such expedients as the international lead-zinc study group.

This group, which started out with a whoop and a holler, has slowly ground to an ineffective position. It has become increasingly evident that the participants, except the United States, are there primarily to protect their own lead-zinc industries. The United States submerges the interests of its mining industries in broad foreign policy considerations. Others take advantage of this and do not hesitate to berate us on any suggestions of moves that would control their participation in our domestic markets for metals and ores, even though these moves may be the only means of preserving some vestige of health in the domestic lead-zinc mining industries.

It is further evident that there is an underlying philosophy of the member governments, including ours, that the lead-zinc industries must accept and operate on a one-world basis. As pointed out earlier, our lead-zinc mining industry, involuntarily caught in the web of inflation, cannot profitably put one pound of its mine product into the world markets. We are the only nation so restricted. As long as this condition and this philosophy prevail, there is little reason to think that the other nations, who exploit our market without fear of retaliation or competition in their own markets, will voluntarily give up this advantage. So, the prospect of anything constructive for the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry coming from the international lead-zinc study group seems extremely remote.

Since the last report to the mining congress there have been two more sessions of the study group in Geneva, with no accomplishment that has been reflected in improvement in world market conditions.

Oddly enough, in the 1962 session our Government did not even barter any more foreign metal into our stockpiles, as it did to no avail in 1961.

Another session is scheduled for October.

There seems to be some prospect that the group is now leading into a discussion of an international commodity agreement for lead and zinc, based on a proposal by Mexico.

Representatives of the U.S. industry are opposed to this for obvious reasons beyond the hopeless complexity of it. Our State Department avers it is not in favor of such a commodity agreement but seems to lack the decision to close the door on it.

Should discussion of this subject get underway in this study group, I think it is reasonable for you to expect the first progress report at the mining congress of 1967.

Another expedient the policy has led us to is the quota plan.

As pointed out in previous reports to you, the quotas were another compromise to facing up to the problem. As it has turned out, the quota plan has been of more advantage to foreign producers than to the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry it was supposed to help. The quotas gave to foreign producers what amounts to a guaranteed quantitative participation in our markets, regardless of the

level of consumption. Since the last report to you, they have continued to use them to full advantage, pushing in practically 100 percent of the quotas and thus using their guaranteed place in the U.S. market as an umbrella over a perilously low price structure in their own markets.

Unfortunately, while the umbrella has been good and tight for exporters to this country, it has leaked all over the domestic industry. In their avidness to find a place for the surplus mine production they import, the metal producers and distributors have got into the habit of buying out the house every night for the popular Broadway show "I Can Get It for You Wholesale" and distributing the tickets to consumers. This is, no doubt, good entertainment for the consumers but is a sad result of surplus foreign mine production being attracted to and encouraged to enter the United States.

Also, there has been increasing adeptness in developing end runs around the quotas by exporting to the United States lead and zinc in manufactured or semimanufactured products. This has been particularly so in the past year with respect to certain lead products.

In fairness it must be said that while the quotas have failed to accomplish their purpose of stabilizing and improving the state of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry, they have prevented chaos. There is little doubt that without them the U.S. mining industry would today be in a completely intolerable position.

And now in recent weeks we have been confronted with the policy at its zenith in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We have heard much in these sessions about the evils and virtues of this highly controversial piece of legislation.

Analysis of the act and the history of its enactment would seem to indicate that the sacrificial prospects are greatly increased for many industries already beset by competition from imports.

Many of these industries can reap no benefit from the achievement of the ultimate general purposes of the act. Their inflated costs, not the least of which is labor cost, eliminate them from competing in foreign markets, and in many cases they will be driven in large part from their own markets. The act itself admits of this possibility.

In the case of lead and zinc, even though there seems to be some prospect that provisions of the act could lead to maintenance of the status quo, we all know that the status quo is not good enough.

Unfortunately, many remaining segments of the lead-zinc mining industry in the United States could well follow those that have preceded them into this sacrificial category.

However, it seems too early to judge how developments in our own Nation as well as elsewhere in the world will influence the exercise of broad powers under this act by our Chief Executive. One can only speculate at this point on what the course will be.

No rule can be hard and fast for everything. It is to be hoped that in the end the wisdom of preserving and encouraging natural resource industries will prevail and that, just as it is founded on anomalies of geology, the lead-zinc mining industry will be found to be an anomaly of political economy and receive by executive or legislative action treatment that will preserve it and encourage it rather than allow its partial or entire destruction.

Another event of the year that has cast a dark shadow over the lead-zinc mining industry has been the investigation of stockpiles. We have likewise heard this subject well covered in these sessions.

The effect of these investigations has been profoundly depressing, and the uncertainties involved most certainly have had their secondary effect on the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry.

This shadow unfortunately will remain as long as these uncertainties remain, and they will remain until reappraisal and wiser counsel demonstrate that stockpiles are not liabilities, as some would make them, but rather are of great value to the Nation, not only for their potential physical use in emergency but for their enhancement of our Nation's position in the current state of international political economy.

I do not mean to leave the impression that the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry is giving up; far from it. There have been some noteworthy achievements in opening new mines and developing means of reducing costs of production. Up to now, however, these must be counted as means of survival rather than accomplishments that can within themselves create a strong, healthy industry that can capture a fair and reasonable share of our own markets.

Likewise, the industries, through their joint research programs, are making highly commendable efforts to further consolidate and expand present uses for lead and zinc and to find new applications that may result in greater consumption.

One might infer from this glum picture of a national policy that the lead-zinc mining industry does not have a friend in the world, let alone in Washington. This is far from the case.

There are many in the Congress who have complete awareness of the importance of a healthy lead-zinc mining industry in the United States. We feel that they believe in the principle that it was on development of natural resources our vast economy was founded, and by their actions have shown they will do all they can in the interest of preserving the industry as an important and necessary part of our national economy.

To mention a few, foremost among them are our eminent Senators Clinton P. Anderson and Robert S. Kerr, supported by Senators Gordon L. Allott, Wallace F. Bennett, Alan Bible, Howard W. Cannon, Frank Carlson, John A. Carroll, Dennis Chavez, Frank Church, Everett M. Dirksen, Carl Hayden, Henry M. Jackson, Len B. Jordan, Estes Kefauver, Thomas H. Kuchel, Edward V. Long, Warren G. Magnuson, Mike Mansfield, Lee Metcalf, Frank E. Moss, Alexander Wiley, and on the House side, the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior Committee, who has already stated his stalwart position to you from this platform, supported by the Honorable Howard Baker, Walter S. Baring, James F. Battin, Frank M. Clark, Peter H. Dominick, Durward G. Hall, Ralph R. Harding, Walt Horan, Harold T. Johnson, Richard Ichord, Cecil R. King, David S. King, Walter L. McVey, Joseph M. Montoya, Thomas G. Morris, Arnold Olsen, M. Blain Peterson, Gracie Pfost, Vernon W. Thomson, William M. Tuck, Al Ullman, Francis E. Walter, William B. Widnall, and Morris K. Udall.

These statesmen are firm friends of the lead-zinc mining industry, and the industry will do well not to forget that they are.

We believe that we even have some friends in Interior, Commerce, and State whose hearts basically are with us but whose hands for the moment must be tied.

For a decade now the once hardy breed of lead-zinc miners in the United States have been shouting for "Chloe" into the dismal swamp of the Potomac but without a rewarding answer. The anly answers that filter back through the morass seem to be in foreign languages, which the lead-zinc miners cannot understand, but they know they are not Chloe. It is certain though that they must keep shouting into the swamp for Chloe, and their smelter cousins, who are approaching equal peril, might do well to add their voices in unison. They must find her soon, for there seems no other way to avoid extinction of the breed.

Those "Mercenaries"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, January 9, 1963, together with letters to the Star from Mr. Robert L. Buell, former American Consul General at Leopoldville and Mr. Aubrey Cox. Since the United States agreed to or advocated the support of the partition of Korea at the 38th parallel, the partition of Palestine, the division of India and Pakistan, and the division of Vietnam, it appears rather inconsistent to me that this administration would listen to the advisers in the State Department to the extent of encouraging, supporting, and financing United Nations forces in waging war on Tshombe and the people of Katanga—possibly the most civilized group in the Congo—in an effort to force them into union with other provinces.

I am unalterably opposed to our financing this type operation through the United Nations. I did not support the U.N. bond issue and sincerely hope that more Members of this House will vote against the appropriation of funds to finance further action of this type through the U.N. In my opinion, there is grave danger that the Congo will end up with another Castro.

The editorial and letters follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 9, 1963]

THOSE "MERCENARIES"

An especially irritating aspect of United Nations propaganada in the Congo matter is discussed in two letters appearing elsewhere on this page.

Time after time, the apologists for the U.N., as well as its official spokesmen, refer in slurring terms to the "white mercenaries" in Moise Tshombe's Katangan Army. The impression is conveyed that these "mercenaries"—a few hundred men at most—are the root of all evil in the Congo, and that if they could be given the old heave-ho all would then be sweetness and light.

The public is not told that many if not most of these so-called mercenaries have lived for years in Kantanga, and that it is at least possible that some of them are fighting for a cause in which they believe—not for money alone. Nor do the U.N. propagandists ever mention that the combat troops in the U.N. Congo Army—whether white, black or brown—are also "mercenaries" in the sense that they are being paid to fight—largely by the United States.

These points are well stated by our correspondents, one of whom is a former American Consul General at Leopoldville, and we think their comments are worth reading.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

The recently published Associated Press photograph of two European prisoners of

the Katangan forces, tied with ropes to their U.N. captors, labeled them as "mercenaries."

Who knows but that they were brave men who volunteered to fight for a cause they believed to be just. One was a Hungarian. Ponder that.

Who, pray tell, are the U.N. forces in the Congo if not mercenaries; yes, and with services paid for more than half by U.S. contributions to the U.N.?

Were volunteers in the Allied forces in World Wars I and II branded as mercenaries? The Hessians employed by King George III during our revolution were. So have Gurkhas always been. Let us leave dictionary definitions aside.

The misguided and, I fear, confused U.N. mercenary forces in the Congo were sent there after the end of Belgian rule, when murder, rape, and pillage ensued in some areas, solely to restore law and order and to protect lives and property. They were not sent there to engage in aggressive warfare; not to shoot innocent noncombatants, as they recently have done; not to impose by force of arms unification of discordant local political groups.

By the invasion of Katangan territory, controlled by the forces of a patriotic political leader, Moise Tshombe, it seems apparent that U.N. forces and those who control them have exceeded the authority which prompted these forces to be sent into this area.

The animosity engendered by this action in large areas of Africa and among our allies may well be the prelude to destroying the U.N. itself. The shocking precedent of misconduct by such mercenary U.N. forces will, I fear, preclude all possibility of future U.N. police actions elsewhere of a comparable nature. The U.N. has, alas, destroyed its alleged reputation as a great moral force for the maintenance of peace and integrity in international relations.

ROBERT L. BUELL,
Former American Consul General at Leopoldville.

The editorials in the Star on the Katangan situation have been excellent; and I am sure that the editor is not laboring under the illusion that the Belgian and French officers who are assisting in the defense of Katanga really deserve to be called white mercenaries any more than the trigger-happy Indian Gurkha and Irish officers and troops employed by the United Nations for the subjugation of Katanga deserve to be called brown and white mercenaries. We, American taxpayers, who are paying most of the hire of the Indian and Irish troops know that they are "mercenaries." And yet, most news stories relating to the Congo (including some of those appearing in the Star) manage to employ the phrase "white mercenaries" in referring to the Katangan army of defense in such a manner as to leave the impression that the Belgians and the French (who really do have a valid interest in Katanga) are in some way immoral in defending that interest, whereas the professional Indian and Irish troops that have been brought half way around the world to subjugate Katanga and deliver her over to a group of hostile tribes headed by Adoula are not subject to the same scornful term of "mercenaries."

I bitterly resent being subjected to the so-called brainwashing process; but I think there is overwhelming evidence that the public is being subjected to a brainwashing program carefully designed to make the strong odor of the United Nations policy in the Congo somewhat less offensive to the nostrils of the American public.

AUBREY COX.

Each NATO Country Must Assume Full Responsibilities of Membership—Acting Secretary General of NATO, Hon. Guido Colonna, Addresses Paris Meeting of NATO Parliamentarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the United States is a shareholder in a 15-power partnership for world peace—a cooperative effort which demands from each participant a strong sense of understanding, trust, and responsibility. And, as our efforts are set in an alliance of 15 sovereign and independent states, and since the degree of cooperation and agreement among the member governments will necessarily dictate its effectiveness, it is essential to the interests of the free world that we unceasingly strive to reach a common accord.

One tangible evidence of a determined drive to attain this unanimity was the conference of parliamentarians from NATO countries in Paris last November. As a member of the official delegation from the Senate of the United States, it was my privilege to be in attendance, and, along with a number of colleagues, to participate in meetings aimed at promoting a singleness of purpose among treaty nations.

One significant highlight of the session was an informative address by Hon. Guido Colonna, who served as Acting Secretary General of NATO during the illness of Secretary General Dirk U. Stikker.

Mr. Colonna began his remarks with an informative digest of the changes in world affairs which had taken place in the last year, and the relationship of these alterations to the NATO alliance. He also discussed the current status of NATO in vital areas of political relationship, military preparedness, and civil emergency planning. The Secretary emphasized dangers which face the treaty countries, not only military, but ideological and economic as well.

In commenting on recent Western optimism over signs of strain between elements of the Communist bloc he observed that—

Anything that may make for more variety and more independence behind the Iron Curtain is all to the good. Here again, however, we should not indulge in wishful thinking and we should not base our policies for today on what may—or may not—happen tomorrow. A less monolithic, less oppressive communism will not necessarily be a weaker communism. It may well be stronger because more firmly based on public support: and indications are not lacking that this may be so.

Mr. President, fully aware of the far-reaching implications of a cooperative spirit among the NATO countries, it is nevertheless my conviction that the United States should move to stimulate a more proportionate degree of participation in alliance activity by some other members nations. Certain of these Allies have, of course, been weakened by shortages of materials and manpower, and they have not yet fully recovered from the devastation of World War II. But, the United States has been shouldering a far larger portion of the military and financial burdens, and it is time that we make clear our desire that others also assume their full responsibilities.

I request that excerpts from the address by Secretary Colonna before the NATO Parliamentarians Conference be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. Additionally, I request that statements of mine dealing with the need for equal adherence to NATO commitments, as reported in the Elkins Inter-Mountain, Elkins, W. Va., December 17, 1962, be likewise reproduced.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH OF THE ACTING SECRETARY GENERAL, AT THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE IN PARIS ON NOVEMBER 12, 1962

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a high honor for me, as the Acting Secretary General of NATO, to welcome you at our headquarters building on the occasion of your annual conference. At the same time, I am all too well aware that this honor has fallen to me only because, owing to his recent illness, the Secretary General, Mr. Stikker, could not be here today himself. Mr. Stikker has, however, asked me to express to you his most cordial wishes for a successful meeting and his profound regret at not being able to be with you.

He has—I know you will be glad to hear—made a remarkable recovery from what was a pretty serious operation; but even he still needs some rest to be fully able to resume his duties. There is every reason to hope that he will be back with us very soon. Meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, I hope I may convey to him the conference's best wishes for a speedy and complete recovery.

During this important conference, as indeed at any other time of the year, the International Secretariat will do everything in its power to lend you such help and facilities as it can in order to promote the successful work of this gathering.

We attach, as you know, the greatest value to your work, because we are fully aware that what we are trying to do, we can never accomplish in a vacuum. To succeed, we need the full support of the public opinion of our 15 member countries, and this means, first and foremost, that of the elected representatives of our allied nations. You, parliamentarians, and we, officials, must work hand in hand in mutual trust and in a common conviction as to the common goal to reach.

Every word spoken by you during this conference, every idea thrown out and every resolution passed by you will be read and listened to by all of us with the greatest respect and with the greatest interest. The wishes expressed by you and the suggestions you make will guide us in our future work as they have in the past.

I now wish to turn to the world situation in general and try to assess what changes there have been since last year. We should be deceiving ourselves if we were to say that there had been any diminution in

the Soviet threat. Indeed, in some ways, it may even have increased. There is, therefore, no reason for either complacency or slackness on our part. Allow me to review the elements of the situation one by one.

The Soviet Union continues to gain economic, technological and military strength. It is true that she, as well as China and some of the satellites, encounters great difficulties in food production and the management of agriculture. The laws of nature often refuse to submit to the laws of Marx and Lenin. It is equally true that the standard of living in the Soviet Union, not to speak of that of Communist China, continues to be miserably low compared with that of the West. Progress is painfully slow, thus often straining the patience of the Russian masses, as manifested in the disturbances in some parts of southern Russia last summer.

But let us not be misled by the undoubted shortcoming in the Soviet system into underrating the expansion of Soviet industrial power, the rapid and in some respects admirable achievements in the scientific and technical field, and the formidable military build-up which these have enabled the Soviets to achieve. We in NATO have, to be sure, considerably improved our military posture. Our alliance possesses a formidable deterrent in time of peace and impressive fighting power in the event of war. The Soviet leaders must realize this. They must also realize that if they were to force a conflict upon us, they might certainly inflict fearful damage and loss on the whole Western alliance, but they would also provoke their own total destruction. That is the balance on which the peace of the world precariously rests. But that balance is not a static thing. If we have not stood still, neither—we may be sure—has our adversary. That is why we cannot be content with our efforts, but must renew and redouble them.

Over the years, there has been a gradual change in the face of communism. Since the death of Stalin, there have been one or two cracks in the grim, monolithic facade. Here and there, a little freedom, a little light has been allowed to seep in. We in the West have watched these developments with interest and not without sympathy. Not one of us would grudge the Russian people some relaxation in the burden they bear. None of us but would be overjoyed if they could have even a fraction of the right and freedom we take for granted. We have no quarrel with them: our enemy is the system under which they are forced to live. There may have been what some people call a thaw. The Soviet leaders may indeed have realized that the human spirit, even after 40 years of despotism, can stand so much tyranny and no more. But let us have no illusions. The central structure of communism remains. If anyone is inclined to believe that there has been a change of heart, let him look at the wall in Berlin, and at the tragedy and shame it has brought.

We know, it is true, that the Communist empire has its ideological and political strains and stresses. We know too that what in the horrible jargon of kremlinology is called "polycentrism" (ugly subjects seem to generate ugly words) is more and more replacing the monolithic bloc of Stalin's day. We have no reason not to welcome this. Anything that may make for more variety and more independence behind the Iron Curtain is all to the good. Here again, however, we should not indulge in wishful thinking and we should not base our policies for today on what may—or may not— happen tomorrow. A less monolothic, less oppressive communism will not necessarily be a weaker communism. It may well be stronger, because more firmly based on public support: and indications are not lacking that this may be so.

So much for our Soviet adversary. Let me now briefly review our own position today compared to our situation last year. Economically, the Alliance as a whole continues to prosper and progress. Production in most countries of the Alliance is still at an all-time high, though the rate of growth in some of the major industrial countries has levelled off, and we have had one or two warnings—in the stock market for example—that we cannot take our present momentum for granted. Encouraging progress is being made in the economic and social development of those countries and regions in the Alliance which had hitherto lagged behind. In the case of Greece and Turkey, two consortia have been set up under the aegis of OECD. This development warrants new hopes for increased and better coordinated economic assistance to these two countries.

The Common Market has proved an outstanding success exceeding even the hopes of its well-wishers. Its radiation and attraction is felt in every part of the Western World and far beyond.

The determination of the United Kingdom Government to negotiate acceptable terms for its entry into the Common Market will, we hope, bear fruit before long. With the addition of Great Britain and other Western countries, and with the association of large parts of Africa, the Common Market would become one of the most powerful units in the world and an entirely new element in world affairs.

If we needed any reassurance on the importance of the Common Market, it would be amply provided by the reactions of the other side. First of all, the line was that co-operation among capitalists was doomed to failure owing to the contradictions of a system under which—as some eminent Marxist once said—if one capitalist announced his intention of hanging himself, the rest would compete with one another to sell him the rope. It was indeed embarrassing when in a Europe which seemed ruined by war, rent by dissension, and doomed, by all the rules of the Marxist game, to decadence and decline, our free economy not only refused to lie down and die, but staged a spectacular renaissance. Later, the Soviets seem to have admitted to themselves that the Common Market could not be laughed or vilified out of existence. They would still like to see it fail. They, and those who consciously or unconsciously play their game, are still trying to prevent its further extension and to misrepresent it to the underdeveloped nations of the world as a cunning device to perpetuate their colonial bondage. But for better or worse they have had to accept that it is a force to be reckoned with—and lived with.

Politically, our alliance is in good health. Khrushchev's hopes to divide us on the issue of Berlin have been disappointed. We have stuck together, and jointly we have stuck to our guns. Most recently the alliance has shown spontaneous and magnificent solidarity with the United States in the Cuban crisis. Other issues which threatened to divide us in the past have faded into the background. Intensive political consultation carried on over the years is beginning to show its fruit, not necessarily by producing unanimity on each and every issue—which is perhaps not essential or even desirable in a community of free peoples—but in creating a common pattern of thought and of reactions to political events around the globe. In other words, we are not only overcoming past divisions, but we are in full process of growing together into a true family of like-minded nations. In this respect the spectacular Franco-German reconciliation—a long-evolving process whose completion was symbolized by Dr. Adenauer's visit to Paris and General de Gaulle's visit to Germany—is in its way as positive and momentous an event for the alliance as President Kennedy's declaration on 4th July of this year on interdependence between the United States and Europe. Europe must unite. None of us here, I think, would gainsay that. But we must not allow the bonds of unity which are growing closer every day to divert us from our goal of a true Atlantic community, or allow any contraction or conflict to arise between the two objectives of European unity and Atlantic solidarity. The Atlantic Ocean must unite, and not divide, the free world.

As to the development and strengthening of our Military Establishment, I have already had something to say in connection with the recommendations of your conference of 1961. I would now like to go into this question in more detail because it is, after all, an essential element in any review of Western strength and achievements that we wish to make.

You are all aware that since the Oslo Conference of May 1961 the North Atlantic Council has been engaged in a thorough examination of NATO defense problems with a view to determining long-term planning and policies. In his opening address to you last year, Mr. Stikker described some of these problems, particularly those relating to the control of nuclear weapons, and also explained to you why the council had temporarily to interrupt this study in order to give the highest priority to the urgent build-up of our military forces in face of the Soviet threat in Berlin.

I should, first of all, like to assure you that the determination and solidarity shown by NATO countries after the construction of the wall in Berlin in August 1961 has in no way slackened and that as a result the efficiency and state of readiness of the forces under SACEUR's command has greatly improved since last year and will continue to improve. But we have still a long way to go before we can be sure that our shield of conventional forces is fully capable of playing its role in the overall deterrent to aggression.

There is another aspect of our work in NATO to which I would like to refer this morning, that is civil emergency planning.

We regard progress in the wide field of planning and preparing for war in the civil sectors as of vital importance. Civil emergency planning is an essential complement to the NATO military buildup.

If our preparations in the civil field are obviously inadequate, the credibility of the deterrent is lessened. If war should be forced upon us, effective preparations in the civil sectors, both nationally and internationally, offer the only practicable means by which our populations could hope to survive and to sustain the allied war efforts to a successful conclusion.

We recognize of course that national preparations must remain the responsibility of the individual member governments. We recognize also that financial, and in some cases psychological, considerations cannot but hinder the full implementation of the wide range of measures ideally required.

We now review annually the progress made both nationally and internationally, and a comprehensive but, I regret, secret report is prepared each year by the senior civil emergency planning committee. Each government will thus be able to judge the success or failure of our international efforts and the extent to which they and their fellow governments have met national goals.

I will not hide from you that much remains to be done, but I am satisfied that the tasks with which we are confronted are being tackled with energy and determination by a sound and satisfactory organization acting under the direct auspices and responsibility of the North Atlantic Council itself.

At the same time I would like to point out the importance that we attach to the aid you can give in this as in other fields. Your sup-

port for legislation and financial measures aimed at enabling your respective governments to prepare for war in the civil fields is vital to the success of our combined efforts.

I should like now to look further afield. In a world in which two powerful alliances maintain an uneasy equilibrium, the position of those countries which remain outside the two alinements, is clearly of cardinal importance. This applies both to those countries which have formally adopted a policy of nonalinement, and to those which, though their political alinement is clear, do not actually belong to any particular grouping. Developments in those third countries are of the greatest importance to our alliances and we must pay the closest attention to them.

With this in mind I should like to try to draw up a kind of balance sheet of developments favorable and unfavorable to the West in those parts of the world which are not covered by NATO or the Warsaw Pact.

In the Far East, we watch with satisfaction and confidence the growing economic power, the social and political stability, and the sense of international responsibility of Japan.

In southeast Asia, the Geneva agreement has put an end to the dangerous fighting in Laos, though we still have considerable misgivings about what seem to be circumventions, if not breaches, of the agreement by the Communists.

In South Vietnam, the bitter guerrilla warfare between pro-Western and Communist forces continues, though the massive aid given by the United States appears to have given the edge of advantage to the West.

By a strange reversal of fortune, India—the aggressor of last year—has herself become the victim of a massive, ruthless and determined aggression by Communist China. It is too early to say how the conflict will develop. But there can be no doubt that it will have profound and far-reaching effects. It will certainly disillusion the Indian leaders and the Indian masses still further about the true nature of communism. The Indian Communists themselves have been unable to find any justification for China's action. It may well shake to its foundations the whole philosophy of nonalinement on which the Indians and many others, following their example, have based their whole foreign policy.

Mr. Nehru himself has virtually admitted that for the past 15 years, India has been living in a fool's paradise. It has already created a major problem in Sino-Soviet relations. Can the Soviets continue to give economic and even military aid to a power which with the other half of the Communist world is in a state of undeclared war, and what will happen to their relations with China if they do?

The Middle East has remained relatively calm, except for the revolution in Yemen and the Kurdish rebellion in Iraq, which General Kassam appears to be unable to put down, and which may yet have wider repercussions.

In north Africa, the farsighted and courageous action of the French Government has ended the 7 years' nightmare in Algeria. It has opened the way for a new pattern of cooperation, on a basis of sovereign equality, between two countries whose fates have been closely linked for more than a century. It has afforded France the opportunity of resuming in the near future her rightful role in the military effort of our alliance. It is our earnest hope that the great work begun at Evian will continue and that the new Algeria will develop along democratic lines and in close friendship and cooperation with France.

In Africa, south of the Sahara, the process of decolonization has gone steadily and peacefully on.

The road from colonial dependence to full sovereignty is a hard one for both sides to travel. There have been difficulties, and there are bound to be many more. But all that has happened over the past year has confirmed the wisdom of the decision to end the colonial link in freedom, order, and friendship. Even in the Congo, the gradual emergence from chaos and civil war affords some hope that some measure of stability may return to that unhappy country. Such progress as has been achieved has been won against heavy odds. The Soviet bloc has been concerned only to exploit and intensify internal divisions. But with patience and goodwill, order may yet prevail.

To turn now to Cuba, the swift and courageous action of President Kennedy has foiled a major threat to the security of the West and the peace of the world. It is too soon to say how things may turn out. It may be that this brave and well-judged stand may have opened up new possibilities and new prospects. Many of us may think so. But in our relief that, this time, catastrophe has been averted let us not forget that negotiations between East and West have been burdened for too long by a legacy of all too well founded suspicions of Soviet intentions and all too blatant Soviet bad faith. The events of the past few weeks can only have added to that burden. It is hard to negotiate with confidence with an interlocuteur whose main weapon in debate is the lie direct.

While the credit for the outcome of the crisis must be given in full measure to the courage and steadfastness of one country, and indeed of one man, I feel certain that the hand of the President of the United States was greatly strengthened by the response of the Organization of American States and by the full support he was given by this alliance. Therein lies a lesson for the future.

On the whole, and despite the alarms and excursions of the past weeks, I think the picture of the uncommitted world emerging from the survey is an encouraging one. Decolonization has continued swiftly and in general peaceably. Gradually, some measure of order and stability seems to be emerging in the southern half of the world. And—perhaps most important of all—slowly, painfully, but nonetheless surely, the neutrals are beginning to understand the realities of the world situation and the realities of world power. The shedding of illusions is always a painful process. We have found that ourselves. It is likely also to be a long one. We shall need all our patience and all our sympathy. But if we keep our heads, and steadily and consistently pursue our policy of promoting the independence, the economic well-being and the social stability of the emergent countries, commonsense is bound to prevail in the end. The neutrals are learning fast. Sooner or later they will realize—as many of them do already—that neutralism only makes sense in a world in which the opposing forces are more or less evenly balanced: that the attempts to upset that balance come from one side and one side only; that they themselves could not survive in a world dominated by communism; and that they bear a heavy responsibility not to upset the balance in favor of those who are in truth the last real and unrepentant imperialists of today.

However, provided we have the willpower to see things through, there is good reason to hope that peace will be preserved and that in the long run our side will win the race. There are many signs and facts to encourage us. Our economic strength and with it our social stability continue to grow. In the scientific field, we are making great strides forward and the recent splendid successes of our U.S. ally in the space field give us hope that the headstart which the Soviets have had in this field will be gradually diminished and finally overtaken by the West. Politically, our solidarity and cohesion as allies are growing and the prospect of a permanent interdependence of a united Europe and a United States of America, opens entirely new vistas into a better future.

Our greatest handicap often seems to be our lack of confidence in our own strength and our skepticism about our own values. A more positive, a more offensive psychology appears to me the necessary complement to a defensive strategy in the military field. And let us never forget that the West is not only NATO, but all those who, whether they are formally associated with us or not, share our aspirations and our way of life. In resolutely pursuing its policy of peace through strength, this alliance is fighting their battle as well as its own.

Mr. Spaak, in a recent and most eloquent speech before the United Nations, appealed to the Soviets to recognize the peaceful character of the Western system and to show through deeds that they are in earnest with their slogan of peaceful coexistence. This speech and this appeal received one of the most thunderous ovations the United Nations General Assembly has witnessed. Will it receive any response? On the answer to that question hangs the whole future of the world.

We live in the midst of many and great dangers, but the dangers that beset us are matched by the opportunities within our grasp. Let us seize them boldly and advance to our goal of a world in which war shall be no more.

[From the Elkins (W. Va.) Inter-Mountain, Dec. 17, 1962]

RANDOLPH SAYS UNITED STATES MUST INSIST ALLIES MEET OBLIGATIONS

Insistence by the United States that its partner governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization meet their defense obligations, is imperative in the belief of U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who returned only recently from a trip to Europe and a visit to the Supreme Allied Headquarters in Paris.

Before leaving Elkins this morning, following a visit here on Sunday, the legislator indicated that America is 10 percent over its commitment for conventional forces, while many other countries in the alliance against communism (Soviet Russia) are below promised strength.

"It is a fact that the covenant has not been adequately met by several nations," declared Senator RANDOLPH, who stated that "we have been the bulwark in this cooperative effort and have reason to be critical of certain deficiencies of our allies. They have, of course, been weakened by some shortages of materials and manpower and they have not recovered from the devastation of actual war destruction. But the United States has been committing 10 percent of its gross national product to defense as Great Britain allocates but 7.4 percent which is a little more than is done in France. In West Germany, the figure is only 5 percent but there will be an increase soon in that crucial area of West Europe."

"We know that the average of 1.1 percent of population in the armed forces in the NATO nations as a group does not equal the 1.5 percent of America.

"A month ago in Paris at the Supreme Allied Headquarters, I was told by Gen. Lauris Norstad, top commander, that we must have a stronger conventional force if our deterrent shield is to command respect of the Communist leaders, I fully agreed with his experienced conviction and so stated in public addresses in several cities in West Virginia."

Senator RANDOLPH went on to stress that citizens of West Virginia are concerned that NATO be more effective and they have been

studying the cost in our budget of the alliance.

Later today at Salem College, the State's senior Senator will speak to the students there on the subject of "the alliance and our part in the organization."

"NATO," said the Elkins citizen, "is generally viewed by the public as primarily a military alliance. The success of this historically unusual venture is due in large part to the military shield which has prevented a Soviet takeover either by direct aggression or internal subversion, but there are other achievements which should be recognized.

"The fundamental objective of the alliance to maintain peace and stability having been achieved, NATO found itself forced to counter Soviet offenses in the political, economic and psychological areas. This led to purposeful cooperation, involving prior consultation among the nations in order to develop a common political front. Exchange of information and views before announcing a national policy has created mutual understanding and trust, especially as such a procedure forces each nation to consider and understand the point of view of its fellow nations before deciding on its own policy. Thus a degree of unanimity has been achieved, without sacrifice of national principle or national policy, unique in the history of the world.

"As a member of NATO, we are shareholders in a 15-power partnership for world peace—a cooperative effort which demands from each participant a strong sense of understanding, trust, and responsibility. And, since our effort is set in an alliance of sovereign and independent states, and since the degree of cooperation and agreement among the member governments will necessarily dictate its effectiveness, it is essential to the interests of the free world that we unceasingly try to reach understanding and accord.

"Though we attempt to maintain open and realistic diplomatic relations with nations the world over, it is in the scope of our NATO commitments that we perhaps meet our most challenging tests of loyalty, determination and resolve."

Banking World Spotlights Hon. Henry S. Reuss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today an article entitled "Banking's Spotlight on HENRY S. REUSS," which appeared in the January issue of Banking, a publication of the American Bankers Association.

Those of us who have served with Congressman REUSS on the Banking and Currency Committee know him to be an energetic and tireless worker for sound monetary and economic measures; he is indeed a battler for those things in which he believes. I know all of HENRY's friends will be most interested in reading this most complimentary article:

BANKING'S SPOTLIGHT ON HENRY S. REUSS, MEMBER, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE AND JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

HENRY S. REUSS, 50-year-old scion of Wisconsin German ancestors, is a Republican family's gift to the liberal wing of the Democrats in Congress.

A prominent member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and of the Joint Economic Committee, who by his probings of Fed and Treasury policies has attracted the notice of the banking world, Mr. REUSS in November won his fifth term in the House by a safe margin of 43,000. He campaigned partly on Cuba, but mainly on the need for a more dynamic economic policy and more vigorous export efforts. These may not all have been the issues the voters would have selected, but they seemed to like Mr. REUSS' leadership and gave him 63.3 percent of the total of ballots cast in his district.

HENRY REUSS is a battler for those things in which he believes. He fought in World War II, entering the service as a private and emerging from the war as a major with bronze battle stars for Normandy, central France, and Germany. In the Congress he fights for the liberal monetary and economic measures he deems necessary, although this brings him into inevitable clashes with the views of the more conservative school represented by Chairman Martin of the Fed.

Congressman REUSS paid no major attention to economics on his way through Cornell and Harvard Law School, but since college days he has read extensively on our central banking system, money and banking, and economic questions. He is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee subcommittee which is concerned with the balance of international payments.

"The commercial banking system plays an indispensable role in the United States," says HENRY REUSS. "The growth we need for our own welfare and for our world responsibilities can come only with a healthy banking system. Since the great depression, our banks have worked well, but there are at least two areas in which the House Banking and Currency Committee under Chairman PATMAN will take a long and deep look: (1) The laws governing the national banks cry for revision and improvement in many particulars; (2) the relationship of the Federal Reserve System to the Congress and to the executive branch needs attention. I believe the Fed should be independent, but also that it must play a responsible role.

"While I don't want the Executive to have the power to overrule the Fed, I do want the lines of authority fixed so that responsibility of decisionmaking won't be blurred and obscured. I think this needs to be the subject of a full-fledged study by the House Banking and Currency Committee, a legislative committee, unlike the JEC which has had many hearings," he continued. "If the public is to understand its government, it must know who makes decisions and why. In this matter the JEC has come to the end of its abilities. Now it is a matter for the legislative committee.

"As for the recommendations of the three interagency committees which have reported to the President on subjects dealt with by the commission on money and credit and others, we'll look at their recommendations. I'd welcome a broadly based Presidential program for reforms; but this does not relieve the Banking and Currency Committee from its constitutional duty to survey the Nation's needs and seek passage of needed laws. I feel a sense of urgency on this, as domestic and foreign policies are almost totally interdependent.

"Under Chairman PATMAN for the first time in recent history I expect the Banking Committee to study the entire field of money and banking and to draft and report appropriate legislation. Also for the first time in many years, I expect subcommittees with specified jurisdictions to be appointed. Congressman PATMAN will prove to be a vigorous, forthright, and responsible chairman."

Asked for his views on particular changes he favors in the banking system, Mr. REUSS explained: "I can't be very specific on the changes in the national banking system, since I need to do a lot more research and study. The one thing that I am clear on is that the present system of divided jurisdiction between the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the Comptroller of the Currency results in divided authority and responsibility, particularly in the field of mergers. Unified regulation should be the first order of business."

Mr. REUSS has been following money and banking not only on the two committees already mentioned, but also as a member of the House Government Operations' Subcommittee on Foreign and Monetary Affairs. Twice during the past year he has carried on individual inquiries on these subjects in Europe and has lectured before several German university groups. Mr. REUSS was one of several Members of the Congress who attended the International Monetary Fund meeting in Vienna in 1961.

In 1939–40 Mr. REUSS was assistant corporation counsel in Milwaukee County. Next he was with the OPA in Washington. In 1945 he was with the price control branch of the Office of Military Government for Germany. Later, before running for Congress in 1954, he held various public and private posts. Mr. REUSS explains how he got into politics very simply: "I didn't like the way the older generation was handling the world."

ONCE A REPUBLICAN

How did a Republican scion become a Democrat? "In the early 1950's Joe McCarthy dominated Wisconsin politics." How did he happen to land on the House Banking and Currency Committee? "Couldn't get Public Works or Foreign Affairs, my first preferences."

The Congressman's grandfather came here from Germany in 1848 as a youth of 18, soon had a job with the Marshall & Isley Bank in Milwaukee, and ultimately became its president. The bank, the oldest in the Northwest, is now Wisconsin's second largest bank. The Congressman's father also made his career with this bank and HENRY REUSS himself, during his college vacations, did stints there as a runner and as a teller in the transit department. Until he entered politics HENRY REUSS was a director of the bank.

ARTICULATE CONGRESSMAN

Mr. REUSS is one of the most articulate of Congressmen. Time magazine has called attention to his "energy, ability, and ideas." He is a leading Congressional conservationist. A former deputy general counsel in Paris for the Marshall plan, he is now a lieutenant colonel in the Infantry Reserve. Mr. REUSS is an enthusiastic outdoorsman; he likes to fish, hunt, hike, camp, sail, and play tennis with his wife and their four children.

The Wisconsin Congressman is keeping a close eye on banking. Bankers should keep an eye on him.

Well Done, FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, while I am sure that all Americans are aware of and appreciate the great contribution being made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the safety and welfare of our

country, it is gratifying to note the praise of our newspapers concerning the recent accomplishments of the FBI during the year 1962. I am herefore pleased to call to the attention of the Members of Congress and the American people an editorial which appeared in the News-Dispatch, Michigan City, Ind., praising the work of the FBI:

WELL DONE, FBI

By custom, FBI agents toil in quiet anonymity, preferring effectiveness to personal glory. Consequently the public often is unaware how well these modern-day "untouchables" fight crime.

Appreciation of the FBI's remarkable record can be gleaned from Director J. Edgar Hoover's yearend report to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Here, briefly, are a few of the things FBI men accomplished in 1962:

1. Apprehended 11,400 fugitives, compared with 10,668 in 1961; provided evidence which led to 12,700 convictions against 12,418 the prior year.

2. Ran up a total of fines, savings, and recoveries well over $200 million—considerably more than it costs to operate the FBI and much higher than 1961's $148.4 million.

3. Located 19,000 cars stolen and driven out of State—and 2,500 fugitive felons for local authorities.

4. Processed 23,000 fingerprint cards a day while maintaining an unmatched identification file that contains 165 million sets of prints from an estimated 77 million persons.

5. Made 236,000 scientific laboratory examinations of evidence for local police in all 50 States—without charge.

6. Assisted, upon request, in more than 3,600 local and regional police schools—and trained another 165 picked lawmen at the famed FBI National Academy, bringing the Academy's graduate total to 4,258 since 1935.

7. Furnished more than 100,000 items of criminal intelligence to other law-enforcement agencies, resulting in some 2,400 arrests and $32.5 million in recoveries—plus the smashing of an international dope ring and seizure of $20 million worth of illicit drugs.

On the security front, the FBI continued to enfeeble the Communists' American apparatus; nabbed three pro-Castro saboteurs and seized their cache of explosives; caught a Navy man passing military secrets to the Russians and developed evidence leading to the expulsion of several Communist bloc diplomats.

In addition, it was largely the FBI which turned up witnesses and information leading to conviction of the U.S. Communist Party as an organization for failure to register with the Attorney General—a decision which puts American Reds in a tighter straitjacket.

In the South, FBI agents turned up church burners who tried by intimidation to keep Negroes from the polls. In Chicago—for the first time in years—they brought gangland killers (of union official John Kilpatrick) to justice and ultimately to prison.

Impressive as it is, the FBI's record of accomplishment is not the only reason Americans should be grateful to Director Hoover and his quiet crimefighters. There are others even more important.

No police agency in the world is more scrupulously considerate of individual rights. None works more harmoniously with other lawmen. And rare indeed is the police force anywhere in the world which can match the FBI's dedication of purpose and incorruptibility.

If you feel, as we do, that these splendid public servants deserve a "well done," why not say so in a letter to the Director? The address is J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C.

What Is Self-Determination?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News has editorially noted that the policy of self-determination subscribed to by the United Nations is often inconsistent with its actions. Cited as a case in point was the United Nations military venture to force Katanga's union with the Congo, and its failure so far to urge self-determination for the nations in Europe held under the iron heel of communism.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Savannah Morning News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS SELF-DETERMINATION?

Many people may wonder, in the light of recent and current history, just what definition of "self-determination" is subscribed to by the United Nations and the United States.

Spokesmen of the U.S. Government, in accordance with this country's own founding, profess a heartfelt belief in independence and self-determination. They have supported the policy of self-determination in some cases so extreme that close allies have been alienated.

The United Nations, which is to say the controlling Afro-Asian and neutral bloc is committed by charter to freedom of people and to noninterference in the internal affairs of nations. The Afro-Asians have made a fetish of anticolonialism and continually espouse the principles of self-rule even though often ignoring the responsibilities which go with independence.

Yet what is the record of the U.N. and the United States in respect to self-determination? Katanga was denied even negotiation on the subject of independence and was invaded to force its union with the Congo in what many call a raw act of aggressive colonialism by the U.N. Goa and West New Guinea were not turned over to India and Indonesia by a vote on self determination; they were invaded and taken over by force or, as in the case of New Guinea, by threat.

In two of these cases, the United States and the U.N. were active participants in the actual denial of self-determination. In the other, both condoned conquest by force.

The record is even worse. The U.N. has yet to call for self-determination for the captive nations of Europe or to oppose totalitarian rule in Cuba or Communist invasions of Vietnam and India. It dropped its lukewarm criticism of the Soviet Union's suppression of Hungary.

The United States has done little better. Our Government soft-pedals its criticism of Russian colonialism and actually sponsored the desertion of Hungary. It has promised not to invade Cuba or to interfere with the flowering of a Communist state in the Western Hemisphere, even if that means discarding this country's historic principles which until now, no foreign power has dared to challenge.

Yes, there is reason to ask what the United States and the U.N. means when they pledge allegiance to the principles of self-determination. But there is an answer.

Self-determination means whatever the Afro-Asian bloc wants it to mean. It means, in most cases, berating the great powers of the West for their colonialism and ignoring the more deadly Soviet brand of the same evil. It means acceptance of aggression by members of their bloc and the turning away from any member, as in the case of India, who has been unfortunate enough to clash with the Communists.

Self-determination, as subscribed to by the Afro-Asians and uncommitted nations, is a self-serving hypocrisy, a policy as devious as their pro-Communist neutralism. Since these countries dominate the U.N. and have their own man in the Secretary-General's chair, their policy is naturally that of the U.N.

The reasons for this are clear. The Afro-Asians and so-called neutrals care for themselves and themselves alone. They have no fear of the West which will accept their hypocrisy and their criticism and still subsidize their irresponsible governments. The Communists are a different matter: Unwilling to give aid without something in return, scornful of world opinion, resentful of criticism, and quite adept at using force to get what they want. This kind of policy the neutrals understand and even admire.

What is not clear is the reasoning of the U.S. Government, which condones all this and allows the U.N.'s boldest hypocrites to set our foreign policy. No wonder the neutrals have little respect for us. Washington doesn't even practice self-determination itself.

A Protest From the Rural Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an alert and perhaps indignant editor of a prominent weekly newspaper makes some pertinent observations about Secretary Freeman's complaints. Because of the relevancy to the farm policies being proposed, I submit it for the benefit of others:

A PROTEST FROM THE RURAL PRESS

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has complained that the smalltown newspapers in the West and Midwest are an impediment to the success of the Kennedy administration's farm program. This information was carried in a daily newspaper report printed Friday, January 4, 1962.

In a memorandum which he gave to President Kennedy at Palm Beach, Fla., last Thursday, January 3, Secretary Freeman referred to the "strongly GOP orientated press" and contended those newspapers were making it difficult to present to the farmers the claim that farm progress had been achieved the past 2 years due to efforts of the present national administration.

Of particular interest to residents of the areas mentioned by Mr. Freeman is his statement that, "The small towns of the West and Midwest where current farm programs have been most beneficial, seem to appreciate it the least."

It would almost seem that Mr. Freeman is convinced that small towners out here are an ungrateful lot—that they appear unable to recognize all the good things he is doing for them. What a sad day when folks don't know how much better off they are now that the ex-governor of Minnesota is doing the

major painting in the farm picture. What can logically be said about such a wealth of ingratitude?

The fact that there have been failures in the national farm administration, even despite the earnest, and no doubt sincere, efforts of Mr. Freeman—is certainly no secret. But what is most amazing is that Mr. Freeman thinks the smalltown newspapers to be largely responsible for rural people not appreciating what his Department is doing or attempting to do. His statement is surely one of the few left-handed compliments regarding the prestige and power of the rural press. While his statement may not be welcomed by most smalltown publishers (whether Democrat or Republican) it is a recognition to the degree that now, at long last, a high-placed official has found out that there are smalltown newspapers.

However, smalltown papers will not be panicked by the unprecedented statement of the Secretary of Agriculture. They will not be extremely nervous for the simple reason that the politicians owe a far greater debt of gratitude to the small rural papers than those papers owe to generations of politicians.

For years the smalltown papers have had to take it on the chin and the business mortality rate of the rural press is a grievous testimony to the growing forces of urbanization and misguided liberalism. And the economic difficulties of the small towns are not by any means limited to the newspapers in those towns.

First of all let's set the record straight. Who is most concerned about the economic welfare of farmers? At the top of that list, and rightfully so, are the farmers themselves. They head the list because their existence is at stake—and the changes in markets and expenses and taxes are of extremely vital concern to them and their families. The advantages which they can give their families depend entirely on the balance between income and expenditure. The situation is of far greater importance in rural areas than the most effective influence that has been exerted by politicians of several administrations.

Next in line among those concerned with farm conditions are the smalltown retailers, doctors, dentists, technicians, artisans, and all those who are dependent upon the patronage of the farmers. These people, who have not been a primary consideration in governmental economic programs, are more appreciative of anything that benefits farmers than any politician can ever know. If times are bad for farmers, they just as quickly become bad for those who sell to the farmers. Farm prosperity is always greatly wanted by all the people who live in small towns. The prices of milk, corn, cotton, wheat, livestock, poultry and eggs, vegetables, and fruits are far more critical in smalltown America than in any big city, including Washington. Policies affecting the economy, the freedom of the people, and the future of America's agriculture are also of much more importance to rural citizens than their concern for the popularity of one political party over another. If politicians have failed to appreciate this latter fact, then they are drifting out of harmony with their farm and smalltown constituents.

There are many reasons why rural conditions, which have caused the worry of many diverse farm organizations, do not go unnoticed by businessmen and other residents of small towns. What easy talkers in far-off places never seem to understand is that in rural areas farmers and small townsmen are of one and the same social-economic family. They go to the same churches. Their children attend the same schools. They belong to the same civic and patriotic organizations, to the same lodges, to the same service groups and to the same political parties. They are of similar ethnic stock in many areas. And, most important of all, in a very large number of rural communities, the farmers and townspeople are interrelated—and many of the townsmen are retired farmers. Add to all this the basic fact that rural people are just as good, loyal Americans as those alined with the powerful forces of mass unification and growing centralization and there seems mighty good justification for rural America to protest unjustified criticism directed their way.

The smalltown newspapers have no enmity toward the Department of Agriculture which most generally moves in an orbit far removed from the editorial paths of the weekly press. But newspapers in any area have a right to speak in defense of their own integrity when an undeserved missile is hurled at them—in a sweep that has the potential of alienating them from their rural friends and neighbors. Such denunciations, if not refuted, could be injurious to the life and progress of the smalltown press and also the advancement of the people and communities served by that press. For this reason, all those interested in such newspapers must register their protest without any equivocation, no matter how much they may regret differing with any governmental official.

A general criticism of bureaucrats is that they often make neat plans for supposed progress and then become angry or petulant when the citizenry fails to become enthusiastic about those plans. Maybe Mr. Freeman's observation is really a compliment to independent-thinking farmers—an acknowledgement that after carefully sifting the facts many have refused to comply with the Department's plans, basing their decision on what they consider best for themselves and their families. Is it possible that thousands of rural people are utterly wrong in their lack of acceptance of some of the Department's programs? Or is it possible that there are policies in the national agricultural program that rightfully should be corrected?

Mr. Freeman received a very great honor when he was chosen to be U.S. Secretary of Agriculture. He was chosen because the President had hope that Mr. Freeman possesses the qualifications to lead American agriculture out of the many ills that sorely beset it. Certainly, it must have been a nettling disappointment to hear the Secretary even indirectly blame the rural press and small towns for the lack of further success of certain programs advocated by his Department.

All serious-thinking persons in State or Federal Governments know of the loyalty (in peace as well as wartime) of the smalltown press in carrying news of governmental and political importance to their readers. In what way then, can Mr. Freeman's criticism of smalltown newspapers be justified?

Effective Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the well-known Capitol Hill weekly newspaper Roll Call carried an editorial in yesterday's edition titled "Effective Speaker." I believe it reflects the feelings of most Members of Congress concerning our distinguished Speaker, the man we have come to know and love as an outstanding and effective leader and a true and valued friend. The editorial follows:

EFFECTIVE SPEAKER

We are getting annoyed at the daily papers' constant harping about Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK's alleged lack of leadership. Some 50 years ago a Speaker was cut down to size when his tyrannical leadership became too strong for his colleagues to stomach. Speaker Rayburn ruled with an iron hand, but in his final years he had lost much of his absolute influence and suffered several reverses on major points.

Congressman MCCORMACK became Speaker following the death of a man who had served longer than any other Speaker of the House. Many oldtimers were chomping at the bit to assert their independent thinking, as well they should.

The record will show that Speaker MCCORMACK has racked up an impressive score of major victories, accomplished in a manner constant with the type of leadership that should be exercised in a body of independent legislators.

To say that he is not an effective leader because one Congressman who aroused the ire of several factions of his party failed to gain a seat on an important committee is unrealistic analysis.

The Speaker has the respect and fidelity of his colleagues. And because he is not one to abuse the power of office, he will maintain both, gaining in the process their admiration and devotion.

Grazing on Lands Managed by Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Utah County Commissioner George Buzianis at the annual meeting of the National Association of Counties in December 1962. This speech deals with grazing on the lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. It is timely and interesting.

As one who has long been interested in county government and who recognizes the effectiveness of our counties, I am extremely pleased with the concern being shown by county officials in effective administration of public lands.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY TOOELE COUNTY, UTAH, COMMISSIONER GEORGE BUZIANIS, AT THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES' GRAZING, WATER, AND REVENUE CONFERENCE IN LAS VEGAS, NEV., DECEMBER 11–13, 1962

I am very happy to have been able to accept Mr. Stearn's invitation to participate in NACO's grazing, water, and revenue conference. The title of my talk today will be "A County Commissioner's Interest in Public Grazing Lands." I don't profess to be an expert but I will do my level best to bring to you a county commissioner's view-

point on this subject. I am sure most of you know the definition of an "expert"—that is just an ordinary man who is far away from home.

One might say that public lands have no direct concern of public officials because they do not directly support the local property tax structure. That statement is entirely wrong. We as county commissioners have a great deal at stake in this matter. We are concerned with the problems which relate to the productive use of the resources of our public lands. The economy of many Western States counties is dependent upon the use of these public grazing lands.

Before I proceed any further on this matter I would like to present to you some figures on this subject "grazing." It is astounding to note that one-fifth of the land in the United States is used as cropland. Somewhat over one-fourth is in grassland, pasture, and range. One-third is in forest. If grassland and forest land used for grazing are included, about 60 percent of all lands in the United States are in crop and livestock production. If all forest land was included, the area for agriculture use would be approximately 80 percent of the land area. It is interesting to note that grassland, pasture, and rangelands were 22 million acres lower in 1959 than in 1930. Why? Much of this change was due to forest use and some nonagriculture uses. Also conservation and soil bank programs have had some effect on this decrease. From 1950 to 1960 there have been approximately a million acres a year of agriculture lands being used for urban expansion, highways, airports, and so forth.

Most of the country's crop, pasture, and range production is on private lands.

Now let us see how much of this agriculture land is federally owned or administered by a department of the United States.

Federally owned lands make up 34 percent of the land area in all of the 50 States. The greatest majority of this land is in the western part of the United States. This land is in timber and grazing uses and also in mineral development. It is also used for recreation, water development, and wildlife.

Of the 765 million acres of federally owned land in the United States, 483 million acres are in forest or grazing land. The federally owned lands are classified in two groups: public domain which consists of 714 million acres or 94 percent, and land that was acquired by purchase or other means which amounts to 51 million acres or 6 percent. It may be of interest to note that the State and local governments own only a total of 121 million acres or 5 percent of the land area in the United States.

Grazing is the largest single use of agricultural land. The gross income from cattle and sheep alone in 1960 was well over $12.5 billion. There are approximately 10 million head of deer, elk, and antelope that also obtain forage on these ranges and pastures which also has a great effect on the local economy. In the past years there have been a continuous cut in grazing permits on Bureau of Land Management and forest lands which has affected the economy in most western counties who are dependent on agriculture as their key source of revenue.

I have taken the time to find out just what the economic value of the Utah cattle industry has to Utah's economy. Just 1 year ago the University of Utah's staff of the bureau of economic and business research made a very thorough study.

The total cash receipts from farm marketing have been running about $160 million a year in Utah. Of this, 78 percent comes from livestock and livestock products. Forty-eight million or 30 percent of this total comes from cattle and calves. Actually cattle and calves are the single most important agricultural product produced in Utah. Approximately 25 percent, or 40 million, of this total comes from sheep.

Another way to evaluate the industry is to examine the number of cattle and calves on farms, the number of animals produced each year and the trends of production in the cattle industry compared with other important industries of the State. In January 1961 there were 726,000 cattle and calves on Utah farms. If the count were taken in the summer at the seasonal peak rather than the low it would be higher than the figure I have cited. According to the 1959 census of agriculture we have in Utah 18,000 farms, 13,500 of these farms have cattle and calves. Keeping this 13,500 figure in mind and compare it with the following: we have in the State only about 700 mining firms; about 3,700 construction companies; only 1,400 manufacturing establishments; 10,000 retail and wholesale stores; 2,000 banks, finance, real estate offices and insurance companies. Altogether we have a total of approximately 25,500 nonagriculture businesses in Utah, or only about twice as many as we have farms with cattle and calves. The value of this industry is approximately one-half billion dollars, as compared to the value of all airlines, trucklines, gas and other pipelines, power companies, railroads, telegraph and telephone companies which amount to just a little less than $1 billion.

The net contribution to Utah's income stream from the cattle industry alone was over $63 million in 1961.

These figures alone indicate the importance of the cattle industry to the economy of the State of Utah. Most of these cattlemen depend upon the grazing lands administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

Note: Utah doesn't rank with the top half of Western States in livestock production.

Not being critical of the actions taken by the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service in this matter and realizing that there is definitely an over grazing problem and our range conditions are depleting very rapidly, the question now is what are the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service going to do to correct this problem. They cannot go on forever making cuts and eventually do away with grazing on public lands. Livestock people everywhere who depend upon Federal lands on which to graze are very much troubled by the present day trends. It could well mean that many livestock men could be out of business before too many years if the present cutting trend continues.

Now back to the question, What are the two Federal agencies, the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service, doing to correct this problem? Several years ago a large group of Senators and Congressmen called to the attention of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior the decline in range use because of the deterioration of Federal rangelands. They felt there had been no comparable range appraisals. They also felt there was a need to coordinate range development programs and to develop data on the character and quality of our range resources.

Last year the Senate Committee on Appropriations directed the Secretaries to conduct a trial program of public land range appraisals. There were three areas selected and they were areas administered both by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. This study was not only for grazing purposes but also for watershed, wildlife and other important uses. I might add at this time the areas selected were in Alamosa, Colo., Dillon, Mont., and Lakeview, Oreg.

Selection of the sample area within each State was contingent upon three basic requirements: (1) Presence of considerable acreages of rangelands administered by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management; (2) several representations of broad classes of range operations using Federal lands; (3) existence of data relative to the needs of the range appraisals.

In July 1962, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior released the findings of the so-called pilot range study.

This data was assembled on factors important to management of these lands. These factors include area and suitability for livestock grazing, past and present management, range condition and trend, current and potential grazing capacity, range use by livestock and wildlife, and existing and needed conservation practices and improvements.

These areas varied in elevation from 4,200 feet to 13,000 feet. The vegetation varied from sagebrush ranges in the lower elevations to the timbered mountain slopes. The three areas studied contained 14,571,850 acres. The Federal Government being the largest owner of the land in each of the areas.

Although the livestock industry in all three areas is dependent upon the public rangelands, all of the livestock industry does not use these public lands. Some operators depend solely upon private lands. Although most operators had a combination of Federal lands and private lands to maintain a year-round operation.

Capacities in these areas were estimated through use of standard methods of range inventory and analysis and were expressed in animal unit months. An animal unit month is defined as one cow unit grazing for 1 month. Five sheep were considered equal to one animal unit. It might be of interest to note in the study areas that Colorado had a total grazing load decrease of 46 percent in the last 10 years, Montana, a 16-percent decrease in 15 years and Oregon a 19-percent decrease in the last 10 years.

It was found that range improvement practices now in force have proved practical and necessary in the three study areas. This being fencing, stock water development, range seeding, control of less desirable brush and weeds, access roads and trails, boundary markings and pest control. The ultimate result of this study showed that all areas need more improvement practices than now exist. There was a definite need of more fencing and more stock watering facilities and last but not least a continued increase in range seeding to convert depleted ranges into productive grazing lands. It pointed out that areas were the vegetation and the soil stability conditions were poor or very poor, the trend was always downward. These study areas showed they had a potential increase in animal unit months from 11 to 41 percent above current capacities providing there were better management and range improvements. You might note that even this potential figure would not equal the cuts made in the past 15 years in these same areas. I feel this study has been very beneficial.

Now the thing that troubles me more than anything is the cost estimated by these two Federal agencies to make this study on all the lands. Now don't take me wrong; I am not opposed to these studies. There have questioning—and this is strictly personal—the cost to make these studies. There have been two procedures suggested. One estimated to require 5 years at a cost of $25 million. This would provide both a generalized appraisal of resources condition and a complete area-by-area inventory useful for administration. The alternative route would require only 5 years at a cost estimate of $7 million and provide only a general appraisal of relative low acuracy.

Now, after talking to some so called range specialists and Bureau of Land Management personnel I am under the impression that this information is available at the present time from Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service districts. At the present time the Bureau of Land Management conducts a continuous 5-year inventory program of the range conditions and I am sure that each

district manager in a short while could plan out in detail what areas should be improved. This could be done in much less time than 5 years and much less money than $25 million.

While I am on the subject of grazing on public lands I would like to comment briefly on the much discussed subject "Grazing Fees on Public Lands." In February of this year the Department of Interior announced there would be no increase in the present rate of grazing fees for 1962. The present rate is 19 cents per animal unit month. Now bear this in mind, that means one cow can graze for one month on public grazing lands for 19 cents. Five sheep which are considered one animal unit month can also graze for 19 cents per month or 3.8 cents per sheep. This fee was set about 28 years ago under the Taylor Grazing Act. I am sure that these fees have not increased proportionately with other costs.

I am sure that much time and thought has been given by the Department of the Interior on grazing fees in the past 10 months. According to Assistant Secretary of Interior John Carver, Jr., in his report at the Albuquerque meeting of the National Advisory Board he requested that the Board come up with a plan for scheduled moderate upward adjustments designed to reach mutually agreed upon standards. A plan suggested would have the Department of Interior fix a minimum and maximum fee, allowing the local districts grazing advisory boards to recommend adjustments of fees within this range based on individual circumstances. One feature of his plan would permit the local districts to retain the amounts collected above the minimum and use them for range improvements within that district. I am sure that most sound livestock operators would welcome such a program.

In summarization:

1. I have shown the amount of public land used for grazing and the value of this grazing to our local economy.

2. Local government depends greatly on assessment of livestock that graze upon these public lands for revenue.

3. We as county officials are deeply concerned with these continuous cuts in grazing allotments.

4. We urge modern methods of range improvements to continue at a much faster pace.

In closing, I would like to commend the Department of Interior and Secretary of Interior Udall's decision to increase the members of the State multiple-use advisory boards and include members of county and State governments. In the past, these boards have been known as grazing advisory boards. Membership was limited to livestock men and wildlife representatives.

Secretary Udall's announcement provides the first opportunity for county government to be represented on these important State advisory boards, whose functions have now been expanded to include all phases of public land management.

Water Resources and Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in this great body are well aware of my devotion to the cause of the full development of our wealth of natural resources. Perhaps, at times, some of my distinguished friends have puzzled over the preeminent position in which I regard our Nation's water resources. Recently, one of the recognized authorities on water resources, William H. Nelson, the associate editor of the Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel, published a series of three articles dealing with some of the problems that are challenging some of our water-short areas. For a brief glimpse at how wide-ranging these problems can be, I recommend to my colleagues the final portion of Mr. Nelson's series.

WATER RESOURCES AND UNITY

(By William H. Nelson)

If water is so scarce, why continue to build irrigation projects?

With farm surpluses costing taxpayers billions not only for purchases but also for storage, why bring more land under cultivation?

Why not use the water still available in industry?

Magazine writers periodically ask these questions and provide answers critical of the reclamation West.

The answer, so far as western Colorado is concerned, to the first question is that using water to grow crops is the only way available at present to establish firm rights to the use of water.

The answer to the second is that reclamation projects do not produce surplus crops.

It is hard to convince easterners of this fact, but it is true.

Industry isn't ready yet in western Colorado to use big amounts of water. Oil shale development is still in the future, and coal hydrogenation may be even further off. Coal will probably be put to use first in thermal electrical generation plants.

If industries were ready to start diverting from streams, there would be less emphasis on irrigation.

A fact which makes the situation more encouraging for the future is that when an industry moves into an area or when a residential development springs up, the amount of water used for farming is about the same as that needed by industry and homes. Water rights acquired for irrigation can be transferred by purchase to industry and municipalities.

With eastern Colorado groups devising new and more fantastic schemes to take water through the Continental Divide, western Colorado water users must prove to the courts they have put water to use to get absolute water decrees.

The lower basin States, California, Arizona, and Nevada, are anxious to use any water which Colorado or other upper basin States do not use. Western Colorado citizens must put the water to use as quickly as possible to perfect and keep rights.

Many farmers and ranchers in western Colorado need dams and canals to increase their supplies of water for irrigation of land now under cultivation. Changes in climate have reduced the precipitation, and the farms and ranches need supplemental supplies.

The Bureau of Reclamation is paying more attention to water for industry and municipalities, but the effort is meeting with considerable criticism from easterners who feel they are subsidizing competition for themselves. They don't look upon reclamation as a national investment that brings in new taxes, creates new business, and helps stabilize the economy. Reclamation farming is more diversified than one-crop farm economies of other sections of the Nation.

A change in criteria—rules, regulations, and procedures—for passing judgment on reclamation projects may result in approval of some projects which would have been rejected under the old A-47 set of rules used throughout the Eisenhower administration.

Demands by Mexico for additional Colorado River water are a threat to future western Colorado projects. The fact that the matter might be submitted to an international court of arbitration group or the possibility of the Kennedy administration being magnanimous to placate Mexico and impress Latin America worries Colorado water men.

Another factor in the speed in which potential western Colorado reclamation projects can be translated from ideas and plans to structures of dirt, concrete, and steel is the attitude of the new Colorado administration of Governor John Love. If Love should openly oppose reclamation or just drag his heels, project promoters will experience additional difficulties in Washington.

How well western reclamation States work together in Congress is perhaps the most important factor, even though one of the least understood. Representative WAYNE ASPINALL was sharply critical of western Congressmen who supported only projects from their own States or own districts and voted against other projects or at best were only lukewarm in support.

How well interstate compacts on administration of rivers work determine in part how must cooperation our neighboring States will give us in backing our projects. Difficulties over the Rio Grande compact, for instance, threaten to cause New Mexico and Texas to oppose openly western Colorado projects.

Promoters of projects face many obstacles. They must find ways of avoiding as many as possible and of overcoming those they must hit head-on. Unity among western Colorado residents is essential, and unity among the reclamation States is also a must. Achieving unity at both levels will require tact, diplomacy, and clear thinking.

Management's Problems in a Dynamic World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, we frequently read that our railroads should do more to take advantage of modern technology, research, and development in order to improve their position. However, I doubt whether there is a general understanding of the great strides which the railroad industry has actually made in research, development, and technology; industry leaders have demonstrated exceptional enterprise and initiative.

Mr. Alfred E. Perlman, president of the New York Central System, discussed this challenge and related considerations in an important address delivered here in Washington, D.C., last November before the American Institute of Industrial Engineers. Entitled "Management's Problems in a Dynamic World," Mr. Perlman's address met with great acclaim in the press and elsewhere. One columnist, Mr. Frank C. Porter, writing in the Washington Post of November 2, had this to say, in part, about Mr. Perlman's speech:

His plea for greater understanding of Government was perhaps the strongest made by a leading executive since the row over an

abortive steel price increase brought a wide rift between the Kennedy administration and much of the business community last April.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby submit the complete text of Mr. Perlman's address so that others may have the benefit of his thoughtful discussion of the industry's responses to the challenges of today's society:

MANAGEMENT'S PROBLEMS IN A DYNAMIC WORLD

(By Alfred E. Perlman)

I want to speak today about management's problems in a dynamic world.

Our world is characterized by constant activity and change, which is a result of the explosive growth of science and technology.

We stand at the dawn of a new age. Through a second industrial revolution, we will lengthen lifespans, create more leisure, produce a higher standard of living, and provide increased economic security. This revolution, utilizing the automated machine controlled by the computer, will eliminate much of the human monotony and drudgery of mass-production industry. For the first time in history, great numbers of people will have the opportunity to develop and use their highest abilities.

The new technology has already placed in the hands of management the means to overcome one of its major problems, the problem of how to increase productivity. This problem has always been with us, but today it is of far greater importance than ever before.

We must increase our productivity just to maintain our present standard of living. Our total population is increasing at a faster rate than our labor force. Young people are staying in school longer, and older people are retiring earlier and living longer. By 1975, we will have to nearly double the amount of goods and services produced by each worker.

Secondly, we must increase productivity to offset long-range inflationary pressures. Even with continued high employment and without a traditional business depression, it is obvious that inflation can effectively and silently destroy the real buying power of millions of people.

Thirdly, we must increase productivity to meet the growing economic challenge from other nations. In the years ahead, virtually everything we produce will be sold, even in our own country, in competition with products moving in international trade. Thus, the efficiency, or the lack of it, of our own industrial establishment will decide whether or not we hold present markets and move into new ones.

Although we now have the means to increase productivity, or are developing them rapidly, the problem is not just a technological one. We have developed our technology to the point where we can do almost anything we desire with matter. But the rapid accumulation of scientific technique has not been matched by a corresponding improvement in the sphere of human and group relations. Our sociology has not kept pace with our technology. We may find ourselves unable to utilize our technological advances, unless we are also able to advance in the social sphere.

Technology deals with material things, while management deals with both material things and human beings. Thus, management, in its efforts to increase productivity through technological innovation, must take into account the human factors involved in such advances. To do this, management must learn to communicate with many diverse groups.

Let me describe a management problem resulting from the disparity between what we are able to do technologically but which we are unable to do because of social factors.

The technology to develop crewless trains is available today. Such trains would give us great savings through higher efficiency and lower wage costs. But, at the present moment, we are not able to operate such trains, primarily because of labor contracts and State laws—unjustified by today's technology—which require a specified number of crewmen on each train.

It is clear from this instance—and I could cite many others—that enlightened labor and enlightened management must communicate with each other, in order to achieve mutually satisfactory solutions to the problems of labor in our modern society. We must increase understanding and cooperation. For certainly, as productivity is increased—and, as I have said, it must be increased—some jobs will be eliminated and some will be radically changed.

The new age will need more technologists, more highly skilled people than we have today. These people will come from today's labor forces. We must seek to create a widespread understanding of the fact that as each individual increases his skill he will deserve added prestige and a higher income. After all, the same thing happened during the first industrial revolution, which raised the manual laborer to the semiskilled worker of today. Today's semiskilled worker is certainly tomorrow's skilled technologist, who will enjoy the benefits of increased productivity.

Of course, business leaders who intend to communicate effectively with any group must remember that communication is a two-way process. If management wants to be understood, it must first understand the views of others. If it wants to be heard, it must listen. And if it wants others to support its aims, it must attempt to support the aims of others.

Thus, management must realize that, before it can propose acceptable employee programs, it must understand its employees' problems. Only then will it be equipped to ease worker adjustment caused by technological change.

The art of effective communication also applies to a second important area—government relations. As cybernation produces increased interdependence between producers, consumers, and the government, it is clear that greater centralized control will arise. Businessmen will find it increasingly essential to understand the expanding role of goverment in our economy. The most successful managers will be those who know how to communicate their needs to the various governmental legislative and regulatory agencies, and who understand the functions and inner processes of government. Communication and understanding will enable them to utilize the activities of government as an aid to their own business operations.

We should not be blind to the fact that there often exists a true community of interest between Government and private business. Government, which spends about a third of our gross national income, will have a real and legitimate interest in certain facets of business. And, certainly, it is right for businessmen, who occupy such a pivotal position in our industrial society, to seek to counsel with those who set public policy and enact law.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. is an outstanding example of an organization that knows how to communicate effectively its policies and objectives to a wide range of audiences. It has representatives in hundreds of communities explaining their company's intentions and actions. With A.T. & T., this is a 24-hour a day program. As a result, the company has the public on its side on most important issues. And, even though it is a true monopoly, it enjoys the confidence and support of Government.

In recent years, my own industry has learned to present its legitimate interests more effectively to the public and the Government. Our efforts were instrumental in securing the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958, which was the first major revision of policies that had been in effect since the days of the railroad monopoly. Legislative reform was long overdue.

We are now experimenting with freight rates for the first time in history and getting a pat on the back from the Government for doing so. We also feel that the President's excellent message on transportation was influenced by more effective communication between Government and industry. This message indicated a real awareness on the part of Government of the many inconsistent and unnecessary regulations under which the American transportation industry must operate. The President referred to a "chaotic patchwork of * * * obsolete legislation and regulation * * * which does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition." No other President in recent history has spoken so strongly or truly concerning our industry.

The recent report of the Presidential Commission on Railway Labor, which upheld many of the views of management, is one more instance of the impact of effective communication with Government.

However, because my industry was a long time awakening to the need for real communication, we still must endure unnecessary and restrictive regulation in many areas. Concerning most of our rates, we are treated as if we were still a monopoly, even though we have only 3 percent of the total passenger business and 43 percent of the total freight. Every State has a railway regulatory commission, despite the fact that the Federal Government's Interstate Commerce Commission exercises a firm control over all our operations. In the State of New York, we have three regulatory bodies which must approve our actions. And we have been unsuccessful in some cases in securing permission to price our services or reduce our costs to the point where we can make a reasonable profit. In Albany, for example, we still are not allowed to move our passenger station a block and a half, even though it would free valuable land for first-class development and save hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for the New York Central.

But we are narrowing these inequities, and the prime tool we are using is communication with a wide range of diverse groups.

The third important management problem centers on marketing. As productivity is increased, it is obvious that managers must employ the true concepts of marketing—as distinguished from merely selling—if they are to distribute the flood of goods produced by a cybernated economy. Marketing takes into full account the needs of the customer, whereas selling considers only the needs of the seller himself. We must increasingly tailor the product to fit the specific needs of the customer. Increased sales, resulting from customer-oriented production and distribution, will create more jobs and income for many people.

In line with this need, 2 years ago the New York Central completely revamped its own marketing operations. We realized that we could expand our market only if we fully understood the business and the needs of our present and potential customers. We set up a marketing industry planning department with specific responsibility to make detailed studies of particular industries and individual shippers, and to act as a logistics consultant for customers. It coordinates the Central's own efforts to develop and sell new services. Working with other groups, including our market research and industrial development departments, this new organ-

ization was primarily responsible for the establishment of a whole new market for the Central—the transportation of automobiles, which had been moving by truck over the highway.

I cite this as an example of the kind of marketing we are going to need as the second industrial revolution progresses. We are going to have to find markets; we are going to have to create markets; and we are going to have to develop new products and services to satisfy old and new needs.

Of course—and I want to emphasize this—managerial freedom to move forward into the new era will be of little use unless management maintains its own energy and creativity. This is the fourth major problem management now faces.

This creativity will be difficult to maintain, since cybernation will place a premium on conformity and standardization. As more and more companies become linked by interdependent systems of production and distribution, the mental ability to see the whole picture may be difficult to acquire. The tendency may be to rely too much upon computers, in order to eliminate the possibility of human error. Carried to extremes, this could lead to a programed mediocrity pervading all facets of life.

We must preserve the ability to think and the initiative to act, in spite of the trend toward pushbutton operations. This is especially true in relation to the traditional training ground for new executives, the area of low middle-management, which is likely to have many of its functions taken over by computers. Thus, we must guard against doing away with the one place where creative People can acquire knowledge and skill. We must preserve autonomous, decentralized operations wherever possible—despite the centralizing tendencies of cybernation—so that we will maintain the freedom for creative individuals to express and exploit their own ideas.

We must find and develop intelligent, decisive people to fill management ranks—the kind who will be so necessary if we are to increase productivity, communicate with many diverse groups, and create the marketing innovations essential to the second industrial revolution. We can maintain closer contact with educational institutions, in order to advise them concerning the type of education needed in the evolving world of business. We can institute internal training programs, to upgrade our own people. We can guard against inbreeding in executive groups, by bringing in people from other industries. And we can delegate more responsibility to younger people, who have greater drive, energy, and ambition.

Management must also create incentives that will attract and reward the right kind of management candidates. The traditional incentive of higher pay for greater responsibility has been weakened by our income tax laws. What happens to a creative person's initiative, when he realizes that the next salary increase may mean the same or even less take-home pay? But, even though our tax situation is not what it should be, we can devise incentives to attract creative people.

The ambitious, talented person sometimes considers money a secondary goal. One may want more prestige. Another, more power. And a third, the freedom to act on his own initiative. Whatever the incentive may be, it is the responsibility of management to find and offer it to the people it needs. To do this, the successful manager must spend a tremendous amount of energy gaining an understanding of what motivates people—even though there are no unchanging rules concerning human behavior, as there are in the world of science. In our dynamic world, managers must acquire the experience, knowledge, and skill to promote and expand human creativity.

To increase productivity will require more than just technological knowledge—it will require the ability to deal with people. As Government becomes more influential and as centralized computer control becomes more prevalent, we must make even stronger efforts to develop—not the common man, the organization man—but the uncommon man, the creative man. He's the one who will lead the way into the new age.

We face no insurmountable obstacles. We have the ability to meet the problems I've outlined today. And, in meeting them successfully, I believe we will be creating a world far better than the one we've known. We no longer face a geographical or technological frontier; we face a human one. On this frontier, we will find our greatest challenges and gain our greatest rewards.

Going Now and Paying Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "Going Now and Paying Later" written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones and published in the Wednesday, January 16, Washington Evening Star. I commend this column to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the Big Rock Candy Mountains via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionally, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paintbrushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals, and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts. He makes the point (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our druthers.

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures, we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gauge may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You'd never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business brain-trusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the Happy Isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigarette-holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose war-wrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by U.S. funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steel makers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grows softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing, the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock:

"Go now, pay later."

Legislators Work for You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the great needs of this country is a better knowledge and understanding on the part of people generally as to how legislative bodies operate both on the State level and in the Congress of the United States. A better understanding would be of mutual help to both the general public and legislators who represent them.

One of the finest articles I have ever read on this subject was one written by Lloyd W. Sveen in the November 16, 1962, issue of the Fargo Forum in his widely read and respected "Column Eight."

I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATORS WORK FOR YOU

(By Lloyd W. Sveen)

Now you have voted, at least some of you, and a select group of your fellow men will represent you in the Congress and in your State legislature. Perhaps your candidates won, perhaps they lost, but if you want your voice to be effective in government your job isn't over just because you voted.

You may not realize that your voice among the millions of us can be heard by the relatively few who pass our laws, so do not sell yourself short.

I have never met a Senator or Representative who does not want to hear from the people back home. His principal business is to represent you in the legislative process of the State and Nation, and faithful representation of his constituents balanced against the national interest determines whether he will be reelected or not.

There isn't anything magic or complicated about getting effective representation. Here, based on the experience of Congressmen, are some do's and don'ts:

Get to know your Congressman or legislator, either in person or by letter. Let him know who you are, ask him to send you his newsletter and let him know of your interests. By knowing you and your principal interests he can better understand your point of view.

Write to him about matters on which you have some information and in which you are concerned. Be sure your letters reflect real information, which you know personally, and show from your own experience how an issue (such as medicare) will affect you.

When you have an interest in a subject write in plenty of time. Remember that the basic work of legislation is accomplished in committees; you can't look for a miracle from your Representative in changing a piece of legislation once it gets to the floor of House or Senate.

Don't make the mistake of trying to give instructions on every vote, and don't berate your man if his every vote isn't the same as your thinking. Legislation is a process of compromise between many points of view, and not every law is going to be precisely what you want in every detail.

Don't join pressure campaigns of petitions, mass mailings, and mass telegrams. A personal letter based on specific points has meaning far beyond a sheaf of identical letters or telegrams.

Don't abuse your Representative if he does not agree with you on all points. Perhaps he voted against a bill which you think he should have supported; write to find out why. The bill may have been amended so it contained features which would have hurt you, which led your man to vote against it. If you are not satisfied with his reasons, tell him why you disagree and if you object seriously you can vote against him at the next election.

Don't rely blindly on voting records kept by pressure groups to rate your Congressman's ability. These groups often compile a list of favorite issues and rank Congressmen only by their votes on those issues. Here again, your man in his campaign may have supported certain issues but when these came before him in bill form he felt the proposed law faulty.

Do judge your Congressman and legislator by the total effect of his work—in committees and in representing his district in the interest of the State and the Nation.

If you follow these suggestions, remembering to speak for yourself without pretending to represent more political influence than you have, you'll help your Congressman and legislator do a first-class job.

Poor Management, Bad Policy Blamed in Army Shakeup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing past actions and in the light of current proposals of the Department of Defense, it appears that the executive department intends to remove an effective National Guard from the States and build up the Reserve which is completely under Federal control.

Because of the milita clause of the Constitution, this cannot be done legally, but unless the Congress writes a specific law preventing continual changes and spelling out in the appropriations bill preventive measures the present method will be used to gradually weaken the National Guard.

The periods of time since World War II in which the National Guard of some State has not been undergoing a reorganization, or an impending reorganization, have been relatively small.

In the past, as is the case now, a number of reasons have been offered the public as a basis such as "to increase readiness," "more responsive to possible contingencies," "strengthen the Reserve components," "modernize the Reserve components," "effectively complement the Active Forces," "improve reinforcement capability," et cetera.

For many years, outside the larger cities, single units of the Missouri National Guard have been recognized as important parts of the economic and governmental structure of many towns. As a result of prior realinements, and in order to maintain a unit in these towns and make use of established facilities, it has been necessary to split one unit between two towns.

It now appears that in order to prevent vacant armories and to keep a token National Guard in these towns, it will be necessary to split one company size unit among three towns.

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, retired, the military writer of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, has set forth in the following column the reasons why he believes "it might be well for Congress to prohibit the reorganization of the National Guard and Reserve Forces more frequently than once in a decade since the Army seems to lack the self-restraint to impose so reasonable a rule upon itself."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will consider the basis for General Lane's suggestion, as set forth in this article, "Poor Management, Bad Policy Blamed in Army Shakeup":

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 9, 1963]

POOR MANAGEMENT, BAD POLICY BLAMED IN ARMY SHAKEUP

(By Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, retired)

WASHINGTON.—The new Congress will have before it the revised plan of the Secretary of Defense for the reorganization of the Army National Guard and organized Reserve Forces.

Revisions were required to meet the hostile criticism which the original plan received from the last Congress. The plan originally was designed to correct deficiencies disclosed in the callup of 1961.

Reorganization looks like the wrong medicine.

The problems of the callup were not organizational; they were created by poor management and bad policy decision. In some degree they are chargeable to reorganization, for the Army had completed in 1960 a reorganization of Reserve Forces which undoubtedly introduced confusion into the mobilization problem.

IT TAKES TIME

It takes time to shake down new organization, to train the new units, to build teamwork, to perfect the new logistical programs.

The first virtue of military organization is stability, for only an old organization can be a good organization. This ancient truth has been little understood by our Army in recent years as it has worked on a series of disrupting reorganizations.

The concept that change is progress seems to be the Army's answer to the atomic age. If it had put as much attention on training and on mobilization planning as it had on reorganization, there might have been less difficulty in the 1961 callup.

Fortunately, the virtue of stability seems to be better appreciated in the Navy and the Air Force.

The 1961 mobilization troubles are chargeable in the first instance to bad policy decision. The callup should not have been made at all, and this should have been clear to anyone familiar with our national defense organization.

Our Reserve Forces are manned by citizens who pursue normal civilian occupations in our society but who have trained and are ready for military duty in time of war. It is not in the basic conception of these forces that they will be called from their civilian occupations every time some international pressure makes desirable an augmentation of Active Army strength.

IMPLICIT CONTRACT

Thus, the callup violated an implicit contract which is part of the very organization of the Reserve Forces.

It was obvious to our people that the Soviet coup in building the Berlin wall merely exploited an opportunity and did not portend any radical change of foreign policy nor threat of war. Thus, the mobilization seemed wholly unwarranted.

An increase of Active Army strength could have been accomplished in good time by retention of men in service, increased draft quotas and voluntary recall procedures. It is a tribute to the patriotism of men called under these conditions that they groused so little.

Reserve Forces are based upon area organization and upon armories and other training facilities which have been built or maintained to support them. If these forces are to have stability and the efficiency which it promotes, it is obvious that their structure cannot be changed every time an administration sets a new manning level for them.

Changing force priorities and related manning levels are normal elements of good mobilization planning. This kind of action does not require reorganization as strength changes. It requires better Army management.

Military organization should be approached from the view that change is bad, that it should be made infrequently and that the disruption and confusion caused by change must be more offset by substantial gains introduced by the change.

In other words, change should not be made for small or questionable advantage, nor to avoid a confession of bad management, nor to cover up a bad policy decision.

It might be wise for Congress to prohibit the reorganization of the National Guard and Reserve Forces more frequently than once in a decade since the Army seems to lack the self-restraint to impose so reasonable rule upon itself.

Hon. Samuel Woden Gralnick Receives the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, of the Republic of Panama, in Recognition of Humanitarian and Philanthropic Services to His Fellow Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the highlights of the proceedings of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, of the Republic of Panama, on the occasion of the luncheon and ceremony in the gold room at the Van Cleve Hotel, Dayton, Ohio, at which the award was made to Mr. Gralnick on November 7, 1962. This high honor was bestowed on him in the presence of a very distinguished group of his friends.

The invocation was delivered by Rabbi Selwyn D. Ruslander.

Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, was then introduced, and he set forth at length the achievements and accomplishments of former President Eloy Alfaro, President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, as follows:

We are gathered here today to honor a great humanitarian and philanthropist, Mr. Samuel Woden Gralnick, for his distinguished public and private services to mankind and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

But because many of you may not be fully aware of the background of the foundation, I would like at this point to describe it to you. The foundation was authorized by decree issued by His Excellency, Domingo Dias Arosemena, the President of the Republic of Panama, on January 22, 1949, to perpetuate the memory of Eloy Alfaro, martyred ex-President of Ecuador, a movement which has been devoted to the task of encouraging the study and propagation of the liberal ideals and principles, for which this Ecuadoran statesman and leader fought and died for during more than a half century.

General Alfaro was a soldier, patriot, statesman, and martyr, was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice and friendship among nations, the self-control and self-sacrifice that marked about a quarter of a century of unflagging service to his fellowmen, extended beyond the confines of his own country, Ecuador.

He was a rebel and a conspirator—but his rebellion and conspiracy was directed against hatred, injustice, discord, and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people. General Alfaro advanced the cause of his nation by setting up the judicial system, and expanded her schools and colleges and other institutions of learning.

How the world needs another Alfaro today. History records that 70 years ago there was convened in Washington, D.C., the Conference of American States, in which Eloy Alfaro actively participated as the dynamic leader. Subsequently, the Pan American Union developed. So that as long ago as 1890, Eloy Alfaro firmly advocated measures for improving the status of the Indians and the downtrodden, in his country and emancipating them from exploitation.

In 1907, Eloy Alfaro again was the dedicated leader who played a leading part at this International Conference in Mexico City, where the United States and six other Pan-American nations assembled and did discuss and resolve questions relating to the well being of the American states. As a matter of historical fact, Eloy Alfaro welded together the factions of the Cuban Freedom Party in December 1895, 3 years before the Spanish-American War, when he publicly petitioned the Queen of Spain demanding Cuban independence. In view of his achievements and accomplishments, there are monuments in the memory of Eloy Alfaro in almost every capital of the Western Hemisphere. And so today, we stand inspired by his example. The magnificent lessons resulting from so many noble undertakings by Eloy Alfaro are worthy of being transmitted from generation to generation for the honor and benefit of an entire community of nations.

Were he alive today, he would be in the forefront of the fight to preserve for the Western Hemisphere the pan-American unity of freedom loving people, that would be the perpetual harbinger against the attempt of any form of despotism to plant the tyrant's heel on even the tiniest portion of the soil of our pan-American nations, as the Soviet Union and Dr. Castro have actually done in Cuba.

Were Eloy Alfaro alive today, he would be a zealous supporter of the work of the program of our United Nations and the Organization of the American States, and he would leave no stone unturned to assure, for all peoples of the world, that hope and peace and good will to all men that is our common heritage from our common Creator.

The philosophy of Eloy Alfaro was based principally on service to his fellow human beings and to the cause and promotion of international peace. The public and private motion of peace. The public and private activities of our distinguished guest of honor, Mr. Samuel Woden Gralnick, comes within the framework of this kind of service to humanity. In recognition of this fact, and that you are a great humanitarian and philanthropist, the ruling body of the foundation grants you, Mr. Gralnick, its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

You know, my dear Mr. Gralnick, that you now join a goodly company of distinguished Americans, who have been similarly honored in the past. They include President Kennedy, former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, General McAuliffe, Commissioner Moses, General Crittenberger, along with J. Edgar Hoover, who typify the caliber of men who hold this high honor.

Indeed, we further the ideals to which we are dedicated, we who are presented to do honor to ourselves, when in behalf of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation it gives me genuine pleasure to exercise a pleasant duty, imposed upon me by the board of dignitaries of this foundation to carry out its determination to honor Mr. Samuel Woden Gralnick with the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gralnick then acknowledges receipt of the award which reads as follows:

Eloy Alfaro International Foundation—"Thus one goes to the stars"—recognizing the special value of the services rendered by the Honorable Samuel Woden Gralnick in support of the objectives of this institution, he has been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In witness whereof, this diploma, with the seal of the foundation, is presented in the city of Panama, Republic of Panama, on the 25th of June 1962.

Mr. Gralnick acknowledges receipt of the award as follows:

I am overwhelmed with the great honors you have bestowed upon me and at joining such distinguished company. I little thought when I followed the dictates of my conscience that I would one day be so honored amidst such outstanding company from all over the world.

To be the recipient is indeed a high honor, and I shall regard it as an inspiration to accelerate my efforts in carrying out the high ideals and principles of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, and the principles for which General Alfaro laid down his life.

I wish to again express my personal appreciation and gratitude for your kindness in conferring this Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross on me.

May God be with you all, always.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the many friends of Mr. Gralnick throughout the United States who sent congratulations which were read by Rabbi Ruslander. The Third District of Ohio is honored by the selection of this public

spirited person to receive such an important award for his achievements and accomplishments.

Top Career Employees Pressured for $100 Democratic Gala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, prior to his recent illness, our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], was preparing to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column written by Joseph Young, an eminent writer on Federal employee matters.

As I share Mr. BROYHILL's concern over the pressure being placed on career employees to contribute $100 apiece to the Democratic National Committee, I am pleased to insert on behalf of Representative BROYHILL and myself the "Federal Spotlight" column from the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1963:

TOP CAREER EMPLOYEES PRESSURED FOR $100 DEMOCRATIC GALA

(By Joseph Young)

The Democratic National Committee is putting increased pressure on Government career employees to attend the $100-ticket Democratic gala in President Kennedy's honor on January 18.

All Federal careerists who haven't responded to the committee's formal mailed invitations to attend the dinner are being contacted by telephone at their homes at night and asked if they plan to attend.

Another gimmick being used by the Democrats is to tie the gala affair with an invitation to attend a cocktail party preceding the affair at the home of the head of the agency where the worker is employed. For example, Veterans' Administration career employees are being invited to attend a cocktail party at the home of VA Administrator John Gleason as part of the $100 affair. This same inducement was used for District government career employees, who were invited to a cocktail party at the home of the president of the Board of Commissioners.

The Star last month disclosed the letters mailed to Government career employees in many agencies in grades 12 and above, asking for the "pleasure of their company" at the affair to be held at the armory.

Career employees charged that this amounted to pressure on them to buy tickets, and they also reported that some of their bosses were getting in the act and asking them to attend.

The last week or so has seen a followup effort by the Democratic National Committee's gala salute committee to have Federal career employees attend the affair which is being held primarily to swell the Democratic campaign fund.

Democratic National Committee spokesmen acknowledged that a squad of Democratic volunteer workers has been telephoning all Government career employees who haven't responded to the written invitation.

The career employees are being reminded that the affair is being held in honor of President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON and that it is one of the most important events of the year.

Career employees charge that the Democratic National Committee is receiving the lists of career employees in grades 12 and above from officials in the various Federal agencies.

The dinner, incidentally, is strictly an entertainment affair, with such top personalities as Judy Garland scheduled to entertain. As one career employee, who reluctantly bought a ticket, remarked: "We're not even going to get anything to eat for our $100."

The gala committee is under the chairmanship of Bedford S. Wynne, Dallas, Tex., attorney and coowner of the Dallas football team.

Employees declare that threats of denial of promotions, in-grade salary raises, etc., are being made by agency bosses in an effort to force purchase of tickets.

Meanwhile, Representative BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, has invited any Federal career employee who has been pressured in the matter to gather whatever evidence they can and contact him.

"I will do all in my power to bring the offenders to justice and see that they are prosecuted to the full extent of the law," Mr. BROYHILL said.

Mr. BROYHILL also said he will bring the matter to the attention of the House Civil Service Committee, of which he is a member, and ask for a full-scale investigation. If a stronger law is necessary to prevent such pressure on Federal career employees, Mr. BROYHILL said he will push for such a measure.

Mr. BROYHILL said that while contact with Federal employees at their homes by non-Government workers such as employees of the Democratic National Committee does not constitute a violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, it constitutes highly questionable ethics. However, he stressed that Government officials who "release their files, including names and home addresses, to the Democratic organization" are violating the law.

He warned that these officials are subject to imprisonment or fines or both under the law.

One career employee summed up the dilemma regarding the invitation to the Democratic gala:

"We're damned if we do and damned if we don't. It's not just the $100 involved, although that certainly is a big factor. But if we don't attend, we may be jeopardizing our careers. And if we do attend, we may also be jeopardizing our careers.

"You may recall that when the Eisenhower administration came to power, some of the Republican officials secured the lists of Federal employees who had attended Democratic $100 affairs and these employees were on the blacklist as far as promotions and even holding their jobs was concerned. The same thing could happen again when a new administration comes into power."

Donations by Intimidation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is there installed in Washington an administration that resorts pressure and intimidation to resolve problems external and internal, including the raising of campaign funds for the Democrat Party?

Is this the real meaning of the New Frontier?

When a Federal employee, supposed to be protected by the civil service system and the Hatch Act, is invited by his or her boss to attend a "booze with the boss" party and it is made plain that a $100 contribution to the Democrat campaign kitty is in order, who is supposed to protect the civil rights of such employee? Is the Civil Service Commission interested?

When defense contractors are called to the White House and told they are expected to contribute to a National Cultural Center, what happens if they refuse to yield to such pressure and their contracts are quietly yet effectively stripped from them?

In these and other dealings, including the tributes being exacted from Federal employees, where is the Attorney General of the United States? Are civil rights covered by a political patent, obtained and controlled by the Attorney General?

The Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier has printed an editorial dealing with some of these questions. Under unanimous consent, I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

At a time when the President is asking increased powers from Congress, the administration has been criticized in several instances for abuse of the immense power it already possesses:

(1) Administration officials called in a group of leading defense contractors and President Kennedy told them in frank terms that they ought to contribute to the National Cultural Center being planned in the Capital.

(2) During the trial of James R. Hoffa in Nashville, the statement was made in court that someone describing himself as a reporter for the Nashville Banner had contacted one of the jurors by phone. Attorney General Robert Kennedy called the publisher of the Banner and asked him not to publicize the matter for fear of causing a mistrial. But the newspaper nevertheless printed the story and offered a $5,000 reward for the arrest and conviction of the person falsely identifying himself as a Banner reporter.

(3) During negotiations on the release of Cuban freedom fighters, Castro demanded payment of $2,900,000 which had been promised for release earlier in the year of 60 ill or injured prisoners. Attorney General Robert Kennedy raised a million from an anonymous donor and Gen. Lucius Clay borrowed $1,900,000 from a bank on his personal signature. American corporations are now being asked to make donations for the Cuban deal; and the question is whether they dare to refuse. During the drive for medical supplies, one company which has been indicted for antitrust law violation received a call from the Justice Department requesting a contribution.

There is nothing wrong, of course, in the simple act of requesting donations from corporations. None of the companies have openly charged that they were promised immunity from antitrust actions if they contributed or the loss of defense contracts if they refused.

But there is, nevertheless, an inference of impropriety when administration officials, with the power of life or death over businesses, ask for voluntary contributions. While the motives involved in the cases cited above are worthy, many examples could be cited to show that the Kennedys are fully capable of retaliating against those who re-

sist pressure. The launching of an antitrust violation against steel companies which refused to accept the voluntary price stabilization program is the best example of this ruthlessness.

The Law Observance Committee of the Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, because of its important current value, I refer to the speech of a distinguished Philadelphia lawyer, Harry D. Shargel, Esq., before the 11th annual conference of the National Association of Citizens' Crime Commissions, held at the Warwick Hotel in Philadelphia on November 13, 1962.

Mr. Shagel is the national chairman of the Law Observance Committee of the Federal Bar Association, and his remarks are concerned with the current drive of the association on a national scale to promote respect for law. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in the material which the national chairman presented:

REMARKS OF HARRY D. SHARGEL, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, LAW OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, AT THE 11TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CITIZENS' CRIME COMMISSIONS, WARWICK HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., NOVEMBER 13, 1962.

When Dan Michie asked me to speak I believe it was our mutual intention that I discuss the work of the law observance committee of the Federal Bar Association and our endeavor to promote respect for law and those who enforce it. I shall do this but before I do, I want to mention something that disturbs me and I hope disturbs all of us and will inspire all of us to constructive action.

I want you to know that I am honored to share this session with Chancellor Scott of the Philadelphia Bar Association. Not only is he the leader of a bar association which has a record of outstanding accomplishments but he is a great leader who in recent months has evidenced the type of courage and impartiality and loyalty to the principle of our profession that should serve as a lesson to other leaders of the bar—a lesson, I am said to say, these leaders should not have needed.

I am a firm believer that the courts are the bulwark of our liberties, our Government, and our established society; that unless we have an independent and courageous judiciary, the America that we know will not be possible. It is incumbent upon all citizens, but especially upon members of the bar, to uphold the dignity of the courts and to do nothing to cast aspersions on the integrity of its members merely because the judges may have rendered a decision with which they do not agree.

Not only must we agree with President Kennedy that the law of the land is what the Supreme Court of the United States says it is but we must go further and say that, until reversed, the law of the case is what the judge presiding over the particular case says it is. Those holding public office as well as those running for public office cannot pick and choose the laws that they will obey or the decisions that they will respect. I have difficulty distinguishing between the acknowledged criminal who does this and the public official. As a matter of fact, I am inclined to condemn and damn such public officials more because they set an example for law-abiding citizens whereas the acknowledged criminal speaks only for himself. The public official in his defiance of the law contributes an aura of respectability to what otherwise may be regarded as a criminal act and when he evidences to the public that it is proper to pick the law that is to be obeyed and the decision to be accepted, he is contributing to the chaos that results when each person is a law unto himself.

I am happy to report that in the course of my activities as chairman of the law observance committee of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association and as national chairman of the law observance committee of the Federal Bar Association I have had contacts with many judges and law enforcement officials and I can tell you this—these people are honest, dedicated, courageous men trying to do an impartial job in the best way they know how. We must remember that the decisions that they make are based on the facts and the law as they see them. Facts the public may not be aware of and law that the public may not understand. It is incumbent upon all the citizens to realize this and to refrain from wild criticism but it is especially the duty of members of the bar not only to defend the courts, but to refrain from wild disparaging remarks about judges who disagree with them or with whom they disagree. I for one feel that it is the duty of the organized bar to discipline its members who violate these precepts. I urge all of you to consider the importance of the courts, of promoting respect for the courts, and of defending its members so that we may maintain an independent and courageous judiciary and protect our liberties and our form of government.

Now that I have gotten this off of my chest, I want to tell you about our law observance committee.

We are endeavoring to promote respect for law and those who enforce it. Our message to the public is a simple one: "The law protects you, respect it, uphold it, obey it. It is a personal message to all our citizens—to every man, woman, and child. The emphasis is on the fact that the law protects you—you personally; that none of us can continue in his day-to-day functions if we are not governed by the rule of law. There would be no safety for the person, no civil liberties, no property rights. Society could not exist without the rule of law. We must appreciate what law does for us and in appreciating it, we will respect it, uphold it, and obey it.

We must also appreciate the important part played by all those concerned with law enforcement in maintaining this rule of law—the local policeman, the Federal agent, the prosecutor, and the courts. By and large these people are dedicated servants trying to do the best job they can with the tools they have. We recognize that ours is a self-regulating society; that in general, our citizens are law abiding; that our law enforcement machinery necessarily assumes that our citizens are law abiding and that the lawbreaker is the exception. It is our objective to reinforce the law-abiding community and to deter the lawbreaker. We must promote the law enforcer's self-respect. We must promote the competence of the law enforcer. We must increase his standards and attract the best personnel to the field.

I do not know whether you are aware of the fact that the Federal Bar Association consists of lawyers who are or were employed by the Federal Government. We have over 50 chapters all over the United States with 3 in Europe. Our national association has established a law observance committee. Our objective is to have each of our chapters set up chapter law observance committees to promote respect for law and those who enforce it. Our national committee provides guidance and assistance and initiates national activities which transcend the jurisdiction of the local chapters. Incidentally, the concept of a law observance committee started here in Philadelphia and we are modelling our activities on that of the Philadelphia chapter.

Here is some idea of what the Philadelphia chapter law observance committee has sponsored:

(a) Coordination conferences among the law enforcement officials, among organizations concerned with juvenile problems and among law enforcement officials and service organizations.

(b) We have prepared a "Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies" in the Philadelphia area describing the jurisdiction and scope of each as well as the cooperative services offered to others. It includes the names of the top officials of each agency as well as his phone number and lists the names of police chiefs of adjoining counties and the presidents of the police associations in Philadelphia and vicinity.

(c) Our efforts have resulted in a course in police science and administration at the Community College at Temple University—the first degree course of its kind in this area.

(d) Exhibits of the work of the various law enforcement agencies were held in a central location and portions of these exhibits were made available to the schools and to other banks in other areas.

(e) We have sponsored radio and TV programs designed to inform the public of the work of the various law enforcement agencies. Incidentally, a weekly series is now in process on station WIBG and we have commitments for TV time on WFIL this Christmas and Easter.

(f) We have disseminated thousands of pieces of literature through the schools.

(g) Our speakers bureau, under Norris Harzenstein, has provided speakers for schools and service organizations.

Our national law observance committee has brought together authority, talent, and ability from the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government and from industry so that working together we can accomplish our program. The following are members of our national committee: Hon. Tom C. Clark, Justice, Supreme Court of the United States; Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General; Hon. Emanuel Celler, chairman, House Judiciary Committee; Hon. Cyrus H. Vance, Secretary of the Army; Abram Chayes, Esq., legal advisor, Department of State; Robert H. Knight, Esq., the General Counsel, U.S. Treasury Department; John T. McNaughton, Esq., General Counsel, Department of Defense; Daniel B. Michie, Jr., Esq., president, National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions. Public information adviser: Mr. Charles R. DeHaven, manager of Public Relations, Philadelphia Gas Works. Community relations adviser: Mr. Milton Eisenberg, vice president, Yellow Cab Co. of Philadelphia. Advertising adviser: Mr. Arthur G. Petry, executive secretary, Traffic Safety Program, Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc.

Radio and television advisory subcommittee: Mr. Alfred R. Beckman, vice president, American Broadcasting Co.; Leon R. Brooks, Esq., assistant general attorney, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.; Howard Monderer, Esq., National Broadcasting Co.; Mr. Stephen McCormick, vice president, Mutual Broadcasting System; Mr. William J. Wheatley, program manager, Station WIBG, Storer Broadcasting Co.

Here is what the national committee is doing to help and supplement the local programs:

(a) The first thing we did was to publish a "Law Observance Committee Manual" which was furnished to each of the chapters. This manual was conceived and prepared by our public relations adviser, Mr. Charles R. DeHaven, manager of public relations of the Philadelphia Gas Works. The manual furnishes the names of our national committee, describes the committee objectives, the functions of the national committee, sets forth a sample organization of a chapter law observance committee and suggests specific activities for the local chapters.

(b) Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, who is a member of our committee, wrote to members of the Federal and State judiciary requesting cooperation with the local chapters and he received letters from judges all over the country offering to cooperate. As the names of these judges were received they were sent to the local chapters with the recommendation that they be invited to become members of the chapter law observance committee.

(c) The Federal Bureau of Investigation has issued directions to its local field offices to cooperate with and participate in the activities of the law observance committees.

(d) The coordinator of Treasury enforcement agencies has urged the Treasury enforcement agencies—locally and nationally—to cooperate in our program.

(e) Your national president, Dan Michie, has requested local crime commissions to participate in our program.

(f) We have a radio and TV advisory subcommittee consisting of representatives of the major networks who are endeavoring to facilitate local programing and to arrange national programs on radio and TV. We have tentative plans for a 26-week program on NBC's "Radio Monitor" starting in January which will describe the work of many different law enforcement agencies over a network of over 200 radio stations throughout the country. Within a few days we hope to inaugurate a series of short messages on the role of law in our society and the need to respect the law and those who enforce it. We expect to start on local station WIBG which is owned by the Storer Broadcasting Co., then—if successful—expand it to the other seven stations of the company throughout the country and ultimately make them available to all radio stations so that the radio will ultimately bring our message to over 100 million people on a repetitive basis. We are also considering plans which may ultimately bring our message through television on a national basis.

(g) We have established an exhibit subcommittee headed by Inspector Lynn Edwards of the FBI. By contacting one person our local chapters can now coordinate exhibits of the work of all national law enforcement agencies.

(h) The Pennsylvania District of Kiwanis International has furnished an initial printing of large 24-sheet posters bearing our slogan, "The Law Protects You, Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It." These posters are to be placed on outdoor billboards. We are endeavoring to establish a revolving fund which will permit us to make these posters available to local chapters for posting on billboards in local communities. The Pennsylvania Kiwanis is endeavoring to induce other districts of Kiwanis to participate in this program and make these posters available throughout the country. Local chapters are being asked to secure billboard space through their own efforts. The General Outdoor Advertising Co. has made 20 billboards available in the Philadelphia area and has arranged for its Washington office to make billboards available in the District of Columbia. The Baltimore chapter has made its own arrangements for billboard space and so has the Omaha chapter. Where chapters need assistance in obtaining billboard space, we will supply such assistance.

(i) We are exploring plans to secure the assistance of industry organizations. We believe we will soon have concrete actions to report.

We urge all organizations to participate in this program. We claim no patent, copyright, or monopoly. You are free to use our materials with or without credit to the Federal Bar Association. We will assist any organization to start its own program and we will cooperate with any organization that wishes to participate in our program.

We are most optimistic. The soil is fertile. We have planted many seeds. We expect a bumper crop.

Thank you.

Mississippi Doctor Writes Voicing Disappointment in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, typical of the many letters I received during the controversy over the Rules Committee was one from Dr. James E. Safley, of Brookhaven, Miss. Dr. Safley's letter poses some searching questions which, I think, would be well for this body to ponder. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including the text of Dr. Safley's letter, and commend it to the attention of the House:

BROOKHAVEN, MISS.,
January 8, 1963.

Members of the 88th Congress, Washington, D.C.:

GENTLEMEN: Speaking as a disturbed and concerned citizen and more important as a parent, I wish to convey my pride and thanks to many Members of the Congress for a job well done but I emphatically wish to voice my disappointment of the Congress as a whole. How does one answer his 12-year-old son who asks, "Dad, if they [the Congress] can pack a committee to get what some people want, why can't you and I slip in and fix the cards so we can beat Mother and Susan at rook?"

How can we, the parents of children who hold the destiny of our country in the palms of their now innocent hands effectively teach them that honesty and truth is the only way to greatness while you "stack" committees to do the bidding of an ambitious family. As Ed pointed out with his question, this is essentially no different from the crooked gamblers who tempt and often succeed in ruining the lives and future of college athletes.

Our President, who is personally ambitious, and his power-mad brother, the Attorney General, speak from both sides of their mouths. First, they justify some of their actions by resorting to court rulings dating back to the 1800's, while at the same time they utilize a "stroke of the pen" or a "packed" U.S. Supreme Court to hand down rulings in the 1960's to justify the New Frontier.

I beg you learned gentlemen to review that part of ancient history which deals with the early stages of the fall of the Roman Empire and compare that with the current history of the United States of America. I believe you will, as I have, find an amazing parallel. I implore you to search your hearts and then vote your honest convictions.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. SAFLEY, M.D.

Civil Service Cocktail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, at last some attention is being given throughout the Nation to the coldblooded blackjacking of career Federal employees for the purpose of raising funds for the Democrat Party.

Let it be pointed out that this campaign to exact political tribute from civil service employees actually started early last December as duly reported by Mr. Joseph Young, expert writer on civil service matters for the Washington Evening Star.

Unfortunately, most of the Members of Congress had not yet returned to the Capital on December 6, 1962, when Mr. Young, in a front-page story in the Washington Evening Star, called attention to this brazen, outrageous, fundraising campaign.

To keep the record straight and to silence any Federal official stationed in Washington who may argue that he or she was unaware of what was taking place, I submit for printing in the RECORD the December 6, 1962, article as printed by the Evening Star:

PRESSURED FOR $100 TICKETS, FEDERAL WORKERS CHARGE

(By Joseph Young)

Government career employees are getting formal invitations to purchase $100-a-plate tickets for the second inaugural salute dinner being sponsored by the Democratic National Committee.

Civil service careerists in grades 12 and above in many of the departments and agencies have received letters at their homes mailed by the Democratic National Committee asking for "the pleasure of your company" at the affair to be held at the Armory on January 18.

The dinner, in honor of President and Mrs. Kennedy and Vice President and Mrs. Johnson, will swell the campaign coffers of the Democratic National Committee.

FOLLOWUP AT OFFICE

Some of the career employees are complaining that the invitations are not-too-subtle pressure on them to pressure tickets if they want to remain in the good graces of their bosses and hang on to their jobs or receive promotions.

In some cases, employees complain that their immediate bosses are following up on the letters of invitation by asking them at work if they plan to attend and stressing that the agency would like to see a good turnout.

Civil Service Commission officials said no violation of the Hatch Act is involved so long as the invitations were mailed to the employees' homes and were not mailed from Government buildings nor at Government expense.

However, some Government personnel officials question the ethics in such a procedure and feel that it does not help the merit system.

The practice of some Government officials in following up on letters by contacting employees personally in their offices to see if they are going to the dinner could be a violation of the Hatch Act, it was pointed out. But it would be difficult to get a criminal

conviction without the definite proof which most employees would be loath to give because of fear of losing their jobs.

The letter received by career employees requesting the "pleasure of your company" was accompanied by a reservation card in which employees were invited to send back in an enclosed stamped-addressed envelope to the Democratic National Committee.

The card contains the information that for each $100 contribution to the Democratic National Committee, one ticket to the dinner will be sent to the employee. It provides the adequate spaces for filling out how much money will be contributed along with the number of tickets desired.

Officials of the Democratic National Committee defended the invitations, declaring that Government workers were also solicited to attend Republican fund-raising dinners during the Eisenhower administration.

They denied that employees' careres would be jeopardized if they failed to buy tickets and said it all was on a voluntary basis.

The personnel director of one of the biggest Government agencies, who for obvious reasons didn't want to be quoted by name, declared:

"While my office wouldn't stand for any direct pressure on Government career employees, and I'm sure in this we would be fully supported by the head of the agency, there is a rather subtle form of pressure used in the sale of the tickets to the dinner.

"The Democratic officeholders, for the most part, are more enthusiastic and politically minded than the Republicans were. And some of them do mention to their career subordinates that it might be nice if they could see their way clear to attending the dinner.

"I'm certain that most of the officials don't intend it to be a 'you-attend-or-else' proposition, but nevertheless some of the employees probably feel that it would be best for their careers and job security if they do go. Our office has made it clear that employees don't have to go and that their jobs won't be jeopardized, but some employees just don't want to take the chance of offending their bosses by not going."

In a few cases, eager-beaver agency heads let it be known to some of the political appointees under them that it will be good for the agency to make as good a record as possible in dinner ticket sales, and this in turn results in pressure on career employees to purchase tickets, the personnel man noted.

The question arose as to where the Democratic National Committee got the list of names of career employees in each department.

"Don't be naive," said the personnel man. "This is a Democratic administration, isn't it?"

Keep the Trucks Off MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as one travels throughout the country and, particularly, in the State of California, one finds that this is certainly the age of freeways and expressways, to take care of the large number of motor vehicles owned by our growing population.

The urgency of meeting the traffic needs of this growing number of motor vehicles presents many complex ancillary problems. This situation is illustrated by a very interesting editorial that was delivered on KCBS radio in San Francisco.

It concerns the interest of Oakland, Calif., in keeping trucks off the MacArthur Freeway which is a main artery currently being developed in that community.

I am pleased to insert this editorial in the RECORD in the interest of my colleagues and other citizens throughout the country who either do face these problems today or will be facing them in the future:

KEEP THE TRUCKS OFF MACARTHUR

The city of Oakland is waging a serious battle to keep heavy trucks from using the new MacArthur Freeway. The people of the city, through their representatives, have taken every legal step available to them to keep trucks from being routed through a fine residential neighborhood, past homes, churches, and schools. The final step has now been taken, in the form of an ordinance passed unanimously by the Oakland City Council, prohibiting trucks from using MacArthur, and designating Nimitz Freeway as the alternate route.

Unfortunately, this ordinance, although it is perfectly legal, is not enforceable.

The reason is that a city has no control over traffic inside its borders if that traffic uses a State highway. The new MacArthur Freeway is not only a State highway, it is also a part of the Interstate System, and a great deal of Federal tax money was spent on its construction.

So at this point Oakland can only ask for help. The city has forwarded its ordinance to the division of highways in Sacramento, asking that the State publicly designate Nimitz as the alternate route for trucks. The division of highways, however, must in turn recommend to the Bureau of Public Roads, an agency of the Department of Commerce, that the Oakland ordinance be enforced.

The MacArthur Freeway, for the benefit of those who have not seen it, is immense. Eight lanes wide, it cuts a tremendous swath through the heart of Oakland. It runs through one end of the Mills College campus, within 100 feet of one residence hall, and an off ramp and underpass will be only 90 feet away from the Mills College Fine Arts Building.

This routing itself is inexcusable, and even with the freeway restricted to passenger cars the effect on the neighborhoods through which it passes will be drastic enough. But if heavy freight rigs are allowed on MacArthur, the situation will become intolerable.

Mills College is not alone in demanding a truck ban. As Dr. C. Easton Rothwell, president of that college, said recently to KCBS:

"Mills College, and all the institutions that have joined to form the committee called citizens against trucks on the MacArthur Freeway, are very much concerned about the increase in noise and dirt and vibration that is going to be caused if these heavy trucking rigs come out through what is the residential and educational and religious heart of the city of Oakland.

"We know that, even taking the estimates of the State highway engineers themselves, the number of trucks when the peak is reached will be more than one a minute, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week."

As Dr. Rothwell further declared, this is a problem of values. The point is, do you build a huge concrete strip through the finer residential area of a great city, and then run huge trucking rigs over it? The matter is too important to be left to the engineers. And especially in this case there is no excuse to justify running trucks on the MacArthur Freeway. If they were to be required to take the Nimitz Freeway around Oakland, rather than MacArthur through it, the distance would be no greater.

KCBS strongly urges the State authorities in Sacramento, and the Federal authorities in Washington, to support the city of Oakland. The time is long overdue for the highway builders to recognize the need for more thoughtful handling of heavy traffic through our major cities. Let's start by banning trucking on the MacArthur Freeway in Oakland.

Dr. W. F. Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD a well-deserved tribute to one of the pioneer educators and welfare officials of my State, Dr. W. F. Bond.

The tribute was delivered by Mr. Kirby P. Walker, superintendent, Jackson Public Schools, Jackson, Miss., on the occasion of the observance of the anniversary of the founding of the University of Southern Mississippi as a normal college, September 18, 1912, and the dedication of Willard Faroe Bond Hall at Hattiesburg, Miss., September 18, 1962.

I should like to associate myself with this splendid tribute to this outstanding Mississippian. I have had the privilege of knowing Dr. Bond for almost a half century. His whole life and efforts have been unselfishly dedicated to the people of Mississippi and in particular to the youth of my State.

Superintendent Walker's speech follows:

President McCain, honored and distinguished guests, members of the faculty, alumni, students, and friends, it is a difficult taks which I am undertaking.

A résumé of 61 years of continuous public service canot be recounted properly in the few minutes I have been allotted. But I hasten to confess that even with more time I would be far from adequate to the honor which has been accorded me in paying deserved tribute to Dr. Willard Faroe Bond. I trust you will be tolerant of my shortcomings.

I

Since attaining the age of accountability W. F. Bond has demonstrated a consuming interest in people and in their welfare.

He committed the first 42 years of his active career to public education. That period of prodigious effort was zealously given for those whose productive years were before them. They were devoted to that segment of our population who needed advantages of education to make them more useful to their families and to their State.

When 16 years old he was teaching in his community for $10 a month, and board. After several years of teaching and going to college, he served as superintendent of a south Mississippi high school for a decade, then professor of Latin and history at Mississippi Normal College for 4 years, followed, by a score of years, as State superintendent of education.

There were no guidelines to follow when Professor Bond entered upon his assignment as chief State school officer. Specialists in education as we now know them

were few in number in that day and when found the limited resource of the State department of education placed most of them beyond reach.

His critics have said of him that his genius was in his ability to judge the competencies and personal qualities of others and to recruit for his colleagues the best of those who would share with him the challenge and excitement of helping to build a creditable State system of public schools.

Such renowned leaders in public education as Claude Bennett, Jim Broom, M. D. Broadfoot, J. T. Calhoun, Sam Hathorn, C. O. Henderson, F. J. Hubbard, G. D. Humphrey, H. M. Ivy, F. C. Jenkins, W. C. Strahan, and Sam Woods, to name a few, are illustrative of educators who joined Professor Bond to give a forward thrust to public education in Mississippi which is not yet spent.

From the beginning of his educational career he used a yardstick which he consistently applied to measure the merits of every proposition or appropriation made in behalf of education—namely, children of Mississippi and their future.

II

The second era of Dr. Bond's public service was fully committed to those persons, in most instances, whose productive years were behind them, who through misfortune or otherwise, required an assisting hand or an opportunity for rehabilitation.

In public welfare administration as it was when he entered State educational administration, there were no guidelines for a State welfare program.

Again the yardstick of human values was employed, and through his sound judgment and unremitting work, Mississippi founded and developed another valued instrument for its people.

III

In my childhood, Horatio Alger novels were to be found in the homes of most boys. Such fiction—from log cabin to White House, from poverty to riches. They were spun out of the pathos and the aspirations of people whose native land was founded on the principle that everyone in the United States had an opportunity to better his station in life. With the turn of the century we needed the romantic dream of better times. The burdens of reconstruction laid heavily upon the shoulders of Mississippians.

The biography of W. F. Bond records a series of experiences from 1881 to 1957 which will thrill young and mature readers as no Horatio Alger fiction could. Listen to these lines which relate his earliest recollections:

"In a lonely place among the trees near a dwelling deep in the pine forests of southeast Mississippi, a young woman had just been buried. There was not much ceremony at the funeral, for it was many miles to the home of the nearest preacher, and the woman had been only a housekeeper in the home of a farmer and stockman where she had worked for board and lodging for herself and her 5-year-old son. As the boy was led away from the scene, he left behind the only relative he had ever known. Three years before, he had been brought to this farm home with his mother. Now she was dead, and there was no will or other papers, for there were no possessions.

" 'What shall we do with the boy?' asked one.

" 'We will keep him,' replied the head of the house, a kindly old gentleman who had no family of his own. A year later [he had] died. This time there was a will, and the first section stated that $500 of his estate should be set aside for the education of the boy, Willard Faroe Bond."

Dr. Bond's extensive, fruitful life of public service had its genesis just a few miles south of this great seat of learning.

He learned how to win friends and influence people long before books were written on the topic. He is chief among the few people I have known who can win others to his view even though their earlier positions were known to be hostile to his.

From raw experience he can attest that "organized society finds human nature the toughest problem to solve," but this never quelled him in working for solutions to improve it.

His great humanism combined with eloquence and power of persuasion provided the thrust and attitude necessary for building and expanding our public school system.

Two things Dr. Bond was not, and is not, to this good hour. He has never been self-centered, nor has he been vindicative. Being human and having to deal with some who were amply supplied with these traits, he had many provocations and temptations to be selfish and revengeful during his long tour of duty in education and welfare.

Through his perceptiveness, his broad experience, and his remarkable vigor, he promoted and defended the causes which he represented with all of the prestige of the office he held and with statesmanlike acumen and leadership.

IV

It is timely and proper that Dr. Bond's public service be dramatically highlighted in the ceremonies of this day and in this particular locale.

The splendid new residence hall for men which bears his name will serve the university for years to come. Not only this generation of students but future generations will be grateful for their commodious campus home which this new dormitory provides.

All of us rejoice in this commemoration of Willard Faroe Bond. We are pleased to see his name and his portrait so fittingly enshrined in public remembrance. Above all, however, we know that the most meaningful, the loftiest, and the most lasting monument to Dr. Bond is the memory which will live in the minds of all who know him. It will remain in the hearts of those for whom he worked with inspiration and devotion, who have been and will continue to be beneficiaries of his noble needs which were designed and measured by his boundless love and faith in his God and in the people of his beloved State.

Mississippi will always be in his debt.

Auto Excise Repeal Logical Starting Point for Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the President has called on Congress to enact measures to revitalize the growth of our economy by reducing income taxes and corporate taxes. I have recently reintroduced my bill to repeal the discriminatory and depressive 10-percent automobile excise tax, a measure that will not only remove a tax inequity but help give the economy the kind of boost the President wants.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from the December 27, 1962, issue of the Flint Journal, of Flint, Mich., which reflects the sentiment of that community with respect to the continuation of this tax. This editorial, entitled "Auto Excise Repeal Logical Starting Point for Tax Cut," points out that the excise tax has outlived its usefulness and its repeal would be a boon to the growth of the economy.

Under unanimous consent, I present the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD herewith:

AUTO EXCISE REPEAL LOGICAL STARTING POINT FOR TAX CUT

"Our tax system is a drag on economic recovery and economic growth." These were words spoken a few weeks ago by President Kennedy.

In that same speech he promised a tax reduction aimed at "creating more jobs and income and eventually more revenue."

The form such a tax cut should take has been the subject of much discussion and argument over the past several months.

Representatives CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of this district, has used the President's concern about the tax drag on economic growth to renew his fight for repeal of the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles. He contends that this is the logical starting point for chartering sound tax revision.

Preparing to again carry his campaign to the floor of the House, he pointed out last week during a Flint visit that while Mr. Kennedy has urged that we get this country sailing economically, "we can't do much sailing without raising the anchor. As long as tax inequities and other burdens are heaped on the economy's major industry, the ship of state won't get very far out of harbor."

By the major industry, of course, he was talking about the production of automobiles. And to underline its importance he called attention to the fact that this industry is responsible for one out of every six businesses, and it employs one out of every seven workers.

"You don't have to be told what automobile production means in the way of jobs," he admitted. "It directly affects everyone in Flint. But sometimes people lose sight of the overall impact of the industry.

"Take the steel industry, for instance. One-fifth of all steel produced in this country goes into the production of automobiles. Car makers also use 62 percent of all rubber, 11 percent of all aluminum, 35 percent of all zinc, 47 percent of all lead and 63 percent of all leather upholstery sold in the United States.

"In the highway transport industries alone, employment totals 10.5 million—one-seventh of the Nation's work force.

"When you think of some of these figures you start realizing what automobiles mean to the economy of this country. And no matter how you look at it, the retension of such a highly discriminatory and depressive tax on this vital industry cannot be construed as conducive to the expansion of our economy."

The excise tax that has been CHAMBERLAIN'S target ever since he has been in Washington was levied as a "temporary" measure during the Korean war. Every year Congress has voted to extend the 10-percent levy.

CHAMBERLAIN'S proposal is to repeal the tax. But even if Congress won't support such legislation, it would be a step in the right direction if it would see fit not to vote its annual extension. Without such an extension, the levy would revert by law from 10 to 7 percent.

"Either of these actions would be a giant step toward releasing an emergency brake that has prevented new automobile sales from reaching even greater levels than they have experienced," he insisted. "And as car sales increase, so does employment."

His estimate is that repeal of the excise tax would make possible an average price reduction of $230 per car, which would be a boon to auto sales and a boost to the entire economy.

We agree it is a discriminatory tax that has outlived its usefulness. It is discriminatory in that it is directed at one industry. If it is necessary to levy an excise tax then it should be a 1- or 2-percent excise on all manufacturing. The automobile industry shouldn't be expected to carry the entire load.

Repeal of the tax would cost an estimated $1.4 billion in Federal revenue. Reduction of the tax from 10 to 7 percent would cost an estimated $400 million. But an average $230 price reduction would boost sales enough to permit the Government to recoup much of the revenue in tax receipts from automobile manufacturers, their suppliers, transportation companies, dealers, finance companies, salesmen, production workers and many, many others down the line.

The President is seeking "long-needed tax reform" aimed at "creating more jobs and income and eventually more revenue." Support for CHAMBERLAIN'S repeal of the temporary excise tax on automobiles would be directed at that very target.

Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of January 17 carries an interesting article by Mr. David Lawrence in which he comments on the Government's fiscal problems in much the same vein as my remarks in the House on that same day. I ask leave to include the Lawrence column with my remarks.

POLITICS AND KENNEDY TAX CUTS—PARTY BELIEVED AIDED, EVEN IF CONGRESS SKIPS REDUCTION AFTER FIRST YEAR

(By David Lawrence)

When President Kennedy delivered his state of the Union message just a year ago, he told the American people he was submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget. A few days later he sent Congress a budget showing there would be a surplus of $500 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1963. Actually the figure officially indicated now for that same year is a deficit of $8.8 billion. This is a mistake of $9.3 billion.

What assurance does the country have that another mistake isn't in the offing? The President in his state of the Union message earlier this week frankly predicted in general terms that there would be a deficit for the 2 fiscal years 1963 and 1964. How are the people to know the extent of the deficit if such a gross error as was made in January a year ago doesn't get corrected for many months thereafter?

It so happens that economists were quite sure early in 1962 that the President's prediction about fiscal year 1963 was wrong, but not until after the congressional elections in November were the official figures revising the January estimate given out. The excuse for the delay was that Congress was still in session and might change the appropriations. But there was no reason why the Government couldn't have issued revised figures as early as August 1962, when it could have conceded the possibility of a slight increase in the deficit. The people at least would have been told that the $500 million surplus was a "myth."

Persons who have followed budget figures for years now say that the President's estimate of a deficit of around $12 billion for the fiscal year ahead is too rosy a prediction. They think the deficit will go much higher.

It is always difficult, of course, to estimate tax receipts. Under the Eisenhower administration and its predecessors the final figures often varied from those forecast, but the percentage of overestimate has seldom been as big as the one Mr. Kennedy made in his state of the Union message in January 1962.

Plainly, the new device of spreading the tax cuts over 3 years will not tend to clarify the picture. Individuals will not know when or whether they will get the promised tax cuts. Congress has a way of changing its mind from session to session about legislation projected for the future. Thus, for 9 straight years Congress has declined to permit certain taxes to expire at the time set under the laws previously written. Instead, these taxes have been regularly retained.

Many Members of Congress are by no means convinced that the President's new formula will ever be applied as he outlines it. For if economic conditions get worse instead of better, there may have to be changes in the formula. Also, if business does boom and big deficits still continue, the demand will be for a cut in the deficits by postponing some of the tax cuts.

The whole picture is, of course, political. The administration apparently feels that, by promising cuts in three separate years, the voter will look forward to them and will reward the Democrats in the 1964 election. But there is also the possibility that the tax cuts will not spur the economy because of the presence of other factors, such as the insistence of laborunion leaders on high wage rates as their share of the savings from a lowering of corporate taxes. Naturally, the employers will then want to increase prices. If the increased wage costs cannot be offset by higher prices, more profit squeezes will develop and the Treasury will get less tax receipts than it has anticipated.

Altogether, America is in for a period of economic confusion and an era of uncertainty that is not conducive to the development of the confidence so essential to business planning. Juggling budget figures for political purposes may win the 1964 election, but the state of the Union messages in 1965, 1967, and 1968 will have to acknowledge the futility of relying on tax cuts alone to stimulate sound business growth. It is already conceded by high officials that the budget will not be balanced until 1967.

An inflationary price wave seems certain to cut down the purchasing power of the dollar to the lowest point in 50 years. This is because the idea of cutting down nondefense expenditures has been scorned by the administration.

Evidently the theories of the 1930's that kept American's unemployment figures high, as pump priming failed, are being applied again. If a tax cut doesn't stimulate the economy this year or next, will it be argued that higher deficts will then be in order? This dilemma will someday confront an administration which is borrowing billions to reduce taxes.

An American Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Medical Society of the District of Columbia brought to my attention an editorial reprinted from Philadelphia Medicine, volume 58, No. 38, of September 21, 1962, entitled "An American's Creed." The executive board of the society reviewed this creed and wholeheartedly endorsed the thoughts behind it and the views expressed in it. It is recognized as Dean Alfange's "Message of 1952; My Creed," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune December 30, 1951. A framed version hangs in the office I occupy in my district as furnished by St. Clair County chairman, Don Giesler, M.D. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I believe the creed is again deserving of consideration by the Members of the House of Representatives, due to its timeliness and as forwarded by our District of Columbia Medical Society:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the State look after me, I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build; to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm and dry rot of Utopia. I will not trade my freedom for beneficence, not my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself; to enjoy the benefit of my creations; and to face the world boldly saying, "This I have done with my own hand, I am a man. I am an American."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

T

IN

h
v
F
R

a
a
c

a
S
s
a

s
u
t

w
a
[1

p
w

c
b
t
i
S
c
S
n
v

g
I
v
p
c
t
f
t
s
t
a
s
v
t
t
s
t
a
s
I
c
t
t
t

Appendix

Theodore F. Shuey, Late Official Reporter of Debates, U.S. Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article giving a vivid and interesting sketch of Theodore F. Shuey, at one time the Chief Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate.

Mr. Shuey was born in Staunton, Va., and while in Washington in 1868 was appointed by Mr. Sutton, then the Official Reporter, as a member of his staff.

From 1868 to 1933, when he passed away, he was Official Reporter of the Senate, and during the 65 years of his service he was never absent a day on account of sickness.

I am sure this article will be of absorbing interest to Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Shorthand Reporters' World, New York, February 1916]

THEODORE F. SHUEY, AGE 71 AT THE TIME

"Let us read together the life story of probably the most scholarly reporter in the world."

There is nothing more inspiring than a conspicuously successful life. Of all the bright names that have honored and adorned the profession of verbatim reporting, there is none greater than that of Theodore F. Shuey, now for more than 47 years and Official Reporter of the Senate of the United States, and today one of the youngest and most vigorous men of all the hundreds who work beneath the dome of the Capitol.

There are great lawyers, great surgeons, great engineers. Let us read together the life story of a great reporter. Let us see what it means not only to put words on paper swiftly and clearly, but to transmute colloquial speech into the finer metal of the smooth, written record. This is the fine art of the linguist, the scholar, the master of speech. "Our business is with words," says Mr. Shuey; "and the more we know about words, the easier and the better is our work." There is no language so rich in its treasures as the English; for it has ruthlessly snatched the wealth of many other tongues, and no one can be a really great reporter of the English spoken words unless he knows a good deal about other languages. The French parliamentary reporting system is better than ours in one respect at least, because in France no man can enter that gate unless he is at least a bachelor of arts.

Of the famous report of a great speech in the British House of Commons it was once said that the scholar in the gallery thought that the scholar on the floor would, in his remarks, make a certain classical allusion which was very apt; but the orator forgot to do so, and the reporter put it into his speech for him. There may be others who can do that sort of thing as well as Mr. Shuey can, but none who can do it better. And when there is a fierce personal debate, and the words are called for, there is no one who can stand up and read them more fluently to the listening Senate. When you add to that the fact that never in more than 47 years has he missed a day of a session of the Senate, and that he has sometimes gone 2 or 3 days and nights at a stretch, without taking off his clothes, when there was a "physical endurance" debate running continuously, you begin to realize something of the fiber and caliber of the man who is the subject of this too brief and modest sketch. For buoyant resiliency in the face of long hours there are few young men who are his equal.

Theodore F. Shuey was born near Staunton, in Augusta County, Va., February 2, 1845. His Huguenot ancestors came to this country nearly 200 years ago. For generations they were successful farmers. When Theodore was 14 years old a farmer clergyman, who was a guest at his father's house, had a copy of Elias Longley's "Manual of Phonography," which he showed to the boy. This clergyman, Rev. Samuel Evers, taught Theodore the alphabet of phonography, and thereby made the career of the most noteworthy shorthand reporter now living. In less than a year Shuey had gone through the Benn Pitman books, and then the "Handbook of Standard Phonography," by Andrew J. Graham.

In Virginia everybody who aspires to be anything gets a classical education. Thomas Jefferson, father of the University of Virginia, believed that no man can lay the foundations of an education except in Latin and Greek; and today, man for man, there is probably no State in the Union where you will find such a general knowledge of the classics as in Virginia. Shuey went to Otterbein University, at Westerville, Ohio. There he began the conquest of Latin and Greek, which he has carried on for more than half a century, so that Homer and Virgil in their original tongues are to him a vacation pastime. Blessings on the hundreds of small colleges in this country, which open to so many thousands the door to the wonderful past, rich with the spoils of time.

Before young Mr. Shuey had been long in college the cannon began to boom the the muskets to rattle in the great Civil War. He lived near the border of West Virginia. As a lad he had seen the sale of the slaves on a neighboring estate at the owner's death. He had seen mothers separated from their children, brothers from sisters. He had seen the slavetraders from Charleston and Savannah bid them off like cattle, and march them away handcuffed, going they knew not where. The unusual sight made him an abolitionist at heart; and when the time came—when in that border region one man chose one side and another the other side, Shuey went with the Union.

In 1863, not waiting to finish his collegiate course, he wrote a cousin in Pennsylvania that he was about to enlist in an Ohio regiment then at the front, in which were some of his classmates. His uncle immediately sent this cousin to bring Mr. Shuey to Pennsylvania, and going there he fairly ran into th Battle of Gettysburg, which he witnessed and of which he made a diary in shorthand. In response to the call of the Governor of Pennsylvania for emergency troops he enlisted, but in this service saw only 6 weeks of soldiering. Then he enlisted in the 3d Pennsylvania Heavy Artillery, and was sent to Fortress Monroe, where he remained until April 1864. But his real fighting came after that.

In the last year of the Civil War those who wanted action got it. In April 1864, the 188th Pennsylvania Infantry was organized from volunteer members of the 3d Pennsylvania Heavy Artillery. Mr. Shuey was in Company H, which, consisting of 82 enlisted men and 3 officers, lost in killed, wounded, and missing in action, 55 of its members. These missing men were killed, so that the total loss was far above the average of the fighting regiments of that bloody conflict. We who are too young to remember have little conception of the terrible character of some of these battles. Mr. Shuey never drilled except under fire, as in the intervals of comparative quiet he was doing high-grade clerical work for his regiment; but whenever there was any fighting to be done, he was in it. A comrade, the same Geist, referred to in the shorthand specimen herewith printed, has published of him the following tribute:

"Having served with him as a member of Company H, 188th, I know that no braver or more faithful soldier ever carried a musket. In the campaign of 1864 he was nearly always on detached service as company clerk and at regimental headquarters, yet he refused to give up his gun, which he always kept in apple-pie order; and in every action in which the 188th was called upon to take part, volunteered to take his chance with the rest of the boys—at Drury's Bluff, Cold Harbor, Petersburg, Fort Harrison—in fact, all of the hard battles of 1864."

General Grant has been described as the most terrible general of all the wars until his time because of the way in which he sent his own men to death to gain the object on which he had set his heart. In his memoirs he says that the Battle of Cold Harbor was one of his greatest military mistakes. At all events the regiment of which Mr. Shuey's company were a part was ordered to charge the outer rifle pits of the enemy, just outside the main Confederate earthworks. Only a few Union troops reached the rifle pits, and these were at once swept by a terrific hail of lead. Shuey and his company comrades were far to the right, where they had no protection, and lying flat on their faces, men were killed and wounded faster than the story can be told. Now read a page from Mr. Shuey's diary, written in shorthand while the scene was fresh in his memory—one of the few shorthand diaries of that war. A photographic facsimile of the page describing the thick of that slaughter is here presented; and while this article was being written, 51 years later, Mr. Shuey wrote the same page again from dictation. The history of his changed shorthand style will be told later. Now read the diary:

"KEY TO THE PAGE OF NOTES FROM MR. SHUEY'S DIARY, MADE IN 1864

"Just then another ball struck him, and then another, which finished his mortal career. In his death agonies he writhed right over the fork [of the limb] behind which I was lying, and remained there, presenting his front to the enemy. To this circumstance I may probably owe the preservation of my life, for I think during the

time I was lying there his dead body received at least half a dozen bullets. Geist who was near me, received a ball through his leg, and made his way out of that as soon as possible. Julio, who was also wounded, crawled to a tree. Price lay almost beside me, and received three balls, all in his legs. Our men who had gained the pits were not able to fire upon the rebels, as the pits could scarcely protect them sufficiently by lying flat on their faces. The bullets passed over and around me in every direction. Many grazed me. I remained there an hour, probably two of them, for in such a position one cannot judge of the time; when a brigade of our troops on the right made a charge which drew the whole rebel fire. Then I sprang up and reached a tree, from behind which I called to Julio, who crawled to me, and then I helped him back. The poor fellow received six or seven wounds, and will undoubtedly die. Crossley was killed just as he reached the pits on the left, and Bates badly wounded. As far as I can learn, in our company there are 6 killed, 12 wounded, and 7 or 8 missing. Captain Leckie and Lieutenant Bean were wounded. Our company, that is, what remains of it, is scattered in every direction. At night I made some coffee, and slept at the edge of the woods, about the same place I did two nights before. There was a good deal of firing on the left."

There may be braver acts than carrying a wounded comrade to safety under such a fire. There are not many. This is just a glimpse of Mr. Shuey's Army experience. In March 1865, he was in the hospital, where at one time he lay unconscious for 13 days and narrowly escaped being taken to the deadhouse. He says that since his recovery he has never had a day of sickness, in more than 50 years.

After the war was over he went back to Otterbein, and then home to Virginia, where he worked for the Richmond Whig and Lynchburg News, but in that limited field there was not room enough for a shorthand career. In the first 10 years of his shorthand experience he had never met a verbatim reporter, but when he did so, found himself well equipped. A. F. Crutchfield, proprietor of the Literary Pastime, was about to remove his publication office from Richmond to Baltimore, and asked Shuey to go with him. On the way Shuey stopped in Washington, and there met Col. John W. Forney, editor of the Washington Daily Chronicle, who had been Secretary of the Senate, and on his saying to Colonel Forney that he knew more about shorthand than he did about newspaper work in a strange city, Colonel Forney told Shuey to go and see Mr. Richard Sutton, contractor for the shorthand reporting of the Senate for the Congressional Globe. He went to see Mr. Sutton, and was employed as an amanuensis at $20 a week.

In 1868 the actual reporting of the Senate was done by Dennis and James Murphy, who, with their brother, Edward, formed the most remarkable family of shorthand reporters that the world has ever known. Dennis had been a reporter in the Senate for 20 years, and most of the note-taking was done by him. James was also a fine reporter, and in those days Edward was in charge of the transcribing department, reading the notes of his brothers with the utmost fluency. In later years Edward became one of the reports, and now, in 1916, he and his son James—namesake of his famous uncle—are doing one-third of all the Senate reporting. If anyone will take the trouble to read the Senate debates of 1868, or any of the preceding years, he will see that we of modern days know nothing more of splendid verbatim reporting than did the Murphy brothers. Dennis in particular was a perfect shorthand machine; he could write at 200 words a minute for hours at a time, if necessary, making notes that several people could read easily. He once called the attention of the writer of this article to a day's debate in the Senate which averaged 208 words a minute for 4 hours. For mere manual skill no one can possibly beat this.

Into this wonderful opportunity came young Mr. Shuey. During the long vacation of 1868 he learned to read Dennis Murphy's notes; and naturally he lapsed into the long, simple outlines of which Murphy was the dextrous master. No one need write such long outlines as Mr. Shuey does, but if God has given a man fingers as nimble as a hummingbird's wings, there is no easier way to record human speech. Compare now the diary of 1864 with the corresponding page, written from dictation on December 20, 1915.

Since December 1868 Mr. Shuey's professional life has been one long, uninterrupted success. In 1872 he assisted in the reporting of the Pennsylvania constitutional convention. In 1876 he went to California in the congressional recess and reported the first senatorial investigation of the Chinese question. In 1896 Dennis F. Murphy died, and Mr. Shuey and Edward V. Murphy were unanimous made the principal reporters of the Senate.

In 1902 Virginia held a great constitutional convention, which began during the recess of Congress. Two men from Washington, with more ambition than skill, obtained the reporting of this convention, and fell down. Then, without solicitation or desire on his part, Mr. Shuey received, at his ancestral home near Staunton, a summons to come to Richmond, where the reporting of the convention was offered to him substantially on his own terms. He and Milton W. Blumenberg did the reporting till Congress met in December, when it was continued by other skilful hands.

In 1904 appeared the Encyclopedia Americana. For that publication Mr. Shuey wrote, and was paid for, the article on the history of shorthand. In it he gave just tribute to the great work of American shorthand authors, Andrew J. Graham, Benn Pitman, and others. It is one of the curiosities of literature, and one of the mysteries of the cyclopedic art, that when this article appeared in print in the Encyclopedia Americana—word for word as Mr. Shuey wrote it except for certain mutilations—it was signed by another name. Mr. Shuey, who showed the manuscript of his article to the writer of this sketch when he was writing it, in 1904, often laughs at the queer transformation, and wonders how it came about.

Some of the reporting in the Senate, as elsewhere, is very easy. Much of it is terrifically hard. When the Senate squares away for months of debate on a tariff bill, it sits 9 hours a day as a regular thing, and often much longer. In recent years there was a debate which lasted 3 days and 2 nights without a break. It is at such times as these that Mr. Shuey's wonderful vitality and perennial youth come to the front. He is tireless and indefatigable, cheerful and elastic as a boy.

But it is as the trained nurse of ailing sentences that Mr. Shuey shines at his best. He is probably the most scholarly reporter in the world. During the past congressional vacation he read the Iliad and part of the Odssey in the original Greek. He is very fond of this quotation from Max Mueller:

"What people call 'mere words' are in truth the monuments of the finest intellectual battles, triumphal arches of the grandest victories won by the intellect of man. When men had found names for body and soul, for father and mother, and not till then, did the first act of human history begin. Not till there were names for right and wrong, for God and man, could there be anything worthy of the name of human society. Every new word was a discovery; and these early discoveries, if but properly understood, are more important to us than the greatest conquests of the kings of Egypt and Babylon. Not one of our explorers has unearthed with his spade or pick-axe more splendid palaces and temples, whether in Egypt or Babylon, than the etymologist. Every word is the palace of a human thought; and in scientific etymology we posses the charm with which to call these ancient thoughts back to life. Languages mean speakers of language; and families of speech presuppose real families, or classes or powerful confederacies, which have struggled for their existence, and held their ground against all enemies."

Here is a reporting incident that has never been told in print. In a recent session of Congress Senator Money, of Mississippi, was whiling away the time during a filibuster by telling the story of an old Greek play, "The Cloud," with the names of the players, and many other interesting facts about ancient heroes of mythology and bygone song. Senator Money always spoke rapidly, and not very distinctly. A former Senate reporter, now dead, who was a great note-taker and splendid reporter of current English, told the writer of this sketch that the only time in his senatorial reporting career that he had been absolutely floored by a speaker so that he could not dictate his notes, was on this turn of Senator Money. After the day was over, Mr. Shuey, with that kindliness which is ever a part of him, bound up the wounded and gave first aid to the injured.

When you have known a man for 25 years, and every year you have admired him more; when his life is full of interest to the younger men in the business, it is a great temptation to write on and on, crescam laude recens. On his father's death he became the owner of his ancestral home, where in congressional vacations he lives the life of a quiet country gentleman. He has been twice married. His only son is a distinguished chemist, and he has three charming daughters. Long may he be with us.

FRED IRLAND.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 20, 1915.*

Fiscal Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted a staggering Federal budget to the Congress for the 1964 fiscal year, with an estimated deficit of almost $12 billion. Judging from past experience, the deficit will go even higher than estimated, and will be the highest ever for a peacetime year.

If the President's recommendations are accepted, we will incur a record deficit, despite the fact that the Government will have the highest Federal income in history. The reason is that the President is proposing the highest level of Federal spending by our Government or any government in the world's history.

These extravagant and uncontrolled proposals seem to have stunned people throughout the Nation, and rightfully

so. Leading newspapers in western New York are reflecting the general reaction, and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to submit two newspaper editorials dealing with the budget; the editorials are, "Red Ink Forever," from the Buffalo Evening News of January 18, 1963, and "President's Frugal Budget Threatens Fiscal Disaster," from the Rochester Times-Union of January 17, 1963.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Jan. 18, 1963]

RED INK FOREVER?

One year ago today, President Kennedy sent Congress a balanced budget of $92.5 billion. The economy, he said, was "moving forward strongly," and to "plan a deficit" under those circumstances would be to risk inflation.

Now the President has submitted a radically different sort of budget, rationalized on a radically different set of economic theories and assumptions. This one is more than $6 billion higher and nearly $12 billion in the red—by far the largest deliberate deficit any President ever recommended in peacetime.

This time, the President says, the economy is still moving forward, but not strongly enough. High taxes are holding it back, and cutting them drastically is his major economic objective of the year. This, he says, obliges him to "limit severely" his 1964 expenditure proposals.

What follows, however, is evidence of a continuing spending spree that, by any conceivable measure, is heading rapidly skyward.

This new budget, besides being $6.3 billion higher than the one submitted a year ago, is $10 billion higher than last year's actual spending—$17.9 billion higher than the last Eisenhower budget (submitted 2 years ago)—$22.3 billion higher than the last full Eisenhower fiscal year (1960).

Or judge it, if you prefer, by another telltale symptom, "new obligational authority." When this runs significantly higher than current spending, it means the spending trend in future years will be higher still. It is here, rather than on current spending, that a really determined economy drive would show up first. Last year, the total of these requested "licenses to spend" was $5 billion greater than actual spending. But in the budget for next year, it is $9 billion greater.

In other words, while this budget's total of spending estimates (which may prove quite wide of the mark) is held below $100 billion, the total of Kennedy requests for new authority to spend comes to $107.9 billion.

Still another overall sign of how little economy the administration has in mind is the trend in Federal employment. Even though the Defense payroll is down, the rest of the vast Federal bureaucracy is scheduled to go up by another 46,000 employees. This will bring the total increase to about 260,000 since this administration took office 2 years ago. And virtually every department and agency shares in the rise.

The President, in presenting all these figures, makes much of the claim that next year's spending for everything but defense, space and interest has been stabilized, or even cut a little. The claim is misleading. For the spending trend in most categories is distinctly up. What causes the illusion of stability is a collection of some $2 billion worth of bookkeeping entries or hopefully low estimates of spending required on programs (like farm subsidies) that are controlled by statute. Where any administrative discretion is involved the trend is generally and markedly up—far short of justifying any claim to have held the line.

The budget contains no suggestion anywhere of an apology for the huge $11.9 billion deficit, or of a challenge to Congress to help reduce it. On the contrary. The President tells us our choice is only between "a chronic deficit of inertia due to inadequate economic growth" and a "temporary deficit" which has been purposely designed to "boost the economy" and "achieve future budget surpluses."

When? He doesn't say, though some aids hopefully mention 1967 as a target date. But if Congress votes a massive tax cut, and still has any hope that its middle-aged members will live to see any of those "future budget surpluses," it had better take a king-sized economy ax to the spending side of this swollen budget.

For the Government actually to step up its spending pace this much while drastically cutting taxes when faced already with a near-record deficit—at a time when the President declares that "America has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery"—is, to us, fiscal irresponsibility.

Lower taxes and faster growth can be prudently expected to produce those "future budget surpluses," only if spending is disciplined much more strictly than is indicated here.

[From the Rochester Times-Union, Jan. 17, 1963]

PRESIDENT'S FRUGAL BUDGET THREATENS FISCAL DISASTER

In Monday's state of the Union message, President Kennedy promised a fiscally responsible program which would cut nondefense spending, reduce taxes and limit the budget deficit to manageable size.

Details of his budget today show that he actually proposes, in our view, to plunge the Nation into a bottomless pool of red ink.

His array of budgets under various names all ask the highest Federal spending ever, in war or peace. He proposed a piddling slice of $300 million in nondefense spending which makes up close to half of the $99 billion expenditure total. His estimated deficit of nearly $12 billion is about as manageable as a tidal wave.

To grasp the dangerous trend of Federal spending, compare the proposed fiscal 1964 budget with its highest predecessor, in fiscal 1945. Then, major national security spending totaled $81 billion and nondefense spending ran to $17 billion. Next year, the President estimates national security spending of $56 billion and a nondefense total of $43 billion.

Even taking restricted wartime civilian activities into account, it is obvious that the Federal Government has pulled the cork on welfare spending.

Expenditure increases for programs ranging from scientific research (already provided with more money than can be spent responsibly) to pork-barrel projects (dear to Congressmen's hearts) again prove that old Federal programs never die, they don't even fade away—they just go on."

The President tries to justify the enormous deficit on two grounds—(1) rising national defense and space costs and (2) proposed tax cuts, which he asserts will spur a business boom and eventually bring budget surpluses.

These arguments don't tell the whole story. If Kennedy really meant what he said about the need to slash nondefense spending, he'd have slashed enough to counter any needed rise in national security expenditures.

Further, the net estimated revenue loss from the President's tax proposals, still to be detailed, is set at only $2.7 billion. He even predicts total tax receipts $1.4 billion higher than the Government is taking in this year—yet the estimated deficit will go up some $4 billion in the same period.

And what if Kennedy is guessing too low on spending and too high on revenue? That's what happened this year, and his small predicted surplus has turned into an $8-billion deficit. If experience repeats itself in fiscal 1964, that $12-billion estimated deficit will zoom out of sight.

The President's failure to bring Federal spending under sharp rein in nondefense areas imperils the tax cuts which everybody agrees are long overdue. His deliberatly planned deficit, raising the national debt to at least $316 billion, threatens inflation and assures sharply increased interest costs.

"This budget presents a financial plan for the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business," Kennedy said. To us, it presents anything but that. If Congress doesn't finally put the brake on the President's profligacy, the Nation will be fully embarked toward fiscal disorder.

Successful Fight To Save Historic Fort Davis Described by Author Barry Scobee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a distinguished Texas author, Barry Scobee, has written a special article for the San Angelo Standard-Times concerning 30 years of effort to make Old Fort Davis a national historic site.

This was successfully accomplished in 1961 when Congress passed enabling legislation, of which I was the Senate sponsor.

Barry Scobee is author of "The Story of Fort Davis, Jeff County, and the Davis Mountains," published by M. Hunter, Jr., of Fort Davis; and of "Old Fort Davis," published by Naylor Co., of San Antonio. Both are valuable historical works on a significant area of the frontier West.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article from the San Angelo Standard-Times of January 10, 1963, captioned "Fort Davis War of 30 Years Ends," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT DAVIS WAR OF 30 YEARS ENDS

(By Barry Scobee)

FORT DAVIS.—This town is almost dancing in the streets with elation over having won a "war" of 30 years duration to save the old frontier army post from total vanquishment by time, weather and vandals. It has been taken over as a national historic site.

The deed to the property, signed by the owners, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Jackson, of Houston, has been recorded here. It conveys to the United States full title to 447 acres, with all buildings thereon, all now in the hands of the National Park Service.

Local citizens through the years turned up a dozen schemes to raise funds for the

purchase of the property, and every one fell flat on its tummy. Then in 1960 Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and Representative J. T. Rutherford, both having personal acquaintance with the crumbling old post, took up their guns to save the historic fort.

In 1961 Congress passed the enabling bill and appropriated $115,000 for the purchase price, to buy no more than 460 acres, which was about the supposed area. In the autumn four men in new jeeps and expensive sweat shirts came here a-surveying. They were not National Park Service men—that much was learned. They sighted their transits and dragged their steel tapes (survey chains) all around the neighborhood, and told nobody anything except that they were "working for the fort," a shut-mouth attitude that irritated the curious population no end.

Two of the men were Americans, two were said to be citizens of Mexico. At least they spoke no English that anyone heard. It may be that the pair was brought in to investigate old Spanish land grant surveys measured in veras rather than feet. It is understood that they examined ancient original records in the State land office at Austin, though this may be a mere guess. It is known that when the United States buys land it really combs the landscape to make certain that the title is sound.

At any rate, it was found that the fort property did not have 460, or 454 acres as had been set out, for the deed shows less than that and that the Government paid the owners $110,000 for the tract.

To supply more music for the victory dancing, last Friday the man arrived here, with his household goods, one wife and three children, who is the first superintendent of the national site. He is Michael J. Becker, a native of Maryland who says "you all" and who was a lieutenant, junior grade, in World War II, in the South Pacific. He has been 16 years with the National Park Service. His first job was at Lake Texhoma in Texas. He came here from 4 years as superintendent of the Tumacacori National Monument, an old mission, in Arizona.

Fort Davis folks just have to find out about people and things—though they took a licking from those four surveyors. Sometimes they find out through a nosey reporter. So now they know that Becker is called Mike for short, that Mrs. Becker's given name is Ruth, that she is a native of Indiana, and that the children are Donna Rose and Joe, in high school; and Kathleen, in the grades. The Beckers have no dog.

Other towns that want Congress to donate 'em a national historic site or such, wonder how in—under the sun this town got the old fort promoted. In the war citizens went from here and the area and blythely told Senate and House subcommittees in Washington exactly what virtues the post had that should be saved for posterity. Here's a few of the highlights:

That the fort was established in 1854 and soon became the most important anti-Indian setup on the (capitalized) Great Military Road between San Antonio and El Paso and points west.

That it is the cradle of the present U.S. Signal Corps, because a young New York doctor by the name of Albert S. Myer arrived here in 1855 to be the post surgeon and saw the Apaches using talkie-talkies among themselves by fires on the mountains at night, smoke in daytime, and by waving their arms or anything else handy.

Dr. Myer scratched his noggin thoughtfully and asked why our soldiers couldn't communicate in some similar manner. Result: He got Congress to establish a signal corps, of which he was the first officer—and and Fort Myer, Va., in plain sight of the Washington monument, is named for him.

Also Congress was told that both Federal soldiers and Confederate troops in the Civil War garrisoned this post, that Fort Davis was the terminal three times on tryouts of the camels that Jeff Davis imported to America for army pack-animals in the Southwest and that eventually Fort Davis troops closed the book on Indian scalping parties and horse stealing in this area.

But where the Fort Davis talkers to Congress really went to town was in their heartwarming sentimentality about how the old post soon became an oasis, a coveted stopover spot on the Great Road where dustry and weary wagon travelers going farther west could relax, wash themselves in the limpid waters of Limpia Creek, get their wheels retired, the harness mended, buy corn at a buck a bushel from Government cribs for their mules and oxen—or get it for nothing if they were broke—obtain fresh supplies of dress goods, flour, sowbelly and Arbuckle; have their hurt and sick doctored by the post surgeons, and their lovelorn pacified by the chaplains.

That almost brought cheers and tears to the hardhearted Congressmen. So that, towns, is the clever way to win a national historic site.

Oh, yes, one thing more. It was pointed out also that Fort Davis is the halfway point between the Big Bend National Park and Carlsbad Cavern. That was a telling ringer, for it indicated brisk business for the historic site.

And also the Congressmen were told that when the post was inactivated in 1891 people coming here to find plentiful grass and water for their "caows" lived in the vacated houses on officers line on the post and were called squatters. Further, that today it is a social distinction for descendants of those early families to say, "My pa and ma were once squatters on the post." That got a Washington smile.

Now what does Supt. Mike Becker think of it all? He phrases his and the National Park Service objective for the site as being:

"To create an interpretive picture of the fort in its aspects as an outpost on the old, wild frontier in opening new land for settlement and civilization a hundred years ago."

If you keep asking questions he will tell you: "When the job is finished 3 or 4 years from now we want the country's youth to see and absorb the meaning of those buildings in relation to bold and earnest soldiers, adventurers, and trailbreaking, homeseeking men and women of a hundred years ago."

In speaking of just what will be done, Becker uses the words "restore" and "reconstruct." It is considered likely that four buildings will be put back to what they originally were and that the many others will be preserved by methods known by the National Park Service, against further deterioration by wind and dust and rain and old daddy time.

County Revenues and the U.S. Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, the National Association of Counties held a grazing, water, and revenue conference at which the question of county revenues and the U.S. Forest Service was discussed by Mr. Hamilton K. Pyles, Deputy Chief of the Forest Service.

This statement is an excellent presentation of the positive partnership approach which is required by the local county government and the U.S. Forest Service to accomplish their mutual goals of full conservation and utilization of our national forest resources.

Under unanimous consent, I include this presentation in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HAMILTON K. PYLES AT THE WESTERN REGIONAL DISTRICT MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, LAS VEGAS, NEV., DECEMBER 13, 1962

It is a pleasure for me to be here, not only to take part in this meeting, but to visit again with people with whom I work more than 10 years ago as a national forest supervisor in California.

The theme of this meeting, which emphasizes a positive partnership approach to mutual problems and opportunities, is most appropriate and timely. A common goal, clear communication, and a good understanding are basic to a productive partnership.

The common goal to which we all subscribe is the achievement of a sound and suitable economic resource base to produce the most in goods and services that the land is capable of. This, in broadest terms, is the goal of the national forest enterprise which I want to talk about here today.

Successful partnership also requires a mutual trust founded on good understanding and frankness. My purpose today is to promote that understanding as frankly as I can.

First, I would like to briefly review the extent and meaning of the National Forest System in the counties of the Western States; the trend in receipts for use of these national forest resources; and other benefits which we believe accrue to local economies through the protection, development, and management of national forest resources.

Second, I would like to discuss some of the difficulties and problems which are causing concern to county governments under the present system of sharing revenues from sale of national forest products and other uses of its resources.

Third, I would like to discuss some avenues of cooperative effort which should result in reasonable progress toward reducing these difficulties and furthering the good relationship which we have enjoyed over the years.

First, the current situation as we see it; about 80 percent of the area in Western States is in private, State, or Federal ownerships other than national forests, yet national forests occupy over four-fifths of some western counties. One-fourth of all the counties in the United States contain at least 1,000 acres of national forest land, and almost two-thirds of these counties are in the West.

The most productive land, both for agricultural use and commercial timber growing, is in private ownership. This is as it should be and testifies to the astuteness of the early settlers who took up land under the various settlement acts including the Timber and Stone Act. The national forests were by and large the residual areas of public domain with much of the area considered to be chiefly valuable for watershed purposes. Less than half of the national forest acreage in the West is usable for commercial timber production.

In spite of much low-value land, management of the national forests has become big business by any standard. These forests are the source of some 15 percent of all of the

timber products used in the country. More than half of the usable water in the West originates on the national forests; and this is a priceless commodity. Ever increasing numbers of people are looking to the national forests for their outdoor recreation. National forest rangeland supplements the requirements of local ranch operations, and national forests comprise one of the greatest natural habitats for big game, other wildlife, and fish under a system of management anywhere in the world. In addition, they have great potential for mineral production and hydroelectric power development. These benefits derived from the protection and multiple-use management of these forests are an essential base in the economy of the country.

The direct financial revenues to counties from national forest receipts have tripled in the last decade reaching a high of about $35.2 million in 1960. The counties' share of receipts dropped to $24.8 million in 1961, and show a slight rise last year to $27 million. The drop in 1961 and slow recovery reflects the severe drop in the lumber market which still requires considerable improvement before we regain the high level of receipts of 1960. This reduction in stumpage prices and reduction in timber volume harvested has a major impact on most county receipts because the sale of timber accounts for more than 90 percent of the dollar revenue from national forest management.

Twenty-five percent of total national forest receipts is the only direct payment through the States to the county. These payments are often used in making comparisons between revenue to county governments from national forest lands against taxes from lands under other ownerships. Tabulations of these payments alone do not tell the whole story for there are other benefits to counties accruing from the existence of national forests within their borders.

National forest roads within a county and used by the public for various purposes are developed and maintained from the return of 10 percent of all receipts. This source of road funds is in addition to the regularly appropriated funds for forest development roads and roads built and originally maintained by the purchasers of national forest timber.

The existence and maintenance of thousands of miles of public forest roads, including the construction of forest highways, aids in the development of the country economy and should relieve counties of a substantial burden in maintaining roads for intracounty travel. These roads add to the capital improvement within a county and under sustained yield management eventually mean higher returns for timber sold and more use of the forest resources.

Protection of national forests benefit a number of county governments which under other circumstances would be required to bear a significant share of the costs.

Indirectly, national forest protection and development activities such as reforestation, erosion control, range rehabilitation, construction of recreational facilities, and improvement of the wildlife habitat have both immediate and long-range benefit to the local economy.

The Forest Service maintains about 750 offices in the Western States. These offices employ several thousand people and the majority of them own their own homes, many in sparsely settled rural areas. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Public Law 874 provides school funds to counties where children of Forest Service people working on national forests create a burden on the school system. The payrolls of these employees and thousands of local residents hired on a part-time basis and other program expenditure including research and capital total nearly $200 million annually.

Impressive as these figures are, they are dwarfed by the payrolls and local income generated by the use of national forest timber, recreation, and other forest use. And many communities and their industries are directly dependent upon the national forest watersheds for their water supply and protection from floods. Recreation use of national forests, currently well over 100 million visits annually, is fast becoming a major segment of the rural economy in many western counties. Winter resorts, motels, restaurants, shops of all kinds, service stations, and many other enterprises owe their existence to visitors attracted to the national forests throughout the year. The tax base and income generated by this public use alone is already decisive in some counties and continued increase in recreational visits and tourist trade are clearly indicated.

This, in brief, outlines the wide variety of benefits from having a national forest in a county, as we see it. However, it is always difficult to combine dollars with intangible benefits and get a meaningful overall measure—particularly one that may satisfy the budget and finance people in all levels of government.

So, 10 years ago a study was made by the Forest Service to determine how 25 percent fund payments compared with the taxes levied on similar lands in private ownership. We studied 135 representative counties containing 40 percent of the total national forest acreage.

It was found that the estimated tax averaged 19 cents per acre from private lands as compared with 11 cents per acre from 25 percent of the national forest receipts. However, taking into account Federal expenditures for that portion of the fire control and road construction and maintenance costs that might reasonably have been expected to have been assumed by the county had these lands been in private ownership, the total Federal contribution averaged 24 cents per acre, about 25 percent above comparable tax receipts.

Then again, in 1955, the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made a comprehensive study of all Federal revenue-sharing arrangements with State and local governments. They concluded at that time that the present revenue-sharing arrangement regarding national forest receipts appeared to be generally fair and reasonable and should not be disturbed. The study also pointed to several problem areas involving other Federal programs and made recommendations for their solution.

These intangible benefits, long-term development programs, analytical studies, or even strong local economies do not always solve the current problems faced by a county government. This brings me to the second point of problems and difficulties of general concern to county governments.

We recognize that fluctuation in dollars returned to the county from national forest receipts is a major problem which creates difficulties in your budget planning, long-term programs, and orderly work. It becomes a most acute and pressing problem when these fluctuations are sharply downward, such as occurred in 1961. The reason for this fluctuation is simply that the value and volume of timber harvested is affected by the lumber market and the lumber market became seriously depressed in 1961 for a variety of reasons. In the eastern national forests, receipts from gas, oil, and mineral leases also fluctuate widely with consequent local impacts.

The problem is further aggravated when this drop in receipts comes as a surprise to the county officials affected. This is primarily a matter of poor communication and we in the Forest Service must assume a major share of the responsibility for correcting it.

A second problem, and one recognized by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was the restriction placed upon local use of these Federal payments. Use of these funds for roads and schools only is considered by some States and counties to be a handicap in meeting changing fiscal needs. The State, of course, can make adjustments between roads and schools but Federal legislation would be required to further broaden this authority.

Another continuing problem to government at all levels is the increasidng cost of doing business and meeting the needs and demands of the people for which each level is responsible. To meet these costs, counties with large areas of national forests must necessarily seek to increase their revenues from these areas as well as from lands in other ownerships.

These, I think, are the matters of common interest that are causing most concern to county officials. New Federal legislation obviously could drastically change the situation; and no doubt some of you believe that this is the path to fiscal salvation for many counties. It is a most difficult route as indicated by the fate of many such bills introduced in past sessions of Congress. However, a great deal can be done in a partnership approach to these problems without legislation. Furthermore, it would be out of order and improper for me at this time to discuss any proposals dealing with Federal legislation involving revenue from Federal lands. These matters involve the policy of the administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and other Federal land-managing agencies. And a major difficulty is to find a common denominator for any broad new legislative proposals which is fair to all.

On the matter of the fluctuating character of annual 25-percent payments to the counties, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended that the 25-percent fund payments be computed on a 5-year average of receipts instead of upon an annual basis in order to secure a greater stability in shared revenue payments. If this were considered desirable and proposed at the Federal level, it would require a change in the present law. However, it might be possible for counties to explore the possibility of a similar system within their individual States.

On the Forest Service side of this partnership, we must continue to improve those operating practices on our timber sales which tend to reduce the receipts to the Treasury and thereby the 25 percent returned to the counties. In some sales of low-value timber we are caught in the squeeze between high operating costs for roads, betterment of the timber sale area, erosion control, disposal of logging slash, fire control, and the reduced value of the timber over the last couple of years. Most of our standards for this work are at a nearly irreducible minimum now to insure continued productivity of the land; a few may not be. For example, we are taking a very critical look at application of our road standards, particularly the spur and branch roads, to determine whether or not we can further reduce the costs in these areas without sacrificing conservation needs.

On the matter of communications, we are just going to have to do a better job of keeping county officials informed of local, short-term projections of national forest revenues. I think in the great majority of cases this is being done and there is a close association and working relationship between our field units and the appropriate county officials. But, perhaps we need to do this on a more formal basis to insure that the outlook for estimated returns to the county reaches the right people in a county organization at the proper time.

We in the Forest Service also need to have a better understanding of the problems of county government. We need your help in

finding solutions that will be effective and have wide application. For example, work is now underway to restudy national forest contributions made 10 years ago. This will again compare the 25 percent fund payment to counties with taxes estimated to be payable on similar lands in private ownership in the same manner as we did before. We are attempting through this new study to determine what changes in the underlying situation may have occurred during the last decade. The study is being made on the same sampling basis as that employed before. In each sample county, the county assessors will be consulted to determine the land and timber classifications and value currently in use as a basis of assessment. The total national forest area in each sample county will then be classified and prevailing tax rates applied to find the estimated tax per acre.

Once the data from this new study have been compiled, we would like to review the results with representatives of your association. This could provide an opportunity for joint interpretation of study findings and we could explore and discuss together the desirability of any changes in our program efforts or in current revenue arrangements.

I am sure a meeting of this sort between representatives of NACO and the Forest Service would not only be fruitful in the interpretation of this current study, but in a general exchange of viewpoints aimed at working together on important mutual problems and at providing direction to national programs that affect county interests.

Now to the problem of carrying out the required responsibilities of government under increasing costs of doing business—that is, the need for more revenue. Our best solution is to do the utmost to increase production from all the products and uses of forest resources under sustained yield. We are working hard on this. The Forest Service has increased its allowable cut limitations. It has moved in other ways to stimulate timber harvesting on national forests. The additional authorization approved by the 87th Congress for stepping up the road development program on the national forests, and subsequent increases in appropriation, will probably do more to aid us in meeting our allowable cut of timber and opening the forests to other resource uses than any other single item. Your association was most effective in supporting this legislation. This was an essential forward step in developing the 10-year program for the national forests. As you know, this program blueprints the actions we plan to achieve greater benefits from these lands and consequently increased revenue to the counties.

Before too long, we expect to have a system of recreation user charges. The new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, with the assistance of the interested departments of Government, is working to develop a uniform system of charges for the recreation use of Federal land and facilities. It is too early to predict just what this system of charges may mean to national forest receipts, and thus to the counties, but the outdoor recreation business is growing by leaps and bounds. There is no question in my mind, barring unseen catastrophes, that the national forests will continue to experience a gradual upward trend in receipts just as we have experienced in the past decade or so.

Finally, I want to reiterate the desire of the Forest Service to work closely with you toward meeting our mutual goals, problems, and opportunities. The detailed problems of revenue sharing are extremely complex. While I have attempted to cover that subject in a most general way, I believe it is quite impossible to tackle the details in a general meeting of this kind. On the other hand, I believe that meetings between a representative group of NACO and a similar Forest Service group could be productive. To be specific, I would suggest a meeting in early 1964 to review the study findings and further to discuss ways and means of overcoming difficulties that are regional or national in scope. If an earlier meeting seems profitable, we would be glad to take part. These meetings should further a positive partnership approach.

Present and Potential Economics of Southern Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, ours is the most prosperous nation in the world, and our strong and stable economy is due in large part to the natural resources with which the United States is so abundantly blessed.

Not the least of these resources are our great forests, and I am proud of the fact that the South and my State of Georgia stand at the top of the Nation's timber economy, in terms of supply, conservation and management.

F. C. Gragg, of International Paper Co., New York, N.Y., in a recent paper presented in Atlanta, Ga., noted that the South earned its position as "wood basket of the nation" through diligence and ingenuity. I commend his discerning analysis of the great forests of the Southland to Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT AND POTENTIAL ECONOMIES OF SOUTHERN FORESTS

(By F. C. Gragg)

In 1935, there were 25 pulp and paper mills in the South, using 2½ million cords of pulpwood a year. Last year, there were 73 mills. Together, they are consuming over 24 million cords of pulpwood annually. The value of the pulpwood crop delivered to the pulp mills in the South last year was more than $482 million. Sawmill chips, once wasted, accounted for almost $63 million of this.

Today, the southern forests bring as much money to the landowner, the lumberman, the turpentine operator, and the poleman as the old forests ever did. The outlet for pulpwood has cemented the foundation of a new prosperity.

What's more important, except in time of all-out war, in which there is no time to plan ahead, these new forests need never fear another wave of destruction. They have only to look forward to continued growth and added importance.

For those who lack the "big picture," let me describe this wonderful 12-State area.

It extends from Virginia into eastern Texas and Oklahoma. It contains 193 million acres of commercial forests—more than one-third of all commercial forest land of the Nation. No other single region approaches this in forest resources.

Generally, the area is a low coastal plain, ranging from sea level to about 1,000 feet, with occasional interior mountain ranges up to 3,000 feet. The coastal area is occupied by almost pure stands of pine, interspersed in the alluvial bottoms with hardwoods and cypress. Mixed pine and hardwood cover the minor mountain areas. In the higher country, almost every species can be found, from the southern lowland trees to the northern hardwood types and into white pine and spruce.

The soil varies greatly, from poor sands and rock to rich alluvium. For every soil there is generally at least one valuable timber tree that thrives upon it. The climate is generally mild, with plenty of rain well distributed throughout the year. All in all, it is a splendid land for growing trees.

Henry Hardtner, of Urania, La., whom many consider the father of large-scale forestry in the South, enjoyed telling how impressed northern lumbermen were with his success in growing trees for the Urania Lumber Co. This was right after the turn of the century. There were no yield tables then, and most people thought it would take 60 to 100 years to grow a merchantable crop.

"When I showed visitors my success in obtaining reproduction on cut-over longleaf stands," Mr. Hardtner used to say, "the results were so marked that they accused me of 'nature faking.' "

Sixty percent of all the tree farms in the Nation are in the South. They represent 66 percent of the Nation's tree farm acreage. Nine of the top 10 tree planting States in the Nation are in the South. The South now supplies about two-thirds of the wood to feed the Nation's gigantic appetite for paper, one-third of its demand for lumber, almost all of its requirement for naval stores, plus such items as poles, pilings, and furniture stock.

In terms of net annual growth in excess of use, the South is better off today than at any time in the past 25 years.

In 1935, when the expansion of the pulp and paper industry really went into full swing, there was some concern that this added demand for raw material would soon strip the southern countryside of all of its existing timber. As a matter of fact, it served only to emphasize the South's great wood producing potential by increasing the financial return on a forest investment and by encouraging the planting of trees on marginal and submarginal farmland.

Since 1935 the forests of the South have supplied a truly phenomenal amount of raw material, not just to the paper industry, but to all the wood using industries as well. At the same time, the South has increased its reserve of growing stock by almost 10 percent.

This fact pinpoints the South as the most important section of the U.S. timber economy, not only because of its present day contribution, but also because of its probable contribution in the future.

It is a most outstanding accomplishment and the credit belongs not only to the pulp and paper industry, but also to the cooperative effort of the U.S. Forest Service, the State foresters, the Extension Service, and others.

There are those, of course, who point to this "miracle" and to current growth-drain ratios and argue that there is too much wood now and always will be. While I concede that there are areas in the South where people have more wood than they can sell at the present time, that is as far as I can go, and for several very good reasons.

In the first place, a medium projection by the U.S. Forest Service Timber Resource Review indicates that in the next 13 years, or by 1975, the demand for pulpwood in the United States will be 72 million cords, and as much as 100 million cords by the year 2000. Assuming that the South will be re-

quired to provide at least 65 percent of that volume, as it is doing now, it is obvious that we must continue building up the growing stock and improving net annual growth of the southern forests.

In the second place, timber surpluses—reserve growing stock is a better term—are not prevalent in every county of every Southern State. There are local shortages or deficits of annual commodity use over annual growth in many areas.

J. E. McCaffrey, a vice president of International Paper Co. in charge of southern woodlands, made this clear at the recent annual meeting of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association.

He urged those attending to think about the string of mills that now exist from West Point, Va., down the South Atlantic seaboard, along the gulf coast, and over as far as Houston, Tex. The wood drainage area available to each of these mills has been drastically curtailed by addition of new mills and expansions within the past 10 years.

Too many engineers and manufacturers, he said, think that the site for a new papermill depends only on its proximity to water, power, transportation, and labor. What's more, because it is less expensive to expand an existing mill than to build a new one, they regard expansion as a logical, competitive step. But, if this construction or expansion upsets the forest economy in their area, it weakens not only that company, but also the entire industry. At this very moment, pine timber use exceeds growth in South Carolina. North Carolina and Florida are rapidly approaching that condition.

Mr. McCaffrey's point was not that the industry should stop growing in the South, but that it should grow in the right places. It is the duty of timberland managers and forest economists to bring these facts to the attention of top management. If we fail to do so, or if they fail to listen, the time could come when the southern pulp and paper industry will no longer be competitive with mills in other sections of the country.

At this point, may I suggest that we foresters update our own terminology—that we stop using terms that may be clear to us but which are misleading to the general public. "Drain" is one of the words often misunderstood. We mean "use," of course, so let's say "use." "Surplus" is another misleading term. When we speak of a timber surplus, we are talking about reserve growing stock. A surplus connotes too much of something or something that is not needed. Reserve stock, on the other hand, is like money in the bank—earning interest on the capital while standing ready for use when needed.

Reserve growing stock is a necessity to the forest industries. It provides the freedom to meet the needs of a growing economy. It is the necessary latitude in which to expand, to improve products and to develop new products. Without this assurance, markets may gradually disappear—not because the consumer has lost interest in wood or paper, but because any question in his mind about the dependability of his source of supply could lead him to seek substitutes. Once a market is lost, it is almost impossible to regain.

So, if the markets are to be held, the industry must grow, through research and expanded manufacturing capacity. These things are possible only if sufficient reserve growing stock is available.

Instead of worrying about excess timber, we might do better to worry about the widespread and continued withdrawal of lands from timber production. In this country, it is estimated that a million and a half acres are diverted to superhighways, airports, reservoirs, recreation and defense projects each year.

We are hardly accustomed to this encroachment on private land ownership in the South. Yet, I daresay few managing sizable holdings have not experienced it.

The biggest drain—and here the use of the word is intended—on privately held forest land in the future will undoubtedly be for State and Federal recreation areas. According to President Kennedy, the increased leisure time enjoyed by our growing population and the greater mobility made possible by improved highway networks have dramatically increased the Nation's need for additional recreational areas. Already we have a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and the administration is advocating and pursuing a vigorous policy of land acquisition for recreational purposes.

The wood-using industries have long been aware of this social need and have been responding actively to meet it. Almost without exception, the industry has subscribed to the multiple-use theory of forest management under which vast areas of privately managed forest land are being made available to the public for recreational use. Recently the American Forest Products Industries conducted a national survey covering some 58 million acres of industry-managed forest land. The survey shows some 92 percent of this acreage open to hunting and 97 percent open to fishing with varying amounts being made available for other public recreational purposes.

If both public and private interests continue to support the theory of multiple-use forest management—if we continue to resist attempts to set aside productive lands for unproductive single-use management which destroys the economic base on which good forestry rests and which benefits only a limited segment of our population—this Nation's forests can continue to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

If, on the other hand, further substantial withdrawals are made by State and Federal agencies for single-purpose uses, particularly, if lands are set aside to serve as so-called wilderness areas, we shall find the day coming closer when our forest needs exceed our means. This will be just as true in the South as in the other forest-growing areas of the country.

Moreover, the unsurpassed forest resources of the South are by no means free from fire, insects and disease. We have made such great strides in fire control in recent years that we are inclined to underestimate its continued importance. It is still our No. 1 problem and a serious deterrent to the growing of commercial timber crops. At the same time, our long summers, mild winters and abundant rainfall, are highly favorable to destructive insects and fungi. Among the more serious of these are the southern pine beetle, tip moth, fusiform rust and fomes annosus.

Fomes annosus is a particularly alarming disease. It attacks the stump and progresses through the roots like cancer, spreading to the roots of adjacent, living trees. It's quick and it's deadly, and so far we don't know how to stop it. The Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association is currently working with a group of forest products companies who are attempting to deal with some of these threats. Their efforts will tie in closely with the U.S. Forest Service, State agencies and colleges, but the successful conclusion of their work will require the concerted efforts of the entire wood-using industry.

In the meantime, we must not relax our conservation efforts on behalf of the private timberland owners. They have proved they can do the job where technical assistance is available and where enough markets exist to make it worth their time and effort to grow trees. Still, according to the TRR, only one-third of the 177 million acres held by small timberland owners in the South are today being managed for high productivity.

I do not believe that Federal subsidies will improve this situation. Instead, I recommend that we devote our attention to the economics of maintaining continuous markets where they are needed. And second, we must begin to provide for the proper regeneration of hardwood stands through research and the development of appropriate silvicultural procedures. Hardwood is now being used more and more throughout the pulp and paper industry, accounting for about 20 percent of our pulpwood requirements in 1960. Trees of little or no value 20 or 30 years ago are becoming highly valued sources of raw material today, and yet we have done little or nothing to encourage the proper management of hardwoods for future production.

In brief review, I have tried to establish that the South is, indeed, the "wood basket" of the nation, that its claim to this title is the result of hard work and perseverance. Where shortages of raw material exist, we have made them ourselves by ignoring the facts of a stable forest economy. In a sense, we have also made our own "surpluses," but these should be considered a bank account of growing stock, paying dividends as the industry expands and markets grow. And, of course, much remains to be done to conquer wildfires, insects and tree diseases, and to develop the hardwood potential that exists today.

Southern forestry needs two more things to assure its future potential. The first is better research by everyone concerned with forest management problems. The development of more reliable data on the economic results obtained from specific silvicultural procedures is a good place to start. The regeneration of pine on good land in combination with brush is an unsolved problem still.

Modern forestry's second need is for foresters who pay attention to the economics of growing timber. Right now, pulpwood accounts for about 65 percent of the cost of making wood pulp. I doubt that the cost of raw material for aluminum or even steel is as high. We need trained foresters who understand the economics of production, who will think and plan in terms of what our raw material is going to cost us 5, 10, 20, or even 50 years from now. Our schools of forestry can help us here.

Given all these things, in addition to its unsurpassed topography and climate, coupled with certain compelling economic factors, the South is destined to remain a great reservoir of highly valuable and diversified timber, upon which the Nation can depend for its future supplies.—Condensed from a paper presented before the 62d annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters, in Atlanta, Ga., October 21–24.

Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Ways and Means Committee has before it numerous major proposals, many of which wear the magic label of "Tax Reform," or "Tax Adjustment." The Palos Regional is typical of the energetic, local newspaper of the

country, and in its Thursday, January 10, edition provides an interesting insight into the thought processes imposed on citizens for tax computation. I believe this editorial worthy of sympathetic attention, and, under unanimous consent, I insert it into the RECORD, as follows:

You should have been around the regional office last Friday morning when we were making up the weekly payroll.

It was the first week for figuring the 3⅝-percent social security deduction for employees and we had quite a time of it.

We started by multiplying the base pay by 3, then taking one-eighth, which of course, never came out even. This answer was multiplied by 5. By that time we had a long line of figures and a question as to where to put the decimal point.

The first answer came out to $48. We figured that was a little too much to deduct at a rate of 3⅝ percent. We moved the decimal point one figure forward, making it $4.80. That didn't look right either, so we moved it one more figure and came up with 48 cents.

To prove our answer, we figured it another way. We did it fraction-wise by multiplying 29 eighths by the base pay. The answer was 44 cents.

Then we got smart. We reasoned that the fraction five-eighth was 0.625 of 100 and adding 3 percent, we got a total of 0.03625, which we decided was a pretty smart way to do it. We were elated until we multiplied this figure by the base pay and came up with 46 cents.

Three different ways of figuring and three different answers, 48, 46, and 44 cents.

At this point we sat back to reflect on the whole problem. We did some mental arithmetic and decided the company would have to raise $200 to $300 more each year to pay its share of the added tax. Our contribution, plus the employees, now amounts to 7¼ percent. We also remembered that it will go up again in 1966 and 1968.

Then our thoughts switched to the increase in postal rates for the regional, and the increase of first-class mail. There will be several more hundreds of dollars which we will have to pay.

* * * * *

By the time we got back to our figures we were hopping mad, but the payroll had to be completed. We checked, and found several just plain arithmetic errors and eventually finished. We started at 8 a.m. that day and finished at 11—3 hours of time that could have been used to go out and hustle up some business.

Kerr-Mills Improvement: A State Responsibility, Not Federal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have repeatedly emphasized, when complaints have come my way about the Kerr-Mills Act, which authorized State-Federal assistance to older people in need of medical care who are not welfare cases—is the fact that the law, as passed by the Congress, is flexible and can be implemented by each State in a manner best suited to the needs of a particular State. This feature was provided for the specific reason that many Members of Congress—Republican and Democrat—feel that the State and local governments know their own problems and possible solutions better than a Federal bureaucracy could ever know them. Therefore the law was couched in terms which left it up to the States to determine how to most effectively administer the law, within just a few Federal guidelines. Retaining the self-respect, as well as the personal initiative of our citizens is of prime importance, not teaching them to rely more and more on a paternalistic Federal Government.

I, therefore, am pleased to offer for the possible guidance and inspiration of our States, one of the solutions worked out by the North Dakota State Medical Association. I am proud to see this evidence of responsibility on the part of our medical profession in North Dakota. While their suggestions may or may not become law in North Dakota, their efforts are certainly to be commended and emulated by other groups in other States.

I commend to the attention of the House of Representatives the following article from the Bismarck Tribune of January 15, 1963, written by Bill Tillottson, and entitled "Bill Will Seek To Widen Medical Care for the Aged":

BILL WILL SEEK TO WIDEN MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

(By Bill Tillottson)

Broadening of the State's medical aid to the aged program to prevent persons aged 65 and over from falling into medical indigency is proposed in legislation being prepared by the North Dakota State Medical Association.

The bill, which will be introduced shortly into the 38th biennial legislative session here, is designed to add to income classes to the 1961 medical aid to the aged law in an effort to spread coverage beyond the present income limits.

The present law limits individual income to $100 per month and income for an elderly couple to $150 to qualify for medical aid to the aged coverage, with a further provision that the first $50 of medical care furnished in the 12-month period prior to application shall not be included in benefits.

The new legislation calls for a second income class for individuals with monthly income up to $125, and $175 for a couple with a "deductible" figure of $100, and a third class for those with incomes of $150 and $200 respectively with a $200 deductible feature.

The Federal Kerr-Mills Act, under which the North Dakota medical aid to the aged program is implemented, permits annual income of up to $2,500 for a single person and a slightly higher figure for couples.

Dr. Clifford H. Peters, Bismarck physician and a member of the medical association's legislative committee—said that while North Dakota's medical aid to the aged program is one of the best in the Nation, it is lacking in the eligibility requirements.

He said he had actuarial figures which will show that broadening the medical aid to the aged base would not push the program above the $2,660,000 appropriated for the program during the current biennium.

Based on the first 15 months of operation of the medical aid to the aged law, $502,000 of the State's appropriation was actually spent for medical aid to the aged care with 65 percent of the medical aid to the aged caseload representing transfers from old-age assistance and other programs with medical benefits.

"I think that we will find the number that fall into those new categories will be very few," Peters said.

"One reason I'm interested in upping these categories is the medical profession wants to see that the catastrophic illnesses are covered," he said.

He said the medical profession is interested in seeing that persons over 65 are able to cope with chronic or serious illness without becoming indigents seeking OAA help.

"That's what we want to prevent * * * indigency," he said.

"When we talk about Kerr-Mills or medical aid to the aged in North Dakota and we think about these increased eligibility levels, we're thinking about benefits and care for these people 365 days of the year * * * a complete program covering any eventuality," he said, not just a 90-day program as proposed under the Federal social security approach.

He said the deductible feature will discourage abuses and clearly define to the applicant and his family the self-help responsibilities.

He quoted from a statement from the American Medical Association and adopted by the State group:

"Personal medical care is primarily the responsibility of the individual. When he is unable to provide this care for himself, the responsibility should properly pass to his family, the community, the county, the State, and only when all these fail, to the Federal Government, and then only in conjunction with the other levels of government, in the above order."

Peters said the State organization will have some suggestions about the so-called means test to obtain medical-aid-to-the-aged care.

"Our contention is that a means test is necessary but it doesn't have to be to the extent that it prohibits a program," Peters said.

He said certain aspects of the test should be modified, but he said that doesn't mean to do away with a test of need entirely. He said the association would suggest changes so that the test will not be as "demeaning" as it is claimed.

Peters said that the medical profession will sponsor legislation creating a public welfare board medical advisory committee to help the State welfare board supervise the medical aid to the aged program. He said he believed the bill will call for nine doctors, all appointed by the Governor.

Peters said the welfare board has repeatedly emphasized that budget and other problems have increased because of the medical care programs.

"If such is true, and we concede a large portion of their budget goes for medical care, then it seems to us only logical that there should be close medical supervision of these programs," he said.

Peters said that the medical profession is not interested in taking part in the administration of the programs, but only in providing orientation and direction where needed.

In commenting on the medical association proposals, Leslie Ovre, director of the State public welfare board, said that the $2,660,000 budget figure for the past biennium was a shot in the dark based on 1960 census figures and was designed to cover the maximum number of persons who might qualify.

"There have been very few applications which have been denied," Ovre said, adding that the board was "surprised" that more persons did not avail themselves of the benefits.

"The rate of those applying is increasing," he said.

The board has estimated that 40 percent of the new applications are from persons who would not qualify under the old-age assistance program.

Ovre said that persons requiring medical aid have been receiving it, either under medical aid to the aged or old-age assistance.

The welfare board director raised the legal question of whether one class of persons receiving tax benefits can be treated differently from other classes.

"I don't believe any other State has set up any classification system," he said.

However, he acknowledged that the basis of need factor depends on how liberally the word "need" is defined.

"After 18 months of operation we know a little bit more about it," he said of the medical aid to the aged program.

Goal of the Federal Prison System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in the winter issue of the George Washington University Alumni Rievew, there appears an article "Talent Scout for Alcatraz" written by Mr. James V. Bennett, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons. The article discusses the goal sought by our Federal prison system and a number of its successes. Mr. Bennett has served our Nation well over the past 25 years, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, I commend this article to the attention of all those who seek a more orderly and responsible society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALENT SCOUT FOR ALCATRAZ

(By James V. Bennett)

(NOTE.—James V. Bennett, L.L.B., 1926, this year completed 25 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, supervising 31 institutions which he visits every year and in which he is responsible for many basic prison reforms. Mr. Bennett was assigned to assist a congressional committee investigating the employment program of the Federal penal system in 1926 and has worked in the Federal prison field since then. He is credited with helping promote and draft the Federal Youth Correction Act. He has served on many boards and commissions of a national and international nature. His awards include the Selective Service Civilian Award and the Exceptional Civilian Service Medal by the War Department, the Distinguished Public Service Award by Navy, the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service. He holds the University's Alumni Achievement Award.)

With the inmate population of the Federal prison system going up every year, as it is in nearly every other penal system, there really isn't any need for me to drum up business. Yet there are those who conceive of my job in just such terms as the title of this article implies. One of them is the old-time bank robber Eddie Bentz who was one of our guests at Alcatraz several years ago.

Eddie occupied a cell off the flat known to the inmates as "Broadway." On my frequent visits to Alcatraz I always stopped by to see him and we became good friends. Our discussions often took a philosophical turn. "Just stop to think," he told me on one of these occasions, "supposing everybody in the world were honest and there were no bank robbers—"

It immediately occurred to me that if this utopian situation come to pass, there would be no Alcatraz. Like Eddie, most of his 250 colleagues at Alcatraz were serving long terms for their depredations on various and sundry banks around the country. But I sensed that this wasn't the point Eddie wanted to make, and without commenting I heard him out.

"First of all," he said, "you would be out of a job, and after you, the judges and large segments of lawyers and policemen would be out of a job, and the locksmiths and the safemakers would be out of a job, and most banks would have to close up."

He paused dramatically and then made his point. "If there were no banks, then there would be no money to loan to keep our economic wheels moving. The logical thing, since I have never robbed any bank that wasn't insured, and since I'm a sort of catalytic agent, is to let me go out and thus keep this whole scheme of yours going."

Eddie wasn't completely wrong from a sociological point of view. But in subsequent years it dawned on him that inasmuch as he and his associates had created jobs for policemen, the policemen were going to carry out their responsibilities. This meant extended terms of incarceration for Eddie. He is now awaiting release from a midwestern State prison, and I am sure that when he gets out he will make a good citizen. And put his money into banks and, like the rest of us, take a rather jaundiced attitude toward his successors in crime who try to withdraw these funds at the point of a gun.

In prison work we are not trying to perpetuate our jobs. A recent 4-year study made by the University of Illinois under the auspices of the Ford Foundation indicates that 70 percent of the persons who leave the institutions of the Federal prison system make good in their efforts to stay out of trouble with the law. On its face this statistic would imply that we are rapidly working ourselves out of a job. But unfortunately—and we choose to look upon it that way—the complexities, stresses, and ills of our society generate more than enough replacements to fill the ranks of those who have gone straight.

The challenge to those of us in prison work is therefore greater than it has even been before. And we cannot meet that challenge with the traditional prisons—the Joliets, San Quentins, and Leavenworths. It is no longer possible, and in my opinion it never was, merely to attempt to try to frighten men into conformity with the law. They must be equipped with the education and vocational skills which will permit them to assume a useful role in a highly demanding and increasingly technological society. Also, those who have become emotionally disturbed under the pressures of today must be given the psychiatric treatment and the intensive counselling that will stabilize them to the point where they can meet the responsibilities of citizenship with resolution and confidence.

We are developing new types of institutions and new types of programs which can cope with the problems of crime and delinquency in the space age. A prototype of the new institution is the famous "Prison Without Walls" at Seagoville, Tex. Here you will find none of the features that characterize the usual concept of a prison. It has no walls, no guard towers, no long lines of men marching off to work or to meals under the watchful eyes of guards. The inmates live in simply furnished rooms, and carry their own keys to these quarters. They go to their assigned jobs at the appointed time on their own initiative. On visiting days a man can take his family to church services or to lunch in the dining hall. A full program of employment, education, and vocational training, religious counseling, casework services, a wide range of recreation and leisure time activities and medical care comprise the day-to-day operations. The emphasis throughout is on self-reliance, self-respect, and trustworthiness.

A full third of the 24,000 prisoners in our Federal institutions are aged 25 and under, and the emphasis in our programs is necessarily upon youth. In 1950 the Congress, with the full support of the Federal judiciary, passed the Youth Corrections Act. This act opened up a wide range of possibilities for dealing with the problem of youthful offenders. Judges no longer had to sentence young offenders to flat terms of imprisonment; they could commit them to the control of the Attorney General for an indeterminate period of 6 years or for a period as long as the statutory penalty provided for the offense. The youths committed under this procedure could be paroled to the community at any time but in no case later than 2 years prior to the end of their term. Under the stimulus of this flexible procedure a number of our institutions were geared to focus on these offenders a particularly intensive program of treatment. The act also authorized the board of parole to set aside the convictions of those youths who followed up programs of institutional treatment with particularly fine records in the community. In effect, the act provided all the means necessary to reorganize the lives of youthful offenders and give them a fresh start.

Not many years ago we received four young men under this procedure from a midwestern court. They had kidnapped and assaulted a young woman. This was a grave offense, and the judge was under extreme public pressure to throw the book at them. But he felt that they could be salvaged and committed them for 12 years under the Youth Act. The youths responded earnestly to the chance that had been given them. They worked hard in the institution to improve their education and to learn a vocation. Eventually they earned parole.

I kept in touch with the progress of these young men. One of them entered college following his release and graduated last year. Two started businesses with the skills they had learned in the institution and are doing well. The fourth is working steadily in a vocation that he similarly acquired. Of the four, two are married and are considered solid family men in their community. Upon the recommendation of their supervising probation officer, the board of parole has set aside their convictions.

But for the new approach permitted by the Youth Act these young men would still be serving extended terms in a penitentiary. Instead of being expensive liabilities perhaps for their entire lifetimes, they are now taxpayers and productive citizens.

It was the success of the Youth Act with cases like these that led in 1958 to the enactment of a farseeing statute permitting similar flexibility in the treatment of adult offenders. It gave the judges discretion to impose indeterminate sentences on older offenders, and in the cases of particularly perplexing cases, to commit the defendants to us for a diagnostic study and sentencing recommendation. The judges have made great use of their new discretion.

One of the first cases committed for study was that of a policeman who had committed a series of robberies. Our institutional staff found that he had a bizarre fantasy life. He imagined himself as the "Black Phantom," and in the darkness of an alley, dressed in a black cloak and hat, he would often swoop down on unsuspecting drunks. Our psychiatrists concluded that he was mentally ill but still sufficiently rational to be considered responsible for his acts. Upon our recommendation the judge committed him for 20 years under the new indeterminate procedure. The policeman is responding well to psychiatric treatment, and I am sure that within a few years it will be possible to parole him to the community with safety.

We have had encouraging success in redirecting the lives of many offenders, but we are also aware that we have a responsibility to keep out of circulation as effectively as possible the dangerously perverted and psychopathic, and the thoroughly ingrained antisocial rebel who will not voluntarily accept any responsibility for himself or anyone else. For these and many others, probation or some other type of controlled supervision in the community seems unrealistic. Even the modern psychiatrist would hesitate to assure us that these distorted personalities could be transformed into attractive, acceptable members of our complex, competitive society.

These men for the most part are confined in the old-line penitentiaries where custodial security remains as tight as it has ever been, and perhaps even tighter with the refinement of our custodial methods and the application of electronics and the other products of modern technology to the problems of security. But even in these facilities we do not entirely give up on our efforts to salvage men. Except for the 2 or 3 percent who eventually die in prison, they all come out some day.

One such man was released nearly 8 years ago at the end of his term, and it was with crossed fingers that the warden saw him go. He had an extended record of offenses and imprisonment. Our psychiatrists tentatively labeled him a psychopath. Although he had taken a number of courses in prison—advertising, business administration, copywriting, and so on—there was little to indicate that he had really changed his attitude and values.

But somewhere in his last prison experience the necessary alchemy had taken place. With the assistance of his probation officer, he found a job as a copywriter in a radio advertising agency. Within a short time he was promoted to an accounts executive, and not long afterward to station manager. He continued to earn successive promotions, and within a half-dozen years of his release from prison he headed a chain of radio and television stations, with a salary several times that of the prison warden who with such trepidation had watched him leave the prison gates.

I had gotten to know this man in prison, and one day there arrived at my office a fine leather briefcase that he made for me during the long evening hours in his cell. I have carried this case home loaded with work every day for the past several years. It is battered now and somewhat the worse for wear. But I would not be without it.

It serves as a constant reminder to me that we cannot give up hope on any man. With an awareness of the amazing transformation in this man's life, I find it much easier to open the case and get to work on its formidable contents—the problems of the 24,000 men still in prison.

Cuba: A National Orgy of Self-Congratulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Great National Orgy of Self-Congratulation," written by Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired, one of the best that this outstanding patriot of America has prepared for that publication thus far, and published in Newsweek issue of January 14, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT NATIONAL ORGY OF SELF-CONGRATULATION

(By Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired)

"Placebo," any harmless substance, as bread pills, given to humor a patient.—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

Uncle Sam has long been suffering from a severe case of national apathy recently aggravated and climaxed in a high Cuban fever. His most dangerous sequela is overconfidence. As an aftermath of Cuba we may become more off-guard than ever, tranquilized by our own nostrums and the propaganda pills constantly fed to us by Dr. Khrushchev.

Our Government acted courageously in the Cuban situation. But that is exactly what I expect the Government of the United States of America to do.

What seems strange to me is that we have been engaged in a great national orgy of self-congratulations. We congratulate ourselves over the confrontation of our sworn enemy who, armed with lethal weapons aimed at the very heart of this country, marched almost openly into our own front yard. It seems to me that rather than congratulate ourselves, we should soberly recognize that Cuba is surely one of the easiest of all the areas and circumstances of possible decisive confrontation with the Soviet Union. Instead of crowing over a 12th-hour decision, we should be taking stock of our national attitudes which permitted the immediate situation to arise in the first place.

I find it especially difficult to understand why our military authorities did not raise the alarm long before October. In my opinion, and I spent many years in the intelligence business, there was enough information to be found in the daily press alone to have led to a military conclusion that the Russians in Cuba were posing a serious threat to the United States.

Surely the stream of Russian ships to Cuba which began last midsummer should have aroused deep suspicion. Could anyone in uniform really have believed that the construction in Havana Harbor was for a fishing fleet? Did the evaluators of Soviet intelligence, who should be chosen for their cynicism, actually give credence to published reports that thousands of Russian troops in Cuba were there for peaceful purpose or that the U.S.S.R. would mount such an effort merely to arm Fidel Castro with defensive missiles? Was not the sum total of indicators enough to raise the alarm long before it was raised?

I am perturbed that, whatever the current arrangement of intelligence organizations, whatever the Department of Defense policies on military expression of views, there should be such evidence of complacency among our professional military watchdogs.

There have been changes in our military intelligence setup, and the military voice has certainly been muted. Nonetheless I am confident that if our highest military authorities had stood up and spoken on this subject, the Commander in Chief would have acted promptly on their warning.

It bothers me also to know that the equipment for launching and guiding certain types of missiles can be hidden readily and that some missiles and aircraft themselves can be transported piecemeal and quickly reassembled. These factors and other clandestine capabilities of the U.S.S.R. in Cuba lead me to believe that as long as there is a Communist government in Cuba, the United States and all of Latin America are in jeopardy. Our naïveté in believing otherwise has brought us close to a major disaster.

We may have been "eyeball to eyeball" and this time the other fellow may have blinked—but maybe he only winked. In any case, we may be sure that he is already plotting a next time. He will continue to feed us propaganda pills to lull our senses and will always be set to administer us a fatal potion. Khrushchev has sworn to bury us. Presumably he would prefer to bury us alive. But if necessary he would gladly bury us dead.

"Placebo," the opening antiphon of the vespers for the dead.—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

Scientific Efforts To Serve Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, several weeks ago, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried a thought-provoking editorial directed to the world scientific community. However in a board context, it was directed to all mankind. We are all responsible for the end use of our efforts. It is not enough to answer that we search for knowledge only or that we follow the directions of our superiors. We must, each of us, strive to see that our efforts serve humanity. Such a path may bring adversity, but the goal is worth the endeavor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "For Death or for Life?" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR DEATH OR FOR LIFE?

The Nobel Prizes for physics and chemistry, we suppose, exemplify the spirit of modern scientists—or many of them. The former went to Lev Davidovic Landau of the Soviet Union whose theories for condensed matter

made possible the sputniks. The other went to Dr. John Cowdery Kendrew and Dr. Max Ferdinand Perutz for their studies of human blood. One achievement has deepened the foreshadow of destruction. The other has brightened hope in the combat against pain and death. Both are applauded equally as contributions to pure knowledge.

Scientists say that is how it should be. Knowledge is to be sought for the sake of knowledge, and the search should not be hampered by the dread of misapplications. Who can say otherwise? Having put the skull and crossbones on the bottle, the scientist may refuse responsibility for those who draw the cork to ill purpose. But is it really so simple?

Of course, one does not bid the searchers to fill their bottles only with elixirs of happiness, and it would be futile to forbid the discovery of deadly draughts. Yet more often than not, the searcher has a purpose as he follows one line of investigation rather than another. In spite of the cant about the "two languages," he also is of this world, and he must choose his work according to its needs. He is not above judgments and priorities.

Happily, great scientists accept the duty which comes with the freedom of the search. The men who gave us the bomb are among the most zealous in curbing its use. It is the ordinary man who sets the goal for the scientists. They did not create the temper of our times; they are more nearly its victims. Yet they, like the rest of us, must be concerned about the applications of their work. The danger is not in knowledge. It is in choosing it for death or for life.

An American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Medical Society of the District of Columbia brought to my attention an editorial reprinted from Philadelphia Medicine, volume 58, No. 38, of September 21, 1962, entitled, "An American's Creed." The executive board of the society reviewed this creed and wholeheartedly endorsed the thoughts behind it and the views expressed in it. It is recognized as Dean Alfange's "Message for 1952: My Creed," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune December 30, 1951. A framed version hangs in the office I occupy in my district as furnished by St. Clair County Republican Chairman Don Giesler, M.D. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I believe the creed is again deserving of consideration by the Members of the House of Representatives, due to its timeliness and as forwarded by our District of Columbia Medical Society:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build; to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm, and dry rot of utopia. I will not trade my freedom for beneficence, not my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself; to enjoy the benefit of my creations; and to face the world boldly saying, "This I have done with my own hand, I am a man. I am an American."

Deserved Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Mme. Odette Lameignere Combs recently was paid the highest honor by her native country. During World War I she married an American soldier. Thereafter, she came to the city and county of Denver and contributed so much to the community. Victor Gares, French Consul General in Denver, presented her with the Cross of the Legion of Honor from French President Charles DeGaulle. Her accomplishments are outlined in an article by Barbara Haddad which appeared in the Denver Post, as follows:

DESERVED RECOGNITION

(By Barbara Haddad)

The most elegant calling card in Colorado probably belongs to a silver-haired little woman who has the privilege of listing two major French decorations after her name. And next Tuesday, Mme. Odette Lameignere Combs will add a third: the Legion of Honor. It's enough to make Molly Brown sink with envy.

Mme. Combs admits she burst into tears when she heard of her nomination for the medal.

"I think I am just a sissy," she said in delicately accented English, "but I shall be most proud to receive it."

Napoleon Bonaparte founded the Legion of Honor to reward valor in battle. Mme. Combs' battlefield has been the classrooms of Denver, ever since she started teaching 2 months after her arrival as a war bride in 1919.

"I was born in Bordeaux," she said, "and came here with my husband right after the war. There were only three of us French brides in Denver, and the mistaken ideas people here had about France * * *." The mistaken ideas leave her almost speechless. But—she's French and female—not quite.

She believes communications have done wonders in providing bridges of understanding. "You always knew about Lafayette and the Huguenots," she said. "And you knew Paris was the fashion center. But if one just mentioned wine or garlic, one was thought to be a low-down renegade. Today Americans are well informed and eager to learn. Civilization is on the march."

Mme. Combs does her part to urge civilization ahead by taking students from South High School, where she teaches French, to her homeland every other year.

"I've done it regularly since 1935, except during the war," she said. "And the students always learn something."

The learning starts even before they leave. The group meets monthly to discuss travel plans. Last Saturday, Neustetr's presented a style show of what to wear where, with the six girls and four boys scheduled for the 1963 trips as models.

The group will sail on the *France*, one of the sleekest ships afloat.

"My brother is a naval officer and so was my father," Mme. Combs said, "so the officers are often friends of the family. They treat us like royalty."

Both her brother and her father also received the Legion of Honor, her brother winning distinction for service in the Indochina war and in the underground during World War II.

"I feel we should all serve our country, in war or peace," Mme. Combs said earnestly. "This is something American young people are not sufficiently encouraged to do. These trips—preparing them for responsible citizenship through understanding—are one way I feel I can serve both my countries."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. William C. Wise, a student at the University of Colorado, had this to say about Mme. Combs:

Having been privileged to sit as a former student of Mme. Combs, I know that I echo the sentiments of thousands of other students and friends when I say that she is an example of that rare class of educator that taught with complete dedication. She fostered the intangible element of enlightened discipline in more than one generation of Denverites and so deserves the thanks of the country she loves.

Late Speaker Sam Rayburn Honored in Many Ways—In His Hometown, Flag Flown on Birthday—A College Building Named for Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, more than a year has passed since the death of the late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, and each passing day his name becomes engraved more deeply into the history of our country. New honors continue to come to Mr. Sam.

On January 6, 1963, the day Sam Rayburn would have been 81 years old, a move was started in his hometown of Bonham, Tex., for the residents there to fly the American flag each January 6 as a reminder to the world that the homefolks have not forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a front-page editorial from the Bonham Daily Favorite of Sunday, January 6, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IS MR. SAM'S 81ST BIRTHDAY

Today, January 6, is a day on the calendar Bonham should always pause to remember. It is the birthday of Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Mr. Sam would have been 81 years of age today.

Time seems to slip by rapidly, but memories remain with us, and for this great man, the memory will linger forever. His birthday should become an observance date

here in his hometown, it should be celebrated each year in some dignified manner so we, his homefolks, could always remind the world that we have not forgotten.

Few Americans achieved his greatness as statesman or the depth of love and respect in the hearts of millions of Americans.

Out of respect to his memory we think it would be well for as many homes as have them to fly the American flag Sunday for Mr. Sam on his birthday.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the same edition of the Bonham Daily Favorite an article entitled "Tribute Paid to Late Sam Rayburn" was published, written by a distinguished Texan who was a long time close friend of Sam Rayburn, Mr. H. E. Perry, of Flag Springs, Tex. I know H. E. Perry from personal experience in campaigns in Texas as one of my State's ablest and most dedicated campaigners for good government.

In his article, H. E. Perry described Sam Rayburn as a man whose "tribute to his fellow man was a life of honest service dedicated to their highest and best interest." Mr. President, the same might well be said of my friend, H. E. Perry.

Mr. Perry was once a neighbor of Sam Rayburn. He lives in the blackland farm country of Flag Springs in Fannin County. Now 61 years of age, he continues to operate a farm and to maintain an active interest in government despite a serious accident while working with a tractor 10 years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE PAID TO LATE SAM RAYBURN

(By H. E. Perry, Flag Springs community)

On this January 6, we all pause in grateful remembrance of the birthday of the beloved Sam Rayburn.

God was good to the freedom-loving people in this and other lands when he gave mankind Sam Rayburn.

As this January 6 is the second birthday memorial since Mr. Sam passed from this life, every true American should be thankful for his life and should have equal cause to mourn his passing.

We have suffered from his death on November 16, 1961, which left a void in American life which can never be filled. No greater statesman or finer public servant ever served a free government than Mr. Sam.

In early life on a farm in the Flag Springs community he heard his country's call.

He answered it with complete devotion to Christian ideals and the democratic concept of government. Mr. Sam has done more than any man of his generation to make this America a better country in which to live.

Whether at work on a farm at Flag Springs, in a schoolroom at study, teaching in a small school or in the halls of the Texas Legislature, he put forth his best efforts.

From the Texas Legislature to the Halls of Congress, Mr. Sam lived and served in the highest and best way his State and Nation—always with great credit to his country and honor to himself.

This country has produced no equal. Mr. Sam's place in history is secure and will shine with lustrous beauty each passing day.

Mr. Sam has made so much history for America and the free world as he belonged not alone to the United States but to the world.

In his knowledge and devotion to democratic ideals, Mr. Sam was the equal of Thomas Jefferson, the father of democracy.

His high concept of legislation from the time he entered public life as a member of the Texas Legislature in 1907 won for him the love and respect of all the people.

In looking at any piece of legislation, Mr. Sam would seek to determine if the bill was fair and just to everyone, would it strengthen the free enterprise system, and did it contain any provision that would give some group special privileges at the expense of others.

He believed in equal and exact justice for all men and special privileges to none. Mr. Sam loved and served the people—not the interests.

His sincerity and honesty won for him the love and respect of his colleagues in the Texas Legislature, his district, his State, and his Nation. That is why he was returned to office every 2 years after his first election in 1906.

He loved his Maker, his fellow man. His tribute to womanhood was a living tribute—a life of devotion to his sainted mother. His tribute to his fellow man was a life of honest service dedicated to their highest and best interest.

Mr. Sam wielded the gavel in the greatest and finest lawmaking body ever assembled. There will be successors to his office, but there will never be another Sam Rayburn.

His life was well lived. He was great, yet so humble, sweet, and kind. He never lost the common touch. He walked the good earth erect with a heart attuned to his Maker, with the upreach to Him who holds the destiny of us all and the friendly outreach to mankind.

We honor his name and memory on this January 6, 1963.

His hands wielded the gavel
And signed so many good bills
This Nation will never see his like
Again yonder on Capitol Hill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, another honor which has come to the late Mr. Speaker is reported in the January 9, 1963, edition of the East Texan, student publication of East State College in Commerce, Tex. The student union building at East Texas State College will be named in honor of Sam Rayburn, a graduate of that college. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point, entitled "S. C. Named for Rayburn."

There being no objection, the article was ordere to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENT CENTER NAMED FOR RAYBURN

The student union building under construction at East Texas was named the Sam Rayburn Memorial Student Center at the November 9 meeting of the board of regents, according to the official minutes of the board.

The naming came in the form of a resolution while the board was in executive session, the minutes of which are not published until weeks after the meeting.

Deplorable Action in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have persistently protested the deplorable action under the banner of freedom in the Congo. The United States has participated in the invasion of a free and sovereign country, Katanga. I believe that people are waking up around the country in regards to this unjustifiable action.

Recently, the Mansfield News-Journal, one of the fine independent newspapers in my district, carried an excellent editorial which asked the question that is on the lips of many Americans today "Why? Why?" One of their syndicated columnists, Robert Ruark, had an excellent column on January 8, 1963, which I am including in these remarks. These two prophetic articles are worthy of the attention of all Members of this body and I include them at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal, Jan. 8, 1963]

U.N. HEISTS TSHOMBE'S BANK

(By Robert Ruark)

The most shockingly immoral action by a mealymouthed nation—the United States of America—employing a sanctimonious weapon, the United Nations—just transpired.

We hadn't seen the like of it since Russia took over Hungary; in fact, there is really no parallel for the United Nations' commercial attack on Katanga, unless you want to consider it in the same class as a TV rendition of "The Untouchables."

It was fitting that the Irish, Indian and Ethiopian mercenaries employed on American money by the United Nations knocked over the bank in Katanga's capital, Elisabethville, since the whole plot was based on hijackery anyhow. Katanga has money. The highbinders of a so-called Central Congolese Government wanted Katanga's loot. So the hired gunmen obviously knocked off Moise Tshombe's bank.

I know this sounds like bad fiction, but it unfortunately is a truth of our times. The United Nations has been on the prod for Katanga ever since Tshombe seceded and expressed a disinclination to share Katanga's copper and cobalt revenues with that bunch of low-comedy politicians in Léopoldville—a minstrel show that we have subsidized even when it had two prime ministers . . . two separate governments in office at the same time.

Adlai Stevenson shows himself as a faker of the purest persuasion when he maintains, as he did the other day, that "Katanga is as much a part of the Congo as separate States are part of the United States." Katanga is no more a part of the Congo than is Angola or Rhodesia or Uganda or Gabon or the French Congo across the river in Brazzaville.

There is no central government. There is a pack of clowns playing at being adults in Leopoldville, on our time and our money. If the current clown falls we get another one, and our leaders are bringing up the old bogey of Russian intervention to provide us with a diversionary crisis for 1963.

Nothing really has changed in the Congo situation since the Belgians freed it for disaster 2½ years ago. There is no more Red menace now than there was then. I doubt seriously if the Russians want such an expensive mess on their hands—in any case, the Russians have stoutly refused to pay their whack of the United Nations bill.

The only thing really worth stealing in the Congo is what the United Nations just stole. That is Katanga, a reasonably civilized business, not a state, that is run by the shareholders in the Union Miniere du Haut Katanga, a subsidiary of the international octopus, the Societe Generale Belgique. Katanga produces annually millions of dollars worth of minerals. Katangan money is something of value; Central Congo money isn't much better than scrip.

But I swear I didn't think that even the United Nations, which made no murmur when India knocked off Goa, or Russia went into Hungary, would be brazen enough to stick up the bank.

[From the Mansfield News-Journal, Jan. 11, 1963]

WHY? WHY?

Slowly, the conscience of the world seems to be awakening to the U.N.'s moral debacle in the Congo.

Thousands of words have been written about this vicious action, ordered by U.N. Secretary U Thant and backed by the United States, in which mercenary troops moved in to deny independence to Katanga Province.

But one news picture seems to have told the story far more graphically than all the words.

It shows a Belgian resident of Katanga on his knees beside his little car. Blood streams down his face from a wound in the head. In his car his wife is dead. They were attacked for no reason by U.N. mercenaries while driving along the road.

On the man's lips are the words "Why? Why?"

That is the question the world is asking.

Why should the Province of Katanga which asked only its independence have been bombed and strafed and invaded?

Katanga had been the most anti-Communist of the newly liberated African areas. Yet the United States backed the U.N. in its drive to crush Katangan independence and to force the big state to become a part of the disarrayed, chaotic Congo.

Why? Why?

Did our own State Department goof again?

In the background is this. The U.N. is facing bankruptcy. The Congo was its most costly operation. Observers in Washington said weeks ago that our Government would back a U.N. move to end the Congo venture quickly by crushing Katangan opposition to being forced into the Central Congo Government.

That is what happened. A phony crisis was created and ballyhooed at the meeting of President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan in Nassau. A U.S. military mission was ordered into the Congo. The U.N. sent Ralph Bunche there and he held a news conference that must have left as bad a taste in African mouths as the recent performance of Senator ELLENDER.

Bunche, smirking with self-satisfaction, gave flippant answers to questions of deepest seriousness to the people of Katanga and Africa. He announced that as soon as possible he was going back to New York where he had something of importance to do.

The way he said it implied that what was happening in the Congo was really of no importance, just a minor nuisance.

He was speaking for the United Nations.

The most patriotic American cannot help feeling secretly ashamed that his Government on one side of the world pays $53 million ransom to a filthy dictator while on the other side of the Atlantic the rulers of "the land of the free" support the ruthless suppression of a free and anti-Communist people, the Katangans.

Why Why?

Inexcusable Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the paramount crisis facing the world is acceptance of the false dogma of communism or acceptance, approval and implementation of some governmental and economic principles of nondictatorial nations. Numerous leaders have pointed to the lack of deep understanding that the public has often manifested toward communism. This fact is very effectively illustrated by an editorial in the La Grange Citizen, La Grange, Ill., of January 10, which I ask to insert into the RECORD at this point:

INEXCUSABLE IGNORANCE

Two recently published items indicate widespread ignorance of what communism does, and is. It is difficult to comprehend that people exposed to millions of words in newspapers and magazines, to news films, to television and radio still lack basic information about what happens when communism takes over.

"It is amazing how widespread this idea still is among Americans—no matter what descent—who cannot imagine that under communism a citizen is powerless and the government is almighty; that one day a citizen owns a store or a farm and the next day has nothing; that he may be imprisoned for no reason." This is a comment in the American Bulletin a publication by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

The author made the comment after telling about opinions and remarks made by people who call the council, mistaking it for the Czechoslovak consulate. Trying to tell people that the council is different than the consulate and that it has nothing to do with the latter because it represents a communistic government gets the retort:

"So what if they are Communists? What difference does that make? Why can't my aunt visit me in the United States if I invite her? There can't be an iron curtain, as you say, because I know lots of people who went to Czechoslovakia."

The article reports: "One young lady was quite irritated by our stupidity when we tried to explain that people in Czechoslovakia no longer own their shops, business, farms, etc. That the Red regime has taken away their land, cattle and machinery without compensation to the owners. 'The farmers wouldn't give their farms if they didn't want to: they must get a lot for their property' was the reply."

The author remarks further: "Incredible as it may seem to some of us, many Americans have no idea what communism is in practice; how it operates; what the dangers are to the free world."

An editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch confirms what the Czech writer stated. It comments:

FIFTY PERCENT FLUNKED

"The hardest thing about teaching young Americans what communism and capitalism stand for may turn out to be the long prevailing attitude that it isn't necessary for them to learn it—that they get it by a kind of osmosis that comes of being Americans. That, at any rate, is a possible conclusion from the results of the first year of a 6-week course in the subject required by State law for high school seniors in Florida."

Only half the Jacksonville students who took the final test scored a passing grade of more than 70 percent.

"Furthermore, a third of them failed to pick out as false the statement 'It is possible to be at the same time a loyal citizen of this country and a true Communist.' which was what the State legislature had been most particular they should learn. The course says the law, shall lay special emphasis on the false doctrines, evils and dangers of communism, and ways to fight it.

"Some of the seniors had only the most confused notion of what Communists and capitalists are even after taking the course. One said capitalists are 'anti-Communists' another that they are 'the haves, and the proletariat the have-nots.'

"As for the other system, a graduate of the course described it by saying that 'whenever you have a thesis and antithesis you always have a synthesis which is communism.'"

All of which means that despite the volumes written on the subject much of the message fails to penetrate. The basic information, about what actually happens to people when communism takes over seems to get lost.

Hatch Act Eclipse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the brazen solicitation of Federal employees for Democrat political campaign funds continues to outrage many of the newspapers of this country.

Not even the Washington Post, which usually carries the banner high for the New Frontier administration, can swallow the tactics that have been used in this political fund-raising drive.

The Post calls it "shabby business" and "subtle coercion." It places the blame right where it belongs when it says "the President could have warned his subordinates that no coercion or pressure would be tolerated."

Mr. Speaker, I offer herewith the Washington Post editorial of Friday, January 18, 1963, for reprinting in the RECORD:

HATCH ACT ECLIPSE

However one looks as it, the pressure that has been applied to Government employees to buy tickets for the Democratic fund-raising affair tonight is a shabby business. The Hatch Act tells Federal employees that they may not participate in partisan activities. The civil service system holds out to them assurance that they will be compensated and promoted on the basis of merit. Yet many of them are being pressured to give $100 to the Democratic cause—in installments if they cannot afford to buy a ticket to the gala outright—by their supervising officials who should be the first to respect the spirit and letter of the law.

The law on the subject is unequivocal. It provides:

"Any executive officer or employee of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall request, give to, or receive from, any other officer or employee of the Government any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States."

Probably most officials have avoided outright violation of the law which forbids them to solicit funds for partisan purposes from other Federal employees. But no one can fail to recognize that, when the head of any agency invites all those who are going to the gala to attend a preliminary party at his home or elsewhere, he is applying indirect pressure to buy a gala ticket. The Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act are designed to protect employees from precisely this kind of subtle coercion.

It may be taken for granted that most of the steam behind this venture comes from the Democratic National Committee. Party officials are always eager to bring in new

recruits and replenish the party's treasury. The chief fault lies in the failure of many high officials, the Civil Service Commission and the President to offer employees any protection against the demands of the politicians.

A very different atmosphere would have prevailed if the CSC had publicly reminded officials of the provisions of the law and assured employees that refusal to make requested partisan donations would not count against them. Better still, the President could have warned his subordinates that no coercion or pressure would be tolerated. In the absence of any such protective measure, many employees are likely to feel that the Government itself is winking at violations of the law, leaving them no alternative to making a "contribution."

The Tax Cut Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a timely editorial entitled "The Tax Cut Plan," which appeared in the January 16, 1963, edition of the Oxnard (Calif.) Press-Courier:

THE TAX CUT PLAN

Everybody knows taxes are too high. So people generally will be happy, we suppose, because President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, plumped for a reduction in the income tax.

His program is one with appeal. Spaced over three years, it will blunt, somewhat, the immediate blow to balancing the budget. Mr. Kennedy believes that the lower taxes will mean more spending. More spending will help business and industry and increase employment. All of this will, by itself, produce higher tax receipts. That is his optimistic view.

He stresses the help it will be to the lower income families, by giving them more money to spend. In the lowest levels it will mean about $18 a year less paid in taxes. Of course that isn't much. But if everyone of the families goes out and cheerfully spends that money, and the $18 goes into business channels instead of into the Treasury maw, it is reasonable to think that overall, tax income may grow.

But the man who has been drawing his weekly paycheck in 1963, will look at the deduction for social security. It has been raised from 3⅛ percent to 3⅝ percent. There's an immediate increase in his tax payment, that he must balance against the chance of saving that $18. So for him there won't be much left to squander, or to spend on nylons for the wife, shirts for the kids, socks for himself.

The corporations, too, will be helped. The $25,000 income corporation—and tax help is needed badly by the little fellow just getting along—will have several hundred dollars more for payrolls and equipment, and for business promotion.

That will help. The bigger corporations, paying the 52 percent on all profits over $25,000, will have that reduced to 47 percent. This could prove even more effective in building up a stronger tax base. For the sum total will mount up. Risk capital will not be so timid about new machinery, modernizing plants, seeking new markets.

That invitation to risk capital could hold real promise for a growing prosperity. But it is hard to explain that. All that many persons would see in a tax saving for their boss would be a chance to grab a bigger paycheck. Those come, too, but they come from expanding businesses in our competitive system.

Mr. Kennedy recognized, albeit in a somewhat perfunctory manner, the obligation to reduce spending if taxes are cut. He held out some hope of reducing the budget outlays in various fields of domestic legislation. He is completely vague about that. He is not vague about the certainty that more money would be spent for paying the interest on the national debt—and that keeps growing; more money for defense needs—and there is no early thrift in sight in that area; and in spending for space achievement—and that means the ventures toward the moon and out-of-space travel will take more, much more money, if we ever do beat the Russians.

Now the President proposes, but Congress disposes. There is no assurance whatsoever that the tax cuts, and the suggested tax reforms, will get to first base with a critical, informed, and independent Congress.

"Tax loopholes" are to be closed. That is a meaningless term. For example, there is talk about reducing the depletion allowance for those who venture into oil and mineral prospecting.

This particular item is not a loophole. It is the law of the land. It is a law based upon the entirely reasonable proposition that if companies are to be encouraged to drill oil wells, even though 9 out of 10 fail to produce oil, they should be given some tax benefit if they are to keep on drilling. Tax loophole, in this respect, is a misnomer. If the law is to be changed, will wildcatting in the oilfield be done despite the heavy risk? No one knows for sure. But there will be a strong fight in Congress, led by those in such oil-producing States as California.

That is only one example. Every Congressman is going to translate the President's specific proposals for closing loopholes, into what that would mean for business and employment in his district.

Mr. Kennedy spoke of the need for reforming the tax structure. Every economist recognizes that need—and it has been a need for a long, long time. When the Congress gets the specific recommendations for reform, there will be a chance to weigh them up and discover whether reform can be accomplished, or whether only a few face-saving gestures will be made.

The tax structure of the Nation, right now is a tax upon production and enterprise. Those fields need encouragement Will they get it through future tax legislation?

The chances are doubtful. It is much easier to apply a cut, tell the voter his saving, and seek reelection.

But the voter is becoming wise. He is going to look beyond the surface appearance of things. He has yet to be heard from.

Steel Price Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 16, 1963:

MR. BLOUGH ATTEMPTS TO KILL A MYTH

Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., who was the most prominent victim of President Kennedy's tantrum over a proposed rise in steel prices last April, tells his side of the story in the current issue of Look magazine. He tries to correct certain "publicly held misconceptions" about the episode, among them that he purposely lulled the President into the false impression that United States Steel would not raise prices, and then raised them.

This, says Mr. Blough, "is absolutely contrary to the facts."

It will be hard to set the record straight. Mr. Blough is up against an administration which tries to manage the news and often succeeds. The administration's claque of commentators and columnists has spread the story that wicked steel magnates double-crossed the valiant young President by raising prices after he had managed to persuade the noble steelworkers to accept a new contract without a strike.

Mr. Blough makes it clear that the steel companies never made a commitment about prices before the labor agreement. For one reason, they could not do so without being hit by the Department of Justice for violating the antitrust laws. Months before the wage settlement Mr. Blough himself explained to the President and to the secretary of labor [then Arthur J. Goldberg] that nobody could speak for the industry about prices. Mr. Goldberg was advised emphatically that United States Steel had not raised prices for almost 4 years and was being squeezed by the soaring costs of wages and benefits for workers.

After the new labor contracts were agreed upon, President Kennedy telephoned the negotiators on both sides, congratulating them on the settlement which, he said, "should provide a solid base for continued price stability." At this point the steel companies made a mistake which they now recognize. They should have reemphasized immediately that they had made no promises about prices and that a price increase was overdue.

Their failure to do so opened the way for the administration to peddle its myth that United States Steel's move to raise prices was a doublecross. The myth was an excuse to threaten the industry with court action and investigations under the antitrust laws. The President addressed the Nation on television, accusing the steel industry of "utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans." The New York Times reported that he had summoned his closest aids to his private office and let go as follows: "My father always told me that all businessmen were sons-of-bitches, but I never believed it till now."

Later, at a press conference, the President denied that he had intended to refer to all businessmen, but he continued to pretend that he was misled by Mr. Blough and other steel executives. He said: "I felt at that time that we had not been treated with frankness, and therefore I thought that his [Papa Kennedy's] view had merit."

Mr. Blough's article in Look shows that he learned a lot from the ruckus last April. He now concludes that Mr. Kennedy's vehement reaction to the news of the proposed price rise was not because he expected an inflationary spiral to result from it, but because he wanted to placate the labor unions. Mr. Blough notes that the President's earlier stand against a 35-hour week had displeased the unions.

"I believe that he and Secretary Golberg felt that an increase in steel prices, following the early wage negotiations, would be viewed as evidence that the administration's

policies were adverse to labor's interests," Mr. Blough writes.

It is a polite way of saying that the administration will do anything, regardless of truth or the general public welfare, to keep on good terms with the labor bosses.

Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, these are indeed awesome times for a newcomer to take his seat in this Chamber.

Abroad we are beset with the menace of communism, the need for arming and strengthening our allies, the constant threat of further crises which we may have to meet at any time at any of half a dozen points on the globe.

At home we are faced with the unending problems of our growing population, the provision of adequate, normal services for our citizens at all levels of government, and the ever-growing costs incident thereto. Military spending is to be increased in the aftermath of the Cuban crises. Our race into space continues to cost billions. The expense of welfare programs already on the books is rising steadily.

To meet these tremendous obligations, we are carrying an income tax load which many competent authorities insist is a drag on our entire economy. At the same time, we are struggling under a mounting burden of State and local taxes.

Against this background, as the time drew near for me to take my oath, I was disturbed by the administration's determination to revive its ill-conceived program to federalize hospital care for the aged under social security.

The program is bad enough; the strange "business as usual" attitude on the New Frontier is past understanding. This is a period of grave national concern over problems affecting our very prospects of survival. It is not a time for power-hungry bureaucrats and irresponsible crusaders to be running wild, bent on rescuing a segment of the population from an artificial difficulty which only they can see. As usual, of course, they expect to accomplish their wonders with other people's money and other people's liberties.

With debate already contemplated over an income tax cut—and the question in some circles already having become whether the cut shall be $13 billion or more or less—it makes no sense to talk at the same time of a new tax levy which will move in the opposite direction and siphon off added billions from the resources of American workers and their employers in the years ahead.

I am not discussing the merits or demerits of a tax cut at this time. That issue will be before us later. We will then have the benefit of the views of the Ways and Means Committee on the wisdom of such a step when Federal spending remains at the highest point in our peacetime history.

What I am saying today is simply that if the economy is lagging, as the administration claims—and if a reduction in personal and corporate income taxes is a valid means for increasing business activity by putting more money in circulation—then a program to increase taxes and take more money away from wage earners and employers is insupportable. The administration cannot have it both ways.

By the same token, it is equally unreasonable to project a new and fantastically wasteful spending scheme in the face of the soaring Federal deficit. Yet that is what the administration proposes in this instance.

No one knows what the ultimate cost of an adventure into Government medicine would be. We do know that no nation which has tried compulsory, government-controlled health care has ever been able to anticipate the cost correctly. England's program now costs five times the original estimates.

The administration's estimate of the cost of its plan was $1 billion at the last session. But that was when, in its infinite wisdom, the administration was ignoring the 4 million Americans over 65 who are not on social security, an anomaly which never has been explained. For among these older citizens are the most needy in the Nation.

Adding them to the program would increase the cost still further. Many actuaries believe, and have produced figures to show, that the $1 billion estimate was merely the beginning. They have computed the cost at $2.2 billion the first year and a steadily increasing load as more and more citizens reach retirement age.

There is only one answer to this—constantly growing payroll deductions lowering the income of American workers, or more deficit spending and a staggering new addition to the national debt.

Moreover, it does not square with the President's pledge last month before the Economic Club of New York as he spoke eloquently of the need for a tax cut to spur the Nation's economic growth. He used the words of our own Ways and Means Committee chairman when he acknowledged that a tax reduction must be accompanied by "increased control of the rise in expenditures."

Said the President:

> That is precisely the course we intend to follow.

Saddling the Treasury with a new burden of spending, the end of which no one can see, to provide federalized hospital care for millions of the aged who are self-reliant and can take care of themselves, hardly seems to be following a sensible course of controlling rises in expenditures.

For the current fiscal year, according to the administration's own estimate in November, we face a budget deficit of $7.8 billion. It will be the 28th deficit in 34 years, during which the national debt has risen from $16 billion to $300 billion. A probable deficit of $11 billion or more is foreseen next year, not all of which is because of defense and space expenditures deemed vital to the national security. If there is a tax cut of $13 billion, the deficit could be $15 billion or more, the largest in peacetime. The overall budget next year will be the highest in history, exceeding the peak spending of World War II.

I say it is folly for the administration to promote extravagant new social spending schemes in the situation confronting us today. But more than this, I say it is folly beyond description for any administration to tamper at any time with a system of medicine that has become one of the wonders of the modern world.

Let me make myself clear. I am not here to defend the medical profession. It has demonstrated that it can take care of itself in the arena of public affairs.

Rather, I am speaking on fundamental principles that lie at the heart of our system. It is wrong, for example, to compel one segment of the population to underwrite a program of health care for another regardless of need. But that is exactly what has been proposed. The measure before Congress in the last session called for young wage earners to pay a double increase in payroll taxes—a one-quarter of 1 percent higher rate for employees and employers, alike, and a broadening of the tax base from $4,800 to $5,200. The rate for the self-employed would have been three-eighths of 1 percent on the first $5,200 of income.

Administration spokesmen quote these small and harmless sounding fractions in their efforts to show how little is involved here. Surely, they argue, anyone who would object to one-quarter of 1 percent to take care of a segment of the population which they portray as being uniformly sick and impoverished must be stingy and unfeeling. To hear them tell it, you would think they have a monopoly on sympathy and goodwill in this country.

What is involved, actually, is a 17-percent increase in the amount of the tax with the burden falling entirely on the small wage earner. The $5,200 clerk would pay as much as the $50,000 corporation executive. At least 40 percent of all taxable income in the United States would escape any responsibility whatever to help defray the cost of medical care for the aged, including the income of 9 million workers not on social security.

We are aware that an automatic increase in the social security payroll deduction went into effect January 1. This is the ninth such increase since the social security program was adopted in 1937. Two more increases by 1968 are already scheduled by law. Without any other increases, the rate then will be 9¼ percent, or within a fraction of the 10 percent which many experts believe is the limit taxpayers will stand.

Had the compulsory hospital care tax also been adopted, employees and employers would now be paying 40 percent more social security taxes than they were in 1961. By 1968, they would have been paying 87 percent more. And these fig-

ures are based on the administration's outdated estimate that the cost of the program will not exceed $1 billion. That was the amount when only older citizens on social security were to be covered. If the cost reaches $3 billion by 1968, which has been forecast, wage earners and their employers would be paying 94 percent more social security taxes than they were in 1961.

But, I repeat, nobody actually knows what the ultimate cost of the program will be. Yet, this uncertainty notwithstanding, Congress is asked to accept the program, and at the same time take away liberties of older people, impose a new tax on younger people, and clear the way for the Washington bureaucracy to fasten its grip on hospitals and physicians in this country for the first time.

This is not all. Passage of the legislation would immediately impose an unbelievable liability of $35 billion on the social security system, already staggering under a mounting excess of outgo to pay benefits beyond income from payroll taxes. This sum is the amount necessary to cover the expected lifetime hospital expenditures of those who would be eligible for care at once without ever having contributed a dime to the program. The money, of course, would have to come from the contributions of younger workers. They would be paying their family medical expenses out of their pockets while they pay increased taxes for the care of the elderly, millions of whom are completely solvent and able to handle their own needs.

Meanwhile, the entire social security system would be subjected to a new and possibly ruinous strain. Most of today's workers are relying on social security for some support in their retirement years. As originally conceived, the system was intended to place a "floor of protection" under the elderly with cash dollars to spend as they see fit, to buy the things they want or need, when their income falls below a certain level. Now something drastically different is proposed. Federal control of hospitalization for the aged would be a program of services, not cash benefits. Instead of trusting people to decide how they want to spend their health care dollars, the Government would spend their money for them through a new system directed from Washington.

Before wage earners join in a move to take social security on this alien venture, they should pause and reflect on the fact that the social security fund went $1,248 million deeper "into the red" in the last fiscal year. An automatic tax increase on January 1, 1962, did not halt the drain on the reserve fund to pay retirement benefits. Even with the new tax rise this month, the Treasury has reported that it sees no hope of getting the fund's current disbursements in the black this year. The total fund is already about $300 billion in arrears in cash to meet retirement obligations to all who have paid into it since its inception, or an amount equal to the national debt.

Surely, this is not the time to be playing fast and loose with a national institution which people are depending upon to permit them to live in dignity and security in their older years.

I have dealt with some of the basic fiscal objections to this unworkable, ill-founded proposal. There is more, much more, that can and will be said on the question in the months ahead. For there is a deeper, graver meaning to this controversy than the surface arguments that have been advanced by the proponents of government control of hospitalization for the elderly.

This is not, as they loudly proclaim, a holy crusade to bring help to a pathetic group of Americans.

If the legislation known as the King-Anderson bill had passed the last session of Congress, it would not have become effective until 1964. What of the ailing older people in the meantime, if the emergency is as great—if the need is as imperative—as the administration says it is? Where were they going to get help for more than a year?

When the program did become operative, according to responsible authorities, it would have covered only about 25 percent of an individual's normal medical expenses. It would not have paid for doctors' bills, or surgery, or prescription drugs outside a hospital. Even the most needy would have been required to pay the first $90 of their hospital bills.

How would the needy sick raise the 75 percent of their illness cost not covered by the program?

How can an indigent sick person pay as much as $90 of a hospital bill?

The questions answer themselves. This program would solve nothing. The need is not present—has never been present in the exaggerated terms employed by the administration in its drive to pressure Congress to adopt the program.

I believe it is well established by now that this is simply a matter of playing politics with human need and not the appealing humanitarian cause claimed for it. It is a bold bid to buy the votes of the Nation's older citizens by taking credit for offering them tax-supported hospital care whether they need it or not. At the same time, there is an appeal to sons and daughters by giving them the opportunity to shift responsibility for their aging parents on to the back of the Government. I do not buy that kind of thinking and I am proud to acknowledge here and now that most Americans have demonstrated they do not buy it either.

Last March, according to the Gallup poll, a majority of voters—55 per cent—favored Federal control of old age hospitalization. By July, those favoring the administration's program had slipped to 48 percent. By August Dr. Gallup reported, public support had fallen another four points to 44 percent—from a majority to a clear minority in the space of a few months as the Nation learned more and more the plan's details and implications.

All of us here are familiar with the gigantic propaganda circus that has been staged by the administration and certain so-called labor leaders to whip up a crisis atmosphere over the health problems of the aged. In the last campaign, many of us had to meet the tide of misrepresenations, untruths and slippery statistics which have marked the calculated efforts to stir the Nation's sympathies for the elderly people. They are portrayed as a mass of helpless, sick human beings, unable to cope with the problems of their later years.

The opposite is true. Today, 55 percent of all Americans over 65, or 9,550,000, have private insurance plans to protect them from the costs of illness. They have demonstrated their self-reliance. They do not need Government paternalism to free them from risk and individual responsibility. In a few years, the figure is expected to reach 90 percent.

For those who are in need, and those generally self-supporting but unable to meet the cost of serious illness, the Kerr-Mills law provides for State-Federal matching funds to help them secure much more complete medical care than under the limited benefits offered a federally controlled hospital program. Administration of the Kerr-Mills law is left where it belongs, at the local level. Tax funds are not squandered on the nonneedy. The self-supporting and the well-to-do cannot get a free ride at the expense of the small wage earner.

But the Kerr-Mills law has never been liked by those, including labor union bosses, who want the Federal Government to assume total charge of medical care. It is not a gravy train or a gigantic handout. It will not produce millions of votes. These forces are most interested in creating a political issue on false grounds than they are in existing law which will do the job now for those requiring assistance. They would substitute compulsion for free choice in financing medical care. This must not happen.

For passage of the administration program in any form whatever would mark the first step down the road toward complete socialization of medicine in this country. This is the fundamental peril that confronts us. The greatest system of medicine ever enjoyed by any people anywhere has unjustifiably been placed on trial in the political arena. Here it must be safeguarded and protected. We cannot afford to retreat to a form of mass medicine, cafeteria style, under Government controls. We cannot permit the quality of medicine to deteriorate or allow the standards of practice to be corrupted under bureaucratic interference.

These are basic considerations. We all know that a healthy nation is a strong nation and at no time in our history has it been more vital that our Nation be strong.

President Kennedy's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gary Post-

Tribune, Gary, Ind., seems to be a rather fair analysis of the important budget problem which will be confronting the Congress this session. These comments coming from a Republican newspaper seem to be nonpolitical and rather sensible.

WILL CONGRESS CUT BUDGET?

President Kennedy has presented some cogent arguments in behalf of his proposed Federal tax cut. A larger immediate deficit is of slight concern if lower rates stimulate the economy and soon bring sizable increases in revenue. The arguments may sound better to our ears, of course, because a tax cut would be a pleasing thing to practically everyone.

At the same time, most of us would agree that there should be a reduction in Federal spending, of at least some degree, at the same time that Federal taxes are trimmed down. We had hoped for efforts to minimize the deficit increase by curtailing the Federal budget.

So it is a shock to learn that Kennedy has proposed a budget for fiscal 1964 of nearly $99 billion, the largest in the national history. Republicans in Congress call it incredible and cynical. Some Democrats are fully as outspoken in criticism. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee says the budget is unbalanced because "we are spending money we do not have on things we could get along without."

The outcries against the monstrous budget are so shrill that a newcomer in the congressional press gallery might well conclude that the President's program was in deep trouble, and that the budget would have to be reduced considerably if the tax cut proposal were to have any chance of getting passed.

A look at the breakdown of the spending proposals will convince otherwise, however. Out of the budget dollar, 62 cents is set aside for national defense, international activities, and the space program. Veterans' programs will get 6 cents; interest on the public debt takes 10 cents; and agriculture is down for 6 cents. All other Federal activities are budgeted for 16 cents.

Nothing can be done about the interest charges, and practically the same thing can be said about funds for the veterans. Does anyone seriously believe a further cut can be made in farm aid, budgeted at about a billion less than this year? Or that much might be cut from the "all other" funds, up about a billion in the new budget?

So we turn to the major item, 62 cents out of every dollar for defense, world activities, and outer space. Is there any chance of important savings being made here? If we are honest about it, the answer will be in the negative.

On purely military budgets, Congress has been inclined to vote more, not less, than the administration has requested. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has said economies are possible, but if any are realized he will have to make them directly, and despite strong local and State pressures to the contrary. These pressures, plus Pentagon lobbying, may be expected to hold the budget fully up to the President's request.

Request is made for larger space funds, to keep the Apollo lunar program on track. Some still question the urgency of going to the moon. However, Congress has been firmly behind the President's decision and we believe most of the people are also.

Through the whole budget, savings of a million here or a hundred million there are undoubtedly possible, and they could add up to an impressive figure. But when the President himself is willing to propose a $10 billion deficit, Congressmen may show little concern for sums that are piddling by comparison, especially when a vocal lobby can be mustered in behalf of almost any spending project.

There will be one massive endeavor to trim the budget, however—an effort directed against foreign aid. The $3.75 billion foreign aid program undoubtedly will be made the whipping boy, although it is one of the most defensible items in the whole $98.8 billion budget.

What Next From TVA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been doing an outstanding job with its fertilizer program. This program, however, needs to be better publicized. I, therefore, commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the publication, Farm Chemicals, and which reflects the growing acceptance of the TVA's fertilizer program.

WHAT NEXT FROM TVA?

Amid all the cries of "too much government" one agency stands out as one of the most useful services an industry can possibly have at its beck and call. We're speaking of the TVA, of course.

True, there have been criticisms leveled at its system of using farmer-owned cooperatives to distribute its high analysis fertilizer to farmer-cooperators. And that's expected. The fertilizer industry has a history of great dislike for cooperatives, because of their tax-free status. But no technologists are more welcome anywhere (including abroad) than TVA fertilizer experts.

Everytime we read about some new innovation in fertilizer technology, we wonder what next from TVA? The way they work, you'd think they'd work themselves right out of a job sooner or later.

The answer to that is: TVA may eventually be this country's answer to increasing foreign competition.

Phosphate manufacturers in particular have benefitted directly or indirectly from TVA's research. As Jesse W. Markham reported in his book, "The Fertilizer Industry," at least 16 companies have obtained designs or detailed operating information, or both, on TVA installations and processes; 5 have employed TVA personnel to assist them with initial plant operations; 5 other phosphate manufacturers and several engineering and construction companies have sent representatives and operators to Wilson Dam for training in TVA plants; and 2 fertilizer producers have built plants using one of TVA's nitric-phosphate processes."

Mind you, that was the report as of 1958. The record since then is equally impressive. In fiscal 1962, for example, TVA issued 43 licenses for use of its chemical developments.

This month we're proud to bring you an exclusive report on a fertilizer material which will have a tremendous influence on liquid fertilizer, indeed the entire fertilizer industry—ammonium polyphosphate. It's the highest of the high analysis fertilizers—even higher than diammonium phosphate.

Boasting 77 percent plant food (16 percent nitrogen and 61 percent P_2O_5), it's primarily a mixture of ammonium orthophosphate and ammonium pyrophosphate. Another factor in ammonium polyphosphate's favor is ease of handling; it is less costly to handle, ship and store than many other fertilizer materials. Diammonium phosphate has 74 percent plant food.

Ammonium polyphosphate can be used conventionally as a fertilizer and it can be used to make highly concentrated solutions. Dissolved in water it gives a liquid fertilizer containing as much as 44 percent plant food—about 10 percent nitrogen and 34 percent P_2O_5—or about the same concentration as made directly with superphosphate acid and ammonia. One of the great possibilities of this material is that it makes possible the preparation of a liquid fertilizer from wet progress acid instead of the more expensive furnace acid.

And herein lies quite a tale, too. Wet process acid, another product of TVA, was considered to be the key to the future expansion of the entire liquid industry back in 1959 when FC brought you a special report the complete liquids field. Now it is being used extensively by liquid operators—and it is also brought the price of white acid down to a competitive level.

We think TVA's biggest challenges lie ahead. As T. P. Hignett reported following a visit to 20 fertilizer companies in seven European countries 2 years ago:

"The quality of granular fertilizer in Europe is probably better than the average in the United States in some cases, 75 percent of the superphosphate granules are on-size."

Continuous operation and limitation of the number of grades, he believed, help producers attain good granulation in Europe.

By way of comparison, in the United States a mixed fertilizer plant's average annual production may consist of 50 or more grades while a European company with more than 5 times the tonnage may produce no more than 5 grades. (Most of the companies he visited had capacities in the range of 100,000 to 500,000 tons.)

Hignett made it clear why European fertilizer manufacturers can compete in the world market, despite the high prices they have to pay for raw materials. They select economical processes and build large-scale, integrated operations.

If we are to continue to maintain our position in the world fertilizer market, it's obvious that the TVA will be needed like never before.

Operation Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and impressive programs devoted to the training of young people in the values of freedom, initiative, and responsibility is junior achievement.

Many of our colleagues, I am sure, are familiar with the work of junior achievement in their own areas, especially the leadership it has taken in conjunction with business, industrial, civic and professional leaders in furthering an understanding and appreciation of the American free enterprise system among those to whom we look for future leadership.

In Union County, N.J., I have followed very closely the progress of what is certainly one of the most successful junior

achievement programs in the country. Its 1962–63 project, Operation Free Enterprise, seems to me to surpass anything Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., has previously accomplished, and I believe a description of the project would be of great interest to our colleagues.

This is the kind of work, Mr. Speaker, which is effective with young people because it is practical, realistic and worthwhile. By engaging in actual business operations, for which they accept full responsibility, boys and girls of high school age learn the meaning and value of private enterprise in the free American tradition. Junior Achievers and their parents, their adult advisers and industrial sponsors deserve great credit for their energy, imagination and genuine contribution to the strength of the free enterprise system.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a memorandum prepared by J. Kenneth Roden, the very able executive vice president of Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., which describes the project in detail:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF
UNION COUNTY, INC.,
Elizabeth, N.J., March 15, 1962.

To: Junior Achievement advisers,
From: J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president.
Subject: Operation Free Enterprise.

Operation Free Enterprise is a three-pronged youth incentive public relations and youth educational project planned and developed by the board of directors of Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc. in cooperation with Junior Achievements of Essex-West Hudson, Inc., Junior Achievement of New York, Inc., Junior Achievement of Hartford, Inc., and Junior Achievement of Delaware Valley, Inc. (Other junior achievement areas will be invited to participate.)

Operation Free Enterprise will start in September 1962 as a dynamic youth incentive and educational program which will continue throughout the junior achievement program year. It will be climaxed with a week-long visit of about 100 Junior Achievers from the Union County, and other participating junior achievement areas, to West Germany. There the Junior Achievers, winners in the youth incentive competition, will have an opportunity to obtain a personal view and impression of the Berlin situation which is creating so much tension and so many world problems which they, as leaders of tomorrow, will have to face and solve. They will come face to face with the Communist wall, evidence of the failure and inhumanity of the Communist philosophy which they will compare with the industrial, educational, scientific and cultural growth and development and general prosperity of the Federal Republic of Germany under its free, democratic government in cooperation with other nations of the free world.

It is contemplated that the group of student-achievers will meet with American and German Government officials both here and abroad, including the U.S. Ambassador and other high-ranking American officials, and the German Chancellor and other top German officials.

An important phase of the visit in Germany will be meetings with industrialists who will discuss with the group Germany's postwar economic development and its effect on the future of the free world. It will be demonstrated to them that the German system is in many ways a replica of our own; its institutions are similar and its policies are based on the same fundamentals: private enterprise and competition free from state and monopolistic interference.

There will be visits to industrial installations, cultural and religious centers. Arrangements will be made for the junior achievers to attend classes at an American school in Germany.

Extensive press, radio, and television coverage will be planned for both the United States and Germany. A publicity factsheet will be made available soon.

A program and itinerary will be distributed at a later date.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

There will be extensive community participation in Operation Free Enterprise. In order to give the American people an opportunity to rededicate themselves to the principles of free enterprise which this Nation followed, in achieving its present position of world leadership, individuals will be able to purchase shares of stock in Operation Free Enterprise at a cost of $1 per share. Their return on this investment will not be monetary, but will be considerable in terms of a more enlightened younger generation dedicated to the task of strengthening and expanding the free-enterprise economy through cooperative good will throughout the world.

Operation Free Enterprise will provide all people of the participating communities with a constructive outlet for demonstrating that the American free enterprise system is not just a system for carrying on business but is much more; it is the best system for promoting human progress while preserving individual freedom.

OBJECTIVES OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

(1) To provide junior achievers and advisers with a positive, effective incentive program designed to stimulate a clear, complete understanding of the principles and the benefits and rewards of the American free enterprise system and to make young people good salesmen of free enterprise.

Operation Free Enterprise will demonstrate that every individual, whether employee or manager or community leader, must always be aware that the vigor of the free enterprise system in America depends on a heritage that attaches prime importance to liberty, equality of opportunity, individual rights and dignity as well as personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership and teamwork with each individual carrying his share of the load and discharging his responsibilities to the best of his ability. Operation Free Enterprise will demonstrate that each individual's contribution, if properly utilized, will result in a profit to himself, to the employer, to the community, and to the Nation. It will further demonstrate that corporate profits will assure continued growth, prosperity, and stability, all of which are more valuable and desirable than security through handout or a welfare-state economy.

(2) To give Junior Achievers an opportunity to become good-will ambassadors and to enable them to feel firsthand the pulsebeat of international relations, especially industrial, governmental, and educational, between the United States and West Germany.

The Junior Achievers will develop a keener understanding of the importance of sincere cooperation in international relations in all areas: human relations, government, and particularly in business and industry. The Achievers will be introduced to the cultural, educational, and esthetic aspects of German life through visits and association with German businessmen and their families, and German officials. German industrialists will have an opportunity to meet personally with representatives of the junior achievement companies sponsored by their American affiliates.

(3) To reverse the emphasis teenagers are placing on benefits and security in employment.

The project will demonstrate that such attitudes contribute to a preference for a welfare-state economy and fail to develop the full potential of the individual as an employee, manager, and community leader.

(4) To maintain the high standards of performance, productivity, and prestige of the junior-achievement program.

Special emphasis will be placed on stimulating and developing personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, high attendance, punctuality on the individual and total company level, improved production techniques to result in reduction of operating costs, and aggressive and continuing safety and sales programs.

(5) To expand the learn-by-doing principle of junior achievement.

The experience of international jet air travel will demonstrate to the Junior Achievers how, under the free enterprise system, research and development in the transportation industry, and aggressive promotion, have aided international trade and communications and generally narrowed the world's horizons. Discussions with German industrialists and visits to German industries will further enhance the Achievers' understanding of international trade.

(6) To demonstrate to Junior Achievers, parents, educators, and the community at large the degree of interest which local businessmen have in our young people.

The program will demonstrate to the community that local business and industrial organizations are good neighbors, willing to help prepare young people for the day when they must accept responsibilities of business and professional leadership at home and abroad.

INCENTIVE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The board of directors of Junior Achievement of Union County has delegated responsibility for the planning and execution of Operation Free Enterprise to Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president. He will be responsible for liaison with junior achievement areas and other participating organizations.

The board of directors has named a committee to advise and assist Mr. Roden, who will also serve on the committee. Members of the Incentive Program Committee are: William M. Bristol, III, president, Bristol-Myers Products Division; John J. Conlon, vice president, Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp.; Harry P. Frank, publisher, the Daily Journal; James L. Macwithey, president, New Jersey chapter, Public Relations Society of America, Inc.; Judge Richard R. O'Connor, general counsel, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.; J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.; W. J. Sheridan, manager, Humble Oil & Refining Co.

PLANNING BY JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT ADVISERS

Operation Free Enterprise is an incentive program to encourage each junior achievement company, as well as each individual junior achiever, to maintain high standards in all phases of operations. Only junior achievement companies which meet or exceed the performance standards outlined below will qualify to nominate company members for participation in Operation Free Enterprise.

Advisers should prepare now to maintain standards in company operations which will assure that their companies will qualify, and also prepare to select outstanding junior achievers for nomination to participate in Operation Free Enterprise.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

(1) Attendance: Each junior achievement company must maintain a monthly attendance rating of not less than 85 percent. In order to be counted present, each achiever must have punched his timecard and reported to his company work area no later

than 7 p.m. Attendance record sheets signed by the company secretary and an adviser must be turned in to the program director at the end of each company meeting. In the case of those companies which do not meet at the Elizabeth Business Center, attendance forms must be mailed to Junior Achievement Headquarters in Elizabeth the day following the company meeting. Reports received by mail will be checked as to the time and date stamped on the envelope at the post office.

Achievers who fail to attend the first company meeting will be contacted by telephone. If the notice of the first meeting was received, and unless the achiever was ill, the absent achiever will be dropped from the company and a replacement assigned by junior achievement.

In the event of dropouts, and if the junior company wishes to maintain its total membership at its beginning number, replacements will be made by junior achievement up until December 1, 1962.

(2) Company meeting schedules: Each company must meet one night a week from 7 to 9 p.m. The first company meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible after junior achievement issues the membership list.

There will be no company meeting on November 22, Thanksgiving Day. Companies which wish to make up lost production and sales time may request an extra work night by contacting the program director.

There will be no official company meetings December 24 through January 1, 1963. Regular company meetings will be held starting January 2. It is strongly recommended that advisers stress the need for achievers to continue to sell their products and to maintain high individual and company sales during this Christmas vacation period.

Official company meetings cannot be canceled because of special school events such as shows, athletic tournaments, etc., or for any operating reasons such as lack of raw materials, low production schedules, or other difficulties which reflect poor planning or lack of achiever interest.

In the event of extremely bad weather, cancellation of a company meeting must be cleared with junior achievement headquarters in Elizabeth.

(3) Production: The junior company must be in production not later than the fourth company meeting.

(4) Operating plan and budget: The company must submit to junior achievement headquarters, not later than the eighth company meeting, a copy of its operating budget and profit plan which must provide for fixed company payments as outlined in the bulletin dated September 15, 1961, entitled, "Operating Procedures—Fiscal Practices."

(5) Special credits for outstanding performance: Special consideration will be given to nominees of junior achievement companies which have shown evidence of outstanding performance in any of the following areas:

(a) Exceptional improvement in any phase of company performance, through increased efficiency, cost reduction programs, sales incentive plans, safety programs, 100 percent attendance, punctuality, good housekeeping, etc.

(b) Originality of junior achievement product.

(c) Originality in any phase of company operations.

(d) Outstanding teamwork among company members.

(e) Unusually good management by company officers.

(f) High individual and company sales.

(g) High sale of stock in Operation Free Enterprise.

(6) Penalties: Although it is not anticipated that there will be any reason for imposing a penalty upon any junior achievement company, it must be emphasized that a severe penalty will be imposed upon a company in the event of an accident caused by carelessness or horseplay. Failure to pay bills, to maintain cleanup and good housekeeping requirements, may also subject a company to penalty.

NOMINATION OF ACHIEVERS

Each junior achievement company which qualified will have the privilege of nominating two members, one boy and one girl, for participation in Operation Free Enterprise. Consideration should be given only to outstanding junior achievers.

Advisers should take into consideration qualities of leadership, personal initiative, appearance, poise, ability to get along with young people and with adults. Junior achievement attendance, punctuality, attitude toward safety regulations, knowledge of junior achievement company operations, and general knowledge of the sponsoring company's operations. Also, consideration should be given to interest in and knowledge of the industrial growth and development of the countries within the European Common Market.

Advisers must bear in mind that junior achievers who are selected to participate in Operation Free Enterprise will be good-will ambassadors of our industrial and educational community, and will be guests of German businessmen and governmental leaders.

SELECTION OF ACHIEVERS

Nominations will be made on a nomination form provided by junior achievement. Four signed copies must be returned to junior achievement headquarters prior to a deadline date which will be specified by junior achievement.

All nominees will be interviewed by a panel of junior achievement officials and members of the junior achievement board of directors. They will be notified by junior achievement of the time and place of the interview.

Selection of achievers who will participate will be announced several weeks in advance of the trip date. At that time instructions will be issued on procedures to follow to obtain passports, public health certificates, etc., and writen permission of parents or guardians to make the trip to Germany.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation to Europe will be arranged by junior achievement. Advisers will be requested to assist in making satisfactory arrangements for transportation of achievers to and from the Junior Achievement Business Center. The Elizabeth Daily Journal will furnish transportation to and from Idlewild Airport.

PREPARATION OF ACHIEVERS

If a Junior Achiever from your company is selected to participate in Operation Free Enterprise, you should take full responsibility for his or her preparation to participate actively in all phases of the program.

Remember: The impression our Junior Achievers make upon radio, television and press representatives, German and American officials, and businessmen will reflect upon Junior Achievement of Union County, and our advisers, and upon our sponsoring industries.

The following points are essential. You will think of others.

(1) Be sure your achiever is thoroughly prepared to discuss the operation of his junior achievement company and, in a general way, the sponsoring company.

(2) Explain carefully to the Achiever that he will be the guest of German Government and business leaders, and will have a unique opportunity to leave with those he meets a fine impression of the American people, especially American youth.

(3) Review the questions which have been prepared for the guidance of the Achievers.

(4) Impress upon the achiever that it is common courtesy to show a sincere interest in his host's community and activities. The Achiever should ask questions.

(5) Explain the importance of good grooming. Advise the Achiever to follow instructions which will be given to him in writing with regard to dress.

(6) Explain the importance of courtesy and punctuality. Ask the Achiever to keep in mind that press, magazine, newsreel and television photographers and cameramen will be invited to take photographs throughout the trip. The Achievers must remember that these men and women have a job to do and should help them by being cooperative, punctual, and courteous.

OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

Henry Beers, chairman of the board, Aetna Affiliated Cos., Hartford, Conn.; William M. Bristol, III, president, Bristol-Myers Products Division, New York, N.Y.; Edwin Broden, president, SKF Industries, Philadelphia, Pa.; John J. Conlon, vice president, Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp., New York, N.Y.; Edward R. N. Douglass, president, New Jersey chapter, Public Relations Society of America, Inc., Elizabeth, N.J.; Frank L. Driver, president, Driver-Harris Co., Harrison, N.J.; Harry P. Frank, publisher, the Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N.J.; Alfred C. Fuller, chairman of the board, Fuller Brush Co., East Hartford, Conn.; William P. Gwinn, president, United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Conn.; James L. Macwithey, director of public relations, Bristol-Myers Co., New York, N.Y.; F. W. Norcross, treasurer, the Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Hon. Richard R. O'Connor, general counsel, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., Elizabeth, N.J.; E. Leslie Peter, international director, Tung Sol, Inc., Newark, N.J.; J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., Elizabeth, N.J.; William J. Sheridan, manager, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Linden, N.J.

SPONSORS OF JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT COMPANIES 1962-63 PROGRAM YEAR

Air Reduction Sales Co., Equipment Manufacturing Division; American Cyanamid Co.; Bristol-Myers Products Division, Bristol-Myers Co.; California Oil Co.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.; General Aniline & Film Corp.; Buick-Oldsmobile-Pontiac Assembly Division, General Motors Corp.; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Bayway Refinery; Humble Oil & Refining Co., New Jersey sales area; Hyatt Bearings Division, General Motors Corp.; Inorganic Chemicals Division, FMC Corp.; International Business Machines Corp.; the Lionel Corp.; Merck & Co., Inc.; Metal & Thermit Corp.; New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp.; Purolator Products, Inc.; Radio Corp. of America; Regina Corp.; Schering Corp.; Simmons Co.; the Singer Manufacturing Co.; the Thomas & Betts Co., Inc.; S.E. & M. Vernon, Inc.; Weston Instruments Division, Daystrom, Inc.

A Cotton Farmer Proposes Important Changes in Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the cotton industry is vitally important to Arizona and to the Nation. While cotton is now

reasonably healthy, there are storm clouds on the horizon and important legislative decisions will face the 88th Congress. Mr. R. Keith Walden, president of Farmers Investment Co., Tucson, Ariz., is an exceptionally intelligent and responsible cottongrower who is recognized in the industry as an independent, thoughtful student of cotton problems. I recently asked Mr. Walden to give me a memorandum outlining his proposals for future legislation and administrative action. His response is so thought-provoking, and his suggestions so interesting that I would like to share them with my colleagues. I commend this letter especially to the attention of the members of the Committee on Agriculture:

JANUARY 16, 1963.

Hon. MORRIS K. UDALL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: As you requested, I will endeavor to recapitulate my comments made in your office last week with reference to the raw cotton industry. First, I would like to refer to some historical background, because it is important in order to understand the cotton problem.

In 1950, the United States experienced a short crop of cotton. This was also true in other cotton-producing countries. Furthermore, world stocks of cotton had not been built up to normal figures since their depletion during the war, and demand was high. These factors resulted in a rapid rise in the price of cotton. During the year, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture issued two orders from which it took the American cotton industry a long time to recover. The orders were (1) an embargo on exports of American cotton to foreign countries and (2) establishment of a ceiling price on U.S. cotton at 45 cents per pound. The world price for about 2 years was more than 90 cents per pound.

In 1951, acreage controls were eliminated, but the world price was still high, and the shortage of supply had triggered the development of cotton production in many foreign countries. Expansion of production continued; and, in 1954, acreage controls were again imposed on the U.S. crop. By this time, the world price was substantially below the U.S. support price, and the United States had become a residual supplier. Our exports had dwindled to slightly over 2 million bales.

In 1956, American cotton was again made competitive in the world markets by an export subsidy. Exports climbed to over 7 million bales in one year. By 1960, the domestic support price had been reduced from some 34 cents to less than 30 cents per pound. Domestic consumption was expanding, synthetic fiber plants were running at 70 percent of capacity, and the future of cotton was bright in the fall of 1960.

Many interests in the old southern Cotton Belt were unhappy with cotton's new outlook. Allotments had been built up in the low-cost producing areas of the Mississippi River Delta and the irrigated West. The newly elected President did not carry the Cotton Belt of the Deep South in the presidential election of 1960. In February of 1961, the newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding strong testimony by leaders of the cotton industry, who pleaded for no increase in price support, increased the price support by more than 3 cents per pound.

After the increase in the domestic price support, Congress authorized a similar increase in the export subsidy. Notwithstanding the increase in the subsidy, the position of American cotton has continued to disintegrate, both at home and abroad, and the rate of deterioration has been accelerated in the last 12 months. Exports last year were off more than a million bales. They will be off another million bales in 1963. Domestic consumption is also off about a million bales.

U.S. textile mills are turning to synthetic fibers wherever they can, and U.S. cottongrowers have had their allotment cut 11 percent for 1963. In spite of the cut, disappearance will likely be 1½ million bales less than production in 1963. One of the principal reasons for the decline in raw cotton consumption by domestic mills has been the price disparity of 8½ cents per pound between the world price and our domestic supported price. It means that American textile mills are required to pay $42.50 more for a bale of cotton than do foreign mills. Both the cotton industry and the textile industry actively encouraged the Tariff Commission to establish an offsetting equalization fee on imported cotton goods to represent the difference in the cost of raw cotton. In September of 1962, the Tariff Commission turned down the request of the industry. On the same day, the President stated that, in view of the Tariff Commission's decision, he had instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to remedy the unfair competitive situation faced by the domestic textile industry. The cotton industry, represented by the National Cotton Council, immediately notified the President that it stood ready to cooperate with him to find a proper solution to the problem. The solution to the problem could be as follows:

1. Immediately reduce the support price on all American-grown cotton by 3 cents per pound.

2. Adopt an equalization payment system to the American textile mill to offset the difference between the support price and the world price, enabling both foreign mills and domestic mills to buy cotton at the same price.

3. Reduce the price support by 1 cent per pound per year until such time as the payment is eliminated.

4. Appropriate $15 million per year for the next 5 years for an expanded research program over and above what the industry is now doing, in order to enable the industry to: (a) lower its costs; and (b) improve its quality.

Simple arithmetic with regard to comparative costs to the Federal Government of the above program for the remainder of this decade, as opposed to the present program, are as follows:

1. Cost of present export subsidy program per year:		
(a) 5,000,000 bales at $42.50 per bale		$212,500,000
(b) Total cost next 7 years		1,487,500,000
2. Cost of proposed program to make cotton competitive:		
(a) Since domestic support price reduced 3 cents per pound, equalization payment on all production at $27.50 per bale times 13,500,000 bales estimated production	$371,250,000	
Research	15,000,000	
		386,250,000
(b) 2d year: Estimated consumption and production up to 14,500,000. Equalization payment at $22.50 per bale	326,250,000	
Research	15,000,000	
		341,250,000
(c) 3d year: Estimated consumption and production up to 15,500,000. Equalization payment at $17.50 per bale	269,250,000	
Research	15,000,000	
		284,250,000
(d) 4th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 16,000,000. Equalization payment at $12.50 per bale	200,000,000	
Research	15,000,000	
		215,000,000
(e) 5th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 16,500,000. Equalization payment at $7.50 per bale	123,750,000	
Research	15,000,000	
		138,750,000
(f) 6th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 17,000,000. Equalization payment at $2.50 per bale	42,500,000	
Research (discontinued)	0	
		42,500,000
(g) 7th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 17,500,000	(1)	----------
Total cost next 7 years		1,408,000,000

[1] No equalization payment.

To the Federal Government, the cost of the declining support price program is indicated at some $80 million less than a continued high support program with an export subsidy for the remainder of this decade. Announcement of a long-range declining support price program would discourage further expansion of production in other countries. Cotton exports would increase, providing, anually, more than half a billion dollars of additional foreign exchange, so badly needed in our balance-of-payments problem.

The alternative is a continually declining domestic consumption and a permanently subsidized export of cotton. Textile people predict that, by the end of this decade, annual domestic cotton consumption would have declined to 5 million bales or less. Acreage allotments would have been cut another 20 percent or more. To Arizona, this would mean a minimum reduction of $65 million in the gross product income to the State. Given an average multiplication of 5, the effect on the Arizona economy would be something in the order of a $325 million overall decline. Needless to say, this would be a terrible depressant on the entire Arizona economy.

The future of American-grown cotton is indeed bright, if we can solve its current problem. If we fail to do so—if we fail to make it competitive—it will likely become just a curiosity product within the next 15 years. I well realize that one of the jobs of the Secretary of Agriculture is to deliver the votes to the administration from voting citizens in the farm belt. In order to do this in the Deep South, perhaps a necessary adjunct to the declining support program outlined herein would be some sort of limited direct subsidy to producers of 10 bales or less. If so, I suggest that we do it, but I trust we will be courageous enough to do it without signing the death warrant of a great American industry.

Sincerely,

R. KEITH WALDEN.

The Fruits of 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week we heard the expected reassuring

description of foreign policy progress of the administration as the President presented his state of the Union message. Actually, the conditions existing throughout the world now, as compared to problems inherited by the New Frontier, are considerably different than described by administration propaganda.

The Chicago Sunday Tribune, January 13, contained an editorial discussing our current relations with 23 different nations. I feel it is a timely commentary on the actual relationship of the United States to these nations.

It is my hope that Members of the House will study these editorial observations, and contrast them to the explanations emanating from administration sources:

THE FRUITS OF 2 YEARS

Mr. Kennedy entered the White House 2 years ago on a tide of complaint that the image of the United States had deteriorated vastly under the Eisenhower administration and that he was going to set everything to rights in our relations with the rest of the world. The halfway point in his administration provides an appropriate opportunity to look around and see how well the prospectus has been fulfilled. A map on the front page of our "Spotlight on the World" section shows how America's troubles range across the globe.

Among the neuralgic spots, these may be noticed:

1. Cuba. After the disaster of the Kennedy supported invasion of April 1961, the President came awake in time to discover boatloads of Soviet missiles, jet bombers, and troops in Cuba. He professes to believe that Khrushchev removed the weapons. The Russian military contingents and Castro's communism remain.

2. Laos: Here Mr. Kennedy adopted the Soviet formula of ending civil war by establishing a coalition neutralist government. Today, instead of the old pro-American regime, we have a hybrid whose Communist faction curtly notifies us that even our mercy food flights to Lao mountain tribesmen will be continued at our own risk, because the Reds have not authorized the operation and will not do so until their own followers are cut in on the food.

3. South Vietnam: American military advisers have found it impossible to get South Vietnam troops to fight effectively against the Communists, and concede that Red guerrillas could win the war for the country with captured American weapons and communications equipment.

4. Cambodia: This country in southeast Asia is angry at the United States because it contends that its border is repeatedly violated by South Vietnam forces armed with American weapons.

5. Thailand: Cambodia's neighbor is equally angry because Dean Acheson, former Democratic Secretary of State, represented Cambodia in a successful action before the World Court to get possession of a disputed border temple. Thailand interpreted Acheson's activity as a sign of American hostility, because the former Secretary still sits in councils of the Kennedy administration.

6. Red China: Keeps snarling that the United States is a paper tiger and a pushover and derides Khrushchev's reminder that the paper tiger still possess nuclear teeth.

7. Korea: No resolution here of a cease-fire now 9 years old which was supposed to lead to the unification of Korea through free elections. North Korean Communists have repeatedly violated the armistice terms and created border incidents.

8. Jordan: King Hussein of this American subsidized country has recently attacked the United States for recognizing the Yemen rebel republic established with help from Russia and the United Arab Republic. Hussein charged that America was alienating her old friends in the Middle East by supporting subversive movements seeking the overthrow of established governments.

9. Morocco: The United States has lost airbases upon which it expended hundreds of millions of dollars in this country, which has proved increasingly receptive to Soviet overtures.

10. Algeria: Ben Bella, the boss, received with open arms at the White House, promptly went to Cuba, embraced Castro, and pinned a medal on him, declaring that Algeria would always be grateful for the Cuban revolutionary example and Castro's support in its own rebellion. The new Algeria has moved far to the left, toward Moscow.

11. Britain: Angry at the United States over the scrapping of the Skybolt missile which was to provide Britain's air force with nuclear striking power. At odds with the United States over its support of United Nations policy in Katanga. Also opposed to American policy in Yemen and other parts of the Middle East.

12. Belgium: Angry with the United States over the Congo, a former Belgian territory, with anti-American demonstrations in Brussels.

13. Holland: Angry that the United States provided the motive force in compelling the Netherlands to hand over West New Guinea to Indonesia in a bloodless surrender after reneging on a declaration by the late Secretary of State Dulles that America would not permit President Sukarno to achieve this steal.

14. Indonesia: Despite American appeasement at the expense of Holland, mobs wrecked the American consulate, the consul's residence, and the United States Information Agency office in Surabaya. The Indonesia Foreign Minister described the violence as a protest against United States policy toward Cuba.

15. France: President De Gaulle continued to be scornful of the U.N., standoffish about NATO, persistent in his intention to make France an independent nuclear power, and antagonistic toward the Congo policy supported in the U.N. by the United States.

16. Spain: Difficulties were developing in negotiations over the continuance of American bases in this country.

17. Portugal: The Lisbon government was angry over America's policy in the Congo, its support of anti-colonialist activities in U.N. against Angola and other Portuguese-African possessions, and was backing away from extension of existing agreements governing American air bases in the Azores.

18. Canada: During the Cuban crisis, when a full alert against attack was declared by the North American Air Defense Command, Canada refused to honor its commitments to arm planes with nuclear weapons and send them to forward bases. It continues to trade with Cuba and to ship great quantities of grain to Red China and other Communist countries, ignoring Washingtons embargoes.

19. Mexico: Is tepid about the American hard line toward Cuba and protects open Communist activities to win over the landless and to infiltrate and propagandize Latin neighbors.

20. Brazil: President Goulart, despite economic bribes by Robert Kennedy, brother of the President, has expropriated American investments, obtained a mandate for virtual dictatorial rule, made trade deals with the Communists, supported Castro in the Organization of American States, and is angry that the United States has not handed over blank checks through the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Kennedy's creation to bring progress and reform to Latin America.

21. Guatemala: Angered over American refusal to support a more forceful policy against Cuba, this country now announces a new policy toward Castro and has ordered the arrest of an anti-Castro leader.

22. Pakistan: Angry with the United States because of arms aid to India in its border war with Red China, fearful that these arms will be turned against Pakistan, but mollified in part by America's action to persuade India to reopen discussions on disputed Kashmir.

23. India: Still nonalined in the cold war despite the Communist Chinese border invasion and American military and economic aid to Nehru. After 1 day of negotiations on Kashmir, Nehru remained as recalcitrant as ever, announcing there was nothing to negotiate.

If we have come anywhere in Mr. Kennedy's first 2 years, the progress is all but invisible. The world is in a muddle, the threats remain, and we are nowhere greatly loved.

California Defense Dollars Go National

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, six of the larger California defense contractors recently reported to the California Defense Industries Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce procurement data covering the national pattern of their relations with suppliers and vendors for articles, materials, and services.

This compilation of the data is on an annual basis for the various corporate fiscal patterns ending in the 1961–62 period, the most recently available data in each case. Each reporting corporation carries on an intensive procurement and contracting program aimed at the widest possible participation nationally, and in each case a main facet of the total program is the determination that small business receive an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts for articles, materials, and services of all kinds.

California defense contractors are doing business in 49 States with all kinds of enterprises from the local hardware store to the giants of industry. Truly, California defense dollars go national.

The six reporting California defense contractors listed $1,608,646,403 in dollars expended in 49 States and the District of Columbia to suppliers and vendors of articles, materials, and services.

Principal States receiving the impact of the California national procurement effort are:

	Percent of total	California dollars
New York	7.976	$128,310,653
Connecticut	6.679	107,441,173
New Jersey	5.555	89,301,969
Ohio	5.252	84,492,287
Massachusetts	3.476	55,919,997
Illinois	2.775	44,645,064
Pennsylvania	2.627	42,263,470

In reporting for this study the companies that reported small business data revealed 37 percent of California procurement dollars to small business; 63 percent of California procurement dollars to large business. By comparison, only 17.7 percent was the national average to small business for fiscal 1962.

The accompanying table shows a percentage breakdown by State of the total procurements reported expended in each State. Truly, California defense dollars go national.

California defense dollars go national—50-State breakdown

	California dollars	Percent of total [1]
Alabama	$1,344,433	0.0835
Alaska		
Arizona	23,716,937	1.4743
Arkansas	395,811	.0246
California	797,918,465	49.6018
Colorado	3,962,904	.2463
Connecticut	107,441,173	6.6789
Delaware	1,496,125	.0929
District of Columbia	1,305,904	.0811
Florida	4,967,319	.3087
Georgia	551,727	.0343
Hawaii	3,517	.0002
Idaho	604,963	.0376
Illinois	44,645,064	2.7753
Indiana	19,648,982	1.2214
Iowa	17,970,482	1.1170
Kansas	211,286	.0131
Kentucky	809,603	.0503
Louisiana	108,463	.0067
Maine	226,251	.0140
Maryland	14,535,750	.9036
Massachusetts	55,919,997	3.4762
Michigan	20,097,718	1.2493
Minnesota	26,262,741	1.6326
Mississippi	431,108	.0267
Missouri	6,978,319	.4337
Montana	8,715	.0005
Nebraska	1,336,837	.0831
Nevada	754,349	.0468
New Hampshire	1,848,212	.1148
New Jersey	89,301,969	5.5513
New Mexico	61,613	.0038
New York	128,310,653	7.9762
North Carolina	1,659,208	.1031
North Dakota	13	
Ohio	84,492,287	5.2523
Oklahoma	3,113,109	.1935
Oregon	6,161,125	.3829
Pennsylvania	42,263,470	2.6272
Rhode Island	1,318,214	.0819
South Carolina	1,004,239	.0624
South Dakota	7,820	.0004
Tennessee	3,158,943	.1960
Texas	41,356,271	2.5708
Utah	496,782	.0308
Vermont	2,208,153	.1372
Virginia	21,325,616	1.3257
Washington	8,919,560	.5545
West Virginia	1,654,813	.1028
Wisconsin	16,270,490	1.0114
Wyoming	58,900	.0036
Total	1,608,646,403	

[1] Will not total 100 percent because of rounding.

Statement in Support of the Establishment of Federal Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 I introduced a bill (H.R. 258) to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks. During the past few Congresses I have been joined by several of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Banking and Currency in introducing similar legislation. In the past these bills have been introduced for the purpose of allowing study of their provisions. This year the bill is being introduced for consideration and, hopefully, early action.

The basic idea of the proposed legislation is to authorize the granting of Federal charters to mutual savings banks. At present this fine thrift system operates solely under charters granted by 18 of our States. It is most appropriate that this legislation be considered during the current year that marks the centennial of the establishment of the dual banking system for commercial banks. Savings and loan associations also have the opportunity to obtain either Federal or State charters. So do credit unions. The passage of this legislation would bring the mutual savings banking industry with its $45 billion of assets into the fold of dual banking.

Mutual savings banks have a long and honored history of stability in this country. The first such banks in the United States were established in the early 1800's in Philadelphia and Boston. They provided a useful facility to encourage people of moderate means to open and maintain savings accounts. Their savings in turn have been invested by the bank in useful community projects in order to earn income adequate to pay an attractive rate of interest return to the savers.

I shall not at this time go into detail but it is a matter of interest that where mutual savings banks exist, the per capita rate of savings has been higher than in places that lack mutual savings bank facilities. It is also interesting to note that in the areas where mutual savings banks are located, the interest rates charged for lending money on home mortgages and other investments are among the lowest in the Nation. Mutual savings banks exist today in 18 States and one possession. Yet their benefits extend far beyond the borders of the States in which they are located because they invest in out-of-State mortgages and other obligations. The passage of the proposed legislation will enable all sections of the country to enjoy to a fuller extent the many benefits that flow from mutual savings bank operations.

Previous bills on this subject matter have received favorable comment from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the past has stated that the proposal deserves careful consideration. The Commission on Money and Credit, a private group of financial experts, has also recommended that Federal charters be authorized for mutual savings banks. It is understood that this position is also being adopted by the Committee on Financial Institutions, a Presidential group appointed to study the recommendations of the Commission on Money and Credit. The National Association of Home Builders, an organization with understandable interest in the increase of home construction, has added its endorsement to the proposed legislation.

The study of this proposal is also underway in several Federal agencies in addition to those named above. Their reports on the legislation may be expected to be received at an appropriate time. Many leaders in the savings and loan industry have expressed their support of the proposal to grant Federal charters to mutual savings banks. Last session, immediately following instruction of the bill, leading savings and loan executives commented favorably on the bill. I would like at this point to reinsert those remarks in the RECORD.

In the Midwest, Mr. A. D. Theobald, president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., made the following observations on October 3:

For the past year or so, several other savings and loan industry representatives and I have had an opportunity to work closely with mutual savings banking leaders in the preparation of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks. Many of the ideas suggested by savings and loan leaders, arising from their intimate experience with the field of thrift and home financing, have found expression in the Federal mutual savings bank bill being introduced in both Houses of Congress today. I believe that upon careful study, others in the savings and loan industry will find this proposed law to be of interest to them as well as advancing the public interest. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the savings and loan industry.

In the South, Mr. Wallace O. DuVall, president of the Atlanta Federal Savings & Loan Association of Atlanta, Ga., stated:

I am pleased to note that a revised Federal mutual savings bank bill has been introduced in Congress. As one always interested in making the thrift institution I serve more useful to the community, I have watched closely the development of the plan for Federal charters for mutual savings banks, because of the opportunity it offers for increased service for mutual thrift institutions. Many savings and loan leaders have outlined suggestions for building an extremely strong institutional system for savings through the combined patronage of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. These ideas have been incorporated in the bill introduced today. It is my hope that serious study will be given to this proposal.

In the New England area, Mr. James E. Bent, president of the Hartford Federal Savings & Loan Association in Hartford, Conn., and former president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, recalled that in 1960 he had encouraged then Senator Prescott Bush, Republican of Connecticut, to support legislation authorizing Federal charters for mutual savings banks. Said Mr. Bent:

I am happy to see a revised version of a Federal mutual savings bank bill introduced at this time. The savings and loan industry will now have an opportunity to study the proposed legislation before it is reintroduced with the prospect of early Congressional hearings in 1963.

From the far south, Mr. Oscar R. Kreutz, chairman of the board and president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of St. Petersburg, Fla., and past president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, and chair-

man of its legislative committee, asserted that the new Federal mutual savings bank bill offers a fine opportunity to those interested in the mutual thrift industry to give some deep thought to the future of that industry. Mr. Kreutz said:

This new bill contains many ideas combining the best features of the savings and loan and mutual savings bank industries. It should serve as an excellent vehicle to prompt thrift and hon finance leaders to consider the best means of developing mutual thrift institutions in a way that will best serve their communities.

I would also like to insert at this point recent speeches on this subject delivered by Mr. A. D. Theobald, president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., and Mr. Morris D. Crawford, Jr., president, the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, N.Y.:

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

(Address by A. D. Theobald, president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Peoria, Ill., at the 16th midyear meeting, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, December 4, 1962, New York City)

BUSINESSMAN, AUTHOR, TEACHER, SCHOLAR

Excerpts from the introduction of Mr. Theobald by John W. Kress, president, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks: "Our guest speaker is a businessman, author, teacher and scholar—a combination hard to beat. He holds degrees from the University of Akron and from Northwestern University. He has taught economics and real estate financing for more than three decades. He is the author of basic textbooks on the savings and loan and the real estate industries. For 8 years he was director of education and research for the American Savings & Loan Institute. From 1935 to 1946 he was on the executive staff of the United States Savings & Loan League—first as assistant vice president and later as vice president. In 1934 he put his academic theories into practice by becoming vice president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago. In 1946 he became president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill.[1] He is presently a member of the legislative committee of the United States Savings & Loan League and he serves on the task force of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Also, he has worked with representatives of both savings and loan and our savings bank industry to develop a sound legislative basis for a united and nationwide thrift system."

I want to visit with you about some things that are close to my heart, and which I think maybe are close to your hearts.

I'd like for a moment to stroke my long gray beard and take a throwback some 31 years to the summer of 1931, and my first contact—actually the first time I was really conscious of the fact that there was such a thing as a mutual savings bank.

In July of that year, I had been hired to work for the American Savings and Loan Institute—actually for the United States Savings & Loan League. I went to work for them because I had to eat. Nineteen hundred and thirty-one, the year in which I had been awarded a master's degree, was not an easy time to get a job. My intention then was to work only during the summer and continue work on a Ph. D. that fall and eventually wind up teaching at the collegiate level.

Well, that was changed in about 2 months for two reasons: One of them, I found the work fascinating; the other was, I got married, and continuing to hold a regular salaried job became of real importance.

In August of that year, the United States Savings & Loan League convention was held in Philadelphia. Several things stand out in connection with that convention. One of them was that the secretary treasurer of the league, who kept whatever statistics there were, was able to announce that in the year 1930 (and the figures were just out in the summer of 1931), the total assets of the savings and loan business had increased. And the second one, pertinent to the savings bank business, was that in the year 1930 the total assets of the savings and loan business had for the first time passed the total assets of the mutual savings bank business.

Well, I was on the staff of the national organization, and we corrected that whole situation real quickly. The total assets of the savings and loan business decreased for approximately 8 years until they got down to something under $6 billion. They stayed under the total assets of the mutual savings bank business for some 15 years beyond that period.

The next occasion that I had to look at the mutual savings bank business was in 1934. John Kress has referred to the fact that I became vice president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago in that year. That was a newly chartered Federal savings and loan association, organized primarily by Morton Bodfish, the executive vice president of the United States Savings & Loan League. I recall that in rounding up a group of outstanding citizens in Chicago to be directors of that association, he received a letter from one gentleman whose name many of you, I'm sure, would recall, asking what are the prospects for this sort of operation—savings and loan association—in Chicago. Morton asked me to prepare a reply for him. I prepared a rather long reply, and I said it seemed to me very probable that the total assets of that institution would in our lifetime pass a hundred million dollars.

SAVINGS BANK BASIS FOR FORECAST

The reasoning I applied to it was first the record of the mutual savings banks in the major mutual savings banking cities. That record suggested that this type of institution could have that sort of performance. So also did the record of the building societies in Great Britain, where they had long been substantial organizations.

I know Morton didn't believe that, but he was busy, and he didn't have time to argue with me—and he sent the letter out. It wasn't a very good guess because although I expect to have a further lifetime, the assets of the First Federal of Chicago are now around $400 million.

I bring this out because in 1933 it seemed to me that there was such a close relationship between the operation of mutual savings banks and mutual savings and loan associations that the performance of one could well be a pattern for the performance of the other.

TWO PERIODS COMPARED

I'd like to take you back to 1931–34 for reasons other than my own personal recollection of them. It seems to me that the period that we are now in, the period, let's say, of 1962 through 1964, in many, many ways resembles that crisis period in the middle part of the depression. That was a period of flux, crisis, danger, change—but the thing to emphasize is that it was also a period of opportunity; a period of opportunity missed in some cases, seized and taken advantage of in others. To a very substantial extent, the question of whether or not opportunity in the changing world of the financial systems of that time was seized or missed rested on the dynamics of trade association leadership.

By trade association leadership, I don't mean just the typical service that we all expect from a trade association, but the leadership which is inherent in the staff of the association itself: developing ideas, concepts, programs—and carrying them through. There are dynamics to that sort of leadership which I see at the present time and which seem to me very significant.

Let's start first with the Federal Home Loan Bank System, which grew out of the President's Conference on Home Ownership called by President Hoover in October of 1931.

As nearly as I can recall, the savings bank industry took very little part in the legislative struggle which took place with regard to the Federal home loan bank system. Among other things, mutual savings banks were integral parts of the American Bankers Association; the ABA opposed the Federal home loan bank idea. The bankers were not too popular, and they were not very effective. The most effective opposition came from the insurance companies using the Mortgage Bankers Association as their particular vehicle.

The push that carried it forward in the private industry field was the United States Savings and Loan League. Now I want to point out to you something that very few people know, because there are not too many of us left who had an active part at that time: at this same United States League convention in Philadelphia in the fall of 1931, a committee report which had been the result of a good many years' study, advocating a Federal home loan bank system of some kind, and advocating a system of Federal savings and loan associations, was rejected by the convention membership by a rather substantial majority. The savings and loan business was not, in itself, pushing for a Federal home loan bank system. But within 6 months, the development of a Federal home loan bank system was a principal activity of its trade association.

SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE STRATEGY

Let's carry on for 1 more year, the year in which the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp. was created. At the executive committee, which was the broad policy group of our national trade association, the leadership of the organization never permitted a vote on the question of whether we should or should not have a system of insurance of accounts for savings and loan associations. The discussion was pointed entirely toward the question of what, if we had to have one, the nature of the system would be. After all, the FDIC already had been enacted. The question discussed was what would be the nature of the savings account insurance corporation that might be set up.

Mutual savings banks, of course, had little interest in the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. So far as they felt that insurance of accounts was useful, they found it through the FDIC, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation became entirely a savings and loan vehicle.

One year later there came the opportunity to develop a Federal system of savings and loan associations. By this time, while there was some real difference of opinion as to the advisability, that difference of opinion was not so effective as to be found in any official position. The development of a system of Federal savings and loan associations was definitely a part of the program of the United States Savings and Loan League.

Now, How many of you know what follows? It was not widely discussed anywhere in the industry. The home mortgage system of the country was prostrate. It became a matter of administration direction to the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board that something should be done about it; some vehicle should be created to revive the home

[1] First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., has assets of $93,008,332.

mortgage market throughout the country. The mutual savings bank industry was first approached to see whether it would be interested and would sponsor the development of a system of Federal mutual savings and mortgage institutions.

SAVINGS BANKS MISSED OPPORTUNITY

They were not interested. Then the savings and loan associations had their opportunity. Up to that time, the idea of a dual system in financial systems was, of course, confined to the commercial banking system. We now had a dual system of financial institutions in the savings and loan field also.

Here I think that some of the things that a dual system—and I emphasize first the Federal part of it because it was the new part—did for our business.

Let me say that, prior to that time, operating under different laws in 48 States, it was hard to say that there was a system of savings and loan associations. There was terrific diversity in name, in practice—in almost anything that you could use to describe a savings and loan association.

The federal system gave us an opportunity to develop common terminology, to borrow from the practices and the laws of the most advanced States—and for the first time in a way that would not have been possible in any other way—to develop a modern savings and loan association; at least modern in its time.

It brought compulsory insurance of accounts to those institutions that chose to and could operate under Federal charter, and insurance of accounts was vital to the restoration of confidence in our business. It brought full time operation of thrift institutions to many States where part time operation had been characteristic before.

And I think it brought the full advantage of the dual charter system to all savings and loan associations throughout the country. From that time on there wasn't exactly competition between them, the State-chartered system and the Federal-chartered system, but there was constant progress, first on the one side and then on the other. In some States a modernizing factor would be followed by the Federals, then followed by other States—all the very real advantages, including continual modern community service, that the dual system is supposed to bring.

POSTWAR GROWTH OF INDUSTRY

Since the war, all financial institutions have grown fantastically. Commercial banks have grown, dollar-wise, more than any other type of financial institution. But by, I suppose, 1955, the end of that period of growth, insofar as it came from the commercial or demand deposit side of the business, was in sight. After all, the growth of a demand deposit, money-creating system is limited by the monetary needs of the country, and we had had an adequate development of the strictly commercial banking, money-creating side of our financial system.

Insurance companies grew. Mutual savings banks grew, and very substantially. I'm willing to bet that few of you 15 years ago could have forecast within even a reasonable percentage the amount of your growth during the past 15 years. Savings and loan associations grew, and they grew much more rapidly than did the mutual savings banks.

Part of this faster growth was due to the fact that they were operating all over the United States, in a much broader field. Sometimes we like to attribute at least a part of that growth to the fact that we felt that we had pretty vigorous, aggressive management. But basically, it seems to me that the savings and loan associations grew because they were fulfilling a fundamental national need.

The tremendous increase in home building and home ownership after the war necessitated the development of vast amounts of capital. I don't think anyone foresaw how much, immediately after the war. The institutions that were set up and specialized in that field had to grow, and if they hadn't, some other type of setup to do the same sort of job would have had to be created.

We have a busy time, and I really didn't have much time to pay attention to the mutual savings bank business until about 3 years ago. I think my attitude toward your great industry at that time would have been fairly typical of that of a great many savings and loan managers. It was something like this: I didn't even realize that John deLaittre had a big mutual savings bank in Minneapolis. I was barely conscious that there was a substantial mutual savings bank in Cleveland. But basically I thought the nearest mutual savings bank to my city of Peoria was 500 miles to the east and 2,000 miles to the west, and that was a real good place for them.

THRIFT INDUSTRIES BEGIN TO CONVERGE

As I did think of them and began to see how closely our two types of institutions were growing together, I still liked our emphasis on purpose, mainly of home financing, as contrasted to what I conceived to be your emphasis on purpose, mainly the development of thrift. And I concluded rationally, whether correctly or not, that our emphasis on purpose in home financing was more likely to survive than an emphasis on the development of thrift because there were so many places where people could save money, and there were not so many places that really specialized in this growing demand for home financing.

For some reason, however, about that time—3 or 4 years ago—I subscribed to your national publication and started reading it. One of the first articles that I read, and it is still very much in my mind, was an analysis by a student of your field of the extent to which a mutual savings bank could take advantage of membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank system and could take advantage of the advance powers—the securing of money and the repayment of that money—from and to Federal home loan banks. The thing that impressed me was, that was exactly what the First Federal of Peoria had been doing for more than 10 years.

If that sort of financial policy seemed reasonable to a student in your business, it seemed to me that mutual savings banks might be much more like what I was doing than I had previously supposed.

TAX FIGHT UNITES THRIFT INDUSTRIES

About that time some disturbing elements started entering into all of our pictures. Mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations became very conscious of the fact that we had a real common enemy—an enemy which, using the taxing power of the Federal Government, had set out to, if not destroy us, certainly to clip our wings. I felt then, and I feel now, that the tax fight which was concluded this year was never an end in itself, at least in the minds of a great many of the people in the commercial banking business, but rather a means to a more basic objective. It became apparent that you and I had a lot of things in common if we were going to see anything like a reasonably satisfactory settlement of that issue.

Another disturbing fact was that it became apparent that there were some pretty slippery customers in the savings and loan business and that more and more we were receiving publicity of a type which was certainly not desirable from the point of view of a good many of us.

With that background, about 3 years ago, I happened to be one of the rather small group of savings and loan managers on whom this idea of a Federal charter for mutual savings banks was tried out. I'll be frank to say my first reaction was a very hostile one.

However, I was exposed to about as effective a group of salesmen as I have ever encountered anywhere. You will agree when I identify them. Those salesmen were Rusty Crawford, John deLaittre, and Grover Ensley. They were so effective that they made me and some other savings and loan managers examine this whole question carefully, as much as possible away from our original prejudice. We learned some things.

We learned, for example, that there were substantial degrees of difference in the operations and concepts of some mutual savings banks, that they were not nearly identical in concept and type of organization. We knew that that was true of the savings and loan business—that there were real differences in the point of view and the operation of the different savings and loans.

DIFFERENCES IN INSTITUTIONS

We learned that there are some savings and loan associations more like some mutual savings banks than they are like some other savings and loan associations, and that the same thing was true on the mutual savings bank side of the picture. This ran through a great many things, including your relations with your depositors or our members; your concept of trusteeship as related to what many of us feel is the fiduciary relationship of the directors and management of a savings and loan association. I became convinced that I could operate First Federal of Peoria under the mutual savings bank charter of a good many States and not really tell very much difference, and that a good many of your managers could operate their institutions under a Federal savings and loan charter and not really tell a lot of difference; and that both of us could operate under a Federal mutual savings bank charter, as it is conceived in the law now introduced, and not tell very much difference in day-to-day operations—that the only real difference on both sides would be a wider concept of services.

So it seems to me that, as in 1931, we have in 1962 an opportunity, a great opportunity for modernization, for renewed development, for redirection in expanded service under the Federal savings bank law as we in the savings and loan business had under the Federal savings and loan law 31 years ago.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PARTNERSHIP

It isn't often that we get an opportunity as I have had in one generation to have two chances like that. I believe that the mutual savings bank business and at least a substantial portion of the savings and loan business does have a situation in which it can and should be partners in progress, and that we also run the risk of being partners in liquidation.

There are some great forces operating in the financial systems of our country which affect that conclusion, which I'll grant is a personal one on my part. Rusty Crawford mentioned some of them. But some others occur to me.

One of them is the emphasis on national economic growth. That is not a partisan matter. It is not confined to either Republicans or Democrats. A great many people in this country—I suppose all—feel that it would be desirable if the rate of economic development in this country were more rapid. We are distressed by unemployment. We are distressed by the fact that we are not making maximum use of our economic resources.

We are convinced that there are going to continue to be efforts to do something about that, and that they will be primarily Federal efforts. To a major extent, Federal vehicles will be used to implement them.

We are confronted with great national flows of capital, and changing demands in these flows of capital. The commercial banks can adjust to those changes much more easily, much more rapidly than can we, and it seems to me important that we do what we can to be a part of those adjustments.

We are involved in the economic forces inherent in the vast movements of people on a regional basis and into urban and suburban areas within regions. They create capital demands far beyond what we have ever experienced before. This requires constant adjustment on the part of the institutions that are to serve them.

Again I return to the dynamics of trade association activity. We are confronted—and possibly the nation is assisted—by the dynamics of the American Bankers Association. That organization is a vastly different one than it was 8 or 10 years ago. You know that it is a tremendously more dynamic one represented by dynamic personalities and dynamic programs.

INFLUENCE OF THE COMPTROLLER

We see the Comptroller of the Currency taking an active part in the program for the development of the commercial banking system, more active, it seems to me, than any other supervisory authority that I have yet seen, and active in the development of the national banking system.

The Saxon report can develop a great many differences of opinion, but it's going to be referred to, and it's going to have influence. The Committee for Economic Development and its Monetary Commission have recognized the fact of change and have made recommendations as to very basic changes. Those we cannot ignore.

In connection with these changes, where they affect our system, where they affect the commercial banking system, we have a responsibility to present our concept of the public interest and to present it as effectively as we possibly can.

We see changing attitudes with regard to the merger of financial institutions. We see changing attitudes with regard to branch policies. There is no part of the financial system at which you can look without being conscious that we are being swept along by some real fundamental changes in thinking.

The question is: Will we see these changes as an opportunity, or will we be swept along blindly by them? Will we help direct them?

Part of this picture, it seems to me, lies in the nature of the commercial banking system. My opinion is that the commercial banking system is a deadly enemy of the thrift institutions, although only in part as the result of a conscious purpose of some individuals. Of course, it's perfectly obvious that some individuals in the commercial banking business seek the elimination of your type of institution and of my type of institution.

COMMERCIAL BANK HISTORY CITED

But beyond that, it is the nature of the commercial banking business to engulf and submerge and eventually get rid of other types of institutions in the fields of activity in which that system takes an important interest. May I remind you that trust companies, beginning in the 1870's, were very important as independent types of institutions; that the national banks were not permitted to have trust departments until as recently as 1913; that very few State banks were permitted to have trust departments until after that time.

Since the enactment of that legislation in 1913, the independent trust business is no longer of any significance; it is a part of the commercial banking system.

Industrial banks, designed specifically for true consumer financing, began to be significant around 1911. Commercial banks were uninterested in the field. Subsequently they became interested and the independent industrial bank is almost gone. The possibilities of very much the same sort of development are inherent in our type of institutions emphasizing thrift and home financing.

This whole situation creates a great mutual interest between your industry and mine. We must find some more effective means of working together to take advantage of opportunities on the one hand and to protect the mutual thrift and home financing idea to which we are all dedicated on the other hand.

We can work together. The tax fight indicated that we can and that we have worked together effectively. However, it seemed to me that on a number of occasions during the past 2 years, it was really a nip-and-tuck proposition as to whether we could keep that unity of interest. To a very great extent the fact that we were able to maintain it rested on the broad and compatible personalities of a rather limited number of people on the staffs of our two great national organizations.

I hope that that will continue. But it does seem to me that it is something on which we should not wholly rely. We must be thinking of how we can make more certain that, in the great fields in which we do have completely mutual interests, we will have a vehicle—some type of organization for working together.

LOCAL COOPERATION IMPORTANT

That question goes to other levels; it goes to the State level and it goes to the city level where there are both of our types of institutions operating together. As an old pro in the trade association field, I know that at that level the problems of working together are more difficult. You are really close to the individual, competitive problem. But I submit to you what I think is the case, that in a given city or a given State, the competition between mutual savings banks on the one hand is more vigorous than their competition with savings and loan associations, and that the competition between savings and loan associations—between themselves—is more vigorous, frequently more personal, than is the competition between the mutual savings banks and the savings and loan associations.

We find ways of having competitive institutions work together for common purposes under the same type of charter in our city and State organizations. I wonder if we can't be giving some thought to a more effective way of having those under different if similar charters work together at city, State, and National levels. Convinced as I am of the importance of dynamic trade association leadership, it seems imperative that we start evolving some way of doing that.

The last thing I'd like to visit with you about is the importance of membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System. Not very many mutual savings banks belong. I can tell you that for every reason that mutual savings banks have for not joining the system, many savings and loan associations have had exactly the same reasons. However, over a period of time economic forces have brought membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System almost universally, so far as savings and loan associations are concerned. I think that this might very well be true so far as mutual savings banks go.

BANKS STAKE IN FHLB SYSTEM MEMBERSHIP

It has been suggested that you join the system to show how interested you are in the Federal charter idea. I think that's important. But I'd like to submit that there are other reasons, maybe more important, that go to the heart of the welfare of your bank and of its depositors; that go really to the immediate interests of your institutions.

All of you, like all of us in the savings and loan business, have a responsibility of providing liquidity to take care of the needs and maybe merely the willful demands of our depositors or savings account holders. All of us have, as a part of our liquidity policies, some assets which could be earning at a higher rate, except that we have to make provision for this unknown emergency.

Membership in the Federal home loan bank is not going to take that responsibility from you, but I think it can help your planning, and therefore the administration of your portfolio assets, if you do have this access to emergency liquidity. Certainly pooled access to the capital markets in an emergency is likely to be much more effective than that of the individual institution.

You, like us, have seasonal flows of money. You, like us, have times when the savings are coming in more rapidly just for seasonal reasons than the outward flow of funds in connection with your lending and investment opportunities. We, in the savings and loan business, have learned to use the Federal Home Loan Bank System to make adjustments to those facts.

You, like us, have cyclical flows. Your net inflow of deposits or savings is relatively low at a period of high mortgage and other loan demands; you must necessarily restrict the amount that you can put into earning assets at a higher earning rate than you will find at any other phase of the cycle because that's the period in which relatively your savings are down. Like us, you've witnessed the other part of that picture. When your mortgage demand and other loan demands are relatively down, and rates are relatively low, you have the most money to invest.

And you can't very well adjust it through the security portfolio because in the period when you need the money your bond accounts are selling at the lowest figures and at the period when you don't need the money, when you are investing, they are at the highest figures. That is an automatic loss situation.

This is the sort of analysis which I encountered in one of your publications some years ago. It points to the way in which we at First Federal Savings of Peoria have been using the Home Loan Bank system for a long time. It helped us to have a more productive policy in connection with our entire investment, mortgage, and security portfolios.

Membership in the bank system would make you somewhat less dependent on the commercial banking system, and I think that generally is desirable.

BROAD APPEAL OF FEDERAL CHARTERS

Now, may I refer for a moment to the Federal charter idea. I don't know whether I have indicated strongly enough my belief that this idea is vital to the development of your business. I think it is vital to the continued development of the mutual thrift idea—either savings and loan or savings banks.

I think it is a vehicle which many of you could use. I think it is a vehicle which many savings and loan associations could use. The strength of my convictions goes to this: If the Federal charter law is adopted in approximately its present form, the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria will convert to a Federal mutual savings bank charter. That is not merely the irresponsible opinion of its president. It is the considered judgment of its board of directors, who have been kept rather constantly informed of the developments in this area; and it seems to me the benefits to the whole central Illinois area, to our members, as we call them now, our depositors as we would call them then, are so obvious that there would be no question about our members concurring in that decision should the opportunity come.

Maybe there has been some reason why the president of a little savings and loan

association in the Midwest should visit with you. I know that my contact and experience with your business has been a most enlightening one to me. It has, I think, made me a better president of a savings and loan association, and—if, as the result of this conversation, I never see you again—it's been nice knowing you.

FEDERAL CHARTERS NOW

(Address by Morris D. Crawford, Jr., president, the Bowery Savings Bank, New York City, at the 16th midyear meeting, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, December 4, 1962, New York City)

MORRIS D. CRAWFORD, JR.

(Mr. Crawford, who is now in his 4th year as chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of NAMSB, has been in the forefront of activity on behalf of Federal charters for mutual savings banks since the current legislative effort got underway in the summer of 1958. He serves on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Task Force, composed of both savings and loan and savings bank leaders, and he has worked with representatives of both industries to develop a sound legislative basis for a united nationwide thrift system.)

On October 2 and 3, a Federal mutual savings bank bill was introduced in the Congress for the third successive year. I am delighted at these tangible results of our long years of effort. In previous years, we have proceeded deliberately. Our approach has been one of caution, of probing. We wanted to test the reactions of Government agencies and of the other financial industries and associations; we were always mindful of the demands of the tax struggle; we wanted to provide time for the study of this legislation; we wanted to gather our allies; and we wanted to identify our opponents.

This process, I am happy to announce, has now been largely completed. The opinions of all interested groups have been sought. Based on the results obtained, the board of directors of the association believes that we are ready to present our case to the Congress. This belief is shared by the congressional sponsors of this legislation. They have counseled us that the legislative climate is favorable and that if we are serious and determined in our purpose—the time to proceed is now.

But even absent this generous counseling—we have only to consult the evidence of our own senses. No banker today needs a seismograph to detect the rumblings of change in the entire banking industry. The commercial banking industry is making its massive presence felt in the savings and mortgage markets. The savings and loan industry, faced with this new competitive pressure, is chafing at its narrow statutory bonds. The Comptroller of the Currency and the State supervisors are confronting one another in a controversy the results of which may change the entire profile of American banking.

Gentlemen, the winds of change have blown through banking once before in our time—the early 1930's—and while they raged, the savings bank industry rode out the gale at anchor, moored in the good ship "Status Quo." That ship is now as obsolete as the *Bounty*. We cannot afford to remain immobile this time. We can and must become part of the reorganization and modernization of the Nation's financial system through achieving our goal of Federal chartering.

In our efforts we will find that we are not alone. The Commission on Money and Credit, established to review the Nation's monetary and credit structure, has completed its studies. Its position on Federal charters is one of unequivocal support. In his 1962 economic report to the Congress, the President characterized the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Money and Credit as deserving of careful consideration by the Congress, the Executive, and the public. It is important to note that the President has established a Committee on Financial Institutions composed of 11 key members of the administration to consider changes in Federal policy that will promote stability, growth, and efficiency of private financial institutions. The Federal chartering of mutual savings banks is included in the agenda of this committee. It is hoped that the committee will favor Federal chartering of mutual savings banks when it submits its recommendations to the President shortly.[1]

FEDERAL AGENCY SUPPORT

The Veterans' Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency are also in favor of Federal charters for mutual savings banks. During the last year the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, originally opposed to the bill, has now indicated its informal approval. Chairman Joseph P. McMurray of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has stated that the task force which he appointed to advise him on a wide scope of issues has given its support to the idea of Federal charters for mutual savings banks. The Federal Reserve Board has agreed that the idea merits careful study.

We have received the support of that great American trade group, the National Association of Home Builders.

The findings of a study by an academic team at the University of Chicago strongly support the economic advantages of extending mutual savings banking beyond its present confines.

The National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, which has repeatedly emphasized its support of dual banking, will maintain, we would trust, a neutral position on this national issue.

Perhaps the most heartening development of the last 2 years has been the work of the savings and loan and savings bank exchange groups—unofficial committees composed of savings bankers and savings and loan executives. This group has worked hard and long, and in an atmosphere of growing understanding and alliance, to perfect a Federal mutual savings bank bill which would combine the best features of both our industries. I would like you to know that the Federal mutual savings bank bill now before the Congress represents invaluable contributions from our savings and loan friends. These men, although not official representatives of the savings and loan trade associations, are important figures in their industry, and they are men committed to the goal of a new, united thrift system through Federal mutual savings banks.

At this gathering of savings bankers, I do not believe that I need review at any length the merits of this legislation for our own industry and its depositors—the increased growth it offers, the greater access to national forums through which we may hope at last to be able to aid in determining the outlines of our future, the potential ability a Federal charter bill will give us to respond to oppressive supervisory practices and the enjoyment of 20th-century powers for 20th-century institutions.

WHY FEDERAL CHARTERS

To persons other than savings bankers, however, I would also urge the suport of this bill on the following grounds:

First. A system of Federal mutual savings banks would result in an increased and evenly distributed flow of savings, savings which will become the ultimate source of that capital expansion so necessary to meet the demands of our country and the competitive challenge of the Common Market.

Second. The increased availability of mortgage and other long-term credit with a consequent reduction in costs of borrowing and in regional mortgage yield spreads.

Third. The ending of restricted entry into financial markets for savings banks, which has led to insufficient savings facilities, inefficient allocation of resources, and limited credit availability.

Fourth. The introduction of new equality of competitive opportunity leading to progress for all competing financial institutions. Mutual savings banks may not be organized in 32 of our States. Recent efforts to have the merits of savings bank legislation considered in these States have been frustrated by short-sighted competitors at the expense of the public welfare. It is clear that extension can best be achieved through Federal charter legislation.

Fifth. The modernization of investment powers for other savings institutions. The savings and loan industry, over the past 30 years, has developed mature, progressive institutions quite capable of investment powers beyond the archaic confines they now must endure. The Federal mutual savings bank bill provides for the optional conversion of such institutions into Federal mutual savings banks—into banks capable of performing brilliantly their traditional role in home financing and at the same time enjoying the flexibility to provide capital to many new areas of the investment spectrum.

These reasons are at the heart of our Federal charter program. We believe in them and we are prepared to go before the Congress and defend them—now.

CENTENNIAL OF DUAL BANKING

No talk on banking would be complete without the mention of the centennial of dual banking: In 1963, the Nation's financial industry is honoring the 100th anniversary of dual banking, that extension to banking of the Federal concept of government found in our Constitution. Dual banking provides for a system under which banks may operate under the authority of either the State or Federal Government.

Dr. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, has stated this analogy between our system of government and our system of banking as follows:

"Indeed, there is in my mind a close if not inseparable relationship between the dual banking system and the concepts underlying the division of powers and responsibility between our States and the Federal Government."

Expanding on the constitutional analogy, and on the system of checks and balances so basic to this Government, Mr. Robert Myers, Jr., secretary of banking for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has stated:

"The dual banking system is the unique feature of American banking. It comprehends two separate and distinct systems of banks, one chartered, regulated and supervised by the States, and the other chartered, regulated, and supervised under Federal law. It is the product and result of the American plan for the division of governmental responsibilities and powers between the States and the National Government. It is in harmony with American ideals and our traditional concept of government."

It is not often so easy to find such unanimity. And that is fortunate for us, for we have always wholeheartedly subscribed to dual banking, and we demonstrate this continually by our efforts to expand mutual savings banking on a State as well as a National level. This industry joined with the State of Alaska in bringing mutual savings banking to that great area. Our committee on extension con-

[1] On December 14, the American Banker reported approval of Federal charters in the staff report of the committee.

tinues to give its entire effort to spreading further our State system.

WHY NOT US?

In our support of dual banking and its benefits, we have often wondered: "Why not us?" Every other form of banking and savings institution enjoys dual chartering. There are National and State commercial banks, there are Federal and State savings and loans, there are Federal and State credit unions. Existing side by side, both systems have continued to flourish and to contribute to one another's progress. Mutual savings banking, alone, though it represents more than $40 billion of the deposits of Americans, does not enjoy membership in the dual banking system. We ask, for the benefit of the country as well as for mutual savings banks and their depositors, that our long exile from dual banking be ended—and that it be ended now.

The sponsors of the Federal mutual savings bank bill, Senator Sparkman, of Alabama; Representative Multer, of New York; Representative Rains, of Alabama, and Senator Bush, of Connecticut, recognize that dual banking presupposes that both the States and the Nation have a vital interest in the strength of American financial institutions. The independence of both necessarily means independent responsibility and so individual conclusions on how best to serve those responsibilities.

Thus, the decision of the States of Alaska, Massachusetts, and New York to regard mutual savings banking as crucial to their banking needs does not dictate that the Federal Government must decide, in its independent appraisal, that Federal mutual savings banks are vital nationally.

By the same token, the decision of other States that mutual savings banks are not needed in their banking structure should not prevent the Federal Government from making a different decision in pursuance of its own responsibilities.

This is the very essence of a dual system. It presupposes two independent judgments as to the best fulfillment of independent responsibilities. Some argue for maintenance at all costs of a delicate balance between State and National banks. They would apparently argue that the goal to be pursued is absolute agreement in the conclusions of 50 States and the Federal Government as to what response to make to banking needs. This kind of search for monolithic uniformity doesn't seem to be in keeping with a dual system concept nor with the basic economic fact that competitive uniformity inhibits progress. The most cogent presentation of this basic fact has come from the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James J. Saxon: "The only sense in which the duality of a banking system can be made truly meaningful is to regard the authority of each segment as separate and distinct, and not subordinate one to the other. Far from posing a threat to the duality of our banking system, this separation of power is the only means by which the dual banking system may be sustained. Under any other approach one authority would become predominant, and duality in any practical terms would disappear." And: "It is no threat to a dual banking system, but merely the natural expression of such a system, to allow the Federal and the individual State authority to be separately and independently exercised in full."

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

The congressional sponsors of the Federal mutual savings bank bill have said that they will urge hearings on this bill within the next 2 months. We must support them every step of the way in what will be a long and closely contested struggle.

I want to impress on you that what is demanded of us is action now. If our years of urging Federal mutual savings banking have been only an academic exercise, then I submit we have done a disservice to our depositors and to the Nation.

This will be an exacting process for all of us, and, as the proponents, we will have to carry the burden of proof as to the merits of the bill. That proof is now being assembled by the national association's leadership and its research and legal departments. Documents substantiating our claim that economic and other public benefits can be expected to flow from enactment of the Federal mutual savings bank bill are nearing completion. They will be of primary importance at the congressional hearings.

CALL TO ACTION

In the meantime, what can each of us do to advance the day when mutual savings banks will be permitted throughout the Nation? You have already received materials analyzing the present bill and presenting the salient arguments. The national association, in coordination with the nine State associations and with designated board members in the rest of the States, is conducting an action campaign to be certain that every Congressman and every U.S. Senator in every mutual savings bank State is well informed about our industry and its extension objectives via the Federal charter route. The materials which member banks have received furnished the basic guide lines for your communcations with your congressional representation. If you need further assistance, the national association's officers and staff are immediately available to you. We must first achieve the support of Federal legislators in the 18 mutual savings bank States before we can expect anyone else's support.

When you enlist in this campaign, there will be no jobs for generals. All of us will be on the firing line. Each of us must speak to our Congressmen, our State supervisors, our trustees, our depositors, our local civic and business groups. And this campaign must begin immediately. Gentlemen, the time is now.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation presents the possibility of two-way conversions between savings and loan associations and Federal mutual savings banks. Many of the specific provisions in this bill result from suggestions made by savings and loan leaders.

The most recent legislation on this subject was introduced by several of my colleagues and me in October 1962. My bill was H.R. 13318. The present bill contains a few comparatively minor changes from the form of the bill introduced in October 1962. Basically the two bills are alike and, therefore, the study given to H.R. 13318 will produce conclusions valid with reference to the new bill. As an original sponsor of this type of legislation, I recommend it highly to my colleagues. It will represent a major stride forward toward reaching maximum economic growth by providing the country with a major source of capital to finance home purchases, industrial development, and public works.

After a reasonable period of time has been afforded for study of this proposed legislation, it is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will arrange for public hearings to be held later during the present session. I fully expect that these hearings in turn will lead to the enactment of a practical piece of financial legislation that will add a substantial number of thrift facilities to the present dual banking system in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a summary and section-by-section analysis of H.R. 258:

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANK ACT (H.R. 258)

The declaration of policy asserts that to increase the savings necessary for capital formation within the dual banking private enterprise system, Federal charters should be authorized for mutual savings banks. Thereby the vitality of State-chartered mutual savings banking will be maintained and strengthened. Home financing and business enterprise in the area where Federal mutual savings banks are located will be encouraged through new sources of long-term credit. Efficiency requires insurance of savings in federally chartered thrift institutions by a single Federal agency.

Title I provides that 5 to 21 members (who may be designated corporators or trustees) may apply to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a charter. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board will issue a charter upon finding that the savings bank will serve a useful community purpose, have a reasonable expectation of financial success, and will not unduly injure existing savings institutions. Federal mutual savings banks must belong to the Federal Home Loan Bank System and have savings insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. Members of a Federal mutual savings bank elect the board of directors, or a board of directors may be elected by applicants for a charter in a savings bank without members. Directors manage the savings bank. Statutory restrictions control any self-dealing by directors with the savings bank.

Savings bank borrowing is controlled by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. A savings bank may issue passbooks or other evidence of savings, and provide for bonus accounts.

Investments authorized include among others Federal obligations, municipal obligations, real estate mortgages under specified restrictions, and corporate securities under the prudent man rule. A savings bank may also make consumer loans. It may establish branches to the extent that financial institutions accepting funds from savers on deposit or share accounts enjoy such privilege.

State-chartered mutual savings banks and State or federally chartered savings and loan associations may convert to Federal mutual savings banks and vice versa. Federal- or State-chartered mutual savings banks may merge or consolidate with one another. Among other general powers, a Federal mutual savings bank may exercise in its State of location all powers of a State-chartered mutual savings bank in such State. Savings banks must be examined at least annually. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has general regulatory authority. Provisions against discriminatory State taxation are set forth. Conservators and receivers may be appointed as provided in the bill.

Title II creates the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation out of the FSLIC and constitutes the Federal Home Loan Bank Board its board of trustees. Insurance premiums are the same as for FSLIC. A State-chartered savings bank insured by FDIC shall take with it a pro rata share of FDIC insurance reserves if it should become a Federal mutual savings bank, and thereafter ceases to be insured by FDIC.

Title III requires an annual report by the supervisory board to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANK ACT (H.R. 258)

Section 1. Title: Federal Mutual Savings Bank Act.

Section 2. Declaration of policy: To encourage increased savings to finance new

housing and other capital formation, privately managed, federally supervised mutual savings banks should be authorized to be chartered by a single agency of the Federal Government. Accounts in such savings banks should be insured by a Federal agency. Such savings banks will aid in executing the constitutional duty of the Federal Government to regulate the value of money and will provide a depositary for public money.

TITLE I

Section 101. Definitions: The following terms are defined: "Board," "conventional loan," "doing business," "financial institution," "first mortgage," "first deed of trust," "first lien," "savings bank," "State," "State of domicile," "domiciliary State," and "thrift institution." "Thrift institution" includes Federal- and State-chartered savings and loan associations and like organizations, and Federal- and State-chartered guarantee savings banks. "Financial institution" includes thrift institutions as so defined, commercial banks, trust companies, and insurance companies.

Section 102. Chartering: 5 signers from 21 or more individuals acting as members (usually known as corporators or trustees in the mutual savings bank system) may apply to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a charter. The Board will issue a charter when it finds the savings bank will serve a useful community purpose, enjoy reasonable expectation of financial success, and in operation will not unduly injure thrift institutions or commercial banks accepting savings deposits. Savings banks so chartered must have the words "Federal," "savings," and "bank" in their titles. Each must become a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, and have deposit insurance with the new Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, successor to Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Section 103. Members: Qualifications for members are prescribed. They serve for staggered terms of 10 years. (They elect directors.)

Section 104. Directors: Qualifications for directors, who manage and control the savings bank, are prescribed. They number from 7 to 25 and hold office for staggered terms of 3 years. Controls over self-dealing by directors with the savings bank are specified.

Section 105. Commencement of operations: Savings banks must qualify as insured banks in FSIC before commencing operations, and must maintain such status to continue operations. Before operating, a cash expense fund satisfactory to the Board must be raised by sale of transferable deferred payment certificates.

Section 106. Reserve fund: Before obtaining a charter, a savings bank must also have in cash an initial reserve fund of at least $50,000, evidenced by transferable deferred payment certificates. The reserve fund can be used only to meet losses. The savings bank may retain additional reasonable amounts for any corporate purpose.

Section 107. Borrowing: A savings bank may borrow funds subject to Board regulation.

Section 108. Deposits: A savings bank may handle usual passbook savings accounts and bonus accounts. It may decline or repay deposits at any time. Interest on savings may be paid as approved by directors. The savings bank may invoke up to a 90-day advance notice of withdrawal. The board may extend this period in an emergency. FSIC may take action necessary to make a savings bank sound and solvent either before or after closing.

Section 109. Investments: A savings bank may invest in Federal obligations, municipal securities, property improvement loans, certain Canadian obligations, World Bank obligations, Inter-American Development Bank obligations, first mortgage loans on real property under specified restrictions of dollar amounts, class and loan, maturity, loan-to-value ratio, and geographical limits. Broad participation powers are granted. Savings banks may also invest in bankers' acceptances, corporate securities under the prudent man rule plus stated restrictions, obligations of mutual savings banks, and certain promissory notes, both secured and unsecured.

Section 110. Branches: With Board approval, a savings bank may establish in-State branches only to the extent any savings institutions can. The Board must first make findings required for issuance of a charter. A savings bank resulting from conversion, consolidation or merger, may retain existing offices and unexercised branch rights.

Section 111. Conversion: With Board approval and subject to new charter provisions, any thrift institution may convert into a Federal mutual savings bank, under specified procedure, but not in contravention of the laws under which the converting institution is organized. Minimum requirements for members and directors are excused for a savings bank formed by conversion. The Board must find the converting institution can observe the duties and restrictions of Federal mutual savings banks, and conform to this act's requirements. A converted savings bank may retain and service all accounts and assets lawfully held on the date of conversion.

A Federal mutual savings bank may convert into any nonstock thrift institution, with approval of the authority regulating the resulting institution, and consent of FSIC. Any resulting savings and loan association shall have its share accounts automatically insured by FSIC.

Section 112. Merger and consolidation: Federal mutual savings banks may merge or consolidate with each other or with in-State, State-chartered mutual savings banks. State approval is required if the resulting bank is State chartered; Board approval if the resulting bank is federally chartered. The Board must consider the act's purposes, the prospects for financial success, and ability to meet the duties of and restrictions of a Federal mutual savings banks. Corporate existence of the combining institutions continues in the resulting one, and rights and obligations are transferred to it pursuant to terms of the merger or consolidation agreement.

Section 113. General powers: Express operational powers are granted to Federal mutual savings banks. Included is authority to exercise all powers of State-chartered mutual savings banks in the same State. Powers reasonably incident to express powers are also conferred.

Section 114. Examination: Annual examinations by the Board are required with expenses assessed to cover costs. The Board may conduct additional examinations.

Section 115. Regulatory authority: The Board is granted general regulatory authority and supervision over Federal mutual savings banks.

Section 116. Taxation: No State shall tax Federal mutual savings banks more than the least onerous tax on any other local financial institution. No State other than the domiciliary State shall tax such savings banks for transactions in the State that do not constitute doing business, but foreclosed properties are subject to ad valorem or income-on-receipts taxes.

Section 117. Conservators and receivers: The Board by resolution shall state any alleged violation of law or regulation and notify the Federal mutual savings bank involved. The bank has 30 days to cure the defect, else the Board shall give 20 days notice of charges and of a hearing by an examiner as provided by the Administrative Procedure Act. The Board is given subpena powers enforceable by the U.S. District Court. Appeal lies from the Board decision, with court review based on the weight of evidence.

When notice of the alleged violation is given, the Board or the savings bank may within 30 days apply to the U.S. district court for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief. The court may enforce Board orders on request. The Board is made subject to suit and may be served through any of its agents and registered mail at its District of Columbia headquarters.

On giving notice of an alleged violation, the Board may issue a cease and desist order effective until the end of the hearing and enforceable by the U.S. district court. The Board can't bring charges on an act over 2 years old or known to the Board over 1 year. Charges must be dismissed if the Board doesn't adjudicate them within 1 year after they are filed.

Grounds for conservatorship of receivership are violation of an order or injunction final because time to appeal has expired or an unappealable order or impairment of capital. On such a ground the Board shall petition the U.S. district court for a conservator or receiver. With savings bank consent, the court may name either one without notice or hearing.

In any event, the court may appoint a conservator after notice and hearing. The person appointed as temporary or permanent conservator must be a Board officer or agent.

If liquidation seems necessary, the FSIC shall be named receiver, and may liquidate the savings bank in addition to having all powers of a conservator.

A temporary conservator may operate the savings bank as in normal course of business, subject to court limitations. A conservator may also reorganize the bank or organize a new savings bank or merge the bank with another savings bank or sell its assets.

Remedies in this section are exclusive. Orders or injunctions expire within 3 years unless extended for cause. Savings banks in custody continue to make reports and the Board must give Congress detailed reports of seized savings banks and of general enforcement under this section. Savings bank officials may contest any proceeding and be reimbursed brom bank assets.

In an emergency, the U.S. district court ex parte and without notice, upon Board petition, may name a temporary conservator. The petition under oath must allege facts requiring prompt action to prevent irreparable injury. The Board must promptly proceed to correct the alleged defects or move to appoint a conservator or receiver. The temporary conservator must be removed when the defect is cured or the motion for a conservator or receiver has been adjudicated.

TITLE II

Section 201. Federal Savings Insurance Corporation: The name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is changed to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, as the board of trustees for FSIC, is given power to manage its affairs, and the chairman of the board of trustees has the same type of powers he has as Chairman of the Board. Federal- and State-chartered mutual savings banks are made eligible to apply for FSIC insurance, and shall pay the same insurance premiums as do savings and loan associations insured by FSLIC. Federal mutual savings banks cannot voluntarily withdraw from insured status with FSIC.

Section 202. Transfer of funds from Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. When a State-chartered mutual savings bank insured by FDIC becomes a Federal mutual savings bank by conversion, merger or con-

solidation and becomes insured by FSIC, it takes with it a pro rata portion of FDIC insurance reserves calculated according to a formula based on assessments the savings bank has paid to FDIC. Amounts so transferred go to the primary reserve fund in FSIC. With the transfer the savings bank ceases to be insured by FDIC, but outstanding obligations to all parties are protected. The same procedure applies to a State-chartered mutual savings bank choosing to change deposit insurance to FSIC from FDIC.

Section 203. Miscellaneous: FSIC is made subject to Budget Bureau control, as is FSLIC.

TITLE III

Section 301. Annual report: The Board must submit an annual report of its operation to the President for transmission to Congress.

Section 302. Separability: The rest of the act stays valid even though a provision or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid.

Section 303. Right to amend: Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

A Lavish Lunch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Wall Street Journal carried as its lead editorial an attack on the new expense account regulations drawn by the Internal Revenue Service. Mindful that everyone's thoughts are turning toward tax reform, I submit the editorial for the attention of my colleagues:

A LAVISH LUNCH

When we were younger and had more hair we used to walk several blocks from the office to eat in the Automat.

Now that some of the younger people show an embarrassing deference to our age, we eat at a nearby restaurant where the checks are somewhat higher. The place isn't noted for the smoothness of its service or the tranquility of its amosphere, but despite the hubbub it seems luxurious beside those days of long ago.

Of course sometimes, nowadays, we get invited out to lunch and the other fellow even pays the check. Just the other day we lunched at one of the leading banking establishments of the country where half a score of economists gathered to discuss the state of the Nation's economy and such things as taxes, cut and uncut.

We had eggs Behedict, which we don't get at home, and the service was refreshingly quiet; more so than the conversation. A Rockefeller or a Kennedy wouldn't have been impressed by the lunch, but we suspect that some young fellows around our shop would have thought it lavish.

Anyway, whether it was or not has now become a matter of State. The Congress in its infinite wisdom has decided that while it's all right to entertain economists at lunch (provided they talk economics) the entertainment must be economical. Otherwise the economists, eating better than is their custom, would be getting an untaxed benefit and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury would be impaired.

And so the metaphysicians of the Internal Revenue Service, poor fellows, are now trying to lay down a rule as to just what is and isn't lavish. Apparently they are finding it no easier than the metaphysicians of the Puritan past who tried to decide how many inches of lace on a lady's petticoat constituted a lavish—or lascivious—display.

Do you measure lavishness by the size of the check; i.e., can you have roast beef at Longchamps but not at "21"? Or by the number of forks by the dinner plate? Is a restaurant with Muzak within the pale while one with its own piano is beyond it? Must the president of General Motors observe the same frugality as a poor journalist—and if not, why not?

The questions are patently ridiculous. Yet it is just such silly questions that sane men must now gravely debate. Unfortunately, however, the consequences of foolish answers are not trivial. For after everybody has laughed at all the jokes, a serious question remains.

Curiously, everyone would see it readily enough if it involved anything but "entertainment," a word that conjures up visions of wickedness. Is the Government going to decide for every businessman in the land what constitutes a good business expenditure?

Let us suppose that the XYZ company is having some trouble with its Chicago business and decides that the thing to do is to send an official there, find the trouble and cure it. Let us suppose the company decides that the easiest, quickest, and cheapest way to approach the knowledgeable people who can help is take a hotel suite, open a bar, and dine them in an informal and relaxed atmosphere. In business as in world diplomacy, sometimes more is accomplished in an hour of civilized socializing than in days of formal meetings.

Now since one man's daily fare is another man's lavishness, who is to say whether the company should buy hamburger or pheasant under glass? Or whether, like the Japanese, it should exclude the ladies from a man's world or have the company official's wife play hostess to the ladies of the guests?

The variations of this problem in business are many, and the truth is that circumstances alter cases. The IRS chief, Mr. Caplin, is well aware of this and he doubtless wants to be reasonable. Still, what is proposed is that Mr. Caplin and his conferees, not the managers of the XYZ company, decide what is "reasonable" under what circumstances.

No one would allow them that arrogance in any other aspect of business decisions. This newspaper, for example, must buy newsprint—no newsprint, no business—and newsprint comes in various qualities at different prices. No one argues that IRS agents should decide what quality is appropriate for our business needs or that they should order us to be no more extravagant in our newsprint expenditure than any other newspaper.

Yet who can be sure they won't try? What's to stop the Government from deciding the limits of extravagance for all business expenses—once it's accepted these all-wise men can tell every man what kind of a lunch is lavish?

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago there emerged in Eastern Europe a new, free and independent nation, the Ukrainian National Republic. The breath of freedom was soon squeezed out of this new nation by the tyrants from Moscow who, through subversion and outright conquest destroyed the Republic. The Communists went further than that; they made of the real Ukrainian Republic a mockery and included that name as one of the many so-called Soviet Republics.

Since 1920 the people of the Ukraine have slaved under Communist domination. Indeed, they were the first people to be conquered by the Communists, the forerunner of many millions more who have been forced into slavery and worse by the Reds.

Mr. Speaker, the date, January 22, is well worth remembering. It should be a goad to the conscience of all freemen everywhere in the world—a reminder that their freedom is precious and a noble thing. This date should serve to remind freemen of the conditions under which their brothers must now live, of the slavery which exists in the world, of the police state and of totalitarian governments.

Although the people of the Ukraine are under the domination of the Communists, I know that there still burns deep within them a spirit of freedom. This may today be only a candle flickering in a great darkness. But if those of us in the free world can act together, perhaps one day this tiny flame will spring into a roaring conflagration which will consume communism itself.

We who today can count ourselves among the fortunate few who are free must also realize that so long as there is one person alive in this world to whom freedom is denied by ruthless, lawless and Godless tyrants, some small part of our own freedom is eroded away from us. We cannot count ourselves totally free if there are those existing in the dark misery of slavery.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must dedicate itself not only to the preservation of freedom here and throughout the world, it must dedicate itself as well to the restoration of freedom for those millions who have been engulfed in communism.

We must each shoulder this responsibility and make this our goal. We cannot sit idly by while slavery continues to exist. We must take every step and follow every course that a rational man can to achieve this ultimate goal.

If as a Nation and as individuals we do dedicate ourselves to these principles, then the goal of freedom for all mankind must inevitably be reached.

Medicare Versus Private Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we fully understand the political nature of

the administration's so-called medicare program. We recognize that we must face this issue with unfortunate emphasis on the vote-purchasing aspects of the administration's scheme, as opposed to a solution which would provide long-range benefits to the public and produce increases in our already high medical standards.

The relationship of the Congress to the issue is very effectively discussed in an editorial of Thursday, January 3, in the Blue Island Sun-Standard, which I insert in the RECORD:

MEDICARE VERSUS PRIVATE MEDICINE

The new Congress, to say what everybody who reads the newspapers knows, will have plenty of business on its hands. Much of it, in a sense, will be unfinished business. It will consist of those major measures which the administration proposed in 1962, and which either fell by the wayside when the vote was taken, or did not reach the voting point at all.

The November elections, as always, brought about some changes in the dramatis personnae of Congress. The Democrats made small Senate gains, the Republicans did the same in the House. But party labels blur nowadays and there is rarely such a thing as a solid party phalanx for or against any particular piece of legislation. The various commentators have discussed at great length what they think—or hope—the majority in the two branches will stand for. We will know that, for sure, 8 or 10 months from now. Meanwhile the lines form and the battles are readied.

In this, we need not consider foreign policy in its principal aspect—here, by constitutional authority and general agreement, the President is supreme. In the cold war, the Nation must speak with one voice, and that voice is his. But domestic policy is an entirely different matter. For example, it is likely that the administration will throw all the weight and authority it can muster behind medicare—the plan whereby everyone drawing social security benefits would become entitled to a wide range of government-provided medical services. The medicare bill failed last session, and it is common knowledge that the President felt deep anger at the rebuff. It is also likely that the new medicare bill will be broadened, to provide the same benefits for several million people in the 65-and-over age group who are not within the social security program.

Some of the supporters of medicare—and, to look at the problem more broadly, of other possible programs which would require more and more government involvement in the national health picture—have chosen as a weapon of argument that private medicine has failed to rise to the need. The other side of this story was recently told by Dr. George M. Fister, the new president of the American Medical Association. In his words, "Hippocrates, the great Greek physician, once said, 'Strong maladies require strong medicine.' These words have special meaning for the medical profession today. * * * We must diagnose the malady and treat it with truth."

Dr. Fister then said that "medicine stands as a proud symbol of the finest achievements of our competitive enterprise system," and reviewed a few pages of the records. Here are some of those pages:

About 4.5 million Americans are alive today who would be dead if the mortality rate of 25 years ago still prevailed. For the first time in history the life expectancy of Americans has exceeded the Bible's three-score-and-ten—it is 70.2 years. Eighty percent of the drugs commonly now used were unknown a mere 10 years ago, and in the last two decades the United States has been responsible for more important drug discoveries than all the other nations of the world combined. Last year the prescription drug industry spent a record $245 million in research—triple that of the average industry. There is now a record number of hospital beds in this country, and the average hospital stay is the lowest in history. A record number of new physicians—7,168—graduated from medical schools in 1962. In that year, infant mortality rates declined to a new low of 25.3 deaths per 1,000 births. A record number of Americans—about 136 million—are covered by voluntary health insurance prepayment plans.

So the story goes. Dr Fister does not think that our medical system is anywhere near perfect. He knows better than most of us how much more needs to be done. But he is convinced, as are legions of other authorities, that it can best be done, and done most surely and effectively, under a free system, not a government-dominated system. So, he urges that the principles involved in the fight be stressed to the limit, and every legitimate means be used to acquaint the American people with the record of achievement of American medicine in all its varied phases. For, he believes, "The people will respond to the truth."

Philadelphia Federal Executive Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity on January 4, 1963, to attend a very interesting meeting of the Federal Government Accountants Association which was held at Kugler's Restaurant in Philadelphia. The meeting notice and newsletter, which I have attached, shows the nature of the subject of the meeting and the agencies represented in the messages which were presented to the accountants who were present. If other large civil service areas operate with Federal executive boards like this one, the future of coordination of government activities will be very successful:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTANTS ASSOCIATION, PHILADELPHIA CHAPTER—MEETING NOTICE AND NEWSLETTER, FRIDAY, JANUARY 4, 1963

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Hon. HERMAN TOLL, Congressman, president, Philadelphia Federal Bar Association.

Frank Matejik, coordinator of career development activities, third U.S. Civil Service region.

"I want coordination of Government activities outside of Washington significantly strengthened." The above words are those of President Kennedy and are contained in his memorandum of November 10, 1961, to heads of all departments and agencies. He directed the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to arrange for a board of Federal executives in each of the Commission's administrative regions. A glance at the partial composition of our Philadelphia Federal Executive Board as displayed in this notice will indicate the stature of the Philadelphia Executive Board with which we are favored. We have an outstanding program introducing us to the constructive work which this group can do.

Our social was a smashng success and particularly smashing at the conclusion when we struggled for the attention of the hat check girls. Fifty-nine members, wives and friends had a very enjoyable evening at the Latin Casino. The only sad note was the absence of Jack Barash, who has been confined to Lankenau Hospital, room 211, since about a week before the social. Altho he cannot have visitors, we understand he is coming along nicely. It is expected he will remain in the hospital for another month. We hope he will improve rapidly and that we will be seeing him at one of the meetings in the near future. You may want to send him a get-well card.

OUR FIRST MEETING IN 1963

Date: Friday evening, January 4, 1963.

Time: 5:30 p.m., FGAA conviviality; 6:30 p.m., dinner; 7:30 p.m., Sing Along With Mitch Patchell; 7:45 p.m., technical program.

Subject: "Philadelphia Federal Executive Board."

The message: Stephen P. Ryder, Director, Civil Service Commission, third region (vice chairman). Dean J. Barron, regional commissioner, Internal Revenue Service (director finance management committee). Edward N. Rosa, regional director, Small Business Administration (director, interdepartmental and community liaison committee). Sedrik W. Melidosian, manager, Veterans' Administration insurance (member, personnel management committee).

The panel: Joseph R. Hock, former Washington chapter president, Comptroller, Maritime Administration; James A. Robbins, former national president, Deputy Chief, Headquarters U.S. Army Audit Agency.

Our esteemed guests: Gordon R. Elliot, regional manager, Veterans' Administration (chairman, Philadelphia Federal Executive Board); A. S. Harzenstein, regional commissioner, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division (chairman, subcommittee government associations liaison).

OFFICERS FOR 1962 AND 1963

President, Harry Levine.
First vice president, Albert M. Greene.
Second vice president, George F. Budd, Jr.
Treasurer, Charles J. Patchell, Jr.
Assistant treasurer, Michael A. Prendergast, Jr.
Secretary, Barbara B. Wright.
Assistant secretary, Ann Lewun.

ADVISERS

Francis G. Green.
Paul N. Righter.
Milton J. Savar.

DIRECTORS

Isadore E. Axler.
Louis W. Mangene.
Arthur W. Miller.
Max Minkin.
Paul F. Peterson.
Willis T. Porch, Jr.
Leonard J. Shackleford.
Joseph Sternberg.
William D. Sullivan.

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES

Army Audit Agency, Glorio J. DiSepio.

Auditor General, U.S. Air Force, George A. Warner.

Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center, Charles E. Campbell.

Federal National Mortgage Association, James R. Riley.

FGAA members not in government, Leonard M. Tucker.

Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Russel E. Vance.

Frankford Arsenal, Charles Belsterling.

General Accounting Office, Victor Antelman.

Headquarters, Air Force, Contract Management District, Edward T. Diviny.
Internal Revenue Service, Harold M. Schwartz.
Marine Corps Supply Agency, Edward J. Sweeney.
Maritime Administration, Charles J. Millard.
Navy Area Audit Office, E. A. Phillips.
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Charles K. Valutas.
Philadelphia Ordnance District, Mark J. Alton.
Philadelphia Veterans' Administration, Edmund Murphy.
Post office, Edward S. Evans.
Signal Supply Agency, Abraham L. Jasner.

PAST PRESIDENTS

S. C. F. Metzgar, POD, 1952–53.
L. N. Teitelbaum, AF–AG, 1953–54.
Frank G. Green, AAA, 1954–55.
Daniel L. Ryan, NAAO, 1955–56.
Scott R. Tyree, GAO, 1956–57.
E. A. Phillips, NAAO, 1956–57.
Charles W. Gissell, NAAO, 1956–57.
Harry C. Kensky, GAO, 1957–58.
Roscoe C. Doyle, PO, 1958–59.
Marshall C. Anderson, AAA, 1959–60.
Milton J. Savar, USASSA, 1960–61.
Paul N. Righter, NAAO, 1961–62.

H.R. 2158

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2158, to provide for recognition by law of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

This legislation is the same as I sponsored in previous sessions of Congress, and it is submitted notwithstanding the fact that it is almost precisely a year since President Kennedy, on January 17, 1962, signed Executive Order 10988 to provide for "employee-management cooperation in the Federal service."

Mr. Speaker, I am told that the postal unions are concluding a basic agreement to apply to all postal employees throughout the country. In an election which was held several months ago, the employees chose six national organizations for exclusive recognition under the terms of the President's order. Listed in alphabetical order, those six organizations are: National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL–CIO; National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees; National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, AFL–CIO; National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, AFL–CIO; National Rural Letter Carriers Association; and United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL–CIO.

Spokesmen for these organizations tell me that the negotiations with the Post Office Department have in the main been very wholesome, and that an overall agreement covering grievance procedures disciplinary action, appeals from adverse action, and advisory arbitration will be signed no later than mid-February.

Even though we have no doubt of the genuineness of the Post Office Department's intentions to fulfill a farsighted Executive order, I feel that the country still needs the law which is envisioned by my legislation.

I feel for example that we may need to improve on the arbitration procedures which are allowable under the Executive order. I have very genuine doubts over whether the language of the Executive order, section 8b, on arbitration goes sufficiently far. That language specifies:

> Such arbitration (1) shall be advisory in nature with any decisions or recommendations subject to the approval of the agency head; (2) shall extend only to the interpretation or application of agreements or agency policy and not to changes in or proposed changes in agreements or agency policy; and (3) shall be invoked only with the approval of the individual employee or employees concerned.

Furthermore, I feel that the Executive order does not go sufficiently far in the area of coverage for negotiation purposes. The Executive order specifies that in making rules and regulations, agencies are to be aware of their obligation to consummate agreements with employee organizations but that the obligation to bargain with employee organizations "shall not be construed to extend to such areas of discretion and policy as the mission of an agency, its budget, its organization and the assignment of its personnel, or the technology of performing its work."

In the Post Office Department expressly, I question whether the Administrators are omnipotent, and I feel that certainly the promotion policy to be followed in various post offices should be the subject of hard and fast agreements with employee organizations, thereby eliminating the multitude of complaints received each time political favoritism is shown or some other kind of special consideration is shown to a candidate for promotion to a supervisory position.

Mr. Speaker, because of considerations such as these, I decided again to reintroduce my legislation governing recognition of employee organizations and I hope that early and favorable action may be taken.

How Taft Did It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the Cuba crisis is growing more, rather than less, complicated, and the apparent victory of October appears much less realistic now, is is practical for us to turn back the pages of history to compare successful programs of the past. The Lansing Journal, did just that in a fascinating and concise editorial, which I insert in the RECORD, entitled "How Taft Did It":

HOW TAFT DID IT

> Fifty years ago, President William Howard Taft ordered the U.S. Infantry to Nicaragua to protect American lives and property during a revolution in that country. He did not try to stop the revolution, but its hostile effect on the United States.
>
> Today, that would be resented as interfering with the internal affairs of a foreign country. But it kept order even while a revolution was being fought, and without taking sides.
>
> There is something to be said for that era.

Bill To Assist Public and Private Nonprofit Hospitals and Nursing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, similar to one I sponsored in the 87th Congress, to assist public and private nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes to undertake badly needed modernization and replacement projects. The bill provides for establishment of a combination matching grant and loan program. The need for such legislation was contained in the President's budget message.

Modernization, rather than construction of new bed capacity, is the primary health facility need of today. This situation, not generally recognized by the public, has come about because of the prolonged concentration on important hospital needs accumulated during the depression and World War II. I want to cite the particularly critical shortage of bed space in rural areas of a few years ago.

Federal aid for construction of new hospitals, through the existing Hill-Burton program, has been instrumental in helping to reduce greatly the Nation's deficiency of hospital bed space. However, in recent years there has been a growing obsolescence of the hospitals that were already in existence and, for the most part, located in urban areas, when the Hill-Burton new construction program was begun in 1946.

In 1960, a U.S. Public Health Service survey of 25 metropolitan areas and 32 sample rural-urban areas showed a projected national cost for needed modernization and replacement of $3.6 billion. That figure is almost four times the current rate of annual construction expenditures in the entire health facilities field, and only a fraction of that is spent on modernization and replacement, which does not add new bed capacity.

This, as the survey showed, is a nationwide problem. I wish to point out that my home State, California, has an estimated modernization need backlog of $513 million.

The bill would authorize the Surgeon General, acting through State Hill-Bur-

ton agencies, to make grants up to 50 percent of the cost of qualified modernization projects, or loans as a supplement to grants or in lieu thereof. The total Federal share may not exceed 80 percent of the cost of the project. Also, assistance would be provided for development of comprehensive regional health facilities plans. The amounts to be authorized are left blank in the bill pending the development in committee hearings of information on the optimum size of the proposed program. The program would be effective July 1, 1964, meaning no budgetary impact until fiscal 1965.

The program in my bill is to complement and not interfere with the existing Hill-Burton construction program. It would be administered similarly. State agencies now involved in the Hill-Burton program would process the new applications and the Surgeon General would employ administrative procedures similar to those presently in effect for the construction program. Modernization assistance funds would be eligible only for projects that would not increase bed capacity by more than 5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation deals with an important national health facility need. Under existing programs, much progress undoubtedly will be made in rapidly adding to the current number of hospital beds. However, modernization and replacement of many facilities is required to improve patient care by increasing adequacy of services, safety and efficiency, and to adapt present facilities to new hospital and related medical needs.

Foreign Tourism for Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Philadelphia Inquirer, of Monday morning, January 21, 1963, an editorial relating to the examination by representatives of the U.S. Travel Service of Philadelphia's tourist attractions and facilities.

The advantages of using Philadelphia as a port of entry and/or departure for most visitors from Europe are very great. I have attached the editorial to my remarks so that my colleagues can see why Philadelphia is so attractive:

FOREIGN TOURISM FOR PHILADELPHIA

Representatives of the U.S. Travel Service, a Federal agency, took a firsthand look at Philadelphia's tourist attractions and facilities over the weekend preparatory to telling prospective foreign travelers why they should come to America. We believe that Philadelphia should rank near the top of the list of must places for foreigners to visit.

Historic shrines in and around Philadelphia, together with the seashore resorts in nearby New Jersey, are made-to-order tourist attractions. This city's proximity to both New York and Washington, which most visitors want to see, is another asset.

Moreover, Philadelphia should be the port of entry and/or departure for most visitors from Europe, whether they come by sea or air. The multilingual welcome signs to be installed at International Airport is a good idea which well might be adopted by hotels, restaurants, and so forth.

It is planned to tell the prospective tourists about reasonable costs of travel in America. The information ought to be realistic. Underestimating costs may lure visitors to our shores but it won't send them home happy.

A foreigner can't see all of the United States in 10 or 15 days—any more than an American can. Let's try to inform and entertain visitors, not exhaust them. Because of time and money limitations many Europeans will need to confine their touring to the eastern part of America.

Paul Miller Heads Associated Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Associated Press, meeting in Phoenix, Ariz., last week, elected as their president, Mr. Paul Miller, president of the Gannett Newspapers, the home office of which is in Rochester, N.Y., a city I am privileged to represent in the Congress. A source of pride for Rochesterians and a source of assurance for the Nation is to be found in Mr. Miller's election.

A free press, as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution, is only as desirable as the competence of those who implement its freedom. The expression, "Associated Press, the byline of dependability," is more than a slogan; it is a way of life.

A recent editorial in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat & Chronicle, in commenting on Mr. Miller's election, described the vital role this news service plays in the advancement of humanity.

Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A NEWS NETWORK'S MIGHTY CHALLENGE

A Rochesterian, Paul Miller, president of the Gannett Newspapers, has been elected president of the Associated Press.

This is more than institutional news for the newspaper business in America.

If it were necessary to name the single factor contributing most to humanity's advancement, the selection would have to go to the growing worldwide distribution of complete, honest, factual news. For there is no way of calculating the power of the simple word to spread the details of a life-saving medical discovery, to warn of warmongers, to expose demagogs, to spread the techniques of peace, to tell of the rights of man, to report the spiritual greatness and the lunatic lapses of mankind.

In this thrilling work of news gathering and news distribution, the Associated Press is regarded as the world's greatest agency. Its multilingual reporters risk prisons and worse to cover riots in South America or savagery in Africa, to write of the wars of the earth and the antics of dictators. From No. 10 Downing Street to Israel, and from Washington to Hong Kong, Associated Press men work with skill and daring to report and to defend the people's right to know.

Today the Associated Press, a mutual, cooperative association, serves some 7,000 newspapers, radio stations and television stations in 100 nations. It laces the earth into a web of enlightenment.

To be chosen for the presidency of such an organization is almost a frightening responsibility. It is not given lightly. And before it is given, many dedicated newspapermen, the Associated Press' directors, must agree that there is not the slightest doubt as to the capacity of the man to do the job. In this case there was no slightest doubt. Of course Paul Miller's selection is a matter of pride to the Gannett group of newspapers, but more than that, it should be an item of pride to Rochesterians and to all readers of newspapers in this group.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 19, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, January 19, 1963)

BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1964

The budget, by definition and practice, is both a financial report and a plan for the future. It is also a request for legislation, and an administrative guide to Government—all based on congressional approval. The President proposes; Congress disposes. The budget is presented to Congress each January, 6 months before the start of a new fiscal year (July 1 to June 30). The fiscal 1964 budget is approximately 1,200 pages and outlines both receipts and expenditures, also the comprehensive overall legislative program for the year of both appropriation by program and revenue by tax measures. The President's message accompanied the budget and described it, a truly amazing, unbelievable statement. Some of his statements should be remembered.

The President said: (1) "This budget presents a financial plan for the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business."

(2) "We have substantially reduced the deficit in our balance of payments."

(3) "I have felt obliged to limit severely my 1964 expenditure proposals."

(4) "The expenditure program is the minimum necessary."

(5) "The Federal deficit which will be incurred in the fiscal year 1964 should neither raise fears of inflation nor cause increased concern about our balance of international payments."

(6) "The total of administrative budget expenditures for all other programs, combined, has been held slightly below the 1963 level."

(7) "Other moderate expenditure increases being proposed * * * are offset by decreases in other administrative budget expenditures. For example, lower expenditures are estimated for the postal service, for certain housing, international and other lending programs, through substitution of private for public credit and for agricultural price supports."

(8) "Our practical choice is not between a deficit and a budgetary surplus. It is instead between two kinds of deficits; a chronic deficit of inertia due to inadequate economic growth—or a temporary deficit resulting from a tax and expenditure program designed to provide for our national security, boost the economy, increase tax revenue, and achieve future budget surpluses. The first type of deficit is a sign of waste and weakness. The second is an investment in the future."

(9) "As the tax cut becomes effective a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit."

Then an administrative digest from the Executive called the budget in brief speaks of the budget as "strengthening freedom" the debt as "our paying for the continuing costs of past war" and that "efficiency is increasing in Government," and that "payments to the public from Government are 20 percent of the gross national product."

THE FACTS

The facts and sound economic interpretation are, of course, just the opposite of the above statements. Let's examine these statements and the facts.

(1) The cash budget outlines expenditures of $122.5 billion (not $98.8 billion of the administrative budget) of expenditures and $112.2 billion receipts (not $86.9 billion of administrative budget) and no one, not even the radical-liberals will deny there is waste and extravagance. The deficit will be $10.3 billion in cash budget. Frugality? Efficiency?

(2) The balance of payments, or gold outflow and accumulating pressures are greater, not less, and the danger more acute. Devaluation of our money is now a real possibility.

(3 and 4) How can the biggest peacetime budget in history, an increase of $5.7 billion over the 1963 budget (which itself ran $8.3 billion in the hole) be called a "minimum or severe limitation in spending"?

(5) Here the President disquiets all sound economic students because he clearly recognizes though decries the two clear and present dangers directly resulting from his profligate spending—inflation and gold outflow—both calculated to destroy our currency value, the purchasing power of U.S. money.

(6) This is a flat misstatement of fact. The nondefense expenditures will soar above the 1963 level, because of (A) increases in almost every existing program, (B) new programs started:

(1) Youth Conservation Corps, (2) aid to education, (3) mass transit aid, (4) medicare, etc.

(C) Usual additions as unanticipated expenses result from domestic and foreign problems that arise. The Appropriation Committee chairman in debate specified a $2 billion increase immediately and more to come. Then he outlined the 27 percent increase in nondefense expenditures compared to 17 percent defense spending increase since 1961.

(7) The alleged decreases specified by the President are fallacious. Agriculture spending goes up, in his budget, not down as he said in his message. Postal spending goes up, not down. REA spending goes up, not down. Public works up, not down. Certain international, and housing and lending programs are mentioned as down only because the President hopes to sell for cash some of the existing Government loans. We have figure juggling, inaccurate bookkeeping methods, and wishful thinking instead of facts and truth.

(8) The choice is not between deficits. It is between profligate spending, wastefulness, Federal control, and aid on the one hand, or reduced Federal spending and a return to limited Government of freedom, incentives, and the Constitution on the other—a choice the President apparently neither recognizes nor understands.

(9) The recognition of a tax cut being a business stimulus is illusory and dangerous if not coupled with reduced Government spending. Inflation may produce more dollars later in taxes, but will destroy our whole economy. The budget in brief calling such extravagance and deficit as strengthening freedom and increased Government efficiency is worth only a laugh, if it weren't too painful a subject over which to laugh. It isn't laughable, it's tragic. We are indeed witnessing and being asked to take a path to fiscal suicide—the bankruptcy of the United States by our own hands—a prediction by the Communists years ago.

WHAT OTHERS SAY

Perhaps others in critical analysis, rather than in blind acceptance, will focus enough attention in days ahead so that Congress will compel our President to return to fiscal solvency and the balanced budget. Here are some comments: "The President's budget can only be termed a radical proposal"—Congressman JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin. "The most inconsistent budget ever submitted by a President"—Congressman HALL. "For 40 years I have never seen or heard a budget message like this one, and neither have you, nor has anyone else"—Congressman CANNON, chairman, Appropriations Committee. "Mr. Kennedy's economic proposals are straight out of the dream book"—Chicago Daily Tribune.

CONCLUSIONS

As I see it this budget clearly shows the President and his advisers' clear lack of understanding (1) the basic economics of a private market economy, (2) the role of constitutional limited government of a free society, (3) human nature, that people will work better for themselves than they will for Government. Now, who is negative and positive? Is it negative for a Member of Congress to vote against deficit spending? Is it positive to be for a balanced budget?

Public works and the Dallas Federal building

Finally, are new and expanding public works justified during times of deficit financing? Of course not. Yet on page 710 of the budget are listed many new Federal buildings. The Dallas Federal building is omitted, no reasons given. This poses two problems and decisions for the people of Dallas:

(1) Are the people of Dallas willing to lead the way to sound, balanced budget economics and constitutional government, asking others to join in, or are we ready to capitulate and join liberals in the race to bankruptcy.

(2) Can we be coerced, bribed or intimidated politically by Federal leaders who do not grade the Federal projects on merit but on political dictation? To pose the questions gives the answer, which a sensible, intelligent constituency will support. The Kennedy administration should disavow the Dallas Federal building because it has not been proven meritorious, if that is the case or it should be given number one priority over all other Federal buildings approved in the current budget. Or to say it another way, in a period of deficit financing there should be no public works and Federal buildings, but if there are going to be such projects, the Kennedy administration cannot morally deny a Federal building to Dallas while approving others of less priority and merit.

Supported by the people of Dallas, who have always supported sound principles, I shall continue my efforts for fiscal solvency and sanity and constitutional government. Your views are always welcome.

Protest Against Apartheid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last month I received a letter from Mr. Melvin Rotblatt, president of London Lamps, of Los Angeles, in which he advised me of his communication with Falks Electrical—S.A.—Ltd. of Johannesburg, South Africa. In his letter Mr. Rotblatt refused to do business with the South African firm because of the policy of racial repression currently followed in that country.

I have commended London Lamps for their courageous action and praised them for their stand which is in full accord with the resolution of the United Nations passed during the 17th session of the General Assembly. That resolution condemned South African racial policies; asked U.N. members to break diplomatic relations with South Africa, to boycott its exports, to close their ports to shipping from South Africa, and to prohibit their ships from sending goods to South Africa.

It is not enough for us to piously condemn the racist policies of South Africa, for such declarations have done nothing to change her actions. However, if sufficient economic pressure is brought to bear, her industrial and business leaders will undoubtedly pressure the government to enact much more moderate policies, and hopefully, to grant equal rights to all the peoples of South Africa.

We have seen in our own country that sometimes pressure is the only means to bring about the vitally important right of equal service or equal access to educational facilities. Hopefully, this de facto integration will eventually result in those who oppose equal rights accepting integration as a moral good.

Therefore, the London Lamps Co.'s action, which might very well deprive it of a profitable contract, is to be commended both for its attempt to help change the racist policies of South Africa, and as an example for other American businesses to follow in refusing to support inequality, whether at home or abroad.

London Lamps has demonstrated the spirit of true Americanism in its letter, which follows:

LONDON LAMPS,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 10, 1962.

Mr. M. KRAMER,
Falks Electrical (S.A.) (Pty.) Ltd.,
Johannesburg, South Africa.

DEAR MR. KRAMER: It has come to our attention that there have been negotiations with your company, with your placement of an order for lamps with our company to be shipped to the Union of South Africa.

Since you are in a country whose national policy is abhorrent to our feelings of morality and common decency, we do not wish to do business with you, and, therefore, cannot accept your order.

We, in this manner, advise you of our protest against injustice, restriction of civil rights, and racial prejudice as a national

policy of your government. We consider this policy and the measures that your government has taken as illegal in the eyes of international morality and law. We agree with the United Nations in the condemnation of these activities and the necessity of making the protest effective by economic isolation.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN ROTBLATT,
President.

GERALD ROTBLATT,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

John W. Tramburg, Devoted Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, the cause of social work and public welfare was dealt a great loss—John W. Tramburg, former Director of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia and of the State of Wisconsin, died at the age of 49 after suffering a heart attack.

Mr. Tramburg, a native of Fall River, Wis., and graduate of Whitewater State Teachers College in 1935, taught at Norwalk, Wis., and had been recreation and athletic director of a CCC camp in northern Wisconsin. He then attended the University of Chicago, where he received a master's degree in social service. During World War II he served for 3 years in the Navy.

Mr. Tramburg was the head of the District of Columbia welfare program in 1950 when he was hired to run Wisconsin's multimillion-dollar public welfare department. He remained in this post until 1955, except for a 1-year interruption to serve as the first Federal Commissioner of Social Security under President Eisenhower in Washington, where he had charge of drafting revisions in the social security system.

In 1955 Mr. Tramburg left Madison to become New Jersey State Commissioner of Institutions and Agencies, a post he held at the time of his death.

During his service in Wisconsin, Mr. Tramburg began a widely copied series of penal reforms for both adult and youthful offenders and he continued his efforts in this field in New Jersey.

Mr. Tramburg gave unstintingly of himself in positions of leadership to the field of social work through working as chairman of the Commission on Social Policy and Action of the National Association of Social Workers. As a member of the ad hoc Committee on Public Welfare appointed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff, he played an important role in developing the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

His contributions to, and concern for, health and welfare issues were signally recognized when he was elected president of the National Conference of Social Welfare for 1963.

The dedication and service to people of Mr. Tramburg crossed party lines—a Republican, he left his Wisconsin post to serve under New Jersey Democratic Governors Meyner and Hughes. In his death, the underprivileged and forgotten people have lost a stanch friend and advocate.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Harris County and Texas Lose Dedicated Leader in Death of Mayor Philpot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texas has lost an able and distinguished citizen in the death of William J. Philpot, who served the thriving and industrious city of Galena Park, Tex., as mayor for 8 years. Mayor Philpot was my close personal friend. He was at my side in five statewide campaigns for good government in Texas. He was a leader in Harris County and in Texas for better government at all levels.

Mayor Philpot was once honored by his fellow citizens as Man of the Year in Harris County. Because of the high esteem in which he was held by all who knew him, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the January 11, 1963, Houston Press, captioned "William J. Philpot," and the article from the January 11, 1963, Houston Post, captioned "Ex-Mayor Philpot's Rites Today," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Press, Jan. 11, 1963]

WILLIAM J. PHILPOT

For eight terms, William J. Philpot led Galena Park as its mayor as it grew from an off-the-beaten-path north shore village crowded by World War II ship channel operations to a bustling city of 10,852 (1960 census).

Mr. Philpot managed to handle his mayoralty duties along with many other civic activities while serving full time as supervisor of plant security in the big Champion Paper & Fibre Co. installation across the channel.

It couldn't have been too easy to handle everything. Yet his remarkable energy and purpose permitted him to accomplish it.

Bill Philpot's death at 58 years of age is a grave loss not only to Galena Park which last year named him its Man of the Year but to all Harris County.

He was a wheelhorse who worked the hardest when the going was toughest.

[From the Houston Post, Jan. 11, 1963]

EX-MAYOR PHILPOT'S RITES TODAY

Funeral services will be at 2:30 p.m. Friday for William J. Philpot, 58, one of Harris County's most colorful politicians and a mayor of Galena Park for 16 years.

He vacated the mayor's office last spring and was drafted by the Harris County Mayors & Councilmen's Association to run for the State legislature under its sponsoship. He was unsuccessful in that.

The services will be held at First Baptist Church with the Reverend Ed Stewart, pastor, and the Reverend L. A. Vermillion, pastor of the Peach Creek Baptist Assembly, officiating. Burial will be in Forest Park Cemetery.

Philpot, who served as mayor of Galena Park from 1944 to 1948 and from 1950 to 1962, died of a heart attack about 1 a.m. Thursday at his home.

The present mayor, Alvin D. Baggett, said the Galena Park City Hall will be closed all day Friday in honor of Philpot and that the American flag will be flown at half mast for the second consecutive day.

He was the supervisor of plant protection for Champion Papers, Inc., and was named Man of the Year for 1962 at Galena Park by the Galena Park Chamber of Commerce at a banquet last month.

Philpot was a past president of the Harris County Mayors & Councilmen's Association and a onetime candidate for county commissioner.

He was a frequent critic of the association because he felt it did not carry enough weight with the Harris County legislative delegation.

Philpot was a member of the First Baptist Church and Masonic Lodge, A.F. & A.M., 1290. He is survived by his wife Mrs. Cornelia Philpot; a son, W. J. Jr., both of Galena Park; five daughters, all of Houston: Mrs. Lois Zinnecker, Mrs. Nelle Patton, Mrs. Inez Dickey, Mrs. Betty Anderson, and Mrs. Betty Reeder; his mother, Mrs. Sophia Philpot of Arkansas; six brothers and eight sisters.

Defense Supply and Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, January 1 marked the completion of the first year of operation of the Defense Supply Agency, an innovation in defense procurement and support that has grown out of the McCormick-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. This Defense Supply Agency was created by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, as the administrative body through which common supply and service functions of the military services could be handled jointly rather than being handled, as before, on a separate basis by each service.

The key to the operation of the Defense Supply Agency is savings. Its justification for existence is that it can, through centralizing the administration of these common functions, save the taxpayers many hundreds of millions of dollars each year. I believe that the DSA has shown great promise in its first year of operation in achieving the goal for which it was created. With the continued support and interest of the Congress and the people of this country, it will be able to effect substantial savings in our annual military budget.

A rundown on the first year of DSA was recently published in the Washington Star. Written by Mr. Allen Smythe, this article shows the scope and promise of the Defense Supply Agency. To help give a better understanding of the DSA, I am placing Mr. Smythe's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

YEAR-OLD DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY SAVES MILLIONS AT PENTAGON

(By Allen M. Smythe)

The performance of Defense Secretary McNamara's pet project—the Defense Supply Agency—may serve him well when he goes to the new Congress to defend the military budget. The ex-president of the Ford Motor Co. has been using his executive and production talents to install some business policies in the Pentagon.

Many congressional leaders had been urging a "fourth service of supply" for the last 10 years in an effort to eliminate waste and duplication in Defense procurement. Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Representative CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, sponsored an amendment to the Defense reorganization bill of 1958 which gave Mr. McNamara a free hand in unifying supply purchases and services.

The DSA—1 year old on January 1, 1963—makes modest claims of savings of $50 to $100 million. Mr. CURTIS thinks these claims are far too low and prophesies that savings in the billions will result when DSA expands to take over all noncombatant supply and related services.

Among the latter, Mr. CURTIS would include aerial surveys, photography, communications, public relations, recruiting activities, engineering efforts, and legal work.

ACTIVITIES FAR REACHING

DSA began operations January 1, 1962, taking over six existing commodity management agencies from the Army and Navy and a traffic management service which supervises the transportation of Defense freight and passengers in the United States. It also began the organization of two new activities centers, one to manage supply of electrical and electronic items, and a second to maintain the Federal Supply Catalog and administer Department of Defense material utilization and surplus property disposal programs.

By July 1, 1962, DSA had taken over two more activities, one managing industrial supplies and another managing automotive parts. Thus, after 6 months in business, DSA became responsible on a phased basis, for food, clothing, petroleum, medical, general, construction, industrial, automotive, and electronic items of military supply.

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES

New management responsibilities assigned to the agency during the year by the Secretary of Defense included:

1. Management of 6,000 items of common chemical material. Apparatus will be added to the items managed by the Defense Medical Supply Center, Brooklyn, N.Y., and chemicals, dyes, compressed gases, and coal to the items managed by the Defense Petroleum Supply Center, Washington, D.C.

2. Designing and establishing a central inventory of machine tools owned by the Department of Defense and management of $1 billion worth of this equipment which is in idle status. Records of the $2 billion of equipment in active use are handled by DSA.

3. Operation of an integrated wholesale distribution system, beginning January 1, 1963, which will involve the use of a network of depots maintained by the military services.

DSA is currently responsible for material management of 241 Federal supply categories while the military services manage the remaining 320 categories including weapons, ammunition, explosives, aircraft, ships, motor vehicles and other end items of combat equipment.

By June 30, 1963, the 21,000 employees of DSA will be responsible for 1,100,000 items of military supply with estimated inventory value of $3.1 billion and annual procurement of $2.9 billion.

Voice of West Rarely Heard in White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Richard Wilson's column in the January 17, Sioux Falls Argus-Leader offers constructive suggestions for the leaders of the present Democratic administration. In hopes that a word to the wise will be sufficient, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAYS VOICE OF WEST IS RARELY HEARD IN WHITE HOUSE

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The westward surge in the country exposes a narrowness of view in Washington unbecoming to a large central government.

Attitudes of mind and behavioristic patterns in the Capital are out of date. Left largely out of account is the westward swing, a population movement dwarfing the opening of the western lands a century ago.

The move west is often regarded in Washington as something remote, as if it were happening in another country. The East remains, it is thought, the financial and cultural heart of the country and the seat of Federal governmental authority, though comparatively less populous.

ADMINISTRATION PAROCHIALISM

This seems quite unrealistic when one returns to the Capital after extensive travels in many sections which are regarded in Washington as fairly remote. But even 3 weeks of such travel does not reveal the scope of the country to the native traveler, for, he has missed many sections and others he has seen too briefly.

The Kennedy administration—with major exceptions, of course—has in general brought to Washington the flavor of eastern parochialism. Its political methods are eastern urban. The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, for example, ventures rarely into the West where he is not well understood.

The voice of the new West is not much heard in the White House. The Kennedy advisers in the main are oriented to the academic thought processes, and behavioristic standards of Harvard.

Where this is not literally the case, the President's advisers are classically eastern. His chief advisers, McNamara, Rusk, and Dillon, are wholly conditioned by eastern standards of thought, behavior, and even dress. This may not necessarily be bad. In fact it may be good, but it is not representative of the whole Nation.

Something more of western flavor would give the Washington government a more national character. Such reflections occur to a traveler as he idles in a jeweled western city lying immaculate under the desert sun within a protecting circlet of hills and peaks, some snowcapped, some golden glowing in the fading light of evening.

Somewhere in Washington, the traveler reflects, there ought to be room for the spirit of the new West.

THEY SEEK THE SUN

Giving the Government a more national character by the introduction of western modes of thought and behavior might have seemed a few years ago to be merely a nod to the West for political reasons. But today more is involved. The Nation has moved and is continuing to move west as the conditions of life and employment make the western areas more suitable for large urban populations.

Whether these areas are suitable or not the westward surge continues. People seek the sun. They seek also to escape the heavy pressures of eastern urban life, the abrasions of closer and closer contact with their fellow man, and the limitations and burdens of a fixed status of which they are tired or consider hopeless.

The West beckons again as it did a century ago to the jaded easterner, to the dispossessed farmer and displaced industrial worker. It has created new opportunities for the technician and the skilled worker. It has gathered a great reservoir of scientific brains around its universities to spawn and nurture the new industrial technologies.

A strange corollary of this is that in the Capital the western influence remains so feeble. Neither in Congress nor in the executive departments is the western influence strong. The sons of the Nation's most populous State, California, play no major part in the large affairs of Government in this administration. Only one holds a truly high place, the Chief Justice of the United States, and he was appointed in the previous administration.

As for the great and growing cities of the new West—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Albuquerque, San Diego, Los Angeles, Dallas, Houston, yes, even Reno, Boise, Tucson—so little is heard that they might be in another country.

And for that matter, who would know in Washington that Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Mount Pleasant, Iowa, offer a cultured way of life of which the average eastern urbanite is not even dimly aware?

CULTURAL DESERT

Lately there has been much emphasis on the new culture in Washington on the assumption that the Capital is a cultural desert, and that the greatest library in the world and one of the greatest art galleries are not enough. Washington must be more like London, Paris, and Rome. The Capital must duplicate cultural facilities already existing in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and elsewhere in this country though, in fact, Washington's overriding preoccupation is and always will be with public affairs.

It seems that no place is really cultured without a $30 million structure in which to perform the ballet, to say nothing of a $10 million aquarium in which to display fish which somehow slipped through Congress.

It would be heartening if, with all this culture, some way could be found also to invest Washington with a more nearly national flavor imported from what is soon to be, or is now, the greatest section of the country, the Golden West.

Repeal Automobile Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members a very gratifying expression of support for my effort to repeal the 10-percent automobile excise tax. I have received from the Flint, Mich., City Commission a resolution condemning the excise tax as a "highly discriminatory and exceedingly depressive" measure that endangers the financial welfare of all individuals and communities dependent upon automotive production for an economic base.

The city commission has reached the heart of the matter, pointing out the unfairness of continuing a tax that was designed to restrict production and consumption of new automobiles, when the need for restriction has been removed. But besides being an inequity, this tax holds back the full expansion and capacity of the economy. If the tax this resolution decries were repealed, business activity and employment in the steel, rubber, and other related industries would be stimulated by further demand for new cars. As we consider action on the President's request for tax reduction and reform to encourage economic growth, I feel this is a matter that should have our most careful attention. I submit the resolution to the consideration of the Members, and for inclusion in the RECORD:

Whereas current U.S. tax legislation requires the levy of a 10-percent excise upon every automobile sold at retail throughout the country; and

Whereas said tax was an emergency measure passed during the Korean crisis but has been given an extension by the Congress every year since that time; and

Whereas by its very nature and conception said tax is highly discriminatory and exceedingly depressive on the automobile industry and all its suppliers, constituting a direct threat to the financial welfare of all individuals and communities dependent upon automotive production for an economic base; and

Whereas previous Flint City commissions have voiced strong and continued opposition to this unfair levy and have endorsed the efforts of our Congressman, and other State representatives to the Congress, to repeal, or as a bare minimum to reduce substantially, the 10-percent excise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this city commission reiterate previous appeals for relief of the 10-

percent excise on automobiles as a long needed tax reform and as a stimulant to the economic vitality of the automotive industry and the diverse industries which depend wholly or partially upon it; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN, Congressman-elect NEIL STAEBLER, and Senators PATRICK MCNAMARA and PHILIP HART, of the State of Michigan, as a reassurance of our support of their efforts to have this odious excise repealed.

The Reasons Why California Is First in Defense Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in recent years, California has come under heavy attack because a substantial slice of the Nation's defense and space contracts has gone to California industries and universities. I have taken the floor several times to answer these attacks, particularly to fight back a misguided plan to divert this critical work to depressed areas unqualified for the job.

Today I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial by the Los Angeles Times, dated December 20, 1962. The Times editorial forcefully spells out the principal reason why California has year after year earned billions of aerospace dollars; namely, California's outstanding educational system and intellectual climate. Those envious of California's share of this vital work would do well to examine the evidence at hand.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent Los Angeles Times editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CALIFORNIA GETS THE WORK

Anyone can get from the Pentagon a list of the Defense Department's outlays, by companies and States, to the aerospace industry. Eastern Congressmen use it when they complain that California gets much more of the money than any of the other States.

If these envious Congressmen knew the full statistical accounting their cries would ascend like a siren's. For the fact is that California eventually gets more of the work than the Defense Department's figures show. This is not because the Pentagon has tried to deceive anybody; it lists prime contractors. But it does not attempt to account for (or map) all the crosscurrents and eddies of subcontracting, which is a labor to be compared with graphing the wriggles of eels in a bucket.

This monumental work was undertaken by the magazine Aerospace Management. It found that for 1961 California did more than a quarter of all the aviation and space work in the United States ($5.2 billion of $18 billion), public and private. A California prime contractor could, and often did, subcontract for work outside of this State (and California manufacturers have often pointed this out), but the subcontractors subcontract, too, and the subsubcontract might very well come home to California to roost. This phenomenon serves to extend the argument we have made here on several occasions, that aerospace work should be done where it can be done most efficiently. That place obviously is California.

The explanation is easy, although it is not a part of the strict analysis of work done and paid for with which Aerospace Management is concerned. More than one-fourth of the money was ultimately spent in California—but California is also the dwelling place of more than one-third of the relevant experts.

These experts are in California not only because the physical climate tempts them but because the intellectual climate is one of the most salubrious in the United States and the world. California attracts some of the experts from other places, to be sure, but it grows many of them at home—and keeps them, for the greater glory and prosperity of the State.

This is a testimonial to California education, which is a regenerative, or feedback, system. If one seeks to justify a system of education by the account book, California's has surely paid off. Forty percent of State revenue goes to education at all public levels but the dividends on the investment are terrific—at least to the materialist assessor. Here are a few statistics gathered and checked by the California Bankers' Association:

California leads the Nation in elementary and secondary school enrollment. It spends more on public schools than 43 other States combined. One-fourth of the population is in school.

With its universities, its "think factories," its libraries, and laboratories, California is the center of a scientific ferment that may be unparalleled elsewhere in the world.

California has 161 private and public institutions of higher learning. Among these are five universities that confer doctorate degrees. In the fall of 1961 these institutions had 600,000 full- or part-time students—13 percent of the State population between 15 and 34.

About 47 percent of the total U.S. enrollment in junior colleges is in California.

More than one-fifth of the members of the National Academy of Sciences (137 of 643) live in California and are associated with one or another of its universities and colleges. (New York has 104.)

Twenty Nobel laureates are associated with these same institutions. The University of California alone has 11 of them, more than all those Russia has had since the Nobel awards began in 1901.

The educational statistics clearly explain the aerospace statistics. The envious eastern Congressmen need more than Federal money, they need talent—and they can't get that by voting for it or soliciting sympathetic testimonials from the President and the Vice President of the United States.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the fair and fertile Ukraine has been a borderland between East and West, between Europe and Asia, and its sturdy inhabitants have borne the brunt of all invaders in either direction throughout centuries. For more than 300 years in modern times it has been submerged in the Russian landmass, and during all that time autocratic czars and Communist tyrants have done their utmost to suppress and crush all distinctive Ukrainian national traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their willingness to sacrifice their worldly posesssions as well as their lives for the attainment of their national goals. Only once in the course of their centuries-long subjugation to alien rulers have they had the chance of attaining their freedom. That was in 1918. When the czar's decrepit autocracy was overthrown, and Austria no longer ruled over western Ukraine, they seized upon the occasion and proclaimed their national independence. That was done on January 22, 45 years ago.

That significant landmark in the recent history of the Ukrainian people has become their national holiday. They celebrate that day in due solemnity, even though the freedom which was ushered in on that day has long ceased to exist. Nearly 43 years ago they were robbed of their freedom by the Red army, and since then these sturdy and stout-hearted peasants have been subjected to the callous and cruel regime of the Kremlin.

To this day the Ukraine remains a province of the Soviet empire, and for more than four decades some 42 million Ukrainians have been living in their homeland as prisoners in a large prison camp, working there mostly for the benefit of their heartless taskmasters. They are separated from the free world by the unspeakable Iron Curtain and they are sealed off from the outside world. Of course, they cannot enjoy any of the freedoms which we in the West regard as our birthright. Under such conditions, of course, they do not and cannot celebrate their national holiday, their independence day. Fortunately hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians who live in freedom in the free world celebrate that holiday, and Ukrainian-Americans solemnly observe the anniversary of this memorable day in an effort to keep alive the undying spirit of an independent Ukraine. I am indeed glad to join them in the 45th anniversary celebration of the Ukrainian Independence Day.

International Printing Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last week was International Printing Week, during which we recognize the influence of printing on the course of history.

In marking the observance of the week, President Kennedy pointed out that "print is the true international currency of the modern world. The printer's art has built the vast array of secular and religious thought, of technical and scientific achievement, which knows no national frontiers and which forms the fabric of today's dangers and possibilities."

He added that printing is "a human achievement which has demonstrated far greater power to shape the world than all the force of modern weaponry."

He called it "appropriate that you have chosen the birthday of Benjamin Franklin for this celebration. That great scientist, philosopher, statesman—and printer—embodied for all time the tremendous fact that to affect the thinking of man is to influence the course of history."

Mr. President, Columnist Bill Gold, of the Washington Post, devoted a major section of a recent column to International Printing Week. I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of this column, as published in the January 14 Washington Post, printed in the RECORD.

There beng no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is fascinating to recall the evolution of communication among men. From a beginning of ideograms painted on the walls of caves we progressed to hieroglyphics on man-made structures and on tablets of clay. We developed phonetics, and languages, and papyrus on which to record these symbols.

But for thousands of years the spoken word remained the principal means of transferring an idea from one mind to another. While the scribe copied his texts laboriously by hand, reading and writing remained specialized skills reserved to an elite minority.

The average man got his ideas chiefly from the folklore of his people. Naturally, his cultural horizons were circumscribed by the limitations of oral communication. Man's memory is not always accurate, nor is his capacity for remembering adequate.

Johannes Gutenberg changed all that with the invention of movable type. He made printing easier and cheaper, and thereby enabled each new generation to distribute the fruits of man's intellectual progress among an ever-growing number of people.

The elite minority became an elite majority, and such a great flood of printed information became available that no man could keep pace with more than a fraction of it. Indices were devised to make these mountains of printed matter useful to those who sought specific information. And finally machines were built to store hundreds of thousands of printed pages on a roll of film, and to reproduce any desired page within seconds at the push of a button or the spin of a dial.

But what does it avail us to have all this knowledge at our fingertips if we have not disciplined ourselves in the wise use of it?

Franklin said: "Printers are educated in the belief that when men differ in opinions, both sides ought equally to have the advantage of being heard by the public, and then when truth and error have fairplay the former is always the overmatch for the latter."

Some 200 years have passed since then. Franklin's goal should have been realized by now. Sagas and crackpots have had their opportunity to be pamphleteers, and truth should long ago have put error to rout.

How is it, then, that there is still doubt as to which ideology will bury which?

Perhaps it is because some people learn the mechanics of reading without ever mastering the art of reading with discernment.

Many phases of communications are automatic now. A man sits in New York and operates a machine that sets type automatically in Washington. Another man touches a button that activates an information retrieval system that automatically reproduces what was printed 10 years before. Electric eyes adjust high-speed presses automatically. But none of these technological marvels becomes meaningful until human thought is brought to bear upon the end product. And thinking has not yet been automated.

It is not enough to read, and to expose ourselves to both truth and error. We must read with active and inquiring minds, alert to the blandishments of error, zealous in our pursuit of truth. We must read with the verve and intentness of a bloodhound following a scent.

Understanding does not come to a man; he attains it by going after it. And I suspect that if we could speed up our understanding as much as we have speeded up our reading pace of late, we'd all be a lot happier.

Elks' Declaration of American Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tad Wilcher, chairman of the Know Your America Week program for the Arlington-Fairfax Lodge No. 2188, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, has called to my attention a declaration of American principles of the Elks.

Because its message will be of interest to all Members and citizens, under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A DECLARATION OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES OF THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is dedicated to the welfare of the United States of America. One of our order's purposes is to quicken the spirit of American patriotism. To that end our order has striven to advance the principles that guide our Nation, and has opposed all attacks upon them from whatever quarter.

Freedom, the historic goal of mankind, is our Nation's basic principle. Freedom has been under steady attack by international communism for many years. Now, freedom and communism are engaged in a struggle for survival. This struggle is not of our choosing but has been forced upon us. Free men have no choice but to accept the challenge.

The Americanism Committee of the Grand Lodge of Elks believes that freedom too long has stood on the defensive. The time has come for us who believe in freedom to take the initiative; fight for what we believe in and stand against those who are against us until freedom has defeated those who would destroy it. To rely on military power alone in this ideological struggle would be illusory and fatal. Our paramount necessity is internal strength which can come only from unity of understanding and purpose and a willingness to place our Nation's safety and welfare above personal interest.

Appealing, as did our Founding Fathers, to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, we submit to our brothers this declaration of American principles on which we shall challenge the enemies of freedom, and to which we invite our fellow citizens to subscribe:

1. Moral values are the basis of our society, and the responsibility of each citizen to live by these moral values is fundamental to the welfare and progress of our society. These moral values include honesty of word, deed and purpose; brotherly love that requires us to be fair with our followmen and just in our relations with them; faithful performance of our labor in every honorable calling; and a recognition that each of us has the duty to contribute to the best of his ability to the advancement of the general welfare.

2. Freedom has made America. Not just political freedom, but the whole environment of freedom is responsible for the tremendous progress of our Nation since its revolutionary birth in 1776. Freedom encourages initiative, experiment, invention, enterprise. Freedom lets citizens choose their work, encourages individuals to discover their talents and make the most of them. In consequence we have a standard of living higher than any nation has enjoyed, a material abundance more widely shared among all our people than ever before, and a high level of intellectual and cultural attainment. Every citizen is the beneficiary of the freedom that has unleashed the abilities of the American people and provided the incentive for their maximum use.

3. Inherent in the American concept of freedom is the integrity of the individual. Individualism makes each person primarily responsible for himself, his welfare, his success or failure. Freedom lays upon each person the individual responsibility and duty of citizenship. A free society will emphasize individualism and individual responsibility as the sure way to produce democratic leadership and preserve freedom.

4. Self-government presupposes the duty of every citizen to obey the established government and to employ only those lawful methods of reason and persuasion that are open to all of us to achieve political action. It follows that government by the majority must be reasonable in the exercise of its authority and protect the rights and interests of the minority.

5. Our ability to change our institutions and practices, through orderly process of law, to accommodate to changing needs has helped our Nation to develop, as it will in the future. All proposals for change in our institutions should be weighed carefully by all citizens to determine whether such change will reduce or add to our freedom. Our goal should be more freedom, not less. We must guard against the growth of governmental power through surrender of civil right and individual freedom for contemporary gain at the expense of future generations.

6. The tendency of groups to seek preferential treatment from government breeds rivalries dangerous to political stability, is harmful to genuine economic growth and leads to fragmentation of society rather than to unity and strength. All groups of citizens ought to measure political and economic proposals advanced in their own interest against their effect on the whole Nation.

7. We believe that the time has come when all citizens who believe in these principles should speak up for them, and set an example by applying them fully in their daily lives. We urge those in positions of leadership and influence—clergymen, educators, business executives, holders of public office, leaders of labor, intellectuals, editors, radio and television producers, motion picture producers and all others—to assume a greater responsibility for the wider understanding of these principles and their practical application in the day-to-day lives of the people.

Inaugural Address by Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week I participated in the ceremonies in which the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania inaugurated a new Governor. William W. Scranton, until recently a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, was sworn in at noon on January 15 at the Farm Show Arena in Harrisburg.

The new Governor then delivered an inaugural address that was deeply moving in its simple eloquence. He spoke to all of us in urging that we look to the past for inspiration in doing what needs to be done. And he spoke for all of us in expressing the hope that we may use our latent resources, imagination, fortitude, and faith to make a better life for all our people.

Since others in the Congress will want to read this address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF WILLIAM W. SCRANTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

My fellow Pennsylvanians, nearly 300 years ago a God-fearing man carved the first bits of civilization out of the land that lay west of the Delaware.

His name was William Penn. He had an idea. It took root in our soil. His idea was that men and women are resourceful and imaginative. He believed that, given a chance, they could turn back a wilderness, chisel out a monument to human dignity, and live in peace and prosperity.

In an age rife with human hatred, with religious bigotry, with political persecution, he had the wisdom, and the courage, to launch a holy experiment. He made Pennsylvania the bastion of freedom—the temple of tolerance, the showcase of economic enterprise. He believed freedom is more than a cliche. He believed courage is more than a slogan. He believed human will power more than a match for all the obstacles of nature or economics. He believed human ingenuity capable of solving human problems. He believed indifference and despair can be put to rout by human hope.

But, most of all he believed in himself, he believed in his fellow men, he believed in Pennsylvania.

That was three centuries ago.

Three months ago I was campaigning through a Pennsylvania town. The day was dreary. A cold rain had drizzled down all morning.

A young man with tired eyes, a sad voice, and a scared handshake told me: "Pennsylvania is no place for me."

And, a day later, I campaigned through a sun-drenched suburb. Other people with other, quite different, problems.

Another young man, this one with a kind of "I'm going places" look about him grasped my hand. He looked me in the eye. He said: "I can't for the life of me figure out why anybody would want to be Governor of this State."

And he explained, "Pennsylvania is going nowhere."

That was 3 months ago.

Three days ago I pondered what to say on the day that I became Governor of this State.

I thought of William Penn 300 years ago. But I remembered the young man of 3 months ago.

With this memory the vim and vigor of the campaign seemed to sour. The flush of election victory paled. The brave hopes of just yesterday seemed puny. The awful responsibility seemed to dwarf the high honor of the office I was about to assume.

But then more of Pennsylvania came to mind. More of what we have been taught and know of Pennsylvania. More of her heritage. More of her people, and their pride and their faith, the hands I had clasped, the warmth of their welcome.

I remembered the face of the woman. Woman of a town blasted by industrial migration. Plants closed. Gates locked. Menfolk idle. I remembered the courage in the face of the woman.

I remembered the eyes of the man. Man out of work. Tiny worry lines around those eyes. The haunting fear that self-respect might flee, but even stronger, the challenge: "Give me a chance, and you'll see what I can do." I remembered the hope in the eyes of the man.

I remembered the hands of the farmer. A sower of seeds. A cultivator of life. A man close to God. Hands flicked with soil, so the tan of the skin seemed almost one with the tan of the earth. Hands that make things grow. I remembered the pride of those hands.

I remembered the arms that swung a lunch pail. Skilled arms. Strong sinews. A cadence to his walk that said: "I do a day's work. I do it well." Perhaps the proudest boast of man. I remembered the fresh, pungent smell of independence.

I remembered the frown of the young college student. Inquisitive. Prove it or I won't believe it. Why can't Pennsylvania move ahead? Who says my only opportunities lies elsewhere? Is it wrong to care? What are you going to do about it? Yes, I remembered the anxious student.

And, I remembered the brow of a businessman. Furrowed? Yes, but perhaps even more accurately, concerned "I have a duty here. A role to perform. I want Pennsylvania to climb to the top. I'm busy and it's easy to find excuses, but point the way and I'll do my share." Yes, I remember the concern, the willingness, in that face.

And, suddenly, I knew that Pennsylvania today is not really very different than the Pennsylvania of three centuries ago.

Yes, the challenges wear different faces. Problems assume different guises. But truly, we hold the same trump cards.

Resourcefulness, imagination, fortitude. And one more—faith.

The Pennsylvania that responded to the 17th century promise of William Penn's Holy experiment.

The Pennsylvania that nurtured an 18th century Ben Franklin and became the Cradle of Liberty.

The Pennsylvania that was strengthened by a 19th century influx of brave, stout hearts from the Old World.

The Pennsylvania that in the 20th century has remained basically strong and vital, despite a buffeting from history's greatest technological revolution.

That Pennsylvania—don't tell me that Pennsylvania can't lick its problems, because I know it can.

We still have the same God-given natural resources, the same advantages for commerce and industry, the same progressive spirit that brought us greatness in other years, in other ages.

But, these things must be tapped. Resources and advantages and spirit must be put to work. Human courage and human hope must drive the motors of human effort and human toil.

Some of Pennsylvania's problems can be solved soon, others can only be solved in time. But nothing will happen, nothing will move, unless the labor begins today.

The State government has an obvious and vital role in that labor. As a Pennsylvanian, no one can convince me that our State is incapable of that labor. No one can convince me that other States and other governments are more capable.

Of course, there are those who would prefer to dwell more on our fears than on our hopes.

There are those who would prefer to curse the darkness, rather than light a candle. Blame the past, rather than work to assure the future.

There are those who would prefer to gossip of yesterday's divisions, rather than work on today's need for unity.

Show me a Democrat who was wrong or shortsighted, I will show you a Republican who was. And vice versa.

Show me a businessman who was selfish, I will show you a labor leader who was. And vice versa.

Show me a citizen in Pennsylvania who has suffered by someone's lack of concern, and I will show you another citizen who has caused suffering by his lack of concern.

But let us hope that in the showing, both you and I will grow wiser and learn that today's opportunities are far more important than yesterday's mistakes.

With these opportunities, Pennsylvania is on the march. Toward greatness for herself. Toward progress, for her people.

Our Commonwealth has the resources, the human strength, the get up and go from which greatness is made. There is work to do, lots of it, but Pennsylvanians have never shirked from that prospect.

In both the executive branch and in the legislature, all of us must vow today to do our part to bring about a new era in Pennsylvania progress. We must have the wisdom to keep what should be kept; the courage to change what should be changed.

With the help of God let us embrace the challenge, let us welcome the labor.

Let us stand tall—as Pennsylvanians.

Let us walk proudly—as Pennsylvanians.

Comparison of Budget Deficits Under Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Mr. Walter Scott, columnist for Parade magazine, and to the president and publisher, Mr. Arthur H. Motley.

I think that particularly in the context of today's events, it is essential that the American public not be hoodwinked into believing that there is anything like the comparison between the fiscal policies pursued under the Eisenhower ad-

ministration and the squandermania which is now the fixed policy of the Kennedy administration.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, by way of comparison, during the last 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, not counting the fiscal year 1961 which was a transitional fiscal year under both Presidents, the Eisenhower administration had a total of $257.6 billion of revenue at its disposal and during this period incurred a net overall deficit of some $12.9 billion.

However, during a like period; namely, the 3 complete fiscal years under the Kennedy administration, the Kennedy administration will have had 25 percent more to spend than Eisenhower—a total of $322.3 billion, but yet with more money to spend the figures reflect a net deficit of some $27 billion for the Kennedy administration.

Mr. Speaker, my letter to Parade magazine follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1963.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT,
Parade Publications,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: As usual, I read your column, "Personality Parade," which appeared in the Washington Post on January 20, 1963. The introduction to your column states that it is for readers who want the facts and want to spike rumors. It is now apparent to me that your column is more than that. It has apparently become a vehicle for those who are trying to justify the spendthrift policies of the Kennedy administration.

You published a question in the issue to which I refer from a Mr. Harrison Cutler, who asked for a comparison of the budget deficit under Kennedy and Eisenhower and then said, "Take a year like 1959." One would have to be completely naive not to assume that the author of this question knew the answer before he even asked for it, for it has been widely publicized that 1959 was the year of the largest peacetime deficit in our Nation's history. However, it should be pointed out that we were in the depths of a recession and it was because of the curtailment of Government revenues that this extraordinary deficit occurred. On the other hand, the Kennedy administration in a period which they proudly claim is one of the most prosperous in our history will show us a deficit of more than $8 billion in fiscal 1963 and they are already predicting a budget deficit of $11.9 billion for the fiscal year not yet begun. You might also inform Mr. Cutler that the Kennedy administration, during the 3 fiscal years for which it has been responsible, has achieved or will achieve budget deficits approximating $27 billion. During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, budget deficits totaled $23 billion.

To conclude, I certainly hate to see your column used for the very obvious purpose that it was used when you published the question by Mr. Cutler. We who constitute the loyal opposition have enough trouble already with the managed news policies of this administration. We therefore sincerely hope that editors and columnists like yourself will not become the foils of those who blandly justify anything and everything that this administration has done.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

Tribute to Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a grand and inspiring lady—Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Sr.—whose life and works have helped shape the history of Missouri, was the special center of attention in Sikeston, Mo., last night, when scores of friends and relatives gathered to join with her in celebrating her 91st birthday.

Born in Tennessee just after the close of the Civil War, she has been a Missourian by choice since near the turn of the century. For 35 years, she and her husband, Col. C. L. Blanton, Sr., worked shoulder to shoulder in publishing the Sikeston (Mo.) Standard. Although this wonderful relationship ended with Colonel Blanton's death in 1948, Mrs. Blanton remained active in the newspaper, and is today still president of the Sikeston Publishing Co.

Mr. President, I would like to incorporate as part of my remarks, an article from the January 19 edition of the Daily Sikeston Standard, which traces the full and active life of this amazing lady, of whom it is said: "To her, each new year is another memory and another opportunity to be doing something."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. C. L. BLANTON, SR., TO CELEBRATE 91ST BIRTHDAY AT DINNER MONDAY EVENING

Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Sr., of 305 Tanner Street, widow of the late Col. C. L. Blanton, Sr., editor and publisher of the Sikeston Standard from 1913 until his death in 1948, will be celebrating her 91st birthday Monday, January 21, not looking a day older than she did last year.

Mrs. Blanton's many friends here and at many points in the United States will join her children, grandchildren, and great granchildren in wishing her a most happy birthday.

Mrs. Blanton, one of Sikeston's most honored and certainly most beloved citizens, does not spend her days being idle and dreaming. She, unlike some to whom the passing years seem to age them and dull their faculties and are content to just sit, takes an active part in several activities. To her, each new year is another memory and another opportunity to be doing something.

Mrs. Blanton is the only surviving member of the group of women who organized the Woman's Club years ago who is still active. She attends most of the meetings and takes a lively interest in its activities.

She is a faithful communicant of the St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church and also of its Ladies Altar Society and the Catholic Ladies Canasta Club.

Mrs. Blanton was born Mary Agnes Cullen, January 21, 1872, in Nashville, Tenn., daughter of the late James F. and Mary Thompson Cullen. She moved with her family to Hot Springs, Ark., where her father operated a hotel until the great fire of 1876 wiped out most of the town.

When that happened three of the children—Mrs. Blanton, and a sister and brother—were sent back to Nashville to go to school and the rest of the family followed shortly after. In 1882 the Cullens moved to Washington, D.C., where Mr. Cullen was employed in the War Department.

On September 17, 1890, Mary Agnes married Charles L. Blanton, then working for his father, Benjamin Franklin Blanton, on the Monroe County Appeal at Paris, Mo., which the elder Blanton had established in 1865 immediately following his discharge from the Confederate Army.

In 1892, Mr. and Mrs. C. L. Blanton, with their first son, Harry, moved to Washington, D.C., where Mr. Blanton was employed by the Government. But, in 1909, they returned to Paris, Mo., where Colonel Blanton worked on the Appeal until 1913 when he came to Sikeston and bought the Sikeston Standard from the Naeter brothers and published it until his death in 1948.

Mrs. Blanton took over the task of handling the business affairs of the paper while her husband gained fame as a fearless editor and known far and wide for his famous "Polecat Column."

With the organization of the Sikeston Publishing Co. to continue the publication of the paper, now the Daily Sikeston Standard, the acquisition of the Sikeston Herald and the Scott County Democrat, Mrs. Blanton became president of the Sikeston Publishing Co., a position she still occupies.

During 58 years of marriage, Colonel and Mrs. Blanton became the parents of eight children. Four of the children are expected to attend a dinner to be given in Mrs. Blanton's honor at the Rustic Rock Inn, Monday evening. Host and hostess for the dinner will be Col. and Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Jr. Others who are expected are Mr. and Mrs. Harry Blanton, Mr. and Mrs. David Blanton, and Mr. and Mrs. N. C. Watkins of Benton (Mary Blanton).

Other children include Edna, now Mrs. Edna M. Payne of Arlington, Va.; Catherine, now Mrs. J. O'C. Roberts, Washington, D.C.; Milton W. Blanton of Atlanta, Ga.; and James Benjamin Blanton of Dallas, Tex.

Mrs. Blanton has 22 grandchildren and 52 great grandchildren.

Although many of her immediate family and many, many friends will not be able to attend to give their best wishes in person, there will be many messages from the absentees who will join all Sikeston in wishing one of its most respected citizens a happy birthday.

Pensions and Employee Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, late last year I had the opportunity of addressing the American Pension Conference in its meeting in New York. At that time I reviewed the work of the 87th Congress in the field of legislative activity in this important area of interest and prospects for further developments in the 88th Congress. I am placing this speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to indicate the ways in which I believe we can move forward and improve legis-

lation in this area by a better understanding of the economic and political philosophy which lies behind the laws and proposals on pension and employee benefit programs.

The speech follows:

PENDING LEGISLATION IN THE PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT AREA

(By Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri)

I am going to renege somewhat on the title of my address. Actually, there is no pending legislation on any subject once a Congress has adjourned its 2d session sine die, as the 87th Congress finally did on October 13, 1962. However, I shall discuss what legislation might be introduced in the 88th Congress, and I shall refer to four measures passed by the 87th Congress which will have considerable influence in the future on pension and employee benefits. Essentially, however, I would like to discuss some of the economic and political philosophy behind legislation in this area of pension and employee benefits.

The bill passed by the 87th Congress which dealt most directly with pension and employee benefits was the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. After a rough road it finally passed the Congress in March of 1962. I am hopeful that those responsible for imposing additional regulations on the pension trustees will bear in mind the primary objectives of pension plans and not burden them with undue costs and strangling redtape. Frankly, I was opposed to this act because I thought the record was quite clear that there had been little abuse and that present law was available to take care of what abuse might exist. On the other hand, we are talking about $50 billion of investment and this fund will continue to increase with great rapidity for many years to come. A great trust has been imposed upon those charged with the care of these funds and, because the Federal Government has given tax-exempt status to payments into these funds the Government has a proper concern to see that the trust is not abused.

I authored a bill which was signed by the President after the Congress adjourned which also directly affects pension funds. My bill, unlike the previous bill, liberalizes rather than restricts pension funds. It permits funds to be accumulated for health benefits and to be included in pension plans without endangering their tax-exempt status, provided such funds are accounted for separately. The Curtis bill, after being passed out of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously, almost met an untimely death because it was heralded publicly by some of the promoters of the King-Anderson bill, which proposed to utilize the Federal social security system to pay for limited medical costs of the aged social security beneficiaries, as legislation in lieu of King-Anderson. Well, there is no question that the Curtis bill will help to alleviate whatever problem exists in older people meeting their medical costs and, to that extent, it cuts down on the political pressures that are, or might be, built up for King-Anderson-type legislation, but it was designed for a positive purpose, not a negative purpose.

I was able to divert the force of this oblique attack, only to run into problems from the promoters of H.R. 10, the Keogh bill, who were reluctant to give further latitude to corporate pension plans until something had been done for the self-employed and professional groups to bring about an equalization. I was in a vulnerable position because, although I was a strong supporter of the equalization principles embodied in the Keogh bill, as far back as the days when it was the Reed-Keogh bill, each time the issue came before the House those in charge of managing it brought it out unbudgeted. It frequently was scheduled as the first budget busting bill. As a member of the economy bloc, I was not about to bust the budget and, accordingly, I have voted against H.R. 10 in the past on several occasions. However, I was able to persuade the zealots behind the Keogh bill that the budget having been long since badly busted I was not going to stand in the way of the progress of the Keogh bill on these grounds at the tail end of the Congress. Even with these opponents satisfied, the Curtis bill ran into further difficulties. At the end of this last session of Congress I was trying to make a strong stand—largely effective, I am happy to state—against the Senate placing nongermane amendments on the House passed revenue bills. This resulted in the word being passed back to me that certain powerful Senators would provide a dire fate for the Curtis bill unless I desisted. My response was, "Then woe is me, and woe is my bill, but I will not alter my position." Incidentally, the Curtis bill remained the subject under discussion on the Senate floor for many days as we moved toward adjournment. Indeed, it may have still remained the subject on the Senate floor when the Senate finally adjourned. I have not checked to see. However, the substance of the Curtis bill was tacked on as a nongermane amendment on another House bill which passed and was sent to the President for signature. So, in this oblique fashion, it became law. I suppose this fine bit of irony was employed to teach me not to insist so strongly on the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives. If so, it has been wasted. I am a humorless man.

H.R. 10 became law, as you know. However, it has been so watered down that I am watching with considerable interest to see the extent to which it is going to be used. However, the principle has now been established in the law, and I believe it is quite probable that it will be liberalized in the next session of Congress. Certainly, it will be liberalized in ensuing sessions.

Three pieces of legislation passed the last Congress which should have great impact in the area of employee benefits. The tragedy is that these three new programs are redundant and conflicting, to some degree, with each other. They have not been carefully coordinated with the existing programs established in the Federal-State unemployment insurance system. I am referring to the new laws in respect to employee training and retraining. The act which deals with the subject directly is the Manpower Training Act of 1962. This act, in my judgment, has been long needed and too long in coming. Its primary feature requires the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare to report back to the Congress within less than a year the progress made in identifying the problems with concrete recommendations of what can and should be done. Only until we receive these reports will sizable sums of money be spent, but it is my prediction that the reports will demonstrate that it is ideas rather than money which are primarily needed.

The two acts having reduntant provisions which will complicate and endanger the proper development of the Manpower Training Act are the Depressed Areas Act, passed in March of 1961, and the Trade Expansion Act, passed in October 1962. However, the Depressed Areas Act fortunately only has a limited ability to damage retraining and the unemployment insurance programs, because it gives only a lick and a promise to retraining and sets its sights primarily on public works spending to solve unemployment. It is a shame to waste money so futilely on public works in the vain hope that this kind of pump priming will solve unemployment but, at least the damage that the Depressed Areas Act can cause is limited mostly to this kind of unthinking extravagance. I wish I could say the same about the trade adjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act. Regretably, this act can create real mischief for both the unemployment insurance programs and the Manpower Training Act. There are real incentives in these provisions to try to establish that one's unemployment came as the result of foreign competition. I would hate to have to administer laws which set up different benefits to unemployed people based, not on the needs or future of the unemployed person, but rather, on what caused his unemployment. What difference does it make in the remedy of what was the cause?

It is my own judgment that we should do a much more effective job of getting manpower training into the Federal-State unemployment insurance system. For example, I have urged that instead of a worker going off unemployment insurance if he is being trained for a skill in demand to replace the obsolete skill he possesses, he should go off unemployment insurance if he does not train or retrain for a skill in demand. Less than 20 States have seen the wisdom of this approach, and there has been little encouragement at the Federal level for the States to take this approach. Furthermore, the States should encourage the employers who will get into this business of retraining for the new skills in demand to replace obsolete skills by giving them credit in experience ratings in the unemployment taxes and direct payments for part of the cost of retraining, if the business finds it is not going to be able to employ the worker in the skill for which he is being retrained.

Perhaps I should explain more clearly what I am talking about. An employer contemplates buying a new set of machinery which will replace, say, 100 workers. He reviews his own demand for skills to see if he can use these employees in other jobs in his employ, but finds that this is impractical. On the other hand, he has, in most cases, considerable flexibility at his command because he knows some months ahead of time what employees and how many will be laid off and that he cannot employ them in other capacities. During this terminal period it is frequently feasible to start training programs for these men in skills which are in demand by other employers. It is not reasonable to expect him to undergo the cost of retraining these employees for skills he will never utilize, but it could be made economically feasible if he received (a) credit on his experience rating for unemployment tax and (b) some of the actual cost for doing the retraining at his plant.

I might state that a great deal of understanding and cooperation is needed on the part of the labor unions to make this kind of forward looking program work. The unfilled jobs in demand are frequently in a field outside the original union's jurisdiction. The union leader is anxious to retain the employee as a dues-paying member in his union, so he encourages featherbedding or starts talking about splitting the work remaining among the same number of employees by advocating a 30-hour week.

While on the subject of unemployment insurance, I want to point out that there is active promotion going on by those who seek to eliminate the present Federal-State system and substitute in its stead a Federal system of uniform Federal standards. This might well become one of the major issues in the 88th Congress. I think the present unemployment system is excellent and only needs modification, not radical change. Aside from the modification I have mentioned of placing a new and greater emphasis on retraining, I would like to see other States follow California's example of

triggering into the system extended periods of benefit payments during the cycles of high unemployment. This is good insurance and good social economics, because it takes the energetic employee between jobs somewhat longer to get relocated in a new job during periods of high unemployment than in the three other periods of the economic cycle * * * the period of low unemployment and the two transition periods from low to high and high to low.

Essentially, we must preserve the unemployment system as an insurance system in which the premiums paid relate to the benefits paid. To have a good insurance system, we must have the tax premiums paid based upon experience rating. It is noteworthy that the attack against the present unemployment system by those who want Federal standards is directed against experience rating. The great danger arises from allowing the unemployment insurance program to be confused with welfare programs. Most of the arguments advanced attacking the unemployment insurance program are based upon arguments that relate to welfare programs.

However, one of the important ways to preserve a good unemployment insurance program is to be certain that it is backstopped by, but not confused with, a good welfare program. Employers themselves often think of unemployment insurance as welfare. They are wrong for two reasons. They support, instead of contest, the basic thesis of those who wish to convert it into a welfare program. They don't keep their eyes on those programs which really are welfare programs and take an interest as taxpayers, more than employers, in being certain that the welfare programs are adequate.

To maintain politically the position that I take, I must be able to say with truth that when unemployment insurance benefits run out we are not talking about leaving a worker and his family destitute. We are only talking about the system under which he derives his income, insurance, or welfare. So, in the last Congress we modified and, I believe, strengthened the welfare programs under the Social Security Act and so strengthened the unemployment insurance program. In the true sense of the word we liberalized these essentially illiberal programs by giving the States and local governmental units more authority in setting up their ideas of what welfare programs they wished and forbade the Federal officials from interfering with these local decisions.

The next Congress will undoubtedly see further pressure to extend the social insurance aspect of the Social Security Act to include payments for some health costs for the aged. I see two basic errors in so doing. One, this proposal radically alters the theory of social insurance which is an advancement over old-age assistance and previous welfare programs.

Parenthetically, I must stress that social insurance is not true insurance in the sense that the unemployment insurance program is or in the sense of private insurance. Social insurance does not relate benefits paid to the individual to the premiums paid in taxes by or in behalf of the individual. Social insurance is not fully funded. Social insurance is really an attempt to make welfare more like true insurance. To this extent, I think it is good, provided it is not done deceitfully. I must say there is much deceit, intentional or otherwise, in our social insurance program under the Social Security Act. The true advancement of social insurance over old age assistance was the fact that cash was given to the beneficiary, unbudgeted by a governmental bureau. The administration proposals to add health benefits under the social insurance title of the Social Security Act do not provide for cash payments to the beneficiary. Instead, it provides a budget for a limited number of health costs and requires that the Federal Social Security Administration enter into contracts with the vendors of health services in respect to their fees and the kind of health services they may provide for the older person. Under the King-Anderson bill the bundle of health service amounts to less than 25 percent of the average health costs an older person experiences. If the old people on social insurance pensions need more cash to meet their total budget, why not give them more cash, not give them cash for all items but one and budget them on this one item—health costs?

The second basic error of the King-Anderson approach is that it seeks to establish a system of prepaid health costs for the future. For the present, all people over 65 are given the benefits without paying a cent into the program. In other words, the political appeal for the social insurance health program is not insurance at all, social or otherwise, but welfare. The insurance aspect, such as it is, is only in the future.

Prepaid noncancelable health insurance is the proper and ultimate answer to the cost problem of the aged for health care. This is the essence of the Curtis bill. It permits company pension plans to move into the field of prepaid health insurance. It is the coming thing in private health insurance, group or individual policies. Why then do I regard it an error for government to get into prepaid health insurance? Here is the reason. Any insurance system which provides prepayment requires creating a fund and the longer the period of benefits is from the payments, the greater the fund. In order to make the costs of any prepayment program as low as possible, the fund must be wisely and productively invested. Government can only invest in sterile and low return investment, Government bonds—bonds which were sold to finance in the main military and related expenditures, not expenditures on economic growth. On the other hand, private pension plans, private prepayment insurance programs can and do invest their funds in the productive and growing economy—into plants, into machinery, into training manpower. These funds bring true economic return on the investment. The earnings are greater than those derived from Government bonds. It is the wise investment of these funds which make prepaid health insurance economically feasible and keep the premiums within the budget of the average American family. Furthermore, there is some opportunity through judicious equity investments to hedge against inflation.

Texas Jewish Post Calls for Vital Community Center in Fort Worth, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent page 1 column in the Texas Jewish Post edition of Thursday, January 10, 1963, was written in support of a community center in Fort Worth, Tex.

The report cited the success and value of a center program in Dallas, and in many other parts of the world. Since this article speaks eloquently of the community need as well as the high civic value of such a center, which has worldwide significance, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the most needed and progressive types of community organizations is the Jewish Community Center. This has been recognized by community leaders in cities all over the world.

Dallas' center program is vibrant and has achieved marked success with the development of its center building and facilities in the ever expanding northern end of town.

Fort Worth Jewish leaders and many members of the community have been pressing for the construction of a center building for several years now. Many interested community members have pledged funds for this building and the Dan Danciger Foundation has pledged the considerable part of the cost for the completion of this project.

A center building in Fort Worth is within view.

In keeping with the development of a center program, the Dan Danciger Community Center Association has activated a program that has included activities for nearly all the segments of the community. For this they are to be complimented.

However, compliments are not enough.

What we'd like to see start—and soon—is a membership campaign to enlist every family who wishes to become a participant in the center's activities.

This can and should be on a nominal basis to enlist all who can possibly benefit from the center, and others who certainly can appreciate the high civic values and purpose behind a vibrant center program.

Recently, in time for Chanukah, the new Jewish Community Center of Goteborg, Sweden, was dedicated as "a symbol of the rebuilding of the Jewish community institutions of Europe which were destroyed during the Nazi years."

Herbert Katzki, assistant director-general of the joint distribution committee, made these remarks to a large audience which included M. R. Henriques, president of the Jewish community of Goteborg, and Julius Huttner, chairman of the Goteborg Center's Building Committee.

There were many others in the audience, however.

Approximately half of the 1,500 Jews now living in Goteborg were victims of the Nazis. And, since Sweden was not occupied by Hitler's madmen, these victims of Hitlerism were lucky to have found refuge in Goteborg.

Out of the 13,000 Jews in Sweden today, half came following World War II.

And, oh, the tales they could recite.

The center in Goteborg was built through the aid of JDC and the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany. But the highlight of the story is that the Jewish community of Goteborg provided most of the funds.

Centers have been built in Athens, Brussels, Berlin, Lyons, Amsterdam, Helsinki, Barcelona, and other cities in Western Europe.

Hundreds of centers have been built in the United States.

Fort Worth will soon have its chance.

Let's join ranks and make certain that the Danciger Jewish Community Center will be a vital, living utility for all the citizens of this wonderful city.

We can do it.

We will.

Address by the Vice President Before Democratic Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last Saturday, January 19, I was privileged to attend a luncheon at the Sheraton-Park Hotel where the Vice President spoke.

As always, LYNDON JOHNSON captivated and inspired his audience. He outlined for a large group of Democrats from all corners of the United States the principles upon which the Democratic Party was founded, and then he showed how these principles have been practically applied through the years in successful and forward-looking foreign and domestic programs.

Mr. President, I believe the Vice President's excellent address will be of great interest to the Members of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE DEMOCRATIC LUNCHEON, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1963

I have never ceased to be amazed by the dedication of the loyal Democratic Party workers who give so freely of their time and their energies to a cause. To me, this is one of the true strengths of a free people.

You have put aside your affairs and traveled hundreds, and even thousands, of miles to strengthen the party. And you have done so only because you believe in goals which are over and beyond your own, individual interests.

A democratic form of government can exist in the modern world only if people organize themselves to make a point of view effective. Without that organization, government becomes the exclusive province of a small group of officials who have succeeded by one means or another in capturing power. And government that is exclusive is exclusive of the people.

There is a cynical view which holds that politics is the art of organizing to seize power. In our country, I believe, it is the art of organizing to achieve goals that will serve the people.

You and I have chosen the Democratic Party because we have faith in its dreams and aspirations. And, as we close out the books on the first 2 years of a Democratic administration, I feel we can conclude that our faith has been justified under the leadership of John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy likes to trace our party's beginning back to 1791, when Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe went from Virginia to New England on what they called a "botanizing excurison." The seeds they planted on that trip blossomed almost immediately and the plant still bears fresh fruit every year in the form of new leaders, new ideas, new accomplishments, and new victories.

We are here as members of the world's third oldest political party—and we were a concern when the English Whigs and Tories were merely the political arm of a few established families.

I never tire of telling people why I think we have remained in good shape for so many years. There is a lesson in this great political success story, and the better we remember it, the more effective we will be when we leave Washington and return to our homes and the voters, the real source of our party's strength.

Franklin Roosevelt once said that the Democratic Party would be the major party as long as it belonged to the people. He went on to describe our party as one that believes "in the wisdom and efficacy of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority."

"Our party," Roosevelt said, also "believes that, as new conditions arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them."

These are principles of constant change—as man's needs are constantly changing. But they are firmly rooted in stable and fruitful soil.

To begin with, we Democrats are not an exclusive party. If this country was founded as a haven where all who believe in liberty could come, live together in harmony, and try to make their lives better, then it follows that a party which hopes to lead the country must believe in these things, too.

So we Democrats have always been the one great national political party, made up of people from all sections, all classes, all races, all religions. From the outset, we have been the party that has met the immigrant at the dock and helped him to become a citizen—just as it reached out a helping hand to the sharecropper, the workingman, the student, and the businessman.

But we knew that this was not enough. Jefferson said that the only healthy republic was one of educated citizens, each with a stake in his country's welfare. So we believe in educating each American to the utmost of his capacity. So we believe in the right of every American to have an equal chance to contribute his talent to our country.

Our foreign policy has been equally uncomplicated down through the years. We Democrats, of course, believe that in a world of aggressors our country can only remain free by remaining brave, by remaining strong. But we do not arm for conquest. We arm to maintain freedom and preserve peace.

But we also believe that the best way to have a good neighbor is to be one. This is the basis of our historic reciprocal trade policy, which encourages commerce among all the nations of the globe. It is the basis of our support of the United Nations in its painful quest for world order, and of our support of programs which help others to help themselves.

These principles, as you can see, are neither numerous nor hard to understand. But they have lasted, and our party has lasted with them.

When I entered politics, some 30-odd years ago, I found my natural home in the Democratic Party. It wasn't hard for me to join—I was born one.

I found it easy to remain in the Democratic Party because my deepest personal political principles were at home there.

I believed that it is the politician's first duty to hold his country together, to appeal to the forces that unite us, and to channel the forces that divide us into paths where a democratic solution is possible. It is our obligation to resolve issues—not to create them.

None of us will ever live to see our country perfect, just as we will never live to see ourselves perfect. But we can try—and if we leave the world a little better than we found it, and if we die with a little more understanding than we had when we were born, we are doing all right. I have found that being a Democrat has helped me to try to do both.

Our work is made easier because during the past 2 years, we have had a man in the White House who has dedicated his life to advancing the cause of freedom and social justice in every corner of our land and in every corner of the globe.

John F. Kennedy has taken the principles of the Democratic Party and has applied them to solving the world's problems.

Because our administration believes in strength, freedom is stronger everywhere in the world. We have pulled the fangs of the Cuban rattlesnake—and made it clear there were no limits to our determination to defend our security.

By calling the bluff in Cuba, we made freedom in Berlin and southeast Asia that much surer. And, where a few short years ago the Communist world was solid and united, its major preoccupation today is a bitter internal quarrel between its two most powerful leaders.

Because we believe in collective security and in being a good neighbor, we have supported intelligent trade, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the United Nations.

Because we believe in solving problems, we are seeking to bring our economy to full capacity, so that every American capable of holding a job or a place in college attains those goals; so that the senior citizens among us need no longer feel the crippling financial effects of lingering illness, and so that our great metropolitan areas are made livable for the overwhelming majority of Americans who reside in them.

The Democratic Party has grown in recent years because the people know it is the best vehicle for carrying out their hopes for a better world. We have gained this confidence for three reasons.

First is our history, our principles, and our present program.

Second is our willingness to work long and hard for what we believe in. We know that human needs change, and we must plan for the future. But also we know that current needs must be solved. We are trusted because we have the eyes to see what must be done and the courage to do it.

Third is the kind of people our party attracts. I mean more than the tens of millions of voters—a vast majority, by the way—who consider themselves Democrats. I mean the kind of people—the hundreds in this room and the millions of people to whom we will carry the message when we leave here—who hold our party together.

So I would like to thank you again, in behalf of the President and myself, for what you did for us in 1960; for what you did last year; and for what you will do next year to help elect the Democratic candidates for President and Vice President—whoever they might be.

We will meet again next year to choose those candidates. If the Democratic Party holds true to the country, and if we hold true to our party, we will have doubly earned the victory that will be ours.

The 45th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic is being marked today throughout the free world. Beginning in 1918 this free Republic endeavored to live in

peace and harmony with all nations. The struggle for survival lasted only 2 years as Soviet Russia overran and suppressed their freedom. The free people of the word celebrate this anniversary with the hope that the Ukrainians will again live in a free republic. The courage these enslaved people demonstrate and the stru e they wage is an inspiration for the thousands of people of other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

A strong group of outstanding Americans of Ukrainian descent has been organized for some time to help their relatives and friends achieve this goal of freedom. The North Dakota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., whose president is Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, a longstanding friend of mine, expresses the determination of these enslaved people who cannot make their desire for freedom known by public speech or printed papers. As a part of this anniversary celebration, Dr. Zukowsky has written an excellent letter in which he presents the history and development of the struggle experienced by the Ukrainian people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Zukowsky's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 17, 1963.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: On January 22, 1963, 45 years will have elapsed since the historical date of the proclamation of the full independence of the Ukraine. This date is one of the greatest in the modern history of the Ukrainian people, as on that day the historical right of the Ukrainian people to their freedom and national independence was again reaffirmed by the democratically elected Ukrainian Parliament—Central Rada—in their official proclamation. A year later, on January 22, 1919, the Act of Union was issued, uniting the Western Ukrainian National Republic and the Ukrainian National Republic, and establishing the united and sovereign State of the Ukraine.

The young and democratic Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by several European governments, including that of Soviet Russia. It endeavored to pursue its own course in harmony and peace with other nations, but Communist Russia, despite its solemn pledge not to interfere in internal affairs of the Ukraine, attacked the Ukrainian Republic and tried to impose the hateful Bolshevik regime upon the Ukrainian people. For almost 4 years the Ukrainian nation struggled gallantly to preserve its independence, but deprived of military, economic, and diplomatic support by the Western nations, it succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia. In 1920 the free Ukrainian State was destroyed and the puppet regime of the Ukrainian Socialist Republic was installed, which in 1923 became a member of the Soviet Union.

Although Moscow claims that Ukraine and other non-Russian Republics of the U.S.S.R. are free and sovereign states, and Ukraine and Byelorussia are even charter members of the United Nations, the fact is that the Ukraine is a colony of Communist Russia. Its human and economic resources are being exploited by the Kremlin for the purpose of spreading the communization of the world and subverting the once free nations, as is the case of Cuba, to which Khrushchev and his Communist chieftains had sent their missiles and other offensive weapons that had been manufactured from economic resources of the Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations.

During the entire Soviet-Russian rule in the Ukraine, Moscow has tried every way to destroy the spirit of the Ukrainian people, by persecuting the Ukrainian churches, arresting their leaders and clergy, by f d collectivization, mass deportation, ex d-tions, inhuman and cruel genocide, and many other inhuman methods. However, all these efforts have failed dismally, for the Ukrainian people have never submitted to the alien rule of Moscow and continue to wage an incessant struggle for the recovery of their freedom and national independence. Also the Soviet Government sends special agents to kill Ukrainian leaders in the free world, as was the case of Stepan Baudera and Dr. Lev R. Rebet, whose killer was recently sentenced by the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe to 8 years of hard labor.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution which listed the Ukraine as one of the captive nations held in enslavement and captivity by Moscow.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence on January 22, 1963, in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of the Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian-Communist imperialism. Therefore, the U.S. Congress and U.S. Government can contribute greatly to keeping the spirits and hopes of the enslaved Ukrainian nation high, by approving Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 and House Resolution 718, by favoring action of persecuted Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches, by creating a special House Committee on Captive Nations, and by issuing a special Shevchenko, Champion of Liberty, stamp in connection with the forthcoming Shevchenko memorial celebration in Washington, D.C., in 1964. A free and independent Ukraine is in the interests of the United States as well as the entire free world.

The entire world, including the enslaved Ukranian people, is looking toward the United States of America as the true citadel of freedom and hope for the oppressed people everywhere. Therefore the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides an appropriate occasion for the American people and the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

Respectfully yours,
Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, U.S.C.A. State Branch of North Dakota.

Mrs. Sam Speir, of Texas, Honored as Outstanding Woman Leader in 4-H Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 22, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mrs. Sam Speir, of Manchaca, Travis County, Tex., has been selected as the recipient of the Travis County 4-H and District 10 4-H Alumni Award for the outstanding woman leader of 1962.

The December 7 issue of the Austin American contained an excellent article about Mrs. Speir's meritorious work with 4-H youth. Mrs. Speir, a longtime employee of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, exemplifies the outstanding community work being performed in Texas and throughout the Nation by employees of the Federal Government.

Although employed full time by the Internal Revenue Service, which has presented her with several sustained superior performance awards, she has given her own time to serve as a director of the Training Union of Marbridge Boys' Ranch, Travis County rural chairman for the Mothers' March for Polio for 3 years, a member of the Governor's committee on children and youth, a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, honorary society for outstanding women teachers, a Sunday School teacher and former president of the Women's Missionary Union of the Manchaca Baptist Church, and has held every office of the Travis County Home Demonstration Council. These are merely a few of the achievements of Mrs. Sam Speir.

I knew her late husband as a devoted fighter for clean government in Texas, and against the entrenched power structure which had so long misgoverned the State. I valued his advice, and especially his judgment of people, highly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Mrs. Sam Speir Gets 4-H Award" from the December 7 issue of the Austin American to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. SAM SPEIR GETS 4-H AWARD
(By Mary Lou Rowland, assistant home demonstration agent)

Mrs. Sam Speir has received the Travis 4-H and District 10 4-H Alumni Award for the outstanding woman leader for 1962.

Leonora Elizabeth Stanford spent her childhood in Williamson and Burnet Counties where she was a 4-H Club girl for 4 years participating in the demonstrations and activities that were offered to 4-H Club members at that time.

4-H had a great influence on her adult life for it was the beginning of the training she needed to start her education away from home. She finished high school at the Baylor College Academy at 15 and remained in Belton to complete 2 years of college work at Mary Hardin-Baylor. With a teacher's certificate she was qualified to teach, but the State law says that a teacher must be 18 years of age. She had to wait for a couple of months for that first teaching job.

After teaching 5 years in the rural schools of Travis County, Lenora Elizabeth Stanford married Sam Speir who was with the Texas Rangers, the department of public safety, a rancher and, at the time of his death, a dairyman in Travis County.

Mrs. Speir says that hers was education in reverse. Now, the wife works and sends the husband to school, but her husband sent her to school, and it was after her marriage that she received both bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Texas.

Thirteen years ago the Speirs became parents of a son. Sam, Junior, who is among the most active 4-H boys in the county, and

now holds the title of Mr. 4-H in Travis County.

Mrs. Speir is—

1. A director of the Training Union of Marbridge Boys' Ranch, a ranch for retarded boys in Travis County.

2. Travis County rural chairman for the first Mother's March on Polio, serving in that capacity 3 years.

3. A member of the Governor's committee on children and youth, attended the Governors' conference on children and youth. At present she is tax technician for the Internal Revenue Service and has received two cash awards for sustained superior performance in Government service. She has been with the Federal Government for 18 years.

4. Is a member of Delta Kappa Gamma honorary sorority for outstanding women teachers, whose membership is by invitation only and is limited to one-tenth of all women teachers. She taught school for 15 years.

5. Is an active member of the Manchaca Baptist Church where she has been teaching Sunday School classes, president of the Woman's Missionary Union, church pianist, and training union director and church educational director.

6. Has been a Home Demonstration Club member 30 years and has held every office in both her club and the Travis County Home Demonstration Council, has served as the county chairman of the Texas Home Demonstration Association, district director; editor of the official organ of that organization, and at the present time is State chairman of the 4-H Committee for the Texas Home Demonstration Association.

7. For many years has been active as a leader in 4-H Club work in Travis County—intermittently from 1936 to 1962. Leader in countywide public speaking, subject matter leader for home management, superintendent and judge at 4-H contests; secretary and chairman of Travis County 4-H Leaders group, and members of the 4-H County Finance Committee.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Development of Nations: A Challenge of Our Times—Address by M. J. Rathbone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 23, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last October Mr. M. J. Rathbone, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, delivered the Founder's Day convocation speech at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. His address, "Development of Nations: A Challenge of Our Times," provides much food for thought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an edited version of this talk be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, there are new and great demands on our educational institutions. One of these is the instruction and motivation of our own people in greater numbers than ever before so that they will be equipped to deal wisely and resourcefully with the challenges and opportunities of an era of unprecedented change and danger. Another is to help provide education and training to people abroad, especially in the less developed areas, who having seen what free enterprise has achieved here, are now demanding more rapid advancement for themselves.

We in this country might assume it logical that if people in other lands are impressed by our standard of living, they would follow our political and economic system. Such unfortunately is not the case. Each nation has its own unique problems, its own heritage, its own customs.

It seems to me that the developing nations have four basic needs: First, capital for industrial development, for modernization of agriculture, and for public facilities. Second, education and training to adapt themselves to industrialized society. Third, the motivational force generated by rewards for accomplishment that can best be provided, I believe, by a free enterprise system. Fourth, a stable and fair system of government.

I think it important to realize that some of these requirements must largely be met by the developing nations on their own. The developed nations must give them all the help we can, and it must be substantial in several areas. This is a challenge. It is a challenge to all our institutions—especially to education, government, and business. This is what I want to talk about today. It is not my intention, however, to do more than underscore the importance of education and government aid. This is simply because I feel better qualified to give you my thoughts on the contributions a free and responsible business enterprise can make to the development of emerging nations.

As we assess the needs of the developing countries, one fact is inescapable. Economic growth cannot be achieved without an infusion of vast amounts of capital. Capital is needed for housing, hospitals, roads, schools, irrigation, sanitation systems, factories, shops, farm equipment, power plants, oil refineries, and all the other material things that sustain life or make for a better one. The need is staggering. For example, here in the United States, government, industry, and agriculture have invested about $9,000 per capita. In the European Common Market it is less than half that amount. What is a realistic goal for the one and a quarter billion people in the 100 countries that Paul Hoffman refers to as underdeveloped? Let's say the goal is to raise the level of development to about one-fourth of that of the European Common Market. Then the capital infusion needed is about one trillion dollars. This obviously dwarfs our U.S. aid programs of $4 billion per year.

What is the answer?

In the long term most of the capital for the development of any country must come from its own savings—private and government. Most must come from the private sector, unless, of course, it is accumulated as in the Soviet Union—by the ruthless exploitation of its people.

Outside sources of capital, while relatively small compared to the internal sources, are vital because of their germination effect on the economy. The world's requirements today for such external sources of capital are so large that governments alone cannot supply them, either as aid or loans. The result is that most nations have a pressing need for foreign private capital. This is not a new development. Private foreign investment capital has already played an important role in world development, but little recognition has been given it. In the case of the United States, private capital expenditures abroad amount to twice as much as U.S. Government economic assistance. Furthermore, it should be noted that since World War II about 40 percent of these investments have been made in the underdeveloped areas.

But private oversea investments are not without opposition. There are some in many countries who oppose it for a variety of reasons. One claim is that it leads to an unfavorable balance of payments for the host country because of the withdrawal of earnings on the investment. The opposite is true. Incoming capital usually brings with it a flow of capital equipment which would otherwise have to be paid in scarce foreign currencies or would not be available at all. The creation of local industry results in products that would otherwise have to be imported at the expense of depleting foreign exchange reserves. The withdrawal of earnings is only a small fraction of the foreign exchange cost of importing equivalent products.

Also in many cases this capital creates commodities or goods for export that directly generate foreign exchange and permit the country to meet its external obligations. This is certainly true of those investments in the extractive industries. Yet this is the area most open to attack. Countries with vast amounts of minerals or commodities have a simple choice. They can, if they wish, hoard these for local consumption within their borders, or they can develop them for export and buy in return goods and services that are directly needed to supply the wants of their people. The latter course is the only one that makes economic sense.

The alternative to private foreign investment that many countries have for the development of their industries is to provide capital from their own public funds. However, if capital comes from this source, other segments of the economy—particularly vital public works—are deprived of needed funds. It is difficult to escape a conclusion: So much capital is required that there is plenty of room for private foreign capital.

There are additional advantages to a country in promoting the use of private foreign investment.

Private industry, wherever it has competed directly with government corporations, has proven itself far more efficient. No one has yet found a satisfactory substitute for the competitive system. Those who favor socialism and the resulting state monopoly tend to overlook this fact.

Though it may sound absurd—one of the principal advantages of private investment is the opportunity to fail. When there are failures in government industrial investments, they are invariably concealed by one means or another. The result, of course, is inefficiency and higher costs. But risk by private capital is a constructive force—it drives men and corporations to strenuous efforts to succeed.

The decision to make a foreign investment by the private owner comes only after he has carefully studied all the alternatives in the light of his own experience—usually in many other countries of the world.

Private foreign investment—made on the basis of commercial consideration—has advantage in that it is free of political ties or influences and of government-to-government obligations.

These, then, are some of the more obvious advantages of private investment in developing an economy. Though governments can provide general education to their people, they are often not equipped to provide the training and business skills required to run an industrial society. It is in these latter crucial areas that private investment is making and will continue to make a contribution—perhaps the most important contribution of all.

I know from experience that international business such as the one with which I am associated has devoted much energy to the training and development of people throughout the world. We try to encourage concepts of leadership, business management, and the spirit of free enterprise. These are ingredients essential to the successful development of any nation.

Satirical comments about the "organization man" notwithstanding, the really significant features of the free enterprise system are: Management independent of political dictation and free to concentrate on economic functions, multiple sources of initiative, delegation of responsibility, encouragement of ambition, recognition of men on the basis of ability, and reward for individual accomplishments.

A basic policy of all our operating affiliates throughout the world is to provide training programs for the development of skills and abilities. Most all of our employees, at one time or another, have participated in either formal training programs or on-the-job training. These cover a wide spectrum of

activities ranging from welding, to analytical laboratory work, to operating refineries, to management. As a basis for this training, we send skilled people into a country when needed. Most of these "educators"—and I really believe they are educators—return to their homeland as soon as they have trained replacements. In a sense, we and other business have had our own "peace corps" for a number of years.

I am reminded of this because our company operates two training centers abroad that specialize in accounting, sales, engineering and business management. One is at Abingdon, England, and the other at Cali, Colombia. During the past 5 years, over 2,000 employees have attended courses there.

The outcome of such programs is reflected in the makeup of our oversea management. In 20 of our principal operating affiliates abroad, 11 of the chief executives are nationals of the countries in which these companies operate. In these same 20 companies, there are 116 full-time directors of whom 79 or almost 60 percent are nationals. In managerial positions below the directorate level in these companies, the proportion of nationals is very substantially higher and in many cases is nearly 100 percent.

Let me give you some other examples of what a foreign corporation can do to help stimulate the economy of a host country. One of our affiliates, Creole Petroleum Corp., operating in Venezuela, recognized that there was a lack of adequate investment funds for industrial and agricultural development in that country. Creole created a subsidiary company with the basic objective to help solve this problem through selected investments. This company does not make loans. Rather, it provides new risk capital for business ventures outside the oil industry, and it limits its participation to less than 50 percent ownership since its purpose is not to control but to stimulate.

Skilled management and technical people from Creole's staff are appointed to the boards of directors of the companies in which investments have been made. An important part of the job of these directors is to help the newborn company on matters of broad policy, to analyze problems correctly, and to adopt all the modern techniques of organization and management that we know.

Results, after a year's operation, have been remarkable considering that this was an entirely new field for Creole. Investments have been authorized in 16 companies, for a total of $4 million. Individual subscriptions vary from $55,000 in a mushroom growing and canning project to $660,000 in a cattle ranch, and holdings in each company range from 7 percent to 49 percent. These investments are creating direct job opportunities for about 1,260 workers, and several thousand other new jobs indirectly.

Another recent example of the ability of private investment to provide income to a nation and thus raise living standards is clearly evident in the United Kingdom of Libya. In 1955 the Libyan Government, with keen foresight, opened the country to foreign capital for the exploration of oil. I'm sure you'll believe me when I say that I could talk for hours about the hazards and risks, the adventure and romance, connected with the search for oil. But to make a long story short, oil was discovered in Libya in 1959.

What has this meant to the country? From 1955 to 1959, several thousand Libyans were hired and trained in the job of exploring for oil. Since 1959, additional thousands have been employed in the construction and operation of facilities required to produce, transport, refine, and ship the oil.

Business and residential building have increased, schools have been constructed, roads built, and a myriad of businesses started to provide the oil industry with services and materials required to carry out its work in continued search for and production of oil. The per capita income of the Libyan nation has nearly doubled since the country was opened to oil exploration. During the last 2 years the national budget has more than doubled.

Training programs have been set up to teach the skills required in operation and maintenance of machinery, basic mathematics, and laboratory techniques. Some of the employees with high school and university education have been provided scholarships to specialize in law, employee relations, business administration, geology, and engineering. From this latter group will come candidates for management.

Other companies as well as the oil industry have stimulated similar activities the world over. We have all learned, however, that the process of developing economic and human resources tends to be lengthy and fraught with problems. One such problem, for instance, concerns the training of our own foreign nationals, many of whom, once they attain proficiency, leave us to join other enterprises or government service. This creates momentary headaches for local management. But from a long-range point of view it isn't quite so bad as it seems since what helps the overall economic development of other nations helps us. The talent we lose can help speed up that development.

In view of increasing world pressures, many of us are concerned with the question of what more we can do to accelerate the development of emerging nations. As a businessman searching for solutions, I'd like to suggest several ideas that might be worth exploring:

1. Where practicable, and where there is no question of conflict of interest, business organizations might undertake a lend-lease program of personnel to governments to carry out special assignments for which they are uniquely qualified. Our needs in this area are so urgent that we must find some way to bring about a spirit of coordination and cooperation between business and government, something like that which existed during the crucial days of World War II.

2. International companies should encourage their management teams abroad to look more closely at additional business opportunities outside their usual scope of activity that will benefit a host nation.

3. Business can assist educators, social scientists, and others interested in the behavorial sciences in searching for ways to teach modern management ideas to qualified people in the developing nations.

4. International business can do more to speed up the tempo and improve the quality of many of the programs already being carried out. While, as I have reported, great work has been done in the training and development of people, too often we find examples of failure and needless delays in preparing nationals for positions for which they are potentially qualified. One of the best jobs an American can do overseas is to help develop a national as his replacement.

5. Industrial research programs can give more emphasis to the needs of developing nations, particularly in the field of agriculture.

Finally, I'd like to suggest that international business should look objectively at that widely prevalent manifestation of our times that we call nationalism. It need not be a negative factor. Historically it has been associated with new and developing nations and our own country was no exception. The pride of a new nation in itself, its desire for independent achievement, the willingness to work hard for accomplishments, can constitute a very constructive force. Nationalism, of course, can, and too often does, take an unreasoning and destructive form.

I hope I have shown here today some of the unique contributions that private foreign enterprise can make and is making to help speed the development of nations. But I should not close without mentioning that there is much these nations themselves can and must do to help themselves. First and foremost they can create a favorable climate for investment through economic and political stability. They can promulgate laws that are fair and that give equal opportunity for all—whether national or foreign investor. With such a basic framework, not only will foreign investment be attracted but domestic capital will not flee.

With such an environment, I believe that all sectors of society—particularly government, education, and business—can provide a concerted and effective effort to expand the economic development of the world. None of the particular problems of any nation would be unsurmountable.

Landmark Decision by Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week, the Supreme Court in a unanimous decision in the case of FTC against Sun Oil Co. ruled that petroleum suppliers, under the Robinson-Patman Act, can cut prices selectively only in competition with their own competitors. They may not cut prices in order to meet the competition of their dealers' competitors.

This is an historic landmark decision. It establishes new limits on the use of discriminatory price cutting by suppliers. It will be of invaluable assistance in eliminating costly and destructive price wars. This decision is one that will have great impact not only upon the petroleum industry, but upon the entire framework of American commerce and the consuming public, as well.

This case arose from a price war in Jacksonville, Fla., in the summer of 1955. At that time, the Super Test Oil Co., an independent retail chain, by virtue of its lower retail prices was drawing substantial business away from a Sunoco station. To help their dealer meet this competition from the independent station, Sun granted certain price concessions. The Federal Trade Commission charged that this was a violation of law for the reason that the Sun Oil Co. had not offered similar price reductions to their other dealers in the Jacksonville area.

The Sun Oil Co. interposed the defense that it was meeting competition in good faith. This was rejected by the Federal Trade Commission on the grounds that discriminatory price cutting can be used only to counter direct competition at the same level; that is, suppliers versus suppliers and retailers versus retailers, not, as in this case, suppliers versus retailers.

The Fifth Circuit Court overruled the Federal Trade Commission, but the Supreme Court sided with the FTC in reversing the circuit court decision. In

the Supreme Court's decision Justice Goldberg said:

> Since there is in this record no evidence of any such (lower) price having been set or offered to anyone by any competitor of Sun, Sun's claim to the benefit of good faith meeting of competition defense must fail. To allow a supplier to intervene and grant discriminatory price concessions designed to enable its customer to meet the lower price of a retail competitor who is unaided by his supplier would discourage rather than promote competition.

The decision does not apply to those cases where a competing supplier distributes his products at the retail level through company-owned stations. It is likewise noted that the record was less than completely clear on whether the independent chain competing with Sun's retailer had received price concessions from a major supplier. It was pointed out that if such evidence was forthcoming the FTC could reopen the case.

The reopening of this case by the Federal Trade Commission could conceivably establish that one of the major companies had supplied the Super Test Oil Co. with its petroleum products. It might even establish that price concessions were made which would give the Sun Oil Co. the right to use the "good faith" defense. But, even assuming this to be so, where does this leave the major oil companies?

There has long been speculation as to the extent to which the major petroleum companies control the prices on both sides of the trenches during price wars. Many independents, of course, obtain their petroleum products from the majors. Thus, the majors are in the position of acting as supplier to both sides—company stations and independents—during many price wars.

If the Sun Oil case is reopened by the Federal Trade Commission, one of the byproducts could be full disclosure as to whether there is agreement within the petroleum industry regarding the wholesale prices to be charged when major companies sell their products to independent stations for resale under an independent brand name. If this should prove to be the case, the possibilities of both antitrust violations and unfair competition are certainly great.

This entire question of price wars and price structure is of vital importance to the many thousands of small businessmen engaged in the distribution of petroleum products.

Every week—virtually every day—I receive letters from throughout the country in which service station operators tell me that if price wars and discounting are not stopped, they will be driven out of business.

Yesterday I received a petition signed by 280 service station operators in the greater Kansas City area, asking that I forward it to the Federal Trade Commission. The petition requested that the FTC "hold an on-the-spot investigation of the gasoline pricing structure for the purpose of determining whether there is price discrimination and price fixing in the area" and "to protect us as small businessmen as is guaranteed under the Robinson-Patman and Clayton Acts."

I have forwarded this petition to the Federal Trade Commission with the urgent request that action be taken at once.

But more is needed to combat price wars than sending investigators to the scene of the latest outburst. We must also examine the entire structure of petroleum pricing practices. We must find a way to stop these costly and destructive gasoline price wars. The very existence of thousands of small businesses throughout the country depends upon the prompt solution of this pressing problem.

Tribute to Dow Henry Drukker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 23, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey mourns the passing of one of its most beloved, constructive citizens. Mr. Dow Henry Drukker, who once served the Nation in the House of Representatives, was still at work as publisher and chairman of the board of the Passaic Herald News this week when, a few weeks before his 91st birthday, he died in Lake Wales, Fla.

Immediately, thousands of his good friends from New Jersey, throughout the Nation, and abroad responded with heartfelt messages of bereavement. They paid tribute to Dow Drukker for many reasons.

Only a few years after he came to New Jersey in 1897 from Grand Rapids, Mich., Mr. Drukker built a reputation as a businessman, a banker, and a newspaper owner. His fellow citizens found him so much to their liking that they elected him as their Congressman in 1914. He served in the 63d, 64th, and 65th Congresses. When he left Congress in 1919, he announced that he would not run for elective office. Neither would he accept appointive office. As one writer has said:

> He felt that as a newspaper owner he wished to be free of partisan compulsions.

In the years that have followed, Mr. Drukker made the Passaic Herald News a newspaper of direct service to his community and to the State. Even as he contributed to the financial vitality of his community, Mr. Drukker also set high standards of journalistic service.

Many honors were given to him over the years. One of the most treasured was the award of the Officers Cross of the Orange-Nassau from the Government of the Netherlands in June 1955. Mr. Drukker, who was born in the Netherlands, had conducted an Operation Holland campaign in 1954 to help the victims of the floods of that year. Mr. and Mrs. Drukker were later received by Queen Juliana at a private audience.

Other heartfelt tributes were given at recent birthday celebrations. There seemed something permanent and continually young about Mr. Drukker. His energy and optimism never left him, even in his final years.

Many additional tributes have been paid in recent days to him. I ask unanimous consent to have two of them printed in the RECORD at this time. One is an editorial which appeared in the Passaic Herald News, and it expresses the high regard felt for him by those who worked on this newspaper. The other is a news article which reports the comments made by Governor Hughes and the legislature of our State.

Mr. President, I am sure that many persons throughout our Nation share the sadness we feel in New Jersey. A great citizen has left us. We miss him. We shall not forget him.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Passaic Herald-News, Jan. 12, 1963]

DOW HENRY DRUKKER: 1872–1963

This man passed this way.

His journey was not hurried; there were long and fruitful years, with ample time for touching hearts and people and for influencing events.

But his steps were vigorous and purposeful, as indeed were his mind and his deeds.

There was humility in his manner, born of genuine interest in and respect for those he met.

There was fairness in his dealing, born of an affection for fellow mortals that would not let him take the unfair advantage, say the unkind word, do the shoddy deed.

There was brilliance in his planning for better things for his country, his State, his community, his neighbors. He served them in government at high and low levels, at personal sacrifices he never would have acknowledged. He served them in enterprise, at profits that were shared generously with those who helped.

What he touched grew brighter, what he stimulated and encouraged grew more useful, what he accomplished was lasting.

This man shunned evil, labored at good works, and walked humbly with his God.

This man passed this way and now is gone.

And although these hearts are heavy, this place is better for having had this man.

[From the Passaic Herald-News, Jan. 15, 1963]

BOTH LEGISLATIVE HOUSES JOIN GOVERNOR HUGHES IN TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF DOW H. DRUKKER

(By Edward J. Mullin)

TRENTON.—"The book closes on a notable career of public service."

That was the phrase used by Gov. Richard J. Hughes yesterday in his statement on the passing of former Congressman Dow H. Drukker. Mr. Drukker, publisher and board chairman of the firm which publishes the Herald-News, died Friday at Lake Wales, Fla. The funeral was yesterday.

Both legislative houses joined the Governor in memorializing Mr. Drukker.

Identical resolutions were introduced in the senate by Senator Anthony J. Grossi and in the assembly by Joseph M. Keegan, Mrs. Betty M. Kordja, Samuel L. Biber, and Robert Wegner, Passaic County's delegation. Both houses passed the resolutions unanimously.

"Not only does New Jersey mourn the passing of this distinguished American," Governor Hughes said in his statement, "but his loss will be felt throughout the Nation and elsewhere in the world, particularly in his native Holland."

The statement and the resolutions eulogized Mr. Drukker as a humanitarian and a legislator in addition to his work as a newspaperman.

"As a young man," the Governor said of Mr. Drukker, "he achieved broad public recognition in his service in Congress. As a master builder, Congressman Drukker has left his imprint on the face of America. As a publisher, he was a practitioner of objective journalism combined with a belief that it is the duty of a newspaper to advance editorially the principles it believes are in the public interest.

"I would like to express my condolences," Governor Hughes continued, "to Mrs. Drukker and the other members of the family. Perhaps it will come as a consolation that Mr. Drukker will not be forgotten."

The text of the resolution passed in the legislature follows:

"Whereas Dow H. Drukker, one of New Jersey's distinguished elder citizens, died on January 11, 1963, in his 91st year; and

"Whereas Mr. Drukker was long recognized as the guiding genius of one of New Jersey's great newspapers and is remembered in the field of business as a builder and in the area of government as a county freeholder and a Member of Congress; and

"Whereas Mr. Drukker's services in many different departments for public and private activities have left an indelible imprint on the history of his times; and

"Whereas Mr. Drukker in his work as a humanitarian has won international acclaim including recognition with a decoration from the Queen of his native Netherlands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate,* That this body gives recognition to Dow H. Drukker's services and achievements and extends to his family sincere condolences and sympathy; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the senate and a copy signed by the president of the senate and attested by the secretary of the senate be forwarded to the family of the late Dow H. Drukker."

How Much Government Can We Afford?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the opening of the 88th Congress I had the chance to address the New York Chamber of Commerce on an issue, the increasing cost of Government, which has been thrust even more importantly into public focus by the President's plans for a tax reduction and his budget for fiscal year 1964. I should like to place this speech, with its comments on these very current questions, in the RECORD at this point:

HOW MUCH GOVERNMENT CAN WE AFFORD?

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves." Abraham Lincoln once used those words to admonish his countrymen. The import of those words inescapably confronts us today. History will remember us in spite of ourselves—and because of ourselves.

Today I would ask the question, "How Much Government Can We Afford?" Asking the question, I suppose, imposes an obligation to try to provide an answer. This I will endeavor to do in the next few minutes.

First, let me express my appreciation to this group of business leaders for inviting me to New York City to join in this chamber of commerce meeting. Much of what I will say this noon will be meaningless unless the people who belong to organizations such as yours take an informed stand on the issue of how much government we can afford; how much our economy can pay for and still be free and enterprising.

You will notice I said "people" must take the stand. An organization undertaking is only as good as the effort by the people who belong to that organization. How much zeal, how much knowledge, how much patriotism, how much conviction, how much principle do the people of an organization bring to their organization objectives and endeavors? When our zeal, our knowledge, our patriotism, our convictions, our principles are too little or too casual we risk having the words "free" and "enterprising" lost as being descriptive of both our economy and our way of life.

I am not here to preach on patriotism nor to speak partisanly. However, I have strong feelings on the urgency of citizen action and organization responsibility; I have strong basic disagreements with others who have recently used New York forums to espouse economic and political views which I believe hold danger for our Nation.

How much government can we afford? Over the past three decades our Federal Government has tried and failed in the effort to spend our Nation rich. With budgetary deficits 80 percent of the time in this period, our economy has grown in fits and spurts. We have failed to produce sustainable economic growth. We have produced a fiscal environment of constantly rising and mounting tax burdens; burdens that consistently proved inadequate to pay the Government bills we incurred.

We have justified our extravagant and profligate ways by giving recognition to a fiscal tenet that just does not work, this tenet says that it is not necessary to worry about a budget imbalance in any particular year so long as it is balanced over a period of years. The resort to expediency implicit in this philosophy has led us to what can only be termed fiscal immorality—the consequences of which can only be measured in a trillion dollars of debt, in a burgeoning Government bureaucracy, and in a curtailment of human liberty.

Thus, one of the answers to the question of how much government can we afford is that we apparently cannot afford as much as we have. The last time we succeeded in even paying our way in a fiscal year was in 1960, and it now seems almost certain that at least a half a decade will elapse from then before we again have a chance of a budget balance. In those intervening 5 years we will add a minimum of between $25 and $30 billion to the Federal debt even if we succeed in stemming the rising tide of annual total spending. In the past three decades we had no program for debt retirement and we have none for the future—as citizens we are content to be prodigals.

The continuing budget deficits of the last 30 years did not occur in times of depression nor in times of little or no change in Government fiscal affairs. Indeed, relative prosperity has marked the post-World War II period and the Government's fiscal experience has found budget expenditures and tax collections increasing more than twentyfold in the last three decades. We have had the opportunity to do something about paying our way, but we have instead chosen a course of Government on credit—we have chosen to let our children be the fall guys for our fiscal imprudence.

But we need not go back three decades to measure an alarming growth in levels of spending and taxing. I will not belabor you with endless statistics but the facts are there as conclusive proof that our spending increases for civil matters exceeded the relative increase in military spending.

If these spending increases had been for Government goods and services that were provided within the framework of a balanced budget, they would have represented expenditures which we were willing to pay for rather than pass on as a charge to succeeding generations. The fact is we did not pay for the cost of those goods and services and, as a consequence, we have a Federal statutory debt in excess of $300 billion. The present annual interest charges on that debt, without providing for any debt retirement, are more than double the total budget expenditures for all purposes by the Federal Government three decades ago.

But this $300 billion figure does not tell the whole story. The truth is that our Federal indebtedness today exceeds $1 trillion, and it means that every American family of four has a share of $22,000 of this debt. This trillion-dollar debt includes such items as $250 billion for unfunded obligations of the social security system, $70 billion for unfunded obligations of Government retirement programs, $300 billion of commitments to veterans, $150 billion for unfunded public works and similar charges to the statutory debt. These are currently accruing obligations of our Government that we are not paying for and that will represent demands on the productivity of succeeding generations.

As bad as these fiscal facts are, I feel that future events will pale our past experience to insignificance. Under the present administration we have found that new spending authority has risen from $80 billion in fiscal year 1960 to $100 billion for fiscal year 1963. It is inevitable that this fact will produce increased spending pressures in future years. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance has predicted that by the year 1965 the Federal budget figures will exceed $135 billion, including $30 billion of trust fund expenditures. I call to your attention the fact that this budget event, if it materializes as predicted, is only 2 years away. Now would seem to be the very latest moment for an all-out program to call a halt to this compulsive spending unless we as taxpayers are willing to pay for it.

In an inaugural speech of not too long ago we were encouraged, if not reassured, by a reiteration of the principle that individuals should concern themselves with what they can do for the state rather than being preoccupied with what the state can do for them. As recently as a few weeks ago we were told, "If Government is to retain the confidence of the people, it must not spend more than can be justified on grounds of national need or spent with maximum efficiency." It seems paradoxical to me that such statements are made by a political leader who since taking office has sent to the Congress 262 different spending proposals which, if they had been enacted by the Congress would, in my judgment, have done much to destroy private enterprise and individual liberty.

Regardless of the fact that our Federal Government is the biggest spender, the biggest employer, the biggest property owner, the biggest tenant, the biggest insurer, the biggest lender and the biggest borrower in all the world, we find a growing impatience on the part of many holding high office in our land to make government even bigger. Thus, we are told that it is the Federal Government which must grant aid to schools, compulsory medical care, a permanent system of extending unemployment compensation

benefits, an expanded food-stamp plan, an expansion of area redevelopment and public works, enlarged public assistance programs, increased public power projects, enlarged housing programs, increased subsidies and other items on a staggering list of so-called Government giveaways—giveaways that inescapably cost the taxpayers of today and tomorrow for programs that involve the massive Federal intervention urged by the Government spenders.

In this tragic failure to control and manage our fiscal affairs within the limits of what we are willing to afford, we have essentially departed from a basic philosophy of our Founding Fathers who believed that it was our citizen duty to support our state and not our country's obligation to support its citizens. To this end, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, once said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt—we must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

In our time we have disregarded the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson. We have also rejected the prophetic admonition of the French philosopher deTocqueville who warned us in the early history of our country that if the time should ever come when people conclude they can vote themselves benefits out of the public treasury, self-government by responsible men will be an impossibility.

I need not tell a sophisticated group such as this that the implications of our failure to do better in handling our fiscal affairs are of concern not only to ourselves and our children but also to any person now living, or to live in the future, who might aspire to be free of political domination. The truth of the matter is that we are the free world's banker; on the strength and stability of the American dollar rests the economic vitality and monetary security of the non-Communist world. In the past 12 years we have had 11 deficits in our balance of payments and our gold supply has dwindled to approximately $16 billion. Our commitments against this gold supply included our obligations of $12 billion of legal monetary reserves and obligations of a considerably greater magnitude held by foreign governments and foreign nations.

The simple fact that as the world's banker we borrow short and lend long demonstrates the importance of confidence in our ability to conduct our fiscal and monetary affairs in such a way as to avoid debasing the purchasing power of the dollar.

Against this backdrop of debt, deficits, and declining gold supply, we are now told that the cure for virtually all our problems is to be found in a tax cut. This proposal makes me wonder whether this issue should be decided by the votes of those American citizens who are now of voting age or by the votes of those young people whose age does not now qualify them for voting status. Indeed, it is the latter group that we will be taxing to make up the deficit from the tax reduction that we give to ourselves. Americans have always felt strongly against the idea of taxation without representation; hence, my suggestion that Americans under age 21 should be allowed to ballot on the question of a tax cut at this time of needlessly high spending and uncontrolled deficits.

There is no one who is more concerned than I am over the stifling effect of our present tax structure on economic growth and national strength. Our tax laws represent a peculiar tax policy for a country that relies on individual initiative for progress. Tax receipts of Federal, State, and local governments take almost one-third of our net national product, and most of these receipts are derived from assessments on earned income and on capital accumulation. The more productive and venturesome a person is, the higher tax he pays.

The result is that our present tax system has an impact that is not conducive to economic growth. We have a sharp progressivity of tax rates that is self-defeating. The complexity of our tax structure discourages enterprise and impairs venture taking. In short, I agree wholeheartedly with those who say tax reduction and reform are long overdue. I wholeheartedly disagree with those who say we can have high deficit spending as usual and still have lower tax burdens across the board. I disagree with those who believe that foolish outlays for untested and unwanted Government programs can be continued even though we are going to tax less to pay more for those programs. In short, I support a major program of tax rate restructuring and reform to stimulate incentive and capital formation, but only within the bounds of fiscal responsibility and monetary prudence.

Tax reduction should not be enacted at this time without a commitment from the administration and a pledge by the Congress to hold spending over the next 2 or 3 years at a level that does not exceed the 1963 figure. Tax reduction should not be enacted unless it is designed to increase productive incentive and to enable the capital accumulation needed to undertake the entrepreneurial risks. Tax reduction should not be enacted if it is designed for a mere short-term stimulant that would not result in sustainable economic growth.

Thus, I think it can generally be agreed among this group that our tax reduction objective (1) must be sought under conditions of our regaining control over our spending activities, (2) must be directed toward the attainment of long-term economic progress, and (3) must have as its focal point the easing of tax burdens from those critical rates and substantive provisions that, under present law, make tax saving more important than taxable earnings. In short, we must free our tax structure from its inhibitants against growth and efficiency. How do we do this?

First, we must realize that as long as we are spending for more Government than we are willing to afford, we cannot have tax reduction solely for the sake of making the cost of Government generally less on our citizens. Any tax reduction must be so planned and designed as to achieve maximum incentive benefit at minimum revenue loss. We must not have a tax reduction that seeks to solve our growth and full employment problems merely by increasing the size of the deficit that would have to be financed by added Government borrowing and bank-created funds.

Second, we must recognize that the economic progress from tax reduction at this time finds its key in the vigorous expansion in business investment in new plant and equipment and in the growth of small business. In our last two recessionary periods business capital investment has lagged and, as a consequence, we have had a recovery in each instance that fell short of expectation. This supports the view that our tax reform at this time and under present circumstances must emphasize easing the tax burdens on savings and investment.

Parenthetically, on this second point, I would observe this fact: Anything we may do in the area of tax reform, revision, and reduction will be to no avail if our people do not have confidence in Government administration and policies. Therefore, we must not repeat the self-defeating mixture of bad and good tax changes that comprised the administration's tax package of the last Congress. We should avoid seeking through tax legislation the accomplishment of nonrevenue objectives such as social reforms and curbs on foreign investment by American free enterprise. We should strengthen, not weaken, confidence in the integrity of government. We should base our tax reform on the hard realities of sound economics and competitive advancement and let the politics be damned.

A third factor that we must take into account as we seek tax reform conducive to growth and efficiency is our present undue reliance on taxes on earned income to produce our Government revenues. The statistic and comparative tax tables on this point are well known, and the details need not detain us here. The effect is that our tax structure with its steeply progressive rate schedule and high corporate rate discourages risk and productive effort and even brings about what I will term the "economic withdrawal" of some of our most promising and able producers.

Tax reduction involving minimum revenue loss and maximum economic benefit will take account of those factors which will encourage utilization of technological innovation and which will sustain in our people a desire to work hard for enlarged incomes and a willingness to accept the risks of entrepreneurial activity. This sort of tax reduction can help us to afford the government we need; government whose every expenditure meets the test of absolute essentiality and government whose every service and good is provided to the people only because the people cannot do it for themselves.

I would close this discussion of how much government we can afford by recalling the words of President Eisenhower in his last budget message presented to the Congress in which he said:

"In summary, if we plan wisely and allocate our resources carefully, we can have both public and private advancement. Sound fiscal policies and balanced budgets will sustain sound economic growth and, eventualy, will make possible a reduced tax burden. At the same time, we can have necessary improvements in Federal programs to meet the demands of an ever-changing world.

"If, however, we deliberately run the Government by credit cards, improvidently spending today at the expense of tomorrow, we will break faith with the American people and their children, and with those joined with us in freedom throughout the world."

My friends, the government we can afford is only that which we are willing to pay for in the tax burden we are willing to sustain. If we seek more government than that, the price we will pay will be in more than dollars—it will be in terms of lessened individual liberty and curtailed economic opportunity. In answering the question of "How much government can we afford," we should do so in the context of how do we wish to be remembered by history in spite of and because of ourselves. Thank you.

John Duncan: Georgia's Big Man in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 23, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the State of Georgia is proud of John P. Duncan, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Agri-

culture, for his indefatigable efforts to better the lot of American farmers. Recently, Mr. Duncan was distinctly honored by the Progressive Farmer magazine, which selected him as an Agriculture Man of the Year for 1963.

The Atlanta Journal-Constitution magazine, on January 20, 1963, also pointed with pride to Mr. Duncan. Miss Margaret Shannon, Washington correspondent for the Atlanta Journal, wrote a discerning article on Mr. Duncan, tracing his career from a Quitman, Ga., farmer to president of the Georgia Farm Bureau and to national prominence in the U.S. Agriculture Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN DUNCAN: GEORGIA'S BIG MAN IN AGRICULTURE

(By Margaret Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—One day last month John P. Duncan, Jr., of Quitman, Ga., and Alexandria, Va., got a four-line memorandum from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. It didn't amount to much in wordage, but it just happened to mean that the one-time south Georgia farm boy had 14,000 additional employees to look after for a while.

Mr. Duncan is Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Stabilization. The memorandum assigned responsibility for the Cooperative Extension Service to his office temporarily. It was the sixth agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to come under his wing. Evidently somebody up here likes him.

Secretary Freeman must. He continues to pile work on him, and the 45-year-old former president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation seems to thrive on it. His hair is almost white, but it has been that way for years. He keeps fit by playing squash with Secretary Freeman at the Pentagon or golfing in the eighties on a Virginia course when he has time.

The highest and best evidence that John Duncan is a success is the shift within the Department last March that put him in charge of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service right at the time of the Billie Sol Estes scandal. Actually ASCS had been taken away from James T. Ralph shortly before the scandal broke, and it fell Mr. Duncan's lot to straighten out a mess he hadn't made.

"We came out all right on Estes," Mr. Duncan said. "The Department didn't lose a nickel on him, and that's more than can be said for anybody else who dealt with him. We have all our grain, and we are holding $2 million in escrow until final disposition of the case."

His presence in Dr. Ralph's old job at a time like that made him a target, too, and last July a Washington newspaper reported that Mr. Duncan once went to speak to the Texas Cotton Ginners Association and accepted free meals and hotel rooms from the organization.

Since Billie Sol's spreading of largess among agricultural workers had been much talked of and testified about, this was news. Mr. Duncan at once asked the Agriculture Department auditor to check all his expense accounts. It turned out the Government owed him $150 in unpaid per diem. Mr. Duncan also said that accepting room and board while on speaking engagements is a common practice for Government officials and lies within the code of conduct promulgated by the President.

Another kind of trouble came Mr. Duncan's way—or he came its way—when he went to Atlanta in December during the American Farm Bureau Federation convention. He didn't go to the convention; he wasn't invited. He went to try to counteract on the scene some of the drastic Farm Bureau criticism of the Government's farm program.

Around the Department, they refer to Mr. Duncan in this role as a one-man truth squad. When the Farm Bureau president said the administration's farm program isn't working, Mr. Duncan fired back that it is, too, working and furthermore, farmers like it.

Such headaches—scandals, bad publicity, powerful opposition—are unpleasant, but they are minor compared to the one that Mr. Duncan calls the biggest of all: "Trying to find some way to cope with the capacity of the American farmer to produce."

"If you turned the American farmer loose to grow all he could, I don't know whether the oceans would hold it," Mr. Duncan said.

It seems an incurable headache. As Mr. Duncan sat talking about it, he'd just learned that the wheat crop estimate was up 25 percent even with thousands of acres taken out of production since the last crop. "That's a lot of wheat," he said.

So Mr. Duncan goes forth to battle with opposition to the Government farm program. Sometimes the battleground is Capitol Hill, sometimes a convention hall, sometimes a press conference. He works, too, at his office—to make the program work.

A large part of the job of crop controls and surplus storage is carried on by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, one of the agencies that comes under John Duncan's supervision. It is in a sense not only the center of the Government's farm program, but also the heart of American agriculture.

When Mr. Duncan left his 807-acre Brooks County farm and the presidency of the Georgia Farm Bureau to become Assistant Agriculture Secretary at the start of the Kennedy administration, he was placed in charge of the Foreign Agricultural Service. This was new stuff to him. He held the assignment for 15 months, and became a well-traveled man in that time.

He went to Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961, and took part in drafting the Alliance for Progress. He went to Rome in November that year and to the Philippines later. He visited U.S. agricultural attachés around the world. Once he flew to London one day and back the next after opening an agricultural trade center there.

What impressed him most, he says, is the part food can play in America's efforts to stop communism and win the peace throughout the world.

"We can talk satellites and sputniks and all that, but the hungry man is more interested in feeding his children. And we have got so much more food to offer the world than have the Russians and other Communists.

"The hungry people in Africa, in South America, and in east Asia, where I visited, were not much interested in whether we or the Soviets put the first man in orbit or which of us was ahead in space. They are chiefly interested in getting food for themselves and their families, and that's where our food-for-peace program is winning us friends.

"I believe we can whip the Russians in the fight for men's minds if we can just put the food where it is needed. And the men who have given leadership to this fight are the American farmers with their abundant production."

Last May, delegates from 38 countries, meeting in Washington, elected Duncan as chairman of the International Cotton Advisory Committee, representing 95 percent of the world's cotton production.

In the departmental reshufflings last spring Mr. Duncan was given supervision over the Commodity Exchange Authority, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Agricultural Marketing Service, as well as ASCS, and was placed on the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, largest Corporation in the world. The Foreign Agricultural Service was assigned to someone else.

He didn't mind the change. "I'm kinda in a shop now that I'm familiar with," he said.

John Duncan learned the "shop" as a farmer who has never farmed except in the time of Government controls and price supports. In 1939, the year after he finished Emory University, tobacco growers decided they'd do better without the Government program. The result was a glut of tobacco on the market and a poor price for all.

"We have opposition now that wants the Government out of the farm business," he said. "The Government would like to get out, but you have to be realistic about it. The problem is not whether to have controls, but to get legislation that would do a better job at a lower cost to the Government."

The big farms could survive, but the family farms couldn't, and Mr. Duncan is concerned about family farms. "You can't say to these people, 'Look, we're going to wipe you out just because you're not big,'" he declared. "We just don't do things that way in this country."

As the 88th Congress proceeds and the administration sends its farm proposals to the Hill, Mr. Duncan will be among the Agriculture Department's salesmen seeking support among the lawmakers. He gets a good share of the credit for saving the administration farm legislation from complete disaster last year. There was a series of cliff-hanging votes, and the Duncan influence helped to turn the tide.

Mr. Duncan averages about a trip a week to the White House to discusss farm problems with presidential advisers and, on occasion, from President Kennedy himself.

There have been reports from time to time that the President is bored with farm problems and doesn't know much about them. Mr. Duncan does not agree.

"I'll say this—he's a lot more interested than President Eisenhower ever was," the Assistant Secretary says.

When the Cuban crisis threatened to develop into nuclear war, Mr. Duncan took part in high-level conferences on how to meet the Nation's food needs under enemy attack.

He also spends some time on the convention circuit, usually as the invited guest. His foray into Atlanta for the Farm Bureau convention was an unusual approach. Most of the time, farm-related organizations want to hear the Government's side.

One of Mr. Duncan's most powerful jobs is on the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation has borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. It makes decisions about commodity transactions that greatly influence prices. Outside traders make and lose fortunes in commodity dealings. The CCC has a tremendous responsibility.

How does it feel to have this responsibility and all the others involved in being Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Stabilization?

"It gives you the feeling of wanting to be pretty doggone careful before you make a decision," Duncan says.

Any decision of his will come from a lifetime of association with farming. His agricultural education began on the family farm 4 miles north of Quitman. Now rented out, it produces cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and livestock.

After finishing at Emory, he took graduate work in agriculture at the University of Georgia. He played professional base-

ball for a short time, but went back to farming.

His wife is the former Branch Ellis Orr of Macon. They and their four children—Judy, 20; John, 15; Ellis, 8, and Nancy, 5—live in a brick split-level house in Alexandria.

Mr. Duncan goes to work at 7:30 every morning and gets home after 7 every night. Often he is in his office even on weekends.

He intended to go back to being Georgia Farm Bureau president after 2 years in Washington, but it didn't work out that way. The administration wanted him to continue. He was on leave from the Farm Bureau office, and staying here meant he had to resign the post. So it won't automatically be his when he does leave the Government.

"I don't know what I'll be doing 2 years from now," he said. "If President Kennedy is reelected and the administration wants me to stay, I might do that. I might go back to the Farm Bureau; I think I could."

"Or"—he was answering a question on this point—"I might run for Congress. It's too soon to say. I didn't think 2 years ago that I'd still be here, but here I am."

W. A. Boyle, New President of United Mine Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 23, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Monday's issue of the Evening Star noted that a distinguished Montanan, Mr. W. A. (Tony) Boyle, is acting president of one of this Nation's major independent unions, the United Mine Workers of America.

About 2 months ago, President Thomas Kennedy appointed Mr. Boyle, then vice president, acting president. With Mr. Kennedy's death, Mr. Boyle will serve out the remainder of the term ending late next year.

Born in a Montana mining camp, Tony Boyle lived in Billings from 1940 to 1948 when he was president of UMW District 27. He is credited with drafting the Montana Mining Code enacted by Montana's legislative assembly.

I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press article, headed "New UMW President Reminiscent of Lewis," published in the January 21, 1963, issue of the Evening Star be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW UMW PRESIDENT REMINISCENT OF LEWIS

The death of Thomas Kennedy brings to the presidency of the United Mine Workers another heavy-browed folksy-talking union leader of the John L. Lewis school.

W. A. (Tony) Boyle has been, in effect, the president of the big independent union for nearly a year because of the 75-year-old Mr. Kennedy's illness.

As vice president, Mr. Boyle assumed most of the administrative duties of the office last spring when Mr. Kennedy first became gravely ill. About 2 months ago, Mr. Kennedy named his top lieutenant acting president.

Mr. Boyle will serve until the end of Mr. Kennedy's 4-year term in late 1964 and it is assumed he will seek reelection.

Mr. Boyle is a native of Billings, Mont., and comes from a long line of Irish miners. His father began work in the mines in Scotland at 9 and his maternal and paternal grandfathers and great-grandfathers all worked in English mines.

STYLE IS REMINISCENT

The 58-year-old Boyle has a fine set of red eyebrows and a gift for direct, plain, and vigorous speech. He hardly compares in either department with his mentor, the 82-year-old Lewis, but his appearance and style are reminiscent of the almost legendary builder of the UMW.

Although long retired as UMW president, Mr. Lewis looms large in the background of coal industry affairs and is believed to have had a part in guiding Mr. Boyle's widespread activities in recent months.

Both men differ markedly in manner and appearance from Mr. Kennedy, a quiet persuader who labored for years under the shadow of the forceful and hard-hitting Lewis.

MEMBERSHIP DWINDLES

For years relations between the larger mines and the UMW have been serene but the union has been having increasing troubles with smaller operators, as coal has been harder and harder pressed by competing fuels.

Nonunion production has increased from 20 to 27 percent of the national output and under the impact of automation UMW membership has dwindled to 160,000.

Mr. Boyle has been attacking these problems, with the advice and counsel of Mr. Lewis, whom he served for 12 years as special assistant at the union's Washington headquarters.

Like Mr. Lewis, Mr. Boyle occasionally shows considerable disregard for both major political parties.

After public schooling in Montana and Idaho, Mr. Boyle studied law at LaSalle University and became active in union affairs at the local level more than 30 years ago. In 1940 he was elected president of District 27 of the UMW and while in that office also served as regional director for the CIO in four Western States. He later was regional director of the UMW's District 50 in the same territory.

ON U.S. COMMITTEES

During World War II, Mr. Boyle represented the union on various Government and industry committees, manpower councils, and War Labor Board panels. He was the first labor representative on Montana's advisory council to the State unemployment compensation commission.

He married a schoolteacher, Ethel V. Williams, and they have a daughter, Mrs. Daryl E. Engebregson, who practices law in Montana with her husband.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the great tradition of the gallant and gifted Ukrainian people there are many glorious events, but the event that marked the rebirth of the Ukraine and the rise of the Ukrainian Republic early in 1918 stands out most significantly in its history. On January 22, 1918, after enduring the oppressive yoke of Russian autocracy for more than 250 years, Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and founded their Republic. From the time of its very birth, however, this weak state found itself in the midst of insurmountable difficulties. And it was surrounded with enemies whose aim was to put an end to its very existence. After struggling for a little over 2 years against formidable odds, the country was invaded by the Red army, and the Ukrainian Republic was no more. The land became part of the U.S.S.R. and its unhappy people fell under the tyranny of the Kremlin.

Today there are no free Ukrainians in that fair land, but even under totalitarian tyranny a stout-hearted and freedom-seeking people cherish their national goal, their freedom and independence. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day let us all hope that they attain that goal.

Gov. Bill Scranton's First Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following message of Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania:

LEGISLATIVE MESSAGE OF GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, JOINT SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JANUARY 22, 1963

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, we gather here today at the beginning of a great adventure; an adventure of the heart and mind.

Our aim can be no less than to create a sounder, more effective, more enlightened framework of government in Pennsylvania. A framework so sound, so effective, so enlightened that it will substantially help a revitalized society to grow and flourish in our Commonwealth.

It is time for Pennsylvania to lead the Nation. To be a pacesetter. A progress-maker. Together, we the legislative and executive branches of this government have it within our power to do just that. We can produce here models in the practice of government that our sister States will hasten to copy.

I look upon this as a joint effort. A blending of the ideas, imaginations, hopes and labors of both the executive and legislative branches. Having served as a legislator myself—on the Federal level of Government—I have understanding for your problems and concerns as members of the legislative branch.

It seems to me that the proper role of the executive is to lead, not to dictate.

In line with this belief, many weeks ago I asked the majority leaders of both houses

to join with me and the Lieutenant Governor in developing a legislative program to carry out the mandate that was given to us last fall by the people of Pennsylvania.

As a result, the program I am about to present to you is a product of the combined efforts of both the administration and the majority leaders in the legislature.

As for the minority party in the legislature, I am sympathetic with their role, too. After all, my legislative experience was obtained on the minority side of the aisle. I expect them to scrutinize the program most carefully. But, just as I voted when I was a legislator with the majority on proposals which were for the good of the Nation, so I am confident that the minority here will give us its support for the good of Pennsylvania.

In this message today it is my plan to offer highlights of our program. Some vital items I will not treat at all today. They will be the subject of full-scale special messages in the next 6 weeks. Other items I will touch on only briefly, fully developing our position in later special messages. Fiscal matters will be handled in a budget message which is planned for early March.

Specific legislation to improve our industrial development program and wage war on unemployment is one of the items which I will discuss in a special message.

But, in a larger sense, every item I mention today is tied to industrial development. Government which does a good job in providing necessary services for people is one of the first essentials demanded by modern industry. If our legislative program were to be defeated, it would be a real defeat also in our battle to build an economically stronger Pennsylvania.

A vote against most of the items I am proposing today, is a direct vote against the jobless men and women of our Commonwealth.

One pressing need in the field of industrial development, however, does require your immediate attention, so I will mention it today rather than wait for the special message.

The loan fund of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority is at present almost completely exhausted. In order that there shall not be the slightest slowdown of the essential activities of this agency, I recommend that you grant a deficiency appropriation of $4 million for industrial development purposes.

Education is another subject so vast as to require a full-scale special message. Two specific recommendations on education are, however, in order at this time.

First, I commend those members of the legislature who on opening day introduced a bill to declare a 1-year moratorium on all deadlines in School Reorganization Act 561.

Considerable confusion exists in the Commonwealth over application of the act, which even its warmest advocates admit is incomplete. Many others describe it as unworkable, both because it is incomplete and for other reasons.

Since opening day, the moratorium has been praised by both educators and laymen in all parts of Pennsylvania. It should be enacted.

Second in the field of education, it is imperative that we move immediately to separate the policymaking from the administrative function. All further progress in Pennsylvania education depends upon this.

To do this, we should set up a State board of education. It would be responsible for formulating general education policy. The department of public instruction would operate under the supervision of the board of education. It would stop making policy. It would administer the policy formulated by the board.

Working with the board of education would be a council of higher education and a council of basic education. Each would exercise primary responsibility in its own field. Among other things, the council of higher education would develop a master plan for college education in Pennsylvania. The council of basic education would be responsible for achieving elementary and secondary education of uniformly high quality throughout the Commonwealth.

In areas where the concerns of basic and higher education overlap, and in budget matters, the State board of education would retain authority.

Each of the councils should have six lay members. Each should be provided with a staff. Members of the two councils, plus three at-large members, would make up the State board of education.

After industrial development and education, the next important need of Pennsylvania is reform of the laws and machinery through which government itself is administered.

I am proposing five actions in this field:

First, we should establish a new department of mental health of cabinet rank. This will take over—without additional cost—the duties of the present bureau of mental health in the department of public welfare. A new department will give our mental health program new emphasis. This is necessary since mental and emotional disorders are our greatest single health affliction today. Moreover, it will assure the complete freedom of our mental health program from political interference. We want no politics in the wards of mental hospitals.

Second, I intend to establish by administrative action a council of human services. Members will include the secretary of public welfare, the secretary of health, the secretary of mental health, and the directors of other State agencies which deal with the problems of those who suffer disease and privation.

This council, while giving us direct and independent action in each area of human services, will also give us coordination of all of these governmental services. This we need to avoid present overlapping and confusion.

Third in the field of governmental reforms, I call for establishing a cabinet-rank department of community development.

The problems of our cities—whether large or middle sized—require expanded attention from the State government.

We have a clear choice here. Either the State government will come to the assistance of cities in such challenges as mass transportation, uban renewal, housing, and the rejuvenation of community life, or the Federal Government will do it.

The Federal Government cannot do it as well as we can. What is more, in the trying, the Washington bureaucrats will destroy the historic relationship between the State and its member communities. If we believe in the Federal principle—the principle whereby the States retain the duties not expressly given to the Federal Government in the Constitution—this is our chance to prove it.

Fourth in the field of governmental reforms, I call for formation of a commission of professional affairs.

Presently, 16 boards, attached with little rhyme or reason to the department of public instruction, handle professional licensing. These duties should be assumed by the new commission, headed by a commissioner appointed by the Governor. For administrative purposes the commission should be assigned to the department of state.

Fifth in the field of governmental reforms, I recommend enactment of strict penalties against fraud in obtaining professional licenses. Proposals to put real teeth in our laws against fraud in this area will be placed before you. They should be enacted. We cannot afford even the breath of scandal in our licensing procedures.

The next major area with which this legislature should be concerned is medical care for the aged.

Once and for all we must eliminate the stigma that this State program is "for paupers only."

Proposals to make the dramatic first steps toward this will be placed before you.

We must increase substantially the limits on assets of eligible elderly persons contained in the present law. We must eliminate completely the cruel liens which the State now files against the estates of persons who have received medical aid. We must establish machinery whereby the eligibility of elderly persons to receive aid can be determined before illness strikes. A system of determining eligibility in advance will remove the additional suffering needlessly imposed by the present law.

Improving medical care will cost money. But the sums involved are comparatively modest when measured against the relief they will bring to our older citizens. When measured against the debt we owe to those who have labored long in the struggle of life, they become very modest indeed.

Improvement of civil service is another area of vital importance in Pennsylvania. Our Commonwealth now suffers from the worst system in the Nation.

First of all, we must write a uniform Civil Service Act. This must replace the current bewildering hodge podge of inconsistent statutory and executive programs. Every employee covered by civil service should be governed by the same laws and regulations. The best aspects of all existing programs should be included in the new uniform act.

The same act, along with covering all jobs now under present forms of civil service, should extend complete coverage to certain vital departments. Among these should be: Complete coverage for the department of public instruction; complete coverage for the public utilities commission; complete coverage for the department of banking; complete coverage for the insurance department; complete coverage for the department of health; complete coverage for the boards which will make up the new commission of professional affairs; and complete coverage for the new department of mental health.

Under the new uniform act, so-called executive civil service will be superseded and jobs now under this status which require civil service protection will be covered by the new act. Persons in these positions, who have qualified under genuine civil service competition, should be protected in their jobs. For the sake of governmental efficiency, as well as out of common fairness, however, it will be necessary that the Governor shall for 1 year have power to review the records of performance of such employees. If necessary, he should have the power to remove these persons who receive their jobs on a political rather than on a professional merit basis. Their replacements should be employed through civil service competition and examination.

Another area in which I urge the attention of the legislature is in the maintenance of fair and honest elections. This is fundamental to our system of Government. We will seek enactment of laws which will prevent an entrenched political machine of either party from completely dominating the election procedure in a given area.

In a separate message I will offer proposals to make it possible for all parties to maintain adequate watchers at every poll, to free election officials of political ties, and to safeguard the use of absentee ballots.

Regarding the problem of bituminous strip mining, I have four recommendations to make.

The strip mining industry has made a valuable contribution to our State's economy. In the future it will continue to do so. I do not, however, accept the argument that the industry can only survive by completely sacrificing beauty and safety.

Therefore, I recommend shifting authority to enforce laws regulating reclamation of strip mined areas from the department of mines to the department of forests and waters. Five of the seven major coal mining States already invest this authority in their departments which are responsible for conservation, and I believe we should join them.

Second, more backfilling of strippings is essential. The law should strictly require restoring terrain to a condition so that farm equipment may move across it or so that new recreation benefits are created.

Third, the amount of the bond posted per acre by strip operators should be increased.

Fourth, I recommend that you pass legislation which would limit both the time which a bituminous strip mine may remain open and the length of the strip that may be exposed at any one time. By such strict limitations we will not only reduce the problems connected with the mines themselves, but also will prevent the accumulation of acid polluted water. No other state has such laws. If they are enacted, Pennsylvania will once again be pioneering in constructive regulation of the strip mine industry.

Also in the field of conservation, I recommend that you approve Project 70 for the second time. It is essential that you do this so that this long-range project for development of the natural beauty and resources of Pennsylvania can be submitted to the voters this November.

In the field of harness racing, I have three recommendations:

First, legislation should be passed prohibiting admission of minors to track grounds.

Second, it should be made unlawful for either public officials or officers of political parties to participate in the ownership of tracks.

Third, to improve administration and cut cost, the harness racing commission should be returned to the department of agriculture.

Another major field of concern for the legislature is the matter of reapportionment. The membership of both houses must be brought into conformity with population shifts. This is primarily a matter for the legislature itself. I am pleased that I have been informed by your leaders that the house and senate committees on elections and apportionments will soon begin to hold joint meetings on this difficult problem.

Next, we must make it possible for residents of our largest city to carry out a long-needed reform in their local government. I recommend that you approve legislation which will permit the people of Philadelphia to achieve, at long last, the final city-county consolidation which was envisioned in the city charter of 1951.

Another matter you have before you is an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to outlaw the poll tax. This device was repealed many years ago in Pennsylvania. It survives today in only a few States where it is used to keep Negroes from exercising their rights of suffrage.

I urge you to swiftly approve the amendment passed last year by Congress so that it will become part of the law of the land.

Next, I urge you to adopt amendments to the uniform commercial code which have been proposed by the permanent editorial board for the uniform commercial code.

Pennsylvania has long led the Nation in this field of legislation. We were the first State to adopt the code. We ought to modernize it now.

Another matter for which I urge your support concerns the blind veterans of the Commonwealth. I recommend enactment of an additional pension of $50 per month to every honorably discharged Pennsylvania veteran suffering service-connected blindness.

Finally, I urge you to take action on the need of Pennsylvania to revise its constitution.

Fundamental inadequacies and anachronisms plague the operation of our government. These can be cured only through the drastic surgery of revision of our State constitution. The unwieldy incubus of dead law and outmoded rules contained in our present constitution is the greatest single deterrent to progressive government in Pennsylvania.

While there is wide agreement that revision is necessary, there is less agreement on how such revision should be achieved. Some suggest that the legislature itself should call a constitutional convention. Others argue that the legislature should submit the convention to a referendum of the people. Still others favor a comprehensive process of amendment such as that which will be proposed next week by the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

Bluntly, I say this to you:

I am not so concerned with the method as I am with getting the job done. To do this, two things are necessary: legislative action and strong leadership in obtaining the support of the people of Pennsylvania.

If it be the will of the legislature to call a convention without a referendum, I shall lend my wholehearted support to such action.

All things considered, however, it is my own judgment that the method by which we stand the best practical chance of seeing a new constitution through to final acceptance is by asking the people to approve in a referendum the calling of a convention.

I recommend that you act immediately to set up machinery for this referendum and convention.

In addition, certainly the legislature should study and take appropriate action on the bar association's amendments. In this way all progress would not be lost if the convention method should fail.

Let me make one thing absolutely clear: I shall devote every ounce of leadership within me to persuade the people of Pennsylvania of the crying need for constitutional revision and to follow through on whatever positive action you take. This is a must for Pennsylvania.

Though this completes my message to you today, it by no means completes the legislative program of the administration.

I will be sending you other special messages. I will be conferring weekly with your leaders. I will welcome all suggestions and criticisms that any of you may individually make.

If the program so far recommended is enacted we will have gone far toward transforming Pennsylvania. Toward restoring her old vigor. Toward once again being the model of her sister States—an example for all men and women who are enrolled in the long struggle to help make government good.

Why Not Reverse Tax Program of President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 23, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the editor of the Washington County (Pa.) paper known as the Washington Observer has come up with an interesting formula concerning the manner in which tax reduction and fiscal reform by the Federal Government might most appropriately be implemented. He recommends expenditure reform first; tax reform, second; and tax reduction, third.

An old and valued friend of mine, L. D. Schreiver, of Dunns Station, Pa., sent me this editorial with his own endorsement supporting the economic concept that expenditures should be reduced before revenue returns are diminished. Borrowing money to reduce taxes does, indeed, seem a strange form of fiscal alchemy which could lead to Federal fiscal disaster if the theorists favoring this strange, new concept should be proved wrong.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Washington Observer editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT REVERSE TAX PROGRAM OF PRESIDENT?

The principal significance of President Kennedy's budget message, delivered Thursday to the Congress of the United States, is that it calls for tax reductions he very likely will not get.

The only way most Republicans, and quite a few Democrats, will vote for such a reduction of revenue will be to make an approximately equivalent reduction in expenditures and outgo. Otherwise, they already feel, the deficit will be so large it will be too dangerous.

The President thinks the cuts will in the end bring about enough more revenue to bring the budget back into eventual balance—after some years. But during those years the Government will operate under such heavy deficit financing that the stability of the currency of the United States will be endangered. This must not happen. It could destroy the Government, bankrupt every citizen of the Nation, and possibly bring about a dictatorship. It would be exactly what such men as Lenin and Stalin and Khrushchev have predicted and wanted, and they would have the achievement of their highest goals.

There is a chance for the tax cuts, however, and every American would like to benefit by them.

That chance is that Congress—or enough Members of both Houses of that body—would have the courage to defy the President and to cut his budget very sharply. They would have to examine and audit it for unnecessary (not merely undesirable) spending proposals and to eliminate them. There are such items. Much of the welfare program has called for pouring money down the drain, the foreign aid program contains provisions for helping peoples who no longer need help or who never used our money for the purposes for which it was given. Congress would not have to search hard to find other actually undesirable items of expenditure, if the Members of the two Houses would discard politics for the national good.

It is true, as the President says, that there are loopholes through which many taxpayers are escaping from their tax liabilities. That kind of tax reform is needed. There is reason to believe also that unfairness in the tax setup forces some to pay taxes they should not have to pay.

In other words, thorough tax reform is needful, as well as tax reduction and spending reform. But the President himself points out that closing the loopholes will not recapture enough taxes by several billions of

dollars to balance the reduction in revenue he proposes.

We would like to reverse his order of procedure and put it in this order: Expenditure reform, tax reform and then tax reduction. And we're inclined to think the most important of the three is the first.

Hon. Burris C. Jackson, President National Cotton Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address delivered by the Honorable Burris C. Jackson, president of the National Cotton Council to the 1963 Beltwide Cotton Production-Mechanization Conference in Dallas, Tex., January 10, 1963.

Mr. Jackson is from Hillsboro, Tex., and is a resident of my congressional district. He has been associated with the commodity of cotton all of his life, and is probably as well versed on the subject as anyone I can think of.

It gives me pleasure to include this address:

COST REDUCTION: THE BIG KEY TO A BIG FUTURE FOR COTTON

(By Burris C. Jackson)

As some of you may know, the National Cotton Council is going to have its 25th birthday this month.

This occasion of our silver anniversary means quite a lot to me as one of the council's founders and one who has been officially associated with it ever since.

As I look back over the last quarter century, I can see many things in the council's record that I am intensely proud of. The council has a record of serving good causes—causes which not only operate in behalf of cotton, but of the country as well. And if there is one great cause that the council has given its all-out support from the very beginning, it is the cause of agricultural research and education.

Throughout its whole existence, the council has championed and built support for the programs in which this group is engaged—programs which seek to advance cotton and agriculture through the use of science and technology.

Those of us in the council have always done our dead-level best to build more adequate programs of research—and research application—for cotton and for agriculture.

We have consistently said that our industry's basic problems cannot be solved by any panaceas to be found in Government price and production control programs.

We have said that in meeting competition for markets, there is no substitute for developing a better product at lower cost.

We have said that science and technology must be at the very heart of any program capable of saving and advancing the American cotton industry.

That is our philosophy, and we have pushed it with all the power at our command. In cooperation with other groups, we have helped win some very significant increases in the total level of cotton research. There have even been a few cases in which we have helped generate an all-out research attack on a particular problem—the new Central Boll Weevil Laboratory in Mississippi being a prime example.

Through the combined efforts of the various groups which do cotton research and education, our industry has made an awful lot of progress in quality improvement and efficiency. And to all of you who have had a part in this accomplishment, I want to say that the council and the cotton industry are indeed grateful.

Yet my principal message to you today is that the total cotton research effort—as productive as it's been—has still fallen woefully short of meeting the industry's needs. The consequences of this are tragically evident today. They will soon become utterly disastrous unless we achieve a big, a fast, a crash buildup in research in the near future.

Just look at the situation we are in today in terms of price competition. We face the most rugged kind of opposition both at home and abroad. And with our production costs where they are, we are in very poor shape to try to stand on our own feet in meeting this competition.

Overseas, American cotton seems to be reasonably competitive with foreign growths and foreign rayon, but only because our Government gives us an export subsidy, which currently comes to 8½ cents a pound. Without the subsidy—which we have no assurance of keeping—we would quickly lose our export market and growers would face the impossible task of trying to adjust their production down to the domestic consumption level.

Remember, too, that the export subsidy—as vital as it is to us at this time—is by no means an unmixed blessing. It permits foreign mills to buy raw cotton at $42.50 a bale less than our domestic mills. This is a huge advantage—especially when you couple it with the fact that the wages paid by foreign mills are only a fraction of those paid in the United States.

The net result of this is that foreign-made cotton goods have been flooding into this country at an ever-increasing rate. Last year, manufactured goods were imported at a rate equivalent to more than 650,000 bales of raw cotton. They took that many bales of consumption away from us in our domestic market. They are going to take over a still larger part of our domestic market unless we do something about the raw cotton cost advantage enjoyed by foreign mills.

But our troubles in the domestic market don't begin and end with imports. Rayon, our biggest and oldest enemy among the manmade fibers, is beating us over the head with the largest price advantage it has ever had. Today, in net cost to domestic mills, rayon is 12 to 15 cents a pound cheaper than cotton. Over the last couple of years, and largely because of rayon's price advantage, we have lost hundreds of thousands of bales of consumption to this competitor.

But this still doesn't tell the whole story. Some of the more expensive fibers such as nylon, Dacron, and Orlon—fibers which have previously competed more on special qualities than on cost—are definitely trending downward in price. There seems little doubt that this downtrend will continue. And as it does, price will become an ever-more-critical factor in competing with the noncellulosic fibers.

The situation we face is not just serious, it's desperate. We have been losing markets fast over the last 2 years. The carryover of cotton has already risen some, and could very well be up sharply by next August 1. The national acreage allotment for 1963 has been reduced by about one-tenth below last year's level. Actually, the allotment is at the legal minimum. And how long can we keep even this legal minimum allotment if it produces more cotton than is consumed?

Now, what are we going to do about all this? What can be done?

An obvious part of the answer—and the only immediate solution—is a revamping of the Government's price and production policies on cotton. This is a must, and there's no question about it.

We must have a Government policy aimed at competitive pricing for U.S. cotton. We must have a policy aimed at doing away with the inequity of the two-price system which we have had for the last several years.

I am extremely hopeful that we will soon see a new Government policy calculated to permit a competitive, one-price system. I can assure you that a determined effort to achieve this goal is underway—and has been underway for the past several months.

President Kennedy has publicly recognized the need for a new cotton program. So have many of our key leaders in the Congress. And of course, the cotton industry itself is mustering every resource it can in the drive for new constructive legislation. Let's hope that this drive will be successful in giving us something that cotton needs—and that success will not be long in coming. To that end, we all pledge our best efforts.

At the same time, let's remember that no government program is going to underwrite and guarantee a big future, or any future, for American cotton.

We are fooling ourselves if we think the Government is going to commit itself to perpetual and massive assistance to cotton in meeting price competition. Certainly the Government has a deep interest in maintaining cotton as a big and vital part of the national economy. But there is bound to be a limit on how far and how long the Government can go in bailing cotton out of trouble. We must, therefore, make plans for the future.

There is really only one long-range solution to our price problems. We must do the things that will permit us to stand on our own feet in meeting price competition. And this means, of course, that we must mount a massive, all-out effort to reduce the cost of producing cotton.

Cost reduction is the key. It has to be the key. In the long run, there is no other way to meet price competition without ruining the producer's profits and driving him out of cotton.

Fortunately, we have a terrific, an enormous potential for getting down the unit cost of producing American cotton, and it is most gratifying to me that the emphasis in this conference program has been placed on exploiting that potential.

One of the ways we can get costs down is simply to do a better job of putting to work the techniques and know-how that have already been developed and proved by research. I would not want to hazard a guess on how much we could reduce the average cost of production by making maximum use of existing technology, but obviously we could make a substantial gain.

How many farmers do you know who are careless about insect control? Farmers who fail to get anything like the full benefits out of mechanical harvesting? Farmers who don't fertilize properly? Farmers who could profit from irrigation? Farmers who should but who haven't tried chemicals for weed control?

What I am saying here is that those of you who work directly with farmers—those of you who have the job of helping farmers apply the results of research—have a tremendous opportunity to help with the vital task of bringing down production costs. This is an opportunity that needs to be exploited with every bit of speed and urgency and resourcefulness that can be applied to it.

Then there's the huge and even-more-difficult task of beefing up our cotton research efforts so they will give us bigger and faster breakthroughs in cost reduction.

Up to now, in spite of a great deal of effort, we have been terribly slow in achieving a buildup in the overall level of cotton research. This has been particularly agonizing in view of the fact that an adequate level of research could in all likelihood reduce the cost of growing cotton by 10 or 11 cents a pound within a reasonable period of time.

If we had had a massive buildup in research several years ago, I am fully confident that farmers would not only be able to meet price competition today, but would be making greater profits to boot. But we didn't get it. Today we still face a great deficit in research. And, in my judgment, we are fast running out of time in which to overcome that deficit.

One of our big hopes for bolstering research lies in the program of self-help that farmers are mounting through the cotton producers' institute. Through the institute, producers are already putting hundreds of thousands of dollars directly into crucial research projects, as well as other hundreds of thousands into cotton promotion, where we also are running a big deficit.

Within a short period of time, the producers' institute expects to be spending millions on research, because this self-help, voluntary program has been splendidly received in all the areas where it has been introduced up to now.

But it is just a plain fact that producers want and need all the help they can get if the total cotton research buildup is to be big enough and fast enough. They need the help of government. They need all possible help from private businesses and industries which are allied with cotton.

I am especially hopeful that the Federal Government will see the wisdom of a sharp step-up in its cotton research efforts. This kind of step-up would involve just a few million dollars, only a minute fraction of what the Government is spending on price and production programs.

Actually, an additional investment in research would be the smartest kind of spending the Government could do for cotton. It would help maintain cotton as a big, dynamic part of the Nation's economy. It would permit farmers to go it on their own in meeting price competition. It would help eliminate any need for heavy subsidies from the Federal Treasury.

In any event, whatever we must do to achieve it, there is no alternative to a crash program to reduce cotton production costs. Without this kind of program, cotton can have no real hope for surviving as a major industry. With such a program, cotton can not only survive but move forward into the healthiest and most prosperous era it has ever known.

There is no question, absolutely no question at all, about our tremendous potential for reducing costs, for meeting price competition, and for increasing the farmer's profits. The only question is whether we are going to move far enough and fast enough in capitalizing on it, and I am confident we will. We simply cannot afford to do anything else

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with Americans of Ukrainian descent in celebrating the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and in paying tribute to these freedom-loving people who have a history of a great struggle for independence.

Their dedication to the principles of freedom and the dignity of the individual, in the face of the oppression to which they have been subjected, is a shining example to all of us in our efforts to see that every country has the right to determine its own form of government.

To those of us who are free, the flame of Ukrainian liberty should renew our desire to maintain and strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere.

It is a pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and to assure the captive people of that country that we in America join in their prayers and hopes that freedom will again shine in their land and they will be given the opportunity for a free and just form of government.

Foreign Economic Policy: The Herter Lecture Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly honored shortly before the opening of the present session of Congress to be invited to initiate the Christian Herter lecture series at Tufts University. In recognition of the services which Herter has given as Congressman, Governor of the State of Massachusetts, and Secretary of State of the United States and in the understanding of the difficult job which lies ahead of him as Chief Trade Negotiator under the new American Trade Act, Tufts has begun a lecture series to look into the difficult area of trade policy and foreign economics. I join with Tufts and the entire Nation in wishing Christian Herter well in his new job, so important to our economic future.

I was very much in favor of personalizing the job of Trade Negotiator as the considerations of the Trade Expansion Act were in progress and I believe both the job and the man offer the greatest promise.

My speech in the lecture series concerned trade, economic policy, and Herter's job as Chief Trade Negotiator.

It is set out below:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Second Missouri District, at the Herter lecture, Tufts University, Boston, Mass., Monday, Jan. 7, 1963)

It is a privilege to be a participant in the Christian Herter lecture series established at this great university. It is appropriate that I should discuss foreign trade on this occasion as Christian Herter, the first Chief Trade Negotiator of the United States, pilots this Nation on a new and an uncharted course in the altered archipelago of foreign trade.

I would be remiss if I did not take note of the appearance of Walter Hallstein, the President of the European Economic Community, here at Tufts in April of 1962, to lecture on the dramatic economic developments occurring in Western Europe in the 5 years since the Rome Treaty was signed. This massive emergence is one of the major reasons that old charts and old courses must be abandoned and new ones charted.

The most important provision of the Reciprocal Trades Act of 1962 (Trade Expansion Act) was the creation of the position of Chief Trade Negotiator requiring Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation, carrying with it the rank of Ambassador Plenipotentiary, and investing in it the basic powers of negotiating our trade treaties, and chairing the newly designed Intercabinet Trade Policy Committee.

There are two basic reasons for the importance of this provision. First, it raised the stature of trade negotiating throughout the world. Other countries sent their trade negotiating teams to Geneva headed by top Cabinet officers or other top governmental official. The United States, on the other hand, frequently and usually sent a team headed or directed by a top civil service employee, a highly competent person with highly competent people to assist him, but one with no stature of his own. His decisions were subject to telephone approvals sought from other faceless officials back in Washington, D.C. Now this has been changed. The decisions now will be made on the spot backed by the authority and integrity of one of the highest officials in our Government, one who is directly responsible to the President.

Second, it raises the stature of trade negotiating in the United States. Personally, I favored the creation of a new Department of Foreign Economics headed by a Cabinet officer who would be the Chief Trade Negotiator, and who would draw together in one place all the various important points where foreign economics impinge upon our domestic economics. As it is, the contact points of foreign economic forces are spread in an uncoordinated fashion throughout our Federal departments, bureaus, and agencies.

I believe foreign trade or, to use the broader terms, foreign economics, has assumed such great importance to our Nation, even though trade itself amounts to less than 10 percent of our gross national product, that we could not possibly deal with the problems it creates under our former administrative setup.

However, I believe it is possible for the Chief Trade Negotiator to develop the powers that are entrusted to him in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 so that he can deal with the most important of the foreign economic contact points.

The powers that go with preparing for trade negotiating are vested in this newly created office. The powers of conducting the negotiations of course are vested here. Furthermore, if the concept of the Intercabinet Trade Policy Committee that some of us had, and tried to spell out in the committee report and during the congressional debate, is carried out, the compliance with the treaties and agreements negotiated will be supervised by the Chief Trade Negotiator. Finally, the Committee has authority to develop procedures for receiving, hearing, evaluating and recommending remedial action to the President on allegations of unfair trade practices which bear on foreign trade agreements, even though not specifically a part of them.

These charges of unfair trade practices may be directed against foreign or domestic businessmen, I hasten to point out.

At this point, let me state that President Kennedy by appointing a former U.S. Secretary of State to the position of Chief Trade Negotiator has captured the full significance of upgrading the place foreign trade should hold in the council of nations and in the United States. Let me further state that by appointing a person with the wisdom, experience, imagination, and integrity that Christian Herter possesses, we are most likely to develop the governmental machinery the new law makes possible for dealing with the problems presented in the field of foreign economics.

It is in these areas that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 deserves the oft applied cliche, bold and imaginative. At the same time I make this point I want to make the point that what has been hailed as bold and imaginative in the Trade Expansion Act—the granting to the President of additional trading material to further reduce tariff rates and eliminate many altogether—is shirking and stereotype. This is no more than the last possible move remaining that could be made under the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. Too many people have forgotten that the Reciprocal Trade Acts were mere amendments to this basic act which remains on the books today. By starting from a level of high tariff rates, we were able to negotiate downward as Congress intermittently gave the President power to do so. Incidentally, the original Reciprocal Trade Act and most of those that followed permitted the President to negotiate upward if he had been so inclined, and so does the present law. This point has not been overlooked by many people who are unsympathetic with the doctrine of freer trade and may have a great significance. Time will tell.

What our trade policy will be, once we have used this last bit of tariff trading material the President now has is one of the questions not yet resolved.

I have said that in this area of trading material the act is shirking, not bold. I justify my choice of words for the following reason. Today tariffs are among the least of the trade barriers that hamper free trade. Quotas, licenses, embargoes, internal excises, monetary policies, exchange rates, governmental subsidies of an infinite variety, state trading, Government sponsored or unrestrained cartels, health and other regulatory laws perverted to embargoes are the major barriers in international trade today. The United States is an offender in these areas, along with the other major trading nations, yet nothing meaningful is said in the Trade Expansion Act about these trade barriers. The GATT, which seeks to eliminate all trade barriers, remains unmentioned in the Trade Expansion Act, either by name or by reference to its principles.

As a matter of fact, the most liberal of all trade barriers is the much abused tariff which is now being abandoned in toto. A tariff at least is a law for all to read, determine, and apply, and courts have been set up to resolve differences of interpretations in accordance with established laws and procedures. The other types of trade barriers I have listed almost without exception require administrative determination without established laws, procedures, or courts. Who gets a quota, and how much, and into what ports in what quantities is the subject of administrative negotiation. This is government by men, not government by law. In this process woe betides the little operator and fortune blesses the operator with political connections and power.

The trade adjustment features in the Trade Expansion Act deserve no such accolade as bold and imaginative. Redundant and defensive are the adjectives that come to my mind to describe them. The adjustment features for the unemployed duplicate the provisions in our unemployment insurance laws, our Manpower Training Act, and our depressed areas legislation. These new provisions can only confuse and damage established programs and do little or no good. The adjustment features which relate to employers are unnecessary for large corporations which can adjust their line of products and services within their own structure, and duplicate for smaller businesses the loan provisions of the Small Business Act. I used the adjective "defensive" because these provisions were placed in the law as a defense mechanism against those who had been claiming for years that foreign competition damaged their business or their jobs. The same reasoning could be applied to any form of competition. The proponents of this defense mechanism fell back on the thesis that this economic damage results from the governmental action in reducing tariff rates and, therefore, the Government should compensate. The same reasoning should then apply when Government moves its contracts from certain businesses in one area to businesses in other areas, or when Government takes any action which has an impact upon the marketplace. This would be quite an undertaking for a Government with an annual expediture of $100 billion.

At this point I would like to make an observation that I have been making for the past few years. I am convinced that most of our people who think they want protection really want fairness in trading—not protection, not an advantage, and definitely not a handout. I have listened for years to the testimony of businessmen, labor and farm groups who have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in opposing the Reciprocal Trade Act extension. I have dug into what seemed to be bothering them. Most of their troubles arise from lack of fairness or reciprocity in trade matters on the part of their foreign competitors, from a State subsidy to their competitor, or an embargo, or a quota system, or an unhealthy wage scale—unhealthy to the overall economy of the country which permitted it.

I recall a statement from one of our exporters to Venezuela. He said his company was unable to compete with the Western German companies in that market because the German companies could offer more liberal credit terms financed by the German Government. I posed this case to Secretary of Commerce Hodges during the public hearings on the Trade Expansion Act last year. The Secretary's response worried me. He said, "Well, we will look into that and perhaps we (meaning some governmental agency) can enable the U.S. companies to match this liberal credit extension." My expressed thought was, if we really are talking about freeing up trade, why not negotiate with the German Government to quit subsidizing their businesses? Don't compound the error by subsidizing ours.

Another matter coming out of the hearings comes to my mind which illustrates the point in a somewhat different way. The Secretary of Interior pointed with some pride to the fact that Government loans had been extended to some of our west coast fishermen who otherwise would have been forced out of business by the Japanese. The point was that our fishing boats were obsolete and needed renovation. I asked why the tariff on fish was not increased, if there was to be protection. In that way the most efficient of our fishermen would do the renovation. By a subsidy, the fishermen who were most efficient in presenting their case to the Small Business Administration for the guaranteed loan, not necessarily the best fishermen, would do the renovation. Either way, however, we were not freeing up trade and by the subsidy method we might even be keeping an inefficient operation alive which would be coming back for more subsidy. As a not too irrelevant side point, there was testimony to the effect that it was not the efficiency of the Japanese fishing boats as much as it was the noncompliance by the Japanese with the international fishing agreements set up for conservation purposes which kept our fishermen from competing.

If this latter point turned out to be true, the gravamen of our fishermen's case was not protection of an American industry, but rather, insistence on the mutual observance of good conservation laws. By protecting instead of insisting that a violation cease, we compounded the error and impeded the expansion of trade.

I want to express one other specific point of concern I have about our foreign trade policy. Section 203 of the Agriculture Act which authorizes the President to enter into international cartel agreements in respect to agricultural products and products manufactured therefrom with other nations was not only not repealed by the Congress, but at the request of the administration, its authority was broadened to provide that these agreements would be made binding on nations not party to the international agreement. It was this authority, incidentally, that lay at the base of the international textile agreement entered into in Geneva in January of 1962.

I asked Secretary of Commerce Hodges how it was determined how much textile, of what varieties, from what companies, from what countries were to come into what U.S. ports. He replied straight-facedly that they were going to use the 1960 census figures. In other words, we are going to freeze the trade pattern as of that date. How expansive and progressive can we get? I know of nothing that more dramatically drives home the point I seek to make of the regressiveness, the stifling aspects of the license-quota type trade barrier. Is this what we are coming to once we have run out of the tariff-rate trading material set up in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act? This is not an isolated example of our use of quotas and licenses or international type cartel agreements. The Sugar Act is an example. Many of our agricultural products are state traded, under Public Law 480. Indeed, very few agricultural products move without knocking against these kinds of trade barriers and government subsidies. Recently we have been utilizing the quota system instead of tariffs for oil imports.

And now I must relate another important piece of legislation affecting foreign economics which was passed the last session of Congress. I refer to the Revenue Act of 1962; that part which altered the tax treatment of American enterprise abroad. It has been my observation that we cannot separate trade from foreign investment and that anything that deters foreign investment will deter trade. I think this is particularly true in face of the development of the European Common Market. Much has been made of the efficiencies the EEC countries will derive from manufacturing for a mass market. However, these are efficiencies that they should be able to put into effect without too much to do. However, mass manufacturing is based upon mass distribution and mass servicing, a point that seems to escape many economic planners. It requires the economic infrastructure of power, communications, transportation, and education. The United States is just about the only society that has developed the techniques of mass distribution and mass servicing. For this reason I have suggested that the greatest opportunities open to U.S. enterprise in the European Common Market lie in the field of distribution and servicing.

If some question this point, let me give just a practical illustration which may drive

it home. I have a friend who mass-produces special pallets to be used in mass warehousing where turnover is fast and handling must be made as efficient as possible. There is no market in Europe, as yet, for his product, because warehousing has not been developed to this point and probably will not be for many years.

We have had so little regard for the distributive and servicing sectors of our economy, probably as a result of what seems to be our mesmerization with mass production, that we really have been unaware of what is going on. We accept packaging as routine and actually curse advertising with an unawareness of the vital economic part they both play in obtaining the efficiencies that can be had in a mass market. Perhaps this point will drive the point home; while employment has been steadily declining in manufacturing in the United States, employment in the service and distributive fields has continued to climb, even during our post-World War II recessions.

Now, to get back to the point I sought to make about foreign investment. If we are going to avail ourselves of the opportunities offered in the European Common Market in the service and distributive fields, we must encourage, not discourage, our capital to move there. All the talk about our manufacturing processes moving to Europe is largely unanalytical. What movement there has been is largely to gain the efficiencies derived from having a crucial part of the manufacturing process nearer to the market for distributive and servicing efficiencies. Actually this process creates more jobs in the United States than it displaces, not less. However, it is true the jobs will be shifted out of manufacturing into distribution and servicing, but they will become better paying and requiring less brawn, but a little more brains.

It certainly is a shortsighted policy which seeks to solve a balance-of-payments problem through discouraging healthy and remunerative private investment going abroad. This is sacrificing gain over the long haul for a very temporary short-term benefit. One of the strongest items in our balance of payments is the income we derive from our foreign investment. And yet government policy seeks to weaken it.

I do not introduce the subject to argue its merits or demerits. I brought it up primarily to emphasize its inseparable relation to our trade policy. In trade we talk of going one way, toward expansion, to help our balance of payments, and in investment we talk and promote contraction, allegedly for the same purpose. This is a grave inconsistency.

I do not like to mention the relatively trivial items the administration sponsored in the previous Congress, such as increasing the tariffs on the most person to person of all foreign trade, the trade between our tourists and the foreign shopkeeper, and cutting back on military personnel purchasing abroad, but they are straws in the wind which reflect the way the trade policy really is blowing. These two pieces of leigslation were also promoted in the name of balance-of-payments problems.

I must mention a major administration policy not referred to the Congress but set by Executive decree. This is the buy American program adopted by the Defense Department. This policy requires purchases of military goods to be made in the United States if the United States price is not 25 percent greater than the foreign price. Already this has cost the Military Establishment over $100 million, at least, that is the boast of the Defense Department and the administration when they were toting up the effective job they claimed they had done in respect to the balance-of-payments problem.

While the administration talks freer trade every policy it has followed to date indicates it is pursuing a course of more restricted trade—all in the name of balance of payments.

From this discussion you may be gaining the impression that I am the greatest free trader since Adam Smith. In theory, I guess I may be, but in practice I am a fair trader which puts me in bad with the so-called protectionists with some frequency. I happen to believe that increased trade depends upon free trade and free trade depends upon fair trade. The points at issue revolve around the definition of fair trade. For a starter I will take the definitions set forth in the GATT. What my protectionist friends call protection I find, on analysis, to be usually a differential reflecting some subsidy or impact of a trade barrier set up on the other side by the competitor. The policy I would have us pursue is to remove the subsidy or the barrier which is the justification for the differential. However, if a differential is to be used, I would recommend that the most liberal differential possible be used; this happens to be also the most flexible—it is the tariff. I would adopt only as a last recourse the other differentials—those regressive devices of licenses, quotas and subsidies. I would eschew without equivocation health and other regulatory laws used as subterfuges for economic differentials.

I would oppose any differential that created a preference, that is, any differential which went beyond the economic difference sought to be measured for adjustment.

I think our foreign economic policy should be trade wherever possible, not aid; when trade is not possible, then loans rather than grants; where loans are not possible, then know-how rather than money; and when know-how is not possible, then outright gifts, rather than money with a string tied to it. When we get to money with strings tied to it, we move out of economics into diplomacy which is the realm of the State Department.

I am happy that foreign economics is being taken out of the hands of the State Department and is being placed, to some degree, in the hands of a new, independent and possibly coequal agency headed by the Chief Trade Negotiator. This new law serves as the authority to do this. I believe our State Department should be relieved from any control of the details that go to make up our economic arm, just as they have no control of the details that go to make up our military arm. Diplomacy is the area of endeavor of the State Department. In implementing our foreign policy, exercising diplomacy that is, we must be able to utilize the strength of either and both arms, military and economic. To make and keep them as strong as possible, they must be under the direction of their specialists, not specialists in diplomacy who sometimes are tempted, like Xerxes, to whip the seas when the laws of nature fail to respond to their pleas.

Freedom and Union Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an article that appeared in a publication entitled, "Freedom and Union," edited by Clarence Streit. The article concerns the splendid election victory of our colleague Representative, PAUL FINDLEY, of the 20th Congressional District of Illinois.

It will be seen that Streit's basis is his article around PAUL FINDLEY'S superb speech on the subject of World Federation. The title of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] address is "America's Greatest Invention—and How Best To Use it Now." Its theme is that the United States made a contribution to the world when it fashioned a Federal union plan for government as embodied in the U.S. Constitution. Why should not, then, this concept be applied to world unity?

Full text of the gentleman from Illinois, PAUL FINDLEY'S, speech is attached along with the introductory article that appeared in the magazine, Freedom and Union:

CONSERVATIVE FINDLEY WINS CRUCIAL SEAT IN CONGRESS, BACKING ATLANTIC FEDERATION

With Atlantic federation as the most distinguish plank in his platform, PAUL FINDLEY, a freshman Republican Congressman, roundly defeated on November 6 Peter Mack, liberal Democrat, who had the advantage of having served seven terms in Congress. Mr. FINDLEY won by a majority of 10,871, in a total vote of 190,209. His victory is the more significant since it came in the heart of the Middle West, in the 20th District of Illinois.

Before the election, Robert C. Albright, political correspondent of the Washington Post, made a special visit to this district. In a column-long report his paper published November 5, he said this was "1 of the 12 House contests that the two political parties consider crucial." Mr. Albright explained:

"Representative Peter Mack, 46, the Democratic loner with the Houdini flair for winning in gerrymandered congressional districts is walled in again but he hopes not for long. In 1952 he confounded Republicans and his own machine leaders by escaping from a similar reapportionment lockup. The big question is: Can he duplicate that difficult feat in Tuesday's election?

"Representative PAUL FINDLEY, 41, a deeply conservative Republican freshman, was thrown into the same district with the Kennedy-endorsed Mack by the Illinois Legislature. The two are grappling for holds in one of the tightest of off-year races. Some say it could be decided by less than 1,000 votes. The statistics narrowly favor Mack's Republican opponent, as they did in 1952 when the dexterous Democratic independent bucked the Eisenhower landslide to hold on to his seat. * * * The 14 counties now comprising the new Mack-Findley (20th) district went 51.6 percent Republican in 1960."

That Mr. FINDLEY'S victory was not due to gerrymandering would seem evident from the fact that he gained 53 percent of the votes and a majority 10 times greater than the experts had expected. Moreover, President Kennedy had gone out of his way to endorse Mr. Mark to quote the Albright report.

"At the Illinois State Fair Colosseum in Springfield, Mr. Kennedy singled Mack out from his colleagues. 'I'd like to have him stand up,' the President said. 'He is a great Congressman.'

"FINDLEY said he was delighted the President had plumped for Mack. 'It helped identify Mack as a New Frontiersman,' said FINDLEY. 'He's been trying to dodge it. Now everyone knows.'

"FINDLEY, rated by some as 'to the right of GOLDWATER,' goodnaturedly denies it. 'I'd class myself somewhere between GOLDWATER and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN,' he said. In fact, he is one of the few Republicans able

to produce letters from both GOLDWATER and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, strongly endorsing his candidacy.

"FINDLEY goes along with some of Rockefeller's foreign policy views, including his belief in a Federation of Western Nations. He said as a youth he won a prize for an essay contest on an almost identical theme. The contest was sponsored by Clarence Streit.

"FINDLEY makes no bones about differing with Rockefeller's domestic views, however. He takes pride in his 100 percent rating with the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action."

The essay contest referred to was one sponsored by the Federal Union Association about 1940, the prize being a trip to Washington and lunch with Mr. Streit at the National Press Club. Mr. FINDLEY was then one of the organization's collegiate Student Federalists. When the association founded Freedom and Union in 1946, Mr. FINDLEY, back from the Guam invasion, was assistant editor through its first year. He left to become publisher and editor of the Pike County Republican in Pittsfield, Ill., and later acquired another weekly. He graduated from Illinois College a Phi Beta Kappa, and married his charming wife, née Lucille Gemme, while on the staff of this magazine. They have two children, Craig and Diane.

Congressman FINDLEY is, so far as we know, the only candidate for either House of Congress who made Atlantic Federal Union a feature of his campaign. Like Governor Rockefeller, he not only shares a widespread view that it is right but he—unlike timid politicians—believed there were votes in it. He seems to have proved it. For he won a resounding victory in what the experts deemed the hardest kind of district in which to test this belief, while Governor Rockefeller, who, after making a bold stand for federation in February, did not speak of it in his campaign because his advisers urged it was not a State issue, was reelected with a smaller majority than before.

We reprint below Congressman FINDLEY's opening speech on Atlantic Federal Union which he delivered at Carthage College in his district September 28, to show the way in which he stepped forward "where devils feared to tread."

"In television statements late in the campaign," Mr. FINDLEY said, in response to a question on whether he supported the U.N., "I have always believed in the U.N. I want it to continue to function. It has performed valuable services in the past and can do so in the future. It is primarily a meeting place for representatives of sovereign nations, and affords a mechanism through which member nations can carry forward projects over which there is little controversy.

"I do object to efforts being made by some groups to transform the U.N. into some sort of world government. Such an effort would surely destroy the U.N. My suggestion is to permit the U.N. to continue to provide the limited but valuable function as a meeting place.

"I do strongly recommend, however, that a new unity—indeed an organic union—be formed among the U.N. members that have demonstrated over a period of years their ability to govern themselves and protect individual liberty. These would be the United States, British Commonwealth nations, France, the Low Countries, and a few others. Such a union would be the greatest possible step forward in the cause of liberty, and the best possible news for the U.S. taxpayer. The cost of armament and space activities would be shared with millions of others. I also referred briefly to the Federal Union idea in several other brief appearances on television.

"I kept this up through my final TV broadcast. Mr. Mack never challenged me on this issue. I don't believe I had even one murmur of criticism on this issue. Which is astonishing. But I learned my lesson before the campaign when I made a speech in favor of Atlantic Federal Union at a DAR meeting in my district and found that, when they understood the proposal, none of them expressed any opposition."

The only part of Representative FINDLEY's Carthage speech which he gave in his press release on it was the lesson he drew from U.S. history at the end, which we have put in boldface type. His full speech follows.—EDITORS.

AMERICA'S GREATEST INVENTION—AND HOW BEST TO USE IT NOW

(By Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois)

"Have you ever considered this question: What was America's greatest invention?

"Was it Alexander Graham Bell's telephone, which opened a new era in communications?

"Was it Thomas A. Edison's electric light, which turned a world of flickering nighttime into one in which night can be as brilliant as day?

"Was it the Wright brothers' airplane, which gave mankind wings, for good and for ill?

"Was it Henry Ford's assembly line which led to mass production and a sharply rising standard of living?

"Was it atomic energy, which ushered in an age that is now only beginning to unfold?

"Each has a claim to greatness. Each is uniquely American. Each has contributed immensely to progress. Which would you choose?

"My choice may surprise you. It is none of these. My choice is nothing more tangible than a manuscript, and yet it has become the most vital force for freedom and progress history has known. It is uniquely an American invention. It is the Federal Union plan for Government as embodied in the U.S. Constitution.

"The laboratory where Federal Union was created was Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The year was 1787. In the same Hall 11 years earlier had been signed the Declaration of Independence, the vital spark that was to ignite this torch of freedom.

"The inventors were farmers, professors, businessmen, lawyers—39 men representing 12 American States.

"In 3 months they created the Federal Union idea, an accomplishment which historian John Fiske called 'the Iliad, the Parthenon, the fifth symphony of statesmanship.'

"You have all seen Christy's massive painting of the signing of the Constitution. It shows a room filled with distinguished bewigged gentlemen. At the speaker's desk with austere bearing is George Washington. One has the feeling that here were the beloved statesmen of the colonies commissioned by a grateful people to fashion a new government, now that the British yoke had been lifted. It is an illusion of peace, unity, good feeling, solidarity, confidence, and high purpose, untainted by usual human frailties.

"The true picture was one of disunity, open warfare between States, rebellion within States, bitterness and sectional strife, and, in Independence Hall itself, a constant struggle between lofty purpose and provincialism, between freedom and slavery. The American States were on the verge of anarchy.

"The Central Government—the 'League of Friendship' organized under the Articles of Confederation—was weak, nearly bankrupt and without support abroad.

"The league was unable to meet its own current expenses and too weak to enforce payment of debts, public or private.

"The league was so weak foreign governments refused to enter into agreements. Barbary Coast pirates were seizing American ships and American citizens. The league was too poor to build a navy, and too poor to buy off the pirates.

"The States erected a maze of foolish discriminatory tariff walls among themselves. New York levied a high import duty on Connecticut firewood, for example, so Connecticut voted to forbid all trade with New York.

"Connecticut and Pennsylvania quarreled over a river valley. One winter and spring was especially rough on the valley. Floods, ice floes, and storm were almost devastating. Under the pretext of helping the population of Connecticut 'Yankees,' Pennsylvania sent militia into the area. Their conduct would have disgraced barbarians. They stole and plundered, naturally got violence in return. On one occasion, the militia emptied a Connecticut town of 500 people, burned the homes and at bayonet point forced the inhabitants, children and all, into the wilderness.

"Currency collapsed in most of the States, and efforts to establish fiat paper currency led to rebellion, a new high in bitterness, hatred. The only sound currency was a meager and assorted supply of foreign coins, called specie. Clipping of coins was so common, many people carried scales with them to verify weight of gold coins before accepting them.

"In Rhode Island, money-hungry citizens forced the legislature to issue paper money, even though it was doomed to failure. Realizing there was no public confidence in paper money, merchants refused to accept it at the same value as hard money, or specie. Laws were passed providing fines or imprisonment for refusing to accept paper money at the same value as hard money. Rather than go to prison, merchants shut up shop.

"In defiance of the merchants, farmers dumped their produce, burned corn for fuel, and tried to starve city people into accepting paper money at face value. All trade, except on a barter basis, stopped. In 6 months, paper money dropped in exchange value from $1 to 16 cents. There was virtually no money to pay debts, and imprisonment for debt became commonplace.

"In Massachusetts, a mob angry over the collapse, of that State's currency, took it out on established authority. The mob stormed the courts and forced the State supreme court to leave town. Rebels seized leading citizens as hostages in other communities.

"Such was the American mood in 1787, on the eve of America's greatest invention.

"An impotent Central Government, unable to defend American rights abroad, or to make foreign agreement, unable to meet its own expenses.

"Bloody warfare between States, and rebellion within States. A maze of tariff walls separating one State from another.

"Looming anarchy because of the collapse of currency.

"Jealousy, hatred, chaos, rebellion, anarchy.

"What was the mood of delegates at Independence Hall? The mood was despair. A year earlier a Convention had been called for the purpose of strengthening the Central Government. The Convention ended before it began, because only five States sent delegates.

"The Second Convention was called to meet in Independence Hall on May 14. There was very little interest in it among the State governments. Indeed, New York thought so little of it that that State did not send its best men as delegates. John Jay, who could have added strength to the Convention, was left at home.

"The one fact which added hope to this Second Convention was the news that Gen-

eral Washington was to be in the Virginia delegation.

"Washington arrived at Independence Hall on schedule. So did a few other delegates. They had to wait 11 days before delegates from the seventh State arrived, providing a quorum. Before the Convention was concluded, 12 States participated. Rhode Island never did send delegates.

"The night before the Convention was to have its opening session, some of the delegates were gathered before the fireplace, 'shooting the breeze.' The Convention was called for the purpose simply of revising the Articles of Confederation, and several delegates warned that the country was in no mood for any radical changes in the Central Government. It would be better for the Convention to deal with mild changes, and avoid anything very sweeping.

"Washington could not bear this talk in silence. He rose and delivered his shortest and one of his greatest speeches. He said, 'It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work?'

"Perhaps thinking of the border warfare, the low estate to which America had fallen in the eyes of the world, the rebellion in Massachusetts and the crying need for a strong Central Government, Washington added: 'Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God.'

"But in the Convention, the outlook fell from bad to worse. Big States vied with little States. Southern interests opposed New England. The longer the delegates debated, the more remote seemed agreement.

"After 6 weeks, Washington wrote a note to Alexander Hamilton, who had left the Convention for business in New York. In the note Washington said, 'I almost despair seeing a favorable issue to the proceedings and do therefore repent having had any agency in the business.'

"At a critical moment when the Convention appeared to be on the verge of collapse, Ben Franklin had this to say:

" 'In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity, and have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance?

" 'I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: we shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

" 'I therefore beg leave to move—that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessing on our deliberations, be heard in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.'

"Tempers were snapping. Angry words were heard. Delegations threatened to go home. But out of desperation and adversity, one by one, were hammered out the great principles which formed America's greatest invention.

"The United States was to be a union of people, not a union of States. The citizen was to be the sovereign power, and he was to have dual citizenship, being a citizen of a State and a citizen of the Nation.

"The Central Government was to have strictly limited powers, with a balance of these powers among the two Houses of Congress—the executive and the judiciary.

"Senators and Congressmen were to vote individually and not by State blocs. This permitted a vigorous party system to develop in the United States.

"States were to have equal representation in the Senate, and Congressmen were to be chosen on the basis of population. This was the result of compromise, and the agreement was reached only after long dispute.

"Laws and treaties of the Central Government were to be supreme.

"Free trade was to be established throughout the area of the Union. It was the first time a group of sovereign States had agreed to abolish all tariffs. This act made possible America's tremendous economic growth and our sharply rising standard of living.

"But it was a gain not without cost. The price paid for free trade and for the right of the Central Government to control foreign commerce was a grisly deal that later was to haunt the United States.

"Involved was the problem of the slave trade. Ten of the twelve States—including Virginia—favored stopping import of slaves, and many freely predicted that slavery would soon be abolished.

"Only South Carolina and Georgia resisted. There, rice was the principal crop, and the death rate in the sickly rice swamps was so high, the planters needed a steady supply of new slaves to replace those who died.

"So a compromise provided that import of slaves could not be halted for another 20 years. By that time, the cotton gin had changed the principal crop of the South to cotton, and a new expanding demand for slaves was created.

"It is ironic that much of the opposition to the deal was from Virginia, soon to become a center of slave activity. George Mason was so incensed that he refused to sign the Constitution, despite Washington's fervent appeal for unity. Said Mason, 'I would sooner chop off my right hand than put it to the Constitution as it stands.'

"Yet, without this and other compromises, the Federal Union would not have been created in the summer of 1787. America would likely have gone the way of Europe with numerous small warring states. Instead of one war on a great moral issue, there would have probably been several wars on petty issues.

"But for this slave deal, a mighty force for freedom might never have been created.

"And who is to say it was a wrong compromise?

"America's greatest invention was a creature of compromise from start to finish, and yet the invention created a strong central government, and protected the liberty of citizens and retained the authority of the States.

"William Gladstone said the U.S. Constitution was the greatest work ever struck off by the mind of man.

"Considering the obstacles, the rivalries, open warfare, suspicion among the States, it is all the more remarkable that the Convention of 1787 should have produced this fifth symphony of statesmanship. As Washington had predicted, the event was in the hand of God.

"Surely a power greater than man contrived to resolve the antagonisms of the day and to inspire those 39 men to create in this greatest of all American inventions a shield for liberty that would survive the test of time and become an example for others to follow.

"Here, indeed, was raised a standard to which the wise and honest can repair—in 1787—and in 1962. How fully we understand and appreciate this great charter will determine in large measure how well we fulfill our stewardship in keeping high the torch of freedom.

"The great historian of this period, John Fiske, concluding his study entitled 'The Critical Period of American History,' had this to say: 'In some future, still grander convention, we trust the same thing will be done between States that have been wholly sovereign, whereby peace may gain and violence be diminished over other lands than this which has set the example.'

"Fiske wrote these words 80 years ago. And today leaders in both political parties speak hopefully and confidently of this still grander convention Fiske foretold. As Longfellow wrote:

" 'Sail on, O ship of state.
Sail on, Union strong and free.
Humanity in all its fears
In all its hopes for future years
Hangs breathless on thy fate.'

"What is the lesson for us now? The United States should take the lead in sponsoring a convention of delegates to take up the proposal, just as delegates met 175 years ago in Philadelphia to construct the American Federal Union. The barriers which keep the free nations from uniting today are no more formidable than those which separated the Original Thirteen States in 1787.

"I would limit union to nations which have demonstrated over the years capacity for self-government and protection of individual rights, and a willingness to stand up and fight for freedom.

"This federation would lighten for U.S. taxpayers the crushing burden of the arms race, make impossible for Khrushchev and future dictators the ancient game of divide-and-conquer, and offer untold opportunities for material progress.

"It would be the most impressive action possible to meet the Communist threat, and might well usher in a millenium of peace.

"It would not replace the U.N. but would create a new union of some of the nations now in the U.N. The U.N. is essentially a meetingplace for representatives of sovereign nations. It is valuable as such, and should be kept alive. The U.N. is not capable of meeting the Communist threat, and in my opinion it is unwise to give the U.N. the powers of government.

"In recent weeks President Kennedy Governor Rockefeller, and former President Hoover have each spoken of the need for a new unity of free nations. Certainly there could not be an hour of greater need."

Former Weaver Coach Retires—Gipson Began Hoop Hoopla

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the House a recent story which appeared in the Hartford Times marking the career of one of the outstanding athletic coaches in the Greater Hartford area.

In the formation of youth and character the time spent in high school sports plays an important role. When a young fellow is learning the skills of varsity football, basketball, or baseball he is also learning how to play the game. The attention given him by his coach, the lessons he learns, the attitudes which are encouraged, and those which he is warned to discard become lessons which he often retains throughout his lifetime. We have often heard of the influence of the playing fields of Eton upon British skills of the last century and we know of General MacArthur's high regard for collegiate sports while he was superintendent at West Point.

In recent decades in Hartford, all of our schools have had fine coaches. Often the men they have taught have taken over the reins of athletic instruction to carry on in the present day. One of the best of the pace-setting coaches was Charles Gipson who was the first to bring a Hartford basketball team through the grueling competition of Connecticut sports to the New England championship finals at Boston.

A summary of the record he achieved is contained in this article, and I believe it is most fitting that we recognize the work he did in building great teams and fine young men. Under consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FORMER WEAVER COACH RETIRES—GIPSON BEGAN HOOP HOOPLA

(By Frank Cline)

Retired from the teaching and coaching ranks of the Hartford school system this week was Charles Gipson. The name may not ring a bell with relative newcomers to the scholastic sports scene, but older fans will recall him as a former Weaver High coach.

Sending teams to the New England basketball tournament had become "old hat" to followers of the three city high school teams. Hartford High won the last two New England crowns and Weaver was top dog in 1957. Bulkeley has never picked up all the marbles but had a contender up there in 2 of the last 4 years.

Know who the fellow was who started all this New England tournament business as far as Hartford teams are concerned? None other than this same Mr. Gipson.

Both a teacher and coach in the Hartford system since 1932 until last week when he retired the first of the new year, Gipson served as head football, basketball, and track coach at Weaver from 1941 through 1948.

His teams were always well coached and almost every year won more games than they lost. Gipson's 1944–45 quintet was the best of them all posting a 10–3 regular season's record and taking three of four in the State tournament before bowing in the finals to New Haven Hillhouse.

In its first New England hoop start this Weaver quintet, made up of Bruce Rosow, George Sottile, Bill Griffith, Everett "Chick" Ciccone and Bill Barnard, caught a tartar in defending champion Waterville, Maine. Waterville went into the game with a 6–0 game winning streak and made Weaver its 61st victim in the opening round at Boston.

"That was a real good ball club," Gipson declared as he recalled his only tournament team. "Lots of hustle and desire along with plenty of ability. Rosow was a real leader and one of finest defensive players I ever coached."

Nor did Gipson, who is a graduate of the University of Illinois, have any mean record as a football mentor. During his 8 years at the helm Weaver gridiron squads scored 33 victories, lost 21 and were involved in 4 ties.

He had undefeated teams in 2 of his 8 years as head football coach. Gipson's 1941 team went 6–0–1 with only a 7–7 tie with East Hartford spoiling a perfect campaign which his 1945 club won all six of the games they played.

Of his 1941 team, which was Gipson's first year as head coach, he said, "Their fine record was accomplished on mostly team effort. That and the fact I had Connie Nappier who is probably the finest athlete I ever coached."

Nappier was a fine halfback while Bob Yellen was the fullback and Bob Christino the quarterback, to mention a few on that fine squad.

"But," declared Gipson, "no question about it, the best team I ever had at Weaver was that 1945 football squad. It was great both offensively and defensively. It scored 222 points while holding its opponents to a mere 25."

One of the highlights of that season was the Bulkeley clash. Both teams went into the game with undefeated and untied records and Weaver came away a decisive 25–0 victor.

Quarterbacking that fine 1945 Weaver club was Leo Yaconello. Fullback was Frank Mangini with George Sottile and Paul Grisovitch the halfbacks. At the ends, two of the best ever to pay in the city were Frank Toro and Bill Griffith. Capt. Moe Romano and Jeff Sklar were the tackles with Nick Tosca and Max Skol the guards and Andy Jenks the pivot.

In recent years Gipson has been serving in the elementary and junior high systems being on the staffs at Burns, Kinsella, and Jones.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Imperative Need To Examine the Social and Economic Implications of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I noted with interest the information in the RECORD regarding the introduction by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] of a bill to provide for a White House conference on the impact of automation, to be called by the President within a year of the enactment of the measure.

The social and economic implications of automation have long been an area of particular concern to me. As Vannevar Bush stated last year in an article, "Automation's Awkward Age," there is "nothing new about automation, except the term itself." The process of technical innovation in the methods and machines of industrial and agricultural production, has been going on for generations.

But the impact becomes more severe as the rate of change accelerates. And as technological developments now reach what the experts term an "exponential" rate of change, they hold the prospect of severe dislocations in our society unless they are accompanied by social, economic, and political innovations as well.

It was such considerations as these that first prompted my efforts as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to confront some of the problems that follow in the wake of technological developments. It was in the 75th Congress, in 1917, that I first introduced a bill to provide for the promotion of the general welfare in relation to the economic effects flowing from scientific and technological developments. Prior to our entry into World War II, I introduced some five bills and resolutions in this general area.

Since that time we have entered virtually a new technological world dominated by developments in the fields of nuclear science and electronics. Yet our legislative efforts to cope with the impact of automation have been largely piecemeal and ameliorative and have failed to come to grips with the central elements of the problem.

It would not be amiss to indicate that if any one of my earlier measures had been enacted by Congress, and if Government, industry, and labor had given more systematic attention to the long-range effects of automation, the coal-producing regions of the Appalachian area would not now find themselves in conditions of severe economic distress.

Mr. President, we cannot meet the problems by simply decrying the advent of more efficient and more highly automatic means of production. Nor can we solve the problem simply by lowering the workweek to 35 hours. The pressure of economic competition from abroad impels us to raise our own productivity. And, indeed, the Federal Government is itself engaged in a major effort toward this end.

According to an authoritative recent study which draws heavily on the National Science Foundation's report, "Funds for Research and Development in Industry, 1959," our national investment for that year in the field of research and development—to increase productivity—amounted to $1.4 billion. Of this total, the Federal Government supplied almost $500 million; that is, in 1959 the Federal Government alone spent almost $500 million in research and development activities to accelerate the technological development that is broadly covered by the term automation.

It is my contention that we must begin to display at least as much ingenuity in the fields of social, economic, and political innovation if we are not to suffer severe dislocations in American society and impose grave hardships on hundreds of thousands of our working men and women.

A cogent editorial in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette points to the need for such long-range planning, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY NEEDS A PLAN TO HANDLE AUTOMATION

Commenting on President Kennedy's budget message to the Congress, AFL-CIO President George Meany said:

"The President's budget is based on a 3½-percent rate of national economic growth. That is not good enough. It leaves our economy stalled on the side of the mountain just where the President said we stood last Monday. Such a growth rate would insure 6 percent and more unemployment in 1963. Idle men and idle plants mean an idling economy. That is the deficit that should alarm us—the deficit in unused resources."

With a statement reminiscent of President Coolidge (unemployment results when a lot of people are out of work), Representative CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, the crusty chairman of the House Finance Committee, decries the Kennedy budget:

"Spending money we do not have for things we could get along without—that is what invariably unbalances our budgets."

Regrettably, CANNON neglects to detail what it is the Nation can get along without. Suffice it to say it wouldn't be any pork barrel project in CANNON's district.

Between CANNON's and Meany's view of the Presidential budget, there is no choice. Meany wins hands down.

The corrosive agent rubbing away at today's economy is hard core unemployment. It is the same corrosion which has been wearing the economy thin for the past 5 years. The higher than 5-percent chronic unemployment rate is too much. It is too wasteful of the Nation's manpower, too injurious to democracy's case in its constant contest with the challenge of communism.

The lamentable fact is that the problem of persistent unemployment started at least a decade ago in the backwash of the technological revolution that saw machine after machine in industry after industry replace men.

At that time the danger of what was to happen—what did happen—was apparent, but government, business, and organized labor neglected their responsibilities and let it happen without fighting back. There were some industries and labor unions which made preparations and softened the impact of automation for employees and members, but they were too few and too insignificant.

The cause of hard core unemployment still defies solution. Automation has triggered most labor-management disputes of the last 4 years, especially those involving transportation workers. Strife and long work stoppages, to the detriment of the whole economy, have replaced hard thinking and creative ideas.

President Kennedy's budget with its substantial tax cuts is a new approach, if nothing else. It deserves to be tried, but, like Meany, we fear it isn't enough. The President must develop a modus operandi to deal with automation, some arrangements which will preempt the necessity for the crippling strike, so harmful to the total economy.

Lowering taxes will not do the job, unless there can be peace on the economic front in those critical industries that contribute so much to the Nation's prosperity.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 45th anniversary of the short-lived Ukrainian independence, a period of but 2 brief years beginning in 1918 after some 300 years of oppression.

We all know the tragic course of events which saw the Ukrainian people trampled anew under the heel of Russian Communist aggression. This brought to a swift end the Ukrainian National Republic, snuffing the flame of freedom and silencing the voices of brave men.

Yet the fierce spirit of independence and freedom lives on; it lives among the 45 million Ukrainians who today are the captive people of Russia; among the many thousands of Ukrainian-Americans who carry the battle forward in this

country, and among the rest of us who add our voices of comfort and hope.

It is proper during this anniversary observance for us to pay tribute to the Ukrainian people who, in the spirit of their great poet, Taras Shevchenko, continue their resistance to oppression and their dedication to freedom.

Let us hope that one day soon the Ukraine will take its rightful place in the world community as a free and independent nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the remarks of Councilman Mary V. Beck of Detroit, Mich., a prominent leader in the Michigan Ukrainian-American community, on this occasion. I also support her in urging the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Her remarks follow:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Mary V. Beck)

On January 22, 1963, in every major city and in hundreds of other cities and towns in these United States, and in the Capital of our Nation, the blue and golden Ukrainian banner will be raised to commemorate Ukrainian Independence Day of 1918. Proclamations issued by many Governors and mayors will be read at commemorative ceremonies acknowledging the sad plight of 42 million Ukrainians enslaved by Russia. Warm words of sympathy, understanding, and encouragement will be uttered profusely.

And even in the Halls of Congress, distinguished Senators and Representatives will rise to make appropriate remarks on this occasion, displaying their awareness of the yearning for freedom of these Ukrainian captives, and expressing their agreement that the denial of liberty to an entire nation whose history and culture precedes that of Russia itself, is a tragic miscarriage of justice and not to be ignored or forgotten.

Yet as gratifying and heart-warming as these manifestations of sympathy may be, alone, they offer no real solace, no solid comfort, nor even the slightest ray of hope to the unhappy victims of Soviet aggression, on whose behalf no voice of protest is raised nor to whom a hand of aid is extended, particularly at a time when throughout the world the need for freedom is being recognized as a deep-seated and undeniable craving of every human being.

Since peace, too, is a natural and basic human aspiration, military warfare as a course of action is abhorrent and unwise, except as a last resort measure when no other alternatives are acceptable or possible. And it is not being suggested that military action is the manner in which our Government should now give meaning and substance to the sentiments expressed by our governmental officials in statements relating to the captive nations and their justified demands for freedom and independence. There is a simpler and easier way.

We Americans are already engaged in a global struggle between two ideologies and have committed ourselves to the prevention of communistic conquest of the world. Would not our own burden of the cold war, and perhaps even of the hot war, if such ever became an eventuality, be lessened and our effectiveness increased by the recognition and the enlistment of the potential strength that exists in the anti-Communist fervor, deeply hidden but always nurtured in the hearts of the captive peoples? And, by the same token, would it not offer them the hope, the encouragement, the inspiration to carry on their own efforts in what must often appear to be a vain struggle in view of the overwhelming odds?

An earnest beginning has already been made and a solid foundation laid for that kind of action by the congressional resolution and the President's proclamation establishing the Captive Nations Week. But to make our political warfare with the Soviet Union and the communistic world a dramatic success there is an urgent need for further constructive action along the same lines.

I share with many others who are well informed on this matter an abiding conviction that the immediate creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations could be the most significant step taken to reveal to the world the Soviet Union for what it is and not what it is purported to be—its skillful propaganda machine notwithstanding.

Continuous and rapid-fire exposure of its colonial system which is sold as a voluntary union of free and independent republics; its widespread persecution of religious groups, which is disputed by pointing to a few churches that are allowed to remain open; its mass exportation of people to Siberia who exhibit the slightest aversion to nonconformity to the Communist Party; its warmongering and aggressive acts while parading as a promoter of peace; and its denial of basic human rights and exploitation while arrogantly labeling the Prison of Peoples the "Peoples' Paradise."

What better way, except by truth and its dissemination, to destroy the U.S.S.R. image that has no foundation in fact? What better way to impress the Communists with the wisdom of the words that, "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones?" What better way to engage them in dealing with the problems on their own doorstep, leaving little or no time for meddling or creating artificial problems where there are none?

Real progress, in my humble opinion, can and should be made in the above-mentioned manner—not only in the cause of halting the expansion and influence of communism, but striking at its very roots with repeated, telling blows and thus sowing the seeds of its own ultimate destruction.

In the interest of our own national security and the preservation of our American way of life; in the furtherance of our own dedication to the promotion of a free world and the right of self-determination for all subjugated and oppressed peoples; in support of our own devotion to the achievement of a just and lasting peace; and in the honest belief that a token commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day or the independence day of any captive nation can only be interpreted by hte U.S.S.R. as meaningless lip service, I respectively urge your serious and favorable consideration of the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Such affirmative action would be the finest and most fitting tribute to accord the countless and valiant people of the Ukraine, past and present, who have never allowed the flame of liberty, no matter what the sacrifice, to expire even though frequently forced to secrete it in the depths of their hearts; and, who, in concert with their neighbors and covictims of Russian aggression massed in other captive nations, are pledged to keep it burning forevermore.

Address of Welcome Honoring New Members of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the local governmental housekeeping problems of Washington, D.C., have beset the National Capital City since the cornerstone of this building in which we are assembled was laid in 1793. From the day Pope's mansion on this site was torn down 169 years ago to make way for the Capitol Building, the problems and plight of local government here have not been easy in this federally owned city.

One week ago the President of the United States sent a special message to the Congress urging legislative and budgetary steps to place the District's local government on what I believe would be a sound, businesslike fiscal basis for the first time in many years.

Since each Member of Congress is a city councilman for Washington, D.C., may I urge that the membership of the Senate and the other body read a most interesting thumbnail history of Washington, D.C., given by the Honorable Charles E. Phillips, president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, before a dinner tendered by that organization on January 16 at the Sheraton-Park Hotel honoring new Members of the 88th Congress. The historical tidbits of Washingtonia are both fascinating and thought provoking.

Mr. Phillips, a native Washingtonian and an outstanding civic leader for many years, points up the growth problems of the past. All of us may anticipate those of the future as this metropolitan area continues its growth to an estimated 3½ million residents in less than 20 years and 5 million residents within 40 years. If the larger growth problems of tomorrow are to be less gigantic for this unique central city in this second, fastest growing metropolitan area of the country, one important growth problem of today—fiscal responsibility—should be faced squarely by Congress with the realistic approach suggested by the President as a guide.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Phillips' address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with a statement I issued as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in connection with the President's District of Columbia special budget message.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY CHARLES E. PHILLIPS, PRESIDENT, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE, AT THE SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 16, 1963

Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a rare privilege, a real pleasure and a great honor to have this opportunity of welcoming recently elected Members of the Congress to Washington. The several hundred residents who are your hosts this evening express warm greetings not only from the 7,000 members of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade but also from the more than 2 million people who live and work and take delight in this great National Capital community. On their behalf, let me also say "Welcome home" to our old friends from the District of Columbia Committees whose fine work in the Congress has merited the faith and continued support of the voters at home.

There was a time—not too long ago—when many new Members of the Congress got their first glimpse of this unusual city when they came to claim their seats. In such circumstances, old-time Washingtonians endeavored to show them the sights and explain to

them the mores and the facts of life in Washington, D.C.

Happily, this is no longer true. I would be surprised if there is a single new Member who has not visited Washington before. In fact, there are many who have made frequent trips, and quite a few who have been residents—some for years—before being elected to the Congress.

All of you know where the White House, the Lincoln Memorial and the Smithsonian Institution are, and what is done in them. You have visited our principal hotels and are well acquanited with Washington's many fine restaurants and stores and, perhaps, even its limited night life.

You know that Washington has been first in war and first in peace and often last in the American League.

Perhaps you may come to feel, as one new Congressman did during the Arthur administration, when he said, "On my first day in the House I looked around on that magnificent body of men, and wondered how in the dickens I got there. But after I had been here a few months I looked around again. Then I wondered how in the dickens those other fellows got there."

In these circumstances, it seems advisable to abandon the posture of the native welcoming strangers to their new and unknown home this evening and to devote instead a few moments to some observations concerning the past and future of this community which are unknown or little known to most of you. I have, therefore, assembled some comments from my background as a native and have done a little reading of Washington's history.

A wit once remarked that stealing from one person is plagiarism but stealing from many is research. The material in this brief talk was collected by light-fingered research from guidebooks, histories, newspapers, and the like.

Early records show that Capitol Hill was probably always an important site. Before 1700 the mighty Algonquin Indians selected it for their tribal council house.

One of our earliest settlers, Francis Pope, built a mansion where the Capitol Building now stands. He named it "Rome," and the hill, "Capitoline Hill." The stream at its foot, which is still there but covered over, he named the Tiber.

The eighth section of article I of the Constitution states, "Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of the particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

In pursuance of this provision, President Washington on July 16, 1790, signed the bill establishing the National Capital on the banks of the Potomac. Commissioners were appointed to proceed with the task and, after some delays, signed an agreement with the 19 proprietors of the land for the original city of Washington. It provided that the United States would receive one-half the lots laid out and would retain public squares and streets. The agreement stated, "For the streets the proprietors shall receive no compensation but for the squares or lands in any form which shall be taken for public buildings or any kind of improvements or uses the proprietors whose land shall be taken shall receive at the rate of 25 pounds per acre to be paid by the public."

George Washington selected Pierre Charles L'Enfant to plan the city. L'Enfant, his associates and his successors—who soon supplanted this eccentric Frenchman—were men of bold imagination who stood among the swamps and briar patches at the head of navigation of the Potomac and visualized a city of half a million people.

They laid the foundation stones, not of a small town, but of a world capital, and they suffered the fate common to genius—of being laughed at while they lived and derided for many years after they had gone to their graves.

They have now come into their own. A full century was required for this great city to prove itself equal to its destiny. For a long time—really until after the Civil War—there was uncertainty as to whether the Capital would stay here.

L'Enfant first selected sites for the White House and the Capitol Building. Since the latter is where you now work, let us quickly note a few interesting facts about it.

The cornerstone of the Capitol was laid September 18, 1793. The original Senate wing, until a few years ago the Supreme Court Chamber—was completed in 1800. The House wing—now the Hall of Statuary—was not completed until 1811; and then soon after, during the War of 1812, the British invaded Washington and set a torch to it. After this humiliating incident, the two wings were rebuilt, and the central segment joining them was completed in 1825. The present House Chamber was finished in 1857 and the Senate Chamber 2 years later. Then, toward the end of the Civil War, the cast iron dome supporting the Statue of Freedom was dedicated. Since then, the only major addition to the Capitol was the extended east front completed just before the last inauguration.

Commenting on Washington in 1800, Oliver Wolcott described conditions like this: "one good tavern 40 rods from the Capitol, and several other houses * * * building * * * but I do not perceive how the Members of Congress can possibly secure lodgings unless they will consent to live like scholars in a college or monks in a monastery, crowded 10 or 20 to a house and utterly secluded from society."

Then, in 1838, a visitor, Captain Marryat, wrote, "Everybody knows that Washington has a Capitol, but the misfortune is that the Capitol wants a city. There it stands, reminding you of a general without an army."

Over the years, many interesting anecdotes and bits of history were recorded. Members wore their hats in the Chambers, and female visitors sat on the Senate floor until about 1838.

Senator Sam Houston was a whittler. Page boys filled his desk with white pine sticks every morning so that he could whittle souvenirs and send them up to the ladies in the galleries.

Styles changed too. It is recorded that in 1853 not more than four Senators wore mustaches; but, in January 1861, there were only four men who didn't have mustaches or beards.

In early days, Congress sat for only a few months each year, and when it adjourned, the city literally came to a standstill. In 1811, Washington Irving wrote, "You cannot imagine how forlorn this desert city appears to me, now that the great tide of casual population has rolled away."

The city of Washington was developed very slowly too, and for years was the butt of jokes both at home and abroad. It was known as the City of Magnificent Distances or the City of Miserable Morasses.

Tom Moore, a visiting Irish poet, composed these satirical lines:

"This embryo Capital, where fancy sees
Squares in morasses, obelisks in trees,
Where second-sighted seers, e'en now adorn
With shrines unbuilt and heroes yet unborn,
Though naught but woods and Jefferson they see
Where streets should run and sages ought to be."

But all were not critical, as evidenced by the words of Lafayette during a visit in 1824: "The city of Washington, the central star of the constellation which lights the world".

Charles Dickens was not impressed. In 1842 he said, "It has spacious avenues that begin in nothing and lead nowhere; streets a mile long that only want houses, roads and inhabitants; public buildings that need but a public to be complete; and ornaments of great thoroughfares which only need great thoroughfares to ornament".

And soon after Andrew Jackson took his place in Lafayette Square, Thackeray commented that "the hero is sitting in an impossible attitude on an impossible horse with an impossible tail".

But, as has previously been noted, this unique planned city was planned well. Alexander Shepherd paved the streets, built bridges and public works rapidly after the Civil War; and, a consequence, the District was impoverished and unable to pay its debts. Then the Congress, through the Organic Act of 1878, provided for Federal financial help and established the commission form of government, which has been effective ever since. At the same time, the Congress assumed the legislative and budget-making functions which it still exercises and which many of us wish will continue in the future.

After the Civil War, more Senators and Congressmen began moving their families to Washington. They became more familiar with local needs and problems, and in 1901 Senator McMillan and his commission unfolded their plan which revived the original L'Enfant concept and has guided the development of the District of Columbia ever since. We are proud of the part local citizens played in this important activity, for it was the Washington Board of Trade which encouraged Senator McMillan to undertake this effort.

From the period of the McMillan report, Washington has continued to grow in beauty and activity. No longer does the city fold when the Congress adjourns. World War II changed the pace forever. As the capital city of a great nation and center of the free world, Washington has become a dynamic metropolitan community of more than 2 million people. It is the seat of institutions—governmental and nongovernmental—which significantly influence the affairs of men throughout our Nation and throughout the world.

But Washington, the city of all the people, has continued to be criticized by many of them. Two highly critical commentaries of the Nation's Capital have just been published by the American Institute of Architects and by the Architectural Forum. It almost appears that these were timed to coincide with your arrival in the Congress.

While we do not subscribe to many of their observations and conclusions, we recommend them to you for early and careful reading. Just as it is fair game and standard procedure for those from afar to criticize and be vitriolic about the city—particularly those who do not understand it—it is standard practice to criticize Members of the Congress for what they do or might not do. These publications I have mentioned do not neglect you.

The Architectural Forum refers to Washington as a "company town" and the American public as stockholders in the company, and then suggests that the stockholders should correct the undesirable conditions. Perhaps you will be hearing from some of them from home.

Every major city in America has its problems. In fact, I know of some of them which deserve a more vigorous raking over hotter coals than this one does. But this is the only one which is the Capital of the United States of America, which was planned, designed and built from the start for that purpose. This is the only one which the Congress rules in accordance with the terms of the Constitution. Truly it is a "company town" and must concern you. Moreover, history has shown, and logic will support our conclusion, that you cannot successfully divest yourselves of the responsibility for this great and glamorous headquarters establishment and showcase of American democracy.

The United States is, was and presumably always will be Washington's principal employer. But, it is by no means the majority employer. More than twice as many people in Metropolitan Washington work for others. The ratio of Federal to other employment has been decreasing and our forecasters predict a continuation of this trend.

We are a great and growing retail market. The number of visitors to the Nation's Capital is increasing year by year and totaled about eight million last year. The $380 million we estimate they spent is a powerful economic force, second only in importance to the Federal payroll.

National organizations—patriotic, fraternal—labor, business and scientific—account for a large payroll and are an important part of the economy.

During the last few years we have also become one of the world's great scientific centers. Some 200 private research and development companies, which have opened here in recent years, importantly supplement the well-known Government scientific agencies which have been on the local scene for many years.

Metropolitan Washington will continue to be one of the fastest growing major urban areas in America. By 1980 we confidently anticipate a population of about 3½ million, and by the year 2000 about 5 million. Most of this growth will be outside the District of Columbia. Its impact may be more readily pictured if I say that it will require urbanization of 100 square miles of rural land in nearby Maryland and Virginia to provide housing and workplaces for the 1½ million more people expected in 1980.

As it has been since 1800, Washington will continue to be a fascinating, dynamic, rapidly changing community. Perhaps you will criticize it, but you will love its excitement, its tempo, its sights, and its people. In the pattern of your predecessors most of you will never return to your homes permanently. While you will maintain close ties, most of you will spend more time in Washington in the years ahead than you will at home. It behooves you, therefore, to give more than passing consideration to its affairs.

We earnestly hope that you will.

One of the reasons you will enjoy the Federal City is the fine people you will meet and get to know here, those who will be your friends and neighbors. Many of them have been here for generations, most of them came from some other place—your home city—your State—Europe or even Timbuctoo. They will respect you because of your position, but I think you will enjoy most their cordiality and neighborly concern for your welfare.

Certainly we of the board of trade, which includes a large number of the community's business, professional, and civic leaders, want to extend a cordial, helping hand to you and your families. We earnestly hope we have made that clear, and urge you to call on some of those you have met this evening if there is something we can do to make you feel more comfortable in and enjoy your new home.

Deterioration of U.S. Position in Nuclear Test Ban Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the body of today's RECORD will be found my discussion of the steadily deteriorating position of the United States in the nuclear test ban conferences. Printed herewith is a summary table of the burden of this discussion comparing circumstances and our positions when the conferences began in 1958 with what they now are, in 1963. It is emphasized that the subject of a test ban treaty was placed in a frame of reference by former President Eisenhower when negotiations began as aiming at a treaty, self enforced by adequate machinery to detect violations and inspection machinery to confirm their occurrence or nonoccurrence. Today the discussions proceed on a basis which would provide neither adequate detection machinery nor adequate inspection procedures. As a consequence, any treaty arrived at on this basis will not be cheatproof. Thus, it cannot be expected to forward the national security interests of the United States, rather it could imperil them.

TABLE ILLUSTRATING DETERIORATION OF CIRCUMSTANCES AND U.S. POSITIONS DURING NUCLEAR TEST-BAN NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE YEARS 1958–63

1958	1963
(1) United States began negotiations:	(1) United States carries on negotiations:
(a) After completion of adequate series of nuclear weapons tests.	(a) After series of U.S. tests in which several planned events had to be canceled.
(b) After sufficient time to analyze preceding Soviet test series for possible nuclear weapons breakthroughs.	(b) Unlikely sufficient time has elapsed to discover any breakthroughs in the Soviet test series which lasted until late December 1962.
(2) Area of Soviet Union demanding adequate detection machinery and adequate inspection procedures spans 2 continents, encompasses 8½ million square miles, and comprises one-sixth of the world's land area.	(2) No change.
(3) Detection machinery:	(3) Detection machinery:
(a) Network of 180 internationally manned and controlled seismic detection stations.	(a) International network replaced by scheme in which cheaters are relied upon to submit seismic evidence of their own crimes.
(b) Nineteen of the one hundred eighty internationally manned and controlled seismic stations to be built at necessary locations within the Soviet Union.	(b) Three unmanned, tamper-prone "black box" seismic devices (as yet undeveloped) for entire Soviet land mass—to be shuttled to and fro by Soviet airplanes and installed by Soviet personnel.
(4) Onsite inspections:	(4) Onsite inspections:
(a) 20 inspections annually on Soviet territory.	(a) Khrushchev's low of 2 annually, Kennedy's high of 10 annually, or something in between.
(b) Mandatory inspections on independent initiative of International Control Commission.	(b) Inspection only upon "invitation" of the U.S.S.R.
(c) No limitation on size or composition of inspection teams.	(c) Size and composition of teams subject to availability of Soviet-furnished transportation and logistics. Soviets may screen windows of transporting vehicle and impose "prohibitions to carrying photocameras, etc."
(d) Inspection methods to include aerial photography, physical above and under the ground surveillance, radiation monitoring equipment and the like.	(d) Again, dependence on Soviet-furnished transportation can limit, delay or "misplace" equipment needed by inspection teams.
(e) Any part of Soviet Union subject to inspection on detection of a suspicious event.	(e) Inspection teams subject to restrictions on or complete denial of entry into an area of suspicion on grounds of "danger to the security interests" of the U.S.S.R.
(5) Objective of negotiations to pose such serious risk to cheaters of getting caught that cheating will be deterred.	(5) Reference frame of current negotiations will encourage cheating by posing only nominal risks of getting caught.
(6) Possibility of France and Red China becoming subject to test ban.	(6) France and Red China have declared unwillingness to forego nuclear testing in any environment.
(7) Negotiations proceed from "safe" basis for U.S. national security.	(7) Negotiations proceed from "unsafe" basis for U.S. national security.
(8) Communist dogma decrees destruction of all that is non-Communist and Communist worldwide domination.	(8) No change.

Space Explorations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last week I made a speech to the Columbian Women of George Washington University in which I discussed the subject of space. I did not anticipate that there would be any interest in my speech beyond the group to which I spoke.

Surprisingly, I have received several requests for copies of that speech—and with most of the requests coming from the Pentagon. It makes me somewhat curious as to what I said that so interested the people, particularly in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and in the Air Force.

I have received so many requests that I think the only practical thing to do is to place the speech in the RECORD. I, accordingly, request unanimous consent that the speech be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that it may be available to all interested parties.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE EXPLORATIONS

(By Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine)

It is a pleasure to be with you this morning. With George Washington University having honored me with an honorary doctor of laws degree and thus made me an honorary alumna of your fine institution, I feel somewhat as though I was a member of the family—a sort of an in-law.

The subject of my discussion is prompted by something that I read in the newspapers recently. To my way of thinking it was big news—but it was buried in the news. It was the statement of the Russian Astronaut Popovich that the Russians would soon send a woman into space and would have the distinction of having the first woman astronaut.

Now I am not going to talk about women astronauts. I think time will take care of that. But I am going to talk about space. I don't profess to be an expert on the subject since I am not a scientist—but this month I became the highest ranking Republican on the Senate Space Committee—and through the years in rising to that position inescapably I have absorbed some information, knowledge, and sophistication about space.

The first difficulty one encounters in discussing space is to comprehend its dimensions. The distances involved are so enormous, so much greater than those we meet in everyday life, that they are practically meaningless. As speeds of aircraft have increased, so has our sense of distance altered.

In the same way our mental attitude in dealing with interplanetary distances must change, even if the mind can never really envisage the vastness of it all. Space extends in all directions and has no known limits or outward boundaries. But in this decade we are determined to explore this vast unknown.

Our prime goal in the 1960's is the moon, and while this is extremely ambitious, it is only the beginning. Our ultimate goal will be the stars and to quote the British astronomer, Sir James Jeans, "There may be as many stars in the universe as there are grains of sand on the beaches of the world."

Thus it is readily apparent that we are engaged in what can truthfully be described as the greatest of pioneering efforts. I would like to talk to you in some detail about the imminent goals we have set for ourselves in this decade and why this effort is necessary.

I am sure you recognize that the United States needs to lead in space for several reasons, each of which will contribute to the scientific, technological or economic advancement, or to the peace and security of the free world.

We must lead because of our basic responsibility for the broadening of our understanding of the universe and our obligation to make available to ourselves and our descendants the resources of the universe which our expanding knowledge will permit us to utilize.

Second, we need to lead because of our desire to realize the direct and immediate benefits from the application of satellites into operational use, and the technological advances and stimulus to our economy which will emerge from our space effort.

Finally, we need to lead because of the potentially hazardous consequences to ourselves, and free peoples everywhere, were a hostile power to surpass us in the race in space. These needs are the impetus for what will be the greatest technological achievement man has ever attempted, manned flight to the moon.

The moon is our first objective, mainly because it is our closest neighbor. It is only 240,000 miles away, or a 3-day trip in the Apollo spacecraft. Also, since it is so close to us—speaking in space terms—there is much we have already learned about the moon through the astronomers.

A day on the moon consists of 14 earth days and since there is no sky to reflect the sun's afterglow, night descends suddenly. The temperature variation goes from about 212° Fahrenheit, which is equivalent to about that of boiling water, to a night temperature of 200° below zero. This compares with the highest earth temperature ever recorded of 136° Fahrenheit and 125° below zero.

It is because of these extreme temperatures and the lack of an atmosphere that it is assumed there is no life on the moon. However, there are some astronomers who dispute this and believe that some lowly forms of plant life may have adapted themselves to the moon's environment.

In any event we cannot tell with any degree of certainty what the moon is composed of and how it was formed without detailed observation. It is to that end that our Ranger program is addressing itself. The Ranger program consists of nine flights which will, among other things obtain high resolution television pictures of the lunar surface and perform scientific investigations of the moon's surface.

The Ranger program will be followed up by the Surveyor program, which is designed to land a package of instruments on the moon's surface. These instruments will return information concerning physical, chemical, and biological properties of the lunar surface, the general environment as well as pictures of the local terrain.

Additional programs will call for the placing of a space platform to orbit around the moon containing instruments for monitoring radiation, determining the properties of the moon's gravitational field and finally to provide information concerning possible sites for the manned landing on the moon. All of this must be done before we can attempt to land a man on the moon with any degree of safety.

The lunar exploration phase of the manned program will be conducted, as part of Project Apollo, in a capsule carrying a crew of three. The Apollo program requires space techniques far in advance of those that were needed in the Mercury program. The Apollo spacecraft must be built for flights of 2 weeks duration. It must be capable of guidance toward the moon and a gentle landing on the moon.

For man to land and remain in this hostile environment the establishment of a manned lunar base will be required. Supporting a base on the moon compared with one at the North Pole is almost like comparing pears and potatoes. While both are edible the similarity thereafter is less evident.

While food, shelter, and fuel can be supplied with comparative ease to the North Pole or any place of the earth's surface the life supported requirements for the moon present a problem of far greater magnitude.

For example, a specially designed space suit with built-in air pressure to offset the moon's airlessness and the streams of ultraviolet and X-rays spewed forth by the sun, must be worn by the astronaut. A two-way radio is also necessary to converse since without air, sound cannot travel.

There will be many other aids for his protection but those I have mentioned provide some idea of his support requirements. One compensating feature for the astronaut is that he will be able to move about freely with all this equipment for his weight will be only one-sixth of what it would be on earth.

Simultaneous with our preparation to explore the moon, programs are underway to venture out to Mars and Venus. Ever since astronomers first reported "canals" and polar snowcaps upon Mars it has been the subject of much speculation. Is it a dead planet? Is it strewn with the remnants of ancient civilization? Does life exist there?

As for Venus, what mysteries lie behind its swirling clouds? Does it hide a lush tropical climate as some believe, or is it a watery waste, or perhaps a desert swept by dust storms. Venus and Mars, though the nearest planets to earth, are 100 times further away than the moon.

One important factor in planning a trip to either Venus or Mars is proper timing. To go to either planet we should plan our departure from earth when those planets will be nearest to us. In the case of Mars that period would occur about every 2 years while Venus comes to within 26 million miles of the earth periodically.

The little we know today regarding these neighbors of ours is from the astronomers. More has been learned about Mars than any of the other planets, since the atmosphere on Mars is thin enough to make telescopic observation easy.

It is from these observations that some scientists have deduced that there could be some form of life on Mars. However, it is doubtful that life exists there that can be compared with that found on earth, because of the scarcity of oxygen.

Venus, though the nearest of our neighboring planets, is called the mystery planet. The Venus' atmosphere is so dense, our astronomers have not been able to see through it, as they have in the case of Mars. Here again we are relying on our Mariner program to penetrate some of the enigma that surrounds Venus.

From all of this space research and exploration will come knowledge—knowledge about the universe and its physical laws; knowledge about the earth on which we live, and knowledge about life itself.

The space program will stretch the abilities and minds of our people for years to come. It will provide a continuing, long-term stimulant to our economy. The magnitude of the task will test the resources and cooperative will of all major elements of our society. Still, space exploration, and manned space flight in particular, offer the United States the opportunity for unparalleled progress in the future.

Ultimately, within this century, the sum of all our efforts will give us the equipment, the knowledge and the skill to utilize space as we now utilize the seas and the air.

This then is our motive—our objective. To develop superior competence in space which will be available for any national purpose which may be required, whether it be for the peaceful use of space for the benefit of all mankind or to keep the peace.

Past experience has shown that the most important benefits of basic research are probably unforeseen. Yet there are many areas in which we can predict direct benefits. The results of materials research—ceramics, metals, and plastics, for example, will inevitably find their way into industry and to the consumers. The values of new fuels, new methods of power generation, and supersonic transportation are clear.

Weather satellites have already shown vividly what can be done to aid in weather surveillance and forecasting. The improved Nimbus satellite is being developed by the United States to succeed Tiros. This will provide the basis of an operational weather satellite system.

Eventually we will be in a position to predict weather anywhere on the globe with precision. The human and monetary values of being forewarned about approaching hurricanes and typhoons will prove invaluable. It has been estimated by authorities in this field that in 1 year alone we could be completely repaid for the initial outlay of the entire program.

Then there is the communications satellite. On July 10, 1962, the whole world knew of Telstar. The telephone company's ground station at Andover has been described as the granddaddy, the champion of them all.

Eventually, of course, there will be many more, some big and some small, depending upon requirements. But I would always hope that this Nation will have not only the grandfather ground station, but the biggest and the best.

What the Telstar can do is only the beginning of what we can expect in improved worldwide communications. Since one of the major problems in the struggle between ideologies is the problem of communication between peoples it is intriguing to contemplate the effect on international understanding and cooperation that could result from instantaneous radio and television presentations.

The communication satellite experts point out that a tremendous increase in global communication capabilities is in the offing. Hundreds of times the number of presently available oversea channels will be opened and service to points where present-day cable and microwave systems do not reach will become feasible.

Lower costs for oversea services should be realized, and such techniques as the use of closed circuit television conferences to obviate the need for some transatlantic travel should come into being. The satellite system will also open the possibility of establishing local communications networks centered on a satellite terminal in areas which now have little or no external communications services.

The technology we are developing in our space program is certain to have immense and growing effects on the national economy, the professions and on everyday life. Already industry is profiting from new techniques, alloys, plastics, fabrics, and compounds of many kinds, originally created to do space jobs.

We are merely at the beginning of an era of profound technological change, whose end no one can foresee. Today, far more than in the past, scientific progress determines the character of tomorrow's civilization.

There are many, many other benefits that will be realized from our space efforts, but basically it will be knowledge, knowledge that will put mankind in a position to develop applications to human progress and welfare, to make new consumer goods, and to build up our standard of living.

We are doing this for ourselves right now with the legacy of knowledge given to us by our forebears. Some of the knowledge that we are now gathering, we will ourselves use for our own gain. But more important than that, it will be our legacy to our children and grandchildren, for them to use in furthering their own welfare.

Analysis of H.R. 265 and H.R. 348, Providing for Basic Reform of Federal Tax Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, my distinguished friend and fellow member of the Committee on Ways and Means, A. S. HERLONG, JR., and I introduced H.R. 265 and H.R. 348. These bills are the reintroduction of measures originally submitted in the 87th Congress which call for basic reform of Federal tax rates over a 5-year period.

These bills strike at the graduated rates of personal income tax, particularly in the middle and upper income ranges, and the high corporate tax rates which restrict the development and use of capital and thereby restrict economic growth to a rate far below that which is actually possible. Tax rates for individual and corporate taxes would be reduced over a 5-year period, unless budget imbalance and current fiscal year domestic and foreign economic assistance spending in excess of the previous fiscal year required postponement of scheduled rate reductions which could prolong the period of reduction over an 8-year maximum span.

The mounting interest in the reform of tax rates as embodied in our legislation has prompted my cosponsor and I to prepare an analysis of each section of the bills.

SECTION 1. REDUCED RATES OF TAX ON INDIVIDUALS

Annual reductions in individual tax rates applicable to the years beginning January 1, 1963, through January 1, 1967, are contained in this section. Over this period the minimum rate would be reduced from 20 to 15 percent, top rates would be reduced from 91 to 42 percent and all other rates would be reduced correspondingly, subject only to the postponement features covered in section 5. The individual tax rate reductions are shown in the table below:

Reform of individual tax rates

Taxable income bracket (thousands) [1]	Present rates	Original rates, Jan. 1, 1963	Amended-actual rates, Jan. 1, 1963	Jan. 1, 1964	Jan. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	Jan. 1, 1967
0 to $2	20	19.0	19.5	18.0	17.0	16.0	15
$2 to $4	22	20.5	21.25	19.5	18.5	17.5	16
$4 to $6	26	24.5	25.25	23.0	21.5	20.0	17
$6 to $8	30	28.0	29	26.0	24.0	21.0	18
$8 to $10	34	31.0	32.5	28.0	25.0	22.0	19
$10 to $12	38	35.0	36.5	32.0	28.0	24.0	20
$12 to $14	43	39.0	41	35.0	31.0	26.0	21
$14 to $16	47	42.0	44.5	37.0	32.0	27.0	22
$16 to $18	50	45.0	47.5	40.0	35.0	29.0	23
$18 to $20	53	48.0	50.5	42.0	36.0	30.0	24
$20 to $22	56	50.0	53	44.0	38.0	32.0	25
$22 to $26	59	53.0	56	47.0	40.0	33.0	26
$26 to $32	62	55.0	58.5	48.0	41.0	34.0	27
$32 to $38	65	58.0	61.5	51.0	43.0	36.0	28
$38 to $44	69	61.0	65	53.0	45.0	37.0	29
$44 to $50	72	64.0	68	56.0	47.0	38.0	30
$50 to $60	75	66.0	70.5	57.0	48.0	39.0	31
$60 to $70	78	69.0	73.5	60.0	51.0	40.0	32
$70 to $80	81	71.0	76	62.0	52.0	41.0	33
$80 to $90	84	74.0	79	64.0	54.0	44.0	34
$90 to $100	87	76.0	82	66.0	56.0	46.0	36
$100 to $150	89	78.0	83.5	68.0	58.0	48.0	38
$150 to $200	90	80.0	85	70.0	60.0	50.0	40
$200 and over	91	82.0	86.5	72.0	62.0	52.0	42

[1] After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, married persons filing separate returns, and "split income" of husbands and wives filing joint returns.

The bills are drawn up in contemplation of enactment after January 1, 1963, but in time to make the first reduction in the withholding rate effective July 1, 1963. Since taxpayer returns are on a calendar year basis, the actual 1963 tax rate cuts apply to the entire year but with a reduction in the withholding rate applying for only the last one-half of the year. The practical effect of the first year cuts is to provide a new scale of rates ranging from 19 percent in the first bracket of taxable income to 82 percent in the over $200,000 taxable income bracket during the last 6 months of the calendar year in place of the present rates ranging from 20 to 91 percent. However, because all individual tax rates resulting from reduction are levied against the incomes of individuals for a full year, the rates applying to the entire year 1963 must actually be one-half of those which, in practical effect and due to withholding, apply from July 1 on. The rates of individual tax, effective January 1, 1963, therefore, range from 19.5 percent at the first bracket of taxable income to 86.5 percent at the top bracket. All other rates are reduced in a consistent manner.

The scheduled second year personal tax rate reductions would remain unchanged from the original version of our bills introduced on July 20, 1962, that is, the range of rates would be from 18 to 72 percent. However, the difference between the personal tax rates effective January 1, 1963, and January 1, 1964, appears as a combination of the half a year's cut carried over from 1963 with the full reduction otherwise scheduled for 1964 or a year and a half reduction compressed into a 1-year period.

On a calendar year basis this is the case but viewing the rates as applied through withholding during the last 6 months of 1963, that is, a tax rate range of from 19 to 82 percent, the net effect is one of lowering the rates from 1963 to 1964 on a basis identical to that contained in the original series of scheduled reductions as contained in the table above.

SECTION 2. REDUCED INDIVIDUAL RATES APPLICABLE TO HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

This section sets forth the reduced rates which apply to heads of households during each year of the period in which scheduled reductions would take place. Rates are comparable to those set forth in section 1.

SECTION 3. REDUCED RATE TABLES FOR OPTIONAL INCOME TAX

Taxpayers with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000 would adhere to the rates shown on this section from the period beginning January 1, 1963, to January 1, 1967, and beyond. Rates follow those stated in section 1.

SECTION 4. REDUCED RATES OF TAX ON CORPORATIONS

This section would amend section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code which currently provides for a normal tax rate on corporations of 30 percent and a surtax of 22 percent on taxable income in excess of $25,000. Five annual reductions applicable to the years beginning January 1, 1963, through January 1, 1967, would be spread between normal and surtax rates.

Due to the halving of the personal income tax rate reductions in 1963, the originally scheduled corporate tax rate reductions of 2 percentage points in the first year also have been halved. Therefore, the corporate tax rate applicable for the full 1963 year is 1 percentage in the normal tax rate, reducing it from 30 to 29 percent. To keep the corporate tax rate reductions for the second year consistent with the original 5-year schedule, that is, reduction in the normal corporate rate to 26 percent, the 1964 corporate reductions would merge the additional 1 percentage point of reduction unapplied in 1963 with the regularly scheduled 2 percentage point cut scheduled for the second year thereby bringing the total corporate tax rate reduction in the normal tax down by 3 full percentage points. The normal corporate tax rate would be further reduced by 2 percentage points during the third year and 1 additional percentage point in each of the last 2 years of the plan. The surtax rate also would be lowered by 1 percentage point in each of the last 2 years of the 5-year schedule or a combined normal and surtax rate reduction of 2 percentage points in each of the calendar years 1966 and 1967. At the end of the 5-year period the normal tax rate would be lowered from its present rate of 30 to 22 percent and the surtax rate would be reduced from 22 to 20 percent or a total reduction of 10 percentage points from the present 52 percent combined corporate tax rates. The following summary illustrates the corporate tax reductions:

	Percent
Jan. 1, 1963:	
Normal tax	29
Surtax	22
Combined	51
Jan. 1, 1964:	
Normal tax	26
Surtax	22
Combined	48
Jan. 1, 1965:	
Normal tax	24
Surtax	22
Combined	46
Jan. 1, 1966:	
Normal tax	23
Surtax	21
Combined	44
Jan. 1, 1967:	
Normal tax	22
Surtax	20
Combined	42

SECTION 5. POSTPONEMENT OF SCHEDULED TAX REDUCTIONS

The language of this section is appended hereto. It incorporates two changes from our earlier bills.

The first change is to make postponement effective only as to rate cuts scheduled for the third and later years, as contrasted to the second and later cuts as originally provided.

The second change is to add to the original postponement test of budget unbalance a new test in regard to expenditure control. Postponement would be applied only if the budget is out of balance and if what are described as "subordinate expenditures" are higher in the current fiscal year than in the preceding year. "Subordinate expenditures" are defined to include all expenditures of the Federal Government except those related to military preparedness, space research and technology and interest on the public debt. As a general positive description, "subordinate expenditures" cover those generally known as domestic spending programs plus foreign economic assistance.

The postponement procedure sets up a series of decisions and acts which if carried through to the final step would result in postponement of the affected cuts for 1 year, moving forward by 1 year all subsequent cuts.

The first step takes place as of November 15. No later than that late, the President is obligated to determine whether a state of budget unbalance would exist for the current fiscal year if the cuts scheduled for January 1 next go into effect and, if his finding in this respect is "yes," then he makes the further finding of whether "subordinate Federal expenditures" for the current fiscal year are in excess of those of the previous fiscal year. If the findings in both respects are "yes," then he has no alternative but to postpone the January 1 cuts for 6 months.

The second step takes place when the President submits his annual budget message to Congress in the following January, in which he is required to recommend to the Congress whether the cuts postponed to July 1 shall take effect on that date or should be further postponed for an additional 6-month period.

The third step is permissive as regards Congress. It may, by joint resolution enacted into law prior to May 15, put the cuts back into effect as of July 1 or postpone them to the following January 1.

The fourth step is dependent upon whether the Congress takes action. If the Congress does not, then the President is obligated to make the further postponement of 6 months.

Regardless of whether the final 6 month's postponement takes place by congressional resolution, or Presidential action, the effect as indicated above is to move forward for 1 year all subsequent proposals. The statute provides however that one set of cuts can be postponed for only 1 year. Hence, the last three scheduled cuts under the bills could be spread over a maximum of 6 instead of 3 years, without substantive change in the legislation.

The budget balance test remains an important benchmark of the postponement objective. It was originated when inflationary pressures were great and when the budget was in balance, as contrasted to the present situation in which most prices have been relatively stable for several years but the budget is substantially out of balance. If tax rate reform is to be accomplished, it has to be done within the realities of the present prospective budget situation, which is the reason for adding the new expenditure test. However, should an easing of world tensions permit a significant cutback in military spending, there would be no reason why the budget should not be quickly brought into balance. If the budget were balanced, the postponement test would be met in this respect, even though there were some increase in domestic expenditures. In short, the two tests together assure that there will be effective control over domestic and foreign aid spending at the minimum, and budget balance at the optimum, while the last three steps of rate reform are being put into effect.

SECTION 6. REDUCTION OF WITHHOLDING TAX

This section would amend present withholding provisions of the Revenue Code to permit reductions in the amounts withheld in accordance with the individual income tax rate reductions scheduled over the 5-year period commencing on July 1, 1963.

REDUCTION OF WITHHOLDING RATES

	Percent
Current withholding rate	18.0
Withholding rate after—	
June 30, 1963	17.1
Dec. 31, 1963	16.2
Dec. 31, 1964	15.3
Dec. 31, 1965	14.4
Dec. 31, 1966	13.5

SECTION 7. DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX BY INDIVIDUALS

This provision makes it clear that declarations of estimated tax filed by individuals can be based on the tax rates in effect on the last day for filing such estimate.

SECTION 8. DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX BY CORPORATIONS

This section extends the same right to corporations as is provided for individuals in the immediately preceding section.

POSTPONEMENT PROVISION—(SEC. 5) OF H.R. 265 AND H.R. 348

Section 5, part III of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by the addition of a new section 22 to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. POSTPONEMENT OF TAX REDUCTIONS.

"(a) SIX-MONTH POSTPONEMENT OF REDUCTION OF RATES.—The President by November 15 shall determine, if the reductions in taxes under sections 1, 3, and 3402 (relating to income taxes on individuals) and section 11 (relating to income taxes on corporations) scheduled for January 1, 1965, and subsequent dates take effect, whether an imbalance in the budget of the Federal Government for the current fiscal year would exist and, if so whether the subordinate Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year as

defined in subsection (f)(2), will exceed the subordinate Federal expenditures of the previous fiscal year. If the President determines that an imbalance in the budget would so exist and that the subordinate Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year exceeds that of the previous fiscal year, he shall, stating his reasons therefor in an Executive order, postpone until July 1 the date upon which such reductions of taxes are otherwise scheduled to take effect. In the next annual budget message to the Congress the President shall recommend whether any reduction in a rate of tax postponed under this subsection should become effective on July 1 or whether such reductions should be further postponed until the following January 1.

"(b) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON RATE REDUCTIONS POSTPONED UNDER SUBSECTION (a).—Congress may by means of a joint resolution which has become law before May 15 act—

"(1) to make effective upon July 1 next the rate reductions scheduled under sections 1, 3, and 3402 which have been previously postponed under subsection (a) or to postpone further such rate reduction dates until January 1 and/or

"(2) to make effective upon July 1 next the rate reduction scheduled under section 11 which has been previously postponed under subsection (a) or to postpone further such rate reduction date until January 1.

"(c) FURTHER PRESIDENTIAL ACTION ON RATE REDUCTIONS POSTPONED UNDER SUBSECTION (a).—With respect to any rate reduction postponed under subsection (a) as to which Congress has not acted under subsection (b) by means of a joint resolution which has become law before May 15, the President shall, by May 15, further postpone until January 1—

"(1) any rate reduction scheduled under section 11 which has been postponed previously under paragraphs (a) (1) or (2), or

"(2) any rate reductions scheduled under sections 1, 3, and 3402 and section 11 and which have been postponed previously under paragraph (a)(2).

"(d) TOTAL POSTPONEMENT NOT TO EXCEED ONE YEAR.—Under this section the date upon which a rate reduction is scheduled to take effect under section 1, 3, 11, or 3402 cannot be postponed under subsections (a) and (b) or (c), for more than one year.

"(e) EFFECT OF POSTPONEMENT ON SUBSEQUENT REDUCTION DATES.—When a rate reduction date otherwise scheduled to take effect under section 1, 3, 11, or 3402 has been postponed under subsection (b) or (c) until January 1, then as to the tax whose rate reduction date has been so postponed, the rate reduction dates not affected by such further postponement shall be deferred for one year upon the occurrence of each such further postponement.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—When used in this section:

"(1) 'Imbalance in the budget' means the existence of a situation where 'budget expenditures' exceed 'budget receipts' as those terms are used in the 'Annual Budget Message of the President' as submitted to Congress.

"(2) 'Federal subordinate expenditures' means budget expenditures as classified in 'The Budget of the United States Government for 1963' except expenditures for the following functions:

"i. MILITARY FUNCTIONS.—Military expenditures by the Department of Defense including foreign military assistance but excluding expenditures for civil defense; expenditures for atomic energy activities directly devoted to military purposes; and expenditures by other Federal agencies for specific defense activities.

"ii. SPACE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY FUNCTIONS.—All expenditures by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and expenditures by the Atomic Energy Commission directly devoted to space efforts.

"iii. INTEREST.—Expenditures for interest on the public debt, interest on refunds of receipts, and interest on uninvested funds.

"Additions or deductions for interfund transactions shall be taken into account in arriving at the total amount of the subordinate expenditure level.

"(3) 'Rate reduction date' means the date upon which would become effective a reduction in the rate of a tax imposed by sections 1, 3, 11, or 3402.

"(4) 'Current fiscal year' means the fiscal year used for Federal Government accounting purposes during which a postponement provided by this section is or can be made.

"(5) 'Previous fiscal year' means the fiscal year used for Federal Government accounting purposes immediately preceding the current fiscal year against which the Federal subordinate expenditure level is compared for purposes of determining postponement.

"(6) 'Following fiscal year' means the fiscal year used for Federal Government accounting purposes which immediately follows the fiscal year during which a postponement provided by this section is made."

Tribute to Hon. Jose E. Benitez, Deputy High Commissioner, Pacific Trust Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I was particularly pleased to note in a recent press release issued by the Office of Emergency Planning of the Executive Office of the President that a certificate of appreciation award was presented to the Honorable Jose A. Benitez, Deputy High Commissioner, Pacific Trust Territory, for the invaluable service rendered by him in connection with the rehabilitation of the Territory of Guam, following typhoon Karen of November 11, 1962.

This honor by the Government of the United States was conferred upon Mr. Benitez by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Mr. Benitez, present during the storm which was one of the severest in the history of Guam, was commended by Mr. McDermott for "his on-the-spot actions and subsequent counsel and guidance which were invaluable to Federal officials working to restore and rehabilitate the territory" which comprises some 70,000 people.

Many of us will recall that there were many casualties as a result of this storm and over $100 million of property damage.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Benitez, who was appointed Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in March 1961, was exceptionally well qualified to render such assistance in the Guam disaster because he has held important administrative posts in the executive and legislative branches of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth where he was confronted with numerous social and economic problems.

I have known Mr. Benitez for a number of years. He is a man of high character, integrity, and outstanding ability. I know that many of my colleagues here certainly join with me in congratulating him for the outstanding service he has rendered and are particularly pleased to note that this service was recognized by the award which was conferred upon him by the Government of the United States.

Patman Report Disputed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Winston-Salem Journal of January 16, 1963:

PATMAN REPORT DISPUTED

(NOTE.—Early this month a report from a congressional committee headed by Representative PATMAN, of Texas, indicated that many philanthropic foundations, including five from Winston-Salem, were using only a small portion of their income for philanthropic purposes. Since the figures released by Patman seemed out of line with the known grants of the local foundations, the Journal assigned staff reporter Chester Davis to check the committee figures against foundation reports. This is what he found.)

(By Chester Davis)

The woes in giving away money are legion and not the least of these is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, a Democrat from Texas.

PATMAN heads a congressional committee that is investigating the operations of the Nation's tax-exempt trusts and foundations. Periodically PATMAN releases reports on his investigations. These reports invariably are so shocking they claim front-page headlines. And PATMAN's reports are customarily so misleading they require a careful second look.

During the first week of January, for example, PATMAN announced that 534 foundations, including 11 in North Carolina, gave less than half of their earnings to philanthropic good works.

FIVE IN TWIN CITY

Five Winston-Salem trusts and foundations were named in the Patman report. According to the figures released by PATMAN these five local philanthropic agencies had a combined income that ran into many millions of dollars during the 10-year period of 1951–60.

PATMAN's figures seemed to show that these five Winston-Salem trusts and foundations spent only a small part of that income on the purposes for which they were created and for which they were given tax exemption. According to PATMAN's figures, the great bulk of this vast income was squirreled away, unallocated and tax free.

PATMAN, for example, reported that from the time of its creation late in 1953 until

1960 the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation showed the following financial profile:

Receipts	$20,661,847
Expenses and administrative costs	260,821
Gave away	4,680,387

The implication is that the Babcock Foundation earned some $20.6 million and spent—in grants and operating costs—only about $4.9 million. The remainder—some $15.7 million—presumably was tucked away in a tax-free corner against some rainy day.

The records of the Babcock Foundation show quite a different story.

This foundation was created in September 1953. At that time $12 million was placed in the foundation under the will of Mrs. Babcock. Since then the corpus, or body, of this trust has appreciated greatly in value because of stock splits and a general rise in the value of the securities and other assets held by the foundation. As of August 31, 1961, the corpus of the Babcock Foundation was valued at $20,561,619.93.

Under the loose head, "Receipts," PATMAN has included the original gift the foundation, the appreciation in value of that gift over the 8-year period, and the income earned by the foundation in that same period.

CONTRADICTED

The charge by PATMAN that this foundation has not spent anything like the income it has enjoyed on philanthropic purposes is flatly contradicted by the published records of the Babcock Foundation. A table accompanying this story reports the financial story of the Babcock Foundation for the period of September 11, 1953, through August 31, 1961.

The fact that the Babcock Foundation actually made grants that were larger than current income is not unusual. Foundations of this type frequently make grants which run over a period of years. In so doing the tendency is to anticipate future earnings and to assume long-range obligations in excess of current income.

PATMAN's report on the John Wesley and Anna Hodgin Hanes Foundation presented the following financial picture of that foundation for the period 1951–60:

Receipts	$2,825,638
Expenses	20,142
Grants	411,433

Here again the great bulk of the "receipts" reported by PATMAN—actually $2,182,769.63 of the $2,825,638—consisted of gifts made by James G. Hanes, Ralph Hanes, and the late Robert M. Hanes to the foundation. (And to this you can add another $159,790.89 that came over the 10-year period in the form of an appreciation in the value of the corpus on the foundation.) The rest of the difference—actually well under $500,000—was earned income.

In the period 1947, when the Hanes Foundation was established, through 1960 the total earnings of the foundation came to $483,077.15. And in this same period the Hanes Foundation made cash grants of $411,433.58. As of October 31, 1962, this foundation had, in addition to its cash gains, outstanding pledges of $159,000.

Here again you have a foundation which in the form of cash grants and pledges, actually has overspent its current income.

At least on first glance the most shocking of the Patman disclosures related to the various Reyonds trusts and foundations. Here is how the Congressman presented that story to the press:

The Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation (1951–60):	
Receipts	$13,513,340
Expenses	40,909
Grants	12,841,545
The W. N. Reynolds Trust:	
Receipts	9,039,029
Expenses	614,152
Grants	6,206,661
The Zachary Smith Reynolds Trust:	
Receipts	8,067,757
Expenses	178,084
Grants	None

Accepted at their face value, these figures imply that the three operations enjoyed a total income of about $30.6 million for the 10-year period and that in this same period they spent, in expenses and grants, only about $19 million. In the case of the Zachchary Smith Reynolds Trust, PATMAN charges that there was an income of just over $8 million and that no grants whatsoever were made.

Actually, the two trusts were established to receive and administer gifts made by members of the Reynolds family. Income from these trusts then went to the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation to be distributed for a variety of philanthropic purposes.

TERMS

The terms under which the two trusts were established differed somewhat:

1. The W. N. Reynolds Trust was to hold back 20 percent of its income until the aggregate of the two trusts reached $50 million. After that, 100 percent of its earnings were to go to the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation for distribution. The aggregate of the two trusts reached $50 million several years ago. In recent years 100 percent of the income of this trust, therefore, has gone to the foundation.

2. The Zachary Smith Reynolds Trust was to withhold 20 percent of its income until the corpus in this particular trust reached $50 million. This point has not yet been reached. As a result, this trust is paying 80 percent of its income to the foundation and plowing the remaining 20 percent back into the corpus.

So, with the exception of the 20 percent of the earnings of the Zachary Smith Reynolds Trust that are plowed back, all of the earnings of these two trusts go to the foundation for distribution. Neither trust makes any other grants.

The record is plain that the Smith Reynolds Foundation has distributed the earnings of the two trusts as fast as these earnings have been transferred to it. PATMAN's figures—which show receipts of $13.5 million and grants of $12.8 million for the Smith Reynolds Foundation—reflect this fact.

Along with these cash grants the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation also has taken on some sizable long-range obligat'ons. These include a $500,000-a-year gift in perpetuity to Wake Forest College. When you add these long-range obligations to the actual grants you find, again, a picture of a foundation which is spending its income right up to the hilt and even a little bit more.

At the time PATMAN blasted the Nation's tax-exempt foundations and trusts for spending less than half their income on philanthropic purposes, the Congressman also released a letter from William A. Johnson, North Carolina's commissioner of revenue.

On its face Johnson's letter appeared to be a strong endorsement of both PATMAN's investigation and of the broadcast charges he leveled against North Carolina trusts and foundations.

REPLY

Johnson's letter, written in November 1962, was in reply to a letter from PATMAN's committee which asked 7 questions relating to the manner in which North Carolina administered tax-exempt foundations.

As a matter of fact, this State has no effective control over tax-exempt foundations and trusts. When these operations are granted tax-exempt status by the Federal Government they automatically receive the same concession from the State.

"But," Johnson says, "these trusts and foundations make no reports to us. From year to year we have no way of knowing whether their tax-exempt status continues to be justified. There are 265 tax-exempt trusts and foundations in North Carolina today. We know that some of them—usually small trusts or foundations set up by individuals—have been used to circumvent income taxes.

"Because this is true," Johnson continued, "I feel strongly that some more effective method of supervision must be established. And in that sense I heartily endorsed the Congressional investigation Representative PATMAN heads.

IMPORTANT SERVICE

"But," Johnson added, "I am fully aware that the largest trusts and foundations in this State—the Duke, Reynolds, Babcock, Hanes, Morehead, and Richardson foundations, for example—are doing a great and very important service for North Carolina.

"For foundations of that type I have nothing but admiration and the warmest feeling. The danger is, however, that we risk getting too many trusts and foundations, some of which are not legitimate and which are used for purposes of tax evasion. My fear is that the few bad apples will cause Congress or the general assembly to adopt punitive legislation which will be harmful to the legitimate and important work of the truly philanthropic foundations."

In making this statement Johnson emphasized that in his letter to PATMAN he did not single out any specific trusts or foundations for either praise or criticism.

Babcock foundation grants

Fiscal year ending—	Net income	Total grants committed for payment	Excess or (deficiency) of income	Grant payments
1954	$41,017.69	$129,500.00	($88,482.31)	$39,000.00
1955	439,820.06	1,165,070.22	(725,250.16)	428,570.22
1956	615,008.05	1,127,000.00	(511,991.95)	913,901.91
1957	662,275.97	624,589.64	37,686.33	680,772.90
1958	721,509.16	345,786.20	375,722.96	908,495.40
1959	771,700.62	1,276,951.87	(505,251.25)	839,282.50
1960	872,782.99	1,371,927.00	(499,144.01)	894,092.00
1961	1,264,179.55	678,292.20	585,887.35	911,685.50
Total	5,388,294.09	6,719,117.13	(1,330,823.04)	5,615,800.43

Newsday Contest Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Newsday of Long Island has been conducting an excellent and worthwhile American history contest for students of all senior high schools in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Each month a new topic is chosen and a boy or girl winner selected. The essays and winners for the month of December have come to my attention, and I am very much impressed with the high caliber of thinking and writing that is shown in these essays by Long Island students. The topic for December was "America's Greatest Military Leader." The two winners were Barry Michael Mitnick, who is a junior at Plainview High School; and Susan Carr, who is a junior at Seton Hall High School in Patchogue. Barry Mitnick chose Nathaniel Greene and defended his choice with an impressive array of Revolutionary War research. Susan Carr nominated Gen. Douglas MacArthur, making an important and perceptive distinction in what constitutes a brave man and a good leader.

Mr. President, I commend these two winners on their good work and I commend Newsday on the stimulating contest it sponsored. I shall look forward to reading more of these winning essays in the future. I hope that when some of these monthly contest winners come down to Washington in June on the all-expense trip, which will be one of their rewards, I will have a chance to congratulate them in person. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD these two essays and the contest rules.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST PICK "AMERICA'S GREATEST MILITARY LEADER"

(By Barry Michael Mitnick—junior, Plainview High School)

What makes a great military leader? He is a man who can consistently snatch victory from the jaws of defeat, triumph from the mouth of tragedy. He is an inspiring leader of men and a model for the men he leads. He is the light in the darkness of despair, the Galahad of the partisan round table, the stanch Gibraltar of determination.

Who was America's greatest military leader? I say Nathaniel Greene.

Nowhere in the Colonies was the struggle more fierce, more desperate, and perhaps more vital than in the South in 1781. Here lay the key to the Revolution, the crutch without which Washington's valiant stand in the North was inevitably doomed. To save the South was to save the Colonies—French aid was penning the British in New York. The South thus became the crux of the Revolution.

Greene directed the Americans here. Replacing inept Horatio Gates in 1780, he brought a remarkable spirit and drive to his task.

On January 17, 1781, Daniel Morgan's detachment routed hated Lord Tarleton's light forces at Cowpens, N.C. Lord Cornwallis' regulars moved to revenge this affront to English arms. Greene, with the rest of the patriot army, joined Morgan, hotly pursued by Cornwallis, and raced for the Dan River. The American general entered Virginia on February 14, just ahead of John Bull.

The South belonged to the king—or did it? The English lord commanded a starving army in the midst of a hostile, aroused country. Greene had outwitted him, for in Virginia, the militia flocked to patriot colors; the army swelled from the influx. Cornwallis' subsequent withdrawal was a desperate search for supplies. The race to the Dan was the turning point of the war in the South—a British army defeated in victory.

GREENE WON THE DAY

At Guilford Court House, on March 15, history repeated itself. Cornwallis won the field of battle, and Greene the day, for the English were forced to fall back to their stronghold at Wilmington for supplies. Greene's was a cat-and-mouse game—he wisely chose not to risk losing the only American Army in the South in a do-or-die fight. His shrewd planning, however, changed a technical British victory into a harrowing strategic disaster.

Daringly, Greene decided to invade South Carolina, a fortress of British strength. Forts Granby, Motte, Watson, Georgetown, and Augusta fell to the partisans. Only General Stewart stood in Greene's way.

On September 8, in a brilliant tactical maneuver, the American general surprised the English at Eutaw Springs. Although twilight saw the field of honor in his hands, Stewart fled to Charleston's safety the very next day. Only Charleston and Savannah still waved the Union Jack in the colonies south of Virginia.

But what of Cornwallis? He did what Greene had foreseen and prepared for by meticulously guarding his rear in South Carolina. Cornwallis marched into Virginia where Lafayette, Steuben, and Yorktown awaited him.

In Greene's startling, masterful campaign, genius and sly cunning turned sorry defeat to smashing victory. This is the quality that great military leaders must possess—the ability to make the most of the situation at hand. Greene exhibited this without winning a single major battle—he had merely freed the South and provoked Cornwallis' march to infamy.

The South boasted many outstanding fighters: Marion, the "Swamp Fox," "Light Horse" Harry Lee, Morgan of Cowpens and Saratoga—but Greene was the brightest star of them all. He is little known, it is true, but it may be that because of his efforts our country exists today.

(By Susan Carr, junior, Seton Hall High School, Patchogue)

A coward cannot be a good military leader but a brave man does not necessarily make a good leader, either. Leadership encompasses more than just a show of bravery. Good leadership can galvanize men into feats above the call of duty. In contrast, however, poor leadership can confuse and bring panic into the heart of the most courageous soldier.

Defining leadership is not easy. What really is this quality? West Point has developed a preferred definition. "Leadership is the art of influencing and directing people to an assigned goal in such a manner as to command their obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation." In light of this definition, many men have been generals, admirals, and commanders in chief but few have been considered great leaders. There is, however, a small group from which one can choose the greatest military leader. In my opinion, Gen. Douglas MacArthur would be this choice.

General MacArthur certainly acquired one important trait of leadership—a good background in and a firm knowledge of military skill. He was exceptionally brilliant as a graduate of West Point and an officer in the Army's Corps of Engineers. His rapid rise to high rank although still a young man attests to his capabilities. Also, the fact that the general reached the top rank of the Army and successfully led a great army in battle can be counted as evidence of his military prowess.

A second measure of leadership is the thorough understanding of the men under command and of their abilities and limitations. As commander of all the United States and the Commonwealth forces in the Philippines during World War II, General MacArthur realized that he had a total of one Regular Army division and four sketchily trained and inadequately equipped Reserve divisions with which to work. His greatest need was for highly trained men to act as instructors. Another 50,000 men were at his disposal, but they were useless for they lacked training and equipment. The men, themselves, were brave and willing to fight so the general used this to the best advantage. He spread the trained men throughout the units and made sure that all the officers were well-trained men. With proper leadership the ill-trained natives became good fighting men, perhaps the best in the Pacific.

A NATURAL LEADER

Few people who have met General MacArthur come away without having the impression that they have been talking to a natural leader. The effect of the general's immortal words, "I shall return," on the people of the Philippines characterizes the faith he can inspire in those under him and around him.

One of the most vital qualities of leadership is personal courage. Personal courage is more than superficial bravery; it goes far deeper. A person has to conquer his own inner problems and have some strong, tangible source from which to draw strength. For most this takes the form of a strong religious belief. General MacArthur certainly has a strong religious belief and he firmly believes that it is necessary in every society.

"I am absolutely convinced that true democracy can exist only on a spiritual foundation. It will endure when it rests firmly on the Christian conception of the individual and society."

The general's personal courage has been shown in his wartime exploits, when he frequently exposed himself to enemy fire.

There have been many courageous men but few great military leaders. Brave men are not necessarily good leaders. However, great leaders are brave men in every respect of the word.

AMERICAN HISTORY CONTEST RULES

1. The Newsday American history contest is open to students of all senior high schools in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Members of the families of Newsday employees may not participate, but Newsday carriers are eligible.

2. Every month, October through May, contestants may submit essays on a subject in the field of American history, selected by Newsday. A new subject will be announced each month for the following month. The subject for January is "The Three Greatest American Inventions."

3. Essays must be original and not more than 600 words in length, typed or written in ink on one side of the paper. The name, address, and telephone number of the contestant and the name of his or her high school should appear in the upper left-hand corner of the first page. All entries become

the property of Newsday and any or all may be published. None will be returned.

4. Each month, a board of judges will select the best essay submitted by a boy and the best essay submitted by a girl. In all matters relating to this contest, the decisions of the judges will be final.

5. The winning essays on each month's subject will be published in Newsday the following month with pictures of the winners. Each of the monthly winners will receive a wristwatch as an immediate award.

6. During the last week of June, the 16 monthly winners of the previous 8 months will receive an all-expense-paid trip to Washington, D.C., as the guests of Newsday, accompanied by members of Newsday's staff.

7. All entries should be addressed to American History Editor, Newsday, 550 Stewart Avenue, Garden City, N.Y., and must be in the Newsday office by midnight of the last day of each month.

Hon. Chet Holifield on Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, recently was keynote speaker to the annual convention of the National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association in Chicago.

Congressman HOLIFIELD, speaking as the owner-operator of CHET HOLIFIELD's store for men in Norwalk, Calif., as well as a 20-year veteran of Congress, addressed his audience of more than 1,000 merchants on, "The Essence of Competition." He directly linked this straightforward talk with the quality stabilization bill.

This legislation was sponsored in the last session by a number of House and Senate Members. It was favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and also acted upon favorably by the Rules Committee of the House. Owing to the impending adjournment of the House and to the congested legislative program in the Senate previous to adjournment, it was decided by the sponsors to postpone legislative action until this session of Congress.

With minor changes, this legislation will be reintroduced by the original and also additional sponsors.

Under unanimous consent I include the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

In previous talks with businessmen, I have asked my audience to look on me as the owner-operator of CHET HOLIFIELD's store for men in Norwalk, Calif., rather than as Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD. However, this evening, since I have a specific legislative challenge in mind, I'm going to ask you to consider me both as a dealer in men's wear and as a Member of the House of Representatives.

These two roles represent an essential need if our country is to win a desperately needed victory. That need is understanding, communication and teamwork between the business community and Congress because at stake is the health of our distributive economy—a vital part of our free competitive enterprise system.

We must remember that this country has really been built on the foundation that the Government doesn't do everything; that the neighbor helps the neighbor; and together, the neighbors help the Government. We must, in this country, be awake to the dangers of blindly relying entirely upon government. But we must be alert to the principle that government justifies itself only on the basis that it shall be the servant of the people, and not the master of the people.

When George Washington took his oath of office in 1789, Congress was elected from only 13 States and it "looked after" the national welfare of only 4 million people. Today, 173 years later, there are 50 States and over 185 million people.

Washington's time was an era of rugged individualism. A man's home State was more important than his National Government. His battle to succeed was more with nature, than with man or science.

Today we live in an unusual universe. Man is increasingly separated from all nature. As a result he himself becomes somewhat artificial. An electricity failure today is as painful for man as lack of bread. A disorder in our enconomy is the failure of his crop. Man's independence, opportunity and reward today depend on his ability to cope with manmade adversities more than nature's. Laws governing his freedom must be made, in consonance with our Constitution, to help him solve new economic and social problems as they arise. Though life today is different, the aims, ambitions and loyalties should remain the same.

The strength of any society rests, as it did in Washington's time, upon the ability and initiative of its people. If ever there was a time when the Government need responsible people and the people need responsible government, this is the time.

Yes, I wear two hats—the businessman's and the Congressman's. I hope that I wear them well. We face ideological, economic and military challenges to our way of life. The best way I know to preserve the American system is to remain militarily strong and economically strong. To keep our economy strong, we must correct the abuses in our distributive system and make it work on stable principles. If we meet the ideological challenge of communism with resolution, we need have no fear of the future.

This Nation's greatness was built on a foundation of small business. From that base the capability of continually producing and distributing more and better goods at competitive prices has developed. The small businessman has been the backbone of America since colonial days. Even with our modern giant industrial corporation, he still comprises in number about 85 percent of the Nation's business firms. The tragedy we now face is the accelerated decline of those small businesses which have formed the backbone of our free enterprise system.

It seems to me, while we agonizingly face the uncertainties of this nuclear age, we must diligently protect the basic sources of our strength. Otherwise chaos is certain, not from nuclear destruction but from our own moral breakdown. And a primarily source of our inherent strength is our free competitive enterprise system.

Everywhere we turn we find evidence that, as we move into the atomic age, the competitive price is being singled out as the dominant element in today's free competitive enterprise system.

In fact, in an increasing majority of business circles, "to be competitive" has come to mean only that one sells at the lowest price in the particular trading area. Unless quality and service is tied to price, then price becomes deceptive.

And is it any wonder when our own Federal Trade Commission in a recent case involving the Snap-On Tools Corp. said; and I quote, " 'Playing off' one dealer against another 'in the hope of obtaining a lower price' is the essence of competition."

The Honorable Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, last May used the platform of the National Electric Manufacturers Association to give added publicity to the above quotation.

Now I do not know whether or not the manufacturers in your industry have left the above quotation unchallenged, but I am delighted to use the platform of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association to challenge the quotation. If we have reached the point that the "playing off" of one dealer against another in hope of obtaining a lower price is in fact the essence of competition, then we have pushed into the background all of the wonderful constructive marketing practices that have played such an important part in the growth of the most prosperous country on the face of this earth.

ESSENCE OF COMPETITION IS PROFIT INCENTIVE

To be blunt, in my opinion as a businessman, in my opinion as a Member of Congress, the Federal Trade Commission has not selected, as the essence of competition, the necessary element that must prevail in order to preserve our free democratic form of government. The essence of competition is unequivocally the incentive. I'm speaking of the incentive that causes us to do all the constructive things that we do to bring to market the splendid products of industry. I'm speaking of the fair reward for those constructive efforts.

In this way the essence of competition is tied to the right to earn a profit, with emphasis on the word "earn."

In exercising your right to earn a profit, you put forth a true competitive effort when you do those things that have built your business into a vital force in your community and have helped build your industry and your country.

As you engage in your right to earn a profit, you have certain prerogatives. Perhaps your organization doesn't exercise all of them. Some you may abandon to manufacturers who confront you with an attractive proposition, perhaps it is necessary to do so to stay in business. Some you plan to undertake tomorrow. Some are an immediate burden but a long-range necessity. By prerogatives we mean the things that you are doing, or that are possible for you to do, to earn a profit:

1. There's your investing in fixed assets.

2. There's the building of an effective personnel organization.

3. There's your investing in merchandise. You abandon your prerogatives in this area when, in order to keep up with competition, you accept floor plans, and special sales and display franchises.

4. There's the physical act of bringing merchandise to your trading area.

5. You advertise this merchandise. Guard this prerogative carefully as you accept cooperative advertising money because you are actually yielding control and authority to your resources.

6. You display.

7. You sell. Here's where the demand-creating function should be at its best.

8. You offer credit, and do so in a responsible manner.

9. You deliver.

10. You install, or take complete responsibility for the installation.

11. You clarify for your customer the warranty or guarantee involved.

12. You service for the most part what you sell.

13. Finally there is the prerogative of spending, saving or reinvesting the resulting profit.

How many of these 13 prerogatives did you exercise?

How many of them did you abandon to others?

You can measure the degree of independence you have—yes, the degree of control you have over your business by checking this list.

There is undoubtedly a trend toward eliminating the retail link in the chain of distribution. To the extent that you answer in the negative when you check these 13 points, I believe you are helping that trend. Of course it is your prerogative to commit business suicide. You can do it by gradual abandonment of the basic practices and responsibilities which justify your link in the chain of distribution. Or you can call a halt in this trend by improving your ability as a free advertiser, as an aggressive merchandiser, a real credit sales manager, a service manager directly interested in customer satisfaction and last but not least the business manager of your own business.

SUPPORT URGED FOR QUALITY STABILIZATION

On the other hand, to what extent is your disappointment with your profit directly attributed to accepting the proposition that price is the dominant element in today's competitive free enterprise system? It's at this point that I recommend that you should exercise the 14th principle, another prerogative. I recommend that you support legislation before this Congress that will restore the competitive price factor to its proper perspective; legislation that will take a big step toward helping you do all those things that you are anxious to do to earn a profit. I refer to a legislative proposal known as the quality stabilization bill.

It's not the Federal Trade Commission, nor the courts, nor the predators in the marketplace that make our laws. It is the U.S. Congress expressing the will of the people that has the power to make the laws in this area.

Congress is the only constitutional arbiter with respect to conflicting views of national economic policy. By enacting the quality stabilization bill, Congress will express its intent, that orderly marketing practices may have an opportunity to prevail, thereby countering the all out price and gimmick trend.

And, in careful study of it, I have noted that virtually every national trade organization representing consumer products, including this impressive association, has endorsed this measure which I feel, for the safeguarding of our basic business pattern, must be enacted quickly in this session of Congress.

No governmental administrative agency or bureau is involved in any way with the quality stabilization bill.

Salesmanship consists of transferring a conviction by a seller to a buyer. You are the seller. Congress is the buyer. There are 535 customers. If the sale of quality stabilization is not made this year, blame no one but yourself. I said 535 customers, but a considerable number of Congressmen are already sold on the bill.

I am sold. I am sold because I am a veteran Congressman of 20 years, who believes my solemn duty is to my constituents.

I am sold because for 35 years I have been a retail clothier in a small town, and have had personal experience in seeing small businessmen — my constituents — destroyed by unfair sabotage of trademarks and brand name merchandise.

I am sold because that which is hurting my business, is hurting every other merchant dedicated to selling brand name merchandise, and is hurting so badly that it is threatening traditional business procedures.

I am sold because I believe freedom under this legislation, would be reserved for the man who lives by his own work, and directs his own business, to protect that business from those who would destroy it.

I am sold because I proudly say I like my life in this country and I want to keep it that way for my constituents as well as my own children and grandchildren. I know it can be so maintained, only by continually defending sound business principles and by constant willingness to do more than sometimes seems necessary.

I am sold on the quality stabilization bill because this bill, studied without prejudice, is basic, simple truth, spelling out a precise remedy for a recognized malady.

I built my retail business on lines of nationally known brand merchandise. If the predators continue to acquire such brand merchandise and slash normal retail prices, I am threatened with destruction to my traditional way of doing business. Much more important than my personal business fate, is the fate of millions of producers and retailers of brand name merchandise.

TRIBUTE PAID TO JOHN W. ANDERSON

I want to take just a minute here to pay tribute to an American businessman. This country is more in need of guided leaders than guided missiles and there would be no quality stabilization bill were it not for the principles and dogged determination of one such leader. He is a man of infinite patience.

His fight for his rights as a manufacturer of high quality brand name automotive parts and for integrity in the distribution of those products has been in essence a fight for you as well. All of us, whether in manufacturing, wholesaling or retailing, or in the Congress, owe John W. Anderson, founder-president of the Anderson Co., of Gary, Ind., a great vote of thanks. He is the mainspring of the Quality Brands Associates movement.

The case for quality stabilization has been well established. The need is now. Victory is in sight. It will take work by you and the only substitute for work is a miracle. Your business cannot await a miracle.

If support comes to each Congressman from his voting constituents, Congress will express its intent for business to have the right to develop a quality product and protect that quality against the cannibalism of price debasement.

In this way, Congress will affirm that the true essence of competition, is the profit incentive. In so doing, Congress will be helping you to preserve your right to earn a profit.

The Hanford Atomic-Steam Generating Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, culminating a long, hard legislative battle, the Congress voted its approval of the Hanford atomic electric facility last summer. The Congress authorized the Washington Public Power Supply System to enter into contract with the Atomic Energy Commission for the production of electric power, utilizing waste steam at the Hanford, Wash., New Production Reactor. The WPPSS, an organization of public power bodies, agreed to finance, construct, and operate the facility at no cost to the taxpayer. Today I am most pleased to request to have printed in the RECORD the text of two editorials written in prominent Northwest newspapers, the Tri-City Herald of Kennewick, Wash., and the Sunday Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., which deal with developments since congressional approval was realized.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kennewick (Wash.) Tri-City Herald, Jan. 9, 1963]

IT LOOKS BETTER ALL THE TIME

The question of "What are you going to do with all that power?" which was asked often by opponents of the Hanford steam project, has been answered.

The big plant, to be the largest atomic steam generating facility in the world, can't produce enough power to satisfy the appetites of public and private utilities. The 800,000 kilowatts it will produce have been oversubscribed.

Yesterday a big event was the long delayed announcement by private power companies that they want the 400,000 kilowatts which Congress said they could have.

During their bitter and intense opposition to the plant, private power used as one argument that there was no market for the power. It was a sham which enough Congressmen fortunately saw through and the steamplant won.

As a matter of fact a host of charges made against the project by private power have already been shot full of holes.

The further the Hanford steam plant progresses the more feasible it appears.

Last week steamplant supporters got another giant shot in the arm when bids for the plant's turbines were $12 million less than the engineer's estimate.

Those close to the steamplant picture knew its backers had been conservative in their estimates and that the plant could be constructed for less than $130 million.

But the $12 million saving in turbines wasn't entirely anticipated and it was—to use the masterpiece of understatement by Owen Hurd, managing director of WPPSS—"a very pleasant surprise."

Another pleasant surprise came a few weeks earlier with the low-interest-rate bid for interim financing. This was an expression by banking interests in the merit of the PUD's banding together to build the plant.

Many weeks ago we predicted in this column that private power would participate in the steamplant's output but that it would wait until the very last minute. The object was to first place every conceivable obstacle in the path of those who sought to construct it.

Perhaps now bygones can be bygones. Charles Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator, announced in Spokane in September that he was going to carry no grudges about private power's position and he hoped private power would do likewise.

Public power, however, would do well to always keep its powder dry.

Happily for all, the steamplant was sold to Congress on the merit basis and now the merits of the steamplant are selling the project to everyone.

[From the Portland Sunday Oregonian, Jan. 13, 1963]

GOOD POWER AFTER ALL

It should surprise no one that five privately owned public utilities of the Pacific Northwest who followed the national electric

utility-U.S. Chamber of Commerce line in fighting the Hanford power project are now exercising their congressional option to take 50 percent of the 800,000 to 900,000 kilowatts of energy to be produced at Hanford from nuclear-generated steam.

Where else could they buy 400,000 or more of firm power on a 30-year contract not subject to public power withdrawals at the going Federal rate of the Bonneville Power Administration?

We leave it to the public to figure out why the Northwest utilities lent their lobbying aid, though quietly, to the efforts of the national utilities and coal industries to bushwack the Hanford power project. The generators were first to have been built by the Federal Government. But that bill was killed in the House of Representatives. Now they are to be built by Washington Public Power Supply System (16 public utility districts), and ideological opposite of the privately owned utilities. WPPSS will sell $130 million in revenue bonds on the open market (to private investors, note) to finance the project. WPPSS is a competitor of four of the region's private utilities in application for licenses to build mutually exclusive dams on the Snake River—Nez Perce and Mountain Sheep. But the private utilities did not seek congressional approval to build the nuclear-powered generators at Hanford themselves. Their line was that the world's largest nuclear powerplant was infeasible.

The Federal Bonneville Power Administration will assume full responsibility for delivery of Hanford power to private and public customers. Because of congressional approval of Hanford power, BPA now has firm power to sell from the hydro supply held in reserve to meet commitments under the Federal preference clause to public agencies. But there has been no rush of big industries to establish new plants. Perhaps that will come. But whether there is an industrial surge or not, the power from Hanford as well as power from Mountain Sheep Dam will be needed in the late 1960's to meet normal demand increases.

The barely undercover fight of regional private utility spokesmen to prevent congressional approval of the use of wasted steam from the new plutonium production reactor at Hanford now has been exposed for what it was: First, an ideological fight against Federal entrance into nuclear power production; second, an ideological fight against regional public power agencies. The Portland Chamber of Commerce, which did not join the campaign in support of Hanford development in Congress, may well consider, now, the validity of the arguments which dissuaded it. The private utilities are ready and eager to sign on the dotted line.

Any needed power development which adds strength to the economic sinews of the Pacific Northwest is certain to help everyone, private utility investors included. There will be more power for everyone as a result of the Hanford victory.

Deepwater Harbor for Northern Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, passed by the AFL-CIO, of Lake County, Ind., comprising the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana, which I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, speaks for itself:

LAKE COUNTY, IND., CLU OPPOSES BURNS DITCH HARBOR—RESOLUTION PASSED ON INDIANA DEEPWATER PORT

Whereas the question of construction and location of a deepwater port in Indiana is of vital interest to our members and their families; and

Whereas this question of a deepwater port has been vigorously debated for many months; and

Whereas the AFL-CIO has adopted sound and constructive policy resolutions pertaining to conservation, slum clearance, and redevelopment programs; and

Whereas the basic issue in dispute revolves around the present contemplated dunes location of the port: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lake County AFL-CIO Central Labor Union hereby goes on record advocating a local program of slum clearance, area redevelopment, conservation, and deepwater port in a package arrangement designed to implement the policies of the AFL-CIO; and be it finally

Resolved, That:

1. We are in favor of the construction of a port on Lake Michigan;

2. We believe it to be in the best interests of our members and their families to preserve as much as possible of the dunes that remain. This should be done in the form of a national park.

3. We believe that the best interests of our members, their families, and the taxpayers can best be served by locating the port between East Chicago and Gary so that it can serve the highly industrialized East Chicago-Gary area and will also be favorably located to service the Midwest Steel Co. and other industrial operations in Portage, thereby concurring with and implementing the resolutions adopted by the national AFL-CIO on conservation, slum clearance and area redevelopment.

The above resolution was passed by one of the biggest attended meetings of the Lake County AFL-CIO Central Labor Union Tuesday evening at the Steelworkers Building in Gary.

Will a port at Burns Ditch cure the unemployment problem or will it rob the working man for the benefit of special interests?

Will the port and the mills bring prosperity or will they destroy all possibility of developing the richest, job-producing tourist industry in the Middle West?

Jobs in the steel industry depend on two basic factors, first, the market demand for the steel, and second, the labor time needed to produce the steel. Layoffs result when market demands drop or when a new development, such as automation, cuts down the needed labor time.

Are new mills needed to satisfy new market demands? According to figures in Iron Age, existing steel mills can meet all market demands for the next 30 years. Existing mills are working at only 50 percent of capacity, producing only half as much steel as they could if they could find a place to sell it—employing only half as many workers as they would if they could market the steel.

The new, automated steel mills will take markets now held by the existing, older mills. The older mills, suffering a loss of customers, will be forced to lay off more workers. Joblessness in the older steel-producing areas of Indiana will jump to new levels.

Will the new mills hire the workers laid off by the older mills? New mills are built with advanced operating procedures and automated processes that require only a fraction of the workers formerly needed.

In a survey of the steel industry by Frank Lynn of the Armour Research Foundation, it is indicated that for every 150 workers hired by the new mills, 250 workers will be laid off by the older mills.

In order to compete with the new, automated mills, the older mills will be forced to adopt more automated operations. The older mills will need still fewer workers. Unemployment will rise again.

Since the percentage of automation in the total steel industry will be greater, the number of employed workers in the total steel industry will be less—much less.

Unemployment spreads like cancer. Decreased purchasing power means smaller markets for consumer goods and more layoffs in other industries.

But won't the Burns Ditch Port make jobs? The Burns Ditch Port will be paid for by taxes on working men and women—it will benefit only the private owners of the two steel companies it will serve.

Indiana already has four ports on Lake Michigan. If we need more ports, a bigger port in the Tri-City area of Indiana (Hammond, Whiting, East Chicago) would cover 16,000 acres—over 20 times the size of the 750-acre Burns Ditch Port—and would provide over 20 times the jobs.

Can we lose anything by building mills and a Burns Ditch Port in our Duneland? Can we lose anything besides picnics?

Steel mills and a port in our Duneland will destroy forever the greatest paycheck-producing opportunity in our State. Yes, our incomparable Duneland can make jobs—if we use it wisely.

The market demand for outdoor recreation grows bigger every year. Areas that offer outdoor recreation also develop steady, long-term employment.

In the words of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, "consumer spending for outdoor recreation is now estimated to be in the neighborhood of $20 billion annually." The Indiana Duneland offers the greatest outdoor recreation attraction in the Middle West. Our Duneland has what other States are spending millions to build—good beaches. New Jersey expects to invest $28 million to renew washed-out beaches. Our Duneland has miles of the finest, self-renewing beaches in the world.

In Jackson, Wyo., before Teton National Park was established, bank deposits were $395,000. In 1959 deposits had jumped to $4,500,000. In the vicinity of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area, trade doubled after the recreation area was established.

If we have the wisdom to establish a national park that will save all that remains of our unique Duneland and beaches, we will boost our entire State economy. Millions of tourists from throughout this country and Canada will flock into Indiana to spend their money.

Taxes? The tourist dollar is a profit dollar. The tourist spends his money and returns home. We do not pay taxes to build schools for the tourist's children. We do not provide unemployment compensation or relief for tourists. In 1960, Gatlinburg, Tenn., gateway to the Smokies National Park, had 3½ million visitors. With an assessed property investment of $25 million, Gatlinburg had a tax rate of only 85 cents.

Jobs? Jobs providing tourists with food, lodging, clothing, roads, housing, automotive and recreational facilities, and jobs providing a host of related services will raise employment levels.

Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the National Association of Counties held its grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev., in mid-December of last year.

Mr. Robert E. Wolf, a professional staff member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presented an outstanding paper entitled "Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wolf's paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES AND SHARED REVENUES

(By Robert E. Wolf, professional staff member for public lands, U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, given at the western regional district of the National Association of County Officials, December 13, 1962, Las Vegas, Nev.)

It is again a pleasure for me to come before your association to discuss with you a subject of vital interest. Before I become too deeply involved in the topic, I would like to say that the work of the county officials, your organization and your staff has been both constructive and useful on the national scene. The fact that the chairman of the committee for which I work, Senator ANDERSON, has authorized me to come here at your request, emphasizes this point.

My major staff responsibility is with our Public Lands Subcommittee and Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, your host State, is its chairman. In Washington, I have often heard it said of Nevada's two Senators, "In Nevada you have your choice of getting a job done with a CANNON or a BIBLE."

The subject which I have been asked to talk about—Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues—is indeed a complex one. I took the opportunity to go back to review some of the work that has been done during the last decade. When Paul Carlin asked me to operate in the cleanup position on this panel, I wanted to try my best to avoid either striking out or hitting a pop fly. I must confess, however, that I approach this turn at bat with some concern. My review establishes that while many have come up to the plate, few hits have been made.

Despite all the commission-type activities of the last decade, today all there is to show in the way of change on this subject is another relatively inactive Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which was established in 1959.

Rather than attempt to recite figures on the vastness of the Federal holdings and their relation to State and local governments, it perhaps would be more useful to discuss the broad policy implications surrounding payments to local governments. This, in turn, may lead you to decide why this is one of those topics on which there has been so much discussion and so little action.

Over the last several decades there have been certain structural changes in Federal, State, and local governments.

Counties have grown in the responsibilities that they shoulder. The demand for services has increased and they collect more taxes. The property tax, as such, while it is up, has actually decreased in relative importance as a source of local revenue. It is this tax, or its equivalent, and the Federal-local arrangement which is the subject of our discussion today.

In addition to what the States do, the Federal Government also has developed a number of programs which distribute money to the counties and to the States. Therefore, it can be said that there is today a greater interconnection and interdependency on the part of all levels of government.

At the outset, I want to dispose of the terms "exclusive jurisdiction" and "retrocession." First, the great bulk of the Federal properties—the national forests and public lands—are not exclusive jurisdiction lands. Second, to the extent that there is private property on Federal lands, that property may be subject to local sales, use, and income taxes.

As you are aware, it is the property tax that may not be levied on private property on Federal lands, nor may it be levied against the Federal lands themselves.

With the exception, then, of the property tax, private developments on Federal properties are subject to taxation.

Your concern, just now, revolves around payments in lieu of taxes and shared revenues on Federal lands.

There are five basic policies that may be followed by the Federal Government:

1. Make no payment.
2. Pay taxes or an equivalent amount.
3. Share income or revenue.
4. Compensate local government in whole or in part for services rendered or hardship caused.
5. A combination of 2 or 3 with 4.

There are examples of all these situations in operation today. The Federal Government has devised a series of compensatory payments to States and local governments and several of these compensatory payments take into account the acreage of Federal land within the State or county. For example, both in the field of education and highways the Federal Government has also made direct payments. Various highways are eligible for up to 100 percent Federal financing.

The most common arrangement for payments directly to counties, in the nature of taxes, are shared revenues. There are numerous techniques that have been devised. In at least one minor case, the Coos Bay Wagon Road lands in Oregon, payments are on a tax-equivalent basis. In another case part of the Minnesota National Forest, payments are set at three-quarters of 1 percent of the Federal Government's estimate of the value of the lands. Usually, the Federal Government has used a system of paying a percentage of revenues to the local government.

A few pertinent figures here might be enlightening: In 1960 the Federal Government paid to States and counties property taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, and revenue-sharing payments totaling $103 million, of which $85 million came from the last category.

In addition, $516 million was paid in cash, or in kind, to supplement services commonly considered basic to local government operations.

Included here are: $258 million in education funds for impacted areas; $120 million, a credit in the Federal highway formula because of the presence of Federal lands; and at least $140 million representing the direct Federal expenditure for roads on Federal lands, such as national forests, parks, public lands, and Indian lands. The total is about $630 million. It is important to note that the indirect payments are five times greater than the direct payments for tax or tax-equivalent purposes.

You are the people responsible for conducting the affairs of local government and, thus, there falls upon you the direct responsibility for raising the taxes needed to support the local services demanded. The need for operating revenue exerts a constant pressure upon you. It is not surprising that where Federal lands are a significant part of a county you look to these lands to help supply a proportionate share of needed local revenues.

It is not unusual to hear people exclaim that Federal lands should be "put back on the tax rolls." However, this statement is often erroneous because most of the Federal holdings are original public domain lands which never have been on the tax rolls. Only the acquired lands were on the tax rolls. The submarginal lands purchased in the thirties usually were not producing tax revenue and were tax delinquent. It is only after these lands are rehabilitated at Federal expense and again productive that a "tax loss" argument begins to be heard.

In cases involving defense and other related activities, lands have been taken from the tax rolls. Where lands are acquired for Federal or State purposes, as you know, direct and indirect payments are usually made.

In almost every case of Federal acquisition there has been consultation with and approval from the local government. Nonetheless, the contention is often made that the tax roll has been reduced, despite the welcome that has often been given to the original Federal acquisition.

Another concept which is often urged is that the public lands be placed on the tax rolls through sale to private individuals. Despite the archaic nature of the public land laws, it has been possible for private citizens to acquire public lands. The fact that they are not under private ownership stems as much from the lack of sufficient private interest in their acquisition as it does from any alleged interest on the part of the Federal Government in holding these lands. There is some reason to believe, for example, that on the Taylor grazing lands, which approximate 180 million acres, it would be more costly to the ranchers to own the lands in fee than to use them under the current system of grazing fees.

A few years ago, the Senate Interior Committee was told that the woods were full of lumber companies eager to purchase one of the finer ponderosa pine forests in the West, the Klamath Indian Reservation. The great bulk of these lands were added to the national forest, due to a lack of private buyers.

It is interesting, when reflecting upon the "value" of these lands, while private buyers were hard to find, some of the Klamaths now are suing the United States for not paying enough for the lands. From the standpoint of the counties, there is reason to believe that the revenue-sharing payments will equal the taxes that would have been paid in private ownership and there is the assurance that the resource will be productive in perpetuity.

Certainly, it is evident in the field of mining claims on public lands and national forests, where there is a clear device for securing a patent, that many claims have been held, worked and dropped without ever an effort to obtain a patent. The improvements made by the claimholder may be taxed by local government because these are not exclusive jurisdiction lands.

County officials should be well aware that if citizen can get the fruit of title without the capital investment, and in the process can escape local property taxes no matter how modest they may be, he may feel impelled to do this. When one urges private acquisition he may be talking into the wind because the sum of the private interest in acquisition may be so small that nothing concrete can be expected.

There are others who talk about Federal lands and their resources in terms of an argument for "tax equality," contending that some existing shared revenue provision, such as that in the Mineral Leasing Act, is not equitable to the State or local government. This group runs into a different situation. First, the division of mineral leasing revenues is 37½ percent to the State and the balance to the Federal Government. However, 52½ percent goes to reclamation and only 10 percent finds its way into the Treasury. Any reduction of the Federal share would adversely affect the reclamation fund. Since legislation to change the mineral leasing formula must proceed through the same committee which is most concerned with reclamation legislation, the difficulties presented should be obvious. In addition, the mineral leasing revenues go directly to the States and it is up to the States to decide the extent to which individual counties receive a share of the revenues.

In fact, in most of the shared revenue formulas the Federal funds are granted to the States. They decide how the counties shall use the funds and, in some cases, they can decide whether or not the counties will receive any money.

However, the major factor to consider in something as substantial as the Mineral Leasing Act is whether there is any rationale for changing the formula. Thus, now the Western States not only ultimately get 90 percent of the mineral leasing revenue, but also they are further strengthened by the presence of this account in the reclamation fund. This ensures that this program is better able to provide the wide benefits of water resources development for the arid West.

The complex interrelationship between the Mineral Leasing Act and the reclamation fund, coupled with the fact that the Mineral Leasing Act makes a most substantial payment to the States, certainly suggests that there is more involved than a simple question of tax equality.

The public domain land and timber disposal laws provide that but 5 percent of receipts be granted to the States and counties. On the other hand, the balance, 95 percent, goes into the reclaration fund. Here again the same set of relationships exist, as is the case in mineral leasing.

On the national forests there is a direct revenue-sharing of 25 percent of receipts, plus an additional 10 percent of receipts allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture to spend on roads. The cause of some concern in western counties has been the reservation of revenues—I might add, fully authorized by law—for such things as brush control and timber stand improvement. When these revenues are kept for the purposes authorized by law they provide for substantial local investments in continued forest productivity which, in turn, protects the economic base of the communities.

If my talk, so far, seems to have rambled and is a bit incoherent, this should not worry you too much, except as to my speaking ability. The fact is that the whole system of payments in lieu of taxes rambles and is filled with inconsistencies. If you are seeking a consistent approach, you won't find it in this field. But there is evidence to suggest that the inconsistencies are not necessarily fatal.

The problem that faces the counties is finding adequate local revenues. It brings you small comfort to recognize that more direct and indirect Federal expenditures occur locally because of the presence of Federal land than is apparent in examining the shared revenues available to the counties. Your interest is in maximizing direct income. Proceeding from this thesis, I would like to lay out a few of the policy implications that you may wish to consider.

Many of the shared revenue formulas require that the money received be spent on schools and roads. This has been a continuous aggravation. But, is it a real problem? The Federal legislation usually provides that the State legislature will decide the proportion allocated to schools or roads. As you know, in each State the school and road people rather jealously guard the proportion of the particular shared revenue allocated to their function.

If, in reality, the total amount expended on either of these programs is substantially greater than the amount in shared revenues, the presence of the restriction is not damaging. It is only when such a restriction would force spending more on schools or roads than the county contemplated that a problem exists.

One of the major suggestions of the 1955 Commission in Intergovernmental Relations was that the limitations on the spending of money for schools and roads, found in many revenue-sharing formulas, be eliminated. I suggest that the counties view this recommendation in the light of fiscal reality.

Another type of suggestion is one which would result in a better definition of the funds which should constitute receipts for the purpose of determining shared revenues. Suggestions are made from time to time as to the effect of brush control and timber stand improvement programs, the effect of exchanges of land and the cost of constructing roads through deductions in the price of the timber on national forests and public lands. These are all claimed to have an impact on the payments to the counties. While it may be true that there is an impact on the payments to the counties, it is also true that these funds are spent locally and, thus, totally benefit the local economy. In other words, if it were reasonable to revise the law so that these expenditures would be treated as revenue for tax purposes, would the result be consistent with the treatment of similar private property?

This year the Federal Government will spend $96 million on forest roads and highways. In addition, $40 million worth of roads will be secured by the deduction in the price of timber which has its effect upon the counties. For reforestation and stand improvement the direct Federal expenditures will total $15 million while timber sale expenditures will be on the order of $14 million. Viewed in balance, what should be the arrangement and the proportions so as to fairly recognize the impact on shared revenues?

One of the more substantial problems in shared revenues stems from the fact that almost universally the payments are made as a percentage of income. If the sale of public land goes up or goes down, or the sale of resources—such as timber, grazing privileges or minerals—varies, the income of the county varies accordingly.

There is a paucity of information on the relation between the location of revenue production and local burdens, as well as whether there is a direct tie between economic activity and local costs which is not properly treated by present formulas.

There is also the issue of whether payments should be better stabilized and made more regular.

The only two public land formulas which produce stability of income are those on the Coos Bay Wagon Road and the Superior National Forest lands. The former pegs the payment to the two counties involved at the equivalent of taxes on comparable private land. The latter approach makes the payment on national forest land three-quarters of 1 percent of the value as determined by the Federal Government. In both of these approaches and appraisal is made every 10 years which forms the basis for payments in the subsequent decade.

There have been various alternatives offered for stabilizing shared revenue payments. One device suggested to produce stability is the use of a 5-year moving average. This would tend to smooth out some of the irregularities in payment.

There are approaches in addition to the Coos Bay lands or Minnesota lands systems. Certainly, it is a fact that a revenue-sharing formula applied to a county where no revenue develops hardly compensates that county. Five, twenty-five, or seventy-five percent of nothing is still nothing.

However, equally important is the question of whether the counties wish to examine the rationale upon which payments are made. In the case of public domain timberland, the direct payment to the countries is 5 percent of income. For the Coos Bay lands it is a tax equivalent. For the national forest, generally, 25 percent of income. All four of these classes of land can be found side by side in the State of Oregon and each of them returns different amounts to the counties in which they are located.

There is no evidence which suggests which formula, in and of itself, whether you take into account other indirect Federal benefits or you do not, produces a fair sharing of revenue with local government. The same thing can be said for the formulas dealing with other types of land and with resources.

As far as I know, while there have been many studies made by the Federal Government, the counties themselves have not made their own analysis of the situation. Despite all the studies and talk, virtually nothing has been done to change these formulas, some of which are now 60 years old.

There is no doubt that some shared revenue formulas produce hardships for some local governments because if there is no revenue or if the revenue is very small, the payment to the county is nonexistent or minute.

There is little doubt that the formulas are not only uneven in similar land and resource situations, but, also, that they are not consistent in meeting the tax needs of local governments.

Canada devised a rather interesting approach to the situation, which has been both commended and condemned because of its simplicity. Virtually all national property in Canada exceeding in value 4 percent of the total property evaluation in any municipality pays an amount not to exceed three-quarters of the amount that the local tax would be if it were privately held. In addition, the Canadians, like ourselves, have developed various additional grant-in-aid programs.

Certainly, any consideration of the national revision of our own system could well include a careful review of the procedure which Canada has apparently found meets her needs.

Where you are dealing with the concept of payment in lieu of taxes as a tax equivalent or as a shared revenue, the realities of the situation require recognition. Under the Constitution, the Federal Government is not required to make tax or tax equivalent payments to local government. It has long done so and there is virtually no Federal property which does not, in some way or other, make a direct cash contribution to local government. In 1960 these payments totaled $630 million.

The States carry the same immunity from local taxation and it is not possible for a county to tax the capitol dome in any State. It is hardly likely, within the scheme of things, to expect either the Federal or the State government to submit the property under their proprietorship to local taxation. In fact, there is some evidence which indicates that, in some instances, the States are more restrictive than the Federal Government.

Any substantial effort to achieve the ultimate goal set by some spokesmen, which would have the effect of placing all Federal

and State property on local tax rolls, probably could only be achieved if, in the process, the entire structure of other grants-in-aid were upset. This is true because the rationale for a great deal of Federal aid is that the Federal Government does not pay local taxes and supplementary assistance is necessary because of this fact.

In the years that lie ahead, local governments are going to continue to find that their sources of revenue are more difficult to tap. No doubt, one of the factors which has led to increased action in State legislatures and in the National Legislature to plow back State and Federal income through grants of various types to local government, is the recognition of the political difficulty local government has in raising taxes. Citizens who are interested in schools, roads, mental health and various other governmental functions, appear before you as county commissioners asking for these services. At the same time, they will often rebel, when you institute the necessary increases in property taxes, to provide the services they ask. In the Washington, D.C., area, in one of the wealthiest counties in the Nation, the taxpayers threw out all the incumbents because of a 37 cents tax increase announced a few weeks before election. Intuitive recognition of this possibility has led both those who want increased services by government and those who are responsible for administering local government to turn to State and National Legislatures with the request that they collect taxes and devise programs which indirectly do what is not considered feasible locally.

Particularly in our Western States where there is so much Federal land, there is always a warm interest in maximizing the shared revenues from the Federal holdings. This, too, is a natural because it represents a way to increase county income without levying a direct tax on the local voters.

What I have endeavored to do today is to lay out for you, as best I can, some of the considerations which come into play when you enter into a realistic appraisal of what may be done on payments to local government.

If this is a subject worth doing something about, it deserves a far different type of approach and effort on the part of the counties in the future than it has had in the past. Because of the complexities of the subject, it would be unrealistic to expect any results if you did not gather substantial data and facts and look at the question from the standpoint of the likely reaction from those whom you are asking for a change.

Federal lands and private developments on Federal lands are not automatically subject to property taxes. Federal land holdings, then, produce this sort of picture. Where there are private facilities on Federal lands you may collect sales, use and income taxes, if the lands are not subject to exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Purposely, I have only touched lightly upon the question of levying property taxes upon private property on Federal lands, for this broad and complex issue really is not a part of the subject before you.

Interwoven with the shared revenue formulas is the system of grants-in-aid. These are certainly related subjects.

The problems that most affect the counties with Federal lands are the adequacy of shared-revenue payments in relation to similar taxes on like lands; the stability of income; the basis upon which Federal receipts are classed as income for revenue-sharing purposes; the rationale for applying different formulas to lands which have the same economic purpose; and the question of compensating counties where no Federal income is developed to share with the counties.

To the extent there is disagreement within your ranks on what the basic issues are and what the solutions should be, your ability to close ranks and move forward together will be hampered.

The Congress usually acts in a comprehensive field such as this only when there is some agreement among the proponents for the change.

If the recent past suggests anything, it is clear that a need for more money—a greater share of the Federal revenue from these lands—has not brought about a change.

The National Association of Counties has become a revitalized organization over the past few years. There is considerable evidence to suggest that after you have considered this subject and assigned to it a priority, you will proceed in a careful and comprehensive approach. Certainly you can then expect the Congress to listen attentively to your views and to endeavor to chart a route responsive to your real needs.

Dick Shelton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 21, 1963, Richard L. Shelton, editor of the Shelby Daily Star, Shelby, N.C., passed away as the result of a severe heart attack. The passing of this outstanding citizen of North Carolina constitutes a great loss to his family, his community, and the newspaper profession.

Dick Shelton was only 37 years of age at the time of his unfortunate death. It can be accurately said that he had just arrived at his most productive stage as a member of the profession of newswriting. His work had been recognized by the North Carolina Press Association through awards for outstanding editorial and news work that he had done.

Dick Shelton was my close personal friend and his passing constitutes a great personal loss to me.

Under unanimous consent I include an editorial from Shelby Daily Star of January 22, 1963, entitled, "Cleveland Has Lost Talented and Dedicated Adopted Son," and an editorial from the Gastonia Gazette of January 22, 1963, entitled "Dick Shelton, Editor, Shelby Star," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Jan. 22, 1963]

DICK SHELTON, EDITOR, SHELBY STAR

The death of Dick Shelton, editor of the Shelby Star, left this entire area shocked yesterday.

Mr. Shelton, a personal friend of us at the Gazette, was deeply loved by those who knew him. He had fine qualities of leadership and his ability to determine the truth and follow after it vigorously do not come often to a person.

Dick was only 37 years old, young by any standards. He had proved himself a capable newspaperman in the past. His future was bright. He brought to the profession an unusual understanding of problems all the way from the community level to the international scene.

He wrote with clarity and purpose. His editorials marched along with a commanding cadence; yet, they were interesting to the point that caused continued reading and later comment when friends would meet on the street.

Shelton was an amiable man who smiled easily. For his friends, he would do anything; for his enemies, he was tolerant.

The Shelby Star and the entire area it served will miss Dick Shelton sorely.

We extend our sincere regrets to his fine family.

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, Jan. 22, 1963]

CLEVELAND HAS LOST TALENTED AND DEDICATED ADOPTED SON

No native-born son could have felt more responsible for the overall well-being and future progress of this city and county than Dick Shelton.

His span as an adopted son was brief.

But in the few years that he called Shelby and Cleveland County home, Dick Shelton delved to the very core of this community's being, stuided its past, planned for its future, made its needs his needs and its hopes and aspirations his hopes and aspirations.

He was dedicated to the end to giving as much of himself as possible toward helping guide the community, slowly, gently, and wisely along a course of justified growth and progress.

Dick Shelton was a every inch a newspaperman.

He lived and worked clutching the deep-seated belief that a good newspaperman and his newspaper justify their existence only by accurately and fairly reporting both good and bad in the news columns and dedicating the editorial columns to unselfish public service.

He made that his unqualified goal.

First as associate editor of this newspaper and finally as editor, Dick Shelton used his uncanny ability for penetrating thought, discerning decisionmaking and powerful writing to give editorial leadership to a score of justified and successful projects.

He nurtured a profound belief that his daily mission was to make his editorial columns, as nearly as humanly possible, the printed conscience of this community.

A community victory in some prodigious undertaking could spur him to hearty, satisfied laughter. A decisive defeat of what he considered a community necessity struck sharply at the very core of his being.

There were occasions when time and events proved him wrong in an editorial stand. He was the first to say, "I goofed." But when he erred, and it was seldom that he did, it was because of a sincere misjudgment. There was nothing petty or narrow about the man.

There was nothing pretentious about Dick Shelton. He never attempted to give the impression that he was anything other than a happy, hardworking newspaperman.

His friends and associates will long remember that he also was an alert, dedicated, conscientious, strongly opinionated and colorful husband, father, editor, and civic leader.

He was a Christian gentleman who loved his church and channeled much of his energy in its direction, serving as a member of the choir, a Sunday-school teacher and as a member of the board of deacons.

He confided to those closest to him on occasion that he never took a profound interest in the church until he moved to Shelby. It was here that he made himself useful and important to his church and made it a significant part of his basic existence.

Dick Shelton's sparkling brand of writing won him statewide acclaim in newspaper circles and his earnest desire to be a part of this community placed him at the forefront of activity at his church, in the Shelby Chamber of Commerce, the United Fund, civil de-

fense, industrial procurement and community betterment projects.

Dick Shelton was a many-faceted talent.

His death leaves a gaping hole in the community which will not soon be adequately filled.

A Legacy From George Y. Loveridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on the 17th of January, suddenly, in the city of Providence, R.I., George Y. Loveridge passed on.

He was a writer, and a great part of his career, after Brown University days, with the Providence Journal-Bulletin, though a goodly part expressed in books and stories sought after by national publishers.

The requiem of a writer is in the legacy of the literature born in his mind, heart, and soul. Man loves to linger on the beauty of thoughts framed in lovely language, though that language may still have the humility of simplicity and the homeliness of a hand shake.

George Loveridge had the rare gift of thinking thoughts that would echo in the reader's consciousness as something the reader himself felt but never with the poetry of the prose that George Loveridge fashioned.

His themes of yesterday will be read and reread. And we are further promised themes he had readied, but not released when the pen fell from his hand.

"I Appointed Myself To Enjoy a Tree" is just such a treat. We sense the appraisal of his fellow writers in the introduction they prepared.

That each and all may have the personal experience of wandering and wondering with the splendid mind of a splendid man, I submit the theme in its entirety, "A Legacy From G.Y.L."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LEGACY FROM G.Y.L.—I APPOINTED MYSELF TO ENJOY A TREE

(George Y. Loveridge, one of the finest writers ever to have worked on these newspapers, died suddenly Thursday night. A number of pieces on people and things that caught his perceptive eye in Rhode Island were still unpublished at the time.)

(By G. Y. LOVERIDGE)

Many men and women know what a tree is, but few, I think, have the time to stop and enjoy one, so I appointed myself, the other morning, a deputy to enjoy a tree for busier people.

There are thousands of tax-supported trees in Roger Williams Park, and any citizen is eligible to go, as I did, and look at them.

The tree I looked at was a beech, like a great silver candelabrum. It was not the most handsome tree in the park, nor the mightiest, but it was evidently the tree that destiny had directed me to, and I was well satisfied with it.

Its span, estimated by pacing, was 60 feet. Moving around it with outstretched arms, I found its girth to be about 10 feet.

Then I drew away 150 feet and sighted at the tree with a fontain pen, like an artist measuring the tree's height before sketching. Making use of some not very abstruse triangulation, keeping in mind that the product of the means equals the product of the extremes, I calculated the height of the beech at about 60 feet.

From the short, thick, silvery trunk, at a height of about eight feet, there gushed a great number of smooth branches, dividing, dividing, dividing until they ended in thin, sharp, dark reddish needles.

Some of the branches had rubbed and wounded others, some bore eye-shaped blemishes, but most of the branches were clear and vigorous. Hardly a bedraggled score of leaves remained, shivering at intervals. A few dead twigs lay under the tree.

The roots plunged into the turf like powerful fingers, performing out of sight of man their prime, mysterious function. From an orifice in the trunk, a thin liquid flowed, staining the bark.

Many a jackknife had been at work in the years of the tree's maturity. Here R.G., D.C., N.Y., N.K., and others had cut initials that have perhaps outlived them—in rectangular plaques, in hearts, some without borders, not only to the height of the first branches but up among the lower branches themselves.

Bordering the turf was a curb of concrete, in which was embedded a small bronze shield. It was the trademark of the thirties, "1935 WPA 1938."

The beech itself was asleep, and there was little life among its branches. A lone starling, staggering back from a sociable night in town, set for a few moments on a limb. A gray squirrel darted onto the trunk, changed its mind, and undulated away over the grass. Scores of cars, taking a short cut to work, swished past.

The morning sun lay warmly on the east side of the tree, draping shadows across the western limbs, leaving that side of the trunk dark; the trunk, its shadow and the lawn formed a sundial from which a person with sufficient knowledge might have read the time of day.

Through bare, innumerable twigs and branches one could see such various things as a white cloud, blue sky, Brig Gen. Casimir Pulaski seated on a spirited horse and flourishing a bronze sword, and the Betsey Williams Cottage.

On the opposite side, wild ducks skidded down onto a pond, and geese honked and swam in truculent armada. The water winked and blinked as it flowed out of the shadow of a granite bridge into the sunlight. Now an athlete appared, a boy in white pants, sweatshirt, and glasses, trotting along the margin of the pond. Geese waddled on the grass, while pigeons got out of their way.

I wondered how old the tree was. A hundred years, perhaps. I saw it as a seed, a seedling, infallibly selecting what it needed from earth and air, building itself into a splendid structure.

Like the steadfast tin soldier, it had stood in snow, in rain, in sunlight, in moonlight, through hurricanes and thunderstorms, now magnificently dressed, now naked, fulfilling an inscrutable destiny. From nothing it came, and to nothing it would someday return, but its elements would rise up again, as grass, insects, birds, flowers, other trees.

I walked once more around my beech, saluted it, and left.

The Future of Antisubmarine Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, through the past years the Congress has been genuinely concerned with respect to the antisubmarine warfare capability of our country. One of the most persuasive advocates for increased concentration in this field has been our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [MELVIN R. LAIRD].

Those of us in San Diego have a unique opportunity to see and hear at first hand the work being done in antisubmarine warfare and also we are very much aware of some of the shortcomings that we have in this very vital segment of our defense.

A very penetrating article has been written by MELVIN LAIRD entitled "The Future of Antisubmarine Warfare." I respectfully submit that this is must reading for all of our colleagues.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. LAIRD's article that appeared in the December 1962 issue of Data, the magazine of research and development management, herewith in my remarks:

THE FUTURE OF ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

(NOTE.—Biographical sketch of MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican Congressman from Wisconsin: A veteran of 10 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, 40-year-old Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin's Seventh District, is considered an outstanding young national leader by Republicans and Democrats alike. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and as a Navy veteran, Congressman LAIRD is well qualified to air his viewpoint in this undersea warfare edition of Data.

(It was LAIRD's amendment 4 years ago that increased funding for the Polaris submarine program over and above the recommendations of the Department of Defense. Without LAIRD's Polaris amendment we would currently have only two Polaris submarines instead of the eight which are on station today. But not one to favor only one service, LAIRD introduced a similar amendment for more funding for the Air Force's Dyna-Soar program during the 1962 session of Congress in order to make possible the first orbital flight of this Air Force manned military space vehicle early in 1965.)

(By Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin)

The Congress, for many years, has stressed the need for an improved and accelerated antisubmarine warfare (ASW) effort. Unfortunately, the general public is unaware of the immense potential, as well as actual, threat the Soviet submarine poses to the United States. Nor, I am afraid, is the public cognizant of the inadequacy of our response.

Outer space today is the center of public and official attention.

Inner space, though not neglected, has not been adequately funded or explored.

In fiscal year 1963 we will spend $5.5 billion for all of the various space agencies.

Our expenditures for ASW and oceanographic research, however, will be less than a half billion dollars. (See table 1.)

It is not my intent in this article to advocate abandonment of our space effort. Rather, I am suggesting that we take a closer look at inner space from a very pertinent perspective; the long-range security and defense of the United States.

We may reach the moon and control it, but in so doing we may lose control of the seas. And as B. D. Thomas, president of the Battelle Memorial Institute, so aptly phrased it, "* * * the power that control the oceans can control the power that governs the moon."

The reasoning that gave rise to Mr. Thomas' above-quoted remark is worth repeating if only to stimulate discussion in an otherwise little-pursued direction:

"It is a sad commentary on our national support of science that much of it derives from a superficial response to Russian prodding. The Russians launch a satellite, and we rocket into a headlong race into space. It is a fair question to ask: Can this be a ruse? I am not suggesting that our space program should be whittled down; I am merely asking that we consider for a moment the hypothesis that the next war will be won not in outer space but on the bottom of the sea. The Russians boast about their missiles and their 100 megaton bombs; they are very quiet about their submarines. They make a lot of noise about their men in space; they are very modest about an effort in oceanography several times as large as ours. What a brilliant military exploit it would be to send us off to the moon, while they seize the ocean. By some logic I have never been able to understand, it has been asserted that the power that controls the moon can conquer the earth. We might add * * * that the power that controls the oceans can control the power that governs' the moon."

How pertinent or prophetic this may be must be left to future historians, but we cannot afford to deny its seeming logic today.

Our Polaris submarine has already demonstarted its potential as the almost invulnerable weapon of the present.

Almost invulnerable because we can neutralize this weapon—but only by destroying the submarine that carries it.

Thus, the very compelling reason for a vigorous ASW program.

PROBLEMS IN ASW

The problems confronted are admittedly numerous, complex, and in many cases, almost defy solution. But then, so is space complex. The phenomenal advances we have made in the space environment in so short a time however, demonstrate that if there is a solution in ASW, given proper leadership, incentive and funds—the solution can be obtained.

First however, the urgency in developing adequate ASW techniques must be demonstrated.

The tendency today is to give the ICBM first place in the litany of deadly weapons. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told our committee in 1961 that "* * * only a year or so ago the principal general war threat to our security was a surprise attack by large numbers of nuclear-armed manned bombers. A year or two from now our principal concern will be a surprise attack by large number of nuclear-armed ICBM's."

I would agree with the Secretary that we face a dire threat from ICBM's but I would not call this the principal general war threat for the immediate years ahead.

The reason is that the nuclear submarine—the so-called absolute submersible—wedded as it is to a ballistic missile that can be launched from almost any position or any direction in the 70.8 percent of the world's surface that is ocean, is harder to detect, defies surveillance, and is highly mobile.

Further, it must be assumed that—

1. The Soviets have our hardened missile sites pinpointed and under constant surveillance.

2. The Soviets can track such a missile when launched, and either now or soon bring it down.

3. The Soviets have inaugurated a crash program in the U.S.S.R. to improve the quantity and quality of their Polaris-type nuclear submarines.

Ladislas Farago, in his recently published "The Tenth Fleet" (Ivan Obolensky, Inc., New York, 1962) tells us that "* * * the most significant new development in the Soviet Navy, that began in 1958, was a shift of emphasis from the quantitative buildup to a qualitive improvement."

Today, although we have the edge because of our Polaris submarines, it is quite conceivable that we will lose this edge.

In my new book, "A House Divided: America's Strategy Gap" (Regnery, Chicago, 1962), I pointed out that the cries of "missile gap" in the 1958–60 period were without foundation, but that a gap could develop if the Soviets got a breakthrough in their missile and missile defense development programs before we did.

This also holds true for any antisubmarine warfare gap. There is little likelihood that the Soviets will overtake us in offensive submarine warfare in the immediate future. But on the defensive side, the picture is not so reassuring.

In our committee report for 1961 we stated: "It is obvious that in this field, as in others, offensive capabilities have far outstripped the known defensive measures."

In that same report of our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, we quoted what Adm. John T. Hayward, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Development), told us in his testimony that by 1970 "every submarine, not only special submarines such as the Polaris, will be able to carry a missile and thus pose a substantial threat to our homeland against which defense methods must be developed."

If this is true, and there is little reason to doubt it, the present Soviet fleet of some 497 submarines (see table 2) will pose an almost intolerable threat, if by then we have not developed adequate ASW measures. This is particularly noteworthy when one realizes that our submarine force, by the end of 1962, will number just over a hundred not counting the Polaris and Regulus.

As I pointed out earlier, a submarine-launched ballistic missile poses a more complex, and therefore greater threat to our defenses than the ICBM. Without knowing the precise location of the launch point, the mathematical computation of the trajectory becomes extremely hard to determine. In fact, it cannot be solved within the short time a submarine-launched missile will be in the air.

R.D.T. & E. TO COUNTER THE ASW THREAT

How then do we counter such a threat? Obviously, by increased efforts in ASW, especially in the area of research and development. We cannot rely solely on developing an effective antimissile missile in time to defend against the coming Soviet proficiency either in ICBM's or in submarine-launched Polaris type missiles.

The first major problem—one in which my committee has long been interested—is proper management of a coordinated ASW program. I was, and still am, convinced that the best solution would be to have a single manager similar to that provided for the Polaris system. According to the Navy, however, this could not practically be implemented. Instead the Navy came up with a compromise in the establishment of the Office of the Diretcor for ASW research and development programs within the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The highly qualified Rear Adm. William H. Groverman was assigned to this position to act as czar fo the R.D.T. & E. aspects. I am sure our committee will give Admiral Groverman its full support.

Procurement too is a major problem. Modern ASW equipment is costly to procure and difficult to operate. Even with expanding defense budgets, we cannot afford all of the funds required to equip fully all of the ASW forces needed to combat the submarine threat. But substantial increases should be in order.

In fiscal year 1962, the total ASW budget in R.D.T. & E. and procurement amounted to $236 million and $1,734 million respectively. In fiscal year 1963 they both increased to $293 million and $1,924 million.

By themselves, these are substantial amounts. And the fact that we have added funds in this area in recent years shows that we are not complacent; but at the same time, the total amounts allotted have not sufficiently demonstrated the urgent concern such a threat should give rise to.

Alongside the space effort, ASW figures pale in comparison. For fiscal years 1960 to 1963 inclusive, we will have spent approximately $12 billion for space research, development, and procurement as opposed to just under $1 billion for our ASW efforts.

Surely, if what was pointed out earlier about the submarine threat is true, we can afford to devote more than one-twelfth (8.3 percent) the amount given to space for an adequate defense against the great threat from the sea, especially when we allude to the fact that $4 billion of the $5.5 billion in our space budget is devoted to the nonmilitary aspects of space. This fact should give rise to a searching dialogue on priorities within the total defense picture.

To date, however, even operating under the handicaps imposed both by a lack of sufficient R.D.T. & E. funds and the diversified efforts in the Naval Establishment, now partially corrected, our advances in ASW have been impressive and gratifying.

PROMISING WEAPONRY

A year ago, Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, and myself took part in Operation Slamex, which was the first full-scale testing of our newest ASW equipment. We were extremely pleased with the development we witnessed, but the fact remains that this new equipment will do our ASW efforts little good if they are not introduced into the fleet at a fast enough rate.

One of the problems that costs time is testing new equipment. The instrumented test ranges being constructed, such as AUTEC, will do much to improve and expedite our evaluation techniques, and hopefully will speed up introduction into the fleet.

The primary purpose of ASW is to detect, classify, locate and destroy enemy submarines. Destruction is the easiest part. In the field of weapons development we are making excellent progress. New propulsion techniques combined with new sensors for acquiring and following a target enable us to destroy submarines at ranges compatible with the new increased sonar ranges we have developed. Our new weapons will include Asroc, Subroc, Dash, MK–46 torpedo, and a complete variety of ASW mines.

I have been highly interested in the MK 46 torpedo because of its versatility. It is a lightweight torpedo, still under development, that will provide both our ships and air ASW forces with a weapon payload designed to cope more effectively with the predicted threat of potential enemy submarines. Our committee added $7 million to the funds requested for the MK–46 to insure successful completion on schedule.

As to the Asroc and Subroc programs, I was fortunate enough to take part in the first firings and evaluations of these systems against nuclear submarines. The antisubmarine rocket system (Asroc) has already reached completion and is being installed

in our surface ASW ships. With this system, they can attack and destroy submerged enemy submarines many miles away as soon as they are detected and identified. Its payload can be either a nuclear depth charge or a lightweight homing torpedo.

One other weapon, especially current today, is the Drone antisubmarine helicopter (Dash). It will be introduced into the fleet this month. Dash can be launched within seconds from a specially constructed platform on the deck of a destroyer. It can then be swiftly and accurately guided to the immediate vicinity of the enemy submarine, drop a homing weapon and then return to the controlling ship. Though it has been likened to a guided missile, it has the unique feature of being recoverable with its weapon load intact. This simply means that the tactical commander has a degree of flexibility unavailable in any other system. He can react instantly without being committed to attack. With this capability of destroying an enemy submarine before it is within torpedo range of our ships, Dash provides the fleet with a revolutionary ASW weapon.

However, no matter how sophisticated our ASW weapons, no matter how accurate, they are without utility if our detection, classification and localization systems are deficient or inadequate. Even in this obstacle-ridden area, we have made significant progress. The sonars being developed, as I mentioned above, have a tenfold increase in range over those now in the fleet. Helicopter-towed sonars, as well as fixed and mobile installations are being developed which will tremendously improve our present capabilities. Unfortunately however, when we go for longer ranges, environment becomes a controlling factor. For example, an increase in power will give an increased range but only up to the point of cavitation. Beyond this there is no gain to be achieved by using increased power. Another crucial point in this regard is that oceanic conditions such as changes in salinity or temperature between the attack ship and the target will bend the sound ray by presently unknown amounts. We must therefore continue to improve our support of an increased oceanographic effort so we can learn just what effects the oceans will have on our future systems.

MORE TIME AND MONEY NEEDED

What can be done to improve our ASW capabilities? The two most important ingredients are time and money. Our Nation has the resources and our Navy has the technical competence to develop, evaluate and procure the systems necessary for an adequate ASW defense. To date, however, we have not been giving the ASW program proper support.

A long-range plan is an absolute must to develop and procure the weapons and associated equipments required for future ASW. Such a plan should delineate in great detail our present capabilities and our future fleet requirements. Once these are known a program should be developed which will meet the fleet's requirements and at the same time be capable of implementation within our available technical and manpower resources.

Too often in our planning do we let available funds determine the actual program. This results in a hodgepodge of unrelated projects that are designed to meet a certain budget. In my opinion, once a program is established, the only thing that will change it are new developments which modify the state of the art or new requirements to meet a different type threat. Funding limitations control only the rate at which the program is to be accomplished, or in other words, the schedule. If a job can be completed in 1 year with $1 million but R.D.T. & E. only get $500,000 for that year, then it will obviously take 2 years to complete the project. In such a case, the program is not changed, only the schedule.

But in the area of ASW, if a project that will add to our ASW capabilities can be accomplished in a certain period of time, fund limitations should not be allowed to interfere with the most accelerated schedule possible. For in this area we are not dealing with desirable items, but with necessities for our very survival.

In my book I advocated the establishment of a priorities review board for defense matters. A realistic priorities system that cuts across all of our defense efforts is the only meaningful way to get the necessary job of defense done. Many programs in the Defense Establishment get top priority rating. ASW, the Navy assures me, is one of these. And yet, in last year's hearings, Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, told our committee that "* * * we see no major breakthrough on the horizon for antisubmarine warfare, no panacea to solve our problem."

We were also told by Admiral Anderson earlier in last year's hearings that "the particular threat which we recognize as increasing—and I would not minimize in any degree the fact that this threat is increasing—comes from the Russian submarine." He then said that in his opinion this means that "we have a limited period of time in which we can greatly increase our own antisubmarine capabilities, particularly as they pertain to coping with this threat of the missile launching submarines."

Clearly then, accelerated, improved, and inspired efforts in the areas of ASW are needed now. The Navy has done an outstanding job as far as they have gone, but they have had neither sufficient funds nor the proper official and public support to give to their efforts the inspiration and urgency so vitally needed to produce the miracle of an adequate antisubmarine capability.

A reorientation of our thinking in this area is long overdue.

TABLE 1.—*Space appropriations contrasted with oceanographic appropriations*

SPACE APPROPRIATIONS

	1960	1961	1962	1963
NASA	$523,575,000	$964,000,000	$1,671,750,000	$3,787,276,000
Supplemental			156,000,000	
AEC	(1)	63,200,000	120,100,000	192,900,000
DOD	560,900,000	793,800,000	1,147,200,000	1,517,700,000
Total		11,698,401,000		
Total (1963)		5,497,876,000		

[1] Not available.

TOTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC EFFORT

NAVY

R.D.T. & E.	$13,900,000	$16,900,000	$22,000,000	$31,500,000
SCN	8,600,000	4,300,000	13,600,000	17,600,000
O. & M.	21,000,000	23,000,000	23,700,000	25,200,000
Other Navy procurement			100,000	2,500,000

OCEANOGRAPHIC EFFORT BY AGENCIES OTHER THAN NAVY

National oceanographic effort	$23,494,000	$30,997,000	$59,000,000	$68,000,000
Total	66,994,000	75,197,000	118,400,000	144,800,000
Navy ASW budget request	174,692,000	180,459,000	235,810,000	286,000,000
Congressional action	45,000,000	50,000,000	None	7,000,000
Total	219,692,000	230,459,000	235,810,000	293,000,000
Total 1963		437,800,000		

TABLE 2.—*Soviet submarines* [1]

Class	Number of class	Propulsion	Displacement	Length	Radius	Complement	Submerged speed	Armament
			(*Tons*)	(*Feet*)	(*Miles*)		(*knots*)	
Atomic powered	3	Nuclear reactor	3,000	328	Unlimited		25	
"Z" type	50	Diesel electric	1,850	310	26,000	70	16	40 mines or 20 torpedoes.
"W"	120	do	1,050	245	16,000	60	16	Do.
Research	1	do	1,050	245	16,000	60	16	None.
"Q"	50	Diesel	650	180	7,000	40	16	6 torpedo tubes.
"K"	13	do	1,457	282	16,000	62	10	20 torpedoes.
Ex-German type XXI	4	do	1,280	252	11,000	57	17	29 torpedoes.
Type VII	4	do	595	220	6,500	45	7	19 torpedoes.
Type XXIII	1	do	233	114	1,350	13	12	4 torpedoes.
SHCH	60	do	620	190	4,000	40	8	10 torpedoes.
"S"	32	do	780	256	9,800	50	8	6 tubes.
M-V	63	do	350	167	4,600	24	5	2 tubes.
M-IV	87	do	205	147	3,400	20	3	Do.

[1] The Russian submarine effort as delineated in "Jane's Fighting Ships, 1959-60," shows the Soviets to have the vessels shown above totaling 497 submarines of which over half are capable of extended operations at great distances from their home ports. Approximately 50 submarines are now under construction, all of which will be equipped with schnorkel and include the following classes: (1) Large long-range nuclear powered; (2) large high speed with guided missiles; (3) long-range patrol type (antishipping); (4) high-speed mine layers; (5) long-range, killer type subs (antisub HUK-type).

House Agriculture Committee Republicans Urge Action on Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing American agriculture today is the threat to our export markets in Western Europe. It is in this regard that I joined with my 13 Republican colleagues of the House Committee on Agriculture in urging the chairman of our committee to take some immediate steps to promote U.S. farm exports and to offer our complete cooperation on the minority side of the aisle in a unified effort in behalf of the American farmer. I therefore under unanimous consent include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter which the minority members of the House Agriculture Committee sent to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], this week, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1963.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned members of your committee, would like to take this opportunity to express our concern about current economic trends in the European Common Market and the discrimination against American agricultural exports and to offer our full cooperation in a unified committee effort to meet this serious challenge to our agricultural economy.

As you know, the full impact of the loss of substantial dollar markets for farm commodities in Western European markets goes far beyond the interest of the agricultural community alone and presents a serious threat to the Nation's balance-of-payments problem.

As the President pointed out in one of his recent budget messages to Congress, "During recent years this country has paid more abroad (for imports, investments, military expenditures, and other Government programs) than it has received from abroad (for exports, earnings on its investments, and repayments of loans)."

If American agricultural exports for dollars are materially diminished the result will be not only an aggravation of our balance-of-payments situation, but also a direct and immediate loss to American farmers who now raise 1 acre out of 7 for export markets.

It has of course been generally acknowledged by administration spokesmen and been extensively reported by the press that the restrictive and protectionist variable import fee tariff plan of the Common Market is already costing American poultry farmers a $50-million annual market in addition to shutting the door of opportunity for the development of new Western European poultry markets. Serious and immediate threats also exist for American wheat, feed grains, and certain fruits and vegetables, and there exist many ominous implications for the long-term growth of European markets for cotton, soybeans, tobacco, and a host of other U.S. farm commodities.

We therefore recommend that in order for American agriculture to hold and expand its markets in the Common Market (which in 1961 took 23 percent of the total U.S. exports to all destinations and accounted for 31 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports sold for dollars) that the Committee on Agriculture take these immediate steps:

First. Give this serious situation immediate and intensive study, starting with a thorough review of the developments which have led up to the present conditions.

Second. Keep a continuing account of these developments and trends, particularly in regard to the economic trade posture of Great Britain.

Third. Emphasize by committee resolution the urgent need for vigorous and effective agricultural representation not only on the President's Committee To Review Foreign Aid, but also and more importantly at the highest levels of tariff negotiations conducted by representatives of the United States and the European Economic Community.

Looking forward to your cooperation in this effort, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, PAUL B. DAGUE, PAGE BELCHER, CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, ALBERT H. QUIE, DON L. SHORT, CATHERINE MAY, DELBERT L. LATTA, RALPH HARVEY, PAUL FINDLEY, BOB DOLE, RALPH F. BEERMANN, BEN REIFEL.

The Return of the "Square"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, to preface the following remarks with concurrent comments of my own would be as futile as trying to gild the lily. It is enough to say that the message falls into that category of things I wish I had authored. It is from a speech by Charles H. Brower, president of the advertising firm of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc., as it appeared in the January issue of VFW, the monthly magazine of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Under unanimous consent, I insert the following speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE RETURN OF THE "SQUARE"

Back in Mark Twain's day, one of the finest words in our language was "square." You gave a man a square deal if you were honest. And you gave him a square meal when he was hungry. You stood foursquare for the right, as you saw it, and square against everything else. When you got out of debt, you were square with the world. And that was when you could look your fellow man square in the eye.

Then a lot of strange characters got hold of this honest, wholesome word, bent it all out of shape and gave it back to our children. Convicts gave it the first twist. To them a square was an inmate who would not conform to the convict code. From the prisons it was flashed across the country on the marihuana circuit of the bopsters and hipsters. Now everyone knows what a square is. He is the man who never learned to get away with wrongdoing. A Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to. A guy who gets his kicks from trying to do something better than anyone else can. A boob who gets so lost in his work that he has to be reminded to go home. A fellow who laughs with his belly instead of his upper lip. A slob who still gets choked up when the band plays "America the Beautiful."

His tribe isn't thriving too well in the current climate. He doesn't fit too neatly into the current group of angle players, corner cutters, sharpshooters and goof-offs. He doesn't believe in opening all the packages before Christmas. He doesn't want to fly now and pay later. He's burdened down with old-fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage and thrift. And he may already be on his way to extinction.

He and all the rest of us are living in a country today that is quite different from the one that we were taught to love. Parents have successfully defended in court their children's right to ignore the flag salute. Faculties and student bodies have found it distasteful to publicly take an oath of loyalty to their country. And the U.S. Military Academy has found it necessary to place a sign beside its parade grounds at West Point reminding spectators that it is customary for men to remove their hats at the passing of the banner that was once unashamedly referred to as "Old Glory."

What has happened? I think we have changed from an exporting country to an importing country.

I do not mean that we have let the world drain all of our gold away, although that is bad enough. I do not mean any imbalance of trade, as threatening as that may be. I mean that we have been importing, instead of exporting, ideas.

The United States of America was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world had ever known. We created and sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility and freedom. We created and sold the idea of government of the people, by the people and for the people—an idea that is still being bought today. We exported the idea of freedom of worship * * * the idea of an unfettered press * * * the idea that those who are taxed should be represented. * * *

It is hard to find a basic idea that America has recently exported. We have bought in the bazaars of Asia Minor the idea that an honest man is either a fool or a liar. From our most mortal enemy we have bought the idea of a strong government for weak people. We have bought abroad the ideas of "Let George do it"—or "What's in it for me?"—and the gesture of the neatly shrugged shoulder.

But, most significant of all, most of us have been gullible patrons of the export firm of Sigmund Freud, who has sold us the idea that all men are born feeble, that we should abandon our ancient disciplines as too stark for the poor souls that we are, and seek our salvation through group support. Freud's discovery that man was not adjusted to his world, and could never be truly adjusted, seemingly justified the lazy cynic and condemned the square. For if you can't win, what is the use of trying? And here was the first great authority who said, You cannot win.

This country was discovered, put together, fought for, and saved by squares. It is easy to prove that Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and almost anyone else you care to include among our national heroes, were squares. This can be proven by simply thinking what they might have said had they not been squares.

Nathan Hale: Me spy on those British. Are you trying to be funny? Do you know what they do with the spies they catch? I'll give you a news flash, chum. They hang them.

Paul Revere: What do you mean—me ride through every Middlesex village and town? And in the middle of the night, yet. Why pick on me? Am I the only man in Boston with a horse?

Patrick Henry: Sure, I'm for liberty. First, last, and always. But we've got to be a little realistic. We're a pretty small outfit. If we start pushing the British around someone is going to get hurt.

George Washington: Gentlemen, I am honored. But I do wish you would try someone else. Let's say, General Gates. I'm just getting things organized at Mount Vernon.

Benjamin Franklin: Who we really need, for Ambassador to France, is a young man. I'm 70 years old. It's time a new generation took over.

It is perhaps a significant fact that what such men actually did say has been quietly sneaked out of our schoolbooks. This Week magazine made a survey recently of school history books issued before 1920, compared with those issued since. That Nathan Hale said, "I regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," was in 11 of the old texts, and only 1 of the new texts.

Patrick Henry was quoted: "Give me liberty or give me death," in 12 of 14 earlier texts, and in only 2 of 45 more recently published ones.

But John Paul Jones set the record. His once famous reply to a British demand for surrender: "I have not yet begun to fight."—is in nine of the old books, and in none of the new ones.

Maybe cutting down a cherry tree is a square thing to do, and maybe throwing a dollar across the Rappahannock River is a waste of money rather than a test of strength, and maybe nobody stands up in boats anymore (especially in midwinter), but there are lessons to be learned in all of these acts by George Washington and schoolbooks are for learning.

Maybe aggressive and nationalistic statements by our country's early heroes have gone the way of contact games and sports. They have been largely abandoned on our school grounds. Maybe the educators thought our children would be more interested in Peter Rabbit, who goes hippety-hop.

Or maybe it is just because our national heroes, and their ideas, are square.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower was President, he appointed a Committee on National Goals to decide where we were all going. Perhaps a first step should be a commission on national heritage, to make sure that some of us at least remember where we have been.

Arnold Toynbee, the famous historian, says, that of 21 notable civilizations, 19 perished, not from external conquest, but from the evaporation of belief within.

Today, our country still has a choice. I believe it has already begun to make that choice. I believe it is going back to its old beliefs in such things as ideals, pride, patriotism, loyalty, devotion, and even hard work.

We have a whole new set of heroes. Their names are Glenn and Grissom, Shepard, Carpenter, Cooper and Schirra. They are named Crews, Bock and Twinting; Smith, Sorlie and McIntosh; Knolle and Hoover. The towns they came from have nice, small town names, like Sparta, Boulder, East Derry, Mitchell, Shawnee and Brownwood.

These lads apparently lived too far from the big city and grew up to be squares. For who but a square would volunteer his life for his country's good?

They are not even ashamed of their feelings.

John Glenn says he gets a tingling feeling down inside when he sees the flag go by. Imagine that.

He is proud of his small town and proud of his small college. He is proud that he belonged to the Boy Scouts and the YMCA.

I hope that some of him rubs off on the next generation.

The forces of conformity are still strong. Too many of us are still sitting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and dare to be square. Because the opposite of square is round, and being round is so much simpler. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy. And we can just roll down the path without any bumps, being careful to stay in the middle, because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

How shall we fight for personal independence? How shall we avoid the group poop; the vortex of mediocrity; the great nothingness of cynical sophistication and bored nonparticipation?

I suggest that we all joint the S.O.S. The S.O.S. is the Society of Squares. It doesn't exist, but it could. Not a leftwing organization. Not a rightwing organization. Just an organization with wings.

We might have to go underground for awhile to avoid being trampled to death by the coast-to-coast, rat-packs of cynical saboteurs and the canned-wit commando whose devotion is to destruction.

But we would come out.

We might even have a secret handshake—grabbing the other guy's hand as though we really meant it, and looking him squarely in the eye.

We would be for participation and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication, for laughter and against snigering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for the honest way and against the easy shortcut, for a well-done job and against the goof-offs, for education and against the tearing down of ideals.

We have, at least, the satisfaction of knowing that our problem is not new.

When Benjamin Franklin was told that the war for independence was over, he said: "Say, rather the war of the revolution is over—the war for independence has yet to be fought."

And today—179 years later—this war has still to be fought.

The FBI Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to submit an editorial which appeared in the January 3, 1963, News-Press, of St. Joseph, Mo., concerning the FBI's annual report. If the efficiency of J. Edgar Hoover and his Bureau would be emulated by other agencies of the Federal Government, our problems would greatly diminish.

The editorial follows:

THE FBI REPORT

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has presented his annual year-end report to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. The statistics show that in FBI operations last year marked increases were recorded in all major categories of FBI accomplishment.

There were more than 12,700 convictions in FBI cases compared with 12,418 the previous year. The apprehension of some 11,400 FBI fugitives topped last year's 10,668. Fines, savings and recoveries totaled well over $200 million compared with $148,421,690 in 1961. The sum far exceeds the amount of money spent to operate the FBI during 1962.

Director J. Edgar Hoover cited the steep increase in violations of the Federal bank robbery and incidental crimes statute. Last year saw a 25-percent increase over the number committed in 1961. One of the FBI's notable achievements in 1962 was the smashing of an international narcotics ring. The seizure of illicit drugs at that time brought in a cache of more than $20 million.

In presenting a résumé of the FBI's past year's work, Mr. Hoover expressed appreciation for the assistance accorded the FBI by other law enforcement agencies. And this is a compliment that well could be turned around. Law enforcement officers, including Police Chief Edward C. Burke's men here in St. Joseph, always have high praise for the wonderful cooperation given to them when the FBI is called in to help on a case.

We are truly proud of the FBI and its law enforcement activities. It is a credit to our Nation and credit for this goes to its Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover.

James Patrick McGrannery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of the Honorable James Patrick McGrannery has removed from the Washington scene one of the finest gentlemen that ever served his God and country.

Judge McGrannery was a personal friend with whom I had the great privilege of serving with in this distinguished body, the House of Representatives, as well as on our State Democratic Committee of Pennsylvania.

Judge McGrannery was a humble man, always interested in helping others, regardless of his or her social standing in a community.

Much of his time had been spent in the service of his church. Repeatedly he was recognized by the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church including two pontiffs, Pope John XXIII and Pope Pius XII.

After he served in the House of Representatives, from the 75th through to the 78th Congresses, Judge McGrannery became an Assistant Attorney General of the United States. He later served as a Federal district judge and still later as the Attorney General of the United States during President Truman's administration. For the past 8 years, until the time of his death, Judge McGrannery maintained a general practice of law here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, here was a great man, James Patrick McGrannery, who served his fellow man and served him until his death. I join other Members in heartfelt condolences to his family and pray that God will comfort his wife and children in their loss as only He can do.

George Maurer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, we embark on a new session of Congress without a familiar voice to intone our names on roll calls, or to read the contents of the bills brought to the floor.

Since adjournment of the preceding Congress, death has taken from our midst George Maurer, whom all of us regarded as a close friend aside from being a highly competent reading clerk in this great body.

George's sudden death indeed was a shock to all of his friends around the Capitol, but possibly the blow was a bit more severe to me as he had been a resident of my hometown and there naturally were close personal ties.

George came to Washington with his wife and two small children, leaving employment as a stenographer and bookkeeper in his hometown to become a Government employee.

He served for a time at the Library of Congress and later was assigned as a clerk in the office of the late Speaker Bankhead.

While working at the Capitol, George attended George Washington University and there received both his bachelor's degree and doctor of laws. It was a protracted and weary road George took to achieve the goal that was reached May 28, 1952, when he received his doctorate of laws degree.

While sandwiching in his law studies after working hours, George continued to move forward here in the House of Representatives.

To improve as a reading clerk, George attended special voice training classes. He was a perfectionist in every sense of the word.

His death prompted Geoffrey Gould, Associated Press reporter, to write:

The voice of the House of Representatives for nearly 20 years is gone.

The death of George Maurer, 56, senior reading clerk of the House, left a gap that may not be filled for a long time, at least not with such an authoritative and melodious voice as his.

Maurer died in Westfield, N.J., Friday night while making arrangements for his mother's funeral.

The voice of George Maurer was the voice remembered by the average visitor to Congress.

It was deep and penetrating. One oldtimer who predated the present microphone system in the House said Maurer could be heard just about as clearly before electronics as after.

Maurer developed a flair and style that others complimented by copying. He could call the roll of the House—435 names—faster than anyone who had gone before him, completing the chore in less than 20 minutes, then swinging into a second call for those who didn't answer the first time.

As each Member voted, Maurer repeated either "aye" or "no" and his way of intoning "Noooo" became a byword in the House galleries. He could hold the note as long as necessary to let the tally clerks catch up.

A dialy ritual at the beginning of each session of the House is the reading of the Journal, a brief summary of the previous day's session.

As Members milled about and a hum of talk filled the Chamber, Maurer would read the Journal and then serve notice that things were about to get started by a little trick at the end.

The Journal always ends with the words, "And then, at such and such o'clock, the House adjourned." Maurer always leaned into the words "and then" with such emphasis and loving enunciation that it served as a signal.

Maurer was noted for the lightning speed with which he could plough through a 90-page bill, reading only a few words from each section, but so smoothly that a casual listener would think he was hearing every word.

Since he became a reading clerk in 1943, his associates never heard him stumble. "He was a perfectionist," said one. "He was like a machine that never made a mistake," said another.

But the reading clerk's job is more than mechanical proficiency at reading. He must have a deep knowledge of parliamentary procedure, and he must know the face of every Member instantly.

Maurer spent long hours before each new session of Congress poring over photographs of new Members, and often was the first House official to greet the new arrivals by name.

Another associate recalls that Maurer had an uncanny knack for identifying persons by their voices. As he bent over his rollcalls, he could place without fail a muffled shout from the back of the Chamber.

Maurer read state of the Union messages to joint sessions of Congress for three Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower. President Kennedy read his own first messages to Congress.

I extend to his lovely wife and his two fine daughters my deepest sympathy. Husband and father, George was an extraordinary man, a man of great brilliance, but more than anything else, a deeply religious person.

Ozark National Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on Monday, January 14, my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, and I joined in the introduction of S. 16 to establish the Ozark National Rivers. This proposal would bring under the control of the National Park Service 94,000 acres of rare natural beauty. The area would extend along 100 miles of the Current River and 39 miles of the Jack's Fork River.

For the sake of our children and our children's children, the Congress must act quickly to insure the preservation of the wooded beauty of this Missouri area with its springs and free-flowing streams.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials recently published in the Columbia Tribune and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch relating to this bill be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (Mo.) Tribune, Jan. 14, 1963]

TO PRESERVE OZARK BEAUTY

It is to be hoped that Missouri's two U.S. Senators, STUART SYMINGTON and EDWARD LONG, and central Missouri's Congressman, RICHARD ICHORD, have struck upon a feasible plan in the legislation which they are scheduled to introduce in the Congress today for preserving the native beauty of a considerable Ozark area along the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. If their compromise of the controversy over the project, which now leaves out parts of the Jack's Fork River in Howell County, the lower part of the Current River in Ripley County, and the Eleven Point River in Oregon County, but includes the Jack's Fork and Current in Carter, Shannon, Dent and Texas Counties, succeeds, they will have saved for posterity a sizeable area of Ozark beauty. The project would include 100 miles of the Current and 39 miles of the Jack's Fork and 94,000 acres bordering the two streams.

The legislators worked out the compromise, which includes a change in the proposed name to "Ozark National Rivers" and if approved it will be the first of several national scenic regions envisaged by the Park Service. The new plan provides for easements rather than purchases, which would make it possible for present owners in the area to keep their property while at the same time retaining the natural beauty of the Ozarks.

The project seems to be an important step in saving nature's beauty from the inroads of commercialization which could range from honky-tonks to high level dams and include ruthless destruction of its forest areas. Missouri, for all of its natural resources, has lost much of the beauty of its forests, fields and streams to so-called progress. What we have left should, so far as possible, be preserved. When it is gone it will be too late to do anything about it.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 14, 1963]

FOR THE OZARK NATIONAL RIVERS

A rose by any other name still would sweeten the air, but that is no reason for being indifferent to the suitability of a name. So Senators SYMINGTON and LONG and Representative ICHORD get an extra clap of the hands for substituting "Ozark National Rivers" for "Ozark Rivers National Monument." The latter does have overtones of the firm, the fixed, the rocklike—not quite right for flowing streams.

The heavy applause, however, is for the reintroduction of legislation to preserve Missouri's scenic treasure. There is a bow, too, for the good work which has enhanced its prospects in Congress. Representative CURTIS gets credit for deference to the amenities which call for sponsorship of the bill by Mr. ICHORD, who represents the river country. Support by Mr. CURTIS would be logical since he wrote the original bill to entrust the area to the National Park Service, though he later sought to transfer it to the Forest Service. The new bill also recognizes his advocacy of scenic easements by making this device available to the Park Service.

A united stand by the Missouri delegation also is more likely due to the elimination of the area in the district of Representative JONES, who says his constituents oppose the project—contrary as this may be to their longrun interests.

All this comes within the bounds of practical political compromise. It is deplorable, however, that the 34-mile reach of the Eleven Point in Oregon County is excluded. Of all the rivers, this stream and its bank most nearly retain their wilderness beauty, and the adjacent land is sparsely populated. There should be long second thoughts about the Eleven Point.

Also helpful will be the enthusiasm of Interior Secretary Udall, who has jurisdiction over the Park Service. And Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has instructed the Forest Service, which is in his Department, to refrain from bureaucratic competition for the project. Productive as its multiple-use philosophy may be, it is not suited to these narrow strips of land. They call for management under the Park Service policy of preservation in the face of population pressure.

The Ozark rivers cannot be given back to the Indians. Nor can their increasing attraction for visitors be reversed. They cannot be contained in a barricaded refuge for the few. They must be guarded for the people, not against the people. Missouri Governors and legislators have recognized that this can be done by the Park Service. Surely Congress, persuaded by its Missouri Members, will issue the mandate.

Private Power Comparison Backfires—TVA Is National Asset; Skybolt a Dud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, a rather ridiculous comparison has been made in the Nashville Tennessean relating Tennessee Valley Authority and Skybolt. A thought-provoking propaganda game is once more being played; the pawns being used are public power and private power.

Again the offender has proven its inability to compete. In the immediate editorial I would like to call to your attention the ludicrous collation:

PRIVATE POWER COMPARISON BACKFIRES—TVA IS NATIONAL ASSET; SKYBOLT A DUD

The private power interests have renewed their age-old attacks on public power, using their unlimited cash resources to manufacture phony charges and circulate uninformed criticism. As usual, the propaganda peddlers have singled out the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Year after year TVA continues to serve its customers, neither feeling the need nor having the funds to engage in propaganda warfare with rich private power. But this time the antipublic power crusade has backfired demonstrating the low level to which its promoters are willing to stoop.

In current issues of national magazines a full page color advertisement appears showing missiles on the wing of a bomber. The accompanying text reads:

"When Skybolt rides a bomber your tax dollars buy defense, but when your tax money is used to build more Federal-Government-owned electrical plants and transmission lines it is spent needlessly."

This obviously was to have been the mighty opening gun in a winter offensive against public power. It also represents a little flag waving and a degree of false patriotism on the part of private power interests.

It is a wrench of logic to compare a resource development program with a missile project, but the tricksters employed by the wealthy power corporations didn't hesitate to invent a comparison, pitting the value of Skybolt against the value of TVA.

Therefore, let the real values speak for themselves. Skybolt was a flop. Obviously it did not represent a good investment of tax dollars. The administration wisely canceled Skybolt after many unsuccessful tests, concluding that any future outlays of funds would be spent needlessly.

The Government during two administrations already had poured $353 million into Skybolt.

It is ironic that since its beginning in 1933 TVA has returned to the Treasury of the Federal Government $348 million from power revenues and $42 million from nonpower revenues. This total of $390 million is enough to have paid for the now impractical Skybolt with $37 million left over for some worthwhile defense project.

This $390 million, incidentally, does not include payments of $190,500,000 TVA has paid in lieu of city, county, and State taxes during its lifetime.

Interesting too is the fact that the Skybolt development project calls for a thousand missiles for the Air Force and another 100 for Great Britain—at an estimated total cost of $2.5 billion.

Again ironic, since the effort to compare missiles and resource development has been made, is the fact that during the 30-year history of TVA, appropriated funds for all valley projects—dams for navigation, dams for flood control, power itself, experimentation, fertilizer production and the rest—amounted to $2.5 billion, or precisely the amount estimated necessary to make Skybolt operational.

Even these figures ignore many other facts about TVA: Resource development creates a climate favorable to industry. This means more jobs and more productivity for the area affected. It brings about general growth and added revenue to State and local governments as well as to the Federal Government. In addition, atomic energy plants and other Federal defense agencies use electricity from TVA at a special reduced rate, saving taxpayers millions of dollars each year—$50 million last year alone.

If the power interests want to make comparisons they should take note that the savings the Federal Government has realized from this reduced rate during the last 9 years have amounted to enough money to have built the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, or more than all the funds spent thus far on Skybolt.

The reason private power interests launched these bitter and frequently uninformed blasts at TVA is because TVA rates force them to hold their own electric power prices down. Millions of electricity users elsewhere in the country are paying lower electric rates because of TVA's "yardstick" policy.

Surveys show that residential electric rates grow progressively higher as the distance from TVA increases.

Yet private power blithely asserts "when Skybolt rides a bomber, your tax dollars buy defense, but * * *."

The truth is that Skybolt was a skyburst and the private power interests, not realizing it, fell into their own pit of quicksand.

From the beginning, the people of the Tennessee Valley have seen through the gross huckstering and stupid misstatements of fact of the rich utility corporations. Now perhaps others will recognize the brainwashing tactics for what they are—hogwash.

Ukrainians and Their Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1963, marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. The history of the Ukrainian people in modern times is the story of a large group of gifted, gallant and industrious people ceaselessly struggling for their inalienable birthright, their freedom and independence. These hardworking and tenacious folk of the fertile steppe land in Eastern Europe tilled their bountiful farmlands for centuries, and enjoyed the fruits of their labor in full freedom when they were masters of their destiny.

After enduring the czarist autocracy for some 2½ centuries, they witnessed the birth of the independent Ukrainian National Republic early in 1918. January 22 of that year, the birthday of that Republic, was just as momentous in the history of the Ukrainian people as was the 21st of November of 1920, when the Red Army overran the country and ruthlessly put an end to the Ukrainian National Republic.

The last tragic event took place 42 years ago, and since then these devotees of freedom and liberty, these dauntless and daring fighters for their national independence, these tough and tenacious toilers of their fair and fertile homeland have not known freedom. They have been fated since then to suffer under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Misery and misfortune, oppression and endless suffering have been the lot of these helpless and innocent Ukrainians for centuries. Long before the rise of czarist Russia, they had suffered under Asiatic invaders, and their country was ravaged by these hordes, but when the wave of these invaders receded late in the Middle Ages, the Ukrainians had managed to recoup some of their losses, had succeeded in rebuilding their ravaged homeland, had real hope of enjoying some peace.

In 1918, after attaining their national goal, when they were about to embark upon the task of creating anew a free and independent life in their homeland, their hopes and their dreams were shattered by the aggressive and oppressive policy of the Soviet Union. Today these people, living in one of the most fertile parts in Eastern Europe, are denied their most cherished birthright, the freedom to live according to their wishes and to work for their own welfare in their historic homeland.

It is paradoxical and tragic that some 45 million Ukrainians, brave and courageous fighters as they are, have been forced to submit to the ruthless regime of ungodly Communists for so long in their homeland. But in this age of paradoxes, full as it is with human tragedy, the unhappy Ukrainians, unarmed,

helpless, and living in constant terror of the agents of the Kremlin, are unable to cope effectively with the massive might of the Soviet Union Government. That is a sad legacy of our age.

In observing the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukrainians, this event will also serve as an excellent occasion to urge the formation of a desperately needed Special House Committee on Captive Nations in the 88th Congress. Such a committee—in stature and purpose appropriate to the scope and value of all the captive nations—would strongly symbolize to the world the determination of the American people never to forget the captive nations and their struggle for liberation and independence.

Shameless Extraction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that the Kennedy administration and its lackeys could remain silent and unconcerned about the coercive tactics that were used in the shameless extraction of funds from career Federal employees for the Democratic Party's political coffers.

As of this date it is clear that neither President Kennedy nor his brother, the Attorney General, who ostensibly is in charge of the Department of Justice, is interested in ascertaining whether this brazen fund-raising drive is in violation of the Hatch Act, the Corrupt Practices Act, and destructive of the civil service system.

The silence of almost all Federal employee organization leaders is also incredible.

The apparent attitude is that "the King can do no wrong."

In the Washington Evening Star of January 18, 1963, are two excellent articles on this subject. One is from the column, "The Federal Spotlight," written by Mr. Joseph Young, who daily covers the field concerning Federal employee activity in the Nation's Capital, and the other is an editorial entitled "Down the Hatch."

I submit both for printing in the RECORD:

EMPLOYEE GROUPS' SILENCE VIEWED AS STRANGE IN $100 TICKET PRESSURE

(By Joseph Young)

Perhaps the strangest aspect of the entire spectacle of unashamed Democratic pressure on Government career employees to attend tonight's $100-a-ticket gala is the complete silence of Government employee unions and the National Civil Service League on the matter.

Not a peep has been heard from any of the major unions or the nonpartisan league, which came into being 80 years ago to uphold the merit system, since this reporter and the Star on December 6 first disclosed the pressure on career employees to purchase the $100 tickets.

The employee leaders appear too intent on such unattainable pie-in-the-sky objectives as a 35-hour work week, etc., to bother with the unprecedented pressure on career employees by the Democratic National Committee and officials of the Kennedy administration. Only the recently formed National Society of Federal Engineers, Scientists, and Allied Professionals have criticized the goings-on.

The unions' excuse is that not many career employees in the upper-middle and top grades are members of their organizations, and hence they don't want to get into the fray. The long-range adverse implications on the merit system seem to escape them.

The silence of the National Civil Service League is even more puzzling. The main purpose of the nonpartisan business-supported league is ostensibly to protect and support the merit system.

The failure of Government employee unions to protest the situation may stem from the close relationship the groups have with the Kennedy administration, and their reluctance to do anything to endanger this alliance. Under President Kennedy, the unions have won formal bargaining rights, pay adjustments, support for a union dues checkoff, etc.

Another reason may be the unionists' indifference to groups of career employees who generally aren't found in their memberships.

This could be very shortsighted on the part of the unions.

The Kennedy administration won't last forever, and the next administration—if it is Republican—isn't likely to forget how the unions backed the Democrats by their silence.

This year's pressure was put on grade 12 and above career employees. Next year the pressure could be put on employees in grade 9 and above, and on even lower grade employees in the years ahead. The Kennedy administration is not bashful in telling employees it is responsible for their latest pay raise and the upcoming one next year, and probably doesn't have many qualms in "selling" $100 tickets to as many career employees as the traffic will bear.

As for the Civil Service Commission's silence until now on the situation, this is rather understandable. CSC officials privately are most unhappy over the situation. But there are only two men in Government who could have done something to stop it—President Kennedy and his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who could have ordered such practices stopped on threat of Justice Department prosecution under the Corrupt Practices Act. Under the circumstances, the CSC could do little but remain silent.

Meanwhile, the performers at tonight's gala—stellar stars though some of them may be—will have to be extra good to get any kind of ovation from the many Federal career employees who have reluctantly shelled out their $100 to attend. And without Frank Sinatra yet.

DOWN THE HATCH

An undetermined number of unhappy civil service workers having put up $100 for the greater glory of the Democratic Party, will toss down a drink or two tonight as guests of their bosses.

The Civil Service Commission, with no pun intended, says that it cannot treat this thinly disguised form of coercion as a violation of the Hatch Act unless it receives complaints from Government workers. We would rather doubt that any worker who has sense enough to find his way in and out of the building is going to be foolish enough to file such a formal complaint. So this throws the whole shabby business back into the realm of the Corrupt Practices Act, which is enforced by the Department of Justice, not by the CSC. Of course, one may always be mistaken in a judgment. But it is our guess that no Justice Department bloodhounds will be sent off on the trail of Democrats who have resorted to this device to raise funds for other Democrats. And if our estimates in this respect should be erroneous, we are willing to bet Robert Kennedy a $100 dinner that any bloodhounds unleashed in this cause will not be young and eager, but, rather, will be of that variety which is old, tired, and quite ready to call it a day.

All of this has prompted some Republicans to rise up in righteous wrath, a circumstance which, we think, should be put in some perspective. In former administrations, both Republican and Democratic, there has been a certain prodding of the Federal worker to kick into the party coffers. But nothing in the past has rivaled the brazenness or the scope of what the New Frontiersmen have been doing. As our "Federal Spotlight" reporter, Joe Young, puts it when speaking informally: "The civil service worker is damned if he doesn't, because his promotion prospects may be adversely affected. And, should the Republicans come in, he is damned if he does, because his new GOP bosses are not apt to look with understanding and tolerance on the fact that he tossed a hundred bucks into the Democratic war chest."

By tomorrow this affair will be over and done with. But the bad smell will linger on. People who make a career of working for the Government ought not to have their shins kicked or their arms twisted to force them to put their money on the line. Nor should they be subjected to the slightly more subtle pressure of not having a drink with the boss unless they pony up.

The Kennedy administration speaks in noble terms to the American people of virtue, dedication, high purpose, etc. If the President, by chance, doesn't know what has been going on recently, he ought to take time out for a closer look.

Teachers' Salaries for 1962–63

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., was recently the author of "Survey of Teachers' Salaries, September 1, 1962." He wrote a summary for the American Teacher, which was published this month under the title "Teachers' Salaries for 1962–63." Because of the great national interest in salaries of teachers and programs for further improvement of same, under unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Dr. Reuter's summary:

TEACHERS' SALARIES FOR 1962–63

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director American Federation of Teachers)

INTRODUCTION

The study this year of teachers' salaries includes 853 districts and 4 territories, or a total of 857. Of the 853 districts of the United States, 233 are in the Northeastern States, 381 in the Central States, 106 in the Southern States and 133 in the Western States. The four territories included are Puerto Rico, Guam, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.

TABLE I.—*National averages*

	1961	1962
Bachelor's	$4,328-$6,228	$4,428-$6,468
Master's	4,567- 6,819	4,730- 7,083
Master's plus year	4,839- 7,256	5,135- 7,724
Doctorate	5,124- 7,887	5,366- 8,126

Salaries have increased on an average throughout the Nation during the past year. The average salary of all types of public school teachers, ranging from the bachelor's degree through the doctorate, is currently $6,133, with the average bachelor's salary of $5,448, which includes all teachers in the bachelor's area. Using the same measurement for the master's it is $5,907; for one year beyond the master's, $6,430; and the doctorate, $6,746.

Table I shows the complete breakdown for 1961 and 1962. Fairbanks, Alaska, has the highest beginning salary in the United States, which is $6,780, and the lowest is Anniston, Ala., with $3,100. For the master's degree Fairbanks, Alaska, leads again with a beginning salary of $7,340 and the lowest is Columbia, S.C., at $3,336.

MAJOR CITIES

Thirty-four major cities with a population ranging from 401,500 to 7,781,984 are considered separately. Also, Phoenix, Ariz., is divided into two parts, as they have separate elementary and secondary schools with varying salaries.

TABLE II.—*Major cities*

	1961	1962
Bachelor's	$4,509-$7,176	$4,753-$7,404
Master's	4,953- 7,659	4,997- 7,928
Master's plus year	5,186- 8,285	5,396- 8,456
Doctorate	5,274- 8,309	5,560- 8,888

Table II shows an increase in average salaries in all categories for 1962. This is true for each beginning salary as well as each ceiling. New Orleans, La., is the low city for the beginning bachelor's salary, which is $3,600 and Chicago, Ill., is the high city in this category with $5,350.

REGIONAL SUMMARIES

The Western States lead the Nation in regional averages. This section is composed of 13 States. The central region, which is composed of 12 States, is in second place, and the northeastern region, which is composed of 9 States, is in third place. This leaves the southern region, which is composed of 16 States and the District of Columbia in the lowest category. Table III shows the regional breakdown for beginning salaries.

The highest State average for a beginning teacher with a bachelor's degree is Alaska, which is $6,456. This is an improvement of $259 over 1961. The lowest average is Alabama with $3,344, which is $103 higher than last year.

TABLE III.—*Regional averages*

	1961	1962
Northeastern States:		
Bachelor's	$4,181	$4,337
Master's	4,455	4,634
Master's plus year	4,733	5,027
Doctorate	5,015	5,385
Central States:		
Bachelor's	4,399	4,592
Master's	4,734	4,913
Master's plus year	5,031	5,191
Doctorate	5,408	5,504
Southern States:		
Bachelor's	3,848	3,986
Master's	4,168	4,298
Master's plus year	4,581	4,962
Doctorate	4,866	5,057
Western States:		
Bachelor's	4,582	4,698
Master's	4,913	5,074
Master's plus year	5,009	5,365
Doctorate	5,205	5,518

TABLE IV.—*Average gains of States*

Alabama	$108
Alaska	259
Arizona	139
Arkansas	8
California	73
Colorado	145
Connecticut	198
Delaware	200
Florida	134
Georgia	61
Idaho	31
Illinois	210
Indiana	108
Iowa	342
Kansas	108
Kentucky	272
Louisiana	100
Maine	105
Maryland	210
Massachusetts	143
Michigan	106
Minnesota	173
Mississippi	13
Missouri	561
Montana	205
Nebraska	258
Nevada	67
New Hampshire	67
New Jersey	157
New Mexico	227
New York	277
North Carolina	38
North Dakota	75
Ohio	165
Oklahoma	240
Oregon	166
Pennsylvania	125
Rhode Island	156
South Carolina	617
South Dakota	40
Tennessee	179
Texas	65
Utah	23
Vermont	175
Virginia	106
Washington	113
West Virginia	59
Wisconsin	162
Wyoming	57

Table IV shows the breakdown of the 50 States concerning improvement over 1961. The average increase is $156. The State with the highest increase over last year is South Carolina with $617, but the State average is still only $3,433. At the other extreme, Hawaii was the only State reporting no change, which keeps the average salary at $4,020.

OTHER FEATURES

The new edition of the "Survey of Teachers Salaries" includes a summary of a recent study by past American Federation of Teachers vice president, Charles E. Boyer. Mr. Boyer's complete study is entitled "Report of the School Fiscal Survey in Major Cities," and was done for the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers. This feature is cited so that various locals of the American Federation of Teachers can more nearly determine how the tax dollar is spent.

The second feature includes a breakdown of the major educational foundations by States for the year 1960, which includes the latest data available. It shows a total net worth of $9,810,467,852. This feature is cited as a possible source for securing additional finance for public education.

The third feature is entitled "Points for Discussion," and is a quotation from data prepared from the American Federation of Teachers workshop in Connecticut. This feature is cited so that the best possible presentation can be made of the salary issue.

Finally, the minimum wage laws for certified teachers, by States, are included again this year.

Your Money and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues the reading of two editorials from the January 15, 1963, edition of the Salinas Californian discussing fiscal policy. Particular attention should be paid to the final outcome of deficit financing. So-called benefits to our citizens which are purchased with deficit dollars actually cost us more by reducing the present value of our money. Those hardest hit are our older citizens living on pensions and fixed retirement incomes who generally are not in a position to bargain for a larger income.

Placed in proper prospective, Government spending programs may not be quite so alluring.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorials, as follows:

AT LAST J.F.K. RECOGNIZES SPENDING

Although he still has a long ways to go, President Kennedy yesterday finally made a tax cut proposal which recognized, at least on the domestic side, that spending is related to revenue trimming.

Although increased spending for defense, space, and interest on the national debt will mean an increase in total Government spending next year, the President has called for a cut of all other Federal outlays. The latter fact, though not decreasing the total picture, unless Congress acts itself, is heartening in the battle to make fiscal responsibility out of overspending.

No interested person, except possibly a welfare-stater, can be displeased with the President's stated intention of budgeting less spending, for domestic programs for the next fiscal year. Such a plan long has been sought by groups interested in the fiscal condition of the U.S. domestic spending, not defense spending, contrary to popular belief, in recent years has been the inflationary factor via its leapfrog increases.

Defense spending, actually, hasn't risen at the same rate as domestic. In fiscal 1954, military and related national defense items cost $46.9 billion. Seven years later, in fiscal 1961, military and related defense items cost $47.3 billion, up only $500 million. For the period, all other items of Government rose $16.2 billion.

It is this 80 percent hike in nonnational defense costs in 8 years that most smart-thinking citizens have been shooting at. We are pleased the Government, and particularly the President, has recognized this economic fact of life. And, if through some Merlin-like power, we can lop off some defense and space costs, we don't even want to talk about the interest on the debt, through superior administration and voidance of duplication, we really will have begun to solve the plague of deficit financing and fiscal irresponsibility.

WHERE THE MONEY'S COMING FROM

The pattern is clear. From the power centers of Washington, D.C., and Sacramento, Calif., the word is that taxes are going to be lowered, not raised, and that Government expenditures are going to be raised, not lowered.

Both President and Governor are offering a variety of new spending programs. The

President proposes to finance his by cutting the income tax; the Governor says he will honor his "no new tax" campaign pledge and that something must be done to relieve the property taxpayer.

In this Alice in Wonderland atmosphere, there are a few voices of commonsense to be heard, to be sure. Democratic State Senator George Miller, for example, asks: "It's nice to make local property tax payers happy but where are we going to get the money?"

If the past is prolog to the future, the answer isn't too hard to discern. We'll get the money by cheapening the value of what we already have, by a new round of inflation by dipping in the pockets of pensioners, widows living on annuities, and old-fashioned frugal folks who try to save for their old age.

Time for Sober Reflection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of our economic status, whether we are a lowly wage earner or whether we are shareholders of a large corporation, I feel all of us should soberly reflect on the three messages which have been sent to Congress in the past 2 weeks.

First, the President's state of the Union address, then his budget message, and finally Monday of this week his message on the economy of this great country.

As a newcomer to this illustrious body I must admit I have become somewhat befuddled. Likewise, I am sure, the senior Members of this 88th Congress must share with me some deep concern as well as considerable confusion.

We were led to believe in the state of the Union message that while the seas are not completely calm, by and large, we are on a safe course, and we shall be guided safely into port.

In his budget, incidentally, the largest ever proposed in time of peace—reaching the astronomical figure of $98.8 billion—his excellency proclaimed a vigorous Federal job economy program. Then, upon careful perusal I find a request for 36,500 more Government jobs. This, added to the 200,000 increase in Federal workers since the New Frontiersmen came into power, gives considerable cause for alarm.

The question may well be asked, has not the President proposed any cuts in Government jobs? In all honesty I must answer this question in the affirmative. He is asking an overall reduction of 30 jobs out of the Army's present 345,284 civilian employees. Big deal—instead of 345,284 employees there would be 345,254. Then I find the Agency for International Development is going to eliminate 48 jobs from 16,588—down to 16,540.

I merely point out these examples to call attention to the inconsistency of this administration's fiscal policy.

Most certainly the proposal for tax cuts is a noble purpose and I am sure all of us would like to see substantial cuts in our income tax. It is, however, difficult to reconcile a $13 billion tax reduction and at the same time increase our deficit by $12 billion.

It is my honest feeling that this program should be approached with honesty and candor, and if we propose substantial tax cuts, then like reductions should be made in Government expenditures.

I am afraid that under the program proposed by the President what we make on the popcorn we shall lose on the peanuts.

Federal Tax Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three editorials dealing with the current Federal tax problems facing the country:

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News]

AS THE YEAR BEGINS

There's always much for which we can be thankful as this new year begins and, as the old saying goes, things are never so bad that they couldn't be worse. But still, we can't very well avoid reminding ourselves, unless we choose to live in some kind of fool's paradise, that, financially speaking, the situation with the Federal Government is about as close as it can get to national bankruptcy without actually tumbling over the brink.

We're about $8 billion short of a balanced budget in the present fiscal year and the national debt is at a peacetime record high. And it's proper to point out once more that the interest we're paying annually on that debt is around $9 billion—a sum that would have covered the entire cost of the Federal Government not too many years ago.

But still, and aside from the big cost of national defense, we're continuing to spend increasingly huge amounts of tax money for a whole passel of welfare state domestic items, a few of which may seem desirable but all of which we could do very well without. But does this bother official Washington? No, sir, not in the least. On the contrary, the welfare staters are preparing a brandnew packet of goodies for congressional consideration when that august body opens its new session in a few days.

But for immediate consideration in the realm of the public purse, come what may, you're going to take a sizable pay cut with your first paycheck of the new year—your social security tax is going up.

Beginning today, for an employee, the social security tax in 1963 goes up from 3⅛ to 3⅝ percent on the first $4,800 of salary or wages. That is matched by the employer. This means that the total increase is a full percent. Thus, the maximum tax in a year rises from $150 to $174 each for employee and employer. That's an increase of 16 percent.

There's a similar increase in the tax on the first $4,800 of earnings of a selfemployed person. The rate rises from 4.7 to 5.4 percent. Thus the maximum tax increases by nearly 15 percent—from $225.60 to $259.20.

The increase effective with the first paycheck in January, is the ninth since the social security program was adopted, and two more increases are scheduled even if the law is left as it is. The rate on employer and on employee is due to rise to 4⅛ in 1966 and to 4⅝ percent in 1968. The rate for a selfemployed person will go to 6.2 percent in 1966 and to 6.9 perecnt in 1968.

But just keep in mind that any increases in benefits, of course, would require rate increases beyond those now scheduled. And the proposal to provide hospital care for the aged under social security, which was defeated by Congress last summer but which will come up again this year, would hike the rate on employee and employer by one-fourth of 1 percent and the rate on the selfemployed by four-tenths of 1 percent—just at the beginning. And it also would have applied the entire tax on the first $5,200 of earnings instead of $4,800.

Now we don't want to make you feel bad on the first day of the year. But it's a mighty good thing to have your feet on the ground at the beginning of anything. You might even want to let your Congressman (RALPH HARVEY) and your two Senators (VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, Jr.) know how you feel about things. Congressman HARVEY can be reached at the House Office Building and Senators HARTKE and BAYH at the Senate Office Building, both at Washington, D.C.

HERLONG-BAKER BILL FOR TAX REDUCTION GAINS WIDE APPROVAL—CAN THE CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE COMMITTEE BLOCK CONSIDERATION?

One way of cutting taxes sure to come before House Ways and Means Committee at the 1963 session of Congress is a proposal for a progressive reduction in rates over a 5-year period. The idea has long been pressed and has the approval of leading business groups. Its most attractive form probably is the so-called Herlong-Baker bill.

Representative A. SYDNEY HERLONG, of Florida, and Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee, both are members of the Ways and Means Committee; BAKER is the second ranking Republican. Their plan is to reduce personal income tax rates from the prevailing 20 to 91 percent range to a range of 15 to 47 percent. For the first bracket, up to $2,000 of taxable income, the rate would drop 1 percentage point, from the present 20 percent, each year for 5 successive years. Similarly, the rates in higher brackets would be reduced progressively, with the maximum rate going from 92 to 47 percent.

At the same time, the 52 percent corporate tax rate would be reduced by 1 percentage point a year, reaching the 47 percent level at the end of 5 years. In previous years the Herlong-Baker bill also would have permitted faster depreciation of business capital investments, eased capital gains taxation for individuals, and reduced gift and estate tax rates.

The First National City Bank 3 years ago described Herlong-Baker as "forward looking" and observed: "The essential goal, upon which everyone should be able to agree, is to lighten the burden of taxation on the creation of income and wealth, to bake a bigger pie for all to share." Last year the bank's survey repeated this recommendation, calling the scheme "the most imaginative plan to reform personal income tax rates."

Two years ago the authors of the bill estimated that the tax cuts would amount to $17 billion over the 5-year period. They insisted that national production resulting from accelerated investment in plant and equipment and higher productivity would offset the tax cuts with new revenue.

President Kennedy in his appearance before the Economic Club in New York on December 24, repeated his pledge of last August of a substantial tax cut in 1963. In reply to a question which quoted, in part, rates similar to those of Herlong-Baker, he said: "I would suggest that details of the tax reduction should wait on the presentation to the Ways and Means Committee."

There's the rub, for Herlong-Baker or any other reduction this year. Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, made clear his opposition in a recent copyrighted interview: "I've been unable to conclude that the situation at the moment justifies a rate reduction alone, with the resulting increase in deficit * * * and the public debt."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 23, 1963]

CHALLENGE TO THE CITIZEN

We realize that many people are by now inured to heavy Government spending, but that is no excuse for anyone's shrugging off the new Federal budget. It is a challenge not only to Congress but to everyone who believes citizenship entails responsibilities.

That is so not only because of the towering spending of just under $100 billion and the promised deficit of nearly $12 billion. Such monstrosities a rich nation can perhaps tolerate for a time.

A budget is more than figures; as President Kennedy says, it is a plan for the conduct of the public business. And what the Nation may not be able to tolerate indefinitely is the philosophy behind the planning.

It is, to begin with, a philosophy of deliberate, planned deficits, not just for fiscal 1962, 1963, and 1964 but seemingly for always. The Secretary of the Treasury, presumably the guardian of the people's money, does not even think in terms of a balanced budget much before fiscal 1967, and that faint hope rests on nothing more than anticipation of some kind of super-boom in business.

In fact, the deficits could grow much worse with the greatest of ease. If the President were to get his tax cuts exactly as he wants them to apply in the 1964 period, and if business does not improve as he hopes, the planned deficit would almost automatically go to $15 billion or more. If a recession occurred, it would be likely to go to $20 billion or more.

In such circumstances there is every reason to believe that the Government prescription would be still bigger deficits. For nothing this Government has ever done suggests that it is aware of any answer to economic problems, whether of inflation or of economic growth, other than more spending and larger deficits.

As befits a philosophy of deficit, this is also a philosophy of waste. The Government, for a glaring example, promises to add billions to the military and space budgets. The Director of the Budget proclaims, as though it were a virtue, that these agencies got every nickel they asked for.

Such an attitude is a blank check for waste and hence weakness in areas vital to the national security. There is already appalling waste in these areas; in the considered opinion of experts who have studied the Pentagon, the only way to cut the waste, get the place under control and strengthen it is to slap a flat ceiling on defense spending and tell the military to start giving the taxpayer real value for his dollar.

But that is not the way of this Government, for its philosophy is also one of nonpriority, of everything for everybody all at once. Defense and space are privileged preserves, but so, it turns out, is the whole sprawling, messy, wasteful political-welfare-spending program. A Mack truck can be driven through the contention that these projects are being held back; the budget itself belies the claim.

Plainly it is directly up to Congress to begin getting the Government down to earth, and this budget is such a thoughtless hodgepodge that Congress may conceivably put its spending foot down. The chances of that happening will be immeasurably increased if the citizen at last finds his too-long-silent voice.

Kings Point: The Story of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted, under unanimous consent, to insert in the RECORD "The Story of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy," located at Kings Point, Nassau County, Long Island, N.Y.

This article, together with the accompanying pictures of the Academy and its campus, was published in the October issue of the magazine called the Compass, published by the Mobil Oil Co.

Those of us from Long Island are very proud of Kings Point, and the young men it has turned out for the U.S. merchant marine. The record is a splendid one, and I am sure all Members of Congress can feel proud that they have had a part in securing permanency for this great institution.

The article follows:

KINGS POINT: THE STORY OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

On the southern shore of Long Island Sound, not very far from the narrow neck that separates it from New York's East River, is Kings Point, locale of one of the United States famous service academies, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. Actually there are five Federal Academies—the others being West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force and Coast Guard Academies—all run by their respective services. Kings Point, on the other hand, is maintained by the U.S. Department of Commerce, under the direction of the Maritime Administration. The setting is superb—a 65-acre campus that slopes gently from a knoll to the waterfront where docks and blue water provide atmosphere and egress to the sea lanes of the world.

Kings Point, as the Academy is more familiarly known, can well trace its origin to a survey conducted in 1931 by the then National Conference on the Merchant Marine. The Conference polled America's maritime industry on the subject of officer training; the responses from more than 6,000 interested people indicated a definite need for such training and that a national system should be created to handle it. But those were depression times. Ships were laid up and many licensed people were on the beach scrambling for the bare necessities to survive.

For 5 years, the concept lay dormant. Then after final passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Federal Government provided the necessary funds that established the U.S. Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, March 15, 1938. The first young men who applied were sent to sea for their training. Then, a little later, temporary establishments were set up ashore. But war clouds were gathering and the need for an expanded Academy, fully equipped to handle the job of furnishing trained officers for American flag merchant vessels, became an absolute necessity.

Shortly after war broke out, the U.S. Government acquired the magnificent Walter P. Chrysler estate plus a few other choice properties on Kings Point and started building the Academy's physical plant. Construction was completed during the fall of 1943. The simultaneous creation of the entire physical structure, even though wartime built, provided a simple uniformity of design that is maintained to this day. The only architectural variation is the old Chrysler mansion. It became the administration center. Since then, another building has been added at the Academy. It is The U.S. Merchant Marine Memorial Chapel, dedicated May 1 as a national memorial to the more than 6,000 officers and men of the U.S. Merchant Marine who gave their lives at sea in wartime.

It is an interfaith chapel with a revolving altar. Of early American design, it can accommodate 500 people. President John F. Kennedy, in his dedication day message said, in part, "it is fitting that the interfaith chapel, in memory of the American seamen of all faiths who gave their lives at sea, be established at Kings Point."

Candidates applying for admission to the Academy must obtain a cong ressional nomination and then take rather searching entrance examinations designed to test both their aptitude and physical fitness. Once admitted, they are subjected to strenuous academic training, rigid military discipline and a rugged physical conditioning program. The average "on board" enrollment at the Academy is about 750 not counting some 250 cadet-midshipmen who are at sea aboard U.S. flag merchantmen, working out what is called the "sea year."

The Academy offers a 4-year technical training program in nautical science or marine engineering. Cadets make the decisions as to whether they will become either deck or engineering officers and then follow the prescribed courses in the field chosen. While professional education makes up a significant part of the curriculum, cadets also receive a good general background in the humanities, social, and physical sciences plus special courses pertaining to operations within the shipping industry.

After finishing their plebe or first year at the Academy, cadets go to sea for their "sea year." They are assigned to merchant ships for practical experience and are fitted into each vessel's bill to develop the technical skills that will be required of them as officers. In essence, the ship serves as a seagoing laboratory where the cadets learn what comprises the day's work and routine of a ship. In addition the student-officers are given a laboratory manual known as the "Sea Project," to guide them in their investigations concerning the ship's structure, equipment, and practices. The manual, after completion, check, and grading becomes a vital part of each student's future reference material—material that he will use continually during his professional career. As a sidelight of this year at sea, it is not uncommon for some cadets to log 40,000 nautical miles and serve aboard three or four different vessels. And they receive pay, $111 per month, from the shipowners for this sea duty.

During the final year, cadets spend some time in making field trips to various offices and industries where they see first hand many of the things they learn in their classroom work. Your editor had the pleasure of addressing a small group of them last year, a group that was spending some time with Socony Mobil Oil Co.'s marine transportation department to see how our company operates its tanker fleet.

The balance of the 4-year course, which runs for 11 months each year, is spent "on board" following a full professional and academic curriculum. In addition, there is a program of extracurricular activities plus intercollegiate and intramural sports.

Upon graduation, cadets receive a bachelor of science degree, sit for the U.S. Coast Guard licensing examinations, and are commissioned ensigns in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

The Academy's physical plant is first class. A great deal of attention has been paid to

setting up and equipping a wide variety of laboratories and shops where cadets spend much of their time. Besides the usual chemical and physical laboratories there are laboratories and shops covering all phases of marine engineering and the nautical sciences plus a waterfront training area for practical seamanship. Of particular interest is a laboratory placed in operation just last year. In it is a small atomic reactor that is used to instruct future officers, some of whom may well serve aboard an atomic powered ship. And all the buildings are named after men whose deeds brought fame to the U.S. merchant marine or to the Academy.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point is performing a very special mission and doing it superbly. The highly trained and extremely capable men it graduates every year are to be found in virtually every facet of the maritime industry, serving in what rightfully has become known as America's "fourth arm of defense." What is more, they are in an industry that has many exceptional career opportunities which they are well equipped to vigorously pursue. Indeed, any young man who is lucky enough to attend this excellent institution can consider himself extremely fortunate; for Kings Point is one of America's great schools whose graduates are much in demand by the entire U.S. maritime industry.

An Editor Views the Alliance for Progress in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in Arizona to have available to us every day the observations of one of the Nation's best informed authorities on world affairs, Mr. William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson. Recently Mr. Mathews addressed the Agricultural Men's Club of the University of Arizona on the importance of the Alliance for Progress in advancing the security and welfare of the United States. I found his speech so stimulating that, under unanimous consent, include it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who may have doubts about continuing a program which admittedly has only modest accomplishments to its credit at this moment in history. The text of the speech follows:

When President James Monroe proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, he made Latin America a matter of primary interest to the United States. A matter involving national security. The record through the next 113 years, to 1936, reflects this. Never was this doctrine comprised. To the contrary, it was enforced. While our Government had to accept the French invasion of Mexico in the 1860's, as soon as the Civil War was over, we used our influence to bring an end to that French expansion of imperial power.

Under President Grant we toyed with the idea of annexing what was then Santa Domingo, but which is now known as the Dominican Republic. In 1896, President Grover Cleveland spoke out emphatically declaring that our word was flat on international matters affecting the Western Hemisphere. Two years later we went to war to break Spain's power in Cuba, and also in the Pacific.

We acquired the Guantanamo Naval Base from Cuba. We made Puerto Rico a kind of principality which might become our 51st State. We bought the Virgin Islands in 1915 to keep them from falling into the hands of imperial Germany.

We built the Panama Canal primarily as a naval effort. We intervened in numerous Central American Republics, including Cuba, Santa Domingo and Haiti.

The Panama Canal is an artery of life, whose security should never be compromized. It should never be internationalized. Never should we tolerate any interference in its operation, in an effort to please some hungary politicos of Panama. Our record in making certain concessions in recent years has not made us any better liked. Respect for us has been reduced, rather than enhanced. The time has come to stop such trifling with its security and without any apologies to anyone, let the world know that it belongs to us, and that we are going to keep it and protect it.

In 1936 President Franklin Roosevelt sent Secretary Hull to Buenos Aires to negotiate what became known as the Treaty of Buenos Aires. It forbade intervention in any form, either direct or indirect, unless it was done after receiving full consent of the various signatories.

This Treaty was an unfortunate one. It It compromised a matter of primary interest which has through time become clearly recognized as the Caribbean area, as distinguished from Latin-America. Today in Cuba we are paying the penalty for the compromise this Treaty imposed on both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Not until the danger assumed the proportion of threatening our destruction, did our political leaders feel free to mobilize our military power and challenge Moscow with a timed ultimatum.

For the future it seems to me that we Americans should distinguish between the Caribbean Sea area, and South American south of the equator. The former is vital to our security, while the latter has relatively little strategic importance. We must never compromise our control of the Caribbean and the Panama Canal.

This brief outline of the impact of the past on what we face today is necessary as a background to answer that question, "Where does America go from here in her relations with Latin-America?" Our first task is to take care of our security.

Events of the past few years have spectacularly emphasized that we Americans, as a part of our destiny, have a job to do in the whole of the Western Hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress is our first organized effort. The job is a difficult and delicate one. It must at all times acknowledge scrupulously the independent sovereignty of all of these nations, large and small. At the same time it requires a huge aggregation of capital, and the best brains and administrative ability to make the mountains, jungles, deserts and plains yield the hidden resources of this vast area.

Any discussion or planning on what we should do, or can do, must be based on the stern realization that it is the job of a lifetime. It will probably last as long as we are a great power. We might as well realize that there is no miraculous quick solution that mere money can buy, although billions of dollars will be needed. Latin America is not a vending machine where one can drop in some coins, press a button or pull a lever, and get what we want to buy.

Two basic challenging facts confront us. We must deal with people who have a different culture, heritage, ambitions, and outlook than our own. Secondly, we begin this job at a tough period in history when throughout the world a great historic change is taking place, and particularly in Latin America. What has been a civilization, based largely on an agricultural economy with aristocratic governments of a relatively few people doing the governing, is now going through a transition into an industrial civilization, governed by a rising middle class.

There is a wide variation of this transition in the many governments of Latin America. Such a situation means that governments in Latin America are going to go through many phases of instability as they strive to meet this change. Their cultures reflect wide differences in literacy, competency, ambitions, aptitudes, and skills. No one rule can be laid down that can be applied uniformly to all of them.

Bolivia, for example, is a relatively primitive nation composed largely of Indians with only a small intelligentsia of Spanish origin. We Americans with our know-how could make Bolivia bloom because we have the know-how and the capital to make the jungles and the mountains of that country yield their hidden wealth. The first thing we would do would be to start educating the Bolivians by training and educating them, while we went ahead with development projects by the efforts of individuals, rather than government. As it is we have been in Bolivia for 10 years, but so far we have little to show for what we have done.

Uruguay on the other hand is a highly developed social welfare state that needs no help whatever. Its people have probably the highest standard of living in all of Latin America, and the most stable government. But the Uruguayans are a nation of homogeneous people of Latin heritage. They have no Indians. As a nation of well educated people they can take care of themselves just as easily as Switzerland does.

Peru has nearly 5 million Indians living in the High Andes. That is nearly one-half of Peru's population. Who are we to tell the Peruvians how to treat their Indians? The American Indians are not integrated in the life of our Nation despite all of the money we have spent on them.

We must not be too gullible in swallowing that old, old issue of "agrarian reform." Certainly large, unproductive estates, whether they are owned by the Catholic church or private individuals, should be broken up. On the other hand, should large areas of productive land be broken up into small plots, experience eleswhere in the world shows that productivity will decline sharply. As we Americans have proven, the greatest productivity comes from large scale production. Since the vast eastern areas of Columbia and Bolivia, which are nearly uninhabited, do offer an opportunity for development, the lack of initiative, lack of willingness to adventure and pioneer, creates the ironic situation of poverty amidst a potential abuandance. If agrarian reform is to better the peasantry and the country as a whole, it must be carried out by agricultural experts and not by political experts, or do-gooder reformers.

These wide desparities in a basic culture we will be compelled to recognize. We must remember to be cautious about assuming that perfectly constructed and other legal institutions and reforms, that work well with us, will not necessarily bring peace, stability, democracy and prosperity to these many nations.

The fact that most of their constitutions have been modeled after our own, but have failed to work continuously should caution us that we cannot impose American ideas of government on them. We must expect ups and downs with periods of democratic gov-

ernment followed by periods of dictatorial government.

Since the education of most of the intellectuals has been European, the doctrine of socialism has wide acceptance as a guiding gospel to follow. Too many of the intellectuals think in terms of national socialism as a means of national independence. Freedom means national freedom as distinguished from the individual freedom we cherish. We will have a difficult job inspiring the free enterprise that we take for granted at home.

Latin culture has a different standard of morals than our own. It teaches respect for authority and by implication teaches that the will of a majority is so righteous that it can scorn the rights of minorities. Most of the people do not know how to make a parliamentary government work. They respect strength and have only contempt for weakness. Too often they take generosity and extreme patience as a sign of weakness.

Because socialism has the reputation of promising the ideal society of abundance for all with peace and prosperity, it naturally makes a moving appeal to politicians in search of a campaign issue, and masses of people looking for an easy answer to their ills. Therein lies the appeal of communism with its promise to build Socialist societies, but instead of doing it peacefully, do it by creating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its glorification of the use of dictatorial power makes an attractive appeal to Latin American politicos.

We must foster public education as a basic necessity in developing workers who can take their necessary place in the development of modern industrial societies. The same muscle and energy that have gone into the building of churches should now be called upon to build schoolhouses.

The increase in wealth production must be our main goal. Only by that means can the lot of the masses be improved. That will require not only enormous aggregation of capital from abroad, and the best technicians and administrative talent, it will require much harder work on the part of the people themselves. It cannot be achieved with a 6-hour day, and 5-day week that prevails today in too many places in Latin America.

We can no longer tolerate expropriation of wealth creating American investments. Such action nullifies the fact that unless foreign capital is attracted, the Alliance for Progress program will languish. All help should be withdrawn immediately from any nation that carries out expropriations. It is just as necessary to help create a climate that will attract foreign capital as it is to furnish help by our Alliance for Progress program. The latter cannot do the job alone.

We must see that all funds granted by our Government or its agencies be wisely spent. It is not enough to make grants and assume that each government will spend such money wisely.

The population explosion that has been going on throughout the world is taking place in Latin America with more increase than perhaps any other locality in the world. That means increased number of mouths will have to be fed. Increasing importance requires the means to earn a livelihood, which must come from increased industrial production. Certainly, there are needs that will require the toil of every adult worker available.

Where is the capital and technical and administrative ability coming from to make this possible? Without an enormous increase in productivity 30 years from now people will be less better off. We will have to run in order to stand still, as Alice would say.

Consequently, if the Alliance for Progress is to be successful we must approach this job with a fair but firm attitude and our eyes open. We must expect, and have, full cooperation of those whom we plan to help. We must take steps to see that the dollars we provide are not used to finance the flight of monetary wealth of wealthy people of these countries. There is good authority for the statement that some $10 billion have been sent by the wealthy people of Latin America to Switzerland.

The most encouraging thing I can say about the Alliance for Progress is that so little appears to have been done during its first year. That is a welcome sign that we are making progress. It will take time, several years, for wealth-creating projects to take form, and still more years to make their productivity available to the masses.

All of what we might try to do, in both the economic and social welfare fields can be defeated, unless the political and intellectual leaders of Latin America zealously assume a financial responsibility that can bring the widely present inflation under control. Only where this is done should funds be advanced to finance economic development. Unless we are willing to act with such realism, we will be wasting our taxpayers' money.

Spending a few billion dollars as a kind of dole to individuals would be spectacular while it lasted, but it would obviously be unwise and harmful. Our job is a tough one but it is a wonderful challenge to our own heritage. Out of it we can hope will emerge the American substitute for what in the past has been known as imperialism. We will not be plundering. We will not be colonizing. We will be trying to prove that by helping others we will help ourselves.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, before World War I, tens of millions of people in Europe found their homelands under foreign control, among them the Ukrainians who for some 250 years suffered under the autocratic regime of czarist Russia. Then in the course of the Russian Revolution in 1917 the czarist regime was overthrown and the chains holding its subject peoples in check shattered. The Ukrainians broke free, proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918, and founded the Ukrainian Republic. But oppressed and helpless Ukrainians were ill-prepared and unable to fend off all their powerful foes to safeguard their new state. In 1920 the republic was destroyed by the Red army and the Ukrainians robbed of their freedom.

Sinec the destruction by the Red army of that short-lived Republic 45 years ago, the people of the Ukraine have suffered even more than their ancestors had under the cruel agents of the czars. They have been dispossessed of their worldly goods and reduced once again to the status of serfs. They have been denied all forms of freedom, and have been sealed off from the free world. And they are being driven to work for the benefit of their alien overlords.

In the midst of all this misery and misfortune, however, the Ukrainians have kept faith with their tradition. They still fervently cling to their ideals and cherish freedom in their homeland. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people during the last several decades this is the one encouraging fact. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we in the free world wish them fortitude and power in their struggle for their righteous cause, for their freedom and independence.

The Congo Civil War and Our Connally Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial issues for the past few years in this country has been our support and encouragement of the armed intervention by U.N. forces into the Congo civil war.

Aside from the Cuban affair or, as some term it, "debacle," the Congo-United Nations issue has been the most divisive issue in that our American citizens have more or less ranged themselves into opposing camps when the subject has come up.

Many feel the United Nations was justified in its action, that is, becoming an armed and active force rather than merely a guiding force through debate and vote in the U.N. On the other hand, many of our American citizens feel the United States not only should not have joined in support of the action because it was interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo after it had won its independence from Belgium—but that most of all, we should not have allowed ourselves to be placed in the position of almost singlehandedly financing this armed intervention.

One of our North Dakota editorials, written by Haakon Stockman in the Williston Plains Reporter of January 16, 1963, makes some rather pungent statements in the article entitled "This and That." Some of the points Mr. Stockman made are well taken. Would we deny the privilege of self-determination to the Congo Government, when we enjoyed this privilege in our own country? Would we have been allowed to break away from our mother country, England, had the United Nations been in existence at that time? What would have been the end result of our own Civil War had the United Nations been in existence at that time?

Many have expressed the belief that if we were not careful we might one day

find ourselves in the position of having the United Nations vote on some of our internal domestic affairs, and the prospect of this taking place in a United Nations dominated to a large extent by the Soviet bloc is not very cheerful.

As far as I can determine, the only thing that might prevent such a catastrophe is the Connally amendment, or reservation, which has been the subject of many legal debates concerning whether it should be weakened or entirely eliminated. There have been many who have beaten the drums for such elimination.

The Connally reservation, for those not familiar with its provisions, in effect protects the rights and liberties of 185 million American citizens, and future generations of Americans yet uncounted. On August 3, 1946, by a 51 to 12 vote, the Senate of the United States wrote into the resolution of adherence to the International Court of Justice—the World Court—eight words which are "as determined by the United States of America."

This means that adherence of the United States of America to the jurisdiction of the World Court contains the complete reservation that "it shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America, as determined by the United States of America."

Those last eight words are, in essence, the Connally amendment.

Opponents of the Connally amendment insist that the wording which they supported—which I have quoted above—should not have added on the last eight words "as determined by the United States of America."

Supporters of the Connally amendment, on the other hand, feel that those eight words are our safeguard against future interference by the International Court of Justice in our domestic affairs.

The mere fact that legal debates have been waged over these eight words makes it clear that they are important to the United States. Let there be no mistake about that.

I believe I can truthfully state that the majority of the people in the United States do not wish to trust the United Nations with the safeguarding of our domestic legal rights.

The International Court of Justice advisory opinion, handed down on July 20, 1962, to the effect that the United Nations financial obligations should be borne by all member nations, has been ignored by the Soviet bloc, and others as well. This should be warning enough that we should not let those eight words which safeguard our legal right to determine what matters fall within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States be either weakened or eliminated.

We do not want to become a Congo at some time in the future. We do not want to become a divided Korea. And we have no intention of ever becoming a Soviet satellite, such as Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and last, but not least, Cuba, have become.

Therefore it appears our salvation lies within ourselves, and I do not feel it is a matter of national pride for us to hold up the United Nations victory over the Katanga Province of the Congo as an example of our clear thinking and fairness as a nation.

In fairness, however, we must grant that the United Nations indeed launched its operation in the Congo at the express request of the legal Congolese Government. The Security Council resolution to send a U.N. force into the Congo was indeed taken without a dissenting vote on July 14, 1960, and reaffirmed by the Security Council on July 22, 1960, August 9, 1960, February 21, 1961, and November 24, 1961, and this was upheld as far as legality is concerned by the International Court of Justice. All this we grant.

But this does not change our personal gratitude that we have a Connally reservation which will preserve our right to self-determination in domestic matters. Indeed, it should increase this gratitude, and cause all of us to inwardly and outwardly thank those Members of the Senate who so wisely voted on August 3, 1946, to include those "eight words" in the World Court resolution.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I ask that the editorial I mentioned, "This and That," written by Haakon Stockman and published in the Williston Plains Reporter of January 16, 1963, be included with my remarks as an expression of the feelings of many American citizens on the Congo affair.

The editorial follows:

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Plains Reporter, Jan. 16, 1963]

THIS AND THAT

(By Haakon Stockman)

Congo was given its independence some years ago and was supposed to be left alone to work out its destiny as best it could. It wasn't.

As several factions in the liberated country rose and part of it succeeded, from the Central Government, wanting to become an independent part of it, certain foreign countries found this undesirable and the United Nations interfered by sending troops to Congo to fight the rebels.

I happen to be one of those perhaps misguided people who think that Congo should have been left strictly alone to settle its disputes, even if it seemed as the Congolese weren't as yet fully ready to do so. But what if so—it is through trials and errors that nations as well as individuals find themselves at last.

When the United States declared its independence some 187 years ago, if there at that time had been a United Nations sending its troops here to mix into our country's internal affairs, wouldn't that have been as uncalled for and as highly resented as the present foreign interference with the Congolese secessionists is?

Or if when the Southern States in the United States in 1861 seceded from the Union, what about it if European powers had sent powerful forces to fight either for or against secessionists?

It would have been an intolerable interference.

Belgium, after having exploited the Congo for so long, although in doing so also civilized and developed it greatly, was finally obliged to give it self government and from there on it should have been left strictly on its own.

Civil warring is of course a most deplorable thing, but if part of the Congolese found it to their advantage to secede, why shouldn't they be allowed to do so without interference by foreign powers? Doesn't independence give certain factions the right to rebel against what they find is an objectionable form of home rule by the central government?

What has been accomplished in the Congo so far, but unnecessary bloodshed and destruction, and what about it if Katanga is forced for the time being to capitulate? Surely its desire for home rule will blaze up again as did the Irish when they were fighting for home rule and finally got it.

Isn't it about time to let all Africa do as it pleases and find its own way around? For hundreds of years the so-called civilized world has taken advantage of the African continent and hated to let go of it, but had to.

If the many new countries there shall have their internal differences and many a bloody fight occur, let them handle their affairs as best they can—they are on their way and should be left alone.

And if they in striving to form the government they desire should have to shed a lot of blood—why, that is what the whole cockeyed world has been doing since the beginning of time, and presumably always will.

Corn Flakes to Caviar to Bologna—The Economic Collapse of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Alice Widener, which appeared in U.S.A. of January 11, brings out some very interesting comparisons. We are constantly being told of the great progress of the U.S.S.R., which is usually pictured as being many percentage points ahead of the United States.

Of course, what we are never told is that 10 percent above zero is not quite as much as 5 percent of a hundred. It also ocurs to the student of Russian history that it is strange and interesting that in the days of the czars, Russia was a great exporter of wheat, whereas today she can barely feed her own people.

While it is probably quite true that the U.S.S.R. is amply supplied with missiles, they still lag, even according to their own figures, behind the United States. They spend far less than we do on defense, $24,025 million at the official rate, whereas we will spend roughly $53 billion to keep up. This appears to be their one big success—to get us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

CORN FLAKES TO CAVIAR TO BALONEY—THE ECONOMIC COLLAPSE OF SOCIALISM

(By Alice Widener)

In a report from Moscow which appeared June 1, 1959, in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, W. Averell Harriman wrote, "New apartment buildings, bright cheerful clothing, shop windows filled with food and household goods make Moscow all but unrecognizable. * * * In the grocery stores the wooden hams and sausages, which were the only decoration a decade ago, have been re-

placed by attractive displays of a variety of foodstuffs from corn flakes to caviar, which, though expensive, are more abundant than at any time in Soviet history."

This glowing Harriman report is only one of thousands such naive and superficial estimates from which the myth of Soviet economic and agricultural might was created.

Probably, it has been the costliest myth ever propagated. American belief in it created a sense of urgency to meet the threat of alleged Soviet economic and agricultural competition. In turn, this feeling was largely responsible for our Nation's having incurred a national debt of $302 billion—the most colossal financial obligation ever put upon any people in the history of the world.

How did the myth of Soviet economic and agricultural might come to be believed in our age of science, when, one would logically assume, economic assertions should be based on provable evidence?

There is only one credible explanation. The Communists achieved indisputable mastery in the field of propaganda. Through this mastery, they used sympathetic socialists as collaborators and dupes. These intellectual supporters were able, in turn, to persuade extremely prominent men and women, who should have known better, that things were thus and so because the socialists said they were thus and so.

The closed socialist society was kept tight shut, except for peek-a-boo inspections conducted by circus-barker guides calling out pink balloon statistics of projected but never fulfilled 5- and 7-year plans.

It is acutely embarrassing for an American to dig into files and take a look at the U.S. historical record. Yellowed clippings from newspapers and magazines tell a tale of big mistakes made by big men in high places.

"I have a suggestion," Neil McElroy of Procter & Gamble said to John Scott of Time magazine, in Cincinnati, spring 1960. "Why don't you look into the question: When are the Russians going to begin to compete with us selling soap?"

To find the answer was John Scott's 1961 assignment for Time. In an introduction to his final report—"The Soviet Economic Offensive," issued November 1961 by Time—Mr. Scott wrote, "Before I had gone far in my early studies, I saw that on the surface at least my assignment would be an easy one. Even before I left on my trip, I could have answered Neil McElroy's question. Soviet soap would not compete with Procter & Gamble in the world market for at least a decade. Indeed, the entire Soviet trade picture was singularly unimpressive. * * *"

What about Mr. Harriman's "corn flakes to caviar" Moscow observation of 1959?

"I had not been in Moscow many hours," reported Time Writer John Scott about his 1961 visit there, "before I encountered what Nikita Khrushchev later referred to in an official speech as 'certain difficulties in food supplies. * * *'. Indeed, on a number of occasions Moscow stores had run short of meat, milk, vegetables * * *. Several times I ran into block-long queues for meat, and several times I was told that 'there is no milk at all in Moscow now'."

The city of Moscow—Scott reported—is the home of the Soviet "elite." In 1961, Mr. Jacquet-Francillon of the Paris newspaper Le Figaro reported, after a trip to nonelite places such as Soviet Siberia, that the food stores were guarded at night by women with shotguns.

RED DEAD END

What about Soviet trade?

It was not until 1957 that the Soviet Union furnished figures to the United Nations. Unreliable as Red figures are, they appeared in the U.N. Yearbook of International Trade Statistics for 1957 (published in 1958), and showed, even so, that the Red bloc was doing less than 2 percent of world trade. Yet a few years earlier, on March 30, 1953, the New York Times had headlined, "Red Nations Show Big Gains in Trade—U.N. Report Also Notes Sharp Rise in Their 1952 Production—World Output at Peak."

On seeing this Times headline, how many people took the trouble to read what followed it? Those who did read the text found out that the Reds' "big gains" were confined to trade among themselves, and East-West commerce had shrunk to one-half or less of prewar volume.

All during the 1950's the myth of Soviet superiority was engendered by American and British intellectuals and by politicians pleading for billions of U.S. dollars to hand out in bilateral and multilateral foreign aid. Anyone questioning Soviet Socialist supremacy was described as a "know nothing" or "isolationist" or "ostrich."

On March 23, 1957, the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald reported that "Max F. Millikan, economist and foreign affairs specialist," was the first witness to appear before a special Senate Committee on Foreign Aid. The late Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, asked Mr. Millikan (who urged Congress to appropriate $10 billion for a 10-year loan-and-grant aid program to underdeveloped nations) what would happen if the United States were to end all its development aid for such economic essentials as transportation, electric power, and the like. Professor Millikan, director of the MIT Center for International Studies and coauthor of the Millikan-Rostow (Walt W.) report, replied that underdeveloped nations "would turn increasingly to the Soviet bloc," and would be encouraged to adopt "totalitarian methods" of government to squeeze more resources from their own subjects.

Not a single hint was offered to the Senate commtitee by Economist Millikan that any turning for aid by underdeveloped nations to the Soviet bloc would be a turn leading to an economic dead end. Of course, Mr. Millikan disagreed entirely with Mr. Benjamin Fairless, who had advised President Eisenhower that private capital could take over a main share of the economic development load.

Only a month after Mr. Millikan's mumbo-jumbo, Ned Rochon of the New York World Telegram & Sun said in a report culled from United Press and Associated Press dispatches:

"A most compelling argument in behalf of superabundant foreign aid in these casual days of the $72 billion budget runs like this: Russia is spending vastly more than we are.

"Let one moderate among Senators question the enormity of America's outlay and a strident congerie of internationalists arises in full bellow across the land. They depose fierce testimonials to the generosity of Russia's effort. Estimates soar into the stratosphere to trigger clouds of inflated statistics, and the economy advocate is drowned in a rain of 15-digit statistics.

"It was in this atmosphere that a British publication dared to take a look at actual Soviet aid, and what it found was revealing indeed. A Royal Institute of Affairs publication, the Chatham House Review, disclosed that Russia's total program for undeveloped nations amounts to $1.4 billion for the next 5 years. That's about one-fifteenth of the rate at which U.S. spending is running in neutral lands.

"The analysis further revealed that no more than one-tenth to one-fifth of Mr. Khrushchev's aid is being delivered, and that is in commodities, not cash."

BETTER BLIND THAN DELUDED

On May 3, 1958, Dean Acheson, former U.S. Secretary of State, delivered a Jefferson-Jackson Day address in Detroit and called on our country "to export capital" to the underdeveloped nations. "Peoples everywhere demand an expanding life," said Mr. Acheson. "Khrushchev promises the faithful and the uncommitted that Communist economics will produce this result. Only a blind man can doubt that it is turning out an impressive performance."

Yet on December 24, 1962, only a few years after Dean Acheson's tribute to socialist economic accomplishment, Barron's Financial Weekly carried the front page headline, "Bankrupt Socialism—State Planning, the Kremlin Has Confessed, Is a Failure."

Perhaps the most ardent and characteristic of all socialist minded American myth-makers about soviet economic might is Pulitzer prize winning historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the man who publicly called the brilliant Henry J. Taylor an idiot.

In 1960, a pamphlet marked "For Private Circulation Only" was issued with the title "The Big Decision—Private Indulgents or National Power?" by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. The Harvard historian wrote that "the American people are growing restlessly aware that the United States is losing ground in the great world competition with the Soviet Union. We are still ahead in many ways, but this is mainly because we had an excellent start. As fast as we continue to move, the Communists seem to be moving even faster. As a result, they are steadily narrowing the gap between us. Even more alarming, in certain decisive categories of national strength—in new weapons, in the contest for space, in technical education, and in the rate of economic growth—the Soviet Union appears already (in Prime Minister Khrushchev's favorite phrase) to have 'overtaken and surpassed' us."

Not content with this, Professor Schlesinger—who was a top adviser to Mr. Adlai Stevenson and became a White House advisor to President Kennedy—went on to the following hysterical assertion in his privately circulated 1960 pamphlet:

"This decade of American decline has equally been the decade of Soviet rise. What accounts for the extraordinary progress made by the Soviet Union in the fifties? The gross national product of the Soviet Union is still only about 45 percent of our own. Yet it has been making faster relative progress than we have in nearly every critical field of national power. There is here no 'riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma.' The answer to the Soviet success is as plain as day. It lies in the power of the Soviet Union to focus its national energies. The visitor to Soviet Russia finds it frightening to see what energy a great nation can generate when it allocates its talent and resources according to an intelligent system of priorities."

Two years after this Schlesingerian pundity, which contained several references to the missile gap, Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal and an educated, perceptive visitor to Soviet Russia, testified before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress:

"The Soviet Union, by the standards of advanced Western industrial countries, is an economically backward country. This is so, I believe, whether the test be industry, agriculture, technology, labor skills, or the standard of living of the people. * * * Soviet economic power today is actually less than that of many other countries with a smaller potential: West Germany, for example, or France."

On January 5, 1963, Richard L. Strout, Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, reported that President Kennedy is seen as "emerging into a more mature second wind."

Part of this new-found maturity may come from Presidential discovery of "Junior" Schlesinger's immaturity. Mr. Strout went on to report that coupled with President Kennedy's mature second wind "is the discovery that the so-called missile gap, which played so large a part in the 1960 election

speeches, does not exist. While perhaps embarrassing to a politician, the misjudgment probably renews confidence in the American defense position to a president."

You see?

The missile gap was all a matter of misjudgment by Professor Schlesinger and his very intellectual associates, such as Walt W. Rostow, now a policy planner in the State Department, and others. The truth is that the Soviet Union was not ahead of us militarily, economically, agriculturally, industrially or technologically.

Wherein, then, does Soviet strength lie?

The correct answer seems to be—

(1) In nuclear blackmail, i.e., the publicly expressed and reiterated Soviet willingness to strike first and without warning against the West.

(2) In socialist propaganda.

Of these two Soviet assets, the second is much the more useful.

After all, it is a neat trick to be able to dupe Harvard University's most eminent historian into believing that failure is success, especially when the dupe is able to progress from a campus classroom to a White House inner sanctum.

BUTTERED-UP TALES OF BUTTER, GUNS

It is interesting to analyze a case history of myth-making about the Soviet economy. Though Khrushchev was forced in the summer of 1962 to announce a 25 percent increase in the price of Red butter, several leading newspapers in New York City (including the New York Herald Tribune) carried a story June 20, 1962, headed, "A Red First—Butter." This story asserted that the Soviet Union leads the world in butter production. The tale was based on a single statistic taken out of edible fats context from the United Nations Statistical Yearbook for 1961.

As all serious economists know, Red production and consumption statistics in the U.N. Yearbook are furnished by the Soviets themselves from within their tightly shut society, are unverified by outside sources, and are cited at entirely fictitious official ruble-dollar exchange rates.

The U.N. Yearbook carried the following relatively meaningless figures for butter production in 1960 in thousand metric tons:

U.S.S.R.	737.0
U.S.A.	622.7

The United States has a total area of 3,628,130 square miles; the U.S.S.R. total is almost 2½ times greater—7,877,598 square miles. The Soviet population is at least 20 million greater than ours. In America, only 5 percent of the population are farmers; in the U.S.S.R. 40 percent or more of the population are at work tilling the soil.

A much truer picture of relative United States-U.S.S.R. agricultural strength is in the following table compiled by this writer from the U.N. Statistical Yearbook for 1961:

Edible fats production for 1960

[Thousand metric tons]

U.S.S.R.	butter	737.0
U.S.S.R.	margarine	431.0
Total		1,168.0
U.S.A.	butter	622.7
U.S.A.	margarine	619.7
Total		1,242.4

So—in an area less than half as large and with a much smaller population, 5 percent of Americans outproduced more than 40 percent of Russians in edible fats during 1960.

But this is not by any means the world picture. The real one shows clearly why Khrushchev shouts diatribes against a European Common Market (EEC) which is reducing to absurdity his claims of Socialist economic superiority. EEC figures in the U.N. Yearbook for 1961 show:

Edible fats production for 1960

[Thousand metric tons]

France	butter	398.0
Do	margarine	115.0
West Germany	butter	406.0
Do	margarine	588.0

The French and West German total of 1,507 is much more than that of the Soviet Union, though the combined area of the two Common Market countries is only 212,659 square miles as compared with the Soviet area of more than 7 million. Moreover, the combined population figure of France and West Germany is less than half as great as the Soviet total.

When the butter production figures for other Common Market countries are added to those of France and West Germany, the total shows that the EEC outproduced the Soviets in butter by 1½ times. Also, France and West Germany produced almost twice as much as the combined production of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

PHONY RUBLE-DOLLAR FIGURING

As in the case of butter, a lot of baloney figures about Soviet military expenditures have been issued to the American people by the press and to Congress by scholars and U.S. Government officials.

On December 6, 1961, the Soviet Government announced revision of its 1961 military defense (aggression) budget. Next day, the New York Times reported on its front page, "Last July, Premier Khrushchev disclosed that military appropriations budgeted for 1961 had been increased by 3 billion rubles ($3,300 million) because of growing East-West tension in the Berlin dispute. The Soviet Union's defense expenditures, which had been gradually decreasing in recent years, thus jumped from 9,300 million rubles ($10,323 million) originally planned for 1961 to 13,400 million rubles ($14,874 million) for 1962. This represents an increase of 44 percent."

How frightening. And please note that the Times converted all ruble figures into dollar figures at the fictitious official Red exchange rate of 1 to $1.10.

Now let us consider this: On October 28, 1959, UPI cited the Soviet-issued defense budget figure for 1960 as 96 billion rubles or $24.025 billion calculated at the then official Red exchange rate of 4 rubles to 1 U.S. dollar.

A comparison of the 1959 figure with that for 1961 would indicate, at first glance, that the Soviet military budget decreased (in round figures) from $24 billion in 1960 to $14 billion in 1961. Of course, this was not the case. On January 1, 1961, the Soviet Union devalued its currency by taking the artificial 1961 tourist ruble-dollar exchange rate of 10 to 1, dividing it by 10, adding a 10-cent gold content, and declaring 1 ruble equals $1.10 of U.S. currency.

When the 1960 Soviet ruble defense budget figure is converted at the 1961 rate, then the comparative ruble figures are:

1960 defense total	9.6 billion
1961 defense total	13.4 billion

Thus the ruble increase for 1961 seemed to be 3.8 billion or 28 percent over 1960.

But what is the dollar figure?

There is none. The Soviet currency is not convertible outside the U.S.S.R. The so-called official rate of ruble-dollar exchange is purely arbitrary and is not established according to supply and demand on the international money market. There is, however, a somewhat indicative way of figuring out an approximate value based on the extremely limited but highly significant black or free market in rubles outside the Soviet Union. Reputable foreign exchange firms in Switzerland, the United States, and elsewhere engage in negligible but nevertheless actual ruble-dollar transactions.

In 1960, the reliable foreign exchange firm of Perera & Co., Inc., New York City, said that a conservative ruble-dollar rate was 24 to 1. On December 7, 1961, Perera's rate was 35 cents in exchange for one new (devalued) ruble.

Now let us take a look at the Soviet military defense (aggression) budget (which does not include sums for Soviet scientific research and many other items of a kind included by the United States in its defense budget):

Soviet military budget

1960 in rubles	96,000,000,000
1960 in dollars at official 4=1 rate	$24,025,000,000
1960 at Perera's 24=1 rate	$4,004,166,666
1961 in "new" rubles	13,400,000,000
1961 in dollars at official 1=$1.10 rate	$14,874,000,000
1961 at Perera's rate of 1=35 cents	$4,690,000,000

The foregoing table shows—at the black or free market ruble rate—a Soviet 1961 increase in military defense (aggression) budget of only 17 percent over 1960, not of 44 percent as claimed in The New York Times.

If it be taken for granted that the Soviets concealed a military expenditure equal to what they revealed, i.e., of approximately $4 billion, it nevertheless appears that the Soviet outlay of $8 billion was about one-fifth of ours. And this Soviet outlay imposed such a heavy strain on the Soviet economy that Khrushchev was forced to declare that for 1962 his country could not invest any capital in new industrial undertakings.

SALIENT FACTS FOR 1963

Indisputably, the Soviet Union has a first strike nuclear capability. Indisputably, too, the Soviet Union has an almost unlimited propaganda capability. These two capabilities are the only substantial Socialist successes.

The first of these could be better frustrated now and for the near future by an American announcement that since the Soviet Union never has pledged itself not to start a nuclear war, the United States cannot be bound by a pledge not to start such a war if its vital interests are endangered. (In essence, this is what President Kennedy said and did when he covered the Soviet nuclear bet in Cuba last October.)

The second successful Soviet capability—that of propaganda—can be thwarted only when American taxpayers quit subsidizing it. They do this mostly through their Congress. It swallows all the corn flakes to caviar baloney about Socialist economic successes fed to it by Socialists and their dupes. As a result, Congress appropriates billions upon billions of dollars to fight a mythical economic challenge, thus seriously weakening the financial structure of the United States, bastion of capitalism.

As the year 1963 begins, there emerge some salient facts about the second half of our century:

1. Marxism is a dead-duck theory everywhere except in some academic and intellectual circles. Even European Socialists have renounced Marxism.

2. Only those national economies in which there is substantial private capitalist enterprise are thriving.

3. The collapse of Socialist economics will cause upheavals within the Socialist bloc countries leading their rulers to embark on intensified programs of military aggression and political subversion abroad.

4. The Achilles' heel of the West is U.S. fiscal folly.

George Saintsbury, essayist and author, said, "Poor scholarship is the endless repetition of other people's mistakes."

Unfortunately, the American Congress has heeded too many experts of poor scholarship endlessly repeating Socialist mistakes.

Members of Congress would do better in 1963 and thereafter to heed their own good commonsense and innate patriotism.

Why Does the President Seek Advice From Socialist Economists Regarding Our Way of Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for what purpose does President Kennedy seek the advice of a Socialist in planning our economy? For that matter, why does the President continue to base his economic planning for the United States on the advice of Walter Heller who contributed greatly to the prosperity and economic growth of West Germany when that nation refused to adopt his program. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD and I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal to show what lies ahead for the American economy if we continue to follow the economic theories of President Kennedy and his Socialist advisers:

ROAD TO CONTROL

Whenever the subject of price controls comes up in Washington, the customary reaction is to deny any intention of imposing them. That sounds all right, but maybe we should listen to some other views.

The Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal, for example, pays a lot of attention to the American economy and his thinking parallels that of the advisers in Washington. He emphatically advocates greatly increased Federal spending, and in a speech excerpted in the New Republic he concedes this course runs a real risk of inflation.

The danger could be minimized or removed, however, particularly if the Government is prepared to extend its controls over investments and, perhaps, over prices. In regard to price control, I sometimes ask myself whether the American Government should not be prepared to tone down its rather fruitless fight against monopoly but instead ask for a share in controlling administered prices, which are so decisive for the general trend of prices.

The prices Mr. Myrdal has in mind are in basic industries, which some people mistakenly allege to be administered without regard to market conditions. What he implies is that Government control of these prices would be tantamount to control of all prices, and that is to be desired. In short, we don't have to worry about inflation because we can always go to price controls.

Such controls historically do not work, of course. They do not attack the inflation itself; in practice they do not necessarily even put a lid on the rising prices which may be a symptom of the inflation. They do distort the economy and place it under burdensome regimentation. They represent by definition the antithesis of the free-market economy.

But the interesting thing is that if anyone were trying to get the United States back to price controls, the present policy of unlimited spending and deficits charts the right course. For an ensuing inflation would then become the justification for the controls.

Mr. Myrdal, at least, is honest enough to carry the theory to its logical conclusion. And what a dismal one it is.

Cuban Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, because of the apparent deceit with which this administration has explained the Cuban invasion failure, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article, "We Were Betrayed," written by one of the veterans of the Cuban invasion, as it appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of January 14, 1963.

It is hard to believe that Mr. Penabaz and the all around expert, Bobby Kennedy, can both be right. The article follows:

CUBAN APPEASEMENT

(How do Cubans who fought at the Bay of Pigs feel about the U.S. role in that fiasco? This is the story of one Cuban invader, told in his own words. Manuel Penabaz tells of assurances made by representatives of the U.S. Government that the invasion against Castro would have U.S. support. Then, he relates, just when the invaders needed help most—and might have won—they were told: "We cannot give you any further support." Many veterans of the invasion, just ransomed from Castro prisons, say they hold no rancor against the United States. But Penabaz says: "We did not fail. We were betrayed.")

(By Manuel Penabaz)

"Keep advancing. Keep advancing—and wait."

So long as I live, I shall never forget those words. They sounded out from an American ship, from the officer who directed our landing operations at the Bay of Pigs on the coast of Cuba, where 1,500 of us Cubans offered our lives in the hope of liberating our beloved country from the rule of the bearded despot, Fidel Castro, on April 17, 1961.

"Keep advancing and firing. Take the area ahead—and wait."

To us who had struggled ashore from our landing barges, the words "and wait" meant only one thing: "Help is on the way."

When we were recruited for this perilous mission, and during our exhaustive training in Guatemala—even while on the slow, ancient freighters that brought us from our embarkation port in Nicaragua—we were promised the support of the armed forces of the United States.

"Over you will be air cover," we were told, "and back of you the Navy and land forces of the United States and other free nations of the Americas. You cannot fail."

We did not fail. We were betrayed.

After 3 days of fighting, we heard again that same American voice that had exhorted us to "keep advancing—and wait." Only this time it said:

"We cannot give you any further support."

The whole invasion operation that had been planned and directed by agencies of the U.S. Government had been abandoned by that Government at the moment when victory could have overthrown Fidel Castro.

Of the 1,500 who began the assault at the Bay of Pigs on that warm April morning, about 100 were killed; 60 later died of wounds, starvation, torture and executions; most of the others were captured.

I was among the lucky. I escaped. Four of my comrades and I found a raft and, after 5 days afloat, were rescued.

Now my surviving comrades of that invasion also have been freed—ransomed from Castro's prison cells. Many of them have told me since their arrival in Miami that their lips are sealed because they have relatives still in Cuba. I, too, have relatives in Cuba. But my lips are not sealed. I will tell the story of what happened at the Bay of Pigs, because I believe that such a mistake must not be made again by any government or people of the free world.

For me, the story of the invasion began in Miami, Fla., when I heard the words: "Recruits are needed—recruits to overthrow Castro."

The Central Intelligence Agency of the U.S. Government, headed by Allen Dulles, was the recruiting and training group for our volunteers.

Several officers of the Central Intelligence Agency were operating in the Miami area, seeking out the leaders among the Cuban exiles and encouraging them to select the likeliest young men for the adventure. I was told that there would be an invasion of Cuba "fairly early in 1961," backed and supported by the United States.

The first airlifts of volunteers to training camps began in late summer, 1960. Any recruits who doubted that the United States was back of the operation were assured that, when we reached our training camps, we would find American officers in charge and there would be the best of American weapons to carry into battle.

Sure enough, when we arrived at Trax Base, high in the mountains of Guatemala, American officers were in charge of the camp, and our weapons were among the best the United States had to offer.

At Retalhuleu, Guatemala, a splendid airstrip had been laid down by American engineers. All about were huge accumulations of war material—aircraft, mortars, tons of bombs and other ammunition.

Over the whole operation, there was an air of great secrecy. Our instructors, American officers, wore only fatigue uniforms, with no markings. We knew them only by first names. But it was apparent that they were experienced and efficient.

It did not take us long to learn that "Frank," the man who gave the orders for both Americans and Cubans, was a colonel. The American subordinate officers were all experts in their fields. "Ray" was our rifle and pistol instructor. It leaked out that he was from California and a pistol champion. "Sam," chief trainer of the parachutists, was plainly a veteran of many combat jumps. "Nick," from New Mexico, was our instructor for intelligence operations. "Bob" demonstrated all there was to know about mortars and machine guns. "Pat" was a security officer.

There was no secrecy about the CIA man in charge at the camp. He was Frank Bender, a man of German descent who had fought in the French underground during World War II. Bender was everywhere—shuttling back to Miami to check on recruiting, going to Washington and New York to try to bring all the Cuban exile leaders together into one united front.

Trax Base was a regular little city, built by the U.S. Government. It had modern paved streets, electric lights, and barracks for about 500 men. As our numbers grew, we had to disperse to four other training bases.

All the training bases were leased from Roberto Alejo, brother of the Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States and a

trusted friend of Guatemalan President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes.

For rifles, we had that infantry workhorse, the M-1 Garand, firing eight shots. Officers carried carbines. We learned to use machine-guns and bazookas, 57-millimeter guns and 4.2-inch mortars.

One prized piece of equipment was an electronic communications-control center—a device so new that it had never been used in combat. It was manned by six men, who could relay messages to artillery, aircraft, and other combat units. The American officers warned us that it should be destroyed rather than be permitted to fall into the hands of the enemy.

Training was rugged, but we endured it cheerfully. We were preparing to free our land of Marxist dictatorship. We understood that our brigade would be the initial attacking party backed by the might of the United States. There would be ample ammunition to stop Castro's tanks and his land forces. Every effort would be made to win the support of the Cuban people. Exile leaders would be formed into a provisional government and would receive the recognition of the United States and of Latin American countries. Such were our assurances.

Our brigade commander, Col. José Perez San Roman, and his headquarters staff hoped that, before embarking, they could have printed thousands of leaflets to be dropped all over Cuba by planes calling upon the people to rise against their oppressor, Fidel Castro.

At the last moment San Roman was informed that the U.S. Government could not approve this plan.

On the morning of April 10 we were flown to Puerto Cabezas, Nicaragua. At the dock we saw the invasion fleet that the CIA had mobilized. There were six ancient craft. Three were Liberty ships of World War II vintage. The other three were old fishing yachts. Most of the officers were Spanish or Cuban, with crews filled out from men of the U.S. merchant marine—among them many drunkards and misfits. We soon discovered that the crews did not want to mix with their live Cuban cargoes, and couldn't have cared less whether the expedition succeeded or failed.

"We carry you, land you and leave you," a crew member explained. We took this as added assurance that we would be covered by air and naval support, for it was unthinkable to us that any civilized government would send men to battle without ample means either for complete victory or honorable retreat.

On the night of April 11, in moonless darkness, we sailed. On the fourth day at sea, we were given our final briefing on our invasion plan. Each man received a mimeographed copy of the operation in detail. The landings would be made on April 17 at Bahia de Cochinos, the Bay of Pigs, about 90 miles southeast of Havana. Battalions 2 and 5 would land first, at Playa Larga, deep in the bay, under command of Eneido Oliva. All other units would land at Playa Girón. Soon after our landings, the parachutists would drop some 12 miles inland to seize the airport of Jagüey Grande.

On the morning of April 15, planes from the Nicaraguan bases would begin bombing Castro's airfields and hangars, to be followed by heavier strikes on the sixteenth and seventeenth. Some of our units would move southeastward to join rebel groups in the Escambray Mountains, and others would move westward to take Havana.

Most important of all, our leaders had been assured of U.S. air cover, the backing of the U.S. Navy, and—if needed—of U.S. land troops as well. No one expected our 1,500 volunteers alone to conquer Castro's forces of 300,000 militia and regulars.

But we did expect that, with our American equipment plus American battle support, we would move inland steadily until we had cut Cuba in two. Castro's forces would then realize resistance was hopeless. Defections would begin and rise like a tide.

Soon we heard the Cuban radio announcing angrily that several planes were bombing the airports of Santiago and Havana and various military bases. We were elated. The bombings by our planes from Nicaragua had gone off on schedule. But Castro's broadcast was followed by a rebroadcast from the United States that chilled us to the bone. It was a speech by President Kennedy in which he affirmed that the United States would maintain a policy of strict neutrality in Cuba's internal affairs. Specifically, said the President, his Government would not intervene in the events shaping up in that island.

"He must say that, to deceive Castro," we finally decided, for all of us had heard Mr. Kennedy, during his campaign for the Presidency, advocate full support of Cubans opposing Castro. Yet doubts assailed me. It was the President speaking now—not the candidate.

On the morning of the 16th we were heartened by the sight of two U.S. destroyers, one on either side of our slow-moving flotilla. They were greeted with cheers. At least, we thought, we would have naval support. And in case of setback, we would be evacuated and saved from capture.

All through that April 16 we waited for news of the second bombing strike. No news came.

That night we saw the lights of Girón Beach, Bay of Pigs, on the horizon, like shimmering pearls. The ships carrying Oliva's units had veered to our right, and his men would be landing soon. As the first shots from Playa Larga sounded, I looked at my watch. It was 20 minutes past midnight, April 17. The tragic invasion had begun.

Oliva and his two battalions met little resistance on their landings—only a small patrol of Castro's militia.

Our ships drew up about 1 kilometer—0.6 of a mile—from the shore and anchored. Landing barges were quickly floated, and all hands began unloading the weapons.

The firing on Playa Larga had ceased. Back and forth from all the ships shuttled the motorized landing barges. As dawn broke, our radios picked up the first message of the American officer, stationed farther out at sea on a U.S. warship. He said:

"The whole bay is ours. The enemy has disappeared."

We learned later that morning that the officer was on the aircraft carrier *Boxer*. How comforting to know that the might of the greatest navy in the world was standing by to support this blow for freedom.

Our ship's captain stuck his head out of his cabin and shouted: "The sky is ours, too." Every man raised a cheer, for surely this meant that the bombing of the 15th had destroyed Castro's air force.

"WE CHEERED TOO SOON"

But we cheered too soon. At 6 a.m., a B-26 bomber flew toward us at low altitude. We supposed it came from our Nicaragua base. But suddenly it swooped low and began firing at the barges unloading their cargoes on the beach.

"Shoot," I shouted to the men still on my ship, the *Atlantico*. There was also firing from other ships. The B-26 sped away. It had given our men their first baptism of fire. But, most important to Castro, the pilot had learned that there was no air cover for the landing.

Two other B-26's appeared from over the sea. Several of our guns started firing. Then the planes identified themselves as ours, from the Nicaragua base. They circled over our landings for a while. Then, with feelings of despair, we saw them head back toward Nicaragua. The pilots said they had fuel enough to cruise over the Bay of Pigs for only about 20 minutes.

Suddenly a Sea Fury appeared. I recognized this British-made fighter plane at once, for Batista had used them against us when I was fighting with Castro in the hills. This one made a pass or two, then zoomed away.

As our landing barge was on its way toward the beach, another Castro B-26 appeared, swooping directly over us. Our guns fired. The plane plunged into the sea.

We waded ashore, through the warm Cuban waters, onto the beach of our native land. Soon we were under terrific fire from several enemy aircraft. Flat on our bellies, many of us crawled into the village of Girón. Some of the inhabitants had fled. Many others ran toward us with welcoming shouts.

HOW "PRECIOUS CARGO" WAS LOST

I looked back toward our ships. One was in flames and sinking rapidly. It was the *Houston*—with most of its precious cargo still unloaded. The stacks of mortar shells, the armored trucks, the electronic communications-control center—all were going down. Another ship burst into flames. It was the *Rio Escondido*. Soon it, too, sank. All the other ships were moving rapidly away. We watched a Sea Fury bring down a B-26 from our base. We asked:

"When will our air cover come? When will those fast U.S. jets go into action?"

The news from Playa Larga was good. Oliva had moved inland; destroying seven enemy tanks and numerous trucks, along with hundreds of enemy soldiers. The news from the parachutists was less hopeful. They had dropped early in the morning, but, for the most part, had landed in the swampy terrain north of the bay. Now they were fighting their way back to join our main force. By midafternoon, we were moving steadily forward.

"Keep advancing. Move inland—and wait" the American officer's voice kept broadcasting.

Late in the day we encountered the first battalions of Castro's militia, advancing among 10 or 12 tanks. How we needed those antitank mines that went down with the *Houston*. But our mortars were ready. We let go our barrage. Our fire was devastating. Castro's poor militiamen fell in heaps. Men? The majority were mere boys—many no more than 14 years of age. Only an insane sadist would have drafted those adolescents to fill his military machine.

As one after another of their tanks were knocked out, the Castro infantry ran like crazy from side to side. Our men got tired of shooting at them. The butchery that went on is impossible to describe. By nightfall, the survivors of Castro's forces were in full retreat.

The U.S. radio "Swan" had kept up a constant chatter all during the day, filled with exaggerated statements that I can now brand as deliberate lies. It said:

"The invaders are steadily advancing on every front."

"Throughout all Cuba, people are joining forces with the underground rebels fighting Fidel Castro."

"Castro's forces are surrendering in droves."

"It is reported that Raúl Castro has committed suicide."

That night our men slept in the open, close to the soil of our Cuba. Next morning we ate what rations we could gather from the villagers. We were set for another battle. But all was quiet for a time—except for the quarreling of vultures over the bodies of Castro's slain militiamen.

From Playa Larga, Oliva and his battalions had advanced more than 12 miles, fighting all the way. They had stopped 3,000 of Cas-

tro's militia, flanked by Russian tanks and covered by British-made Sea Fury planes. Our units had advanced almost that distance to the northeast. Realizing that our lines were too extended, San Roman ordered them pulled back.

Oliva began his withdrawal to join our forces north of Girón.

By noon of that second day, all officers and men realized it was then or never for victory. We had demoralized Castro's infantry with our deadly mortar and machine-gun fire. A few more days of pounding like that, and his forces would be surrendering in droves.

Colonel San Roman communicated with the American ship: "Where is our support?" he asked. "We must have jet cover immediately."

The answer he got was nothing new—simply that we should advance and wait.

"WE LOOKED IN VAIN FOR AIR SUPPORT"

All afternoon the enemy B-26's strafed and bombed us, while we looked in vain for the air support that could have knocked Castro's planes from the sky.

By nightfall, our forces had retreated from the Jagüey Grande area. Despite the terrific punishment from the air, we still held the terrain for 6 miles north of the bay, including the road junction at San Blas. We still stood guard over the airstrip on Girón Beach.

But we were running out of ammunition. Every battalion reported it was running short of mortar shells, and even the small-arms bullets would soon be exhausted.

Meanwhile, from our advanced sentinels, we learned that Castro's forces were concentrating in huge numbers, with scores of tanks, hundreds of cannons and armored trucks, forming a ring of steel around the Bay of Pigs and getting ready to mount an attack.

Not a single plane from our bases had engaged the enemy during that second day of fighting.

At midmorning of the third day, we saw two of our B-26's winging in from over the water. Two Cuban planes zoomed out to met them—one a Sea Fury, the other an American-made jet fighter—and within seconds our planes fell into the sea.

Soon afterward, three more of our planes flew over the beach and across the battle area. Two left quickly, but the third swooped down and began strafing the advancing Castro columns. Antiaircraft shells converged on that plane and it crashed. We found later that the pilot was Leo France's Berle of Boston, an American instructor from the Nicaragua base. Early that morning he had learned that the invasion forces were to be abandoned to their fate. Apparently, in anger and frustration, he had determined to uphold his own honor, at least.

One of Oliva's radiomen kept repeating this message: "This is Cuba calling the free countries. We need help in Cuba—now."

Like the coils of a great python, Castro's columns, with thousands of men supported by Russian tanks and bombing planes, were encircling our units and pressing them back toward the beach. We were outnumbered 40 to 1.

There can be no adequate description for the emotions that gripped us as we thought of what those planes on the U.S.S. *Boxer*, those guns on the two destroyers that had escorted us, and all our sunken mines and ammunition could do for us.

Manuel Artime Buesa and I were close by Col. San Roman during the final hours of our defeat. We heard him make his last anguished plea for help.

"Where is our support?" he asked.

From far away in the ocean came the reply:

"We cannot give you any further support. You are on your own."

Quickly, in the anger of a leader forsaken, San Roman replied:

"And you, sir, are a ———."

As the coils of Castro's python strangled us, one of our men shouted: "Headquarters says it's every man for himself."

I had resigned myself to being captured when I ran into Rene Salvia, a boyhood friend from my hometown. "Follow me," he shouted. We ran to the beach. Several lifeboats were filling with men and pushing out to sea. Howitzer shells were falling all around us. We spied a rubber raft floating near the shore—one used by frogmen to mark the route for our landing barges. It had an outboard motor and three oars. Rene and I piled into it, followed by Pepin Casals, Gardo Orlando, and Perez Jemenez. The motor refused to start, so we rowed out to sea.

For 4 days we paddled and drifted. About 5 o'clock on the fifth afternoon a freighter, the *Luisse*, bound for Corpus Christi, Tex., plucked us from the sea. Eventually I returned to Miami.

Since then, I have learned much from my friends in the revolutionary council about the invasion at the Bay of Pigs. I have learned that no preparations were made for our cooperation with the underground in Cuba. No campaign of civilian uprising and sabotage had been planned.

Both the U.S. military chiefs and the CIA blandly assumed that there was enough opposition to Fidel Castro inside Cuba to overthrow his regime, once the movement had been sparked by our invasion.

Our exile leaders reflect with great sorrow upon the fact that the U.S. decision to cancel the promised help to our invading forces included also a refusal to rescue our men and prevent their capture. Not even those in lifeboats or struggling in the water could be rescued. American naval personnel at Guantanamo heard our pleas for help, but, on orders from Washington, they could not move a vessel to assist.

It is known that Castro salvaged every item that went down with the *Houston* and the *Rio Escondido*—including our new secret communications system which, doubtless, now has been duplicated by every Communist military command in the world.

"NO RANSOM WAS NECESSARY"

Fidel Castro convicted 1,179 of the captives of treason. Now his demands for ransom have been met.

From my comrades of the invasion I have had my belief confirmed that no payment of ransom was necessary. The cowardly dictator had his plane all warmed up and waiting during the recent missile crisis, ready to flee the country at the first military move by the United States.

For me and for my comrades, the question still remains unanswered:

Why were we denied the help that would have uprooted the seedbed of Communist power in the Western Hemisphere?

Dr. Frank L. DeFurio, Distinguished Surgeon and Educator of Auburn, N.Y., Announces His Retirement From the City of Auburn Board of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week Dr. Frank L. DeFurio, a distinguished physician and surgeon from Auburn, N.Y., in my new congressional district, announced his intention to retire from the board of education of the City of Auburn after a long and distinguished service of 15 years.

Dr. DeFurio has long been an active and outspoken leader in the great city of Auburn. His wisdom, his energy, and his dedication have been reflected in the schools of the city.

In tribute to Dr. DeFurio's service on the board of education, the Auburn Citizen-Advertiser saluted him in its editorial page, and under unanimous consent I include herewith a copy of that editorial, which appeared on January 19, 1963.

The editorial follows:

DR. DEFURIO RETIRES

With the retirement of Dr. Frank L. DeFurio from the Auburn Board of Education, the Auburn board will lose a man who has been a strong supporter of good schools for Auburn.

The doctor has served on the unsalaried nine-man board for 15 years, and these have been busy years for the board. During this time Herman Avenue School, Genesee Street School, Owasco Elementary School, Auburn Community College have been built. Thornton Avenue School is under construction. The way has been cleared to start construction on Casey Park School and a new library for the college. Plans are being made for a new junior high school.

As a professional man Dr. DeFurio has appreciated the importance of good education and has been willing to spend money to see that Auburn children received this kind of education.

A Complaint Against Postal Regulations Inaugurated January 7, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to H. W. Brawley, Deputy Postmaster General, which was sent to me from the Voice of St. Matthews, a very highly respected newspaper in my congressional district, in which they outline a complaint against postal regulations inaugurated January 7, 1963, which complaint I feel should be brought to the attention of this body:

THE VOICE OF ST. MATTHEWS
AND THE HIGHLANDS,
Louisville, Ky., January 21, 1963.

Mr. H. W. BRAWLEY,
Deputy Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRAWLEY: We would like to call your attention to what we believe to be a grievous wrong caused by your issuance of Post Office Services Transmittal Letter 120, of January 7, 1963.

The particular wrong is section 134.82 and the wording "All sealed pieces mailed at the third-class postage rates must be legibly marked with the two words, 'third class.'"

Millions, perhaps billions, of shipping labels have been printed for general use during the past years with the wording: "Postmaster, contents, merchandise. This parcel may be opened for postal inspection if necessary. Return postage guaranteed."

To our own knowledge third-class matter bearing this slogan is now being marked postage due at the first-class rate. The most grievous part of this is that the postage-due balance is being collected from the intended recipient.

Clearly this is an injustice. This section of the Postal Manual hamstrings post offices throughout the Nation into the legal thievery of charging postage-due rates for all such third-class matter including any sealed packages up to 1 pound.

Sealed bulk mail which does not carry the marking "third class" is likewise charged, even though it is obvious by the very use of the bulk mail permit that the intent of the sender is to post the pieces third class rather than first class.

It is our deep conviction that this little-known section of the postal regulations is being used to glean untold amounts of moneys deviously milked from unsuspecting business firms and general patrons of the U.S. postal service.

Sincerely,

AL. J. SCHANSBERG,
Publisher.
C. ROGER GERNERT,
Circulation Manager.

The Sculptor of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. JENSEN, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to express what I believe to be the satisfaction of this House that a citizen of this country, Oskar Hansen, after whose name we appended a noble phrase, "sculptor of liberty," on the cornerstone of the monument to the alliance and victory, at Yorktown, Va., has now been accorded similar, signal honors, abroad.

His name has been inscribed among the Immortal Four Hundred, as a life fellow of the International Institute of Arts and Letters.

I have long felt that Oskar would inevitably bring this, and other similar honors, to add luster to our country. In order to underscore the many reasons why this should be so, I extend my remarks by including in the RECORD quotations from the book, "Beckoning Desert," Prentice-Hall, Inc., publishers, by the distinguished critic and author, on the staff of the Los Angeles Times, Edward Maddin Ainsworth.

I include the quotations from the writings of Edward Maddin Ainsworth in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STALLION'S HEAD

At the entrance, in the place of honor, where every visitor to the gem room of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington must see it, stands a special pedestal with a glass case upon it. In the glass case is the head of an Arabian stallion, carved in turquoise. The large size of the carving, to those who know turquoise, is unbelievable. Yet there it is, the fiery embodiment of the king of horses, nostrils flaring, great eyes ablaze, the inward curve of the face emblematic of the breed, the whole statue bespeaking the bursting arrogance of the triumphant male from the ancient deserts of the Mohammedan world.

I know a story about that piece of turquoise.

Oskar J. W. Hansen, for me the peer of American sculptors and a transplanted Norseman of such gargantuan attainments that I often wonder whether he leaped through space to our century from a more heroic age, was catapulted into my vision for the first time on a day of splendid sunshine in the Arizona desert in 1939–40. I say catapulted advisedly. Oskar Hansen cannot merely move. He projects himself. He becomes a missile. Life is his target.

As he was catapulted into my sight, at Boulder City near Hoover Dam on this particular summer day, he was heading with our mutual friend John Hilton for an obscure spot known as Chloride, Ariz. Into the whirlwind preparations for this impromptu expedition I was sucked as into a vortex. Before I quite realized what was happening I was introduced to Hansen by Hilton, provided a seat in a truck, handed a miner's pick, and whisked across the countryside through Joshua trees toward our objective. Oskar Hansen, with his large, animated face, flashing eyes, expressive tongue and slight accent, swept us along in a torrent of conversation.

It developed that we were in search of mineral specimens.

As we proceeded, I began to become aware of the stature of the man whom I had just met. His booming laugh and devastating wit alone were enough to inform me that I was in the presence of no ordinary mortal. When he lapsed into serious discussion it was as though he walked through the wide doors of the world's knowledge and handed out largess to his listeners with kingly gestures. Never have I met one who so humbly shared the greatness of his spirit with those around him. Never have I seen him condescend, never seek to shame one who knew less than he.

He was engaged at that particular moment upon two projects of extraordinary nature. One was the completion of the placing on the Navada side of Hoover Dam of two 32-foot winged bronze figures typifying the American Republic and the achievements of the engineering profession in creating the dam and Lake Mead. These figures, the largest single-cast bronzes in history, he had created after winning a national competition of U.S. leading sculptors.

His other undertaking was the making of a bronze and marble "Timetable of the Universe" at the base of the statues, to anchor for posterity the exact moment at which Hoover Dam had been dedicated. * * *

Chloride itself is situated at the entrance to the so-called Mineral Park between Boulder City and Kingman. Mineral Park is one of the Nation's most productive areas, boasting the possession of gold, silver, lead, zinc, copper, turquoise, amethyst, and other metals and gems, all within a few miles of each other. Many of the turquoise mines are said to have been worked by the Aztecs, and even perhaps their predecessors, way back in prehistoric times.

The combination of so many minerals and gems, all raw materials for sculpture or figure casting, had stirred the artistic feelings of Hansen despite the unromantic nomenclature of Chloride itself. On this day he was scouting for any sort of material which might look promising for sculpture.

As we drove through the increasing heat, Hansen disclosed to us his concept of basic sculpture.

"I can always see the figure I want to carve inside the stone," he said. "It is just a matter of peeling the outside, like taking the skin off an orange."

I was trying to absorb the simplicity of this idea, incidentally trying to make up my mind whether Hansen was serious or joking. * * * We embarked with added enthusiasm on the search of sculpturing materials. I had no idea what we were looking for, but by now I was beginning to enter into the spirit of the occasion. * * *

Within an hour we were hot on the trail of something which sounded too fantastic to be true. A grizzled ex-miner, who had lost all his teeth but not his powers of description, told us he knew where there was a piece of turquoise as big as a football. Allowing for the inevitable exaggeration expected from the mining gentry, we were still intrigued enough to ask its location. * * *

It all happened within 5 minutes then.

Hansen spoke to the resident of the shack, a patriarchal character who looked as if he should be playing Moses in a film rather than living in Chloride. The old fellow nodded, went to some secret hiding place and came back with a burlap sack.

From this he carefully extracted an object. It was the turquoise, living up to advance billing. Here it lay, before our eyes, gleaming with that unmistakable color halfway between sky and sea. It was as large as the two doubled fists of a large man. * * *

The patriarch was reasonable under the Hansen persuasion. Money passed. We reentered the car.

"Drive like hades," urged Hansen in a whisper, "before he changes his mind."

Fondly, Hansen held the unbelievable piece of turquoise in his hand and looked at it with a faraway expression on his face. Hilton and I watched him curiously.

"I see the head of an Arabian stallion in here," Hansen said, almost to himself. * * * This is what he saw. It is now in the place of honor in the national gem collection. * * *

The next day I saw the two heroic bronze sculptures at the Hoover Dam. Set against the sky and rocky cliff which serves as a backdrop, they are identical, Hansen explained, because "they represent the rulers and the people, and in this American democracy the rulers and the people are the same."

The figures look down on the astronomical chart.

This amazing creation, spread out over a large marble mosaic floor was intended to anchor in time the exact moment of the dedication of Hoover Dam, September 30, 1935, so that future astronomers could tell the conjunction of the planets and stars and, from them, calculate the date. The dedication, though, was far from being the only event chronicled. Every important happening for 5,000 years of recorded history, including the age of the pyramids, the beginning of the Christian era and other "time spots" was included. In addition, the course of the earth for the next 20,000 years was charted.

The mosaic floor on which the stars and planets were laid out was made up of black, white and grey marble and the heavenly bodies were represented by bronze castings made by Hansen himself. The path of the earth during a platonic (or great year) was traced in relation to events, planets and solar systems. A platonic year consists of 25,694.8 ordinary years.

Hansen had made hundreds of thousands of intricate astronomical calculations during the 5 years required to evolve the map of the heavens. He explained that at the end of a platonic year the earth would be in the same relative position as on the date of the dedication of the dam.

I was curious to find out why a sculptor also was so avid an astronomer. Hansen gave most of the credit to his longtime friend, the late Dr. Albert A. Michelson of Chicago, who was internationally known for

his experiments in calculating the speed of light. * * *

Naturally, I did not obtain the full story of Oskar Hansen in the few days of my assignment at Hoover Dam. Even now, after nearly three decades, I still have not been able to absorb all the multitudinous details of his crammed and achievement studded career. Through those decades, though, I have learned enough to list him as the only genius I have known. * * *

Then, before long, the desert interlude did indeed come to an end for all of us. Each went back to his own task, regretting that there were no more opportunities to participate in desert trips and campfire sessions. * * *

Oskar returned to Virginia to take up other creative tasks. He acquired a vast tract of ground of tremendous historical and sentimental value, a mountain portion of the original Thomas Jefferson estate, across the highway from Monticello. He designed and largely built a futuristic structure containing delicate electric ovens for the gem work which he liked to do, such as enameling on gold with pulverized gems—a virtually lost art dating back past medieval times. * * *

Included in the decorations were cacti of all kinds from the Arizona desert, nurtured in a huge solarium.

I heard of his works and his progress through various channels, but the years slipped by without the opportunity presenting itself for us to meet again. At last I heard that Oskar was embarked upon the most prodigious undertaking of his career. He had been granted a contract, by the Congress of the United States, to create a gigantic new figure of liberty for the top of the monument to the Alliance and Victory, at Yorktown, marking the successful conclusion of the American Revolution on the site of the last battle where General Cornwallis surrendered.

On a trip East I went to see Oskar in his studio to observe the almost unbelievable task of the carving of Liberty from two solid blocks of granite, one weighing 23,000 pounds, the other 11,489.

I asked him to put down in writing what Liberty meant to him. This is his reply, penned in the solarium amid the desert cacti:

"I like to remind you that the brute strength of this granite block from the primal crust of the earth which we quarried at Mount Airy is also the result of the thought and spirit of the Great Sculptor and was fashioned by His mind while 'darkness lay over the bosom of the deep.' A granits block is, therefore, more than just a large stone; it is a form of capital asset of the spirit, His spirit, which remains with us always.

"What is the face of Liberty? What character molds her features? On this Pantop Mountain in the Albemarle, on soil once hallowed by the feet of Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson, it is more likely that the true nature of Liberty may be perceived than on any similar spot on earth, outside Mount Sinai.

"The victory at Yorktown was a victory of the spirit. There is spirit in the face of the Liberty which will stand again at Yorktown.

"This figure of Liberty which I am bringing out of the granite is larger than Michaelangelo's David. One may accomplish, out of this 4-billion-year-old matrix, only that which has made a well-nigh indelible impression upon one's own mind.

"It is not completed, in a moment of sudden inspiration, with a line of the pencil or the stroke of a brush. Required is the iron will of a consistent and wholly dedicated purpose. Day by day and chip by chip, one must grow to the stature of the image one brings into form. The emotions which she may evoke in the beholder must be questioned in turn.

"When the Liberty of America again graces her shaft at York, it is my prayer that every American may search her face and find there the suggested presence of his own mother and of the mother of his sons. In the face of that reality men have ever sought reassurance for doing that which life requires and for the approval which shapes our conduct for that day when we may stand with clean hands and a shining face before the Great White Throne of God."

Hansen did not elaborate upon his mention of Michaelangelo's David, but he could have done so. Actually, "Liberty" was the largest single figure carving ever undertaken by one man alone in the history of the world, according to any historical records now known. Liberty measured 14 feet and 2 inches. Her completed weight was 25,000 pounds. She weighed much more than stated, in the rough.

When I heard Oskar speak of what Liberty meant to him, when I sensed the full force of his mental and physical powers going into the creation of the symbolic statue, I realized fully for the first time what genuine freedom has meant to Americans who have come here from other lands and gained citizenship in our Republic.

I went up to Washington from Oskar's studio and took time for a visit to the Smithsonian Institution.

At the entrance to the gem room I encountered the Arabian stallion.

It, too, spoke of Liberty in its own way. The proud, unconquered head burst upon view as the embodiment of freedom in the desert, the incarnate spirit of the untamed.

I closed my eyes and seemed to be transported at once to the brilliance of an Arizona day—to be surrounded by sun and sage, hearing the booming laugh of Oskar.

Then, once more, I gazed upon the stallion's head.

I knew a story about that piece of turquoise. * * *

J.F.K.: The Job Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a most thoughtful editorial analysis of the President's state of the Union message in the January 15, 1963, edition of my hometown newspaper, the San Jose Mercury.

Under unanimous consent, I present the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD herewith and commend it to the attention of my colleagues and other citizens throughout the country:

J.K.F.: THE JOB AHEAD

President Kennedy's state of the Union message lived up to its advance billing; it dwelt heavily on the necessity for a tax cut this year and for maintenance of cold war military strength.

This, it seems to us, reflects a reasonable reaction to the state of the world and of the Federal Union as they exist today, not as theorists might wish them to exist.

It is, of course, too early to criticize the President's program in detail; it hasn't been submitted in detail. But the hints contained in yesterday's state of the Union message provide reason for cautious optimism.

For example, President Kennedy appeared to recognize that congressional conservatives will give his tax cut proposals short shrift unless there is a companion effort to reduce Federal spending. He promised, therefore, to keep domestic programs for next year under this fiscal year's spending levels. This is a step in the right direction.

It is also a step in the right direction when the President says, as he did in the state of the Union message, that labor pressure for a shorter workweek is inimical to economic growth and will not receive White House support.

In this regard, President Kennedy noted that his proposed net tax reduction of $10 billion over the next 3 years would "mean tens of billions of dollars more each year in production, profits, wages, and public revenues.

"It would mean an end to the persistent slack which has kept unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 out of 62 months—and an end to the growing pressures for such restrictive measures as the 35-hour week, which alone would increase hourly labor costs by as much as 14 percent, start a new wage-price spiral of inflation, and undercut our efforts to compete with other nations."

We concur most heartily in these sentiments.

We concur, too, in the President's observation that internal strife in the Communist world gives the West cause for hope which must be tempered with caution.

"A dispute over how best to bury the free world is no grounds for Western rejoicing," is the way the President put it. We agree.

In light of this, it is sensible that the budget to be submitted later this week contains an estimated $50 billion for defense expenditures out of a $99 billion total.

And the President spoke sense, too, when he in effect urged our NATO allies to concentrate on developing their own conventional forces as a complement to the U.S. nuclear strike capability. In the President's words:

"Threats of massive retaliation may not deter piecemeal aggression—and a line of destroyers in quarantine or a division of well-equipped men on a border, may be more useful to our real security than the multiplication of awesome weapons beyond all rational need."

Take it all in all, President Kennedy's state of the Union message is a hopeful statement.

All Americans hope the President's optimism proves to be justified. A more meaningful appraisal must await the details.

Robert S. Kerr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable Robert S. Kerr, has left a deep mark on all of us.

This past session of the 87th Congress, all of us marveled at the stamina and skill of this great Senator as he directed the fate of the most important pieces of legislation to come to the floor of the other body.

There is no question that Bob Kerr was a self-made man, a go-getter. At times his foes sharply criticized his actions, but Bob Kerr feared no man.

He was, as one newsman wrote, "beyond doubt, the most powerful single Senator—and by himself more powerful than most of them in groups."

It did not take one long to know where Bob Kerr stood on a certain piece of legislation. All he needed was an explanation of the legislation and he would form his own opinion on its merits, and immediately would become its champion if he thought the bill was worthwhile.

This was brought home repeatedly in my own personal dealings with Bob Kerr. In the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senator Bob Kerr, as chairman of the Public Works Committee, became one of the strongest advocates for the Delaware River Basin compact and helped lead the fight for its enactment by that body when it was threatened by a battle over public versus private power.

Outside of the Halls of Congress, Bob Kerr was a personable, knowledgeable individual who commanded the respect of a multitude of friends.

His every action was made in behalf of his constituents in that great State of Oklahoma, where he was born in a log cabin. His unique talents brought him widespread acclaim and his climb politically was compared with that of President Lincoln.

All of us, and the people of Oklahoma, will greatly miss this distinguished Senator. I join my colleagues in extending heartfelt condolences to Senator Kerr's devoted wife, Grayce Breene, and his daughter and three sons. Their grief is shared by all of us who had the good fortune and privilege to serve with this outstanding American.

What Is the Administration Covering Up Regarding Our Foolish Policy in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the news and editorials of the past several days are fraught with terror as to what is happening to the once powerful United States in our policy regarding Cuba. The President continues to tell the country what a great victory he has won there, but his brave words are followed by a rewriting of the historical record of what happened at the Bay of Pigs by his brother, the Attorney General, and by Communist boasts of how they took the United States in on the Cuban deal, and the worried questioning of talented newspapermen who are bringing to light that there was not indeed a victory in Cuba, but what may be a tremendous defeat. Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that Congress investigate our Cuban policy and demand of the administration a true statement of what has been accomplished and what we intend to do about increasing Soviet military expansion there.

As a part of these remarks, under unanimous consent, I would like to include a powerful column by Henry J. Taylor in the Dallas Morning News, an equally powerful piece by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star. I would also like to include the lead of a news article written by William L. Ryan, Associated Press staff writer in Berlin, in which the German Communist leader Walter Ulbricht tells of Communist plans for Cuba and the rest of the Western Hemisphere. Finally, to complete this dismal picture, I include a new article by Earl H. Voss, staff writer for the Washington Evening Star, telling of our abandonment of low-level aerial reconnaissance of Cuba. Mr. Speaker, in heaven's name, what is the administration trying to do?

The articles follow:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Jan. 21, 1963]

ABOUT SOVIET TROOPS—PENTAGON WHISPERS CUBA CONFESSION

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Pentagon has whispered a confession; whispered it to achieve minimum notice and yet amend the rigged record in Washington's manipulated news.

This column repeatedly stated that throughout the White House campaign to call the Russians in Cuba "technicians," Mr. Kennedy knew these were heavily armored, fully equipped Soviet combat troops, more than 10,000 strong. Our Central Intelligence Agency had even identified the troops' shoulder patches. Our Moscow Embassy's military attaché had confirmed these designations as elite elements of the Red army. Moreover, Castro had (and still has) an estimated 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and at least 500 antiaircraft missiles, including many as "hot" and intricate as anything we possess.

Soviet submarine fishing base construction on the Isle of Pines, Seguanea Bay, continues apace. So does the military adaptation of the great Caverna de Santo Tomas, Caverna del Suisenor, Escaleras de Jaruco and Caguanes Caves, undetectable from the air.

MISSILES BEGAN ARRIVING IN 1961

In addition, the big missiles began arriving as early as November 1961—a fact the White House no longer denies but has never admitted.

Impeccable Cuban underground sources, dead right from the very beginning, still insist Khrushchev placed 86 long-range atomic missiles there, balanced against the 42 that the Pentagon "is sure" Khrushchev took out. But the whole charade was supported by the governmental brigade of tax-paid publicity agents pumping out misinformation like bouncing nymphs or charging Valkyries in yellow braids and 10-league boots.

That is what happened and that is the noisy side of the manipulated news technique. Now the manipulator's problem is to square up the noisy record as quietly as possible and thus ultimately challenge those who claim the public has been misled.

As the French would say, they have a sea to drink up.

Notice the method regarding the Soviet troops still in Cuba: No press release. No public statement. No leaks to "fill in" newsmen or a TV interview to bring the people closed to the Presidency. Why, even the state of the Union message reveals nothing about how Cuba remains a looming bastion fringed with fire or the downhill negotiations that still allow this result 90 miles from our shores.

HOW THE STORY SHIFTED

First was the White House insistence that there were no Soviet soldiers there. Then the President's, oh, well, perhaps there are "two or three thousand." Finally, months later, the Pentagon confirmation that the 10,000 was true. And now the Pentagon has been instructed to state, but only in reply to inquiries, that yes, Mr. Kennedy's estimate of Cuba-based Soviet combat forces is "somewhat higher than had been thought."

How much higher, you ask? Oh, quite a bit. The Pentagon's official admission as of the day of the President's State of the Union message is 17,000. That message stated "while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed." Has it?

Moreover, Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester finally agreed to reveal that at least 20,000 Soviet soldiers were in Cuba at the hurry, hurry why? moment of lifting the blockade. By the Pentagon's own calculation less than 3,000 have left. Why?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in turn, falls right in line with the whole news-manipulation program. Testifying before a Senate Foreign Relations Committee closed session on January 11 he kept up the same old charade—the hair-splitting fiddle-faddle that the President hadn't given a commitment not to invade Cuba. Stalwart Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, protested Mr. Rusk's "ambiguities."

CYCLE STARTS WITH RATIONALIZED LIE

The truth seldom bounds out of any political forest like a leaping deer. It must be sought. This is the function of the free press. And under the administration's manipulation policy it is admittedly impossible to accept even our highest officials' statements at face value.

The rationalized lie starts the cycle. Then the denial compounds the felony. Then the adjusted lie adds to the crime. Finally the ultimate confirmation that it was all false from the beginning is forced out only by exceedingly unfashionable persistence.

The Communists are ideologists but they are not idiots. Khrushchev, of course, knows the truth. The only people being fooled are the American people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

UNITED STATES AND THE BAY OF PIGS FIASCO—QUESTION OF MILITARY COMPETENCE OR CIVILIAN INTERFERENCE IS RAISED

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to know whether the Chiefs of their armed services are incompetent or whether, in strictly military operations, they are being interfered with by civilians in the Government.

A congressional investigation of just what happened before the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba took place in April 1961, is more than ever necessary now, because of what is being disclosed as the "true story" of the fiasco. For unless the responsibility of the U.S. Chiefs of Staff during military operations is clearly fixed, the capacity of the United States to prevent or resist armed attacks in this hemisphere may be open to question.

More than 300,000 men of our armed services were mobilized last October inside the United States for a possible invasion of Cuba in order to get rid of the Soviet missile bases there. But there is no way to judge whether the military Chiefs even then had the full authority to act and just what restrictions were placed upon them which could have affected the success of that expedition.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who, because he is a brother of the President, is regarded as the administration's authoritative spokesman in many matters outside his own department, has just given two interviews on the Cuban fiasco, one to the Knight

newspapers and the other to U.S. News & World Report.

The two interviews dovetail, though they do not cover all of the same points. The Attorney General told David Kraslow, Washington correspondent of the Knight newspapers, that there had been no invasion plan completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. He said: "There was just a general concept. The logistics and the details were worked out after the President [Kennedy] took office."

Added interest has developed now in this whole subject, because many of the Cuban officers of the invasion force, who were recently ransomed have been telling Americans that the United States had assured them of air cover. Attorney General Kennedy makes quite a point of the fact that "no U.S. air cover" was ever promised. Technically, this is correct. But the United States was fully cognizant of the air support the Cubans were supposed to have. Yet this was inadequate. Attorney General Kennedy said in his interview in U.S. News & World Report:

"The first point is that there was not U.S. air cover and none was withdrawn. In fact, the President didn't withdraw any air cover for the landing forces, United States or otherwise.

"What happened was this: One air attack had been made on Saturday on Cuban airports. There was a flurry at the United Nations and elsewhere and, as a result, U.S. participation in the matter was coming to the surface. This surfacing was contrary to the preinvasion plan. There was supposed to be another attack on the airports on Monday morning.

"The President was called about whether another attack which had been planned should take place. As there was this stir about the matter, he gave instructions that it should not take place at that time unless those having the responsibility felt that it was so important it had to take place, in which case they should call him and discuss it further. And that's what was postponed. It wasn't air cover of the beaches or landings. And, in fact, the attack on the airports took place later that day."

The air cover provided was from a base in Central America. What part the U.S. Government played in organizing it is not disclosed. In the middle of a military operation, however, you can't make a long-distance call to the White House and discuss the next move. The anti-Castro forces were sure air cover was coming from somewhere.

The Attorney General was asked who did the planning. He declared that "the plan that finally went into effect was approved by our military—the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency." He added that, while the Joint Chiefs "approved" the plan, "the responsibility for the planning lay primarily with the CIA," and that, since the President had to give final approval to the plan, he had accepted the blame.

In both interviews, the Attorney General said that U.S. air power was to have been used only if the ships transporting the Cuban invasion force had been detected by Castro before they reached the target area and were attacked on the high seas on their way back to Central America. This is the explanation given for the presence of U.S. warships, including an aircraft carrier, in the vicinity of the Bay of Pigs on the day of the invasion. Yet it is asserted that before the invasion the President had "made it clear" that U.S. armed forces, including airpower, would not be used.

In the interview in the Knight newspapers, the Attorney General said, "The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

But what does "cleared" mean? Do the Joint Chiefs take responsibility for any such plan as was employed?

Listing the major "mistakes," Mr. Kennedy added: "There was not sufficient air cover at the beach. That was a mistake. There were not enough men and equipment. That was a mistake. Underestimating the T-33's (Castro's airplanes) that was a serious mistake. The planning was inadequate, just inadequate."

But who did all this planning, and why wasn't someone in the U.S. Air Force able to say in advance whether the T-33's had the capacity to carry rockets? These were the U.S. planes originally given to the Batista regime in Cuba.

The important "details" have never been divulged, as there has been a constant cover-up. But if Congress now fails to make a searching inquiry, with testimony available to the public, another military fiasco could occur, especially if the same "military planners' are still in command at the Pentagon or elsewhere.

REDS WILL FLOURISH IN CUBA AND EXPAND, ULBRICHT SAYS

(By William L. Ryan)

BERLIN, January 15.—East German Communist Leader Walter Ulbricht told world Communist chieftains today that communism will continue to flourish in Cuba and intends to extend itself in the Western Hemisphere.

With Soviet Premier Khrushchev listening from the platform, the spade-bearded East German denounced Red China's attacks on the Russian leader's policies. He credited him with saving the world from nuclear war by compromising the Cuban crisis with President Kennedy.

In his opening address to East Germany's Sixth Communist Party Congress, Mr. Ulbricht also proposed a vague solution for the problem of divided Berlin. He said the United Nations flag should replace the NATO flag in West Berlin, but that any such arrangement must recognize East German sovereignty, especially access routes on the land, water and in the air.

ASNS INDIAN SETTLEMENT

Mr. Ulbricht also called on Peking and India to settle their border dispute at once. He criticized the Chinese Reds for launching their border operation against India in October without consulting other Communist states.

Mr. Khrushchev's handling of the Cuban crisis, Mr. Ulbricht said, prevented the world from experiencing the horrors of nuclear war. Mr. Khrushchev nodded agreement.

Mr. Ulbricht maintained Mr. Khrushchev kept communism alive in Cuba and gave it an opportunity to spread in the Western Hemisphere.

"There was a compromise," he told the party congress. "President Kennedy had to abandon his idea of aggression. * * *

"Cuba was freed of the threat of aggression and is now able to build up its country on the basis of socialism."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

LOW-LEVEL CUBA FLIGHTS DISCONTINUED BY UNITED STATES

(By Earl H. Voss)

The United States has ended low-level aerial reconnaissance of Cuba and now relies exclusively on high-flying U-2's to keep an eye on Soviet and Cuban military moves in the Caribbean, according to American officials.

It was new evidence gathered by U-2's that caused American analysts to raise their estimate of Soviet forces in Cuba from upwards of 10,000 to 16,000 to 17,000.

Soviet-manned antiaircraft missile batteries in Cuba, which proved they can reach the unusual altitudes at which U-2's fly by knocking one out of the sky, are not now firing at the planes on their regular reconnaissance flights over the island.

The administration has not felt so sure, however, that the low-level Cuban antiaircraft weapons, supplied by the Soviet Union but believed to be under Prime Minister Castro's control, would hold their fire indefinitely if low-level reconnaissance were continued on a daily basis.

For this reason, the low-altitude flights have been suspended. They could, of course, be resumed if U-2 or other intelligence tips should acquire it.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev apparently is hoping to set an example, by withholding fire on the U-2's, in avoiding a direct clash between Soviet and American military forces.

President Kennedy ignored this principle which the Kremlin apparently hopes to establish, when he discovered Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba. He interposed a U.S. naval blockade in the path of Soviet ships bound for Cuba.

The possibility of a clash between Soviet and American military forces again would be posed if there were an anti-Castro uprising in Cuba. The United States hardly could avoid a fight with Soviet forces if they tried to prop up Castro by crushing Cuban freedom fighters.

The range of other contingencies in which the United States might be forced to move against Soviet troops is being canvassed now.

President Kennedy's unwillingness to risk incidents between a low-level American plane and Castro-controlled antiaircraft batteries indicates, however, that the administration wants to choose carefully the circumstances under which it again directly challenges Soviet military power, if this ever is found to be necessary.

Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the October 1962 issue of Fortune magazine entitled "The Priority of Politics Over Economics," casts considerable light on the fallacies of the economic theories of the New Frontier. In its emphasis on Government planning and direction of the economy as well as on heavy Federal spending, the New Frontier economic theorists misunderstand the dynamic nature of the free-market economy and the intricate functioning of the price, wage, and profit system. It is this free system that creates wealth and economic progress, as well as serving as an indispensable buttress to individual liberty. Government must maintain institutions and a climate favorable to growth, but healthy economic growth cannot be imposed from the top down. It must grow from the bottom up.

The Kennedy administration appears to believe that Government spending and control can bring faster economic growth and solve our still serious unemployment problem. Since the last fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration, Federal expenditures have increased from $76.5 billion to an estimated $93.7 billion in fiscal 1963. Yet the economy is still afflicted with an unsatisfactory rate of economic growth and a very high level of 5.8 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed.

As this article by John Davenport points out, Government spending may be regarded as the flywheel of the economy, but it cannot supply the motive power. That motive power resides in the creative energies of the people, and the most Government can do is help to release it. Under unanimous consent, I include the article, as follows:

THE PRIORITY OF POLITICS OVER ECONOMICS

(By John Davenport)

This month the anxiety that overhung the Nation's economy all through the summer will give way, at least momentarily, to the turbulence and excitement of a political campaign. Even as an off-year election, it will be an enormous expression of the national will: all the House seats (435) are at stake, 39 Senate seats, and 35 governorships. Parochial arguments in States and cities and the racket of personal political feuds will fill the air. But the man to whom the outcome will be most important, is the man who isn't running, President John F. Kennedy.

For while local issues will be mainly in the forefront, below the surface will always be the big, rocklike questions: the questions of jobs, of prices, of profits, of Government spending, of taxes. No one is more aware of this than the President, who is taking his case directly to hundreds of thousands of people, attempting to resell his various programs of medicare, urban renewal, and electric power expansion. It could be said that he began his campaign in August in his televised report on the economy. Then he found the economy good enough so that no immediate tax cut was needed. But he promised that in 1963 he will present a bill to Congress that will include an "across-the-board top-to-bottom cut in both corporate and personal income taxes," and will also include "long-needed tax reform that logic and equity demand." This promise of tax reduction obviously has enormous political appeal. It will also be one of the most bitterly debated issues in the new Congress that will be elected this fall.

For quite apart from their obvious and necessary function in government, taxes have become in the last quarter of a century an instrument of social welfare, a weapon of intervention in the economy, a pervasive factor in business decisions, and a demonstration of the intent and power of Washington, and it is impossible, of course, to separate tax reform from the issue of Federal spending. When Harry Hopkins said, "We shall spend and spend and tax and tax and elect and elect," he expressed a cynicism that must pervert and defeat any effort to remedy the tax structure. One test of John F. Kennedy's sincerity will be whether he has left this kind of cynicism behind.

But the greater test of the President's promise of tax reform and of his domestic policies turns on the question of whether he understands the nature of the American enterprise system and the unique system of government that has allowed enterprise to flourish. During the fifties, President Eisenhower clung to the salty philosophy that it was the function of Government to build the framework and to create the atmosphere in which business could prosper and so provide jobs and rising living standards. Ike was not too articulate in this belief; sometimes his metaphors about frames and atmosphere got pretty mixed. And in the end Federal expenditures got out of hand. Nevertheless, Eisenhower's attempt to delimit the functions of Government and relate them to the profit system was welcome and constructive after the Truman years. Now under John F. Kennedy there has been a "shift" in a different direction. How far has this shift gone? And, more important, on what kind of philosophy is it based?

JAMES MADISON PUT THE QUESTION

One paradox that must strike the inquirer at the beginning is that while Kennedy is the most politically minded of men when it comes to gathering votes, he has laid little emphasis on political theory as such. While doubtless an admirer of the Federalist papers, he has not in public, at least chewed over the great questions therein raised as to how a government, endowed with coercive power, can be prevented from misusing it and, in James Madison's phrase, can be obliged "to control itself." Nor does the President seem to have noted that to the architects of the republic, politics in the philosophic sense of the word had clear priority over what we today call economics. Because they took a certain view of man and his liberties, they favored strong but limited government, and in favoring such government, they more or less took for granted the virtues of a free economy. In a curious way the pragmatists and activists of our day have reversed this order of thinking. President Kennedy's politics seems to flow from his economics and his economics in turn forces the Government into a positive and expansive role.

Such expansion breathes through most of the multiple messages that the President has fired at Congress. It is also implicit in his constant talk of "moving America ahead." Under the elms of New Haven last June the President stated that the central problem of our time was "the practical management of the modern economy." And he then asked almost plaintively, "How, in sum, can we make our free economy work at full capacity—that is, provide adequate profits for enterprise, and adequate wages for labor, and adequate utilization of plant, and opportunity for all?" But who is the "we" of this strange, tortured question? And just how is a free economy to be made to do something? And is it really a prime function of such an economy to provide profits for enterprise? Surely matters are the other way around: in the right environment businessmen will as a matter of course seek a profit as the reward of risk taking and the producing of goods that the people demand, and this in turn will expand the economy.

NEW EXPERTS FOR OLD PLANS

Direct interference of the government in the economy is associated with another tendency—namely, reliance on "experts" and expertise. While calling for a dialog, the President said that the central domestic problems of our times "relate, not to basic clashes of philosophy or ideology, but to ways and means of reaching common goals—to research for sophisticated solutions to complex and obstinate issues." The idea implicit in this kind of statement is that economic problems should be left to technicians to solve without the emotional debate that has stirred the country in the past. The President himself doesn't always follow the rule: witness his impassioned plea for medicare. But, beyond this, it must be asked whether research and experts can really resolve basic issues without some kind of guidance. If experts are told to help solve the farm problem within the limits of freedom for the farmer, they will come up with one kind of solution. If they are given no directions they are all too apt to smuggle in their own values, and suggest some elaborate schemata of their own. It so happens that reliance on expertise has usually gone hand in hand with government planning of one kind or another. An expert who tells the government just to let things alone and let the free market take its course will not be earning his salary very long. The Russian Government is full of experts, precisely because it seeks to control every aspect of the economy.

There is nothing new, of course, about Government planning and interference with the market. Its famous practitioners can be traced through history. The Emperor Diocletian, for instance, tried price controls in Rome. King Richard started England on its long experiment with the Corn Laws. One of the great planners was Colbert, minister to King Louis XIV. It was against Colbert and his school that Adam Smith revolted in his "Wealth of Nations" published in the same year as the Declaration of Independence. In the United States, also, planning has a history. It was not so long ago, in the thirties, that the Technocrats under Howard Scott were preaching that modern economic problems are too complicated for the politicians or the population, and should be left to engineers. At about the same time the historian Charles A. Beard was calling for a "single national authority" that would, among other things, fix a "standard of life budget" for the American people and implement it with the aid of production experts. And the idea of planning dominated the NRA, with its codes for controlling prices, wages, and output, which the well-remembered Gen. Hugh (Iron Pants) Johnson strove mightly to uphold. Fortunately the codes were finally declared unconstitutional.

One person who saw through this whole cult of planning very early and tried to change things to a more hopeful direction was President Kennedy's good friend, Walter Lippmann. In his wonderful book, "The Good Society," published in 1937, he made a devastating attack on the planners of his day, arguing that they had missed the central economic development of the modern world. That development was the division of labor, which requires that the specialized work of one man be coordinated with that of another, and that the production of both be somehow linked to the freely choosing consumer. Such coordination, Lippmann held, cannot possibly be achieved by government directives, and those who believe it can are in a literal sense reactionary. Rather, the division of labor necessitates the very market economy that planners scorn, and requires a government that rules by law rather than by arbitrary decree. Wrote Lippmann: "It is no accident that the division of labor, common laws, the ideal of equal justice, the restraint of prerogative and privilege * * * should all have evolved together in the same regions of the earth. They are merely different aspects of the momentous change in which men have been passing out of their primitive self-sufficiency into the intricate interdependence of the great society."

THE VITAL CONNECTION

These philosophic reflections are of immense importance in judging various tendencies and programs put forward in the name of the New Frontier. For if the philosophy of the good society is right, the trouble with the New Frontiersman is not that he is too radical, but that he has missed the bus—or shall we say the jet?—of modern history. In our day government must wield great power in the national defense, in the maintenance of internal law and order, in the provision of a sound and dependable currency system; the functions of government are not fixed and immutable. But the dynamic force of progress is the free collaboration of individuals made possible by the widening of the competitive market and the intricate functioning of the price, wage, and profit system. It is this system, not the directives of government, that creates wealth and work in the modern world. And it is this system, with its wide dispersion of power and decision, that serves as an indispensable buttress to human liberty.

The President has never given sufficient stress to this vital interconnection of political and economic liberty. While his administration has blown cold and hot toward businessmen as a group, it has not consistently upheld free-market principles. The admin-

istration favors freer trade abroad, and in his message on domestic transportation the President recommended less, not more, government interference. But in general the New Frontier's domestic policy points in a different direction. The newly elected President placed great emphasis on setting up national goals for the United States, which always somehow implied more government power and decision. A theme song of the campaign was that the United States had been growing to slowly and that the Democrats would take measures to speed things up.

Growth and economic progress have always been characteristic of the American economy, but there are two ways of approaching these desiderata. One is to assume that healthy economic growth basically comes from the bottom up rather than being imposed from the top down. On this view it is the function of government to maintain institutions favorable to growth—for instance, property rights, contracts, and sound money—letting the growth itself occur as the result of the activity of the citizens of the country. The other approach is to make government itself responsible for economic growth and to set up definite "targets" for this performance, which, if not achieved by private action, must be achieved by more massive doses of government intervention.

The New Frontiersmen favor the target approach, and there has been endless argument about output gaps, defined as the difference between what the economy has done and might have done going full blast. In the process the true meaning of growth has been obscured. It is the assumption of many calculations in this area that growth is simply the piling up of goods and services as measured by the gross national product. But if this is all there is to progress, then a society that simply built pyramids by the use of slave labor might be said to be growing just as fast as a society that put its resources to more constructive use. Again, many economies have grown rapidly in wartime if one counts the output of munitions as economic goods. The fact is that the whole concept of growth is meaningless unless one allows purposes and values into the equation. True growth involves, not just the piling up of goods, but the widening of human options. It means producing goods that people want and freely choose, and the virtue of the market lies precisely in giving the consumer this vote.

A CARTEL FOR AGRICULTURE

The planned economy by definition denies that such choice is important. Russia grows—by producing the goods its government thinks will be best for the population. The Kennedy administration came closest to advocating this kind of specific planning in the case of agriculture. Ever since the depression thirties the Government, of course, has been propping various farm prices above market levels and creating surpluses by so doing. Under the Eisenhower administration there was recognition at least of the fact that the proper solution to the so-called farm problem was to lower support prices and to reduce the number and extent of specific controls. This policy, strongly endorsed by the Farm Bureau, was never given a fair trial or enough fighting support by Eisenhower and Secretary Benson, but at least the direction of the thinking was correct.

The Kennedy administration in its first 2 years simply abandoned any idea of returning agriculture to the marketplace. Its program was to hold price supports high and to extend them to more and more commodities. Then, in an effort to prevent overproduction and surplus, it asked for more and more controls on the number of acres to be planted and the amount of each crop that could be marketed. Such a program, if ever finally enacted, would collectivize or cartelize agriculture completely. Moreover, its benefits, if they can be called such, would tend to go, not to the farmer who might need help, but to the richest producers. The whole history of price-support operations is that they put money in the pockets of the well-to-do commercial farmers. They do little for the marginal family that consumes most of what it produces on the land. (And as the Billie Sol Estes case dramatizes, even the present system of Government controls is a haven for sharpers and speculators and just plain crooks.)

Congress refused to go along with the New Frontier's more stringent controls, and the farm mess remains as bad as ever. The point is that the Kennedy-Freeman plan aims in the wrong direction. Running through the President's initial message to Congress on agriculture was the old, tired idea that there is a fair income for the American farmer and a fair price for what he produces, and that Government can somehow guarantee both. These concepts quite literally come out of the Middle Ages. They imply a completely static view of society in which classes are fixed and each class deserves a certain cut or share out of total income. But America is not like that. The farmer of yesterday is the mechanic of today and maybe the lawyer or entrepreneur of tomorrow. As the result of this constant change farm families now constitute only 7.7 percent of all families as against 30.7 percent in 1910, and meanwhile farm output per man-hour has quadrupled through mechanical invention and advances in chemistry. The Government should not interfere in this process by tampering with prices. For in doing so it jams the mechanism through which progress is made; and its controls strike directly at individual freedom. In agriculture the Kennedy administration was trying to turn the clock back all the way.

Elsewhere in the economy the New Frontier was less committed to specific planning but some of the fallacies inherent in its farm program reappeared. As in the case of agriculture, the administration seemed to conceive of both industry and labor as constituting separate and almost hermetically sealed groups in our society, forgetting again that individuals from one group are constantly passing into the other, and likewise forgetting that the rational purpose of the economic process is to serve the consumer, who is literally everyman. This group approach is reminiscent of the kind of thinking that pervaded both the New Deal and the Fair Deal. Society is thought of not as a coherent whole, in which individuals and their basic rights are important, but as a series of powerful producer pressure blocs. Besides the farmer there is big business and big labor, and, of course, big Government, which somehow must reconcile conflicting group claims.

But whereas the administration has been trying to shove agricultural prices up, it attempted in industry to hold "strategic" prices stable, while putting only a nominal pressure on wages and costs. The most dramatic expression of this, of course, occurred in steel where the President intervened to bring about a wage settlement, and apparently took it for granted that there would be no price increase. When Big Steel attempted to raise prices, he launched the attack which shook all of industry, and was a cause—though probably not the main cause—of the stock market break in May.

Administration spokesmen professed to be astonished at this reaction from the country, thereby showing themselves to be somewhat naive. For businessmen saw the intervention as an attack on the whole price-and-profit system, and as a blatant misuse of executive power. As Charles Reich of the Yale Law School wrote in the New Republic: "The evidence is overwhelming that the actions taken by the President were primarily for the purpose of intimidating and coercing the steel industry. * * * Such use of power, whether its objectives are good or bad, is dangerous. * * * It means that people offend the President at their peril."

THE WOBBLY GUIDEPOSTS

While reacting violently to the attempted increase in steel prices, the administration was far more tolerant as regards wages. In this matter its Council of Economic Advisers last January staked out its famous guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior. The central guide was that wages in all industries could rise with overall, or national, productivity without producing inflation. As noted last month, this guide was surrounded by many modifications and was promised on the idea that the economy was actually nearing a state of full employment. Few labor leaders or, for that matter, businessmen troubled to read this fine print. They simply assumed that the Council said wages could rise with normal productivity, and they assumed that this productivity was 3 percent. It is no coincidence that wage settlements so far this year have averaged about 3 percent, with fringe benefits piled on top. Meanwhile, productivity, which spurted sharply in mid-1961, has tended to level out.

These are scarcely the conditions that favor a rapid rise in employment and a diminution of unemployment, which is one of the chief goals of administration policy. For employment depends on profits and profit expectations on the part of employers, and profits in turn are the margin between costs and prices. It was the argument of Lord Keynes, whose thinking has strongly affected New Frontiersmen, that the best way to produce more employment is to have prices rise faster than wages, and this was the whole point of his "reflationary" spending theories. Again, if wages and prices are both stable over a period when productivity is advancing, then the latter may improve profits and so improve job opportunities. But where prices are stable and wages rise with or faster than productivity, as they have been doing, it is very difficult to put more men to work.

THE SPENDING CURE-ALL

The uncomfortabel truth, which few people like to acknowledge, is that maladjustment in wage rates is a positive cause of unemployment, perhaps its most important cause. Labor is not a commodity, but man's work certainly is a commodity, and in this sense a wage is a price. It is perfectly evident that if a businessman sets his price too high he loses his market. It should be equally evident that if wages are pushed too high by union monopoly action, unemployment will follow, unless the government takes countervailing action, by trying to "float off" the unemployment through easy money and doses of government spending.

The administration from the beginning placed great emphasis on these monetary cures for unemployment but with indifferent success. For unemployment is still well above the 4-percent level, which the administration considers as its logical target, despite a big rise in spending. In the last budget year of the Eisenhower administration, fiscal 1960, Federal expenditures ran to $76.5 billion and the budget showed a surplus of $1.2 billion. In the first full budget year of the Kennedy administration, fiscal 1962, Federal expenditures ran to $89 billion and the deficit to $6.3 billion. Nor do these figures tell the whole story. In addition to expenditures reflected in the formal budget are the cash outlays of the social security funds. And in addition to all this Federal activity there is the spending of the States

and local communities. In the calendar year of 1961 the total of all this spending ran to a colossal $150 billion or to 28 percent of the gross national product. This compared with total Government spending of $61 billion in 1950, when expenditures ran to only 21 percent of product.

Surely if Government activity was the whole cure for unemployment and the harbinger of prosperity, the United States would be in prime condition. In fact, while the size of Government has been increasing, the pace of growth has been slowing down. Says Raymond Saulnier, head of the Council of Economic Advisers under Eisenhower: "What recent history tells us about the effect of increases in Federal spending is not very favorable to the view that an economy such as ours can spend itself into prosperity via the Federal budget. * * * What this experience tells us is that if the environment is not favorable to an increase in private spending, an increase in Federal spending, even a large increase, is a well-nigh futile exercise."

A WORLD AT RISK

It can also be a dangerous exercise in view of the condition of the U.S. balance of payments abroad. If the United States were a closed economy, isolated from the rest of the world, then government spending, however wasteful, and government deficits, however potentially inflationary, might not matter so much. But this is, of course, not the position. The dollar is still the world's key currency, and foreigners hold some $19.5 billion worth of short-term claims, which theoretically could be presented for payment in gold. These claims have steadily increased because the United States has been unable to earn enough abroad to cover its outpayments. Last year the U.S. deficit ran to nearly $2.5 billion and the loss of gold to $857 million, and the drain continues.

The administration has taken a number of specific measures to correct the foreign balance and to staunch the gold flow—some good, some bad, and some indifferent. It has rightly tried, for instance, to persuade foreign governments to step up their own defense spending, thus allowing the United States to shave its enormous expenditures for oversea troops and installations. At the same time, however, it has continued to pour out foreign economic aid in profusion, much of which is wasted, while suggesting changes in the tax laws that would tend to restrict U.S. private foreign investment. Meanwhile Washington has tried to throw up an elaborate series of defenses for the dollar, including currency swaps and endless talks with foreign bankers. And the U.S. Treasury has begun maintaining positions in the forward exchange markets of the world to counter speculation against what was once supposed to be the world's strongest currency.

Whatever the merits of these latter stratagems, they fail to come to grips with the question: why should foreigners distrust the dollar and want to reduce their holdings? One reason undoubtedly is that in an effort to stimulate economic activity at home the United States has tended to maintain lower interest rates than prevail abroad. The second and broader reason for distrust of the dollar and indeed for the balance-of-payments gap itself has been a continuous inflationary bias within the United States due in part to its farm program, in part to labor demands, and in part to a succession of unbalanced budgets. In the long run a nation's foreign accounts simply mirror its internal policies. This is what the United States has preached for many years to other nations, and it is time it swallowed some of its own advice. As David Rockefeller wrote to the President last spring: "I would urge upon you a more effective control of expenditures and a determined and vigorous effort to balance the budget. Such measures would act to place our economy in a much stronger position for real economic growth in the period ahead; they should increase our ability to expand exports, and they will strengthen confidence everywhere in the future of the dollar."

A NEW DIRECTION

What all this comes down to is that, given the realities of the modern world, the U.S. economy needs very different policies from those that have been recently in evidence along the New Frontier. While Government spending can perhaps be regarded as the flywheel of the economy, it cannot supply the motive power. The motive power resides in the creative energies of the people, and Government can at best help release it. In his report to the Nation last summer on the state of the economy President Kennedy told the story of a displaced Pennsylvania miner, George DeMart, who had found a new job with a trailer company through the good offices of two Government agencies. Asked for comment by the press, Mr. DeMart blurted out: "Why did they pick on me?" And his question unintentionally packed a lot of significance. For while Government may assuage distress, it is all too easy to overemphasize this role, and to lose sight of what keeps America at work and moving. It is the private economy that today yields employment to some 60,700,000 men and women and will provide expansion in the future.

The vital juice here is no doubt profits, which encourage firms to maintain present levels of output and to invest in new plant. Significantly, the slowdown in the growth of the U.S. economy over recent years has been accompanied by profits taking a declining share of the national income, and by a squeezing of profit margins both on sales and on investment capital. Emphasis on this point should not be taken to mean that there is some predetermined level of profits to which businessmen are entitled and which Government must help them achieve; for this all too easily becomes one more invitation to statist intervention. But profits do play an indispensable role in the free society since they are the reward for risk taking, and for bringing together at the right time and place the elements of production—labor, materials, and capital. Someone must undertake this organizational function. And the alternative to a profit-and-loss economy is either socialist planning or plain chaos.

Once the social significance of profits is understood, the Government's role in an enterprise economy comes clear. This role is assuredly not to butter up the businessman as one more pressure group, but rather to lay down firm and dependable rules under which he, like any other citizen, can operate. One contribution the Kennedy administration could make right now is to make it clear that such interference with the pricing system as occurred in steel won't happen again. Businessmen must be allowed to make their own decisions and their own mistakes if need be—if a mistake is made, competition and the market will soon enough correct it. The Government's job is to see that competition is enforced and here it is amply armed (perhaps too amply) by the antitrust laws.

But sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. The obvious threat to the market economy today is not the big corporation but the big union, which wields enormous power as the result of privileges granted to it by the Government. This power needs trimming down. One place to begin is the rigorous enforcement of State and local laws against violence. It is one thing for men to strike; it is quite another for them to prevent men who want to work from working. Secondly, unions should become purely voluntary organizations, which would preclude the union shop, the closed shop, and all variants of the same. And in addition union exemption from the Sherman Act should be reconsidered. Whatever the reforms, the objective should be to bring unions within the framework of law as it applies to other voluntary associations. Such reform would protect the freedom of workers and have a beneficent effect on the whole economy. We would begin to break the vicious cycle wherein wage maladjustments cause unemployment, the Government spends to alleviate unemployment, and this in turn touches off a new round of wage and price pressures leading to direct Government intervention.

THE LOGIC OF TAX REFORM

Finally, Washington will contribute to growth and economic expansion as it combines fundamental tax reform with putting its own sprawling house in order. A general cut in Federal taxes—a kind of handout to the people—will accomplish little or nothing. What is needed is to cut the corporation-tax rate from its present 52 percent to, say, 45 percent and to start, at least, to reduce the ruinous rate of progression in the personal income tax (setting an upper limit of, say 60 percent as against the present confiscatory rate of 91 percent). Such reform, encouraging both saving and investment, might in the long run yield a revenue dividend to the Treasury, but this should not be counted on. Tax reform can easily turn into demagogy unless accompanied by Federal retrenchment.

Given the necessities of defense the budget will inevitably be big, but precisely for that reason cuts should be sought elsewhere. The place to begin is agriculture, where the policies advocated by the Kennedy administration should be reversed. There should be a gradual unwinding of the whole price-support mechanism, which, besides costing over $2 billion a year, is doing incalculable harm. Price supports would have to be lowered in stages, say, over a 10-year period, until prices for the great commodities reflected true market values. This is less of a job than it is sometimes made out to be. Over 50 percent of all farm income is still received from products having no direct price supports. The prices of most vegetables, to take a small example, do not sink to zero because they are unsupported by Government. What happens is that supply and demand make their own adjustment to the great benefit of the consuming public as well as the taxpayer.

Beyond this the Federal Establishment could be cut down to size by recognition of two broad principles. The first is that of federalism, under which the States and local communities can be responsible for many government services at their own levels. The prime example is education. When all is said an done, responsibility for education is a local one. Money taxed away by Washington for aid to education leaves that much less in State and local treasuries. The second path to Government limitation is to recognize that many public ends are best served by private initiative and enterprise. Talk about the need for enlarging the public sector largely overlooks this fact. This is not an appeal for private initiative to build State roads or to run the city garbage-disposal units. But the fact is that the toll road, privately financed and paid for by those who use it, is based on a sound principle. In the matter of health it is already an enormous achievement that 74 percent of U.S. citizens have adopted some form of private insurance. The whole argument that government functions must be enlarged as an economy grows larger and richer is really a reversal of the truth: the richer an economy becomes the more citizens may be able to do for themselves.

THE LIBERAL AGENDA

This kind of agenda, including both tax reform and retrenchment, is liberal in the sense that it looks to the enlargement of

human liberty. It also takes account of two great developments that have helped shape the modern world. One is the rise of government by law rather than by decree. The second is the evolution of the market process, which makes government by decree unnecessary. In his moving inaugural address, President Kennedy spoke of "the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the State but from the hand of God." This is in the great American tradition. The trouble has been that the President seems to have no politcial or economic philosophy to support this moral insight.

Yet the elements for both are surely at hand and follow logically from the premise. It is because the rights of man are inalienable that limited, as against unlimited, government is a necessity. And if government is to be limited, then in its turn the free competitive market is the only possible solution for man's economic problems. Fortunately, it is also the solution that accords with hard common sense and realism. The United States is too big and varied to be managed or manipulated or pushed around. And its basic institutions are premised on precisely that blend of the practical and ideal which the President admires.

Remarks by the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, at the Panel Session, Second Annual Transportation Workshop, District of Columbia Chapter, American Society of Traffic and Transportation, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., November 15, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the 88th Congress there will probably be need to give renewed attention to the President's transportation program which was outlined succinctly in the President's transportation message of last year.

In this connection, I would invite attention to the remarks of Hon. Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, made at the Second Annual Transportation Workshop of the American Society of Traffic and Transportation, held in Washington, D.C., on November 15, 1962. Significantly, Mr. Murphy notes that the President's message was the first effort by any President to deal directly with the complex and confusing transportation problems from the viewpoint of a coordinated national system, and that it suggests a policy of equity and justice which protects the interests of both the industry and consumers. The translation of the philosophy of the President's message into necessary amendments to existing law will, undoubtedly, require careful examination and full discussion in this session of the Congress, but I share the hope expressed by my fellow Rhode Islander, Vice Chairman Murphy, that its implementation will not be frustrated by the petty dissents which may arise in various diverse quarters in the transportation industry. The President is to be congratulated upon focusing our attention upon some areas for improvement in our patchwork transportation laws. I believe the remarks of Mr. Murphy may be timely and helpful in this connection.

President Kennedy's message to the 87th Congress relative to the transportation system of our Nation is a significant milestone in transportation history for more than several reasons.

It is the first effort by any President to deal directly with widely divergent transportation problems from the perspective of a coordinated national system.

It realistically recognizes that many of the ancient ills afflicting one or another mode of transport cannot be simply solved by Federal regulatory elixirs—yet it poses a well-reasoned program of fundamental reforms in transportation policy in clear and concise terms.

Federal regulatory laws were passed for each mode of transportation individually, primarily to solve a major problem for that mode at a particular point in its own history. The reasons for each, and the motives behind them, were quite different. It is therefore no wonder that the regulatory and promotional functions of the Federal Government, individually justified at the time each was passed, may have the appearance of a patchwork as far as concerns a uniform Government philosophy for a transportation system. However, a foundation upon which to build a national transportation philosophy already exists and the President is asking us to get on with the construction.

I sincerely believe in and support the philosophy of the President's message since it suggests a policy of equity and justice which protects the interests of both industry and the consumers and, hence, advances our common welfare.

From my point of view, foremost in our thinking should be the President's stated conviction that less Federal regulation and subsidization is desirable in the interest of a healthier intercity transportation network. This decreasing Federal regulation and subsidization is to take effect with a correlated increase in the role of normal American competition and normal economic motives. In fact, a primary objective of regulation appears to be to have the regulated industry play the part it would if it were subject only to normal free competitive influences. However, because the industry, at a critical point in its development, failed to produce the desired results of our free competitive enterprise system, and failed by such a wide margin in a field of prime public interest, it was made subject to Federal regulation. Still, we hope that it will produce, approximately, the good effects for the public and for its stockholders that it would if unregulated.

Implementation of the President's message obviously will require examination and debate in all quarters in the months ahead; however, implementation must not be frustrated by petty dissents on the minutiae of legislative proposals. The transportation industry, including the airlines, have reason to support the substance of the message.

I have too often seen extremely important programs fail to be adopted because of relatively minor points. Sometimes its opponents kill it by diverting emphasis from its extremely valuable central thrust to little flyspecks around its edges. Sometimes, unfortunately, its supporters become so absorbed in achieving ultraperfection that they wrangle the main objective into futility.

I say, this program is so important to the public, to the entire national economy, and to the Federal Treasury—don't "nickel and dime" it to death.

The policy of limited control of minimum rates and the tolerance of experimental rates, particularly in the freight and cargo field, has a particular application to air transportation and is in line with curernt Board policy. The Civil Aeronautics Board and the industry are presently trying to work out an approach to cargo costs which we hope will become generally recognized and defined for practical use. These costs would then give us a common ground upon which to build our ratemaking principles and policies. If industry and Government follow reasonable costing and pricing principles, the need for minimum rate regulation would be lessened, and the likelihood of ill-advised experimental rates would also be considerably reduced.

Reduction of aviation subsidies is a principle which has underscored many of the Board's actions in recent years and the new impetus given by the President's pronounced policy requesting a specific step-by-step program is both welcomed and desirable and in accord with the policy of Congress. The questions of how far and how fast subsidy should be reduced are matters of judgment. Agreement on the overall objectives of the Executive and the Congress seems clear. However, possible detailed disagreements on the precise level of subsidy to be paid, and during exactly which years, should not interfere with attaining the primary result.

The public benefits flowing from increased emphasis on through routes and joint rates have particular significance in the field of air transportation; the recommendations of the President have already stimulated additional efforts in this field. The expanded highway building program facilitates improved surface-air services, particularly of freight, which must be fostered by the agencies and which are under careful study at this time.

Transportation is more and more considered in terms of door-to-door service. We in the Board realize to an increasing extent, as is probably true of other transport media, that both passengers and shippers want service from ultimate origination to ultimate destination. The total quality of service, and the total elapsed time, are from the door of your home to the door of your destination, or from the door of your factory to the door of the customer. Complete and satisfactory air service is not simply from one airport to another, where the customer is left to his own devices to beat his way through traffic jams to the real end of his journey. Many problems in this area must be solved.

Added emphasis on coordinated research is likewise significant and the Board is ready to cooperate in making its extensive research activities available to all Government agencies through a central clearinghouse. Basic information and research should be interchanged, so that we in the Government and industry can be mutually self-educated on the more commonly agreed facts and theories.

Already, the Board has availed itself of information relating to highway development as it relates to air service and, through its regional airport programs, will continue to seek to properly relate the Federal investment in highways to reducing Federal investment in air transportation wherever justified.

In conclusion, I should note that the transportation message coincides in purpose with the President's equally important message stating the national policy of protecting the interests of consumers. Viewed as a whole, the President's transportation message states a solid beginning point for coordinated Government effort in moving toward a more rational and practical policy for all of the carriers of the Nation's freight and passengers.

Percy B. Ruhe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, since adjournment of the 87th Congress, this Nation lost one of its top newspapermen, a man admired for his unceasing devotion to his community.

I refer to my good friend, Percy B. Ruhe, editor emeritus of the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, who died November 28 at the age of 81.

His death was noted on all the news service wires of the country for Percy Ruhe was one of this country's most respected editors as he strove constructively to aid all walks of life.

Quiet spoken, thorough, industriously devoted to duty, he was nevertheless in quick and easy touch with life's lighter moments. His approach was earnest and responsible but—enriched with a tasteful, intellectual sense of humor—by no means dour.

Percy Ruhe exuded a fierce determination in calling for good government at all levels, better schools, more health services, improved parks and recreational outlets, wider cultural facilities, industrial development and cohesive community facilities. He was known as "The Father of Allentown's Playground System," one of the finest in Eastern United States.

May the great heritage that he has given to his lovely wife and children give them strength in this their greatest trial and sadness. May the Almightly reward him with the blessings of faithful life in the service of his fellow man and his adherence to the tenets of a religious life.

Also, I wish to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the editorial that appeared in the Morning Call the morning after this brilliant editor died:

THE MEASURE OF THIS MAN

Regardless of where they lived or the positions they held, few men had the impact on any community for so many years that Percy B. Ruhe had on Allentown and the Lehigh Valley, their people and institutions and progress.

For 50 years this was his page of a growing newspaper. For a half century he used it to challenge and inspire and inform, to encourage and admonish, to laud notable achievements and at times to criticize what he considered the frailties of men or their shortcomings.

Here, in daily thought-provoking columns of comment that could be read and reread, he applied the measures of history and philosophy and religion and ethics in evaluating the significance of the eventful news that poured across his desk. Here he sought to give this community sound and valid judgments and the vision to strive toward its full potential.

The assignment he held for so many years as editor of a newspaper that in his time became a daily visitor in some 85,000 homes is one of the most responsible in any community with such a vehicle of communication. Self-seekers and those with special causes to plead covet its power and prestige. Some would use the position to attain their own objectives, regardless of the broader consequences. Many would influence it, not always with selfless motives.

Percy Ruhe detached himself completely from these prejudices and pressures. He brought to the editor's desk an uncommon sense of fairness and values, a thorough knowledge of the community that was his lifelong home, a broad familiarity with national and international goals and issues, and an understanding of people and their nature gained from his countless and continued contacts all hours of the day and night with men in all stations and situations. He was close to those who made the news and those affected by it, yet able to detach himself from any personal association for a penetrating and perceptive view on the editorial page.

Although books were among his important tools, he needed few for reference, particularly on local affairs. He knew the admonitions of Scripture, the wisdom of philosophers, and the lessons of history. His mind was a storehouse for the facts and situations of the age in which he lived and worked, both those recorded and the more intimate ones that never reached paper. Throughout his life he trained himself to remember what was worthwhile or important, to quickly forget what was shoddy or petty.

The monuments he helped build for this community are many and will keep his memory alive. Better schools with their junior high division and vocational shops and art courses, activities to stimulate and recognize youth, playgrounds and other recreational facilities in an expanded park system, the Baum Art School and the creative talents many hundreds discovered and nurtured through it, a strong and active Humane Society, better government at all levels than many communities have, are just a few. The broadening concept of a more closely integrated Lehigh Valley community is another. He argued convincingly for these and other worthwhile objectives and in many instances joined in taking the progressive steps that made them realities.

Through his lifetime of service to his fellows as the editor of this newspaper and in so many other capacities, Percy Ruhe asked little for himself but the privilige of working as he did to advance noble and worthwhile causes. His own needs were simple and not given to ostentation. They centered primarily about his occupation and his family. In their own right, his children are another monument to his achievement.

Like the late David A. Miller, with whom he worked so closely and devotedly to build this newspaper and make it a constructive force in the broad community it serves, his name will live not for what he had but for what he did for others. This, after all, is the lasting measure of a man.

Spraying With Poison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter to me from a well-informed friend of mine, L. L. Henderson, of Corning, Iowa, in which he points out the destructive effect of poisonous spraying:

CORNING, IOWA,
January 16, 1963.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: First, I want to compliment you on your speech, January 10, "American at the Crossroads." As usual, it was to the point, factual and timely.

I have read the book "Silent Spring" which so forcefully and factually presents the case against wholesale, indiscriminate spraying of crops, meadows, forests, shade trees, fruit trees, rivers, lakes, wildlife and people. I was glad to see that the Congress is making preparations to look into the matter. It deserves most serious study. One should by all means read the book carefully and then decide whether its critics speak with authority or prejudice, or from purely selfish reasons. The review appearing in Time and also copies by Reader's Digest is far from satisfactory; it is biased in favor of the powerful chemical corporations.

A news item by George Mills appeared in the Sunday Des Moines Register January 13 which told of a recent experience with DDT which was mixed in a spray but not indicated on the label, or if it was, it was listed under a high-falutin name which Lavern Osterson of Paton, Iowa did not understand. Result: he sprayed his laying flock of 5,700 birds; the Department of Agriculture quarantined his flock; he had to destroy the entire flock and 100 cases of eggs in addition. The fat tissue in the hen's bodies was found to have up to 40 parts of DDT per million. Seven PPM is the maximum permitted in meat by the USDA. Loss, $18,000.

The book "Silent Spring" explains clearly how the poisons in sprays (many of them being in fact synthetic with no known andidote) builds up in the tissues of people, birds, worms, and animals to the lethal point, even though the original spray was only one to two PPM. Hence, a fish which died from absorbing the poison in its fatty tissues would, when eaten by a bird or animal, be more deadly than arsenic. Birds that eat worms (as most do) which live in the ground that has been sprayed with a 1 PPM mixture will eventually store up enough poison to kill them—and also the birds that eat their bodies.

Sorry this is so long. You probably don't have time to read books. But I think it is high time something be done to control this wholesale spraying. Surely there are more good insects than bad ones; and more good weeds than bad weeds. Surely the Good Lord saw to that.

Yours truly,

L. L. HENDERSON.

Mississippi Sets National Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the January 20 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, which I am pleased to call to the attention of the House:

STATE SETS NATIONAL PACE

Folks, make way for Mississippi. Our great State is fast speeding toward bigger and better things. This State's rate of economic

gain and financial improvement is among the highest in the United States.

The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in a study of population and occupational changes in rural areas reports that on the basis of the 1950 and 1960 censuses Mississippi led all of the States of the Union during the past decade in the percentage of increase in median income of all families.

The gain in the 10-year span for Mississippi was 96.7 percent. This compared with 50.5 percent for the United States. Second highest gain was made by Georgia with 81.1 percent. Alabama was third with 77.3 percent. The South raced ahead of the North, the East, and the West.

Why has Mississippi led the Nation in increasing family income? From 1950 to 1960, nearly one-half of all male workers on Mississippi farms shifted to employment in industry or other off-farm work where they made more money. The percent of all male workers on farms declined from 48.1 percent in 1950 to 26.3 percent in 1960.

But despite this shift of workers from farms to off-farm work, Mississippi farm income continued to climb as farms increased in size and farmers used more machinery and other means to handle more acres per worker and to increase production and income per acre.

In interpreting the revolutionary changes in farm employment, John H. Southern, farm economist of USDA, says "it is probable that we have not yet faced up to the real extent of adjustments of the labor resource out of agriculture. Of all employed males in the United States in 1960, only 8.3 percent were in farming, or 1 out of 12 workers. This was a decline from 15.2 percent in 1950."

But Mr. Southern then referred to the sharper change in Mississippi and predicted that "in Mississippi, the decline in farmworkers is so rapid that probably by 1965 it will be more nearly in line with other Southern States, that is, 15 percent or less of the employed males will be doing farmwork."

Only four other states have so large a proportion of its male workers engaged in farming. These States are North and South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa.

It is clear that one of Mississippi's most important resources is its people. Our State still has a large farm population with a surplus of fine men, women, and young people available for employment in industry, while at the same time retaining enough workers on the farm to maintain and even increase our farm production and income.

If Mississippi can accelerate its industrial growth fast enough to provide employment for all of our rural people who are seeking off-farm work and at the same time begin to provide technical training for these workers, our State will increase its speed toward a higher and higher ranking among all of the States in total family income and better living.

No State has a brighter future than Mississippi. We have the climate, the resources, the people. We predict that you can look for more and more investment in Mississippi.

Small Business Problems in the Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a statement of the Grower Committee of Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc., concerning the recent report of Small Business Problems in the Poultry Industry issued by the Select Committee on Small Business.

The statement appears, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE GROWER COMMITTEE, DELMARVA POULTRY INDUSTRY, INC., CONCERNING THE REPORT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

During a recently held meeting of the grower committee of the Delmarva Poultry Industry organization, this group took strong issue with the committee report of the U.S. House of Representatives on "small business problems in the poultry industry," according to Paul Phillips, a broiler grower of Mardela Springs, Md., and chairman of the DPI Grower Committee.

"Our group," said Mr. Phillips, "believes that for most of our growers the advantages of contract growing offset the disadvantages of this method of raising broilers."." Continuing, the DPI chairman said, "Our people realize that growing broilers under a contractual agreement, with a minimum guarantee to the grower by the feed manufacturer-contractor who assumes the financial risk, is for all practical purposes an insurance plan. While we do have some people here in our area who continue as completely independent growers, most of us prefer to have our feed companies assume the risk of financial loss on our flocks; they can better afford to spread this risk among many growers and many flocks than we can spread any loss encountered among four flocks that most of us grow during any year."

It is further realized that competition is sufficiently keen between feed manufacturers and grow-out contractors that an individual broiler raiser has plenty of opportunity to shop around and grow for the company of his choice. Best of all, he can grow independently or on a contractual basis with any feed manufacturer within this area.

This attitude of Delmarva's broiler people toward contractual growing is similar to that found in a study conducted by the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station. According to this study, reported in Bulletin No. 571 and released in May of 1958, most of the growers indicated they would not like to raise broilers on an independent basis, even if they could obtain the necessary financing. Practically all of their reasons for this preference relate to the element of risk involved in producing broilers independently.

A more recent report, prepared by Washington College for the Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., reveals that vertical integration (which often is associated with contractural growing) is a natural move for a well-financed and agressive firm and has in many cases helped to improve efficiency. This Washington College study further pointed out that "growers also gain, not only from the integrator's aids to efficiency, but also from his assumption of an important portion of the risks of disease loss and of a poor market."

DPI grower committee members, as a result of their evaluation meeting of the congressional report on "Small Business Problems in the poultry industry," took issue with other conclusions and recommendations. Referring to the statement found in the congressional report that, "Existing data indicates that an unhealthy trend has developed and may be continuing, DPI's committee members, on this point, had this to say: "We fail to agree that there is an unhealthy trend or a bad situation of the broiler industry within this area." The DPI group points out that more houses, and better ones than ever before in the history of our broiler industry, are currently being built on our farms; processing plants are being enlarged; new feed mills erected; and soybean processing is being increased. Such developments indicate strength and confidence rather than weakness and discontent.

The fifth recommendation contained in the congressional report stated: "The broiler industry, universities, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should devote serious efforts to increasing the demand of broilers." The DPI committee heartily concurs with this statement and the five specific practices suggested:

(a) Expand sales abroad where the consumption is far below that of the United States:

(b) In connection with the above, make every effort to protect agricultural interests when negotiations are conducted with the Common Market nations and the governments of other nations;

(c) Where possible, increase purchases by the Federal Government for the military and school lunch programs;

(d) Increase research in broiler freezing methods so as to enhance the industry's bargaining power;

(e) Increase research into new ways of marketing broilers and new methods of serving broilers."

At the same time, DPI's group wants to remind the congressional committee that the USDA, universities, many industry associations, retailers, and other members of the poultry trade have for years been doing a tremendous job in promoting the use of poultry meat. These poultry promotional programs have been done through poultry industry initiative, on strictly a voluntary basis, in contrast to regulated, or compulsory, checkoff plans.

A most creditable example of a self-help promotional program has developed right in the shadows of our Nation's Capital. Poultrymen and civic leaders of the Delmarva Peninsula, birthplace of today's commercial broiler business, from a modest beginning, back in 1948 with an annual budget of approximately $7,000, has continued to expand its activities into what is now a year around program in the interest of both production and utilization. This program is conducted by an association, the Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc., and is commonly spoken of as DPI. For the past few years, their annual budget has exceeded $100,000. Funds are obtained through a self-help approach in the form of the now famous Delmarva's poultry booster day banquet ($100 a plate dinner). Last year's campaign for funds resulted in exceeding their quota of $135,000, obtained entirely by voluntary workers interested in the future of the Eastern Shore's poultry industry.

One of the principal promotional projects conducted by this industry association is the staging of the national chicken cooking contest, held as a highlight of the annual Delmarva chicken festival. The 1963 festival will be held in Salisbury, Md., June 13, 14, and 15.

The national chicken cooking contest is cosponsored by the Delmarva Poultry Industry organization and the Poultry and Egg National Board. Since its inception 15 years ago, over 6,000 chicken recipes have been submitted, with approximately 2,500 men, women, boys, and girls taking part in the final cookoffs. The contribution of the national chicken cooking contest, resulting in tremendous volumes of follow-up publicity focusing attention on many different ways of preparing and serving chicken, has been of inestimable value to the entire poultry industry. At the same time, consumers everywhere have benefited greatly as they use chicken more often in trying out the many winning recipes printed and distributed coast to coast following each year's contest.

The best evidence that a phenomenal product-promotional job has been done through cooperative efforts of industry people, agency personnel and members of the retail trade is found in the rate at which broiler consumption has increased. During the 20-year period, 1940 to 1960, the per capita consumption of broilers increased from approximately 2 pounds to 23.4 pounds.

DPI's grower committee does not mean to infer that promotional efforts alone are responsible for such progress in the eating habits of our Nation's population. Technological developments of the poultry industry have made the progress of commercial raising of broilers and fryers the envy of all branches of our country's agriculture. Back in 1927, it took 16 weeks and 12 pounds of feed to produce a 2¼-pound chicken. Three decades later, it took only 9 weeks and 8 pounds of feed to raise a 3¼-pound broiler. Currently, Delmarva growers are disappointed if their chickens do not weigh 4 pounds in 9 weeks of age.

In completing their evaluation of the congressional report, DPI's grower committee went on record favoring this regional poultry association's oftrepeated stand as being opposed to Government controls, including marketing orders.

"Delmarva poultrymen are not satisfied with their plight or content to settle for the present situation," said Chairman Phillips. "New heights in efficiency of production must be reached, hard work is needed as we encourage people to eat more chicken, and, of course, we'd like to see chickens sell at a higher price; however, marketing orders and other forms of restrictions would retard continued growth and efficiencies in the production and marketing of poultry meat and would adversely affect millions of consumers through increased consumer prices. We sincerely believe that judging from the rate of growth of our industry, the low cost of production, and through the wide acceptance by consumers everywhere of our young, tender chickens, broiler production will continue to be one of our Nation's most important agricultural enterprises," concluded Mr. Phillips.

The Delmarva Poultry Industry leaders have frequently commended Federal and State agencies for their efforts in assisting the poultry industry in the fields of research, education and market development. However, they continue to believe that the growth and vitality of the poultry industry in the years ahead will depend on the free enterprise system of production and marketing. Admittedly, there are risks involved, but with responsible and intelligent action, sound management practices, and exerting rights as free leaders, it is believed that an efficient poultry industry will continue to benefit both producers and consumers.

Delmarva's position is not an opinion at which they have quickly arrived. Instead, it is truly a reemphasis of their position over the years. Opposition to governmental controls has been repeatedly stated to Members of the Congress and to officials of various agencies.

"Such a philosophy is one of the big reasons why DPI's organization is currently busy, through its fund drive committee chairmaned by William R. Murray, one of the pioneers of our industry, selecting dozens of its members on a voluntary basis to meet its 1963 fund drive goal of $140,000," said A. E. Bailey, president of the Delmarva Poultry Industry Association.

A. E. BAILEY,
President, Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc.
PAUL PHILLIPS,
Chairman, DPI Grower Committee.

Walter L. Meyer Spreads Friendship With Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article which appeared in the January 3, 1963, issue of the Home Journal, daily newspaper published in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands. The article concerns the recent appearances in the islands of Milwaukeean Walter L. Meyer, the world-known professional song leader:

WORLD-KNOWN SONG LEADER DELIGHTS GROUPS

Milwaukee's world-known song leader, Walter L. Meyer, on Monday night gave a demonstration of his "Songobatics" (community singing fun), before a delighted audience of Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts at the Catholic school auditorium.

Being his first appearance in the Virgin Islands, Monday night's program marked the 58th country or territory in which the Milwaukeean has entertained. "Music is an international language," remarked Mr. Meyer. "And when you combine it with laughter, you have a wonderful medium with which to spread friendship and good fellowship around the world."

He appeared in two school assembly programs Wednesday, one at the Charlotte Amalie High School, and the other at the Sugar Estate Elementary School.

Possibly no one other person has conducted as many people of all ages in group singing, in as many nations of the world, as has Mr. Meyer. He is active in scouting in Milwaukee, and because of his participation in world jamborees, trekorees, camporals, and meeting events of all kinds—has become known as an "international scouter."

In addition to scout songs and yells, Mr. Meyer included several folksongs from Denmark and Austria and the United States rounds and fun songs. For extra audience participation merriment there was the "Hukilau" from Hawaii in which several scout leaders were brought to the stage to perform the hula.

A professional song leader at home, Mr. Meyer's services are available on his goodwill tours to a variety of charitable, educational and religious groups or institutions without charge. He is unsponsored and pays his own travel expenses. He has been doing this since 1948 when as a graduate student at Columbia University's Teachers College he made his first trip abroad to England, Scotland and France. His present good will song tour which started last week in Puerto Rico, and, and now the Virgin Islands, is his 13th.

As a world entertainer he has succeeded in bringing song and laughter to many orphanages, old folks homes, hospitals, refugee camps, and other welfare institutions where entertainment is seldom received from the outside.

His biggest contribution, through song, comes, Mr. Meyer feels, from the carryover benefits to groups whose leaders learn new techniques for group participation. "This is the best thing that could have happened for our seamen," an officer aboard the World War II famed British aircraft carrier *Ark Royal* stated following an evening singsong attended by 500 of the sailors in the ship's dining room. "We're going on maneuvers in the Arctic waters where they will receive no leave for several weeks. Tonight's experience has shown them the way, namely, how they can create their own group entertainment."

The globetrotting songster has conducted many special workshops in song leading and group fun, and it is because of this teaching and guidance at the grassroots level that he has been described in several sources as a musical one-man peace corps. One of Mr. Meyer's boosters in Washington is Congressman REUSS who is generally credited as being a founder of the Peace Corps idea.

SONG LEADER

From St. Thomas, Meyer returns to Puerto Rico where today, January 3, he is scheduled to spend the day at the YMCA camp. The Dominican Republic is another country in which the songleader has not yet appeared, and he hopes to include it in his present itinerary before returning to Milwaukee.

Len Stine of WSTA interviewed Mr. Meyer for broadcast Monday night at 4:45.

Under Secretary of Agriculture Murphy Addresses Meeting of the Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy addressed the annual meeting of the Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts, which was held here in the Washington area a few days ago. His remarks, which I herewith extend in the Appendix of the RECORD, are very pertinent to our Nation's relationship to the Common Market countries. We in Virginia, as do many other States, have a vital stake in our export market. We want to keep it.

Under unanimous consent, I commend Under Secretary Murphy's comments to my House colleagues for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It is indeed a pleasure to be here this morning. First, it gives me an opportunity to thank personally those of you who actively supported the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

Second, I would like to discuss a matter that is of growing concern to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I refer to the European Common Market and its possible impact on our farm economy.

Finally, I would like to look ahead at conservation's opportunities under the rural development program.

I believe we have here this morning a number of the Virginia supervisors who called on their Congressmen, urging endorsement of the 1962 Food and Agriculture Act. The Secretary and I, in fact, everyone in the Department, deeply appreciate this support.

It exemplifies the positive leadership and readiness to act that have made soil conservation districts such a vital force in rural America.

Too often organizations who would support certain legislation hang back and do nothing. This cannot be said of the Virginia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

I hope you will continue to take an active role in agricultural affairs. The Department earnestly seeks your guidance, understanding, and support in its operations.

This support and guidance is especially needed in 1963.

As you know, one-fifth of our agricultural output goes to oversea markets. During the past year, we exported more than $5 billion worth of farm products. Some of this was provided at low cost to underdeveloped nations through our food-for-peace program. But nearly $3½-billion worth was sold abroad through regular commercial channels, one-third of it to the six Common Market countries of Western Europe. These countries—France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—are our bigegst and best oversea customers, for industrial items as well as farm products.

Under the 1957 Treaty of Rome, these six nations agreed to merge their economies into a single customs union, or common market.

Our Government has applauded the move. No doubt history will show that formation of the Common Market, or the European Economic Community, as it is more properly known, was one of the greatest things that could happen to Europe. It is a catalyst that can, in fact, already has, injected new vigor into the Old World. Tariff walls have been drastically lowered between member nations, and they are to be removed completely before 1970. Capital and labor flow freely over what used to be closely guarded boundaries. Train passengers, for example, can now ride between Belgium and Germany without stopping for inspection of passport and luggage. National feelings and prejudices are giving way to common overall interests.

The United States has supported the EEC concept in the belief that closer economic cooperation may ultimately lead to political union, a United States of Europe. This, in turn, could be an essential part of the foundation on which East-West peace is built.

But in recent months, we have become increasingly disturbed by evidence that the Common Market countries are leaning toward a highly protectionist policy for agriculture that could seriously impair the prospects for the success of this whole enterprise.

They have drastically increased the import levies on some of our major commodities, to an extent that threatens to choke off a large share of our agricultural exports to these countries. The duty on our poultry going into West Germany, for example, has been increased from less than 5 cents a pound to more than 12 cents.

Virginia's $28 million-a-year broiler industry already is feeling the pinch of these higher import duties. Our exports of frozen poultry to West Germany have dropped to less than half their prior volume. And if it were not for the lingering effect of a devastating attack of blue mold on the French, Italian, and Greek tobacco crops, your State's $83½-million-a-year tobacco industry might be losing customers because of the new common tariff imposed last winter.

It goes without saying that our agricultural exports are of the utmost importance, not only to you as farmers, but to our Nation as well. Loss of our European agricultural markets would jeopardize our security and foreign aid commitments around the world.

Two decisions are expected this year which will have great impact on the future of the Common Market and international trade itself.

One is the question of Common Market membership for the United Kingdom. The other is the setting of grain prices for the Common Market countries under their common agricultural policy.

For 14 months, the United Kingdom has been negotiating for Common Market membership. Pressure is mounting for a decision this year.

I need not dwell on what it would mean to us, or to the Common Market, to have Great Britain become a member of the European Economic Community. She is the world's largest importer of agricultural products, and one of the leading producers of consumer goods.

A Common Market which included Great Britain and other European nations now seeking membership would be an economic colossus with a population of 250 million. This exceeds the United States population by nearly 70 million.

Moreover, it is what is popularly called a seller's market. Individual buying power in the Common Market is on the increase, and there is a great, unsatisfied demand for automobiles, television sets, and other consumer goods.

The United States could ill afford to be walled from a bloc of nations with such vast buying potential. And by 1970, economists estimate the gross annual output of an expanded Common Market will increase $170 billion.

The second decision I mentioned, the grain price issue, will have a profound effect on the course of history.

The Common Market may fix its internal price for wheat early this year. This is a critical decision. If the price is moderate, it will temper the movement toward an isolationist policy for agriculture, and perhaps signal the start of an expanded level of free world trade. If the price is excessive, and high protectionist walls are erected to limit competing imports, the expansion of uneconomic production inside the Common Market would be accelerated sharply. This could lead to indiscriminate "dumping," or even an international trade war.

The six common market countries are, of course, trying to protect the income of their farmers. We can understand that. We do the same thing ourselves. Virtually every industrial nation has experienced a growing disparity between farm and nonfarm income, and has had to undertake corrective measures.

However, in trying to protect and improve farm income, responsible nations must take into consideration the effects that their actions will have outside their own boundaries. The United States has used export payments to keep certain commodities moving on the open market. But we have used these payments only to maintain our fair share of the world trade. We have not tried to undercut other nations, or take away their markets.

As Secretary Freeman has said, "If we expect others to act responsibly when it comes to setting agricultural policies, we must continue to do so ourselves." And he added: "We are in complete sympathy with measures to protect the income and economic well-being of the farm segment of the European economy. We don't believe it necessary, however, to sacrifice international trade in the process."

The United States recently revamped its international trade policy to meet the jet-age needs of the sixties. This was done through passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This act gave the President the power to reduce our tariffs on imports from the Common Market in exchange for greater access to their markets.

In the debate which preceded enactment of the law, the Congress made it clear that we were to negotiate trade agreements which benefit our agricultural as well as our industrial products.

One section of the act directs the President to take all necessary and feasible steps to eliminate unreasonable trade restrictions that any country, or group of countries, imposes on our farm products. These steps include withholding of concessions and most favored nation treatment, and if necessary, retaliatory action.

The President has clearly indicated his firm purpose to see that the channels for agricultural exports are kept open, and you may be sure that one of the major purposes of the Department of Agriculture this year will be to support the President's efforts in this field.

Another of the Department's major goals for 1963 is to inject new vitality into rural America through creation of new economic opportunities and elimination of wasteful, outmoded land use patterns.

In formally putting the new Rural Areas Development program into motion last November, Secretary Freeman announced that local initiative and leadership would be "the first criterion" for departmental help.

And he invited soil conservation districts to provide this motive power and leadership. I would like to emphasize the word "invited." You supervisors will determine the role played by the districts in developing and using the new conservation and rural development tools. This role can be as large, or as small, as you choose to make it.

We hope you will select the first course. Rural development is a vast undertaking, one that calls for talents and knowledge often unique to local soil conservation districts.

Think for a moment. How many organizations do you know that have your knowledge of what the local soil can do, what it is capable of? How many organizations know the resources that exist in your area? And by resources, I mean both human and natural resources. What other groups in your community know the area's problems, and have the organization and leadership to cope with them? Consider the difficulties a city engineer would have planning land use changes for a farming community.

As you can see, soil conservation districts possess some unique qualifications. I hope you will put these talents to work and make rural development a success.

One of the first things that I would suggest you do is to modernize your working agreement with the Department of Agriculture as suggested by Secretary Freeman.

Many of these agreements were written more than two decades ago, and do not reflect the advances that have occurred in this field of soil and water conservation.

Today we are faced with new problems and new complexities. To cope with the resource problems of the sixties, we must reevaluate our programs, and bring them up to date. We must use the new tools, as well as the old, if we are to create a better way of life in rural America.

When I say "rural areas," I mean more than farm country. Rural America is people, people in towns and small cities as well as on farms and ranches. It is land, rivers, small streams, and forests. It is north, south, east, and west. It is, in fact, all our land, all our people, and all our wealth outside our urban centers.

Today many areas of rural America are in serious trouble. Their farmers and ranchers are living in a state of chronic depression. They work from dawn to dusk, producing more than ever before on fewer acres, but they are unable to buy the equipment they need to expand, or to make their operation more efficient. The land has been drained of its wealth by erosion and unwise use. The

nearby towns and cities long ago stopped growing, and fell into economic stagnation. With no job openings in the area, the brighter young adults move to faraway cities to find work.

The goal of the RAD program is to help the people in such local communities determine exactly what resources they have, then help them develop a plan that will make full use of these resources. Only in this way can we close the gap that exists between our urban and rural economies.

Farmers and ranchers are the backbone of our rural communities. The economy of the area revolves around them. If the farmer is prosperous then the rural community where he shops is prosperous. If the farmer is in financial straits, then the town is, too.

But we must do more than develop family farms to get rural communities moving again. It takes new enterprises, expanded business opportunities, modern rural electrical systems, watershed development, rural housing, water and sewerage systems, new outdoor recreational facilities and better schools.

One of the best ways to revitalize a community, short of a complete rural renewal job, is through a multipurpose watershed project.

These multipurpose projects can stop destructive floods and provide water for irrigation, municipal, and industrial use. They attract new industries, create water-based recreational areas, increase land values and protect and improve farmland.

You have an outstanding example of what a watershed project can do right here in Virginia in the Mountain Run watershed project.

Mountain Run used to flood the city of Culpeper in the spring and fall, then dry up and leave her without water in the summer. The floods were bad, but the summer droughts were even worse.

Culpeper needed a new hospital, but the city couldn't build it, because it couldn't provide water for it. The chamber of commerce had been trying to get new industry to come to Culpeper. But with flooding in the winter, and droughts in the summer, industry wasn't interested.

Late in 1954, the city filed application for a watershed project. Five years and $545,000 later, the project was completed. One multipurpose structure stores 190 million gallons of water for municipal use, better than half a year's supply at the present rate of consumption.

The hospital has been built. Three new industries employing more than 400 people have moved to Culpeper, and other industries are making inquiries. Culpeper didn't have to go after those plants. They came to the city, once the flooding and water shortage problems were licked.

Now that the water mains have been extended, new homes are going up. The former unoccupied floodplain has become a shopping center, adding to the city's tax base. Conservation measures have put Culpeper's farmers on a sounder financial footing.

A 4-acre park was developed bordering one of the watershed structures, giving Culpeper citizens and visitors a place to fish, boat, and picnic.

The success of the Culpeper project is known far and wide.

There are already more than 70 small cities and towns like Culpeper benefiting from watershed projects. Another 453 communities have started similar projects, and 1,294 others have filed application for the same treatment. Our land is, and will be, so much the better.

Recreation is emerging as a use of the land that shows great economic promise. At the regional land and people conferences, and in surveys conducted by the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, thousands of farmers described how they switched from conventional farming to outdoor recreation, and made it pay.

It is not surprising. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission reports that our parks, camping grounds, lakes beaches, and highways are jammed with people searching for outdoor fun. Furthermore, the Commission says this demand will continue to grow, outstripping even our population boom. Where can they turn, but to our privately owned farm and ranch lands?

The Department can now help farmers and ranchers develop recreational enterprises on their land. We also can cost-share on recreational developments in watershed projects.

Just 1 month ago, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service announced plans for a pilot program to convert unneeded or unsuited cropland to other uses. These activities will be based on the basic farm conservation plan, and they will be carried out under long-term cost-sharing agreements negotiated with the Department of Agriculture.

These are just a few of the new conservation and rural development tools provided by the past Congress. Loan authorities were expanded to include recreation and cropland conversion projects. ASCS was authorized to expand its list of cost-sharing practices in certain areas. The watershed program was enlarged to add as a purpose both recreation and water storage for future municipal or industrial uses.

I urge you to study these and the other new authorities and see how they can be fitted into your existing district program. They represent an orderly step forward in our efforts to keep soil and water conservation dynamic and attuned to the needs of a modern society.

This is the 25th anniversary year of the district movement in your State, the Tidewater district being the first in Virginia to sign a memorandum of understanding with the Department on December 16, 1938.

You have done much to make your rural communities a better place to live. Today you have an even greater opportunity for service. I urge you to seize this opportunity to help yourselves, and your community. Let us push forward together until we have built a firm foundation for permanent prosperity in rural America.

Text of a Speech by U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, Before the Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base Montgomery, Ala., January 17, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the legislative branch of Government has a responsibility to maintain the prerogatives and the obligations of the Congress. To fail in this duty is to upset the balance of power in our constitutional system. The distinuished gentleman from Arizona, a Member of the other body, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, has spoken forcefully on this subject in words that merit the attention of the Congress and the country:

Once, when the architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, was asked to give an address to a distinguished audience, he rose, said his address was Paradise Valley, Phoenix, Ariz., and sat down. I could, just as accurately, say that my view of national security policy today is that it tends to be wrong, and sit down. This, however, would give you an overabundance of leisure and would undoubtedly result in a traffic jam at the library as you rushed to fill the time constructively.

It would also leave us where, unfortunately, many supposedly important national debates leave us—understanding fully who says yea and who says nay but still totally unaware of the process by which the disagreement was reached. It is the process about which I should like to speak today. I will not be able to avoid, because of a personality quirk perhaps, some discussion of specific disagreements, but I will begin, at least, with the broader topic.

My address to you today is supposed to increase an understanding on your part of the role performed by the American party system in developing, supporting, approving, and evaluating national policies. I wish that I could do this, but unfortunately, the American party system no longer plays a major role in these activities affecting national policies.

During the past 30 years of this century, both parties have seemed to recede from positions of principle and have taken attitudes closer to each other to the point that in the last elections, we saw an almost wholesale disregard for the party label and a voting for the man. The party historically in this country is a vehicle by which the citizen has been able to participate in the formation of national policy.

To a great extent, the policies of both parties as enunciated in their platforms have grown so close to each other, that it is difficult for the citizen to distinguish between them.

I suggest then, the proper question for Americans today is not so much what can America's policies do for the citizen, but what in the world can the citizen do for the policies. There was a time when the answer, very simply, would be: he can participate in the formulation of those policies.

As a matter of fact, we fought a Revolution to provide access for him to do just that. We brought representative government to its fullest flower for that purpose.

But, we did it in such a way that government always would be representative—of all the people—and not just of simple majorities. Only thus does representative government remain representative and not become repressive.

Basic in the equation is the balance of power between the three major branches of the Federal Government: The legislative to make laws; the executive to administer them; the judiciary to test them against the great legal framework of the Nation.

Now patience and principle are tested by new demands on this old balance. Congresses are criticized when they resist executive programs, not so much on the basis of why they resist but simply because they resist. The judiciary is caught in a boiling debate about whether it should judge the constitutionality of laws or whether it should also interpret them for maximum social benefit. States are criticized for their differences in approach or standards or wealth whereas they once were felt to be inviolate basically to preserve the opportunity for regional and cultural differences. Big cities, emerging as city states rather than as state units, look past the State capitol to the National Capitol for solution of their problems.

Federal regulation of trade practices has moved from the protective—which prohibits malpractices—toward the coercive—which

demands conformance with practices decided upon administratively.

We are larger and more populous, it is said, than when the Federal system was developed. Old ways are not adequate. Old balances are not meaningful. Does this mean that there is a population limit on liberty? That when 100 million persons live together they can maintain free markets and free and balanced institutions but that when 200 million persons live together they must delegate their local institutions to central authority? There is, at the root of it, no other explanation advanced for the movement today away from the Federal system of balanced powers toward an executive system of concentrated powers.

Now, is it proper for you, as members of the executive branch of government to consider these matters? As a member of the legislative branch, I think so. I think so, among other reasons, because of the essence of our civil-military relationship in this country, the essence of civilian control, directly through the civilian Commander-in-Chief but, as importantly, through the legislative branch which funds the military, makes laws broadly governing it, and to which the military must account when called upon to do so.

It follows that, to the degree that the legislative branch of government loses its weight as part of the balance it also stands to lose its power in relation to the military services. We do not want that to happen. Nor, despite the annoyances sometimes occasioned, do most military men.

Let me elaborate just a bit, lest anyone get the notion that I am urging some sort of political activity on the part of the military. I am doing quite the opposite. I am discussing a system which should make it possible for the military to devote itself fully to its professional mission. And I am discussing developments which threaten to introduce political disruptions into that professional role.

But first let me round out the basis of my argument—that a serious shift is, in fact, taking place in the way in which policy is made and in the way that the Federal system is brought to bear upon the policymaking process.

Some years ago, in his book, "Why England Slept," the then student, now President Kennedy, wrote at some length about the difficulties of preserving free institutions in times of stress and strain. He concluded, however, that despite the obvious advantages of efficiency enjoyed by a totalitarian government, the free institutions work best in the long run and must be preserved even though they might have to be sharpened or refocused in time of crisis.

Last month, speaking to a nationwide television audience, however, the President shifted his position basically. Commenting on the efforts to change the makeup of the House Rules Committee, he said that a failure to do this would "emasculate" the administration's program. This, by clear inference, was the reason that he was giving to change this particular legislative procedure.

There are certain technical reservations I would take to his statement—the House Rules Committee cannot, as so often said by those unfamiliar with the situation or trying to make a special case, the Committee cannot absolutely block legislation by preventing it from getting to the floor. There are no less than four established ways of bypassing the Committee. All are practical, all are available.

My major difference is with the President's reason. And, again, it is a difference based upon my membership in and regard for the legislative branch of government and my deep belief that it is this branch which most constantly, most closely makes a reality of representative government and provides proper access to the formulation of policy.

It is a blow at the very concept of representative government to say that a procedure of the Congress should be revised in order to permit untroubled development of the program of any administration.

In the first place, the elected chief executive of the United States supposedly is representative of the entire Nation, not just the citizens who cast ballots for him. To say otherwise is to suggest, in this particular time, a disenfranchisement of almost exactly half of the population of the United States.

If the programs and policies of any administration are opposed by the legislative branch it is just a sharp reminder of that fact—of the fact that this is a representative government and that the direct representatives of the entire electorate are expected to do their work regardless of which party or person is in power.

Interestingly enough, spokesmen for a particular administration program had gone just as far in another direction a few months earlier. After the Senate defeated the administration's social security medicare program, a medicare proponent figured out, and the President echoed in a press conference, that the Senators who voted against the bill did not represent a majority of the citizens of the United States; that is, the States they represented did not contain a majority of the electorate.

Again we have a colorful new view of representative government. The Senate was never designed to represent equal numbers of people. Two Senators are elected from every State despite population. They represent the State. They represent, also, a basic part of the Federal system's great balance of powers. To discuss the Senate on a numerical basis cannot be the result of simple ignorance of the Constitution. It must be on the basis of a simple disagreement with or misunderstanding of the Federal system itself.

On the other hand there are evidences that some supporters of the administration do not hold at all with majority representation—when a majority might interfere with a policy. The now famous memorandum on anti-Communist educational efforts issued by Senator FULBRIGHT, contained the frank statement that there could be too much public involvement with policy. It cited foreign aid, saying that if the program were submitted to direct ballot by all the people, it would probably fail. But this sensitivity to a representative government that makes it possible to balance policies between majority and minority measures—and still accomplish wonders—does not seem to be generally applied.

We have another indicative situation, which bears directly on policy formulation, in the Senate and in the House of Representatives today. It is the matter of staffs for the committees of Congress. Let me first describe why they are important.

Just as generals must, so must Senators and Representatives depend upon staffs to do the real digging and much of the work of putting together the background on which a policy decision can be made. What witnesses will a committee hear, what precedents should be reviewed, what is the status of similar legislation, what are the needs for proposed legislation, and so on and on—all this is the work of the committee staff.

Today, of course, the majority party, which is the Democratic Party, expects a substantial share of the staff to be working for them and to be appointed by them. Republicans would feel the same way.

On committee after committee, however, the minority party has not been able to appoint any staff member at all. On most there is at least a disparity of staff appointments that is far beyond the disparity in party representation. And this disparity, to raise this beyong a mere quibble between the in-party and the out-party is several times more pronounced than under the previous situation of a Republican majority.

Again, the point is simply that less attention than ever before is being paid to the essential role of the legislative as a forum for the views of all the people and as the great molder of policy on their behalf.

Insufficient minority staffing makes the legislative more dependent than even upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point as emphatically, I assure you, if the situation were to deny proper committee staffing to the Democrats.

The need is for proper policies, properly arrived at, properly researched and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch.

But what of defense policies in particular? Part of my assignment today was to discuss the role of the two parties in forming these policies. I want to disobey the assignment simply because that role is nowhere near as significant today as is the role of the executive branch operating with virtual autonomy, particularly through the Department of Defense.

It should come as no surprise to you gentlemen to be asked to consider, for instance, the policy implications of the existence of counterpart civilian research or consultative groups for virtually every operational function of the Armed Forces. This shadow Department of Defense is a fact of your everyday military life. It is a reflection, I think, of the new direction in policymaking, the direction away from the proceses of representative government and toward government by expert, specialist, technician, or even computer.

Policies evolved by these outside research groups can have the most profound and direct impact upon our national defense policies. Often, their policies are our national policies. And this is not to debate the point of whether the policies are right or wrong. It is to state, however, that from my position as a member of the legislative branch, responsible to an electorate, the process of forming those policies is wrong, dead wrong.

Policy formation should never be far removed from policy responsibility. By creating this shadow Department of Defense, however, authority and responsibility are widely separated. You might call it a responsibility gap in our policy structure.

Most serious, however, is the possible politicalization of the military services themselves. Let me cite an example. One of the branches of the shadow DOD, a research and analysis group, has been going quite deeply into the question of disarmament. This suggests a possible effort to stress, in our defense policies, actions that will enhance the purely political efforts toward disarmament. This, I hold, is improper. It is not the function of the Armed Forces to beat their swords into plowshares—no matter how devoutly they may cherish the notion. Nor is it the function of defense policies to become an adjunct of particular partisan political policies—such as a particular administration's proposal for disarmament. The implications are obvious and shocking.

Political decisions, of course, must guide the use of the Armed Forces. They should not guide the purely internal and professional decisions and composition of the Armed Forces. For instance, the decision to scrap any particular weapons system should be made on the basis of technology and strategy. It should not be made on the basis of partisan political plans.

Yet, today, the scrapping of Skybolt and the offer to place Polaris missiles at NATO's disposal is essentially the politicalization of what should have been a professional military decision.

As far as I have been able to ascertain in the short time that I have been in Washington since the opening of this Congress, not one member of the Senate Armed Services Committee was apprised of the decision to scrap Skybolt and to offer the Polaris missiles to NATO. Yet, the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which handles military appropriations, have an interest in these decisions and how they are arrived at, because of their overriding interest in what is good for the Republic. From the exercise of this interest comes the decisions of the committees, and secondly of the Congress, that enable the Department of Defense to build their weapons systems. I might inject at this point that the present disarmament proposal offered at Geneva by the United States, which contains in my opinion the mechanics of unilateral disarmament, was not discussed with the Foreign Policy Committee of either House or with leaders of the Senate who would have a natural interest in any such proposal.

Again we see the emphasis on centralization that characterizes our own domestic situation.

News emanating from the Department of Defense is another familiar example of the way in which policy support is attempted by executive management rather than by representative persuasion.

Suppression of news, I would admit, is a conceivable necessity of a national emergency. But when a spokesman for the Department of Defense argues, publicly, that it is the inherent right of government also to lie in its own defense, then I say that we have moved another giant step away from representative and toward repressive government.

How ironic it is that many of our citizens today are worried by such hyperthyroid considerations of a military coup d'etat as that contained in the book, "Seven Days in May."

How much more to the point would it be to worry about the tiny coups d'etat which take place everyday so that the federal system is being reshaped into a lopsided monster that is virtually all executive in the way it walks, thinks, talks, and cannibalizes the other two branches.

Americans of all political hues were particularly sensitive to a single manifestation of this when another administration attempted to pack the Supreme Court with justices favorable to a point of view rather than dedicated to points of law.

The situation today is far more striking and far more obvious. Our 7 days in May, in truth, are ticking off not in the duty rooms of military stations but in the paneled cloisters of executive offices.

I believe it to be common knowledge across this country that the membership of the 87th Congress almost unanimously supported additional appropriations for the B-70 program and that the Department of Defense has consistently refused to recognize the will of the people as expressed through the votes of the Congress. It is true that a rather piddling sum has been applied to this project, but it is also true that the uninformed civilian researchers in the Pentagon resist this program and are determined to see it fail. This, I suggest, is a very obvious example of the growing determination of the executive to ignore the wishes of the legislative. I stress this balance and point to a lack of it as a principal reason why I could not direct my remarks as suggested by the school toward the methods of solutions of problems by the two-party system.

Policy formulation, in a representative form of government, is like a man. It works less well if its limbs are lopped off. It needs a mind and it also needs heart. It needs eyes and it needs ears. It needs muscles and bone structure linked, balanced, and functioning. Starve the sinews and it collapses. Close the eyes and ears and it risks collision.

And we do starve the sinews and close the eyes and ears when we deny representation and rely overly on administration.

Actually, the situation I have been describing is a direct comment also on the question of how political parties form, support, and press policy positions. They do it less and less as parties and more and more as reflections of particular administrations. The administrations, in turn, do it less and less as representative bodies and more and more as the reflections of their particular sets of policy specialists.

And why? Basically because the keystone of the great arch of representative government, the legislative, is subordinated in policy considerations and more and more asked only to approve what the executive technicians have developed. In the case even of the opposition there is less and less opportunity to speak out for a new formulation of policy. Opportunity usually is left only to oppose.

A domestic example would lie in the medicare proposal to which I referred previously. The Congress already has passed legislation establishing certain means of obtaining medical attention for elderly persons, the Kerr-Mills bill. In short, it has said that there is another way to reach the goal of medical care. But, because this representative expression does not please this executive branch, its operating agency in the field, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is deliberately using its powers to stutlify the Kerr-Mills procedures and thus pave the way for a new attempt to obtain congressional surrender to an executive proposal. It is not enough for representative government to agree on the goal and then work out a consensus on how to reach it. Executive emphasis in government, says, instead, that the legislative must also agree to, accede to, the exact wording, the punctuation, and the procedures of the Executive plan.

In international policies it is even more pronounced. Time and again, the legislative branch has sought to hammer out a broad base of policy that could guide us as a Nation. Time and again, the executive branch in this and in previous administrations has moved ahead unilaterally to positions that may solve a momentary problem but beg the whole broad issues of national objective.

There is no doubt, for instance, that the consensus of the Congress is opposed not just to missiles in Cuba but to the toleration of a Communist base there at all. Executive policy, operating behind a nearly total blackout of information regarding even the invasion prisoner negotiations, takes a different tack, offering no-invasion pledges, pinning policy to offensive weapons and not to offensive doctrine, and so forth.

Skybolt and the RS-70, the whole elimination of the manned bomber program is one of executive engineering and too little congressional debate—and information.

The pause theory, the no-cities theory of nuclear attack are executive decisions. They have not passed any of the tests that should be applied to major decisions in representative government. They have passed the review only of the executive's technicians. And these technicians, supposedly representative of the Nation as a whole, are in obvious fact representative only of a faction of a fraction.

There may be, in all of this, instances of bipartisanship. But it is a bipartisanship only of convenience and of detail.

Half of this Nation has been, in effect, disenfranchised. The half that seems to believe, by its voting record, in policies of lessened centralization of government at home and in a strategy of initiative rather than reinforcement of the status quo abroad, are disenfranchised by an executive branch that is out of sympathy with their position and all too sensitive to and resentful of efforts to redress the balance in the legislature which is the only ameliorating body available.

True bipartisanship would, at least, find the executive appreciative of and not laying siege to legislative prerogative.

Properly this is the only way to focus the policies of the two parties upon the debates from which the single policy of national statement should emerge.

Your interest in the actions of the two parties must be counted partially academic. Until the balance between executive and legislative and judicial is fully restored, policy will remain essentially a possession—not of a party or people, but of an Executive. Only when the balance is restored can it again become a process and a participation.

What has been taking place in America is a revolution directed at the piecemeal changing of our concept of government. One might say that the revolution was based upon the concept expressed in our Declaration of Independence, "all men are created equal," for the proponents of the revolution intend to see that man is not only born equal, which is the true meaning of the words in the Declaration, but that he remains equal in material things all through his life. This material equality would be maintained by taking from the ambitious their property to be distributed among the lazy. To do this—to either take property without the due process of the law—or to change the laws through Executive edict to ignore that prohibition of the fifth amendment—would require a thoroughly controlled centralized government. The revolution, of course, has been a bloodless one. We have had no fighting in the streets, no bombings, no assassinations, but no one can successfully argue today that the revolutionists have not been successful. Actually, when we discuss conservatives and liberals today we are discussing the opponents in this revolution. The liberals believe that the power of a central government can best regulate the lives of men regardless of what it does to their freedom. The conservative believes that the closer government remains to the people, the more the people have to say about policies of their government, the more can be gotten for all of the people, including that most important point, the preservation of freedom.

Had I felt it possible to discuss this broad problem within the confines of a two-party system, it would have been an easy assignment and I could have accomplished it in length of this paper. It is not an easy assignment, however, because as I said at the outset, we in effect have drifted away from the two-party concept, and while we still do not have a one-party mechanism which might be called the alternative, we do find a terrific growth of power in one branch of our government, which, if allowed to continue, will successfully stamp out both parties. And I am afraid also that the legislative and then the judicial branch of government will fade further leaving only the executive. This process of deterioration, I might remind you gentlemen, has been experienced by nearly every government in the history of the world and the experience has caused their ultimate undoing.

I look forward, therefore, to the question period so that we might develop in a more specific way questions that I might have placed in your minds.

How an Iowa Democrat Looks at the Tax and Spend Policies of This Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, of special interest to me was a recent letter to the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register from Mr. Frank Engel, 1727 Division Street, Davenport, Iowa.

Mr. Engel is a leading Democrat in our State but he certainly has no stomach for the pellmell race which the President and his spendthrift advisers are conducting with sophisticated economics to run this Nation into insolvency.

Because I feel that Mr. Engel's remarks will strike responsive chords in the Congress, and because I feel that they carry a special message to the taxpayers of this great country, I wish to insert this letter to the editor in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

EDITOR,
Des Moines Register,
Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR SIR: The big tax loot the country has been shelling out is beginning to make itself felt, and if something drastic isn't done, it's going to hurt more. It's going to take more than some scrawny cut by Congress in deference to President Kennedy's plea, to preserve the incentives favorable to the success of the capitalistic system in the United States.

A lot of people say a cut in taxation should be accompanied by a cut in government spending. They should know better and be more realistic about offering such high-sounding economic platitudes, for the logical conclusion of such reasoning will never appeal to the government spenders and it will never be ardently advocated by those who live off the public trough. So long as you keep filling the trough for them, they will be your unwelcome guests. No genuine desire for efficient and economical government will ever come from the taxeaters and the tax-spending donkeys we are feeding as the free-loaders on the bin of American production.

Take into account the gigantic dollar total of all governmental taxing bodies, beginning with local, school, city, county and State taxes in addition to the huge Federal budget, and it already eats up more than half the national wealth produced in the United States annually. We are literally being eaten out of house and home. The size of that tax dish is a stupendous portion of our production.

The tax-eating hordes will strive, however, to make the tax trough bigger to hold more. They don't want employment in productive industry. They don't want to help bake a bigger pie. They just want a bigger slice, which, of course, leaves a smaller share for those who make it, or keep on trying to make it. To them, the idea of cutting taxation is bizarre and "unorthodox."

Perpetuated long enough, our taxation system will ultimately destroy the fabric of unity which binds our people together. We have now become already, a nation divided by those who produce the national gross product for the maintenance of the standard of living requirements from those who produce nothing, except persuasive arguments for more spending and taxation, and socialism.

Taxation is like a drug. It easily becomes an immoral habit. A little may be useful and necessary, but the appetite grows with what it feeds on. The orgy of tax-spending is now swallowing our economic production and destroying the legitimate incentives which has made capitalism successful. Like drug addicts, if the tax-spenders can't get enough money by taxation, they go on with deficit spending and push the country into the red with debts. We go into deficit spending very naively for the benefit of foreign nations, therefore why not go with the same deficit practice by giving something to the American taxpayers in the way of a substantial tax cut. The billions we give foreigners they now use to buy our gold supply and we even let them shell that out without protest.

While the tax-spenders wreck the economy, they yet consider themselves our overlords and the masters of the public welfare state. The U.S. State Department even runs advertisements on television suggesting people to seek careers in government. In the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration an additional 180,000 people have been added to the public payroll. They can't all be relatives. The demand for the social welfare state is hatched and built up by propaganda conceived and launched by the political tax-spenders and never was originated by the majority of the people. In short, the public doesn't know what it wants. It never has, and short of some intellectual utopia, never will. Its collective mind is a vacuum into which will rush the dreariest social-demanding divertisements conceived by such cynical suppliers seeking political status. In truth the public opinion is a shapeless glob, waiting to be given form by men richer in political cleverness than conscience. And that's how we got into the mess we've been shoved. We take it without protest and keep shelling out the loot to the tax-eaters and the tax-spenders. Let's start driving those donkeys and make them pull their share of the load with productive employment as the President suggests.

FRANK L. ENGEL.

Joseph William Briggs: Our First Postman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans would appreciate what Joseph W. Briggs has done for them but they may never have heard of him. Forgotten, except for a handful of relatives is the Clevelander who conceived the free postal delivery service for cities, served as the first mailman and designed the first free delivery letterbox.

Mr. Briggs, who died in 1872 and is buried in Woodland Cemetery in Cleveland, had nine children. His closest living descendants are two grandchildren: Mrs. Victor P. Minier, 12479 Cedar Road, Cleveland Heights and Mrs. Irene B. Allen, Thompson, Ohio. Their grandfather had reached his early fifties in the Civil War period. Cleveland got its regular mail route in 1803 and its first post office in 1805, located on Public Square on the site of the present Federal Building. During the Civil War, Mr. Briggs was stationed there as a clerk and assistant to the postmaster. At that time everyone had to go to the post office for his mail, which was either placed in special boxes or delivered at the windows.

During the winter of 1862–63 Mr. Briggs noticed that the women who stood in line in the cold suffered unnecessary hardships. They were so anxious to get letters from their husbands and sweethearts who were away at the fighting fronts that some of them used to stand exposed to the cold for hours before they could reach the delivery window. So Mr. Briggs suggested the idea of sorting the mail and taking it to the various grocery stores in different parts of the city where it could be distributed to the people who lived in the immediate vicinity thus saving them a long trip downtown and waiting in line. The idea was adopted and it worked out so successfully that Briggs went a step further. He suggested that uniformed post office employees should deliver the mail at the homes of the people to whom it was addressed. At first the idea met with every kind of opposition, but it was finally put into effect and Mr. Briggs designed the first uniform worn by the post office employees who became our first letter carriers.

On March 3, 1863, Congress passed the bill authorizing city free delivery. The Postmaster General in Lincoln's Cabinet, Montgomery Blair, then made Mr. Briggs a special agent of the Post Office Department for the supervision of the free delivery system. In that capacity, he organized the system of free delivery of mail matter in 52 cities from Bangor, Maine, to San Francisco, Calif.

I do not suppose any man ever contributed as much good to as many people as Joseph W. Briggs, who died in 1872, unhonored and unsung. Today, some of our most beloved public servants are the postmen who bring our mail to our homes daily. However, if it had not been for the foresight of Joseph W. Briggs, we might still be going to the central post office and standing in line to get our mail.

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, the Republic of Chad celebrated her second anniversary of their independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Francois Tombalbaye; and His Excellency, the Chad Ambassador to the United States, Adam Malick Sow, on this memorable occasion.

This month the people of the Republic of Chad are celebrating the second anni-

versary of their independence. Although proclaimed free and sovereign on August 11, 1960, and admitted to the United Nations the following month, formal independence celebrations were deferred until January 11, 1961.

Chad is a republic, one and indivisible, secular, democratic, and social. It has seen a period of gradual and peaceful transition from colonial rule to independent status. This Republic became a separate colony in 1917, distinctive from the other colonies in France's African empire. Chad attained the status of an oversea territory of the French Union in 1946, becoming in 1958 an autonomous republic of the French community. The final step was full independence in 1960. This peaceful and gradual transition has instilled in the people a feeling of responsibility to adhere strictly to democratic processes. In the preamble to the Constitution of Chad, the defense of the rights of man, the separation of powers, and civil liberties are laid down as the fundamental principles of the nation.

Chad is a land of many terrains and a great diversity of people. There are settled farmers in the south, raising cotton on lush riverlands. There are ranchers in the center of the nation raising cattle and sheep on the expansive savannas. And finally, there are nomads in the north, living off the desert, guiding their caravans into the interior. The country's landlocked position and relative inaccessibility are the major deterrents to development. Since the economy is dependent on cotton and cattle, it is necessary to have sufficient transportation facilities to enable these products to reach foreign markets, and in turn, to be able to receive much-needed produce from the outside. That is why immediate development plans for the future call for railroads, paved roads, and expanded air service. In the near future, development projects also outline plans for greater diversity in industy and the exploitation of minerals and other raw materials.

When the President of the United States recognized the independence of Chad, he stated that the United States looked forward to close and friendly relations with Chad's government and people. On this second anniversary, I extend the wishes of the people of the United States for continued progress and success.

Our American Heritage: Will We Keep Freedom Alive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our American Heritage: Will We Keep Freedom Alive?" by a prominent American, Mr. Walter Knott.

Mr. Knott is a conservative patriot who has unselfishly dedicated much of his own time and resources to maintaining and furthering the American system. He is founder of the California Free Enterprise Association, a sound organization that publishes important economic facts of our times and encourages schools to teach free enterprise the American way.

The article follows:

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE: WILL WE KEEP FREEDOM ALIVE?

NOTE.—Walter Knott is the founder of Knott's Berry Farm and the builder of Ghost Town, an authentic replica of early California gold mining towns, at Buena Park, Calif. This article by Knott appeared in Tax Digest, third quarter, 1962, a magazine for taxpayers published by the California Taxpayers Association. Richard Winter is editor. Knott was born in San Bernardino, Calif., in 1889. In 1920, he and Mrs. Knott moved to their present location in Orange County, and built their farming enterprises from 10 acres of rented land to their present extensive acres. Their four children are partners in the business and now manage it. In addition to the world famous Berry Farm and Ghost Town, their ventures include the restoration of Calico Ghost Town, halfway between Los Angeles and Las Vegas.)

(By Walter Knott)

For a few minutes let us examine our great American heritage—our individual freedom—from whence it came; what it has done for us; and what we are doing to pass this heritage on to our posterity.

Throughout all history comparatively few men have ever been free. Some historians say not more than 5 percent and most of these have lived in America. Until our American Revolution the common man everywhere had only the freedoms that his government chose to bestow on him.

Our founding fathers when gathered together to form our Constitution came up with a whole new concept of government. These men (divinely guided, I believe) said that freedom was God-given and rested in the individual. The rights were his and he could give as little or as much as he chose to his government. These pioneers chose to form a very limited government keeping their individual freedom and bearing their individual responsibilities. Here for the first time in history the chains were taken off the individual and placed on his government.

At the time of the American Revolution there were less than 5 million colonists. Yet this small number, together with freedom loving people from other parts of the world, filled the Atlantic coast and started moving west, subduing a wilderness as they went. In an incredibly short time these pioneers who had so little to work with, had subdued the West and built a nation.

How was it that they were able to build our towns, our cities, our roads, schools, churches, colleges and their homes and all without government aid? And how is it that now, even with all our accumulated wealth, we have to run to Washington when we have to build a wing on a hospital or a dormitory at a college. I think there may have been several reasons. First, hardships overcome, make strong, self-reliant people and certainly they were used to hardships. Second, they did not have to support a large and expensive government. And third, they had a degree of personal freedom that we don't have today; and fourth, they had an understanding that with freedom, there must be responsibility.

In the year 1910 the cost of running our Federal Government was $1 billion and by chance that year the national debt was just about $1 billion. Our population then was 90 million people.

Since 1910 our population has doubled but the cost of running our Federal Government has jumped from $1 to $90 billion this year and the budget for next year is $93 billion. In these same years our national debt has climbed from $1 to $298 billion and we are adding to this debt at the rate of $650,000 per hour (24 hours per day) for every hour since January 20, 1961.

Today it costs us 90 times as much to govern twice as many people as it did 50 years ago. Why? How and when did we let this take place?

It started in the year 1913 when we passed the 16th amendment to our Constitution When that amendment was ratified without any limit beyond which the Government could tax its citizens, the Government began to grow.

With this new easy money coming in, the Government bureaus began to grow, slowly at first but it was soon found that Government could buy favor with blocs of voters so as the Government grew, it again needed more money and the rates were raised. Then the Government had more money to curry favor with more voters and rates could again be raised. We soon learned that Government bureaus never die, they only multiply.

In less than 50 years (less than my adult lifetime) I have seen that innocent appearing tax of 3 percent on a few rich people, grow until today those same rich people are paying 91-percent tax and the poor people who were to have been the beneficiaries of the tax, are paying 20 percent.

With every increase in this tax there has been a corresponding increase in the size of our Government, an increase in the controls on our lives, and a corresponding loss in our freedoms.

Perhaps you feel that the rich man who finds himself in the 91-percent bracket is not personally hurt and to a degree this is true. Today we are in an industrial age where it costs from $7,000 to $30,000 of invested capital to provide each new job. If the Government continues to penalize the industrious citizens by assessing a higher and higher penalty on thrift and industry, where will this large amount of capital come from to provide the new jobs for today's generation of young people? Obviously we will have to go to the Government for capital, and when the Government owns the tools of production, that is socialism.

Today America and the rest of the free world are fighting a cold war against communism. More than 100 years ago Karl Marx told his followers that the way to capture any capitalistic society was to get a high and progressive income tax levied. Ours is now up to 91 percent. Frank Choderof puts it this way, "Without the income tax, socialism is impossible, with the income tax, socialism is inevitable."

During that same 50 years our national debt has grown from $1 billion to $298 billion.

We have only balanced our budget six times in the last 31 years and 25 of these years we have plunged deeper into debt.

During the first 140 years of our life as a nation, we paid our national debt down after our wars, even after the great Civil War and World War I. But during the last 30 years instead of paying, we have added to our debt at a fantastic rate, and have made absolutely no effort to pay. I will bet you have not heard a politician in years even suggest that we should be paying on this ruinous debt.

No doubt some of you are thinking how can things be so bad when we are so prosperous. Yes, we are properous, we have gone $25 billion deeper in debt during the last 15 years since the end of World War II while we should have been paying on our debt.

We are prosperous because we have been mortgaging 150 years of thrift and hard

work, saving and capital accumulation. A 150 years during which we saved, worked and became the most productive people in the world. We have mortgaged this until now the interest on our national debt is more than it cost to run our whole Government 22 years ago.

And, our generation is making no effort to pay. We are greedily enjoying a fool's prosperity by mortgaging everything our forefathers accumulated and leaving the responsibility to pay to our children. Do you think we are rearing children who will be more responsible, more self-denying, willing to bear their debts and ours too?

Why did this breakdown of morality, this lack of responsibility, this dishonesty happen in our generation after America had lived through five generations without building a big, extravagant Government to control the lives of its citizens? Was it the 16th amendment to the Constitution that made it possible?

Note the change in our people's thinking during the short 49 years since that fateful day in 1913. When this amendment was being discussed in Congress, one farsighted lawmaker stood up and said if we pass this iniquitous law, without setting a limit beyond which some future Congress can go, some of you will live to see the day that Government will not take 3 percent from the rich people as planned now, but will take 10 percent and they hooted him down because 49 years ago no one in America could conceive of taking 10 percent from anyone.

Well, the years passed and the Government grew and taxes were increased slowly at first, then faster and faster. From 1913 to 1933 the growth was in such little doses we hardly noticed it, even though during this time we fought World War I and we were paying on the debt this war had created during the 1920's.

Since 1933 Government debt, taxes, and Government controls have grown at a fantastic rate. We are governed today by an incredible bureaucracy.

In 1910 you could go from one year to the next and never see a Government agent, while now one person out of seven who is gainfully employed in America, is working for Government.

One-third of our national production goes to pay taxes. The average American works 4 months out of each year just to pay taxes. We are one-third socialized.

During a very brief span of years America has tried the only real experiment in freedom the world has ever seen. It has succeeded far beyond anything the world ever accomplished in all history. Under this freedom and our free-enterprise system (Capitalism) one-seventh of the world's population has been able to produce one-half of the world's goods and wealth. And we have been able to divide this production and wealth more equitably among our people than any other people during all history.

Either we will again assume the responsibilities of freedom or the light of freedom will go out in America, and if it goes out in America, hope of freedom will go out all over the world.

Today we have both a great opportunity and a great responsibility. We may be writing the last chapter in this wonderful experiment in freedom started by our Founding Fathers. This experiment that has given us so much. That has made us the envy and hope of people everywhere.

If the wealth, the luxury, the leisure that our system has brought us makes us smug and complacent, willing to load our responsibilities on our Government, we will lose and deserve to lose our freedom and with it will go all of these fruits of freedom.

We have no right to lose this freedom that was given to us to use—to enjoy and to pass on to our children. Our children deserve the same opportunity.

Let us write our chapter so that our children and their children will have the opportunity to add theirs to this, the world's greatest experiment in freedom.

Proposed Merger of New York Central Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, January 14, 1963, with respect to the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad.

The resolution is self explanatory and I felt it would be of interest to several of my colleagues whose constitutents also have an interest in this proposal.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NIAGARA FALLS AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, JANUARY 14, 1963

With respect for the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad, which is before the Interstate Commerce Commission for consideration in finance docket Nos. 21989–21990, and in which the citizens and businesses of the city of Niagara Falls have a significant interest because the New York Central Railroad prominently serves enterprises of this city and community, and in consequence of a public hearing of this matter held in the city of Buffalo on December 19, 1962, at which testimony of individuals was heard, it is the desire of the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce to present a restatement of its resolution adopted on October 30, 1962, as follows:

"Whereas there is presently proposed a merger between the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad and a joint application has been filed by these railroads with the Interstate Commerce Commission (finance docket Nos. 21989–21990); and

"Whereas a statement and testimony under oath in opposition to this merger were submitted at the public hearing on December 19, 1962, purporting to represent the sentiment substantially of this city and community, which differ with the conviction held by this organization; and

"Whereas this organization reached its decision only after extensive effort to secure facts in addition to those facts readily available. It relies on expressions by organizations and declarations by individuals closely allied with the transportation industry who are, in reality, experts in this field who state: An excess transportation capacity exists in the United States; the facilities of the several transportation modes overlap; the major modes of transportation suffer from overregulation applied as an awkward device for dividing the available traffic; that the railroad industry, in particular, in spite of extensive investment in and widespread use of the most modern operating techniques, has been unsuccessful in its efforts to derive net revenue sufficient for healthy operation; and the further fact that insolvency may be imminent; and

"Whereas improved conditions of operation, with consequent improvement in net revenue, reductions in expenses, increased efficiency, the elimination of duplicate physical facilities, and the effective pooling of managerial skills, are persuasively promised by a merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad, all to the end that markedly improved freight transportation service may be expected in the Niagara Falls area with a corresponding effect on its economic growth; and

"Whereas testimony which springs from hearsay, or relies on misleading information or misunderstood data, all of which is presented in summary as truly representative of this community, clearly disputes the considered judgment of the directors and officers as they represent the membership of the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce; and

"Whereas this organization desires emphatically to reiterate its earlier adopted position for the betterment of Niagara Falls industries who must rely on adequate railroad service: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, in its continued emphatic support of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad proposed merger for the reasons stated, does so in the firm belief that its position truly represents the sentiment of the area, and furthermore, intends this resolution shall have the effect of correcting in the Interstate Commerce Commission record any reference to a contrary attitude which it believes to be detrimental to the interests of the people of the Niagara Falls area.

Voss Manufacturing Co. of Atlantic, Iowa, Wins at National Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are always duly proud when our friends receive recognition for outstanding accomplishments.

Mr. George Voss, president of the Voss Manufacturing Co., has again proven his company's slogan: "If it is made of wood we can make it."

Under leave to extend these remarks, I include the following editorial from the Atlantic News Telegraph, Altantic, Iowa:

[From the Atlantic (Iowa) News Telegraph, Jan. 8, 1963]

VOSS MANUFACTURING WINS AT NATIONAL SHOW

A kitchen built by the Voss Manufacturing Co. of Atlantic and designed by Georgia Tonnelli the former Georgia Voss, has been chosen the outstanding exhibit in the kitchen department of the National Home Builders show in Chicago. The kitchen, designed for Better Homes and Gardens, was pictured in a four-page spread in the November issue of the magazine, has been exhibited at a number of national home shows and has won widespread attention. The Home Furnishings Daily of December 19 featured pictures of the outstanding units of the kitchen and this national publicity has brought to the Voss Manufacturing Co., inquiries from as far away as both coasts.

Before the job of building the kitchen was given to the local concern, Better Homes and Gardens had submitted the plans to a large group of furniture builders. Without exception they had said that they could not build the kitchen. The project was all but abandoned, when Georgia mentioned to the firm that her father could build it. He was handed the job with the result that now an entirely new field for the services of the local firm appeared to be opening up.

The kitchen, French provincial in design, features a wall-hung table adapted from a maple chopping block, with wood and wrought iron supports attached to a corner post extending from floor to ceiling. It is built in pie-shaped wedges and seats six. Another unique feature is a spindle-supported plate rack, while the spindle features is carried over into cabinet bases.

The Home Furnishings Daily describes the kitchen under the headline "Fine Furniture Look in the Kitchen," and from all the exhibits at the National Home Builders used three of the Voss-built kitchen features out of a total of seven selected for detailed descriptions.

Work of the Trustees of the New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport Post of Wednesday, January 17, carried an excellent editorial tribute to the work of the trustees of the New Haven Railroad. It should be encouraging to all Members to know that this railroad, which is being operated under the Bankruptcy Act, has such highly competent men at the controls. When the New Haven, through the joint action of Federal, State, and local governments, is at length restored to financial health, we all will owe a great deal to the imagination and dedication of the trustees, who are laboring against great odds to preserve and improve this vital asset. The editorial from the Bridgeport Post recognizes this and I am happy to offer it for the RECORD:

THE TRUSTEES ARE TRYING

The trustees of the New Haven Railroad, with initiative and energy, continue their valiant effort to revive the line against heavy odds.

A new train-to-airport transfer service is a good example of the trustees' modern thinking, the search to overlook no possibilities. Through an arrangement with a motor coach service, the railroad provides rides from Grand Central Terminal to the major airports.

There may not be an enormous amount of profit in this new program but every little bit helps. And it bespeaks an up-to-the-minute outlook which has the feature of turning competition to advantage so that it isn't, as they say, a total loss.

In the vital matter of freight revenues, the New Haven is acquiring substantial new "weapons" in its fight to increase business in southern New England. The first 3 of 50 additional modern piggyback flatcars were placed in service the other day on the Boston-New York Shore Line.

Here again, there is the factor of turning competition to advantage. The 85-foot flatcars, each capable of carrying two 40-foot highway trailers, are 3 feet high. This permits them to carry tall, 12-foot 6-inch trailers in the restricted clearance area between New York and New Haven.

Acquisition of the flatcars involves modernization. They will be paid for from the proceeds of old locomotives and other outdated rolling stock.

The trustees, explaining the reason for acquiring the new cars, cite the savings in operation and labor costs, the faster service of benefit to the shipper and railroad.

The trustees are to be commended for refusing to act as though the situation is hopeless.

Did the Appeasers Sabotage the Invasion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with apostles of appeasement surrounding the President, the American people are not getting the truth.

David Lawrence, in an article in the January 22 issue of the Washington Evening Star, raises a very serious point when he questions whether our Military Establishment is competent and if it has been unduly interfered with by civilians.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 22, 1963]

UNITED STATES AND THE BAY OF PIGS FIASCO—QUESTION OF MILITARY COMPETENCE OR CIVILIAN INTERFERENCE IS RAISED

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to know whether the chiefs of their armed services are incompetent or whether, in strictly military operations, they are being interfered with by civilians in the Government.

A congressional investigation of just what happened before the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba took place in April 1961, is more than ever necessary now, because of what is being disclosed as the true story of the fiasco. For unless the responsibility of the U.S. Chiefs of Staff during military operations is clearly fixed, the capacity of the United States to prevent or resist armed attacks in this hemisphere may be open to question.

More than 300,000 men of our armed services were mobilized last October inside the United States for a possible invasion of Cuba in order to get rid of the Soviet missile bases there. But there is no way to judge whether the military chiefs even then had the full authority to act and just what restrictions were placed upon them which could have affected the success of that expedition.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who, because he is a brother of the President, is regarded as the administration's authoritative spokesman in many matters outside his own department, has just given two interviews on the Cuban fiasco, one to the Knight newspapers and the other to U.S. News & World Report.

The two interviews dovetail, though they do not cover all of the same points. The Attorney General told David Kraslow, Washington correspondent of the Knight newspapers, that there had been no invasion plan completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. He said: "There was just a general concept. The logistics and the details were worked out after the President (Kennedy) took office."

Added interest has developed now in this whole subject, because many of the Cuban officers of the invasion force, who were recently ransomed have been telling Americans that the United States had assured them of air cover. Attorney General Kennedy makes quite a point of the fact that no U.S. air cover was ever promised. Technically, this is correct. But the United States was fully cognizant of the air support the Cubans were supposed to have. Yet this was inadequate. Attorney General Kennedy said in his interview in U.S. News & World Report:

"The first point is that there was not U.S. air cover and none was withdrawn. In fact, the President didn't withdraw any air cover for the landing forces—United States or otherwise.

"What happened was this: One air attack had been made on Saturday on Cuban airports. There was a flurry at the United Nations and elsewhere and, as a result, U.S. participation in the matter was coming to the surface. This surfacing was contrary to the preinvasion plan. There was supposed to be another attack on the airports on Monday morning.

The President was called about whether another attack which had been planned should take place. As there was this stir about the matter, he gave instructions that it should not take place at that time unless those having the responsibility felt that it was so important it had to take place, in which case they should call him and discuss it further. And that's what was postponed. It wasn't air cover of the beaches or landings. And, in fact, the attack on the airports took place later that day.

The air cover provided was from a base in central America. What part the U.S. Government played in organizing it is not disclosed. In the middle of a military operation, however, you can't make a long-distance call to the White House and discuss the next move. The anti-Castro forces were sure air cover was coming from somewhere.

The Attorney General was asked who did the planning. He declared that "the plan that finally went into effect was approved by our military, the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency." He added that, while the Joint Chiefs "approved" the plan, "the responsibility for the planning lay primarily with the CIA," and that, since the President had to give final approval to the plan, he had accepted the blame.

In both interviews, the Attorney General said that U.S. airpower was to have been used only if the ships transporting the Cuban invasion force had been detected by Castro before they reached the target area and were attacked on the high seas on their way back to Central America. This is the explanation given for the presence of U.S. warships, including an aircraft carrier, in the vicinity of the Bay of Pigs on the day of the invasion. Yet it is asserted that before the invasion the President had "made it clear" that U.S. Armed Forces, including airpower, would not be used.

In the interview in the Knight newspapers, the Attorney General said, "The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

But what does "cleared" mean? Do the Joint Chiefs take responsibility for any such plan as was employed?

Listing the major "mistakes," Mr. Kennedy added: "There was not sufficient air cover at the beach. That was a mistake. There were

not enough men and equipment. That was a mistake. Underestimating the T-33's (Castro's airplanes), that was a serious mistake. The planning was inadequate, just inadequate."

But who did all this planning, and why wasn't someone in the U.S. Air Force able to say in advance whether the T-33's had the capacity to carry rockets? These were the U.S. planes originally given to the Batista regime in Cuba.

The important "details" have never been divulged, as there has been a constant cover-up. But if Congress now fails to make a searching inquiry, with testimony available to the public, another military fiasco could occur, especially if the same "military planners" are still in command at the Pentagon

In an AP dispatch of January 22, a member of the Cuban Revolutionary Council disputes Bobby Kennedy's version of the Cuban invasion.

The President of the United States, instead of having his hatchetmen speak for him, should be forthright with the American people and clear the air like a man.

The article follows:

CUBAN EXILE INSISTS U.S. PLEDGED AIR AID

MIAMI, FLA., January 22.—A leader in the exile organization that mounted the 1961 Cuban invasion insists that the anti-Castro brigade was promised full air cover.

Manuel Antonio de Varona, of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, said he was obliged to break silence because of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's statement yesterday that no U.S. air cover was planned.

The Attorney General said President Kennedy couldn't have issued last-minute orders canceling air cover, as many administration critics have maintained, because there never were any plans for the United States to provide air support.

Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, also disputed the Attorney General. In Washington Senator GOLDWATER said he talked with the President just after the invasion and "I certainly got the impression then that an air cover had been part of the original invasion plans."

Mr. Varona, a former Cuban Prime Minister who headed the leading Cuban democratic revolutionary front at the time of the invasion, said in a statement:

"The colonel designated by the Government of the United States as head of the camp where the Cubans trained assured me in February 1961, when I expressed concern over the reduced number of troops, that the Cuban patriots would have 'full air control' during the invasion.

"The brave expeditionaries never had the promised air coverage.

"Neither was I informed of the date nor of the plans for invasion, which in any case would not have had my approval in view of the conditions under which it took place."

The Essence of Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, recently addressed the annual convention of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association in Chicago.

As usual, our colleague delved deeply, with an analytic address entitled "The Essence of Competition."

Mr. HOLIFIELD linked his subject with the quality stabilization bill, saying Congress, by enacting that bill, will affirm the true essence of competition; namely, the profit incentive, the right to earn a profit.

His meaty words have brought much comment. Typical is this column by Earl Lifshey, the well-known writer of Home Furnishings Daily.

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

"Everywhere we find evidence that the competitive price is being singled out as the dominant element in today's free competitive enterprise system. In fact, in an increasing majority of business circles, to be competitive has come to mean only that one sells at the lowest price in the particular trading area. But unless quality is tied to price then price becomes deceptive.

"And is it any wonder when our own Federal Trade Commission in a recent case involving the Snap-On Tools Corp. said: 'Playing off one dealer against another in the hope of obtaining a better price is the essence of competition.' I don't know whether the manufacturers in your industry have left the above quotation unchallenged, but I am delighted to use the platform of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association to challenge it."

The challenger in question is Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the ranking Democratic member of the Government Operations Committee, who tossed that gauntlet at the FTC the other evening in a speech at the NARDA convention dinner. Long a retailer himself—he has a men's clothing store in Norwalk, Calif.—he spoke with the authority of a merchant as well as a legislator. And, he continued:

"If we have reached the point where 'playing off' one dealer against another in the hope of obtaining a lower price is in fact the essence of competition, then we have pushed into the background all of the wonderful constructive marketing practices that have played such an important part in the growth of the most prosperous country on the face of the earth.

"In my opinion, the FTC has not selected, as the essence of competition, the necessary element that must prevail in order to preserve our free Democratic form of government. The essence of competition is unequivocally the incentive. I'm speaking of the incentive that causes us to do all the constructive things that we do to bring to market the splendid products of industry. I'm speaking of the fair reward for those constructive efforts. In this way the essence of competition is tied to the right to earn a profit, with emphasis on the word 'earn.'"

Citing the various factors that contribute toward earning a profit in merchandising, the Congressman declared that in doing those things "you have exercised your prerogatives * * * your right to earn a profit. But did you make a profit? If you did was it commensurate with the effort expended?" To help insure the continuation of the right to earn a profit and to help protect against the cannibalism of price debasement, however, he urged the exercise of another prerogative, the wholehearted support of the pending quality stabilization bill in Congress.

"That legislation will restore the competitive price to its proper perspective and will take a big step toward helping you do all those things that you are anxious to do to earn a profit," Representative HOLIFIELD continued, reminding the dealers that "It's not the FTC, nor the courts, nor the predators in the marketplace that make our laws; it is the Congress expressing the will of the people that has the power to make the laws in this area."

Whether the housewares industry, which is currently staging its great semiannual exhibition in McCormick Place here, or the home electronics and appliance industry would take top honors in any profitless, price-cutting contest no one particularly cares about. But that the quality stabilization bill constitutes a highly desirable measure to help correct that situation is something on which I have often declared myself here most emphatically. And I join Representative HOLIFIELD in strongly urging you to promptly write or wire your Senators and Congressmen to support it when it comes up for a vote.

But there is, apparently, still a lingering misunderstanding in the minds of some people in the marketplace, if not in Washington, about this legislation. It does not guarantee a profit to anyone. All it does—and this is a point I have emphasized again and again—is help insure the right to try to earn a profit—but under the basic, traditional terms of individual, free enterprise—not under terms dictated by those who want such rights for themselves but deny them to others.

Many things have changed in this distribution revolution, but free, individual enterprise is still a two-way street.

Pilgrims and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is natural discussion these days of the virtues or lack of virtues of communism. It is equally natural occasionally to compare the communism of today with its original theories and comparable practices.

I was especially intrigued by an editorial which appeared in the January 10 issue of the Lansing Journal, which discusses the economic principles of the Pilgrims in a most interesting fashion. Under leave granted, I include the editorial "Pilgrims and Communism" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PILGRIMS AND COMMUNISM

We were intrigued the other day by an investment banker's speech that called our Pilgrim Fathers a bunch of Communists and then went on to prove it.

He was, of course, showing why our great free enterprise system is the only way to achieve the standards of living we have today, but he chose to do it by telling how the Pilgrim Fathers gave the communistic principles quite a whirl in 1620, even down to a 7-year plan, but pitched it out when they found it wouldn't work.

The speaker was Amyas Ames, president of the Investment Bankers Association, who addressed their convention in Hollywood, Fla.

He noted that the Pilgrims signed a 7-year agreement; agreeing to put all of their profits

and benefits gotten by trade, teaching, working, or fishing into a common stock. Also all of them drew their meat and drink from this common stock.

"Three years later," Mr. Ames said, "they were wise enough to forsake communism by allowing the incentive of profit to energize their people."

The lesson is clear. We have built a prosperous nation on the energy of profit. The postwar world has been remade on the energy of industrial profit—in Japan, in West Germany, France, England, and Italy.

We can't put it any clearer than by using Ames' words: "Profits pay our taxes, support our Government, and our schools, and most important of all they work for people and energize our communities."

Scranton's Program Warmly Received by Both Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article and editorial from the Pittsburgh Press:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 23, 1963]

SCRANTON'S PROGRAM WARMLY RECEIVED BY BOTH PARTIES

(By Sherley Uhl)

HARRISBURG, January 23.—Both parties have responded warmly to Gov. William W. Scranton's "program for progress" but Democratic reaction contained a grain of tongue-in-cheek skepticism.

Democrats generally endorsed the Governor's 11-point legislative program and noted that it contained several planks frequently scorned by the GOP Old Guard.

Their attitude was that the Governor would encounter more roadblocks within the conservative wing of his own party than would be erected in the legislature by his Democratic opposition.

Many privately expressed the conviction—if not hope—that Democrats could now sit back and watch the Republicans fight among themselves.

Republican leaders, however, exhibited no qualms. They too accepted the Governor's recommendations favorably and predicted few hitches.

There were a few reservations, however. House GOP Leader Albert W. Johnson said he couldn't anticipate reaction to the Governor's desire to extend civil service protection to an additional 17,000 employees.

The same proposal was greeted cynically by Democrats who observed that it was hitched to a qualifier permitting the Governor to review records of current payrollers for 1 year to determine which are ineligible.

This qualification inspired a wave of Democratic titters and smirks in the course of the Governor's address yesterday before a joint session of the Senate and House. It provoked the only adverse restiveness noticeable during his entire speech.

Aside from this, the Democratic leadership offered to provide votes for the Governor's program if it should be stalled by the Old Guard.

Conservative Republicans, for instance, have customarily rejected proposals to rewrite the State Constitution via the convention method—as advocated by Mr. SCRANTON.

Upstate Republicans also may dissent from his proposal to establish a separate department headed by a Cabinet-rank officer to assist cities and metropolitan areas with their special problems.

Genevieve Blatt, Secretary of Internal Affairs, called the Governor's attention to the existence of the Bureau of Municipal Affairs in her own department.

She said she is prepared to spare the State the expense necessary to create an entirely new department by volunteering to deal with municipal problems. Miss Blatt is a Democrat.

After the Governor's address, Senator William J. Lane, of West Brownsville, Senate Democratic whip, commented:

"This guy sounds like a Democratic Governor."

Senate Minority Leader Charles R. Weiner, of Philadelphia, said the Governor's message sounded like a variation of the Democratic platform. He said his party would support some administration bills if they ever let them out of committee—an oblique reference to possible opposition by GOP committee chairmen.

Senator M. Harvey Taylor, Harrisburg, senate president pro tem and GOP old guard leader, described the Scranton program as sensible and constructive.

But Representative K. Leroy Irvis, Pittsburgh Democratic caucus chairman, observed:

"I noted the grimness with which Senator Taylor greeted the speech."

Republican Senator George N. Wade, Camp Hill, labeled the Governor's recommendations as "appropriate but revolutionary."

Other Scranton proposals would—

Declare a 1-year moratorium on the school district reorganization act.

Place strip-mine controls under the department of forests and waters (conservation) and remove them from the department of mines, where industry's influence is sometimes paramount.

Create a separate department of mental health with no political activity.

Separate policymaking from administration in the education field by establishing a State board of education to draft principles to be followed by the department of public instruction.

Place all professional licensing under a commission of professional affairs.

Reform election laws to free election officials of political fetters, and supply the polls with adequate inspectors.

Enact Project 70—a Democratic plan to encircle metropolitan areas with forests and parks, and locate year-round recreation facilities within reach of all Pennsylvanians.

Liberalize Pennsylvania's participation in the Kerr-Mills (medical care for the aged) program by erasing the assumption that it exists for paupers only.

Return the harness racing commission to the department of agriculture, and bar politicians from investing in parimutual tracks.

The Governor also urged the general assembly to appropriate an additional $4 million for the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority to keep it solvent through this fiscal year.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 23, 1963]

EDITORIAL

GOVERNOR SCRANTON'S HOPEFUL START

If there is anything Pennsylvania needs, it's a batch of new ideas to help us cope with our community problems, our need for industrial development and the whole range of health, educational, welfare and governmental issues which remain to be tackled.

In outlining his program to the Legislature yesterday, Gov. William W. Scranton tackled these issues head on. He presented a set of suggestions which can be the basis for both legislative and administrative reforms, for the better conduct of State government and better service to the people.

Each of these proposals probably will need further discussion before the citizens, or their legislators, can properly assess their worth and decide whether or not they favor them. But the issues raised by the new Governor are the kind we should be studying.

Mr. Scranton's proposal for a new department for community development will interest many people and many communities in western Pennsylvania. Most of us have some interest in such matters as public transportation, urban renewal, housing and community facelifting. If there is anything the State government can do in this regard, Mr. Scranton will find a broad base of public support for his proposal.

It may be pointed out that, in the absence of substantial amounts of State money for loans and grants, the State may be able to do little. But it is equally true that the State is in position to make studies and firm up plans that will be of value both to local governments and to the legislature. And, as Mr. Scranton points out, if Harrisburg does nothing to help, the Federal Government surely will.

The new Governor's proposal for a State board of education deserves study by educators and legislators. He envisions separate councils of such a board for higher education and the elementary-secondary field. Meanwhile, he asks a 1-year moratorium in the effective date of the school merger law. Many will deplore this delay as unnecessary and harmful to the ultimate objective of larger and more efficient districts, but it cannot be denied that it was a hot political issue in many districts during last year's election campaign.

A separate department for mental health is a long-time objective of many informed persons in that field. A council of human services to include heads of welfare, health, and other State services to people could help to coordinate programs. A commission to handle professional licensing could replace the present slipshod and scandalous method of handling this function.

Mr. Scranton has reiterated his views on strip mine legislation and while the precise terms remain to be defined, he has appointed an able committee to draft legislation. There is a good prospect that a strong bill will emerge from this group and, with administration support, have an excellent chance of avoiding the legislative pitfalls which undoubtedly await it.

Great value can be attached to Mr. Scranton's proposal to expand and consolidate the State civil service system, adding 17,000 employes to the group included. Pennsylvania is notorious as one of the last great strongholds of the spoils system, which benefits only the politicians at the expense of the taxpayers. There are whole departments, and Mr. Scranton named them, which should be completely out of the field of patronage politics.

The new Governor's endorsement of Project 70—the huge parks and recreation plan—is wholesome. So is his support for measures to prevent the more obvious abuses which can come out of legalized horse-race gambling, to which the State is committed by prior action.

Most of us will want to hear a great deal more about Mr. Scranton's proposal for constitutional revision before declaring ourselves on that long step, but he showed courage in kicking that ball out in the open for such action as the Legislature may take.

In all, it was a hopeful message which could result in many governmental reforms if legislators of both parties approach it in the same way the Governor has presented it. Mr. Scranton has made a good start.

Eric Waldman Discusses German Bundeswehr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eric Waldman, director of the Institute of German Affairs at Marquette University in Milwaukee, has recently returned from a study trip to Germany. He is the author of the recent book, "The Soldier Within the State," on the German Army. His article on the status of West German armed forces appeared in the January 20 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. It is a penetrating and illuminating analysis of the Bundeswehr and its new director, and I commend this excellent article to the attention of the Members of this body.

As the West German armed forces—the Bundeswehr—celebrate their seventh birthday today, they are the strongest single national contribution to the conventional forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The 11th West German army division was integrated into NATO last month and a 12th is soon to be added, fulfilling Germany's promised quota to NATO.

Within these 7 years, the Federal Republic of Germany thus has contributed to the Western defensive alliance more than 400,000 men, designated as trained and combat ready, in the 11 army divisions and numerous air force and navy units.

At the 7-year mark, the Bundeswehr also has a new civilian chief, Defense Minister Kai-Uwe von Hassel, who this month replaced the competent though controversial Franz Josef Strauss. It was under Strauss' direction that West German forces were built into such an important component of the NATO shield which stands guard against Soviet aggression in Europe.

But Strauss was plagued—as his successor is likely to be—by critics from both extremes: Those who say the bundeswehr is too weak, and should be greatly strengthened, and those who fear its strength as a rebirth of German militarism, with all its unhappy historical associations.

What actually is the nature of West Germany's military, as the new minister takes over, with the declared intention of continuing Strauss' major policies?

The number of men under arms alone does not provide a reliable yardstick to measure the quality of the military contribution. Ever since the highly publicized article in the German weekly magazine Der Spiegel the question of the overall reliability of the bundeswehr has been of considerable concern to many people within as well as outside of Germany. This article of October 10, 1962, which brought about a government crisis in Germany and the removal of Strauss, said that the German units received a very low efficiency rating as result of their performance in the NATO maneuvers last fall.

Der Spiegel has advocated for many years a neutralist position for Germany in the East-West struggle. It therefore opposed from the very beginning German rearmament and Germany's participation in a European defense system.

The perennial hostility to Strauss, exponent of a strong German military contribution to NATO, is seen by Bonn observers as part of Der Spiegel's effort to discredit the German military and Germany's alinement with the West.

Strauss' successor, Hassel, the former minister president of Schleswig-Holstein, is a longtime, faithful follower of Chancellor Adenauer. It remains to be seen to what degree Der Spiegel and the elements in Germany which either endorse its neutralist conceptions or appeal to antimilitary tendencies among the German people will shift their attack to the new defense minister.

Hassel might prove a more difficult opponent to bring down than his predecessor because of his calmer personality and his avoidance of petty arguments.

Hassel, 49, an energetic and strong-willed man, has repeatedly demonstrated great administrative and political ability since he joined Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union (CDU) in 1946.

He was born in German East Africa, the son of a German planter in what is now Tanganyika. During World War I his family was expelled. In 1935 Hassel returned to Africa and worked himself up to director of several plantations. In the spring of 1940 he was deported again to Germany and became a lieutenant in the German Army. He was captured by the British in Italy in 1945.

After the war he became mayor of a small resort town on the Baltic Sea and a member of the state legislature of Schleswig-Holstein. In 1953 he was elected to the bundestag, or lower house of Parliament, in Bonn. To accept his appointment as minister president of Schleswig-Holstein in 1954, he had to give up his seat in the bundestag. From 1956 until 1957 he was the president of the bundesrat, the upper house of the German Parliament.

Hassel's strong position within the CDU makes him one of several men mentioned as possible future chancellors. In 1955 he was appointed as one of two deputy leaders to Chancellor Adenauer of the national CDU.

NO INDEPENDENT ROLE

Hassel's general political outlook is conservative. He is reluctant to accept at face value the announced change in domestic and foreign policies of the Social Democrats (SPD). It remains to be seen if his distrust of the socialists may prove to be a handicap for the new defense minister in obtaining SPD support in military matters and in making his minist-y less a partisan office than it was under his politically ambitious predecessor Strauss.

If in 1963 the present coalition government of Christian Democrats and Free Democrats should break up once more, a so-called great coalition of the CDU with the SPD is most likely. This development might terminate Hassel's position as defense minister. He might be replaced by the military expert of the Social Democrats, Fritz Erler, who has been serving as vice chairman of the defense committee of the German Parliament since its inception.

The combat efficiency and reliability of the forces for which Hassel will be responsible is a question of great concern to NATO, because of its impact upon the effectiveness of the entire conventional defense structure in Europe.

There are two aspects to evaluation of the new West German military forces: One is the question of political reliability and the other military preparedness.

In regard to political reliability, great attention was paid from the first to the proper integration of the military into the young German democratic state and society. The German armed forces were to be under the executive branch of the civilian government and were not to play an independent role in the political life of the nation.

Between 1950 and 1955, representatives of the three major political parties, educators and former officers who were known for their anti-Nazi position carefully studied civilian-military relations in the Western democracies and incorporated in their planning of the bundeswehr those features which could be applied to the German situation.

The aim was to develop a politically conscious soldier who would be aware of the values he might be asked to defend. The planners believed that only this type of soldier would be able to stand up to the psychological pressures of a future hot war and to the propaganda warfare of the present cold war.

CITIZEN SOLDIER ARMY

On the basis of a thorough investigation, this writer believes that the German armed forces have achieved the goal of the planners and created an army of citizen soldiers. It is not a democratic army since no military establishment can successfully eliminate the hierarchical principle, but it is an army made up of citizens who, during their military service, retain their basic rights. The West Germans understand well the significance of the ideological cold war and they orient their political education to the challenge which reaches across the Iron Curtain and attempts to undermine Western resistance. (This judgment is based on a careful analysis of the educational material used within the bundeswehr and on 4,660 questionnaires completed by officers and soldiers throughout the German military forces.)

The combat efficiency of the young German military forces probably can be much improved even though high ranking NATO officers have repeatedly praised the excellent German performance in maneuvers. The relative short term of draftees is one handicap. Up to 1962 the military service for draftees was limited, because of strong political pressure, to 12 months. The present 18 months of service has brought some improvement but obviously could not overcome the entire problem.

The fact that Germany had no military forces for 11 years is the reason that there is a shortage of young field grade officers to command battalion size units and to occupy staff positions.

When judging the new German armed forces, the complete integration of the German combat units into the NATO structure must be considered. Criticizing the lack of support units, a necessity for an independent military striking force, is not valid for an integrated army.

NOT A NATIONAL FORCE

Indeed, the absence of an independent German military capability should put those people at ease who lack confidence in the changes which took place in postwar Germany. A bundeswehr which must rely for heavy weapons and supply support primarily upon its American ally is hardly capable of repeating Hitler's attempts at subjugating Germany's neighbors.

Moscow is aware of the integrated nature of the West German military. Nevertheless Soviet propaganda to undermine NATO unity accuses the West Germans of plotting to continue Hitler's aggressive policies agasinst Eastern Europe.

In contrast, most foreign observers are suprised at the radical change of the German political scene and at the strong impact made by concepts of western unity and European integration.

Italy Honors Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the people of Chicago had the great privilege and honor of welcoming the Prime Minister of Italy, Amintore Fan-

fani. The Chicago Sun-Times has expressed the spirit of the people of Chicago most eloquently in the following editorial welcoming the Prime Minister:

ITALY HONORS CHICAGO

Today the Prime Minister of Italy, Amintore Fanfani, visits Chicago at the personal invitation of Mayor Richard J. Daley. During his short stay he will be honored with a military reception at the city hall, he will lunch with business and civic leaders, tour the University of Chicago and the Museum of Science and Industry, hold a reception at the Italian consulate and he will receive the plaudits of Chicago at an official city dinner.

Chicago is accustomed to receiving distinguished visitors but the Prime Minister is quite an exceptional one. A strong fighter against fascism, a keen economics expert and an able statesman he typifies the new Italy—a country ready and eager to take her place in the world community of free nations.

In Chicago, Prime Minister Fanfani will find that the Italian community is a large and valued part of this great city. Americans of Italian birth and extraction have already made their mark—and are still making it—in religion, business, politics and the arts. This city has always cherished the strong ethnic groups that make for a great democracy and the Italian segment of Chicago's population is especially appreciated.

We welcome the Prime Minister and we hope that in the near future he can come again and spend more time in Chicago.

Hatch Act Eclipse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of January, I had occasion to call the attention of the House to reprehensible activities taking place in the executive branch which violated the basic principle of the civil service. The Washington Post has commented on this same situation in an objective editorial which I append:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 18, 1963]

HATCH ACT ECLIPSE

However one looks at it, the pressure that has been applied to Government employees to buy tickets for the Democratic fund-raising affair tonight is a shabby business. The Hatch Act tells Federal employees that they may not participate in partisian activities. The civil service system holds out to them assurance that they will be compensated and promoted on the basis of merit. Yet many of them are being pressured to give $100 to the Democratic cause—in installments if they cannot afford to buy a ticket to the gala outright—by their supervising officials who should be the first to respect the spirit and letter of the law.

The law on the subject is unequivocal. It provides—

"Any executive officer or employee of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall request, give to, or receive from, any other officer or employee of the Government any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States."

Probably most officials have avoided outright violation of the law which forbids them to solicit funds for partisan purposes from other Federal employees. But no one can fail to recognize that, when the head of any agency invites all those who are going to the gala to attend a preliminary party at his home or elsewhere, he is applying indirect pressure to buy a gala ticket. The Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act are designed to protect employees from precisely this kind of subtle coercion.

It may be taken for granted that most of the steam behind this venture comes from the Democratic National Committee. Party officials are always eager to bring in new recruits and replenish the party's treasury. The chief fault lies in the failure of many high officials, the Civil Service Commission and the President to offer employees any protection against the demands of the politicians.

A very different atmosphere would have prevailed if the CSC had publicly reminded officials of the provisions of the law and assured employees that refusal to make requested partisan donations would not count against them. Better still, the President could have warned his subordinates that no coercion or pressure would be tolerated. In the absence of any such protective measure, many employees are likely to feel that the Government itself is winking at violations of the law, leaving them no alternative to making a "contribution."

Dr. D. M. Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Nation lost one of its foremost educators, and Mississippi one of its most beloved and distinguished Christian leaders in the death of Dr. D. M. Nelson, president emeritus of Mississippi College. It was my happy privilege to have known Dr. Nelson as a close personal friend for many years. He exerted a tremendous influence for good throughout the State of Mississippi and the South.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an article written in memory of Dr. Nelson by one of his closest friends and associates, Dr. W. M. Caskey, a member of the faculty at Mississippi College. Dr. Caskey's eulogy to Dr. Nelson is a fitting and deserving tribute to the memory of a great man, and the sentiments expressed therein are shared, I am sure, by everyone who knew Dr. Nelson in his lifetime. The article follows:

IN MEMORIAM

(By Dr. W. M. Caskey)

The great essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, said, "There is properly no history; only biography." A great Christian institution, such as Mississippi College, just didn't happen. It is the lengthened shadows of dedicated men. Our college has become a great and honored institution, and much of the credit must be attributed to Dr. D. M. Nelson, a devout, selfless man with a vision and a sense of mission.

Dr. Nelson's tenacity and determination to succeed in life is revealed in his zeal in seeking an education. In spite of the fact that at 18 he had only completed the 8th grade, he not only graduated from high school, but also earned his bachelor of science degree from Mississippi College, his law degree from the University of Chicago, and his master's and doctor of philosophy degrees from the University of Indiana. Still obsessed with that insatiable desire and incentive to acquire learning and knowledge he was a student, and continued his fluent writing until the end of his more than fourscore years.

After graduation from Mississippi College in 1907, Dr. Nelson spent the greater portion of five decades serving in the field of education. Most of these 50 years were spent at his alma mater to which he was totally dedicated. The last 25 years he served as its distinguished president.

Few individuals in Baptist life were ever as closely identified with the development of an institution as Dr. Nelson had been at Mississippi College. During his long tenure, this financial wizard discharged the large indebtedness accumulated during the dark depression years of a half million dollars, and he operated during all these years in the black. Not once during these 25 years did he have a deficit or a financial reverse. In fact, he had a sizable surplus when he retired. This was, of course, turned over to his able successor.

As one Baptist editor has so well said of the phenomenal strides made under his dynamic leadership: "His amazing career in the service of the Great King was one of the seven wonders of the Baptist world. He, like Saul of Tarsus, moved through his busy life with divine compulsion." Undoubtedly, this great Christian educator has earned for himself a unique place in the affections of all the people of all the faiths in Mississippi. He has made Mississippi College one of the most cherished and respected institutions in the country.

Dr. Nelson had an innate love for young people. In chapel talks—and this greatest of orators always participated in these inspirational services—he often affectionately addressed the student body as "my children." This was indeed a Christian college guided by a dedicated man of God, whose personality will live within this college so long as time shall exist. The testimony of his "children" will bear fruit in the lives they lead as they put into practice the principles which were instilled in them as they studied under this great southern Christian gentleman.

The writer, who feels his inadequacy to write this editorial, came to Mississippi College shortly after World War II, and was closely associated with Dr. Nelson until the end. This great scholar grew on this writer, and, as was soon discovered, he was not only a man of deep and worthy convictions, but also a man of courage, which he demonstrated by showing complete loyalty to the causes he endorsed, and by his refusal to sidestep any issue in which principle was involved.

Dr. Nelson was a versatile man, but never a man of expediency. One consuming cause of his life was of course Mississippi College. Another cause in which he was always a devout believer was our southern cause and our traditional southern way of life, which he considered an essential integral part of our American way.

The accomplishments during the presidency of Dr. Nelson would require volumes for individual listings, and must necessarily be omitted. But a brief résumé of some of the most notable achievements made during his tenure must include: the addition of some 30 buildings; a greatly enlarged library; remodeling of all old buildings; greatly increased number of departments; built concrete streets, stadium, and tennis courts; growth of endowment from about

$100,000 to approximately $1½ million; faculty and staff increased to more than 100; acquiring Hillman College property; and becoming coeducational in 1942.

The beautiful old reconditioned chapel, "a historical ante bellum landmark, stands for the traditions and ideals that have made Mississippi College one of the truly liberal arts colleges in the country." Nelson Hall, built in more recent times, "during the enlargement program, and named for Dr. Nelson as a tribute to him and his outstanding administration, symbolizes the progressive and determined outlook of the college, while it continues to remain true to the past that has made it great."

It must never be forgotten that Dr. Nelson was blessed by "The-Other-Self," Mary White Nelson, who enabled this Christian statesman to achieve all his remarkable accomplishments. With her natural talents, and most pleasing personality, this gracious lady could have risen to high attainments in her own right; but she chose the better part of being the queen of a Christian home, and the mother of a worthy son and daughter, and sharer of her husband's burdens, responsibilities, joys and successes. Miss Mary, as she was known to her closer friends, was always near at Mr. Nelson's (as she called him) beck and call. Always standing by his side, she was a model hostess at all college functions, and a personal friend to all the students.

In conclusion, no more appropriate sentiment can be found to express our impression of the life and work of this really great man, who served not only as president of this institution, but who also became an institution among Mississippi Baptists, than these sublime lines from Longfellow's Psalm of Life:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

From New Orleans Comes a Program To Increase the Efficiency of the Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention today "Unique Training Experiment—A La Nouvelle Orleans," which has won national recognition from the National Civil Service League.

The program has been outlined by Felix J. Bethancourt, senior personnel specialist for the Veterans' Administration regional office in New Orleans. This regional office, under the management of Frank W. Sheridan, a dedicated career man, has made remarkable strides during his stewardship and well deserves the plaudits of every citizen interested in veterans' affairs. The regional office in New Orleans is most fortunate in having Mr. Sheridan assigned to that post and the improvements in efficiency and morale since he arrived have been most marked and outstanding.

As to Mr. Bethancourt, the author of the article describing the program: I have known Mr. Bethancourt since his birth and have seen him grow into manhood. He, too, is a dedicated public servant who went directly to the Veterans' Administration following his discharge from the U.S. Army in World War II. I know of no individual with higher ideals and determination to discharge his responsibility than Mr. Bethancourt. Here is a man who is wedded to the public service with a fierce determination to contribute his every ounce of energy to proving that those in the public service measure up to the high standards expected of them.

Mr. Bethancourt is one of those individuals who believes that there are those in the civil service who are interested in giving the taxpayer his money's worth and would like to substitute the words "work and service" for the stigma words "coffee break."

There is no doubt that Mr. Bethancourt and those associated with him have gotten a great deal of satisfaction by participating in this training program and I assure you that satisfaction is the only compensation received by them. They believe that they have struck on one medium of improving their image.

These dedicated men decry any attempt to politicalize the civil service and seek to eliminate any taint of political patronage by allowing the system to maintain an honest merit system instead of a spoils demerit system. These men are determined to advance and live by the ideals in which they believe and will not be sidetracked by the nonbelievers and the cynics. All power to them.

This program was not only recognized nationally but the New Orleans States Item editorially recognized their efforts with an editorial which I also am directing to your attention. Perhaps it is better to direct your attention first to the editorial and then to the article by Mr. Bethancourt which is done in simple open style that should be the envy of any professional writer.

Here is the New Orleans States Item editorial followed by the article which appeared in the National Civil Service League official bulletin Good Government:

[From the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, Jan. 18, 1963]

BETTERING GOVERNMENT

Graduation of another class from the Public Employees Training Institute this week centers attention again on this important piece of pioneering in New Orleans.

Purpose of the institute is to give both Federal and State supervisors in this area an opportunity to take a short course relating to their field under a faculty drawn from universities, business, and government.

The new graduating class of 25 includes supervisors from 12 Federal and 5 State agencies. Because of the 12-week training, they are better qualified, meaning enhancement of their public service.

A creation of the Federal Personnel Council of Louisiana and the Louisiana Personnel Council, the training institute only last month was hailed by the National Civil Service League for its worth and originality.

In doing a good turn for taxpayer and public careerist in this area, the idea should catch on nationally, multiplying its benefits.

[From the Good Government bulletin]

A UNIQUE TRAINING EXPERIMENT—A LA NOUVELLE ORLEANS

(By Felix J. Bethancourt)

"Way down yonder in New Orleans, in the land of dreamy dreams * * *"—well-known lyrics to an ever popular song. Those words may have a validity to a tourist who stops off in this Crescent City and weaves his way through our famous Vieux Carre. But to the residents of this old city, it isn't all dreamy. There are those who do have dreams—the kind that helped make this country great. Maybe this analogy is a bit dramatic and exaggerative for what follows. Nevertheless we will let the future contradict it.

This dream emanated from Ronald L. Brignac, an aggressive and sincerely dedicated Louisiana State employee. Ronald is executive assistant for the Housing Authority of New Orleans.

Early in 1961, Brignac addressed the memberhips of the New Orleans Federal Personnel Council and the Louisiana State Personnel Council. His proposition was this: that these two groups sponsor a training organization aimed at presenting courses in good supervisory practices to Federal, State and municipal supervisors. Brignac pointed out "demands for government services are growing with our rapidly expanding population along with steady pressure for economy in operations. We are not likely to economize by eliminating the services; but we can economize by performing the services we are now rendering more efficiently. We can substitute the long-run economy of doing a good job for the high cost of doing a mediocre job." He added: "Increased competence in supervision is a very tangible need and it can best be achieved by united study and effort." He emphasized that in Federal and State services many agencies have developed excellent training programs in the hands of experienced trainers. "By forming a training school," he said, "we can bring all this experience and know-how to bear on our local situations for the good of all agencies, large and small, who are willing to use the pooled resources."

The membership of the two personnel councils readily agreed to explore the possibility of forming an organization as proposed. They authorized their respective chairmen to appoint a committee to study and present a plan. The State personnel council appointed Brignac; Henry R. Rauber, Port of New Orleans; and Miller Lee Martin, Louisiana State Department of Civil Service. The Federal Council appointed Walter J. Laroque, gulf district, U.S. Maritime Administration; C. B. Harrison, Army Transportation Terminal Command, gulf; and the writer.

Appointing a committee to investigate, study and report is a common practice and quite often, as we all know, that is the end of the proposal. It didn't turn out that way with our committee. The enthusiasm generated by Brignac caught on quickly and all members of the committee pitched in to make the dream a reality.

After several get-togethers, and burning of the midnight oil, a constitution and bylaws were drafted under the name of "Public Employees Training Institute." The constitution provided for a board of directors to be appointed by the chairmen of the two personnel councils, with terms of each appointee designated to extend for 1, 2, and 3 years. The appointed committees of each council presented the constitution and bylaws to its membership and received unanimous approval and sponsorship. Members of the original committee were appointed as the first board of directors of the institute. Members of the board elected Brignac as chairman; Laroque, vice chairman; Rauber, secretary; and Harrison, Martin, and Beth-

ancourt, members of the board. The board then appointed an executive director and assistant director. Edward Boettner, Jr., Department of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, and his assistant, Norwood Jatho, Jr., were appointed to the No. 1 and 2 spots. Each of these gentlemen has had considerable experience in the field of training. They lost no time in collaborating with the board in setting up administrative controls and scheduling courses.

After study and review of various State and Federal training manuals, we decided to offer our first course in middle management. A combination of the best materials available was consolidated to present 25 conference-type sessions totaling 56 hours. It was decided to assess each agency a fee of $10 per trainee to cover cost of materials. Sessions were scheduled each Tuesday and Thursday from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. General Services Administration provided a conference room in the new Federal Building.

The subjects presented were: "Leadership on the Job"; "Elements of Human Relations"; "Differences in Job Relationships"; "Building Good Relations"; "Handling Behavior Problems"; "Handling Employee Dissatisfactions"; "Dealing with Breaks in Relationships"; "Memory Training"; "Performance Evaluation"; "Employment Interviewing"; "Orienting the New Employee"; "Finding Training Needs and Instructing Employees"; "Developing Understudies"; "Communications; Listening"; "The Management Concept"; "Techniques of Management"; "Planning Work"; "Making Sound Decisions"; "The Nature of Organization and Organizing for Effective Action"; "Directing Operations"; "Coordinating Operations"; "Controlling Work Activities"; "Community Resources Available for Self-Development."

Brochures were perpared outlining the curriculum and objectives of the institute. These were mailed to heads of local Federal and State agencies. Each agency was requested to nominate a middle-management supervisor. The response was excellent, however. Selections were based on comparable grades and levels of responsibilities in the nominee's respective agencies.

In the meantime, a volunteer faculty was selected by the board and executive director on the basis of teaching ability and experience in the subjects to be presented. It was our good fortune to secure the services of high caliber individuals from several of the State and Federal agencies, private industry, universities, and private schools in the area. Each member of the faculty was furnished conference outlines and requested to modify the material so as to relate it to the cross-section of supervisors in attendance. A different conference leader was assigned to each session.

Members of the board alternated in attending each session and introduced the conference leader assigned for the particular session. Also, the executive director or his assistant was in attendance.

At the beginning of each session, students were given a specially prepared critique sheet and asked to evaluate the contents as presented, as well as the manner of presentation by the conference leader. The board member in attendance also completed a special evaluation sheet.

As the course neared completion, we presented an open-type questionnaire to the students which we asked them to complete prior to the last session. We emphasized their honest and sincere evaluation would enable us to determine the feasibility of continuing future courses.

It was obvious from the evaluations and individual critique sheets that overall the course was a success. All students voiced the opinion that the training as given was worthwhile and encouraged us to continue the insititute. They were also helpful in offering constructive criticism where they felt weak spots were evident in either presentations and/or material used. We found that the most common criticism referred to: desire for more participation; elimination of duplication and repetition of material; a desire for more handout material and more use of visual aids.

On the other side of the ledger, the majority commented that they liked the wide variety of subject material; the use of a different conference leader for each session; and the opportunity to observe and associate with a variety of governmental and industrial leaders.

One pertinent comment that should give food for thought to those above the middle-management level was this: "This course would be beneficial to some individuals above me. I am thankful, however, that I was the one who benefited from it. I feel more confident and a little better qualified to carry out my specific duties, but discouraged in knowing that so much could be improved in my organization. Maybe if the opportunity comes my way, I will be able to put into practice the principles I have learned." Perhaps this feeling is not universal, but to repeat, it does give food for thought.

We do feel that our efforts have been rewarded and the dream has become a reality. We are now underway with definite and improved plans for another course. As far as we are concerned, we have passed the pilot stage, and we're in business. Better supervision with the end product of better service to the taxpayer is our goal.

We would be flattered if our movement extends beyond the "land of dreamy dreams."

Alaska Economy Expanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaska's growth continues to be a matter of widespread interest, especially in view of a recent controversial television show by David Brinkley which left erroneous impressions that Alaska's economy is lagging. The facts, as disclosed by a report of the National Bank of Alaska, of Anchorage, show vigor and growth. Excerpts from said report are published in an article in the Anchorage Daily Times of January 19, 1963, which article I commend for the information of my colleagues. The following is from that article:

The report deals generally with the State and more specifically with the coastal areas served by the bank and was given by Elmer Rasmuson, president of the bank.

The National Bank of Alaska serves Anchorage, Ketchikan, Juneau, Sitka, Kodiak, Wrangell, Soldotna, Homer, and Skagway.

Statewide, Rasmuson said the overall economy is continuing to climb.

Excerpts from the report follow:

Alaska Department of Revenue figures show that the gross volume of business increased to a new high for the State. Gross business volume for fiscal 1961–62 was $948 million as compared with the $842 million total for fiscal 1960–61.

More people called Alaska their home.

Provisional U.S. Census data for July 1, 1962, sets the State's population at 246,000 persons. This is a 4.2 percent increase over the figure for July 1, 1961.

Total employment was up for the first 8 months of 1962.

July and August traditionally are peak months of employment. In July 1962, the total number of persons employed was 78,200. This figure is 2,100 above that for July of 1961.

The August 1962 figure is 77,800 persons employed and is an increase of 2,800 persons over the same month in 1961.

Record catches of halibut and king crab highlighted the 1962 commercial fishing season. The commercial salmon fishing season was one of the best in years in central Alaska and in the southern section of southeastern Alaska.

The 1962 shrimp catch, estimated at 21 million pounds, exceeded the 1961 catch by 5 million pounds.

The total salmon pack was 3,420,000 cases. Total pack was down in Bristol Bay (53 percent) and in the northern section of southeastern Alaska (64 percent) from 1961.

Total pack for western Alaska was 521,300 cases; central Alaska, 1,989,100 cases; southeastern Alaska, 910,000 cases.

Halibut landed in Alaska totaled 32,452,000 pounds as compared to 1961 landings of 26,014,000 pounds.

Approximately 50 million pounds of king crab, valued at about $4 million, was caught.

New highs were reached in petroleum and natural gas production and activity.

More than 10.2 million barrels of crude, an increase of 59 percent over last year, were produced. Its value was in excess of $28 million.

Natural gas production jumped to 1,600 million cubic feet, a 230-percent volume increase over 1961. Value of natural gas production was $340,000.

Twenty-seven exploratory wells and 9 development wells were drilled. There are, at present, 50 producing oil weels and 6 producing gas wells in the State.

Estimated expenditures by the petroleum industry during the year for exploration, production, and the construction of a refinery on the Kenai Peninsula is $60.5 million.

First step in a development to extend the State's sea roads by adding a new element was accomplished in 1962.

Three State-owned ship ferries, to carry freight and passengers, were launched. All are expected to go into service this year. (The first ship ferry will leave Seattle Monday en route to Alaska.)

Each is capable of transporting 500 passengers and 105 automobiles.

They will serve southeastern Alaska from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, to Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka, Juneau, Haines and Skagway, and will provide a sea tie to inland road systems at each of their terminal points.

The Canadian National Railroad extended its freight service to Alaska early in 1962 when it initiated barge service from Prince Rupert to Whittier.

Plans are now underway to provide similar barge service between Prince Rupert and southeastern Alaska ports.

The Alaska Railroad showed a slight increase in gross revenues and revenue tons carried. Gross revenues for fiscal 1961 were $14,308,295; in 1962, the railroad's gross revenues were $14,455,225.

Tonnage was 1,331,359 in fiscal 1961 and 1,447,966 in fiscal 1962.

Air passengers making use of Anchorage International Airport totaled 398,629 persons last year. In 1961, the passenger total was 377,695.

Air freight and express carried last year increased to 41,103,844 pounds from the 1961 total of 40,785,032 pounds.

There was a total of 9,490 inbound flights. Approximately one-third of these were jets.

Landings of all aircraft at Anchorage International Airport and on Lake Hood during 1962 total 128,524.

Military expenditures for the calendar year of 1962 were an estimated $37,452,000, according to the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

Civil works expenditures totaled $2,110,000, according to the corps.

Completion of a power and market study for the Rampart Dam, authorization of Bradley Lake (on the Kenai Peninsula) and Snettisham (near Juneau) hydroelectric project for design and construction, installation of additional pumping stations on the Haines to Fairbanks petroleum pipeline, construction of small boat harbors in Dillingham, Douglas, Homer, and Seldovia highlighted the year's program.

More land was under agricultural production last year than previously with a total of 18,648 acres tilled. Statewide, production climbed for hay, grain, silage and most vegetables.

The Matanuska-Anchorage-Susitna area accounted for two-thirds of the total agricultural production in the State.

Power generation and transmission in the Cook Inlet area took great strides during the past year.

Both the City of Anchorage and Chugach Electric Association took steps to fill this vital need.

An 18,000 kilowatt capacity gas turbine generator was built and installed for the city of Anchorage.

Completion of CEA's transmission line from Cooper Lake made additional power available to the Greater Anchorage area. Cooper Lake generates 15,000 kilowatts.

CEA is in the process of constructing a $2 million oil fired generating plant, of 10,000 kilowatt capacity, north of Kenai. The turbine generator is scheduled to go into operation before summer of 1963.

FISH, PULP, OIL, CONSTRUCTION

The city of Anchorage issued 1,110 building permits during the past year. These covered a total construction value of more than $18 million. Twenty public works projects were completed at a cost of $2.2 million.

Cargoes crossing the Port of Anchorage dock more than doubled in tonnage.

School district construction came to an estimated $4,750,000.

School enrollment increased from 14,049 in 1961 to 15,188 in 1962.

Ketchikan's salmon pack was the best in several years; halibut landed there reached a new high.

The Bay West Mining Co. mined and sold 6,000 tons of uranium ore valued at $1.5 million.

Building permits within the city totaled $1,318,977. In the school district, permits totaled $950,000 in valuation.

In Juneau, 250 building permits were issued for a valuation of $1.5 million.

Voters approved two bond issues: $3 million for improvement of streets, sidewalks, sewers and a small boat harbor, $776,000 for a new grade school.

Bids for construction of a new Federal building, to cost about $12 million, will be let early this year.

Improvements were made at the airfield to permit all-weather jet landings.

Kodiak's 1962 salmon catch was the largest in the city's history. Total pack reached 711,900 cases.

The king crab pack set a record. The economy of the community has been increased and stabilized as a result of more concentrated king crab fishing in the area.

More than 34 million board feet of spruce was shipped from the Wrangell Lumber Co. during the year. Eighteen ocean vessels operated out of Wrangell to move this cargo.

Shrimp and crab pack totaled $479,000 in value; the salmon pack totaled $600,000 in value.

The past year marked the second consecutive year of more than $1 million of construction in Soldotna. Population of this community's trade area is now estimated at 4,000 persons.

A good fishing season bolstered Homer's economy. Two new oil wells were started within 14 miles of this community. Work on portions of the Sterling Highway continued preliminary to paving.

Skagway saw a good tourist year with more persons visiting there than in several previous years.

Work is being done on the ferry landing in anticipation of the Alaska State ferry system beginning operations.

Pulp production at Sitka's Alaska Lumber & Pulp Co. reached a new high. Plant expansion, to allow for an increase in output from 370 to 450 tons of pulp per day, were nearing completion. Pulp is destined for Japanese markets; brings in an average of $24 million a year.

Firm's Alaska payroll is approximately $4.75 million. Local loggers receive approximately $7 million annually.

Federal payrolls in Sitka are in excess of $3 million. A $5 million expansion of Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities at Mount Edgecumbe Hospital is planned.

Congress Should Have Authority To Fix Postage Rates for Fourth-Class Mail the Same as Congress Fixes Rates for First-, Second-, and Third-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to return to the Congress the authority to fix rates of postage in fourth-class mail which includes the parcel post system.

I have discussed the grave problems confronting the parcel post with several Members of Congress, including the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and we are in agreement that immediate action by the Congress is necessary in the interest of protecting the parcel post system.

As Members know, Congress a number of years ago relinquished its authority to fix rates in parcel post and gave concurrent responsibility in this matter to the Postmaster General and to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This arrangement, although workable at the time that this authority was granted the Postmaster General and the ICC, has proven to be unsatisfactory and, as a matter of fact, now poses grave financial threats to the very existence of an efficient and well-operated parcel post system.

Within the last 2 years a proceeding was instigated by the Postmaster General at the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding fourth-class rates. This proceeding has been drawn out for a year and a half and finally was brought to a halt with no action taken.

The present statutes require that whenever the parcel post system is more than 4 percent out of balance as between costs and revenues, the Postmaster General is required to petition the ICC for its permission to place into effect rates which the Postmaster General determines are needed to place parcel post within 4 percent of cost.

The Interstate Commerce Commission in numerous proceedings under this statute has determined that it has no independent authority to make investigations of figures presented by the Postmaster General, and has no authority to make any change at all in the petition of the Postmaster General.

In addition to this problem, several recent proceedings of this type in fourth class have demonstrated that this arrangement gives rise to many costly and time-consuming adversary proceedings which delay and hamper the arrival at decisions in the public interest involving parcel post rates.

The Congress has complete authority to set postage rates in all other classes of mail, including the fixing of zones and the assignment of priorities of delivery. The Congress met this responsibility last year in proper fashion as all of us know.

It is my sincere belief that the fixing of rates for parcel post can no longer be separated in any administrative proceeding from the fixing of rates in all other classes of mail. We have but one Post Office Departemnt with one overall operating budget. This Department has four classes of mail and the problems of all of these classes are interrelated. If the Post Office Department is to serve the public, it must be considered as a whole, and its services must be considered collectively.

I am informed that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee intends, at an early date, to begin an exhaustive study of the parcel distribution systems in the United States. I am informed further that on the basis of the information elicited in this study that the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee desires to take action in this Congress in the matter of establishing rates in fourth class. I believe that this is a correct course of procedure and that we can all benefit from such a study.

In view of the grave threats to the parcel post system and its ability to serve the public, I hope that the appropriate agencies of Government who are presently concerned with parcel post rates will take note of the interest of those of us in the Congress who intend to take action to rectify the situation with which we are confronted. The problems of price, volume and service to the public in our parcel post system are extremely important to all and I feel confident that all agencies will want to cooperate with the Congress in solving these problems. I hope further that we may proceed without delay to hearings on my bill and action in the House.

Uncle Sam Has Butter Running Out of His Ears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, our huge dairy surpluses stand as mute testimony of the failures of the New Frontier stewardship in this area of our economy. Now they are proposing another costly, grandiose program for our dairy industry. The Congress should examine it carefully in view of the past, complete lack of performance in this area by this administration.

I commend an article on this subject by Robert Dietsch which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 23, 1963, to my colleagues. It follows:

UNCLE SAM HAS BUTTER RUNNING OUT OF HIS EARS

(By Robert Dietsch)

People on relief in this country use a lot more butter per person than do the people who support them.

This doesn't necessarily mean relief clients prefer the higher priced spread. They're entitled to the butter under Federal- and State-operated welfare programs, and the Federal Government is only too glad to donate it.

Uncle Sam has butter running out his ears.

Under the farm-price support program, the Government is committed to buy excess dairy products—dried milk, Cheddar cheese and butter. Because supplies are up and demand down, surplus stocks are at an all-time high.

INVENTORY

This was the inventory situation at year's end:

Two hundred and ninety-four and three-tenths million pounds of butter in stockpile—almost twice as much as on December 31, 1961; 2 years ago stocks totaled only 15.9 million pounds.

Sixty three and two-tenths million pounds of Cheddar cheese—compared with 5.4 million at the end of 1961 and none at the end of 1960.

Five hundred and thirteen and nine-tenths million pounds of dried milk—against 186.1 million pounds and 177.4 million pounds the 2 previous years.

The growth of dairy surpluses—and the end isn't in sight—is leading the Kennedy administration to renew its plea for legislation to cut production voluntarily. At present, law requires the Government to guarantee certain prices to dairy farmers and buy up stocks farmers say they can't sell above those prices.

The administration would lower the support price and pay a bonus to farmers who agree to reduce the amount of milk they send to market.

NO ENTHUSIASM

Up to now, Congress has shown little enthusiasm for such a program.

The dairy program now costs taxpayers $500 million a year; Agriculture Department spokesmen say a production cutback plan would save $150 million.

"The butter surplus situation is acute; cold storage space is already scarce," said one source.

There's just no way of handling much more butter.

Certainly efforts to step up butter giveaways haven't solved the problem. Last year people on relief received almost 59 million pounds of butter; generally speaking, policy calls for giving a relief recipient 1 pound of butter a month.

Therefore, each person on relief may have received—and used—12 pounds of butter last year—far above the U.S. per capita consumption average of 7.4 pounds.

Kennedy Administration Backs Labor's Demands Against Rest of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what is being hailed as a statesmanlike settlement of the strike of the longshoremen which seriously affected the entire economy, is in reality a disgraceful surrender to the demands of a few. It is always easy to reach a settlement by surrendering, but I wonder how long 185 million Americans will tolerate being blackjacked by powerful labor leaders abetted by the administration to giving in to unreasonable demands? The following editorial emphasizes this point.

SETTLING A STRIKE BY SURRENDER

A Presidential Board appointed to recommend a settlement of the disastrous dock strike has followed the usual practice of such boards—give the union most of what it wants.

The striking longshoremen demanded a wage increase and other benefits amounting to a total of 50 cents an hour over a 2-year period. The shipping companies offered a package totaling 22 cents an hour. The Presidential Board, headed by liberal Senator WAYNE MORSE, compromised at 39 cents.

The union leaders accepted the Board's proposal on Sunday, and Presidential pressure was applied upon the shipping companies to do the same. Mr. Kennedy asked the Mediation Board to express his concern. Senator MORSE predicted the shippers would accept the settlement, even though they are not happy about it.

Yesterday the shippers gave in, announcing that they did so in the national interest and in cooperation with the President.

At the beginning of the strike the most important issue was a demand by the shipping companies that the size of dock crews be reduced to take advantage of improved methods of handling cargo. The union insisted on preserving the old crew size. This issue has been removed from the dispute and will be tourned over to a board to be appointed by Labor Secretary Wirtz.

President Kennedy, in his annual economic message to Congress Monday, declared: "As long as wage rate increases stay within the bounds of productivity increases, as long as the push for higher margins through higher prices is restrained * * * the outlook for stable prices is excellent.

This sound advice has been ignored by the President's own Board in the proposed settlement of the dock strike. The shipping companies have been trying to keep wage increases within the bounds of productivity increases. How can they do so unless they can be assured that the work crew issue will be settled in their favor?

Fine Accomplishments of the U.S. Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and the American people, the facts and figures on the amazing success of our U.S. Air Force Academy. As Congressman from the 27th District of Pennsylvania, it has been a high privilege and deep responsibility to appoint 12 young men to this fine Academy. Here is the evidence of the Air Force Academy's highly commendable accomplishments.

Six Rhodes scholarships have been awarded to members of the five graduating classes including the current class of June 1963. This places the Air Force Academy among the top four colleges and universities of the United States in the percentage of graduates so honored. In addition to Rhodes scholars, many have gone on to university and college graduate schools throughout the country and have done exceedingly well. For example, among the members of the class of 1959 who went to graduate schools, three won top honors at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California Institute of Technology, and Princeton, majoring in astronautics, aeronautics, and political science respectively. One of these young lieutenants had the distinction of being chosen an all-America football player during his undergraduate days.

Academic success has been remarkable as attested by the scores achieved by cadets on the graduate record examination in comparison with those of graduating students at 231 representative colleges and universities throughout the country. The class of 1962 ranked No. 1 in the social science area among the 231 schools, and the classes of 1959, 1960, and 1961 were second. This certainly broadens the popular conception of the military mind.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. McDermott, dean of faculty, describes the curriculum this way:

Half our courses are in the social sciences. It may appear surprising that a service considered highly technical does not give more emphasis to science and engineering courses.

But we're not producing engineers. The cadet here receives a broad liberal education and a good knowledge of the sciences applicable to his service, which means aeronautics, astronautics, nuclear physics, and electronics.

We think our graduate's cultural attainments will command respect not only for himself, but for the Air Force and the country. Most important of all, his judgment should be tempered by an understanding of humanity—this is the sort of judgment the world demands of one entrusted with the means for its destruction.

In the area of natural sciences, the classes of 1959, 1960, and 1961 ranked

second among the above-mentioned 231 representative colleges and universities. Such achievements contributed to the Air Force Academy receiving academic accreditation as an institution of higher learning by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools even before it graduated its first class in 1959.

The Air Force Academy cadet graduates as a second lieutenant and bachelor of science on completing a 4-year program of academics, military training, and physical training which totals 189¼ semester credit hours. This compares favorably with the 140 to 145 semester hours required in the Nation's engineering schools and 120 to 130 hours at the average liberal arts college.

The Academy curriculum is equally divided between basic and applied sciences on the one hand and the social sciences and humanities on the other. Building on the experience of the other U.S. service academies, foreign academies, such as the English and French air academies, and civilian colleges and universities the Air Force has developed and continues to evolve a curriculum best suited for young men who will spend their lives serving the Nation primarily through the application of aerospace power. In doing so, the Air Force Academy was the first undergraduate school in the Nation to establish a Department of Astronautics—space vehicles and environment.

A program of elective enrichment courses was developed at the Air Force Academy soon after its founding. The cadet can take advanced and graduate level courses in addition to the required curriculum. Cadets entering with previous college work or who volunteer to take courses in addition to the set curriculum may range far beyond the required program. The Air Force Academy encourages its cadets to advance academically as far and as fast as their talents and interests permit. This program is one of the primary reasons for the outstanding scores attained in national graduate placement examinations. The Air Force Academy was the first of the service academies to institute an enrichment program beyond its prescribed curriculum.

Over 50 percent of the cadets have participated in the enrichment program. As a result, 25 percent of the graduates have earned majors in one or more of four areas: basic sciences—including physics, mathematics, and chemistry; engineering science—with options in aeronautical and electrical engineering; military management; and international affairs. Normally, service academy graduates receive only a bachelor of science degree without a major.

The Engineering Council for Professional Development recently authorized the Air Force Academy to award engineering degrees. This accreditation of the Academy is a result of the enrichment program of elective studies. About 80 cadets, or 16 percent, of the next graduating class will fulfill requirements to graduate with the degree of bachelor of science in engineering sciences. The Air Force Academy is the first of the national service academies to receive this accreditation.

The enrichment program also permitted the Air Force Academy to pioneer among the service academies in developing graduate level courses. Cadets who take this advanced work can, after graduation, complete graduate programs in astronautics or international affairs at civilian universities and receive their masters' degrees within 7 months.

The Air Force Academy has accomplished much in a remarkably short time. There are several reasons for this. The Academy selected the best from the older service academies, foreign academies, and civilian colleges and universities and added many progressive new practices. Maj. Gen. James E. Briggs, the second Academy Superintendent, said:

> Being new has its advantages. Nothing binds us to the past. That goes for customs that may have outlived their usefulness and it certainly goes for teaching methods and curriculum.

Equally important has been the support given by Air Force Headquarters and the Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, who insists that top priority be given to the assignment of instructor and administrative personnel for the Air Force Academy. This is good judgment and broad vision for the future.

Of the Academy's all-military faculty, 21.6 percent have doctorates and the remainder master's degrees, placing the Air Force Academy faculty first among the service academies in academic qualifications. Instructing at the Academy is a job which is very popular within the Air Force, and over 4,000 applications from qualified officers are on file.

The military program is equally as important as the academic program. It is woven throughout the entire 4 years of the cadet's career. The young man is molded into an officer willing and able to accept responsibility for leading and directing a military team in peace or war. Cadets are given increased privileges and responsibilities as they advance through their 4 years at the Academy. Seniors are given the responsibility for the basic summer training of the new members of the cadet wing. Under a newly instituted system of fourth class—freshmen—training, emphasis is placed upon leadership by example and training without harassment. Upper classmen must train, encourage, and exercise positive leadership rather than prejudge or degrade. All disciplinary and training must have a definite purpose. As a result, the military program is more challenging and objective and has significantly reduced fourth-class losses.

Flight training at the Air Force Academy includes indoctrination in flying and navigation. Those who choose to earn their wings must go through 13 months of flight training after graduation. Approximately 90 percent of the first four classes have gone on to pilot or navigation training. Academy graduates who have gone to flying training have done exceptionally well. Whereas the overall elimination rate for flying trainees is approximately 30 percent, Academy graduates who go through flying training have had but half that attrition rate.

Military training motivation was revealed last summer when 85 of the cadets gave up their leave to enroll in paratroop training at Fort Benning. No cadets were eliminated and 1 cadet was first in the total class of 700.

The third lieutenant program is another important element of military training. Each senior cadet gets a short tour of summer duty with an Air Force unit so as to gain first-hand familiarity with the work and environment and problems he will face following graduation.

The honor code is one of the most dynamic features of life at the Air Force Academy and is the foundation of all programs and activities. It is:

> We will not lie, cheat, or steal, nor tolerate among us those who do.

To this code all cadets pledge themselves without reservation and live religiously by it.

The athletic program, along with the academic and military training programs, play an important part in the development of a well-rounded Air Force officer. On the playing field, the cadet develops self-confidence, aggressiveness, courage, leadership, and the will to win. Each must compete in 14 sports—football, field hockey, soccer, cross country, boxing, handball, squash, wrestling, water polo, lacrosse, rugby, swimming, basketball, and judo. He must participate as a member of an intercollegiate or intramural team. Many of the 2 million visitors to the Academy last year viewed the intercollegiate athletic program in which the cadets won 66 percent of their contests. The Academy fields intercollegiate teams in 15 sports. Last year its new 40,000-seat football stadium was dedicated, a gift from the Air Force Academy Foundation, a private organization of civic, business, and Government leaders who deserve a great deal of credit. Funds for the stadium were voluntarily contributed to the foundation from private sources and by individual members of the Air Force. The Academy is extremely fortunate to have such support.

Extracurricular activities at the Air Force Academy are similar to those of civilian institutions. There are cadet clubs devoted to languages, cameras, debating, mountaineering, and geography. Cultural activities of all kinds are encouraged. Religious and devotional facilities are excellent and the chapels are extremely well attended. During the Academy's first year, cadets took over Sunday school classes for children of base personnel. More than 100 men volunteered, making it, in the words of one chaplain, "the only Sunday school with more teachers than pupils."

We have in the U.S. Air Force Academy an excellent, intelligently planned, and well-run institution of which we can be justly proud. In its short life it has excelled remarkably in the academic, military, and athletic areas. Because of its accomplishments and its dedication to prepare young men for a career of service to our Nation, the Air Force Academy

is deserving of our fullest support, respect, and esteem.

Congratulations to the U.S. Air Force, and to our U.S. taxpayers on the success of the Air Force Academy, and a hearty pat on the back to the present cadet corps, the graduates, and the teaching staff for dedication and topflight results.

To ambitious young men in our high schools and secondary schools in America, if you want a really high-level education with a promising future, look up to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Hartwell Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the board of directors, Saluda River Electric Co-op on January 8, 1963. This association represents Laurens, Blue Ridge, Broad River, Little River, and York Electric Co-ops and Greenwood Electric Power Commission which serve the northwest one-third of South Carolina. Blue Ridge, Little River, and the Greenwood Electric Power Commission are in my own congressional district. The Greenwood Electric Power Commission and all of these co-ops in northwest South Carolina are among the best in the United States and are doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and I urge the Department of the Interior to deal fairly with the preference customers of South Carolina in the distribution of Hartwell power.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SALUDA RIVER ELECTRIC CO-OP AT THEIR REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 8, 1963

Whereas the Southeastern Power Administrator of the Department of Interior has been engaged in working out a marketing and wheeling arrangement for power generated at Hartwell Dam with regard to the amount going to the South Carolina side of the Savannah, and it appears that a contract for wheeling will be entered with Duke Power Co.; and

Whereas the within named six electric cooperatives of South Carolina and two from nearby North Carolina have conferred and worked with Southeastern Power Administration for many months to plan for delivery of this power to them and other preference agencies, and during all of this time it has been planned that the area of delivery would likely be either 100 miles or 125 miles from the dam depending upon the number of preference agencies served, and this plan appeared to satisfy both the South Carolina and North Carolina cooperatives and cities; and

Whereas it now develops that the Interior Department through the Administrator for Southeastern Power Administration now proposes to allot this power to the uttermost part of the vast Duke system which will produce the result that the majority will be sold in North Carolina, even to the Virginia and Tennessee borders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Saluda River Electric Cooperative, an association representing Laurens, Blue Ridge, Broad River, Little River and York Electric Cooperatives and Greenwood Electric Power Commission which serves the northwest one-third of South Carolina, That we strongly oppose this new plan and we contend that the marketing area should be not over 125 miles from Hartwell Dam for the following reasons:

1. Half of Hartwell power is already going into Georgia. Under the new formula of the remaining half of the total, three-fourths will go to North Carolina and only one-fourth of this half will go into South Carolina.

2. In order to attain an appreciable saving it was formerly planned that all customers may receive 30 percent of their power requirements, but under this new plan, consumers will now get only 10 to 14 percent of their requirements, so small that it will be difficult to transmit such savings to the ultimate consumers.

3. Greenwood County Electric Power Commission now purchases power from Duke in a substantial quantity, and therefore, it should be allotted its pro rata amount of Hartwell power in relation to this connected load.

4. At the time that Hartwell Dam was authorized it equally received the full support of every Senator and Congressman from South Carolina and Georgia. Congress never intended that the power from a dam on the Savannah should be allotted 50 percent to Georgia, 37½ percent to North Carolina, and 12½ percent to South Carolina, as would result from this new policy.

5. Duke Power Co. has stated that it can deliver and wheel power to any consumers designated by Southeastern Power Administration, near or far. There is ample precedent for the Interior Department to limit the area of distribution. It could be inferred that the diversion of the lion's share of this power away from South Carolina may be a punitive measure by the Department in payment for the fact that every South Carolina Representative and Senator has not always supported every request of the Interior Department. The result could be that added ammunition is given to those who allege there is ineptness and false economics on the part of those who advocate public power.

6. No public power from within North Carolina or Georgia has ever been wheeled or transmitted into South Carolina although there are interconnecting lines by which this could be done. It would appear then that this new policy would require that we go back and redetermine an exact pro rata allocation to all preference customers in all three States by a pooling of all such public power and by utilizing all available interchanges. If it is the policy that we seek to reach the greatest number of people regardless where they may be situated this is a means to get it done, and be consistent with this new policy.

7. There are undeveloped hydropower resources in North Carolina which can be developed to better serve all the areas over 125 miles from Hartwell, and it is fair that these areas should look to their own resources to serve their own areas.

8. This plan for unlimited service areas becomes arbitrary and capricious by reason of the fact that it is without precedent, it was never discussed with your relators prior to its disclosure, and it was not sought or expected by the more remote areas of North Carolina.

Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Interior Department, to Senators and Congressmen from South Carolina, and to all other officials and persons who have an interest in this matter.

Adopted unanimously at a regular meeting of the board of directors on January 8, 1963.

——— ———,
Secretary.

Our Debt to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the complex problems facing us in the field of foreign affairs, the lack of consistency has been one of our most prominent failings.

Consistency would require the proper perspective and appreciation of the contribution to free world strength other nations have made. It has been my thought that we have not provided consistent understanding of the problems that our British allies have faced, taking them for granted as often as they have taken us for granted.

Our attitude toward Great Britain is very graphically illustrated in an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star by syndicated columnist, William S. White, which I include in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE MANLY DEBT WE OWE BRITAIN

(By William S. White)

A hard-used cousin of the United States has fallen ill, and wearily so, and now requires our help and understanding, for the sake of ordinary decency but most of all for the sake of ourselves.

This cousin is Great Britain. And this national illness is like that personal illness which comes as a chilling vision upon a middle-aged war veteran long, long after the guns have rusted in the silence of the yesterdays. Suddenly, as though in the middle of the night, he sees clearly that all his old exertions and perils have ended in dust and ashes for him and that his late rivals and even enemies are doing far better than he in the world they lately sought to destroy.

He wears, along with his wound stripes and the invisible medals that bring no profit in the marketplace, the gray badge of economic fear while more fortunate men are living it up on top of that world which only his valor and honor had helped to make for them.

This parallel between an ex-soldier now suffering postcombat fatigue and a nation suffering the same, through no fault whatever of its own, is not inexact. It is plain, given the smallest perception and understanding, that today's Britain has had altogether too much to bear for altogether too long. (And it is petty undertone to the tragedy that the mist brittle of England's young entertainers now wow them on this side of the Atlantic by venomous commentaries on the land of their birth.)

BARRED BY FRANCE

The nation which so long stood alone against Hitlerism—a Hitlerism backed for a time by Stalinist Russia, too—now finds itself barred from its best hope to recover its wasted strength, the European Common Market. And by whom? By the country, France, which went to its knees before Hitler's very first blows and left that island kingdom across the channel, that England which was once forever green, naked to a storm which blew not merely against England but against all freemen everywhere.

The nation whose civilians uncomplainingly underwent not days and weeks but months and years of bombing from the skies and freely spent its substance and its lives awoke at last from the nightmare of war. And to what? To an implacable pressure

(at which the United States of America stood at the very forefront) to strip from her all that she had in colonial wealth; to tear from the living body of the old Commonwealth every oversea resource she might have had to repair her ravaged strength.

But not even all this ends the tale of the hero of war who was to fare so ill in the peace which so indispensably he had helped to win.

The harsh realities forced the United States to pour out treasure, not upon tired and broken old England but upon those other lands—whether ex-enemy, as in Germany, or ineffectual ally, as in France—which it was now necessary to bolster against the sick appeal of communism.

BRITAIN GOT SYMPATHY

We could always depend upon the British, tired and broken or not. So to Britain we gave, perforce, our sympathy; to the others we gave our billions. So at length these others, notwithstanding their past guilt and failures, became, not Britain's fair equals but Britain's subsidized superiors in the economic rat race which was one of the legacies of the war.

The British are stout fellows, and very proud, too. But, to repeat, they have had altogether too much to bear for altogether too long. They would reject pity; but manly help in mutual respect they need from us. Help in the economic rat race—a determination here that no Charles de Gaulle and no dozen Charles de Gaulles shall further push Britain down, economically or otherwise—that storied first home of an American Republic which was, after all, raised up by British men.

What, then, is required of us? Why, simply, all that may be required by them to keep that honored place which by blood and valor and brains and historic decency they have a hundred times over earned. If they are no longer quite a top power in this world, they have irreplaceable values to offer still. And that world without them would be poor beyond belief—for us as well as for them.

President Again Hails as a Victory the Giving in to Soviet Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Kennedy administration is replete with piecemeal surrenders to Soviet demands which are then hailed as Kennedy victories. This happened in Laos where surrender was called a compromise, in Cuba where a brave show of strength developed into a farcical coverup of continued Soviet military expansion, and now in the talks for banning nuclear testing. The firm statement of the President that no ban would be effective without adequate inspection has now been watered down to accepting with enthusiasm a weak counterproposal by Khrushchev which will put us completely at the mercy of Soviet duplicity which is the rule in most of her agreements. The following editorial should be read with care for it indicates to what lengths President Kennedy is willing to go in ignoring bad faith on the part of the Communists.

THE BIG NUCLEAR TESTING "THAW"

The United States, in negotiations now in their fifth year, originally notified the Soviet Union that America's minimum terms for a permanent ban on nuclear testing called for 180 monitoring stations around the world and 20 on-site inspections a year within the Soviet Union.

The Kennedy administration revised the quota of inspection downward to 12 to 20. Then President Kennedy said there must be "some." Last August he and the British offered the Soviet Union an unpoliced ban on tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. They left underground explosions to later negotiation, but held out for some sort of inspection.

Now Premier Khrushchev, of Russia, proposes placing three mechanical detectors at widely spaced spots in the Soviet Union where there are frequent seismic disturbances. He would permit American inspectors to come in and look at tape recordings two or three times a year to satisfy their suspicions, provided the United States and other nuclear powers permitted the Soviet Union similar access to their territories.

Provided, further, that the American inspection team be flown by Soviet airmen in Soviet aircraft with screened windows and no cameras. Provided, also, that these inspectors take it on faith that they are being transported where they are told the automatic detectors have been placed, and provided they don't snoop around anywhere else.

Mr. Kennedy, in a well-buttered note, found all this "helpful" and expressed himself as "encouraged." Why? Having started out demanding foolproof inspection and control, he has progressively retreated until the kind of ban he is now hopeful of achieving has more holes than a sieve. Some remaining element of caution has deterred him from full acceptance of the Khrushchev proposals.

The President, in his statement, omits reference to a few matters which are of an importance overriding any terms committed to paper. The first is that, in all 45 years of the existence of the Soviet Union, that Government has never honored any treaty or agreement any longer than it has been useful to Russia.

The second is that Mr. Kennedy has before him the unexampled record of Soviet bad faith in secretly preparing and resuming nuclear tests in the autumn of 1961, in flat violation of the solemn moratorium on testing which it entered with the United States in the autumn of 1958. Khrushchev himself had sworn that he would never be the first to break the agreement. He then proceeded to do just that.

Mr. Kennedy seemed to have learned that lesson when he made a last chance offer for a permanent ban in a speech March 2, 1962. On that occasion he said, "But this must be a fully effective treaty. We know now enough about broken negotiations, secret preparations, and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium."

The third consideration is that Mr. Kennedy has had a more recent demonstration of Soviet bad faith. When he announced to the people last October 22 that Khrushchev had converted Cuba into a missile pincushion, he told how the Soviet Government, the Soviet Premier, and the Soviet Foreign Minister had all brazenly lied when they had given him assurance that no Soviet strategic missiles would ever be emplaced outside the Soviet Union.

Now he seems on the verge of being willing to take these chronic liars at their word. As the old rhyme has it, " 'Step into my parlor,' said the spider to the fly."

Easy Guide to Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a recent column, entitled "Easy Guide to Growth," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal within the past week. Prof. B. H. Beckworth of the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, has skillfully used satire to focus the spotlight of commonsense upon the ridiculous new theories of economics which the New Frontier is attempting to formulate. I commend this article to my colleagues with the comment that not all academic people have accepted the principle that deficit financing is the best road to economic growth. Thankfully I say that there are still some sound economic thinkers. I would hopefully say that I wish more of them were in Washington.

The article follows:

EASY GUIDE TO GROWTH

(By B. H. Beckworth)

"Growth, it is wonderful," exclaimed the Government economist, sipping champagne with evident pleasure. "You see, it is not what the country can do for you, it is what you can do for your country. I did my bit by using the money freed by tax reduction to buy good American champagne. That helps growth."

"Why does that contribute to growth?" inquired a serious-looking listener. The economist gave him a withering look. "Why, as everyone knows, it increases the gross national product," he replied. "That is growth."

At the mention of GNP, there was a respectful silence in the room.

"Would it be proper," asked another individual, "for me to use my tax savings to repay a bank debt?"

"Of course not," the economist replied condescendingly. "That would be a Keynesian leakage. That destroys money. That does not help growth."

"Should the deficit resulting from tax reduction be financed by selling securities to investors?" timidly inquired another listener.

"How ridiculous," responded the economist, "you don't understand the miracle of modern money. Commercial banks need no money. They create money by a stroke of a pen. The Federal Reserve banks, too, create money by a stroke of a pen. The pen is not only mightier than the sword; it takes the place of taxes, it takes the place of savings, it causes interest rates to decline."

"But why should interest rates fall?" inquired a doubting Thomas.

The response came slowly and pedantically: "With a stroke of a pen the Reserve banks create high-powered money, with a stroke of a pen commercial banks multiply this high-powered money, into everyday money. Money is the seed of money, money begets money, no population control here."

"But," persisted the doubting Thomas, "are we never to balance the budget?"

"Simply one of our grandfathers' myths. A balanced budget is a drag on growth." Then the Government economist added: "We have budgets for every occasion: administrative, cash, income and capital. They meet every need, they win every vote."

"But will not," asked another, "a large deficit cause foreigners to lose confidence in the dollar?"

"Not at all. The balance-of-payments deficit gives the foreigner dollars. With these he buys Government obligations. One deficit finances another. I regret that I have only two deficits to give to my country."

The questioner was not wholly satisfied and put still another query.

"I was in France a few years ago and found that the budgetary deficit did not help the franc."

"Oh," declared the economist, looking at him pityingly, "the franc is not a key currency. Deficits help only key currencies. The duty of non-key currencies is to key in with the dollar. We swap dollars for francs, we swap dollars for marks, we swap dollars for guilders, we swap where we can. 'Tis Gresham's law in reverse."

All of the bystanders gazed in amazement at the erudition of the economist. Finally one of them exclaimed: "If a little deficit is a good thing, why not bigger deficits?"

"Now you understand the new economics," exclaimed the Government economist as he drained his champagne glass.

West Penn and Project Keystone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently, publicity was given to a new project of great proportions and great importance to the area of Pennsylvania I represent, as well as a vast area including parts of New York, New Jersey, and West Virginia.

This project is to be constructed entirely by investor owned utilities. The magnitude of the project makes it one of the boldest and largest privately financed endeavors of this day and age. If this can be accomplished without Federal or Public Treasury moneys it will mark a rebirth of the private enterprise system in the field of power producing installations.

Those of us in Government charged with fiscal responsibility will watch with more than passing interest the progress of this project.

The great promise of increased economic activity in western Pennsylvania coal mines, which can add at least 1,200 new mine jobs, will be a welcome lift to this hard-hit region.

Unemployment in this area is chronic and the recession is serious. Many of our people have been unemployed for many months, some stretching into years.

This condition cannot endure much longer. The depreciation of values in both human, as well as economic conditions must be halted.

If this project succeeds in this area it can well set up a pattern for an economic revival in other hard hit, depressed areas of our country.

I sincerely hope the Members can find time to read this encouraging message to all of us whose districts have felt the blight of economic depression for too long:

WEST PENN AND PROJECT KEYSTONE

The same kind of thinking big that inspired Americans to cross the Rocky Mountains in wagon trains or slice through the Isthmus of Panama became evident once more in the electric utility industry on November 19.

That day, West Penn Power joined with 17 other investor-owned utilities[1] in announcing plans for a giant $350-million coordinated extra-high-voltage transmission line and power plant construction program.

Allegheny Power System's part will account for $75 million of this total program, which calls for completion of the first stages by 1967.

Simultaneously at press conferences across the State, the 18 companies revealed the mammoth project which includes construction of a 1,600,000-kilowatt power station in Armstrong County, a 500,000-kilowatt station near Point Marion on the Pennsylvania-West Virginia border, and a 600-plus-mile extra high voltage transmission system that will supply power from the 2 stations at 500,000 volts to a 7-State area with a population of 30 million persons.

This is one of the largest coordinated extra-high-voltage transmission line and powerplant construction programs in the history of the electric utility industry, and will mark one of the first full-scale uses of 500,000-volt transmission in our Nation. Transmission at 500,000-volt is so far limited to experimental lines.

Civic and business leaders throughout the country and especially in the 7-State region have hailed it as an important step in meeting future electric needs efficiently and at low cost. (The project will also boost the economy of western Pennsylvania areas near the power stations, and northern West Virginia.)

Participating companies will benefit from such economic factors as lower costs in transmitting large blocks of power at extra high voltages, more efficient operation of larger generating units, power pooling between companies and systems to meet peak loads and emergencies more efficiently, and coal mined near the new power stations to reduce hauling expenses.

General Public Utilities Corp. (GPU), Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., and Philadelphia Electric Co. will jointly own the $175 million Keystone station set for construction near Elderton just inside the eastern boundary of Armstrong County in Kiski District.

Our neighboring utility, Pennsylvania Electric Co. (Penelec), headquartered at Johnstown, is one of four GPU subsidiaries.

The first of Keystone's two 800,000-kilowatt generating units will go into service in 1967, and the second will follow a year later, making this the largest power station in Pennsylvania. (Its 1,600,000-kilowatt capacity will approach West Penn's total 1963 capability of 1,662,000 kilowatts after Mitchell unit No. 3 goes "on line" early next summer.)

Keystone's high-pressure boilers will consume about 4.7 million tons of coal each year for the first 10 years and during their estimated useful life of 40 years should burn about 160 million tons of coal.

Most of this coal will be mined within 15 miles of the plant—although some will come from a radius of 40 miles, providing 1,200 new mining jobs. The station itself will employ about 175 persons.

The nearness of coal to Keystone will keep down costs of hauling fuel, following the "mine mouth" concept that it is cheaper to generate near the coal supply and transmit the power than it is to haul coal a long distance to a power station.

Lacking a large water supply, Keystone, situated near the confluence of Crooked and Plum Creeks, will require four huge cooling towers which look like prehistoric silos. The only other similar cooling tower in the country is at Kentucky Power Co.'s Big Sandy plant.

Allegheny Power System will build and operate the power station on the Monongahela River at the State line near Point Marion, a $57.5 million plant.

When this APS unit goes into operation in 1967 it will consume as much as 1,350,000 tons of coal annually in its early years of operation, and over a 40-year period use 40 million tons. This will become the largest generating unit and plant in the Allegheny Power System, and could possibly be doubled in size if future economic conditions should warrant it. Consolidation Coal Co. will supply fuel for this station.

More than 600 miles of extra high voltage transmission lines stretching from a point near Wheeling, W. Va., across Pennsylvania and on into northern New Jersey and metropolitan New York will tie these two new stations into existing interconnected transmission networks to the west as well as the east and deliver power from these two stations at 500,000 volts alternating current (a.c.) to terminals near Philadelphia, Newark, and New York City.

One 500-kilovolt line will run westward from the new APS station to tie in with the American Electric Power System's Kammer station near Wheeling. Another line will run northeast from the APS station to the new Keystone station. West Penn will build most of these two lines which will total 130 miles and will cost $17.5 million.

From Keystone station, two 500-kilovolt lines will run eastward. One will terminate near Philadephia, a 225-mile distance, and the other will connect with northern New Jersey and New York City 300 miles away.

The decision to build the giant power stations and 500-kilovolt lines came after more than 2 years of careful study of tests and research conducted by utilities and electrical equipment manufacturers during the past 15 years.

Penelec's pioneer 2-year experimental operation of a 13-mile section of 500-kilovolt lines provided valuable information in making the decision. By special arrangement with Penelec, West Penner William C. Guyker took part in this research program to help our company gain firsthand knowledge of extra high voltage operating methods and results.

West Penn and other companies involved in this program have already developed facilities to interchange power.

For years, interconnections between companies have existed as a protection against emergencies. But only beginning November 1 was frequency coordinated between the interconnected systems group of which West Penn is a part and the PJM companies to the east.

Last month, APS and GPU companies placed six interconnections in parallel operation, three of which involved West Penn and Penelec:

Near Clarion, 4.25 of a 115-kilovolt transmission line connects West Penn's Burma

---

[1] Allegheny Power System and its subsidiaries: Monongahela Power, Potomac Edison, West Penn Power; Pennsylvania-Jersey-Maryland Power Pool Co.—Atlantic City Electric, Baltimore Gas & Electric, Delaware Power & Light, General Public Utilities Corp. and its subsidiaries: Jersey Central Power & Light, Metropolitan Edison, New Jersey Power & Light, Pennsylvania Electric; Luzerne Electric Division of United Gas Improvement, Pennsylvania Power & Light, Philadelphia Electric, Potomac Electric Power, Public Service Electric & Gas, and Consolidated Edison.

substation to Penelec's Piney station; a 138-kilovolt interconnection at our Loyalhanna substation, near Blairsville; and the interconnection at our Shingletown substation.

Potomac Edison System also has three interconnections.

How does the $350 million project fit into the national and international electric industry pictures?

The Federal Government is making a survey of transmission facilities in the United States. The present administration has indicated an interest in building a coast-to-coast transmission network linking Federal and rural electric cooperative generating facilities. Such a move would cost U.S. taxpayers many hundreds of millions of dollars and entrench the Government deeper in the electric business.

In addition to providing economic advantages for its participating companies, the new project ties together the entire mid-Atlantic region into one large-scale transmission network.

American Electric Power, serving nearly 5½ million persons in seven States including Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, and Tennessee, has a 345-kilovolt transmission network.

The direct tie-in between these two systems will provide a major investor-owned transmission grid stretching one-third of the way across our Nation.

Other investor-owned transmission networks—existing or proposed—will eventually make a coast-to-coast grid which should offset the need for Federal construction to duplicate facilities.

For example, studies indicate that it may be desirable to connect the new 500-kilovolt transmission system with that of Virginia Electric & Power Co. now under construction.

Internationally, Russia is the United States' closest competitor in electric generation and transmission.

Russia pushed ahead fast in developing extra high voltage because of its need to carry power over vast, undeveloped areas of land.

However, U.S. capability is 199.9 million kilowatts, or three times that of Russia, and the total number of miles of transmission lines in the United States far exceeds Russia's.

Furthermore, the announced extra-high-voltage project in which West Penn is participating will strengthen our Nation's position in extra-high-voltage transmission.

President Streuby L. Drumm has cited extensive engineering and economic studies of the past 2 years as supporting the technical and financial feasibility of the overall $350 million project.

He said, "although this program is one of the biggest single projects ever advanced by the electric industry, it is only a small part of future expansion plans.

"The Nation's investor-owned utilities will invest a total of $42 billion in plant and equipment during the current decade and another $80 billion in the 1970's. This continuing investment is one reason Americans are so far ahead of the rest of the world in availablity and use of electric energy."

The following correspondence is worthy of reprint:

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR PRAISES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall lauded West Penn and the 17 other investor-owned electric utilities for their bold and imaginative plan to link 3 mid-Atlantic power systems at a cost of $350 million, and called it American private enterprise at its best. Here is his complete letter, and President Streuby L. Drumm's answer to it:

NOVEMBER 21, 1962.

Mr. S. L. DRUMM,
President, West Penn Power Co.,
Cabin Hill, Greensburg, Pa.

DEAR MR. DRUMM: I read the press accounts yesterday of the bold and imaginative plan of your company, and 17 other private utility companies, to further integrate and coordinate your systems. Having recently seen some of the pioneering work which the Soviets are doing in extra high voltage transmission power, it was heartening to me to note your plan to activate a long-distance line as part of your overall program to keep the cost of electric power at the lowest possible level.

It is my strong feeling that a plan such as the one you have just announced will do much to keep American energy competitive and to help our Nation meet the challenge of efficiency which President Kennedy has stressed so many times as a major national goal.

I should, therefore, like to commend you and your associates in the highest terms for the scope of your plans. To me this is American private enterprise at its best.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

NOVEMBER 28, 1962.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. UDALL: It was considerate of you to share with us your reaction to the recently announced $350 million, 18-company generation and transmission project.

We too, of course, are enthusiastic over the contribution this project will make in holding the line on the cost of electrical energy and meeting the ever-growing energy needs of America.

We are particularly pleased at your reference to this as a contribution of private enterprise.

Sincerely,

S. L. DRUMM.

The Shame of the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, written by a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Raymond J. Dulye, points up once more the sentiment among so many of our people.

The average citizen is ashamed and appalled at what has taken place in Katanga. He is ashamed and appalled when he realizes that all this has been paid for largely with his hard-earned tax dollars.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, many of us agree with Mr. Dulye that the United Nations has become our Svengali, and a dangerous and savage one at that.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Wolden (N.Y.) Citizen Herald, Jan. 17, 1963]

THE SHAME OF THE U.N.

Through the 18 years of our starry-eyed involvement with the global fantasy called the United Nations, both the actual injury and the potential peril of our misguided altruism have become increasingly apparent and painful.

We emerged from World War II, the savior of the free world and we entered the sanctified company of the United Nations as the strongest of all. But what has happened to us since that day passeth all understanding.

Undertaking a "peace action" in Korea we became involved in a war in which our armies, joined by token forces from a few other U.N. members, were under U.N. command; a war we were not allowed to win, a war in which 125,000 Americans died in vain.

In 1956, after years of encouragement by our radio propagandists, Hungarian patriots rose and beat their Red slavemasters with fists and stones and clubs and a few small arms—but we lacked the courage to help and allowed them to be massacred by hordes of Soviet and Red Chinese troops. We averted our eyes while Mao's forces pillaged and enslaved Tibet, while Nehru took the peaceful, industrious Portuguese enclave of Goa, and a Communist stooge seized Portuguese Angola.

But now we have been stirred to action in airlifting U.S. arms to the U.N. "peace force" in its ruthless destruction of the hopes and resistance of pro-Western Katanga and its president, or once-president, Moise Tshombe. Our presence in Katanga is illegal by the law of this land and by the law of the United Nations, yet we're there. As what, international brigands? Strange we could not lift a finger, not point a gun or a plane against the Cuban bandit, Castro, a grave menace on our very doorstep. But against the friendly Katangese, yes!

The U.N., it seems, is our Svengali. We have been hypnotized, rendered incapable of acting in our own interest and traditions. We have even given the U.N. a blueprint for the three-stage takeover of the U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force.

This same U.N. is considering a grant of $2.1 million to Castro, of which we would supply nearly half a million. Our U.N. Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson is opposing it, yet he admits that if the U.N. bosses approve the plan there isn't much that can be done about it.

Isn't there? If we have any spirit or pride left, we can do what we should have done before Korea. We can get out before it's utterly too late.

Congress Must Guard Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing the recurrent phenomenon of Congress being roundly condemned by a plethora of liberal columnists and authors. Their vision is quite myopic when they glance in the direction of the executive branch and its legions of disciplined $100-a-plate bon vivants. But when they take a look at Congress they see visions of oligarchy, autocracy, and a host of other dangerous symptoms of chronic constitutional malaise. Recently the Nation was advised by Mr. Kennedy's friendly biographer, Prof. James MacGregor Burns, that:

The basic thing wrong with our political system is that our Government was set up to be a divided government with internal checks at a time when we did not need a strong National Government. Today it is imperative that we have a strong National Government, but we still have our old constitutional checks. This is the basic problem.

Implicit in these intemperate remarks is the vengeful frustration of the liberals who view the Congress as merely another stumbling block to the onward march of executive power. They knowingly avow that we have simply outgrown the Constitution of an 18th century agrarian society with its checks and balances and silly notions of three independent and coordinate branches of National Government. All important legislation must now come from the Chief Executive in a series of "must" bills. Should the men in the Congress tarry too long in determining the "rolling national consensus" one of those terms of which New Frontiersmen are so everlastingly fond, the remedy becomes clear. They must be labeled as "obstructionists" and drummed out of public life.

How the liberals used to fume about the father image of former President Eisenhower. Today these same liberals are carefully creating the image of the man in the White House as the sole repository of national purpose and the wisdom to achieve our national goals. What a tragedy that they display so little faith in the inherent genius of the Founding Fathers when they provided for a separation of powers.

The last thing they want is a strong Congress; rather they demand a subservient Congress. If they and others of so-called liberal persuasion have their way, "of the people, by the people, and for the people" will all too soon become "of the President, by the President, for the President." Then the management of the news which is now the policy of the present administration will certainly preclude the kind of comment about the Chief Executive which they are now so free to make about the Congress. We do not need a man on horseback; we have got a man in the White House. This, sadly enough, is the bankrupt philosophy of the liberals whose impatience with the legislative process is now plain to behold.

It is against this background and within this context of current opinion that I was pleased to read a recent editorial by Rex Karney, editor of the Rockford Register-Republic entitled, "Congress Must Guard Authority." It points out that we, as Members of Congress, have a responsibility to lay aside petty intramural bickering and join in a common defense against the assault that is being made against the integrity of our National Legislature as a coequal and coordinate branch of the Federal Government. His warning against the inevitable results of further encroachment by the executive and judicial branches of Government should command our attention as we proceed into this first session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karney's excellent editorial follows:

POWER DELEGATED OR NOT USED IS POWER LOST—CONGRESS MUST GUARD AUTHORITY

(By Rex Karney)

Unless U.S. Senators and Representatives stop their squabbling—Republicans against Democrats and liberals versus conservatives—they will find that they have lost another more important battle. Unless our national lawmakers quit fighting among themselves, they will soon discover that while their attention was diverted to relatively minor issues, they have been relegated to a position of subservience to the judicial and executive branches of our National Government.

Under the U.S. Constitution, the Nation is given three separate but distinct branches of Government.

All lawmaking power is given to the Congress, which consists of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Executive power is given to the President. And the power to interpret the Nation's laws as written by Congress rests with the Supreme Court.

But in the past three decades the lines of demarcation between the three branches of Government have become blurred. Presidents have successively reached out to steal authority from the Congress, or to nullify its will as expressed by laws. And the Supreme Court has likewise edged over into the area of legislation, torturing the English language to wring from Federal statutes meanings that never were intended.

This week the White House succeeded in convincing a sufficient number of Representatives that the House Rules Committee should number 15 members, rather than 12. As President Kennedy said in one of his recent television shows, he felt that the committee should number 15 rather than a dozen so that appointment of additional liberals would make it easier for him to get his program through Congress.

That may or may not be the case. Time will tell. But the fact of the matter is that the President succeeded in dictating to Congress the proper size of one of its committees.

Congress in the majority of the years since 1932 has been controlled by members of the Democratic Party. Senators and Representatives alike have drifted into a position where it is accepted procedure for lawmakers to wait for the President to come forth with his legislative program. The success or failure of most congressional sessions now seems to be calculated on the basis of what percentage of the President's program has been written into law.

This is not to say that the President should have no right to ask for or recommend certain legislation. He has that right, indeed. But the congressional tendency has been to await orders, to surrender the initiative to the Chief Executive, to bow to his will. Only occasionally, when White House pressure becomes too extreme, does Congress balk. Mr. Roosevelt ran into trouble when he tried to pack the Supreme Court. Mr. Kennedy ran into resistance last year when his lieutenants got too heavyhanded.

The extent to which the executive department and Government bureaus nullify the clear intent of Congress is too seldom realized, even by Congressmen themselves.

Administrative agencies such as the Labor Board, the Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission all make decisions and issue orders that have the full force and effect of law. Many of these orders and decisions would never have a chance of passage if they had to run the gauntlet of legislative debate. The Justice Department and Internal Revenue Service, for example, apparently cooperated in the decision to make individual and corporate contributions toward ransom payments to Fidel Castro tax deductible. Does anyone think such a proposal would pass if it were put to the test of a rollcall vote in Congress? Right now the Kennedy administration is using Government contracts as a bludgeon to force aerospace companies to deliver all their employees into labor unions. If such a program required congressional sanction, it couldn't be done.

The other day Mr. Kennedy again crossed swords with Congress when he refused to allow unspent foreign aid funds to revert to the Treasury, or to be spent only with the consent of congressional committees. It will be interesting to see whether Congress will take this lying down, or whether it will reassert its control over the public purse.

Congress has authority, but authority not used, or delegated elsewhere, is authority that is lost. Unless Congressmen, regardless of party, soon reassert their authority, they will find they have lost it. Congressmen always will quarrel among themselves, but they should be united in a stand against encroachments by the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

"And Some Men Yield to Temptation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the happy sight of the returned Cuban prisoners in recent weeks should not obscure the reasons for their being in Cuban jails—or the methods by which ransom was raised for their release. While the Bay of Pigs fiasco can be referred to as past history from which a lesson must be learned, the half-hidden moves of the Kennedy administration in negotiating the return and raising the ransom, by their very obscurity, are neither history nor encouraging for the future.

It, of course, has been no secret that the President felt a need to do something for these men. We also know that the Justice Department, and the President's brother as Attorney General, participated in the operation to redeem the Cuban invaders. Ostensibly, the manufacturers and other businessmen who contributed supplies or money to the ransom shipments did so voluntarily. No doubt, some did, or would have, had they been approached by private individuals.

A very public individual, however, did the approaching, and the persuading; namely, the President's brother. Whatever the value of the end to be sought, the fact remains that the methods used, and the public office involved, are highly questionable. It is not surprising to me, therefore, that the following editorial appeared in the January 11, 1963, edition of the American Metal Market, and this editorial leaves no doubt that business as well as the American public lose confidence in any administration where even the suspicion occurs of the use of a public office in one sphere to aid the administration in another.

Over 2 years ago, the then Senator Kennedy, in a speech at Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, on October 17, 1960, outlined an eight-point policy

statement he hoped would govern officials of his administration should he be elected. The second point stated:

Secondly, no officer or employee shall engage in any business transaction with * * * any enterprise or person * * * who is subject to regulation, investigation or litigation under the jurisdiction of that (the employee or officer's) unit. To be above criminality is not enough; I want my appointees, like Caesar's wife, to be above suspicion.

As the editorial states, there is sufficient uncertainty about the application of antitrust laws and other regulatory measures now without more being added. Perhaps we can only return to Mr. Kennedy's campaign speech for an answer:

But experience has shown that such promises are not enough. For ours is a government of men, not promises—and some men yield to temptation * * *."

The editorial follows:

MISCARRIAGE AT JUSTICE

However one may extol Americans for their humanitarianism in gaining the release of the Bay of Pigs invaders from Castro prisons, the details of the exchange now coming to light are posing questions more provocative than the ransom itself. They center not so much on Castro's extracting of a tribute of medicine, food and other supplies as they do on the manner in which the money was raised for freeing the prisoners.

The salient fact emerging from the Cuban prisoner affair is that the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, played a leading role in securing the more than $50 million worth of medicine and food and nearly $3 million in cash demanded by Castro. Most of these contributions were made by American industry, chiefly pharmaceutical and food concerns, although the last-minute cash contributions may have been raised outside of these industries. In all of the fundraising, the Kennedy administration exerted strong pressure on industrialists to contribute. Spearheading the effort was the Attorney General.

Considering the often bewildering and multifarious array of antitrust cases and other litigation pending by the Justice Department against American business, it is laudatory, but puzzling, that the Attorney General also was able to find so much time to promote the Cuban rescue.

Be that as it may. The real damage is that the head of the Justice Department has gravely prejudiced the agency's interests. By his action, he has established an intimate connection between law enforcement—and particularly any possible lack of it—and those companies who contributed to pulling the Kennedy irons out of the Cuban-prisoner fire.

If anyone does not sense the conflict of interest involved here, let him consider a possible parallel in which a police chief seeks financial backing for a business venture from a leading citizen whom he someday may have occasion to arrest.

Indeed, a number of the pharmaceutical companies who donated money at the Attorney General's behest have been under fire from Washington. More disturbing was the report last week by a Minneapolis newspaper that help for the Cuban prisoners came from a large corporation that is currently facing a Government lawsuit. The company reportedly received a call from the Justice Department asking it to supply specific items plus an amount of cash. A spokesman for the company is reported to have said: "We knew we were being blackjacked, but there was nothing we could do about it."

Uncertainty about the application of U.S. antitrust laws and other business regulations is already a serious matter. It is well known that the Justice Department exercises considerable discretion in the selection of cases it will pursue in the courts. It is intolerable, therefore, to permit the creation of suspicion that the Justice Department's pursuit of certain litigation can be influenced by business cooperation with the administration in other matters. Yet the Attorney General of the United States has succeeded in arousing such suspicion.

Thomas Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned of the death last Saturday of Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America. He was born and raised in the State of Pennsylvania. He died at his home in Hazleton at the age of 75. He had the respect and love of everybody in his native State.

Tom Kennedy was a statesmanlike leader for organized labor. He worked and fought to better the working conditions for the miners.

He had many fine and great qualities including personal modesty. The labor movement has indeed lost a great friend and champion in his passing.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Standard, Uniontown, Pa:

THOMAS KENNEDY

Throughout most of his life, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America, who died on Saturday at the age of 75 years, lived in the shadow of John L. Lewis, the volatile retired leader of the miners.

Mr. Kennedy rose from a 4-cent-an-hour slate picker in the anthracite region of eastern Pennsylvania to the international president of the UMWA.

During the 4-year term of Pennsylvania Gov. George Earle in 1935–39, Mr. Kennedy was Lieutenant Governor of the State. He was defeated in a bid for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1938.

When Mr. Kennedy became the UMWA secretary-treasurer he was the principal negotiator for the anthracite districts in wage negotiations.

He was a balancing influence on the fiery John L. Lewis during the many contract battles with the coal operators. Lewis roared, Kennedy was reserved. But they worked together splendidly as a team through the many years of their close association. When Lewis retired in 1960, Kennedy succeeded him.

Mr. Kennedy was deeply concerned with the workingman. He labored to have better working conditions, a fair day's pay for a day's work.

The labor movement lost a great champion in the death of Thomas Kennedy.

Chicago's Northwest Side Keeps Pace With Modern Living, Builds and Remodels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Jefferson Park (Ill.) Press, which is published in my district by Mrs. Morton Steinman, ran an excellent review of activities in my district during 1962.

Since my congressional district is certainly representative of the entire Nation, I should like to include this excellent review, prepared by Miss Sally Swanson, in the RECORD today.

Miss Swanson has done an outstanding job of writing an interesting chapter about one little corner of our great Nation—its people, its problems, and its progress.

The Jefferson Park Press and Miss Swanson deserve the highest commendation for this fine journalistic accomplishment.

The article follows:

REVIEW HEADLINES OF ENDED YEAR—1962 WAS TIME OF CHANGE HERE—NORTHWEST SIDE KEEPS PACE WITH MODERN LIVING, BUILDS AND REMODELS—AREA PROTESTS NOISE OF JET ENGINES; TALKS ABOUT RELIEVING TRAFFIC JAMS

(By Sally Swanson)

What was the Northwest Side like in 1962?

It was, above all, changing—building new and remodeling old to keep pace with a mode of life influx.

It was complaining about the roar of jet engines.

It was arguing how to relieve congested patterns of transportation.

It was protesting high taxes.

And it was intensely interested in politics.

A review of press papers' headlines for the year just ended tells of merchants giving Jefferson Park a clean, young face—their confident reply to modern shopping centers proliferating near new expressways.

It tells how individuals' grumblings about noise from jetliners were translated into concerted areawide protests through community clubs and elected officials.

Recalled too, are objections to recommendations that Chicago Transit Authority rail service be installed in the median strip of the northwest expressway—objections voiced mainly by the Chicago & North Western Railway, which said the Chicago Transit Authority service, necessitating a public subsidy, would compete unfairly with railroad commuter service.

And 1962 headlines reported a flood of protest votes from Northwest Side wards in April, playing an important part in the defeat of $66 million public improvement bonds, and they recall bitterly fought political campaigns that brought out voters in record numbers to the November election.

FALLOUT SHELTER APATHY ENDS

Through three-fourths of 1962, efforts of civil defense officials to stir up interest in fallout shelters met with uniform indifference.

Northwest Siders received with a shrug news that the area was being surveyed as

part of a public fallout shelter study to determine where 50 or more persons could be accommodated in the event of enemy attack.

And only passing interest was given a cutaway model of a shelter when it was displayed here last spring by Edwin P. Fifielski, 4758 Milwaukee, who as national commander of AMVETS toured the country with the shelter display.

Public apathy ended abruptly in October when the world tipped on the brink of nuclear war after a United States-Russia flare-up over Cuba.

Civil defense officials, who overnight became popular, reported thousands of calls asking locations of public shelters.

The bald truth was that no public shelters existed and private shelters were rare.

Officials, however, promised that the locations would be announced soon, and in November designated 11 Northwest Side schools as community shelters.

TRANSPORTATION CREATES BIGGEST PROBLEMS

People going places fast and ever faster—by plane, train, and automobile—gave the community its biggest headaches.

When in January, streamlined twin terminal buildings replaced O'Hare Field's 5-year-old temporary terminal, public relations men proclaimed the jet age had in truth come to Chicago. But this was no news to Northwest Siders who knew too well, and already were protesting the roar of jet engines disrupting the quiet of formerly peaceful neighborhoods.

Brunt of the complaints was borne largely by the area's representative in Congress, Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, 11th District.

Aroused individuals joined local civic groups in assembling data to present at a congressional hearing scheduled in Chicago to investigate the O'Hare noise problem.

When in March the hearing was postponed, about 20 persons, representing scores of community clubs, attended a Sunday meeting called by Congressman PUCINSKI to thrash out O'Hare problems with him and FAA officials.

Perhaps one of the most vocal of the protesting clubs was the Bryn Mawr-Higgins Community Association, which circulated petitions last summer asking that the east-west runway at O'Hare be extended west instead of east, and that a south-west runway be installed.

A congressional hearing on O'Hare noise finally was held in July in Washington, D.C.

"What started out a few years ago as a minor annoyance has now become a problem of such proportion as to override other municipal problems in our area," 41st Ward Alderman Bell, one of those testifying, told the committee.

In evaluating the hearing, Congressman PUCINSKI listed as two immediate results:

Disclosure that at least one major airline planned to institute underwing markings.

Announcement by the FAA that it would start maintaining running records on frequency of use of the various runways.

In the autumn Northwest Siders had a chance to voice their grievances to the aviation committee of the city council, which subsequently adopted a resolution by Alderman Bell recommending congressional legislation that would impose on the FAA a responsibility to effectuate and regulate a noise abatement program.

By yearend, complaints of jet noise had decreased considerably although there were those who claimed the disturbance was unchanged.

Relief in 1963 has been predicted by Congressman PUCINSKI who said that $3,972,693 allocated by the FAA for improvements at O'Hare next year would help reduce the noise.

Largest expenditure, according to PUCINSKI, is for extending the shorter of two northwest-southeast runways, 1,900 feet to the northwest.

PLAN NEW EXPRESSWAY IN CICERO AVENUE AREA

Plans for a new expressway that would connect Northwest-Edens Expressways with Congress and Southwest Expressways were announced in March by the Illinois Highway Department.

To cost about $150 million the new expressway would be in the vicinity of Cicero Avenue, ending near Midway Airport.

The Chicago Motor Club endorsed the expressway in general, but insisted it should have connections also with the Skyway and South Expressways.

Immediately the club began pushing plans for the crosstown links with all Chicago expressways in a series of meetings of neighborhood clubs throughout the city.

Northwest Federation of Improvement Clubs approved the crosstown expressway with connections to all Chicago expressways, but added that it believed crosstown should be the final Chicago expressway and that hereafter concentration should be on rapid transit service.

TWO SURVEYS RECOMMEND CHICAGO TRANSIT AUTHORITY RAILS IN EXPRESSWAY

More ammunition was collected by the Chicago Transit Authority for its controversy of 2 years' standing with the Chicago & North Western Railway, which objected to proposed Chicago Transit Authority rapid transit in the Northwest Expressway median strip.

Chicago Transit Authority rails in the expressway were recommended in the third part of the Chicago area transportation study, a research project begun in 1955 to determine transportation needs of the Chicago area through 1980.

And in December an 18-month survey financed by the Chicago Transit Authority and Chicago & North Western Railway reported that Chicago Transit Authority expressway rail service was the most feasible way of easing the Northwest Side's traffic congestion problems.

The Chicago Transit Authority's real problem is $39 million needed to complete the road beds and rails for expressway extension of the Logan Square elevated service.

Prospects for the $39 million brightened when President Kennedy urged Congress to enact Federal aid to urban transportation, but dimmed again when Senate failed to pass the legislation, which would have provided matching grants to metropolitan areas to build up their mass transit systems.

However, Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, 11th District, a cosponsor of the bill in the House of Representatives, said he was hopeful that the legislation would pass during the upcoming congressional session.

YEAR 1962 MARKED BY AROUSED INTEREST IN POLITICS

There was a lively interest in politics, unusual for an offyear election traditionally marked by voter apathy.

The Northwest Side led opposition to $66 million city bonds for public improvements—expected to win easily—which were rejected soundly in April by voters who flocked to the polls in largest numbers recorded at a primary for 20 years.

Locally, party primary interest centered around the Republican nominations for 14th district State representative candidates, where a determined Norwood Park businessman, Hellmut Stolle, 56, of 6111 Northwest Highway, had pitted himself against the party-endorsed candidates for a berth on the GOP ticket.

When primary smoke had cleared, Stolle held an uneasy 52½-vote margin; a recount was demanded; Stolle won again and was slated for the Republican ballot along with incumbent State Representative Oscar Hansen, 66, of 4507 North Long, who won handily in the primary.

In another contest, State Representative Walter P. Hoffelder, 62, of 5641 North Mango, who carried the party label, had little difficulty putting down opposition for the GOP 29th District State senator nomination.

NORTHWEST SIDE A REPUBLICAN STRONGHOLD IN NOVEMBER

The far Northwest Side was a Republican bulwark in the November general election, handing GOP State and county candidates their strongest Chicago support.

The surge of Republican votes was not strong enough, however, to carry into office the GOP candidate for the 11th District congressional seat, Henry Hyde, 38, of 6841 North Tonty.

The contest between Hyde, a Loop attorney going after his first political office, and the incumbent Congressman, ROMAN PUCINSKI, 43, of 2815 North Kostner, was one of the most fiercely fought in recent Northwest Side political history.

During the early hours of November 6, election night, PUCINSKI led by slim pluralities and his job seemed threatened until about 11 p.m., when he moved virtually out of danger with a 9,000 plurality. The Congressman was reelected to a third term by a respectable 12,300 plurality.

The Democratic 29th District State Senator James Strunck, 42, 3459 North Pontiac, lost his post to Republican Hoffelder, who polled an early and overwhelming vote majority.

Republican Hansen and Stolle and a Democrat, Chester P. Majewski, 34, of 3906 Oketo, an attorney and political newcomer, were elected State representatives from the Northwest Side's 14th District.

In the 13th District, which includes Mayfair, the three incumbent assemblymen were reelected: Elroy Sandquist, Republican, 62; James Loukas, 45, and Nathan Kaplan, Democrat, 53.

As 1962 drew to a close, candidates were lining up for another contest, the February aldermanic elections, the first since ward lines were redrawn reducing the 41st ward and creating a new 45th ward on the Northwest Side.

A Citizen's Protest Against the Invasion and Occupation of Mississippi by Federal Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi who know the true story of the sequence of events which have occurred at "Ole Miss" are justifiably aroused and incensed. As a result, hundreds of letters protesting the Federal Government's actions there have poured into my office. Typical of these is one which I received recently from Mr. N. S. Brown, of Jackson. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following copy of Mr. Brown's letter to

me and commend it to the attention of the House:

JACKSON, MISS., *January 17, 1963.*
Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS: Now that the 88th Congress is underway, the administration and its New Frontier spenders will be manipulating every conceivable device to wrangle the approval of an exorbitant budget for more spending toward the destruction of our State and National sovereignty. But before Congress gives them the green light, as it has done in the past, it would be well for them to invite their constituents, the taxpayers, to inspect some of the worthy (?) Federal projects their hard-earned money is financing.

It would not be necessary for the State Department to cable foreign countries for reservations and entertainment in luxurious resorts, nor to supply funds, Government planes, and expensive side trips to Switzerland for this inspection.

The most unique Federal project in all the annals of history can be seen right here in "occupied Mississippi," conducted under the direct orders of John Kennedy, President of the United States, and his brother, Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General. An average of more than $1 million per month has been spent on this project for 4 consecutive months.

The supposed purpose of this fantastic Government-financed deal—which has practically wrecked the University of Mississippi and embittered and destroyed the morale of 5,000 white students—was to force the undesired person of an unqualified Negro male, who was selected in New York City by the NAACP, into this all-white university.

Air Force psychiatrists who examined this Negro, James Meredith, stated that he had "a condition described as compulsive obsessive neurosis," and that "at times, he starts a crusade to get existing rules and regulations changed." The accuracy of this diagnosis has twice been proven. Once when he demanded that the Army change their guards, and again a few days ago when he called a press conference and announced that unless the policy of the university was changed he would leave.

Immediately following this statement, Robert Kennedy requested that the 5,000 "Ole Miss" students and faculty adjust to this Negro's demands.

While posing as a student, Meredith attends NAACP meetings in Memphis, Chicago, New York, and elsewhere, and may be seen driving along the highways in his big black Cadillac (one of two cars he owns), preceded and followed by a caravan of U.S. marshals. These marshals act as companions and serve him in his domicile and on campus. Even though he owns two cars, Government planes and cars have been furnished for his transportation.

When the Government spends more than $4 million on 1 Negro student without spending a like amount on each of the 5,000 white students, it is guilty of practicing racial discrimination in the rankest form.

Bloodshed, death, and destruction reigned on the "Ole Miss" campus for 18 terrible hours in the wake of the Kennedy invasion and occupation by more than 30,000 U.S. marshals, Federal prison guards, members of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps. (Enough force to have wiped Communist Cuba off the map.) But, this action was not against communism. It was against Mississippi in fulfillment of Communists and Communist-front demands wired to the President.

"Oh, no," you say, "this couldn't happen here. This is America. You have had a nightmare. You are not in Russia. Wake up."

No, I'm not asleep, although it is a nightmare. A horrible one. But, I'm wide awake, and I know I'm not in Russia. I saw it happen here. Just as it did in Russia, Siberia, Poland, and Hungary. I saw caissons rolling in, miles of them, and multiplied thousands of soldiers, bayonets, guns, tanks, gas, and ammunition. Mississippi citizens were shot in the back. Students who loved their university and their freedom were shot, beaten with rifle butts, cursed, and abused on their own erstwhile peaceful campus by brutal Federal forces. Why? Because Communists and Communist-front groups demanded it and the Kennedy administration produced it.

The conscienceless atrocities the Kennedys have inflicted upon the bodies, minds, hearts, and souls of Mississippians will never be healed, nor can they ever be erased by the steady grind of the sands of time. They are too deep, too bitter, and too damnable to forget.

However, I believe the tragedy we have suffered, gory as it has been, will in the end prove a blessing in disguise since it is serving to awaken the Nation to the fact that our Government is in the hands of tyrants and must be wrested from their despotic grasp.

It is my firm belief that this occupation of Mississippi was planned as the first step toward the armed takeover of the South for a Communist Soviet as outlined in Stalin's plan to use the Negro to incite revolution and bring about the Communist enslavement of this Nation. The presence of hundreds of troops unlawfully stationed on Mississippi soil and the building of barracks adds strength to this belief which is shared by hundreds of our citizens.

We urge you and our Congress to initiate legislation to protect U.S. citizens from Federal Government atrocities.

Sincerely,

N. S. BROWN.

The Challenge We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times recently carried an excellent editorial on the tremendous problem confronting our Nation with the steadily increasing rate of American children who fail to complete at least a high school education.

It is my earnest hope that my colleagues will ponder the wisdom of this editorial which, while it deals with the problem in Chicago, enunciates principles which can be applied to any community throughout the United States.

The editorial follows:

THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

This past September 26,024 students entered high school in Chicago. Of this number fully 35 percent will have left school before their classmates graduate.

These are the dropouts. They total 1,000 every month of the school year in Chicago. They pose a serious problem to the Nation as well as Chicago; in this country 1 million students drop out of school each year.

Why do they drop out?

It is a difficult problem for the educator and the sociologist to determine, but this much is known: the climate for the dropout is established in the home before and during the early school years. Too many families fail to appreciate the technical age we live in. Too many fathers who went to work at an early age and managed to survive economically because of the war years, seniority, strong unions, or whatever, take the attitude toward a son who is experiencing difficulty in school—"I had to work and it did not hurt me. I get by. What is wrong with my kid quitting school and getting a job?"

Educators who study this problem know that the seed of disassociation with school is planted early in life. Herbert Lehmann, director of the cooperative work study program of the Chicago public schools, says that a dropout is conditioned to leave school before he reaches the sixth or seventh grade. If the student has any trouble in learning in the very early grades he encounters real difficulty in the middle grades where comprehension is required and the decision to drop out of school begins to form. By the time the student reaches high school, sometimes before, he drops out.

The employment prospects facing the dropout are not pleasant nor are they rewarding. More and more business concerns are demanding a high school diploma as a requisite for employment. As a general rule management simply does not want a dropout. Most craft unions require a high school diploma before they will accept a candidate for their apprentice programs.

The job market for the unskilled worker is poor. In 1950, 5.6 percent of the employed people in Illinois were classified as unskilled. Ten years later, in 1960, with far more jobs available and filled, the percentage of unskilled workers who were employed had shrunk by almost one-fourth—to 4.3 percent.

In April of 1960, 12.2 percent of the unemployed in Illinois were classified as unskilled, and this percentage shows every sign of increasing as time goes on.

When the industrial revolution mechanized the farms, the great pool of farm labor, relatively unskilled, disappeared. Today the Nation has no measurable unskilled farm labor force.

As the electronic age progresses it is very likely that within a decade the demand for any laborer without technical skills will disappear. Even now most employers demand at least the basic skills of comprehensive reading and demonstrated ability to be trained. The dropout too often quits school because he has trouble reading, and his reading troubles gravely affect his ability to comprehend and be trained.

Walter E. Parker, superintendent of the Illinois State Employment Service, says:

"From my experience of 30 years in this field I will say that the high school dropout is going to be much worse off than his father was in the unskilled groups. The market for the unskilled shrinks daily. Our hard-core unemployment problem is the uneducated. It is really difficult to get jobs for these people."

Herbert Lehmann underlines this by saying: "Once you could put a dropout kid to work in a laundry. Now the laundries are automated and they want someone with some demonstrated intelligence to work in them."

Chicago has started a new program for seventh and eighth grade students called upper grade centers. These are, in effect, junior high schools where the elementary student is given a running start toward high school by being introduced to laboratory classes, shop courses, and increased group activity. These new centers attempt to lessen the sharp cleavage between the elementary and the high school.

The real and necessary area for work toward the elimination or lessening of the dropout is in the first four grades of elementary schooling. Here is the proving ground of education. Prof. Benjamin S. Bloom, professor of education at the University of Chicago says, commenting on the efforts made to save the dropout while he is still in high school or after he is out of school:

"It is apparent to us that these programs begin too late. The help given a youngster comes at a time when his capacity to learn has stabilized. How much more effective an effort it would be if put into the first three grades rather than at the end of his public schooling."

The very fact that 1,000 youngsters drop out of Chicago schools every month is a sobering and shocking statistic. In an age where even a basic high school education is going to be a minimum requirement for a productive earning capacity the Nation is losing 1 million youngsters a year from its schools.

Some of these will find employment. Some will be fortunate enough to be fairly steadily employed during their working lives.

Some—too many—will become welfare recipients.

The evidence is clear. The demand for college graduates for 1963 employment is greater than it was in 1962. Coincident with the demand for college graduates is a demand for people who can be trained as technicians. Soon there will be no place in our society for the uneducated, no place for those who cannot intelligently read, comprehend, and be trained.

The place to begin corrections is in the lower grades. Perhaps it is time to recognize that the teacher who assumes the awesome responsibility of first opening the minds of little children to the wonders of education—and its necessity—should be most carefully chosen and amply rewarded.

If parents would realize that the future of their children truly begins in the home and educators would realize that the child's course is set in the first four grades of elementary schooling a great step forward will have been taken.

Military Threat From Cuba Undiminished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, events in Cuba continue to threaten the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. From almost every source we hear of continuing Russian support to the Castro government, resulting in an ever-increasing arms buildup. While events of this past fall certainly strengthened the U.S. position in all of Latin America, we still have not secured onsite inspections in Cuba.

Mrs. Jeanne S. Perry, writing in the Palm Beach Post-Times, clearly outlines the continuing threat facing this Nation. Since last summer she has traveled extensively in Latin America, and from her contacts there and with Cuban exile sources she is able to report documented facts clearly and concisely. I include Mrs. Perry's article of January 6, 1962, in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY THREAT FROM CUBA UNDIMINISHED

(By Jeanne S. Perry)

Cuban Minister of Industries, Che Guevara, clearly outlined future Communist plans in a recent interview with the Daily Worker.

Said Guevara, "Armed struggle against American imperialism is the only way to solve the problems confronting Latin America. To this end, the Communist regime in Cuba would continue to foster communism and support armed intervention in all of Latin America."

Guevara is a man well known to do exactly what he says he will do. His past statements, followed by his subsequent actions bear this out. The Soviets are giving impetus to Che's plans for Latin America by continuing to bring arms into Cuba for the purpose of equipping guerrilla movements. Since the naval blockade was lifted on November 20, more than 30 Communist bloc ships have arrived in Cuba and disgorged their cargoes of arms. Twenty ships from countries outside the Soviet bloc have also contributed their share of weapons during the same period.

Four crack battalions of armored shock troops are still on the island. They are supported by more than 12,000 troops in charge of radar, the air force, heavy artillery, and missiles.

Four Sundays ago, we said we would rather believe Cuban underground information when released than all the administration's denials of this information. Now, we have one more example that shows our faith has not been misplaced. Reports from Washington now confirm underground declarations that 20,000 Russian troops are in Cuba. This information was reported by the underground and published here last September.

In spite of all this, Secretary of State Dean Rusk saw fit to dismiss Guevara's statement as "just talk." One has only to review events just prior to Rusk's comment to conclude that Guevara cannot be dismissed as "just talking." Cuban Communists actively aided and abetted—

1. A determined effort to overthrow the legally constituted government of President Ydigoras Fuentes in Guatemala.

2. Five Cuban Reds were picked up in New York City before they were able to carry out their plans to sabotage department stores there and oil refineries in New Jersey.

3. Communists in Venezuela paralyzed one-sixth of that country's oil production.

Was this "just talk," Mr. Secretary?

On December 10 Dean Rusk told the Washington press that the United States could not accept the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba as a "normal condition." This is all very well and good. But, are we then to accept communism in Cuba "as a normal condition"?

We might also add that everyone of our varied underground sources continues to report the presence of missiles and troops in Cuba. Furthermore, this information is also confirmed in letters written to Cuban friends in Florida by relatives still remaining on the island.

We have just learned that the Soviets don't plan to get caught out on a limb with any shortage of fuel for their hidden missiles. The U.S.S.R. is sending special equipment to Cuba so that they can produce their own liquid oxygen. The first shipment is expected shortly at the Cuban port of Matanzas.

Anyone reading Premier Khrushchev's New Year's message knows that Russia fully intends to continue their military buildup in Cuba. Khrushchev stressed "unbreakable, brotherly Soviet-Cuban friendship" and said the U.S.S.R. "will never leave Cuba in the lurch, that revolutionary Cuba will not remain defenseless."

We quote from our column of May 14, 1962: "There are many ways in which the United States is helping Castro financially. Paul G. Hoffman, as head of the United Nations Special Fund, has signed an agreement whereby the special fund is to help Cuba get away from heavy dependence on sugar by diversifying its farm production. The United States pays about 40 percent of the Special Fund's annual budget, which stands this year at about $47 million."

On May 28, we published part of a letter from Brooks Hays, then Assistant Secretary of State. He was replying to inquiries made to the Department of State regarding disbursement to Castro of Special Fund dollars.

Mr. Hays stated that Cuba would receive assistance in agricultural research and research training in such areas as plant diseases, soil conservation, and food technology. The total amount requested from the Special Fund is $1,157,600, of which $763,500 would be for experts and consultants, $200,000 for equipment, $50,000 for fellowships, and the balance for miscellaneous and overhead costs. The Government of Cuba would provide at least $1,878,000 of its own funds to cover additional costs of the project for local experts and technicians, labor, land, and buildings.

"The statute of the Special Fund forbids the Fund from intervening in the internal affairs of any country or from placing any political conditions upon its assistance. On the other hand, projects undertaken by the special fund are supposed to bring early results and have the greatest possible impact in advancing the economic, social, or technical development of the country concerned."

Due to publication of the United Nations offer of financial and technical assistance to Castro (plus the many objections voiced by irate citizens) the project was dropped. This was not the end of the matter, however. Now, it looks like Mr. Hoffman has gotten the ball rolling once more. Castro has again been offered this same bonanza by Paul Hoffman. The total amount of dollars to be given Castro by the Special Fund remains the same. So does the nonpolitical attitude of U.S. officials involved in giving Castro this helping hand. The only difference is that this time the Food and Agriculture Organization is acting as agent for the Special Fund. The FAO and the Cuban Ambassador have recently been winding up negotiations in Rome.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day is a tribute not only to that occasion in history which marked a triumph of the centuries for the Ukrainian people, great as that occasion was. It is also a tribute to the force and steadfastness of ideas that persist despite all the adversities of the flesh that have beset mankind. For the Ukrainian people have, in the course of their long history, known more suffering, more physical violence, more of the tribulations attendant upon wars and invasion than most of the people on earth. Yet they have, throughout centuries of ills inflicted by those who sought to conquer them, maintained their identity, their independence of spirit, and the pride and determination necessary to preserve the dream of an independent Ukraine.

This dream which became a reality on January 22, 1918, was age-old. Despite the long history of subjection the Ukrainian people had never willingly submitted to the indignities of political domination. Superior in their heritage, their civilization, their resources, to the Russians whose force had overcome them, they retained their separate culture and that spirit of independence which has marked them wherever they are. The celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day is a reminder that the freedom of the mind cannot be conquered.

Appendix

Definition of a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 25, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, defining a true farmer has never been a simple matter. A great many people are proud, and I think justly so, of having some farm background. Others, though their major endeavors may be in some field other than farming, still like to claim they are farmers if they happen to own a farm. Sometimes there is a vast difference between an honest-to-goodness farmer and a sidewalk farmer like myself.

I am indebted to the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association for coming up with one of the best definitions I have heard yet of a farmer. The idea originated with radio station KMA in Shenandoah, Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the recent broadcast by the Grain Terminal Association included as a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problems and burdens of the world are heavy on the shoulders of some people, while others carry their loads lightly. Farmers, being people, are like that too. Some are worried and burdened, others happy and carefree.

Trying to define a farmer is no easier than defining a family farm. But there's always somebody ready to make the try. Latest of these offerings on "What is a Farmer," was boomed out over radio station KMA in Shenandoah, Iowa, recently. We are indebted to our alert watchdog on news, J. K. Stern, president of the American Institute of Cooperation, for calling it to our attention.

Let's see how it jibes with your picture of the farmer.

"A farmer is a paradox. He is an overall executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos, and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

"He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

"He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

"He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers or helping with housework.

"Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

"A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

"Might as well put up with him. He is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: 'The market's up.' "

Who Owns the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we have been projected into the space age with the rapidity with which the missile is projected into space. The physical problems and the biological problems that confront us have been tremendous but one that cannot be neglected and must be reconciled is the legal problem of space.

Mr. Andrew G. Haley, past president of the American Rocket Society, and an expert in this field poses the question in This Week magazine with a provocative article entitled "Who Owns the Moon?"

It has been my privilege to attend more than one symposium at which Mr. Haley has been on the panel and it has always been an enlightening experience.

I commend this article to my colleagues and urge them to read it:

WHO OWNS THE MOON?

(By Andrew G. Haley)

For centuries, there has been no question about ownership of the Moon. It has belonged to astronomers, poets, and young lovers. But now that the space race has changed the Moon's role from romantic to strategic, the question of who owns it has taken on life-or-death importance.

I am firmly convinced that unless an effective international treaty governing celestial bodies is signed before the first cosmic Columbus sets foot on its craterpocked surface, the Moon could become not an exciting new frontier but a tragic new battleground.

The urgent need for such a treaty became painfully clear the night of September 13, 1959, when Lunik II planted the Soviet flag on the Moon, ironically near the Sea of Tranquility. I was at the Moscow observatory that night, a guest of Soviet scientists, fellow members of the International Astronautical Federation. I know I should have been thrilled at this triumph of the skill and ingenuity of mankind, but as I congratulated my Russian hosts, I could not help but wish I were somewhere else, preferably on the Moon.

The Russians did not claim the Moon that night. Nor did they claim it 3 weeks later when Lunik III photographed the Moon's dark side. But their flag planting, plus their aerial mapping, laid strong legal groundwork for a future Soviet claim to the Moon, particularly if they achieve the first manned lunar landing.

FIGHT FOR THE MOON

When ships were propelled by winds rather than rockets, new lands were claimed by the planting of flags. But events proved that effective control of a territory could only be achieved by colonization and the exercise of political jurisdiction.

The first nation to reach the Moon can claim it all. But because the Moon is foodless, airless, and waterless, effective colonization of its vast surface before another nation's arrival will be well nigh impossible. The inevitable dispute over Moon land ownership might then be resolved, as were so many New World land clashes of the past, only today gunpowder wouldn't be the weapon.

Peaceful agreement is possible. This was proved recently when a dozen nations having claims on Antarctica signed a U.N.-endorsed treaty setting up that region as a kind of scientific preserve. A start was made toward peaceful use of outer space with the universal acceptance of the astronautical program of the International Geophysical Year. Satellites have since circled the earth many thousands of times without a single complaint of airspace violation, creating, in effect, a freedom of outer space skin to the long-recognized freedom of the seas.

The U.N. took an important step when its General Assembly resolution of December 20, 1961, declared that "celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states in conformity with international law and are not subject to national appropriation." But we have never been able to agree on what constitutes national appropriation here on Earth. And it would hardly be necessary to appropriate the Moon in order to set up a missile base on a piece of it.

BASE FOR WAR?

Only a worldwide treaty, setting up the Moon as a kind of outer space Antarctica, with common control among all nations, can eliminate use of the Moon as a base for aggressive war. Such a treaty would be only the first step in cosmic law. Astronomers estimate that there are 100 million habitable planets in the universe, and that life may exist on many of them. We will one day soon need an international commission to negotiate with these beings and their governments. It could also administer projects like the propelling of Saturn into an orbit closer to the Sun, giving it a capability for sustaining life as we know it that might solve our population explosion.

But the closer the United States and the U.S.S.R. get to the Moon, the farther apart from agreement on its ownership we are likely to drift. Let us agree now, while we still can, that—

An international commission shall administer new worlds for the common good.

Any nation which first develops mineral or other resources on the Moon may obtain exclusive rights over those resources but may not own the area from which they are taken.

No nation may fortify the Moon.

Power politics must not be permitted to obscure simple truths like one voiced recently by a young friend of mine. Said he, with the uncomplicated wisdom of the 6-year-old: "The Russians shouldn't own the Moon, but neither should we. God made the Moon for everyone."

Grants To Aid Construction of Various Health Professions Training Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, to provide Federal grants to aid construction of various health professions training schools, and also schools for training public health personnel.

My bill is similar to one introduced in the 87th Congress and which was reported favorably by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It had widespread support.

This bill is in keeping with President Kennedy's request in the fiscal year 1964 budget. The President asks $34,352,000. My bill would provide $60 million a year for 10 years for constructing facilities to train dentists, physicians, optometrists, pharmacists, osteopaths, podiatrists, nurses, and professional public health personnel.

This legislation will have a great effect on the future of every American. Presently, there are 141 physicians for each 100,000 population. Ten years ago, there were 143. By 1970, the figure can drop to 138 and by 1975, to 135.

By taking action in this session, the Congress can contribute to the means of educating the people who will serve the Nation's health needs.

The health professions schools have been turning out more graduates, but not in proportion to the Nation's growing population. We face a critical shortage in 10 years.

Coupled with the expanding population is a change in the demand for medical services. The greatest users of medical services are those under 15 and over 65. Both age groups are expected to grow in disproportionate ratio to the balance of the population.

Three factors contribute to the shortage of medical personnel: limited enrollment capacity of schools, mounting costs of professional education, and the diminishing supply of qualified applicants.

Just to maintain the present proportion of doctors and dentists, we will need 20 new medical and 20 new dental schools by 1970.

Present sources of school financing must increase their contributions. But these sources—State legislatures, alumni, business, and industry, foundations and private donors and voluntary societies—cannot meet all additional needs. Federal funds are the only source able to meet the need in time to avoid a real crippling of medical manpower.

In the last session, the committee heard considerable support of the legislation, from those in Government, education, and medicine and including the American Medical Association.

I intend to support this measure vigorously because I believe it is vitally important to the Nation's health and therefore a most appropriate area for Federal Government participation.

The Economic Situation of East Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 25, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I was delighted to read in the January 20 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal an article, written by Mr. Joe Creason, a staff writer for that newspaper, which I feel places in better perspective what the mountain region of eastern and southeastern Kentucky is doing to pull itself up by its bootstraps.

I do not minimize the economic situation in this area, because it is severely depressed, and much remains to be done before anything approaching a stabilized economy will be reached. Publicity in magazines and newspapers and on television telling of the mountain area's plight has, in my opinion, neglected to give proper credit to the positive side of the picture.

In his article, Mr. Creason writes about the determination, initiative, and optimism of many communities, and in item-by-item fashion details what they are doing to make themselves more prosperous economically.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Creason's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIVELY SICK MAN

(By Joe Creason)

The impression left by recent magazine articles and television documentaries to the contrary, depression-plagued east Kentucky has not settled back placidly to await the obituary the crepe hangers intimate will be read over the remains of the region any day now.

A check on the region shows that, far from wringing its hands in despair and refusing to help itself, east Kentucky, which covers a quarter of the State, is showing a dogged determination not to give up in this hour of great need.

Problems which seem as high as the dark mountains that stud the region are present in east Kentucky and have produced a depressed economic condition perhaps never before known in any part of the State.

SORRY LEGACY

Coal, traditionally the one industry, has petered out in some areas and is being mined in others by machines, leaving a legacy of mass unemployment, privation, and actual hunger. In some counties, 30 percent of the labor force is without work; many families exist solely on surplus food commodities doled out once a week at the courthouse door.

Nevertheless, eastern Kentucky is fighting back, spurred on by leaders who preach the optimistic gospel that a new day can come to the mountains.

Largely because of this leadership, mountain towns have initiated more projects aimed at helping themselves than have communities in more economically prosperous sections of the State.

FAITH AFFIRMED

Eastern Kentuckians have affirmed their faith in their region in recent months by raising tremendous sums of money via increased taxes, civic-obligation bonds and personal cash to start the changes they feel are necessary to put their part of the State back on its feet.

For instance, on a per capita basis, Prestonsburg and Hazard have put up more money in the last 18 months to finance badly needed projects than has Louisville or Lexington.

Prestonsburg (population 4,000) raised $100,000 over 2 weekends to buy land for a community junior college; collected $40,000 for a high school football stadium, and led the drive which resulted in health and library taxes being approved by voters of the county (Floyd) by a 4 to 1 margin.

MILLION FOR HAZARD

Last year alone, Hazard (population 5,000) obligated itself to the tune of more than $1 million as its share in the cost of projects—sewage-disposal plant, waterline extension, a new municipal building, and swimming pool. Without any outside help, the city is paving 13 miles of streets and has built $50,000 worth of sidewalks and an $850,000 elementary school.

Every source of help—Federal, State, and local—has been explored by eastern Kentucky towns in rounding up funds to plan and start self-improvement projects. These projects range from urban renewal and slum clearance developments to schools and churches, and from vast tourist resort centers to sewerline extension.

In every instance, it has been mountain area leaders who have initiated the projects, since the line of development of even the Federal assistance programs is from the local level outward to Washington and then back, not the reverse.

COMMUNITIES "SOLD"

It has been these leaders who have "sold" their communities on the fact that there will be no return to yesterday, that the coal industry will not be reborn, and that the situation, while dark now, is not hopeless if all avenues of economic development are explored.

This is the philosophy which has resulted in the establishment in many towns of industrial-development groups ready to finance the purchase of land or construction of buildings for manufacturing concerns through bond issues.

It is the philosophy which also has brought about an awareness of the great tourist potential of the region as a source of employment.

There are many who feel that tourism can be the salvation of eastern Kentucky. To that end, the State has expanded its Pine Mountain and Jennie Wiley Parks, and similar programs are planned at Buckhorn Lake and Natural Bridge in the mountain country.

New privately financed resort motels have been opened near Harlan and Paintsville,

while imaginative, multimillion-dollar developments are planned at Hazard and near Whitesburg.

The Hazard resort project is called Magic Mountain, and would cost an estimated $4,500,000. It would be financed privately with the Area Redevelopment Administration lending 65 percent of the money at an interest rate less than 4 percent over 40 years.

LAND OPTIONAL

More than 500 acres of mountaintop and valley land has been optioned. Plans call for a 100-acre lake, a 200-unit motel, convention hall, and nightclub atop one 1,600-foot peak; a ski lift and slope; a cable-car ride from one peak to another; horse-riding trails, and a model coal mine through which visitors would be escorted.

The project would create same 400 new jobs directly. And if all the details fall into place, work might start this year.

The Whitesburg resort development is Cloud City, and it would spread over some 6,000 acres of Pine Mountain at the eventual southern end of the East Kentucky Turnpike and adjacent to the proposed Allegheny Parkway from Cumberland Gap to Breaks of Sandy.

A basic new city would be built, and selected sites would be made available to large resort and motel operators. The initial cost would be about $2,500,000, of which $750,000 would come from private stock sale and the remainder from a combination of Federal and State loans and grants.

Also in the line of tourism, two east Kentucky towns will stage summer dramas this summer. Pineville citizens have pledged $30,000 to underwrite "The Book of Job" for a fifth season, while in Prestonsburg, $10,000 has been pledged to produce a new play by Paul Green.

SUCCESS STORIES

In their determination to improve their lot, east Kentucky towns have the amazing success stories of three communities—Corbin, London, and Somerset—to spur them on. During the last year, development programs paid off handsomely in all three towns.

Corbin, where 4 years ago community leaders took a close look at their town and then set out to bring it up to par in schools, hospitals, recreation, and housing, landed four industries which will employ 800 eventually. London, which years ago was the test city in a Kentucky chamber of commerce community-improvement study, attracted one new plant with 200 jobs, while Somerset landed three plants with 700 employees. Somerset's biggest prize was a plumbing-fixture plant which will be built with a $3 million municipal bond issue and then leased to the company.

With these examples of what can happen before them, other towns all over the region are rife with self-improvement programs.

It would be impossible even to mention all the work that is under way in the region one TV commentator called "impoverished to the point that the will to do anything for itself is about gone."

However, these are highlights of projects in some towns:

Barbourville: One of the first towns in Kentucky to start a municipal housing project, this Knox County seat now is completing plans for 30 more units of federally financed low-cost housing. An urban-renewal project also is being planned, while the county is about ready to start a new $479,000 courthouse.

The county also has built three new elementary schools and a vocational school at a cost of more than $700,000. The city has raised $16,000 in cash to reactivate its chamber of commerce, and a new country club has been organized.

Middlesboro: Leaders there say things never looked better for solid, long-term growth. An ambitious industrial development program has been launched, an industry locater has been hired, and a $500,000 bond issue is available to finance buildings for industries.

Middlesboro is the smallest city in the State with a full-time city planner. It also has a zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, and a building code adopted and enforced.

SCHOOLS SCHEDULED

Two elementary schools, costing $875,000, will be started this spring. About $350,000 worth of sewer extensions, half the cost being paid locally, will be started this year if Federal assistance through the accelerated public works program is approved. Plans also are being studied for expansion of the sewage-treatment plant.

Martin: This Floyd County town (population 900) is the smallest municipality in the Nation with an urban-renewal project actually underway. The work is centered on a 7-acre plot that formerly was covered with submarginal buildings. The land and buildings were bought with a $75,000 city bond issue, and the Federal Government is providing $238,000 to level the area, build 85 parking spaces, and open 7 lots that will be auctioned off. The State is constructing a Kentucky 80 bypass route through one edge of the site, and a new post office building probably will be built.

The town also has been approved for a 40-unit, $628,000 housing project.

Whitesburg: Including the Cloud City resort, some $15 million worth of projects well might be started this year in Letcher County, of which Whitesburg is the seat.

PROJECTS ON HAND

Projects involving the city directly include a start on the southern end of the East Kentucky Turnpike, a 40-unit municipal housing development, an urban-renewal project, extension of the water system, construction of a new courthouse and completion of a mountaintop airport.

The water-system improvement calls for a $350,000 filtration plant. Under the accelerated works program, 66 percent would come from Washington, with the remainder financed by a city bond issue.

Paintsville: These, among other things, have been done without outside help: a $250,000 city park opened; water filtration plant put in use; new high school built; $300,000 in street paving and widening started; 50 acres of choice land optioned and reserved for industry by the Paintsville Development Corp.; a $350,000 courthouse and an $80,000 health building erected, and the municipal golf course expanded to 18 holes.

With about $250,000 in Federal help, a $1,121,000 sewage-disposal plant has been started. State-Federal money has built a U.S. 23 bypass route around the town, and a 52-unit, $800,000 low-cost housing project has been started adjacent to the bypass.

CRAFTS CENTER HELPS

Also fronting the bypass are the new home of Kentucky Hills Handicraft, and a 32-room motel. Both were built with loans made available through ARA. The crafts center serves as a wholesale shipping point and retail outlet for items made in homes and small workshops in 10 counties.

Pikeville: Recognizing that participation of all the people is necessary to finance the self-help program they visualize, the city fathers passed a 1-percent payroll and a 1-percent net-profits tax. This has produced revenue equal to that from property tax.

Application has been made for a $3 million Government loan to finance construction of waterlines, sewer-collection lines and a sewage-treatment plant. The city's $1 million share of the cost would be paid from bonds issued against the municipally owned water system.

However, the most ambitious project being talked is a $6 million urban renewal undertaking that would all but rebuild the town. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, which now follows a wide bend in the Big Sandy River through the center of town, would be relocated and the right-of-way used for a four-lane boulevard. Pikeville's approximately $1,500,000 share of the cost would be from parking-meter income for the next 30 to 40 years. A $48,000 grant has been requested to determine the feasibility of the idea.

Pikeville College is nearing completion of an expansion program costing more than $1 million, much of which has been raised in the hills.

Prestonsburg: Construction of a junior college is expected to start soon on land provided by the community. Adjacent to the college site, work is being pushed on a 40-unit, $560,000 housing project.

Two urban-renewal jobs are on the fire. Work should start soon on a $1,038,000 sewer line and disposal plant project, with the 42-percent local share in the cost coming from a 70-percent increase in water rates.

A new fire truck and garbage truck have been put in use; two new county schools have been built, and application has been made for a loan to cover 52 percent of the cost of a new courthouse.

Hazard: In addition to the self-help work already mentioned, 98 units of public housing soon will be opened, and application has been made for 30 more units.

The city was the first in Kentucky to complete a federally financed urban renewal project. Back in 1960, a blighted area on Main Street was razed to widen the street and make room for a city-owned parking lot.

On the drawing boards is another big urban renewal job that would clear three blocks of substandard homes and stores on North Main to provide space for a recreation center and diversified new businesses. The feasibility survey has been completed, and the total cost would come to about $12 million. The city's 25-percent share would come from pooling of noncash grant-in-aid credits.

Perry County has some $450,000 on hand to use in building a new courthouse, a step that would do much to improve the appearance of Hazard.

Besides projects listed, Pineville, Hyden, Manchester, Jenkins, Neon, Cumberland, Fleming, Jackson, Harlan, and other eastern Kentucky towns, large and small, have enough projects underway to indicate that the region may be down but not out.

Tomorrow Must Be Earned—Not Appropriated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 25, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the December 31, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report carried an advertisement, "Tomorrow Must Be Earned—Not Appropriated," sponsored by the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. President, this message I feel cannot be repeated too often, and I ask unanimous consent to have it included as an extension of remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW MUST BE EARNED—NOT APPROPRIATED

Voting more money for schools doesn't make this an educated nation. It isn't billions for more veterans' hospitals that will make America healthy. It is honest production, not shorter hours, that protects jobs. It takes more than costly playgrounds to cure juvenile delinquency. Pouring our billions all over the world doesn't buy security nor peace.

Nothing worth having or worth being is ever reached except by honest hard work, but it is becoming the tragic fashion to think we can shortcut the work, and have everything we want if we only spend enough Federal dollars. And then we mistakenly feel "the Government has taken care of it," so we can sit back and relax.

Another once great nation withered and died when its people were drugged with the same fatal poison. (Perhaps "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" should be required reading in many places today.)

Everything Government offers free is obviously and always paid for by all of us in higher taxes or a worsening deficit—both of them deficits of dollars but, even more tragically, deficits in national character and self-respect. What would ever be worth that?

State Planners Take Heed—The Kremlin Admits Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the trend in the United States these days, is to consider the presumed advantages of planning and attempt to apply them throughout the economy and Government at all levels. I have no objections and agree to giving thought to the future—but I am hesitant to confer power in the present that may portend chaos in the years to come.

The citadel of the planned economy, the organization state, and the automated human being—the Soviet Union—has finally discovered through a painful experience I want this Nation to avoid that planning is no substitute for individual initiative within an orderly society of freemen. Nikita Khrushchev himself has berated the crop failures, under production and shortages that have resulted, and has called for a new look at the capitalistic incentive system.

I call the attention of all those here in America fondly dreaming of the perfect ordered society through planning to the following editorial in the December 24, 1962, edition of Barron's National Business & Financial Weekly that follows:

BANKRUPT SOCIALISM—STATE PLANNING, THE KREMLIN HAS CONFESSED, IS A FAILURE

Throughout the free world, so chastened investors are painfully aware, the past 12 months have been a time of agonizing reappraisal. In this country, despite the brisk recovery in stock prices since October, the average portfolio probably has dwindled in value by 20 percent or more; other financial centers, notably West Germany and Switzerland, have suffered heavier losses. Business empires, built on exuberance and easy credit, have tottered; here and there, a few have crashed. Curiously, however, the greatest economic shakeout of 1962 has engulfed not some citadel of capitalism, as might be supposed, but the homeland of communism. In a speech that must have rocked the Kremlin to its foundations, Premier Nikita Khrushchev last month publicly confessed that the Soviet system doesn't work very well. What the U.S.S.R. needs, he added, is less planning and more enterprise. "We should remember Lenin's injunction to be able, if necessary, to learn from the capitalists—to imitate whatever they have that is good and profitable."

In a proletarian dictatorship that condemns people to death for the crime of speculation, these remarks have an ironic ring. Whether they portend a lasting change in either Communist theory or practice, no man—probably not even the Premier himself—can safely say. Nonetheless, Khrushchev's confession (which may be likened to a plea of philosophic bankruptcy) is an historic event. For one thing, while few U.S. demonologists have noted the fact, it marks the end, for all practical purposes, of the vaunted 7-year plan. In the Politburo, long-range blueprints of production and distribution suddenly are out of style. The shift in the party line, moreover, is bound to encourage the few bold spirits at home who lately have dared to urge upon the Kremlin such precepts as proper cost accounting and profit incentives. Finally, it constitutes a wonderful rebuff to all those in the West who, one way or another, are seeking to foist collectivism upon the world. Everyone else may have known all along that the emperor was naked, now the emperor himself has owned up to feeling a chill.

The presence of trouble in the workers' paradise long has been an open secret. While Walter Reuther, Barbara Ward, and other like-minded innocents were marveling at the rapid rate of Russian economic growth, knowledgeable observers were noting the drastic devaluation of the ruble, the wholesale confiscation of savings, the persistent reports of civilian unrest. Last summer a party of U.S. newsmen, including Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal, made an 8,000-mile guided tour of the Soviet Union. In testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress recently, Mr. Royster told of visiting collective farms where 17 men do the work of 2; of seeing scores of buildings unfinished "for want of the proverbial nail"; of traveling in a land virtually without roads. A few outspoken Russians have been equally caustic. In Izvestia not long ago, one writer denounced tires and ball bearings that quickly wear out, textile mills that produce shoddy cloth, and production lines that creep and crawl.

One of the loudest critics has been Nikita Khrushchev, who last winter complained bitterly about the perennial shortages of meat. Now, in an astonishing break with tradition, which has worshiped at the shrine of Soviet industry, he has shattered ikons right and left. While the current 7-year plan has yielded impressive statistics, said Mr. K., it has fallen short in production, notably that of power and natural gas, synthetic fibers and plastics, turbogenerators, diesel engines, and oil refinery equipment. Furthermore, he went on, too many items are being produced for which no real demand exists. Finally, the Soviet product mix is growing obsolete. "If we had merely met the target for steel but overfufilled the plan for polyethylene, we should be substantially better off."

Besides citing specific failures of planning, the angry Premier sweepingly assailed the inner workings of the system. The Soviet economy, he charged, is plagued by phony bookkeeping, excessive integration (from bitter experience with unreliable allocations, most plants turn out their own components), theft of state property (with which some rugged entrepreneurs do a thriving business on the side), bribery (a common means of gaining access to government credit or scarce raw materials), waste and fraud. It is technologically backward and hostile to innovation. Above all, it is inefficient. Hence Mr. Khrushchev proposes to throw the whole creaking apparatus, 7-year plan and all, into the Communist equivalent of chapter X.

What will emerge from reorganization remains to be seen; the Kremlin, which cares nothing for full disclosure, has been vaguer than usual. Some outmoded government machinery has been scrapped, and certain planning functions have been decentralized. More posts apparently have been created for the party faithful. Inevitably, however, none of the reforms cuts to the heart of the matter, and none is likely to succeed. For contrary to good Marxist doctrine, it is communism, not capitalism, that suffers from fatal contradictions. Thus state control of the means of production has not eliminated workers and bosses; it has merely thrust into positions of authority a new class, which, through close affiliation with state and party, enjoys all the fruits of ownership without incurring any of the risks, notably that of going broke.

Similarly, long-range planning has tended to perpetuate the expansion of obsolescent or useless products and processes; no planner in any country has been either able to foresee, or willing to preside over, the often unpleasant effects of technological change. In the absence of a marketplace, Soviet prices frequently bear little or no relation to costs or, for that matter, to each other. Lacking unhampered choice, finally, the Russians willy-nilly also must do without what one of their technical experts has aptly called feedback, i.e., the effective consumer response which sooner or later serves to punish the inefficient or shoddy producer and to reward his businesslike competitor. Like some superstitious savage, who believed that it was literally possible to steal his enemy's thunder, the Soviet Premier has urged his followers to imitate what is "good and profitable" in capitalism. In so doing he has chosen to forget that plenty and freedom—like poverty and socialism—go hand in hand.

As a doctrinaire Communist, Mr. Khrushchev may be pardoned for his lapse. The same excuse, however, hardly suffices for American officials who, through the Alliance for Progress, the 5-year plan for India and similar extravagant designs, are helping to further the cause of statism. By supporting such schemes, the U.S. Government, despite its vaunted pragmatism, is underwriting economic systems that simply do not and cannot meet people's needs. "I have seen the future and it works," the misguided Lincoln Steffens once was moved to exclaim. After decades of deception at home and propaganda abroad, the Kremlin has finally exploded the myth.

Great Work of Senate Special Committee on Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 25, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of the 17 million people in the United States over the age of 65, some 700,000 are in my home State of Texas, and the people of Texas are deeply appreciative

of the public service of the Special Senate Committee on Aging, which is headed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. Many thousands of the people of this Nation over 65 live on small incomes, or small savings, with help from their families, or from tax-financed agencies.

No nobler service can be done for these people than to protect them from medical quackery, crooked promoters, and other fast-buck operators.

Abraham Lincoln once wrote that the legitimate operation of government was to do for the people what they need to have done but cannot do as individuals. The investigative work of the Special Senate Committee on Aging is in the highest tradition of government service to the people.

In a fine editorial captioned "Bilking the Elderly," the Houston Post of January 20, 1963, praised the work of the Special Subcommittee on Aging.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BILKING THE ELDERLY

There are now approximately 17 million Americans over 65, about 9 percent of the total population of the country, and both the number and the percentage are increasing rapidly because of greater longevity. It is estimated that by 1980 there will be more than 24.4 million in this age group, almost three times the number in 1940.

Although the average annual income and the resources of this group of citizens may leave much to be desired, they are today not exactly impoverished as a group, because of social security, private pension plans, savings, and public assistance. As their total number increases, the total amount of money they have to spend, save or invest increases.

It is not surprising that Americans in this age group should receive increasingly the special attentions of confidence men, frauds, quacks and slick promoters out for a fast buck. And there are no more limits on the ingenuity and imagination of these predators than there is on their unscrupulousness.

The pluckings are particularly profitable because such a large percentage of the older people are in need of more income than they have, have chronic physical ailments for which they are always hopeful of some miraculous cure, and because of infirmities of one kind or another, are not able to keep fully informed about new developments in the confidence game.

Repulsive as the idea of swindling the elderly may be to most people, the fact remains that they are being bilked of hundreds of millions of dollars annually through false nostrums, worthless health foods, phony retirement schemes, crooked land sale deals or spurious work-at-home schemes.

The Special Senate Committee on Aging, which is headed by Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, is performing a distinguished service by putting the public spotlight on these operations through its current hearings. It is doubtful if the hearings will produce any information that is startling to the lawmakers or other public officials. They may or may not show a need for additional Federal legislation to protect the Nation's older citizens.

But at least they serve to make the public more aware of the problem, and perhaps more of the older people or members of their families will be quicker to recognize some of these fraudulent schemes than they would be otherwise.

With new gimmicks turning up constantly, it also is necessary that all laws aimed at preventing or controlling these activities be reviewed more or less continuously, to make certain that all is being done that can be done to protect the elderly.

In a society that views tolerantly exaggeration in advertising, it sometimes is difficult to draw the line between what is legitimate and what is an outright fraud. It also is difficult to get adequate laws at the Federal, State, and local levels of government. Most professionals know where the legal loopholes are and how to keep from crossing over the line where they might be in danger of criminal prosecution.

Even if it is accepted that most citizens should be able to protect themselves, the same thing cannot be said with respect to older people who, although no more gullible, are less able to recognize the new gimmicks which are being dreamed up constantly to separate them from their money. The committee hearings therefore are a public service for which there is a real need.

Walter Splawn: A Great American Has Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great minds of America passed to his reward on last Thursday. Dr. Walter M. W. Splawn, twice Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and former president of the University of Texas, will be remembered for generations yet to come because of his profound contribution to the good of mankind and to the cause of good government. To me he was a friend and an inspiration. To the entire Nation he was a benefactor. Few men in our time have done so much.

As a part of my remarks, I include a news article about Dr. Splawn which appeared in the January 18, 1963, issue of the Washington Post, which follows:

WALTER SPLAWN, EX-ICC CHIEF

(By William J. Raspberry)

Walter M. W. Splawn, twice Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and former president of the University of Texas, died of a heart ailment yesterday at his home, 3133 Connecticut Avenue NW.

The 79-year-old economist, author, attorney, and educator was an authority on railroad law. The Texas railroad laws which he formulated as a member of the State railroad commission served as a basis for the Federal railroad reorganization laws of 1922.

A consultant to the House Interstate Commerce Committee during the early 1930's, Mr. Splawn was largely responsible for the formulation of the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Trust in Securities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, and the Federal Communications Act, all initiated during the administration of President Roosevelt.

He was a close friend of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn who, as chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, sponsored the regulatory legislation on which Mr. Splawn worked.

Born in Arlington, Tex., he was graduated from Decatur Baptist College in 1904, earned his law degree at Baylor University in 1906, took his master's degree at Yale University in 1908, and received his doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1921.

After practicing law in Fort Worth for a time, he taught social science at Baylor and economics at the University of Texas, where he was president from 1924 to 1928.

During the late 1920's he served as chairman of the Western Railroad, board of arbitration and referee of the War Claims Settlement Act.

Mr. Splawn retired as Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1957 and, despite his having become blind, returned to Decatur College as a teacher.

He was a member of the American Bar Association, the American Economic Association, the Southwestern Political Science Association, the Masons, and the Baptist church.

Surviving are his wife, Zola, and two daughters, Mrs. Thomas E. Taylor, of Lincoln, Va., and Mrs. Joe H. Munster, of Cleveland.

The 45th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for reserving time to address the House on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Flood, has been keenly interested in the plight of the Ukrainian people. Their tragic state, their aspirations for freedom and self-determination, deserve our utmost consideration.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the news was received that a group of Ukrainian peasants and farmers forced their way into the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. They told a tale of denial of religious freedom and other civil liberties at the hands of the Communist government.

Their plight has evoked well-deserved sympathy from freedom-loving peoples of the world. More than that, we can applaud the courage of that little group of Ukrainians who dared defy the terror of their totalitarian police state.

Their example should be a reminder to us that the fire of freedom still burns bright in the hearts of the millions of men and women behind the Iron Curtain. History has demonstrated that the undaunted human spirit cannot be suppressed.

Let us remember this as we pay tribute to the brave people of the Ukraine who have amply demonstrated their determination to regain independent national status. Let us pledge ourselves anew to the task of working toward a better world where all peoples can find peace, freedom, and justice.

The Chances for Education Bills in 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest, I should like to submit an article which appeared in the Sunday Star of January 20, 1963.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE CHANCES FOR EDUCATION BILLS IN 88TH CONGRESS

(By George W. Oakes)

Prospects for major new education legislation in the new congressional session depend on whether the administration and the Democratic leadership can "put the pieces back together" after the bitter controveries and failures of the last 2 years.

Federal financing for college academic buildings seems to have a real chance of enactment if the church-state issue can be resolved.

President Kennedy in his state-of-the-Union address last week mentioned aid to education first in presenting his recommendations for domestic legislation but did not go into any details.

The Senate 2 years ago passed a large-scale program for construction or teachers' salaries for elementary and secondary schools. The House, traditionally education's stumbling block in Congress because of the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition, defeated the bill due to Catholic demands that private schools be included. Therefore this particular approach to Federal aid at the elementary and secondary level seems doomed and no major school legislation appears possible this year.

LOANS PASSED

The college building program, the most important new education legislation up for decision last year, was beaten in the House after a Senate-House fight over the issue of Federal grants to church-related colleges and a large federally-financed scholarship program. Senate education leaders opposed grants to private colleges, especially those affiliated with the Catholic Church but passed last February a $300 million a year loan program for public and private colleges over a period of 5 years, $250 million in grants for public community colleges for 5 years, and 212,500 college scholarships costing $149 million averaging about $700 per year per student.

THE BILL THAT FAILED

The House last year passed a bill for private and public colleges with $180 million a year in grants for 5 years and $120 million in loans over the same period.

In conference the Senate and House leaders agreed in September on a $2.345 billion academic building and student aid bill for higher education that would have provided:

One billion five hundred million dollars over 5 years—60 percent in matching grants and 40 percent in loans, to construct engineering, physical and natural science buildings and libraries excluding buildings for religious purposes.

Five hundred ninety-five million dollars in student loans of $1,000 per student, of which 20 percent would be for "nonreimbursable loans" (a political device) for needy but outstanding students.

The House defeated the conference report 214 to 186 on September 20, 1962, by a combination of Republican, Southern and some Western Democrats. Most Southern Democrats objected to any Federal grants to church-related colleges, largely because of the Catholic issue. They were joined by such normal administration supporters as Representative UDALL, Democrat, of Utah. The National Education Association, which lobbied against the bill, felt that elementary and secondary education should have had priority in congressional action.

DEMOCRATIC DEFECTION

Although the administration has claimed that three or four more Republican votes in the House could have been decisive, influential liberal House Democrats are convinced that the legislation's defeat reflected the defection in Democratic ranks caused by poor strategy of the administration and the House Democratic leadership.

The religious issue on higher education had not raised its head in a vital way until certain prominent Southern legislators in September stirred up the church-state issue to defeat the conference report.

President Kenedy's education proposals for this year, likely to be sent to Congress the latter part of this month, probably will be included in one omnibus measure as a result of House Democratic strategists' insistence that the administration concentrate its objectives in one bill rather than recommend a deluge of education legislation as in the last 2 years.

The omnibus bill seems certain to include the folowing major proposals for new programs:

1. A revised college building program that would include loans and possible grants to nonchurch related institutions. The total cost might be larger than the 1962 Senate bill of $1.5 billion but, for budgetary reasons, would be stretched out over a longer period of time and therefore cost less on an annual basis. By limiting the grants to nonchurch related institutions the administration hopes to avoid the church-state issue.

2. A proposal for technical education to overcome the national shortage of engineering technicians. Congressman BRADEMAS, Democrat of Indiana, proposed this a year ago and it has been vigorously supported by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's science adviser.

3. A proposal for expanding the number of teacher training institutes in the humanities and the social sciences modeled on the successful experience of those in the physical and natural sciences operated by the National Science Foundation. Certain national standards might be set to encourage new teachers of ability and to retain present ones.

4. A modest proposal for elementary and secondary school construction in certain urban depressed areas extended over a number of years.

5. A proposal for a work-study plan providing Federal funds for needy students who would be employed, for example, as laboratory research assistants.

CONTINUED PROGRAMS

The following major existing programs in Federal aid to education would be continued:

1. The National Defense Education Act which expires this year. The student loan section of this successful program would be expanded and more graduate fellowships would be added.

2. A 1-year extension of Federal aid to impacted areas which may be the House's first education order of business. The House might provide that a commission renew the entire program, which many in Congress feel has outlined its usefulness.

3. Modernization of the old vocational training program.

These recommendations can only be regarded as a considerably watered-down version of the administration's original programs for both elementray and secondary schools as well as higher education as promised during the 1960 campaign and as submitted on paper to the Congress during President Kennedy's first year.

The major reason for such a drastic cutback is the resounding defeat the President has suffered in education legislation. Many observers, including leading Democratic congressional advocates of Federal aid to education, attribute the disaster to administration mishandling of its program. In recent months the White House seems to have lost whatever real enthusiasm it had for large-scale education legislation. The President is said to have privately expressed his sense of frustration and discouragement. His dispirited attitude has spread throughout the Government and on Capitol Hill and in itself has discouraged Congressmen holding marginal seats from taking a political chance on a program they feel the White House doesn't really intend to support to the fullest extent possible.

However, Francis Keppel, the new Commissioner of Education and the first to be sworn in at the White House, has the enthusiastic backing of the educational community. He is expected to instill a new spirit of optimism and to take an active role in presenting the administration's program to Congress.

The major struggle with Congress this year will be over the college building program. In 1970 the college population is expected to be twice what it was in 1960. Administration officials believe that the election has not improved appreciably the political problem in the House, the main hurdle to be faced. However, the elevation of Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey, a long-term supporter of higher education, to ranking minority status on the House committee is encouraging.

QUESTIONS REMAIN

Enactment of the higher education legislation mainly depends on how these questions are resolved:

1. Can the administration and House Democratic leaders get the various powerful Democratic personalities in the House to reconcile their views and support a unified program?

2. Will the administration and House Democratic leaders utilize fully the available Republican support in the House?

3. Will Senate Democratic leaders go along with a bill if it passes the House where it may be taken up first?

4. Will the education community, in particular the influential college presidents, agree on what they want and exert every effort to press their views on Congress?

5. Will the Congress face squarely up to the church-state issue and bring it to a vote?

Otherwise, the best possible political alternative might be to use the probably renewal of the National Defense Education Act as a vehicle to incorporate a major college academic building program.

Polish Insurrection Against the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the centenary of a glorious event in the modern history of the Polish people. One hundred years ago the Poles openly defied the oppressive and auto-

cratic Russian regime in their homeland in the fond hope of regaining their independence. Under the firm leadership of their national committee in Warsaw the movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In every hamlet and town, in all Polish communities under Russian rule, there were instantaneous uprisings. Irrespective of the sacrifices involved and the sufferings to be endured, the people seemed to have vowed to fight or die for their freedom. At first czarist officials in the country were bewildered by this sudden explosion and for a while they seemed unable to cope with the situation. Most unfortunately for the Poles, however, time was on the Russian side. In due time, in a matter of months, they were able to bring Russia's ferocious might against these ill-armed, ill-organized but gallant Poles and crush this national uprising.

But even in their failure to attain their goals Polish leaders and their united followers showed greatness and gallantry, they also showed nobility in spirit and purity in purpose. In their proclamation they urged the Poles to fight for the emancipation and the complete enfranchisement of every person in the Polish realm without regard to race, religion, or previous condition of bondage. By the display of such broad-mindedness Polish leaders were hoping to unite non-Polish elements in the country behind their cause. But they had also counted on outside intervention by certain governments; they were almost sure of French and British aid in their fight against their oppressors. Unfortunately they were sadly mistaken and misled in this calculation, for even if the governments of these countries wanted to intervene effectively they were ill prepared to come to Poland's rescue. So in the end carrying their fight against huge Russian armies for more than a year, their glorious uprising was cruelly crushed by the defeat, capture, and public hanging of their youthful leader, General Traugutt, on August 5, 1864. On the centenary of this most heroic armed uprising in Poland's modern history we pay tribute to the gallantry of Poland's patriotic leaders.

World Airways Orders $8 Million Boeing Jet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article that appeared in the Daily Commercial News of San Francisco under date of January 15 pertaining to the expansion of World Airways, a company with headquarters in Oakland, Calif.

World Airways is headed by Mr. Edward J. Daly, a dynamic leader and astute businessman, who has developed this organization into one of the leading nonschedule air transportation companies in the United States.

I am sure that you will see planes of this company in all of the ports of the Pacific in which our military establishments are located.

Ed Daly has done a great job in building an organization that is a standout in the United States.

The article follows:

WORLD AIRWAYS ORDERS $8 MILLION BOEING JET

The final phase of a $25 million buildup of jet aircraft by World Airways, Inc., of Oakland, was announced today, with disclosure the company is purchasing a third Boeing 707-320-C cargo-passenger transport for a price of $8 million. The price includes spare parts and engines.

Last May, World Airways ordered two similar jets for a price of $17 million including spare engines and parts, at the same time obtaining an option to purchase the third.

Exercise of the option, according to World Airways President Edward J. Daly, was accomplished through a $5,600,000 loan from the Bank of America's headquarters office in San Francisco, with the balance of the money coming out of World Airways reserves.

The new jet is due for delivery in September, Daly said, with the first two scheduled to arrive in June and July.

SERVICE

The huge planes will be used in the company's transpacific operations for the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), and in supplemental transportation services, according to Daly.

When they go into service World Airways will be the first carrier to operate jets from the Oakland International Airport, where a 10,000-foot runway was completed last fall.

The new jet equipment will augment the company's present fleet of 8 Douglas DC-6A/B's and 11 Super Constellations, which operate in flights for MATS, Logair, and various contract services, including a twice-weekly round trip to the Nike-Zeus project at Kwajalein for the Western Electric Co.

Like the 19 piston-driven aircraft, the new jet equipment will be committed to the civil reserve air fleet, thus being available to the military in times of national emergency.

The first two jets, ordered last May, have been financed by Boothe Leasing Corp., in connection with the Central Valley National Bank of Oakland and the Republic National Bank of Texas.

TERMS

Under terms of the leasing agreement for the first two jets, World Airways has the option to purchase the aircraft from Boothe at any time during the 10-year term, or at its termination.

All three of the new jets will have a cruising speed of 595 miles an hour and a nonstop range of 3,400 miles with full cargo load.

In MATS configuration, the 707-320-C can carry 168 passengers or 95,000 pounds of cargo, or any required combination of passengers and cargo. In economy configuration, 188 passengers can be carried. In either passenger configuration the craft can fly in excess of 6,000 miles nonstop.

They can be converted from passenger to cargo service in less than 4 hours.

Among the points which the new aircraft will serve in World Airways' flights for MATS will be Honolulu, Wake, Guam, Manila, Saigon, Bangkok, Tokyo, and Okinawa. Flights will originate at Oakland International Airport.

West Allis, City of Homes and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the January 21, 1963, issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel concerning West Allis, Wis., a city in my congressional district. Written by Sentinel reporter, William Janz, the article is one of a series on the history and progress of communities in the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

Now the fourth largest city in the State of Wisconsin, West Allis has made significant strides since it was incorporated in 1902. Industry found the community a good one in which to settle and expand. It became the home of the Wissin State Fair and as such, the center of the State's industrial and agricultural progress.

But West Allis is also a city of homes. The people who live there have a deep sense of identity with their community and a justified civic pride. Its leaders have been farsighted and progressive. Past achievements and present prosperity point to a bright future for this city of homes and industry.

It has been my great privilege to represent the people of West Allis in the Congress since 1949. To demonstrate further the cause of my pride, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the interesting and informative article which follows:

WEST ALLIS TIES INDUSTRIES, HOMES

(By William Janz)

West Allis is an industrial city whose growth has been marked by the rhythmic pounding of heavy hammers.

Though a suburb, West Allis has become one of the State's major cities. It got there carrying a tool box and a lunch bucket.

The city's astonishing success was predicted in 1920 when Mayor Delbert Miller said, "We are so close to Milwaukee that people do not realize what we have, but if they'll wait, we will show them."

This industrial boomtown that "showed them" was dug out of nearly empty fields 60 years ago like a piece of raw material, heated, hammered and polished.

The sound West Allis makes is loud enough that it cannot be drowned out by the giant, Milwaukee, as Mayor Miller foresaw more than 40 years ago.

The quest for industry that had so much to do with forging this community of factories and homes is still going on.

In the city hall office of Mayor Arnold Klentz, who has been chief executive for 19 years, 13 colored bricks are lined up on a ledge below the windows. Each brick has a small pennant flying atop it with the name of a new industry or commercial venture. The bricks are from the foundations of new businesses.

The successful merger of industry and home wasn't always as peaceful a coexistence as it is today.

In 1920, when Miller was mayor, there was a mass meeting of citizens of the first ward

to discuss whether legal action should be taken so residents could get some sleep and not have to duck falling plaster.

It seemed some new giant steel hammers at a drop forge company were disturbing the usually peaceful slumbers of the occupants of 500 homes near 54th Avenue and Burnham Street.

But this was an early crisis in this marriage of home and factory. Since the end of the honeymoon, there haven't been many noticeable spats, and meanwhile, production has gone on—giant turbines, generating equipment, tractors, machinery and engines used all over the world.

"Our residential growth was naturally influenced by the plants that located here," Mayor Klentz said. "When the early industrial expansion went into high gear, people wanted to live closer to their employment and the result was a residential building boom."

West Allis today has a population of almost 69,000. When the Edward P. Allis Co. (Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.) moved west from Milwaukee shortly after the turn of the century and triggered the industrial explosion, there were about 1,000 persons in the area.

On Milwaukee's south side, the Edward P. Allis Co. had only room to employ about 3,000 persons. It needed 10,000 workers. So it purchased 100 acres of farmland at $250 an acre in what was known as North Greenfield and in the 1850's had been called Honey Creek.

With the purchase, a run on land began as other industrial concerns moved west with their workers.

Shortly after, in 1902, the village of West Allis was incorporated by a vote of 189 to 33. In 1906, Gov. J. O. Davidson proclaimed the village a fourth-class city.

"There's a funny story the old timers tell about the city being called West Allis," Mayor Klentz said.

He quoted from a book by Father J. H. Burbach, an early West Allis historian and an uncle of the present city engineer, Peter Burbach.

Mayor Klentz said there were those who wanted to retain the name of North Greenfield and those who wanted to call the new village West Allis. A meeting was called at Cuppel's hall at 55th and Greenfield and those favoring the new name arrived first.

The meeting was called to order, a chairman and secretary elected, a motion made and carried to organize a village, to call it West Allis, to have a census taken and to have the village surveyed and mapped.

All this took only 5 minutes and when the supporters of North Greenfield arrived for the meeting, West Allis supporters were kind enough to read them the minutes.

Since then, West Allis has prospered and expanded. It boomed through the war years with its factories working 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. It annexed 6 miles of land in the early 1950's and is now fairly well developed.

"There is no substantial residential area left not committed for subdivisions," Mayor Klentz said. "There are about 300 acres of unoccupied land for industry and commercial use and you can bet we're certainly still looking for industry."

If the State fairgrounds are ever abandoned, as proposed, this will leave a large section of land for use.

The fair site was purchased by the Wisconsin Agriculture Society December 9, 1891. It helped play its part in the city's development because manufacturers were attracted by the ease of travel along streetcar lines put in for park users.

This was the beginning for the city that became known the employing suburb of Milwaukee County. More people used to work in West Allis than live there, although that isn't true today.

The four largest companies in the city presently employ about 17,000 persons, city officials estimated. They are Allis-Chalmers, Kearney & Trecker Corp., Pressed Steel Tank Co., and the Wisconsin Motor Corp.

Completely Free by 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 5, 1963, edition of the Michigan Chronicle under the authorship of my highly esteemed and dear friend, Dr. Broadus N. Butler.

Richly endowed with an irrepressible spirit, depth of perception and intellectual strength, this articulate and inspiring American has continued to offer vigorous leadership in the field of human rights and human development.

The editorial follows:

COMPLETELY FREE BY 1963

(By Dr. Broadus N. Butler)

The tide of events since this declaration was adopted by the NAACP in 1953 has successively borne a Supreme Court school desegregation decision and an equal public accommodations resolution in 1954; a nonviolent spiritual movement in Montgomery, Ala., in 1955; a high-gear series of moral and irrevocable national movements by the Federal Government to achieve equal employment opportunity and open occupancy housing opportunity from 1960 to 1962; and 1962 saw James Meredith and the Federal Government combine to finally seal the moral commitment of the entire country in their University of Mississipppi demonstration that there will be no turning back.

There is now freedom in the air we breathe, but the air is not yet completely free. Segregation and discrimination are like dying serpents—weakly wriggling but still as deadly poisonous as when they were full alive. The bombed church in Birmingham, Ala., the shots that pierced the sanctity of the Meredith home in Mississippi, and the announcement by the Governor of Alabama that there will be more violence when Miss Malone registers at the university are sobering reminders that the freedom year of 1963 is not to be approached with unreserved and irresponsible glee. Nevertheless, the very fact that our Nation has officially and morally recognized that the serpent has been mortally wounded calls for unremitting determination to complete the task of stamping out forever this evil.

Equally important is the imperative that we not leave a vacuum where segregation was; for nothing is more quick to rejuvenate than something that is evil and negative. Unlike segregation and discrimination which are characterized by negations and denials, freedom is a very positive condition which must be produced by the constructive wills of men who set themselves to be free.

Freedom starts, in the words of James Weldon Johnson, with inner assurance. In his memorable book, "Negro Americans, What Now? (1938)," there are these salient closing words: "In the situation into which we are thrown, let each one of us, let the whole race, be ceaselessly on guard against the loss of spiritual integrity. So long as we maintain that integrity we cannot be beaten down, not in a thousand years * * * I will not allow one prejudiced person or 1 million or 100 million to blight my life. I will not let prejudice or any of its attendant humiliations and injustices bear me down to spiritual defeat. My inner life is mine, and I shall defend and maintain its integrity against all the powers of hell."

From this foundation alone is built the personal and social disposition of the truly free man. No matter how decorated a man may be with the mythological garb of superiority, that man is not free who cannot look himself squarely in the private mirror of his own life and see his own integrity intact.

Contrariwise, no forces of men or institutions, nor all of the evil contrivances of slavery systems, segregation systems, or even genocide systems, can bend to submission the will of the privately freeman.

The whole massive slavery system at the height of its power could not weaken the will of Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner, Harriet Tubman, or Frederick Douglass. The entire national educational system aimed to keep the Negro submissive and ignorant could not stay the minds of W. E. B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, James Weldon Johnson, and a host of Negro intellectuals. The savage and unspeakable sadistic lynch mobs and murderous bigots could not dent the courage of Mary White Ovington, Arthur Spingarn, William Pickens, Walter White, and Roy Wilkins. The economic sanctions and year-long absence of transportation could not deter the spiritual purpose of Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King, and the Negroes of Montgomery.

The jails, the burning of busses, the crashing of lead pipes and chains against the heads and bodies could not stop James Farmer and the freedom riders. Nay, not even hot coffee down the backs and pepper in the eyes of the sit-in demonstrators could lessen their demand for dignity. Why? Simply because they were already free. The steel of freedom does not bend to the exigencies of ignorance, vice, malice, or hate.

Freedom is a many-splendored and positive thing that is either there in the soul of the man or it isn't. The two most enslaved types of men in America—the most persistently wracked with fear and the most dangerous to themselves and others—are those who have to admit to themselves and their God that they are bigots and those who are so demeaned by the consequences of bigotry as to look at themselves and believe that they are inferior. Both are enslaved by the systematic loss of their own souls, and both seek irresponsible control over truly freemen.

This year, 1963, marks 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation. Now that the denigrations, deprivations, and desecrations of the segregation system are reduced to but the wriggle of a dying asp, we must never again permit racial injustice, religious injustice, or any other form of systematic destruction of the dignity of our persons, either by myths of inferiority or by physical brutalities, to hold sway in this Nation. And every man must start within himself, where he is—now. The time of promise is nigh. Be it solemnly resolved: "But as for me, I shall be free."

Soviet Three Onsite Inspection Offer Rejected by United States in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1962, Premier Khrushchev

wrote President Kennedy that he would permit two or three onsite inspections annually of the Soviet Union in connection with a nuclear test ban treaty. The President replied on December 28, 1962, that he was encouraged and suggested further negotiations. Later, of the Khrushchev two or three statements, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said the United States is "encouraged to believe that the way is now open for some serious talks." On a Voice of America broadcast the President's science adviser, Jerome B. Wiesner said it "does bring us within shooting distance of some agreements."

Somehow the impression has got around that the Khrushchev letter amounts to some magnificent concession extracted from the Kremlin by some wizardry or other of the Kennedy administration.

The truth and fact is that the three onsite inspection proposition was put up by the Soviets in 1960 and rejected by the United States. Here is what was said of it in the Atomic Energy Commission's annual report to Congress dated January 1961 at page 128:

> The Russian negotiators at Geneva have offered to permit only three onsite inspections per year in their country for all unidentified seismic events. The U.S. position is that, in view of the fact that more than 100 locatable seismic events of greater than 4.75 magnitude occur each year in the Soviet Union, 20 percent of these should be eligible for inspection (20 inspections per year.)

This quotation is recalled simply as a reminder to those who might wittingly or unwittingly attempt to rewrite history regarding this particular matter.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Address by Herman Robinson Before United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most moving talks that I have ever read was delivered last October at the national legislative workshop of the United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., in Washingon.

The speaker was the Honorable Herman Robinson of Elizabethton, Tenn., who in his own words "was not born to speak, and until 7 years old neither spoke nor walked" because he was afflicted with a form of cerebral palsy. But Mr. Robinson has refused to surrender to his handicap; indeed, today he is a successful newspaperman and a member of the Tennessee State Senate. He serves on the Tennessee Legislative Council and on a subcommittee studying the problems of the handicapped. He represents Tennessee on the Southern Economic Development Commission and also serves on the National Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Robinson's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thank you Mr. Lyons, Mr. Bogatin, for inviting me to this great meeting. My being here—to speak to you, briefly is the greatest honor that has ever come to me. An honor, yes, and a challenge—for I have never before undertaken to address so many distinguished people at one time. And just as I consider it my greatest honor, I consider it also my greatest victory. For when I came into this world, the doctors shook their heads sadly and said I would never walk or talk, or even live—and here I am speaking before a great assemblage in a great city. You will pardon me if I seem somewhat overawed.

When I am through, you will not say I made a great speech. You may not say that I even made a good one. You may say that I made a bad one; that I did not enunciate well; that I spoke haltingly; that there were times when I seemed confused. But all this will not matter to me. I will rejoice in the bare fact that I spoke at all—that I mustered the courage to make this attempt. For I was not born to speak, and until I was 7 years old I neither spoke nor walked—because I was afflicted with spastic paralysis, a form of cerebral palsy. So each time I speak in public, each time I communicate successfully with an audience, I consider that I have won a victory—and tonight, as I said, I have won the greatest victory of all.

What does all this prove? It proves, I think, that man can be greater than his handicaps. His mind can be disciplined to overcome the weakness of his body. With determination and perseverance, he can do what he wants to do and be what he wants to be, regardless of any physical deficiencies. In short, if he refuses to accept defeat, he cannot be defeated.

I am reminded of the farmer who had an old blind horse which had outlived its usefulness. One day the horse fell into an unused well, and the farmer found him there, standing knee deep in water. There was no way to get him out, and as both he and the well were useless, the farmer decided to fill the well up, and leave the horse buried in it. He shoveled the dirt into the well as rapidly as he could. But the horse was not ready to be buried. When the dirt began to pour in upon him, he shook the dirt off and kept treading on the dirt under his feet. Gradually the well filled up, and the horse, at the same time, rose higher and higher, until he was able to step out and walk away to the pasture. The moral, of course, is that none of us need be buried under hard times, discouragements and calamities, unless we are willing to be buried.

You did not invite me here, I am sure, to hear the story of my life, but I feel I must tell it to you briefly because I consider myself to be much like that old horse in the well. I just refused to be buried.

Let us go back to 1912 and let us picture a tiny mountain village in southwest Virginia called Castlewood. Now add to that picture a rural mail carrier and merchant and his wife excitedly looking forward to the birth of a baby—me. And now think of that picture becoming dismal and black as the baby is born with birth injuries to the head and nervous system—injuries which led physicians to say the child would not live "and it is better that way."

But the baby did live, though medical specialists continued to shake their heads and say walking or talking, or any vestige of normal life, was out of the question. It appeared they were right, because by the time I had reached 6 years of age I could do no more than sit in a wheelchair—and had to be propped up with pillows even to do that.

Even so, my mother was determined I should go to school with normal children. And, though doctors and school officials alike said no, she persisted. She told them, "He may not be able to talk, but he sure can listen good." They finally gave in. In those days, I think I made a great deal of progress by imitating the other children, their movements especially. In watching the other children, I tended to forget myself momentarily—and that helped.

In about a year, I was able to stumble out of the wheelchair and stand briefly. Then I began trying to walk. I suppose I fell down several hundred times—but finally the day came that I walked out of that chair and never returned to it. It seemed almost like a miracle. Learning to talk was a separate problem—and just as hard as learning to walk. I wanted to communicate what was inside me, but the sounds would not form. I made noises but didn't say anything. My parents kept saying words to me, and I tried to repeat them. Eventually, I succeeded—enough to make myself understood not only at home but at school. I do not mean to say I spoke as well as the other children did, or even as well as I do tonight, but I did speak. And that, to me, was really something.

I kept up well in school. Perhaps this was due in part to sympathetic and understanding teachers. They kept promoting me from grade to grade. By the time I was ready for high school, the family had moved across the State line to Elizabethton in east Tennessee. That is where I live now.

My hero was a football coach whose name was E. N. Brown, but everybody called him "Mule." I decided I was going to play football for Mule. He had other ideas, but in an effort to make me feel a part of the team he made me manager. I guess I was just a glorifield waterboy. I spilled so much water opposing teams accused Mule of wetting down the field.

They were justified. How well do I remember that first ball game in early September when the players called time out because of heat and called for water. Those days the team had a big water pail and a family dipper. I grabbed the bucket with the dipper in the other hand. I went to the team with the water splashing and the crowd in the stands laughing. You know, when I got to the team, I was wet; but I was there. I had made it. The captain took the water pail from my hand and turned it upside, not a drop left. He called for more water. And I'll never forget halftime when the boys asked the coach never to send me out there again. I handled that problem by getting bottles for each individual. And too, we were practicing more sanitation.

Those were good old days. You know, when I would bring the footballs out to the practice fields, very often one of the players would say, "Give me that football before you shake the air out of it."

The manager business was good—but not good enough. I still wanted to play. I got a signed statement from my parents saying it would be all right, and that did it. In modern parlance, I was in orbit when Mule said I could get out there and practice with the team. I don't think I was exactly a star—it seemed at times they were using me as a blocking dummy, but I did make the team and earn a letter. At that time, I could not have asked for more. It seemed to me I had no more worlds to conquer. I had proved I could mix it up with the roughest of them and hold my own.

After high school, I attended East Tennessee State College in nearby Johnson City, but by that time I had been bitten by a bug which left a virus from which I have never recovered—newspaper reporting.

I was interested in writing for the papers—sports, social events, anything. That was in the time of the depression, and publishers were cutting off instead of putting on. They wouldn't give me a regular job, but let me sweep out at $2 a week. Between sweepings, I managed to contribute a few articles that found print. I could not ask for anything more, even money.

Eventually, I worked my way into regular employment, first in my hometown and then in neighboring Johnson City. I have worked for these newspapers ever since, and they have contributed more to my education, I feel, than all the classroom instruction I received. It was through newspaper work that I became interested in politics, which I found fascinating to report. Perhaps it was only natural that this fascination should lead me to enter the "great game" on an active basis and be elected to

the Tennessee State Senate, in which I am now serving my fourth consecutive term. The last three without opposition.

Up until now, I am afraid I have been giving myself credit for what I have accomplished. Perhaps I may seem to have been boasting. I have not meant to do this. Truth compels me to say that I could never have done anything if I had not had patient and loving parents, many faithful and understanding friends—and most of all, a loving wife who came to me (for what reason I do not know) and has stood by me through the years when the going was rough as well as when it was smooth. It was she who gave me social confidence—something I surely lacked even after winning the physical battles. It did not occur to me that I could ever be a part of "boy-meets-girl" life, because I felt no young lady could ever be attracted to me. (And I am still mystified as to how it could happen.) But she brought romance to me, and it has never left me—and I know it never will so long as I have Margie.

This young woman has been my bride for 28 years in December—and she has been my partner in my work. We are a team. I never undertaken anything of importance without getting her advice and consent. We planned our family, waiting 8 years for our first child, a son. We wondered if he would be handicapped. Would my affliction carry over to him? We were anxious, and we consulted the best physicians. I can answer the question of "carry-over" best by telling you this boy is kicking extra points and field goals for the University of Tennessee Volunteers, a football team of which you may have vaguely heard. He is a sophomore studying law. We also have a daughter, 13, who is doing well in the accelerated program of the Elizabethton school system—and equally well in tap dancing, piano, and band. She and our son could hardly be more normal teenagers. And so, you can readily see why I feel life has treated me well. It has responded generously when I have called upon it. It has given me more than I deserve. For all of this, I humbly thank a kind Providence.

I have found that it isn't the handicap that gets a person down. It is the surrender to a handicap. If one is determined, he can conquer the handicap, but if he is sorry for himself, it will conquer him. Look at it this way: Everybody is handicapped. Some are handicapped in body, some in mind. Some have handicaps which show, others have handicaps which are not seen with the eye. Some of the people most envied by their fellows are nursing burdens which sorely test them. From the highest to the lowest—even including the President of the United States—all are burdened. All are put to the test, all are challenged to conquer or be conquered, to hope or to despair, to win or to lose. Nobody is free of handicaps. Yours may be different from mine, but it is there. God did not intend that any human be perfect—in mind, or in body, or in soul. He made us a little lower than the angels, each one of us with frailties which, after all, means that we are human and not divine. But God did not intend that we surrender to our handicaps. He gave them to us as challengers. He intends that we shall fight to overcome them. In a sense, then, they are blessings as much as burdens. They are crosses which, when we bear them bravely, can give life meaning it otherwise would not have.

The greatest victories in life are those we win against great odds. The victory which comes easily brings with it no sweet taste. So whatever may be our lot, let us accept it without bitterness—and determine to improve it.

We can do it, if we will. I know we can. We can grow and we can build, if we but have faith.

A builder builded a temple
He wrought it with grace and skill
Pillows and goins and arches
All fashioned to work his will.

Men said when they saw its beauty
It is never to decay
Great is Thy skill, O builder
Thy fame shall endure for aye.

Fathers and mothers builded a temple
With infinite hands and care
Planting each arch with patience
Laying each stone with care.

Gone is the builders temple
Crumpled into dust
Low lies each stately pillow
Food for consuming rust.

But the temple the parents builded
Will last while the ages roll
For this beautiful unseen temple
Is a person's immortal soul.

Obvious Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask permission to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial, written by Mr. Gordon Fister, in the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, praising the work of our distinguished colleague, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I wholeheartedly agree with the editor's observations on the outbursts made at a recent committee hearing. Mr. Fister wrote:

> Demonstrations * * * serve neither the cause of peace, the interests of this country, or the individuals who seek a place in the sun by making spectacles of themselves.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article for the Appendix of the RECORD:

OBVIOUS CRITICS

There isn't much reason to become excited about abuses sometimes charged to the House Un-American Activities Committee so long as the objections to its procedures come principally from those who plead the fifth amendment when asked about present or former Communist affiliations.

Little more significance need be attached to outbursts by any who like Jack Levine, survived the rigorous training and life of an FBI agent only long enough to launch an attack on this law enforcement agency and its respected chief, J. Edgar Hoover. It takes more than one agen with less than a year of service on his record to discredit such a force.

Demonstrations like those once again being mounted by adversaries of the Un-American Activities Committee at hearings in Washington serve neither the cause of peace, the interests of this country, or the individuals who seek a place in the sun by making spectacles of themselves.

Few Americans who are not Communists now and never have been would hesitate to vigorously deny such affiliations publicly or privately. Few who could not give a negative answer to the simple question would want either their present or former associations with the party on the record. Their reasons for objecting to hearings like these are obvious. Communists, after all, aren't in the best repute among most Americans.

There probably are many well-intentioned and conscientious folks in pacifist groups like the one identified as Women Strike for Peace. There could, however, be some who use this and other organizations with high-sounding names to feed innocent victims poisoned Moscow pap.

The House Un-American Activities Committee, for so many years headed by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, and the FBI, both are charged by Congress with determining what insidious forces are at work behind convenient cloaks in this country. Most folks want them identified so they can more accurately determine which groups are dedicated to serving this country and which are under the influence of others.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, in Wilton and Belfield, N. Dak., the Ukrainians of North Dakota joined Ukrainians throughout the free world in observing the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian state on January 22, 1918.

As a part of the observance, Hon. William L. Guy, Governor of North Dakota, issued an executive proclamation setting aside January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota.

The proclamation is a symbol of freedom for the Ukrainians of North Dakota and throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's proclamation and a press release by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Bismarck, N. Dak., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY IN NORTH DAKOTA

"Whereas on January 22, 1963, Ukrainians in North Dakota and throughout the free world will solemnly observe the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian state; and

"Whereas after a defensive war lasting 4 years, the free Ukrainian state was destroyed in 1920 and a puppet regime of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was installed, later becoming a member state of the Soviet Union, and

"Whereas the once-free Ukraine is now no more than a colony of Communist Russia and its vast human and economic resources are being exploited for the purpose of spreading communism, and

"Whereas some 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent now living in North Dakota have made significant contributions to both State and Nation. Now, therefore, I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim the week

of January 22, 1963, as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota and urge all citizens to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to again achieve its rightful inheritance of freedom and independence."

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of North Dakota here in my office in the State capital at Bismarck, N.Dak., this 17th day of January 1963.

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

Attest:

BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

JANUARY 22 PROCLAIMED UKRAINIAN DAY

For many years the 22d of January has been proclaimed and celebrated in our American cities and States from coast to coast as Ukrainian Independence Day.

On January 22, 1963, Americans of Ukrainian descent are observing the 45th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of Ukraine which took place on January 22, 1918, in the capital of Ukraine, Kiev.

On that day, a free and democratically elected Parliament and Government of Ukraine issued a solemn act and proclamation of the reestablishment of the Ukraine as a sovereign and independent nation called the Ukrainian National Republic.

The young Ukrainian state was recognized by a number of governments including that of Soviet Russia. But despite the fact that it officially recognized the independence of Ukraine and pledged itself to respect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation, Communist Russia attacked Ukraine both by military aggression and subversion and infiltration from within. After almost 4 years of bloody war, Ukraine, deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic help from Western nations, succumbed to the forces of Communist Russia.

Since 1920 Ukraine has remained under the domination of Communist Russia, but it has never surrendered the spirit of resistance nor given up the hope of liberation and complete independence. During the whole period of enslavement, Ukrainian resistance to the Communist regime and Soviet Russian oppression continued. As a result the Ukrainian people were subjected to harsh and inhuman treatment and persecution. Both Ukrainian churches; namely, the Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic Church, were physically annihilated by Moscow; the Ukrainian intelligentsia was decimated by purges, deportations, and executions; while over 5 million Ukrainian peasants died from hunger and starvation during a manmade famine. It was Khrushchev himself who declared at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party that Stalin planned the total extermination of the Ukrainian people, which plan failed only because there were too many Ukrainians. How significant was the Ukrainian problem to the Russians was evident in 1959–60 when the Soviet Government sent special agents to kill Ukrainian leaders in the free world, as was the case of Stepan Bandera and Dr. Lev R. Rebet, whose killer was recently sentenced by the German Supreme Court in the fall of 1962, to 8 years of hard labor.

Both the U.S. Government and the President have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people, enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which listed the Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia. During the debate of the United Nations General Assembly, a number of Western statesmen, including Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada; Hon. Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.; the Ambassador of the Republic of China; and others raised their voices in protest against the colonial enslavement of the Ukraine by Communist Russia.

In the summer of 1962, special Senate and House resolutions calling for congressional inquiry into the persecution of religious groups, its genocide of the Ukrainian churches and 18 years of imprisonment of Archbishop Joseph Slipy, were introduced by Senator Milton R. Young and Congressman Don L. Short.

Today the Ukrainian people everywhere are celebrating the memorable date of January 22, 1918, as their greatest national holiday. Today, after 45 years of unrelenting struggle against Moscow, the Ukrainians have made much progress, and their cause is known as never before.

The cause of Ukrainian freedom and independence is no longer a patriotic desire of the Ukrainians. Since the Communist menace has spread to our shores in Cuba and Latin America, it has become a political necessity for the free world, since the independent Ukraine means a substantial weakening of the Soviet Communist empire and therefore the permanent Soviet threat which hangs over an intimidated humanity.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence on January 27, 1963, in Wilton and Belfield, in a fitting and solemn manner.

Therefore the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides an appropriate occasion for the American people to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

Monkey Wrench in the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star on January 26, 1963, clearly illustrates some of the grave difficulties arising out of the proposed tax cuts accompanied by the largest annual budget in the history of this country.

If the state of the Union is as good as we were assured it is in the President's state of the Union message, then why all of this tampering with the economic system.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MONKEY WRENCH IN THE ECONOMY—PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN VIEWED AS LEADING TO UNCERTAINTY AND POSSIBLY STAGNATION

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has thrown a monkey wrench into the national economy. His message to Congress on taxes was well intentioned, but the confusion, disruption, and uncertainty it will bring in the next few months to business operations in this country could stagnate the economy and result in the very opposite of the hoped-for stimulus; namely, a recession.

For, again Mr. Kennedy has depended on academic advisers who boldly disregard the most important single factor in the national economy, the confidence necessary to future planning.

Instead of getting the widely heralded tax cut, corporations will pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before. They will not actually get on the promised percentage basis of reduction till 1969. It's a stimulus in 1963 that's needed, not in 1969.

This outlook is partly due to the President's scheme for moving up tax collections from many corporations to larger payments during the same year the income is earned. This involves a surgical operation on the cash flow of a company that could block expansion or even the financing of current capital outlays to which many corporations have already committed themselves for the next several years.

On the face of it, moreover, individuals in the higher brackets are being told they will have the rates reduced from 91 to 65 percent over a 3-year period, but the President's recommendations call for such vital changes in the handling of capital gains as well as contributions and other deductions that the net result may be little, if any, decrease in the payments by the taxpayer.

A man with an income of $20,000 a year, for instance, may hitherto have had legitimate deductions of $2,000. Under the proposed plan, the Government would disallow deductions, including interest on the mortgage on his home, contributions, and city and States taxes, equal to 5 percent of his income, or the first $1,000. The deductions allowed would then amount to $1,000. But should he happen to have casualty losses, these would be deductible only in the amount they exceed 4 percent of his gross income, and even this would be subject to the basic 5 percent limitation. Also, he would be required to pay taxes on the premiums paid by his employers on any group life insurance policy above $5,000. There are other new increases in taxes and removal of exemptions, so that the taxpayer could wind up with less net revenue than before.

But what the President's plan does to individual planning for estates is even worse. A capital gains tax on the appreciated value of real estate, for example, will have to be paid at the death of the owner, even if the property isn't sold. This would be in addition to inheritance taxes. There will have to be a revision now of many a will. A person who thought he was leaving a certain sum to his family will find the amount materially diminished.

The repeal of the provision that sick pay is not subject to taxation up to $100 a week will cause dismay to the head of many a family who becomes ill and tries to make ends meet on a diminished income, especially if his work is largely on a commission basis. Also, while heretofore he could deduct medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of income, now he will be given a deduction for such expenses above 4 percent and will be able to take even this only to the extent that his total deductions exceed 5 percent of his gross income. So more of his income will be taxable than before.

When one surveys the confusion to individuals and the diminution of the capital or reserves in the treasuries of corporations, one wonders if the President's advisers gave any thought to the high cost of the transition period in terms of a demoralized national economy.

There are dozens of categories on which increases in taxation will result, yet the President's plan is hailed as a tax cut. It will take many months for such a measure to go through Congress. Meanwhile, what will individuals and businesses do? How can they plan? Will spending be discouraged? People don't spend money expected from tax cuts till they are actually in effect. Since the changes in rates are to be spread over 3 years, while the changes in regulations about deductions and expenses of all kinds,

including certain classes of gifts, are to go into effect next January, it will certainly make people in 1963 cautious about what they spend. This caution and hesitation may last 2 or 3 years, because there will be no certainty that Congress will not be compelled, due to public-opinion pressures, to make more changes next year.

All in all, when the country fully understands the President's tax plan, the Democratic Party will certainly be on the spot. The division in the electorate between the two major parties is a narrow one, anyhow, and it takes only a small percentage shift of voters to produce a landslide for the other party. That could mean a Republican Congress and a Republican President in 1964. Until Mr. Kennedy made public his tax plan, it looked as if he might win again in 1964. But now it looks as if a nationwide protest will develop. This will be felt in Congress, which will hesitate to adopt the President's plan, alluring though a tax cut seemed to the politicians at first glance.

In the final analysis, what good is a cut in tax rates if business conditions turn for the worse and individual incomes begin to shrink? That's the unanswered question in the President's message.

What Is a Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, farming remains the basic industry in all America. When farmers are successful the Nation is prosperous; when farmers are in economic distress, the Nation falters; should farmers fail completely in their production of food and fibers, all of us would be reduced to inadequate diets, deteriorating health, and unsuitable clothing. A sound and productive agriculture is essential to a stable and successful American economy.

But how about the men and women who operate these all-essential farms? Who are they? How do they think? What are their attitudes, their goals, and their ambitions? What manner of human being and fellow citizens are they actually? Station KMA of Shenandoah, Iowa, recently broadcast a description of a typical farmer which was reprinted in the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of St. Paul, Minn. It summarizes well the sturdy, self-reliant characteristics exemplified by our Nation's farmers and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A farmer is a paradox. He is an overall executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos, and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers, or helping with housework.

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him. He is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

The Crisis for American Poultry Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the strong protectionist policy adopted by the European Economic Community toward importation of agricultural products from nations outside its group has had a devastating impact on the American poultry industry, which, in recent years, had developed a substantial export market in Europe, particularly in West Germany.

The Virginia poultry industry alone had built to an annual volume of $7,500,000 in shipments to West Germany. In recent months, this business virtually has been extinguished. Other poultry producing States have suffered comparable economic damage.

Conscious of the overall dollar loss to the State, not only in direct payments to poultrymen but also in business generated among those selling goods or services to poultrymen, all segments of Virginia's economy have banded together in a cooperative move to press for more intensive efforts by the U.S. Government toward modification of the oppressive tariff, variable levy and "gate price" policies adopted by the European Economic Community.

As of possible interest to colleagues from other poultry States, Mr. Speaker, I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, some background material on the problem:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Set out below are several items of information in reference to the European common agricultural policy that may be helpful in presenting the case for the poultry industry.

1. The present treatment of American poultry entering Common Market countries is a result of regulation No. 22 of the European Economic Community adopted at Brussels on the 4th day of April 1962. To request the official translation of regulation No. 22, address inquiries to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agriculture Service, Washington, D.C., and request Foreign Agricultural Circular FPE 4-62, November 1962.

2. Under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) nonmember countries' exports are subjected to (a) gate price, (b) equalization fee (variable levy), (c) ad valorem duty (internal), (d) ad valorem duty (external).

See attached sheet for explanation of these levies.

3. It is important to stress that poultry is a nonsupported, non-Government-controlled agricultural commodity, the price of which is established by the forces of the free market. Poultry has the best case of any agricultural product to point out the unfairness of the Common Market action. Poultry is a substantial export item that is sold for dollars and consequently not only helps achieve a favorable balance of trade but also would help to achieve a favorable balance of payments. In short, the export of poultry helps to stop the outflow of gold that is posing for this Nation a serious economic dilemna.

4. The Common Market has stated that it expects to follow a liberal trade policy, and their action on poultry in using a series of levies is a flagrant example of an extremely protectionistic policy in order to establish a domestic production capability.

5. Unless the case for poultry is made now, it will be much more difficult to achieve a solution once they have invested heavily in their own production capacity.

6. Under the forces of a free market system, Common Market poultry cannot compete with American poultry. To emphasize this point, it is estimated that the American industry could place broilers into the Common Market at a cost of 29 to 31 cents per pound. American imports have reduced the price of poultry from a luxury foodstuff to a reasonably priced commodity more nearly within the reach of the average European housewife. The price of chicken per pound in Germany as of December 31, 1962, was approximately 44 cents per pound. Prior to August 1, 1962, and the common agricultural policy, the maximum price per pound of chicken was approximately 38 cents per pound.

7. There is no certainty as to the firmness of levies of the Common Market. The deliberations of the Council of Ministers are closed, and to point this out, a supplemental levy of 2.84 cents was made in the November meeting and announced overnight—suddenly disrupting the American market and confusing exporters and importers. Importers were caught with thousands of pounds of poultry on the high seas purchased at one price but subject to higher levies on entry to Europe.

8. Although Virginia provides only about 3 percent of U.S. poultry production, it has 13 percent of the national exports.

9. It has been argued by Common Market officials that poultry has only recently become a major export item to the Common Market, especially Germany, and, therefore, the American poultry industry has not been hurt. It should be emphasized that only within the last few years could we get into Germany because of extremely high tariff walls. Secondly, the market was built by aggressive sales promotion, through advertising, trade fairs, and other media to develop a consumer demand.

10. It should also be emphasized that the American poultry industry has the experience in growing, processing, and packaging that enables us to develop our markets in Europe. Another major factor is the American capacity and experience in freezing poultry products.

11. The argument is made that we can avail ourselves of the negotiation procedures under the recent Trade Expansion Act. Persons who raise this point are probably referring to the Christian Herter team which will implement the negotiation procedures of the act. However, it should be stressed that the negotiation procedures provided in the act will not be available until some time in 1964.

This entire organization must be planned and put together and until that is done, State Department officials advise that normal diplomatic procedures will have to be followed in communicating with Common Market nations. Many observers feel (foreign and domestic) that strong action on poultry could minimize future unfair trade policies by the Common Market.

The new Trade Expansion Act, section 252(a)(3), gives authority to the President and our negotiators to retaliate against countries which impose unreasonable tariffs on poultry and other agricultural products.

12. There are indications of support of the American industry in several of the Common Market countries, particularly Germany and Italy.

13. Many persons do not look on poultry as being an industry. This is especially true in the Common Market. There are also indications that many persons in this country cling to the idea that chickens are raised by walking out the back door and throwing a handful of grain in the yard. The point must be brought home that the poultry industry is a highly-technical operation that affects and involves many other areas in our economy and a host of related industries from a farm operation to a complex modern marketing operation.

14. In a paper prepared by the Georgia Poultry Federation, it is stated:

"Economists estimate that if there had been no exports in 1960, broilers would have brought a cent a pound less, eggs over a cent a dozen less and turkeys over a half-cent a pound less."

15. Special mention should be made concerning West Berlin and the importation of poultry to that city. The present levies of the CAP are applied in that city to our poultry imports, and a strong position should be taken without admitting, or agreeing, to any of the levies established under the CAP on poultry—that, in any event, the citizens of West Berlin should have made available to them foodstuffs at the lowest cost at which they can be provided to the people of that city, especially in light of the heavy commitment this Nation has made to the defense of West Berlin and to the costs of garrisoning and possibly subsidizing the supply of foodstuffs to that city.

16. There is little or no turkey production in Europe, and the large fowl market is in geese. Similar levies, but at different rates, are applied to turkeys and other large fowl. The market price of geese and turkeys are quite close, and up until the recent holiday season the "variable levy" (equalization fee) on geese and turkeys was about 9½ cents per pound; however, in November the variable levy was dropped by about 6½ cents for geese but held at 9½ cents for American turkeys. Among the principal suppliers of geese on the Common Market are Poland and Yugoslavia, and the result of this action was to exclude turkeys, our major fowl export, from the market which was captured by the cheaper-priced goose. It is understood that the variable levy on geese, as of January 1, 1963, was raised to the 9½-cent level; however, the holiday demand had ceased.

COMMON MARKET LEVIES ON AMERICAN POULTRY

"An equalization fee (sometimes referred to as a variable levy) is to be charged on poultry to correct for the amount by which feed grain prices in the importing country exceed the price of the same grains in the world market. This fee will be levied per kilo of meat (2.2 pounds).

"A gate price—the minimum price at which poultry may enter the Common Market—is also provided. This is designed to prevent dumping by nonmember countries.

"The gate price is based upon the world market price for feed grains and a feed conversion factor which is considered to be typical of the exporting countries. When prices offered by the exporting country are below the gate price, the importing country must charge a fee equal to the difference.

"An ad valorem duty (inte nal) in the amount paid by member countries to each other will be charged all outsiders. For instance, Germany charges a duty of 10.5 percent on poultry from other Common Market countries. Any outside count ies shipping poultry into Common Market countries will have to pay such a fee as of July 1.

"The German duty is now 15 percent on poultry from outside countries. Hence, the United States will benefit from the reduction. The duties vary according to the problem of member count ies in adjusting their farm policies to free trade conditions. These duties are all scheduled to be reduced gradually to zero by December 31, 1969.

"Another ad valorem duty (external) of 2 percent is being added this year. It is to be built up gradually to 7 pe cent by 1970. This so-called preferential duty will be charged on all poultry from outside the Common Market."—Taken from an article by Dr. Harry M. Love, published in the Virginia Poultryman, May 1962.

One thousand pounds eviscerated poultry generates the following gross income:

Income to producer of feeds (to grower of grain, etc.)	$150.00
Income to flock owner (to hatching eggs produced)	18.00
Salaries, wages, and other:	
To broiler grower	33.00
To delivering feed and servicing broilers	14.00
To truck to haul live poultry from farm to plants	7.50
To wages to process and pack	30.00
To boxes, paper packaging material	18.00
To ice	3.00
To trucking dressed poultry to seaport	10.00
To repairs, replacements to plant processing equipment	15.00
Total	298.50

(Taken from statistics supplied by the Georgia Poultry Federation.)

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE

1. Adoption of a resolution by trade associations and other organizations in the Commonwealth which would be forwarded to a coordinating committee that would make proper distribution.

2. Make it a point to discuss this Common Market action with your local newspaper editor, radio station, radio-television station and other news media.

3. Arrange for insertion in trade organs of a story covering the Common Market action.

4. Organize a letter and telephone campaign by different organizations and individual citizens directed to the appropriate agencies of the executive branch of our Government. Correspondence should be addressed to the White House and the Department of State.

5. Organize a speakers team of individuals to address civic clubs, trade associations and other clubs throughout the Commonwealth explaining this matter and requesting their assistance by demanding support of the poultry industry by our Government.

6. Inform your elected representatives of the situation.

7. Arrange for a conference with appropriate officials at the highest possible level in the executive branch of the Government.

The Power of Belief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, several of us in the Senate were privileged to hear a most inspirational address by our colleague, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, delivered at the Old St. John's Church, Georgetown, on January 13, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK DELIVERED AT OLD ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, GEORGETOWN, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 13, 1963, BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL, OF RHODE ISLAND

From the time I was confirmed until I graduated from college, I occasionally contemplated entering the clergy. I used to think, and still think, that the pulpit can be a most wonderful podium from which to change the course of events for the better. But I am afraid I had neither sufficient determination, nor virtue, to follow through with this interest.

So, following a rather indirect route, I became a politician. However, I believe that a politician can also be a force for good, because a good politician—and remember a politician is never a statesman until he is dead—a good politician is also driven by the desire to help and to lead. If we weren't, we'd be doing something else, and usually something a lot more profitable. And, so I am very, very glad indeed to be standing here talking with you now.

Today, when we hear so much about the balance of power, yes, the balance of terror, I would like to discuss the tremendous weapon that we of the West have and the Communists do not have.

To my mind, it is a weapon that can more than hold its own with nuclear missiles over the long haul. Although it must be confessed, the decisiveness of the nuclear missile over the short haul would be pretty decisive.

This weapon is religion. It is a universal weapon, too, because when I say religion, I am not just thinking of a particular faith, nor am I thinking of Christianity with all its rich intermixture of faiths, but I am thinking of religion in general and the common belief of certain origins and certain values.

I wonder how many of us have stopped to think that it can be said that Jesus Christ, Mohammed, and Moses are all descendants of Abraham. I believe one could actually trace out a genealogical cousinship, a consan-

guinity, between these three. It is quite interesting, incidentally, to see with what pride the Moslems consider themselves of the same general religious family as do the Jews and the Christians. I guess this all goes to show that Senator Austin's plea at the Security Council to the Israelis and the Arabs to settle their problems in a truly Christian spirit, may not have been such an unattainable idea after all.

Then, on a more universal scale still, many comparative religions not only show the same misty origins of the world starting with the Great Flood, but will also show a surprising similarity in values, values that oppose the Communist ones: the importance of loving, the importance of generosity, and, perhaps, the greatest difference with the Communist bloc, belief in the afterlife.

Let us see now, the role of religion in the uncommitted, undeveloped areas of the world such as Africa—particularly sub-Sahara Africa and southeast Asia. Here we have a very specific debt to the missionaries.

Until I made a trip to Tanganyika some time ago, I had always given a very long look at the activities of missionaries since I was under the impression that they were often disliked by the people of the emerging nations and regarded by them with great suspicion.

However, my trip to Africa deeply impressed me with the great educational and medical contribution made by missionaries there. In Tanganyika alone, I found that there were 400 American Christian missionaries, or 20 times the number of American Government personnel in that country. In fact, in tropical Africa, as a whole, there are close to 10,000 American missionaries. This is a number more than a thousand percent higher than the 778 American Government personnel there.

Another way of looking at it, and an even more impressive figure, is the realization that there are 23,000 missionaries of all nationalities, including Americans, in tropical Africa, approximately 6,440 Catholic and 15,970 Protestant.

These dedicated men and women may handle very high caliber education, as is the case with the Anglican St. Andrew's School outside Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika, where the graduates are able to compete on an equal basis with youngsters finishing the best English school at home. Or, as is the case with the majority of missionary schools, the education may be more simple and elementary, giving the students a basic knowledge of reading and writing. But, no matter what may be the particular level of missionary education in Africa, without it, that continent would be undergoing far greater turmoil and internal strife than is now the case.

In this connection, it is interesting to notice that 16 heads of state and prime ministers of the newly emergent nations of tropical Africa received their education in full or in part in missionary schools. In fact, with only a single exception, every African head of state or prime minister in tropical Africa who is not a Moslem was educated to some degree in a Christian missionary school.

Moreover, in those countries not yet independent, we find the leaders equally owe their education to missionaries.

Altogether, a total of 35 men are included. Of these 35, Christian missionaries educated 25. Catholic missionaries educated 17, and Protestant missionaries educated 8.

In the remote vastness of the mountain lands in the periphery of Communist China, there are many American missionaries, including incidentally, a goodly number from my own State.

In general, in the area of missionaries, our Protestant Episcopal Church is not seen as much in the Far East as others.

Now, let's examine the situation of religion behind the Iron Curtain. Here, I would like to cite two differing views on religion.

The first you are familiar with—Karl Marx's dictum that "religion is the opiate of the masses." But, I believe more in the words of Bela Udvarnoki, who, in an article in Christianity Today last July said, "Man is incurably religious."

The fact, I think, that man is incurably religious is our great secret weapon against the Communists. It is secret only because we are not sufficiently aware of it and do not recognize its importance and strength.

There is another interesting set of circumstances behind the Iron Curtain and that is that in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, appropriations of one sort or another are actually granted by the atheistic governments for church or parochial schools.

Religion, too, is a means of expressing their feelings toward communism by the unhappy people behind the Iron Curtain.

Having lived and traveled in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary since these countries have fallen behind the Iron Curtain, I am always struck by the intensity and fervor with which religion is practiced there today. I can remember, in the churches before World War II, the people attended but they did not attend and pray in the same numbers and with the same intensity.

Yet, I recall that shortly after the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, the church parades on Saints' Days and Sundays suddenly became two or three times as long as they had been before. Why? Because this was a way for the people to show how much they opposed communism.

In Poland, President Gomulka and the Communist regime have had to accept the church and the practice of religion by the vast majority of Poles.

Cardinal Midszenty still in our Budapest Legation, remains a symbol to many of the Hungarians, and the churches there too are crowded on a Sunday.

Even in the Soviet Union, religion is reemerging a bit more than we realize. The atheism that for two score years has been forced upon the young scientists and the intelligentsia of the Soviet Union does not give the logical answers as to what caused human life: in essence, why are we, and to the question of the afterlife.

The best description of the beliefs of the younger Soviet scientists was offered by V. Tenoryakov when he said, "I do not imagine God as he is depicted on icons. To me, God is a sort of spiritual principle, the stimulus to the evergreen of the galaxies, the stars, the planets, and of everything which lives and reproduces on these planets, from the most elementary cells up to man."

Now, how exactly is religion doing in the Soviet Union? I was there a few years ago and took the opportunity to go through two of the five religious seminaries and two academies that are there. I found that almost 80 percent of the new babies in Leningrad were being baptized. Though, I must confess that in general, I don't believe the babies were being baptized because of their parents being true believers as much as an insurance policy being taken out by the parents in case there was an afterlife.

Just as Khrushchev has followed policies that differ from Stalin's, so the Russian Orthodox Church has tended to become more ecumenical under the direction of Archbishop Nicodemus who succeeded Metropolitan Nicolai.

A rough estimate in the Soviet Union today is that there are some 50 million believers out of a population of 215 million and some 20,000 churches.

The atheistic pressure of the Soviet Government is directed more against the Baptists, and other fundamentalists, than the Russian Orthodox Church, and this was underscored by the sad plight of 32 Evangelical Christians who sought sanctuary in the American Embassy the other day. There is even more pressure being brought against such faiths as Jehovah's Witnesses and the Seventh Day Adventists.

Religion then is one of the principal reasons why it is that communism has the seeds of its own disintegration and destruction within itself. Man is innately religious, and communism goes against his innate human nature in this, as in every way. Under communism, he can't talk freely, work freely, travel freely, collect property freely and, most important, his religious freedom is violated.

So, I believe that it is religion, particularly Christianity, that will play a principal role in the eventual erosion of communism.

Now, for a final moment, let us look inwardly at ourselves. Religion in the United States is presently at a record high. Statistics published in October 1961 showed U.S. church membership at a record high of 114,449,217, or 63.6 percent of the total population of about 180 million.

The breakdown was 63,668,835, Protestants; 42,104,900, Catholics; 2,698,663, Eastern Orthodox, 5,367,000, Jews; 589,819, Old Catholic, Polish National Catholic, and Armenian Apostolic; 20,000 Buddhists.

Yet, in their annual statement in November the U.S. Catholic bishops warned of a "widespread moral apathy" in America touching virtually every group. They said this makes it vitally necessary for Americans to "make open profession of religious beliefs and moral convictions."

In conclusion, then, as well as weapons in our nuclear arsenal, we can each help forge the principal and most permanent weapon we have—religion—and especially, Christianity.

Let us remember, too, the thought expressed on a plaque in a church in my neighboring town of New Bedford, "Church is a hospital for sinners; not a haven for saints."

We sometimes tend to become a bit too smug. We preach a good life, but practice it too little. We listen to fine words on the Sabbath, but do not always practice them in the remaining 6 days of the week. For instance, there are far too few applicants for the Peace Corps. We, as parents and leaders in our community, could do a lot to see that more applied.

So, I guess the only thought I would like to leave is the hope that throughout the week we may try to believe in our hearts and practice in our lives the words which we have heard with our ears and said with our lips on the Sabbath.

The Lord Giveth and the Government Taketh Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the President's tax proposals tend to once more confirm the truth of the old adage, "All that glitters is not gold."

There is complete agreement when he says present taxes are so high they are

selfdefeating. There is less than unanimous agreement, however, when he proposes spending at an alltime high, piling deficit upon deficit, and sending our national debt beyond all bounds of fiscal responsibility.

All agree further that all loopholes should be closed, but as one commentator suggested, why not close the granddaddy of all loopholes, the oil depletion allowance? Oil may produce a fire too hot to handle.

The following editorial in the January 25 edition of the Wall Street Journal points up some facts not commonly recognized.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE GIVING AND THE TAKING

The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, that is the not particularly surprising theme of President Kennedy's detailed tax proposals sent to Congress yesterday.

Politically such a hodgepodge of giving and taking faces a dubious fate at the hands of the lawmakers; if they approve any tax cuts at this session, the package seems unlikely to bear much resemblance to the Kennedy message.

Economically the claim that it would be a tremendous boost to business sounds more and more specious, especially since Mr. Kennedy adamantly sticks to his philosophy of planned deficits and calls them a piddling price to pay for prosperity; that way confidence does not lie.

Unlike the U.S. Government, we don't presume to know how consumers will react when they digest the import of these tax recommendations. But what they will digest is far from wholly palatable.

Out of the $11 billion cut individuals are supposed to get over 3 years, the message plans to recoup about one-fifth, among other things through drastic limits on deductions for home mortgage interest, contributions, medical expenses and local taxes. Only that portion of the total amount which exceeds 5 percent of the taxpayer's income could be deducted. And the present provisions modestly curtailing the double taxation of dividends would go out the window.

In other words, the individual's taxes are going up as well as down, and the net result depends on many factors, including steeply rising social security taxes, State and local taxes. Perhaps all this will send the consumer on a grand and glorious spending spree, but it is permissible to be slightly skeptical.

Much the same is true of corporate taxes. Reducing the top rate from 52 percent to 47 percent seems like a useful step, though grudging and incredibly belated. It doesn't look so great, however, when you consider that it is spread over years, and the only cut in 1963, affecting small business—is of minor economic significance.

Indeed, it is mildly ironic that the first tax event to occur is to boost the corporate rate beyond what it would otherwise be for the rest of this year. By existing law it would automatically drop to 47 percent in a few months, but the President insists it must be kept at 52 percent until next January.

Moreover, the net effect of the proposed speeding up of the timetable of corporate payments could be to increase taxes. In theory what is taken faster is given back; in practice a company may not get it back unless it liquidates or ceases to be profitable.

Then, when all the business reforms are thrown in, the claimed economic adrenalin doesn't feel particularly potent. Stricter treatment is to be accorded the oil-gas industry, stock options and stock dividends. Whatever else may be said of these recommendations on other grounds, they cannot be ranked as investment incentives, which is one of the chief ostensible purposes of the whole elaborate exercise.

As in anything so ramified, there are some improvements, though not of momentous economic potential. A somewhat more sensible approach is taken, for example, to the tax treatment of authors, professional athletes and others whose income is sporadic. Yet even these efforts at equity are offset by monumental new inequities, like taking about 1 million people off the tax rolls entirely.

And that is one of the basic troubles with this kind of reform. For many months the Nation has been alerted to expect a bold, dynamic new concept of taxes that would inject tremendous new zest in the economy, and in a famous phrase get America moving.

We have always believed the President is right in denouncing the present tax structure as an obsolete checkrein on the economy; moreover, that now is the time for radical correction.

But to be effective a tax program requires two things: Control and reduction of Federal expenditures, which weigh so heavily on the economy and are the inescapable other face of taxes; and a true simplification of the dangerously complex tax structure. All the experts know that the vast bulk of tax provisions could be swept away and rates drastically lowered to a flat percentage of all income, with no loss of revenue.

Instead of anything of that sort, we are being given much heavier spending, huge and chronic deficits, new tax inequities and confusions piled on red tape. The totality may please some people, but it certainly takes away a lot of the Nation's high tax hopes.

Kennedy Asks 36,500 More Jobs, Contradicts Pledge of Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Evening Star of January 21 gives an added insight into the President's budget message. In addition to economy, it seems as though we badly need a little more candor in Government.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article:

KENNEDY ASKS 36,500 MORE JOBS, CONTRADICTS PLEDGE OF ECONOMY

(By Joseph Young)

Members of Congress are still befuddled by the logic of President Kennedy's budget message which proclaims a vigorous Federal job economy program and winds up asking for 36,500 more Government jobs.

Mr. Kennedy was so proud of the administration's new manpower utilization program, which seeks to eliminate minimal Federal jobs as well as trim other jobs by demanding greater employee work productivity, that he devoted an entire section of his budget message to it.

Economy-minded Members of Congress sat beaming as they heard the President proclaim the administration's Government job economy program in his budget message.

This reporter, after the speech, ran into one of the economy-minded members of the House Appropriations Committee. With a happy smile, the Congressman asked us, "How many thousands of Government jobs will be eliminated by Mr. Kennedy's 1964 budget request?"

"Congressman," we said gently, "he is asking for 36,500 more Government jobs."

"But why all his talk of cutting job costs through greater efficiency and productivity?" the bewildered legislator asked.

"Well," we answered, "President Kennedy said there would have been an even greater increase in Government employment had not he initiated his economy program and kept the job requests down. The population keeps growing all the time, you know."

The legislator groaned, "But hasn't there already been an increase of 200,000 Federal workers since Mr. Kennedy took office?" he asked.

"Yes, but the President says it could have been worse," we reminded him.

"Well," he asked pleadingly, "hasn't the President proposed any job cuts anywhere in Government?"

"Of course," we replied. "He is asking an overall reduction of 30 jobs out of the Army's present 345,284 civilian employees. Army would then, only have 345,254 civilian employees."

"Well, that's something, I guess," the Congressman remarked bravely.

Knowing the Congressman's special antipathy regarding our foreign aid program, we sought to cheer him up even more. "The Agency for International Development is going to eliminate 48 whole jobs from 16,588 down to 16,540," we told our friend.

"Oh. This is an encouraging start," he exclaimed, his eyes misty with emotion. "And to think that only last year AID told us that not a single employee could be spared, and now we find that 48 of the 16,588 employees are expendable after all. We are making progress indeed."

As we prepared to take our leave, the Congressman wrung our hand and said in an emotion-filled voice, "And to think that only a few minutes ago I was so discouraged that I was thinking of giving up my appropriations post for a place on the District of Columbia Committee."

The Need To Encourage Our System of Government-Free Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced a bill, H.R. 49, to provide a tax credit for amounts paid on account of tuition, fees and similar educational expenses at a level above the 12th grade. I first introduced this bill in the 87th Congress—H.R. 12771, 87th Congress, 2d session. I am reintroducing it in the belief that its enactment is vital to the continuance and further expansion of our present educational system.

Under the bill a taxpayer would be permitted to reduce his taxes equal to 20 percent of the cost of such educational expenses for the taxpayer or his dependents.

A tax credit of 20 percent has the same effect as the deduction in full of educational expenses for a taxpayer being taxed at the rate of 20 percent. This is equivalent to allowing the full deduction of educational expenses for a taxpayer in the first tax bracket.

An outright deduction for educational expenses would be of no benefit to more than 37 million taxpayers, who elect either to use the tax tables or to take the statutory standard deduction instead of itemizing their deductions. By the use of a credit, however, such taxpayers will be in a position to avail themselves of the benefit of the educational tax credit in their returns and also use the tax tables or standard deduction in the computation of their tax liability.

Many of my colleagues in this body have likewise recognized the need to encourage further growth of our educational system through tax incentives to the individual. In the last Congress alone, there were approximately 100 bills introduced which would have provided some form of tax relief for educational expenses.

Our educational system, free from Government control, is one of our greatest national assets. It is essential to encourage the expansion of that system, and to make its benefits available to the greatest number of people. This bill will aid in the attainment of that objective.

The President's Budget and Our Global Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., who has recently returned from a global tour of Europe and Asia, has made some interesting comments in his recent newsletter regarding the President's budget recently submitted to the Congress, as it relates to defense and world expenditures. I believe many of our colleagues and others will be interested in reading Mr. Hearst's comments in this connection and I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his published newsletter be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, which follows:

When we were in Moscow this time, there wasn't the same anxiety to sound off in interviews that Khrushchev and his crew had shown on our previous trips. Frank Conniff, Bob Considine and I got the distinct impression that the Kremlin biggies hadn't yet figured out their new course and didn't want to give that fact away in talking.

But trust Nikita S. Khrushchev to put on a good act to cover any uncertainties. When he shook hands with U.S. officers over the Berlin wall on last Thursday, grinning and mugging for the crowd, he could almost make you believe he considered the wall the Red victory he pretends it is.

The fact is, and he knows it very well, the wall in Berlin represents to the world communism's inability to keep people happy. Nobody risks being shot to death trying to escape from a paradise.

As I have noted before, there is another important difference between family quarrels of free nations and those of the Communists. On our side there can be playing for selfish angles, but the overall idea is to come through eventually with agreement for the common good. On their side, it's a battle for supremacy that can reach a life-or-death climax.

In his special piece yesterday, however, Frank Conniff points out that our allies are led by men of such ability and determination that we cannot rule out the possibility of our being left behind within the Western family. That is, unless we are sure we, too, are on the move to destiny.

The point is valid and I think it especially deserves consideration when we debate the merits of President Kennedy's budget submitted Thursday. Getting on the move is its avowed purpose. The figures taken in themselves are awesome, to say the least. Look:

Ninety-eight billion eight hundred million dollars Federal spending ($55.4 billion for defense, $4.2 billion for space projects, $39.2 for the rest), biggest ever in peace or wartime.

Eleven billion nine hundred million dollars deficit calculated on expectation of $86.9 billion Federal revenue.

Thirteen billion five hundred million dollars tax cuts for individuals and business spread over 3 years, expected to be partly offset later by $3.5 billion in tax reforms.

By orthodox, traditional economics, that is a picture to turn hair white. But I, who am not a trained economist, see the question rather from the viewpoint of a newspaperman who came out of college in 1930 in the dark days of depression and watched the United States climb back to being the world's richest Nation.

In the 33 years since then, and I don't see how you can avoid describing that as our times, there have been only 5 years in which our Federal Government did not operate on a deficit. Three were under Democrat Harry Truman, two under Republican Dwight Eisenhower.

In other words, we've been living under deficit financing as a national economic system most of our lives just as surely as most of us have been living that way personally, where we call it installment buying. How many of us, for instance, buy our automobiles with spot cash?

The United States started with deficit financing. From 1789 to 1800, the record says, the Federal Government had an average annual intake of $5,717,000 and an average annual outgo of $5,776,000. We balanced better most of the time after that, but from the war entry years of 1917 on, the first time the budget went into 10 figures, and 1941, the first time it hit 11 digits, the budgets have borne closer resemblance to astronomical distances.

Let's not kid ourselves, in that period our country has surmounted two wars, one whopper of a depression and several smaller recessions, and all kinds of cold war milking of our substance. And we have seen it give proof through the night that our flag was still there, right on top of the world.

I can remember when my father, who took positions on the issues as he saw them and couldn't be properly taped as conservative or radical more than a few weeks running at a time, advocated printing $5 billion more money to help yank ourselves out of the depression of the 1930's.

If that isn't deficit financing, what is?

Anybody who'd call President Eisenhower a radical economist would be ridiculous, but Ike pulled us out of two recessions with heavy deficit spending, including the Nation's great roadbuilding program for which the Hearst papers can take a big bow.

The old saw that economics is not an exact science is as true as ever. Our world has expanded beyond the imagination of the men who projected orthodox economics long, long ago. Now more than ever we have to think in a global framework, because economic blocs make that imperative if we don't want to get hurt.

President Kennedy believes his pump-priming plans can spur the U.S. economy to growth that would bring the Government more tax dollars at cut rates within a few years—because there would be more business activity to tax.

You cannot prove that either way without trying it.

I'm for a bigger, more prosperous and more powerful United States, first, last and always, and I think that America's growth is the world's best bet. If, because of traditional shibboleths, we drag our feet in a fast-moving world, it could be the biggest mistake in our history.

Report on National Defense to the Board of World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of a report to the National Board of Administration of Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., prepared by Mr. Kai A. Koch, director of defense and secretary for the World War I veterans.

Mr. Koch is a long-time resident of Omaha, Nebr., and for many years has been active in positions of responsibility and leadership in veterans' organizations in our State.

I was pleased to see the strong stand taken by World War I veterans in regard to our national defense and foreign policy matters. I am very pleased to submit a copy of Mr. Koch's report to the national board:

REPORT ON NATIONAL DEFENSE TO THE BOARD OF WORLD WAR I VETERANS

As your national director of defense there are a number of things pertaining to our national security that I would like to bring to your attention and for your consideration and possible action and I am sure many of these items are of interest to all American citizens and particular veterans.

At the national convention held in Buffalo, N.Y., there were two resolutions passed, one commending President John F. Kennedy for the the firm stand he took pertaining to the Cuban situation, and the second one that the Universal Military Training and Service Act be extended in its present form until June 30, 1967.

While we have been informed that the missiles have been removed from Cuba we are of the opinion that we should insist that an on-site inspection by a neutral party be made to determine that all missiles have been removed, also that the 15,000 to 17,000 Russians soldiers now stationed in Cuba be sent back to Russia as they pose a threat to our ecurity. Furthermore, while there has

been a lot of agitation about the Cuban prisoners being released and sent to the United States, we fail to see much about the 21 or 23 American prisoners being held there and we are of the opinion that they should have been released before any of the Cubans and we should ask our Government to take action with regards to these prisoners.

We advocate that there will be no appeasement in either Cuba or Berlin including the associated issues of ground and air access by the United States and our allies to Berlin.

We must realize the strategic value of the naval base in Cuba and the need of it in our defense of the Caribbean Sea, the Panama Canal, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic coast of the United States against the Russian submarines operating in these waters.

We should insist on adherence to the Monroe Doctrine as it would tend to keep the Communists out of the Western Hemisphere and keep the independence and freedom of the Americas protected, which also means that the Red aggression in Cuba must be eliminated and Cuba returned to the community of free nations.

That Red China will not be allowed to become a member of the United Nations as this would be a repudiation of a major feature in the U.S. policy, and if such an act should come about the United States should withdraw from the United Nations.

We should balance, modernize, and stabilize our Armed Forces which calls for increased strength, properly balanced in every category—land, sea, and air.

We should increase our Navy's antisubmarine program, keeping in mind that Russia has nearly 500 submarines, also remembering the Germans had only 57 submarines in the Atlantic during World War II and nearly won the battle of the North Atlantic Ocean.

A positive civil defense program should be established.

We should support the Joint Chiefs of Staff system as this is the most efficient method for overall military planning.

After spending millions of dollars perfecting the Skybolt missile and succeeding with the sixth trial, our Government wants to scrap this missile due to the fact that it takes super aircrafts to carry them to the target, a procedure that General LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, has advocated for some time; and as per the newspapers there is a move afoot to remove him as Chief of Staff due to his activities in this matter. We are of the opinion that we should continue to manufacture the Skybolt, also retain General LeMay as Air Force Chief of Staff.

We are of the opinion that everyone of the World War I veterans is conscious of the fact that our country is in peril if we do not stop this communistic menace and all red-blooded and patriotic Americans should rally to the aid of our country even to the extent of war.

Again may we offer the above mentioned items for your consideration.

KAI A. KOCH,
Director, National Defense and Security, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.
OMAHA, NEBR.

Warning on Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Stevens Point Daily Journal of Stevens Point, Wis., on January 21, 1963, carried a very interesting editorial based on the warning of the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. The editorial is as follows:

WARNING ON DEFICIT

As Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, Jr., is closely attuned to matters affecting world currency transactions. He knows the relative strength of the dollar in comparison with other currencies.

Mr. Martin, in a speech to the American Finance Association and the American Economic Association, cited that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was disappointing in 1962. Instead of the anticipated deficit of $1.5 billion, he said, the final tally will probably show the United States well over $2 billion in the red for last year.

Adding such a large deficit in a year which began with the United States owing more gold to foreign creditors than it possessed, weakens the dollar's standing at home and abroad. Should gold demands by creditors reduce U.S. gold stocks below the Federal Reserve certificate requirement, the dollar almost certainly would encounter devaluation pressures. Only a few billions in gold separate the United States from this prospect.

"Whatever other consequences would follow from a devaluation of the dollar," Mr. Martin warned, "I am convinced that it would immediately spell the end of the dollar as an international currency and the beginning of a retreat from the present world role of the United States that would produce far-reaching political as well as economic effects."

It is not a cheering prospect, but Mr. Martin's warning is likely to be heard again and again throughout this session of Congress. And it should be heeded, especially when money bills affecting U.S. balance of payments come before it.

Anti-Semitism in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union proclaims itself as the champion of minority rights. Premier Khrushchev boasts that the Soviet Constitution guarantees individual and group liberties. These self-serving declarations are indeed hollow when viewed against the background of anti-Semitism in Russia today. The Soviets have gone beyond the limits of an anti-religious campaign in their treatment of Jews within their own borders. Their tactics have entered into the realm of racism. The anti-Semitic campaign in the U.S.S.R. today is reminiscent of the dark, despotic days of Stalin and Hitler.

The story of discrimination against the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union provides a somber lesson for all peoples of the free world. The emerging nations of Asia and Africa should note the facility with which the Communists resort to racism in pursuit of their goals.

A group of religious leaders of all faiths have made a direct protest to Chairman Khrushchev. Their cablegram was published as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times, the Providence Journal, the Washington Post, and the Jersey Journal. This message was echoed editorially in newspapers throughout the Nation. The injustices it chronicles merit reading by all. I include this message as part of my remarks:

PREMIER NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
The Kremlin, U.S.S.R.:

The Soviet Union declares it is a champion of human dignity and equality. No nation has been more persevering in pronouncing itself a defender of minority rights.

Soviet spokesmen cite your country's constitution, wherein equality of citizens is guaranteed, as proof that religious discrimination is not countenanced in the U.S.S.R. You yourself have said: "The question of a man's religion is not asked in our country. It is a matter for the conscience of the person concerned. We look upon a person as a person."

But what are the facts?

The Soviet Government's persistent enmity to religion is a matter of historical record. While most faiths are permitted bare necessities, such as requisites for worship, sacred literature, theological seminaries and central bodies, their activities are sternly circumscribed. Devout citizens suffer harassment. Nowhere, not even within the walls of church or mosque, is religion secure from surveillance. This is a fact of Soviet life.

It is also a fact that within the narrow framework of permissible religious practice, discrimination is enforced. Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union, numbering close to 3 million, are denied minimal rights conceded to adherents of other creeds.

Hard pressed as they are by blanket restraints, none of the other major religions of the Soviet people, neither the Orthodox, Armenian or Protestant Churches, neither Buddhism nor Islam, have been subjected to the extraordinary disabilities inflicted on Judaism and its followers.

Legally constituted Jewish congregations are isolated from one another. They are forbidden to organize a central body. They are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries. Their leaders are singled out for abuse.

Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for the alleged crime of meeting with foreign visitors to their synagogues.

Scores of synagogues have been closed by the state. The few that remain are served by rabbis who were ordained more than 40 years ago. For more than a generation, Jewish theological seminaries have been banned, except for a lone yeshiva in Moscow, opened in 1956. Its enrollment, never permitted to exceed 20, was reduced to 4 in April 1962.

No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years. No articles for Jewish ritual can be produced. This year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential to observance of the Passover, was banned. The prayers of Judaism are said in Hebrew, yet the teaching of that language is prohibited.

Although half a million Jews declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the Soviet census of 1959, their hundreds of schools, their once-flourishing theaters, have been stamped out. Much smaller ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books, and newspapers in their own languages.

These conditions conjure up memories of the anti-Semitic Stalin regime, which you yourself have denounced.

According to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the con-

stitutions of enlightened countries, freedom of conscience and expression is vested unconditionally in every human being.

Unless the Soviet Government conforms its behavior to this universal standard and to its own professed principles, it forfeits the confidence of all peoples.

When will synagogues and Jewish seminaries be reestablished, imprisoned synagogue leaders set free, the ban on unleavened bread rescinded, ritual articles and Jewish prayerbooks made available?

When will the Yiddish-language institutions that sustained Soviet Jewish culture and education be restored?

When will Jewish congregations, like those of other religions, be enabled to form a central body, to join in fellowship for the continuity of their faith?

The world awaits your response.

By deeds alone, can your Government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man.

Minneapolis-St. Paul Area Helps Earthquake Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, last fall the people of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area performed a remarkable act in providing assistance to victims of the major earthquake in Iran. The project is described in the following article from the People to People News of October 1962:

SEND 18,500 BLANKETS TO IRANIAN VICTIMS

A thing called compassion stirred residents of Minneapolis-St. Paul to community action resulting in the collection and shipment of 18,500 blankets to Iranian earthquake victims who are facing winter with no shelter.

It began when a group of Minneapolis citizens—members of people to people—resolved to help Iranian students at the University of Minnesota and at Macalester College, St. Paul, to send aid to their anguished countrymen.

"What shall we do to help?" they asked.

Mrs. Gertrude Swanson, chairman of the Minneapolis People-to-People Committee, called Elmer "Tweet" Tvetene, manager of Pan American Airways in the Twin Cities for advice.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS HELPS

"I'll call you back in 15 minutes," he told Mrs. Swanson. He did and informed her an entire cargo plane would be available in 1 week at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport bound for Teheran. "Make up your minds what you want to put on the plane," he said.

The people-to-people committee continued to meet for most of that night. They called the Iranian Embassy in Washington and learned that blankets would be the most helpful single item that could be sent on the plane. Thousands were needed.

The committee decided to invite St. Paul and suburban residents to participate in the blankets-for-Iran project.

TWO MAYORS' SUPPORT

Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis and Mayor George Vavaoulis of St. Paul issued proclamations on the state of emergency in Iranian earthquake disaster areas and urged Twin Cities residents to show friendship by donating blankets.

Fire stations were designated as collection depots throughout the area. Firemen enthusiastically participated in the people-to-people effort by folding, sorting, counting, and bundling the blankets as they were brought in by residents of all races, religions, and social groups.

A goal of 10,000 blankets was set. The first 2 days brought in a disappointingly small number of blankets.

Then area radio, television, and the press took up the cause and the blankets poured in. A week later, when the plane was ready to leave, nearly twice as many blankets as the cargo plane could hold had been baled at the old air terminal building. James Grant of WTCN-TV spent many hours writing press releases for the project, using air time to tell residents of the Twin Cities how they could help.

American agencies, such as CARE, are administering distribution of the blankets to the needy in Iranian disaster areas.

A telegram expressing the deep appreciation of the Iranian people was sent to mayors of St. Paul and Minneapolis by Hossein Ghods Nakhai, Ambassador of Iran to the United States.

Nuclear-Age School—New Mexico Students Pursue Knowledge Underground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I include an article by David Nevin which appeared in the January 26, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post referring to the undeground elementary school in Artesia, N. Mex. Mr. Vernon Mills, superintendent of the Artesia school district, is to be commended for his foresightedness in initiating the construction of this nuclear-age school. Rosewell architect, Standhardt, demonstrated imagination and ingenuity in his design of this unique structure which has brought high praise from architects and school officials the world over. The construction of this underground school was made possible through the efforts of the city of Artesia together with the Office of Civil Defense. This school was dedicated in June 1962 by the Honorable Steuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NUCLEAR-AGE SCHOOL—NEW MEXICO STUDENTS PURSUE KNOWLEDGE UNDERGROUND

Betsy Anne Hart, a fourth-grader in Artesia, N. Mex., learned something new at school the other day. "Mother," she burst out when she got home, "did you know there is a room for dead people at our school?"

Having a morgue on the premises is just one of the things that makes Betsy Anne's school unusual. For Abo Public Elementary School, named for a nearby oil formation, is the only school in the Nation which lies entirely underground, and which doubles as a fully equipped fallout shelter.

Abo opened for the first time last fall, with some 460 pupils. The experiment has attracted considerable interest among both schoolmen and civil defense officials around the country. Some educators have condemned the whole idea out of hand. Others haev adopted a wait-and-see attitude. They feel that, taken simply as a teaching plant, Abo deserves high marks for efficiency and interior beauty. But, they wonder, can the school be taken that simply?

From aboveground all that shows of the school is a huge concrete slab, which serves as a playground for the children who go to school beneath it, and the covered walkways which connect three block structures housing the stairwells. These entrances are narrow, dimly lit and painted a dark red. Somehow they seem vaguely threatening.

Inside, however, the building looks like a school, and an attractive school, at that. The central corridor is 14 feet wide, wider than usual, to prevent claustrophobia, and the tiled floors and walls are green balanced with a warmer rose. The fluorescent lighting has a daylight quality. One has no sense of being in a basement or even, save for the lack of windows, of being underground. Automatic air conditioning keeps the temperature at 72° and the humidity at 50 percent. The 18 classrooms, each approximately 28 feet square, are superbly equipped. An air of quiet industry pervades the building, due partly to the insulation of acoustical plaster on the inside and solid earth on the outside, and partly to the somewhat sobering effect the school appears to have on its pupils. On the whole, Abo seems a remarkably pleasant place in which to tackle the three R's.

NUCLEAR SCHOOL

But this is not only a school, it is also a carefully planned fallout shelter, and the children are well aware of the fact. Bedding and survival food for 2 weeks are stored in spare rooms. Two deep wells can supply safe water. There are air filters, an emergency power system, and decontamination showers. If an attack should come during school hours, the school would shelter its own students and those from nearby schools. At any other time, it would accommodate the first 2,160 people to reach it. Then, 1,800-pound steel doors at each entrance would be bolted shut, barring those who came late, the parents, perhaps, of the children inside. Some time this year 2,000 Artesians will spend a night at Abo to test its shelter facilities.

This dual-purpose concept of school construction sprang directly from Artesia's experience with two windowless, but aboveground, schools built in 1959. With its near-desert climate, Artesia switched to schools with solid walls when it found that the rapid heat transference in its old glass-walled buildings made economical air conditioning impossible.

These buildings, designed by architect Frank Standhardt of Roswell, N. Mex., were among the first windowless schools in the Nation. Since then the idea has spread as far as California and Florida. But meanwhile, back in Artesia, the board's thinking had gone a step further.

AN AF BASE IS NEARBY

It had discovered that, with the cold war periodically threatening to turn hot, and with both an important Air Force base and the White Sands Proving Ground uncomfortably nearby, there was not a single building in town which could serve as a public fallout shelter. Since it felt responsible for the safety of its students—and, less directly, for the public in general—the board reasoned: Why not build another windowless school, and this time put it underground?

Architect Standhardt accordingly designed a subterranean structure with 12-inch concrete walls and an overhead slab of 21-inch

reinforced concrete which could resist a 20-megaton blast at 10 miles. His plans called for a building with classrooms along the four outside walls, then the hall, then an inner block of classrooms. The voters of Artesia approved the project by passing a bond issue, and the school was built—at a cost of $469,847, of which $134,067 went for putting it underground. The Federal Government readily paid the latter sum, since it planned to use Abo as a pilot project for a study of the shelter-school concept.

At this early date only a preliminary report is possible. The indications, however, are hopeful. The teachers like the building because they find it more comfortable than most other schools and also because they believe that the students' performance is better. Mrs. Gertrude McCaw, the most experienced teacher there, said, "They simply are less rambunctious. You spend more time teaching and less time disciplining." She believes the quiet and the lack of windows, with their distractions, are responsible, and the other teachers agree.

The children say they like the school too. Artesia can be brutally hot, and they enjoy the air conditioning. Russ Baldwin, a fourth grader with a long face that breaks into a sudden, winning smile, explained, "You get your brain cooled off down here. It runs better when it's cool."

They think their school is pretty and say they learn a lot there. Surprisingly, several volunteered the information that its lack of windows helps keep them from getting into trouble with their teachers. But Andy Ashton, fifth grader, probably summed it up best when he said, "I like it because we go to the only underground school in the world." He meant, of course, that he liked the attention, the publicity, the sense of being different and therefore, somehow, superior.

Sociologists recognize that people who take part in novel experiments often enjoy the experience and are stimulated to do better work than usual. This stimulation, however, is only temporary, and one suspects that in the long run the students at Abo will like their school no more and will learn no more than students at schools aboveground.

Most outsiders' reaction to Abo is twofold. First, they wonder if it isn't cruel to deprive a child of the sight of the outdoors. Second, and even more important, they wonder if sending him underground, where he can't help being reminded daily of possible nuclear horrors, won't necessarily implant in him a fear psychology, an unhealthy preoccupation with safety and protection.

The success of aboveground windowless schools and the easy adjustment of the children to life without windows tend to answer the first objection, but the second cannot be set aside so easily. The president of the Artesia board, however, tries hard. She is Mrs. C. P. Bunch, a peppery little woman with graying hair. "I'm tired of hearing about the horrors of going underground," she snaps. "This is much overplayed. I've lived in large cities, no one says anything there about becoming moles when they ride the subways. No one says, 'I'm going underground to shop,' but I never met a woman who wouldn't go into a basement for a bargain."

Supt. Vernon Mills, a short, portly, soft-spoken man, explains more mildly, "What matters is the approach. This is a school which could serve as a shelter, not a shelter that doubles as a school."

Nevertheless, some of the youngsters do seem deeply affected by their school's second purpose. All are aware of it and of the implications of nuclear weapons and fallout. When asked, they say this does not disturb them but in several roundtable discussions, interesting remarks cropped up.

Martha Terpening, a six-grader with a classically beautiful face, said softly, "What I'm afraid of is that my mother is a teacher and she would be safe, but my daddy works at the post office and he wouldn't have any place to go." Russ Baldwin said, "You think a lot about the danger while you're here. Sometimes I have the feeling that fallout is coming now, that it is out there now, and then I go out and it isn't." Rusty Heckel, aged 9, who worries about his parents, said, "Being underground gives you a funny feeling, but you know you're safe."

Yet even while blithely making remarks that sounded dire indeed to the adult mind, the children seemed happy. It was Martha Terpening who, when asked if the stairs leading down into the ground upset her, replied, "It makes my legs tired, but my mother says it develops them, so I don't mind."

Dr. George Collins, chief of elementary and secondary education for the Office of Education in Washington, believes that chronic worry is symptomatic of our times. He finds that children in other schools in other cities also worry about the bomb and the future.

PARENTS ARE NOT ALARMED

The parents of Abo pupils do not seem to think their children are being damaged. Mrs. Preston Greve, blond mother of a fifth grader, spoke for the majority. "Well, I don't think that war will come, but if it does, I guess a fallout shelter is a good place to be."

Criticism of the school-shelter concept comes mainly from observers outside Artesia. At its most recent annual meeting, the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction said flatly that "shelter provisions are not compatible with educational requirements." The State of California has taken a vigorous stand against such dual-purpose buildings. For California, at least, Charles Gibson, chief of school planning, finds the expenditure of any educational funds for fallout protection ridiculous. The two ends, he insists, simply don't fit.

The Artesia School Board has encountered some local opposition, too. Dr. Gerald Slusser, an Artesia surgeon whose child does not go to Abo, asks rhetorically, "Is driving our children underground to become a way of life? Is this the future we give them?" And Bill Hart, Betsy Anne's father and the vice president of a bank, is disturbed to realize that his young son probably faces 9 school years underground, for a new junior high school with many of its classrooms belowground, facilities like the gymnasium will go aboveground, will be built soon.

But the board is inclined to discount this sort of criticism. The bond issue for the new junior high passed by a margin of 2 to 1, and the board not unreasonably regards this as an indication of local approval for its actions. Now that support from those who know Abo best has brought the underground school concept past the pilot stage, other school districts will surely study the idea with heightened interest. And in view of the prospect for continuing international tension, the chances are good that parents in communities far from Artesia will be asked, one of these days, to decide whether they, too, want their children to go to school underground.

What Price Slavery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier day this question was put to a few Americans and they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor for individual freedom, individual privilege, and liberty.

Today the question is in reverse. Americans are not being asked what price they are willing to pay for liberty but what price they are willing to accept for the liberty that has been theirs.

The old adage has it that "every man has his price"—the planners are simply determining what that price is. They are willing to pay it, particularly so long as it is your money they use to pay your price.

The American farmer was the first to be bought off. Agricultural tariffs were reduced or wiped out. As agricultural imports poured across our border and onto our tables and upon our backs the farmer was required to take his land out of production to make room for these imports. Of course, he was paid by the Government to remove his acres from production.

In January 1963, over 30 million pounds of dressed beef, lamb, and mutton were imported from New Zealand and Australia alone. It is difficult to determine the American acreages these shipments supplanted, but with the imports of beef alone in 1962, over 2½ million head of 1,000-pound beef supplanted the production of more than 45 million American acres.

The planners, of course, paid the farmer a certain stipend for each acre they forced him to take out of production to make room for these imports. The Department of Agriculture "leaked" their plan in December 1961 to subsidize and remove 2 million farmers from the land—that subsidy is the price these farmers must accept for the sale of their freedom.

Those planners who would force every American to sell his freedom were able to ram through Congress last session a bill known as the Trade Expansion Act which was intended to do to industry and labor what they have already done to the farmer and forced him to accept, even if against his will, a price for his freedom.

Already the mines of America are coming in for payment under this act for the business that is taken from them by low tariffs and foreign mineral imports, forcing the mines of America to sell their freedom for a price.

Factories are reducing output, or closing, and accepting a subsidy price in exchange for their freedom to compete. Labor, idled by imports, is seeking its subsidy—the price it is receiving for its freedom.

Independent businessmen in almost every community across the Nation are making plans to come to Washington for free money for community development. They, of course, must agree to comply in order to get it.

WHAT PRICE SLAVERY?

Three interesting letters came to my desk in the morning mail. One enclosed an editorial from the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak.; the second was the reprint of a broadcast from the public relations division of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., and the third was a letter

enclosing an editorial from the Custer (S. Dak.) Weekly.

I have asked permission to reprint each because of the story the three tell. The first outlines the Socialist Manifesto, as set forth by former Congressman Samuel Pettengill, the second urges the wonders of farming under "regulated abundance through intelligent Government programs," and the third depicts "intelligent Government programs" in operation; its title is "The King Can Do No Wrong."

With a view of presenting not where we are going, but where we are, I present one morning's mail:

[From the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak.]

DOWN THE ROAD

The Constitution of the United States does not guarantee that America will remain a republic forever. It does guarantee the American people the right to change the form of government to whatever a two-thirds majority of any generation may desire it to be.

Back in 1944, Congressman Samuel Pettengill described the unconstitutional methods used by socialists to destroy free government. He called it the 12 points of the Socialist Manifesto. We believe it will be good for all Americans to review his words:

"The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind, there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.

"The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.

"The centralized government, while appearing in form to represent the people, must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.

"Constitutional guarantees must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as outmoded and as obstructions to progress.

"Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined.

"The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

"Economically, the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which, under one pretext or another, they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the government that controls him. Capital and credit is thus completely within the control of government.

"A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire nation.

"A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive, so that the public may not begin to rely upon its own resources.

"Government bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under the authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible. It is a government of men, and not of laws.

"The education of the youth of the nation is taken under control to the end that all may, at an early age, be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

"To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing, there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee, and to vilify those who dare to raise a voice in dissent."

How far down the road of this Socialist Manifesto has America gone?

BROADCAST BY FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION

Did you ever think very seriously about what is going to happen in the future on your farm? Farmers are the people most concerned so they hadn't ought to lag behind in looking ahead.

The other day we told you about a research groups set up by businessmen and education leaders to dig into the whole problem of the economy of the region. It's called the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council and one of its latest studies does some farm prognosticating way ahead in 1975.

Are you going to be rich or poor, worse off or better off? Who's going to be farming and who isn't in 1975? The report of this research group points out what most everyone already knows—farms are getting bigger and farmers fewer. Also it says that farm income depends on national policies which is another way of saying what we've always said, that farm prices are made in Washington.

But let's get down to some specifics about 1975 and, as the report says, that's of special concern to young fellows 20 years and under who are on their dad's farms today. Less than 15 percent of them are likely to find positions as farm operators of adequate-sized units in the words of the report. So now is the time to educate many of them for other jobs, maybe in towns and cities or in the rural areas connected with agriculture. Does that make good sense to you?

What's going to happen to the land itself? The businessmen and educators seem to agree here with progressive farmers. It believes that Government programs ought to aim at regrassing big acreages. That ties in with more livestock production. Also a little more growing of specialty crops, like safflower, might fit in. Uncle Sam, says the report, should help get some of the less desirable land into trees for industry and recreation. And by 1975 it recommends a lot of land should just be idled under Government programs. Again, do you agree?

Farmers will continue to feed the Nation and probably a good piece of the world, of course. They'll produce more per acre, so the Upper Midwest Research and Development group sees a need to reduce crop acres even more by 1975. It believes that acreages of wheat, corn, soybeans, oats, barley, and flaxseed should be reduced by almost 16 percent and we'll still have abundance. But (and this is a point that the businessmen and educators emphasize) it has to be regulated abundance. The report speaks of "coordinated effort at local, State, and National levels." In other words, farm programs to avoid unmanageable surpluses and severely depressed farm prices and incomes.

You might wonder why businessmen and college people have a deep concern about the welfare of farm people as long as they have plenty to eat. They answer that question when they point out that "agriculture is the key factor in this region's economic future."

So again, even looking to 1975, we see that regulated abundance through intelligent Government programs is the course most people are thinking about. That makes it easier to understand the importance of the wheat vote coming up this spring.

[From the Custer (S. Dak.) weekly]

THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG

On various occasions, particularly when editorials have pointed up the present problems in the lumbering industry, the Custer Weekly has been accused of being "anti-Forest Service." This is not the case—we are in conflict with various Forest Service policies, but not with the service as a whole.

Howard Lee, supervisor of the Black Hills National Forest, recently pointed out that a community benefits from the spending of Forest Service personnel who live there. This is a factor of which Custerites have long been aware, though when controversies and tempers flare, it is one we sometimes are inclined to forget, and Mr. Lee's point is well taken.

We would even go a step farther than the forest supervisor and add that economic benefits are not the only ones reaped when Forest Service people live in a community. Many of these families have wide interests and excellent educations and share them to enrich the community socially and culturally. We have noticed, too, that many Forest Service people seem to go out of their way to participate in civic betterment. Although we're not completely sure, we suspect this is a part of Forest Service policy—if so it is one with which we are completely in accord.

The Forest Service has been with the Custer community for a long, long time. During this period, many lasting friendships have been formed, local people have found employment within the Forest Service and Forest Service wives have not infrequently worked in local businesses. Most of us realize the community is dependent upon this Government agency to a degree that it would be very difficult to prosper without it.

The problem here is that the community is also dependent upon the lumbering and ranching industries which are frequently at odds with Forest Service rulings, many of which seem reasonable when made at a higher level, but seem neither reasonable nor fair when applied to local situations.

We take issue with the apparent policy of the Forest Service to grow ever bigger and more powerful—insofar as land, people, and money are concerned. The Custer Weekly firmly believes in free, private enterprise, feeling that the arm of Federal Government should reach into a problem only when private enterprise has failed or refused to cope with an urgent situation—We grant here that men—and agencies—do not always agree on what is urgent and what is not.

The Forest Service, well aware of the important part tourism plays in many forest regions, points with pride to the recreational facilities which it has developed. Who can say this would not have been done by private enterprise—after all, one doesn't just go into a national forest and start developing.

There was a time when lumbermen went into a virgin forest and laid it waste with never a thought for the morrow; there was a time when few ranchers knew or cared they were overgrazing. Though both elements are better informed today, it was probably vital to conservation that the early day Forest Service intervened. But today, it many times seems just too much of a good thing.

It particularly becomes "too much" when an individual, meeting up with a regulation which works a hardship asks for a reprieve and is confronted with what seems to be an attitude of unyielding superiority. The Magna Carta, limiting the powers of the king, and laying down as a principle that justice may not be denied or delayed, was signed in England 747 years ago. American government was based in part upon this important document which freed the common people from complete royal dictate. It is a sorry situation when an agency of that same American Government appears to operate under the premise, "The king can do no wrong."

Monroe Sweetland—A Memorable Name in Oregon Politics, Journalism, and Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the current newspaper strike in New York has focused attention on the importance of the daily newspaper. In my home State of Oregon there is a small weekly newspaper which has had a salutary influence in the community under the able editor-ownership of Mr. Monroe Sweetland. Last fall Monroe Sweetland, long active in Oregon politics and journalism, sold the Milwaukie Review as Mr. Sweetland had accepted a position as executive vice president of the Indonesian-American Society of the United States.

Mr. Sweetland is a Democrat and has served his party as a member of the legislature and as national committeeman. A tribute is paid to him by another well-known Oregon publication, the Oregon Voter, which is more inclined to present the Republican view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD that tribute from the Oregon Voter of September 29, 1962:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPER SALE—RECALLS SWEETLAND INFLUENCE IN MILWAUKEE'S POLITICAL HISTORY

Sale of the Milwaukie Review and the North Clackamas Shopper by State Senator and Mrs. Monroe Sweetland to a corporation owned by Dale Johnson and Robert G. Swan, both Oregon newsmen, recalls the Sweetland influence as a Democratic newspaper editor during the two decades in which he was at the helm of several Oregon weekly newspapers. Early in the fourties he purchased the Molalla Pioneer which he sold in 1947, then buying two struggling publications at Newport from which he created the Newport News, which he sold in the early fifties, buying the Milwaukee Review in 1954. In the meantime, Senator Sweetland had acquired the Oregon Democrat, which he operated for 9 years, and which succumbed shortly after he disposed of it several years ago.

Wherever Senator Sweetland has taken over a newspaper his enterprise as an editor and publisher has been a factor in increasing the Democratic registration in the area; the newspapers showed improvement in appearance, advertising, and news content, and especially in sharp political news and comment. During this period Mr. Sweetland's influence in the Democratic Party steadily increased and he rose, not only in party leadership in Oregon, but maintained active touch with the party's national leaders. To what extent the Democratic Party was a factor in his acquiring the several newspapers is not known to us, but in each case he took over weekly papers more or less Republican in their political philosophy, converted them into aggressive and sometimes militant Democratic newspapers with results that were soon evident.

Now, for the first time in 20 years, the Sweetlands have no newspaper property in Oregon. Senator Sweetland a year ago became executive vice president of the Indonesian-American Society of the United States and has spent little time in Oregon. The Sweetlands however retain their home on McLoughlin Boulevard in Milwaukie, and there has been no announcement that the corporation he headed, Milwaukie Publishers & Printers, Inc., will be dissolved or continued.

The sale to the new corporation brings Dale Johnson, a former Oregon (Portland), and Idaho (Boise), newspaperman, and more recently an executive in the investment firm of Atkinson & Co., in as editor of the Milwaukie Review, but Stan Federman who has been editor during the Sweetlands' absence remains with the newspaper. The sale will have some impact on the local community as the new owners have announced the paper will be printed offset at a plant, probably in Hillsboro, removing some of the mechanical operations from Milwaukie. Four printers and a pressman have been notified they will no longer be needed. The Sweetlands had a contract with the Tyopgraphical Union due to expire in July 1963.

Since 1952 Mr. Sweetland has been in the Oregon Legislature, the first Democrat elected to the house from Clackamas County in 14 years, and when he went to the senate in 1954 the first Democrat from his district in 20 years. He was reelected to the senate in 1958 and did not seek reelection this year, indicating he will continue in his Far East educational work. The Indonesian Society office is at 218 North Canon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

The Milwaukie Review was established April 14, 1921, and its first editor and publisher was George A. McArthur, at the time a 50-year veteran among Oregon printers, who was also one of the printers who assisted Tom Dillon and M. H. Vorhees when they started the East Side News in Portland. The latest sale of the Milwaukie Review recalls, also, that on November 21, 1850, Lot Whitcomb, founder of Milwaukie, then a bitter rival of Portland, started the Western Star, dedicated to making Milwaukie the metropolis of Oregon, giving it 2 weeks seniority over the Weekly Oregonian in Portland. The Star carried under its first masthead this patriotic boast:

"As far as breeze can bear or billows foam, survey our empire and behold our home."

Milwaukie was a town of 500, a year old, about the size of Portland, but his paper's financial losses caused Lot Whitcomb to lose the paper to his unpaid printers, who on June 5, 1851, overnight, moved the plant to Portland as the Weekly Times, from which were graduated some men destined to become notable in the history of Oregon politics, before the Times died in 1864. The colorful newspaper history of Clackamas County, and the Milwaukie community in particular, makes fine reading in George Turnbull's "History of Oregon Newspapers" and Senator Sweetland's sale led us to his pages. Politics has almost always had a place in Milwaukie's newspaper history.

Her Concern Is Progress in the "People" Area of AID

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his state of the Union message did an admirable job of detailing the compelling reasons for the continuance of our mutual security program. Our aid program has been a major bulwark against the threat of Sino-Soviet imperialism. As the President stated so well:

> If these programs were ever to be ended, our failures in a dozen countries would be sudden and certain.

I am pleased that President Kennedy's eloquent words have gone out to the Nation. When Americans have realized that the sacrifices they are making contribute to our peace and security, they have been unfailingly willing to bear the burdens required.

Another fine contribution to public understanding of the importance of the mutual security program to the United States is contained in a recent Washington Post article by Sue Cronk. In her article Sue Cronk reports on an excellent speech given by Assistant Secretary of State Leona Baumgartner before the Woman's National Democratic Club.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the Washington Post article, headed "Her Concern Is Progress in the 'People' Area of AID," published January 11, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

DR. BAUMGARTNER OUTLINES FOREIGN AID PROGRAM: HER CONCERN IS PROGRESS IN THE "PEOPLE" AREA OF AID

(By Sue Cronk)

Lack of public understanding and support of America's foreign aid program is one of the chief problems faced by the Agency for International Development, one of its assistant administrators said yesterday.

"I've never known a program so misunderstood by so many and so unknown by so many more," Assistant Secretary of State Leona Baumgartner told the Woman's National Democratic Club.

She noted that AID, which has changed its name and its administrator with dizzying rapidity in recent years, seems "like a whole lot of different pieces (of various foreign aid programs) all glued together."

Nevertheless, its purpose has always been the same: "to help produce the kind of political and economic development in the world in which the United States can best pursue its own way of life."

Foreign aid isn't something invented since World War II to plague American taxpayers, Dr. Baumgartner said. "We've been in this business a long time, ever since Congress voted $50,000 for aid to Venezuela during the War of 1812."

Nor is Uncle Sam the world's only sugar daddy in the field of foreign aid. "Nine other countries also are in the foreign-aid business, some of them countries we helped to get back on their feet with the Marshall plan," she said. "And although we contribute 57 percent of the total foreign aid, we spend smaller percentage of our gross national income on it than they do."

Dr. Baumgartner is no starry-eyed dogooder in the AID job she accepted last November 1. "In all honesty," she admitted, "we respond to a lot of political pressures, both from foreign countries and in our own country. We do a tremendous lot of hand holding with green ministers of health and education in developing countries. At times our short-range foreign policy goal may be to shore up the internal stability of another government which may not be a very good one, but the only one available."

However, she said, the important facet of American foreign aid is "its long-range goal, which boils down to transferring what we know in a modern industrial country to developing countries.

"We've built a tremendous number of things—roads, dams, airfields, factories, hospitals, schools. We've increased crop yields. We've promoted land reform, tax reform, and self-help community development. We've trained teachers, doctors, technicians, and government workers. We've steadily eliminated malaria."

As head of the newly created AID Office of Human Resources and Social Development, Dr. Baumgartner is particularly concerned with the human element of the foreign aid program.

"People who are hungry and sick, who are without shelter and have few skills, are not the people who are going to build a stable government," she said. "The human side cannot be ignored."

Unfortunately, she noted, progress in the people area of the foreign aid program is not as readily noticeable or impressive as "a new dam or silo which anybody can see. The process of educating people, of wiping out disease," is not so tangible.

Yet she pointed with pride to several such AID achievements:

In 1954, 100 percent of the residents of an Asian village had malaria. They were taught to spray their homes for the disease and five years later the number of malaria victims had dropped to one-tenth of 1 percent.

In the Turkish Army, 175,000 of the conscripts were illiterate. The soldiers were taught to read and write and 3,000 of them have been trained as teachers.

In Guatemala, village residents too poor to pay for the meals provided by Food for Peace agreed to work for them instead and have built schools and roads.

Not all of our foreign-aid projects have turned out so well, Dr. Baumgartner admitted. "We assume our scientific and technological methods will work anywhere, and they don't always. Some need a great deal of adaptation." Furthermore, AID is hampered by "so little continuity in either leadership or in the funds voted for it by Congress."

But all in all, she said, "our programs have achieved a remarkable degree of success. And the success of our efforts is intimately related to our own future."

Department of Agriculture Follows Recommendation of House Small Business Committee in Ordering an Investigation of the Domestic Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to note in the press, the Washington Post, under the byline of the Associated Press, dated January 25, 1963, that the Agriculture Department is to launch a broad-scale investigation of pricing and other trade practices in poultry marketing.

A special subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee held extensive hearings during the 87th Congress concerning trade practices relating to processors and the broiler aspect of the poultry industry. This subcommittee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, held hearings on this subject in Washington, D.C., and at the express request of Members of Congress held hearings in Missouri and Indiana.

The special subcommittee submitted a report on these hearings—House Report No. 2566—which points up the difficulties being faced by small processors in the poultry industry and suggests a number of recommendations which could help alleviate the situation. Also, the final report of the full committee—House Report No. 2569—contains recommendations pertinent to this field. Included in these recommendations is the opinion that, "Farm organizations and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should actively assist such voluntary measures," that could go far toward correcting the existing inequities and that "cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture should be expanded."

The recent announcement that the Department of Agriculture will look further into this problem is evidence that our executive agencies are following the work of the Small Business Committee in working to solve critical domestic problems.

The article referred to concerning the impending investigation by the Department of Agriculture follows:

PRICE PROBE OF POULTRY UNDERWAY

The Agriculture Department yesterday reported that it is launching a broad-scale investigation of pricing and other trade practices in poultry marketing.

Roy W. Lennartson, associate administrator of the Department's Marketing Service, said numerous complaints had been received in recent months that many producers, particularly smaller ones, are being treated unfairly by some buyer-processors.

A series of hearings on similar complaints was conducted by a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee late last year.

The broiler industry, which has grown tremendously in recent years, has been marked by periods of overproduction and low prices, both at the producer and retail levels.

CHAIN OPERATIONS EYED

Figuring in the inquiry will be sales operations of chain stores which periodically offer poultry at cut-rate prices.

Lennartson said the investigation will not be a "witch hunt," but an attempt to get facts about operations with the idea of correcting wrong ones through new regulations, enactment of new legislation or prosecution of law violators.

He said the inquiry, which may take a year, will seek to determine to what extent, if any, processors and others in the industry are violating the Packers and Stockyards Act. This act directs the Department to police the livestock and poultry industries against unfair, unjustly discriminatory or deceptive trade practices.

MARYLAND INCLUDED

Lennartson said preliminary investigations made in Arkansas, one of the major producing States, indicated there is need for a full-scale inquiry.

Lennartson said that some of the complaints claim that some producers are being discriminated against because they joined producer associations or cooperatives; that others were discriminated against because they testified at the House committee hearings, and that some processor-producer contracts contained provisions that are in restraint of trade because they limit producer dealings with a single processor.

No Time To Abolish House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege to have received appointment to one of the outstanding committees of this Congress, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I am mindful of the abuse that will automatically be directed at anyone who enlists his support to the vital work of this committee.

I am also mindful, Mr. Speaker, that I am filling the vacancy created on the retirement of an illustrious Ohioan, Hon. Gordon H. Scherer. You note I did not say I will be filling the shoes of Representative Scherer because I do not believe that I can do this. The void created by his absence in the 88th Congress will not be replaced by this speaker or anyone else. Mr. Scherer's fine work, patriotic zeal, and statesmanship will serve as an inspiration to me.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in yesterday's Cincinnati Enquirer and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, Jan. 27, 1963]

NO TIME TO ABOLISH HUAC

In much the same way they look forward to flu, taxes, and death, the American people have become accustomed, during the past quarter of a century, to expecting a biennial campaign to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

This year, oddly enough, the campaign has assumed particularly energetic proportions. And we use the term "oddly enough" because it should be clear in 1963, if it was never clear before, that the HUAC is a vitally important feature of the Nation's total defense against international communism. To abolish it now would be roughly tantamount to dismantling the Defense Department or abrogating the North Atlantic Alliance.

The phase of the Communist conspiracy to which the HUAC devotes its attention is not, of course, the only phase. But to expend scores of billions for defense and to ignore the internal threat to our freedoms scarcely makes sense.

Yet that is what the committee's enemies would have us do.

THE IMPETUS COMES FROM SOVIET SOURCES

The 1963 campaign against the House Un-American Activities Committee has enlisted the support of thousands of well-intentioned, non-Communist Americans. But the campaign's impetus comes from the Communist apparatus itself. Communist Party headquarters not long ago sent word to its members that "we must join forces with the anti-HUAC forces wherever they

are." The party's chairman, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, has sounded a clarion call to destroy "this disgraceful witch-hunting committee."

Accordingly, an organization known as the National Committee to Abolish the HUAS has gone to work. Its coordinator is Frank Wilkinson, of Los Angeles, identified on several occasions as a Communist. Wilkinson was released a year ago after serving a 1-year sentence for contempt of Congress. His strategy is to convert the HUAC battle into a sacred war for civil rights, fairplay, and all of the other high-sounding notions that international communism traditionally perverts and distorts for its own insidious ends.

The 1963 campaign is aimed primarily at abolishing the committee and its functions outright.

If that goal proves to be unattainable, the HUAC foes will settle for the establishment of a subcommittee with sharply curtailed activities. Another alternative is transferring the committee's present functions to the House Judiciary Committee. And if all of these tactics fail, the committee's enemies will seek to cripple the committee by sharply reducing its funds.

Two years ago, when the last major attempt to destroy the HUAC was undertaken, the House of Representatives rejected the attempt by a lopsided vote of 412 to 6. In ordinary circumstances, a mandate as impressive as that would discourage the HUAC's enemies. But such is far from the case.

THE HUAC IS NOT A NECESSARY EVIL

For, even if the 1963 effort fails, it will have the subsidiary effect of discrediting the committee's work in the eyes of millions of Americans. The facts altogether too frequently don't catch up with reckless accusations. There are, as a result, many Americans who look upon the HUAC as a necessary evil, when, in reality, it is an altogether legitmate and normal feature of the legislative process.

Campaigns like the one presently afoot have the additional effect of intimidating Members of Congress who have the temerity to serve as HUAC mebers.

In this connection, we have this impressive testimony from Cincinnati's former Representative Gordon H. Scherer:

"When, soon after my election to Congress in 1952, I accepted a place on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I had neither misgivings nor forebodings. Our boys were dying in Korea. The mischief wrought by Soviet agents was no longer a matter of surmise; enough of it had been exposed in detail to alarm the American people. To help dislodge these internal enemies seemed to me a task any patriotic American could undertake proudly.

"What I failed to foresee was that mere act of joining the committee would make me a target for organized slander, regardless of how I might conduct myself. I was not unfamiliar with the rugged give-and-take of political life, but not until I joined the struggle against Red sedition had anyone impugned my patriotism, honesty and decency. Thereafter, I had to accustom myself to being called, to my face, in print and on the air, a witch-hunter, a character assassin, an inquisitor, and Fascist. I had become an enemy of the Bill of Rights.

"But my real dismay is not with the Communists and their friends who are engaged in protecting themselves and their cause. What distresses me is that a large portion of the public swallows the Communist distortions and blandly echoes the Red billingsgate."

From the day the committee was created a quarter of a century ago up to this crucial moment in the cold war, the story has been the same.

Fortunately, Mr. Scherer and his associates in the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee have won, in addition to the abuse of the Communists and their apologists, the applause of conscientious Americans.

"For years," J. Edgar Hoover notes, "the Communist Party has campaigned against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The Department of Justice and the FBI have not been spared, and we have come to judge our effectiveness by the intensity of the Communist attacks."

The furiousness of the 1963 anti-HUAC drive only underscores the importance of retaining the committee, its powers and its appropriation.

Federal Highway Administrator, Hon. Rex M. Whitton, Reviews Progress in Construction of Interstate Highway System in Address Before National Limestone Institute Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute was held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C., the week of January 21. One of the high points of the agenda was a luncheon address by Federal Highway Administrator, Hon. Rex M. Whitton, who emphasized the need for effective Federal-State cooperation in the construction of our Interstate Highway System.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, and its Subcommittee on Public Roads, it will be my privilege to work closely with Mr. Whitton and his associates during the 88th Congress, as he administers the vital Federal-aid highway program.

Speaking before representatives of the various segments of the limestone industry, Administrator Whitton stressed that a sense of partnership must prevail between the State and the Federal Government if we are to complete on schedule the huge network of freeways envisioned in the Federal-aid highway program. He indicated that some form of work is completed or underway on 70 percent of the Interstate System, but that some States are lagging due to problems in design, acquisition of rights-of-way, and in providing State matching funds. Mr. Whitton likewise emphasized the role of the Bureau of Public Roads as the agency responsible for overseeing this vast national project, and charged with assuring both sustained progress and efficient administration in Federal-aid highway construction.

Mr. President, I request that the remarks of Mr. Whitton before the National Limestone Institute Convention January 23, 1963, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(Remarks by Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Congressional Room, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, January 23, 1963, 12:30 p.m.)

I want to thank you for this chance to talk with you today. I know I'm among friends. Here's Bob Koch, your president; and some of the people from my home State, Missouri; and others from both Washington and all over the country that I know well.

I can tell from your printed program that this annual meeting is well planned. The subjects for your discussion range from broad problem areas, to those of current and practical concern. I am sure you will find that the sessions will be of real value, both to you who are producers, and to some of us who are in effect your customers.

Again, I want to tell you how proud I was to receive your Distinguished Service Award. I am very grateful. I must say that work deserving such an award is accomplished with the help of many people who work with me in the Bureau of Public Roads, in the State highway departments, in associations such as yours, and at the top of the list is Mrs. Whitton.

Let me start, today, by sketching just what the Federal-aid highway program is. It has grown a lot since its modest start in 1916. Almost 880,000 miles of roads and streets are included in the Interstate and ABC Systems, and are eligible for improvement with Federal aid. That's about one-foutrh of our total road and street mileage, and generally the most important part. Today, Federal aid accounts for over 40 percent of all funds spent for road and street construction by all levels of government.

Yet the basic concepts created by Congress 46 years ago still prevail. The Federal-aid program is a Federal-State cooperative effort in which the States might be called the "initiating" partners. They choose the system routes and the projects to be built. They select the detailed locations and draw the plans. They let the contracts and supervise the construction. The States maintain the highways without Federal assistance.

The Congress has decided, by methods prescribed in the law, how much Federal highway aid each State is to get, each year. And Federal-aid payments are made to the States, project by project, only for work completed and accounted for.

In this whole process, from choice of routes to payment for projects, the Bureau of Public Roads' function is that of review and approval—or disapproval. Disapproval does not come frequently, and it is more apt to be a reservation than a flat denial.

Of course such cases seem to make news. I assure you that disapprovals come only after careful thought. And they occur through differences of judgment based on engineering and economic analysis. Further study often resolves such differences, and the Bureau and the State thus reach agreement.

Now, I have said that the States are the "initiating" partners in this program. Nevertheless, Public Roads believes that it is dutybound to provide both guidance and controls. This, to me, is both right and proper. We are not hamstringing the States with an overabundance of regulations. But we certainly are expected, by the Congress and the public, to assure them they are getting full value for the money they invest in Federal highway aid.

We have recognized that both our own procedures, and those of the States, must change from time to time. The growing size and complexity of the highway programs surely merit that attention.

During the past few years we in Public Roads have taken a number of major steps to strengthen our controls in the Federal-aid program. None of these have been taken without careful study. We think they are reasonable and necessary, and that they do not infringe unduly on the States' functions or rights.

One major step taken last year was the creation of two new primary units in our headquarters organization.

One of these is the Office of Right-of-Way and Location. These are areas of great importance. Route location is often the subject of strong and heated argument. Right-of-way purchase is a field new to many highway officials. It is difficult in that right-of-way costs cannot be measured and compared with standards as easily as construction items.

Our second new major unit is the Office of Audits and Investigations. It handles a dual job. One is that of auditing State claims for Federal-aid payments. The other is to maintain vigilance over all phases of our programs.

This office investigates all charges of incompetence and fraud. But it does much more. It surveys the procedures of both Public Roads and the States, to see that they are properly applied and that they work well.

We are not interested in witch hunts. But we are interested in providing good checks and balances. And we know that these must tread a middle path that assures good workmanship without slowing the work to a standstill.

One of our techniques now in use is called inspection in depth. Individual projects, chosen at random, are examined in detail from start to finish by Public Roads staff. If there are faulty procedures, or if good paper procedures are not being carried out, they will show up in this inspection in depth. The process is most helpful both to the States and to Public Roads.

We have also applied this process to the right-of-way procedures of every State. The 35-point review has shown possible weaknesses in some cases. We have worked with those States in overhauling and tightening their right-of-way policies and operations.

We have developed a current billing method for Federal-aid payments, called concurrent auditing. The process calls for a good deal of preparation, and we are helping the States to organize for it, one by one. The system, among other things, first requires a thorough review of procedures.

In use, it permits the States to get Federal reimbursement much sooner than before, when projects were not audited until they were finished. And it also turns up more quickly any procedure flaws or nonallowable items. Thus corrective action can be taken promptly.

You will note that our so-called controls are mostly concerned with procedures and their actual use. We are primarily interested in improving our and the States' operations.

Still, we know fraud and carelessness can and do occur. We intend to keep on hunting out such instances, and taking drastic action when necessary. But we are convinced that fraud, incompetence, and poor work in the Federal-aid program are of very small proportion. We and the States want to keep it that way.

Now, let me turn to more positive reporting. All of you are interested in the Interstate Highway System. Some of you produce materials for its construction. All of you are potential users, both with your own cars and with your company trucks.

We are about 1,700 miles further ahead with the system than we were a year ago. Well over 13,000 miles of these freeways are open to traffic and are in daily use.

Of this total, about 8,000 miles have been completed to fill the needs of traffic expected in 1975. Another 3,000 miles have been improved enough to handle today's traffic well, but they require further work to bring them up to the 1975 standards. And 2,300 miles are toll facilities, included in the system as permitted by the law.

We also have nearly 5,000 miles under construction, and close to 11,000 miles with preliminary engineering or right-of-way work going on.

So some form of work is finished or underway on 70 percent of the Interstate System. It's a good record. But this national figure is an average for all of the States. Compared with that 70 percent, some States have already passed the 90-percent mark. Some others haven't reached 50 percent as yet.

We in Public Roads think it is important to move ahead on a mileage objective. In a sense, the public is already sold on the Interstate System. Through Congress, they have provided the money. To be convinced that it is worth the cost, they have only to ride on it, and see the better, cheaper, faster, and safer travel they are buying.

It is for this reason that we are urging the States to plan their interstate schedules with certain goals. One is to develop long, usable sections of completed freeways, particularly those connecting major cities. Another is to concentrate on replacing badly deficient or dangerous existing road sections.

We also are urging a target of half the system mileage open to travel by the end of 1964, the halfway mark in the 1957 to 1972 time schedule.

Our present estimates and the States' show that we have a good chance of reaching that goal. But it, in turn, is only a halfway mark. The Congress expects us to complete the entire system by 1972.

Some States, using bond or other financing and knowing they will receive their Federal aid later, are going ahead rapidly. A few will finish well before 1972. Others are lagging on a mileage basis. Some will have to complete five times as much mileage annually in the next 10 years as they did in the past 6.

Mileage isn't the only measure of program progress, of course. But the fact remains that Congress has given us a time limit.

A number of States are facing very real problems. There are 2,500 miles of the Interstate System where locations aren't settled. Twenty percent of the States have some lag in design work. Thirty percent are having difficulty in acquiring right-of-way. Twenty percent face trouble in providing State matching funds.

The need for careful, long-range planning becomes clear if we view the successive steps of the program from the far end. To complete the system in 1972, the final construction projects should be awarded to contract in 1970.

Then the last right-of-way purchase and clearing should be started in 1967 or 1968. And, in turn, all Interstate project design work ought to the underway in 1966.

Final route location has to be settled before then. Location requires preliminary studies of alternates, public hearings, and reaching agreement with various Government and planning agencies. So it is evident that final route location work should be in progress right now.

It is obvious that we cannot hold up all or many remaining Interstate projects to these several terminal dates. If we do, there well be a construction "pile-up" in the last few years before 1972, with above-normal building costs and an impossible strain on inspection staffs.

It is for this reason that long-range planning of all operation phases is essential.

I have been dwelling at some length on the Interstate System program because of its importance. But this does not mean I attach less importance to our ABC program for the improvement of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban and rural areas.

Perhaps less needs to be said about the ABC program because it has been going on for 46 years now, and getting bigger every year. This past year the Congress authorized $950 million for the program for fiscal year 1964, and $975 million for 1965. Your own organization with Bob Koch speaking ably for you, strongly supported that legislation.

For the record, during fiscal year 1962, Federal-aid ABC projects were completed on more than 18,000 miles of roads and streets. This work cost over $1.5 billion, of which nearly $800 million was Federal aid.

Some of this work was new construction, extending our total road and street mileage. But much of it was for improvement of existing roads, better curves and grades, and stronger and wider surfaces. About one-fifth of the 5,000 miles of primary projects completed in fiscal 1962 were four-lane highways. A good many of them had partial or full freeway design. We certainly expect this trend to continue.

In fact, we expect the great speedup in road building, begun in the last decade, to continue throughout this one. And the 1970's will probably see an unslacked continuation.

I won't forecast dollars far ahead, but in this year of 1963 we expect to see highway construction outlays of $6.1 billion; up $600 million over last year. That's just construction, excluding right-of-way, engineering, maintenance, and all the rest of the annual highway costs.

The use of materials in the highway program is staggering. In 1962, in all road work, 582 million tons of aggregates were used for construction and 172 million for maintenance. In the 1962 to 1972 decade we expect 9 billion tons of aggregates to be used for roads.

Aggregates, of course, include sand, gravel, and slag, as well as crushed stone. Limestone will certainly account for a healthy share of the latter.

One of the problems in which you and I share concern is that of specifications. Last year the Bureau of Public Roads published a report of real interest to you.[1] It was called "Aggregate Gradation for Highways." It pointed out the benefits that would result if aggregate gradation specifications could be simplified, standardized, and made more uniform.

You, as producers, would benefit because you would not have to prepare and stock such a wide variety of aggregate sizes and mixes. We, as customers, would benefit from possibly lower costs and less confusion.

We believe there is considerable room for improvement in most other specifications areas, too. Material usages could be more standardized, and construction methods made more uniform. Roadbuilding production rates could be increased and the end product would be better, if such steps were taken by the States.

And the States are taking just such steps. The American Association of State Highway Officials is now preparing a complete book of construction specifications. The book has already been through several drafts and is now under committee review.

Some time this spring the final draft will go out for review and comment to State highway people, to equipment manufac-

[1] Your organization had a committee that worked with us over a period of 2 years in developing this report.

turers, and to materials producers. I know your organization can be counted on to offer helpful and constructive comment. And you can be sure your comments will be given careful attention.

Thereafter, the book will have final review by AASHO and will be voted on by the States. I am hopeful of seeing the final product before the summer of 1964. Then we will have a complete and modern guide specification book for the construction of highways. I am confident it will lead to what we aspire among the State specifications—standardization, simplicity, and uniformity. It is an objective that will help all of us.

While I'm on this subject I want to tell you that the Bureau of Public Roads is fostering a greatly expanded research program, on its own and with the States. One important research area is better quality control in highway construction.

I don't mean restraints, either. But we have a great need for a scientific approach to sampling and testing. In the end, it will mean less interference with the contractor; and assurance that materials and methods are checked out before it is too late.

One final word, for the future. When one tries to look 100 years ahead, one wonders what kind of transportation systems we may have, perhaps radically different.

But, for a somewhat lesser range, we must remember that planning for, say, 1980, is already on the drawing board or in the thinking stage. The United States will be even more urbanized then. But I cannot foresee drastic change in the shape of our cities or in the forms of our transportation.

By 1980 we may have some forms of automated highway in the development or tryout stage. We will probably have more rail transit in our very largest cities. I certainly expect much more urban bus service, perhaps some of it in little local buses, such as are to be tried out here in Washington, as well as express buses running on special or reserved lanes of freeways.

But the public is unlikely to forego, by 1980, its great desire for personal mobility. We will probably have additional mileage of freeways in the Interstate System, financed by Federal aid or otherwise, and thousands of miles of primary highways will be rebuilt to higher standards; thousands of dirt roads will be surfaced.

In our lifetime, you need have no fear of running out of a market for limestone.

In closing, once again I express my gratitude for the award you conferred on me last night, and I appreciate this opportunity to talk with you.

Your organization has cooperated fully with us and with the States, in the past, and your help has been very real. I know we will continue that friendly and useful relationship.

Is Oxford the Rehearsal of the Takeover?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a thought-provoking article written by Mrs. Katharine Phelps Close, a native of the State of Maryland, which I feel deserves the attention of this body:

IS OXFORD THE REHEARSAL OF THE TAKEOVER?

(By Katharine Phelps Close)

Well, the sound and the fury seem to have quieted down for the time being in Oxford, Miss., and I have been watching for some reply to David Lawrence's cogent article (Oct. 3d) on the "tragic silence" concerning the validity of the controversial 14th amendment to our Constitution, but I have seen none so far. Therefore, I am impelled to add my few words that may help clarify the Southern point of view to some readers who may not be familiar with the Reconstruction era in American history. As a Southerner from the State of Maryland I had ancestors who fought on both sides of this terrible conflict—brother against brother—and one of my grandmothers was from Mississippi, so I was raised on stories of the Old South and the terrors of Reconstruction. They lived through a crisis not unlike that which happened recently in the Congo.

The Southern people can never forget. But through the ensuing years following the horrors of the Civil War they have tried to work out a decent solution to the Negro problem, giving the Negroes equal but separate facilities which were improving with every year, and they lived side by side in peace and mutual respect, until lately. (Had Abraham Lincoln not been killed, his plan was to send all the freed slaves back to Africa to settle Liberia, a name derived from Liberty, and whose capital is Monrovia, so called for our patriot James Monroe of the famous and now forgotten Monroe Doctrine.) As a Southerner, but a nonprofessional one, I am proud of it, and I feel it is unfair that the brutal subjugation of the Southern people following this war has been glossed over by historians (Northerners most of them. Surely the basic sin was slavery at all, from which the Northern slave-traders profited handsomely.) There is an old proverb which so aptly says: "The past foretells the future."

The War Between the States ended April 10, 1865, after 4 bloody and terrible years. The 14th amendment giving citizenship to the freed Negro slaves was first proposed June 12, 1866. By July 28, 1868, the prostrate former Confederate States were forced by Federal arms to ratify this amendment, and it was a shocking and brutal scandal at the time. The 15th amendment, giving the freed slaves the right to vote was put into force in March 1870. (The American Indians were only franchised in 1924.)

In those days following the Civil War many of the Governors of Southern States were Negro puppets put in power by the Federal conquerors, and their legislatures were a rabble of white renegades and newly free black men, many of them illiterate. The intolerable situation created by the Federal victors in the South during the Reconstruction, as it is called, gave rise to the Ku Klux Klan (since shamefully degenerated) but which was, in those days, a respectable organization made up of white gentlemen in an effort to protect their homes and their women against barbarism. These Southern white men had been stripped of all they possessed, their homes and plantations had been burned and property destroyed or confiscated (stolen) by the swarms of carpetbaggers from the North—and by roaming bands of bewildered free Negroes used to a paternalistic way of life and who, faced with the responsibilities of freedom and of earning their own keep, resorted to pillage and rape and brought terror to their homeland. All this was graphically shown in an old and historic movie by D. W. Griffith of the silent picture days, called "The Birth of a Nation," which has now been muzzled as it is no longer politically popular to remember the painful, historic truth as regards the South.

It would be interesting to know just why this 29-year-old Negro, James Meredith, was chosen by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, over many applicants, to be the martyr-hero he now is to his race in breaking, with the aid of thousands of heavily armed Federal troops, the solid white barrier at the University of Mississippi. It would be even more interesting to know how much James is being paid to endure this education. It would be further absolutely fascinating to know how deeply the Communists have penetrated in this powerful and rich political lobby of the NAACP, which, in appealing to the huge Negro vote in the United States, is now a power to be reckoned with in our national politics. It is not as if Meredith were unable to obtain a satisfactory education in his own State of Mississippi, for he had been attending a well accredited Negro college there for several semesters (and which his colored wife is still attending), when he demanded and got a transfer to the previously all-white State university. Some may say, "There is a principle involved and by the recent Supreme Court decision this man was given the right to go to the university of his choice." But what about the majority? Don't the majority have any rights any more? (The Negro minority, certainly in the South, pay no taxes, or, if they do pay taxes at all to the State or Federal Government they are negligible in proportion to the rest of the population.)

And what about the serious consequences of using force to push through this issue at this time, knowing full well what the reactions of the white citizenry would be? Of the wisdom of sending 14,000—or was it more?—armed military including Negro troops (an added insult) to this small town of little more than 5,000, so that one stubborn Negro could make himself a public figure, a hero, to his people, and crack the hitherto barrier there, backed up with all the strength of Federal might. (The old wounds of the Reconstruction days have been opened up afresh all over our South. A wedge, driven at the national Achilles heel, has been driven in to divide our people once again.) And what about the other students? Certainly the tense atmosphere of an armed camp is not conducive to quiet study for anyone, white or black. Will having this Negro there make others more acceptable? I don't think so. This one needs guards day and night, shameful as it is, and he will continue to need them as long as he remains there. If education is really what this Negro wants, wouldn't the more tranquil campus of his former Negro college with the companionship of his wife, be preferable? On being admitted to the University of Mississippi in the midst of the wildest melee seen there since the Civil War, James is reported to have said, "This is not a happy occasion." This remark wins my personal prize as the understatement of the year. Then to further enhance his importance publicly and in the eyes of the Negro voters, this colored student—a true troublemaker if there ever was one—gives interviews to the press, criticizing the Federal Government that had just saved his life with the aid of an army invasion into the State, by saying that not enough Negro troops had been used in Mississippi, claiming this as segregation of the Negro service personnel, and useful to the boys in the Kremlin for propaganda purposes. (The very fact of having any Negro troops there, armed against the white citizenry of the South, was enough to madden the population, remembering as they all do the days when a Negro was in control with his henchmen.)

If a principle is involved in this Mississippi situation, then, as David Lawrence so rightly and sufficiently pointed out, the whole subject of the legality of the 14th amendment, as well as the Supreme Court decision based on it, "should be opened up for trial after 94 years of tragic silence by the Supreme Court of the United States." This matter of school integration was never put up to the States for a decision, knowing that the Southern States would probably never ratify it. It is one of the slickest deals ever pulled off by a powerful lobby group in the politics of our country. The naked military force shown in the little town of Oxford, Miss., poses the question "What has become of State rights—of State sovereignty—of the very cornerstone of our country, and the basis of the name, United States?"

The real neglected minority is the American Indian, the first and true American, because his voting power is weak and unimportant. This whole integration problem is for political purposes, for votes at home and to try to win over the Afro-Asian block in the U.N. In spite of all the high-flown moral reasons given, votes are the real basis for the deplorable situation * * * but at what cost in prestige abroad and at the risk of open rebellion among our own people. It will take a long, long time for the wounds of this new-Reconstruction to heal.

The Chief Joseph War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very interesting article reprinted from the winter, 1963, issue of Montana, the magazine of Western history, written by Rowena L. and Gordon D. Alcorn, of Tacoma, Wash. Both Dr. and Mrs. Alcorn have been deeply interested in the Nez Perce Indians for more than a quarter century and Mrs. Alcorn is internationally famous for her paintings of outstanding Indians of the past and present.

This story concerns Sam Tilden, a nephew of Chief Joseph, one of the oldest survivors of the famous retreat in 1876 of the Nez Perce from central Idaho through the Lolo Pass, down the Bitteroot Valley of Montana, thence southeasterly into the general area of Yellowstone Park and then north, heading for the Canadian border. This retreat is sometimes referred to as "the Chief Joseph war." Many colorful sidelights are set out in this account of this famous retreat in which the Indians, although greatly outnumbered, were successful in many pitched battles and, in fact, were never defeated until the last battle which occurred in northwestern Montana east of the Rocky Mountains. The Indians thought they had reached Canada when the troops, under Gen. O. O. Howard, caught up with them and Chief Joseph, because of the exhaustion of his entire band, was forced to surrender.

The article follows:

OLD NEZ PERCE RECALLS TRAGIC RETREAT OF 1877

(By Rowena L. and Gordon D. Alcorn)

"Under a buffalo skin robe, I was sleeping soundly in our tepee beside Chee-Nah my grandmother. Suddenly a rifle shot, then neighing of startled horses roused us. Chee-Nah rose to peer out and a bullet pierced her left shoulder * * * blood streamed from the wound as she pushed me from the tepee crying, (Suhm-Keen run to the trees and hide.' I raced up the slope as fast as I could * * * bullets kept whizzing past clipping off leaves and branches all around me. I was very afraid * * * soon some other boys joined me there and we watched trembling at the awful sight below. Our tepees were set afire and our people shot as they tried to run for cover in the timber."

Thus recalled our aged friend Sam Tilden, whose Nez Percé tribal name, Suhm-Keen, means "shirt on." We visited him again last summer (June 1962), and he was telling us boyhood memories of the historic Battle of the Big Hole on August 9, 1877. Tilden was 10 years old when he went along on that tragic retreat. Five nontreaty bands of the Nez Percé Nation were forced to flee their homeland in what was a part of Washington, Idaho, and Oregon, to seek sanctuary in Canada, "Land of Redcoats."

After they had crossed over the Lolo Trail of the Rockies, the tribesmen hoped they were safe from pursuit by Gen. O. O. Howard's U.S. Army forces. So, exhausted from their arduous trip (encumbered as they were with old men, women, and little children) they at last stopped to rest at Big Hole, which they called "Is-Kum-Tse-Talik" (Place of Ground Squirrels).[1]

Scouts should have been sent up the pass to be sure they were not being followed, but in the council of chieftains, Looking Glass vehemently insisted that it was not necessary: "Montana people our friends." This decision that speed was most imperative was to cost the Nez Percé many lives.

Lulled into a false sense of security, they made camp. Tepee poles were cut, squaws dug camas bulbs, and soon roasting pits to cure them were smoldering. They would need as much of this nourishing food as they could prepare for the long trek to Canada. Two camas bulbs and two kous roots could sustain one for a day.

Tilden continued his account of the battle: "About 4 a.m. before dawn, one of our old men, Nata-Le-Kin who had poor eyesight, heard the ponies stirring restlessly up on the hillside where most of them were hobbled. It was a chilly night, so he drew his blanket around his shoulders and rode up to investigate the cause of that disturbance. Colonel Gibbon's troops were hiding up there ready to attack the sleeping camp, when Nata-Le-Kin appeared. They shot him and the report of the rifle roused our encampment and our warriors rushed from their tepees to do battle. Many of the tepees were set afire by the soldiers, who shot our people as they tried to run for cover in the timber. The first warrior to be killed was Rainbow (Wah-Chum-Yus) who had always told us that if he had to fight before dawn, he would surely be killed."

It was not yet light when the battle started. Five Wounds (Pah-Kah-Tos), lifelong friend of Rainbow, had made a pact with him that they would die on the same day as their fathers had died many years before. When Five Wounds saw that Rainbow was slain, he deliberately walked out into the enemy fire and died. Tilden also saw other great warriors killed: Red Moccasin Tops (Sarpsis-Ilp-Pilp), Shore Crossing (Wah-Lit-Its), Woodpecker (Woo-Kaw-Kaw) and Circling Sun (Wet-Yet-Mas-Lik-Leinen).

In spite of the surprise attack, the Nez Percés were able to drive off the enemy, and even managed to capture the one howitzer hidden in the timber. Then, while a number of warriors held the troops pinned in rifle pits, the other tribesmen buried their dead. Then they hastily fashioned travois from poles of the unburned tepees. On these they placed the wounded and left the sad "Place of Ground Squirrels," and again headed toward Canada. Riding on fast ponies, the fighting men joined the others when they made a camp after traveling "one sun" from Big Hole.

The name of this place they called Tak-Seen (The Willows). Here Ollokot's wife, Al-Hits-Palo-Jam (Fair Land) died of the wounds she had received the day before. She left an infant baby. Husis-Ow-Yeen (Wounded Head), whose Indian name was given to him from the severe head wound received at the battle, had tallied the dead at Big Hole on his buffalo drinking horn: 63 had been killed, 32 of them men. All the others were women and children. There was much grieving and wailing in camp that night.

Sam Tilden was born in 1867 when his parents were camped on the Musselshell River during a buffalo-hunting trip. His father was We-Ahch-Chech-Kan (Packing Blankets), his mother Ka-Too-Cham-Miyah (Horse Chewing Grass Noisily). The name of Samuel Tilden was given to young Suhm-Keen by a teacher, Frank Kettenbach of Lewiston, Idaho. The names were freqently given to Indian children by teachers or ministers.

Chee-Nah, Suhm-Keen's grandmother, was the sister of Chief Old Joseph, and she was known as Martha Joseph. The wound she received as the attack at Big Hole started, gradually healed during the retreat. She was captured at Bear Paw and taken prisoner with Chief Joseph. She returned to Lapwai where she died after the war, many years later.

"During the early summer of 1877," Tilden remembers clearly, "we were camped on the bank of the South Fork of the Clearwater River, not far from the present village of Stites, Idaho." After the Battle of White Bird Canyon on June 17, 1877 the Nez Percé moved up onto the Camas Prairie and then down to the South Fork of the Clearwater River (Koos-Koos-Kie). There they made a camp in the sloping meadow directly across from what is now known as Battle Ridge. There, Tilden's family joined the other tribesmen.

On July 11 and 12, a band of 24 Nez Percé warriors, led by Yellow Wolf, Ollokot, Wottolen, Peo-Peo-Tholekt, Rainbow, Five Wounds, and others, held off the Army forces along this high promontory. Meanwhile salvos from the two howitzers landed in the Indian encampment. Finally it was decided that their camp should be moved for safety, and so the Nez Percé headed for Kamiah while the warriors held the soldiers on the ridge. The last to leave was Yellow Wolf, who helped Springtime, Joseph's young wife, to mount

[1] Located on State Highway 43 in western Montana, the spot is now marked by a monument maintained by the National Park Service. It is 12 miles west of Wisdom and 21 miles from its junction with U.S. Highway 93. Shallow, grassy trenches and many battle-scarred trees remain as evidence of the historic encounter here.

her rearing pony frightened by the roar of the howitzers. With the cradleboard containing her baby, she could not handle the terrified animal. Together, Yellow Wolf and Springtime rode to join the retreating Nez Percé.

Tilden recalls the stormy council of chiefs—Joseph, Looking Glass, Ollokot, White Bird and Too-Hool-Hool-Zote—after the next attack which came the following day on July 13 at Kamiah Crossing. Chief Joseph suggested that they go back down into the rugged terrain where they could easily elude the soldiers. This was the Salmon River area which is gashed by awesome canyons. Joseph was overruled by the others who wanted to leave Idaho and go to the "Land of Redcoats," and so preparations were made to leave at once.

Several of the warriors who had fought bravely at White Bird Canyon, the Clearwater Battle and at Kamiah Crossing, decided to remain behind at Kamiah with Chief Red Heart and his band which had just returned from Montana where they were hunting buffalo. These tribesmen were all taken prisoner and were later held for a year at Fort Vancouver. Among them was Halfmoon, and an old man, Chief Jacob, who had signed the Treaty of 1855. What a change had taken place in 22 short years.

"On the way up over Lolo Trail," Tilden told us, "we had plenty of wild game. I was usually put on night duty to guard the horses. Chief Joseph was my uncle and he asked me to do this."

After the Battle of Big Hole, the Nez Percés were attacked again at Camas Meadows (Kamus-Nim-Takin). This was on August 20. It was while they were still in this area that some of the Nez Percés warriors led by Yellow Wolf and Peo-Peo-Tholekt ran off some of the army animals in a night raid. This was a daring maneuver, especially since the redmen had to stampede them into joining the herd of Indian ponies. However, when it grew daylight, the raiders were chagrined to discover that there were only three horses; the rest were mules. Suhm-Keen (Tilden) laughed when he remembered this incident. "I helped to guard those animals—those mules which they thought were horses in the dark."

On and on the fleeing Nez Percés traveled northward toward Canada. Then at Canyon Creek, Col. Samuel Sturgis' troops tried to corner them on September 13. Only one warrior was killed in this encounter. Tee-Wee-Wow-Nah's pony became terrified by the shooting and bolted, running out into the open where the soldiers found the redman an easy target. Canyon Creek, although not a narrow place, was skillfully defended by the expert marksmanship of the Nez Percé.

"It was growing colder every day as we headed northward," Tilden continued. "On September 29 when we finally arrived in the Bear Paws at the place we called 'Ali-Kos-Pah' (Place of Manure Fires), it was already starting to snow. I helped to gather buffalo chips and before long many fires were burning."[2]

"We are at least two suns ahead of the soldiers and only two suns from the 'Land of Redcoats,' so we can rest here awhile." This was again Chief Looking Glass who had spoken. However, the other chiefs seemed to agree that they might be safe now to remain there at least "one sun."[3]

Several scouts had arrived at the camping spot ahead of the main body of the Nez Percé, and had shot some buffalo. Soon meat was roasting over many fires. The Indians, their hunger appeased and warmed by the buffalo-chip fires, felt at ease now that they were such a short distance from Canada. All night long the fires were kept aglow by the squaws. To keep warm enough this was necessary, for many of their thick buffalo robes had been destroyed when their tepees had been burned at the Big Hole.

A light snow had fallen during the night and it was bitterly cold as dawn broke. The camp was just stirring when scouts were sent out in different directions as a precautionary measure. "But we were not worried," says Tilden.

"The scouts had been gone just a short while when suddenly we heard a distant rumbling * * *. We all knew that this was not Hein-Mot (real thunder). It was the ominous sound of stampeding buffalo * * * this could mean only one thing. At that very moment one of our scouts appeared on top of the highest ridge. He yelled, then he fired his rifle in the air, at the same time he waved a blanket giving us the signal, 'Soldiers coming—soldiers coming.'

"While this scout was still waving the blanket to warn his tribesmen, there suddenly appeared two long lines of cavalry from the ridges; as they raced toward us, they formed two wide arcs to encircle our encampment.

"My mother screamed at me, 'Suhm-Keen, grab your packsack and get away to the Redcoats.' I ran to my pony and galloped him as fast as he could. The noise of shooting had stampeded the Indian ponies and they were running away from the encampment. As I left the others, ahead I saw another Indian on a pinto pony. He had a long warbonnet on. This Indian rode toward me and tried to shoot me but missed." (He was no doubt one of the Cheyennes who were helping the soldiers. Some Crow Indians were also at Bears Paw, and it was a great shock to the Nez Percé to see that these Crows who were supposed to be their friends, had turned against them. The help of these Indians to the troops made the plight of the Nez Percés even more desperate.)

"It was again snowing as I rode on to the north. Toward evening I crossed the Milk River which was almost dry. Here I stopped for the night; my horse was too tired to go on. I had no food, no blankets except the one I used for the horse's saddle-blanket. Along came an Indian, and when we 'threw the signs,' I discovered he was a friendly Cree. He was kind and generous, for he gave me a pair of moccasins and some food. He was a good-looking Indian."

Sometime later, about 30 or 40 Nez Percés arrived at the Milk River, and among them, to young Suhm-Keen's joy, were his parents. They had waited until dark, and then slipped away from the camp, and fortunately had located some of their ponies which had run away when the shooting started. Later, more Crees came along and provided these shivering refugees with a few blankets, food and moccasins. Many had arrived barefoot, and it was very cold.

Several days later this bedraggled party slipped over across the border of Canada and at last arrived at the camp of the Sioux Indians. There, Chief Sitting Bull welcomed them and they were treated well. (Sitting Bull rode out to assist the Nez Percé when the word came that the tribesmen needed his help. While he was en route to the Bears Paw, he met some of the tribesmen who were on foot led by Chief White Bird. When Sitting Bull saw their said plight, he dismounted and stood there and wailed in sympathy for their lost cause.)

When Chief White Bird arrived with the news that Ollokot was dead, Too-Hool-Hool-Zote was dead, and Looking Glass was dead, they were shocked but almost worse was the dreadful news that three of their bravest warriors had been killed by mistake, by one of their own tribesmen. White Bird told them too that Joseph had surrendered on October 5, and there was much grieving and wailing among the Nez Percé in far-off "Land of Redcoats." They all knew now that this was the end of all the things they loved.[4]

Tilden's parents remained at the Sioux encampment until 1878, then they crossed into Northern Montana where they lived about 2 years on a small ranch near the border of Alberta, Canada. The father worked for some white settlers there, milking cows and doing other farm chores. In 1880 they moved onto the Flathead Indian Reservation where they stayed until 1910; then they returned to Lapwai, Idaho.

Gradually more and more Nez Percé tribesmen drifted back into the United States. Some were caught and sent to the Indian Territory where Chief Joseph was being held with all who had surrendered with him at Bears Paw. Chief Joseph was permitted a last visit to the Wallowa Valley, the "Land of Winding Waters," in August 1899.[5]

Sam Tilden says "I was one of the two first Nez Percé Indians to attend Carlisle Indian College. When I returned from there, I was through school, so I married Amy who was half Nez Percé and half Yakima. We moved back to the Flathead Reservation where I worked as a teamster. We had three boys, Harry, Lawrence, and Ralph. In 1914, I became a member of the Flathead Indian Reservation police force, and served on that force for 20 years. During World War I, I was on duty guarding the border between Montana and Canada."

Sam Tilden, a gentle soft-spoken man, lived 30 years of his life in Montana, but when he retired from the police force, he returned to live near Lapwai, Idaho (Valley of Butterflies). His home was between Lapwai and Spalding in a grove of tall locust trees. In the early 1940's Ralph, his eldest son who was deaf, was run down by a train just a few hundred feet from their house. His son Lawrence and family now live in this house, for Sam Tilden has for the past 2 years made his home in the Orchards Nursing Home at Lewiston, Idaho.

For many years he took part in special Indian celebrations throughout the North-

---

[2] This site of the last major Indian battle in the United States is located 16 miles south of Chinook in eastern Montana. It is a little more than 40 miles from the Canadian line, across which Joseph believed he would find refuge for his people. It is now a Montana State Park.

[3] According to some historians, Joseph and his chiefs believed they had actually reached safety in Canada when they arrived in the Bears Paw country of northeastern Montana. "The mistake was discovered when General Miles attacked on September 30," states the Montana Guidebook. "A 4-day battle forced Joseph to make a decision—he must either surrender or abandon the wounded, the old women, and children."

[4] Chief White Bird (Peo-peo-hih-kis-kiok), known as a great medicine man as well as warrior, never returned to the United States. He died about 5 years after the surrender and is buried near Fort McLeod.

[5] Max Wilson, an attorney who has lived almost all his life in Joseph, Oreg., recalls this sad visit by Joseph to Wallowa. Although he was only 14 years old at the time. Wilson followed the famed chief around during the 3-day visit. So much had changed during the 22 years which had passed that Joseph realized there was no hope of his people going back to their beloved homeland in Idaho, although he continued to press for permission until his death.

west. He was active in the Stevens Treaty Centennial at Walla Walla in June 1955, and was always there for the Chief Joseph Days held each summer at Joseph, Oreg. Although he no longer takes an active part in most of these things, he rode in the Lewiston centennial parade in the summer of 1961. He was dressed in his unusually handsome white beaded buckskins.

"I am very proud that my uncle, Chief Joseph, asked me to go back to Washington in 1903 (the last time he made a trip there to plead for the return of the Wallowa country to his people). He told me that I was one of the few people left that he could really trust." (On that trip, James Stewart, Joseph's relative, went along as an interpreter. Tilden speaks perfect English, but there had to be an official interpreter along).

"Chief Joseph wore civilian clothes back there, but always wore moccasins. He never put on shoes of the white man. We went to the White House to meet President Roosevelt * * * you know, the roughrider. We had dinner, too, with General Miles; we ate buffalo meat. Then, Congressman Charles Curtis from Oklahoma took us to the Congress where we shook hands with many people."

The next year, Chief Joseph was dead, many said from grief.

Sam Tilden is not the lone survivor of the retreat over the Lolo Trail in 1877. There are two other Nez Percé still living who were with their fleeing tribesmen.

One of them is Josiah Red Wolf, grandson of the famous Chief Red Wolf who ruled with Chief Timothy over the Alpowa Band. (Both were signers of the 1855 treaty at Walla Walla.) Josiah Red Wolf's mother and baby sister were killed at Big Hole. When Chief Joseph surrendered at Bears Paw, Josiah Red Wolf went into captivity to "Eekish-Pah" (Hot Place). He was 5 years old in 1877, so he remembers everything.

Then there is Lillie Lindsley, of Lapwai. She was only 2 years old in 1877, so she can recall nothing of the war. Last summer, death came to Shining Light (Johnson Hoyt) who had reached the century mark. He, too, had been on the retreat, and had escaped at Bears Paw when he raced to the Canadian border on his pony as the shooting started.

The oldest living Nez Percé tribesman was 101 on November 19, 1962. He is Albert Moore, whose Indian name is Peace Pipe (Tuk-Tar-Mal-Way-Une). He watched the Battle of the Clearwater from the Nez Percé camp on July 11 and 12, 1877. When the five bands started over the Lolo Pass after the Battle of Kamiah Crossing, Peace Pipe wanted to go, but his mother, In-Mah-Mah, persuaded him not to go. "There are too many soldier-coats along the way. Our people will never reach the Land of Redcoats."

So Peace Pipe stayed behind. But he, along with the remaining few old Nez Percé, witnessed some awesome history. It is more than likely that 1962 was one of the last years in which any of us will be permitted person-to-person contact with them.

Salute to Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the people of Indiana saluted the people of Thailand. The city and State of Indianapolis, Ind., joined with the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs and the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra January 12 and 13, 1963, in the Salute to Thailand. The 2-day civic and cultural activities were cosponsored by the U.S. Information Agency and the Voice of America.

The tribute to Thailand marked the beginning of a second decade of Hoosier salutes to other lands and people of the free world.

Welcoming His Excellency Visutr Arthayukti, Thai Ambassador to the United States, were Indiana Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, Lt. Gov. Richard O. Ristine, and Indianapolis Mayor Albert H. Losche. Indiana news media, businessmen, and civic and social leaders also joined with the sponsoring organizations to make the salute a success.

An exotic Thai menu and ball was held the evening of January 12, attended by the Ambassador from Thailand and ranking city and State officials and members of the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs and the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra.

The musical salute to Thailand January 13 was the 11th annual salute by the city of Indianapolis and the orchestra to a foreign land. Included in the program was the Thai national anthem and a delightful Thai composition, "Kridaphinihan Dance." As in the past, official exchange of greetings took place at intermission time, with His Excellency Visutr Arthayukti representing Thailand.

The President of the United States sent a special telegram commending the orchestra and the council for their participation in the annual program of musical and civic greetings. The programs, which are recorded by the Voice of America for rebroadcast overseas, have been heard by an estimated 50 million people throughout the world. Obviously, they constitute an important diplomatic activity for the United States.

And the programs are an excellent implement for spreading the name of Indiana worldwide. Further, the programs are an invaluable economic tool for firms of Indiana doing business in the respective countries. Lieutenant Governor Ristine informs me that some 50 Indiana firms have offices or business representation in Thailand—including such distinguished firms as Eli Lilly & Co. and P. R. Mallory. In addition to Hoosier agricultural products, made-in-Indiana drugs and chemicals, machinery, and automotive and transportation equipment are sold in Thailand and other southeast Asian markets.

The success of the Salute to Thailand, the enthusiastic support of the people of Indiana, and the appreciative response of the Thai Ambassador are indicative of the fine work done by the salute committee: Izler Solomon, conductor of the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra; Virgil Hunt, president of the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs; Harold Boxer of the Voice of America; and Mr. and Mrs. E. F. Taggert, Albert Losche, Jr., Richard Spikerman, and Harold Sundstrom.

Editorial comment and stories from the Indianapolis Star and the Indianapolis Times about the Salute to Thailand are typical of Hoosier reaction to this important people-to-people program, and I insert at this point in the RECORD the following:

Editorial, "Salute to Thailand," Indianapolis Star, January 12, 1963.

Editorial, "Salute to Thailand," Indianapolis Times, January 13, 1963.

News feature, "Salute to Thailand Is Set January 12–13 in City, State," Indianapolis Times, January 6, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Indiana are proud to recognize the people of Thailand and to have hosted that nation's Ambassador and his party in their visit to our State. Let the splendid example of the citizens of Indiana serve as a constant reminder to all of our people that in the area of self-government and relations among mankind there are no political partisans. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, are Americans first, interested in the world about us and in the preservation and advancement of the cause of freemen everywhere.

The material follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Jan. 12, 1963]

SALUTE TO THAILAND

It casts no aspersions, in any direction, to confess that the land which will be saluted in Indianapolis this weekend is chiefly known to most of us as the locale of "Anna and the King of Siam," and its musical version, "The King and I."

Thailand is remote and mysterious. Its name conjures up all those mental pictures associated with "the mysterious East"—exotic temples in sultry jungles, dancing girls laden with jingling bracelets, incessant, restless rhythms in cymbals and minor-key music. And so on.

This is all the more reason to rejoice that the occasion of a "Salute to Thailand" brings both incentive and opportunity to get a little better acquainted with this storied land.

Few cherished illusions need be shattered. Thailand is indeed a land of oriental charm and beauty and mystery. It has clung to the deep-running, quiet culture of the East, yielding but little and but slowly to the impatient bustle of Western fascination with growth rates and the industrial revolution. It promises unforgettable experiences to the perceptive visitor. The chance to learn a little about Thailand, and hear some of its music, promises delight to weekend audiences in Indianapolis.

Let it not be thought, either, that Thailand has stood in the shadows while the world passed by. It plays a significant role in the complex and constantly moving affairs of modern Asia. Its government is strong and dependable though turbulence and fear and uncertainty lap at its borders. In any roster of the friends of freedom and the West, the Thais stand up to be counted.

We are happy and proud to join the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra and the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs in this weekend's salute to Thailand. We welcome the visit of the Ambassador from Thailand, and hope he will find this a warm and hospitable city. We wish the two sponsoring organizations gratifying success in this enterprise, and many happy returns of the occasion.

[From the Indianapolis Times, Jan. 13, 1963]

SALUTE TO THAILAND

King Phumiphon Aduldet, of Thailand, is so skilled a musician, and so modern in his

tastes, that he once played his clarinet in a jam session with Benny Goodman. But he doesn't approve of how the classic musical, "The King and I," treated one of his ancestors.

The present king is proud of his lineage and proud of the glorious history of Siam. But things are different now, even to a new name.

Still blessed with the beauty, culture, and traditions of the ancient East, Thailand is building to a meaningful place in the modern world. Politically and economically, it believes in the things we believe in, and it is a firm ally.

Its industry is booming. Its lovely capital, Bangkok, is the transportation center of southeast Asia.

Today, the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra salutes Thailand in a concert sponsored by the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs. We salute this project.

The Thai Ambassador and other dignitaries are visiting us. We are proud to welcome them.

[From the Indianapolis Times, Jan. 6, 1963]

Agricultural abundance is a common bond linking Indiana farmers with Thailand, the nation being saluted January 12 and 13 by the State of Indiana, the city of Indianapolis, the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs, and the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra.

A billion-dollar farm State, ranking in the top 20 percent of the Nation's livestock and crop producers, Indiana can be proud to salute Thailand. Fertile soil and willing farmers have made Thailand a rarity among her negihbors in southeast Asia. In an area where poverty and starvation are the rule, Thailand's agriculture-based economy is on a steady upswing, and she is one of the world's largest exporters of rice.

Located in the tropics beneath Red China, 7,700 miles across the North Pole to the other side of the globe, Thailand has almost a year-round growing season. More than 75 percent of the 25 million acres of cultivated land is in rice production. Tobacco is grown in the north, but the Thai import U.S. tobacco to blend with the locally produced variety in order to make an American-blend cigarette. Corn crops are grown twice a year but are almost entirely exported, with little used for food or animal feeding. Casava, cotton, peanuts, soybeans, sugarcane, and coconuts are other agricultural crops.

Agricultural comparisons point up the efficiency of the Hoosier farmer. Thailand is 5.5 times larger in size and population (200,000 square miles and 26.2 million people) than Indiana (36,200 square miles and 4.6 million people). The 18 million acres of farmland in Indiana have a farm population of approximately 670,000 people against Thailand's 25 million acres and 9 million farmworkers.

In the livestock area, Indiana produces over 5 million hogs each year compared with Thailand's 4.7 million in 1959. Indiana's 2 million cattle and calves and 500,000 sheep and lambs match up favorably against Thailand's 5.7 million buffalo. In 1959 Thailand produced 57.5 million chickens, 20 million ducks, and 500,000 geese. Last year Indiana had 13.8 million chickens on the farm and produced 38 million broilers. Thailand does have one variety of livestock that Indiana farmers will never come close to matching—12,500 elephants.

Add to these production figures Indiana's 300-million-bushel corn crop, her $100 million worth of soybeans, $60 million worth of wheat, and you begin to realize how productive the Indiana farmer is. In a land much larger than Indiana and which has as good a climate for agriculture, 13 times as many Thai farmers work the land but produce less.

Indiana farmers, relying heavily on modern U.S.-developed technology, are continuing to increase yields. Pesticides, weedkillers, vaccines, better breeding practices, resistant varieties of crops are all familiar ideas to Hoosier agribusinessmen. They are almost unheard of in Thailand, where hand labor is the norm. Yet Thailand manages to produce more than she nee's, mostly by relying on a favorable climate and hard work.

Another agricultural link between Thailand and Indiana dates back to 1955, when a missionary collected a soil sample in a Thailand rice paddy and sent it to the Indianapolis laboratories of Eli Lilly & Co. From the soil sample Lilly scientists developed the agricultural antibiotic Tylan,[1] now used to combat chronic respiratory disease in poultry and to boost weight gains and feed efficiency in swine.

Typically, the United States is not jealously safeguarding its agricultural secrets. Improved breeds of poultry, hogs, and cattle have been imported from the United States in a cooperative program to develop the livestock industry. Once-prevalent animal diseases are being combated, and Thailand is now starting to export meat to the markets of Hong Kong and Singapore. American and Thai technicians have joined forces in helping farmers develop cooperatives for farm machinery, marketing, and credit.

At present Thailand imports about $8.3 million worth of agricultural goods from the United States, with cotton and tobacco the major items. It has been predicted that the rising economy of the Thai nation will likely result in a growing demand for U.S. agricultural and manufactured products. This is already evident, as the people are beginning to eat bread and drink milk.

A graphic example of the contrasting technology of the two agricultural areas is in the field of farm power units. Indiana farmers own 165,000 cars, 188,300 field tractors, 90,000 trucks—for a total of 443,300 units. Thailand has a total of 134,000 registered motor vehicles, and 78,000 of these are located in Bangkok, the capital city.

In other areas that Indiana farmers and citizens take for granted are these comparisons: Thailand has 3 million radios and 80,000 TV sets, and used 440 million kilowatt hours of electricity in 1960. In Bangkok there are 17 telephones per 1,000 residents. Indiana citizens own 1.2 million radios, 1.2 million TV sets, have 40 telephones per 1,000 residents, and used 19,753 million kilowatt-hours of electric power in 1962.

Although technologically Thailand does not yet compare with Indiana, she is not a backward nation. A free world bulwark against communism in southeast Asia, Thailand is moving forward in industry as well as agriculture. The people are progressive and are proud of their freedom (Thailand means "land of the free"). Just as the United States did in the past, the Thais are using agriculture as the springboard to a higher standard of living. Their past successes and present efforts are being watched carefully by their neighbors.

---

[1] Tylan (tylosin tartrate, Elanco).

Reds Active in Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body have mentioned the force of communistic revolutionary subversion in the Caribbean with the result that letters are sometimes received requesting information as to the numerical strength of Communist parties in the countries of that area.

An informative article by Al Burt of the Miami Herald giving the number of members in the Communist parties in the countries of Central America was published in the December 9, 1962, issue of the Washington Post.

In order that its data about the conspiratorial fifth column now at work in the Caribbean may be readily available to all concerned with the security matters, I include it as part of these remarks:

REDS ACTIVE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Al Burt)

GUATEMALA CITY.—Communism speaks directly to some 10,000 hard-core followers in Panama and Central America. And this organized strength feeds on the sympathy of between 60,000 and 75,000 fringe believers.

Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala have the Communist danger inside their houses, and they know it. The Communist strength runs to students and laborers, and thrives on domestic situations that create widespread dissatisfaction. Unemployment, lack of freedom, government corruption, and the miseries of the poor and illiterate are their favorite poison.

In general, Fidel Castro has lost his messiah's license, but sympathy still exists for the Cuban revolution. There is a feeling that Russia and Cuba may have lost more prestige in the current crisis than the United States did in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion fiasco in 1961. But optimism is tempered by the knowledge that each country has its own crop of Communists eager to make a new Cuba.

In capsule, the countries line up like this:

Panama: Estimated hard-core Communist strength, 1,000; sympathizers, 10,000 to 20,000. Strong influence at the university, among labor. Aided by unemployment, concentration of wealth and power, United States-Panama friction over the Panama Canal. Justice Minister Marco Robles: "Panama is the most important objective of the Communists because of the canal." A Robles crackdown during the Cuban crisis kept unrest at a minimum.

Costa Rica: Estimated hard-core strength, 300; sympathizers, 10,000. Making strong pitch to bananaworkers and trying to organize peasant leagues among the campesinos. Problem regarded as less serious here, proportionately, but an "elite" Communist group is making strong effort. Government has support of people.

Nicaragua: Estimated hard-core strength, 1,000; sympathizers, 10,000 to 20,000 and growing. Strong among students and laborers. May 1 prade drew 5,000 protesting against the United States for Cuba. Take advantage of widespread unrest resulting from 26 years of rule by one family, the Somozas. Working to recruit large group in 18–25 age bracket who have never voted and have no political affiliation.

Honduras: Estimated hard-core strength, 2,000 to 5,000; sympathizers about 10 times that number. Effectiveness rises and falls directly with Cuba's fortunes. Down now. Honduras has reputation of being most heavily infiltrated of the six countries. The Government says this is exaggerated. Take advantage of economic problems, particularly unemployment, of underdeveloped country. Government pushing social reforms.

El Salvador: Estimated hard-core strength, 1,000; sympathizers, at least 5,000. Prin-

cipal threat in urban areas with Communist-front organizations among labor, teachers, student groups. Strong Government cracks down hard. Antisubversion law passed this fall gives broad police powers, provides up to 7 years in jail. In September, Government headed off trouble by grabbing agitating leaders, hustling them to airport and sending them out of country. Take advantage of overpopulation problem in small country. Government critics complain police work goes beyond efficiency.

Guatemala: Estimated hard-core strength, 1,500 to 2,000; sympathizers, 5,000. Take advantage of discontent with present Government. Strength in rural areas. Popular support in rural areas for return of former President Juan Arevalo, generally blamed with leading country into communism before. Previous Communist experience makes literate wary, but illiteracy high.

Panama Canal: President Theodore Roosevelt's Decision on Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the long history of the Panama Canal there have been many state papers but none of greater importance than President Theodore Roosevelt's message to the Congress of February 19, 1906, submitting the reports of the International Board of Consulting Engineers and of the Isthmian Canal Commission concerning the vital question of the type of canal to be constructed.

Strongly supporting the recommendations of Chief Engineer John F. Stevens for a canal of the lake-lock type, President Roosevelt's stand led to a scorching congressional debate known as the "battle of the levels" in which Stevens played an important role in preparing addresses for Members of Congress. The outcome was decision for the high-level lake-lock plan of the general type as proposed by the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers as authorized by act, approved June 29, 1906. The successful completion of the Panama Canal, with its opening to traffic in 1914 within cost limits, and the subsequent transit, in both peace and war, of hundreds of thousands of vessels of various types has completely established the wisdom of the 1906 decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level lake-lock type—the great decision.

Since the enactment of Public Law 280, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945, as the result of the hysteria over hypothetical questions of security, the Panama Canal has been in another battle of the levels. Featured by arguments based on the newer term "security," rather than the earlier one, "vulnerability," the ensuing debate was, in effect, a reenactment of the 1906 struggle.

With only minor revision, President Roosevelt's 1906 message is just as applicable today as it was then. In order that this important state paper may be read by every Member of the Congress and all the cognizant officials in the executive department, and be known to the Nation at large, I quote it as part of these remarks:

To: The Senate and House of Representatives.

From: Report of the Board of Consulting Engineers for the Panama Canal.

I submit herewith the letter of the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers on the Panama Canal and the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission thereon, together with a letter written to the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission by Chief Engineer Stevens. Both the Board of Consulting Engineers and the Canal Commission divide in their report. The majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers, eight in number, including the five foreign engineers, favor a sea-level canal, and one member of the Canal Commission, Admiral Endicott, takes the same view. Five of the eight American members of the Board of Consulting Engineers and five members of the Isthmian Canal Commission favor the lock canal, and so does Chief Engineer Stevens. The Secretary of War recommends a lock canal pursuant to the recommendation of the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers and of the majority of the Canal Commission. After careful study of the papers submitted and full and exhaustive consideration of the whole subject I concur in this recommendation.

It will be noticed that the American engineers on the Consulting Board and on the Commission by a more than 2-to-1 majority favor the lock canal, whereas the foreign engineers are a unit against it. I think this is partly to be explained by the fact that the great traffic canal of the Old World is the Suez Canal, a sea-level canal, whereas the great traffic canal of the New World is the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, a lock canal. Although the latter, the Soo, is closed to navigation during the winter months, it carries annually three times the traffic of the Suez Canal. In my judgment the very able argument of the majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers is vitiated by their failure to pay proper heed to the lessons taught by the construction and operation of the Soo Canal. It must be borne in mind, as the Commission points out, that there is no question of building what has been picturesquely termed "the Straits of Panama"; that is, a waterway through which the largest vessels could go with safety at uninterrupted high speed. Both the sea-level canal and the proposed lock canal would be too narrow and shallow to be called with any truthfullness a strait, or to have any of the properties of a wide deepwater strip. Both of them would be canals, pure and simple. Each type has certain disadvantages and certain advantages. But, in my judgment, the disdvantages are fewer and the advantages very much greater in the case of a lock canal substantially as proposed in the papers forwarded herewith; and I call especial attention to the fact that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project.

A careful study of the reports seems to establish a strong probability that the following are the facts: The sea-level canal would be slightly less exposed to damage in the event of war, the running expenses, apart from the heavy cost of interest on the amount employed to build it, would be less, and for small ships the time of transit would probably be less. On the other hand, the lock canal at a level of 80 feet or thereabouts would not cost much more than half as much to build and could be built in about half the time, while there would be very much less risk connected with building it, and for large ships the transit would be quicker; while, taking into account the interest on the amount saved in building, the actual cost of maintenance would be less. After being built it would be easier to enlarge the lock canal than the sea-level canal. Moreover, what has been actually demonstrated in making and operating the great lock canal, the Soo, a more important artery of traffic than the great sea-level canal, the Suez, goes to support the opinion of the minority of the Consulting Board of Engineers and of the majority of the Isthmian Canal Commission as to the superior safety, feasibility, and desirability of building a lock canal at Panama.

The law now on our statute books seems to contemplate a lock canal. In my judgment a lock canal, as herein recommended, is advisable. If the Congress directs that a sea-level canal be constructed its direction will, of course, be carried out. Otherwise the canal will be built on substantially the plan for a lock canal outlined by the accompanying papers, such changes being made, of course, as may be found actually necessary, including possibly the change recommended by the Secretary of War as to the site of the dam on the Pacific side.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1906.*

Private Power Comparison Backfires—TVA Is National Asset, Skybolt a Dud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, private power interests have once again attempted to launch a bitter attack on the Tennessee Valley Authority by making an ironic comparison of the TVA and the Skybolt development project.

Private power interests in national magazines have gone so far as to say that investment of tax dollars into the Skybolt project buy defense while tax money used to construct public power-plants and transmission lines is spent needlessly. How wrong indeed are the propagandists. Skybolt has been canceled as a dud, while TVA continues as a national asset.

The Nashville Tennessean has pointed out the complete folly of the statement contained in this advertising and has shown that the TVA has returned to the Treasury more than enough money to pay for the costly Skybolt program which was a miserable failure and which has been canceled by the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE POWER COMPARISON BACKFIRES—TVA IS NATIONAL ASSET, SKYBOLT A DUD

The private power interests have renewed their age-old attacks on public power, using their unlimited cash resources to manu-

facture phony charges and circulate uninformed criticism. As usual, the propaganda peddlers have singled out the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Year after year TVA continues to serve its customers, neither feeling the need nor having the funds to engage in propaganda warfare with rich private power. But this time the anti-public-power crusade has backfired, demonstrating the low level to which its promoters are willing to stoop.

In current issues of national magazines a full page color advertisement appears showing missiles on the wing of a bomber. The accompanying text reads:

"When Skybolt rides a bomber your tax dollars buy defense, but when your tax money is used to build more Federal Government-owned electrical plants and transmission lines it is spent needlessly."

This obviously was to have been the mighty opening gun in a winter offensive against public power. It also represents a little flag waving and a degree of false patriotism on the part of private power interests.

It is a wrench of logic to compare a resource development program with a missile project, but the tricksters employed by the wealthy power corporations didn't hesitate to invent a comparison, pitting the value of Skybolt against the value of TVA.

Therefore, let the real values speak for themselves.

Skybolt was a flop. Obviously it did not represent a good investment of tax dollars. The administration wisely canceled Skybolt after many unsuccessful tests, concluding that any future outlays of funds would be "spent needlessly."

The Government during two administrations already had poured $353 million into Skybolt.

It is ironic that since its beginning in 1933 TVA has returned to the Treasury of the Federal Government $348 million from power revenues and $42 million from nonpower revenues. This total of $390 million is enough to have paid for the now impractical Skybolt with $37 million left over for some worthwhile defense project.

This $390 million, incidentally, does not include payments of $190,500,000 TVA has paid in lieu of city, county, and State taxes during its lifetime.

Interesting too is the fact that the Skybolt development project calls for a thousand missiles for the Air Force and another 100 for Great Britain—at an estimated total cost of $2.5 billion.

Again ironic, since the effort to compare missiles and resource development has been made, is the fact that during the 30-year history of TVA appropriated funds for all valley projects—dams for navigation, dams for flood control, power itself, experimentation, fertilizer production and the rest—amounted to $2.5 billion, or precisely the amount estimated necessary to make Skybolt operational.

Even these figures ignore many other facts about TVA: Resource development creates a climate favorable to industry. This means more jobs and more productivity for the area affected. It brings about general growth and added revenue to State and local governments as well as to the Federal Government. In addition, atomic energy plants and other Federal defense agencies use electricity from TVA at a special reduced rate, saving taxpayers millions of dollars each year—$50 million last year alone.

If the power interests want to make comparisons they should take note that the savings the Federal Government has realized from this reduced rate during the last 9 years have amounted to enough money to have built the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, or more than all the funds spent thus far on Skybolt.

The reason private power interests launched these bitter and frequently uninformed blasts at TVA is because TVA rates force them to hold their own electric power prices down. Millions of electricity users elsewhere in the country are paying lower electric rates because of TVA's "yardstick" policy.

Surveys show that residential electric rates grow progressively higher as the distance from TVA increases.

Yet private power blithely asserts "when Skybolt rides a bomber, your tax dollars buy defense, but—."

The truth is that Skybolt was a skyburst and the private power interests, not realizing it, fell into their own pit of quicksand.

From the beginning, the people of the Tennessee Valley have seen through the gross huckstering and stupid misstatements of fact of the rich utility corporations. Now perhaps others will recognize the brainwashing tactics for what they are—hogwash.

Oil Spokesman Shocked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the tax proposals made last Thursday by the President in his message to the Congress were very broad and will require much serious study before action is taken. At first glance many of the programs seem sound and equitable.

However, the proposals effecting the petroleum industry seem to me to reflect a lack of understanding of the problems of this vital sector of our economy. The oil industry, so vital to our national security and our continued progress in living standards, has been declining for the past several years. The new tax proposals of the President would hasten this decline and severely hamper an industry which needs help and not another setback.

A statement issued last Thursday afternoon by Mr. Harold Decker, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, states the case of the oil industry and points out very well the disastrous effects the new tax proposals would have on the oil industry if they were adopted. Here is Mr. Decker's statement:

President Kennedy in his tax message to the Congress today has recommended changes in petroleum tax policy which would be a drastic setback to the economy and national security. His proposals would directly and severely depress the development of oil and gas resources.

The President's recommendations are shocking because the effect of the proposed changes on the Nation's largest resource industry would run contrary to his objective of stimulating capital investment and economic growth.

The recommendations are designed to impose an additional tax burden of $280 million on oil and gas development. Dollar-wise, this is equivalent to reducing percentage depletion from 27½ to 17½ percent. Even worse from the standpoint of the national economy, this additional tax would come directly at the expense of the development of our petroleum resources.

It would reduce drilling activity by more than 5,000 wells per year, which would cost the Nation more than 500 million barrels of new oil reserves each year.

The President's proposal, if enacted into law, would threaten the self-sufficiency of our Nation in petroleum. The industry already is in a depressed condition. Exploration and development activity has declined steadily for 6 years. In 1962 exploratory drilling, the necessary forerunner to the discovery of new reserves, was more than 30 percent below the rate in 1956. So far this year, it has suffered a further decline. Only yesterday it was reported that domestic rotary rig activity is at a 19-year low.

In discussing the broad objectives of the tax philosophy of his administration before the New York Economic Club last December 14, President Kennedy made clear that the basic goal would be to stimulate the economy, and stated that "we can and must step up development of our national resources."

In light of the stated objectives of the President, it comes as a shock to us that he would propose and advocate adverse changes in the long-standing resource tax policy which the Congress wisely has maintained in recognition of the peculiarities of the petroleum industry, the hazardous risk in oil exploration, and the unusually large capital requirements of the petroleum producing industry, which exceed those of any other industry.

The recommended changes which the President has made would seriously aggravate the unhealthy conditions which the domestic oil producing industry is now experiencing. Both the political and business communities are advocating tax and fiscal policies designed to stimulate capital expenditures and economic expansion. These goals cannot be served by actions which would discourage the Nation's largest natural resource industry, expending about $5 billion annually for exploration and development, with roots in thousands of local communities in more than 30 oil and gas producing States.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America is confident that congressional studies will reconfirm, as previous ones have for more than three decades, both the necessity and propriety of existing petroleum tax provisions.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the Democratic National Committee Luncheon, January 19, 1963, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a recent luncheon of the Democratic National Committee and hear our distinguished Vice President make a stirring speech on the philosophy and role of the Democratic Party over the years. I urge my colleagues to read this wonderful expression of the belief and guidelines of politics as enunciated

by a man who adopted them as his way of life. It follows:

I have never ceased to be amazed by the dedication of the loyal Democratic Party workers who give so freely of their time and their energies to a cause. To me, this is one of the true strengths of a free people.

You have put aside your affairs and traveled hundreds, and even thousands, of miles to strengthen the party. And you have done so only because you believe in goals which are over and beyond your own, individual interests.

A democratic form of government can exist in the modern world only if people organize themselves to make a point of view effective. Without that organization, government becomes the exclusive province of a small group of officials who have succeeded by one means or another in capturing power. And government that is exclusive is exclusive of the people.

There is a cynical view which holds that politics is the art of organizing to seize power. In our country, I believe, it is the art of organizing to achieve goals that will serve the people.

You and I have chosen the Democratic Party, because we have faith in its dreams and aspirations. And, as we close out the books on the first 2 years of a Democratic administration, I feel we can conclude that our faith has been justified under the leadership of John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy likes to trace our party's beginning back to 1791, when Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe went from Virginia to New England on what they called a botanizing excursion. The seeds they planted on that trip blossomed almost immediately, and the plant still bears fresh fruit every year in the form of new leaders, new ideas, new accomplishments, and new victories.

We are here as members of the world's third oldest party, and we were a going concern when the English Whigs and Tories were merely the political arm of a few established families.

I never tire of telling people why I think we have remained in good shape for so many years. There is a lesson in this great political success story, and the better we remember it the more effective we will be when we leave Washington and return to our homes and the voters, the real source of our party's strength.

Franklin Roosevelt once said that the Democratic Party would be the majority party as long as it belonged to the people. He went on to describe our party as one that believes "in the wisdom and efficacy of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority."

Our party, Roosevelt said, also "believes that, as new conditions arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them."

These are principles of constant change—as man's needs are constantly changing. But they are firmly rooted in stable and fruitful soil.

To begin with, we Democrats are not an exclusive party. If this country was founded as a haven where all who believe in liberty could come, live together in harmony, and try to make their lives better, then it follows that a party which hopes to lead the country must believe in these things, too.

So we Democrats have always been the one great national political party, made up of people from all sections, all classes, all races, all religions. From the outset, we have been the party that has met the immigrant at the dock and helped him to become a citizen—just as it reached out a helping hand to the sharecropper, the working man, the student, and the businessman.

But we knew that this was not enough. Jefferson said that the only healthy republic was one of educated citizens, each with a stake in his country's welfare. So we believe in educating each American to the utmost of his capacity. So we believe in the right of every American to have an equal chance to contribute his talent to our country.

Our foreign policy has been equally uncomplicated down through the years. We Democrats, of course, believe that in a world of aggressors our country can only remain free by remaining brave, by remaining strong. But we do not arm for conquest. We arm to maintain freedom and preserve peace.

But we also believe that "the best way to have a good neighbor is to be one." This is the basis our historic reciprocal trade policy, which encourages commerce among all the nations of the globe. It is the basis of our support of the United Nations in its painful quest for world order, and of our support of programs which help others to help themselves.

These principles, as you can see, are neither numerous nor hard to understand. But they have lasted, and our party has lasted with them.

When I entered politics, some 30-odd years ago, I found my natural home in the Democratic Party. It wasn't hard for me to join—I was born one.

I found it easy to remain in the Democratic Party because my deepest personal political principles were at home there.

I believe that it is the politican's first duty to hold his country together, to appeal to the forces that unite us, and to channel the forces that divide us into paths where a democratic solution is possible. It is our obligation to resolve issues—not to create them.

None of us will ever live to see our country perfect, just as we will never live to see ourselves perfect. But we can try—and if we leave the world a little better than we found it and if we die with a little more understanding than we had when we were born, we are doing all right. I have found that being a Democrat has helped me to try to do both.

Our work is made easier because during the past 2 years, we have had a man in the White House who has dedicated his life to advancing the cause of freedom and social justice in every corner of our land and in every corner of the globe.

John F. Kennedy has taken the principles of the Democratic Party and has applied them to solving the world's problems.

Because our administration believes in strength, freedom is stronger everywhere in the world. We have pulled the fangs of the Cuban rattlesnake—and made it clear there were no limits to our determination to defend our security.

By calling the bluff in Cuba, we made freedom in Berlin and southeast Asia that much surer. And, where a few short years ago the Communist world was solid and united, its major preoccupation today is a bitter internal quarrel between its two most powerful leaders.

Because we believe in collective security and in being a good neighbor, we have supported intelligent trade, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the United Nations.

Because we believe in solving problems, we are seeking to bring our economy to full capacity, so that every American capable of holding a job or a place in college attains those goals; so that the senior citizens among us need no longer feel the crippling financial effects of lingering illness, and so that our great metropolitan areas are made livable for the overwhelming majority of Americans who reside in them.

The Democratic Party has grown in recent years because the people know it is the best vehicle for carrying out their hopes for a better world. We have gained this confidence for three reasons.

First is our history, our principles, and our present program.

Second is our willingness to work long and hard for what we believe in. We know that human needs change, and we must plan for the future. But also we know that current needs must be solved. We are trusted because we have the eyes to see what must be done and the courage to do it.

Third is the kind of people our party attracts. I mean more than the tens of millions of voters—a vast majority, by the way—who consider themselves Democrats. I mean the kind of people—the hundreds in this room and the millions of people to whom we will carry the message when we leave here—who hold our party together.

So I would like to thank you again, in behalf of the President and myself, for what you did for us in 1960; for what you did last year; and for what you will do next year to help elect the Democratic candidates for President and Vice President—whoever they might be.

We will meet again next year to choose those candidates. If the Democratic Party holds true to the country, and if we hold true to our party, we will have doubly earned the victory that will be ours.

Influence for Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many people have been rightly concerned with the recent emasculation of the civil service system by the Democratic National Committee in the brazen pressure it put upon career Federal employees to buy $100 tickets to the committee sponsored vaudeville show. The following article by Robert Baskin in the Dallas Morning News has even more frightening implications wherein White House influence was peddled at $1,000 a clip. Is there no lengths to which the Kennedy administration refuses to go in playing politics and in building a political machine in the basest image of ward-heeling politics?

CLUB MAY HAVE TROUBLE MAKING GOOD ON PROMISES

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—The Presidential box at the National Theater in Washington contains seats for six persons.

What, then, might happen if some 32 Dallas residents—or, worse still, 500 people from across the country—demanded their right to exercise the privileges of the newly formed President's Club?

Membership in the President's Club cost $1,000 a member and members have been assured, by telephone but not in writing, of a number of special privileges not conferred on ordinary taxpaying citizens.

The right to sit in the President's box at various public functions is one of these.

But there are other prerogatives attached to membership in this exclusive club, which sets a record in Presidential effort to assist the financial condition of the Democratic Party.

Each member, for instance, receives a gold-plated membership card in the President's Club, good for 1 year—which means it is good until next year's party fundraising effort starts.

Members of the club, who held their first gathering last Friday at Washington's International Inn, with personal greetings from the President and Vice President and their wives, are also entitled to an invitation to at least one major White House social function during the year.

This, in itself, is going to be difficult to arrange. If carried out, some White House social events will be dominated by the $1,000 card holders, including a very sizable contingent of socially aspiring and well-heeled Texans.

This is not all of it.

Some of the elite crew have been advised that a so-called liaison office is being established at the White House just to handle problems that members of the President's Club have with the Federal Government.

One can readily see that the $1,000 membership in the club could be the biggest bargain ever conceived, particularly if a member has a problem in the field of Government controls.

Invitations to the $1,000 event carried none of these promises of special favor.

However, various officials in the Democratic National Committee followed up the printed invitations with phone calls which assured the recipients of special considerations involved, although these assurances varied somewhat from person to person.

Most Washington lobbyists, for example, were told nothing about the White House liaison office, since they would know this was a pretty ridiculous prospect. Some of the folks in the hinterlands got no word on the presidential box project.

But practically everyone was assured that he would be invited to a major White House social event during the year.

There is a lot of cynicism among the veteran Washington lobbyists who had to shell out the $1,000 for the elite dinner last Friday, at which the President and his wife tablehopped while the paying guests ate. They later sat down for dinner privately with Vice President and Mrs. Johnson.

"It represents a new low for the office of the Presidency," said one lobbyist who attended the $1,000 dinner.

Youth and Unemployment in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which was broadcast over WCBS-TV in New York City on January 11 and January 12.

The problems of a city the size of New York are many and varied. One of the most serious is that of unemployed and—at present—unemployable young people. A strong campaign and concerted effort must begin now to solve this problem if these young people are to be turned into useful citizens.

The editorial follows:

YOUTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN NEW YORK CITY

ANNOUNCER. The following program is an expression of opinion of WCBS-TV. Speaking for the station: Mr. Norman E. Walt Jr., vice president and general manager of WCBS-TV.

Mr. WALT. Good evening.

New York City is developing a new kind of unemployment problem that may seriously affect its economic life as well as the welfare and safety of its citizens.

Recently, the mayor's task force on youth reported that there are almost 77,000 young people in our city who are out of school and out of work, and that the number of unemployed youth is increasing steadily. Some eagerly seek work and a few manage to find occasional, part-time employment. But a large number of them have stopped looking for work altogether because they are convinced their search will be fruitless, and they are drifting on a tide of frustration and despair.

Who are these young people? A large percentage of them are Puerto Rican and Negro. But nearly all the young unemployed, regardless of their economic or racial backgrounds, are school dropouts.

Each of these young people represents a tragic human waste. But what happens to them as individuals also has consequences for the entire community.

The existence of large numbers of untrained, poorly educated young people is a major problem for our business and industry. Office and industry jobs increasingly demand a minimum of high school education or special training. Many offices and plants will be forced to relocate outside the city, if a sizable portion of the city's work force can't meet their job requirements.

These young unemployed also present a serious threat to those who are employed. Cheap labor in large supply inevitably depresses the labor market and affects everyone else's living standards. It encourages "sweat shops" and economic exploitation.

In fact, the existence of a mass of unemployed youth affects every resident of the city. Idleness and juvenile delinquency go hand in hand. Crime in our city streets has already caused many families to flee the city. If these young people are permitted to attain maturity without any improvement in their lives, even more people will leave the city to avoid the burden of coping with large-scale poverty, unemployment and crime. Every taxpayer should realize that an unemployed youth who is not helped today becomes a community burden tomorrow.

It is, therefore, in our interests—as taxpayers, as employers, as workers—to see that something is done for these young people. It is not simply a matter of finding jobs for them. These youngsters are caught in a vicious circle. There are few jobs for which they are qualified. They are not qualified because they dropped out of school. They dropped out of school because there is no motivation to continue. And they don't have the motivation to remain in school because they have seen from the experience of their parents, older brothers, sisters and friends that racial discrimination bars them from most job opportunities.

This truly is a vicious circle and it has to be broken at many points. As Mayor Wagner pointed out recently, we have to deal with the total environment of these youngsters—housing, family relations, education, and discrimination in hiring. There are any number of well-intentioned public and private agencies who are trying to do just this—the schools themselves, welfare agencies, youth services, employer and trade union groups. But none of them are as effective as they might be because each operates on its own, with little or no heed to the work of other agencies and frequently with duplication of effort. For example, there are school vocational courses which train youngsters for jobs which rarely exist, such as cabinet-making, while there are no training opportunities at all in a number of fields where there are job opportunities. Again, for lack of coordination, various vocational schools are actually in competition with one another for available jobs.

What is needed is a team effort with a good quarterback.

During the past year, the city youth board made a good start toward creating this kind of effort when it sponsored the mayor's task force on youth and work. But this is only a start. There still is no citywide agency which coordinates all the various youth programs and services now in existence. There still is no single agency in the city responsible for gathering the kind of information which would provide schools with a clear picture of the changing job market, that would identify expanding industries and new skill requirements and thereby define the kinds of vocational programs the schools should emphasize. What the city needs is a single agency that would provide this information service and, at the same time, have the responsibility for planning overall city youth policy and seeing to it that all the youth services work together as a team. Without such an agency, much of the efforts to help young people in our city will miss their mark.

Channel 2 urges the mayor to give the youth board the authority and the financing to enable it to develop an overall plan of attack on youth unemployment and to see that the best use is made of present efforts. Channel 2 urges the mayor to take such steps now. The presence of large numbers of unemployed youth in the city is social dynamite. No problem has a more compelling claim on our attention and on our resources.

Thank you and goodnight.

Mrs. Harper Sibley: A Matter of Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my home community of Rochester, N.Y., has as one of its residents one of the distinguished women of the world. She is Mrs. Harper Sibley.

Mrs. Sibley has gained distinction far and wide for her selfless activities. She has applied her talents and energies to a host of humanitarian projects. Not alone has been the benefit to mankind of Mrs. Sibley's contributions, for her service also has proved an inspiring example to other women.

On a recent visit to her home from one of her many globe encircling missions, Mrs. Sibley gave an interview to the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. I take pleasure in submitting it at this time for insertion in the RECORD:

MRS. SIBLEY RETURNS—HOME FRONT WHIRL BEGINS

(By Lynne Watson)

Rochester's famous lady has been home for just 5 days after a 4-month trip to

Europe and the Near East, barely enough time for her to open the piles of mail in her office at her 400 East Avenue home.

In fact Mrs. Harper Sibley probably won't get all that mail read, for the churchwoman and lecturer is off again tonight—this time to New York for meetings on one of her favorite projects, the Japan International Christian University.

After New York, Mrs. Sibley goes to Oxford, Ohio, to speak to Western College for Women. In February she plans a trip to California to see "my two daughters, six grandchildren and five great-great-grandchildren there" as well as address a Rotary meeting in Los Angeles and a women's group in San Francisco.

Today's agenda is typical of the fast-moving former president of the United Council of Church Women. She'll introduce Andrew W. Cordier, dean of the Graduate School of International Affairs at Columbia University, to the City Club of the Chamber of Commerce, and speak that evening herself at the Century Club.

Mrs. Sibley thrives on this schedule which would exhaust many a man or woman younger than her 75 years.

"I believe there are infinite sources of energy in the universe," she said last night at her home. "It's a question of living in harmony with these spiritual resources."

As usual on her trips abroad, Mrs. Sibley combined her love of travel with a desire to check the progress of religion in other nations.

As an unofficial observer at the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council in Rome, she found this historic meeting "has moved so fast that of the eight volumes of schemata (agenda) for its reopening September 8, the second already has needed revising."

She had these comments on other subjects:

The Supreme Court decision outlawing the board of regents school prayer in this State: "It's too bad the regents wrote that prayer," she said. "But it really was a Government group entering into the picture. This doesn't mean religion is finished in our schools—there's just a little hysteria at the moment over the decision."

Israel: "Israel has had a great deal of help" from other countries in its drive for progress. "But I hate to see girls in military uniforms, it's bad enough the boys must do it."

Evangelists: "Certain people have been stirred to something very permanent" after hearing one of them. She welcomes the rebirth of religion that some observers feel is happening in America, but cautions that nuclear war alone shouldn't send people to God—"religion just from fear has no validity."

A nonbeliever in God can also live life to its utmost, "but he misses something," said the widow of the former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

"Why live in the cellar and not see the sun?"

The Administration's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to some remarks in the January 24 issue of the Durand Gazette, Durand, Ill., under the column entitled "In This Column," written by the Editor and Publisher Mr. John van Sickle.

I think that these few lines very succinctly captured the thoughts of many thinking citizens with respect to the administration's tax proposals. The article follows:

IN THIS COLUMN

No matter what your politics happen to be, does it make sense to increase the Federal budget and propose tax cuts in almost the same breath?

Admittedly, I am no economist, but I know that if I don't put more money in the bank than I check out, that I am headed for trouble. Perhaps, a government can run its finances differently.

President Kennedy's theory is that a cut in income taxes will give people more money to spend, will create more consumer demand, and eventually enable the United States to balance its budget as improved business conditions will be reflected in higher tax collections even at lower rates.

But, to be realistic, if our Government continues to spend more than it takes in, will this not lead to inflation and depreciation of the value of the dollar still further?

Senator DIRKSEN says the budget proposals are incredible. Indeed they are. Even many of the Democrats are alarmed at the size of the budget.

Nor is the end in sight. With medicare given a chance of being adopted during this session of Congress, another increase in social security taxes lie just ahead.

Probably the thing that irks me the most is that I know there is so much waste in Federal spending. When a government is as large as ours, there is bound to be an immense amount of waste, but it breaks my heart to pay my income taxes and know that so much of what you and I have paid will literally be going down the drain.

George H. Mead—The Mead Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, George H. Mead was not only a great industrialist, but he was a great American. Mr. Mead became the first president of the Mead Corp. when it was formed from the Mead Paper Co. in 1930. In 1942 he was elected chairman of the board. At the time of his recent passing at age 85, he was honorary chairman of the board.

Although the headquarters of this great corporation is in Dayton, Ohio, and Chillicothe, Ohio, is the "White Paper capital of the world," Mead was a leading pioneer in the development of the paper industry in the South.

Few people know the story of the paper industry in the South, and the important part it has played in developing the South's great new vigor and economic progress. Mead played a major role in this southern development. Today every school boy in the South knows the importance of tree farming.

Mr. Mead devoted much of his energy to the national welfare. He was one of the founders of the Business Advisory Council for the United States in 1933, and a member of the National Defense Mediation Board in 1941. He served on the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government in 1947.

As a member of the National War Labor Board in 1942, he was closely associated with the "Assistant President of the United States," our own beloved James F. Byrnes. He greatly aided Mr. Byrnes in mobilizing the industry and manpower of this Nation for complete victory over the Axis Powers.

Mr. Mead maintained a residence at Aiken, S.C., and donated his property at Aiken to St. Thaddeus Episcopal Church in 1955 for the establishment of a school, Mead Hall, in memory of George H. Mead, Jr., who was the first marine officer killed at Guadalcanal, during World War II.

The following editorial from the Kingsport Times, Kingsport, Tenn., where one of the Mead plants is located, pays a very eloquent and deserved tribute to George H. Mead, industrialists, philanthropist, and American patriot:

A BUILDER OF AMERICA

In a day and age when the old-fashioned American businessman has become almost an object of suspicion to some people, or at least regarded as something out of date, it is good to remind ourselves that there is no class of people to whom this country owes more than this same businessman. There is no class of people who have contributed more to building the country and who have done more to bring into being the American way of life. While the socialists and demagogues and political opportunists slander the American businessman with dirty words, he has been the real builder of America.

We are reminded of this fact by the death of George Mead, honorary board chairman of the Mead Corp. George Mead was one of those industrial tycoons we hear so much about. In the course of a long and vigorous life he had the leading role in the building of a great industry that gave many thousands of Americans jobs and in so doing helped to create many happy and prosperous communities in this country.

George Mead was not the classical example of the poor American boy struggling up from the bottom. He was the classical example of the young man brought up in a good home, given a good education which included understanding of the responsibility of citizenship. He went to work to prove that he had learned that lesson and he proved his right to come to the top by the use of a good brain, a fine character and the use of the old-fashioned virtue of hard work and diligence.

Like other men of his stamp and caliber George Mead took time out for what is called public service. He took on government work and served on many advisory committees and agencies of the Federal Government under different Presidents. But the point we would like to make and a point we think really needs stressing in our time is that his greatest public service was the role he played in the development of American industry. This was every bit as much public service as his work with government agencies, and we submit that it had a greater impact, a greater effect on the country and came closer to the American people. America would not be America without this sort of public service.

We here in Kingsport know something of this fact. We know that much of the prosperity and happiness of our people comes from the growth of the Mead operation in this city. We know what a shattering effect it would have if the plant shut down for good. We know that the men who operate the plant here understand that the manufacture of paper is not the be-all and end-all of their work. It is a contribution to the growth of the community and the growth of the Nation. This is not a materialistic idea but a human idea.

We get a little tired of hearing demagogs speak of corporations as if they were some devilish invention of wicked men. We get a little irritated at hearing it implied that all businessmen are interested in is profit and have no concern for human values. That does not square with the facts. The history of this country gives it the lie.

Men like George Mead in their lives give the lie to such charges and insinuations. The growth of America has been the growth of American business. It is American business that creates the jobs for our millions of people and gives them the highest standard of living of any people on earth.

George Mead was a representative of the highest type of American businessman. We repeat, it is such men who are the true builders of America.

Fifth Anniversary of International Tracking of Space Vehicles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release from National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERNATIONAL TRACKING OF SPACE VEHICLES

The Government and people of the United States will express their thanks and appreciation to the peoples and governments of 16 countries at a ceremony marking the 5th anniversary of international tracking of space vehicles on January 31 at the Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, will participate in the program.

The Vice President, as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, will award scrolls of appreciation to the ambassadors of the countries which have cooperated with the United States in the establishment of the worldwide networks used in tracking manned and unmanned satellites.

Dr. Harry Goett, Director of the Goddard facility, will preside at the ceremonies and Astronaut Walter M. Schirra, Jr., of the Manned Spacecraft Center will be among the speakers.

The tracking station network was activated to track *Explorer I*, launched on January 31, 1958. This network included minitrack stations located primarily in the Western Hemisphere. Since that time, other networks—Deep Space, Manned Space Flight, and Baker-Nunn—have been added to form a worldwide tracking network and data acquisition system for satellites and space probes launched by the United States.

Explorer I carried the International Geophysical Year scientific experiment of Dr. James A. Van Allen and discovered the radiation belt around the earth. The satellite is still in orbit, although no longer transmitting information from space. A model of this first U.S. earth satellite will be displayed for the occasion, as well as other historic NASA satellites and launch vehicles.

A signal from this country's oldest transmitting satellite is expected to be received in the Goddard auditorium during the ceremonies. This is the 6-inch grapefruit-sized Vanguard I, launched March 17, 1958, whose transmissions led to calculations showing that the earth is pear shaped. Information received from Vanguard I via the tracking networks has also helped in locating points on earth to an accuracy not previously known and has provided data on the effects of solar pressure.

While the other speakers will talk of the scientific and political implications of such a worldwide cooperative effort, Astronaut Schirra, whose Sigma 7 spacecraft orbited the earth six times last October 3, will express his personal appreciation and that of his fellow astronauts for the manned space flight network which kept Astronauts John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, and himself in constant communication by voice and signal with men on the ground during their orbits around the earth.

Following the formal anniversary ceremonies, the Ambassadors and other guests will tour Goddard facilities and view the progress made in earth's contact with outer space. The Goddard tour will show how the limited communications which tracked Explorer I 5 years ago have expanded through the demands of the space age to an integrated network of teletype, telephone, and high-speed data circuits comprising 177,000 miles of communications with 27 oversea facilities in 19 different political jurisdictions.

The minitrack network has grown to a worldwide tracking and data acquisition system for unmanned satellites and space probes launched by the United States. Established primarily in the Western Hemisphere in 1958, minitrack today comprises five stations in the United States and eight abroad. These stations provide precision tracking, command and telemetry data to the Space Operations Control Center on such satellites as Vanguard, Explorer, as well as the Ariel and Alouette scientific satellites of the United Kingdom and Canada.

Spacecraft traveling to the moon and beyond are tracked by the Deep Space Instrumentation Facility (DSIF) network. Three permanent installations of powerful transmitters and sensitive receivers are located approximately 120 degrees apart around the earth at Goldstone, Calif.; Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa; and Woomera, Australia.

The manned space flight network was built for the specific requirements of Project Mercury, which demands constant and dependable communications by voice with the astronaut from launch to landing. This network is capable of faster data handling than minitrack and maintains immediacy of conversational contact with the capsule through eight ground stations abroad, eight ground stations in the United States plus U.S. ships at sea.

The fourth tracking network is optical rather than electronic and comprises a worldwide system of Baker-Nunn telescopic cameras. While used as backup for the radio tracking system, its primary function is to obtain information on atmospheric densities and exact earth dimensions. The network is operated by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory under a NASA grant and functions in nine countries abroad.

Countries to receive scrolls of appreciation for their international efforts from Vice President JOHNSON are: the Argentine Republic, Australia, the United States of Brazil, Canada, the Republic of Chile, the Republic of Ecuador, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and northern Ireland, India, Iran, Japan, the United Mexican States, the Netherlands, the Federation of Nigeria, the Republic of Peru, the Republic of South Africa, and Spain.

New Farm Policy Omits Mandates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 25, 1963, edition of the Albert Lea Tribune. I call attention to the views stated in this editorial because they are such an outstanding presentation of the opinions of many of the people in our agricultural areas and worthy of consideration by my colleagues.

NEW FARM POLICY OMITS MANDATES

With no little satisfaction, the Tribune notes that the Kennedy administration will abandon its get tough policy for farmers. We have long protested the "or else" approach to the problems of surplus farm produce. Newsmen now write from Washington that a special farm message may be submitted to the Congress in a few days that will emphasize voluntary compliance.

Mandatory controls were the basis of Democratic election campaign in 1960 and were basic to legislative proposals made to the Congress in 1961 and again last year. This rigid control approach has long been advocated by Dr. Willard Cochrane, formerly a teacher at the University of Minnesota. When former Governor Freeman became Secretary of Agriculture, he took Cochrane and Cochrane's ideas with him to Washington.

It seems worth noting that the news of the administration's about face on its farm approaches was given to news reporters by "an authoritative source." Secretary Freeman wasn't that source and only in the most lengthy dispatches does the Secretary's name appear at all and then only in connection with the dairy industry program—which even he admits is failing.

The best news is that no longer will a farmer be forced to do what his Government believes to be good for him or face economic ruin. As noted above, the administration—which is to say Secretary Freeman—had urged rigid controls on farmers in the Congress twice and twice the Congress voted not to extend the managed production concept.

The Congress, instead, adopted voluntary statutes. Results in the voluntary feed grain program are generally so satisfactory, the administration has apparently decided on its shift from mandatory to voluntary controls for feed grains, dairy and cotton programs.

Taxpayers will benefit from this shift of policy. The feed grains program will cost less, because the present voluntary program has markedly reduced surpluses. A dairy

program is expected to cost nearly $150 million less than today's figure. Cotton costs will offset some of these savings.

But the most important fact of all is that the gun has been removed from the farmer's head.

Dr. Kelsey Describes New Drug Protections for the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as an absolutely safe drug—one which would not be harmful to some one, or to many people, under certain circumstances. That is why the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for nearly 25 years has required extensive pretesting of all new drugs before they can be placed on sale.

But the 1938 act nevertheless had many deficiencies. These loopholes were recognized by some of us long before the thalidomide incident last year stirred public concern to such a fever pitch that we were finally able to close the worst loopholes in the 1938 act applying to prescription drugs. My bill introduced originally in January 1961, H.R. 1235, to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, contained many of the provisions of the prescription drug provisions of the law we enacted last year along with provisions to close other loopholes in the act. Eliminating the provisions of H.R. 1235 on new drugs which are now law, I have now reintroduced substantially the same bill in this Congress, under the same number, H.R. 1235, to achieve the additional reforms needed in our 25-year-old consumer protection laws. These include stronger controls over over-the-counter drugs, over barbiturates, and over amphetimines, the pretesting for safety of all cosmetics, more stringent factory inspection requirements for all foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the required pretesting for safety and efficacy of therapeutic devices, and so on.

TIGHTER SUPERVISION OVER EXPERIMENTAL DRUGS

Under the Drug Control Act we passed last year, the public is now being given far greater protection in connection with the experimental use of new drugs before they go on sale. It is most fitting that Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, the one individual most directly responsible for preventing the sale in this country of the drug thalidomide, is now in charge of this work as the newly designated chief of the Investigational Drug Branch of the Food and Drug Administration.

Her assignment is an extremely difficult one because, as I noted earlier, there is no such thing as a completely safe drug under all circumstances. She must weigh the methods being used to test drugs before they can be used experimentally on humans. She is also in charge of the re-investigations of drugs previously approved for sale. One of the main achievements of the new law we passed last year, based on one of the cardinal points in H.R. 1235 as introduced originally in 1961, is in the form of new powers the Government now has to remove from public sale previously approved drugs which are later suspected of constituting an imminent hazard to public health. Previously, the Government had to prove such a drug was actually dangerous in use in order to revoke its earlier clearance and take it off the market.

"ON THE RECORD" INTERVIEW WITH DR. KESLEY

Public confidence in the protections accorded consumers under our drug laws will certainly rise as a result of the assignment of Dr. Kelsey to this important assignment, and also by the intelligent and forthright manner in which she has undertaken this challenging and awesome responsibility.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks an excellent article by an outstanding Washington correspondent, James Deakin, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, about Dr. Kelsey's approach to her new assignment. This article is based on a joint interview conducted with Dr. Kelsey by representatives of the Detroit News, Newark News, and Washington Star, as well as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Many of the Members may have seen the copyrighted question-and-answer interview yesterday in the Sunday Washington Star. While both papers in which I have seen the interview used the question-and-answer text in full, each had its own analysis and summary of the information, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring Mr. Deakin's story to the attention of the Members.

Jim Deakin has followed the drug-control issue over a long period of time. He did an outstanding job of informing the people of St. Louis about the need for tighter food, drug and cosmetic legislation long before we had ever heard the word "thalidomide." I am grateful to him for the many stories he has written over the years about my concern in this field, and I herewith present his account of the joint interview with Dr. Kelsey along with the text of the reporters' questions and Dr. Kelsey's answers, as carried in Sunday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

TWELVE MORE DRUGS SUSPECTED OF CAUSING DEFORMITIES

(By James Deakin)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The Government has asked for reports from the manufacturers of 12 drugs suspected of being possible causes of birth deformities, Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the Food and Drug Administration said today.

Dr. Kelsey emphasized, however, that there is no proof at present that any of these drugs actually are harmful. If any proof had been found, she said, "something would have been done."

As an FDA medical officer, Dr. Kelsey last year prevented the sale of the drug thalidomide in the United States, by refusing to license it for commercial distribution. Thalidomide is believed to have caused birth deformities in thousands of European babies.

Dr. Kelsey talked with Post-Dispatch, Detroit News, Washington Star, and Newark News reporters in one of a series of copyrighted, on-the-record interviews with Government officials. She was appointed last month as Director of the FDA's new Investigational Drug Branch.

In reply to a question, she confirmed that the 12 drugs under investigation are in the popular and much-sold fields of tranquilizers, antihistamines and various cold remedies. Some of the antihistamines are taken by pregnant women as treatment for morning sickness.

Dr. Kelsey pointed out, however, that the drugs in question can be obtained only with a physician's prescription if they are recommended for use during pregnancy.

Two of the drugs on which reports are being sought, Dr. Kelsey said, are preludin and postafen, both of which are suspected of being possible causes of deformities in newborn babies.

Preludin, also known as phenmetrazine, is an appetite-curbing preparation. Postafen, an antihistamine preparation sometimes mixed with the vitamin pyridoxine, is a remedy for morning sickness.

The other drugs under investigation were not identified, but in a recent speech at a symposium on birth defects, Dr. Kelsey listed several others believed in medical circles to be possible causes of birth deformities. Among them were:

Glutethamide (doriden), a hynotic; chlorthalidone (hygroten), a diuretic; tolbutamide, an oral antidiabetic drug; thiazide-type diuretics; podophyllin, a cathartic; podophyllotoxin, a constituent of podophyllin; ancoloxin, an antihistamine used as a morning sickness remedy; the phenothiazine tranquilizer drugs; the nasal decongestants commonly present with antihistamines in various cold remedies, and tetracycline, an antibiotic.

In reply to a question, Dr. Kelsey said that some of these drugs have been on the market for 10 or 15 years.

The FDA, she said, has asked the manufacturers of these drugs to report any information they may have on adverse effects experienced by persons taking the drugs.

Asked whether new FDA regulations that will go into effect February 7 will prevent a repetition of the thalidomide incident, Dr. Kelsey said no one could give absolute assurance of the safety of a drug. She added, however, that many harmful drugs can be brought to light through careful clinical testing.

The new FDA branch headed by Dr. Kelsey will check on whether drugs have been tested adequately before the manufacturer applies for permission to put them on the market. This is the so-called investigational stage, in which drugs are tested on animals and human beings but not sold for general use.

Following is the transcript of the interview with Dr. Kelsey, copyright 1963 by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Detroit News, Newark News, and Washington Star:

"Question. Dr. Kelsey, you have been named to head the investigational drug branch of the Food and Drug Administration, and new regulations for your branch go into effect February 7. What protections will the public have now that it didn't have before?

"Dr. KELSEY. The FDA will be aware of every drug that is under investigation, being tested in humans. Previously, we were only required to be told that these tests were going on at the time the drug was submitted for clearance as a new drug. Consequently, many drugs might be tried on humans which we would not be aware of. We might not know a drug was being tested that had shown toxic effects.

"Now we will have some control over the types of investigations, the investigators that

will be used, the subjects that will be used, the types of tests, how much animal work should precede particular types of human testing, and so on.

"Question. Do these new regulations prevent a repetition of the thalidomide incident?

"Dr. KELSEY. I don't think one can give an absolute assurance of the safety of a drug. There are so many factors involved so many different adverse reactions that may only come to light in a few persons or a select group of the population, that may not show up until years of use.

"There are many, however, that with careful clinical testing can be brought to light, and physicians can be made aware of these, and weigh whether the drug should be used or not.

"Question. Are other new rules or regulations still needed to prevent the toxic effect of drugs?

"Dr. KELSEY. I think it is simply new knowledge that is needed, a further knowledge of how drugs act and how human subjects respond to them.

"Question. The last time I looked, Dr. Kelsey, this investigational drug branch consisted of yourself and two chemists. Under these new regulations, do you have sufficient authority and employees to do this big job?

"Dr. KELSEY. We are shorthanded now, and we are going to have a great many more drugs to handle under the new regulations, so I hope to get considerably more people.

"We already have perhaps 300 new drug applications a year. You realize that perhaps there will be maybe 10 investigational drugs to every new drug.

"Question. You mean that, on February 7, you will have only yourself and two other people to handle hundreds of drugs in the coming year?

"Dr. KELSEY. What we anticipate doing at first is to get assistance, so we will borrow, as it were, from the personnel in the existing new drug division. Meanwhile, we are having a very active recruitment program, and we are getting new medical officers in all the time.

"Question. Do you feel you have enough authority to do the job on other drugs that you apparently did on thalidomide?

"Dr. KELSEY. I think so, yes; I believe so.

"Question. Doctor, the American people look to you as a symbol of better protection in the drug field. Do you think they may be expecting you to do miracles that you can't perform?

"Dr. KELSEY. It depends on how realistic their hopes are. If they think that toxicity of drugs is going to be absolutely eliminated, they will be bound to be disappointed. The decision whether to allow a drug to be used, or to take one off the market, simply because a few side effects appear—these are going to be very difficult decisions, and some of them are bound to be wrong. We hope there won't be many, though.

"Question. You said recently that FDA had 12 drugs under investigation as possible causes of birth deformities. Are these drugs in the popular and much-sold field of tranquilizers, antihistamines, and various cold remedies?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right. Now, some of these, we know, are based on rather sketchy reports, and there may be no valid reason to have concern about these drugs. On the other hand, we do have these reports and we have to examine them and then weigh the evidence. There have been two or three reports from Europe on antihistimines. There are, of course, dozens of antihistamines. Many are used in the treatment of morning sickness, and according to British reports, at least 30 percent of women take such a drug during early pregnancy.

"If you have a deformity among these mothers, is it a coincidence? Is it somehow related to the fact that she was nauseated during pregnancy? Did the drug somehow play a role? We just don't know.

"Question. Are a substantial number of these drugs on sale in the United States now?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is correct.

"Question. What is the FDA doing to find out whether any of these drugs are harmful?

"Dr. KELSEY. At the moment there is no proof that these particular drugs cause any harm.

"Question. Are you calling for reports from the manufacturers of these drugs now?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right, yes. We are asking them.

"Question. What information are you asking now?

"Dr. KELSEY. In general, if the manufacturers have had any reports of adverse reactions.

"Question. Are they bound to give you that information?

"Dr. KELSEY. They will be legally bound to comply, beginning May 1 under the new law. At the present time they usually do this on a voluntary basis. We have been receiving reports.

"Question. Have you had good cooperation from them?

"Dr. KELSEY. Yes.

"Question. Are you reviewing the applications that they originally filed for these drugs?

"Dr. KELSEY. Well, we certainly are looking over them, yes. It may be a question of revising the labeling to indicate that the safety of these particular drugs has not been established in pregnancy. Remember, these are prescription items if recommended for use during pregnancy.

"Question. Antihistamines are also widely available without prescription?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is correct; yes.

"Question. Thus far, you have found no pattern of thalidomide scope with any of these drugs?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right. If we had, something would have been done.

"Question. Italy has banned the sale of preludin, which is a drug suspected of causing birth deformities.

"Dr. KELSEY. Italy has put it back on the market again. We are going to follow this drug as well as any others where there are any reports that suggest that there might be an association between the drug and malformations of the fetus, but we have no basis at this time for taking the drug off the market.

"Question. Does the same situation apply to the drug postafen, which Sweden apparently is in the process of withdrawing because it is suspected of causing birth deformities?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right. This is one of these mixtures of antihistamine and the vitamin pyridoxine, and we have similar ones in this country. We are requesting the manufacturer for details. This has not been removed from the market anywhere. It has been made a prescription item only in some countries.

"Question. But, as yet, you have no evidence of any excessive birth deformities?

"Dr. KELSEY. No, that is perfectly right, and these drugs have been used, oh, for 10, 15 years I would say.

"Question. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has placed great emphasis on the difficulty in getting international coordination, when suspicions are raised about a drug in one country. It takes a long time for the information to filter across the Atlantic. Has there been any improvement in this coordination?

"Dr. KELSEY. We have a liaison officer with the State Department, but I don't think any system is adequate that we have now. We have certainly got to get improved communications. We are working on it, and I think already there is some evidence that it has improved. Being faced in a matter of 2 or 3 months with acquiring a great deal of information here, we have got to be able to handle that ourselves, and this is a problem. This is our No. 1 problem, I would say.

"Question. But as of now, you are relying essentially on newspapers to find out whether a drug is being or has been removed from the market, let's say, in Italy?

"Dr. KELSEY. I would think that, at the moment, is correct. My branch frequently gets a call from a newspaperman first, to be perfectly frank. It is usually followed very closely by some other information from, say, the State Department.

"After May 1 any American manufacturer who acquires information about an adverse effect of a drug is required to report that information to us. Some of these firms have direct contacts and associations with foreign manufacturers.

"Question. Since enovid is still under investigation by the FDA for suspected blood-clotting difficulties, are women using this drug for birth control taking a risk of injury or death?

"Dr. KELSEY. Well, I think this is a loaded question, because if I say 'No,' you will say, 'Why are you investigating it, then?' As you know, a group is coming to discuss it. A great many women have taken this drug, and some have developed thrombophlebitis. But many women developed it before the drug was introduced. It is a question of deciding. You have to weigh the theoretical—at this time—harm of this drug with the known value to your patient.

"Question. Do you think the new regulations will delay new drugs reaching the market?

"Dr. KELSEY. I think it will have the reverse effect. We will be able to point out deficiencies in the plan of testing, or in the toxicology, and so on. The manufacturers will be able to adjust their studies as they go along.

"Question. The very controversial cancer drug, krebiozen, has long been in use as an experimental drug, and never as a regular prescription drug. Is there any way its manufacturers can continue to use it without coming to you with their data?

"Dr. KELSEY. The situation here is quite complicated, since this drug comes under the Public Health Service as well as FDA. But to answer your question about submission of data, they would have to—in order to continue to investigate the drug.

"Question. If they do not comply, can you stop the investigational use?

"Dr. KELSEY. If we feel that the investigation is not being carried out in a manner which is safe, we can stop it, yes.

"Question. Dr. Kelsey, remembering the thalidomide incident, how are you and the pharmaceutical houses getting along now?

"Dr. KELSEY. Oh, fine, I would say. I hope."

Commonsense in Advertising Copy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the commonsense contained in the following copy which appeared in an

advertisement by Warner & Swasey Co. in the U.S. News & World Report:

AS EVERY BANKRUPT KNOWS YOU CANNOT SPEND YOURSELF RICH

Did you enjoy your trip to Europe? You paid for one, in subsidies to steamship lines.

Are you glad to pay someone else's electricity bill? You do. You have to pay the billions for Federal power dams, but people near them enjoy cheaper electricity than you do.

If you are not in a depressed area you soon may be, with your savings being poured out to so-called depressed people.

Do you get enough benefit from the Federal roadbuilding program to pay your share of the billions it costs in taxes?

Billions to farmers is pleasant for the farmers, but has to be paid by all taxpayers, including you.

Veterans with nonservice disability may like the billions they cost, but that doesn't help the vast majority of taxpayers.

The billions pour out, the deficit grows, of course. Any child knows that when you waste money, when you spend more than you earn, you go broke. If you could spend yourself rich, every park-bench panhandler would be a millionaire.

WAVZ Radio Editorial on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we received in this Chamber the President's tax message. It was a message which not only prescribed a tax reduction, but also a series of badly needed reforms in our tax structure. I am in full agreement with the President's proposals. I believe that the tax reforms are no less important for the Nation's economic growth and the expansion of business as are the proposals to reduce taxes. The two go together and Congress should act on them both.

Recently there came to my attention the text of a brief editorial broadcast over radio station WAVZ of New Haven, Conn., dealing with the subject of taxes. The editorial was broadcast by Mr. Daniel W. Kops, president of WAVZ, on Tuesday, January 15, and Wednesday, January 16, 1963, and was heard in many parts of the State of Connecticut. This editorial expresses my sentiments on the subject and I am pleased to commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It reads as follows:

EDITORIAL BROADCAST BY DANIEL W. KOPS

We take a great deal of pride in the leadership that the United States has given the rest of the world in the development of democracy and technological advances.

But there are times when it behooves us to abandon our complacency and take advantage of what we can learn from abroad. We have in mind at the moment the booming prosperity which has developed in Western Europe while our economy has rested near dead center.

We don't want to oversimplify the differences, but the one that stands out is taxes. The countries of Western Europe have found that a simple tax structure encourages business growth, which in turn raises the standard of living of the country generally.

On the other hand, we have perpetuated taxes so heavy that they have discouraged expansion of business and growth. We think that sentiment around the country has crystallized in favor of tax reduction. We agree with President Kennedy's proposal that reductions be coupled with tax reform. If instead, Congress enacts perfunctory changes in rate without real reform, it will be years before we have another chance.

We in Connecticut faced with the possibility of increased State taxes would have special reason to welcome a cut in individual tax rates. It is equally desirable to see changes in the corporate tax structure which would spark the economy. We look to our Congressmen for effective action in this field.

Thank you for your attention.

Where Labor Unions Get Their Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, in view of recent events, J. Mack Swigert's article, which appeared in the January 21st issue of U.S. News & World Report, is particularly timely. Because this article, entitled, "Where Labor Unions Get Their Power," is authored by an authority on labor law, I believe its contents will be of interest to all Members and citizens and ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WHERE LABOR UNIONS GET THEIR POWER

(By J. Mack Swigert, authority on labor law)

Today there is a widespread feeling that unions need further regulation. How is this to be achieved? The public must understand that this is not a simple problem. Union power has many roots. Here are the major ones.

1. PUBLIC SYMPATHY FOR UNIONS

One of the ultimate sources of union power is the public sympathy which arose in the early sweatshop days and which has persisted in a large group of the population even though the conditions which originally created sympathy no longer exist.

Public identification with the weakness of the individual worker in his relations with the large corporate employer seems to have created a David-against-Goliath sympathy. Many seem to forget that, if the union was originally David, for many workers it is now itself Goliath. Also, there is a certain class feeling in this country, a tacit admiration for Robin Hood, who robbed the rich to help the poor.

In addition, one must bear in mind that we are a nation of employes. Most adults are in business for themselves, but are employed by somebody else. Many employees, even when not union members, tend to feel that "unions are on our side" even though many union objectives are basically selfish and against the interest of the nonunion majority.

Basically, it has been this underlying public sympathy which has enabled the unions to obtain the legislation and special treatment from public officials and communication media which today is a direct source of their power.

This prounion sympathy has been particularly evident among intellectuals and members of the educational community. Because of this factor, many economics and industrial-relations textbooks and reference works tend to present facts and weigh arguments in favor of the union position. These intellectuals, also, when called upon to give advice to Government representatives or to serve as arbitrators or members of fact-finding panels, tend to lean in favor of the union position because of their sympathy for the union movement.

2. LABOR'S POLITICAL STRENGTH

Votes are the currency of politics. Because of the public sympathy referred to above, the formidable union machinery for getting out the vote and for collecting political-action funds, and also because the unions have many members who presumably share a common point of view, many politicians believe that the unions control a substantial number of votes. They believe that the unions, when aroused, can cause officeholders to be elected or defeated.

As politicians make laws and enforce them, this idea that unions can influence the direction of thousands or even millions of votes leads politicians who want to keep their jobs or advance in their profession to bend in the union direction when a union issue is before them.

Through COPE (AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education), the unions are now able to collect and expend enormous sums of money in the political arena. They have also had the support of the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action), and certain other groups of similar political bent.

The growing effectiveness of union political action on local, State, and National levels is an important source of union power.

3. FAVORABLE LAWS

(a) National Labor Relations Act: This Federal labor law protects employees in their right to form and support unions. The act creates a special status for unions and gives them special rights and privileges of great importance and enjoyed by no other economic group. Among these special rights are the following:

(1) A union designated by a bare majority of employees in an appropriate bargaining unit becomes the representative of all employees in the unit including those who are opposed to the union.

(2) Moreover, such union becomes the exclusive representative of such employees.

(3) The employer must bargain with the union so designated on all aspects of wages, hours, and working conditions.

(4) The subjects of collective bargaining are broadly defined in section 8(d) of the act a sencompassing wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. Because of the generality of this phraseology, almost any conceivable subject is placed in the area of collective bargaining and consequent union interference with management decisions.

(5) The employer may not interfere in the internal affairs of the union in any way and may not terminate an employee or otherwise discriminate against him because of union activity.

(6) Excepting in States which legislate otherwise, the employer is permitted to sign a compulsory union-membership contract. Such a contract ordinarily requires all employees to join the union within 30 days and remain members thereof as a condition of further employment.

(7) Exclusive jurisdiction over the subjects covered by the act is vested in an administrative board—NLRB—which has ordinarily been dominated by members sympathetic with unions.

(b) Exemption from Sherman Act: Although unions may originally have been subject to the Sherman Act, the Supreme Court in later years has ruled that, because of the Clayton Act and the Norris-La Guardia Act,

unions cannot be regarded as legal monopolies or combinations in restraint of trade—even though they intentionally and maliciously put employers out of business—unless they are acting in conspiracy with an employer. This exemption from the antitrust restraint applicable to employers is an important source of union power.

(c) Practical exemption from Corrupt Practices Act: Through the Taft-Hartley Act, enacted in 1947, Congress attempted to put unions under restrictions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and thus limit the use of union funds in political campaigns.

In a subsequent test case, the UAW-CIO was found not guilty of violating the amended Corrupt Practices Act even though its telecaster, Guy Nunn, gave widespread publicity to union-backed candidates in the 1954 primary and general-election campaign, and even though his propaganda was paid for out of the union's general funds accumulated out of the dues of the members.

For all practical purposes, the failure of this test case seems to have freed unions from the restrictions of the act and has enabled them to amass large political war chests and to spend the money in such a way as to further the special interests of the union leadership. This has enhanced union power.

(d) Norris-La Guardia Act: Because of the Norris-La Guardia Act and similar legislation in many States, it has become very difficult to enjoin violations of contract or law by labor unions even when the injury resulting from the violations is irreparable. This protection is extended by legislation only to unions.

The Norris-La Guardia Act itself is particularly important because, for practical purposes, it closes the doors of Federal courts to employers seeking injunctive protection against illegal union conduct. In these situations, the Federal judge would ordinarily be the most effective remedy, because he not only has a special status of respect in the community, but is also appointed by the President for life and, therefore, is not subject to the usual political pressures.

Money damages are ordinarily not a very effective remedy for the employer, because they do not, as in the case of an injunction, stop the illegal conduct at the time it is going on. A damage suit is usually not tried until at least 6 months or a year after the event.

Secondly, unions follow the tactic of refusing to settle a strike until the damage suit is dismissed. Thus, it is dismissed before it ever comes on for trial, and, therefore, operates only in a remote way as a deterrent to illegal union conduct. Of course, there are special situations in which the damage remedy results in the collection of money from a law-violating union, but these situations are quite exceptional.

With respect to injunctions, the Norris-La Guardia Act applies a double standard not applicable to other individuals or economic groups, a double standard which substantially enhances union power with respect to employers, members, and the public at large.

4. SPECIAL TREATMENT FROM COURTS

Largely because of public sympathy and effective political action, as indicated above, unions not only benefit from favorable legislation, but also are singled out for special and favorable treatment from courts, arbitrators, law officers, and other public officials.

Labor-violence cases, when presented in police court, are customarily continued until the strike is over and then dismissed. The reluctance of many courts to issue and to enforce injunctions against unions is well known to lawyers.

Police assigned to strike duty often look the other way when union violence occurs. Even the FBI is reluctant to intervene in labor disputes. Many States have statutes forbidding or limiting the use of State highway police in such disputes. A tendency to lean in the direction of the union when the question is a close one is observed throughout almost the entire hierarchy of public officials.

Favorable treatment of unions is particularly marked in the case of State and Federal administrative officials and employees who deal directly with labor problems.

State departments of labor, workmen's compensation commissions, unemployment commissions, industrial commissions, mediation boards and labor boards are almost uniformly staffed with union members or former union officials or persons otherwise closely associated with and sympathetic to the union movement. This is true even though these agencies are charged with the protection of all workers, including the great majority who are nonunion.

Similarly, the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and, to a considerable extent, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as well as other agencies dealing with labor problems, are staffed largely with union members or sympathizers.

Since the advent of the Kennedy administration, the National Labor Relations Board has openly moved in a direction very helpful to organized labor.

The unions now have a clear majority of union sympathizers on the Board.

During the past 2 years, under the leadership of the new chairman of the Board, numerous precedents have been overruled and discarded, and the labor law has been substantially changed without legislation.

In almost every instance, the change has favored organized labor against the employer or nonunion employees and has been retroactive. As a result of the Board's continuing rejection of precedents and retroactive overruling of interpretations of law previously established by Board decisions and relied on by employers and others in the industrial relations field, no employer can be sure today that any action taken by him which might prove harmful to a union will be sustained by the NLRB.

The tendency of this policy is toward a government of prounion men instead of a government of law. This uncertainty tends to discourage employers from attempting to resists union demand and activities and is, therefore, an important contemporary source of union power.

This tendency towards a government of men instead of law, favorable to unions, appears to extend all the way to the White House.

Recent presidential intervention in the steel strike and the west coast airframe-industry dispute benefited the union and weakened the employer. There has been no comparable executive action against unions and none seems likely or even possible.

This factor of favorable treatment from the courts, law officers and other public officials is a further important source of union power.

5. FAVORABLE TREATMENT FROM PRESS

Generally, unions get favorable treatment from the national wire services, radio and TV. These are important sources of public opinion.

Most news writers belong to unions or are union oriented. It is natural for them to slant stories which might otherwise place the union in a bad light. Besides being protected by their friends in the large newsgathering and dissipating agencies, unions also obtain considerable publicity for their affirmative programs. This favorable treatment is an additional source of power.

6. RIGHT TO STRIKE AND BOYCOTT

The right to strike is recognized and protected by the Taft-Hartley law and miscellaneous other legislation, including the Norris-LaGuardia Act. In the Taft-Hartley law, "strike" is defined as a "concerted stoppage of work" or a "concerted slowdown or other concerted interruption of operations by employees."

This legal right of employees to band together and withhold their services in concert from a particular employer is an obvious source of union power. The Sherman and Clayton acts, and general public policy against monopoly, deny other business entrepreneurs a right to band together for the purpose of influencing price or wilfully inflecting economic harm in this way.

Unions are also permitted to advocate and advertise consumer boycotts against employers with whom they have a controversy, even though the Taft-Hartley law and the Landrum-Griffin Act have substantially limited their previous right to engage in secondary boycotts.

Businessmen are generally not permitted to advocate in this way a public boycott of their competitors, suppliers or others with whom they have business relations.

As there is almost no limitation of the right to strike, the use of the strike weapon is often abused. The strike power is frequently used to force retention of surplus or excess personnel and in support of various forms of featherbedding. Strike power is also used to force union recognition without recourse to the election procedures provided by the NLRB.

Sometimes a small group, through use of the strike power, is able to shut down virtually an entire operation or industry. In Pittsburgh, for example, a strike by a union representing a small number of steel-mill railroad employees was able to shut down an entire steel mill.

7. UNIONS' PICKET SYSTEM

The great and traditional source of union power is the picket line. This probably ranks along with compulsory bargaining, required by the National Labor Relations Act, as one of the two most immediate and potent sources of union power in this country today.

The picket system includes two types of picketing—peaceful and violet. Both can be highly effective. Peaceful picketing—even when only one man with a banner is present, is effective because the working population as a whole has come to recognize this symbol placed in front of a place of business as a quarantine signal. Millions of workingmen have been disciplined and educated by unions to believe that they are doing wrong when they walk past a fellow workman who is carrying an "on strike" banner or an "unfair" banner. Therefore, in many situations, the mere presence of a man with a banner in front of any employer's place of business brings great economic harm to the employer.

In situations where the peaceful picket line is ineffective, the violent picket line usually does the job. It creates physical injury, property damage and fear. Most people do not want trouble. They will not risk physical injury or property damage to continue business relationships with a besieged employer. Through keeping third persons from taking the jobs of strikers, the picket line enables the union to monopolize the jobs in the struck plant. It is a coercive power weapon employed by the union to bludgeon the employer into submission. In their economic relationships, employers possess no comparable weapon.

8. TRADITION OF THREATS AND VIOLENCE

Closely associated with the picket system, but having an effect beyond the picket line, is the union tradition of threats and violence. The labor movement in this country has been characterized by many violent strikes. The more spectacular of these in recent years, such as Kohler, Perfect Circle,

Republic Aviation, Southern Railway, and Southern Bell Telephone, have received widespread publicity. Hundreds of lesser strikes, however, have been accompanied by widespread acts of violence and terrorism. Even in so-called "peaceful" strikes, petty coercions, such as nails in the driveway and verbal threats, are almost always present. Most people do not want trouble. Therefore, this well-known tradition of threats and violence helps the union leaders keep workers in line and is a source of union power.

Fear of some form of reprisal is a factor which helps union organizers sign up workers for union membership. It helps union leaders control union meetings and direct the votes of the members. The standing vote is very common in union meetings. In certain situations, a member may feel that he is risking personal injury by standing up and being counted against a proposition strongly urged by union leadership.

Fear of ostracism may exist even when there is no fear of actual physical injury. Most unions encourage class feeling. Members are encouraged to feel that they do wrong if they stand with the employer against fellow workers. The threat of ostracism is itself a potent weapon when directed against the ordinary man who just doesn't want any trouble.

In many instances, the union threat extends far beyond mere ostracism. Each year there are many strikes characterized by shooting, dynamiting, physical beatings, mass picketing, car rocking, window smashing, paint throwing, and other forms of injury to person and property.

9. LOYALTY OF UNION MEMBERS

Another important source of union power is the dedicated loyalty of many hard-core members. Almost every local has a hard-core of members who attend meetings regularly and who sincerely believe in the union movement. With many of these individuals unionism is almost a form of religion. They deeply believe that unions have advanced the workingman and that employers would exploit workers ruthlessly if it were not for the existence and continued vigilance of labor unions. These dedicated members are a very important source of strength in all unions.

10. COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP

During recent years, unions have used strikes and the threat of strikes with great success in forcing compulsory-membership provisions and checkoff clauses into a high percentage of the contracts in the two-thirds of the States of the Union where such contracts are lawful.

Under these provisions, there is no longer even the pretense that a union is a voluntary association. With these clauses in the contract, workers must belong and pay their dues in order to hold a job in the plant. In effect, the union is given the power to tax usually reserved solely to the sovereign. Although the Taft-Hartley Act gives employees some protection against discharge at the request of the union for reasons other than nonpayment of dues, the existence of compulsory-membership contracts is a very important source of union power and control over both employees and employers. Also, unions benefit greatly and are strengthened by the fact that employers can be made to collect the dues for the union before the employee ever receives his pay.

11. UNLIMITED SIZE OF UNIONS

The fact that the law permits unions to function as "internationals" is a root of union power. The union which is certified as the exclusive bargaining representative in a particular plant is usually not the local but the international union, which may have its headquarters and center of control hundreds of miles from the particular plant.

Through the provisions of its international constitution, and its usual power to appoint receivers, displace officers and take over the assets of the local if considered necessary, international officials have great practical power over the local and its members.

Craft unions also have apprenticeship systems, and membership cards which attract and hold members. As a practical matter, many skilled men can't even get a job without one of these cards. The international receives its tax-free financial support from locals throughout the country and is able to build up huge strike funds and also large welfare funds, pension funds and the like. Through the granting or withholding of strike benefits, the international is able to control the course of the negotiations at the local level. Through using strike funds to pay employees to strike, the international often can cause small employers to give in to union demands.

As there is no limitation on size, international unions can also organize an industry vertically as well as horizontally—as in the case of the Steelworkers, who represent ore mines, boat crews, and other groups in all phases of the industry.

The true picture of modern collective bargaining, therefore, is not that of a group of employees banded together to bargain with their own boss. Instead, an organization representing hundreds of thousands of employees throughout the country bargains with an employer who may possibly have only a hundred people working for him.

The fact that the law permits union bargaining power to be centralized in huge international organizations, which exercise discipline and tight control of the union funds, the union locals, and the individual members, and which are run by an expense account aristocracy of professional union managers, is, of course, an important source of union power.

12. WEAKNESS OF EMPLOYERS

In any catalog of the sources of union power, this item cannot be overlooked. Some industries are so sensitive that the employers cannot take a strike of any duration and remain in business. In other industries, direct labor costs are such a small percentage of the total cost that it is not considered practical to stand up to the union. These factors enable unions to be very strong in such industries.

Sometimes employers do not have the financial strength to withstand union pressures. These employers cannot go to the brink, where most important labor issues are ultimately settled. They cannot risk a strike, so ultimately must submit to the union demands.

In other situations, however, the source of union power may lie to a considerable extent in the weakness of the employer himself. Many employers regard labor relations as a nuisance.

They want to get the negotiations over with as soon as possible. They have no stomach for a fight. They do not understand the ponderous and time-wasting machinery of collective bargaining. In some instances, employers are even physically afraid of the union.

Many employers are opportunists. To save a few cents on wages, they are willing to make concessions to the union which over the years may cost them a great deal more than an extra 2 cents or 3 cents in wages. Their philosophy is to settle today and take their chances on tomorrow. If they cannot pass the cost on in price, they may be able to save the difference by changes in operations.

In dealing with employers of this type, professional union leaders, rich with experience, know that if they stand their ground, the employer will give in. Union leaders regard such employers as weak. Just before Christmas, the President asked the Longshoremen's Union to postpone a shipping strike for another 90 days "in the national interest." The international vice president of the union refused, explaining: "They're very weak, we'll lick 'em fast."

The weakness of employers, no matter how justifiable its cause, is an added source of union power.

CONCLUSIONS

Like banyan trees, unions today draw strength from many roots.

Favorable legislation and favorable treatment from courts, law officers and other public officials, and from news media, are important sources of union power. So are the right to strike and boycott, the picket system and the tradition of threats and violence.

Compulsory membership and checkoff and the unlimited size permitted by law also buttress union power. The hard core of members, and the vulnerability, disunity and weakness of employers, contribute to the strength of these organization. In addition, there are the strong roots of public sympathy and effective political action.

Today, unions are big business—rich—taxfree—and run by a new class of well-paid professional union managers.

On the political front, unions, acting through their grand lodge, the AFL–CIO, constitute a national Tammany Hall, with political machinery which functions in their self-interest from coast to coast. The influence of these unpoliced organizations, which are capable of shutting down basic industries and destroying small business, is felt in all walks of life. At few points are unions responsible for anything, even to their own membership.

There is a growing feeling that the national interest now calls for additional restraint on union power. The Supreme Court recently suggested that Congress correct the Norris-LaGuardia Act to permit Federal courts to stop union strikes in breach of contract. Many believe that the antitrust laws should be amended to cover unions. Others believe that a more fruitful course would be to withdraw some of the special privileges conferred by existing laws, which were enacted to encourage the growth of unions when they were small and weak, and which seem out of place today. A basic review and revision of union privileges and immunities seems in order if the public interest is to be protected.

Make Them Use the Front Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. NORBAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Verne McKinney in the Hillsboro (Oreg.) Argus on the subject of back-door spending:

MAKE THEM USE THE FRONT DOOR

One of the most rewarding New Year resolutions that the administration and Congress could jointly make would be the elimination of back-door spending.

Back-door spending is the expenditure of funds outside the regular appropriation process. It is a violation—at least in spirit—of the Constitution which holds that Federal money can only be spent when the Congress duly appropriates it.

This practice cannot be dismissed as inconsequential. In 1961 it amounted to just under $20 billion—divided among Federal programs for agriculture, airport, area redevelopment, foreign aids, highways, housing, school milk, and loans for veterans. As large as that sum was the money originally requested was even greater—$29 billion.

In 1962, happily, encouraging progress was made in curbing back-door spending. Through the combined and commendable efforts of the administration and the Congress the rearflow was reduced to $437 million. First the budget requests were slashed from the $29 billion sought in 1961 to $2½ billion for 1962. Then the Congress performed more surgery on that amount, reducing it to $437 million.

It is not enough merely to cut down on the total spent in this evasive manner. The back door should be securely locked and permanently sealed.

Stephen B. Luce, 1827-1917: Founder of the Naval War College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of many years, especially since becoming a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, it has been my privilege to study the records of many of our naval leaders who have made notable contributions to U.S. history.

Preeminent among them was Rear Adm. Stephen B. Luce, who entered the Naval Academy in 1841 and was the 173d graduate of that famed institution. It was, therefore, with the keenest interest that I read in the January 1962 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the Naval Academy Alumni Association, a most informative biographical account of this distinguished naval leader by Rear Adm. John D. Hayes, U.S. Navy, retired, of the class of 1924.

Admiral Luce's greatest contributions were in the field of education. He was the architect and first president of the Naval War College, and prepared the first book on "Seamanship" for use at the Naval Academy, where Luce Hall was named in his honor.

In order that the career and contributions of Admiral Luce may be better known, I quote the indicated character sketch as part of these remarks:

STEPHEN BLEECKER LUCE, 1827–1917

(By John D. Hayes)

Stephen B. Luce has been made the subject of this first of a series of character sketches because I believe him to be one of the greatest figures that our Navy has produced. Another and perhaps more controlling reason is that he forms the link between the two great periods of our naval history—that of the sail Navy in the days of wooden ships and iron men with its revolution during the Civil War and the steam and steel Navy which did not have its beginnings until 20 years after that war. He, almost alone, preserved and carried forward the spirit and tone of the old Navy through those barren 20 years and infused it into the modern Navy of today. He did so by insisting that men were as important as weapons and machines and by constantly pointing out that no matter how remote the possibility, the purpose of a navy is war and the duty of officers is to study it and to train their men for it.

Fate did not grant to Luce the fortune of a major command in war, the opportunity by which a place in history is usually gained in the military profession. Instead it destined him to serve, as a young but seasoned officer, through the greatest of American wars and to see firsthand, as an impressionable man, the purposes of a navy in war and the needs of the men who make it. He never afterward allowed himself or those who followed him to forget these two foundation stones of their profession. His enthusiasm and acumen through the next 50 years were to bring about a revolution in naval thought, education, and administration that has had its impact to this day, not only in our own Navy but through it to the navies of the world.

The contributions of Stephen B. Luce to his profession cannot well be measured in tangible terms. He taught the Navy to think of itself as a whole. He saw strategy as clearly as others see a weapon or a ship. He defined better than anyone has since the relations that should exist between a government and the officers of its armed services. Nevertheless his concrete accomplishments were many. They include the following:

1. He prepared the first textbook on "Seamanship." It was first published in 1863 and went through several editions before it was replaced by the present Knight's "Modern Seamanship" in 1900.

2. He was commandant of midshipmen in the Naval Academy's most dynamic years just after the Civil War while David D. Porter was superintendent.

3. He pioneered the concept of training for merchant marine officers and established the first Maritime Academy for the State of New York in 1875.

4. He started the naval training system which today prepares our recruits for life aboard ship.

5. He saved most of the sea chanties of the days of sail by his book of "Naval Songs," first published in 1883.

6. He wrote the first article published by the U.S. Naval Institute and was president of that institution for 11 years from 1887 to 1898.

7. He is best known for establishing the Naval War College in 1886. What is not so well known is that he spent the next 25 years saving it.

8. He gave Alfred T. Mahan his great opportunity by asking him to lecture at the new college and this evolved into Mahan's famous books on Sea Power. It is interesting to note that the title of the series of lectures given was not "The Influence of Sea Power on History" but "The Influence of Naval Power on the Growth of Nations."

9. Finally, Luce was the leader of a group of forward-looking officers who, after a 30-year fight, finally succeeded in properly organizing the Navy Department by the establishment of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

LUCE'S CAREER

Luce was born in Albany, N.Y., in 1827 and entered the Navy in 1841. He spent only his last year as a midshipman at the Naval Academy. One of his early cruises was under the War of 1812 hero, Commodore James Biddle, in the 74-gun line-of-battleship *Columbus*, which made a voyage around the world and visited Japan several years before Perry. During the Civil War Luce served in the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron, first as a watch officer in the flagship *Wabash*, later in command of a monitor and finally in command of a blockading gunboat. In the latter he had a contact with General William T. Sherman, which he himself claimed started him in the study of the art of war.

Sherman in January 1865 was at Savannah, Ga., after his March to the Sea. It was Luce's job to cover the Army's initial movements by water on the march north. Almost 40 years later Luce, in a lecture at the War College, told the story of his meeting with Sherman. "On reporting to headquarters, General Sherman indicated in a few short pithy sentences and by the aid of a map his plan for the campaign from Savannah north. * * * And he added in the pleasant style of banter with which he was accustomed to talk to naval officers: 'You Navy fellows have been hammering away at Charleston for the past 3 years. * * * I will cut her communications and Charleston will fall into your hands like a ripe pear.' And that is just what actually came to pass."

Luce continued: "After hearing General Sherman's clear exposition of the military situation, the scales seemed to fall from my eyes. 'Here,' I said to myself, 'is a soldier who knows his business.' It dawned on me that there were certain fundamental principles underlying military operations, principles of general application whether the operations were on land or at sea."

The prime of Luce's life, from the ages of 40 to 60, was spent in the period when the U.S. Navy was at the nadir of its history. The eyes of the American people after the Civil War were turned inward to the development of their heartland and away from the seas and overseas which had been the prewar outlook. The Navy and the merchant marine were neglected, forgotten. Senior naval officers seemed content to reflect in the glories of Civil War days and even Luce's contemporaries chose to look backward rather than ahead. Luce's thoughts, however, were kept focused on the future, on war and on the potentialities of war's handmaiden, strategy. His happy enthusiasm was able to transmit this ardent and unselfish professionalism to the young men who were to create the Navy of the future—Sampson, Evans, Chadwick, Taylor, Sims, and Gleaves.

Although best known for his establishment of the Naval War College, Luce's greatest monument should be the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The organization he thereby brought to the Navy Department has survived two wars and is essentially the same today. Luce was assisted in this work by Mahan; Henry C. Taylor, third president of the War College; Bradley Fiske; William S. Sims; and Dudley W. Knox. On the civilian side were President Theodore Roosevelt, through Sims then his naval aide; Secretary of the Navy Meyer in President Taft's administration; and Congressman Richmond P. Hobson, 1889, who introduced the legislation. These civilians however were only agents. It was the line officers, sparked by Luce, who were the positive, dynamic driving force to reform. This was in contrast to the Army reorganizational improvement which was largely the work of Elihu Root, Secretary of War in Theodore Roosevelt's administration. It is in contrast to the situation today.

Luce's impact was not alone on the line officers. He made efforts to start a school of naval architecture at Massachusetts Institute of Technology a generation before it was finally established. He encouraged the study of naval engineering but was opposed to the amalgamation of the Engineer Corps with the line. The man who brought it about, George W. Melville, finally came to agree with Luce that it was a mistake. Luce introduced the word "logistics," created by Jomini, into naval terminology and from there

it has gone into the military language of the free world.

LUCE'S METHODS

Luce to a large extent accomplished what he did through persistent letter writing, mostly to people in influential positions both in government and outside, as his papers, now preserved by the Naval Historical Foundation in the Library of Congress, indicate. He was always prolific with his suggestions and persistent in his demands. He was not hesitant about giving advice to those in high places, a service not always appreciated.

It was with his writings, however, that he made his great imprint on naval thought. They were mainly in the form of periodical articles, many of them in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute. They covered many subjects in the fields of warfare, naval history and administration, military ethics, officer education and enlisted training. Thirty-six of them, written between 1874 and 1911, have been summarized in an article in Military Affairs, winter 1955, under the title of "The Writings of Stephen B. Luce." Many of the concepts expressed therein are as pertinent today as when Luce stated them. They have become so ingrained into our naval administrative system that we take them for granted. If they were known better in the abstract by naval officers, they might have been applied with some benefit to the present day Department of Defense whose organizational problems are strikingly similar to those of the Navy in Luce's day.

Luce also wrote for many of the general periodicals of his day such as the Galaxy, North American Review, Harpers, and Youth's Companion and for several encyclopedias. However, he never took the time to compose his thoughts into books, as Mahan did, and for this reason his writings remain unknown while Mahan's are gaining in popularity each year.

Luce's learning was outstanding even in a day when anti-intellectualism was less prevalent in the service than it is today and when officers were not ashamed to quote Shakespeare to each other. Researching the references in his articles is a liberal education in itself.

His familiarity with foreign languages enabled him to know firsthand the French military writing in the 19th century when it was at its best. Luce had a much better knowledge of the French Navy and French naval strategy than did Mahan.

His devotion to his profession kept Luce a poor man all his life, unable even to give a college education to his son. On active duty he always preferred posts of usefulness to posts of honor. He was blessed with good health and he lived to be 90. An active mind, never devoted to self, no doubt contributed to this long life.

The last act of his career was a hallmark of the man. Asked to address the War College in 1911 at the age of 84, he might have reminisced. Instead he chose to make a fighting speech. He was frankly worried because there was so much interest in the then new postgraduate school of engineering and still so little in the Naval War College.

"Your profession is the art of war and nature will be avenged if you violate one of its laws in undertaking to make a part greater than the whole."

LUCE'S CHARACTER

Luce's character is best described by his contemporaries.

Admiral Porter wrote of him in 1866 to Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox: "He is a straightforward fellow and nature has not given him the soft manners possessed by some people who are all smiles to your face and abuse you behind your back."

John S. Barnes who served with Luce in the Wabash and at the Naval Academy but who resigned to pursue a successful legal and business career: "Stephen B. Luce, all through his distinguished career, was one of the most capable officers in our or any other Navy. Besides his professional accomplishments which were great, his scientific and literary knowledge, increased by constant study and reading, made him an ideal naval officer, fitted to fill any office with dignity and power within the scope of Government action. My intercourse with him, then and later, I regard as one of the most fortunate intimacies of my life."

Robley D. Evans: "That master of his trade."

Albert Gleaves: "To such as he, there is no successor."

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at the 31st Annual Dinner of the Citizens Budget Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of Friday, January 11, 1963, the Citizens Budget Commission held its 31st annual dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. The principal speaker on this occasion was His Honor Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York. Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include Mayor Wagner's address on this occasion:

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WAGNER

I am pleased to join tonight in greeting and saluting the Citizens Budget Commission on the occasion of its 31st anniversary. I wish a happy and fruitful year and many more in the times ahead to this organization which I have long known, always respected—and have sometimes differed with. But CBC, I love you anyway.

Again, as in the past, I congratulate CBC on its president, a true friend of mine and a public-spirited citizen if ever I knew one, Bob Dowling. And CBC is full of the spirit of Bob Dowling.

I intend tonight to make what might be considered a major pronouncement on the fiscal affairs of New York City. I am glad to do this under the auspices of the Citizens Budget Commission.

I shall deal with our budgetary prospects for next year—in fiscal terms and in terms of some of the practical problems we face and the decisions we must make during the weeks and months immediately ahead. They are very difficult ones.

The question is sometimes asked: Why must the city approach each year's budget problem as though it were being faced for the first time and, why can't we engage in more long-range budgeting and budgetary planning. The answer is very simple. Unlike the Federal and State Governments, we in the city government do not have ultimate control over our fiscal affairs. We can and do schedule our expenditures but the State government, above all, has the ultimate power of decision over our revenues and sources of revenue. New York City proposes, but Albany disposes.

In the current year, our revenues are expected to reach record levels. Our tax receipts from real estate are expected to attain their highest peak in our city's history due, among other factors, to the city's steady and sometimes spectacular development—as on Sixth and Third Avenues in Manhattan, Riverdale in the Bronx, in the Borough Park area of Brooklyn, in half a dozen sprouting areas in Queens, and in almost every section of Staten Island.

But as I said, we have no real power of decision or control over these revenues. When I first took office in 1954, real estate taxes accounted for 47.7 percent of our total city revenues. Today they only account for 41.04 percent of our revenues. To increase this tax would require an amendment to the State constitution, which takes a minimum of 3 years to enact. All other tax levies are subject to State authorization and some of this authorization is given us on a short-term basis like the authorization given us last year to establish for 1 year a tax on vault space under the city's streets and sidewalks. Likewise, State aid for education and other purposes is given us on a year-to-year basis. We know what we ought to be able to get from the State, but we never know what we are actually going to get.

Under such circumstances, long-range fiscal planning is extremely difficult if not impossible. Nobody would be more pleased to see this condition remedied than myself.

This brings me to the situation we face for next year. The fact is that for next year we face a very sizable budgetary imbalance—so substantial in magnitude as to require major decisions and measures by both the State and the city governments to meet the situation.

I am really not telling you any deep secrets. Anybody with a sharp mind and a dull pencil can figure it out and he doesn't need a very long piece of paper either. The Citizens Budget Commission issued a statement not many days ago giving a range of anticipated budgetary imbalance. For reasons I shall cite, I do not yet have the exact official figure, but I can say that the imbalance for next year will certainly be above the lowest figure in the CBC projection—which was, as I recall, $117 million. How much higher it will be, I am not yet prepared to say, but it will be substantially more.

We are hard at work right now reviewing the budgets and the proposed programs of the various city departments and agencies. I am examining and reexamining, in budgetary terms, the programs we had planned to inaugurate or expand next year and to achieve further savings and economies which may be possible. Until all this process is completed, I can't say finally what our minimum budgetary needs are. I know only that they will be substantially greater than in the present fiscal year, if only by virtue of automatic and mandatory increase.

Nor, of course, can I make a prediction as to our revenues for next year. Thus, I can only guess at the amount of aid we are going to get from the State government. I have no idea what increase, if any, we might hope to get in school aid; and I must say that for the long overdue increase in per capita payments, the prospects do not appear very bright. I wrote to Governor Rockefeller on December 2d, asking for the rectification of the inequities in State-city fiscal relations. I have no idea at this point what additional revenues we may count on from Albany.

For some years now we have been fighting for the authorization of legalized off-track betting, which could, within a few years of enactment, provide $100 million a year for New York City and a like amount for the State treasury—from off-track betting in New York City alone. This year there appears to be a somewhat more favorable climate in Albany for this proposal, or at least for an authorization of a referendum on it. But that doesn't promise us much money to meet next year's expenses.

For many weeks now, ever since August, in fact, I have been giving intense consideration to this problem and have been making such studies and holding such consultations as could be helpful.

Last April I said I would commission a group of experts to review the tax and revenue sources of the city and to reassess them in the light of our impending needs. I, and members of my staff, held preliminary discussions with a number of tax and fiscal experts in the effort to organize such a study. In the end we abandoned it as a formal enterprise—simply because of the factors to which I have already referred. There were just too many variables for a useful study by experts. Instead, in addition to a number of informal meetings with experts, I held and am holding frequent meetings on this subject with the comptroller, the president, and the majority leader of the city council, and other elected public officials, and, of course, with the appropriate officials and experts in the city government. I have also been seeking and considering the views on this subject of outstanding community leaders. These meetings are continuing.

Against this background, let me tell you that upon the conclusion of these studies and discussions, and after some of the variables I referred to become a little more definite, sometime within the next month, I will make my recommendations on the measures which I feel to be needed, including new tax proposals, to meet the urgent needs of the people of this city.

What do we mean when we speak of the urgent needs of the people? I think that the vast array of the services which the city government provides and the vital importance of them are sometimes forgotten when people talk about budget and taxes.

When we talk about city government, we are talking about the police, for whose services $204 million are included in this year's budget which provides 25,000 police. This amount pays for the greatest per capita police protection of any large city in the country. As a result of this protection, New York—contrary to impressions given by some headlines—ranked, for the first 9 months of last year, well down among the second 10 of the major cities of the country for per capita cases of crimes of violence.

We are also talking about $104 million for the fire department, which is widely acknowledged to be providing one of the most efficient and effective firefighting services in the country.

We are talking about the $191 million budgeted for the hospitals department for the maintenance of 27 city hospitals—for the recent spectacular improvement in the level of medical care and treatment in those hospitals—improvements which were overdue and must continue.

We are also talking about the more than $800 million budgeted for our city's primary and secondary schools and for our free-tuition city university providing essential education, including vocational training, for over a million of our young people.

We are talking about the $31 million for our health department for a wide range of activities including funds for the care of infants and children, for the largest medical research program to be financed by any city in the world, the inspection and supervision of the availability of heat to millions of tenants, and for the unending and essential war against rats and vermin.

We are talking about the $9 million budgeted for the department of buildings to administer and enforce the building code—so essential for public safety.

We are talking about only $1,500,000, which the city government's money contribution to our great housing program, which makes possible—together with the funds and credit of the Federal and State Governments—the vast amount of low-income and middle-income housing now under construction and on the drafting boards. We have, by far, the greatest government housing program in the Nation. More governmentally aided low-income and middle-income housing has been built in New York City than in any other city or group of cities in the country.

Included in the $1,500,000 the city has budgeted for housing, is money for our area services program which is designed and has achieved spectacular success in halting deterioration in neighborhood conditions, both housing and social. There is a crying need for the extension of this program to many areas of this city which do not need urban renewal but do need the kind of interim program we have developed under the name of the area services program.

We are talking also of our youth services program centered not only in the youth board and the parks department and also in other agencies, amounting to $329 million. A part of this money has been used to bring juvenile gang wars under some sort of control. I had occasion today to pay my last sad tribute to a frontline fighter against youth gangs who gave his life to this undertaking. He was brutally beaten when he stopped an incipient rumble—I think they call them. He had stopped many in East Harlem where he worked. There hadn't been one in his area for a long time. I had met him. He was typical of the dedicated youth board workers who at modest pay are doing heroic and successful work in this field.

We are also, of course, speaking of welfare, for which $298 million is budgeted this year. What is not generally known is that only a small percentage of this goes for general welfare. The largest percentage and the overwhelming number of so-called welfare clients are needy children and the needy and disabled aged. These amount to 338,000, out of the total of 352,000 served by the welfare department.

Then there is also the $36 million for parks and playgrounds, and the $28 million for libraries and museums, and the $47 million for the department of water supply, gas, and electricity, and the $12 million for our piers and docks.

I have covered practically the entire budget, aside from such irreducibles as debt service, pensions, and the like. I have asked myself—I ask each of you tonight—Which of the services covered in the budget totals I have listed would you eliminate or stringently curtail?

Of course, the drive for savings through administrative efficiencies has been going on for some time and must continue to go on.

As a result of the recommendations of experts in the office of the city administrator and budget director, we have eliminated, over the past several years, thousands of jobs, and made other savings amounting to more than a hundred million dollars. I and the deputy mayor for administration and my budget director are now searching for additional ways to economize and to pull the belt tighter. This will not be the last you will hear of economy this year and next, I promise you.

It is a fact that our expense budget has increased by 68 percent since I have been mayor. But over the same period, the State budget just for State purposes has increased by 74 percent and the Federal budget, even exclusive of defense, has increased by 75 percent. We have been providing an increasing number of new but essential services, through the Police Department, the housing program, the area services program, the improvements in our city hospitals and nursing homes, the services for youth, the activities of the health research council, and the special aids for the aged, among many others.

Just as an example, there is such an item as payments to voluntary hospitals for the care of needy patients assigned to the hospitals by the city. In 1946, the city paid $3.25 per patient per day. Today, it is $30 per day.

Of course, there have been major increases in the cost of almost everything the city buys, and also in the salary and wage rates and scales.

We now have on our statute books a career and salary plan which provides for automatic increases. All this is necessary not only to help our employees meet the rising costs of living but also for the city to compete with outside business and the State and Federal Governments, and to attract to the city service capable professional workers.

There are at least two ways of looking at city government—from the viewpoint of the balance sheet or from the viewpoint of the essential services it provides for the people.

The projected balance sheet for next year shows that we face a heavy problem. The program sheet for next year shows that we must not only maintain present government services, but in some categories, we must expand them.

Thus we must continue to improve and expand our new program for traffic control. We must continue to improve and expand our police department. We must continue to improve our hospitals. We must step up our efforts to promote the cultural and artistic life of our city, to provide more vocational training facilities for the unskilled—especially the unskilled youth—and thus to diminish our waste of human resources. We must take new steps to promote and encourage business activities, to keep the businesses that we have and to attract new trade and enterprise to our city. Such programs and many others, I will not take the time to mention, are essential if we are to keep our city dynamic, to make the most of our human resources.

To do all this and more, budgetary provision will have to be made. If our revenues are to be increased to meet the need, that increase must come either from substantially increased payments from the State government or by added taxes, or by a combination of both. For reasons I have already stated, we can get no substantial increase in the amount of money received from our real estate taxes. We must look elsewhere.

As I said, I will make my recommendations as soon as I get all the facts and complete the discussions I am now in the process of holding. One thing is certain: we will solve this problem as we have solved others.

New York is a wonderful place, and New Yorkers are wonderful people. If New York weren't such a thriving, throbbing, dynamic city, it wouldn't be as attractive to all the people of the world. If it weren't so attractive, it wouldn't be so crowded. And if it weren't so crowded, it wouldn't be so interesting.

The decisions we must make on budget and taxes will require a concensus of all our citizens. There will need to be a great deal of public discussion. I know that the citizens budget commission will play its part in helping to lead an informed, responsible, and constructive public discussion of this matter. I promise you that I will do my part to help this along.

Now it is my special pleasure to make a surprise announcement and award. It is my privilege to pay a special tribute to the executive director of the citizens budget commission, Col. John M. Leavens. Mr. Leavens has been executive director of the CBC for the past 10 years. He has, at the staff level, provided a driving, tireless leadership, and has helped in a major way to make possible the fine contributions of the CBC to the cause of good government in this city and State. I am pleased to be able to present to you, John M. Leavens, the scroll of the city of New York as an expression of the appreciation of all the citizens of New York, for your fine work with the citizens budget commission.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JANUARY 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sunday 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Special exhibition: Mona Lisa by Leonardo da Vinci, lent by the French Government. From January 9.

Continuing exhibition: John Gadsby Chapman, a retrospective exhibition. Through January 13. Central gallery.

New publication: "The Mona Lisa," illustrated booklet, 16 pages, 7 by 10 inches, 50 cents postpaid.

Recent publications: "John Gadsby Chapman." Exhibition catalog 7½ by 10 inches, 32 pages with 20 illustrations. Introduction by William P. Campbell. Price $1 postpaid. "Treasures from the National Gallery of Art," edited by Huntington Cairns and John Walker, 11¼ by 15 inches, 85 color plates. Price $25 postpaid.

New reproductions: Color postcards. Seven new postcards of paintings: Annibale Carracci, "Landscape"; Innes, "The Lackawanna Valley"; Morisot, "In the Dining Room"; Renoir, "A Girl With a Watering Can"; Reynolds, "Lady Caroline Howard"; Steen, "The Dancing Couple"; Titian, "Saint John the Evangelist on Patmos." Five cents each postpaid.

Sunday lectures: A series of lectures on "Stylistic Origins" will begin on January 6 and will continue through February 10.

Holiday Lectour: On New Year's Day the gallery will be closed. A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these Lectour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. Closed January 1.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 31 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 6

Painting of the week: Hals. "Balthasar Coymans" (Mellon collection), gallery 47, Wednesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Early Florentine, rotunda, Wednesday through Saturday 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Origins of the Classical Style." Guest speaker, Charles Morgan, professor of art history, Amherst College, Amherst; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; Marjorie Mitchell, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, JANUARY 7 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 13

Painting of the week: Monet. "Banks of the Seine, Vétheuil" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 83, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Late Florentine, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour introduction to the collection: Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Origins of the Gothic Style." Guest speaker: Robert Branner, professor of art history, Columbia University, New York, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Claude Frank, pianist, east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, JANUARY 14 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 20

Painting of the week: De Hooch. "A Dutch Courtyard" (Mellon collection), gallery 47, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; 47, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30."

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Venetian, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Sunday lecture Z ,u

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Oriental Influences in Early and aLte Medieval Art." Guest speaker Benjamin Rowland, professor of art history, Harvard University, Cambridge, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Luis Garcia-Renart, cellist; Marta Garcia-Renart,, pianist; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JANUARY 21 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 27

Painting of the week: Orazio Gentileschi. "St. Cecilia and an Angel" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 49, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Umbrian, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Renaissance Experimenters." Speaker, Margaret Bouton, associate curator of education; National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: George Walker, pianist, east garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, REpublic 7–4215, extension 272.

Salute to the Ukrainian People on Ukrainian Independence Day, January 22, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during the last several centuries the long history of the Ukrainian people entered a period full of calamities and tragedies. Since the middle of the 17th century the Ukrainians have been subjected, except for a brief period from 1918 to 1920, to alien rulers in their homeland. After suffering under the autocratic czarist regime of Russia for some 250 years, they were freed from the chains of that regime by the Russian Revolution of 1917, and early in 1918 they proclaimed their national independence. Ukrainian leaders instituted a democratic form of government and proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic. During the next 2 years Ukrainians worked heroically to rebuild their war-torn country and to make it a safe haven for its people. Unfortunately they had neither the time nor the means to accomplish these difficult tasks because their foes were preparing to put an end to the new state. In 1920 the country was attacked, invaded and overrun by the Red army, which viciously put an end to the Ukrainian Republic. Soon the country was completely overrun and was made part of the Soviet Union, and so it remains to this day.

For nearly 43 years, the Ukrainians have suffered under Soviet totalitarianism. Some 42 million stout-hearted and patriotic Ukrainians have been unsuccessful in their continuing attempt to free themselves from Soviet tyranny because with their bare hands they have been facing the ferocious might of the entire Soviet Union. The freedom-loving people of Ukrainia have not, however, abandoned their struggle for independence. They have been carrying the fight for freedom on, and still carry on with all the means at their disposal, hoping and praying that their righteous cause will eventually win. On the 45th anniversary of their Independence Day I join millions of Americans in wishing the Ukrainian victims of Soviet treachery fortitude and power in their struggle against the forces of totalitarian tyranny.

Tribute to Herbert H. Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, Herbert H. Lehman, one of the great statesmen of our times, was honored by the women's division of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Senator Lehman, who has been elected to the highest offices New York State can bestow, is loved and respected as no politician has been since Franklin Delano Roosevelt. One of New York's great Governors and the voice of liberalism in the Senate during the 1950's, Senator Lehman's constant demonstration of courage and dedication is an everlasting inspiration. It is with great pleasure that I direct the attention of

my colleagues to the following remarks made by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at the luncheon. The address follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER, AT LUNCHEON OF WOMEN'S DIVISION, FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES

I would not, for anything, have missed this opportunity to join in paying today's heartfelt tribute to Herbert Lehman. Herbert Lehman needs no testimonials, but in honoring him, we honor not only a man but an era—not only an individual but a tradition—a tradition of greatness of which he has been of the main builders, and of which he remains today one of the last great exponents.

Herbert Lehman is, among many other things, a living proof that virtue, integrity, and nobility can pass through the weathered streets of public life, and through temptations and stresses of elective office, and of standing for public office, and can come through undimmed, untarnished, and unsullied. I believe that the answer lies in the strength with which these virtues are attached to the character and personality of the man. In Herbert Lehman they are cast in one piece. In him these characteristics, these virtues, are found almost unalloyed. Yet, contrary to the theory of cynics, this man is recognized in all the places of the earth and among his own friends and family as well—which is an even harder test—as a truly great man.

I knew of Governor Lehman before I knew him. Even before I knew him as a friend, he was pictured in our household as a symbol of rectitude and uncompromising integrity, and of unswerving devotion to the public good. We knew of his greatness of character even before we came to realize his greatness as a public officeholder.

I knew of him as a generous and passionate admirer of Al Smith and as a man who shared my father's ideals and principles, even though Herbert Lehman had arrived at his first places of public eminence by a road quite different than that traveled by my father.

It is worth noting that both my father and Governor Lehman's father came here from Germany, although his father preceded mine to this country by more than a full generation. Beginning in the late twenties, Governor Lehman's career in public office came to dovetail closely with that of my father. In the thirties, they worked together under the supreme leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the achievement of what is often called the Roosevelt revolution.

Then in the Indian summer of Herbert Lehman's career, after he had retired from the last of his great public offices, he returned to the grassroots of his political life—to the sidewalks of New York—to the great task, as he conceived it, of reforming the Democratic Party organization of New York, as a means of generating improvement in the political and governmental atmosphere of his native city.

It had been my privilege ever since the days I was a freshman assemblyman in Albany, my first public office, to look up to Governor Lehman as a symbol of all the political values I had learned to cherish. I followed his leadership while he was Governor. I was proud to have him speak for me and for the people of New York City in Washington while he was Senator, and finally in the end, I was immensely fortunate to have him not only as my friend but as my counselor and supporter.

He had long been called the conscience of American liberalism and so he became the embodiment of what was called here in New York City the reform movement. The impact of that movement on New York City may be debatable. I will not undertake today to give a full evaluation of Herbert Lehman's influence in the political or governmental life of this city. That would take a book. I hope sometime, when I have the time, to be able to contribute to the writing of such a book. But today I will only say that in my judgment this impact has been historic, and altogether constructive and salutary.

To see this great man, already full of all the honors that the people of New York City and State could give him—the most venerated man of his faith in all the country and in all the world—to see him go barnstorming along the sidewalks of the city, into every neighborhood and section, shaking hands, speaking from the backs of trucks and jerry-built platforms, speaking so earnestly and sincerely as only he can speak, to see him in this way, to see him at my right side over a period of so many arduous months, was a spectacle to be remembered beyond even the narrow frame of the political circumstances which brought about his involvement.

As I said, I will leave it to the historians to measure the full proportion of the impact of the New York City reform movement. But I would be ungrateful, if I did not observe that had Herbert Lehman chosen to retire and enjoy his honors and the leisure and rest that his years deserved, it is rather unlikely that I should be standing here today as mayor of this city.

Certainly not because of this, but for a wide range of reasons which are so obvious that I need not enumerate them here today, I have asked and secured Governor Lehman's tentative agreement to be here in New York City on March 28—which day and week I shall proclaim as Lehman Day and Lehman Week. And there shall occur on that day and during that week, I am sure, appropriate observances of the 85th birthday of this beloved and heroic man, this compassionate and generous man, this gentle, gracious, peace-loving and yet fighting man. All of us will join on that occasion in tribute not only to Herbert Lehman but to that beautiful, devoted, gracious and ever-zealous and protective wife and helpmate, who with Herbert Lehman have made up one of the finest man-and-wife teams I have ever known—Herbert and Edith Lehman.

And now let me conclude my tribute to Herbert Lehman with words which are deeply appropriate to him—words that come from that great book, the Talmud. That wise and inspired book says: "The best preacher is the heart; the best teacher is time; the best book is the world; the best friend is God."

Herbert Lehman has lived these sentiments.

Cardiologists' Oversea Program Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago, my good friend Mr. Eddie Cantor, a great American and well-known entertainer, wrote me with respect to an oversea program involving the American College of Cardiology. This nonfund raising educational organization has set up a committee to provide postgraduate courses in cardiology for less privileged countries, and particularly to present the great recent advances in cardiology in America. This program was particularly conceived to bring good will for our country and to improve the scientific image of America overseas.

The first circuit course was conducted in the Philippines and then Formosa, and was received with great enthusiasm by the over 2,200 physicians who attended. The reports received by our State Department were most satisfactory. The traveling expenses of this first circuit course were met by a $10,000 education grant from the Eli Lilly & Co., International. The program was intense, but the interest of the local physicians made the effort worthwhile.

The American Specialists Division of the Department of State recommended that the college obtain invitations from other countries, and advised that the Department of Cultural Exchange hoped to provide funds to pay the travel expenses for future faculties. A second course was arranged, but despite the immeasurable success of the first journey, the State Department officially advised that while it considered the program a commendable one, it could not offer the financial assistance requested—the nominal sum of $9,000.

At this point Mr. Cantor asked that I contact the Department of State to request that additional consideration be given to this project. I was happy to do so, and as a result the proposal was approved. Its success is attested to by a letter to Mr. Cantor from Dr. Eliot Corday, chairman of the committee which arranged the courses. Mr. Cantor has graciously shared this highly interesting report with me, and I believe you will also find satisfying the immense good accomplished by a small sum by these dedicated representatives of their profession and country:

INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH,
CEDARS OF LEBANON HOSPITAL,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 31, 1962.

Mr. EDDIE CANTOR,
Beverly Hills, Calif.

DEAR MR. CANTOR: I would appreciate it greatly if you would transmit the attached information to our Congressman, JAMES ROOSEVELT, and thank him for his help in this program.

In summary, we have now conducted 3 circuit courses in 6 countries, the first 1 to the Philippines and Formosa (a copy of this report is attached), the second to Lisbon and Madrid, and the third to Jerusalem and Istanbul (programs attached). All these programs were overwhelmingly successful. You will notice that the doctors served without remuneration, only their traveling expenses were paid. In many areas the per diem did not cover their living costs. They refused an honorarium because they wished this to be their contribution to our country, and for the benefit of mankind. They often suffered a great loss of income. President Kennedy's motto of "Ask not what my country can do for me, but what I can do for my country," would be most appropriate.

Each visiting faculty came back exhausted, but so enthused by the reception they received. Usually, the auditorium was too small. In Turkey a public address system had to be installed in an adjoining hall. The local committees were overwhelmed by the turnout. The U.S. Information Agency used each ceremonial event for press, television, and radio so that the people throughout the land could appreciate that American medi-

ciné was supreme. It helped improve the scientific image of the United States. Senator FULBRIGHT and Congressman MORGAN were present at the Ambassador's reception in Madrid. I understand they commented on the effectiveness and low cost of this program, and considered it should be expanded.

The State Department has asked us to prepare to send similar groups to South America in the spring of 1963. Chancellor Murphy of UCLA who is an authority in medical affairs in South America has helped us with our plans. In addition, we have invitations from countries behind the Iron Curtain. Yugoslavia and Poland asked us to present courses there. Other requests have been received from Pakistan, Thailand, France, Greece, and the Australian Asian Heart Associaton. The State Department is checking on the authenticity of these invitations.

I am enclosing reports from the program chairmen of Lisbon, Jerusalem, and Madrid, and from the cultural attaché in Lisbon. I wish that you would transmit these along with the copies of the programs to Congressman ROOSEVELT. Programs were sent to all the doctors in Spain—35,000 copies. You can realize the immense good-will value that such distribution would have.

Again, Mr. Cantor, I hope that you will extend our best wishes to Congressman ROOSEVELT and thank him again for his assistance in making this program possible.

Wishing you the best of everything in the new year, and with kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

ELOIT CORDAY, M.D.

MADRID, *December 4, 1962.*

ELIOT CORDAY, M.D.,
Institute for Medical Research, Cedars of Lebanon Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR ELIOT: The course was a great success. From 500 to 600 doctors attended it and many took part in the discussions. Everybody was really pleased not only because of the prestige of the American colleagues but because of their efficiency, sincerity, modesty, and good will.

We tried to make pleasant their stay here and I have the empression that they did appreciate it. We do keep a wonderful memory of these past days.

Please receive my congratulations for it and forward my gratefulness to the American College of Cardiology for its initiative in organizing such courses. I thought of you very often during those days.

With very kind regards to you and Mrs. Corday, I am,

Yours very truly,

C. JIMÈNEZ DÍAZ.

LISBON, PORTUGAL,
December 3, 1962.

DR. ELIOT CORDAY, M.D.,
Chairman, Postgraduate Program Overseas, American College of Cardiology, University of California School of Medicine, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR ELIOT: The course in cardiovascular diseases you worked so hard to bring about was a huge success.

The members of the faculty were top grade, their subjects of the greatest interest, and they had a full house every time they spoke.

All of us that had the privilege of knowing these great men enjoyed meeting them and were stimulated by them.

To you as the prime instigator and principal organizer of this wonderful meeting go our most heartfelt thanks.

Kindest regards from

Yours ever,

Arsénio,
ARSÉNIO CORDEIRO.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Lisbon Portugal, December 10, 1962.

ELIOT CORDAY, M.D.,
Institute for Medical Research,
Cedars of Lebanon Hospital,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR DR. CORDAY: First, I should like to apologize for taking so long to send you a report of the distinguished cardiology team we were privileged to have with us for a few days at the end of November.

The seminar was held at the School of Medicine of the University of Lisbon and was very well organized by the Portuguese Cardiology Society headed by Dr. Arsenio Cordeiro. The seminar was well publicized through the local press, radio, and television and by the previous distribution of 1,500 programs (see attached copy) to leading physicians throughout the country. Attendance at the sessions was unusually high; 280 doctors and students received certificates for attendance at seven of the eight sessions. At one of the sessions on the last day Dr. John LaDue presented technical books by various team members to the University of Lisbon. This presentation was covered by the local press, including photographers. Parts of the opening session were also filmed for television transmission. On November 20, the American Ambassador offered the visiting team a reception at the Embassy residence for approximately 75 professional people.

Portuguese response to the seminar was extremely favorable; not only were local participants greatly impressed by the high category of the American team, but they also reacted positively to the consistently high level of the individual presentation. I attended the opening session and can honestly say that Dr. Dwight E. Harken's lecture on "The Past, Present, and Future of Cardiological Surgery" was the best organized and most absorbing talk I have ever witnessed. The fact that all sessions were conducted in English seems to have presented no impediment to general understanding of the material.

Members of the team expressed themselves as satisfied with both the results and with their reception by their Portuguese colleagues. They all agreed, however, that the program was an exhausting one which left very little time for rest and recuperation. I gather, however, that it was the intention of the American College of Cardiology that this visit be strictly a work session, as I can assure you it was.

Altogether this project was one of the most successful I have known and left an excellent impression upon both sponsors and participants. The Embassy feels particularly grateful that the team could have come to Portugal at a time when Portuguese-American relations need strengthening in every possible way. I am sure the Ambassador would wish to add his gratitude to mine and to wish these distinguished cardiologists all success in their future missions.

Sincerely,

ROD W. HORTON,
Cultural Affairs Officer.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine is an event that demands commemoration here in the House of Representatives, the oldest continuous free representative assembly on earth. So I consider it a privilege to join with our colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Ukraine, both here in the United States and in their captive homeland, and to their love of personal freedom and national independence which has survived centuries of persecution and oppression.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Not only do they seek for themselves what we have found and firmly established here and what we proclaim to be an inalienable right of all peoples—that is, government by the consent of the governed—but we have also been the beneficiaries of the approximately 2 million people of Ukrainian ancestry who have brought to this country the spiritual qualities and the human values of an old and distinctive culture.

In the congressional district which I am privileged to represent, I have seen at first hand the importance of the contributions being made daily by our fellow citizens and neighbors of Ukrainian descent. Because of their friendship, I have obtained a closer, more personal appreciation of the dedication of Ukrainians everywhere to the goals of individual liberty and national self-determination.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of those of our colleagues who were not present at the opening of our session this noon to the fact that the prayer today was offered by the Very Reverend Walter Bukata, pastor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension of my neighboring city of Newark. On my own behalf and that of my many constituents who know and admire Father Bukata, I am delighted to welcome him to the House of Representatives on this memorable occasion.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is the largest and one of the oldest of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. Yet, the period of her independence as a nation during the 20th century is the shortest, the 2 years between 1918 and 1920 during which Ukrainians fought for and won their freedom from Russian monarchists only to have it torn away by the Russian Communists. Thus it is that Ukrainians know, perhaps better than most, the evils of imperialist tyranny and despotism, whether of the tsarist variety or the Godless brutality of communism. To have refused to succumb, to have kept alive the dream of freedom and the light of independence in the face of almost permanent persecution, is worthy of our deepest admiration and gratitude.

Unfortunately, Ukraine is sometimes omitted from the lists of the so-called captive nations of Eastern Europe, possibly because this brave nation was forcibly incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Whatever the explanation, however, this must be considered one of the real ironies of modern history. For Ukrainians have not freely subordinated their consciousness of nationhood to the iron demands of the Soviet state. On the contrary, it was

only because of their undeniable claim to nationality and their determination to fight for it that Soviet Russia was led to concede the Ukrainian people the status of a republic with the false hope of independence it implied. The hypocrisy, of course, was compounded when Soviet Russia obtained a seat in the United Nations for its puppet government of Ukraine.

But make no mistake about it, the 40 million Ukrainians now living in captivity and their countrymen everywhere know all too well that Ukraine is not free or independent. Nor have they given up the struggle for what is theirs in justice, despite the difficulties, the dangers, and the discouragements. We salute them for their courage.

On this occasion, however, we should do more than salute a people's courage, more than indicate our understanding of their problems, more than pledge our support in general terms. We owe them action, effective action, even though we recognize the limits of our own national power. We cannot arbitrarily or single-handedly change the face of the map or even raise the iron curtain, but there are concrete and positive steps we can take to advance the cause of freedom.

Among them, Mr. Speaker, we can establish the proposed Select Committee on the Captive Nations here in the House and thereby help equip the Congress to deal with developments in Eastern Europe more expeditiously and effectively. The hearings held last year on the captive nations by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs indicates the real usefulness of such a group whose full-time attention could be devoted to this critically important subject. Consequently, I have today introduced agains legislation to create a Captive Nations Committee.

We can also act to strengthen the U.S. Information Agency and its Voice of America with regard to the quality, frequency, and scope of its programing behind the iron curtain.

We can broaden and increase exchange programs and other means of contact between the people of the captive nations and our own people.

We can do a better job of reminding the rest of the world as frequently as practicable that the United States, as a matter of fundamental principle, refuses to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe and continues to insist upon the right of every people to political liberty and national self-determination.

We can expose at every opportunity—especially in the forum of the United Nations—the ugly record of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, a record of subjugation, discrimination, economic exploitation, and military domination, a record that deserves the official condemnation of that world body.

These and many other actions can be taken which would give to the Eastern European policy of our Government the emphasis this important area requires. In keeping with our own ideals and in justice to those who have suffered for freedom's sake, we can do no less.

An Expensive Dock Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues, I have been deeply concerned in recent weeks about the losses which this Nation has and is still suffering as a result of strikes. In the few weeks since this Congress convened, we have seen several dramatic examples of abuses of the substantial economic power of the labor monopoly.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 25, 1963, which raises some serious questions worthy of consideration by all Americans and which demand the attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

AN EXPENSIVE DOCK SETTLEMENT

The 31-day longshoremen's strike which tied up 600 ships and idled 100,000 men at ports up and down the U.S. Atlantic and gulf coasts is estimated to have cost more than $700 million in lost wages and business.

How much indirect loss was caused in shutdowns and layoffs in industries producing goods for overseas shipment will never be known.

But now that a settlement has been forced by a kind of compulsory mediation on the part of the Government, the cost of the imposed terms to the shipping industry and to users of shipping will be far from insignificant even compared with the costs of the strike.

The spokesman for the New York Shipping Association calls it a "very, very expensive" settlement. And a look at the terms bears him out.

In the first place, the most emotional issue in the dispute, reduction of work gangs in northern ports from 20 men to 17, had earlier been referred to the Department of Labor for a 2-year study. This is probably the best way to handle the matter. But it means that savings by mechanization with which the shipping companies could meet the cost of wage increases are denied them for at least 2 years.

Meanwhile, President Kennedy has referred wage issues in the dispute to a special board headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, an experienced labor arbitrator but also a pronounced political liberal. The terms recommended by this board, backed by the prospect of a report to Congress if the shutdown continued, involve increased labor costs of 37-cents-an-hour by the end of a 2-year period.

This is, if anything, a shade nearer the 51-cent serious demand of the International Longshoremen's Association than to the 22-cent offer of the employers. It is enough to raise serious question whether the increase is "in the national interest" to which President Kennedy appealed when he appointed the special board.

One of the national interests, as the President and others repeatedly emphasize, is to compete effectively in international trade, so that earnings from exports may reduce the deficit in balance of payments which results from defense and aid costs. This is not served by permitting unchecked continuance of a wage spiral enforced by labor monopoly.

Further, will the example of what the dockworkers have gained by subjecting the Nation to their economic power encourage the New York Typographical Union to continue its strike against New York newspapers until one or more of those publications goes out of business? Or encourage the United Steelworkers to reopen their contract with demands that would have far-reaching and depressive effects?

ROA's Minuteman, Dennis Chavez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to present for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting and significant article from the Officer, the publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. It deals with the life and accomplishments of the late Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico. Senator Chavez was selected last fall to receive the honor of "Minuteman of 1963" by ROA. On November 17, 1962, Senator Chavez died, and the award will be accepted posthumously at the midwinter national conference banquet on March 1 by his widow. Senator Chavez led an interesting and colorful life and was a great and good friend of the military. The article herein reprinted was written expressly for the Officer by John J. Ford, legislative editor of the Army Times, and is an authority on Capitol Hill matters.

The article follows:

PROFILE OF AN AMERICAN—BORN IN ADOBE HUT, ROA'S MINUTEMAN ROSE TO BECOME POWERFUL LEADER

(By John J. Ford)

Born in an adobe home with a dirt floor, too poor even to go to high school and past 30 before he could afford to study law, Dennis Chavez rose to become chairman of the most powerful subcommittee in the U.S. Senate, the group that sets the annual appropriations for national defense. At the time of his death last November he was fourth senior Member of the U.S. Senate and had served as a Senator longer than any other man from New Mexico.

As a boy he was forced to leave school in the seventh grade to go to work and help suppor his family, driving a grocery wagon 12 hours a day for the princely salary of $2.75 a week. As a Senator he headed the unit that wrote awesomely expensive Defense bills, directing the spending of $40 billion or more annually. His first job had taught him the value of the dollar but in his last he never made the mistake of trying to put a price tag on defense. Chairman of the Defense Appropriations unit during 8 years when Congress was showing renewed interest in strategic planning and exerting a big influence on such planning through the money bills, he consistently fought for a stronger Defense Establishment. He was in the forefront of the fight for a larger Army and Marine Corps, minimum strengths for the Reserves, speedier development of Polaris, a nuclear carrier, more conventional airpower and development of the B-70.

The grocery wagon job was in Albuquerque 25 miles north of Los Chavez, in Valencia County, where Dennis was born on April 8, 1888, the son of David and Paz Sanchez Chavez. The name of his birthplace was not coincidental; his roots went deep in the soil of Valencia County. He was on land deeded to his direct ancestors by Phillip II of Spain in 1597. One of his progenitors was the first jefe politico (Governor) of the New Mexican territory when Mexico won its independence from Spain in 1821.

The roots were deep but the soil was dry. David Chavez struggled in vain to provide a living for his family on the parched earth of his forebears. When Dennis was 7 the family moved to Albuquerque where there were jobs and also schools. In Los Chavez there were no schools, no books, and only Spanish was spoken. Dennis later said he had become a Democrat because, "I saw that under the Republicans English-speaking communities had schools, Spanish-speaking communities had none."

TO WORK AT 13

But the family was still poor and at 13 Dennis, oldest of 8 children, had to go to work. He not only drove the delivery wagon, he cared for the horse and stable. He once said he spent his youth "playing valet to a horse at 6 o'clock in the morning." The hours were from 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. except on Saturday. On Saturday he worked till 11 p.m. On weekday evenings he studied in the local library, reading his great hero, Jefferson.

After 4 years the pay was up to $11 a week but 1 day the store owner told him to deliver food to men hired to break a strike. He refused and was fired. At 17, he had taken his stand on the side of the underdog. It was the only side he was comfortable on for the rest of his life.

Examples of this come up again and again in his career. He worked tirelessly for the Mexican people of his State, who had discrimination problems, and for the often neglected Indians of the West.

A little-known incident happened in connection with the Defense money bill, which regularly contains restrictions against buying food and clothing from foreign suppliers. In 1955, Chavez added to the restriction the buying of "spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth." A man who owned a small silk plant who had supplied the cartridge covers to the Navy testified he was being forced out of business because the Navy was buying the covers from Japan. He had some evidence the Japanese product did not wear as well as his own. He had a small business and no lobbyist or Senator to fight his cause; he was a little man being disregarded by the Federal Government. Chavez put in the rider to protect him and the jobs of the people who worked for him. Senator Chavez had never seen the man before the committee hearing and never saw him after that but the rider stayed in the bill despite pressure from the State Department and other sources. It is still in the Defense bill today.

TAKES SENATE JOB

The ex-wagon driver studied at night to become a qualified surveyor, worked as assistant engineer for the city of Albuquerque. A job as interpreter for Senator A. A. Jones in 1916 brought an offer of a clerkship in the U.S. Senate. Encouraged by his wife, whom he had married in 1911, he gave up a promising start in the contracting business to come to Washington and fulfill his long dream of studying law. At the tender age of 30, a married man with two children who had never seen the inside of a high school or a college, he entered Georgetown Law School.

Years later, any young man who served on Senator Chavez' staff was required to use his spare time bettering his education. Among ex-Chavez staffmen who got their higher education this way are a former lieutenant governor, a former district attorney, and a number of prominent lawyers and doctors.

With his law degree in 1920, Chavez started a notably successful law practice, though often defending clients who could not afford attorney fees. In 1923 he was elected to the State legislature where he introduced the first bill to provide free textbooks to the schoolchildren of New Mexico. In 1930 he was elected to the House of Representatives, unseating incumbent Republican Albert Simms.

Reelected in 1932, he tried unsuccessfully to defeat Republican Senator Bronson Cutting in 1934 in one of the more acromatic campaigns in New Mexico history. It was the only 1 of 13 major primary and general election campaigns he lost. When Cutting died in a plane crash in 1935, Chavez was appointed to the seat. He was elected to it in 1936 and reelected in 1940, 1946, and 1952. Early building a reputation as a fighter for the things he believed in, he fought some tough battles in the political arena, once complaining it was his fate "always to run against a million dollars."

PROUD OF HERITAGE

The only Senator of Spanish descent, he was intensely proud of his heritage. Once, when asked his nationality, he replied, "American since before Plymouth Rock." An aid once said Chavez was recognized by his colleagues as "one of the last great individualists in the Senate." Like the great individualists throughout the history of the Senate, he had courage. His fellow Senators much admired that courage in 1950, at the height of the McCarthyism era, when many in the Congress were afraid to speak out. Chavez rose on the Senate floor to denounce McCarthy's favorite witness, Louis Bundez, as a man who gave un-American, un-Christian dubious testimony under the shield and cloak of the Catholic church. Chavez, himself a Catholic, said the period might be remembered as a time "when we have quietly shackled the growth of men's minds."

Early in the years of the war he showed that foresight on defense matters that marked his later service. The Senate was debating the Army appropriation bill in 1940 at a time when air power was still little understood and attempts were being made to cut the funds for pilot training. Chavez argued, "I maintain that our national defense in the future will be * * * the airplane of the future. I am for anything that may be done for the making of better pilots and for bringing about of technical improvements in this field."

EQUAL PAY FOR NURSES

Senator Chavez often helped on defense matters in less conspicuous ways. Early in the war there was a terrible shortage of nurses in the Army. Looking into the problem Chavez learned the pay for nurse second lieutenants was below that of male officers of equal grade. He prodded the War Department into paying nurses the same as other officers and recruitment soon picked up.

He wanted a strong defense and he wanted Congress to take the lead in bringing it about. In 1959 his committee reported a bill providing a 200,000-man floor on the Marine Corps and minimum strengths of 300,000 and 400,000, respectively, for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. He had also voted for an active Army of 900,000 but it had lost in committee. When some in Congress questioned whether Congress should be setting strength minimums or other details of military policy, Chavez said:

"The fundamental issue involved far exceeds in importance the question of what constitutes an adequate strength for the Marine Corps. What is in fact involved here is the constitutional role of the Congress in the formulation of national military policy. The Constitution places the ultimate responsibility for defense squarely on the shoulders of the Congress."

He then lectured his colleagues with precedents, dating back to the time when veterans of the Continental Congress served in Congress, of the legislature setting the size of the Armed Forces and such details as how many marines would be carried on specific naval vessels. He even brought up a case where Congress had specified the tensile strength of the steel to be used in construction of warships.

"In those occasional incidents where our most carefully considered judgments differ from that of the Executive," he concluded, "the Congress cannot in honor and good conscience absolve itself of the burden by supinely bowing to the Executive."

Senator Chavez had a clear understanding of the value of the Reserves. On July 13, 1959, he told the Senate:

"Over a period of years there have been progressive reductions in the strength of the Active Army. One of the factors compensating for this reduction has been the increasing effectiveness and readiness of the Army National Guard and Reserve.

"The Guard and the Reserve are the lowest cost military forces that we have. As an economical and effective alternative to large standing forces they should, at all times, be kept at the optimum levels comparable with the importance of their mission.

"Because no nation, however prosperous, can afford to maintain on active duty all of the personnel who might be needed in time of national emergency, it is imperative that there be a pool of trained manpower available at a moment's notice. The Guard and Reserve, if properly maintained at adequate strength levels, will be able to fulfill this requirement."

LONG, USEFUL LIFE

The respect that fellow Senators had for Senator Chavez' service on national defense matters was well expressed by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON who said, "I believe the Members of the Senate and every liberty-loving American looks with a great deal of approval upon his efforts. The Senator from New Mexico has had a long and useful life of public service, and I think the Senate is honored to have him head this important subcommittee."

Senator Chavez was thought to have won a year and a half battle with cancer of the throat and was learning to talk again with a metal tube in his throat. He left the hospital last fall to campaign for his party's ticket in New Mexico. He contracted a virus which, coming after the long illness, led to a heart attack that took his life November 17, 1962.

Those who attended the funeral in Albuquerque noted that when the funeral procession moved through the poorer sections of the city the people lined the streets for miles to pay their last respects. They had lost a great friend and they knew it. They always do.

Washington State Senate Opposes Japanese Halibut Fishing in Bering Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Senate unanimously passed

a memorial urging Federal action to cancel recent concessions of the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty Commission to allow Japan to fish for halibut east of an existing treaty line.

This memorial was adopted 44 to 0 and charged that a halibut fishery conservation program was threatened by the concessions.

On February 5 a meeting of the International Commission is scheduled to be held in Tokyo to consider Japanese proposals for conservation. It seems to me the agreement to allow Japan to cross the line heretofore established by treaty is premature. Conservation arrangements should have been agreed to first.

Once this halibut resource was almost destroyed but through regulation and self-denial of our fishermen the catches have been increasing in the Bering Sea area. Now the question is, Will the Japanese make 30 years of such restraint and sacrifice in vain?

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, let me add that a joint House-Senate congressional committee has scheduled a hearing on February 14 and 15 in Seattle, Wash., to investigate as to whether the halibut Commission's action was justified.

Plain Commonsense on So-Called Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by James Tobin which appeared in the January 19, 1963, issue of the New Republic. Mr. Tobin takes the commonsense approach and gives an accurate assessment of so-called deficit spending.

The article follows:

DEFICIT, DEFICIT, WHO'S GOT THE DEFICIT?

(By James Tobin [1])

Question: "Sir, on that point, what do you think of the President's tax cut proposal and his idea that it would spur revenues even though we would have what he calls a temporary deficit? Does this make sense to you?"

Answer: "My own background is that of a small businessman who has had to scratch right hard to keep his head above water at times. The arithmetic of this thing just doesn't work out. I coudn't in my business increase my expenses and reduce my revenues and stay alive. I don't think a government can do it without an eventual change in our form of government."—Interview with Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, Chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

For every buyer there must be a seller, and for every lender a borrower. One man's expenditure is another's receipt. My debts are your assets, my deficits your surplus. If all of us were consistently "neither borrower nor lender," as Polonius advised, no one would ever need to violate the revered wisdom of Mr. Micawber. But if the prudent among us insist on running and lending surpluses, some of the rest of us are willy-nilly going to borrow to finance budget deficits.

In the United States today one budget which is usually left holding a deficit is that of the Federal Government. When no one else borrows the surpluses of the thrifty, the Treasury ends up doing so. Since the role of debtor and borrower is thought to be particularly unbecoming to the Federal Government, the Nation feels frustrated and guilty.

Unhappily, crucial decisions of economic policy are too largely blind reactions to these feelings. The truisms that borrowing is the counterpart of lending, and deficits the counterpart of surpluses, are overlooked in popular and congressional discussions of Government budgets and taxes. Both guilt feelings and policy are based on serious misunderstanding of the origins of Federal budget deficits and surpluses.

American households and financial institutions consistently run financial surpluses. They have money to lend, beyond their own needs to borrow. Chart 1 shows the growth in their combined surpluses since the war; it also shows some tendency for these surpluses to rise in periods of recession and slack business activity. Of course, many private households have financial deficits. They pay out more than their incomes for food, clothing, cars, appliances, houses, taxes, etc. They draw on savings accounts, redeem savings bonds, sell securities, mortgage houses or incur installment debt. But deficit households are far outweighed by surplus households. As a group American households and nonprofit institutions have in recent years shown a net financial surplus averaging about $15 billion a year, that is, households are ready to lend, or put into equity investments, about $15 billion a year more than they are prepared to borrow. In addition, financial institutions regularly generate a lendable surplus, now of the order of $5 billion a year. For the most part these institutions, banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, pension funds, and the like, are simply intermediaries which borrow and relend the public's money. Their surpluses result from the fact that they earn more from their lending operations than they distribute or credit to their depositors, shareowners and policyholders.

Who is to use the $20 billion of surplus funds available from households and financial institutions? State and local governments as a group have been averaging $3 to $4 billion a year of net borrowing. Pressures of the expanding populations of children, adults, houses and automobiles, plus the difficulties of increasing tax revenues, force these governments to borrow in spite of strictures against government debt. Unincorporated businesses, including farms, absorb another $3 to $4 billion. To the rest of the world we can lend perhaps $2 billion a year. We cannot lend abroad, net, more than the surplus of our exports over our imports of goods and services, and some of that surplus we give away in foreign aid. We have to earn the lendable surplus in tough international competition. Recent experience shows clearly that when we try to lend and invest too much money abroad, we either have to borrow it back or else pay in gold.

These borrowers account for $8 to $10 billion. The remainder—some $10 to $12 billion—must be used either by nonfinancial corporate business or by the Federal Government. Only if corporations as a group take $10 to $12 billion of external funds, by borrowing or issuing new equities, can the Federal Government expect to break even. This is, moreover, an understatement of what is required to keep the Federal debt from rising. For the Federal Government itself provides annually $3 to $4 billion of new lending; and the Treasury would have to borrow to finance these Federal lending programs even if the Government absorbed no net funds from the economy. It is gross Federal borrowing which offends the fiscal conservative, whether or not the proceeds are used to acquire other financial assets.

The moral is inescapable, if startling. If you would like the Federal deficit to be smaller, the deficits of business must be bigger. And would you like the Federal Government to run a surplus and reduce its debt? Then business deficits must be big enough to absorb that surplus as well as the funds available from households and financial institutions.

That does not mean that business must be run at a loss, quite the contrary. Sometimes, it is true, unprofitable businesses are forced to borrow or to spend financial reserves just to stay afloat; this was a major reason for business deficits in the depths of the great depression. But normally it is businesses with good profits and good prospects which borrow or sell new shares of stock, in order to finance expansion and medornization. As the president of A.T. & T. can testify, heavy reliance on outside funds, far from being a distress symptom, is an index and instrument of growth in the profitability and worth of the corporation. Financial deficits incurred by business firms, or by households and governments, do not usually mean that they are living beyond their means and consuming their capital. Financial deficits are typically the means of accumulating nonfinancial assets, real property in the form of inventories, buildings and equipment.

When does business run big deficits? When do corporations draw heavily on the capital markets? The record is clear: When business is very good, when sales are pressing hard on capacity, when businessmen see further expansion ahead. Though corporations' internal funds, depreciation allowances, and plowed-back profits, are large during boom times, their investment programs are even larger.

Chart 2 shows the financial deficits or surpluses of corporate business and of the Federal Government since the war. Three facts stand out. First, the Federal Government has big deficits when corporations run surpluses or small deficits, and vice versa. Second, Government surpluses and business deficits reach their peaks in periods of economic expansion, when industrial capacity is heavily utilized: 1947–48, 1951–52, 1956–57. Third, the combined deficit of corporate business and the Federal Government is greater now than in the early postwar years; this is the counterpart of the upward trend in available surpluses as shown in chart 1.

Recession, idle capacity, unemployment, economic slack, these are the enemies of the balanced Government budget. When the economy is faltering, households have more surpluses available to lend, and business firms are less inclined to borrow them.

The Federal Government will not succeed in cutting its deficit by steps which depress the economy, perpetuate excess capacity, and deter business firms from using outside funds. Raising taxes and cutting expenses seem like obvious ways to balance the budget. But because of their effects on private spending, lending, and borrowing, they may have exactly the contrary result. Likewise, lowering taxes and raising Government expenditures may so stimulate private business activity and private borrowing that the Federal deficit is in the end actually reduced.

This may seem paradoxical, and perhaps it is. Why is it that the homely analogy be-

[1] James Tobin was a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers from January, 1961, until last July, when he returned to Yale University. His article on "Growth Through Taxation" appeared in the New Republic of July 25, 1960.

tween family finance of Government finance, on which our decisive national attitudes toward Federal fiscal policy are so largely based, misleads us? If John Jones on Maple Street is spending $8,700 a year but taking in only $8,000, the remedy is clear. All Mr. Jones need do to balance the family budget is resolutely to live within his income, either spending some $700 less or working harder to increase his earnings. Jones can safely ignore the impact of either action on the incomes and expenditures of others and the possible ultimate feedback on his own job and income. The situation of John F. Kennedy on Pennsylvania Avenue, spending $87 billion a year against tax revenues of $80 billion is quite different. Suppose he spends $7 billion less, or tries through higher tax rates to boost Federal revenues by $7 billion. He cannot ignore the inevitable boomerang effect on Federal finances. These measures will lower the sales, payrolls and profits of business firms, whether they were selling aircraft to the Government or pleasure boats to taxpayers. These business firms will in turn spend less for new machinery; their employees and stockholders will spend less on vacation trips. This chain is not endless. But before it ends, it will shrink total spending and income in the economy by a multiple of the original $7 billion. The Federal tax base shrinks correspondingly. In the end the Federal deficit will be reduced by much less than $7 billion; perhaps it will even be increased.

Incidentally, many of the very critics who are most vocal in chiding the Government for fiscal sin advocate policies which would make fiscal virtue even more elusive. They want to keep private borrowing in check by tight credit policies and high interest rates. They want to increase corporations' internal flow of funds by bigger depreciation allowances and higher profit margins, making business still less dependent on external funds to finance investment, even in boom times. When these apostles of sound finance also tell the Government to shun external finance, have they done their arithmetic? If everyone is self-financing, who then will borrow the surpluses?

The Nation is paying a high price for the misapplied homely wisdom which guides Federal fiscal policy. The real toll is measured by unemployment, idle capacity, lost production, and sluggish economic growth. But fiscal conservatism is also self-defeating. It does not even achieve its own aim, the avoidance of Government deficits. Federal fiscal and monetary policies consciously and unashamedly designed to stimulate the economy would have sufficient justification in economic expansion itself. But they might well improve the Federal budget too, by inducing business to use the private surpluses that now have no destination other than a rising Federal debt.

New York City: Educational Stepchild of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, another example of the way an urban area is discriminated against by a rural Republican-dominated State government is the area of education. The amount of money that New York City pays into the coffers of the State treasury is astronomical, and yet we have the spectacle of the State returning $107 less per pupil in State aid to the city's schools than the average received by other school districts throughout the State.

The people of New York City are not blind to this fiscal discrimination and will exert their influence at the polls at the proper time. An example of the awareness of this problem is the following editorial which was broadcast by station WCBS–TV on January 10 and 11:

ANNOUNCER. The following program is an expression of opinion of WCBS–TV. Speaking for the station: Mr. Norman E. Walt, Jr., vice president and general manager of WCBS–TV.

Mr. WALT. Good evening.

New York City schools have been a chronic source of dissatisfaction for a long time. Twenty years ago, our schools were widely regarded as being among the best in the country. Since then they have steadily declined.

Just last month, the State education department issued a report on the city's school system which pointed out that we don't have enough teachers, our classrooms are overcrowded, there aren't enough textbooks, a lot of equipment is antiquated, and many of our school buildings are dingy and dilapidated. While this report was no great revelation to teachers, to parents or, for that matter, to the school children themselves, it was useful to the extent that it spelled out what can be done to remedy these deficiencies. But as responsible citizens who live in New York City, we must face up to the fact that whatever has to be done will cost money, a lot of money. According to an estimate made in a joint report by the Public Education Association and the United Federation of Teachers, the amount required will be close to $200 million more each year than we are paying now. We must also face up to the fact that there are only two ways to raise it—by increased city taxes and by increased State aid.

Where can New York City taxes be increased? There have been proposals to increase the tax on cab rides, on amusements, on overnight parking, and a proposal to extend the city's sales tax to beer. Channel 2 opposes these taxes because they hit hardest at those who are least able to pay.

However, there are other tax possibilities which channel 2 believes should be carefully studied. One possibility might be to add one-quarter of 1 percent to whatever rate the taxpayer is paying in State income tax. This is called a surtax and would yield approximately $60 million. Its advantage is that it is based fairly on income. Another tax possibility which could yield as much as $269 million would be to raise the legal tax limit on real estate 1½ percent—to bring it in line with tax ceilings elsewhere in the State. Or the city might consider taxing the profits from the port authority's nonaviation enterprises at Idlewild Airport as well as any port authority project which has already paid for itself. And finally, there is offtrack betting as a possible steady source of city income.

Now, what about increased State aid? At present, State aid to our city's schools is $107 less per pupil than the average received by other school districts throughout the State. Why do we receive less? Because the current State aid formula bases the amount any school district shall receive on the tax value of its real estate. This formula is based on the premise that the greater the value of a city's real estate, the greater the taxes it may impose, and, therefore, the greater its financial ability to support its schools. The State figures that New York City, with its high real estate values, doesn't need as much State aid for schools as other districts. The difficulty with this premise is that it fails to take into account the city's expenses in relation to its income. The fact is that our city spends a far greater proportion of its tax revenues for a far greater number of public services than do the less populous areas. For example, in order to provide adequate police protection, New York City must spend a greater proportion of its total income than that spent by upstate Yates County for the same public service, in fact, 4 times as much. And it must spend proportionately 8 times as much of its total income for its fire department, 10 times as much for sanitation and more than twice as much for welfare. New York City also has to provide services which may not figure at all in the rural county budget, such as air pollution, water pollution, museums and markets. As a result, New York City actually has less of its total income to spend on education than far smaller communities where the cost of other public services is not so great.

If New York City is ever to halt the steady decline of its schools, and to restore them to the high scholastic level they maintained 20 years ago, we must face up to the fact that sacrifices will have to be made. It is going to take money—a lot of money—$200 million more for our schools than we are paying now. The additional money can only be obtained in two ways: by increased city taxes and by increased State aid. But we can't increase city taxes without the approval of the State legislature and we can't get increased State aid until the legislature comes through with a school formula that no longer discriminates against New York City.

For years our rural-dominated State legislature assured us that it is giving New York City its fair share of aid for education. On this station last November 20, Republican majority leader of the senate, Walter J. Mahoney, assured our viewers that in the field of education, and I quote: "the legislature is appropriating millions of dollars each year in special aids, over and above the amount the city is entitled to under the statewide formula." But significantly, he failed to discuss the formula itself—a formula which doesn't provide the city with anywhere near its fair share of State funds.

Parents of children enrolled in New York City schools can no longer afford to be passive about this form of discrimination. Channel 2 is convinced that Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner can—and ought—to take the problem of our schools once and for all out of the realm of politics. If these two men will work out a statesmanlike formula for new city taxation and increased State aid—before the issues get distorted in legislative infighting—they will have given the legislature much-needed leadership and they will have earned the gratitude of every citizen in New York City.

Thank you and good night.

ANNOUNCER. The preceding program was an editorial opinion of WCBS–TV by Norman E. Walt, Jr., vice president and general manager of WCBS–TV.

Loans for Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a new bill in the 88th Congress—H.R. 1978—to increase the funds which the colleges and universities can get for

loans to students. The bill will double the amount which the institutions of higher learning will have available for loans to needy students. In the 87th Congress, Representative Bailey, of West Virginia, had a similar bill which did not reach the floor.

I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will give immediate consideration to my bill or to any similar bill which may have been introduced. The universities and colleges are unable to meet the requests for loans which are made by needy students. The National Defense Education Act program, involving loans to needy students, is acceptable to and supported by all groups interested in higher education. It provides for the return of the public funds loaned, with interest. It contains special benefits for loans to students who are preparing to be teachers so that the teacher shortage can be overcome. The programs for education are vital to the welfare of our country. Many States and cities are cooperating in a splendid manner with education grants, but these sources cannot begin to adequately solve the problem. This Congress can be a tremendous help if the loan program can be doubled at once so that needy students can be helped immediately.

National Revolutions and Russian Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable confusion with respect to communism, Russian imperialism, and national revolution which we read and hear so much about in these changing times. National revolutions have been in conflict with the aims of Russian imperialism for more than a century. Today the Russian Communists call out for peaceful coexistence while at the same time they are plotting and working to destroy the national independence of all free nations.

A very significant analysis of the relationship of Russian imperialism, peaceful coexistence, and the aspirations of nations to be independent was made by Dr. Michael S. Pap, director of the Institute for Soviet and East European Studies, John Carroll University, Cleveland, on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic. His analysis relates to the atmosphere which permeated the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918 and the attitude taken by the Russian Bolsheviks with regard to the newly independent nations which arose with the collapse of the Russian czarist empire. This analysis is a positive contribution toward clearing up the confusion which exists on the nature of imperial Russian communism. By leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD Dr. Pap's analysis on national revolutions and Russian imperialism:

The anniversary celebrated by the Ukrainians in the free world each January has a meaningful significance not only for the Ukrainians but for the people of the United States and the whole free world as well. It is obvious that when freedom is obliterated in one country, it indirectly affects all the other free peoples. At a time when Moscow tries to impress the world as the champion of anticolonialism, there is an urgent need to remind our people of the fate of nations forced to live under the brutal oppression of Communist-Russian dictatorship.

Ukraine with a population of 45 million was the first victim of Soviet Russian aggression. It is the largest non-Russian nation within the Soviet Russian Empire. This entitles it to rank in Europe next to Russia, Germany, and France not only in terms of population, but also in terms of strategic geographic position and rich resources. Because of its resources, it had always been regarded as a coveted prize of aggressors—first the Mongols, then Moscovite czars, and finally the Russian Communists.

When, in 1917, the Russian autocratic government disintegrated, the Ukrainian people availed themselves of the opportunity to regain their own independence. A national government was formed which then issued decrees and promulgated laws, securing liberty and equality for all citizens of Ukraine. At the same time, the Russian Communist Party issued its declaration in favor of the right to self-determination.

It soon became apparent, however, that this Soviet declaration was only a clever Bolshevik maneuver to preserve the unity of the former Russian Empire. Simultaneously with the ostentatious proclamation of the right to self-rule, the Soviet Russian Government dispatched to the Ukrainian National Government a 48-hour ultimatum dated December 17, 1917, signed by Lenin and Stalin, demanding unconditional surrender and the acceptance of Soviet Russian domination over Ukraine. The reply by the Ukrainian Government of December 19, 1917, is regarded today as a historical and a classic document which clearly exhibits a unique comprehension of the potential Communist threat not only to the young Ukrainian Republic, but to the free peoples throughout the world. Ukrainians realized already in 1917 that between the czarist and the Bolshevik imperialism, there was little or no difference. Rejecting the Soviet ultimatum, Ukraine proclaimed her independence on January 22, 1918. A proclamation of the reunification of all Ukrainian territories in one single democratic state followed a year later on January 22, 1919. With these two significant acts, the Ukrainians demonstrated to the world that Moscow and Kiev represented two different cultures, two different nations, and two different mentalities. Kiev personified the democratic concept of government based on respect for human rights and the dignity of man, while Moscow represented not only totalitarianism but also a godless force of destruction.

The ensuing Russian-Ukrainian war of almost 4 years' duration (1917–21) is rather obscured, because at that time communism was not recognized as a danger to the free world. The Russian Communists were aided in their war against Ukrainians by a majority of the Russians who sacrificed democracy in order to preserve the unity of the Russian Empire. How well the Ukrainians understood the danger of Russian Bolshevism can best be described by quoting the Ukrainian Representative Liubinsky at the Brest-Litovsk Peace Conference in February 1918 when following Trotzky's declarations of Communist peaceful aims, he stated:

"The noisy declarations of the Bolsheviks regarding the complete freedom of the people of Russia is but the vulgar stuff of demagogy. The Government of the Bolsheviks, which has broken up the constituent assembly and which rests on the bayonets of hired red guards, will never elect to apply in Russia the very just principle of self-determination, for they know only too well that not only the Republic of the Ukraine but also the Don, the Caucasus, Siberia, and other regions do not regard them as their government, and that even the Russian people, themselves, will ultimately deny their right; only because they are afraid of the development of a national revolution do they declare here at the peace conference and within Russia, with a spirit of demagogy peculiar to themselves, the right of self-determination of the peoples. They themselves are struggling against the realization of this principle and are resorting not only to hired bands of red guards but also to meaner and even less legal methods."

Since the Bolshevik Russian occupation of the Ukraine, 10 million Ukrainians or more died in the defense of their independence. The Ukraine would have remained free had the Western nations paid heed to her warnings of the potential Communist menace and answered her desperate call for moral and military assistance. Without the Ukraine's strategic position and her immeasurable mineral resources, the Soviet Russian Government would have difficulties in initiating aggressive pressures toward the West. We, Americans, should find comfort in knowing that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not all Russia, but a chain of captive nations yearning for an opportunity to break this chain of bondage and become masters of their destinies within their respective Republics. During and after World War II, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, was actively engaged in fighting nazism and communism alike. Paradoxically, the Western Powers again were not interested in the emergence of this freedom force in Eastern Europe, and unwittingly helped the Kremlin pave its way to the heart of Europe and Asia. On the basis of our experience with the Communists, we should know by now that the only policy capable of shaking the foundation of the Soviet Russian slave empire is a policy motivated by the idea of individual and national liberty for all. It is this ideological weapon the Communists fear most. For this reason, the Ukrainians would wholeheartedly support the U.S. ideological reorientation which would include an open support for the Ukraine's as well as for other nations' right to liberty and independence. Such a policy would force the Kremlin into a defensive position and may prove to be the best deterrent to a nuclear war.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 26, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

The economic report and tax messages of this week, as well as the earlier state of the Union and budget messages are sick documents, as I see it. Realizing this, I have of-

fered my own general analyses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following each message, respectively.

Economic report

"Governmentitis" is the sickness. Keynesianism, that is, modern socialism, is described in detail. The deficit specified as $11.9 billion likely will run up to $20 billion or more. The President's four reports to Congress under the Employment Act of 1946 were: (1) Economic conditions; (2) foreseeable; (3) economic expansion; and (4) program for carrying out policy. Both the original act and the President's report carry all the language necessary for total control of the U.S. economy by the Federal Government.

Items from the report:

(1) Unemployment is still too high. Unmentioned are these factors: (a) Everyone over 14 years of age having requested work but unemployed are carried on the roles; (b) in a free society of 185 million there will always be several million unemployed.

(2) Gross national product and growth should be greater. Implicit in such statements is the assumption of our President that there are certain mandatory growth amounts in a free society, that he knows them, and that the Government can and will change them by Federal mandate. Unmentioned and/or unrecognized is the stultifying effect of Government redtape, control, and burden now on our private economy. The President confuses Government's role with the voluntary actions of millions of citizens and the Chief Executive's role with that of the Almighty.

3. The 1961–62 historical analysis is inaccurate. He characterizes the social security program as antirecession legislation which it is not; public works pumppriming as healthy economic growth, public housing and urban renewal as aids to recovery which, with Federal aid and deficits, they are not. The bugetary policy shift is explained, into deficits, and we are told to disregard as fallacious current fears over inflation on the one hand and gold outflow on the other, both endangering the value of our currency. Deficits are defended as prelude to wealth.

The President defended again: (1) the need for Executive quickie tax cuts at his pleasure and, (2) quick and massive public works expenditures (the second Congress passed last year—but not the first) and outlined for all to see a blueprint for dictatorial power.

So I presented then and now, a constructive program, quite revolutionary to some, of: (1) Balanced budget; (2) surplus accumulation; (3) debt reduction; (4) tax reform as part of my legislative cures for our economic sickness.

Tax message

The tax message carried further earlier references in other statements concerning tax reform and reductions, but still dealt in generalities instead of being in legislative form: $13.6 billion total tax cut, $11 billion individual and $2.6 billion corporate, with $3.4 billion recovered by increased taxes in various areas.

These are some of the suggested areas: (1) Reduce current 20 to 91 percent bracket percentages to 18½ and 84½ this year—next year down to 14 to 65 percent, respectively; (2) reduce 52 percent corporate to 50 percent first year and further to 47 percent; (3) change capital gains both in time property held and percent rate resulting in slightly lower rates; (4) repeal $50 exclusion and 4 percent tax credit on stock dividends over $50; (5) tighter tax rules surrounding oil and mineral depletion; (6) speed up quarterly payments of corporations; (7) eliminate individual deductions under 5 percent of income not permitted (instead of present 10 percent or $1,000).

The tax message has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. Hearings open to the public for several weeks will be held starting February 6 followed by executive sessions by the committee.

FUNDAMENTAL FACTORS

Basic factors to be remembered: (1) Tax cuts should be matched at least by Government spending cuts and not divorced; (2) deficits lead to debt, not the wealth as the President foresees; (3) contrary to the President's avowed belief, inflation and gold outflow are twin dangers we must not disregard. Currency devaluation is inherent and would sabotage our economy.

Specific tax factors to remember: (1) Corporate taxes are passed on in higher prices to consumers; (2) corporate taxes drop automatically this year to 47 percent—Congress is being asked to keep them up in order to cut them starting next January; (3) speedup in tax payment—stricter law, more regulations—are not incentives to investment as heralded; (4) 1 million are being taken off the tax roll; (5) individual deductions elimination will increase taxes for everyone by that amount; (6) medical expense and drugs less deductible is Federal coercion of people to support the President's medicare program; (7) less charitable deduction is more Federal coercion for Federal aid to replace charitable help, while foundations tax-free operations are overlooked; (8) double taxation is increased by removal of stock dividend and credit.

FLAT PERCENTAGE TAX

Tax reform as I see it, to be fair must move to the flat percentage tax, paid equally by all people. That is my proposal. Meanwhile, our hodge-podge is further scrambled, not fair, not equitable, not an incentive, while the monstrous sabotage of private enterprise—Federal deficit planning and control of our people—is perpetrated. In the President's language "Tax reform * * * will stimulate growth and steer income or investment into areas which better serve the national purpose." By whose judgment I now ask? I believe individuals are entitled to what they earn, not to have Federal planners take it in taxes and replan individual lives in a society conforming to the planners' ideas and concepts of what's best for people.

CURRENT EVENTS

Current events, via Presidential action and statement: (1) Bay of Pigs fiasco. What really happened? Lesson learned: Tragedy of managed and manipulated and censored news by White House mandate; (2) surveillance of Cuba by U–2 proudly acknowledged by our President is same Communist surveillance for which Democrat leaders denounced President Eisenhower; (3) President wants to extend trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, saying "Trade really is better in this case than aid," never thinking apparently that both are wrong, and that both must be terminated.

Elsewhere this week the United States is displaying brinkmanship on the edge of danger in encouraging: (1) Nuclear test ban without adequate inspection; (2) capitulation to labor demands in the dock strike via Federal mediation; (3) seeking of more Socialist advice (beyond Walter Heller, the President's Chief Economic Advisor), by soliciting Socialist Gunnar Myrdal's counsel, who admits big Government's spending leads to inflation and therefore we need price and investment control.

PREDICTIONS

Predictions department: Present United States course will lead to: (1) Devaluation of currency through inflation and reduction of gold backing; (2) price control; (3) increased wage control, more than at present; (4) full managed economy.

How does all this tie in and is it affected by the statement of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense: "That it's inherent in that Government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when it's going up into a nuclear war. This seems to me basic—basic."

Let's hope our country wakes up in time.

Once again the Dallas Federal Building is in the news with the usual misunderstanding or misinterpretation, of what happened. The Democratic leadership has admitted that the building has been held up for political reasons. The record proves I have done everything that is ethical and possible to have this project included in the budget.

House committee appointments: The appointment of ED FOREMAN to the powerful Armed Services Committee in his first term shows recognition by the Republicans of the importance of the South and is a real tribute to ED's qualifications as a Member of Congress.

Our National Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, all Marylanders take great pride in the fact that Francis Scott Key wrote the immortal words to our national anthem at Fort McHenry in Baltimore. In recognition of this event, the Stars and Stripes fly over Fort McHenry 24 hours a day and there are only 2 other places in the world where this is permitted.

Next year, we will mark the 150th anniversary of the penning of the "Star Spangled Banner," and we in Maryland would like to have the rest of the Nation join with us in celebrating this historic event.

The Metropolitan Civic Association of Baltimore is taking the lead in arranging for appropriate activities in our own State. This organization has adopted a resolution calling upon the President to appoint a Special National Commission to arrange for a nationwide celebration marking this 150th anniversary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have this resolution and a brief statement by the executive secretary of the Metropolitan Civic Association, Mr. Maurice Shochatt, printed at this point in the RECORD:

METROPOLITAN CIVIC ASSOCIATION,
Baltimore, Md.

The Metropolitan Civic Association, a group dedicated to Metropolitan Baltimore activities, has won recognition for its activities in the spheres of transportation, rehabilitation, beautification, and taxation.

As part of its activities, the organization presents annual achievement awards to outstanding citizens of Maryland. Recipients of such awards include Baltimore Police Commissioner Bernard J. Schmidt; Charles P. McCormick, chairman of the Baltimore Civic Center Commission; Francis X. Gallagher, people's counsel to the Public Service Commission of Maryland; Dr. George B. Brain, superintendent of the Baltimore public schools; Inspector Thomas J. Keyes, of the Baltimore Police Department; Joseph F. Caskey, director of the youth traffic section of the municipal court of Baltimore City; and Hyman A. Pressman, champion of citizens'

causes. The organization is headed by Warren J. Weinberger, president; Reuben Fedderman, senior vice president; and Maurice R. Shochatt, executive secretary.

Within recent date, the executive board of the Metropolitan Civic Association passed a special resolution, in conjunction with the 150th anniversary of the "Star-Spangled Banner" that is to be observed in 1964. The text is as follows:

"Whereas 1964 will mark the passage of 150 years since Francis Scott Key saw our flag flying over Fort McHenry 'in the dawn's early light' on September 14, 1814, and then penned the immortal "Star-Spangled Banner": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President be requested to appoint a Special National Commission to begin formulating and arranging for a nationwide "Star-Spangled Banner" celebration in 1964 so that all citizens may point with pride to Francis Scott Key's unique contribution to the Nation, as exemplified by our national anthem and its 150th anniversary."

America the Beautiful: Heritage or Honky-Tonk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Kiplinger magazine for November 1962, carried a provocative article on "America the Beautiful: Heritage or Honky-Tonk?"

This article has been reprinted for wider distribution by the National Trust for Historic Preservaton, a nonprofit educational organization, chartered by an act of Congress, and privately supported by membership dues and contributions.

Overcommercialization does pose a serious threat to the beauty and dignity of many of our historic shrines. This is a natural development in keeping with the greater mobility of our citizens. More and more of them are attracted to the battlefields and other historic spots each year and entrepreneurs are quick to capitalize on the availability of these customers.

Preserving our national heritage is of overriding importance, however, and it behooves thoughful citizens to work toward keeping a dignified balance in the development of all of these historic sites.

In bringing this article to the attention of my colleagues, it is my hope that the Congress will provide the necessary leadership in preserving our national monuments for the enjoyment of the many rather than for the private gain of the few.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL: HERITAGE OR HONKY-TONK?

What are they really like today, the places your kids read about in school and which you hope to show them sometime as the finest representations of the American spirit? In case you haven't looked lately, a shock is in store. Marvels like Yellowstone Park and Gettysburg battlefield are infested, often within their borders and almost always around the edges by a spreading disease of our time—tourist blight.

It's more than a sickness of an era marked by mobility and leisure; the manufacture of tourist blight is also a lucrative business. Competition is keen among those who cater to and exploit the simplest expressions of public taste.

Now Coney Island is one thing. It serves a delightful purpose, afluter with pennants and sideshows and mistaken for nothing else but itself. So does Atlantic City, for those who like to walk the Boardwalk and Steel Pier, feeling content in company of loud signs, loud noises and throngs of people. But this is hardly the atmosphere to spread from one coast to another, hardly an appropriate symbol to find at the gateway to, or within, a national shrine.

Of course, everyone is entitled to his own taste and should pursue it freely. But the public landscape, which all of us must live with, deserves farsighted care. And our national monuments should be more than an opportunity for promoters to make a fast buck.

Perhaps the surge of the last decade to lay waste to large sections of the countryside owes its inspiration to the success of Disneyland. Walt Disney built a synthetic thing, ballyhooed it on television and proved that millions of families would come running. Enterprising hopefuls copied some of the Disney image, playing up to public interest in history, the American West, nature, patriotism and religion. In almost every part of the country—often adjacent to a national park or monument drawing millions of visitors—are places bearing such names as Fantasyland, Six Gun City and even Bibleland.

But they lack Disney's greatest promotional advantage, the handy access to network television, and have to compensate in other ways. They resort to mammoth roadside billboards unashamed representing their attractions as the "most outstanding," "foremost," "most historic," "most scenic" single spot in the State or Nation. They harass with their signs, they demand attention, they cajole through appeals to children and parents until the poor family can hardly pass the place by without a guilty conscience.

Some resort to the lowest form of attention-getters, the display of caged animals at souvenir stands, gas stations and other tourist places.

Is this really what the public deserves? Some of those who profit from blight say, "Yes, most people have poor taste and we give them what they want." Yet there is the pitiful example of the Civil War Centennial to show how little opportunity the public is accorded to express its taste freely.

Long before the centennial began, it was marked as a target of exploitation by all manner of commercial interests hoping to capitalize on the instincts of patriotism. Manufacturers of toys and gimcrack souvenirs advanced from one direction. Tourist operators attacked from another, establishing paid attractions close to the gateways of sacred battlefields.

When Allan Nevins, the distinguished historian, became chairman of the Commission in late 1961, he pledged that the sufferings and sacrifices of a century ago would not be memorialized with a carnival and that commercialism would be muted and disciplined. The hopeful objectives became to save a neglected battlefield, commission a symphony, raise a monument, get important books written. The scholar, very clearly, expresses a different concept than does the self-serving tourist promoter.

Dr. Nevins and others like him, the garden clubs, historical societies, the advocates of planning and zoning, endeavor to preserve and protect the characteristics that made them natural wonders and historic shrines in the first place.

What can you do to help, besides let your blood boil? We'll get to that later, but for now come abroad the calliope and tour the country for a look at blight on the landscape. The following are choice examples:

Gettysburg, Pa.: No matter how you approach this hallowed ground, the route is lined with signs leading to extraneous commercial attractions. On the west, the Chambersburg Road, which Lee followed en route to the fateful battle, there is an Indian village, complete with totem poles and tepees; it's labeled "authentic," although Indians have not been in this area since 1750, and never did use totem poles or tepees when they were here. On the north, the road from Harrisburg, near the place where Gen. Jubal Early's force smashed Union defenses the first day of battle, there is a Horse 'N' Buggy Museum, variously and modestly advertised as "America's largest" and the "world's largest" collection.

But to be near is not enought. The new Howard Johnson motel advertises happily that it is practically in the center of the battlefield inviding guests to experience the art of pleasant living only a few hundred yards from the field of Pickett's Charge and the scene of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Then there is America's most beautiful land of make-believe, a place called Fantasyland, with monkeys and Mother Goose, right in the center of things facing General Meade's headquarters just below the National Cemetery. And Stuckey's garish red and yellow roadside emporium, accompanied by Texas Fire Chief, astride the line of Longstreet's daring and bloody attack of the second day, where you can purchase mementoes of the battlefield, including ceramic birds, dogs, horses, alligator bags, and ash trays with such inscriptions as "Gasoline and alcohol don't mix—but gasoline straight ain't bad."

Then there is another group of attractions at Gettysburg, the "inspirational and educational." One is the Hall of Presidents, an array of wax figures that constitute an "exciting and patriotic exhibit" and a must for every American. Next, the National Civil War Wax Museum, with more than 150 figures in stirring tableaux. If you find them not sufficiently stirring, proceed to the "newest and finest attraction," the Gettysburg Battlefield Diorama and Museum, which features sound effects of smoking rifles, burning wagons, and blazing cannon fire. There is also the granddaddy of them all, the Gettysburg National Museum, now pressed into proclaiming itself as "Home of the New Electric Map."

These places are determined to leave absolutely nothing to the visitor's imagination. The battlefield tour, provides moments of emotion-drenched history in stereophonic sound. You travel by bus and listen to the voices of Lincoln and Pickett, with cannons thrown in as chills run up and down your spine.

Lincoln, in his utterance that brave men consecrated these fields far above our poor power to add or detract, proved a poor prophet.

Natural Bridge, Va.: Thomas Jefferson would hardly recognize the towering limestone arch that he once owned. He treasured the great bridge, carved by rushing mountain streams over the centuries, and described it as "the most sublime of nature's works." He resisted suggestions for manmade changes and said the bridge should remain as nature left it.

Today the wide bridge, 215 feet above Cedar Creek, supports Route 11, the main road down the Shenandoah Valley. But the view is blocked by a wooden fence, as though protecting the inside of a baseball park. Jefferson would be required, before gaining admission, to pay his fee of $1.50. But there would be no extra charge if he elected to visit during the evening to see the soul stir-

ring performance of the "Drama of Creation," when the bridge is illuminated with colored lights and voice recordings evoke various religious images. And after coming through the entrance, he could also stop at the swimming pool, skating rink and an enormous souvenir counter vending a multitude of trinkets and doodads.

A recent addition at Natural Bridge is the antique car collection known as the "Museum of Motoring Memories"; this kind of companion piece is now widely found together with moneymaking commercial tourist attractions. Natural Bridge is perhaps the pacesetter for Route 11, a once-beautiful route, now adorned from Winchester to Roanoke with unrestrained advertisements for motels, commercial caverns, a place called Zoorama—it failed after a short, unhappy life, but the signs remain—and some ill-maintained State roadside rests.

The Great Smokies, N.C.: "The lowest form of tourist blight involves the exploitation of wild animals, and some of the most distressing examples are found in the highlands of western North Carolina. Michael Frome, in his book on the national forests, "Whose Woods These Are," passes lightly over moonshining as a menace of the mountains to describe the caged-bear routine, as follows:

Gracing the foreground of the historic gateway to Pisgah National Forest is a roadside souvenir and refreshment stand. Here you can buy a coke, hand it to a bear through the bars of his cage and watch him drink it. The purpose of his presence is to attract your interest and trade. Western North Carolina has a variety of such crude attractions. One is the reptile garden, which everyone who loves wild creatures should see, not because it is good, but to observe how the animals, assorted scraggly deer, a bear and snakes, are cared for. There are the Twin Yona—yona is Cherokee for bear—caged on the roadside in the Indian reservation between the National Forest and Great Smoky Mountains National Park. And like displays of wildlife before gift shops and gasoline stations in Maggie Valley.

How are these creatures captured? And how are they cared for? The author asked these questions of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, which endeavored, in reply, to place the full blame on the Cherokee Indians although bear-displaying souvenior stands invariably are operated by white Carolinians. After the book stirred a commotion, with the Governor receiving letters of protest from all sections of the country, officials of the wildlife commission conceded the bears are kept in deplorable, unsanitary and inhumane conditions but have so far failed to protect the animals from their roadside exploiters.

The Tennessee side of the Great Smokies provides hardly a better foreground setting for the most popular of America's national parks. The town of Gatlinburg, an obscure mountain crossroads until chosen as the site of park headquarters, offers all manners of neon-lit commercial diversions, plus a chairlift ride over the town and a Biblical garden with dioramas of the life of Christ. There are some fine craft shops, in the best Smokies tradition, but far more prominent are those inevitable trinket stands—where the price is cheap but the markup is high. "Sure, I'm in the craft business," said one souvenir dealer with a laugh. Get some of my best merchandise over the mountain—in Jay-pan."

Lookout Mountain, Tenn.: From top to bottom, four commercial tourist attractions decorate the landscape of Lookout Mountain. But their influence does not end there. The city of Chattanooga, with signs of all sizes and shapes advertising attractions, motels, and restaurants, is a difficult maze to pass through unscarred. And for hundreds of miles around, barn tops, billboards and birdhouses exhort the motorist and his family to "See Rock City."

Many visitors actually find Rock City, atop Lookout Mountain, an attractive place, with sandstone formations and trails over suspension bridges, through tunnels and "fairyland caverns." Admission may be high priced at $2, 75 cents for children (plus extras for special displays), but 30 percent of the revenue is poured back into highway advertising. Then there is Ruby Falls, reached by elevator, located in a cave below the surface. This attraction considers itself "the most spectacular of the world's wonders," and if this slogan is not sufficient enticement, there is another: "Worthy of the Master's hand alone."

To go up and down the mountain, there is the incline railway, which spans "America's Most Amazing Mile." To visitors the cost of being "breathlessly suspended above the city" is $1 round trip, while to commuters it is 36 cents. At the base of Lookout the new Confederama, "the world's largest battlefield display of its kind," is guaranteed to tug at the heartstrings of every red-blooded son of Dixie.

If you persevere in ascending the mounain, and successfully penetrate this glowing ring of commercial superlatives, you will ultimately reach Point Park. Maintained by the Federal Government to commemorate the Civil War "Battle Above the Clouds," it overlooks the city of Chattanooga and the sweeping Moccasin Bend of the Tennessee River. And, without binoculars, there's not a billboard in sight.

Silver Springs, Fla. The jungle waters and swamp growth of the springs have been a tourist attraction ever since a paddle-wheel steamer carried passengers up the Oklawaha River a century ago. Today this is big business, even by booming Florida standards. The traditional 1-hour electrically operated boat trip is only the beginning. From there you are invited to the adjacent reptile farm, or "institute"; the Prince of Peace Memorial (depicting the life of Christ in diorama); the deer ranch, and, of course, the inevitable collection of antique automobiles. Each of these components charges a separate admission, and the average family is likely to spend $10 or more.

Big business requires big promotion, and Silver Springs is a master of the art. Billboards are located all over the State, tracking the visitor from the instant he crosses the line; what is more, boards change frequently to keep timely and topical. Doormats at motels are not inscribed with the usual word of "welcome," but with "See Silver Springs." Bathmats are apt to say the same. So are placemats at restaurant tables. Any child traveling with his family to a vacation in Florida who doesn't say, "I want to see Silver Springs, daddy," has clearly had his head buried in a commic book the entire way.

Customers leaving the springs are also enlisted in the campaign, voluntarily or otherwise. One autumn a Florida newspaper editor thought he would take a presidential poll by assigning a reporter to tally Republican and Democratic bumper strips. "Sorry, chief, neither party can win," his man advised after spending a day on the street. "It's 'See Silver Springs' way out front."

Ocala, Silver Springs' neighbor in central Florida, bears the heaviest saturation. Advertising assumes urgent, imperative qualities, with such expressions as "Don't Miss" and "You Must." This basically attractive town appears despoiled and mesmerized, with its beautiful live oaks and subtropical foliage on the verge of obliteration by the unending message of "See Silver Springs."

Curiously, almost adjacent to the Springs lies Ocala National Forest, where on pennants flutter a welcome reminder of Florida's natural glories; yet its recreation areas receive scant attention from tourist promoters in Ocala or the State government. Little wonder, perhaps, considering the overwhelming emphasis on real estate, industrial development, hotels, motels and manmade tourist attractions. Places like the Ocala National Forest and Everglades National Park are hard put by many pressures. Yet they are the pattern for the synthetic, like the tourist place in southern Florida that offers the convenience of a little bit of the Everglades in the heart of Miami.

Black Hills, S. Dak.: "Yes, it is amazing to see the long line of commercial attractions on the road out here," a prominent and responsible citizen of the Black Hills area told a visitor from the East last summer. "The number is growing each year, too. Of course, we receive many complaints from visitors that this sort of thing destroys the feeing for Rushmore. But it seems somebody is bent on trying a new gimmick on every piece of private land from Rapid City to Mount Rushmore."

The gimmicks are multifarious indeed. The 25-mile road to Rushmore is an obstacle course of commercial attractions, all seeking to divert a million visitors, heading for a famous shrine, into their little crannies. The Reptile Gardens leads the way with the largest number of signs. There are four separate self-professed natural phenomena: Gravity Hill, Gravity Spot, Dizzyland, U.S.A. (Mysteries of Gravity) and the Cosmos—the real nature's mystery area—then assorted caves and gold mines, and the usual Horseless Carriage Museum and Fairyland's Bewitched Village.

At one point the tragic contrast between the shrine and the commercial surroundings becomes most evident. A neat, small, green and white sign reads, "Mount Rushmore Memorial, 3 miles," but this can hardly be seen for the much larger, garish signs above and around it advertising mines, motels, caves, and bars.

There is a novel little stunt in the Black Hills not seen elsewhere, a seal of approval at the entrance to many of these places. This sign reads "Family Approved Attraction." Approved by Parents' magazine? The Automobile Club? No, nothing as objective as that. These tourist operators have their own organization, the Black Hills, Badlands, & Lakes Association, and simply approve each other.

The picture within the memorial grounds has its dim side, too. One would think the National Park Service would maintain the vantage points facing the four Presidential heads carved high on the granite mountain. But one of the best spots is operated by a commercial concessionaire as a kind of carnival.

The mammoth souvenir shop carries the feeblest assortment of native handicrafts made by the Sioux Indians. The emphasis is on merchandising such items as nylon flags of all nations, Japanese-made plates bearing pictures of President and Mrs. Kennedy and figurines of Jesus Christ.

Yellowstone National Park: The sorry truth is that Federal officials sometimes contribute to tourist blight, too. Despite the proud tradition and generally high standards of the National Park Service, the core of Yellowstone, the Nation's oldest and largest national park, has deteriorated into a scandalous slum, the consquence of poor commercial management over a period of years and of soft and sloppy administration by park officials.

Park people concede this privately, often with grim humor. "I heard my neighbor brushing his teeth this morning," says one visiting park man to another after spending a night at Canyon Village Motor Lodge, the first new overnight accommodation in the park in 30 years. "That's nothing," his friend replies. "I heard my neighbor think-

ing about brushing his teeth. When do we leave?"

In short, 512-room Canyon Village, intended as a model in commercially developed lodgings for the entire park system, has turned out to be a failure, faulty in design, faulty in construction, with poor heating, flimsy soundproofing and a multitude of other shortcomings. Rooms are horribly overpriced ($13.50 for two, $18.50 for four), and the entire setting is incongruous with the great park, landscaped largely with black asphalt and blinking lights over the cocktail lounge. The gift shop offers one of the worst assortments of trinkets in America, 8,000 separate items, principally cheap, but profitable, importations from the Far East, including imitation English Wedgewood, Spanish toreador figurines in several colors, bells of Sarna and bongo drums.

The tragic debacle of Yellowstone illustrates the power exercised by private concessionaires. The three firms at Yellowstone appear to have more authority than the park superintendent. The Yellowstone Park Co., which operates lodgings and restaurants, made profits over the years while its plant became outmoded, overused and ill maintained. Finally goaded into construction of Canyon Village, the company paid $5,500,000 for a project originally estimated at $3,500,000. In an effort to recoup its losses, the firm last summer cut the number of college boys and girls on its payroll, then cut the wages of those it hired, to the barest minimum of compliance with wage-hour laws.

Yet for all the failings of the concessionaires, it remains for the park staff to answer the many complaints. The principal ones last summer were poor housekeeping, antiquated facilities, poor service, poor food.

Avoid the blight of Yellowstone? It is possible to a certain extent. You can find decent, clean and modern cabin and motel-type accommodations at the Grand Tetons, or well-kept campgrounds in surrounding areas. Look only at the thermal wonders, the wildlife and the marvels of a vast wilderness, shutting your eyes to all else.

But this is exactly the trouble: thinking Americans have shut their eyes for to long while blight and mass vulgarization have swept over the landscape. The amusement parks, the souvenir stands, the roadside animals won't go away by themselves. But neither must they be accepted as being here forever.

The point isn't that such places are not interesting or entertaining or even, in some cases, in good taste. But, rather, do they belong where they are? What does Mother Goose have to do with the commemoration of a Civil War battlefield? What are commercial biblical dioramas doing in the Great Smokies?

IT'S NEVER TOO LATE

"Honky-tonk, cheap-facade joints in the mountain areas are a disgrace to the State," declared a recent editorial in the Greensboro, (N.C.) Daily News, which pointed out what should be done. "Agitation in the public prints will do something to tidy up these roadside monstrosities. A little local or community pride might jolt the owners into at least partial recognition that an attractive, neatly kept roadside establishment is the best advertisement in the world for business."

Look over your own community. Demonstrate pride in its appearance and your desire to protect its inherent values. Sure, there's money in the tourist industry, but beauty is a far better advertisement for any town than a billboard. Certainly accommodations and commercial attractions are entitled to directional signs, but unrestrainted coercive advertising of a captive audience is quite another thing.

Support the type of beautification work undertaken by the garden clubs, the true historic restoration urged by preservation groups, the strict zoning proposals. They will do far more to create a favorable image that visitors will remember, and that you can live with, than gimcrack atractions, high prices, and unrestrained signboards.

In going places with your family, be selective. Visit places of reputation and stature because they really interest you, not because of their repetitive advertising along the roadside. If you want to see animals, there are zoological gardens in major cities. For souvenirs, purchase craft items indigenous to the area, not some cheap trinket that will scarcely survive the trip home. Cultivate an appreciation of the best of America in your children.

When you're good and mad, write letters. To the President, about the tragedy of Gettysburg. To the Governor of the State where you feel any shrine is marred. To the Director of the National Park Service, about the shabbiness of Yellowstone or of national park souvenir counters. Letters to the editor of your daily newspaper are useful because other people see them, too. Tell about places you are not going back to visit a second time.

Such words will find their way around, and nothing will shake a tourist community more than realizing it may lose business. Perhaps nothing will do more to encourage it to enhance, instead of exploit, its endowment of history or natural wonders.

Resolution To Create a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a resolution to create a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament in the House of Representatives. I had originally proposed the creation of such a committee during the last session of Congress, and hope that it will not be possible to obtain prompt consideration of the legislation during the current Congress.

This resolution provides that the committee would be composed of 13 Members of the House of Representatives chosen for their special knowledge of foreign affairs, armed services, atomic energy, science, and astronautics. The committee would be authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of proposals for arms control and disarmament including, but not limited to, first, efforts made by the United Nations in seeking the control and reduction of military forces and armament of all types; second, disarmament proposals developed by the United States and other governments as well as by private groups and individuals; third, methods by which the attitudes of the American people and their Government on the subject of disarmament and world peace may be communicated abroad; fourth, the relationship of armaments to the state of the world economy; fifth, the relationship of underlying international tension to the problems of disarmament; sixth, the dangers implicit in unilateral reduction of armaments; and seventh, methods of assuring that plans for reduction of armaments shall not endanger the security of the United States.

I realize that any proposal to create another standing committee would probably meet with some difficulty and with much reluctance on the part of many Members of the House. Therefore I ask that a select committee be set up to stimulate discussion and consideration of one of the most pressing issues of the day—that of arms control and disarmament.

Creation of such a committee would be desirable and necessary fist step to reduce the grave possibility of nuclear war, because it would emphasize the efforts being made by the United States in its current negotiations with the Soviet Union to end nuclear weapons tests. I think we have all been heartened by the recent exchanges between President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev, and by the temporary halt in U.S. underground atomic tests, announced by the President the other day, which is another step in the direction of world peace. I fervently hope that the further discussions which are due to take place in New York this week will bring us even closer to an agreement on a nuclear test-ban treaty at the Geneva meetings next month. Establishment of such a committee would have a tremendous impact on world opinion, and would demonstrate for all to see that the Congress of the United States is completely in accord with the efforts of the President to reduce the possibility of thermonuclear war, which could destroy us all.

I certainly hope that this resolution will warrant the consideration and support of each and every Member of the House.

Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, year before last, on May 23, 1961, I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled, "A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro." The Library of Congress had prepared this for me, at my request, in order for me to keep the events taking place in Cuba in their proper sequence.

Since that time the Library of Congress has continued to keep this chronology up to date and I now wish to follow up my original action by placing the later continued story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on 5 consecutive days, beginning today.

I am doing this because of the renewed controversy over who did what and who did not do what they should have with regard to our U.S. policy toward Cuba. Our Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, has made it a point to come up with some fairly myopic remarks during the course of an interview by the U.S. News & World Report on January 28, 1963, published under the title of "Robert Kennedy Speaks His Mind."

I used the word "myopic" because I feel his viewpoint is rather nearsighted, to say the least, as far as the Cuban issue is concerned. Let me quote a portion of his remarks to indicate why I feel this way:

> Question. Do you feel that the latest Cuban crisis was a lesson to the Russians?
>
> Answer. I think it makes a great difference because that's the first time that the power position and determination and energy of the American people and their Government—all of this had been brought to bear.

Now I suppose we cannot really blame Robert Kennedy for wanting his brother's administration to stand out as the one which singlehandedly solved the Cuban issue. However, a review of the chronology I previously inserted will prove that former President Eisenhower took, and attempted to take some steps which would have shown the power position and determination and energy of the American people and their Government. Attempts have repeatedly been made by many of those around the President to blame the Cuban problems on the Eisenhower administration. I feel the American people are entitled to something more than that sort of demagogery. Space will not permit my quoting some of the actions taken by President Eisenhower, but again I commend the former chronology on Cuba to the Members and the public's attention.

While a candidate for the Presidency, then Senator Kennedy called the October 19, 1960, embargo on all exports to Cuba, with exception of medical supplies and various food products—placed by President Eisenhower—"a dramatic but almost empty gesture—a gesture which will have so little impact on Castro as to be almost meaningless." Yet President Kennedy on February 3, 1962, proclaimed an embargo on almost all U.S. trade with Cuba, with the exception "on humanitarian grounds" of the export to Cuba of certain foods and medicines. His feelings as President seem to be greatly different than his feelings as Candidate Kennedy.

Again, Candidate Kennedy on October 6, 1960, made a speech at a Democratic dinner in Cincinnati, Ohio. Exhibiting a detailed knowledge of Castro's attempts to carry his revolution through South America, Mr. Kennedy stated:

> The American people want to know how this was permitted to happen—how the Iron Curtain could have advanced almost to our front yard. They want to know the truth—and I believe that they are entitled to the truth.

The American public for some time now has longed to know the truth about the failure of the Cuban invasion and our part in it. Statements made by Bobby Kennedy, and backed by the President cover only the small issue of whether we promised air cover or not. But a statement by Manuel Penabaz, a veteran of the Cuban invasion, does not back up this supposed "official report."

Former President Eisenhower, by no means a man who could ever be called a demagog, stated on December 22, 1962 that he believed the truth is a far better weapon in hte cold war against communism than managed news. He stated further that he has no reason to think the American people have not been told the truth on the Cuban situation, but he noted that he doesn't know all the facts. He stated further that he sees no reason why the administration should not now release a full and official version of what happened in the disastrous attempt to invade Cuba in April 1961. The Bay of Pigs invasion is now history, he said, and the official story should have been told long ago.

On April 24, 1961, Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger declared in a statement to the press that President Kennedy "assumes sole responsibility for the U.S. role in the action against Cuba."

Yet on May 24, 1961, President Kennedy, in discussing the tractors-for-prisoners ransom demand of Castro, in which he declared the U.S. Government would not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners, stated:

> these men were trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration. The signal to let them go and the means to get them there were given by the Kennedy administration. The United States still has a responsibility for those lives.

Now, former President Eisenhower, on January 24, 1963 says no plan was drawn up during his administration for a U.S. air cover for a refugee invasion of Cuba. He added however that he had "no kick with the plan" for air cover for the invaders. "If that had been done," he added, "that might have made the difference, because once these forces were ashore, ready to take care of themselves, it might have been easy to get more reinforcements through from the island itself and, finally, to recognize a government there."

Is it any wonder that Members of Congress, the public, and the press would like a truly official report of what happened? The Congress, you will remember, took some pretty strong actions itself in passing resolutions and legislation aimed at solving the Cuban crisis. They took these actions because they were close to the American grassroots opinion. They knew the American public wanted something done, that it was tired of speeches and soothing words, promising action but taking none. Those who trouble to read the original chronology on Cuba and Castro and follow through my continued chronology, will refresh their memory on some of the events, as reported, on the Cuban situation. And perhaps the congressional investigations suggested and promised will make the official actions clear to the American public.

I believe we can depend upon the commonsense and good judgment of the American people to know and recognize partisan politics when they see it played. And if the administration truly desires a bipartisan foreign policy and the continued support and encouragement of the American public and the Republican Party, it should remember that we do not intend that former President Eisenhower should be labeled directly or indirectly as a weakling by any member of the Cabinet, regardless of relationship to the President. This man, whose name has always been synonymous with honor, bravery, and love of his country, does not hesitate to call for support of the President's foreign policy. And he is not afraid of the truth or an "official version" of what took place on the Cuban issue.

Let me say that neither the Kennedy administration nor the minority party nor the majority party are doing themselves, or the public, justice if this matter is allowed to fall and rest in the area of purely partisan politics. The public, who gave the President complete, enthusiastic, and unequivocal support at the time he announced the "quarantine" of Cuba could well lose its enthusiasm for further support of this administration if they are denied the truth, or given half-truths or distortions.

And that is why I am including, Mr. Speaker, with my remarks today, a second portion, covering the period between May 20, 1961, through September 13, 1961, of the "Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro," and every day hereafter a continuation of the chronology for a total of 5 consecutive days.

We want to keep the record straight.

A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro [1]

May 20, 1961: A committee of U.S. citizens, headed by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther (president of the United Auto Workers), and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, is formed to raise the funds to provide the 500 tractors. "President Kennedy was reliably * * * reported to have personally asked three prominent private citizens * * * to organize the 'tractors-for-prisoners' exchange with Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba" (New York Times, May 24, 1961).

May 24, 1961: President Kennedy urges all Americans to contribute to the purchase of the 500 tractors.

June 2, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee informs Premier Castro that it is ready to send the 500 tractors in exchange for the 1,214 prisoners. The committee gives him until noon June 7 to accept the offer.

June 6, 1961: Premier Castro suggests that his prisoners be exchanged for "political prisoners" allegedly held in jail in the United States, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Spain. He also demands that Mrs. Roosevelt or Dr. Eisenhower, two of the leaders of the Tractors for Freedom Committee, come to Havana for further negotiations.

June 7, 1961: Cuban Government nationalized education.

June 8, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee offers to send six agricultural experts to Havana to discuss details of the types of tractors to be sent in exchange for the prisoners. The committee also announces that it is prepared to send the first consignment of 100 tractors to Cuba by June 22.

---

[1] Based chiefly on excerpts from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs.

Premier Castro accepts the offer the next day.

June 14, 1961: Experts confer with Premier Castro. He now demands tractors valued at $28 million, the equivalent of 1,000 farm-type tractors or 500 heavy-duty construction tractors, and will exchange them for 1,167 prisoners instead of the 1,214 he had originally offered to trade. He explains that the difference is due to some fatalities, special trials he plans, and other reasons.

June 19, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee in Detroit cables reply to Premier Castro. They give him until noon June 23 to decide whether he will accept 500 farm-type light tractors in exchange for the 1,214 prisoners he originally offered to trade. If he refuses, the committee will return the funds it has collected to the contributors.

June 26, 1961: Adlai E. Stevenson, President Kennedy's special envoy to Latin America and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., declares at the National Press Club in Washington that during his recent trip to Latin America, Cuban agents preceded or followed him for propaganda purposes.

June 28, 1961: Florida court orders seizure of 29 carloads of lard going to Cuba. "The seizure order was obtained by a Miami advertising firm to help satisfy a judgment of $429,000 against the Cuban Government tourist agency" (New York Herald Tribune, July 6, 1961).

July 4, 1961: U.S. authorities in Florida seize three Cuban planes which have landed in the United States after being stolen from Cuba by refugees. The planes are seized on court orders to satisfy claims against the Cuban Government.

July 21, 1961: U.S. Government announces that it will finance the passage of 20,000 refugees from Cuba to the United States, because the refugees cannot obtain dollars.

July 23, 1961: Cuban Government orders Pan American World Airways—the company chartered by the U.S. Government for the airlift—to limit its flights from Miami to Havana to two round trips a day.

July 24, 1961: U.S. commercial airliner—worth $3.5 million—en route from Miami to Tampa, Fla., is forced by an armed passenger to fly to Havana. The other passengers and the crew are returned to the United States the following day, but the plane is kept by the Cuban authorities.

July 26, 1961: Premier Castro, in a speech made at the 26th of July celebrations, declares that he will return the airliner if the United States returns "the 10 Cuban planes which it has stolen."

During a speech made at the celebration of the 8th anniversary of the 26th of July movement, Premier Castro announces that all Cuban political parties are eventually to be merged into the United Party of the Socialist Revolution. The celebrations are attended by Soviet Astronaut Maj. Yuri Gagarin.

July 27, 1961: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk declares in Washington that the United States will not agree to the exchange. He declares that final authority for the return of Cuban planes to Cuba rests with the courts, and not with the U.S. Government, and that if it is entitled to do so, the Cuban Government may apply for "sovereign immunity" for the planes. Rusk points out that since mid-1959, 25 Cuban planes have been held in the United States. Some of these have been sold in pursuance of court orders.

July 29, 1961: Cuban note to the U.N. accuses the United States of preparing an "imminent military aggression" against Cuba, and of using the plane incident as an excuse for its plans. Foreign Minister Raul Roa announces that the Cuban Government has placed the U.S. plane under the jurisdiction of the U.N. Security Council. The U.S. State Department declares that the Cuban move in the U.N. is a "transparent tactic to divert attention from the actions of the Castro government in detaining" the plane.

August 2, 1961: Government announces the reorganizing of the country's labor unions under direct government control. Henceforth, there will be only one union for each industry, and all unions will be grouped under a Workers' Confederation.

August 3, 1961: Two U.S. citizens—a former convict and his son—fail in a plot to take a Boeing 707 jet airliner to Cuba from El Paso, Tex.

August 4, 1961: Cuban government again protests to the U.N. Security Council that the U.S. Government is preparing military aggression against Cuba, and is using plane incidents as an excuse.

August 5, 1961: Cuban Goverment declares that it will release the airliner if the United States releases a Cuban patrol boat brought to Florida by defectors a week ago.

Cuban Government orders the immediate replacement of all Cuban currency. All bills now in circulation must be traded in for new ones. No more than 200 new pesos will be given any one household. Any amount over this will be deposited in a "special account" and may be drawn upon in a week's time. Bank holdings are not affected. There is no revaluation involved in the move. Cuban borders are closed to all ships and planes through August 7, to prevent any Cuban money being brought in from abroad.

August 8, 1961: Premier Castro declares that Cubans will be allowed to draw up to 1,000 pesos in cash from their special accounts. Thereafter, they will be allowed to withdraw at the rate of 100 pesos a month. Total deposits of 10,000 pesos will be allowed, but any amount over 5,000 will be placed into savings accounts. Castro also declares that any amount over 10,000 pesos will be confiscated.

Minister of Industry Ernesto Guevara (during a 2-hour speech, at the Inter-American Economic Conference in Punta del Este, Uruguay), accuses the United States of attempting the assassination of Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro on July 26, and of attempting the invasion of Cuba on the same day. He also implies that the United States was implicated in the assassination of President Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, on May 30. Guevara ridicules President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, and declares: "While Cuba is there, the United States is ready to give." He suggests that with a little push, Latin America will get the $30 billion in U.S. aid which Castro called for 2 years ago. Guevara declares that Cuba expects $450,000 in loans from Communist countries over the next 4 years. Cuba, he says, "pledges a guarantee that it will not export revolution" to other Latin American countries. Guevara also produces two U.S. "secret" documents, allegedly State Department reports. The first characterizes Venezuelan officials as "inept and indifferent"; the second indicates the South American countries which can be counted upon for anti-Cuban measures.

August 9, 1961: U.S. Pan American jet airliner, en route from Mexico City to Guatemala, is forced by an armed passenger—a French Algerian, reportedly, a psychopath—to fly to Havana. The other passengers, the crew, and the plane are allowed to leave for Miami the same day. The Cuban Government declares that it is releasing the plane out of deference to the Colombian Foreign Minister, Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala, one of the passengers, and because Cuba is opposed to air piracy. In Washington, before it is known that the plane is returning to the United States on the same day, the news of the incident causes various U.S. Congressmen to advocate the use of force to retrieve the plane.

On the same day, Cuba requests the U.N. to place on the agenda of its 1961 General Assembly—due to open in September—an item on "threats to peace and security" by U.S. "aggression" against Cuba.

August 10, 1961: President Kennedy declares in a news conference that the anger aroused by the hijacking of planes must not be allowed to overshadow the importance of the Inter-American Economic Conference, meeting in Uruguay which he calls "perhaps one of the most significant meetings in the history of the Western Hemisphere."

August 14, 1961: The 5,805-ton *Bahia de Nipe*, a Cuban merchant ship carrying sugar and tobacco to a Soviet Baltic port, was seized by the captain and 10 crew members and diverted to Norfolk, Va.

August 15, 1961: A patrol boat, valued at $50,000, which was brought to the United States on July 29, by Cuban defectors was returned to the Castro regime.

At the same time the Eastern Air Lines Electra hijacked on July 24 was returned to the United States by the Cuban Government.

August 21, 1961: President Kennedy declined to use the Cuban ship, *Bahia de Nipe*, as ransom for the families of the Cuban seamen who brought the ship here and have sought political asylum.

Earlier the Cuban Government formally asked for the return of the vessel and U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk asked a Federal court to release the ship.

August 24, 1961: In a special session of the U.N. General Assembly called to discuss the Bizerte dispute between France and Tunisia, the Cuban delegate challenged the validity of the treaty under which the United States maintains the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base.

U.S. Ambassador Stevenson called Cuba's charge "international lawlessness."

August 29, 1961: Premier Castro called on the Brazillian people to "take arms * * * and take to the mountains and jungles" to fight the military leaders who are trying to keep Joao Goulart from becoming president of Brazil after the resignation of President Janio Quadros.

August 31, 1961: The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America said it was satisfied that an encounter in Montevideo, Uruguay, between Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Richard Goodwin, President Kennedy's Special Assistant on Latin American Affairs, was a casual and unimportant meeting at a cocktail party.

The subcommittee met with Mr. Goodwin after Argentina's Foreign Minister Adolfo Mugica declared on August 22 that the conversation had been politically vital and had touched on a possible resumption of United States-Cuban relations.

September 7, 1961: A spokesman for the Democratic Revolutionary Front, a Cuban exile group, announced that the front will shortly merge with the Revolutionary Council. The new group will be called the Cuban Revolutionary Council and will be headed by Miro Cardona with Antonio de Varona as second in command.

The U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals freed the hijacked freighter *Bahia de Nipe* for return to Cuba but stayed its order for 5 days to permit an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

September 9, 1961: Five of the prisoners captured after the unsuccessful invasion attempt last April were executed on charges of murder and torture committed before they left Cuba. Nine others were given 30-year jail sentences on similar charges.

September 10, 1961: Four thousand Cubans shouted antigovernment slogans in downtown Havana until they were dispersed by machinegun bullets. Seven were injured. The demonstration was touched off by cancellation of a Roman Catholic procession in honor of the Virgin of Charity, the patroness of Cuba.

September 13, 1961: A third request for an order blocking the immediate return of the freight *Bahia de Nipe* to Cuba was submitted to U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren by the United Fruit Co. which has claims against the freighter's cargo of sugar.

G. Gernon Brown—A Tribute to One of the Nation's Outstanding Molders of Men and Developers of Character in the Youth of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its outstanding developers of character and molders of men in the unexpected death last week in New Orleans, of G. Gernon Brown, executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreational Department and for more than two decades the football coach of the Jesuit High School in that city.

Gernon Brown was nationally known in the sports world and in the field of youth development.

Such All-American football players as Ki Mills, of Virginia Military Institute, and John Pettiborn, of Notre Dame, were developed by him.

To the big leagues in baseball he had sent "Tookie" Gilbert, Connie Ryan, Charlie Gilbert, "Fat" Dantoni, among others.

The affection held for him by the people of New Orleans is reflected in many tributes paid to him by press, radio, and television following his death.

Gernon Brown was my lifelong friend. We were boyhood companions and classmates from parochial school through our formative years at Jesuits in New Orleans during which time we were inseparable associates. It is not, however, because of this personal devotion to him that I pause to pay tribute to him today. It is because of the niche which he occupied in the community and the respect which he had earned as one of the most successful scholastic football coaches in the Nation.

I pay this tribute because I think it fitting and proper that something should be said at this time when an enduring recognition can be made of a man who has contributed so much to so many during his lifetime. Other communities undoubtedly have Gernon Browns in their midst. Other cities and other States have given birth to men of like statute who have never come into the national focus. I doubt, however, if there ever lived an individual who brought such eulogies from those among whom he lived and from those who knew him and profited by their association with him as did Gernon Brown.

His classmates borrowed from Shakespeare to say of him in the Blue Jay, the graduating classbook of 1920:

He was a man, take him all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again.

That was Gernon Brown.

How he kept that image in the years that followed is mirrored in what was written about him the day after he died.

Here is Charles L. "Pie" Dufour, columnist for the New Orleans States-Item and now an author of prominence with such books as "The Gentle Tiger," "The Night the War Was Lost," and "Nine Men in Grey," to his credit. It is an inspired tribute to the boy and to the man, written by one well qualified to write about his schoolmate and his friend. Dufour's column speaks eloquently for that segment who knew Gernon Brown as he lived and as he left his imprint on those who were privileged to have known him over a span of 30 years and more.

Here is "Pie" Dufour's tribute:

DEATH OF GERNON BROWN CREATES ANOTHER VOID IN NEW ORLEANS

(By Pie Dufour)

When a good man dies, there is a void in the world. Such a void has been created in New Orelans by the death yetserday of Gernon Brown.

Gernon—I use his first name, because we were friends for more than 45 years—was good in everything he did, everything he undertook.

As an individual, he was moral, ethical, honorable, a genuinely good man, cherished by friends and family.

Gernon Brown could have been a great actor. He was a great high school football and baseball coach. He could have been a great mathematician. He was a great math teacher.

But whatever he was, or could have been, he never failed to be a great human being. For here was a man with literally thousands of friends.

You'll read on the sports pages of his remarkable coaching career at Jesuit High, and in American Legion play and the records his teams compiled and the players he produced. But far beyond the records and the stars is Gernon Brown's influence for good on the boys he coached. Long after they, too, have forgotten what they did on the athletic field under Brown's tutelage, will remain the lessons in character that he instilled into them.

I was in the eighth grade at the old Jesuits on Baronne and Common when Gernon Brown was in first high. He was in the same class with EDDIE HÉBERT, U.S. Representative from the First Congressional District. Just 6 months ago, Gernon was voted the Jesuit alumni Man of the Year Award, presented annually by Congressman HÉBERT.

Recently Charlie Wicker wrote about the old Jesuit team on which Gernon Brown played, and he quoted EDDIE HÉBERT as saying that one year when the Blue Jays didn't have a coach, Gernon was player-coach. I challenged that in a conversation with Charlie, and he said that he had even checked it with Gernon, and that that was correct.

Well, that fact had escaped my memory entirely and just the other day, I wrote Congressman HÉBERT, chiding him on his memory playing tricks upon him. He came back in the same vein, insisting that he was right. I had intended calling Gernon Brown up to get the word from him. Just a few weeks earlier, HÉBERT had pointed out that Dan Levy, fullback on the old Blue Jay team in question had died within a few days of Dr. Joe Palermo, who once was a part-time Jesuit coach.

And now, a third member of those great Blue Jay days—the first of the great Jesuit teams—of 1919 and 1920, Gernon Brown, is gone.

As a fellow student of Gernon, I remember him as much for his histrionic ability as for his athletic prowess. He was really magnificent on the stage—a high school boy who could have stepped right onto the professional stage. I remember him as the jester in "In a Fool's Bauble," a play by whom, I know not, and he was great. But in his final year, 1920, Brown played the title role in Bulwer-Lytton's "Richelieu."

I've never forgotten Gernon's "Richelieu." I still hear him declaim: "Armand Duplessis, Duc de Richelieu dies not by the hand of man." Over the 43 years that have elapsed since Gernon played the famed cardinal of France—it was at the Lafayette Theater, now the Civic, I believe, but it could have been the old Tulane Theater—I would frequently greet him with that quote. I had good cause to remember, because I was a spear carrier in that production of "Richelieu," a companion warrior to Ellis Henican. We heard the play over and over in rehearsals, and grew quite familiar with other parts than our own. For, as I recall it, on the night of the play, we were so absorbed in Gernon's impressive performance that when the time came to do our military duty, we arrested the wrong character.

Had Gernon Brown gone on the stage, there is no doubt in my mind that he would have become one of the leading figures on the American stage. Instead, he went to Annapolis, but a broken leg as a plebe football player ended his naval career. He finished his education at Loyola.

A teaching post at Jesuit High, after graduation, led to his becoming an assistant coach under "Doc" Erskine. Judge Ike Carriere, then a young lawyer, taught and coached with Erskine part time. When he began to be too busy as a lawyer, he retired from this part-time coaching and teaching, and Brown took his place as a coach. When "Doc" Erskine went to Loyola as head coach, Gernon took over the Blue Jays. His more than two-decade performance was tremendous. For the last 10 years or so, Brown was the executive assistant director of NORD under $1-a-year-man Lester Lautenschlaeger.

Death came for him at his desk, yesterday. But wherever and whenever it had come, it would have found Gernon Brown ready. He was, in every finest sense of the word, a good man.

Here is Cro Duplantier, executive sports editor of the New Orleans States-Item whose facile pen describes the man and the memory he has left behind:

AS COACH SAID, HE'LL BE AROUND

(By Cro Duplantier)

Lester Lautenschlaeger, executive director of New Orleans Recreation Department, said G. Gernon Brown, New Orleans Recreation Department's assistant director, was completing a call made to set a luncheon date.

"I'll be over in 10 minutes," Gernon said and hung up.

That was the last that Lester heard from Gernon and about the last thing anyone heard. For about 10 minutes later Gernon Brown was dead.

But the ending perhaps is a bit prophetic for Gernon will be over, he'll be around again, perhaps not in 10 minutes but time and time again in the minds and hearts of the thousands of boys grown into men whose lives he touched.

For when he touched the touch left an imprint—the G. Gernon imprint—and the mark has stayed with most of his boys forever after.

Gernon's own family life is indication enough of his attitude toward young people. He fathered 10 children and raised 9 of them. A man who raises nine children has to love children, has to love young adulthoods, has to love people. And Gernon, for all his occasional gruffness, loved people.

We met Gernon the year he became a head coach. We were a boy of 11, he a vigorous, husky, impressive, assured man of 31.

If taking the jump from assistant to head man frightened him, there is no record of it. And that there need not have been any worry on his part was obvious immediately. He was a smash success from the start and to the finish.

His years were not only the years of the Jays' greatest successes, but also the years when the prep league was at a height never since attained.

There were fewer schools. The schools that did exist largely had been there for a long time and their rivalries were traditional ones. Gernon loved it. And the Jay fans loved him.

But for the rest of the league it was a period of aggravation. Beating Jesuit was the goal. And making Gernon eat humble pie was something that all strived for.

Failing that, the fans from rival institutions were forever finding excuses. They blamed their defeats on Jesuit luck. On the pregame prayers the Jays said before each contest, led quite frequently by boys of Protestant faiths. But they missed their mark. Gernon was the guy to blame.

He liked being a winner. He wanted his boys to like being winners. And he inculcated that idea into them. If you've got the equipment, the talent, you ought to use it, he figured. And Gernon and his kids did.

We've had a few differences with him over the years. But they were minor ones and and they lasted only briefly.

For he was that kind of guy.

You admired him because he was smart. You admired him because he knew his business. You admired him because he could handle himself well in a contest, before a crowd.

And you liked him because, for all his assurance, for all his gruffness, for all his talent, he was still warm, still anxious to please and, above all, because you felt that he liked you and you were important to him.

Gernon Brown was the kind of man who could have been a big success in any undertaking, for, with everything else there was a dynamism, a restlessness to go, go, go * * * and to get others on the move too.

He spent his life in work which certainly offers small financial rewards for the talents and energy that he put into it. But we suspect that he rarely gave thought to this, though there must have been occasions when that army of kids was growing when he could have used a bigger income.

He spent his life as he did, because his work was the kind of work he loved.

This perhaps could be the key to sum him up as completely as is possible in a couple of words. He chose his work because he loved it. Because he loved it he was a happy man. And a happy man is bound to have many friends, and bound, also to make a lasting impression on them.

"Coach," as most of us called him, and as he called most people in return—told Lester he'd be "over in about 10 minutes."

He's already here, he's here right now, all around this area of ours, the death notice notwithstanding.

He's here and will be as long as any of the boys he coached and guided are.

He was that kind of guy.

Harry Martinez, my old associate and dear friend and sports editor of the New Orleans States, was a sportswriter when Gernon Brown played his first football game for Jesuits. He points out the difficulty it will be to replace Gernon Brown in the New Orleans recreation department program:

DIFFICULT TO REPLACE BROWN

(By Harry Martinez)

Replacing Gernon Brown as assistant director of the vast New Orleans recreation department program is not going to be an easy task. In his position he carried out the work outlined by Director Lester Lautenschlaeger and the two worked hand in hand to build up New Orleans recreation department's activities so well that other cities used the local programs as a model for their own.

Brown's death is mourned by thousands, particularly among boys who came in contact with him in sports. As a coach and as a teacher he had a great influence over his athletes, in mapping out their lives and causing them to become worthy citizens.

His life was dedicated to teaching youth. As a coach for 20 years at Jesuit High School he not only turned out championship teams, but built character. He taught fair play and, win or lose, his boys always played like champions.

The long years he spent coaching high school boys made him an invaluable man to take the position with the New Orleans recreation department which he held until his death. He knew the recreation work from all phases and helped to build it to the point where New Orleans was regarded as having one of the finest recreation programs in the Nation.

In recognition of his long association with athletics and recreation work, Gernon Brown served on many boards both local and national for the improvement of high school sports. Only last Tuesday he returned to New Orleans from New York where he was elected vice president of the All-American Baseball Association.

As one who has followed Brown's activities from his high school playing days at Jesuit back in 1919, we can add nothing but praise for his devotion to the work of moulding the character of many who have made their mark in the business world.

Then there is Buddy Diliberto, most articulate sports columnist of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who wrote:

FROM THE BENCH: THE PASSING OF GERNON BROWN

(By Buddy Diliberto)

The unexpected death of Gernon Brown Tuesday hangs heavy with all who knew the man, especially hundreds of former Jesuit High athletes.

In his latter years Brown distinguished himself as executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department but it was as a Jesuit coach that he was known best.

Brown was a coach in the tradition of Knute Rockne or Frank Leahy. His greatest attribute was the ability to make boys perform beyond their normal capabilities.

The manner in which he accomplished this varied but the result was usually the same—success.

Hal Breeding, one of Brown's former athletes, recalls a game against Warren Easton in the early 1940's in which Easton outweighed Jesuit about 20 pounds per man.

"Gernon told us a story and when he was finished there wasn't one of us who thought Easton was too big to beat," Breeding recalls.

The story was about a second-string basketball player who played for Jesuit years before.

"The kid weighed only 135 pounds and unbeknown to the coaches suffered from epilepsy," Brown told the team.

"One afternoon during practice the kid had an attack and five of the biggest athletes on the team couldn't hold him down.

"Remember, boys, it's the size of fight in the dog not the size of the dog."

Easton's weight advantage made no difference that afternoon.

THE YEAR BROWN GAVE UP SMOKING

Brown hated to lose. He once said, "When you lose once it's always easier to lose the next time."

Jesuit teams seldom lost during the Brown years but when they did he wanted every player to take the loss as seriously as he did.

In 1941, Doc Blanchard led St. Stanislaus to a victory over Jesuit at City Park Stadium.

Gernon herded the team into the bus after the game and there was hardly a dry pair of eyes.

Brown walked up and down the aisle studying each of his players until he came upon a boy who wasn't crying.

"What's the matter son, are you happy we lost?" Brown barked.

"No sir," the boy replied.

"Well, start crying real tears or turn in your uniform when we get back to school," Gernon bellowed.

In the fall of 1946 Jesuit needed to win the State football title to complete a sweep of championships unmatched in the history of Louisiana high school athletics. The Jays had already won State basketball and baseball crowns under Brown that year and the track championship under the late Eddie Toribio.

Brown was a chain smoker yet no sacrifice was too big if Gernon thought it would help achieve victory.

He gave up smoking for a year that season as a sacrifice and the Jays went on to complete the slam by winning State in football.

It was a nerve-racking ordeal for the man but he lived up to his promise. The picture of Toribio following Brown around him with mints and chewing gum as a substitute for cigarettes is still vivid in the minds of the players on the 1946 team.

MOLDER OF TRADITION, SPIRIT

Brown, shirttail hanging out and arms waving, delivered many pregame and halftime speeches that would have made a Rockne proud. And at other times just a sentence would do the job.

John Petibon recalls a game in 1946 in which Jesuit was a topheavy favorite and Brown was convinced his team wasn't ready to play a good football game.

"Our practices were sloppy the entire week and we were all waiting for Gernon to tear into us," Petibon recalls.

"But he didn't utter a harsh word. Then moments before we went onto the field he said, 'Okay, girls. Let's go take our whipping.'

"That one sentence burned us so much we went out and won 40 to 0."

One of Brown's favorite tricks to fire a team was to address a letter to the squad and sign the name of the opposing team.

The letters were usually the same. They had references to the Jesuit players being "girls, mollies, mama's boys, etc." And they never failed to bring the desired result.

With all due respect to the many wonderful priests and lay teachers through the years, I feel Gernon Brown did more than anyone to build the tradition and spirit of Jesuit High.

The New Orleans States-Item said this of Gernon Brown editorially:

G. GERNON BROWN

Because he devoted his life to the moral, mental and physical development of New Orleans' youth, the death of G. Gernon Brown Tuesday imposed a particular deprivation on this community.

Mr. Brown leaves the stamp of his character not only on the athletes and students of Jesuit High School, where he served as head coach for 21 years dating back to 1933 and as faculty member, but also on New Orleans' younger generation in general.

For he was, of further reaching consequence, executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department and had, since its inception, played a major role in growth of that agency.

He was a charter member of the New Orleans Junior Sports Association, predecessor of New Orleans Recreation Department, and an organizer of many activities that comprise the recreational department program.

Milestones of the career which he dedicated to development of youngsters lie on the local, State and national levels.

For unstinted devotion to the ideal of inspiring tomorrow's citizens, Mr. Brown, during his notable career, earned the gratitude of the community many times over.

Now comes Peter Finney, one of the better young writers on the staff of the New Orleans States-Item who knew Gernon Brown as a student and later covered him from the sports desk:

BLUE JAY SPIRIT MADE BY GERNON BROWN: A SUPER SALESMAN

(By Peter Finney)

In later years, Gernon Brown would throw back his head and roar when reminded of the standing joke on the 1944 Jesuit basketball team.

"Let's steal his book," Tookie Gilbert used to say, "and he'll have to call off practice."

So far as I know, Gernon Brown was the only man who actually coached from a book.

Thumbing through the pages in practice, he readily admitted his knowledge of the sport was limited to what Stanford's Everett Dean had set down between two red covers.

As time when on, however, and you were in a position to assess Gernon Brown—the coach—you realized the extraordinary talents which made him the brightest figure in the golden era of prep sports.

It is not difficult to conjure up an image of the master at work—on the sidelines at City Park Stadium, in the dugout at Muny Park, on the bench at Jesuit's old quonset-like gymnasium.

Hair in disarray, suit rumpled, and eyes blazing, he was an eloquent picture of a forceful personality leaving his stamp on all who played under him as well as on the league in which he competed.

All of the high school heroes he mass produced—from Jesse Danna to Putsy Caballero, from Clay Calhoun to John Petitbon, from Connie Ryan to Hugh Oser—will tell you the intangible thing known as Blue Jay spirit was "made by Gernon Brown."

To what did he owe his success?

"Give Gernon a piece of chalk and a blackboard," Eddie Toribio once told me, "and he'll sell anyone on anything."

Yesterday, with tragic suddenness, 61-year-old Gernon Brown joined one of his greatest pupils. And, as news of his fatal heart attack sank in, bits of conversations with the wizard of the preps came back to you in staccato fashion.

"I learned most of my football from Lester Lautenschlaeger and most of my baseball from Larry Gilbert and Mel Ott," he'd tell you.

But this did not explain (as Eddie Toribio had) his amazing success on Carrollton Avenue during a 20-year period which began in 1932—an era in which his Jesuit football teams won 6 city and 5 State championships, his baseball teams captured 11 city and State titles, and his basketball teams 3 city and 3 State crowns.

"Mr. Brown was a supersalesman all right," declared Ray Coates, tailback on the 1943 city and State kingpins and his coach's choice as the finest triple-threat back that ever passed his way.

"He had a way of getting the best out of everyone. He simply had the God-given talent of knowing how to handle different types of boys. Some had to be petted, some had to be pushed and he knew which ones.

"Another thing he mastered was the knack of never allowing a game to be lost at practice. He knew just when to ease up. This plus his stirring pep talks and his passion for perfection made him the great coach he was.

Following his retirement from the coaching ranks in 1953, Gernon was constantly badgered with questions on his Jesuit football teams. The persistent poser: Which was the best?

"The 1940 bunch with O. J. Key, Tony DiBartolo, Lenny Finley, Paul Limont, Cy Kirsch, and many more," Gernon would tell them. "I never saw such talent on one squad."

Then he'd quickly add: "But that 1946 crew with John Petitbon, Hugh Oser and Mire Thomas was another great one * * * No one came within two touchdowns of us."

The only question Gernon liked to answer unequivocably was: "Which team gave you the most satisfaction?"

"That crowd in 1943," was his quick reply.

Sweeping to the city and State championships, the lightweight Blue Jays upset Holy Cross, 18–14, and Byrd High, 25–7.

"Mister Brown never let us believe we had less than an even chance of winning," said Coates. "We came from behind in four of our games that year; in fact, we had to come from behind three times against Holy Cross."

For the Baton Rouge game, Coates took two left shoes to the State capital and had to borrow a pair from the Bulldog coach. He used them to run 100 yards with an intercepted pass.

Gernon called the halftime demonstration against Byrd "the greatest I ever saw."

"When I came into the dressing room, we were behind 7–6," he told me once. "I was all set for a real rah-rah sermon, but I never got to say a word.

"The squad was standing when I walked in and Coates said: 'Don't worry, coach, we'll beat hell out of these guys.' Then all of the other players began shouting. They sold me."

There was another time when Gernon worked magic without uttering a word.

"We won our first State football championship in 1933," he once recalled. "That year we played Morgan City for the South Louisiana title and the score was 0–0 in the fourth quarter.

"Eddie Toribio's knee gave way on him and I went out and carried him from the field * * * he was crying like a baby * * * it fired the team up so much we had the game's only touchdown 2 minutes later."

Gernon Brown was fired up too—by a speech to the graduating class in June, 1940.

"You are the first clas in the history of the school to graduate without seeing the football team defeat Warren Easton," said the principal.

Beginning that fall, Brown's football teams went on a rampage that brought his school four city and four State titles in the next 7 years—and four victories over the Eagles.

It also brought to mind the advice he received when he took over as football boss in 1932. Doc Erskine, his predecessor, told Gernon: "Don't get too het up about winning because you open yourself to too much disappointment.'

Commented George Gernon Brown with a wry grin: "That's one rule I was never able to follow."

Finally there is N. Charles Wicker, who came to known Gernon Brown as a young prep school reporter covering the high school athletic beat. Charlie Wicker's deep personal tribute reflects the personal emotions and feelings of those who were exposed to Gernon Brown in his days as football coach and executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department program in New Orleans:

WHAT'S WHAT

(By N. Charles Wicker)

New Orleans mourns the death of a great man, a wonderful father, a leader of youth and men, and a coach, whose record will never be matched, with the passing of G. Gernon Brown, executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department, and former Jesuit High School coach.

Gernon Brown excelled in everything he did. He was an outstanding teacher in the classroom, an unexcelled coach on the field, and truly our best friend.

Gernon is the second of our great coaches to pass away while serving as executive director of New Orleans Recreation Department.

A little more than 10 years ago Gernon Brown was forced to retire as head football coach because the priests at Jesuit didn't want him to die on the field.

Proving that he was not finished, he took over as head of the recreation department when Johnny Brechtel passed away, and served in that position since.

We began our newspaper career just a few years before Gernon Brown became head football coach at Jesuit in 1931. Many happy and joyful hours were spent with him in the Jesuit athletic office, at various meetings, in fact, everywhere we were together. He was a man that the Jesuits let run the show. Why? Because they knew Gernon Brown to be a great leader and a man who stood for what was right.

Gernon Brown served as captain and coach of the 1918 Jesuit football team. He coached dramatics, he was a great math teacher, and at the time of his death he was part-time teacher at Jesuit. Every morning before he went to his office in the city hall he taught classes.

He became head coach of the football team in 1931. Without any basketball knowledge he coached the basketball team and won championship honors.

Several of his proteges, all great coaches, the late Eddie Toribio, Lou Brownson, and the present Jesuit coach, Ken Tarzetti, got their start as assistants under Gernon.

Ray Coates, present assistant at Jesuit, is another of Gernon's boys.

Without a question of a doubt, Gernon Brown developed more high school athletes than any other man in the city of New Orleans.

In a matter of a few years he would have been connected with Jesuit 50 years. He devoted his life to Jesuit.

Just a few months ago he was given the Blue Jay of the Year Award presented to the alumni voted as top man by the old grads for work done for Jesuit. "It was long overdue," said Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT who presented the award, and who started the idea some years ago.

Gernon Brown and the late Johnny Brechtel, along with the Brown brothers, "Little" and "Big Fuz" of Istrouma were the backbone of the Louisiana High School Coaches Association when it was formed.

W. L. Colvin, former president of the Louisiana High School Athletic Association, and Grover C. Koffmann, former secretary-treasurer of the LHSAA, were both great admirers of Gernon Brown. But who wasn't?

Brown worked long and hard to raise a wonderful family, the eldest of whom is Dr. Gernon Brown, a very successful physician in our town.

He never shirked his responsibility. He gave endlessly of his time. After a full day at Jesuit High School and football practice, Gernon found time to serve as math instructor for the nurses at Charity Hospital.

Each year at this time on the morning of the New Orleans Athletic Club banquet honoring the outstanding athlete of the greater New Orleans area, we devote much of our space to the winner of the award. But we just couldn't let the opportunity pass without paying tribute to a true friend.

To his wife Kathryn, and to everyone of his children, his sisters, and his brother, in behalf of my family and my children who have all been very fond of Gernon, may we

extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

Gernon is the third Blue Jay of the same era to pass away with a heart attack in a period of 10 days of each other.

Yes, we must agree with Gernon Brown's classmates at Jesuits in 1920 in New Orleans that this was a man whose like we shall not see again.

Mobile, Ala. Editor Cites Dangers in Political Reprisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an editorial from the Mobile, Ala., Register in which the editorial writer points out the danger to our Republic in the action of the Kennedy administration in holding up a needed and meritorious project, the Federal Building in Dallas, until the people of that great city elect a Representative to Congress acceptable to the President. The editorial speaks for itself, but it should remind the President, as I said on the floor a few days ago, such tactics are not good politics and the President should remember the American people will exercise their freedom to vote as they please and they will not be bought nor pressured by any political machine:

WHERE NOT TO USE POLITICAL SPOILS TACTICS

This being a free country, the people are free under the American system to vote for candidates of their choice.

In some instances, however, it has seemed that the people have been free to vote for candidates of their choice only at the peril of being politically penalized.

Right now, to cite a case in point, Dallas, Tex., is less than supremely happy because of a feeling that spoils politics tactics are being used to give it the cold shoulder on a Federal building project.

More specifically, they suspect in Dallas, that the cold shoulder is coming from Washington, D.C., because the Kennedy New Frontier is burnt up over the presence in Congress of a Republican House Member from Dallas, Representative BRUCE ALGER.

Mr. ALGER has been in Congress 6 years longer than the New Frontier has been in the White House, but the New Frontier is suspected of resorting to political reprisal because of his presence there.

The Republican Congressman himself has sharply criticized what he calls a "deliberate attempt of the Kennedy administration to penalize and punish one of the great metropolitan areas of the Nation because its people did not support the candidate of the President's choice for election to the House."

Mr. ALGER says (and these quotations are from his remarks in the House) that "such a bold and tyrannical attempt to force the election of favored candidates to the legislative branch cannot, must not, go unchallenged in this free society."

He has also called attention in Congress to newspaper comment in Dallas.

He called attention to this from the Dallas Morning News:

"On Dallas' failure again to get its Federal center, one can strongly suspect but not prove that—

"We are being punished because Dallas County voted against Mr. Kennedy by nearly 70,000 votes. Other Republican districts are getting their share of projects.

"Continued reelection of BRUCE ALGER, a Republican to Congress, mitigates against us.

"Dallas doesn't want the (Federal building) center if it doesn't deserve it and if it doesn't need it.

"Truth is, we do need it, it is worthy, it will save the Government money; and regardless of how the people of a free district vote freely for whom they please, the center should be authorized on merit—and merit alone—regardless of ALGER, Kennedy, or anybody else."

Even more pointed has been the comment of the Dallas Times Herald, in saying:

"The Federal Government is using political reprisal for an inexcusable hatchet job on one of its greatest American cities; namely, Dallas. Dallas County (which forms the congressional district represented by Mr. ALGER) is getting its punishment from the Democrat administration because it voted a Republican Congressman into office.

"There are no party labels pasted on taxes we send to Washington and we want none in return."

If the Kennedys are going to operate a political spoils system of blacklisting people who have not seen fit to vote New Frontier, more than one-half of all who cast votes in the 1960 presidential election are eligible to the blacklist, for President Kennedy received less than 50 percent of the nationwide popular vote.

But the Kennedys surely know that apart from the poltical smallness of such tactics, the idea of running the U.S. Government on that basis is utterly incredible.

Democrats and Republicans have an identical right under the American system to vote for candidates of their choice without reprisal or fear of reprisal from the White House.

The American system would become empty and meaningless if the American people were browbeaten into goosestepping to the polls to do only the bidding of the White House, whether Democrats or Republicans were in power.

Ballots cast in that manner and under those conditions would be cast by robots, not by voters.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Bonneville Power Administration Must Increase Its Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 17, the Congress received the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1964. Even though many of us anticipated that it would be larger than his requests for 1963, I don't think we were quite prepared for the fantastic figure of over $107 billion requested in new appropriations in this document. It is almost inconceivable that Congress could be asked to consider a budget of this magnitude, while at the same time being asked to consider rather sizable decreases in Federal taxes.

I, for one, firmly believe the level of personal and corporate income taxes is seriously hampering this Nation's rate of economical growth. The excessively steep progression of tax rates to a point approaching an almost confiscatory level very often has the effect of stifling initiative and inventiveness of our citizens.

However, I do feel that if a tax cut is forthcoming it must be accompanied with a concomitant serious reduction in the level of governmental expenditures or a conscientious effort on the part of Members of Congress to find additional ways to increase Federal revenues.

In my humble judgment, one outstanding and immediately obvious way to reduce Federal expenditures, while at the same time increasing Federal revenues, would be to establish a realistically increased electric power rate for the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the audit report by the Comptroller General of the United States on the financial statements of the Columbia River Power System and related activities for fiscal 1962, which was transmitted to Congress on December 11, 1962, clearly points out that that power system sustained a net loss—and I repeat, a net loss—of about $13.1 million in fiscal 1962. This is the fifth straight year Bonneville has sustained losses from the sale of power because of its unrealistically low rates. In 1961, the loss was $14.2 million; in 1960, it was $10.9 million; $6.6 million in 1959; and $2.9 million in 1958—for a total of about $47.5 million in 5 short years.

The Comptroller General also reported to Congress that the Bonneville Power Administration failed to meet its scheduled repayment of the capital investment in commercial power facilities by about $17.6 million in 1962. This compares with a failure to meet its scheduled repayment of $15.3 million in 1961, $11.6 million in 1960, $9.7 million in 1959—for a total of $54.2 million in 4 short years.

Mr. Speaker, in these trying times when the demands of our Federal commitments at home and abroad create ever-increasing pressures for greater spending, and the poor taxpayer is almost stumbling from his burden of excessive taxation, to allow Bonneville to continue this folly is intolerable. It is made even more intolerable because it does not have to be.

Mr. Charles Luce stated in the 1961 annual report o fthe Bonneville Power Administration that "future deficits are predicted for the next 4 or 5 years." It will be remembered by many of us who were in this House during the 2d session of the 87th Congress that this same Mr. Luce promised us that if the Hanford project resulted in additional losses that Bonneville's rates would also have to be increased.

In my opinion, fiscal responsibility and sound public financing will not permit further procrastination in our need to face up to the realities of the Bonneville rate structure.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have also heard spokesmen for the Bonneville Power Administration say that its rates cannot be reviewed and adjusted except at 5-year intervals, and the next review would not be until December 1964. However, the organic Bonneville Project Act states only that contracts shall contain provisions for equitable adjustments of rates at "appropriate intervals not less frequently than once in every 5 years." Let me remind my colleagues, that Mr. William A. Pearl, then Bonneville Power Administrator, told the House Committee on Appropriations in May 1957—and let me quote him:

> Periodically, in accordance with the Bonneville Act, we are to review our rate structure—that is, no less often than once every 5 years. Actually, we review it every year.

He said also:

> About 2 weeks ago we announced there would not be an increase in rates for the year beginning December 1957.

When Mr. Pearl was telling the House Appropriations Committee this, the next so-called 5-year review would not have been until December 1959.

In other words, even though the review required under existing contracts was still almost 2½ years in the future, the Administrator announced there would be no increase in the year beginning December 1957. This announcement would seem to indicate—at least by inference—that if he had felt it necessary to increase rates before 1959, he could have done so.

The Bonneville Act further states very clearly that rates may be modified "from time to time by the Administrator" subject to the confirmation and approval of the Federal Power Commission and subject to the terms of existing contracts. Furthermore, the act specifically requires that rates charged by Bonneville must be sufficient to cover the cost of producing and transmitting the electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment in power facilities, over a reasonable period of years.

However, even assuming, for the sake of discussion, that the Bonneville Power Administration cannot increase rates under existing contracts until December 1964, I can find nothing in the Bonneville Act which would prohibit the Administrator from increasing rates under new contracts or under mutually agreed revisions of existing contracts which would be adequate to recover at least a portion of the losses and to repay a part of the investment until such time as a general rate increase might be applicable to all contracts. The act merely states that rate schedules may—and I emphasize may—provide for uniform rates but does not state that the rates must necessarily be uniform.

Mr. Speaker, because of the seriousness of allowing Bonneville to continue operating at such large deficits, I have sent a letter to Bonneville Administrator Charles Luce sincerely suggesting that he and his staff begin immediately to prepare for a realistic increase in Bonneville's power rates. Even though the overall increase may not be applicable to most of its customers until late next year, I think it is only fair to forewarn them at the earliest possible moment of the necessity for a forthcoming rate increase.

Under unanimous consent I insert a copy of my letter to Mr. Luce in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

> CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D.C., January 28, 1963.*
>
> Hon. CHARLES F. LUCE,
> *Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oreg.*
>
> DEAR MR. LUCE: I have recently read the audit report of the Comptroller General of the Columbia River Power System submitted to Congress in December. The report, as expected, shows the Bonneville Power Administration lost another $13.1 million in 1962 and failed to meet its scheduled repayment of the capital investment in commercial power by $17.6 million. As a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a taxpayer, I am deeply concerned about these losses.
>
> This is the fifth straight year BPA has sustained losses from its sale of power: $14.2 million in 1961, $10.7 million in 1960, $6.6 million in 1959, and $2.9 million in 1958, for a total over the 5 years of $47.5 million.
>
> Also, for the past 4 years, including 1962, BPA has failed to meet its scheduled repayment of the capital investment in commercial power to the extent of $54.2 million. To the 1962 deficiency, there must be added deficiencies of $15.3 million in 1961, $11.6 million in 1960, and $9.7 million in 1959.
>
> Furthermore, it was brought out in the House Public Works Appropriations hear-

ings for 1962, that these stated losses are not a true reflection of the real losses to the U.S. Government.

The information you supplied for the record clearly showed that if Bonneville were paying interest at the more realistic rate of 4 percent instead of 2.5 percent, the losses for 1960, 1961, and 1962 would have been more than double the amount shown as losses in your reports.

In BPA's 1961 annual report you state, "future deficits are predicted for the next 4 or 5 years." You also observe that it will be most difficult to avoid a rate increase, if this trend is not reversed.

You have consistently stated or implied that BPA rates cannot be reviewed less than each 5 years, and the next review date would be toward the end of 1964. However, the Bonneville Project Act provides that contracts shall contain provisions for equitable adjustment of rates at "appropriate intervals not less frequently than once in every 5 years." The act further provides that rates may be modified "from time to time by the Administrator" subject to confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Finally, may I remind you, the act also specifically requires that the rates be sufficient to cover the cost of producing and transmitting the electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment, over a reasonable period of time.

As I read this act, you cannot by contract preclude the Bonneville Power Administration from reviewing the rates charged thereunder at least every 5 years. This does not prohibit the Bonneville Power Administration from making more frequent rate reviews and, if necessary, rate adjustments as would be in accord with existing contracts.

In order to at least minimize the impact of losses temporarily, it seems to me that BPA should immediately review its rate schedule with a view to assuring that any future new contracts contain rates adequate to enable BPA to comply with the law. In the interest of fiscal responsibility by the Government—in the face of increasing Federal budget requests and the expressed desire by the administration to reduce taxes—I think it is urgently necessary to insure that any new customer taken on by BPA apparently is committed in existing contracts.

I can find nothing in the act to prohibit you from treating any new contracts under new rate schedules which would be adequate to recover losses and repay investments. The act states that rate schedules "may provide for uniform rates." It does not state that the rates must be uniform.

Mr. Luce, for these reasons, I sincerely suggest that you and your staff immediately begin to prepare evaluations of the BPA rate structure which will lead to appropriate increases necessary to comply with the law and today's economic facts of life. Remembering that your customers must also have sufficient leadtime to plan future needs, I would further suggest that they should be forewarned as soon as possible that a rate increase will have to be forthcoming in the not too distant future.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as a longtime member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I realize full well the consequences and implications of a rate increase for the Bonneville Power Administration. However, as I said in my opening remarks, it is intolerable that Bonneville should be allowed to continue to operate at a serious deficit. The Government can and must strive to find every possible means of meeting its financial requirements while at the same time reducing the burdensome load on the average taxpayer.

In closing, I would like to compliment the Comptroller General and the Government Accounting Office for the quality of their audit report on the financial statements of the Bonneville Power Administration for fiscal 1962. I have been reading these GAO audit reports for several years now and I think that in general they are outstanding. I have been somewhat concerned, however, that they seem to have received so little attention here in Congress. We should all remember that the Government Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress—not the executive—and, therefore, is deserving of more consideration.

The suggestions from the Comptroller General and his staff for improving Government and very often for saving money are usually well founded and excellent. I sincerely hope that in the future every Member of Congress will pay more attention to these reports and suggestions.

Walter Hall, of Galveston County: A Banker for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Walter Hall, a leading Texas businessman who has risen to prominence both as a successful banker and civic battler for good government, was recently the subject of an excellent article in the Houston Post.

Walter Hall is known statewide in Texas for his courage in stepping forth against great odds to defend the people who helped him build his business—the people who start at the bottom of the ladder and work hard for a living. He has fought great odds, economically and politically, and always with growing strength and support from the people. He is a stanch Democrat.

The Houston Post quotes Walter Hall:

I didn't consider it going out on a limb to help these people get started. Some of the first loans in that area were no more than $100. And the same people who borrowed these small amounts are pretty well off today.

This is a statement from a banker who knows where the basic strength of a country, or a business, is to be found. He has never forgotten this fact in his life as a banker.

On the subject of government, the Post quotes Walter Hall:

It is my feeling that all citizens should take an informed interest and have some participation in politics. I believe good government is almost in direct ratio to the percentage of people engaging in it as voters and in political activities.

Walter Hall and I have worked shoulder to shoulder for more than a decade for better government for Texas and the Nation.

Mr. President, because Walter Hall is an outstanding example of an American businessman who has achieved success in a relatively small town, and because of his continuing courage in working for good government locally, statewide and nationally, I ask unanimous consent that the article captioned "Friend of the Little Man: Walter Hall, Banker, Doesn't Act the Part," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIEND OF THE LITTLE MAN—WALTER HALL, BANKER, DOESN'T ACT THE PART

(By John Rainey)

DICKINSON.—Walter Hall has been a banker for 31 years.

For 31 years he has broken the so-called cardinal rules of banking, has become the image of a man most bankers refuse to be, and he's still solvent.

This has confused his financial and political opponents no end. They can't figure out how he manages to remain solvent.

"Some bankers laugh at me for making small loans of $50 and $60. Yet, I know when people need money in a country town they have no other place except a bank to go. Loan sharks have tried to move into the towns where my banks are, but they don't stay long," Hall says.

Hall is a liberal Democrat, in the national sense.

He is president of banks at League City, Dickinson, and Alvin. And plans are being readied for the fourth, at Webster.

Dickinson, League City, and Webster are in the heart of the NASA development. But before the space age came along the area was expanding rapidly.

Most of the loans in the Bayshore area—which helped it to grow, originated at the Citizens State Bank at Dickinson, Hall's first bank.

He bought controlling interest in the Alvin State Bank in 1953. Then along came the Chocolate Bayou plant of the Monsanto Chemical Co., swelling payrolls in wealth in the town this year.

He acquired control in the Dickinson bank during the midst of the depression, not an era of health for banks. Yet the Texas City petrochemical boom was mushrooming. He was in on the ground floor.

Doesn't sound much like luck, does it?

But most of the major windfalls in the area from which he has benefited were entirely unforeseen, he says.

Hall quit the Humble Oil & Refining Co. in 1931 to take a job as cashier in the League City bank, then owned by the Hutchings family of Galveston.

It was then called the Citizens State Bank. Hall got into the insurance business on the side and saved his profits to buy an interest in the bank. In 1932 the competing First National Bank at Dickinson closed.

The League City bank was then moved in 1935 to Dickinson. Hall gained controlling interest in 1943.

From 1933 to 1934 the expansion at the chemical plants was astronomical. In 1934 an oil field was discovered in Dickinson. In 1938 the League City field was uncovered.

In 1939 Camp Wallace was established in the La Marque-Hitchcock-Dickinson area. A blimp base was built at Hitchcock.

As he tells it: "The Camp Wallace and blimp projects filled every living unit in the area. And I had been making loans for additions to homes and for apartments.

"Our bank was the first in a 16-county area to make FHA title I loans. The other

banks were slow in getting into this new program.

"But then I didn't have the handicap of experience and outmoded ideas to tell me I shouldn't do it.

"In the same period, the people trying to develop the Bayshore area were considered wharf rats by many. I felt that the rapidly expanding population in Houston and along the coast would create a boom someday in the recreation business.

"I didn't consider it going out on a limb to help these people get started. Some of the first loans in that area were no more than $100. And the same people who borrowed these small amounts are pretty well off today.

"When I acquired control of the Alvin bank in 1953 the decision was based on the premise that oil in the area would cause other industry to grow. It did. But they were primarily of a diversified nature—rice farming, dairy, and beef cattle ranching. I had no idea that Monsanto would build at Chocolate Bayou.

"And that has been the story. I was in the right place at the right time."

The three banks now have combined assets of about $25 million.

Hall may have been in the right place at the right time; that is part accident. But the loan policies he has instituted are not accident.

At the Alvin bank for example, he raised the ratio of loans to deposits from the previous 10 to 25 percent to 50 percent. The rate of growth of assets was 7.2 percent annually, up until 1961. That year the rate was 19 percent.

He organized the League City State Bank in 1956. It has had an annual rate of growth of 12 percent. It now has over $6 million in assets.

He has been active in his banks but he considers himself a citizen first, a banker second. He has hired competent people to run the banks, given them authority and then turned 'em loose.

For Hall has been as active in politics as he has in business. His views on economics put him in the class of radical among most businessmen and definitely so among bankers.

He gave more than voice support for Don Yarborough for governor this year. He campaigned and supported Yarborough financially. But this is not new with Hall. He is a prime supporter of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH. Hall is also close to Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

He gets around, though his ideas on State finances have not been given much attention.

Here they are: "I don't gripe about taxes. I realize that the economic world we live in makes them necessary. I do think that the State tax structure is unfair, though.

"Taxes should be levied relative to the capacity to pay. They should be levied fairly with the least disturbance to the economy and living conditions of the people.

"Also, economy in the mechanics of collection is important. One of the main defects of the sales tax is the heavy cost of collection and the difficulty of enforcing it fairly.

"In many States where it is levied too much of the tax collected never reaches the State treasury because of collection costs.

"The State corporation tax, which is in effect in 37 States, has the advantage of being easy to compute and collect. And, of course, it is based upon profits. It is, therefore, a tax that meets the requirements of the capacity to pay.

"A glaring example of a vicious tax that is not related to the capacity to pay is the State franchise tax. This is a tax on capital and long-term debt and will literally bankrupt a company that is just barely getting by before the tax.

"One thing in favor of the corporate tax on a State level is that much of the money so collected by the State amounts to a diversion of Federal taxes.

"Texas is at a distinct disadvantage in not using the State corporate tax to help finance expenses.

"Taxes are heavy and will continue to be so. For the people want more things from all the various governmental units. These cost money and there is only one place to get it, from the people. But taxes have to be in relation to the income of those paying them, otherwise they become confiscation.

"People, especially businessmen, can't understand why I should be so interested and also mixed up in this business of politics.

"I do not consider myself a politician at all. We approach all problems through some political unit, generally, I like to see the efforts of meeting changing problems made by applying reason and using the best information possible.

"All of us, the busy businessman included, should see that tax money is spent efficiently and for the things the taxpayers want it spent. That there may be some penalty risk by businessmen participating in politics as I do, I do not question. Some say there is, some say there is not. Personally, I do not know. But I do know a man is, or at least should be, a citizen first, and a banker, engineer, farmer, or whatever, second.

"I respect politicians because I realize we cannot have a democracy without them. While democracy may have its defects, it is so far superior to anything yet devised that to me there is no alternative.

"I have been called a liberal and I suppose by some measures I am. This is because I know that change is inevitable and that orderly change is the most desirable kind. I do not fear change and it wouldn't matter if I did because it would still be with us, and I would have to meet it.

"It is my feeling that all citizens should take an informed interest and have some participation in politics. I believe good government is almost in direct ratio to the percentage of people engaging in it as voters and in political activities.

"People scream about the Federal Government invading the States, taking away States rights. While I do not regard the Federal Government as some sort of enemy as do some folks, I do not think it is good, in a State with the basic wealth of Texas, to have development of these resources depend upon Federal financing.

"I think it is a poor trade to exchange some degree of State control for Federal dollars.

"Yet, we have seen, countless times, people who constantly criticize Federal taxes and expenditures go all out for the Federal aid to finance State projects. In some States this is necessary, it is not in Texas. And yet, there is nothing now to cause anyone to believe there is any basic change in sight."

Hall has one other favorite topic—soil and water conservation. He served as president of the San Jacinto River authority for 11 years, from 1943–54.

He became interested in water supplies because of the need in the area for fresh water, especially for industry.

"Water supply has been the ceiling on every civilization," he says. "The need is now, and it will increase in the future."

"It can be said, perhaps, with logic, that the people will see the need when they become sufficiently educated. This may be true, but I point out we have many well educated people now and only a few of them seem to be much concerned about all of the aspects of taxes and water development.

"While the educational process is going on, and I hope being improved, considerable damage is being done in the State through neglect of soil and water development.

"For instance, there goes down the rivers of Texas into the Gulf of Mexico enough of our soil each year to create 8,000 farms, 100 acres each, with soil 6 inches deep.

"The leaders must lead. But the fact that the masses are not greatly concerned over these problems is a reflection on the leaders."

Hall does not demand that others listen to his opinions, only that others be tolerant of them. His politics is not a company policy. For example, his own secretary is a Republican.

Those who differ with him rarely become bitter over the differences.

He likes to have ideas on problems come out in full play, regardless of their nature. He likes to philosophize and mix economics with his philosophy. He received his bachelor of arts degree from Rice University in 1928. His favorite subjects were economics, philosophy, and history.

He was born in 1907, the youngest of seven children.

His parents moved from Illinois to a farm northwest of Webster in 1898. The 1900 hurricane ruined their crops and home. The family moved to Houston where Hall attended Central High School.

He is still essentially a country boy at heart. He knows the people in his area, personally.

One of his friends sums him up this way: "He has listened to the small because he considers them important. But the listening has not made him small. If he has a banner, it is one of individualism. He carries it high. It is, though, the kind of higher individualism that grows out of looking for meanings in the human drama."

The Romance of the Mona Lisa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are all so much pleased and interested in the display of the Mona Lisa at the National Gallery of Art, it is particularly interesting to note what the newspapers of our country are saying with respect to this matter. I think the editorial headed "The Romance of the Mona Lisa," which recently appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel sums the matter up very well and I am pleased to include it herewith.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE ROMANCE OF THE MONA LISA

It is indeed a heartwarming contrast that against a background of so much that is negative and ominous in international relations there should fortuitously be such a positive and ennobling expression of international relationship which is currently being graphically enacted in our own country—indeed in our National Capital.

The fruition of this salutary romantic and artistic international gesture became a reality when Leonardo da Vinci's incomparable masterpiece, the Mona Lisa, went on public view at the National Gallery of Art in Washington today. On loan from the French Government, it will also be shown in the Metropolitan Museum in New York City before being returned to the grand gallery in the Louvre.

The Mona Lisa, of course, is not the oldest portrait in the world, and there could be some division of expert artistic opinion as to whether it is the greatest. But it is a veritable miracle in international esteem. Mona stands for madam, and Lisa, her given name. Relatively speaking, it is a small portrait, just 30 inches high and 21 inches wide.

Lisa was the third wife a Florentine patrician, Francesco di Zanobi del Giocondo. She was about 25 years old when she sat for da Vinci, then in his early fifties. Incidentally, Giocondo was an ordinary rich man such as one encounters often and everywhere. He was neither overly handsome nor ill featured, and while he was preoccupied with his affairs, he nevertheless was still devoted to culture. He was 20 years older than Lisa, who to him was the ornament of his home. But legend has it that he really understood less of the consummate beauty and charm of his madonna than he did the quality of a new breed of beef cattle.

Lisa was a Neapolitan and a scion of an ancient family. Disaster struck her family, for her once rich father had been ruined by the French invasion in 1495. She was said to have married, not for love, but out of filial obedience. Her marriage disappointed many passionate, obstinate and desperate suitors. But none could speak ill of her. A biographer of Leonardo describes her as: "calm, modest, pious, charitable to children, a good manager, a faithful wife, and very tender with her stepdaughter, Dianora."

This then was the Lisa who remarkably sat to Leonardo for the better part of 3 or 4 years. That they both enjoyed the platonic seances is evident. Leonardo always had mimes, musicians and poets at his studio to keep the Madonna amused. A bitter note of tragedy intervened when one of her children died during her sittings.

It was most distinctive of the artist that he is historically reputed to have been, that Leonardo was never satisfied that the portrait was complete. He took it with him when he went to France in 1516 and sold it to the King, Francis I (Giocondo never got his hands on his wife's historic likeness), for 4,000 golden ducats. Nevertheless Leonardo kept the Mona Lisa on a whitewashed wall in his mansion at Chateau de Clous until the day he died.

The loan of the enigmatic Mona Lisa to the Washington National Gallery by the French Government represents alike a master stroke of diplomacy and international friendship. Significantly, Le Monde, the highly influential Paris newspaper, already has suggested that the French might "hope in return for the loan of artistic works which will arouse a lively interest." Noted international art connoiseurs have for centuries paid profound tribute to da Vinci's artistry in the Mona Lisa. The following by Walter Pater is typical: "Hers is the head upon which all the ends of the world are come. It is beauty wrought from within the flesh, the deposit, little cell by little cell, of strange thoughts and fantastic reveries, and exquisite passions."

Let Us Be Better Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of a speech recently delivered by Mr. Harry Ostrov, grand master of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York, which was recently delivered at the Garden City Hotel, Garden City, Long Island.

Mr. President, in my judgment this address is worthy of the consideration of all thinking Americans. It is a call and a challenge to all of us to fill our responsibilities as citizens under a free government. As Mr. Ostrov points out, the citizens of America have never before been faced by the challenges that confront us throughout the world today. He concludes:

If we pride ourselves on being Americans, let us be better Americans. Let us work for the day when there will be peace on this troubled earth, when every man shall be free, when all of us can follow the dictates of our conscience, when all of us can work together for a better world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this stirring address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BEFORE THE MASONS OF LONG ISLAND AT THE GARDEN CITY HOTEL, GARDEN CITY

We have started this day in a very auspicious manner. We have arisen and directed our footsteps to our houses of prayer and there, as the first act of the day, have paid our obeisance to our Almighty Father who is in Heaven; and then we gathered here to break bread together, and to share each other's fellowship, with the thought in mind that we will leave this place a little bit stronger than when we arrived, for we will be leaving with the good wishes of our brethren in our hearts. Would that we could start every day in this fashion, for then we would be ever mindful of the responsibilities which are ours, both as Masons and as Americans. We would then be able to gather the courage that we need to face the problems of our day; and problems, my brethren, we have.

From the very beginning of our Nation's history we have had problems. We have been confronted with one crisis after another, and we have survived as a nation primarily because of these crises; for each of them presented a challenge to us, and as we met the challenge day by day we became stronger in our convictions, strengthened in our purpose, and we developed a character which is known as the American; and we today inherit the steadfastness, the zeal, the courage, and the dedication of those who founded this Nation. In the forefront of those who established this country were members of our craft. Many of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Masons; and also many of Washington's generals. Down through history, wherever our country needed men of courage and conviction and trustworthiness, it often developed that they were members of our craft. They had a job to do for their young Nation; we have a job to do for the Nation that has grown out of their efforts.

The one fault I would find with Americans, if it can be called a fault, is that they take too much for granted. We know that ours is a great fraternity and a great country, but we sometimes forget that this Nation was not born out of wishful thinking, nor was our fraternity. This Nation resulted from the sacrifice of many dedicated men who were willing to offer their wealth, their position, their sacred honor, in order to establish here on this continent a new nation conceived as it is in liberty, and firmly based on the principle that we are all God's children; and that there should be equality of opportunity for every man, for every citizen, to develop his highest best, not for any selfish reason of his own, but that he may thereby be better enabled to contribute greatly to the success and prosperity of his Nation, this beloved land of ours, and of all mankind. Freemasonry, my brethren, has ever been in the forefront of every movement for democracy and for freedom, and come what may we will always be in the vanguard of the battle for the dignity of the human soul.

We face a particular crisis today. We have met a challenge straightforwardly, unequivocally; we have accepted the challenge that was laid at our doorstep and we are now willing to negotiate and, if need be, to fight for the preservation for our way of life. It may not be easy, but nothing that is worthwhile, my brethern, comes easily. This is a time when Americans must stand united behind the leaders of our Nation, and support them with calm dignity. The worst thing that we can do is to panic. The best is to preserve our calm, maintain our faith in these institutions which we cherish so dearly, and, with the help of Almighty God and the dedicated efforts of all Americans, we shall be vindicated in establishing the principles for which this country has ever stood. I am proud this morning to be an American.

With this realization, I think that we should do this a little bit more often. Confession is good for the soul, and it would be well for us to stand up every once in awhile and speak about the things we believe in, and the things for which we stand, rather than devote our time, and such talents as we may have, to decry those things which we do not like.

Let us be positive. Do you believe in Masonry? Work for it. Do you believe in America? Fight for it. Do you believe that there is one Almighty Parent in heaven, which makes us all members of the human family? Brethren, if you believe in that ideal, fight for it. In no other way can these precious liberties, and these wonderful privileges, be maintained and preserved for the generations that come after us.

I attended a cornerstone laying in Philmont recently, a quiet little village upstate. There we heard much about the history of the times that preceded the laying of that cornerstone. But histories, my brethren, are unimportant excepting what we may learn from the lessons of the past. The history that is important is the history that we make today. We make it by the things we do today, by the things we think today, and by the manner in which we live our lives. Every moment of today is the history of tomorrow, and you who sit before me now, are writing history. What kind of history will it be? Will it be the kind of history that you will be proud to have your children read? Will it be the kind of history on which future generations will look back and say, "There were men of courage." It must be that kind of history, and to the making of that history I enlist every member of our fraternity, and I would enlist every American, for we have the opportunity now of showing the world that Americans are not just a country of preachers. Americans are not just a group of people who mouth their sayings without meaning them. We can prove to the world that Americans, and especially Master Masons, believe in their preachings, practice their preachments, and are ready to fight to see that this preaching is put into practice and that these faiths that we espouse will prosper and go on to greater glory. Never, in the history of America, have the citizens been given such a challenge. Never has the proper response to that challenge been so important. This morning, my brethren, let us dedicate our-

selves to the thought that if we are going to be Masons, let us be better Masons. If we pride ourselves on being Americans, let us be better Americans. Let us work for the day when there will be peace on this troubled earth, when every man shall be free, when all of us can follow the dictates of our conscience, when all of us can work together for a better world.

May I read to you, in conclusion, the prayer that was uttered at one of our services this morning, and in which I ask you all to join. "Bless our country, that it may even be a stronghold of peace, and its advocate in the council of nations. May contentment reign within its borders, health and happiness within its homes. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship among all the inhabitants of our land; plant virtue in every soul; and may the love of Thy Name hallow every home, and every heart. Praised be Thou, O Lord, giver of peace."

Ohio's Favorite Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the 6 months since his appointment as Secretary of Health, Eduation, and Welfare, Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze has proven himself a tireless worker dedicated to the successful administration of his far-reaching Department. More recently, Secretary Celebrezze rendered extra service in his cordial meetings with Premier Amintore Fanfani, of Italy, serving to strengthen the ties between our nations.

The State of Ohio is proud of its favorite son, who has distinguished himself and continues to bring great honors to Ohio.

On Saturday, January 26, at the dinner meeting of the Ohio Society of Washington at the Lawyers Club, Secretary Celebrezze delivered the following inspiring address:

REMARKS BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Since I am a lawyer by trade and since all of us here are from Ohio, it occurred to me that you would indulge me in a stipulation or two about our State.

Without making too fine a legal point of it, I think that in these circumstances we can stipulate that Ohio is a great State—and that all Ohioans are great people.

As a matter of fact, I suppose on this occasion I could probably stipulate that Ohio is the greatest of all States. But that would be bragging, and since—among our many other virtues—we are naturally modest, we'll simply stipulate that we're a great group of people from a great State, leaving the superlatives to someone else. There are, after all, only so many superlatives, and those that New York and Texas haven't cornered, Alaska and California have—or will.

So acknowledging our natural modesty, we will simply confine ourselves to the facts. We will merely note that Ohio was the pioneer State in one of the most brilliant chapters in American history—the development of the Northwest Territory—and that it has been a leader ever since.

We'll merely note that Ohio is blessed with rich soil, abundant water, healthful climate, and all other characteristics of a fine piece of real estate and that its people are industrious, imaginative, honest, forthright, progressive, conservative, and otherwise—by any standard—quite without fault.

I could, of course, go on. But having stipulated these self-evident facts, I am sure none of us wants to dwell overlong on the past or even on the present. The past is static—at least to the extent that it doesn't get rewritten. And there's not much any of us can do about the present—it, too, is in the process of freezing into the past.

But the future. That's where the great game is—always ahead of us. The seed not yet planted, the machine not yet invented, the song not yet sung—these are the things that lead us on.

Now, don't misunderstand me. I don't underrate the past. It is not only important, it is imperative that we understand and interpret the past. It is imperative that we grasp the significance of the present. We must know the past and appreciate the present if we are to command—and not be commanded by—the future.

But granted the most penetrating analysis of the past, the most sensitive appreciation of the present—granted all that, and the future is still an uncertain business.

What will the world be like—10, 20, 30 years from now? What will America be like? What will Ohio be like?

No one, of course, can know with certainty. But we do know that what each of us does or does not do tomorrow may—and in all probability will—have some bearing on the shape of things to come.

The other evening I was in Cleveland helping to celebrate the 70th birthday anniversary of a great and wonderful friend—Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. And I quoted some of Rabbi Silver's own words from an address he had given several years ago.

"We have long been admonished by our sages not to observe the wind too closely lest we fail to sow, nor to regard the clouds with too much concern lest we fail to reap."

I like those words—let us not observe the wind too closely lest we fail to sow or regard the clouds with too much concern lest we fail to reap.

Somehow these words remind me of the traveler who stopped to ask the way of a local citizen. You all know the story of how the local citizen, after deep thought and a number of false starts, finally gave up and said to the traveler: "You can't get there from here."

We are seeking our way to the 21st century. It is just over the horizon, but how do we get there from here? Or more precisely, how do we go about making the world of the 21st century the kind of world we want it to be?

From some of the things you read, you sometimes get the notion that there's no way to get to the 21st century from here and that anyone who tries to figure it out ought to have his head—and even his motives—examined.

I expect that somehow we'll make it, but I thing we can stipulate that it's going to take some doing. We're going to have to do a lot of sowing, wind or no wind, and a lot of reaping, clouds or no clouds.

It takes a lot of work to keep a nation like this humming. But work is no problem. We seem to like work, and I am sure we will continue to like it.

The point is that it isn't enough in this day and age—if indeed it ever was—merely to get "A" for effort. The really difficult part is making our efforts, as individuals and as a nation, count. And that means developing and using all our resources.

Up to now, I haven't mentioned my dominant concerns, and I don't intend to burden you with them this evening. But since we are making some stipulations, I think we must stipulate that progress in the fields of health, education, and welfare are essential to our progress as a nation.

And we have made progress in all these fields. We are spending more money for medical research than any nation on earth, we have provided more education for more people than any nation in history, and we are spending billions of dollars a year to see that no one is destitute.

In short, we have gone to considerable trouble to deal with those problems which are of manifest public concern. The question is, Are we really taking advantage of our opportunities in these fields?

I suggest that merely alleviating human problems is a costly investment. I suggest that this approach belongs to a less enlightened, less resourceful age.

The youth loitering on the street corner, out of school, out of work—is he merely a problem, or does he represent an opportunity?

The once-clean river, laden by waste and debris—is this merely a problem, or does cleaning it up represent an opportunity for progress?

The mentally ill, living out their lives in custodial institutions because known methods of treatment are not available to them—are they merely problems, or do they represent opportunities for constructive action?

In a less enlightened, less resourceful age, the most we could hope to do in dealing with problems of health, education, and welfare was to try to relieve the symptoms.

But times have changed. We now know that it is possible, through timely and constructive action, to prevent many of the problems that have beset humanity throughout the ages.

It seems to me the better part of prudence that we steadily move in that direction—in the direction not only of dealing with problems after they have arisen but in the direction of preventing them from occurring in the first place.

There is nothing, it seems to me, quite so important to our progress and well-being as a nation as increasing the vitality of our educational system. I think you will agree that this becomes more and more evident as we advance further and further into the age of technology.

Consider merely one product of technology—automation. Consider the problems it poses for our educational system—and the opportunities it offers for increased productivity and the manifold benefits that go with it. But we must look upon automation as an opportunity for all—rather than a problem for many—if its true value is to be realized.

Well, I said I wouldn't burden you this evening with these concerns. If I haven't kept my promise, I apologize. But in all candor, I think we must stipulate that the work of the great State of Ohio is not yet done.

I think we must stipulate that Ohio, in common with all the other States, must not rest on past achievements but must keep moving forward—toward the 21st century.

There is bound to be a way to get there from here—if we will but find it.

Adlai Stevenson and the Cuban Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning's edition of the Washington

Post carried a very interesting and informative editorial concerning a situation illustrative of the less effective side of American journalism. The editorial refers to the role played by U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban crisis and subsequent revelations of his actions by a national magazine.

History has wasted no time vindicating Ambassador Stevenson, and I hope that this incident, painful as it has been to Mr. Stevenson, has taught us that eavesdropping and supposition are not suitable substitutes for factual reporting and analysis based on the facts of diplomatic life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUTABLE MUNICH

"We're eyeball to eyeball, and I think the other fellow just blinked." So began the celebrated Saturday Evening Post account of the Cuban crisis as written by Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett. Near the end, this passage occurs: "Only Adlai Stevenson, who flew down from New York on Saturday, dissented from the Excomm consensus. There is disagreement in retrospect about what Stevenson really wanted. 'Adlai wanted a Munich,' says a nonadmiring official who learned of his proposal. 'He wanted to trade the Turkish, Italian and British missile bases for the Cuban bases'."

Last week a curious footnote was written to the melancholy controversy over Mr. Stevenson. President Kennedy confirmed at his news conference that the missile bases in Turkey, Italy and Great Britain are being phased out in favor of Polaris, "a much more modern weapon." Mr. Kennedy concluded by remarking, "I think we are going to be in a stronger position."

In other words, what would have been a Munich in September became a matter of modernization in January. Surely this ought to serve as a sobering lesson to those who persist in evincing a retrospective rectitude about what may or may not have gone on in the secret councils of state during a moment of supreme crisis. Mr. Kennedy would have been derelict if he had not considered the missiles bases as part of the diplomatic equation, especially since their removal does not, on the President's testimony, lessen western security. Events have brought Mr. Stevenson and his critics eyeball to eyeball, and it looks suspiciously as if history has just winked.

Quincy Soldier Cited in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress an award given to a brave young man who lives in my district. Pfc. Kenneth B. Eaves of 282 Wilson Avenue, Quincy, Mass., graduated from high school in 1961. He is a former newspaper boy and is a typical young American who is courageously doing his duty in order that peace may be established in the world. In this far-off place Kenneth Eaves is engaged in combat just as deadly and as dangerous as any battlefield in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict. It is fitting that we should recognize the great sacrifices being made by these brave young Americans. Their devotion to duty, to God, and country has never been excelled.

I enclose a news story that appeared Thursday, January 24, 1963, in the Quincy Patriot Ledger that reads as follows:

QUINCY SOLDIER CITED FOR VIETNAM HEROISM

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A 20-year-old helicopter gunner from Quincy, Mass., was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross today by U.S. Army Chief of Staff Gen. Earle G. Wheeler for heroism in a battle January 2.

WAS WOUNDED

Pfc. Kenneth B. Eaves of 282 Wilson Avenue, Wollaston, was shot down twice and slightly wounded in the leg in five missions during the 12-hour battle of Ap Bac.

He was 1 of 12 American soldiers awarded medals today.

Three Americans died and Vietnamese Government Forces suffered heavy losses in the battle with Viet Cong rebels about 40 miles south of Saigon.

Eaves, a machinegunner on a U.S. Army troop-carrying helicopter, has been stationed in this embattled country for 9 months.

On one mission, though covered with oil from a burst pipeline, he continued to fire his machinegun until his helicopter crashed. He survived the crash and waded across 100 yards of knee-deep mud to reach a rescue helicopter.

The gunner, his Distinguished Flying Cross dangling from his shirt, said after the ceremony: "I will stay in the Army and I hope to join the Special Forces."

FORMER NEWSBOY

Eaves, a 1961 graduate of North Quincy High School, has been in South Vietnam since last April. From junior high school until his sophomore year at North Quincy he was a Patriot Ledger carrier boy.

Five Distinguished Flying Crosses, six Bronze Medals and one Air Medal were awarded. Seven went to helicopter pilots and crewmembers and the other five were to military advisers.

"This is a dirty, nasty, little war," General Wheeler said in the ceremony at Soc Trang, a major American helicopter base 100 miles southwest of Saigon. Referring to the Normandy invasion of France, he said:

"You know you can get killed here just as easy as you would landing on Omaha Beach."

It was a "lonesome war," he added.

But he said although some might consider the Vietnam war a strange war in a strange country, no American should feel alien in any country fighting for freedom.

Address by Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze Before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on January 19 the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, was honored to have as their main speaker our great Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze. The speech given by my personal friend Secretary Celebrezze set forth as well as anything I have read regarding our national objectives in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS [1] BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Madam President, distinguished colleagues. Seldom do I have the opportunity to speak before an audience whose major concerns, both personal and professional, are so deeply meshed with my own and so broadly extended over the field of government.

We are, each of us, in one way or another, trustees of the public welfare. Together we share the task of administering to the needs of the American people, and together we share the tremendous responsibility of safeguarding the future of democratic institutions both here and around the world.

It is fitting, at the beginning of this new year—at the beginning of this new legislative session—that we should pause to redefine our common goals and to examine some of the issues surrounding them.

Abraham Lincoln once observed that, "If we could first see where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

President Kennedy, on Monday, provided such an overview on the state of the Union.

Today, I would like to make some further observations concerning our national objectives in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

These objectives and the means of meeting them have often been the subject of vigorous public debate.

I am not dismayed by this attention. It reflects the fact that the programs of our Department touch directly, most intimately, the interests and concerns of the individual citizens of our Nation. Their spirited reaction to our programs and proposals is not something to be deplored. It is a very healthy sign of American democracy in action.

It is through such debate that we are able to reconcile differing points of view and produce a consensus that serves as a basis for action.

It is this that propels our Nation forward. When we fail to reach a consensus on matters of urgent public need, as in education, for example, then we are in trouble. For unless our Nation can move forward, not only we Americans but free peoples everywhere are imperiled.

How to resolve the differences that divide and tend to immobilize us, how to keep this Nation moving along on all fronts, is the function of government, the function of politics, the function of responsible citizenship. It is your job and mine.

It requires the free flow of ideas. It requires honest effort at accommodation among the special interests that are bound to exist in a pluralistic society such as ours. It requires broad perspective and broad understanding of all these interests.

I am most concerned that we should understand each other, you and I and the pub-

[1] Before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Grand Ballroom, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., Saturday, Jan. 19, 1963, 12:30 p.m., e.s.t.

lic at large, on the fundamental issues concerning our objectives in health, education, and welfare.

Let us see ourselves first in the broadest possible perspective before we attempt to resolve the finite issues that appear to divide us. There is much that we are agreed upon, and from this vantage point I am certain that we can move to even closer understandings and to more productive leadership for the Nation as a whole.

In a global and historic perspective we know these things:

That we are a nation of 185 million people in a world of 3 billion, one-third of whom live under the yoke of communism;

That we share grave responsibility for leadership of the free world;

That we are a people of diverse national origins and races, with differing religious and political beliefs, who have made a common commitment to defend the freedom of man and to support the rule of law.

We are also a compassionate people, a people of good conscience, whose concern for the well-being of others is a fundamental and active component of our democratic way of life.

In the history of the world, ours is a unique experiment in democracy. It is true that we have fulfilled many of the great expectations of our Founding Fathers. We have survived the bitter tests of civil strife and economic hardship—of world conflict and militantly challenging ideologies. Our people have prospered. Our national stature has grown.

But the time of testing is not yet over. We are not preordained either to succeed or to fail. Our destiny will be determined by our actions, by our response to the needs and the aspirations of mankind today and tomorrow, here and around the globe.

During the last 20 years, since the end of World War II, the world has been undergoing a remarkable change in human attitudes.

This social and political change which we are experiencing is still too close for objective evaluation. That will be a task for future historians. But we can perceive its general outlines in the changing social, political, and economic structure of Western democratic states.

The change was heralded by Franklin D. Roosevelt when he added "freedom from want" to the essential rights of man. It was echoed by Winston Churchill when he proclaimed our era "the century of the common man." One of its first major international expressions was the Marshall plan, a truly historic gesture of man's concern for his fellow man which infused the nations of Western Europe with new life and new hope.

The concept of the Atlantic Community, the growth of the European Common Market, the Truman doctrine, the decolonization of Asia and Africa, the Alliance for Progress in our own hemisphere, all these are manifestations of the interdependence of free nations and of the rising hopes and expectations of free peoples for a new kind of society, for creation of what President Kennedy has called "a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

This is the promise of democracy. Whether this new world of law ultimately comes into being will depend to a considerable extent on us, on our own continued strength, on our ability to achieve social and economic progress in our own land. We must continue to demonstrate that a free society is a viable society in which the rights of man are guaranteed, in which the common good is sought by common consent, in which civilization can grow and prosper.

This is the larger picture. But it is in this context that I would like you to consider this administration's objectives in health, education, and welfare. For we can no longer view the needs of our society or the obligations of our Government without an awareness of our place in the family of man.

Deterrents to progress in our land are no different from those in any other. Disease and poverty, ignorance and idleness all bear the same form and wear the same face. We are pledged to overcome them. Not all of them today, or tomorrow, or even perhaps in this generation. But we are pledged to make a fresh start. And we have made a fresh start.

We have begun by reaffirming our faith in the individual, in the 185 million men, women, and children who make up our national family. Our goal is to increase their personal freedom, to enlarge their capacity to build a good life for themselves and their families.

We believe that this can best be done by preventing the conditions that lead to dependency, to loss of personal freedom. Or, if we are too late, we would seek to restore their independence, to help them to help themselves.

In every field of social action, in health, in education, in welfare, these approaches are applicable. And they make sense.

Our social security system provides basic economic independence for retired or disabled workers, their widows, and surviving children. This does not intrude upon individual freedom and dignity. It makes them possible.

Our proposal to extend this insurance system to meet the basic health needs of the aged is another preventive measure, bearing no relation to socialized medicine. It would help protect the economic independence of older people by allowing them to insure themselves against some of the crippling costs of illness by prepaying part of these costs during their working years.

In the field of education we are facing a national crisis of alarming proportions. The growth of our economy is stunted on the one hand by the large and still growing number of educationally handicapped people, more than 8 million functional illiterates, 1 million school dropouts each year, and hundreds of thousands of men and women whose skills are becoming obsolete in today's highly developed industrial society. On the other hand we are experiencing a severe shortage of highly skilled manpower, particularly in the scientific and technical fields.

Thus, important national objectives are threatened by inadequacies in our educational system. Federal aid is clearly indicated, but of necessity can be only a small part of the total $30 billion invested annually in this country for education from all sources. Accordingly, the Federal contribution to education must be used to the maximum possible advantage of our schools.

Primarily, as President Kennedy pointed out in his budget message, Federal aid must "provide a major impetus to the solution of a selected number of critical educational problems."

The President has proposed that the Office of Education be strengthened and that the National Science Foundation play an increasing role in supporting the education of scientists and engineers. Other phases of the program, to quote the President, are designed "to obtain improved quality in all levels and types of education * * * to help break crucial bottlenecks in the capacity of our educational system by providing funds for building expansion * * * to increase opportunities for individuals to obtain education and training by broadening and facilitating access to colleges and universities and by providing an expanded range of technical, vocational, and professional training opportunities for teachers and students."

This is not too ambitious a program for America. Every phase of it is geared to stimulate State and local activity in overcoming an immediate and urgent national need.

And every phase of the porgram, in one way or another, has this objective: To prevent the tragic waste of stunted intellectual development in individual human lives and to assure that the Nation has the skills and brainpower it will need for the long haul in the years to come.

This program stands on its merits.

In the field of health, the principle of preventive and protective Federal action in concert with the States and local communities has long been practiced with success. The record of the Public Health Service is one of progressive triumphs over the agents of death, human suffering, and disease.

These efforts will be continued and strengthened and hopefully expanded to include national programs to prevent the appalling waste of human lives resulting from mental retardation, from drug addiction, from accidents, and other causes.

Our public health needs today are further complicated by manmade hazards in the environment, by the pollution of our waterways and the contamination of our atmosphere from industrial wastes, automobile exhaust, and the very same chemicals that serve to protect us.

During the last Congress we sought and received authority to strengthen our nationwide program of water pollution control, a major legislative achievement. We believe that effective air pollution control will require a major joint effort of nationwide scope.

We are also concerned about our manpower needs in the health fields. Today's shortages of doctors and dentists, nurses and public health specialists will not be overcome because we are already too late to do much about them. Tomorrow's shortages we can prevent by preparing for tomorrow's needs. This will require a huge national effort to expand our medical teaching facilities, to increase enrollments in medical schools by at least 50 percent and in dental schools by 100 percent.

These are our major objectives in health, education, and welfare. I believe they are sound objectives. They are all aimed at guarding and conserving our human resources, protecting the health and well-being of the individual citizens of this Nation and promoting its general welfare.

They are forthright, practical, and responsible approaches to difficult social and economic problems that must be solved.

The tasks we face today are not the same as those of yesterday. They require new approaches, new tools, and the testing of new ideas. Only by remaining flexible in our thinking and in our attitudes can we meet the challenges of change.

And change we must, for the status quo is neither safe nor desirable. We are by nature an open society, a dynamic society, that is responsive to the needs of its people and protective of their human rights. Other nations are looking to us, and we shall not disappoint them.

Among our goals, as you are well aware, is the provision of equal rights and opportunities for women.

We have not yet provided a fully satisfactory answer to Susan Anthony's question: "Are women persons?" In spite of the progress we have made in securing for women their basic rights, there remain shameful inequalities and prejudices that prevent the full partnership of women in our democracy.

The establishment by the President of his Commission on the Status of Women is a frank acknowledgment that much more can and needs to be done to assure that women in our society are part of "the whole body of the people." The Federal Government has assumed its leadership responsibility in this

area by translating intent into action. Our department has consistently supported a nondiscrimination policy in employment and promotions and will continue to do so.

But we do not need to be convinced of the huge contributions that women can make to the advancement of the Nation's welfare. We know how great it has been and can be.

We rely, perhaps more than any other Federal agency, on the efforts of women to further our programs of social improvement through voluntary and professional activity at national, State, and local levels.

We also rely on your leadership.

In the important unfinished business of achieving social progress in our land, this year and in the years to come, may we continue to benefit from your leadership, your talents, and from the high sense of purpose and dedication that you bring to the conduct of public affairs.

Quiet, but Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years the people of Indiana have been extremely fortunate to have the services of Mr. Robert Kellum as executive secretary of the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission.

During this period many important and progressive strides have been made in Indiana to conquer the annual threats of flood and develop the State's water resources for the betterment of the entire State.

No individual has played a more important role in the solving of these difficult and time-consuming problems than Mr. Kellum who has served with a quiet efficiency becoming of any public official.

The recent resignation of Mr. Kellum from his post leaves a vacancy that will be extremely difficult to fill.

In honor of the 12 years' work by Mr. Kellum the Indianapolis Star recently published an editorial which depicts with clarity and accuracy the service rendered to the State of Indiana by Mr. Kellum.

The editorial from the Indianapolis Star follows:

QUIET, BUT EFFECTIVE

Those who are associated with him for any period of time soon learn that Bob Kellum is a quiet-spoken man of great sincerity not given to exaggeration or overstatement.

His comment on resigning as executive secretary of the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission is typical. Kellum wrote after 12 years' service, "It does seem to me that the commission can take credit for a number of extremely important developments that will be of lasting benefit to the people of Indiana." That statement hardly tells the progress in this field during a tenure that spanned four governors and both political parties.

Flood control and the conservation of water resources have been solidly established as matters of prime importance in Indiana under Bob Kellum's able and patient leadership. The scope of this work ranges from relatively small projects to the huge Monroe Reservoir, and the ambitious program to check flooding on the upper Wabash. Local flood control programs have benefited from his quiet cooperation.

The Star is proud that such an outstanding citizen is part of its family. Hoosiers should applaud a public servant who can leave a responsible office knowing his accomplishments will, in fact, "touch every segment of the population in some way."

In Retrospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, three Congressmen have the distinction of representing former Presidents of the United States.

Residents of the 19th District of Pennsylvania are delighted to have the most recently retired President as its No. 1 citizen.

The following editorial appearing in the Friday January 25, issue of the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa., is eloquent testimony to the high regard in which he is held by one man. A great majority of people everywhere would subscribe to the statements which follow:

J.F.K.'S YEARS—HOW HAS IKE FARED?

(By David Lawrence)

This is the second-anniversary week for the Kennedy administration, and a lot has been written lately evaluating what has happened since the inauguration in 1961.

So maybe it is timely to examine retrospectively how Mr. Kennedy's predecessor has fared in the last 2 years, how Dwight Eisenhower has weathered the storm of contrasts to which he has been so often subjected since he left the White House.

For it seems that President Kennedy's speechwriters are politically expert enough to make sure that, when anything bad develops on the current scene—for instance, the early phases of the Cuban controversy—the public must be told that the whole thing originated under the Eisenhower administration anyhow.

Indeed, the other day, in defending America's prominent role in supporting the U.N. intervention in the Congo—which is growing in unpopularity—the official White House statement was careful to put the umbrella of virtue over the existing policy by intimating that it was the preceding administration which had initiated U.N. efforts to harmonize things in the Congo.

Except, however, for these occasional efforts to gloss over delicate situations that may not be popular with the people, the tendency of the Presidential speech writers now is to imply that the U.S. Government really began to function only after January 20, 1961.

Perhaps General Eisenhower, quietly sojourning at Gettysburg or Palm Springs, is given to reflective soliloquy. He must be happy to read that, after all, it apparently was all right for him to go to Augusta, Ga., to play golf or to be away from the White House on vacation and weekend trips. For the latest statistics from the White House confirm that, whether on official or unofficial travel, Mr. Kennedy, during his first 2 years in office, has been out of Washington more days than was his predecessor during the same period in office. It is quite clear that such statistics will be considered meaningless now, for it is being said that the President has to keep moving if the country is to keep moving.

As for big crises when the people's hair stood on end, the impression has been conveyed that this happened for the first time when the "quarantine" was imposed around Cuba last October. Yet the tensest moment in recent history occurred when President Eisenhower and the Congress took a firm stand to ward off any attacks on Quemoy and Matsu that might lead to an invasion of Formosa. Red China has been and is far more irresponsible than the Soviet Union.

There was tension, too, when American Marines landed in Lebanon in 1958 in a turbulent Middle East situation. But these events today seem as far away as the Korean war, which wound up under President Eisenhower's administration in 1953.

When it comes to domestic problems, Mr. Eisenhower can look back on his relations with Congress as satisfactory in the main, even though the Democrats were in control of both Houses for 6 out of his 8 years. He didn't pick fights with the Democratic leaders but tried instead to preserve harmony and thus get his programs adopted. He must today view the passing scene with extraordinary interest because, theoretically at least, Mr. Kennedy has a majority in both Houses but is troubled by the same Republican-Democratic coalition of nonradicals that helped Mr. Eisenhower.

Eight years is a long time for a man to occupy the White House and the business of the National Government is so heavy from day to day that it must have caused Mr. Eisenhower to arch his eyebrows when his political opponents spoke of him as a do-nothing President. Maybe he does have some qualms of regret that he didn't engage in such publicity operations as Mr. Kennedy's energetic staff have conducted so intensively. For lots of things that Mr. Eisenhower did quietly and without fanfare would have made good news stories or fascinating shows on TV.

Mr. Eisenhower is basically a military man. He has an orderly mind and, as President, he followed a system of organized staff work. He constantly delegated tasks to his subordinates. He didn't try to be his own Secretary of State. He listened to his Joint Chiefs of Staff on military matters, even though he had been commanding general of the largest Armed Force in the world in a major war. Anyone who says he didn't keep in touch with what was going on every hour of the day, whether he was at the White House or away, doesn't know the fidelity with which such a man dedicates himself to his job.

After 2 years out of office, Ike continues in his own way to be useful to his country. While he makes speeches and indulges in criticism on domestic policies, he never impugns the patriotic motives or conscientious purposes of his successor—and that's one measure of the meritorious behavior of any former President of the United States.

More From Mohawk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think most Members of Congress would be in-

terested in the following editorial from the Watertown Daily Times. At a time when airlines are demanding continued subsidy assistance from the Federal Government, it seems in poor taste to offer better inducements to air travel to potential customers abroad than to those of us who use the facilities at home, and are frequently subjected to erratic performance.

I think it might be well for the CAB to take a good look at the proposal mentioned in the editorial of January 24:

MORE FROM MOHAWK

The accusation has been made, not infrequently, and perhaps justifiably that we pick on Mohawk airlines. We cannot let the latest missive from Mohawk move past us without at least a plaintive comment.

Mohawk has announced that, effective March 1, a foreign visitor to the United States may purchase for $99 an airline ticket good for unlimited travel on Mohawk routes for 30 days. How about that? And how about the loyal regular patrons of Mohawk—loyal, that is, through thick and thin—getting in on this? Does it seem too much to ask that for every foreign visitor's ticket sold one should be offered at the same price to a regular customer?

The 1963 Feed Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, farmers will soon be making a decision as to whether or not to participate in the 1963 feed grain program. Since the feed grain program, in itself, is somewhat complicated and since there are important differences in the 1963 program, as compared to 1962, I was pleased to find in the February 1963 issue of Successful Farming magazine, an objective explanation. I believe the Members of the House of Representatives will find this analysis helpful in explaining to their constituents provisions of the 1963 feed grain program and I accordingly, under unanimous consent, include portions of the article with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

(By Fred Bailey, Jr., and Bill Brantley)

"Figuring with a sharp pencil or a dull one," Secretary Freeman recently said, "farmers will be money ahead to sign up for this year's feed grain program." Before you rush into a contract, however, take time to figure it with your own pencil.

Some farmers will get bigger Government payments than last year. But others will collect less. And few if any will find it as profitable to divert "extra" acres. As finally settled on, here's the program—with sign-up beginning February 1 and ending March 22.

All or nothing. Be sure to realize from the outset that this year you must divert all the acres you agree to divert in order to be eligible for any payments or price support. It's a new rule for 1963. And if you receive partial payment, then fail to comply in full, you forfeit the money and must return it (possibly with interest; this hadn't been decided at press time).

A three-crop program. Corn, grain sorghum, and barley are combined into a single program in 1963. Barley was separate last year. Thus, under the new program, your farm's feed grain "base" will be the average 1959–60 acreage of the three grains. (If your 1963 barley crop is in the ground, you can still participate in the program by reducing your total feed grain acreage.)

To participate, you must divert at least 20 percent of your 1963 base acreage. But you can, as in past years, divert more. The maximum per farm is 40 percent of your base or 25 acres, whichever is larger. In no case, of course, can the total diversion exceed your base.

Participation in the program entitles you to—

1. Diversion payments: These are paid on the acres you divert and they vary according to the crop idled. Payments average 20 percent of county support rate (national averages: Corn—$1.25, grain sorghum—$2, barley—96 cents) times normal—1959–60—yield of acres diverted. On acres diverted over the minimum 20 percent, payment is 50 percent of the local support rate times normal production.

2. Direct payments: These are 18 cents a bushel for corn, 14 cents a bushel for barley, or 29 cents a hundred for grain sorghum. You'll get the appropriate rate times the normal yield on the acres you plant for harvest.

3. Price support loan or purchase agreement: The CCC loan for this year's crop is $1.07 a bushel for corn, $1.71 a hundred for grain sorghum, and 82 cents a bushel for barley. It's available on your total 1963 production. Last year it was limited to normal production.

Other program details: Oats and rye are not included in the 1963 program, so you can plant all of them you want and still get price support on them—whether or not you participate in the program for other crops. National average support price on oats is 65 cents a bushed, and on rye $1.07 a bushel.

There's special payment this year to encourage small growers (those with a base of 25 acres or less) to divert their entire base acreage under the program. They will be paid at 50 percent of the support price for their full diversion.

Malting barley is not exempt in this year's program. So if you grow it, you must participate in the 1963 feed grain program to be eligible for price support.

About soybeans: There's no cross compliance. That is, you don't have to participate in the feed grain program to get soybean support. But you may be required to maintain your farm's total soil conserving and idle acreage to qualify for soybean loan. This rule wasn't firm at press time, so check your ASCS office.

What to do with diverted acres? USDA says the land diverted must be put to a conserving use, and that it must be in addition to the average acreage of conserving and idle land on the farm for 1959–60.

Payments you receive for diverting acres under the 1963 wheat or feed grain programs are only one part of the bargain you enter into when you sign up. There also are some obligations, and some opportunities you shouldn't miss on the handling of diverted acres.

Remember—your contract with the Government is just that—a contract. And the payments it offers are conditioned on a big "if". If you live up to your side of the agreement. So be sure you know just what is required. Here are some reminders on the requirements.

1. You must maintain your farm's normal soil-conserving acreage. This means the average number of acres in noncrop use during 1959 and 1960 must be maintained. Generally speaking, whatever conserving use this land was put to during this 2-year base period is considered an acceptable use for 1963.

And the acres you get paid for diverting under either the wheat or feed grain programs must be in addition to the above soil-conserving base.

2. The diverted acres must be from land currently used for crop production or from land previously under a Government conservation contract.

3. The law further requires that producers must keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. Chances are you can comply with this requirement simply by having the land in a suitable grass or legume soil-conserving cover.

Close mowing of diverted acres keeps weeds from seeding and controls foxtail, ragweed, smartweed, and similar weeds. If bindweed is a problem, or noxious weeds such as Canada thistle, perennial sow thistle, and horse nettle, spot spraying with 2,4–D will kill them.

Nationally, the USDA lists dozens of acceptable conservation uses for diverted acres. But a word of warning: By no means are all of these considered acceptable in all counties. Best bet is to check with your county ASCS office.

4. An other rule you should know about prohibits bringing new cropland into production, unless you make an equal reduction in present cropland. Otherwise, you will be subject to an acre-for-acre reduction in your diversion payments.

5. Except for specially permitted crops, diverted acres cannot be harvested or grazed during the contract period. The ban on grazing begins at the end of the signup period and is usually lifted after normal harvesttime.

Specific crops you can grow on all or part of the acres diverted from wheat or feed grains this year are: Guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, and castor beans.

You can grow and harvest these crops without affecting your eligibility for wheat or feed grain program benefits, but your diversion payments will be reduced, and with safflower, you forfeit all the payment. With sesame, you get 40 percent of the farm's regular diversion rate; guar and castor beans 30 percent; sunflower, 20 percent.

Note that production of flaxseed, rapeseed, and mustard seed will not be permitted this year on diverted acres.

What about starting crops next fall on diverted acres? Yes, you can, if it's a crop that's normally fall-seeded, and one you will not harvest before the end of the year when your contract ends.

This means you can start crops such as alfalfa, wheat, barley, or winter oats next fall on diverted acres. You can start new orchards of fruit or nut trees on diverted acres, too, provided required conservation measures are followed.

Seedling legumes or grasses is probably one of the best ways to use your idle acres. Although you can't harvest the crop while the land is in the program, this is a good way to establish a hay crop for the following year. Or you can plow it under and build up soil fertility.

Since legumes on diverted land don't have to be managed to produce good feed, there's no point in clipping early, unless you want to avoid too heavy a blanket of material on the ground. By waiting until late-bloom stage to clip alfalfa, reserves build up in the roots and crowns, strengthening the plants.

A topdressing of phosphate and potash is recommended on established legume stands. The reason is that legume clippings left on the soil result in a buildup of nitrogen. This favors grasses at the expense of the legume.

Check into getting conservation cost-sharing help through the ASCS. While the law doesn't specifically provide for ACP cost-sharing on diverted acres, neither does it prohibit it. The decision is left up to individual county committees. So visit your local ASCS office to find out about this and for answers to other questions about diverted acres.

The Political Perils of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article points up the extreme partisanship of this administration. The Kennedy family in building their ruthless, political juggernaut is perfectly willing to sacrifice national policies to gain one seat in the House as evidenced by the Dr. Walter Judd case.

More than any other Member of the House, Dr. Judd was responsible for the passage of the foreign-aid legislation last session. This case should be a warning to other Members of the House that you cannot buy political immunity by going along, but you possibly can purchase internal revenue immunity or antitrust immunity by giving $1,000 for a Presidential interview or $1 million to free the Cubans.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article by William S. White which was published in the Washington Star, January 28, 1963:

THE POLITICAL PERILS OF FOREIGN AID

(By William S. White)

Both past and present instances of small bore Democratic partisanship have already brought danger to the only proper conduct of our foreign policy—which is to say its bipartisan conduct. They may bring yet more.

The Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have just repaid President Kennedy's participation in the defeat last fall of the veteran internationalist Representative Walter Judd, of Minnesota. They have calmly stacked the Republican side of the House Foreign Affairs Committee with five new anti-foreign-aid members.

This comes at a time when the continuation of the foreign aid program, one of the keys to the administration's world approach, is admittedly in hard straits in Congress.

No one on the administration's side can fairly cry "foul" at this action of the GOP. For if ever there was a case of built-in and inevitable tit for tat it was this unhappy instance of Presidential intervention against a first-rate Member of Congress simply bebecause he happened to be in the other party.

Judd in fact risked his political life last fall by staying on in Washington to assist Mr. Kennedy's then current foreign aid bill—while the President was out in Minnesota demanding Judd's head in behalf of the Democratic Party.

It was a singularly clear illustration of the odd unwisdom of President Kennedy's uncharacteristic decision to go all out in a domestic campaign to return a Democratic Congress which just might be more amenable to him on such relatively picayune issues as medicare.

The President has always regarded the cold war as neither a Democratic nor a Republican but simply an all-American undertaking. But for this momentary switch from his usual course he has tried to keep partisan home politics out of his foreign policy.

Whatever moved him, it was a melancholy "victory" for him. For Judd's absence from the House will cause the President infinitely more trouble on the things that really matter than any possible gain it can bring him on the things that matter a great deal less.

Nor is this the end. While the House Republicans have been moving to retaliate, the ultraliberal Senate Democrats have been maneuvering in a characteristically myopic way to spread the damage, by way of both petty ideological and purely party partisanship.

They have been attempting to bar the Senate Republican leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, from a seat on the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee. They proceed here on the curious theory that DIRKSEN is likely to be critical of the President's tax bill; ergo, DIRKSEN has no right to be on the committee.

But this touches foreign policy, too, because DIRKSEN until now has been a tower of bipartisan strength to the President on all the top foreign crises in which he has thus far had to be engaged.

The same Democratic ultraliberals are running a muttering campaign against the ascent to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the few public men in the country who have been right about Castro Cuba from the start, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida. SMATHERS' crime? Why, he does not support the President on every little domestic issue that may come up.

The ultraliberals are highly unlikely to be able to bar either DIRKSEN or SMATHERS from earned committee advancement. The mere fact that they have set off upon these absurd and juvenile vendettas, however, will surely do nothing to promote bipartisan foreign policy unity in a world in upheaval everywhere. The President himself could do worse than to call off these frantic advocates of a total conformism at the cost of what really matters—the proper, or bipartisan, conduct of foreign policy.

Congress Must Assume Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of Saturday, January 26, 1963.

CONGRESS MUST ASSUME CONTROL

A feeling of dismay is sweeping over the country.

A cascade of words is tumbling out of Washington—but they seem to make little sense to the people. We speak for the Western Alliance—and our allies reel in doubt and confusion.

The President's fiscal program has lost all meaning. Even leading members of his own party, and many of them normally political liberals, also seem bewildered.

On the one hand, the President says taxes are a drag on the economy, proposes to cut them and practice fiscal frugality; on the other hand, he dumps on Congress a vast new spending package and waves aside a fantastic deficit.

As one Democratic Congressman is supposed to have expressed it, "if that is being frugal, I'm Peter Rabbit."

Walter Heller, the professorial Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, says he has the answer to all of this. He says that the deficit merely "means, after all, that the Government is putting more money into the economy than it is taking out."

The old chain-letter fad seems to have been adapted to economics. Even the President refers to a "chain reaction" of spending, as if every dollar not collected in taxes and every dollar that is spent by the Government automatically carries its own seed of prosperity.

What has emerged in Washington, and is being passed off as a fiscal program, is a hodgepodge reflecting the diverse suggestions coming to the President from left-liberal politicians, radical professors, immature advisers, and assorted speech writers. Dropped in here and there, with an eye to public support, are concessions to conservative, or orthodox thinking.

Tax reduction is necessary for economic growth, but it was too much to expect that those who sought more Federal power would suddenly favor a freer economy. The administration is merely restoring inflation. The President's messages have been speeches more than programs.

In these messages the President has almost abdicated his responsibility. He has swept up a conflicting mass of ideas and thrown them at Congress—or you might say, at the people.

If it all doesn't work, he says, he'll try something else.

To whom are the people to turn for guidance? For understanding of what is right or wrong?

The Congress must step in and take hold of the Government of the United States, as far as constitutionally possible.

The Congress must immediately assert its full authority over the spending and taxing powers of Government and over its fiscal policies. It should throw out the President's program in its entirety, and begin the task of charting a clear and acceptable course of action.

The United States cannot be governed by chance and by theory. Congress must act, for the good of the country.

The appropriate committees of the Senate and House also must begin thorough hearings into our foreign policy, our relations with our allies, into the truth about the situation in Cuba, and into the manipulation of public information.

Let's find out what is going on, who is doing what and why, and what can be done about it.

George Washington Alumni Rank High in Number of Federal Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across an article relating to the alumni of the George Washington University and thought that since there are so many of them in the public service it

would be of interest and include it herewith:

GEORGE WASHINGTON ALUMNI RANK HIGH IN NUMBER OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVES

The George Washington University ranks first (men) and second (women) among educational institutions from which Federal executives (those in the Federal civil service at GS grade 14 and higher have received undergraduate degrees.

In an article entitled "Women Executives in the Federal Government," by W. Lloyd Warner, professor of social research at Michigan State University; Paul P. Van Riper professor of administration at Cornell University; Norman H. Martin, professor of management at New York University; and Orvis F. Collins, professor of business administration at Michigan State University, which appears in the October 1962 issue of Public Personnel Review, the authors include in their statistical study a ranking of those educational institutions from which women Federal executives have been graduated, with a comparative listing for men Federal executives.

The top institutions from which women Federal executives have received undergraduate degress in order are California, George Washington, Vassar, and Wisconsin. Those from which men Federal executives received undergraduate degress are George Washington, City College of New York, California, and Harvard, in that order.

At the master's level, George Washington is not among the top four alma maters of women Federal executives (Columbia, Chicago, Harvard, and California), but again ranks high among alma maters of men: Harvard, George Washington, Columbia, and Chicago in that order.

State Opposes FCC Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission has announced its intention of holding a public hearing in the city of Omaha, Nebr., for the purpose of inquiring into the local service given by Omaha TV stations. This highhanded action has aroused the Nebraska State Legislature into adopting a resolution that I think should be read by every person who is alarmed at the prospect of Federal interference.

The resolution follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 8

(Introduced by William Moulton, 10th District, George Syas, 4th District, Fred O. Gottschalk, 26th District, Matt Wylie, 27th District, Cecil Craft, 38th District)

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C., has announced its intention to hold a public hearing in the city of Omaha, Nebr., for the purpose of inquiring into the local service rendered by the television stations of Omaha to the citizens in and around this great community of our State; and

Whereas this forthcoming hearing which is scheduled to commence to January 28 is not related to any complaints received from the citizens of this State, as to the kind and quality of service which is provided by the Omaha television stations, nor has any issue been raised in any renewal or revocation proceeding as to the qualifications of these licensees to operate in the public interest; and

Whereas television in this country constitutes a major and vital arm of our free press which should not be subject to direct or indirect pressure or control by government at any level if it is to exercise its full responsibility of serving and informing the people in our democratic society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 73d session assembled:

1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska convened on this 24th day of January in the year of our Lord 1963, does register its strong opposition to the scheduling of this public hearing by the Federal Communications Commission without just cause or reason, believing that this action constitutes an unwarranted intrusion by the Federal Government into the freedom of broadcasting, and the affairs of the citizens of this sovereign State.

2. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska expresses both pride and commendation for the outstanding service which is provided by television stations, KETV, KMTV, and WOW-TV, Omaha, and the broadcast media generally of this State, in advancing the best interests of our citizens.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 8, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 73d regular session on the 24th day of January, 1963.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

United States of Europe—Dream of Christian Democratic Leaders in Europe a Century Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during these chaotic days, when every effort is made to establish peace, we should recall that a century ago Christian democratic leaders in Europe were planning and visualizing a United States of Europe, based on the pattern of our American democracy. Had such a plan been adopted, communism probably would not have succeeded in taking over these Christian democratic countries.

Mr. President, in order that we may better understand the plan these people had in mind, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The author of the article is Mr. John C. Sciranka, of Passaic, N.J. Mr. Sciranka is a well-known American Slovak journalist. The article was published in the Dobry Pastier (Good Shepherd), official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BROTHERHOOD OF CYRIL AND METHODIUS CENTURY AGO COULD HAVE SAVED RUSSIA FROM COMMUNISM

(By John C. Sciranka)

When two high officials of the Russian Orthodox Church, the bearded Archpriest Vitali Borovoy, professor at Leningrad Theological Faculty and representative of the Russian Church at the World Council of Churches headquarters in Geneva, and Archimandrate Vladimir Kotliarov, vice chief of mission of the Russian Church in Jerusalem, were received by Pope John XXIII in Vatican after the opening of the 21st Ecumenical Council, we were reminded of the efforts for the SS. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood (Bratstvo) in Russia a century ago.

We often mention the historical meeting of Slavs, held in Prague in 1848 inspired by our famous Ján Kollár, where the Slavonic leaders pledged unity for the liberation of their nations. But 2 years before this historical meeting, an informal group of pan-Slavists met in Kiev and formed the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood in honor of the apostles of the Slavs.

This brotherhood, although representing the organization of saints, was a democratic and semipolitical society with far reaching ideals. It advocated the Federated pan-Slavdom, ruled by the principles of representative government and constitutionalism. These democratic concepts, the historians inform us, remained the backbone of the society, which had been part of the intellectual atmosphere of eastern Europe from the time of the French Revolution.

Other historians inform us, that the prototype of the society had existed in Russia under Czar Alexander I. This Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius composed of some 100 Ukrainian intellectuals. The leaders were: M. I. Kostomarov, teacher and future historian; P. A. Kulish, writer; Hulak and Bilozersky, students and Taras Shevchenko, the liberated serf and artist, who became the national poet of Ukraine.

The members believed and advocated that the Ukrainians were equal to any other Slav nation. Although they advocated independence, nonetheless they felt that Ukraine was surrounded by enemies and would become as an independent state a pawn of more powerful neighbors. They have, therefore, advocated a federation and led a movement for unification. The society conceived a federation like the early Greek republics or the United States of North America, which would maintain basic laws, internal free trade, etc., prohibiting serfdom.

They were then so precisely informed about America and its democracy that way back in 1846 they formulated and proposed two plans for this federation. One was for a "Slavonic United States," with a president serving 4-year terms, and the other plan was to form a "Slavonic District of Columbia", an independent capital city. Of course, Kiev was to be given preference. They had then formulated a plan of embracing the empire of Russia and forming 14 states, including Poland, Bohemia, Ukraine, Moravia, Slovakia, Servia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, etc.

The Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood (Bratstvo), although bearing the names of two saintly Slav apostles, was breathing such liberal principles that the drafts of its rules and aims, omitted references to religious sects and emphasized guidance by "Christian teaching."

Unfortunately the group dissolved in March 1847, when the czar's police acted on reports of an informer and arrested those it considered most dangerous. However, no conspiracy against the state could be proven.

But Kostomarov and Hulak were anyway sentenced to prison and later exiled. Shevchenko was forced into army and forbidden to write. Others were exiled. Yet the cause of liberation and ideal of SS. Cyril and Methodius never died and it has more adherents now than ever before. It was through the efforts of such movement, that a century ago, the millenium of SS. Cyril and Methodius was observed by some 80 million Slavs.

It is providential that the Holy Father, John XXIII, called the 21st ecumenical council to the Eternal City during the observance of the 11th centennial of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia. All Slavs honor these two brothers as their apostles, even the Slav Protestants. With the representatives of Slav nations in Vatican, during this ecumenical council, even from the satellite countries, we hope and pray that the ideals of those apostles will mark a new era of stopping the persecution of Christian church in Soviet Russia and the satellite countries.

Although the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius was dissolved in Russia in 1847 the faith in the people continued to live and lives even under the Communist persecution. In the past century the heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius has grown in adherents. There were more churches and various institutions built in the past century in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius than in all 10 centuries put together. This is a vindication of their sacred cause. We Slovaks are most fortunate that during this 21st ecumenical council the building of SS. Cyril and Methodius Institute in Rome will commence and will be dedicated in 1963. Since even the Russian Orthodox Church sent its representatives to Rome for ecumenical council, let us be more encouraged to make even greater sacrifices for this Cyril and Methodian heritage.

The Political Perils of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star of Monday, January 28, 1963:

THE POLITICAL PERILS OF FOREIGN AID—KENNEDY'S FALL DRIVE TO DEFEAT JUDD BLAMED FOR GOP COMMITTEE CHOICES

(By William S. White)

Both past and present instances of small bore Democratic partisanship have already brought danger to the only proper conduct of our foreign policy, which is to say its bipartisan conduct. They may bring yet more.

The Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have just repaid President Kennedy's participation in the defeat last fall of the veteran internationalist, Representative Walter Judd, of Minnesota. They have calmly stacked the Republican side of the House Foreign Affairs Committee with five new anti-foreign-aid members.

This comes at a time when the continuation of the foreign aid program, one of the keys to the administration's world approach, is admittedly in hard straits in Congress.

No one on the administration's side can fairly cry "foul" at this action of the GOP. For if ever there was a case of built-in and inevitable tit for tat it was this unhappy instance of Presidential intervention against a first-rate Member of Congress simply because he happened to be in the other party.

Judd in fact risked his political life last fall by staying on in Washington to assist Mr. Kennedy's then current foreign aid bill, while the President was out in Minnesota demanding Judd's head in behalf of the Democratic Party.

It was a singularly clear illustration of the odd unwisdom of President Kennedy's uncharacteristic decision to go all out in a domestic campaign to return a Democratic Congress which just might be more amenable to him on such relatively picayune issues as medicare.

The President has always regarded the cold war as neither a Democratic nor a Republican but simply an all-American undertaking. But for this momentary switch from his usual course he has tried to keep partisan home politics out of his foreign policy.

Whatever moved him, it was a melancholy victory for him. For Judd's absence from the House will cause the President infinitely more trouble on the things that really matter than any possible gain it can bring him on the things that matter a great deal less.

Nor is this the end. While the House Republicans have been moving to retaliate, the ultraliberal Senate Democrats have been maneuvering in a characteristically myopic way to spread the damage, by way of both petty ideological and purely party partisanship.

They have been attempting to bar the Senator Republican leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, from a seat on the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee. They proceed here on the curious theory that DIRKSEN is likely to be critical of the President's tax bill; ergo, DIRKSEN has no right to be on the committee.

But this touches foreign policy, too, because DIRKSEN until now has been a tower of bipartisan strength to the President on all the top foreign crises in which he has thus far had to be engaged.

The same Democratic ultraliberals are running a muttering campaign against the ascent to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the few public men in the country who have been right about Castro Cuba from the start, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS of Florida. Smathers' crime? Why, he does not support the President on every little domestic issue that may come up.

The ultraliberals are highly unlikely to be able to bar either DIRKSEN or SMATHERS from earned committee advancement. The mere fact that they have set off upon these absurd and juvenile vendettas, however, will surely do nothing to promote bipartisan foreign policy unity in a world in upheaval everywhere. The President himself could do worse than to call off these frantic advocates of a total conformism at the cost of what really matters, the proper, or bipartisan, conduct of foreign policy.

The Honorable John J. Bell

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, news of the untimely and sudden passing of our former colleague, the Honorable John J. Bell, of Cuero, Tex., was particularly distressing to me. The day before, I had written to him in response to a request of his, a request not for anything in his own behalf but something to help a constituent of mine who was particularly well known to him.

John, even after he left Congress, continued to be a natural-born public servant and one who was always ready to be of assistance to anyone who needed it.

I was especially close to him because when he was a State senator, a portion of the Ninth Congressional District was also a part of his senatorial responsibility. He worked together on many projects in complete harmony and mutual regard. Our friendly relationship continued after he returned to private practice of law, and I relied on him frequently for advice.

I shall miss him, and I know how much more his loss will be felt by his devoted wife, Mabel Claire. She and all the members of the Bell family have my deepest sympathy.

High Cost of Keeping Our Powder Dry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "High Cost of Keeping Our Powder Dry," which appeared in the January 22, 1963 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville.

The editorial is as follows:

HIGH COST OF KEEPING OUR POWDER DRY

A fellow has merely to glance at items in the $98.8 billion budget submitted to Congress by the President to see that a lot of the money asked goes for war and preparation for war.

More than half the budget, in fact, as is shown when you tally up the items to find that outlay for the cold war in which our Nation is engaged with the Bolsheviki runs to something like $53 billion a year. This is the U.S. outlay, not that of the other countries of the West, and the $53 billion is the amount spent directly on defense preparations alone, and does not include the carrying charges on other wars in which our country has engaged.

Yet, burdensome though this heavy obligation may be, and however expensive to the American taxpayer, the following thoughts will not down:

The thing which caused Nikita Khrushchev to back down some weeks ago on the Cuba issue, and which caused him to pick up his deadly nuclear hardware and cart it back home was the simple fact that we were better armed for war than Russia, that we had the drop on the Soviet Union, nuclear bomb wise, and that we showed a determination to wage devastating war on the Russians if we were obliged to.

We had kept our powder dry, to use a phrase from the pioneer days, we had mended our stockade, and we were ready

for the worst that the enemy in pioneer days the Indian and in modern days the Bolshevki could send against us.

Our defense preparations paid off, in other words, and won a considerable victory for us without the firing of a single shot. Nikita Khrushchev has changed his tune, and in recognizing that the paper tiger has nuclear teeth, has widened Russia's split with Mao and Red China, willing to see world war on the simple mathematical possibility that enough Chinese would be left to take over whatever of the earth happened to survive.

As for the cost of defense, everybody is aware that it far exceeds all other costs of government. Yet it has been pointed out recently that, burdensome though this heavy obligation may be, the effect probably would be far more serious if by some chance, remote though it be, the necessity for defense spending were removed. By disarmament, for instance.

Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia University said the other day that it might be time for industry in this country to begin thinking about the possibility and planning how to convert its vast production facilities to nondefense purposes.

Melman and other professors cited our country's heavy reliance on defense spending at a symposium of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. They came up with an estimate that 6 million Americans and 50 million persons in the world are actively engaged in defense activities. Also that more than half of all research and development activities are paid for by the Government, being connected in one way or another with military projects and needs.

Assuming that Russia spends as much as the United States, and adding the expenditures of smaller nations, it is considered likely that $120 billion a year or even more is devoted to warmaking preparations and related activities.

A fellow doesn't have to look any further than Fort Campbell to our south or Fort Knox to our east to see two examples of defense expenditures in the United States, and to guess at the vast cost when you toss in all the larger and smaller forts and plants and ships and aircraft and whatnot.

Professor Melman's remarks were prompted in part by the fact that the United States has submitted to the United Nations a proposal for general disarmament, and that Washington insists that the proposal is meant in earnest and is not a mere gesture.

"What if it were accepted?" the professor asks, adding that the economic dislocation would be severe. Economic dislocation is always severe, come an end to war, and it has happened to us before, but on no such vast scale as would be the case now.

So far as we can see now, the United States might as well be watching migratory wildfowl as offering disarmament to Russia in any hope that the Bolsheviki might agree. Old Khrush hopes capitalism may die without the necessity of killing it by gunfire, but he doesn't hope it strong enough to quit the arms buildup. And this buildup, which we are obliged to top if we are to survive, is what makes it necessary for us to devote a major portion of our resources and energies to defense against the Communist threat.

A threat which was deadly real, a few weeks ago, in little Red Cuba just 90 miles off our shores.

Proposed Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be general agreement that our high income tax rates should be reduced. In this connection, I should like to submit a letter received by me from Mr. Joseph L. Manning, managing director, the Independent Retail Food Distributors of Maryland, also, a copy of one written by him to President Kennedy. The suggestions made by Mr. Manning are, in my opinion, sound and I commend them to the attention of the Members of the House.

THE INDEPENDENT RETAIL FOOD DISTRIBUTORS OF MARYLAND,
Baltimore, Md., January 17, 1963.

Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON,
U.S. Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALLON: Since we so strongly believe that any tax out passed by the Congress should contain provisions to generate full employment and increase sales volume, we have written to the President urging certain studies be made in an effort to accomplish that purpose.

We are aware that time is of the essence, since the tax bill has been submitted to Congress. However, in the committee hearings and discussions we hope the suggestions we have made will be given consideration. If opportunity is afforded, we plan to attend any sessions in Washington we believe will be helpful to the committee studying this matter.

In writing directly to the President, we have no intention of bypassing our duly elected Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. We felt, however, that it was urgent to have our views placed before the President as early as possible. All of our elected Representatives will receive a copy of this letter which is enclosed.

I would appreciate deeply your reaction to this suggestion and ask your advice and help in stimulating and generating this suggested proposal. Won't you please let me hear from you as soon as you possibly can, since I intend to publish this letter in the February edition of the Maryland Grocers' Food Trade magazine, the Skirmisher.

Best wishes for a happy and healthful new year.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. MANNING,
Managing Director.

THE INDEPENDENT RETAIL FOOD DISTRIBUTORS OF MARYLAND,
Baltimore, Md., January 17, 1963.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are sure any income tax cut proposed by the administration will have for one of its purposes the stimulation of our economy in the form of increased employment with resultant increments to general income to Federal, State, and local governments.

If there is any reasonable device which would encourage improvements to dwelling properties where part of the costs of such improvements could be deducted from the individual homeowners income tax, it would put many hundreds of people to work and encourage property improvements, thus reducing the cost of urban renewal programs. Prevention is cheaper than demolition but our present laws offer little or no incentive for improvements.

I am sure you are aware that in most jurisdictions properties which have been well maintained are assessed for more than similar properties in the same block but which have been allowed to fall into disrepair.

A considerable number of plumbers, electricians, carpenters, bricklayers, etc., were employed for a fairly simple neighborhood rehabilitation project such as we conducted here in Baltimore several years ago. In addition, building materials, fixtures, etc., are required for each individual improvement. We cannot help but believe that if some tax incentive were offered, thousands of properties would be improved and in the long run, less money would be required for urban renewal.

We also learned that providing new and modern kitchens, bathrooms, family rooms, etc., creates an incentive to purchase new furniture, rugs, and other items, and to generally refurbish the entire property.

In another field, domestic help could be employed if some relaxation on withholding taxes and a simplified form of reporting were adopted. Part-time help around the home could result in considerable employment if the property owner had less bookkeeping to do. Also, as soon as you tell a part-time gardener, maid, or handyman you will have to withhold certain taxes and pay social security, he or she is not interested in the job.

Perhaps these are oversimplifications. However, we sincerely believe they merit study in any new tax revision.

In our judgment, what is needed is tax revision designed to stimulate business and promote employment, and we believe the items we suggest will generate considerable business activity.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. MANNING,
Managing Director.

Exemption of Pension Payments by Retired U.S. Government Employees—H.R. 533

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced H.R. 533 to exempt from income tax, annuities, and pensions paid by the United States to its employees.

It has long been believed that most people should retire at 65 years of age. However, every day more and more people eligible for retirement refuse to quit

because they find that their pension will be inadequate to live on. Especially is this true for the Government employee who finds that his small annuity is further reduced by income taxes.

Anyone who retires on a pension or annuity of $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000 will usually be forced to live on an income considerably less than his former income. Steadily rising living costs and the depreciation of the dollar will make life in the late years of life an even more unpleasant prospect. Therefore, the Government should not place further obstacles in the way by taxing the small income of these people during the declining years of their lives when their expenses are especially high. Rather, the Government should encourage its people to retire and take steps to insure financial independence in their old age. Exemption of Government employees' pension payments from the income tax will provide a long step in the right direction.

I do not urge that the Congress should restore to all annuitants the same purchasing power they once had, but it can and should allow them the same tax benefits that it allows others who draw pensions from the Federal Treasury. For example, pensions paid under the Railroad Retirement and Social Security programs are exempt from all Federal income taxes. As an illustration of how this discriminates against the retired Federal Government employee, I call attention to the fact that while a retired railway worker enjoys this tax relief for his pension, the retired railway postal employee who may have worked right beside him enjoys no such relief. This discrimination cannot be justified. Therefore, my proposal is introduced to promote equity where there is need for it.

George Maurer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing on November 16 of my dear friend, George J. Maurer, from a heart attack.

George was a native of Easton, Pa., who received his education in the parochial school of his hometown and at the George Washington University School of Law here in Washington.

At the time of his passing, he was only 56 years of age, but he had already distinguished himself by his long and outstanding career of service in the legislative branch. His first job was with the Library of Congress from where he was requisitioned as a clerk in the Speaker's Office in 1939. In September 1943 he began his work as a reading clerk of the House and during the long years that have since gone by George won the friendship and admiration of the Members of the House by his unstinting devotion to his work as well as by the efficient way in which he discharged his responsibilities.

We are all going to miss George and the smooth efficiency he displayed in discharging his duties has set a high target for his successor to achieve and emulate.

May I take this occasion to extend to George Maurer's widow and the other members of his family my heartfelt condolences and to assure them that their grief and sorrow is shared by the host of George's good friends here at the Capitol.

Tariff Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I think, as we opened the new session, the fears that some of us had on our trade policies and where they would lead us are beginning to become realities. The case of stainless steel is one in point. I believe the following news release issued from my office on January 28 tells a story that should have the attention of every Member of Congress. Those of us who believe job protection is essential to the well-being of our Nation will find ourselves ofttimes condemned by those whose interest is subject to question on more than one ground. Those among us who believe that we can have free trade without having foolish trade and the defense of our Nation goes beyond that of military and physical defense, but must, of necessity, in order to guarantee the security of the Nation reach into economic defense. The economy of this Nation is dependent entirely upon the work security of the people. This Nation, which could not live half free and half enslaved, cannot live half working and half loafing. This economy cannot change into a prosperous and growing era unless we reevaluate our job security.

The release follows:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT today introduced legislation calling for an amendment to the Tariff Act to close a loophole which is causing a serious disruption in the domestic production of stainless steel. The attached memorandum covers the contents of the legislation and its purposes.

"This is a very serious matter because of a veto by GATT of the tariff schedules, included in last year's Tariff Classification Act of 1962, which would have closed this loophole, but since the GATT veto in October, this act of Congress has not been put into effect, thereby creating a situation which has become acute," said Dent.

"Because of the discovery of a loophole by the Japanese in the spring of 1960, imports on stainless steel in 1959 totaled $14,000. In 1960, when the loophole was discovered, it jumped to $257,000, and in the first 11 months of 1962, $5,518,000.

"Specifically, stainless steel carries a duty of 14½ cents per pound but, by manipulation of the loophole interpretation, the Japanese—with their cheap labor—polish one side of a sheet of stainless steel and come in under paragraph 309–1001 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and thereby pay a duty of only 1¼ cents a pound on an ad valorem equivalent of less than 3 percent. This subterfuge was not employed by any exporters to the United States, but since the Japanese steel complex has grown to a surplus production unit, they are seeking any and all means to dump their surplus into the United States.

"This is not an attack against free trade as such. This is a move intended to preserve the jobs fast disappearing in the steel industry of the United States," concluded DENT.

The following memorandum is designed to bring to your attention a serious import problem facing U.S. producers of stainless steel and their employees and to urge remedial legislation which would eliminate threat of substantial economic injury to domestic firms.

The legislation we recommend is in the nature of a technical amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, it would neither conflict with present foreign trade agreements nor interfere with trade expansion goals. It would merely close a disturbing loophole.

TARIFF LOOPHOLES

The appropriate duty rate on stainless steel sheets is at least 14 percent ad valorem. Stainless steel sheets which are polished, however, enter under paragraph 309, 1001, Tariff Act of 1930, at a duty rate of 1¼ cents per pound, a figure which, based on recent import values, may be expressed at 2.9 percent in ad valorem equivalent.[1]

These contrasting duty rates can be outlined as follows:

	Specific duty per pound (cents)	Ad valorem rate
A. 1. Plates and sheets, n.s.p.f. (par. 304).	----------	9½ percent.
2. Additional duty based on alloy content of stainless steel (par. 305).	----------	4 percent plus 1 percent additional.
3. Total	5.94	14½ percent.
B. Plates and sheets, polished, planished, or glanced (total).	1.25	2.9 percent.

There is no justification for such a discrepancy in effective duty rate: Stainless steel sheets properly dutiable at 14 percent, are subject to a duty of less than 3 percent simply as a result of the polishing process. Ironically, since polishing necessitates greater labor content and commensurately increases the competitive labor cost advantage of foreign over U.S. stainless steel sheet, the process should militate in favor of a higher rather than a lower import duty.

The history of paragraph 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930 explains its illogical impact. Tariff provision for "sheets and plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated" as found in 309 has existed with only minor changes since 1883. Stainless steel, however, is of comparatively recent commercial importance, not being in production in significant quantities until well after World War I. It is apparent that the provision was intended to apply only to high-tonnage carbon steel. This duty, when applied to substantially higher value stainless steel sheets, however, presents the opportunity for tariff evasion.

[1] The average value of imports of this item is 42 cents per pound.

The apparent discovery of this loophole in 1960 creates the present serious problem.

INCREASE IN IMPORTS

As a result of the discovery of the discrepancy, the importation of stainless steel sheets and plates has increased by more than 1,000 percent since 1960, a rate of increase which far exceeds any precedent. The level of importation itself, even assuming stabilization of the increase rate, threatens serious injury to domestic producers of stainless steel.

The import situation is clearly revealed by the following chart:

	Imports, schedule A No. 6039700 [1]	
	Pounds	Value
1955	32,755	$19,102
1956	30,478	18,881
1957	32,574	31,168
1958	42,952	11,020
1959	15,650	14,251
1960	736,746	257,160
1961	1,872,909	814,059
1962 (11 months)	14,056,178	5,518,943

[1] "Sheets or plates of iron or steel, polished, planished or glanced." Over 90 percent of this total is comprised of stainless steel.

Source: Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Japan is by far the greatest source of these polished steel sheets, accounting for well over 90 percent of the imports during the first 10 months of 1962. Japan's share of imports under paragraph 309 during the month of October 1962 alone was 1,493,018 pounds, a figure which exceeds the all-nation total for the entire period from 1955 through 1960. Foreign competition of this nature threatens immediate injury to the U.S. industry. It is inexcusable that the threat is greatly enlarged by an obvious tariff loophole.

THE ANOMALY HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Acting under legislative mandate, the Tariff Commission has recently completed a series of tariff schedules which collate and simplify the U.S. tariff structure. In cognizance of the anomaly, the Commission would correct it by classifying plates and sheets in a single category, thereby eliminating the illogical result in accordance with the standards of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954. Congress authorized the proclamation of the tariff schedules early last year in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 when the President implements this act, the schedules will have the force of law.

Unfortunately, by reason of the difficulty of conforming the schedules to trade agreements, the proclamation has been delayed. As the matter is dependent upon successful negotiation with principal foreign nations, there is no way in which domestic stainless steel producers can know when this loophole will be closed.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

Corrective legislation is the only solution which will effectively prevent the continuation of injury. Such legislation would provide for the deletion of the reference to polished, planished or glanced plates or sheets from paragraph 309. No tariff adjustment, or other adjustment assistance relief, may be sought, since polished, planished or glanced sheets have never been the subject of a trade agreement.

There is ample precedent for legislation to correct an inequity of this sort. See Public Law 749, 83d Congress; Public Law 454, 85th Congress. Furthermore, the proposed amendment would not constitute a discriminatory duty against foreign suppliers—the current import duty on polished stainless steel sheets is 15 percent ad valorem in Japan itself.

In conclusion the industry is certain that it was not and is not the intent of Congress to permit an obvious loophole in tariff structure to imperil the continued existence of a viable segment of domestic industry.

Joseph P. Riley: Dynamic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this moment to call attention to the selection of an outstanding South Carolinian to head our State chamber of commerce in South Carolina.

He is Joseph P. Riley, of Charleston, a dynamic civic leader and businessman.

Joe, as he is called by his many friends in the low country and the State, is a member of countless civic and community organizations.

Well versed in the ways of business promotion, he is a successful real estate executive and will do well for the Palmetto State in cultivating a warm industrial climate for new industry seeking a favorable site to locate.

In his new post, he will play a vital role in directing an organization which influences the economic welfare of our citizens to an important degree through attracting new payrolls by extolling our assets—industrial and otherwise.

The chief position of our South Carolina Chamber of Commerce is in capable hands. I personally extend to Joe Riley my best wishes for a fruitful tenure of office.

In Charleston's two large newspapers, editorials were carried on January 24 and 25 concerning the high regard people hold for Joe Riley. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert these editorials for the information of my people and the Members of the Congress:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Jan. 24, 1963]

BUSINESS TEAM

Selection of Joseph P. Riley of Charleston as the new president of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce brings to State leadership a low countryman already well versed in the ways of business promotion. For years Mr. Riley has been among the leaders in community and civic projects in Charleston. We commend him to the people of South Carolina as a likable and aggressive personality.

Mr. Riley has served as president of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, as a director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and in countless other capacities. He is well acquainted with business and political leaders of this region.

With his associates—G. G. Dowling of Beaufort as vice president for the eastern district and James Chapman of Spartanburg for the western district, and W. G. Edwards of Columbia as chairman of the board—Mr. Riley leads a strong team to represent the business interests of the entire State. We know something about all these men and the work they have been doing for the public service. The public would be fortunate to obtain their services at high salaries—and they are donating their time. When we wish them well, we are wishing for everybody.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1963]

RILEY ELECTED BY STATE CHAMBER

To the long list of high civic and business offices to which Joseph P. Riley has been elected is added still another—the presidency of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce. The Charleston real estate and insurance executive assumed that office this week.

Few people can claim to have given as much time to worthy causes as Joe Riley has given in the last 25 years. To list the organizations he has served would require a column or more of space.

Among the groups he has headed as president are the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, the Charleston Board of Insurance Underwriters, the Charleston Board of Realtors, the Charleston Lions Club, the Hibernian Society, the Charleston United Fund, the St. Francis Hospital Advisory Board and numerous others. He has served on the board of directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Charleston Development Board, the State development board, the Charleston Red Cross, the Coastal Council of the Boy Scouts, etc.

In his new post, Mr. Riley will direct an organization which plays an important role in the orderly development of a favorable climate for the growth of business and industry in South Carolina. The State chamber remains in capable hands and we wish for Mr. Riley a fruitful tenure of office.

Part 3: Let's Keep the Record Straight — A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro, September 21, 1961-February 20, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in the third part of my chronology of events on Cuba and Castro—we find outlined the growing realization of Latin American countries that Cuba is indeed Communist-controlled, and Castro's admission publicly that he is a Marxist-Leninist "and will be one until the day I die."

Fifteen Latin American countries and the United States have severed diplomatic relations with Cuba. The Organization of American States held a Foreign Ministers' conference on January 31, 1962, and voted—14 to 1, with 6 abstentions—to exclude Cuba from participation in the inter-American system. Later this conference action was to culminate, on February 14, 1962, in Cuba being formally excluded from the Organization of American States.

We find that $12 million a year in U.S. exports are being sent to Cuba, via Mexico, and that 18 American firms and individuals later are penalized by the U.S.

Commerce Department for their part in ignoring the U.S. embargo.

We find on February 3, 1962, that President Kennedy has decided it is necessary to proclaim an embargo on almost all U.S. trade with Cuba, with the exception "on humanitarian grounds" of exporting certain foods and medicines—thus continuing the embargo which President Eisenhower had originally proclaimed and which then-Candidate Kennedy had criticized as being a gesture which was almost meaningless.

It is good to review history—and with the continuing threat of a Communist Cuba only 90 miles from our shores—it is good to learn from history. Our 20th President, James A. Garfield said:

History is philosophy teaching by example, and also by warning; its two eyes are geography and chronology. History is but the unrolled scroll of prophecy.

The article follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, SEPTEMBER 21, 1961–FEBRUARY 20, 1962,[1] BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

September 21, 1961: President Osvaldo Dorticos leaves Moscow for Peking, after a 10-day visit to the Soviet Union. In a speech at the Kremlin on September 20, Dorticos expresses the solidarity of Cuba with the Soviet Union on all foreign policy issues, and says that Cuban industrial development is based on Soviet credits. "In Havana, Premier Fidel Castro announced that Socialist countries have guaranteed to buy 4,500,000 tons of Cuba's sugar for each of the next 5 years. The message was conveyed to Cuba's Premier by President Dorticos now visiting in Moscow. It means Cuba will be able to sell her total crop of some 6,500,000 tons of sugar for the next 5 years, a gratifying assurance to the Castro government which is having its economic difficulties."

September 22, 1961: President Dorticos is greeted on his arrival in Peking by Communist Chinese head of state, Liu Shao-chi, who praises Cuba as "standing in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism, which is the common enemy of the peoples of both our countries."

September 25, 1961: Dorticos (addressing a mass rally in Peking) declares that the Nationalist occupation of Taiwan "reminds us of the shameful occupation of a part of our territory in the Guantanamo Base. Cuba and China will recover these territories through a resolute and tenacious prolonged struggle; the imperialists will have to give up these territories." Five men are executed and 64 are imprisoned for terms ranging up to 30 years for alleged anti-Castro activities. "Firing squads already have executed 20 persons this month, 111 this year, and 944 since Castro came into power in January 1959."

October 9, 1961: Cuban Government (in a "white book" presented to heads of 31 foreign missions in Havana) accuses the United States of training anti-Castro invasion forces at 20 U.S. bases and 9 camps in the Caribbean (in Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, the Panama Canal Zone, and at Guantanamo).

October 10, 1961: U.S. State Department declares that Cuban accusations that the United States is training new invasion forces "are not only totally unfounded but are ridiculous." On the same day, Foreign Minister Raul Roa (in the U.N. General Assembly) accuses the United States of planning a new attack against Cuba which he described as the scene of "the building of a Socialist society 90 miles from a stubborn empire determined to repress the inexorable flow of history." He says that Cuba would welcome "the amicable mediation of a number of American governments to explore the possibilities of worthy and honest negotiations with the Government of the United States."—"Although he implied that these efforts had failed, Latin American sources said that this was Cuba's first public acceptance of the idea of mediation."

October 17, 1961: Council of the Organization of American States (meeting in Washington) votes 20 to 1 (Cuba) to study a Peruvian request for a meeting of American Foreign Ministers to consider taking collective action against Cuba. Peru claims that such action is both justified and necessary to protect the Western Hemisphere from Communist subversion. The Cuban Ambassador to the OAS accuses Peru of acting on orders from the United States.

October 18, 1961: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk (in a press conference) praises the Peruvian Ambassador to the OAS for having "eloquently described the causes for hemisphere-wide concern with development in Cuba since the Castro government transformed that country into an accomplice of the Sino-Soviet bloc." Rusk adds: "The world will be watching the OAS approach to the Cuban problem. The central question here, as it is in other parts of the world, is: Can people who are devoted to a world of free choice, opposed to a world of coercion, keep Communist intervention from undermining and destroying independent nations?"

October 25, 1961: OAS Council votes to delay action on the Peruvian proposal by referring it to a committee for further study: "It is known that the United States was not in favor of bringing the issue before the OAS just yet, because it has not been able to persuade a majority of the Latin American nations to support any moves against Cuba. * * * Some of the larger and more influential South American countries, notably Argentina and Brazil, are firmly against such OAS action." (Times, London, October 26, 1961): "Brazil and Ecuador led a movement to kill the proposal outright. The smaller Central American nations and the United States sought a compromise formula that would keep it alive. Opposition from the big nations, especially Argentina, Chile, and Mexico, made it impossible to expect outright approval by the council."

November 8, 1961: President Kennedy (at a press conference in Washington) declares that U.S. exports to Cuba now amount to about $12 million a year.

November 9, 1961: Colombia asks the Organization of American States to convene an Inter-American Foreign Ministers' conference on January 10, 1962, to consider measures for the defense of the Western Hemisphere against any threat posed by the intervention of extracontinental powers. Although the request did not mention Cuba, the Colombian proposal is specifically designed to counter what is regarded, in effect, as the Habana alliance between Premier Fidel Castro's regime and the Communist bloc as well as the subversive activities of Cuban agents in most Latin American countries.

November 11, 1961: Venezuela severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

November 21, 1961: Cuba requests urgent meetings of the U.N. Security Council and the OAS Council to consider her charge of U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic.

November 22, 1961: OAS Council meets (in Washington) to hear Cuban charges refuted by the U.S. delegate as a new low of irrelevance, hypocrisy, and slander, and adjourns without taking action.

November 28, 1961: U.N. Security Council ends its debate on Cuban charges of U.S. aggression against the Dominican Republic without taking any action. In the three-day debate, Cuba had asked the Council to brand the United States as an aggressor and to demand the recall of American ships from the Dominican coast. She was supported only by the Soviet Union, but Soviet support did not extend to submitting a resolution in the matters.

November 29, 1961: President Kennedy (at a press conference) declares that the United States would be most concerned if the Castro regime in Cuba attempted to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic or in any other Latin American State.

December 2, 1961; Premier Castro (in a 5-hour television speech) declares: "I am a Marxist-Leninist, and will be one until the day I die." He says "the world is on the road to communism," and he is taking Cuba along that path. He also says: "We must study all the experience in the building up of the world's first Communist society [the Soviet Union]." He rejects neutralism, saying: "There is no half way between socialism and imperialism. Anyone maintaining a third [neutralist] position is, in fact, helping imperialism." Like Soviet Premier Khrushchev, he denounces the cult of personality, and says: "It would be absurd for a single man to make government decisions. * * * I firmly believe in collective leadership. * * * I never have wanted to be a Caesar." He announces that he is forming a "United Party of the Cuban Socialist Revolution," as a single, monolithic party which will lead Cuba to "a people's democracy or the dictatorship of the proletariat."

December 4, 1961: OAS Council adopts the Colombian proposal by a vote of 14 to 2 (Cuba and Mexico), with 5 abstentions (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador).

December 9, 1961: Colombia severs diplomatic relations with Cuba, a few hours after Premier Castro denounced Colombia and Panama as "accomplices of imperialism." Colombia is the 12th nation of the Americas to sever relations with Cuba. The others are the United States, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela.

December 14, 19611: Panama announces that it has severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, and that the break is to be considered effective as of December 8 when Premier Castro made insulting remarks about Panama.

December 18, 1961: Cuba (in a letter to the Organization of American States) rejects a request of the Inter-American Peace Commission that it be allowed to visit Cuba to investigate Peruvian charges of Communist subversion against other American republics and claims that the Castro government is violating human rights. The Cuban note refers to "the servile, corrupt, despotic" Government of Peru, and the "abject submission and repugnant immorality of the Inter-American Peace Commission." (The Commission is an autonomous body of the OAS, whose members are from the United States, Colombia, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Venezuela.)

December 20, 1961: U.S. Commerce Department announces it has taken action penalizing 18 firms and individuals for illegal shipments of aircraft, automotive and other equipment to Cuba via Mexico. A Department statement says: "There has been great effort on the part of the Castro regime to attempt to obtain U.S. parts and equipment in the face of the U.S. embargo."

December 22, 1961: OAS Council (meeting in Washington) agrees to hold the Foreign Ministers' Conference, convoked at Colom-

[1] Sept. 21, 1961–Sept. 20, 1962, excerpted from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs. September 1962–October 1962 from New York Times.

bia's request, at Punta del Este, Uruguay, on January 22 (originally scheduled for January 10). "The 19-to-0 vote [Cuba abstained; Mexico, which opposed the conference, was absent] did not reflect the sharp division that has persisted among the 21 member nations of the Organization of American States on the desirability of considering collective action on the Cuban problem. The question today was limited to the date and place of the ministerial conference."

January 2, 1962: Premier Castro (at a mass rally in Havana to celebrate the 3d anniversary of the overthrow of the Batista regime) declares: "We reiterate that we are Marxist-Leninists and we do not repent it." He attacks the OAS Foreign Ministers' meeting (to be held in Punta del Este on Jan. 22), and warns "governments of America sold to [United States] imperialism who are willing to attack a brother people" against any military adventure. He says that if any new invasion force attacks Cuba, "we will exterminate [them] to the last man." "The Premier backed his statement with a display of military might supplied by his Communist allies. Soviet-built MIG fighter jets, multirocket launching units and twin antiaircraft guns were shown during a 90-minute military parade."

January 3, 1962: Expert on cannon law, Msgr. Dino Staffa of the Vatican Secretariat of State, declares to the press that Premier Fidel Castro and certain officials of his regime have fallen under automatic excommunication because they are responsible for "impeding and imprisoning" Roman Catholic bishops. He says the excommunication has been incurred without formal announcement.

On the same day, the U.S. State Department makes public a document entitled "The Castro Regime in Cuba," which was submitted by the United States on December 6 to the Inter-American Peace Committee (an organ of the OAS). The document says that "as a bridgehead of Sino-Soviet imperialism within the inner defenses of the Western Hemisphere, Cuba under the Castro regime represents a serious threat to the collective security of the American republics."

January 4, 1962: Government announces the execution of an anti-Castro guerilla leader, Margarito Lanza, convicted of killing three militiamen. "It was the first execution to be announced in 1962. Firing squads killed at least 136 Cubans in 1961 and an estimated 968 since Fidel Castro assumed power 3 years ago."

January 10, 1962: Soviet news agency Tass announces that the Soviet Union and Cuba have signed a trade protocol for 1962, which provides for "a considerable increase" of trade between the two countries. Under the agreement Cuba will export sugar, alcohol, rum, tobacco, canned fruit, nickel ore, and other products to the Soviet Union. The latter will export to Cuba oil and petroleum products, ferrous and nonferrous metals, chemicals, fertilizers, sawn timber, cellulose, paper, cotton, wheat, flour, animal fats and vegetable oils, various plants and equipment, instruments, and other commodities. The Associated Press quotes Cuban Foreign Ministry sources as having said that the Cuban-Soviet protocol provides for trade worth $700 million between the two countries, a rise of $150 million over 1961.

January 18, 1962: Inter-American Peace Committee publishes a report (approved unanimously by the five members of the committee—Colombia, El Salvador, Uruguay, Venezuela, and the United States), which denounces Cuba's ties with communism, subversion, and violations of human rights. The report declares: "Such acts represent attacks upon inter-American peace and security as well as on the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, and therefore [constitute] a serious violation of fundamental principles of the inter-American system."

January 22, 1962: Conference of Foreign Ministers of the 21 American Republics meets in Punta del Este, Uruguay, to consider collective action against Cuba.

January 31, 1962: OAS Foreign Ministers Conference votes by a two-thirds majority—14 to 1 (Cuba), with 6 abstentions (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico), to exclude Cuba from participation in the inter-American system. President Osvaldo Dorticos of Cuba declares that the exclusion of Cuba from the OAS will convert the organization into a "political-military bloc at the service of the United States." He says: "You may expel us but you cannot extract us from America. You may put us out of the OAS, but the United States will continue to have a revolutionary Cuba 90 miles from its shores." On the same day (Jan. 31), President Kennedy declares (at a press conference in Washington) that he is satisfied with the outcome of the Punta del Este Conference. He says: "It is the first time the independent American States have declared with one voice that the concept of Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system."

February 3, 1962: President Kennedy proclaims an embargo on almost all United States trade with Cuba, with the exception—"on humanitarian grounds"—of the export to Cuba of certain foods and medicines. The embargo (which goes into effect Feb. 7) will stop U.S. imports from Cuba of tobacco, industrial molasses, and vegetables—thereby depriving Cuba of an annual income of about $35 million—"Through sales of sugar, tobacco and some other food products, the Cubans are thought to have earned about $100 million in the free world last year. The U.S. action thus is expected to reduce Cuban dollar income by about one-third." (New York Times, Feb. 4, 1962): "The embargo * * * is frankly described * * * in the serious Eastern press [of the United States] as a unilateral act meant to compensate in part for the failure of the OAS to act as a punitive body."

February 4, 1962: Premier Castro denounces (at a mass rally in Havana) the U.S. trade embargo as "another economic aggression." In answer to the exclusion of Cuba from the OAS, voted by the American Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este, Castro issues a "Second Declaration of Havana" which states that the Punta del Este conference has shown the OAS "in its true light [as] nothing more nor less than the U.S. Ministry of Colonies."

February 7, 1962: Brazilian Foreign Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas (in a report to the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies on the Punta del Este Conference) defends Brazil's abstention in the vote excluding Cuba from the OAS. He says that the American Republics should negotiate with Cuba rather than isolating her. He declares: "It is not true that Cuba is lost as a nation for coexistence with the other countries of the hemisphere." He denies that the U.S. delegation tried to use economic pressure on the six countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico) which abstained in the vote on Cuba.

February 8, 1962: Argentina severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

February 11, 1962: Cuban Revolutionary Council, headed by Jose Miro Cardona, announces (in Miami, Fla.) the formation of a hemispherewide anti-Communist, anti-Castro alliance. The announcement lists among the adherents Pres. Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, former Pres. Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin of Puerto Rico, former Pres. Luis Batlle Berres of Uruguay, Gov. Carlos Lacerda of the state of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, Victor Raul Haya de la Torre and Eudocio Ravines, leftist leaders in Peru, and many others. The primary object of the body is described by Cardona as inter-American action against the Castro regime and internationalization of the struggle of Cuban exiles to free their country from communism.

February 14, 1962: Cuba is formally excluded from the Organization of American States by the OAS Council—thereby carrying out the resolution voted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este.

February 15, 1962: U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee rejects a Czechoslovak-Rumanian resolution calling on the United States to cease "interference in the internal affairs of Cuba." (All Latin American countries—except Cuba—vote against this resolution.)

February 20, 1962: United States asks its NATO allies to prohibit voluntarily trade in strategic materials with Cuba and to reduce in general their trade with that country. The request is submitted to the Permanent Council of NATO in Paris.

Swede Nelson and the Carens Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an excellent article by the able, distinguished writer of the Boston Traveler, Tim Horgan, concerning my dear friend, the incomparable N. V. (Swede) Nelson, recent recipient of the Carens Award at Boston.

This award, given annually to the person who, in the opinion of the committee, has done most for football in New England for the year, is a very great honor, and its presention to Swede Nelson this year has met with overwhelming public acclaim and approval.

Swede Nelson has distinguished himself in many ways—great football star in his college days at Harvard, well-known coach and football expert, successful businessman, resolute advocate of highest standards of sportsmanship, many-sided humanitarian and an inspiring human being.

Devoted in his many activities for worthwhile, charitable causes, diligent, effective worker for the underprivileged, the handicapped, and the helpless, Swede Nelson throughout the years has furnished a striking example of noble achievement and unselfish service.

A widely known wit and accomplished after-dinner speaker, he has given most generously of his time, efforts, and amazing talents to innumerable fine causes in Boston, New England, and throughout the Nation. He is loved, admired, and respected by all who know him and by a host of people of every rank and station throughout the country.

Certainly no one has ever received this valued award, given in the honor

of the late, very distinguished George Carens, famous Boston newspaperman and sports authority, who more truly and wholeheartedly exemplifies the highest aims and traditions of American football and dedicated citizenship than Swede Nelson.

I congratulate my beloved friend, Swede, and his lovely family upon this great honor, and wish for him and for them continued success and true happiness for many years to come.

The article follows:

SWEDE GIVES ENTIRE LIFE TO FOOTBALL

(By Tim Horgan)

Nils V. Nelson visited his barber the other day, and in the course of his once-overlightly, the barber wondered about Swede's age.

"I'm 43," Swede reported.

"On one side," the barber scoffed.

"You cut the hair," Swede told him, "and I'll tell the jokes."

That's the way is should be, of course, because nobody tells a joke quite as well as this loyal son of Harvard, 1918. Very few have told so many, also. This is partly because it all began back in 1914, when no less than the late A. Lawrence Lowell advised the toastmaster at the Harvard freshman football banquet: "You were terrible, but you can be very good if you stick at it."

Since this came from the president of his beloved Harvard, Swede went out and set a world record for tenacity.

He had made approximately 150 talks per year after year since, although his arthritis and those 43 years of age have cut him to 40 or 50 recently. If there are people in New England who haven't heard Swede speak, they haven't been in New England more than an hour.

"Out in the open spaces," he begins launching his favorite gag of all time in that rollicking voice, "out West, they do a lot of proselyting. That's a Harvard word, I can't spell it. I can't even pronounce it, but it sounds good."

It sounds better every time he tells it, and nobody enjoys it more than Swede himself. "I speak," he says, "because I love it." That's part of the reason.

Swede is one of those men everybody knows but very few know much about. One of the least known aspects of this incomparable buffoon is that behind the raucous guffaw and the wagging cigar is a superb and dedicated man.

This was discovered when the football writers, in a startling turn of events, gave Swede an award yesterday. The man who has given so many awards, they finally named one after him, got the George C. Carens Memorial Trophy. Its for the person who has done the most for New England college football over the years, and the choice was perfect, if not evitable.

Nobody has done more for New England college football, in his own inimitable way, than Swede. This is even apart from his work on the Bulger Lowe Committee, for the Gridiron Club, or as a former Harvard coach. It's also not only because he has entertained more football groups than the shotgun formation.

What Swede does is live, breathe and, mostly, talk football with a purpose. He's a man with a message, a message to the effect that people are good, life is wonderful, and football is the best part of both.

He carries the message wherever he goes, because it's as much a part of him as his wit. In fact, it's why he goes to so many places, particularly where there are teenagers.

In the past 2 weeks, he has spoken at Somerville and Beverly High Schools, the Shirley Industrial School and the Dedham County Jail or maybe he's kidding. He goes to the teenagers and he says: "I understand you kids because I spent the best 9 years of my life in high school."

The kids love him for it and are thus available for the message, which Swede slips in between jokes, in epigrammatic form. Some of his favorites:

"The greatest thing in life is enthusiasm. The finest things of life are born out of it. Everything in life is dull and drab without it."

"Never hate in the plural. Dislike individuals if you want, but don't indict a whole race or a nation because of an individual."

"Truth is the best defense of all. It's better than a nine-man line."

His goodness, as much as his humor, makes Swede an extraordinarily popular man, which is why he shouldn't have been so genuinely surprised to get the Carens Award. After all, Swede admits: "Everywhere I go somebody is opening a door for me or holding my coat or giving me two scoops of ice cream."

Columnist Appraises the First 2 Years of the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to an editorial by David Lawrence in U.S. News & World Report, January 28, 1963. Mr. Lawrence makes a keen appraisal of the President's first 2 years in office and his analysis is a serious indictment of the failures of this administration. My purpose in including it as a part of these remarks is not to make of it a partisan issue, but in the hope that President Kennedy made be made to realize before it is too late that his policies of playing politics at all costs may prove disastrous for this Nation.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AFTER 2 YEARS

(By David Lawrence)

There are two ways to appraise an administration at a given time, either in terms of political popularity or by a realistic evaluation of the actual progress that has been made in the Nation's economy.

If an election were held today, President Kennedy would win a second term. This would be due not to his own efforts on television, radio, and in the press to present an image of successful leadership, but largely to the failure of the Republican Party, both inside and outside of Congress, to tell the American people the other side of the story.

The record of the Republicans as an opposition party in the last 2 years is the poorest in a half century of American politics. The Republicans have ignored the lessons of the past and feel they must fashion their strategy to fit Democratic Party concepts. They argue among themselves about "liberalism" and "conservatism," or about "old Republicanism" and "new Republicanism," while they should be uniting to tell the country of the scandals that are emerging under the Kennedy administration. For rarely in history have governmental powers been so brazenly used to build a national political machine.

The administration has kept the peace. After waiting until Soviet missiles were actually assembled and emplaced in Cuba, President Kennedy finally acted with a show of firmness. Even though his action was belated, and there is still considerable doubt as to whether the danger has been removed, the fact remains that on balance today the electorate would on this specific issue vote to sustain the President.

But does the country know the facts? Why hasn't the truth about the ilifated invasion of Cuba in April 1961 been disclosed? Is it conceivable that our military chiefs did not protest an invasion plan that failed to provide adequate air cover of some kind? If they did recommend it, did the President disregard their advice? Didn't this debacle give the Soviets their opportunity to threaten us and bring on our worst war scare in recent history?

Premier Khrushchev concedes that the United States now has at least 40,000 nuclear bombs and warheads and that war is unthinkable. So the average man feels more secure for the time being.

If, to be sure, the Republicans hadn't been asleep at the switch, they would have been pointing out that the military strentgh of this country could not have been built up to its present superiority in just 2 years.

The charge that the Eisenhower administration permitted a "missile gap," for instance, is no longer heard in debate. It remains nevertheless as one of the biggest falsehoods ever perpetrated in American politics.

The Republicans can hardly rely on the present administration to give credit for what was really achieved militarily and on the diplomatic front in the preceding 8 years.

Measured in the perspective of history, the administration has failed to come to grips with the fundamental problems of our economic life. Most important is the inability either to balance the budget or to cure the unemployment problem. The President's recent messages call for budget deficits which will run until 1967. The administration intends to stand in 1964 on a platform of deficit spending which, without a curtailment of spending on nondefense items, must result in gradually cutting down the purchasing power of the dollar.

The economy at present is bogged down by labor troubles. The longshoremen's strike, which has obstructed the Nation's shipping, and the newspaper strikes in New York City and Cleveland do not augur well for the future. Such situations are not conducive to business planning despite the stimulants to private spending being offered through tax cuts.

For the President has been patently unwilling to deal with the growing monopoly power of labor unions. The administration has not hesitated to harass and slander American businessmen, but it has cravenly refused to use its inherent powers to quell the conspiracies that restrain commerce and provoke costly strikes.

From the standpoint of political morality, the huge campaign funds collected by labor unions from their members present a glaring example of an unholy alliance between the administration and a large group that enjoys a special privilege in America today. The country has been told little about this, and the Republican Party has not fought hard enough for an investigation by Congress to expose the truth.

To curry favor with political groups, President Kennedy, by his Executive orders on a variety of subjects, has ignored the law of the land. Yet the Republicans have failed to emphasize this usurpation of governmental power.

All in all, the country needs a purging of political immoralities. It needs an opposition party with the courage to present the facts to the American people consistently and persistently. For when the people are given both sides, they usually recognize truth.

National Geographic Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago last Sunday a small group of scientists gathered here in Washington at the Cosmos Club, January 27, 1888, and their deliberations resulted in the founding of the National Geographic Society, respected and well known throughout the world for its fine publication of the literate and informative journal, the National Geographic.

Under leave to extent my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a history of the National Geographic Society that appeared in the Washington Sunday Post, January 27:

THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC IS 75 TODAY

(By Sterling Seagrave)

Today is the 75th anniversary of the National Geographic Society.

Founded by a small group of scientists at the Cosmos Club in 1888 to promote "the increase and diffusion of geographical knowledge," the Society's thin, arid journal has blossomed into one of the most highly respected publications in the world, famous for its lavish color illustrations, a household furnishing adored by adults and children.

Its 3,500,000 readers loyally renew their subscriptions in advance each year. For their small annual fee, they become members of the society, participate by proxy in countless expeditions, and enjoy seven 10-color map supplements a year.

Washington members attend regular illustrated lectures at Constitution Hall from famous explorers, scientists, and off-the-beaten-path travelers.

The society has built an immense reserve fund of many millions and helps sponsor research programs, expeditions, and photographic junkets. "Junior Geographics" are sent to schools each week as part of a subsidiary educational program that helps maintain the society as a tax-exempt, nonprofit institution.

Its 1,500 staff members work in quietly elegant surroundings gorged with trophies and artifacts collected all over the world, slowly and painstakingly crafting each month's issue.

In autumn of this year, the society will move into a new building designed by Edward Durell Stone at 17th and M Streets NW., a $10 million structure with thin fluted ribs, individual offices, and an expansive Explorers Hall filled with displays and exhibits.

Behind the success is Gilbert Grosvenor, the first editor of the magazine. Now in his eighties and retired to his estate in Coconut Grove, near Miami, Grosvenor built the society and magazine with a keen eye at public relations and less attention to the restrictive definition of "geography."

Grosvenor is probably the only man ever to have his name given to four babies, a fish, a seashell, a lake, and a plant.

He is a modest man, once described as having the "sprightly air of an inquiring grasshopper," and he usually cannot remember all the things named after him. However, when the Interior Department in 1925 decided to change the name of Grosvenor Lake because it did not seem right to name topographical features after living persons, Grosvenor contacted President Coolidge who was two classes ahead of him at Amherst. The President chided the Interior Department for even thinking of such a thing.

Although Grosvenor retired in 1954 to become chairman of the board of trustees, his influence, character, and personality still pervade the society and its offices. That influence has made the society condemned or complimented diversely as a brown study, an aristocratic fief, a stuffy and protectively dignified private club, or one of the last strongholds of all the good things that went with 19th century manhood, a mood of great adventure, bearded men with weathered faces, tweed and privacy.

For years, no staff member dared smoke in the building. One always wore a coat in the hallways and never went out without a hat.

Men and women staff members ate in separate cafeterias, and do so to this day, to permit "blue" conversation among the men without offending the women. Senior staff men dined sedately in a separate room.

Viewed as a benevolent monarchy, the National Geographic Society has a remarkable genealogy.

At its founding in 1888, Boston philanthropist Gardiner Greene Hubbard became first president. Hubbard had financed Alexander Graham Bell's experiments with the telephone. Bell married one of Hubbard's daughters and became second president.

By 1899 the National Geographic magazine was several thousand dollars in debt and had only 200 readers. It was cryptic reading for anyone outside the scientific community and not exactly inspiring to those inside the community who submitted its cold, learned papers.

Bell brought in Gilbert Grosvenor, a lad fresh from Amherst, and explained that he wanted to make the magazine a success by popularizing the science of geography and taking it into the homes of the people.

In half of a tiny office, Grosvenor took on the job of transforming bleak geographic facts expressed in hieroglyphic terms into a vehicle for carrying the human interest truth about this world of ours into homes everywhere.

The next year he married Bell's daughter, Elsie May. She later designed the Society's flag of brown, green, and blue, for earth, sea, and sky.

For 5 years Bell paid Grosvenor $100 a month. Grosvenor did everything himself, including hand-addressing magazine wrappers. His first purchase as the new editor was a $20 addressing machine.

Grosvenor was convinced that the magazine should use pictures to draw readers into the little-known corners of geography. A fluke gave him the opportunity—and simultaneously started the magazine on its way to setting many firsts in photography.

"I came into the office one December morning in 1904 deeply discouraged," Grosvenor said. "The printer was urgently demanding copy for 11 pages for the January issue. I simply had no manuscript available."

A bulky envelope lay on his desk. He opened it listlessly and out fell 50 striking photographs of Lhasa, Tibet, taken by a Russian explorer. Grosvenor took a chance on offending the handful of members and filled the 11 pages with the pictures.

During the following decades, the magazine printed the first natural color photos taken from the air, underground, and beneath the sea. The society helped finance Peary's expedition to the North Pole, Amundsen's to the South Pole, Byrd's flights over both, and many other explorations into the darkest recesses of the earth. Each expedition brought fame and the gratitude of the explorers, not to mention their photographs and personal accounts for the magazine.

As the age of exploration became a page of history, so it became many colorful pages in National Geographic.

The magazine described everything from the first exploration of Carlsbad Caverns to the discovery of Machu Picchu, unearthing giant carved stone heads in Mexico, tribal customs in Borneo and New York City, fossils in Africa, mountains in Alaska and the Himalayas and the Alps, volcanoes hither and yon, bird life in New Zealand, ruins in Italy, unclad maidens in Africa and the Amazon, bird life in the Caribbean, coral reefs off Australia, bird life in Canada, balloon flights into the stratosphere, lizards in New Guinea, fishes in the Pacific, and bird life in Grosvenor's backyard in Maryland.

In the last 10 years alone, circulation (i.e., membership) rose by over 1 million.

A distinct style has evolved with Grosvenor's determination to make the science of geography both popular and intelligible. Known within the profession as the "Dear Aunt Sally," the style strives to give a refreshing first person account of faraway places with strange sounding names, exciting and sometimes frightening sights.

It is an effective style, and equally great pains are taken to select vivid photographs.

There is no reckless rush at the magazine, where care and precision are all important.

A crack newspaperman was hired once and his first assignment was to write captions for several pictures for the magazine.

Accustomed to the adrenal pressure and precipitous pace of a newspaper city room, the ex-reporter hammered out the captions adroitly and had them back in his new editor's office in 15 minutes.

"Good grief," said the dismayed editor, "you have 2 weeks to do those. Take them back and stew over them for a while."

The society's photographic staff is equally diligent and no man has yet been lost on an expedition, although several have plunged into the drink, equipment and all.

Volkmar Wentzel shot thousands of pictures during a month in Southwest Africa's skeleton coast diamond mines. He was about to clear customs on his way home when a diamond-conscious customs official decided to X-ray all his baggage for smuggled gems. Before Wentzel could stop him, the official had X-rayed out all of Wentzel's film.

The society's membership extends around the world, including King Paul and Queen Frederika of Greece.

A number of Presidents have written for the magazine, including President Taft and President Theodore Roosevelt. President Franklin D. Roosevelt had a National Geographic mapcase he liked so much he asked the society to make another as a gift for Winston Churchill. There is a similar mapcase in President Kennedy's office.

The present board of trustees, elected for life, includes Gilbert Grosvenor, chairman; Thomas W. McKnew, vice chairman; Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury; Lyman J. Briggs, director emeritus of the National Bureau of Standards; Leonard Carmichael, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Rear Adm. L. O. Colbert, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey (retired); Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA; and T. Dale Stewart, of the Museum of Natural History.

When Grosvenor retired, his longtime right-hand man John Oliver LaGorce succeeded him as president and editor. LaGorce, who had a few mountains named after him, retired in 1957 and died in 1959.

Melville Bell Grosvenor became president and editor, continuing the dynasty established by his father, grandfather, nad great-grandfather.

An intense, nervous man deeply involved with his work, he has brought outward changes to the staff, which is younger, and added color pictures to the sacred yellow-bordered cover of the magazine.

While still conscious of the dignity, ethics, and discretion traditional to the society, the younger generation smokes, including the women; shirtsleeves appear in the halls, and that last stronghold of masculine privacy, the dining rooms, will be combined in the new building.

The birds have given way to missiles and satellites in the National Geographic's pages, fishes have been made obsolescent by nuclear submarines, and soon even the famous sections on native girls in more or less native costumes may give way to articles on the denizens of distant planets.

Melvin M. Payne, executive vice president and secretary, a man with a word gift who directs the society's worldwide research and exploration, thumbnailed just a few of the current projects.

They include the American team setting out to conquer Mount Everest; archeological undersea digging off Turkey on a sunken Byzantine ship; anthropological research at Olduvai Gorge, Tanganyika, where fossil beds are giving up clues to the ever-missing link; a photographic study of the brighter planets by astronomers at Flagstaff's Lowell Observatory.

Consumer Reports Calls for Safe Cosmetics Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of the magazine, Consumer Reports, published by Consumers Union, contains a very worthwhile discussion on the need for tighter laws to protect the public in the purchase and use of cosmetics. This is an objective which I have been pursuing ever since coming to Congress in 1953. I have introduced safe cosmetics bills in every Congress since then, and I am delighted that this magazine which is held in such high esteem by so many consumers has also been championing the same cause over the years.

The article, which I am placing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks, is entitled "Cosmetics Versus the Consumer," and is based on an address given by CU's medical adviser, Dr. Harold Aaron, as part of a symposium of the American Medical Association's Committee on Cosmetics at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Dermatology in Chicago last December.

There is one oversight or inaccuracy in the article which I feel I should mention, in placing it in the RECORD. After discussing gaps in the law which often prevent the Food and Drug Administration from moving effectively against an unsafe cosmetic item until a great deal of harm has already been done to consumers, the article states:

When injuries do occur, especially allergic reactions, the problem is compounded for the victim and his doctor by the lack of a requirement that ingredients be revealed. The law proposed to the last Congress did not take cognizance of this problem. CU believes that cosmetics makers, like food processors and drug manufacturers, should be required to list ingredients on their labels.

H.R. 1235 CONTAINED REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF INGREDIENTS OF COSMETICS

Mr. Speaker, the omnibus bill which I introduced on January 3, 1961, to rewrite the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938 and to require, among many other things, the pretesting for safety of all cosmetics, contained exactly the sort of cosmetic ingredient identification requirement Consumer Reports mentions. Hence, the bill the article refers to when it says: "the law proposed to the last Congress did not take cognizance of this problem" would not have been H.R. 1235.

Subsection (f) of section 9 of H.R. 1235 in the last Congress (it is now renumbered as section 8 in the new H.R. 1235 introduced January 9, 1963, in this Congress), would add a new subsection (3) to section 602 of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act dealing with misbranding, of cosmetics, to read as follows:

(e) Unless its labeling bears (1) the common or usual name of the cosmetic chemicals, and (2) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient: *Provided,* That to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (2) of this paragraph is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition, or is not in the best interest of the consumer, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, with that one exception or oversight clarified, I think the article in Consumer Reports on the need for better laws to protect users of cosmetics represents an excellent outline of the problem. I am happy that H.R. 1235 covers all of the major points raised in this article, plus some additional ones not mentioned by Consumer Reports such as the exemption in the present law for soap, an exemption which H.R. 1235 would repeal.

The article referred to is as follows:

HEALTH AND MEDICINE—COSMETICS VERSUS THE CONSUMER—CU HOPES IT WON'T TAKE A THALIDOMIDE TRAGEDY TO TIGHTEN COSMETICS SAFETY LAWS

Although there have been no great cosmetics scares in recent years, an addition to consumer protection legislation to require that cosmetics be tested for safety before they are marketed is sorely needed. Legislation to require protection was introduced in the last Congress, but no action was taken; it will undoubtedly be reintroduced this year.

Americans now spend more than $2 billion a year on cosmetics, a 300-percent increase from 1940. And despite the prominence of the word in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the protection afforded consumers of cosmetics under present Federal law is minimal.

PROVISIONS AND DEFICIENCIES OF THE LAW

The cosmetics sections of the law as it now stands do little more than require sanitary production, honest weights and measures, and disclosure of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor of the product. The buyer of an unfamiliar cosmetic has no assurance of its safety in normal use. The FDA has authority to act on a hazardous cosmetic before it actually does harm to a buyer only in the not very likely event that a manufacturer incorporates a known hazardous ingredient in his formula. New ingredients or elaborate new concoctions of ingredients may be placed on the market without previous testing, and, if the products turn out to be harmful, the FDA may step in only after enough people have been hurt—and have reported the fact—to demonstrate that the produce is harmful. With TenDay Press-on Nail Color a few years ago (Consumer Reports, May 1958), 700 women had reported damaged fingernails before the FDA could get the product off the market.

When injuries do occur, especially allergic reactions, the problem is compounded for the victim and his doctor by the lack of a requirement that ingredients be revealed. The law proposed to the last Congress did not take cognizance of this problem. CU believes that cosmetics makers, like food processors and drug manufacturers, should be required to list ingredients on their labels.

That a cosmetics tragedy of thalidomide proportions has not brought a precipitous correction of deficiencies in the law, CU's medical consultants believe, can be credited only to good fortune plus the instinct for self-preservation, if not social reponsibility, on the part of the large cosmetics manufacturers. While there have been no recent serious outbreaks of injury comparable to the cases of blindness caused by hair dyes in the 1930's, it is almost impossible to obtain a reasonable estimate of the safety record of today's cosmetics. There is no systematic reporting program, and even if there were a great many of the less spectacular injuries, especially allergic reactions, would never be counted.

CU recently received a letter from a professor at Yale University telling of some inquiries he made after a bubble bath product had caused severe irritation of the vulva in his 3-year-old daughter. From talking to local physicians and friends he learned of eight similar cases in young girls. Although this seeming epidemic in one area is not likely to be an isolated instance, the FDA has not had a notable number of complaints on this product. Unless a severe complication sets in, an injured person apparently just crosses the product off her shopping list and lets the incident drop.

The regular channels for exchange of medical information show little interest in cosmetics injuries. Except where a novel and interesting kind of toxicity is involved, very few cases are given space in the clinical literature. Medical societies, State and local regulatory agencies, better business bureaus, consumer groups, and other such organizations receive reports of cosmetics injury sporadically, but they are often lax about passing the word on. If all these sources funneled to the FDA the information they receive, the protection of other people might be speeded. Consumers, too, could do a real service by taking the time to notify the FDA of any unhappy experiences they may have with cosmetics, giving the name of the product and details of their trouble with it (see "Government Aids to Consumers" in the current buying guide issue, p. 93).

LIMITATIONS OF TESTING

Pretesting, important as it is, cannot fully avert the possibility of cosmetics injury. There are inherent limitations in the testing procedures. The manufacturers which now test products before marketing them generally engage commercial laboratories which chiefly use animals. Such testing screens out highly toxic products. It is in the shift to human subjects, particularly in the search

for allergic reactions that problems arise. Often a cosmetics company carries out the first tests of a new product in significant numbers of human beings simply by selling it in a limited area. If there are no complaints, marketing is expanded.

While a law could bring this practice within better scientific and ethical control, the final verdict on the safety of a product might still have to await use more widespread than desirable from the point of view of maximum safety. Researchers know that in allergy investigations a test population as large as 30,000 may fail to reveal a reaction rate of 1 in 10,000, enough to bring complaints with a popular cosmetic. Premarketing tests for safety are unlikely ever to reach that scale.

Even large-scale testing might fail to uncover unusual hazards. Would it, for example, have revealed a potentially lethal effect of the powdered hair-coloring agent with which teenage girls put a streak in their hair: A 7-year-old boy in California recently had to have a tracheotomy to open breathing passages irritated by the powder inhaled as he watched a 12-year-old girl use it.

A good reporting network of consumer experience with cosmetics, then, will continue to be important whatever changes are made in the law.

THE NEED FOR CAUTIONARY LABELING

Even the best possible consumer protection would still leave open another source of injury, those products which are known to have some degree of potential hazard but are permitted on the market anyway, because their usefulness is judged to outweigh the hazard. A great many products fall in this class. Most cosmetics, for example, may be irritating when they get into the eyes. A commercial testing laboratory has found that nearly all of a group of 140 cosmetic products for use on the head, including various antidandruff products, shampoos, and hair sprays, would have to be labeled as eye irritants if they were subject to the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act. Perfumes, which are most commonly the ingredients that cause allegic reactions, are added to almost every cosmetic product. And there are some products, depilatories, for example, which have to be potentially injurious to accomplish their purpose. Few cosmetics now bear any cautionary labeling.

What is needed, then, to assure a minimum of injury from the growing use of cosmetics is a combination of better laws, continued vigilance, and intelligent consuming.

COSMETICS ADVERTISING

It is not so easy to suggest an approach to another aspect of consumer difficulties with the cosmetic industry, the modus operandi of cosmetics promoters.

The world of cosmetics advertising is a strange one. A girl can spend her holiday on the deck of a sailboat beating into a 10-knot breeze, one would judge by the slant of the deck, without disturbing a hair of her well-sprayed head. A previously lonesome male suddenly has to fight off the feminine pursuers after he slicks down his unruly hair with a magic cream. In the commercials for another product the cream, in turn, becomes "that greasy kid stuff" in the he-man atmosphere of the locker room. In this remarkable world, you are invited to lubricate the skin with a product whose prime action removes fats and oils—Dove detergent bar. You can be tranquilized by a simple antiperspirant ("Ice Blue" Secret). And you can cure dishpan hands by washing dishes (Ivory Liquid).

All these exaggerations are embellishments attributed for promotional purposes to products of basically limited usefulness. Commonsense says the products cannot possibly do all that is claimed for them. Why, then, does not the Federal Trade Commission step in?

The answer is simple if the remedy is not. The FTC must prove an advertising claim to be false before banning it. With cosmetics claims this raises a multitude of problems. For one thing, most cosmetics claims are not susceptible to proof, either true or false; what researcher would care to find proof, for example, of the claim that a cosmetic can make your body "a scented column of silken smoothness and your presence a sheer delight?"

Another group of claims difficult for the FTC to attack are those based on data which are scientifically weak but still can be dressed up to impress lay judges and juries; toothpaste claims often fall in this category.

Still other questionable claims rest on physiological notions which are extremely difficult if not impossible to disprove with today's knowledge and technology; the claims for products which cater to dry skin are cases in point. Virtually all these products are emollients of one sort or another; yet it has been shown that dryness of the skin is caused by escape of water from the tissues, not by the removal of fats or oils. The best that an emollient can hope to do is to give the dry skin a smooth feel and inhibit further evaporation of moisture. Moreover, there is no objective measurement for skin dryness.

SKIN ILLS MADE TO ORDER

Cosmetics promotion, both through advertising—especially on TV—and through the hidden persuasion of the women's magazines, is having a profound effect. Good Housekeeping, in surveying the purposes for which women apply substances to their skin, found a remarkable growth in skin problems between 1957 and 1961: dryness up from 35 to 41 percent; chapping, 10 to 18 percent; flaking, 14 to 21 percent. Such a marked increase in dryness, if real, could only have been produced by a meterological upheaval resulting in unprecedented changes in the mean relative humidity or by a nationwide metabolic disturbance. But the survey also showed oily skin increasing, as well as freckles, large pores, and blemishes.

The commercial philosophy of this Nation invites anyone with initiative to enter the marketplace and sell whatever he can, short of harming his customers, and it need not be a better mousetrap. If it can be artfully enough promoted, it need not work at all. Considering the limited range of physical effects that cosmetics can have, one may argue that the purposes of cosmetics are mainly psychological; that if the buyer can be convinced she is benefited by using the product, full value is received. While this reasoning may contain some truth in respect to cosmetics, it is also a justification for any kind of deception, so long as the victim is unaware of it and makes no complaint.

CU has no ready answer to the ethical questions posed by the general acceptance of gross deception in cosmetics promotion. But there is perhaps some comfort in the thought that a mind well supplied with reliable information is less likely to be gullible. CU intends to continue contributing to its readers' fund of reliable information.

(The article above was prepared from material gathered for an address given by Harold Aaron, M.D., CU's medical adviser, as part of a symposium of the American Medical Association's Committee on Cosmetics at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Dermatology in Chicago last December.)

FULL TEXT OF COSMETIC PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1235

Mr. Speaker, the section dealing with cosmetics is only one of many sections in H.R. 1235 to rewrite our nearly 25-year-old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. Other provisions of H.R. 1235 would tighten the labeling requirements for all foods and drugs, as well as cosmetics, to prevent deceptive packaging and other consumer frauds; attack the sale of fake cures for cancer; require new therapeutic devices to be proved both safe and efficacious before they can be sold; provide more adequate controls over the distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and amphetamines—the sleeping pills and "pep" pills; strengthen the factory inspection laws for all products covered by the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and make other important and long-overdue changes in our basic consumer statute.

Relevant to the article from Consumer Reports which appears above, however, would be only section 8 of the bill as it now stands, applying entirely to cosmetics.

I, therefore, submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD, section 8 of H.R. 1235, as follows:

PRETESTING COSMETICS

SEC. 8. (a) The following new section is added at the end of chapter VI of such Act:

"PRETESTING COSMETICS

"SEC. 604. (a) No person shall introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any cosmetic—

"(1) the composition of which is such that such cosmetic is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of cosmetics, as having been adequately shown to be safe for its intended us and other uses reasonably to be anticipated, or

"(2) the composition of which is such that such cosmetic, as a result of investigations to determine its safety for such a use, has become so recognized, but which has not, otherwise than in such investigations, been so used to a material extent or for a material time, unless an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) is effective with respect to such cosmetic.

"(b) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any cosmetic subject to the provisions of subsection (a). Such persons shall submit to the Secretary as a part of the application (1) full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether or not such cosmetic is safe for use; (2) a full list of the articles used as components of such cosmetic; (3) a full statement of the composition of such cosmetic; (4) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such cosmetic; (5) such samples of such cosmetic and of the articles used as components thereof as the Secretary may require; and (6) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such cosmetic.

"(c) The Secretary, within ninety days after the filing of an application under this subsection, shall notify the applicant that the application is effective or shall give the applicant notice of opportunity for a hearing on the question whether to permit the application to become effective, except that prior to the ninetieth day after such filing the Secretary may notify the applicant in writing that the time for action by him has been extended to such time (not more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of filing the application) as the Secretary deems necessary to enable him to study and investigate the application.

"(d)(1) If the Secretary finds, after due notice to the applicant and giving him an

opportunity for a hearing, that (A) the investigations, reports of which are required to be submitted to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b), do not include adequate tests by all methods reasonably applicable to show whether or not such cosmetic is safe for its intended use and other uses reasonably to be anticipated; (B) the results of such tests show that such cosmetic is unsafe for any such use or do not show that such cosmetic is safe for such uses; (C) the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such cosmetic are inadequate to preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity; or (D) upon the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application, or upon the basis of any other information before him with respect to such cosmetic, he has insufficient information to determine whether such cosmetic is safe for its intended use and other uses reasonably to be anticipated, he shall, prior to the effective date of the application, issue an order refusing to permit the application to become effective.

"(2) A cosmetic shall be deemed unsafe and an application with respect to it may not become effective—

"(A) if its intended use or any use which can reasonably be anticipated will or may result in ingestion of all or part of such cosmetic and (i) the cosmetic is found by the Secretary to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal or (ii) it is found by the Secretary, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of safety of cosmetics, to induce cancer in man or animal, or

"(B) if its intended use or any use which can reasonably be anticipated will not result in ingestion of any part of such cosmetic and, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of the cosmetics for any such use, or after other relevant exposure of man or animal to such cosmetic, it is found by the Secretary to induce cancer in man or animal.

"(3) An application with respect to a cosmetic may not become effective if the data before the Secretary show that its intended use or any use which can reasonably be anticipated would promote deception of the consumer in violation of this Act or would otherwise result in misbranding or adulteration within the meaning of this Act.

"(e) The effectiveness of an application with respect to any cosmetic shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, by order of the Secretary be suspended if the Secretary finds that (1) for reasons set forth by him, there is reasonable doubt as to the safety of the cosmetic for its intended use or any other use reasonably to be anticipated, or (2) the application contains any untrue statement of a material fact.

"(f) An order refusing to permit an application with respect to any cosmetic to become effective shall be revoked whenever the Secretary finds that the facts so require.

"(g)(1) An order of the Secretary after a hearing unnder this section shall be based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record at the hearing and shall include a statement setting forth in detail the findings and conclusions on which it is based.

"(2) Orders of the Secretary under this section shall be served (A) in person by any officer or employee of the Department designated by the Secretary or (B) by mailing the order by registered mail or certified mail addressed to the applicant or respondent at his last known address in the records of the Secretary.

"(h) In case of denial or withdrawal of approval of an application under this section, the applicant may file in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such applicant resides or has his principal place of business, within sixty days after serving of notice of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, or any officer designated by him for that purpose, and thereupon the Secretary shall file in the court a transcript of the record of the proceedings on which he based his order, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record with it shall be exclusive, to affirm or set aside the order. The finding of the Secretary as to the facts shall be sustained if based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record at the hearing. If any person shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Secretary, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts and order by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file with the court such modified findings and order. The court, on judicial review, shall not sustain the order of the Secretary if he failed to comply with any requirement imposed on him by subsection (g)(1). The judgment and decree of the court affirming or setting aside any order under this section shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of the Secretary's order.

"(i) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations for exempting from the operation of this section cosmetics intended solely for investigational use by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety of cosmetics."

"(j)(1) Every person engaged in manufacturing, compounding, or processing any cosmetic with respect to which an application, filed pursuant to this section, is in effect shall establish and maintain such records, and make such reports to the Secretary, of data relating to experience and other data or information, received or otherwise obtained by such person with respect to such cosmetic, as the Secretary may by general regulation, or by order with respect to such application, prescribe on the basis of a finding that such records and reports are necessary in order to enable the Secretary to determine, or to facilitate a determination, whether there is or may be ground for invoking subsection (e) of this section.

"(2) Every person required under this section to maintain records, and every person in charge or custody thereof, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at all reasonable times to have access to and copy and verify such records."

(b) Section 201(i)(2) of such Act is amended by changing the semicolon to a period and deleting the words "except that such term shall not include soap."

(c) Section 301 of such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out in paragraph (d) thereof "or 512" and inserting in lieu thereof "512 or 604".

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (e) thereof a semicolon and the following: "or the failure to establish or maintain any record, or make any report, required under section 604 (i) or (j), or the refusal to permit access to or verification or copying of any such record."

(3) by inserting "604," in paragraph (j) after "507,".

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(q) The using, on the labeling of any cosmetic or in any advertising relating to such cosmetic, of any representation or suggestion that an application with respect to such cosmetic is effective under section 604, or that such cosmetic complies with the provisions of such section."

(d) Section 304 of such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (a) thereof "or 512" and inserting in lieu thereof "512 or 604".

(2) by striking out in subsection (d) thereof "404 or 505" and inserting in lieu thereof "404, 505, or 604".

(e) Section 601 of such Act is amended—

(1) by changing the semicolon after the word "usual" in subsection (a) to a period, and deleting the remainder of the subsection.

(2) by changing subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) If it is, or it bears or contains, a color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706(a)".

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) If it is a cosmetic to which the provisions of section 604 apply but with respect to which an application is not effective under such section."

(f) Section 602 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(e) Unless its labeling bears (1) the common or usual name of the cosmetic chemicals, and (2) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient: *Provided*, That to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (2) of this paragraph is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition, or is not in the best interest of the consumer, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary".

Congressional Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the House Rules Committee is taking steps to institute urgently needed reforms in the business of congressional travel.

I strongly believe that Members of the House and Senate should educate themselves on world problems, problems which we often tend to judge with little knowledge of overall global conditions and international pressures. It is healthy for Members to be continually confronted by the other man's point of view. Proper travel under proper circumstances can, therefore, be a definite aid to the Member in discharging his responsibilities and such travel is to be encouraged. However, it would more than strain my imagination to justify some of the trips made by Members of Congress, trips which neither promote the

Members' understanding of world affairs nor contribute to the American legislative process. And we are all aware that some of the worst abuses of the Congress transpire in the use of counterpart funds by Members traveling abroad.

Hence, there is a need for the firm tightening of the rules and procedures concerning congressional travel. The least of these reforms should be an accurate and complete public accounting of all expenditures including both those itemized in travel vouchers and those taken from counterpart funds. Experiencing once again how the flagrant abuses of the few reflect upon the conscientious actions of the many, we should all recognize the need of exercising self-discipline and of establishing a code of ethics. This we owe to the public and to ourselves.

The Small Business Administration Must Remain an Independent Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following correspondence between George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and President Kennedy.

If the Small Business Administration is to continue its very effective and necessary work, it must remain independent of the Department of Commerce.

Those who know the value of SBA's work will be interested in the reply that Mr. Burger received from the White House expressing the President's strong support for an independent Small Business Administration.

The correspondence follows:

JANUARY 10, 1963.

Re: Small Business Administration.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The record will disclose from the first instance the National Federation of Independent Business has been in the forefront supporting legislative action creating the Small Business Administration.

Our action was authorized by the registered vote of our nationwide membership, all independent business and professional men in the 50 States, now numbering approximately 200,000, all individual members comprising all types of industry in small business.

This agency has served a necessary and important function, opening up credit channels that heretofore, by State or Federal regulation in banking circles were prohibited.

During the life of this agency these past 10 years the Federation has stood in the forefront in supporting any legislative move that would strengthen this agency in its aid to small business, not alone in financial matters but all other actions within the agency, provided by law.

We understand that during the life of the agency, up to December 31, 1962, 35,072 small businesses have been able to help themselves through the help of this agency. Then again, the agency has assisted, in no uncertain terms, in making certain that small business receives its fair share of Government contracts.

A more important aspect is that during the life of the agency the banks nationwide have taken more receptive action in cooperation with the Small Business Administration in loan participation.

If this agency had not been established by the Congress, all this needed help to small business would have been denied, which would have resulted in possibly increased small business failures.

There have been rumors that there is a movement underway for the Small Business Administration to be taken over as a Department within the Department of Commerce. This rumor has been in existence for nearly 2 months, and more recently the rumor is more or less confirmed by responsible sources.

Now, Mr. President, we are committed, in behalf of small business, to oppose any such action of the Department of Commerce absorbing the Small Business Administration, and we are further on record opposing any duplication of action within the Department of Commerce now being performed by and originating with the Small Business Administration.

This is a very serious matter if there is merit in the rumor.

Mr. President, can we expect your wholehearted cooperation in keeping the Small Business Administration as a separate and distinct agency of the Federal Government, and may we expect to hear from you at your very earliest convenience?

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 17, 1963.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: The President has asked me to reply to your letter indicating there are currently rumors that the Small Business Administration is to have its functions transferred to the Commerce Department. I can reassure you without any reservations or qualifications, there is absolutely no justification for any such story.

As you know, the President has given strong and vigorous support to the Small Business Administration. I am pleased to advise you that this support will continue and that the Small Business Administration will remain an independent agency.

Sincerely,

LEE C. WHITE,
Assistant Special Counsel to the President.

Poem by a Golden Ager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to extend my remarks to include a letter from my friend and constituent, A. J. Goldsmith, and a poem the reading of which I recommend to all my colleagues.

This is the letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am taking the liberty of sending to you what I believe is a very beautiful poem written by Alta Schoenbrod, a 75-year-old resident of the Jewish Federation's Drexel Home for the Aged located in your district.

The poem was published in a special Chanukah edition of the Drexel Home News that is written and edited by the residents.

Perhaps, Congressman, you could enter this poem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a tribute to the many golden agers who are seeking to live full lives in our great land.

Very truly yours,

A. J. GOLDSMITH,
Assistant Director of Public Relations.

Mr. Speaker, this is the poem written by Alta Schoenbrod, 75 years of age, a resident of the Jewish Federation's Drexel Home for the Aged located at 6140 South Drexel Avenue:

FREEDOM

While walking home to the Annex, across the street,
I stopped at a tree and heard the young birds tweet!
I am not fond of poetry, much more of prose
But the muse then got me, so here goes!
I was inspired many hours, to appreciate the twittering of birds,
A garden of beautiful flowers,
The sunshine, the air, that is free,
Also stars, and the moon.
A God-made tree! (Joyce Kilmer.)
The mountains, rivers, and lakes,
So numerous and lovely
In our United States!
We live and are blest, unaware
Of the many features, that are free as the air.
Freedom of speech, pursuit of happiness
Which we crave
Are in our beloved America!
Land of the free, and home of the brave.
We should pray for peace,
Thankful for natural courses
And take advantage of its many resources.

Khrushchev Charts a Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Khrushchev Charts a Course," which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette, of January 19, 1963. This editorial is a grim warning of the method employed by Communists to infiltrate free nations in their quest for world domination, and should be of interest to every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

KHRUSHCHEV CHARTS A COURSE

Nikita Khrushchev has just made things a lot tougher for leaders of the Western alliance, particularly President Kennedy. In what may be one of the major speeches of his career, the world's boss Red has made it clear just where he thinks communism is going in the next few years, and how he thinks it is going to get there.

It is not at all beside the point that this Communist chieftain at the age of 68 boasts that he will be alive to see socialism, that is, the Communist system, triumphant in the world. It is highly significant that the boast

was repeated in the same speech in which Khrushchev inferentially warned Communists against provoking the United States into nuclear war.

The new cult of Kremlinologists in this country, beset by a fixation that compels them to picture Khrushchev on the defensive, hastily interpreted his Berlin speech of last Wednesday in terms of what they call a split between the Soviet Union and Red China.

It makes a great deal of difference if you look at the talk as a blueprint for a continuing attack on the free world. What Krushchev said makes a great deal more sense in this light. He said he will live to see communism triumphant. He said the triumph can be achieved only by avoiding a head-on war with the United States. He noted that this country has 40,000 nuclear warheads—his spies are still at work—and that it would be folly to challenge this strength directly.

Then he cited Cuba as an example of the way in which communism will win. He had a point there. He had backtracked to avoid a head-on clash over Cuba, but by doing so he protected tremendous gains. Soviet troops are in Cuba. Soviet arms, short of nuclear missiles, are there. Communism is far ahead of what it was a year ago in Cuba. This is what Khrushchev was saying.

He was telling Communists throughout the world what Lenin first told them years ago, that it is orthodox Communist procedure to take one step back if you have taken two steps forward. Khrushchev took a step back in Cuba, a sensational step, it is true, but it left him still one step forward.

He took a step forward when he built the Berlin wall, and he has not taken a step back there yet. So he is ahead on that front. A troika government in Laos was his step ahead in Southeast Asia. His pal, Sukarno, took over West New Guinea, which was another half step ahead in that part of the world.

Against this, Khrushchev has taken nuclear missiles out of Cuba, one step backward, and withdrawn a deadline on a Berlin settlement, which was a psychological if not an actual step backward. Also he has engaged in a dispute over dogma with Red China's Mao Tse-tung, the question being whether it is better to destroy the free world piecemeal or all at once.

In view of this record, we believe Khrushchev was saying in his Berlin talk that he has measured Mr. Kennedy, and found him ready to fight when directly challenged. We believe this is a proper estimate. Khrushchev says further that communism cannot win in an all-out fight. Again, a proper estimate. So, he says, Communists must outsmart the free world. He says they have been doing it, and will continue to do it.

We can only hope Mr. Kennedy understands communism well enough to know what he means.

Report on Foreign Film Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker I would like to add to the RECORD at this time a report of an important meeting just held in the office of Secretary of Labor Wirtz dealing with the problems of the movie industry.

This meeting was the result of suggestions made in the report filed by the Committee on Joint Labor Management, which I had the privilege of chairing during its studies into the many problems posed by our trade policies.

All of us are hopeful that the end may be in sight of international trade piracy and discriminations against U.S. enterprises.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Hollywood's Joint Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Film Production came to the Kennedy administration today, January 24, for help to increase domestic motion picture production.

The joint group formally petitioned Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz for administration assistance in obtaining the removal of unfair foreign trade barriers that lead to American film production abroad. The group urged our Government to work through appropriate international bodies to get rid of foreign subsidies, import quotas, screen time quotas, remittance restrictions, and other unfair competitive handicaps.

The group pointed out that a shifting of production to film centers overseas has been created by such foreign trade practices.

Secretary Wirtz is Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, which is responsible for recommending to President Kennedy "policies designed to insure that American products are competitive in world markets."

The labor-management delegation was led by its cochairmen, Pat Somerset, president of the Hollywood AFL Film Council, and Charles Boren, executive vice president of the Association of Motion Picture Producers. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, introduced the delegation to Secretary Wirtz.

The joint committee was established a year ago as the result of a proposal by Representative JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania, chairman of a House Education and Labor Subcommittee which held hearings on the problem. DENT suggested that the best solution would be found through joint labor-management action within the industry.

In its comprehensive 29-page petition, the joint committee said: "Only by standing together and energetically working together on a realistic and constructive basis can labor and management in the American motion picture industry perform the big internal job that needs to be done within the industry to encourage domestic production.

"But we need the willing and earnest help of the Federal Government too in fighting against the unfair and discriminatory trade practices engaged in by some foreign governments that attempt to place American-made pictures at an artificial disadvantage in foreign markets."

In addition to Johnston, Somerset, and Boren, the following labor-management representatives attended the meeting in the office of Secretary Wirtz:

Representing the Hollywood AFL Film Council: Richard Walsh, president, IATSE; George Chandler, president, Screen Actors Guild; Jeffrey Sayre, president, Screen Extras Guild, O'Neill Shanks, secretary, Film Council; John Lehners, film editors; Cappy DuVal, property craftsmen; Phil Fischer, American Federation of Musicians; Tex Jarrard, studio utility employees; and Robert W. Gilbert, counsel for Film Council.

Representing the producers: Gordon Stulberg, Columbia Pictures; Alfred P. Chamie, secretary treasurer, AMPP; Maurice Benjamin, counsel, AMPP; and E. L. DeLeVigne, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Also attending was Herbert Aller, cameramen.

Judge Max M. Meltzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News on January 25, 1963, commemorating the anniversary of the death of Judge Max M. Meltzer, a friend of all of us who have long resided in the lower East Side of New York:

JUDGE MAX M. MELTZER, 1908–62

(By Abe E. Eisenstein)

January 30, 1 year ago, the last mortal breath left the lips of Max M. Meltzer, one of East Side New York's beloved sons, a friend of youth and adults, an outstanding lawyer, a noted community and civic leader, a great humane being, industrious, able, and respected jurist.

Max M. Meltzer, son of Mrs. Rose Meltzer and the late Israel Meltzer, was born in an old tenement house on the lower East Side. His father was for many years a secretary of a benevolent society. He died at the age of 59, on August 20, 1959. His mother is a typical East Side woman and well liked in the neighborhood.

"He was a marvelous soul, modest, unassuming, gentle, qualities that endeared him to us all. Service was his chief commitment in life."—Justice Birdie Amsterdam, New York Supreme Court.

Famed old public school 20, De Witt Clinton High School, St. John's University, New York University, and University Settlement alumnus, Max Meltzer's early life was far from easy and this developed in him an inner strength and courage reflected in his entire career. The late brother of Abe, Lillian, Phyllis, Anna, was employed during the day while attending New York University Law School. In 1931, Max was admitted to the New York bar and was an associate in the office of Skinner & Bermant. From 1945 to 1948, he served as law secretary to Lazarus Joseph, then comptroller of the city of New York.

"Judge Meltzer's word was his bond. We learned to know him as a scholar and gentleman. He bred in us a respect and admiration for his unselfishness and for his human sympathy and understanding."—Judge Eugene B. McAuliffe, of civil court.

Organizer and secretary of the HIP for the New York City civil service employees, member Alfred E. Smith Democratic Club, New York Lodge No. 1 Elks, Knights of Pythias, Samuel Dickstein Lodge, B'nai B'rith, New York County Lawyers Association, the Community Synagogue Center, University Settlement Alumni, Max M. Meltzer was appointed in May 1948 a judge of the municipal court (Manhattan Borough, second district) by the then Mayor William O'Dwyer. In the fall, he was elected for the full 10-year term. His popularity with all the people (endorsed by all political parties) was evidenced by his reelection in 1958.

"Judge Meltzer was one of the most beloved and respected jurist—possessing a fierce moral fire and exemplifying honesty, decency, integrity in the fullest sense of the word."—Judge Xavier C. Riccobono, of civil court.

Past president and charter member Forton Club Lodge, a director of Public School 20 Alumni Association, honorary member University Amigos, member East Side Chamber of Commerce, Manhattan Democratic Club,

East Side Housing Conference, Grand Street Boys' Association, Civic Center Synagogue (a plaque unveiled in his memory on April 2, 1961), board member University Settlement House, etc., Judge Meltzer was loyal to the traditions of his beloved East Side. His dreams, no less than his desires and talents, were always put at the disposal of the greatest possible good.

Judge Max M. Meltzer was a resident of 230 East Sixth Street. He was married to the former Miss Eva Paskin. They were the parents of three children: Mrs. Arlene Ochberg (grandchild Ricky), Miriam and Charles. He died on the Hebrew date of Shevat 25, 5722, and was buried in Beth David Cemetery, Elmont, N.Y.

We salute the memory of Judge Max M. Meltzer who has been a strong ally and a great influence for good in our midst.

Medical Aid for Senior Citizens Under the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am giving top priority to the proposal to give medical aid to our senior citizens under the social security program, and further liberalization of the social security laws.

I have again introduced my bill providing for such medical aid, and will spare no efforts to secure its passage. I consider this a major responsibility of the Congress and one which should be met without further delay. It is inconceivable that we should continue to ignore the hardships being suffered by our older citizens because of their inability to pay for adequate medical care. It is estimated that half of our senior citizens over 65 years old—8,000,000 of them—live in abject poverty. The average per capita income of those over 65 is now estimated to be slightly over $20 a week—about $1,000 a year. Now consider that medical costs during the 1950's went up by 36 percent, hospitalization costs rose by 65 percent, and group hospitalization costs—Blue Cross premiums—rose by 83 percent. When our senior citizens can barely afford to eat, they have no alternative except to deny themselves necessary medical attention.

I consider it a sad commentary upon our great Nation that we have so blithely and shamefully neglected this large portion of our population. Congress must be made to face, and effectively deal with, this grave problem and help our senior citizens.

I have also reintroduced my bill to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under social security and to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55.

Under existing law, social security annuitants are permitted to earn only up to $1,200 per year; if they earn more than this sum, they are penalized; deductions are made from their social security payments. No one can possibly support a home on his social security check. When social security payments represent a pensioner's entire income, if he wishes to enjoy a dignified existence and not become an object of charity, he must find some employment. The law as it stands now hurts the very people for whose benefit it was originally intended—those who work for their living. If the morale and well-being of our older citizens is to be restored, the limitation must be removed.

Another important amendment provided in my bill would enable men to collect full social security benefits at the age of 60; women could collect at the age of 55. Many workers who wish to retire at an earlier age and are financially able to do so when they can include social security payments should be given that opportunity. They are entitled to enjoy their later years in leisure after many years of toil. Also, by retiring, they provide vacancies for the younger men and women who need employment. There are many workers in poor health who must struggle to work in their last years because they cannot afford to quit, looking forward to the age of 62 and their social security benefits and a lessening of their hardships. A realistic approach to the problem of assisting our senior citizens is to reduce the age limits as provided in my bill.

I have also introduced a bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until the child's insurance benefits may be received under the Social Security Act. Many of our young people are forced to leave high school after completing a year or two, upon reaching the age of 18, and go to work, because social security payments are stoppped. Those who wish to attend college are prevented from doing so. This occurs when the family is in poor circumstances and dependent upon such payments to take care of the child's expenses and support. Education of our youth is important; the assistance provided by my bill is necessary, so that our young people may have the opportunity to secure the highest degree of education possible.

The Honorable John Bell

SPEECH

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the death of our former colleague, John Bell, brings with it a sadness which occurs with the passing of one with whom we had an association and for whom a strong friendship was developed.

John Bell was a real friend to those who wanted a friend. He was quiet and unassuming, but his influence was felt wherever he was.

I join with my other colleagues from Texas in expressions of sorrow and extend deep sympathy to his lovely wife, Mable Claire, who also made many friends while they were in Washington.

Analyzing the President's Message on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, everyone is for education the best for the most; in quality second to none; in quantity, all of our people, if that is possible. We all agree with the President when he says, "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." The many general statements he makes are good reading, such statements as, "fundamentally, education is and must be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy."

Where then is there any disagreement with the President. Here it is, on page 13 of his message:

> The program here proposed is reasonable and yet far-reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control.

There it is, the nonsequitur. The President's inconsistencies are the basis for honest disagreement.

Federal aid requires Federal control or else we fail to do our fiscally responsible job as Congressmen. And Federal control contradicts the local control the President eulogizes.

There is no need for me to evaluate selectively, as the President endeavors to do, the various programs because the statement is utterly self-contradictory and self-defeating.

The best and only maximum educational program in a free society will come from local and private effort, not government. This is the maximum to follow.

Perhaps the President's own languge shows most pitilessly his misunderstanding and inconsistency:

> In all the years of our national life, the American people—in partnership with their governments—have continued to insist that "the means of education shall forever be encouraged," as the Continental Congress affirmed in the Northwest Ordinance. Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

Now study that statement. What did he say and mean. For example, "The American people, in partnership with their governments." This is impossible. We have a Government of, by and for people, do we not? So it follows according to the President that people are in partnership with themselves—a rather ridiculous situation. Such error of judgment and of the role of Government is particularly serious when it is our President who is erring. We must point out and correct his errors—not permit their acceptance as basic American thinking.

The President goes on:

In our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient.

Mr. Speaker, under our system there is nothing but the private efforts and initiative of the people. The Government creates no wealth, only the industry of the people does that. What you propose is to take the wealth from the people at the local level and return it to them in whatever manner an all-encompassing Federal bureaucracy determines. This is not the way we have been taught to solve our problems. It is not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution which gives to the people the right and the opportunity to do for themselves.

Because we are experiencing population growth, economic expansion, and technological advance are we to throw the Constitution out the window? Are we no longer sure the people can be the government? I do not believe it. The best way to handle education is still at the local level. The most help the Federal Government can give is to trim the fat from the budget so that people will be able to keep more of their own money and they, at the local level, will take care of building enough schools, hiring the best teachers, and providing for their children the best educational system.

The Fight Against Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the report to the President from the Attorney General on the fight against organized crime. The report follows:

JANUARY 10, 1963.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The administration during 1962 greatly expanded its coordinated drive against organized crime and racketeering.

In the Department of Justice, racketeering prosecutions involving the organized crime section of the criminal division increased approximately 300 percent over 1961 and 700 percent over 1960. Convictions increased more than 350 percent over 1961 and almost 400 percent over 1960.

Internal Revenue Service figures show a sharp decline in gambling, the source of the enormous profits which bankroll other forms of racketeering. We prosecuted gambling cases in 20 States and further gambling investigations are underway in 45 States. Federal law enforcement agencies also took major action against other types of racketeering, such as narcotics, labor-management payoffs, and, most important, corruption of public officials.

These actions, while significant and encouraging, are not conclusive. Organized crime continues to tap the pocketbooks and sap the morality of our citizens.

At the beginning of this administration's antiracketeering effort, we sought to develop close coordination among the 26 Federal law enforcement agencies; to develop within the Department of Justice the manpower and dedication required for an effective effort; and to obtain the antiracketeering laws necessary for the fight against modern crime.

FEDERAL COORDINATION

I can report to you that all the Federal law enforcement agencies have participated with total dedication and cooperation. The successful record of 1962 is in large part the result of their activity.

With their help, we have been able to set up and expand a central information pool on the background and activities of more than 1,100 major racketeering figures. Because of this intelligence and because of the agencies' accelerating assistance, the criminal and tax divisions of the Department of Justice have been able to prosecute cases not previously possible.

I mention particularly the outstanding work of the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Internal Revenue Service, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, Secret Service, Bureau of Customs, Postal Inspectors, and Bureau of Labor-Management Reports.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ORGANIZATION

Within the Department of Justice, the work of the organized crime and racketeering section of the criminal division has been greatly expanded. Since January 1961, the personnel strength of this section has been more than tripled, from 17 attorneys to more than 60. Permanent field units have been set up in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Miami and teams of special attorneys have been assigned to various other cities to develop and assist in specific cases. The work statistics of Assistant Attorney General Herbert J. Miller's entire criminal division reflect this section's intensified effort:

	1960	1961	1962
Man-days in court	283	555	809
Man-days in field	1,963	5,086	7,356
Man-days before grand juries	388	1,052	1,146

NEW LEGISLATION

Passage of the new antiracketeering laws has been instrumental in this increased activity. Five of the laws now have been in effect for 15 months. They forbid interstate shipment or transmission of gambling information or paraphernalia and interstate travel in support of racketeering, and expand previous laws against flight to avoid prosecution and shipment of firearms.

In the 15-month period, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has investigated 852 cases under the new laws. Of these, we so far have secured indictments in 34 cases involving 134 defendants, and convictions in 12 cases involving 37 defendants. There were three acquittals but in one of these, the defendants were convicted under another law. While no case brought under these new laws has yet been appealed to the Supreme Court, the constitutionality of the new gambling laws has been upheld in lower courts.

Last year, I reported to you that the passage of these laws had the immediate effect of forcing many of the Nation's major racing wire services to shut down. Since then, two more have closed their doors. So have telephone gambling information services. So have large- and small-scale bookmakers across the country. Others have seen their business greatly reduced.

We have taken action under the five laws against a variety of gambling enterprises. In one case, we uncovered a numbers game operation in an eastern seaboard State which alone took in more than $20,000 a day and nearly $6,250,000 annually.

In another numbers case, in the Northeast, we found that while the average daily bet was only about 30 cents, the annual gross of the operation exceeded $2 million.

Action in a large western city resulted in the closing down of a multi-million-dollar sports gambling operation. A total of 19 different outlets were involved; the annual gross in only 1 of these exceeded $600,000. Shortly afterward, the mayor declared that the city's policy of tolerating gambling had ended and sent police out to close down other betting operations.

Last fall, a national magazine conducted its own survey of the betting situation across the country. It concluded that "the new laws have succeeded surprisingly well. * * * Bookmakers all over the country are up against it as they never have been before."

Internal Revenue Service figures further indicate the decline in illegal gambling. Gamblers across the country reported accepting bets of $53,490,000 during fiscal 1962. This represents a 20-percent drop from fiscal 1961 and is the lowest total since 1952, the first year this tax was collected.

Even more graphic are the figures for specific localities in which there has been sustained law enforcement activity. In fiscal 1961, for example, Kentucky bookmakers reported accepting a total of $7,650,000 in bets. In fiscal 1962—following the cleanup of gambling in Newport, Ky.—the figure was $2,200,000.

A sixth antiracketeering law was enacted in the last session of Congress and went into effect December 17. This law, greatly expanding an earlier statute, forbids interstate shipment of gambling machines and requires manufacturers, repairers, and sellers of such machines to register with the Department of Justice. Enforcement of this statute will further assist local authorities in action against illegal gambling.

Nevertheless, betting on sports events particularly remains a major problem. In both 1962 and 1961 we investigated reported attempts by gamblers to fix professional and amateur athletic events. Federal responsibility in this area is limited and further legislation might well be necessary. We will continue, however, to take action under present authority should it be required.

The combination of new coordination, new organization and new legislation has enabled the Federal Government to launch a sustained and successful effort against not only gambling but against all organized crime and racketeering.

One of the most insidious of the other aspects of organized crime is illegal traffic in narcotics. This administration sponsored the first coordinated inquiry into the causes and treatment of addiction—the recent White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse and the resulting effort to draft new legislation dealing with the problem. At the same time, continued outstanding work by the Bureau of Narcotics has resulted in important prosecutions.

For example, John Ormento and Carmine Galante, among the most important narcotics

dealers in the country, were convicted in New York of smuggling millions of dollars worth of heroin into this country over a 5-year period. Sentences for the 13 defendants in the case totaled 276 years, including 40 years for Ormento and 20 years for Galante.

In Chicago, Nathaniel Spurlark, organizer of a large-scale smuggling ring, and five other defendants were convicted and sentenced to terms of 5 or 10 years in prison. Other important cases were successfully prosecuted in Texas, Tennessee, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and elsewhere.

In the labor-management field, we have continued to intensify the efforts of the Federal Government both against employees who seek to bribe union representatives and against union officers who seek to extort funds from employers. In 1962, 79 persons were indicted and 44 so far convicted for violations of the Taft-Hartley, Hobbs, or Labor-Management Reporting Acts in cases involving our Organized Crime attorneys. These totals compare with 20 persons indicted and 11 convicted in 1961 and 15 indicted and 13 convicted in 1960.

During the year, the Department also secured favorable decisions in deportation actions against a number of foreign born racketeers, including Frank Costello and Paul "The Waiter" Ricca DeLucia.

Probably the most damaging of all the uses to which racketeers put their illicit profits is corruption of public officials, and we have exhorted particular effort to expose and prosecute such official corruption—in Newport, Ky.; Lake County, Ind.; New York City; and elsewhere. We have investigations of official corruption underway in 22 States.

The acceleration of our effort against all forms of organized crime is indicated by these statistics for cases involving the Organized Crime Section:

	1960	1961	1962
Number of indictments	17	45	118
Number of convictions	22	24	86
Number of individuals indicted	49	121	350
Number individuals convicted [1]	45	73	138

[1] Includes trials of indictments returned in previous years.

Other important convictions of the past year include—

Anthony (Tony Ducks) Carallo, New York labor racketeer, Justice James V. Keogh of the New York State Supreme Court, and Elliott Kahaner, a former assistant U.S. attorney, for conspiring to fix a Federal bankruptcy case;

George Chacharis, mayor of Gary, Ind., who recently pleaded guilty to charges that he failed to report and pay taxes on more than $250,000 in payoffs from construction firms;

Henry Grillo, an Internal Revenue Service official in Boston, and three attorneys, for attempting to bribe another IRS official to fix a tax case;

Frank Andrews, well-known Newport, Ky., numbers game operator;

George Roxburgh, business agent of Detroit Teamster Local 299 on Taft-Hartley payoff charges;

Frank (Buster) Wortman, of St. Louis, Michael Coppola of Miami, and Metro Holovachke, former prosecuting attorney of Lake County, Ind., all on tax charges.

Los Angeles gambler Alfred Sica, brother of Joseph Sica, who was convicted last year with Frankie Carbo and Frank "Blinky" Palermo, on charges of making false statements to the Government.

Irving Tolub, New York City, a former officer of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, on extortion charges;

Samuel J. Marroso, Detroit, labor consultant, on charges of transporting $190,000 in stolen Ohio Turnpike bonds across State lines;

Anthony Zambito, West Virginia "layoff" gambler, on charges of conspiring to violate and actually violating the new antigambling statutes;

Christopher Columbus Parker, one of the leading gamblers in the Southeast, also on charges of violating the new laws.

We also have secured a number of important indictments, which have not yet come to trial. Defendants in these cases include James G. Cross, former president of the Baker & Confectionery Workers Union, on charges of embezzlement and conspiring to fix his trial for perjury; Leo Carlino, of New York on charges of making grossly exorbitant expense deductions; Benjamin Dranow, previously convicted for tax evasion and mail fraud, for jumping $25,000 bail in Minneapolis; August J. Lippi, president of United Mine Workers District No. 1, on charges of embezzling more than $300,000 from a Pennsylvania bank; Matthew (Mike) Rubino, Detroit, for a wide-ranging hundred-thousand-dollar retail sales fraud; Anthony Dolasco, Newark, N.J., and Abe Zimmerman, Chicago, gamblers charged with tax evasion.

The past year also was a successful one in law enforcement areas other than racketeering. The Department is charged with the responsibility for protecting the integrity of Government operations through enforcement of the bribery and conflict-of-interest laws.

Cases in this area include the indictment of two Members of Congress, Thomas F. Johnson and Frank Boykin, on charges involving nearly $25,000 in payments and more than $3 million in real estate transactions. Two military officials at Fort Monmouth, N.J., were indicted on charges of attempting to influence Government contracts. Continuing investigation also led to the return of additional indictments in Massachusetts in connection with Federal highway projects.

Cooperation with other agencies also has been extremely effective in areas other than organized crime. At the request of the Food and Drug Administration, the Department this year instituted more than 150 seizures of misbranded or otherwise legally sold food and drugs—including the sale of stale and falsely labeled human blood to hospitals.

In close cooperation with the Post Office Department, we have brought a record number of mail fraud arrests—an estimated 702—and have secured an estimated 500 convictions, also a record. Included in these cases was the initial prosecution of Texas Businessman Billie Sol Estes, for mail and securities fraud. He also is under indictment for filing false statements with the Government. The past year saw a particular resurgence of fraudulent retirement haven land sales and more than 150 investigations are underway in this area alone.

The record of the year, then, against crime generally and against organized crime in particular is an encouraging one. We have made significant progress. Again, let me make it clear, however, that no one believes the tide of the battle is turned. It is not likely to be decided by one set of laws, one anticrime program, or one administration. Ultimate success will require years of cooperation among Federal and local agencies. It will require energy and integrity on the part of all law enforcement officers. Most of all, it will require the interest and involvement of every citizen.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

When the Communists Take Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday we in the House and our colleagues in the Senate set aside time for Members to speak in tribute to the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence. During that time, it was my privilege to address the House and to offer a resolution (H. Res. 175) calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Because of my concern for the Ukraine and the blatant example of Soviet suppression that exists in that country of proud people, I recently read with special interest a Rochester, N.Y., newspaper column about a naturalized citizen in my home community who had given a first-hand account of the Communist enslavement of his homeland. The story of George Kusiw as he told it to Bill Beeney, of the Democrat and Chronicle, is one that should not go unread by our fellow Members.

I hereby offer it for insertion in the RECORD:

STALIN'S 100 DOGS

(By Bill Beeney)

One evening recently I met a man named George Kusiw who pronounces the "s" in his name like "jsh" because he is a Ukrainian and that is the way they do it.

He is remarkable in a sense, and like many Europeans he also is a knowledgeable student of modern European history. Not by reading about it in books, but by having lived it.

After the manner of almost anyone who has felt the weight of the Communist yoke upon his shoulders, he is an outspoken critic of communism.

"If you think Hitler and his Nazis were bad—and they certainly were bad enough—you should know how the Communists treat the people in countries they take over. When they take over a town, they simply post the rules and regulations on the street corners; the first one is that no longer does any individual own any property, it belongs to the state.

"It is impossible to live a life of dignity and decency under communism. And little by little, in maybe 40 years, I believe communism will perish by its own inadequacies."

George operates a restaurant in Hudson Avenue. He is 44 years old, was born in Rohatin, Ukraine, and is a storybook example of what some people may shortsightedly consider a myth, that America is a land of golden opportunity.

"When the Russian Army advanced on the Ukraine in July 1944, I escaped to Czechoslovakia. I stayed there for about two years and as the Russians began taking over the country I fled to Germany and stayed there for a couple of years. It was always my dream to come to America; I made it in 1949."

He was nearly penniless when he arrived in this country alone (his wife and father had been killed in the war). He buckled down to work, getting a job at Wollensak Optical Co., also working part time as a

baker, and spending his spare time buying older houses, fixing them up and selling them. He saved his money.

He saved well. Exactly 7 years later, in March 1956, he was able to make a cash downpayment of $16,250 for the $44,000 restaurant he purchased at 858 Hudson Avenue. He had become a U.S. citizen in 1954.

The Russian philosophy has not always been clear to some of us. Perhaps George Kusiw shed some light.

"Have you ever heard the story about Stalin and the dogs?" said Kusiw. "It is a true story.

"Shortly after he took over, Stalin conducted an experiment. Or demonstration. He rounded up 100 dogs. He put 50 of them in one large kennel, and 50 in another.

"He gave one group of dogs everything it wanted—the choicest food, plenty of exercise, fine quarters. They had the run of the place and nothing was too good for them.

"He gave the other 50 dogs just enough food to keep them alive. He did not starve them, but he kept them going on the barest essentials. Their lives were bleak and barren.

"The dogs who were living high became arrogant, well muscled, independent. Stalin pointed that out to anyone who visited their kennel.

"The other dogs were pitifully abject to visitors. They wagged their tails and tried to lick the hands of the visitors and cried and whimpered as they begged to make friends.

"Stalin said: 'The way it is with these dogs is the way it will be with the people we rule. We will give them the barest essentials, just enough to keep them alive, and they will always be figuratively wagging their tails and licking our hands to try to better their lot.'

"That is the Communist way of operating."

Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am again sponsoring the bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps. Under this bill unemployed young men between the ages of 17 and 23 would be given the opportunity to undertake useful conservation work in America's great out-of-doors. The bill authorizes the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps of 150,000 young men for a year's service.

This bill presents an approach which would go a long way in directing the energies of the youth of America, in developing our young men physically and morally, besides having an inestimable value in conserving our natural forestlands and parks.

I have been active for many years in the legislative field to eliminate some of the hazards which are attached to the problem of youth. Dr. John Otto Reinemann, director of probation of the county court of Philadelphia, was a great supporter of the bill which I sponsored in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to create forestry camps. It was enacted in the 1955 session and it operates under the supervision of the department of welfare and the department of forests and waters.

In Philadelphia under the leadership of Commissioner Randolph Wise the city's welfare department has had considerable success with a youth conservation corps program since 1959.

I hope that this important legislation will be enacted in the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

Arab League Boycott Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may recall that more than a year ago I initiated correspondence with the Departments of State and Commerce to express my profound concern and deep regret with reference to the policy and practice of the U.S. Government regarding the Arab League Nations' boycott and the consequent invasion of American rights. I later, in testimony presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, expressed my disappointment in the terminology used in the replies I received, for it was my opinion that both Departments were adopting an ostrichlike policy on a situation which demanded firm action.

While the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 did not contain language as strong as that which I advocated, it did nevertheless contain the provision that the "President shall transmit to the Congress after the close of each fiscal year a report concerning operations in that fiscal year under this Act. Each such report shall include information on progress under the freedom of navigation and nondiscrimination declaration contained in section 102." I, for one, shall be eagerly awaiting such progress report.

Thus I found of particular interest an article in the January 25, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Times by the noted columnist, Victor Riesel. In the belief that this is of vital interest to us all, I have requested permission to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it follows:

CARGO FOR CASTRO AND RED CHINA: WHO HALTED THE BLACKLIST MOVE?

(By Victor Riesel)

Apparently some authority quite high in the State Department does not deem the Communist buildup in Cuba a personal insult nor offensive to the United States. For someone inside the State Department has prevented other Government bureaus from punishing those shipowners who have run Communist supplies into Havana.

There is definite evidence that this authority has insisted that the United States continue to do business with ship operators who have been serving mainland China as well as Fidel Castro's military and economic machines.

Just why the Department of State has reversed decisions of other Federal agencies no one really knows. But that it did is quite certain, as in the case of the SS *Nora*, a Norwegian vessel of 8,998 tons. As recently as last July, at the height of the Soviet's secret buildup in Cuba, the *Nora* ran for Castro.

On October 2, the U.S. Maritime Administration publicized a list of NATO nations ships trading with Cuba, and the SS *Nora* was on the sheet.

Not long after that the United Arab Republic chartered the *Nora* to pick up 12,000 tons of tallow in the port of New York. This tallow is a sheep and cattle fat. It is used in making soap and in industrial finishing processes, such as the finishing of leather. The UAR was to receive the tallow under our foreign aid program.

Since the U.S. Department of Agriculture handles such transactions and checks on the ships' charters to see that we're not getting rooked on transportation costs, it checked the *Nora*.

The Department's special unit discovered her on the Maritime Administration's list. The Agriculture people vetoed the vessel.

Then they heard from the Department of State, which is in almost daily contact with Agriculture. The word from the State Department was firm. If the UAR wanted to use the *Nora*, it must be used. That was final. The charter was approved on December 17.

But there was an outcry from the Seafarers, from the American Maritime Association, which follows such matters closely, and from many of us who take the Cuban fascism as a personal insult.

On December 22, the *Nora* left without the tallow. But that's just the beginning of this story. Why are the UAR's wishes so paramount and pressing inside the State Department? It appears to be almost forgotten that the Nasser government in Cairo has blacklisted 33 U.S. vessels.

This blacklist is operated out of Alexandria by the Arab League's Israel Boycott Office. Any ship which does any business with Israel not only is prevented from doing business with members of the Arab League, but is forbidden to use the Suez Canal.

Yet, the State Department insists on giving the UAR full rights, though Cairo denies 33 of our ships the right to pass through the Suez, at both ends of which are ports to which we send so much foreign aid. These harbors are Port Said and Alexandria.

Furthermore, the United Arab Republic could hire American ships, giving work to U.S. seamen to carry U.S. Government-generated cargoes of aid from our gulf ports to Egypt.

But to add insult to this injury to our shipping people, as well as to our national dignity, there is another United Arab Republic practice unreported until this very moment.

Here's what the United Arab Republic has done: It has boycotted some 300 ships in all by placing them on the proscribed list in Alexandria. These ships are operated by owners in Greece, Norway, Britain, Italy, Sweden, as well as in the United States. Any operator can get his vessel off the list if he pledges not to deal with Israel.

Recently the boycott office lifted the blacklisting of the Norwegian ship *Tove Lilian* after the owners promised not to trade with Israel.

Last summer this column discovered that the *Tove Lilian* was in the port of Leningrad being loaded. It was taking on vital cargo for Cuba.

Thus we find that the United Arab Republic prefers to deal with ships that supply Communist cargoes to Communist Cuba rather than vessels which deal with the

democratic Government of Israel. And our State Department then insists that we still defer to the wishes of the United Arab Republic when it comes to transporting the generous aid we send to Egypt, mostly at our expense.

President of All the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has a very difficult role in these days of grave international crises. No other public official in the world is subject to more universal criticism than our President.

John F. Kennedy is constantly bringing new and greater respect to the office of the Presidency. A recent Gallup poll indicated almost unprecedented popular support in this country for his endeavors.

The other day I had the opportunity of seeing the London Sunday Telegraph for January 13, 1963, which contained a most glowing tribute to the President by an Englishman, Peregrine Worsthorne.

The critique of our President's accomplishments contained in this article certainly reflect in the eyes of one noted expert on the subject that the President is realizing his desire of molding Western interests together in a supranational spirit of peace and prosperity.

Mr. Worsthorne makes very significant points in his article and under leave to extend my remarks, I am very pleased to present this article for the RECORD:

PRESIDENT OF ALL THE WEST

(By Peregrine Worsthorne)

After 2 months of working in Washington from Cuba onward, I began to think about Mr. Kennedy, not as the 35th President of the United States, but as the first President of all the West, and to feel a much wider and stronger political involvement with him and his administration than I do with the British Prime Minister and his government.

For rather an old-fashioned Tory like myself this was a most disturbing experience, affecting my whole attitude to political relations, comparable in political terms to what a change of sex would be physically.

By this I do not mean that I began to feel in any way more American or less British. Nothing as straightforward as that. The magnetism of Mr. Kennedy's Washington is that it is genuinely supranational, with a style of government and an approach to the world which is quite as un-American as it is un-English, just as exhilaratingly—or disturbingly—new and strange and challenging for the native American from Chicago, say, as it is for the Englishman from London.

It is quite simply a Government which is the first in history to be absorbed, even obsessed to the exclusion almost of all else, with the revolutionary challenge of thermonuclear power.

Unlike Mr. Khrushchev, whose political attitudes are even now primarily governed by Communist ideology, or General de Gaulle, still poignantly concerned with the glories of France, or Mr. Macmillan, urgently preoccupied with the search for new British alinements, or Mao Tse-tung, faced with the stark threats of famine and ruin, or Nehru, Adenauer, and the rest, all of whose past experiences and present political anxieties preclude concentration on the facts of thermonuclear life, President Kennedy is alone able and willing to put first things first.

PARAMOUNT PROBLEM

That is why of all the world's capitals, including Moscow, Washington is the only one today where the thermonuclear problem takes precedence over all else. To have an administration with its head permanently in the mushroom clouds is as irritating and frustrating to American Senators seeking to promote special State interests as it is to allied heads of government seeking to enlist U.S. aid for their own national interests. But to the visiting reporter, without any particular ax to grind, this absorption with the No. 1 new question of the age is precisely what has restored to Washington its pristine quality of revolutionary dedication.

This could not have been more apparent than in the weeks immediately after Cuba. Talking to Presidential aids like McGeorge Bundy and Walt Rostow, both of whom had been closely involved with decisions that could have destroyed the world, it was impossible not to recognize that this experience had introduced a new dimension into their political thinking almost wholly lacking among their counterparts in this country.

The kind of ordeal which they had just been through is almost impossible to imagine, particularly if it is extended even higher in the chain of responsibility to the President himself, who, on the fateful night just before Khrushchev blinked, had even ordered the transport to take him and his staff to the deep shelter Headquarters in Virginia from where thermonuclear war would be fought to its catastrophic end.

AND NOW IMPATIENCE

It is surely scarcely surprising that men who have lived through that week, and well realize that they, and only they, will have to live through it again in the event of another comparable crisis, find it difficult to understand why any ally should wish to complicate their problems. Against this background they find the arguments for a British national deterrent as irrelevant and archaic as those absurd demarcation disputes which used to convulse the prerevolutionary French court about which duke should be allowed to carry the King's slippers.

Like so much else, British reactions to this American impatience is very much a question of generations, but since returning from the United States 10 days ago I have found nobody under 30 who is not fully prepared to accept American strategic leadership. What is more, it seems to me that more and more young people respond to Kennedy much more readily than they respond to their own Prime Minister; read his speeches, look at his television appearances, and talk about his family, etc., as if in their minds he was already far more relevant politically than any of the leaders whom they have themselves elected.

GLITTERING COURT

I do not believe this is just accident. One of the most revolutionary changes which President Kennedy has introduced into American government is a conscious effort to attract European popular support, even at the expense of shocking and alienating his own countrymen. In many ways Washington today is attempting to be what Versailles was in the 17th century, not merely a center of a great national Government, but a glittering court that casts its spell across the whole civilized world. Artists, philosophers, couturiers, chefs, leaders of fashion and of thought, drawn for the most part from Europe than from America itself, throng the White House in a way that would have seemed shocking and shameful to its earlier occupants.

More un-American activities of this kind go on in the American capital than in any other place in the world. Senator McCarthy, not to mention George Washington, would turn in his grave. What other President's wife, for example, would have thought of inviting the Mona Lisa to Washington, or if she had, is it likely that the French would have sent it?

These are, of course, only the outward and visible signs of a new style of American life at the top—a determination to bring America's social and cultural horizons into line with her worldwide expansion of power. Under Truman and Eisenhower the United States sought to lead the world metaphorically speaking, from a log cabin. President Kennedy has purposefully discarded this traditional American approach, consciously choosing a style which owes far more to the Old World than to the New, and one which is likely to appeal far more to Europe than to the Middle West.

FAREWELL TO PRINCE HAL

This is not only conscious choice. It is also inescapable necessity, since Mr. Kennedy himself could not fit into the traditional folksy American style, even if he tried. His manner is essentially unplebian, harking far back to the early aristocratic 18th century leaders of the young Republic. Watching him perform at his first post-Cuba press conference I was tempted even to go further and see him almost in a Shakespearian light, as he marched to the rostrum, royally handsome and commanding, far more like a young king back from foreign wars than a Republican leader about to be questioned by the press.

Indeed, to someone like myself who had not seen him in the flesh since his carefree senatorial days, the occasion was intensely, almost theatrically, moving, reminding me of that superb scene in Henry IV, part II, when Prince Hal ceases to be the playboy friend of Falstaff and assumes the grave authority of sovereign power.

Nobody who saw Mr. Kennedy then, restrained, yet gloriously confident in his hour of victory, could avoid concluding that in him the West has a leader who in personal style can out-act any other figure on the world stage today, a glittering heroic figure out of an earlier age.

MAN OF DESTINY

Perhaps this sounds like the lucubrations of a "Limey at the Court of King Kennedy." But as the President's full impact begins to make itself felt I am convinced that many others will react in the same way.

For what we are witnessing is the conjunction of two historic facts. First the mounting evidence that the security of all the free peoples rests primarily on the shoulders of this man, and that he, more than anyone else in the next 6 years, is likely to take the decisions that most crucially affect our lives; and secondly that the man destiny has chosen for this role has the stuff of greatness about him.

I do not see how, in the long run, this conjunction of circumstances can fail to change the way Europe looks at the United States, making it possible for the first time to conceive of a new office, in fact if not in name: President of the West. With the grand old men, Macmillan, de Gaulle, Adenauer, Nehru, not to mention Khrushchev and Mao, still on the scene, perhaps this is merely fanciful. But it is more than likely that these venerable figures will soon pass away, leaving Mr. Kennedy behind to confront their successors, no longer as the brash young newcomer but as the only remaining

veteran of the old order. To his other qualities, in short, superior experience will soon also be added.

I find this, frankly, an exciting prospect and one which the Allies should welcome and exploit, since it offers the forces of freedom the greatest uncovenanted blessing since God gave us Winston Churchill.

New York State Republican Shenanigans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following joint statement of Senator Joseph Zaretzki and Assemblyman Anthony J. Travia, Democratic legislative leaders in New York.

It is most unfortunate that the Governor of New York resorts to the political conduct, or should I say misconduct, referred to.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

This session of the legislature will be called upon by Governor Rockefeller to appropriate funds to finance his personal gestapo. The Governor seeks to have the legislature endorse and retroactively finance his re-creation of the one-man investigating commission—a post that the legislature itself previously abolished.

The one-man investigating commission originally was created under the Dewey administration, but the Republican legislative majority hastened to abolish the post when it came under the control of a Democratic State administration, and in its place established the four-man bipartisan State Commission of Investigation.

But Governor Rockefeller, for his own political purposes, wanted a personal gestapo beholden only to him to do his dirty work. He did not dare to propose this openly to the legislature. He waited until long after the legislature had adjourned and, in the midst of his reelection campaign, appointed Herman T. Stichman as a special commissioner and special assistant attorney general with vast and virtually unlimited powers to pry into anything the Governor chose. With the acquiescence of the Republican legislative leaders, he advanced $300,000 of State funds to finance the job.

The Governor already had cut this year's appropriation for the State commission of investigation, thus curtailing its operations. He allowed the State investigation commission only $600,000, but he gave his new private eye half of what the State investigation commission got to cover the entire State for one job only—to go into New York City to pry for purely political purposes; to do a hatchet job.

Why does this 1-man OGPU need $300,000 to investigate in one city while the State investigation commission, with the responsibility for conducting investigations throughout the entire State is given only $600,000?

If the Governor were at all sincere about wanting a job done on a bipartisan or nonpartisan basis, then he should have given the additional $300,000 to the State investigation commission, which already has the responsibility and the authority, instead of creating a new post to overlap the State investigation commission's field. Nor was there any need to assign the investigation of the telephone company boiler explosion in New York City to his own personal investigator instead of to the State investigation commission, except to make it a purely political probe for campaign purposes.

Why did he need a personal investigating agent when he already had an established State investigating agency if it were not to serve his own political purposes? Why did he take the underhanded method of creating this personal investigating agency by executive order in the absence of the legislature if it were not because he dared not do it openly?

But he had no qualms about using the taxpayers' money to set up his own private political detective agency as long as it could be done by executive order before the public knew anything about it.

We intend to demand a detailed accounting of the activities of this private eye before we approve any appropriation.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Administering a Public-Land State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on December 11 through 13 of 1962, the National Association of Counties held its grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev. During the course of the conference, Gov. Grant Sawyer gave an address entitled "Governing a Federally Owned State." In that address he pointed out some of the difficulties which arise as a result of the high percentage of federally controlled land and some of the efforts being made to facilitate the cooperative agreements that must necessarily be entered into.

His speech gives an interesting and informative résumé of the admission of Nevada to the Union and for these reasons should make interesting reading for Members of the Congress.

During past sessions I have attempted at different times to abate the view held by many people that Nevada was not a good place to hold conventions. In each case where meetings have been scheduled and held these reservations have been eliminated. Consequently, I am pleased that Governor Sawyer chose to begin his remarks by setting out for the record the true facts as they relate to some of these misconceptions.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Sawyer's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. GRANT SAWYER, OF NEVADA

I would like, at the outset of your gathering, to make an observation: I am most confident that you will find that the facilities and environment for serious deliberation in Las Vegas rank with the best in the world. After all, gentlemen, your meetings take place in the day time. And the dazzle of our entertainment grows brightest after sundown. So, unless you insist upon enjoying all of the sights of this remarkable city, you will find ample opportunity to get down to the business of good government.

But seriously, there has been concern in some quarters about the selection of Las Vegas for no-nonsense conventions.

The highly proper American Medical Association was invited in 1961 to hold its convention in this city. The bid was rejected for an outspoken minority felt the atmosphere was unfit for a serious-minded convention such as theirs.

This year, however, an equally august group, the American Academy of General Practice, held its convention here in Las Vegas. The membership was delighted with the results. The Las Vegas site drew the largest turnout the academy had ever enjoyed at a convention.

In a letter to the Las Vegas convention director, the executive director of the academy had some words of advice for the other cautious groups. He wrote: "To whatever extent I may have felt originally that we were gambling in selecting Las Vegas, I can only say now that we hit the jackpot. To those other groups who have waited to see how the academy fared, I can give hearty reassurance that Las Vegas can be included in their future schedules with full confidence."

So the American Medical Association also came to Las Vegas, and enjoyed one of the finest conventions of its distinguished existence. AMA's success has been repeated by many other of the Nation's top-ranking organizations. During the first 9 months of this year, 91 convention groups, totaling 89,752 delegates and associates, have been held in our Las Vegas convention center. Our resort hotels, moreover, provide the best in convention facilities.

Las Vegas, then, offers the ideal package for conventions: the proper atmosphere for serious deliberations, and the drawing power of the world's finest entertainment. I am confident you will find this to be a fact during your visit in this city.

The subject of administering a public-land State is perhaps not too different than in States where a large percentage of land is in private ownership. Nevada does, however, point the problem up more than other States because Federal ownership controls all but about 13 percent of the land area of the State.

Before going into some of the statistics of the State, you might be interested in a brief review of some of the early history of Nevada. What is now Nevada was owned by Mexico up to the time of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 when Mexico ceded to the United States the area covered by the States of California, Nevada, and Utah, the larger part of Arizona, about one-half of New Mexico and small parts of Wyoming and Colorado. This cession, representing about 18 percent of the total area of the United States, cost about $16 million.

It was in 1846, 2 years previous to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, that the fatal journey of the Donner party in its attempt to reach California over the Sierra Nevada Mountains a few miles westerly of Reno, took place, and it was in 1847, 1 year later that the Mormon people, led by Brigham Young, arrived in the region adjacent to Great Salt Lake. Some years after arriving in the great basin, Brigham Young and his people began to colonize this little-known region, and in 1849 organized the free and independent State of Deseret. This State embraced a large area extending south from the 42d degree of latitude, which is the northern boundary of California, Nevada, and Utah, to the 33d degree of latitude near the southern Arizona boundary and westerly from the Rocky Mountains to the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and including a section of territory now in southern California, with Salt Lake City as its capital. Congress rejected a memorial asking for recognition as a territorial government. In 1850 California was made a State, the territory of Utah was created, and also the territory of New Mexico. The Utah territory extended from the Rocky Mountains to the California State line and from the 42d degree of latitude to the 37th degree of latitude.

At that time, what is now Clark County with Las Vegas as its county seat, was in the territory of New Mexico and remained so until it became a part of the territory of Arizona which was created in 1863.

On March 2, 1861, the Territory of Nevada was created and James Nye was appointed Governor of the Territory by Abraham Lincoln. When Governor Nye arrived to take over his duties he brought with him Orien Clemens as his secretary. Orien Clemens was accompanied by his secretary, his brother Samuel Clemens, better known by his nom de plume of "Mark Twain," who subsequently related in one of his books that he found out after arriving his job carried no salary.

On October 31, 1864, the Territory of Nevada became a State. Clark County and parts of Lincoln and Nye Counties were not in the State but were still in the Territory of Arizona. In 1866, by a congressional act, this southern boundary of the State was moved 2° southward, which took in Clark County. However, it was provided that this area could not be added to the State without approval by the State legislature, which was not obtained until 1867. History relates that during the legislative deliberations there was some discussion as to whether or not they should add to the State such a barren waste of volcanic rock. Little did the early pioneers visualize the present-day Las Vegas.

Nevada has an area of 70,265,000 acres of which 61 million is owned by the Federal Government. This represents 86.9 percent Federal ownership. Other than Alaska, Nevada has more Federal ownership than any other State. California follows with 45 million acres representing 44.9 percent, then Utah with 36,400,000 acres or 69.1 percent federally owned.

The federally owned land in Nevada is under the jurisdiction of a number of agencies, the major ones being Bureau of Land Management, 47,360,000 acres; Forest Service, 5,058,000 acres; Air Force, 3,331,000 acres; Fish and Wildlife, 2,927,000 acres; and Bureau of Reclamation, 1,160,000 acres.

The 9,240,000 acres not in Federal ownership includes the grants to railroads comprising 5,086,000 acres. The remaining lands in private ownership represent about 6 percent of the State's total area.

In 1867 Nevada, through its legislature, consented to take advantage of the 16- and 36-section grant, but in 1880, also through its legislature, it consented to relinquish the 16 and 36 section grant and to take in lieu thereof 2 million acres to be selected on any part of the surveyed open public domain. Apparently the State at that time felt it necessary to enter into that compromise. The surveys of the public lands were proceeding so slowly and the young State so desperately in need of revenue on which to exist that, at that time, there seemed no alternative.

Nevada received in total grants 2,733,564 acres of land. At this time, in 1962, there are only a few hundred acres of land remaining from the grants in State ownership. Of the 11 Western States, Nevada received by far the smallest acreage in grants. The next lowest was the State of Washington with 3,077,000 acres in grant land. New Mexico received 13,153,000 acres, Arizona 10,589,000 acres, California 8,837,000 acres, Utah 7,550,000 acres.

The basic industry in Nevada has until recently been agriculture and mining. Of recent years recreation has become one of Nevada's major industries and it is growing. Not content to rely upon this one industry. Nevadans have started a new State program to attract industry to Nevada and it is paying off in new payrolls of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Names such as Rolley, North American, Aerojet, and Sandia grace the State roll of home industries and many others are surveying the State as sites for branch offices and plants.

But what is most important, industry is discovering a political and personal climate created by aggressive, warm, friendly, imaginative, and progressive people. This is the greatest inducement of all, along with a low and limited tax structure. So, within the last 3 years small industries have been locating in both our large and small counties. I do not intend to indicate that we have scored an industrial breakthrough. But we have started, and we must walk before we can run.

The population of the State 10 years ago was approximately 150,000. Today it exceeds the 350,000 mark. Next to Alaska, we are the smallest State in population, but per capita we are the fastest growing State in the Union.

Informed predictions tell us to expect over 500,000 residents in the next 8 years. Of this number, more than 135,000 will be of school age. This would be 25,000 more than the entire population of the State in 1940.

As we daily lay the solid foundations for the future, we can also expect a record prosperity. The personal income of Nevadans, estimated at $512 million in 1960, should increase to almost $2 billion by 1970. Tourism, which should bring in about $660 million this year, is expected to double in the same period.

This, then is a brief picture of Nevada. We are in a period of fantastic boom and we must do everything we can to develop all the resources at our disposal. Being a State with 87 percent of her land owned by the Federal Government, we have attempted to use another very valuable resource at our disposal—the Federal Government.

Along this line, I authorized the creation of a resources council under the direct charge of our State department of conservation. This council, known as the Governor's natural resources council was enacted in November of 1959 and is made up of 14 State agencies and 5 Federal agencies, all working in the field of natural resources. The five agencies are Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Indian service.

I cannot stress too much the important work this council has done in the field of better coordination and better operations. It has provided a mechanism to facilitate exchange of information so that each agency can plan its program with full knowledge and better understanding of the related programs of other agencies. The council provides a forum for discussion and clarification of matters of mutual concern. At the present time the council is working out the final details of a proposed State development plan.

Our relations with the Federal agencies has been good. We have made every effort to bring around good working relationship and have made them feel they are a part of our team. I can say that we have found the personnel of these agencies most receptive. This is, we think, important in a public-domain State such as Nevada if we are to develop our natural resources to meet the ever-increasing demands of rapid growth.

Fortune Magazine Article on Cuban Invasion Worth Rereading in Light of Recent Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after the ill-fated Cuban invasion, Charles J. V. Murphy, the respected and thorough Washington editor of Fortune magazine, did a full scale study of what had taken place and this I placed in the RECORD of September 20, 1961, A7456–A7460. It is noteworthy that at that time President Kennedy called the article "the most inaccurate" published about the Cuban affair, and although we have all become more used to the heavy handed pressures of the Kennedy administration upon the press, we had not reached the stage of "managed news" that exists now. The Murphy Fortune article was later awarded the best foreign reporting award by the Overseas Press Club of New York—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1962, page 7829—an organization not exactly noted for being critical of the Kennedy administration. What happened was that honest reporters and editors knew these were the facts and were able at that time to vote as their consciences dictated. Now in a recent interview with President Eisenhower, David Kraslow, of the Chicago Daily News—St. Louis Post-Dispatch service, in an article dated December 23, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, says:

He mentioned favorably an article that appeared last year in Fortune magazine, purporting to give the inside story of what went wrong in the Bay of Pigs planning.

General Eisenhower repeated his praise for this article and its accuracy on CBS–TV during an interview with Walter Cronkite, Wednesday, January 23, as part of the "CBS Report" series. In view of the fact that reliable reports reached me at the time of the original Fortune piece that the White House had sent at least one general and others up to New York to try to suppress this story, and having failed to do so, sought to discredit it, it does seem appropriate for all of us to reread this Fortune article. This is all the more necessary in light of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's interview in U.S. News & World Report this month rewriting history about Cuba. It is to be hoped that the editors of Fortune will continue to report the news as they find it and that efforts to blackball, intimidate, and otherwise harass editors like Mr. Murphy will be stopped. We need a free press and the members of the press need to fight a lot harder for it.

The above-mentioned article follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 23, 1962]

EISENHOWER ADVOCATES TRUTH OVER MANAGED NEWS POLICY

(By David Kraslow)

GETTYSBURG, PA., December 22.—Former President Eisenhower believes that truth is a better weapon in the cold war against communism than managed news.

In an exclusive 1-hour interview in his office on the Gettysburg College campus, Eisenhower spoke with feeling on the controversy that erupted in the wake of the Kennedy administration's handling of news in the recent Cuban crisis. He spoke as one who had lived with the problem during 8 years in the White House.

His comments implied criticism of President Kennedy's news policies, but not once did Eisenhower refer by name to Mr. Kennedy or any official in his administration.

However, when Eisenhower wanted to urge more truth and less news management, he chose to turn around a statement made by a Department of Defense official in the Cuban crisis. The statement he chose was the one made by Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Sylvester admitted that news was used as a weapon in the showdown with the Soviet Union.

Eisenhower had known for several weeks that the interview would deal almost entirely with the news management issue. He was told so in the written request for the interview.

NECESSARY COLORING

We have to recognize, he stressed, that on sensitive international matters governments occasionally have to color or withhold news, but he warned that this can be heady stuff, that such a practice, unless sharply controlled, can easily lead to distortion and manipulation of news for political convenience rather than for national security.

He said that there was some indication of management of news not merely in the interests of national security, but for personal reasons. He did not relate this remark to the Cuban crisis or otherwise explain it.

Eisenhower said that he has no reason to think that the American people have not been told the truth on the Cuban situation, but he noted that he does not know all the facts.

He said that he sees no reason why the administration should not now release a full and official version of what happened in the abortive attempt to invade Cuba in April 1961. The Bay of Pigs invasion is history, he said, and the official story should have been told long ago.

He mentioned favorably an article that appeared last year in Fortune magazine, purporting to give the inside story of what went wrong in the Bay of Pigs planning.

Eisenhower expressed surprise when informed that Mr. Kennedy, at a press conference, branded the article as inaccurate. He said that he was not aware that the President had made such a statement.

A TOUGH QUESTION

If management of news is to be accepted, Eisenhower was asked, how can the people feel assured that the Government is not using this power to conceal mistakes and even scandals?

That, he replied, is a really tough question, one that he wrestled with in the White House. He is not sure that there is a satisfactory answer. He was aware, he said, that he had been criticized severely a number of times for what was called excessive secrecy.

He said that there must be a certain amount of trust in a President and that a

President should apply a rule of reason consonant with the first amendment's guarantees of a free press.

As a matter of principle, he said, he is against censorship, even in wartime, because he regards it as self-defeating. "We don't want to tell the enemy anything, of course," he noted, "but the important thing is to keep faith with the American people and our heritage. We must not confuse our people and undermine the credibility of our Government."

REGRETS ACTION IN U-2 CASE

Eisenhower then indicated his regret that he did not obey his instincts when Francis Gary Powers and his U-2 reconnaissance plane were shot down over the Soviet Union. His advisers urged him to put out the cover story that had long been prepared to disguise the spying mission in such an eventuality.

His instinct told him to say nothing, he said, but he finally accepted the strong advice of his aids.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev then proved to the world, by producing Powers and photographs of his plane, that the U.S. Government had lied.

Apparently the incident still nettles Eisenhower, and perhaps helps to explain the strong views he expressed on the danger of tampering with a flow of honest news in a free society. It is so easy to misuse power. Government should never fool the people for the sake of fooling the people, he said.

Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy and Catholic Herald Citizen Lead Fight Against Racial Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, America's position in the world today requires that we remove from our shores all traces of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation. One of the most important leaders in this fight is Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy, editorial manager of the Catholic Herald Citizen, of Milwaukee.

The Herald Citizen recently covered the National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago. This conference was attended by 700 Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, and Jewish leaders from all over the country. I include an article from the Catholic Herald Citizen covering this conference. I also include the final statement which the conference issued, "An Appeal to the Conscience of America." Monsignor Kennedy has said of this document that it "is not only a stirring reminder of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, it is a call to action":

RACIAL PREJUDICE IS AN INSULT TO GOD; IT MUST GO NOW, CONFERENCE STATES

CHICAGO.—More than 700 representatives of the Nation's major faiths met for 4 days here last week in a National Conference on Religion and Race. Because they agreed unanimously that "racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God," they issued "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People."

Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen confessed that their churches had done little in focusing their peoples' attention on the immorality of racial prejudice. Frequent references were made to the possibilities that if the churches had spoken out in a united voice more than 100 years ago the Civil War might have been avoided.

The conference did more than lament the failure of the churches and issue a statement. It decided to set up 10 pilot projects to provide religious leadership in an attack on racial bias on an interreligious basis. These cities were selected on a regional basis: Chicago, Detroit, New Orleans, Oakland, San Francisco, St. Louis, San Antonio, Seattle, and Pittsburgh. There is a possibility that other cities—including Milwaukee, Washington, and New York—will undertake the project at a later date.

The conference was convened by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (its chairman is Archbishop Cousins); the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches; and the Social Action Commission of the Synagogue Council of America.

At the plenary session on Monday evening, Cardinal Meyer was the Catholic spokesman on the subject: "Interracial Justice and Love: Challenge to a Religious America." Archbishop Cousins was chairman of this meeting. In addition to these members of the American hierarchy, there were 2 more archbishops and 19 bishops present. At the various workshops and forums, they shared the platform with rabbis and ministers and lay people from the 68 participating religious groups.

More than one speaker from each of the religious faiths commented publicly that the conference was an outgrowth of the Ecumenical Council called by Pope John XXIII.

Archbishop Cousins said: "He has shown us all the way to work together. In the past, misgivings and misunderstandings have hampered cooperative effort. Now, following our Holy Father's example, we meet as brethren in the fullest Christian sense."

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

We have met as members of the great Jewish and Christian faiths held by the majority of the American people, to counsel together concerning the tragic fact of racial prejudice, discrimination and segregation in our society. Coming as we do out of various religious backgrounds, each of us has more to say than can be said here. But this statement is what we as religious people are moved to say together.

I

Racism is our most serious domestic evil. We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the American people.

This evil has deep roots; it will not be easily eradicated. While the Declaration of Independence did declare "that all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," slavery was permitted for almost a century. Even after the Emancipation Proclamation, compulsory racial segregation and its degrading badge of racial inequality received judicial sanction until our own time.

We rejoice in such recent evidences of greater wisdom and courage in our national life as the Supreme Court decisions against segregation and the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans. However, we mourn the fact that patterns of segregation remain entrenched everywhere—north and south, east and west. The spirit and the letter of our laws are mocked and violated.

Our primary concern is for the laws of God. We, Americans of all religious faiths, have been slow to recognize that racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God, the Giver of human dignity and human rights. Even worse, we all have participated in perpetuating racial discrimination and segregation in civil, political, industrial, social, and private life. And worse still, in our houses of worship, our religious schools, hospitals, welfare institutions, and fraternal organizations we have often failed our own religious commitments. With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent.

We repent our failures and ask the forgiveness of God. We ask also the forgiveness of our brothers, whose rights we have ignored and whose dignity we have offended. We call for a renewed religious conscience on this basically moral evil.

II

Our appeal to the American people is this: Seek a reign of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private ones serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring and promotion, medical and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all.

Seek a reign of love in which the wounds of past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; racial barriers will be eliminated; the stranger will be sought and welcomed; any man will be received as brother—his rights, your rights; his pain, your pain; his prison, your prison.

Seek a reign of courage in which the people of God will make their faith their binding commitment; in which men willingly suffer for justice and love; in which churches and synagogues lead, not follow.

Seek a reign of prayer in which God is praised and worshiped as the Lord of the universe, before whom all racial idols fall, who makes us one family and to whom we are all responsible.

In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and equality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life.

We call upon all the American people to work, to pray, and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while there is still time, to eliminate racism permanently and decisively, to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing an ancient rupture in the human family, to do this for the glory of God.

Part 4: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro, March 12, 1962–September 13, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I now offer part 4 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro, as my continuing effort to refresh the memories of the Congress and of the American people on the course of events taking place between Cuba and the

United States and which now are a part of our modern history.

We find detailed here the desperation of Premier Fidel Castro in his efforts to cope with economic chaos in Cuba. We find the Cuban youth being urged to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and their Premier promising them the glories of a "more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

Then we find on March 28, 1962, the first U.S. State Department reports of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba.

We find $62 million in ransom demanded for Cuban prisoners taken during the abortive uprising of the exiles.

And we find the odd spectacle of President Kennedy announcing that these Cuban prisoners are really a responsibility of the United States because they were "trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration" and given the "signal to let them go by the Kennedy administration." However, he states the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. And the thought occurs to us that the American public then must pick up the pieces and be responsible for Government actions of which they were never really officially informed—and at this late date still have not been—if we analyze the President's thinking correctly. And our thoughts further turn to the four Americans known to be imprisoned in Red China: Hugh F. Redmond, Richard G. Fechteau, John T. Downey, and Bishop James E. Walsh. These men are known to be political hostages and our State Department declares their release and return to this country to be an issue of utmost importance.

We remember, too, the 21 prisoners of war who first refused repatriation after the Korean war was ended. Ten finally became disillusioned with dialectical materialism and returned to this country. One died in Red China. And 10 still remain there.

We think of the 389 American soldiers still officially regarded as missing out of the original figure of 944—and of whom no trace, report, or record has been found—since the Korean war.

And we finally think of the eight American prisoners—one being held in the Soviet Union, three held in the Soviet Zone of Germany, one held in Czechoslovakia, and another still thought to be held in Czechoslovakia.

And we wonder how the families and friends of these American prisoners feel and if perhaps the American public should not be reminded that these men, too, were caught in a Communist trap and deserve to be considered a national responsibility by the public and the American Government.

In this portion of the chronology we find reports of weapons, ammunition, and propaganda in the form of a Communist-authored book on how to wage guerrilla warfare are being sent to nine Latin American countries from Cuba. Then we learn of 20 Soviet ships carrying from 3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc technicians, goods and weapons, arriving in Cuba—with an acknowledgement 2 days later by the President that this was indeed true.

This recalls to mind the press conference on November 29, 1961, in which President Kennedy declared that the United States would be "most concerned" if the Castro regime in Cuba attempted to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic or in any other Latin American state. And that prior to the news report of the shipments to Latin American countries of weapons and propaganda, the Guatemalan Government—on March 20, 1962—formally accused Cuba in a note to the Organization of American States of aiding an uprising in Guatemala.

The chronology details our military callup of 150,000 members of the Reserves to active duty and that three of our Republican Senators proposed amendments to the Presidential request for authority for the callup, which would give him added authority to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba, if it became necessary.

The American public, along about this time, was admonished by the President to "keep both their nerve and their heads." This brings to mind Plutarch, who in commenting on a man being praised for his foolhardy bravery, stated:

> There is a wide difference between true courage and a mere contempt of life.

And this quotation—in a nutshell—describes the difference in the attitude of a truly republican form of government—and the Communist form of government—toward human life.

The chronology follows:

A Selected Chronology on Cuba, March 12 to October 24, 1962, by the Legislative Service, the Library of Congress

March 12, 1962: Premier Fidel Castro announces nationwide food and soap rationing to become effective March 19. He links shortages of food and consumer goods to a "brutal economic blockade" against Cuba. He denounces "Yankee imperialism" for making "desperate efforts" to destroy the Cuban revolution. He also says that "we have the shame of not being able to fulfill promises because we made subjective analyses" and because many of Cuba's most skilled workers were either "taken away by imperialism" or "driven away by our mistrust although they could have been won over."

March 14, 1962: Premier Castro (at a University of Havana rally) urges Cuban youth to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and says that the young in Cuba will some day live "in another more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

March 17, 1962: Premier Castro (in a television broadcast) declares that "the revolution needs to revise all the revolutionary nuclei and all the political apparatus * * * to do away with the errors and abuses and to gain good performance." He singles out those "who think they are more revolutionary than anybody and have the right to mistreat and humiliate others." He also criticizes the watchdog defense committees set up to guard against counterrevolution (which exist in every big city and throughout the countryside) as having committed injustices. "Observers linked Premier Castro's statements to the advancement of Communist Party assumption of authority in the Castro regime at Havana" (New York Times, Mar. 17, 1962).

March 20, 1962: Guatemala formally accuses Cuba of aiding an uprising in Guatemala: the charge is made in a note to the President of the Council of the Organization of American States.

March 22, 1962: House Government Operations Committee urges the U.S. Government to press a $99.4 million claim against Cuba for seizure of the Nicaro nickel plant in Oriente Province, because the plant had been operated by the U.S. Government.

March 23, 1962: U.N. Security Council rejects by a vote of 7 to 2 a Cuban charge that the Organization of American States violated the U.N. Charter in barring Cuba from the inter-American system. The Security Council also rejects by a vote of 7 to 4 a Cuban request that the question of the legality of the OAS action be submitted to the World Court.

On the same day, Fidel Castro and his brother Raul are named to the two top posts in the Secretariat of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization, the 25-man directorate which is to set up a single political party in Cuba. The Premier is named the organization's first secretary and Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro is named second secretary.

March 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a radio-television broadcast) denounces Anibal Escalante, a long-time Cuban Communist leader, for having brought "real chaos to all the country" and having "tried to create an apparatus to pursue personal ends." He adds that Ecsalante has been "separated" and that he had much to do with inspiring a spirit of "sectarianism," leading many to believe that the only ones who could be given important posts "were the old and militant revolutionaries."

March 28, 1962: U.S. State Department issues report of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba; it estimates that Cuba has received $100 million of military aid to train several hundred Cuban pilots in Czechoslovakia and provide 50 to 75 MIG jet fighters, and provide modern weapons for Cuba's ground forces of 300,000 men. These weapons include: 150 to 250 heavy and medium tanks, 50 to 100 assault guns, 500 to 1,000 field artillery pieces, 500 to 1,000 antiaircraft artillery guns, 500 mortars, 200,000 small arms, and some patrol vessels and torpedo boats.

March 29, 1962: Government begins trial (at Principe prison, in a suburb of Havana) of 1,182 prisoners captured after the unsuccessful invasion last April.

On the same day, the Council of the Organization of American States votes by 16 to 0, with 3 abstentions, to express a firm hope that the rebel prisoners will have every legal guarantee of their trial.

April 3, 1962: Ecuador severs diplomatic relations with Cuba, and becomes the 15th nation of the Americas to do so.

April 8, 1962: Military tribunal sentences each of the prisoners to 30 years imprisonment, but offers to free them on the payment of a total of $62 million in ransom. The ransom is set at $500,000 each for the 3 leaders of the invasion force, $100,000 for 221 others, and $50,000 or $25,000 for the remaining 995 men.

April 11, 1962: Pravda (official newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party) endorses the expulsion of Escalante by Premier Castro for trying to further his personal ambitions.

The Cuban exiles report from Havana that Cuba will release 54 sick and wounded prisoners, in return for ransom payment.

On the same day, President Kennedy (at a news conference) declares that the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. "[These men] were

trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration. The signal to let them go and the means to get them there were given by the Kennedy administration * * *. Can the U.S. Government * * * wash its hands of them? We think not. Though the idea of bartering with Castro for human lives is deeply repulsive, the United States still has a responsibility for those lives."

April 28, 1962: Premier Castro demands that the committee pay the $2.5 million ransom within 1 week; if not, he states that the remaining prisoners will be sent to the Isle of Pines to begin serving terms of 30 years imprisonment.

May 14, 1962: Tass (Soviet news agency) reports that the Soviet-Cuban trade agreement for 1962 is to be increased to about $750 million under an agreement signed in Moscow, a level of trade almost 40 percent higher than in 1961. The supplementary agreement calls for the supply of considerable quantities of wheat, corn, beans, fats, canned meat, and milk.

June 3, 1962: New York Herald Tribune states that President Kennedy has been given an intelligence report of clandestine movements of rifles, automatic weapons and ammunition from four dispersal centers in Cuba to nine Latin American countries: Nicaragua, Honduras, Venezuela, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay and Bolivia. The report asserts that the arms have been accompanied by hundreds of copies of Maj. Ernesto Guevara's book, "Guerrilla Warfare."

June 16, 1962: Government parades tanks, troops, and artillery through the streets of Cardenas, a port 90 miles east of Havana, in response to popular demonstrations over food scarcities. President Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado denounces (at a political rally in Cardenas) "wretched counterrevolutionary provocations."

July 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a speech at a celebration in Santiago de Cuba of the 9th anniversary of his 26th of July Movement) declares that President Kennedy "is set on launching an attack against our country." He announces to thousands of workers that rationing will be extended from food to shoes and clothing.

August 6, 1962: James Donovan, the U.S. lawyer representing the Cuban Families Committee, announces the opening of a public drive to raise the $62 million ransom required to free the 1,180 Cuban rebel prisoners. (Donovan is the American who arranged for the exchange of U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers for convicted Soviet spy Rudolf Abel.)

August 20, 1962: Press reports state that between July 27 and July 31, 20 Soviet ships arrived at 4 ports in Cuba—3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc technicians and large quantities of goods and weapons are said to have been landed. "The equipment may include ground-to-air missiles, largely defense weapons. There apparently is transportation, electrical and construction equipment, radar vans and mobile generators. These appear to be going into coastal and air defense."

August 22, 1962: President Kennedy acknowledges, at a press conference, that Communist "supplies and technicians of rather intensive quantity in recent weeks" have been landing in Cuba.

August 24, 1962: Several buildings in Havana are damaged by shellfire from two small powerboats sent from Miami by the Student Revolutionary Directory, an exile group of former University of Havana students. The U.S. State Department states that the U.S. Government was not involved in the raid and had no prior knowledge of it.

August 28, 1962: Tass, the Soviet press agency, reports that the volume of shipments from the Soviet Union to Cuba in 1962 will be double that of 1961, and that 10 Soviet ships and 5 ships of West German, Norwegian, Greek and Italian registry are on the way to Cuba.

August 29, 1962: President Kennedy (at a press conference) states that United States has no intention of invading Cuba "at this time." He adds that "the words do not have some secondary meaning. I think it would be a mistake to invade Cuba." He declares that the United States has already been in consultation with NATO nations whose shipping firms have chartered vessels to the Soviet Union to haul military goods to Cuba.—"Even to consider [blockade or invasion] as possibilities requires far greater Latin American sympathy for Washington's attitude than now exists."

August 31, 1962: U.S. Navy plane on a training flight over international waters near Cuba is fired on by two naval vessels. The White House announces that the ships are believed to be Cuban, and that U.S. aircraft and ships have been authorized to use "all means necessary" to protect themselves against any similar attack in the future.

September 2, 1962: Soviet Union announces (in a communique issued on the talks between Minister of Industries Ernesto Guevara and Premier Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders) that it has agreed to supply arms to Cuba and to provide specialists to train Cuba's armed forces. The communique states that the arms are intended to meet the "threats" of "aggressive imperialist quarters," a watershed in hemispheric history. It was a power move in the cold war by the Soviet Union, as if a pawn had been advanced on a global chessboard. It was also a daring and defiant gambit by Premier Castro to strengthen his regime and his revolution. Cuba now cannot be invaded * * * without killing Russians. The added dangers of an invasion are clear. Far more than Cuba and Fidel Castro are involved. The wrecked Cuban economy will take a long time to rebuild—4 or 5 years at least, if the revolution lasts that long * * *. No direct move on our part could succeed unless the other Latin American powers went along with us.

"It took 50 years to create the OAS, and only the most extreme emergency would justify breaking it up" (New York Times, Sept. 9, 1962).

On the same day, a U.S. State Department spokesman declares that the Moscow announcement "merely confirms what has been going on in recent months."

September 4, 1962: President Kennedy declares (in a statement issued after consultation with congressional leaders) that the United States would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent Cuba from exporting "its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force" against "any part of the Western Hemisphere." The President adds that "there is no evidence of any organized combat force from any Soviet-bloc country: of military bases provided to Russia * * * of the presence of offensive ground-to-ground missiles * * *. Were it to be otherwise the gravest issues would arise." He states that the Cuban question must be dealt with as part of the worldwide Communist challenge and in the context of the "special relationships which have characterized the inter-American system."

On the same day, the Latin American Free Trade Association (in its second conference in Mexico City of the nine members who have signed the association's charter so far) votes by 7 to 0, with Mexico and Brazil abstaining over juridical procedure, to reject Cuba's application for membership of the association, declaring that a Communist economy is incompatible with the market principles of free enterprise and free competition.

September 5, 1962: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk holds a meeting with 19 Latin American Ambassadors in Washington and informs them of the U.S. determination to prevent the export of communism from Cuba. Press reports state that there was "full unanimity" with President Kennedy's "containment policy" that the United States would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent aggression by Cuba against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

September 7, 1962: President Kennedy asks Congress for authority to order 150,000 members of the military Reserves to active duty for a year, if necessary, "to permit prompt and effective responses * * * to challenge * * * in any part of the free world."

September 11, 1962: Soviet Union (in a statement issued by Tass, Soviet press agency) warns that any attack by the United States on Cuba or upon Soviet ships bound for Cuba would mean war. It asserts that Soviet arms in Cuba are for defensive purposes only. It adds that the Soviet Defense Ministry is taking "all measures to raise our armed forces to peak military preparedness."

On the same day, Premier Castro (in a speech to an educators' convention in Havana) declares that the United States is "playing with fire and with war," and adds that "we do not want imperialism to commit suicide on our coast."

Also on the same day, the Havana radio reports that a "pirate vessel" entered a harbor in north-central Cuba and fired more than 60 shots into a British freighter and a Cuban ship. An exile organization in Miami known as Alpha 66 acknowledges responsibility for the attack.

September 12, 1962: Three Republican Senators propose amendments to President Kennedy's reserve mobilization bill that would authorize the President to take "such action as is necessary" to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba.

On the same day, Moscow newspapers publish the statement of the Soviet Government warning of war if the United States interferes with Cuba.

The effect on Soviet policy of the Russian people's reactions toward Cuba: "There is considerable sympathy for the Cubans among the Russian people. However, there was an adverse public reaction in July 1960, when Premier Khrushchev implied that Soviet rockets would be launched if the United States attacked Cuba. The Premier later qualified this remark as symbolic. Experienced Western observers [in Moscow] believe that a large section of Soviet public opinion will feel unhappy about Soviet involvement in the Caribbean. Fear of war is often the dominant motivating factor in the reaction of the Soviet people to international crises. The defensive tone of the Soviet statement in describing the nature of military aid to Cuba lent support to this theory * * *. Mr. Khrushchev has barred world wars and * * * 'imperialist local wars' as instruments of policy * * *. However, he has appended two stipulations to this rule, both of which fit the case of Cuba * * *. First, Communists must support without reservation wars of 'national liberation.' Then, once such a war has been consolidated internally, as in the instance of the Castro revolution, it must be shielded by the Soviet Union under the slogan 'no export of counterrevolution.' In the Soviet statement this thesis was translated into the warning to the United States * * *. Western observers interpreted [the Soviet warning to the United States] as an indication that Soviet leaders were worried over the possibility that the United States might confront them with the necessity of intervening militarily in the Caribbean or retreating from their doctrine of "no export of counterrevolution.' They believe that Premier Khrushchev, well aware of the attitude of his people, will go to great lengths to avoid a conflict with the United States. But few were willing to predict what the Soviet leader would do if a [rebel] motorboat * * * suddenly put a torpedo into a Soviet ship in Caribbean waters." (Seymour Topping, New York Times, Sept. 13, 1962.)

September 13, 1962: President Kennedy asserts (at his weekly news conference) that

the United States would move swiftly against Cuba if the military buildup there threatened U.S. security in any way, "including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union." He says that if the United States should ever find it necessary to take military action against the Castro regime, the Communist-supplied weapons and technicians "would not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve the result." The President adds that the Cuban economy is crumbling as a result of Premier Castro's "own monumental economic mismanagement" and the economic boycott by the United States. He criticizes loose talk in the United States which serves "to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat [of an American invasion] exists." He expresses the hope that "the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, keep both their nerve and their heads."

Cuban GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which was sent to the President of the United States, by two Senators and me.

I feel that this letter from one of my constituents echoes the belief of may people in this country in regard to the conscience money which is being spent as a result of the Cuban fiasco.

The letter follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *January 28, 1963.*

His Excellency, JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The President of the United States.
Hon. THRUSTON MORTON,
U.S. Senator.
Hon. JOHN S. COOPER,
U.S. Senator.
Hon. GENE SNYDER,
U.S. Representative.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT AND SIRS: Enclosed is an article from our local paper, the Louisville Times, dated January 26, 1963. The title of the artile, "Cuban GI Bill Due," is enough to make George Washington and the rest of this country's great past leaders turn over in their graves. Since when does the Government of the United States give veterans of other countries college and vocational training when it doesn't even give it to its own veterans who pay the taxes for such things. I am referring to the GI bill which was killed by Congress for the veterans of the cold war not so long ago. I ask you to tell me that these Cubans deserve such rights when Americans don't.

I spent 4 years on active duty and over a year in the Active Reserve. I received nothing for my time except the satisfaction that I was doing my duty for my country. I ask nothing in return as I feel I have been receiving my reward in the form of freedom that I enjoy every day. Thousands upon thousands of other men did the same. Why all of a sudden do we now have to give such rewards to the veterans of the Cuban invasion. They are not citizens of the United States and they were not fighting for the United States. Why do we have to reward the Cubans, we did not reward the Chinese when they were driven from the mainland, nor many others.

Why, if the U.S. Government wants to educate someone, doesn't it retrain the coal miners who are fast losing their jobs because of machines, and this is just one of a dozen or more fields where men are becoming obsolete if they don't receive special training. I think our first responsibility is to the American people. Perhaps the American people should have something to say about this proposed bill, after all we will be paying for it. I think they would rather send their sons and daughters to college with those taxes than send someone they don't know. I feel we should help those who helped us in the past, namely the ex GI out of work, the fathers and mothers who gave sons to die for our country, etc. If we make this a business of wholesale giveaway, then it will lose it's prestige to those who worked hard to earn it.

Not only are these men of the brigade being considered for such payments for fighting for their country, Cuba, but they are receiving well over a $100 a month for living expenses. Do the unemployed in our country receive that much money when they are out of work, I think not. Even those Cubans who are at present in the armed services of the United States are receiving special treatment. Not long ago they were removed from Fort Knox, Ky., to the south because of the severe weather. If these men cannot stand all climates of weather what good will they be to the United States if we have to fight a future war in Russia. Our GI's have fought all over the world in all extremes of weather. Are these men going to be able to rest out their days in the sunny south. What would have happened if George Washington, that winter in Valley Forge, had taken his army and run off to Mexico or someplace else. I think Americans learned long ago that nothing is won by running, so why do the Cubans leave their homeland by the thousands. Perhaps if these men want lessons, they should take a course in American history. It could teach them many things. I could continue on and on, such as why the brigade leaders called the President of the United States a liar concerning the air cover story. Possibly they never heard the old saying, "don't look a gift horse in the mouth."

Let me state here that I don't dislike the Cuban people, nor am I criticizing my Government or it's elected officials. I only want to know why the Cuban people are receiving preferential treatment when, I feel, that there are more deserving Americans. I think we should help these people to a reasonable extent. But I think the benefits mentioned are beyond reason. Our country is open to all peoples of the world as it should be, but why can't the Cuban people wait their turn as other peoples of other countries are doing. I don't feel we owe the people of Cuba anymore than the people of other countries.

I feel this matter should be taken before the American people. Abe Lincoln once said the Government was for the people and by the people. How are you going to know what the people want unless you ask them.

I would appreciate hearing an opinion from each of you gentlemen. Thank you for your time, and hoping to hear from you soon, I remain,

Sincerely,

DON L. THOMPSON.

New Civil Rights Organization Formed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the field of civil rights is a vast one, and it requires a great deal of original work and study. Up to now, the American Civil Liberties Union of New York, with local branches in many States, has pretty much had this field to itself. During the past years, I have often had the occasion both to defend and to criticize this organization and its work. I have done this in the spirit of caring a great deal about the men and women whose fates hang upon the work done by American Civil Liberties Union and its opponents. I have had numerous RECORD items about American Civil Liberties Union and its projects. Last year I was honored to meet with the board of directors of American Civil Liberties Union, to share some rather frank thoughts with them. A new organization has sprung up called the Defenders of American Liberties. It will seek to handle cases which American Civil Liberties Union for its own reasons does not want to work with, or where limited funds allow only one organization to be active. Clearly the makeup of both organizations and their personnel is very different. This should not disturb people. Competition between a more conservative and liberal point of view in the civil rights field should help bring out new issues and assist thoughtful citizens in doing more in this field. The Newhouse newspapers story—St. Louis Globe-Democrat—and the Christian Science Monitor report of December 31, 1962, and January 2, 1963, respectively, follow:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Dec. 31, 1962]

MORRIS OUTLINES CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHT FOR CONSERVATIVES

DALLAS.—Two sparsely furnished rooms in a Dallas skyscraper are headquarters for an organization whose president says it is fighting for the civil rights of conservative Americans—and filling a vacuum by doing so.

The new organization is Defenders of American Liberties. Its president is Robert Morris, attorney, former New York City judge, former counsel to congressional investigating committees, and former president of the University of Dallas.

In 1960, Morris, then a Point Pleasant attorney, ran for the Republican Senate nomination in the New Jersey primary, but was defeated by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE.

LIMIT CASES

Morris said the organization will not take any case in which a meritorious civil rights issue is not involved, and in any such case it limits its action to the cause of civil rights.

He said Defenders of American Liberties is looking for this kind of man in trouble: "A poor guy who is not a member of any particular organization, has no pressure group behind him—and, say, he's losing his farm because of a tax debt."

In fact, Defenders believes just such a man is L. R. Gajewski, a Mitchell, N. Dak., farmer.

Morris said Gajewski may lose all his land and buildings on an income tax lien, and on January 8 he is to go on trial on criminal charges growing out of the same circumstances. Defenders thinks his case has merit and will try to help.

NOT ALL OBSCURE

Not all cases taken on by Defenders are this obscure. Its most widely publicized case was that of retired Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker after his arrest following integration riots at the University of Mississippi last fall.

The officers of Defenders of American Liberties were convinced Walker was being railroaded into a mental hospital—and being denied his constitutional right to a speedy, public trial—through improper psychiatric evidence. Morris acted as Walker's civil rights counsel. As soon as the general's mental fitness was established, Morris removed himself and Defenders from the case. Morris has had no connection with Walker in any other legal capacity.

The organization is now preparing to defend seven New Yorkers charged with malicious mischief after they held a card party in a Yonkers store. In this kind of party, printed cards are hidden in merchandise to point out to purchasers that the store is dealing in Communist goods.

PREPARE BRIEFS

And Defenders is preparing briefs and hopes to intervene as a friend of the court in two cases involving public school prayers scheduled for hearing before the Supreme Court.

"The American Civil Liberties Union defends those who want to eliminate prayers and delete the word 'God' from public school," Morris said. "We are intervening on the side of those who would retain the word 'God.' Until now, those people had no group organized to help them. That's what I mean when I say we are filling a vacuum."

Defenders of American Liberties was founded in Chicago last June. Three of the founders—Morris J. Nelson, publisher of community newspapers in the Chicago area, attorney J. F. Schlafly, Jr., and Mrs. Carl Zeiss, widow of a vice president and general counsel of the Northern Trust Co.—asked Morris to join them and serve as president. He took over the job on August 15.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 2, 1963]

GROUP DEFENDS U.S. TRADITIONALISTS

DALLAS.—Two sparsely furnished rooms in a Dallas skyscraper are headquarters for an organization whose president says it is fighting for the civil rights of conservative Americans—and filling a vacuum by doing so.

The new organization is Defenders of American Liberties. Its president is Robert Morris, attorney, former New York City judge, former counsel to congressional investigating committees, and former president of the University of Dallas, a Roman Catholic school.

Mr. Morris said the organization will not take any case in which a meritorious civil-rights issue is not involved, and in any such case it limits its action to the cause of civil rights.

He said Defenders of American Liberties is looking for this kind of man in trouble: "A poor guy who is not a member of any particular organization, has no pressure group behind him—and, say, he's losing his farm because of a tax debt."

EXAMPLES GIVEN

In fact, Defenders believes just such a man is L. R. Gajewski, a Matchell, N. Dak., farmer. Mr. Morris said Mr. Gajewski may lose all his land and buildings on an income tax lien, and on January 8 he is to go on trial on criminal charges growing out of the same circumstances. Defenders thinks his case has merit and will try to help.

Not all cases taken on by Defenders are this obscure. Its most widely publicized case was that of retired Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker after his arrest following integration riots at the University of Mississippi last fall.

The officers of Defenders of American Liberties were convinced General Walker was being railroaded into a mental hospital—and being denied his constitutional right to a speedy, public trial—through improper psychiatric evidence.

Mr. Morris acted as General Walker's civil rights counsel. As soon as the general's mental fitness was established, Mr. Morris removed himself and Defenders from the case. Mr. Morris has had no connection with General Walker in any other legal capacity.

The organization now is preparing to defend seven New Yorkers charged with malicious mischief after they held a card party in a Yonkers store. In this kind of party, printed cards are hidden in merchandise to point out to purchasers that the store is dealing in Communist goods.

And Defenders is preparing briefs and hopes to intervene as a friend of the court in two cases involving public school prayers scheduled for hearing before the Supreme Court of the United States.

"The American Civil Liberties Union defends those who want to eliminate prayers and delete the word 'God' from public school," Mr. Morris said. "We are intervening on the side of those who would retain the word 'God.' Until now, those people had no group organized to help them. That's what I mean when I say we are filling a vacuum."

PRECOURT ACTION

Defenders of American Liberties was founded in Chicago last June. Three of the founders—Morris J. Nelson, publisher of community newspapers in the Chicago area; J. F. Schlafly, Jr., an attorney; and Mrs. Carl Zeiss, widow of a vice president of the Northern Trust Co.—asked Mr. Morris to join them and serve as president. He took over the job on August 15.

Mr. Morris said he modeled the charter after that of the American Civil Liberties Union. However, Defenders of American Liberties, unlike the American Civil Liberties Union, has no members except for its officers and directors.

That, Mr. Morris said, is so the new organization cannot be labeled an extremist outfit, as it might be if "some wildeyed characters joined and made indiscreet remarks in public."

So instead of election by a general membership vote, the directors will elect their own successors and may choose any Americans they want and can get to accept.

NO MEMBERS

Since Mr. Morris became president and counsel, Defenders has acted in about 30 cases and only a few of these have gotten as far as a courtroom.

Mr. Morris said he receives about five requests a day for help, about one in six is worth investigating and perhaps one-third of these will reach the stage of action.

In each case, Defenders has acted from the viewpoint generally labeled conservative. It is a label Mr. Morris does not particularly like. He prefers "traditional." He contends that as the U.S. Government becomes more international in viewpoint through its foreign aid commitments and support of the United Nations, the big civil rights battles in the years to come will have to be waged in behalf of conservative—or traditional—Americans.

Federal Mine Safety Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from areas where coal mining has been a major industry have been seriously concerned with the lack of adequate protection of the workers in the coal mines of America.

I have been privileged to be the sponsor of legislation bringing to the small mines added protections afforded by Federal Government inspection. Unfortunately, after unanimous approval by our Committee on Labor and Education the Rules Committee failed to grant a rule for this legislation during the last term. I have again introduced this legislation and respectfully urge all Members to read the attached resolution and transmittal letter from the United Mine Workers of America, which calls attention to a recent mine disaster in southwestern Pennsylvania. Many large holdings in the coal industry are being subdivided into small contracts which enable the operators to qualify for small mine exemptions under the Federal inspection law. More and more this is becoming the rule rather than the exception. The very nature of this operation, which some claim to be a subterfuge, has increased the dangers to the men who work for a living in this industry.

I am hoping that during this session Members of Congress will give more attention to the seriousness of this situation and that we may be able to pass legislation that will give each miner, regardless of the size of operation in which he is employed, a reasonable protection against the loss of life and serious injury.

The United Mine Worker's covering letter and resolution follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1963.

To the Members of the 88th Congress.

DEAR SIR: The terrible tragedy occurring on December 6, 1962, at the Frosty Run shaft, Robena No. 3 mine, of the United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners lost their lives, was before the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America during its meeting in Washington, D.C., December 12–15, 1962.

During this meeting, the board adopted the enclosed resolution, which is self-explanatory.

We again urge earnest consideration by the Members of the 88th Congress to enact enforcement legislation to bring all employees in the coal industry under the provisions of the Federal Mine Safety Act.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS,
President Emeritus.

THOMAS KENNEDY,
President.

W. A. BOYLE,
Acting President.

JOHN OWENS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Whereas this board is horrified and appalled at the explosion which occurred December 6 at the Frosty Run Shaft, Robena No. 3 mine, United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners were killed violently; and

Whereas 31 of those who died were members of United Mine Workers of America, Local Union 6321, district 4, Masontown, Pa.; and

Whereas this pre-Christmas tragedy also symoblizes a growing trend in the industry toward placing production of coal ahead of human lives; and

Whereas many American coal miners who work in small underground mines do not now receive full protection under Federal law because of an arbitrary exemption granted their employers by the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this international executive board and all officers of this organization including local union officers and mine safety committeemen press with renewed vigor for strict compliance by coal operators with all Federal and State mine safety laws and with the Federal Mine Safety Code which is written into the national bituminous coal wage agreement; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Bureau of Mines and mining departments in the various States be informed that that organization will insist on their strict and to-the-letter enforcement of existing mine safety regulations; and be it further

Resolved, That the international union, Labor's Nonpartisan League, and district officers urge with renewed vigor that the 88th Congress pass an amendment to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act that would extend enforcement provisions of that act to all employees of underground coal mines regardless of size; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Local Union 6321, each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and directors of mining departments in coal-mining States, and that it be printed in the United Mine Workers Journal.

Unanimously adopted by the international executive board, United Mine Workers of America, this 14th Day of December 1962.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS,
President Emeritus.
THOMAS KENNEDY,
President.
W. A. BOYLE,
Acting President.
JOHN OWENS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

(International executive board: John T. Kmetz, John Ghizzoni, Ewing Watt, W. J. Hynes, Joseph Yablonski, Peter Phillippi, Mart F. Brennan, Wilbert Killion, Joseph T. Kershetsky, Sam Nicholls, Louis Austin, Joseph Shannon, John A. Hupton, Henry Allal, John L. Mayo, R. O. Lewis, Edward Boyd, James W. Ridings, William Mitch, David Fowler, Arthur Biggs, John H. Delaney, R. J. Boyle, Carson Hibbitts, George J. Titler, C. J. Urbaniak.)

Block Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, I introduced a resolution—House Resolution 174—to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives so that bills authorizing loans or advance contractual obligations against the Treasury could not receive House consideration unless reported by the Appropriations Committee.

The resolution, if adopted, would provide conformity with the Constitution's clearly stated limitation:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of an appropriation made by law.

This provision was intended to assure that all expenditures from the public treasury would be carefully weighed in terms of necessity, available revenue and fiscal soundness.

However, because of an interpretation of the House Rules in 1949, legislative scrutiny and control of billions of dollars annually expended were eliminated. Consequently, whenever an administration becomes impatient with the tried-and-true method of financing projects, it merely seeks authority to borrow from Treasury trust funds—in some cases amounting to many billions—without bothering to get a legislative appropriation.

At a time when our country is challenged to fight against inflation and for a stable economy, the power and ability to control the public purse must be restored to Congress. At stake is national solvency and public confidence in our economy, both here and abroad.

Further back-door drains on the Treasury will occur until Government agencies are compelled to go before the Appropriations Committee and justify their expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

In offering this resolution, I joined with more than 120 other Members who introduced similar measures or announced their support of this bipartisan effort to oppose back-door spending.

Hon. John J. Bell

SPEECH
OF
HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a former Member of the House, the Honorable John J. Bell, of Texas, has been a great loss not only to the State of Texas, but to the entire Nation.

John Bell was one of those rare men whose great ability led him to success in every field he entered. It was a great privilege for me to have been a fellow student with John in the University of Texas Law School. John Bell's brilliant career on the campus, both in student politics and scholastics, left little doubt as to his future success.

In the following years I watched his climb to the top in business and politics. In the Texas Legislature, in the Second World War, and ultimately in the Congress of the United States he served with honor and distinction.

That a man of John Bell's stature should pass on so early in life is a great misfortune. To his devoted wife and family, I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Great Progress in Civil Rights in 1962 Reported by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 1962 was "a year of great progress in civil rights" and we are pleased to hear these words of reassurance from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy in his report on the "Progress of Civil Rights" to the President.

Under unanimous-consent agreement, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post, Monday, January 28, 1963, on the Attorney General's report, together with the complete report:

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS

The civil rights report which Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has presented to the President has the especial value of putting into perspective the gains that were largely eclipsed by the spectacular events at Oxford, Miss.

Notwithstanding this untoward incident, it is plain that the year was one of achievement and one, moreover, in which the most notable progress was in the changing spirit of the South. The catalog of interventions to enforce voting rights, transportation rights, and education rights makes reading of which the country has reason to be proud. If there still remains a great deal of discrimination in the land, it is discrimination about which the Government continues a persistent and serious effort to do something. There must be no slacking in this effort, for as the Attorney General points out: "Substantial numbers of American citizens are being deprived of their right to vote because of race."

While progress sometimes seems slow, it is cheering to note, in the language of the report, that "there are no segregated airport facilities in the Nation" and that there is only one city in the Nation in which there still is segregation at interstate rail and bus facilities.

Prince Edward County, Va., continues to have the dubious distinction of being the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools. That nearly 1,500 of the 1,800 schoolchildren of that county have had no education in 3 years is, as the Attorney General puts it, "a disgrace to our country." It is to be hoped that the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit will order the schools there opened, in accordance with the plea of the Justice Department.

The Attorney General has been wise to acknowledge that difficult racial problems remain throughout the country. He also has been wise to point out that they exist not only in the South "but throughout the country where Negroes are victims of school 'resegregation,' bias in housing, or employment or other facets of society."

The report will unnecessarily offend many objective people by an excessive effort to exhibit this administration's comparatively

greater zeal in the civil rights fields. This repetition of comparative statistics on suits filed and actions undertaken introduces into the report a political note that might better have been omitted. If it had to be included, it would have been considerate and generous if the Attorney General had acknowledged that the Department of Justice under the administration of his predecessor pushed through to enactment in the face of great opposition the legislative foundation for many of the actions of this administration. Whatever progress that has been made is the result of the efforts of public men in all parts of the country and both parties.

A REPORT ON THE PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF CIVIL RIGHTS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO THE PRESIDENT, JANUARY 24, 1963

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For those only interested in headlines, rioting and violence at the University of Mississippi overshadowed the civil rights field and painted 1962 as a year of resistance by the South to law and the orders of our courts. The historian, however, will find, on the contrary, that 1962 was a year of great progress in civil rights, in large measures because of the responsibility and respect for law displayed by the great majority of the citizens of the South. In 1962, the United States took major steps toward equal opportunities and equal rights for all our citizens and in every area of civil rights—whether voting, transportation, education, employment, or housing.

There were outstanding efforts throughout the administration on behalf of the full and free exercise of civil rights. Let me take particular note of the successes of the Vice President and your Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; the work of the Commission on Civil Rights; the impetus provided by the Executive order against segregation in housing; the impact area school efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and improved hiring practices and other activity by all parts of the executive branch.

This report, however, is limited to the work of the Department of Justice and here is a summary of our efforts in this field during the past year.

VOTING

The most significant civil rights problem is voting. Each citizen's right to vote is fundamental to all the other rights of citizenship and the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 make it the responsibility of the Department of Justice to protect that right.

It has been the sustained policy of this administration—in all areas of civil rights—to consult with local officials and seek voluntary, peaceful compliance with the commands of our courts and our laws. Under this policy, legal action is brought only after such efforts fail. While we have secured cooperation and compliance in all civil rights areas, this policy has met with particular success in the voting field.

During this administration, officials in 29 counties in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana have voluntarily made voting records available to the Department in our investigations of voting complaints, without the need for court action.

In four southern counties we have been able to avoid bringing lawsuits because officials abandoned discriminatory registration or voting practices, and scores of other counties and cities, notably in Georgia, have abandoned segregated balloting at our request, in voluntary conformance with a court decision in one county.

There have, however, been a number of areas where voluntary local compliance was not forthcoming and where we were required to bring legal action. Between the passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act and the change of administration, 10 voting suits were filed in southern counties and 7 were tried.

In this administration, 23 more voting suits have been filed, including 1 this week. A total of 17 suits have been tried, including the 3 pending January 20, 1961. Thus, of a total of 33 voting cases filed in both administrations, 24 have been tried so far. Satisfactory results have been achieved in 16 of these. Three cases have been tried but are not yet decided and the other five are on appeal.

There also has been an acceleration in voting records inspections. In the previous administration, records were inspected in 20 counties and photographed in 12 of these. In this administration, 62 voting records inspections have been undertaken, including photographing of records in 53 counties.

In short, the total number of counties in which the Department has taken action, ranging from records inspection to lawsuits, has increased from 30 at the beginning of this administration to 115 at present.

Each of the lawsuits filed has required extremely detailed preparation. In the suit brought against Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voter applications and to subpena 185 witnesses at the trial. Such suits require the total attention of from 4 to 6 of the 40 attorneys in Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall's Civil Rights Division for several months.

In some instances, we have had to take action even after obtaining court orders forbidding further discrimination against Negro registration applicants. In one of our suits, the registrar of Forrest County, Miss., was ordered by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to register all qualified Negroes. He nevertheless rejected as unqualified 94 of the first 103 Negroes to apply after the judgment, including a National Science Foundation graduate student and a high-school science teacher with a master's degree. The Department prosecuted him in the first contempt case stemming from a court voter registration order. The case is awaiting decision.

In East Carroll Parish, La., the voting referee provisions of the 1960 act were used for the first time in 1962, with the Federal judge himself hearing registration applications. Although he approved the application of 26 Negroes, the State of Louisiana attempted to block their registration through a State court injunction. We acted to set aside the State injunction and obtained an order forbidding further interference. On July 28, 5 days later, Negroes voted in East Carroll Parish for the first time since Reconstruction.

The Department's total voting rights effort, from records inspections to law suits to followup activity, has produced significant results. In a number of counties such as East Carroll Parish, Madison Parish, La., and Clarke and Tallahatchie Counties, Miss., where no Negroes had been registered in decades, Negroes are now beginning to be registered.

In Macon County, Ala., Negro registration has risen from 1,100 to more than 3,000 since an end to discriminatory registration practices was ordered by the court in March 1961. Negro registration in Bullock County, Ala., has risen from 5 in September 1961 to more than 1,000. In Montgomery, Ala., the Department's suit was decided November 20, 1962, and 1,100 previously rejected Negroes were ordered registered immediately. All have now been registered.

Two particularly significant voting suits were filed in the past year. While our voting suits generally challenge discriminatory application of voter qualification laws in specific counties, we filed suits in both Louisiana and Mississippi challenging the constitutionality of the State voter qualification laws themselves. Both cases are in pretrial stages.

In addition to suits challenging general discrimination against Negro registration applicants, we also have sought to guard against specific attempts to frighten, intimidate, or penalize Negroes who seek to register or vote. Of the 33 voting suits filed so far, 7 have been directed against such attempts at intimidation, verbal, economic, and physical.

The importance of these cases exceeds their specific circumstances. Negroes' fear of attempting to register is, perhaps, as great a problem as their being prevented from registering. These suits, like our followup actions in such cases as Forrest County and East Carroll Parish, have helped eliminate the fear by making it clear that the Government will meet its responsibility to guarantee not only the right to register and vote, but also the right to do so without intimidation or coercion.

A vivid example is provided by Haywood and Fayette Counties, Tenn., where intimidation actions were filed in the previous administration and successfully concluded in this administration. Last summer, we secured assurances, by consent decrees, against economic intimidation. Between late 1960, when the cases were filed, and the present, the number of Negroes registered has increased from none to more than 2,000 in Haywood County and from 58 to more than 3,000 in Fayette County.

Last summer, four Georgia churches used as centers for Negro registration efforts were burned and burnings were attempted at two others. In another illustration of our efforts against intimidation, the FBI investigated immediately. In one case, the FBI turned its findings over to local authorities, who arrested four men in connection with one burning. They were convicted in State court and sentenced to prison terms. In the second case, two men were arrested and face Federal charges. Our investigations of the other burnings continue.

In the field of voting, then, we have been able to make progress through both negotiation and litigation. The fact remains, however, that the heavy burden of effort lies ahead. Substantial numbers of American citizens are being deprived of their right to vote because of race, and we continue to believe that additional legislation in this field is necessary.

In 1962, Congress adopted the anti-poll-tax constitutional amendment, but did not enact legislation forbidding the discriminatory use of voting qualification tests. Even where we have brought suit, we often have been confronted with considerable delays between the time of filing and the time of trial.

We believe that additional legislation is necessary to insure prompt relief in such instances—where the facts indicate that substantial numbers of Negroes are being deprived of the right to register and vote because of race.

TRANSPORATION

As the result of action taken by the Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission last year, I can report to you that in the past year, segregation in interstate transportation has ceased to exist.

The majority of segregated bus and rail stations were desegregated in 1961 in accordance with new ICC regulations. Others followed in 1962. During 1962, we surveyed 165 airports in 14 States and found 15 airports in 6 of those States which were still segregated. All of these desegregated during the year, 13 voluntarily and 2 after the Department brought legal action.

At present, then, there are no segregated airport facilities in the Nation. There is only one city in the Nation, Jackson, Miss., in which systematic segregation at interstate

rail and bus facilities—as exemplified by signs directing the use of separate facilities—is still atempted. Even in this case we have taken legal action, now on appeal.

There have been isolated instances of discrimination against Negroes in this field and there will no doubt be other such instances in the future. But systematic segregation of Negroes in interstate transportation has disappeared.

Again, I would like to emphasize that in the great majority of cases, this is the result of voluntary compliance with law and regulations by citizens and officials.

SCHOOLS

In the past year, the number of desegregated southern school districts increased 60, from 912 to 972. In a number of these districts the Department continued its policy of consulting informally with school officials to help assure peaceful and orderly desegregation. As in 1961, public schools in each of these districts were desegregated without incident.

Efforts also were made to secure peaceful compliance with a series of court orders requiring the admission of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi, before his scheduled enrollment. We appeared as a friend of the court in the case before the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and the Department sought continuously to induce Mississippi officials to fulfill their responsibilities to law and to order.

These efforts were unsuccessful, but the Federal Government's responsibility to enforce the laws and the orders of the courts remained. The responsibility was met.

In another area, the Department in the past year initiated action concerning impact area school funds. Various local school systems receive Federal funds because they educate children of Federal employees who may not be permanent residents. In the 12 years of this program, nearly $2.5 billion has been paid to school districts across the country.

Again, we have sought abandonment of segregation through negotiation first. The Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have succeeded in obtaining voluntary desegregation, without going to court, in several districts and other negotiations or field surveys are underway in approximately 120 districts. Additional inquiries are scheduled for the coming months.

Negotiating efforts failed, however, in Prince George County, Va., which educates children of defense personnel stationed at nearby Fort Lee, and we filed suit. Four similar suits were filed last week regarding segregation in Huntsville and Mobile, Ala.; Gulfport and Biloxi, Miss.; and Bossier Parish, La.

In another kind of school case, also in Louisiana, the Department brought a contempt action against State education officials for failing to desegregate a State trade school, as had been ordered by a Federal court in a private suit. When the State board of education passed a formal resolution stating there would be no racial discrimination as to race, the Department agreed to dismissal of the case, but withheld the right to inspect the school records.

The Department also took action in Prince Edward County, Va.—the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools. They have been closed since fall, 1959, in order to avoid court desegregation orders. That nearly 1,500 of the 1,800 school-age Negro children in the county should have had no education in more than 3 years is a disgrace to our country. Last month, we asked the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, as a friend of the court, to order the schools opened promptly without racial segregation.

EMPLOYMENT

The Department has continued its policy of seeking out qualified personnel on the basis of ability and irrespective of race. Negroes are not denied employment because of their race. Neither are they hired because of their race. They, like all our employees, are selected on the basis of ability and merit. This policy has resulted in notable gains for Negroes in the offices of U.S. attorneys and marshals in the Nation's 92 judicial districts.

Of the approximately 350 assistant U.S. attorneys appointed in this administration, 32 are Negroes. Of these 32, 16 were appointed in 1962. Approximately 35 Negro assistant U.S. attorneys are now in service. Two Negro U.S. attorneys were appointed last year. This year, the first Negro assistant U.S. attorneys were appointed in at least seven States, including Southern and border States.

Of the 114 deputy U.S. marshals appointed in this administration, 14 are Negroes. Of these, 11 were appointed in 1962. Approximately 30 Negro deputy marshals are now in service. Luke C. Moore was appointed U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia in the past year, the first Negro to hold that position in a century. As with assistant U.S. attorneys, appointments of Negro deputy marshals were made in several Southern and border States, where no one of their race had ever before served.

The effort to assure that qualified Negroes are properly considered for these positions is continuing and Negroes are among the candidates for vacancies in several districts.

Improved hiring practices within the Department as a whole have resulted in continued gains for Negro attorneys. There were 10 Negro attorneys in the Department at the beginning of this administration. Now there are more than 70, out of approximately 1,900 in the Department.

There have, as well, continued to be a number of Negroes appointed to distinguished positions in the Government, such as Homer L. Benson, appointed to the Board of Parole.

OTHER AREAS

Albany, Ga.: The Department acted to the limit of its authority in Albany, where a series of mass protests by Negroes against segregation resulted in numerous arrests and civil rights complaints. All such complaints were speedily investigated by the FBI. Although no violation of Federal law was found in most cases, prosecutive steps were taken where appropriate. In August, the Department filed a voting intimidation suit against 16 officials of nearby Sumter and Terrell Counties and also filed a friend of the court brief in a suit brought in Albany. The brief asked the court to ignore the city's request for an injunction against demonstrations until the city first complied with the law and abandoned segregation. The two sets of arrests for church burnings in the area previously referred to were the result of FBI action. Throughout the Albany difficulties, the Department consulted with leaders on both sides in an effort to encourage an amicable resolution of the racial difficulties. All matters of dispute have now been brought before the Federal court in Albany, and I have no doubt that the constitutional rights of all citizens of that city will be protected.

Sit-ins: In a friend of the court brief filed in October, the Department asked the Supreme Court of the United States to reverse convictions of more than 30 Negroes for sit-in violations in four States. The Department argued that States cannot arrest Negroes for trespass when the States themselves, by law and policies, foster the discrimination which led to the sit-ins.

Hospitals: In May, the Department sought to intervene in a private suit seeking the desegregation of two North Carolina hospitals which were built with Federal Hill-Burton Act financial assistance. The Department asked the court to declare unconstitutional the separate-but-equal provision of the act. While the Department was permitted to intervene, the court subsequently dismissed the suit, filed by Negro doctors, dentists, and patients. An appeal appears likely.

Employment suit: Problems of racial discrimination are by no means peculiar to the South. The Department appeared as a friend of the court in an appeal to the Colorado Supreme Court by a Negro pilot who charged he was denied employment with an airline in violation of a State antidiscrimination law. The Colorado court denied the appeal, but the Supreme Court of the United States has agreed to review the case.

Police brutality: During 1962, the Department brought 18 police brutality prosecutions, many of them in Northern States. These cases included one in Indiana where two Negro detectives were convicted of brutally beating a Negro defendant to coerce him to confess several crimes.

In summary, 1962 was a year of progress for the United States in the field of civil rights. This is not to say the problems are disappearing. They remain, and they remain difficult—not only in the South, with open discrimination, but throughout the country where Negroes are the victims of school "resegregation," bias in housing, or employment, or other facets of society. Ugly incidents like the Mississippi riot may occur again.

But we are accelerating our progress. Again, let me say this acceleration occurs in large measure because of the emerging spirit of the South. In 1962 this spirit was not the brutal one of rioting and violence at the University of Mississippi. The spirit was that exemplified in Georgia last week by Gov. Carl E. Sanders, in his inaugural address.

"We revere the past," he said. "We adhere to the values of respectability and responsibility which constitute our tradition." Then he added, "We believe in law and order and in the principle that all laws apply equally to all citizens."

Sincerely,

ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

Private Enterprise Making Most Progress in Latin America—Alliance for Progress Could Learn From It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the constant refrain and discussion as to why the Alliance for Progress, much over-press-released and ballyhooed by the Kennedy administration, is not working as well as expected, one item is all too often forgotten. American companies and loyal, dedicated American business men and women, have been doing a good job in South America in their own quiet way long before the massive Government spending programs began.

As one who was impressed personally last year while in South America as a member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact the there are many success stories which do not involve Government, but mainly private American initiative. Rereading the February 1962 issue of Fortune devoted to Latin America recently, I was struck by the number of men in private enterprise who are seldom discussed with all this emphasis on the Alliance for Progress.

The Fortune article follows:

PRIVATE ALLIES FOR PROGRESS

The inscription on a photograph in the Chicago office of a Sears, Roebuck vice president reads: "To John Gallagher, who has lived with us and understood and cared for Venezuela." It is signed by Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt. Gallagher is one of many Americans who have lived in Latin America and made significant practical contributions to its economy. Long before President Kennedy proposed his Alliance for Progress these men were already engaged in private alliances with individuals, business firms, and government agencies in Latin America. They brought down the skills and experience of the U.S. economy and planted them in the local environment. These Americans do not preach or propagandize the American way of life. They offer practical guidance in such matters as mass marketing, credit unions, capital investments, housing, and farming. And most of them are making a profit for themselves or their companies at the same time. On these pages are portraits of 12 men who exemplify this personal diplomacy for free enterprise:

Richard O. Provost, 38, has introduced modern merchandising techniques in 18 supermarkets in Venezuela, enabling them to sell foodstuffs as much as 20 percent under the local markets. He is the general manager of CADA (C. A. Distriduitora de Alimentos), owned 51 percent by the Rockefellers' I.B.E.C. (International Basic Economy Corp.) and 49 percent by Venezuelan investors. The company's supermarkets buy most of their wares from local suppliers, whom Provost has trained in mass production, sanitation, packaging, and marketing. Ninety percent of the employees are recruited in Venezuela, and he has had to teach them how to stock supermarkets shelves, keep up the inventory, and run the checkout counters.

John F. Gallagher, 43, uses his position as Sears, Roebuck's vice president in charge of Latin-American operations to help build a consumer-goods industry. Local manufacturers in nine Latin-American countries now supply Sears with 80 percent of the merchandise it sells in those countries. Under Gallagher's direction, Sears' buyers advise manufacturers on what and how much to make, and when to make it. Recently, for instance, Sears helped a Peruvian businessman to go into the manufacture of refrigerators. And 50 percent of Sears' Latin-American profits are reinvested in the countries where the stores operate. Before taking his present job in Chicago headquarters in 1960, Gallagher was Sears' local manager in Venezuela for 5 years.

Father Daniel M. McLellan, 45, is a Maryknoll missionary who fortifies his spiritual guidance with practical assistance. When he first arrived in the Peruvian mountains in 1950, he realized that he could best overcome the Indians' distrust by helping to alleviate their poverty. He spent 5 years gaining their confidence and then, in 1955, started a credit union to help his parishioners build houses and schools, start farms, and buy livestock. His first credit union had 23 members and capital of $32. The system has since spread throughout Peru, now has over 750,000 members and capital of over $2 million. The borrowers, who previously had paid up to 50 percent a month to usurers, are charged 12 percent a year on their unpaid balance.

Clarence J. Dauphinot Jr., 49, pioneered in raising investment capital from South Americans who had never thought of owning a share of stock before. Founder (in 1946) and president of Deltec, S.A., in Brazil, Dauphinot sent his crew of salesmen by jeep to villages in the mountains and jungles in a door-to-door campaign to raise capital for such companies as Willys-Overland do Brasil and American & Foreign Power. He later extended operations, with a network of companies, into Argentina, Venezuela, Chile, and Peru. In such risky new ventures things don't always turn out successfully: investors claim they have lost over $1 million in a Deltec-financed housing development in Venezula that never got off the ground.

Thomas Jefferson Williams, 67, practices philanthropy in the U.S. style, where the giver carefully organizes the uses of his money. In 1943 he and his wife started the Williams Foundation to promote cultural and sicentific exchanges between the United States and Argentina. ("We owe loyalty and gratitude to both countries.") A resident of Buenos Aires since 1914, Williams is one of the richest men in South America; his enterprises include textiles, chemicals, mining, and automobile manufacturing. His foundation sends young men to U.S. colleges, gives subsidies and scholarships for research, donates chemical laboratories to universities, and has recently established a cytology center, a cardiovascular laboratory, and a laboratory for plastic surgery.

William Max Pearce and James F. McCloud have been encouraging the growth of an automobile industry in Brazil and Argentina respectively. Pearce, 48, is managing director of Willys-Overland do Brasil, and McCloud, 43, is president of Industrias Kaiser Argentina. Both companies were started by Kaiser Industries, but the majority of the stock is now owned by Latin Americans and all but a handful of the employees are local nationals. Pearce and McCloud have sought out local industries to produce parts for the cars they manufacture (less than 10 percent of the cars' components are brought in from overseas). And they have established educational programs to train skilled technicians and send bright young men abroad for further training. McCloud has recently spent almost $3 million on a new training center. He has also set up an acceptance corporation to finance sales of Industrias Kaiser Argentina's cars, plans to branch out into cement and aluminum, and is studying the feasibility of building a steel plant in Argentina.

John D. J. Moore, 51, is vice president of W. R. Grace & Co., the great shipping and industrial firm, which has old and deep roots in South America. Nowadays Moore spends much of his time working with Latin American businessmen and government officials on noncompany projects to improve economic and social conditions. A regular commuter between New York and South America, he is chairman of the United States Inter-American Council, an organization of U.S. firms and business associations "dedicated to the defense of free enterprise in the Americas." He is a firm believer in helping Latin Americans to help themselves—but within their own traditional framework. Says he: "We're not trying to Yankify them."

William F. Coles, 54, has helped give the Venezuelan economy better balance by bringing in U.S. capital and technical skills. Coles, who has been in Caracas for more than 20 years, started as a lawyer for Compañia de Fomento, a Rockefeller-sponsored development agency that was among the first companies in Caracas to offer stock to the public. He is counsel for I.B.E.C. and a director of several Venezuelan finance and investment companies as well as of the Caracas Daily Journal. Through I.B.E.C., Coles started a dairy company, an improved cattle-breeding ranch, and a supermarket chain. He believes that the influence of U.S. businessmen in the country has firmly established Venezuelan private enterprise in the U.S. pattern.

Angus C. Littlejohn, 45, channels U.S. corporate money into the Brazilian economy. He acts, on the one hand, as adviser and representative for foreign business investors in Brazil and, on the other hand, as director of more than a dozen important Brazilian firms. A wartime assistant U.S. naval attaché in Rio, Littlejohn started a one-man consultant firm there in 1946. Today he operates in fast-growing São Paulo—more or less out of his hat; his office staff consists of three Brazilian associates and two secretaries. But there is nothing small about his clients—among them are Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Koppers, Quaker Oats, and Container Corp. With his advice, offered after extensive research and study, they have invested millions in Brazilian enterprises.

Harry A. Jarvis, 52, is seeking ways to put U.S. oil profits to work stimulating Venezuelan industrial growth. As president of Creole Petroleum Corp., a subsidiary of Jersey Standard, Jarvis recently set up Creole Investment Corp. with initial capital of $10 million to be invested in diversified enterprises. Creole's interest is "never more than 49 percent," says Jarvis. "We want Venezuelans to put up their own money and have control." Creole has helped finance three ventures: a firm to make starch and glucose from yucca plants, a company to make fiberboard from bagasse, and a fish-meal plant. Seventy-five other projects are under review. The scheme is not a philanthropic gesture, says Jarvis. "We expect it to show a profit."

Serafino Romualdi, 61, has been stumping Latin America for 15 years to promote "a constructive type of nonpolitical trade unionism." Romualdi, an Italian-born veteran of the U.S. labor movement (he was in the publicity division of the ILGWU), is now the AFL-CIO's inter-American representative. The most important result of his efforts is ORIT (Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers), which he helped found in 1951 to fight communism in organized labor. Now Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers has some 15 million Latin American affiliated members as against 2 million in Communist-dominated unions. Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers, says Romualdi, is "based not on the concept of the class struggle, but aimed at rapprochement with free enterprise—as a partner."

The President's Fiscal 1964 Budget Message

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has called his estimated fiscal 1964 budget deficit of $11.9 billion a "temporary deficit" and an "investment in the future." A look at the recent past gives us little confidence that under this administration our deficits will be either temporary or serve as a useful investment in the future.

The history of the Kennedy administration is a history of persistent and ever-increasing Federal expenditures

and budget deficits. From fiscal 1962 through the estimates for fiscal 1964, deficits will total about $27 billion, or about $5 billion over the total net deficit of the 8 fiscal years of the Eisenhower administration.

In spite of the theories about the beneficial effects of budget deficits, experience shows that this kind of investment has failed to bring about the Kennedy administration's goal of a faster rate of economic growth.

Based upon the pattern of recent years, it would be surprising if the $11.9 billion estimated deficit were not considerably higher by the end of the fiscal year. The President's estimated deficit is based upon highly favorable and "iffy" assumptions, both as to the stimulative effects of the tax cut and to new legislation, particularly in agriculture, which the administration intends to request.

The administration's excuse for its rising expenditure level—which next year will exceed spending at the peak of World War II—is that a large part of the increased spending has been devoted to our defense and space efforts. This raises the question whether we can build a sound defense and meet our other obligations as a great power on the basis of a policy of dangerous fiscal irresponsibility. Defense and space should not become sacred cows. The very rapidly rising level of expenditures in these areas should be subjected to the closest examination in order to insure that we get the most from our defense and space dollars. Unless this is done, programs may expand too fast and result in waste, which in the final analysis may slow our progress in space and impair our national security.

The President's claim that civilian expenditures next year will be below this year's level is somewhat misleading. Agricultural expenditures are shown dropping by about $1 billion next year, a hoped-for decrease which will permit increases in almost all other civilian programs. Although spending on agriculture is supposed to decline, the administration will be asking for a sharp jump of $1.4 billion in new obligational authority for agricultural programs—or slightly more than new obligational authority being asked for the Department of Defense. Health, Education, and Welfare is asking $1.7 billion in new obligational authority. This is the real test of the Kennedy administration's budget, since new obligational authority is an indication of what future expenditures will be. The fact is that the administration is not holding the line on civilian expenditures, but is steadily increasing them, even while asking for a tax cut which will reduce Federal revenues.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Wall Street Journal of Monday, January 21, discussing the trends in spending as indicated in the 1964 budget, in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

SMALL INITIAL OUTLAYS PROMISE STEEP RISE IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S FUTURE SPENDING

(By Lindley H. Clark)

WASHINGTON.—Once the economy really gets rolling, the administration believes, it will generate big increases in revenue, even at reduced tax rates. And, the argument continues, spending won't be allowed to rise as fast as revenue, so at some point—perhaps as early as fiscal 1966—the deficit will be eliminated.

But if this is to happen, according to many people here, the tax take will have to climb sharply if it is ever to overtake the spending envisioned by the administration.

The evidence of this comes in part from comments of officials who've had a hand in preparing the budget for fiscal 1964. In putting together that bulky document, says Budget Director Kermit Gordon, a large number of worthwhile projects were canceled or deferred, so that the spending requests of the various agencies were scaled down by $7 or $8 billion. But past history suggests that the deferred projects will be back on the tracks before long.

COSTS ARE CLIMBING

The bulk of the evidence is in the budget figures themselves. Consider first some of the projects that have been around for a while. Whatever the worth of many of these programs, there's no doubt that costs are climbing fast.

Outlays for the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1964, for instance, are estimated at $4.2 billion, more than triple the figure for the year ended last June 30, and no slowdown is even remotely in sight. For the year begining next July the administration wants congressional permission to commit the Government for $5.7 billion of future outlays.

Some of this new obligational authority—NOA in Federal lingo—will be used in fiscal 1964, but a lot of it is for spending beyond that year. In some cases, the NOA figures point to trends quite different from those shown by spending estimates.

Foreign aid is one example. Actual outlays under this program, which has been coming under increasing congressional fire, are estimated at $3.7 billion for fiscal 1964, down $100 million from the year ending next June 30. But the NOA figure heads upward. For next fiscal year it comes to $4.9 billion, up more than $1 billion from the amount for the 12-month period.

The statistics on Federal spending on agriculture paint a similar picture. Outlays in the fiscal year just ahead are estimated at $5.7 billion, surely a sharp drop from the anticipated total of $6.7 billion for the current year.

Although the saving may be illusory—the Government hopes to sell off next year a lot of cotton it expects to take into the price support shelter this year—economy advocates may still find some comfort in the bare figures. At least there may be a bit less money going out. But the NOA figure tells a quite different story: For fiscal 1964 it's $7.2 billion, up more than $1.5 billion from the current year.

TOTAL REQUESTS RISE

Nor are these activities the exceptions. Throughout the Government, agencies are seeking Congressional go-aheads for sharply increased amounts of spending. Total new obligational authority sought for fiscal 1964 adds up to $107.9 billion, $4.7 billion above the current year and around $15 billion over the figure for the year ended last June 30.

Another good gage of future spending trends is the figure for new commitments under Government credit programs. These commitments result when the Government either agrees to make direct loans or to insure or guarantee repayment of loans advanced by private lenders. The budget document declares that "new commitments are the best single measure of the trends in most Federal credit programs."

With that in mind, perhaps we shouldn't pay much attention to the fact that actual budget outlays under Federal credit programs are expected to drop to $1.2 billion next year, down from $2.7 billion in the current year. For one thing, that drop would result partly from the Commodity Credit Corporation's hoped-for sell off of cotton. For another, it would stem to some extent from expected sales to private lenders of loans now held by the Export-Import Bank, the Federal National Mortgage Association and some other agencies. Nobody in Government seems to worry for a moment that the private lenders may not be eager to buy.

Most important, however, is that figure on new commitments. For fiscal 1964 it's expected to be $27.5 billion, up $1.4 billion from the year ending June 30. And lest anyone console himself with the thought that the Government may not have to make good on loan insurance and guarantees, it is perhaps worth noting that well over half of the projected increase is in direct loans.

Moving on from current programs into those that exist now only on paper, the portents are equally clear.

It may be, as President Kennedy says, that all the proposals for new programs have been culled carefully to set aside all but those which "represent a necessary payment on future progress and should not be postponed." But it is clear that all of the things which wound up in this select category will be expensive.

They will not be so expensive in fiscal 1964, of course, Government programs have a way of starting slowly, however big they eventually may turn out to be. But both the broad scope of these programs and, in some cases, the spending authority already being requested show that bigger outlays are expected.

Perhaps the most striking example is Mr. Kennedy's projected new program in education for which he says, "The Federal Government can provide only a small part of the funds."

As Government figures go, it's true that the proposed 1964 outlays for the new education program look fairly small—only $144 million. But for the same fiscal year the administration is seeking new obligational authority totaling $1.2 billion.

A BROAD PROGRAM

And though the details of the program remain to be spelled out in a forthcoming special message, there's nothing small or temporary-sounding about the general aims outlined in the budget. The program, the budget says, will seek "the (a) buttressing of research in education and improvement, of course content, (b) expansion and improvement of teacher training programs, (c) improvement of community library services for people of all ages, (d) and strengthening of public elementary and secondary education. Very little, it would seem, is being overlooked.

The President is also proposing again a program to "revitalize" urban mass transportation. The projected outlay for fiscal 1964 looks modest: A scant $10 million. But the administration also is asking the right to spend $500 million on the program over the ensuing 3 years.

Though the figures on public housing spending already show a steady rise, the budget suggests more may be coming. It talks of studies under way and studies yet to come on how to "improve" Federal housing programs. Whatever "improve" may mean to anybody else, to a Government man it's likely to mean more money.

The list could be stretched onward a great deal further. Proposed legislation for hospital construction calls for 1964 outlays of only $5 million but new obligational authority of $35 million. A proposal for medical education assistance lists 1964 spending at $9 million but asks for a go-ahead on a total of $34 million. The pattern elsewhere is much the same.

What the pattern shows is not necessarily that we won't ever achieve a balanced budget. Someday we perhaps will. But few readers of Mr. Kennedy's new budget would see it as a guidebook on how to get there.

Appendix

Industrial Growth in the City of Laramie, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State which I represent has one of the greatest potentials for growth and development in the Nation and it has been my continued effort to bring realization to that potential of natural resource, dynamic population, and efficient transportation and communication. The job has not always been easy but progress is being made. The most recent indication of the progress we have been working for is the development of a new industry in my home town, Laramie, Wyo.

This vigorous, dynamic city has attracted a new industry that bodes well for the future industrial growth of the city. The new industry is a $500,000 low temperature bulk storage warehouse which will hold frozen foods and other commodities in transit across the Nation.

A recent article in the Laramie Boomerang gives many details on the new storage facility and also illustrates the many attractions Laramie has for industries seeking new homes. An editorial in that same newspaper further spells out why Laramie has a future of growth and greatness. I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACKERS' COLD STORAGE TO BUILD $500,000 WAREHOUSE—LARAMIE TO GET NEW INDUSTRY

(By Vern Shelton)

Laramine has been selected as the site for a $500,000 low-temperature bulk storage warehouse, according to Tom Henry, president of Packers' Cold Storage, Inc., of Fullerton, Calif.

The plant, located at the west end of Clark Street north of the Spiegelberg Lumber Co., will be in operation June 30 with completion scheduled 15 days earlier.

Construction on the new facility will start by the end of March.

Present plans call for construction of one 50,000-square-foot storage warehouse with the possibility of seven similar units in the future, boosting the eventual overall investment to approximately $4 million.

Richard Wagner, Packers' Cold Storage vice president, estimated it will cost approximately $10 per square foot to put the low-temperature warehouse and equipment in full operation.

The California company has leased a 20-acre site from the Union Pacific Railroad near the old Hahns-Peak depot, although only 10 acres will be used initially. If additional units are constructed, the warehousing operation could eventually have as much as 400,000 square feet of storage under roof.

The warehouse will be for frozen, instransit storage on a contractural basis only and will not be open for public storage. Principal contractor at present is Safeway, Inc. Safeway officials in Oakland, Calif., Friday emphasized the facility will be used for storing frozen products enroute to other shipping points outside the State. The warehouse will provide a storage and distribution point for 43 production plants west of Laramie in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

The warehouse manager will be transferred to Laramie from southern California. All other labor will be employed locally. The warehouse payroll will list 10 to 12 persons on a permanent basis with other jobs becoming available as the operation expands.

Although the warehouse will be involved only in low-temperature storage, there is a strong possibility other industries might be attracted to Laramie. "Where you have this sort of facility, other manufacturing or packing operations generally come into the area," Henry said when in Laramie recently.

"The warehouse is probably one of the cleanest industries it's possible to have," he added. "We palletize all of our storage. There are no fumes or noxious gases. The building will be modern and well-maintained. The type of business doesn't attract undesirable people as employees. I feel it will be a very sound industry for the city to have."

Henry added, "Our biggest demand will be for power. This has been pretty well resolved. We'll have a need for water and we'll have to know the fire zone rating in the area."

A sewer line is already located in close proximity to the building site. An existing 3-inch water main in Clark Street is being relocated as part of the viaduct construction program and could be enlarged.

Packers' Cold Storage officials pointed out the warehouse could have been located anywhere between Laramie and Evanston but the Gem City was chosen because of its tax advantages and because of the city's location as a transportation center. Goods stored in Wyoming are not subject to tax until they have been in the State 9 months.

Other factors leading to the selection, in order of importance were Laramie's distribution potential, the University of Wyoming, the new viaduct which will provide quick access from the plant to the downtown area, Laramie's reputation as a progressive and clean city, a young and aggressive city council and the availability of part-time help.

The California corporation completed an 18-month survey of the city before making the decision to move here, company officials pointed out.

"This is an industry breakthrough for Laramie," Harold Flater and Floyd Harmston, president and first vice president of the Laramie Area Industrial Development Corp., said Friday night.

"We feel that the factors that caused the Packers' Cold Storage Co. to come to Laramie are the same factors that will attract other industries. These could be connected with the cold storage plant, with other distributive industries, with the university, or with the resources of the area."

The two men continued, "We have plenty of potential resources for expansion such as available land sites, utilities, transportation, and all of the things which appealed to these people.

"It would pay for any industry looking for room for expansion or for new plants to take a good hard look at Laramie. This is the first time we've had an industrialist look at our city and tell us what he likes about it. We know that Laramie has these advantages and it is good to hear it confirmed by someone willing to back his feelings with action.

"The water needs of this industry indicate the wisdom and farsightedness of the voters when they voted for the $3,300,000 water bond issue in November.

"We are pleased to notice that Mr. Henry has emphasized the importance of research facilities at the University of Wyoming. We feel this will be a big factor, appealing to other industrialists who might wish to come to Laramie.

"This is probably the first time anyone has selected Laramie in relation to markets and this is highly significant. It's indicative of the growth of markets in the western area.

"Laramie AID officers and directors will continue to stand ready to assist Packers' Cold Storage and any other industrialists in locating their plant and facilities in Laramie. The selection of Laramie by Packers' Cold Storage is indeed an honor."

AT LAST A BREAKTHROUGH

The announcement of a new industry for Laramie in yesterday morning's paper was a welcome piece of news for Laramie residents, and particularly for those men who have been working with the Laramie Area Industrial Development Corp.

In deciding on Laramie for location of its storage warehouse, Packers' Cold Storage cited tax advantages and the city's location as a transportation center. Both of these factors could have a heavy influence on any other type warehouse industry seeking a good location.

The distribution potential of the city was another factor, along with the University of Wyoming. Also a deciding factor was Laramie's reputation as a progressive and clean city and a young and aggressive city council.

Another factor that might be overlooked except for Packers' mention of it as a deciding factor is the availability of part-time help and the use of the university in research work.

Packers' decision on Laramie was no quick move. The company studied the area for 18 months before making its decision. The fact that a plentiful power supply and water supply was available also helped in reaching the decision to locate in Laramie.

The coming of one new industry to Laramie can very well be the steppingstone to new industry. New industry is more likely to look over the area to see why Packers' chose this particular spot. A close look at the area can very well develop into an invitation to other industry.

Laramie's position as a transportation center is well established. The city is served by main line Union Pacific, by Frontier Airlines with connections possible to any airline a few short miles away in Denver, located on a main highway east to west and a good highway south to Denver, and served by two bus lines with a good schedule.

The city has plenty of power available and water will present no problem since passage of the water bond issue last November. Other factors include good fire protection and a mild climate with good recreation facilities.

Laramie has a lot to offer industry. We're not surprised that at least one industry has recognized that. We feel sure that more and more will study Laramie carefully before making a selection for a site for a new plant, particularly when Laramie AID is available to offer help and at the same time to supply adequate information on the town for any prospective industry.

Tribute to Richard Kunz, Hoosier Peace Corps Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in view of the outstanding accomplishments of Peace Corps volunteers in an ever-growing number of countries and areas of activity, I believe the following article, printed December 21, 1962, in the Washington Daily News under the byline of one of our country's finest reporters, Dan Kidney, should be brought to the attention of all Americans in view of its content concerning the activities of one Peace Corps volunteer, 21-year-old Richard Kunz of Indianapolis, Ind. The example set by this young Peace Corps volunteer should serve as a challenge to all of us to strive for improved international relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRIDGE TO FRIENDSHIP—PEACE CORPSMAN IS NOW "THE MAN WHO KNOWS"

(By Dan Kidney)

When President Kennedy established his Alliance for Progress in Latin America, he had in mind how successful was the good neighbor policy of President Roosevelt, in building friendships there.

Now a Hoosier Peace Corpsman has changed that idea from a symbol to a reality by building a bridge and other much-needed facilities where he is stationed with the Peace Corps in Colombia, South America.

He is Richard L. Kunz, 21, of Indianapolis. A glowing report on his accomplishments has been received by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana.

The Indiana Senator considers the report on Mr. Kunz's Colombian service, compiled by CARE, one of the best from the Corps, as it points up how in the last year his "technical know-how, combined with individual initiative, has resulted in building two aqueducts, as well as the bridge and other projects."

Here are excerpts from the report given Senator HARTKE:

"One of the aqueducts is bringing fresh water to a cluster of mountain villages in the Santander del Norte area and the other, now under construction, will serve the little town of Rosaria. The bridge has been built over a mountain stream near the village of Santa Teresita.

"Young Kunz, who was majoring in engineering and industrial management at Purdue University when he volunteered for the Peace Corps, also has guided construction of a road connecting the hamlet of Villa Nueva with the main highway of the Province."

Senator HARTKE, who always has supported Peace Corps legislation, said CARE, Inc., officials have told him that none of these projects, or smaller improvements introduced by Mr. Kunz, would have been carried out without the use of CARE tools and equipment and the voluntary labor of the villagers. The tools and other equipment being used by Mr. Kunz and others were donated by American contributors to CARE, Senator HARTKE said.

The report continues: "Mr. Kunz is working with a group of farmers banded together to improve their living conditions. Mr. Kunz reports it wasn't always easy to overcome the hesitancy of the farmers to accept an outsider.

"He uses the bridge at Santa Teresita as an example of what he means. He said that for years the people had done a great deal of wishful thinking about a bridge. It would provide a short cut, he explained, because the old road approached the town in a roundabout way.

"Mr. Kunz surveyed the site he helped residents of the area to select for the bridge, then planned the structure. Mr. Kunz reported he foresaw no great engineering problems and then reported this conclusion to the farmers' committee. Meanwhile, he asked the CARE mission in Bogotá for the necesary carpenter, mason, and brush-clearing tools.

"But the farmers' committee failed to make a decision on whether to accept Mr. Kunz' recommendation to go ahead with the project.

"Finally, Mr. Kunz won the support of a young priest, Padre Moras, who headed the local parish. The 23-year-old priest gently insisted that Mr. Kunz' proposal be accepted. The villagers and farmers responded, gathering seasoned timber, stones, and cement for the bridge project. Once the Peace Corps volunteer removed the indecision, construction of the bridge was completed in 3 days.

"Mr. Kunz reports the Colombians he assisted in construction of the bridge showed their appreciation by scratching into wet concrete of an abutment that the span had been built by the Peace Corps with CARE tools."

Senator HARTKE said Peace Corps officials report Mr. Kunz' persuasiveness and winning ways with the villagers and farmers of Colombia have earned him the title of "Don Ricardo—El Hombre Que Sabe." That is, "The Man Who Knows."

A Peace Corps spokesman said Mr. Kunz is being sought out by Colombian farmers and villagers of the district to which he's assigned. They want his opinion and advice on construction of housing, schools, and other buildings.

He is becoming a familiar sight on backroads and village streets as he tours the district on mule-back, assisting the people of Colombia in their efforts to improve their living standards.

Small Is Big

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Rocky Mountain News of January 27, 1963:

SMALL IS BIG

In 1931, when the country was hobbled with one of its worst depressions, the Government created a banking agency, called the Reconstruction Finance Corp. (RFC).

It was to be a temporary agency, 2 years. It was just to tide over hard-hit businesses until they could get on their feet.

Thirty years later, after loans of $50 billion, the RFC was liquidated, its still outstanding loans shifted to other agencies. Meanwhile, its lending, which had got so out of hand it became a scandal, had been shut off by a shocked Congress.

Another Congress in 1954 set up the Small Business Administration (SBA). There was no depression, lending money was plentiful from private banks. But a group in Congress had built up a belief that small business wasn't getting all it had coming, so the Government should help, with cutrate loans on projects turned down by the banks as bad risks.

This, too, was to be a "temporary" agency. It began with a revolving fund of $55 million and 600 employees.

Now, 10 years later, the "temporary'" has become permanent. Today SBA has a revolving fund of nearly $1.3 billion, and 3,200 employees. By 1967, the SBA expects, and hopes, it will have outstanding loans of $2.5 billion. Big business, indeed. One of the biggest.

This is what happens to Government agencies. When they run out of one excuse for being, they dream up two more. The "small" businesses eligible for SBA loans get bigger and more diversified. Now the loans include bowling alleys, dude ranches, amusement parks, even offices for doctors and lawyers. It is easy to borrow from SBA.

Scripps-Howard Writer Dickson Preston reported on the situation in Saturday's business pages. Just remember, it is the taxpayers who keep this small business banker in business by paying its losses.

Goals for the Electric Power Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on October 19, 1962, Chairman Joseph C. Swidler, of the Federal Power Commission, delivered before the Electric Council of New England, at Boston, Mass., a very good speech on the power situation in New England. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOALS FOR THE ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY

(By Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman, Federal Power Commission)

I am delighted to be here today to talk to the members of the Electric Council of New England. Your program demonstrates the lively interest of your members in the improvement of New England power systems and in the developing technology of the industry, including not only the conventional power technology but the so-called exotic developments as well. It is gratifying to participate in a program of such broad intellectual interest.

You may be surprised to know that this is my first talk to an organization representing the investor-owned electric companies. I have made a good many talks since I became a member of the Federal Power Commission some 15 months ago, but most of them have been on natural gas problems. My experience has not been unique; so far as I can find out, in recent years the members of the Federal Power Commission have spoken rarely to electric utility groups although speaking engagements before natural gas industry organizations have been relatively frequent. This difference probably reflects the fact that the Commission has spent most of its time since World War II in attempting to master the deluge of natural gas cases brought on by the postwar development of the natural gas industry. However that may be, my own background is in the electric power field and I am glad to have this opportunity to talk about electric power problems, particularly in an area of the country which has pioneered in electric power technology, both steam and hydro.

I want to take the occasion of this first talk to the executives of the regulated power companies to emphasize that the Commission is now aware of the urgency and importance of its responsibilities in the electric power field and allocation of funds and manpower are being made toward the objective of fully discharging those responsibilities. Your invitation to speak here today is, I believe, evidence of the industry's awareness of this revitalization in the Commission's administration of its responsibilities under the Federal Power Act.

The Federal Power Commission has a variety of responsibilities in the electric power field, some of them regulatory in the strict sense, that is, relating to the regulation of rates, license proceedings and the like, and others which involve Commission programs for the encouragement of the optimum development of this country's system of power supply. I believe that the present Commission takes both kinds of responsibilities with equal seriousness and proposes to give great emphasis, in the words of the statute, to "assuring an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States with the greatest possible economy and with regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources."

The resurgence of the Federal Power Commission's electric power activities comes at a most appropriate time in the technological development of the industry. In the last decade the industry has witnessed changes so drastic as to amount almost to a revolution in its technological base. In 1950, the largest steamplant unit on order was 225 megawatts, while today units ranging up to 1,000 to 1,100 megawatts are being manufactured. In the same period we have moved from pioneering at the 345-kilovolt level of transmission to the 500-kilovolt level, which represents more than a doubling in line capacity. The new developments in power generation, particularly in the construction of large units with their vastly improved economy in the use of fuel, labor, and capital, combined with the great improvements which are taking place in the transmission field, have changed the basis for evaluation of generating plant location. In some parts of the Nation these technological advances have substantially altered the balance of advantage away from sites close to load and in favor of sites which are located close to fuel sources and to the networks of neighboring utilities with which the new plants can be integrated for power pooling purposes. Inevitably these advances in the technology of the industry will lead to much more important movements of power in interstate commerce under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. It follows that the wise and effective exercise of the Commission's authority is a matter of growing importance to the industry and its customers.

The major utilities of New England have operated for a long time on an interstate basis, and were among the first in this country to recognize the advantages of interconnections among individual companies. Some of your outstanding members have been working closely with the Commission in recent months in our efforts to bring a national perspective to the industry's interconnection and coordination plans through the Commission's Coordinated National Power Survey. The Commission is indebted in particular to William Webster and Bob Brandt of the New England Electric System, Howard Cadwell of Western Massachusetts Electric Co., Thomas J. Galligan of Boston Edison, E. C. Brown of the Hartford Electric Light Co., not to mention Eugene S. Loughlin, that outstanding member of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission and leader in the field of utility regulation. Their assistance in the National Power Survey has been indispensable.

The New England region has always provided leadership in science and technology. Its magnificent schools and laboratories are among the best in the world. In this region there is a scientific ferment and excitement so sharp as to be almost palpable. Here there is taking place much of the pioneering in the newest frontiers of knowledge, including electronics and space. From this area, too, come some of the most advanced equipment used in the power industry.

There is evidence of great activity in New England to improve the efficiency and economy of the area's power systems and to restore New England to its former place as a leader in the electric power field. For example, the Yankee Atomic Power Plant built here in Massachusetts by a group of New England companies is probably the nation's closest approach to conventional thermal plants in terms of cost and dependability. Indeed, its success has stimulated plans for a larger sister plant at Haddam Neck, Conn. It may well be that we are witnessing here one of the great economic breakthroughs in the nuclear reactor program.

In the transmission field 230-kilovolt lines are now bringing lower cost hydro power into New England from the Niagara and St. Lawrence projects and are strengthening the interties among many of the New England utilities. Plans have been announced for a 345-kilovolt line which will tie New England with New York City.

In recent years, some relatively large generating units have been installed in New England. A unit of 340 megawatt capacity is on order for the L Street station of the Boston Edison Co. Two units of 250 megawatts each are scheduled for the new Brayton Point powerplant of the New England Power Co. and a 235-megawatt unit is being planned for the Middletown plant of the Hartford Electric Light Co.

There are steps in the right direction and I have no doubt that in normal course units of 500-megawatts and higher will be in use in the next decade. On the utilization side there are some New England companies which are leaders in promoting electric space heating and I know of one company in this region which is setting an enviable pace in load promotion by capturing one-third of the new homes in its service area for electric space heating—a record not matched by many companies operating under climatic conditions much more favorable to the promotion of electric house heating.

These are all important achievements and I do not mean to minimize them in pointing out that New England still has far to go in taking advantage of its opportunities to reduce the cost of producing and selling electric power. From the point of view of use, New England is still an underdeveloped power market, even giving consideration to the fact that the housing pattern in New England is not as favorable to load growth as in some other areas. The average annual residential use has of course steadily increased from year to year in New England as in the rest of the country, but the pace of growth in this region has not matched the national average despite the fact that per capita income in New England is 11 percent above the national average. In 1961, the annual use of the average residential customer in New England had grown to 3,113 kilowatt-hours but this was 23 percent below the national average of 4,019 kilowatt-hours. These figures raise sharply the question whether consumers in New England are achieving the full benefits of electrical living.

Of course there are many reasons why per capita electric consumption in New England is below the national average and many of these reasons are beyond the control of the management of the New England electric companies. However, I should like to dwell for a moment on some factors that are within your control.

The low level of use in New England is accompanied by a relatively high level of rates. The average charge for 3,000 kilowatt-hours, which is close to the average annual use in New England in 1961 is 3.47 cents per kilowatt-hour, which is more than 15 percent above the national average. New England industry similarly paid approximately the same percentage over the national average for its power supply. True, the national average includes areas of low-cost fuel and of Federal power operations, but even if these are excluded, the retail rates in New England are still well above average. In fact, in 1961 the highest charges in the continental United States for residential use at prevailing levels were found in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maine, and Rhode Island, in that order.

As you all know, the electric power industry is a conspicuous example of an industry in which greater utilization of plant investment results in lower unit costs and in which low rates encourage greater utilization. Conversely, high rates discourage broader utilization which in turn leads to higher costs. The low level of use in New England therefore not only reflects the existing higher costs, but helps to keep the unit costs at a high level.

I realize that New England operates under handicaps in its efforts to reduce power costs. Fuel costs are higher in New England than in most of the rest of the country, and in all fairness this factor must be given full weight in comparisons among regions. The average fuel costs of New England steamplants in 1961 was 36.9 cents per million B.t.u.'s as compared to a national average of 26.7 cents. However, fuel accounted for only 15 percent of each dollar of revenue for the New England utilities in 1961 and if the fuel prices had been brought down to the national average and the whole benefit passed on to consumers, the bills to the ultimate consumer would have been reduced by less than 5 percent, leaving New England rates still well above the national average.

No one can blame the New England power systems because their area does not have large deposits of low-cost fuel, but with fuel costs high, it would be natural to expect the New England utilities to concentrate their efforts on the development and installation of highly efficient generating units which would make the best possible use of the expensive fuel supply. The more costly the fuel the greater should be the incentive toward efficiency in its use. Progress is now being made in New England toward installing larger and more efficient units, but there is still a long way to go to rectify past failure

to keep New England's power systems abreast of the industry technology in efficient use of fuel.

Not since 1953 has a generating unit installed in New England been included among the first 20 in the country in efficiency in the use of fuel as measured by the so-called heat rate. In 1953, New England attained an average heat rate of 13,317 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour, an average which had been reached in the United States a year earlier. In 1961, however, New England was 4 years behind. Its average heat rate in 1961 of 11,331 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour was reached in the United States as a whole by 1957, and is 7 percent higher than the national average today of 10,552 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour. I want to give full credit for the large progress which the New England companies have made in recent years in improving their average heat rate, but if New England had merely kept up with the national average in the efficiency with which it uses the fuel it imports, it could have reduced its fuel bill by more than $7.5 million a year on the average in each of the last 5 years.

One of the basic reasons for New England's relatively less efficient use of fuel becomes apparent from an examination of the generating stations which make up the bulk of the power supply sources of New England. In brief, New England in the past has built and still relies on too many small and inefficient generating units and on too few of the large, low-cost units.

As of January 1, 1962, the total investor-owned steam-electric generating capacity in New England, that is to say in FPC power supply areas 1 and 2, was about 6,400 megawatts. Of this total, 88 units with an aggregate capacity of over 350 megawatts were of a size of 10 megawatts or smaller. Thirty-eight of these units were more than 40 years old, well past the age of honorable retirement by any standard. Equally surprising, five of these expensive small units have been added since World War II.

More significant than the figures on these small units, which account for only a small proportion of total capacity, are the figures with respect to units below 50 megawatts in size. Here we are talking not only of peaking units but of base load units as well. These small units total almost 3,500 megawatts or 53 percent of installed capacity in New England at the beginning of 1962. By modern standards, a 50-megawatt unit is not an efficient unit and an area which relies on units of this size for base load is not getting the benefit of modern power technology. Power from a 50-megawatt unit costs 30 percent more than from a 500-megawatt unit, some of which are in operation in the United States and others of which are on order. As a matter of fact, the calculations of our engineers show that power from such large units could be produced in New England, at existing higher fuel charges, at less cost than from 50-megawatt units at points where fuel could be bought at the national average price. Here, indeed, by realization of the benefits of present-day technology, is the path for New England to offset its fuel disadvantage.

Let me say a word about the small old units of which New England has so many. It is not uncommon to hear utility operators justify their continued existence on the ground that their cost has been written off and that they are adequate for reserve. However, many of them still have high taxes and other fixed charges and extremely high operating costs which penalize average costs. Their continued operation is justified only if they are held for emergencies of a high order of improbability of occurrence. If they are used to any substantial degree their operating costs become prohibitive. New England utilities should look and work toward the day when their reserves for load growth will be in units with operating costs low enough to encourage load building.

The evidence suggests that New England's electrical progress is restrained by the chain of high costs, which in turn leads to high rates, which delays growth of energy use and thus tends to keep costs high. The challenge to New England power leadership is to break away from this chain to what I might call the wheel of progress—low costs which make possible low rates and high use and thus contribute to further cost reductions.

There is no sovereign road for achieving this transition. I cannot suggest to you any one step you could take which would transform the New England power economy because if there were an easy solution I am sure you would long ago have put it into effect. However, I am sure the transition can be made by pursuing progress along many paths. In not too many years, if the men in this room determine that New England shall again assert its leadership in the electric power field, it can make an increased contribution to New England's and the Nation's economy.

Specifically, I suggest to you the following paths of progress:

First, greater integration of facilities and operations. The modern concept of an intercompany power pool originated in New England and large advances have been made in the direction of interconnected system operations. However the New England companies have not taken full advantage as yet of the benefits of coordinated planning, construction and operation of the overall power supply system required to serve most economically and reliably the growing loads of this region. The direction of the future is toward a pooling of the programs of all the systems in the area, both publicly and privately owned, in the interest of the greatest possible economy. A look beyond the area itself is also required, in order to appraise the possible benefits of coordinated planning for adding capacity in joint ventures with neighboring systems. Distance is no longer as important a factor as it once was. Extra-high-voltage transmission will make the pool which New England could tap an ever growing one with rich potential rewards in savings from lower fuel costs, lower costs per kilowatt of installed capacity and reduced requirements for reserves.

Second, power pooling for the region as a whole and in cooperation with neighboring regions will also justify a review of the economic feasibility of many of the area's undeveloped hydropower sources for additional blocks of capacity. These hydro sources hold promise of greater rewards to the utilities of New England when explored and developed by an integrated regional and interregional power pool, than when considered only as a part of a single company system.

Third, I have already referred at length to the special need in New England to accelerate the movement from small to large generating units, and to make the most efficient possible use of the fuel which New England must import at high cost.

Fourth, greater use of power. The electric power industry in New England must plan on a greater utilization of its plants by building up average use at least to the national level. Since the rest of the country will not stand still during the next 10 years, the industry in New England is aiming at a moving target. Rate reductions should not be delayed until new plants are completed. On the contrary, every stimulus should be given to load development now by all known promotional means. For example, it costs very little to offer substantial rate inducements for usages which are still largely nonexistent. Any increment above out-of-pocket costs for these new loads will make some contribution to net income, and as more efficient capacity is added to the system, these loads will become increasingly profitable.

In the residential field, in particular, there is strong evidence of great elasticity of demand, of many unsatisfied wants for electrical equipment in the home which would be satisfied if rates were lower. When you know that new and cheaper generating capacity and low cost power imports are coming in, you should anticipate the savings and insure heavy and economical loading of your own equipment by load-building rate reductions.

The difference involved in attaining in New England a level of use equal to the national average would give a tremendous impetus to the whole economy of New England. Hundreds of millions of dollars of new investment would be required not only in generating and transmission facilities but also in the strengthening and improving of distribution networks, the rewiring and modernization of homes and places of business, and the sale and installation of hundreds of thousands of electric appliances.

My study of industry statistics suggested no way of reconciling the differences in rates of growth among various companies except in terms of people. Some companies do a much better job of selling electricity than other companies. This simple fact suggests a great opportunity for New England. It is evident from comparing the records of the various companies in New England that if all could increase their sales to the level of the best, the electric power industry in New England as a whole would show great progress and achieve approximately the level of the national average.

In urging upon you this aggressive program for building loads, I know that I shall not add to the tranquility of my job as chairman of an agency which regulates not only the interstate transactions of power companies, but of natural gas companies as well. Perhaps I should say that I regard it a part of my job to give them comparable advice. When both the natural gas companies and the electric power companies exert their greatest efforts to make low-cost energy available to the American consumer, both industries as well as their customers and the Nation will receive maximum benefits.

Coming back to the subject of system integration, I should like to say another word about the Commisison's national power survey. Its purpose is to explore the full benefit potential to the country of integrating the planning and operation of the Nation's power systems. The survey assumes no changes in ownership or in utility responsibilities, but only carrying through in much greater degree and with greater completeness the strong trend which already exists toward system interconnection and integration. The results of the survey should be useful to the New England systems in planning their future. However, the emphasis will be on the requirements of the 1970's. We hope that the studies which are now being carried on throughout the industry as part of the survey will lead the industry to accelerate their own interconnection and integration programs, hopefully in ways which will lend themselves to future strengthening of interties and integrated operation to reflect long-term power survey recommendations.

From the long-term point of view, the future for New England power systems is bright. The technological progress in recent years in conventional equipment is constantly minimizing the importance of New England's distance from cheap fuel sources. Of course a continuation of the progress in the atomic reactor program should further narrow the gap in energy costs. The existing power sources in New England in the course of little more than a decade will be but half of the electric plant then in service,

and the opportunity for the addition and replacement of facilities offers enormous opportunities for improvement in average unit costs by supplanting equipment of low efficiency with the best units that the manufacturers can make available. I am confident that in the next decade the enterprise of the electric power industry in New England will find a way to bring power to New England consumers in amounts which are greater and at rates which are lower than those in the rest of the country. The Commission for its part will do everything it can to facilitate your efforts to meet this goal, which has great importance to the future growth of New England and to the Nation as well.

Postmaster General Farley Comments on Closing of Starkey (N.Y.) Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, early this month the post office at Starkey, N.Y., in my congressional district, was closed down after a continued existence of 143 years. I am sorry that this center of Government service on the banks of Seneca Lake has ceased to function.

As a boy, on a canoe trip from the Rochester Boy Scout camp on Seneca Lake, I can still remember the long, hot climb up the road from the lake to the small community of Starkey and its post office.

To commemorate the passing of this historic landmark the other day former Postmaster General Farley, a man who has always had the "human touch" in abundance took the time out of his busy schedule to pen a note to the retiring postmaster at Starkey, Raymond Brewer, Jr., which I read with profound interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a story from the Geneva Times of January 25, which quotes the letter of that great American, Jim Farley.

The article follows:

IN LETTER TO STARKEY POSTMASTER—FARLEY RECALLS CLOSING HOMETOWN POST OFFICE

STARKEY.—Raymond Brewer, Jr., who was postmaster of the Starkey post office which closed January 4, has received the following letter from James A. Farley, a former Postmaster General.

DEAR POSTMASTER BREWER: When reading the National Observer several days ago I noted with interest the story about the closing of the post office there after 143 years of existence and that your grandfather also served as postmaster during that period.

I understand full well how you feel about the office being closed as I had a similar experience when I was Postmaster General. It was necessary for me to close the office at Grassy Point, N.Y., where I was born and raised, and placed it on a rural route about a mile and a half from the Grassy Point site. I received the last letter canceled and I sent it with my stamp collection and other material to the Smithsonian Institute in Washington.

The post office was as old as could remember and was run by the Ossman family in their general store. I used to go down there every afternoon after the 5 o'clock train came in from New York with the mail. As a matter of fact, all the boys made that daily trip to the office.

When I became old enough to be interested in baseball I went down about a hundred yards from the post office to read the scores in the old New York Herald.

I think mine was the only instance of where a Postmaster General closed the post office in his old home town. It wasn't an easy task as there was, of course, much sentiment connected with the office. However, the rise in population and the rapid transit of the mail has caused many hundreds of small post offices to be closed since I was Postmaster General. I hope you won't misunderstand my writing you at such length but the story of your office brought back memories of Grassy Point office.

I have always felt rather close to the postmasters and the postal employees because of their loyalty and assistance during my tenure as Postmaster General. Whatever success any Postmaster General achieves is due to their loyalty and efficient performance of their duties.

Inasmuch as you and your father no doubt served during my time as Postmaster General, I thought you might like to have the attached autographed photograph.

With my very kind regards and best wishes to you and yours for success, good health and happiness during the new year.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

JANUARY 16, 1963.

Declaration of American Principles by Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a "Declaration of American Principles of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks."

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DECLARATION OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES OF THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is dedicated to the welfare of the United States of America. One of our order's purposes is to quicken the spirit of American patriotism. To that end our order has striven to advance the principles that guide our Nation, and has opposed all attacks upon them from whatever quarter.

Freedom, the historic goal of mankind, is our Nation's basic principle. Freedom has been under steady attack by international communism for many years. Now, freedom and communism are engaged in a struggle for survival. This struggle is not of our choosing but has been forced upon us. Freemen have no choice but to accept the challenge.

The Americanism Committee of the Grand Lodge of Elks believes that freedom too long has stood on the defensive. The time has come for us who believe in freedom to take the initiative; fight for what we believe in and stand against those who are against us until freedom has defeated those who would destroy it. To rely on military power alone in this ideological struggle would be illusory and fatal. Our paramount necessity is internal strength which can come only from unity of understanding and purpose and a willingness to place our Nation's safety and welfare above personal interest.

Appealing, as did our Founding Fathers, to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, we submit to our brothers this declaration of American principles on which we shall challenge the enemies of freedom, and to which we invite our fellow citizens to subscribe:

1. Moral values are the basis of our society, and the responsibility of each citizen to live by these moral values is fundamental to the welfare and progress of our society. These moral values include honesty of word, deed, and purpose; brotherly love that requires us to be fair with our fellow men and just in our relations with them; faithful performance of our labor in every honorable calling; and a recognition that each of us has the duty to contribute to the best of his ability to the advancement of the general welfare.

2. Freedom has made America. Not just political freedom, but the whole environment of freedom is responsible for the tremendous progress of our Nation since its Revolutionary birth in 1776. Freedom encourages initiative, experiment, invention, enterprise. Freedom lets citizens choose their work, encourages individuals to discover their talents, and make the most of them. In consequence we have a standard of living higher than any nation has enjoyed, a material abundance more widely shared among all our people than ever before, and a high level of intellectual and cultural attainment. Every citizen is the beneficiary of the freedom that has unleashed the abilities of the American people and provided the incentive for their maximum use.

3. Inherent in the American concept of freedom is the integrity of the individual. Individualism makes each person primarily responsible for himself, his welfare, his success or failure. Freedom lays upon each person the individual responsibility and duty of citizenship. A free society will emphasize individualism and individual responsibility as the sure way to produce democratic leadership and preserve freedom.

4. Self-government presupposes the duty of every citizen to obey the established government and to employ only those lawful methods of reason and persuasion that are open to all of us to achieve political action.

It follows that government by the majority must be reasonable in the exercise of its authority and protect the rights and interests of the minority.

5. Our ability to change our institutions and practices, through orderly process of law, to accommodate to changing needs has helped our Nation to develop, as it will in the future. All proposals for change in our institutions should be weighed carefully by all citizens to determine whether such change will reduce or add to our freedom. Our goal should be more freedom, not less. We must guard against the growth of governmental power through surrender of civil right and individual freedom for contemporary gain at the expense of future generations.

6. The tendency of groups to seek preferential treatment from government breeds rivalries dangerous to political stability, is harmful to genuine economic growth and leads to fragmentation of society rather than to unity and strength. All groups of citizens ought to measure political and economic proposals advanced in their own interest against their effect on the whole Nation.

7. We believe that the time has come when all citizens who believe in these principles

should speak up for them and set an example by applying them fully in their daily lives. We urge those in positions of leadership and influence—clergymen, educators, business executives, holders of public office, leaders of labor, intellectuals, editors, radio and television producers, motion picture producers and all others—to assume a greater responsibility for the wider understanding of these principles and their practical application in the day-to-day lives of the people.

Employment Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I attempted to point out to my colleagues some of the fallacies contained in the budget message of the President.

As time goes on I am more and more convinced that the economic gains and advantages claimed in the President's tax program sound more and more specious. I base this conclusion on the inevitable truth that under the program proposed an individual's taxes are going up as well as down.

In my humble opinion an effective tax program must contain two elements. One, we must better control and reduce expenditures and; two, we must set up a more simple tax structure.

Instead of following these simple steps toward improvement we are hastening toward larger and larger deficits, creating more tax inequities, and becoming lost in a maze of fiscal redtape. If the present trend continues our Federal deficit could well reach $50 billion by the end of the President's 4-year term of office.

Last week I also endeavored to point up the growing increase of Government employees. I believe the following excerpt from the Wall Street Journal of January 28 bears me out.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THIRTY-SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED MORE

Now that Members of Congress and interested taxpayers have had time to read the fine print in the administration's budget for fiscal 1964, it's dawned on them what the President really was saying in his budget message about management improvement and cost reduction in Government employment.

What President Kennedy said was that his budget had been prepared "with special attention to employment trends in the Federal Government." And that "requests for additional jobs have been reduced or denied wherever possible." The key phrase there is "requests * * * have been reduced." For the President certainly did not say that the number of Federal employees is going to be reduced. Or even that he proposed to hold the line on Federal jobs. That fine print discloses that the President gave "special attention to employment trends," all right. And those trends, as usual, are ever upward.

For instance, the President asked for an increase of 5,315 employees in the Agriculture Department, which would raise the total to 121,583. For the Commerce Department, where Secretary Hodges has been making such stirring pare-the-payroll talks, an increase of 3,497 is being asked.

Indeed, in only two places is a decrease in the number of employees apparent, and these two cuts total only 78.

Altogether, the President is asking Congress for almost 36,500 more Government employees. It certainly makes for an interesting approach to management improvement and cost reduction.

J.F.K.'s Vigorous Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the President disclosed his budget plans to the Congress, people have been puzzled, at first, then indignant by the obvious contradiction of principles. Only last year Mr. Kennedy "lectured" the steel industry that any inflationary act would rob widows and ruin foreign trade, undermine the struggle for human freedom, and retard the economy. Now his spenders have convinced him that inflationary action by the Government is going to be good for us. As we review the budget line by line noting how each agency has hiked its estimate and left open the door for supplemental requests, we think that another "lecture" would be most appropriate—this time to the Cabinet. I believe that the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of January 23, 1963, expresses this need most effectively:

J.F.K.'s VIGOROUS DOUBLE STANDARD

It occurs to us that President Kennedy is a very forceful speaker. You might say in the language of these days that he speaks out with great vigor.

But we can't help wishing sometimes he would use the same logic in different places.

We think it would be interesting if he had lectured the Department heads who brought in a budget that forecasts something over a $10 billion deficit, who knows how much? The last balanced budget forecast he made missed by several billions the same way he lectured the steel industry on a $6-a-ton price hike.

We wish he had told them, and the post office with its 20- to 50-percent raise in rates, and the Defense Department with its 14½-percent increase in pay for all hands what he told Roger Blough about the effects of inflation.

Didn't he then say with great indignation that any inflationary act was an act to rob widows and orphans and the elderly?

Didn't he say that any such inflationary move would be a move to ruin our foreign trade? To sabotage our country in the great struggle for human freedom, the cold war, that is, to hold back our economy?

Ah, yes. We wish he had played that speech back to his henchmen grabbing with both hands at the Treasury moneys these days. But the tune has changed. Inflationary action by the Government is going to be good for us, now.

We wish he might have said, also to the State Department's million-dollar booze budget, and all like budgets for the Government's entertainment activities, the same rules apply to spending this as we have now applied under the income tax laws to entertainment expense of private business.

And there must be a thousand places in this budget where he could usefully offer that good, old line from the inauguration: "Ask not what your country can do for you."

No such luck. The New Frontier is progressive. They only look ahead. They never look back, not even to yesterday's speeches, and certainly not to yesterday's promises.

"Don't look back." That's the progressive watchword.

Of course. They are scared to death to look back: Especially at their record.

John Y. Yoshino Honored as Roosevelt University's Alumnus of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last October 27, Mr. John Y. Yoshino was honored by his alma mater, Chicago's Roosevelt University, as its alumnus of the year and received the Eleanor Roosevelt Key.

Mr. Yoshino is the Deputy Director of Field Services for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and has a fine record of leadership in the overcoming of racial discrimination.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement in connection with the honor bestowed on Mr. Yoshino be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN Y. YOSHINO HONORED AS ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY'S ALUMNUS OF THE YEAR

A White House aid and Roosevelt University graduate, Mr. John Y. Yoshino, was honored as Roosevelt University's 1962 Alumnus of the Year at the university's 7th annual homecoming banquet, Saturday, October 27, in the Knickerbocker Hotel here in Chicago.

Deputy Director of Field Services for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, this Japanese-American, a 1948 graduate of Roosevelt University, was presented with the Eleanor Roosevelt key, the highest honor this university can bestow on an alumnus, by the university's president, Dr. Edward J. Sparling, acting on behalf of the alumni association.

Working with the U.S. State Department and the Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems, Mr. Yoshino in 1961 helped to end the discrimination against Afro-Asian diplomats in public eating places along the stretch of U.S. 40 that leads from Washington to New York.

Prior to his government service, Mr. Yoshino was Chicago director of the job opportunities program of the American Friends Service Committee, a Quaker organization with the purpose of ending discrimination in employment.

Presented annually to a distinguished Roosevelt alumnus, the Eleanor Roosevelt key was presented to Mr. Yoshino for his "courageous efforts to end segregation" and for his "long, noble, and patient struggle for equal employment opportunities." The citation reads as follows:

"To you, John Y. Yoshino, alumni honoree, faithful public servant, for your long, noble, and patient struggle for equal employment opportunities for all Americans—a struggle which began in our very city and which has led you to the White House itself; for your especially courageous efforts to end segregation in public eating places along U.S. Route 40, a route which so many diplomats travel on their way from New York to Washington; for your constant and never swerving devotion to the promotion of sound inter-group relations through equal opportunity and through the recognition of the good deeds of all men; and for the singularly dignified, humble, yet truly courageous way in which you bore the burdens of all Japanese-Americans after Pearl Harbor and yet served your government and its cause with honor and with all your heart; for such meritorious achievement and for the high standard of moral courage you have shown, the Roosevelt University Alumni Assocation is proud to present you with its 1962 Eleanor Roosevelt Key Award."

A native of Alameda, Calif., Roosevelt's alumnus of the year was evacuated to a relocation camp in Utah following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Shortly thereafter, he joined the U.S. Army and served with a military intelligence unit in the South Pacific.

Coming to Chicago at the war's end, Mr. Yoshino obtained a bachelor of arts degree in labor relations from Roosevelt. In 1953 he received a master's degree in social and industrial relations from Loyola University (Chicago).

From 1956 to 1961, he was contract compliance adviser for the President's Committee on Government Contracts.

Mr. Yoshino has served two terms as President of the Capital's chapter of the Japanese-American Citizens' League. He is currently chairman of the league's eastern district council.

The award winner was a delegate to the recent White House conferences on youth and the problems of aging.

Accompanied to Chicago by Mrs. Yoshino, the homecoming guest of honor lives with his wife and son in Silver Spring, Md.

Roosevelt University was founded in 1945 to provide opportunity for learning and teaching in conditions of freedom and equality. The university's educational purpose is to produce well-informed, thoughtful individuals capable not only of adapting themselves to the world as they find it, but also of thinking critically and constructively about that world, so that they may act effectively for the betterment of human institutions. The University seeks to provide this opportunity and achieve its purpose by:

Admitting to its membership both teachers and students on the basis of individual merit and without regard to race, color, or creed;

Maintaining full freedom of inquiry, teaching, and expressions of opinion in the spirit of the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of Illinois;

Providing to an unprecedented degree for participation by teachers and students in the government of the university, under conditions which ensure that those who have rights also share responsibilities;

Setting a goal of excellence in its teaching and research programs in the liberal arts, the sciences, and the professions, and expecting that teachers and students alike will strive toward this goal to the maximum of their powers;

Insuring that, from the standpoint of location, time, and cost, its educational facilities are made as accessible as possible to all qualified students.

Reduced Rates on Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and controversial cases to come before the Interstate Commerce Commission in recent years involves the reduced rates on grain transported in the Southern Railway System's "Big John" hopper cars.

This case, and its ultimate resolution by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts, may have a considerable influence, not just on the transportation practices of the Nation, but also on the various legislative proposals dealing with the regulation of freight rates.

A three-member panel of the ICC, consisting of Commissioners Howard G. Freas, Abe McGregor Goff, and John W. Bush, recently unanimously approved the reduced rates sought by the Southern Railway System in this case. The 81-page decision of Division 2 of the ICC is too lengthy for insertion in the RECORD, but because of its importance and interest, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a press release from the ICC announcing the decision, together with an article about it by John P. MacKenzie published in the Washington Post of January 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the press release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVISION 2 APPROVES SOUTHERN'S MULTIPLE-CAR GRAIN RATES

Division 2 of the Interstate Commerce Commission today unanimously approved Southern Railway system multiple-car rates (except for a minor tariff provision concerning substitution of cars), minimum 450 tons in 5 jumbo cars, on grain from Mississippi and Ohio River crossings to destinations in the South and Southeast.

The proceeding in Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 7656, "Grain in Multiple-Car Shipments—River Crossings to the South," involved reduced rates on grain transported in Southern's "Big John" aluminum covered hopper cars of large loading capacity.

In a report by Commissioner Howard Freas, the division stated that "progress is achieved not by condemnation of innovation but by its encouragement" and noted that "technological efficiencies and managerial initiative constitute elements to be promoted under the national transportation policy rather than to be stultified." The division found the proposal to be "an effort by the Southern to obtain revenue, which has bypassed it over the years, to enable it, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide railway service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service."

The rates were filed to become effective August 10, 1961. Upon protest of numerous interests the Commission, in accordance with provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, suspended the operation of the rates for a 7-month period ending March 9, 1962, and their effective date was voluntarily further postponed through August 7, 1962. The Supreme Court, however, extended lower Federal court orders preventing the rates from becoming effecive pending its determination as to whether Federal courts have jurisdiction to enjoin or suspend rates published by common carriers before entry of a final order of the Commission.

The proceeding was one of the most sharply fought cases in the Commission's history. Some 140 days of public hearings concluded August 29, 1962. The voluminous record which was compiled included 15,815 pages and 766 exhibits. Briefs were filed by the parties on November 5, 1962.

The division noted that the proposal was designed to meet unregulated truck competition which has already upset the railroad grain rate structure and distorted relationships among markets, commodities, and shippers.

In dealing with numerous Interstate Commerce Act violations alleged by many protesting parties, the division declared that the Southern made a prima facie case of lawfulness, and that protestants failed to overcome it.

The proceeding marked the first instance wherein a formnal determination was made as to "public costs" of barge transportation, i.e., what, if any, portion of public investment and maintenance costs must properly be assignable to barge transportation on the various rivers. The division indicated that "it is manifest that in competitive ratemaking where one mode does assert the inherent advantage of low cost in performing a service, sound economics plainly require that all costs, including 'public costs,' which go to make up the asserted inherent advantage must, in all justice, be considered."

Other rates of the Southern subject to minima of 900 tons in 10 cars and 1,800 tons in 20 cars were found not justified as were the proposed rates of other railroad respondents not utilizing jumbo-car equipment.

The Interstate Commerce Commission determined that the proceeding involves an issue of general transportation importance.

ICC STUDY HAILS RAIL EFFICIENCY

(By John P. MacKenzie)

If the ratemaking division of the Interstate Commerce Commission has its way, rewards in transportation will go to the resourceful, aggressive innovators in a rough-and-tumble competitive world.

The Commissioners' 81-page decision approving the Southern Railway system's proposal for drastic reductions in grain-hauling rates is full of language praising the virtues of rugged competition.

"Progress," the Commissioners declared, "is achieved not by condemnation of innovation but by its encouragement."

Southern's solution to growing truck competition, a solution which involved millions of dollars invested in new ways to haul grain, displayed "technological efficiencies and managerial initiative," they added, "elements to be promoted under the national transportation policy rather than to be stultified."

While striking a blow for rugged individualism, however, the Commissioners also took some of the steam out of the drive by the railroads to repeal the ICC's powers to set minimum rates. If upheld by the full 11-member ICC, the ratemaking Commissioners' ruling will be a strong counterpunch for regulation.

Railroads complain, and President Kennedy has backed them up, that they should

be placed on a more equal footing with the unregulated barges and trucks which are taking away much of their business.

In his transportation message last year, the President proposed an end to the ICC's power to suspend and outlaw minimum freight rates found to be too low to bring a profit and destructive of other modes of transportation. As an alternative, the President said Congress might decide to extend regulation to barges and trucks.

Either way, Mr. Kennedy said, the different forms of transportation should be treated alike. He made clear that he preferred his main proposal. The ICC, however, backed the alternative.

Among the chief spokesmen for "the dead hand of Government regulation" line of criticism has been D. W. Brosnan, president of Southern and beneficiary of Thursday's decision. What Brosnan did not say in his statement hailing the decision was that the ICC has demonstrated that it can use its regulatory powers to offer incentives to railroads.

Brosnan did say he was "gratified" by the ICC action. But he added he would be still more gratified if the ICC granted more of what he asked for.

The Commissioners approved Southern's bid to lower rates an average of 62 percent on grain shipments of 450-ton minimum as long as the shipments are in radically new "Big John" aluminum-covered cars specially designed to regain grain traffic. The Commissioners rejected lower rates for still larger volume shipments, and Brosnan said he would press for those rates also.

Barge lines, which haul grain and charge rates not subject to ICC jurisdiction, contested the Southern proposals bitterly in yearlong hearings. They said Southern was determined to drive the barges out of business.

The bargemen contended that Southern's rates actually were below cost. They claimed an inherent advantage over trains in their cheap operation and pointed to the Interstate Commerce Act's admonition to foster those inherent advantages.

But the Commissioners replied that, in weighing natural advantages, the barges could not utilize the "public costs" of Government expenditures to improve the waterways. These expenses, the Commissioners declared in a precedent-setting ruling, must be added to the cost of barge transportation.

Turning to the motor carriers, the Commissioners declared that unregulated trucking "has already upset the rail grain structure and distorted relationships among markets, commodities, and shippers.

"While Congress has exempted such carriers from the licensing and rate regulation," the Commissioners added, "we do not view such action as indicating any intent to isolate them from competition."

And competition is just what the Commissioners have ordered.

The Late John J. Bell

SPEECH

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Texas in paying tribute to the late Honorable John J. Bell, a man who served his State and his Nation ably and well.

I knew John Bell when he served in the Texas Legislature, where I had the privilege to serve. I knew him personally and by the distinguished reputation he left as a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the Texas Senate, prior to his service in this body.

John Bell's untimely death saddens me, as I know it does all his friends. At a time like this, words are of little consolation to the family of such a great man. But the thought that we share this deep loss with them, may perhaps help ease the burden of sorrow they carry.

My deepest sympathy goes to this great American's devoted wife, and to the people of Texas, who lost a valued and proven public servant.

Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Baltimore was one of the many cities in which memorial services were held for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The service was held on December 9 with prominent Baltimoreans participating. Among them were the Reverend Robert T. Newbold, Jr., the Reverend Don Frank Fenn, Rabbi Morris Lieberman, Father James B. O'Hara, and the Edmondson High School choir under the direction of Mrs. Georgeanna Chester, accompanied by Mr. Edward Roberts. Music was furnished by the Winterbourne Quartet.

I believe that the type of organizations sponsoring the memorial is a tribute to the high regard and esteem in which Mrs. Roosevelt was held by all of our citizens. They were the American Civil Liberties Union, Maryland branch; American Jewish Congress, Maryland chapter; Baltimore Council, AFL–CIO; B'nai B'rith; Baltimore Teachers Union; Baltimore Urban League; Congress on Racial Equality; International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; Maryland Council of Churches; Maryland League of Women's Clubs; National Association for Advancement of Colored People; National Council of Jewish Women, Baltimore section; National Council of Negro Women; United Nations Association of Maryland; United World Federalists; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The assembly was fortunate in having as its speaker the former mayor of Baltimore and Governor of Maryland, Theodore R. McKeldin. In the belief that this tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt will be of interest to all Members, I am inserting his remarks in the RECORD:

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, MERGENTHALER HIGH SCHOOL, SUNDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1962

Nearly 25 centuries have passed since Pericles, the Athenian, noted that in his day it was already a time-honored custom of civilized men to gather at an appointed time to pay formal tribute to the dead who were held in honor by the survivors. It is for that purpose we are gathered here today. A memorial service is a response to a human impulse as old as history; and nothing lasts so long unless it meets a deep-felt human need.

Perhaps in the dim, distant past men may have cherished the superstitution that by word or act they could add somewhat to the honor of the dead, but we have long outgrown that delusion. Our need is not to contribute anything to the past, but to clear ourselves for the future of any suspicion that we were too blind, too dull of soul to recognize and respond to greatness in our own time.

Nothing said or done in this place at this time can add in the slightest degree luster to the name of Eleanor Roosevelt; but the fact of our presence here does acquit us of suspicion, in time to come, that we were too stolid, too lumpish to feel a lift of the spirit when we are touched by the splendor that radiates from a great heart and a noble mind.

It will be years, it may be a generation before history will be able to set in true perspective the contribution that this woman made to the advancement of American civilization. It is not my purpose or my desire to attempt that task. This is not the occasion for laborious documentation and careful analysis, even if it were practical. I take, instead, the Psalmist's view that, "We spend our years as a tale that is told," and from that point of view I tell you a tale of one woman's life, not for its historical significance, which is still to be assessed, but for its sheer beauty, which is before our eyes.

Every reader of Eleanor Roosevelt's autobiography has noted the persistence with which she insists upon her own insignificance in her early years. Most of us, I think, refuse to take that at face value, believing that she was overmodest, but she does convince us that she honestly regarded herself as lacking any of the qualities that the world most values in a woman—beauty, grace, sparkle, the power of fascination, all that goes to make up what in an earlier day was called a heartbreaker. Her own half-joking, half-rueful description of herself was "an ugly duckling."

At first, we may reject that as shocking, but if we stop to think it over perhaps we may change our minds. The "Ugly Duckling" in Hans Christian Andersen's story, you remember, was not a duckling at all, but a cygnet, a newly hatched swan; and in the course of time the cygnet developed the beauty and the grace of the swan, that put all the other birds to shame.

We usually classify the tale as a fairy story for children, but it is not, properly speaking, a fairy story; it is an allegory, a fictional presentation of a great literary artist's view of one aspect of human life. So understood, it is one of the most charming tales in literature, fascinating to children, but a help and comfort to many a grown man and woman.

For the cygnet, you remember, was not transformed into a swan by the touch of a fairy godmother's magic wand. It was the slow emergence of an inner grace, an inner beauty that had always been there. Time, the enemy of most of us, was a friend of the ugly duckling, for the swan, according to the old tradition, increases in beauty with the passage of time, and with the swansong, ends in music.

With this in mind, I am quite willing to accept Eleanor Roosevelt's description of herself, for while Anderson wrote, she lived the story of the "Ugly Duckling." The creation of art she brought into everyday life, high fantasy she transformed into plain fact. Any man or woman who can convert human life into art, who can make real what to the storyteller was only a lovely dream, has achieved a wonder; and this woman did it.

To say that she was well born is true, but she was not born to great wealth or to great happiness. Her childhood, indeed, was bleak to an extent unknown to many poorer children in obscure families, and her young womanhood was touched by tragedy more than once. She was early acquainted with grief and sorrow was more familiar to her than pleasure. She did achieve the happiness of marriage to a man she sincerely loved, but even that did not last long, because her husband while still a young man, was stricken by a crippling malady, which gave her, first, weeks of mortal terror and then years of incessant care. But the more crushing her burdens became, the more she developed that inner strength, that spiritual power that alone can endow mortal beings with beauty and grace that last throughout their lives. Her husband rose to fame and more than imperial power, but at the very moment when he seemed in the way of achieving his greatest work, the hand of death intervened, and the woman who had richly earned the right to wear the purple had instead to put on widow's weeds.

It is hard to think of a more bitter demonstration of the irony of history, but if the bitterness entered the heart of this woman no word of it escaped her lips. Her response to the crushing burden that fate had laid upon her was to take on new burdens. Instead of being engrossed in her own sorrows she became more attentive than ever to the sorrows of others. Instead of wailing over her losses she heard ever more clearly the cry of the oppressed.

Even if time permitted it would be useless for me to try to catalog her achievements, and I doubt that any human being knows them all, for much of her noblest work was done secretly. But we are all aware that Eleanor Roosevelt was known to the poor and distressed in New York City long before she was known to the Nation. In schools, and studios, and workshops, she brought sympathetic understanding to the problems of young people before she brought them to the problems of statesmen. Prisoners and outcasts knew her before she had entered any royal palace. She disdained the boundaries of race and creed; her hatred of injustice inflicted upon the children of Israel, or the children of Africa was as strong and relentless as her hatred of injustice inflicted upon her own household.

To the self-centered this was folly for which they upbraided her. But out of this seemingly folly she distilled, as the years passed, such wisdom that many of the wisest statesmen of her time sought her counsel on problems that baffled them. I do not believe that any other woman in American history was listened to respectfully by so many of earth's greatest and most powerful; and few, if any, have been so beloved by the poor and weak.

Well, the tale is finished. The story that Andersen wrote has been lived before our eyes. It has gone through all its phases, through grace to beauty, through beauty to splendor, through splendor to music, for it can be said of her as confidently as it was said of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth that "all the trumpets sounded for her on the other side."

Eleanor Roosevelt is done with us, but are we done with her? If we must answer, yes, then this is a vain assembly without purpose or effect. But we cannot answer yes, for the influence on humanity of a great life is never ended by the death of the great man or woman. Frequently it is at the moment of death that its most powerful influence begins; for once the great person is removed, envy, detraction and prejudice cease to obscure the splendor of fine deeds.

This life is certain to be remembered long because of its extraordinary effectiveness in offering strength and encouragement to others. For it is not a story of Fortune's darling, who achieved without effort and conquered without pain; but a story of one who, like the rest of us, knew labor and sorrow, but who was not crushed by burdens nor dismayed by grief. It is a story reminding us that while not all of us can achieve greatness, the least of us can achieve growth; and that the grace and beauty that are everlasting are not those that are given by capricious Fortune, but those that are developed from within. Thinking on these things, who does not take heart of hope? Who is not encouraged by hearing such a story, who is not spurred to higher achievement by it?

This is the legacy that Eleanor Roosevelt has left the world. Destiny called her to high places, where she walked among princes and potentates, but all men know that it was not her great position, but her great heart that made her memorable. Because that memory remains with us, to cheer and inspire as long as human hearts respond to greatness, her death is no more than a punctuation mark, the period set at the end of a golden story. Death's stroke served only to give her a place among the honored dead of whom it is written—

Men from tears refrain,
Honor, and praise, but mourn them not.

A distinguished American, a great statesman and an ambassador of genuine ability and integrity by the name of Adlai Stevenson spoke for us all when he said:

"She lit candles instead of cursing the darkness, and their glow has warmed the world."

May God make us worthy of her memory.

Israel: A Real Friend of America and the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I know we have all watched with pride and pleasure as the State of Israel has grown in strength over the years, and has extended its influence in the troubled Middle East as a genuine friend of the United States and of the same principles of freedom on which our own country was built.

I hope our foreign policy will always recognize this close tie which binds us with Israel and that we never let ourselves be diverted for transient objectives to any course that might even indirectly provide aid or comfort to those who are committed to the destruction of Israel and all she stands for.

One of Israel's latest achievements was recently paid tribute to in the pages of the Washington Post. Under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Post's issue of January 28:

The editorial follows:

ASSIST FROM ISRAEL

Israel is increasingly playing a unique role as a workshop for developing countries. Although pressed for funds for its own development, Israel has nevertheless undertaken technical assistance programs in a host of Afro-Asian countries. Doubtless there is a political incentive, but Israel's way of extending here influence is commendable, successful and popular. It is welcome news that Israel is now expanding its technical assistance program in this hemisphere and plans to train about 200 Latin American students in agricultural techniques.

The special value of Israel's initiative is that the country is small and its problems akin to those in developing nations. What is especially important is that few can ascribe imperialistic designs to its aid programs. An increasing exchange between Israel and Latin America can be an effective supplement to the Alliance for Progress; it is good that it has already begun.

Catholic War Veterans Honor Max Steiner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at a recent meeting in Chicago, Edward F. McElroy, national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States bestowed upon Max S. Steiner, of Chicago the Distinguished Service Medal of the Catholic War Veterans. The presentation address of Commander McElroy so clearly typifies the spirit of cooperation and togetherness which has helped to build the strength of this great Republic that I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. McElroy be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COMDR. EDWARD F. MCELROY

I stand before you as the national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America to present an award to a most charitable man and a dedicated American. I can honestly say that I am experiencing one of the greatest moments of my life in making this presentation.

The highest medal that we of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America may present is the Distinguished Service Medal. That is the award that I am about to present to Max S. Steiner, president of the Clifford Peterson Tool Co., of the great city of Chicago.

Before this highlight of the day, I would like to tell you a little about this kind, considerate, loving, charitable man.

Max Steiner is a self-made man. As a boy, he came from little. But through his own dynamic wit, personality and congenial attitude, he became a topflight salesman. Almost a quarter of a century ago he came to Peterson Tool Co., and rose to be its distinguished and loving president.

Anyone in his employ feels as though he were working for Santa Claus 365 days of the year. Max S. Steiner's many charitable deeds are not limited to just those of the Jewish faith, of which he is a member, but to all faiths and denominations. He has assisted boys in becoming rabbis and Catholic priests. He has mended marital problems and has helped the young, struggling boys and girls get married. Max S. Steiner has helped develop and make leaders of our city, county, and State government. May I proudly and humbly say he played

an important role in my successful election as the National Commander of the Catholic War Veterans of this great country of ours. My family, my good Irish, Catholic mother and yours truly are eternally grateful.

There you have just a part of the life of a dedicated American and most charitable man of all causes. Max, I know you feel thrilled about receiving our Distinguished Service Medal, but I sincerely feel that it is more of a thrill for me to be able to do something for you. God bless you and good health to you for many years to come.

Tribute to Colin F. Stam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Tax Foundation, Inc., one of the finest independent institutions for research on governmental affairs in the United States, observed its 25th anniversary at the Plaza Hotel, New York, on December 4, 1962.

On that occasion the foundation's annual award for distinguished public service was presented to Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The presentation was made by the Hon. Rosewell Magill, chairman of the foundation's board of trustees.

It was my privilege to be Chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation at that time. I wish to say that Colin Stam richly deserves recognition of his service to his country and the Congress, and such recognition by Tax Foundation is an honor indeed.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks by Chairman Magill as he presented the award to Mr. Stam.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO COLIN STAM BY ROSEWELL MAGILL, CHAIRMAN, TAX FOUNDATION, INC.

The man the Tax Foundation has chosen to honor this year with its annual Award for Distinguished Public Service has been chief of staff for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for 24 years; he has been a member of the committee staff for 35 years.

The committee for which he has worked so long and so diligently was created by statute in 1926. Its purpose is to study the operation and effects of the Federal system of internal revenue taxes and the administration of such taxes. It is composed of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Our award recipient tonight was born in Chestertown, Md., was educated at Washington College and Georgetown University. He received a law degree in 1922 and began his career as an attorney for the Bureau of Internal Revenue in that year. Four years later he was named attorney in the office of the general counsel of the Bureau. He began his work with the joint committee in 1927 when he was named assistant counsel. He served as the committee's counsel from 1929 to 1938 when he was named chief of staff.

By nature, the man we honor in this presentation is a retiring man. His eminence is based on his ability and the quality of his work. He is a dedicated public servant in the very best sense of the words.

Senator BYRD of Virginia, who has been a member of the joint committee since 1949 and has alternated as its chairman and ranking member since 1955 recently made this observation about our guest:

"I regard him as the best authority in the field of Federal tax law, in all of its aspects, in government and perhaps in the country * * * I know he has rejected positions outside of Government which would have been far more remunerative. His public service is invaluable. I know him as a man motivated by devotion to this work and his best endeavor to protect the interests of the Government with all justice to its taxpaying citizens."

The foundation is pleased and honored to give its award this year to a man who has so long and so well served the American people.

The award is represented by this silver plaque on which are inscribed the following words:

"Presented to Colin Ferguson Stam, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Taxation, Congress of the United States, for His Distinguished Service to the American People of His Outstanding Contributions to Tax Law and Administration and for His Dedication to the Highest Ideals of Public Service, by the Tax Foundation, New York, December 4, 1962."

The Agricultural Program—Address by the Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 22, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, delivered before the National Limestone Institute an excellent speech relating to certain phases of our agricultural program. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE FREEMAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, AT ITS BANQUET ON JANUARY 22, 1963

It's a great pleasure and a privilege to be here with you tonight to enjoy this very generous hospitality, and I might add, to have the opportunity to speak to so many Members of the Senate and the House so early in the session; but according to ground rules, I understand they don't have much chance to talk back. I assure you that this is a very desirable situation, particularly for a Secretary of Agriculture. This is a most impressive gathering and it provides a very real opportunity to visit with you a bit about matters of common concern that we share. In agriculture and soil improvement and in the modern roads so vital to rural America and agriculture—the farm-to-market roads—we have very real and common interests to share.

I thought I might direct my remarks this evening to some of the great changes taking place in rural America in this rapidly growing, expanding, and changing land of ours—to the broad subject in which I know we share a very real common interest—conservation. And I'd like to preface my remarks by saying at the outset that I dislike the words "soil bank," "diverted acres," "idle acres," and the whole concept of nonuse that they represent. To me these terms and the practices they describe are the direct opposite of true conservation. For true conservation in a real and meaningful sense means serving people—the use of land and water to meet human needs now and in the future. Unless we use the land and water to satisfy human needs—what purpose does it serve?

So the question is: Are we making the best and wisest use of our land and water to serve our national well-being?

I think we all would agree here this evening. The answer is "No."

But I believe we are moving in the right direction. Your organization, the National Limestone Institute, has contributed mightily to a more rapid movement toward the goal of real conservation. And I believe that in the future you will continue to play a critical role in pointing the way to proper and beneficial land use—true conservation in this great and changing land of ours.

Today and for the foreseeable future, our American family farm agriculture will be able to feed our people at home and to make available increasing amounts of food and fiber for trade and aid and economic development around the world. I make this most significant statement not as conjecture, or even as an estimate, but rather as a simple statement of fact.

From this statement of our very great potential for production flow some other very, very important facts that I think we need to keep in mind as we work together to chart the path to take maximum advantage of the changes, to apply our resources, for the betterment of the lives of our people; and, yes, for the building of a better world, for the road to a peaceful world is surely the building of a better world for people everywhere.

At home, this great miracle of abundance which we enjoy has meant great things to our people.

It has meant that the average farmworker now feeds himself and 26 others—freeing the vast majority of our people for productive work of other kinds.

Food in these United States today is the best bargain we have. A lot of people don't know that. A lot of housewives don't know that. The food budget of the average family accounts for less than 19 percent of the family's income after taxes. In 1952, Americans were spending 23 percent of their income for food—and in 1947 it was 27 percent. The people of this country are getting better food, better packaged, and more of it prepared—but at less real cost than any people, anywhere in the history of the world.

In the different countries of Western Europe—where living standards are relatively high—consumers spend anywhere from 30 to 45 percent of their after-tax incomes for food. In Russia the proportion is well over 50 percent.

Sometimes I think that the people of other countries have a finer appreciation of America's abundance than we do—because they have food problems. The hungry of the world know about American agricultural abundance because food for peace is supplementing the food resources of more than 100 countries. The Iron Curtain countries know it—and their leaders are struggling to find a formula for a similar success.

Every single country behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—and the Sugar Cane Curtain too—is having food problems.

Just 4 years ago Fidel Castro assumed power in Cuba. At that time farm production accounted for over one-third of the national income and employed about two-fifths of the labor force. Food supplies were adequate for the country's people, and farm exports brought in most of Cuba's foreign exchange earnings.

The situation today is quite different, I assure you. Cuba is in the midst of an agricultural crisis—and there is no change in sight. There simply is not enough food—and per capita consumption has dropped a fifth since 1958.

Russia is havings its food problems—a failure of communism that even Khrushchev freely admits. Production is far behind the country's goals—especially for grains, meat and dairy products. And in Red China tonight, where agriculture has broken down, millions of people go hungry. East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria—you name it—every one of the Communist countries has a serious food shortage problem.

There has been no such problem in this generation in the United States because of the productive ability of the American family farm—the most successful agrarian institution ever developed.

But this miracle of abundance of producing more and more on fewer and fewer acres has also meant sharp and very quick changes in the face of rural America. And these changes have brought with them a great deal of hardship.

Farmers and others associated with them in rural America have suffered unfairly as a product of these changes.

In most recent years, American farmers have produced 5 or 6 percent more food than we could consume or give away. And without adjustment programs, overproduction would have much more severe consequences. Individual farmers acting alone can do little to prevent overproduction.

Overproduction in a free enterprise economy means, of course, sharp downward pressure on prices. The result is the cost-price squeeze we are all so familiar with. In the decade of the 1950's, net realized farm income declined more than a tenth at a time when other incomes were rising steadily.

Many family farmers were pushed off the land. In the 5 census years between 1954 and 1959, the total number of farms declined 15 percent.

And it wasn't only farmers who suffered. I know that many of you in this room live in and serve small rural communities. Others of us have revisited the small towns we know. And we see many of these communities have fallen into the backwater of America's economic growth.

In many of them, agriculture was once—but no longer is—an economic mainstay. Many of these towns were once—but no longer are—bustling centers of opportunity in business and agriculture.

There are many ways to measure what has happened.

You can measure it in the changing character of our population. In the decade of the 1950's, our national population increased by 29 million people. Yet, population declined in most towns of fewer than 2,500, and increased only slightly in those of 2,500 to 10,000. The farm population that supports these smaller towns and cities fell off by a third.

You can measure it in the lack of adequate opportunities for education. Urban people over 25 years of age have on the average a fourth more formal schooling than do their farm counterparts.

You can measure it in the lack of job opportunities. Underemployment in rural areas is the equivalent of around 4 million entirely unemployed.

You can measure it in the unwillingness of younger people—especially the more ambitious—to remain and work in their hometowns. For many rural communities, this rapid outmigration of the young is particularly tragic. Opportunity could have been created locally as well as at a distance.

You can measure the rural problem in the incidence of actual poverty. More than half the poverty in the United States today is in rural America—a rural America which has at the same time created a worldwide success story in food production.

Yet these communities, even where economic problems are most acute, all have important resources—both natural and human resources. They deserve the best efforts we can give to their problems—through every public and private source available.

Change is inexorable. We may disagree as to whether or not a particular change is beneficial or otherwise, but we cannot disagree with the fact that change takes place. It is a law of life. Yet the threat to rural America does not lies in scientific and technical change itself. The threat lies in the failure to direct changes growing out of that progress in ways to meet the real needs and wants of all the people. Change must be shaped to work for people—not against them.

And I sincerely believe that if we are alert and willing to act, we can shape these changes so that rural America as well as urban America will prosper and benefit from the production miracle that is American agriculture.

There is no reason for income in rural America to lag—and I think we ought to be challenged as long as the income in rural America lags so significantly behind that in the urban areas. Even though we've seen in these past 2 years an increase of gross income in agricultural of over $2 billion a year, which has reflected itself in a more prosperious business community, in higher bank deposits in rural towns, in farm machinery sales, in the sale of household appliances, and many, many other things we can name. Even so, this $2 billion income increase, or $1.1 billion net increase, still leaves per capita agricultural income only about 60 percent of that in our urban areas. And until we have real parity of income, by that I mean equality of income between rural and urban America, there is work to be done—the kind of work I know this institute seeks to contribute to. It all comes down again to conservation—to proper land use in the most meaningful sense of that word.

We know that we don't need all of our land and water to produce the food and fiber we require. During the past 2 years, we have been using for crop production less than two-thirds of the land we classify as cropland. With acre yields growing more rapidly than population year by year, we know that we can produce all the food and fiber we need with much less cropland than we have available.

At the same time, we do need land and water for other things. We have growing needs for recreation, for timber, for grazing for livestock, for industry. The expanding urban character of our population indicates a growing urgency for the preservation and use of green areas around cities and towns, or simply open spaces to look at, climb on, walk through, or mediate in.

We are a people with a pioneer tradition. Open space is a part of that heritage, and it is essential that we maintain the opportunity for Americans everywhere to make use of space as one of our natural resources.

So now as true conservationists, our challenge is clear—to make the land adjustments needed, we must work not idle, use not bank, apply not divert, our great natural resources of land and water.

We must seek alternative land and water uses that will serve our people in worthwhile ways, now and in the future. This isn't an easy proposition.

It is relatively easy to generalize about, but to do it in a free economy, to do it in an economic manner, that will contribute to the economic well-being and the standard of living of the people in the city and the country alike, is something that taxes our ingenuity, and that will tax our foresight, our thinking and our cooperation. But it is something, I believe, that can be done, and I believe that progress is beginning, or at least we see the glimmerings and the beginning of things that might be.

And as a part of this, we have developed a program in the Department which we call the rural areas development program. You may see more of these words—"rural areas development," "the rural areas development program." The philosophy behind this program is the effective use and adjustment of our great natural resources. Incidentally, as many of you may know, your president, Bob Koch, is a member of the national advisory committee on rural areas development, has been most faithful and attentive, and has contributed significantly as we've attempted to think our way forward and to test and to try and to experiment in terms of trying to move in the direction of real use and meaningful adjustment.

The rural areas development program is a blending and coordination of all available resources—private and public, local, State, and National—toward the common goal of a prosperous rural America.

Let me describe a number of things we have done in the Department. One has been a departmental reorganization. With us here this evening is Assistant Secretary John Baker, the man who directs the rural areas development program. Under him are related programs that contribute to the overall rural areas development purpose, mainly the Forest Service, Farmer Cooperative Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. Playing a very vital part in all of this, too, are agencies working closely with him—particularly the Federal Extension Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Many of you know the Administrator of that program, whom you honored a year ago, Horace Godfrey and his assistant, Ed Jaenke, and their ladies who are with us here tonight. They work through Assistant Secretary John Duncan, whom many of you know. I mention this because I would like to emphasize that the rural areas development program is a top-priority effort within the Department of Agriculture, and I can assure you that it will continue to command our best energy, our know-how and all our resources.

In this description of rural areas development, I would like to pay tribute to the Members of the Congress here tonight. They have contributed vitally to what was highly significant legislation in the farm bill passed last year. You know the commodity programs—where there is always strong controversy and very heated feelings on occasion, and I am sorry to say sometimes partisanship—tend to attract the most attention. I would hazard a prediction that 10 years from now, or maybe 5, commodity programs will be long since forgotten. But the action in land and water conservation, in programs for credit, in providing cost-sharing and adjustment payments under long-term cropland conversion programs, in the authority to initiate rural renewal projects through technical assistance and loans to local public agencies will mark this act as one of the most significant in the annals of history.

Regardless of what we may do, however, and we're proud of the Department of Agriculture and the dedicated able people in it, and despite what Congress in their wisdom may do, any rural areas development program

rests on local people and local leadership. Happily we have found a great deal of enthusiasm in local communities. Today there are rural development committees in 1,800 counties—and they are preparing thousands of projects that will help create the conditions essential for economic growth.

One of the most encouraging things about the program is the growing evidence that Federal funds can be used to stimulate a many-fold investment from other sources. In other words, Government financing is playing a "seed capital" role by bringing about the investment of much larger sums by private and local sources.

For example, the Rural Electrification Administration surveyed about 400 industrial and commercial projects that REA borrowers had helped to launch. It was found that the 400 projects are being financed by more than $250 million of private capital compared with only about $15 million from Federal sources.

Incidentally, it is anticipated that those 400 projects will directly create some 30,000 new jobs—and indirectly, another 22,000.

Another, much broader survey discloses that throughout the country 133,000 jobs have been created or saved already as a result of rural areas development activity.

A key role in the rural areas development program is being carried out through cost-sharing under the agricultural conservation program. In the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, agricultural conservation program was placed on a permanent basis for the first time—which is quite a landmark for the program. In the past, agricultural conservation program has been known as a "continuing" program that had to be renewed periodically by the Congress. This will no longer be necessary.

The 1962 act also amended the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for long-term agreements under the agricultural conservation program, to help farmers change their cropping systems and land use and to develop soil, water, forest, wildlife and recreational resources. And it authorized USDA to share with local public bodies up to half the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way for small watershed projects to be dedicated to public recreation.

The Department is already developing pilot projects under this legislation—to help farmers shift unneeded cropland to other uses. Last month, we named 41 counties in 13 States for long-term test programs to shift land out of crops and tame hay. The main idea is to convert this land to grass and forest—although water storage, wildlife habitat, and recreation uses will also be encouraged. In addition, other counties throughout the Nation are eligible to participate in a pilot program to convert cropland to income-producing recreation uses.

In some States, the test program will be tied in with small watershed projects authorized under Public Law 566. Such watershed work is underway or approved in 13 of the 41 counties where conversions to grass and trees are being started.

Farmers who are interested in this cropland conversion program will be helped through adjustment payments, cost sharing on conservation practices, and technical assistance. Farmers can enter into long-range agreements to shift land under plans which they have developed in cooperation with their local soil conservation districts. In addition, farmers or groups of farmers will also be able to obtain credit to help pay their share of the cost of conversion.

As I said, this pilot program, under the leadership of our ASC committees, is limited to this year. Our intention is to expand this cropland conversion program very rapidly and widely.

So far pilot projects in cropland conversion and recreation are limited to an expenditure of $10 million. The extension of the conservation reserve authorized by Congress is for only 1 year. So this is something the Congress will again turn its attention to. The basic legislation and direction is there. The implementation to carry forward the blueprint is something that will be in active consideration in the days ahead as we seek to convert and use land for new purposes which serve the changing needs of all people.

This, then, is a kind of quick recap of an important new thrust and direction in rural America. I do not suggest that this is a complete answer for all problems, but I would suggest to you that it is a meaningful beginning.

May I then conclude this address as I began by repeating: The answer is not to idle land, but rather to use it to meet other needs, and, as we do so, to provide constructive opportunities in areas other than farming for those who remain by choice in the rural community. There is important work to be done by such people. Our challenge is to work out the proper balance—a better word is conservation—the proper use of land and water to serve people.

This is an exciting enterprise—and 1963 is a key year. I invite each of you to look at your own community in terms of these opportunities—and to give your cooperation to these long-term programs for conservation and rural development. The reward will be great and long lasting to rural communities and to the Nation.

Meaning of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Parent-Teachers Association of Amherst, N.H., recently had a speaker who stated that children had little understanding of what they were saying. She used as an example the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag." One of the Amherst teachers decided to check on this statement and asked the members of her fourth grade class to write the "Pledge of Allegiance" in their own words. Two of these were selected as the best and published in the Milford (N.H.) Cabinet. Because I believe these so well indicate the feeling which the children of New Hampshire have for the United States and its flag, I ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alexander Buchanan: "I promise to be faithful to the flag of the United States of America and to the country for which it stands; one group of free people under God who work together with freedom and fairness to all."

Martha Gray:

"I promise to be faithful
In my duty
To the people in my country
And to the flag
Of the United States of America!
I shall not part
From these free people
Who give freedom and fairness to all!"

John Sharp Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 40 years ago the Nation suffered a loss when John Sharp Williams left Congress. His capacity for leadership, his intellect and his wit all helped shape the course of national legislation for 28 years; 16 in the House of Representatives and 12 in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Robert W. Collins, of Yazoo City, Miss., where John Sharp Williams also made his home, has sent me a reprint of an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post under date of March 10, 1923.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Saturday Evening Post article and the biographical sketch of John Sharp Williams which appears in the Biographical Directory of the American Congress. They follow:

Williams, John Sharp (grandson of Christopher Harris Williams) a Representative and a Senator from Mississippi; born in Memphis, Tenn., July 30, 1854; after the death of his parents moved to the family homestead of his mother in Yazoo County, Miss.; attended private schools, the Kentucky Military Institute near Frankfort, the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, and the University of Heidelberg, at Baden, Germany; subsequently studied law at the University of Virginia and in Memphis, Tenn.; was admitted to the bar in Shelby County, Tenn., in 1877; moved to Yazoo City, Miss., in December 1878; engaged in the practice of law and also interested in cotton planting; delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1892; elected as a Democrat to the 53d and to the seven succeeding Congresses (March 4, 1893–March 3, 1909); was not a candidate for renomination in 1908; Democratic minority leader in the 58th, 59th, and 60th Congresses; temporary Chairman of the Democratic National Convention at St. Louis in 1904 which nominated Parker and Davis; elected to the U.S. Senate in 1910; reelected in 1916 and served from March 4, 1911, to March 3, 1923; declined to be a candidate for renomination in 1922; was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore in 1912, which nominated Wilson and Marshall; retired from public life and lived on his plantation, Cedar Grove, near Yazoo City, Miss., until his death there September 27, 1932; interment in the family cemetery on his plantation.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Mar. 10, 1923]

WHO'S WHO—AND WHY—SERIOUS AND FRIVOLOUS FACTS ABOUT THE GREAT AND THE NEAR GREAT

A SENATOR OF THE OLD SCHOOL

The first families of the South have always been reluctant to apply the phrase "a gentleman and a scholar" to individuals who did not possess certain fundamental qualifications. Among these qualifications may be mentioned the possession of commodious plantations, preferably cotton plantations, an extreme sensitiveness concerning the honor of himself and his kin, an instinctive abhorrence for the Republican Party and all

its works, a marked willingness to fight at any and at all times for any cause that seems good, a large number of ancestors who have made notable contributions to the well-being of the South, a wide acquaintance with the classics and the ability to quote therefrom with precision and fluency, a thorough knowledge of the law of the land, a strong determination publicly to express dislike for offensive persons and measures, a complete command of invective in all its branches, an inexhaustible supply of hospitality, generosity and sentiment, and enough eloquence, religion and card sense to make himself a welcome and honored guest in any circle at all.

In the old days, for one reason or another, it frequently happened that Southern States were prepresented in the U.S. Senate by men who could be called both gentlemen and scholars without starting an argument anywhere in the South. Today the gentleman and scholar of the old school, as measured by the standards of the first families below the Mason and Dixon Line, is vanishing from the U.S. Senate with more vanishing power than that possessed by the American bison, and almost as much as that ascribed to the great auk.

Some people blame this unfortunate state of affairs on the high price of cotton plantations; still others on the direct-primary law, which so often permits demagogs to get further, nowadays, than statesmen. Whatever the reason, there are gentlemen from the South in the Senate, and there are scholars from the South in the Senate; but the last gentleman and scholar of the old school departed from the Senate Chamber on March 4, 1923, when John Sharp Williams, Democrat, of Yazoo County, Miss., voluntarily gave up the desk and chair once occupied by Jefferson Davis and repaired to his home near Yazoo City to devote himself to the varied pursuits of a cotton planter and to the reading of about as many books each day as Henry James used to produce each decade.

ORATOR AND KEEN DEBATER

It has not been the usual thing for gentlemen and scholars to retire voluntarily from the U.S. Senate; but much of the conversation that emerges from senatorial lips in these effete days can scarcely be classed as either stimulating or elevating. Book lovers, therefore, sometimes prefer to read books rather than listen to the sages of the Senate in action. John Sharp Williams is a book lover; and it is that fact, probably, which led him to remark not long since that he would rather be a dog and bay the moon than remain a Member of the U.S. Senate as at present constituted.

The records show that the branch of the Williams family, of which John Sharp Williams is the direct descendant, emerged from the mountains of Wales in a healthy and active state in the year 1678, and arrived in Hanover County, Va., in the same year, thus qualifying in the copper riveted and airtight group sometimes known as the First Families of Virginia.

Being fresh from the mountains, however, the Williams family found itself somewhat oppressed by the muggy climate of Virginia and moved on up to Yadkin County, N.C. At this point appears the first but not the last member of the Williams family to get a national reputation as a fighter, said member being John Williams, who, in addition to being the great-great-grandfather of John Sharp Williams, was captain of the Hillsboro, N.C. Minute Men and subsequently colonel of the Ninth Carolina Line Regiment.

Having duly accounted for the proper number of King George's cohorts, Colonel Williams was appointed by the North Carolina Legislature to the position of surveyor general of western North Carolina lands which were situated in what is now the State of Tennessee. So the Williams family moved over into Tennessee, where its members became even more prominent and wealthy than they had previously been, and where they retained their prominence and wealth with Welsh thoroughness and tenacity. The gentleman who is somewhat loosely referred to by present-day Williamses as Uncle Robert Williams, but who was the uncle of John Sharp Williams' grandfather, was appointed Governor of the Territory of Mississippi before the Territory was divided into Mississippi and Alabama; and in this way the Williams family established connections in Mississippi.

John Sharp Williams was born in Memphis, Tenn., in 1854. His father was colonel of the 27th Tennessee Volunteers, Confederate States Army, and was killed in the Battle of Shiloh. His mother, who had died, was from Mississippi; so when Memphis was threatened with capture by the Federal Army, his family took him to his mother's homestead in Yazoo County, Miss.

Southern boys whose fathers died through the agency of northern bullets were remarkably free from any passionate devotion to the North; and John Sharp Williams was no exception to the rule. When he had absorbed the education that the South afforded through various private schools, the Kentucky Military Institute, the University of the South, and the University of Virginia, he was still bothered by a slightly uneducated feeling. Being an unreconstructed rebel of the most unreconstructed type, it was impossible for him to alleviate this feeling at any northern university; and he therefore set off for the University of Heidelberg, carefully dodging the city of Washington on his way in order that he might not be forced to see the hated symbol of the conqueror floating over the Nation's Capitol.

He spent 2 years at Heidelberg; and then he came back home and studied law at the University of Virginia and with a Memphis law firm. As a result, at the age of 23, he was licensed to practice in the courts of law and chancery of Shelby County, Tenn.

As a further result, he had laid the foundation of his education with such success that while he was a Member of the U.S. Senate he was almost universally regarded as being without a peer in sustained logic and eloquence, in strength in running debate, in his knowledge of the origin of politics, of political science, of the history of nations and of the classics, and in his fund of general and accurate information—and he was so regarded, too, in spite of the presence of that celebrated Massachusetts institution, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, with his accompanying smokescreen of 11 university degrees and 19 bulky books.

At the age of 24 he went back to Yazoo City and practiced his profession and indulged in the various pursuits which are customarily pursued by the wealthy, gentlemanly, and scholarly cotton planter, and otherwise behaved as a gentleman and a scholar should behave; and in November 1892, he was elected to the 53d Congress, following which he was reelected with such persistence and enthusiasm that many southerners—and northerners, too, for that matter—began to think that he would be flowing up to Washington from Mississippi long after the Mississippi River had ceased to flow into the Gulf of Mexico.

He had no sooner entered the House of Representatives than he burst into eloquent speech; and those who sought to oppose this rambunctious youngster from the cotton plantations of the distant South discovered to their pain and chagrin that the keenness of his tongue was sufficient to remove the hide from a Siberian mammoth in long, quivering strips.

THE SENATOR IN ACTION

Since that time many a master of invective in both the House and Senate has confidently entered a battle of tongues with him, only to limp painfully to a first-aid station in the nearest cloakroom and apply poultices to the blisters raised by the stinging Williams attack. In addition to rising to the position of Democratic floor leader in the House, John Sharp Williams was his party's candidate for Speaker of the House in the 58th, 59th, and 60th Congresses—a period when the Speaker of the House was almost as important a figure as the President of the United States. On January 23, 1908, he was elected to the U.S. Senate by the Mississippi Legislature; and on April 4, 1911, he took his seat, the same seat—not by chance or by coincidence, but because of the uproarious and determined demands which he made for it in his most unreconstructed and rebellious manner—that had been occupied by Jefferson Davis when that distinguished gentleman, scholar, and leader of a lost cause was sojourning in the Senate. In 1916 he was renominated and reelected to the Senate without opposition.

John Sharp Williams frequently deceived those awestruck souls from Coot Point, Maine, and Constantinople, N.Y., who entered the Senate gallery expecting to see the Senate floor populated with statesmen 9 feet in height, all busy debating with one another in words four syllables long. They were not greatly impressed by John Sharp Williams when he shambled through the center door opposite the Vice President's rostrum, and stood there in apparent helplessness, with his shock of white hair and his old gray suit that looked as though it had been slept in ever since the Civil War, and as though the pockets had been used as common carriers for dumbbells or other heavy weights since the Cleveland administration. Nor were they particularly thrilled or stirred when John Sharp supporting himself on adjacent desks, wobbled rather wearily over to a Senator who might be witching the other Senators with his own particular brand of oratory, and took up a sitting or a standing position some 3 feet in front of the speaker. Sometimes the galleries could be heard asking who the rude little old man was. Their attitude was more respectful, however, when they heard him make replies to speeches in the wavering drawl that, in conjunction with his white hair and mustache, makes him seem so much like Mark Twain.

In spite of the 2 years that he spent in Germany during an impressionable period of his life, he failed to develop that sympathy for the Germans that early in the war afflicted so many Americans who had spent more than 3 days on the far side of the Rhine. The Germans, he has always complained, haven't enough imagination to interest him.

On April 4, 1917, Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, made a long speech in the Senate against the United States entering the war. John Sharp Williams, who had listened carefully, then rose and delivered a few pointed remarks in the direction of Senator La Follette; and they were pointed so successfully that La Follette has never since acknowledged his existence by either word or sign.

John Sharp Williams was never one of that sturdy group of southern Democrats who believe in putting a protective tariff on nothing except the things that are raised or made in the South. One of his distinguished colleagues was one day ranting and ramping for a high tariff on Sea Island cotton, which is the same sort of cotton that John Sharp raises on his Mississippi plantations; but to his horror the ramper discovered that he did not have John Sharp's support.

"It is a very strange thing," bawled the ramper, "that the Senator opposes this tax when he himself is a raiser of long-staple cotton!"

John Sharp at once remarked in quavering tones, "Well, whenever my plantation can't

produce cotton without imposing a tax on the American consumer, I'll plant every foot of soil to other crops."

Being an idealist himself it was natural for John Sharp Williams to burn incense at the shrine of one whom he regarded as an arch-idealist, the same being Woodrow Wilson.

So he burned incense; and Wilson had a high regard for him, corresponding with him in affectionate terms. When, therefore, Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, a brother Democrat, developed violent anti-Wilson tendencies, it gave John Sharp great pleasure to r'ar up, as the southern phrase has it, and skin him alive whenever the occasion offered. And, it should be understood that one who wishes to skin James A. Reed alive must be quick on the trigger and handy with the punch, for Reed has the qualifications to do some rather rough and painful skinning on his own account. One of the last occasions when John Sharp attended a skinning party was on September 22, 1922, when Senator Reed had been stalking proudly up and down the Senate Chamber and demanding dramatically and eloquently that the bonus bill be passed over the President's veto.

When Reed had sat down, steaming at every pore, John Sharp wabbled to his feet and replied to his passionate outcry in the following unemotional manner:

"Mister President, if it were true—and it is not—that the bonus bill was for the benefit of those who looked into the mouths of the cannon and who walked up the steeps against the German artillery and infantry, there would be some reason in the attempt at eloquence made during the last 5 minutes of the speech of the Senator from Missouri; but it is not true. This is a bill to give a bonus to something like 4 million men, over one-half of whom never faced a shot, over one-half of whom never went across the seas, about a quarter of whom never served outside of a military camp, about one-tenth of whom, men and women, were serving with shoulder straps in Washington departments, and never got anywhere to illustrate their courage."

WAR HEROISM

"For the man who marches forward facing the cannon's mouth, whether for glory or for self-respect or for his country's welfare, everybody has high respect. Why did they not confine this bonus bill to the men who faced fire, the men who, upon Flanders fields or France's fields, offered their breasts to gunshots? Why did they take in all the clerks around Washington, and all the men in the encampments who never did anything except subject themselves to a new process of being washed every morning and living a more sanitary life than they were accustomed to? Why did you put them all in? Why, you put them all in because you knew you could not carry off the steal without putting them all in. You knew that if you confined it to the 1 million men who went to France, and a little bit over a million, you would not have gotten much consideration from the politicians of America.

"Let us get rid of the pretense of eloquence and oratory and heroism about this bill. If you will confine it to the men who actually entered action in France or in Belgium in American uniforms, you will get my approbation; but if you dare do that, you know you cannot pass the bill.

"I suggest that the Senator from Missouri offer an amendment that nobody shall receive any benefit under this act unless he was actually under fire during the war. I will bet three plantations to two ginger cakes that he dare not offer the amendment, and I will deliver the plantations if I lose, in absolute hopelessness of ever collecting the ginger cakes if I win."

THE NORRIS BILL

The Members of the U.S. Senate who tag themselves Progressive and announce that everything they do or propose to do is Progressive, never aroused much of a thrill in the breast of John Sharp Williams. To those who came to him and urged him to join the Progressive Democrats he gave the hoarse rebel hoot and stated that he was a plain ordinary damn-fool Mississippi Democrat, and would so remain. When the urgers protested in horror that he must be either conservative or progressive, and that it would be better for him to be progressive, he replied baldly that they were crazy; before he could be either conservative or progressive he had to know what it was that he was to be conservative or progressive about, and anybody who said that he was going to be conservative or progressive without knowing what was being contemplated was well worth avoiding. About some things any sane person would have to be conservative; about others he would have to be radical; and about still others he would have to be reactionary. Careful observation over a long term of years had also convinced John Sharp Williams that professional radicals will never be found working along consistent lines, inasmuch as their bent to change everything will always lead each one to want to change the things that the others propose.

His sentiments toward the farm bloc legislators were stated in his remarks against the Norris bill to establish the Farmers' and Consumer's Financing Corporation, with a capital of $100 million.

"Nobody who believes that this is a government of limited powers and delegated powers," he declared, "could vote for the Norris bill, which involves the idea that the Federal Government is to become a commission merchant at a possible percentage to deal in agricultural products, to buy and sell them, and an owner and operator of elevators and a warehouseman—mighty near as bad as the 'bosun tight, the midshipmite, and the crew of the captain's gig.'

"The old Ocala platform which the Populist Party adopted 30 years ago in this country was an angel of light in comparison with the Norris bill. After nearly 30 years of public service I have the honor to say that I still believe the best government in the world is the government which a man exercises over himself. I still have the honor to believe with Thomas Jefferson, and even with George Washington, that the power of government over the individual and over business ought to be restricted; and I still believe with Thomas Jefferson—not to the extent to which he went, but to some extent at any rate—that the least-governed people is the best-governed people.

"I would not want to live in a country where the state government under which I lived, much less the Federal Government should be my commission merchant and my warehouseman and elevator dealer. Government is one thing; individual affairs constitute another thing. To put the Government in the pawnbroking business, to put the Government in the warehousing business, to put the Government in the elevator business, to put the Government out as a competitor against every man in the world engaged in any sort of business, strikes me as an aboslute prostitution of the purposes of all government.

"Mr. President, government was not intended to be you and me. Government was intended to restrain you and me from transgressing against each other. Government was not intended to carry on the business of a nation. Government was to see that in carrying on the business of a nation, justice and fair dealing and honor were maintained.

"So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon live in Prussia as to live in any country, whether my own or any other, that undertook to say that the government had the right to carry on with me every sort of business."

WILLIAMS ON SENTIMENT

On one occasion Senator Reed referred contemptuously to sentiment. This offended John Sharp deeply, and he reared up.

"To say that a man is sentimental," he declared, "is to pay him the highest compliment that one man can pay to another. I belong to a breed of men who for 400 years have been dying on the wrong side. Some of them fought like fools for the Stuarts in England. Some of them died under Tyronne's Roman Catholic insurrection in Ireland. Some of them followed the Stars and Bars until they fell in gloom, although not in disgrace, at Appomattox. We do not recognize that sentiment is to be referred to contemptuously, if it were to be so referred to, the man who died for the Stuarts was simply an infernal fool, and the man who followed Robert E. Lee to Appomattox did not have much sense; but all the same, he had heroism, he had courage, and he had communion with the immortal gods, because they were in his heart; and the very spirit of Jesus Christ was working before him, because Jesus Christ fought for the greatest lost cause that the world ever witnessed."

There are many things to be said of John Sharp Williams; such things, for example, as that he is as idealistic as a poet, and sensitively honest, and wholly conscientious in all things, and generous, and a linguist, and a student, and so on. These things, however, occupy too much space without getting us anywhere. He is a gentleman and a scholar, and a Senator of the old school; and that's as eloquent and as glowing a tribute as any man ought to have.

Growth of John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as one who believes that our American way of life, our freedoms and respect for individual liberty can be subverted from the right as well as the left I have long held that the John Birch Society and its extremist fellow travelers are a threat to democracy. In recent months many people who hold similar views have been led to believe that the society is dying on the vine and is no longer an active force seeking to tear down our American house of traditions to protect it from a fire that only the society can see. An article in the Washington Post of January 31 summarizes a report of the B'nai B'rith which points out that the John Birch Society is increasing in strength in many areas. The report also notes other areas where prejudice is still a major force in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER POLITICAL ACTIVITY FORECAST—B'NAI B'RITH REPORTS BIRCH SOCIETY GROWS STRONGER

(By Morton Mintz)

The John Birch Society is growing stronger and may try to exert real political muscle in congressional, State, and local elections.

This was reported last night to the annual meeting of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the Sheraton Park.

Lawrence Peirez, of New York, chairman of the league's factfinding committee, said it would be "superficial and incorrect" to conclude that the society was damaged by the defeat of four Birchers who ran for Congress last year.

The candidates were incumbent Representatives John A. Rousselot and Edgar W. Hiestand, both California Republicans; H. L. (Bill) Richardson, also a California Republican, and Mayor Jack Seale of Amarillo, Tex.

Each of them, Peirez said, ran a strong, well-financed campaign. In a number of States, particularly California, Michigan, Texas, and Wisconsin, the impact of the Birchers on the election campaigns "was far out of proportion to the numerical strength of the Birch members and their fellow travelers."

And, he added, the society's continued existence and growth depends not on election victories, but on extremist forces which are basic in American life.

Peirez presented a detailed report on the society which included these high points:

Founder Robert Welch has been indicated to be "seeking to unify all radical right forces under his own banner."

There are signs that a quiet move may be underway to organize the society around the country for more openly political activity, despite Welch's continuing stress on the society's educational nature.

Only the society's top leadership knows the actual membership, but an educated guess is that it is currently between 50,000 and 60,000, compared with 20,000 to 25,000 in 1961.

In 1961 the society claimed chapters in about 35 States, but Welch now claims chapters in all States but Alaska and Hawaii, 300 chapters in California and members in all 50 States.

Newer areas of reported growth include the Washington region, Long Island, N.Y. and parts of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Washington, Idaho and Arizona.

The home office staff in Belmont, Mass. numbered 24 in 1960, 41 at the end of 1961 and about 50 at last report. Members are being recruited by 38 paid organizers, 70 parttime paid and volunteer "coordinators" and hundreds of volunteer section leaders. The probable rate of staff payroll and expenses is $750,000 a year.

The society's so-called American opinion libraries, or reading rooms that sell books, remain a top-priority program. At the end of 1961 there were about a dozen; now there are perhaps 45, excluding perhaps 50 in members' homes. Book sales reportedly have become a major source of income.

Towns from California, to Colorado, to Wisconsin, to Texas, to Florida, to New Hampshire have been split down the middle by Birch campaigns against alleged leftist influences in schools, churches, and local libraries, for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren, and against merchants selling products imported from Iron Curtain countries.

An effort has apparently been undertaken to convey the impression that the society is not being run by Welch alone, but by a group of sound, respectable men of substance and standing, such as the Boston area's Col. Laurence Bunker, and Attorney Robert H. Montgomery, Jr.

Society spokesmen continue to disavow anti-Semitism officially and publicly, but Welch's society still serves as a magnet which attracts anti-Semitic bigots and hatemongers.

If other radical right organizations are declining, the Birch Society is not.

RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE IS SEEN IN TEXT BOOKS

A 3-year analysis of elementary social studies textbooks shows that most favor Protestantism over Catholicism and Christianity over Judaism.

This was reported yesterday by Samuel Dalsimer of New York, an official of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. He said that most of the texts fail to view religious history objectively, have definite sectarian tendencies and are grossly inadequate to the Nation's needs.

The study was conducted for the league by New York educator Judah K. Harris and disclosed at the league's annual meeting at the Sheraton-Park.

Harris reviewed 120 books, most of them in the collection of the Teachers' Central Laboratory of Hunter College in New York City. Here are some of his findings:

On anti-Catholic bias, "Many anti-Protestant acts of persecution are detailed, but no specific acts of anti-Catholic oppression by Protestants are included. Martin Luther is treated in a wholly favorable light, no hint is given of the intolerance he advocated and practiced toward those whom he considered heretics, although, religious intolerance of the 17th and 18th centuries was by no means a Catholic monopoly."

On Jewish history, "Practically all of the information conveyed about the Jews relates to the Biblical period. The little information * * * about Jewish history after the year 70 deals in the main with Jewish tribulations as victims of persecution and exile. Virtually nothing is given about the Jewish population of America. The strong impression is conveyed that the present-day Jew is not distinguished positively by his customs, religion or culture, but negatively by the hatred, contempt and scorn in which he is held by others."

On Hitler and nazism, this is a topic in 11 volumes, of which only 5 refer to persecution of the Jews under Hitlerism. "Of these five, one does not indicate whether Hitler's policy was right or wrong."

On the crusades, "The treatment usually stresses the misdeeds of the Moslems of the period. Only 2 of the 13 textbooks dealing with the crusades say anything about Christian persecution of Moslems."

On the crucifixion, this "delicate subject * * * is often dealt with in a way that tends to stimulate prejudice."

On the importance of religion, although textbooks stress that religion was a motivating force in the past history of mankind, they "treat contemporary religion as being primarily a matter of church going, with a limited role in welfare services and character education."

CAMPUS DEMOCRACY HELD LONG WAY OFF

Continuing discriminations in college fraternities was attributed yesterday principally to old grads who would flunk a course in how not to be prejudiced.

The oldtime defenders of the system are oblivious to contemporary attitudes and trends, according to a report published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The study, released at the league's annual meeting at the Sheraton-Park, said that "democracy on the campus" is still a long way off.

"But," said the study, "pressure from undergraduates and college administrators has markedly lessened fraternity bias since the end of World War II."

The conservative old grads are influential because they are contributors to their alma maters and have a say about job opportunities for many new graduates, the survey said.

Tribute to the Late Warren R. Austin, Former Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Ross Valentine, entitled "Warren R. Austin, a Tribute."

This article appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on December 30, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARREN R. AUSTIN, A TRIBUTE

(By Ross Valentine)

Twenty years ago Warren R. Austin's was a name to conjure with; a power in the U.S. Senate, a voice respectfully listened to in disputes involving international and constitutional law.

News of his death on Christmas day, at the age of 85, must have surprised quite a few people who had been under the impression that he had died years ago.

Yet he had served for 6 years as our first ambassador to the newborn United Nations until 1953, when he was succeeded by Henry Cabot Lodge, Mr. Eisenhower's appointee.

So much has happened during the past 9 years that Austin, tending his apple orchard in St. Albans, Vt., had dropped out of sight.

When he wired me immediately after his 1946 appointment by President Truman, I was startled, and a bit flattered; flattered because his message reached me some hours before the news appeared on the Associated Press teletype, startled because of Mr. Truman's unexpected appointment of a Republican leader.

Cynical editorialists speculated that he had been "kicked upstairs"; that he had been "named captain of the *Titanic* after she struck the iceberg." In 1946 very few realists expected the U.N. to survive.

Austin, also a realist, was an exception. He had tremendous faith in the concept of law, as a moral force to weld competitive peoples together, internationally—as well as nationally.

During the lend-lease debate in the Senate, (in 1941) he said in a floor speech:

"Ought we not to ask Britain now to join us in an endeavor to establish something new * * * in the world hereafter (the war)—a new and different sanction of peace? This is not a mere dream. I believe we are in one of the great movements of civilization in which it advances to a higher step after it has slid backward."

This was the first time the idea of a new world peace organization had been suggested in embryonic form, on the floor of the Senate.

When, the day after V-E Day in 1945, others rejoiced, I grimly predicted that Soviet communism would seek to profit from the chaos of a postwar Europe. Some ardent New Dealers condemned me for that. Austin allowed it was a distinct possibility to be considered. I mention this as an example of his independent mind.

He was a realist to the core, but he saw no reason why a man with both feet on the ground should not reach for the stars.

As Arthur Krock said of him (while Austin was still in the Senate) "He is one of those men who, in any legislature, although strong party leaders, are capable of rising above partisanship when national crises arise."

In that respect Vermont's Austin was much like Virginia's Byrd is to this day.

Austin vigorously disapproved of the New Deal and most of its works. He fought Mr. Roosevelt's "Court packing plan" and Senator O'Mahoney's ill-disguised economic proposals with fierce energy, denouncing such schemes as an approach to "a collective system akin to Nazi national socialism."

But he anticipated and later endorsed the Roosevelt foreign policy when he told the Senate:

"It is not his policy, it is not mine or any other person's. It is our traditional policy of siding and upholding democracy."

As early as 1937 he foresaw a militaristic Japan as an aggressor, and urged the United States to apply unilateral sanctions against the Tokyo government, in the event that the League of Nations failed to do so. This won him no love among fellow Republicans.

A week or two before Pearl Harbor GOP isolationists banded together to block Austin from serving as minority leader in the absence of Senator Charles L. McNary. But McNary had grown to respect Austin for his way of voting his convictions, and the revolt collapsed.

There were quite a few issues on which I could not see eye to eye with Austin, such as his bill to draft nonmilitary manpower for war production; but I respected him for the courage of his convictions and for his faith in international law as the only alternative to suicidal war.

When, at the request of Governor Tuck, I invited Austin, in 1947, to attend a dedicatory function in Richmond, I was happy to do so, because—as Governor Gibson of Vermont, who had married a southern girl, had said—"There's not much difference between a Vermont Republican and a Virginia Democrat."

Indian Wars Veterans Roll of Honor Made Known by Marion, Ind., Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is today in our great land a small body of men who, having in their time endured extreme hardships and sacrifices for their country, and are now apparently relegated to obscurity.

I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, of the 26 known surviving veterans of the Indian wars, who, during the period 1865–98, fought the battles that won the West.

The dangers these men faced and their plight today, is told very admirably in a thoughtful story by Mr. Paul L. Hillsamer, in the News-Herald of Marion, Ind. Mr. Hillsamer has also assembled the names and addresses of the survivors in a "roll of honor" accompanying the article.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hillsamer's article, together with the "roll of honor" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS AT 4 A.M.

As far as the editor knows the full list of living veterans of the Indian wars, to the right of this column, is a News-Herald first. We know of no other publication in the country which has published this 1963 list. We hope more papers will. These men deserve honor and recognition in their old age.

An old gentleman named Charley Gibson died at Delphi, Ind., a couple weeks ago. He was 102 years old.

Born in 1860, Mr. Gibson was the oldest living veteran of the Indian wars, the engagements little and big between U.S. Army troops and Indian warriors in the period 1865–98.

The Veterans' Administration, for pension purposes, considers 1898 as the year the Indian wars ended.

Since Mr. Gibson's death, there are 26 living veterans of these wars whose service is recognized by the Veterans' Administration.

The oldest veterans, since Charley Gibson's death, are Charles Creek, of Annapolis, Md., and George Niehaus, of Greencastle, Ind. Both are, or will be, 100 years old, having been born in 1863.

These 26 old heroes are so aged that other deaths may have occurred since News-Herald procured their names, addresses, and years of birth some 6 days ago.

Not much attention has been paid the Indian war veterans by the Nation's press. But they are a part of our national past and now, in their twilight years, deserve honor and esteem.

Theirs was not an easy life, in the 1870's, 1880's, and 1890's. The scores of engagements in which Regular Army troops participated ranged from small local scuffles to greater battles such as Little Big Horn, where George Custer lost his life, and his army.

But the bullets and arrows of those long-ago days killed and wounded just as effectively as the weapons used in our more publicized wars.

A trooper unfortunate enough to be captured could expect scalping or, far worse, torture. Anyone who served in the Regular Army's conflicts with the Indians of the West and Southwest was a brave man.

These 26 surviving veterans were American soldiers. They fought and risked their lives for less than a 14-year-old baby sitter earns today. They lived rough lives in the saddle, on the march or in the primitive Government forts of that era.

They deserve honor now, in their last years. Just as the last survivors of the Civil War deserved, and received, honor.

We have, to date, been unable to obtain the names of living Indians who are veterans of those same wars.

They, too, are Americans. They, too, were soldiers. The wounds of long ago have healed. We are one Nation now.

They too, should be honored in their years of great age.

Indian veterans, as former enemies of the United States, do not receive pensions.

Carroll County Sheriff James Coghill gave the editor considerable information regarding Charley Gibson, in a telephone conversation last Tuesday.

Coghill said that Gibson was a rancher in the West for many years before retiring to Delphi.

The sheriff described Mr. Gibson as "a fine man" and added that his own young son greatly admired the old gentleman.

Mr. Gibson was baptized in the Catholic Church at Delphi at the age of 99. Sheriff Coghill said that the Delphi parish priest "probably knows more about Charles than anyone else" and promised to ask the priest to forward detailed information to News-Herald.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

Surviving veterans of the Indian wars, recognized and being paid compensation by the Veterans' Administration:

Reginald A. Bradley, 2122 Lakeshore Avenue, Oakland, Calif.; born, 1867.

Harry E. Brockman, St. James, Mo.; born, 1874.

Isaac H. Burgess, 506 West Jefferson Street, Springdale, Ark.; born, 1872.

Charles Creek, 63 Spa Road, Annapolis, Md.; born, 1863.

John Crump, 106 H Street, Boston, Mass.; born, 1868.

John Daw, Red Lake Trading Post, Ariz.; born, 1869.

Charles Dickens, Fort McDowell, Scottsdale, Ariz.; born, 1870.

Jerome Faunce, 309 Magnolia Avenue, Hannibal, Mo., born, 1875.

Howard D. Fielding, Little River Station, Post Office Box 472, Miami, Fla., born, 1872.

Frederick W. Fraske, 3746 North Spalding Avenue, Chicago, Ill., born, 1872.

Henry W. Hanft, 666 Short Street, St. Paul, Minn., born, 1887.

Walter C. Harrington, 5622 Tangerine Avenue, Gulfport, Fla., born, 1869.

Frank Heidelberger, V.A. Center, Hot Springs, S. Dak., born, 1867.

Joshua Johnson, 415 Crawford Street, Boone, Iowa, born, 1871.

Charles G. Jones, 2743 Mount Vernon Avenue, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, born, 1873.

G. W. Kinnay, R.D. 1, Box 125, South Webster, Ohio, born, 1869.

Simpson Mann, 2101 Bartlett Street, St. Joseph, Mo., born, 1867.

Hugh McGuiness, Crandon, Wis., born, 1868.

James E. Moorehead, 1203 Robin Road, St. Petersburg, Fla., born, 1864.

George Neihaus, 11 Northeast St., Greenfield, Ind., born, 1863.

Robert Norman, 1002 Harris St., Kelso, Wash., born, 1869.

Walter J. Potter, 1011 Road 20, San Pablo, Calif., born, 1871.

John F. Roberts, 206 Peninsular Avenue S., New Smyrna Beach, Fla., born, 1869.

William Sutphin, Route 1, Box 542, South Boston, Va., born, 1873.

William Wilkinson, 504 Seminole St., Clearwater, Fla., born, 1865.

(EDITOR NOTE.—Mr. Henry Hanft seems very young to have fought before 1898. However, he is definitely listed. It is possible the year of his birth was a typing error in the list we obtained.)

Singular Demonstration of Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the newspapers and newscasts of the past 2 days have been telling the story of a singular piece of heroism that occurred in my State, Monday. I refer to the man who piloted a light plane to a safe landing at Cheyenne, Wyo., after the pilot slumped dead of a heart attack in the air. The man, Lester Peterson, exhibited a cool head in the face of a real emergency. Another man whose ability to face down

panic and provide the necessary guidance in that perilous situation was Lou Domenico of Cheyenne, a flight instructor and air service operator. His coolness and competent instruction provided the key to a safe landing.

Mr. President, I would like to commend these two men for their heroism, presence of mind, and ingenuity and I ask unanimous consent that an article in the Washington Post of January 30, on their exploits be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NOTHING," SAYS MAN WHO LANDED PILOTLESS PLANE

(By Paul Albright)

CHEYENNE, WYO.—A construction engineer, who guided a small plane in for a safe landing after the pilot collapsed, said there was "nothing to it." He had never flown an aircraft before.

"My worst moment was when we hit down on the runway and bounced a couple of times," said Lester Peterson, 38, assistant project manager for the American Bridge Co., after he and two other passengers had completed the landing.

The pilot, Edgar R. Van Keuren, 56, of Rapid City, S. Dak., was dead on arrival at a hospital. He apparently suffered a heart attack.

Peterson had to grab the controls when Van Keuren was stricken as the craft headed for a landing at an Atlas missile site 45 miles northeast of Cheyenne.

"I grabbed the wheel and pulled it back," Peterson said. "It appeared we were heading straight for the ground. They said we missed the ground about 2 feet."

Peterson climbed the plane, a Cessna 180, to 7,900 feet while his companions, Lester Laun and John Pawlack, also engineers with the American Bridge Co., experimented with the radio.

"I was thinking of landing in a wheat field near the missile site," Peterson said. "But Les Laun suggested we head for Cheyenne where there were facilities for a crash landing."

When they reached Cheyenne they radioed the airport tower and explained the situation. Lou Domenico, a flight instructor, was summoned and talked the plane and its passengers down.

A recording of the conversation between Peterson and Domenico included these comments:

Plane: "You're gonna have an ambulance there for this pilot, aren't you?"

Tower: "Roger. We've got an entire crash crew standing by and don't let 'em bother you. It's an emergency precaution. I think we can talk you in."

Plane: "Aw, I know you can. Over."

Two planes and a helicopter were sent aloft to escort the plane in.

"All I did was steer the thing and follow instructions," said Peterson.

"What about flaps?" questioned the passengers from the cockpit as the plane nosed toward the field.

Tower: "No flaps. No flaps. Just pull back on your throttle and when you are down close to the runway pull the throttle all the way off and fly level to the runway. * * * Just ease back on the stick, get down real close, take all your power off now, throttle clear back let it roll. * * * When it gets on the ground just let it roll. * * * Just hold the stick clear back. * * * Hold it back. * * * You're doing fine."

Plane: "Nothing to it."

The plane landed on the runway, bounced some, blew a tire, and then ran off the strip, doing minor damage to the craft.

"He did a real beautiful job," said Domenico. "He kept his head."

It took 45 minutes from the time Van Keuren was stricken until Peterson landed the plane.

Peterson, formerly from Union City, N.J., said he had never wanted to be a pilot, "but I would like to learn how to land the thing."

Judges Visit Federal Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has from time to time addressed itself to the problem of sentencing disparities in the Federal courts. In 1958, it enacted my bill which authorized the Federal judiciary to convene periodic institutes and seminars to study the problems of sentencing. The bill also gave the Federal courts for the first time the discretion to commit convicted defendants under diagnostic and indeterminate sentencing procedures. It was hoped that through the institutes the judges could work out a more consistent sentencing philosophy and practice and that sentences, therefore, particularly under the new procedures, would more commonly fit both the problems of offenders and the resources available for their treatment.

In the speeches which I have prepared for my own participation in a number of these institutes I have repeatedly urged the Federal judges, as a part of their institute program, to visit our Federal penal and correctional institutions to learn exactly what programs and facilities exist for the treatment of offenders. Without this background information the judges simply cannot do an intelligent job of formulating sentences for offenders whose crimes, backgrounds, and problems vary greatly by individual. Such visits would also enable the judges to see for themselves in selected instances whether the purposes they had in mind at the time they imposed sentence were being carried out. In other words, judges ought to find out what happens to the defendants whom they have sent to prison in order to have a sound basis of experience in sentencing similar cases in the future.

Although the Federal judges are making increased use of the diagnostic and indeterminate sentencing provisions of the 1958 legislation, the problem of disparity remains acute among those terms imposed under the old definite sentencing system. President Kennedy, with great justification I think, has used his powers of clemency to correct several of the more aggravated instances of disparity which the Attorney General has brought to his attention. In the final analysis, however, only the judges themselves can remedy the problem, and a greater knowledge of the implications of their sentences and the programs of our Federal institutions would help them to do so.

Among the Federal judges who have responded to my suggestion for institutional visits and to the standing invitation issued them by Director James V. Bennett of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons have been Chief Judge Thomas M. Madden and his associates in the districts of New Jersey. I have received a copy of the very fine report which this group wrote to Chief Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the third circuit concerning their impressions and recommendations. I hope this report will be widely circulated among the Federal judiciary. It contains a particularly penetrating evaluation of the institutions and programs that these conscientious judges observed. The circulation of the report should also influence other Federal judges, both old and new, to make similar visits. Further, I hope that some action can be taken to fulfill the need for more adequate physical facilities in the Federal prison system as recommended in Judge Madden's report.

The report should also be of great interest to the Members of the Congress.

REPORT TO HON. JOHN BIGGS, JR., CHIEF JUDGE, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

INTRODUCTION

A number of the judges of the district of New Jersey made arrangements with Director James V. Bennett of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons to visit several Federal institutions during the past summer. It was our expectation that in acquainting ourselves with the physical facilities, programs, and staffs of these institutions we would gain a greater measure of understanding of the problems involved in the treatment of offenders committed.

On June 18, 1962, the group that visited the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., included Chief Judge Thomas M. Madden, of Camden; Senior Circuit Judge Phillip Forman, of Trenton; Judge Arthur S. Lane, of Trenton; Judge Anthony T. Augelli, of Newark; Judge Robert Shaw, of Newark; U.S. Attorney David M. Satz, Jr., of Newark, and Mr. Michael Keller, Jr., clerk, U.S. district court, Trenton. In addition, Judges Madden, Lane, and Augelli, accompanied by Mr. Keller, visited the following institutions on the following dates:

July 10: Federal Reformatory for Women, Alderson, W. Va.

July 11: Federal Correctional Institution, Ashland, Ky.

July 12: U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky.

July 13: Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio.

July 14: U.S. Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pa.

September 14: Federal Detention Headquarters, New York, N.Y.

Danbury

This institution, built with funds made available by the Federal Public Works Administration in 1938, was opened in August 1940. Its buildings are arranged to form a rectangular enclosure about a central compound and recreation yard. It is located in beautiful, rolling, Connecticut countryside. It was originally designed for about 550 inmates, but the population now averages nearly 700. The prisoners are committed from the Federal courts in the New England and New York State area.

The institution has a total personnel complement of 130; 63 of this number comprise the correctional officer force and the

remainder are assigned to such institutional services as administrative, treatment, food, farm, mechanical, medical, and industrial. All are civil service employees, and fully half of them have seen prior service at other Federal institutions. Warden Frank Kenton, for example, is a 20-year veteran of the Federal prison system and was previously assigned as warden of the New York Detention Headquarters, and as associate warden at the Lewisburg Penitentiary and the medical center at Springfield, Mo.

The inmate population is rather heterogeneous. Their ages vary from 16 to 80; the average is about 33. Also, the sentences represent the full range that can be imposed by a judge, from 30 days to life; the average is about 22 months. The offenses involve violations of laws governing narcotics, theft of motor vehicles, income tax evasion, theft from U.S. mail, forgery, and immigration.

The newly committed inmate spends his first month under study and diagnosis in a unit set aside for this purpose. He is examined by a physician, his social history is compiled by a caseworker, and he is given a number of tests to determine his educational and vocational training needs. Also, during this period the inmate is familiarized with the program of the institution. At the end of the month he meets with the classification committee, and he is assigned to the quarters, employment, and training activities that best fit his needs. If the committee determines that he requires treatment services that are not available in the institution, it recommends his transfer to a more suitable institution.

The day for the inmate begins at 6 a.m. After performing his ablutions and cleaning his quarters, he may go to the dining hall for breakfast at any time between 6:30 and 7:30 a.m. At 8 a.m. he reports to his assigned employment in one of the institutional departments or industries. There is a break for luncheon between 11:45 a.m. and 12:45 p.m., and during the afternoon most inmates are again at work. Those inmates who are illiterate or nearly illiterate may be required to attend remedial classes during the afternoon. The evening meal is served between 4:15 p.m. and 5:15 p.m., and from then until 9 p.m. the inmates may engage in recreational activities, visit the library, or attend educational classes. Ten-thirty p.m. is lights-out time in the dormitories and cells.

We were favorably impressed by the general operation of the Danbury institution. The medical facilities were excellent, and the hospital beds were occupied only by those who were ill or required surgery. A new school had just been constructed by inmate labor, and in addition to classrooms, it had a fine library. Good facilities were also available for visiting between inmates and their families. We had lunch in the officers' dining room and the menu was exactly the same as that served in the inmate dining room; the food was nutritious, well-balanced and prepared in an appetizing manner.

Danbury gave us our first glimpse of the factories operated by Federal Prison Industries, Inc. The glove factory and the office machine repair shop employed about 25 percent of the inmate population. The men assigned to these activities earn a small wage, two-thirds of which is usually sent to their dependents and the remainder saved toward the day of their release or spent at the commissary. They are also credited each month with an extra 2 to 5 days extra good time, depending upon how long they have been assigned to industries.

The inmate industrial workers perform their duties with an amazingly high degree of diligence. In our opinion, they worked as rapidly and skillfully as their counterparts in private industry. We talked to a number of inmates in the factories, and although they answered our questions politely and intelligently, they did not slow down in their work. The factories obviously provided an outstanding training situation for inmates. The work habits they gained at Danbury would be valuable assets to them in private industry and should substantially enhance their employability.

Alderson

The women's reformatory dates from 1927. Of all the institutions visited it is the least penal in appearance. It is located in the midst of the scenic beauty of the foothills of the Allegheny Mountains and is very much like a university campus with its two-story cottages, which stand on a hillside with groves of trees and mountains as a background. Yet, it is a penal institution and security measures not evident from the "campus" are adequate. After 35 years, some of the cottages are showing the effects of age.

Inasmuch as it is the only fullfledged institution for women in the Federal Prison System, its population consists of women of all ages, sentenced to all types of terms for a wide variety of offenses. The largest group has been convicted of narcotics offenses; it is unfortunate in this respect that nearly one-third the entire inmate population is not eligible for parole, under the terms of the Narcotics Control Act of 1956. The women prisoners come from all sections of the country and differ greatly in their backgrounds and mental, physical, and emotional makeup. The problems of treating such a wide variety of offenders are understandably numerous and complex.

The institution is staffed by approximately 200 personnel, tradesmen and department heads. Warden Gladys V. Bowman is a career civil service employee who entered the prison service in 1946 as a correctional officer and earned successive advancement to her present position. For a number of years she was also in charge of the women's division at the Federal Correctional Institution at Terminal Island, Calif.

The program is basically similar to that which we observed at Danbury, except that it is adapted to the needs of women. The educational program includes elementary and secondary classes as well as all basic subjects taught in accredited public schools; typing, shorthand, and filing receive special emphasis. The women may also receive training as beauticians, and Federal Prison Industries, Inc., operates a garment factory and laundry which provides special training and paid employment. The dressmaking and arts department teaches sewing skills and makes all the inmate clothing, uniforms, hospital gowns, bedspreads, draperies, and other household articles, as well as the clothing and accessories for the women being released. Additional occupational training is afforded by the food service of the institution, where the women may be trained as waitresses, bakers, and cooks. Of particular value in this electronic age is the opportunity to become skilled in machines such as IBM key punch, IBM verifier, Varityper, calculators, et cetera. The State of West Virginia is to be commended for recognizing those inmates who complete the high school courses and for issuing certificates of proficiency in some of the acquired skills.

Discipline is handled in the same manner as it is at the other Federal institutions. Inmates who have been reported for infractions appear before the reformatory's adjustment committee, composed of three staff members representing the custodial, medical, and one additional department. The infraction is discussed with the inmate, and depending upon the nature of the infraction, the attitude of the inmate, and the staff's knowledge of her personality and problems, appropriate action is taken. This usually takes the form of counseling, but may involve a reprimand, a temporary suspension of her privileges or a short period in seclusion. If the violation is serious enough to warrant a forfeiture of earned good time, a special board convenes for this purpose and the inmate may be represented before the board by a staff member of her choice.

We toured the entire institution and received the impression that it was operated on a high level of efficiency. The relative isolation of the institution, however, did present some obvious problems to the institution. It is difficult for the warden to recruit specialized types of personnel, who are typically reluctant to work and live at great distances from metropolitan areas. Also, while the other institutions may draw easily from the local communities for consultant medical services, the isolation of Alderson presents a distinct handicap in this respect. It is occasionally necessary, for example, for the doctors to take a difficult pregnancy case over the mountains a distance of 50 miles to a hospital that is equipped to handle this type of emergency.

We might comment at this point that we were rather surprised to learn that a number of babies are born each year at the reformatory; we were not aware that so many young women were pregnant at the time of their sentencing. While the babies may be born in the prison hospital, the reformatory has made arrangements with county authorities to issue birth certificates which bear no evidence that the birth took place in a penal institution. The babies are cared for in the reformatory hospital for a short period of time and then turned over to their father or to the families of the inmate mothers.

Although we were greatly impressed with the medical facilities available at Alderson, the lack of an elevator in the hospital gives rise to some serious problems. It is necessary that surgical and other nonambulatory patients be carried up and down stairs on stretchers. The kitchen is in the basement. Meals are served to the upper two floors by means of a human chain on the stairway passing the individual trays from hand to hand. This makes it more difficult to serve hot meals and also creates a sanitation problem.

Ashland

The institution, opened in 1940, was originally designed for the confinement and treatment of adult offenders. With the implementation of the Federal Youth Corrections Act in 1954 it was converted to the confinement and treatment of youths committed from the district courts west of the Mississippi. At the time of our visit, we were furnished with various statistics relating to the inmate population as of the last day of the previous month. They indicated that of 494 inmates, at the time of sentencing 478 were between the ages of 14 to 19, inclusive; and the remaining 16 were between 20 to 23, inclusive. As of the date the statistics were prepared, 428 of this total were still between 15 to 19, inclusive. It is understandable that there is a problem of "gross emotional insecurity," a need for "stabilizing influences" and the necessity of "finding ways to fulfill the youth's psychological needs" as set forth in the brochure for this institution. Most of the inmates are violators of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act and, by reason of their ages and minimum prior records of serious crimes, they are excellent raw material for intensive efforts toward psychiatric and educational rehabilitation. However, as will be indicated below, needed personnel and facilities to this end are not available in sufficient quantity.

The institution has a staff of about 172 personnel. Although the institution has a number of problems stemming from staff shortages and the necessity of adapting an institution for minimum custody adults to one serving youthful offenders, we think it

is being operated as well as could be expected. The hospital is well equipped and at the time of our visit there were only a few patients in the wards. The food, as at the other Federal institutions, was excellent. Federal Prison Industries operates a wood furniture shop, and the boys learn the woodworking trade in the manufacture of bookcases, desk trays, costumers, and other articles of office furniture. The institutional shops building also affords training in a number of trades.

At the time of our visit the institution had no psychiatrists. In the course of our conversation with the warden we learned that one had just left and the new one assigned by the Public Health Service had not arrived. However, the professional staff did include a qualified psychologist and a number of trained workers. It was our feeling that the institution should have a staff of several psychiatrists, particularly in view of its designation as a youth center. The absence of a more adequate staff of psychiatrists may be partially attributed to the general shortage of psychiatrists in the Nation, which would make it difficult for the Public Health Service to recruit a sufficient number for service in the Federal Prison System, even if sufficient funds were appropriated therefor.

We had also expected to see a larger number of boys receiving instruction in the academic classrooms. But there were two successive escapes at the time of our visit, and the schoolrooms were closed while some of the staff were engaged in attempting to apprehend the escapees. The educational building did not appear to be large enough to meet the requirements of a youth center, but we understand that the construction of a more adequate educational building is on the long-range construction schedule for Ashland.

Although a large area in beautiful Kentucky countryside was acquired for this institution, we were somewhat disappointed with the physical plant at Ashland, for its appearance and layout were not what we had expected to see in a youth center. This is due to the fact that it was originally designed for adults. It is our understanding that the Federal Prison System at present does not have any institution which was specifically designed for youths, and funds have never been available to design and construct an institution of this type since the enactment of the Federal Youth Correction Act. Director Bennett has informed us that the long-range construction schedule of the Bureau of Prisons includes three such institutions, and it is our hope that the Congress will appropriate the necessary funds for this badly needed construction at an early date. Only through such construction can the full intent of the Federal Youth Corrections Act be realized.

Lexington

This narcotics hospital operated by the U.S. Public Health Service was activated in 1935. It is located on a tract of over 1,000 acres of rolling Kentucky bluegrass country. It accepts male addict patients from the section of the United States east of the Mississippi and female patients from the entire country. The number of patients at any one time averages about 1,000, including about 500 who are serving terms of imprisonment, about 375 who have voluntarily committed themselves, and a number of other types of addicts and nonaddicts.

We were informed that a very high percentage of the admissions during the year, however, are voluntary patients. The hospital has no authority to retain them, and at least half of them leave as soon as they have been withdrawn from drugs. Most of the remainder also leave before they have completed the full course of their treatment. A further defect in the treatment of the voluntary addict lies in the fact that there is no follow-up program in the communities. The high rate of relapse among these addicts therefore can be blamed not on the inadequacy of the treatment that is available for them but on the inability of the authorities to subject the addicts to the full benefits of that treatment. It seems to us that there should be some statutory requirement that the voluntary patient must remain at Lexington for the full period prescribed by the medical staff and not permitted to leave whenever he chooses.

The hospital has a complement of about 600 persons, all of whom are U.S. Public Health Service personnel. The newly admitted addicts are studied much as prisoners are in the institutions of the Federal Prison System. There are also a wide variety of opportunities for vocational training. In addition to training in the several institution departments the patients may learn occupations in the four industries: printing, woodcraft, needle trades, and agriculture.

In the absence of the medical officer in charge, the second in command gave us a thorough tour of the institution by means of slides; following the slide tour we inspected those parts of the hospital which particularly interested us. Our host explained to us the difficulty of convincing addicts that the desire to be cured of addiction must start with themselves and cannot be generated by anyone else. To bring about this insight the hospital depends on the group therapy technique, in which a group of 20 or 25 patients discuss the problems associated with their addiction. We participated in one of these discussions, and found that it was a particularly enlightening experience. The addicts in the group by and large were educated and intelligent men. Among the subjects they discussed and emphasized were those of entrapment and the mandatory phases of the Narcotics Control Act.

None of the visiting judges, incidentally, approved of the mandatory provisions of any penal statute. We feel that very often, particularly with reference to the addict seller of a few small packets of narcotics, the minimum mandatory sentence may produce an injustice. The judges should be given the same discretion in dealing with narcotics offenders as they have for any other type of offender; if a severe sentence is indicated the courts can recognize this requirement and impose a maximum term.

Chillicothe

This institution was built over a period of years beginning in 1926 and its buildings now spread over a 72-acre enclosure on its 2,000 acres of splendid Ohio rural country. Its age is apparent in the deterioration of some of the buildings, particularly the dormitories. At the time of our visit considerable construction was underway with the use of inmate labor, including the erection of new chapels for Protestant and Catholic services.

The population of the reformatory averages in excess of 1,200; the majority were committed under the Federal Youth Corrections Act, a few under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act, and others under regular adult procedures. Most commonly the inmates were convicted of violations of the Dyer Act and were committed from the district courts of the northeastern and midwestern regions of the United States.

We were tremendously impressed by the manner in which the reformatory is operated. It has a staff of 326 personnel, many of whom have seen service in other institutions of the Federal Prison System. All of those with whom we came into contact appeared to be well trained for their duties and dedicated to the basic mission of the institution.

The inmate training program appeared to be particularly well organized and thorough. The Aviation Mechanics' School is an outstanding example. It is operated through the cooperation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which approves the instructors, supervises the examinations which are given to the students, and issues certificates of qualifications to those who pass. A similarly high level of operation characterized the reformatory school. The youths who successfully complete their high school courses receive certificates that do not bear any indication that they were earned in a penal institution; they are issued by the Sherman High School with the authorization of the State Board of Education. The certificates are therefore a considerable help to released inmates in securing employment.

The other training opportunities were also excellent. The reformatory has a chair factory where the youths may learn production skills and earn a small wage at the same time; the working conditions and safety measures of the factory compare favorably with those of modern factories in the free community. In addition, there is a large number of well-equipped shops where the youths may undertake trade training that meets the requirements of the Ohio State Apprenticeship Council. Trainees in these programs are registered with the Council, under a formal agreement, and receive apprenticeship credit which may be applied toward journeyman certification. Also, several of the trade courses have been approved by the Trade and Industrial Service of the Ohio Department of Education, and each graduate receives a certificate from this agency for successful completion of the courses. An employment placement officer on the institution staff helps these young men obtain employment in line with their training when they are released.

We were well satisfied with the hospital and medical situation at Chillicothe. The chief medical officer is an unusually dedicated individual who previously worked there many years ago, went into private practice long enough to earn a degree of financial security for his family, and then returned to reformatory work, his real interest. While visiting the hospital we observed the doctor performing cosmetic surgery on a boy whose skin was badly scarred from acne. This boy's rehabilitation should be considerably enhanced by an improvement in his appearance which will make him more presentable to prospective employers and society in general.

During the tour of the institution I had an opportunity to speak with one young man whom I had sentenced. At the time of sentencing, this offender had been antagonistic, fresh, and as difficult a defendant as I had ever met in 17 years on the bench; the defendant had appeared before me on five different occasions for violation of probation and as a last resort I committed him. At Chillicothe the young man greeted me with a smile, and during the course of our conversation said that he had learned his lesson, realized that I had been trying to help him, and intended to use his time at the reformatory to improve himself.

Lewisburg

The U.S. penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., is within a walled 26 acre tract on a 1,000-acre reservation. We visited it on a Saturday and therefore did not have an opportunity to view the program in full operation. Nonetheless, we were greatly impressed with the efficiency that characterized the institution, particularly in view of its size. It has about 1,450 inmates in the main institution, 150 in a farm camp, and another 300 in an honor camp about 14 miles north. The original penitentiary was built in 1932, and it is so constructed that many of its buildings radiate from a central corridor.

The inmates come from the district courts in the northeastern section of the United States and are older and more sophisticated in crime than those we saw in Chillicothe and Ashland. The penitentiary also affords a greater degree of custody; it is operated by a staff of 360 persons, about 175 of whom are custodial officers. Warden J. T. Willingham is a 25-year veteran of the Federal Prison System, and was warden at the Federal Correctional Institution at La Tuna, Tex., before coming to Lewisburg. Immediately responsible to him are three associate wardens, each of whom has several departments under his supervision.

Warden Willingham took us on a tour of the entire institution, and as at the other institutions, we were highly impressed by the industrial operation. The penitentiary has three factories—metal furniture, clothing, and custom furniture—which employ more than 500 inmates. The layout of the factories, the safety practices, and the products again can be favorably compared with those of up-to-date industries in the free community.

The hospital was the largest and best equipped that we saw on our trip. The staff includes a psychiatrist, psychologist, medical officers, two dental surgeons, and a number of medical technical assistants. Also, there are a number of specialists in the surrounding communities who are available for consultation when needed. The hospital fully meets the standards prevailing in a big city and has been accredited by the American Medical Association.

It is our view that Lewisburg is well prepared to perform the diagnostic studies on the defendants committed there under section 4208b of title 18, United States Code. The staff's ability in this respect is confirmed by the high quality of the reports we get from Lewisburg indicating a thorough study and evaluation of each case. While we are not bound to follow the recommendations made by the Lewisburg team, it is of considerable reassurance to us in sentencing these defendants to have at hand the studies and recommendations that have been so carefully and thoughtfully formulated.

In connection with the diagnostic studies being made of youth offenders under section 4208(b), it is unfortunate that youths who will eventually serve their sentences at a youth correction center must be mingled with the older and more sophisticated criminals. We are of the firm opinion that new facilities should be made available so that all diagnostic studies of youths may be made at centers specifically designated for such offenders.

New York

We concluded the tour of Federal institutions with a trip to Federal Detention Headquarters in New York City where prisoners committed from the district of New Jersey are first received for transshipment to other Federal institutions. In our estimation, this facility approaches a disgrace and it is unfortunate that one must confess that it is a Federal institution. It is a converted garage near the riverfront with a continual extermination problem because of vermin from adjoining and contiguous buildings. The so-called dormitories resemble medieval cages with bars on the sides and tops.

These remarks are not meant to be derogatory to the warden and his staff. As with the staffs of other institutions visited, they impressed us as well qualified and doing an excellent job despite the plant handicap under which they function. Our inspection of the cafeteria and kitchen indicated that the food was of the same high quality as that found in other Federal institutions. The medical facilities are also good, with a sufficient number of beds and trained personnel; also, when necessary, the ambulance service can transport inmates to New York hospitals.

The jail has a severe problem in the daily in-and-out movement of prisoners. There is a steady flow of men to and from the courts in the southern and eastern districts of New York. Prisoners are also being removed to different jurisdictions, and others are being transferred by bus or by U.S. marshals to the institutions designated for service of sentence. In a single year there are nearly 14,000 such movements of men in and out of the jail, requiring a staggering amount of processing for the small staff of 64 persons.

Generally, there are three types of prisoners detained at the facility: first, there are those who are being held pending plea or trial and who are presumably innocent; second, there are those who have been sentenced to term imprisonment and who are being held for classification and/or transfer to the place of their ultimate incarceration; and third, there are those who are not criminals in the correct sense of the word—deportees and those held for administrative purposes. Although we appreciate the fact that a single detention headquarters is the most economical manner of handling the unique problems of this institution and we realize that the present available facilities offer no alternate solution, we feel a fundamental mistake is being committed in commingling the three different types of prisoners. Those who are not criminals in the correct sense of the word should not be compelled to associate with those accused or convicted of crime, and some attempt should be made to segregate those held in default of bail from those already convicted. Under the present physical conditions this is almost impossible.

General impressions

Except for the Federal Detention Headquarters in New York City, we wish to compliment the authorities for their selection of sites for the institutions we visited and the acreage acquired. The institutions are all located in beautiful areas of the various States and sufficient acreage exists for whatever expansion may be required.

We left each institution visited with the impression that it was efficiently administered. Any inadequacies we found and may have criticized in this report result from physical inadequacies of the plant and not of the personnel. The inmates are treated well and every effort is made to promote their health and well-being by personnel who are entitled to our highest regard and respect for their apparent dedication to their work. Our conversations with the inmates, including some whom we ourselves committed, indicated that their morale was quite good and that they were fairly treated.

Except for the lack of sufficient psychiatrists and the difficulty in recruiting them for prison duties, the medical facilities and services are in general quite excellent. Of particular significance was the fact that only a small percentage of the hospital beds were occupied; and those were cases where such treatment was necessary. It indicates a minimum of malingering which usually results from dissatisfaction with prison conditions.

Conditions in all the institutions regarding food were oustandingly excellent. Kitchens were clean and well managed; diets were balanced, the calorie and protein rate was high; the menus were prepared well in advance and met the high standards established by the Director of Prisons in Washington. A very salutary practice in each Federal institution is that the warden and staff eat the same food as the inmates. Of particular note was the fact that each cafeteria was pleasantly decorated and furnished with tables for four instead of the ancient regimentation at long, bleak, board tables.

It was noted that all of the institutions were racially integrated, and we saw no evidence of segregation other than that voluntarily chosen by the inmates themselves.

Religious services are available for all faiths and every effort is made to encourage the spiritual growth of inmates. The programs are fair and adequate and all areas of an inmate's religious welfare are thoroughly covered to permit him to meet his religious obligations. In some instances, it was with great interest that we noted the efforts made by the inmates to beautify the areas set aside for religious worship.

The inmates are afforded a wide range of education and vocational training opportunities. The prison libraries are well stocked and well attended.

Perhaps the greatest impression gained from our tour relates to prison industries, the factories operated by Federal Prison Industries, Inc. It was gratifying to see that almost 100 percent of all inmates were engaged in some vocational or industrial activity, earning money plus additional good time off their sentences. The standard 40-hour week, with overtime pay and extra good time, is the first regularity of employment for many. This is a very important factor in rehabilitation. The machinery and equipment are modern and in an excellent state of maintenance. Working conditions and safety features equal, if they do not exceed, private industry. Though we were aware of the importance of industry to the prison program in earning money and time off for the inmates, as well as the contribution to rehabilitation, it was of equal importance to learn that the products of the industry were not entering the general commercial market and were all being used by various governmental agencies.

On the basis of our observations, we concluded that the Federal judiciary has every reason to have full confidence in the operation of our Federal penal and correctional institutions. The personnel of the Federal system is trying conscientiously to carry out the sentences in the manner that the courts intended. They are also competent by experience and training to perfom the diagnostic studies requested from time to time by the Federal courts under the procedures of section 4208(b).

Recommendations

Such deficiencies as we observed in the course of our inspections were traceable to conditions which cannot be directly controlled by the administration of the Federal system. Deterioration in physical plants, obvious personnel shortages, and deplorable overcrowding are matters relating to appropriations. In order to improve the socially valuable work that is being done in the Federal institutions we would recommend that:

1. The Bureau of Prisons should be given the funds to establish youth institutions especially designed, built and staffed to carry out the full intent of the Federal Youth Corrections Act.

2. The Federal Detention Headquarters in New York City be abandoned and a new and adequately designed institution constructed so that the three general types of prisoners can be segregated: (1) those awaiting bail and trial; (2) those committed and awaiting transfer; (3) those held pursuant to administration procedures.

3. Legislation be enacted to provide a minimum period of compulsory commitment and treatment of the addicts who presently are admitted to the Lexington narcotics hospital on a voluntary basis that permits the staff no control over their period of treatment.

4. The U.S. Public Health Service should explore every means of obtaining additional psychiatrists for the Federal Prison System, especially where younger prisoners are confined.

5. Such visits would seem to be a logical extension of the sentencing institute program. In order that the courts may achieve a more equitable sentencing practice, they should be more completely familiar with what happens to defendants after sentence has been imposed. This would improve the courts' ability to evaluate and use with intelligent discrimination the various sentencing alternatives now available. Every sentencing institute for newly appointed judges should recommend that new judges visit a number of institutions as soon as it is convenient to do so. Thereafter, additional visits be made from time to time. Judges who have been on the bench for some time should visit such institutions from time to time.

Conclusion

The judges of the district of New Jersey feel that their visits to the Federal institutions were well worth the time and effort. We gained a tremendous amount of information and more knowledge of the problems of rehabilitating Federal offenders than we had before. This experience will be highly valuable in sentencing the offenders who come before us. We intend to make more visits of this kind, and it is believed that all judges who do so will find them professionally refreshing and helpful.

It should be pointed out that the final report contained herein was prepared after conference with and suggestions from those who visited all the institutions described: Judge Arthur S. Lane, Judge Anthony T. Augelli and Michael Keller, Jr., clerk of the court.

Respectfully,

THOMAS M. MADDEN,
Chief Judge.

VFW Supports Pay Raise and Other Benefits for Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous technological developments taking place in our Armed Forces, there is an all too frequent tendency to overlook the importance of the most essential ingredient—the personnel of our Armed Forces. I share the opinion of many others in this House that the most important single factor in the defense of our Nation is the personnel who comprise our military services. The officer and enlisted personnel who are serving our Nation and protecting our freedom on land, sea, and air in the United States, as well as distant points of the world, deserve our appreciation and support.

As Members of the House are well aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, consisting of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, is one of the Nation's most effective organizations in supporting our military personnel and protecting the interests of those who are serving and have served in our Armed Forces. The alert action on the part of the VFW and other veterans organizations in legislative and administrative matters pertaining to military personnel, both active and retired, and their dependents, has been of tremendous assistance.

Consequently, it was reassuring, although not surprising, to read the letter of the VFW commander in chief, Byron B. Gentry, to Mr. Leroy Whitman, editor of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register, pledging continued VFW support of military personnel. Commander in Chief Gentry's letter was printed in the January 19, 1963, issue of the Journal and Register. In that letter the VFW commander in chief outlined a few of the key issues of major interest to those in the Armed Forces and explained the VFW's position on these issues.

I am particularly glad to note that Commander Gentry pledged the support of a fair pay bill, and urged that it be passed quickly and given an early effective date. It is encouraging indeed to read Commander in Chief Gentry's forceful statement expressing opposition to proposals to delay the effective date of pay increases for our Armed Forces personnel. His statement that—

It is just not fair that military personnel should have their pay increases delayed, for budgetary purposes, while at the same time Government civilian employees are receiving pay increases granted during the past session of Congress—

Deserves the attention and support of both Congress and the Pentagon.

Also, I am confident that our military personnel, active and retired, and their dependents, will derive a genuine sense of reassurance in noting the clear-cut position of the VFW in support of hospitalization and the PX and commissary systems.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House to Commander in Chief Gentry's letter which is printed in its entirety at the conclusion of these remarks.

VFW COMMANDER STRESSES URGENT NEED FOR QUICK PASSAGE OF FAIR PAY BILL

I take this opportunity to assure you that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States will continue to give full support to constructive legislation in the interest of military personnel, active and retired, and their dependents.

Also, I would like to express on behalf of the 1,300,000 combat veterans comprising the membership of the VFW, our appreciation for the longstanding and effective interest which the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register has taken in matters concerning military personnel.

As a result of resolutions unanimously adopted at our 1962 national convention, the VFW is committed to a definite program in support of military personnel. These resolutions of our national convention, which establish guiding policy in such matters, call for support of commissary and post exchange rights of active and retired military personnel. In this connection, we will urge that action be taken to permit retired members of our Armed Forces full and unlimited post exchange and commissary privileges throughout the world. The VFW does not believe that these military personnel should be deprived of such well deserved entitlements because of local restrictions or monetary policies of countries in which the military installations are located. And certainly, it is vitally necessary that selfish commercial interests are not permitted, directly or indirectly, to undermine or curtail the PX and commissary systems either in the United States or abroad.

We also support continuation of adequate hospitalization and medical facilities for our active and retired military personnel and their dependents. The U.S. Government has a clear-cut obligation in this matter, and there must be no default in providing such services.

As a result, also, of the action of our recent national convention, the VFW vigorously supports legislation for an adequate and fair pay bill for military personnel. In this respect, the VFW is of the firm conviction that while it is an artificiality to compare military service with civilian employment as a basis for determining military pay, it is abundantly clear that military pay scales, both officer and enlisted, are far behind civilian standards of compensation.

We will oppose proposals for undue delay of the effective date of such increases as result from pending legislation. It is just not fair that military personnel should have their pay increases delayed, for budgetary purposes, while at the same time Government civilian employees are receiving pay increases granted during the past session of Congress.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that as an organization composed entirely of oversea combat veterans, the VFW realizes that active duty military personnel are, by the nature of their profession, unable to speak out in protection of their own interests. The VFW believes it understands the problems of our military personnel and we will continue our longstanding policy of supporting the interests of those who are serving and have served in our Armed Forces.

BYRON B. GENTRY,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Roll Out the Barrel (Pork)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is fun for all and something for everybody in the administration budget, in view of the editor of the Rock County Star-Herald of Luverne, Minn. Unfortunately, says Editor Alan McIntosh—

It now seems that we have been pushed, not led, to the precipice of national financial suicide.

I submit his editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

ROLL OUT THE BARREL (PORK)

This administration's war cry which used to be "forward to the New Frontier" seems to be updated to "forward to the abyss."

It now seems that we have been pushed, not led, to the precipice of national financial suicide.

Only a few of the stanchest Democratic leaders in Congress are able to conceal how badly shaken and shocked they are by President Kennedy's $98 billion budget.

This budget, prepared to suit the philosophy of a man who never met a payroll or earned a dollar in his own right, is so ghastly that people are frightened.

The budget is one gigantic "roll out the barrel" pork distribution for everything and everybody with fun for all and something for everyone.

There is brave talk about tax cuts ahead to get our economy moving again. Only someone who still believes in babies being

found in the cabbage patches will fall for that idea. The Government will continue to take away with its left hand what it giveth in tax cuts with its right.

A $98 billion budget is beyond the comprehension of most of us.

Statisticians have translated $100 billion into these terms: $1.62 per second from Christ's birth to date, $1 per second for 3,171 years.

The sum total of all the money spent by the U.S. Government from 1789 through 1930.

It would make a stack of dollar bills 6,774 miles high.

No use lamenting the "good old days" when they ran the entire Government on half a billion dollars. (1900.) Even the extravagant F.D.R., whose peak peacetime budget was $9 billion, would roll over in his grave at the thought of $98 billion.

Those days are gone forever because the defense of America is going to take a lion's share of all our tax dollars * * * and for years to come.

But the need for keeping America strong in its military posture makes it doubly imperative that we bolster America from internal financial collapse.

There is more than a bit of trickery in the defense budget figures inasmuch as more billions of foreign aid are tucked away in the total.

We do not strengthen America by adding 130,000 new employees to Federal payrolls * * * civilian employees having no connection with defense.

We do not strengthen America by doubling the deficit rate from $4 to $8 billion a year.

We do not strengthen America by increasing the civilian payroll from $13.8 to $15.4 billion per year.

We do not strengthen America by taking the attitude that we can afford every bit of do-gooder ventures in socialism just because they "only cost $50 million."

Even the Peace Corps which started out in an itty bitty way now takes a $47 million cut out of the taxpayer and now the wild eyed are talking of a Peace Corps for within America.

The only way this economy can be gotten off dead center is for the Government to set an example of sacrifice instead of that malarkey about "don't ask what the Government can do for you but what you can do for the Government."

Why Should All Other Taxpayers Pay This Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, asking that he disapprove two outlandish proposals now being considered by the Bonneville Power Administration, one of the agencies in his department. In one instance, the agency is proposing to extend its market area to sell power it does not have in an area that has plenty of power at reasonable rates. The taxpayers would be called upon to furnish around $100 million for the extension at a time when our national debt exceeds $300 billion and a deficit of nearly $12 billion is forecast for the next fiscal year. It is unthinkable that any consideration be given to such a proposal at any time, and particularly so when BPA is currently running into the red at a rate in excess of $15 million annually.

The second proposal is to extend the payout period and thus permit a new phony paper accounting through which a large part of the present deficits of the agency could be hidden.

In addition, I understand the two proposals taken together are to provide for setting up a basinwide payout scheme, whereby approval of uneconomic and unjustified reclamation projects would be requested on the basis that they could be paid for in the far distant future from presently nonexistent surplus BPA power revenue.

My letter to the Secretary follows:

JANUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the early days of your administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior, I had the feeling we were poles apart on many features of the Federal power program. However, some of your actions in 1962 lead me to believe that you desire to operate in a manner that will protect the taxpayers' interest and also provide a desirable degree of cooperation with both the private and public utility groups.

Recent articles in the press indicate that the Bonneville Power Administration—one of the Interior agencies—is considering two far-reaching proposals that I believe are neither desirable nor justified. I hope that you will come to the same conclusion.

The first of these is a proposal for a new payout system for Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest that would extend the payout on individual power projects to way beyond the 50-year payout periods currently in use.

When the funds for the construction of the Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest were approved by the Appropriations Committee and the Congress, it certainly was with the understanding that repayments would be based on a 50-year payout period. To now change the basis for repayment of the taxpayers' money appropriated for these power projects would not be keeping faith with the Nation's taxpayers.

The present Bonneville power rate is the lowest in the Nation. This low rate was only made possible by the use of—

1. Over $2½ billion in taxpayers' money.
2. Interest charge below interest cost of long-term U.S. bonds.
3. No local, State, or Federal tax charge.
4. Excessive allocation of Federal project costs to nonpower uses.

Even with this subsidized low rate, Bonneville is currently operating at an annual deficit in excess of $15 million. Bonneville contends that it will be ahead of scheduled payout by around $6 million as of the end of the present fiscal year. Actually, if the payout was based on a proper interest charge in keeping with actual interest cost on long-term U.S. bonds, as it should be, there would be a deficit in payout of around $100 million.

The Bonneville proposal for a change in the payout basis appears to be an attempt to show a paper reduction in Bonneville's tremendous annual losses. I am surprised that Bonneville would put forth such a proposal.

The Bonneville Act provides for making periodic examination of Bonneville power rates to see that the required revenue to meet the payout is obtained. It seems to me Bonneville should be spending its time, not on studies of how to hide its present losses but on studies of what increases in rates are necessary to provide for the actual interest cost on and the repayment of the taxpayers' funds provided for the Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest. Personally, I think Bonneville power rates should also provide for in-lieu-of-tax payments to Federal, State, and local treasuries, equivalent to those being assessed against private utilities.

I am sure that you will not approve this outlandish proposal by Bonneville before it has been considered by the proper committees of Congress.

I cannot believe that the people in the Seventh Congressional District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent, as well as the people in most other areas of our Nation, should be called upon to help provide lower-than-cost power for the Pacific Northwest. Surely, if the Missouri River Basin power rate of 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour and the Colorado River Basin power rate of 6 mills can be absorbed in those areas, there can be no justification for trying to juggle figures in an attempt to justify holding the present BPA rate at a little over 2 mills.

The second Bonneville proposal relates to a proposed extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. From the press reports, it appears that Bonneville and Bureau of Reclamation officials have held a number of public hearings in Idaho to build up support for their scheme. At such hearings, the Federal officials were forced to admit that no economic analysis had been made in the matter. Also, according to the press, an Idaho State official has labeled the proposed BPA report "an absolute farce" and said that the report was being made without the necessary background data.

I can agree with the Idaho State official that the BPA proposal is a farce of considerable magnitude, when by Bonneville's own admission it will be short of firm power in its present market area by 1965, and that there are estimated to be increasing deficits in firm power with the total reaching over a million kilowatts by 1970.

The extension of BPA power into southern Idaho appears to be coupled with a proposal for a sort of basinwide payout of reclamation projects to be accomplished by administrative action.

In my opinion, neither of these Bonneville proposals is justified in itself. Taken together, they constitute a brazen attempt to achieve by administrative action some very questionable end results not considered or approved by the Congress. It is an attempt to hide part of Bonneville's large annual deficit, on the one hand, and on the other hand, to achieve a basinwide payout system to secure approval of regionwide projects on the claim that they can be paid for from theoretical surplus BPA power revenue in some far distant future.

In order that the other Members of Congress and the people of the Nation may be made aware of what these two bureaucratic agencies in your Department are proposing, I am inserting this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope you can advise me that no serious consideration will be given either of these proposals.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Thomas Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine

Workers of America, died January 19 at his home in Hazleton, Pa. He was a labor leader of the first rank; one who, over a long period of years, saw his industry and the union movement grow and increase in strength.

Among the many tributes sent to Mr. Kennedy's widow are the following comments from the men who had worked with him for many years:

The passing of President Thomas Kennedy has left a vast void within the ranks of our organization. He, for more than half a century, devoted his life in promoting economic benefits through legislation and collective bargaining which has brought about workmen's compensation laws, pensions, unemployment insurance, safety laws, increased wages, and improved working conditions to the coal miners and the working men and women of America. His voice was always raised publicly and privately in the legislative halls of the States and the U.S. Congress in behalf of a better America and a better way of life for all its citizens. He served with distinction as Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and on many governmental boards to which he was appointed by the Presidents of the United States. He represented the United Mine Workers as a delegate to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the Miners' International Federation while giving his vast knowledge and strength as one of the executive officers of our international union. His leadership was recognized by all who came in contact with him. He was admired and respected not only by the coal miners but the coal operators as well. His passing is a tremendous loss to our union and its membership. He was a gentleman, a labor statesman, and a great American. In behalf of our membership, we extend to you and the members of his family our sincere sympathy.

UNITED MINE WORKERS
OF AMERICA,
JOHN L. LEWIS,
President Emeritus.
W. A. BOYLE,
Acting President.
JOHN OWENS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Washington: Mostly Boondoggling and Brassy Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Charles Dancey.

WASHINGTON: MOSTLY BOONDOGGLING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—There's not a thin dime that can be cut from the new, mammoth U.S. budget, you know, without sabotaging America in the cold war or wrecking our national security. It is the pure necessity of this bitter struggle for peace that makes a $98 to $99 billion budget absolutely essential even with an also essential tax cut—so we must just accept a $10 billion-and-up deficit.

Sure, it's all essential.

Like the new airport at Pekin for private planes, and perhaps one at Peoria, too, and in other cities and towns across the Nation. This is an urgent problem, friends.

And the new Federal buildings, each costing millions, that are sprouting up in LYNDON JOHNSON'S native Austin, Tex., and all across that fair State, nowadays—everywhere, that is, except in booming Dallas, Tex., where they have admittedly had a desperate need for new facilities and Federal agencies are scattered all over creation.

Republican Dallas can get along without, while Democratic Fort Worth, just next door, will join the list of other cities with much less urgency who will get new Federal buildings in this essential, "pared to the bone" budget just submitted.

Fort Worth, Austin, and so forth can get along without just as easily, and in most cases more easily than Dallas, and we fail to see how this multimillion-dollar boondoggle in Texas is going to get us to the moon faster, save the free world, or frighten the Russians.

Tragically, every cost control expert and major executive in any business in the land, large and small, knows that this very carefree attitude on "little" costs is precisely what accumulates into a fiscal disaster.

Sure, we want some, too. If they aren't going to leave it here, we want some of our money to come back here. We're sick and tired of leading the pack in paying taxes and being the tail-ender of all the 50 States of the Union in getting any of it back.

But that practical reality doesn't mean we have to pretend that this huge budget and its huge accepted deficit is really made up of life-or-death expenditures for the Nation.

It is just not the truth. It is armpit deep in politics and special interests—as usual.

AND BRASSY HYPOCRISY

The funniest thing in Washington these days is the screaming that goes up from the administration Democrats (that's just one of several categories) over Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN'S comment about the need for investigating the Cuban invasion attempt to set the historical record straight.

"No partisan investigation," they screech. "Nothing political." Yessiree, any political, partisan, or not completely objective investigation would be indecent, improper, and immoral.

So, they just want to let the record ride on the investigation that WAS made, and the beautifully "impartial" report that has just been made by said chief investigator, that impartial, objective, disinterested, nonpartisan, nonpolitical, noncontroversial young man—the President's brother, campaign manager, and Attorney General, Bobby Kennedy. The perfect, fair minded, unprejudiced investigator, obviously.

What classic, open-faced, brassy hypocrisy it is now to protest piously against any partisan or political investigation.

What the devil do they think we have just had?

The Chenango Union Comments on President Kennedy's Tax-Cutting Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House begin their study of President Kennedy's 1964 budget, together with his proposals for substantial tax cuts to get our economy moving again, I commend to their attention the following thoughtful editorial from the Chenango Union, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in my district and indeed in the entire upstate New York area. The editorial appeared in the issue of January 24, 1963.

THAT BUDGET

The big newspapers are making a fuss over the President's budget. They keep asking how you can cut taxes and yet let the Government spend more money. Every big newspaper runs notices of sales of merchandise at cut prices. There would be no such sales if they didn't bring in more money. Cut taxes and you increase the number of taxpayers. The money left in the hands of the citizens will be spent. Every added transaction will bring in more taxes.

We have a certain number of people who have more money than they can use. Some of them will not invest in new industries or even to promote the growth of established industries. Our President intends to get some of that kind of money into circulation. The value of a dollar is usually measured by what you can get for it. Another measure is by what you can make it earn. Idle money earns nothing.

Without squeezing more dollars out of people who do not have enough the President intends to use the economic sinews of the Nation to get things moving in high gear. He knows what makes wheels go and what makes them stop. We are not making as much money as we should because we have too many people who will not spend some to make more. The President believes in a dynamic economy. Those big words mean let's put our money to work.

We have been plagued by strikes. Merchants, in cities, lose business because there are no newspapers to announce their sales. Other cities suffer from clogged traffic arteries because there are no public means of transportation. Docks have been loaded with merchandise that could not be moved. The unwillingness of some people to spend money in order to make more money has been a factor in most of these situations.

We do not say that labor is always justified in its demands. But when thousands of workers go without pay, for a long time, there must be some reason. Our President has made it clear that he will crack down on labor when it gets unreasonable. He proves himself to be a true friend to labor by proposals that will increase employment by increasing private purchasing power.

We have plenty of money in the United States of America. A man may have plenty of blood and yet die because his heart stops pumping to make the blood move. The President is asking the Congress to function with pulsating power to invigorate our economy. He wants all of that American money to be working for the American people. We hope our Congressmen get with the idea.

Federal Bar Association's "Justice" Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of Congress will be pleased to learn about a new series of radio programs entitled "Justice" which has been inaugurated by NBC Radio Monitor in

cooperation with the Federal Bar Association.

For about 26 weeks on Saturday or Sunday, on approximately 200 stations around the country, millions of listeners will hear how the Government agencies safeguard the rights of all citizens.

The "Justice" series is intended to give listeners a more intimate knowledge of the various law enforcement agencies in the Federal Government from the Secret Service agent protecting the life of the President to the Food and Drug inspector protecting the interests of the corner drugstore shopper. The objective is to generate a greater respect for the law and those who enforce it by presenting a fuller understanding of the work of these Government agencies.

The National Broadcasting Co., Inc. is to be highly commended for this important public service. I want to especially mention the following representatives of NBC whose vision and creativity made this series possible: Howard Monderer, Esq., NBC Washington attorney and member of the Radio and Television Subcommittee of the Law Observance Committe of the Federal Bar Association; Russ Ward, NBC commentator; Ted Steele, NBC commenator; Bob Mauer, executive producer of Monitor; and Robert Wogan, director, programs, NBC radio network.

My distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD E. LANKFORD, who is the national president of the Federal Bar Association, is to be congratulated on the work of the association's law observance committee, which arranged the series.

Address of Administrator John E. Horne of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, recently addressed the 21st annual convention of the Mid-South Farm Equipment Association in Memphis, Tenn. Mr. Horne in an excellent speech pointed out some of the services of the Small Business Administration and how the SBA is helping the small business community. He points out that our private free enterprise system requires the existence of a strong small business community.

He then tells some of the ways in which the SBA has contributed to the strengthening of the small business segment of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues who are interested in knowing more about the work and operations of the Small Business Administration and others interested in SBA will find Mr. Horne's speech quite informative.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS PREPARED BY JOHN E. HORNE, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE 21ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MID-SOUTH FARM EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATION, INC., HOTEL PEABODY, MEMPHIS, TENN., MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1963

Good morning, it is a pleasure to be with you, and at the very outset I want to express thanks to your executive director, Thad Caraway, for inviting me here on behalf of your association.

As one who was born on a farm in Clayton, Ala., and can recall the days of horse-drawn plows and reapers, and the fields of cotton that were picked by hand, I am continually gratified and amazed at the vast changes that have come to the farm since I was a boy.

In 1910, there were about 24 million horses and mules and only about 1,000 tractors on farms in the United States. Today, there are some 5 million tractors and only 3 million horses and mules.

In my opinion at least, modern mechanized equipment has done as much for farming as rockets and satellites have accomplished for space science. We now have things down on the farm—"pop-up" bale loaders, straw choppers, "sure-feed" seeders, chisel plows, tillage tools, and whatnots, that would have startled farmers right out of their boots, except that most of them didn't wear boots, if they had even heard about them 40 or 50 years ago.

We have in the United States the most efficient and productive agricultural plant in the world. One American farmer today produces enough, on the average, to supply the food and fiber needs of 27 people.

As Secretary of Agricultulture Orville Freeman pointed out in a recent speech, farm income has improved substantially, even since 1960. He said that net income from farming averaged $373 higher per farm in 1961 as compared to 1960, and according to his figures, total net farm income in 1961 increased by $1.1 billion over the previous year.

It is clear that our farm production is in better balance with our markets and needs than for many years. It also is clear that farmers constantly require additional tools and machinery with which to work their fields or produce their dairy and meat products.

New and better farm equipment is coming off the assembly lines every day. You are the people who buy this equipment from the manufacturers, so you are more aware than I of the progress that is being made in farm machinery and methods. You also are the people who sell this equipment to the farmers, and so are well familiar with their needs.

I am told that many of you are anxious to expand and modernize your businesses.

To do so, you may be in need of financial assistance. In this and in other areas, the programs of the Small Business Administration may be of deep interest to you. Before discussing these programs, though, let us examine briefly how the small businessman fits into our country's overall economic picture today.

When we speak of "American business," we are speaking largely, in numerical terms at least, of small business. Of all the business firms in operation in this country, more than 4½ million, or some 95 percent, are "small." And they account for about 45 percent of the Nation's employment and 40 percent of our total business activity.

During fiscal year 1962, there was a net nationwide increase of 40,000 firms, the vast majority of them being small independent concerns. In the first 7 months of 1962, more than 112,000 new businesses were incorporated, 3.4 percent more than during the same period of last year. Business failures declined in every major industry category, and particularly in manufacturing and the retail trades.

Many business statistics bear a particular relevance to small firms. Retail sales reached an alltime high in October. For the nearly 2 million retailers this figure, like the high levels of personal income and of personal consumption expenditures, is encouraging news. A larger percentage of the gross national product has in recent years been attributed to the service industries which are predominantly characterized by small businessmen and are traditionally strong in adaptability, service and specialization.

I view these developments as encouraging news for the small business community.

Our private free enterprise system, which is basic to our liberty and to our prosperity, demands the existence of a strong and vigorous small business segment of the economy.

This is where the Small Business Administration comes in. This agency was established by Congress, not to dominate or control, but to provide the kind of services which will encourage and support the growth of small firms throughout the Nation.

We have four major areas of activity. They are, our financial assistance programs; our procurement programs; our management counseling services; and our activities as the small business spokesman in the executive branch.

First, let us take our lending activities. More than 9,000 loans for over half a billion dollars have been approved by SBA during the first 18 months of this administration, double the amount during the previous year and a half.

Several measures have been taken to speed up loan processing and otherwise to improve our lending procedures. The most recent was last September, when SBA and the American Bankers Association announced a new cooperative lending program which opened a significant new source of intermediate-term loans for small companies. Under this program, banks will lend 50 percent or more of approved loans and will receive repayment of their share of the loan before SBA is paid its share of the loan.

The chief purpose of this plan is to enable banks to participate in loans of up to 10 years.

This is simply the most recent step in our continuing efforts to increase participation with the banking community so as to make more adequate financing available to small businesses.

As you know, it is SBA's policy to supplement the bank, rather than to replace it, or to compete with it, in making loans to small companies. We actually have a requirement that before a small businessman can get a direct loan from us, he must be unable to obtain the financing from a private lender. We are pleased that about two-thirds of our loans are made with bank participation.

I want to emphasize, however, that we have the authority to make loans directly, and to approve the full amount of the loan. Thus, if for some reason a bank will not or cannot make a loan or any part of it, we will make the full loan if it is a sound and eligible application.

SBA has made a number of loans, many with excellent bank participation, to farm equipment dealers in your area.

For example, in one small town we made a $50,000 loan with 25-percent bank participation to a dealer who needed the funds for working capital. We made him this loan at 4-percent interest, since he was located in an area of substantial unemployment. Our regular rate of interest is 5½ percent.

Another one of our loans went to a tractor company in Mississippi which had outgrown its building space and was using its parking lot for machinery and equipment.

This firm borrowed $25,000 which it will use to construct a new building.

Thus, if you are in need of a loan and for some reason can't negotiate with the bank, you may want to visit one of our field offices. To try to give you personalized and convenient service, we have set up 60 field offices from coast to coast, and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. In Tennessee, you will find one in Nashville and Knoxville. There also is one in Jackson, Miss.; Louisville, Kansas City, and St. Louis, and Little Rock.

In addition to our regular business loans, we give financial aid to victims of major disasters. We are also authorized to make loans to small business concerns, which have suffered substantial economic injury because of drought or excessive rainfall in their areas. This means that any dealer in an area officially designated as a disaster area because of either excessive rainfall or drought, may borrow money from SBA at 3 percent interest to tide him over until the farmers are in a better position to meet their debts.

You are all familiar, I am sure, with the financial aid we give to victims of major disasters, such as floods and storms. We have made a number of disaster loans in the Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Missouri, and Mississippi area.

Our lending programs also extend to the more than 630 small business investment companies throughout the Nation. Fifteen of these companies are located in Tennessee, Missouri, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

These small business investment companies, in many cases supplementing their own investments with funds borrowed from SBA, fill a great need in providing long-term loans or equity financing to small business. A larger firm can sell stock or borrow long-term money at reasonable interest rates from a private lender. A small businessman, as you know, usually cannot meet the cost of a public sale of stock, and private financing institutions have traditionally been reluctant to make such long-term commitments. Under the small business investment companies program, the small firm may be able to obtain either long-term debt or equity financing, or both.

Latest figures show that the small business investment companies have capital and surplus of more than half a billion dollars and have made over $300 million in loans and investments to 4,200 small firms.

Small business investment companies are making and will, I hope, continue to make highrisk investment. This they must do if they are to fulfill their function of helping small business concerns needing ten, fifty or a hundred thousand dollars or more on a longterm basis to expand their businesses or to promote new markets. These are the firms which, up until the establishment of the small business investment companies program in 1958, had literally no place to go to obtain the longterm financing they required to meet their problems. As a result, they either had to find a partner or several partners or somehow generate their own funds, a slow and frequently unsuccessful procedure.

Now, I would like to review briefly some of our other services in which you might have a special interest. Lack of sound management practices constitutes the greatest single cause of small business failures, and we are endeavoring to help small firms overcome this difficulty. One of the ways we are doing this is through our management counseling programs. One such program includes management courses which are usually cosponsored with universities or colleges.

During the past 2 years we have greatly increased the number of these courses. To date, more than 50,000 small businessmen have taken these courses throughout the Nation.

In addition, we have a great number of publications which you may obtain from our field offices. We finance management research studies as another aspect of our counseling services.

For example, we financed a management research summary on farm equipment retailing in Louisiana. This summary has just been released. While the research was done by persons affiliated with Louisiana State University, I believe the contents pertains sufficiently to your areas to be of interest to you.

The study shows that in 1960 the State of Louisiana had 214 retail farm equipment dealers who sold about $60 million worth of farm machinery. Farm expenditures for gasoline and other fuel amounted to another $20 million.

Information received from questionnaires showed that on the average, 56 percent of a firm's business was realized from equipment sales, 24 percent from spare parts, and 20 percent from the service department.

About half of the firms sampled said they started with some borrowed capital, and more than half also borrowed part of their annual operating capital. Very few of the firms leased equipment to farmers, but interest in this practice appeared to be growing.

The study was made to obtain data that might lead to a better understanding of the farm equipment retail business, which is an important segment of Louisiana's economy. You may obtain copies of the full report from the Louisiana Agricultural Experimental Station at Louisiana State University.

Perhaps you are familiar with our set-aside program for small business through which we assist small firms to obtain a fair share of Government contracts. If you sell or have a desire to sell to the Government, you will want to explore the possibilities of this program.

Regardless of what the product is, the Government is doing its best to see that the small firms get full opportunity to share in Government business, and this includes everyone, from the businessman who sells office equipment to the manufacturer who makes airplane parts.

And I also wish to point out that the Small Business Administration acts as spokesman for the small business community in the councils of Government.

As you may know, one of the first things President Kennedy did after he took office was to establish a White House Committee on Small Business. This Committee, of which I am Chairman, includes representatives of the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Justice, Labor, and Treasury, and the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Trade Commission, the General Services Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Among other proposals, the committee thought it would be a good idea to hold tax clinics for small businessmen. And this we are doing jointly with the Internal Revenue Service. Kansas City and St. Louis, Mo., are among the cities in which these 1-day clinics are scheduled to be held this month.

SBA is constantly seeking new and proper avenues of assistance to help the small businessman to grow and prosper.

And for good reason.

Small business is part of our individualistic, independent way of life, one of the distinctions between this Nation's free and open society and a totalitarian state.

Small business constitutes a large and diversified source of employment opportunities. They serve the public interest by helping to preserve competition and to insure high quality and reasonable prices.

They can perform some services better than large firms. They are frequently the source of new products and new methods. And, since small business is dispersed throughout the country, it becomes vitally significant in times of national emergency.

In conclusion, I want to leave these thoughts:

1. If you need counseling or other assistance, see our representatives at our field offices. The Small Business Administration exists solely to help you and other small businessmen.

2. The Small Business Administration and the national administration, President Kennedy and his Cabinet, are friendly to business, including small business. This, I think, is made clear by several things, but especially by the new tax depreciation tables, the tax investment credit program, and now by the proposed new tax reduction.

3. Finally, I read in a recent issue of your monthly magazine that the farm equipment business has improved 100 percent in the Midsouth in the last 3 years and that the outlook for the coming year is for further increases. This prediction ties in with an overall favorable outlook for a moderate business rise this year. Certainly, I wish you success in obtaining a good share of it.

How To Approach Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. C. Warfield, a constituent of mine from Bemidji, Minn., has supplied me with a copy of a very interesting article. I would like to share it with my colleagues today. The article appears in Span, the Standard Oil Co. publication, and was written by our former colleague, Frank N. Ikard. His appropriate remarks are drawn from his experiences during the 10 years he represented the 13th Congressional District of Texas. I respectfully submit his article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOW TO APPROACH YOUR CONGRESSMAN

(By Frank N. Ikard)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Many Americans have a sincere desire to have more of a voice in National Government than voting, but confess a lack of understanding as to how and when to communicate effectively with Congressmen. We asked Frank N. Ikard to provide some suggestions from a Congressman's point of view. Now executive vice president of the American Petroleum Institute, Mr. Ikard for 10 years represented the 13th Congressional District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives. His views follow.)

People have wanted to know how to influence Congressmen since the first days of our Republic. In recent years, even Madison Avenue has come into the act. Instructions, bulletins, pamphlets, and recommendations in depth have poured out from New York and Washington headquarters of various organizations to the grassroots level, urging each member to "write his Congressman" on issues affecting the organization.

As a Member of Congress for 10 years, including 6 on the Ways and Means Committee, I was on the receiving end of this barrage of response.

My recommendations for effective communications are simple: (1) Know your Congressman; (2) know your subject; and (3) know the procedure to follow.

1. Know your Congressman. If you don't, it is your own fault; a Congressman is about

the easiest public servant to meet. Up for reelection every other year, he has little time to mend fences, work up grassroots support, or find material support. He must continually maintain all of these prerequisites. If he ever loses these contacts, he will be replaced by a new man who has been "out meeting the people."

When he does get back to his district, he is eager to meet as many constituents as possible. He wants to know you and your problems even more than you want to know him. Next time your Congressman comes home, go to his office and meet him. Then, later, when you get in touch with him, he will have a personal feeling about your problems.

This applies to every constituent, regardless of party. Suppose you are a Republican and your Congressman a Democrat who knows you have not supported him in the past. Get to know him, anyway. More votes cast in the House and Senate cross party lines than those cast strictly along party lines. Your Congressman represents all his district, Democrats and Republicans alike. He desires to please all his people all the time, even though he knows this is impossible. Because you are on the opposite side, he should be doubly eager to find some common ground to win your support. To the true professional in politics, the best way to destroy one's enemies is to make friends out of them.

Don't fall out with him because, he doesn't vote your way on every issue. Keep your eye on the main issue. Suppose, for instance, your principal interest is legislation on the taxation of cooperatives. After discussing it with your Congressman, if you feel you see eye to eye on it, don't ruin this beautiful relationship by writing him a nasty letter when he votes for a new dam in the West, or more public housing in the East. You don't know what his commitments are on these subjects. Give him the benefit of the doubt. He will appreciate it.

2. Know your subject. Of the sackful of mail hauled into a Congressman's office every morning, only about 1 letter in 25 will be from a constituent who really knows his subject. The Congressman has, at best, only 3 or 4 staff members to answer about 300 letters a day. They can't tarry trying to explain in detail what the facts are, because tomorrow will bring in another 300 letters. So, the misinformed letterwriter receives a vague but pleasant stock reply that pleases no one, including the Congressman.

In 1962, the Senate Finance Committee was holding hearings on a tax bill that would have withheld, at the source, a percentage of interest and dividends. Senators on the committee averaged as many as 3,000 to 5,000 letters a day on this issue. They were appalled to learn from these letters that many of their constituents didn't know they already owe income tax on their interest and dividends. Their indignation only emphasized what the Treasury Department contended all along: that many citizens, through ignorance, were not paying this tax.

So, if you don't know your subject, your letter could do more harm than good.

The best evidence, as in court, is your own personal experience. Base your request on what you know from your own experience. Give your Congressman facts and figures clearly and concisely. Tell him how the issue would affect your own business.

One good source of information is your trade organization. Most of them have staffs in Washington who keep a constant stream of advice pouring out on every subject that would affect your business or organization. They're not always infallible, but on the whole, they do a good job in keeping you informed about what is happening in Washington.

3. Know the procedures to follow. Let us assume your primary issue is taxation of cooperatives. Your Congressman is, let us say, a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As such, he attends daily committee meetings from 10 a.m. until Congress convenes at noon. He's an expert on subjects under consideration by his committee, but not necessarily on other matters. From noon until about 6 p.m. he is on the floor of the House where legislation being voted upon requires his presence, or else he is back meeting with his committee. After 6 p.m. he gets a chance to read and sign the answers to today's 300 letters. Even putting in a 10- to 12-hour day, he won't know too much about the taxation of cooperatives, which is under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

Therefore, put your problem on a personal basis. He is a lot more interested in you and your financial well-being than in the impersonal problem of a general tax bill, which is the task of the Ways and Means Committee. He rarely knows what a bill will contain (unles it arises in his own committee) until the proper committee reports it out favorably. Often the bill reported out by the committee only faintly resembles the bill originally introduced. So, why should he waste time studying legislation before it is being considered in committee?

Let's go back to your letter about taxation of cooperatives. Ask your Congressman to discuss it with your regional representative on the Ways and Means Committee. Each Member elected to that committee represents a region of the United States. For instance, on the committee I represented not only Texas, but New Mexico, as well. Therefore, ask your own Congressman to consider your request, and, if he approves, to discuss it personally with the member on the Ways and Means Committee who represents your area. This is the most effective way to bring your position on an issue to the attention of the members of the proper committee. You may, of course, write directly to the members of the committee where the bill is pending. But you may not receive an answer. I tried to answer such letters from my region. But my first consideration was to letters that came from my friends and constituents in the 13th District of Texas, and to letters referred to me by my colleagues representing other districts in my region.

A constituent who follows the procedure I have recommended has not only the weight of his own testimony, in his letter, but the added persuasion of his Congressman's endorsement. Remember, it is your Congressman, regardless of his political affiliation or committee assignment, who will cast that vote on the floor of the House eventually. Also, by proceeding through him, you avoid the appearance of bypassing him in appealing to the members of the committee "over his head." Some Congressmen consider this an affront.

Timing is also very important. Write to your Congressman when the bill is pending in committee. Do not wait until the bill is brought to the floor. The place to "kill" a measure or amend it favorably is in committee. Your Congressman will be helpless if your appeal reaches him after the bill has been reported from the committee to the floor. This is particularly true in matters arising in Ways and Means Committee, because most of these bills are brought to the floor under a closed rule: no amendments can be offered from the floor.

Don't wait until a measure has already passed the House and is pending in the Senate committee. About all your Congressman can do then is refer you to your two Senators, who may not be in a position to assist you. A Senator, representing a whole State, has commitments to many more varied and conflicting interests than does your Congressman.

In general, here are some do's and don'ts:

Do try to talk to him personally about your legislation. If this is impossible, write his a letter with your business letterhead printed, and your name signed legibly or typed at the bottom. Keep it simple and personal. Show by facts and figures how you, yourself, will be affected. A letter is better than a telegram. Each day a Congressman may get from 20 to 50 telegrams, urging his vote for or against legislation. Many of them don't give enough information about either the constituent or the bill he's interested in. And the Congressman and his staff don't have much time to dig up this information, especially toward adjournment.

If your Congressman pleases you with his vote on any issue, write him and tell him so. After each rollcall vote on any major issue, Congressmen are braced for a deluge of mail from displeased constituents. Those who agree seldom express their approval.

About half of a Congressmman's mail pertains to things the constitutent wants done. The other half consists of requests to vote a certain way on legislation. The conscientious Congressman—and most are—tries tto fulfill all these requests. Once in a great while, he receives a letter thanking him. When he has voted your way, write and thank him. He will remember.

Don't feel your letter would impose on your Congressman. As long as he gets letters from home, he knows he is on the right wave length. If the mail drops off, he begins to wonder which fences have broken down. He wants to know what his constituency is thinking.

I have purposely ignored "pressure mail." This type of approach is of very little benefit to your cause. The Congressman cannot completely ignore it. But in the long run it carries very little weight, and sometimes it defeats its own purpose.

It is the straightforward letter that commands your Congressman's respect. He never tires of hearing from constituents who can contribute to the welfare of the Nation. He knows he is their voice in Washington. Your Congressman is profoundly influenced by your opinions.

How Much Is That Tax Cut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while a lot of folks in Illinois are busily deciding how they might spend their share of the highly propagandized tax cut this year, the administration is trying to pull the rug out from under them. Many of our solid, homeowning citizens will find themselves without that extra spending ability and some with even less than before if this Congress supports the proposed tax program. The January 25, 1963, editorial in the Peoria Journal Star, expresses my sentiments:

HOW MUCH IS THAT TAX CUT ANYWAY?

President Kennedy's proposed tax cut is beginning to look like a real slash—right across the wrists of everybody who itemizes his deductions.

It took quite a while for the administration to ballyhoo how great a break it was going to give us taxpayers and we were on cloud 9 over the whole thing. But we fell back to earth yesterday.

We would have to see a copy of the new income tax form Kennedy has in mind before we could even guess how much of a tax cut it would mean for a person who itemizes his deductions, but we don't have to wait any longer to see that his cut is going to be a lot less than the one proposed for the majority of people who take the Government's standard deduction allowance.

We can expect that the Kennedy proposal will be recast a great deal by Congress, and we hope that our Congressmen can see that striking at those who itemize their deductions is striking at those who are carrying the heaviest tax burdens right now.

The average itemizer is the owner of a home with a heavy mortgage and a heavy real estate bill. The fact that these costs are deductible gives him a break on his income taxes—just about the only break he gets from anybody. Now J.F.K. would take that break away.

We have yet to see any explanation for this except that the administration wants more people to use the short form to cut down on the expense of collecting the tax.

This is bureaucratic thinking at its best. In order to save $1 on 5 million returns, it would set up a system which would discriminate against 5 million people to the tune of $100 apiece.

Firsthand Report of a Recent Trip Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we can always gain information from those of our citizens who travel around the world and take time to make reports concerning their visits to foreign lands as in the case of Mr. Calvin K. Katter, of Minneapolis, Minn.

He addressed a letter to the Wanderer published in St. Paul and it was printed in the January 10, 1963, issue. In my opinion, Mr. Katter proves himself to be a very observing traveler. His letter follows:

FIRSTHAND REPORT OF A RECENT TRIP AROUND THE WORLD

EDITOR, THE WANDERER:

My wife and I have just returned from a trip around the world, visiting 30 countries, including a visit last summer behind the Iron Curtain. We drove along the wall in West Berlin and saw the crosses and flowers where many have been killed. While we did not actually get into Poland, we did spend some time in other satellite countries. On the first day there, we were assisted by a young lady, a Government tourist guide. She extended us every courtesy and we had no difficulties at any time. However, as we had some knowledge of their language and many of their people speak English, we were permitted to travel after that pretty much on our own. This gave us more opportunity to mix with the people.

People were friendly and approached us in museums, on the streets, and in cafes and restaurants. We traveled by bus, streetcars, boats, trains, and by plane. Usually, after some introductory remarks, we talked freely with the people on many subjects.

Generally, sooner or later, someone would ask the questions of us: "Why does your Government and/or State Department or, in some cases, certain officials coddle and favor Communist governments?" Some stated: "Your Government policies must be soft on communism, or why do you help them?" They had no reservations about letting us know they were not in sympathy with our aid to Communist governments, thereby keeping them in power, since such aid was not helping their people.

We found it difficult to give them a satisfactory answer, particularly after witnessing all the anti-American propaganda activities in these countries.

Americans simply have no idea of the immensity of the anti-American campaign being conducted constantly by Communist sources. On one Government tour we visited a large museum in a capital city. One long wall covered with anti-American propaganda for all to see—called to our attention by Hollanders, English and others on the tour.

There are more bookstores in these countries than drugstores in the United States, and all are peddling the Communist philosophy. These Communist countries also supply magazines, periodicals, literature, free, via their embassies, hotels, libraries, and public places in Asia, Africa, and the Orient as well, which carriers a tremendous amount of anti-American material. I picked up a news magazine in a satellite airport and was shocked at the anti-American caricatures. Every phase of American life is covered. Unemployment, capitalistic profits, racial tension, etc. The information of course, is false or so twisted as to give false impressions, but how are these readers to know that? Every dollar spent on Communist products helps to support this vicious anti-American program.

Another question: "Didn't we know that the major part of all our foreign-bound production is taken by the Communist governments to use as they please?" For example, food is actually taken and being shipped to Cuba in spite of its scarcity in the satellite countries. (Actually these countries have been and are being sacked by Russia.)

After seeing the conditions under which these people have to live; after seeing the standing lines of people waiting to buy the simple staples of existence—such as meat, milk, eggs, butter—which we were told are sometimes not available for days or even weeks—I wouldn't accept a Polish ham as a gift. If the Polish people have surplus meat, why isn't it directed to other satellites where meat is in such short supply? Why is it directed to the United States to compete with our farmers when millions of their own people are going hungry? Moreover, we have learned that the Polish Government has an arms contract to furnish war material to the Government of North Vietnam. This material is killing our allies in South Vietnam as well as their American advisers.

Question No. 3: "What about the racial problems in the United States?" Communist propaganda never lets up on this one. Newspapers carried full-page stories, complete with photographs, of the James Meredith episode in Mississippi the day after it happened. When we carefully explained that a few million Negroes in the United States drive and own more cars than 220 million Russians, and that the American Negro in our country takes home more pay than the average European, they were flabbergasted. We couldn't tell them that many of our Negroes have a living standard that they, the Europeans have never dreamed of.

Eastern Europe is an economic poorhouse by any standards, both as to quantity and quality.

At one large city, we waited an hour at the depot for a taxi that never came, and then were advised that taxes must be ordered a day in advance. While shopping, we were appalled at the number of people who came into the shops to sell rings, jewelry, dishes, china, to get money to buy food. Valuable art objects are padlocked in owners' homes to be "reserved" for the State. In one large city, a Lutheran church was made into a wine museum. The people have very little to say about anything.

In our humble opinion, when these nations provide the means for free elections and the people can select their own governments, that will be sufficient time to deal with their elected governments and negotiate on items of which they might have a surplus and which do not take employment from our own people.

In early August we were in Istanbul. On a boat trip up the Bosphorus, a Turkish professor who spoke good English told us that as many as 12 Russian freighters a day were passing through the Dardanelles. Most of these, he said, were loaded with war materials and other trouble-making equipment against the free world. Where does the payment for these war materials come from? Certainly not from Castro. He explained at length how it comes from out of the hides of the Russian and satellite peoples.

A few days later the papers in Greece carried the story of the Egyptian plane forced to land in Greeec for violating Greek territory. On board was $1 million in American gold bound for Yugoslavia, you can guess where it went from there—so whom are we helping?

Newspapers in the Orient carried press reports of serious food riots in Russia with many killed. Another one-half-page account told of the thousands of Rumanian "objectors" who have been liquidated in the past 10 years.

Communism is a tragic failure everywhere you look. It is kept in power by ruthless suppression. Their people told us frankly, we the free nations are their only hope; so why should our country help this diabolical masquerade? Why should Americans contribute to the torture of enslaved masses?

Karl Marx's life was a tragic failure. His children died of malnutrition, his wife died for lack of medical care. In his lifetime he earned less money to support his family than the average man of his day earned in a few months. He was kept alive by gifts and donations from Engels and others on a meager, bare subsistence level. This man is the dreamer—the schemer who is communism's symbol of success.

Communism is costing free nations billions of dollars that could be used to build schools, educational facilities, hospitals, roads, industries in many undeveloped nations. We saw many such opportunities in Africa, Asia, and the Orient. We visited many missionaries and mission stations of all denominations and have seen the phenomenal works of these groups. We've seen thousands of children and teenagers who have had an opportunity to get an education through these mission educational facilities. We visited hospitals, too. The American people can be proud of these groups and also of our embassies who are trying to help these less fortunate nations. These mission groups serve without reservation or political motives and, according to local businessmen and government officials, are among our best ambassadors abroad.

America could use many more thousands of these who get to and help the people with no strings attached.

Our best day abroad was the day the United States announced the blockade of Cuba, while we were in Hong Kong. Recognized as Americans, we were stopped on the street and

congratulated with "Hurrah for the U.S.A." and "America is finally waking up."

We found a world full of friendly people, but many spoke very frankly about our being soft on communism. Our coddling of Communists and lack of counteraction at home and abroad to them is incredible. We were chided about quick action in Mississippi and lack of action about Cuba.

People everywhere, particularly the Eastern European satellites, are happy to see tourists come and show an interest in their problems. We sensed the feeling among the satellite peoples that trade with Communist governments should stop. Such aid does not reach the people and only disturbs and confuses their confidence in our judgment. They know, as should we, that any help to such Communist governments is only aiding our own destruction.

CALVIN K. KATTER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Inaugural Address of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., President of Indiana University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago Indiana University inaugurated its 12th president. His name is particularly well known in this body because at this time last year he was the Secretary of the Army. I refer, of course, to Mr. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.

The inauguration of a new president is of great interest to the university community and to the State of Indiana generally. Because of his former associations and the aptness of his remarks, I submit the inaugural address of President Stahr, made in the university auditorium, at Indiana University on Monday, November 19, 1962.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ELVIS J. STAHR, JR.

President Hickam, Governor Welsh, excellencies of the diplomatic corps, distinguished delegates and guests, colleagues, and friends of Indiana University, let me at the outset affirm most solemnly that this is a very great moment for me personally, that I appreciate deeply the honor just conferred upon me, that I am profoundly grateful for your confidence and support, and that my best efforts are and shall be pledged to the advancement of this university.

But beyond that, and more importantly, this is also a moment of significance for Indiana and for Indiana University, not because it formalizes a change in academic administration, for no change in institutional character, direction, or personality necessarily flows from that, but because it marks, perhaps as well as a single moment can, the beginning of a period in the life of higher education in this State and Nation so momentous, so fraught both with brilliant opportunities and with heavy penalties for failure, that it can without extravagance be termed a new era. It will inevitably be an era of great change, if only, though not only, because of the pace of our times and the impact of forces I shall mention in a moment.

The presence of each of you in this great gathering this morning contributes to both the significance and the enjoyment of this ancient ceremony, and the university is grateful to you all, as I am. You will understand, I know, if I acknowledge with special happiness the presence of my mother and my father. And it is a most delightful thing to me that my alma mater, the University of Kentucky, is represented on this platform by her distinguished president and by her noble and beloved president emeritus, under whom I once served through 8 years of rich experience, and that my second alma mater, the University of Oxford, is represented by my warm friend, fellow Rhodes scholar and esteemed colleague, the president of Purdue University.

My feeling of pride in becoming the president of Indiana University is tempered with profound humility each time I reflect, as I often do, that I am succeeding one of the great educational statesmen of the 20th century, Herman B Wells. Possibly no one but me will ever know fully what a source of continuing strength it is that he is actively with us as chancellor, inspiration, and friend.

No one should, and I shall not, take lightly the challenge inherent in the leadership of one of the great universities of the greatest nation on earth in the most exciting yet critical period in the history of our planet thus far, for American universities are closer to the heart of State, National, and global concerns than they have ever been.

"Universitas—all together, the whole, the universe"—custodian, discoverer, transmitter, interpreter, of all that is known, the university stands at the apex of the educational structure, symbolizing, if not, in fact, embracing, all knowledge, in its diversity and its unity.

In the contemporary surge of creativity and discovery, knowledge doubles and redoubles, each new fact or proposition lighting new paths for exploration and revelation beyond the anticipation or imagination of the most sophisticated. Long established divisions of related knowledge, categorized for convenience and manageability, are stretched beyond the original concepts. Subsequent splinterings into specializations and subspecializations are soon themselves made to seem arbitrary as changed awareness of the grand pattern follows each new discovery and insight.

The function of the university becomes the more important as the accumulation of what we know defies the individual mind to contain it, and frequently challenges the human mind even to classify it so that it may be retrieved with the aid of wondrous new machines and meaningfully interrelated.

Where today, but in the traditional university, can the unity in knowledge be constantly sought and honored whilst the pursuit of new knowledge along all its diverse paths is encouraged and nurtured?

THE NEW PLACE OF THE UNIVERSITY

These dual responsibilities place an exclusive and unique charge upon our traditional universities, and with the breakthroughs of basic research and the unbelievable pace of technological development, the new place of the university in the total fabric of society begins to unfold.

At the pinnacle of new specializations, new discoveries burst forth, whereupon new relationships suddenly reveal themselves. That which was a research device becomes the heart of a production machine. That which was a theory becomes a fact. The processes of research and development across the whole spectrum of knowledge have pushed universities into a new essentiality to our life and times. Exploring the unknown has always been at the heart of all that education stands for, but the products of its own efforts have placed upon the university of today a mantle of central responsibility for the future of civilization.

Postulate what worthy goals you will for man in this modern world: justice, knowledge, human dignity, economic vitality, international concord, the conquest of space, government by and for the people, the opportunity of every child, every man and woman, to realize the best that God put in him—and ignorance is the bar, education the gate, to each such goal.

The current chapter in the long annals of man's earthly adventure is an unusually dramatic one, with all the elements of high drama focused into an incredibly fast-moving plot. All here present are familiar with the simultaneous bursting upon us of the almost inconceivably powerful forces of what have been called the "explosions" of population, of knowledge, of technology, and of the aspirations of billions of people who for centuries had played but minor roles in the world's affairs. We dare not discount the potentials and rapidly emerging effects of any of these forces, nor the long shadow which intrudes persistently into our contemplation of them and of the future. For looming over every horizon is a deep and seemingly irreconcilable conflict—not a new one, to be sure, but one which in our time has reached heights of danger and suspense never before seen on a global scale. It is at bottom the age-old conflict between slavery and freedom, between deceit and honesty, between aggressive force persistently seeking to invade any vacuum it can find and defensive strength which will move only when there is no answer save a protecting shield.

What a pity that this should be. From the moment victory over fascism was won on the field of battle, this Nation and most of the war-weary peoples of the world turned their backs on armies and conquest. We in America disbanded the greatest military forces ever seen on earth; we offered to every surviving veteran the greatest opportunity our country or any country could offer, the opportunity for higher education; we gathered tens of billions of dollars of our treasure and used them to help friend and foe bind up their wounds and renew their search for a decent life in freedom; we went further and extended a helping hand to hundreds of millions of newly awakening peoples who were yet illiterate and ignorant in the ways of the modern world, but who had legitimate human aspirations. We envisioned and struggled hard, asking all others to join us, to help create a world in which all men might have the opportunity to live in peace, with freedom to pursue their finest goals, each in his own way. And we are still struggling toward those ends.

What a pity, indeed, that the only nation in that postwar world with even the possibility of rivaling America in world leadership should have been one whose own leaders found all of this repugnant, who could not accept the prospect of success of this great effort, this great dream, and who deliberately turned the world into a kind of living hell for country after country, people after people.

Perhaps it was inevitable; I don't know. Maybe we, who ourselves are not free from sin, are doomed on earth to cope with Satan till the day of judgement. Be that as it may, I refuse to believe that we are doomed to surrender to him. We therefore must not succumb to self-pity or to self-righteousness, any more than to the overt challenge of arms.

There are many big and little things we must all do in these anxious years, many day-to-day decisions our elected leaders must make, but, if we are to stay alive, and to keep alive the things that make it worth being alive, there are two overriding tasks confronting America and all free people. The first is to continue to build societies in which man can cultivate the full fruits of freedom, and the other is to maintain mili-

tary power which will deter the enemies of freedom from attempting to destroy or overrun us.

And education is today indispensable to both.

Military power of the most advanced kind will be essential to protecting freedom so long as the forces of antifreedom themselves have such power and are not content to stay at home. But true education is essential to extending freedom; indeed, it is part of the essence of freedom, and, without it, there can be neither a great deal worth defending nor any means adequate to defend it.

THE ESSENCE OF EDUCATION

I am scarcely saying anything new when I remind all of us that under our American system, from its beginning, the major responsibility for military power has been that of the Nation as a whole through the agency of the Federal Government, while the major responsibility for the education of our people has been reserved to the States and to the people. It might be supposed that this indicates that education was thought the less important by the framers of the Constitution, but I am confident they had quite a different view. They knew full well that no democracy can function without an educated citizenry. They also knew that while military efficiency by its very nature requires strict discipline of large groups of men, centralization of authority, and absolute loyalty to that authority when asserted, education by its very nature requires diversity, decentralization, experimentation, dissent, and inquiry. The higher learning in particular is, at its best, a disciplined approach, not to indoctrination, but to the full development of the individual intellect and to the searching out, through many approaches, of the deepest roots of truth, whether about nature, the universe, society, or that wondrous creature, man himself. Therefore, the framers may well have reasoned, nationwide responsibility for all of education should not be vested in any single authority. But it should not be overlooked today that education is too vital to the Nation to be permitted for long to be inadequately supported.

All of this presents exceptional challenges to the State of Indiana, for upon each State still falls responsibility under our American system for providing most of the financial resources needed for the work of public education.

Frankly, I doubt one could find more than a handful of citizens of this State who don't want Hoosier children to have opportunity as full and real as is open to any other children of their generation. And I doubt there can be found any instance in history where a high level of educational opportunity failed to make any society more advanced and more prosperous than it was before. But it is enough to recognize that no state or nation can advance without it today.

Many have asked me in recent months how I like it here. It has been clear in every case that they hoped I do like it, that they wanted me to like it, because they like it and are proud of it. My answer was and is unequivocal, I like it wholeheartedly, and so do my wife and our children. This is a beautiful place, conducive to contemplation and learning, as anyone can see, and it is a warm and friendly place, as anyone with good will can feel. It is also an exciting place, a place where more than 17,000 young people, among the brighest of their generation, are striving to complete the process of truly growing up, are gathered with hundreds of mature and superb scholars in pursuit of answers to all the great questions of the centuries and all the new questions of the age of space and the atom, are trying to digest knowledge which daily probes deeper into the unknown, are trying to prepare for life in a world greatly changed, and still changing, from what their elders have known. These eager students are not data processing machines into which mere information is fed and then regurgitated; they are questioning, debating, impatient, ambitious, sometimes confused, always expectant, never wholly good, rarely really bad, sons and daughters of humankind, and heirs to whatever world we may leave them. This is a very large institution, and I am all the more proud of the living reality of its tradition of active, personalized concern for every individual member of its family, be he student, teacher, or staff member.

The most wonderful thing of all is that this is an intensely vital place: a place of teaching and learning, of searching and finding, of thinking and creating, of high challenge to youth, of profound stimulations and satisfactions for the scholar, the artist, the curious mind, the discriminating taste, and the imaginative spirit. We must keep it that way.

The university itself, though seemingly embodied in lovely acres and impressive buildings, is in truth far more spirit than stone, its beauty but a backdrop for its high endeavors. Dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, it also has a deep sense of mission in the service of both society and of the individual human being. We must keep it that way.

It is even justifiable to say that the entire State, much of the Nation, and most of the world's continents contain parts of this great institution. I speak not just of our alumni, who are found throughout this State and all over the world, nor just of our students, who come from every county of the State, every State in the Nation, and 86 countries around the world, but also of our direct working relationships with many other institutions, in this State and this Nation, and in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In this, as in other ways, we are helping to fulfill that sense of mission of which I spoke. We must keep it that way.

Nearly half of our credit students are enrolled in places other than this Bloomington campus, mostly in our fine center for the schools of the health professions in Indianapolis and on our several regional campuses. Together with our sister institutions of higher learning, both private and public, we have provided for Indiana a system which places opportunity for education beyond high school within 25 miles of almost every boy, girl, and adult in the State of Indiana. We must work to strengthen all these institutions, and we shall continue to work with them, constructively and cooperatively, for the benefit of the entire State.

What else must we do, particularly we of Indiana University? The list of specific challenges is far too long to be compiled in this address, but I hope that mentioning a few will suggest many of the others.

WE MUST KEEP THE DOOR OPEN

First, we must keep the door of educational opportunity open. In the face of the great upcoming surges in college-age population, we must do every practical thing to insure the continuing vitality of the proposition that ability to learn, not ability to pay, is the key to that door. We must help our fellow citizens understand that the oncoming waves of young people seeking preparation for productive careers should be looked upon not as a problem, but as a blessing.

Second, we must insure that when a youth or an adult enters our door, he will find education of excellence, never of mediocrity. This means that our libraries, our laboratories, our facilities for study and growth, and above all our faculties, must be of the high quality needed to educate for tomorrow, for it is in the complex and demanding world of tomorrow that our students must live their lives and make their contributions. The competition for first-rate faculty nationwide is becoming so fierce that some institutions may not be able to obtain or retain them. Will our own institution be among these? I pray not. The numbers of bright, ambitious young people who will graduate from high school will increase so vastly and so rapidly, beginning in the middle of the very next biennium, that in some places many will find either closed doors or greatly diluted opportunity inside the doors. Will Indiana be among these? I pray not. Should we at any time be faced with resources inadequate to provide education of high quality to all young Hoosiers who are qualified and determined to pursue it here, then some must be turned away; for it is better truly to educate a few than to defraud many. But we must strive with great energy to prevent such a tragic choice from being forced upon us, for the future of all of us and of our children is bound up with the level and quality of education of our total citizenry.

Third, I would urgently add that we have a heavy obligation within the university to insure in every feasible way that the hard-earned tax dollars entrusted to us are so used as to get every last penny's worth of educational mileage out of every last dollar. This we have done and shall continue to do. Through imagination, ingenuity, sound planning, and determination we can even turn the necessities of doing larger tasks into stimulations for doing them better.

Fourth, we must insist that the university retain its leadership in the fields in which it is nationally distinguished. It cannot and will not try to be all things to all people, but it has special obligations in a number of fields in which its contributions to the State and to mankind have been and will be signal. Central among these, and basic to all cultural, technological and professional advancement, must always be the liberal arts and sciences. I was thrilled, as all of you must have been, last month when a graduate of this university received the Nobel Prize in the field in which he had studied here under a very distinguished faculty which itself includes a Nobel Prize winner. I was thrilled again earlier this month when one of our faculty, himself an alumnus, presided at the dedication of the world's largest solar telescope, a joint enterprise of the 10 leading universities in the field of astronomy, spanning the Nation from Harvard to Indiana to California. There have been other great moments in the life of this institution and there will be again if we keep our sights on the finest and best. It is worthy of mention now, I think, that we will soon be bringing to this campus the editorial officers of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, probably the most distinguished periodical in the field of American history. Our distinction in linguistics and in languages, of which we regularly teach more than 20, and in international studies, is recognized worldwide. Few universities between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts have as many fellows of the National Academy of Sciences and the other great learned societies as do we. Indeed, several of our departments in the academic disciplines clearly rank among the Nation's best, and I am aware of none which is less than excellent.

These vital assets enable us to carry on our largest single function, undergraduate education, with both thoroughness and high standards, in a rich intellectual environment. They also enable us to provide graduate work of demonstrably superior quality. We must keep it that way.

There are two other major concerns of this university—one is professional training; the other is research.

Each of our many professional schools and divisions today is strong; some are among the Nation's leaders; one or two are probably unexcelled. Yet we are determined to

improve them all, for complacency is a dangerous enemy of excellence.

The general public is perhaps not fully aware of how important to its own well-being are the professional schools of their State university. Here are the sources of very substantial percentages of the State's physicians, dentists, nurses, lawyers, college teachers, librarians, schoolteachers, and administrators, business managers, scientists, coaches, journalists, artists, musicians, optometrists, medical technicians, public administrators, and others who play key roles in the service of the people. Most professional training is relatively expensive, but it is indispensible to the progress of our society.

Whether in the realms of the natural sciences, the fields of the literary, creative and performing arts, the study of the affairs of man and nations, or the development of competent and ethical practitioners of the learned professions, both the disciplines and the professions at Indiana, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, are dedicated to objectivity and creativity, are uncompromising toward mediocrity, are hostile to extreme rigidities of thought. We must keep them that way.

The reference to rigidities of thought may profit from a further word. In the presence of such rigidities on both the extreme left and the extreme right, in a world of terrible tensions, the university's role must be to maintain its even-tempered but relentless search for truth. We shall not stifle, but shall promote, restless seeking and inquiring and debating, so long as it is honest. But we shall insist that there be an atmosphere of basic objectivity. We shall encourage intellectual excitement, but shall firmly suppress both physical violence and efforts to provoke it. We shall be intolerant only of intolerance, and of deceit.

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

As to research, a symposium of several days' duration would be required to report on the university's accomplishments, activities, and aims, covering as they do a wide range, from seeking the causes and cures of cancer and heart disease to probing the secrets of the universe and of life itself, from the motivations of human behavior to ways of making responsible freedom more real to more people, from the management of great enterprises and the administration of justice and government to ways of making education itself more efficient and more fruitful.

There is a further point in this connection. From the basis of two vantage points I have been privileged to occupy in this single calendar year, I am convinced that the economic future of this State and region depends upon intensified efforts in several fields of research. If adequate investment is not made in this area, and in the highest development of our abundant native brainpower, the center of gravity of industrial productivity will move out of the Middle West to the two seacoasts, as it has already begun to do, and an economic wasteland could replace it.

Today, as we have noted, higher education is more directly and significantly involved in technological advancement and economic progress than ever before. Of even private universities is this true; and public universities have felt this responsibility keenly, and with ever-increasing benefits to us all, at least since the inception of the land-grant college movement whose centennial is celebrated this very year.

Both Indiana and Purdue are particularly alert to this challenge, and both stand ready to help. To Purdue's splendid new McClure Park will shortly be added at Indiana University a new Center for Industrial Applications of Aerospace Research, supported in part by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in part by Indiana business firms, and in part by the Indiana University Foundation and the university itself. There are other contributions the university can and must make to its own economic base, without which the university itself cannot go forward.

All I have said thus far may help to explain my earlier statement that exceptional challenges are presented in this new era to the State of Indiana. Why "exceptional"? Almost every State faces the exceptional effects of the great population explosion which began throughout the country following World War II, and the resulting necessity of educating greatly increased numbers of youth; in this sense, Indiana is no exception, and Indiana University and her sister institutions of Indiana must play greatly expanded roles. Every university faces the exceptional effects of the explosive expansion of knowledge in recent years, and the cumulative, spiraling demands it places upon the functions of organizing, preserving, and transmitting this knowledge, seeking new applications for it, integrating its specialized fields, and, not least, adding to it. In this Indiana University is certainly no exception. But few States will feel quite as acutely as will Indiana the problems resulting from the explosive changes in technology, still only in their infancy. Like an automobile, they are capable of carrying us forward or of running over us. Here, the modern university can play an important, indeed an indispensable, though never an exclusive, role, particularly through research, carried forward vigorously and with the finest talent available.

Alas, there is no magic by which either the State or her colleges and universities can expect to meet these exceptional challenges without a substantial increase in the level of resources invested by the State in higher education. And this decade would be the worst possible time in the history of either our State or Nation for Hoosiers to turn away from the obvious and inevitable facts confronting us. May I bluntly restate just one of these facts, for emphasis? During the next biennium, there will be ten thousand more Hoosier boys and girls, fully qualified, seeking education at the four State colleges and universities of Indiana than during the current biennium—and the numbers will go on up from there, for the foreseeable future.

THE WAY TO A HAPPY ENDING

This part of our story can have a happy ending. Life sometimes, even often, calls for permanent sacrifices for the achievement of worthwhile goals. But not always. Education is one of those wonderful things which is purchased at a profit to the buyer, which only enriches the State which provides it, which returns infinitely more, even in dollars, than it is ever given, which, as in the moral of the parable of the talents, costs only those who will not invest. For Indiana, the needed investment may now appear large, but it will be both small and temporary compared to the enduring richness of the dividends.

In sum, my friends, we at Indiana University are a significant part of the great world of scholarship, and our first allegiance as an institution must always be to that world. Other agencies, other people, have other worthy missions, but ours needs no apology; it is basic to them all.

In the years ahead, if God be willing, we shall carry forward with all our strength the great work in which we are engaged, building upon the splendid foundations erected by our predecessors, striving for excellence in all we do, alert to the complex problems, deep conflicts, and tremendous challenges in the world around us, and keeping before us the vision of bringing light to our youth, knowledge to our people, progress to our State, strength to our Nation, and, hopefully, wisdom to ourselves and to our fellows.

Remarks of Honorable Robert Moses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to present the remarks of the Honorable Robert Moses at the opening ceremonies of the Alexander Hamilton Bridge, the George Washington Bridge Bus Station, and sections of the Cross-Bronx Expressway, on January 17, 1963.

This new bridge runs into my congressional district and the Cross-Bronx Expressway runs through the center of my district. Eventually this will be one of the most important links between New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

It was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies and to hear Mr. Moses' fine address, which follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES AT THE OPENING OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON BRIDGE, GEORGE WASHINGTON BRIDGE BUS STATION, AND SECTIONS OF THE CROSS-BRONX EXPRESSWAY

Sloan Colt, your excellencies, Mr. Mayor and friends, these great metropolitan land and water crossings and incidental traffic facilities represent no happy impulse, no mere gleam in an official eye, no ambitious political and planning gestures. They are thrown open to the traveling public today as the result of much thought, conviction, and stubbornness in the face of misrepresentation, misunderstanding and other formidable obstacles.

As you ride next year over this roadway to the World's Fair at Flushing Meadow, the rock outcrop below grade on the Cross-Bronx Expressway, which we made into monolithic landscaping, will show no scars and will seem always to have been there. This is no gasoline gully, no elevated eyesore. As it sinks below and soars over the heart of the great city, this is metropolitan architecture in the finest sense.

Those who profess to believe such results are obtained within the conventional political framework, in a congested, highly critical community, by diplomacy, smoothness and clever avoidance of criticism and controversy, are never in evidence in the hours of trouble and conspicuous only after the event when success is acknowledged. In this, as in other similar contexts, the cost of prolonged delays has been enormous. I suppose we must charge it more or less cheerfully to the inherent expensiveness of the democratic process.

The remaining east and west crossings from Long Island through Manhattan and the Bronx, over and under the East River, Harlem and Hudson and across the Palisades to the Jersey meadows and beyond, will be increasingly difficult to realize as those in charge are thwarted, lampooned and libeled and without steady support. It is easy for demagogs to shout about bulldozer methods and indifference to the wishes of small people. If Government Smith were here, he would call the Lower Manhattan Elevated Expressway a Kathleen Mavourneen—"It may be for years, and it may be forever." On the other hand, like the maid in St. Matthew, it may not be dead, but sleepeth.

Nothing is easier than to drum up opposition to any major public work where the press leans to sensation, libel goes unpunished and officialdom worries about block votes and reprisals. In these rhu-

barbs the less durable characters are broken like old matches. Only the tough survive. Over and over again I have seen dead projects miraculously revived, minority opposition disappear and early opponents admit to being ashamed of their initial bitter denunciations.

Without a lower Manhattan elevated expressway, bridge and tunnel congestion will be appalling. If there is no midtown Manhattan elevated expressway, the essential third tube of the Queens Midtown Tunnel and its maze of Queens arterial approaches will be impossible to finance. With all due respect to the elected officials who suffer most from the pressures of vociferous minorities, time will tell them how shortsighted the opposition to these links in the great metropolitan chain has been. Is there a sane economist who proposes to curtail the production of motorcars? If there are more cars, there must be roads for them to run on, and in building these roads, through traffic must be separated from the local street pattern.

This building of public works to meet the challenges of urban growth is a fascinating and baffling business, and the number of those willing to take it on grows less. Nobody can clear the way for these swaths, which lift and depress expressways above and below the local streets and over and under rivers, without moving people and business, and it can't be done with mirrors, by sleight of hand or by magic. The task is for those more concerned with ultimate respect than with immediate popularity.

Perhaps this is why, in addition to any energy we may still possess, those of us who have been in the game a long time and want nothing further, have something to offer. Wise men were living before us. We have invented little. At most, we have supplied the guts and elbow grease to build what others previously urged but lacked the gumption, support and luck to achieve.

If it were not for the big authorities with their relative independence and private financing, the task would be hopeless, but the authorities are not automatic, electronic business machines. They perform no miracles without men. The port authority came into its own slowly. Triborough was a paper organization for a decade and the power authority was dormant for 24 years before anything significant happened.

Some of us who have been called upon by the heads of the State and city governments to establish new or rescue and revitalize sluggish or dying authorities, have accepted the task as a public duty, without expectation of plaudits. The success of agencies like the Port of New York Authority, the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, and the Power Authority of New York is evidenced upon the sound reputation and rating of their bonds and the confidence imposed in them by banks, bankers, and prudent investors. If this confidence is undermined, the authorities will soon decline, and this ingenious device, combining government, business, and private financing, will no longer have merit or validity.

We of the Triborough have been most happy in our close association with the Port of New York Authority, and I can speak also as the link which cements the authorities with the city, Federal, and State arterial program. Many public agencies, private corporations, engineers, and technicians have joined the building trades and the makers of steel and other materials in this notable example of cooperation.

Much remains to be done to finish the metropolitan arterial complex, and the end is not in sight. Mayor LaGuardia's pet slogan was "patience and fortitude." It is as good a motto as any, but there is today less time for patience and more demand for fortitude. If the distinguished officials who speak here today will give us the tools and the backing before it is too late, we can finish the job.

We have traversed in good company the spine of Manhattan. We have met rocks, rivers, and resistance of modern redskins. The whole island of Manhattan cost only $24. Maybe in time this arterial expenditure too will be considered a bargain. In any event, the job has had its enduring satisfactions, and that's all there is to public work.

The REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration, which has provided through the years one of the greatest benefits to the rural citizens of our Nation, has again come under attack from one of our Nation's large newspaper chains.

On the same day that the REA was being taken to task for providing long-term loans to assist many rural areas in our country in obtaining electricity and in improving their electrical service, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman was addressing the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association Convention in Nevada on the service that REA has provided the Nation.

Secretary Freeman pointed out the very valuable assistance the REA has provided our farm citizens through the years and particularly some of the more important achievements of the last 2 years.

The Secretary points out that in order to serve the sparsely populated rural areas rather than the high-density urban areas it is necessary to provide the REA cooperatives with low-interest-rate financing and that through this type of financing REA cooperatives have provided a great benefit to our Nation's farmers and residents of rural areas.

He states as one example that REA cooperatives have built 1.4 million miles of electric lines in order to serve 4.8 million rural customers. This means that the REA cooperatives serve 3.3 customers per mile and the average urban-based utility has 32.2 customers per mile. Thus, it is much less profitable to serve the areas covered by REA cooperatives than by the urban-based utilities. Therefore, a low interest rate for REA loans is both justifiable and needed.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary points out other important services of the REA in his very interesting and informative speech.

Under unanimous consent, I include the remarks of Secretary Freeman in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, LAS VEGAS, NEV., JANUARY 14, 1963

I welcome this opportunity to speak to the 21st annual meeting of your association for several reasons:

First, it is a good time to review the progress of the last 2 years, progress in rural America, in agriculture, and specifically, progress by the Rural Electrification Administration.

Second, it gives me an opportunity to take a close look with you at some of the policies which guide REA, to reexamine their validity in this time of change.

Third, I want to discuss the need to apply more broadly the local leadership tradition which REA cooperatives have developed to such a significant degree.

As 2 years of the Kennedy administration draw to a close, it is appropriate to bring to farmers and city people a report of the highlights of the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Since 1960, through actions by the Administrator and by the Congress, we have seen:

An increase in gross farm income of $2 billion in 1961 and $2.5 billion in 1962, as compared to 1960. Net farm income in both years averaged $1.1 billion higher than in 1960.

Grain surpluses have been reduced 700 million bushels, and taxpayer costs will be down some $300 million this year as a result. With continued progress over the next 2 years, we can see the end of feed grain surpluses in 1964. The end of wheat surpluses is in sight, if favorable action is taken this spring by wheat farmers in the referendum for the 1964 crop.

With a favorable vote, wheat farm income can be maintained at the favorable 1960–62 level, and the wheat surplus can be scaled down to near an adequate level in about 3 years. If the referendum fails, the surplus will remain and wheat income will decine sharply, as wheat prices fall from $2 to $1. per bushel. The effects will be disastrous to farm and city and to foreign markets alike.

While these advances in agriculture have been taking place, the cost of food has remained stable, increasing about as much as the overall cost of living.

Today we are sharing our food abundance more widely at home and abroad, thus fulfilling our moral responsibility to those who do not have enough. In March 1962, as many as 7.4 million persons in needy families in this country shared in our food supplies through the direct distribution program compared with 4.1 million in March 1960. The food stamp program launched by direction of the President is being expanded to 48 areas, and has become one of our most successful programs. The food-for-peace program during, fiscal 1962 moved a record volume of $1.6 billion worth of food and fiber overseas to feed needy, hungry people. Food and fiber is becoming an increasingly vital tool in our programs to stimulate the progress of developing countries all over the world.

We have launched a massive, all-out effort to infuse new economic vitality in rural areas through the redirection of old programs and the creation of new programs in rural areas development, a subject I will have more to say about shortly.

Now these are just a few of the accomplishments of 2 years, all of them together represent only the beginning of our effort to meet the task ahead in agriculture and rural America. But I am proud of the start we have made.

I am proud, too, of what we have done in REA where, as you are well aware, there is much progress to report.

Last year the President requested and the Congress authorized an increase in REA loan funds to permit the financing of additional generation and transmission facilities. For fiscal year 1963, $400 million was authorized for the REA loan program, including $100 million for a contingency fund. This made a record $250 million available for generation and transmission loans. By comparison, 1960 authorizations were $161 million, and

only $89 million was loaned for G. & T. purposes.

Since January 1961, REA has approved 28 loans to borrowers seeking new or additional sources of power. Seven of these loans represented new starts. Overall, these 28 loans will mean a 10-year saving of more than $47 million as compared with the power supply arrangement available to the borrowers at the time their loan was approved.

An equally significant measure of progress in REA is the recognition by the President of those policies which are essential to the vitality of the REA idea, to the integrity of the rural electric cooperative.

Let me be more specific.

This administration supports the 2-percent interest rate. This is not a recent or a capricious decision. It is based on a careful analysis of conditions inherent in the job you are trying to do. There are vast differences between the conditions under which you operate and the conditions which prevail on the city-based utility systems.

Some of the special handicaps you face in providing areawide service which will permit your consumers to use power fully and efficiently bear repeating. They are not generally known, and need to be emphasized. I want to take this occasion to set them down clearly and carefully.

Low density: In order to serve 4.8 million rural consumers, the REA cooperatives have built 1.4 million miles of line. It means that you have 3.3 customers per mile. The average urban-based utility has 32.3.

Lack of diversity: Where farms in a particular area are of the same type, and this is usually the case, power needs tend to be heavy during certain periods of the day, and often negligible in the rest. REA systems, with few small commercial or large powerloads to provide diversity, must make proportionately greater investments in facilities used only a few hours a day. Interest charges are based on a 24-hour day.

Low revenues: Low density and lack of diversity keep revenues low. In 1960, for example, when commercial utilities reported revenues of $6,580 per mile, REA-financed systems had average revenues of $414 per mile. On a per customer basis, your revenues averaged $127, or a little more than half the $204 reported by commercial utilities.

Low load factor: Whether you generate power or buy it, low density and lack of diversity work to increase REA co-op power costs. This is true because the capacity and the facilities you build for certain peak loads, a necessity, are used on an average of only 50 to 60 percent of the time.

Isolated systems: REA co-ops have undertaken to serve the remote and out-of-way pockets in America. Here in the West, for example, you have mountains, deserts, and large forest areas which create special problems. These and other factors have kept many systems small and separated from other REA borrowers. Low interest rates enable such borrowers to perform the services expected from rural systems.

Yet, despite these handicaps, rural electric cooperatives have made an outstanding record in repayment of their loans. Last year, repayments passed the billion-dollar mark, representing 29 percent of the funds advanced. Only two electric borrowers are behind in their payments and these total only $140,000.

Another policy of great importance is the increased emphasis on generation and transmission loans. We propose to continue this emphasis.

During the past 2 years, G. & T. loans have accounted for about 57 percent of all approved loans. Each was in response to a demonstrated need for lower cost power, the low-cost kilowatt that permits your consumer-owned systems to get on with their essential job in rural areas.

This policy which has made possible the expansion of the REA co-ops as their task has grown is also designed to meet two other particular needs, to enable you to take advantage of new technology, and to help preserve your territorial integrity.

It is essential that the REA-financed generating stations, which account for less that 1 percent of the Nation's total electric power capacity, be geared to the technological advances within the electric power industry.

In the last 2 years, this new emphasis on G. & T. loans has been applied by rural systems to take practical advantage of savings in power pooling, system interconnections, large-scale generating units, and in the location of plants adjacent to sources of low-cost fuels.

The use of G. & T. loans to block raids by private power companies seeking the historic area of rural electric co-ops is new. Where such situations arise in the future, G. & T. loans will be approved.

This criterion has been used only once. It was in an area where a supplier, who was serving several distribution co-ops at wholesale, insisted that he be able to go into their territory and pick off retail consumers as he chose. This demand posed a distinct threat to the service capabilities, and to the existence, of the cooperatives.

I hope raids on REA territory will stop. But as many rural electric cooperatives build their power volume, this problem remains a very real threat. It must be recognized that the expansion of urban areas into the surrounding rural countryside provides a particularly inviting target to raid.

It is possible, therefore, that more G. & T. loans will be made to strengthen REA co-ops in the immedate months and years ahead. In the long run, however, I hope and I believe raids will cease as the more moderate leaders in the private power field prevail.

When that day comes, real cooperation between all commercial and cooperative power systems, with the resulting maximum use of all systems, will mean increased benefits to all users.

I repeat, it is not asking too much to recognize that the service areas you have developed are rightfully your own, and that the consumers within them, new and old, are rightfully your consumers.

On review, then, I believe these past 2 years have shown that the pledge which President Kennedy made in 1960 in Billings, Mont., has been kept. He said that his administration would: "Restore REA to its former role of preeminence, freeing it from constant concern over political interference, higher interest rates and budgetary starvation, and enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family."

For my part, the contribution which rural electric cooperatives have made to my own State of Minnesota, to its farm families, has long ago earned them my dedicated support.

I have worked on farms before, and after, REA. To me, REA is more than a concept, it is the difference between a kerosene lamp and an electric light; between a hand-cranked cream separator and one driven by an electric motor; between a refrigerator and an icebox with an overflowing pan of water; between milking by hand and by machine; between an electric clothes washer and the old type of washer I pumped back and forth when I was a boy.

Each of you can be extremely proud of the accomplishment you have made in electrifying rural America, in meeting a challenge which many people considered beyond hope. I salute you for progress. At the same time I challenge you as we look to the future.

If one reason had to be selected as to why the REA idea has achieved its great success, I would give the credit to the unique pattern of local leadership which you have developed.

Perhaps other factors, such as effective Government assistance and a helpful attitude from local, State and Federal governments, have been important—but the quality and leadership of REA people have been the determining factor.

And this brings me to the third point I made in my opening remarks, there is a very real need to apply your local leadership pattern to a new program, to use your skill for a task greater than REA, a task which encompasses all rural America, and for which you are only beginning to mobilize your talents and resources.

That task is to wipe out the causes of rural poverty.

Let me briefly describe the nature of this new challenge.

First, there is more poverty in rural America today than in all the urban sector combined. More than 15 million Americans in rural areas live under poverty conditions by our standards today. Of the 8 million families in this country today who earn less than $2,500 annually, some 4.1 million live in rural America. In other words, rural areas account for only a third of our population but for over half the poverty.

Second, the commodity programs which have monopolized public attention for so long will, at best, even when full parity income is attained, provide adequate incomes for less than half of those who now live on farms.

Strangely, much of this poverty has come in the wake of astonishing advances in farm technology and production. It underscores the fact that an expanding rural economy necessary to combat this problem cannot be achieved by conventional commodity programs alone.

In fact, I believe that farm programs as we are familiar with them will at best be able to do only half the job that must be done.

This, then, is a real challenge. It is a challenge that I am confident we can meet. But nothing less than a massive counterattack combining the resources of both government and local people will do the job and reverse the downward spiral in which rural America finds itself today.

Such a counterattack has been launched through a dynamic new action program. Most of you have heard something about this program called Rural Areas Development—or RAD, for short.

The RAD program is a blending and coordination of all available resources of the Department—conservation, credit, forestry, recreation, industrial development, education and other public services—into a long-range effort to erase the blight of rural poverty.

A very important responsibility in this program has been assumed by the leadership of the cooperative movement, and your REA co-ops, in particular, have much to contribute. As you know, your dynamic and driving general manager, Clyde Ellis, recognized the importance of this program very early, and has been a strong force in it for effective action.

As a result, the REA has been assigned primary responsibility for developing industrial and commercial projects under the area redevelopment program, and other programs, as well.

You already have some experience in this task through the use of consumer facility loans authorized in section 5 of the REA legislation. Under this section, some of you have assisted industries and businesses in your areas with the financing of electrical equipment and plumbing. Using these funds only when financing is not available on reasonable terms from any other source, public or private, you have made possible new job opportunities that could not otherwise have been created. Since July 1961, you have used these funds 14 times and for only a little over a million dollars, but the avail-

ability of section 5 loans has made much else possible.

In helping the local community within your territory to increase jobs, and expand the benefits of economic growth, you also are increasing your own business. It is a natural combination, and fulfills the basic aim of REA to bring progress to rural America in many forms.

However, REA leadership in stimulating community development is not always tied to a direct REA power benefit. The manager of a local electric cooperative in Pennsylvania, for example, has led the drive in his community to get four new industries, and each buys power from a private power supplier.

The manager maintains, and correctly so, that both the private and cooperative power suppliers are benefiting, the co-op from new consumers who live in its territory. But most importantly, the community, the people, will benefit from new opportunities.

I am encouraged to see the dedication and energy which local REA co-ops are giving to the RAD program. Reports from about one-third of the REA borrowers indicate that since July 1961 they have helped to launch 400 industrial and commercial projects. It is anticipated that they will directly create 30,000 new jobs, and indirectly, another 22,000. When reports are in from all co-ops, undoubtedly these figures will be higher.

More than one-fourth of these new enterprises involve processing and marketing of farm and wood products, which mean additional outlets for farm and forest products as well as new jobs for rural citizens. This is a real "double shot" in the arm.

It is also important to note that in these newly launched projects, Government financing is playing a "seed capital" role by stimulating the investment of much larger sums by private and local sources. The REA figures indicate that the 400 projects are being financed by more than $250 million of private capital compared with about $15 million from Federal Government sources.

These projects are scattered throughout the country. They include a lumber project in Idaho, a furniture factory in Kentucky, a commercial recreation enterprise in Illinois, a packing plant in Nebraska, and a chipping plant in Mississippi. In addition, the 600 REA borrowers report they have assisted their communities in launching a number of public facilities, hospitals, water systems and sewerage systems.

Thus, we have, with your assistance, made a good start with the RAD program, but it is only the beginning, for we have only scratched the surface of the need in rural America.

A good start means that rural electric cooperatives will have more and more to do as rural America responds to the challenge of the sixties, as it moves positively forward once again. And as these things take place, demands for power will expand rapidly.

Presently your members are doubling their power needs every 7 to 10 years. Today, the power requirements of your systems are about 37 billion kilowatt-hours. By 1970, those requirements will soar to 68.6 billion (or more) and by 1985 to almost 200 billion (or more).

President Kennedy has said that power is the key to this century, power on the farms and in rural areas as well as in the cities. At Oahe project in South Dakota last summer he said: "The role of the REA is not finished, as some would believe. To be sure, most farms now have electric lights. Most REA cooperatives and power districts are well established. But we are rapidly approaching the time when this Nation will boast a 300 million population, a $2 trillion national income, and a grave responsibility as the breadbasket and food producer for a world whose population will have doubled. That is the prospect for the end of this century, and the key to this century is power, on the farm, in the factory, in the country as well as the city."

The role of the REA is not finished, it is only beginning.

This, I submit, is sound policy and one that will serve the Nation well. Let us, working together, militantly carry it forward.

It's Only Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a great many comments about the administration's proposals to increase spending by several billions of dollars and to reduce Government income by several billions at the same time. Perhaps few of these comments are as much to the point as the following editorial taken from the January 29 issue of the Washington Daily News:

IT'S ONLY MONEY

Sly adulteration and debasement of money probably started with the first coinage. The names of Polycrates of Samos (500 B.C.) and Dionysius of Syracuse (400 B.C.) are associated with the great monetary frauds of antiquity.

Besides setting fire to Rome, Nero reduced the precious metal content of the coinage by 10 percent and pocketed the difference. Henry VIII of England is remembered for his many wives. He also issued a silver-plated shilling, bearing his likeness. When the plating wore off, starting with his most prominent feature, he was known as Old Coppernose.

All this was done in the dark of night. During the Middle Ages the penalty for doctoring the coinage was to have the head held under in a kettle of boiling water. After Hastings, William the Conqueror decreed mutilation, such as having the ears cut off, for anyone caught fooling with the coinage.

As we note, this practice was frowned upon into modern times. It took John Maynard Keynes, in the depression years of the 1930's, to figure out that legal counterfeiting not only was respectable, it actually would help the economy. Lord Keynes probably never intended to go that far but such, in effect, is the deduction of his disciples who are as thick as hors d'oeuvres around Washington.

Since, between Nero and Keynes, paper money had been invented, probably by Kublai Khan or his mandarins, procedures were simplified. It no longer was necessary to melt up the silver and gold, adding copper or other inexpensive metal in the reissue. The printing presses merely could be turned loose to print unlimited quantities of certificates that at least looked like money.

That, in substance, is what we've been doing in the United States for a generation. The sum of this production is tabulated in a major part of the public debt, now $305 billion in round numbers.

But just as the Romans found the new denarius wouldn't buy as much as the old one, Americans have found the new dollar has lost its punch. At last acocunting it had declined in purchasing power to 46 cents as compared to what it would buy just less than 25 years ago.

And the tax cut—spending program thought up by the disciples of Keynes to get the economy moving again involves more of the same—a great deal more.

In the administration plan it is contemplated that at the end of the 3-year program, $8.5 billion a year in personal tax-cut money will be pumped into the economy. Every dime of this, and more besides, will be borrowed money—which is just another way of saying it will be printing press money. The deficit for next year alone is very conservatively estimated at just under $12 billion and even Treasury Secretary Dillon can't look ahead to the year in which the budget may be balanced.

This trick practically is guaranteed to bring a quick flush to the economy. But over the long haul it never has worked in the whole history of money finagling—and never will, except as a means of siphoning away the savings of the people. It is within the power of the Government to call 50 cents a dollar but no government ever has been able to make it buy more than half a dollar's worth.

But they never quit trying.

Part 5: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro—September 13–October 14, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 5 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro begins with a series of newspaper quoter on our U.S. policy for dealing with Cuba.

While the Monroe Doctrine and its application to the present situation was endlessly debated by our newspapers, our columnists, commentators, and newspapers in other countries—our Congress stubbornly went ahead adopting resolutions upholding the right of the United States to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, protect our country, and protect the entire hemisphere against an extension of the Marxist-Leninist Cuban Government.

Because of the reluctance of our NATO allies to cease shipments of materials and goods to Cuba which would be detrimental to the interests of this hemisphere, the House of Representatives boldly included amendments to our foreign aid appropriations bill which would cutoff aid to any country that permitted its ships to transport goods to Cuba. This perhaps was not what we might call a diplomatic approach but it certainly was a practical approach to the problem. It underlined the psychological approach of appealing to self-interest when the idealistic approach failed.

And on September 21, 1962, Adlai E. Stevenson admitted in the United Nations, in answering Soviet threats, that it was officially known that the U.S.S.R. was stuffing Cuba with planes, rockets, and other arms.

It began to be clear to all who followed the situation that some of our news columnists were about to find themselves

with "egg on their face," because of their weighty—and in some cases—frightened pronouncements on what we as a Nation should do or what we could not do.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO—PART 5

September 13, 1962: U.S. policy for dealing with Cuba: "If necessary we can take care of Cuba; and if the necessity is obvious, the Russians, despite what they now say, will acquiesce. They do not have any greater desire to fight a nuclear war over Cuba than we do. Force might some day prove the lesser of two evils for us; but it could never provide a solution for the Cuban problem" (New York Times, Sept. 12, 1962). "The only plausible employment for [the Russians] in Cuba * * * is to do more or less exactly what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam; that is, to train the local army to fight a more advanced kind of war . . . the defense of Cuba against another invasion. Whether [the Russians] are troops or technicians is at bottom immaterial . . . in the sense that the Americans cannot very well assert the right to intervene, whatever the Russians are. Doubtless, in a perfectly ordered world, the Monroe Doctrine would require the removal of these alien intruders. But in the imperfect real world, where the Americans keep troops along the border of the Communist block (in one case, within it; remember Berlin), and claim an unhindered right of access to these outposts, it is going to be awkward, to say the least, to expel or blockade the Russians in Cuba. Mr. Khrushchev has made the neatest of moves in the international chess game; take my pawn in Cuba, he says, and you risk your castle in South Vietnam—or your Berlin queen. If Dr. Castro is one day replaced by a democratic government, it will not be as a result of the one threat against which Russian advisers can give his army any real help—a regular invasion, a la D-day, from over the sea. The United States learned its Cuban lesson in April last year. The United States can perhaps help to organize and supply a rebellion, as the Communists do elsewhere; it cannot import a rebellion, prepackaged. Given enough time, and enough rope, the Cuban regime may yet produce the internal disaffection that will be its downfall. If [Dr. Castro's] support in the countryside begins to fade, one of the conditions of a successful revolt against him will have been established. And if the test ever came, it would be far harder for the Russians to keep an unpopular government in office in Cuba than it is for the Americans to do a similar job in other parts of the world which are better left unnamed. Mr. Khrushchev has no 6th or 7th Fleet to keep his supply lines open. If things go the way the United States hopes—if discontent grows inside Cuba—any further investment in Dr. Castro is going to look very risky indeed to Moscow. Patience, not a choleric lunge, is the Americans' best policy" (Economist, London, Sept. 8, 1962).

"In the hemisphere, in the United Nations, with the uncommitted nations, the reaction [to a U.S. invasion of Cuba] would be most unfavorable for us" (New York Times, Sept. 14, 1962). "The United States is, of course, able easily to blockade Cuba. But stopping ships under threat of seizure or sinking would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. The invasion of Cuba would, of course, be an act of war against Cuba. But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent the retaliatory moves to which we would have laid ourselves wide open, moves against Berlin or against Turkey, or against Iran. For we would have acted on the rule that a possible threat against our security or our interests justifies us in going to war. We would be saying that because Cuba is in the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying too that the Soviet Union has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier. Let us not fool ourselves. Such an argument does not wash. It would be rejected, probably even laughed at, not only by all neutrals but by powerful elements among our closest allies. We could go to war if Castro injures us. But we cannot go to war, even against Castro, because of what he may do in the future. We cannot wage a preventive war against Castro without establishing the rule that a preventive war is legitimate against our military position in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Formosa, Okinawa, South Korea, and Japan" (Walter Lippmann, in the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 18, 1962). "Cuba has made Mr. Kennedy look like a man with not one, but two, Achilles heels [Berlin and Cuba]. Americans are suffering from the all too familiar affliction of frustration. They think that they were ineffectual in dealing with the Berlin wall and they fear that the administration is going to be ineffectual again in dealing with Cuba * * * acknowledging that an armed invasion of Cuba would mean the deaths of thousands of Cubans, of an untold number of Americans. Not totally precluded are landings by anti-Castro Cubans, avoidance, this time, of a Bay of Pigs disaster and the start of serious guerrilla warfare. Almost everyone is perfectly aware of the dangers of Cuba becoming the scene of another Spanish civil war, in which Russians as well as Cubans would no doubt kill and be killed.

"Perhaps the chief restraining factor on bitter American impatience is that action by the United States against Cuba, including a naval blockade, might tempt Mr. Khrushchev to snap shut the trap in which Berlin finds itself. Yet the administration's own view of the world remains essentially unaltered. It is still thought that Mr. Khrushchev will not in fact risk a third and final world war over Berlin; that, whatever happens there, he still has his own difficulties and that one of them is that his own country is changing, on the whole for the better; and that an eventual easement of tensions through disarmament and bans on nuclear tests is in Russia's interest as well as the West's. Recent events suggest, however, that Mr. Khrushchev, having grasped the fact that general war has become impossible, is tempted as a result to be more rather than less provocative" (Economist, London, Sept. 15, 1962).

On the same day, U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, declares that "the American people will not be satisfied with President Kennedy's reiteration of a do-nothing policy toward Cuba."

September 15, 1962: Press reports state that the U.S. Government has had little success in persuading its Allies to withhold ships being chartered to carry Soviet supplies to Cuba. The Governments of Britain, West Germany and Norway are reported to have begun inquiries among their shipowners, but these are regarded as polite responses to U.S. diplomatic pressure, and center on the question whether Allied ships are carrying arms among their cargo to Cuba. U.S. officials have pointed out to these Governments that the use of Allied ships for ordinary goods releases Communist-bloc shipping for arms deliveries to Cuba.

September 17, 1962: U.S. Secretary of State Rusk briefs members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Forces Committees at a joint closed door session. "Rusk took pains to assert a direct relationship between events in Cuba and Berlin, particularly in the next 3 months. * * * It is widely assumed [in Washington] that the Russians will make the big push in Berlin before the first of the year, but after the November 6 elections [in the United States].

September 18, 1962: Former U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon urges President Kennedy to take stronger action on Cuba and suggests a program including a naval blockade of the island and the obtaining of commitments from U.S. allies that their vessels will not be used by the Soviet Union for shipments to Cuba. He concedes that the risks of nuclear war are raised by a blockade, but asserts that "the risks of inaction are far greater." He adds that immediate action is needed to "revitalize" the Monroe Doctrine.

The present state of the Monroe Doctrine in relation to Cuba: "The policy of the United States in the Western Hemisphere is guided by two main considerations: its own national security and the peace and security of its hemispheric neighbors. On the one hand, the United States has the tradition of the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated more than a century ago as a warning to European powers that the United States would move against intrusions into the hemisphere. On the other, the United States is pledged, under the Rio Treaty of 1948 which formed the OAS, and under the U.N. Charter, to abstain from unilateral military action. The United States, nevertheless, has affirmed that it would take whatever steps are necessary to move, unilaterally if necessary, against a clear and present threat to its security and that of its allies in Latin America. * * * There is a vocal body of opinion that the Russian shipments of arms to Cuba is a clear threat to U.S. security and therefore a violation of the Monroe Doctrine demanding immediate action. This opinion holds that the Cuban buildup, in effect, constitutes the establishment of a military base by Russia in the Western Hemisphere" (New York Times, Sept. 16, 1962).

"The Monroe Doctrine has been modified to apply only to situations which directly endanger the security of the United States; 'The United States will consider any attempt by European powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.' * * * Soviet Russia has made this extension in Cuba, and is amplifying the activity. But President Kennedy has evaluated it thus far as not endangering our peace and safety, thereby narrowing the original scope of the Monroe Doctrine. The fact is clear. But the only administration spokesman who has publicly conceded it is Senator HUMPHREY" (Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1962). "It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet we cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Why not? The crucial point is that the American claim for the isolation of the Western Hemisphere was coupled with a renunciation of American interest in the Eastern Hemisphere: 'In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.' * * * This basis of the Monroe Doctrine disappeared in the 20th century, in the two World Wars, the Korean war and the cold war. We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine without meeting the question of what we are doing all over Europe and Asia. Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade an invader, rests not on the Monroe Doctrine but on the elementary right of a people to insure its own security. * * * This right can, however, be exercised only when there is a clear and present danger. Castro is an insulting nuisance but he is not, and is not now remotely capable of becoming a clear and present danger to the United States. So we must practice watchful waiting, and hold ourselves in readiness, never for a moment forgetting the vastly greater dangers elsewhere" (Walter Lippmann, in the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 18, 1962).

On the same day the U.S. State Department announces that an informal, private meeting of American Foreign Ministers will take place in Washington on October 2 to review the Soviet military buildup in Cuba and possible steps for dealing with the whole Cuban problem.

September 20, 1962: U.S. Senate adopts by 86 to 1 a resolution stating that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or threat of force its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere; to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States.

On the same day, the U.S. House approves the foreign-aid appropriation bill, including three amendments intended to cut off aid to any country permitting the use of its merchant ships to transport arms or goods of any kind to Cuba.

The House approved the foreign aid appropriation bill without restoring any of the $1,124 million urged by President Kennedy. By a 249-to-144 vote, the measure was sent to the Senate after the Democratic leadership decided not to risk deeper cuts in a floor fight. In earlier voice votes, the House shouted its approval of three amendments to cut off aid to any country that permits its ships to transport goods to Cuba (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962).

A resolution endorsing the use of arms, if necessary, to prevent Cuban aggression or subversion in the Western Hemisphere was adopted by the Senate, 86 to 1, after 3 hours of debate (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962).

September 21, 1962: The Soviet Union issued a new warning that any U.S. attack on Cuba would precipitate a nuclear war. The threat was made by Foreign Minister Gromyko in a tough and uncompromising policy statement to the United Nations General Assembly. Adlai E. Stevenson replied that the threat to peace came from the Soviet Union, which is "stuffing Cuba" with planes, rockets, and other arms.

September 24, 1962: Secretary of State Rusk met yesterday with the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard M. Lange, in an effort to win cooperation in blocking shipments of strategic goods to Cuba. They conferred in New York where Mr. Rusk has been making similar appeals to other allied diplomats. Italy and West Germany were said to be responding more favorably than Britain and Scandinavia.

September 25, 1962: Russian trawlers will operate out of Cuba under a plan disclosed by Premier Castro in a television speech. He said the two nations would build a port somewhere on Cuba's coast for a joint Atlantic fishing fleet.

September 26, 1962: The House of Representatives completed congressional action on a declaration of the U.S. determination to oppose with force, if necessary, Communist aggression or subversion based in Cuba. The House approved the joint resolution as anger and concern mounted in Washington over Moscow's plans to help build a port in Cuba for Soviet fishing trawlers. Moscow portrayed the project as a routine agreement for aid to the Castro regime.

Ways to guard against Cuban-based aggression and subversion were discussed in New York by Secretary of State Rusk and foreign ministers of the Latin-American nations. One proposal is the establishment of a Caribbean military organization.

September 29, 1962: Cuba stands in greater danger of attack, Premier Fidel Castro asserts, because U.S. politicians facing November elections are "trying to push the country toward aggression."

In a television address last night, Premier Castro said that in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate "there is a competition to see who can shout most. It doesn't matter to them that they play with the destiny of the world and play with war."

He said armed intervention in Cuba could lead to World War III.

"We know the Soviet forces are with us," Dr. Castro declared. "If the imperialists think the Soviet Government's words are merely words, they are wrong."

September 30, 1962: At a White House luncheon, the President and Britain's Foreign Secretary discussed ways to contain further Communist expansion and subversion in the Caribbean. A joint communique suggested that Britain might have changed her policy of regarding the Cuban problem as a matter of concern only to Washington.

October 1, 1962: OAS meets today to discuss Cuban crisis.

October 2, 1962: Behind closed doors at the State Department, Secretary of State Rusk assured Latin America's foreign ministers that the United States was prepared to give the necessary leadership to efforts to defeat Communist inroads in this hemisphere.

October 4, 1962: A U.S. program to penalize all shipowners who transport Soviet-bloc supplies to Cuba will be even tougher than expected. The four-point program, to be started within 2 week, will threaten foreign shipowners with the loss of all U.S. Government-owned or financed cargo if even one of their vessels engages in such trade.

October 8, 1962: Amid the applause of some delegates and the cries of hecklers, Cuban President Dorticos urged the United Nations yesterday to condemn the American "naval blockade" of his country. Gripping the rostrum, the bespectacled President had to shout his speech to the General Assembly. He was interrupted 4 times by hostile demonstrators in the visitors' gallery and about 12 times by applause, mainly from the Soviet bloc.

Havana sources predicted that the release of 1,113 captives held since last year's abortive invasion would be announced soon after final talks today between Premier Castro and James B. Donovan. In a move against Cuban trade, leaders of the International Longshoremen's Association planned to ask their men not to load cargoes to or from the Soviet Union and to boycott all lines servicing Cuba.

October 9, 1962: On Cuba, Secretary of State Rusk vowed U.S. aid for Cuban development if Communist rule is ended there, but he said the big issue now was Communist use of Cuba as a military and subversive base. Meanwhile, Washington said the release of anti-Castro Cubans seized in last year's invasion attempt still was not set. In Havana, however, James B. Donovan, who is negotiating for the prisoners' release, was optimistic about an early agreement.

October 10, 1962: A Cuban exile group—Alpha 66—announced that its members made a successful raid Monday on the Cuban port city of Isabela de Sagua. The exiles said that a commando group of 15 to 25 men had killed about 20 defenders, including Russians.

October 12, 1962: Britain has discussed with the United States a threat by a Cuban exile group, Alpha 66, to attack all merchant ships carrying supplies to Cuba. A carefully worded statement by a Foreign Office spokesman avoided saying that any complaint had been made. Washington indicated it was not yet ready to act against the exiles.

October 14, 1962: Responding to a radio message, the Coast Guard picked up two wounded crew members of a Cuban patrol boat and flew them to a Miami hospital. The Cubans were shot when their craft was sunk by a raiding vessel manned by exiles off the Cuban coast.

Women Play a Good Part in Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my quarter century of service in this House has gained for me, so I am told, a reputation of being rather tight-fisted with the people's money. I own up to the charge.

However, one place where I am quite generously disposed to spend tax dollars is in the field of soil conservation. I am even willing to support amounts in excess of budget figures for this important work.

No undedicated person is ever likely to rise to become head of the Soil Conservation Service, so there is not going to be any chance to compare good and bad administrators or administrations in this vital field. The country started out in 1937 with the daddy of soil conservation, the late great Hugh Hammond Bennett, heading the service. And now for several years we have had another director with conservation in his blood, Don A. Williams.

As a matter of fact, the country gets twice as much for its money in having Don at the head of the Soil Conservation Service, because with him we get the fine supporting cooperation of Mrs. Williams, the experienced Ruth, who is a true champion of conservation practices throughout this blessed land.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Women in Conservation Are All Alike—They All Are Doing Their Part," by Ruth Williams, from the January 1963 issue of Soil Conservation:

WOMEN IN CONSERVATION ARE ALL ALIKE—THEY ALL ARE DOING THEIR PART

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This "women in conservation" issue of Soil Conservation would not be complete without this personal observation by the wife of SCS Administrator Donald A. Williams, one of the many wives who have been through the soil and water conservation ranks with their husbands. A South Dakota farm girl, she has since 1935 shared with him, and with the wives of the farmers and ranchers with whom he worked, the fight against soil erosion and water waste—lived and "preached" conservation from coast to coast.)

(By Ruth Williams)

It was the spring of 1932 and I was on my way from Aberdeen to Clark, S. Dak., to see my prospective husband. It was spring and like James Russell Lowell's poem:

"Now is the high tide of the year
And whatever of life hath ebbed away
Comes flooding back with a ripply cheer
Into every bare inlet and creek and bay
And no matter how barren the past may have been
'Tis enough for us now that the leaves are green."

But the poem we memorized back in the fifth grade just didn't make sense this spring morning. Another "black blizzard" had just roamed through the Plains States and had again left it a sea of desolation. There were no songs of the birds to herald the morning,

for birds must have water and cover. There was neither—only powdery dust.

The road passed through miles of once-fertile fields and pasture—now a vast nothingness—broken down fences half buried in dust, trees trying desperately to put forth a few leaves—that is if they still survived. We were stopped at the railroad crossing as a long train of cattle cars filled with bellowing, bawling, half-starved animals on their way to Omaha or Sioux City crawled past. They should have been in green pasture with new calves.

Along the road were farmhouses, once painted white with organdy curtains and potted plants in the window. Now they are like the landscape about them—gray and forlorn, and some abandoned. The man at the next filling station, once a farmer, muttered: "I just can't take it any more." Even hope for many had become a meaningless word.

The dust bowl was only one of nature's rebellions against man's misuse of her resources. For example, I remembered the little city of Vanport, Oreg., destroyed in minutes by a flood on the mighty Columbia River, made mightier by uncontrolled water runoff from melting snow on the watersheds. Then there was a lovely little lake back from the coast a mile or so—where Don actually caught fish. A clear-cut logging outfit had raped the bordering mountains, leaving the slashings. Fire followed, and then flood silt drained into the lake, and it no longer had an abundance of fish. And who can forget the Tillamook Burn in the Cascade Mountains in Oregon. Thousands of Douglas-fir trees lay waste—a scene as desolate as the dust bowl itself. And how about the strip-mining spoils and debris in the Appalachian Mountain country at the other end of our great country?

These are all dreary pictures we would like to forget, as we would like to forget the week of October 19, 1962, with its possibility of laying waste our Nation. But we dare not forget! It often takes disaster or near catastrophe to start a movement for a better way of life. So it was that out of disaster the Nation's modern soil and water conservation program as we know it today was born 30 years ago.

Men everywhere joined in the movement and with them, as the coworkers, the moral support, the "power behind the throne," the "no dollar a year gal"—the women. I have yet to meet a wife of a conservationist or of a conservation farmer or ranches who was not conservationist in her own right. She may not build stockponds, terrace the hills, or make contour furrows; but I'm sure she's approved his conservation program, pushed it, preached it, and cut the budget so it could be done.

There is no greater pleasure than to go with Don to conservation meetings. It doesn't matter which State you go to, the women in conservation are all alike. They all are dedicated and are doing their part in conservation.

We have a Ladies Auxiliary of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. It is an effective education arm of the association; and there are growing numbers of State association auxiliaries, and even some local district auxiliaries. You will find the conservation women also have left their mark on the public school course of study, on garden clubs, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, 4-H clubs, Girl Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls. You name it and, if by chance they missed, well, just give them time.

I knew a little Camp Fire Girl several years ago who could classify land like an expert. And I've heard more than one teenager proudly express the wish in typical teenage fashion that just once they'd like something dished out, other than conservation, at the evening meal. So you see this conservation movement is not for men only but a family affair.

Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on the Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads has made numerous appeals to higher authority to standarize firehose coupling threads and thus avoid undue disaster. Therefore, I have reintroduced my concurrent resolution calling for the President to appoint a commission to study the feasibility of requiring by the enactment of Federal legislation the standardization of threads on the couplings on fire hoses used by fire departments.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include both an address to the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads by Robert Ely, chairman, and a highly applicable and illustrative poem entitled "Tragedy."

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS' COMMITTEE ON STANDARDIZATION OF FIREHOUSE COUPLING THREADS

First I want to thank our committee members, Chief John Garthe, and Chief Nicholas R. Warner for their help in making our progress possible. We also want to thank Chief Ray W. Shukraft and Chief Roi B. Woolley for their invaluable assistance. The help and guidance received from your executive director, B. Richter Townsend, and your public relations director, Al Drayton, has been a great help. The support of your president, Chief Edward F. Deignan, and the entire membership has been greatly appreciated.

Your committee has continued to urge the use of national standard firehose threads and standard gasket grooves on all couplings and fittings used for fire protective purposes. It has been a pleasure working for you and we appreciate your continued support on this worthwhile project.

From history we find that standardization of firehose coupling threads was the main topic of the first convention of the International Association of Fire Engineers in 1873. Concern in 1873 was caused by confusion due to misfits of hose coupling threads experienced in the great Boston fire of 1872. Ninety years later we are still trying to get all sizes of firehose coupling screw threads converted to the recommended national standard dimensions.

According to the New York Times, nonstandard firehose coupling threads were a contributing factor in the disastrous fire aboard the aircraft carrier *Constellation* on December 19, 1960. Forty-nine workmen lost their lives and there was a property loss of $47,942,000. A lot of threads could be standardized for that price. Refer to the New York Times of December 28, 29, and 31, and January 4, 1961.

We are happy to report that the U.S. Forest Service has converted their 1½-inch firehose coupling in southern California to the national standard thread and they are now in the process of converting their equipment in northern California.

Yes, progress has been made, but as long as any firehose coupling threads are in use that don't comply to the national standard dimensions there is still work to be done.

We suggest that each divisional organization of the International Association of Fire Chiefs appoint a committee to assist in the standardization of firehose coupling threads in its particular district. Our international committee will assist in any way possible. We have had experience in the standardization program which should be a help. Methods have been developed to rethread existing equipment at considerable savings. We are also open for suggestions and will welcome any assistance to help get the job done.

In last year's report we enclosed a copy of our letter to the President of the United States informing him of the use of so many nonstandard firehose coupling threads and asked that he take the necessary steps to aid and assist the fire service in standardizing all firehose coupling threads nationwide. Our letter was answered by Mr. Barent F. Landstreet, Deputy Assistant Director for Emergency Community Services, Department of Defense, and as yet there has been no help from the President or Office of Civil Defense to help get firehose coupling threads standardized.

The International Association of Fire Chiefs 1959 Resolution 5 asking OCDM for matching funds to help defray the costs of the equipment necessary to accomplish the standardization has apparently been ignored. We urge OCDM to reconsider the resolution and assist the fire service in the standardization program.

On September 27, 1961, Congressman BOB WILSON, of California, had our letter to the President of the United States, with the supporting material on firehose coupling threads read in the House of Representatives and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You may find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on pages A8028 and A8029 of the October 10, 1961, issue.

The fire service is on record asking that all coupling threads be standardized and has notified the responsible people of our country of the dangerous condition that exists with the use of so many nonstandard firehose coupling threads. The fire service cannot be held responsible for loss of life and property by fire where nonstandard firehose coupling threads are a contributing factor if the fire chief has gone on record in writing to his superiors asking that their nonstandard firehose coupling threads be converted to the recommended national standard firehose coupling screw thread dimensions as soon as possible. Have we protected ourselves in writing?

The NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC have adopted standards for the coupling screw threads for all 10 sizes of firehose used for fire protective purposes. The American Standards Association has adopted seven of these standards. However, the 4-, 5-, and 6-inch sizes which were the last to be adopted by the NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC have not been adopted by the American Standards Association as yet. It is desirable to have these standards adopted by the ASA as it will make the NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC coupling thread standards more secure and will help to get wider adoption of the standards. There has been a committee appointed by the ASA to study the firehose coupling threads.

Having worked with the development of the 4-, 5-, and 6-inch standards and through the recommendation of your executive director I have been appointed to represent the IAFC on the ASA coupling thread committee. A meeting of the ASA coupling thread committee will be held soon.

Funds should be appropriated for traveling expenses so that I can attend the meeting and help to get your IAFC 4-, 5-, and 6-inch thread standards adopted as the American standard.

It has been a pleasure working for you and your continued support for the standardization program is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT ELY,
Chairman, IAFC Committee on Standardization of Fire Hose Threads.

TRAGEDY

(By Bill Pitts)

The huge ball of fire rose fearsomely
As the "H-bomb" rent the night.
And the heart of the great metropolis,
Dissolved in the hellish light.

Though 50 percent of the city
Was beyond the help of man.
Most of the rest might still be saved
By a previously set up plan.

As the "fire storm" ate like a cancer,
Apparatus began to roll
From fire departments far and near
The stricken town their goal.

This was to be the ultimate test
Of Disaster Defense of the State.
Untried as yet, only theoried,
If not right, it was far too late.

The companies arrived to make their stand.
Then frustration forced them to quit.
Despair took over as the cry rang out,
"The fire hose threads won't fit!"

That just couldn't happen, may be your thought,
And it shouldn't happen, it's true.
But it does and will continue so,
While hidden from public view.

A hundred or more different hose threads
Are manufactured today.
Instead of one national standard thread,
As national requirements say.

And who do you think bears the added cost,
Of producing these various threads?
Is it those who won't listen and correct this mess,
But like ostriches bury their heads?

No, it isn't they, it's someone else
Like me and you and you.
The tab for payment with public funds
Is picked up by old John Q.

And what of the added fire loss,
Caused by this national disgrace.
It seems 'tis time for responsible men
This serious fact to face.

So start the clamor for action,
'Ere disaster with accompanying dreads,
Overtakes your State and catches it short,
Without national standard threads!

Straining the Imagination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the comments of F. A. Douglass, editor of the Lakefield (Minn.) Standard, on the hazards of the administration fiscal program are so much to the point that I include the editorial on the subject as a part of the RECORD.

STRAINING THE IMAGINATION

President J. F. Kennedy's plan for raising national spending while bringing about a reduction in taxes may test the imagination a little too much for the average American.

We are sure that Mr. Kennedy had the advice of some of our Nation's leading economists and we are just as certain that both they and he are convinced the plan can be consummated with no ill effects on the economy.

And for every economist so inclined, we could probably find another who would insist, also with good reasoning, that deficit spending does constitute a danger to our economy.

The danger, however, is not with the deficit itself. It is the danger that the American people, conscious that a good business cannot continue to run successfully at a deficit, will lose faith in their Government and in its monetary system.

If that faith is badly shaken, a panic or depression could ensue.

We are not saying that will happen if Mr. Kennedy's plan is enacted. And we would be foolish not to admit that the economics of our Nation has become much too complicated to break down in such simple terms.

It may be that it is this very complication which has been the salvation of the American system during record spending and record deficits.

The whole subject will undoubtedly come under close scrutiny in the Halls of Congress before the budget is approved.

We cannot help but conclude, however, that while the possibility of a tax cut captures the imagination of all of us, a plan to cut taxes while raising spending may strain that imagination just a little.

Federal Intrusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received information calling to my attention what appears to be another step toward moving into the field of private enterprise by the Federal Government. This, as often is the case, is done under the guise of being for the public good. Not through the legislative process but rather by rules established by governmental bureaus.

A case in point, I believe, is the proposed rulemaking as it appears in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, relating to electric power transmission lines traversing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

It should be pointed out that federally owned land, whether a large national forest or a tiny post office lot, are held in public trust. As the Government is the servant of the people, so are its lands similarly expressed. It would thus appear reasonable that they should not be used as a pawn in the intrusion of government into the field of gainful activity.

One can only ask, what is the real motive behind this proposed rule change? Within reasonable bounds of public safety and welfare and the preservation of natural resources from unconscionable dispersion of destruction, government lands have always been available to persons for traversal upon payment of a fair price. If this statement is correct and I am confident it is, then I ask in all candor, are the proposed rules reasonably appropriate or are they arbitrary and capricious?

Mr. Speaker, today we hear much of back-door referendums and back-door spending. Well, it occurs to me that this sort of low by regulation is a kitchen-door approach—a foot-in-the-door entry by government into the field of gainful production.

Both departments in this particular instance allude to the right to withhold a right-of-way grant if it is not consistent with the Federal marketing program. What is this program? Nowhere in the proposed rule change is it described nor its limits defined.

Once more we tread on dangerous ground. Let us all be more alert to the dangers ahead. Thanks for the opportunity to express myself on this subject.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress on Tuesday the President said:

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress.

I think that statement would be meaningful if the word "to" were substituted for the word "and." It would read:

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom to progress.

Thus the arch is freedom and it leads to progress.

Of course the message was the President's appeal for Federal aid for education—a 25-point program which some observers say is the most all-inclusive ever. It is not my purpose at this time to go into detailed comment on the subject. I am sure I will have plenty to say about it in the future.

Many proponents of the President's education program will in the weeks and months ahead be insisting that Federal funds for education and the best possible education for America's children are synonymous.

A most timely and appropriate message places the emphasis where it really belongs, and focuses on the greater need. It suggests that more attention be given to the "thinking" of our young people, and the best kind of "learning" will follow. It is contained in an editorial in the January 26, 1963, issue of the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, a highly respected newspaper published in my district. The editorial reflects the grassroots thinking of people who are concerned with both providing the best education for our children and seeing that their thinking as they approach their studies is straight. I believe every Mem-

ber of the Congress would profit from reading this thoughtful message.

KEEP THEIR THINKING STRAIGHT

The future of this society will depend upon the thinking of young people who are now learning what life is in this country and elsewhere. It is vital that they learn the basic truths that make this country great and that the facts be correct. In coming years their thinking will be based upon the information they are given today, by teachers, by what they read and what they hear.

It is important that young Americans learn what freedom means, how precious it is, how dearly it was paid for, and what they as individuals must do to preserve it. Likewise, it is important that they learn why the American system of a free economy produces more than the systems of other nations.

Allied with this is the basic truth that without freedom they would not be attending such a school and that freedom to work is as vital and as rewarding as the freedom to worship.

Rather than following the demoralizing concept of "security from cradle to the grave" they should be taught the satisfactions of giving of themselves to whatever work they undertake, of contributing to society, of producing and adding to the knowledge and wealth of mankind.

Too often a youngster, avid for learning, arrives at adulthood with the concept that society is made for his benefit, that he has only to go to an office for a check, that government—near or remote—will take care of his illness, provide security, pay him when he is unemployed, take care of his old age, his children and even provide life insurance.

There is no such thing. His thinking ought ought to be started right so that he is imbued with the pride of independence, with the desire to stand on his own feet, with the purpose to give more to life than he takes from it, with the spirit of doing something for his fellow man.

Social security is not a gift from some genie or government uncle, it is bought and paid for by the employer and the employee in equal shares. Nothing is free. Government has nothing to give that it does not first take away.

Unemployment compensation, which many believe, is free, is paid entirely by the employer. The employee pays nothing but receives all the benefits.

Working people receive sick benefits, hospital, and surgical benefits because their employers provide such group insurance or the employer and employee pay for it together. But it is not a gift of some government. Hundreds of millions of American workers have these benefits because they pay for them with their employers. Some employers even offer hospitalization insurance to their pensioned employees.

Most companies offer pensions of some kind to their employees, and most of these likewise are paid either by the employer or by the employer and employee together. Many unions also have pension trusts which members pay for.

The so-called four freedoms include freedom from want, as though this were an individual right. It is no more a right than is the right to steal. As a matter of fact freedom from want, from toil, and from need would reduce man to a worthless, shiftless idler. Let the Government feed him from cradle to grave and he would deteriorate into a spiritless, spineless begger. Man is not made to be fed at the hand of Mammon.

One of the problems of young people today is that they are encouraged to seek security first. As one schoolboy wrote, "Security is the problem of keeping people free from worry." Since when have Americans been free from worry? That is as unnatural as for them to be kept free from want. No largess from Uncle Sam can lift these human driving forces.

Young America should be inspired by the tales of the Edisons, Ketterings, the Lincolns and the Morgans and Clarks. If they are taught that Government is the solution to their problems, they will soon be trading freedom for socialism.

Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following analysis of the President's tax bill was sent to me by a friend and constituent, Mr. J. Fletcher Gillinder, of Port Jervis, N.Y.

What Mr. Gillinder writes is an exact statement of how the new proposals will affect him as an individual. It is not the rosy dream of a Keynesian egghead or the griping of a bloated plutocrat.

It is the truth as it affects an average citizen, and will affect many more like him:

GILLINDER BROS., INC.,
Port Jervis, N.Y., January 28, 1963.

Re income tax reduction.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I have just completed my income tax report for 1962. I also have studied "Kennedy's Tax Blueprint" as printed in the Wall Street Journal of Friday, January 25.

With my figures before me for 1962, I applied the proposed "tax reduction" to them. The resulting tax was actually higher. To be sure I was correct, I had a CPA do the same for me—not merely check my figures but make the entire calculation. The result was the same.

The main reason for this is that part of the blueprint which would allow as a deduction only that part of itemized deductions, including taxes, interest, etc., that exceeds 5 percent of income.

About 45 percent of the increase is due to the proposed loss of dividend received credit and removal of the dividend exclusion.

The dividend received credit and the dividend exclusion are surely an incentive for capital investment in industry to produce growth and expansion. It should not be overlooked that there already is a double taxation on dividends as they have already been taxed 52 percent at their source. Contrary to the avowed purpose of the administration to stimulate such growth, it is proposed that this be eliminated.

The limitation on the deduction from income of real estate taxes and interest on loans likewise is contrary to the stated purpose of the administration of stimulating growth. It will surely be a deterrent to home building and will penalize consumer credit purchasing.

This same limitation, as applied to contributions, will unquestionably adversely affect the work of organizations, such as the Red Cross, and many others, and will probably and unfortunately be felt by the churches throughout the Nation as well.

I well realize these are proposals only and are a long way from enactment. Doubtless, some will be eliminated—perhaps were put there for that purpose so there can be something on which to appear to yield in the showdown.

In my thinking, there are not grades of honesty. A policy is either honest or dishonest. To foster a tax reduction of this kind on the public under the sole guise of helping the economy, when it is obviously to woo votes of a certain bracket of taxpayers, is anything but honest.

Sincerely,

J. FLETCHER GILLINDER.

Surrender to Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since Mr. Rostow went to Russia it seems almost according to his plan that we are stripping ourselves of first-strike capability. In the January 26 issue of the Long Island Press, Edith Kermit Roosevelt makes an excellent analysis of the danger of current thinking of the President insofar as it affects our security:

RUSSIAN ROULETTE, AMERICAN STYLE

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Cancellation of the Skybolt under investigation by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is only one of a series of disarmament steps by our Government in recent months.

We are in the process of abandoning all our first strike capability weapons which preserve our standing as a class A nuclear power. First strike weapons are all those weapons which could be destroyed by an enemy attack—or those in stationary, unprotected positions. Here is the record to date:

B-58 supersonic medium bombers—production stopped.

B-70 bombers with speeds of 2,000 miles per hour and an altitude range of more than 70,000 feet—development halted.

Nuclear powered bombers—development halted.

RS-70 reconnaissance planes—cutback in research funds.

The Dyna-Soar or manned spacecraft bomber system—cutbacks in funds in the new defense budget.

Goal of military use of outer space replaced by Presidential anouncement of "peaceful uses of outer space." Instead of developing a satellite weapons system capable of delivery nuclear weapons, funds are diverted to the moonshot. As one grim-faced Army colonel expresses it, "While the Russians have parties all over the world, we're planning a tea party on the moon."

Finally, there is the replacement of Thor surface-to-surface missiles in England and Italy by the Polaris, a second strike capability weapons system designed to fire missiles from submarines.

Second strike capability weapons include all those weapons groups which cannot be destroyed by receiving the first blow because they are either mobile or hardened. However, erosion of our second strike capability also has already begun.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara bluntly told Congress that he would not put component parts of the Nike-Zeus system into production even though this system had been successfully tested. Yet the Nike-Zeus system, an antimissile system, was de-

signed to defend the United States and Europe from Communist attacking ballistic missiles.

But disarming unilaterally, policymakers apparently hope to induce the Soviets to compete with us in this Americanized form of Russian roulette. But irrespective of any physiosophical motivation, concentration of all the defense apples in the missile basket constitutes in itself a disarmament measure.

Presently, the 200-missile U.S. missile right arm includes 126 Atlases, 54 Titans, and 20 Minutemen. This missile force represents a firepower of about 600 megatons. If you add the firepower of 144 Polaris missiles and 100-odd Jupiters and Thors remaining, our present missile force has a 1,000-megaton punch. But about 1,600 B-52's, B-58's, and B-47's are able to drop in excess of 10,000 megatons. This is their single mission punch. (These figures do not take into account carrier aircraft, fighter bombers, and tactical missiles.) And even if the Soviet defenses were perfect many of these planes would fly several missions.

If we wish to replace our bombers with missiles, we will need a minimum of some 10,000 missiles. But no one has yet talked about a U.S. force even approaching this size. If we reduce our strategic force to 2,000-odd missiles, as seems to be the present plan, our deterrent and retaliatory power would be cut by four-fifths or more.

Furthermore Khrushchev stated recently that the Soviet Union has invested in a defense effort against ballistic missiles equal to that invested in the missiles themselves. Obviously, the invulnerability of our Intercontinental Ballistic Missile system cannot last.

As Dr. Stefan T. Possony, former adviser Chief of Staff Air Force intelligence, points out aircraft must come out on top in the offense-defense race because (a) it is manned and therefore, genuinely maneuverable; (b) it can carry defensive armament and (c) it would be used jointly with ground-to-ground and air-to-ground missiles which would be aimed at the enemy's missile and aircraft interceptor bases.

The missile is unable, by itself, to identify and pinpoint targets; attack moving targets; and destroy very hard targets. Hence, a missile force cannot function without aircraft and cannot be the main element of a strategy designed to knock out the enemy's offensive force and stop the invasion of Western Europe.

"If the manned aircraft fleet is dead," says Dr. Possony, "perhaps the United States should prepare for its dignified funeral."

The Russell committee should investigate the entire spectrum of defense policies. A one-sided "peace race" could result in war sooner than an arms race since military weakness invites aggression. It could be a war the United States would lose.

U.S. Navy Honors James Iredell Waddell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of their history the United States have produced many leaders who have been honored in many ways. One of the most effective means of the U.S. Navy in recognizing the just fame of its heroes, has been in the naming of certain types of war vessels after them.

It is indeed gratifying that over the years, the policy of our Government in these regards has been broad, permitting vessels to be named for leaders on both sides in the supreme catastrophe of our history—the War Between the States.

One such recent example is that of the missile destroyer named in honor of James Iredell Waddell, the 138th graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy in 1847, who joined the South in 1861 and won fame as commanding officer of the Confederate States ship *Shenandoah*.

An informative article by Ruby R. Duval in the December 1962 issue of Shipmate, magazine of the Naval Academy Alumni Association, summarizes the career of Captain Waddell.

The article follows:

U.S. NAVY HONORS JAMES IREDELL WADDELL

(By Ruby R. Duval)

A guided missile destroyer has been assigned the name *Waddell* in honor of James Iredell Waddell, Naval Academy class of 1847, who distinguished himself in later years as captain of the Confederate States ship *Shenandoah*.

The *Waddell* (DDG-24), a highly maneuverable combatant ship larger than destroyers of earlier years, is designed for a complement of 24 officers and 330 enlisted men. Her armament, and that of her sister Tartar guided missile destroyers, will greatly increase the antisubmarine and antiair warfare capability of our Navy.

When James Iredell Waddell, of North Carolina, received a midshipman's warrant at the age of 17 from Secretary of the Navy George E. Badger he was destined to become a Marylander by adoption and one of the most colorful citizens of Annapolis after the War of 1861-65. He reported for duty aboard the ship-of-the-line *Pennsylvania* at Norfolk, Va., in December 1841. Later assignments led to duty in the *Vandalia* and, during the war with Mexico, he was one of the complement of the brig *Somers* off Vera Cruz.

While attending the naval school midshipmen had ample opportunity to meet Annapolis families and their young ladies; and young Waddell soon lost his heart to Miss Anne Sellman Iglehart, daughter of James Iglehart, whose home was within a few blocks of the Old Fort. He claimed Miss Anne as his bride in 1848 and his effusive "Lines to Miss Iglehart," U.S. Naval School, December 8, 1845, are found among treasured keepsakes in the late Mrs. Waddell's scrapbook.

In the summer of 1859 Waddell received orders to the U.S.S. Saginaw under construction at Mare Island, Calif., and scheduled for duty in the Far East. Two years later, while serving aboard this vessel off Hong Kong, he received news of the distressing political situation in the United States and the impending war. He was fortunate to be detached from the Saginaw and ordered to the *John Adams*, a sloop-of-war, about to sail for New York.

When the *John Adams* reached New York in November 1861, James Iredell Waddell lost no time submitting his resignation to Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles, explaining that he could not bear arms against the South. Not until late January 1862 was his resignation acknowledged, and he was informed that his name had been "stricken from the rolls." He soon made his way to Annapolis, where his wife awaited him at her father's home, and he promptly made preparations for departure to Virginia and the Confederate capital.

In the interim between assignments at sea, Waddell was under instruction at the Naval School which had been established under Comdr. Franklin Buchanan at old Fort Severn, Annapolis, and was graduated as a past midshipman in 1847.

The whole State of Maryland was under Federal martial law by this time and normal means of travel were avoided by Southern sympathizers to escape possible detention and arrest. It was the latter part of February when Waddell sadly took leave of his wife and little daughter and started his trek South, via southern Maryland, where he crossed the Potomac and made his way to Richmond.

In the spring of 1861 James D. Bulloch, of Georgia, formerly an officer in the U.S. Navy, was selected to serve as the Confederate States naval agent in Europe to seek ships and necessary supplies with which to build a Confederate States Navy. At that time the South had only one fighting ship—the *Sumter*, skippered by Raphael Semmes—and Bulloch was arranging not only for the construction of vessels but for the purchase of seaworthy ships already completed. It was through his cautious negotiations that the Confederate States goverment was able to acquire the *Sea King* in the fall of 1864. Built at Glasgow and known to be one of the fastest ships afloat, the *Sea King* was readied to begin an epoch-making voyage around the world.

James Waddell had been commissioned as a lieutenant in the Confederate States Navy in March 1862 and ordered to a ram under construction at New Orleans. Later he was detailed as ordnance officer at fortifications erected at Drewry's Bluff overlooking the James River below Richmond, and eventually duty took him to Charleston, S.C., where he received letters of instruction in regard to an impending command. It can be justly stated that his most significant opportunity came when he was ordered to Europe for foreign service in August 1864 and, upon reaching England, learned that he was slated to skipper the swift cruising *Sea King*, soon to be commissioned as the C.S.S. *Shenandoah* and to work havoc with commerce and the whaling fleets of the United States.

Among the officers detailed for Waddell's command and who joined the *Shenandoah* off Funchal, when the Stars and Bars of the Confederacy were run up and the cruiser was duly commissioned, were: William C. Whittle, of Virginia, first lieutenant and executive officer; Lt. John Grimball, of South Carolina, Sidney Smith Lee, Jr., of Virginia, Francis T. Chew, of Tennessee, Dabney M. Scales, of Virginia, and Sailing Master Irvine S. Bulloch, of Georgia. Whittle and Grimball were former classmates at the Naval School, Annapolis, Class of 1858; Sidney Smith Lee, Jr., was a son of Capt. Sidney Smith Lee, C.S.N., and a nephew of Gen. Robert E. Lee, C.S.A.; and Bulloch had served under Capt. Raphael Semmes in the Confederate cruiser *Alabama*, sunk off Cherbourg in the engagement with the U.S.S. *Kearsarge* in June 1864. Lieutenants Chew and Scales had received their initial training at the Naval School, Annapolis, and resigned in the spring of 1861 to offer their services to the South.

Promoted to the rank of captain, Confederate States Navy, James Iredell Waddell lost no time in getting underway to follow his official orders and headed the *Shenandoah* into the South Atlantic to leave in her wake many burning merchant vessels. He rounded the Cape of Good Hope and set sail for Australia, en route to the South Pacific and thence to the Arctic Ocean, where the *Shenandoah* took heavy toll among the large wooden whaling ships off Siberia. In her historic cruise of 1 year and 17 days this swift sailing vessel ran down and captured approximately 39 ships and took many prisoners. Many of the captured ships were sunk and others, considered too valuable to destory, were manned by prize crews and sent to the nearest Southern ports.

On August 2, 1865, the *Shenandoah* fell in with a British merchantman which had sailed from San Francisco 13 days earlier, and Captain Waddell learned that the war of 1861–65 was over, that General Lee had surrendered at Appomattox nearly 4 months before. Realizing that his officers and crew had been waging war on Yankee-owned vessels after the official surrender, Waddell pondered his next maneuver with a view of just what it would mean to each and every man of the *Shenandoah's* complement. He decided to spike the ship's guns and set a course for England via Cape Horn—a journey of approximately 17,000 miles.

The *Shenandoah* put it at Liverpool on November 6, 1865—still flying her wind-torn and faded Confederate flag. This was the only Confederate flag to circumnavigate the world—it waved on every ocean, except the Antractic, and was hauled down over 6 months after the termination of the war. Captain Waddell surrendered his proud ship to the neutral British Government and begged asylum for his officers and crew.

For several years after his arrival in England, James Iredell Waddell remained abroad. When he returned to the United States and to his family in Annapolis he sought employment in keeping with his wide experience in maritime service and procured command of the *San Francisco*—one of the steamships of the Pacific Mail Co.'s passenger fleet. In 1877 the *San Francisco* struck an uncharted reef off the coast of Mexico and sank. Fortunately for all concerned, Waddell's rigid discipline and excellent leadership prevented any loss of life even though over 400 passengers were abroad in this disaster.

Soon after this trying exigency he returned to Annapolis where he and Mrs. Waddell made plans for the erection of their home on a lot at the south corner of College Avenue at the intersection of Prince George Street and overlooking the campus of St. John's College. Eventually he was appointed by the Governor of Maryland to command a flotilla known as the "State Oyster Fleet," a small number of patrol vessels serving as an enforcement agency to protect the State's oyster beds from the raid of illegal tongers.

When Captain Waddell died in March 1886, the Maryland Legislature adjourned to attend his funeral service at historic St. Anne's Church, and to thus pay their respects to the man who won the distinction of commanding the only man-of-war to fly the Stars and Bars of the Confederate States of America all around the world.

Let's Get the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is astounding that President Kennedy should be so exercised over the French veto, when he has been so condescending at Russian vetoes in the United Nations. Perhaps I, too, do not like the result of the French decision on the Common Market, but nevertheless, France is still an ally of this country and our differences should be talked out. Here again, why does President Kennedy want so much to talk with Khrushchev and not with Mr. de Gaulle?

To show the other side of the coin, an excellent article by David Lawrence in yesterday's Washington Star and an analysis by Ted Lewis in the January 26 Boston Herald indicate that Mr. de Gaulle is not solely to blame in this matter.

It is my view that the Kennedy administration has generated this serious deterioration in relations between France and the United States.

Just as the great Winston Churchill thought of Great Britain first, so does Charles de Gaulle think first of France. I wish President Kennedy would show that same concern for the United States.

The articles follow:

[From the U.S. News, January 30, 1963]

DE GAULLE: REALIST FOR FRANCE

(By David Lawrence)

There's no use getting mad at General de Gaulle just because he is a realist in a world of anxiety or just because he doesn't see things the way Washington or London see them.

The French President has lately been the subject of some rather severe criticism as a stubborn, self-centered individual who would rather mess up NATO and the whole defense plan of the West than give up his concept of a united Europe based on continental supremacy without Britain. Naturally this irritates many people and causes intimations to be given in White House circles that maybe General de Gaulle is living in the 19th century.

Yet General de Gaulle has merely stood firm on the principle that a leader's first obligation is to take care of his own countrymen. He hasn't swallowed the propaganda of the supranationalists who think the many nationalities in Europe can be best governed by a single council of state.

It was on January 14 that General de Gaulle gave comprehensive answers to questions asked at a press conference in Paris. He has not modified his position since. While his views were not accepted with enthusiasm here or in London, they were by no means opposed fundamentally to allied solidarity or to the organization of a common defense against the Communist menace. His statement explained that France would welcome Britain into the Common Market on terms of equality, but not as a special partner with trade concessions for the benefit of its home agriculture and its Commonwealth associates.

Nor did General de Gaulle exclude the strategy of a common military defense. He said:

"In these conditions, no one in the world—particularly no one in America—can say if, where, when, how and to what extent the American nuclear weapons would be employed to defend Europe. Moreover, this does not in the least prevent the American nuclear weapons, which are the most powerful of all, from remaining the essential guarantee of world peace. * * * But it remains that the American nuclear power does not necessarily and immediately meet all the eventualities concerning Europe and France.

"Thus, principles and realities combine to lead France to equip itself with an atomic force of its own. This does not at all exclude, of course, the combination of the action of this force with the action of the similar forces of its allies."

Referring to the agreement reached at Nassau between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, the De Gaulle statement said:

"It is a question of constituting a so-called multilateral atomic force, in which Britain would turn over the weapons it has and will have and in which the Americans would place a few of their own. This multilateral force is assigned to the defense of Europe and is under the American NATO command. It is nevertheless understood that the British retain the possibility of withdrawing their atomic weapons for their own use should supreme national interest seem to them to demand it. As for the bulk of American nuclear weapons, it remains outside the multilateral force and under the direct orders of the President of the United States.

"It is true that we, too, can theoretically retain the ability to take back in our hands, in the supreme hypothesis, our atomic weapons incorporated in the multilateral force. But how could we do it in practice during the unheard of moments of the atomic apocalypse? * * * In sum, we will adhere to the decision we have made: to construct and, if necessary, to employ our atomic force ourselves. And that without refusing, of course, cooperation, be it technological or strategic, if this cooperation is, on the other hand, desired by our allies."

Here is a nation's leader who is thinking primarily of his own country and who is not willing to entrust its safety to the trigger finger of an executive in another country. General de Gaulle thinks this would entail "a web of liaisons, transmissions, and interferences within itself, and, on the outside, a ring of obligations such that, if an integral part were suddenly snatched from it, there would be a strong risk of paralyzing it just at the moment, perhaps, when it should act."

The lesson of all this is that there is need for soul-searching conferences and consultation without the emotional discords that arise when the head of a foreign state is described as "egoistic" just because he thinks of the future of his own people and is unwilling to entrust their safety to a strategy that relies wholly on missiles or, to a large extent, looks on conventional weapons as obsolete. Yet the possibility of a big war in Europe without nuclear weapons remains as always, on a continent in which the Soviet Union today has the biggest standing army in the world.

BRITAIN NOT BLAMELESS IN TIFF

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—The amount of hysteria generated here by French President de Gaulle's alleged attempt to keep Britain out of the Common Market definitely requires the application of a cold towel.

This can be supplied only by French sources which scarcely anyone here has bothered to contact, preferring instead to froth at the mouth over de Gaulle's activities without trying to find out the whys and wherefores of the general's position.

NEW PARTNERSHIP

Nobody here in high or low authority has blamed the British for the Common Market mess.

In fact, without trying to determine what really has been going on, such Senators as New York's JACOB JAVITS have now joined the Anglophile ranks with a "down with de Gaulle" statement proposing a new trade partnership of the United States, Britain, and Japan.

Close friends and aids here of de Gaulle are understandably furious about his being made the whipping boy. They certainly, whether right, or wrong, should have their case put on the record.

French officials, for example, insist that de Gaulle did not slam the door on Britain's entry into the Common Market. He still stands ready to accept this momentous step, however many misgivings he might have personally.

The real reason for the present snafu, in the French view, is simply that Britain has refused and is still refusing to agree to the rules of the club it wants to join—even after many concessions have been made to meet its special problems. All de Gaulle did in his now famous press conference a week ago, the French say, is to lay it on the line to the British to fish or cut bait, to accept the Market terms or forget about full membership.

With all the inexorable logic of a man of destiny, De Gaulle sharply questioned whether Britain would ever be willing to cut its ties to the Commonwealth or its special relationship to the United States to join the European Community "without restriction and without reservation."

NO ULTIMATUM

This was widely interpreted as an ultimatum to Britain to drop its links with the United States—the Nassau agreement on the Polaris missile, for example—or forget about getting into the market. But the French say nothing of the sort was intended.

They insist that De Gaulle's worry about what Britain might do to his ideas regarding the future political organization of Europe doesn't rule out the admission of the United Kingdom to the Market now.

Strong currents are propelling the Market along toward an eventual political organization, but this hasn't happened yet. At the moment, the Market is still purely and simply an economic union. And in the French view the reasons for the current snag over Britain's admissions are basically economic.

Negotiators for Britain and the six Market countries have been haggling for 15 months over the terms of Britain's admission. Concessions have been made on both sides, but two critical issues still stood in the way of agreement at the time of the De Gaulle press conference.

Britain still refused to agree to the Market proposals for solving the knotty problem of British agriculture. France and its partners insisted that Britain immediately accept the Market rules on farm tariffs, price supports and other issues, but agreed to permit a transition period of 7 years.

Britain insisted it should be allowed to continue its own farm subsidy program. It promised to adapt progressively to the Market system but did not agree to the 7-year limitation.

As De Gaulle put it, the British nourish themselves "by importing foodstuffs purchased at low prices in the two Americas or in the former dominions, while still granting large subsidies to British farmers." He said this is "obviously incompatible" with the Market system.

Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest, and I may say some dismay, a series of articles which appeared recently in the Washington Daily News concerning the Small Business Administration.

The articles, written by Mr. Dickson Preston, give a biased, incomplete, and distorted account of both the functions of this agency and the services it offers to the Nation's small business firms.

If I may, Mr. President, I would like to mention just one of the several very important functions of SBA which Mr. Preston either overlooked or chose not to discuss. And I am rather surprised, too, at this omission, inasmuch as Mr. Preston's articles discussed at length SBA's lending activities.

One of the most important facets of SBA's lending program, is that of making loans to local development companies organized specifically to assist small firms.

This authority, given to SBA by Congress through enactment of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, has proved invaluable to small communities interested in improving their economic position.

I know of one small community in my own State of Louisiana for example that formed its own local development company and got a $250,000 loan from SBA to assist a small lumber company. In this one instance alone, 150 new jobs were created.

Throughout the country, SBA has made about 250 of these local development company loans totaling over $32 million. SBA has advanced nearly $29 million and local banks have added another $3 million. The development companies have in addition put up about $13 million, and the total value of these projects is nearly $45 million.

These loans have resulted directly in the creation of nearly 16,000 new jobs.

Of course, the total effect of these loans is not apparent in the basic figures cited. But loans of this type have a cumulative or "snowballing" effect. As a result of these loans a community gains more people, more households, more schoolchildren, higher personal income, higher bank deposits, more passenger cars, more retail establishments, and more retail sales.

This beneficial effect on the Nation's economy is the net result of this one program offered by SBA.

Of course there are also other valuable services rendered by the SBA which were not mentioned in Mr. Preston's articles but which are, nevertheless, an integral part of the functions of SBA which represents the more than 4½ million small businesses in the country and does so most effectively.

That is why I do not wish to let Mr. Preston's slurs on the SBA—and his omissions—go unchallenged.

SBA is doing a good job and we should all work to help it become still more effective.

Eliminate the Two-Price Cotton System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made yesterday before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee which is considering legislation to end the two-price cotton system:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROY A. TAYLOR, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Since 1956 the Federal Government has subsidized the purchase of U.S. cotton by foreign buyers to the extent of 8½ cents per pound, creating a two-price system for U.S. cotton. A substantial quantity of U.S. raw cotton is exported under this subsidy plan and later shipped back into this country in a manufactured form to compete with the output of U.S. mills.

It is not right that foreign buyers should be permitted to continue purchasing American cotton on the world market 8½ cents per pound cheaper than American manufacturers can buy the same cotton on the domestic market and then sell the finished products on the American market in competition with the American textile industry.

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of cotton products have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952 to 225,000 bales in 1956, to 234,000 bales in 1958, to 526,000 bales in 1960, and approximately 672,000 bales in 1962. This upward trend in the main has occurred since 1956 when the two-price cotton system was created.

Since the advent of two-price cotton in 1956 active cotton spindles have dropped 9.1 percent. Textile employment has declined 176,000 workers. Mill consumption of cotton has declined and imports of cotton textiles continue an upward surge.

The textile industry is the second largest employer in the United States and has been hard hit by imports from low-wage countries. The American cotton farmer is being hurt by this decline in the textile industry on which he must depend. A bale of cotton has little value until it is processed. The export market is uncertain so the strength of our Nation's cotton production industry must depend on a healthy American textile industry. The two-price cotton system is not only weakening the textile industry but is hurting the American cotton farmer.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams from textile and garment manufacturers in my congressional district pointing out the necessity of early action to eliminate the two-price cotton system. I hope that new cotton legislation can be passed by Congress in time to apply to the 1963 crop. We cannot afford to delay, with textile employment shrinking, and the number of cotton spindles being constantly reduced. Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer unemployment and shorter hours while their foreign competitors are supplying so much of the American market.

President Kennedy has characterized the two-price cotton system as "a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future."

We must quickly eliminate the system under which oversea textile mills may buy American cotton at $42.50 less a bale than U.S. mills must pay.

Native of Southwest Missouri Heads Associated Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in this House of the Seventh

Congressional District of southwest Missouri I am honored to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarkable and well-deserved success of a talented man who was born 56 years ago at Diamond, Mo.

That gentleman, Paul Miller, is the president of Gannett newspapers and has just become president of the worldwide news service of the Associated Press.

Mr. Miller, who is to receive the William Allen White Journalism Award in a few weeks, is the son of the late Reverend James T. Miller, of Diamond and Neosho, Mo. The new AP chief executive was educated in the fine schools of the city of Neosho and from there began the career that has led him to this high post.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial honoring Mr. Miller which appeared January 25 in the Carthage, Mo., Evening Press:

THE RISE OF PAUL MILLER

The world's biggest, most comprehensive news wire service is the Associated Press. It taps the flow of current events at a thousand points on the globe, and transmits concise summaries of everything from an international incident to an individual's case in municipal court to newspapers, radio, and television stations on every major continent.

And the president of that vast organization is a man from Diamond, Mo., a town well known to all Carthaginians. According to the 1960 decennial census it had 453 residents. Not only is Paul Miller new head of the Associated Press, he's president of the Gannett Co., which publishes 17 newspapers in 4 States, operates 4 radio and 2 television stations. He's also editor and publisher of the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union and publisher of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle.

How did the 56-year-old Miller, eldest of eight children of a circuit-riding Christian Church preacher, get from Diamond to leadership of the world's most powerful wire service?

He started as sports editor of the Daily O'Collegian at Oklahoma A. & M. College at a salary of $15 a month plus another $25 for college publicity work. The money enabled him to enroll as a student there. Two years later he quit to become editor of the Guthrie Daily Leader, although later, while working in Oklahoma City, he finished out his college education with 2 years at the University of Oklahoma.

Hired as a member of the Columbus AP bureau, in 5 years he advanced to the New York cable desk, then to the general news staff and work as a correspondent in Kansas City, served as bureau chief in Salt Lake City, then chief at Harrisburg, Pa., and on to Philadelphia.

After serving as executive assistant to the general manager, Miller was named chief of the Washington bureau in 1941. In 1947 he left AP and became executive assistant to Frank E. Gannett of the Gannett chain, and upon Gannett's death in 1955 became operating head of the group and president of the Frank E. Gannett Newspaper Foundation. Meanwhile, he served three terms as an AP director, and was elected first vice president last April, leaving that post for the presidency.

And that's how you get from Diamond to the leadership of the Associated Press.

His achievement makes Miller another of the national leaders of whom southwest Missouri is justly proud, and under his direction the citizens of Diamond, of Missouri, and of the Nation can expect to see the Associated Press rise to new heights of service to the free world.

Congressional Fellowship Program Benefits Fellows and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to participate this year for the first time in the congressional fellowship program of the American Political Science Association. As many of the Members of this House already know, this program provides congressional experience for young journalists, political science teachers, and career Government employees, and also includes a group of fellows from Asia.

I would like to point out that this nationwide fellowship program is the only one operating in Congress which provides congressional offices with the services of professional men, who already have proved their talents in their chosen professions. While the program benefits the fellows in large measure, it also is a boon to the congressional offices able to utilize their services.

I highly commend to my colleagues the nonpartisan congressional fellowship program. And I submit for publication in the RECORD the following list of congressional offices, the names of the fellows working in them this session, and the newspapers, colleges, and Government positions from which the fellows came:

HOUSE OFFICE ASSIGNMENTS—1963 CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts—Agustus Adair, of Gramling College, Louisiana.

Hon. NEIL STAEBLER, of Michigan—Dale Arnold, of the Detroit Free Press.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois—Bruce Beacher, of the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri—Jerald Blizin, of the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times.

Republican Policy Committee—Terry Cabahug, of the Philippine Senate.

Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania—Everett Cataldo, of Ohio State University.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana—Carl Chelf, of the University of Nebraska.

Office of the Speaker of the House—George Condon, of Washington State University.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—Howard Farkas, of the Public Health Service.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California—Fariborz Fatemi, of Syracuse University.

Hon. KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia—Daniel Fleming, of Marietta, Ohio, High School.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri—Jerry W. Friedheim, of the Joplin, Mo., Globe.

Hon. W. R. POAGE, of Texas—George Herzog, of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota—Andrew Hickey, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey—James Hoge, of the Chicago Sun Times.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota—William Jacobson, of NASA.

Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER of Ohio—Colt Johnson, of Columbia University.

Hon. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan—S. K. Law, of the Sarawak Information Service.

Government Operations Committee—Thomas King of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania—John Lim, of the Korean Foreign Service.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES, of Maryland—Richard Melton, of the Department of State.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, of California—John Morgan, of the Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent.

Hon. JOHN KYL, of Iowa—Shams Nizami, of the Pakistan Ministry of Justice.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida—Kenneth Olson, of Smith College.

Hon. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin—Ronald Steel, of Scholastic Magazine.

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama—George W. Tourtillot, of the Forest Service.

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., of New Jersey—Thomas van der Voort, of the Public Health Service.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan—Bruce Van Dusen, of the Providence, R.I., Journal.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York—George Von der Muhll, of Harvard University.

Office of the majority whip—Eric Wentworth, of the Portland Oregonian.

A Salute to Fleet Reserve Association, Branch 63, for Their Distinguished Contributions and Patriotic Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the very worthy comments taken from a letter to Mr. Roy Baker, branch president, from Capt. C. D. Simonsen, regarding the distinguished contributions and patriotic efforts of the Fleet Reserve Association's Branch 63, located at Iwakuni, Japan. Under unanimous consent, I include these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

January 15, 1963.

Mr. ROY BAKER,
President, Iwakuni Branch No. 63
Fleet Reserve Association
Iwakuni, Japan.

Dear Mr. BAKER: Because of the honorary membership your branch afforded me at the outset of my tour, and also because of the close association I have had with many of the members of Branch 63, it has been my pleasure and privilege to observe closely, and often participate in, the many tremendously beneficial programs and projects continuously being sparked and sponsored by your dynamic group. All who benefit directly and indirectly from your well-placed support and sponsorship efforts realize beyond all doubt that you provide a most meritorious and indispensable service to your country, the Navy and this very important oversea community.

In particular the numerous youth activities backed by branch 63 including all categories of Scouting, Pee Wee Basketball League, Little League, Pony League, bowling leagues, are of inestimable benefit to the youngsters of this base and the city of Iwelani. These efforts will produce untold dividends in terms of character, health, and

teamwork for the upcoming generation. The works your members accomplish in terms of the President's people-to-people program in helping support the Iwakuni Home for Destitute Children, assisting elderly U.S. Navy Japanese retirees, counseling many Japanese in their problems relating to U.S. customs and procedures, coming to the fore in emergencies such as the recent Guam typhoon disaster and providing generous help and cheer for less fortunate orphans at Christmas and other holidays, are most commendable.

It has also been my privilege to attend your traditional and impressive Fleet Reserve Association Memorial Day services in both 1961 and 1962. Indeed, I have never known a group which has been so active and achieved so much in the realms of meaningful community and human relations. The noteworthy achievements you have accomplished for the good of the U.S. forces stationed here and our Japanese hosts in Iwakuni are absolutely superlative in every way. Speaking as one whose problems concerning morale, personnel welfare, recruiting, youth activities, and wholesome recreation have been immeasurably eased and benefited by your fine organization I am deeply thankful to every member of branch 63. Your works are of great importance. They bespeak a true Christian and American endeavor.

I am proud to commend Branch 63, Fleet Reserve Association for its distinguished efforts, its vitality, patriotism, and the high ideals for which it stands. I thank you all again for the many courtesies and hospitality extended to me during my stay in Iwakuni, and I shall pray for continued success, growth, and development of your outstanding association.

Sayonara,

C. D. SIMONSEN,
Captain, U.S. Navy, Commander Fleet Air Wing 6, U.S. Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan.

Eighth Air Force, Strategic Air Command, With Headquarters at Westover AFB, Observes 21st Anniversary of Founding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the battle-hardened 8th Air Force of the Strategic Air Command, with headquarters at the great Westover Air Force Base at Chicopee Falls, Mass., in my congressional district, is celebrating its 21st birthday this week. I include with my remarks a story on the history of the 8th Air Force published in the Springfield Daily News on January 28:

BATTLE-HARDENED 8TH AIR FORCE COMES OF AGE (21 YEARS) WITH ICBM

WESTOVER AIR FORCE BASE.—The 8th Air Force reached voting age today—its 21st birthday.

A fair argument might be whether any organization, military or civilian, has traveled farther or faster in reaching majority than has the 8th—or has endured more.

Born and nurtured in warfare, the 8th Air Force, fittingly enough, recently marked its coming of age with the takeover, at frigid Plattsburgh Air Force Base, N.Y., of an intercontinental ballistic missile complex.

That move ushered in the space age for the historic, battle-hardened command, and is an augury of its future. Already the most powerful arm of the Strategic Air Command, its devastating retaliatory striking power was enormously increased by the addition of the dreaded, nuclear-tipped ICBM to its weaponry.

NINE HUNDRED AIRCRAFT

Headquartered at Westover, the 8th Air Force now has more than 900 aircraft, including B-52, B-47, KC-135, and KC-97 models, along with its ICBM's. Its more than 78,000 personnel are assigned with 21 units spread along the eastern coastline, anchored north and south at Thule Air Base, near the Arctic Circle in Greenland, and Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, and inland in Ohio.

Actually, the 8th Air Force has been "mansized and shaving" for many years.

The 8th Air Force was activated on January 28, 1942, at Savannah, Ga. By the summer of that year, on August 17, the first of its great Flying Fortress B-17's were in combat. On that date, a small force of 12 Flying Forts took off at Grafton Underwood, England, in the first daylight, unescorted raid of Europe. Almost as an anticlimax, all 12 planes returned undamaged to their base.

DAYLIGHT BOMBING

The decision of the Army Air Force generals to send their four-engine bombers against German Luftwaffe fighters in broad daylight was a momentous experiment, the significance of which may be lost on Air Force recruits today, many of whom were not yet born. The entire concept of strategic bombing—and, indeed, the Strategic Air Command itself—were founded on it—and thus the maintenance of the peace today.

Commanded by such legendary figures as Gen. Carl "Tooey" Spaatz, Gen. Ira Eaker and Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, the 8th grew to tremendous size during World War II. By the end of the war, its record stood at 600,000 sorties flown during which 700,000 tons of bombs were dropped. Its aerial gunners and fighter pilots destroyed 15,000 enemy aircraft.

This was not without cost, however, as hundreds of its planes were shot down, and thousands of its personnel killed or taken prisoner. Thirteen of its members were awarded the Nation's highest decoration—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Eighth Air Force reached its wartime peak of power on Christmas Eve of 1944 when the command sent 2,000 bombers and 800 fighters over Germany.

DESTRUCTION POWER

Today, however, the nuclear tips on 8th's Atlas ICBM's at Plattsburgh or carried in the bomb bays of the B-52 Stratofortresses represent far more destructive power than in all the weight of bombs dropped during World War II.

Its 200-ton B-52's, utilizing air refueling, a concept developed by the command, can range the world in reaching targets.

The command has never stood still during its 21 years, moving from plane to better plane and concept to better concept as they developed. As signified at Plattsburgh, its eyes are to the future when the Air Force and the 8th, shall become true space powers. Its huge personnel—as was proven recently during the Cuban crisis—stands ready on the instant to swing into wartime footing.

But its mission, like that of all armed service branches, remains the same—"Peace through power."

The American Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry is suffering a great disadvantage in the highly competitive textile market by reason of the advantage enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in the purchase of American cotton. Under the existing law foreign mills can purchase American cotton 8½ cents a pound cheaper, or at a cost of $42.50 less per bale than can the American manufacturer.

Legislation has been introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] to remove the inequity existing in our two-price cotton program. Yesterday I appeared before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in support of the legislation, and it is my earnest hope that some relief will be secured for the textile industry in the immediate future.

I commend the members of the Agriculture Committee on the approach that the committee is taking to this vital matter, and I include the statement I made before the Cotton Subcommittee yesterday on the two-price cotton program in the Appendix of the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, 10TH DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA, BEFORE COTTON SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 30, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am deeply grateful for the opportunity that is being given for the presentation of my views with reference to the two-price cotton problem. As I understand it, the committee has two bills before it; one of these is the Cooley bill and the other is the Gathings bill. I further understand that these bills are intended generally to be a basis from which to work in arriving at legislation which will serve the public interest.

By way of introduction let me say that I represent a congressional district which has a very keen interest in the entire cotton economy. One of the counties in my district is the second largest cotton producing county in North Carolina, and the district is the largest textile manufacturing congressional district in the United States. It is, therefore, necessary that I take into account the interest of agriculture and industry in what I say and do in dealing with legislation affecting cotton.

The members of this committee are well aware of the genesis and history of the two-price cotton system. It is, therefore, not necessary that I take your time to give any detailed statement as to reasons for the present price differential of 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 per bale, which is enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in their competition with the domestic textile industry.

I would also hasten to point out that I believe that it is important to our economy that our cotton farmers continue to receive a fair price for the cotton which they produce upon their farms. I think it is equally important that we take the long-range view and try to protect the cotton farmer from

losses of his market in future years. If we confine our action to the picture as it exists today and disregard the future, we will not have served either the farmer or the public generally in a very commendable fashion.

Already your subcommittee has had testimony from economists and other interested parties giving you statistical data with reference to the failure of cotton fiber to keep pace with the growth and use which has been experienced in the use of manmade synthetic fibers. You have had testimony which is uncontradictable setting forth the reasons that there has been a great acceleration in the use of these manmade synthetic fibers in the production of many end products which were formerly produced entirely from cotton fiber.

Let me first deal with the matter of the future of the cotton farmer as it relates itself to the question of eliminating the two-price cotton system.

On November 13, 1961, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in a letter to the President of the United States, recommended that the President request the U.S. Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, with reference to the effect of the two-price cotton system upon the cotton programs being carried out under the supervision of the Secretary. I know that no one would even suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture in making this request was speaking as a representative of industry. It is abundantly clear that his concern was for the future of the American cotton farmer. His request to the President was made solely with the view of serving what he deemed to be the best interest of our cotton agricultural economy.

In his letter the Secretary pointed out that the programs and operations for upland and long-staple cotton which were being threatened by the two-price system included our price support programs, acreage allotment, marketing quota program, and the export subsidy program for cotton and cotton products.

The Secretary pointed out that during 1961 525,500 bales of cotton were used to manufacture cotton textiles imported into the United States and that this was a new high. He further pointed out that for the 5-year period ending in 1960 there had been an average annual rate increase of 69,000 bales of cotton imported into the United States in the form of cotton textiles.

It was also interesting to note that Secretary Freeman found that the aggregate mill consumption of cotton in the United States had shown a decline in the average of about 29.3 pounds of cotton per person in the 1946–55 period to about 23.9 pounds per person in the period between 1956 and 1960 and that imports of cotton textiles had increased from about the equivalent of 0.5 pound per person in 1955 to approximately 1.4 pounds per person in 1960. These findings by the Department of Agriculture properly alarmed them with reference to the future of the cotton programs heretofore enacted by the Congress.

Related to this problem and its threat to the farmer is the rapid growth in the total textile output of goods made of synthetic fibers. Wherever possible, textile mills have been shifting into the use of synthetic fibers or blends of such fibers with cotton in such a manner as to turn their spindles and looms away from cotton textile productions. This has been done for several reasons, but primarily because of the price situation. Of course, there has been a great deal more attention given to research and development and promotion of synthetic fabrics than has been given to cotton fabric. Another factor which enters into this shift to synthetics is the uniformity and quality of the synthetic fiber as compared to the lack of uniformity in cotton, together with a predictable source of supply at predictable price rates in a manner not enjoyed by industry when dealing with cotton.

I am told by many of our manufacturers that in recent years this item of quality of cotton fiber has been a major consideration with them in the operation of their plants. Within the past few days members of the textile community have told me that it is most difficult to find cotton grown in the eastern part of the United States which measures up to the requirements for the production of fine-combed yarns. They attribute this to a multiplicity of factors. Some of these factors are the production by the farmer with the view of producing quantity rather than quality because of our supported price situation; the use of mechanical pickers and subsequent overginning of cotton; and the weather elements which always enter into the cotton-producing experience of our farmers. These are problems which do not face the producer of synthetic fiber who can bring forth his production with chemical processes under fully regulated climatic and plant facilities.

So, the cotton farmer today is threatened in his domestic market by the rapid growth of the synthetic fiber industry with its advantage in price, quality, and convenience.

The legislation that the committee has under consideration would approach this price differential problem by an additional subsidy which would reflect itself ultimately in the price paid by the domestic textile manufacturer for the cotton fiber which he processes in his plant. Candor compels me to state that from my contact with industry people that they do not feel that they should be paid a direct subsidy at the expense of the taxpayers. Their reasoning, in my judgment, is sound when they say that they do not want to be accused of seeking a direct subsidy for themselves when they have no responsibility for creating the situation which makes an artifical price equalization program necessary. They correctly aver that the two-price system results from the action of our Government in placing artifical prices upon domestically grown cotton through the price support program at such a level as to make our American cotton sell at such prices as to remove it from competition in the world market with foreign-grown cotton. They contend that it was not by any action on their part that the price of American cotton has reached the level at which it has become necessary for our Government to place a price on our cotton in the foreign market place at a level of 8½ cents per pound or $42.50 per bale cheaper than the same American cotton may be bought by an American manufacturer.

The American cotton textile manufacturer, however, does take the position that he should be permitted to purchase American-grown cotton at the same price that the same can be purchased by a foreign textile manufacturer. He further feels that it is the obligation of his Government to bring about this result and that this should be done in such way as not to have a direct subsidy paid by the Government into the hands of the textile manufacturer and subject him to the accusation of taking a handout from his Government. Basically, gentlemen, I believe that it is the attitude of our American textile people that they are entitled to be dealt with equitably and fairly by their own Government. So long as the price differential in the raw material which they use in their plants exists by reason of Government action, equity and justice will not have been meted out to this important segment of our economy.

I would also like to present for your consideration another contention which I do not believe has been presented to this committee in connection with its consideration of the problem of two-price cotton. This relates to the effect that it would have upon the pocketbook of the American taxpayer.

I know that there are those who apprehend that the subsidy approach encompassed in the bills now under consideration would constitute an excessive burden on the American taxpayer. I believe, however, that it can accurately be said that when we talk in terms of subsidy from the taxpayers that we are engaging in illusory conversation. This is true for the reason that it seems logical that a reduction in the cost of cotton to the American mills to the extent of 3½ cents a pound would result in a substantial price reduction in the end product which is purchased by the American consumer. In fact, when profit margins are considered in the various stages of manufacture and distribution, the reduction in raw cotton prices of 8½ cents per pound could result in savings to the consumer equal to 17 cents per pound, or in excess of $700 million annually.

You will no doubt immediately ask how this is possible. Consider with me some of the basic facts which lead to this conclusion.

The cotton textile industry is one of the most competitive industries in America. A study of mill margin reports over a period of years indicates that the price of cotton tends to follow closely trends in the price of market cotton. Any reduction in the price of raw cotton would be reflected in reduced raw material costs to processers of cotton textile products and would ultimately pass on to the consumer. In the industry there is a tendency for a savings at an early stage in the productive and distributive process which is magnified on an absolute basis through later stages, resulting in the maintenance of a more or less constant percentage price.

During the early stages of a reduction in raw cotton prices this reduced cost of the end product to the ultimate consumer would not, in my judgment, dramatically present itself. This is because of a general tendency of prices to remain at a certain level pending the industrywide experience of reduced production costs to the extent necessary to make the normal competitive practices come into play. You can well understand that this delayed action, insofar as price reduction to the ultimate consumer is concerned, would be a natural experience because of the considerable period of time involved between the opening of the bale of cotton and its being converted into yarn, and then fabric, and then cut and sewed into wearing apparel, and then going into the retail market. In the case of wearing apparel this could vary from 3 to 8 months from the opening of the bale until the date that the apparel is placed on the retail counter. So, when I project the thought that the ultimate consumer—the American taxpayer—would realize a saving in excess of the so-called subsidy, I would want you to understand that I am not predicting that it would be an overnight occurrence.

As a basis for this projection I would point out that in the years 1958–61 approximately 4.2 billion pounds of raw cotton was consumed in the United States. Of this total 0.6 billion pounds went into industrial goods, and 3.6 billion pounds went into consumer goods, including 1 billion pounds for home furnishings and 0.4 billion pounds for other consumer-type products. Experts estimate that a reduction of 5 cents per pound in the production of raw cotton would result in a minimum saving to ultimate consumers in nonindustrial goods of $180 million per year. These same people state that in their judgment the savings to the ultimate consumer of industrial fabrics would be even greater and that it would probably amount to $30 million per year as a minimum. They state

that as a broad overall figure that it can be assumed that the percentage of markup on the value of goods moving through manufacturing and distributive channels beyond the stage of first consumption of cotton can be taken as approximately 100 percent. This would mean that while the savings to the ultimate American consumer flowing from a 5-cent-per-pound reduction in raw cotton would eventually be a minimum of $210 million per year that the more probable figure is $420 million per year.

Based upon an estimate that the saving to the consumer resulting from each 1-cent-per-pound reduction in the price of raw cotton would amount to $84 million in the United States and that the saving can be estimated on the most conservative possible basis at no less than $42 million a year, it appears that it is probable that a reduction of 8½ cents per pound would bring to the ultimate consumers in America a saving of $714 million.

If these projections from expert observers are at all accurate, it is readily apparent that in the final analysis the American taxpayer will be benefited rather than burdened by the equalization of the price which he pays for cotton with that paid by his foreign competitor.

Another benefit that would no doubt flow from elimination of the two-price cotton system would be the improvement of our competitive situation in the world market for finished yarns and fabrics of the type having a high cotton content. As you no doubt know, coarse carded yarns and cotton fabrics made of that type yarn have a high cotton content which means that the ultimate price of this type product is more greatly influenced by the price of cotton than is true in fine combed yarns and products made of that type yarn. American manufacturers of these types of textile products have particularly felt the cutthroat competition from foreign textile manufacturers, and the elimination of the price differential of 8½ cents per pound on cotton would open up new foreign markets for our domestic manufacturers because of the ability that they would then have to meet the lower cost of foreign-produced yarn and fabric. Generally such foreign-made products are quoted in America at approximately 10 cents per pound lower than domestic prices. The 8½ cent per pound reduction in the cost of cotton to the American manufacturer, together with the loss resulting from waste, would make the American manufacturer more nearly competitive on the foreign market and would clearly make him competitive with the foreign producer in the American market.

It is apparent that once we have attained this goal of unquestioned competitive equality for the American textile market and possible competitive opportunity for the foreign textile market, we will see a greater demand for the product of our cotton farmers and at the same time will be creating American jobs for our own people.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many aspects of this problem that I would like to discuss with this subcommittee, but out of consideration for others who have come here to testify I do not feel that I should consume more of your time. Let me conclude, however, with the expression of my sincere hope and the hope of the people that I am privileged to represent, that this committee will act with real dispatch in bringing out legislation which will bring about equality of opportunity for our American industry and the people who earn their livelihoods in the American textile industry insofar as cotton pricing problems are concerned.

I have said that I hope you will act with dispatch because this is essential. You gentlemen are familiar with the devastating effect that the uncertainty of the course of action which the Congress will take has brought about at all levels of the cotton industry. Cotton purchases have been limited by industry to the bare minimum, and the purchase of finished textile products by the customers of the mills are being held at a minimum awaiting the outcome of the matter which you are considering today. Mills are already curtailing because of this condition. Certain types of textile products are becoming more difficult to buy because of this uncertainty. For these and other reasons with which you are familiar I believe it is imperative that we give to the American people an answer on this question at the earliest possible date.

In closing I express to you again my deep appreciation for your willingness to hear me today in my effort to present to you the need, as I see it, for legislation eliminating the unfavorable differential which has been forced upon our domestic textile industry.

Thank you.

America's Answer—A Commonsense Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the great executives of the shipping industry, Mr. George Killion, has presented a most thought-provoking expression of views on the American economy and the resurgent national interest in foreign trade.

Mr. Killion's views are contained in the December 1962 issue of the Industrial News Review. In this article the point is made that the merchant marine of the United States will have a prominent role in the future economic progress of our great Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD this significant article entitled, "America's Answer—A Commonsense Market."

The article is as follows:

AMERICA'S ANSWER—A COMMONSENSE MARKET

(By George Killion)

Not for a century and a half has the future of America been so unpredictable as it is now. As we struggled simultaneously to conquer a frontier and to form a nation, it would have taken a bold and prophetic eye to envision the industrial giant and the economic marvel we were to become.

By the combined grace of geography and of an enterprising cast of mind and character, we had become by the early part of this century the world's foremost economic power. Our success was not then primarily due to our foreign trade, but to the almost incredible growth and development of our internal market.

For most of the last half century, however, our economic growth and our prosperity have been dependent upon our foreign trade. About 10 percent of our manufactures are sold abroad, about 8 percent of our goods consumed come from abroad. This is the sensitive 10th of our economy. Without it, we stagnate; with a vigorous and growing foreign trade, the whole Nation prospers. We can no longer build a wall, of customs duties or of prejudices, about our shores. Our economy must draw nourishment from abroad.

We are no longer the unquestioned economic masters of the world. Our gross national product, that handy, stylized index of how a nation is getting along in this world, is increasing at the rate of about 3 percent a year. That of Europe is increasing at the rate of 6 percent; that of Japan at 7 percent; and so far as we can tell that of Soviet Russia at a rate of about 5 percent.

A few years ago we had a statistical consolation. A war-ravaged economy, with a low industrial base, would naturally register a larger percentage growth as its recovery progressed. We have outlived an easy statistical rationalization. I suggest that we must start from the premise, however novel and however disquieting, that along with the United Kingdom we represent in this year 1962 one of the less dynamic of the major industrial areas.

THE CHALLENGES

Who are our competitors, and what are their challenges?

First, there is Soviet Russia. It has a vast internal market with great natural resources, about three times the extent of the United States and with a third more population. It operates with a ruthlessness we can never match. In terms of purchasing power its best paid workers would come up only to about the level of our minimum wage laws. Its products are sold abroad at prices which reflect not their costs but the tactics and strategy of economic and political warfare.

We should not stand in dread of this competition. We have the greater assets of individual decision, of the flexible adaptability of the profit economy, and of free workers. But let none believe that we don't have a hard and rocky road ahead.

Second, there is Japan. Their natural resources are negligible, unless one includes in this category their wonderfully perservering, shrewd, and enlightened people. They are able, almost without effort it seems, to match the best of Western innovation, efficiency, and daring and to mask it disarmingly behind the centuries-old graces and dignity of the Orient.

Finally, and probably most formidable of all, we face that vigorous young giant, the Common Market of Europe. Taken together, the seven countries have, even before the entry of the United Kingdom, the largest population of any of the industrial powers. It is a skilled, educated, and civilized population which has been endowed by the Common Market not with the languid spirit of an aged civilization but with the bursting, ambitious drive of a newly expanded and newly invigorated economy.

Dr. Robert R. Dockson, Dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Southern California, recently told the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities that in the next 13 years the United States must double or triple its exports if "the private enterprise system is to remain predominantly private."

How well equipped are we, at home and abroad, to hold our own?

THE OBSTACLES

We still have, in the ranks of government, industry, and commerce, vigorous leaders who have in their blood the inherited vigor of the frontier and the daring of the 19th century. We have a freedom of business decision which is, much as some may from time to time denounce Washington and all its works, probably greater than any of our great competitors and incomparably greater that that of the Soviet business-government bureaucracy.

We have also some major obstacles to overcome, and they can be overcome. Probably most of our obstacles come down to the question of price. There aren't many areas left where we can sell products simply

and solely because they are American made. By and large, the American exports are no longer the world's cheapest. We have no longer a near-monopoly on the economics of mass production. We have, to be brutally frank about it, in many areas a high-wage and high-cost industrial and commercial structure where either the ingenuity of the machinemakers, or our ability to put their machines to efficient use, has lagged behind the constantly mounting wage bill. The wages of the Japanese and the Russian worker are about equal; the European worker is almost twice that amount, and the American rate is about double that of the European.

High wages make for healthier, happier, and better people. They make also for expanded markets and active economies. But there is an obvious limit. If we are not to price ourselves out of the world markets, our high wage rates must go along with prices equal to or lower than those of our competitors.

This is not impossible. This country has for many decades typically produced the cheapest product with the highest paid labor. That has been due to two things, the ingenuity, scale and efficiency of our mechanical plant and the enterprise of our managers. Both, from quite divergent sources, are endangered today.

In our Nation today automation is in many areas limited not by the ingenuity of the engineers nor the capital of the investors but instead by the attitude of labor. It is human and perhaps natural that the union leaders should try to drive out, by frontal assault or by costly conditions, the machines which will cost jobs in his plant. But somehow they have got to learn that high wages, in a worldwide market, are based only upon major reliance on machinery. Somehow they have got to learn that full employment can be reached only by making the economy thrive, only by joining with industry in making production improvements so that the plant can continue and so pave the way for the creation of different jobs and more jobs in other fields in our economic civilization.

Business does not ask the impossible of labor. John Lewis has brought the coal worker from the bottom to the top of the wage brackets by fighting for the maximum of mechanization. He has half the number of coal miners paying dues, but they are well-paid and contented men. Many other examples, most especially in the oil refining and aluminum industries, can be found. But these are, by and large, the exception rather than the rule.

The second major deterrent to effective American competition seems to be found in the ranks of management rather than of labor. It is much less tangible and just possibly much more dangerous.

I refer to the organization man, to the conformist, and to his company's policy. To an increasing degree we demand of our junior, and sometimes even of our senior executives, not only that they do the right kind of job but that they live in the right kind of house, drive the right kind of car, marry the right kind of wife, read the right kind of books, wear the same distinctive kind of clothes, and play the right kind of games.

It would not be so bad if the young men of today were in rebellion against the neat and tidy pattern of the company life. But vast numbers seem to welcome it. When a youngster of 22 asks about the company's retirement plan before he takes his first job, quite likely he is going to be a docile man around the office but he is never going to lead the company, or any part of it, to new and greater heights of accomplishment.

We need daring, nonconforming minds. We need men who believe individual enterprise means doing something on their own, not just lower taxes or fewer antitrust suits. We need men who will take risks, who will do new things. Where are we going to find them if we will hire and promote only those who fit tidily into the company pattern? Where, if we grow up a race of pensioneers, will business find the new thoughts and the bold innovations which have in the past made business prosperous and the Nation great?

THE SHIPPING INDUSTRY

Now let me get down to particulars, in the industry I know best and the one which is an essential part of almost every export or import transaction.

The shipping industry is a sizable one. The U.S. merchant marine employs more than 200,000 in seafaring, shoreside, and shipbuilding jobs—54,000 seamen, 72,000 longshoremen, 52,000 shipyard workers, 24,000 office workers. The merchant marine's total contribution to the national economy is estimated at $5,300 million annually.

In a speech last August, Donald W. Alexander, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, told the Propeller Club of the Port of Los Angeles-Long Beach that our active merchant fleet today numbers about 900 oceangoing ships. Nearly 1,900 other vessels are located in reserve fleet anchorages around the country. He then pointed to the rising curve of the Soviet shipping offensive, which will bring its deadweight tonnage to within 2 million tons of ours in less than 3 years, and will surpass ours in less than 10 years. He then ascribed our shipping decline in large part to what he considered "poor labor-management relations," and warned that "unless there is improvement in this area there will, in the foreseeable future, be no American merchant marine at all."

U.S. foreign commerce has more than doubled during the past 10 years, from 65 million tons in 1950 to 155 million tons in 1960. Yet during this decade the share of that doubled foreign commerce carried by the U.S.-flag merchant fleet has dwindled to less than half of what it was immediately following the end of the Korean war. It dropped from 28 percent to a mere 11 percent. Today, U.S.-flag ships carry 16 percent of the export trade and only 8 percent of the imports of the United States.

Also decreasing has been the number of ships available under the U.S. flag. Since 1954 the decline has been about 22 percent.

One would expect that as the fleet declined, the number of active seafaring personnel who derive their livelihood from sailing U.S.-flag ships would decline in approximately the same ratio. But this is not so.

Since 1954, the number of active seafaring personnel has increased by about 8 percent. An 8-percent increase in the face of a 22-percent decrease in the number of ships that needed manning. In terms of the ratio of the number of seamen to the deadweight tonnage of the U.S. flag merchant fleet, it has since 1954 risen from something less than 3.5 men per 1,000 deadweight tons to 4.5 men per 1,000 deadweight tons.

This may be illustrated perhaps more concretely by the fact that the west coast U.S.-flag privately owned merchant fleet has decreased in the number of vessels during the past decade from close to 300 ships to a little over 100. Yet at the same time, the number of seamen employed on each ship has increased from 50 to 61, an increase in manning of 22 percent.

It should be clear from these figures that as ships have been driven out of service by the heavy cost-price squeeze, seamen have been effective in artificially maintaining work opportunity and even in forcing expanded manning of the remaining ships in the fleet. Wages, including fringe benefits, paid to seamen who man the U.S. ships sailing from Pacific coast ports, have risen at twice the rate of the increases in the Consumer Price Index. They have risen at a rate 50 percent greater than the index of general freight rates in the Pacific West-Bound Conference.

Wages, including fringe benefits, paid to longshoremen on both the east coast and the west coast have nearly doubled in this same period. While national productivity has gone up 31 percent, longshore productivity has dropped 14 percent.

In contrast with most onshore industries a generation ago, and with many today, our wage costs can't be absorbed by the economies of a more efficient factory. There is today almost nothing to choose in the way of efficiency of operation between a foreign and an American-built ship. Yet there is a very great deal to choose in the way of the price of the vessels. The costs of shipbuilding in the United States are the highest in the world. Since 1950 the costs of acquiring a ship have increased 65 percent.

Because freight rates must be kept competitive on an international basis, whereas wages must be kept competitive on a domestic basis, those of us in international commerce find ourselves bound to a sort of two-way procrustean bed: stretched out to fit labor's demands, cut off short to meet competition.

It is highly doubtful, and sad to contemplate, that we would have any American-flag ships sailing in our foreign commerce today if it were not for our subsidy program and our cargo preference laws.

THE STEPS THAT MUST BE TAKEN

First. We can no longer afford to put aside automation and any other mechanical or procedural road to efficient operations. We should of course make generous provision for displaced workers, but neither the Nation nor they can afford to have our industrial machine build unnecessary work into the price of our products.

Mr. Stanley Powell, president of Matson Navigation Co. of San Francisco, recently said:

"Our studies reveal that the average C-3 freighter now requiring a crew of 51 can be operated safely and efficiently with a crew of 15. And without developing any new technologies or equipment. What's more, the capital investment for such a conversion would not be large. Our studies have also shown that an orderly and economically attractive procedure can be developed to alleviate the burden on the unions involved."

If we could operate our C-3 freighters with 15 men, we would be competitive with any foreign vessel, and I dare say to the delight of our Government and taxpayers.

The unions must be made to recognize that the choice is between all 51 men losing their work or, eventually, having them employed on several vessels. We can sail three ships with competitive costs where we now sail one and may in a few years sail none.

Second. We must have a machinery to permit settlement of basic and critical labor-management disputes. These, incidentally, are to an increasing degree arising out of labor-saving proposals of management which are most bitterly resisted by many of the unions. We are in a world market, and ground so lost can never be regained.

Senator Butler at the last session of the Congress introduced S. 3511 which would permit, when all other alternatives were exhausted, compulsory arbitration of off-shore maritime labor disputes. The west coast steamship industry, which had by then been battered by three strikes within a year, gave it their unanimous support.

Third. We must re-think our anti-trust laws. When the Sherman Act was passed in 1890, and the Clayton Act in 1914, our markets and our economy were essentially domestic. A near monopoly, or a trade com-

bination, in the domestic market gained powers which would not be limited by foreign competition.

Consolidation and integration of separate units tend to increase efficiency and to lower costs. In areas where there is intensive foreign competition, this sort of efficiency should be encouraged and not prosecuted.

Fourth. Let us recruit and train our young executives so that we reward the innovator, the man who builds new roads to travel, and give to our stereotyped young organization men the dim, gray and modest careers many seem to want. We need boldness and initiative, not simply inoffensiveness. We are not going to keep our customers, and certainly we are not going to win new markets, simply because our top executives play a good game of golf at the right clubs.

TWO STEPS ALREADY TAKEN

The 87th Congress has within the past few months taken two gigantic steps toward a realization of our national goal of a resurgent foreign trade.

The first is President Kennedy's trade expansion program. It embarks us firmly on the course of greatly increasing our foreign trade, not stagnating behind immovable tariff barriers. It gives us the tools by which we can in many areas work out an effective partnership with the enormously important European Common Market.

The second is the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. It represents the beginnings of what might be a bright and brilliant future. The Congress has now opened the way for this country to achieve what should be a permanent leadership of the world in global communication. It has done so, what is more, in a fashion that gives appropriate recognition both to the advantages of private enterprise and to the regulatory responsibilities of the Government.

CONCLUSION

We are going to need the most thoughtful analysis and the most vigorous action of which we are capable. Given that, surely the world can erect no barrier to a resurgent American economy. The American merchant marine, whose own life depends upon that success, will do all that it can to aid, to work and cooperate, in fighting for the economic progress of our great Nation.

Little People to Little People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the young son and namesake of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER W. RODINO, has already evidenced outstanding qualities of mind and heart that bespeak a brilliant future for him. Young Peter III, troubled by today's bitterly divided world, conceived the idea for a little-people-to-little-people organization that would increase the contacts and cooperation between and among children all over the world. Peter has pursued his goal of a better world with tenancity, undaunted by the pessimism of older folks who would let the obstacles in the way overcome their will and determination to secure peace with justice and liberty for all. Not Peter—he knows that all great achievements in all ages have been great precisely because they had seemed beyond our reach. Who can measure the influence for good that young Peter and his children's crusade will exert through the years ahead?

Among those who have recognized the value of young Peter's work is the illustrious organization, UNICO National, which presented him with an award on January 2, 1963, at the Newark UNICO meeting. Prof. Hugo W. Senerchia, past national president, delivered a brilliant speech on the occasion that will be of interest to all Members. I commend UNICO for its wisdom in selecting for this signal honor "this youthful crusader for international understanding." As Professor Senerchia stated:

If we share in his vision for world peace through the mobilization of young hearts, we too shall hope for a better tomorrow.

Professor Senerchia's full remarks follow:

PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO PETER RODINO III AT NEWARK UNICO MEETING, JANUARY 2, 1963

(By Hugo W. Senerchia)

In all the years UNICO has been presenting awards, the reasons for such recognition have been as diverse as the personalities of the recipients. They have been honored for exceptional bravery, for their generous gifts to worthy causes or simply because they exemplify those noble qualities we all admire so much as they struggled to overcome adversities to attain success in their fields of endeavor. As for the recipients themselves, they have always been adults with years of worldly experience, and with different religious and ethnic elements that are found in our democracy. But no matter how richly deserved and meritorious their achievements have been, none of them can parallel the significance of the award and of the recipient we honor tonight.

Tonight we place in the UNICO spotlight for honor and public commendation, a 10-year-old boy. He has done nothing heroic or sensational such as rescuing someone from drowning; his youth obviously does not carry the weight of worldly experience. Nevertheless, he has conceived an idea that bespeaks of the wisdom of the ages; his magnificent and tremendous idea embraces the community of the whole world. An idea of such universal proportion is in itself remarkable, but that it should be conceived in the mind of a 10-year-old boy is astounding.

With the innocence and the simplicity of a child's heart, he penetrated the knotty problems that beset the world today to arrive at a solution. If youngsters of all countries could unite in mutual understanding and hope for peace, their protest against war could be an important beginning for the avoidance of war. With this in mind, he wrote a letter to Khrushchev and one to President Kennedy.

What shall we say of young Peter's little-people-to-little-people's program? We certainly cannot dismiss it as too visionary or impracticable, or as a child's fanciful dream or a passing whim. It strikes a responsive chord in our hearts because we too feel the same need and desire for peace through better understanding. But because we are oppressed with a superior knowledge of the frailties and the deceptions of human nature, we remain timid and silent.

Hope in survival against the forces of nature and against the greed and stupidity of man has grown painfully slow through history. Many times hope has yielded to cynicism and despair. And yet, because we have had apostles of faith and hope in human nature, man has survived. The rest of mankind lived like dwarfs on the shoulders of those giants.

Who can forget the fateful week in October when we hung perilously on the brink of destruction and chaos? There was fear, despair, and gloom as we recalled the annihilating consequences of an atomic war. One bomb alone, we were warned, could kill between 30 and 70 million. Many were ready to accept this doom as inevitable because faith and hope were regarded as useless and outmoded luxuries or myths.

When confronted with such a crisis, we can appreciate the significance of Peter's dream. When we stand in need of inspiration and renewal of faith in human values, we can find them in this youthful crusader for international understanding. If there will be a future and if men will learn to live in peace, they too will be like dwarfs living on the shoulders of this youthful giant.

Tonight, therefore, UNICO takes pride in honoring this young man who expresses our universal dream for peace. If we share in his vision for world peace through the mobilization of young hearts, we too shall hope for a better tomorrow.

Address of Mayor Robert F. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the manifold problems which confront the youth of America are nowhere as much in evidence on a broad scale as in the city of New York. The effort through the several agencies in the administration of Mayor Robert F. Wagner to cope with these problems is a matter of interest to all of our people who live in urban areas.

I believe the following address by Mayor Wagner pointing out many facets of youths' fitness will be of interest to my colleagues.

Under unanimous consent I insert the address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT MEETING OF ADVISORY COUNCIL OF PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH CRIME

I am pleased to be at this meeting of the Advisory Council of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. I am particularly happy that the Council has chosen New York City for its first field meeting. We can benefit from your experience and observations, and I very much hope, vice versa. We do have the problem here, and a few of the answers. But all of us are still looking for the answers to the main questions.

Here, as all of you know, the city government provides an unprecedented variety of services to its citizens, especially in those humanitarian categories which can be labeled "human services."

In general, in my judgment, the quality, of the "human services" provided in our metropolitan communities and the manner in which we approach and handle our human problems, are among the great challenges of our time. I am referring to those

Government programs which are designed to achieve the following basic social purposes:

1. Education of the young.

2. Integration of minority groups into the life of the community.

3. The full development and utilization of our potential manpower, by the development of skills and aptitudes and their use without discrimination by reason of sex, race, color or creed.

4. The promotion and protection of the physical, mental and moral well-being of all our inhabitants.

5. The special care and comfort of the aged, the sick and the emotionally and mentally disturbed, and

6. Promotion of the constructive and restorative use of leisure time through exercise, instruction and cultural development.

The number and extent of governmental services in these categories, especially as they concern youth, has increased spectacularly, almost astronomically, within recent years, as I shall illustrate in a moment by fact and figure. Yet there is both pressure and need for a continued expansion in these services. But in my judgment the real touchstone of progress today lies in the quality of the services being rendered, as much as in the quantity and variety of them.

How greatly we strive, how deeply we resolve, and how well we succeed in raising this quality and in meeting the need will serve as a principal measure of what we who are engaged in government on the local level have been able to give to our times and our country.

We live in days full of tension and danger, but also of infinite promise. The depression of the thirties, the wars of the fourties and early fifties, the surge toward equality of Negroes and other peoples in the United States and throughout the world, the great migration of Americans from one part of the country to another, the fearsome danger of nuclear holocaust, these powerful forces have shaken and reshaped our lives. They are beyond the control of any municipal government, and in many ways beyond the control of even national governments.

The impact of these forces on the lives of children is even greater than on those of adults. This is a fact we sometimes overlook or fail to recognize. The young personality is far more vulnerable and sensitive to external impact. Generally we know this. Yet we sometimes seem to be surprised that the young should react so violently to the impact of the violent forces all around us. But this impact which can do enormous damage can also help develop enormous strength. There is evidence that both effects are being achieved today.

This is not the occasion further to discuss these factors or to weigh their impact. We know that the effects are there, and we believe that the basic factors I have mentioned have contributed to these effects and to the present problems.

In New York City, the government expends a major portion of its energies and income on and in behalf of the youth of this city. An analysis of our budget shows that the city government spends $100,000 annually, or we will this year, on social and educational services for our young people. Let me break this figure down into the classifications and the specialized undertakings which seek to give our services the quality I referred to a few moments ago.

The basic teaching process in the public schools has been under continuous improvements through the expansion of the size of staff and the quality of teachers and of the curriculum.

More than 6,000 additional teaching positions including 900 additional remedial reading teachers have been filled during the past 8 years. Teachers' salaries have been increased most substantially, a 75-percent increase in the minimum salary and a 60-percent increase in the maximum salary between 1953 and 1962.

In the public school system, there has been a growing emphasis on meeting the special problems of children coming from severely deprived backgrounds. Thus, the number of full-time guidance counsellors in the schools has been increased from 100 in 1955 to 600 during the current school year.

The higher horizons program, an innovation of the New York City school system, which is now being widely copied in many cities of the country, serves over 60,000 children in 76 schools.

Municipal recreation services have been substantially increased during the past decade; over 175 playgrounds, 250 community and recreation centers in schools and public housing projects have been added to the facilities previously available. It has been estimated that during the last 6 years the cost to the city for recreation serving all age groups has increased by approximately $10 million.

Social services for seriously troubled children and families have been expanded and intensified. The street-club project of the New York City Youth Board, which was in contact with 22 gangs in 1955, has been so greatly expanded that it now serves 250 of these groups.

Yes, the city government is engaged in a great many different youth activities through the schools and through many other public and semi-public agencies which I have not taken the time to mention.

This listing, however, and this citation of the total amount of money we are spending on youth does not in any way mean that we are satisfied with the amount or the quality of what we are doing. As I said at the very beginning of my remarks, we do not know the answers to the really tough questions about youth. In order to dig more deeply in the direction of these answers and to make our existing programs more effective, we have embarked within the year on a second major approach epitomized by the mobilization for youth project on the lower East Side. This will be followed next year by another major effort, in Harlem; Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited. These are area projects. In these areas we are attempting to find the ways not only to improve the educational training opportunities for low-income youth, but to give them better access to jobs; to enable them to find the jobs that they can do, and to train them for the jobs that they can find.

By raising the levels of opportunities for these young people, we are attempting to affect the root causes of delinquent behavior. We have also been trying to help forge a true partnership between the local voluntary agencies, the local population, the city government and a great university.

I am convinced that these demonstration projects hold forth great promise, and the role of this council and of the President's Committee has been of inestimable value in stimulating these and other innovations on a national scale.

At the same time, we are reviewing the proliferation of governmental youth services and their relationship to the organization of the city government itself. It is apparent to me, as I reflect on the activities of our complex municipal government, that it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate the planning and coordination of services from the other activities of government.

It is clear that the problems of different age levels are both interrelated and interdependent. The problems of juvenile delinquency cannot be separated from the problems of family life generally.

Mindful of this fact, we have been greatly concerned over the adequacy of the city's administrative machinery for planning and coordinating its mammoth efforts for children and youth. Hence, we have recently commissioned a thorough administrative review, by the Institute of Public Administration, of our machinery for the planning and coordination of youth services. We expect the report of this survey late this spring.

I see the need for greater emphasis on social planning in our metropolitan communities. We need fresh approaches to using our human resources, to unleashing the full potential within each individual for his own well-being and the welfare of the community. We may compare this need for social planning to the recognition a generation ago of the need to establish machinery for urban planning. In order to face current social problems, we need to define basic goals, arrange priorities and evaluate our efforts.

I said that New York City's direct expenditure for its children and youth is $1,100 million. Of this sum, almost $300 million is spent for children who need special kinds of care because of handicaps, dependency, delinquency, or neglect. The balance is spent as part of the general educational, recreational, and cultural services of the city government. In the past 7 years, expenditures for financial assistance and rehabilitation services have increased by $140 million. Our costs for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts, for example, have increased manifold in this period; our expenditures for casework and related services have increased fourfold, from $8 million in 1955 to $31 million currently.

These expenditures constitute a great proportion of our total expenditures for youth. Moreover and unfortunately, we have found that these expenditures are not self-reducing. They do not reduce the size of the problem. Instead, there is a constant pressure to increase these expenditures. This diverts funds from more fundamental undertakings.

Today we clearly realize that we must devote increasing energies to creating new jobs and to training our young people in new skills, and to breaking down the barriers of discrimination. Unless we do this, we will be compelled to meet the steadily mounting costs of public assistance, rehabilitation services, and of police activity. This pattern has become increasingly clear. Let us hope that this pattern may be reversed by an increase in communitywide social planning for the creation of better social conditions which will, in the end, greatly reduce both the human and financial costs of social and economic maladjustment.

I believe this to be among the truths which we must take into consideration in our further spending and working on the youth problem.

Recognizing these truths, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime has given strong support to comprehensive planning, but with a neighborhood focus. This, of course, is what the mobilization for youth is all about. I believe that the time is approaching to consider broadening these planning efforts. We must look at the problem and plan for the attack on the problem on a citywide basis, and also on a nationwide basis, even while we continue to seek ways to mobilize neighborhood energies for the attack on the neighborhood problem.

For this broader social planning approach, we will need the experience and dedication of the voluntary agencies as well as the objectivity and scientific skills of our academicians. We must make it possible for all to work together, and not, as in separate worlds.

We must be ready to move in new directions and to follow untrodden paths. We must be willing to follow any course of action which holds promise, no matter how unorthodox.

What is at stake is not just the welfare of a few maladjusted, socially disadvantaged individuals, but the welfare and fate of all our children and of our country and the world whose destiny will one day be guided by the emerging generation.

With the Boy Scouts, Character Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 7 through February 13 marks the 53d anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. An organization incorporated in 1910, chartered by the U.S. Congress in 1916, with the President of the United States as honorary president, and dedicated to the development of good citizenship among the rising generation, is an organization which we as a nation proudly salute.

The young people of our great country are today, as in the past, faced with the task of preparing themselves to meet an uncertain future, one which holds many grave responsibilities and duties, both private and public; many opportunities, rights and privileges, both those granted by law and those gained through individual initiative. Perhaps never before in the history of our democratic process have the meeting of these responsibilities, and the utilization and exercise of these opportunities and rights been so necessary to the perpetuation of the doctrines and beliefs upon which this country is founded. The Boy Scouts of America is an organization in the finest American tradition. It teaches the values of both responsibility and opportunity.

The principles underlying the Boy Scouts' activities and practices are framed to develop character, intelligence, skill, handicraft, physical, mental and moral health, self-care and reliance, and the practice of service for others. The efficient individual becomes an asset to his community and in turn to his Nation.

The thousands of men and women who have contributed countless hours to perpetuate the teachings of the movement deserve our respect and gratitude, for without their tireless efforts, the high ideals and purposes set down in the charter would not be fully met. The feeling of belonging to a group is a basic need in every young boy, and the competition, group activity, firm and able leadership offered to a Scout do much to meet this need. It is therefore not surprising that where the scouting movement is strong and vigorous, the amount of juvenile delinquency is proportionately less.

The Explorer Scout has a code by which he tries to live. It is a code from which every American might profit:

I believe that America's strength lies in her trust in God and in the courage and strength of her people.

I will, therefore, be faithful in my religious duties and will maintain a personal sense of honor in my own life.

I will treasure my American heritage and will do all I can to preserve and enrich it.

I will recognize the dignity and worth of my fellow men and will use fairplay and good will in dealing with them.

I will acquire the Exploring attitude that seeks the truth in all things and adventure on the frontiers of our changing world.

Private Initiative Wins Foreign Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, so often, in the constantly increasing whirl of public activity and government involvement, we overlook the important role being played by countless voluntary private efforts to help those less fortunate, here and abroad. One such effort has taken place in Sussex County, N.J., within the confines of my district.

Two young missionaries, Joe and Jeri Blakeslee, son and daughter-in-law of Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Blakeslee, of Halsey, N.J., have been serving unselfishly in the Amazon jungle reaches of Ecuador. A mission school has been established among the Indians, but a need was recognized also in relation to the task of making a living from the soil. For this reason, friends and neighbors of the Blakeslees in Sussex County organized a Mission to Ecuador Tractor Fund Committee, to buy a tractor and equipment for use in the jungle environs.

The contributions and efforts have been rewarded with the shipment and arrival of the tractor in Ecuador, at the seaport of Guayaquil. Joe Blakeslee and two other drivers took the tractor on a truck over the Andes Mountains. From there, the Ecuadorian air force, free of charge, made three trips with the dismantled tractor to the mission area.

We can only speculate on the good will, as well as the good works, springing up from this voluntary effort by private American citizens, but there can be no doubt as to its existence. The following article from the November 25, 1962, edition of the New Jersey Sunday Herald gives further details on this inspiring activity:

The young missionaries have been in Ecuador for just about a year now, and are slowly making progress in their endeavors to bring a better way of life to the Aucas, the seminomadic Indians there. With the Blakeslees is their young daughter, Jill, who is 16 months old.

In his letters home, Joe refers with deep feeling to the people back home who made the gift of the tractor possible. With it, the backbreaking work of carving farmland out of the jungle is eased for the missionaries and the Indians.

The mission project is based on the belief that, with civilization encroaching on the Amazon jungle, these people will be pushed to the bottom of the social and economic ladder unless they can wrest a living from the soil. This will, in turn, make it increasingly difficult for the Indian to have a strong church and evangelize his people.

The Blakeslees have established a school for the missionary children, with a teacher who is a widow from Indiana. She has seven students in grades 3 to 6, each on a different level, a situation she considers quite a challenge. Joe is also learning—in turn teaching—the art of butchering.

MEMORIES OF HOME

About a month ago, he wrote that Gene Hawk, the mission-building foreman, had returned from a visit to Sussex County, where he spoke in Lafayette. Among the contents of the barrels he took back with him were such things as a meat slicer, grinder, and lard press which, Joe's letter said, "we used to use at home. I confess * * * I felt a little homesick."

He has also written that a film is being made showing the great spiritual strides made by the Aucas, and that a 20- to 30-minute silent film of the work at his base will soon be available. Any interested group in Sussex County may make arrangements to use the film, when it is received here, by calling Mrs. J. A. Blakeslee, DU 3-4537; Mrs. Alfred Snook, DU 3-4241, or the Reverend Carl Luthman, DU 3-4451.

The fund committee here in Sussex County met this past week to hear a report on the project. A total of $700 was received for the fund this month, leaving $3,300 still due on the note. A committee spokesman said "We hope you will remember this project when making your special thanks offering this holiday season."

Civil Rights and the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions recently held its 10th anniversary convocation at the Americana Hotel in New York City. Leaders from all over the world attended and many fine analyses were presented under the subject "Challenges to Democracy in the Coming Decade." Among these was an address by the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, entitled "Civil Rights and the Cold War." As we read his speech, I am reminded what James Baldwin has said, "Great men have done great things here and will again, and we can make America what America must become."

Under unanimous consent I insert the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE COLD WAR BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY

First, I want to congratulate President Hutchins and the Board for Directors of the Fund for the Republic for the imagination and the initiative that have gone into the preparation of this 10th anniversary program, Challenges to Democracy in the Coming Decade.

Secondly, I wish to express my appreciation for being asked to consider with you the question of individual rights and privileges in this troubled time. It is a time of hope as well as we have seen in recent months even days.

But bright as we believe the world could be, we must face it as it is, a world of nation states seeking public solutions to what are inherently personal questions. This is the dimension of the time we live in and which we call the cold war, a struggle very grand in scope but very personal in importance. For this reason an examination of those personal questions, the rights and interests of individual human beings is as timely as ever before.

Some of you may be familiar with the recent classroom scene in a Russian elementary school. A little boy, when asked to describe the United States, said, "The United States is a sad country where workers and peasants are starving under capitalist exploitation by the cynical ruling classes." "Correct," said the teacher, "and what is the major goal of the Soviet Union?"

"To catch up with the United States," was the sober reply.

Throughout our parallel histories, I believe the United States, as a whole, has lagged behind Russia in the exploitation of one class by another.

The comparison is an old one. De Toqueville concluded his treatise on America with these prophetic words:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world which started from different points, I allude to Russia and America." "The principal instrument," of America he went on, is "freedom" and of Russia, "servitude."

"Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

In today's terms this may seem a generous oversimplification. We have only to look at the growing power of free Europe, or the snarling giant tiger that is Red China, or the awakened democracy of India, or the rising nations of Africa and Latin America, to know that there are other handholds on the globe, other forces capable of swaying its destiny. It would be quite wrong, and quite unlike a group such as the one assembled here, to become mesmerized by the present confrontation of the Soviet Union and the United States. Yet in this brief moment in time we can see some polarization of allegiance, some to the Communist way, some to the way of freedom.

This is the tug of the cold war. We should be excused if we venture the opinion we are winning. As the President said last week in his state of the Union message: Not a single 1 of the nearly 50 United Nations members to gain independence since the Second World War has succumbed to Communist control." In one case, a wall has gone up to prevent a great people from accepting the tug of freedom. History will record that while the Great Wall of Old China was built to keep barbarians out, this brooding ugliness by the Brandenburg gate was built to keep civilized people in. And men may speculate on the current Soviet proficiency in the high jump.

But overall, we are winning—Why? What is it we have that others will reach for, run for, die for? Surely, it is more than houses, cars, and dishwashers. Even communism, with some rearrangement of production priorities and a few other sacrifices by the new class, could provide these things. No, the attraction of the so-called materialist West is more a thing of mind than of matter. Why then do young foreign students become disaffected with Iron Curtain curriculums and seek out our consuls? What is it that brings tears to the eyes of new Americans as they take the oath of citizenship? What is it they sought? What is it men want? Isn't it freedom of conscience and action conditioned only by the legitimate needs of private and public security?

Our civil rights laws and actions are founded on that premise. No recitation of them should be necessary. Observance of them is entirely necessary. Encouraging lip-service is paid also in articles 124 and 125 of the Soviet Constitution to the principles of freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. But they have gone the way of many a New Year's resolution. The British have proved a constitution needn't be written. The Soviet have proved a constitution must be more than written.

This discussion deals primarily with the United States and the Soviet Union, not because we are the only nations involved, but because there is still some reason to believe we are the leaders respectively of the free and Communist worlds.

Our Bill of Rights, particularly in the first nine amendments, holds out a series of personal promises. The addition of the 14th amendment increased the commitment of the National Government to insure that those promises are kept. In most respects, our legislatures have followed with the greatest care the mandates implicit in the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment. An independent judiciary has served well to correct misconstructions of those principles. And while the matters affected have ranged from freedom of speech and press to questions of search and seizure, and right to counsel, most of these protections were well established from our early times and are invoked today not at all with regard to their validity, which is certain, but to their vitality in a modern society.

But the matter which the very term "civil rights" brings most immediately to mind in our time is the position of the American Negro in American society and the treatment accorded him in all walks of life.

In this respect I would like to glance at the record.

For the headline hunter the violence at Mississippi has been the most noticeable event of the current period. The historian, however, will record the progress made, not only in the unflinching commitment of the Federal Government to civil rights, but more importantly, and more notably in the amount of voluntary compliance by southern officials and citizens in this area. For example, over the past year in voting—in 29 counties in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, officials have voluntarily made voting records available to us without need for court action.

In about 50 counties in the same States, discriminatory practices have been abandoned voluntarily, avoiding the need for suit.

Where voluntary action was not forthcoming, however, we have brought suit.

Under the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the Department of Justice has undertaken 32 suits and 82 voting record inspections.

In transportation: Discrimination of interstate travel has disappeared. Virtually all bus and rail terminals were desegregated in 1961 pursuant to ICC regulations sought by this administration. In 1962 we surveyed 165 airports and found 15 still segregated. All are now desegregated, 13 voluntarily and the other 2 after suit.

At present, the only such segregated facilities in the country are bus and rail terminals in Jackson, Miss., and there we took successful legal action, which is now on appeal.

In education: In 1962, 28 more southern school districts desegregated voluntarily and peacefully, many after consultation with the Department of Justice.

As Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government, Vice President JOHNSON pointed out in November that Negro employment in the Federal Government stood at 28,986 at grades GS-5 through GS-11, an increase of 18.3 percent over the previous years, although the increase in such job vacancies was only 4 percent.

In grade GS-12 through GS-18, the number of Negroes increased from 343 to 1,380—a 33.1-percent increase, as compared with a raise in the total number of such jobs of 7.8 percent. In the private sector 104 major national business firms have signed equal employment pledges under the plans for progress program.

The right to travel, to share public facilities and accommodations, together with the right to equal education, these rights have been given Federal impetus as never before, but again, more importantly, they have received wide public acceptance in a quiet, normal way that hasn't hit the headlines.

The President's order last November prohibiting discrimination in federally assisted housing, together with the actions of some 17 States and 55 cities barring discrimination in that area is a milestone on the march. And on this march the American Negro himself has walked well. Much depends on the scope and dignity of Negro leadership; and it is equal to the test.

The trail is long, we've crossed rough terrain; and there's more ahead, much more to do for the American Negro, the American Indian, the migrant worker, minorities yes, as the American people themselves a minority in this world.

Meanwhile, back in the Kremlin's shadow, what do we find? We find over 100 persons executed in the past year for economic crimes, most of them Jews. We find Christian faiths harassed and Christian peoples persecuted. We find a statement last year by Roman Rudenko, Soviet Public Prosecutor, that the very causes of crime in capitalist countries are absent in the Soviet Union. Then we find a complaint in Pravda that Muscovites removed daily without paying, 77,000 bus tickets from help-yourself dispensers. We find a law branding as treason any unauthorized departure from the country, and the unhappy story of a Jewish woman sentenced to be shot last February for "currency manipulation," after a prior 3-year sentence in Siberia for trying to escape to Israel, and long after seeing her two daughters murdered by the Nazis. And we find a 1961 commentary on lawyers in a Soviet paper as follows:

"There are two groups of lawyers—one: Modest, quiet, unobtrusive, who will acknowledge guilt (if his client is guilty) and refer to mitigating circumstances.

"The other, working with his vocal chords and elbows, even shedding some tears. His voice going through the whole courtroom, 'My client's arrest is due to a mistake.' When the case was retried at the public prosecutor's demand, the same man was found guilty when another lawyer took his defense."

Another unobtrusive lawyer no doubt. Save us from them.

What is the difficulty here? What's missing in communism's instant utopia?

An appreciation for the natural rights of man? I should think so. It suffers from an overdose of Marxism-Leninism and a deficiency of Lockism-Jeffersonism. It would benefit so much from just a little exposure to first amendment principles.

If freedom is to thrive in any corner of the world, there must be communication and a sense of law. There can be no meaningful discussion of civil rights until these concepts have been examined.

Turning first to communication, if our Constitution had followed the style of St. Paul, the first amendment might have concluded, "But the greatest of these is speech." In the darkness of tyranny, this is the key to the sunlight. If it is granted, all doors open. If it is withheld, none. But a truth unheard is as much a social force as a tree falling in the lonely forest is sound. Truly

free speech implies a guarantee of the right to listen, in passing, it was my impression that it was to prevent truth from going unrevealed that the center itself was established on Eucalyptus Hill. There's no such hill in Russia.

Those matters which a government tries to conceal from the outside world are guides to its personality, but what it would hide from its own people is a reflection of its character. Thus, the secret speech denouncing Stalin in 1956, hidden from the public, told as much about its authors as its subject. More recently, in the past year, mobs of angry people have tested the laws of many nations. We read about the Walloon-Flemish differences in Belgium, violence in Paris and Mississippi. But what did we hear of the wage and price riots in southern Russia—that left hundreds of dead and wounded, what beyond vague references to rowdiness, while during that same week both Pravda and Izvestia highlighted the following earthshaking events:

The stock market dropped in New York.

A group of New Jersey students protested U.S. atomic tests.

Two unknown persons slipped into the Soviet sector of Germany.

This is the fact of Soviet news policy. What is the doctrine? I take it we can still look to Lenin for guidance on Soviet doctrine.

In 1903 he wrote indignantly: "Until freedom of speech and of the press is declared there will not disappear the shameful Russian inquisition which persecuted profession of unofficial faith, unofficial opinions, unofficial doctrines."

Later he wrote: "The periodical and nonperiodical press and all publishing enterprises must be entirely subordinated to the Central Committee of the Party."

Thus, today's Soviet leaders have a fairly wide latitude of Leninist press policies to drawn on.

There is, of course, freedom in the U.S.S.R. to say the right thing. This was brought home to a young American visitor to Moscow who was earnestly explaining how any American could openly denounce the life and morality of the United States, even ridicule the President.

"It is the same here," said the guide. "A Soviet citizen may also denounce life and morality in the United States and ridicule your President."

Freedom of communication involves both information and expression. I have touched on information. It is crucial to a dynamic society, which communism claims to be. But expression is no less so. Thus we read with concern the Soviet party's reply last month to Russian intellectuals who had claimed that "without opportunity for different artistic directions, art is condemned to death." The reply said that the party does not tolerate experimentation in the arts, and "is determining the tasks and directions of artistic creativeness." What sad rebuff; but what a fine claim.

And we shall wait to see if and how a young Soviet poet changes a now famous poem of protest, particularly so since it concerns racial persecution.

The Soviet Government seems to have good working relations with the Soviet press. If the Soviet chief of state should take exception to the editorial policies of a paper, he needn't cancel his subscription; he just cancels the paper. But that is hardly necessary at present.

Soviet papers serve their party well, rewriting human history even as it rolls off the presses of human endeavor. As the great hand writes, and having written, moves on, the agitation that follows is a team of Soviet historians with erasers. Someone should tell them to relax.

I have tried to explain how difficult it is for me at least to picture the struggle for civil rights where there is a limit of communication.

It seems to be recognized by some Soviet authorities that terror is inefficient. The so-called Special Board of Ministry of Internal Affairs has been abolished, and with it, its function, which was to send people to labor camps without a hearing, in secret procedures without right of counsel or appeal. Confessions must now be corroborated by other evidence. And all in all there seems to be a growing appreciation for what the Soviet calls legality, and a growing awareness among the Soviet legal profession itself of the obligation of law to society, and of lawyers to the law. The outcome of this trend remains uncertain. You may recall that after a great deal of noisy pride about abolishing the death penalty, the Soviet Union in 1961, reinstated it for crimes described as economic and specifically for illegal transactions in foreign currency. Subsequently, two men were executed under an ex post facto application of the currency law.

From Harvard's expert on Soviet law, Prof. Harold Berman, I learned of a conversation he had on this incident with a leading Soviet jurist. Berman had remarked on the unusual nature of the trial and sentence and suggested it violated the 1958 Soviet Principles of Criminal Procedure. The jurist replied, "we lawyers didn't like that," a response, Berman noted, which was no less remarkable for its "we lawyers" as for its "didn't like that."

I suppose what is needed is more lawyers who don't like things.

The law's slow progress in the Soviet Union may be due, in large part, to the lack of public debate. Thus the recent "anti-Parisite" laws by which people not doing socially useful work may be exiled to remote areas for 2 to 5 years, went into effect as quietly as the falling tumblers of a combination lock.

All great questions must be raised by great voices, and the greates voice is the voice of the people, speaking out in prose, or painting, or poetry, or music, speaking out, in homes and halls, streets and farms, courts and cafes—let that voice speak and the stillness you hear will be the gratitude of mankind. Man giving thanks—Jews thanking the God of Abraham for their lives, Siberian Christians thanking the Lord for their children—people giving thanks. It is a good sound.

And the world is listening, watching, weighing, deciding.

Latin Americans listen to the stifled sounds of Cuba. Macao and Hong Kong receive the gaunt refugees of Red China and hear the unspeakable. Europeans watch what they hope is the final chapter in subjugation on that continent.

Africans can see these things, and there is much to occupy their own moralists on their own vast continent.

There is ample evidence that dictatorial conduct is not confined to societies ruled by whites. South Africa's sabotage bill, and restrictive laws on voting and free speech, are no less encouraging than the Preventive Detention Act of Ghana, which empowers the government to imprison without trial for up to 5 years all persons suspected of subversion, or Ghana's dignity-of-the-President bill passed last year which subjects presidential detractors to £500 fines or 3 years' imprisonment. (If there is a Ghanaian Vaughn Meader, he's laughing on the inside.)

Wrongs that passed as white no color can make right.

A nation, it is true, must work its own evolution in its own way and at its own pace. Time and tide have favored ours. The best hope we can have perhaps is that governments may listen to the voices of their people. American governments have tried to do that. We have found that when people find a willing ear they are more disposed to lend a willing hand. We think with Jefferson that our Government is, "The world's best hope; the only one where every man at the call of the law would fly to the standard of the law and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern." This is a Virginian's answer to the demagogues of today, both foreign and domestic. It is the answer of thousands of southern citizens and of the U.S. marshals, most of them southerners, who held the line at the Lyceum in Oxford.

It is clear that the standard of law in America flies to protect the civil liberty of all American citizens from private as well as public invasions. Thus the Sherman Antitrust and Interstate Commerce Act give protection from excesses of the business community. Other legislation guards the public and the workingman from the abuses of labor. And today we face in this country a conspiracy which could be extremely erosive of the rights and liberties of our citizens, organized crime. So when we move against these excesses, we do so on behalf of all our people, and at their call. And the agencies and bureaus of government which answer this call, with the patience and care their work requires, deserve the respect of all Americans.

Finally, we have found that man's handhold on the globe is a precarious one. But we had always believed that. We always thought that our destiny was cradled in another Hand. And when Mr. Khrushchev reported that the cosmonauts, like the Bolshevik pilots of the early twenties, reported seeing "no signs of God," we can only suggest that they aim, with the rest of mankind, a little higher. In the meantime, there is work to do here on earth, to that day when Caesars render unto man what is man's.

Eulogy for Robert Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of Robert Frost, dean of American poets, and know that all my colleagues in this House join me in mourning his loss.

Frost was close to nature, and wrote of it as perhaps no other American poet ever has. His poetry was quiet and deep and brought the spirit of nature close. All Americans are familiar with the fields and woods of New England as Frost described them. We all know of his immortal, "Road Not Taken," in which the poet faced two imaginary roads. He took "the one less traveled." Few men indeed travel the road of art, and fewer still travel it with such success as Frost did. His poetry came to be read and loved more than that of any living poet in our country.

In an age of cynicism and helter-skelter, he provided a breath of freshness and rest.

He has now passed. But he has left behind an enormous and immortal contribution to the American spirit and culture.

Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, if passed, would amend our Social Security Act to permit both men and women to retire at the age of 60 and receive full benefits at that age.

It would also eliminate the age requirement for spouse's benefits—thereby permitting the payment of spouse's benefits simultaneously with that of an eligible retiree. In other words, should a man reach the legal retirement age and secure his social security pension, his wife—although she may be younger than he—would also be eligible to receive her benefits. This, too, would be true in the case of a wife becoming eligible first—the husband would then be eligible to receive benefits as her spouse, unless, of course, his own earnings would entitle him to greater benefits and he chooses to wait for benefits under his own eligibility.

It would also permit the retiree to receive a larger annual income from other sources and still be eligible for social security benefits. The present allowance is $1,200 annually, and my proposal would allow $2,000 annually.

I feel that these amendments would not only be beneficial to the recipients of our social security benefits but would also be most helpful to our general economy.

By permitting full benefits to be paid at a lower retirement age, many who are still employed would be more inclined to retire, with the possibility of job opportunities then being available to younger people. With both husband and wife receiving benefits simultaneously, and with a slightly larger outside income permitted, the consumer purchasing power of our retirees would be increased, and this—in turn—would help out the national economy.

The 1960 census disclosed the fact that we had 17 million citizens 65 years of age and older. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that we have—each day—a net increase of 1,000 persons reaching the age of 65. In fact—by 1980—it is expected that 10 percent of our national population will be comprised of this group of 65 and older. Today it is 9.3 percent.

If we lower the retirement age to 60—this percentage would be increased.

In our present list of unemployed—we have many in the age bracket from 60 to 65—too old to be reemployed but too young to retire on full benefits. This results in ever-increasing public assistance rolls.

My amendment would remove many from public assistance—from mere existence, so to speak—and permit them to qualify under a program to which they have paid their money for many years. My amendment would reduce the amount of money the State and Federal governments must pay out of general taxation for relief, while—at the same time—assure these recipients of a better income and increase their purchasing power for consumer products.

A prospective consumer market of 15 percent of our total population would be quite an incentive for our small business people throughout the Nation, if one cares to look at this problem strictly from a monetary viewpoint.

However, from a humanitarian viewpoint the wealthiest nation in the world could well afford to permit its elder citizens in this age of rapidly advancing technology to live their remaining years with dignity and respect, especially when you stop to consider the benefits which they receive are from a program to which they have contributed since 1937.

This legislation permits the Members of this Congress to be both practical and humane and I sincerely hope it will receive the support of all.

Father Junipero Serra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the date of November 24, 1963, marks the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra, the Franciscan priest who was the founder of the 21 California missions. One of the most beautiful of these missions is Mission San Jose, situated amongst the vineyards in the foothills of southern Alameda County, in the Ninth Congressional District of California. We Californians are proud that a statue of Father Serra stands in Statuary Hall, here in our Capitol.

At the annual convention of the 17 Serra Clubs of northern California, held in Monterey, October 19, 1962, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas it is the custom of the U.S. Post Office to issue commemorative stamps marking significant dates and events in history; and

Whereas November 24, 1963, will be the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra, founder of the California Mission; and

Whereas Father Junipero Serra is regarded by the people of California, of all denominations, as a leader, a teacher, an administrator and a perfect exemplar of the humility and spirituality of St. Francis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the northern California districts of Serra international, in regional convention assembled, does hereby urge the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in 1963 in honor of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra.

Mr. Speaker, I think the request of Serra international that we honor the birth of this gentle and saintly priest in this way is entirely fitting. I am therefore today introducing a bill providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and respectfully request the favorable consideration of my colleagues and the Postmaster General.

The 20th Anniversary of the Women Marines, February 13, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the proud history of the U.S. Marine Corps dates back to 1775. February 13 marks the 20th anniversary of an important part of this organization, the Marine Corps Women's Reserve, now known simply as the Women Marines.

The history of women serving in the Marine Crops, however, goes back much more than 20 years. During World War I, the Marine Corps was authorized to enlist and train women reservists in order to free men from clerical duties for combat in France. Over three hundred women thus served their country in this capacity from 1918–19.

In February 1943 the call went out once again for women to serve in the Marine Corps. This time, under the great demands of World War II, women were needed by the thousands to free combat-capable Leathernecks from scores of duties which tied them down behind the front. Thus, under provisions of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, the Marine Corps Women's Reserve was formed on February 13, 1943. By June 1944 the authorized quota of 18,000 enlisted women and 821 officers had been met, and these women were serving in their assigned duties. Over two hundred skilled categories were filled by these women, supporting Marine Corps capabilities on the ground and in the air. They served at every major Marine Corps post and station in the continental United States, and by 1945, were serving in Hawaii as well.

Following the war, the need was seen to maintain a nucleus of trained Women Marines as a mobilization base. At the same time difficulties were seen in maintaining this nucleus as nothing more than a volunteer reserve organization. These difficulties were resolved with the passage in 1948 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act.

Today, the women marines, under its Commandant, Col. Margaret M. Henderson, numbers about 150 officers and 1,600 enlisted women on active duty with the corps, throughout the United States, England, France, and Italy. These women perform important duties in aviation, personnel, administration, management, intelligence, communications, supply, transportation, disbursing, and many other fields which support the activities of the combat arm of the U.S. Marines.

Mr. Speaker, all of the women serving in our Armed Forces serve proudly, but

the women marines especially have earned the highest respect of their fellow servicemen and their fellow citizens. Therefore it gives me great pleasure to mark the 13th day of February as their 20th anniversary.

I include for the RECORD a copy of a proclamation issued by His Excellency, Gov. Endicott Peabody, of Massachusetts:

A PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY, ENDICOTT PEABODY, GOVERNOR, 1963

"Whereas the women marines freed thousands of men for combat during World War II, thereby aiding and assisting the Marine Corps in the achievement of their great victories in the South Pacific and elsewhere during this world conflict; and

"Whereas the women marines performed an equal service during the Korean conflict enabling thousands of marines to participate in the heroic battles which stemmed the tide of communism in the Far East; and

"Whereas the women marines have manned a host of key positions in our peacetime Marine Corps, buttressing greatly this branch of our armed service and strengthening its role as a prime deterrent against aggression; and

"Whereas the women marines have, by their diligence, ability, and patriotism served as a model for all women who wish to serve their country and community; and

"Whereas the 13th day of February 1963, marks the 20th anniversary of the women marines as part of the U.S. Marine Corps: Now, therefore, I, Endicott Peabody, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts do hereby proclaim as Women Marines Day February 13, 1963, and urge that all the citizens of the Commonwealth give every recognition to this observance."

Given at the executive chamber in Boston this 24th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1963 and of the independence of the United States, the 187th.

ENDICOTT PEABODY.

By His Excellency the Governor:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

We Must Work Out a Truly Equitable Answer to Aid to Education Within the Framework of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the closing dinner of the Catholic Youth Organization Diocesan Youth Congress, in Providence, R.I. on January 27, 1963.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Your Excellency, the most reverend bishop; right reverend and very reverend monsignor; Father Charles W. McConnell, diocesan CYO director; and reverend members of the clergy; distinguished representatives of State and local governments; CYO regional officers and representatives; members and friends of our outstanding Catholic Youth Organization here in Rhode Island, in an address to a group of teachers, the late Pope Pius XII urged them to take as their ideal the training of fine young Christian men and women, who would be prepared to participate as active members of modern society. And the Pope went on to say, "By the perfect Christian we mean the Christian of today * * * a citizen and not something apart from the life led in his own country."

It seems to me that these words perfectly express the aims and objectives of the CYO, which is an organization that applies the eternal truths of religion in the daily life of young people who are learning to become the future leaders in both civic and religious activities.

And I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to be with you and to participate in this evening's program. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, I have long been identified with the battle against juvenile delinquency. Consequently, I have heard a lot of testimony about what is supposed to be wrong with our youth. But I have also been impressed with the fact that in spite of the seriousness of the delinquency problem, the vast majority of our young people are doing a very fine job with the difficult task of growing up in this complicated modern world. Looking at this CYO congress tonight, I know that it represents a very important part of what is right with America's youth.

The five CYO members who have been awarded the Eagle of the Cross Medal certainly deserve special congratulations. In order to gain this honor they have had to demonstrate, not only real moral integrity, but they have had to work in apostolic activities and display true Christian leadership. As we all join in honoring them, I feel sure that their example is truly symbolic of what every CYO member believes in and works for.

Here is an organization in which laymen and the clergy are working together with young people to improve, not only the physical, but the spiritual and intellectual life of its members and the entire community. All of us owe a debt of gratitude particularly to the lay directors; past, present, and future; who volunteer their help in this good work.

Men and women of all faiths have been impressed and encouraged to hear of the deliberations of the Vatican Council, in which our own bishop is a participant. And we know that the Council is much concerned with the important responsibility of laymen in the field of Catholic action. Here in Rhode Island the hard-working lay directors of the CYO are certainly among those who have already shown practical proof of the good that can come when members of the laity assume their responsibilities for service to their church and their fellow citizens.

In every area of our national life today cooperation is essential if we are to defeat the drive of atheistic communism and build a better life of peace and freedom from want and fear. But in no area is cooperation more important than in matters which pertain to youth and its education. Our whole American educational system is, in fact, a great partnership. It is a vast and varied cooperative enterprise, which involves publicly and privately controlled schools. It is the responsibility of government at every level and of taxpayers who are parents, as well as taxpayers who are not. The American ideal of democracy calls for equality of educational opportunity, and we cannot rest satisfied until that goal is achieved for every American child and young person of school age, regardless of the type of school to which his parents, in the free exercise of their conscience, may decide that he should go.

It should be obvious that in the face of mounting costs and rising enrollments, we cannot achieve a national goal of equal educational opportunity without an increasing degree of cooperative effort between all concerned, especially in solving the problem of financing. Local school districts will have to be given more cooperative help from the States and the States in turn will have to be given more cooperative help by the Federal Government, without undermining either local autonomy or destroying local incentive.

Admittedly, this presents what looks like an almost insurmountable problem, to which no one has yet offered a complete solution. And the problem is complicated by the complex constitutional questions which arise when it is pointed out that our democratic goal of equality of educational opportunity must include consideration of those who exercise their free right to choose independent schools, many of which have religion as a part of their curriculum and are church related.

In this connection, I should like to point out a few facts that are revealed in the most recent Government survey of enrollment in public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools.

Between 1950 and 1960 nonpublic school enrollment increased by an estimated 82 percent, while public school enrollment increased by 43 percent. If this trend continues, it is estimated that nonpublic school enrollment will increase from 100 to 123 percent during the period between 1960 and 1980, while public school enrollment will increase 48 to 66 percent. In 1960 there were 6,224,000 children in the grades from kindergarten through high school enrolled in nonpublic schools, but in 1980 that figure may well go over 12 million.

Today, at the precollege level, about 15 percent of the total enrollment is in nonpublic schools; but the comparative growth rate shows that this percentage will rapidly increase. At the level of higher education, where private institutions have always played a vitally important role, 40 percent of the present enrollment is in nonpublic institutions.

In the light of these facts, it would be most unrealistic to talk about educational equality of opportunity without giving consideration to the private or independently supported segment of our educational structure. We must, and will, work out a truly equitable answer within the framework of our Constitution. The best legal minds do not yet agree as to what the precise relation between Government and church-related schools ought to be under our Constitution. A study of the decisions of the Supreme Court from the Cochran Louisiana textbook case of 1930, the Everson bus case of 1947, and the Zorach released time case of 1952 does, however, point to a possible solution: Wherever aid directly benefits the pupil and his parents and is not directed to church-related institution or does not use public facilities for direct sectarian instruction, that aid can be considered to be constitutional. As time goes on and more legislation is tested, our understanding will be further clarified. I see the method of educational tax relief for parents as very desirable and I have sponsored such legislation. But we are not going to solve all the questions affecting elementary, secondary, and higher education in one law or one court decision. As is the case with civil rights, so it is with achieving real equity in the question of school aid. The constitutional process is deliberative; it is not going to be rushed. But all who believe in constitutional democracy know that this deliberation is the firm guarantee of that justice which will, in the end, be done.

And I think that considerable progress has been made under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, with which I have been closely identified. For example, under that legislation, private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools are eligible

for loans to purchase equipment, instructional materials, and to do minor remodeling in order to improve their teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Such loans have already amounted to more than $2 million.

As the Supreme Court pointed out in the released-time case of *Zorach* v. *Clauson* in 1952, the first amendment "does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state." A rigid theory of secularism in government may fit the ideas of communism, but it does not accord with either the spirit or the history of this Nation, which has inscribed upon its coinage the motto, "In God we trust." As Dr. Robert Hutchins, the noted educator and president of the Fund for the Republic, has recently observed in an address before the University of Chicago Law School, the theory of an absolute wall of separation is an unworkable idea that is "hampering us in our search for what we need * * * a national idea of education and a national program to carry it out."

The history of America is a story of the search for the attainment of equality of opportunity, not only in education but in every aspect of our social, political, and economic life. This is in complete accord with the ideals of the great social encyclicals of the Popes, which teach that every person has a right to the opportunity to live a reasonable, moral life, and the right to social justice. Through legislation, through court decisions, through cooperation between the agencies of government, steady progress is being made in this direction. But each American also has the responsibility to rid his heart and mind from social, ethnic, and class prejudice. In this effort, the CYO spirit can and should continue to play an important part, for it is the spirit of true Christian charity and loyal citizenship. It is the spirit which can help most to make this truly "one nation, under God."

Many of the old prejudices which once divided America are disappearing. Who would have thought a generation ago that we would have a Catholic as our President or that Protestants would send official observes to a Vatican council? Here in Rhode Island the discussion of textbook aid to nonpublic schools has been conducted in an atmosphere of reason, good will, cooperation and understanding which has set an example to the whole country. In the same way, I believe, we are moving away from the habit of judging people on the basis of what country their ancestors came from. Ethnic prejudice is just another form of racial discrimination, which has not only been condemned by the Popes but also by the leaders of all our major faiths at a recent conference in Chicago. Those of us in public life who believe, as I do, that no candidate should be either elected or defeated on the basis of his ancestry look to young people like yourselves to help us in our fight to end ethnic prejudice. As Americans, and as Catholics, I know that we share the belief that God made all men equal, with a right to equal opportunity, not only for personal development but also for public responsibilities.

Mass Transportation Compact: A Focal Point for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session I introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 126, which would authorize eight eastern seaboard States and the District of Columbia to form an interstate compact and authority designed to ease the plight of the railroad commuter and the industry itself. This bipartisan measure is, in my opinion, one possible approach to the solution of one of America's most pressing problems in the area of mass transportation—the deteriorating and deficit-ridden rail commuter system.

Far from being a call for supergovernment, my proposal is an attempt to offer an alternative solution, one that is recognized in the Constitution itself, to the ever-growing centralization of authority in the Federal Government. Sooner or later this problem will have to be viewed on a wider scale than the piecemeal local-state approach. Transportation systems, like metropolitan areas, do not stop at State or city lines, and neither does the problem.

My own district contains a large number of the commuting population working in New York City, and in neighboring metropolitan communities. A significant editorial reaction to the compact proposal appeared in the January 19, 1963, edition of the Record, a daily newspaper of wide circulation in the Bergen County commuter area of New Jersey. It grasps one of the main points of importance in connection with my resolution—this is an opportunity for the States, the industry, labor, and interested citizens to express their views and needs in relation to a proposed solution, specific in nature. What better way to test the idea of an interstate compact in this area of national concern?

The editorial follows:

ONE WAY OF GETTING THE SHOW ON THE ROAD

Aside from the fact that it strangely finds Representative WIDNALL, Republican, seventh district, sponsoring something which sounds much like supergovernment, the proposal to have 8 Eastern States operate a passenger rail system sounds a great deal like more of the same except bigger.

There is one thing in its favor. It's in the grand manner. Proposed is a compact composed of New Jersey and seven other Atlantic seaboard States and the District of Columbia, to be approved by the Congress. Created would be an authority which would take over operation of eastern railroads' unprofitable passenger services, leaving the paying freight business in the hands of their present owners. Existing right of ways would for the most part be used.

The idea was proposed but failed to get off the ground last year. It's chief Senate sponsor is Senator PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island. It requires that a presidential delegate participate in negotiations among the States and report on them to Congress and that the compact be not binding until it has been ratified by all the States and by Congress. This last provision in itself would seem to doom the idea for any immediate purposes. It took years to get New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania together on the Delaware Basin project, and only 4 States were involved.

But Mr. WIDNALL does bring out and effective point in favor of the resolution:

"[It] does, however, provide one special solution to a special problem in one geographical area and its introduction, I hope, will give the States involved a focal point for comment and action."

Perhaps creating a focal point for comment will generate the chief benefit. Being asked here is an authority which would take over a gigantic deficit operation and run it, with or without a profit—more likely without. That would certainly mean some form of public subsidy, very likely switching this unattractive burden to Washington and away from the several States, all of which except New Jersey have shown a chronic distaste for doling out hard-cash financial help to passenger railroads.

But the project could accomplish at least one purpose—perhaps, just by being introduced, has accomplished it. It would show that in an area of 37 million persons containing 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing capacity our chief means of mass transportation is in such sorry straits that it needs help this big. The idea may not be the solution, but it certainly is a graphic way of posing the problem.

Our Vanishing Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an editorial in the Watonwan County Plaindealer, St. James, Minn., which vividly expresses a concern which I share—bigger spending, bigger deficits and bigger controls. The able editor of the Plaindealer, Leslie G. Curtis, states the case very well. I submit his editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

OUR VANISHING SURPLUS

When President Kennedy delivered his state of the Union message to Congress just a year ago, he stated that he was "submitting for fiscal year 1963 a balanced Federal budget".

A few days later he sent Congress a budget showing there would be a $500 million surplus for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1963. After the election last November Kennedy changed his estimate to an $8.8 billion deficit. And it may be more before the end of the year. Thus his original estimate was in error by only a mere $9.3 billion.

This year President Kennedy is pushing for a tax reduction with a promise that he would hold the spending to the present level. He estimated that his proposed tax reduction and holding down of domestic spending would produce a deficit for fiscal year 1963 of about $11.8 billion.

Then he submitted a budget of $99.8 billion, the largest peacetime budget in history, full of new welfare and other spending projects that have made many congressional leaders fairly gasp. If he is as far off in his estimates this year as he was last year, that $11.8 billion deficit could amount to $15 or $20 billion.

The thing that knocks any advance estimates into a cocked hat is the fact that Congress is controlled by a bunch of Democratic spenders who have no consideration for the already overburdened taxpayer. They concentrate all their efforts toward bringing more and more of our daily activities under Federal control.

Never in the history of our country has so much power and control been concentrated in Washington. Never have we had an administration that even dreamed being able to bring such a dictatorship of authority to the maze of bureaus and departments that we now have in the Federal Government.

All of this concentration of power in Washington costs money—taxpayers' money. The pressure for increased spending mounts higher and higher under the encouragement of a false philosophy of government that believes we can spend ourselves into prosperity.

We are certainly in agreement with President Kennedy that both individuals and industry need a reduction in taxes to help stimulate employment through increased investments of profits. However, we do not believe that any tax relief can be accomplished unless there is a corresponding reduction in Federal spending.

When the administration proposes to cut income taxes on the one hand and then takes it right away from us by increasing other forms of taxes, there isn't much prospect of bettering our economic condition.

A promise of tax reduction is a good propaganda piece, and will be exploited to the *n*th degree. But until there is also a reduction in Federal spending, there will be no real tax relief.

Key West Naval Base 140 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago tomorrow—February 1—naval orders were issued to the distinguished Commodore David Porter, U.S. Navy, to take command of the West Indies Squadron; to sweep away the buccaneering brethren of the coast, whose piratical domination of the seas extended from the West Indies into the Gulf of Mexico; and to establish a naval depot on Key West in the Territory of Florida to supply the vessels of the squadron.

Today, from that embryonic post—which was the first U.S. naval base in the Territory of Florida—the U.S. naval base at Key West, Fla., has evolved into an expansive and strategically significant naval complex ranging over 135 miles from Key West to Florida City, Fla.

Commodore Porter, when he first saw the area, called it the "Gibralter of the gulf" and envisioned the naval base as the place "to watch and guard our commerce passing to and from the Mississipi" as well as the "key to the commerce of Havana."

The missions carried out with high honor by the men of the Key West Naval Base since that time have paid tribute to Porter's words.

The function of the naval base from its birth until the Civil War was one of a coaling and supply depot. When the conflict between the States arose, the base fulfilled its first strategic mission as the home port for the Eastern Gulf Blockading Squadron. This naval group, operating under the commands of Flag Officers Farragut and McKean—with some 32 ships—cut off southern commerce and captured a total of 229 blockade runners and brought them to the island.

As the only Southern port in Union hands throughout the war, great quantities of contraband were amassed at Key West and it was from this naval station that the joint Army-Navy amphibious operations were launched leading to the destruction of the Confederate-held Florida salt works.

Following the war, the Key West Naval Station quickly returned to activities of peacetime progress and assisted the International Ocean Telegraph Co. in 1866 to lay the cable connecting Key West with the mainland of the United States and with Cuba. In 1881, a naval lieutenant named Robert E. Peary—who was to make history far to the North—reconstructed the Naval Wharf and further storage facilities were added in 1895.

As it was during the October days of 1962, the Key West Naval Base took on a role of major significance during the Spanish-Cuban days of the decade of the 1890's.

The battleship *Maine* departed from Key West on its death cruise and her dead and wounded were returned to this base. On April 23, 1898—reminiscent of recent days again—military observers on the Key West shores saw the first shot of the Spanish American War when the U.S.S. *Nashville*, operating out of Admiral Sampson's squadron, encountered the Spanish steamer, *Buena Ventura*, fired across her bow and took the first prize of the war.

During the crest of this struggle, the entire Atlantic Fleet operated from the Key West Naval Base as well as the entire force of correspondents who reported on the war.

By 1903 Key West was the headquarters for the newly established Seventh Naval District and a radio station marked Navy technological advance in 1906.

As the ravages of war swept across Europe in 1914, the Key West Naval Base began to take on its present day appearance with the arrival of seaplanes, submarines and blimps.

The primary mission of the base as the war raged on was then, as it is now, "supply and maintain the forces afloat." These were active years with the establishment of a seaplane training center, yachts being converted for destroyer patrol, submarines from the German patrol to be serviced, a naval magazine constructed, hospital facilities going up, and the radio operations reaching our farflung fleet in action.

With the return of the hope of peace following World War I, Key West relaxed in the magnificent Florida sun with only a single officer and 16 men operating the radio station until the Cuban revolutionary activities in 1934 brought the return of destroyers and Coast Guard craft.

Quiet returned again for a few years—civilian yachts used the submarine basin and swimmers used the military piers. The relaxation was halted with the return of war to the nations of Europe and the naval station was reactivated on November 1, 1939.

Destroyers pulled alongside the piers—the men of Patrol Wing 5 arrived—and Key West's role as an essential base for the neutrality patrol had begun.

The wartime role of the Key West command illustrated Commodore Porter's vision of the island's place in national defense. Missions were flown from the air station against German submarines in the gulf—the blimps resumed patrol—support of our submarines became a major activity—and a convoy control center effectively operated to reduce ship sinking from 107 in 1942 to only 4 in 1943.

Seventh District Headquarters returned to Key West in February 1942, and the gulf sea frontier was established in May 1942, with both commands moving to Miami in June of that year.

Following the cessation of hostilities, there was little retrenchment at Key West for the strategic importance and ideal climate for year-round operations—as recognized in 1823 by Porter—came to be recognized. The Atlantic Fleet's submarine development detachment transferred to Key West and the island was redesignated as a submarine base.

Soon came the helicopters and the jets—training and research brought expansion of land and facilities and the base acquired a tridimensional strength—on, under, and above the sea.

The eyes of the world focused on the Key West Naval Station just a few short months ago as we escalated toward the threat of nuclear war—a crisis once again involving Cuban affairs.

As we mark the 140th anniversary of the establishment of this stronghold in our defense system, I wish to join Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy in saying to the officers and men of the U.S. Navy at the Key West Naval Base: "Well done."

Miss Norma Lindsay Picked as Birmingham, Ala.'s Ambassadress to Birmingham, England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Birmingham, Ala., has a unique tie with the city of Birmingham, England. For many years there have been people to people exchange programs of one kind or another. Our mayors have exchanged visits, and travelers from Birmingham make a point of visiting our sister city in England.

It was during World War II that the people of Birmingham, Ala., became so deeply impressed with the spirit and indomitable character of their English counterparts. At that time, I can remember how packages of food and clothes were sent to Birmingham, England, in those dark and storm-tossed days of World War II.

These great steel producing communities have much in common. Last fall

the people of Birmingham, England, sent us their ambassadress, a lovely English lass, Miss Shireen Dixon, to visit our city. She toured the eastern part of the United States and was treated regally everywhere.

After the visit of Miss Dixon to Birmingham, the Birmingham Advertising Club decided it would be a good idea to send our own Birmingham girl to visit in England.

Miss Norma Lindsay, of 401 Poinciana Drive, has been picked as Birmingham, Ala.'s, ambassadress to Birmingham, England. This charming young lady is the granddaughter of Mrs. Belle Leftwich, of Birmingham.

She will represent the people of Birmingham, Ala., as she travels from Magic City to Birmingham, England. Miss Lindsay was the choice of a committee of outstanding Birmingham citizens who were seeking "a typical American girl who is poised and proud of her city."

She will carry the friendship and goodwill of the people of Birmingham, Ala., to the people of Birmingham, England. She will also be carrying typical products of Alabama manufacturers as gifts to industrialists and dignitaries of the cities she will visit.

I am inserting herewith an article from the Birmingham News concerning this program, which I believe all of the Members will be interested in:

FLASHING-EYED BRUNETTE WINS BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND, TRIP

A lovely, flashing-eyed 20-year-old brunette accepted the delightful task Saturday night of carrying the friendship and goodwill of the Magic City to our sister city, Birmingham, England.

Norma Lee Lindsay, of 410 Poinciana Drive, was chosen from 20 finalists at the Ambassadress Ball sponsored by the Jaycees in the Terrace Ballroom of the Dinkler-Tutwiler Hotel.

First alternate to the ambassadress is Nancy Carolyn James, 23-year-old youth director for the Birmingham Baptist Association, and second alternate is Martha Lackey, 21, a senior at the University of Alabama.

Birmingham's ambassadress is a tall, willowy, 5-foot-6 native of Birmingham who sings in the choir at the First Presbyterian Church. She lives with her grandmother, Mrs. Belle Leftwich.

As the representative of the people of Birmingham, she will put to use valuable acting experience gained with Actor's Theater and the Jewish Community Center Players.

Sponsors for the event who will present her a dazzling 9-day trip to Washington, D.C., New York City, Birmingham, and London, England, are WBRC-TV, the Birmingham Ad Club, and TransWorld Airlines.

Local industries and manufacturers in Alabama have been asked to send some of their typical products along for the Ambassadress to present to industrialists and dignitaries of the cities she will visit.

Her first appearance will be this morning at 9:30 when she and the alternates are presented on Harry Mabry's "Sunday Morning Show" over channel 6.

Monday night she will be presented by Robert T. Schlinkert, general manager of channel 6, and Jim Crim, president of the Ad Club, at the annual banquet of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce in the Tutwiler Hotel.

Tuesday, she will choose her wardrobe for the trip at Taylor's of Eastwood Mall, accompanied by Mrs. Alyce B. Walker, associate editor of the Birmingham News, and will receive a matched set of luggage from the Birmingham Trunk Factory.

Tuesday afternoon she will meet Gov. George Wallace and tour state offices in Montgomery.

She will be a guest at the Birmingham Ad Club luncheon at the Thomas Jefferson Hotel Friday.

She will leave Birmingham February 10 for Washington, where she will meet Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN, and Representative GEORGE HUDDLESTON.

February 11 she will go to New York City for a night and a day of interviews and touring. She will stay at the beautiful Belmont-Plaza Hotel.

The next night she will leave for London via TWA's royal ambassador jet service. She wil be met in London by a committee from Birmingham, England.

Awaiting her are appearances on the British Broadcasting Co. radio and TV stations, press interviews, and appearances and interviews in all the cities that she visits.

Thelma King Wants Republic of Panama Opening of Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, 1962, the new bridge across the Panama Canal at Balboa, designated by act of Congress as the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, was inaugurated with impressive ceremonies, which were marred by radical demonstrations of communistic inspiration.

This bridge and its approaches lie wholly within the Canal Zone territory and the cost of its construction was borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

Despite these facts, a bill to rename the bridge and to provide for its inauguration by authorities of Panama was introduced in the National Assembly of that country by Assemblywoman Thelma King, an outspoken sympathizer of Soviet Cuba. A news story in the November 16, 1962, issue of a Panamanian newspaper, giving the text of the bill and other details follows:

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THELMA KING WANTS REPUBLIC OF PANAMA OPENING OF BRIDGE, BUT TIME RUNS SHORT

A bill which would require Panamian authorities to carry out the official inauguration of the new bridge over the Panama Canal on November 28 was introduced in the National Assembly yesterday by Assemblywoman Thelma King.

Miss King is an outspoken nationalist and sympathizer of Fidel Castro.

Assembly sources pointed out that, apart from other considerations, there is hardly time available to complete the legislative process required for enactment of the bill into law prior to November 28.

A bill upon presentation is referred to a committee, in this case the Foreign Relations Committee, which calls for hearings on it. The law allows 10 days for this purpose. The days are working days, not calendar days.

If the bill is reported on favorably by the committee, it remains in the office of the clerk of the Assembly for 2 days before it can be included in the agenda for the Assembly's daily sessions.

Once it is posted on the agenda, the measure is required to pass two additional readings on separate days and once this has been done then it goes to the President for signature or veto. The law gives the Chief Executive so many days, depending upon the length of the bill, to act upon legislation requiring his signature.

If he elects not to sign the bill, but does not veto it outright, the measure then is returned to the National Assembly for signature by the president of the Assembly.

But even after it has been signed, a law requires publication in the Official Gazette before it can be enforced.

There are 8 working days left between today and November 28, which itself is a national holiday in commemoration of Panama's independence from Spain.

Miss King's bill reads:

"The National Assembly,

"Whereas the 28th instant marks another anniversary of our independence from Spain;

"Whereas, last October 12 a project known as the Thatcher Ferry Bridge was inaugurated, which project the National Assembly named the Bridge of the Americas;

"Whereas the project has not yet been inaugurated by the National Government, which has sole right to do so,

"Decrees:

"ARTICLE 1. The Bridge of the Americas will be inaugurated, officially, by the authorities of the Republic of Panama on November 28 next.

"ART. 2. The Protocol Office of the Ministry of Foreign Relations will issue the invitations to the national authorities, the diplomatic corps and any others whom it deems convenient."

The formal inauguration of the new $20 million bridge on October 12 was attended by President Robert F. Chiari and other high Panamanian dignitaries and by U.S. Under Secretary of State George Ball and local Canal Zone officials.

The bridge was built by the United States to fulfill a treaty commitment with Panama. It lies in the Canal Zone, which is under U.S. jurisdiction.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, water, its adequacy both in quantity and quality, continues to be without question the most significant consideration confronting the Nation in the entire resource conservation field. These two water aspects, quantity and quality, are inseparably linked together in our concern. We have only to recall the plight of the ancient mariner to remind us that water supplies are less than useless when they lack the necessary quality for the specific uses they are called on to fill.

The measures authorized in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as

amended, encompassed the preservation and maintenance of water quality adequate for all legitimate uses, public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses as well as the protection of the public health. Water pollution control is not, therefore, any longer solely a health problem. Its impact extends to all water resource considerations. The 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 87-88, stressed the significance of this wide sweep of Federal interest and responsibility by vesting in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the former responsibilities of the Surgeon General for administering the act's provisions. It was fully anticipated and intended that in this manner the upgrading within the Department of the Federal water pollution control program required for the effective achievement of its purposes would be satisfactorily resolved. Only one of the desired effects has resulted. Overseeing responsibility has been assigned to an able and conscientious Assitant Secretary additionally burdened with other Department affairs. At the same time, however, the operating program, itself, remains submerged in its long occupied basement within the Public Health Service.

The bill, which I introduce today, would establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration as an independent operating agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would he headed by a Commissioner acting under the supervision and direction of the Secretary and an Assistant Secretary. My proposal in no way impugns the Public Health Service but the realities involved point to this action as the best means of securing effective administration of all of the act's provisions.

In accord with the emerging necessities for keeping our waters clean for the future, my bill states the purpose of the act in establishing a positive national policy in this regard as opposed to the irresponsible policy of using our streams for waste assimilation to the limits of their capacity.

Major concentrations of our population reside in our larger cities. Provision by these cities of treatment facilities to service the needs of their inhabitants demands the expenditures of proportionately great amounts. To remedy the ratio of inequality that obtains in regard to the provision of construction grants funds as concerns these larger municipalities, and to provide a more adequate degree of inducement toward their construction of needed treatment plants, the dollar ceiling limitation presently authorized in the act are proposed to be increased from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project.

Municipal and industrial wastes are admittedly the major contributory sources of this pollution. Accordingly, the predominant share of our current water pollution control effort is focused on these two major contributors. The stimulatory grants-in-aid to municipalities for construction of waste treatment works provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act have been greatly successful in this respect, so much so that the Congress in enacting the 1961 amendments authorized a continuation of this program at twice its previous rate.

Little if any regard has been given, however, to the outmoded waste collection systems in many of our older cities that in themselves serve to greatly reduce the benefits to be expected from the installation of new treatment plants. This is because, on an annual average, 10 percent of the municipality's sanitary sewage never reaches the treatment plant. This amount of the city's raw wastes is carried off by storm overflow directly into the nearest waters. The fact that many cities collect the wastes from their industries in their municipal sewers to receive treatment at the central plant adds to the gravity of the situation.

Many municipalities at the turn of the century constructed a system of combined sewers to carry their sanitary wastes and to collect the runoff from their streets after a rainfall. At that time, this was an economic course for the cities to take. The sanitary wastes from their smaller populations used only a small portion of the combined sewer capacity. The portion of this sanitary sewage that was carried off by storm overflows into the receiving wastes was readily diluted by the proportionately larger street runoff collected by the sewers.

As a result of the vast population increase, the huge centers like New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and others find that their combined sewers are sufficient only to handle the sanitary sewage with little or no capacity remaining to cope with storm runoff. With these combined sewers filled to capacity with sanitary wastes, the runoff resulting even from a short summer afternoon rainfall causes the sewers to overflow at spillways necessarily provided for this purpose directly to the stream. It is conservatively estimated that as much as 35 percent of the sanitary sewage bypasses the treatment plant and is carried directly into the watercourse after a heavy rainfall fills the sewers and pours out of the convenient spillways.

In the opinion of experts it is this factor which is directly responsible for the serious interference with recreational and other legitimate uses of the waters that are adjacent to our larger communities. For example, the city of New York administers conscientious treatment of its sanitary waste discharges. Its bathing beaches, however, are to a great extent posted as unsafe due to the unusually high coliform count samples obtained there. This situation is attributed in large degree to the storm overflow from its combined sewers, carrying a large amount of raw sanitary sewage. Similarly, the closed beaches at Milwaukee, now an annual affair, are also traceable to storm overflow. The pollution of the Potomac River caused by storm overflow from the combined sewers in the Nation's Capital was recognized and cited as a principal cause of the shameful condition of this stream in the Federal enforcement action begun in 1957 to restore the quality of these waters. The conferees recommended as one of the absolutely necessary remedial measures that pollution from storm sewer overflows be substantially alleviated by the end of 1966.

Our programs of municipal treatment works construction should be accompanied by the construction of separate storm and sanitary sewers in our metropolitan areas. This is necessary and imperative to assure the efficiency of the treatment plants themselves, which are designed to handle sanitary sewage without the complicating factor of intermixture with storm runoff. And, more importantly, the deleterious discharge of raw sewage will be effectively halted—allowing our streams to recover without the necessity of experiencing periodic heavy doses of the pollutants that have so long plagued them.

In order to alleviate this problem my bill includes provisions for a program of grants assistance to municipalities in separating their combined systems. For these purposes, outlays of $1 million annually are proposed, from which grants in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable costs of combined sewer systems projects would be made.

The impairment of the growth and well-being of our urban centers must not be permitted to result from the injudicious use of Federal funds no matter how well-intentioned. In order to assure that grant-assisted projects conform with metropolitan area plans for their regulated development, an additional 10 percent of the grant amount would be authorized to be made in the case of projects so certified by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency.

Pollution control and prevention guideposts are increasingly sought and requested by conscientious water users mindful of their responsibility for preserving water quality. Equally, the furnishing of such guideposts would greatly facilitate taking enforcement measures against those who perform acts in disregard of officially promulgated regulations. To this end, my bill would require the issuance of regulations by the Secretary setting forth standards of quality applicable to interstate or navigable waters and the type, volume, or strength of matter which may be safely discharged into these waters. The regulations are to be based on consideration of the present and future uses of interstate or navigable waters for all legitimate uses. Violation of the regulations is declared a public nuisance and made subject to abatement under the act's enforcement provisions.

Our efforts to control and prevent water pollution must be fully and aggressively responsive to the challenge before us. In order that we may not fail through any lack of sufficient powers and resources, I ask for the early consideration and enactment of my bill.

Gaitskell: A Leader in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to meet and know the late leader of the British Labor Party, Hugh Gaitskell, during my stay in England almost 10 years ago. Although a Londoner, he represented the Leeds constituency where I lived for some time with my family. He was a man of brilliance, dedication, and courage. The United States and the free world have lost a great and true friend.

As Max Freedman stated so well in his Washington Post editorial of January 21:

The death of Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the British Labor Party, has done much more than to change the balance in British politics. It has robbed many honorable causes of a voice of reason that has often filled the world * * *. Other leaders will come, but he will be remembered with affection and gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, the Freedman article is a fitting tribute to a great citizen of the Western World, and I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

MR. GAITSKELL IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Max Freedman)

The death of Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the British Labor Party, has done much more than change the balance in British politics. It has robbed many honorable causes of a voice of reason that has often filled the world. For his friends, there will be personal grief at the knowledge that the sword at last has worn out the scabbard. There will be other battles, but his flashing spirit no longer will point the way. Other leaders will come, but he will be remembered with affection and with gratitude.

In these last few days we have seen a dramatic example of the way the fortunes of free nations have become entangled. We have all known that in the course of time the political period associated with aged leaders like Adenauer, De Gaulle, Nehru, and Chiang Kai-shek must end. Mr. Gaitskell, measured in these terms, was still young, and was out of power. We had the right to expect that long years of service awaited him. Now our vigil on the medical bulletins has ended in sadness.

Mr. Gaitskell followed his own path of leadership. It was said of the first great leader of the labor party, Keir Hardie, that he hated the palace because he remembered the pit. He was almost as eager to tear down the rich as he was to raise up the poor. This passion for social justice, never tumultuous in Ramsay MacDonald, thinned out in the latter days to little more than a timid advocacy of tentative reform.

An interlude of pacifism marked the party's history as it followed the brief leadership of George Lansbury, who mistook the mandates of his conscience for the facts of life. The labor party reached its glory under the guidance of Clement Attlee, whose threadbare personality concealed a mind of surprising power and dexterity.

Poverty never cradled Mr. Gaitskell into socialism nor did trade unionism give him its rewards. He was an intellectual, and the slovenly waste of the British economic system irritated his precise mind even more than the curse of injustice outraged his conscience. For many years he was the respected spokesman of the Labor Party in the age of the welfare state. Neither a pioneer nor a prophet, he brought into the British debate an instructed conscience without which public controversy would more easily have fallen into a mere argument over managerial techniques.

He stirred Englishmen to think anew of the perils as well as the hopes of an equal society. In the process he persuaded British socialism to disenthrall itself of many ancient dogmas. He was a liberator even more than a leader, for the verdict in national elections went against him.

Inside the Labor Party, he never lacked rivals and opponents. Aneurin Bevan, who was born, like Lloyd George, with a silver tongue in his cheek, once derided Mr. Gaitskell as a dessicated adding machine. The gibe was a victory of invective over accuracy. Mr. Gaitskell's offense consisted in being far more interested in the rights of Englishmen than in the wrongs of man. It is a small offense, and for it his friends need offer no prolonged atonement.

Always in British politics the Liberal or progressive party has wavered between two distince groups. Gladstone as liberal leader had to remember the protests of John Bright and the campaigns of the young Joseph Chamberlain. In a later period, Rosebery suffered under the more imperious spirit of Harcourt, and Asquith bowed to the mercurial genius of Lloyd George.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find the Labor Party, in our day, divided by quarrels and quivering with antagonisms. Mr. Gaitskell managed to compose these disagreements even though he never could end them. His departure has raised many anxious questions about the future of the Labor Party.

During the Suez crisis of 1956 Mr. Gaitskell never hesitated to denounce British policy even while British troops were moving into action. This conduct is more consistent with British than with American experience. The tradition here calls for the closing of ranks in an emergency, to be followed by a loud and painful postmortem when it can do very little good. The British people are no strangers to national unity. But they respect the voice of conscience amid the crash of arms. Mr. Gaitskell convinced few voters that he was right about Suez. But even his critics honored his independence, and his refusal to be stampeded by organized appeals to national emotion.

In the last period a shadow crept across Mr. Gaitskell's career. He had every right to be critical of British entry into the Common Market. But his tone was wrong. He was querulous and bitter where he should have been sedate and constructive. He winced from the embrace of Europe. The friend of the Commonwealth was reluctant to go on the new pilgrimage.

Walter Bagehot said the House of Commons has more brains than everyone in it. It has a corporate judgment and sense of honor more sensitive and profound than the qualities of all its members. Soon the Labor Party must find a new leader. One hopes he will be as good a friend of this country as Mr. Gaitskell was at every stage of his career. Meanwhile there is a lonesome place in Parliament, and a burden of sadness in the hearts of many Americans who never had the privilege of his friendship.

If Depletion Laws Are Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, Missourians interested in the oil industry and new mining developments in Missouri are greatly concerned about any proposed changes in the percentage depletion tax laws.

A very informative feature story containing statements of the feelings of Gov. John Dalton, Dr. Thomas Beveridge, State geologist, and Laurence Schneider, director of Missouri's division of commerce and industrial development toward depletion tax and the effect of such changes upon Missouri's economy changes, appeared in the Sunday News and Tribune of Jefferson City, Mo.

Under unanimous consent I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

MISSOURI'S ECONOMIC GROWTH WILL BE RETARDED—MANY JOBS WILL BE LOST SHOULD CONGRESS ALTER MINERAL, OIL PROVISIONS

If exploration for oil, iron, lead, zinc, and other minerals suddenly came to an end, this Nation's economy would suffer a near fatal blow.

Sound fantastic?

It could happen if some groups succeed in their efforts to remove or alter provisions in the law that are essential to bring out risk capital for such ventures.

Early in its experience with the income tax amendment, Congress adopted a provision to cover depletion of discovered reserves in oil and other mineral industries. After experimenting with an arrangement based on discovery value of a well or mine, Congress in 1926 adopted the percentage depletion law.

The rates of this provision vary according to the nature and characteristics of the affected minerals. For example, oil and gas being the most difficult and expensive to hunt for and find, the depletion rate for these minerals is 27.5 percent. This takes into account the special problems involved in discovering and developing replacements for depleting reserves.

Sulfur, uranium, bauxite, lead, zinc, nickel, and tungsten are part of a long list of minerals receiving a 23-percent depletion rate.

MORE THAN 100 MINERALS

A 15-percent rate applies to all metal mines and many other minerals; a 10-percent rate to such resources as iron, coal, sodium chloride, and lignite.

Persons who locate brick and tile clay are entitled to a 5-percent rate.

Altogether, more than 100 minerals are now included under the precentage depletion tax provision.

These rates have been examined repeatedly over the years by committees of Congress and other official groups.

In the face of these recurring inspections, the rate for oil and gas has remained unchanged, rates for some other minerals have been increased, and new minerals of strategic or economic importance have been added to the list.

Appendix

Part 6: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro—October 22-29, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, this sixth portion of my continued chronology on Cuba and Castro begins with the action by President Kennedy in imposing a sea and air "quarantine" on the shipment of military equipment to Cuba—of which the public was informed on the evening of October 21, 1962, during a nationwide TV broadcast.

It had been apparent for several days to most people in political and government circles, as well as the press, that something unusual was afoot. The return of President Kennedy from his very active speaking tour on behalf of Democrat candidates for House and Senate seats was more or less a tipoff to many that something out of the ordinary was happening.

I believe it is safe to say that the American public, although understandably on edge, gave an almost collective sigh of relief after the broadcast was over. Although many felt the action taken should have been stronger, most were glad at least that it was not weaker. The public, almost to a man, expressed their complete support of the action taken by President Kennedy in finally drawing a definite line of demarcation on what the U.S. Government would tolerate as far as Cuba and the Soviets were concerned. The public had for a long long while been frustrated and uneasy about efforts which had been made for almost a generation to keep a steady footing and clear head in dealing with the Soviets. The harassment and humiliating thrusts from Castro in Cuba had been almost more than they could take—therefore the action taken by the President amounted at least to an assertion of our national pride—and a natural concern over the safety and welfare of our citizens and the security of our way of life. All seemed relieved that the President had, at long last, "dropped the other shoe." It appeared that this had the effect of welding together formerly warring factions, and we seemed to be joined in a common purpose—to protect our Nation.

This same electric impulse somehow touched many foreign nations who shared our love of freedom, but who had obviously doubted for some time our will to fight for it. One by one, many who previously had engaged in sniping at the United States—accusing us of being too soft—too hard—too vacillating—or too concerned about the whole subject of communism—Latin American countries and NATO allies alike—all lined up behind the United States and expressed approval and support. Although some had to be convinced by photographic proof that a threat really existed in Cuba—such as Great Britain—it did not take too long for the British as well as Mexico and several of the Latin and Central American countries to realize that this threat indeed existed and could swing in many directions—and that whether they liked it or not, their national fortunes were also involved to one degree or another.

The Soviets were, of course, shocked and unbelieving. They accused us of hysteria. Somehow they had formed the opinion that we would not, as a nation, "fight when the chips were down." They seemed to have forgotten or overlooked the fact that many times in the past we had successfully held the line against Soviet advances or threats—such as during the Berlin blockade-airlift, our resumption of nuclear testing after the U.S.S.R. had broken their moratorium, Korea, the Chinese Nationalist Government in Formosa, and so forth. The significance of these stands taken by the United States had somehow been overlooked by the Soviets and they had formed an unflattering opinion of what they termed our "softness" as a Nation.

The following chronology of events will refresh our minds on the variety of charges, countercharges, threats and counterthreats, which took place but through it all, I do not believe the spirit of unity of the American public ever really wavered. They had wanted firm action by the President and others concerned with our national and foreign policy—and were overjoyed that this had taken place. The comment was often heard that if President Kennedy had been running for reelection in the fall campaign, he would win "hands down" against any candidate—and I am fairly sure this was true.

I would like to point out here, however, that if the American public showed their pride in President Kennedy because of his action, the President had even more reason to be proud of the American public. For he had, whether intentionally or not, created an atmosphere not only in foreign countries but in his own as well which can best be described by a paragraph taken from the Globe and Mail, Canada's leading conservative newspaper, in an editorial entitled "Mr. Kennedy's Arrogance," and printed on December 31, 1962:

Mr. Kennedy's high-handed attitudes and ruthless methods attracted a great deal of unfavorable comment in the United States and abroad during his campaign for the Presidency. His record in the White House has not been reassuring; often he seems to confuse willfulness with toughness, and bullying with strength.

The chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO—PART 6

October 22, 1962: In a speech of extraordinary gravity, President Kennedy imposed a sea and air "quarantine" last night on the shipment of military equipment to Cuba. Broadcasting to the American people and listeners abroad, he said the Soviet Union was building offensive missile and bomber bases in Cuba. He said the bases could fire medium-range nuclear missiles 2,000 miles. Calling on Premier Khrushchev to withdraw the missiles, he said any launching against a Western Hemisphere nation would be met by retaliation against the Soviet Union. He made clear that Washington would not stop short of military action to end the provocative threat.

American warships and planes quickly put the quarantine into effect and a worldwide alert went out to U.S. Forces. Destroyers, submarines, and other units put to sea all along the eastern seaboard to join a large Caribbean fleet, which included 40 ships and 6,000 marines diverted from maneuvers.

After nearly a generation of trying to avoid a direct United States-Soviet confrontation, the United States drew the line—not with Cuba but with the Russians. Mr. Kennedy's order bore out his decision to oust Soviet missiles from his hemisphere at the risk of war. American ships have orders to attack blockade runners that resist.

Havana radio said Cuba's armed forces were alerted after Mr. Kennedy's speech.

London sources said Britain would approve the quarantine. Canada closed some of its airbases to Soviet planes bound for Cuba.

Moscow radio charges hysteria in Washington. (Foreign Affairs Division, Oct. 22, 1962.)

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, OCTOBER 23-25, 1962

October 23, 1962: Soviet Government statement (handed to the U.S. Ambassador in Moscow) warns the United States that its quarantine raises the threat of thermonuclear world war. It says that the Soviet Union has "repeatedly declared that not a single Soviet nuclear bomb would fall either on the United States or on any other country unless an aggression is committed. * * * But if the aggressors touch off a war, the Soviet Union would strike a most powerful retaliatory blow." The statement insists that the weapons provided to Cuba by the Soviet Union were "aimed solely at enhancing Cuba's defense potential." It adds: "The United States demands that military equipment Cuba needs for self-defense should be removed from Cuban territory, a demand which, naturally, no state which values its independence can meet."

The U.S. blockade against ships delivering offensive weapons to Cuba goes into effect. U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara announces that 25 Soviet merchant ships have been spotted on the way to Cuba, and that the first U.S. Navy contact with these ships will be in 24 hours.

Premier Fidel Castro (in a televised speech) describes the U.S. blockade of Cuba

as an act of piracy. He says that Cuba will "never" accept the U.S. plan for a U.N. investigating committee to check on Soviet missile bases in Cuba.

The United States introduces a resolution in the U.N. Security Council calling for the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba.

The Council of the Organization of American States (after granting itself emergency powers as a ministerial-level organ of consultation under provisions of the 1947 Rio Treaty) formally authorizes (by a vote of 19 to 0, with 1 abstention) "the use of armed forces" to carry out the quarantine of Cuba. (Uruguay—which abstains on a technicality due to a delay in instructions from the Montevideo Government adds its affirmative vote.) "[In] the greatest display of Western Hemisphere solidarity since the days of World War II—Latin America acted swiftly to join the United States in recommending all necessary measures to halt the flow of offensive weapons to Cuba from the Soviet bloc."

The British Government expresses "deep concern at the provocative action of the Soviet Union in placing offensive nuclear weapons in Cuba," and declares its support of the U.S. position. "NATO lined up solidly behind the United States. The 14 other members of the NATO Permament Council at Paris took under urgent consideration the question of a military alert for their forces."

October 24, 1962: U.S. Defense Department announces that some Soviet-bloc ships headed for Cuba appear to have changed their course, while others are still proceeding.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant sends urgent appeals to President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev asking them to suspend, respectively, the blockade and the shipment of arms to Cuba, for a period of 2 or 3 weeks which would allow for negotiations.

In answer to a telegram from the British philosopher and pacifist, Bertrand Russell, who had appealed to Soviet Premier Khrushchev "not to be provoked by the unjustifiable action of the United States in Cuba," Khrushchev (in his reply) calls on the United States to "display reserve and stay the threat of execution of its piratical threats which are fraught with most serious consequences," and he suggests a summit meeting "in order to discuss all the problems which have arisen, to do everything to remove the danger of unleashing a thermonuclear war."

October 25, 1962:

U.S. Navy intercepts the first Soviet ship (an oil tanker) to penetrate the blockade, and allows it to continue on its way to Cuba after it is determined that it carries no offensive arms.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev accepts U.N. Secretary General U Thant's proposal of October 24 for a suspension of the U.S. blockade and Soviet shipments of arms, and for talks leading to a negotiated solution of the Cuban crisis. President Kennedy (in his reply to U Thant) says that "the existing threat was created by the secret introduction of offensive weapons into Cuba, and the answer lies in the removal of these weapons." He says that the United States is willing to engage in "preliminary talks" with the U.N. to see whether a satisfactory basis can be found for negotiations on the Cuban crisis.

In the U.N. Security Council, U.S. Delegate Adlai Stevenson displays photographic evidence of Soviet missile bases in Cuba, after Soviet delegate Valerian A. Zorin insists that the U.S. assertion is based on false evidence.

Stevenson-Zorin exchange in the U.N. Security Council, October 25, 1962:

Stevenson: "Let me ask you one simple question: Do you deny that the U.S.S.R. has placed and is placing medium- and intermediate-range missiles in Cuba? Yes or no? Do not wait for the translation. Yes or no?"

Zorin: "I am not in an American courtroom, and, therefore, I do not wish to answer a question that is put to me in the fashion of a prosecutor. In due course you will have your reply."

Stevenson: "You are in the courtroom of world opinion right now, and you can answer 'Yes' or 'No.' You have denied that they exist, and I want to know whether I have understood you correctly."

Zorin: "Will you please continue your statement? You will have your answer in due course."

Stevenson: "I am prepared to wait for my answer until hell freezes over, if that is your decision. I am also prepared to present the evidence in this room."

Canadian Government endorses the U.S. position in the Cuban crisis. Prime Minister Diefenbaker says (in the Canadian House of Commons) that the Soviet offensive weapons in Cuba are a direct and immediate menace to Canada and a serious menace to the deterrent and strategic strength of the whole Western alliance on which our security is founded.

British Prime Minister Macmillan (in a speech to the House of Commons on the Cuban crisis) does not specifically endorse the U.S. blockade, but says that the measures taken by President Kennedy are not extreme, since they are designed to meet a situation without precedent. He expresses the hope that a peaceful solution to the crisis will soon be found which will make it possible to move to a wider field of negotiation. However, he adds: "I think what has happened in the last few weeks must confirm our view that in these grave matters we cannot rest upon mere words and promises. These need, if they are to restore confidence, to be independently verified and confirmed."

October 26, 1962: In answer to a new appeal from United Nations Secretary General U Thant, Soviet Premier Khrushchev agrees to keep Soviet ships away from the U.S. blockade area for the time being, and President Kennedy says that he will try to avoid any direct confrontation at sea "in the next few days." Kennedy points out, however, that certain Soviet ships are still proceeding toward Cuba, and that work on Soviet missile bases in Cuba is still continuing.

The White House issues a statement which says: "The development of ballistic missile sites in Cuba continues at a rapid pace. * * * The activity at these sites apparently is directed at achieving a full operational capability as soon as possible * * * there is no evidence to date indicating that there is any intention to dismantle or discontinue work on these missile sites. On the contrary, the Soviets are rapidly continuing the construction of missile support and launch facilities and serious attempts are underway to camouflage their efforts."

The U.S. Navy stops and searches a Soviet-chartered freighter of Lebanese registry. The ship is allowed to proceed to Cuba after no offensive weapons are found on board.

A message from Premier Khrushchev (which is not made public) reaches President Kennedy: "Never explicitly stated, but embedded in the letter was an offer to withdraw the offensive weapons under United Nations supervision in return for a guarantee that the United States would not invade Cuba."

October 27, 1962: President Kennedy receives a second message from Premier Khrushchev (made public in a Moscow broadcast), which proposes that the Soviet Union will dismantle its missile bases in Cuba and withdraw its jet bombers from the island, if the United States will do likewise in Turkey. In his reply to Khrushchev, Kennedy ignores the proposal to link Turkey with Cuba, and bases his answers on Khrushchev's private letter of October 26 which—Kennedy says—contains proposals "which seem generally acceptable," i.e., the Soviet Union would dismantle its bases and remove its offensive weapons from Cuba under U.N. supervision, and would halt further shipment of such weapons to Cuba, and in exchange the United States would end the quarantine and give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. Kennedy adds: "I am confident that other nations of the Western Hemisphere would be prepared to do likewise." Kennedy emphasizes that "the first ingredient * * * is the cessation of work on missile sites in Cuba and measures to render such weapons inoperable, under effective international guarantees. The continuation of this threat, or a prolonging of this discussion concerning Cuba by linking these problems to the broader questions of European and world security, would surely lead to an intensification of the Cuban crisis and a grave risk to the peace of the world."

The White House issues a statement which implicitly rejects Khrushchev's proposed Cuba-Turkey deal: "Several inconsistent and conflicting proposals have been made by the U.S.S.R. within the last 24 hours, including the one just made public in Moscow. The proposal broadcast this morning involved the security of nations outside the Western Hemisphere, but it is the Western Hemisphere countries and they alone that are subject to the threat that has produced the present crisis—the action of the Soviet Government in secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba. * * * The first imperative must be to deal with this immediate threat, under which no sensible negotiation can proceed. * * * As to the proposals concerning the security of nations outside this hemisphere, the United States and its allies have long taken the lead in seeking properly inspected arms limitation on both sides. These efforts can continue as soon as the present Soviet-created threat is ended." Well-informed sources [at NATO headquarters in Paris] indicated that they regarded the kind of horse trading proposed by Mr. Khrushchev as dangerous to Western security and the morale of the Atlantic alliance. It was pointed out that the missile bases in Turkey were put there on the openly proclaimed decision of the heads of government of the NATO states in December, 1957 * * * [and] this was in direct response to repeated threats of employment of Soviet missiles against the West. It would be intolerable, in the opinion of some Western diplomats, to equate this action with the clandestine installation of Soviet missiles in Cuba at a time when the highest Soviet officials were proclaiming that none but defensive arms were being supplied to Cuba.

The U.S. Defense Department announces that a U-2 reconnaissance plane is missing and presumed lost over Cuba, and that other unarmed U.S. planes on surveillance missions over Cuba have been fired on. The Defense Department warns that measures will be taken to "insure that such missions are effective and protected." At the same time, the Defense Department announces that 24 troop-carrier squadrons of the Air Force Reserve are being recalled to active duty. In this connection, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara says: "We must be prepared for any eventuality." Premier Fidel Castro (in answer to an appeal from U.N. Secretary General U Thant) says that Cuba will suspend work on missile bases while negotiations are in progress if the United States "desists from threats and aggressive actions against Cuba, including the naval blockade of our country." He invites U Thant to come to Cuba "with a view to direct discussions on the present crisis."

Communist saboteurs in Venezuela blow up 4 electric power stations of the U.S.-controlled Creole Petroleum Co.'s installations at Lake Maracaibo, thereby cutting Venezuela's oil production by 500,000 barrels a day and reducing by $1.2 million a day Venezuela's Federal oil revenues which make up 70 percent of its budget. It is estimated that it will take 1 to 3 months to repair the power stations.

October 28, 1962, Premier Khrushchev (in a message to President Kennedy) announces that he has ordered the dismantling of Soviet missile bases in Cuba and the return of Soviet offensive weapons to the Soviet Union, to be carried out under U.N. supervision.

President Kennedy issues a statement, welcoming Khrushchev's statesmanlike decision, and says (in a message to Khrushchev) that the Cuban blockade will be removed as soon as the U.N. has taken the necessary measures, and he pledges that the United States will not invade Cuba. Kennedy says that he attaches great importance to a rapid settlement of the Cuban crisis, because "developments were approaching a point where events could have become unmanageable."

Premier Fidel Castro issues a statement which declares that the United States must fulfill five conditions if the present crisis is to be resolved. These are: (1) End of economic blockade and all measures of commercial and economic pressure exercised against Cuba by the United States. (2) End of all subversive activities, dropping and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, organization of mercenary invasions, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, "all of which actions are organized in the territory of the United States and certain accomplice countries." (3) End of pirate attacks carried out from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico. (4) End of all violations of air and naval space by U.S. planes and ships. (5) U.S. withdrawal from the naval base of Guantanamo and return of this territory to Cuba.

October 29, 1962: United States announces it will lift the blockade of Cuba for 2 days, at the request of the U.N. Secretary General U Thant during the latter's mission to Cuba which begins on October 30. (On the next day, the United States also suspends its air surveillance of Cuba during U Thant's 2-day mission.)

President Kennedy appoints a three-man coordinating committee (headed by John J. McCloy, former disarmament adviser, Under Secretary of State George Ball and Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric) to carry on negotiations for a conclusion of the Cuban crisis with U.N. Secretary General U Thant and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov (Premier Khrushchev's special envoy, sent to the U.N. to negotiate about the dismantling of the Soviet bases in Cuba).

Proposed Supplement to the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Bloomington, Ind., Herald-Telephone daily newspaper an editorial about one of our distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Indiana, Senator VANCE HARTKE.

The editorial suggests that Senator HARTKE has proposed a valuable supplement to the Peace Corps, which is doing an outstanding job for this Nation.

Senator HARTKE's proposal would make the talents of retired American businessmen and industrialists available to underdeveloped countries by sending such persons to those countries to assist and direct in building business and industry, which is the key to dissipating poverty and raising the standard of living.

Since this editorial deserves the attention of the Members of this Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bloomington (Ind.) Herald-Telephone]

HARTKE PROPOSES VALUABLE SUPPLEMENT

Indiana Senator VANCE HARTKE has come up with a plan, a sort of supplement to the Peace Corps, which seems to be a good means of accomplishing several goals of this country.

HARTKE would make talents of retired American businessmen and industrialists available to underdeveloped countries by sending such persons to those countries to assist and direct in building business and industry which is the key to dissipating poverty and raising the standard of living.

HARTKE said that these retired persons would use their vast reservoir of productive talents to advise business leaders in countries including newly emerging African nations. He urged Commerce Department Secretary Luther Hodges to make available the talents of these retired Americans.

The idea has much merit in that it apparently would accomplish a great deal without a tremendous outlay of taxpayers' cash.

Since most persons who would be available are already reasonably well fixed with pensions, savings, social security, etc., they would probably be willing to serve at comparatively low remuneration. It would give them, however, an opportunity for foreign travel and adventure with no outlay of their fixed incomes.

The United States has millions of people who are still in the prime of life when they reach retirement age. Age 65 is becoming younger all the time. Look around the community and you will find a great many people past 65 competing vigorously in energy and vitality with people 20 years their junior. Yet many industries and large business organizations have arbitrary rules that when you are 65, you're through.

The Hoosier Senator said that his plan would give the Nation an unparalleled opportunity to win friends and increase the productive capacity of the world through utilization of our vast reservoir of productive talents.

Late last year, HARTKE spent several weeks in Africa, visiting the new nations on the continent. It is not difficult to imagine what he found. He found a continent abounding in natural resources but almost totally lacking in business and industry know-how and virtually devoid of ability to create and expand industry.

"Although the heads of government, ministers and leading businessmen were profoundly interested in the various types of aid we have made available to these new countries," he said, "they were unanimous in saying that of equal and perhaps paramount importance was the learning of the business and production techniques which have made our own country great.

"Everywhere I went there was a thirst for knowledge for American business methods which are admired by nearly all Africans." He quoted I. N. N. Tambo, secretary general of the Federation of Nairobi Traders Association in Kenya, as saying "we need the American business know-how to survey our resources and markets, to set up small productive facilities, show us how to create demand and how to sell, how to treat our labor, how to make a profit, and how to expand."

The reservoir of retired American talent would be tremendous. There would be need of people with experience in all types of business and industry, large and small.

The idea in itself should be exciting to retired people in good health who have had limited opportunity to travel. They would not only be able to satisfy their desire for travel and adventure, but also to serve their country and humanity at the same time.

They would contribute to expansion of American trade as underdeveloped countries began to emerge from the darkness and become consumers of world products as well as producers.

They would strike severe blows at communism by teaching initiative and industriousness.

HARTKE's plan would not be heavily demanding on the participating retirees. They could work short hours and their service in any one country could be of short or long duration, depending on the desires of the people. They could be provided adequate earnings and expense money so that they would not have to endure hardship.

It appears that the plan may make it possible for many retired persons to find the most rewarding work of their lives.

HARTKE is interested in obtaining the views of his Hoosier constituents on the proposed program. Why don't you give him your ideas?

John Duncan: Georgia's Big Man in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert an excellent article on John P. Duncan, Jr., an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

John Duncan is truly dedicated to finding workable solutions to our agricultural problems; and needless to say, all Georgians are extremely proud of the wonderful job he is doing in the Department of Agriculture.

The article about Mr. Duncan, which appeared in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution magazine on January 20, 1963, was written by Miss Margaret Shannon, and I insert it in the RECORD believing it will be of much interest to my colleagues in the House:

JOHN DUNCAN: GEORGIA'S BIG MAN IN AGRICULTURE

(By Margaret Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—One day last month John P. Duncan, Jr., of Quitman, Ga., and Alexandria, Va., got a four-line memorandum from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. It didn't amount to much in wordage, but it just happened to mean that the onetime south Georgia farm boy had

14,000 additional employees to look after for a while.

Mr. Duncan is Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Stabilization. The memorandum assigned responsibility for the Cooperative Extension Service to his office temporarily. It was the sixth agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to come under his wing. Evidently somebody up here likes him.

Secretary Freeman must. He continues to pile work on him, and the 45-year-old former president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation seems to thrive on it. His hair is almost white, but it has been that way for years. He keeps fit by playing squash with Secretary Freeman at the Pentagon or golfing in the eighties on a Virginia course when he has time.

The highest and best evidence that John Duncan is a success is the shift within the Department last March that put him in charge of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service right at the time of the Billie Sol Estes scandal. Actually ASCS had been taken away from James T. Ralph shortly before the scandal broke, and it fell Mr. Duncan's lot to straighten out a mess he hadn't made.

"We came out all right on Estes," Mr. Duncan said. "The Department didn't lose a nickel on him, and that's more than can be said for anybody else who dealt with him. We have all our grain, and we are holding $2 million in escrow until final disposition of the case."

His presence in Dr. Ralph's old job at a time like that made him a target, too, and last July a Washington newspaper reported that Mr. Duncan once went to speak to the Texas Cotton Ginners Association and accepted free meals and hotel rooms from the organization.

Since Billie Sol's spreading of largesse among agricultural workers had been much talked of and testified about, this was news. Mr. Duncan at once asked the Agriculture Department auditor to check all his expense accounts. It turned out the Government owed him $150 in unpaid per diem. Mr. Duncan also said that accepting room and board while on speaking engagements is a common practice for Government officials and lies within the code of conduct promulgated by the President.

Another kind of trouble came Mr. Duncan's way—or he came its way—when he went to Atlanta in December during the American Farm Bureau Federation Convention. He didn't go to the convention; he wasn't invited. He went to try to counteract on the scene some of the drastic Farm Bureau criticism of the Government's farm program.

Around the Department, they refer to Mr. Duncan in this role as a one-man truth squad. When the Farm Bureau president said the administration's farm program isn't working, Mr. Duncan fired back that it is, too, working and furthermore, farmers like it.

Such headaches—scandals, bad publicity, powerful opposition—are unpleasant, but they are minor compared to the one that Mr. Duncan calls the biggest of all: "Trying to find some way to cope with the capacity of the American farmer to produce."

"If you turned the American farmer loose to grow all he could, I don't know whether the oceans would hold it," Mr. Duncan said.

It seems an incurable headache. As Mr. Duncan sat talking about it, he'd just learned that the wheat crop estimate was up 25 percent even with thousands of acres taken out of production since the last crop. "That's a lot of wheat," he said.

So Mr. Duncan goes forth to battle with opposition to the Government farm program. Sometimes the battleground is Capitol Hill, sometimes a convention hall, sometimes a press conference. He works, too, at his office—to make the program work.

A large part of the job of crop controls and surplus storage is carried on by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, one of the agencies that come under John Duncan's supervision. It is in a sense not only the center of the Government's farm program, but also the heart of American agriculture.

When Mr. Duncan left his 807-acre Brooks County farm and the presidency of the Georgia Farm Bureau to become Assistant Agriculture Secretary at the start of the Kennedy administration, he was placed in charge of the Foreign Agricultural Service. This was new stuff to him. He held the assignment for 15 months, and became a well-traveled man in that time.

He went to Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961, and took part in drafting the Alliance for Progress. He went to Rome in November that year and to the Philippines later. He visited U.S. agricultural attachés around the world. Once he flew to London one day and back the next after opening an agricultural trade center there.

What impressed him most, he says, is the part food can play in America's efforts to stop communism and win the peace throughout the world.

"We can talk satellites and sputniks and all that, but the hungry man is more interested in feeding his children. And we have got so much more food to offer the world than have the Russians and other Communists.

"The hungry people in Africa, in South America, and in east Asia, where I visited, were not much interested in whether we or the Soviets put the first man in orbit or which of us was ahead in space. They are chiefly interested in getting food for themselves and their families, and that's where our food-for-peace program is winning us friends.

"I believe we can whip the Russians in the fight for men's minds if we can just put the food where it is needed. And the men who have given leadership to this fight are the American farmers with their abundant production."

Last May, delegates from 38 countries, meeting in Washington, elected Duncan as Chairman of the International Cotton Advisory Committee, representing 95 percent of the world's cotton production.

In the departmental reshufflings last spring, Mr. Duncan was given supervision over the Commodity Exchange Authority, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Agricultural Marketing Service, as well as ASCS and was placed on the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, largest corporation in the world. The Foreign Agricultural Service was assigned to someone else.

He didn't mind the change. "I'm kinda in a shop now that I'm familiar with," he said.

John Duncan learned the shop as a farmer who has never farmed except in the time of Government controls and price supports. In 1939, the year after he finished Emory University, tobacco growers decided they'd do better without the Government program. The result was a glut of tobacco on the market and a poor price for all.

"We have opposition now that wants the Government out of the farm business," he said. "The Government would like to get out, but you have to be realistic about it. The problem is not whether to have controls, but to get legislation that would do a better job at a lower cost to the Government."

The big farms could survive, but the family farms couldn't, and Mr. Duncan is concerned about family farms. "You can't say to these people, 'Look, we're going to wipe you out just because you're not big,'" he declared. "We just don't do things that way in this country."

As the 88th Congress proceeds and the administration sends its farm proposals to the Hill, Mr. Duncan will be among the Agriculture Department's salesmen seeking support among the lawmakers. He gets a good share of the credit for saving the administration farm legislation from complete disaster last year. There was a series of cliff-hanging votes, and the Duncan influence helped to turn the tide.

Mr. Duncan averages about a trip a week to the White House to discuss farm problems with Presidential advisers and, on occasion, with President Kennedy himself.

There have been reports from time to time that the President is bored with farm problems and doesn't know much about them. Mr. Duncan does not agree.

"I'll say this—he's a lot more interested than President Eisenhower ever was," the Assistant Secretary says.

When the Cuban crisis threatened to develop into nuclear war, Mr. Duncan took part in high-level conferences on how to meet the Nation's food needs under enemy attack.

He also spends some time on the convention circuit, usually as the invited guest. His foray into Atlanta for the Farm Bureau convention was an unusual approach. Most of the time, farm-related organizations want to hear the Government's side.

One of Mr. Duncan's most powerful jobs is on the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation has borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. It makes decisions about commodity transactions that greatly influence prices. Outside traders make and lose fortunes in commodity dealings. The CCC has a tremendous responsibility.

How does it feel to have this responsibility and all the others involved in being Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Stabilization?

"It gives you the feeling of wanting to be pretty doggone careful before you make a decision," Duncan says.

Any decision of his will come from a lifetime of association with farming. His agricultural education began on the family farm 4 miles north of Quitman. Now rented out, it produces cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and livestock.

After finishing at Emory, he took graduate work in agriculture at the University of Georgia. He played professional baseball for a short time, but went back to farming.

His wife is the former Branch Ellis Orr, of Macon. They and their four children—Judy, 20; John, 15; Ellis, 8, and Nancy, 5—live in a brick split-level house in Alexandria.

Mr. Duncan goes to work at 7:30 every morning and gets home after 7 every night. Often he is in his office even on weekends.

He intended to go back to being Georgia Farm Bureau president after 2 years in Washington, but it didn't work out that way. The administration wanted him to continue. He was on leave from the Farm Bureau office, and staying here meant he had to resign the post. So it won't automatically be his when he does leave the Government.

"I don't know what I'll be doing 2 years from now," he said. "If President Kennedy is reelected and the administration wants me to stay, I might do that. I might go back to the Farm Bureau; I think I could."

"Or"—he was answering a question on this point—"I might run for Congress. It's too soon to say. I didn't think 2 years ago that I'd still be here, but here I am."

Future Urban Transportation Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in the current issue of Metropolitan Transportation, a magazine published "for coordinated transportation and urban renewal," appears an article by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., who is the chief sponsor of U.S. mass transportation legislation.

Perhaps one of the most profound statements in Senator WILLIAMS' article is this:

It is imperative that there be no dogmatism and rigidity in thinking about future urban transportation needs.

This provocative article deserves the attention of all Members of the Senate, Mr. President, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S RIGHT IN RAIL-BUS ROW?

There's no doubt that certain interest groups will cite a recent report to the White House on urban transportation to promote conflict and confusion over the merits of bus versus rail transportation in metropolitan areas.

It is imperative that there be no dogmatism and rigidity in thinking about future urban transportation needs. Transit needs could not be considered without taking anticipated and desired land use developments into account.

The recent report on urban transportation, "Technology and Urban Transportation," undoubtedly will be used by those interest groups which seek to promote bus transit as the wave of the future to the exclusion of all others.

In the report, made to the White House Panel on Civilian Technology, the three authors, John Meyer, of Harvard University; John Kain, of Rand Corp., and Martin Wohl, of the Department of Commerce, made this conclusion:

"The probably best economic solution of the urban transportation problem would be further improvement of the capacity utilization of highway systems, by redesigning the public transit system to make better use of highways. The evidence clearly points to the superiority of the express bus, reserved rights-of-way, transit system for most metropolitan areas."

This report needs to be put into the proper perspective because it is not the job of the Federal Government or others to tell a metropolitan area what modes of transportation it should have.

DECISION UP TO PEOPLE

If this report is taken as providing some useful food for thought, it should be welcomed. But there are some who will try to promote it as gospel, when in fact only the people of the metropolitan area involved can make the decision in the light of their own best interests and needs.

This philosophy is implicit in the administration's transit bill. It requires only that the urban area seeking funds undertake the planning that will enable it to evaluate different alternatives and determine what mix of transportation facilities would be best for that area.

The Federal Government would contribute financial aid to the development of that transit system, whatever it might be. And the fact that the State or local government involved must also contribute to the project cost will insure that sound and well-thought-out projects will be undertaken.

Undoubtedly there are many cities that want to improve their bus systems, but certainly highway lanes devoted exclusively to bus service do not come for free. It will be necessary to obtain financial assistance if truly modern and fast bus systems are to be devised.

There seems to be some doubt whether the authors, who were asked to identify useful technological research areas, were fully qualified as observers of the social and economic urban scene on which they commented.

The report suggested it might be better to attack the housing segregation problem itself rather than attempting to perpetuate it by subsidizing additional transportation facilities for those whose travel demands are created by a search for segregation.

A PERTINENT QUESTION

A pertinent question is involved here whether this observation would also apply to future highway as well as transit expenditures, and whether the authors would go so far as to say that the problem of traffic congestion should be attacked by a program to get people to live within walking distance of their place of work.

The authors of the report also asserted that transit had little or no effect on the growth or welfare of central cities.

How could the authors make such a sweeping comment inasmuch as there hasn't been a major transit system built in the United States in nearly a half century?

Fragmentary evidence, at least, indicates a substantial beneficial effect on central cities from transit improvements, and it might be better to await the results from San Francisco before transit is consigned to the junk heap.

Let's defer judgment on the relative costs of bus versus rail transit. The question of taking x dollars and deciding whether they would be better spent on a new bus or a new rail system is not the same as deciding whether it would be more economical to develop a new business system or rehabilitate an existing rail system of comparable value.

The Late Senator Dennis Chavez

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I received news of the death of Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ. Especially to us in the Southwest, Senator CHAVEZ was in every respect the image of our real America. Indeed, his life reflected the America where humble beginnings in no way need cause a man to falter in quest of his destiny. I am certain the Senator has left a mark which few can ever hope to equal, and yet aspire to it we should.

On behalf of my fellow Arizonians, and particularly the 195,000 Arizonians of Spanish-speaking background, I extend heartfelt condolence to the family of this great man. Que su alma descanse en paz y que siempre sea nuestra inspiración.

Activities of the United Nations in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there recently appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer an article by Alice Widener dealing with the subject of the United Nations in the Congo. The article raises the pertinent question of, "What if the table were turned?" It is a thought provoking article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. IN CONGO—WHAT IF TABLE WERE TURNED?

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Six months ago, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and House Committee on Foreign Affairs issued jointly a supplement (prepared by the State Department) to their earlier report, "Information on the Operations and Financing of the United Nations." On page 20 of this supplement is table 11 showing "U.S. contributions to the United Nations operations in the Congo through June 30, 1962."

MEANING FOR FUTURE

The statistics in table 11 bear out the contention that the United Nations military operation in the Congo is largely an American go-it-alone venture setting dangerous precedent in world affairs.

Many experienced West European diplomats see in table 11 a set of statistics with gravest implications for the future. These diplomats wonder aloud whether the American public is aware of the real situation.

"What if someday the U.N. Congo table 11 were turned?"

This is a question being weighed in West European circles. Spelled out, it means, "What if someday a power inimical to the United States and the West were to finance United Nations military operations by the U.N. General Assembly but opposed by the United States and the West?"

Apparently, few Americans are aware of the extent to which the U.N. military operation in the Congo is subsidized by the United States. This is shown clearly in table 11, a set of statistics which West Europeans can read as well as we. Here is what it shows:

United Nations military budget for Congo through June 30, 1962: U.N. total, $240 million; U.S. contribution, $114,489,290 (or 47.70 percent).

In table No. 11 there also is listed under "economic" the following figures for totals up to June 30, 1962:

U.N. fund for the Congo:

U.S. cash contribution, $37,950,000.

Other U.N. economic programs:

U.S. contribution for import financing, $5 million.

U.S. contribution for U.S. commodity import financing (fiscal year 1962 AID), $28 million.

U.S. food for peace title I and title II contributions, $26,600,000.

U.S. airlift of flour and food, $721,953.

Total Congo economic, $98,271,953.

Plus U.S. air evacuation of troops and civilians, $540,331.

There is no figure for total United Nations economic aid to the Congo in table No. 11, and probably there is no way to get an overall figure. The State Department did not cite one. Nevertheless, various figures cited in U.N. documents indicate that the United States has put up more than 65 percent of all U.N. economic aid to the Congo.

Moreover, it is generally conceded that the United Nations could not have remained in the Congo if the United States had not provided most of the U.N. multilateral economic aid money.

POINT TO BRAZIL

Be all that as it may, statistics in table No. 11 on the financing of United Nations operations in the Congo show that the United States put up the lion's share.

Some farsighted West European diplomats are asking, "What if some day the U.N. Congo table No. 11 were turned?"

Even, they are mentioning Brazil as a country where future anarchic conditions might be used as an excuse for United Nations military peacekeeping action voted by the U.N. General Assembly over U.S. protests and then financed by the Red bloc.

John J. Bell, Former Congressman, Passes Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John J. Bell served in the House of Representatives in 1954–56. He was a very popular Member with his colleagues. He was a very true, genuine, dedicated servant of the people. He had been tried in many capacities as the people's choice and never was found wanting.

The Ganado Tribune, Ganado, Tex., of January 31, 1963, carries an interesting article about John Bell. It is as follows:

FORMER LEGISLATOR JOHN J. BELL EXPIRES SUDDENLY JANUARY 24

John J. Bell, 52, formerly a member of the Texas Legislature and also a Member of Congress, died suddenly of a heart attack at his home in Cuero Thursday night, January 24, at 10:10 p.m.

Bell had served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1937 to 1947, and in the Texas Senate from 1948 to 1954.

He was elected to Congress in 1954 but was defeated in 1956 by John Young, when he sought reelection as Congressman.

Mr. Bell was a member of a pioneer Texas family who settled in Texas before the Texas independence.

He was born in Cuero, May 15, 1910, his late parents being John York and Gertrude Grunder Bell.

On December 29, 1948, he married Miss Mabel Claire Breeden of Cuero whose family were also pioneer residents of De Witt County.

Mr. Bell was educated in the Cuero public schools after which he entered the University of Texas.

While at the university he played a prominent part in campus activities being president of the students' association and holding offices in various other organizations at the university.

He was a Phi Beta Kappa and belonged to Phi Kappa Alphi fraternity.

He received his bachelor of arts degree in 1932 and his LL.B. in 1936.

While attending the university law school, he earned his own way as a member of the university teaching staff. In addition to being president of the student body, he belonged to the debating society and was an honor student.

His service in the legislature was interrupted only once and that when he waived the draft immunity granted all legislators during World War II and entered the U.S. Army as a private.

A recognized authority on water law, Mr. Bell did much for water conservation.

In 1949 he called for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution repudiating the Federal claim to the Texas tidelands.

In 1936 he was admitted to the bar and was a member of the Texas Bar Association, the DeWitt County Bar Association, and the American Bar Association.

He was also associated with the American Judicature Society.

From 1937 to 1954 Mr. Bell was a member of the Texas Legislature as State representative and senator. He succeeded the late Fred Mauritz of Ganado to the senate.

He was a veteran of World War II and a charter member of the Cuero Lions Club. He was also a member of the Knights of Columbus of Cuero.

For a number of years Mr. Bell had engaged in ranching and he was also an executive and member of the board of directors of the Victoria, Shiner and Taft compresses.

One brother, Carlos, preceded him in death in 1943.

Mr. Bell is survived by his wife, Mrs. Mabel Claire Bell of Cuero; a niece and ward, Miss Katherine Joan Bell, of Midland; one brother, Basil B. Bell, of Victoria; and an aunt, Miss Sarah G. Bell, of Cuero.

Rosary was recited last Friday evening at 7:30 at Freund Funeral Home.

Funeral services were held Saturday at 10 a.m. at St. Michael's Catholic Church, the Reverend William Jansen officiating assisted by the Reverend John Flynn. Burial was in Hillside Cemetery at Cuero.

A Bill To Right a Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to see the thoughtful comment that has been generated about the bill Senator CLARK and I introduced, along with Senators GOLDWATER, MILLER, LAUSCHE, YOUNG, and HICKENLOOPER, to provide optional exemptions for social security for people of the Amish sect and others with strong religious scrupples against such insurance.

As pointed out in an editorial from the Harrisburg Patriot of January 29, 1963, our proposal would alleviate a grievance, but would in no way harm the rest of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BILL TO RIGHT A WRONG

Although a Lawrence County Amish couple have withdrawn their suit against the Federal Government, the issue they raised last year in seeking restitution for three horses taken from them by the Internal Revenue Service has not died.

The horses were sold to satisfy a lien against the couple for nonpayment of social security taxes. Until 1954, self-employed farmers were exempt so the social security laws and the religious principles of these people did not clash.

Earlier this month, Pennsylvania Senators JOSEPH CLARK and HUGH SCOTT joined in introducing a bill that would exempt from social security the Amish sect and other groups with strong religious feelings against insurance.

Their reason was simply stated:

"This bill is to right what we consider an injustice, in terms of civil liberties, to a very small group of people, the Amish sect, who reside primarily in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Iowa."

Though there may be far more earth-shaking legislation facing this 88th Congress, it would be a shame if this bill were ignored. Social security has come to play an important economic role in our national life, and it takes the broad-based participation of Americans to make it work. But the exemption of the Amish would not gut the program.

The Amish have been sincere and consistent in their efforts to follow their simple religious precepts in our increasingly complicated society. Permitting them to do so in the case of old age and survivor's benefits would in no way harm the rest of the Nation.

The Lesson of the Skybolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the monthly Reporter of the National River and Harbor Congress.

THE LESSON OF THE SKYBOLT

The real meaning of the President's reported concurrence in the decision of the majority of his military advisers to omit further budgetary provision for development of the Skybolt lies beneath the controversy over the potential merits of this missile. The decision is one more of the accumulating signs of the growing belief in the Pentagon (1) that the prospect of nuclear war diminishes with our preparedness (now considered to be approaching adequacy) to effectively wage such a conflict with land- and sea-based missiles, and (2) that it is imprudent to neglect our development of the means for making war with so-called conventional weapons.

This latter is not a new concept. For a number of years it has been expressed by many, including the Reporter, and the uninterrupted annual appropriations by Congress of billions of dollars for conventional armament bear witness to this. But the decision with respect to the Skybolt has dramatized the current thinking of the majority of those in the Military Establishment and has permitted the emergence of a maturing view of the probable course of warfare in the future as presently seen by most military men.

Equally impressive is the fact that the budget for fiscal year 1964, while providing what appear to be adequate funds for the continued development of sea-based nuclear missiles such as Polaris, and for land-based nuclear missiles such as Minuteman, emphasizes preparation for conventional warfare. Provision under the latter heading includes the development and supply of small arms, helicopters, transport and fighter planes, amphibious trucks, antisubmarine equipment, destroyers and hydrofoil craft. In all, it apepars that dollarwise the emphasis on conventional weapons now begins to preponderate.

There is wisdom in this, as we see it. For, while it is difficult to escape the expectation that the nuclear bomb will remain as the "ultima ratio," our best hope at present appears to lie in an ability to enter a major conflict with a reserve of effective nuclear weapons which, coupled with preponderant strength in means for waging conventional war, will make inexpedient the use of devastating nuclear weapons by the enemy.

But, for years, both Congress and the Executive have been insufficiently attentive to the fact that conventional warfare on a scale commensurate with the armament for which we continue to appropriate funds cannot be waged without adequate transportation facilities in being at the time of the outset of the conflict. Today, our internal transport network is dangerously inadequate to support the civilian effort necessary for the effective employment of such armament. No sufficient remedy for this can be developed during a major war. If World War II taught us anything, it taught us that.

We must begin now, while there may be time, to modernize our rail and highway transportation to extend and improve our inland navigation channels and to connect those of the midcontinent with those of the eastern seaboard by the long authorized and too long delayed Cross-Florida Barge Canal; to find and develop the best possible substitute for the Panama Canal for the defense of our Pacific coast; and to develop a technology and a legal basis for the efficient interchange of carriages employed in road and rail transport. All of these things are feasible and within our means. So long as they remain undone our defense policy will not be completely realistic, nor will our fiscal policy be consistent.

Tribute to Macintosh Murchison, Good Citizen of El Paso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Macintosh Murchison, "Mac" to his friends, a civic and business leader of the highest ethics and principles, passed away at El Paso, Tex., a few days ago.

When I went to El Paso in the year 1927, he was one of the first persons I met there. His was no narrow, local personal, selfish outlook—he was interested in the broad progress of his city, his State, and his Nation. His interests went beyond the boundaries of his city and State. He was easy of access to the humblest citizen, and was courageous enough to support the most difficult public causes. El Paso and Texas will miss him.

In paying tribute to this good and influential citizen, and my good friend, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD this article captioned "Business Leader Dies at 69" and this editorial captioned "S. M. Murchison" both from the El Paso Herald Post.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS LEADER DIES AT 61

S. McIntosh Murchison, civic and business leader and resident of El Paso since 1922, died in a local hospital Tuesday. He was 61.

Mr. Murchison, born in Athens, Tex., July 1, 1901, was a graduate of the University of Virginia.

He was one of the original organizers of El Paso Savings and Loan Association in 1929 and in 1957 he was elected president of the association following the retirement of M. E. DeBord, another of the organizers.

Mr. Murchison, president of Mortgage Investment Co., was chairman of the board of directors of El Paso Federal Savings and Loan Association. He served as a member of Providence Memorial Hospital board of trustees.

Mr. Murchison also was a director of South Shore National Bank of Chicago, Ill.

Active in local social and civic affairs, Mr. Murchison was a member of El Paso Scottish Rite bodies, Pioneer Association of El Paso, Five Points Masonic Lodge, and El Paso Chamber of Commerce.

He was also a member of El Maida Shrine, El Paso Historical Society, and El Paso Country Club.

Mr. Murchison is survived by his widow, Louise B. Murchison, and a daughter, Mrs. Patricia M. Rogers, both of El Paso; a sister, Mrs. Kent Andrews, of Ireland, Tex., and three grandchildren, all of El Paso.

Funeral services will be held in the First Presbyterian Church at 10 a.m. Thursday with the Reverend George Burroughs officiating.

Private burial services will follow. Harding-Orr and McDaniel Montana Avenue Chapel is in charge of arrangements.

Pallbearers will be C. Price Williams, Joe C. Yarbrough, Paul Huchton, Dave P. Hastie, Dan P. McKinney, and Eugene R. Rister.

The family has requested memorial contributions be made to the First Presbyterian Church or American Cancer Society.

S. M. MURCHISON

All too seldom does a man like S. MacIntosh Murchison come along—a man of quiet good nature, successful in business, yet mindful of his obligations to his fellow men. In short, a fine gentleman.

Mr. Murchison, who died yesterday at the age of 61, has left his mark upon El Paso, partly through his work in the fraternal, financial, and business organizations of which he was a part, but mostly through the impression of his own strong yet kindly personality.

A short time ago, he donated to the First Presbyterian Church a companile and carillon bells in memory of his father and mother. These now will serve to preserve the memory of the son as well as the parents.

To Mr. Murchison's family we extend our deepest sympathies. All El Paso shares their loss.

Automation Layoffs Spread to White-Collar Workers—Could Be Avoided if Steel and Auto Industries Would Cut Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sylvia Porter, the well-known and widely respected financial columnist, had a most interesting article in the Washington Star of January 31, dealing with the growing fears of white-collar workers of wholesale layoffs because of automation. According to Miss Porter—

The fears of blue-collar workers and manual laborers of what automation and aggressive cost cutting by industry will do to their jobs * * * are starting to grip the white-collar worker—always believed generally "protected from the recession and economy layoffs which periodically hit production workers—and with reason.

Miss Porter cites the Chrysler firing in 1961 of 7,000 of its 36,000 white-collar employees as historic, but says this pattern is being followed by more and more companies. The steel industry, for example, cut its salaried force between May and October 1962 by over 4,800 to 115,416. United States Steel also fired at least another 1,000 lower management workers since the first of the year.

Some companies—

She says—

have slashed their white-collar payrolls 15 percent or more virtually overnight and many jobs are being erased forever.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE EXPLORED AUTOMATION PROBLEMS IN 1955

The coming threat of automation to economic stability was the subject of study by the Joint Economic Committee in 1955. The situation today is obviously becoming worse and worse. No one wants to stop progress. Our great civilization rests on the enormous advances we have achieved in mass production techniques. We welcome the development of electronic devices which eliminate the drudgery of untold clerical operations. However, we must face up to the problems in lost jobs these developments entail.

INDUSTRY COULD CUT COSTS AND EMPLOY MORE PEOPLE BY WORKING AT HIGHER RATE OF CAPACITY

Industry should cut costs—but the best way—the free enterprise way—is to sell more goods at lower prices. By cuttting prices industry would increase the demand for its products. It would then operate at a higher percentage of capacity with the effect of sharply cutting unit costs.

This is the old Henry Ford theory of private enterprise and its works. The trouble is our big industries today refuse to cut prices and are content to operate much below capacity. I see no sense in the steel industry holding up its prices and operating, as it is today, at only 60 percent of capacity. In fact, operat-

ing at such a low percentage of capacity is a crime against the public interest. If the steel companies and firms in other basic industries would cut prices and enhance demand, our balance of payments difficulties would evaporate overnight, for we would sharply increase exports and discourage some imports.

This is a much better way of cutting costs than operating way below capacity and laying off workers—people who want and need to work to support their families.

Under unanimous consent, I include Miss Porter's article, as follows:

LAYOFF FEAR HITS WHITE-COLLAR MEN

(By Sylvia Porter)

The fears of blue-collar workers and manual laborers of what automation and aggressive cost cutting by industry will do to their jobs have been pushed deep into the American public's consciousness by the crippling dock and newspaper strikes of 1963. Now the same fears are starting to grip the white-collar worker—always believed generally protected from the recession and economy layoffs which periodically hit production workers—and with reason.

Wholesale layoffs of white-collar workers are taking place the Nation over. Chrysler's firing of 7,000 of its 36,000 white-collar employees in 1961 was historic, but its pattern is being followed by an increasing number of companies, big and small. The American Iron & Steel Institute estimates that between May and October 1962 the steel industry cut its salaried force by over 4,800 to 115,416. United States Steel alone has been drastically reducing its white collar staff, is reported firing at least another 1,000 lower management workers in these early months of 1963. Some companies have slashed their white collar payrolls 15 percent or more virtually overnight and many of the jobs are being erased forever.

The extent to which white-collar payrolls have ballooned in recent years is basic to top management's new determination to cut back. Since 1956, when white-collar workers outnumbered blue-collar wage earners for the first time in our land, the number of white-collar workers has risen to over 28,500,000, or 47 percent of total nonfarm employment. While the total number of production workers in manufacturing has dwindled 7 percent in the last 15 years, the total of white-collar workers in manufacturing has soared 65 percent.

Now giving the belt-tightening movement major impetus is the spreading use of computers, automatic devices, other electronic data processing equipment. New computer installations are being added at a rate of about 10,000 a year. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates 25 percent of the jobs affected by these computers will be permanently abolished. Other workers skilled over a lifetime in ordinary office techniques are losing their jobs to automatic devices which read and transmit 1,800 words a minute or which electronically scan, punch, verify, and total numerical information for tabulating machines.

As Howard Coughlin, president of the Office Employees International Union, pointed out in an interview in New York, although the overall unemployment rate in our country has fallen from a high of 7.7 percent in 1960 to 5.6 percent today, the jobless rate of clerical and kindred workers has been rising steadily from 3.8 percent in 1960 to 4.9 percent late in 1962.

There is no doubt that computers actually raise employment in many instances by creating new jobs for programers, researchers, other automation specialists. There also is no doubt that white collar employment will continue in an upward trend despite computers and cost cutting. But in the white collar area, as in the labor force generally, rising employment does not necessarily mean declining unemployment—not when our labor force is climbing to new highs each week, not when the machines are making so many office skills obsolete.

What does this imply to unionization of white-collar workers?

Says Mr. Coughlin, speaking from the union side, "The clerk who feeds cards into a computer all day is not too different from the production line worker who repetitively stamps out bottle caps," and Mr. Coughlin claims the cutbacks in clerical staffs have revived interest in his union.

Warns Clark Caskey of the University of Michigan, speaking from the management side in a recent issue of the Iron Age, "Given the right set of conditions, a group of white-collar workers will organize," and he mentions among the conditions "sudden cuts in salary, changes in process, acquisition of new equipment."

We cannot stop automation—we must not. We cannot tolerate a growing hard core of unemployment either—we must not.

The answers for the white-collar worker are the same as for the blue-collar man: (1) a faster rate of growth to create the jobs to absorb new and displaced workers; (2) adequate training-retraining to fit our workers for the jobs that exist and will open up.

Man of the South for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year, an outstanding southerner is cited as Man of the South by Dixie Business magazine, published by Hon. Hubert F. Lee, of Decatur, Ga. The 1962 honor was bestowed upon Dr. R. Manton Wilson, retired medical missionary of the Presbyterian Church, United States, who devoted 40 years to working with the lepers of the R. M. Wilson Leper Colony which he founded in 1909 in Korea.

Mr. Lee, in making the announcement, said "the life and record of Dr. Wilson has been one of the finest in America's history and is typical of missionaries' dedication to unselfish service." I join Dixie Business magazine in paying tribute to Dr. Wilson and ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Lee's announcement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1962

(By Hubert F. Lee)

R. Manton Wilson, M.D., retired medical missionary who lives at 1308 Avondale Avenue, Richmond, Va., who worked 40 years among the lepers of Korea at the R. M. Wilson Leprosy Colony which he founded in 1909, has been named Man of the South for 1962.

Dr. Wilson was named from leading southerners on the South's Hall of Fame for the Living honor group, limited to 200 living leaders, in a poll conducted by Dixie Business magazine.

Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business and founder of the South's Hall of Fame for the Living honor movement said that the life and record of Dr. Wilson has been one of the finest in America's history and is typical of the missionaries dedication to unselfish service.

The editors of Dixie Business named Dr. Wilson "a Great American for 1961," the same honor accorded Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., in 1962.

D. Tennant Bryan, publisher of the Richmond Times Dispatch and Richmond News Leader, one of the 200 on the honor group, in ratifying the 1962 poll, wrote Hubert F. Lee:

"Your selection of Dr. R. Manton Wilson as Man of the South for 1962 is strong evidence of your good judgment.

"I can't think of anyone to whom the award would have been more appropriate."

Benjamin M. McKelway, editor of the Washington Star (born in Fayetteville, N.C.) another of the honor group, in ratifying the poll wrote, "It strikes me that this is an excellent proposal."

Lance Corporal Hubert F. Lee, Jr., U.S. Marines, stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., who was 3 years old when the first Man of the South, Thomas W. Martin, Birmingham, was named in 1946, said, "Of course I approve. His 40-odd years working and healing lepers is a record few have equalled."

Dr. Wilson was born in Columbia, Ark., in 1880 and graduated from Arkansas College and received his M.D. in 1905 from Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, Mo. Dr. Wilson's wife died last spring and a church now being built in Korea is named in Mrs. Wilson's honor as a memorial.

Thomas W. Martin, Birmingham, wrote: "His record is very wonderful and indicates an unusual type of public service, and indeed sacrifice endured over the years."

C. Hamilton Moses, Little Rock, Man of the South for 1948: "Here is life dedicated to the service of mankind and not controlled by the dollar mark. This is rare in the human makeup."

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta, Man of the South, 1954: "I heartily approve of the selection. I know of his splendid work in Korea and am writing him today."

Dr. John R. Cunningham, director, the Presbyterian Foundation, Inc., Charlotte, N.C.: "I have known Dr. Wilson and regard him highly. I approve fully in this decision."

Dr. Jas. A. Jones, president, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, who was one of the speakers when the late David Ovens was honored in Charlotte, N.C., as Man of the South for 1952 (also 1 of the 200) wrote:

"Certainly I could not agree more with the Man of the South for I think Dr. R. M. Wilson is one of the great men of our day."

Dr. J. McDowell Richards, president, Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga.: "I most heartily approve of Dr. Wilson's selection. I do not know of anyone who deserves it more."

Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, Asheville, N.C., consultant, Fund for the Advancement of Education and Ford Foundation and former president, University of Alabama, wrote: "I am sure the appointment will meet with general approval."

Frank P. Samford, Birmingham, Man of the South for 1958, president Liberty National Life Insurance Co.: "The work that he has done qualifies him and I congratulate you upon this choice."

Jack Williams, Jr., publisher, Waycross (Ga.) Journal-Herald and president of the Georgia Newspaper Publisher's Association: "I approve of your choice of Dr. R. M. Wilson.

Gen. E. W. Opie, publisher, Staunton Leader and News-Leader, Staunton, Va.: "From your report, I judge he is certainly worthy of the Man of the South distinction."

In his letter to Editor Lee, Dr. Wilson said:

"I am quite overcome with all this honor you have heaped upon me, of which I am quite unworthy. And just why I cannot see. Thanks so much. It was my great joy for all those years to help bring light to those sad outcast lepers or to remove a cataract from a blind man's eyes. One ole man, after removing his cataracts sent me 100 eggs and 12 roosters every Christmas for 15 years and after his death his son kept up the habit.

"When I was born in 1880 it was death penalty for a foreigner to enter Korea; yet today there are 400 churches in Seoul and there are over a dozen Korean doctors teaching in our medical schools in the United States. The growth of the church has been the modern miracle in evangelism. The leper comes as an outcast from his own family and calls himself a dead dog, but receives a Bible and becomes the happiest man in the land.

"Dr. Stanley Topple, (young doctor from Decatur, Georgia, who is today working among the lepers of Korea at the R. M. Wilson Leprosy Colony) and Rev. Elmer T. Boyer (who has 30 churches in addition to the R. M. Wilson Leprosy Colony under his charge in Korea), are carrying on the leper work in a very fine way. Even the cured leper is not received back in his home so they have erected villages for them, 1 of 30 duplex cottages and a church where they can be self supporting."

The session of the Glen Haven Presbyterian Church, Decatur, Ga., of which Editor Lee is a ruling elder, voted approval of Editor Lee giving a dinner honoring Dr. Wilson in the church's recreation room.

Peoria Kiwanis Clubs Aid in Civic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, London House is an idea conceived by a group of dedicated men who realized a responsible purpose to the society in which they live. A group banned together under the emblem of Kiwanis International and took on the project of providing a multiple apartment dwelling for the senior citizens of Peoria.

Society praises the medical science and high standard of living that prolong our latter years. Yet, there has been too little accomplishment in providing suitable living quarters for healthy, independent and active senior citizens. Their needs are special and require special consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this is why London House was adopted as a project by the Kiwanis Clubs of Peoria, Ill. It will contain individual apartments, designed and furnished to meet the needs of older men and women. While each occupant will enjoy privacy and independence, there will be the benefits of group living and association with contemporaries. The history of the project follows:

THE LONDON HOUSE STORY

The original idea for such a project was conceived by a group of Peoria businessmen who learned of similar projects that had been developed in Sweden, for their senior citizens. These men made a trip to Sweden to investigate further.

Bringing their findings back to Peoria it was immediately thought to have great possibilities and was picked up as a long term project under the sponsorship of the Kiwanis Clubs of Peoria.

In 1959, the Kiwanis Clubs Building Corp. was formed with the cooperation of all three Peoria Clubs and a board of directors was named.

The project was then shifted into high gear and several planning meetings were held to determine financing, building site, the building itself, and construction costs.

With the help of the Forrest Park Foundation, a suitable building site was purchased on London Avenue near Peoria Heights, this area was near churches, transportation, recreational facilities, shopping centers, and at the same time, is in a residential area.

The next phase of the project was to determine the type of building that would be erected, keeping in mind the popular modern day idea of one level dwellings with attractive and well-landscaped surroundings along with a functional and pleasant interior, which would be sectioned into several apartments, each containing its own kitchen and bath.

Satisfied with the plans, the Kiwanis clubs then selected the general contractors who would do the major portion of the work. They were able to select them from the ranks of Kiwanis. They were Schad Bros. General Contractors, McQuellons Peoria, Inc., Oberlander Electric, and J. C. Dillon Plumbing Co.

The excavation of the ground was done at no cost and much of the building material from suppliers and subcontractors has been donated or furnished at a considerable reduction from normal costs—themselves realizing the value of such a project to their community.

London House will be completed sometime in 1963. Already several residents have enthusiastically signed contracts for residence in anticipation of the cheerful, active life that awaits them in a community of people with many of the same desires as themselves.

London House will provide an atmosphere of comfortable living in private quarters at a cost to the occupant which will be reasonable enough so that he can afford it on pension income. Each occupant will also be required to pay an entry fee which is really an investment and partially redeemable upon termination of the contract or would be paid to his or her heirs in case of death.

It should be made clear at this time that the London House project is set up on a long-term pay-as-you-go basis with the residents paying for the operation of the building over the years. This, of course, does not include some of the original starting costs which are being underwritten by the Kiwanis Clubs of Peoria and through private and corporate donations. Their contributions reduce monthly rentals by reducing the loan payments.

Residents of London House will have the opportunity to lead rich lives full of activities and hobbies. The crafts and community room will be used extensively for such things as games, sewing, playing cards and a host of worthwhile functions.

Outside they can enjoy the beautiful park-like layout which will be complete with ponds, patio, evergreen trees, and attractive floral plants which is maintained by the resident manager who would welcome any help and advice from those residents who exercise an educated green thumb.

The manager has been selected for his ability to get along with people as well as his skill of being able to handle business matters and general maintenance which an apartment dwelling of this type would require.

This has been a brief look into a long term project. One which will serve as a monument to those who made it possible * * * a project that will provide a place to live for "senior citizens" who are healthy and want to continue an active day-to-day association with other people who share their likes and dislikes in an atmosphere of comfortable, attractive, resort-like living.

One where people can make and maintain a way of life of their own choosing. A project which will enable "senior citizens" to enjoy their latter years.

Such a project is London House.

The 103d Anniversary of Congressional Invocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the House was not in session on Friday, February 1, which was the 103d anniversary of the first congressional invocation ever made by a rabbi. I include in my remarks an article which appeared in the Philadelphia Jewish Exponent of February 1, 1963, which describes the prayer which was offered in the first session of the 36th Congress.

THE 103D ANNIVERSARY OF CONGRESSIONAL INVOCATION

(By William Scheibel)

February 1, 1963, marks the 103d anniversary of the first congressional invocation ever made by a rabbi. On that day, one of the dramatic and eventful in American history, Rabbi Morris Jacob Raphall of the B'nai Jeshurun Temple in New York stood before the Members of the 36th Congress and invoked the blessings of God to guide a dissension-torn House from impending civil war, onto the path of peace and brotherhood.

"Almighty and merciful God," prayed Rabbi Raphall, "we approach Thy presence this day to thank Thee for Thy past mercies and humbly to beseech Thee to continue and extend the same to Thy servants, the Representatives of these United States in Congress assembled."

The 1st session of this 36th Congress opened on Monday, December 5, 1859, just 3 days after John Brown had been hanged for his ill-fated raid on the U.S. Arsenal at Harpers Ferry, W. Va. The entire country was still seething with excitement. In the South, antinorthern feelings were at the boiling point, and this was reflected in the attitudes of the southern Senators and Congressmen then assembled in Washington. Threats of secession were openly and frequently voiced by the men who represented the South in both Houses of Congress.

Men who loved the Union and who pledged their support to uphold the Constitution on which it was founded, feared the future, which all conceded to be dismal. The fate of a country of 30 million persons, envisaging the possibilities of unlimited growth and prosperity, was hanging on a tenuous thread.

The 237 somber-faced Members of the House stood silent, with heads bowed, as Rabbi Raphall continued his prayer, "Lord, the ordinary lifetime of a man has barely elapsed since this Constitution came into

force, and under its auspices our country, from being poor and feeble, has become wealthy and powerful, ready to take rank with the mightiest, and Thou, O Lord, wilt realize unto it Thy gracious promise unto Thy chosen people: Vehosircha Adonai Letobeh—the Lord will distinguish thee for that which is good."

Some months before, the South had been thrown into a flame of agitation over a book written by a poor white North Carolinian. It was a furious indictment of slavery, not from the moral or ethical point of view but rather from the standpoint that it was fatal to the economical interests of the nonslaveholding whites of the South. The basic argument set forth was that the elimination of slavery would promote the material welfare of the South by encouraging manufacturing and commerce thus giving wider and more lucrative employment to these whites. Once this was established, the author said, the cities and country would grow and prosper bringing better schools for the children thus enhancing their opportunities for a brighter future. Had the poor white, to whom this book was really addressed, been able to read and understand it, slavery would have been doomed because at least 7 out of 10 voters in the slave States were nonslaveholding whites.

Because of its tremendous impact southern newspapers and politicians charged that the book had been instigated by the North and that it was intended to incite "rebellion, treason and insurrection." Feelings against the book ran so high that it was suppressed in all of the so-called slave States and the possession, or mere endorsement of the book was sufficient cause for abomination.

Comments allegedly favorable to the book, voiced by certain northern Members of the House unified southern Congressmen in their determination to prevent the election of a Republican to be Speaker of that body. Thus, or this first day of February, in 1860 as Rabbi Raphall stood on the rostrum of the House, 2 months of acrimonious bickering had already elapsed without any progress made toward the selection of a Speaker.

The tense and bitter feelings, everywhere rampant, reached heights seldom witnessed in any great democratic deliberative body. "I believe," wrote Senator Hammond of South Carolina to one of his friends, "that every man in both of our Houses is armed with a revolver—some with two—and a bowie knife."

To add to the gravity of the situation a resolution was introduced in the House that read: "Whereas certain Members of this House, now in nomination for Speaker, did endorse the book hereinafter mentioned, resolved, that the doctrines and sentiments of a certain book called 'The Impending Crises of the South: How to Meet It' are insurrectionary and hostile to the peace and tranquility of the country and that no Member of the House, who has endorsed or recommended it, is fit to be the Speaker of the House."

Forty-three futile ballots, taken during this period of 2 months, failed to give any nominee the majority required for election as Speaker. Such was the situation on this eventful day as Rabbi Raphall stood before a solemn House and invoked his prayer to God.

"Supreme Ruler of the Universe, many days and many weeks have gone by since Thy servants, our Representatives, first met in this Congress, but not yet have they been able to organize their House. Thou who makest peace in Thy high Heavens, direct their minds this day that with one consent they may agree to choose the man who, without fear and without favor, is to preside over this assembly. To this intent, Father most gracious, do Thou endow them with Thy spirit; the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and of amity; the spirit of knowledge and of fear of the Lord.

"Grant, Father, that amidst the din of conflicting interests and opinions, Thy grace may direct them so that each one of them and all of them may hold the even tenor of their way * * * the way of moderation and of equity; that they may speak and act and legislate for Thy glory and the happiness of our country; so that, from the North and from the South from the East and the West, one feeling of satisfaction may attend their labors; while the whole people of the land joyfully repeat the words of Thy Psalmist; "How good and how pleasant it is when brethren dwell together in unity.'

"Lord God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, I, Thy servant beseech Thee bless these Representatives, even as Thou hast directed Thy priests to bless the people; Yebarekeka Adonai Veyishmirka Ya-air Adonai Panaraleka Wychaneneka, Yissa Adonai Penar Aleka Veyasem Leka Shalom.

"May the Lord bless ye and preserve ye. May the Lord cause His countenance to shine upon ye and be gracious unto ye. May the Lord raise his countenance unto ye and grant ye peace. May this blessing of the One who liveth and reigneth forever rest upon your counsels and yourselves this day and evermore. Amen."

As the rabbi stepped off the rostrum, the Clerk of the House, John C. Allen, of Illinois, acting as Speaker, directed the Members to resume their deliberations. Shortly thereafter a deal, previously worked out behind the scenes, resulted in the election of Pennington from New Jersey, on the 44th ballot, to be the Speaker. His election was hailed in the North but deplored in the South, but the House had at last been organized. Thus were brought into fast fruition the reverent words of Rabbi Raphall * * * "Thou who makest peace in Thy heavens, direct their minds this day that with one consent they may agree to choose the man who, without fear and without favor, is to preside over this assembly."

Unfortunately, the election of a Speaker was not enough to calm the troubled waters on which the future of the country was riding. The sharp knife-edge of the slavery question had already cut too deeply and before the year had ended South Carolina led the parade of secession from the Union which resulted in the Civil War. The prayers and the hopes of all patriotic Americans had been in vain.

Rabbi Raphall had been born in Stockholm, Sweden, on October 3, 1798. He came to America in 1849, at the age of 51 and shortly thereafter assumed his duties with the New York Congregation. In addition to his responsibilities with B'nai Jeshurun, he found time to write books and also translated the Mishna and the writings of Maimonides, Joseph Albo, and others. On June 23, 1868, Rabbi Raphall died at the age of 70.

Felix Guenther, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Kingsport (Tenn.) Times-News, Sunday, January 27, 1963, regarding Felix Guenther, Jr.

Mr. Guenther passed away on December 19, 1962, but his memory lingers on. The good deeds he accomplished for others and especially his work for the Holston Valley Community Hospital is a living monument to his devotion to his community and his fellow citizens:

FELIX GUENTHER, JR.

(NOTE.—The following editorial was written by Howard Long, a former editor of this paper, as a resolution for Holston Valley Community Hospital. We believe that it expresses the feelings of everyone who knew Felix Guenther, Jr., in life.)

On December 19, 1962, the city of Kingsport lost one of its most valuable and esteemed citizens and Holston Valley Community Hospital one of its most loyal and devoted friends in the death of Felix Guenther, Jr.

It was upon the solid foundation of men like Mr. Guenther that our community was established, and it has been through the example and leadership of citizens like him that it has progressed and prospered since its inception.

Serene and unassuming, he quietly put the weight of his means, his energy, and his great ability behind every movement for the city's welfare. Coming to Kingsport in 1918 with what was then the Clinchfield-Portland Cement Corp., he served as superintendent and general manager of the company from 1918 until 1935, when he was called from the city to duties elsewhere for a period of some years. His wise counsel and able leadership during the early years of Kingsport's struggle to become an industrial center were invaluable.

He was equally active in civic life. For 2 years, from 1933 until he temporarily left the city in 1935, he was a member of Kingsport's board of mayor and aldermen. For many years he was a member of one of the civic clubs. He served on the Salvation Army advisory board. He helped originate the Community Chest in Kingsport and was one of its stanchest supporters. He was a pillar of the church and in every regard his life was an outstanding example of Christian citizenship.

But perhaps it was the development of hospital facilities in Kingsport which throughout commanded his most devoted civic interest. He was one of the group which organized the original general hospital here, located in Old Kingsport, and later moved to the location which is now the Reed Apartments. When Holston Valley Community Hospital was incorporated in 1933 he was one of the original incorporators. His steadfast and continued interest in the institution is evidenced by the fact that upon his death he left in his will a bequest for the hospital in the amount of $5,000, to be used in whatever manner the directors may deem advisable.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the directors of Holston Valley Community Hospital that we take this means of expressing our deep gratitude, not only for this valuable gift, but for the exemplary life of the giver and the part which he played over a long period of years in making our community a better place in which to live; that we communicate to his family our deepest sympathy; and that we place upon our minutes this tribute to a cherished friend and fellow worker.

Equal Pay for Equal Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter—and a sponsor—of

legislation to provide for equal pay for persons doing the same work, I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial on this subject which appeared last month in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Noting that both Houses of Congress last year passed such legislation, but that the bill was not enacted into law in the 87th Congress, the Post-Dispatch expresses the hope that the 88th Congress will finally write this proposition into Federal law, adding:

The strength of the equal-pay principle is perhaps best indicated by the weakness of the arguments used against it.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post Dispatch editorial referred to is as follows:

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Women should receive equal pay with men for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skill. We hope that proposition, which women have been trying for more than a century to write into Federal law, will be legitimized by the 88th Congress. It was approved in both Houses in the 87th but killed on a technicality. It's about time this act of economic justice was finally performed.

The strength of the equal-pay principle is perhaps best indicated by the weakness of the arguments against it. Some employers claim it costs them more to employ women than it does to employ men—because of higher absenteeism and turnover and increased costs of pension and health plans. Proponents of the bill dealt with this argument by making it a complete defense for an employer if he can prove the differential in his pay is due to a differential in his costs. The remaining objection is that Federal equal-pay legislation for women would be an unwarranted interference in private business. At this day, and considering BARRY GOLDWATER'S praise of the measure, that is pretty antediluvian.

Women are an important part of the U.S. work force—they constitute a third of it, more than 24 million of them. Yet in almost every business, industry, and profession in which they are employed they are discriminated against in pay—and many occupations are virtually barred to them. This is not a situation of which the country can be proud. It is rooted, not in rationality, but in habit—and not a good habit. Nineteen hundred and sixty-three is a good year to change it.

Mr. Speaker, I now submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD the bill which I have introduced again this year on the subject of equal pay, H.R. 1151, as follows:

A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, and to provide procedure for the collection of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Women's Equal Pay for Equal Work Act of 1963".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards of employees necessary for their health and efficiency;

(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this Act—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representatives, or any organized group of persons.

(b) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(c) "Affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led to or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(d) "Employer" includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of any employer in relation to an employee but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(e) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer.

(f) "Wages" means all remuneration for services performed by an employee for an employer, including board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished by an employer to his employees.

PROHIBITION OF WAGE RATE DIFFERENTIAL BASED ON SEX

SEC. 4. No employer engaged in commerce or in operation affecting commerce shall discriminate between employees on the basis of sex by paying to any employee wages lower than those which he pays to employees of the opposite sex for work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system which does not discriminate on the basis of sex.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of Labor—

(1) shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this Act, including regulations to provide standards for determining work of a comparable character on jobs the performance of which require comparable skills;

(2) may investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment in any industry subject to this Act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act;

(3) may enter and serve upon any employer found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing in conformity with sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, to be engaged in or to have engaged in any violation of section 4 of this Act an order requiring such employer (A) to cease and desist from such violation, and (B) to pay to each employee who has been adversely affected a sum equal to the aggregate amount or value of the wages which such employee has been deprived by reason of such violation plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages; and

(4) may enter and serve upon any employer found by the Secretary, after such notice and hearing, to have discharged or otherwise discriminated against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of section 4 of this Act, an order requiring such employer to reinstate such employee, or to remove such discrimination, and to pay to such employee a sum equal to the aggregate amount or value of the wages of which such employee has been deprived by reason of such discharge or other discrimination plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.

(b) For the purpose of any investigation conducted under paragraph (2) of section 5(a) of this Act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), shall be applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor.

(c) Any order entered by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of this Act shall be subject to judicial review, and shall be enforced judicially, in the same manner and with the same effect as provided by section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) with respect to orders issued thereunder by the Federal Trade Commission, except that in any proceeding before any court for the review of any order issued under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of this Act the findings of the Secretary as to the facts shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

WAGE RESTITUTION

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise the payment of any amounts for which any employer has been finally determined to be liable under any order for payment under clause (A) of paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of this Act. Any sum so recovered by the Secretary on behalf of any employee under this subsection shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) No wage restitution shall be made with respect to any violation of this Act for any period which preceded by more than four years the date of commencement by the Secretary of Labor of the proceeding in which such restitution is ordered.

INJUNCTIONS

SEC. 7. The district courts, together with the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, shall have jurisdiction upon application made by the Secretary of Labor, for cause shown, to restrain any violation of section 4 of this Act. No court shall have jurisdiction, in any action brought by the Secretary of Labor to restrain any such violation, to order the payment to any employee of any wages of which such employee may be deprived by reason of such violation.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 8. (a) In any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all of the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all of which are referred to hereinafter as agencies of the United States), for the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, or the rendition of any service, there shall be included stipulations under which the contractor (1) is required to com-

pensate all persons employed by him in the manufacture or furnishing of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, or in the rendition of such service, in conformity with the requirements of section 4 of this Act and (2) shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act with respect to the compensation of such persons.

(b) Unless the Secretary of Labor shall by order otherwise determine and permit, no contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act or of any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until three years has elapsed after the date of final determination that such violation has occurred. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of such persons.

POSTING

SEC. 9. Every employer subject to this Act shall keep a copy of this Act posted in a conspicuous place in or about the premises where any employee is employed. Employers shall be furnished copies of this Act by the United States Department of Labor on request without charge.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment.

The Union Is Good—Good and Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Hoppe, columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, has again made most interesting comments about our national situation as viewed from Washington and under unanimous consent I am inserting his columns of January 16, 24, 28, and 29, 1963:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 16, 1963]

THE UNION IS GOOD—GOOD AND SICK

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Everybody went over to Capitol Hill to find out from Mr. Kennedy what kind of a state our Union was in. I was pretty nervous while waiting for the diagnosis. You know how it is. Even though we've all been feeling pretty good, you never can tell.

So I was very glad when Mr. Kennedy started right off by saying we're in a fine state. More or less. Of course we were in awful shape 2 years ago. But thanks to the "toil and dedication" we've given him, he's managed to fix up our state very well. As a matter of fact, he says with pardonable pride, "The state of this old but youthful Union is good."

Well, there's nothing like an unqualified healthy diagnosis to buck up the spirits. And I sat there with the old but youthful blood coursing through my veins, all aglow with energy, virility and a radiant sense of well-being.

Of course, Mr. Kennedy promptly went on to say, our taxes are a mess, our water's polluted, our youth are uneducated, our workers are unemployed, our old people are sick, our farm surpluses are coming out our ears, our teeth are falling out, but you can't get a doctor, and traffic's terrible. And, he says, let's not be complacent. So who's complacent?

You can imagine the state I was in by that time—all these nagging headaches and shooting pains in my underprivileged areas. Talk about tired blood.

But, fortunately, says Mr. Kennedy, he just happens to have a remedy for each of these awful ills he's mentioned. And he will be glad to prescribe them for us later. And if we take them faithfully, it goes without saying that we will once again be in a fine state. I assume as fine a state as we enjoyed back there in the opening paragraphs of this diagnosis.

Mr. Kennedy then went on to diagnose the state of the world—which is pretty good except it's terrible. And we all went home to lie down with cold compresses on our foreheads and do pushups.

Frankly, I didn't know what to think. But since then I've gone back and checked over a number of previous state of the Union diagnoses by our leaders. And I found it most reassuring to discover that the state of our Union has almost invariably been exactly what it is today: Schizophrenic.

I guess it's that our leaders face a difficult problem when it comes to telling us how things have been going. They can't say things have been going terrible. How would that reflect on their leadership? So they've got to say things are going great; under their leadership.

But, at the same time, they can't say everything's peaches and cream. Because then we'd all go around saying: "So who needs them?".

Consequently, the state of the Union, research shows, has remained constant for more than 185 years: everything looks rosy and we're all going to hell in a handbasket.

It's my opinion that the state of the Union is never as bad as our leaders diagnose it. Nor as good; more or less.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 24, 1963]

AN APOLOGY TO POPULAR MECHANICS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The Saturday Evening Post is out with its rehash of its rehash of Mr. Adlai Stevenson's role in the Cuba crisis. And it's pretty sore at Mr. Stevenson for denying its charges that he had moral scruples, an awful accusation to make against a man in a position of trust these days. But I know just how Mr. Stevenson feels. Popular Mechanics is mad at me.

I don't blame them. I mean Popular Mechanics. Last month I said I was going to write my own rehash of the Stevenson crisis, called "How To Build a Trial Balloon with Simple Tools." And I would sell it to Popular Mechanics because, I said flatly, it was "the only magazine in the country without an inside story on the Cuba crisis."

So now I've got a letter from Mr. Don Dinwiddie, the editor of Popular Mechanics. And while it's a very nice letter, you can tell he's got good reason to be sore. You can tell because with the letter are proofs of an article for the February issue entitled: "The War Preventers: How Today's Aerial Reconnaissance Experts Do It."

And—wouldn't you know?—it's the inside story behind the Cuba crisis.

It's a great inside story. Better than the Post's any day. For it answers a bothersome question: Is it really okay for us to fly spy planes over another nation's territory? Even though it's illegal?

Okay? Why it's the most humanitarian thing we've ever done. The article explains how we had spy planes flying every which way over Cuba, high, low, and sideways. And it was these planes, says the article, "which in one master stroke last October, tipped off American authorities to the Communist buildup in Castroland. Result: Prevention of thermonuclear war or an abject American retreat."

Thus, it was all very moral. Because we were really violating Cuban air space illegally in order to save Cuba from thermonuclear war. So, you see, spy planes are good for you. And if Mr. Castro should send a couple of his IL-29 jets swooping low over Miami Beach, I hope to goodness we don't shoot them down. They could save us from a thermonuclear war. Or perhaps even an abject Cuban retreat.

Oh, you can see the dramatic scene when the radar scanners first pick up the blip bearing in from the south; the panic in the lobbies; the tension in the antiaircraft batteries as the helmeted GI's lick their lips nervously. And then the great relief as the plane is identified. "It's OK, men," says the captain, wiping his brow. "It's one of theirs."

So, slowly, the magazines and the press, in rehashing our Cuban victory, are solving all the sticky moral and legal problems it involved..

In fact, the only problem I've got left is financial. Where am I going to sell my inside story on the Cuban crisis? They're obviously a glut on the market.

And I jazzed up the title, too. It's now called, "The Very Existence of Democracy Depends on Respect for the Law." But, as I say, these days who'd buy that?

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 28, 1963]

NOTHING'S SURE BUT SEX AND TAXES

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Mr. Kennedy has explained his 3-year tax program in 12,500 well-chosen words. And now everybody's explaining his explanation. Actually, the whole thing's quite simple: It's based on love.

The love took place in 1945. And will again in 1966. The economic future of our Nation depends on it. The 1945 love, of course, produced what economists call our bumper crop of war babies. Each of whom will (1) be 21 in 1966, will (2) fall in love, will (3) get married, and will (4).

So if we can just hang on until 1966 we'll all be rolling in clover. Selling off those old bassinets and whatnot down in the basement. Thus Mr. Kennedy's 3-year plan, economic circles agree, is simply designed to get us through the doldrums until we've got a little more love around here.

Well, if there's anything I'm for, it's love and babies. I mean as a disinterested taxpayer. But I feel the whole situation illustrates the basic flaw in our economic planning. What we obviously need in order to have more love and babies is more wars—like one every fiscal year.

Actually, I think Mr. Kennedy's also recognized this problem and has taken measures. Even if he's too modest to say so. But he's taken only halfway measures. And these have produced only what we economists call war-crisis babies.

You've noted, I'm sure, that we've had a war crisis each year recently with regularity. And in each Mr. Kennedy has wisely called up the Reserves; on short notice.

There's the reservist hustling home on his last night as a civilian. And there's his lovely wife serving a last romantic dinner by candlelight. And he's got to hurry and pack

and. * * * Well, looking back on that 1962 Cuban crisis, I can confidently predict we are in for a banner economic year in 1983.

But we face a basic problem with war-crisis babies. It's not they aren't the real thing—like war babies. It's simply there aren't enough of them. And love will never be on a sound fiscal basis without a real annual war.

Personally, however, my feelings are mixed. I'm sure it's good to know our social evolution has so progressed that our Government can feed our human love for each other into its electronic computers. I'm sure. But it also makes me nervous to think our Nation's whole economic future rests on the failure of Mrs. Margaret Sanger.

And what, I ask, if our war babies reach maturity, take a good look at each other, say the hell with it, and join the Peace Corps? Another great depression, that's what.

No sir, it won't do. Men, it's up to us. There is but one sure way to break this vicious cycle of wars, busts, and booms. At the very next cocktail party, approach the nearest comely young lady and explain how the fate of the national economy rests with her. I expect every young lady to do her duty.

So that sums up Mr. Kennedy's tax plan. And I think it's a much nicer summation than that by a Republican gentleman in the men's bar. Imagine, calling it "Kennedy's (obscenity) tax program." That's not only * * *.

Hold it. Good heavens. He's right.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 29, 1963]

PSST, SWEETIE-PIE, WAR'S IMMINENT!

(By Arthur Hoppe)

As I was saying yesterday before I was interrupted by Mr. Drew Pearson's head, our national economy is built on war and love. War produces love and love produces a bumper crop of war babies, who stimulate the economy. In 21 years, the crop ripens, falls in love, gets married, and takes its turn stimulating the economy. Which is very stimulating. But there are these long dry periods.

And I saluted Mr. Kennedy for doing his best to fill the gap by producing an annual "bumper crop of war crisis babies." Not personally, good heavens! I mean by his foreign policy—Berlin, Cuba, calling up the reserves, ordering blockades and generally making everybody panicky once a year.

Because when people get panicky, as you know, they * * *. Well, the whole economy benefits eventually. But the question we must now ask ourselves about Mr. Kennedy's bold and daring program to stabilize the economy is: "How long can he keep it up?"

After all, an annual war would be simpler. In the past, a nation could declare war and double its population overnight, win or lose. Well, practically overnight. But nowadays, wars aren't very good for populations. So it was natural that Mr. Kennedy should turn to the war crisis as an ecomonic substitute.

But the problem is we're running out of places in which to have war crises. Look at the record: We've had three crises in Berlin and two in Cuba already. It's getting to be like summer reruns. And I don't think they stimulate anybody.

Obviously then, as any psychologist will tell any economist, we must be conditioned to react with the proper Pavlovian response to an even lesser stimulus. Like, say, the withdrawal of the U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia.

"Goodness gracious!" cries the husband on seeing the headlines at the breakfast table. "We've recalled George Kennan for talks, Honey" says his wife, panic in her eyes. "Darling" said he, taking her in his arms. He is a little late to work and in the following fiscal year the Internal Revenue Service is 12 percent over its estimates.

Eventually, of course, we can reduce the economic stimulus to a one-paragraph item back in the psoriasis ads saying the U.S. Consul in Vhtnnng neglected to respond to a cheery "Good morning" voiced in Vhtnnngian by a native street sweeper. Mainly because he thought it was a belch. And all over the nation, magnates of the great American diaper pin industry will read it, rub their hands happily and double their production quotas for the following year.

Once so conditioned, we must, of course, guard against indiscriminate uses of the word "war." Such as by a professor of ancient history in a lecture to a coeducational class. As the results would be chaotic. Even if economically beneficial.

But the only grave danger I foresee is that without a constant diet of wars and crises, we may ultimately achieve true world peace and universal love. And, if I understand the foundations of our economic system correctly, that will spell the end of the human race.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled, "A Thought for Today" by Dwight Marvin, which appeared recently in the Troy Record newspaper, Troy, N.Y. Mr. Marvin is a former editor of the Troy Record and has had a distinguished career in the field of journalism. I feel he has presented an excellent, down-to-earth analysis of the Federal budget and his reasons why it is always dangerous to spend what we have not got. To foster a tax reduction along the lines of the President's proposal, under the guise of helping the economy when it is obvious to gain votes of certain taxpayers is, without an effort to reduce spending, fiscally irresponsible. I fully concur with Mr. Marvin's conclusions and I commend his article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

A THOUGHT FOR TODAY

(By Dwight Marvin)

Although I always hesitate to go deeply into politics in my column I cannot resist having a word to say about the budget which President Kennedy has presented to Congress

Personally I believe it the most outrageous, un-American piece of financial legerdemain I have ever seen—my acquaintance with such matters dates back more than half a century.

It is never right to spend what you haven't got—except in a great emergency. There is no great emergency in this country at the moment. We are riding high. The only emergency is the coming presidential election in 1964 and the need, among partisans, of buying all necessary votes with the people's money.

Of course everybody likes lower taxes. Of course everybody would like full employment, if any trick can produce it. And of course everybody, who is in on it, likes subsidies, higher wages and all sorts of luxuries if there is any way to get them.

Let us not forget that the President has two serious handicaps. First, practically all of his top advisers are present or former ADA men, leftists once commonly looked upon as fellow travelers and most of them committed to socialism or the welfare state. And second, he has never earned a cent in his life and knows nothing of business except what he has picked up. He lives joyously upon the 10 millions or more which have been handed him by his father. He doesn't realize the danger of debts, never having had to worry about them as an individual.

And this talk of full employment should remind us that we have had the same situation twice before in this country and spending, on both occasions, was tried. It didn't work; it never will work. Those who advocate it admit privately that it is a gamble; but they like the gamble—which cannot hurt them personally.

The trouble with unemployment is deeper than something curable with cash. It dates back to the rapid advance of women in business, now 37 million strong. Women who need to work must work. But often today there are two or three earners in a family—for the sake of easier living; and the work is lost for those who need it. So today there are more people working and willing to work than there are jobs.

Reducing taxes cannot correct this situation. Spending billions won't do it. Franklin Roosevelt found the only cure for unemployment was war. This takes up the slack. We don't want to take it up that way. We have legislated continuously in ways to make conditions difficult—always to please groups that are greedy.

The budget, as I have said, is intolerable as it stands. To please people today is mortgages tomorrow. Already we have a debt that probably can be settled only through socialism—which is what some of the Washington advisers want. It is impossible to please people with handouts without endangering general welfare and threatening our national future.

The Late Honorable Dennis Chavez

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. I was indeed saddened when I learned of his passing last November. I had been with him at the funeral services of Senator Dworshak of Idaho in October, which was the last time I saw him. I thought at that time he was looking better and I felt very encouraged over the progress he seemed to be making in the recovery of his health.

I wish to extend my sincere sympathy to my colleagues from New Mexico in the great loss they have sustained. Senator CHAVEZ was a neighbor and a friend. Colorado and New Mexico have many things in common, and we always knew we could count on Senator CHAVEZ to help us on matters of interest to our State.

I always enjoyed a visit with Senator CHAVEZ, and we talked many times about

mutual friends and matters of interest to New Mexico and Colorado. When I would introduce a friend to him he always mentioned that he was a warm friend of Colorado, since Mrs. Chavez was born in Del Norte, which is in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Senator CHAVEZ was a great loss, not alone to the State of New Mexico, which he served so ably over the years, but to the entire Nation. Senator CHAVEZ was always fighting for the development of our natural resources in the Western States, and made a most valuable contribution to the growth and expansion of the West.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Chavez and the other members of the family.

HEW Drags Feet on Kerr-Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 23, 1963, the Wausau Daily Record Herald carried a very timely editorial on the administration of the Kerr-Mills Act by the Department of HEW. This editorial deserves the consideration of each Member of Congress. The Kerr-Mills legislation passed the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate almost 3 years ago with bipartisan political support. This legislation was supported by the then Senator Kennedy along with an almost unanimous vote of Members of both parties of the House and the Senate. The Department of HEW is not fulfilling its responsibility to the Congress in properly promoting the benefits of this legislation.

The editorial follows:

HEW MUST ADMINISTER KERR-MILLS

For 2 years, now, the Kerr-Mills Act has been providing funds for medical care for the aged under a State-Federal program. Now, it seems, the Social Security Administration is quietly putting the brakes on the program as a means of promoting the administration's medicare program.

In a 15-page report on its activities, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department plugged medicare, but generally ignored the fact that the number of aged who received benefits under Kerr-Mills had risen from 46,000 in 1961 to 101,000 in 1962.

The official line is still that there is no help for the aged indigent when they become ill, and that the only answer is to provide certain kinds of medical payments under the social security system.

John Troan of the Scripps-Howard newspapers reported that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was "too busy" to supply personnel to help the American Hospital Association organize action to improve Kerr-Mills benefits, and to secure enactment of laws that would extend the program to 25 States and the District of Columbia not now covered.

The question arises: Is HEW really concerned about the medical needs of the aged when it neglects to extend what help is now available for the political purpose of promoting a substitute program favored by the administration? Or is HEW callously dragging its feet, ignoring a law that Congress enacted giving HEW responsibility for helping the elderly with their medical needs?

Medicare is a strange proposal, which would tax some citizens to pay the medical bills for some specific other citizens, who have made no contribution to social security for this purpose. It would pay some medical expenses, but not others, and would confer charity on those who need it and those who do not need it alike.

Kerr-Mills can be challenged on the grounds that medical care for the indigent always has been available, and Federal programs are not needed. But at least it contains none of the rank discrimination against some taxpayers, and does not pay bills for those able to pay their own.

Kerr-Mills is the law. HEW is obligated to administer it, not sabotage it.

Better Control of Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Greensburg Daily News:

NEED BETTER CONTROL OF FEDERAL SPENDING

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, is introducing a resolution in Congress to provide procedures for effective annual spending control.

The Senator from Virginia points out that Federal expenditures will exceed $100 billion in fiscal year 1964. He states:

"On this basis the Federal deficit in the coming fiscal year probably would exceed $11 billion without a tax cut, and it would approach $14 billion with the first step of the administration's tax cut proposals.

"With the tax cut this would be the greatest peacetime deficit in history. Without the tax cut it would be approaching the previous record deficit of $12.4 billion in fiscal year 1959."

The purpose of Senator BYRD's resolution is to amend House and Senate rules with respect to appropriation processes. He adds:

"To reduce taxes in the face of chronic deficit financing simply would charge the tax cut into the Federal debt, and short of national emergency that is fiscally irresponsible.

"If expenditures were reduced first, perhaps a tax cut could be justified; but the President says expenditures will rise. The Congress needs more effective procedures for curbing the increase.

"Under present procedures Congress acts on spending authorizations, such as appropriations, but where funds are available for more than 1 year it does not limit annual expenditures under the authorizations.

"Under the resolution Congress would put an annual expenditure limitation against all expenditure authorizations, including current appropriations, unexpended balances, back-door spending items, etc."

Representative RALPH HARVEY, Member of Congress from the 10th Indiana District, introduced a resolution this week to change the rules of the House of Representatives so that all money bills would pass through the Appropriation Committee.

Directing his bill against the practice of back-door spending, HARVEY said: "The Constitution is clear in defining the responsibilities of Congress, and I intend to remind my colleagues that all appropriation bills should originate in the House of Representatives."

HARVEY said it has become common practice for Federal agencies to receive handouts without Appropriations Committee approval. He referred to the occasional actions in Congress allowing the Government to conduct new functions through use of Treasury borrowings or other nonbudgeted money, including private loans.

In support of his resolution, HARVEY stated that his bill would compel such programs to receive appropriations clearance before they would be eligible for consideration in the Rules Committee, where measures are scheduled for debate on the House floor.

Better control of Federal spending appears to be needed, and legislative procedure in this field is in order.

Republican Views on Kennedy Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, last week President Kennedy sent his annual farm message to the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by the Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture issued at a press conference today covering our views on the President's recommendations:

HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE REPUBLICANS COMMENT ON KENNEDY FARM MESSAGE

I. GENERAL

By formally dropping his plea for the complete control of American agriculture, the President's farm message is, to some extent, sweet music to the ears of the American farmer. Its general tone is in sharp contrast to the radical request he submitted in 1961 for Congress to delegate its constitutional and legislative responsibilities to the Department of Agriculture to write and enforce strict farm controls on every commodity produced in our Nation. Fortunately, in regard to dairy products and feed grains, it is also a substantial reversal from the President's request of last year for stringent controls over producers of these vital commodities.

And, finally, it represents the complete repudiation by the Democratic Party of the concept of farm price suports at 90 percent of parity. The record of Secretary Freeman has for some time been abundantly clear in this regard, for he has at no time supported, nor is he at the present time supporting, any agricultural commodity at 90 percent of parity, even though on many commodities (including rice, peanuts, cotton, and wheat, which are alerady under "supply management" programs) he could do so with the stroke of his pen.

We applaud the President's repudiation of marketing quotas on producers of livestock, feed grains, dairy products, and all our other farm commodities. We are happy to see no mention of criminal penalties and penitentiary terms as was proposed last year for dairy farmers. We hope that now, at long last, the administration will cooperate with Congress in the formulation of sound and workable Government farm programs.

We will continue our efforts to strengthen the prosperity of rural America. We insist

that the President give more concern to the problem of rising farm costs (which just 3 days ago reached another all-time record) in the conduct of the general fiscal affairs of our National Government which proposes to operate on a $11.9 billion deficit next year. We support a unified and bipartisan effort to hold and expand markets for U.S. agricultural commodities in the European Common Market. We have already taken the initiative in this regard by pledging our full cooperation to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

We now support as we have in the past the selective diversion of farmland to long-term conservation practices. We favor the expansion of the conservation reserve program as well as the extension of contracts expiring in 1963, and thereafter.

We regret very much that this administration has injected partisan politics into the operation of the Federal Extension Service. We share the traditional view of the American farmer that the Extension Service should not be transformed into a political tool if it is to continue its long-respected status as an institution of true agricultural progress.

II. COMMODITY PROGRAMS

1. Wheat: We deplore the threatening tone of the President's message applying to wheat farmers. We feel that the wheat farmer is the proper person to decide his own economic destiny in 1964 in choosing between the two alternatives that this administration is presenting to him. We feel that he will express an intelligent answer in the wheat referendum if left free of intimidation. In the event of a "no" vote in the referendum, however, we pledge our support toward the enactment of sound and constructive legislation during this session of Congress.

2. Feed grains: We feel that the feed grain problem can be met with in the framework of a voluntary program based on land conservation where program benefits are available only to cooperators operating in a market economy. It is noteworthy that the President has already rejected his 1964 corn program calling for 80-cent corn, (50 percent of parity) even before it is scheduled to become effective.

3. Cotton: We recognize the very serious problems facing the cotton industry. Under the present program, cotton farmers face a cut in income in 1963, U.S. textile mills face an inequitable 2-price cotton market structure, man-made fibers have taken and are continuing to take away cotton markets, many textile workers face the loss of their jobs, and the burden on taxpayers continues. We submit that this serious situation came into being primarily because of the administrative action taken by Mr. Freeman shortly after he became Secretary of Agriculture.

In reversing the progress that had been made under the Agriculture Act of 1958, Secretary Freeman's record shows these results between 1959–60 and 1961–62:

Exports down from 6.9 to 4.7 million bales.

Total disappearance down from 15.4 to 13.2 million bales.

Domestic consumption down from 8.5 to 8.45 million bales.

Carryover up from 7.1 million bales at the end of the 1960 marketing year to a now estimated 9.9 million bales on August 1, 1963.

Until and unless the cotton industry, the Kennedy administration, and the majority members of the Committee on Agriculture reconcile their differences as to needed cotton legislation and put it into bill form, the minority members of the Committee must of necessity withhold comment as to further legislation at the present time.

4. Dairy products: The President's recommendation on dairy products should be closely scrutinized in view of increasing signs that Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of dairy products are beginning to decline. The latest Dairy Situation published by the Department of Agriculture makes this appropriate comment:

"The milk equivalent of CCC purchases, after running ahead of a year earlier during April through July, slackened in August. From August through November CCC purchases have been about three-quarters of a billion pounds of milk equivalent less than a year ago. This decline in milk equivalent of purchases (delivery basis) is the result of a drop in butter purchases, since cheese deliveries during August through November were about the same as a year earlier.

"From August through November of this year, CCC purchases of butter were around 36 million pounds compared with 73 million pounds a year before. This lower rate of purchase reflects (1) about 16 million pounds less butter production in August–November of this year than last year; and (2) a net difference of 16.7 million pounds in the August–September movement of butter stocks compared with a year earlier."

It is, we feel, still too early to tell whether an adjustment in dairy production is coming or whether there is need for further legislation.

III. EXPENDITURES AND PERSONNEL

We sincerely hope that the President will, in the spirit of his farm message, make every possible effort to control the spending of the Department of Agriculture.

We respectfully submit that the taxpayers of this Nation cannot much longer afford the alleged savings the President discussed in his message. Secretary Freeman has already spent more money, $7.418 billion, in 1 fiscal year (fiscal year 1962) than has any previous Secretary of Agriculture spent in the history of the United States in a like period * * * and in fiscal year 1964, the Office of Budget and Finance of the Department of Agriculture estimates that total USDA spending will be some $8,481,700,000. This is nearly 5 times the amount required to operate the Department of Agriculture 10 years ago (fiscal year 1954) and 49 times the amount needed when farm programs began in 1933.

At a time when the farm population is dwindling rapidly, the number of employees in the Department continues to grow. While it took 76,276 employees to run the Department of Agriculture 10 years ago, the Department has asked for 121,583 jobs in fiscal year 1964, an increase of 45,307. In the 3-year period June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, this represents an increase of 19,026 people, the equivalent of a U.S. Army field division.

Unless the President places some realistic restraints on the employment policies of the Department of Agriculture, we may indeed see the day that the number of employees in USDA exceeds the number of farmers in America.

Salute to the Golden Forrest Donnells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 28, 1963, saluting former U.S. Senator and Mrs. Forrest C. Donnell on their 50th wedding anniversary.

SALUTE TO THE GOLDEN FORREST DONNELLS

On January 29, 1913, Forrest C. Donnell was married to Miss Hilda Hays, the daughter of a St. Louis broker and lay preacher in the Methodist Church.

Before the nuptials, Mr. Donnell had gained a reputation as a fiery scholar, three-time valedictorian—in high school, at the University of Missouri, and at the University of Missouri Law School—member of Phi Beta Kappa, and a most promising young lawyer.

He soon became widely known for his public service. A 33d-degree Mason, he was president of the Missouri University Alumni Association, vice president of the State bar association, head of the Sunday School Association and an active worker in the YMCA and Salvation Army campaigns.

In 1940, because of his obvious integrity and his eloquence at Republican party meetings, he was nominated, then elected Governor of Missouri. Four years later he became a U.S. Senator. His oratorical ability soon earned him distinction in the Senate. Last December he was inducted into the State's academy of squires.

We are delighted to pay tribute to Forrest C. Donnell and his wife on their 50th wedding anniversary.

Assistant Attorney General Speaks on Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the second week of December 1962, I had the privilege of attending meetings held by the National Association of Counties on the general subjects of grazing, water, and revenue.

At that time I had the pleasure of hearing an excellent address delivered by one of the outstanding young men brought to public service by the present administration. He is the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division, Mr. Ramsey Clark, who spoke on the general subject of water rights.

Mr. Clark's speech was one of the finest that I have heard on the subject and I think that it will help dispel much of the fog that sometimes beclouds this subject. As the principal assistant to the Attorney General charged with responsibility in the field of Federal-State water rights, he demonstrates a keen insight into the position of the Federal Government and I recommend that all Members read his address which I include in the RECORD at this point.

ADDRESS BY RAMSEY CLARK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL IN CHARGE OF THE LANDS DIVISION, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES GRAZING, WATER, AND REVENUE CONFERENCE, DECEMBER 13, 1962

County government is the foundation of the democracy. Its representatives are closest to the people and fulfill the most vital function of government. It is the base on which government of the people, by the people, and for the people stands. Where it fails the entire structure crumbles.

What agents of government should be more intimately aware of the water needs of an area than the county officials? Hence, my

pleasure at this opportunity to discuss this vital subject with you.

Nature endowed no land more bountifully than the North American Continent. Here was offered an abundant supply of all of nature's resources.

And as surely as the north wind made the vikings, we owe in large measure, our moral, political, and economic strength to this land we live in.

The power of the Nation in its life or death struggle with communism depends upon our intelligent dedication of natural resources to their highest and best use.

The natural wealth of our lands seemed limitless to the 3½ million Americans in the Thirteen Original States. It was 120 years before our first conservationists warned us that our seemingly limitless resources had limits.

Now 188 million Americans can foresee a limit to the most precious of all natural resources: Water. By 1980, our scientists tell us 275 million Americans will require more water than is presently available annually from a firm yield.

In 1955 we had augmented nature's provision to create a dependable supply of 314 billion gallons daily for the entire United States. We used only 220 billion gallons daily.

By 1980 our gross national use is estimated at 600 billion gallons daily, virtually twice the present supply. Only through an immense increase in storage reservoirs, in water treatment programs, in desalinization, in inter- and intra-basin diversions, and in development and use of ground water reservoirs can we expect to develop a dependable supply of 515 billion gallons daily.

Such statistics cannot be taken specifically, but they effectively demonstrated the existance and dimension of the water problem. Further, to speak in gross figures over simplifies the problem, because neither the distribution of water, nor its use, is uniform over the country. Nature divided the land mass between Canada and Mexico into 17 principal drainage basins before we divided it into 48 States. Both California and Nevada fall into three of these basins.

The basins vary tremendously in water resources. Thus, the Great Basin including parts of California, Nevada, Utah, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Arizona has an average annual runoff of 1 inch per year, or 10 billion gallons daily, over an area of 200,000 square miles. This nearly equals its present consumptive use.

The Pacific Northwest Basin, including all of Washington and parts of Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, and Nevada, having a common border with the semiarid Great Basin for 1,000 miles, has an average annual runoff of 13 inches per year or 159 billion gallons daily over an area of 257,000 square miles. Its annual runoff is over 12 times its present consumptive use, and 8 times the estimate for 1980.

Nor are the disparities all between basins. Within each basin there are both areas with a sufficient water supply for the foreseeable future and areas with a present shortage.

Without sufficient water, our cities, our farms and our industry cannot grow. By 1980 we foresee an increase in domestic water use of 300 percent, in industrial use of 400 percent, and in agricultural use of 50 percent. The growth rates will vary in different areas and the character of those areas and their peoples will be changed thereby.

Only through the wisest conservation and use of our water resources can we achieve the growth and prosperity essential to our survival. We can allow no unnatural restriction to hamper the fullest and most efficient use of water.

In 1931 Justice Holmes said, "A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure." Today those rivers have become our most precious treasure. They are the provision for our continued development, the fountainhead of our future. It is the urgent business of America to see to it that the last full measure of each of its rivers is devoted to the best interests of all its people: to see to it that there shall be no misuse, no inefficient use and no waste. In pursuit of this business we must remember that the river is no respecter of borders, or the laws of man. It follows the single mandate that it shall seek its level.

As President Kennedy in his message to the Congress on natural resources said: "Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home and industry."

Major efforts must be made in four areas to meet the water crisis.

First, we must provide sufficient storage capacity to efficiently conserve water that is needed and available.

Second, we must plan and execute water diversions from areas of plenty to areas of need.

Third, we must minimize pollution which destroys the usefulness of so much of our water.

Fourth, we must manufacture fresh water from the sea and brackish sources.

President Kennedy has made the most far-reaching proposals in our history in each of these areas. Congress has followed his recommendation in two.

First were the amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Act, which provide the most extensive effort in history at stream pollution abatement. Eighty million dollars will be made available this year to 800 communities for waste treatment plant construction. Based on past experience, each Federal dollar will stimulate $5 in local expenditure. Still there will remain 5,000 communities, with a combined population of over 42 million people, badly in need of sewage treatment facilities. Today there are 16,000 local water systems, but only 9,000 sewage disposal systems. Obviously our water conservation efforts cannot be more successful than our pollution abatement. We cannot afford to use our rivers and lakes as cesspools.

The second major recommendation of the President, enacted by the Congress, will greatly accelerate the development of low-cost processes for converting salt water into fresh. This law changed a minor year-by-year effort by the Federal Government into a $75 million, 6-year program aimed at achieving a major breakthrough.

Finally, President Kennedy presented his river basin commission bill. It would provide the most effective planning by all interests, Federal, State, county, local, and private, for the optimum conservation, distribution, and use of our water resources on a river basin basis with national coordination.

The several aspects of the water crisis are as inseparable as water itself. They must be treated together. Viewing the problem as a whole the national interest is clear. How can the States alone meet our commitments to Canada and Mexico in our several mutual major sources of water supply? How can the States individually best plan for the conservation and use of water resources in the 17 major drainage basins and the many major interstate streams of the Nation? How can the States alone provide for interbasin transfers of water such as the spectacular Frying-pan-Arkansas project which will afford a vital part of the Nation its only opportunity for growth? How can the States by themselves provide and coordinate the tremendous increase in storage reservoirs and other projects necessary to increase our dependable supply of fresh water? What prouder symbol has America than the Hoover Dam and the Central Valley project of California, great monuments to man's ability to make the desert bloom. How can the States abate interstate stream pollution? How can the States efficiently stimulate desalinization of sea water? How can the States preserve the navigability of the interstate streams and waterways? How can the States protect the national interest in hydroelectric power, in reclamation, in interstate commerce? How can the States regulate, control, or own the waters on the lands of the Union, property of all the people of all the States; lands which comprise more than one-third of the entire United States: 86 percent of Nevada and 49 percent of California?

This is the national interest in water resources.

What has this to do with the so-called Federal-State water rights controversy? It demonstrates, to me at least, that the Federal Government, of necessity, is deeply involved in the water crisis.

If there is a Federal-State water rights controversy, it must be considered in context with the real water crisis, shortage, pollution, maldistribution and in that context, while perhaps one of the greater controversies, it is surely one of the lesser problems. I have no doubt that the vision, engineering skill, labor and wealth of America will provide the physical means of maximizing diversion, conservation and beneficial use of water. Nor do I doubt that the political genius of America can readily resolve any Federal-State water rights controversy without damaging our common interest in Federal, State, county, local government, private enterprise or private property.

But the former task is far greater and far more urgent than the latter. ●

For all the hue and cry arising from this controversy, not one State, not one county, not one municipality, not one irrigation district, not one corporation, not one individual, has come forward to plead and prove that the United States exercising alleged proprietary rights in the unapproved waters of the public domain, has destroyed any governmental power, or any property right. Why? Because it has not happened, and this is December 1962.

What is the Federal-State water rights controversy? Do you know? It is a controversy more frequently characterized by heat than by light. It is a controversy that on occasion displays much emotion and little reason.

Reading through the substantial body of literature on the subject, as distinguished from the case law, it is often difficult to find more than a fear. Careful analysis, however, will reveal three fairly distinct elements of controversy in the reasoned discussion. All have been presented as legislative proposals to the Congress. These proposals would seek—

1. To require the United States and persons acting under its authority or with its license to obey State laws and the decisions of State boards and engineers where the appropriation, control and use of water is involved, not only in the acquisition of rights, but also in the administration of Federal projects;

2. To assure the integrity of State-recognized rights to the use of water, as against future exercise of undefined reserved rights by the United States and as against future exercise by the United States of its powers under the commerce clause of the Constitution;

3. To remove uncertainty respecting quantities of water reserved, and priority for claims, of federally reserved rights, thereby assisting the orderly administration of State water laws.

The first would involve an abandonment to State governments of responsibilities placed by the Constitution in the Congress

and the executive branch of the Federal Government. Authorities of 50 States could then tell the military, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other Federal offices if, when, how and how much water each could use. Was this ever intended by the Constitution? Could the Federal agencies operate under such a system? I suggest that such a proposal would seriously impair the effective and efficient operation of the Federal Government: that it is not in the interests of the States, the Nation or the general welfare, and that it is of dubious constitutionality.

The second two proposals are a different matter. Here cooperation and coordination can and should permit the effective and unimpaired functioning of Federal, State, county and local government. Where doubt is deterring development, rights and claims should be made known. To this end the Federal Government will cooperate fully. But an indiscriminate abandonment of Federal right would involve irreparable injury to all concerned. Who profits if the United States abandons a water right today essential to future operation of a major reservoir site tomorrow which permits an inconsistent development of water use, that in turn must be acquired with public funds to permit operation of the needed reservoir? Who profits if the only waters available for development of valuable Federal lands are released to downstream users with alternative sources of supply?

At a time when foresight is essential, the blind release of Federal rights can only cause the abandonment of valuable rights, improvident development and waste. What urgently needed Federal project may become economically unfeasible because of the lack of foresight and how much might the cost of essential projects be increased? Who will suffer most from such a course of action? Frequently the very locality to which the rights were abandoned. How has your county profited if abandoned Federal rights secured for local private uses of marginal benefit, render unfeasible a needed reservoir or hydroelectric project?

If a specification of Federal rights and claims is desirable so that anyone can know their extent, Congress could provide for a special study and delineation of all Federal claims of rights to the use of water, including claims based on reservations of the public lands in areas, wherever there is need for this knowledge. The results of such study and delineation would give the States and local interests information which would enable local determinations of the waters available for local development. Such provision, coupled with authorization for the appropriation of waters on reserved lands in excess of the anticipated Federal needs would very materially further those objectives of the various proposals for legislation which can be accommodated without hindrance to the national interest in water resource development and utilization.

Where appropriate, Congress could authorize the sale, lease, permit, or grant of rights to use federally reserved waters pending realization of the Nation's need for these waters.

A program might also be developed with respect to the use of navigable waters. As to such waters, the rights and powers of the United States under the commerce clause of the Constitution are too well established for me to be able to accept the various proposals which have been made to attempt to assure in advance the compensability of all State recognized rights in such waters as against any future exercise by the United States of its powers under the Constitution. This is a matter which ought to be dealt with on a project by project, or program by program, basis according to the circumstances and considerations of the times and the particular situation. However, a program to encourage local development in some areas for the consumptive use of navigable waters under permit from the United States, with assurance of the return of investments made in reliance upon such permits, may have merit. A study could determine this.

It is from this vantage point that I urge consideration of the water crisis. Cooperation, not controversy, is the keynote to achieving the wisest resolution of water rights problems. It is through cooperation and coordination that the Federal and State Governments can disprove the old claim that man never knows the worth of water until the well goes dry.

Castro's Red Wings Over Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article in the January 1, 1963, issue of the Houston (Tex.) Press by Henry J. Taylor gives some new angles to mounting policy problem of U.S. relations with certain countries in Latin America.

The article follows:

CASTRO'S RED WINGS FLUTTERING OVER ALL OF LATIN AMERICA

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Within 12 hours after President Kennedy lifted the Cuba blockade, flint-fisted Cuban Communist Ernesto (Che) Guevara, a Red brain behind Castro, stated:

"Armed struggles will take place in Venezuela, Guatemala, Paraguay, Nicaragua and Peru."

The joyous announcement was heard in Cuba and each of those six countries. Do we hear it from Washington? We do not.

This Scaramouch has had a good look at our Cuba policy, held together by New Frontier baling wire and TV care. Moreover, Guevara was dealing in a little manipulated news of his own. He omitted the Castro Communists' main target: Brazil.

Even that nation's central plateau alone, a fraction of the country, is larger than Argentine and seven times the size of France. Brazil borders on every country in South America except two. If Brazil is caught in the Communist push, the Red border touches everywhere. Farewell, South America.

Guevara further stated: "We will use different methods in different countries, according to the exigencies of a given situation." Yes, sure, indeed, of course, and why not?

LOOK WHO HOLDS THE POWER

The suitable exigency in Brazil emerged in January 8 elections. The result greatly built the powers of President Joao Goulart, a wily peacock with cobra emotions. Moreover, Communist sympathizers dominate his Red cabinet.

These include Premier Hermes Lima, furiously anti-American; Justice Minister Joao Mangabeira, living proof that the hangman never runs out of rope; Attorney General Evandro Lins Silva, Information Chief Paul Ryff, and Lionel Brizola, confiscator of the American properties, a deadly enemy of the United States. Sprouting from Brazil's largest group of European-descended Brazilians—the Italians—Labor Leader Dante Pellacani backs up the Red cabinet.

Each of these helpers represents all that is malefic in the stars which rule the destiny of an unworthy man. Goulart, in turn, plucks the day.

But this is only half the story: The Castro-Goulart axis not only touches everything from Panama south but arches like a Roger Maris flyball straight to Mexico City.

Landing drenched in a confetti storm, President Kennedy carried a fresh $200 million grant to the Mexican Government last fall and delivered its personally. But the Mexican Government's behavior typifies the melancholy fact that such state visits, and goodwill tours as a whole, never, never have any real bearing on national policy.

For example, when emphatic White House Clansman John Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India, cabled President Kennedy, "Mrs. Kennedy's visit has taken all the bitterness out of our relations with the Indians," this sycophant was telegraphing a raw piece of self-serving, apple-polishing nonsense. The exquisite clarity of Galbraith's motive explains, again, why Mr. Kennedy is often so badly informed.

"SI" SAID MEXICO, BUT—

Mexican policy noted America's willingness to defend itself in the Cuba crisis:

On October 23, the morning after Mr. Kennedy's TV talk, the Organization of American States organ of consultation voted unanimously with us to implement the Rio Treaty and employ every means, including joint military force, to throw communism and Castro out of Cuba.

Mexico shouted "Yes." But Mexico now notes that, since then, Washington does not even seem alarmed by the Communist regime which shoots political missiles throughout Latin America on a stepped-up basis. Seeing us negotiate our position downhill, Mexico has returned to isolationism and a rosy look at Castro and at Brazil.

The whole Cuban-Brazilian-Mexican setup now shines with the brilliant blackness of some fatal jewel. Yet the great crisis of this century is the expansionism of Communist tyranny. And our President, who solemnly pledged that "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere," has not only been negotiating about it ever since, but he threw away America's bargaining position by hurriedly, hurriedly (why?) lifting the blockade and abandoning on-site inspection when Khrushchev reneged.

Cuban-Brazilian-Mexican Reds are watching Mr. Kennedy, not listening to him. And we have ended up guaranteeing the existence of their powerhouse at the hub of the whole hemisphere problem.

Subsidy for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News, dated January 14, 1963:

SUBSIDY FOR POWER

When Government budgeteers are looking around for ways to save a dollar here, a dollar there, as they are supposed to be doing,

they might take a look at the Rural Electrification Administration.

This New Deal agency, set up in 1935, is principally a banker—although no private banker operating on the same basis would last out a year, let alone the 28 years REA has been in business.

REA borrows money from the Government and lends it to rural power systems, in nearly every case a tax-exempt cooperative. By law, REA is required to lend this money at 2 percent interest. But the Government does not borrow that cheaply.

One of our reporters recently got from the U.S. Treasury a statement showing that the Government, going back to 1942, never had been able to borrow on long-term securities at less than 2.5 percent, and sometimes has had to pay as much as 4.25 percent.

The Treasury said the average interest rate on long-term money borrowed by the Government as of December, was 3.29 percent.

The tax foundation estimates REA has nearly $4 billion in loans outstanding. The difference between paying 3.29 percent on that money and getting back interest of only 2 percent is obvious. The taxpayers make up the difference.

This program was designed to provide electricity for farms. But the cooperatives banked by REA also sell power to industry. As long ago as 1955, the Hoover Commission reported that more than 92 percent of all farms had been electrified. Yet REA goes on lending hundreds of millions a year for this purpose.

At the least, this private business should pay the Government an interest rate no less than the Government is obliged to pay.

Strengthening of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a thought-provoking speech made by John F. Rand, vice president, A. J. Armstrong Co., Inc., before the Overseas Automotive Club recently in which he dealt with many of the perplexing problems in Latin America:

The problem in Latin America is that all these countries have been sustained by foreign capital investment or by bailout loans from the United States and other governments. This must result in a country having its ups and downs because such investments and loans are based on the economic and political climate of each country. The problems in Latin America will be resolved for the most part when a country can sustain itself from within. I have the following suggestions to offer which might help to alleviate some of the problems of Latin America:

1. An election should be held every 3 years. There is no point in electing a president for 4, 5, or 6 years when in most cases he is not given a chance to finish out his term. Perhaps with the people having a right to express their confidence or lack thereof in any administration every 3 years, it might result in the politicians trying to do more good more quickly and more importantly, they may not have enough time to develop contacts to facilitate graft and corruption.

2. Inasmuch as the lower classes will not permit their children to go to school because the children are required to work for the family in one capacity or another, the Latin governments should make a law that every child must attend school until he is 16 years of age and the government should pay the families the equivalent of say $50 a year to every family whose child attends school to compensate for the loss of income that a family might incur by the child attending school. In many cases the child has not earned more than that amount and the government, directly or indirectly, pays more in subsidies to those families so, why not gain some benefit on the basis proposed. Without education of the masses, Latin America willl never be able to resolve its problems.

3. Introduce an effective system of taxation and especially, tax collection. I would venture the guess that only half of the taxable population is paying taxes and even then half of what should be paid.

4. Eliminate dual exchange rates. In every country where there is an official rate of exchange and a free rate of exchange I assure you that the government is losing millions of dollars each year by shrewd people who utilize this system specifically for the purpose of cheating the government out of hard earned dollar exchange income. A single free rate of exchange is the only system which should be employed. If you want to cut down on imports you can always resort to an import license control but you don't have to have multiple exchange rates.

5. One of the biggest problems in Latin America is the flight of capital whenever there are economic or political problems. I suggested a few months ago in Miami that our own Government should consider the issuance of Alliance for Progress bonds payable at a decent rate of interest and with assurance that we would never disclose the names of such bond holders to any foreign government. Perhaps the best solution would be to issue the bonds in bearer form. I am sure that a lot of people in Latin America who keep their money in Switzerland or elsewhere would not be averse to buying Alliance for Progress bonds especially if they were freely negotiable and I think that this money would go back to the Latin countries in the form of aid under the program and reduce a very heavy tax burden on the American taxpayer.

6. If any foreign government confiscates any property held by foreign interests or rather, by American interests, any aid that we may be extending to those countries should immediately cease until such time as an investigation has been made to determine whether the confiscation was necessary and whether the holders of the property have been properly and adequately compensated.

7. Many Latin countries have army, air and navy forces which are far too large and unnecessary. I would suggest that each country reduce its armed forces to a very small extent, small enough to make it equivalent to a good police force. To substitute for each country having large armed forces I would propose that Latin America form a standing army, navy and air force similar to NATO under the jurisdiction of the Organization of American States which forces would be contributed by each country and which standing army would not only be used to stave off aggression from foreign powers but also to put down any conflict within the Latin American sphere. I think this would result in a savings of millions of dollars every year.

8. Our stand in Cuba may have lost us many friends in Latin America because of the age old fear of many Latins of intervention on our part but I can safely say that it has finally won us the respect of those Latins who were not our friends before, who I think were more numerous than the friends that we supposedly had. At the risk of our being called imperialists, aggressors, interventionists, etc., let us make it a policy to stand firm and take decisive action in any Latin country where there are signs of a turn toward communism or Castroism.

I also believe in the future of Latin America as I am sure many of you also do but there is no sense in talking about the problems because talks have not proven successful. It is high time that these problems be recognized and dealth with decisively. We have been talking too softly for many years but we have not carried a big stick. Let us at least show that we still have the stick even if we don't want to use it.

Pittsburgh Program for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to point out to my colleagues the latest information on Pittsburgh's renaissance in redevelopment. This is done through the cooperation of Mr. Robert B. Pease, the outstanding executive director of the urban redevelopment authority, who publishes a newsletter from time to time on this subject. Nineteen hundred and sixty-three should be a meaningful period in urban renewal's contribution to Pittsburgh industrial and employment growth.

The newsletter follows:

PITTSBURGH PROGRAM FOR PROGRESS

(By Robert B. Pease)

Since 1949, the urban redevelopment authority has undertaken 11 urban redevelopment and renewal projects within the city of Pittsburgh.

The first six, all privately financed, are complete or nearing completion. The next four, federally aided, are in varying degrees of property acquisition, demolition and reconstruction. Recently the authority began buying property for its fifth federally assisted project.

In the meantime, four additional federally aided projects have been given definite status on the planning boards. In 1963 and 1964 the authority will be purchasing property in those project areas. Also nearly ready for positive action are two more privately financed projects, both soon to be announced.

TO BOOM IN 1963

Pittsburgh's urban renewal program likely will reach a new peak of activity in 1963. Renewal progress will be much in evidence in the form of demolition and construction work in at least a half dozen vital areas of the city, including the Lower Hill, the North Side, and East Liberty.

Furthermore, as the result of accomplishments of the past year, the renewal program is entering into what probably will be its most meaningful period.

In 1963 the authority recorded its first sales of cleared land to private developers for new industrial, commercial, and residential uses in the East Liberty and Manchester areas. This will continue on an expanded scale this year, demonstrating in particular urban renewal's contribution to-

ward industrial and employment growth, a major goal in this program.

EMPHASIS OF REHABILITATION

Another move of potentially great importance in the past year was establishment of a rehabilitation department by the authority. This department, now manned by a competent staff, will concentrate on the very necessary job of saving existing houses and neighborhoods, and of finding practical and economic ways to improve and modernize them, so that they may assume their proper role in Pittsburgh's renaissance.

In 1963, the authority, now adequately equipped to undertake such work on a realistic basis, expects to move rapidly ahead with planning the city's first full-scale neighborhood conservation project. In line for this project is a stable residential area of Homewood-Brushton.

To summarize briefly, the 11 projects completed to date or now underway cover 609 acres of city land and represent a total investment of well over $400 million in private capital, 90 percent of that taxable. The investment of public money, for acquisition of land, and site and public improvements, amounts to approximately $75 million, two-thirds of that supplied by the Federal Government.

By 1968, these 11 projects will have increased tax revenue dollars to the city, county, and school board by over $5 million per year. They will have removed some 5,000 families from declining and blighted areas, produced more than 5,000 new privately financed dwellings, and some 25 major new commercial, industrial, cultural, educational, and other buildings.

Following is a thumbnail status report of the 11 projects, as well as the 4 others proposed for an early start:

GATEWAY CENTER

Six office buildings, one hotel and two underground parking garages completed. Steel framework erected for eighth building (IBM). Ground broken in December 1962, for $10 million apartment-hotel.

Total private investment to date: Over $105 million.

JONES & LAUGHLIN

South Side: Plant expansion completed with construction of $80 million open hearth furnaces.

Hazelwood: Acquisition of properties completed for future J. & L. expansion.

Scotch bottom: Area acquired and cleared for storage of J. & L. raw materials.

DESOTO-THACKERY (OAKLAND)

Addition to Children's Hospital and Graduate School of Public Health (University of Pittsburgh) erected at aggregate cost of $12.3 million.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH (UPPER CAMPUS)

Land acquired and cleared in Center-Morgan Street area of Oakland for new student athletic facilities, at cost of $10.6 million to university. Field house and swimming pool completed; tennis courts, volleyball courts, other outdoor playing fields soon to be installed. In 1963, the city will begin rebuilding Allequippa, Carillo, and Robinson Streets, and providing a new traffic link between the upper campus area and Center Avenue.

LOWER HILL

All but 2 of 1,325 structures have been razed for the following construction projects:

Civic arena: Completed and in operation.

Crosstown Boulevard: Under construction from Center Avenue to Bigelow Boulevard; first connection scheduled for completion in late 1963.

Washington Plaza Apartments: First building (Forbes Tower—396 apartment units) under construction at approximate cost of $8.5 million to Zeckendorf Property Corp. Final plans being developed for second of three apartment buildings.

Chatham Motor Hotel (formerly known as Golden Triangle Motor Hotel): Developers hope to begin construction early in 1963. Design includes approximately 500 guest rooms, 2,000-car underground parking garage, restaurant, bowling alleys and other facilities. A Federal court suit initiated by downtown hotels has delayed start of the project. The third circuit court of appeals recently sustained the authority and Chatham Motor Hotel sponsors.

Center for the arts: Plans being prepared for new symphony hall and art museum, with underground parking facility, on site east of the arena and adjacent to Crawford Street.

Bell Telephone computer headquarters: Construction pending outcome of suit argued last fall before the State supreme court.

Others: Several additional lower hill sites now for sale or soon to be offered for sale for private residential, commercial and office building uses. One site in the Colwell Street area is reserved for a new synagogue now in final planning.

Anticipated total private investment: $90 million.

CHATEAU STREET WEST (MANCHESTER)

Only a relatively few buildings, families and business firms remain in the 53-acre area scheduled for total clearance. Demolition is proceeding rapidly in preparation for new construction.

To date, six sites, totaling about 15 acres of land, have been purchased or leased from the authority by private firms for new industrial, distribution and commercial facilities.

Negotiations are expected to be completed in the near future with seven other concerns, assuring development of an additional 13 acres for new productive uses. This will leave less than 13 acres to be sold to private developers. Construction of several new facilities, including a 5-acre shopping center, will begin next spring.

New street construction also will begin in the area. Meanwhile, the State highway department is completing plans for the Beaver Avenue leg of the Ohio River Boulevard Extension, for which the right-of-way is being acquired and cleared by the authority.

Anticipated total private investment: $12 million.

EAST LIBERTY (SECTION A)

Demolition operations will be nearly complete by next spring. At least three building projects are scheduled to begin by then, or soon thereafter.

Largest of these will be Pennley Park, $8 million development proposed for 570 apartment units at rentals ranging from $87.50 to $165–$185 per month. Vernon C. Neal, Inc., Pittsburgh, will build the apartments on 14.3-acre site flanking Penn Avenue, between Euclid and Negley.

Starting this year, the city will install two community parks to serve Pennley Park and the surrounding neighborhood, where extensive rehabilitation of existing residential properties is taking place.

Other projects scheduled for construction by next summer include (1) new White Tower restaurant, central Pittsburgh commissary, and (2) new Rambler sales-service center to house newly franchised agency of James P. Donahue, Jr., well-known East Liberty auto dealer.

Anticipated total private investment: $18.5 million.

ALLEGHENY CENTER (CENTRAL NORTHSIDE)

Acquisition and demolition operations are progressing through North Side's central business district.

Authority board has approved final plans for 13-acre shopping plaza, 3,000-car underground parking garage, 10 six-story apartment buildings, and 216 townhouses.

Allegheny Centers, Inc., private firm organized to redevelop area, expects to break ground early in 1963. Entire project scheduled for completion by late 1966.

Anticipated total private investment: $60 million.

BLUFF STREET

In December, the authority began buying first properties. Razing operations expected to begin in September, 1963.

This project, approved last summer by city council following a public hearing, will permit Duquesne University to expand its campus from 12.9 to 37 acres and, thus, to double its enrollment to over 10,000 students at a total capital investment (by the university) of approximately $35 million.

The first sites to be cleared for erection of a science hall and student union by the university, and a privately financed, high-rise apartment house.

EAST LIBERTY (SECTIONS B AND C)

Pending final approval by city council and the Federal Government the authority plans to begin buying properties in the early fall of 1963.

Renewal plans call for conversion of main business streets into pedestrian-oriented shopping plazas; an additional large supply of conveniently located offstreet parking spaces; a new and improved traffic circulation system; 1,300 to 1,500 moderately priced dwelling units; extensive modernization of existing homes and business establishments; a variety of public improvements.

OAKLAND CENTER

On December 1, the authority opened a field office at 125 Oakland Avenue to provide full information to the Oakland community while its first renewal project undergoes detailed planning.

Assisted by Action-Housing, Inc., and other agencies, the authority also has initiated a series of meetings for the purpose of explaining the plan and discussing it with all residents, merchants, and property owners of Oakland.

Preliminary inspections indicate that many houses and commercial buildings will remain and should receive rehabilitation treatment. The 122-acre renewal area is roughly bounded by Fifth Avenue, Forbes Field, Bates Street, Halket Street, and the Boulevard of the Allies.

MUNICIPAL STADIUM (LOWER NORTH SIDE)

Preliminary redevelopment planning is in progress for 84-acre area designated as the site of a new 55,000-seat municipal sports stadium and 5,000 integrated parking spaces.

A financial proposal is in the process of being worked out and, if it proves satisfactory, the purchase of property will be started by the authority by late 1963, with construction following in the fall of 1964. This would mean completion of the stadium by late 1965 or early 1966.

HOMEWOOD-BRUSHTON

The authority will apply to the Federal Government next spring for survey and planning funds with which to plan in detail the conservation of a 95-acre residential section of Homewood-Brushton. This will be the first phase of a long-range renewal program proposed for the entire Homewood-Brushton community. The conservation project area is bounded roughly by Frankstown Avenue, North Braddock Avenue, Forest Way, Stranahan Street, Brushton Avenue, and Homewood Avenue.

Progress data summary

Project	Total acres	Acres of clearance	Total parcels to be acquired	Parcels acquired to date	Buildings razed to date	Total displaced families	Families rehoused to date	Business firms relocated to date
Jones & Laughlin—Southside	32	32	177	177	148	203	203	6
Gateway Center	23	23	111	111	96	25	25	150
Jones & Laughlin—Hazelwood	74	74	193	193	159	405	405	None
Jones & Laughlin—Scotch Bottom	13	13	73	73		120	120	3
DeSoto-Thackery	3	3	41	41	35	78	78	13
University of Pittsburgh—Area No. 8	26	26	155	155	117	142	142	None
Lower Hill [1]	95	95	989	989	1,323	1,551	1,551	416
Chateau St.—West [1]	98	53	811	752	815	739	677	178
East Liberty (A) [1]	100	32	313	232	223	344	280	125
Allegheny Center [1]	103	79	406	218	30	262	81	93
Bluff St. [1]	43	26	279	None	None	444	None	None
East Liberty (B. & C.) [1]	154	(2)	(2)			564		
Oakland Center [1]	122	(2)	(2)			[3] 1,000		
Stadium [1]	84	84	(2)			63		
Homewood-Brushton (A) [4]	95	(5)				1,360		
Total	1,065	540	3,548	2,941	2,946	7,300	3,562	984

[1] Federally aided projects.
[2] Not yet determined.
[3] Approximate.
[4] Homewood-Brushton will be primarily a conservation-rehabilitation project, requiring only negligible amounts of spot clearance.
[5] Negligible.

Tax summary, 1949–64

Project	Estimated taxable assessed values		Annual tax yield to city only [1]		Project	Estimated taxable assessed values		Annual tax yield to city only [1]	
	Before renewal	After renewal	Before	After		Before renewal	After renewal	Before	After
	Millions	*Millions*				*Millions*	*Millions*		
Jones & Laughlin—South Side [1]	$6.8	$21.3	$170,000	$532,000	East Liberty (A)	5.3	9.8	132,500	[3] 245,000
Gateway Center [2]	8.2	42.1	205,000	[3] 1,062,500	Allegheny Center	10.4	31.0	260,000	[3] 775,000
Jones & Laughlin—Hazelwood [2]	3.6	1.6	90,000	40,000	Bluff Street	2.4	1.6	60,000	[3] 40,000
Jones & Laughlin—Scotch Bottom [2]	.13	.06	3,250	1,500	East Liberty (B. & C.)	20.3	26.0	507,000	[3] 650,000
DeSota-Thackeray [2]	.22	(4)	5,500		Oakland Center	12.2	20.0	315,000	[3] 500,000
University of Pittsburgh—Area No. 8 [2]	.45	(4)	11,200		Stadium	2.3	(5)	57,500	(5)
Lower Hill	12.4	37.7	310,000	[3] 942,500	Homewood-Brushton (A)	3.7	(5)	92,000	(5)
Chateau St.—West	3.9	7.9	97,500	[3] 187,500	Total	92.3	199.06	2,316,500	4,976,000

[1] Additional annual revenues to county and school board not included.
[2] Non-Federal-aided projects.
[3] Estimated; based on projects completed and known construction plans; others are actual amounts.
[4] Tax exempt.
[5] Not available.

Timetable

Certified for redevelopment by city planning commission	Approval by city council	Start of acquisition	Start of demolition	Certified for redevelopment by city planning commission	Approval by city council	Start of acquisition	Start of demolition
Apr. 17, 1949	Nov. 22, 1949	1949	1949.	Dec. 22, 1959	June 12, 1961	October 1961	October 1962.
Mar. 29, 1947	Jan. 27, 1950	1950	1950.	June 17, 1952	July 13, 1962	December 1962	August 1963.
Jan. 30, 1951	Oct. 31, 1952	April 1953	1953.	Apr. 26, 1959	April 1963 [1]	September 1963	June 1964.
Feb. 15, 1955	do	do	1953.	Apr 26, 1962	October 1963 [1]	June 1964	March 1965.
Mar. 31, 1953	Oct. 28, 1953	March 1954	1955.	Nov. 30, 1962	Not yet determined	Not yet determined	Not yet determined.
Do	do	do	1956–57.				
Aug. 1, 1950	Sept. 16, 1955	April 1956	November 1956.	December 1962	March 1964 [1]	Not yet determined	Not yet determined.
July 14, 1959	May 5, 1960	January 1961	June 1961.				
Apr. 26, 1959	July 8, 1960	March 1961	October 1961.				

[1] Tentative date for public hearing required prior to action by city council.

Local Invention Helps Harvest the Oceans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the great American characteristics of initiative and ingenuity have been demonstrated graphically by one of my constituents, Mr. Gregor Jonsson, of 950 East Westleigh Road, Lake Forest, Ill.,

Norman F. Hirsch, business manager, of the North Shore Group Newspapers a chain of seven periodicals servicing the 12th Illinois Congressional District, has recently presented the story of Mr. Jonsson's accomplishment. The following article is offered for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of free enterprise and as encouragement to all our citizens. It appeared in the Highland Park News, Lake Bluff Review, and Lake Forester, in the editions of January 24, 1963:

LOCAL INVENTION HELPS HARVEST THE OCEANS

To the fishing fleets of Spain, to the Australian patent office and to Swedish metallurgists, Highland Park, Ill., is not the pleasant upper-middle-class suburb Highland Parkers know. It is, rather, the source of a machine which helps put tons of food from the sea on the whole world's table.

Several hundred Highland Parkers discovered this important aspect of their own hometown for the first time January 13, when Gregor Jonsson Associates held open house in their new location at 1520 Berkeley Road.

The former city garage there has been transformed beyond recognition since Jonsson bought it last April. Where city trucks once parked, amid all the greasy spare parts typical of vehicle maintenance, is now the cleanest machine shop the reporter from the News ever saw.

"We have many bearings and bushings." Jonsson explains, "dirt and grit would defeat our purpose."

Visitors at the Sunday afternoon open house watched Jonsson's Shrimp Trim machines neatly peel and devein 3600 shrimp an hour—and ate their fill of shrimp afterward. City officials and Sherwood Forest neighbors present agreed that this plant in the shadow of the cloverleaf is compatible with the homes across the street to the west.

The cost of automating the process is compatible with the labor savings, also, agree the large commercial fisheries who are Jonsson's customers.

A Shrimp Trim can be bought for $4,500 by a foreign customer or rented for $125 a month in the United States. Ten such machines, working 8 hours a day for 200 days a year at upward of 75 percent capacity (which is typical) save $100,000 a year over the cost of peeling and deveining by hand.

Jonsson was peeling and deveining shrimp by hand one day in 1938, in his sea-food market on First Street, when his wife said, "Greg, why don't you invent a machine to do that?"

OPENED IN 1932

The Jonsson's had opened here in 1932; and had created enough business for fancy crab meat and fresh cavier to send two delivery trucks a day to Lake Forest—although previous fish markets failed after 90 days, on the average, of Friday-only business, recalls Fred E. Gieser, who then operated the Merchant's Delivery Service.

Jonsson put the tail of a shrimp into a paper clip hanging from a nail on the wall; slit it with a pair of scissors; drew the meat out by impaling it through the slit with an iceshaver.

After 14 years of experiments, in 1952, he loaded his first production model on a trailer and drove to Tampa, Fla. That machine passed tests which landed the first order for 10 machines to be installed in a specially-constructed quarter-million-dollar plant. Jonsson sold his retail business to build the machines and spent a year in Tampa getting the bugs out of them. The 10 machines cleaned 4 million pounds of shrimp that year.

The present Shrimp Trim has several hundreds parts; all specialized. The electric motors and gear boxes must work underwater. Everything must be made of noncorroding materials to meet Federal Food and Drug standards of cleanliness—stainless steel, special aluminum, and a copper-nickel alloy Jonsson went to Sweden to find.

In place of the paper clip is a wheel with clamps which grasp the tail but reject any shrimp improperly loaded into the first conveyor. In place of the scissors a small circular saw slits the underside of the shrimp and removes the black vein (actually the digestive tract). A nylon brush and a jet of water complete the automatic cleaning. In place of the ice shaver, the prongs which grasp the shell and meat to separate them are now made by the Elgin National Watch Co., which also makes the springs for the nylon clamps.

The machine automatically adjusts to the size of each shrimp fed into it. It adapts to broken shrimp; cleaning them just as neatly as whole ones to avoid waste.

Drawings of the parts, which are made by specialists throughout the Nation for assembly in Highland Park, now fill a whole filing cabinet. There are several U.S. and foreign patents already, with more to come as improvements are thought up. Currently the Shrimp Trim can peel and devein, or devein only (for cooking in the shell) at the turn of a lever. Models which will peel all but the tail are being developed, to provide a handle for french-fried shrimp; and which split a large shrimp almost in half, for butterfly shrimp.

The cost of cleaned shrimp has been cut; and the market volume of shrimp is expected to increase as the machines become more available. The oceans of the world contain, Jonsson explains, more shrimp than anything else considered edible by an exploding population.

Eighty-eighth Congress Convenes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in past years I have periodically mailed to constituents of the Second Congressional District newsletters, which I believe help them to keep abreast of the work of the Congress.

My first newsletter for the 88th Congress has been prepared. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the newsletter so that it will be available to those who may not be on my mailing list.

The newsletter follows:

THE 88TH CONGRESS CONVENES

Congress, as usual, has gotten off to a slow start. The Senate is debating its filibuster rules and the House has been waiting for committee assignments. But, like everything else, this will pass and the Congress will get on with its real business.

I'm still on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is important to Washington State and the Pacific Northwest. Also, I shall remain on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, an extremely critical assignment.

Since Congress convened, I have introduced several bills which I hope will become law. Some are bills I've introduced before, but, as you know, the process of getting laws enacted can be pretty slow. One bill I've dropped into the hopper would permit students at the college level or parents of students in college to deduct up to $1,000 when they figure their income taxes. This, I believe, is a grassroots approach which would encourage many persons to obtain higher education and could be more effective than direct scholarships.

Another bill I've introduced would give a preference to industry of the Pacific Northwest over California public utilities in the use of hydroelectric power produced in the Columbia Basin. Also, I've asked Congress to reaffirm the right of a State to regulate the time and method of taking fish in our rivers. As you know, there has been some doubt in Olympia about this right as it concerns Indians who fish illegally. I'm sure this bill will interest everyone who is a sports fisherman like myself.

The problems of commercial fishing also are important to everyone in the Second Congressional District. America has lagged behind many nations in fisheries research, particularly Japan and Russia which compete directly with our fishermen. This is one reason I've introduced a bill to authorize construction of a stern trawler to be used for fisheries and oceanographic research.

A bill of particular interest to dairy farmers is H.R. 963, which I have introduced that would make it possible of a milk producer to deliver his allocation of the market requirement at a price related to the class I price rather than the average price now in use.

It seems to me the present system discriminates against the dairy farmer who wants to keep his production at a level that would represent his allotment of the market requirement, because he can get only the blend price even though he is selling what amounts to only class I fluid milk.

All of these bills have been assigned to committees for hearings and I'll appear as a witness in their behalf. The wheels grind slowly, but surely.

All Members of Congress are greatly interested in the proposals the President has made for a tax cut and his budget. I don't know of anyone who wouldn't like to have his taxes cut—I know I would. But, if it means a $12 billion deficit, we had better take a pretty close look at these proposals, otherwise every housewife might have to use a wheelbarrow to carry her money to the grocery store to buy a loaf of bread.

The President's budget proposals make it the highest ever—peace or war—yet, he calls it a frugal budget. Ninety-nine billion dollars. For 1 year. Frugal? I believe it can be cut substantially and still leave plenty to run the Government. What do you think?

Let me hear from you. We may not always agree on everything, but I do welcome your opinions.

Sincerely,

JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Thanks to so many of you for taking the time to tell us that you approve of, and enjoy hearing remarks about life in Washington, D.C. "As I See It."

And speaking of seeing things, getting a view of the Mona Lisa was probably the greatest undertaking. We called at the National Gallery of Art three times before we were successful. Fashionwise it is a story in itself. On the first visit, we were in formal attire, but the lady had too many other guests and it was impossible to pay her proper homage. Two nights later, we tried again, this time wearing casual cold weather gear. But, she had closed her home away from home at the appointed hour of 9 p.m. Finally, on a Sunday evening, after checking Mona's calling hours, we rushed to the gallery in our Sunday-go-to-meeting clothes, got in line with hundreds of other sightseers and sure enough there was Mona Lisa smiling at us as though she was amused by our fashion antics in attempting to call on her. It was worth it, for she's lovely to look at.

Visitors:

Oak Harbor: Mr. and Mrs. A. Glenn Smith.

Deming: Mr. and Mrs. Harold L. Woolf and family.

Snohomish: Kenneth Schilaty.

Sedro Woolley: Sig Berglund.

Mount Vernon: Mr. and Mrs. Frank Gilkey.

Health Insurance Growth Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, constantly besieged by misleading and inaccurate information by those who urge nationalization of health care and of the health insurance business, the following article of January 21, 1963, in the New York Journal of Commerce reports facts indicating that the private sector is meeting whatever problems arise in this area. While we all recognize the need for government assistance in caring for the indigent—a small percentage of our population—it is likewise important to protect those who have the ability to provide for themselves and to protect their continued right to do so.

RECORD HIGHS EXPECTED—HEALTH INSURANCE GROWTH SEEN

(By James R. Williams, vice president and general manager, Health Insurance Institute)

The Nation's health insurance business will continue to expand and refine its health care activities during 1963. If 1962 is any indication of what to anticipate in terms of people protected and benefits received by insured people, record highs can be expected.

Last year was an alltime record period. An estimated 140 million Americans—3½ million more than in 1961—were protected by some form of voluntary health insurance. This figure represents 75 percent of the

civilian population—people of all ages and in all walks of life.

PAYMENT OF $7 BILLION

Also during 1962, a record in benefit payments was reached. It is estimated that $7.1 billion was paid to persons insured by the 839 insurance companies, by 77 Blue Cross and 69 Blue Shield programs, and by some 800 other health care plans. The benefit payments total is 11.5 percent higher than the $6.4 billion paid out in 1961.

In the last decade the health insurance field has become one of the Nation's most highly competitive business activities. And 1963 undoubtedly will be another year of innovation in programs offered the public.

Health care plans for the country's 17 million senior citizens are certain to show added and significant activity. Last year, voluntary health insurance helped protect over 9 million people 65 years of age and older or 55 percent of this age group.

THE "65" PLANS SUCCESSFUL

In 1962, the now famous Connecticut-65, Massachusetts-65, and New York-65—special company-sponsored plans for older people on a pooled risk basis—came into their own. Offering low-cost policies through group underwriting during preannounced enrollment periods, these plans have proven even more successful than anticipated. Experience so far indicates that much of the success in selling the plans is due to the wholehearted efforts of individual agents who participated extensively in the enrollment periods. The New York-65 program enrolled 107,000 people alone during its first enrollment period conducted late in 1962.

Many other States are now studying this health insurance pooling mechanism for possible adoption in 1963. Among them are: Missouri, Minnesota, Texas, Pennsylvania, Michigan, California, and Virginia.

Meanwhile, the list of companies offering guaranteed renewable health insurance policies to older citizens—the vast majority offered without regard to previous medical history—is certain to grow. At year's end, more than 80 companies were marketing these plans to older people and their families.

SPECIALIZED COVERAGE

So encouraged are insurance company spokesmen with the rapidity of acceptance of these and other specialized health care coverages that many predict that by 1970, 75 percent of the over-65 age group will be protected by voluntary health insurance.

Some new areas of health insurance coverage will receive considerable attention in 1963. They include long-term disability insurance, dental coverages, care in nursing homes, care in the home, and vision care coverage, among others. Implementation as well as experimentation in these new coverages is currently in progress.

The five main types of health insurance protection—hospital expense insurance, surgical insurance, regular medical protection, major medical protection, and loss-of-income insurance—will continue to receive refinements this year.

Each of these coverages showed significant growth last year. Of the estimated 140 million persons with hospital expense insurance, 130 million had surgical protection as well, and 97 million had regular medical-expense protection. Thirty-eight million Americans were protected by major medical-expense insurance written by insurance companies. Loss-of-income insurance protected 43.5 million wage earners.

A year ago, comparable figures were: 136,522,000—hospital expense; 126,940,000—surgical expense; 94,209,000, regular medical expense; 34,138,000—major medical expense; and 43,055,000—loss-of-income protection.

MAJOR MEDICAL

Perhaps the most dynamic of the above coverages in terms of growth and protection, is the major medical-expense-protection type policy. In 1950, less than 100,000 Americans were covered by this coverage which helps to pay hospital and medical bills for serious and catastrophic illness or disability in or out of hospital. Benefits range from $5,000 to $10,000 and higher, and can cover costs of hospitalization, physicians, private duty nurses, surgery, physiotherapy, X-ray and radium treatment, laboratory examinations, ambulance, prescribed drugs and medicines, blood appliances and similar expenditures when prescribed by a physician.

The great majority of these plans are written under the group mechanism at places of employment. Policies cover the employee, his wife and his children. The plan itself is administered by the employer as policyholder, facilitating more than ever before service to insured people.

In a little more than two decades, voluntary health insurance has grown from a point where fewer than 1 in 10 were protected against health care expenses to the current coverage for three out of four Americans. The health insurance business itself, in the same period, has emerged from its early basic hospital and medical plans to a panoply of highly sophisticated and practical programs designed, more than ever before, to accommodate all people, thereby strengthening the insurance business fulfillment of its social obligation to the public.

Food Cheaper Today Than Ever Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the RECORD a particularly enlightening editorial from the February 2, 1963, issue of the Packer, a leading publication in the vegetable trade.

This editorial brings the matter of food costs into proper perspective. It points up the fact that food is still the consumer's best buy, and then it goes on to explain just why.

FOOD CHEAPER TODAY THAN EVER BEFORE

The bag of perfect apples you now pay 69 cents for could cost $2 a bag or more. The can of green beans which now sells for 29 cents could sell for 90 cents. The 27-cent quart of milk could rise to 34 cents a quart.

Why the higher costs? Because if we let them, insects and diseases and other pests would destroy or seriously damage our plentiful food and fiber supply. When supply is down, costs go up.

As it is, insects alone destroy $3 billion worth of food and fiber each year. Losses to all kinds of pests—including weeds, animal and plant diseases, and rodents—amount to $24 billion a year. For every dollar's worth of food eaten in the United States, another 50 cents worth is "paid" to pests and the food which they destroy.

Without pesticides, losses to insects would be much higher, and so would food costs. For example, if the American farmer today followed pest control methods of 1940, it has been estimated that each person in the Nation would pay $72 more per year for food.

Thus, not only is food cheaper in dollars and cents, thanks to pesticides, but it's cheaper in terms of man-hours. In 1940, it took 57 hours to supply a family of five with their food needs. Today it takes only 39 hours.

To top it off, there's a greater variety of food items in the stores today than there was 20 years ago: about 1,900 in 1940, over 4,000 today. The increase is due to many advances within the framework of a more efficient American agriculture—plant breeding methods, mechanical technology, education, development of pesticide chemicals. It is efficiency which keeps food costs low.

In no other nation on earth do so few farmers produce so much food to feed so many people a high-quality diet at such a reasonable price.

One American farmer produces enough food for 25 people. In Russia, a collective farmer produces enough for three and one-half people. In Red China, a farmer produces only enough food for his family.

According to Nikita Khrushchev's admission: "Soviet farmers are using more than 7 times as much labor to produce grain as the United States, 5 times more labor to grow potatoes, 6 times as much to grow beets, 14 times as much to raise cattle, over 16 times as much to raise pigs."

And while Americans and Western Europeans worry themselves over too much weight (and how to take it off), three-fifths of the world's population go to bed hungry each night and two-fifths suffer malnutrition.

Food costs too high? Not on your life. We're eating more nutritious foods which are available in greater variety at the lowest prices in history.

And, contrary to what many people may think, food costs have risen less than most items used in computing the cost-of-living index.

According to figures gathered by the Council of California Growers, food costs (including food served in restaurants) increased 22 percent, while all other items increased 33 percent since the 1947–49 consumer price index base period.

In relation to income, however, food actually costs less today than it did only a few years ago. That's because incomes have gone up more than the price of food. For example, today Americans spend 20 percent of their income on food, as compared with 26 percent 10 years ago and 40 percent in 1940.

When the council conducted a public opinion survey in California only a couple of years ago, a large percentage of the persons polled thought the farmer was responsible for the higher food costs.

O. W. Fillerup, executive vice president of the council, cites Government figures to show that the farmer actually receives 13 percent less for the food products he sells today than he did for the same items in 1947–49.

Increased efficiency—the result of the technological revolution on the farm—is responsible for the fact that farmers today are producing food at less cost than 10 to 20 years ago, the council executive states.

A recent U.S. Department of Agriculture study revealed that productivity of the American farmworker is growing more than twice as fast as the productivity of workers in industry, and mechanization and better cultural techniques in farming are largely responsible.

One reason many people have the feeling that food costs have climbed more than they actually have is because they do not differentiate between their food bill and their grocery bill, the council points out.

"What we mean is that when people pay their bill at the checkstand in a modern supermarket, they often forget that a substantial part of that bill is for nonfood

items," says Mr. Fillerup. "Items such as household supplies, cigarettes, cosmetics, and even phonograph records."

One study shows that nonfood items account for almost 20 percent of consumer purchases in supermarkets.

Food prices have gone up, yes. But, reminds the council, one item not listed on the cost-of-living index issued regularly by the Government has increased more than all of the rest. That item is taxes, which have increased 121 percent in the past decade.

Liquidate the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville News of Indiana dated January 30, 1963:

LIQUIDATE THE UNITED STATES?

Now is the time when the paymaster hands out forms which show how much we sacrificed last year to support defense, interest on the debt, Yugoslavia and the Supreme Court, among other items.

It must be a great problem in public relations for Washington to have to present a new budget at the moment when voters learn the awful news about what the last (and smaller) one cost them.

One method used to ease our pain about the mounting debt is to issue at this dismal hour a sort of national inventory. This year shows the Government owns property which cost $299.4 billion. We are told that if the Government sold it all at cost, the debt would be liquidated, and so we are solvent.

Of this total, $86 billion is real estate. The Government might break even on these parcels, although some of them consist of abandoned barracks, jails, missile sites, and waterless waste incapable of supporting life.

The bulk of what Uncle Sam owns is "personal property." When the Government does sell such items, it's lucky to get a dime back for each dollar the thing cost new.

The whole inventory is just intended to divert us, however, because the Government couldn't go out of business—and the citizens haven't enough loose money to buy its property if it could.

A study of the budget is even more discouraging. We learn that programs which last year required "irreducible" to prevent some "national disaster" can now be cut quite safely by savings that officialdom denied could ever be made. We learn that new programs in new areas are required, or some kind of new disaster will overtake us.

And we learn that, as always, medical programs for unspecified persons take precedence over our own family's medical needs, subsidized housing for other people has prior claim over our own family's housing needs, subsidies for Latin-American railroads take dollars we might have spent traveling with our family on our own ailing carriers.

That form we received from the paymaster tells the story. How much better would life have been for your family last year if Government had cut its take by as little as 10 percent? How much better is life for your family because it spent all it did?

Viewed this way, a national budget becomes a personal question. Only you can know the truth of it, unless you impress your views on growing government to your Congressman.

General Motors Profits Up: United States Steel Profits Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Friday, February 1, 1963, which comments upon the interesting fact that General Motors, one of the biggest buyers of steel had the greatest profits ever while United States Steel reported the lowest profits in a decade.

All of this should be viewed in light of the rash and overwhelming use of governmental power, some of it with questionable authority, by President Kenney last April in keeping steel prices down.

The Globe-Democrat editorial provides real food for thought for all of us interested in the private enterprise system.

J.F.K. GIVETH AND J.F.K. TAKETH AWAY

General Motors has reported for 1962 the greatest profits ever earned by any business. United States Steel has reported for the same year its lowest profits in a decade.

And we think it fair comment to say that never before in our history was a President more directly and personally responsible for the vast difference in the earnings of two corporations.

With his rollback in steel prices in April last year, Mr. Kennedy literally took money out of Big Steel's pocket and put it into the pockets of GM to the tune of $6 a ton.

Unquestionably, other factors entered into the picture. GM's spectacular gain in its own competitive field was of tremendous importance. Its sales rose more than $3 billion over the previous year.

But with the steel and automobile industries so closely interrelated, the leader of one could hardly have had its best year and the leader of the other one of its worst, if free enterpise had been given free play in the United States in 1962.

What happened was that J.F.K. in his infinite wisdom took it upon himself to say how the steel sector of the American economy should be run.

Working through Cabinet officials and others to avert a threatened strike in the industry, the President virtually dictated the terms of the labor contract to keep it within his formula for wage-price stability. The 430,000 workers were given an increase of 10 cents an hour in benefits without an immediate pay hike.

But when United States Steel and other companies announced an increase in prices to meet this increase in cost, all the power of the Federal Government was thrown at them.

The Defense Department was going to cancel contracts. The Department of Justice was going to file antitrust suits. The Federal Trade Commission was going to charge them with price collusion.

The President in his wrath angrily denounced their "wholly unjustifiable and irresponsible defiance of the public interest."

Backing down and calling the price increase off, United States Steel earned $2.56 a share during 1962, its lowest profits since 1952—$163,900,000.

Getting cheaper steel for the 5,239,000 cars and trucks it sold, General Motors earned $5.10 a share during 1962, amassing more profits than any other business ever earned in a year—$1,459,000,000.

Blessed be the name of J.F.K.

Is It a Crazy Budget?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of Tuesday, January 29, 1963.

This excellent editorial by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, sets forth some interesting thoughts with regard to the operation of the Government and the economic situation regarding the President's proposed tax cut.

The editorial follows:

IS IT A CRAZY BUDGET?

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is not going to be easy to prove the case for the new budget which superimposes a planned deficit of nearly 3 billion on top of an involuntary deficit of some 7 or 8 billion. It is easier to argue the case—which is novel and highly debatable—when it is done with the modesty and learning of the economic message than when it is done with the dogmatic assertiveness of the tax message. For nothing can be so certain as the tax message says it is and no tax bill can be so unqualifiedly wonderful.

The basic question which will have to be debated for some months to come is whether the budget for fiscal 1964 is likely to do what it is designed to do. Will it, that is to say, cause business to expand, thereby reducing unemployment and using to something nearer full capacity the industrial plant?

The principle of the 1964 budget is a new one. Why should there be need of a new budget principle? Because the country is confronted with an economic problem which first made its appearance toward the end of 1957. The problem arises from the fact that there is a condition of chronic economic sluggishness: the average rate of unemployment has moved up to a new level—from 4 percent for the years from 1947 to 1957 to 6 percent ever since.

The American economy has been sluggish because total demand has been sluggish and capital investment consequently inadequate. This sluggishness is a heavy burden on the Nation. We are not producing each year about $30 billions of wealth that we have the labor and resources to produce. As a result of this nonproduction tax revenues have fallen, and the chronic sluggishness has produced chronic budget deficits.

The problem of economic sluggishness appeared under Eisenhower and has persisted under Kennedy. It cannot be blamed on either party or on either President. There is something wrong for which we have no generally accepted remedy. As we cannot afford to nonproduce $30 billion annually while we are bearing the great burden of military defense and trying to take care of our expanding population, we must make a bold attempt to overcome the sluggishness. We must take measures to produce the lost $30 billion.

That is what the new budget is designed to do. Actually it is a new experiment for

the United States to have a planned budgetary deficit. But it is not a new experiment in the rest of the modern world where all of the advanced nations, if they used our system of accounting, would be showing planned deficits.

The difficulty in adapting the new budget principle to the American situation is that there are so many serious and respectable and successful people who think it is crazy, who think it is ridiculous, and who think it is not far from being a swindle. They are outraged at the idea of the Government going further into debt to make the country richer.

This is not the first time that a true theory looked absurd. The earth, for example, seems flat and is round and it is not so easy to remember how to explain why it is round. The new theory is that the total demand for goods and services should be approximately large enough to pay for approximately all that labor, plant, and capital resources are capable of producing efficiently.

Those of us who accept this fundamental theory agree that the chronic sluggishness since 1957 has been due to insufficient total demand. We agree, therefore, that demand should be increased, and while this could be done by massive Government spending, it is easier and quicker and has less of what the doctors call side effects to do this by reducing taxes. Experience has shown that consumers spend 93 percent of their disposable income, which means the total demand will rise quickly after a tax reduction.

There are not many who now oppose a reduction of taxes. But there are many who believe that the principle on which the administration is acting is crazy and immoral. They are saying that while taxes should be reduced, the budget should be balanced at the same time by reduction of Government expenditures.

Have they, one wonders, looked at the figures, and if they have, can they really mean what they are saying? The deficit in the new administrative budget (1964) is estimated at $11.9 billion after tax reduction and tax reform. That is over 10 percent of the total administrative budget which is estimated at $98.8 billion. Where do they think they can find the nearly $12 billion to cut? Presumably they will not wish to cut national defense which takes $55 billion. Nor will they cut space research which takes $4.2 billion. Nor the veterans which take $5.5 billion. Nor interest on the debt which takes $10 billion. Nor, if they are politically candid, will they cut very seriously the $5.7 billion taken by agriculture.

That leaves $20 billion for everything else. Practically everyone who talks about the wild spending in Washington is talking about those $20 billion. Does anyone think those $20 billion can be cut in half? The truth is that those who mean seriously to cut Government expenditures to an amount equal to the deficit must cut defense, or give up the hope of balancing the budget and cutting taxes.

The fact of the matter is, however, that if by some kind of major amputation they did cut expenditures by $10 billion, the result would not be a balanced budget. The withdrawal from the economy of that much demand for goods and services would be a heavy blow at business, and it would cause such a loss of revenue that the budget at the end would be more unbalanced than ever. In all likelihood we would have a serious recession.

There is no getting away from this. There is only one way to balance the budget and that is first to balance the economy.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 2, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, February 2, 1963)

TAXES—UP OR DOWN?

Tax changes, the year's most important legislative issue according to the President, are quite uncertain. Not only is there no specific legislative language yet available, but there is legitimate doubt whether the total effect will be up or down to many individuals. Corporate taxes will be lowered, yet the speed-up of pay-in will more than offset the tax cut for the first 2 or 3 years so that there cannot be reduced prices, increased investment, jobs, and production, in short, the economic stimulus envisioned by the President. As to individuals, while rates are cut, some deductions being eliminated might balance out or even increase future taxes over present taxes.

Middle income group to pay bill: The President's tax proposals could be disappointing to the bulk of our citizens. He stresses tax relief for the aged and the low income group, but then proposes to make up the difference by taking more from the middle income group. For instance, he calls for reductions of $320 million for the aged; $220 million for the $3,000 and under income group; and $440 million for small corporations in the reversal of rates. This accounts for $1 billion in tax cuts. He then plans to take $2.5 billion from the the middle income group by cutting back or eliminating certain deductions. This is the joker in the New Frontier deck. Cutback in deductions is to be compensated for by adjusting rates, but we all know that rates go up and down with regularity. Once a deduction is lost it is almost impossible to regain it. So, as spending goes up and the need for more tax money becomes acute, the rates must rise and in the end the majority of the taxpayers will be paying more because they have lost their deductions.

The long laborious process of hearings and drafting tax legislation now begins before my Committee on Ways and Means. The views of all constituents are welcome and the technical knowledge of tax attorneys and accountants is solicited—certainly everyone should be concerned and study the progress of this legislation. I shall do my best to bring about sensible tax reform and tax reduction in all brackets. I will then continue, on the floor of the House, the constant battle to cut spending so that tax cuts, so badly needed, will be effective and in sound dollars, not watered currency.

INVESTIGATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

House Resolution 210, which I introduced this week, calls for an investigation by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the "personnel and policymaking practices, procedures, and methods of the Department of State." This investigation is necessary to find out, once and for all, who are the policymakers in the State Department and why so many of their decisions prove to be wrong in protecting U.S. self-interest. A long list of fatal decisions could be recited from our failure in China which made possible the takeover by the Communists, to the confused and questionable policy in Cuba which has allowed the Soviet Union to establish a firm beachhead in this hemisphere. Congress must know, and the American people are entitled to know, just who is responsible for our weak, or total lack of a firm foreign policy.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The President's fourth message to the 88th Congress called for a broad and comprehensive plan for Federal aid to education. Everyone is for education, the best for the most; in quality second to none; in quantity, all of our people, if that is possible. We all agree with the President when he says, "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." The disagreement with the President stems from this statement of his: "The program here proposed is reasonable and yet far reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control." This cannot be. Federal aid requires Federal control or else we fail to do our fiscally responsible job as Congressmen. And Federal control contradicts the local control the President eulogizes. The best and only maximum educational program in a free society will come from local and private effort, not government.

There is no need to evaluate selectively, as the President endeavors to do in his message, the various programs because of the many self-contradictory and self-defeating statements it contains. Perhaps the President's own language shows most pitilessly his misunderstanding and inconsistency. "In all the years of our national life, the American people—in partnership with their governments. * * *" This is impossible. We have a government of, for, and by the people. So it follows, according to the President, that the people are in partnership with themselves. The President's statement shows an error of judgment and of his misconception of the role of government is particularly serious. He implies that the American people are an entity separate from another body politic which is government. How far a cry from the philosophy of our Founding Fathers and the great Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson. We must point out and correct these errors in the thinking of the President—not permit their acceptance as basic American thinking.

MISUNDERSTANDING OF OUR SYSTEM

The President's misconception of our system continues when he says: "In our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient." Under our system there is nothing but the private efforts and initiative of the people. The Government creates no wealth, only the industry of the people does that. The President proposes to take the wealth from the people at the local level, in the form of taxes, and return it to them in whatever manner an all-encompassing Federal bureaucracy determines. This is not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution which gives the people the right and the opportunity to do for themselves those things they themselves determine are their goals in the pursuit of happiness.

Are we to throw the Constitution out the window because we are experiencing population growth, economic expansion, and technological advance? Are we no longer sure the people can be the government? I don't believe it. The best way to handle educa-

tion is at the local level. The most help the Federal Government can give is to trim the fat from the budget so the people will be able to keep more of their own money and then they, at the local level, will take care of building enough schools, hiring the best teachers, and providing for their own children the best possible educational system.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

The President's farm message, like the five previous messages presented to this session, speaks in broad, general terms without ever coming to grips with the problem. Underlying the whole message is the same New Frontier philosophy for more Federal direction, more ultimate control, instead of presenting a plan to allow farmers to operate in a free market. As a counterproposal to solve the complex farm problems with which this Nation has been plagued for three decades, I suggested we begin the long journey back to freeing the farmer, to make him the master of his own destiny. Our objective should be that the farmer should be free to operate his own farm in whatever manner he feels is best for him, to grow the crops that he wants to grow, and to engage in those farm practices which he alone is best fitted to decide. As a starter, because we cannot abolish all the programs at once, we can enact a program which will permit a farmer to grow on his own land whatever he needs for his own use and for use on his land. We should never forget that the American farmer, operating as a free individual in a free marketplace, built the greatest and most efficient agricultural plant in the history of the world. I have faith in the American farmer as I have faith in all the American people. Free him from the slavery imposed by the theorists and the Washington desk farmers and he will solve the problems of agriculture and will contribute, as he has always contributed, to the progress, the growth, and the freedom of all our people.

More Taxes Loom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Palladium-Item and Sun Telegram of Indiana dated January 30, 1963:

MORE TAXES LOOM

The tax eaters are at it again. You know full well who the victims will be.

Our State legislature is having a field day with all kinds of ideas on how to raise more money. What the taxpayers would like to see is some really serious effort to reduce expenditures.

In Washington, the Congress has before it President Kennedy's plan for a 3-year tax cut, but a close anaylsis gives rise to wonder whether, in view of so-called tax reforms, it will amount to much after all. There is considerable doubt that it will.

Time-honored bona fide deductions which the average taxpayer has counted on year after year would be lost or restricted. Fortunately, under our form of government the President proposes but the Congress disposes. Kennedy's bill still faces that hurdle.

There are other unfavorable factors in our tax picture.

The social security tax went up, again, last January 1. And about 8 out of 10 Hoosier property owners face higher tax bills on their homes because there was no appreciable gain in the total tax base which was supposed to have followed an upward adjustment of assessed property valuations.

From the standpoint of the taxpayer, it isn't a very optimistic outlook, is it?

One of the measures being studied by the Indiana Legislature is a State net income tax. It is designed to double the yield from gross income tax, which then would be abolished.

Incidentally, when the gross income tax was established back in the 1930's, it was supposed to have been a temporary measure, just to get the State back on its feet.

It not only never was abolished but it since has been increased 50 percent, from 1 percent to 1.5 percent on all income over a $1,000 exemption.

Whoever heard of a tax being wiped off the books?

There is a growing trend over the country for States to adopt net income taxes. Needless to say, the idea is to gather more money for individual States. These taxes can be deducted from your Federal income tax bill.

As State income tax collections mount, a lesser amount necessarily finds its way into Uncle Sam's Treasury. The Federal Government, of course, will find some way to get it back, for it, too, is spending more all the time. You can bet there will be another bite on the taxpayer. It's as simple as that.

Local governmental units seem to be straining at the leash, too. A bill has been introduced in the Indiana Senate to triple the bonding power of local governmental units. That means they could go into debt for three times the amount to which they are now limited.

Those debts, inevitably, must be repaid. That would be another addition to the load under which the taxpayer must stagger.

Taxes are said to be as certain as death. But there is a limit to how much we can stand. Our lawmakers simply must be made to realize it.

Confusion on the Tax Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as was to be expected, the President's tax message to Congress has provoked comment throughout the Nation. The comments naturally range from favorable to completely unfavorable.

The Chicago Heights Star, an independent publication in south suburban Cook County, Ill., has very concisely and thoughtfully commented on the President's tax program in an editorial of Thursday, January 17, and I place this editorial into the RECORD at this point:

CONFUSION ON THE TAX FRONT

Federal income tax reductions, to pre-Korean war levels, will become a reality if President Kennedy's fiscal program is adopted by Congress.

We presume it would be difficult to find an American wage earner who will quarrel with the prospect of retaining a greater share of his income, provided it is a saving in fact as well as in name. Speaking well for many citizens, however, is their fear that unless a tax reduction is accompanied by stringent economies in Government, the net gain will sink in a sea of inflation.

Americans are entitled to be slightly confused, too, in interpreting administration views of the tax cut proposal. It is hoped that the reduction will buoy up the economy, with the result that much, if not all, of the tax loss will at length be recovered through a greater gross product.

But to a great extent the same voices which speak of this happy outlook will soon be heard urging yet another increase in social security taxes, this time to provide hospitalization for the elderly, rich and poor alike. Will not this tend to drag the economy back toward where it is now?

And while the leaders in one room discuss paring the budget, will not the leaders in another room be discussing Federal aid to education and sundry other fractional returns of taxpayers' money to the States?

You can count us among those desiring a slash in Federal taxes. At the same time, we prefer to achieve it without the confusion engendered by trying to be all men, and without the danger of further bankrupting the Nation.

Lord Grant Us That Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a communication from my good friend, David Gimbel, of Brooklyn, N.Y., in which he included a poem that touched me deeply. In the thought that it might be of inspiration to others I would like to quote it under leave to extend my remarks.

LORD GRANT US THAT DAY

(By David Gimbel)

We shall always remember the day we were told
I touched my wife's hand she was trembling and cold.
We looked at the doctor but could not reply
So filled with emotion but we just could not cry.
He kept right on talking but we just could not hear
Our faces were etched with agony and fear,
I looked into her eyes we were ever so near,
And on cheeks that were pale I first saw a tear.
I held back my own t'was only a stall,
But right at the moment my world seemed so small.
Those dreams that I treasured were turning to dust.
My shimmering plans were now coated with rust.
But suddenly I felt a tug by my hand,
With a childish gesture so that I'd understand
I looked down at an angel so innocent and sweet
And I knew that this challenge we would both have to meet.
Now the road will be rugged and the skies will be grey
But somehow, Oh somewhere we shall find our way
For hope is eternal, every moment we'll pray
For the most blessed of miracles, "Lord Grant us that Day".

To Keep Them in Perpetual Childhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, when we consider this fantastic budget proposal, we might also consider what Alexis de Tocqueville said 120 years ago about "Democracy in America."

The following editorial appeared in the Richmond News Leader, August 2, 1962:

TOCQUEVILLE REVISITED

More than 120 years have passed since Alexis de Tocqueville wrote his "Democracy in America." We happened to browse through the final chapters one evening recently, and came across a passage of such startling foresight and immediate application that we pass it along to readers who share a concern for the drift of events in this Republic.

During his visit to the United States in the 1830's, Tocqueville several times remarked upon his apprehension that "a democratic state of society, similar to that of the Americans, might offer singular facilities for the establishment of despotism." The subject absorbed him. On his return to France, he reflected upon the prospect over a period of 5 years, and found his fears undiminished.

What sort of despotism might befall the United States? Writing in 1840, Tocqueville first looked back at the despotism of the Roman emperors: They possessed an immense and unchecked power, which they frequently abused to deprive their subjects of property or of life; yet even so, this power was limited, and for the most part, the details of social life and private occupations were left alone.

With that much introduction (and keeping in mind the prodigious growth of our Federal Government in the past quarter century), let Tocqueville speak for himself:

"It would seem that if despotism were to be established among the democratic nations of our days, it might assume a different character; it would be more extensive and more mild; it would degrade men without tormenting them * * *.

"I think * * * that the species of oppression by which democratic nations are menanced is unlike anything that ever before existed in the world; our contemporaries will find no prototype of it in their memories. I seek in vain for an expression that will accurately convey the whole of the idea I have formed for it; the old words "despotism" and "tyranny" are inappropriate; the thing itself is new, and since I cannot name, I must attempt to define it.

"I seek to trace the novel feature under which despotism may appear in the world. The first thing that strikes the observation is an innumerable multitude of men, all equal and alike, incessantly endeavoring to procure the petty and paltry pleasures with which they glut their lives. * * *

"Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. The power is absolute, minute, regular, provident and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent if, like that authority, its object was to prepare men for manhood; but it seeks, on the contrary, to keep them in perpetual childhood: It is well content that the people should rejoice, provided they think of nothing but rejoicing.

"For their happiness such a government willingly labors, but it chooses to be the sole agent and the only arbiter of that happiness; it provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry, regulates the decent of property, and subdivides their inheritances: What remains, but to spare them all of the care of thinking and all the trouble of living?

"Thus it every day renders the exercise of the free agency of man less useful and less frequent; it circumscribes the will within a narrower range and gradually robs a man of all the uses of himself. The principle of equality has prepared men for these things; it has predisposed men to endure them and often to look on them as benefits.

"After having thus successively taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting. Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd."

We had not planned to write anything more just now on the medicare bill, or on the President's plan for a tighter network of small complicated rules to govern farm production, or on urban renewal, and planned recreation, and other aspects of the welfare state. For today, we will stand on Tocqueville. He said it all, and said it superbly, 122 years ago.

Railroads: Why Not Try Service?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the railroads of this country seem to have a tremendous following among people in all walks of life who claim to be railroad enthusiasts and who say they prefer rail travel to all other types of transportation, if the rail service is good. Unfortunately, I guess too many of them, when about to travel decide the service is not good enough, because we all know what has happened to railroad passenger traffic volume.

About a year ago, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a friend and constituent who recounted the difficulties of getting railroad sleeping accommodations, only to discover, after finally succeeding in getting a reservation, that the Pullman car was practically empty for the entire trip. I was amazed at how many people commented on this story after reading it in the RECORD, or in news articles based on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertion, and often they said they had experienced similar, or even more infuriating, incidents in trying to patronize the railroads.

I remembered this yesterday when I saw an article in the Washington Post by Staff Reporter John P. MacKenzie entitled "Doubters of Magic in Mergers Suggest: Why Not Try Service?" in which the writer discusses the inadequacy of research by the railroad industry in methods to promote increased freight business.

In view of the widespread public interest in the railroad industry, and the desire of so many Americans to see this industry once again a healthy and dynamic competitor for the Nation's transportation business, I submit Mr. MacKenzie's Washington Post article for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NEED OF RESEARCH STRESSED—DOUBTERS OF MAGIC IN MERGERS SUGGEST: WHY NOT TRY SERVICE?

(By John P. MacKenzie, staff reporter)

Even as large railroads rush to consolidate and become larger, some second thoughts are being advanced whether mergers are the simple, one-shot cure for an ailing industry.

The current merger trend, which involves half the Nation's trackage and two-thirds of its railroad assets, has tremendous appeal for many railroad leaders.

Says James M. Symes, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad:

"If someone asked me what I consider the most important single thing the railroads can do to get the industry back to its healthy and vigorous status of 30 years ago and ready to take a progressive place in the transportation of tomorrow * * * I would answer in one word—mergers."

The railroads are not abandoning their complaints about Federal "regulatory roadblocks" and competition by unregulated barges and trucks, but these themes have been hammered out for decades. The exciting idea today is merger.

A COMMON THEME

The Pennsylvania wants to merge with the New York Central into the largest corporation in U.S. history. The Norfolk & Western wants to absorb the Nickel Plate and lease the Wabash. The Atlantic Coast Line wants to merge with the Seaboard Air Line Railroad. The Great Northern wants to merge with the Northern Pacific and the Burlington into the longest railroad in the country.

Through all the merger applications now before the Interstate Commerce Commission runs a common theme: the merged railroad will save millions of dollars in costs by pooling resources and avoiding duplication. Cost cutting, say the applicants, is essential to survival.

It is the emphasis on cost cutting that bothers some observers who, unlike the truckers, the barge operators and labor unions, have no specific antimerger ax to grind. Among the questioners is Martin Wohl, transportation consultant to J. Herbert Holloman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology.

Wohl, former MIT professor of transportation engineering, is part of a research team that is seeking new, scientific ways to help American industry grow. He is, if anything, an opponent of too much Government in business. His task is to help improve the policymaking process in Government and help transportation inform itself for better reasoned policy decisions of its own.

To Wohl, much of the current talk about "sick" railroads is itself a symptom of a troubled industry. More deeply underlying the trouble, however, is the fact that in

his opinion railroading is technologically obsolescent.

This means more than dilapidated rolling stock, bumpy roadbeds and late train arrivals. To Wohl, it means an industry that fails to account for social and technological change, won't change as the world changes and sees only dimly where it can improve.

Cost is only one factor in the decision by a shipper either to use railroads or to avoid them, Wohl notes. Another factor is service and still another is reliability.

COST EDGE OVER TRUCKS

In the fierce competition with trucks, says Wohl, railroads already have a big cost edge. So why not concentrate on improving service? The railroads could improve service and maintain much of their built-in competitive cost advantage, Wohl insists.

He takes no position on merger proposals. But he asks whether a merger like the Penn-Central one will help the railroad industry if its cost cutting, without swifter and more reliable service, fails to win back the traffic the two roads are now losing.

What effects would a stepped-up program of service have on competition? What if more retailers knew they could rely on prompt rail delivery of their wares and could plan accordingly? Wohl says nobody knows, or nobody knows much—which is precisely his point: more research is needed.

"Basic research and development put each of the present modes of transportation into business," Wohl says, "and it was ignoring research and development that put buggy and stagecoach manufacturers out of business."

Wohl is talking about long-range research, not the hardware of repairing wornout boxcars, but the software of new concepts of moving traffic, of adapting to the specialized needs of shippers and their markets.

Can railroads operate more reliably by running more trains with fewer cars? Would such a sacrifice in economy bring in more profitable traffic? Can more be done to integrate rail freight with other forms of transportation, such as the train-to-truck piggyback method?

Why not explore the chances for integrated rail-airplane transport, with vehicles capable of traveling along rails and switching to airborne operations? What is so wild about that idea? Is any form of transportation sacred?

These are some of the possibilities Wohl thinks the railroads should investigate with fewer inhibitions. The face of transportation will certainly change drastically in future decades, Wohl warns, "because you must not forget what happened to the buggy."

But can the railroads, many of them losing money and low on credit, afford such far-out expenses? Some financiers think not. Wohl replies, "Nonsense."

The railroads are spending half a billion dollars on hardware each year, says Wohl, but only about $15 million of it goes to research and development, or R. & D. "That is less than the railroads spend on stationery, and you can look it up," he adds.

Wohl is not alone in his views. A number of railroad presidents have taken up the same cry, and many of them say they want to invest more heavily in research and development. One of the best known projects is the $1.5 million study of systemwide rail operations at the Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio.

GOOD—BUT NOT ENOUGH

The institute, a private, nonprofit industrial research foundation, has been hired to construct in a computer a model railroad. The mathematical model records the total effects upon a railroad system of the isolated decisions which are made along hundreds of miles of track—how, for instance, the freight yard of one city is affected by the addition of another section of train elsewhere.

The project is the cooperative effort of six railroads, the Central, Southern, Norfolk & Western, Canadian National, Chesapeake & Ohio, and the St. Louis-San Francisco. Wohl applauds this project but complains, "It's not enough."

The Southern Railway cashed in on its research and development program last week when the Interstate Commerce Commission approved Southern's proposal for drastic reductions in grain-hauling rates. The ICC rate division went out of its way to praise Southern's initiative in developing radically new, more economical "Big John" aluminum hopper cars.

Wohl's call for more research is a modest one. Research needn't be a set of computers grinding out miles of taped questions and answers, although computers offer a new tool for transportation. Wohl says research may be a guy thinking if he's thinking broadly enough.

Research and development, which he notes is not his patented product, is being bought by some railroads. If other railroads don't buy the product, modesty may be one reason. He promises no sure results, only better guesses for the future.

Wohl is selling a radically different approach, an experimental attitude. Perhaps research on how to market ideas is in order.

Byron Gentry, National Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Byron Gentry, an able defense counsel on the west coast, and the present national commander of the Veterans of the Foreign Wars of the United States is a man of many abilities, among which is the writing of poetry.

As an ex-Infantry officer of World War II, I shall always have an undying admiration for "GI Joe," or the "dogface" as they call those who serve in the Infantry. Commander Gentry has written a poem of these men, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this work:

GI JOE

(By Byron Gentry)

Born to independent freedom
  Of his thinking and his ways;
With no military training
  In his school or working days,
He was thrust on moment's notice
  Into war he didn't make—
Bitched and joked at situations
  Regulations made him take.

What was "honorable profession,
  And the art of bearing arms,"
To the Germans and the British,
  Was to him ideal for farms.
SNAFAU was the term he gave it,
  But he took it just the same.
Insubordinate by nature,
  He remained the way he came.

Thus they called him General Issue,
  Just plain GI Joe for short,
As he shrugged at regulations
  And made discipline a sport;
Voiced his caustic observations
  Without caring who might hear;
Viewed both officers and non-coms
  As a parson looks at beer.

Sergeants moved him to coin phrases
  Which defy a writer's use;
While lieutenants were the object
  Of his penchant for abuse.
Added to his native talents
  And the courage of his race,
Stubborn pride made him a soldier
  Whom the Germans feared to face.

When the dawn barrage exploded
  Its terrific missile shower,
Every GI cursed the "bastards
  Who dared wake him at this hour."
When he learned his lines were severed,
  And his radios were jammed,
He accepted isolation
  With the comment, "I'll be damned."

At a far advanced command post,
  Facing winter quartered Huns—
Where Intelligence reported
  Just two horse-drawn heavy guns,
A GI observed with wisdom
  From his country Uncle Seth,
"Christ, the Germans must be working
  Those two horses half to death!"

Where a small group manned machineguns
  In the midst of German tanks—
Mowed down wave on wave of Germans
  From their endless charging ranks,
"Take a breather," called a German
  In good English, "We'll be back."
"Not unless you watch that traffic."
  Was a GI's answering crack.

Thus the "brat" who broke your window,
  And the "kid" who dunked your cat;
Stuffed your paper down the drainpipe;
  Or threw snowballs at your hat,
Called upon his love of mischief
  When his life was on the block—
Shrugged at hardship and disaster;
  Laughed at battle's fearful shock.

Every ounce of him a soldier;
  Every inch of him a man—
When he fought your battles for you;
  Ate with fingers from a can.
And the courage of his laughter
  Dulled the panic of his fear—
When it came his turn for dying,
  He stepped up without a tear.

Central America Asks Abrogation of Canal Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many months there has been much discussion of a second canal across the American isthmus. For such an undertaking, there have been various sites proposed, extending from Tehuantepec to Colombia. Of these locations, the Nicaragua site has always been the historic rival of Panama.

With that possibility in mind, the Government of Nicaragua, in the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty of August 5, 1914, proclaimed June 24, 1916, granted in perpetuity exclusive proprietary rights to

the United States for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an interoceanic canal by way of the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua. In ratifying that treaty, the Senate of the United States provided for safeguarding the rights of Costa Rica, Salvador, and Honduras. The text of the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty and its amendments can be found in the 1931 report of the U.S. Army Interoceanic Canal Board (H. Doc. 139, 72d Cong.) page 242.

Despite the construction of the Panama Canal the people of Central America have never forgotten the idea of a second canal at Nicaragua and, in the intervening years, have periodically advocated it. This is merely one more facet in the overall canal question, which requires an independent investigation under congressional authorization.

The latest development is a movement among Central American countries, no doubt following the example of Panama, to demand abrogation of the 1914 Nicaragua Canal treaty. The official source of this movement is revealed in the following news story:

[From the Panama American (Panama, Republic of Panama), Dec. 31, 1962]

CENTRAL AMERICA ASKS ABROGATION OF CANAL TREATY

MANAGUA, December 31.—The presidents of Central American States will urge President Kennedy to abrogate a treaty giving the United States the right to build an interoceanic canal in Central America, a high Nicaraguan official said yesterday.

The official said the request will be made at the January Central American presidents meeting in San Salvador, El Salvador. Kennedy has promised to address the meeting.

The treaty in question is the Bryan-Chamorro pact signed by the United States and Nicaragua in 1916. For $3 million, Nicaragua ceded the United States the perpetual right to construct a canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, using the streambed of the San Juan River.

Both El Salvador and Costa Rica have been unsuccessful in getting the treaty annulled in international courts. El Salvador alleges that the treaty violates territorial boundaries, and Costa Rica charges the pact fails to secognize Costa Rican access rights to the San Juan headwaters.

Honduras also opposed the treating signing.

There has been speculation that the Central American Confederation (Organization of Central American States) might eventually seek to build its own canal.

Irrigation in the Ozarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the members of the Southwest Missouri—Seventh Congressional District—Farm Advisory Council, Mr. Gene Poirot, has made remarkable strides in the application of irrigation to farm problems in the Missouri Ozarks. Members of my farm advisory council and others who have attended our meetings are extremely interested in developing a program for making water for irrigation at low cost readily available in adequate quantity during the dry spell as a means of strengthening the agricultural economy. At a recent inspection tour of his irrigation system, Mr. Poirot elaborated in great detail on this subject.

Under permission to extend my remarks, the following is his challenge to those who attended:

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss some thoughts for increasing the production of economic goods in this area. Our most important natural resources are (1) agricultural soils, and (2) people.

The fundamental problems, simply stated, is to increase the efficient production of profitable products from the soil, and to, as far as possible, process such products in the rural towns, thus using the labor available there.

The supply of labor is already great enough to exceed the local demand, causing many of the boys and girls, educated at our expense, to leave us at a time when they are ready to create wealth by their work. The profitable employment of these people at home would be most desirable.

Our most important natural resource from which to create new products is agricultural soil. Such soil may be a hillside of half rock and gravel or a rich bottom field. If and when they are put to the proper use they will grow profitable products which must be hauled, processed and wrapped, and transported for the market by labor available at home.

We have already increased the capacity of our soils to produce by an average of more than 300 percent in the last 30 years. Many farmers have increased their individual capacities by 600 or 700 percent. What are the limiting factors that now prevent farmers from reaching much higher levels in our southwest Missouri area?

Some of the limiting factors are:

1. Water for irrigation at low cost, readily available in adequate quantity during a dry spell.

2. More suitable crops or products, of higher values, which can be best produced under our conditions of soil, climate, and markets.

There are agencies already available to help us meet the problems posed by the limiting factors. The effort of farmers and businessmen can lead to a coordinated program by these agencies for this area. The effort can be stimulated by calling attention to the good final results through the columns of rural and urban newspapers. The final financial result is as important to the people in town as it is to the farmer.

In certain watersheds, irrigation water can be provided by the Federal Soil and Water Conservation Service. The necessary financial aid to individual farmers or groups of farmers can be provided by the Federal Farm and Home Administration, local banks, and other local credit sources.

"The first necessary step," according to Gene Poirot, "is to vote in the soil and water conservation districts for Lawrence and Jasper Counties. All surrounding counties have already voted in these districts. Only when this is done can the Federal Soil and Water Conservation Service go to work in surveying and outlining the project for any watershed. Through this service, if we want it and will ask for it we can have much cheaper irrigation water than any now available to farmers in the West from Government high dams and lakes now supplying it to them. We will need far less of it to grow as much or more than they are growing."

The limiting factor of "More suitable crops or products of higher value" is a task of research which can be undertaken by the college of agriculture at the new research center at Mount Vernon, Mo.

"We have lost the tomato industry in the Ozarks while at the same time the demand for tomatoes has increased. Research in other places has developed tomatoes which can be grown in greater amounts per acre and of more desirable quality than those we were growing here. We have lost the strawberry industry to other States to the extent that while we are harvesting our crop, strawberries of better quality produced in California, 2,000 miles away, are being sold in our local stores. We are losing much of our dairy industry and in the end will lose the industries which process the milk we should be producing. Our potential to produce high-grade vegetables and fruits for freezing and canning here at home, crops for special oils and industrial raw materials, drugs and medical plants, grains and alfalfa meal for feeding larger numbers of dairy and beef cattle, is here if we have the water and the necessary research.

"Research must not be considered as an infallible cure-all. Our State's greatest single resource of wealth is agriculture. Most taxes are being paid by those who provide materials and services to agriculture and who haul and process farm products. The amount of money, however, appropriated for research to expand this wealth-creating machine of agriculture is shamefully low and for that reason does not bring the results enjoyed by other States. The farmer's part of the actual money value resulting from the findings of research is estimated at less than one-seventh of the total return. The human nutrition value to all of us is the difference between our living better than any other people in the world at less cost, or living in fear of starvation. Money for agricultural research should always be in substantial amounts and with it should go demands for results of economic value.

"This is an outline of the thinking done by farmers and businessmen who have been in contact with the college of agriculture, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Farmers Home Administration representatives, various county agents, our Congresman, State senators and representatives. All of these agencies and people are ready to give the general idea their support and to work out more of the details as the project takes form. Can we count on your help for your town and farming community?"

Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Clare Boothe Luce appeared in the Washington Star of February 2.

Mrs. Luce has given some study, and her original thinking, to the present situation in Europe—General de Gaulle's stand on Britain's entry into the Common Market.

Apparently, apart from Mrs. Luce, and a few others not very high in the councils of state, the whole situation has caught the United States and its policymakers completely by surprise and flatfooted.

Most of what has happened could have been foreseen, but obviously not by those

happy souls who felt that the handling of the Cuban situation was a triumph for our diplomatic policy and technique.

General de Gaulle is too old a hand and too great a patriot to hand over his country's, and Europe's, future to such slap-happy treatment.

POINT OF VIEW—DE GAULLE UPHELD ON NUCLEAR STAND

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

PHOENIX, ARIZ., February 2.—The President was asked in his last press conference what he thought of the theory put forward in Europe that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was linked in General de Gaulle's mind with his determination to have his own nuclear deterrent force, because Cuba showed that the United States would not defend Europe.

The President replied that this charge had indeed been directly made, and he indicated that some Europeans had deduced from the fact that the naval blockade had ended with Moscow in unchallenged control of Cuba that, "since the Soviet developed their own nuclear capacity there is a balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and neither would use it, and therefore Europe cannot rely on the United States." This he called "peculiar logic."

But after Cuba not only some, in some parts of Europe, but also many in many parts of America, and in Latin America, no longer believe in the United States commitment to defend other countries from communism, if to do so should mean to initiate a nuclear war with Soviet Russia.

And, the President's remarks notwithstanding, there is much recent evidence that Mr. Khrushchev himself is now thoroughly convinced that once the 400,000 American troops in Germany are withdrawn, America's nuclear commitment will then extend no farther than its own coast line.

KHRUSHCHEV ASSUMES ROLE

If memory serves, after the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion, Mr. Kennedy repeately warned Mr. Khrushchev that communism in this hemisphere was "not negotiable." Mr. Khrushchev, strongly suspecting that this warning was merely for United States domestic political consumption, bolding seized the opportunity to put it to the acid test: Fully aware that he would be detected in the end, he sneaked nuclear weapons into Cuba, and zeroed them in on the White House.

When the President found this out—quite a long while after Cuban intelligence sources had told him it was happening—his reaction was immediate. He called out the Navy, which called Mr. Khrushchev's brilliantly and carefully calculated bluff.

This was probably precisely what Mr. Khrushchev intended. Mr. Khrushchev had long been in the position of having to lose his face in order to save it. He wanted to lose his ugly nuclear "mug"—the face of the nuclear aggressor. He was anxious to show the world that he was not the man to start a nuclear war against anybody over a third country, and he certainly wanted to have it made plain that Mr. Kennedy wasn't the man either. A solid basis for negotiations of all kinds (and popular fronts of all kinds) could be built on the foundations of a U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. nuclear peace pact.

One can only imagine Mr. Khrushchev's satisfaction when his theory vis-a-vis the U.S.A. military position was proven correct. But he could hardly have been prepared for the next surprise. No sooner had he agreed to remove all the nuclear hardware U.S. air surveillance had spotted, then Mr. Kennedy at once referred to him as a great statesman and, to show that there needn't be any hard feelings over the little episode, gave him Cuba.

KHRUSHCHEV REPEATS THREAT

Mr. Khrushchev did not naturally bother to return the President's compliment. He realized, of course, that it had been made to gentle him. (Mr. Khrushchev is as easy to gentle as a king cobra.) A few weeks later at the East Berlin World Communist Congress Mr. Khrushchev was bragging to the world that his missile play in Cuba had achieved its real objective—to scare Mr. Kennedy into giving up Cuba. After accepting the thunderous applause of the 2,500 Communist Party delegates present from 70 nations, Mr. Khrushchev vowed all over again to bury us, this time with his 100-megaton bombs, but only if we were ever so rash as to initiate a nuclear attack on him.

Ever since Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev has worked hard on his new image. Each passing day he sounds more and more like John Foster Dulles: He will never launch missiles at the United States of America (or Europe), but he will—if attacked—produce "massive retaliation."

The fact is that Mr. Khrushchev had long ago opted for nuclear peace with the United States. Since Cuba, he knows that the United States has also opted for nuclear peace with Soviet Russia. There is today an undeclared nuclear peace pact between the U.S.S.R. and the United States for the simple reason that the initiation of nuclear war is not to the best interests of either.

The U.S. press, following the President's lead, is currently taking a benign view of Mr. Khrushchev's new nuclear posture. (Besides, it feels so good since he stopped poking his Cuban missiles into our solar plexis.) The vials of their wrath have been saved up for Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has had the gall to say, since Cuba, that he thinks France would now certainly be more safe under its own nuclear umbrella than under America's.

DE GAULLE BACKED UNITED STATES

Because of this, General de Gaulle's "image" is being rapidly worked over, with the enthusiastic help of the American left, to resemble a half-mad Napoleon, or an Abominable No-man. It is even being suggested that General de Gaulle wishes France to become a nuclear power in order to make a deal over Germany with Russia. This is to suggest that France desires to have Russia on her own borders, instead of Germany's, which is, of course, preposterous. If either France or Germany falls to the Reds, all Europe falls with them, and every European knows it.

It is interesting to inquire what General de Gaulle was doing the first tense hours of the United States naval blockade, while Soviet missiles were being leveled by Russian troops on American cities. Was he threatening to pull out of the "grand alliance" if the United States invaded Cuba? Was he begging us to throw the whole business into the U.N.? Was he reminding us that the French feel that the United States let France down in Indochina, Algeria, and Suez, so France couldn't be expected to sympathize with our troubles about Cuba? Was he advising President Kennedy to make a deal with Khrushchev about Cuba fast, because if the United States invaded Cuba Khrushchev might retaliate by striking at West Berlin and thus trigger world war III?

He was not. The general was offering to fight by the side of the United States if we felt our vital interests required us to kick Castro and Khrushchev both out of Cuba. And by this very fact he was pledging France to take all the nuclear risks we felt we might be incurring.

The President, in his recent press conference, acknowledged that General de Gaulle "responded when we were in difficulty in Cuba." "But," he added, with some extraordinarily peculiar logic of his own, "I would hope that our confidence in him would be matched by his confidence in us."

FRANCE GAINS STRENGTH

This whole sentence must have been a typographical error.

The President had just admitted a period back, that when we were in difficulties President de Gaulle had shown the ultimate in confidence by his willingness to risk nuclear war (if risk there was) by the side of America.

What the President really meant to say, of course, was that whereas President de Gaulle had shown confidence in us at the time of the naval blockade, the final United States political capitulation to Khrushchev and Castro had diminished that confidence, and that the President hoped that somehow it could be restored.

The hope is an idle one. The fault is by no means entirely the President's. France has grown economically strong enough to stand on her own legs. It would follow naturally, in any case, that she should desire sooner or later to stand on her own legs militarily. The significance of the two Kennedy backdowns over Cuba is that what was a desire now seems—or at least to General de Gaulle—to be an urgent necessity for France's own survival.

The character of the U.S. nuclear commitment made in 1946 changed in the fifties when Russia became itself a nuclear power. Today, as in 1946, that commitment is to launch a nuclear attack on Soviet Russia if she moves against Germany. But in 1963 the same commitment means a willingness to destroy the United States for the sake of Europe. When the matter is put in this blunt fashion, how many Americans are for it?

Khrushchev took the full measure of President Kennedy and U.S. public opinion in the Cuban crisis. So did Charles de Gaulle. His conclusion: If the war chips should ever go down in Europe, the United States will not initiate nuclear war on Russia until Russia wages nuclear war on America—and vice versa. The effect of this undeclared nuclear pact is to subtract both United States and U.S.S.R. nuclear forces from the European military equation.

BORROWS KENNEDY BOOK

Europe is today, without its own nuclear force, a "limited war" area. Consequently the outcome of any European conflict would then be decided by Russia's 125 divisions and NATO's 23—or a negotiation. Militarily Europe is Germany and France. Their choice today is as plain as the nose on General de Gaulle's face. It is to get their own nuclear umbrella, or to trust the United States, if they are attacked by Russian conventional weapons, to launch her missiles at Russia, knowing that she would get Russia's 100-ton megaton bombs right back.

General de Gaulle has made the only choice a patriotic Frenchman could possibly make. Like the rational Frenchman he is, he chooses to build up his own nuclear establishment. He knows that the day U.S. troops are pulled out of Germany, France will be unable to defend itself without its own nuclear force.

In his youth, President Kennedy wrote a book called "While England Slept." It described how England, in 1939, was caught militarily napping by the Germans, and its very sound thesis was that no nation can afford to wait until it is attacked to prepare its own defenses, and that above all, it cannot rely on the military or economic strength—even of its allies—to save it from destruction.

Charles de Gaulle has paid the author of "While England Slept" the compliment of taking his advice. He does not intend to be caught napping, if at some future date the United States, in order to prevent a world

holocaust (and its own destruction) yanks its nuclear umbrella away from Europe.

It is hard to see what is "Napoleonic" about a Frenchman's desire to protect France, or why the desire to remove France from the category of a limited war area should be considered a folie de grandeur. What is much more a folie de grandeur is the desire of the United States to keep Europe a U.S. nuclear colonial area and to keep Great Britain, France, and Germany forever in the U.S. nuclear nursery.

Washington Announces Flag Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a joint United States-Panama communique issued on January 10, 1963, by the Department of State summarizes the results of 6 months' discussions between Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., of the Canal Zone, and Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, representing the United States, and representatives of Panama.

While the items listed in this release are characterized by certain officials of our Government as only minor concessions to Panamanian aspirations of no consequence, realistic Panamanians and Americans on the isthmus are not misled by such talk.

It is deplorable that the press of our country has virtually ignored this issue. In contrast, the press of the isthmus has featured it in banner headlines.

The following news story from the Star & Herald, of Panama, Republic of Panama, the well-known Latin-American newspaper established in 1849, quotes the indicated joint communique:

WASHINGTON ANNOUNCES FLAG AGREEMENT—CONSULS' EXEQUATURS, STAMPS ALSO COVERED

(By Endre Marton)

WASHINGTON, January 10.—The United States and Panama announced today that agreement has been reached on the display of the flag of Panama and on the functioning of foreign consuls in the Canal Zone.

A joint communique issued by the State Department summarized the results of 6 months of discussions in Panama. The talks started last summer after President Roberto F. Chiari's visit with President John F. Kennedy "to discuss points of dissatisfaction," the State Department said.

Gov. Robert J. Fleming and Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, the U.S. envoy to Panama, met regularly every second week with Panamanian representatives, State Department officials said and added that the joint communique represents the results of the talks.

The first issue settled, the communique said, was an agreement on the use of the Panamanian flag which in the future "will be flown together with the flag of the United States of America on land in the Canal Zone where the flag of the United States of America is flown by civilian authorities."

The two countries had agreed in September 1960 that the flag of Panama could be flown on one particular site, officials explained, and added that this was not a satisfactory solution for the Panamanians. They said that the new arrangement will authorize Panama to fly its flag in the Canal Zone in about 16 to 20 sites.

Private organizations and persons in the zone are free to display flags at will over their places of residence or business, the communique said, and added that other aspects of the flag question will be discussed later.

The second point of the communique affects foreign consuls. The two countries agreed that "on the basis of exequaturs issued by the Government of Panama" such foreign consuls may function in the Canal Zone. The exequatur is a formal document, sort of a license to practice issued by the host government to a foreign consul.

The agreement means that the U.S. Government will not issue such a document in the future but the aide memoire attached to the joint communique explained that the United States "would not be agreeable" to the opening of a consular office in the zone by a government not recognized by the United States.

Also, the aide memoire said, the United States preserves the right to "prohibit a consular officer from acting in the Canal Zone if, for example, in the opinion of the U.S. Government, a situation arises in the future in which a consular officer accredited by Panama is a security risk, or his functioning would interfere with the operation, maintenance, or defense of the canal."

This means in practice, the aide memoire explained, that Panama would notify the State Department that it has issued an exequatur to a foreign consul. Then the State Department will inform the Government of Panama whether it has no objections to the functioning of the foreign consul, but should the State Department object then the consul cannot undertake consular functions in the Canal Zone.

The communique listed the following issues as still pending: Labor problems relating to Panamanian citizens who work in the Canal Zone; the use of Panamanian postage stamps; and Panama's needs for pier facilities in Cristobal. These subjects, the communique said, continue to be under study and discussion.

The communique formally announcing the United States-Panama agreement on the display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone was issued simultaneously at noon yesterday by the Panama Foreign Office and the U.S. State Department.

There was immediate speculation on what effect such an official announcement would have on the action pending in the U.S. district court in Ancon which is aimed at restraining the Governor of the Canal Zone from displaying the Panamanian flag in the zone.

The speculation ranged from opinions that the announcement nullifies the pending court action to opinions that in the absence of a formal proclamation by the President of the United States the official communique has little effect on the flag suit.

The full text of the joint communique is as follows:

"The representatives of the Governments of the Republic of Panama and of the United States of America, appointed to discuss points of dissatisfaction in United States-Panamanian relations with regard to the Canal Zone have periodically met during the past 4 months. Various aspects of pending questions have been discussed up to the present, with the following results:

"1. It has been agreed that the flag of the Republic of Panama will be flown together with the flag of the United States of America on land in the Canal Zone where the flag of the United States of America is flown by civilian authorities. Private organizations and persons in the zone are free to display flags at will over their places of residence or business. Other aspects of the flag question will be discussed later.

"2. Foreign consuls, on the basis of exequaturs issued by the Government of Panama and, in accordance with procedures and understandings which have been agreed upon by the Government of Panama and the Government of the United States, may function in the Canal Zone. Subject of these procedures and understandings, the U.S. Government will cease issuing documents of exequatur.

"3. The representatives of both Governments have discussed labor problems relating to Panamanian citizens who work in the Canal Zone. Special attention has been devoted to the subjects of wage scales, equal opportunities for Panamanian and United States citizens at all levels, and social security benefits. All these problems continue to be under discussion.

"4. The representatives of Panama submitted for discussion the question of using Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone postal system. The U.S. Government has proposed the use of Panamanian postage stamps in the zone in accordance with technical arrangements now under consideration and in accordance with international postal standards.

"5. In accordance with instructions, the representatives have discussed Panama's need for pier facilities and have visited the present pier facilities in Cristobal. This subject continues to be under discussion.

"The representatives of the Governments of the United States of America and of the Republic of Panama will continue their present discussions aimed at finding solutions to other problems which remain unresolved.

"The discussions are continuing in the spirit of the joint communique issued by the President of Panama and the President of the United States of America at the end of the visit which the President of Panama made to Washington in June of last year. From time to time additional joint communiques outlining the program of the discussions will be issued."

An announcement from the Canal Zone Doyle Flag Fund—named after Gerald A. Doyle, plaintiff in the Canal Zone flag suit—said that $4,800 has been raised already. The estimated minimum cost for legal fees and expenses is $12,000.

In Panama City, a group of business organizations issued a resolution of support to the Panamanian Government for its "just claims of our sovereign rights in the Canal Zone" and to the "authorities of the United States for ordering the raising of our flag in the Canal Zone in recognition of one of the rights of Panama which had been ignored heretofore."

The resolution was approved by the Federation of Chambers of Commerce, the Panamanian Association of Business Executives, the National Association of Cattlemen, and the Association of Real Estate Owners of Panama.

Robert Lekachman on Taxes and Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President has laid before this House an unprecedented proposal. He has explicitly asked the Congress to accept the Federal Budget as an instrument for maintaining an overall balance in the economy. To this end he has

called for a general cut in taxes in order to encourage consumption and investment to make full use of our presently unemployed resources.

So important a proposal is certain to generate controversy. Already it has been subjected to sharp and sustained criticism. But the criticism has very largely reflected a single perspective. These critics argue that a cut in taxes must be accompanied by a corresponding reduction in Federal expenditures.

In dealing with so vital an issue, we must be sure that we have considered several points of view. One concern seldom voiced in these halls but frequently expressed by reputable economists is that the President's proposed tax cut may prove to be too little and too late. Prof. Robert Lekachman, of Barnard College, has raised this question. Moreover, Professor Lekachman urges increased Federal expenditures for our pressing social needs as a stimulant for economic growth.

I believe many Members besides myself will find it helpful to consider such arguments in reaching a judgment on the President's proposal. Under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by Professor Lekachman which appeared in the New Leader for February 4, 1963:

TAXES AND BUDGETS

(By Robert Lekachman)

In combination the state of the Union, the budget, the economic, and the tax messages make explicit the grand economic design for the remainder of President Kennedy's term of office. The administration has committed itself to the proposition that unemployment can be reduced to tolerable proportions, economic growth can be stimulated, and budget balance can ultimately be attained primarily through the expanded private activity which is the expected consequence of lighter corporate and personal taxes.

The President has openly accepted Walter Heller's thesis that the high progression of present taxes takes so much money out of private hands that expansions are checked far short of full employment, either of factories or of men and women. The solution is implicit in the theory's premises: Smaller and less progressive taxes will diminish the danger of repetition of the incomplete recoveries from the 1957–58 and the 1950 recessions, and will terminate the quasi-stagnation which these episodes left in their wake.

The details of the President's budget are consistent with this economic doctrine. On the expenditure side, only military, space, and debt service programs receive generous provisions. In fact, almost the whole of the $4.5 billion increase in the 1964 budget represents the sum of an expansion of defense programs from $53 billion this fiscal year to $55.4 billion in the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1963, and of space spending from this year's $2.4 billion to next year's $4.2 billion. The budget envisages total expenditures of $98.8 billion and a deficit of $11.9 billion.

Thus, on paper at least, the President has averted the twin political hazards of breaking the $100 billion barrier and exceeding Eisenhower's record peacetime deficit of $12.4 billion in 1959. In order to do so, he has deliberately reduced "the total of administrative budget expenditures for all other programs combined . . . slightly below the 1963 level." This decision makes it certain that even if such programs as education, youth opportunity, medical care and manpower retraining are advocated, the sums to be appropriated will be small.

The biggest news is on the revenue side of the budget. In a huge message, the President has placed before Congress a combination of tax reductions and tax reforms which are surely the most controversial, as they are the most technical, portions of the tax prospectus. At his January 24 press conference, Kennedy indicated a certain flexibility in his approach to the reforms and a greater insistence upon the tax reductions. Some of the reforms are designed to alleviate hardships; these include a slightly less grudging approach to the costs of child care, an improved income-averaging provision, and a little more latitude for small businesses.

Other reforms are designed to close loopholes. Two of the more noteworthy of these efforts subject stock option gains to taxation at ordinary income-tax rates and eliminate the dividend credit and exemption passed during the Eisenhower administration. One of the most controversial changes will curtail the benefits of itemizing deductions by forcing the taxpayer to bear the burden of his own deductions up to 5 percent of his income. One omission, however, is conspicuous. Even though death has removed Senator Robert Kerr and Speaker Sam Rayburn from the legislative scene and the Vice Presidency has diminished LYNDON JOHNSON's political effectiveness, the President is still not prepared to do anything about the granddaddy of all tax loopholes, the mineral depletion allowance.

Although Congress may well spend most of its time on these reforms, the heart of the administration program is general tax reduction. Over the next 3 years the President is asking a global reduction of taxes of $13.6 billion. If all the tax reforms which he advocates are somehow miraculously enacted, the Treasury will gain an offsetting $3.4 billion and the net tax reduction will be reduced to $10.22 billion. Corporations will pay 47 instead of 52 percent of their profits in corporate income tax, after the three-stage reduction is completed. And at the end of their 3 years of tax reduction, individuals will have traded the present 20- to 91-percent rate structure for a 14- to 65-percent structure.

The combination of reforms and rate reductions makes an estimate of the distribution of the benefits difficult. The Treasury's examples of impact upon families of four suggest that, within the $5,000–$20,000 range at least, those who receive the smaller incomes will enjoy the largest percentage savings. The family whose adjusted gross income is $5,000 will pay 18.3 percent less taxes, but the $20,000 family will gain only 13.4 percent of its present taxes. Alert as always to its constituents' interests, the Wall Street Journal estimates 9 percent savings for those whose incomes exceed $50,000.

In themselves, tax cuts and tax reforms are excellent policies. In 1963, however, they must meet the test of adequate response to what the Council of Economic Advisers calls "5 years of persisting slack in the economy." The stigmata of that "slack" include average unemployment during these 5 years of 6 percent, a rise between 1948 and 1957 of the average duration of unemployment from 10.3 to 14.3 weeks, and a cumulative loss of economic output between 1958 and 1962 in excess of $170 billion. Today, at the conclusion of the second year of recovery from the 1960 recession, the gap between actual and potential production is $30 to $40 billion.

Will tax reduction solve the problem? Will consumers spend 92 to 94 per cent of their additional income on goods and services, as they have in the past? Will businessmen dramatically expand their purchases of tools, machinery and inventories because lower corporate taxes leave them a larger share of the profits which they earn, and enlarged consumer outlays places pressure on existing facilities? Will unemployment obediently respond by approaching the still depressingly high interim target of 4 percent?

Such consequences are not impossible, but neither are they highly probable. For one thing, the current economic expansion is fairly long already. Even as the Council of Economic Advisers forecasts moderate expansion during 1963, it notes that such a recovery will stretch over 34 months—the second longest expansion in the postwar period. But if the Council is more nearly accurate in its bullish forecast this year than it was last year, the employment outlook is still extremely grim.

Additions to the labor force have begun to show the effects of the postwar surge in birthrates. Babies born in 1945 are youths seeking jobs in 1963. The Council estimates an expansion of the labor force in 1963 by 1.2 million persons, double the 1962 increment. If unemployment in the smaller labor force of 1962 is to be reduced from the current 5.6 percent to 4 percent, another 1.1 million jobs must be provided. If business improves, as many as 800,000 persons will be drawn back to the labor market or drawn into it, from homes, schools and retirement. And this total of 3.1 million new jobs does not even take into account the needs of workers forced out of their present jobs by technological improvement, factory reorganization and computing devices.

In itself the administration's tax program certainly promises relatively little for 1963. On the President's own schedule, effective tax relief, starting July 1, 1963, will produce benefits of the order of $1.5 billion. Expenditure increases in the same period will amount to another $2.3 billion. Even if a multiplier of 3 is applied to these amounts to take account of the effects of respending of the original increments to income, the total increase in gross national product is only a bit over $11 billion, or no more than a third of the gap between actual and potential output of last year. New investment and net additions to the labor force will considerably enlarge that gap as the year continues. Unless we are extremely fortunate, unemployment will be just about as large at the end of the current year as it was at the end of 1962.

Quite possibly the President's analysis of the politics of his program explains his pledge to curtail nondefense spending and to spread tax reduction over 3 years. Politics may have something to do with the free-enterprise tone of the state of the Union message: "A massive increase in Federal spending could also create jobs and growth—but in today's setting, private consumers, employers, and investors should be given a full opportunity first." Nevertheless, in purely economic terms the program offers too little, begins too late, and spreads itself over too long a period. Offered at the end of a recession or the beginning of an upturn, the tax reductions might make good sense. Near the end of a cyclical upturn, though, the best that can be expected is a cushioning of the next recession.

Yet even if the timing and the size of this fiscal measure were appropriate to the economic circumstances, a serious question needs to be asked about the quality of the President's design for economic growth and high employment. Keynesian doctrine conceives the treatment for the disease of deficient total demand to be the increase of business, consumer or government outlays on goods and services. In the present protracted period of deficient total demand, an intelligent administration faces the choice of whose demand to stimulate.

By focusing upon private spending, President Kennedy declares that an additional dollar spent by a consumer or a businessman is more important than an additional dollar spent by Federal agencies. New machines designed to produce more goods Americans

must be persuaded to buy assume a greater value than aid to underdeveloped countries. Tax savings for prosperous Americans become more significant than improved vocational education, more adequate programs of manpower retraining, general aid to education and more rational programs of urban redevelopment.

Nor is this emphasis upon increased private spending capable at its best of handling another structural difficulty: the combined impact of technological progress in manufacturing and the continuing shift of employment and spending from manufacturing to the service trades and professions. The rash of newspaper and dock strikes is an unsurprising union reaction to what the solid citizen is prone to regard as technical progress. The reaction will grow stronger unless we learn to cope with the human fact that every threatened worker is a natural luddite.

The Council of Economic Advisers correctly observes that "past periods of expansion have demonstrated industry's capacity for employing and training large numbers of persons who were considered unemployable in times of slack." But it is equally cogent in its emphasis upon programs which get short shrift in the President's appropriations plans: youth opportunities, expanded support of Manpower Development and Training Act programs, and rapid integration of the adjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act.

It may well be that we can enjoy the fruits of technological advance only if we act vigorously on a number of fronts. Retraining and vocational education are two of them. Probably the most vital is education in general. For one of the obstacles which current retraining programs encounter is the inadequate basic education of the workers enrolled in them. If, as now seems likely, young Americans need to be prepared to change skills several times during their working lives, they urgently require the command of mathematics, language arts, and the operations of their own society which the inadequacies of our schools prevent many of them from acquiring. In 1961 the President was correct when he declared that education was our most pressing domestic problem. It still is, but every sign points to administration concessions rather than to its doing battle in this critical area of future unemployment.

In many detailed respects the President's program is thoughtful and equitable. The $300 deduction allowable for all taxpayers will benefit primarily small taxpayers, and the tax saving for very low income groups may be as large as 39 percent. And if the President has left the oil depletion allowance untouched, he has at least struck as some of the associated loopholes to the extent of seeking $280 million of extra revenue from the oil and gas industry.

Still more important, for the first time in our history the Chief Executive has boldly deployed the budget as an instrument of national policy. In seeking a deficit, President Kennedy has broken with the ancient practice of his predecessors of deliberately exaggerating revenues and understating expenditures. He has even taken a step toward familiarizing the American public with the cash budget, a much better measure of the icpact of Federal operations on the economy than the conventional administrative budget.

The pity is that the President has combined this sensible vision of fiscal possibilities with so limited an estimate of American needs. Indeed, if legislative cavemen like Senator Harry Byrd and Representative Clarence Cannon and their journalistic sympathizers like Arthur Krock and David Lawrence did not scream so loudly about New Frontier radicalism, it would be almost impossible to disguise the fact that in economic affairs our President is moderate, optimistic and devoted to private enterprise. As Nicholas Davenport observed in the London Spectator, he appears to be running for president of the entire capitalist system.

How Good Do Old Folks Have It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this body, a report which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of January 21, 1963, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT—HOW GOOD DO OLD FOLKS HAVE IT?

Tax planners, looking for added sources of income to tax, have their eye on income of a favored group—older people.

Over the years, persons who reach the age of 65 and those who retire have been given one tax concession after another.

Income from social security pensions, amounting now to $14.5 billion a year, is tax free. At 65, each individual enjoys a personal exemption double that of those younger. There also is a special tax credit on retirement income. Medical deductions of persons over 65 are far more generous.

A suggestion has been made that social security benefits be made subject to income tax. The special tax credit is viewed critically by some tax planners. Odds are strong there will be no action to take away these tax favors in 1963, although the privileges of old people will continue to get official attention.

NO LONGER "FORGOTTEN"

Benefits now going to old people, in taxes and other fields, represent a dramatic swing of the pendulum in the course of a little more than 25 years.

In the days before 1936, persons over 65 were largely the forgotten people. There was no social security system to provide a monthly check. Private pensions were few. Each family was expected to take care of members unable to care for themselves.

Young people, in those days, were the more favored group. Now the older people get the concessions and the younger age groups bear an increasing load.

It is pointed out that young families today carry the big burden. They start out with homes to establish and pay for, with children to educate, with insurance costs to meet, and an estate to build.

Along the way, taxes have tended to go up on the houses they buy and on the incomes they earn.

Now it is being suggested that real estate taxes and State and local sales taxes not be allowed as deductions against income subject to Federal taxes.

A POWERFUL BLOC

Old people find that they have great strength as a group. On proposals affecting group interests, there is a tendency for the aged to stand together.

Right now there are more than 17 million persons in this country who are 65 or older—nearly double the number in 1940. By 1970, this age group will exceed 20 million—not far from 10 percent of the total population.

Politicians have learned that the aged, as a group, can be a potent force. Over the years the tendency has been to compete in giving favors to old people, rather than in taking away favors already granted.

Actually, up to now, young people have favored more and more benefits for those who are growing old. They look forward to the time when they, too, will be retiring. At that time they will want the financial security afforded by a pension, the ability to be independent and not a burden on their children.

BENEFITS THAT GROW

The result of the attitude of younger people has been broad support for an increasingly generous social security program. For example:

Cash benefits have been raised every few years. Workers permanently disabled before age 65 have been made eligible for pensions. Retirement age of 65 has been cut to 62, for those willing to take reduced pensions.

With the rise in benefits, however, have come stiffer taxes on working people. Effective January 1, the social security tax rose one-half point to 3⅝ percent of the first $4,800 of a worker's pay—the ninth increase since 1949.

This tax must be matched by employers, bringing total payroll taxes now to 7¼ percent. Within 5 years the combined social security tax will climb to 9¼ percent.

On top of this, President Kennedy is proposing an added program of hospital and nursing-home care for social security pensioners. This would open up a broad new field of benefits. Costs eventually could run into the billions annually as the aged population grows and as benefits, following past trends, are liberalized. Payroll taxes, meanwhile, would have to be pushed still higher.

Already, social security taxes are a heavier burden on many lower income workers with large families than are income taxes.

For example, take a worker, with a wife and four children, earning $4,000 a year. His Federal income tax is negligible—$5. But his social security tax takes $145 out of the paycheck.

HOW FAVORS FALL

The charts on these pages give you an idea of benefits and favors granted older people.

A man and his wife retiring today can draw as much as $183 a month for the rest of their days. The maximum pension when retirements under social security first started, in 1940, was only $61.80 a month. The buying power of the pension dollar in those days, of course, was much larger than it is today.

In addition, many retired workers draw added retirement income from company pensions. The days when a firm gave a retiring worker only a gold watch and a handshake are over for the great majority of U.S. companies.

Added together, the two pensions often give a retired couple nearly two-thirds of preretirement income.

Take the case of a steelworker, making $400 a month, who retires at 65 after 30 years on the job. Assume his wife is also 65. Social security benefits for the couple will total $183 a month. The company pension will bring in $75.30 more. Total retirement pay: $258.30—equal to 65 percent of monthly income while working.

Or consider an auto worker and his wife with the same number of years on the job, but with earnings of $500 a month before retirement.

His social security check would be the same as that of the steelworker—$183—but the company pension would amount to $84. Total monthly income in this case: $267, or more than half of preretirement pay.

BONANZA IN BENEFITS

Social security benefits received by retired people far exceed the money paid into the program during working years.

A glance at the chart on page 69 shows you the bargains that are available.

By law, the people who receive social security pensions will have to pay no tax on such benefits.

That's only one of many tax concessions on the books.

Old people need not file a tax return unless income is $1,200 or more—double the amount at which other people must file a return.

An aged couple may deduct medical expenses up to $40,000. The requirement that medical expenses must exceed 3 percent of income to be deductible does not apply for old people.

Retirement income of certain types—such as interest, rents, dividends—up to $1,524 a year is given a special tax break. For a husband and wife, each with retirement income, the tax saving from this concession can run as high as $609.60 a year.

MORE SPECIAL AIDS

Housing programs of the Government provide added benefits for old folks.

The Public Housing Administration pays special subsidies for projects housing elderly people. From FHA, people 62 or older can get special mortgage-insurance terms to make it easier to build a home.

In many ways, thus, the Government eases the burdens of old age. More and more the idea has become: "Nothing is too good for the old folks."

Now, however, in the search for new revenue, tax planners wonder whether the trend may have gone too far.

THE "BARGAIN" OF SOCIAL SECURITY—SOME EXAMPLES

1. Employee paying maximum social security tax since program started in 1937, and retiring this month. Both worker and wife are 65.

Taxes paid by worker	$1,584
Taxes paid by employer	1,584
Total taxes paid	3,168
Benefits, in total, assuming normal life expectancy by both husband and wife	32,339

2. Employee paying maximum tax for 45 years, and retiring in 1982. Both worker and wife to reach 65 at that time.

Taxes paid by worker	$5,610
Taxes paid by employer	5,610
Total taxes paid	11,220
Benefits, in total, assuming normal life expectancy	33,399

3. Self-employed man paying maximum tax since 1951, when self-employed became eligible, and retiring this month. Worker and wife are 65.

Taxes paid	$1,724
Benefits, assuming normal life expectancy	32,339

"ALL-OUT" SOCIAL SECURITY: ITALY'S COST

ROME.—Americans who wonder how much it would cost in tax money to create an all-out system of social security can get an idea from what's happening in Italy.

Italian social-security taxes amount to more than 50 percent of payrolls.

The average worker pays about 8 percent of his wages in social-security taxes, and there is no upper limit to the amount on which these taxes apply. The employer contributes an amount equal to about 46 percent of each worker's pay in compulsory taxes.

In United States the social security tax has just gone up to 3⅝ percent each on the employee and the employer, and this applies only on the first $4,800 of pay.

In 1968, the U.S. tax is to rise to 4⅝ percent each on worker and employer.

If Americans now paid the same payroll taxes as Italians, the social security program would collect a staggering $160 billion in taxes annually.

An Italian making $2,000 a year pays $160 in social security taxes, while his employer pays $920—a total of $1,080.

In the United States, on the same day, there is now a combined social security tax of only $145—shared equally by the worker and the company.

And note this: Despite heavy taxes in Italy, the social security program is running in the red. The Government is having to dip into general tax revenues to make ends meet. Later this year, social security taxes will go up again on both workers and companies.

Italian social security covers a broad list of benefits. Among the major ones:

Workers can retire at age 60 under the system—or at age 55 for women—and draw a pension for life. The typical retirement check: $50 a month.

Complete costs of doctors and medicines are covered. Tax-paid hospitalization is provided up to 180 days a year for the worker, and up to 30 days a year for each dependent. Partial reimbursement is made for the cost of dental care and eyeglasses.

For a working mother who has a baby, the Government pays 80 percent of her wages for a period up to 3 months prior to the birth and 8 weeks after.

A worker absent from the job because of illness gets from the social security agency a cash allowance equal to half his pay for up to 150 days annually.

Social security in Italy pays a "family allowance." For example, each month a worker is paid $5.80 for his wife, $8 for each dependent child, and $2.30 for each dependent parent or grandparent.

The program also provides low-cost housing for workers who qualify—after years on a waiting list.

For this social-security umbrella, Italy will pay close to $5 billion this year. That's about 13½ percent of the country's output, as against 6 percent of U.S. national product going for social benefits.

Italy's social-security program got started 65 years ago. Initially, the program was modest and simple.

Now, Italians say, it has become so complex that people have trouble figuring out benefits due them.

Patronage institutes have sprung up around the country to help people determine their benefits. These institutes are subsidized by the Government—adding to the costs of the program.

The present system includes three major agencies—each completely independent of the other—and 23 smaller agencies. One of the principal agencies, alone, employs more than 16,000 people.

As the system has become more and more tangled, there are growing cries for reform. Up to now these cries have gone unheeded.

And there are many other complaints. Workers must go to doctors on a certified list, and many of these doctors have more patients than they can handle. Hospitals, in some cases, are short of beds and must turn patients away. Low-cost housing is often found to be shoddily built, lacking in needed facilities.

Italians, in general, approve the idea of social security, but many feel that they are not getting anywhere near their money's worth.

The 88th Congress and Our Highway Future—An Address Delivered by the Honorable William C. Cramer, of Florida, at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute in Washingon, D.C., January 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, of very special interest to me was the recent speech of our able colleague from Florida, the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, who addressed the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute at Washington's Statler Hotel, January 23, 1963.

As a member of the Public Works Committee on which Congressman CRAMER serves with distinction, I can attest to the vital interest the entire Nation has in our highway system. This is one of the reasons why Congressman CRAMER's remarks should be read by all of us.

Congressman CRAMER is currently the ranking Republican member of both the Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program. He is, indeed, qualified to discuss the topic, "The 88th Congress and Our Highway Future." I know my friends in the Limestone Institute enjoyed the privilege of hearing his address and I know my colleagues will find it as informative as I did.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I request that Congressman CRAMER's remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE 88TH CONGRESS AND OUR HIGHWAY FUTURE

"The 88th Congress and Our Highway Future"—this title could imply that the future of our highway program depends upon the 88th Congress. In one sense, of course, this is true. During the 88th Congress, careful attention will be devoted to the highway program, its progress, the laws pertaining to it, and related matters. I am sure that during the session the Congress will consider legislation which could have a deep and lasting impact on the highway program. In another sense, however, its future does not depend upon the 88th Congress. The present Federal-aid highway program is the result of the efforts of many succeeding sessions of Congress, beginning at least with the 64th Congress which, in 1916, enacted the original and basic Federal-Aid Road Act. The Federal-aid highway program is a continuing program, and, although each session of the Congress devotes attention to it and may enact laws which affect it, and has periodically expanded it, its basic concept has remained substantially the same: an essential, State-Federal partnership program, which must grow with the Nation and without which the Nation cannot grow. I am confident that the 88th Congress will not

alter this concept, or substantially change the Federal-aid highway program as it exists today, although I feel sure that the Congress will consider and enact legislation of considerable importance to the program.

OUTLOOK AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SESSION

Two years ago, at the beginning of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the problems confronting the highway program were varied, difficult, and, in some cases, highly controversial. First, it had become obvious that the revenues deposited in the Highway Trust Fund would not be sufficient to continue the highway program on an orderly basis under existing and anticipated authorizations. Second, the estimates of cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways made it clear that additional funds would have to be provided in order to complete the Interstate System as orginally planned. Third. the Special Subcommittee on Federal-aid Highway Program had disclosed serious deficiencies and irregularities in the highway program, including construction practices in Oklahoma, and intolerably cozy relationships between contractors in my own State of Florida.

In a fine display of bipartisan effort, the 87th Congress enacted the Federal-aid Highway Acts of 1961 and 1962. which provided solutions to most of the financial problems, continued the highway program on an orderly basis, and added certain modifications and revisions to the Federal-aid highway laws.

However, the 87th Congress did not solve all of the problems, and the 88th Congress will have much to do on the subject of highways.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE A–B–C SYSTEMS

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, with subsequent amendments, has already authorized the appropriation of funds adequate, on the basis of present estimates, to complete the 41,000-mile Interstate System in 1972, as originally contemplated. The next estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System is not required until 1966, so the 88th Congress will not be confronted with the problem of authorizations for that system.

However, authorizations for continuation of the construction of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways, and their extensions in urban areas, the so-called A–B–C program, has been on a biennial basis. These authorization bills traditionally have been considered and enacted during the 2d session of each Congress, and I expect the same practice will be followed by the 88th Congress.

The 87th Congress authorized the appropriation of $950 and $975 million, respectively, for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for the A–B–C program. In doing so, the Congress reaffirmed the original plan (which had been temporarily abandoned by the 86th Congress) to progressively increase authorizations for the A–B–C program until an annual authorization of $1 billion is reached. In light of this, I expect that the 88th Congress will authorize $1 billion for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, and I can assure you that this will have my full support.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY REFORM ACT

The 88th Congress will also give attention, I feel sure, to legislation to revise and strengthen the Federal criminal laws in regard to the highway program.

The Congress has repeatedly demonstrated its confidence in the highway program and the persons who are involved in it. I believe that most members of Congress share my firm belief, that the vast majority of persons who participate in the program are honest and competent. Nevertheless, it would be the height of naivete—it would be ignoring established facts—to pretend that no fraud, deficiencies or irregularities occur in the highway program. Such things do occur, and are almost inevitable in any program involving great sums of money and great numbers of people.

In order to punish the comparatively few persons who seek to profit at the expense of the public, and to provide strong deterrents to others who might be tempted to follow the same course, we must have comprehensive, adequate criminal laws. Experience over the past few years has made it obvious that the Federal criminal laws applicable to the Federal-aid highway program are badly in need of revision and strengthening.

In September of 1961, I introduced a bill to accomplish this objective. The 87th Congress took no action on the bill. However, I have introduced another bill for the consideration of the 88th Congress and am hopeful that my bill or a comparable one will be enacted.

Briefly speaking, my bill would do the following:

1. It would prohibit donations to political parties or political candidates by individuals or firms contracting with the States on Federal-aid highway projects. Existing Federal law, enacted in 1940, contains such a prohibition with respect to Federal contracts. My bill would simply extend this to Federal-aid highway contracts which are generally State rather than Federal contracts, although Federal funds may bear from 50 to 95 percent of their cost.

2. My bill would prohibit reprehensible practices which we know have occurred with disturbing frequency: the practice of highway contractors giving money and other things of value to the highway department personnel responsible for inspecting or supervising the contractors' work, and the directly related practice of performing work or furnishing materials and equipment, or permitting the performance of work or furnishing materials or equipment other than as provided in the contract or applicable plans and specifications.

3. The bill contains provisions directed toward conflicts of interest. It would prohibit persons performing services for the highway departments (including highway department employees) from having a financial or other personal interest in Federal-aid highway contracts with respect to which they have performed such services. It would also require such persons to publicly disclose any interest they might have in any real property required for Federal-aid highway projects on which they worked or had an offcial responsibility.

4. The bill would revise and strengthen the existing law having to do with false statements and certifications concerning Federal-aid highway projects, by extending its terms to cover real property transactions.

The need for enactment of legislation covering these matters has become obvious, and I intend to press for early congressional action.

TOLL ROADS ON THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Since 1921, Federal law has required that all highways constructed with the aid of Federal funds be free of tolls of all kinds with certain exceptions in the case of toll bridges and tunnels. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which provided for construction of the Interstate System with Federal funds paying 90 percent of its cost, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to approve as part of the Interstate System toll roads which meet the geometric and construction standards adopted for that system. This provision was designed to avoid the economic waste that could result if toll-free highways were constructed to duplicate the service provided by toll roads.

Since 1956, 2,167.2 miles of toll roads in 17 States have been approved as parts of the Interstate System. Some other States are even now constructing or contemplating the construction of additional toll road sections of the Interstate System, which were not planned as toll roads in 1956.

In my opinion, the legislative history indicates that the Congress intended the provisions of the 1956 act to apply only to toll roads then in operation, under construction, or authorized, and not to authorize the future substitution of newly conceived toll roads for toll free highways on the Interstate System. The unrestrained placing of toll traps on the Interstate System is not, in my opinion, either in the public interest nor in accord with the intent of the Congress.

Early in 1961, I introduced a bill to require concurrence by the Public Works Committees of the House and the Senate before any toll road, bridge, or tunnel is hereafter approved as a part of the Interstate System. Hearings were held on this bill, but no further action was taken by the 87th Congress.

Within the next few days, I intend to introduce another bill on this subject and to press for early consideration. Our Interstate System, which the public thought would be generally toll free is already polka-dotted with toll traps, and the motorists, in too many cases, are being forced to pay twice—one through gasoline taxes and again at the toll gates. The longer congressional action is delayed the worse the situation will become. In my judgment, the public interest demands early corrective measures.

DIVERSION OF HIGHWAY FUNDS THROUGH STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

One aspect of the highway program which is of increasing concern to highway officials is the matter of increasing costs and diversion of highway funds as a result of State and local taxes.

During recent years—particularly since enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956—there has been a noticeable tendency for some States and many local governmental units to impose taxes which increase the costs of highway construction. Examples are taxes on sales of highway construction materials, and taxes measured by the size of highway contracts. The proceeds of such taxes are ordinarily used to provide funds for general governmental expense including such items as salaries, school construction, relief and welfare programs, and the like.

Nobody questions the need for the imposition of taxes to pay the cost of such necessary governmental expenses. However, a question does exist as to the extent to which Federal-aid highway funds—which are derived from highway user revenues—should be used to pay such taxes, and this is particularly true on Interstate System projects, where Federal funds pay 90 percent or more of the costs.

During the 87th Congress, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, the highly respected chairman of the Roads Subcommittee, introduced a bill to prohibit Federal participation in highway construction costs attributable to such State and local taxes. No action was taken by the 87th Congress, but I believe that this is a subject which should receive the serious consideration of the 88th Congress. I anticipate that this will be done.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 required the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain studies, and make reports to the Congress, concerning taxation and motor vehicle sizes and weights. Much information relative to these studies was derived from the Illinois Test Road project, with which you people are familiar because it utilized considerable quantities of limestone and limestone byproducts.

The Secretary of Commerce has not yet submitted his final findings and recom-

mendations, but it is expected that he will do so during the 88th Congress. Thus, the 88th Congress will have for consideration two important reports. One will be the final report concerning adequate and equitable taxation for highway purposes, based upon needs, burdens, and benefits. The other will involve the question of maximum sizes and weights of motor vehicles on the Federal-aid highway system, and whether Federal laws should be enacted on this subject.

I cannot forecast the results of congressional consideration of these subjects, but I think you should follow their progress with considerable care.

PROGRESS OF THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 provided for the completion of the Interstate System, simultaneously in all of the States, by 1972. At the beginning of the year 1963—6½ years after the 1956 act and about 10 years before the expected end of the program—the program is on schedule, if averages are accepted. However, this record has been attained only by accepting averages. A few States are well ahead of schedule, while several States are deplorably behind schedule. The objective of completing the Interstate System simultaneously in all States by 1972 can be attained only if all the States maintain comparable and acceptable progress.

I believe that the Congress should and will give attention to this problem.

CONCLUSION

Most of the Members of Congress approve the conduct and purpose of the Federal-aid highway program, but their obligations as representatives of the citizens of their districts require them to give objective and critical attention to the program. As I mentioned at the outset, I believe the Federal-aid highway program will be preserved and promoted by the 88th Congress. But many important legislative proposals will be considered.

Questions asked of Congressman CRAMER and his answers following his speech to the National Limestone Institute 18th Annual Convention.

Question. Congressman, is there a problem of any States losing their Federal money because of slow construction—how can we find out the status of our State, moneywise, mileagewise, and so forth, compared to others and what can be done so we won't lose our money?

Answer. Well, the Bureau of Public Roads issues a quarterly report on the progress of each State and I am sure that any of you that are interested could get a copy by requesting it from the Bureau of Public Roads. This report shows, by State, the mileage of Interstate highways now open to traffic, the mileage on which work is now in progress, and the mileage on which no work has yet been done. It also shows the amount expended for completed projects, and the estimated cost of projects underway or authorized.

As to whether there is danger of any State losing Federal funds, I can say that no State has lost interstate funds, and no States have lost other Federal-aid highway funds since the 1920's, when two States (Montana and Hawaii) lost funds. Of course, if a State does not use available Federal funds within the time allowed (2 years after the fiscal year for which they are authorized) the State would lose those funds. So, it is essential that the States move ahead with the program as rapidly as possible. There have been States who have accelerated construction, for instance, in urban areas and downgraded construction in rural areas; the result being that less mileage is constructed as compared to other States, but an equal amount of dollars is spent because it obviously costs more money to build in urban areas.

So there are a lot of factors that enter into it. When I suggest Congress is going to look at these matters, all these would obviously have to be taken into consideration. I will say this, however, that a number of States have lost Federal matching money by inserting these toll roads into the free roads, because they have no way of getting that money back. Once they insert X number of miles into what we suppose to be a free Interstate System, the cost of constructing that X number of miles is subtracted from the Interstate funds they are entitled to. So, any time a toll road is injected into the free system, the State loses the money. There isn't any question about that. I don't know of any other State that is losing money, otherwise, on the Interstate System. Now, they could be, possibly by poor administration, not getting as much dollar value out of it. But I don't know of them actually losing the money—the Federal matching funds.

Question. Congressman, what is the current thinking as to what will happen with our road program after 1972?

Answer. That's very interesting. I intended to project my thinking just a little bit by suggesting that unquestionably before 1972, I think Congress is going to have the duty to sit down and consider that very question. Should the mileage on the Interstate System be increased, should additional connecting links be authorized, and if so, on what basis or should an entirely new program be considered, not called the Interstate System, but perhaps increases on the ABC system? What additional needs are there defensewise? These are all going to have to be looked at. Then you have the other interesting question of reimbursement of these States for toll roads, this 2,400 miles I mentioned, that has already been inserted into the Interstate System, and those States have lost that mileage at the very outset of the program—are they entitled to bonus mileage? Are they entitled to any reimbursement of any kind, and that is a very debatable question and hotly contested in Congress. But, I don't think that there is any question but what the highway program after 1972 is going to continue to go forward on a long-range planned basis.

Kansas Secretary of State. Hon. Paul R. Shanahan, Dedicates Lawrence Employment Service Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1963, Hon. Paul R. Shanahan, secretary of state of Kansas, delivered the dedicatory address at the dedication of the new Kansas State Employment Service Building in Lawrence, my hometown. The general thrust and tone of Paul Shanahan's message are so timely and to the point that I include here his full text, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress who share my concern for the challenges of full employment and the proper role of the States and local communities, working with the Federal Government, in meeting those challenges:

REMARKS BY PAUL R. SHANAHAN FOR DEDICATION OF LAWRENCE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY BUILDING

The dedication of this building seems especially fitting today. While being proper recognition of the fine role the Kansas State Employment Service has taken in the Lawrence community in the past, our gathering here today should also mark a new vitality for resolving manpower problems and spurring economic growth in the days and years ahead.

The Lawrence community can boast with pride of its past record in industrial development. With the University of Kansas providing a sound job base, Lawrence has successfully attracted a number of fine manufacturing firms to complement the continuing growth of the university. This growth in manufacturing is especially significant in view of the high degree of competition among cities vying for plants today and in the recent past.

The remarkably low rate of unemployment and the diversification of industry in Lawrence are the products of unified efforts among community leaders, the public employment service and all groups and organizations that concern themselves with the social and economic development of the area. This community spirit and the sound achievements of the past form a solid foundation for the challenges and opportunities which are ahead. Rapid changes which are continually taking place in both the economic and industrial phases of our lives will require even more attention and a higher degree of professionalism if the community is to continue its industrial growth and its record of well-being among its citizens.

As we dedicate this building today, we should rededicate the services we offer and our community spirit to assure that the Lawrence area and the other communities of Kansas will enjoy the fruits of a progressive industrial climate.

With new emphasis placed on the importance of research in the production of almost every item being marketed today, Lawrence is extremely fortunate to have a built-in research center at the university. This attribute alone is probably the most important single factor in the development of the Kaw River Valley for use in a wide range of industrial endeavors. This research, however, will add to the responsibilities of the public employment service all through the gamut of its activities.

As new industries are established, new skills are needed and as new techniques are developed, workers may well be replaced and need retraining.

As the population grows, the utilization of all members of the work force becomes increasingly important. In a period of growth, economic functions move swiftly, requiring of the employment service prompt and proper payment of unemployment insurance benefits, the careful counseling, selection, and placement of young people as they move into the labor market, and the thoughtful and careful selection of trainees to meet the demands of new or expanding industries.

In this program, it is heartening to note that the State employment security agency is spending more than $300,000 in the current fiscal year and proposes to spend that amount again in fiscal year 1964 in the field of manpower development—to assess training needs, to join with the vocational education department in developing training programs and to pay training allowances to worthy individuals. While this may seem at first glance a large amount, it will surely prove a wise investment on the part of the people of Kansas in moving toward the assurance of a work force which is properly trained to meet the demands of the State's employing units. It should also improve the climate in the State for new industry and for more jobs for our own people.

Those of us who deal in governmental functions and services often speak of change. This is good, and it is necessary, since these governmental services must constantly change to keep pace with the needs of the people. This does not mean adding new services; sometimes it may mean discontinuing a program or combining two functions into one. In any case, it should always mean improvements; a better service for the people and the employment security agency has a worthy record along that line.

It was only 14 years ago this month that the speaker and the late John Morrison, together with some others that are here today, and some other members of the legislature, began work toward making the first significant postwar improvements in the benefit payments portion of the unemployment insurance phase of the program. In the session of 1945, we were able to increase the maximum benefit amount from $15 to $16 a week, and in 1947 we had gotten these payments up to $18. In 1949 we introduced the idea of making the weekly benefit amount equal to one-half the average weekly wage of insured workers. Somehow this measure was passed by the legislature, although subsequent sessions again set an arbitrary maximum, even though the maximum weekly benefit amount was increased a number of times. Today the weekly benefit amount is again set each year to equal one-half the average weekly wage of insured workers, which is $45 per week for calendar year 1963.

Unemployment compensation for veterans of the Second World War has ended and payments to Korean veterans have come and gone. We have seen the introduction of programs providing for the payment of unemployment insurance benefits to Federal employees and exservicemen and the payment of extended benefits to persons who undergo unusually long periods of joblessness.

If these were to be looked upon as mere doles from the public treasury, the pride which many of us have about the program would be dimmed. But since we have seen these payments move in as a strong force in averting depressive movements in the economy, especially in 1949, in 1954 and in just the past few years, we know of their real significance as a bulwark against serious and far-reaching depression.

It should be noted here that careful attention has also been continuously given to the tax rates of employers who directly pay the bill for this program. Amendments in the tax rate structure adopted in 1955 made it possible for employers to reduce their state unemployment tax rate at gradually decreasing levies from 2.7 percent to zero, depending upon their experience in layoffs or unemployment. Tax rates are thus kept in line with the unemployment risk in their individual firm. Since the adoption of these tax rates for employers, the average rate has stayed at near one percent.

Perhaps even more significant than the changes in the unemployment insurance field has been the strong steps taken to improve service in the areas of job counseling and placement. The public employment service has made great strides in its efforts to assure equal employment of age groups and minority groups which may have experienced discrimination. Through cooperation with the schools, today we have well-planned programs of guidance for young people who are leaving high school and entering the labor market. This guidance service, coupled with the placement activities of the employment service, are of untold value in planning a course for these young folks which will lead to continuing gainful employment throughout their lives. Scientific testing of occupational aptitudes and interest has been introduced as a regular function when beneficial in the placement function.

The Kansas State Employment Service undertakes invaluable activities in placing agricultural workers during those periods of the year when manpower is imperative for the production and the harvesting of farm crops. Of special interest is the activities of employment service offices in some areas which place youngsters in farm homes during the summer months, turning idle hours into productive days and providing needed help on family farms.

As exemplified here in Lawrence, a number of Kansas communities have utilized the available facilities, research data and know-how of the Kansas Employment Service to move forward in community employment planning and to make real effort towards maximum utilization of manpower resources and productive effort.

These changes or the progress that we have seen in the few years since 1949, also provide a solid groundwork or beginning on which the employment service can build its activities for the future.

This edifice has been planned and constructed to provide the physical facilities necessary for an active and imaginative program in the manpower field.

So once again we dedicate this building to that end. Let us also rededicate the services of the employment security program and the spirit of the community to a progressive economic and industrial climate and to a productive and rewarding life for each of our citizens.

National Bad Check Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following penetrating analysis of the theories of Walter Heller, Presidential economic adviser, appeared in the January 31 edition of the Long Beach Independent newspaper under the byline of Bill Sumner:

HERE'S THEORY FOR OUR TAX PROBLEMS: BAD CHECK DAY

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—Many people have expressed concern with the economic theories of Mr. Walter Heller, the President's top economic adviser. It was all right when he was expressing some of these notions back at the University of Minnesota. You know how professors are. Impractical dreamers. But now he is in a position where he may possibly have his way, and this calls for a new appraisal.

What he wants to do now, to get the economy moving faster, is to cut taxes while Federal expenditures are increased. The idea behind it all is to pump more money into the economy, both from Federal and private sources, which, in turn, will ultimately produce more Federal revenues because we'll all be richer and in higher tax brackets. Unemployment would be reduced, and with even more people working there will be another source of tax revenue.

This having worked, we can then begin another cycle, slashing taxes still further and increasing Federal expenditures to new heights. And we will live happily ever after.

Economists, of course, are a strange breed. There are some who think Heller goes too far. This is the set which has not yet cast off the old superstititons and slogans about making outgo equal income. There are some who don't feel that he goes far enough, however, which may be surprising to everyone.

A member of this school was advancing his theory yesterday and referred, in passing, to Heller as a reactionary. This particular chap is the author of a plan known as Bad Check Day.

"Money," he said, "makes the world go around. But its value is an illusion. Look at this crumpled old bit of paper (it was a $1 bill, and crumpled). What is that good for?"

Two cab fares in zone No. 1, 10 newspapers, a drink plus tip, and—

"Right," he said. "You are making the economy move. You don't stuff it in a mattress, because it has no value unless it is spent."

I smiled modestly at this little compliment to my understanding of economics. But what about Bad Check Day?

"You make X-many dollars a year," he said. "One day a year the President declares National Bad Check Day and you can write checks—for purchases only—of up to 5 percent of your adjusted gross income."

If you go over the amount?

"You go to jail, of course. That is known as check kiting."

But on the one day, and up to the certain amount, it's OK?

"Right. Under your signature, you write 'Bad Check Day' so the bank will know what to do with them."

And what do they do?

"They are credited with cash from the Federal Government for the value of all the checks. The banks end up with more money than they had had. They increase interest rates. You have bought things for the house, luxury items, clothes, and so on, and food, of course. Your bills for the month. And with your own paycheck money you can go on a ball for the rest of the month."

Get a yacht, and don't worry about whether it is a business deduction?

"You are thinking," he said.

But where was the money to come from? I mean, there is only so much.

"Nonsense," he said. "With the money pumped back into the economy, business moves ahead, people find jobs, investments go up, production booms. Tax revenues go up. And there is an incentive. People will work harder to get into a more favorable bad check bracket."

"I told you not to take too much off the top, and look at it," I said.

"I thought you wanted a flattop," he said. "Sorry."

It is hoped that National Bad Check day will receive due consideration by the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee as a somewhat less cumbersome procedure for implementing a proposed national policy which appears to appeal to Mr. Heller and his associates.

Are Deficits Good for Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members an editorial from one of our daily

papers in Maine, the Kennebec Journal, which poses some interesting questions.

ARE DEFICITS GOOD FOR US?

As urged by Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, President Kennedy ought to fire Kermit Gordon, the new Director of the Budget—if Gordon actually said what BYRD says he said, in a statement the other day to a congressional committee.

Senator BYRD quotes the Budget Director as having said "a balanced budget would lead to increased unemployment, higher taxes, and a general economic decline."

In Senator BYRD's opinion—and, as the veteran chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, his opinions command respect—"Responsible fiscal positions should be filled with sound men. If we do not get crackpot economists out of these positions, the American system will be lost."

Imagine any Government official with a practical understanding of the fiscal facts of life uttering the belief that balancing the Federal budget would bring on all the ills listed in that quotation from the Director of the Budget.

If indeed Mr. Gordon believes that balancing the budget would be so great an evil, the Kennedy administration should replace him immediately with someone who does understand that 2 and 2 make 4.

The Kennedy administration hopes Congress will cut taxes to stimulate the national economy—although it has shown no inclination thus far to cut Federal spending anywhere, to make tax reduction possible. In fact, the President's proposed budget calls for spending more and taxing less.

To reduce taxes in a deficit situation would, of course, simply charge the tax cut against the $300 billion Federal debt—a debt which has to be paid with interest.

It seems to Senator BYRD and—it is to be hoped—by millions of other worried Americans, that confidence in the Government's fiscal policy can best be restored by presenting a budget with expenditures reduced as well as taxes.

"All of us could support constructive tax reduction under such circumstances," says Senator BYRD. And he believes the alternative lies in the answers to these grim questions:

"How long can the Federal Government spend, tax, and borrow at the present rate?

"Are we on a permanent deficit basis?

"When will the breaking point come?"

President Kennedy ought to ask himself those questions. And he certainly ought to fire any public official with budgetmaking power who expresses the crackpot belief that the way to national prosperity is to continue—for heaven knows how much longer—spending year after year far more than we collectively pay to the tax collector.

Ernest L. Goff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the House an editorial which appeared in the Bristol Press upon the passing of Ernest L. Goff, senior vice president and director of Associated Spring Corp.

I held him in the highest regard and I know that my feeling was shared throughout the State of Connecticut, as well as in his own community of Bristol where he contributed so much of his time and efforts for the improvement of his community. Bristol has lost an outstanding civil leader with his untimely death.

The editorial follows:

ERNEST L. GOFF

It is a generally accepted fact that in the day-to-day life of any community, when specific tasks are required for social welfare or civic betterment, there are usually men who are willing to give more of themselves, their time and their effort than is encompassed in a normal working day.

Ernest L. Goff was an outstanding individual as a community leader. He was ever willing to assume responsibilities for the improvement of his adopted home and one in which he devoted a large portion of his comparatively short life.

The news of his untimely demise at the age of 55 years came as a shock to his legion of friends.

A recital of his rise in his association with the Associated Spring Corp. and the many organizations with which he was connected would serve no useful purpose here. But it is definitely proper to pay tribute to Ernie for the many fine jobs he handled with much material benefit to the community.

In spite of his various civic and community endeavors, he will be best remembered for his personal traits. A friendly man, he had the rare ability to exude warmth and a genuine friendliness toward all with whom he came in contact.

An executive who came up through the ranks and reached the heights of his chosen line of endeavor, Ernie Goff was not an individual whose hat size grew with his many promotions. The friends he made on the way up remained his friends throughout his life. The passing of Ernie Goff is a permanent loss to the community.

We trust that many treasured memories will serve in some degree to lessen the sorrow which has befallen his family.

Late Hon. Franklin Delano Roosevelt

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the last inaugural of that distinguished and beloved President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, his inaugural remarks occurrred at the White House. The ground was covered with snow and those privileged to attend stood on spread canvas outside in the rose garden. Mrs. Doyle and I, both then and many times since, have recognized it was a high privilege for us to be present on that occasion.

To enter the White House after the outdoor ceremony was completed we were favored by being asked to accompany Hon. Carlos Romulo, Ambassador from the Philippines, and his lovely wife. This we did.

The President spoke from the portico facing the Jefferson Memorial to which memorial across the Potomac Basin from the White House Mrs. Doyle and I walked through the snow upon the conclusion of our brief visit inside the White House. The reason we did so was chiefly because of the following circumstances which occurred during the President's inspiring remarks about an hour before.

We shall never forget that occurrence, for at a high point in his inspiring words he suddenly stopped markedly short for several seconds and looked steadfastly over the heads of his listeners who were standing on the canvas spread below the portico from which he spoke. His pause in his speech and his steady gaze in the direction of the Jefferson Memorial caused Mrs. Doyle to remark to me that she wondered why he had stopped in his speech and why he deliberately looked over the heads of his audience as though they were not present as his listeners.

Upon entering the White House for tea, we learned that he was looking at the recently completed Jefferson Memorial, and situated therein the magnificent very large bronze statue of Thomas Jefferson standing erect and looking directly at the White House. We concluded that President Roosevelt consciously was thinking of the great life and sacrifices and contribution of his great predecessor in the Office of President of the United States of America. In company with this experience, which we shall never forget, we learned there previously had been one very large tree in the direct line of vision and view between the portico from which President Roosevelt spoke and the statue of Thomas Jefferson, but that in the winter time when the tree was utterly barren of leaves it had been removed by request of the President so that he could have a clear, unobstructed view of Thomas Jefferson on whose magnificent statue and memorial his gaze was fixed so steadily and assuredly when he stopped in his inaugural speech on that occasion.

In this, my 17th year of membership in the House of Representatives, I have increasingly been thankful that I had the great opportunity and inspiration of personally meeting and knowing—even though very slightly—Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for it was during his last administration as President of the United States of America that I was first elected to membership in the House. His dedication to the needs and problems of humankind, including the poor and the handicapped, and his magnificent voice of hope and faith that great humanitarian good and blessings would come to all peoples have always been a great inspiration to me. Not only have the pages of history of our own beloved Nation written a page of everlasting gratitude to him, but the pages of the history of all mankind have done the same thing.

Textiles, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days Textiles, Inc., Gastonia, N.C., and its subsidiary, Threads,

Inc., has issued a very splendid brochure entitled "A Pictorial Tour Through the Plants of Textiles, Inc." In this publication there is a brief word description of the basic textile processes in a yarn manufacturing plant. In another section of the publication there is a brief statement of the processes involved when the yarn reaches the thread plant.

In view of the fact that we are so much concerned with the cotton textile problem at this time I thought that it would be helpful to our colleagues to have access to the description of cotton textile manufacturing contained in the publication, as well as a familiarity with the terminology used in the industry. As we discuss these matters on the floor of the House from time to time, I am sure that some of the Members must find the terms we use to be confusing to them. I believe that a reading of this matter will eliminate that problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Tour Through a Textile Plant," as well as the one entitled "How Yarn Is Converted to Thread," be made a part of the Appendix of the RECORD:

A TOUR THROUGH A TEXTILE PLANT

FOREWORD

The cotton textile manufacturing industry is ever increasing in importance. Today it is one of the greatest industries in our Nation. The significant place it occupies in our economic affairs has caused a greater interest in its study by students in our high schools and colleges. Our companies receive each year many requests from students—and other interested people—for information about the manufacture of cotton and synthetic yarns and threads. The primary purpose of this brochure is to acquaint our readers with the principal operations in the manufacture of our products without being too technical in the description.

The manufacture of cotton textiles is generally divided into two major operations—spinning and weaving. We shall confine ourselves to our own types of operations—spinning of fine cotton yarns and the manufacture of various types of threads, made both from cotton and synthetics.

Bales of cotton arrive at our central warehouse from the areas in which they have been grown. Bales will weigh from 475 to 550 pounds. The bales are opened, samples checked by skilled cotton laboratory technicians for quality control, and the cotton, from as many as 10 to 25 bales, is fed into machines called blending feeders. Blending is a very important process because a spinner must have maximum uniform fibers to insure top quality yarn.

The next operation is the removing of any impurities including leaf, burs, dirt, and other foreign matter by running the cotton through a machine known as a picker. After cleaning, the cotton is then in the form of "laps" or rolls of cotton about 18 inches in diameter by 40 inches wide.

Next, the laps are fed into the carding machines where they are unrolled and the process of straightening the tangled mass of fibers begins. Cylinders straighten the fibers and shape them into a very thin film which is then drawn through a funnel-shaped metal piece which forms it into a sliver, this being a round ropelike strand of cotton about an inch in diameter. Then come the drawing and lap winding processes before the yarn goes to the combers.

COMBING

The comber is a very necessary machine in the production of fine combed yarn where strength, smootheness, and fineness of quality are desired. Fine-toothed combs continue the process of straightening the fibers and removing the short fibers. The remaining long fibers are formed into comb sliver.

DRAWING

The next step transfers the cotton from the combers to the drawing frames. These machines combine several slivers into one sliver without twisting. The resulting slivers are about the same diameter as one of the original.

ROVING

From the drawing frames the slivers are taken to the roving frames. The cotton is twisted by this process and drawn into a smaller and stronger strand.

SPINNING

The roving next goes to the spinning frames where it is further drafted and twisted into yarn of the size desired, and wound on bobbins—this in a single process. When the bobbins on the frames are filled, the frames are stopped and the full bobbins are doffed—removed from the frames—and empty bobbins are quickly placed on the spindles.

TWISTING AND WINDING

Our plants are equipped to furnish our customers with both single and ply yarns. Single yarns are wound to specifications after spinning. If yarn is to be plied it is wound for twisting. Ply yarns are two or more single yarns twisted together. Twisters are used to ply yarns.

The next process after twisting is to wind the yarn on the type packages specified by the customer. This yarn may be put on tubes, cones, skeins, beams, or warps.

The last process includes inspection, packing, and shipping. Orders are carefully checked and sent on their way to customers all over the country.

THE SUPPORTING TEAM

The hundreds of skilled employees who operate the expensive and complicated machines receive the full support of many others equally versed in their own lines, in the production of our fine combed yarns. We refer to the buyers of cotton, the laboratory technicians, the electrical and mechanical experts who keep the plants in good condition. Also the general office force where experts in finance, mill management, sales, and shipments constantly do the multiplicity of jobs laid out for them. And, of course, the sales organization, operating from coast to coast, adds its important part in the overall picture of our manufacture of fine combed yarn.

HOW YARN IS CONVERTED TO THREAD

Threads, Inc., receives from Textiles, Inc., and other sources gray yarns and converts these yarns into finished thread. The thread may be processed in various ways, and for that reason, yarn received by Threads, Inc., is put up on ball warps, cones, transfer tubes and other forms.

Orders received by Threads, Inc., determine the kinds of processing needed. Identifying numbers are applied to the orders and follow the lots throughout processing. Instructions with each lot are carefully followed and careful checks are made at various points to insure proper handling. The machines have predetermined rates of speed, time, temperature, ingredients needed, etc., according to the various orders being processed.

FIRST OPERATION

Yarns arrive from the spinning mills and are stored in the gray yarn stock department. Then the yarns go to the gassing and warping machines where surplus fibers are removed by singeing and the yarn is prepared in proper packages for the mercerizing machines.

The ball warps received from the spinning plants may be mercerized, packed for dyeing, dyed to a desired shade, finished, quilled, wound, and shipped. Cones of yarn are usually gassed and then made into ball warps before following the same process as that used with ball warp packages.

The yarn is received on paper tubes and, before dyeing, is transferred to stainless steel tubes and placed in the package dyeing machines. They are then dyed, finished, and dried and either glaze finished or wound on cones as soft finished thread.

The mercerizing machines are essentially a series of boxes with guide rolls and between the boxes are squeeze rolls which serve to keep the yarn in tension. Cotton yarns may be mercerized in two forms, either warps or skeins. Warp mercerizing is the form usually employed. Mercerizing strengthens the yarn and adds luster.

Next, packers are used to wet out and prepare lots for dyeing and bleaching.

DYE MACHINES

Yarn is dyed and bleached in the dyeing department in either of two forms—warps or packages. The machinery used consists of huge warp dye machines and package dye machines which are used for the dyeing and bleaching of the lots. The next process is to pass the yarn through finishing machines which wash and apply finishing agents.

QUILLING

The function of the quilling machines is to take the yarns in warp form (378 ends or strands) and wind these onto individual bobbins for further processing.

WINDING

The bobbins go to the winding department where either Universal winders or Foster winders take over. These machines wind the thread on proper types of cones or tubes, with required yardage, as specified in the order. In some instances, the yarn may go to the glazing machines before winding. Here a sizing material is applied to the thread which increases its strength and prepares the thread for heavy-duty sewing.

After being wound in proper packages the thread is inspected, labeled, wrapped, and packed for shipping.

WWL Radio Renders Splendid Service to Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, WWL radio station in my hometown of New Orleans was 1 of the 10 radio stations in different parts of our country which rendered splendid service to our country during the very tense days of the Cuban crisis. These stations, of which WWL was a leading one with its 50,000 watts beaming out into the Caribbean, gave up their nighttime programing in the service of their country by broadcasting in Spanish throughout the night Voice of America messages of information and reassurance to the Cuban people. For 26 days, from October 22 to November 16, 11 hours a day, WWL radio broadcast these messages of enlightenment and hope to the people of Cuba, and in so doing, voluntarily turned away thousands of dollars in advertising revenue. This is in the kind of voluntary sacrifice

which has made the American people, both individually and collectively, a great people, and I am proud that WWL joined with 9 other stations in this very fine effort for the good of our Nation, and for the oppressed people of Cuba who long for freedom once again in their own land.

For their voluntary service during the Cuban crisis, WWL and the other stations were presented Citations of Merit by President Kennedy at a White House ceremony on December 4, and Father A. B. Goodspeed, Loyola University faculty moderator for the station, accepted the award on behalf of WWL. In tribute to WWL radio, its sister television station, WWL-TV, broadcast an editorial salute, written and presented by Phil Johnson, and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my fellow colleagues would know of the fine service rendered by this New Orleans station and 9 other of our Nation's large radio stations, as follows:

This station did not go into the business of editorializing just to blow its own horn. As we said at the start, we intend to provide comment on and about New Orleans. And about things which affect New Orleans. We mention this today, because after bending over backward to be objective, we find we really should say something about our sister station, WWL radio, and the honors it has received from the President of the United States. In a most impressive ceremony this week at the White House WWL radio was awarded a Presidential citation for its tremendous contribtuion to the Nation during the time of the Cuban crisis. Father A. B. Goodspeed, Loyola faculty moderator for the station, and General Manager Bill Dean were called to Washington for the awards. In presenting the citation, President Kennedy praised the station for its immediate and unselfish response to the Government's request for help. What did we do? Well, if you were one of the hundreds of thousands who listen to WWL in the evening, you were probably surprised in October and November to hear nothing but Spanish being spoken. This was the Voice of America, telling the people of Cuba why we were setting up our naval quarantine. This was probably the first time these people knew that Russia was using their island home as a missile base. Because WWL radio is so powerful—it is the only 50,000-watt clear channel station in this area of the Nation—it was a natural choice to bring this message to the Cuban people * * * a message that Russian blocking equipment could not drown out. For 26 days, from October 22 to November 16, 11 hours a day, WWL radio broadcast to Cuba, voluntarily turning down thousands of dollars in advertising revenue. As General Manager Bill Dean put it: "We were proud to be able to help our country." To this we can add nothing more. We feel that President Kennedy, by his award, has said it for all of us.

Growth Through Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges delivered a most interesting and timely speech to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States public affairs conference a few days ago.

I wish to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress and our people throughout the country in view of the importance of research and technology to the business community. I ask therefore it be included in the RECORD:

I am happy to have this chance to talk to you about a matter that bears importantly on business progress and prosperity: what we are putting into science and technology today and what we are getting out of it for the consumer.

With all that has happened since World War II, most Americans, I daresay, are aware of how much our scientific and engineering capability has to do with our world position, our military effectiveness, and, certainly, our hopes for leading man's conquest of space.

I think, too, there is general recognition of how much research and development means to our economy—invention, new techniques of production, along with improved skills, are the lever of rising living standards and economic growth.

We now know, for instance, that less than half the rise in this country's output since 1900 can be accounted for by increased amounts of labor and capital. The rest, it appears, has come largely from improved skills and education of the labor force and from advances in management and technology.

Because we have had a great surge of research and development activity in the past decade, we have also seen accepted a third "truth," one that, unfortunately, is as faulted as it is well rounded. This is the assumption that all the money we're spending for research and development will not only give us military security and space supremacy, but will automatically provide improvements in productivity and a cornucopia of new products and processes to invigorate and expand the economy.

As anyone can see, research and development has become big business. The total of a century and a half of research and development spending—that is $18 billion—has been matched in just 5 years, from 1950 to 1955. And it was almost equalled in 1 year, fiscal 1962, when we spent an estimated $15 billion, or about 3 percent of our gross national product, on research and development. Today, about three-fourths of all research and development in the United States is being done by corporations. If Government now finances some 60 percent of this work—versus 40 percent in 1953—it is nonetheless true that business has doubled its aggregate outlays for research and development in the last 8 years and has largely validated the prophecy of "a new industry of discovery."

The trouble is that relatively few people have bothered to see exactly what sort of discovery industry this is.

By wrongly assuming in the first place that research and development for any purpose—space, military, or whatever—automatically fosters economic growth, they have completely missed the point that this is a highly concentrated industry, restricted by purpose, by geography, by company. Of the total effort, overwhelmingly oriented to defense, relatively little is directed to the creation of new consumer products, or to improved machines to make the products, or to improved processes to use in the machines. In short, the national research and development effort is not the incubator of demand and productivity increases that people think it is, or that the country needs for a growing, healthy economy.

Actually, only about a quarter of our huge research and development expenditures—or an estimated $4 billion—is being spent by industry for civilian purposes. And only about $1.5 billion of this is aimed at work that is likely to increase productivity.

In many companies and industries that are important contributors to gross national product—textiles and construction, for example—there is relatively little research and development. Nor is there much being done on the needs and conditions of our urbanized society. Transportation, air pollution, water resources—all require research and interested technical people, but they are attracting relatively little of either.

What makes this situation doubly disturbing is that our competitors in the world are not caught in this net.

Other industrialized nations, free from a burden of large military and space commitments, are able to devote almost their entire scientific and technical effort to developing the civilian economy and their social welfare. West Germany, for instance, spends a far larger portion of its total resources on civilian needs and product development than we do. The speed with which other nations adapt scientific advance to practical use often exceeds ours, which explains, in part, why they are able to compete against us today in both price and quality.

Given the fact that good ideas won't keep—that all nations today share each other's discoveries and that it's mainly a matter of which one applies them first—it seems to me that if we don't want to spend the next decade just talking about competition and inadequate economic growth, we are going to have to do something to strengthen civilian technology and correct the imbalance in our scientific and engineering effort.

Now what are we up against in doing this?

The crux of the matter is people—technically educated people. Even if we were prepared to double our outlays for civilian research and development next year, we could not double our effort. There just would not be enough technical people available to do the job. And, unfortunately, we can't increase the supply of brains on an assembly-line basis.

Consider what's been happening to technical manpower in the past few years:

Since 1954, the number of scientists and engineers doing research and development in industry has risen by 160,000. But all but 30,000 of these have been absorbed by projects for Government. The demands for personnel doing research and development for Government purposes jumped more than 300 percent, 10 times the increase for industry-oriented research and development.

In 1963, the supply of scientists and engineers for R. & D. is expected to enlarge by about 30,000. But the increase in space R. & D. alone this year will require almost the entire new supply.

With engineering enrollments dropping—and engineers, remember, are the people we count on to apply technology—the manpower problem in civilian research and development is, obviously, beyond short-run solution. This fact makes it all the more urgent, that we take steps now to conserve and husband our scientific resources, while at the same time working toward improving the supply of personnel for improving industrial technology in the future.

What steps, specifically?

At the direction of the President, the Department of Commerce has initiated a civilian industrial technology program to be guided by the new Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. Initially, it will rely on Federal funds. But its continuation and expansion, as well as its areas of concentration, will depend directly on the extent to which Federal funds are matched by State and local governments, and by industry associations.

Let me emphasize that this program will be to stimulate and invigorate, not to control industrial or university work.

We have asked the Congress to provide funds for:

1. Attracting personnel at universities to work in industrial research and development. Through the award of research contracts, we hope to provide incentives and training for research workers and educators in specific industrial fields and, at the same time, develop new knowledge on which to base industrial innovations.

2. Stimulating research in industry institutions. The idea here is to generate technical work, necessary to progress advance, but not normally undertaken through simple profit incentives. We want also to provide additional research services and facilities for those firms that lack a broad enough line of products and services to support an efficient R. & D. program. Federal funds through contract awards, will be used primarily to stimulate industry and local initiative. And the selection of particular industries for contracts will be guided by the advice of industrial leaders, educators, and others.

3. Developing an industry-university extension service. This service, I think, can be extremely important in increasing the rate and extent of diffusion of technology throughout industry.

Just 100 years ago, we took a giant step in this country by establishing land-grant colleges to provide broad education for rural Americans. Out of these colleges grew agricultural extension and research activities where, under local control, agricultural technology was developed and made available to the American farmer. The resources thus open to agriculture have been immeasurable and have contributed mightily to the rise of U.S. farm productivity.

Through an industry extension service, we hope to provide similar rootfeeders for civilian technology.

Working with the business community, the universities, and local governments, we hope to define technical problems affecting local industries and seek solutions for them. In some cases extension research teams may initiate the studies. Or industrial groups, or government, may bring problems, bearing on an industry or the local economy, to the centers.

Here, as elsewhere, the key element will be the encouragement of local grassroots initiative, and specialized attention to the problem of developing technology to fit specific local needs.

Fourth, and finally, we have asked for funds to support technical information services that meet industry's specific needs for knowledge about technological activities and developments. These information services would collect, abstract, review, and disseminate pertinent information from Government, universities, and foreign laboratories, in forms that industry can use. The information would also enable workers at universities and in industry to remain up-to-date on the state of the art of their respective fields. In addition, these services would alert technical people to existing developments and thereby reduce duplication of effort.

The initial effort of the civilian industrial technology program will be applied to industries that are major contributors to our gross national product and our export trade, and that also currently have limited or dispersed technological resources. Among them, we envisage, will be textiles, construction, machine tools, metal fabrication, lumber, foundries, and castings.

But even with a more far-reaching program, which may evolve, our main hope for improving civilian technology is business itself. In large matters, as in small, there is much that Government can do to help scale down the barriers that stand between us and a higher rate of technical development. But unless industry itself recognizes the basic problem—that we must find ways to make engineering education possible for everyone capable of it and desiring it, and that we must put more of science to practical use—we shall not achieve the productivity rises or the new products that can lead us to faster growth.

Let me make it perfectly clear, too, that how much we increase productivity will have great bearing on our effort to expand American exports and to ease our still critical balance-of-payments problem.

If American goods are to remain competitive in world markets, we have no choice but to accelerate the productivity rise. Nor is this simply a matter of productivity—and costs—in export commodities and services. It goes, rather, to the whole of the domestic cost structure and, therefore, to productivity in fields such as energy, construction, and transport, all of which affect substantially the cost of the goods we sell abroad.

World War II and our postwar commitments taught us that we must be economically strong to repel threats to freedom and help strengthen the other democracies of the world. Our ability to defend ourselves, to assist underdeveloped areas, to lead the way in space, depends on science and technology.

If public and private policymakers can bear down on the problems of investment in plant and equipment and in education, if we can accelerate the rate of technological progress in the nonspace, nonmilitary parts of this economy, if we can raise disposable incomes of consumers we will be able to achieve our target of an economy of maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power. It's a big order, but this is not the first time that this country has faced, and met, a challenge of this magnitude.

Patriots, Are They?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Don Nelson, news editor of the Arizona Record, a weekly newspaper published at Globe, Ariz., examining the motives of reactionary, ultraconservative patriotic groups. These remarks should be of great interest to all of my colleagues.

THERE—I'VE SAID IT—PATRIOTS, ARE THEY?

Patriots, they call themselves.

In the name of patriotism they organize. They chide. They condemn. They deride. They speak with a fervor and voice aimed downward at the apathetic man on the street. The movement has gathered intellectuals, pseudo malcontents.

They formed the John Birch Society, naming their group after a martyred soldier who, were he alive today, would probably have misgivings about the role history will ascribe to his name.

They formed the Minute Men, the group that decided the only safe loyalty was the loyalty to its own ranks.

They gathered behind the likes of a political nonentity in Dallas named Dan Smoot, who proclaims God's blessing upon his listeners while using vicious verbal tactics to call up impeachments, abolishment of the U.N. and disbelief in the democratic processes of our country.

I try to practice tolerance for other men's opinions, but I'm finally beginning to get a bit weary of the "patriotic" speeches:

"You can't believe a word that J.F.K. or any of his henchmen tells you.

"The techniques for controlling men's minds are widely known. If these techniques are used by evil men, then we are in danger.

"We must impeach Earl Warren and Bobby Kennedy.

"Let's not let Caroline plan any more invasions."

Through their preachments have run, several common characteristics: a lack of faith in the intelligence of the American people, a lack of faith in the ability or desire of the press to dig out facts and report them, a lack of faith in the ballot-box system, distrust in the present administration.

Of course the public mind must be challenged. The press must be held to answer. The administration must take its lumps. Free, open-market exchange of fact and opinion is the lifeblood of our democracy.

But mixed into that lifeblood also is responsibility. And I wonder if the patriots who speak so fervently of deception and near-treason in our Government have stopped to consider the possible consequences of their now dogmatic words.

I don't think they have. Those I have heard don't seem willing to discuss an idea; they only want to sell one.

And what they're peddling are doubt and suspicion. Their verbal hatchets, while chipping away at our present administration, could incidentally be chipping away at our democratic processes also. I get the feeling that the freedom they demand is more than they, if in power, would allow.

No suspicion is as vicious as that raised in the name of patriotism. It was in the name of patriotism that the ovens of Dachau were built.

Conservatives and patriots, temper your words with the knowledge that our democratic processes need not be torn down to be rebuilt.

And discard your idea that our great unwashed masses can be cleansed only by your tears. In the heat and agony of four major wars, these unwashed masses have secured and preserved your right to speak. So speak responsibly.

Aroused Populace Can Halt Administration's Plunge Into Financial Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Jack W. Gore, one of the most gifted and far-sighted editorial writers in the Nation, has done an exceptionally fine piece of work in the January 22 edition of the Fort Lauderdale News. In this editorial, which I submit as part of my remarks, Mr. Gore uses blunt language about the present plight of the Republic:

AROUSED POPULACE CAN HALT ADMINISTRATION'S PLUNGE INTO FINANCIAL DISASTER

(By Jack Gore)

From events of the past few months it has become frighteningly clear that thinking

Americans who value the great heritage of freedom they have been given and who wish to preserve this Nation as an independent republic must gird themselves for a tremendous and all-important fight in the days ahead.

If this fight is lost—and it can well be lost through continued complacency and inertia—then the face of America as we have known it so long will be drastically altered.

As President Kennedy made clear in his budget message to the Congress a few days ago, he no longer believes in the philosophy that progress and prosperity for our Nation can be achieved through the sound principles of a balanced budget and conservative spending policies.

Instead, he has surrendered to the Keynesian philosophy that real prosperity can only be achieved by spending what we don't have for things we don't truly need in the hope this reckless spending binge will produce an artificial kind of prosperity that will keep us afloat in a sea of red ink.

There is one of the most dangerous fiscal gambles any American President has ever embarked upon. If it fails we will have budget deficits of unparalleled peacetime proportions and of such tremendous magnitude and import that our whole financial and economic structure can be wrecked on the shoals of galloping inflation.

Along with this we will have thrust upon us a Federal bureaucracy of truly stupendous size and regimentation. And with the "managed news" policy that has already been adopted as official administration policy, we will be increasingly told that all this is for our own good and is necessary to get us moving again in the path of progress and sweet prosperity.

It is amazing how many Americans have already fallen for this line of pure guff. As Steve Stahl, head of the Investor's Union, said recently:

"We have traded the Declaration of Independence for the fetish of interdependence. We are transforming the powerful wings of the mighty American eagle into the fluttering feathers of a mother hen—right here at home where we are teaching our children at our own expense that free enterprise has failed and the Government is more capable of managing our affairs than we are ourselves."

Dr. Edward R. Annis, president-elect of the American Medical Association, echoed much the same theme recently when he declared:

"A Federal Government takeover is like poured cement. If you do not struggle while it is being poured, but wait until it is an accomplished fact, it hardens and you never escape."

This is all too true. Right now we have an administration firmly dedicated to vastly increasing the influence of the Federal Government on our daily lives. In just 2 years this administration has added 145,342 persons to the Federal payroll and the payroll padding technique has just started good. It is an administration which thinks nothing of buying Congressional votes with lush patronage jobs and of twisting arms in every way possible to get what it wants. Its political morals come right from the barnyard and it is a complete stranger to the truth unless telling the truth happens to serve its own ends.

This is blunt language to be sure, but it is the kind of language that America must hear and heed if it is to survive another 6 years under the dynasty that is now being built in Washington.

With the kind of politics this administration plays there is only one effective way to keep this administration from getting just what it wants. Congress must be persuaded that the administration program is not the program our people want and the only way that can be done is to mount a letter writing campaign of such effectiveness that our congressional representatives must listen to the voice of the people.

That means that each and every American who is dedicated to preserving constitutional government and sanity in our taxing and spending programs must plunge into this fight and make his or her voice heard where it will do the most good. Sounding off to a neighbor or a friend isn't going to do any good, but sounding off to a Congressman can do a lot of good, and we are going to have to do a lot of that in the months ahead if we are to keep this Nation's head above water.

Let no one kid himself that this administration isn't politically smart. It is the most ruthless and the craftiest political machine that has ever come into power in this country, and it is not the least bit averse to using every trick in the book, including downright falsehood, to stay there.

It is time more Americans woke up to what is going to happen to their country if we don't get some sanity back in Washington. The cold, hard truth happens to be that we are riding for a very nasty fall, and it could be a disastrous one, indeed, unless some checkreins are applied while there is still time.

Independence Day of Ceylon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 4th, Ceylon will celebrate the 15th anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take the opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Governor General of Ceylon, Sir Oliver Goonetilleke; and His Excellency, the Ceylonese Minister Counselor to the United States, Dr. Jan H. O. Paulusz, Chargé d'Affaire ad interim.

Ceylon, a beautiful island situated south of India, has the heritage of a highly developed civilization dating back to the sixth century B.C., and the Ceylonese people justly possess a strong nationalistic feeling inspired by pride in the antiquity of their culture and the glories of the past.

In recent centuries, Ceylon has been dominated successively by Portugal, the Netherlands, and Great Britain. The British, while deriving economic benefits from their development of tea and rubber plantations in Ceylon, at the same time brought benefits to Ceylon by developing schools, a free press, legal institutions, transport, communications, health facilities, and finally the representative principle of government. One measure of these benefits may be gained from the fact that Ceylon's literacy rate is over 70 percent, among the highest in all of Asia.

But after World War I the winds of national self-determination swept around the world, thanks partly to the fervent eloquence with which President Woodrow Wilson had advocated the principle of self-determination. After World War II the time for Ceylon's independence arrived, and she made a remarkably peaceful transition from a British colony to a dominion within the British Commonwealth. In spite of the existence of internal tensions based on ethnic, religious, and economic differences, there was no partition such as on the Indian subcontinent, and no rebellions such as in Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia.

Since independence, Ceylon has had remarkable political stability, within a highly democratic framework, and made significant economic and social progress. General elections were held in 1952, 1956, and 1960, representing the free expression of the will of the people through universal adult suffrage. In the 1956 election, one group of leaders, who had been in office since well before independence, was peacefully replaced by a new coalition of political forces. The machinery of government has functioned since independence without interruption and has coped with many serious social, economic, educational, administrative, and political problems with considerable success.

Nor has Ceylon enjoyed responsible government only in its internal affairs. In its foreign relations Ceylon has steadfastly pursued a policy of nonalinement in her political, economic, and military relations with the major powers of the world. Her foreign policy is aimed at the preservation of peace, the fostering of friendly and mutually beneficial relations with other nations, and the protection of her own freedom and independence. To achieve these aims, Ceylon feels she needs the freedom of action that a nonalinement policy provides.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is satisfied to cooperate and maintain amicable relations with Ceylon on those terms. The nationalism and the heritage of democratic institutions prevailing in Ceylon are as good guarantees as any that Ceylon will not succumb to evil forces, either external or internal, which might aim at depriving Ceylon of the freedom and independence of which she has had a taste in recent years. I am confident that I speak for all Americans when I express my deep sympathy to the people of Ceylon and wish them continued progress along the paths they have freely chosen.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

SPEECH

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, January 30 is not only the 81st birthday anniversary of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, but also marks the moment when we can look back 30 years to the beginning of an era of accomplishment—unparalleled in history—which he set in motion.

He called it with the characteristic shorthand of politics—the New Deal. It was the beginning of a new stage of de-

velopment for our Nation and for every individual in it.

Rarely, if ever, in a 30-year period have so many momentous changes taken place in the life of a country and of the world. Most dramatic of all was the change in our material circumstances. We had reached the point where our productive system could eliminate poverty, but instead was producing it. F.D.R. turned it around, enlisted the people of the country in a purposeful utilization of the system, and opened up the most productive and creative period, in a physical sense, that the world has ever seen.

But great as was his accomplishment in the field of unlocking American capacities for industrial and agricultural production, he accomplished much more. He pioneered in the development of a new sense of responsibility for Americans, a realization that the worth and dignity of the individual can be made a living reality in government and American life.

In the long perspective of history, it is still too early to draw the full dimensions of F.D.R.'s significance to America and the world. We can be sure it will be a role of prime importance. But it is not too early to record the feelings in the minds and hearts of his fellow countrymen. There were those of us who saw the New Deal unroll, one bold, imaginative step after another and who saw the old sores of economic and social life being healed. Our belief in the integrity of American life and faith in human nature and civilized living was strengthened and deepened by what he did. For those of us, Franklin Delano Roosevelt joined Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln as one of the ever-living forces which shape our lives and our country.

Is It a Crazy Budget?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the budget which the President has submitted for fiscal year 1964, including the proposal for tax reform, will almost certainly produce the great legislative debate of this year. It will produce such a debate in large measure because it contains the new principle, for this country at least, of a planned budget deficit.

In a penetrating, thoughtful column which appeared in the January 29 Washington Post, the distinguished journalist, Walter Lippmann, has examined this principle and I commend his excellent analysis to our colleagues for their careful attention.

I would particularly call attention to Mr. Lippmann's succinct and prophetic closing statement:

There is only one way to balance the budget and that is first to balance the economy.

TODAY AND TOMORROW—IS IT A CRAZY BUDGET?

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is not going to be easy to prove the case for the new budget which superimposes a planned deficit of nearly 3 billions on top of an involuntary deficit of some 7 or 8 billion. It is easier to argue the case—which is novel and highly debatable—when it is done with the modesty and learning of the economic message than when it is done with the dogmatic assertiveness of the tax message. For nothing can be so certain as the tax message says it is and no tax bill can be so unqualifiedly wonderful.

The basic question which will have to be debated for some months to come is whether the budget for fiscal 1964 is likely to do what it is designed to do. Will it, that is to say, cause business to expand, thereby reducing unemployment, and using to something nearer full capacity the industrial plant?

The principle of the 1964 budget is a new one. Why should there be need of a new budget principle? Because the country is confronted with an economic problem which first made its appearance toward the end of 1957. The problem arises from the fact that there is a condition of chronic economic sluggishness: the average rate of unemployment has moved up to a new level—from 4 percent for the years from 1947 to 1957 to 6 percent ever since.

The American economy has been sluggish because total demand has been sluggish and capital investment consequently inadequate. This sluggishness is a heavy burden on the Nation. We are not producing each year about $30 billions of wealth that we have the labor and resources to produce. As a result of this nonproduction tax revenues have fallen, and the chronic sluggishness has produced chronic budget deficits.

The problem of economic sluggishness appeared under Eisenhower and has persisted under Kennedy. It cannot be blamed on either party or on either President. There is something wrong for which we have no generally accepted remedy. As we cannot afford to nonproduce $30 billions annually while we are bearing the great burden of military defense and trying to take care of our expanding population, we must make a bold attempt to overcome the sluggishness. We must take measures to produce the lost 30 billions.

That is what the new budget is designed to do. Actually it is a new experiment for the United States to have a planned budgetary deficit. But it is not a new experiment in the rest of the modern world where all of the advanced nations, if they used our system of accounting, would be showing planned deficits.

The difficulty in adapting the new budget principle to the American situation is that there are so many serious and respectable and successful people who think it is crazy, who think it is ridiculous, and who think it is not far from being a swindle. They are outraged at the idea of the Government going further into debt to make the country richer.

This is not the first time that a true theory looked absurd. The earth, for example, seems flat and is round and it is not so easy to remember how to explain why it is round. The new theory is that the total demand for goods and services should be approximately large enough to pay for approximately all that labor, plant, and capital resources are capable of producing efficiently.

Those of us who accept this fundamental theory agree that the chronic sluggishness since 1957 has been due to insufficient total demand. We agree, therefore, that demand should be increased, and while this could be done by massive government spending, it is easier and quicker and has less of what the doctors call side effects to do this by reducing taxes. Experience has shown that consumers spend 93 percent of their disposable income, which means the total demand will rise quickly after a tax reduction.

There are not many who now oppose a reduction of taxes. But there are many who believe that the principle on which the administration is acting is crazy and immoral. They are saying that while taxes should be reduced, the budget should be balanced at the same time by reduction of Government expenditures.

Have they, one wonders, looked at the figures, and if they have, can they really mean what they are saying? The deficit in the new administrative budget (1964) is estimated at 11.9 billions after tax reduction and tax reform. That is over 10 percent of the total administrative budget which is estimated at 98.8 billions. Where do they think they can find the nearly 12 billions to cut? Presumably they will not wish to cut national defense which takes 55 billions. Nor will they cut space research which takes 4.2 billions. Nor the veterans which takes 5.5 billions. Nor interest on the debt which takes 10 billions. Nor, if they are politically candid, will they cut very seriously the 5.7 billions taken by agriculture.

That leaves 20 billions for everything else. Practically everyone who talks about the wild spending in Washington is talking about those 20 billions. Does anyone think those 20 billions can be cut in half? The truth is that those who mean seriously to cut Government expenditures to an amount equal to the deficit must cut defense, or give up the hope of balancing the budget and cutting taxes.

The fact of the matter is, however, that if by some kind of major amputation they did cut expenditures by 10 billions, the result would not be a balanced budget. The withdrawal from the economy of that much demand for goods and services would be a heavy blow at business, and it would cause such a loss of revenue that the budget at the end would be more unbalanced than ever. In all likelihood we would have a serious recession.

There is no getting away from this. There is only one way to balance the budget and that is first to balance the economy.

Containerization and Transport Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Morris Forgash, of New York City, who is president of the United States Freight Co., has for years been one of the foremost advocates of shipping by containers.

The following article is taken from "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science," volume 345, and gives the modern trend toward containerization and transport economics:

THE ROLL AND ROCK OF CONTAINERIZATION IN TRANSPORT ECONOMICS

(By Morris Forgash)

Abstract: The movement of freight in containers which are transferred from one vehicle and one type of carrier to another, avoiding rehandling of the contents en route, is

one of the fastest growing developments in transportation. Still in its infancy, containerization has sparked a revolution which could culminate in a genuine renaissance in transportation. Limited experience already has produced abundant proof that containerized transportation shortens transit time, results in greater safety of cargo, and effects substantial economies for both carriers and shippers. The clearly discernible potential of the concept is fully coordinated transportation, by all media, on a global basis. Agreement on standard sizes of containers, a first essential, has already been reached in this country, and key European nations have tentatively accepted our standards. Methods and techniques have not been perfected or standardized, but this phase of the problem is being tackled with intelligent determination. An all-purpose container, capable of carrying almost any type of cargo, is a second phase of the concept and is a definite possibility. Policy problems must be solved before the services of the underlying carriers are completely coordinated so that containers may be freely interchanged among all modes of transport.

The term "containerization" perhaps already qualifies as a word of art in transportation parlance, like "wharfage" or "f.o.b." Its meaning, however, is neither so well understood nor so precise as that of most other terms that have found their way into our lexicon of transportation terminology.

Containerization, viewed as a working tool of transportation—as an integral part of the transportation process—contemplates the movement of goods from the shipper's door to the receiver's place of delivery in a packing box which is integrated into the transportation system. The packing box may consist of a conventional highway trailer, with wheels attached or demountable, or it may be a container of another sort designed so that it can readily be secured to a chassis or flatcar or lifted or rolled aboard a ship or other media of transport.

Containerized transportation has an almost limitless range. In its simplest form, it may be provided by a single carrier, confined to points on its own line or route. For example, a railroad might elect to transport its freight in trailers or containers mounted on flatcars in lieu of the conventional boxcar. The trailers or containers would be sent to the shipper's door for loading and delivered at the platform of the receiver without rehandling of the goods, but both locations would have to be within the area authorized to be served by that railroad.

If perfected and advanced to the ultimate extent of its potential usefulness, containerization could afford the basis for completely integrated, worldwide door-to-door transportation, in all-purpose, readily interchangeable equipment acceptable to substantially all types of cargo, thus forming a transit pipeline by all modes of transport—rail, highway, water, and air, separately or in any combination.

The "roll and rock" of containerization—its progress, problems, and potentials—will be considered here within the format and range so defined.

THE APPROACH

Progress in containerization in the last few years has been truly phenomenal, but overall, the concept is still in the experimental stage, and formidable problems remain to be solved. The subject should be viewed in proper perspective. Any analysis of progress in containerization is likely to start with a technical description of the plans which have been put into actual use and to project its future along those horizons. And any appraisal of the problems of containerization is almost sure to center attention on the competitive scrimmaging and legal and legislative battles which those plans have produced. Thus, at the outset, the subject usually is made to appear extremely complex and the problems are pictured as vexing and numerous.

Consideration of the subject of containerization should start with a definition of goals. If we can determine where we want to go, we can chart a course toward that destination. Progress in containerization can then be evaluated in the light of whether we are moving forward on target or making headway down a blind alley. The seriousness of the problems can be measured against the strength of our resolution to overcome them.

It might be well to remember that complex though our transportation system has grown to be, the formula for transportation remains constant and very simple. The formula is locomotion, a way, and a carrying unit—movement, a path of movement, a container. Our transportation plant, the greatest ever produced on earth, grew up in compartments, and we have permitted and even encouraged it to remain that way, in the hope that free competition would preserve for the public the best that each mode of carriage could produce.

Each of our modes of transportation developed and improved its carrying units according to its own physical characteristics and needs. This created gaps between carriers and between modes which could be filled only by manual labor, transferring cargo from one unit to another. The railroad companies, spurred by lessons learned in the Civil War, gradually standardized track and equipment so that there is now complete freedom of interchange among railroads without physical transfer of cargo. The motor carrier industry is making headway in the interchange of equipment between trucklines, but between rail and motor there still is only an insignificant amount of interchange. Between land, sea, and air carriers, transfer of cargo also remains pretty much in the primitive stage. The mission of containerization is in these areas.

THE GOAL AND THE PATH

Now let us consider the goal toward which we wish to direct our efforts in making use of this new tool of transport, the container. Do we wish simply to replace present inefficient equipment with more efficient units of carriage? We can make a good deal of transport progress that way, but containerization will never usher in a renaissance in transportation unless and until it spans the void that compartmentalizes transport media in this country and around the world.

Our goal must be the worldwide, completely integrated system of transportation heretofore described. What is the best and shortest course toward that objective?

To reach our goal, we must find a way to bring about complete coordination of the physical transportation plant.

Two obstacles stand across that path. One is physical, and the other is in the realm of policy—government and managerial. Effective and efficient coordination requires interchange of equipment without transfer of cargo. Interchange requires, first, the physical ability freely to transfer equipment from one carrier and one mode to another; second, a willingness, or a legal compulsion, to effectuate interchange; and finally a working arrangement for compensating each carrier, out of total revenue, for its contribution to the joint endeavor. The physical problem is to devise the interchangeable equipment. The policy problem is to encourage or require the making of workable arrangements for interchange and for an equitable distribution of revenues.

THE PHYSICAL PROBLEM

Standardization of equipment and method is the first step toward solution of the physical problem. But, if the full potential of containerization is to be realized, a further step must be taken. The standardized equipment must be capable of accommodating substantially all cargo—dry, liquid, refrigerated, packaged, and in bulk.

Standardization

The problems of standardization have been seriously studied for a long time, but, somehow, the studies never got past the drawing-board stage until, in the fall of 1958, a crash program was mounted by the National Defense Transportation Association and the subject was placed in the hands of a Special Subcommittee on Containerization and Standardization. Headed by the author, and made up of industry, transport, and government executives and experts, that subcommittee, in less than a year, came up with recommended basic dimensional standards for containers which are now widely accepted. The recommendation was for containers of 20- and 40-foot lengths, or other lengths of which 40 is a multiple, for use singly or in tandem, with 8- by 8-foot height and width dimensions.

Many people said that these standards were not workable, citing a variety of reasons and special situations. It was said that even if adopted for use in this country, such standards could not be made applicable in Europe because of clearances and for other reasons. Nevertheless, the report was the spark that lit the tinder and, despite all objections, orders for containers of the specified sizes began to flood the manufacturers. Then, in May 1962, the electrifying news came from London that the community of European nations, acting through the International Organization for Standardization, had tentatively agreed upon standard 10- and 20-foot containers with cross sections of 8 feet. These are the American standards except that they do not extend to the maximum length of 40 feet.

Thus, the essential breakthrough on standards has been made. The time for implementation on a national and a global basis is at hand. There is a worldwide consciousness of the importance of standard, interchangeable transport equipment to the economy and the safety of free nations everywhere. The success of the venture in this country will be closely watched, and acceptance of the concept on an international basis will hinge on the vigor and intelligence of our leadership.

Incentives to standardize

According to an old adage, the world will beat a path to the door of the man who builds a better mousetrap. But the mousetrap first has to be built and demonstrated and, for that, we will need, in the case at hand, some bait. We must obtain standardized transportation equipment, in quantity, now, not at some indefinite time in the future when the old plant has completely broken down.

One means of insuring the rapid replacement of existing equipment with standardized containers, and the equipment to facilitate their use, has been suggested by the author on several occasions. It is the simple but effective incentive of accelerated depreciation for tax purposes for all types of new equipment built to specified standards. Possibly this can be effectuated under the existing statutes, but, if not, it should be brought about by a change in the tax laws.

The statute or directive should specify the standards to be complied with in order to qualify for tax relief. Not only the dimensions of containers but the hardware of interchange should be particularized. Stubborn problems remain in such areas as transferring containers from one mode of transport to another, of locking them together, and of securing them to flatcars or undercarriages. Fundamental conflicts of interests may retard standardization of device and method for years unless a powerful

enough incentive is employed to overcome the perfectly understandable resistance of vested interests.

A practical approach and the application of bullheaded commonsense crashed the dimensional barriers which for years had defied the efforts of scholars and technicians. If containerization is to penetrate the next frontier, a bold approach to implementation will be required. The climate for the tax approach is ideal. The existing equipment fleets of nearly all common carriers are in an advanced state of obsolescence. The railroads should be spending $2 billion a year for modernization of facilities and overcoming obsolescence—they are spending less than three-quarters of a billion. Now is the time to get the containerization movement into orbit.

ALL-PURPOSE EQUIPMENT

To reach the ultimate goal of containerization, we must have not only standardized equipment but versatile, all-purpose equipment. The greatest drag on the economy and efficiency of the common-carrier system is empty mileage brought about very largely by specialized equipment. The situation is much worse than we have been led to believe.

The movement of railroad cars is measured in car-miles. It has been estimated that 40 percent of the car-miles produced on American railroads represent empty movements. The facts prove that this estimate is far too low. The Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) recently released the results of a special 7-day study in which the loaded and empty car-miles by each class of equipment were recorded and reported by all class I railroads.[1] The study presents a truly shocking picture of the waste and inefficiency which are the inevitable consequence of the use of special-purpose equipment.

According to the actual figures, as revealed by the study, the ratio of empty to loaded car-miles for all types of equipment combined is not 40 percent but 62 percent. This means that, for every 100 miles of rail service actually received, the shipping public pays for 162 miles of railroad operation.

The ICC study sharply emphasizes the fact that the degree of specialization of equipment determines the extent to which it must be moved empty. Tank cars, for example, actually travel empty a greater distance than they move under load. Special-service boxcars have an empty to loaded care-mile ratio of 72 percent. Flatcars not used in piggyback service have a 68 percent empty car-mile movement. The empty mileage of such cars when used for handling trailers is only 25 percent.

It is not the imbalance of traffic which results in these fantastically high ratios of empty to loaded car-miles—it is specialization of equipment. Empty boxcars going east meet empty refrigerator cars going west. With proper engineering, the same unit could be loaded in both directions. The engineering already has been accomplished, and empty car-mileage can be cut to 10 percent or less of the total if transportation management can be induced to employ what technology has produced.

A prototype of the all-purpose container was unveiled at the annual convention of the National Defense Transportation Association in Seattle in the fall of 1959. The 40-foot container there displayed could carry automobiles on retractable ramps, liquid cargo in collapsible rubber tanks, or dry cargo when the tanks were removed and the ramps folded against floor and ceiling. It was capable of being insulated and refrigerated.

Since that time, dual-purpose containers have been manufactured and put into practical use between the eastern and western seaboards, hauling dry cargo westbound and refrigerated cargo eastbound. The techniques of refrigeration and insulation have been so perfected that only an insignificant amount of cubic capacity is sacrificed to produce this equipment which practically doubles the productive capacity of each container. Similar equipment is being used in certain land-sea operations.

Such is the panoramic view of the physical status of containerization. Containerization has arrived. We have only to accept it and put it to its fullest use. Invention and imagination have passed the challenge to initiative and determination. Now we examine the challenges in the area where policy decisions must be made.

POLICY AND DECISION

The finest fleet of the most modern container equipment which science and technology can produce will not fill the gaps which separate the transportation system into tight compartments unless the services of the several modes of transport are in some manner coordinated. Coordination has been a cardinal goal of transportation policy in this country for many years, but policy is not self-executing. Where, as under our system, the matter is left largely to carrier management, only self-interest or survival can be depended upon to provide the incentive to coordinate.

Again, the initial problem is to define terms and select a course. Coordination is not meaningful in and of itself. The only kind of coordination that serves any useful purpose is a combination of services of different modes of transportation in a conjunctive sense and on such a basis as to give the shipper the maximum benefits of each mode in terms of economy, speed, and convenience.

Substitution of one form of carriage for another is not coordination, because it is not conjunctive. Under the so-called substitute-service plan of piggybacking which is employed on a relatively small scale, a motor carrier contracts with a railroad to haul the trucker's trailers for a part of all of the journey within the truckman's authorized territory. In substance, the motor carrier simply subcontracts to the railroad a part of its obligation to carry, and the shipper obtains truck service at truck rates.

Voluntary coordination will come about only when the inducement to coordinate is strong enough to overcome the natural reluctance of all carriers to deal with their actual or potential competitors. Experience with piggyback and related plans of containerized service thus far obtained indicates that realistic pricing could be the key to true coordination. If the amount received by each carrier for the service which it performs reflects the economic and service advantages of that carrier, the play of economics should bring about the best overall pattern of service.

The almost instantaneous success of the plans established by the railroads for the movement of trailers, or trailers and flat cars owned or controlled by shippers, supports this view. These plans, known as plan III and plan IV, respectively, diverted a great deal of freight which was moving by highway in private carriage back to the railroads. The shippers still employ private or proprietary truck lines for that portion of the service which such carriers perform more economically or expeditiously.

The service provided under plans III and IV piggyback is priced on the same basis on which a shipper computes his cost of hauling his own freight by highway—a flat charge for all the freight of whatever kind that can be loaded into a vehicle of given cubic capacity. And when the shipper has such an accurate yardstick by which to compare services, he selects the one which is fastest and cheapest. In this way, coordination on an economic basis has been effectuated, but, of course, plans III and IV do not extend to all situations.

If similar realistic pricing techniques could be established as between common carriers, it is believed that coordination could be effectuated on a national and, ultimately, an international scale. At present, there is no uniformity in intercarrier arrangements for through containerized service. Freight forwarders, by reason of statutory limitations, employ rail plans III and IV and pay the published rates. Motor carriers, being confined by law to the provision of joint service on the basis of joint rates and divisions, engage in so-called plan I and plan V service. Plan I is the substituted service plan which, as stated, does not represent true coordination. Its legality is at least suspect. Plan V is based on joint rates, but it has had indifferent success.

These differing arrangements have led to competitive struggles and legal and legislative battles. The President's transportation message of April 5, 1962, recommended that steps be taken to equalize the opportunity of all carriers in the utilization of piggybacking and related techniques. Unfortunately, the message suggested a totally misguided and unworkable means of implementing that recommendation. The suggestion was that all carriers be permitted to ship containers by all other carriers and pay whatever rates are established for shippers. This is foreign to all basic concepts of policy and regulation. Its defects are too numerous to be mentioned here.

Uniformity and equality in intercarrier arrangements for the joint provision of containerized service are desirable, but they should be achieved on the basis of a carrier-to-shipper relationship. No pattern for such intercarrier arrangements is suggested here, but, if the idea is sound, reasonable men can devise a just and workable formula.

CONCLUSION

One thing stands out above all others. Containerization is not just a physical contraption. It is a concept of transportation. Its advantages are meaningless to the shipper unless they are translated into a realistic price. The essential "bridge" between the producer and the consumer of transportation is the freight rate. As a concept, containerization remained an illusive vision until the railroads discarded timeworn principles of ratemaking and devised a pricing structure for piggybacking that reflects only the service performed.

The danger that stalks a troubled world forces upon us the certain knowledge that there must be a closer unity among all peoples who cherish and are determined to perpetuate freedom and individual liberty as a way of life. The efficiency of transportation will measure the success of that endeavor, and the economy and safety of this Nation and of the free world may depend, to a very important degree, on how well and how quickly we build a global transit pipeline, using the best tool that we have—containerization.

[1] Interstate Commerce Commission, Statement No. 3-62, June 1962.

Tax-Free Power

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very fine speech given by T. E. Roach, president of the Idaho Power Co., at a meeting of the Pocatello Chamber

of Commerce at Pocatello, Idaho, on the 15th of August 1962. This speech aptly discloses why "Tax-Free Power Is Not the Answer."

Mr. Roach's speech concerns the proposed extension of the Bonneville Power marketing area to southern Idaho. I recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A126, a copy of a letter I sent to the Secretary of the Interior protesting the approval of such an extension of the BPA power market area.

To spend $100 million of the taxpayers money to provide subsidized power to an area now fully supplied at reasonable rates is totally unwarranted. Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks and to include Mr. Roach's speech:

TAX-FREE POWER IS NOT THE ANSWER

(Speech by T. E. Roach, president, Idaho Power Co., August 15, 1962)

I welcome the opportunity to speak to the Pocatello chamber membership about Idaho Power and about problems in Idaho that have a direct bearing upon the future of your various businesses as well as Idaho Power's. Pocatello comprises an important part of our service area and we have the same concern for its growth and expansion as each of you. This is evidenced by the fact that Idaho Power has been a member of the Pocatello Chamber of Commerce since its organization and has had an active part in all of its constructive efforts. We are represented in Pocatello by Milt Sargent, division manager, and his community interest is well known to you by reason of the fact that he is currently serving as vice president of the chamber. Before him, Larry Brainard, a director of Idaho Power, served as chamber president and helped spark special industrial interest. Before Larry's time, Don Brown and others have responded to all important civic calls. Beyond that, our industrial development department under Orland Mayer has been active over more years and spent more money in that field than any other organization in the State, including other chambers of commerce and even the State of Idaho.

This is tangible evidence of our continuing interest in and concern for the importance of constructively contributing to the economic development of the area.

We are proud of our almost 50-year record of never letting the area down in the assurance of ample, low-cost power supply, no matter the size of the demand. Because we have a substantial stake in the economic welfare of the State, we have an understandable concern over any misinformation that might adversely affect the area's economic reputation or that of our company.

Despite the fact that our service area has enjoyed an unbroken record of sound and expanding economic progress—as well as a phenomenal increase in power supply unmatched anywhere in the West—we hear with some regularity, but particularly in an election year, that our economy is decadent, and the only cure is Federal power. In glowing terms, a picture is painted of the great industrial development and prosperity that will accompany the introduction of a tax-free power supply.

This well-planned effort to decry and downgrade the economic status of the State for the purpose of creating a political strawman is a disservice to the area and gives to outsiders a wholly unwarranted impression which is detrimental to constructive efforts being put forth to attract new business to the State.

Are these pronouncements accurate? Is Government power the vital ingredient? The answer is clearly found in a direct comparison of those areas which have been served by Bonneville and those in Idaho, which have been supplied with power by taxpaying enterprise. Let us look for a few moments at some of the principal yardsticks which measure the economic status of Idaho with that of Oregon and Washington.

IDAHO COMPARES FAVORABLY

1. Unemployment is one of the very sensitive barometers of economic health and, on this point, it is enlightening to note that the U.S. Department of Labor lists 36 areas of substantial unemployment in the Northwest. Fourteen of these are in Oregon, including Portland; 16 are in Washington, including Spokane and Tacoma; and only 6 are in Idaho, these being in north Idaho. Not a single area in southern Idaho is mentioned.

Significantly, all of these unemployment distress areas are within the Bonneville marketing area, and you who are familiar with the north Idaho economy are aware that being in the Bonneville marketing area has brought little economic comfort to it.

2. The same Department of Labor figures show that employment in nonagricultural establishments between 1950 and 1960 increased 19 percent in Idaho, 16½ percent in Oregon, and only 6½ percent in Washington.

Even in the category of "strictly manufacturing," this same Department of Labor source shows the gain in employment between 1950 and 1960 was 38 percent in Idaho, 25 percent in Washington, and 6 percent in Oregon.

Thus, from an employment standpoint, Idaho has definitely made greater progress than either of our two adjoining States to the west, where Bonneville dominates the electric power supply.

3. On the score of increased per capita personal income, Idaho led both Oregon and Washington for the decade 1950–60 with an increase of 43 percent as against 42 percent for Oregon and 40 percent for Washington. For the year 1961, Idaho was up 3.2 percent, compared to Washington's increase of 2.7 percent and Oregon's 1 percent. These figures are from the U.S. Department of Commerce.

4. That Idaho compares favorably with our sister States to the west in value added by manufacture is also disclosed in the U.S. Department of Commerce report for 1958 (the latest), which compares the 5-year period 1954–58. Here Idaho's percentage of increase was 35 percent, or double Oregon's 18 percent, and only slightly below Washington's 40 percent, which was greatly influenced by the volume of work at the Boeing plant in Seattle.

5. Another sound test of economic health is comparative debt and tax levels. Here again Idaho stands out with a State bonded debt per capita of only $9.88, compared with $151 for Washington and $188 for Oregon.

In terms of annual tax burden at the State level, Idaho again finds itself in better shape, with total 1961 taxes per capita of $102, compared with Oregon's $111 and Washington's $164.

6. In the 7-year period 1955–61 the new industries locating in southern Idaho and eastern Oregon totaled 116. They furnish employment to approximately 5,500 people.

We do not have comparable data for Oregon and Washington on a statewide basis, but we do have the industrial development record for Bonneville over the past 10 years. That record shows in 10 years Bonneville has added a net of exactly two industrial customers. They lost the Kaiser Aluminum plant at Tacoma and added the Harvey Aluminum Co. at The Dalles, the Hanna Nickel Co. at Riddle, and Anaconda Aluminum Co. at Columbia Falls, Mont. The Harvey and Hanna installations in Oregon were Government-sponsored projects, whose output goes into the already heavily overburdened Government stockpiling program.

Certainly, a comparative record of this kind provides no warrant for deprecating, downgrading, or holding up to scorn the economic and industrial growth of Idaho compared with Oregon and Washington; and more particularly, it does not demonstrate that tax-free, subsidized Federal power contains within itself any magical formula for industrial growth.

Probably the most accurate and positive comparison of economic progress is found in the area increase in use of electric power. Here again the answer is crystal clear that by this yardstick the area served by Idaho Power has made greater economic progress than either Oregon or Washington. In the 18-year period 1943 to 1961, Idaho Power's average load has increased 8½ times, while that of Bonneville has increased only 5 times. If we compare only the last 10 years, Idaho Power Co.'s growth has been 250 percent, while that of Bonneville in the same period has been only 190 percent.

This evidence would seem to demonstrate conclusively that so-called cheap Government power is not a guarantee of industrial and economic growth—but let us go one step further and see if rate per kilowatt-hour is the all-important consideration.

INDUSTRIAL POWER RATES

Except in a very few manufacturing activities, the cost of power represents less than one-half of 1 percent of total production costs. The exceptions are found mostly in the fields of electrometal and electrochemical reduction, where cost of power is an appreciably greater percent of total cost. Certainly, taxes and labor costs are much more important and controlling in most industries, and particularly those furnishing substantial employment in relation to power needs.

Over 35 percent of Bonneville's output goes into the electrometal and electrochemical industry, and of this amount 83 percent goes into the production of aluminum. As I pointed out earlier, however, there has been no increase in this particular field except for the additions of Anaconda, Harvey Aluminum, and Hanna Nickel, the latter two being Government-subsidized undertakings. Moreover, all of the aluminum plants are now, and for some time have been, operating at less than full capacity. Additionally, these types of industries, requiring large blocks of power and employing comparatively few people, do not contribute purchasing power in proportion to their power requirements, as compared to a well-balanced group of average industries. It was this fact that caused a representative of the Governor of the State of Washington to comment, "an aluminum plant takes one million kilowatt-hours of power to keep one man busy cracking the crust in potlines." Why should such industries be singled out for special Government subsidy in the form of tax-free power?

Closer to home is a comparison in the electrochemical field. Over the past 10 years, the quantity of electrical energy supplied by Idaho Power to FMC has increased 4½ times. Victor Chemical Co. at Silver Bow, Mont., on the other hand, started elemental phosphorus operations with Bonneville power in 1952, and despite the availability of Bonneville's rates, has not increased its operation a single pound beyond its initial capacity. On the basis of this evidence, what justification is there for the loose and generalized statements that Government-subsidized power is any assurance of industrial growth or economic prosperity? Indeed, on the contrary, the evidence points to exactly the opposite conclusion.

On the subject of rates, I hope it will be of more than passing interest to this audience to know that the rates of Idaho Power for large industrial operations requiring relatively large quantities of power, such as in the production of elemental phosphorus, are

substantially lower than that of any other taxpaying utility in the United States, and approximately the same as the rate of TVA for this type of service, despite the inclusion in our costs of a heavy tax load—a burden not carried by any public agency.

GOVERNMENT POWER IS SUBSIDIZED

Bonneville's freedom from taxes and access to tax-free capital funds represents a direct rate advantage of 48 percent. If Idaho Power were relieved of that part of its costs, its large industrial rate would be less than that of Bonneville. To put it another way, relief from that tax burden, as is enjoyed by Bonneville, would permit Idaho Power to lower all of its rate schedules by 48 percent, or with that annual tax relief it could pay off all its outstanding bonded indebtedness in 8½ years, or all of its outstanding capital securities including stocks in 11⅓ years.

Tax exemption would be fine for Idaho Power, but what about all the various State and local functions of government and school operations dependent upon that tax money for support of these essential functions?

TAX REVENUES ARE VITAL

Idaho Power is today the State's largest taxpayer, with its payments spread over 27 counties. Sixty percent of our property taxes go to the support of our public school system. As one editor expressed it recently, "many counties in Idaho could not maintain their services without the property taxes paid by Idaho Power."

Since World War II, Idaho Power has created over $300 million in new taxpaying property, which has increased its annual State and local taxes from $670,000 to over $5 million or eight times. If an industrial plant prospect came along, proposing to spend only one one-hundredth of that amount in a new plant, he would be greeted with open arms and a brass band by all levels of government, and certainly by the chambers of commerce in the area; yet an investment of a hundred times that amount by Idaho Power has created hardly a ripple in these same circles. Had Bonneville built these power facilities with taxpayers funds instead of Idaho Power, not one dime of additional taxable wealth would have been created. Local and State taxes, as well as Federal taxes, presently being paid by Idaho Power on these facilities would have been added to your tax bill instead.

For increased power facilities over the next 6 years, we expect to spend another $140 million of taxpaying capital, providing, of course, that our plans to create these new power facilities are not stymied by the recent proposal to bring Bonneville lines and power into the area to take away from Idaho Power the market it has served so well over a period of almost 50 years. The bringing of Bonneville power into the area would, of course, force the abandonment of much of this proposed expenditure and correspondingly destroy the future tax revenues it would have created.

A COSTLY PROPOSAL

To bring Bonneville lines into this area would cost a minimum of $40 million—and, of course, to develop such tax-exempt power facilities would require tax money, the only purpose of which would be to eliminate the building of taxpaying electric units.

At a time when the overall burden of State taxes is so heavy, when Government spending is mounting at a rapid pace, when extreme measures are being proposed to insure every possible dollar of tax collection, and when the Pocatello Chamber itself is spearheading a drive for a sales tax to ease the burden of State property and income taxes—at such a time it is strange indeed to hear of proposals for spending millions upon millions of these hard-to-get tax dollars for the purpose of building a tax-destroying Federal power empire in southern Idaho.

Even more strange is it to see such a program being proposed for execution by Bonneville, which for the 4 years ending June 30, 1961, and without the burden of taxes, has lost $40 million in its operation. It is reliably reported to have lost another $18 million for the fiscal year just ended, or a total loss of almost $60 million in a 5-year period. Such a suggestion evidences a complete disregard for the economic realities of the Bonneville financial predicament and its inadequate power supply situation.

IDAHO IRRIGATION WOULD LOSE

Not only would such an action do great and permanent damage to the present and future tax income of the State—while benefiting only a few public agencies and perhaps a high consumption industry or two by enabling them to become tax evaders—but it would do great and lasting harm to the State's irrigation resources and future expansion. This would inevitably follow from the substitution of Bonneville as the marketing agency for Bureau of Reclamation power at rates substantially below current Bureau rates, thus greatly decreasing the revenues available from Bureau power sales and earmarked for support of irrigation projects in the area. To answer that no concern need be felt on this score because Bonneville would assume that responsibility is small comfort in the face of the already enormous and mounting losses reported by Bonneville.

Irrigation benefits cannot be paid from admitted losses by Bonneville. Hard dollars are needed—and if not forthcoming from Bureau power sales, they must come either from increased payments by the irrigators themselves or from the taxpayers generally.

Attempts to attach irrigation projects to Bonneville power revenues will not be popular nor approved by our neighbors to the west. This is best evidenced by the refusal of Congress in just the past few weeks to saddle Bonneville revenues with the irrigation benefit responsibility of the Mann Creek project near Weiser, sponsored by Congresswoman PFOST, and the Baker project in Oregon, sponsored by Congressman ULLMAN. On top of that, Oregon's leading daily newspaper—The Oregonian of July 29—carried an editorial entitled "Irrigation Albatross," reading in part as follows:

"The gimmick of attaching irrigation projects to Bonneville power revenues in order to make irrigation feasible cuts at the heart of the BPA rate structure. We don't know all about some of the other arguments in a minority report of the House Interior Committee opposing the Baker project bill and another project in Idaho, but we do know that saddling of these projects on Bonneville revenues threatens to harm the entire Northwest."

So you can be sure that Bonneville customers in Oregon and Washington have little interest in Idaho irrigation.

PRESENT COORDINATION BEST

The Bureau of Reclamation power system, on the other hand, is designed to operate for the advantage of the irrigator, and the maximum irrigation benefit is realized through the integration of that system with Idaho Power's interconnected system. This coordinated operation has been in existence since 1923, and by reason of a recent contract arrangement has provided the Bureau with 30,000 kilowatts of added power capacity for the further benefit of the irrigation program. As a matter of fact, Idaho Power's coordinated and cooperative arrangement with the Bureau, and the guaranteed market we provide for the Bureau's surplus power in the summer months, is the key to the financial soundness and payout ability of many of our irrigation projects—all of which would be destroyed if Bonneville should replace the Bureau as the marketing agent.

At stake, therefore, is not only existing irrigation project feasibility but also that of all future irrigation projects dependent upon power revenues for financial aid.

FEW GAIN—MANY LOSE

What argument or justification then can be advanced for urging Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho, other than the desire of a few to obtain preferential treatment in avoiding a fair share of the taxes that Idaho Power must include in its costs, and which the schools and other necessary local agencies of government must have in order to carry out the necessary functions essential to the welfare of our State and its people? And after all, can Bonneville power be developed and supplied at a cost less than that of an investor-owned company such as Idaho Power?

To be sure, Government power may be sold for less, but does it really cost less? The engineering design of a hydroplant requires a precise quantity of excavation, concrete, and man-hours of labor no matter who does the building and who owns it. Over a given distance of transmission the same miles of conductor, number of towers, and man-hours of labor are required, irrespective of the owner. When it comes to efficiency in building or operating, I think the record is clear that Government operation of anything has not been done as efficiently as it has in private business. Nor can Bonneville build and operate electric facilities as efficiently and economically as Idaho Power. Where then is it possible for Government costs to be less than those of private business operation? The only area, of course, is in the privilege it enjoys of avoiding, as part of cost, the legitimate and necessary taxes we must all pay as our share of supporting Government functions, and the taxes evaded by any one of us must be made up by the rest.

BONNEVILLE HAS NO FIRM POWER

Not only is Bonneville unable to produce and deliver power at a cost level less than Idaho Power—except as it evades its legitimate tax obligation—but it has, by its own admission, no firm power for sale. In its most recent published advance program, it shows not only a shortage or deficit in firm power supply in its present marketing area of 200,000 kilowatts in 1965 but a continuing and growing deficit in each year thereafter, reaching an overall deficit of 1.3 million kilowatts in 1970. From what source, then, is it going to find power for distribution in southern Idaho that would justify spending 40 million tax dollars for transmission lines into this area? In a statement to the Bonneville Advisory Council last October, Bonneville Administrator Luce stated that "we are short on firm power to the extent that we cannot make offerings to new industries." By its own figures, and by the statements of its Administrator, Bonneville has no dependable power to offer southern Idaho.

Idaho Power, on the other hand, has never failed its service area in the adequacy of power for any need and any quantity, as witness the obligation it took on and met in supplying the rapidly increased requirements of FMC. To serve this load alone, Idaho Power has a total of $40 million of taxpaying capital committed.

Not only has Idaho Power met all power demands today, but it is preparing to continue to meet them in the future with $140 million worth of added taxpaying facilities in the 6 years ahead—that is, unless Bonneville's entrance into southern Idaho attempts to substitute tax-free dollars for Idaho Power's taxpaying dollars. Incidentally, the entire aluminum industry in Washington and Oregon, which consumes the lion's share of Bonneville's tax-free power, actually pays less State and local taxes than

does Idaho Power alone. And, if you took the time to check the property tax records in Bannock and Power Counties, you would find that Idaho Power Co.'s property tax payments were over three times that of our largest consumer of electric energy.

What southern Idaho needs is not more tax-free property in the State, but more taxpaying businesses, such as that of Idaho Power, to help meet the ever-increasing revenue demands of our schools and local and State government units. And what we need at the national level, with our enormous Federal debt and ever-mounting cost of Federal Government, is a curtailment of unnecessary and wasteful spending.

You can be sure that the appropriation committees of Congress, when the facts are presented to them, will not look with much favor upon allocating $40 million of your tax money to Bonneville for a wholly unnecessary transmission line which can only add to the already large annual Bonneville operating loss.

America in a Challenging World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, within the last few weeks a great amount of attention has been focused toward the European Common Market. In this connection, I read an address, entitled "America in a Challenging World," by Lamar M. Fearing, president of the International Paper Co. This speech contains comments that are very much to the point and make up a comprehensive analysis of opportunities for real trade expansion that will stimulate American production and the flow of American made goods and commodities in an expanding world market.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to include Mr. Fearing's remarks in the RECORD:

AMERICA IN A CHALLENGING WORLD

(By Lamar M. Fearing, president, International Paper Co., a speech before the Annual Business Outlook Conference, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, November 14, 1962)

I am delighted to be here this evening. I am flattered by your invitation to participate in the Annual Business Outlook Conference of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. This has become one of the significant annual examinations of our economy by business leaders.

I am also very conscious of the distinguished predecessors who have addressed your annual dinner. I approach this responsibility with all appropriate modesty, and I am reminded of the remark of Sir Winston Churchill when a political opponent was described to him as "modest." Said Churchill, "He has a great deal to be modest about."

When I was asked to speak tonight it was suggested that I might like to examine the national and international outlook. I accept that suggestion, but not as a professional economist examining the outlook for 1963 and beyond, nor as an expert on world trade; I am neither.

Any credentials I may have spring from my many active years with International Paper Co. and its widely scattered enterprises. My company and its subsidiaries have substantial operations throughout the United States and Canada. We have 28 primary pulp and paper mills and have just begun building a $35 million mill in Oregon. We also have 81 converting plants, of which 8 are in California, 2 right here in the Los Angeles area. They convert our primary products into such things as shipping containers, folding cartons, labels, paper milk containers, multiwall shipping sacks, and grocery bags and sacks.

Ever since our company was founded in 1898 it has been export minded; we have always sold a substantial part of our tonnage in oversea markets. We export to some 55 countries and participate directly in a number of oversea operations, including the Common Market countries and Latin America. We are vitally concerned with what happens in the business world, not only in this country but throughout the world.

THE OUTLOOK

I can say that for the paper industry volume is good this year. We are, of course, feeling the price squeeze and the effect of excess industry capacity, but the steadily increasing demand for our products is encouraging. The average American today uses 440 pounds of paper and paper products each year, compared with 319 pounds in 1946 and 249 pounds in 1937. We are an expanding industry.

As we look abroad we see vast potential markets as standards of living rise. You cannot have mass markets and high standards of living without the great contribution to public knowledge provided uniquely by the printed word, the free press in all its forms, newspapers, magazines, books, and a variety of informational material. The theme of our own institutional advertising is "Send me a man who reads."

Mass distribution and advertising are inseparable twins. And you cannot have mass distribution without paper packaging and paper shipping containers. All of this means a growing need for paper.

To a large degree, paper consumption provides a measure of a nation's standard of living. Look at some figures. Against the yearly U.S. per capita consumption of 440 pounds of paper and paper products, Canada consumes 290 and the United Kingdom 235, the Common Market countries as a group average 146, South America about 31, and in most parts of Asia and Africa 5 pounds or less.

As living standards continue to rise, particularly in the underdeveloped countries, important potential markets for the products of American industry, including paper, are sure to develop.

In the opinion of the economists we consult, the U.S. economy today is sluggish, but at a high level. It lacks vigor. When it will move out of this condition involves prophecy, which I leave to the experts. As to the outlook, over the next 10 years standards of living throughout the world are going to rise and with this will come new opportunities for American business. How well we do as a nation will depend entirely upon our ability to compete, to meet increasingly strong foreign competition, and to come home with a profit.

AN ECONOMIC REVOLUTION

But what I would like to explore with you briefly is not this long-term economic outlook, or even the near-term economic outlook, but the economic revolution which is taking place in the world today. The world is being economically reorganized in a way and to a degree that is unprecedented.

The thrust toward a European Economic Community is perhaps the most visible evidence of this economic reorganization. But I believe these changes are worldwide and carry truly global implications.

The European Economic Community is a symptom of this general pattern of change, perhaps at the heart of it. But whether or not the Common Market succeeds in developing according to its plan, whether or not the United Kingdom becomes a member, whether or not major roadblocks develop, the idea of a Common Market is a symptom of our times and has made an indelible impression upon the minds of all the peoples of Europe—and it will have far-reaching effects in all corners of the world.

Our thinking about world trade must be different in 1963 from what it was in 1962 or in any previous year. World trade will develop significantly in new ways over the years ahead.

The vast U.S. market, the world's first great common market, will soon be matched by a second vast Common Market in Europe, almost as large as ours and potentially larger. We in this country must reexamine many of our basic ideas with respect to world trade.

THE COMMON MARKET

The six original Common Market nations have a population of roughly 173 million people. If you include the 19 associated nations and 9 others that have asked for admission on one basis or another, the total population would be over 350 million.

The gross national product of the original six nations was $180 billion (at current prices) in 1960, the last year for which figures were available, and it is increasing rapidly. Add the potential members and you reach a figure of better than $300 billion as of 1960. Our own gross national product in 1960 was $504 billion, and while it is also increasing the rate is slower.

The arresting figure, of course, is the combined product of the two common markets—the potential Common Market of Europe and that of the United States, potentially a trillion-dollar gross national product.

No wonder Premier Khrushchev takes a very dim view of the Common Market. It dwarfs in size the industrial output of the Communist bloc. If the two common markets are combined, they will represent 60 percent of the world's trade.

A "CAPITALIST PLOT"

Khrushchev calls the Common Market a "capitalist plot." Of course it is exactly that, a capitalist plot, but not against the Russians. It is a capitalist plot to benefit greatly the people of Europe and the free world, by expanding business, increasing earnings, raising standards of living, strengthening the forces of peace through trade and by encouraging production. It is not aimed against anybody, it is aimed for the people of Europe, just as the United States was created for the people of this Nation.

But the Common Market is not the whole story. It is only the beginning, visible evidence of vast changes that should result in greater stimulation to world commerce as trade becomes organized on a more rational basis.

The President of the United States asked for extraordinary powers to negotiate a sound and profitable relationship between the Common Market and the United States. He has been given the powers he requested through the Trade Expansion Act passed in October by both Houses of Congress. Certainly this is an immensely important piece of legislation. It opens up opportunity for wise, hard-headed and effective negotiating.

We hope that negotiations will be fair and successful. The paper industry fully shares the position taken by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce with regard to this act. We especially want hard bargaining on a truly reciprocal basis. We certainly hope top business leaders will be involved directly and importantly in both planning and negotiating these new tariff structures.

THE COMPETITIVE CHALLENGE

But the heart of our national problem and opportunity is not the Trade Expansion Act, it is America's ability to compete.

We face today a Common Market that has many of our advantages. It will develop many of our strengths. If we have advantages of mass production, and often we have, they are rapidly developing the same advantages. If we have superior know-how, derived from long experience, know-how will grow in the Common Market, as it is already growing. With these strengths we will find the Common Market countries competing with us in all export areas of the world, yet increased exports are vital to us as we work to solve our pressing balance-of-payments problem.

There does not seem to be much doubt that the spread between their labor costs and ours will tend to narrow. But according to recent studies our average hourly labor cost, including social security and fringe benefits, is 3½ times that of either Germany or the United Kingdom, and nearly four times that of either Belgium, France, Italy, or the Netherlands.

The concept of the Common Market and the fast-growing industrial capacity in all of the free world offer us a magnificent opportunity. It provides us the promise of vast growing markets, if we can compete. Starting from a lower base these countries have, of course, a growth potential that is greater than our own.

In the underdeveloped countries it has been estimated that each $10 increase in per capita income will require an additional $1 of imports. We need this expanding and profitable foreign-trade base to sustain our growing population and economy.

A VERY LARGE IF

But there is that very large if, we can prosper greatly if we are competitive in the hard, vigorous, resourceful world of the European Common Market; if we can meet the challenge of Japan and other vigorous nations; if we can compete to maintain and enlarge our trade with Canada, Latin America, the Far East, and Africa.

It seems perfectly clear to me that the ultimate vitality of our free enterprise system will be tested in these world markets. We must be competitive all around the world, in our products, in our costs, in our quality, in our service, in our credit terms.

We must adjust to the reality that we are no longer competing with countries emerging from the destruction of war. As the war-torn industries of Western Europe and Japan have been rebuilt, other countries no longer depend on our industry. And, even more important, these rebuilt industries are new, modern, efficient. Our industrial plant escaped destruction, and consequently more of it is old, approaching obsolescence and handicapped in meeting this vigorous new competition.

Can we compete? Of course we can, but we cannot do it unless we are lean and fit. We cannot go into this race with increasingly effective competitors while carrying excess baggage.

A PROFITABLE ECONOMY

As we look ahead, I would like to underscore the fact that what this country needs now and at all times is a profitable economy.

Only a profitable economy can develop the means to grow, expand, and produce full employment now and over the years ahead.

Only a profitable economy can provide high standards of living, maximum real earnings at every level.

Only a profitable economy can provide the vast funds needed for national defense.

Only a profitable economy can produce progress, through research, through the discovery and development of better processes, better materials, better products. Research is dependent upon earning power and requires very heavy capital investment in facilities.

I do not mean merely a prosperous economy. We have a prosperous economy now by all reasonable standards, but it lacks vigor, substantially because it is becoming less profitable.

Corporate profits in this country were about 7 percent of gross national product throughout the 1920's and in the years immediately preceding World War II. They were better than 7 percent in the years immediately following World War II. But in 1960, 1961, and the first half of 1962 they had declined to about 4½ percent.

PROFITS: EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

I am sure it is not necessary to point out the importance of profits to this audience of business leaders. I am trying to express not a business objective but a national purpose vital to management, investors, labor, government, consumers. Profits are everybody's business because they benefit everybody.

If labor does not worry about profits, it will need to worry about unemployment and wages. Samuel Gompers, founder of the American Federation of Labor, once declared, "The worst crime against working people is a company which fails to operate at a profit."

If Government does not worry about profits, it will need to worry about its source of revenue.

If management does not worry about profits, it will not make the contribution to a strong, free, and expanding nation which the American people count on.

If investors cannot expect profits, our growing needs will not be met because a free economy creates and attracts capital through the successful operation of millions of profitable private enterprises.

Even in Russia they recognize the need for profitable enterprises. Recently Pravda reported a debate going on in Russia as to how their factories can achieve higher output at lower cost. They are now considering an incentive system, suggested by Prof. Y. Liberman of Kharkov, that proposes bonus payments to industrial enterprises that overfulfill their profit plan. Imagine this in Russia, a bonus not on output but on profits.

A NEW UNITY OF PURPOSE IN A FAVORABLE CLIMATE

Now, how do we go about developing this more profitable economy that is so important to us all? Remember we will be operating in an increasingly competitive world against old nations, newly invigorated by American ideas, tasting for the first time the rewards of mass production and mass distribution in an increasingly free market.

Above all, I would suggest that in the years ahead we need a new unity of purpose. We need to create a national climate that fully recognizes the essentiality of profits. It seems to me that we should concern ourselves with:

First, tax reform—tax cuts on work and production;

Second, economies in the cost of Government;

Third, a clear understanding as to where the benefits of progress should go;

Fourth, Government understanding of the nature and needs of a market economy;

And fifth, a much more active role on the part of businessmen in discussions of our national economic policies.

Let us turn now to a brief discussion of each of these points.

First, tax reform. We need the sort of tax reform that is aimed at raising the necessary money while stimulating the economy and increasing the national income. Taxes should be cut on work and production. The present system shackles productive enterprise and initiative. Over 85 percent of our Federal tax revenues come from levies on income and capital, and only 15 percent from a wide range of taxes on consumption, excise taxes, customs duties, etc. Western Europe has been moving away from taxes on income and capital and toward consumption taxes. Our present tax system favors consumption and penalizes production. It is production that yields the fruits for consumption and for progress.

Our Government has suggested the need for tax reduction and reform. Certainly this is vital. The liberalization of the depreciation provisions is a step in the right direction. The 7-percent tax credit on investments in new equipment is another good step. But what will produce an invigorating increase in capital investment is a substantial hope that investment will be profitable.

The present Federal tax load upon productive income has become a brake on our national growth. Neither the national interest nor our interests as businessmen are served when we allow taxes on incomes to suffocate what we have always recognized to be such laudable virtues as thrift, effort, and enterprise.

Let us turn now to the second point, economies in the cost of Government.

Can we cut costs? There is no doubt about it. Federal expenditures in 1955, other than defense, amounted to $23.9 billion. In 1962 they had risen to $38.6 billion, an increase of 61 percent. Moreover, when we look at individual items we find that expenditures have more than doubled in many purely administrative categories. Certainly some of that increase is unnecessary.

In a memorandum to the President last July 5, Defense Secretary McNamara said, "Based on the actions we have taken to date and those we contemplate for the future, I can report to you that within 5 years we can cut the costs of the Department's logistical operations by at least $3 billion per year. These annual savings will result from the more efficient management of our logistical system and will not be achieved through a reduction in the strength of our combat forces."

If such savings are possible through good management in our vital defense expenditures, can anyone doubt that similar good management in other areas can lead to other substantial savings?

Speaking of Government costs, you may remember that "Boss" Kettering of General Motors once remarked, "One of the things we can be thankful for is that we don't get as much government as we pay for."

Our third item for consideration, a clear understanding as to where the benefits of progress should go.

On this subject I want to make the point that all the benefits of progress derive from research and from increasing productivity, both resulting very largely from capital investment. They should be given to all segments of the population, including labor, of course. Unless this is done the life-giving flow of investment is cut off and there is no growth and expansion.

Benefits belong to labor, the consumer and the investor. All three must share in the benefits of progress if we are to have progress.

In the sharply competitive world that lies ahead of us, labor must share in the challenge to compete. This does not mean lower wages and lower standards of living to match foreign labor. It does mean the elimination of waste that has been supported by subsidy and coddling at home. The modern challenge of world markets cannot accommodate subsidy and coddling. The hard fact of harder competition makes productivity a basic concern.

In a competitive world the needs of the American economy must increasingly determine wage-settlement patterns. Wage settlements will need to be something more

than what is politically expedient at home—they must be competitive abroad.

Before World War II there was a cartoon by the famous British cartoonist Low, which showed the nations of the world sinking in a lifeboat, some huddled in the bow and some in the stern. Those in the bow were bailing frantically, very nearly submerged; those in the stern looked on foolishly and took comfort by saying, "That's a nasty leak. Thank goodness it's not at our end of the boat." What weakens the economy affects all of us. A boat may leak at one end, but it sinks all over.

Our fourth item, Government understanding of the nature and needs of a market economy. Let Government recognize that a free market is a very efficient decisionmaker—far more so than any centralized planning power. The role of Government is that of referee, to see to it that the game is played under the rules. Government is not coach or signal caller. Above all, Government is not a member of the opposition team, set on breaking up fair plays. Government should be aware of the problems faced by the businessman in trying to maintain his business as a going concern.

Our fifth and last item for consideration, a much more active role on the part of businessmen in discussions of our national economic policies. To produce an invigorating climate, business and industry have a duty to innovate not only products and processes but policies.

One such innovation, it appears to me, would be more speaking out by businessmen. I believe there is a new pressure on business and industrial leadership to help give direction to the national purpose. I am not the first to suggest that we are not contributing as vigorously as we should to the national discussion of economic policy. But if, as I believe, we are at the beginning of a world economic revolution, it is vital that we all contribute to the discussions of national policies in this time of change.

Surveys have repeatedly indicated an appalling lack of understanding by the American public of the fundamental workings of the American economy. Few high school students ever study even basic economics. Indeed few social studies teachers in secondary schools are qualified to teach even the most elementary economic principles. The problem of economic literacy is of real concern to us. We are happy to see some efforts being made now to improve this situation and they should be supported by businessmen.

The political decisions that affect the economics of our time depend in large degree upon the man on the street, who is one of the chief beneficiaries of a profitable economy. There must be more speaking out by businessmen to the man on the street and to employees and to our representatives in Congress.

I saw a graphic example of how the consumer himself benefits from the profitable operation of an industrial enterprise in a recent report of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. They pointed out that in 1919 a long-distance call from Washington to Cleveland would have cost $2.25; by 1936 you could call Chicago for the same amount; by 1946 you could call Denver; and today you can reach the entire west coast for the same $2.25.

This, of course, reflects continual heavy investment in research and improved equipment and facilities by the Bell System. Not only has the customer benefited, but steady dividend payments have been made to the investors who have provided the necessary capital funds, and I am sure the Bell System employees, approximately 725,000 of them today, enjoy wage scales that reflect improved productivity.

THE ENERGIZING FORCE OF FREEDOM

As we move into the expanding arena of world trade, our greatest strength lies in our political and economic systems—democracy and free enterprise. Wherever men are free to choose they choose freedom. Wherever they are free there is a release of energy beyond anything known under any other system.

Regimented on collective farms and governed by political considerations, the farmers of Russia and China have been unable to feed their populations. The most significant propaganda fact of our time is the failure of Communist farming as compared to the massive farm surpluses produced by freemen.

But I do not need to proclaim the virtues of free enterprise to this audience. I would like, however, to urge that it is vital to our growth and progress as a nation in this increasingly competitive world that we become missionaries of the greatest young idea in the world today, political and economic freedom of men, the most revolutionary concept of modern man and the most difficult to achieve and hold.

SUMMARY

Let me summarize by saying that, given peace, we see a great and exciting new world before us. We see a world economic revolution which presents not only a very great opportunity but also a very hard challenge to our capacity to compete. We feel that our country's potentialities were never greater. But we have no notion that the future will be easy.

We feel very strongly that a profitable economy, one that is generating new capital to support new growth, one that is efficient, low cost and competitive, is an objective vital to all Americans. Our national security as well as our prosperity demand a profitable economy.

I suggest as a national policy that we all unite behind clear objectives to compete successfully, to work together, to find new solutions, to invest in growth and to use the energizing power of freedom to build the future of world peace and prosperity we all want. This requires work on your part and mine, and I assure you that we in the business world cannot accomplish much from a sitting position.

We need to create a national climate that fully recognizes the essentiality of profits. It seems to me that we should concern ourselves with:

First, tax reform—tax cuts on work and production;

Second, economies in the cost of Government;

Third, a clear understanding as to where the benefits of progress should go;

Fourth, Government understanding of the nature and needs of a market economy; and

Fifth, a much more active role on the part of businessmen in discussions of our national economic policies.

Farm Boy's Rise to Banking Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert an article on a friend and fellow Georgian, M. Monroe Kimbrel.

Mr. Kimbrel, who is president of the American Bankers Association, will be in Washington on February 25 to lead the organization in its observance of the 100th anniversary of commercial banking in this country. I believe my colleagues in the House will enjoy reading this story about him, written by Katherine Barnwell, that appeared in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution magazine on February 3:

FARM BOY'S RISE TO BANKING LEADERSHIP

(By Katherine Barnwell)

When Monroe Kimbrel was a tall, lanky youth living on a farm in southwest Georgia, his ambition was to become a country banker.

He didn't have any bankers in the family, but he'd known a couple and he thought a job in a small bank would appeal to him.

To raise money for a college education he did all kinds of farm chores, including driving a tractor. Then he rashly spent a large part of his earnings for a new bicycle.

But he soon displayed a banker's canny talent for making a profit on an investment. He sold the bicycle for more than he'd paid for it. That's how he got most of the $95 in cash he had when he left his home in Miller County near Colquitt to go to the University of Georgia.

"I also had a round trip railroad ticket," he recalled recently. "I wanted to be able to get back home in case I couldn't afford to stay at the university."

The ambitious farm boy got a job waiting on tables at the university—and 3 years later he was graduated in the top 5 percent of his class.

Today, M. Monroe Kimbrel is president of the American Bankers Association, the highest honor that can come to anyone in banking. At 46, he is the youngest president in the 88-year history of the association—which represents approximately 13,000 banks all over the United States.

He is also a self-styled country banker in Thomson, Ga.—a town with about 6,000 people. He's chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Thomson, which has less than $5 million in deposits. It's believed to be the smallest bank ever to produce an ABA president. Many of the bank's customers are from surrounding rural areas.

Mr. Kimbrel is a friendly, chatty, personable man who is equally at ease with Wall Street tycoons and overall-clad farmers. His accent is as southern as crackling bread. Extremely articulate, he frequently makes speeches at meetings all over the country—and he smilingly admits big-city bankers in the North often kid him about his drawl.

He is sometimes called Bones—but his tall, lean frame is not responsible for the tag. He candidly explains, "In college I had one lucky night—and the nickname stuck."

Last year Mr. Kimbrel served as vice president of the ABA and traveled about 82,000 miles in the interest of the organization. He expects to exceed that mileage in the presidency this year.

Along with two other ABA officials Mr. Kimbrel was invited to confer with President Kennedy at the White House.

"I was favorably impressed by him," the Georgia banker said. "I don't agree with some of his theory and philosophy, but I was amazed at the extent of his knowledge. He spieled off figures that we in banking might be expected to know—but I was surprised that he knew them. And I was later told he had not been briefed before the conference."

Mr. Kimbrel's rise in the banking world has been punctuated by a remarkable record of accomplishment. When asked for his success formula he replied:

"Hard work, I guess. I still don't know any substitute for that."

After he was graduated from college in 1936, he got a job with the Farm Credit Administration at a salary of $80 a month. "Jobs were hard to get then," he recalled. As a credit examiner and troubleshooter for an agency that makes farm loans, he learned firsthand the importance of adequate financing—both to the borrower and the lender.

Mr. Kimbrel believes he obtained wonderful experience in his 9 years with the Farm Credit Administration. During this time he was assigned for a while to Thomson, where he met a pretty brunette named Nita Matlock at a dance. They were married in 1941.

After their marriage Mr. Kimbrel accepted a job as a cashier in the First National Bank of Thomson. Actually, he had never wavered in his determination to become a country banker. He was elected successively vice president and cashier, executive vice president, and then chairman of the board and chief executive officer. Paul A. Bowden, the 87-year-old founder of the bank, has remained as president.

"I like working in a small bank," said Mr. Kimbrel, who has turned down offers from some big-city financial institutions. "I feel I can make a real contribution to the economic life of our country here. Most of the banks in our country are small—about 10,000 of them have deposits of only $10 million or less. As a country banker, I am familiar with their problems."

Mr. Kimbrel served on various committees for the Georgia Bankers Association. He was elected president of the association in 1956 after a year as vice president.

He was a member of the American Bankers Association's Federal legislation committee for 7 years—including 4 years as chairman. His committee work involved study of all legislation before Congress that affected banks or was related to the Nation's economy. Besides doing basic research, he helped determine the association's policy.

Mr. Kimbrel has maintained his interest in agriculture and at the same time has helped spearhead the move toward industrialization in his area. In 1955 Thomson's First National Bank received the Robert Strickland Agricultural Memorial Award given annually to a Georgia bank for outstanding service to agriculture.

For the past 5 years Mr. Kimbrel has been on the McDuffie County Board of Education. He has served as president of the local Rotary Club and as district governor of Rotary International. He is a member of the board of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. Mr. Kimbrel has done volunteer work for various youth organizations—the Boy Scouts, 4-H Clubs, and the YMCA. For about 20 years he taught a Bible class at the First Methodist Church.

Mr. and Mrs. Kimbrel and their children, Jenny Wood, 17, and Danny, 13, live in a handsome white-columned home on a shady hilltop a couple of miles from downtown Thomson. Near the house is their small private lake where they enjoy fishing and swimming.

One of his jobs as president of the American Bankers Association will be to lead the organization's observance of the 100th anniversary of this country's commercial banking system this year.

Mr. Kimbrel said the ABA has arranged an economic symposium in Washington, D.C., February 25, to mark the centennial. More than 300 top leaders of business, industry, and the trades will participate. President Kennedy will be among the speakers—and "Bones" Kimbrel, the country banker from Thomson, Ga., will be on hand to greet him.

The Concept of National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, a very informative and thoughtful address was delivered at the December 12, 1962, Commencement Convocation, International Broadcast Seminar, Syracuse University, by Francis P. Miller, Special Assistant, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State. Titled "The Concept of National Interest," this address was recently brought to my attention, and I believe it merits review by my colleagues. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Miller's remarks.

THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL INTEREST

I want you all to know how delighted I am to be invited to speak on this occasion. As the sponsor of your International Broadcast Seminar, the Department of State is deeply interested in your program and in all those who have participated in it. Communication between people is essential to a peaceful and prosperous world. As broadcasters, you are responsible for what is potentially one of the most useful means of international communication. You are servants of the world community in a very real sense and your performance will in one way or another vitally affect the development of relations between people. I am sure that every one of you here intends to devote his life to supplying accurate information and to creating a more informed opinion in order that people of different cultures and different races may understand each other better.

In view of the role that you will play in molding public opinion in the future, it occurred to me that you might be interested in my discussing the concept of national interest.

From the time when men first began to organize themselves into nation-states the policies of these States have been primarily determined by what people in any one country conceived to be the national interest of that country. Consequently, it is essential that each of us examine this phrase carefully to make sure that we understand its meaning and also that we know what the elements are that constitute the interest of any one of our respective countries at the present time.

Traditionally national interest has been defined very largely in terms of either withdrawal from the world scene or imposing the national will upon that scene through diplomatic skill or military might. War has been normally considered the final resort if the national will were effectively and permanently thwarted.

It is customary to speak of the age in which we live as being essentially the age of revolution in which the patterns of centuries are being broken and replaced by new patterns better suited to the requirements of the present time. We usually think of these revolutions in political terms or in terms of the economic and social convulsions which drastically alter the character of national life. I suggest that there is another revolution in progress which in some respects is more profound than the earth-changing political, social, and economic revolutions which capture the headlines and preoccupy the minds of our generation. This other revolution is essentially a moral revolution. It is a revolution in the concept of national interest. If this revolution succeeds and wins general acceptance it will pave the way for peace and will change the face of the earth more completely than any other development in the entire history of the human race.

The revolution to which I refer consists in the extent to which mutual aid is supplanting force as the most important ingredient in the concept of national interest. I believe that there is meaning in history and that this development expresses that meaning on the level of relations between sovereign states.

Perhaps I can make my point clear by referring to a book by a great Russian which I read nearly half a century ago. The title of the book was "Mutual Aid" and the name of the author was Kropotkin. He adopted the Darwinian thesis that the fittest survive, but he addressed himself to the question "Who are the fittest?" This question was very relevant around the turn of the century because most Darwinians thought of the "fittest" as being the most powerful in terms of military might. Brute force was considered by many the sine qua non of survival. In the jungle of international relations—red in tooth and claw—it was thought that only the beast of prey could survive.

Kropotkin in "Mutual Aid" attempted to show the complete fallacy of this concept of the fittest." He pointed out that during recorded time it was the beast of prey who was disappearing from the scene—it was the beast of prey who had no survival value. In due course the only lions and tigers left would be confined to game preserves for exhibition in zoos and circuses.

On the other hand, the one animal who had proved itself capable of surviving was the only animal capable of rendering mutual aid and that animal was man.

It is true that man is capable of acting like a beast of prey even to the extent of threatening the destruction of the whole human race, but this is not what makes him a human being. What makes him a human being is his capacity to give and take aid that is mutually beneficial. And the only animals other than man who will survive in the long run are animals who are attached to man and who therefore participate vicariously in his capacity to render mutual aid. The line of development in human society is from the use of methods characteristic of beasts of prey toward the use of methods characteristic of human beings—in other words, from the application of brute force toward the practice of mutual aid.

This development is not a matter of years but a matter of centuries and millenniums. Nor is the development proceeding evenly at the same rate of speed in all nations. In some parts of the world the development as far as international relations are concerned has hardly begun. In other parts of the world it is already well advanced and gives great promise for the future.

Until the principle of mutual aid is generally accepted as the most important ingredient of national interest and therefore of foreign policy it is essential for the United States to maintain military striking power greater than any other nation or group of nations which reject that principle. By doing so a zone will be established within which the application of the principle can be successfully achieved and its superiority demonstrated. Our military might will serve not as a threat to anyone else but as a protecting egg shell within which new life can grow and from which in due course it can be hatched.

Mutual aid has not yet become the dominant characteristic of the foreign policy of any nation but it is constantly becoming an increasingly important element in the foreign policies of all the nations whose freedom is guaranteed by NATO and other similar alliances. It is becoming so because free peoples everywhere are beginning to recognize the truth of Kropotkin's thesis—that it is only through mutual aid that men or nations can acquire the fitness that guarantees survival. This is not a theoretical hypothesis. It is a fact of creation. This is the nature of things. The world in which we live is made like that, and we had better come to terms with it. The survival of all of us is at stake.

Fortunately the Government of the United States is one of those moving in the direction of interpreting national interest more and more in terms of mutual aid. It is a thrilling story, beginning after World War II with Greek-Turkish aid and the Marshall plan, followed by the extension of this concept to many developing nations and most recently expressed through an Alliance for Progress with Latin American countries.

The exchange program organized under the direction of the State Department is an expression of this same policy. More than 70,000 scholars, scientists, politicians, artists, and leaders of all kinds have participated in this program during the past 15 years. Approximately 50,000 have come here from 125 different countries and we have sent more than 20,000 to other lands. We hope that the students who have come here have received the kind of training which will make them more useful leaders at home. And we know that our scholars have benefitted enormously from pursuing their studies in foreign universities. Your presence here is an illustration of the benefit of this exchange program and I sincerely hope that you feel that your experience in this country has been worth while. Taking the program as a whole I believe one is justified in concluding that skills have been increased, better understanding has been insured and the culture of each land has been enriched by the cultures of other lands. This is mutual aid at its best.

If I were to choose one institution which symbolizes more concretely than any other the extent to which American policy is based on mutual aid as the highest expression of national interest I would choose the Peace Corps with which I am sure you are all familiar. I do not believe it is an overstatement to say that this is the first time in recorded history when the most powerful nation in the world has called upon its young people to volunteer to serve others—to help others rather than to hurt or hinder others. Heretofore nations have usually called upon their young people to volunteer exclusively for military service. Now a new concept of the meaning of national service has been introduced. As such the establishment of the Peace Corps marks a significant milestone in the pilgrimage of the human race.

Policies of mutual aid are, of course, only operative in areas where governments have ceased to think of the realization of their national interests purely in terms of the application of force. The tragedy of our times is that some of the greatest nations still think of imposing their national wills on the rest of the world through brute force. The recent Communist Chinese attack on India is a case in point. As long as this condition prevails (and it may prevail a very long while) a shield will have to be provided to protect the free world against aggression. Meanwhile, it is entirely possible that the policy of mutual aid will gain increasing support even behind the Iron Curtain, because this policy rather than Marxian economic determinism is the condition of survival, and nations that do not practice it will in due course lose their importance on the world scene.

At the same time it needs to be stressed that there is no inevitability nor any magic in the shift of opinion among vast masses of people from believing that brute force is the highest expression of the national will to believing that mutual aid is the highest and finest expression of that will. Such a shift is the work of generations of education and of faith. It is the churches, the schools and the families of a nation which produce its culture. And it is out of the culture of a nation that some great new insight is born.

You and I are called upon to devote our lives to making the culture of our respective nations a culture out of which the policy of mutual aid will eventually grow. We will do this because we believe that that is the meaning of history. We will do it because we want our respective nations to survive, and we know that survival depends upon our interpreting national interest in those terms.

What a marvelous thing it would be if in the years ahead the Soviets rediscovered Kropotkin and began to take his views seriously as far as relations between East and West are concerned. I believe that in due course that day will come. When it does come, a new age will be ushered in.

Dr. Tyrus A. Timm, A. & M. College of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Dr. Tyrus A. Timm, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics of the A. & M. College of Texas, was asked to make a study of the forces that determine foreign agricultural policy of this country. He headed up a task force which did this study and presented it to the National Agricultural Policy Conference held at Gull Lake, Mich., September 1962.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this paper, and commend it to the Members of this body for their reading:

"SOME FORCES THAT DETERMINE FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL POLICY"—A TASK FORCE PRESENTATION AT THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL POLICY CONFERENCE

(By Tyrus R. Timm)

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural policy around the world may be either private or Government policy. Only Government policy will be examined here.

A further restriction, only three aspects of Government policy will be considered. These are:

1. Major considerations in current agricultural policies of foreign governments.

2. Unfavorable situations for the United States arising out of foreign agricultural policies.

3. Institutional forces important in policy formulation.

All three aspects are examined in terms of their interrelationship with agricultural policies of the United States.

MAJOR CONSIDERATIONS IN FOREIGN POLICIES

Formulating and executing agricultural policy makes up a significant part of Government activity in the world. Some of the considerations used follow:

1. U.S. agricultural policies for production, price, and income often are studies by foreign planners as guidelines. They, then, shape theirs to take maximum advantage of U.S. programs.

2. Self-sufficiency dominates the ideas and ambitions of developing countries. One reason for so doing is to protect a party's political position.

3. Self-sufficiency conserves dollars that otherwise would be spent for food imports and provides a base for further economic growth.

4. Low food prices is another policy of government, particularly among several Common Market countries. Stability of food prices helps control other prices and wages.

5. Protecting a reasonable level of farm income is pursued by some countries where agriculture is the chief support of the economy. In many other countries where agriculture is a small, but politically strong part of the economy, governments, in order to survive, must have a farm program.

6. Tariffs and other controls are sometimes used to equalize prices between domestic and foreign goods in foreign markets. The variable external levy of the Common Market would be an example.

7. Relatively free markets are maintained by countries such as the United Kingdom and Hong Kong, both being deficient in food. There are two reasons for this. First, it invites a wider variety of food imports and, second, it keeps food prices at lower levels with benefits to both government and consumers.

8. The "Commonwealth preference" program provides an incentive for wider trade among associate countries. France and England provide both lower tariffs and preferential quotes to their associates. This is particularly true for meat, spices, sugar and cocoa. The Philippines, while independent, sell sugar to the United States under a similar arrangement.

9. No moral issue is involved in trade with Communist countries—that's the feeling in much of the free world. Examples are trade between East and West Germany; India and Russia, etc.

10. Price rather than quality dominates much foreign demand, in developing countries. Indian hand looms turn out lower quality products that do not command higher prices. This makes it necessary to purchase less costly raw cotton which means lower quality and shorter staple.

SOME ADVERSE EFFECTS UPON AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Following are a few key policy matters which affect U.S. agricultural trade throughout the world. Some policies can't be changed; others can be negotiated. Some are listed only to indicate areas where caution should be observed or where the U.S. Government and business should be more aggressive.

1. Foreign currency earned locally under Public Law 480 sales is sometimes reloaned to foreign governments which in turn use it to develop competing crops. One such instance is in Colombia where this money is being used to expand African palm oil which reduces imports of soybean and cottonseed oils. The present U.S. policy is to avoid such loans where possible.

2. If a high external levy is imposed by the European Economic Community the United States would no longer have much of a market there. Currently, around 25 percent of U.S. agricultural products going abroad go to that area.

Some people are inclined to charge that the EEC is constructing fences which are new; in reality, they are not. There have been some fences there all the time. Sec-

ondly, it may be easier to deal with one fence than it has been to deal with many.

3. A close trading relationship often exists with the Communist bloc. Bilateral agreements are in effect between countries in west Africa and Asia where Russia gives aid in return for products. In other instances sales and barter agreements exist.

While governments may not trade openly with Red China, they may as France has, permit private corporations or semiautonomous government agencies to do this.

The trade between Canada and China on wheat has been so extensive that it has improved the U.S. competitive position in the Japanese market.

4. Shifting from finished goods to the import of raw materials for processing is the goal of the Western European and some Latin American countries. To do this will require the importation of management, technology and capital. If these come from the United States, the question arises as to where the allegiance of the firm is.

In many developing countries the status symbol of self-sufficiency and industrialization is such that processing plants and transportation facilities are built, irrespective of economic considerations.

(a) Flour mills: the Philippines.

(b) Food oil refineries: Colombia.

5. An indefinite policy of closed borders is maintained by some countries which endangers acceptance of U.S. merchandise en route or causes small amounts to be shipped.

6. Policies of licensing importers and requiring that domestic supplies be exhausted before allowing imports, are maintained by some countries. Mexico, for example, maintains such a policy, and this makes it difficult for certain U.S. goods to go in.

7. The quality and quantity of product demanded abroad—plus terms offered by competing countries—may be such that the United States cannot compete. This Nation must be aware of the specific wants of the market it is trying to serve.

8. Competitors maintain permanent trade missions in third markets to work on (a) credit, (b) uses of products, (c) customer service, (d) promotion, (e) advertising This is particularly true of the British Commonwealth nations operating in Latin America.

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

Within the political framework of foreign countries certain important situations impinge upon agricultural policy.

Developmental or operational plans covering a period of 3, 5, or 7 years including import and export considerations are common. For example, the central governing body of EEC will have plans and policies related to agricultural production, prices and trade. Details of the plans carry limitations for each country. If the plans become unduly disruptive, ways likely will be found to defer or to minimize their effectiveness.

Stability or security of an existing government is an important consideration in most countries. Agricultural policies frequently will be directed toward retaining the present government. However, if a government is changed, farm policies will frequently change also. For example, in Italy, a coalition of the Christian Democratic Party and the Socialist Party has a majority of less than 10 votes over the remaining parties. The present coalition government favors Italy's participation in the European Common Market. Should strong farmer opposition appear toward agricultural policies of the Common Market, the present coalition in Italy and elsewhere may have difficulty retaining power.

Pressures brought by Eastern bloc countries, including Russia and China, influence Western and developing nations to permit private entrepreneurs to trade. This trade can have significant influence on the supply and demand situation for U.S. farm products. India may sell cotton to Russia as a means of maintaining friendly relations, so Russia would have an incentive to discourage Red China from engaging in unfriendly activities on the Indian border.

Changing political allegiance of large U.S. corporations to United States may reduce their interest in sales of farm products abroad. For example, as the portion of its activities abroad increases, it may become advantageous to the packer of meat, fruits, or vegetables to decrease the emphasis on sales of U.S. products overseas and push the sales of the foreign packed product. He may even shift his interest to selling foreign produced products in the United States.

Political unity and common defense were important considerations in formation of ECC. Similarly, there may be some merit in consideration by the United States to compromise on some market advantages with other countries in the interest of political unity and common defense. One significant question is how far should the United States compromise market advantage to achieve political unity? How far can it go and not unduly influence political stability at home?

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Officials of Government agencies can influence agricultural programs in a number of ways. Thus, plans and programs on paper may not be the same in fact.

Agencies can circumvent legislative statutes. They may fail to seek adequate funds for administering the program. Little supervision may be given to cooperating farmers. Violators may not be reported. So, even though member countries must approve edicts of the Common Market administration, this does not mean the programs will be implemented as written.

Another opportunity for influencing legislative decisions originates in the ministries of agriculture in a given country. Agricultural statutes require operational interpretation by the minister and his legal aids. The minister can insert some of his own philosophy and ideas into policies and procedures of the agency.

The issue of federalism is not as prevalent in foreign countries as in the United States. Nearly all agricultural programs are financed, directed, and controlled through Federal agricultural agencies. Important exceptions are Germany, where all agricultural programs are administered by the states, and Brazil, where the states under the leadership of Governors, originate and direct programs. In both instances, the federal governments more than likely will finance a substantial portion of the programs through grants-in-aid.

The behavior of agricultural agencies in foreign countries, many of them having semiautonomous status, makes it advisable for the United States to have representatives in daily contact with them. Continuous negotiation is necessary. Agricultural attachés and representatives of farm organizations stationed in a given country perform an important part of this function. Most of the representatives of farm groups are giving leadership to market development projects abroad under Public Law 480.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Foreign farm organizations often have a different relationship with government than their counterparts in the United States.

Farm organizations in foreign countries usually are more active in planning and executing government programs. They even administer some of the programs.

General farm organizations operating abroad usually are few in number. One general farm organization, or a closely knit national council of two or three of them, usually dominates. Commodity organizations, except in Latin America, are not strong politically. Farmer cooperatives are gaining in political power in many countries.

Processing and mass distribution of food and fiber products are growing around the globe. As expected in the more advanced countries, this development is bringing forth strong organizations of agribusinesses. Often these organizations find their policies in conflict with those of farm organizations.

These behavior patterns in political institutions, agency operations, and farmer movements must be watched carefully by agricultural leaders in this country, for these forces will play an important role in the agricultural trade of the United States in the future.

Diplomacy and Military and Economic Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to comment in a paper I gave at Tuft's University on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 23, 1963, pages A221–A223—that I was pleased to see the control over economic affairs partially taken out of the hands of the State Department and placed in the hands of economic experts. I remarked that this was just as important as keeping the control over military matters in the hands of military experts and out of the State Department.

However, I would observe that this is partly to free the State Department so it can concentrate its efforts in its prime field of endeavor: diplomacy. Diplomacy is the art of using the economic, military and other powers that a society possesses effectively to attain its goals.

The events of recent weeks involving the meeting in the Bahamas between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan where the Secretary of Defense, McNamara, but not the Secretary of State, Rusk, was in attendance, suggest that perhaps the point should be made that those in charge of military affairs and those entrusted with economic affairs not seek to take over the field of diplomacy.

Advance magazine, a real comer in mature political observation and comment, has a recent article which touches on this point and many important substantive points as well. It is entitled "Why the United States Is Failing in Europe" written by George F. Gilder. It is most timely and well worth reading.

WHY THE UNITED STATES IS FAILING IN EUROPE

(By George F. Gilder)

No member of the Kennedy administration other than the President himself bears as great a responsibility for its successes and failures as Robert Strange McNamara, the gifted and dedicated Secretary of Defense. Inside reports on the deliberations of the Cuban crisis indicate that McNamara was the most consistent and articulate proponent of the course the President finally chose. McNamara's achievements in bringing order to the bureaucratic labyrinth of the Penta-

gon, partly the result of the implicit confidence of the President in his Secretary's judgment, have been astounding to those aware of the long frustrations of his predecessors. Yet thought it might seem desirable to have such a talented man in such an influential role, the commanding authority of the Secretary of Defense may also have had undesirable effects, which may be more important in the long run than the miracle in the Pentagon or the triumph in Cuba.

THE M'NAMARA IMBALANCE

For not only is McNamara a brillant and persuasive man, as Secretary of Defense he is also the proponent of the distinct and somewhat parochial viewpoint of a single department of government. Moreover, within the Pentagon he represents a controversial school of strategic thought. Though his viewpoint should receive attention in the high councils of national policymaking, it should not receive preeminent, almost exclusive, attention. In particular the viewpoint of the Secretary of Defense cannot consistently eclipse or overshadow that of the Secretary of State without ultimate damage to American foreign relations.

There is considerable evidence that through the force of his personality, McNamara is causing this kind of imbalance in the decisionmaking processes of the administration in foreign policy. This imbalance has been accentuated by the limited perspective of the McNamara brilliance. The result has been one of the greatest failures of the administration to date—the failure to develop a defense strategy which is both militarily feasible, and politically and diplomatically acceptable. The current McNamara strategy, based on the counterforce, "no-city" doctrine for exclusion of nuclear war from city targets, has foundered on the hard realities of European politics. He has still to develop an alternative which meets the minimal European demands. Thus though he has concentrated more on strategy than any of his predecessors, he begins his third year in office strategically adrift, unable to carry out the policy he favors, unwilling to adjust his course to the manifest poltical realities. On the outcome of this conflict between McNamara's doctrine and its political opposition hangs the cohesion and effectiveness of the Western alliance.

Yet the Secretary has failed to even find a way to communicate to his European opponents. He continues to answer in terms of technical utility and strategic theory questions which spring from deep political anxieties or grand historical aspirations. The result is that the United States is losing its position of leadership in the formulation of military policy for the Alliance, and NATO faces the Soviet Union divided, uncertain, and vulnerable, despite the fact that the balance of power is now more favorable to the West than at any time since the Soviet Union first developed the intercontinental missile.

THE M'NAMARA STRATEGY

McNamara's strategy is the triumph and the failure of the approach developed at the Rand Corp. and other foundations for the study of strategic problems. These organizations depend greatly in their researches on computer determinations of the results of military strategies. From these tabulations it is possible to decide on an optimal strategic doctrine. The problem is that it is difficult to program many of the most crucial elements on the computers: such factors as Senator RUSSELL's instincts, General de Gaulle's sense of grandeur, Prime Minister Macmillan's precarious hold on power in England, Premier Khrushchev's reaction to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by West Germany, the psychological breaking point of general officers under the stress of nuclear war, the lifespan of Prime Minister Adenauer. Yet one intractable or unforseen element can upset a strategy like McNamara's which requires scrupulous planning and control. As the operations researchers soon discovered in World War II, war is hell on scientific prediction. McNamara's experience has shown that politics is hell on scientific war planning.

Secretary McNamara said in his commencement address at Ann Arbor in June that the United States had arrived at an optimal strategy, that not only "minimizes the danger of nuclear war," but makes it possible "to preserve the fabric of our societies if war should occur." The policy he went on to delineate, this counterforce or no-city strategy, is based on the assumption that if the United States spares Soviet cities in its first nuclear strike but retains the capacity to destroy them in a later strike, the Soviet Union is likely to spare Western cities in its attacks. According to this theory, if the United States should destroy Soviet cities, the Soviet Union would lose any incentive to restrain its attacks on American cities. But in order to spare Soviet cities, or to have any close control over the nature or intensity of a nuclear war, Western striking forces must be subject to the most stringent command and control. Since the effective execution of the strategy would depend on an immediate response, carried out with exquisitely accurate timing, crisis consultations among the allies would be prohibited. The McNamara strategy in effect, therefore, meant complete American command of all the nuclear forces of the alliance. This American control, according to the Secretary, afforded the greatest likelihood that the damage of a nuclear war could be limited since it would make possible the limitation of a Western nuclear response to specific military objectives in the Soviet Union or elsewhere.

DE GAULLE WAS NOT INTERESTED

Theoretically feasible, the strategy does appear to offer the United States a chance of reducing damage and increasing the possibility for victory in a nuclear war. McNamara's other claim, that the strategy also "minimizes the danger of nuclear war," though tenable, has been strenuously debated by many authorities. His contention, however, that it obviates the need for independent nuclear forces is technically true but irrelevant. The reasons for the French determination to acquire an independent nuclear force, the British desire to retain its own, and the German desire for equal NATO participation were not technical but political. De Gaulle is just not interested in an "optimal strategy" if it necessitates the perpetual subordination of France to the United States on the question of defense. Adenauer is not interested if it means the permanent division of Germany and its relegation to permanent second-class status in the alliance; Macmillan is not interested if it means he will lose the next election to labor; and the American Government as leader of an alliance, not dictator of an empire, should not be interested if Messrs. de Gaulle, Adenauer, and Macmillan are not interested.

Thus the American strategy could not be carried out unless the United States could find a role for the European countries that would satisfy their political aspirations. Yet the American concept of their role was dictated not by political considerations but by McNamara's own controversial view of the technical military needs of the alliance. McNamara urged that the European countries abandon their attempts to acquire independent nuclear forces and concentrate their efforts on increasing the conventional forces on the European front. Though this also would be eminently desirable, this proposal, too, ignored the political realities. It gave the Europeans the unenviable job of fighting a conventional war in Europe, while retaining for the United States the weapons which could be ultimately decisive. Thus the proposal seemed to indicate both that the United States might not fight a nuclear war for the defense of Europe (why otherwise would increased conventional forces be necessary?); and that the United States would not allow the Europeans to use nuclear weapons in their own defense, or to deter attack on themselves, until the increased conventional capability was achieved. The European nations, growing daily more affluent and powerful, thus were being asked to subject themselves entirely to the caprice of the United States on the issue of their very survival.

AN ALLY IS SKYBOLTED

Because of these essentially political considerations, and despite the fact that the Europeans were as impressed by McNamara as the Americans were, none of the McNamara proposals were adopted. De Gaulle was fortified in his determination to acquire nuclear weapons. Germany grew more restive. Great Britain, though willing to integrate its nuclear forces under the American plan, was unwilling to increase its contributions to the conventional defense of Europe. Thus Europe went its own way, ignoring the McNamara prescriptions and undermining them in their military policies. Yet the United States showed no indication of abandoning its strategy or developing a new one. When a crisis occurred the administration administered palliatives. These failed on two counts. While bypassing the basic political problems, they still contributed to the nullification of the McNamara strategy. Finally the Skybolt affair and the proposals improvised in response have eliminated almost all possibility of the strategy's implementation. Still the political problems of the alliance remain acute and the counterforce plan remains in nominal effect.

The sudden decision of the United States to abandon the development of Skybolt missile brought into play a number of the conflicting political forces ignored by McNamara. The British 2 years ago gave up their expensive attempt to construct an intermediate range ballistic missile on the grounds that they could prolong the effectiveness of their fine Vulcan bomber series by acquisition of Skybolt air-to-ground missiles, then under development in the United States. Although no specific agreements were made, it was understood that the United States would be willing to provide the weapons. At the time, the Labor opposition attacked the Macmillan government for committing its whole defense strategy to a weapons system which did not exist.

When the Government strongly defended its decision, Skybolt became a major political issue, with the prestige of the Macmillan government importantly engaged in the availability of the missile. The strong support of the United States for British entry in the Common Market, opposed by Labor, gives the administration an important interest in the prestige of the Tories as the critical negotiations begin. Yet when McNamara's comparative systems analysis indicated that the Skybolt was more expensive than its alternatives, it was summarily dropped without any warning to Great Britain, or the State Department. So engrossed was the Pentagon in the purely technical consequences of the decision that the resulting furore was unanticipated. We read in the January 14 Christian Science Monitor that Pentagon officials indicate they would not be unhappy should the Labor Party come to power in Britain. Though one hesitates to entertain the idea that the Pentagon would deliberately embarrass an allied government, it would have had trouble finding a better way to damage the Tories than jettisoning Skybolt. The British, understandably, were bitterly resentful.

POLARIS FOR CHRISTMAS

This resentment induced an American response which showed all the political negligence of the original Skybolt decision. Having undercut the policies of the British, the administration went on to undercut the policies of the United States. In his proposals to appease Macmillan in the meeting at Nassau, Kennedy managed to get in the way of most of the established American policies toward Europe. The key demarche was an ambiguous and conditional offer of Polaris missiles to Britain and France to be committed to NATO, except in instances where "supreme national interests are at stake."

Since it is difficult to imagine instances where nuclear weapons might be used when supreme national interests are not at stake, the Nassau proposal seems to be a complete surrender to the advocates of independent national deterrents. But it is worse than that. For the United States stipulated that it would be up to the British and the French to provide the submarines and warheads for the missiles. Both countries are far from developing these necessary components. To do so will cost enormous sums of money which might otherwise have gone to fulfill the other prescription of the McNamara strategy: the provision of more conventional forces to provide an alternative to suicidal nuclear war for the defense of Europe. Thus under the Nassau proposals Europe would be induced to make renewed and intensified efforts to acquire the independent nuclear forces which the administration opposes. But these same efforts would make less likely the provision of the increased conventional forces which the administration advocates. Moreover the European desire for increased military independence would also be undercut. The lack of sufficient conventional forces would make the Europeans even more dependent for their defense on the American threat of a nuclear war which would destroy Europe. To boot, the chances for limitation of the arms race would be reduced. To maintain the credibility of the American threat to fight a nuclear war in defense of Europe, we will have to continue our enormous expenditures for first-strike preponderance over the Soviet Union.

GERMANY AFFECTED

Not only Britain and France are affected by the Nassau proposals. Indirectly the problem of the German role in the alliance was exacerbated. By acquiescing in the French and British demands for independent deterrents, the United States implied that they might in fact need them if supreme national interests were at stake. Yet if any nation's supreme interests are likely to be at stake in an attack on Europe, Germany's are likely to be. Why then should the Germans not have a few missiles of their own, for independent use when their own supreme national interests are threatened?

The reason, of course, is that the United States has another policy, which conflicts directly with the Nassau agreement. That policy is to limit the dispersion of nuclear weapons, most importantly to Germany because of the professed Soviet fears of German revanchism. So far this policy has not seemed invidious to West Germany largely because we have scrupulously maintained our policy against helping other countries to acquire independent nuclear forces. The British exception was plausibly rationalized on the grounds of the essential British contributions to the development of the atomic bomb during World War II. The Nassau proposals, however, with their "supreme national interests" clause, violate this policy against independent deterrents. Henceforth, it will be more difficult for us to maintain the impression that Germany is not considered an untrustworthy special case, whose supreme national interests are less important than those of France and Britain. It is ironic that one reason for Germany's lesser position appears to be that unlike the British and the French, the Germans have cooperated with McNamara; they have increased their conventional forces in NATO, and have refrained from acquiring their own little arsenal of nuclear weapons. This object lesson will not be lost on German political parties. The Nassau proposals thus may bring urgent new German demands for nuclear weapons, which if satisfied may provoke a dangerous reaction from the Soviet Union, and if unsatisfied may induce dangerous anti-NATO political pressures in Germany.

If the past is indicative, the United States will improvise again, attempt again to patch up the weakening fabric of the alliance. But though patchwork might give a passing impression of unity, there comes a time when the patched-up fabric will no longer hold up under stress. This curious "supreme national interests" clause would seem to provide for a breakdown of the alliance whenever a concerted front is needed. Whenever an individual country's supreme national interests are threatened it presumably could act alone, beginning a war which necessarily would threaten the supreme national interests of all the participants, justifying presumably the withdrawal of all their forces from the alliance, also.

MORE IMPROMPTU POLICY

Perhaps it is unfair to reduce this combination of the worst strategic possibilities to the absurdity of its implications. Predictably, it was not accepted by France. And the administration has been feverishly backpedaling ever since its lost weekend in Nassau. Suddenly it has started to do some of the things it should have done years before to make possible an autonomous NATO nuclear force. It is even discussing the possibility of changes in the Atomic Energy Act to permit establishment of a NATO deterrent which is not in reality under complete, independent American control. Of course this belated activity will appear in Europe as a hasty response to European initiatives. The administration still has not met the basic strategic problems. This is unfortunate, but there is little else to do but improvise when one waits until the last moment. However, there were many things to do 2 years ago, when it first became clear that De Gaulle was unshakably determined to acquire nuclear weapons.

First of all it should have been understood that this determination was a reality which could not be ignored in the development of an American strategy. This reality should have been accorded as much importance as the conflicting reality: That the best strategy for the West requires both centralized command and control of the deterrent, and increased conventional forces to provide an alternative to a self-defeating nuclear strategy in Europe. Since it was impossible to achieve both these objectives in view of the French determination to acquire an independent deterrent, the United States should have provided nuclear weapons for NATO in exchange for a larger contribution of conventional forces. At this point we might have insisted that these weapons be placed under some form of joint command, probably under plenipotentiaries of the three nuclear powers and West Germany. By deferring the offer until it was extorted out of us, we failed to acquire any concessions at all from the Europeans in exchange for the ostensible sacrifice of both our principal military objectives in Europe: the prevention of the spread of independent national nuclear forces, and the strengthening of NATO conventional forces to the point where the Soviet Union could not expect to defeat them without using nuclear weapons.

Crucial to any solution of European military problems is a solution of the extremely intractable problem of command and control. Though McNamara prefers complete American control and has adopted a strategy which seems to make it necessary, it has become clear that the Europeans will not accept this easy way out. This is too bad, but it is a political fact which must be taken into consideration in the development of a strategy. The problem is that though the Europeans will not trust the United States in complete command, even less will they trust one of themselves. It would appear therefore that unitary command is unacceptable, and so therefore are strategies like our counterforce, "no city," which require it. By pressing further for the adoption of this strategy, the United States will exacerbate alliance divisions, jeopardizing the paramount American political interest in NATO solidarity.

The reasons for the failure to anticipate European reaction to our European defense proposals can only be speculated in the absence of knowledge of exactly how the final decisions were made. Suggestive evidence is available, however. For one thing, most press reports on the elevated catfights and polite power struggles within the inner circles of the administration indicate (1) that McNamara has been rising in the President's favor ever since the two men met, and (2) that the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, the only man high in the administration with wide diplomatic experience, is now valued less as a foreign policy adviser than Brother Bob. Though it is a mistake to jump to conclusions, these speculations seem to be confirmed by the President's decision to take McNamara to the Nassau meeting with Macmillan, and leave Rusk behind despite an agenda reported to include non-military matters. In combination with the testimony of the decisions themselves, which show no evidence of State Department influence, these newspaper reports seem to indicate a general depreciation in the high councils of the administration of the considerations which an experienced Secretary of State would be expected to emphasize. Certainly the decision to drop the Skybolt would not have been made so summarily if the American Ambassador in Britain had been consulted and if the Secretary of State had been granted an opportunity to assert his objections.

NEVER UNDER IKE

Though the personal relationships involved are probably important, the decision-making failures were facilitated by Kennedy's procedural approach. Among the President's most important departures from the practice of the Eisenhower administration has been his downgrading of the importance of committee deliberations in the decisionmaking process. As a Senator he wrote an article in the Reporter criticizing Eisenhower for an alleged failure to provide decisive leadership. Hans Morgenthau and other critics of Eisenhower's policymaking procedures attributed his failures to a tendency to leave decision making to committees composed of representatives of the divergent interests of the various bureaus of Government. In order to get a decision approved, it was necessary to to acquire the assent of all the departments of Government which might be affected. Thus the committee reports were said to be couched in abstract generalities concealing rather than resolving the basic conflicts; the action which followed was often designed more to propitiate the various interests concerned than to achieve some specific policy objective. But though this system prevented as definitive expression of policy as is possible with more independent executive decision making, it did have the important virtue of engaging all the interests which would be affected by a decision before rather than after it was made.

Thus in the Eisenhower administration, McNamara's strategy, and the decisions he made in prosecuting it, would have been subjected to the scrutiny of the Cabinet and National Security Council. A decision to drop Skybolt without informing the British could never have been made, because the State Department would have asserted its interests. Moreover, McNamara's strategy as a whole probably would have been compromised in committee rather than undercut in Europe. For whatever the deficiencies of the committee system, it does to some degree reproduce the political conditions under which a strategy must be carried out.

Though the President and the Secretary of Defense are more or less omnipotent in the Pentagon and in the privacy of their own capacious minds, they are far from omnipotent in the international arena where American foreign policy must operate. The problem under the Kennedy administration has been that the criteria for the adoption of a policy—its internal consistency, the cogency and personality of its proponent, its political appeal—have been different from the criteria for its successful execution—its external consistency, its consistency with other policies of the Alliance, its political feasibility. The result ever since the inaugural, has been eloquent and definitive declarations of policy, often followed by embarrassment, compromise and frustration at the hands of political reality.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt—A Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, history will record that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose birthday anniversary we celebrate, was one of the greatest of great Americans. Not only did he anticipate history, but he changed its course and changed it in a manner which saved the free world. Few men saw as clearly as he that the fight against Hitlerism was a fight for freedom all over the world. His vision, his courage, and his beneficent wisdom led us through the most devastating war known to civilization.

The courage which enabled Franklin Roosevelt to conquer his personal physical handicap enabled him to inspire a nation and a world. From the memorable and eloquent words he gave us in his first inaugural address—"the only thing we have to fear is fear itself"—to the last words he wrote just before his death—"the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today"—Franklin Roosevelt kindled in our hearts a confidence in our ability not only to build a stronger democracy at home but also to lead the world in shaping a better destiny for all mankind.

As Franklin Roosevelt, himself, said in one of his final messages in 1945:

The creed of our democracy is that liberty is acquired and kept by men and women who are strong and self-reliant, and possessed of such a vision as God gives to mankind—men and women who are just and understanding and generous to others—men and women who are capable of disciplining themselves—for they are the rulers and they must rule themselves.

Franklin Roosevelt's great work will live forever and his greatness as a man will continue to inspire us.

The Crisis in U.S. Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have introduced legislation to create a Department of Transportation and Communications.

It was rather pleasing to me to find that David I. Mackie, chairman of the Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, is advocating a similar organization confined solely to transportation.

The following article entitled "The Crisis in U.S. Transportation" was condensed from Railway Age and published in the January 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest:

THE CRISIS IN U.S. TRANSPORTATION

(By David I. Mackie, chairman, Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference)

Today we Americans spend roughly $100 billion a year on transportation—half of it to move ourselves around the country, half to move our products. Transportation consumes about a dime of every dollar we spend on products; for example, you could knock roughly $300 off the price of a $3,000 car if, beginning with the hauling of the ore, there were no transportation charges. With the transportation industry so crucial to our economy, one of the most important questions we can ask about our economic health is: How is transportation doing?

The unanimous answer of the experts is: very badly.

Last April President Kennedy delivered a lengthy message to Congress devoted entirely to what he called "the pressing problems burdening our national transportation system." He described these problems as "jeopardizing the progress and security on which we depend." Though his report is one of the bluntest and most clear-sighted we have had, it is merely the latest in a long series of warning flags.

Four full years ago a subcommittee of the House of Representatives found the transportation system "a picture of obsolete equipment, 19th-century economics and laws, and antiquated thinking—all detrimental to the economy and dangerous to the defense of the country."

In 1961 a special Senate study group warned that we are headed for a "major crisis in our transportation history."

In that same year, the Interstate Commerce Commission called for drastic action to "help arrest the plunge to disaster."

The basic trouble with our transportation system is that it is not a system at all. It is a collection of components thrown together helter-skelter and competing with one another with little regard for the inherent economic efficiency of each, under a maze of different rules and different umpires.

On a national level the Interstate Commerce Commission sets rates for and regulates the performance of all the railroads, some trucks and some barges, and pipelines, sharing parts of this job with the 50-State public-service commissions. The Federal Power Commission regulates the pipelines not regulated by the ICC. The Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency split up the job of subsidizing and regulating the airlines. The Bureau of Public Roads oversees the highway building program nationally, again sharing the job with the 50-State highway commissions.

The Federal Maritime Board subsidizes the oceangoing ships that compete with other methods of transportation on many of our rivers and via the St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes as far inland as Duluth, Minn. Even the Post Office Department has an important effect on transportation through its granting of mail contracts to trucks, rails, and airlines.

In all, a dozen Federal agencies juggle bits of the responsibility for our transportation system among themselves and 100-State commissions. "A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation" is how the President described it. Nowhere among the tens of thousands of public officials involved is there one person whose job is to look after the overall efficiency of the system.

As a result, the system is constantly clashing its gears. For instance, during a recent winter, the Hudson River froze over, creating an emergency demand for fuel oil and food in upriver communities. The Coast Guard spent several days organizing a convoy of tankers, and then assigned three icebreakers to inch the ships upstream—even though throughout the emergency railroads were operating on both sides of the Hudson.

The multibillion-dollar highway building program is crisscrossing dozens of crowded metropolitan areas where the railroad commutation problem is worst. Yet the Bureau of Public Roads, which supervises the building of the highways, and the ICC, which regulates the rails, have made no attempt to coordinate their thinking. The results can be ludicrous. For example, the highway program is now necessitating the building of bridges and underpasses on some of the 60,000 miles of railroad that will probably be abandoned—under the ICC—after the highways are finished.

In addition to letting too many government cooks stir the transportation broth, we have given each cook a different recipe to work with. No two agencies treat the branches of transportation under them in the same way. In fact, they operate under two conflicting philosophies.

Some of them—the ICC is the prime example—simply regulate; they play the role of policeman to make sure that the industries operate in the public interest. Others, like the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, promote industries by handing out subsidies indectly in the construction and operation of facilities. Some agencies, like the Maritime Board and the CAB, mix the two roles. This results in competitive chaos.

For instance, since 1947 the Government has spent $132 billion building, operating and subsidizing our waterways, airways, highways, airports and domestic airmail; and this year it will spend another $14 billion. Yet in this century the only money that the Government has spent on the railroads and pipelines has been the administrative cost of regulating them.

Today the railroads pay all the costs of maintaining and operating their huge physical plant. Yet they must compete with trucks, buses, airlines and water carriers whose entire "track" and most of whose "stations" are built and maintained by the Government. (These other branches pay so-called user charges on some facilities, but such charges are hardly in the same league with full operating costs.)

The State of New York built and pays all maintenance costs on the Champlain Canal,

a toll-free right-of-way for all comers. The canal parallels the Delaware & Hudson Railroad from Albany to Plattsburgh, where the Strategic Air Command operates a jet-bomber base. When the base was opened, the railroad anticipated a lucrative traffic in jet fuel. Today, however, the D. & H. hauls no fuel to Plattsburgh; the business has gone to the toll-free canal—despite the fact that the waterway is closed during winter, and that in wartime the railroad would be depended on to carry the fuel. In peacetime, the base can store enough to carry it through the winter and allow it to avoid the railroad's unsubsidized rates.

The Army Engineers are in the process of improving the navigational facilities of the Arkansas River at an initial cost of $850 million and an eventual maintenance-and-operation cost of $10 million a year. This is despite the fact that a recent Senate study found no evidence that the Arkansas basin area has lacked, now lacks or in the foreseeable future might lack, adequate transportation services. The reason given by the study for the improvements is that the residents of the area "want to force down railroad rates." Even if these rates were the Army Engineers' responsibility, spending $850 million would be an expensive way to bring them down. If they are indeed too high, the ICC could reduce them with the stroke of a pen.

The transportation laws themselves are in such bad shape that they alone would make a decent job almost impossible. The Interstate Commerce Act was passed in 1887 to curb the railroads' monopolistic excesses. Over the years, this law has been added to and subtracted from, but the original flavor of distrust of the railroads remains.

Over these same years, competitors—trucks, buses, pipelines, waterways, airlines—have been taking traffic away from the railroads. And, as these different methods of transportation became important nationally, laws were passed to pull them into the regulatory scheme. There was this basic difference, however: Congress felt more protective of them than angry with them. Consequently, the laws applying to these later entries are strongly flavored with benevolence.

The result is a mass of legal inconsistencies and contradictions, which permit huge sections of the transportation industry to operate free of regulation while competing with other sections that are under rigid Government supervision. Two major examples of these inconsistencies that were cited by President Kennedy are the bulk-commodity exemption for water carriers and the agricultural commodity exemption for trucks.

In the section covering water carriers, the following innocent language appears: "Nothing in this part shall apply to the transportation by a water carrier of commodities in bulk." Bulk commodities are those that are not individually packaged or counted, such as grain, coal, or petroleum. Barges carrying not more than three of these exempt commodities need not follow the regulations covering common carriers. They can charge any rates they want.

But as soon as one of these commodities is transferred from a barge to a railroad car, the regulation snaps back into force. The railroads must publish their rates; they must charge the same to all customers. And since bulk commodities add up to 94 percent of the tonnage hauled on our waterways, the law regulating barges is so written that it applies to only 6 percent of what they carry.

A similar exemption for trucks carrying agricultural products was intended to protect the farmer in the movement of his produce to his so-called first market. But the wording was so loose that today trucks haul such items as poultry from the farm to the processing plant and thence into big-city markets totally free of Government regulation.

How can railroads compete with the service described in the following advertisement from the Grand Forks, N. Dak., Herald: "Potato Shippers. We have trucks returning empty from Grand Forks to Chicago and the St. Louis area daily. Set your own rate."

The answer is: They cannot compete. The New Haven has lost almost all its fish traffic out of Boston—formerly 45 carloads a day—and its cranberry tonnage from Cape Cod. The Milwaukee's fresh meat and packing-house-products haulage to Washington State went down 81 percent between 1954 and 1956. Railroads now haul only one-tenth of all cattle and hogs to market, virtually no eggs; their fresh fruit and vegetable traffic has been cut in half since the war.

These exemptions for barges and trucks are typical of many inequities in the law that penalize one form of transportation to the advantage of another. What are the effects of our economy?

The first effect is to make it impossible to gage the actual economic efficiency of any one method of transportation. "There is no doubt," says a Commerce Department study, "that, were all traffic distributed in accordance with the true comparative advantage of the several forms of transport, the annual freight bill would be reduced by several billion dollars."

The second effect is the gradual shriveling up of our common-carrier system. This is the real crux of the "major crisis in our transportation history." For common carriers are the basis of our economy. They are by law required to haul anything haulable, from any point of their system to any other point, for any shipper, at the same publicly announced and Government-regulated rate for all customers.

Today the only true common carriers—100-percent regulated and unsubsidized—are the railroads. Nine-tenths of our water carriers and two out of every three long-haul trucks on the road are exempt from all but safety regulations. And the railroads are declining rapidly. In 1930 they hauled 75 percent of our intercity freight; last year they hauled 43 percent. We face the bankruptcy of our railroads, and of our common-carrier system.

We can avoid this crisis, but we have to work fast. First, we must put transportation's legal framework in order. This means developing what President Kennedy called for in his message: "A consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity." We must either remove such inequities and the bulk- and agricultural-commodity exemptions or apply them equally to all forms of transportation. Second, we must coordinate the system by giving overall responsibility for it to one agency. Some recommendations have favored a Cabinet-level Secretary of Transportation; others have favored gathering in the reins at a lower level. One way or another, we must pull the system together and give it unified direction.

If we don't, there is not the slightest doubt that it will soon begin to fall apart, piece by piece.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Postmaster General J. Edward Day Addresses West Virginia Legislators—Stresses Need for Resolute Action in Order To Realize National Economic Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the pressing need for rethinking and restructuring in current tax procedures has been effectively brought out by President John F. Kennedy in his state of the Union message of January 10, 1963. The Chief Executive has pointed out that we must institute a permanent program of expanded incentives and opportunities for private expenditures, promoting fuller use of industrial capacity and higher employment.

Another effective and significant expression of this challenge which faces Congress and the Nation has now come from the capable and conscientious Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable J. Edward Day.

Speaking before members of the West Virginia Legislature at a banquet given by the Charleston Chamber of Commerce in our capital city on January 29, 1963, the Cabinet member stated that:

> The dynamic age in which we live requires vital adjustments to new ideas. The challenges that face us are gigantic—but the opportunities are exciting.

Mr. Day also stressed that current tax proposals are designed to bring into balance our entire economy, and that the general principle of tax reduction has the support of liberal economists and conservative business groups.

Mr. President, I request that the address by Postmaster General J. Edward Day in Charleston, W. Va., January 29, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE CHARLESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER IN HONOR OF WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATORS, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 29, 1963

I am happy to have this early opportunity to congratulate West Virginians on the 100th anniversary of your State. We are going to issue a commemorative stamp marking the centennial, on June 20 in Wheeling.

Second, I have enjoyed coming to West Virginia, to Capon Springs, for family weekends. We were there to help my old friend, W. Willard Wirtz, and his family, celebrate his appointment as Secretary of Labor. He has been going there for 20 years.

In addition, as a New Frontiersman, I have a personal and sentimental interest in West Virginia. Two hundred years ago my great-great-great grandfather, John Day, was an old frontiersman right in this area and fought the Indians.

He settled in what is now Pocahontas County and fought in the Revolution, on the frontier.

It was not until 1832 that Congress authorized pensions for Revolutionary War veterans and my ancestor filed for his at age 91.

Sometimes people say that government today is complex and bureaucratic. But, you should see the complicated, lengthy application that old gentleman had to file in 1833. He had to give his whole life history. I have a copy of it which I obtained from the National Archives. Here is a section from his application:

"The Shawnee Indians had * * * killed my brother David Day and taken my mother and two sisters, Sally Day and Martha Day, prisoners, and also took some other property and made for their towns. The first night the Indians camped on a mountain, between Cape Capen River and Cedar Creek, and at that camp killed my mother, Susan Day * * *. And Captain Fry raised 20 men, of which I was one. We followed said Indians, and when we came to the Indian camp aforesaid, there lay my mother dead, and stripped naked, her head skinned; and we lifted her and laid her between two rocks and laid some rocks over her; and we followed on after the Indians, and the second day came in sight of them at their camp. I saw one of my sisters rise up right before the muzzle of my gun between me and the Indian; and I was so alarmed at seeing my sister rise before my gun that I involuntarily hollowed, which so alarmed the Indians that they broke and run, leaving the prisoners, and what they had at the camp, and run with all their might. And we got the prisoners, and what property the Indians left at the camp, and brought all safe to the fort."

The man whom this hotel is named after—Daniel Boone—was an Indian fighter of much greater note than my grandfather. Boone blazed a trail across to Kentucky which was at that time known as the dark and bloody land. After losing his holdings in Kentucky he moved back to West Virginia. In 1791, he was elected to represent Kanawha County in the general assembly.

As more and more people joined the westward migration, the Old Dominion became conscious of the needs of her western inhabitants.

Regular communication with the East was made possible by the creation of post offices at Morgantown and Wheeling in 1794, at Greenbrier Court House and West Liberty by 1797, at Clarksburg in 1798 and at Union at 1800.

A post office was established at Kanawha Courthouse sometime before 1801. (The name of the office was not changed to Charleston until 1879.)

Our ledgers show that Postmaster James A. Lewis, who served from 1822 to 1852, received total remuneration of $147.85 in 1829. Total receipts of the office were about $250 a year.

I am happy to say that the receipts of the Charleston Post Office are now a good deal larger. I am also happy to say—and I am sure Charleston's present Postmaster, Jim Lakin, shares my gratification on this—that his compensation is measurably higher than was Postmaster Lewis'.

The Post Office Department today is the largest service establishment on earth. We have a payroll of $10 million a day—with 587,000 full-time employees in 45,000 locations.

We handle 68 billion pieces of mail a year—over half the world's total. We make use of over 90,000 vehicles. We perform services for 10 other Federal agencies, such as registering 2½ million aliens annually—since we are the only department with employees and locations in every village, town and major neighborhood.

I am proud that the Post Office Department is doing a better and more efficient job in carrying the Nation's mail than ever before. Our productivity is climbing steadily.

America has made significant strides forward in the last 2 years. The last 22 months have seen uninterrupted economic recovery.

The gross national product has risen by 12 percent and inflation has been brought under control. Employment has increased by 1.3 million. Profits, personal income, and living standards have never been higher.

Even so, we are not doing well enough. As President Kennedy said in his state of the Union speech: "We cannot be satisfied to rest here. This is the side of the hill, not the top. The mere absence of recession is not growth. We have made a beginning—but we have only begun."

Our economy is capable of producing $30 to $40 billion more than we are producing today. Business earnings could be $7 to $8 billion higher. Existing plant and equipment is not being fully utilized.

Certainly we cannot be complacent about the continuing high rate of unemployment. It was 5.6 percent in December and has remained above 5 percent for 61 out of the last 62 months.

The major attack on unemployment must be increased demand. Other measures, however, are needed as well. Many able-bodied workers have skills which have become outmoded. Others remain unemployed because they and their families are too far from the places where jobs are opening up. The Manpower Development and Training Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the "adjustment" provisions of the Trade Expansion Act passed by the last Congress were aimed at bringing about a better balance between job skills and job requirements. Further measures may be needed if "structural" unemployment is to be reduced to a tolerable level.

Unemployed young people are one of our most serious national problems. We are faced with the prospect of between 7 and 8 million youngsters dropping out of school and coming onto the labor market in this decade. The great success the Peace Corps—which is comprised mainly of young men and women—has achieved overseas has suggested the utility of a similar corps, working in the areas of our own community needs—in slums, in hospitals, in centers for the aged, in schools for the illiterate and handicapped, etc. President Kennedy will ask Congress to enact legislation setting up such a corps this year.

To cure the chronic slackness in our economy, President Kennedy last Thursday sent specific Federal tax cut proposals to the Congress. The last decade has clearly taught us that budget deficits are not caused so

much by increases in Government spending as by sluggish economic growth and periodic recessions. Our present Federal tax system, which is largely a legacy from World War II, is unduly burdensome. It siphons out of the private economy too big a share of personal and business purchasing power, and reduces the financial incentives for personal effort, investment and risktaking.

The chronic deficits of recent years have been caused not so much by too little taxes, or by too much spending, as they have been caused by a sluggish economy. It is, as President Kennedy said last month, "a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high today and tax revenues are too low, and the soundest way to raise revenues, in the long run, is to cut rates now."

Our real aim, in the President's tax proposal, is to help balance the economy. Tax cuts in 1954 were followed by a higher total of Federal tax revenue.

The administration's proposals do not involve a quickie tax cut or a temporary shot in the arm to the economy. They represent a permanent program to expand the incentives and opportunities for greater private expenditures, for fuller use of industrial capacity, and for higher employment.

The President has made clear that this tax proposal is the top priority item on his program at the present time. The general principle of tax reduction has support from liberal economists and it has support from conservative business groups. But in between are many doubters—many men of little faith.

Some of those who oppose the tax cut say, cut Federal expenditures by an equal amount. Let us insist they tell us just where. Do they want to junk the space effort? Do they think we should spend less on defense and give up having a military position second to none? Do they want to hurry along the alarming trend toward bankruptcy for small farmers? Do they want to return to isolationism?

In 1939, 44 percent of our Federal budget went for labor, education, and welfare. Today that figure is only 7 percent. We are today using 79 percent of our Federal budget to pay for past wars and to prepare for and to attempt to prevent future wars.

Let us insist that those who oppose the President's tax proposal tell us their alternative for restoring buoyancy to our economy. Let us find out if they are among the pessimists who are believers in the so-called matured economy theory and if they think there is nothing that can be done or should be done about an unemployment rate persisting above 5 percent for 61 out of the last 62 months.

The early settlers on the Virginia frontier, in what is now West Virginia, faced challenge and struggle. Some turned back. Some were afraid. But most moved ahead and built a great State and a great nation.

Let me mention one statistic which hammers home why we have to grow and move ahead. Today there are about 3½ million students in college in the United States. It is estimated that by 1985—in just 22 years—there will be 12 million students in college. Just to provide the physical plant for this surge of new college entrants will cost nearly $90 billion.

Some throw up their hands at such a figure as this and say: "It can't done," "Where will the money came from?" "We will have to be satisfied with less."

But all those same things could have been said a century ago when this great State was new. In 1870, in the entire United States, only 8,000 students graduated from college. Last year it was over 50 times that many.

We must cast off old slogans, old inertia, and old doubts. We must think brave and think big.

Speaking last year at Yale University, President Kennedy said:

"As every past generation has had to disenthrall itself from an inheritance of truism and stereotype, so in our own time we must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult, but essential confrontation of reality.

For the great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived, and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic. Too often we hold fast to the cliches of our forebears."

The dynamic age in which we live requires vital adjustments to new ideas. The challenges that face us are gigantic—but the opportunities are exciting.

We are a resourceful nation and an energetic people.

We are not afraid of government. We are not afraid to use its powers—at local, State, and Federal levels—to advance the cause of the greatest good for the greatest number.

I am confident we shall boldly meet the challenges of a changing and expanding world, and fill the needs of Americans in the 1960's.

An Outrage Upon Justice: The Case of Gerald M. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the accusations, trial and final acquittal of Airman Gerald M. Anderson by an Air Force court has attracted nationwide concern. One of the most challenging editorials I have read on this subject is one written by John Hjelle, editor of the Bismarck, N. Dak., Tribune, in its issue of February 2, 1963, and entitled "An Outrage Upon Justice." There is considerable justification in the editorial's demand that action should be taken by Congress to make sure that an unfortunate situation such as this does not occur again. An investigation of this matter by an appropriate committee of the Congress may well be desirable. If the Air Force is not guilty of the accusations being leveled against them, this would be disclosed by an investigation and they would be exonerated. If the Air Force is guilty of the charges made in this editorial, then Congress should check to make sure that this never happens again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OUTRAGE UPON JUSTICE

When Airman Gerald M. Anderson was turned loose Tuesday after being held by the Air Force without cause for almost 10 months for a murder another man had admitted, he said he owed thanks mostly to God.

The history of the case is one which should make any American revolt, and which ought to bring an investigation which will shake the Air Force and its administration of justice to the foundations.

Quite a few weeks ago, the Tribune called attention to the plight of the unfortunate Anderson in an editorial. It was obvious then that the Air Force was not interested in catching a murderer but in "saving face" by proving an innocent man guilty of a crime he did not commit.

The whole story is told again this week in the Saturday Evening Post. It's enough to make anyone who believes in justice vomit, and also enough to throw a cold fear into any mother or husband of an airman subject to the same kind of Air Force "justice." Since it happened to Anderson, it could happen to one of theirs. This is what makes the investigation imperative.

Chief among the men who ought to be grilled is the commanding officer of the Mountain Home Air Force Base, under whose jurisdiction the offense against decency was tolerated for 10 long months. If it can be proved that he knew about it—and as commanding officer he ought to have known about it—he should be court-martialed and cashiered from the service.

Next is the Office of Special Investigation operator Townsend, who threatened and lied to Anderson—saying his wife also would be accused as an accomplice and that she already had admitted her husband's guilt when neither was true—until he forced him to sign a false confession after endless hours of constant inquisition.

These men were chiefly responsible for inflicting 10 months of mental and physical torture on an innocent man, deliberately and with malice even after another had proved he was guilty of the crime of which Anderson was accused. Until they have paid the fullest penalty, meaning total disgrace, the crime against Anderson cannot be expiated, nor can Air Force justice to its own men be trusted.

Gordon L. McDonough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, recently I had an opportunity to read a composition written about our highly esteemed former Member of Congress from California, Gordon L. McDonough, who served so ably in the Congress for 18 years.

The composition will be of interest to many Members because of their associations and friendship with Mr. McDonough, but there is also a special reason why this paper is unique and why it will be of interest. It was written by Mr. McDonough's granddaughter, Elaine Miller, of West Covina, Calif., in the district I represent.

Elaine's composition provides a meaningful and descriptive insight into the importance to her of having her grandfather serve in the U.S. Congress and I believe many Members would like to read it.

The composition follows:

THE CONGRESSMAN I KNOW

What is a politician?

To some people the word politician always brings to mind someone occupying a public office who engages in shady deals and negotiations.

While it is true we have had our share of this type of public official, I know one elected Representative whose integrity in

high public office has been above reproach for more than 30 years.

I'll tell you about this man a little later.

The men and women who are elected by the people to represent them in all levels of our Government are truly public servants. Theirs is not a life of just glamour and praise, but rather a life of hard work, dedication, and the daily reminders that they are entrusted to serve well the wishes of their people.

To be successful in public life, one must be a politician. This means he must know the ways of government; must understand the feelings of those who elected him, and must be sincere in his dedication to the cause of good government.

In a land where the Government is "of the people, by the people and for the people," it is obvious that those who direct the Government must be honest in their endeavors. Otherwise, home rule upon which our country has prospered, will fail.

Few people have the opportunity to know personally and intimately a high official. I am one of these few because my grandfather has been in public life for more than 30 years—12 years on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and 18 years a Member of the U.S. Congress.

While I have not visited him in his office in Washington, D.C., I know well his daily schedule because when he comes home between sessions I have a chance to talk to him about things that happen in Congress. I know he attends the daily sessions of the House of Representatives which meets at 12 noon. I know he attends many committee meetings including the Banking and Currency and the Atomic Space Committee because he's a senior ranking member of these two committees.

I know my grandfather best when we would all help to reelect him. I recall helping out after school and on weekends, stuffing envelopes, licking stamps, and mailing letters. I attended many meetings for my grandfather where I distributed his literature.

Through all of the trying times of the campaign my grandfather remained levelheaded, sincere in his approach and always very truthful. He was, what I would say, a "square-shooter."

I believe because he was honest and sincere, the people of his district returned him to Congress again and again. They knew he was doing his best, and was dedicated to the cause of good government.

My grandfather has enjoyed a successful career as a public official. This success was due to a large extent of his personal and devoted attention to the needs of the district which he had served for 18 years in the Congress.

Two years ago when his district was reapportioned the boundary lines were so drastically changed that only a small portion of the original district was retained. As a result the vast majority of the voters were not acquainted with his many years of personal and devoted service. I believe this was the reason he was defeated by a very slim margin of votes at the November general election.

As a result California has lost the services of my grandfather, whose senority in the Congress for 18 years made him a powerful and influential Member of the Congress. While he is not a Congressman any more, he is just as great in his defeat as he had been in all of his victories, and I know I will cherish for many years to come the fond memories of helping him in his campaigns. He is one public official who always has and always can hold high his head, because no one can say anything to discredit the name of Congressman Gordon L. McDonough, my grandfather.

Keys to Better Land Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, making best use of our natural resources, including their wise reuse, requires much effort as well as vigilance.

This is true whether the resource is publicly or privately owned.

Some examples of how well this job is being done come to each of us every day. Recently my attention was called by Paul N. Carlin, assistant director, National Association for Counties, to an excellent paper presented to the western regional district meeting of the association. W. A. Crocker, consulting agronomist for the Cascade Lumber Division, Boise-Cascade Corp., prepared the paper. Mr. Crocker lives in Yakima, Wash.

I ask the unanimous consent that the paper prepared by Mr. Crocker be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAZING OPPORTUNITIES ON PRIVATE INDUSTRIAL LANDS

(By W. A. Crocker)

Rather than generalize on this rather broad and involved subject, I shall use a specific example, namely, the grazing practices on the lands belonging to my major retainer account, Cascade Lumber Division, Boise-Cascade Corp. Before getting into the actual meat of this topic permit me to introduce a few statistics that might be of interest to you and that should serve to present a better picture of the example to be used.

The State of Washington has slightly more than 44 million acres within its boundaries. Only about 14 percent of the State is cultivated, approximately 29 percent of the area is open grazing land and about 56 percent is covered by forest vegetation. It may surprise some of you that over 50 percent of the forest lands in the State of Washington are owned by private interests and that the Federal Government ownership is only about 39 percent and this includes two major national parks, Mount Rainier and Olympic, which contain a total of almost 1,150,000 acres themselves. The State of Washington, counties, and municipalities account for the other 10 percent of ownership.

The above areas—all of the State—are supporting about 1,100,000 head of cattle, about 230,000 head of sheep, approximately 42,000 head of elk and almost 500,000 deer plus sundry other domestic and wild animals.

Dividing the State into two distinct and vastly different areas is the Cascade Mountain Range. On the eastern slope of the Cascades and in the counties of Kittitas, Yakima and Klickitat, we find the lands that are being used as an example in this talk. The Boise-Cascade Corp. owns about 225,000 acres of land scattered throughout this area with units varying in size from a few hundred acres to several thousand acres. At the present time about 190,000 acres are being leased to livestock men for grazing purposes and some 800 acres are being leased to the State game department as a part of their wild game program.

Before I proceed to the actual grazing management, let's take a brief look at the overall management program.

After all, the primary economical income from these lands is timber production. Most of the lands involved are in the ponderosa pine belt; however, other species of merchantable timber are to be found. Selective harvesting on a sustained yield basis is being carried out.

Permit me to comment further on terms "selective harvesting" and "sustained yield." Selective harvesting is a practice used in timber stands that are primarily uneven aged in which only the mature and over-mature timber is removed. The younger trees are left to continue their growth. In fact, when this under-mature timber is released from the competition of the elder trees it accelerates quite rapidly in growth. Stands that are predominately ponderosa pine lend themselves best to selective harvesting as it is characteristic of this species to grow in uneven aged stands. By contrast, clear cutting in blocks is practiced on other species such as pure stands of douglas fir, lodgepole pine, or spruce where the trees are all of the same age and size. Clear cutting, in fact, is the only way that pure stands of douglas fir, for instance, can be perpetuated. However, I would be getting into a long lecture in forest silviculture if I pursued this subject any further and it is certainly out of my field. The term "sustained yield cutting" means simply that the timber in any large unit or area, such as we operate in, is being harvested at a rate which is in balance with the volume of growth.

Recreation is an important crop from these lands. Boise-Cascade Corp., has constructed no less than 10 camp grounds. These camp grounds are provided for the use of the general public without charge and they have tables, fireplaces, toilet facilities and in some cases, baseball and/or softball facilities, horseshoe pitching facilities, etc. These camp grounds are presently, or soon will be fenced, so that the domestic livestock grazing in the area will not interfere with those enjoying these recreational facilities. However, I do permit the lessees to utilize the forage that is growing in the camp grounds at designated times so that a fire hazard will not develop. I shall have more to say on this subject of fire hazards in a few minutes. I might add that the company cleans and maintains these camp grounds regularly and at a considerable expense.

In addition to the camp grounds that are provided for the general public, all of the lands belonging to the Boise-Cascade Corp., are open at all times for hunting, fishing, hiking, general outings, etc. The only exceptions being when an area might be closed for reasons of a serious fire danger and one other case involving a controlled watershed management for the city of Ellensburg in Kittitas County.

Besides the obvious uses of the lands involved that I have named above, timber production and recreation, we are vitally concerned with watershed management. This phase of the overall management warrants a great deal of emphasis. In the first place few nontechnical persons realize the importance of this phase of the management and in the second place and of even more importance, still fewer persons have a real objective and adequate knowledge of plant-water relationships to be able to manage a watershed to its greatest capacity.

Visualize for a moment how dry it can be under a large tree, or a group of small trees for that matter, even in a heavy rain. If you consider one additional step it shouldn't be hard to realize that trees are dependent upon subsurface translocated water. In other words, almost all of the water that a

tree uses enter the soil profile at some other site than immediately under the tree. Also, springs, wells, some streams, etc., are equally dependent upon water which has entered the soil profile at some distant point, or more probably, points. Therefore, those of us involved in the management of lands located at the higher elevations have a very large responsibility to not only the vegetation, primarily trees, upon these lands, but to all of the lands located in the lower lying areas and even to all of the persons who are dependent upon the agriculture production of that area.

I find it a great temptation to indulge in a lecture on watershed management. However, I shall resist doing so. I would like to mention two basic facts, nevertheless; first, water that is consumed by a plant which has no economical value is lost to the watershed in which it is located. The same statement can be applied to plants which could have an economical value but do not because we fail to harvest them. Second, watershed management, like most other management philosophies, involves a series of choices of the lesser of the evils. No program of management is possible which does not have some drawbacks and is therefore subject to some degree of criticism. .

In the last few minutes we have discussed to a limited degree timber production, recreation, and watershed managements. Now it is time to discuss some of the aspects of grazing on these same lands. Remember, all of these activities are taking place on the same lands. All of the activities are important, however, some of them are more important than others. The difference in importance is not nearly as great as it may seem at first. The reasons that these differences are not great are because ideal management includes a consideration for all of the possible uses and their interrelated management. Grazing is only one of these uses.

Grazing on Boise-Cascade Corp. lands in the area we are discussing, brings in an average of slightly less than $100 per section per year. How does this compare with the return from other uses? Boise-Cascade's chief forester tells me that the timber growing at a rate that would result in an average return of about $2,000 per section per year. On opening day of deer season in 1960 the State game department reported that there were some 1,921 hunters in the North Fork of the Teanaway River area. Almost all of this area is owned by the Boise-Cascade Corp. I don't think it is possible to place a real value on the watershed functions. On the surface it would appear that simply because of limited income from the grazing, it isn't very important. This is certainly the attitude that has been taken by some individuals, and it is erroneous. Grazing provides benefits that are not easily recognized and I shall attempt to outline a few of these.

Earlier I mentioned the problem of fire hazards. On the lands under discussion fire is a real danger. What have you really accomplished when you have done an excellent job of timber management otherwise and then encourage conditions which exposes it to a serious fire hazard? Grass and other forage species can and do become sources of serious fire hazards when permitted to grow unharvested.

Also, earlier I mentioned that water entering into plant which in turn are left unharvested constitutes a very large loss of water from the watershed involved. These forage plants need to be harvested and the harvesting method is with livestock and wild game grazing them. Therefore, the removal of the forage species is beneficial to both the timber production and watershed management functions. Grazing is also beneficial to the recreational facilities because it affords them a degree of protection from fire.

Before we continue, let me again remind you that the watch phrase in the management of these lands is the choice of the lesser of the evils. This statement provides the basis upon which grazing is encouraged on the lands under discussion.

Permit me to outline some of the management techniques presently being employed for the grazing on the lands under discussion.

Frankly, we prefer sheep grazing on most of the units, because distribution constitutes the greatest single management problem and sheep are distributed by means of herding. Therefore, sheep range management may be controlled by means of herder management.

This isn't as simple as it sounds because people just aren't easily managed. Also, sheep consume large quantities of brush and these forages are more competitive to timber growth than the grasses and they also are less effective in desirable watershed functions. However, you may recall that at the present time we have only about 230,000 sheep in the State of Washington. This number is no longer adequate to provide sufficient sheep for the grazing of the forest lands. For this reason most of the grazing is done by cattle and wild game.

Distribution problems involving wild game and cattle are not easily solved. The problem associated with wild game, primarily elk, distribution has received, in my opinion, very little and certainly inadequate attention. Elk during the calving period generally occupy the open south facing slopes in the lower regions of timber production. During this period, April and May mostly, soil conditions are very muddy and forage removal is at the stage of growth when grazing is very detrimental to its later season production. Fencing as a general rule is not possible in these cases because of costs. A cooperative program between the game department of the State of Washington and Boise-Cascade Corp. is now in the initial planning stages to attempt to correct this problem. The distribution problems with elk are almost nonexistent after the calving period and rarely occurs with deer in our State.

Distribution problems with cattle are no less serious than those created by wild game and they are almost as difficult to solve. Fencing is one of the tools used and at the present time there are almost 175 miles of fence on Boise-Cascade Corp. lands for this purpose. We are attempting to design fences that are more cheaply constructed so that we may install more for the purpose of improving cattle distribution. We are also highly interested in maintainance costs of these fences, as well. As an example, we have only recently designed, constructed and installed a cattle guard that we hope will be effective and yet very economical. At the present time, cattle guards that are sufficiently strong to hold heavy logging trucks cost about $350 to install. We hope that the new method will reduce this cost to less than $100.

Water development is of prime importance in improving distribution. Many different ways are used for this purpose and we almost always adapt the construction so that fire fighting water is also available. The location of potential watering sites consumes a great deal of my range inspection time.

We encourage and sometimes insist upon the lessee choosing salting sites which will encourage the cattle to more uniformly utilize the forage on the grazing units. In many cases the location of salting sites is highly overrated, however, it does help to a limited degree to improve distribution.

Within the last 2 years we have conducted some experiments of a limited nature using fertilizers in the attempt to improve distribution. It isn't possible to predict the results at this time, however, I feel that there will be a place for this type of program in some future cases. We also are interested in the effect that fertilizers will have upon the timber growth and upon the existence of fire hazards.

Grass seeding is and will become a more important program as we proceed with the development of the overall management program. Each area as it is logged, is seeded to domestic grasses. Some of the obvious benefits from grass seedings are to reduce excessive water runoff which in turn would leave the watershed and to provide additional forage for the livestock in the area. Domestic grasses also stay green longer, thus reducing the fire hazards. Some of the less obvious and possibly debatable benefits of grass seedings are timber species selection and the reduction of the growth of brush species following logging.

In closing, may I point out that the real theme in the management program that I have outlined, is a concept of multiple use. Each phase of the management program is interrelated, not only because of its individual importance, but because of its influence upon all of the other phases. It may seem that I have diverged from the topic of grazing opportunities, but I did not, in fact, because opportunities are directly related to method of management that is employed and I would like to suggest to you that I have briefly outlined a land management program that has been developed by a large corporation, which has very few areas in which it can be justly criticized.

Ikard Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, although my predecessor as Representative of the 13th District of Texas now resides in the Washington area, we still love and cherish him as one of our own.

Frank Ikard, well known and respected by all who served with him in the House of Representatives, has recently been named president of the American Petroleum Institute. This is a position which is very important to Texas and the Nation.

On learning of his acceptance of this important position, the Haskell Free Press, of Haskell, Tex., printed the following article in its editorial columns of January 24, 1963. This is indicative of the feeling of high regard we all hold for Frank Ikard:

Elevation of Frank Ikard, until just over a year ago our own Congressman, our friend, and our neighbor, to the top job in the oil industry as president of the American Petroleum Institute, is heartwarming news indeed.

We aren't surprised. He grew up in the oil patch in Clay County. As a Congressman for five terms, he parried and thrusted with the best of them in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government in working for the best interests of the folks back home, those in the oil and gas business and otherwise. He was a respected member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the House.

As president of the American Petroleum Institute, Frank will represent all segments of the industry. No better qualified man could have been placed in this responsible position. It is one which measures the pulse and heartbeat of our precious natural resources—in time of crisis as well as in time of peace. We wish him Godspeed in the titanic task that lies ahead, with the full knowledge that he will deliver—enough and on time.

A. L. Schultz' Last Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the well-known adage "the pen is mightier than the sword" has been graphically illustrated for many years by a well known and widely respected writer whose columns have appeared in newspapers throughout the length and breadth of Kansas.

The hand which has guided it, that of A. L. Schultz, will pick it up no more because on December 27 "Dutch," as he is affectionately known to thousands, penned his last column, because of failing health.

Through his many years of political reporting, he established a wide reputation for keen insight and amazing accuracy in forecasting Kansas political developments.

His columns, which have become a household word, will be sorely missed. His admonitions against the consequences of more and more centralization of power in the Federal Government have aided immeasurably the cause of conservative government. This influence will be a great loss to the cause of sanity in governmental affairs.

With a heavy heart I submit, for the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Schultz' last column:

TOPEKA, KANS., December 26.—All things have a beginning—and an ending. The most certain is the ending.

This is my last column.

Please excuse the perpendicular pronoun.

After more than 52 years on the newsfront's firing line, I am laying aside my typewriter and pen—the only weapons of force I ever knew.

Through mist-filled, but happy eyes, I look back on associations and friendships seasoned with the salt of all the years. The long and winding trail I have followed has led me the length and breadth of the State and Nation.

Now, in the confines of a hospital room, I have time to think, to remember, and to be warmed. The memories enfold my friends in all of life's stations. They seek to understand my enemies.

Throughout my years, I have been praised and criticized, cheered and reviled. This has been expected. Political thinking always has ably presented both sides of the public coin.

Often I have felt I spoke with the wee voice unheard in the wilderness of new social thinking. Always I have been forced to continue. An inner voice insists there still is unsung virtue in individual responsibility, honesty, integrity, loyalty, energy, and enterprise.

Even as so-called social reforms result from a wilderness of single instances, so does the importance of the common man slide closer to insignificance. I dread the days to follow me when men, women, and children will be little more than wards of government, waiting for disbursal of taxes of others.

Time after uncounted time I have urged citizens to use their ballot to preserve what has been a wonderful way of life. It has been a forlorn hope they would try to inform themselves of the workings of complex government.

But this voice, however strong or faint, is being stilled by circumstance.

Perhaps it will not be missed. Perhaps its passing even will be cheered by its adversaries. I only hope its principles will be continued stoutly by its friends.

Something made this country great. Certainly, greatness stems only from the people—not their monstrous government.

I like to believe I haven't fought reforms. I have never felt I could reform honesty and integrity, patriotism and loyalty, or responsibility and enterprise. To reform these holdings is to wreck our life.

Nor have I criticized the role our newspapers play in our daily life. They are the last fort of freedom for the people they serve. I have known personally the publishers in Kansas and many in the Nation.

They are honest, they are dedicated, they are fair. Their daily duty as they see it is to best serve their communities. They work for this unceasingly. They do their level best. They welcome advice from responsible persons. They also heed it.

The printed page, in these days, can be augmented by television and radio, but never be replaced. Who, I ask you, can remember seeing a scrapbook of radio and TV programs? But they are a part of the modern scene. Newspapers have new neighbors.

But as I said, this is my last column. I come to that time feared by all writers—the time for a period.

Here they are—not a requiem—just periods—and goodby.

Expenditures and Personnel in the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most confusing and complex problems facing a Member of Congress every year is the spending and lending programs of the executive branch of our Government.

While our colleagues who serve on the Committee on Appropriations have both the opportunity and responsibility to grasp the details of these programs, many on legislative committees find a great deal of confusion and conflicting claims to be in existence.

This situation is particularly true in the case of expenditures on agriculture and agricultural resources. The many programs administered by the Department of Agriculture are financed in a variety of methods ranging from the conventional appropriation process and the collection of import duties to Treasury borrowing.

As a result of these different methods used and the necessity for periodic supplemental appropriations, it is often quite difficult to get an accurate picture of the Department's fiscal affairs.

In order for Members of Congress, farmers, and the general public to have a more complete understanding of the fiscal affairs of this great Federal agency, I requested Dr. Walter Wilcox, senior agricultural specialist of the Library of Congress, to compile a set of financial data concerning the Department of Agriculture which I hope will help clarify some of the confusion which exists.

At the outset, let me point out the very basic fact that a great part of the expenditures by the Department of Agriculture are not earmarked for farmers alone. Many programs and expenditures are for the benefit of all our citizens and, in some instances, for the major benefit of nonfarmers. Foreign assistance, conservation, flood control, resource development, meat inspection, research, disease and pest control, school milk and school lunch, and surplus food distribution are examples of programs for the overall benefit of our Nation. In addition, the Department administers a number of loan programs which return almost all of the original outlay.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert copies of my correspondence with Dr. Wilcox along with some explanatory comments:

JANUARY 10, 1963.

Dr. WALTER WILCOX,
Senior Agricultural Specialist, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WILCOX: As we move into the 88th Congress, I feel it is important that we have at our disposal an accurate and objective picture of the expenditures by the Federal Government for American agriculture, both in the past and at present. I would therefore appreciate your assistance in compiling some accurate and comparable facts in this area.

In particular, this is what I would like to know:

1. The total expenditures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (including the U.S. Forest Service) by fiscal years from 1933 through 1963 (estimated) along with the projected expenditures for fiscal 1964 on a basis comparable to the data set forth in the attached table which appeared in this week's issue of the American Farm Bureau Federation Newsletter.

2. The total expenditures by USDA by commodity or program for activities designed to enhance farm income from fiscal year 1933 through fiscal year 1963 (estimated) along with the projected expenditures for fiscal 1964.

3. The total value of the following crops produced in 1962: (a) corn, (b) oats, (c) rye, (d) barley, (e) sorghum, (f) wheat, (g) cotton, (h) rice, (i) peanuts, (j) tobacco, (k) soybeans, (l) dairy products.

4. The number of employees in the U.S. Department of Agriculture on June 30 each year from 1933 to 1963 (estimated).

5. The total Federal debt by fiscal years from fiscal 1933 to fiscal 1964 (estimated) along with the budgetary surplus or deficit incurred in each of those years.

If you have any other information on this general subject which you believe is pertinent, I would appreciate having it, too.

I enjoyed very much seeing you at Ames last month.

With best wishes for a happy new year, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Member of Congress,
6th District of Iowa.

TABLE 1.—*USDA appropriations (fiscal year)*

[Millions of dollars]

Item	1960	1961	1962	1963
Special milk program	66.7	74.7	90.0	[1] 200.0
School lunch	110.0	155.0	170.0	170.0
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	40.5	43.6	44.0	[2] 95.4
Sugar Act program	71.5	74.5	78.0	[2] 77.7
Public Law 480, titles I and II	1,072.5	988.1	[3] 3,013.0	1,330.6
Wheat	63.9	32.6	[3] 159.5	81.2
Barter	129.0	423.0	[3] 288.2	125.0
Surplus commodities (sec. 32)	251.4	320.0	325.9	324.0
Wool	50.1	67.2	75.3	65.0
Feed grain administrative costs	--------	--------	18.5	([5])
Conservation reserve	335.0	330.0	312.0	[7] 300.0
ACP	241.5	242.0	238.0	[2] 212.9
CCC losses	2,043.7	1,151.8	1,017.6	[4] 2,278.5
Total [6] (support programs)	4,475.9	3,902.4	5,820.0	5,260.3
General activities and loan authorization	958.0	823.6	1,292.1	1,436.4
Total [6]	5,433.8	4,726.1	7,122.1	6,696.7

[1] Includes reimbursement of $95,000,000 to CCC and appropriation of $105,000,000 to put program on pay-as-you-go basis for current year.

[2] Established as a consolidated appropriation item under the head "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service," for items formerly appropriated for within the items of "Acreage Allotments and Quotas" through "Special Agricultural Conservation and Adjustment Programs" for administrative expense costs.

[3] Congress appropriated funds to reimburse CCC expenditures and to put program on a pay-as-you-go basis.

[4] This budget item covers the following types of programs: (1) Price support; (2) commodity export; (3) storage facilities; (4) supply and foreign purchase; (6) feed grain, special program; (6) wheat stabilization program; and (7) special activities. This amount includes $2,066,955,000 for net realized losses, on price support activities in 1961, plus $211,500,000 to reimburse a part of realized losses due to revaluation of inventory to reflect acquisition value. The sum of $211,500,000 is included in the 1963 appropriation to restore to CCC's operating funds over a six-year period the $1,069 million involved in the inventory adjustment. The procedure adjusts the book value of commodity inventories to remove costs incurred for storage, handling, and transportation of such inventories.

[5] Special feed grain and wheat programs costs are included in CCC and export program financing.

[6] Excludes Forest Service.

Dr. Wilcox replied to my original letter as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1963.

To: Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN.

From: Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture.

Subject: Letter of January 10 requesting statistical information on the Department of Agriculture.

The attached table includes statistical information in response to items 4 and 5 in your letter of January 10, 1963.

Budget officers in the Department of Agriculture inform me that it may take perhaps another 2 weeks to prepare the basic data requested under items 1 and 2, unless the request is put on a time urgency basis. If you need the information at an earlier date, let me know, and I will try to meet your deadline.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. public debt, budget surplus or deficit, and number of employees in the Department of Agriculture, 1933 to 1964 (estimated)*

Fiscal year	Public debt at end of fiscal year [1]	Budget surplus or deficit at end of fiscal year [1]	Number of employees in the Department of Agriculture at end of fiscal year [2]
	Billions	*Billions*	
1933	$22.5	−$2.6	[3] 33,233
1934	27.0	−3.6	[3] 54,208
1935	28.7	−2.8	[3] 85,114
1936	33.8	−4.4	[3] 82,302
1937	36.4	−2.8	[3] 80,125
1938	37.2	−1.2	[3] 84,031
1939	40.4	−3.9	[3] 86,250
1940	43.0	−3.9	[3] 81,886
1941	49.0	−6.2	[4] 90,169
1942	72.4	−21.5	[4] 91,141
1943	136.7	−57.4	[4] 104,510
1944	201.0	−51.4	77,720
1945	258.7	−53.9	81,984
1946	269.4	−20.7	96,590
1947	258.3	+.8	87,483
1948	252.3	+8.4	82,134
1949	252.8	−1.2	86,247
1950	257.4	−3.1	84,097
1951	255.2	+3.5	81,350
1952	259.1	−4.0	78,559
1953	266.0	−9.4	78,404
1954	271.3	−3.1	76,276
1955	274.4	−4.2	85,503
1956	272.8	+1.6	89,398
1957	270.5	+1.6	95,998
1958	276.3	−2.8	101,139
1959	284.7	−12.4	97,220
1960	286.3	+1.2	98,694
1961	289.0	−3.9	102,557
1962	[5] 298.2	[5] −6.4	[5] 110,511
1963 [6]	[5] 303.5	[5] −8.8	[5] 116,268
1964 [6]	[5] 315.6	[5] −11.9	[5] 121,583

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Budget. "The Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1963." Washington, January 1962, p. 63.

[2] U.S. Bureau of the Census. "Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1938-62."

[3] Employment figures for December.

[4] U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[5] U.S. Budget, 1964. Washington, 1963, p. 422.

[6] Estimated.

I then replied to Dr. Wilcox as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1963.

Dr. WALTER W. WILCOX,
Senior Specialist in Agriculture, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WILCOX: Thank you for your memorandum of January 18 in response to my request for statistical information concerning the Department of Agriculture. I very much appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Your memorandum indicates that the additional information requested will be furnished in several weeks. However, since other members of the Committee on Agriculture have asked me to obtain this data in their behalf also, and since we need it urgently at this time, I would be pleased if you could ask the Department to try to get it by the end of this week.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Member of Congress, Sixth District of Iowa.

Dr. Wilcox then replied as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1963.

To: Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,

From: Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture.

Subject: cost of farm programs.

Attached are tables showing the realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income for 12 major farm commodities, 1932 to 1961. The Department of Agriculture has not worked up similar data for fiscal 1962, and it is not possible to make reliable estimates for the fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964.

Also attached are the values of selected crops in 1962.

On receiving your letter of January 21, I asked the Office of Budget and Finance to try and have the other data you requested available by the end of this week. They agreed to do their best and thought it would be possible. I will forward the USDA expenditure data to you as soon as it is available.

TABLE 3.—*Appropriations and REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1954*

[Figures in parentheses ( ) not included in totals. Adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in 1961]

[In millions]

	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Agricultural Research Service	$33.8	$32.0	$28.9	$33.0	$57.0	$52.7	$56.4	$53.7	$50.9	$46.1	$48.2
Extension Service	10.3	10.2	9.5	17.5	17.9	18.3	18.8	19.4	19.3	19.7	19.8
Farmer Cooperative Service	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4
Soil Conservation Service	.4	.4	.3	6.0	21.3	21.2	27.1	23.0	20.1	26.8	22.6
Agricultural Marketing Service:											
School lunch program	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	(12.4)	(15.3)	(23.1)	(15.3)
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec 32)	--------	--------	--------	92.1	109.1	125.1	144.0	205.5	235.5	222.5	175.3
Other	6.8	6.2	5.4	5.7	6.6	6.6	7.3	7.8	8.1	8.3	9.0
Foreign Agricultural Service	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3
Commodity Exchange Authority	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.5	.6	.6	.6	.6	.5
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:											
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Sugar Act program	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	40.0	54.4	47.9	47.9	47.8	47.4
Agricultural conservation program	--------	--------	--------	--------	469.0	429.1	494.8	555.4	461.4	494.7	444.6
Parity payments	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	212.0	225.0	211.7	211.7	5.4
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	25.4	5.8	25.4	8.4	8.4
Rural Electrification Administration, including loan authorizations	--------	--------	16.4	--------	80.8	31.3	142.1	42.4	103.1	103.7	13.0

TABLE 3.—*Appropriations and REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1954*—Continued

[Figures in parentheses ( ) not included in totals. Adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in 1961]

[In millions]

	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Farmers Home Administration, including loan authorizations	$0.5	$40.0		$2.0	53.0	$12.9	$260.1	$249.5	$281.2	$279.9	$207.1
Office of the General Counsel	.3	.2	$0.4	.5	.9	1.2	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.3	1.9
Office of Information	.9	.7	.6	.7	.8	.8	.8	.9	.9	1.3	1.1
National Agricultural Library	.2	.3	.2	.3	.3	.3	.4	.4	.4	.5	.5
General administration	.7	.7	.6	.7	1.1	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.7	2.0	1.9
Forest Service	18.2	13.5	12.5	17.7	24.1	37.0	46.5	35.6	30.6	37.5	33.6
Commodity Credit Corporation:											
Restoration of capital impairment						94.3		119.6		1.6	
Special activities financed from CCC funds											
Corporate administrative expense limitation						(0.5)	(0.7)	(2.0)	(2.3)	(3.5)	(4.4)
Other funds	100.0	428.6	791.5	470.9			1.8			47.4	45.6
Deduct amounts included in above figures transferred for Pay Act costs											
Total, Department of Agriculture	173.0	533.4	865.9	647.9	812.7	873.0	1,496.3	1,596.7	1,501.6	1,563.6	1,086.4

[In millions]

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Agricultural Research Service	$45.9	$52.0	$52.7	$58.7	$60.2	$75.6	$80.0	$77.0	$88.8	$79.2	$80.0
Extension Service	19.8	19.9	24.4	28.4	28.8	32.2	33.5	33.5	33.5	33.6	35.3
Farmer Cooperative Service	.4	.4	.4	.5	.5	.5	.5	.6	.4	.4	.4
Soil Conservation Service	22.8	28.6	34.6	46.7	41.7	53.6	62.1	59.1	69.3	66.6	71.9
Agricultural Marketing Service:											
School lunch program	(50.0)	(57.5)	(57.5)	81.0	70.0	75.0	83.5	83.5	83.4	83.4	83.2
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec 32)	97.1	119.3	114.3	116.2	84.0	57.9	125.6	111.2	158.9	181.0	172.4
Other	9.6	10.0	10.2	14.1	15.3	18.4	19.5	19.9	19.7	20.0	22.4
Foreign Agricultural Service	.5	.5	.6	.7	.6	.7	.8	.8	.7	.8	2.4
Commodity Exchange Authority	.4	.4	.3	.5	.5	.6	.6	.7	.7	.7	.7
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:											
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas				1.9	5.1	14.9	30.1	23.0	10.0	10.0	43.3
Sugar Act program	63.9	52.5	48.4	53.5	55.0	72.0	60.0	63.8	70.0	65.0	59.6
Agricultural conservation program	400.1	302.6	355.8	312.5	223.1	145.0	257.0	256.5	291.0	251.7	227.0
Parity payments	170.3										
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	3.5	33.4	8.3	27.3	15.0	4.5	5.1	7.1	7.9	8.5	7.5
Rural Electrification Administration, including loan authorizations	22.6	28.3	304.7	255.6	405.0	406.0	502.1	305.3	133.5	100.8	248.1
Farmers Home Administration, including loan authorizations	180.8	155.5	192.5	179.5	104.8	115.2	156.2	176.1	212.4	193.3	338.7
Office of the General Counsel	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.6
Office of Information	1.0	.8	.7	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3
National Agricultural Library	.5	.6	.5	.6	.7	.7	.7	.6	.6	.6	.6
General administration	2.2	1.8	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.3
Forest Service	40.8	44.3	52.5	72.4	73.9	73.5	80.9	84.3	98.7	104.3	108.0
Commodity Credit Corporation:											
Restoration of capital impairment		256.8		1,563.3				66.7	421.5	109.4	96.2
Special activities financed from CCC funds				10.8	30.5	34.0			109.5	193.4	178.8
Corporate administrative expense limitation	(5.4)	(7.2)	(8.9)	(8.8)	(8.5)	(10.8)	(15.4)	(19.1)	(16.5)	(16.5)	(20.0)
Other funds	69.2	57.3	44.2	24.4	4.4				1.5	2.0	
Deduct amounts included in above figures transferred for pay Act costs				−15.6		−2.2	−.2				
Total, Department of Agriculture	1,153.4	1,166.9	1,249.2	2,839.1	1,224.5	1,183.5	1,503.8	1,375.9	1,817.8	1,510.4	1,782.3

[In millions]

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963 [1]	Budget estimates, 1964
Agricultural Research Service	$70.1	$76.5	$112.8	$104.7	$141.0	$146.6	$171.3	$165.3	$179.1	$186.7
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service	19.6	25.0	30.0	30.9	32.1	32.1	33.2	36.2	38.2	40.4
Extension Service	43.6	49.1	54.1	60.3	63.9	64.1	67.4	70.8	75.8	77.3
Farmer Cooperative Service	.7	.8	.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.3
Soil Conservation Service	75.1	84.9	97.2	124.1	134.7	133.2	155.2	178.6	193.3	210.0
Economic Research Service	4.7	5.9	7.3	7.8	8.2	8.1	8.7	9.1	9.5	10.3
Statistical Reporting Service	4.7	5.1	5.5	6.2	6.6	6.6	8.1	8.8	10.0	11.6
Agricultural Marketing Service:										
School lunch program	83.2	83.2	100.0	100.0	110.0	110.0	110.0	125.0	125.0	137.0
Special milk program									105.0	102.0
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec. 32)	180.1	166.8	200.0	220.9	235.9	251.4	320.0	325.8	318.1	361.5
Other	16.0	16.7	18.2	22.7	29.8	33.5	35.8	41.1	43.1	46.8
Foreign Agricultural Service	2.2	14.3	7.2	10.6	9.1	8.7	17.5	15.9	21.1	19.0
Commodity Exchange Authority	.7	.8	.8	.9	.9	.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:										
Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	65.0	63.6	67.1	118.0	104.2	88.1	87.6	105.1	95.4	114.9
Sugar Act program	58.1	58.0	65.8	65.5	73.8	69.2	72.0	75.8	77.7	80.0
Agricultural conservation program	169.2	191.5	203.2	187.3	209.8	214.7	212.9	209.0	212.9	220.0
Conservation reserve program				147.3	183.8	316.6	317.6	300.7	300.0	294.0
Acreage reserve program				565.6	590.6					
Land use adjustment										27.0
Emergency conservation measures			4.0	20.0				5.0		
Other		.2	2.0	29.7	24.5	50.1	67.2	75.3	69.2	69.0
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	6.0	6.2	19.2	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.6	6.5	6.8	7.2
FCIC fund (operating expenses payable from premium income)		(1.5)	(2.0)	(2.0)	(2.3)	(2.3)	(2.6)	(2.8)	(3.3)	(3.5)
Rural Electrification Administration, including loan authorizations	252.4	243.1	522.6	248.1	419.1	249.6	320.0	417.5	490.5	506.3
Farmers Home Administration, including loan authorizations	176.9	199.3	713.3	239.7	252.7	256.7	500.0	380.4	375.7	406.7
Office of Rural Areas Development									.1	.1

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—*Appropriations and REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1954*—Continued

[In millions]

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963 [1]	Budget estimates, 1964
Office of the General Counsel	$2.4	$2.7	$2.8	$3.0	$3.2	$3.2	$3.6	$3.6	$3.9	$4.0
Office of Information	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.7
Centennial observance of agriculture								.1		
National Agricultural Library	.6	.6	.7	.7	.8	.8	1.0	1.0	1.2	2.2
General administration	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.4	4.0
Forest Service	112.8	130.4	153.0	168.2	181.6	208.4	317.9	286.8	274.7	310.3
Commodity Credit Corporation:										
Price support, supply, and related activities	550.2	1.6	906.9	1,194.2	1,703.4	2,043.7	1,151.8	936.4	2,278.5	2,799.4
Special milk program			22.4	45.6	57.0	66.7	74.7	171.2	95.0	
Special activities financed from CCC funds	2.1	117.3	13.2	605.0	19.4	1.1				
Limitation on administrative expenses	(25.3)	(30.8)	(33.0)	(35.4)	(39.6)	(42.4)	(45.7)	(47.9)	(43.2)	(43.9)
Foreign assistance programs	129.6	66.9	257.2	2,550.0	1,315.8	1,265.4	1,443.6	3,460.6	1,576.9	2,429.8
Deduct amounts included in above figures transferred for Pay Act and other costs	−2.8	−1.0	−4.0	−9.9	−28.9				−8.0	
Total, Department of Agriculture	2,026.5	1,613.3	3,587.0	6,878.5	5,894.5	5,641.2	5,510.1	7,418.5	6,975.8	8,481.7

[1] Includes anticipated supplementals and transfers for Pay Act and postal costs.

NOTE.—Figures may not add to totals shown due to rounding.

TABLE 4.—*Realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income, major commodities, fiscal years 1932–61*

["Realized cost" means the net cost incurred to date; it does not include anticipated gains or losses from stocks in inventory. Costs reflect the realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, value of commodities shipped to foreign countries under Public Law 480 less proceeds from sales of foreign currencies, and sec. 32 programs.]

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total feed grains	Cotton and cottonseed	Wheat	Rice	Tobacco	Peanuts	Dairy products	Potatoes	Rye	Flax, flaxseed, and linseed oil	Dry edible beans	Wool
1932-39	292.0	790.3	346.5	19.9	33.2	6.0	45.6	11.2		2.1	4.8	12.3
1940	160.7	264.1	171.7	6.4	7.2	1.3	17.8	5.8			1.6	
1941	148.9	264.1	121.8	3.3	14.4	8.3	14.8	16.4		.1	6.9	
1942	144.2	121.8	124.9	3.3	16.5	1.1	29.4	15.0			7.8	
1943	195.7	60.1	124.4	.5	10.2	.7	10.4	34.5	.1		3.3	
1944	129.1	47.2	163.6	.6	4.2	[1] .2	3.7	8.5	[1] .3		.2	.6
1945	8.2	[1] 19.7	16.1		[1] .2	[1] .4		13.2	.1		.7	1.1
1946	[1] 7.7	[1] 29.0	3.0		[1] .4			16.9	.1	22.5	.1	14.2
1947	[1] .4	6.9	[1] .9		1.0	[1] .7		88.8				33.4
1948		2.8	[1] .2		6.2	5.2	[1] .4	67.5		.2	.1	19.5
1949	4.4	4.7	8.4			36.2	1.7	214.5		3.1	.1	12.6
1950	35.8	6.6	114.4	1.6	[1] .4	47.4	27.0	77.6	.2	4.4	1.0	10.8
1951	35.1	[1] 27.5	201.6	.1	1.2	17.6	46.0	58.7		58.6	11.7	[1] .1
1952	1.7	[1] 3.2	174.6	[1] .1	2.3	10.6	5.3	.1		4.7	15.4	.1
1953	22.0	[1] 6.7	148.7	.3	2.2	4.8	25.7	.1		1.4	6.8	
1954	102.3	48.3	193.3	[1] .6	.5	25.1	172.0	2.1	.1	51.3	8.3	.5
1955	125.8	92.7	400.6	[1] 10.4	5.1	3.5	133.1	.5	2.8	22.8	13.6	.7
1956	246.1	158.3	499.4	38.5	5.0	10.5	166.6	5.0	7.6	7.7	10.6	7.3
1957	455.2	648.7	766.9	117.5	13.8	18.7	109.6	4.1	5.4	2.5	9.9	66.7
1958	511.6	574.2	693.1	60.0	34.5	12.8	172.4	2.6	3.2	15.5	.8	58.0
1959	620.4	396.7	511.4	43.8	32.4	19.5	134.7	7.3	7.4	1.4	1.7	16.1
1960	267.3	507.6	537.5	50.8	7.8	17.4	78.2	.1	2.5	1.2	.3	85.2
1961	1,481.6	463.8	1,350.6	50.1	4.7	33.7	180.9	1.0	5.0	.2	1.9	53.9
Total	4,980.0	4,372.8	6,671.4	385.6	201.4	279.1	1,374.5	651.5	34.2	199.7	107.6	392.9

[1] Represents income or minus expenditures.

Source: USDA Office of Budget and Finance Appendix Tables, December 1959 anp later unpublished data.

TABLE 5.—*Value of production of selected farm commodities, 1962* [1]

[In millions]

Corn for grain	$3,923
Oats	640
Barley	395
Sorghum grain	506
Rye	40
Wheat	2,205
Rice	323
Cotton	2,383
Tobacco	1,352
Peanuts	200
Soybeans	1,563
Dairy products	4,870

[1] Preliminary.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 1963.

In regard to the table showing total USDA spending, you will note that the Office of Budget and Finance of the Department has compiled a detailed statement of USDA spending and lending for 30 years.

In regard to the table on realized costs by commodities, a word of explanation is in order. As reflected in the table, the realized cost does not include anticipated gains or losses from stocks in inventory. It also reflects the value of Public Law 480 shipments which in many instances are grants on loans of foreign currency. It should also be noted that this chart goes only through fiscal year 1961.

Later, my office contacted Dr. Wilcox in regard to obtaining the 1962, 1963, and estimated 1964 figures, and he replied as follows:

From: Legislative Reference Service.

To: Hon. CHARLES HOEVEN.

The attached costs for price supports for fiscal years 1961 and 1962 are based upon unpublished USDA data as indicated in the headings, which are not completely comparable with the realized cost data for earlier years furnished you under date of January 25.

WALTER W. WILCOX.

TABLE 6.—*Farm price support costs and value of marketings, specified commodities, fiscal years 1961–62*

Commodity	Value of marketings, 1961–62 average	CCC realized losses (excluding Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961–62 average		CCC realized losses (including Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961–62 average		Commodity	Value of marketings, 1961–62 average	CCC realized losses (excluding Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961–62 average		CCC realized losses (including Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961–62 average	
	Million dollars	*Million dollars*	*Percent of value of marketings*	*Million dollars*	*Percent of value of marketings*		*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*	*Percent of value of marketings*	*Million dollars*	*Percent of value of marketings*
Feed grains	[1] $5,439	$1,175.0	21.6	$1,277.0	23.5	Dairy products	4,824	[2] 384.0	8.0	[2] 402.0	8.3
Cotton	2,509	260.0	10.4	438.0	17.5	Wool	110	58.0	52.9	58.0	52.9
Peanuts	180	25.0	13.8	25.0	13.8	Rye	22	2.0	8.8	2.0	8.8
Rice	255	47.0	18.5	106.0	41.5	Tung oil	6	.5	7.8	.5	7.8
Tobacco	1,234	6.0	.5	20.0	1.7	Dry edible beans	135	11.0	8.5	13.0	9.3
Wheat	2,185	343.0	15.7	1,058.0	48.4	Soybeans and vegetable oil	1,339	27.0	2.0	92.0	6.9

[1] Value of feed grain crops produced.
[2] Includes costs of special school milk program.

Source: Computed from U.S. Department of Agriculture data.

As Dr. Wilcox pointed out, these figures in table 6 are not completely comparable with the realized cost data for earlier years appearing in table 4.

Since the Department states it is not possible at the present time to make reliable estimates for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, I trust that the Committee on Appropriations will be able to determine these costs in their hearings on the appropriations bill for agriculture this session.

Nature Proves a Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it rained and snowed in California last week, and we are grateful for it because this is the first storm of consequence we have had since October.

As the Sacramento Bee points out, this variable weather is nature's own argument for water conservation and flood control. Were it not for the dams of the Central Valley project, such as Shasta and Folsom, this year's winter drought would have been catastrophic. But the dams were there; they caught much of last October's downpours; and despite the drought, we have sufficient water in storage to get by this year in the Central Valley of California.

The lesson is that we need more water conservation. One place that we need it is on the American River which is now only partially controlled by Folsom Dam. It will be completely controlled only when we build Auburn Dam on the north fork of the American, as provided in my bill, S. 351.

I ask unanimous consent that the Sacramento Bee editorial of January 25 entitled "Nature's Argument" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURE'S ARGUMENT

In the current extreme drought nature itself is making the best case for more water conservation projects in California.

Were it not for Shasta and Folsom Dams, the Sacramento and American Rivers would be mere trickles. All the water which fell in the abundant rains in October would have been lost long since to the Pacific Ocean and the State would be facing one of the most desperate water situations in its history.

Unless heavy rains come during the remainder of the winter and this spring, many sections of the State will suffer severely. But the two big Federal projects in the north, because they caught and stored the October downpours, will have enough water to meet commitments.

It is as certain as the next sunrise that the growth in population will make the construction of more reservoirs necessary to meet future droughts. Or, next year, it may be the floodwaters which the dams hold back.

United Jewish Appeal—Address by Governor Hughes, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Gov. Richard J. Hughes, of New Jersey, gave a deeply moving address on January 29 during a dinner observance of the 25th anniversary of the United Jewish Appeal. His comments were given at Princeton, and the Governor pointed out that it was appropriate to hold the first of such anniversary dinners in New Jersey, because it was in New Jersey that the United Jewish Appeal first came of age.

The address described the response of New Jersey communities to refugees who arrived during the Nazi era and before. The Governor also reviewed the contributions refugees have made to American life and to a better world, and he described the great efforts needed "to do the job of justice." He added:

This notion of responsibility to our fellow man along with our concepts of freedom and justice offers still the greatest hope and benefit to mankind.

Mr. President, the address was one of many we will hear this year as we join in hailing the United Jewish Appeal on its anniversary, and it sounded several major themes. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. RICHARD J. HUGHES AT THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL, NASSAU INN, PRINCETON, N.J., JANUARY 29, 1963

It is my honor to join with you this evening in observing the 25th anniversary of the United Jewish Appeal. And what memories does this quarter century evoke.

During these years we have witnessed a scourge of death and disaster almost unprecedented in human history. But we have witnessed also the triumph of life and achievement, the victory of the human spirit over oppression and disaster. This triumph was necessary for the soul of all mankind. For as all men were diminished by the suffering of the Jewish people so we all share now in their victory over the forces of darkness.

In that victory the United Jewish Appeal was and continues to be prominent. It represents a great and remarkable answer by American Jewry to one of the most terrible challenges that ever faced any people in modern times. Any man who played a part in winning that victory would have a right to be proud—and you all have that right.

From that many lands of despair, oppression and terror, from the DP camps, the survivors of the Hitler years were able to go to a land of their choice, indeed, a land of their own. Could anyone predict that the agonies of these homeless would be turned into the joy of rebirth?

In these years of achievement we celebrate tonight, there were men in this country who were ready to give unsparingly of their time, their energies and their means, to raising the funds needed to save lives and to build. They did this through a great movement called the United Jewish Appeal.

Here in New Jersey you were those men—you are those men still—and I salute you.

It is fitting that the first of such anniversary dinners should be held in New Jersey. For here it was that the United Jewish Appeal came of age. In Atlantic City, at the historic United Jewish Appeal Conference in December 1945, America's Jewish communities first dared to decide that they would try to raise $100 million in a single campaign. You did raise that sum—and when it became clear that only such massive funds could do the job of justice—you went forth to even greater feats of fundraising and lifesaving.

New Jersey can be proud of its Jewish community which has for many, many years accepted the responsibilities accompanying the freedom and religious tolerance all Americans found here. And one of the greatest responsibilities of the Jewish community has been helping its brothers in need

of refuge. Fortunately, the Jewish communities of New Jersey were prepared to welcome and help the refugees who came here—some 8,500, I am told.

Many years before Hitler's rise, you and your predecessors organized local health and welfare agencies under Jewish auspices, such as hospitals, homes for the aged, family and child care organizations, vocational services, Y's, and a host of others, which were ready to assist the refugees from oppression, find homes, jobs, educational opportunities and economic security.

It is good that these voluntary services continue to flourish and serve today, as in the past, not only new immigrants, but thousands of other citizens of the Jewish faith and, in many instances, people of other faiths who need help.

But Jewish refugees have come to us before. And as we gave them haven, they gave us back something in return. They gave us their labor, their creativeness, their deep sense of responsibility to home and community and nation.

In New Jersey, in 1890, we know that Jewish refugees started one of the first such successful farm movements of modern times in the area of Vineland. From such agricultural surroundings came Jacob Lipman, who, at Rutgers University, established this country's first department of soil chemistry and bacteriology. And in time, an immigrant Jewish boy became a student of Professor Lipman and, in turn, became the great Dr. Selman A. Waksman, the discoverer of streptomycin and a Nobel Prize winner.

In reviewing the contributions of refugees to American life, to a better world, we in New Jersey can say with some pride that the late Dr. Albert Einstein came to live among us. This refugee—perhaps the greatest mind of our century—gave us the key to atomic energy with the promise it offers for peaceful use if only man could learn to control his destructive impulses. If only man could learn the lesson of that fundamental teaching of Judaism—man's responsibility to his fellow man—perhaps the terrible history that occupies much of the energies of United Jewish Appeal might not have come to pass.

It is this idea which moves the United Jewish Appeal, as it remains one of the basic principles of our Western World. This notion of responsibility to our fellow man along with our concepts of freedom and justice offers still the greatest hope and benefit to mankind.

When you devote your efforts to saving Jewish lives and to building Israel, you are making your contribution to the preservation of these precious concepts of freedom, human dignity and justice because you are insuring the existence of men and women who have cherished these ideas for 40 centuries.

God bless you in your work.

The Point of No Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, since the question of taxes and tax reduction is, according to the administration, the priority problem facing this Congress, I think it is essential that we gather together all of the information on this subject which is available.

The attached talk by Allison R. Maxwell, Jr., president of the Pittsburgh Steel Co. to the Traffic Club of Pittsburgh at their annual dinner held January 24, throws some new light on this subject.

I insert the talk in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE POINT OF NO RETURN

(By Allison R. Maxwell, Jr.)

I. STEEL AND THE RAILROADS

It is a rare privilege for a steelman to be able to talk to the top management of so many large customers all at one time. The railroads are buying some 2 million tons of steel a year, worth about $300 million annually. And, of course, we would like to sell you much more. It is somewhat of a handicap, however, to have so many competitors here, sitting in on my solicitation.

I am sure you railroaders, on the other hand, are glad to hear from steel—because we are also one of your largest customers. You are currently hauling somewhere close to 300 million tons of raw materials and finished steel products for us each year, turning in revenues of over $1 billion annually.

Yet these figures tell only a very small part of the relationship between steel and the railroads. And perhaps Pittsburgh is the logical place to discuss them—Pittsburgh the cradle of the steel industry—and Pittsburgh the transportation gateway to the West.

Our industries have been linked by history. You have developed the greatest rail transportation network of any nation in the world—using locomotives and cars of steel, rolling on steel rails. You have opened the arteries of commerce to new and expanding markets. At the same time, we have developed the greatest steel production capabilities of any nation in the world. In peace and in war, we have both helped to shape the progress of this Nation for more than a century.

Today, our two great basic industries are somewhat equivalent in size, if such comparison can be drawn. We both have billions of dollars invested in heavy plant and equipment. We both generate billions in revenue annually, employ hundreds of thousands of people, pay out hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes each year, and wind up with disappointing profits to show for our efforts.

When discussing steel prospects with railroaders, I am tempted to tell the story about the harried corporation executive who complained: "If conditions don't improve soon, I guess we'll have to rob some banks."

His companion quickly came back: "If conditions don't improve soon, some bankers who have loaned us money will believe we have already robbed them."

Of course, the outlook is not this desperate. But I would like to give you a steelman's views on the problems confronting our industry, our progress toward solving them, and prospects for the future.

II. STEEL PREPARES FOR THE FUTURE

You may recall that steel production peaked during the 1955 to 1957 period at an average level of 115 million ingot tons a year. Then output dipped and recovered to a plteau level close to 100 million tons a year during the past 3 years. We now expect it to be on the same plateau for the fourth straight year, during 1963.

But these lean years of little change in production levels serve to conceal dynamic changes occurring in our industry. Steel has been going through a grass roots adjustment to cope with an array of economic pressures and competitive challenges.

During this period, we have weathered a massive reduction in consumer inventories, suffered one of the longest and most costly strikes on record, and encountered rigorous competition from other materials and from steel produced abroad.

We have been forced to accept rising employment costs, with no compensating price increases; in fact, the average price of steel today is lower than it was 5 years ago. So the cost-price squeeze on profits has tightened. More than half of what remains is drained away by taxes.

Nevertheless, we have made progress. We are reducing materials and production costs with technical improvements in ore beneficiation in blast furnaces to smelt iron in less time, oxygen injection in open hearths to speed melting and refining of steel, installation of basic oxygen furnaces that turn out a heat of steel eight times faster than the average open hearth, construction of larger and heavier rolling mills for faster production of better products, automation of controls throughout our facilities, and many more.

And we are reducing the rate of increase in our employment costs—from 8 percent to less than 3 percent a year—striving to bring pay rates into closer line with the economic limits imposed by competition. We are striving to achieve this through collective bargaining negotiations—free from Government pressures and interference, and free from industrial strife. And this is no eay task, as we are burdened with the highest steel wages in the world.

But improved efficiency and lower costs mean little without markets to sustain production. So we have launched new merchandising programs, and supplemented these with stepped-up research to develop new products—products providing greater strength and lighter weight, to serve steel users better and at lower cost. We are invading new markets—witness new steel homes, soft drinks in cans of tinplate, new rail rapid-transit cars, steel in space-age rockets, and a host of others.

Yet we still have a long way to go.

Today our greatest challenge is the challenge of world trade. Until the midfifties, we could afford to concentrate on serving our traditional markets here in the United States, and we enjoyed a comfortable export balance.

Today we are truly in competition for world markets with steel producers in all parts of the globe. Since 1950, world steel production has doubled—increasing from 200 to 400 million tons a year. But steel output in the United States as a percent of the world total—on the other hand—has dropped from 46 percent to less than 25 percent.

World steel markets have been expanding, but we have been unable to secure our share of growth. Instead, foreign competitors are carving some 8 million ingot tons a year from our traditional markets at home and abroad.

So while steel is making progress, we now recognize an even larger task ahead. We must plough huge additional investment into advanced tools of production—facilities to make better steel ever more efficiently, until we surpass this competition once again. And this huge additional investment can come from only one source—profits.

III. OUR COMMON PROFIT PROBLEM

Steel's current profit levels are inadequate to do this job. You have probably heard advice, as I have—from high office—to hold down prices, and increasing volume will bring the profit we require. This may sound fine in textbooks, but facts and figures prove that profits must come first.

Your experience in the railroad industry, as well as ours in steel, serves to illustrate the point. Entangled as you are with Government regulation; and competing against trucks, airlines, barges, and other forms of

transportation—nevertheless, you have cut your operating costs with sweeping modernization programs.

You have dieselized locomotives, remodeled freight and passenger car fleets, streamlined traffic control systems, installed pushbutton freight classification yards, reconstructed roadways, and mechanized track maintenance. You have battled for full benefits from this modernization by restraining pay increases, and striving to eliminate featherbedding. You have curtailed passenger service to economize; but at the same time you have expanded freight service, tapping new business by "piggybacking," seeking to diversify, and pursuing area development programs.

Your rates are regulated by the Government, and passenger fares have gone down with removal of the wartime excise tax at last. But what has happened to your volume, and where are your profits? The current round of merger and consolidation efforts bears ample testimony to your urgent need for greater profits through efficiency.

And so I'm sure you are not surprised to find that we have a profit problem in common. And indeed we share this problem with a great many industries, including most all those represented here tonight. Our future welfare now depends heavily on our Nation's total progress toward solution of this problem.

The old maxim "as steel goes, so goes the Nation" has been reversed. Today we can more accurately say: "as the Nation goes, so goes steel." And so go the railroads and other basic industries. And we go as our profits go.

This brings me to the main point I would like to discuss with you tonight. Our noncompetitive tax structure is imposing a monumental burden on all profits in this country. Tax reduction, if it is skillfully engineered, could spark the new surge of progress we're all awaiting—for steel—for the railroads—and throughout our economy.

But let's not delude ourselves. The wrong type of tax reduction could be worse than none. It could lead us to the point of no return—no return to business—and no return to our economy. Gentlemen, this is the critical issue we face during the months ahead.

IV. KEY POINTS IN THE GREAT DEBATE

Rarely in history have so many people arrived at the same conclusion at the same time, and rarely has a single idea such as tax reduction mobilized such popular approval. As one magazine has aptly quoted Victor Hugo: "Greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose hour has come."

Ranks of the proponents embrace Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, businessmen and scholars. The Committee for Economic Development, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the President's Council of Economic Advisers, his Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, the AFL-CIO—and last, but not least, the administration—all have advanced specific plans for cutting taxes. Magazines, newspapers, TV, and radio are broadcasting the joyous tidings daily.

But let me hasten to point out, gentlemen, that among those advocating tax reductions are some strange bedfellows, and they are not all talking about the same thing.

"Tax reduction" has become a catchword—a symbol—a slogan—with a multitude of meanings. There is supposed to be something in it for everyone. It implies that in some magic way, we will all get something for nothing. And there are as many different interpretations of it as there are people who expect to have their taxes reduced.

The administration's tax proposals, now before the Congress, appear destined to become the issue of a great debate—one that may ring down through the annals of history. There is strong likelihood that the full content of the measure will not take shape until next year. But eventual passage is a safe bet because 1964 is a presidential election year.

So let me voice this word of warning. Although the slogan "tax reduction" is cloaked with mystery and confusion at the moment, there will be nothing confusing about the tax rates that result. We will have to live with them, and reap the consequences for many years to come. Basic tax law is revised about once every generation. Once these new rates are written into law, we will have passed the point of no return.

The great debate, therefore, portends a period of crisis for all of us in industry. Long ago, Chief Justice Marshall said: "The power to tax involves the power to destroy." And, gentlemen, this power to destroy is what we all must guard against today.

Main purpose of the current proposals is to stimulate development of a new era—an era of increased production, higher employment, and greater prosperity. Almost everyone agrees with these objectives. But there is broad disagreement on how to achieve them.

The main proposals are to reduce personal income taxes, and to reduce taxes on corporate profits. A few are opposed to either. Some want one without the other. Prevailing sentiment seems to favor both. But from this point on, almost every facet is in hot dispute.

Few agree on the amount of the reductions. Some say a $5 or $6 billion annual cut will supply the gentle nudge that's needed. Others contend that less than $13 or $14 billion will fail to have sufficient impact.

Timing will be argued. Some maintain we need the tax cuts now. Some prefer a 2- or 3-year gradual progression. Others would wait until the Federal budget is in balance. And some would await the next recession.

Inflation is an issue. Most agree that Federal budget deficits create inflation. Some believe tax cuts will restore inflation rather than release the brakes on progress.

One group contends that any immediate deficit resulting from tax cuts would lead to future budget balance—as the tax base broadens with growth of the economy. Another would cut Government spending to offset losses in tax revenues.

And just beyond the issue of inflation lies this question: will tax reduction affect our international balance of payments? Some say we will increase our trade deficit and undermine the value of the dollar. Others are confident the move is sound.

Then there are the issues of tax reform. Loophole closers will seek to recover at least part of the tax revenues—perhaps $3 billion or more—by reducing permissible deductions and exemptions under the present law.

Most people who examine these "loopholes" believe to close them would be self-defeating. When the economy is gasping for breath, why seal off any source of air? Others ardently support the closing of someone's loophole other than their own.

In any case, loophole closing is masquerading under a false banner when it is given the title "tax reform." True tax reform is something deeper and more fundamental—something more akin to tax redistribution.

V. THE NEED FOR TAX REDUCTION

Now I hope you won't interpret these remarks as opposition to tax reduction. They are intended to be words of caution. We all know that production and employment are not growing as they should, because our national demand for goods and services is not expanding in a balanced manner.

Analyze our changing pattern of purchases from 1957 to 1962, and you will discover this: Private purchases of durable equipment and building construction—the elements of industrial expansion—decreased 2 percent; while all other purchases increased 17 percent.

You will also find investment rates have been particularly low. Private business investment, as a percent of our gross national product, has been trending steadily downward—and during the past 5 years, it has been consistently lower than in any year prior to 1958 clear back to World War II.

The main-root cause for this performance is clearly traceable to an obsolete tax system, originally designed to restrain inflation during wartimes, but now restraining growth in peacetimes.

It runs tax revenues up at twice the rate of increase in gross national product, when GNP is on the upswing, acting as an automatic damper on demand. And at the same time, by increasing business tax costs at an accelerating clip, it slices down incentives to invest.

Reduction of personal income taxes would give people a little more money to spend, stimulating purchases of goods and services. It would tend to increase demand, and indirectly to increase investment. But popular as this may be—in a presidential election year—it will have less lasting benefit than a balanced program that will also spur investment.

To say we are all in favor of reducing taxes on corporate profits would be the understatement of the year. We all know the most obvious way to induce investment is to assure a greater profit yield.

Revisions in depreciation rates can make investment less risky by enabling a faster chargeoff—but you can't charge off depreciation faster when you have no profits to charge against. Special tax credits on investment are modestly encouraging. But a new tax structure—one designed to unleash corporate profit incentives—can offer motivation, confidence, and willingness to invest. It could get the soaring sixties off the ground.

VI. THE NEED FOR TAX REDISTRIBUTION

Now let me turn abroad for guidance on this subject. Compare our tax structure with those of other free world nations, and you find this contrast: Our system imposes an overwhelming burden on income and capital. Theirs more closely balances these taxes, with taxes on consumption—including levies on retail sales, excise taxes, custom duties, and the like.

Of our total Federal revenues, over 85 percent comes from personal and corporate income taxes, and only 15 percent from taxes on consumption. And this ratio does not significantly change when we add in State and local taxes. In almost every other major nation—including England, Germany, France, Italy, Canada, Australia, and Japan—on the average—less than 60 percent of tax revenues come from personal and corporate income taxes, and over 40 percent from taxes on consumption.

Lately foreign nations have been stepping up their taxes on consumption. Even such Socialist countries as Sweden and Denmark have cut income taxes and increased sales taxes. Austria, Holland, and Norway are moving in the same direction.

In brief, the United States now stands unrivaled for high tax rates on income and capital; and unrivaled for low rates on consumption.

Here lies the clue to why our private purchases of durable equipment and building construction—the elements of industrial expansion—have dwindled 2 percent, while all other purchases have increased 17 percent during the past 5 years. It helps explain the shrinkage of private business investment in relation to our GNP.

Our rivals in the free world are growing more rapidly than we are. They have benefited from our aid and from the example of

our industrial prowess. Perhaps we should begin to take a few pages from their book, and learn the technique of their apparent superior skills at controlling taxes to stimulate economic growth instead of restraining it.

This will take far-sighted wisdom. Everything I hear or read about our tax reduction problems centers on the amount, the timing, the possible inflation, our balance of payments, and even such trivia as closing loopholes on expense accounts—but where?—and I ask you again, where and when have we heard mention of tax redistribution?

Yet this is fundamental to our problem. Tax systems of other nations are designed to stimulate production and investment. Apparently they recognize, far better than we do, that profits are the driving force of economic progress—the force that spurs demand and yields consumption—the force that keeps employment high—the force that builds the future—and holds government spending down by removing the need for pump priming.

Our tax structure—favoring consumption and discouraging investment—puts the cart before the horse. Sheer consumer spending cannot sustain prosperity alone. We must have the propelling investment and expansion of production to sustain progress. This is what we lack. And this is why the tax reduction crisis is upon us.

Gentlemen, let me strongly recommend that we bend our best efforts to reduce taxes on income and taxes on corporate profits—to the limits of our ability—as the essential first move toward redistributing the Federal tax burden.

And let us face this issue now, and face it squarely. Reduction of these taxes can result in Federal budget deficits. But balance can be restored in two ways:

Government spending can be cut to offset loss of revenue. Or if spending can't be cut, revenues can be increased by new taxes on consumption—even by a general sales tax if this becomes necessary—following the wise example of other free world nations.

We can't afford to watch these tax reductions sidetracked, or totally derailed, for fear of an unbalanced budget. We must have these reductions. They must be big reductions. And consumption taxes must begin to carry a larger share of our tax burden.

Politically unpopular as this may sound right now, it is the only realistic answer. And it will certainly prove more popular than prolonged industrial stagnation and increasing unemployment—the frightening alternatives.

Let's remember this: The Government is not a source of income. It merely collects and distributes income. Any tax reduction that does not stimulate profit incentives to improve production and employment will result in budget deficits, with attendant problems of inflation and an adverse balance of payments. Tax redistribution is the root answer to the problems that confront us now.

Earlier this evening, the thought was expressed that all meetings of businessmen, such as this, should influence future action. So let me summarize this way:

We have a big job ahead in Washington, helping to shape a tax reduction program of lasting value to the U.S. economy. We can't afford to underestimate its importance nor to miscalculate the opposition we will face during the great debate that lies ahead.

Far more than tax reduction is involved, and more than tax redistribution. Our profit system is at stake. The advocates of creeping socialism will be arrayed against us. The Halls of Congress will become the battleground. And the outcome will be crucial.

The tax law that emerges can serve to strengthen or to stifle economic progress.

If it spurs profits and investment, then private enterprise—thus strengthened—can increase production and solve our pressing unemployment problem. If, instead, it fails to strengthen private enterprise, then Government will try to solve this problem by doling out prosperity through such devices as inflation and pump priming and private enterprise—thus stifled—will yield to further Government encroachment.

So Congress has this vital issue to decide. And we must present our case, for it can make or break us. Private enterprise can do the job if our overwhelming taxload is relieved. Our course of action is already clearly charted. We must act today, before we reach the point of no return.

Grazing, Water, and Revenue Conference Held by National Association of Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in December the National Association of Counties held a highly interesting and constructive grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev. One of its outstanding papers was presented by Mr. Harold R. Hochmuth, Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

In his paper Mr. Hochmuth reviewed the significant trends in the management of the Nation's public grazing lands. Since the public lands constitute a substantial portion of the land ownership pattern in the western counties, Mr. Hochmuth stressed the need for partnership cooperation between local officials and the Federal Government in planning for the highest and best use of public lands, particularly where these lands lie in the path of urban-rural development.

I commend Mr. Hochmuth's remarks to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HAROLD R. HOCHMUTH, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE GRAZING, WATER AND REVENUE CONFERENCE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, LAS VEGAS, NEV., DECEMBER 12, 1962

Just 1 month ago, the national advisory board council met here in Las Vegas. It is a group of highly respected citizens appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to advise the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management on public land matters. The meeting in future perspective will be viewed as an historic occasion.

The stepchild of the people's domain, the leftovers from more than 100 years of picking and choosing is coming of age. The public domain with a past and no future is changing. It is now recognized as a most valuable asset— in fact a multiplicity of assets. The augmented national council, it is expected, will interest itself in a wide variety of matters affecting the public domain lands.

Sitting with the council as new members were two men well known to the National Association of Counties; Mr. George Ricca of Kingman, Ariz., and Judge Loyd Rea of Baker, Oreg.

Although the session this afternoon is concentrating on grazing matters, I do not wish to pass up an opportunity later on in these remarks to dwell briefly on other land and resource matters of great interest to this organization.

More than 25 years ago, Congress reviewed the previous 100 years of acquisition, reservation, settlement, disposition, and use of the public land. It found that, exclusive of Alaska, there were about 200 million acres left—200 million acres not permanently set aside for specific purposes. Millions of acres of mountains and forests, plateaus, plains and grass, deserts, sagebrush and saltbush. Mostly though, a land of deserts or semideserts, conquered and put to productive use by the stockmen and the miner.

Competition for the sparse vegetation was the prelude to a repeat of what had happened to arid regions the world over. But not quite. Fortunately, our lawmakers and leading stockmen were aware of the calamitous effects of overgrazing in other dry regions of the world. Westerners brought forth a new act to regulate the public domain.

The Taylor Grazing Act with its subsequent amendments will rate in history as an outstanding conservation act. After 28 years, it still is the basic act under which is administered this land empire of the people.

But changes have taken place. Uses made of the resource have enlarged which in turn have brought new interests into the picture. Many interested groups have, for years, wanted to counsel the Secretary of the Interior on the use of the public lands.

The Taylor Grazing Act provides for an advisory board of local stockmen in each Bureau of Land Management district established by the Secretary pursuant to the act. The advisory board for each district consists of not less than 5 nor more than 12 stockmen plus 1 wildlife representative. To supplement this system of district advisory boards, the Secretary of the Interior established a State advisory board in 1949 for each of the 10 Western States which have organized grazing districts. As initially established, each State advisory board consisted of two of the stockmen members from each of the districts within the State plus one wildlife member.

Also in 1949, the Secretary established the national advisory board council with 2 livestock members from each of the 10 Western States which have organized grazing districts. In 1955, at the recommendation of the council, three wildlife members were added; one from each of the three Bureau of Land Management areas. In 1961, the wildlife representation was increased to include one from each State.

For a quarter of a century this system of advisers has been of invaluable assistance to administration. But change also has taken place here.

With new developments in the use of the public lands and resources, who is advising on matters other than grazing and wildlife? Uses such as mining, forestry, oil and gas, recreation, soil conservation, rural and urban development, open space; all are demanding a place at the council table. The new State advisory boards and the national advisory board council now have representation of a wide spectrum of interests in the new look at public land use and development.

This session of your conference is to concentrate on discussions of grazing mat-

ters. A review of significant trends in this field in the past year or two affecting the national land reserve may help in setting the stage for some discussion concluding this session.

It seems of significance to report that the Congress has recognized the need to rehabilitate and develop the forage, soil, and other resources of the public lands. For the current fiscal year, the Congress appropriated a total of $2 million to initiate 4 projects; 1 each in the States of Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, and New Mexico.

These projects are designed to show what can be done to rehabilitate and return to full productivity large areas of the range livestock region. We hope to reseed the range, control brush, reduce soil erosion, improve water supplies, improve wildlife habitat, and develop the recreation potential of selected sites. It is a big order. The future of many areas may ride on the results.

I believe we have not only to prove that this physically can be done; we have to prove that it must be done and prove that the future benefits will greatly outweigh the costs. In balancing off benefits and costs in capital investments in resources, we might also consider the future costs to the Nation of putting off until tomorrow what should be done today.

These programs of development are not born, cannot survive beyond birth, and cannot mature without local interest and cooperation. The common good both locally and nationally must be established. It is not estimated and nurtured alone by professional resource managers. Even persons who derive a direct economic benefit, the users who convert the resource for profit cannot carry the load alone. All who receive benefits, both tangible and intangible, direct and indirect, should have a hand, however small, in resource development.

Someone besides the one who is paid to care, should care. And the people of the Western States, always so closely involved with public lands, have developed a new and awakened interest in the future of these lands. If they had not, the rising curve of capital investment in the public lands would not have occurred.

Rehabilitation projects of the size and scope contemplated create a host of other problems. For example, to what extend do increases in forage, construction of water detention, soil erosion, and water spreading structures, contouring, etc., affect downstream water delivery? How does manipulation of vegetal cover, particularly brush, affect big game and upland birds? In addition, in many States, we have a problem of manipulation of forage on critical big game winter range areas.

These matters so quickly uttered here have for decades occupied the best talents of scientists, economists, and land managers. We know that some things, certain broad principles of land and water management, have been established. But the scientists say that in managing forage things vary. The grass depends on the soil, the soil on the grass, and both on climate. Then we throw in a few cows, some deer, prairie dogs, rabbits, a drouth or two, a 50-year storm, fire. These are, they say, variables. Some dependent and some independent. So we ask which is which? And are told, that depends.

In managing our grazing resources, be the manager a stockman or a bureaucrat, one thing is for certain—no range can carry, over a series of years, more animal life than its forage producing capacity. But what is the forage producing capacity of a specific area? This year? Next year?

The land manager is beset with a multitude of vexing problems in the western range area, but the determination of proper or optimum carrying capacity produces the most ulcers. When this becomes an exact science, peace will reign supreme.

Beyond the significant trend in specific project development work, there has been provided by Congress significant increases in appropriations for general soil and moisture conservation work.

These are substantial amounts of money and substantial increases have occurred in the past 2 years. However, soil and moisture funds when spread over 60 districts and 160 million acres are inadequate yet to check deterioration of the resource.

Another trend to be observed relates to fees and charges for the use of Federal services and goods. Federal agencies are under directives from the President to charge full value for the services rendered and resources furnished. For a number of years, there have been studies made of the economic position of ranches. Recent studies have related grazing fees as one element of ranch costs to ranch returns.

The district boards, State boards, and the national advisory board council as advisers to the Bureau and the Secretary have contributed to these studies. The recent meeting of the council recommended that there be no change in the formula whereby grazing fees are calculated. The formula relates grazing fees to the average price of cattle and sheep in the western markets. The council also recommended that if there is to be an increase in grazing fees, the increased fee not exceed a 50-percent increase of the present fee. It appears probable that there will be an upward revision of fees for the the use of forage obtained from the public lands.

The whole question of fee levels and value of forage as related to grazing capacity, resource protection, and nongrazing uses made of the public lands is an extremely complex one. If grazing were the only use made of the public lands; if grazing capacity were fairly uniform and if range tenure were something in the nature of a right, the matter would be simplified. However, this is not so, and perhaps few would argue that it should be or can be that simple.

With the increasing demands made on the public lands for other uses, it is not expected that the ranchers, the purchasers of the forage, should carry the whole burden or even the major portion of the economic return for the use of these lands.

There are other users of the public lands, and their demands for a place on the merry-go-round cannot be denied. Many of these uses do not directly conflict with grazing, others are bound to displace grazing.

Outdoor recreation in its broadest sense, including such uses as wildlife and hunting, rock searching and general esthetics, is affecting the use and management of the public lands for grazing. Again, this is not to say that most grazing will be displaced or that the public lands in their entirety will be set aside for other uses. It is, however, encouraging to note that with all other uses developing as anticipated the forage capacity of the public lands can be more than doubled with intensive development and better management practices.

Another indication of the interest shown by the Congress as to the state of the resource and as to how this resource might be developed is found in the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee for fiscal 1962. The committee directed that the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture initiate a trial program of public range appraisal to determine how the range can be brought to full productive potential and the probable cost of a complete inventory. This study has been published as Senate Document No. 19, 87th Congress, 2d session.

The trial program indicated that an appraisal of the public rangelands would assist greatly in development and management. If initiated and completed, it would be a companion to the surveys of "Outdoor Recreation for America," "Timber Resources for America's Future," and "Agricultural Land Resources."

A report to this organization on grazing problems of public lands would not be complete if I did not extend my remarks to include collateral land problems now developing. County governments, of all governmental structures, have the most direct concern in public land laws and administrative actions taken under those laws by public land agencies. How these lands are administered affects your tax structures, the health of your local economies, and the distribution and efficiency of your county services. This is recognized by the Congress in statutes requiring payments in lieu of taxes and, I note, occupies a prominent place on your program tomorrow.

The Department of the Interior has recognized the effect of its land and resource management activities on counties. We are aware that grazing adjustments and land adjustments are of great importance to you. We are aware that land sold, exchanged, or acquired by the Government has its effects. We know we cannot conduct these activities without direct consultation and advice from local officials. These officials are in the best position to determine the internal effects on local governments and communities. I can assure you that this trend in cooperation and consultation will continue and be intensified.

As an example of recognition that Federal land policy can have its effect on local governments, and recognition that cooperation with local government is necessary, I cite proposed changes in the Department's small tract regulations. I quote from the stated purpose of the regulation: "To permit acceptance of small tract applications only for lands opened to such application, to insure consistency between the small tract program and county planning and zoning, to discourage unethical promotion of small tract applications and for other purposes in the public interest."

There has been some information in the press a few months back about joint Bureau of Land Management-Forest Service land adjustment studies. This resulted from information issued by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. There has been inquiry why local people and county governments have not been consulted in the matter. In some instances, they have been.

The study to date has been only factfinding, to seek out what lands, if any, administered by one agency can better be administered by the other. Criteria are efficiency and economy of administration, and service to local communities and users of the public lands. When the facts are in, it would appear probable that before any land transfers are made the program must be taken before the people—to the local communities and to the Congress.

There are other public land problems developing that are of such urgency that I plead for assistance and action by county governments. Some counties are already involved in action programs. Those that are not, should be. Tomorrow may not be too late, Friday may be.

Our problem simply is that with all of the open spaces in the West it "ain't" in the right places. With the population increase and with western migration, the continent seems in danger of tipping to the West. Our western cities and villages are running out of open space. Read "California, Going, Going."

People are turning to two residences. The rural landscape is becoming urban. In 1943, in New Guinea, and again in 1958 at Point Barrow, Alaska, I saw identical signs, both of which when translated must have

frightened the natives. The signs said "Los Angeles city limits."

It is not the spreading of people into rural areas—in public lands in many places—that should be our only concern. People must have some space. It is the lack of planning, perhaps lack of rural zoning. Little or not provisions for open space in areas which a few short years ago were open space.

In many counties of the West, public lands constitute a substantial portion of land ownership. Some of the public lands lie in the path of urban-rural development. We need a partnership with local officials and planning groups. We need to know your forecasts 10, 20, 30 years hence for land for economic expansion, for parks, playgrounds, and schools—for open space.

In our inventory and study of the highest and best use of public lands, we will be seeking information from and consultation with State and local governments as to your future needs. The course charted in this decade will affect our children in the 21st century. We should—we must—consider now the capacity of our lands and resources. There is no more. For each area, for each community, as part of the whole, the various choices are before us. Do we need this land for the future as a park, a meadow, a housing development, for grazing, for timber production, or just for aesthetics and open space.

A little story as a closing note. About a month ago, a little boy in San Diego County, Calif., wrote to the President asking for help. It seems he had a deep and personal problem. It was his wont to walk a certain dry canyon of that area studying lizards. One day, the bulldozers tore it up for homes—his canyon. He found another canyon containing his favorite fauna. Again the same catastrophe—for the boy.

The President asked Secretary of the Interior Udall to reply. Apparently, the reply was not easy to phrase. It admitted that these things do happen—but also it seems that we ought to do something to preserve the right of a boy to find his place in the sun. The sun of the open space, the dry canyon, the abode of the lizard.

Want No Farm Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Palladium-Item dated January 25, 1963:

WANT NO FARM DICTATORSHIP

A growing opposition is being noted against increasing Government control over agriculture.

Leaders of the American Farm Bureau are urging the country's million or so wheat farmers to reject President Kennedy's wheat program for 1964 and beyond. Under it, farmers would receive higher price support but they would have to knuckle down to stiffer production and marketing controls.

We don't want President Kennedy to have control of our agricultural system. As Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has pointed out, success of the wheat referendum inevitably would lead to even stricter controls on production and prices of other crops as well as livestock.

The farmer deserves, and must have, a fair return on his investment. The ultimate well-being of the rest of us is inseparably linked with the prosperity of the farmer.

However, we want no agricultural dictatorship under which the President, through his Secretary of Agriculture, could sit in Washington and virtually direct the lives of the Nation's farmers who produce the food which keeps up alive, as well as many others over the world.

Our country was not developed by a handful of politicians through clever manipulations. Over the years we have produced leaders in a variety of fields—business, industry, agriculture. It should be to them, in their respective categories, to whom we look for guidance, not to power-conscious bureaucrats in Washington.

The Birth of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first of aserics of articles in the State magazine section of the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail, relating to the protests in western Virginia regarding secession of the State from the Union. It was from such protest meetings that the State of West Virginia was born.

This is the centennial year of West Virginia, and for those Americans who plan to visit the mountain State this year, to see the sculpture of our hills and valleys and the many places of natural and historic interest, I commend a reading of this first article, entitled "The Protest Meetings in Western Virginia." The reader will then understand why West Virginians are proud of their heritage.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROTEST MEETINGS IN WESTERN VIRGINIA

(By John G. Morgan)

Late in April of 1861, a series of mass meetings popped up in northwestern Virginia to protest secession of the State from the Union.

An unusual document was adopted unanimously at one of the meetings in the courthouse at Clarksburg on April 22, 5 days after the Virginia convention passed an ordinance of secession.

Entitled "Preamble and Resolutions" and later known as the "Clarksburg Protest," the document said the ordinance was "contrary to the expectations of a large majority of the people" and urged the calling of a new convention for May 13.

It was resolved that the new convention consist only of delegates representing the people of northwestern Virginia and that they determine what actions should be taken in the "present fearful emergency."

Membership was fixed at not less than five of the "wisest, best, and discreetest men" in each county.

The text of the document was printed in an extra edition of the West Virginia Guard, a newspaper published at Clarksburg.

Volunteer expressmen, riding farm horses, rushed copies of the paper to Weston, Kingwood, Morgantown, and other points.

"There was manifested the greatest enthusiasm ever seen in this county," a Clarksburg area resident said in writing to Granville Davisson Hall, a newspaper reporter and historian.

"When the call was made for the express riders, a sufficient number volunteered instantly, and old farmers who were never known to get excited before came down with their money to pay expenses and with offers of horses; and in a very short time expresses were on their way."

John S. Carlile, a delegate at the Virginia convention from Harrison County, was a central figure at the Clarksburg meeting, attended by approximately 1,200 persons. He openly advocated the creation of a new State.

A principal speaker at some of the other meetings was Francis H. Pierpont, 47-year-old Marion County lawyer and a solid Union man.

A general campaign was mounted against the ordinance of secession on which the people were to vote for ratification or rejection on May 23.

About 2,500 persons attended an April 22 meeting at Morgantown. The program was opened by the sound of a fife and drum coming down Main Street.

A flag of the Union Boys of the Flats was followed by about 300 local farmers. Another group of men followed the emblem of Fort Martin Boys.

Units of the parade gathered around the flagpole in front of the courthouse. Favorite Union selections were played by the Mechanics Bugle Band.

Pierpont delivered an address in which he "handled the secessionists without gloves and, in the opinion of all honest-minded men, completely swamped the disunionists, who went away and refused to hear the truth," a newspaper said.

The meetings were held at a time when the people still were shaken by the news of the opening of the Civil War on April 12, followed quickly by the passage of the secession ordinance at Richmond.

Rumors were rampant, neighbors suddenly were not to be trusted, and some families were split. The usual way of life in the communities fell apart. Armed groups of men roamed the public highways. The nights often were filled with terror.

A friend wrote Hall in another letter:

"The residence of Caleb Boggess, Union delegate from Lewis County, was burned by secessionists here yesterday."

In the southern and central part of what is now West Virginia there was much sympathy for the Confederate cause. Residents of those areas frequently held mass meetings in support of secession and against creation of a new state.

Secession activites were reported in at least 21 counties during the winter and spring of 1861. Even in Union counties, some meetings were held.

Early in April, a resoluiton adopted at a mass meeting in Jackson County instructed delegates at Richmond to vote for the ordinance of secession. Citizens gave three cheers for Jeff Davis and nine groans for Abe Lincoln.

Henry Mason Mathews, who was to become a major in the Confederate Army and later the fifth Governor of West Virginia, wrote to Virginia Gov. John Letcher on April 21:

"There is but one sentiment here. Every man, young and old, is ready to start at a minute's warning to defend the old Commonwealth."

Barbour County was regarded as a secession hole, a southern stronghold in Union country. Kanawha was listed among coun-

ties in which Confederate meetings were held.

The Confederate flag was raised over the courthouse at Logan in May, and three Rebel companies were organized there.

The very southern-minded Kanawha Valley Star said in an editorial on April 30:

"There are no 'Black Republicans' in Virginia except in Wheeling. Should the Abolitionists of Ohio send an invading army into western Virginia, not a soldier of them will return alive. The mountain boys would shoot them down like dogs."

Unionism, with the Wheeling Intelligencer as its principal beacon, gained strength in the northwest. Public meetings were the rallying points.

After adoption of the "Preamble and Resolutions" by citizens of the Clarksburg protest meeting, the newspaper issued a call for the convention to meet in Wheeling on May 13.

Edited by the talented and influential Archibald W. Campbell, the newspaper was unrelenting in its campaign against secession and was at the very source of the new State movement.

A bold and dramatic editorial said on April 30:

"Union men of the northwest. We conjure you as you have any manhood—as you have any hope for yourselves or your children—in this hour of our deadliest peril—to throw aside and trample under foot the last vestige of partyism.

"Let it be blotted out from your remembrance that you have ever been divided as partisans, but keep simply and only before your minds the one great momentous truth that if you falter or fail now your all is gone.

"Organize and enroll yourselves everywhere in Union organizations. Summon every energy of your mind and heart and strength, and let the traitors who desecrate our borders see, and let history in all after time record it, that there was one green spot—one Swiss canton—one Scottish highland—one county of Kent—one province of Vendee, where unyielding patriotism rallied, and gathered and stood, and won a noble triumph."

New patriotism was generated at more meetings. On May 3 at Clarksburg, a crowd estimated about 1,000 persons came, despite torrents of rain, followed by snow and then more rain.

People were called together by the ringing of the courthouse bell. Pierpont talked 2½ hours to the crowd jammed into the courtroom and hall. A reporter commented:

"He (Pierpont) was full of fire, perfectly fearless and determined, and his electrifying appeals met with an equally electrifying response of thrilling cheers at every point from the most enthusiastic and determined crowd of men I ever saw.

"He traversed the whole ground of secession. He examined it at all its points, showed up all its weaknesses and fallacies * * * Never did I hear secession in all its phases so completely skinned, so literally flayed alive."

The meeting closed with cheers for Pierpont and others and three terrific groans for Jeff Davis and the Virginia convention at Richmond.

At Wheeling on May 4, Pierpont stood on a table and addressed a crowd of about 3,000 persons in front of the courthouse.

At a meeting in Fairmont on May 6, the Unionists were denied the use of the courthouse, but they conducted their program in front of Ben Fleming's hat store.

Pierpont again spoke with apparent effectiveness, but was annoyed by a group of about 50 heckling secessionists in the large crowd.

Later a fist fight broke out, and the crowd swayed back and forth while two big men hit savagely at each other. "Go in, Jenkins," and "give it to him, Stevens" were among the shouts heard above the general uproar. Others began to take part in the battle.

"Many rushed in with clubs and canes and, reaching over the heads of others, struck wildly and at random," a newspaper reported. "Others who could not reach over, contented themselves with punching the combatants with the ends of their canes."

The speaking stopped, and the crowd dispersed after the two principal fighters became so exhausted that they were separated without difficulty.

Expansion of unionism in the Northwest continued. On May 10 the Intelligencer said:

"There is a most unprecedented awakening on the subject of secession. The fact that we have been despotically dealt with has come upon the conviction of the people like a horrid fright.

"That fright has been succeeded by a most intense indignation, which is rapidly kindling into a towering and devouring flame of resentment and repudiation."

Some alert businessmen took advantage of the situation by reflecting their sentiments in advertisements. Samples:

"We have a few large and small flags on hand and can furnish to order any number at short notice,

"The Union forever. Laird's Bloom of Youth or Liquid Pearl will not only remove all kinds of tumors, tans, freckles, sunburns, and other cutaneous diseases of the skin, but * * *"

"Union among the bedbugs. Use Costar's bedbug exterminator. It is the only article that has or will give satisfaction."

Mayor A. J. Sweeney proclaimed May 9 as a day of "fasting, humiliation, and prayer" in Wheeling.

The day was described as a very beautiful one. "The streets were full of people, all of whom had their good clothes on, and seemed to enjoy and respect the occasion," it was reported.

At the Fourth St. Methodist Episcopal Church, Rev. Wesley Smith declared:

"War is an evil—a tremendous evil, but there is an evil a thousandfold greater, and that is the iron heel of despotism, a cruel, heartless, relentless despotism that would supersede the ballot box by the cartridge box; a despotism that would plunder our property, peril our lives, and rob us of that without which life would be a curse, our liberty."

Next: The First Wheeling Convention.

Country Banker Heads American Banking Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this year, the 100th anniversary of the commercial banking system in the United States is being observed throughout the Nation.

I am proud that a fellow Georgian and dear friend of mine, Monroe Kimbrel of Thomson, the president of the American Bankers Association, has a key role in the association's observance of the centennial.

Mr. Kimbrel, chairman of the board of directors of the First National Bank of Thomson, as a farm boy in southwest Georgia set his sights on becoming a country banker and never once wavered as he diligently worked to achieve that goal. He is a credit to Georgia and to banking, and I join the Nation in saluting him.

On February 3, 1963, Mr. Kimbrel's career was featured in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution magazine. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

FARM BOY'S RISE TO BANKING LEADERSHIP

(By Katherine Barnwell)

When Monroe Kimbrel was a tall, lanky youth living on a farm in southwest Georgia, his ambition was to become a country banker.

He didn't have any bankers in the family, but he'd known a couple and he thought a job in a small bank would appeal to him.

To raise money for a college education he did all kinds of farm chores, including driving a tractor. Then he rashly spent a large part of his earnings for a new bicycle.

But he soon displayed a banker's canny talent for making a profit on an investment. He sold the bicycle for more than he'd paid for it. That's how he got most of the $95 in cash he had when he left his home in Miller County near Colquitt to go to the University of Georgia.

"I also had a round-trip railroad ticket," he recalled recently. "I wanted to be able to get back home in case I couldn't afford to stay at the university."

The ambitious farm boy got a job waiting on tables at the university—and 3 years later he was graduated in the top 5 percent of his class.

Today, M. Monroe Kimbrel is president of the American Bankers Association, the highest honor that can come to anyone in banking. At 46, he is the youngest president in the 88-year history of the association—which represents approximately 13,000 banks all over the United States.

He is also a self-styled country banker in Thomson, Ga.—a town with about 6,000 people. He's chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Thomson, which has less than $5 million in deposits. It's believed to be the smallest bank ever to produce an ABA president. Many of the bank's customers are from surrounding rural areas.

Mr. Kimbrel is a friendly, chatty, personable man who is equally at ease with Wall Street tycoons and overall-clad farmers. His accent is as southern as crackling bread. Extremely articulate, he frequently makes speeches at meetings all over the country—and he smilingly admits big-city bankers in the North often kid him about his drawl.

He is sometimes called "bones"—but his tall, lean frame is not responsible for the tag. He candidly explains, "In college I had one lucky night—and the nickname stuck."

Last year Mr. Kimbrel served as vice president of the ABA and traveled about 82,000 miles in the interest of the organization. He expects to exceed that mileage in the presidency this year.

Along with two other ABA officials Mr. Kimbrel was invited to confer with President Kennedy at the White House.

"I was favorably impressed by him," the Georgia banker said. "I don't agree with some of his theory and philosophy, but I was amazed at the extent of his knowledge. He spieled off figures that we in banking might be expected to know—but I was surprised that he knew them. And I was later told he had not been briefed before the conference."

Mr. Kimbrel's rise in the banking world has been punctuated by a remarkable rec-

ord of accomplishment. When asked for his success formula, he replied:

"Hard work, I guess. I still don't know any substitute for that."

After he was graduated from college in 1936, he got a job with the Farm Credit Administration at a salary of $80 a month. "Jobs were hard to get then," he recalled. As a credit examiner and troubleshooter for an agency that makes farm loans, he learned firsthand the importance of adequate financing—both to the borrower and the lender.

Mr. Kimbrel believes he obtained "wonderful experience" in his 9 years with the Farm Credit Administration. During this time he was assigned for a while to Thomson, where he met a pretty brunette named Nita Matlock at a dance. They were married in 1941.

After their marriage Mr. Kimbrel accepted a job as a cashier in the First National Bank of Thomson. Actually, he had never wavered in his determination to become a country banker. He was elected successively vice president and cashier, executive vice president, and then chairman of the board and chief executive officer. Paul A. Bowden, the 87-year-old founder of the bank, has remained as president.

"I like working in a small bank," said Mr. Kimbrel, who has turned down offers from some big-city financial institutions. "I feel I can make a real contribution to the economic life of our country here. Most of the banks in our country are small—about 10,000 of them have deposits of only $10 million or less. As a country banker, I am familiar with their problems."

Mr. Kimbrel served on various committees for the Georgia Bankers Association. He was elected president of the association in 1956 after a year as vice president.

He was a member of the American Bankers Association's Federal legislation committee for 7 years—including 4 years as chairman. His committee work involved study of all legislation before Congress that affected banks or was related to the Nation's economy. Besides doing basic research, he helped determine the association's policy.

Mr. Kimbrel has maintained his interest in agriculture and at the same time has helped spearhead the move toward industrialization in his area. In 1955 Thomson's First National Bank received the Robert Strickland Agricultural Memorial Award given annually to a Georgia bank for outstanding service to agriculture.

For the past 5 years Mr. Kimbrel has been on the McDuffie County Board of Education. He has served as president of the local Rotary club and as district governor of Rotary International. He is a member of the board of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. Mr. Kimbrel has done volunteer work for various youth organizations—the Boy Scouts, 4-H Clubs and the YMCA. For about 20 years he taught a Bible class at the First Methodist Church.

Mr. and Mrs. Kimbrel and their children, Jenny Wood, 17, and Danny, 13, live in a handsome white-columned home on a shady hilltop a couple of miles from downtown Thomson. Near the house is their small private lake where they enjoy fishing and swimming.

One of his jobs as president of the American Bankers Association will be to lead the organization's observance of the 100th anniversary of this country's commercial banking system this year.

Mr. Kimbrel said the ABA has arranged an economic symposium in Washington, D.C., February 25, to mark the centennial. More than 300 top leaders of business, industry, and the trades will participate. President Kennedy will be among the speakers—and "Bones" Kimbrel, the country banker from Thomson, Ga., will be on hand to greet him.

A Fright for Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal dated February 5, 1963:

A FRIGHT FOR FRIENDS

To no one's great surprise, the end of America's international payments deficit is glimmering ever farther away. Balance was supposed to be restored late this year, but now Treasury Secretary Dillon says it may not come until 1964 or 1965.

At the rate the Government is going, that could be unduly optimistic. Last year the deficit was cut only $500 million from $2.5 billion in 1961. And Washington officials appear to be empty of useful ideas for getting out of this hole.

Mr. Dillon evidently plans to go on doing what he has been doing—make some effort to reduce military spending abroad, sell more U.S. weapons to allies, require more foreign-aid dollars to be spent in this country. None of this is enough; none of it gets to the root of the matter.

So far the Government has also been hoping that the Europeans would continue to cooperate and not do anything to aggravate the deficit. This hope looks considerably less impressive than it did a few weeks ago, with the Western alliance now in such a disheveled state. If De Gaulle wanted to give a further demonstration of his anti-Americanism, he could put quite a dent in what's left of our gold stock. Even if he has no such plans, this is an extremely poor time to be weakening confidence in the dollar, which is bound to be the consequence of letting the deficit and gold outflow go on almost unchecked.

Meantime, the only new suggestions being heard fall far short of the mark. George Mitchell, President Kennedy's sole appointee to the Federal Reserve Board, rightly expresses concern about the failure of the payments situation to improve enough to show the world our determination to correct it.

Mr. Mitchell's ideas of correctives are two new steps. One is a special tax incentive for U.S. exporters designed to lower the cost of American goods abroad; yet exports are the brightest part of the payments picture. The other is a special tax on movements of U.S. capital to Europe, aimed at trying to discourage European borrowing here; yet the return from U.S. investments exceeds the outflow.

This second proposal, Mr. Mitchell insists, would not be an outright curb on the exchange of U.S. dollars into European currencies. All the same, it seems clearly headed in the direction of exchange controls, something the Government has opposed until now.

Exchange controls would indeed be an admission of defeat. Moreover, such interference with capital movements would probably give everybody such a scare that it would worsen the whole payments condition.

That, though, is the kind of fix governments get into when they refuse to apply real remedies to their policies. A government, for example, will inflate the money supply for political or other purposes; then, when the inflation is getting out of hand it will slap on wage-price controls in a futile attempt to deal with symptoms. In the same simple-minded way, the time may come when exchange controls are presented as the cure of the payments sickness.

What urgently needs serious analysis and fundamental correction is the Government's entire monetary and fiscal policy at home and abroad. No matter how much the Government tries to blame others for the payments deficit, the fact is that if you remove Government from the calculation, there would be a payments surplus on commercial export and investment accounts. At home the Government is wedded to easy money and huge planned deficits, which ought to frighten sensible people.

Only the Government can restore the confidence the Government itself has done so much to weaken. But with wild policies like these, the Government can hardly be expected to get the dollar out of trouble.

An Anniversary for a Great Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 50th anniversary of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith was observed in a memorable way last week. On a television broadcast, President Kennedy and others joined in tribute to this great organization. Those of us who saw the program will remember it as a dramatic, moving occasion which forcefully reminded us of the common quest we have in this Nation for full equality of opportunity and full equality of treatment for all Americans.

To those of us from New Jersey, the evening was made all the more memorable by the fact that a New Jersey native, Dore Schary, was closely associated with the television production. Mr. Schary has always raised his voice in admirable causes; he has fought discrimination and injustice in many ways. His election as national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League on February 3 was a welcome, logical development.

Mr. President, we can be proud of the B'nai B'rith, and we can be grateful for the vigilance its Anti-Defamation League has maintained for the benefit of all citizens. President Kennedy commented briefly on this at the close of the television broadcast. His message was very much to the point. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, together with a Washington Post story describing the election of Mr. Schary on February 4.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 50TH ANNUAL MEETING ANTIDEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Schultz, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Schary, members of the Supreme Court, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to receive this award from an organization which, on its 50th anniversary, should, itself, be receiving an honor for distinguished contribution to

the enrichment of America's democratic legacy. Your tireless pursuit of equality of treatment for all Americans has made a lasting and substantial contribution to our democracy.

The men who first shaped the democratic legacy that you honor tonight were filled with a sense of commitment and of wonder at the importance of the events in which they were participating. It was not only as John Adams exulted, that they were to have the unique opportunity to write a new Constitution and form a new Government and begin a new Nation; it was also the deep conviction, as later expressed by Walt Whitman, that here we have planted the standard of freedom, and here we will test the capacities of men for self-government.

America was to be the great experiment, a testing ground for political liberty, a model for democratic government, and although the first task was to mold a nation on these principles here on this continent, we would also lead the fight against its tyranny on all continents. In short, wrote Jefferson to Adams, "The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble energies of despotism." Although Jefferson also foresaw that to attain liberty in other parts of the globe, years of desolation must pass over.

Almost two centuries have passed since a small, weak nation, a beachhead on a continent, began the great experiment of democracy in the world where government by the consent—it is almost 11 o'clock where government by consent of the governed was extinguished for 2,000 years. As Jefferson prophesied, there have been many years of desolation and destruction. It seems to me that it is our responsibility in this year of change and hope to prove that we are equal to this great inheritance, to make it possible for the four freedoms which Franklin Roosevelt so eloquently described in another time of peril and danger 20 years ago—to make sure that those four freedoms, indeed the great concept of indivisible freedom, are made available to all of our people, to all of our citizens, and to bear our part of the burden as we have for so many years in making that great concept available to all people.

This is a great inheritance. It is a proud privilege to be a citizen of the great republic, to hear its songs sung, to realize that we are the descendants of 40 million people, who left other countries, other familiar scenes, to come here to the United States to build a new life, to make a new opportunity for themselves and their children.

I think it is not a burden, but a privilege to have the chance in 1963 to share that great concept which they felt so deeply among all of our people, to make this really, as it was for them, a new world, a new world for us, and, indeed, for all those who look to us.

That is what this organization has stood for for 50 years. That is what this country has stood for for 200 years, and that is what this country will continue to stand for.

Thank you.

PLAYWRIGHT DORE SCHARY IS ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

(By William Raspberry)

Dore Schary, 58-year-old author of "Sunrise at Campobello," was elected national chairman yesterday of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the closing session of the League's 5-day, 50th annual meeting at the Sheraton-Park.

Schary, producer as well as playwright, has been active in Anti-Defamation League affairs since 1937, when he helped organize a chapter in Los Angeles to combat Fascist activities.

Now living and writing in New York, Newark-born Schary was one of the first Hollywood figures to take a public political stand when he campaigned for Presidential nominee Adlai Stevenson and other Democratic candidates.

While refusing to say he started a trend for taking political positions in the film capital, he acknowledges that he "helped move many Hollywood people away from their splendid comfort and brought them out of political hiding."

"Problems are creeping up all over America—sensitive problems, rightwing groups, extremists," Schary said in an interview. "We must take open and full opposition in any way we can."

He feels that Anti-Defamation League's fight in these areas has been sound and said he plans to broaden these programs.

His participation in political and intergroup problems does not hinder his work, Schary said.

"Anybody who achieves any sort of reputation in any field—business, arts or science—has an obligation to participate in the world around him," he said. "Any creative person finds himself deeply embroiled with the pain of the world we're living in."

Anti-Defamation League's new president admits to an element of enlightened self-interest in this: "What affects James Meredith in Oxford affects me as a Jew. All members of minority groups have to fight for the rights of all the others."

Despite Schary's involvement in the fight against bigotry and injustice, he does not want to see minorities absorbed.

"If we could cure anti-Semitism once and for all by evaporating our individuality," he said, "I'd be against such a cure." He said he would prefer a society in which group differences are accepted without prejudice rather than a society of standardized Americans.

Tax Cuts and What Must Go With Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the January 27, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Times contains an editorial entitled "Tax Cuts and What Must Go With Them."

I would like to bring this editorial to the attention of the Congress because in my view it assesses simply and accurately the situation we are confronted with in connection with the proposal for a tax cut.

The Times editorial summarizes the proper position to take as follows:

Obviously, the proper way to solve the problem is to reduce taxes and cut spending while at the same time inaugurating tax reform.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

TAX CUTS AND WHAT MUST GO WITH THEM

President Kennedy's sweeping proposals to cut Federal taxes and inaugurate reforms in the income tax system, while at the same time urging a deficit-laden budget, require some statesmanlike action by Congress. For one thing, Congress must resist the political temptation to cut taxes without compensating for the loss in revenues.

Congress must recognize that it will have to view the President's proposals as a whole plan and not as separate items. Three major parts of it—tax reduction, tax reform and spending—are interlocking, each dependent on the other.

Mr. Kennedy's suggestions for a reduction in the income tax for both individuals and corporations are difficult to fault. Certainly the news that fewer taxpayers' dollars will go to Washington is welcome.

But the reductions leave the budget with a larger deficit because it is not eased by lowered Federal spending. The administration refuses to take the view that spending must be in line with revenues. It contends a net tax cut of $10.2 billion spread over the next three years—and combined with some rather startling reforms—will eventually balance the budget because taxpayers will pump the money "saved" in taxes back into the economy and thus raise Federal revenues.

But already there have been cries about the President's tax reforms. Some Americans are going to dislike his tinkering with deductions—deductions that some feel are vested rights and others claim are loopholes.

They question whether it is proper to reduce deductions like State and local taxes, interest payments on homes, charitable contributions and casualty losses. Some say it will cause many taxpayers to cut down on their charitable contributions. Others claim the changes in deductions on property taxes and mortgage interest paid will eliminate one of the incentives to home ownership.

Arguments can be made for or against nearly every one of the changes in the tax reforms that the President suggested. Obviously, the proper way to solve the problem is to reduce taxes and cut spending while at the same time inaugurating tax reform. There would be little room for complaint that way.

In Appreciation of the Honorable Barratt O'Hara

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in this tribute to one of the best loved Members of this body, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, on this 50th anniversary of his public service.

Few men in America today have had the rich and varied career of this distinguished and eloquent statesman.

A man of great personal courage and independence, Congressman O'HARA never hesitates to speak out in support of his convictions, whatever may appear to be the tide of public opinion on the issue at the moment.

When he does speak, it is always with force, eloquence and conviction, and with the keen attention of his colleagues.

It has been a great privilege and pleasure to serve with this great Illinois Congressman, and I join my colleagues in congratulating both Congressman O'HARA and his constituency.

Idaho's Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Idaho is this year observing the centennial of its territorial organization. In this connection, an Idaho newspaper has published an editorial which will be of interest to many people.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the following from the Boise Valley Herald, published at Middleton, Idaho, by Boyd B. Cornell and Edna A. Cornell:

CENTENNIAL OF LARGE TERRITORY PLANNED FOR 1963 IN IDAHO

Idaho—the largest area of this earth ever created and named by our Government as part of the United States is celebrating its hundredth birth year in the true western tradition in 1963. It was created a hundred years ago during the dark crisis days of the Civil War when the hand of President Abraham Lincoln signed the necessary act of Congress March 3, 1863. So a great group of rich western lands became Idaho; the Idaho Territory.

It was much bigger than the State of Texas: big enough to be comparable to the Thirteen Original States. It contained what is now Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and parts of North and South Dakota and Nebraska.

POPULATIONS VANISHED

A geographical monstrosity, it was called. But it was a hopeful idea to help assure the best progress for a tide of revolution that was reshaping the lives of everyone in the Far West. Whole populations were shifting suddenly from west coast areas to the goldstrike fields of Idaho. Populations vanished and reappeared in Idaho almost overnight. Idaho appeared ready for independence as a territory with 33,000 or more inhabitants, whereas Oregon became a territory with about 9,000 and Washington with something over 3,000. Many of the thousands who suddenly settled in Idaho rushed in from Oregon, Washington and surrounding States.

FABULOUS GOLD STRIKES

Gold was the magnet: more gold than in half a dozen Alaskas. The great Idaho gold rush was on. Miners poured in from California and the West. Lewiston was founded by a tent-store owner and boomed into a flourishing distributing point. Many businesses and homes were set up hurriedly in tents which when lighted at night gave the city a picturesque Japanese-lantern glow. It was nicknamed Ragtown in the echoing tradition of such romance names as Baboon's Gulch, Hangtown, Louseville, Bisuka (Bazooka), a town named Zaza, and a lady named Molly b'Damn. Idaho had more than its share in the wealth of real western color and visitors still find it there today. But in the old days the prospectors found gold. The news of this gold swept many men from well established positions into the pursuit of wealth.

NO ONE TO GOVERN?

Oregon then was a sovereign State with permament boundaries, but Washington was a Territory and subject to changes at the will of the Federal Government 3,000 miles away. Governing bodies feared the loss of their capitals, authority and their jobs as gold miners rushed to the promising Idaho fields and even capital cities took on a ghosttown look. Gold centers were larger than cities: Idaho City (first called Bannock) became the biggest city in the Northwest. Back in Washington, D.C., Republican Senators were favorable to establishing sympathetic States in the West so as to strengthen their majority against the return of Southern Democratic States at the end of the Civil War.

THE BIGGEST TERRITORY

A leader in maneuvering the bill through the Congress was William Wallace, who became Idaho's first territorial Governor, and the fact that he was a great personal friend of Lincoln's was considerable help. The bill started through the House with the new Territory's name as Montana, but the name on the printed document was changed, in pen and ink, to Idaho and won full approval. Lincoln signed the bill on March 3, 1863. On March 17, Wallace was sworn in as Governor by Lincoln.

CALLS FOR CELEBRATION

On March 6, before they knew they lived in a Territory or had a Governor, the Idaho City Volunteers left their diggings to fight and defeat the Snake Indians who resented mining in southwestern Idaho. More gold and silver discoveries followed. Events poured into the reservoir of past time, as fast as Idaho's flashing rapids and waterfalls. For Idaho's wild frontier sprang to life in a time when the tempo of human action was only a lifespan away from us and things happened many times faster than had ever before occurred on a wild frontier.

Site of the U.S. military post was chosen as Fort Boise, where Idaho's capital spreads its tree-shaded beauty today. This was July 4, the day of Vicksburg and Gettysburg (though the news didn't reach Idaho till weeks later). On July 7, Boise City was founded near the fort. On July 10, Governor Wallace organized the Territory at Lewiston, his temporary capital, which then actually didn't even belong to the United States, much less Idaho.

In the tradition of western individualism and tradition of the President who officially named the area, Idaho's centennial celebration will be, "for the people and by the people." In addition to renewed and expanded activities in Idaho's four-season world of sports and events—boating, hunting, fishing, everything the outdoors can offer, and rodeos that stir memories of sunny days and thundering hoofs and set starry nights ablaze with color. There will be national events in every field from the National Oldtimers Fiddlers Contest, National Appaloosa Horse Show, to the opening of museums, square dance festivals, pioneer festivals, oldtime costume celebrations, and others. The wild West is only a yesterday away in Idaho and some of the best of the West is still here to celebrate this special and happy birth year.

World Scientists Urge Scientific Data Processing Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced H.R. 1946, which provides that the National Science Foundation shall establish a Federal Scientific Data Processing Center which would serve as a clearinghouse for all scientific information and would make such information available not only to American scientists, but also to scientists all over the world.

Under my proposal, this Scientific Data Processing Center would be established in Chicago, and through the use of electronic computers and data retrieval equipment, scientific information assembled from all over the world would be translated into the English language, codified, and then made readily available to scientists in their scientific pursuits.

I am proud to call the attention of the House to the fact that this basic principle for the establishment of a science data pool has the support of leading scientists from 87 nations now attending the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology in Geneva, Switzerland.

I am including in my remarks today an article on this subject reported by Reuters Press Service from Geneva, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on February 5, 1963. I am particularly gratified that this article points out that "a powerful body of opinion emerged in favor of an institute to act as a coordinating body to channel information and tailor technology to the needs of young nations."

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that if Congress will approve this legislation, the United States will capture the imagination of the entire world in providing this centralized facility through which will flow scientific data assembled not only throughout the United States, but throughout the entire world. The readily available scientific data would be a boon to scientists both in our Nation's institutions of higher learning and in industry, where scientists are constantly probing new areas of research.

The Chicago Tribune article follows:

SCIENCE POOL URGED AS U.N. MEETING OPENS—TECHNOLOGISTS OF 87 NATIONS ATTEND

GENEVA, Switzerland, February 4.—The formation of an international institute to act as a pool for world knowledge was urged today at the opening of an 87-nation United Nations conference on science and technology.

The 2-weeks conference, which brings together 2,000 scientists with a vast fund of technical information to aid underdeveloped countries, was launched with good will messages from President Kennedy, Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev, and other world leaders.

A powerful body of opinion emerged in favor of an institute to act as a coordinating body to channel information an tailor technology to the needs of young nations.

KENNEDY AID SPEAKS

Specific proposals came from President Kennedy's scientific adviser, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, and from Pakistan's President Mohammed Ayub Khan in a message read to the delegates.

Wiesner said the institute should work in close association with "efforts in the many existing * * * centers around the world dedicated to education and research for development."

He said his thesis was a simple one, "First we must educate our peoples for modernization, for living productively and happily in the modern age; and second, to do this effectively, we must apply to education itself the tools of research."

HITS SIMILAR THEME

A similar theme was struck by Britain's Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, of the Imperial College of Science and Technology, who said a

major task for education in new countries was to provide as soon as possible a technological intelligentsia.

President Kennedy saluted the U.N. officials who arranged this pioneering event as well as the delegates "who now share the responsiblity to prove once again there is more to be gained in this world by cooperation than by aloofness or hostility."

Khrushchev said he hoped the conference would "mark an important event in the historic process of pooling all efforts of mankind to speed up the economic and social progress of nations which have liberated themselves from imperialist oppression."

OTHER MESSAGES

There also were messages from British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan and Canadian Prime Minister John Diefenbaker.

The only note of political discord in the proceedings came when a Russian, E. K. Fedorov, expressed "regret and disagreement" at the failure "for political reasons" to invite scientists from Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and East Germany.

Federal Charters for Savings Banks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 24, 1963, I delivered the following address before the Banking Law Section of the New York State Bar Association.

Under unanimous consent I insert the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL CHARTERS FOR SAVINGS BANKS?

(An address by the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, U.S. Congressman, Brooklyn, N.Y., before the Banking Law Section of the New York State Bar Association, Thursday, January 24, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow members of the bar, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to you today on the question of Federal charters for mutual savings banks. On January 9, I introduced in the Congress H.R. 258, the Federal mutual savings bank bill. That bill represented the fifth time that I have introduced such legislation. The first time, in 1957, I was alone in my sponsorship. For several years this proposed legislation has received strong bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. I am happy to report that my exclusive rights to this legislation seem to have run out and are, I believe, permanently ended. The idea of Federal mutual savings banks is one which is getting more and more support—both inside and outside Congress.

Many of you are aware of the main provisions of Federal mutual savings banks legislation. For those who are not, let me summarize: A Federal system of mutual savings banks would be authorized to exist concurrently with our present State system. These banks would be chartered and supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. They could be formed either de novo or through the voluntary conversion of savings and loan associations and State savings banks. Insurance of accounts would be under the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, which would be organized through redesignation of the present Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Federal mutual savings banks would enjoy, as they do today in the 18 States where they exist, diversified investment powers. Branch rights would be tied to thrift institution standards.

I need hardly point out that this is a major piece of banking legislation. It is not one to be lightly proposed or lightly enacted. That is why the sponsors of the bill have been deliberate in the extreme, we have been content to introduce and reintroduce this bill over the past few sessions so that its merits could be carefully appraised by all interested and by expert Federal agencies and outside groups.

The comments of these groups are now largely in hand. The great majority are favorable. Based on these responses, it would seem that the time has arrived to move from contemplation and study to action.

I spoke of the growing support for this bill. Many of you are aware of rumors that the President's Interagency Committee on Financial Institutions, composed of representatives from 10 Government agencies, will approve Federal charters for mutual savings banks. This would carry out the earlier recommendation of the Commission on Money and Credit. In addition, the national home builders organization believes the bill could greatly increase the availability of home mortgage funds. It has also become clear that many influential savings and loan association leaders welcome this opportunity to acquire diversified investment powers by converting to Federal mutual savings banks.

I am informed by the mutual savings banks national trade association that over 1,600 requests for information, from 50 States, have been received in response to their rather modest advertisements mentioning this legislation. It seems clear to me that the public's response to this bill indicates a real national interest.

I need hardly tell this group that 1963 is the 100th anniversary of the dual banking system in America. I have nothing but praise and, indeed, I have heard nothing but praise, for this uniquely American institution. There are some complaints about its operation, but none against the principle.

Dual banking is apparently on the side of the angels—it has been hailed by such dissimilar groups as the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, and the American Bankers Association. Dual banking, of course, reflects in microcosm the concept of our Federal Government, the ideal of separate and independent operations on a State and Federal level, of independent problems and responsibilities for the State and the Nation, of the necessity for independent solutions to these problems and responsibilities. In sponsoring this bill to extend dual banking to its logical limits, my colleagues and I are suggesting Federal response to Federal responsibilities in the banking area.

Dual banking has long been the order of the day for the commercial banking industry, for credit unions, for the savings and loan industry. My fellow sponsors and I propose to end the illogic of excluding mutual savings banking from the dual system, and in doing so to make available a time-tested financial institution to the entire Nation to serve in marshaling and protecting personal savings and providing additional capital for national growth.

This year of the anniversary of dual banking is clearly a year of unusual activity in the entire financial industry—a year of reawakening and of clamor for change. The Comptroller of the Currency has indicated his belief that our entire branch banking structure should be changed. In this belief he is confronted by our State supervisors. Legislation is now being prepared for introduction in the Congress calling for a Federal banking commission to unify the Comptroller's Office, the FDIC, and the banking supervisory powers of the Federal Reserve under one agency. The banking community can also expect consideration of the so-called truth-in-lending bill and legislation providing for the exclusion of the Comptroller as a member of the Board of FDIC. In this atmosphere of reformation and change, the Federal mutual savings bank bill will, I would hope, be sympathetically received.

I have called the Federal mutual savings bank bill "major" legislation and so it is. And no "major" legislation will ever, or should ever, succeed without being tested in the cauldron of controversy. Important questions must be answered by my fellow Members of Congress. "Is Federal mutual savings banking, in fact, the logical extension of the dual banking system?" "Will Federal mutual savings banks aid national growth?" "Will Federal mutual savings banks help provide additional and less expensive home financing for the people of America?" "Why not include stock banks and associations?"

I have already answered some of these questions in the affirmative. At the moment I am certain there will be hearings on the Federal mutual savings bank bill. I need hardly tell you that the House Banking and Currency Committee solicits your views.

I would like to suggest some of the benefits I perceive in Federal mutual savings banking.

First, I think the public will benefit through more personal savings in local mutual institutions; secondly, more mortgage funds will be made available to them through local mutual institutions; and third, lower and more uniform borrowing costs can be expected to develop throughout the Nation. These benefits will very definitely aid in the broad objective of economic growth.

It may well be that commercial bankers and State supervisory authorities perceive little benefit for themselves in this legislation. I wonder if this is true? For commercial banks, I submit, the conversion of savings and loan associations to banks will result in more uniform bank standards between commercial banks and their competitors.

State supervisory authorities will see a strengthening of the dual banking system, but many argue that it also dilutes their powers by giving State institutions another place to go when dissatisfied with State supervisors. I discount this as a valid objection because the identical situation has prevailed in each of the other three instances to which I have alluded, all without any bad effects or results. If the principle of a dual banking system is good in one instance, it should prevail in all. If bad in one, it should be eliminated. I have heard no one urge elimination. The cries for improvement continue—in fact—become louder.

Federal mutual savings banks with modern operating powers may very well stimulate State legislatures into modernizing State banking, thus aiding the supervisors in their efforts to provide their banking systems maximum opportunity for safety and performance.

We have all seen the benefits of mutual savings banking in New York. We are aware of its unparalleled record in protecting the savings of our people. We know the homes it has financed. We know the high standards of fiduciary conduct that has characterized its trustees. Because of this knowledge, I am of the opinion that people in other areas of the country should have an opportunity to decide for themselves whether a mutual savings bank in their community might not be to their advantage. Only through providing the opportunity, can we be assured that the people's freedom of choice in their financial institutions has been preserved.

It has come to my attention that an opponent of this legislation has commented that there is no interest in organizing these institutions, and besides, the presence of these institutions will introduce a destructively

competitive element in banking. I ask you to ponder those pleadings for a moment. Even alternative defenses should have some consistency. I submit that if there is no interest in these banks, then, quite simply, none will be organized. If there is no interest and, therefore, none are organized, there will be no competitive threat.

I believe that many Federal mutual savings banks will be organized as a result of this legislation. I believe that in time we will see an entirely new nationwide thrift system, supplementing the commercial banks and savings and loan associations.

This legislation does not contemplate competitive anarchy, nor even an entire new system of banks that will suddenly spring full-blown from the collective congressional brow.

Under H.R. 258, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is merely authorized to charter these banks if the organizers can demonstrate: First, community need; second, probability of financial success; and third, no destructive competitive effect on existing financial institutions. Therefore, each time a charter is sought for one of these banks, opponents will have an opportunity to argue the merits of the proposed Federal mutual savings bank in a specific factual situation in a given community.

The need in many areas of this country for additional thrift facilities is dramatized by the recently organized Alaska Mutual Savings Bank. After 1 year in operation in Anchorage, it has $4,500,000 in assets and has made available millions in loans to finance homes.

There are other States in this country, nonmutual savings bank States, where the number of local financial institutions has proven so inadequate in meeting capital demands that mutual savings banks, through their out-of-State lending programs, have loaned to residents of those States $9.1 billion in home loans. New capital can be generated in many, if not all of these States through their own local thrift institutions. I urge that local mutual savings banks should be given a chance, along with local commercial banks and savings and loan associations, to prove they can do the job.

As I have stated, in the months ahead the Congress is going to be turning its attention to our Nation's banking problems with a scrutiny and purpose not seen since the early 1930's. Representatives of the entire financial spectrum, the Comptroller, the State supervisors, FDIC, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, will come forward with new legislative recommendations. It would be a mistake for anyone to misinterpret the temper of the Congress. It may well respond to many of these widespread demands for change.

In this legislative climate my fellow sponsors and I are determined that the Federal Mutual Savings Bank bill will be given its day in court.

I will not take your time to relate the details of the bill at this time. A summary of the bill and a section-by-section analysis appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My office will make copies available to you upon your request therefor.

Report on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what is the truth about Cuba? The administration refuses to tell Congress or the American people, but insists on trying to make us believe there is no Russian Communist buildup and that we did, indeed, win a magnificent victory last fall. From all available sources comes the information that the Communist military buildup continues, that our so-called victory was indeed a hollow one as it seems both Khrushchev and Castro gained their objectives—we are withdrawing our bases in Turkey, we are pledged against invasion of Cuba—and at the same time Soviet missiles and Soviet troops continue to fortify that island. To help establish the record I include, as a part of these remarks, the following article from U.S. News & World Report of February 11, 1963:

WHY SOVIETS ARE RUSHING A MILITARY BUILDUP IN CUBA

(It's more than just Cuba that Khrushchev is after. The Russian dictator—still pouring in Soviet troops and weapons—is building up Fidel Castro's island as a military base for Communist expansion throughout all of Latin America.)

Cuba, once again, is growing into a military menace. Soviet arms shipments are continuing to arrive in the Red-ruled island. So are Soviet troops.

Evidence of that Soviet buildup in Cuba has been accumulating for weeks. Now it is clear: Nikita Khrushchev is turning Cuba into a Soviet military base of impressive proportions.

At least 18,700—possibly 35,000 or more—Soviet troops are in Cuba. They are armed with Russian-made missiles, planes, tanks, submarines, and guns.

What is Khrushchev up to? Why is the Communist boss building such a huge military base in Fidel Castro's Cuba?

As the evidence grows, these Khrushchev aims are becoming clear:

1. Russian troops in Cuba are, first of all, an "occupation force." They serve to keep the Cubans—and Castro—in line. They protect Cuba's Communist regime against revolt from within.

2. Russian military power also serves to protect Cuba against invasion from without. If the United States should invade Cuba now, it would be fighting against Soviet troops. President Kennedy, having missed two opportunities to get communism out of Cuba, now finds himself facing the possibility of a major war if he should try again.

3. Khrushchev is building in Cuba a base for Communist expansion throughout the Western Hemisphere. From Cuba, with hordes of weapons and hordes of trained fighters, he can carry revolution and subversion into one Latin American country after another.

Behind this size-up of Soviet activities and aims in Cuba is a mounting mass of new information. From inside Cuba came such reports as these:

On January 25, a large Soviet ship loaded with military equipment docked in Havana's harbor.

That same day, 1,500 Russians in military uniforms arrived by ship at another Cuban port.

Officially, the Kennedy administration is cautious in assessing the significance of such reports. On January 31, the Defense Department confirmed that two large Soviet ships arrived in Cuba but said: "There is no evidence that either carried offensive weapons."

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara said: "Since removal of the missiles, our coverage has not revealed the existence of strategic weapons systems in Cuba."

Cuban exile leaders, however, challenge the claim that all of Khrushchev's offensive missiles have been removed.

On the basis of underground intelligence reports from inside Cuba, these exile leaders say that 44 medium- and intermediate-range missiles still remain in Cuba, hidden in caves.

The picture of Cuba that these underground reports paint is one of an island that already has become a huge and well-stocked military base.

Set out in the chart on this page is the underground's count of Soviet weapons and troops in Cuba. This count, the underground leaders maintain, is conservative.

Russians are not the only foreign troops in Cuba.

There is in Cuba an organization called the International Brigade. Its members are mostly Latin Americans brought into Cuba for training in sabotage and guerrilla warfare. Their trainers are Russians, Czechs, Red Chinese, and Spanish Republicans who fought in Spain's civil war.

Men of the International Brigade are known as special mission forces. Their special mission is to go back to their home countries in Latin America and spread revolution, start wars of national liberation.

The Communist idea is to avoid using Cubans to invade other nations in the Western Hemisphere because that would almost certainly bring retaliation by the United States and Organization of American States.

An underground report on the Communist organization for subversion in Latin America has been given to U.S. News & World Report by Manuel A. de Varona, a member of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. That report says:

"There is a Revolutionary Command for Latin America in charge of directing military action throughout the continent. This command is international in character and was created in Havana, in 1959, under the personal supervision of Soviet Col. Jaroslav Volenkesky, Chinese Lin Chiao Yen and the Spanish Gen. Alberto Bayo. Che Guevara [a top Castro aide] and Raul Castro [Fidel's brother] belong to this command.

"Its mission is to prepare armed action in the Caribbean area, with ramifications in all parts of the continent. This action is not planned for invasion from abroad, but for what the Communists call 'national-liberation wars,' which consist of invading from within with a strong decisive support from abroad."

The International Brigade, according to this report, "operates under the direction of the Revolutionary Command."

In addition to its training bases in Cuba, the Brigade is said to have operation bases—with guerilla groups and stores of arms—in Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica and Venezuela.

STIRRERS OF TROUBLE

Numerous acts of troublemaking and sabotage in 10 Latin-American countries are attributed to this international outfit. So is a plot to blow up installations in New York City which was uncovered last November.

With all these troops and weapons in Cuba, the Soviet Union now is engaged in a vast building program there. Military barracks are going up. Radio transmitters and military telephone lines are being installed.

Biggest Russian troop concentrations is reported near the town of Remedios, in Las Villas Province. There work is being rushed at top speed. Remedios recently ran short of water because the military construction was using up its supply.

Directing the show for the Russians according to underground intelligence, are five Soviet generals.

Head man is identified as Gen. C. O. Slazenko. He has set up headquarters on the top 3 floors of a 20-story building in Havana.

Now, only 3 months after most Americans thought Khrushchev had agreed to pull out of Cuba, this is plain:

The Russians are digging in to stay.

SOVIET MILITARY STRENGTH IN CUBA—AN UNDERGROUND INTELLIGENCE REPORT

The following figures on Soviet armed strength in Cuba come from intelligence reports of anti-Castro underground organizations working inside Cuba:

Troops: At least 18,700 Russians, perhaps as many as 35,000, including 5 Soviet generals.

Missiles: Soviet removed 42, but 44 medium- and intermediate-range missiles are reported still in Cuba, hidden in caves, manned by Russians. In addition, 140 or more ground-to-air or ground-to-sea missiles are in Cuba. All missiles are capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

Planes: 184 Mig fighters have been counted, capable of carrying nuclear bombs into the United States. Also in Cuba are 37 Soviet transport planes, 83 Soviet helicopters. No jet bombers are known to remain in Cuba.

Submarines: 12 to 15 Soviet submarines are manned by Russians, operate from at least 4 new Russian-built bases.

Tanks: 260 Soviet-made T-34's and T-54's.

Patrol boats: 32, including 9 with launchers for nuclear rockets.

Guns: 1,900 artillery pieces, 2,200 antiaircraft guns, 2,720 mortars, 425,000 rifles and small arms.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Richard M. Titmuss, professor of social administration at the University of London and the head of the Department of Social Science and Administration at the London School of Economics, on what British doctors really think about socialized medicine, appearing in this month's issue of Harper's magazine.

The article does a great deal to dispel some of the quaint fiction disseminated by the American Medical Association about the British Health Service, which they so blandly attack so regularly and hold up as such a fearful bugaboo to the people of our country:

WHAT BRITISH DOCTORS REALLY THINK ABOUT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Richard M. Titmuss)

At the end of a 2 months' visit to the United States, from the west to the east, I am left with one clear impression. The extent and character of misconceptions about the British Health Service are really quite startling, particularly when one remembers our common language and democratic values, and our common interest in combining the freedom of doctor and patient in the provision of medical care.

At the same time I encountered a deep sense of frustration about the power of organized medicine in the United States and widespread feelings of helplessness and cynicism in the face of rising medical costs. It is not for me to explain the cause of this disquietude. But were I an American citizen, I would fear for the good name of medicine. In California, for instance, I learned that a young doctor has to pay around $820 a year for malpractice insurance. In Britain the comparable figure is $6.

Since 1948 when the British Health Service Act was adopted, an unbelievable quantity of generalized ink has been spilled on the subject; and it has run into the Atlantic from both sides. During my stay in the United States I heard most of the familiar arguments—that the quality of medical care has deteriorated; that doctors have been turned into minor bureaucrats and are so unhappy about their condition that they are fleeing the country in large numbers; that the general practitioner has lost status; that the Health Service unleashed a torrent of demand and is bankrupting the country.

Leaving aside the more piquant and colorful statements, my purpose here is simply to set the record straight. Some of the major lessons of the Health Service can be illustrated by a rather simple story.

A few years ago I was involved in a medical and sociological study of the structure and functions of general (family) practice in Britain. For 6 months I spent a good part of each day sitting in a doctor's office recording, minute by minute, what took place in each consultation. There was one patient I remember—let us call her Mrs. Smith—who appeared regularly every Monday morning for about 2 months. She was an elderly widow, living alone on her old-age pension, who suffered from chronic heart disease. After full diagnostic investigation, the treatment consisted of a drug containing digitalis and a certain amount of social-work aid.

The core of the matter, however, was to find the right dosage; to adapt the therapy to the biology of the unique individual; to find the level of stabilization; to avoid harmful side effects; to keep Mrs. Smith out of the hospital. This is a usual problem today in the use of many new and potent drugs. To solve it requires regular and frequent contact between doctor and patient.

Mrs. Smith's doctor was asked to comment on the effects of the Health Service on his practice. "Before the act," he said, "I would have had to carry on a private soliloquy with myself as to whether I could ask Mrs. Smith to see me regularly for a longish period. She might have thought I was more interested in collecting more fees than in the condition of her heart. I did not want her to think this of me—after all, I am a doctor. But unless I could see her often I could not explain all the facts about the action of the drug. We could communicate less—a restriction of the patient's freedom. Now, on the Health Service, our relationship is more open. I can say what I professionally think."

This doctor was consciously separating the professional and financial elements in his life. Essentially, he was talking about self-respect: his self-respect (the basis of professional behavior); the patient's self-respect (the basis of personal freedom); mutual respect (the basis for effective medical care). Self-realization in modern society depends on the building of a hundred and one such tiny acts of self-respect. We cannot organize them; we can only so arrange our affairs as to make more of them possible.

The single most important effect of the Health Service Act in 1948 was that it abolished the financial barrier between patient and doctor. This was the first principle set down in the wartime coalition government's white paper of 1944; to divorce the care of health from questions of personal means or other factors irrelevant to it."

Another basic principle of the Health Service was to provide medical care that would be comprehensive (i.e., meet all of the individual's health needs) and of high quality. This has not been an easy goal to achieve. A major obstacle has been the fact that many of our hospital buildings in Britain are ancient. About 45 percent of them were erected before 1891 and, with Victorian solidity, they were built to last. Hospital construction stopped in 1939 and during the first 10 years of the service little money was spent on new hospitals. This was due partly to the priorities in capital investment given after the war to houses and schools, and partly to the sustained attacks on the Health Service for being too costly. By the middle 1950's, however, it was found that Britain was spending a lower proportion of its national income on medical care than in 1948. It is now argued that Britain is not spending enough, and the rate of hospital building has been stepped up.

Moreover, 3 months ago the Government published a 10-year national plan for hospital development. This envisages the replacement of over 40 percent of all existing hospitals; the construction of many new general hospitals with a total of about 150,000 beds; the closing of many small and specialist hospitals; the eventual abolition of large mental hospitals; and a great expansion in home and community care for the mentally ill and disabled.

Britain's hospitals have been nationalized which means the distinction between voluntary and public institutions has been virtually wiped out. But this change has not introduced centralized ministerial rule into our hospital system. In practice it meant no more than a reshuffling of the same people who had always run the hospitals—the unpaid volunteers who had acquired some expert knowledge, plus a much higher proportion from the medical profession.

At present, except for a handful of private hospitals and clinics, Britain's 3,000 or so hospitals are run by some 400 hospital management committees on which doctors have at least a quarter of the seats (all professional matters are entirely in the hands of doctors). The committees also include local government officials and people who had been governors of voluntary hospitals before 1948.

Since the early 1950's there have been as many unpaid volunteers in health activities as ever, if not more—though, it should be remembered, they now spend very little of their time in the fund-raising which occupies so much of the energies of health volunteers in the United States.

Illustrative of the role of the volunteer in Britain is the National Blood Transfusion Service—an increasingly vital element in modern hospital care, surgery, and highway-casualty treatment. The number of blood donations, freely and volutary given by members of the public, has risen steadily from 384,000 in 1948 to 1,024,000 in 1960. The number of effective blood donors rose from 374,000 in 1948 to 854,000 individuals in 1960. This service is also largely run by voluntary organizations and unpaid helpers. Blood transfusions are used in the hospitals without distinguishing between public and private patients. (About 2 percent of the beds in British hospitals are set aside for private patients who pay in full for accommodations and service. In general, the supply of such beds has met the demand for them.)

Most of the medical staffs of all hospitals are paid on a part-time or sessional basis. Of all qualified and practicing British doctors, around 40 percent are full-time salaried. Suprisingly to some people, that is only about 5 percent or so higher than the proportion of full-time salaried doctors in the United States.

So far as the general practitioner or family doctor is concerned, we in Britain have held onto the conception of personal physicians as the first line in medical care. This is con-

trary to the trend in the States where, I am told, the family doctor is a disappearing category. About one-half of all British medical students now enter general practice. All members of a family are free to choose and change their doctors and some 95 percent of the population now have the family doctor of their choice under the Health Service. The remaining 5 percent or so of the population get medical care privately either by paying doctors' bills directly or, more generally, through membership in nonprofit prepayment schemes. According to the code laid down by the British Medical Association, patients must not go directly to specialists or consultants without first being seen and referred by general practitioners.

Each general practitioner is restricted to a ceiling of 3,500 Health Service patients—a figure too high in the opinion of many people. In addition, they may have as many private patients as they like. Between 1948 and 1960, the average number of Health Service patients on doctors' lists fell considerably and is now 2,300.[1]

Doctors are paid on a capitation basis, receiving an annual payment for each patient accepted. There is a special "loading" (i.e., an additional payment per capita) to favor doctors with medium-sized lists and to taper off rewards for larger practices. There are also built-in incentives to partnerships and group practices, payments for the training of assistants, special fees for maternity services, for clinic sessions at local maternity and child-welfare centers, for part-time school and factory work, for part-time posts in hospitals, and for new entrants in underdoctored areas.

A particularly important innovation is a payment to doctors who attend postgraduate and refresher courses. One of my more amusing medical friends said recently (in talking about scientific advances in medicine): "If you now go away for the weekend you are out of date on Monday." Last year 13 percent of all general practitioners in Britain attended a postgraduate course and received a public grant to help pay for a substitute. In 1948 the figure was only 5 percent.

At the outset, doctors, being highly organized, did not take kindly to change—whether caused by political, administrative, or scientific factors—and in this respect they are no different from workers in other professions and trade unions exposed to changes induced by technology, cybernetics, and science. But over the years the discontents of the medical profession has diminished.[2] And certainly the health service has brought about a better geographical distribution of doctors. This trend toward territorial justice (as I call it) has been accompanied by a movement for more doctors to work in partnerships and group practice. By 1960 the percentage had risen to just over 70. At the same time general practice has been made more attractive by a policy of throwing open (known as open access) the X-ray, pathological, and other diagnostic facilities of the hospital. This means that general practitioners have the right to send their patients direct to these departments and to get the reports back quickly.

This policy has helped to avoid the wasteful duplication of expensive diagnostic equipment and to make possible a more rational use of pathologists and other scarce specialists. The complex diagnostic procedures of modern medicine can no longer be successfully interpreted by the average doctor or small local hospital. It is a job for the expert. The health service has been able to deploy more widely the benefits of medicine's technological skills. The removal of financial barriers has aided this process; so too has the removal of political and administrative boundaries. For example, it is possible under the service for a child in the north of Scotland suffering from a rare form of spinal disease to be sent to a London specialist hospital without any bookkeeping or financial problems.

What of the demand for medical care? Of course, we still have unmet needs: waiting lists at hospitals (mainly for tonsillectomies and other "cold" surgical cases), inadequate hospital buildings, too many old people in hospitals for chronic illness, not enough nurses, psychiatrists, and other health workers, and so on. What, indeed, is the limit in more prosperous societies to demands for medical care? This is an almost metaphysical question applicable to all Western societies. How then can one judge whether there has been "abuse" of a free-on-demand health service?

So far as the general practitioner is concerned, we can at least say that expressed demands for his services are no higher than they were before 1948. Measured statistically in terms of all consultations (office and home), demand is somewhat lower than in the 1930's—around four consultations a year per patient. Moreover, general practitioners now have fewer night cases, less weekend work, smaller quantities of certificates, forms, and accounts to deal with, and no unpaid bills. Over one-third of all consultations take place in the patient's home—thus helping the family doctor to take account of social factors in diagnosis and treatment. The comparable home visit figure in the States is around 10 percent.

There is thus no evidence of inordinate demands on the family doctor since 1948. The removal of the financial disciplines of the private market has not had the consequences that were feared.

So far as the hospital is concerned, there has been a striking fall in the average length of stay of patients although treatment is free for 98 percent of the population. In Britain as in the United States, some 40 percent of all hospital beds have been occupied by mental patients. However, this picture is changing rapidly thanks to a new and revolutionary Mental Health Act passed in 1959, which makes practically all admissions free and voluntary; and thanks also to the growing use of the mental hospital as a therapeutic short-stay instrument, the development of short-stay mental units in general hospitals, scientific advances in the treatment of schizophrenia, a new research interest in the chemical functioning of the nervous system in relation to mental illness, and the drawing together, clinically and administratively, of physical and psychological medicine.

All these trends mean that we can now envisage the disappearance of the vast, outworn, archaic, recumbent mental institutions of the past. Only 20 years ago, by a patient's 11th year of residence in a mental hospital the odds were 100 to 1 against his discharge from the hospital. Today, in Britain, the chances are almost 100 to 1 against a patient's remaining in a mental hospital after 2 years.

This, I think, is one of the most important lessons we have learned since 1948. Without the Health Service, it would not have been possible to move on a national scale toward the integration of physical and psychological medicine. One could not grow without the other. To separate the two professionally, administratively, and financially—to regard mental illness, organizationally, as a "bad risk"—is to promote the growth of the "institutionalized" personality, a dead end for patients, a dead end for doctors.

The corollary of this change in medical care—a shift from the institution to the home—calls for more community care services. Apart from the problems of finance, this, in my view, is the biggest challenge in Britain in the field of medical care.

One criticism of the Service that is still heard is that the cost was seriously underestimated. Of course it was. Twenty years ago, when the original estimates were made by the Government, no one could predict the scientific advances that have changed the fate of medicine in two decades.

In 1949–50, the first full year of the Service, the gross cost to public funds was 3.8 percent of the gross national product. This figure fell slowly to 3.2 in 1955 and has since risen to 3.6 in 1960. (In the United States in 1958–59 total public and private expenditures for medical and health care were estimated at 5.4 percent of the gross national product.) Clearly, Britain has not been overspending on medical care. Public demand for a free service and the rising costs of new drugs have certainly not bankrupted the nation. We have learned, however, that we shall have to spend more on building new hospitals, in training more social workers, and in developing community care services.

We have also learned in Britain to respect the political and trade-union power of the medical profession. The last Royal Commission on Doctors' Earnings, reporting in 1960, showed that, compared with other high-income groups, doctors had done well out of the Health Service. Between the ages of 30 and 65, for example (and disregarding the benefits of a generous pension scheme and heavily subsidized medical training), medical specialists and consultants earned substantially more than acountants, actuaries, lawyers, architects, university teachers, and all university graduates in industry. There is no lack of young people in Britain who want to be doctors. The real problem for the deans of the medical schools has been how to select and how to restrict (as they have done) the number of candidates accepted for training.

It has been alleged recently that over 600 doctors are leaving Britain every year. It is further said they are refugees from socialized medicine. But such statements fail to point out that these estimates include graduates from British medical schools born and brought up overseas (including the United States of America, Canada, Ireland, and many other countries), British doctors working temporarily with the World Health Organization in hospitals and posts in Africa and other parts of the underdeveloped world, and British doctors doing graduate and research work overseas. Wrongly included in these estimates (incautiously bandied about by the American Medical Association) are also substantial numbers of British-trained women doctors marrying oversea citizens and emigrating, and many categories of British doctors of

---

[1] No precise comparison with an American doctor's private practice is possible. Assuming, however, that each patient on the British doctor's panel of 2,300 is seen 4 times a year, this would amount to 9,200 visits annually. It is estimated that a typical general practitioner in the United States sees 25 to 30 patients a day, amounting to 6,000 to 7,000 a year. (See "Doctors, Patients, and Health Insurance," by Herman M. and Anne R. Somers. Washington, the Brookings Institution, 1961, pp. 49–50.)—The Editors.

[2] Experts from nine British medical associations completed a 4-year study of the health service in October 1962. This committee found the service essentially sound although a number of operating improvements were recommended. Chiefly, the committee urged a greater voice for physicians in administrative matters and a reduction in the maximum number of health service patients on each general practitioner's list. Concurrently, the committee released the results of a Gallup poll which showed that 89 percent of the people questioned were satisfied with the health service.

both sexes who after a spell abroad return to practice medicine in Britain.

What is more to the point is that despite this international exchange, the ratio of all types of practicing doctors in Britain per person in the population has risen by 21 percent since 1949. Though we still need more doctors, we have done better than the United States, where the ratio has fallen during the same period.

After 19 months of deliberation, a committee appointed by the British Medical Association to consider recruitment concluded in its report published in May 1962 that it is not prepared to commit itself on the need for more doctors. The report adds that there are more than enough potential recruits of the right caliber to fill the places available at the medical schools.

These conclusions are very different from those of the U.S. Surgeon General's committee in the 1950 Bane report. Here it was said that the United States may expect to be 20,000 short, in the next 15 years, of the number of physicians required to maintain the present position—let alone improve it. In other words, the ratio of doctors to patients may worsen by 50 percent. It would thus follow that the United States will be less able to make a contribution to less fortunate countries. If this should happen, the underdeveloped world will be even more desperately undersupplied with doctors, and other countries will be asked to make greater sacrifices to uphold the high traditions of Western medicine to serve the poor.

What We Need Is a Few Fast Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of sharp differences of opinion on the course and role of big government, it is good for us to get the benefit of opinion of good thinking citizens at the grass roots. By way of illustration of popular thinking, I submit a letter to the editor written by one of my constituents which appeared in a recent issue of a Florida newspaper. Incidentally he has been a past chairman of the Fort Pierce Chamber of Commerce Congressional Action Committee:

WHAT WE NEED IS A FEW FAST REFORMS

EDITOR THE HERALD: We live in the wackiest country I know.

The Government permits strikes in transportation and other essential services which deprive workers of their wages, companies of their profits and the general public of needed services at a total cost of hundreds of millions of dollars each year. This is a complete waste which, if avoided by compulsory arbitration, would add greatly to our National welfare.

The Government subsidizes farmers by artificially fixed prices, buys their product, stores it at additional expense and finally gives it away to some so-called backward people. This also is almost a total waste. Let the law of supply and demand prevail on the farm as it does in other businesses. With reduced stockpiles of such food we can store enough to meet any home emergency plus a surplus for any real emergency abroad.

The Government advocates huge deficits year after year in order to give away billions to other countries. That is, it borrows money instead of using income, in order to give it away. Such a practice by an individul or a private corporation would bring quick bankruptcy. Our attempt to buy friendship has been a dismal failure. Let's reduce it to a needed trickle.

It pretends to desire a stimulation of private business, but continues to compete with business by operating hundreds of business enterprises in no way related to the proper function of government.

I could add other items, but isn't that enough?

HUNLEY ABBOTT.

Milborn N. Chesser Picked as Top Alabama Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the fact that Milborn N. Chesser, of Fyffe, Ala., has been chosen Alabama's outstanding young farmer of 1963. He was chosen by the Alabama State Junior Chamber of Commerce.

In the 6 years he has been farming, he has truly demonstrated what personal drive and individual initiative can accomplish in our free enterprise system.

The many improvements that he has accomplished on his small De Kalb County farm has made a better home for his family and his community a better place to live. He is active in many community and civic activities and I believe that all the Members will be interested in the enclosed article which appeared in the February 4, 1963 issue of the Birmingham News.

The article follows:

DE KALB MAN NAMED TOP YOUNG FARMER

MONTGOMERY.—A 29-year-old De Kalb County farmer was named Alabama's outstanding young farmer of the year here Saturday night at the Jaycee's annual awards banquet.

Milborn N. Chesser, a poultry, cattle, and swine farmer from Fyffe, was named top farmer from 21 candidates.

First runner-up for the title was Louis E. Hatchett, 32, of Grand Bay, Route 1.

The second runner-up was George William Smelley, 35, of Talladega, Route 1.

AUBURN GRADUATE

Chesser, who is married and has two children, is a graduate of Auburn University where he received degrees in agricultural education and poultry husbandry and nutrition.

The young farmer in his 6 years of active farming has increased his cash assets and savings by 300 percent; his land by 425 percent; his poultry by 3,000 percent, and his buildings and equipment by 6,800 percent.

He was selected top farmer by a three-man panel of judges composed of J. D. Hays, president of Alabama Farm Bureau; A. W. Todd, commissioner of State department of agriculture, and Dr. Hoyt M. Warren, assistant to director of programs of the Auburn University Cooperative Extension Service.

Chesser, when interviewed, said his favorite newspaper is the Birmingham News, his favorite radio station is WVOK, and his favorite television station is channel 5 of Atlanta.

FARMER SOLDIER

A former master sergeant in the Army, Chesser began his farming career while working for his master's degree at Auburn in 1957. He bought a 21-acre poultry farm which had been allowed to run down by the former owner.

Contest judges said Chesser paid $2,000 down on the farm which had only four dilapidated broiler houses and no dwelling house. The farm at that time had a capacity of 15,000 birds.

In the 5 years following, Chesser built the farm up, adding his home, four new broiler houses, and remodeling one rundown broiler house.

Last year he produced 400,000 broilers with an average weight of 3.6 pounds at 9 weeks old, 30 brood sows, 700 production hogs, and 25 dairy cows.

Chesser is a director of the Farmer's Telephone Cooperative, member, superintendent, and teacher at the Robertson's Chapel Methodist Church, a member and president of the Fyffe Ruritan Club, a member of Gamma Sigma Delta Agricultural Society, and the Alabama Cattlemen's Association.

TRIP TO TULSA

He also is a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Alabama Poultry Association, the American Legion, VFW, Fyffe High School board trustees, and board of directors of the De Kalb County Poultry Association.

As Alabama's outstanding young farmer, Chesser will receive an all-expense paid trip to Tulsa, Okla., April 7–9, to compete for the title of one of America's four outstanding farmers.

Hatchett, the first runner-up, is the brother of Leslie J. Hatchett, 36-year-old Grand Bay farmer who was Alabama's outstanding young farmer in 1959.

Married and the father of two children, Hatchett runs a 420-acre farm producing cotton, corn, soybeans, pecans, timber, and cattle.

He began his farming career as a member of the 4-H Club and Future Farmers of America.

His first farm was 30 acres he inherited from his father.

A Famous West Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the courage, industry, and ability of West Virginians is well-known, but most of the stories about the heroes of my State refer to men—Lewis Wetzel, the famous Indian fighter, and Gen. "Stonewall" Jackson, to mention just two indomitable Mountaineers. Few stories, however, tell of the West Virginia women who have served our State and our Nation with distinction. For this reason I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story about Col. Ruby C. Bradley, who at present is serving as director of nursing activities at Brooke Army

Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex. This story appeared in the State magazine section of the Charleston (W. Va.), Sunday Gazette-Mail. The article ably relates why Colonel Bradley is one of our country's most decorated members of the nursing service, and why she has received many other honors from a grateful citizenry.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMOUS WEST VIRGINIANS

Col. Ruby G. Bradley, the Army's most decorated nurse, was born December 19, 1907, on a farm near Spencer, W. Va., the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Fred O. Bradley.

She received her elementary education in Roane County schools and was graduated from Spencer High School in 1925. She attended Glenville State College and taught for 3 years in Roane County schools before deciding to become a nurse.

She received her nurse's training and was graduated from Philadelphia General Hospital in 1933. On October 16, 1934, she entered the Army Nurse Corps and was assigned as a surgical nurse at Walter Reed General Hospital.

Five years later, with world tensions mounting, she was assigned to Fort Mills, Corregidor, but was shifted to Camp John Hay, Baguio, Philippine Islands, as an administrative nurse. On December 29, 1941, she was captured by the Japanese and spent the next 37 months as a prisoner of war. She was liberated from Santa Tomas, Manila, on February 3, 1945. As a prisoner of war she had assisted in 230 major operations, delivered 13 American babies and shrunk to a mere 86 pounds.

Two weeks after her liberation, she was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for meritorious achievement while in the hands of the enemy.

Returned to the United States in July 1945, Colonel Bradley was assigned to the Station Hospital at Fort Myer, Va., as assistant chief nurse. In August she was transferred to McGuire General Hospital, Virginia, also as assistant chief nurse and the following March was made chief nurse at Fort Eustis, Va.

In April 1946, she was awarded a second Bronze Star for meritorious achievement in connection with military operations against the enemy in the Southwest Pacific area from December 8 to 23, 1941.

In September 1946, she enrolled in the University of California under the Army's training program, as a candidate for a degree in nursing education. In August 1947, she was assigned as an administrative nurse at Letterman General Hospital in San Francisco and a year later she was back at the University of California to complete requirements for her BS in nursing education, in January 1949.

In the interim, she had been awarded the Army Commendation Ribbon, the Distinguished Unit Badge with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, the World War II Victory Medal, the American and Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medals, the American Defense Service Medal, Philippine Defense Medal, Philippine Liberation Ribbon, the Allied Occupation Medal (Japan), and the Philippine Presidential Unit Citation.

One month after the Korean war broke out, Colonel Bradley volunteered for oversea assignment and was assigned to the 171st Evacuation Hospital. She went as a combat nurse, despite her experience as a prisoner of war earlier.

Always near the frontline troops, she worked to set up casualty hospitals from the North Korean capital of Pyongyang to the South Korean capital of Seoul. Finally, in December 1950, she was ordered to Japan with the 171st Evacuation Hospital, but in a few months she was back again, and with tenacious stamina served as the 8th Army's chief nurse until she left Korea in June 1953.

In June 1951, she had been awarded the Legion of Merit for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service from October 31 to November 30, 1960.

In April 1952, she was awarded the U.N. Service Medal.

On June 18, 1953, as she prepared to leave Korea, Colonel Bradley was given a full-dress, honor guard ceremony—the first woman ever to receive a national or international honor guard salute—and Lt. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, 8th Army commander, awarded her the first Oak Leaf Cluster to the Legion of Merit. She was entitled to wear 7 Korean war battle stars.

Three days later, on June 21, 1953, she left Korea to return to the United States, where she was assigned as chief of the nursing division, medical section, at 3d Army.

The Women's National Press Club, Washington, D.C., named her "Woman of the Year" in 1953. In 1954, she was named "Atlanta's Woman of the Year in Defense Effort." A few months later, in May 1954, the West Virginia Society of Washington, D.C., picked her as "Daughter of the Year."

The International Red Cross Committee awarded her the Florence Nightingale Medal in June 1955. In January 1958, U.S. Lady magazine named her U.S. Lady of the Year—the first woman in uniform ever to be so honored.

At present, she is serving as director of nursing activities, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex. She will retire at the end of next month, after 30 years of service. Her sister, Mrs. Blake Pritchard, of Spencer, says she thinks Colonel Bradley will return to West Virginia to live after a period of "just playing" in the West.

Of all the honors Colonel Bradley has won, the most signficant, perhaps, was a letter from a Decatur, Ga., mother, which summarizes everything Colonel Bradley has worked for during her Army career. The letter was written after Colonel Bradley had appeared as the honored guest on "This Is Your Life," in 1954:

"If every mother whose wounded—even dying—son could have, at the time, known that her child was being cared for by such a God-sent woman as you are, how comforted she would have been. Surely some of them were watching last night and even now their grief is made more bearable in the knowing.

"I pray that my own 19-year-old son will never have occasion to know a battlefield, but in the event that comes to pass, I pray also that you're somewhere near. And I must be speaking for literally thousands of mothers."

Yes, Col. Ruby G. Bradley is a West Virginian of whom we can all be proud.

Her name was entered by Mrs. Freda Chloe Cox, 307 Delaware Avenue, Charleston.

President's Coddling of Labor Leaders Is Costing American Workers Jobs and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what is the Kennedy policy of giving large labor unions favored treatment costing the workers in jobs and money? While the President ignores the impact upon the economy of unreasonable wage demands and the imposition of additional featherbedding practices, the Nation faces the prospect of bigger and longer strikes. The demands of certain labor leaders are threatening the existence of many business enterprises with further loss of jobs. The long strikes are throwing countless thousands of allied workers out of employment and millions of dollars in wages are being lost, never to be regained. We cannot permit such a situation to continue or to deteriorate further. Large labor unions and irresponsible union bosses must be subject to the same rules as all other segments of our economy. That is why it is imperative that Congress start labor legislation reform by considering the several bills, my own included, H.R. 264, to make labor unions subject to antitrust law.

As a part of these remarks I include the following article from U.S. News & World Report of February 4 detailing this era of costly strikes:

NOW BEGINNING: AN ERA OF COSTLIER STRIKES?

(Costly strikes against shippers and newspapers suggest more such strikes are on the way. It could be a big strike year. Unions seem convinced that conditions are favorable to push new demands, with a friendly President in the White House. Employers, finding it harder to pass added costs on to consumers, are resisting. The combination points to trouble ahead.)

An era of big and costly strikes appears to be on the way back. Strikes on docks and against big-city newspapers have ushered in what threatens to become a period of growing strife.

New demands on the steel industry lie just ahead as contracts are reopened. The industry faces more trouble in 1964 when contracts expire.

The railroads are threatened with nationwide strikes in 1963. Walkouts in two aerospace companies are now halted only by Taft-Hartley injunctions. Unions are stirring in industry after industry.

Big demands are sure to be made on the automobile manufacturers, as well as steel companies, in 1964.

It seems that the present is a favorable time to strike. Union leaders hold great power in Congress, although sentiment has been rising for legislation to curb the power of unions.

Union leaders count heavily on a President who is in debt to them for political support. President Kennedy is resisting antistrike legislation. Unions look to him, in showdowns, to name friendly factfinding boards.

A STRIKE ENDS, BUT—

The impression that this is a favorable time for the unions to push their demands is strengthened by a settlement just worked out by a Presidential board for dockworkers who struck—causing hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of damages to the country.

The question has been raised as to whether the dock settlement violates the Kennedy administration's wage guidelines for limiting pay raises, generally, to 3 percent a year.

Concern has been expressed over the possibility that the dock settlement might spark a pattern of higher union demands, reviving inflation.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, Chairman of the Presidential Board in the dock dispute, defended the settlement in a speech to the Senate on January 22. He said the wage increase amounted to less

than 4 percent a year. In addition, the formula provides 13 cents an hour in fringes.

In the dock strike, some of the added cost of the settlement proposed by the presidential board may ultimately be picked up by American taxpayers in the form of shipping subsidies.

Not all of business, however, is subsidized. It is at this point that the strike threat for the future grows.

While the unions are described as emboldened by their political strength, and in a mood to make big demands, the attitude of employers has hardened.

WHY EMPLOYERS BALK

Several reasons are cited for the increasing resistance of employers to pay raises and other additions to costs.

They are no longer able to pass on added costs in the form of higher prices. Prices are held in check, both by political and economic pressures.

Employers say they are under pressure to hold down costs—and prices—to meet foreign competition in the United States and to broaden markets overseas.

The efforts of employers to curb costs takes two forms—resistance to raises in pay, and increasing automation as a way of reducing the need for labor.

Unions, thus, find themselves fighting not only for higher pay but also for protection of their jobs as well.

Strikes, and threats of strikes, tend to grow out of a situation of this kind. A major cause of the shipping strike, for example, was the effort of shipping companies to reduce the size of work crews. The issue was finally dropped for the time being, and settlement was limited mainly to pay raises and fringe benefits, as shown in the chart on this page.

The threat of strikes is increased when unions make demands in new fields, as they are now doing. These new fields include profit sharing and two union-proposed remedies for unemployment: shorter workweeks and sabbatical leaves for older workers.

WHAT'S AHEAD IN STEEL?

In steel negotiations, which are set for this summer, the Steelworkers Union is expected to demand sabbatical leaves, along with higher pay.

Some employers in the steel industry already have indicated they will fight to hold down costs of any changes in their contracts. It is out of this struggle that the strike threat arises for this year.

The steel industry faces trouble again in 1964, when contracts expire. The union then is expected to press for its long-range goal of a shorter workweek.

The United Auto Workers Union is preparing to push for two of its major goals in the auto industry next year. One of these is profit sharing, the other is a shorter workweek. The companies seem certain to resist.

More immediately, threats of major strikes lie ahead against the railroads, over demands of workers for pay raises and moves by employers to reduce featherbedding. Thus a crisis on the railroads could come at any time.

That is not all. Contracts expire in many major industries in 1963—among them, rubber, shipbuilding, communications, aluminum, electrical-equipment manufacturing, coal mining and paper manufacturing.

MOOD: TOUGH ON BOTH SIDES

The walkouts on the east and gulf coasts and against big-city newspapers, thus, could be just the beginning of an era of big and costlier strikes.

The reason: Unions are in a more aggressive mood, and employers are offering more and more resistance to costly settlements.

An Excellent Reason for the Passage of H.R. 524

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by J. A. Livingston, which appeared in the January 3, 1963, edition of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

Corporations would not be so quick to grant these restricted stock options if my bill, H.R. 524, were to become law. They are one of the rankest forms of discrimination and if the proceeds from exercising the option were to be treated as ordinary income for tax purposes there would certainly be less of these shenanigans.

Mr. Livingston's article follows:

HEADS, AND EXECUTIVES WIN—TAILS, THEY WIN EVEN MORE

(By J. A. Livingston)

"Outrageous. Season's greetings."

That's how Lewis D. Gilbert, self-appointed oneman stockholder vigilante committee, inscribed a copy of Texas Instruments, Inc., recent proxy statement. In this instance, he cannot be accused of overburdening facts.

The officers and directors of Texas Instruments are asking stockholders to create for them what stockholders can't create for themselves. They want a "fairy godmother" committee to wave a magic wand so that they—the executives—can capitalize on the decline in Texas Instruments stock from a high of $206.75 a share in 1961 to a low of $49 last year. It's now around 60.

When Texas Instruments was one of the glamor babies on the New York Stock Exchange, its high-vaulting movements brought comfort and joy to officers who held options to buy stock at $28.50 and $37.75 a share. They needed no fairy godmother then. They were masters of their destiny, captains of success.

GLAMOR BURSTS

As the stock advanced in Wall Street, the price on additional options likewise rose. Some day, Texas Instruments would hit $500 maybe; perhaps an even $1,000. So, an option at $178.75 a share was a genuine incentive.

Then the glamor brust. The "amour pocketbook" of options was sorely deflated. Texas Instruments options lost their cash-and-carry value.

To soothe the "amour pocketbook" of officials, directors have latched on to an idea developed by the Aluminum Co. of America in 1958. A "fairy godmother" committee would cancel the old options and issue new ones at prices escalated downward to the fall on the New York Stock Exchange.

INCENTIVE FADES

Rationale: Options are granted to executives as an incentive to work conscientiously and remain with the company. But when options lose their cash-and-carry value, this incentive seemingly disappears. Yet, you could argue the other way: That executives ought to be so humiliated by the drop in the stock below option prices that they would work all the harder to get the stock up to where it had been—and so make their options valuable.

J. E. Jonsson, Texas Instruments chairman, offers stockholders this justification of the "fairy godmother" committee.

"Because of declines in the market value of our common stock, options held by many key persons * * * do not fulfill the plan's basic purposes * * *.

"While the board of directors has the power to cancel outstanding options by mutual agreement and grant new options * * * based on current market values, the board believes that action of this nature should be taken only pursuant to an amendment of the plan."

DOUBLE PENALTY

If stockholders approve the proposal, they will pay a double penalty for their beneficence:

First, they reduce the price of stock to officers and directors, who already get substantial pension- and profit-sharing benefits.

Second, as taxpayers, they will be giving officers and directors a free ride in the stock market at the 25 percent capital-gain tax rate. Stock optionees don't take up their stock—put up cash—until the market price is well above the option price. They are well padded, if not absolutely protected against a fall.

Stock options started out as heads-I-win, tails-I-can't-lose bounty to corporate officials. Now, with a one-way Wall Street escalation clause added, the option has become a heads-I-win, tails-I-win—more blessing.

Remember the joke about the executive who, on hearing about twilight sleep doing wonders for labor, complained to his physician, "Haven't you got anything like that for management?"

The physician now can offer the escalated stock option.

It's Our Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman Bob Rich, for whom so many people in the present House hold such high regard because of his steadfast support of economy and fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government, has sent me an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News which certainly merits the serious consideration of all the Members of Congress. At this time, when we are considering action on the administration tax proposals, it certainly behooves us to give serious thought to the editorial comment in this fine pronouncement:

AROUSED POPULACE CAN HALT ADMINISTRATION'S PLUNGE INTO FINANCIAL DISASTER

(By Jack W. Gore)

From events of the past few months it has become frighteningly clear that thinking Americans who value the great heritage of freedom they have been given and who wish to preserve this Nation as an independent republic must gird themselves for a tremendous and all-important fight in the days ahead.

If this fight is lost—and it can well be lost through continued complacency and inertia—then the face of America as we have known it so long will be drastically altered.

As President Kennedy made clear in his budget message to the Congress a few days ago, he no longer believes in the philosophy that progress and prosperity for our Nation can be achieved through the sound principles of a balanced budget and conservative spending policies.

Instead, he has surrendered to the Keynesian philosophy that real prosperity can only be achieved by spending what we don't have for things we don't truly need in the hope this reckless spending binge will produce an artificial kind of prosperity that will keep us afloat in a sea of red ink.

This is one of the most dangerous fiscal gambles any American President has ever embarked upon. If it fails we will have budget deficits of unparalleled peacetime proportions and of such tremendous magnitude and import that our whole financial and economic structure can be wrecked on the shoals of galloping inflation.

Along with this we will have thrust upon us a Federal bureaucracy of truly stupendous size and regimentation. And with the managed news policy that has already been adopted as official administration policy, we will be increasingly told that all this is for our own good and is necessary to get us moving again in the path of progress and sweet prosperity.

It is amazing how many Americans have already fallen for this line of pure guff. As Steve Stahl, head of the Investor's Union, said recently:

"We have traded the Declaration of Independence for the fetish of interdependence. We are transforming the powerful wings of the mighty American eagle into the fluttering feathers of a mother hen—right here at home where we are teaching our children at our own expense that free enterprise has failed and the Government is more capable of managing our affairs than we are ourselves."

Dr. Edward R. Annis, president-elect of the American Medical Association, echoed much the same theme recently when he declared:

"A Federal Government takeover is like poured cement. If you do not struggle while it is being poured, but wait until it is an accomplished fact, it hardens and you never escape."

This is all too true. Right now we have an administration firmly dedicated to vastly increasing the influence of the Federal Government on our daily lives. In just 2 years this administration has added 145,342 persons to the Federal payroll and the payroll padding technique has just started good. It is an administration which thinks nothing of buying Congressional votes with lush patronage jobs and of twisting arms in every way possible to get what it wants. Its political morals come right from the barnyard and it is a complete stranger to the truth unless telling the truth happens to serve its own ends.

This is blunt language to be sure, but it is the kind of language that America must hear and heed if it is to survive another 6 years under the dynasty that is now being built in Washington.

With the kind of politics this administration plays there is only one effective way to keep this administration from getting just what it wants. Congress must be persuaded that the administration program is not the program our people want and the only way that can be done is to mount a letter writing campaign of such effectiveness that our congressional representatives must listen to the voice of the people.

That means that each and every American who is dedicated to preserving constitutional government and sanity in our taxing and spending programs must plunge into this fight and make his or her voice heard where it will do the most good. Sounding off to a neighbor or a friend isn't going to do any good, but sounding off to a Congressman can do a lot of good, and we are going to have to do a lot of that in the months ahead if we are to keep this Nation's head above water.

Let no one kid himself that this administration isn't politically smart. It is the most ruthless and the craftiest political machine that has ever come into power in this country, and it is not the least bit averse to using every trick in the book, including downright falsehood, to stay there.

It is time more Americans woke up to what is going to happen to their country if we don't get some sanity back in Washington. The cold, hard truth happens to be that we are riding for a very nasty fall, and it could be a disastrous one, indeed, unless some checkreins are applied while there is still time.

The Facts on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Facts on Cuba," published in the Washington Daily News of February 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FACTS ON CUBA

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS appropriately likens Soviet troops in Cuba to Soviet missiles in Cuba, as twin menaces to United States and hemispheric security.

The long-range missiles presumably are gone, along with the Russian bombers—though we have no certain proof of it. The Russian troops remain. At his last press conference, President Kennedy estimated the number of Russians on the island at 16,000 to 17,000.

Senator STENNIS, a Democrat, has considerable prestige in both parties in Congress. As chairman of the Senate preparedness subcommittee, he soon will start an investigation of the Cuban buildup. He is well qualified for the job.

The investigation will not be a post mortem on the Bay of Pigs, which Sen. STENNIS aptly terms "spilled milk." Not where we've been but where we are going is the correct point of view.

As Senator STENNIS points out, Cuba rapidly is becoming the second strongest military power in this hemisphere with potential for blackmail, subversion and even invasion of the smaller Latin American countries.

We should have a hard, firm policy, he says, and "it could lead to the proposition that we would have to make demands for this force (the Soviet troops) as we did for the missiles and the bombers." This is an inevitable development, in our opinion.

Expected within hours is a belated order barring U.S. cargoes to ship owners whose vessels have traded with Cuba since January 1. This is a mild start on a program, talked about since the blockade, to close hemisphere seaports and airports to ships and planes trading with Cuba, to freeze Cuban funds and cut off hemisphere communications with the island.

Even these measures, requiring joint action by the members of the Organization of American States (OAS), are insufficient to deal with the problem. But at least they would make support of Castro more expensive for the Soviets.

As Senator STENNIS says, most of his subcommittee hearings will have to be held in secret executive session—"but at the same time, I hope that we can get out to the American people the basic facts we develop."

This is of vital importance. There is great confusion in the public mind as to what is going on in Cuba and what the U.S. Government is doing about it. On the basis of available information, what is being done appears far short of the hard, firm policies Senator STENNIS suggests.

War Veterans Salute J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last fall, a great American was honored by one of the most distinguished war veterans' organization in the United States. I am speaking of the Gold Medal of Merit awarded to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, last November, by the Jewish War Veterans.

This honor, coupled with a lifetime honorary membership in the organization, is the highest recognition presented by the Jewish War Veterans.

The inscription on the plaque accompanying the Medal of Merit reads:

In recognition of outstanding and meritorious services in the battle for civil rights and liberties. His integrity and devotion to justice will be remembered forever.

I can think of no person more deserving of this award. In his 39 years as Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover has quietly but effectively advanced the cause of civil rights and civil liberties. His devotion to the fair and impartial administration of justice for all citizens, while protecting our basic rights and privileges from those who would destroy them, has earned for him a prominent place in our history.

J. Edgar Hoover has most significantly advanced the cause of liberty by impartially advancing the cause of justice. His record of transforming the FBI from a politically dominated and inept organization in the early 1920's into the most trusted and effective crime-fighting agency in the world is indeed a landmark which benefits every American.

I think the greatness of J. Edgar Hoover can also be measured by his humility. For example, he accepted the award from the Jewish War Veterans, "on behalf of the men and women of the FBI." I think Mr. Hoover's remarks are

both penetrating and worthwhile and at this time I wish to have them inserted in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, UPON RECEIVING THE MEDAL OF MERIT FROM THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS, NOVEMBER 9, 1962

This is indeed a great honor. I accept your Medal of Merit on behalf of the men and women of the FBI who are deeply grateful for your approbation and your support in the never-ending fight against crime and subversion.

The Jewish War Veterans bears a proud reputation. Thousands of your members have been tested and, with an abiding faith in God, have courageously proved themselves capable on the field of battle.

There remains an urgent need for the loyalty, the courage, and the undying determination which have characterized the membership of this outstanding organization during other great crises in our Nation's history. Today, fully one-third of the earth's people languish under the hobnailed boot of fascist enslavement. The foremost target of their Red masters—in Europe, Asia, and Cuba—is to destroy America's freedom.

My associates and I shall always treasure the distinction of having been cited by the Jewish War Veterans for our work in safeguarding civil liberties. Nowhere is the difference between communism and freedom more pronounced than in the vital area of human rights and dignity.

In contrast to the Communist state, our Government is built upon an abiding faith in God—the God from whom we have derived our entire heritage of freedom. These freedoms constitute America's greatest strength and vitality. To help preserve and strengthen them is indeed the FBI's most sacred obligation.

Tribute to Representative Joseph Minish, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a veteran New Jersey labor reporter, Tom Gallagher, of the Newark Star-Ledger, has written a fine tribute to Representative JOSEPH MINISH, one of our new Congressmen from New Jersey. Mr. Gallagher points out that JOE MINISH has the respect and friendship of those with whom he worked over the years for the objectives of organized labor in New Jersey. In a column on January 13, Mr. Gallagher also says that JOE MINISH would easily be named "Labor Man of the Year" in New Jersey if such a selection were to be made.

It is heartening that one who understands labor so well is now on hand in Congress to help us deliberate on legislation of direct importance to labor. JOE MINISH is also the kind of man who will give careful, sympathetic attention to the social and economic needs of all Americans. It was a pleasure to see this article; I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE MINISH: UNION MAN OF YEAR

(By Tom Gallagher)

If a selection were to be made for Jersey's "Labor Man of the Year," Congressman JOE MINISH would walk away with the honors.

For one thing, he chalked up a "first" when he took his seat Wednesday on Capitol Hill. He was the first union official in the history of New Jersey to achieve that distinction.

Of course, the handsome margin by which he defeated an aggressive array of political opponents last November was quite an achievement, but it was the swearing-in ceremony that put the seal of accomplishment on the feat.

The new Congressman's claim to the "Man of the Year" title in labor circles would have a more substantial foundation than any election campaign.

His fellow IUE members would be the first to point that out. They have on every occasion since he first expressed interest in becoming a Congressman more than a year ago. They immediately set about the job of selling him to the Essex County Democratic Chairman, Dennis Carey, the Democratic Party generally, and just about everybody they could persuade to listen.

His popularity with them was not accidental nor the result of an artificial public relations buildup. He began to earn it shortly after he became an IUE member in the early 1940's and his steady advancement since then was due to unselfish and unremitting service to its members.

They showed what they thought of him when they turned the IUE Washington headquarters, the Philip Murray building, inside out to celebrate his first day in Washington. And just about everybody in Jersey labor or politics, from AFL-CIO President Vince Murphy to Governor Hughes showed up to do him honor.

The IUE enthusiasm will be climaxed by a MINISH victory dinner at the Essex House January 26.

MINISH's accomplishments in labor circles were by no means confined to the IUE, however. His service for 10 years as secretary of the old CIO Essex West Hudson Council earned for him recognition on a wider scale than that which the IUE had accorded him.

And as executive secretary last year of the merged AFL-CIO county group, recognition was quickly forthcoming from the AFL leaders, who got to know him and appreciate him as a tireless worker.

It was a disappointment to many when he declined to continue in that post upon becoming Congressman. They felt the prestige he acquired would rub off on the council itself as the only group in the Nation with a Congressman as secretary.

He felt, however, that his promise to the voters of the 11th District that he would quit that job if elected was a pledge to be kept. He will be made an honorary executive board member and secretary emeritus.

Those who know him are certain he will do his best to serve the people of his district.

Common Market Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress legislation was enacted which we hoped would be beneficial to the Common Market. Needless to say, we share in the disappointment of the entire world when one of our close allies recently refused the admission of Britain into the Common Market.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent editorial which reflects the pulse of the Nation on this very important issue. The editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on January 31, 1963, follows:

COMMON MARKET CRISIS?

We leave to others the reading of General de Gaulle's motives and grand objectives in slamming the door of the European Community upon the British.

In the end, insular Britain is left standing outside for reasons that have to do more with political and military concepts than the tariffs on Canadian pulp or New Zealand butter.

It was, it would seem, the prospect of reconciling bread-and-butter issues that forced the General de Gaulle gamble with the unity of the six Common Market members. In exercising their veto, the French took the ultimate step to force their view that the acceptance of Britain now would upset the timetable—if not distort the plans—for continental unity along the political lines favored by Paris.

Whatever General de Gaulle's ultimate objectives, it will be well now in appraising the damage to Western unity to bear in mind that influential elements in Brussels and elsewhere—though not sharing the Paris concepts—did wish that the whole subject of British membership might be deferred until the eventual political framework of Europe is better defined.

Even among Market officials friendly to London, the suspense hanging over the Brussels negotiations has been a source of concern lest it throw out of gear the momentum in the delicate harmonizing of commercial and economic policies.

But one ironic issue now posed by Britain's setback is the effect of the door slamming on the unity of the Community itself—most notably on elements in Italy, the Benelux countries, and in the Market authority for whom the Common Market was a step toward a broader Western partnership.

Will those whose views are the antithesis of General de Gaulle's now stand still for a wall building between the two halves of the Western World? Or will they insist upon a confrontation between the inward- and outward-looking elements of the Community to avert what some see as a calamity?

Those now pressing for a reassessment before it is too late can find eloquent expression of their views in the remarks of the EEC President, Dr. Walter Hallstein, less than a year ago: "Now America and the new Europe—an enlarging Europe—must establish a new basis for their continuing economic relationships. If they do not, they run the risk of letting trade matters become a source of dissension rather than of unity. This would be folly on an Atlantic scale."

The Ozark National Rivers Project in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, as our society moves forward at an ac-

celerated rate in this age of science and technology, we cannot neglect our need as humans for the simple beauty of nature.

In our rush for material accomplishment, we have far too often destroyed beyond repair the wondrous beauty of the land. In the State of Missouri, we have an area of land resplendent with the jewels of nature. This woodland contains free flowing streams and springs. Fortunately, it has escaped to a great extent the march of progress. However, what about tomorrow? If we are to insure the preservation of this land, we must act today. We must stake out a claim without delay.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, and I have introduced S. 16 to establish the Ozark National Rivers as a part of our national park system. A similar bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the Congressman in whose district this area lies.

Recently, editorials in support of this proposal appeared in the Kansas City Star and the Springfield News and Leader. I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader, Jan. 20, 1963]

TRIMMED BACK

Missouri Senators STUART SYMINGTON and EDWARD V. LONG, and Congressman RICHARD H. ICHORD have launched a new effort to insure that the natural beauties of a 94,000-acre area along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers will be preserved for all time.

They have introduced identical bills in the Senate and House authorizing the National Park Service to create an Ozark National Rivers area in Carter, Shannon, Dent, and Texas Counties.

The measures are a cut-down version of those offered at the last session of Congress—which drew a good deal of loud opposition from some residents of the region—and are designed, say the lawmakers, to meet the objections raised then.

The word "monument" has been dropped from the name of the project. Parts of Ripley, Oregon, and Howell Counties included in the original plan have been dropped. And specific authority for the National Park Service to negotiate scenic easements with owners of land in the project area is included in the new bills.

These newspapers endorsed the original project, as being vital to the protection of the natural beauties of the area against the encroachments of commercialization. We consider that the original plan was sound, but if, in the judgment of its sponsors in Congress, it appears better to retreat a little, we will accept that judgment.

We trust that the residens of the area will also accept it, and that the plan can be carried through to a successful conclusion.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Jan. 21, 1963]

THE OZARK RIVERS RATE TOP PRIORITY

The Ozark Rivers bill is back in Congress again. This time, it has been altered to undercut virtually all of the major opposition. As far as it goes, it seems an excellent proposal.

As now designated, the area would be called the Ozark National Rivers, an entirely proper name. The new label is in keeping with the designation of the three national seashore parks that were created by the 87th Congress. Actually, the general layout of the Ozarks playground does not fit into the traditional category of the national parks. The national monument label would be inappropriate, for it suggests some single natural wonder or a shrine of history. The Ozark National Rivers designation should satisfy just about everyone.

The only difficulty with the plan introduced last week lies in its scope. Originally the park proposal included the Current, Jacks Fork, and Eleven Point Rivers. Now the Eleven Point has been dropped and the lower Current Valley in Ripley County has been omitted.

Of course, it is better to get some action than to continue submitting a bill in each session of Congress, without results. However, there remains time for the people of Hoswell, Oregon, and Ripley to reconsider their position. The Eleven Point Valley is lovely country and merits preservation for the people of the United States.

The Ozarks bill now before the Congress strikes us as fine compromise legislation. We hope compromise will not be necessary, but certainly it would be far better to preserve the proposed 94,000 acres than to preserve nothing. The Ozark Rivers can become a playground of genuine national stature. The bill introduced by Senators SYMINGTON and LONG and Representative ICHORD can start the debate. The Ozark National Rivers rates priority treatment by the 88th Congress.

Ukraine Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the House has taken note of the fact that January 22, 1963, marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

It is most appropriate that the observance of this event should have been held in the House of Representatives where for several years now our membership has joined in commemorating this great event in history.

We are all aware of the very significant history of this great country of the Ukraine the long bitter struggle of its loyal, faithful people, their persistent, determined fight against oppression, and their unflagging determination to enjoy the blessing of free, representative government.

I am proud indeed to congratulate the entire Ukrainian people, and their loyal descendants and relatives in this country, upon the birthday of their great Nation. Although the shadows of tyranny and oppression surround them, they have demonstrated in the past that they will never lose heart and that they will never give up their aspirations and struggles to be free men and women.

Today they are the largest captive nation in Eastern Europe—45 million people who worship God and love freedom. Our great Nation will never forsake them and others like them who are suffering from cruel, Soviet bondage.

If we and the rest of the free world continue our efforts for peace and freedom, tomorrow may bring to the Ukraine and all other subject nations the blessings of freedom and governments of their own choice.

It is for us in the House to intensify our efforts for this great cause and never to lose an opportunity to indicate our support, encouragement and effective measures of assistance for the Ukrainian people and all other people who are suppressed by the great Red octopus that is endeavoring to strangle the free world.

This is an appropriate time to speak in behalf of the Special House Committee on Captive Nations which has been urged so eloquently and appropriately by our dear, most talented and distinguished friend, Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, the great American from Pennsylvania. A committee of this kind could render a great service to those behind the Iron Curtain, and to the sacred cause of freedom, and I hope that the day is not far distant when such a much needed Committee of the House will be authorized, and will commence to function effectively in behalf of personal liberty, democracy and freedom.

Who knows but that such a committee headed by that great statesman and patriot, DAN FLOOD, might be the final leverage required to swing the world pendulum of liberty over to the side of justice and humanity and usher in an era of liberation and individual freedom that would bring enduring peace, democracy and happiness for all mankind.

God save the Ukraine.

Ansley Wilcox House as a National Historic Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the bill which would designate the Ansley Wilcox House at 641 Delaware Avenue in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site. This is the place where Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in as President of the United States, and it is one of only four sites outside Washington, D.C., where the Presidential Oath has been administered. The others are the old Subtreasury Building in New York City where George Washington was inaugurated for his first term; Philadelphia's Congress Hall—the scene of Washington's second and John Adams' inauguration; and the homestead in Plymouth, Vt., where Calvin Coolidge was sworn in.

There is no question but that the Wilcox House is a national historic landmark of the utmost significance.

Last year legislation was enacted to add Sagamore Island on Long Island, N.Y., and the Theodore Roosevelt birthplace in New York, as national historic sites. This is a fitting tribute to our 26th President. I feel that the preservation of the Wilcox House in Buffalo, as a

historic shrine, would be an even richer tribute to this great American. The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, New York, as a national historic site

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire on behalf of the United States the real property described in section 2 of this Act, known as the Ansley Wilcox House, which real property is of national historic significance as the place in which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States on September 14, 1901, following the assassination of President William McKinley. The Secretary shall maintain and preserve such property as a national historic site for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land, situate in the city of Buffalo, county of Erie, State of New York, and beginning at a point in the east line of Delaware Avenue distant 110 feet southerly from the southerly line of land of Catharine Marie Richmond, recorded in Erie County clerk's office in liber 247 of deeds at page 167; runing thence easterly a distance of 110 feet;

Running thence southerly a distance of 60 feet to a point in the north line of land of Morris Michael, recorded in Erie County Clerk's office in liber 531 of deeds at page 335; running thence easterly and along the north line of land of the said Morris Michael 64 feet more or less, and continuing easterly on a line extended from the land of Morris Michael a further distance of 174 feet more or less to the westerly line of Franklin Street; running thence northerly along the westerly line of Franklin Street 110 feet; running thence westerly 134 feet; running thence northerly and parallel with Franklin Street 59.51 feet more or less to a point distant 40 feet more or less easterly from the southeast corner of lands of Amelia Stevenson, recorded in Erie County Clerk's office in liber 669 at page 299;

Running thence westerly 40 feet to the southeast corner of lands of the said Amelia Stevenson and continuing westerly in a line along the south line of the land of Catharine Marie Richmond a further distance of 174 feet more or less to the easterly line of Delaware Avenue; running thence southerly along the easterly line of Delaware Avenue 110 feet to the place of beginning.

And being subject to an easement as contained in a lease agreement dated January 6, 1959, between the landlord and the Liberty Bank of Buffalo covering a driveway ramp and automobile parking privileges, together with the right of ingress and egress to Delaware Avenue and Franklin Street, as contained in said lease.

The Men in Blue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am calling the attention of my colleagues to the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 29, 1963, entitled "The Men in Blue":

THE MEN IN BLUE

It is easy to forget the main point of the Congo settlement. It is larger than Tshombe and the cause of federalism, brighter than the copper and uranium of the Katanga and the taxes they pay, more significant than a unified Congo, bigger even than the tide toward responsible, independent national units in all Africa.

The history books will record all these importantly. But at their head will be the first major success in all history of a genuinely international police force.

The nightmare of violence that marked the division of a subcontinent into India and Pakistan never took place in the Congo, though it was freely predicted on all sides at the outset. The violence that did come was minor. The reason was the presence of a blue flag with a white laurel wreath, at the head of uniformed ranks in blue.

No one could say where and when these forces, responsible to a secretariat serving all governments but dominated by none, will be needed again. No doubt the United Nations, officials will plead for a breathing spell. They have every reason to be exhausted by the diplomatic tightrope walking which made them the most inhibited police unit in memory.

The rest of the world is still so divided and wearied by 2 years of frustrated maneuver on all sides, in the Congo operations, that most onlookers would groan at another U.N. policing operation.

Yet the basis of the U.S. proposals for arms control in a nuclear world is inevitably some form of international police. Yet the U.N. flag flies on the Arab-Israel borders and on the truce line in Kashmir. Yet an international control commission—a not unsimilar technique—is more useful than is generally recognized in Laos. The next need for an uncommitted, objective force to keep order in some difficult trouble spot or country in transition, may be taking shape unnoticed, right now.

We reject what is generally called world government. We do not wish to see any form of international police overriding political authority, and we consider that independent nations, cooperating under principles and rules to adjust their differences, are the best means for constructing as well as preserving peace. But the U.N. force in the Congo acted under just this system and was never allowed to become a power on its own.

When the next need comes, the world will probably look back on the Congo with more perspective. It will almost certainly continue to use the mechanism that painstaking and scrupulous international cooperation has now wrought.

A View From Capitol Hill—An Article on the Role of Junior Colleges by Representative Edith Green, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent commentary on the implications of Federal legislation affecting junior colleges by our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, of Oregon.

The article entitled "A View From Capitol Hill," appears in the January 1963 issue of Junior College Journal, a publication of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

The article follows:

A VIEW FROM CAPITOL HILL

(By Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon)

It seems evident that junior colleges stand on the threshold of their greatest period of service to higher education in our country.

We know that last fall 4.1 million students enrolled in degree-credit courses in colleges and universities across the Nation, and that by 1970 this number will rise to 7 million. It is obvious that junior colleges must provide for an increasing share of the college population if these 3 million additional students are to obtain a higher education.

At the same time, our modern society demands an increasing number of semiprofessional technicians trained at a level below the baccalaureate degree. Here, too, it is obvious that junior colleges have the opportunity to supply the semiprofessional training so greatly in demand.

How can, or how will, the junior colleges meet these twin challenges? I know that there is considerable discussion of the major function of the junior college. Should it concentrate on the 2-year terminal student, or on the transfer student working toward a baccalaureate degree? I believe that there is room for—and certainly need for—both types of junior colleges, or both types of courses in the same institution, if it possesses the resources, in funds and in faculty, to provide them.

With the growing pressures upon junior colleges for a rapid expansion in two directions, I should like to inject a note of caution. It seems to me that the junior colleges can render the most valuable service to education by emphasizing quality in whichever courses they decide to provide.

The Members of Congress, I am sure, will want to be certain that Federal funds will in no way help to perpetuate mediocrity in either a 2-year or a 4-year institution.

The junior college would have little reason for existence if it could not offer education beyond the level of a good high school, since it then would be merely stretching out a secondary education. While growing in size, it cannot grow in stature without careful attention to the quality of its faculty and its curriculum.

In recent years, we have witnessed a greater public interest in junior colleges, and indeed in all higher education. This has been reflected in the number of bills introduced, and also in the increased amount of Federal support for higher education, especially in the sciences and particularly at the graduate level.

I think it inevitable that Federal assistance to higher education will increase in the future. I would hope that the new Congress can be convinced of the urgent need for financial assistance in constructing academic facilities and will enact legislation in 1963. It was encouraging to us in the last Congress that all major higher education organizations, including the American Association of Junior Colleges, united in support of the college academic facilities bill. As the new year begins, the need for additional college classrooms, laboratories, and libraries has not diminished.

I believe it is accurate to say that there is a particular interest among Members of Congress in junior colleges as the avenue for providing higher education at the least cost for our rapidly growing student population. If any higher education legislation is enacted—and I am optimistic that it will be—it most certainly will include junior colleges.

Junior colleges may look for further support through the National Defense Education Act. The National Defense Education Act has demonstrated its worth in improving both secondary and higher education in some areas. But the National Defense Education Act has gaps which should be closed, and I would hope that the Congress would be receptive to changes in this act in 1963.

As mentioned earlier, the demands of the space age require an increasing level of education. This means not only more education for large numbers of our young people (and older, too), but a higher degree of education in our complex professions.

The Federal Government has provided support—often quite generous—for advanced graduate work, mainly in the scientific fields. It seems to me that the national interest requires that more support be given to higher education at the undergraduate level in all fields—if we are to maintain our educational advance. The process may be gradual, but I think it is inevitable.

Editorial Criticism of the Kennedy Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, two widely read and highly regarded newspapers, the Washington Post and the Christian Science Monitor, have raised points of criticism with regard to President Kennedy's tax proposals that I believe should be seriously considered by Congress. These are sources of opinion and insight that we can ill afford to overlook when considering a measure so immense in its impact and so susceptible to political forces in its evolution.

The editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of January 31 states the central issue succinctly: "An orderly tax structure which will stimulate the economy." It goes on to point out that on the surface the tax cuts provided for various income groups appear reasonable enough—it is only when the measures to recoup some of the loss are taken into consideration that inequities quickly follow. Apparently the Kennedy reforms will simply replace old mistakes with new ones. Although the proposal calls for eventual cuts in corporate taxes, the delay in putting them into effect may be costly. The Monitor "leans strongly toward giving direct stimulus to business an early and vigorous push," and I heartily agree.

A specific defect in the administration proposal is nailed down in the February 3 editorial in the Washington Post. This is the unwise and unjust proposal to limit itemized deductions to expenses in excess of 5 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income. Presumably this plan is an attempt to eliminate the deduction of interest charges on the grounds that this discriminates against renters of homes and apartments. This reasoning itself, of course, runs counter to the administration's stated objective of encouraging home ownership and construction.

As the Post correctly points out, a deduction limitation will not eliminate inequities since the allowable deductions for persons within the same tax bracket will vary according to the amount of interest-bearing debt. The editorial adds that honest taxpayers will consider this an attempt to give with one hand and take back with the other. What even the Post and the Christian Science Monitor fail to see, however, is one rather obvious fact—if you wish to eliminate the inequity of an interest deduction, the simplest way is to eliminate the deduction. And if this presumed inequity is the only reason for creating a greater one for a larger number of innocent taxpayers, I submit that the 5-percent deduction floor does not even merit serious consideration on the part of this body.

The editorials in the Christian Science Monitor and the Washington Post follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 3, 1963]

THE TAX DEDUCTION FLOOR

Although the debate on the administration's tax program is just beginning, it is already apparent that a heavy volley of hostile criticism is going to be concentrated on the proposal to place a progressive limitation on personal income-tax deductions which are itemized.

President Kennedy recommended that corporate and personal income taxes be reduced by a total of $13.6 billion, but $3.4 billion of the Treasury's losses be recouped through reform measures the principal one of which involves itemized deductions. By limiting the total of itemized deductions to those in excess of 5 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income, the Treasury would raise nearly $2.3 billion, or more than two-thirds of the $3.4 billion that is to be recouped. Since 40 percent of the taxpayers will claim some $40 billion in itemized deductions for 1962, neither the political nor the economic impacts of this proposal can be ignored .

The rationale for eliminating or limiting personal deductions involves considerations of equity and economic incentives. Since interest charges may be deducted, the present tax regulations have been criticized on the ground that they discriminate against persons who rent dwelling space and therefore pay no interest on mortgages or against those who purchase automobiles and other consumer durables for cash. Moreover, personal deductions narrow the tax base, making it necessary to impose higher tax rates which have a deleterious effect upon economic incentive. Under the President's program, personal income tax rates would range from 14 to 65 percent. But if the progressive limitations on itemized deductions were not imposed, the tax rates required to raise the $2.3 billion would range between 14.5 and 77 percent, and rates would run from 2 to 3 points higher over the $10,000 to $20,000 income brackets.

But the incentive and equity arguments are blunted when the compromise proposal to limit itemized deductions is weighed against political realities. Few honest taxpayers with legitimate expenses are going to be impressed by the subtle considerations that motivate the proponents of tax reform. They will instead charge that the deduction proposal is an ill-concealed attempt by the Treasury to take away with the left hand what it gives with the right. Furthermore, the proposal merely to limit deductions will not go very far in eliminating inequities. The allowable deductions for persons in the same tax bracket will be largely determined by the size of their interest-bearing debts.

Unlike the proposals affecting oil depletion allowances or real-state tax shelters, the limitation on itemized deductions affects a broad segment of the taxpaying public. And in view of the stiff resistance that the administration will encounter to its proposals for a tax cut and a planned budgetary deficit, the introduction of this dubious measure of reform is hardly the better part of political wisdom.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 31, 1963]

TAXES: THE LARGER PLAN

The shakedown cruise of the President's tax program has already begun. Within days of the message to Congress a dozen battles have broken out, both of ideology and conflicting special interests.

For our part we wish to keep a close eye on the central issue: an orderly tax structure which will stimulate the economy.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States says, after studying the details of the administration program, "the promised tax reduction and tax benefits to encourage investment, provide jobs, momentum, and growth do not emerge in the President's tax proposal. The emphasis is almost entirely on the importance of consumer spending."

Is this, then, a political tax program, designed to put money in the pockets of the lowest income group where the large mass of voters reside?

POLITICAL ANGLES ARE BUILT IN

The first quick answer is to say that everything is political in the field of government. No party, in any major piece of legislation, will fail to consider its own brand of practical politics. But having said this there is a good deal more to the President's initial proposals and there will be a good deal more to the interaction of political forces and the national interest during the adjustments in Congress.

The controversy of the moment concerns not only politics but an honest difference of approach. American business is chiefly concerned with incentive, as indeed we are. The President has agreed to reduce the corporation income tax, not by a minimal amount but by a sizable 5 percent which has been well received by business. It is also true that while the President offers approximately a 28-percent cut in tax rates to the large low-income group under $5,000, the group from $5,000 to $10,000 gets 23 percent, the group from $10,000 to $20,000 gets 25 percent, and the group from $20,000 to $50,000 gets 23 percent. Over $50,000 estimates range between 15 percent and 19 percent.

There is no gross inequality in these tax rates, but then come the substantive measures like the cut in itemized deductions which would bear down with great disproportionate weight on the middle income groups. If this and other such measures pass there would be a serious inequity.

TWO THEORIES OF INCENTIVE

At this point the honest difference of opinion sets in. Businessmen think of incentive as putting more investment money into middle income pockets and more profit into the books of businessment who will use it to modernize and develop new products and markets. They welcome more purchasing power in the hands of low-income workers partly because it is politically inevitable that tax benefits be distributed and partly because much of this money will be spent. But they don't agree that the bulk of primary incentive can come to business via stimulated consumer spending.

A group of economists, from which many of the White House advisers are drawn, argues differently. There will be an inter-

mediate period, they argue, before the direct incentive to investors and to business enterprises can take effect. Especially in this interim period they think that more vitality can be poured into the economy by consumer spending at a time when there is overcapacity in many industries.

ARE TWO SCHOOLS COMPATIBLE?

It is not easy to resolve this difference between two schools—those who would emphasize direct stimulus to business through the middle and upper income groups, and those who would enlarge low income purchasing power. A political settlement through compromise is expected. We hope it is not true, as some have suggested, that half measures in each direction will frustrate both. We hope it is not true that only a massive trial of the purchasing power theory or equally concentrated emphasis on the investment theory can succeed and that anything less is bound to fail.

We lean strongly toward giving direct stimulus to business an early and vigorous push. We hope the ultimate bill which emerges from Congress will provide both incentive and purchasing power without weakening the impact of either.

Federal Stockpiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strategically Overstocked," which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGICALLY OVERSTOCKED

Senator SYMINGTON says he has finished his investigation of Government stockpiling—and will write a report and recommend new law.

So now the Government's program to accumulate strategic war materials for a day of need has run the full course of most Government programs of this type.

It started out as a good idea. In World War II, we ran into grave shortages of the stuff it takes to wage war. As a preventive—postwar—it was decided the Government should buy up these materials, store them, and have them if and when the need arose.

But the stockpile became a device for keeping mines in business, propping up market prices and, possibly, doing favors for some people.

President Kennedy has complained of unconscionable profits, and Senator SYMINGTON has described the whole $9-billion program as "this unbelievably unbusiness-like situation." He tends to blame it all on misplays of the Eisenhower administration.

But we also note that the Comptroller General has just accused the Kennedy administration of letting helium contracts which permit unjustified profits. And we recall that the Senate itself insisted on buying more tungsten—over Eisenhower objections—so now that stockpile is four times as big as the original objective.

This is the usual pattern of big Government programs—there is so much money involved, so many hungry beneficiaries and habitually so much looseness in administration that they wind up in a Congressional investigation, an enormous amount of deploring and buckpassing, and demands for reforms.

Just now, for example, the Comptroller General has reported the Agriculture Department wasted $4.6 million on storage and insurance for the cotton it buys under the subsidy program.

Senator SYMINGTON has some sound suggestions for gradually getting out of the "unbelievably unbusiness-like situation" in strategic materials. But this won't retrieve all of the taxpayers' money unnecessarily spent—and it won't prevent a similar situation from developing out of the next big "program."

If Congress were a little less avid about approving such programs, a little less generous in writing blank checks for the bureaucracy, and a little less tolerant of some of its own Members looking out for political interests—well, there is the first answer to this type of scandal.

Tax Legislation Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the January 22, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Times which sets forth very pertinent and timely comments on the administration tax legislation proposals:

PLUCKING THE TAX CUT STRING

President Kennedy hammers like Cato on the same point. In his third message to Congress within 2 weeks, tax reduction and its usage are the major theme.

His case for lower income taxes, personal and corporate, is reiterated in his economic report on Monday with the same arguments as before. From one message to another he adds a few details. For example, he now names July 1 as the effective date for the first phase of his grand plan of tax reduction, which eventually, Congress being willing, would reduce the highest rate from 91 to 65 percent and the lowest from 20 to 14 percent.

Under the unfolding program, corporation tax cuts would have to wait (except for a 30- to 22-percent reduction in the first $25,000 of profits). Eventually the higher corporate tax rates would be reduced from 52 to 47 percent.

The leader of his party in the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, does not think the Congress will approve a tax cut this year, largely because the legislators will insist on reforms in the tax system going hand and hand with rate reductions. But he may be underestimating the force of Presidential propaganda, which has been building up for months.

Mr. Kennedy in the budget message rather skillfully came to the basic issue of reform by asserting that the Federal tax cuts he proposes will enable the States and localities to collect more revenues at their present rates. The stimulus to business, he says, will enlarge all the tax bases—and he may be right. Indeed, all those who support his tax-cutting proposals believe this.

But tax reform has broader implications than that. Even though the States and localities' present tax rates would fetch more money under the Federal reduction program, the additional funds would hardly be enough to keep the lower governments going. The President's own statistics make it pretty clear that the State and local tax bases are inadequate.

It seems to follow that true tax reform demands that the Federal and State governments divide the taxing authority. Federal taxes are not only high, but the National Government has intruded into areas that ought to be reserved to the States. The field of excise taxes is an example of where a division could be made. Proper separation of the areas of taxation would mean that the States and localities could cope with a number of the problems for which the President is forever advocating Federal assistance.

Mr. Kennedy hammers away on the minor themes, too. He returns again with his proposal of last year that Congress should continue to work on a plan to give the President authority for a quick tax cut in case of a recession (which at the moment he does not foresee). But this is one on which the Congress will blow with chilling breath, and with reason, for Mr. Kennedy asks the legislators to delegate a part of their most precious prerogative. One can wonder, in fact, whether our remarkably flexible Constitution could stretch enough for this.

A Newspaper in Idaho Establishes a Commendable Sports Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there was a recent sports event in my home State of Idaho that merits wide attention. It concerns an innovation by a newspaper in awarding annual trophies to outstanding athletic teams. It was an occasion attended by 700 people at which the speakers were nationally known baseball players and coaches. Team of the Year for 1962 trophies were awarded to the Lakeland Hawks football team and to the Post Falls basketball team.

Speakers were Vernon Law, Pittsburgh Pirates; Jerry Kramer, Green Bay Packers; Dee Andros, Vandal coach; Charlie Dressen and Maury Wills, Los Angeles Dodgers.

It strikes me that Duane Hagadone, publisher of the Coeur d'Alene Press, at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, who sponsored the event, deserves high commendation for his interest in sports and for his personal activities in honoring young athletes. He thereby encourages young people to engage in competitive sports, and, as one of the speakers said, to "keep faith with God."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from the Coeur d'Alene Press concerning the event:

[From the Coeur d'Alene Press, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, Jan. 23, 1963]

The Lakeland Hawks football team of 1962 and the Post Falls basketball team of 1962 were the grand winners of the first annual Team of the Year award at the Coeur d'Alene Press Sports Banquet last night. They will

share the beautiful press trophy for the next 12 months.

S. M. Wollan of the Post Falls Kiwanis club received the plaque and will share the trophy for the Post Falls team; Herb Nagel of the Lakeland Boosters received the plaque and will share the trophy for the next year.

Wollan and Nagel were presented the duplicate plaques by Duane Hagadone, publisher of the Coeur d'Alene Press.

The presentation of the special award was the final act of a program highlighted by professional talent that would do a major city in the United States proud.

Seven hundred sport fans, wives, and children packed the NIJC Auditorium and were thrilled to the many fine speeches by the talented personalities.

From the opening prayer by the Reverend D. M. Dorpat, the event of the sporting year took on an air of greatness that made Coeur d'Alene the sporting capital of the world for one night.

Dee Andros, football coach at the University of Idaho enlightened the fans with his talk on the future of football teams at Vandaltown. Dee reported that he lettered 11 spohomores, that 5 were first string boys and that things certainly look rosy for the future at Moscow.

Jerry Kramer, the great Sandpoint footballer who has thrilled millions of grid fans, made a big hit with his remarks about his experiences with the Green Bay Packers.

Kramer told the fans that despite the investigations of gambling in the pro football ranks, the game is clean and upright. He backed his former teammate at Idaho, Wayne Walker, now a rugged linebacker for the Detroit team, in his honest and righteous playing and in his conduct off the field.

Vernon Law, probably the most outstanding pitcher in the major leagues in the past 10 years, impressed all present with his remarks of loving Idaho. He said he regards this state as a grand place to be from, but more especially to come back to and to reside.

Base-stealing Maury Wills received a standing ovation from the fans before—and again after—his speech.

Wills, coming to Coeur d'Alene for this banquet after receiving the Hickok Award in Rochester, N.Y., Monday night, kept the audience enthralled. He said his great desire to be a major league player and his wonderful faith in God were the major factors in attaining what success he has had. It is considerable, as shown by major award after major award he has won this year.

Charlie Dressen, the featured speaker, had the fans in constant bursts of laughter with his many humorous stories of his 43 years in baseball.

Dressen hit the fact that youth of today must buckle down and think more of physical fitness. He brought out how automobiles are one of the physical downfalls of youth today. Having the desire to be a major leaguer and the ability to keep yourself in top physical shape are most important, Dressen said.

Dressen was introduced by Spencer Harris, general manager of the Spokane Indians. Harris remarked on the great attendance at the Indians' baseball games by the north Idaho fans.

Coeur d'Alene Press general news editor Harry Arnold, introduced representatives of the seven teams that were nominated for the top honor award. Each booster representative was presented with a special framed certificate of the team's nomination.

Cotton Barlow, Bob Johnson, and Jack Crollard were selected for special awards. Kramer and Law were made honorary members of the Hydromaniacs by "Maniac" President Tuffy Elford.

Wills was presented with a fishing license by the Sandpoint Bulldogs Bench. Wills also received his official officers cap and certificate, making him an honorary member of the nonexistant Coeur d'Alene Navy, with the title of "Captain of the Brig." Wills' award was presented by Quarterback Club President Otto Litzenberger.

Coaches of each north Idaho athletic team were introduced, taking bows for the fine job they are doing to further competitive spirit and physical fitness in the Panhandle area.

Besides the Panhandle area of Idaho, the Spokane Greater Sports Association, Spokane Athletic Round Table, Spokane Indians, Inland Empire Sportwriters, and Broadcasters and Kettle Falls, Wash., were represented.

Harry Lantry, Hayden Lake, longtime sports announcer and booster of athletics in north Idaho was presented with a special framed certificate for his many years of service to Idaho and his community.

Bruce Simon, president of the NIJC student body greeted the wonderful turnout of fans with an impressive welcome.

Bob Maker, Coeur d'Alene Press sports-editor, was master of ceremonies.

John C. Carters of Macon County Named Outstanding Alabama Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the Birmingham News and the Cooperative Extension Service of Auburn University began an extensive search for Alabama's outstanding family. Every county in the State nominated its outstanding family, and last fall four families were chosen as district winners. They came to Birmingham and I was privileged to have the opportunity to meet the families.

Last week the judges of the committee selected the John C. Carters, of Macon County, as the outstanding Alabama family. These fine people have fully demonstrated the meaning of the word "family." Their home is built on love and their relations with their neighbors characterized by the "Golden Rule."

I believe that all of the Members will be interested in the enclosed article which appeared in the February 3, 1963, edition of the Birmingham News.

The article follows:

SPECIAL HONORS BESTOWED ON OUTSTANDING STATE FAMILY

(By Tommy Hill)

TUSKEGEE.—A Macon County family that uses the Golden Rule as a yardstick for everyday living and family relationships has received special honors here.

Selected as Alabama's exemplary family from hundreds of families from all over the State, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Carter, Jr., and their five children were lauded here by friends, neighbors, city and county officials, and representatives of the sponsors.

The search for Alabama's typical family was launched several months ago by the Birmingham News and the Auburn Cooperative Extension Service.

FOUR SELECTED

Each county participating considered the many families in its area and nominated one to represent the county. Each of these was judged carefully and from these, four district winners were named and brought to Birmingham for special honors.

Then the judges pondered again and again, and selected the Carters to represent all the rest.

Vincent Townsend, vice president of the Birmingham News, was master of ceremonies at the presentation banquet held Saturday night at Lakeview Restaurant.

"We are here," said Townsend, "to pay tribute to that Alabama family which has most fully demonstrated the meaning of the word 'family.'"

Townsend in citing reasons the Carters were selected for the statewide honor, read a letter written by Mrs. Carter in which she said she felt their home was built on love "not only for each other, but also for God."

She said that each child in the family plays a part in family life and responsibilities, for "it takes all of us to make a family." Townsend quoted from the letter.

He introduced Dr. and Mrs. John C. Carter, of Montgomery, parents of Carter.

The invocation was delivered by the Rev. Richard Bond, pastor of Bradford's Chapel Methodist Church of Shorter.

The Alabama family program was discussed by Alyce Walker, associate editor for women, the Birmingham News, and Dr. Fred Robertson, director of the Auburn Extension Service.

Macon County Agent Jack Bolling described his relations with the Carter family.

A handsome, silver bowl was presented the Carters by John Bloomer, News managing editor, who praised the Carter family for its accomplishments.

Bloomer pointed out that the Carter family had loomed outstanding from the moment they were selected to represent Macon County in the statewide search.

"It came as no surprise to find they had been named Alabama's most exemplary family," he said.

"They have used the Golden Rule as a yardstick for daily living, for their relations with each other and their relationships with their friends and neighbors."

Sharing the limelight with their parents were the Carters' five children, Marjory, John Carter III, Mary Elizabeth, Eugene and Emmie, as well as the two young men the Carters had taken into their home and into their family, Billy Fondren and Ted Johnson.

The Carters live on a 3,000-acre plantation at Milstead, near Shorter, where they raise cotton and some beef cattle.

As another reward for winning the search for Alabama's exemplary family, the Carters will receive a trip to Washington.

The Late Honorable Dennis Chavez

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the late Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ served in the Congress more than 30 years, and the great loss which his beloved State of New Mexico has sustained is shared by us all. Senator CHAVEZ was a man of humble origin, and during his many years of public service he was a champion of the underprivileged and his a strong voice on behalf of human rights and the dig-

nity of man. He worked unceasingly to improve the living conditions of the people of New Mexico and his was a life devoted to the welfare of others. He contributed much toward the development of the natural resources of the western regions of our country. In later years, stricken with a grave and serious illness, Senator CHAVEZ displayed great personal courage and despite ebbing strength he continued to work for the causes in which he believed so deeply. His life was an inspiration to all Americans but particularly to those of Spanish and Mexican descent. A noble man—a strong defender and protector of our country has left us. He leaves behind a record of achievement equaled by few men. I have lost a good and respected friend, and to Mrs. Chavez, his daughters, and his son, I extend my deep and heartfelt sympathy on their very great loss which is shared by the Nation.

Soviet Seapower on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial appearing in the December 31, 1962, issue of the Daily Commercial News which deserves the attention of every Member of Congress who is interested in seapower and national defense. The two are inseparable, as the Soviets seem to know better than do some of our own officials.

SOVIET SEAPOWER ON THE MARCH

We have been told that this country does not need a major U.S.-flag merchant marine, and that it can depend upon the vessels of friendly powers, which, because of lower wages and other costs, can operate ships more cheaply. We have also been told that in certain and varied areas we are falling behind the Soviet Union. There is an interrelationship between these two statements, and an editorial in the Marine Digest of Seattle points it up.

According to the Digest, the Soviets are conducting a frantic drive in an effort to build one of the world's largest merchant marines. Russia is not only building ships within her own country but is placing contracts with foreign yards. The vessels involved include dry cargo ships, tankers, and other types, and she is expanding her ports in order to take care of her world trade. Marine Digest ends its comment with these words, "Soviet seapower is on the march." The deficiencies which still are apparent are rapidly being healed through the Soviet's ship building and ship buying programs. New vessels are being added at a rate of between one and a half to 2 million deadweight tons a year. They are willing to sacrifice large amounts of badly needed foreign exchange to the purchase of ships in free world markets. America is going to have to match them step by step or fall behind.

The Russians understand that in the world of the present a nation must depend upon its own resources. Here is a place where we can learn a lesson from the realistic, hard-eyed Communists. In the event of a major emergency the use of the ships of our allies could be lost to us overnight. The national security, in peace and in war, demands that we build and maintain a U.S.-flag merchant marine second to none.

Better Education Begins at the Local Level Not Through More Federal Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 31, reminds us that we can improve our educational facilities through local effort and the intiative of the people who are most concerned, rather than by further Federal spending and Federal dictation and Federal controls.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IN THE NAME OF QUALITY

In our village, and from all we hear in thousands of other communities, the quality of education has improved dramatically in recent years. Courses are tougher and more is demanded of the student.

This is in large measure a grassroots revolt against too many years of soft thinking and soft teaching. It has not been inspired by official Washington or brought about by Federal funds. Perhaps, as President Kennedy says, it is by no means enough; that much more must be done to increase the quality and availability of education at all levels. But the education message delivered to Congress this week raises the strongest doubts that it is showing the way to do it.

The recommendations, for one thing, rest on certain misconceptions and superficialities. The assumption throughout seems to be that a sprawl of new or expanded Federal programs can all but solve problems of ignorance, unskilled workers, and school dropouts; problems that lead to delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, and waste of human resources.

It would be fine if it were so simple, but we all know that the roots of these social ills go deeper than any lack of classrooms and teachers. The disturbing thing is that the message proposes far-reaching Federal remedies without any evidence of a serious analysis of the causes of the problems.

In the same way, the message glibly repeats the cliche that the crisis in higher education facilities is now at hand. It ominously declares that $23 billion worth of new facilities will be needed by 1970 to accommodate the college enrollment.

Such statements reflect superficiality with a vengeance. Many colleges have more space than students, and a good education is not a monopoly of the schools with the most glamorous reputations. Moreover, multiple applications by the same students are inflating the whole enrollment crisis. And the message overlooks a basic question in this regard, whether the Nation is trying to put too many youngsters through college, in many cases beyond either ability or desire.

The tendency to ignore fundamental questions also shows up in the emphasis on research. The Federal Government already dominates the Nation's research effort, and the signs of abuse, waste, and distortion are mounting. For it is by no means true that anything and everything in the name of research is worth doing. Yet the message, proposing much more aid in this area, seems to make that unthinking assumption.

In short, we will not improve quality by ill-conceived programs which in fact put the stress on quantity of classrooms and other facilities. What we will get, through this sort of legislation, is a new proliferation of Federal activity costing an estimated $5 billion over 5 years.

The President says his ambitious educational enterprise offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It isn't necessary to debate the abstract theory of Federal versus local control; it is enough to note that aid of such scope must entail control, just as it already does in research.

In fact, it would be irresponsible for the Government to spend so much without trying to determine how it is being spent. The only question then becomes to what ends the control would be exercised.

One of the practical virtues of our traditional system of community control of public schools, plus numerous private schools, is that local mistakes do not become national mistakes. They are also more easily corrected, as we have been witnessing in the hometown revolt against softness.

The Nation should not be eager to infringe a system which has done spectacularly well in the past and today is bringing radical improvements in quality. Certainly it should be skeptical of Federal programs that proclaim quality but map paths to a new conformity.

Resolution of Detroit Parks and Recreation Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution passed by the Detroit Parks and Recreation Commission at its meeting on January 9, 1963.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the National Park Service has recognized the natural beauty and recreational potential of the Sleeping Bear Dunes and the Pictured Rocks areas as worthy of national preservation; and

Whereas the tremendous growth in population during the past half century, the increase in leisure time, the expansion of the highway system, and the increased use of automobiles have created a great demand for more outdoor recreation facilities; and

Whereas Michigan, with its distinctive scenic and recreation attractions, ranks as the third most popular tourist State in the Nation; and

Whereas the Sleeping Bear Dunes and the Pictured Rocks areas are rich in features that are ideal for outdoor recreation, with their sand dunes, Great Lakes beaches, inland lakes, forests, and streams; and

Whereas the proposed seashores are two of the few remaining areas of national importance along the Great Lakes, and a considerable portion of both areas is already in public ownership: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Parks and Recreation Commission of the City of Detroit gives its support to the National Government to ac-

quire and develop the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Seashore and the proposed Pictured Rocks National Seashore as national park and recreation areas.

Urban Transit in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an article appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday, February 3, of considerable interest on the subject of America's urban transportation needs.

The article, entitled "How European Cities Are Tackling Traffic Jams," was written by Mr. James N. Sites, while serving on an Eisenhower exchange fellowship.

While the degree of car ownership and the patterns of urbanization in the United States pose us with different kinds of problems, I think it is nevertheless true, as Mr. Sites points out, that there is much this country can learn from the ways in which European cities are tackling their transportation problems.

In Europe the public officials and the people appear to regard transit service as the friend of the motorist, not the enemy. They seem to have recognized that we need both highways and transit if we are to cope with the burgeoning population rates in our metropolitan areas.

This is indeed a refreshing contrast to some of the "religious wars" that are going on in the United States today in the field of urban transportation.

One of the most important findings, I think, is the degree to which the governments of Europe have recognized the folly of trying to pile all the capital costs as well as the operating costs on the fare box—which merely tends to drive more and more riders away.

As Mr. Sites points out, transit fare structures are generally set to cover operating and equipments costs "but never any taxpayments and seldom the capital investment." Government units, he says, "generally put up the money for original construction and charge it off to general public services."

I should add here that this is precisely the concept embodied in the administration's urban mass transportation bill, S. 6, which I have sponsored together with 23 of my Senate colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask that this highly informative article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW EUROPEAN CITIES ARE TACKLING TRAFFIC JAMS

(By James N. Sites)

(NOTE.—Mr. Sites is assistant to the vice president of the Association of American Railroads. His study of rapid transport situations in cities abroad leading to conclusions in favor of more construction of rail transit facilities was made on an Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship and appears in the American Legion Magazine for February. It will appear also as a chapter in his book "Quest for Crisis: A World Ranging Search for Clues to the Transport Future." The heart of his argument is in this excerpt.)

One rainy afternoon last fall, I hailed a taxi in Paris near the Arc de Triomphe and gave directions to a hotel on the Rue de Richelieu. My destination was only 1½ miles away, yet it took nearly an hour as the driver and I sweated out traffic jams equal to any met on crosstown streets in Manhattan. The next day, feeling much older and a little wiser, I went underground, took a Metro subway train and covered the same distance, portal to portal, in about 10 minutes.

Similar situations were encountered in one city after another around the world during a yearlong study of oversea transportation problems. The study was made to learn what other nations are doing about their problems and to discover what both problems and solutions may mean to America. The result was some eye-opening lessons.

No one need prove that we have an urban traffic problem. Everyone who lives in a big city knows it only too well.

The fact is that a 20th century nightmare has been created by the addition of new millions to city populations. Census Bureau figures project an America of 230 million people by 1980, and the majority of these 50 million newcomers will cluster around existing urban areas. The result is a frustrating stagnation of street traffic that, despite billions spent for feverish roadbuilding, seems to be getting steadily worse. Our abundance of cars and highways is proving to be simply too much of a good thing. Providing circulation for our teeming supercities has already become such a chore that it is now almost easier to cross the continent than to cross town.

STUDY IN MAJOR CITIES

It was a desire to discover how Europe solves its traffic problems that sent me on an Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship through major cities dotting the world map from Ireland to India and into Russia. I rode subways, buses and streetcars, pushed rented foreign cars through fierce traffic jams, and talked with city planners, transport officials and private citizens.

There are many worthwhile things Americans can learn from others in coping with the urban transport problem. West Europe long ago found out the value of running whole trains of cars on tracks and thus moving enormous numbers of people safely and rapidly, regardless of the tricks of nature and motorists. In Paris and Moscow, most passenger movements, including even short-distance trips, are handled by underground lines. In London, which has the longest subway network of all, surface buses still handle more passengers; yet railroads move people over much longer distances and are taking over more of the load as the surge of private auto driving brings increased street congestion.

This underscores the guiding principle Europeans are following in meeting city transportation needs—balanced development of both highways and railways. Europeans generally start with their long-established intercity rail lines reaching to major downtown stations, which are developed to the fullest capacity for long-haul commuting to and from the suburbs. (It might be added that Europeans somehow don't seem to understand the U.S. system perfected in Los Angeles where rail transit was first driven out of existence by spreading slabs of concrete, only to be relaid later at exorbitantly increased costs when the need for rail service became unquestionably evident.)

Next, Europeans build a metropolitan railroad to handle major passenger movements within the city itself; this is labeled a Metro (Paris), Underground (London), Tunnelbana (Stockholm), or plain old subway (New York). Finally, roads for auto and bus services are developed to complement and extend these basic rail networks. In other words, automobiles, trains, and buses are paired up into a team pulling together in harness. In fact, Europeans consider the train a car's best friend—and the other motorcar a motorcar's worst enemy. Accordingly, construction of urban subways is considered the best way to relieve traffic congestion on city streets, and new or extended rail services are being built or planned in virtually every major foreign city from Oslo to Athens.

BREAKING BOTTLENECKS

Europe's cities are doing vast amounts of street work to break up road bottlenecks and expedite the flow of surface vehicles. Like America, they are putting in parking facilities, shifting to one-way street patterns, and installing modern traffic control signals. But unlike the United States, foreign cities are not being gouged open to make way for giant expressways and mammoth downtown parking lots. The realization has dawned abroad, as one expert put it, that autos and cities simply don't go well together, and that a city's center area has to have fast, high-capacity, mass-transit service in order to survive and prosper.

"America is our grim warning," states A. B. B. Valentine, chairman of London Transport, which operates both underground trains and surface buses as far out as 25 miles from Charing Cross. "In spite of the spending of vast sums on their highways, the attempt in American cities to rely mainly on private transport has manifestly failed. The only alternative to strangulation of our traffic by the excessive use of private cars is to expand the underground systems and suburban railways."

European cities have to contend with one unusual limiting factor that may paradoxically proved their salvation: their old city centers with churches, forts, palaces, guildhalls and marketplaces have an overriding historical and cultural significance. They are going to be preserved and will not be leveled for expressways. The resulting transport pattern is for highways to be built in concentric circles at varying distances from the city center. These cut across mass transit lines radiating out from the downtown area, which in turn, channel the flow of people that cars and buses gather together at the city's outskirts.

SYSTEM IN COPENHAGEN

Copenhagen officials neatly point up this approach. Rail lines radiate out from this gay port city like fingers of a hand. Faced with a constantly rising auto ownership, the city is planning two rings of circumferential highways, with parking facilities at the points where the roads cross the radial rail lines. It is planned not to charge the motorist who parks at outer ring lots and then shifts to a train. However, there will be a moderate charge at the inner ring lots; and if the motorist drives all the way into the city, he will pay stiff and perhaps prohibitive parking fees. All this is calculated to make the motorist leave his car at home—or, if he uses it, to leave it as far as possible outside the downtown area and turn to rapid transit.

The city of ancient Rome has all the problems of coping with a deluge of auto traffic coupled with the impossibility of widening streets and otherwise tearing up and improving the historic area around the Roman Forum and the Colosseum. There are projects galore for constructing downtown subways, including one from the main railroad station to St. Peter's, plus three rings of ex-

pressways at distances of roughly 2½, 7, and 10 miles from the city center. Another plan would provide for building an elongated north-south expressway to the east of Rome, which would steer city expansion and the press of population along this route and away from the historic center.

MODERN IN STOCKHOLM

Stockholm, with its T-Bana, has one of the most modern subway systems in Europe. Indeed, Sweden might well qualify as the land of the happy commuter. With an auto ownership (one car to five people) which comes closest to United States' levels of any country in Europe, the Swedes have managed to combine the best features of both road and rail service. The first sections of Stockholm's subway system were opened in 1950, and expansion is still going on. Today, a half million passenger rides are recorded daily along its 25 miles of lines in smooth-running cars, through gleamingly modernistic, escalator-equipped stations.

Stockholm is of further interest since it, like Copenhagen, has a population of slightly over 1 million people. European city planners use this key number as a rule-of-thumb in justifying a subway. In other words, if a city has that many people, or anticipates having that number in the future, it should lose no further time in building an underground rail system.

Accordingly, the growing city of Oslo, which already has about 600,000 people in its metropolitan area, has embarked on a $100 million subway building program. Like most cities, Oslo's population expansion is taking place not downtown but in the suburbs; so that the outlook indicates more people will be riding longer distances by rail.

About 30 of America's cities have populations of 500,000 and over, and hence fall into Europe's rule-of-thumb subway category. One of the major differences, however, is that except for a handful of cities, most U.S. urban areas have been built on a horizontal rather than a vertical pattern. That is, instead of having concentrations of apartment buildings, our average medium-size city has a central commercial area surrounded by sprawling suburbs of individual homes. Yet the experts say that mass transit operates well only where volume is present in concentrated quantities. European officials, when asked if their urban transportation approach would be different under conditions existing in the United States: (1) More people living in scattered individual homes rather than in apartments, and (2) a greater popular ownership of automobiles generally answered that in the larger cities the same emphasis would still go into mass transit to serve downtwon areas, but that greater stress would be placed on the problem of collecting traffic volume for rail flows—by means of circumferential roads, parking lots at suburban rail stations and bus operations on the city fringes.

MATTER OF COMFORT

What about the all-important matter of personal convenience and comfort in commuting when in Europe? Again, a city's size seems the key factor. Peak hours bring fierce crowding in big cities like London, Paris or Rome. In fact, the urban transport problem really boils down to a problem of handling the peak-hour loads from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. and from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Transit officials, in effect, have a huge, expensive factory on their hands which is used only about 4 hours a day, and almost not at all on weekends.

Londoners, with 10 million people in their metropolitan area, have given up hope for comfort at peak hours. Then street traffic jams are unbearable—as is the crush on the underground.

London Transport has taken all possible steps to increase capacity of present subway lines—lengthening the average train from 8 to 10 cars and loading the maximum number of trains on track. And now proposed is construction of the 11½-mile-long Victoria Line subway which would connect with every existing underground route and many surface railroad stations, and redistribute much of the load in downtown London. Yet the problem of handling this peak passenger load remains. As one official cogently commented: "I don't believe London or any other city has enough wealth to provide enough capacity to meet peak demands. Demand itself must be attacked. The peak hour movements must be spread out by staggering work hours. And since exhortation doesn't seem to achieve this, perhaps the final answer is simply to let overcrowding build up such back pressures that people will stop traveling at peak hours or else move their offices out to the suburbs."

THE PROBLEM IN MOSCOW

The traffic problem is far less pronounced in Moscow and Iron Curtain capitals, the reason apparently being the low level of auto ownership. For instance, while there is 1 car to every 3 Americans, there is only 1 for 330 Russians, forcing Muscovites to use the 50-mile-long Moscow Metro not just for traveling to and from work but also throughout the day. Communist officials in Moscow related that only 35 percent of their total daily travel volume of 3 million riders is handled in the 4 peak hours. This compares with 80 to 90 percent in Western cities.

It costs 5 kopecks (about 5½ cents) to ride anywhere in Moscow on the Metro. The Communists expect surface traffic of taxis, buses, and trucks to increase considerably in coming years and therefore are anxious to have the people continue to use rail transit instead of cars—if and when available. The Communists are even thinking of allowing free travel on the Metro, official thinking being that it will be cheaper to the overall community to provide free subway fares than to attempt to build enough highways and parking lots to accommodate Western-style street traffic.

Much of this same viewpoint exists in Western Europe. Holland has been conducting studies and holding meetings among top transportation leaders to consider paying the full bill for constructing highways to handle auto traffic in cities like Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The unpublicized conclusion was that such a program would not only bankrupt the Nation, but might even increase street congestion by inducing people to buy and use still more autos. Further development of rail transit is therefore being pushed to the hilt. And the radical step of barring all private automobiles from downtown streets may eventually be taken.

A city's subway system in Europe is expected to have a fare structure which will cover its operating and equipment costs but never any tax payments and seldom the capital investment for building tunnels and laying track. Government units generally put up the money for original construction and charge it off to general public services. If fares were raised high enough to cover both transit operating and original construction costs, Europeans fear they would probably be so high that customers would not be attracted out of their own cars. The major problem is that motorists add up and compare commuting costs in terms of gas money and parking fees and ignore car purchase and repair bills. No transit operator can do this, however; so fares must cover all his expenses.

THEY EXPRESSED HORROR

Many transport authorities overseas have visited the United States and closely studied America's problems in order to acquire ideas on what to do with their own ballooning automobile traffic.

These informed officials expressed outright horror at the way Americans build expressways into cities with apparently little thought of coordinating these fine auto roads with existing surface and underground railroads. And where rail services exist in American cities, Europeans are incredulous that public officials want these facilities to pay their way all the way, and in addition, contribute tax revenues to general Government purposes (some of which sometimes include the creation of competitive facilities). Railroads and subways on the continent do not pay taxes because they are publicly owned, in the first place, and because they usually run at vast deficits, in the second.

As seen from abroad, one of the major U.S. problems (perhaps the major one) is that governments here have set up elaborate systems for obtaining a massive flood of money from highway users to be spent for highway purposes, while no system exists for acquiring money for rail transit. Thus, if cities are to develop rail transit, they are faced with the need to levy special taxes, float special bond issues or dip into general government revenues which are already over obligated for myraid other purposes. One of President Kennedy's current proposals for urban transportation legislation attempts to right this lopsided road-rail situation by providing funds for transit development from the Federay Treasury. The big cities themselves, meanwhile, have done all too little at the local level to meet this challenge, and much of what they were doing has now ground to a near-halt as everyone waits to see if Washington (meaning the U.S. taxpayer) will put up the dough.

FOR PRIVATE OPERATION

Despite their background of public transport ownership, Europeans don't hesitate to go to bat for private operation of mass transit. In fact, they insist that municipalities seldom give private companies an honest chance. An official of the International Union of Public Transport in Brussels, the association representing the world's big urban transit systems, told this reporter: "You can't expect private businesses to sustain operating losses indefinitely and also bleed them white by taxation."

So the first step that virtually all experts everywhere agree should be taken here is to wipe out all taxation on mass transit facilities. The tax savings would give operators a better chance to tailor fares to build up passenger volume and to buy attractive new equipment and services.

Let's Stop Exalting Punks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, "it is not what a man does that seems to count today—it's what he can get away with" is the theme of a disturbing but observing article in the January issue of the Reader's Digest. Indicating that traditional values of honesty, hard work, and sacrifice have been largely replaced by acceptance of dishonesty, inferior work, and weakness, the article calls for new

heroes who will search for the best in man.

Good pay for inferior work and a "you're no better than I am" attitude of equality are principal factors in the destruction of merit as a standard of human conduct and performance.

The policy of the Federal Government in paying everybody, everywhere, all the time, for anything, anyplace has not exactly exalted human virtue, I might add.

The Digest article follows:

LET'S STOP EXALTING PUNKS

(By Marya Mannes, novelist, critic, and TV personality)

The hottest broadway musical this past year has been "How To Succeed in Business Without Really Trying." For a time its major contender was "I Can Get It for You Wholesale." The "heroes" of both shows are men who ride over others to get what they want. The young man characterized in the first hit is funny and appealing; the young man heading the second hit is brash and ruthless. But both are egocentrics; both are amoral, unethical, and blissfully numb to the prickings of conscience.

The elevation of such heroes to stardom, not only in musicals but in the majority of plays, novels, and movies of the last 15 years, is coincidental only in that it coincides with a breakdown in public morality following World War II, a cynical acceptance of dishonesty as the natural state of man. After the legends of heroism came the truth as many saw it: the stripping of illusions from the public eye; proof of the futility of sacrifice, honor, nobility, and all those qualities which made one man better than another. Enter then the hero-punk, firmly committed to the comforting democratic principle that no man is better than his fellows.

The "punk" is not a new phenomenon; every age has seen the ascension to power of those unfit for it. What concerns us here and now is that, in our day, he is not only accepted and excused but celebrated. His life is deemed important, his opinions carry weight, his example is followed. Under the banner of ambition, self-interest and opportunism, this shabby image of man marches on, inflated by the bellows of press-agentry.

Look here, if you will, rather than toward broken homes, poor housing and poverty, for the making of delinquents. Look here for the source of corruption, whether it be questionable business deals amounting to millions or false deductions on a tax return. A society reflects what it admires; a week's admiration for men like astronauts Glenn, Carpenter and Schirra hardly makes up for 51 weeks of admiration for men without honor.

Of these the smart operator, the big fixer, is foremost in the news—after he has been found guilty of crimes ranging from fraud to theft on a giant scale. Until the moment of exposure he not only has prospered but has been courted, envied and admired by men who did not question the sources of his power. In any major scandal like the Billie Sol Estes brew are the names of law-abiding citizens who should have known better. But our society finds it convenient to tolerate the pursuit of the extra buck; everybody does it, so why shouldn't I? And if "it" walks the wavering line between the questionable and the illegal, who's to know?

Then, of course, we come to the politician. Where money and publicity are corrupters in other areas, votes are the corrupters here. Most Americans have been brought up to believe that politics and politicians are dirty, blithely ignoring the fact that it is we who elect them. It cannot be denied that it is possible for the punk to attain prestige and power in Congress and in the State capital because the line between honest compromise and connivance, between accommodation and betrayal, is often too fine for easy detection. That the smart politician may be dishonest matters less than that he is charming, homey, and a holder of high office. After all, was not a Boston mayor elected time and again in spite of conviction for offenses which sent him to prison?

Now let us focus on the leader of a big labor union, as he addresses its thousands of members. You know him well: companion of gangsters, crony of strong-arm men, he has amassed power that touches the Nation's security.[1] He has achieved this power through a combination of acumen, ruthlessness, and the acquiescence of underlings as greedy as he. In recent decades labor leaders have fought for their workers' just rights and rewards. Now the rewards are often channeled into luxuries for the unscrupulous few, and into fees for lawyers retained to keep them out of jail. Power devoid of responsibility is the kindgdom of our labor boss: the punk.

Beauty devoid of responsibility might be a way of describing a familiar kind of female punk: the Hollywood star who makes marriage a game of musical chairs (or beds) and love a five-star final. Yet, however severely the public may cluck over her tempestuous sexual engagements, however many columnists may deplore their greedy rotation, the press treats them as front-page news. A whole generation of high school girls is tempted to envy this volatile goddess, and a whole generation of high school boys and their fathers is invited to yearn for her.

And what of the great pop singer? He never took singing lessons or learned to read music. But after canny press-agentry he is worth thousands of dollars a night. Reports that he has neglected his family, become a woman chaser and engaged in highly dubious business deals in no way impede his progress By no standards of any kind was he ever an artist, yet he has become a power in the entertainment world and a household name in 50 million homes.

And here we come back to where we started: the audience or, if you will, society. Since these punks cannot succeed without public acceptance, our acceptance must be explored. Why is it possible for small talents to be great stars? For cheats to hold public office? For crooks to lead labor? Why have we so lowered our expectations of human behavior?

Some say that religion no longer plays a vital role in setting standards, that we may pay it lipservice but no heed. Some say that parents no longer pass on to their children a clear code of ethics. Some blame the school for not providing what the home neglects, and here I think a legitimate question can be raised concerning one particular aspect of education: the standards of craftsmanship. If the young were taught the basic requirements of a good job, they would be more critical of the singer without a voice, the star without talent. Untutored teenage consumers bear a large share of responsibility in elevating the punk. It is their money that buys the records of the bad singer, their ecstatic squeals that sustain him, their tastes that too many of the mass media cater to.

The makers of movies know that the restless, rebellious young will identify with the punk-hero; the makers of television crime shows know that the hero who solves all problems by smashing his fist into another man's jawbone will win their approval. Money, violence, success—these stir young hearts empty of values and impatient with virtues. How can honesty be the best policy when the cheat gets by?

Prosperity is the punk's climate: a condition of general welfare where most citizens can earn good pay, even for inferior work, and receive the benefits of civilization without merit or serious effort. Combine this prosperity with a blurred concept of equality, and "I can be as good as you are" becomes "You're no better than I am." This viewpoint is a great comfort, for it condones the weaknesses and dishonesties to which man is heir and makes any effort to transcend them unnecessary.

Surely the punks have had their day. It is time now for heroes, for restoring man to his potential stature. Emerson wrote, "The search after the great man is the dream of youth and the most serious occupation of manhood." Only when people know the best in men will they learn to reject the least in men.

[1] See "These Labor Abuses Must Be Curbed," the Reader's Digest, December 1962.

Cuban Freedom Fighter Gives His Version of Bay of Pigs Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, because it seems impossible to get the truth from the administration concerning our policy in Cuba, the Bay of Pigs incident, and the present Soviet military buildup in this hemisphere, it is necessary for Members of Congress to gather all available information in order to piece the true story together. For this purpose, I include, as a part of these remarks, the following broadcast interview on the Manion Forum with Enrique Llaca, Jr., one of the freedom fighters recently released:

WHO IS BETRAYING THE EFFORTS TO FREE CUBA FROM COMMUNISM

DEAN MANION. In U.S. News & World Report of January 14, a Cuban veteran of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion said this:

"We were promised the support of the Armed Forces of the United States. Over you will be air cover, we were told, and back of you the Navy and land forces of the United States * * * you cannot fail. We did not fail. We were betrayed." (U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 14, p. 46.)

This explains why a larger number of the ransomed Bay of Pigs prisoners refused to show up when President Kennedy addressed the group in Miami last December. One of the ransomed prisoners who was not present for the President's speech is Enrique Llaca, Jr., who is here with me now at this microphone.

Mr. Llaca was a young lawyer practicing in Havana when Castro came to power in 1959. He was never deceived by the bearded bandit and denounced him openly and at once in the Havana newspaper, Diario De La Marina. Llaca called Castro a Communist agent who planned to subvert Cuba and subject it to a Communist dictatorship.

Because he was telling the truth, Llaca was arrested by Castro and he went into exile in July of 1959. In February 1961, he entered a training camp where the April invasion was being prepared and served as supply officer on the SS *Houston* which was sunk at the Bay of Pigs by Communist aircraft.

Now, Mr. Llaca, please tell us in your own words, just what happened at the Bay of Pigs?

Mr. LLACA. Two armies fought at the Bay of Pigs. The Communist army had an arsenal of the most modern weapons produced by the Soviet Union. The Democratic army had a meager supply of obsolete weapons, of World War II and Korean war vintage. While the Communist artillery had a range of 9 miles, our artillery reached only 3½ miles. While Communist aviation had jet fighters, the aviation that was going to defend freedom was made up of a few old B-26 bombers without even the tail gunner—sitting ducks for the Communist jet fighters.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union gave its full support to its Caribbean tyrant in the Assembly of the United Nations, while the Western World turned its back on the patriots who were fighting for freedom at the Bay of Pigs, as though our cause was unjust or illegal.

DEAN MANION. How did the Communist troops and your own troops behave in this battle?

Mr. LLACA. During the first hours of combat the Communists, believing that we were the vanguard of a powerful army, gave a poor account of themselves. More than 500 militiamen surrendered to companies of Battalion 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. As everyone knows, our battalions consisted only of 160 soldiers.

As the military action progressed, Castro's troops began to find out that we had only a small, ill-equipped force without air cover. This assured them of victory and gave them a new outlook that made them regain their lost confidence. Having recovered their valor, they attacked us in an uninterrupted avalanche.

Our troops, in spite of our precarious situation, resisted courageously the onslaught, even when we knew from the start that we did not have an alternate plan for retreat nor the possibilty of a Dunkirk.

From the morning of the 18th, defeat could be predicted. Communications had failed. The ships that carried our equipment were forced to retreat, or had been sunk by the Communist aviation. Our ammunition was rapidly running out.

In spite of this situation our troops did not lose their morale. On Wednesday the 19th, our supplies completely gone, and our men completely exhausted, we were forced to retreat.

By this time our 5 tanks—though handicapped by numerous defects such as turrets that did not rotate—put out of action more than 15 enemy tanks and our men had written a page of valor and patriotism for history.

Once on our own, we were forced to retreat to the swamps of Zapata. Many days of hunger, thirst and desperation followed while we traveled through mud and dirty stagnant water.

Our wounded fell unattended because we lacked medicines and medical assistance. Some of our men had found boats and took to the sea, only to find their death because of the lack of drinking water and food, aggravated by exposure to the tropical sun.

Those of us that took to the swamps had to eat roots and the fruit of trees that only the wild hogs consume.

Finally, we were captured and were on the road to a long cruel period of imprisonment, where we learned what the real meaning of Communist inhumanity stood for.

Dean MANION. Mr. Llaca, how do you feel about this fiasco? I am sure that those of us who were comfortably seated in our homes while you fought at the Bay of Pigs for those principles of freedom that are so dear to all of us would like to know your feelings.

Mr. LLACA. This fiasco, which cost the lives of more than 100 young Cubans and caused untold misery and suffering, is one of the most deplorable military actions in the history of the free world.

We landed in Cuba on April 17, 1961, full of hope. Two days later, on the 19th, only death and desolation remained. We felt bewildered. We suddenly realized, with preoccupation and sorrow, how the Soviet Union, thousands of miles away, had backed Castro to the hilt. We, who were fighting only 90 miles from our most powerful ally—the leader of the democratic world—were abandoned to our grim fate.

Today, 20 months after the invasion that has caused so much suffering, we stand for the same democratic ideals for which we fought. Let me hasten to make clear that we harbor no resentment against the United States. Your great country and ours are bound together by old and strong ties of affection and common destiny. However, we ask ourselves: Is the United States willing to back the ideals it professes, and for which it fought Spain, two World Wars, and Korea?

Is the United States going to aid and abet, by its vacillation and timidity, the ultimate victory of communism?

While the Soviet Union, at the snap of a finger, mobilizes all its resources to back tyranny and oppression, Will the United States turn its back to those who fight for God, freedom, and law?

Dean MANION. What is your solution to the Cuban problem?

Mr. LLACA. In our opinion, it is up to the Cubans to solve their own problems. This will avert the threat of a nuclear holocaust to the entire world, which could only happen if one of the two great powers should directly intervene in an armed conflict to liberate Cuba.

We are firmly convinced that the Cubans, who are ready and willing to fight communism, can defeat Castro. There are more than 30,000 young Cubans in exile anxious to make the supreme sacrifice for our country. All we need is that the United States and the Western Powers, realizing what is at stake in Cuba, supply the necessary armaments, equipment, and facilities.

We are striving to show our allies, in particular the Government of the United States, that we have the necessary capacity to assume full responsibility for this struggle and that the free world should have enough confidence in us to provide the modern armaments needed.

If the Soviet Union can trust the Cuban Communists enough to give them first-class military equipment, the free world must likewise have confidence in us and provide their best weapons.

Today's world is like a big glass mansion housing a Red elephant—the Soviet Union—and a White elephant—the United States. A little Red ant—Fidel Castro—has crept into this glass mansion and is stinging the White elephant. If the White elephant attempts to destroy the little Red ant, the Red elephant will move to defend her. This might cause the complete destruction of the glass mansion. What, then, is the solution? Simple. A little White ant must creep in to fight and destroy the little Red ant.

Dean MANION. Mr. Llaca, Would you like to send a message to the American people through the Manion forum?

Mr. LLACA. Yes, Dean Manion, and we would like to thank you for the opportunity which you are affording us to do so. Our message to the American people is not only a message of friendship, but also a warning of the grave peril that is threatening the free world.

For more than 40 years, the forces of barbarism have advanced from the East. Up to now the West has been unable to find the adequate means to stop and defeat them. It is essential for our victory and the survival of Western civilization that a policy be quickly found and urgently implemented. The liberation of Cuba would be the first step in the right direction.

By defeating communism in our country we will demonstrate that the Communist contention that their victory is inevitable, is a complete falsehood—nothing but propaganda. We are convinced that the forces of God, on whose side we fight, will inevitably defeat the barbaric forces of evil. For this decisive battle we count on the full backing of our sister republics, especially the United States which has traditionally been the bulwark of freedom, democracy, and human rights.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Enrique Llaca, for the courage you have shown in fighting communism and for the heroic attempt you made to free your country at the Bay of Pigs.

Americans who love liberty and who understand the lethal nature of the deadly Red weapon that has now been built upon our doorstep in your country will hear your account of the Bay of Pigs battle with an overpowering sense of shame. I hope and pray that this sensation will be followed by a nationwide spirit of resolution and determination to help you and your oppressed countrymen to restore freedom and national independence to Cuba.

My friends, last October when President Kennedy announced that this country was prepared, singlehanded if necessary, to drive the Communist menace from Cuba, he stirred an immediate favorable response from the people of the United States and unanimous support from the governments of Latin America. Since that moment of courage and resolution we have drifted back to a Cuban policy of vacillation and appeasement.

Last January 13 (Chicago Tribune), Senator KEATING, of New York, produced figures showing that Khrushchev is constantly increasing his arms shipments to Cuba and that Castro is stronger militarily now than ever before. How does our Government justify its merciless pursuit of the anti-Communist leader in Katanga which is 10,000 miles away, while it pacifies and protects this aggressive Red Communist Castro arsenal on our own threshold?

What possible explanation of this insane and contradictory policy can we make to people like Enrique Llaca, who have faced up to this horrible menace to civilization with the courage that is demanded of all God-fearing, freedom-loving men who understand the diabolical nature of this enemy?

When will our Government officially declare that communism is intolerable and that all of our policies henceforth will be predicated upon that primary self-evident truth? That official declaration will follow your firm personal resolution to bring it about. Start now by sending Enrique Llaca's statement to your Congressman. Ask him to put this broadcast into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

President's Faulty Economic Policies Undermining Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if any proof is needed that the faulty economic policies of the Kennedy administration are not helping our economic health and growth, the current annual reports of the steel companies should provide it.

The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of February 4, details the disastrous results of the President's widely heralded attack on the steel companies last year.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MEANING OF STEEL PROFIT DECLINE—KENNEDY MOVES TO RESCIND PRICE RISE DEPLORED AS SLOWING INDUSTRY GROWTH

A significant piece of news in the last few days casts doubt on the soundness of an administration economic theory, which is that, if the Government stimulates spending and thus increases the volume of sales, profits will rise.

Three of the biggest steel companies have just issued their annual reports. These show that, for the year 1962, although sales went up, profits went down. They show also the total effect of President Kennedy's error in judgment when last April he ordered governmental agencies to use all their powers to coerce the big steel companies into abandoning a proposed price increase of three-tenths of a cent a pound.

The United States Steel Corp.'s report for 1962 has just come out. The company's sales went up by $163 million, but profits went down $6 million. A few days later, the annual reports of the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. were published. They revealed the same thing, larger sales but smaller profits. All three companies continued their reduced dividend payments. How long will investors be inclined to supply funds for new equipment if the outlook for dividends is discouraging?

Also, even after taking into account the new tax rules permitting larger depreciation reserves, the United States Steel Corp.'s net profits for 1962 were $6 million behind net profits for 1961.

Yet this narrow margin of profit comes when the total volume is up more than one million tons. In 1953 and again in 1955, the United States Steel Corp. had an output of 25 million tons of steel, but this volume steadily went down until it reached 18 million last year.

There have been few changes in steel prices in recent years, while expenses, largely wage costs, have steadily gone up faster than the employers could absorb them.

Even though the gross national product has risen, steel has faced a steadily decreasing volume of sales in the last few years. This is because previous high sales were due primarily to wartime conditions or to the catching up by buyers in connection with periods of recession or strikes or threats of strikes.

Growth must be at a normal rate to make a steady increase in profits from a larger volume of sales. Wages cannot go up out of proportion to the rate of profit increase and yet maintain a healthy condition. That's really the fundamental trouble with the American economy today, and the administration has not faced up to the facts. Thus, labor exercises a virtual monopoly throughout the industry and the Government sits by and allows the wage factor to be thrust into the business mechanism arbitrarily and without guidance or restraint.

Price is the crucial factor in modern industry. Nowhere has it been more conclusively demonstrated that misguided labor policies have dealt a severe blow to national progress than in steel This industry does a volume of $15 billion a year, and the fabricators and related manufacturing businesses do another $15 billion in sales. So it is well worth while for the Government to take a good look at what its one-sided handling of the steel controversy last April has done to a major industry.

At least 100,000 steelworkers are today jobless. This means a lost payroll of $500 million a year. Tax cuts will not help these unemployed persons, nor will "consumer spending" help increase profits unless wage costs are overcome either through new machinery or increased prices.

If the prices proposed for steel had gone into effect in April, they would never have been uniform anyway. They would have been selective so as to enable the companies to compete with foreign producers while, at the same time, moving up their own rates on certain products that Europeans cannot make competitively.

In this very complex system of price-making, the administration intervened and slowed down a $30 billion industry. Yet Mr. Kennedy said on TV last December that, if he had it to do all over again, he would proceed exactly the same way he did before.

Perhaps last week's steel figures will be helpful in persuading the administration that the time has come to do something about the disruptive effects of high wage demands. For the present steel contract is coming up soon for possible reopening by labor. The union leaders on the national level are said to be hesitant to ask for wage increases now, but rumblings are heard among the local leaders who have political ambitions inside the unions. The administration could do a constructive job of education at these levels and give the steel industry a chance to recover before it is faced with more wage increases.

Part 7: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro (October 30–31–November 20, 1962)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 7 of my continued chronology of Cuba and Castro deals with the period when negotiations were underway between Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations and Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, concerning United Nations supervision of the dismantling and removal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba.

We should keep in mind that in an interchange of messages between Soviet Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy the United Nations was suggested as the proper agency to verify that the missiles were being removed and shipped back to the U.S.S.R. On October 28, 1962—detailed in part 6 of my chronology—Khrushchev announced in a message to the President that this was to be done under U.N. supervision, and was congratulated for his "statesmanlike decision" in a return message from the President, in which he pledged that the U.S. would not invade Cuba. This was followed by a five-point statement by Fidel Castro setting forth his conditions on whether the present crisis would or would not be resolved.

About this time the public began to be a little uneasy because of a growing feeling that we perhaps were making too many concessions to Cuba and the U.S.S.R.

It seemed reasonable and right that inspection and verification be made of the missiles removed from Cuba, since our country was making our willingness to negotiate the issue clear to the U.S.S.R., Cuba, and the world. But U Thant, although assuring us that his talks with Castro had been "fruitful," and assuring us that proper arrangements had been made for dismantling the missiles and shipping them back to the Soviet Union, could not assure us that their talks had borne the fruit we expected

One bright spot in the picture appeared to be signs of a quarrel shaping up between the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese over the yielding of Khrushchev to what they term "U.S. imperialists attempt to browbeat the people of the world into retreat at the expense of Cuba." Even this had its drawbacks, however, because we knew if Red China's support of Cuba was substituted for the Soviets, our dealings with Red China would call for much more strength of purpose on our part since they were not members of the United Nations and we had no diplomatic relations with them. And while the American people's strength of purpose could not be doubted—the memory was still strong of the frustrations experienced in the Korean war in which we fought an enemy backed by the Red Chinese, in a war which it appeared could not actually be won by anyone.

We were offered the alternative of the International Red Cross assuming the task of inspecting Cuba-bound ships to determine whether or not they carried offensive weapons, in lieu of our continuation of the task which we assumed by our quarantine." However, they failed to accept the task in the end and the problem was laid back in our laps.

The "fishing port" construction plan of the Soviet and Cuban Governments, which had created such consternation and anger in the Congress previous to the "quarantine" appeared to be moving ahead, although our State Department tried to reassure us that "appropriate measures" would be taken if such facilities represented a "military threat" to the United States or to the hemisphere. But these words had a familiar ring and we could not be sure what "appropriate measures" would mean.

When President Kennedy formally lifted the quarantine on November 20, 1962, after extracting a promise from the Soviets that the IL–28 bombers—also a bone of contention—would be removed from Cuba in 30 days—and uneasy peace seemed at last to shroud the entire Cuba-United States-Soviet Union issue.

And although the public seemed to need and want a little reassurance from time to time, the general feeling appeared to be that they felt they must, and could, trust their leadership. But those who felt differently were forced to merely try and preserve a calm attitude because, after all, they really had no place to go.

Part 7 follows:

PART 7: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT—A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO

October 30–31, 1962: Secretary General U Thant (accompanied by 18 U.N. officials) in Havana for talks with Premier Fidel Castro with regard to U.N. supervision and verification of the dismantling and removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. On his return to New York on October 31, U Thant says that he has been "reliably informed" that Soviet missiles in Cuba are being dismantled and that this operation will be completed by November 2. He also says that he has been informed that arrangements for shipping the missiles back to the Soviet Union are "in hand." He describes his talks with Castro as "fruitful."

October 31, 1962: White House announces that the arms blockade and air surveillance of Cuba (suspended during U Thant's visit) will be resumed on November 1, because of "the absence of effective United Nations arrangements." It is announced in Moscow that Premier Khrushchev is sending First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan on an urgent mission to Cuba.

Communist Chinese newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao (People's Daily) publishes an editorial which indirectly accuses Soviet Premier Khrushchev of yielding to the "U.S. imperialist attempt to browbeat the people of the world into retreat at the expense of Cuba." "There is no doubt that * * * this latest struggle of the Cuban people against U.S. imperialist aggression will have the firm support of the entire Socialist camp. China's 650 million people have stood consistently and firmly at the side of the Cuban people. We are fully convinced that the Cuban people, under their great leader Premier Castro, will * * * smash all U.S. imperialist acts of aggression and intervention."

November 1, 1962: Communist Chinese Note to Cuba (made public in Peking) gives "unreserved support" to Cuba's "just demands" which include U.S. evacuation of Guantanamo. The note assures the Cuban people that China will stand by them and "fight against our common enemy, U.S. imperialism, to the very end."

Premier Fidel Castro (in a radio-television broadcast to the Cuban people) categorically rejects any international inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. He also turns down a Soviet proposal (transmitted to him by U.N. Secretary General U Thant) that the International Red Cross Committee be entrusted with the task of inspection. Before Mr. Thant made his trip to Havana the Soviet Union had suggested that the Red Cross organization be used for the inspection. Castro says that "we respect the Soviet decision to withdraw their strategic weapons," and that Cuba is not trying to hinder their withdrawal. He declares: "If we have any misunderstanding with the Soviets they must be discussed only among the principals and not before the world. We trust the principles of the Soviet Union. Between the Soviet Union and Cuba there will never be a breach."

November 2, 1962: President Kennedy (in a broadcast report to the Nation on the Cuban crisis) says that aerial reconnaissance shows that "the Soviet missile bases in Cuba are being dismantled, their missiles and related equipment are being crated and the fixed installations at these sites are being destroyed." He declares that the United States will "follow closely the completion of this work through a variety of means, including aerial surveillance, until such time as an equally satisfactory international means of verification is affected." He says that the quarantine will remain in effect until "adequate procedures can be developed for international inspection of Cuba-bound cargoes," and adds that the International Committee of the Red Cross would be an "appropriate agent" for this task. He asserts that "progress is now being made toward the restoration of peace in the Caribbean."

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan arrives in Havana for talks with Premier Castro.

November 4, 1962: Meeting in New York between John J. McCloy, chairman of the U.S. coordinating committee on Cuba, and Vasily V. Kuznetsov, special Soviet representative for the U.S.-Soviet-U.N. talks on Cuba. "The United States was reported * * * to have protested that the Soviet Union had failed to remove jet bombers from Cuba. Reliable sources said that John J. McCloy * * * made the protest to Vasily V. Kuznetsov on November 4 * * *. These sources said that recent U.S. reconnaissance photographs showed no reduction in the number of bombers—most of them still in packing cases—at an air base near Havana. The planes are IL-28's, which are capable of carrying nuclear bombs.

"Soviet Ilyushin-28 medium bombers * * * are still being unpacked and assembled in Cuba [the U.S.] Government has learned. By instruction of * * * President [Kennedy], Mr. Kuznetsov was warned [by McCloy], it was learned, that the Cuban crisis could revert to its most acute stage if the Russians turn over the bombers to Premier Fidel Castro.

November 5, 1962: Official Communist Chinese newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao publishes an editorial rejecting any "appeasement" toward the United States in the Cuban crisis and offering "full support" for Cuba's rejection of U.N. supervision over withdrawal of Soviet missile bases from Cuba.

The International Red Cross Committee declares [in Geneva] that it has been informed through the U.N. of Premier Castro's agreement to its representatives inspecting Cuba-bound ships to determine whether they carry offensive weapons.

November 6, 1962: U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson confers (in New York) with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov. After the meeting, Stevenson says: "The missiles are moving out and the talks are moving on."

November 7, 1962: Soviet Premier Khrushchev announces (at a reception in the Kremlin on the 45th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution) that the Soviet Union has taken its rockets out of Cuba and that they are "probably" on their way back to the Soviet Union. He asserts that there was a total of 40 Soviet rockets in Cuba.

Subsequently the U.S. Defense Department announces: "The Soviet Union has reported ships are leaving Cuba with missiles aboard. Arrangements are being made with Soviet representatives for contact with these ships by U.S. naval vessels and for counting the missiles being shipped out." (The United States and the Soviet Union also reach agreement that inbound Soviet vessels headed toward Cuba will be inspected by the International Red Cross Committee.)

November 8, 1962: U.S. Defense Department announces that aerial reconnaissance shows that "all known" offensive missile bases in Cuba have been dismantled; "significant items of equipment" have been moved from the missile sites to port areas; "a substantial number of missile transporters have been loaded on to the main decks of certain Soviet cargo vessels * * * and several of these vessels have already departed Cuban ports." The statement also says: "Within the next 24 hours (the United States expects to obtain additional confirmation through the close alongside observation of Soviet vessels by U.S. naval vessels. It is understood Soviet vessels will cooperate in this. "The Cuban Government has informed other members of the United Nations that the bombers sent to Cuba by the Soviet Union are Cuban property and will not be returned."

November 9, 1962: U.S. Defense Department reports that U.S. Navy vessels have intercepted five Soviet cargo ships outward bound from Cuba. Three of the ships were carrying missiles back to Russia. No Americans boarded the Soviet ships which were inspected by U.S. destroyers which pulled alongside and helicopters which flew overhead.

Venezuela (at a special session of the OAS Council in Washington) presents documentary evidence (which is not made public) linking the Castro regime with recent sabotage and subversion by Venezuelan Communists.

November 10, 1962: Havana Communist daily Hoy reports that Soviet economic aid to Cuba has amounted to $912 million since the first Soviet-Cuban trade agreement was signed in February 1960. Soviet aid is reported by Hoy to have been distributed as follows: New industrial plants, machinery and equipment, $192 million; food, $130 million; raw materials, $416 million; trucks and transportation, $131 million. In addition, some 3,000 Cubans (according to Hoy) have been or are being trained in the Soviet Union. "Informed sources (in Washington) said that in addition to the economic aid, Russia and her satellites have delivered at least $1 billion in military hardware to the Caribbean island, excluding the strategic missiles that are now being shipped back to the Soviet Union."

November 11, 1962: U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric, announces that the United States has counted 42 medium-range missiles being removed from Cuba on Soviet ships. He declares that the United States cannot be certain "that 42 was the maximum number that the Soviets brought to Cuba. With regard to the IL-28 bombers which the Soviet Union sent to Cuba, Gilpatric says: "We hold the Soviet responsible for the types of military equipment which it has funished to Castro and as of the present time, we regard the removal of those bombers as within the capacity of the Soviets to bring about." He also says: "We regard aerial surveillance as a part of our inherent self-defense, a means of protecting our country as we would through any form of intelligence collection. The extent to which we will need to rely on continued air surveillance over Cuba will depend again on what the nature of the threat is that remains in Cuba after the Soviets have completed, if they do complete, the undertakings made by Premier Khrushchev to President Kennedy."

November 12, 1962: International Chamber of Shipping (consisting of independent shipping associations in 18 maritime nations outside the Communist bloc) rejects, at a meeting in London, a U.S.-sponsored proposal recommending that member shipping associations should withdraw voluntarily from trade with Cuba.

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan (in a speech at Havana University) declares that the Soviet Government supports Premier Castro's five demands which he describes as "a program for peace in the Caribbean." He adds: "The Soviet Government will always be behind Premier Castro and the Cuban people."

November 13, 1962: Soviet Union and Cuba submit to U.N. Secretary General U Thant a joint proposal to settle the Cuban crisis. Although the nature of the proposal was not disclosed, usually reliable sources said that it would give neutralist ambassadors stationed in Havana a vaguely defined observer function.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (an all-Swiss body) issues a statement (in Geneva) specifying that only in a case that it considered a major threat to world

peace and to the survival of humanity would it consider providing inspectors for ships bound for Cuba. For the moment there is no question of the Red Cross moving into action and appointing inspectors.

November 14, 1962: U.S. State Department announces that air reconnaissance photographs show that the Soviet Union is constructing naval facilities at the fishing port of Banes, in northeastern Cuba. The State Department warns that appropriate measures will be taken if such facilities might represent a military threat to the United States or to the hemisphere.

November 15, 1962: West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer (after talks with President Kennedy) declares to newsmen in Washington: "If you hear only of peaceful coexistence over and over again, then you gradually get used to believing that such a state exists with the other side. But in the future, when I hear peaceful coexistence mentioned again, I will think of Cuba."

Premier Fidel Castro (in a letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant) warns that Cuba will shoot down any U.S. planes flying reconnaissance missions over Cuba.

November 16, 1962: United States declares it will continue its reconnaissance flights over Cuba and will take "appropriate measures" to protect its planes.

November 17, 1962: Three pro-Castro Cubans are arrested in New York on charges of planning sabotage. Two members of the Cuban delegation to the U.N. are also implicated in the conspiracy, and their recall is demanded by the U.S. Government.

November 18, 1962: Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda publishes an article defending Premier Khrushchev's policy in the Cuban crisis against the unlimited slander of critics within the Communist bloc (mainly the Communist Chinese). The article says: "They have undertaken an especially shameful and generally provocative campaign in connection with the crisis in the Caribbean. Once they talked hypocritically about peaceful coexistence, giving it an anti-Leninist content. Now they openly pursue a course of undermining peaceful coexistence and pushing mankind toward thermonuclear war."

The official Communist Chinese paper, People's Daily of Peiping, attacks as pure nonsense the claim that the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba has saved the peace.

November 19, 1962: Premier Fidel Castro sends a message to U.N. Secretary General U Thant declaring that Cuba will not object if the Soviet Union removes the IL-28 jet bombers from Cuba (which Castro had previously claimed as Cuban property). Castro describes the bombers as "antiquated equipment in relation to modern means of antiaircraft defense."

November 20, 1962: President Kennedy announces (in a televised press conference) that he has ordered the lifting of the naval blockade of Cuba after being informed (earlier the same day) by Soviet Premier Khrushchev that all of the Il-28 bombers now in Cuba will be withdrawn in 30 days. Kennedy reports that progress has been made in fulfillment of his agreement with Premier Khrushchev on the withdrawal of Soviet missiles and other offensive weapons from Cuba. "Nevertheless," he says, "important parts of the understanding of October 27 and 28 remain to be carried out. The Cuban Government has not yet permitted the United Nations to verify whether all offensive weapons have been removed and no lasting safeguards have yet been established against the future introduction of offensive weapons back into Cuba. Consequently * * * the United States has no choice but to pursue its own means of checking on military activities in Cuba."

The importance of our continued vigilance is underlined by our identification in recent days of a number of Soviet ground combat units in Cuba. Although we are informed that these and other Soviet units were associated with the protection of offensive weapons systems and will also be withdrawn in due course, I repeat we would like nothing better than adequate international arrangement for the task of inspection and verification in Cuba."

Kennedy says that if these measures are carried out "and if Cuba is not used for the export of aggressive Communist purposes, there will be peace in the Caribbean." He adds: "We will not, of course, abandon the political, economic and other efforts of this hemisphere to halt subversion from Cuba, nor our purpose and hope that the Cuban people shall some day be truly free. But these policies are very different from any intent to launch a military invasion of the island." He expresses the hope that "the achievement of a peaceful solution of the Cuban crisis might well open the door to the solution of other outstanding problems."

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

New Frontiers for the Old West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on December 13, 1962, the National Association of Counties held a grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev. This meeting brought together officials representing county units of government throughout the western region to discuss improved programs and policies for use of our natural resources.

The concluding banquet address at the conference was delivered by the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. He offered a proposed revolution for western counties. Through forward-looking proposals, Secretary Freeman suggested methods by which we could renew and revitalize development of rural areas. I ask consent that a portion of the text of Secretary Freeman's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY HON. ORVILLE FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

I want to challenge you to help rural America.

In the past 2 years we have made sound progress in bringing rural areas development from a vague concept to a specific and detailed program which can bring new economic opportunity to rural America. We have both recognized and taken vigorous action to meet the problem of underdeveloped areas in our own country. And I say underdeveloped advisedly, for there are many areas in our own country which lag far behind the rest of the Nation. These areas desperately need economic and technical assistance.

Now this administration has begun to develop ways to get our own underdeveloped areas moving ahead, as well as those in other nations. The actions we have taken should have been taken long ago.

Some of it has been administrative action which could have been taken any time the will to act was there. Other steps involve legislative action which could and should have been requested years ago.

The single most significant advance in rural areas development came with the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1962.

It provides authority to initiate rural renewal projects, a tool which can be most effective in helping rural areas in the most serious economic trouble. We can provide technical assistance and loans to local public agencies designated by the Governor or the State legislature to develop comprehensive, far-reaching programs in rural areas which are similar in purpose and scope to the more familiar urban renewal projects.

It places the agricultural conservation program on a permanent basis, marking the turning point in land use legislation. It makes many farmers eligible for additional help under long-term agreements with USDA to change cropping systems and land use and to develop soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resources. Much of the land coming out of the conservation reserve will be eligible for the new land use adjustment program. The act authorizes USDA to share with local public bodies up to half the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way for small watershed projects to be dedicated to public recreation.

Earlier this week we announced the first pilot program to develop the most effective techniques for converting land on which crops are now grown to other uses—grazing, timber, recreation and others. This is in line with our philosophy that the land resources of rural America should be used and not lay idle.

It gives new authority for FHA loans for outdoor recreational enterprises at a time when the Department was getting thousands of inquiries about such enterprises. The large number of requests for information about the opportunities for family farms and groups of farmers under this program reflect a high degree of interest—and it encourages us greatly.

The Congress also took other actions this year which will benefit the rural development program. It appropriated increased funds for credit through FHA and REA, and it also increased funds for research on new uses and new processes for farm commodities.

Through the Manpower Development and Training Act, persons living in rural areas can obtain assistance in learning new skills which can open doors to new opportunities for employment either in their home community or other areas.

The urgent task is to inform the people. The recent series of land and people conferences which some of you may have attended was an important first step but more needs to be done. We need to take vigorous action to awaken local interest in rural areas development, to help rural residents organize local programs, and then help them draw on the technical competence and rural credit facilities of the Department of Agriculture. The measure of our success will be determined by the response of people in the local community.

Too many people do not yet know of the going programs—people who stand to benefit most from supervised farm credit, from low-cost loans for rural homes, and from pooling their resources in cooperatives or community development corporations.

There are examples of rural growth today where local initiative, combined with financial and technical assistance from the Department, has produced new jobs and new opportunities.

Sanders County, Mont., is such an example. For years, many farmers there had been hard presed to make a living from dairying, hay, and grain. The soil conservation district supervisors wondered why woodlots on these farms couldn't be managed to increase farm income.

They asked the forest ranger to make a survey. He found that the area's timber if properly managed could keep a small mill in business.

Today, Sanders County has a mill employing about 75 people, and providing supplemental income for about 200 farmers. It is operating because local leadership provided the catalyst that combined local resources with those available from the Government. The Small Business Administration supplied some of the funds to build the mill. The local electric cooperative loaned money to the plant to buy needed electrical equipment.

The new accelerated public works program already is putting additional resources into Sanders County. On Lolo and Kaniksu National Forests, new projects have been started to construct roads and trails and improve timber stands. More than 3,000 man-days of work will result from these public works projects. And these national forests will become even greater assets to the county. I'm told that the national forests last year returned nearly $100,000 to the county's treasury—money which supports schools and roads.

To illustrate the importance of credit to development of a county, I cite Roosevelt County, N. Mex.

In 1940, only 56 percent of the county's farmers owned their farms. By 1960, the number of owners had increased to 71 percent of all farmers.

Loans from the Department's Farmers Home Administration were a major factor in this rise. FHA has loaned $1,750,000 to 150 county families to become farmowners. FHA has also advanced $2,500,000 to farmers in the county for operating expenses. It has aided nearly 100 rural families to build new homes and farm service buildings.

You county officials, who struggle day in and day out with local financial problems, know what this new capital has meant to the people of Roosevelt County.

And the effect goes far beyond the county. It is like a pebble dropped in a still pond. It provides additional markets that help to buoy the urban economy. This is extremely important, for we are an interdependent people—rural, suburban, and urban. Revitalization of the countryside will be speeded by a strong and vigorously growing urban economy with the means to buy the goods and services, including outdoor recreation, produced in rural areas.

A second task that we see developing is the great need for technical and financial assistance to help local groups of citizens organize and begin drawing plans for overall economic development. This work is presently being carried out through the Extension Service and the technical action panels, but we already find ourselves being swamped in some areas.

It would be of great assistance if local government bodies could provide financial and technical aid to supplement the work now being done by the technical action panels. These men are not specifically trained for development planning, and they also have normal workloads to carry in addition to these new assignments.

A third area of concern relates to the development of new industries in rural communities. Many of those people who have experience in this area recognize that the community that waits for a new industry to be located from outside the community will usually wait a long time. The hope for real progress is best realized by emphasizing the growth potential from within the local community itself.

Individually, these people cannot meet the requirements for financing, management, promotion, and other essential skills. But by pooling their funds and skills, and through assistance from State and Federal agencies, the needs of establishing modern industry can be met. Perhaps cooperative arrangements can be very useful in this regard, but we need to explore ways of creating a more effective technique for developing industrial opportunity in rural communities.

The solution to this problem will also help solve a universal problem in rural areas—that of finding job opportunities for the young people as they leave high school.

A fourth area where your advice will be most helpful relates to the creation of a domestic peace corps—a project which currently is being discussed among several departments and agencies of the Government.

We have assigned one man to a special group being formed by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to study and evaluate the proposed development of a corps of men and women who would serve in rural and urban areas of this country where social and economic conditions required immediate and massive attention.

How could a domestic peace corps contribute most effectively to correcting some of the very serious problems we know exist in rural areas? Can the drive and enthusiasm which is found in the Peace Corps abroad overcome the apathy and frustration in poverty areas where rural renewal projects are needed? Could these corpsmen help the low income white, Negro, and Indian families value the economic barriers which tie them to a life of poverty? Can they provide educational opportunities which now are lacking for many young people in rural America? Can they provide the personal and individual attention needed to help the illiterate, the physically and mentally handicapped?

I believe a domestic peace corps can be a healthy and dynamic influence in the rural areas development program, and I would welcome your ideas and thoughts on the subject.

Finally, it is clear that the scientific and technological changes in agriculture have come so swiftly—and are still at work at an unbelievable speed—that most people could no more accurately describe rural America today than they could the surface of Venus. It is at once the most outstanding example of productive success in the history of man and yet harbors more poverty than all the metropolitan centers put together. It is one of the basic elements in our ability to lead the free world and yet young people leave it for want of adequate opportunity. It is sometimes described as the last bastion of freedom and yet some organizations advocate using economic pressure to drive people out of it.

It is clear, both from cold statistics and the observable events of the past decade, that the core of the problem in rural America has two parts—low income caused by chronic overproduction, the inability of the market to absorb at a fair price what our farms can easily produce and a social problem caused by farms too small to support a family, and by the failure to develop adequate income opportunities through putting the resources of rural America to nonfarm uses.

Emphasis on improving farm prices and income is essential but it is not the full answer, nor will a concentration on developing nonfarm uses of rural resources be enough to enable the Americans who live in rural areas to enjoy a standard of living equal to that of their urban cousin.

Supply management, applied as a tool and not as a doctrine, is a flexible instrument to increase production of commodities in short supply and to balance production with demand when stocks become too great. It furthers at the same time the welfare of both the producer and the consumer. It provides for national security and our commitments to friendly nations abroad by maintaining adequate reserves for war, natural disaster and the food-for-peace program. It maintains fair prices for the consumer and fair income for the farmer.

I believe we can reach a fair level of living for the rural American if we are willing to accept new ideas and explore new ways. Tangible progress has been made in that direction. We have new tools, and many people have shown their willingness to use them. We know the resources are in rural America waiting to be put to new uses. We are at a critical time when action counts.

And I am optimistic that rural America will make the most of its new opportunities.

Part 8: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Cuba and and Castro (November 21–December 15, 1962)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 8 is now offered as a continuation of my chronology on Cuba and Castro.

The "mopping-up" operations which normally take place after a battle is over now became the order of the day after the coldest of cold wars was over. First the American quarantine was lifted, the Soviets returned the courtesy by ending their combat readiness status, our ships, reservists, Navy, Marine Corps, and Strategic Air Command returned home or ceased their operations in and around Cuban waters. Even the Cuban Government was reported to have begun demobilizing its militia units which had been called to arms the day after our quarantine was declared.

Then the glow of our uneasy peace began slowly to fade as a Cuban Government newspaper renewed the controversy by an offer to swap U.N. verification of Soviet missiles removal from Cuba for U.N. supervision of dismantling of alleged anti-Castro camps on U.S. soil which supposedly were "training camps of mercenaries, spies, saboteurs, and terrorists."

Mikoyan, the Soviet's No. 1 trouble shooter, left Cuba, returned to New York, and journeyed to the White House for what was termed an "inconclusive conference on Cuba and other cold-war issues" with President Kennedy.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk did little to relieve the renewed tension when he broadcast a warning that Americans must not draw too many conclusions about a relaxation of world tensions. Stating that easing of the Cuban crisis "gives us all some confidence for the future," he nevertheless pointed out that "there were special circumstances in Cuba which are not necessarily present in other parts of the world." And the American public swallowed this bitter medicine reluctantly, but with resignation, because it knew Secretary Rusk spoke the truth.

We soon found controversy was going to remain our way of life when the Stevenson-Alsop-Bartlett issue was suddenly dropped in our laps. Publication in the December 8 Saturday Evening Post of a joint Alsop-Bartlett article alleging that Adlai Stevenson—whose public image had improved immensely during the U.N. discussion and debate of the Cuban-Soviet missiles buildup—had advocated a soft policy toward Moscow in National Security Council discussions created a new issue. The combined indignant denials of Stevenson, his supporters, and a carefully worded letter of confidence written by President Kennedy to Stevenson were not able to put to rest a rumor that President Kennedy himself had engineered the whole thing. Later public utterances of both Stevenson and the President not only did not clear up the muddy waters, but in the opinion of many, added a shade more mud.

And it remained for Soviet Premier Khrushchev—in his own fight for an improved public image in the U.S.S.R.—to place the whole Cuban affair in clear and cold perspective by a few well-chosen words. Pointing out that although the so-called Marxist-Leninists — Chinese Communists—called imperialism a paper tiger—that paper tiger has nuclear teeth—and therefore should not be treated lightly. Then he outlined some undeniable, but to us indigestible, truths, which it would pay us to memorize in order not to forget them:

> In what way have we retreated? Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba. The threat of thermonuclear war has been averted. Is this a retreat?

Then, staying in character, Khrushchev continued pressing for a guarantee of noninvasion of Cuba by the United States. Ignoring completely the fact that his own guarantees to the United States regarding verification of the missiles removal were worthless, he admonished us to take care lest the Soviet confidence in the word of the United States was destroyed.

And the Red Chinese added the final note of hypocrisy in virtuously declaring that they really had no part in the whole thing because they neither introduced nuclear weapons into Cuba, nor obstructed their removal. In their denial of the charge of "adventurism" or of attempts at plunging the whole world into a thermonuclear war, however, we concede that they to a certain extent spoke the truth because their actions smacked of the typical troublemaker who says, "I'll hold your coats, and let's you and him fight."

Part 8 follows:

PART 8—A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO

November 21, 1962: Soviet Union ends the combat-readiness alert of its armed forces which was imposed at the beginning of the

Cuban crisis. Most of the U.S. ships participating in the blockade of Cuba return to their ports. The U.S. Defense Department orders the release from active duty of 14,200 Air Force reservists called to active duty during the Cuban crisis, cancels involuntary duty extensions of Navy and Marine Corps personnel, and ends the special alert of the Strategic Air Command.

November 24, 1962: Castro Government begins demobilization of militia units called to arms on October 22.

November 26, 1962: Cuban Government newspaper Revolucion reports that Cuba will permit UN investigators to verify the removial of Soviet missiles from Cuba if the United States will agree to U.N. supervision of the dismantling of "training camps of mercenaries, spies, saboteurs and terrorists" allegedly set up as anti-Castro bases on U.S. soil.

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan leaves Cuba and returns to New York.

November 28, 1962: The Cuban situation was discussed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on a television program tonight. He warned that although negotiations here and in Washington had eased the Cuban crisis, Americans must not draw too many conclusions about a relaxation of world tensions.

"We were deeply gratified to see the immediate unification of the [Western] hemisphere with unanimity on the nature of this threat and the necessity that it be removed," Mr. Rusk said in reference to the Soviet introduction of missiles and other offensive weapons into Cuba and their subsequent withdrawal. "Had there been disunity and had we fallen to quarreling among ourselves, I think the results might have been quite different."

He said of the easing of the Cuban crisis: "I think it gives us all some confidence for the future."

However, he added: "I don't want to mislead you on that because we have cautioned our friends from drawing too many conclusions from the Cuban experience. The Soviet Union remains a great power. There were special circumstances in Cuba which are not necessarily present in other parts of the world."

November 29, 1962: President Kennedy and Anastas I. Mikoyan, a Soviet First Deputy Premier, met for 3 hours and 15 minutes today in an apparently inconclusive conference on Cuba and some other cold-war issues.

Both the White House and Mr. Mikoyan announced after the meeting that an agreement had been reached to continue at the United Nations the United States-Soviet negotiations on the Cuban situation.

November 30, 1962: A luncheon conference in Washington between Anastas I. Mikoyan and Secretary of State Rusk covered a wide range of issues. There was no sign of any change in Soviet and United States positions.

December 1, 1962: Anastas I. Mikoyan left Washington for Moscow, affirming the goodwill of the United States and pledging that the same "will be evinced by us." The Soviet leader expressed optimism on a settlement on Cuba and future Soviet-United States relations, but American officials were more reserved.

December 2, 1962: Secretary General Thant voiced hope that the "spirit of compromise" in United States-Soviet negotiations on Cuba would be extended to other outstanding problems. The United Nations leader cited Berlin as an issue on which compromise might be imperative and added that the West did not seem to grasp the full significance of "an obvious change" in the Soviet political mood.

December 3, 1962: Washington announced yesterday that Soviet jet bombers were being shipped out of Cuba in line with Premier Khrushchev's pledge to President Kennedy. The Pentagon said patrol planes had spotted the Russian freighter *Okhotsk* sailing from Cuba with at least three dismantled Ilyushin-28's on deck, while other jets were being crated at a Cuban airbase.

December 5, 1962: President Kennedy sought yesterday to end speculation that Adlai E. Stevenson would be replaced as U.S. representative to the United Nations. In a letter to Mr. Stevenson, the President expressed his "fullest confidence" in him and voiced deep regret over a controversial magazine article implying that Mr. Stevenson had advocated a "soft" line toward Moscow in the Cuban crisis. Mr. Stevenson termed the article "wrong in literally every detail."

December 5, 1962: The economic plight of Cuba was reflected in a Government decree nationalizing most shops dealing in clothing, shoes, and hardware. The move was regarded as a first step toward rationing. Many of the stores were painted with the word "nationalized"—and a hammer and sickle.

December 6, 1962:

U.S. Navy planes have verified that 42 Soviet jet bombers are being transported home from Cuba aboard 3 ships. Coincident with this Pentagon announcement yesterday was a report from anti-Castro sources in Havana that Soviet troops were apparently bolstering Cuba's defenses. The report, dated November 29, said that many Soviet troop units were building underground fortifications and airfields throughout the island.

December 7, 1962:

U.S. analysts expressed doubts today that Cuban negotiators would be able to obtain sufficient Soviet-bloc aid to overcome Cuba's worsening economic difficulties.

This view was held despite the contention by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, head of the 16-man economic mission that flew to Moscow Wednesday, that in 1963 Cuban-Soviet trade would exceed this year's total.

U.S. specialists believe the Soviet bloc may lack both the capacity and the desire to raise again at this time the flow of aid and of subsidized trade that has been reaching Cuba in recent years.

December 8, 1962:

Nine thousand marines quit Caribbean.

A Marine brigade of about 9,000 men is on its way back to California after service in the Caribbean area during the Cuban crisis, the corps announced Friday.

This was the first official disclosure of the size of the Marine force sent to the Caribbean and to the Guantanamo Naval Base in late October, when the United States was building up its military power to cope with a missile threat from Cuba.

December 9, 1962:

Adlai E. Stevenson sought to draw the final curtain yesterday on the Adlai affair.

"There has been too much talk, I think, already, and much of it wholly uninformed," said the United Nations Ambassador of the furor created by a Saturday Evening Post article last week suggesting that Stevenson favored a softer policy on Cuba than President Kennedy adopted.

"The important thing," Stevenson said yesterday, "is that the Soviet Union has removed the nuclear weapons and the bombers from Cuba without us firing a shot or seriously risking world war and without cost to the United States.

"I think that President Kennedy's firmness and prudence have been richly rewarded, and I am proud to have had a part in the formulation of his policy and in its execution."

Stevenson continued: "The important thing, it seems to me now, is to conclude this transaction with the Soviet Union and to move on to further negotiations with them about the many other problems and conflicts that embarrass our relations and the security of the world."

He said the United Nations throughout the Cuban affair, "performed in the classic manner in which it was intended to perform."

"It provided a forum for the parties to expose their grievances. It afforded a means of marshaling world opinion. And it provided an opportunity to the United Nations, to the Secretary General, to offer mediation and conciliation."

December 10, 1962:

The United States is about ready to close the book on the Cuban crisis and open the way for possible talks with the Soviet Union on other world issues, Secretary of State Dean Rusk made clear yesterday.

The one remaining obstacle, Rusk indicated at his first press conference in 5 months, is the continuing presence in Cuba of Soviet military forces. The Secretary recalled President Kennedy's statement that the Soviets had promised that at least some of these forces would be withdrawn. Rusk added:

"Certainly we in this hemisphere could not accept as a normal situation any Soviet military presence in Cuba."

Rusk said there are several thousand troops still in Cuba, adding that "the numbers are significant but not large. Their role there is something that is of great concern to us and something we will follow very carefully."

Rusk called the failure of the Soviet Union to provide in Cuba the verification of missile removal which Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev had promised the President "a very serious deficiency." But he made it evident the United States was not going to push any further on this. The United States intends to continue aerial reconnaissance over Cuba and is prepared to shoot back if any of its planes are shot at, it was learned elsewhere.

December 11, 1962:

Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev today rebuked Communist China for its criticism of Russian handling of the Cuban crisis in the most direct Russian comment so far on the ideological rift between the two countries.

In a 2-hour and 48-minute televised address to the final session fo the Supreme Soviet (Parliament), Khrushchev said the "so-called Marxist-Leninists" who criticized his Cuba policies were trying to get the United States and Russia at each other's throats and provoke a world war.

He said those who call imperialism a "paper tiger" should remember that "the paper tiger has nuclear teeth."

It may still use them and should not be treated lightly. Therefore, in relations with imperialist countries, compromises are possible.

He said that if Russia listened to "ultra-revolutionary shouters" during the Cuban crisis the world would have been plunged into a thermonuclear war.

The Soviet leader said the time had come for ending the crisis through negotiations.

"In what way have we retreated?" he asked. "Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba. The threat of thermonuclear war has been averted. Is this a retreat?"

Khrushchev pledged himself to fulfill Soviet commitments in the Cuba settlement "so long as the other side stands by this understanding." Then he added:

"But if the commitments assumed are not observed by the other side, we shall be compelled to take such action as may be required by the situation."

Referring to Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's five demands (which include U.S. evacua-

tion of its Guantanamo Naval Base on Cuba), Khrushchev called them "just demands in keeping with the elementary rights of every soverign state."

Khrushchev noted that Russia had withdrawn its rockets and bombers from Cuba.

Now, he said, it was time for President Kennedy to guarantee noninvasion of the island.

Should U.S. pledges be broken, he said, it would have a far-reaching effect in destroying Soviet confidence in the word of the United States.

He said the main result of recent Soviet foreign policy was that an attack on Cuba "prepared by aggressive militarist circles of the United States was averted."

World public opinion warmly greeted "the victory of the policy of commonsense."

He said Russian rockets were sent to Cuba only so that the United States could see "the real danger of thermonuclear war.

"We were sure that this would bring them to their senses," he said.

Khrushchev ridiculed contentions that Russia had chosen Cuba as a jump-off site for war against the United States and said this was "malicious fabrication."

"Had we wanted to start war against the United States we would not have agreed to dismantle the rockets installed in Cuba which were ready for launching for action. We would have brought them into play. We did not do that because we had no such aims," he said.

December 12, 1962:

President Kennedy indicated yesterday that there has been too much speculation about Adlai Stevenson's role in the Cuban crisis and pointedly declared that the matter should be left to historians.

At the same time, the President stressed that positions taken in the Cuban crisis frequently changed during the discussions as the National Security Council examined alternatives and the possible repercussions.

But, he added in a discussion of the matter at his press conference, the final judgment was always made by him as President.

December 13, 1962:

Under Secretary of State George W. Ball said today the world may be entering a period of "profound political change" in which both the hazards and possibilities of peace would be increased.

Ball said recent events in Cuba and other trends suggest that we may be passing from a period of rigidity in world politics into an era of great mobility and maneuver.

Ball said President Kennedy's quarantine of Cuba to be only the first move in a complicated strategy. But Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's decision to remove his missiles made the rest of the strategy unnecessary, Ball said.

December 13, 1962:

American firmness and flexibility in handling the Cuban crisis have transformed the spirit of the Western Alliance, members of the NATO Ministerial Council acknowledged to one another today.

German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder aptly summed up the feelings of many others when he said that Cuba had shown that the United States was prepared to run the necessary risks to safeguard mutual interests.

As a result of the Cuban experience, Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the 15-nation NATO Council, there is a sense of anticipation among the Allies that the opportunity for new initiatives may be opening up.

Nevertheless, he said, it would be dangerous to think that the Cuban developments have made the situation in Berlin any more favorable. The Russians still reject any notion of continued Western presence in Berlin.

Actually the Cuban crisis is not yet over, Rusk pointed out. The United States is reasonably confident that all Soviet missiles and IL-20 bombers have left Cuba, but cannot be entirely sure.

A non-American source said Rusk told the Council that 10,000 to 12,000 Soviet troops remain in Cuba in four distinct combat units. These are not instructors or a military assistance group but definite military units, the source said.

In addition, Rusk asserted, Russian surface-to-air missiles are still in Cuba, despite Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's indications that all would be removed.

Although the United States has no desire to invade Cuba, Rusk reiterated, it cannot be in the position of giving assurance above its treaty commitments in the Western Hemisphere or of sanctioning interference by the Castro government with neighboring countries.

December 15, 1962:

North Atlantic Alliance countries today wound up their 3-day fall ministerial meeting with a tribute to the American stand on Cuba and a concession to appeals for strengthening conventional military forces.

Soviet action in secretly stationing nuclear missiles in Cuba had brought the world to the verge of war, the final communique said, but the peril was averted by the firmness and restrain of the United States, supported by the alliance and other free nations.

December 15, 1962:

Red China, asserting unshakable belief in its brand of communism, issued a manifesto today accusing the Soviet bloc of attempting to split the Communist world.

And while chiding Moscow over its role in the Cuban episode, the 6,500-word Peking policy statement proposed a meeting of all the world's Communist parties to attempt to heal the Chinese-Soviet rupture.

The Chinese stand was published in the Peiping People's Daily, official organ of the Chinese Communist Party.

In backing down on Cuba, the Soviet Union was "scared out its wits" in the face of nuclear strength, Peiping said.

"We neither requested the introduction of nuclear weapons into Cuba, nor obstructed the withdrawal of 'offensive weapons' from that country," the People's Daily said. "For us, therefore, there is no question whatsoever of 'adventurism,' still less of 'plunging the whole world into a thermonuclear war.'"

The Merger Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the greatest threats to our free enterprise system is the tremendous merger movement which has affected practically every industry in the Nation.

The early development of this merger movement first came to my attention at the end of World War II. At that time I was a Member of the House of Representatives and served on the House Small Business Committee.

Those of us who worked to plug the gaping loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act through passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950, hoped that this legislation would hold the merger movement in check. Although the antitrust agencies have been given more effective statutes, the merger movement nonetheless has continued to gather force.

The sharp upward trend in the merger movement has been highlighted in a staff report recently issued under the direction of the able Congressman and my good friend, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. That report, entitled "Mergers and Superconcentration," reviews the merger movement in recent years since the passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act, and is required reading for anyone concerned with the monopoly problem.

The Washington World of December 7, 1962, published a debate between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and Dr. Chares T. Stewart, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] contending that big mergers are snuffing out American small businessmen and Dr. Stewart taking the opposite position. Dr. Stewart is the director of economic research of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I have carefully studied the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN'S] report on "Mergers and Superconcentration." This document is mentioned in the Washington World article, along with a report entitled "Concentration Ratios in Manuafacturing Industry, 1958," recently issued by the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I am chairman.

Dr. Stewart's argument to the contrary notwithstanding, it is my opinion that these two documents are full of objective evidence of the dangers to small business posed by the merger movement. In any event, I am surprised to see the representative of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce taking the position that recent increases in concentration represent merely a shake-out of small business and a return to normal. Moreover, I am amazed that such a representative would take the cavalier position that many small firms which remain must make the invidious choice of merge or fill.

Dr. Stewart has no factual basis for intimating that mergers are motivated by technological factors. The fact is that most mergers are motivated by power and profit, and small business is the victim.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Washington World previously referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SMALL BUSINESSMEN: ARE BIG MERGERS SNUFFING THEM OUT?

(NOTE.—Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, is chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, which recently released a study of business acquisitions of the Nation's 500 largest industrial firms and 50 largest merchandising companies. A Member of the House since 1928, he is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and vice chairman of the Joint Defense Production Committee.)

YES

(By Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas)

America is at the crossroads. It must face up to the alternative paths lying ahead. Will it follow the road to monopoly and ever-increasing concentration of economic power? Or will it take the other alternative—the hard and rocky road to a restoration of competitive free enterprise, with the preser-

vation of the American ideals of opportunities for small, locally oriented companies to enter business and thrive and grow?

The Congress has repeatedly paid allegiance to a competitive enterprise system. Such allegiance has been expressed in the passage of our various key antitrust statutes—the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Celler-Kefauver Act.

Both the Senate and the House have Small Business Committees, and small business has a voice in the executive branch in the Small Business Administration.

Yet despite these noble efforts designed to preserve opportunity for small, local enterprise, big business has grown apace. Loopholes have appeared in our antitrust laws, and big business has fashioned new techniques of controlling markets and enhancing its power.

Mergers feed growth

It is most appropriate that this report be titled "Mergers and Superconcentration," for all appearances suggest that we are moving into a new phase of industrial and financial domination and control of American industry. Merger movements have fed this cancerous growth. The United States is rapidly becoming a nation of clerks and hired hands. Opportunities for independent small businesses are eroding.

More than a decade has elapsed since the Celler-Kefauver Act was enacted with the purpose of forestalling increasing concentration resulting from mergers and acquisitions.

By interesting coincidence, on the very day (June 25, 1962) that the Supreme Court handed down its first opinion (*Brown Shoe Co.* v. *United States*) interpreting the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950, the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator KEFAUVER, issued a new report on manufacturing concentration.

According to Senator KEFAUVER: "The most important single fact brought out by the report is that in the years following World War II the industrial economy has become significantly more concentrated in the hands of a few large corporations. Thus, between 1947 and 1958 the share held by the 200 largest companies of total industrial output, as measured by value added by manufacture, rose 27 percent. In 1947 the 200 largest companies accounted for 30 percent of the value added by manufacture; by 1958 their proportion had risen to 38 percent."

Top firms absorb others

Much of the recent increase in concentration has resulted from merger activity of the larger corporations. Based on the information reported in the various financial manuals, the top 500 industrial firms absorbed some 3,404 other companies and the 50 largest merchandising firms acquired 332 companies.

Moreover, based on limited data as to the size of the acquired firms, the preponderance of the assets removed from the stream of private business enterprise has stemmed from merger actions of the top corporations.

The merger movement has, of course, affected many lines of business in addition to those in which the large industrial and merchandising firms are engaged. In particular, it has made enormous inroads in the field of commercial banking—traditionally an important small business field in the United States.

The latest annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for example, indicates that in 1961 some 133 banks, operating some 423 banking offices, with aggregate resources of $5,994 million, were absorbed by mergers, consolidations, and acquisitions.

(The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation report stated: "The House Small Business Committee has underway a number of inquiries into banking, including regional concentration of commercial banking, growth of chain, holding company, and branch banking, the bank merger movement and its impact on concentration in banking, availability of bank credit for small business and related subjects.")

NO

(By Dr. Charles T. Stewart)

(NOTE.—Dr. Charles T. Stewart is acting director of economic research at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He is an expert in the field of economic growth. The economist taught at Utah State University and George Washington University before joining the chamber 4 years ago. His current job includes the preparation of testimony for congressional inquiries.)

The recent report, "Mergers and Superconcentration," by the staff of the House Select Committee on Small Business, warns that "much of the recent increase in concentration has resulted from the merger activity of the larger corporations"; that we are "becoming a Nation of clerks and hired hands"; and that "opportunities for independent small businesses are eroding."

But nowhere does it present any objective evidence of such dangers.

Another recent publication cited to prove the alleged rise in concentration is the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee's "Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958." But that report demonstrates no significant 1954–58 change in the level of manufacturing concentration in the United States. Moreover, most of the 1947–58 increase in concentration—of which the committee makes much—was spurious: It largely reflects the shakeout, as the economy returned to more normal market conditions, of the large number of ill-conceived new enterprises formed immediately after World War II in response to the lure of pent-up demands.

Ratios declined

Due to this rapid postwar formation of new firms, concentration ratios fell during 1945–47 below their prewar levels; and the 1947–54 rise in concentration appears to have been a return toward the longer-term normal, rather than a rise above it. Moreover, this statistical approach to concentration takes no account of the roles played by rising foreign competition and interproduct substitutions as sources of increased competition within our domestic economy.

In fact, the whole concentration through mergers issue is grossly exaggerated. When the number of mergers in manufacturing and mining (reported by the Federal Trade Commission) is expressed as a proportion of the total number of manufacturing and mining businesses in operation (reported by the Department of Commerce), there is no postwar wave of mergers.

More opportunities

If we relate the number of separate businesses in the United States (Department of Commerce) to the labor force (Bureau of Labor Statistics) we find an alltime high, 66 operating businesses per 1,000 civilian labor force, in 1961. In other words, the opportunity for members of our working population to have their own businesses was never better than now. We are not "becoming a nation of clerks and hired hands."

The Small Business Committee's report is so preoccupied with one part of the economy that it fails to see any other. Between 1950 and 1961, the total number of operating businesses in the United States rose by 18 percent. Manufacturing and retail trade, the two sectors which concern the Committee, increased less than did the national total (by 2 percent and 12 percent, respectively).

These two sectors, primarily for technological reasons, are the two most likely to contain large and growing firms. On the other hand, most of the opportunity for successful independent small businesses is now to be found in contract construction (up 36 percent) and the services industries (up 21 percent), which today account for a significant and rapidly expanding portion of all business enterprises.

Complex problems

A fair summation of the real merger-concentration issue would be technological and institutional forces beyond individual businesses' or businessmen's control make many of today's business problems too complex and all-pervading to be coped with by yesterday's typical small business. Therefore, many smaller firms in many lines (including mining, manufacturing, distribution, and banking) must choose among (a) growing to a larger size, (b) merging into a larger firm, or (c) failing. The small enterprise must be exceptionally well-managed in order to survive.

No available evidence demonstrates rising concentration to result from the deliberate plans of any particular group.

Even though we may look back with yearning to the "good old days" of small shops, atomistic competition, and problems which seem simple when compared to today's global issues, only the most unrealistic-minded think that such a system can be maintained or re-created in a modern setting. In order to realize those "good old days" we would have to give up more progress and prosperity than Mr. PATMAN probably would be willing to sacrifice.

Praise and Challenge for Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous respect I have for Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, and the great work he has accomplished in protecting the Nation's wildlife, I would like to extend my remarks by inserting an editorial appearing in the Yuma Daily Sun, a newspaper published at Yuma, Ariz., praising Secretary Udall for his efforts to preserve the Dyke Marsh as a wildlife refuge. These remarks should be of interest to all Members of the Congress:

PRAISE AND CHALLENGE FOR UDALL

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, the first Arizonian to serve in a Presidential Cabinet, has his heated critics. He also has some warm advocates.

One such advocate is Irston R. Barnes, chairman of the Audubon Naturalist Society. Mr. Barnes had occasion recently to publish a report on a situation involving marshlands along the Potomac River south of Alexandria, Va. These marshlands, known as the Dyke Marsh, are the home of wildlife which the Congress, in 1959, sought to preserve and protect with a special enactment. With this wildlife preserve being threatened by the dredging operation of a sand and gravel company, Mr. Barnes had occasion to write the following words about Secretary Udall:

"At a time of crisis in the preservation of natural and wilderness areas, the Nation is fortunate to have Stewart L. Udall heading the Interior Department. Future Americans will have just cause to be grateful to him

for the long perspective, the intelligence and wisdom, the courage and skillful leadership he has brought to an office which must place the welfare of the whole people ahead of the short-term profit of a few.

"The qualities of a great Secretary of the Interior were clearly visible last November 27, when Udall addressed the Great Swamp Committee of the North American Wildlife Foundation at Somerville, N.J.

"He praised the initiative of the citizens who had acquired the Great Swamp and presented it to the Federal Government as the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge. He compared this achievement to the preservation of Tinicum Marsh on the outskirts of Philadelphia and the dedication of the 500-acre Cherokee Marsh within the city limits of Madison, Wis.

"He promised the best cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service in making 'the Great Swamp a national showcase for wildlife education and interpretation,' for the benefit of the 3 out of 4 Americans who seek their open-spaces recreation 'no farther than 50 miles from their home.'

"And he warned that only ceaseless vigilance will prevent even dedicated areas from being invaded by commercial exploitations."

Such high praise from the chairman of the Audobon Society is not, we suspect, carelessly given. It is true that the need to preserve wildlife and wilderness areas is today poorly understood by a nation which so recently had all the outdoor space it wanted, and more. But those days have passed, as Secretary Udall realizes. The mushrooming of great cities and the commercial demand for natural resources is pressing insistently against some of the Nation's irreplaceable wilderness areas.

Secretary Udall will most assuredly have need of the "long perspective, intelligence and wisdom, the courage and skillful leadership" of which Mr. Barnes speaks if he is to persuade Americans to preserve something of their precious natural heritage.

Support for Legislation To Improve Conditions Under Which Migratory Workers Live and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in a recent editorial the Washington Post and Times Herald calls attention to the unfortunate conditions under which so many migratory workers live and labor, and it gives editorial support for legislation along lines of several bills introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARION

This centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation could be observed in few better ways than by bringing a new birth in dignity for 3 million Americans who toil as migratory workers. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, who has capably championed their cause, calls these migratory workers "the mobile serfs of the Nation." They are not held in legal bondage; they are pressed down by circumstances to a level of subsistence that is nagging rebuke to a country that boasts of affluence.

Last year, Congress, after 170 vain attempts, finally passed the Migrant Health Act and did something specific about a problem that came to indignant national attention more than 20 years ago when John Steinbeck wrote "The Grapes of Wrath."

But other measures designed to help the migrants failed to get through the labyrinth; several were waylaid by the House Rules Committee. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Senator WILLIAMS is about to introduce again the bills that, collectively, could lessen a harvest of shame. The group includes measures to provide decent housing and sanitation facilities, day-care centers for migrant children, improved educational opportunities for the migrant and his family, modification of existing child labor laws, national labor relations coverage, improved employment services, and a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.

These bills have not been capriciously drafted but are the fruit of extensive hearings. They reflect a recognition of the problems of the employer; no attempt has been made, Mr. Williams asserts, "to impose unfair or arbitrary provisions upon the farmer or the farmworker." The aim is to create a rational labor market and to provide a reliable work force free from the stigma of degradation.

The outcome of Mr. WILLIAMS' campaign will be a test of our political system. The migrants have no powerful lobby to press their cause; their very mobility costs them their votes. A source of national shame should be finally removed by rescuing 3 million Americans from what amounts to economic servitude.

Alabama Waterways and Inland Docks System—Significant Advantages to Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the river system of Alabama is larger and more extensive than that of any other State in our great Nation. But we in Alabama have been making careful diligent efforts to improve our God-given resources so that today the Alabama river system offers significant advantages to industrial firms who wish to locate in Alabama.

A series of inland docks have been built along the river system. They are located at Dothan, Phenix City, Eufaula, Florence, Decatur, Huntsville and at Birmingport. All have reserved land for future industrial development.

The following article from the Journal of Commerce of February 4, 1963, tells the complete story which I believe will be of interest:

INLAND PIERS AID INDUSTRY IN ALABAMA

In the beginning Alabama had its rivers. And in the first decades of the 1800's, the planters came from the Carolinas; they saw the rivers and scraped at the rich black soil at their feet and said: "Looks like we've found it." They were looking for a place to continue an empire.

And up, grandiosely, majestically, it went. The empire was cotton. The land grew it, and the rivers floated it to Mobile where it left for Europe's looms.

COTTON, EMPIRE AND WAR

Cotton had everything its own way. It even produced a system that would keep it alive. Creaky and inefficient, and based on human misery, maybe, but a system. Its administrators could apply it because it wasn't scientific, just based on authority. The administrators had plenty of that.

Next, cotton produced the administrators themselves, the directors of the empire.

Then came the Civil War and the empire came tumbling down.

Mud and silt clogged the rivers. River towns stagnated. Alabama, with more navigable rivers than any other State in the Union, stood still. King Cotton's court disbanded, and now a century later, all that remains are a few relics entombed in quaint little mausoleums called antique shops.

For the rivers, though, and the land, the story has been different. The cycle has come full. Today, the State is a complex interchange of barge traffic moving over a vast network of river highways covering the face of Alabama. Locks lift barges, and dams maintain deep slack-water routes while generating power for industry. The rivers throb with the beat of diesels and the tonnage exceeds the wildest projections of yesteryear's water route enthusiasts.

Today, a single tow may mean 3½ acres of barges with a payload equal to that of 500 freight cars.

What happened?

The answer lies in geography, hard dollars and cents thinking, a developing industrial area, industries' thirst for fresh water. It lies in the foresight that built the Alabama State Docks at the port of Mobile and followed through with the $10 million Alabama State Docks inland dock program.

The new terminals owe their construction to rediscovery by shippers over the past 25 years of how navigable rivers and bulk transportation distort maps.

The port of Mobile is a modern highway interchange located where one highway system (the Alabama rivers system) meets a long superthroughway stretching from St. Marks, Fla., to Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican border (the Gulf Intracoastal Canal).

This throughway ties in with the Mississippi River highway.

At Mobile, the rivers system connects with the ocean routes to Europe, the Mediterranean, Africa, and the Orient.

On this great highway system, tugboats push barges from Texas and Louisiana bearing petrochemicals to Birmingham via the Gulf Intracoastal Canal and the Tombigbee-Warrior. Sulfur from Texas on the same canal moves up the Chattahoochee River to Columbia near Dothan and will move on to Eufaula and Phenix City when locks and dams nearing completion back water up to those areas this year.

Birmingham coal and iron moves down to industrial sites and steam generating plants in Florida. Phosphate rock from the phosphate fields of Florida moves up the rivers. South American iron ore, barge located at Mobile, heads for Alabama steel mills.

Add to this picture, the Tennessee River, a broad highway looping through northern Alabama to its junction with the Ohio-Mississippi system and you see how the Alabama inland docks serve shippers in a 17-State area.

Alabama does this because it is out for industry, and wants to have something to offer when it makes its pitch.

Thus, the terminals inland. These will be used to load and discharge barge cargoes. Barging, of course, is a cheap way to haul things. And there's nothing inspecific about a transportation saving.

FISHING FOR INDUSTRY

Manager of the State's inland dock project W. J. Black, Jr., sums up the effort by saying: "We are standing on the riverbanks fishing for industry. We think we've got the best lure that industrialists will take.

"A business which could transport raw materials by barge would be perfectly suited to locate on our rivers. Imported materials could be transferred from steamers to barges at Mobile and brought to the plant site, then discharged by our facility. A manufacturer can serve any market in this half of the country cheaply from Alabama."

Behind all this is Alabama's hopes that the inland docks will cement together a fortuitous combination of things:

1. The State has the highly efficient ocean terminal at Mobile, a nationally leading seaport.

2. It has the waterways connecting the interior to the port.

3. Alabama has more navigable rivers than any other State, and they all connect to major waterways, and so, in the crazy cartography of water shipping, Alabama is right next door to everywhere—consuming area, producing area, raw material area. The rivers distort the maps in Alabama's favor.

4. The State has equal footing with other Southern States in such advantages as availability of labor, tax structure, etc., and the accessibility to markets that businessmen are looking for down South. Industrial Encouragements Acts have been passed.

But behind the construction of these docks lies some complex reasoning on the part of the State legislature. Much of the reasoning is based on the success of the deep-water terminal at Mobile.

RECOVERY OF MOBILE

The port of Mobile is a phenomenon among ports for the reason that from the time of Civil War Reconstruction through the 1920's, Mobile was a tired, overaged King Cotton port that had never gotten off its back since the Civil War. But, with the initial expense of some $10 million in bonds voted in the late 1920's Mobile began a comeback. State docks at Mobile have since bourgeoned into a $75 million facility, and have taken Mobile out of the doldrum into prominence.

Mobile climbed to rank among the top 10 ports in the country.

Moreover, the State docks have been the city of Mobile's chief contributor to success in business, and each year it brings to the State some $100 million.

Some 30 years after the construction of the State docks at Mobile in the late 1950's, the success of the ocean terminal was brought up in the State legislature with a slightly different slant. If construction of the facility at Mobile had added so much to the State, why couldn't history repeat itself with smaller terminals built on the banks of the rivers?

The State legislature voted bonds subject to the ratification of the people. Alabama's electorate went to the ballot box and agreed with the legislature. Now, 5 years later, seven terminals are either at work or on blueprints. These seven terminals which make up the system have a specific job. They will lock together all the advantages of the State and make locating along Alabama's rivers attractive to industry.

THE SEVEN FACILITIES

The inland dock facilities include covered warehouses, docks, basins, back storage area, and rail and highway connections. These inland facilities can be used by shippers who originate cargo anywhere on the gulf coast or by shippers in Minneapolis and Chicago, Kansas City and Dubuque, Cincinnati and Evansville, Pittsburgh and Joliet, St. Louis and Omaha.

All the docks have industrial land available adjacent to them. For example on the Tennessee River, Decatur has 227 acres of land; Florence 22 acres; and Huntsville 39; on the Chattahoochee River, Columbia has 57 acres; Eufaula has 287 acres, Phenix City has 137.

Festival of the Performing Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, television has so often been criticized for the quality of its programs that it is a distinct pleasure to call attention to the new winter-spring series of a program that features world-renowned artists of the theater and concert hall. This is the "Festival of Performing Arts," which will be opened in New York on February 12 with a concert by the violin-piano duo of Yehudi and Hephzibah Menuhin. Among other artists who will appear on the 10 weekly programs of the festival are the pianists Robert and Gaby Casadesus; the British actor, Robert Morley; the Robert Shaw Choral; Cesare Siepi of the Metropolitan Opera; and other artists of similar high caliber. This program is produced in New York City by David Susskind and James Fleming.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD with my remarks a letter by Mrs. Dexter O. Arnold, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, to Mr. M. J. Rathbone, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, sponsors of the program, commending him upon its renewal for a second year.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1963.

Mr. M. J. RATHBONE,
President, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. RATHBONE: I am sure you are aware that the General Federation of Women's Clubs, an international organization with membership in 53 countries and representing some 12 million women, has from the inception of commercial television sought earnestly to urge upon the medium's developers the highest standards of programing. Our concern in this area stemmed from the feeling that this exciting sight and sound medium has an enormous potential for communication, enlightenment, and entertainment.

It is, therefore, with pleasure that I wish to congratulate your farsighted company in its decision to bring back for a second season the widely acclaimed television series, "The Festival of Performing Arts," a fascinating project dedicated to the pursuit of excellence and artistic freedom.

This appreciation comes not only from those of us who reside in Washington, D.C., and New York City, hitherto the only two cities whose residents had the privilege of seeing and hearing such artists as Paul Scofield, Rudolf Serkin, Isaac Stern, Andres Segovia, Pablo Casals and other world-famed performers. I speak also for those of our members who live in the additional five cities in which Jersey Standard plans to present "Festival of Performing Arts": Boston, Philadelphia, New Haven, Rochester (N.Y.), and Raleigh (N.C.).

We are certainly looking forward to tuning in to such artists as Yehudi and Hephzibah Menuhin, Jason Robards, Jr., Robert Morley, Cesare Siepi, Robert and Gaby Casadesus, Miriam Makeba and others.

Programs like "The Festival of Performing Arts" deserve the widest possible audience and, in making it possible for us to see such superb video fare, Jersey Standard dramatizes handsomely the marvelous way in which our business community can act as a patron of the arts to the enrichment of all of us.

Sincerely,

MRS. DEXTER O. ARNOLD,
President.

Urban Renewal for Downtown Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the importance of downtown urban renewal programs to the economic life of a community is being underscored every day as our merchants find themselves faced with the problem of constantly diminishing revenue and slow strangulation of business because of the inability of the downtown area to provide ample and convenient parking facilities.

The problem and the remedy were described to the American Newspaper Advertising Executives in a detailed discussion by Robert P. Groberg, assistant director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials and director of its urban renewal division.

A graduate of the Law College of Columbia University, a member of the bar and the holder of a master's degree in public administration, Mr. Groberg has devoted many years to the study of the problem of urban renewal in private industry and the Government service in New York and Washington. He is the author of several acclaimed studies on the subject. I believe all the Members of the Senate will find "Urban Renewal for Downtown Areas" interesting reading and for that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Groberg's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL FOR DOWNTOWN AREAS

(By Robert P. Groberg)

Urban renewal is good business, is good for business, and is good for your business.

It would be presumptuous of me to tell newspaper advertising executives about the problems of downtown areas. You all know the statistics on retail sales and hotel bookings, on parking spaces and traffic jams. You may have to decide daily whether to walk to your favorite restaurant for lunch, or whether you have time to take a taxi. You live with the problems 8, 10, maybe 16

hours a day—before you go home to the suburbs.

Newspaper advertising executives are among the best people in any city to assess the collective problems of business and commerce, and this includes the problems that make urban renewal a must for most downtown areas.

You've evidently made your assessment of the seriousness of these problems and that's why you've invited me here today.

The effects of successful urban renewal are pretty obvious—including the impact on your newspaper trade. Just consider three events that occurred in downtown New Haven, Conn., last year. In October a 1,500 space municipal parking garage opened for business. A week later, Malley's department store relocated in a new structure with 250,000 square feet of floor space—and direct access to the municipal garage. Macy's department store signed to purchase another 250,000 square feet of floor space in the same area—the Church Street redevelopment project.

But New Haven has had a strong urban renewal program for the past 10 years. What most of you would like to know is how can your city take advantage of the Federal assistance for downtown areas. Where do you start? How do you proceed? How can you add to work already underway by the downtown businessmen's groups or by other organizations?

Admittedly, this program of Federal aid is not a fully developed one. It began as an experiment in housing and continues as an experiment in downtown renewal, in preserving open space, in improving mass transportation, and in developing regional and metropolitan areas. The problems we face in these areas, especially in downtown, could not have been foreseen in 1949 because few realized the tremendously expanding role the suburbs would play and the impact of the automobile on our central areas.

You may think it unusual that the Housing and Home Finance Agency is responsible for downtown problems. I worked until recently for the Urban Renewal Administration, one of the constituent agencies of the HHFA, and I agree with you. What does a housing act have to do with downtown areas?

Well, in fact, aid for downtown areas was not part of the original Federal program of slum clearance and urban redevelopment. As the title indicates, housing was the primary interest. Congress declared, in its preamble to the act, that "the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, and the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

While it started as a housing program, it has evolved over the years into something much broader than that. By 1954 Congress was convinced that no city should get Federal aid for redevelopment or renewal until it first developed its own comprehensive program for community improvement. This workable program is a document prepared at local expense by local officials. It describes the following seven tools a city must have before it can hope to do a successful urban renewal job:

1. Good housing codes, building, plumbing and electrical codes.

2. A comprehensive general plan for land use, thoroughfares, public improvements, zoning, and subdivision controls.

3. Analysis of blight, its nature, intensity and causes.

4. Adequate staff and a fixed responsibility for code enforcement and other urban renewal activities.

5. The means for financing comprehensive planning and urban renewal activities.

6. A program for relocating families displaced by governmental activities.

7. Communitywide participation by individuals and citizen's organizations to help provide the hometown understanding and support necessary to insure success.

Since 1954, when Congress established this requirement, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has certified as acceptable, workable programs in about 1,500 communities. By the way, does your city have one? Do you know what's in it? It has to be recertified each year for the city to remain eligible to receive Federal aid. To be recertified, your city must demonstrate acceptable progress in achieving the goals of the workable program. How much progress has your city made this year? How much publicity has your newspaper given to this progress?

By 1959 Congress had decided that the cities needed funds to help develop such programs. Grants are now available to study the entire city, its economic base and prospects for growth in population and employment, the prospective supply and demand for housing and land for development. Grants may also be used to evaluate the overall public costs and problems of municipal finance for carrying on urban renewal. The Federal Government will share the cost for special studies of downtown problems, such as business and industrial displacement, the market factors affecting such displacement and the analysis of land requirements and opportunities for expansion.

No city can hope to renew its downtown, properly, without placing its program in the context of citywide and regional developments. This is not a chicken-and-egg problem. The broad studies must come first, and there is now Federal aid to help make them.

It's clear that the whole program is changing, developing, moving forward. I have no doubt as to its direction and its tremendous momentum. There are about 1,000 projects in 500 cities. By the end of fiscal 1964 the current authorization of $4 billion will probably be committed. About $3 billion has already been set aside for cities with projects in planning or execution. As an illustration of direction, I quote the President's last message to Congress on housing and urban renewal legislation:

"Urban renewal programs to date have been too narrow to cope effectively with the basic problems facing older cities. We must do more than concern ourselves with bad housing—we must reshape our cities into effective nerve centers for expanding metropolitan areas. Our urban renewal efforts must be substantially reoriented from slum clearance and slum prevention into positive programs for economic and social regeneration. This program, if it is to be truly effective, must help local communities go beyond the project-by-project approach."

Most of the $4 billion authorized to date will be used as grants for projects carried out by local public agencies, the redevelopment or renewal agency or authority in your city.

The grants from the Federal Government may be two-thirds or three-fourths of the net cost with the city putting up one-third or one-fourth in facilities, services, land or cash. Net cost is the expense of a project after deducting what you get from the sale of land. In addition, advances are made for project planning, and loans made by or backed by the Government's full faith and credit, to provide the working capital. Finally, grants are made for relocation costs up to $200 per family and $25,000 per business. Since projects are the basic tool for accomplishing urban renewal downtown as well as elsewhere, I think it worthwhile to spend a little time explaining how they work. I'll give you some figures to work with. All newspaper advertising executives are accustomed to working with figures.

Lets' say a hypothetical downtown project might require $200,000 for planning. With the approval of the city council, the local public agency may apply to the Urban Renewal Administration for an advance of $200,000 and for a reservation of capital grant funds for when the project will be executed. The advance will cover the cost of surveys and plans, real estate appraisals and preparation of a project plan that shows land to be acquired, property to be rehabilitated, new uses permitted and the restrictions on the land, such as building height and setback. To work out the financing scheme for the project, for example, the purchase price of real estate, cost of demolition and installation of site improvements such as streets and utilities, total $2,100,000. Also add the cost of public facilities necessary to serve the area. For this downtown project it might be a municipal parking garage costing, $500,000. For administration, add $200,000 giving a total or gross project cost of $3 million. Subtract from that the proceeds from the sale of the cleared land, to arrive at the net cost of $1,500,000. The Federal grant will be two-thirds of this or $1 million. The local share will be one-third or $500,000. The city must pay for and construct the parking garage, but since it is considered necessary to serve the urban renewal objectives of the project, it is included in project costs. In this case the $500,000 for the garage covers the city's share. No other local grants are needed. If the garage were not eligible, then it would not be included and the city would have to pay some cash into the project.

When the project execution begins, after approval of the plan by the city council and a public hearing, the local public agency will need, in this case, $2,500,000 in working capital. This will come from a loan, either direct from the Government or from guaranteed notes sold privately. The loan will be repaid out of the Federal grant and the proceeds from the sale of the project land.

The key to the city's financing of this project is the garage, the noncash grant-in-aid. Without it, gross project cost would be only $2,500,000, net project cost $1 million, and the city's share $333,000. But this share must be paid in cash. And, in addition, the city would still have to finance the cost of the garage.

Sound planning and programing of the locality's public improvements should result in combining with the project, activities that may have been part of the city's regular capital improvements with the result that the Federal Government will share in their costs. This is standard practice for experienced LPA's. However, certain types of facilities, those that serve the entire community rather than the project area specifically— city hall, main library—are not eligible for credit; they are considered of benefit to the city as a whole and not necessary to support the project alone. This rule presented little problem to most residential renewal projects, but it may restrict the scope of projects in downtown areas, since this is where most municipal facilities are found.

Urban renewal projects are local undertakings—locally initiated and locally executed. To make a truly effective program, communities must gain and keep local support each step of the way. Here is where you personally come in.

Urban renewal is a program involving citizen participation in many ways. The local public agencies are staffed by paid profes-

sionals, but the commissioners themselves are in most cities unpaid citizens who take time from their businesses, trades and professions to set policy for what are really multimillion dollar enterprises. Projects are not kid stuff. They involve acquisition of millions of dollars of real estate, temporary management of hundreds of buildings with thousands of tenants, both residential and commercial. They promote the sale of real estate on a big scale, and require careful supervision of redevelopment to make sure that it is in accord with the objectives of the plan. No matter how large the paid staff—and it is usually quite small—it always needs informed local support. It needs the assurance of the rest of the community that what the program proposes is in keeping with what the city wants. It needs the technical know-how and the contacts of the whole business community—the kind of know-how that is used to attract new industry, new investment, new people to your city. This is not a novel technique, but the way it has been used in conjunction with urban renewal programs is decidedly different. Let me give you two case histories: New Haven and Little Rock.

The citizens' action committee in New Haven was essentially created in 1954 by Mayor Richard C. Lee to participate in a nonpartisan community effort to solve the manifold problems facing the city and the area. The committee is a corporation with an annual budget ranging from $20,000 to $35,000 contributed by the New Haven Foundation. Its action committees include groups on the central business district, traffic and parking, on education, on industry and harbor development, on housing, and on human values. Membership is close to 600. While Mayor Lee has provided extraordinary leadership, the roles of local bankers, businessmen, professionals and others (for example, the president of Yale University) cannot be underestimated. This group played a significant role in making New Haven the first city in the country to establish a business relocation office to help merchants in the path of highway and slum clearance programs find suitable new locations. And its role in providing financing—a loan from Yale University to help the redevelopment of the Church Street project mentioned earlier—can easily be imagined.

For my second example, Little Rock, the lead was taken not by the mayor but by the citizen's group itself. Plans to revive central Little Rock began in 1957 with a citizen's planning conference when the Arkansas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects drew its concept of Main Street, Little Rock—1969. Not long after that 40 local business and civic leaders organized the urban progress association for the purpose of supporting, promoting and initiating activities determined to be good for the development and redevelopment of the metropolitan area. Urban progress ran study groups for representtaives of all the public agencies in the community, studied the historical aspects of structures in the central area, and transportation and terminal facilities. They aided in the local public agency's neighborhood meetings to keep the public informed. They concluded, as have most experienced planners and developers, that public investment for facilities in the area such as cultural, recreational and governmental facilities, had to be provided to make the area attractive to private investment. And it would be private investment that would account for most of the work to be done in central Little Rock. They estimated that public investments of about $14 million should promote in excess of $75 million in private investments. These studies, along with earlier ones by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission of Pulaski County, were the basis of what was really a downtown master plan.

Meanwhile, back at the local public agency, a $350,000 planning grant was approved by the Urban Renewal Administration in 1959. This was the first such project approved by URA for planning that encompassed an entire central business district, 508 acres. It was admittedly an experiment, for ordinarily it would require several projects to treat an area this size. But Little Rock argued that flexibility was needed for downtown renewal and that the limits of project boundaries would prevent them from taking advantage of opportunities for private investment as they arose anywhere in the area.

The studies under this advance were not limited to the type usual to residential redevelopment projects. They included counts of and careful analysis of pedestrian and working population, space utilization of various kinds, traffic origin and destination, outlying shopping centers. Within the framework of the master downtown plan, the project plan for central Little Rock was developed. It encompassed many of the features envisioned in the Little Rock 1969 proposals—pedestrian ways, arcades, a transit center, hotel and sports centers, and, above all, plenty of parking space. The project was approved in June 1962 and execution is progressing rapidly. During all this time, the Urban Progress Association promoted and advised. Its efforts have been substantially responsible for creating and maintaining the climate attractive to new investment. In September urban progress was able to announce several new and remodeling construction projects for the downtown area due to urban renewal activities. The National Investors Life Insurance Co. has bought one site for the construction of a $1¼ million office building; a department store completed a $250,000 remodeling job, and expansion and remodeling of another company's building was completed. This is not peanuts for a city of 125,000.

New Haven and Little Rock provide just two among many examples of how citizens' organizations have been instrumental in promoting and making a success out of urban renewal. Each of these organizations was well represented by local newspapers. I've heard, for instance, that Hugh Patterson, of the Arkansas Gazette, and August Engel, of the Arkansas Democrat, worked for the revitalization of central Little Rock. They did it because the bulk of their advertising came from downtown merchants and the downtown service firms. They supported the downtown renewal program with news, with editorials, and with advertising space, and they both put their money into the programs—as investments, not just contributions.

The climate for new investment is something you all understand and work with daily. It's as important for downtown renewal as it is for retailing. It thrives on information and publicity, provided the goods are there. It's part of your job in the program to make sure that the goods will be there. You are expected to take the lead in promoting and selling. You're selling a location, a labor force, a state of mind that will say to an investor, this is the place for me, people are doing things here, and I like what they're doing. It makes sense—the whole town is working on it.

Urban renewal should be considered as a public investment, not a public expense. Urban renewal creates wealth in the areas that are redeveloped, wealth that pays far more in taxes than the slum buildings that once blighted the land, and requires far less in the municipality's services. This makes urban renewal good public business.

Urban renewal is good business, too, for private enterprise. It's good for the contractors who clear the land and install the utility lines and build the streets. It's good for the furniture companies that sell the furniture that goes into new buildings. It's good for the department stores that sell the appliances for the new apartments and homes. It's good for the insurance companies that sell the performance bonds on the contractors and the fire insurance on the new buildings, the new furniture, and the new appliances.

And it's good for the newspapers, because where there's a market for goods and services, there's more advertising—and the newspapers will get their share of it.

You newspaper executives have a unique opportunity, one you shall not see again. You can take the lead in renewing, in revitalizing, your cities. But first, you must visualize an image of the future downtown—the place that will be economically sound and thriving, and much more. It can contain whatever you wish: cultural center, athletic stadium, amusement area, university campus. It should be the place that attracts people day and night, to walk, to see, to buy.

There is an ugly rumor afoot that Americans cannot walk any longer. This rumor is highly exaggerated, as a look at St. Marks Square in Venice during the tourist season will prove; 90 percent of the walkers crowding it are Americans who have traveled at great cost, 3,000 miles just in order to walk.

This new downtown is now possible of realization with the assistance available from Federal loans and grants. Make downtown what you want it to be. Perhaps then you will want to give up your suburban home, move into a townhouse, a downtown house, and perhaps walk to work.

Then we can agree that urban renewal is good business, is good for business, is good for your business.

Unequal Hiring Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Commission Discloses Unequal Hiring Practices," by Jessie Ash Arndt, published in the Christian Science Monitor, issue of January 8, 1963. The article relates to information which has been publicized by the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 8 1963]

COMMISSION DISCLOSES UNEQUAL HIRING PRACTICES

(By Jessie Ash Arndt)

Many myths still raise their hoary heads to influence employers' views as to what are termed "men's" and "women's" jobs, recent studies by the President's Commission on the Status of Women have indicated.

A review of the results achieved by the Commission so far is given in a recent report by Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary

of Labor and executive vice-chairman of the Commission, of which the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was Chairman.

Many of the reasons cited by employers for failing to advance women to positions of authority in a firm have no facts to support them; the Commission has determined.

BASED ON MYTH

Among these are: "Male supervisors have a better chance of success in supervising an all female department; male workers might resent a woman supervisor; women are more emotional; women consider themselves as temporary workers, so they don't aim for higher levels of responsibility; women have higher rates of absenteeism and labor turnover; men should be paid better because they're heads of families; it costs more to hire women; insurance costs more because women live longer; women work for pin money; men produce more on most jobs than most women, and so forth.

"The experience of the Federal Government and some American employers makes it clear that many of these suppositions are based on myth," says the report, "that with women, as with men, education, skill, experience, and goals determine an individual's qualifications for a job."

Last April, action initiated by the Commission's Committee on Federal Employment resulted in the Attorney General's removal of the last legal barrier to equal opportunity for women in the Federal service.

In the report, the word "legal" is underlined. With few exceptions, men and women are now certified without regard to sex, although 2 years ago in a period between September 1960, and February 1961, a study showed that the Washington office of the Civil Service Commission was receiving 29 percent of its requests for men only; 34 percent for women only; and 37 percent not specifying sex. Significant in this was that more than half the requests for persons to fill positions above the four lowest grades were for men only, and 94 percent at the three highest regular grades also were for men only.

LARGELY A HABIT

John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and a member of the Commission on the Status of Women, commented, according to Mrs. Peterson's report, that "this practice of requesting men only for most jobs was largely a habit or outmoded custom."

The Committee on Federal Employment—one of seven committees within the Commission, each headed by a Cabinet officer—is also interested in the Federal service entrance examination, and promotion and training opportunities in the Federal service as these affect women.

A study of the relative career progress of men and women in comparable grades will also be made.

The Commission on the Status of Women has endorsed the principle of minimum wage legislation and its further extension, and has also approved the principle of equal pay for equal work.

ACTIVITIES CHANGE

Mrs. Peterson's report points out that the increasing participation of women in all the aspects of our national life has occurred so rapidly that society and the economy have lagged in fully accepting and adjusting to women's changing activities. By focusing on some of the changes and some of the remaining inequities, the commission expects to foster understanding and acceptance of these activities.

The Committee on Government Contracts has found in correspondence with industrial relations executives in firms operating in a variety of industries that, although women may be well qualified for higher level administrative, professional, and supervisory positions, cultural and social attitudes often restrict their opportunities to obtain such positions. However, some industrial relations executives, especially in department stores, real estate, banking, and consumer products, reported satisfactory experience with women in high-level executive, professional, and technfcal positions.

The commission, on recommendation of the Committee on Protective Legislation, has endorsed the principle of extension of effective minimum wage legislation and its application to both men and women workers.

The Committee on Civil and Political Rights is exploring all avenues for tackling the problem of differences in the legal treatment of men and women in regard to political and civil rights, property rights, and family relations. Although in most States a woman is a legal person in her own right, in four States of the Union a man still has complete control over his wife's earnings, and in Texas, a married woman cannot go into business for herself without permission of a court.

BOTH WIVES AND WORKERS

The Committee on Social Insurance and Taxes, concerned with social security, unemployment insurance and Federal tax laws, finds some of the most difficult problems relate to women eligible under social security as both wives and workers.

The Committee on New and Expanded Services is involved with such subjects as day care for children, homemaker's services, problems of wives of migratory workers, and the best uses of volunteer services in our society.

The Committee on Education is exploring educational needs of women at different stages in their lives.

"It can't be assumed that a woman's need for a job is less because she is a woman," Mrs. Peterson states in her report. "The fact is that most women seek jobs because they need money * * * Four and a half million women are heads of families, and in 1961, half of them were the chief support of their households."

Tribute to Robert Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very beautiful little poem written by Mattie Richards Tyler. It is a tribute to Robert Frost. Miss Tyler, as I understand, was for many years associate editor of the Blue moon, a poetry magazine, and is past president of the District of Columbia branch of the League of American Pen Women.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 31, 1963]

ROBERT FROST

Dear Robert Frost, as you passed quietly by
The lovely snow-filled woods that thrilled you so,
Deep evening shadows fell without a sigh
Although the world was grieved that you must go * * *
For poets come and poets pass away * * *
Their words too often fade upon life's page;
But yours will live far, far beyond your day,
America's great poet, gifted sage.
Your little horse wore tinkling, silver bells
That may have played your requiem that night,
Caressingly, across the hills and dells
Filled up with snow and drenched in pale moonlight.
No longer had you "promises to keep"—
Nor "miles to go" before you fell asleep.

—*Mattie R. Tyler.*

Two-Price Cotton System Penalizes Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the two-price cotton system hangs like a stone from the neck of the American textile industry, slowly but surely dragging it down to economic ruin.

Textile mills and cotton farmers of the United States are struggling for survival in the face of unfair foreign competition, brought about not only by cheaper wages and other lower costs of manufacturing overseas, but also by the two-price cotton system.

The offshore mill can buy cotton, whether it is grown overseas or in the United States, at $42.50 a bale less than our own mills must pay. Obviously, with such a manufacturing cost advantage, foreign mills are able to send their products into our markets and displace products made in the United States from American cotton. Inevitably, the loss of a market for domestically-made cotton textile products results in a loss of a market for American-grown cotton.

The cotton farmer suffers, the textile worker suffers, and the Nation's economy suffers.

An editorial pointing to this problem and calling on the Congress to act to remedy it appeared in the February 4, 1963, edition of the Atlanta Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM: HOW TO ERASE THE INEQUITY

There is widespread recognition of the need for Congress to eliminate the differential between prices domestic and foreign mills pay for American cotton.

Because of subsidies on the commodity, textile plants abroad can buy this country's cotton approximately $42.50 per bale cheaper than can plants in the United States. This penalizes the American textile industry many millions of dollars annually and makes it extremely difficult for mills here to compete with those overseas.

In asking Congress to eliminate the differential, President Kennedy failed to say how to go about it other than recommending a 2-year trial method under which the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make payments to cure the inequity.

So the question is: Who would receive the payments?

If we correctly read the thinking of the majority of the textile industry, most plant owners do not want to be put into the position of accepting a direct monetary subsidy from the Government.

Cutting off the $42.50 per bale subsidy would put a lot of cotton growers out of business. The Winston-Salem, N.C., Journal and Sentinel recently pointed out that of 800,000 American cotton farmers, some 600,000 are small, marginal producers. As President Kennedy said, the average American farmer cannot, as yet, produce cotton profitably at world prices. The possible exception is some of the large, highly mechanized producers in Western States.

There also is talk of cotton handlers, or brokers, receiving the subsidy and they in turn would sell cotton to American mills approximately $42.50 cheaper. This arrangement doesn't sound right and would be in for tough sledding in Congress.

Other possibilities have been advanced, all of which have bugs in them. Congress' responsibility is to do away with the inequitable differential, make prices on export cotton competitive on the world market, and at the same time avoid forcing the average American cotton farmer out of business. We hope there are some modern-day Solomons in the distinguished Halls of Congress.

A Tribute to Congressman Barratt O'Hara

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and deep respect that I rise today to add my voice to those who have praised Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, and his outstanding record of 50 years of public service.

His life and career have been brilliantly reviewed here in this Chamber, but I would like to say a few words today about BARRATT O'HARA, the man; a man I have been privileged to know.

It is impossible to grow up in Illinois these days without feeling the influence of this warmhearted and generous man who has become so much a part of the history and lifeblood of our State. His love for Illinois, his civic pride and great compassion for his fellow countrymen have been expressed throughout his life.

It has been said that a man's life is the sum of his knowledge and experience put to use. BARRETT O'HARA's eventful years have been scored by thousands of deeds and actions which eloquently bespeak the motivating philosophy of the man behind them. When I think of BARRATT O'HARA, I am always reminded of the saying that the difference between a dream and reality is action, action taken by a man of ability who is not willing to give less than the best of himself in any endeavor.

The State of Illinois, this House of Representatives, and our great land have increased in stature owing to the great contributions Mr. O'HARA has made to the true ideals of our Democratic process.

My own career in public life has been relatively brief, by comparison to the years Congressman O'HARA has served the people. And it is particularly gratifying to know that, in a world which often scoffs at idealism, there are still those rare individuals, like BARRATT O'HARA, who can renew our faith in the future and our will to accept the problems thrust upon us by the times.

BARRATT O'HARA is ageless and of the ages. I am proud to be associated with this great man and to call him friend and colleague. On this 50th anniversary of his election to public office, I take the opportunity to wish him many more years of health so he can continue his impressive record of public service.

Siskin Memorial Center, Chattanooga, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Garrison and Mose Siskin of Chattanooga, Tenn., are two of the Nations most thoughtful and generous humanitarians. They organized and finance the Siskin Memorial Center, which is a $4 million rehabilitation center at Chattanooga, which gives remarkable help to the lame, blind, and mentally handicapped. An article in the Washington Star of January 26, tells the reason Garrison became interested in this center.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF FAITH

In 1942 an accident caused a blood clot in Garrison Siskin's leg. Three surgeons told him they would have to amputate, gave him only a 50 percent chance of recovetry. Garrison spent one whole night praying. He says, "I promised God, if I recovered, I would devote the rest of my life to helping people. I consider this a contract." The leg healed. There was no amputation. Garrison's brother Mose, his partner in a steel scrap business, was moved by Garrison's faith to work with him on his covenant with God. They started simply, helping a family made homeless by fire, helping a sick child, helping most anyone truly in need. Out of this modest beginning has arisen a $4 million rehabilitation center in their hometown of Chattanooga, Tenn. A large part of this has been made possible from the profits of the Siskins' business. The center has a nondenominational chapel, a building serving religious, cultural, and educational groups, as well as the rehabilitation building. To the center come the blind, the lame, and other physically and mentally handicapped. None is turned away because of inability to pay. Thousands have been helped since the center opened in 1955. The Siskins are extending the scope of the center through the 365 Club, whose members contribute a penny a day. Garrison calls the center "Operation Crossroads" because it is the crossroads for those who pass through from a life of despair and pain to one of hope and fulfillment.

Next Door to the Cuban Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in yesterday's Evening Star there appeared an article written by one of the foremost news writers, Eric Sevareid, with respect to the Cuban situation. It was written from Key West. Not only was I impressed with the point he made, but I was particularly impressed with the statement of the need to go forward with a program with respect to Cuba. The program he suggested in this particular article was recognition of the Cuban government-in-exile. I have agreed with that point of view, so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT DOOR TO THE CUBAN TRAGEDY—EXILES WILL LIVE IN A STATE OF SUSPENSION TILL THEY KNOW THEY CAN RETURN OR NOT

(By Eric Sevareid)

KEY WEST.—This is where freedom comes to a point.

The southeastern tip of this southernmost fragment of the United States is a low stone seawall curving from the Navy installation, along the George Smathers public beach, past the Howard Johnson emporium, the long row of stabled fishing boats, and the Food Fair until Roosevelt Boulevard becomes Truman Avenue. At the corner of Truman Avenue and Margaret Street stands the Margaret Truman launderette.

Key West, part Spanish, part Anglo-American is an architectural mishmash of lovely, balconied New Orleans-style framed houses lost in a neon-lighted nightmare of gas stations, shops, and joints. The tourists are few, middle aged and middle western. Youth consists of pairs and trios of bored U.S. sailors drifting along Duval Street under the eye of the shore patrol. The cars move at sedate speeds, the pelicans glide very slowly and even gulls seem rarely to scream. It is the frequent jet fighter planes on patrol that supply the vigor and the sound.

The tip of freedom points toward Cuba which is closer than Miami, and easily penetrates the azure curtain of sea and sky. One has only to switch the television knob to channel 5 and Castro, communism, and the new songs of old Cuba, lyrics by ideologues, suddenly fill one's motel bedroom with clamor and tense reality. Nothing but the sea and the sky separate this place from the tragedy, ever present in the faces and the conversations of Cuban waiters, chambermaids, drivers, and fishermen all over this raddled spit of land.

From here the refugees are scattered, all the way up the keys, through and to the north of Miami, their mecca of desperation, their gathering and their festering place. There the complete agony is assembled out of its tens of thousands of human parts—the pride, the soulsickness, the blind but urgent hopes, the shapeless plans to somehow plan. The joy over the returned heroes of the Bay of Pigs was short lived; the fiery, promising words of President Kennedy in the Miami Stadium fade from the conversation or are repeated in ironic echoes. The demurrer of the Attorney General on the

question of the air support came like a whiplash in their faces.

The fact that they may be truly lost is beginning to penetrate. They are a passionate people; they speak their bitterness as readily as they spoke their gratitude. The State of Florida and the Federal Government have an enormous and growing problem on their hands. Every living Cuban here asks himself and his friends the daily question, spoken or unspoken: Are we going back? There is no answer. If an official answer does come and it is affirmative, with evidence to support it, they will remain together and live only for the day of their return. If the answer is negative, they would explode, but sooner or later they would begin to dull the pain and to think in terms of assimilation to North American life. One way or another, their life would go on with some meaning and purpose. But today they exist in a state of suspension, their feet not on the ground nor their heads in the clouds. Prolonged, this will prove unendurable.

The other side of this coin is the dilemma of the U.S. Government. It can issue general assurances, as the President did in Miami, but it cannot support the assurance with public proof of specific plans. There is a difference between an official attitude and an official policy. For this slowly festering pool of displaced humanity there in Florida an attitude very soon will not be enough. A positive policy, even if short of armed invasion, but promising a specific schedule of pressures severe enough to realistically foreshadow Castro's downfall, would seem to justify the idea of a Cuban government in exile, for a host of useful purposes, including Cuban cohesion in Florida now and limiting the anarchy and fraternal violence in Cuba later.

It would also permit and inspire serious advance thinking here about the nature of the post-Castro Cuban political and social order. It is these formulations for the future that responsible Cubans here now wish to get on with. It is a new vision of Cuban life in liberty and social justice, thought out in some detail, that ought to be crackling through the airwaves now, to the ears of all within that island fortress. They ought to hear it night after night, as they now hear the mechanical drumbeat of communism's slogans, insults, and alibis. Where the vision is unstated, as where there is no vision, people perish, whether in their homes or abroad and seeking to find their homes.

Texas Loses a Dedicated Public Servant in Warren McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texas State Senator Warren McDonald, of Tyler, passed away on November 26, 1962. He had served as assistant Smith County attorney, and served for three terms as Smith County attorney. He was a naval officer in World War II, and was a State senator from the Tyler district of eight east Texas counties, from 1951 to 1959.

In an era of blackout for good government at the State level in Texas, he stood up and fought for justice and progress in the traditions of Govs. Jim Hogg, "the Great Commoner," and O. M. Roberts, "the Old Alcalde," who, like Warren McDonald, came from Tyler, Tex.

Some of Warren McDonald's ancestors fought for independence in the American Revolution, others signed the Texas Declaration of Independence, another fell at the Alamo.

Warren McDonald was an unselfish patriot. He never used the prestige of his office to advance his own financial interests. He traveled with me over the counties in his district. The people of his district knew and trusted him. He loved them. Tyler and Texas have suffered a serious loss, in losing one of the most dedicated men to come out of Tyler in this generation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article and editorial: "Ex-Senator McDonald Dies Here," from the Tyler Morning Telegraph of November 27, 1962, and "Warren S. McDonald" from the Tyler Courier-Times of November 29, 1962.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Morning Telegraph, Nov. 27, 1962]

EX-SENATOR MCDONALD DIES HERE

Warren S. McDonald, 55, former Smith County attorney and State senator, died in a Tyler hospital Monday afternoon after a long illness.

Funeral services will be held at 10:30 a.m. Wednesday at Glenwood Methodist Church with the Rev. James Lee Riley, pastor, officiating, assisted by Dr. Walter Kerr. Burial will be in Rose Hill Cemetery under direction of Lloyd James Funeral Home.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Gertrude Talbert McDonald of Tyler; one son, George Warren (Mike) McDonald of Tyler; one daughter, Mrs. William P. Riddick of Corpus Christi; one brother, G. J. McDonald of Tyler; two sisters, Mrs. Helen Barham of Scarsdale, N.Y.; Lt. Col. Mary G. McDonald of Washington, D.C., and five grandchildren.

Pallbearers will be R. P Power, Milton Greer Mell, Lester Heiser, J. G. Powers, Eugene Talbert, Jim Sid Johnson, Royall Brown, T. Lamar Johnson and William L. Gunn.

Honorary pallbearers are Ses Haynes, Murph Wilson, Sam Bright, Dillard LaRue, Earl Andrews, Roy Pair, George Nokes, Ned Price, John Allen, W. B. Connally, M. J. Harvey Sr., the Board of Stewards of Glenwood Methodist Church and members of the Lamar S. Clark Sunday School Class.

Mr. McDonald, who resided at 526 S. Chilton, was born in Tyler.

A Navy veteran of World War II, he served in the Judge Advocate's office.

He was graduated from John Tyler High School in 1925, attended Tyler Junior College and played on the college's first football team. Later he attended the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., and received his law degree from the University of Texas where he was a member of Sigma Nu fraternity.

A member of Marvin Methodist Church for many years, he was a former member of the board of trustees of that church and past president of the Friendly Class. Mr. McDonald helped organize and start Glenwood Methodist Church. He later joined Glenwood Methodist Church and was a member of the church's official board at the time of death. He taught the Lamar S. Clark Sunday School Class at Glenwood until he became ill.

He was a former assistant Smith County attorney and served three terms as county attorney. He served two terms in the Texas State Senate, from 1951 to 1959. While in the senate, he headed a number of important committees and he was active in locating the East Texas Tuberculosis Hospital in Smith County. He was instrumental in giving Tyler and Smith Counties the chance to participate in the Upper Neches River Authority.

He belonged to St. John's Masonic Lodge No. 53 and was a member of Knights of Pythias.

A past president of the Tyler Lions Club, he was secretary for the Smith County Bar Association and was a director of the county bar association at the time of death.

Mr. McDonald was on the local board of directors of the American Cancer Society. He helped organize the Tyler Junior Chamber of Commerce and was one of its first presidents. Also, he helped organize the Tyler Little Theater.

Some of his ancestors fought in the American Revolution and at the Alamo, and some were signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Courier-Times, Nov. 29, 1962]

WARREN S. MCDONALD

Warren S. McDonald's lifespan covered little more than a half century, but if life is reckoned in terms of worthy deeds, his earthly sojourn was a long one in achievements.

He served this area 8 years as State senator. Earlier he served well as assistant Smith County attorney and then as county attorney. He was active in the county and State bar associations and in numerous community and civic organizations. He gave generous support and leadership to church work and had a leading part in establishing a new Tyler church, Glenwood Methodist, where he taught a Sunday school class and served on the board until illness disabled him. He belonged to the Masonic and Pythian fraternities.

In these alliances, in his legal profession, and in warm personal friendship, he served many of all classes, colors, and creeds. He was deeply sympathetic to the needs of people and he often went the Biblical second mile in giving aid and helping others overcome their difficulties.

The sorrow over his death is eased in the minds of many by memories of the good deeds that enriched the life of Warren S. McDonald.

Dave Marion Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Senators are especially proud of their home States and are not bashful about describing them. However, there are times when we feel a special pride that develops from some special deed or event back home.

Today I would like to describe something that has made me really proud to represent Wyoming. In this case the action resulted from a tragedy. A young student at the University of Wyoming, a star football player, was severely injured when a pistol used in a hunting expedition accidentally discharged. Mr. President, the bullet severed the spinal

column of Dave Marion and his splendidly athletic body is now paralyzed from the neck down.

An accident like this brings immediate sympathy from all concerned but it is all too easy to put such matters aside when the initial shock has worn off. I am proud to report that the people of Wyoming are not forgetting Dave Marion. A trust fund that will pay the cost of his medical care and rehabilitation is being set up. This trust fund is in the highest traditions of sportsmanship and American fairplay.

An editorial in the Laramie Boomerang presents an excellent description of this trust fund, how it is administered and what it will do. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CAUSE WELL WORTH SUPPORTING

The Dave Marion trust fund drive is finally out of the planning stages and is now being carried out throughout Wyoming.

Today Dave Marion, the Wyoming football star who held some of the greatest promise of any athlete seen on a Wyoming field, flies home to Bakersfield, Calif., paralyzed from the neck down. His football days are over, but the short time he managed to play for the Cowboys he gave his all, at times it spelled the difference between victory and defeat.

People of Wyoming have been asked to donate to the Dave Marion trust fund. A fund which will be set up so that the income from it will help defray some of the expenses the Cowboy grid great will incur in his treatment in a California rehabilitation center. Wyoming had no place where Marion could go and receive adequate treatment.

Under the rules governing the trust fund the money from the income would go to care for part of Marion's costs. Nothing or no one could draw directly from the trust fund, and no one would ever be able to touch the money coming out for Marion's expense. That would be handled through a board of three directors in Wyoming.

The trust fund has been set up so that when Marion no longer needs funds to meet his expenses, it will be available for any other athlete in Wyoming, high school or university, who might need special funds to care for injury or disability. The board would rule on what constituted a case which was eligible to draw on the fund.

The Dave Marion trust fund has been carefully worked out so that it is foolproof. There will be no cost for administering the fund and nothing but the income can be spent, and that only on cases where it is needed.

Goal of the fund is $50,000 which would give Marion between $1,800 and $2,000 per year. This in itself will not be enough to pay his expenses in the rehabilitation center, but it will pay a good share of them. Dave needs special massaging every day. It requires four persons to turn him over at regular intervals throughout the day.

Contributions have already started to pour in but there will be a need for liberal giving by all who want to help. We've seen the people of the West and Wyoming in particular come to the help of unfortunate neighbors in their communities and in the State. We feel the fund drive will gain momentum and will go over the top. We know it won't though, unless the people of the State and Albany County dig in and make a donation.

Those persons making donations are reminded that they can be deducted from income tax at the end of the year. The university checked into this with the Internal Revenue Service to make certain of this deduction before the trust fund was even announced.

All you have to do to make your donation to the fund is to fill out your check and mail it to the business office at the University of Wyoming. Be sure to put a return address on your envelope because a receipt will be mailed to each person contributing.

It's a good cause for anyone to spare a little money on. Remember, even though your contribution may be small, if everyone does the same Dave Marion will be assured of care. Wyoming athletes in the future will be assured of care if anything happens to them of a similar nature.

Get your check off today. You'll be glad you played a part in making the drive a success.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Let's Be Adult

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important article by former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, James J. Wadsworth, which appeared in the December 29, 1962, Saturday Review. In this article Ambassador Wadsworth explores cold war attitudes and makes an eloquent plea for a renewed effort toward controlled disarmament. At a time when a test-ban agreement is under discussion, this article is of special interest.

The article follows:

LET'S BE ADULT

(By James J. Wadsworth)

(NOTE.—James J. Wadsworth, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, is currently president of the Peace Research Institute in Washington, D.C.)

In common with most boys of my generation, I was brought up a devoted military-preparedness advocate. I majored in military science (ROTC) at college, then enlisted in the National Guard, took my commission in the cavalry, and served with the Guard for 11 years. When war threatened in 1941 I tried to get my commission out of mothballs, but, failing my physical, took a job in an aircraft company where I "fought the war," meanwhile acting as inspector general of a New York State Guard regiment headquartered in Buffalo.

All in all, I was and still am about as poor a candidate for what is called "pacifism" as can be imagined. By that I mean that peace, to me, is not something one espouses for religious, moral, or ethical reasons, or even political reasons. To me, peace is just the only thing that makes sense. I believe in peace precisely because I am a devoted American who would volunteer to fight for his country if she were at war; but I am also one who fervently hopes that honorable alternatives can be found to keep war from our shores and from the whole world.

It strikes me that as a first step toward finding such alternatives we Americans should take a more objective view of our peace versus war posture. Let's explore that idea for the moment, in terms of a common denominator. We are all familiar with the ways children fight with each other: Somehow the whole outlook of a child seems to revolve around the question of who started the fight and who, therefore, is solely to blame. Such wrangling is part of what I call the playground procedure. Don't you think that the adults in high offices should by now have improved a bit on the routine?

Of course, we know they haven't. Take the ever-current argument about nuclear tests. It offers plenty of material for discussion, but since September 1961 the free world has confined itself, in the main, to reiterating the accusation that the Russians broke the moratorium that had been in effect nearly 3 years. People seem to forget, however, that there had never been an agreed moratorium, and that on December 29, 1959, President Eisenhower proclaimed that as far as the United States was concerned, there was no moratorium and that we felt ourselves free to test at any time. People also forget that, since then, the United States has turned down no less than 3 suggestions on the part of the Soviets and the nonaligned states that a moratorium be entered into. Now, I have no quarrel with that policy at this time—an unpoliced moratorium can be a dangerous thing. I merely feel that when we insist on saying the Soviets "broke" a moratorium we refused to recognize as existing, we are behaving in an unadult way.

Perhaps, too, we should have listened with more care to the statements of Soviet representatives during the late summer and fall of 1958, and ever since. Many times, both at Geneva and elsewhere, we were told plainly that the Soviet Union considered it her right to conduct as many tests as had the United States and the United Kingdom put together. The main reason for Soviet resumption a year ago was indeed for the purpose of catching up, both in technology and in number of shots. I don't condone it: I think it was a bad business, but at least we were warned, even if the warning itself was not very adult.

It is interesting to note that the Soviet series conducted in 1962 seems to have occasioned only mild disturbance within the administration, and interesting too that the decision to resume U.S. tests in March of 1962 was made in the full expectation that another Russian series would follow. There was considerable speculation that after both series have been completed the Soviets would be more amenable to a test band treaty. But mark this well: there are few persons in official Washington today who are ready to say that the latest Soviet series will not trigger off still another U.S. series. And, if the United States does fire another series, what then? If the Soviets follow the playground procedure, we know the answer.

The tensions of the cold war have created a strongly belligerent posture among many Americans. Some of this is understandable, some of it unjustified by the facts, and some largely a matter of public confusion over the news. I find it all over the country, however, coming from all sorts of people. They say they are tired of being pushed around and lied about and lied to; that it is time we stood up on our hind legs and did some pushing ourselves. If you ask them whether they want an all-out nuclear war, they say "no," but they don't fear it as much as they used to because they have become accustomed to the talk about it—perhaps "numbed" would be a better word. But they call for a military invasion of Cuba in almost the same breath as they reject war.

Perhaps the most dangerous factor in this attitude is that people who have it don't see any inconsistency in it. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why one of the great Communist inconsistencies of all time seems to have made litle impression on the U.S. public, or the press, or even the Government. This inconsistency lies in the fact that the Soviet Union incessantly calls for general and complete disarmament, and just as incessantly proclaims its support both now and in the future for "wars of liberation." How one can advocate war and disarmament in the same breath I have never been able to discover, but our most belligerent Americans fall into the same trap.

Look at the situation in Berlin from the standpoint of the playground procedure. The facts are grim: they include not only the infamous wall, but the existence of massive Soviet and East German military strength right across the street. Even so, would Khrushchev readily go to war over Berlin—I mean, all-out war, which could not be avoided in such a tinderbox? Yet until Cuba, Khrushchev kept placing that chip on his shoulder with bombastic and provocatory statements, and Secretary McNamara kept threatening to knock it off by proclaiming that we have loaded nuclear weapons in our airplanes, ready at the end of the runways to take off if the President gives the word.

Haven't we seen this before? Haven't we heard it over and over again in the backyards, playgrounds, and parks of our communities? The buildup for the original charge, usually to such a point where the accused has to embrace a position of aggression never contemplated; the resentment and counterbelligerence of the accused at being unfairly pushed around; the inexorable increase of pressure, tension, and bellicosity to avoid the stigma of being "chicken," with sensation seekers yapping "let's you and him fight"—this is the cold war in our world today. It is a sad commentary on our capacity for adult thought that in the last analysis so many of us still appear to prefer the "rumble"—the mindless physical conflict—for the settlement of arguments.

Consider for a moment the concept underlying the "rumble" mentality—that if you are big and strong enough, no one will attack you. As it happens the writer of this article, who is 6 feet 4 inches tall and weighs 240 pounds, can controvert this notion. For, the fact is that there will always be those who are out to prove something (Heaven knows what) by attacking the big guy. The fact that he is big is no more a deterrent against attack than the penalty of the law, even of capital punishment, is enough of a deterrent against crime. Yet it is worth remembering that the big fellow himself can often control the situation by the exercise of adult thinking.

To scorn a trial by battle is very difficult. Our ingrown ideals of courage forbid us to refuse such a trial. Yet if to be strong automatically makes us a target for some (as indeed it does), then we must decide whether we are strong enough to ignore the occasional accusation of "chicken." If we have confidence that our way of doing things is better than that of our competitors, then we don't have to prove it by force. What we desperately need to do, then, is to develop a force of example which proclaims our inward force of character.

Our military-minded friends will retort that force of character cannot protect a country against a "mad dog" neighbor country, if the latter decides to attack. Probably true. But the point is that some people are more anxious to go out and shoot what they think is a mad dog than to make sure that it is really mad. They don't want to inquire whether some other action might not be more effective. There are even those who instead of killing the dog prefer to throw stones at it, or even to tie tin cans to its tail, which is what international diplomacy calls provocative acts. Either way, such people are not even trying to live up to their self-proclaimed label of "peace loving."

Both the great power blocs say, "We want to survive in peace." Significantly, in the United States, that simple phrase is almost inevitably followed by the word "but": "but we cannot allow communism to take over the world"; "but the Communists understand only the language of strength"; "but the Berlin Wall represents a challenge we can't afford to sweep under the rug." Whether these statements are right, wrong, or half true, the important word in them is the "but," for it means that the simple phrase that precedes it, (e.g., "We want peace") is secondary in our minds. It means that we really do not want peace under existing conditions, and that preliminary fighting may still be necessary. We have used the same "but" for the last 15 years to becloud our position in the disarmament debates and other negotiations involving the world's nations; and though it is only a tiny word, it has seemed to our antagonists and even some of our friends to qualify our acceptance of disarmament as a principle.

It might therefore prove helpful to everyone if we reminded ourselves, regularly and out loud, that the primary cause is the quest of peace and that the secondary part is the surmounting of the difficulties blocking that quest. Singlemindedness is a trait which can range from admirable devotion to stupid stubbornness, but unless we are singleminded about peace we might just as well forget it.

Today our leadership is still indulging in the same qualifying method of enunciating policy. The other day I heard a TV news commentator describe the U.S. posture in these terms: "The administration is determined to add to our military strength in every possible way and at the same time to seek disarmament." What kind of double talk is that, and what does it really mean? Our President and our top military men tell us there is no security in piling new armaments on top of old ones, but we seem determined to do it, come what may. Why do some Americans in high office display such an appalling disregard of the world? It is customary, of course, to explain away the arms escalation by saying it is merely a reflex response to what others are doing. If we were the definite underdog in this weapons business, if we needed desperately to catch up with a much more powerful adversary, I could perhaps understand this argument. But this is not the case. We do not occupy a position of weakness at all. We have enough weapons to destroy all our potential enemies many times over.

Why then the emphasis on increasing our military potential? Is it to frighten the Soviet Union into disarmament? That simply does not make sense. If there is one truth that has been proved out in the past, it is that a strong and proud nation will go to almost any lengths to keep from being surpassed militarily—to catch up if they are behind, and to keep ahead if they are ahead. Frighten the Soviet Union into disarmament? You might just as well try to frighten the United States into communism.

My quarrel with my Government, as well as with the governments of friend and foe alike, is, therefore, that they have not convinced even themselves that a world without war is worth a supreme effort. No nation has ever tried an allout, concerted, organized offensive against war as the method of settling international disputes. Many have joined together in treaties, agreements, leagues, and associations such as the United Nations, but each of them has always felt it necessary to reserve the right, out loud, to take unilateral military action should they deem it necessary.

Up until the era of the nuclear weapon this preoccupation with force-as-policy was neither surprising nor particularly vulnerable to criticism. Most wars arose from the desire for power or aggrandizement or the annexation of valuable territory. It seemed worth the time and expense of most nations either to plan for or to guard against aggression for such purposes. But it is no longer as simple as that, nor are the consequences of a shooting war in the same league today with those of times past. Therefore, if we are interested in survival, and most human beings are, we are forced in our own self-interest to find honorable alternatives to shooting.

It is all very well to swagger and strut and warn of our power and defy the antagonist to knock off the chip. Play-acting of this sort may still carry considerable weight in the playground, but not in 20th century diplomacy, because the nuclear weapon has in fact become the "great equalizer" between the warring "camps." A new way of impressing the adversary must therefore be found which will have the effect of removing the wholly uncalled-for pressures that characterize the cold war impasse.

No one has all the answers, but they exist somewhere, and they will be found. On the level of brute, man-to-man contention, we humans have often come to the realization that fighting is not as important as learning to get along; we have come to understand that the energy, substance, and blood wasted in fighting can be put to far better use in peaceful, cooperative pursuits. In such situations, neither man need be afraid of the other's strength. Each man may well figure he has a good chance of winning any set-to, regardless of his antagonist's brawn. Yet both men can find in judging each other's potential that there is room for respect, even without total agreement, and can find that this respect leads gradually to cooperation and perhaps even to friendship. Is such an evolving friendship impossible between nations? It has, after all, not proved impossible between neighbors, between communities, between cities and States.

But such respect and cooperation do need a new atmosphere, a new environment in which to thrive. And the more we yip and yap about how we should not only flex but use our muscles, the further we remove ourselves and our friends from that environment. Let me be quite clear: no one disapproves more than I do of being pushed around. I have the same wholly human reactions to indignity and injustice as most men. I do not advocate "turning the other cheek" as the preferred path to peace; rather, I insist that we can block or parry the first blow, thus making the "turning" unnecessary. But, though I understand human reaction, I cannot condone either the belligerence of the Communist line or the counterbelligerence which that line creates. Both reactions, are simply not adult, in the light of the holocaust to which they can lead.

So we must give more thought and attention to what I call the Three A's: The attitude which can help create the atmosphere in which we can take the action which will lead us and our adversaries away from the brink together. Neither of us really wants to jump off: this would mean destruction for us both. Why not, then, put as much thought and energy into creating and developing such a course of action as we do in creating and developing ever newer and more devastating weapons? Which course is more likely to be our salvation in the long run? Which makes more sense? Let's try being adult.

Proposed Changes in Senate Cloture Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, during the entire discussion over changing the rules of the Senate, the question of what should be done has often been confused with the question of how a change should be made.

I have steadfastly supported making a change in the cloture rule and I believe my votes during these proceedings have made my position clear. But I have not agreed with those who believe that the method we should use to accomplish a change is to insist that the Vice President exercise powers that properly belong to the Senate itself. I believe the Vice President has fully and faithfully discharged all of his responsibilities, and I believe the Senate should exercise its responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials and letter be inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL BROADCAST ON JANUARY 31, 1963, OVER WTOP TELEVISION AND WTOP RADIO

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON has made what we consider to be a most effective reply to criticisms of his rulings in the Senate filibuster fight.

Mr. JOHNSON came under fire from some Members of the so-called liberal bloc for his alleged failure to use all his powers as Senate presiding officer to curb filibusters.

In reply to this charge, Mr. JOHNSON cited unbroken and impressive precedents dating back to the first years of Congress. He told the Senate that he does not intend to "arrogate to himself a responsibility and a power which he does not have." He declined to "appoint himself a dictator of the Senate."

Mr. JOHNSON's position was supported by Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY of Minnesota, who certainly is no friend of the filibuster. Senator MCCARTHY declared, "For Senators to stand up and say that the Vice President, who is simply the presiding officer of this body, must save the Senate from itself is, in my judgment, most unfair. If anybody is on trial today it is not the presiding officer but it is the Senate of the United States."

This seems to us a precise description of the situation. We are not entirely convinced that a change in the filibuster rule is essential. But even conceding that it is, such an important revision in Senate procedure must be decided by the one hundred senators. It is both unfair and unwise to demand that the Vice President reverse many years of precedents to achieve for members of one group what they have been unable to achieve for themselves.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1963]

THE FILIBUSTER DEBATE

Hope for modification of the Senate's anti-filibuster rule as a result of the present maneuvers in that body has dwindled to a very thin thread. Senate Majority Leader MANS-

FIELD is working hard for an agreement to vote on Senator ANDERSON's motion aimed at bringing the rules controversy to a showdown, and there appears to be a good deal of support for this solution. But as it must necessarily involve consent of the filibustering southern Senators, they must have concluded that the outcome will be defeat of the proposed reform.

The preliminary move which prepared the way for defeat of the proposed majority cloture was Vice President JOHNSON's ruling on Monday. Citing 36 precedents, the Vice President ruled that the asserted constitutional right to close debate and adopt new rules at the beginning of a new session must be decided by the Senate itself. The issue thus laid before the Senate is debatable; so there was nothing to prevent indefinite continuation of the filibuster—unless the southerners can foresee an end in their favor.

The question before the Senate is not, of course, whether the rules can be amended by majority vote. The Senate acts by majority whether in passing bills or making its rules. The problem is to stop the talking so that a vote can take place. If Vice President JOHNSON had ruled as former Vice President Nixon had indicated he would rule, to the effect that the Senate is not a continuing body, the question would have been whether a majority of the Senate would sustain him in that view. It is highly improbable that the filibusters would permit a vote unless they are convinced that it will not.

The Senate liberals who are fighting for an easier way of cutting off debate claim 46 signatures on a statement supporting their view. If they could obtain a majority, they would score an important point in public opinion. But the effect in the Senate would doubtless be to solidify the ranks of the filibusterers, and hope of stopping the talkfest by a two-thirds vote for cloture under rule 22 appears to be virtually nil.

What is to be gained, therefore, by prolongation of the agony? Probably the legislative program has not been seriously delayed to date by the talkathon, but it cannot long continue without holding up the works and wearing down senatorial energy. The time appears to be near at hand when the Senate will have to lay aside its biennial quarrel and get on with the business of the session. If it can do this by an agreement to vote on the constitutional issue, so much the better.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1963]

THE FILIBUSTER DEBATE

I find myself in general agreement with the conclusion reached in your editorial of January 30, that little is to be gained by prolonging the agony of the cloture rule debate.

I do question, however, your contention that "If Vice President JOHNSON had ruled as former Vice President Nixon had indicated he would rule, to the effect that the Senate is not a continuing body, the question would have been whether a majority of the Senate would sustain him in that view."

Mr. Nixon said that "until the Senate indicates otherwise by its majority vote the Senate is proceeding under the rules adopted previously by the Senate," while adding that he believed "a majority of the Senate has a constitutional right at the beginning of each new Congress to determine what rules it desires to follow."

So it seems to me that Mr. Nixon recognized the continuance, even if provisional, of the Senate rules. Of course, it also appears that, if he had been a Senator, he would have voted for the Senate's constitutional right to close debate on a rules question, at the beginning of a new Congress by majority vote.

Further, Mr. Nixon said that as Presiding Officer he would put the constitutional question to the Senate for its decision, after indicating his opinion that it was in order. The procedure Vice President JOHNSON has followed in 1963 is exactly that indicated by Mr. Nixon's opinion: he has submitted it to the Senate for its decision. He accepted the view of his predecessors, that, as Mr. Nixon said, "The Chair lacks the power to make a decision on a constitutional question."

Since 1803, Presiding Officers have not decided constitutional questions, to be sustained or overruled by the Senate itself; they have instead submitted such questions to the Senate for its independent determination.

The suggestion raised in recent debates, that the Vice President should "exercise his authority" to close debate and order a vote on the matter, is unprecedented and in my opinion highly dangerous. The Vice President, a member of the executive branch, has no such authority in the Senate. As Presiding Officer he is empowered to close debate only when the Senate rules authorize him to do so, or pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement. Together with Senators HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY I have resisted the implication that he has authority to close debate by arbitrary fiat.

As a supporter of a more liberal cloture rule, I believe it is the Senate's responsibility to make the rules under which it will operate, not the Vice President's. The question of a constitutional right to end debate by majority vote was placed where it should have been—before the Senate, for its decision.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1963]

SENATE RULES

Much confusion has arisen from the criticism of Vice President JOHNSON for refusing to rule on the constitutional question implicit in the liberal bloc's motion to amend the rules. The Vice President was accused by Senator JAVITS and others of not exercising the powers of his office to promote liberalization of the antifilibuster rule. What they were asking the Vice President to do, however, was to disregard limitations on his office that have a long history.

As early as 1826 the Vice President submitted a constitutional question directly to the Senate. That practice was followed by Vice President Calhoun in 1830 and apparently by all subsequent Vice Presidents who have had to confront such issues. When the question arose in Vice President John Nance Garner's day, he said:

"It seems to the Chair * * * that this is purely a constitutional question; and under the precedents for more than a 100 years, where constitutional questions are involved as to the right of the Senate to act, the Chair has universally submitted the question to the Senate."

In the debate on Monday some of the liberal Senators who are trying to induce the Senate to disregard its old rules and vote on a new rule 22 agreed with the Vice President's ruling. Both Senators CLARK and HUMPHREY voiced their assent. Senator HUMPHREY's statement was especially significant. "I am not sure," he said, "that I want to give the Vice President of the United States the power to choke off debate. I should like to have the Senate itself face the responsibility."

This goes to the nub of the issue. The power to make rules belongs to the Senate. Should the Vice President say to the Senate that its old rule is unconstitutional and that it may proceed to an immediate vote on the making of new rules in disregard of the old rule, despite the insistence of a substantial group of Senators that the issue be debated ad infinitum? To say the least, such action would amount to an assumption of far-reaching power on the part of the Vice President. It would be welcomed in this case by some groups, but in the long run would doubtless be resented and vetoed by the Senate.

Incidentally, former Vice President Nixon did not differ from Mr. JOHNSON on this particular issue. While he expressed the view that rule 22 unconstitutionally restricts the authority of the Senate to adopt new rules at the beginning of a session, he went on to say that "under Senate precedents, a question of constitutionality can only be decided by the Senate itself and not by the Chair." In the light of the current debate it may be assumed that if the Vice President should presume to rule on a constitutional issue, some of the sponsors of cloture reform would vote against him merely to keep the Vice President in his place.

The Senate's rejection of the liberal bloc motion yesterday will not of course end the struggle to devise better means of limiting debate in the Senate. But it appears obvious that sponsors of the reform will now have to devise a more appealing approach than trying to induce the Vice President to assert the prerogatives of the Senate in the decision of constitutional issues.

The New York Newspaper Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the recent newspaper strike in New York City has created many acute problems in that metropolitan area. It illustrates a part of the total problem inherent in existing labor legislation. I am sure my colleagues will be interested in reading an editorial entitled, "Roots of Power," which appeared in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of February 1, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOTS OF POWER

Something new has turned up in the New York City newspaper strike.

Frequently, in spectacular strikes, public opinion seems to support the strikers. In this case opinion appears to have turned against the union bosses. This is so evident that it has become a matter of widespread comment.

Liberal magazines, such as the Reporter and Saturday Review, which are usually sympathetic with organized labor, in this case are attacking the union leaders and the union position. Commentator Eric Sevareid, onetime darling of liberalism, is exceedingly critical of the unions.

This is interesting news. It may be a sign that many Americans, of various shades of political and economic belief, are getting fed up with the excesses of some labor leaders and some unions.

But so far there are no signs of uneasiness among the great and powerful bosses of labor.

And as they look down from their position of vast power and privilege, why should they care?

Public opinion is a will-o'-the-wisp—and organized labor has almost everything else going for it.

The roots of union power were listed recently by J. Mack Swigert, authority on labor law, in the news magazine, U.S. News & World Report. The list is long and impressive and we can only abbreviate it here:

Unions have favorable laws that give them rights and privileges enjoyed by no other groups in America. They are exempt from the antitrust laws and, for practical purposes, exempt from the Corrupt Practices Act.

In the courts it is difficult to enjoin unions for violations of contract or of laws, and they get special and favorable treatment from arbitrators and law officers, and even the FBI is reluctant to intervene in labor disputes.

The Federal bias in favor of unions is flagrant. Mr. Swigert says that under the present administration the National Labor Relations Board has a clear prounion majority and has substantially changed labor law without legislation.

Unions have the right to strike and to boycott. They use pickets to discourage commerce. They have a tradition of threats and violence. In recent years compulsory membership is becoming commonplace. The size of unions is unlimited and the great national unions are "big business, rich, tax free, and run by a new class of well paid professional union managers."

On top of all this, the unions have the protection of a President who does not hesitate to bring the steel industry to heel but who will not blow the whistle on organized labor.

With so many things going for them and only public opinion against them, why should the bosses of labor care?

Not until opinion is outraged to the point that unions are stripped of their special privileges and made accountable to the laws that restrain other Americans will the union bosses need to worry. So far there has been no serious threat to the roots of their power.

Site of Historic Frontier Fort Chosen for Construction of New 500,000-Kilowatt Electric Generating Unit by the Allegheny Power System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, located near the university city of Morgantown, W. Va., is the original site of historic Fort Martin, hub of a small frontier community of Revolutionary War days. Settled about 1773 by a family related to Lord Fairfax, the fort will shortly become the construction site of a new $57.5 million electric-generating unit to be built by the Allegheny Power system.

Don Potter, president of the Monongahela Power Co., has announced that the plant, known as the Fort Martin power station, will be located on a 950-acre tract 8 miles north of Morgantown, W. Va., and will have a power capability of 500,000 kilowatts. Preliminary construction is scheduled to begin late this year, and when completed in 1967 the plant will be the first of two similar units which will together burn some 2,700,000 tons of West Virginia coal annually. It will be part of an overall power supply development involving 18 investor-owned electric utilities serving more than 30 million people.

It is gratifying to see this tangible evidence of progress toward prosperity and growth in an area needing economic stimulation. And in this connection it is appropriate to state for the record that the Monongahela Power Co., under the capable executive and inspirational leadership of President Don Potter, is a vital force for economic development and civic betterment in West Virginia.

The members of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress were privileged today to have been guests of Mr. Potter and his associates at a luncheon. We were briefed on the significant Fort Martin power station project, and were afforded the opportunity to discuss important economic and industrial subjects relating to the area served by this progressive company in West Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press announcement made today by the Monongahela Power Co. be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fort Martin power station, the name a derivation of an old frontier fort once situated on the proposed construction site, will be the designation of the new $57.5-million, 500,000-kilowatt electric generating unit to be built by the Allegheny power system on the Monongahela River north of Morgantown.

President Don Potter, of Monongahela Power Co., one of the operating units of the Allegheny system, said the plant would be located on the West Virginia section of the 950-acre site which is bisected by the West Virginia-Pennsylvania State line. He added that no historic relics on the early land grant which is a major part of the site would be disturbed either during construction or operation.

Preliminary construction work on the new Fort Martin plant is scheduled to begin late this year. The site is on the west bank of the Monongahela River, 8 miles from Morgantown and 2 miles from Point Marion, Pa.

Potter said that through the fine cooperation of Dr. Paul H. Price, director of the West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey, Morgantown, his company has been able temporarily to borrow the services of Dr. Edward V. McMichael, the archeologist on the survey's staff. Dr. McMichael has already made some preliminary field studies and is engaged in research to determine as accurately as possible the exact location of "Martin's fort" as it was sometimes known, or Fort Martin. The company is also interested in locating the original site of Fort Martin Methodist Church, believed to be the fifth Methodist Church built west of the mountains and the fourth church of the same name in this general location.

Members of the Monongalia County Historical Society, representatives of the faculties at West Virginia University and at West Virginia Wesleyan College, and others are also assisting in the historic study phase of the work.

Fort Martin was constructed probably no later than 1773 by Charles Martin whose first wife was a daughter of Lord Fairfax. It was on a 400-acre land grant made to Martin in 1768 in Cass district, Monongalia County, on or near Crooked Run.

There was one recorded Indian attack on Fort Martin, made in June of 1779, at a time when most of the men in the community were at work on their farms and the women, children, and some men were outside the stockade, attending to normal work assignments. A party of Indians surprised the settlers outside the fort, killed three men and carried away a man and woman and five boys as prisoners. The Indians remained in hiding in the vicinity of the fort throughout the day and during the night made an attempt to break through the barrier surrounding the main structure but were driven off when dogs sounded an alarm.

Colonel Martin likewise built a Methodist chapel on the property in 1778, the original site of which Potter said he hopes may be located. The present Fort Martin Methodist Church, built in 1912, is the fourth of the same name located in this general area.

The original Fort Martin Church is referred to in the Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury who noted that he "journeyed to Morgantown" on July 15, 1788.

"I had a lifeless, disorderly people to hear me at Morgantown. * * * It is a matter of grief to behold the excesses, particularly in drinking, which abound here. I preached at a new chapel near Colonel Martin's and felt much life, love, and power."

The new Fort Martin powerstation, due for completion in 1967, is expected to be the first unit of two of similar capability and which together will burn some 2,700,000 tons of West Virginia coal per year.

The plant is part of an overall power supply development, announced last November, involving 18 investor-owned electric utilities serving more than 30 million people. That development, expected to cost $350 million, includes two generating stations, the other to be built near Indiana, Pa., by three companies of the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland interconnection, and 650 miles of extra high voltage transmission lines. The Allegheny power system will build 130 miles of that line at an estimated cost of $17.5 million, one section extending from Fort Martin to the Ohio River, another north and east to connect with the PJM plant. From there, two lines will be built eastward into the Philadelphia and New York areas.

He's for Proper Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Paterson Evening News of January 28, 1963. It deals with the dedicated work of U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, our distinguished junior Senator:

HE'S FOR PROPER GROWTH

U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS continues to persist in his quest of a governmental fixed image of the cities of tomorrow and he is pressing the White House to conference of every agency which would be involved in such a consideration.

Speaking before the Passaic County Bar Association on Saturday night, Senator WILLIAMS indicated that while he is hopeful the White House will finally respond to his importunements, he envisions a final determination a long way off.

If his program moves with the speed which generally characterizes such massive projects, and especially under Federal aegis, the urban blight will have flowed over into the suburbs and he will then have to develop a brand new program.

This business of what's happening to cities has long plagued the junior Jersey Senator. He sees highways coursing through communities, slums springing up all around them, the massive need for good planning with transportation thinking intermingled.

Senator WILLIAMS is no fanciful dreamer. He knows the rugged path which lies ahead of such a program as he contemplates but as he told the lawyers at their dinner, it took a long time to educate people to use trash cans before they could get their litterbug attitudes. We've got news for the Senator, the bugs are still here and so is their litter.

The progress in a program as vast and esthetic as this will necessarily be slow. But if someone like Senator WILLIAMS keeps it alive, eventually what now seems a dream can become an actuality. It's worth trying.

Why Not Cut Spending, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress is considering the matter of tax reductions and reforms, I think it might be helpful to observe some of the public reaction as evidenced by editorials in newspapers throughout the country. One such editorial from the LaGrange (Ind.) Standard is entitled "Why Not Cut Spending, Too?" It follows:

WHY NOT CUT SPENDING, TOO?

It has become acceptable these days—even fashionable—to declare that once major tax cuts are rammed through Congress, buying and business activity will be so spurred as to give Federal coffers a net increase in tax dollars—maybe.

Right now the Federal Government is faced with a deficit of $7.8 billion when the fiscal year ends July 1. The reason for the huge deficit is by no means complicated. Revenues were that much less than expenditures.

Proponents of the tax cuts say that business activity and employment were significantly dampened by the Government's oppressive tax rates—to the extent that revenues didn't meet expectations.

This is completely correct—as far as it goes.

No one can argue that a tax system that drains off 52 percent of a corporation's earnings is not oppressive. The same is equally true of the Federal progressive tax structure that takes from 20 to 91 percent of an individual's income.

The administration is reportedly thinking about reducing individual income tax rates to a range of 15 to 65 percent and of cutting the corporate rate from 52 to 47 percent by January 1, 1964. But along with such welcome reductions, the administration is giving strong voice to plugging loopholes.

If this means clamping down on outright tax evaders, it is one thing. But if it means eliminating deductions which are now legitimate, it is quite another.

Does the administration's proposal envision a sleight-of-hand tax reform that will leave effective taxation virtually unchanged—while creating an illusion of lower taxes?

And then there's the other side of the taxation coin—that of spending—which has for the most part been ignored by tax-cut proponents.

Suppose—as actually has happened in the current fiscal year—revenues do not come up to expectations. Suppose next year's deficit—on top of the one we already face—amounts to $12 or $13 billion.

This means that an increasing proportion of tax revenues will be required to pay the interest on a mushrooming debt—leaving less for current national demands.

So more money is needed. Can it be raised by lowering tax rates again? Or does the deficit continue? Or are more oppressive taxes to be levied?

Whatever the course, where does it end—and how?

Unless the administration can be made to understand that spending must conform to revenue, the end can only be chaos.

Answer to the Do-Gooders Consisting of Two Signed Pieces, "Hands Off," by Mikola Tarnovsky, and "Witches' Sabbath," by Valentine Rechmedin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 22, 1963, numerous Members of this body, including myself, as well as many Members of the other body, joined Ukrainian-Americans in celebrating the 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's proclamation of her independence. At that time, I described how the Ukrainian people became the tragic victims of Soviet colonialism and expressed the hope that "the freedom we enjoy in the United States can become a way of life for all the lands now controlled by communism."

My desire to see a free Ukraine has provoked the ire of her dictatorial masters. In an article entitled "Answer to the Do-Gooders," in the January 25, 1963, issue of the Soviet-Ukrainian magazine Literaturna-Ukraine, two mouthpieces for the Soviet dictatorship inveighed against my speech for a free and independent Ukraine. The article claims that the government shaping the life of Ukrainians is already "in their hands" and that statements to the contrary "darken the clear day and foul the spring beauty of the Ukraine, blooming in the garden of the Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. President, all the horticultural metaphors in the world cannot erase these harsh and saddening facts: the Ukraine's people have no real say in their government, their future is in the calculating hands of Moscow, and this slavery over the Ukraine and the rest of the once-independent East European States was imposed through one of the most horrible exercises of force in modern history.

The acerbity of the Soviet attack on my statement indicates a very important fact: expressions of concern for the fate of the Iron Curtain captives does reach these unfortunate people and, consequently, does make their masters uneasy. I strongly urge all Americans to continue to show, through speeches and actions, that they have not forgotten their fellow human beings behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, the article in question was drawn to my attention by the American Committee for Liberation, a distinguished and widely known organization, which supports Radio Liberty and the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. At this time, I respectfully request unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWER TO DO-GOODERS

HANDS OFF

Messrs. Rockefellers, Wagners, Scotts, and others. Do not make fools of yourselves. Certainly the peoples of the world know that especially in your famous America, in the kingdom of Wall Street, the people groan under the iron heel of oligarchy, and that there is not even enough freedom for the peoples of this country alone. What is going on in your Southern States? This is simply a shame for all civilization. In New York itself, as well as in many other places in this State, and in other States, not only Negroes and Puerto Ricans, but also millions of people of different race and national origin enjoy no freedom. For example, Negroes are not allowed to live anywhere except Harlem. I lived in your kingdom many decades and have seen a lot of your false democracy.

Now I live in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, in the country you want to liberate. Give this idea up. The Ukrainian people became free as long ago as 1917, when they rescued themselves from the czar's regime and from various magnates like you, Messrs. Rockefellers, and Wagners. The Ukraine is a free and independent country, the Ukrainian people have never before felt so free as they do now, under the Soviet Government. Only under the Soviet Government, because it is a government of the people; it is a government of the workers, peasants, and intellectuals.

All the natural resources of our country no longer belong to such magnates as Tereshchenko, the Tyshkevichs and the Radziwills. You are sorry for this. The natural resources of our country belong to the people, and the government is in their hands. And this people is telling you, gentlemen: Hands off our republic, off the whole land.

NIKOLA TARNOVSKY.

WITCHES' SABBATH

Powerful bigwigs of imperialist America—like the Rockefellers—have organized a new witches' Sabbath—have organized a so-called Ukrainian Independence Day. We should not have paid attention to such an ordinary explosion of temper by the provocateurs who are doing all they can to darken the clear day and to foul the spring beauty of the Ukraine, blooming in the garden of the Soviet Socialist Republics, if their undertaking did not smell of powder.

It is said that before the Senate meeting statesmen prayed tearfully for the Ukrainian people, for their freedom and independence, and someone named SCOTT even shed

crocodile tears because, believe it or not, he is sorry, that we, Ukrainians, do not enjoy American freedom. And of course, appeals to liberate the Ukraine were sounded.

The question is: From whom, from what do these Scotts and Rockefellers invite the liberation of our Soviet Ukraine From the Ukrainian people? From the people, who for nearly 50 years, have run their own country?

There were many of those liberators in Ukrainian history. And we advise the transatlantic crusaders not to forget about this.

The Soviet Ukraine, which is blooming in the family of fraternal Socialist nations cannot be bullied.

All honest people in the world know where the truth is to be found, and where the falsehood. No supplications of transatlantic madmen will help.

Nothing will come of it, gentlemen.

VALENTIN RECHMEDIN.

Hon. Dennis Chavez

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the House and Senate in paying tribute to the life and services of the late U.S. Senator, DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico.

All of us have lost a very fine friend and colleague and his passing will be felt not only in the State and Nation which he served so well, but especially among the common people of the world. His heart was as big as the world in which he lived, and he gave unstintingly of it to the service of mankind. In the contributions of his life we find especially the rights of the minority served and protected.

Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, was no novice in the field of legislative service. He spent a lifetime in such endeavors. He ended his career as he began it—in service in the U.S. Senate, first as an employee and then later as a distinguished Member. There are but few Members of the Congress of the United States who have climbed up the rungs of the ladder as did he from his first position as a clerk to the Secretary of the Senate until the time of his death when he had reached his position as a senior Member of that great body.

He was trained as a lawyer and returned for a while to his native State of New Mexico to practice law, but the political thread which had been sewn into his very being during his time as an employee of the Senate soon led him into the field of active politics and into the legislative halls of the State of New Mexico where he served with distinction. In 1931 he returned to Washington as a Member of Congress where he served with honor and ability throughout the 72d and 73d Congresses. His services were further recognized by his State and he finished his life with more than a quarter of a century of service in the U.S. Senate.

The late senior Senator from New Mexico was molded of no ordinary clay. His was a personality set apart for him and him alone. He loved people; he knew how to serve them, and he used every available tool at his command to bring success to his efforts in behalf of his people. His life will serve in our memories as a symbol of great tradition of dedication to those whom he loved and the purposes which motivated him.

I extend my sympathy to the loved ones he left behind. In their sorrow, they can be consoled by the fact, however, that the spirit which was his will never die, but will continue to be a guiding light to those who serve their fellow man.

Ceremony Introducing the New 5-Cent American Flag Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, the Government Employees Council—AFL-CIO—joined with the Post Office Department in sponsoring a very impressive stamp ceremony that introduced a new 5-cent American flag postage stamp.

I was privileged to witness this ceremony and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the program.

The opening comments were made by Mr. James F. Kelleher, special assistant to the Postmaster General. Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, chairman, Government Employees' Council, made appropriate remarks pertaining to this new stamp issue.

The main speaker was the Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY, chairman, House Appropriation Subcommittee, Departments of Treasury and Post Office, and his remarks follow:

REMARKS BY HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY, OF VIRGINIA, AT THE AMERICAN FLAG CEREMONY, JANUARY 9, 1963

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which is normally concerned with what the Post Office Department spends each year, it is a refreshing experience for me today to participate in this revenue-producing venture—the dedication of the new 5-cent American flag stamp.

The Post Office Department is to be congratulated for its efforts in this field. Postmaster General Day gave up writing novels but he continues to produce best sellers. You have used men in space and upside-down diplomats to sell stamps—and you have played Santa Claus, to the mailers of the country with a popular Chritsmas issue.

It looks like you have another big seller here today and it is likely to serve a double purpose. It is jsut possible that the stamp we are dedicating will be the sugar coating for the pill some people find the increased postal rates to be. You have wrapped that extra penny of cost on first-class mail in the Americn flag and I know of no better way to make it more palatable to the patriotic citizens of this country.

But I seriously question whether the sugar coating is necessary. Reflect for a moment on the service you can get for a 5-cent stamp.

You can let your relatives in San Francisco know that you are coming West next summer for a 2-week visit. And you can let your other relatives in Texas know that you are sorry, but you won't be home when they want to visit you.

You can drop Casey Stengel a line to let him know that you watched him on television and that you think he should have taken his pitcher out two innings earlier.

Or you can write George Marshall and ask him when the Redskins are going to get a punter—or a team so good it won't have to punt.

You can even write your Congressman and tell him what you think of him for voting to increase postal rates.

But seriously, the postage stamp is still one of America's best buys. It is encouraging to note that a country which has almost forgotten about a good 5-cent cigar can still rely on a good 5-cent stamp.

And while the service is costing a penny more this year on first-class mail, the increase is a step toward solving a very real problem—the postal deficit. I am told that the required 5-cent stamp on first-class letters will bring in an additional $400 million in the coming year. I understand further that all of the rate increases will reduce the annual postal deficit to approximately $250 million.

This is progress that is particularly pleasing to the Congress. As I look upon the colors in this new stamp today, I am mindful of my former colleague, the Honorable Gordon Canfield, who once served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee it is now my privilege to head. Gordon Canfield was a prime advocate of the multicolored stamp program and I know he will be proud of this issue today.

Let me congratulate you again on your salesmanship. And let me assure you that those of us in the Congress close to your operation of the world's largest business know that in handling close to 70 billion pieces of mail a year you are performing a masterful and patriotic service. It is most appropriate that you utilize in this service the flag of the United States of America to carry the mail over the land of the free and to the homes of the brave.

The ceremony was concluded with some well-chosen words by the Postmaster General, Hon. J. Edward Day.

Otsego Lake the Site of One of Aviation's Great Historic Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last year I took occasion to point out the claim of Hammondsport, N.Y., to be the birthplace of naval aviation, not San Diego, Calif. For it was at Hammondsport, on the waters of Keuka Lake that the first naval aircraft flew and the first naval aviators became qualified. While Hammondsport itself is not in my district, most of the waters of Keuka Lake, including those over which the first naval aviation flights were made—are in my district.

Now I am proud to learn that another historic aviation event, the first flight from a frozen lake surface, also occurred at one of the many beautiful lakes within New York State's 35th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. The details of this event are included in the following story from the January 30 issue of the Freeman's Journal of Cooperstown, N.Y.:

HISTORIC FLIGHT FROM OTSEGO LAKE 48 YEARS AGO

Forty-eight years ago Tuesday, January 29, 1915, a locally built airplane made its initial flight from the ice-covered surface of Otsego Lake, the first airplane to use the surface of the lake as a landing strip.

The airplane, a Curtiss type biplane popular in those days, was designed and built by the late J. Arthur Olson of this village, who had already spent 7 years in the embryo aviation field when his plane made its first flight. He had been employed by the Curtiss Aeroplane Works in Hammondsport, and the Thomas Aviation School at Bath beore returning to Cooperstown to build his plane at the old Francis Wagon Works on Railroad Avenue.

An account of the flight as it appeared in the Freeman's Journal of February 3, 1915:

"The hopes of the builder, J. Arthur Olson, and the fears of the self-appointed committee of '47' were both realized Saturday (January 29) when the biplane which had been under construction for several weeks at the Francis Wagon Works, moved gracefully into the air and after a flight of nearly a mile, was brought to the frozen surface of Otsego Lake again by the pilot, William B. Stewart, because of engine trouble.

"The machine was taken to the lake and the day before the first tests were made. The mercury was hovering near the zero mark and the extreme cold caused many difficulties. Water was heated and the radiator filled several times and finally about 6 o'clock the motor was started. Crossed wires, however, prevented it from running perfectly, and shortly after dark, the trials were given up for the day.

"Saturday morning, Mr. Olson, the plane's owner, George E. McNamara, of Boston, and Mr. Stewart, who made the flight, and several local mechanics were on the job and made ready for further trials. A leak in the radiator caused a postponement until afternoon, and the crowd which had anxiously awaited further proceedings, departed to partake of the midday meal.

"Shortly after 2 o'clock, all was in readiness and after a due amount of coaxing, the motor whirled and Mr. Stewart guided the machine over the ice for a trial spin. The engine did not run perfectly, but nevertheless the aviator circled on the ice nearly to Two Mile Point, and returned.

"Following further adjustments, the engine was started and Stewart guided the plane across the ice again. It was not his intention to attempt any flight, but the biplane handled so well that he changed his controls, and slowly the machine left the ice and ascended to a height of about 50 feet. For nearly a mile it glided along and then engine trouble developed, and Stewart brought the plane to the ice again. The crowd, however, was well pleased with the flight and Mr. Olson was heartily congratulated.

"While preparing for another flight, the plane caught fire directly beneath the engine, and was put out with little difficulty, but not before a good sized hole was burned in the covering.

"Sunday afternoon, it was drawn back to the factory, and Monday the owner and builder began to disassemble it. As soon as it can be taken down and packed it will be shiped to Boston where Mr. McNamara will make further flights."

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I suppose those things that happen to us in our youth are among the most memorable of all in our experience. Like most people of my generation, I think of the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a magic name.

Very vividly do I recall, because I was of an impressionable age at the time, how stirring was the coming of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the Presidency of this country. I remember a cold and windy March day in 1933 when a man rose from a wheelchair and stood with the aid of a cane, and looked into the heart of a Nation. What he saw was a picture of stagnation and fear. One-third of the Nation he saw ill clothed, ill fed, and ill housed. Twelve million men were out of work. They walked the city streets and the country byways, they crossed the Nation as best they could in search of employment. Farms were being foreclosed and each time a farm gate swung shut on rusty hinges, yet more Americans joined this army of unemployed.

Home mortgages were being called; savings of a lifetime were being lost; and families dispossessed. This was the picture that he saw; this was the picture which was so vivid to me in that year

Then he spoke. I remember wherever men and women had gathered to sit beside a radio there came his clear, resonant voice, bespeaking confidence. The Nation regained its poise, recaptured its balance as it tottered there on the brink of the abyss of despair. He told us that the only thing to fear was fear itself, and we overcame our fears.

Confidence begot confidence. The wheels of industry slipped into a higher gear. Men who stood in the pay line again received a good wage and had a full dinner pail, and they bought the things industry turned out. So too did the farmer who began to find again a decent price for the products of his soil and of his toil. It was not long until the wheels of industry slipped into a still higher gear. Confidence was astir. Our Nation was on the road to recovery. And in the White House was a man with a great and compassionate heart who seemed mindful of us and of all the plain and nameless people like us. I remember we sang a song called "Happy Days Are Here Again."

Then as the Nation was recovering, I, like most of my contemporaries, saw the storm clouds as they crossed the horizon. Was was in the air. Europe was in flames. Japan was on the march. We tried to stay out. We tried to be neutral without giving the world over to the lawless expansion of a band of marauding aggressors. But we could not. Then suddenly we were attacked. I remember as though it were yesterday the sound of his words as he spoke of December 7, 1941, "a day that will live in infamy", and the strength of his vow to win through to the ultimate triumph—so help us God.

I remember Franklin D. Roosevelt as a gallant wartime leader whose inspiration helped us to marshal the forces that a free nation alone can marshal. Americans of my generation were sent to the far corners of the earth. Gradually the tide of battle turned. Victory seemed assured. And then almost suddenly, it seemed, the President was no longer young, but very old. For each time a young American fell in the flower of his youth before the grim frenzy of war and new white crosses appeared on foreign hillsides from Saipan to Salerno, something within the President died also.

I remember as do all of us that dismal day in April, 1945, when from his shoulders the impediments of the Presidency and the burdens of free men everywhere were shaken off and he, like all mortal flesh, had gone to his reward. Seldom has an entire nation been so smitten by an event as we were by his death. It was almost as though every one of us had lost a close relative and an intimate friend. So great was his attachment for us, and ours for him.

Even today as we look back I know that those of my generation when we think of the Presidency of the United States do now and will forever think it reached its apex under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Still his name symbolizes for us, as he then embodied for us, the Presidency. He was to us a great leader, unquestionably one of the greatest Americans who ever lived, surely the towering figure of his time—and I am constrained to believe one of the greatest Presidents, if not the greatest President of all time.

Army Cites Long Island Industry for Excellence of Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Korfund Dynamics Corp., of Westbury, N.Y., one of the progressive industries on Long Island and in my congressional district, has been awarded a certificate of appreciation by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for its excellent performance in supplying shock isolation systems on an accelerated schedule to Titan II launch sites.

The citation states:

CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

Korfund Dynamics Corp. is cited for superior service to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from September 29, 1961, to September 28, 1962, in the fabrication and delivery of shock isolation devices to 57 Titan II intercontinental ballistic missile complexes near Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.; McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans; Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.; and Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. The highly professional approach, superior initiative, and excellent performance in the

execution of this contract under the difficult conditions imposed contributed to the successful completion of an element of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers intercontinental ballistic missile construction program and represent a patriotic civilian service to the accomplishment of the Army's mission in the national defense.

Mr. Donald H. Vance, executive vice president of Korfund Dynamics Corp., in accepting the award, had this to say of the project:

On behalf of all my associates at Korfund I would like to express our sincerest appreciation of this honor which you have bestowed on us. In these madcap times of the nuclear armament race, it seems so seldom that anyone takes the time to say "thanks for a job well done." Your appreciation of our efforts is the greatest personal reward that each of us on this project could have received.

This was the most challenging and rewarding job encountered during my 20 years with Korfund. The problems were tremendous. As you know, much of the shock isolation system had to be designed around the equipment it supported. Much of the equipment had never been built before, so design data on the equipment was not available to the architect-engineers until very late in the construction phase of the missile sites. Much of this data was revised even after we received the contract due to last minute equipment changes. This resulted in a situation where the Korfund shock isolators became a critical controlling factor in the activation of the missile sites.

No one man or organization was responsible for the successful crash program involving redesign of the hardware, critical material procurement, tooling up and production of these shock isolators so that the job was actually completed 6 weeks ahead of the contract schedule. Only a team effort could have made this performance possible. That team consisted of Colonel May, Mr. Kuminsky, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Bell and others at the Corps of Engineers Ballistic Missile Construction Office, Ralph M. Parsons Co., and Colonel Freer, Mr. Y. Peterson, Irving Rosenfeld, and John Price from the New York District Office of the Corps of Engineers, plus the production workers, supervisors, engineers, and executives here at Korfund who frequently worked 12 to 15 hours a day on this job. I think that this type of cooperation, when the chips are down, between Government, management, and labor is one of the greatest factors in our country's history of success in meeting emergencies.

We at Korfund are proud to have participated in this project and are grateful for the opportunity to be members of such a dedicated team. Again, many thanks for taking the time to express your appreciation of our efforts.

To Still Freedom's Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, in the RECORD is an article written by Harold E. Fey, editor of the Christian Century magazine, which gave reasons why the continued existence of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is detrimental to the Nation's health.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD the text of the January 31, 1963, newsletter of the American Security Council, entitled "To Still Freedom's Voice." This newsletter, as an editor's note on page 1 indicates, was written by our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER, at the request of the American Security Council because of "the renewed vigor of the Communist attack" on the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This newsletter is, I believe, a most effective reply to the article by Mr. Fey and makes it crystal clear why this House should, without question, retain the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In comparing these two articles, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the House consider the relative authority with which the authors speak and also the authority of those who are quoted in or endorse these two articles.

First, I would like to point out that Mr. Fey is not, and never has been, recognized here in this country or anywhere else as an authority on communism and how to fight it. To the contrary, although I am certain that he is not in the least bit pro-Communist, he has naively given his support to a number of Communist fronts.

To bolster the position he takes in his article, Mr. Fey quotes two men, Alan Barth and Telford Taylor. These two men, again, are not recognized as authorities on communism, and such public name as they have is based largely on the fact that they have been outspoken critics of numerous anti-Communist and security measures taken by the U.S. Government and particularly congressional investigations of subversion.

Mr. Fey names some religious leaders who, he says, have called for abolition of the committee. Again, not one of these men is recognized as an authority on communism. On the other hand, religious leaders who do have such recognition, are the authors of well-known books on the subject and famed speakers on it, have indicated their support of the committee by voluntarily testifying before it on various phases of communism. They are—

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the 84-year-old Christian Herald, the most widely circulated interdenominational monthly in the United States; Bishop Fulton Sheen; Dr. S. Andhil Fineberg, community religious consultant of the American Jewish Committee and director of its program against communism; and Dr. Charles W. Lowry, chairman and executive director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.

Numerous other clergymen and religious leaders have endorsed the work and urged its continuance.

Though, as I said before, Mr. Fey is in no way recognized as an authority on communism, the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on the other hand, is recognized throughout our Nation as a real authority on the subject and how communism should be fought.

Moreover, in what he states in his article, he does not stand alone. He is supported by the distinguished officers, members, and consultants of the American Security Council.

Who are these men? I will not take the time to name them all, but do want to mention a few of the names, at least, that are known to every American and also some of those who, because of their scholarly writings on the subject of communism, are recognized not only in this country but abroad as outstanding authorities on the subject: Loyd Wright, former president of the American Bar Association and former Chairman of the Commission on Government Security; Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb; Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, and former special adviser on strategic intelligence to the Air Force; Adm. Felix B. Stump, former commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and chief executive officer of the Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge; Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, of the University of Notre Dame; Edward Ansel Mowrer, the well-known author, columnist, and commentator on national and international affairs; and Dr. William R. Kintner of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.

I could go on, but I believe the few names I have mentioned are sufficient to convince all Americans where the voice of authority, the voice of knowledge, and the voice of America lies on the question of the Committee on Un-American Activities and whether it should be continued by this House.

The newsletter follows:

TO STILL FREEDOM'S VOICE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Due to the renewed vigor of the Communist attack on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, we have asked Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of that committee, to prepare this exclusive discussion of this attack on his committee.)

At the direction of Moscow, one of the most intense Communist drives to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities that has ever been waged is now in full swing.

Top-ranking Communists from more than 20 countries met in Liblice, Czechoslovakia (near Prague), at the end of May 1962, to plan how Communists in various countries could best destroy their enemies and thus pave the way for a Communist victory. Under the title "Anticommunism, the Enemy of Mankind," abridged proceedings of this gathering have been published in the World Marxist Review, the official world Communist directive organ published in Prague in 18 languages.

These proceedings reveal that seven steps were spelled out at this international Communist conference as essential to the victory of communism in the United States. The fourth reads, in part, as follows: "Abolition of the House Un-American Committee."

For months the Communist press and top U.S. party leaders have been exhorting the party faithful to concentrate on abolition activity. Numerous party fronts have been thrown into the campaign. Many thousands of dollars are being spent.

WHAT IS THE PARTY'S ABOLITION STRATEGY?

It is to demand outright abolition of the committee by amending the House rules. Knowing, however, that there is no possibility of achieving this at present, the party is concentrating on a half-a-loaf strategy. It has called for the transfer of the committee's functions to a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and, failing that, a large cut in the committee's appropriation. Either move would drastically impair the committee's operations and, the party hopes, pave the way for its complete destruction.

Representatives LINDSAY and FARBSTEIN, of New York, and ROOSEVELT, of California, have introduced resolutions to transfer the committee's functions to the Judiciary Committee.

The party is now claiming that, as a result of the thousands of telegrams and letters it has caused to be sent to Congressmen and the personal visits to them by about 100 Communists and fellow travelers who were in Washington on the opening days of the new Congress, 84 House Members will vote for these resolutions or to oppose the committee appropriation.

The actual record of the committee—as opposed to the lies about it spread by the Communists with the help of some not so highly principled liberals—reveals what will actually be at stake when these questions come to a vote.

Committee documents are used as texts and supplemental reading materials in high schools, colleges and seminars, Government agencies, and by foreign governments. They provide speech material for Government officials, civic leaders, educators, and clergymen, as well as Members of Congress and the press. They have been distributed abroad as weapons in the battle for men's minds.

Numerous books on communism, written by recognized scholars and authorities, refer to, quote from, and base their findings on committee hearings and reports.

Abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities—let's face it—means destroying the agency that has developed more security legislation, given the Congress more information about communism, and done more harm to the Communist Party than any other institution, public or private, in this country. To do this at a time when world communism strength is at an alltime high, is suicidal.

I fully appreciate why the Communists, and Moscow, want to destroy the committee. The so-called liberals, though, have me utterly confused.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Universal Appeal of Lincoln Comes Through Kinship With All Mankind—Clarendon E. Van Norman Writes of the Youthful Years in New Salem, Ill., in Article, "Lincoln and the Land That Shaped Him"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, throughout the world, wherever thinking people pause to ponder the true responsibilities of freedom and democracy, the name of Abraham Lincoln is honored. We celebrate the anniversary of his birth on next Tuesday, February 12. The universality of this humble man transcends barriers of time, distance, culture, race, and religion, bringing to all who study his life new dimensions in understanding, and limitless challenge for the future.

Poet-historian Carl Sandburg has said that—

Not often in the story of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm and peace unspeakable and perfect. Here and there across centuries come reports of men alleged to have these contrasts. And the incomparable Abraham Lincoln * * * is an approach if not a perfect realization of this character.

Perhaps a portion of the worldwide acclaim which has come to Lincoln can be attributed to his rough beginnings, and to his lifelong dedication to improving the lot of all mankind. In an effort to grasp the essence of his awareness of people and their needs, historians have devoted much study to Lincoln's early years, to his family, and to the environment in which he lived. West Virginians are proud that our beloved State was the birthplace of Lincoln's mother, Nancy Hanks, and that through her, we gain a sense of kinship with her immortal son.

Mr. President, a scholarly discussion of a portion of Lincoln's early life, "Lincoln and the Land That Shaped Him," has been written by Clarendon E. Van Norman for the February issue of the Rotarian. A noted authority on "The Great Emancipator," Mr. Van Norman tells of young Abe's arrival at New Salem, Ill., in July 1831, "penniless, on his own, and for the first time away from kinfolk." He then dwells on the succession of jobs Lincoln held in this small community: store clerk, soldier in the Black Hawk War, political candidate, merchant, postmaster, surveyor, and above all, student. While struggling with all of these duties, the growing Lincoln was driven by the realization that to attain any measure of success he must first educate himself.

Mr. Van Norman takes us on a tour of the restored town of New Salem, noting the various shops and homes where the young President once worked and lived. He then relates that—

In leaving the village I paused to look at the heroic statue Abraham Lincoln—From New Salem, by the sculptor Avard Fairbanks. The aimlessness is gone—an energetic, determined Lincoln lets fall from his left hand the ax as he firmly holds in his right arm the copy of Blackstone. He sets out for Springfield and the larger avenues that will lead him to the U.S. Presidency and to the stature of world citizen.

I request that the article "Lincoln and the Land That Shaped Him," by Clarendon E. Van Norman, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN AND THE LAND THAT SHAPED HIM

(By Clarendon E. Van Norman)

The pioneer village of New Salem, Ill., lies 20 miles northwest of Springfield. From St. Louis, where in June Rotarians will gather in convention, it is a leisurely 3-hour motor trip. "Lincoln's New Salem" it is often called; he lived there from 1831 to 1837.

The village was founded in 1829 by James Rutledge and John M. Camron. They built a saw and grist mill on the Sangamon River just below the hill. A loghouse village grew, flourished briefly while river transportation by steamboat seemed a possibility, then declined. In 1839 it flickered out.

Recently I visited New Salem, where now stands the village, reconstructed, cabin after cabin. The Berry-Lincoln store was the first building in the restoration, the cornerstone being placed in November 1932. It was a gray, misty morning and no person was in sight as I moved from cabin to cabin. From Samuel Hill's residence I went to Onstot's cooper shop, to Miller's blacksmith shop, and on, traversing the length of the village.

In the buildings and their contents I sensed something of the historic import of the American pioneer community. Environments like this helped to mold the character of the early Americans. Here in New Salem, confidence in the common man and abiding faith in the Almighty were impressed deeply in the soul of Abraham Lincoln.

In April of 1831 Lincoln hired out to Denton Offutt to pilot a flatboat of produce to New Orleans. The boat became stranded on the dam built near the Rutledge mill opposite New Salem. There it hung, bow in air and stern taking water. Villagers yelled instructions to the tall pilot, who devised an ingenious plan to get it underway once more. Offutt saw possibilities in Lincoln and offered him a store clerk job on his return from the river trip.

Penniless, on his own, and for the first time away from kinfolk, Lincoln came to New Salem in July 1831, like a "piece of floating driftwood."

At 22 he was undecided and full of contradictions. He had a good sense of humor, yet at times was deeply melancholy; he was athletic, yet ungainly; now energetic, now lazy.

Offutt liked Lincoln, and his boasting of Lincoln's abilities brought Lincoln a challenge to a wrestling match from Jack Armstrong. Jack was champion of the rough-and-ready boys from Clary's Grove. Lincoln accepted the challenge and before a crowd he bested Jack, winning not only the match but the friendship and political support of the clan thereafter.

At Offutt's store, work had hardly started when the Black Hawk War broke out. Lincoln volunteered and was chosen captain of his company. At Kellogg's Grove he helped bury five men killed by Indians. His vivid, recorded recollection reads, "And every man had a round, red spot on the top of his head, about as big as a dollar, where the redskins had taken his scalp. It was frightful, but it was grotesque; and the red sunlight seemed to paint everything all over. I remember that one man had on buckskin breeches." He was in no battle, but he made friends, told stories, and gained knowledge of men under discipline.

Back from the war without means and without business, he became a candidate for the Illinois State Legislature. He watched the effect of his speaking on people. The people listened and found him convincing. The community was impressed by his ambition. Abe lost his first campaign, but 277 out of 290 in his own precinct voted for him. He remarked later that this was the only defeat by direct vote of the people he ever had. He easily won in 1834 and again in 1836.

Stephen T. Logan, who later was to be his law partner, described the young politician: "He was a very tall and gawky and rough-looking fellow then—his pantaloons didn't meet his shoes by 6 inches. But after he began speaking, I became very much interested in him. He made a very sensible speech."

The election over, he studied what he should do—thought of learning the blacksmith trade—thought of trying law—rather thought he could not succeed without a better education.

From Rowan Herndon he purchased a partnership in a store with Bill Berry. The firm of Lincoln and Berry was formed. It is noteworthy that Herndon "Accepted his note in payment of the whole." The store did not prosper, but "winked out" and Lincoln found himself in debt.

In 1833 he became postmaster of New Salem, a position which he held until the office was moved to Petersburg in 1836. Lincoln netted little above $50 a year. He was lax in his duties and a contemporary letter comments: "The postmaster is very careless about leaving his office open and unlocked during the day—half the time I go in and get my newspaper, etc., without anyone there."

As a source of income, surveying was more important than being postmaster. Under Thomas M. Neale he became deputy surveyor. Surveys of New Boston, Bath, Albany, Huron, and a resurvey of Petersburg were made. Roads and boundary lines run by him still exist. But to his meager income the most significant additions came in warrants for his legislative service.

All the while he studied and read. He was helped by schoolmaster Mentor Graham, an able man who loved teaching those of ambitious nature. Abe delved into Kirkham's grammar, which he walked 6 miles to get. In writing he developed a habit of accuracy to the smallest detail. In mathematics his interest now centered on Euclid. Lincoln knew the importance of reason and proof.

At an auction in Springfield he purchased a copy of Blackstone's Commentaries. It was said in one session he mastered 40 pages. Bowling Green, justice of the peace, enjoyed young Lincoln's logic and wit. Lincoln argued minor cases in his court. He witnessed deeds, identifications of stray horses, and other documents. In learning the law, and, from his legislative experience, the importance of further study in the field became obvious to him.

In leaving the village I paused to look at the heroic statue Abraham Lincoln—From New Salem, by sculptor Avard Fairbanks. The aimlessness is gone—an energetic, determined Lincoln lets fall from his left hand the ax as he firmly holds in his right arm the copy of Blackstone. He sets out for Springfield and the larger avenues that will lead him to the U.S. Presidency and to the stature of world citizen.

About him someone said, "They laughed at his stories until they had almost shaken their ribs loose." Another said, "He mastered surveying in 6 weeks and grammar in 3." Others wondered and spoke softly of Ann Rutledge. The great Lincoln writer Carl Sandburg wrote, "The facts and myths of his life are to be an American possession shared widely over the world." And again, "The people of many countries take Lincoln for their own. He belongs to them."

Prophetic sound the words of the Bard of Avon:

"His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, 'This was a man.'"

How To Lose Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial from the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., appeared on February 5, 1963.

People are beginning to wonder what strange influence is at work to cause us to lose our friends in droves all over the world, and continue to promote our enemies, especially those of Communist persuasion.

It is time to pause and ask: Why? and How? It is a time to go much further and root out these sinister influences that may in the end even prove to be our country's downfall.

The article follows:

HOW TO LOSE FRIENDS

It isn't clear to all of us yet, and probably won't be until the news-managing business permits, but one thing must be obvious to the American people. We are losing a lot of friends. Or antagonizing them.

Some of them, like the unlamented Batista in Cuba and Trujillo in the Dominican Republic could be spared, but Castro in Cuba is far worse than his predecessor Batista.

Others, all strong opponents of communism and pretty good friends of the United States, have had occasion for painful reappraisals in recent months. These include Pakistan, which saw hostile India get arms purportedly for use against Red China; Portugal, which suffered distress over Angola and Goa; the Dutch, who were shoved out of West Guinea; the Belgians who were shoved out of the Congo and Katanga; the French, who were subjected to pressures with respect to nuclear research and armament, as well as diplomatic and publicity heat over British admission to the Common Market; the Canadians, who suffered similar pressure with respect to use of nuclear weapons; the British, with respect to some African problems(not to forget a certain Suez situation a few years ago).

To all of these we contributed. Why?

Many of these nations or administrations are active allies in our North Atlantic Treaty Organization. They are foes of communism. In any engagement at arms with the Reds, nuclear or otherwise, we would need to rely upon them.

There may be some good reason for these happenings, but it hasn't been made clear. Only the events, themselves, and such consequences as jeopardized governments in England and Canada. If anything happened to De Gaulle, this could extend to France.

It's encouraging to see that Congress is growing restive. The Nation should be told who's cooking in the kitchen and what he's trying to serve.

Farmers Do Not Want Compulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the February 2 issue of the Prairie Farmer magazine contained two interesting surveys of farmer opinion. One indicated that only 23 percent of Indiana and Illinois farmers want the compulsory farm program. The other showed that only 38 percent want a cut in Federal income taxes.

The article follows:

ONLY 23 PERCENT WANT COMPULSORY FARM PLAN

Most farmers in Indiana and Illinois want nothing to do with a compulsory farm program, according to a recent Prairie Farmer survey. Asked if they believed that every farmer should be required to take part in a farm program in order to make it work, 60.2 percent said no; 22.6 percent said yes, and the rest were undecided.

Opposition to a mandatory farm program was slightly stronger in Indiana than in Illinois.

As was expected, opposition to compulsion is higher in Farm Bureau ranks, and lower among Farmers Union members. It is interesting to note again as we have noticed in previous polls that farmers who do not belong to any farm organization think pretty much like Farm Bureau members.

Here is the breakdown of the poll by farm organization affiliation ("none" means no affiliation):

Indiana

	Farmers Union	Farm Bureau	NFO	None
For	42.6	21.3	27.0	16.9
Against	34.0	65.5	50.8	63.8
Undecided	23.4	13.2	22.2	19.3

Illinois

	Farmers Union	Farm Bureau	NFO	None
For	65.9	24.7	42.2	22.3
Against	25.0	58.2	46.5	57.9
Undecided	9.1	17.1	11.3	19.8

FARM POLL SHOWS 38 PERCENT FAVOR CUT IN INCOME TAXES

Should we have a cut in Federal income taxes? This is one of the hottest political questions at present. Indiana and Illinois farmers are pretty evenly divided in their opinions, according to a recent Prairie Farmer poll.

Both Indiana and Illinois figures show that 38 percent want a cut in Federal income taxes now. In Indiana 39.7 percent said no, and 22.3 said they were not sure. In Illinois 40.2 percent were against cutting income taxes now, and 21.8 percent were undecided.

There wasn't much difference in the views expressed according to a breakdown by farm organization membership. Even Farmers Union members saw eye to eye with Farm Bureau members on this question. Farmers over 65 tended to be more strongly opposed. Other farmers of all ages felt about the same way with a slight margin in opposition.

One of the strange things about the poll was that the farm people in the upper income brackets were more strongly opposed to a tax cut than the men in the lower income brackets, and yet it is the men in the higher income category who pay the highest taxes. Men with gross farm income of $20,000 or more were 60 percent opposed to a tax cut. But only 35 percent of the men with a gross of less than $5,000 opposed an income tax cut.

Many said they would go along with a cut in taxes if a cut in spending came first.

Home Was Never Like This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the feelings of a new Congressman arriving

in Washington for the first time are certainly worthy of note, but they are seldom adequately recorded. Some of these impressions and the motivations and problems of a man who runs successfully for Congress have been graphically set down by Charles Bartlett, the noted Washington correspondent.

I believe that the following column by Mr. Bartlett which appeared in the New Haven (Conn.) Register on January 20, 1963, records some of these motives, attitudes, and experiences with such skill that it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The jolly bustle which accompanies the assembly of a new Congress is a poor reflection of the trouble which each Member has taken to get here and of the discomforts which lie ahead of him.

The enthusiasm for legislative life remains one of the great sociological enigmas. Why should men or women be eager to surrender the serenity of their homes and the security of their positions for the hazards of a campaign, the frustration of playing the small frog in the large pond, and the problems of simultaneous residence in two places?

The spirit of the convening Members is almost ebullient as they pick their way through the crates in their offices, the countless receptions and other forms of mass hospitality which are the congressional lot through the year.

Rarely bemoaning the comfortable homes they have left behind, the new Members crowd their belongings into hotel rooms, apartments or small but expensive houses in the suburbs. Startled children are dragged in the middle of their school year into a totally strange environment and dumped into classrooms wherever room can be found for them.

The situation is not as bleak as it was in December 1847 when Mary and Abraham Lincoln checked into Mrs. Briggs' boarding house across the plaza from the Capitol. The lure of the city was so limited then that the Illinois Congressman's wife left after 3 months for her father's home in Lexington.

The wives don't leave Washington today until they have to. Europeans may still find the city fairly provincial but to most of the wives it is Paris on the Potomac.

Nevertheless they still face many of the problems which drove Mary Lincoln to Lexington. They have lost their husbands before they arrive to the mistress of politics and here the dalliance becomes a marked preoccupation. Long hours on the Hill and weekends spent politicking at home restrict the time for family life. The Congressman's vacation rarely jibes with the school's vacations and he is apt to be home in his district when the children are in school in Washington. The home is often divided with the wife striving like a colossus to keep a foot in each camp.

The motives which bring men into politics and thus into Congress are many but they are usually tied to a quest for recognition and power. These come slowly to a new Congressman.

His first committee is rarely the one that he had in mind when he ran for Congress and his voice on that committee is deeply muted by his junior status. He can attend the long hearings, have a late turn at questioning the witness, and cast his vote. But he knows well that the Machiavellian heart of the system reposes in the gnarled hands of the committee chairman. And he knows that he will not feel the tingle of that power until his own hands are gnarled and he has survived many campaigns.

He faces a kaleidoscope of legislation, a blur of activity which may seem at times to overwhelm him. He will find it difficult to keep up the titles of bills that pass before the House and have little time to learn their substance.

Representative JOE MARTIN can remember when only three or four bills of consequence came before Congress each year. He remembers a time when the House Foreign Affairs Committee debated for a week whether to allow $20,000 for an international poultry show in Tulsa. The pace today is somewhat different.

The acceleration has been matched by a rise in salaries from $7,500 to $22,500 and by substantial increases in the amount of office help and facilities for each Member. But the secretaries are swamped by mail that must be answered and the salaries are dissolved by the multiple costs of political and urban life. There are junkets and retirement funds and free long distance telephone calls but membership in Congress is no bonanza for an honest man.

However, despite the problems behind and before them, the new Members come with the spirit of victors determined to make the most of their conquest and do the best for themselves and their country. Their arrival brings a lift to a rather staid community.

Fortress in the Dark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it is a relief to find that now that the 88th Congress has convened and that some of the sound and fury of the political campaigns have subsided that the Members, or at least some of them, are beginning to awaken from the sweet dreams of peace that the administration fostered during the campaign.

Indeed this Congress comes back to find that the Cuban situation, which we had been led to believe had been settled to our advantage, has simply become a Communist fortress on our doorstep and that it is receiving daily reinforcements in men and armaments from the U.S.S.R.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 6 sets out the facts, so far discovered, and many more snakes will be found under these same rocks:

FORTRESS IN THE DARKNESS

The ominous reports about Cuba are bound to be deeply disturbing not only to Members of Congress but everybody else. And not the least disturbing part is the lack of any clear official explanation of what's going on and what if anything is to be done about it.

There have been some official comments, to be sure, none of them reassuring. Defense Secretary McNamara admits that five different kinds of missiles "undoubtedly are stocked in Cuba"; he adds that none is of a type that would imperil the United States. A report in Congress, however, puts the number of intermediate-range missiles—definitely capable of striking the United States—at about 40, beyond the 40 or so the United States forced out during the October crisis.

Whatever the truth of the missile reports, it is widely conceded that roughly 17,000 Soviet troops are now in Cuba, and some estimates run much higher. According to people with good sources, the troops are turning the island into a mighty fortress with the most modern military equipment.

This seems an exceedingly ambitious enterprise if its main purpose were to discourage any thought of an American invasion. So further explanations are sought; for example, that Khrushchev is trying to recover from his prestige blow last fall and particularly show Red China that the United States did not compel him to abandon Castro.

But regardless of the motive that may be uppermost in Khrushchev's mind, the huge buildup spells trouble, a staging area for trouble in Latin America if not indeed against the United States. The buildup has been rolling steadily along right under our noses, after the American people were led to believe that the Cuban crisis was mostly over many weeks ago. And as far as anyone now knows, it is a question whether the Government has plans for dealing with it.

Naturally the Government can't be expected to broadcast in advance the details of any plans it may have. Yet this apparent attempt to ignore, or downgrade, the whole business leaves the uneasy feeling that the plan may be simply to wait. For what? Until Khrushchev and Castro start using their weapons somewhere?

If such is the policy, most Americans would regard it as not good enough. The lesson of October is that we can compel Khrushchev to abandon dangerous activities in our part of the world before he is able to translate the danger into action. Unfortunately, it is now all too evident, the United States failed to drive the lesson home with sufficient force.

Now as in October it should not be necessary to limit initial American reactions to the extremes of nothing or full-scale invasion. For that missile menace also taught that a partial response can be effective; the blockade plus warnings of further action did at least succeed in getting a sizable number of the big weapons removed. Comparable pressure might be enough to force the withdrawal of the Soviet troops.

What may ultimately have to be done about Cuba is something the ordinary citizen can hardly answer at this point. But it seems incredible that the Government can permit this fortress to continue building without exerting any pressure to stop it. It is worse than incredible to try to keep the American people in the dark about a direct threat to their safety.

Presentation of the Annual Gold Medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association to Andrew S. Roscoe, President of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings at the presentation of the annual Gold Medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association to Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, on January 28, 1963, at a luncheon held at the Towers Hotel in Brooklyn, N.Y.:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DOWNTOWN BROOKLYN ASSOCIATION'S LUNCHEON HELD AT THE TOWERS HOTEL, JANUARY 28, 1963

The national anthem will be sung by Mr. Everett J. Livesey, accompanied by Mr. Wesley Meytrott. (The national anthem was sung.)

For the benefit of those talent scouts in attendance, Mr. Livesey occupies the office of the president, City Savings Bank, while Mr. Meytrott is a vice president, Con Edison.

Enjoy your lunch.

Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to welcome you to the 36th annual meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association on behalf of the members, directors and officers.

We are honored by your presence.

I would be derelict in my duty were I not to acknowledge the heavy debt owed to my predecessors who gave form and substance to our organization.

The late Henry Joralemon Davenport—the Downtown Brooklyn Association's catalyst who was, for years, its inspiration and guiding light.

Robert Blum—who occupies his rightful place on the upper dais as one of Brooklyn's legion of honor.

The late Dr. Harry Rogers—who set a pattern for cooperation between the educational and business community.

Andrew Roscoe—about whom more might possibly be heard later.

It is always a happy task to present to you the guests on the dais. In so doing, may I respectfully request that you withhold your applause until all have been introduced.

On the upper dais, all past recipients of the Downtown Brooklyn Association's Gold Medal Award, from your left to right:

Robert E. Blum, gold medal recipient, 1956; vice president, Abraham & Straus; former president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association; honored associate, friend.

Mrs. Adrian Van Sinderen, Gold Medal recipient, 1952; gracious lady—public benefactor.

Louis C. Wills, gold medal recipient, 1937; lawyer, humanitarian, gentleman.

Maj. Benjamin Harrison Namm, gold medal recipient, 1947; ardent supporter throughout the years, of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, whose activities in the field of merchandising have carried far beyond the borough and indeed these United States.

Dr. Paul D. Shafer, gold medal recipient, 1961; president, Packer Collegiate Institute of Brooklyn; public-minded citizen, educator whose interests encompass the entire spectrum of that which makes a community healthy.

Hon. Miles F. McDonald, gold medal recipient, 1954; justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York who, despite the responsibilities of many years of high office, has found time to provide leadership in communal causes.

Walter R. Miller, president, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; president, East Brooklyn Savings Bank; a close, effective coworker in the cause of civic betterment.

Hon. John F. Hayes, deputy borough president, commissioner of borough works, immediate past president Borough of Brooklyn, a knowledgeable city planner.

Richard B. Loomis, president, South Brooklyn Savings Bank, chairman of gold medal committee of award; member of board of directors, Downtown Brooklyn Association; one who exemplifies the finest traditions in business leadership.

Hon. Paul R. Screvane, honored member of the board of estimate, president of the Council of the City of New York; a highly skilled and talented public official.

Hon. John R. Crews, commissioner of elections, highly respected chairman of the Kings County Republican Committee, a leader in the truest sense of the word. May I also bow to his charming coleader, Mrs. Marguerite Bergen Kuhn, who is one of our honored guests.

I will skip the next two gentlemen, Andrew Roscoe and Hon. Abe Stark, although I rather suspect the identities of both are known to you.

Hon. Abraham D. Beame, comptroller, city of New York; Brooklyn resident, member of the board of estimate, a fiscal expert extraordinary.

Hon. Stanley Steingut, chairman, Kings County Democratic Committee; able and constructive legislator, attorney, and gentleman.

Edmund W. Madden, vice president, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co.; chairman of member's meeting committee; responsible for this successful luncheon; member of the board of directors, Downtown Brooklyn Association.

Hon. Edward S. Silver, district attorney, Kings County; conscientious public servant whose efforts on behalf of the community are well known to all of us.

Hon. Charles A. Reidel, consulting engineer-city planner; a man who gets things done for the Borough of Brooklyn and who has always been extremely sensitive and responsive to the needs of the business community.

Grover M. Moskowitz; I will skip Mr. Moskowitz for the moment.

More often than not, the president of any organization takes the plaudits while others do the work. The Downtown Brooklyn Association has a very active, enthusiastic and responsive board of directors, and to one and all, I am deeply grateful for their constant constructive cooperation.

I should like to pay special tribute to Robert M. Burke, vice president, Downtown Brooklyn Association; vice president, New York Telephone Co.; with whom I have been in constant communication through his facilities.

Frank X. Kissane, treasurer, Downtown Brooklyn Association; vice president, Chase Manhattan Bank; whose efforts are largely responsible for our fiscal solvency by such highhanded means as turning a deaf ear to my requests to visit other associations in Europe.

Hon. George C. Wildermuth, our learned counsel who gives so generously of his time that should he render a bill for legal services, our treasurer's efforts would be as of naught.

Fred Zeitz, president, Martin's; former vice president of this association and one of its founders, who has been a fountain of strength and guidance to me.

Hon. William R. Bayes, dean of the board of directors of Downtown Brooklyn Association; former presiding justice of the court of special sessions; advisor and friend who perhaps and represents the very essence of what our association has stood for throughout the years.

May I also present to you our former treasurer, John DePalma, who served in this post with great distinction.

Somewhere it is written:

"There are two entirely different sets of circumstances wherein a man may be called upon to speak in public. The first is when he has something to say. The second is when he has to say something."

In this, my first attempt in this arena, I shall endeavor to adhere rigidly to the first concept.

However, according to the bylaws of the association, it is required that there be a rollcall, reading of minutes, reports of officers, reports of committees, election of directors, and unfinished business and new business.

A motion was made that the regular order of business be dispensed with, but that the report of the nominating committee concerning election of directors be read to the assembled members.

Do I hear the motion seconded?

All those in favor.

Motion carried.

The Downtown Brooklyn Association counts high among its many blessings our executive vice president. The real driving force and executor of the board's wishes, Grover Moskowitz, possesses the rare talent of speaking softly and carrying as his big stick the sincerity and integrity that opens all doors. May I call upon him for his report.

You have heard the report of the nominating committee. All in favor say "aye."

The "ayes" have it.

I declare the report approved as submitted.

A few moments ago, I alluded to my inexperience in conducting a meeting of this kind. As such, it was with a certain amount of anticipation that I approached the job at hand. I must say that presenting Andrew Roscoe with the association's gold medal poses no such problems to me, for when one knows a given subject, he can tackle it, confidently secure in the knowledge that he knows whereof he speaks.

It is my privilege to know Andy Roscoe.

I have worked closely with him these past few years in many matters pertaining to the well-being of our community. His vocabularly is replete with phrases such as ethical conduct, contributions to the progress of Brooklyn's economy, community engineering projects, betterment of Brooklyn.

The man's every fiber vibrates and responds to the call of his fellow citizens. Often, he has expressed gratitude for the opportunities afforded him. In banker's language, the balance of payments is in your favor. The list of your activities is a formidable one. Time precludes all but a partial telling of the tale, but its scope may be somewhat indicated.

In the field of civic affairs: member of New York Academy of Sciences; past president and currently a member of the board of directors, Downtown Brooklyn Association; director, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; director, Brooklyn Real Estate Board; 1962 citywide chairman, New York City Civil War Centennial Committee appointed by the mayor; chairman, 30th anniversary dinner, National Conference of Christians and Jews; and 1961 civilian member, New York State Selection Committee for the Regular Naval Officers' College training program.

In business: president, Equitable Savings & Loan Association; former director, Mortgage Facilities Corp.; and director, J. W. May's Department Store.

In philanthropy: director, Industrial Home for the Blind; member, advisory board, Salvation Army; former borough chairman, police athletic league drive; former chapter chairman and campaign chairman, American Red Cross; former director and treasurer, Brooklyn Juvenile Guidance Center; and former director, Victory Memorial Hospital.

The Girl Scouts, United Hospital Fund, Greater New York Fund, Flatbush Boys Club, Travelers Aid Society, Navy Yard Boys Club, have all been served by you in important roles.

Awards are no novelty to you. The Kings County Catholic War Veterans honored you in 1959, as did the Brooklyn Division of the Protestant Council in 1962. Just last year, the borough president proclaimed June 29 as Andrew S. Roscoe Day.

It is not possible for a community to repay the endless time and effort you have devoted to these many causes at the obvious sacrifice that must be involved on the part of your gracious and charming wife. Yet it is altogether fitting and proper that a society

pause from time to time to give tribute to one of its members for jobs well done and in anticipation of assignments that will be carried out in the future.

Brooklyn's Legion of Honor well deserves your addition to its ranks, and Andrew Roscoe has earned his membership in this elite group.

May I read to you the scroll that accompanies this beautiful gold medal:

"The Downtown Brooklyn Association awards for the year 1962 the association's gold medal for the most distinguished service to Brooklyn to Andrew S. Roscoe, in recognition of his inspiring leadership in important communal, civic, borough, city, and statewide activities and his untold, unselfish devotion to innumerable humanitarian causes."

Response by Mr. Roscoe: "Mr. President, reverend sirs, Mr. Borough President, members of the judiciary and of the body politic, honored guests, my ladies and gentlemen: Allow me, please, to record my appreciation to Mr. Wilbur Levin, president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, for this wonderful presentation, and to the board of directors of the association for the award. It is indeed a great honor to join Brooklyn's legion of honor. However, I have not earned this medal by my efforts alone. Twenty-one years ago, the board of directors of Equitable, then the South Brooklyn Savings and Loan Association, established standards for our community activities for my guidance. I am most grateful to our directors for their good will and solid support.

"My 7 years' service as vice president and 7 years' tenure as president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, was an easy task for I was endowed with a precious heritage by way of sound policies established by my three predecessors, the late Henry J. Davenport, the late Dr. Harry S. Rogers, and by Mr. Robert C. Blum. To them I am most grateful. The board of directors of the downtown association, another group of men whom the community holds in the highest esteem, have never hesitated to provide the moral and substantial support for the association's activities. To them, I am deeply grateful. I feel gratefully indebted to the association's counsel, the Honorable William R. Bayes and later, the Honorable George C. Wildermuth. I want to thank Mr. Grover M. Moskowitz, Jr., executive vice president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association for superior performance. I should like to tender my gratitude to the spiritual, political, professional, economic, social and civic leadership of Brooklyn for their good will, and I wish to thank our free press. I am grateful to the membership and leadership of our other Brooklyn trade and civic organizations. They have always cooperated with the Downtown Brooklyn Association and, more than that, they made priceless contribution to every movement for community improvement starting with the great program of the American Red Cross. I am particularly grateful to our borough president, to our judiciary, government officials, and other members of the body politic, for their cooperation and understanding.

"So, in accepting this medal, I say to you that this award really belongs to those wonderful people who are the firmest pillars of our great community. Mr. President, I am humble and grateful."

"It is my honor to present a man whose political office makes him the titular first citizen of Brooklyn, but whose activities earned for him this designation long before it was affirmed at the polls. A particularly good friend of the Downtown Brooklyn Association as he is to every force for the good in our borough."

The Honorable Abe Stark, president of the Borough of Brooklyn: "The Downtown Brooklyn Association in its 33 years of existence has once again done honor to itself by honoring our loyal and unassuming friend, Andrew S. Roscoe. Although Andrew hands over his money to the income tax collector in Huntington rather than in Brooklyn, he has more than demonstrated his affection for the people of our town by his devotion and concern for our business interests here. This borough of ours has also been blessed by his dedication and his generous contributions to most every charitable and civic institution that serves people. So, for this honor bestowed upon Andrew this afternoon, we salute the Downtown Brooklyn Association and congratulate him on having received its gold medal award in recognition of most distinguished service for Brooklyn in 1962.

"My friends, we have much to be grateful for in this country of ours and our own Borough of Brooklyn; 1962 was an exciting year. Explosions of many kinds happened. Some of them brought about progress; others we would like to forget. However, good or bad, all of them should be remembered, in order to prevent or correct mistakes and to encourage the good that has been accomplished.

"If we are to make this world a better place to live in—not only for ourselves, but especially for our greatest possession, our children, and our neighbors' children—all of us have to understand that we must learn to live with one another and to help each other. On this approach I want to base my remarks.

"As an example, let me start by speaking about the now-famous communications satellite Telstar. As you know, it was developed in the Bell Laboratories of the American Telephone & Telegram Co. which met all the costs.

"When Telstar was being built, all kinds of special parts and services were needed. Just the other day I inquired about this. Through the good offices of the New York Telephone Co., I was furnished with a list giving the names of nearly 40 Brooklyn companies that provided some of these important parts or services. In doing so, they not only identified themselves with this highly successful scientific achievement, the chances are they even made a little money while they were doing it.

"Where else could it happen except in our own Brooklyn?

"Now, why do I mention such matters as these? Frankly, it's because we should be reminded of them; we should talk about them constantly. For here we have the know-how, the skills, the business genius and the manpower to turn out anything—from a roll of adhesive tape to one of the world's biggest aircraft carriers.

"Last year the Committee for a National Trade Policy took a good look at us. Later it issued a statement from Washington saying the "bustling Borough of Brooklyn exports everything from penicillin to powdered milk." The committee also said that the list of our companies that ship products to foreign markets reads like a "Who's who of the business world."

"Here, right on our own doorstep, we have some of the world's finest shipping facilities. Over 60 percent of the dollar value of general cargo that enters the port of New York passes through the Brooklyn marine terminals and piers. And right now, over $125 million is being spent for new piers and modernization projects.

"Our Brooklyn population is more than 2,600,000. This is larger than the population of any of 26 States. Except for New York City itself, and Chicago, we are tops among all the cities of the United States. Even if Los Angeles should challenge this, we have the 1960 census figures to prove it.

"Our school population is 370,000. If we add the children attending our private parochial or denominational schools, the total exceeds one-half million. This total is as great as three other boroughs combined, Manhattan, Bronx and Richmond. Just think what this means for Brooklyn's future in the arts and sciences, the professions, in business and industry.

"Our business climate is healthy. Just last year, our retail sales were about $2,400 million. In 1961 the Fulton Street area had a record year. In 1962 it had another record year. Retail business was excellent also in other shopping districts of our town.

"When we consider what this means in revenue to the city of New York and to the economy of our State, we have every reason to be proud in this regard.

"Here is another significant fact. How many of us know that the savings deposits of our Brooklyn families have been growing so that the total now has gone over $7 billion.

"Just a year ago, the savings deposits in the 21 mutual savings banks of Brooklyn were $6 billion. At the beginning of 1963, this total had increased to $6½ billion. One of the two largest savings banks of the entire country is right here in Brooklyn.

"But this isn't all. We also have savings and loan associations, such as Andrew Roscoe's Equitable, and the commercial banks. When we add the money in their savings accounts, it is reliably estimated the grand total goes to about $7¼ billion.

"What other community in the whole United States can match this record?

"Actually, the savings deposits of our Brooklyn people are even higher. This is so, if we think of people who are doing their banking elsewhere when they really have a chance to put their savings into our fine Brooklyn institutions. Mind you, no one is being criticized. But we are all for Brooklyn. And we know every little bit helps, especially when it runs into millions of dollars.

"This afternoon we are guests of the Downtown Brooklyn Association. At this time, we want to congratulate the association on the wonderful job it is doing for our main shopping and business district. Just a month ago, during the holiday season, this entire area was transformed with beautiful and dignified decorations and displays, both indoor and outdoor. They brought much favorable comment, and I want to add my own compliments to the association and to the stores.

"Among all the downtown districts of our large American cities, the Fulton Street area is in a class of its own. It is only a short walk from our $250 million civic center. It's just a 6-minute subway ride from Wall Street, the world's financial capital. It is the only shopping district that serves both downtown Brooklyn and downtown Manhattan.

"So, it's not surprising our downtown stores do $500 million a year in retail sales business. On a busy day, they serve as many as 250,000 people. Most of the shoppers are our own Brooklyn residents.

But we know shoppers also come here from other parts of the city and from out of town.

"Considering all these facts we know, therefore, that a tremendous rotating population visits this area. It's already outstanding, but we want to make it even better.

The Pratt Institute study of the civic center will be completed shortly. It will then be issued and I hope it will be the basis for some exciting developments in this town of ours.

"For some time I have been giving much thought to a possibility. This is a good time to discuss it.

"We know the Downtown Brooklyn Association works in close cooperation with other civic and trade organizations. These have a top membership of their own. It is developing a program to attract new industry to Brooklyn and to retain existing industry.

This will result in bringing new retail business to our town.

"All of us agree that the Downtown Brooklyn Association and the others are fine and solid business groups. Their members are dedicated to the growth and upbuilding of Brooklyn.

"Therefore, this question presents itself: Could these outstanding groups—acting in conjunction with banking institutions, insurance companies, and builders—encourage the formation of a corporate partnership in which all could invest in what I believe would be a novel, worthwhile, and successful enterprise?

"I have in mind the building of a modern hotel on the old supreme court site that is now vacant. Such an improvement would become a beacon of progress right at the crossroads of the civic center, the shopping district, borough hall, and the municipal building. It would be in the heart of downtown Brooklyn, close to Brooklyn Heights and at the center of all the new office buildings and the millions of dollars of new apartment houses already built, with more coming in the near future. This area is served by the IRT, BMT, and the Independent subways and by as many as 18 buslines. Without question, it is today one of the fastest-growing business and residential areas in all New York City.

"Such a modern hotel would undoubtedly meet with success from the very beginning. There are many sound reasons for this.

"In addition to Brooklyn's great permanent population, it would serve the large rotating population of the downtown area. It would provide convenient accommodations in this centralized location for all types of meetings, sales conferences, conventions, and large dinner and luncheon gatherings. Here in Brooklyn we actually have more than 1,000 different organized groups. They meet throughout the year. In all probability, they would be most eager to hold their functions at this location.

"For just a moment, let's consider what has been happening recently. In Manhattan, no new hotel was built for about 30 years after the Waldorf Astoria was opened. Then, suddenly, there was a dramatic change.

"The new Summit Hotel was opened in 1961. Last September the new Americana was completed. Motor inns were built. More new hotels are opening this year. In different cities of the world, the Hilton chain is opening 12 new hotels costing $200 million this year, including 1 in Manhattan.

"This has been a trend. The existing hotels in Manhattan accommodate about 14 million transient guests a year. One hotel accommodates 2,000 on a single day.

"We have to remember the boom in new office buildings and hotels in midtown Manhattan may be reaching the point of saturation. When this happens, the trend will be to downtown Brooklyn. This is not only my own opinion. It is the judgment of some of our city's foremost real estate experts.

"Not only as businessmen, but as citizens with Brooklyn's well-being at heart, we have to think of these matters.

"This is just one opportunity that is presented to us. There are others.

"In December 1964 or January 1965, the great Verrazano-Narrows Bridge will be completed. It will become a new and major traffic artery for motorists, shippers and other commercial users. Without a single traffic light—and in just about 20 minutes of driving time—it will connect with every important arterial highway, running north and south on the Atlantic seaboard. It will connect also with the big transcontinental highways.

"In addition, we have to bear in mind that next year also marks the opening of the 1964–65 World's Fair. It will attract from 70 to 80 million visitors to our city and many to our borough. It isn't generally realized, but the fact is that only about 300 working days remain before the fair opens in April 1964.

"Again, I say, we have to consider how these opportunities will benefit Brooklyn.

"At borough hall, I have been meeting week after week with other city agencies, and with business and civic groups to plan Brooklyn's future. I have made a number of specific recommendations. I have already mentioned the civic center. Another concerns the area at Flatbush, Atlantic, and Fourth Avenues. And let me tell you right here, that pretty soon I expect we will begin to see more positive results.

"I have also been asking representatives of the private building industry and the banks to cooperate, so that we may have more housing and especially, more middle-income housing that we need so urgently.

"It is true we have a fine, healthy and prosperous community. But we cannot overlook the fact that we also have problems—some very serious problems—that need attention.

"So, I want to appeal to you as a group and as individuals for your cooperation. If you have a suggestion for Brooklyn's betterment, let's have it. We know from experience it is good business to take an interest in the one business that concerns us all—namely, our community's welfare.

"We want to make Brooklyn a better place for living, for working, and for doing business. Remember, that we are at borough hall to serve you, and we want to serve. This is my whole purpose and policy. With your cooperation, I know that we can—that we shall succeed.

"I close with this reminder: This is a complex town, made up of all kinds of people. But they are people who get along together very well. They live together in peace and harmony. America can be proud of Brooklyn. It can take lessons from our people in ingenuity, in their industriousness, in their good citizenship and in their tolerance and mutual understanding and good will. Yet, Brooklyn can project itself to the whole world as a model of democracy in action and an example to all humanity."

Thank you, Mr. Borough President. Our borough cannot help but continue its progress under your enlightened, able leadership.

Often one forgets his best friend when he enters his house. Lest this be said of us, and in the spirit of best things last, may I introduce to you one of the country's senior Members of Congress, Hon. EUGENE KEOGH, a man who proudly sells Brooklyn to the rest of the Nation, and is indefatigable in his efforts on behalf of our community.

The Chair declares the meeting adjourned.

"A Bill of Duties" Encourages American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in Congress as well as the American public will be quick to appreciate the value of "A Bill of Duties," written by Judge Luther N. Hussey, municipal court, San Diego, Calif. I therefore include it as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

A BILL OF DUTIES

(By Judge Luther N. Hussey, municipal court, San Diego judicial district)

To respect all religious beliefs.

To respect the privacy, the dignity, and the opinions of others.

To assemble and discuss public issues.

To vote.

To help choose good public officials.

To support law and order.

To live peaceably.

To respect public and private property.

To pay taxes.

To serve on juries.

To assist courts by giving evidence.

To assist public officers in preventing crime and detecting criminals.

To serve as needed in the Armed Forces.

To abide by majorities.

To preserve the rights of minorities.

To meet financial obligations.

To be self-supporting if possible.

To be charitable unto others in need.

To have pride in the product of our labors.

To preserve and pass along to the next generation the rights and duties which have made us a great nation.

Encourage a higher plane of education by encouraging better schools and competent instructors who respect the American way of life.

Extension of Social Security Benefits to Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which I received from Veterans' Administration Lodge 1151 of the American Federation of Government Employees. The letter is a comprehensive discussion of extending social security to Federal employees. This thoughtful letter sheds much light upon this problem. I have introduced H.R. 1970 to provide social security coverage for U.S. Government employees, and I hope it will be acted upon favorably.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the letter:

JANUARY 11, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RYAN: The Congress will, at this session, consider a number of measures for the extension of social security coverage to Federal employees. We should appreciate the opportunity of presenting our views on this subject.

Some years ago, social security coverage was granted to city and State employees. Under the plan that was enacted into law, city and State employees could elect to receive social security coverage in addition to their existing retirement plans. The Congress, at the time, rightfully avoided integration of the retirement systems of cities and States with that of social security because of the obvious congressional policy that people were people and employees were employees irrespective of the character of

their employment or the status of their employer. The Congress sought to avoid setting up different classes of employees and integration of the retirement systems with that of social security lest a precedent be set for the integration of the retirement systems of private industry. Thus, by this enactment, the Congress decreed that public servants were no different from employees in private industry and, as such, merited the same accord and consideration. The statute which extended social security coverage to city and State employees properly gave such employees neither more nor less than was prevalent in private industry.

There is no question but that the present comprehensive retirement system applicable to city and State governments and to private industry have advanced to the degree where they put the Federal retirement system to shame. The sum total of retirement benefits that are now available to city and State employees have, by far, accelerated the meager pensions that are granted to loyal, tried, and tested Federal employees. Private industry has likewise passed the Federal retirement system in both amounts granted to their retired employees and in the rapid growth of pension systems wholly subsidized by employers. It should also be noted in passing that in a number of local governments, the retirement system is either wholly subsidized by the local entity or the major share of contributions flow from the entity into the system.

Some of the proposals under consideration will seek to merge the Federal retirement system with that of social security or require that Federal employees elect between continuing in the Federal retirement system and entering the social security system, reserving Federal retirement benefits frozen as the date of election. To allow the enactment of such provision demarcates between the public servants in city and State governments and the public servants in the Federal Government as well between Federal employees and employees in private industry. Further, such enactment would, in the minds of most Federal employees, appear to be a psuedo motion pretending to extend a benefit, yet in the final analysis, constitutes a retrenchment.

We believe that all Government employees are essentially members of the same occupational class and we do not believe that rights and privileges that are accorded to a segment of the class should be denied to other members of the class. This is in accord with the profound policy at the foundation of our Government which calls for equal treatment of all citizens.

It is manifestly unfair and unreasonable to repay the long years of faithful service on the part of Federal employees by granting them meager retirement benefits in an inflationary era. It is also manifestly unfair and unreasonable to grant them retirement benefits that differ from those of local governments or private industry or require supplemental income to make their "ends meet." It does not seem to be fair or reasonable or dignified to expect aged or disabled retirees to scrounge for supplemental income or to expose himself to exploitation because of an inadequate retirement plan. Yet, this is precisely what would obtain if Federal employees were required to elect between Federal employees retirement and social security or by the merger of the Federal employees retirement and social security.

We favor the granting of social security coverage to Federal employees on the same basis as was granted to city and State employees. We favor the granting of social security coverage to Federal employees in addition to existing retirement benefits and as a separate entity. Fair play dictates that we be treated no differently from the treatment accorded to the employees of local governments.

It is our hope and belief that the Congress will treat Federal employees fairly. However, in order that this may be accomplished, it is essential that the Congress know and recognize our position. We trust that you will use your good offices to make our attitude known to the Members of the Congress and continue to give us your kind assistance.

Very truly yours,

PEARL J. ALPERN,
President.
HARRY N. ZUCKER,
First Vice President.
PHILIP J. KELLY,
Second Vice President.
JAMES CONWAY,
Third Vice President.
VIRGINIA RODRIGUEZ,
Secretary.
RALPH V. TROPEANO,
Treasurer.

The Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, recently there was published a comprehensive review of the new Voice of America installation which will greatly aid us in our attempts to tell the free world story around the globe.

Because of the importance to all of us of the successful operation of the Voice of America, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following extremely well-done story by John P. MacKenzie, a staff reporter on the Washington Post, which appeared on Sunday, January 27, 1963:

OUR VOICE BOOSTS LUNGPOWER

(By John P. MacKenzie)

When the Voice of America dedicates its awesome new transmitters at Greenville, N.C., next month, the speakers will stress that the United States has new lungpower with which to tell its story abroad.

Voice officials will proclaim that "the world's largest and most powerful long-range radio facility is on the air." With due emphasis on the sheer power of the new voice, the officials will predict a bright future for the U.S. Information Agency's shortwave radio network.

President Kennedy will praise the project in a televised speech from Washington. National and State notables, led by USIA Chief Edward R. Murrow, will be invited to participate in the program.

Understandably, the speeches will deal in superlatives. Greenville will produce 4.8 million watts of power, more than doubling the Voice's output. It will add half of Africa and South America to its range and will count new listeners in the millions.

With the stepped-up power of relay stations in Africa and Europe and new transmitters planned for the Mediterranean Sea and the Pacific Ocean, the Voice's Greenville outlet will form part of a worldwide operation designed to beam clearer signals to the remotest regions.

STALLED BY M'CARTHY

Behind all the fanfare and optimism about the future of the Voice, there is a deeper feeling about its history. For those who remember the wave of McCarthyism 10 years ago that ground U.S. radio propaganda almost to a halt, Greenville symbolizes a major departure from the nightmarish past.

For Greenville is 10 years overdue. Its six largest transmitters, each producing half a million watts of power, have been in a Brooklyn warehouse since 1953, when an investigation led by the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, killed construction of the so-called Baker East station near Wilmington, 95 miles south of Greenville.

Baker East and its ill-fated counterpart, Baker West near Seattle, were planned as 2.2 million-watt stations. They would have sent Voice programs across the Atlantic and Pacific to relay sites, to be aimed from there to friends and enemies deep inland. Both coastal stations would have sent considerably stronger radiobeams than those from the North American transmitters built in World War II.

Even if McCarthy had not been the investigator, there could have been a lively debate on the merits of the Bakers East and West locations. Some technicians argued that more southerly sites would have provided greater freedom from atmospheric interference. The sites, representing compromises on location, cost and other factors, could be attacked on several grounds.

But in the atmosphere of the McCarthy era, the proponents of locations farther south became the hardline "anti-Communists" while the Senator branded as soft, stupid "or worse" those who favored Wilmington and Seattle.

LEADING THE WITNESS

The very nature of shortwave transmission, the inability of scientists to say categorically that Baker East was perfectly located, made Baker East a perfect vehicle for a McCarthy investigation.

Hunting for subversion and determined to find some, McCarthy followed a familiar pattern on Baker East. He would call a witness who would criticize the Wilmington site. The next question would be whether that northerly location was not "the best way to sabotage" the Voice of America. The witness would agree.

The followup question would be: Did the witness think "this mislocation of stations, this waste in the construction program, has not been entirely the result of incompetence, but that some of it may have been purposely planned that way?" The witness would reply that he had been "forced to reach" that very conclusion.

In this manner, McCarthy gathered evidence to support a finding by his Government Operations Committee that "poor planning, reckless disregard for taxpayers' money, incompetence, stupidity, or worse was the rule and not the exception in the operation of the Voice of America."

As was the case so often in the early 1950's, the sober second thoughts never received the public attention that was given to McCarthy's charges. Unable to stand the pressure or explain its position, the Voice canceled both Bakers East and West. McCarthy claimed a resulting tax saving of $18 million.

EXPOSED BY LEBANON

Hopes for better transmission never were completely extinguished. Voice officials quietly beefed up two existing stations in California. Pressure began to build up again for Baker East in 1957, about the time of McCarthy's death.

These efforts were spurred by an entirely new political climate. The 1958 Lebanon crisis exposed the inadequacies of America's radio network and prompted a new look at programs for the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.

No one was more shocked at these revelations than Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, head of the House Appropriations subcommittee which traditionally cuts USIA and State Department projects to the bone. At the 1959 hearings, ROONEY called the radio situation alarming and blamed the McCarthy investigation.

Where McCarthy found an $18 million saving, ROONEY found that $2.4 million had been wasted in the sale of the sites at a loss and in other expenses that could not be recouped. He added:

"I guess it would be pretty hard to determine what the loss might be insofar as our relations with foreign countries and the amount of turmoil that the average American citizen finds himself in today with the rest of the world. It's hard to figure on that basis, is it not?"

"I'm afraid it would be," replied Henry Loomis, Voice director who spearheaded the recovery. The Greenville appropriation went through.

A BOON TO GREENVILLE

Construction began in 1960. Total cost was $23 million for three sites: two transmitter sites and one receiving station. The receiving station takes broadcasts originating in Washington—beamed to Greenville along an eight-tower, 250-mile wireless microwave chain—and relays them to the two sending sites.

The three tracts of land total 6,100 acres. They are about 20 miles apart and ring the city of Greenville, whose 23,000 population is oriented largely to the needs of 6,000-student East Carolina College.

The Voice of America has been received cordially by most of those townspeople who are aware of it, according to one city councilman, partly because some of its $2 million annual operating expenses will turn up in the local economy.

Each of the twin transmitter complexes can produce 2.4 million watts of power through three half-million-watt transmitters paralleled with three transmitters of 250,000 watts and three 50,000-watters. Happily for the Voice and the taxpayer, the largest transmitters did not become obsolete during their 10 years in mothballs. Nothing so powerful had been built in the interim because there is no other demand for such power, according to Greenville Project Manager Fred K. Blackburn.

SIX BOOSTER STATIONS

Greenville's output is more than doubled by the high sophistication of its 73 antennas, which focus transmitter energy into a strong, narrow beam. Besides helping the signal, the greater power gives operators a wider choice of frequencies and thus greater flexibility in competing on an increasingly cluttered radio spectrum.

The signal can reach points deeps in Europe and South America directly. For added range and reliability it is bolstered and relayed by stations at Munich, Germany; Tangier, Morocco; Thessalonica, Greece; Wofferton, England; Colombo, Ceylon, and aboard the ship *Courier* at the Isle of Rhodes.

A five-fold power increase is slated for the British station, which is leased from the BBC. By late summer, a mobile station at Monrovia, Liberia, will become a gigantic 1.55-million-watt relay center. The *Courier* will be replaced by land-based, more efficient relay equipment. Another Mediterranean site is in the works.

In the Pacific, other relay stations are sending along the broadcasts of the two California stations. Negotiations are under way for still another Pacific site which will provide additional power.

JAMMING NOW SELECTIVE

The stronger the signal, the less chance that Communist jamming will prevent Voice broadcasts from reaching their audiences. Jamming is the production of nuisance noise on the broadcaster's frequency. The USIA estimates that the Communists use 2,000 transmitters in a jamming effort that would cost the United States $150 million or five times the annual Voice operating cost, to duplicate.

Soviet jamming, which once was a broadside attempt to drown out all American broadcasts, has become more selective in recent years. The Soviet selection of programs for jamming tells the United States, which does not jam, which programs are hurting most.

With the increase in power, Voice officials anticipate fresh challenges. The wider audience demands ever more varied programing in new languages and dialects. The new transmission will reach areas of the world where broadcasting competition is keenest. Russia and China outproduce the United States in raw broadcast hours. More techniques like the 1000-word vocabulary "special English," aimed at the language beginner, must be devised.

BAD WITH THE GOOD

But in meeting the challenge, Voice workers have the advantage of less "interference" than they had 10 years ago. There is less apprehension today that their actions will be purposely misinterpreted.

Not that the Voice is immune from fault-finding legislators. Its sensitive yet open operations make it a sitting duck for demagoguery or second guessing about editorial content. But the Voice has this mandate from President Kennedy:

"We compete with other means of communication, of those who are our adversaries who tell only the good stories. But the things that go bad in America, you must tell them also. And we hope that the bad and the good are sifted together by people of judgment and discretion and taste and discrimination, that they will realize what we are trying to do here."

Thus Greenville represents more than an impressive array of broadcasting hardware. To many at the Voice of America, it means that the Voice will be coming through not only louder, but clearer as well.

Connecticut's Fifth District Holds Gold Keys to Good Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Connecticut Sportswriters' Alliance selects three outstanding contributors to good sportsmanship and athletics in Connecticut to receive their Gold Key awards. The Gold Keys are presented each year at the annual dinner of the alliance which is attended by men of national prominence in sports activities.

In the 22 years that this program has been conducted by the Connecticut Sportswriters' Alliance, it has not been uncommon for prominent and highly respected coaches and athletes from the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, to be singled out for honors. In 1962 a Gold Key award was presented to Frank "Spec" Shea, of Naugatuck, a former pitcher with the New York Yankees and with the Washington Senators, who enjoyed his most effective seasons under the direction of Bucky Harris who now has returned to the Senators.

On January 28, 1963, two of the three Gold Key recipients were, I am proud to say, my personal friends and residents of my district, Arthur "Dutch" Forst, of Seymour, Conn., a former postmaster at Seymour; and Cornelius E. "Connie" Donahue, of Torrington, Conn. The third award this year went to Jordan Olivar, Yale's illustrious football coach, who announced at the Gold Key dinner that he was retiring.

I have already congratulated these gentlemen, not only for the honors accorded them, but also for their work and for their outstanding efforts in the interest of developing American manhood through clean athletic endeavor.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point articles which appeared in the Torrington (Conn.) Register and the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel, which summarize the careers in sports of "Dutch" Forst and "Connie" Donahue. I believe they are a credit to the district and I am honored to have them as friends and constituents:

[From the Torrington (Conn.) Register, Jan. 28, 1963]

TO HONOR DONAHUE AT KEY DINNER TONIGHT

(By Owen Canfield)

Upward of 700 sports fans from all parts of Connecticut will gather at the Ambassador Restaurant in Hamden tonight to pay tribute to three men who have made outstanding contributions to sports in the State.

The occasion is the 22d annual Gold Key Dinner of the Connecticut Sportswriters Alliance, and among the recipients of the Gold Key awards will be Cornelius E. "Connie" Donahue, baseball and basketball coach at Torrington High School for 28 years.

Donahue, popular and highly respected in sports circles throughout Connecticut, will be honored along with Yale's head football coach, Jordan Olivar, a native of Los Angeles, and Arthur "Dutch" Forst, of Seymour, onetime semipro football player.

Howard Holcomb, sportswriter for the Manchester Herald and long time friend of Donahue, will make the presentation to the Torrington resident. Harry Katzman, sports editor of the Ansonia Sentinel, and John Leary, of the New Haven Register, will present the coveted awards to Forst and Olivar, respectively.

Last year's winners were Frank "Spec" Shea, former Yankee pitcher; George "Kiddo" Davis, onetime New York Giants baseball star; and Maurice Podoloff, president of the National Basketball Association.

FORMER TORRINGTON HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETE

"Connie" Donahue returned to Torrington High School as baseball, football, and basketball coach in 1936, after having starred in all three himself both at Torrington High School and at the University of Connecticut. In 1945 he was named athletic director. With the added burden, he gave up coaching football, though he continued to handle the other two major sports.

In 1944 Donahue guided his basketball team to the State championship. The team won 19 games in a row that season. In 1948, his club finished second to Hillhouse in the State.

His most successful baseball team was the 1939 squad, which won the State championship.

Donahue is a member of the Connecticut Coaches' Association, which he served as president in 1960; the Litchfield County Baseball Umpires' Association, and the Hartford Board of Football Officials. He was at one time president of the Naugatuck Valley League.

The Torrington man is a longtime member of the Civitan Club and is its president this year. He is one of the cofounders of the Torrington Babe Ruth League, the local K. of C. and the Redmen.

Donahue was chairman of the Torrington Recreation Commission for 12 years and served on the commission for 23 years. In 1955 he was selected by the Probus Club of Torrington as its man of the year.

Donahue and his wife, the former Rose Brennan, are parents of two sons, Thomas, a schoolteacher, and Dennis, a student at Torrington High School.

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel, Jan. 28, 1963]

FORST TO GET GOLD KEY AWARD AT DINNER OF SPORTS SCRIBES

Former Seymour Postmaster Arthur H. (Dutch) Forst, a grid giant in the golden era of New England pro football, will receive a Gold Key at the Connecticut Sports Writers Alliance's 22d annual dinner tonight at the Ambassador Restaurant, Hamden.

Forst starred in his college days at Villanova and competed on a pro level with such immortals as the Four Horsemen of Notre Dame. One of the three to receive the coveted gold key, tonight, Mr. Forst will be joined by Yale football coach, Jordan Olivar and Connie Donahue, veteran basketball coach at Torrington High School.

Dutch played 4 years of varsity football at Villanova from 1912 to 1915 and captained the team in 1913 and 1915, the latter year when the Wildcats upset Army, 16–13.

CITED BY CAMP

Born in Beacon Falls, but raised in Seymour, he attracted attention of college scouts for his play at Seymour High School. He was lauded by the famed Walter Camp one of the game's greatest.

He performed with pro teams after graduation and joined the famous American Chain team of Bridgeport as starting fullback. Before retiring from an active athletic career in the mid-1920's, Forst also competed with the great Mulligan Blues, a Hartford team, which featured the four storied athletes who had made history at Notre Dame.

Mr. Forst has served as president of Seymour's George J. Hummel Little League since its inception in 1950. He is also a former football, baseball, and soccer official.

The father of three married daughters, Mr. Forst is credited for organizing and building recreational facilities for Seymour's youth.

KEY SPEAKERS

The key speakers at tonight's sellout shindig will include Rev. Robert Keating of St. Jude's Parish, Derby; New York Yankee Manager Ralph Houk, Manager Johnny Pesky of the Boston Red Sox, and International League President Thomas Richardson.

The list of guests comprised of today's outstanding athletes and past gold key winners, will include Ansonia's Al Webb, brilliant defensive back of the New York Giants, and Derby's Jim Keefe, the Central Connecticut State College long-distance star who holds the New England mile, 2-mile, and cross-country championships.

Sholom: From Jerusalem and Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by Dr. Heinrich Gruber, dean of the Lutheran Evangelical Church of Berlin, has been brought to my attention. It was presented before the Lieutenant Greenstein Post No. 39, Jewish War Veterans of America, at Atlantic City. It is a brief on-the-spot commentary entitled "Sholom: From Jerusalem and Berlin," and is certainly worthy of reading and contemplation by we Americans, coming as it does from a citizen of West Germany. It follows:

SHOLOM: FROM JERUSALEM AND BERLIN

It is a special pleasure and honor for me to be able to speak to you, and I owe it to my good friend, Rabbi Weitz, that he has arranged everything so well that I could also come to you here to this city.

Many Americans asked that I speak to them after I appeared in the court in Jerusalem as the only German and as the only Christian witness in the Eichmann trial. My testimony and examination lasted a whole day and was broadcast by television and radio all over the world. I have always had friends in America. Many hundreds of people whom I helped out of Germany during the Hitler era, and thus saved their lives, live here. After the heavy program in November 1938 it became more and more difficult for my Jewish friends in the "Reichsvereinigung der Juden" to negotiate with the authorities. We jointly carried on all of our consultations. In especially difficult cases, however, I went again and again to the authorities and above all to Eichmann, I dare say, and Eichmann admitted during the trial, that I was the only one who always resisted and contradicted him. At the beginning of his terrible action, called the end of solution, he apprehended me for concentration camps, first to Sachsenhausen and then to Dachau.

I do not like to speak about my work, and about that which I suffered in the camp. I also refused to do that during the trial. My suffering was small compared to that of my Jewish colleagues and friends. It has always been so in life, that compassion causes us more pain than one's own suffering. Today I would just like to speak to you about that which binds us together. You once fought against Hitler and his regime with weapons in your hands. As citizens of your country, you performed your duty toward your people and Government. We fought against Hitler with other means: by resisting the system and by sabotaging his plans. We both took every risk to health and life in this struggle—we in Germany, above that, risked our freedom.

I may repeat in all modesty what I often told my friends of the resistance in the districts occupied by the Germans: "In your fight against Hitler, you fought for your government and for your people." We stood against the government, and were not only in its eyes, but also in the eyes of the wide masses of people, guilty of high treason and of treason against our country. When we fought against Hitler, we did not contribute to the victory of our people but to its defeat. Your fight against Hitler was for the victory of your people.

I don't know, my friends, whether you can entirely understand this inner struggle. Our sons and relatives perhaps stood on the same battlefields, and when we thought of the defeat of our army, we realized that a lost battle would mean their death, and that a lost war would be a misfortune for our whole people. This inner anguish, being torn within one's being, was so much worse than all that which we suffered in the concentration camp. They also knocked my teeth out, and after a severe heart attack, I already lay among the corpses. I told my foreign friends in the camp: "We too suffer from hunger and beatings, but we Germans also suffer from shame." All that happens, happens in the name of the people to which we belong.

But there was also another feeling. We both not only fought against something; we also fought for something: For right and justice, for a better order in the world, and for another, peaceful, and democratic Germany. And now we always find our way together, in that we want to go on and fight for a good thing. Your fight against Hitler was especially for you as Americans at the same time a fight for humanity, liberty, and justice.

Now, I ask my friends to believe me when I say that we should not be satisfied with that which we accomplished, that we dare not rest on our laurels. There is so much injustice, inhumanity, and agitation in the world, against which we must fight. You in America know too that there is still intolerance, racial hatred, and also anti-Semitism here in your land. Here too there are people who are abused and persecuted because of their origin, and because they are members of a specific group or race. A Japanese proverb says: "After the victory one has to tie the helmet tighter." That means, one should not think that after one has done his duty, he may fold his hands.

When I, at the age of 71, call again and again not to become tired, to be an example especially to the youth, that it grow up into another, better spirit then I know that not only in Germany, but all over the world, much has been neglected. We have to make up for many things, and that which we neglected and have been guilty of in the past, has to be compensated by an increased activity.

Let me tell you very frankly, you in America too have neglected many things for which you have to make good. I do not want to minimize the guilt of my people or my own. During the Jerusalem trial I said it before the world, that had there been in 1938 the same amount of responsibility for the suppressed, for the exiles and refugees, as there is today, then perhaps hundreds of thousands could have been saved who perished in the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Maidanek.

Therefore, we have to continue to stand together. I am from Berlin, the city which is now separated by a wall. It is a wall which reveals so much injustice, so much pain and need, but which also can become a new and great danger. My church lies in the eastern part of the city. I cannot enter it any more. I can no longer see my children, grandchildren, relatives, and friends who are living in the Soviet sector of Berlin. But this same thing happened to hundreds of

thousands of people. Any one of you who has been in Jerusalem knows what a separated city means. It is not easy for a Jew to see the grave of King David, the court of the Temple, the Wailing Wall, and Mount Scopus. But it is not such a great trouble for this city, since these are different people on the two sides who have nothing to do with each other, here Israelis and there Jordanians, here Jews and there Mohammedans. In Berlin families and friendships are torn apart. Tens of thousands can no longer work at their former working places. It is not even possible to go to the sickbed of one's parents, nor to the grave of one's relatives.

Berlin and Jerusalem point up the great trouble of our time. They show us our great task, that men of good will stand together. Churches and synagogues, Jews and Christians, have to face the danger of our times together.

I may call attention to a special danger, which lies in the realm of the possible, but which I hope will never become a reality. It is the threat to the young state of Israel of the surrounding Arab world, which is again and again crying for the removal of this state. I can tell you that I have been astounded again and again during my several visits in Israel by the development there. I see not only an extraordinary political and economic phenomenon here, but also the realization of the promise of the prophet that the desert will become a vineyard. We all would like to help to realize this promise even more fully. My friends collected money for my birthday, as a result of which a forest with about 3,500 trees were planted which bears my name. It is situated on Mount Synhedria near Jerusalem, directly on the Jordan border. I am grateful and I am proud of this forest of peace, near the "City of Peace"—Jerusalem.

But the decision in the Syrian-Israeli conflict by the Security Council of the UNO has disturbed me again. All of the examinations have proved that the Syrians were the aggressors, and yet Israel was condemned. I did not understand the reasons for this condemnation, especially not the attitude of the U.S. delegate, Adlai Stevenson, whom I otherwise like very much. When I spoke with a diplomat from another country about this, he said: "There are 40 million Arabs and 2 million Israelis." Everything in life is viewed from an economic standpoint. The Arab world is a greater economic factor than Israel. I personally am of the opinion that this was the viewpoint of a Hitler: "That is only right which serves my purpose." I think that particularly the politicians of our day are obliged to consider themselves bound to moral values. All might without right is destroyed by might without right.

I can only warn all people in the world not to take the question of the existence of the State of Israel lightly, and not to deal with this subject marginally, as they dealt with the fate of the Jews in Germany and German-occupied countries during the time of Hitler. I am convinced that in case the Arabs one day carry out their threat and put an end to the State of Israel, or, as they would call it, free the country, most of the governments of the world would just stand by and watch as they did in the 1938 program in Germany.

If the Jews are once again forced to flee, or are murdered, a still greater curse will come upon humanity than it is suffering now. It is not only that 2 to 3 million people will become homeless. As of a person who believes in that which God demands and promises, there is more involved. For me there is the Word that He will keep the people of His covenant as the apple of His eye.

You in America dare not take the destiny of Israel too easy. Don't think, "we live in a free America and Israel as far away." It is not enough to take a trip once to the Holy Land, to give a gift for U.J.A., or to sign up for Israel bonds. That may be necessary, but it is not enough. If the State of Israel no longer exists, this old land in which so many found a new home, then Jews all over the world will become rootless and homeless.

That means for us Germans that we shall have to recognize our moral responsibility for Israel, and that diplomatic relations with Israel should be established immediately. There, too, consideration for Arab countries should not prevent us from doing that which we recognize as a moral responsibility. I am happy that just among the young people in Germany this demand is made again and again. We have in Germany a large segment of wonderful young people who are willing to make good for that which their fathers and grandfathers neglected. They are ready to do this by going to Israel to work in the Kibuzim (colonies).

On the evening before my departure for America, I spoke to representatives of the political parties in Berlin during a great mass meeting arranged by the youth organization. In this meeting a request was made for the opening of diplomatic relations with Israel.

Let us continue to stand together in the fight for freedom, humanity, and the well-being of the world, and also for the security and welfare of the State of Israel. Shalom for mankind and for Erez Israel.

Irrigation in the Ozarks—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I inserted in the RECORD the initial discussion of a far-reaching irrigation project on the farm of Mr. Gene Poirot in southwest Missouri. Today, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I am inserting part II of this project, including Mr. Poirot's views of the actions which can be taken to insure a better use of water resources in areas which are often plagued by serious deficiencies:

WHAT WE HAVE SEEN

What we have seen today is a low cost, efficient, system of irrigation which can be made available if we want it, to most southwest Missouri farms through the work of the Federal Soil and Water Conservation Service where soil conservation districts have been voted in by farmers.

The irrigation project here on Poirot farms has been done without the help of any agency, for the purpose of providing a cheap and efficient source of water for irrigation during the dry spells which occur almost every year during the summer. This method has been very successful during its past 10 years of existence. Modifications have been made during that time and will be made whenever they are feasible.

It can best be described as a large lake of 11 acres located at the high point of cultivated land. It is constructed somewhat like a soup bowl, the rim of which represents the dam. All of the water, except which fills the area where the soil was removed for making the dam, is on or above original ground level. When full, the shallowest water is 10 feet deep while the deepest part of the excavation is 17 feet deep. Low cost gravity irrigation is therefore practical and possible. The water in it and that in a holding basin is enough to irrigate about 300 acres of corn.

Filling the lake by gravity flow from a small dam upstream at a point located at about the same level was also part of the original plan. This was impossible, however, because the land was not available at a place far enough up the creek to provide the necessary elevation.

Another smaller dam was therefore constructed across the creek to impound floodwater which could be released through a gate equal to that amount an 8" centrifugal pump would pump when driven by a farm tractor and thereby deliver it to the larger impoundment on the high ground.

This extra cost amounts to $1.20 per acre-foot which, though very reasonable, can be eliminated by the method described a little later.

Perhaps the most outstanding features connected with this method of utilizing surplus rainfall for irrigation are:

1. It can be applied to and made available for a high percentage of our cropland.

2. It can be adjusted to fill the needs of small farms, medium sized farms, and large farms equally well.

In addition to providing water, it has these other important advantages:

1. It also serves equally well as flood control.

2. It keeps the water near the place where it falls, thus providing water for wildlife and farm animals during a severe drought and recreation for people who can't afford to go to a big lake.

3. Before the water impounded and used this way can reach the ocean, it must again fall as rain. It is therefore used twice.

4. The impoundments holding the water for individual farms will be on private property built by private capital and therefore under the complete and final control of the landowner, as against water held in large impoundments built at government expense and controlled by people who are not farmers.

Such an approach to water conservation has therefore many advantages that cannot be had after the water moves further and further downstream. The flood control part is a natural phenomenon of holding the water temporarily in an impoundment and then slowly releasing it downstream to allow the impoundment to become emptied and ready for the next flood. This, however, does not fully use water except perhaps for electric power production, recreational facilities on lakes and, in some cases, for downstream irrigation.

If, however, in place of releasing the water to go downstream, it is diverted to farm reservoirs on private land and held there until needed for irrigation or other purposes by the farmer, the damaging effects of floodwater are not only prevented but floodwater is made into a valuable asset for producing our crops with the help of irrigation.

THE COST

Nationally we have already accepted the needs of flood control. The methods of doing it in the past are the building of levees or dikes along streams, like the Mississippi, to hold the river in its channel rather than allowing it to spread over lowlands when it overflows its natural banks, or to build high dams upstream to hold large amounts of water on the tributaries to the main river, or to go still further up the tributaries and impound water in smaller dams to catch the silt it carries and then slowly releasing the water into its natural channels.

These costs are, in almost all cases, without any resulting profit, excepting that which comes from electric current, prevent-

ing flood damage to crops and farms and recreational uses.

In the Western States, the large impoundments trap and hold the water on rocky soils of low agricultural value. It is then made available to farmers downstream who live on much more valuable agricultural soils and which are in desperate need of irrigation water for profitable production. In our Central West area and in much of south Missouri, the best land is on the watershed far above the large lake which holds the water. It is this land which needs the water for irrigation in our region.

Small upstream dams therefore which are built to hold floodwaters, can also supply water for upstream irrigation if the water is diverted to ponds on private land.

The principal adjustment which must be made is simply that of diverting water to private ponds in place of wasting it by allowing it to go down the natural course of the stream at a slower rate of speed.

Irrigation thus tied to effective flood control on the watershed is not only very low cost water but it serves as an economic advantage to farmer and rural town alike and we can have it if we want it.

According to this concept of water utilization, the only cost that a farmer would have would be that of building a suitable pond on the high place of his farm which would be filled by gravity flow from a still higher place upstream thus eliminating the cost of pumps and power equipment to run them. Because his pond is located on the high part of his farm, gravity flow again will deliver water to the growing crops without the need of pumps and power equipment. He will perhaps need some open trenches or a flexible lightweight plastic pipe to deliver the water where he wants it without too much waste.

We have found that 6 inches of water or less will in most years supply the needs of summer crops yet this small amount of low-cost water delivered to a crop at the right time can easily increase the net profit income by 300 percent or more to those farmers who use it.

In addition to these direct advantages to the farmer, there are advantages that come to the rural towns because irrigation not only increases total production of the crops we now grow, which extra towage must be hauled, processed and delivered to markets, but it also enables the farmer to grow other crops of greater value requiring exacting amounts of water at the right time, such as vegetables and fruits which can be used by processing industries located at home.

The cost therefore generally accepted as necessary to flood control can be actually changed to a profit for the upstream community if they will find a way to use floodwater while also preventing its damaging effects downstream.

THE WAY TO GET IT

If we want these advantages for ourselves and our community, we can have them by asking for them. The Federal Water and Soil Conservation Service plus the help of the Army Engineers, the college of agriculture and its extension service, the Farm Home Administration, local businessmen, chambers of commerce, and resources planning agencies can all have a share and a part in getting this task done. It can be done in less time with the help of the newspapers telling the facts and acquainting the public with the advantages we can gain through irrigation and more effective use of our soil in growing abundance and products of greater value.

Since the Soil and Water Conservation Service has already indicated that they can undertake to provide irrigation water in this way, and since they appear to be the only group at the present time who can do it under the law, they seem to be the logical group for us to employ through our vote for soil conservation districts. Like county agents and many other services available to us, they too are already organized and ready to do the job when individual farmers or groups call upon them as soon as soil districts are established within a county. The plan up to the point of diverting the water to private ponds is not new to them. In other places, one of which is Clinton, Okla., they have developed watersheds using small lakes for so-called siltation basins that hold the water during a flood and release it rather slowly downstream over a long period of time thus making an ever flowing stream out of a dry river.

The modification of this method which is suggested by the impoundment used for irrigation purposes on Poirot Farms, is nothing more than leading the water to ponds on private land as a means of storing it in place of allowing it to run down the natural channel of the stream. In actual operation, the Government siltation impoundment can be built to the side of the stream in place of across it thus holding only the floodwaters of heavy rains which always go to waste and cause damage downstream.

These are some suggestions that arise because of the practical low-cost irrigation system we have developed here within three miles of the high plateau dividing the rainfall between the Missouri River and the Arkansas River. The fact that irrigation is possible here at this high level indicates that a great percentage of farmland lying at a lower level where even more water is available can be used in an irrigation program such as this one. The importance therefore seems to be the wide scope of land which can be reached by water, the many farmers and rural towns it will benefit, the flood control aspects, and the rewards which come from changing a destructive force such as floodwaters, to a force of economic value such as irrigation.

In taking advantage of this opportunity, we are using the services of agencies already available to other communities. If we delay, others will take advantage of this same opportunity and we will lose more and more of our agricultural production to those who can do the job better and at less cost. It is the way economics rewards or penalizes individuals or regions.

U.N.'s Dubious Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for reprinting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Richard Pattee, which appears in the January 31, 1963, issue of the Witness, published at Dubuque, Iowa, and whose circulation is mainly to thousands of members of the Catholic church in the Midwest.

I agree completely with Mr. Pattee's views and especially his concluding paragraph in which he says it is "a tragedy that Katanga has been invaded, forced into submission, and treated with contempt by the United Nations which is so zealous about handing New Guinea over to the Indonesians and condemning the Goans to Indian imperialism."

The complete article follows:

U.N.'S DUBIOUS VICTORY OVER SECESSIONIST MOVE

(By Richard Pattee)

The end has apparently come for the secessionist movement in Katanga after the capture of Elisabethville and Jadotville by the armed forces of the United Nations. President Moise Tshombe has been reported as virtually abandoned by his own army and forced to seek some sort of accommodation with the Leopoldville government.

This may seem to many as the happy conclusion of a very trying experience in which the world organization has been pitted against a lone African leader and his rebellious province. I wonder if the interpretation thus deduced from recent events will not be belied by the greater tragedy that may well come of it.

Now that the Katanga affair gives the appearance of reaching its last chapter, it may be appropriate to repeat that the solution as provided involves far more than a distant Congolese province that refused to give in to the madness that gripped the former Belgian colony after independence in 1960.

Even if Katanga has been forced to capitulate there is no evidence at all that it has done so voluntarily or with any conviction of the excellence of the government presided over by Adoula in Leopoldville. If bringing Tshombe to heel has cost $10 million and an unending amount of anxiety and bloodshed, how can the U.N. troops depart in the expectation that the Katangans will live happily ever after with those whom they have been resisting for nearly 3 years?

The basic error in the whole business is, of course, that the U.N. with full U.S. approval, has operated on the assumption that a Congolese nation exists and that secession from it is a very bad thing.

There never was a Congo nation and there is none today except as an artificial and unrealistic creation in international practice. I have written before that there is nothing awful about Katanga leaving the Congo after the central Congolese state had demonstrated its total incapacity to perform the functions of a properly organized administration.

Moreover, with the elimination of Moise Tshombe, if that comes to pass, just what do we have in his place? Surely no one can have much faith in Adoula. Kasavubu, the Congolese President, is scarcely mentioned any more, so inept has he revealed himself to be. General Mobuto seems to have dropped from the scene.

Just how the present Congolese regime is going to achieve everything that is expected of it after Katanga is brought back into the fold, is a mystery. Tshombe, whatever his defects of tortuous procrastination—and he certainly indulged in that—is a proven moderate by African and any other terms.

PRINCIPAL SIN

He was friendly to the Belgians, and this was construed as his principal sin. He stands in well with Rhodesia and this is even worse. Now that he appears to have been banquished, the danger mounts still higher for the Portuguese in Angola and the Rhodesians in their exposed state.

I doubt very much that this will prove to be a good thing either for Africa or for the world. Of course, to those who anticipate with glee the collapse of the Rhodesias, Angola, Mozambique, and ultimately the Republic of South Africa, the eclipse of Tschombe hastens that happy consummation. One does not have to be much of a prophet to predict that we have gone one step closer to anarchy in Africa, leaving the last bulwarks of resistance to racism in reverse more exposed than before.

I find it a tragedy that Katanga has been invaded, forced into submission and treated with contempt by the United Nations which is so zealous about handing New Guinea over to the Indonesians and condemning the Goans to Indian imperialism.

Nelson Award: Great American Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nils V. Nelson Award for Sportsmanship was presented January 5 at Boston to Pat Culpepper, great University of Texas football star, for being the player who, by his conduct on and off the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree. Thus, a notable award named for one of Massachusetts' most famous and beloved sports heroes and leaders, was conferred upon a brilliant, promising, stalwart young son of Texas, distinguished for his high character as a young man and his sense of fairness, skill and leadership on the gridiron and in his great university.

Established some years ago by the noted Gridiron Club of Boston in honor of its outstanding member, its former esteemed president, and star Harvard football player, the beloved, and incredibly magnificent, Swede Nelson, this award has taken its place as one of our Nation's most cherished honors for lofty sportsmanship and noble character.

The code of American football is something far more than an empty phrase, something far more than stellar performance on the gridiron. It is a set of principles of high honor, fair dealing and clean sportsmanship that pertains, not only to playing the game of football, but playing the game of life in the best sense of that term.

It is a rigid code in that it calls for courage, toughness, tenacity and the do-or-die spirit. But it rigorously demands fairness, toleration and recognition of the thesis upon which most of the great achievements of free civilization are based: that individuals should be judged on their merits and their true worth, rather than on the superficial standards of birth, position or material success. That is Americanism in perhaps its purist form—true equality of opportunity for all.

The many-sided, monumental contributions of Swede Nelson give special distinction and significance to this award, because his entire life has been an incredible story of unselfish service to country, community and very many great causes.

The selection of this fine young man from Texas, Pat Culpepper, to receive the Nelson Award, is another chapter in American sport that evidences the universal nature of those qualities of character, courage and talent which provide ready inspiration for all those who aspire and strive by their own efforts to set an example that may well be followed by others, and that will exert beneficial influence upon our youth and upon our way of life.

It has been well said that any game worth playing is worth winning, but it must also be recognized that any game must be won fairly and that out of defeat often come great lessons. To be sure, defeat is not a substitute for victory.

Many have paid tribute to Swede Nelson's great dedicated work throughout the years and I fear that I can add little to the many fine things that have been said of him so many times and in many places by some of our greatest leaders. I would make this one observation, however, that having known Swede as a very dear friend, and having seen the tremendous impact of his character, his personality, his wit, and his ever-present spirit of buoyancy and helpfulness, and the fine code of human understanding and human uplift that he has religiously and zealously followed, that the Nation that has a Swede Nelson to inspire, to aid, to counsel, and to encourage its youth in lofty patriotism, higher standards and achievements, is most fortunate.

Those of us who are interested in the advancement of clean sport and high-level sportsmanship, and the perpetuation of the great values of our heritage, family, school, free religious worship, toleration of our fellow man, and the building and strengthening of the Nation may well be grateful that such a fine person and leader occupies such a lofty place in American life.

I think that the award committee has made a splendid selection this year in choosing this splendid young man from the University of Texas to receive the Nelson Award. As his famous coach, the gifted Darrel Royal, another great American, said of him, "I have never known a boy who practices the art of sportsmanship as Culpepper does. I would be happy if my own sons would emulate him. He has been living like Swede Nelson all his life."

Our State and our people are very happy that our very distinguished Nelson Award goes to this fine American boy from Texas this year. Texas and Texans are close to our hearts. Pat Culpepper is a credit to his family, school, State, and country.

May the Nelson Award which symbolizes the fine qualities and contributions, high sense of values, and patriotism of the incomparable Swede Nelson long continue to inspire American youth, sustain the cause of good sportsmanship, and enrich our great Nation.

Mrs. Peggy Lloyd Aids FBI in Catching Two Bandits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, we have all read and heard appeals from the Federal Bureau of Investigation for help from all citizens in catching dangerous criminals. Sometimes we read these requests for vigilance with good intentions but, all too often we forget about them within a short time.

However, one public spirited citizen in Maryland did not forget last week. Mrs. Peggy Lloyd overheard men ordering tellers into a vault at the Suburban Trust Co.'s Bowie branch office and immediately alerted the local police. As a direct result of Mrs. Lloyd's tip, two of the bandits were arrested by police and FBI agents within 3 hours of the robbery, which involved some $7,500.

The Director of the FBI, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, has commended Mrs. Lloyd for her assistance in this instance and, under unanimous consent, I include his letter in the Appendix of the RECORD. I would also like to express the sincere appreciation of all Maryland citizens to Mrs. Lloyd for the public service she has rendered. The letter follows:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1963.

MRS. PEGGY LLOYD,
Secretary to the General Manager,
Bowie Race Track,
Bowie, Md.

DEAR MRS. LLOYD: I have learned of your alertness yesterday in contacting authorities to advise of suspicious activity at the Suburban Trust Co. in Bowie. Your prompt action was largely responsible for preventing a successful getaway by the bandits who robbed that bank.

Effective law enforcement so often depends on the help and cooperation law-abiding citizens render, and your assistance in this instance is an outstanding example of the results which can be achieved. My associates and I join in expressing our appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Tax Cuts and Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more apparent to millions of citizens throughout the country that the tax cut being offered by the administration does not completely deserve that description. The changes in the tax structure being proposed by the administration would have the practical effect of increasing the Federal tax that would be paid by millions of individuals. This can hardly be called tax reduction.

This subject was very effectively discussed in an editorial of Sunday, Januare 27, in the Chicago Heights Star, which I include in the Appendix of the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

TAX CUTS WITH STRINGS ATTACHED

It is to be hoped that nobody committed himself to purchasing a new suit on the

strength of prospects for a reduction in Federal income taxes.

President Kennedy now says that along with the tax cuts, he will request revisions in the schedule of deductions. Under his terms, payments of real estate and sales taxes, mortgage interest and contributions to charity could be deducted from gross income only insfoar as they exceed 5 percent of that income.

This is similar to the present method of permitting deduction of medical expenses only to the extent that they exceed certain percentages of gross income. This, we have pointed out, is a quaint practice for an administration which frequently expresses anguish over the high cost of staying well.

Since the President considers income tax reductions essential as a spur to the economy, we wonder if he doesn't risk dulling the spur beyond use by attaching the new deduction strings to his proposal.

Surely Federal tax credits on mortgage interest encourage home ownership, and probably in many cases make homeownership possible. Limiting the amount deductible would scarcely rev up the economy as far as the construction industry is concerned.

With respect to gifts to charity, there can be little question about the unfavorable impact which might be expected if the tax allowance is reduced. Some gifts just wouldn't be made, and the charities would suffer.

One of the most perplexing suggestions, however, is the proposed slice in the allowable deductions based on local tax payments. At present the Federal Government performs a service in the direction of aid to education by allowing taxpayers to subtract from gross income their real estate and personal property taxes, as well as sales taxes.

All of these levies help support schools; moreover, full deduction of realty and personalty tax payments eases the pain of authorizing school building bond issues and school tax rate increases. And the real estate tax deduction serves also as a further incentive for homeownership.

The proposal to dilute the income tax reductions comes on the heels of increases in social security taxes and postal rates. It suggests that Mr. Kennedy might be backing away from the only sensible route to sound economic growth—income tax cuts made possible by elimination of needless Federal spending.

Tax Reform and Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, in the President's special message on tax reduction and reform, he said:

> The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, under-investment, unused capacity and persistent unemployment. The result is lagging wage, salary and profit income, smaller take-home pay, insufficient productivity gains, inadequate Federal revenues and persistent budget deficits.

Of course many of us are in agreement and many of us feel that something should, in fact, be done. The President then recommended a tax rate reduction which would provide a cut in tax liabilities of some $13.6 billion, and other proposed adjustments, some of which would gain and some of which would lose revenue, but would "on balance produce a revenue gain of $3.4 billion, leaving a net reduction of $10.2 billion."

The President then went on to tell us that this loss of revenue would be more than offset by stimulated business activity and increased individual spending. Here are his very words:

> Total output and economic growth will be stepped up by an amount several times as great as the tax cut itself. Total incomes will rise—billions of dollars more will be earned each year in profits and wages.

I am not yet convinced that this is, in fact, true; I have not yet been converted to the principle that we can cut taxes, increase spending, and get rich in doing so. Individuals and private businesses can't do it and there is serious doubt in my mind, and in the minds of many other Americans, that governments can.

The purpose of this comment is not to criticize or take issue with this basic proposition, but certainly we are entitled to some concrete evidence that this bit of sophisticated tax planning will work in practice as it does in the minds of the sophisticated planners. And most certainly each of us will have to expend a lot of time, study and research before we can take a firm position on the President's overall tax proposal. Most certainly, any consideration of the tax reduction and reform must be made with a full and complete knowledge of the proposed budget.

Great concern with the President's proposal arises from the following statement in which he recommended a floor on itemized reductions:

> I, therefore, recommend that itemized deductions, which now average about 20 percent of adjusted gross incomes, be limited to those in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

This recommendation very simply and clearly means that the first 5 percent of itemized deductions on the individual's tax return will not be deductible, and itemized deductions will be limited to those in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This floor under the itemized deductions of individuals will make $2.3 billion available for the reduction of individual tax rates. I suggest that this revenue will come from churches, schools, boy scout organizations, community chest funds and other very worthwhile charitable organizations that are forced to rely upon charitable contributions for their operating revenue.

I can think of no way in which the Federal Government can discourage charitable contribution more than by placing a penalty on contribution itself. The reform proposes that we take $2.3 billion away from those who itemize deductions and spread it around to those who do not. It may very well be true that everyone will receive a reduction in taxes, but, in many instances, the taxpayer who itemizes his deductions will not receive the same tax cut as his neighbor who does not. The President indicated in his message that this floor will help to simplify the filing of tax returns and that an additional 6½ million taxpayers will no longer itemize their deductions but will still benefit overall from the reduced rates and other relief measures. The 6½ million American taxpayers will no longer itemize deductions simply because 6½ million taxpayers will not find it to their advantage to itemize their deductions and, obviously, many of these taxpayers are those that make sizable contributions to charities and charitable organizations. In my own State, a reasonably high percentage of the total population are members of the Latter-day Saints Church, more commonly known as Mormons. As such, they are committed to a principle of charity known as the law of tithing, wherein they contribute 10 percent of their total income to their church, plus other contributions for the construction of church houses, the maintenance of church buildings, and so forth.

To those of my friends and neighbors in this category, the proposed tax cut is not, in fact, a very enticing measure, and the interests of these people and those many other millions of Americans who make sizable contributions ought to be protected. Proponents of this plan may very well argue that it is not the business of Government to reward those who contribute to charities, and that the donor is not and should not be motivated by a concession from his Government to induce him to perform his Christian duties and become his brother's keeper.

Even if we cannot become too concerned for the taxpayer, we ought to give every consideration to the charitable organization. We ought to be concerned when Government takes positive action which dampens incentive of its citizens to give of their means and substance to the poor, the sick, the Boy Scouts, the Community Chest, the Heart Fund, and a host of other organizations dedicated to the service of the community and service to the less fortunate. The President himself recognized the desirability of symphony orchestras, educational institutions, community chests, and cultural centers, and proposed that the ceiling on charitable contributions be liberalized. This is fine for the large contributor, but the small or moderate contributor receives no consolation from the fact that the ceiling on charitable contribution is lifted from 30 to 40 percent. He is much more concerned by the fact that the first 5 percent of his itemized deductions will not be deductible.

I am greatly concerned about the individuals to be affected by the proposed change, and I am greatly concerned about the organizations mentioned herein. These facts and the problems may well have been overlooked by the President and his planners. I hope that this is the case, and I hope that they and the Congress take a good long look at the proposal and act in accordance with the spirit of charity and consideration for our fellowman, the less fortunate, and those organizations that have dedicated themselves to the service of these people.

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Robert F. Wagner, the great mayor of the greatest metropolis in the world, recently spoke at a meeting of the Advisory Council of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. This meeting took place at the Education Alliance, a voluntary settlement house in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

Inasmuch as the contents of his message concern all who are interested in the problems confronting the authorities in our large cities, I submit it to the attention of the Congress. Incidentally, the mayor's message makes reference to the mobilization for youth program which was initiated in my district as one of the fronts in the struggle against juvenile delinquency which can well be joined with a domestic peace corps. I introduced legislation last year to establish such a domestic peace corps and again expect to introduce the legislation in this session of Congress.

All the foregoing, in my opinion, makes the mayor's message both vital and timely:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

I am pleased to be at this meeting of the Advisory Council of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. I am particularly happy that the Council has chosen New York City for its first field meeting. We can benefit from your experience and observations—and I very much hope, vice versa. We do have the problem here, and a few of the answers. But all of us are still looking for the answers to the main questions.

Here, as all of you know, the city government provides an unprecedented variety of services to its citizens—especially in those humanitarian categories which can be labeled "human services."

In general, in my judgment, the quality of the "human services" provided in our metropolitan communities and the manner in which we approach and handle our human problems, are among the great challenges of our time. I am referring to those government programs which are designed to achieve the following basic social purposes:

1. Education of the young.
2. Integration of minority groups into the life of the community.
3. The full development and utilization of our potential manpower, by the development of skills and aptitudes and their use without discrimination by reason of sex, race, color, or creed.
4. The promotion and protection of the physical, mental, and moral well-being of all our inhabitants.
5. The special care and comfort of the aged, the sick and the emotionally and mentally disturbed.
6. Promotion of the constructive and restorative use of leisure time through exercise, instruction, and cultural development.

The number and extent of governmental services in these categories, especially as they concern youth, has increased spectacularly, almost astronomically, within recent years, as I shall illustrate in a moment by fact and figure. Yet there is both pressure and need for a continued expansion in these services. But in my judgment the real touchstone of progress today lies in the quality of the services being rendered, as much as in the quantity and variety of them.

How greatly we strive, how deeply we resolve, and how well we succeed in raising this quality and in meeting the need will serve as a principal measure of what we who are engaged in government on the local level have been able to give to our times and our country.

We live in days full of tension and danger, but also of infinite promise. The depression of the thirties, the wars of the forties and early fifties, the surge toward equality of Negroes and other peoples in the United States and throughout the world, the great migration of Americans from one part of the country to another, the fearsome danger of nuclear holocaust—those powerful forces have shaken and reshaped our lives. They are beyond the control of any municipal government, and in many ways beyond the control of even national governments.

The impact of these forces on the lives of children is even greater than on those of adults. This is a fact we sometimes overlook or fail to recognize. The young personality is far more vulnerable and sensitive to external impact. Generally we know this. Yet we sometimes seem to be surprised that the young should react so violently to the impact of the violent forces all around us. But this impact which can do enormous damage can also help develop enormous strength. There is evidence that both effects are being achieved today.

This is not the occasion further to discuss these factors or to weigh their impact. We know that the effects are there, and we believe that the basic factors I have mentioned have contributed to these effects and to the present problems.

In New York City, the government expends a major portion of its energies and income on and in behalf of the youth of this city. An analysis of our budget shows that the city government spends $1,100 million annually—or we will this year—on social and educational services for our young people. Let me break this figure down into the classifications and the specialized undertakings which seek to give our services the quality I referred to a few moments ago.

The basic teaching process in the public schools has been under continuous improvement through the expansion of the size of staff and the quality of teachers and of the curriculum.

More than 6,000 additional teaching positions including 900 additional remedial reading teachers have been filled during the past 8 years. Teachers' salaries have been increased most substantially—a 75-percent increase in the minimum salary and a 60-percent increase in the maximum salary between 1953 and 1962.

In the public school system, there has been a growing emphasis on meeting the special problems of children coming from severely deprived backgrounds. Thus, the number of full-time guidance counselors in the schools has been increased from 100 in 1955 to 600 during the current school year.

The higher horizons program, an innovation of the New York City school system, which is now being widely copied in many cities of the country, serves over 60,000 children in 76 schools.

Municipal recreation services have been substantially increased during the past decade; over 175 playgrounds, 250 community and recreation centers in schools and public housing projects have been added to the facilities previously available. It has been estimated that during the last 6 years the cost to the city for recreation serving all age groups has increased by approximately $10 million.

Social services for seriously troubled children and families have been expanded and intensified. The street-club project of the New York City Youth Board, which was in contact with 22 gangs in 1955, has been so greatly expanded that it now serves 250 of these groups.

Yes, the city government is engaged in a great many different youth activities through the schools and through many other public and semipublic agencies which I have not taken the time to mention.

This listing, however, and this citation of the total amount of money we are spending on youth does not in any way mean that we are satisfied with the amount or the quality of what we are doing. As I said at the very beginning of my remarks, we do not know the answers to the really tough questions about youth. In order to dig more deeply in the direction of these answers and to make our existing programs more effective, we have embarked within the year on a second major approach epitomized by the Mobilization for Youth project on the Lower East Side. This will be followed next year by another major effort, in Harlem: Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited. These are area projects. In these areas we are attempting to find the ways not only to improve the educational training opportunities for low-income youth, but to give them better access to jobs: to enable them to find the jobs that they can do, and to train them for the jobs that they can find.

By raising the levels of opportunities for these young people, we are attempting to affect the root causes of delinquent behavior. We have also been trying to help forge a true partnership between the local voluntary agencies, the local population, the city government, and a great university.

I am convinced that these demonstration projects hold forth great promise, and the role of this council and of the President's Committee has been of inestimable value in stimulating these and other innovations on a national scale.

At the same time, we are reviewing the proliferation of governmental youth services and their relationship to the organization of the city government itself. It is apparent to me, as I reflect on the activities of our complex municipal government, that it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate the planning and coordination of services from the other activities of government.

It is clear that the problems of different age levels are both interrelated and interdependent. The problems of juvenile delinquency cannot be separated from the problems of family life generally.

Mindful of this fact, we have been greatly concerned over the adequacy of the city's administrative machinery for planning and coordinating its mammoth efforts for children and youth. Hence, we have recently commissioned a thorough administrative review, by the Institute of Public Administration, of our machinery for the planning and coordination of youth services. We expect the report of this survey late this spring.

I see the need for greater emphasis on social planning in our metropolitan communities. We need fresh approaches to using our human resources, to unleashing the full potential within each individual for his own well-being and the welfare of the community. We may compare this need for social planning to the recognition a generation ago of the need to establish machinery for urban planning. In order to face current social problems, we need to define basic goals, arrange priorities, and evaluate our efforts.

I said that New York City's direct expenditure for its children and youth is $1,100 million. Of this sum, almost $300 million is spent for children who need special kinds of care because of handicaps, dependency,

delinquency, or neglect. The balance is spent as part of the general educational, recreational, and cultural services of the city government. In the past 7 years, expenditures for financial assistance and rehabilitation services have increased by $140 million. Our costs for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts, for example, have increased manifold in this period; our expenditures for casework and related services have increased fourfold, from $8 million in 1955 to $31 million currently.

These expenditures constitute a great proportion of our total expenditures for youth. Moreover and unfortunately, we have found that these expenditures are not self-reducing. They do not reduce the size of the problem. Instead, there is a constant pressure to increase these expenditures. This diverts funds from more fundamental undertakings.

Today we clearly realize that we must devote increasing energies to creating new jobs and to training our young people in new skills, and to breaking down the barriers of discrimination. Unless we do this, we will be compelled to meet the steadily mounting costs of public assistance, rehabilitation services, and of police activitiy. This pattern has become increasingly clear. Let us hope that this pattern may be reversed by an increase in communitywide social planning for the creation of better social conditions which will in the end, greatly reduce both the human and financial costs of social and economic maladjustment.

I believe this to be among the truths which we must take into consideration in our further spending and working on the youth problem.

Recognizing these truths, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime has given strong support to comprehensive planning, but with a neighborhood focus. This, of course, is what the mobilization for youth is all about. I believe that the time is approaching to consider broadening these planning efforts. We must look at the problem and plan for the attack on the problem on a citywide basis, and also on a nationwide basis, even while we continue to seek ways to mobilize neighborhood energies for the attack on the neighborhood problem.

For this broader social planning approach, we will need the experience and dedication of the voluntary agencies as well as the objectivity and scientific skills of our academicians. We must make it possible for all to work together, and not as in separate worlds.

We must be ready to move in new directions and to follow untrodden paths. We must be willing to follow any course of action which holds promise, no matter how unorthodox.

What is at stake is not just the welfare of a few maladjusted, socially disadvantaged individuals, but the welfare and fate of all our children and of our country and the world whose destiny will one day be guided by the emerging generation.

Meritorious Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, John D. Swygert, on December 19, 1962, received the Post Office Department's Meritorious Service Award, being one of the first recipients under the Department's new awards program. His citation read:

For outstanding leadership and direction in the initiation and administration of the Christmas and vacation operation programs; for expert direction of staff work required to improve the work measurement system; for effective manpower control resulting in efficient and economical organization of our Nation's post offices.

Mr. Swygert has been Director of the Installations Management Division, Bureau of Operations, Post Office Department, since August 1961, having been promoted to this position from executive assistant to the Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Operations.

Mr. Swygert is a native of Columbia, S.C., and first entered the postal service in October 1935 as a substitute clerk. He volunteered during World War II and served in the U.S. Navy with honor and distinction. At the time of his separation from service, he was district postal officer of the 6th Naval District. Immediately upon his discharge, he returned to postal service.

Mr. Swygert was elected a member of the executive board of the National Association of Postal Supervisors in September 1950 and, in August 1953, was appointed by President Michael C. Nave to fill the unexpired term of national secretary in Washington, D.C. He continued as secretary until December 1958, having been elected unanimously to the secretary position on three occasions in Miami, Omaha, and Louisville. In December 1958 he resigned as national secretary to accept a position with the Post Office Department as organization management officer in the Atlanta regional office.

Mr. Speaker, John D. Swygert typifies the dedicated, loyal, public servant. His many friends and admirers in the Congress join me in congratulating him for this great honor and in expressing our appreciation for his many kindnesses and courtesies to us. Mr. Swygert like his chief, the able and distinguished Edward Day, exemplifies those traditions, principles, and ideals of public service that made the Post Office Department the superb organization that it is today.

District of Columbia Delegate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials which appeared in the Evening Star of February 1, 1963, and the Washington Post of February 1, 1963, relevant to my bill, H.R. 2893, which I introduced on January 28, 1963, to establish in the House of Representatives the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to provide for the election of the Delegate, and for other purposes:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 1, 1963]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE

Among pending legislative proposals affecting the District of Columbia, the bill introduced by Representative MATHIAS of Maryland to give the District a nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives stands in the front rank of importance.

As an end in itself, of course, this limited form of representation does not provide that full degree of national enfranchisement to which District residents are entitled, and which still is denied them. The ratification of the 23d amendment to the Constitution 2 years ago, which will enable Washingtonians to vote for President and Vice President in 1964, was a very important advance. But their full rights of citizenship will not be realized until another constitutional amendment authorizes them to elect voting representatives to both the House and the Senate.

The significant consideration now, however, is that the Mathias bill may serve as an important step in that direction. There is reason to believe that Congress' reluctance to approve voting representation in 1960, when the 23d amendment was under debate, sprang partly from concern over the absence of a well-developed political electorate in the District. The confusion which resulted in 1956, when Washingtonians voted for the first time in presidential primaries, revealed the scope of the problem.

Fortunately, encouraging strides have been made toward the development of orderly and effective machinery for voting in the presidential elections next year. Even so, the right to vote in this single election only once every 4 years would make the building and maintenance of effective electoral machinery an extremely difficult matter. With the election of a Delegate in off-presidential years as well, the structure of political parties would be greatly strengthened. Moreover, vigorous contests for the office of Delegate every 2 years would increase interest in the entire process of voting, which in turn would make for a more stable and informed electorate.

Essentially, the Mathias bill would grant to the Delegate the same rights and privileges which were enjoyed for many years by Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska. While he could not vote, he could introduce bills, participate in debate and represent the interests of the District through committees. Beyond these things, his day-to-day relationships with Members of Congress would surely result in a greater understanding of and sympathy for the needs of the Nation's Capital.

The attainment of meaningful voting representation in the House and Senate through another constitutional amendment must remain the ultimate goal. Until that goal is realized, however, a nonvoting Delegate in the House would serve a very useful purpose. The simple law which is required to authorize such elections should be enacted this year, and efforts toward that end should receive vigorous support—both in the local community and on Capitol Hill.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1963]

DISTRICT DELEGATE

Occasionally, when Congress takes up District legislation, the question will arise: What are the wishes of the people who live here? A great many Congressmen, particularly those who have been here some time, know with great certainty what is best for the District. But not even they can describe with any assurance the aspirations of the 785,000 people who, unlike themselves, are the inhabitants and taxpayers of Washington.

Upon inquiring the conscientious Congressmen will get a great deal of advice, all of it conflicting. As an experienced politician he

will discount it all heavily, for he understands the insuppressible tendency of every witness to convince himself that his own peculiar views are the whole world's.

An election, every 2 years, for a nonvoting District delegate to Congress would put in the House a man who, at last, could speak with the only authority that Congress really recognizes. There would be one man, able to speak in the floor debates and in the committees, with a breadth of information on local issues that no Congressman, with his responsibilities to his own constituents, could acquire.

Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, of Maryland, has reintroduced his bill to provide a delegate from the District, and it becomes increasingly clear that this bill deserves vigorous and sustained support from the people who would vote under it. In addition to all the obvious advantages, it would provide a powerful stimulant to the organization of the political parties here. A presidential election every 4 years is not enough, by itself, to keep the parties effective. One highly desirable effect of biennial elections on local issues would be the development of community leadership in every neighborhood.

The delegate is neither an alternative to home rule nor a substitute for it. The city sooner or later must have both. Both have been included in most of the recent home rule bills, but they are separate issues and can be debated separately. If a delegate bill can be passed in this session, the District can elect its ambassador to Capitol Hill in the same election in which it casts its first votes for President.

Proposed Changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1924

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, for many years there have been proposals for changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1924. As one who has long been interested in immigration problems, I feel that we have now reached the point where a minimum of change is expedient.

To accomplish this, I have introduced two bills. The first of the bills would amend section 201 of the act so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available in the following year to immigrants of oversubscribed nations. Under the law as it exists today, the total annual quotas number 154,659. In 1960 only about 101,000 quota immigrants were admitted. Generally speaking, about one-third of the quota goes unfilled each year. This lack of utilization is caused by the fact that there is an excess of quota numbers allotted to some countries. As the Congress determined the annual number of immigrants who shall enter the United States, I can find no valid reason for not permitting the full number to enter each year. So long as we have determined that the United States has sufficient room for a specific number of good immigrants, let us admit them.

The second bill I have introduced concerns a more basic change in the law. I propose that the Census figures for 1950 instead of 1920 be used as a basis for determination of annual quotas. In 1920, the population of the continental United States was 105,710,620. Today, the total population including Alaska and Hawaii is 179,323,150—1960 census. My bill would thus provide for a population increase in annual quotas and enable the quotas to reflect the up-to-date pattern of national origins rather than those existing in 1920. Allocation of quotas among countries in the same proportions as the countries are reflected in our population is the basis for the entire national origin theory. Surely this system, in order to sustain its validity, must be shown to be sufficiently flexible to reflect the present and not the distant past.

The Bureau of the Census estimated that the change I propose would raise the total annual quota to 210,492 places for an increase of 55,835. Some important differences in the quota allocations would be as follows:

Country	Present quota based on 1920 census	Implied quota based on 1950 census
Austria	1,405	3,309
Baltic States	734	1,317
Greece	308	676
Italy	5,645	11,499
Poland	6,488	8,155

I therefore respectfully urge that these proposals be considered at an early date and that any other Members who so desire join with me in their support.

Jersey City Volunteer Housing Corps a Model for Domestic Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of H.R. 2656, a bill to establish a domestic Peace Corps to provide opportunities for dedicated American citizens to serve their country, I have been most gratified by the numerous letters of support I have received from citizens in all parts of the country.

The enthusiasm for service demonstrated by those who have written me urging passage of the domestic Peace Corps bill is nowhere better demonstrated than in Jersey City, N.J., in my own congressional district.

Last Monday, February 4, the Housing Authority of the City of Jersey City honored six charter members of the authority's housing volunteer corps with well-deserved certificates of merit. These six dedicated people have given freely of their time and money for several years to help the 6,673 children and other residents of Jersey City's public housing.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my domestic Peace Corps bill—which is in full accord with the recommendations of President Kennedy—is to enable dedicated Americans to answer many of the unmet social needs in the United States by using their skills in programs designed to promote the welfare of less fortunate groups in our society.

Under the terms of my bill, local authorities in the cities, towns, and countryside would make requests for the assignment of volunteers to their areas. Local authorities would direct the activities of the volunteers and provide them with facilities and space for carrying out their wide-ranging services.

I know of no better argument for the potential success of a domestic Peace Corps than the successful example of Jersey City's housing volunteer corps. I am certain that the dedication and spirit of community service of Michael Scrudato, Capt. Charles E. Griffin, Thomas Broderick, Teresa Berghold, Anthony Ambrosio, and the Reverend Earl Greene is shared by thousands of Americans in our great country. And I am certain that the creation of a domestic Peace Corps will enable more Americans to serve their country in the same unselfish manner.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following material in the RECORD:

First, a letter of January 30 from Conrad Vuocolo, director, tenant relations, Housing Authority of Jersey City.

Second, a letter of February 1 to Conrad Vuocolo.

Third, an article, "Housing Volunteer Corps Gives Services in Silence," from the February 5 Jersey Journal.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE
CITY OF JERSEY CITY, N.J.,
Jersey City, N.J., January 30, 1963.

Hon. NEIL GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR NEIL: I read with interest in the papers lately of your desire to have a Domestic Peace Corps established. We heartily approve as the need is great, especially with groups like housing tenants, many of whom are senior citizens or broken families needing help.

To help us to obtain volunteer community citizen participation we have formed a housing volunteer corps. This group is designed to encourage various individuals or organizations to aid us in social, welfare, recreational, educational, and even religious programing for our almost 14,000 tenants.

On Monday next we are honoring the charter members of our housing volunteer corps by presenting them certificates of merit for their work. You will note that we are honoring the president of a dress manufacturing company for donating each year cloth, thread, and materials for our girls' sewing class at Currie's Woods. We are honoring a police captain for providing 5,000 candy gifts for the children who are entrants in our various contests. The president of the Musicians Local No. 526 will receive a certificate as a tribute for the many times his union has provided free music and entertainment for our senior citizen groups. An amateur artist is being honored for work as a judge in our art contests, which our children enter by the thousands. Local No. 617 of the Teamsters is being honored for providing more than 1,000 gifts for the kids at Christmas in the past 2 years. Reverend Greene is also to be honored for his work providing religious instructions to the

tenants at Marion Gardens. By the way, he comes all the way in from Hackensack each Sunday to do this in our community hall.

I am notifying you of this housing volunteer corps for several reasons:

1. It points up what a great job a thoroughly organized Peace Corps as you recommend can do for us here in the United States.

2. It may offer some justification for your stand for such a bill with whatever committees you are working with.

3. It is an invitation to groups who are not directly related to us to help provide or underwrite some worthwhile activity and help us reach our main objective of molding better citizens of tomorrow.

We have checked in housing circles and we know our regional office is pleased with this activity and new approach in getting active voluntary citizen participation on a broad community basis.

Please let us know if we can arrange any program on this for you. Best of health and success in your new session.

Very truly yours,

CONRAD J. VUOCOLO,
Director, Tenant Relations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1963.

Mr. CONRAD J. VUOCOLO,
Director, Tenant Relations, Housing Authority, Jersey City, N.J.

DEAR CONNIE: I want to thank you very much for your kind invitation to attend the housing volunteer corps award ceremonies of the Housing Authority of Jersey City on Monday, February 4.

Unfortunately, legislative business will compel me to stay in Washington. However, I wish to convey to all those receiving certificates of merit my sincerest congratulations.

It is the dedication and spirit of community service of Americans like Michael Scrudato, Capt. Charles E. Griffin, Thomas Broderick, Teresa Berghold, Anthony Ambrosia, and the Reverend Earl Greene which has enabled America to build a nation free from the conflict and misery which characterizes less fortunate countries in the world. This same spirit of idealism and service characterizes the young people in our Peace Corps who are representing America so well abroad.

As a sponsor of the domestic Peace Corps bill, it is my hope and expectation that the successful example of local groups of citizens, like Jersey City's own housing volunteer corps, will result in the creation by the Congress of a nationwide domestic Peace Corps dedicated to the same unselfish ends.

I also wish to commend Samuel C. DiFeo, board chairman, and Conrad J. Vuocolo, director of tenant relations of the Housing Authority of the City of Jersey City for their important role in creating and guiding the activities of the housing volunteer corps. The success of the housing authorities' own domestic peace corps sustains me in my belief in the future success of a nationwide domestic Peace Corps.

To all of those assembled at the award ceremonies, I extend my greetings and best wishes. It is the idealism and dedication of citizens like you which makes our country great.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER.

[From the Jersey Journal, Feb. 5, 1963]

HOUSING VOLUNTEER CORPS GIVES SERVICES IN SILENCE

Jersey City's Housing Volunteer Corps came out into the open today after years of operating underground.

Before the domestic Peace Corps was dreamed of in Washington, the six members of the Jersey City corps were on the scene, donating time and money to help the 6,673 children—and others—in the city's public housing.

Their services were free, and unpublicized. None of the six is directly connected with public housing. Their activities are known to few—except the children.

But today the housing authority—at ceremonies in its Newark Avenue offices—made the volunteer corps an official honorary group.

The ceremonies probably came as a surprise to some members. They had helped out with the children because they enjoyed it and hadn't thought of themselves as a corps at all.

One member is Capt. Charles E. Griffin of the Jersey City police.

"He's been very generous in furnishing candy for more than 5,000 children who have entered various contests the authority has sponsored over the years," said Samuel C. DiFeo, chief housing commissioner.

As a result, said DiFeo, the contests boomed and they are a major event in the children's lives.

Another member is Thomas Broderick, president of Musicians Local 526, AFL-CIO.

"Several times a year he has seen to it that free music was provided at the projects," said Conrad Vuocolo, head of tenant relations.

A minister is also a corpsman. He is Rev. Earl Greene of the Interdenominational Ministerial Council of Hudson County.

Reverend Greene lives in Hackensack, but he has driven continually from his home to the Marion Gardens housing project in Jersey City to give religious instruction and to conduct services.

"Our tenants tell us of the inspirational value of his leadership. It has played a big part in the great improvements in the project over the past year," DiFeo said.

Michael Scrudato, president of a Jersey City dress company, is another member of the group.

He organized a free weekly sewing class for 102 young girls at the Currie's Woods development. At his own expense he provided cloth, thread and other items.

An artist is a member, too. Teresa Berghold of Jersey City regularly acted as a judge in the authority's Easter, Halloween and Thanksgiving coloring contests.

How much time, and effort this required over the years is indicated by the several thousand children who enter each contest.

Another union leader, Anthony Ambrosio, business agent of Independent Teamster's Local 617 of Jersey City, completes the list.

"For the past few years his local has sent us more than 1,000 toys for distribution to children at Christmas," DiFeo said.

"Obviously we can't repay these people," said Vuocolo. We can only give them a certificate."

"But at least they will know we appreciate them. And they have their own kind of satisfaction."

The People Solving Medical Care Through Voluntary Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable story of the growth of voluntary health plans shows how well the people solve their own problems and points up the fact that much of the supposed need for Federal solutions to the health program actually does not exist. To help keep the record straight on what the people are doing in the field of medical care, I would like to include the following editorial from the AMA News of February 4, 1963:

AMERICAN PHENOMENON

Representatives of management, labor, private insurance firms, prepayment plans and medicines will meet next week to study the future of voluntary health insurance. They will be discussing an American phenomenon.

A few years ago voluntary health insurance did not seem to have a future. Some people gave it up for dead in 1938.

But the third national congress on voluntary health insurance and prepayment, sponsored by the committee on insurance and prepayment plans of AMA's council on medical service will review statistics that reveal a vibrant life and growing vitality—

At the end of last year, 140 million persons—75 percent of the population—had some form of coverage. In 1947 only 30 percent of the population had coverage.

Some 1,800 companies and prepayment plans were providing this insurance in 1962. They show records of expansion in surgical, major medical, regular medical and loss-of-income insurance, as well as in hospital expense insurance. They paid benefits totaling $7.1 billion, an increase of 11.5 percent in 1 year.

This remarkable growth shows that the value of prepayment is recognized by the public, that the public accepts voluntary methods, and that private enterprise has the ability to satisfy the public's needs. In most other countries the people have been forced to turn to their governments for health care, paying for this service with more taxes and less freedom. In the United States, the expansion of voluntary health insurance has done much to destroy the argument for government medicine.

In 1938 the national health conference reported voluntary health insurance could never reach more than a small fraction of those who needed protection. By 1948, although coverage had risen from 8 percent to 42 percent of the population in 10 years, the Federal Security Agency saw no hope for continued growth. In 1961 two proponents of the Federal health care proposal for the aged told a congressional committee that they had once advocated a compulsory health plan for the entire population. But, as one of these witnesses put it, "I think our experience with the voluntary programs has modified our basic attitude." These witnesses should by now have discovered that they also were wrong about the need for Government medicine for the aged.

For the Nation's elderly are buying health insurance faster than any other segment of the population. In 1952 only 26 percent of the aged had some form of coverage. Ten years later 55 percent of the noninstitutionalized elderly had coverage, and it should be noted that a large number of persons over 65 do not want or need private health insurance. By 1970, at least 80 percent of the aged who want and need coverage will have it.

The expansion in voluntary health insurance has included a rapid growth in the variety and flexibility of programs. Some 240 private companies, in addition to the many prepayment plans, offer health insurance to the aged. Many of the plans require no medical examination, more than 80 companies offer policies that are guaranteed renewable for life, many policies can be continued after retirement, and some firms offer paid-up-at-65 policies to their employees.

There will, however, continue to be a need for improvements, innovations, and fresh ideas. Progress and refinements in health insurance can be expected, because the sys-

tem is competitive and eager to meet the different needs of different people. The AMA-sponsored congress provides a forum at which the goals of insurers, consumers, and purveyors of medical care can be determined.

The voluntary response to the challenge for health insurance is unique to the United States. That it has succeeded beyond all expectations within 25 years is a credit to the people of this country and to their way of doing things.

Our Canadian Cousins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman along with Senator GEORGE AIKEN of the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group, I am especially concerned with our relationship with our great and good friend Canada.

In view of the election campaign now being conducted in Canada I think the following editorial which appeared in today's Washington Post is the best policy for all Americans to follow. I am particularly pleased with the wise counsel it contains:

When all the tumult and the shouting have died, the statesmen of the United States and the statesmen of Canada (whoever they are) will sit down and work out their mutual defense, economic and political arrangements, as they have always worked them out in the past.

The editorial follows:

OUR CANADIAN COUSINS

Canada now is about to engage in an election campaign in which the wisest thing that Americans can say is nothing. Our Canadian friends are annoyed with us most of the time because we take too little interest in Canadian affairs and they are annoyed with us the rest of the time because we take entirely too much interest in Canadian affairs. We have been altogether too interested in Canadian defense policies to suit our northern neighbors.

That the defense policy involved really was our defense policy, too, does not make much difference. That the complaint this country made was justified, far from mitigating the offense only made it worse. What the State Department said was impolitic and undiplomatic, but worst of all, it was foolish, in view of the fact that Canadians were busily at work making over the policy with their own do-it-yourself political kit.

There is nothing we can do to restrain those in Canada who wish to make political capital out of anti-Americanism. Anything we do or say is more likely to arouse additional hostility toward this country. It ought to be unnecessary to say this, but recent events make it doubtful that this is a kind of wisdom that goes without saying. Whatever torrents of invective come rolling across that celebrated 3,000 miles of undefended border ought to be echoed by no traffic in vituperation headed the other way. American politicians and editors in times gone by have twisted the tail of the British lion until that terminal appendage was often as unreliably fastened on as the tail of Eeyore in Winnie the Pooh. There are going to be lots of eagle feathers flying before the election of a new government in Canada. Let there be no screams from the eagle.

When all the tumult and the shouting have died, the statesmen of the United States and the statesmen of Canada (whoever they are) will sit down and work out their mutual defense, economic and political arrangements, as they have always worked them out in the past. The accord of yesterday, today and tomorrow, fortunately depends upon nothing so intangible as sentiment or affection. It is founded solidly on the inevitable and the inevitable is quite impervious, thank goodness, to the exertions of clumsy diplomats and reckless politicians.

Advice of President's Economic Adviser Smacks of Witch Doctor Cures for Economic Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, even though his economic theories have been disproved and rejected, as in the case of West Germany who ignored his advice, Dr. Walter Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, continues to insist that the American people trade fiscal responsibility for planned deficits. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 30, 1963, suggests that Dr. Heller's solutions for economic ills smack slightly of witchcraft and the fantastic cures of tribal medicine men. I suggest we should be wary of adopting the untried theories of the administration as proposed by Dr. Heller, lest we contribute to the complete demise of our economic system.

The editorial follows:

LEECHES TO CURE ANEMIA

It was not long ago, as time runs in history, that physicians recommended curing every human ill from gout to pernicious anemia by bleeding the patient. The few who questioned the practice of leeching met the crushing retort that they were challenging the main stream of informed medical opinion. And so they were.

Today the same retort is often hurled at anyone who questions the current doctrine that chronic Government deficits are good—nay, even miraculous—economic hygiene. Recently Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, used it quite effectively in response to some criticisms of the administration's budget, tax and monetary policies.

"I think what you are challenging," said Dr. Heller to his critic, "is really the main stream of economics. I don't think you are challenging merely the policy of one Administration."

If by the phrase "mainstream" Dr. Heller means the economic views which dominate our times, then Dr. Heller is right. At least the voices heard most loudly, in the academy or in public life, are those of economists who tell us we need never worry about big Government deficits.

Certainly he is right that anyone who questions all this is not challenging merely the policy of the Administration now in power.

There have been, of course, other voices, and not all of them eccentric editors or simple-minded people mindful of what Dr. Heller calls the Puritan Ethic or quoting maxims of McGuffey's Readers. Indeed, more and more theoretical economists with impeccable credentials have lately spoken out against the new economics, so that it is no longer wholly disreputable to do so. There are even signs that the mainstream of economic thinking is already changing.

But be the alinement of opinion as it may, it is all beside the point. Policy which is thought put into political action, may be determined by the number of people who endorse it; a division by the numbers has nothing to do with the truth or falsity of an idea.

What the public has now somehow to determine for itself is the truth or falsity of an idea. This idea, as wrapped up by Dr. Heller and put forward by the President, is that the way to cure a professed anemia of the economy is to prescribe for it the biggest peacetime Government deficit ever deliberately planned by any administration.

This idea is presented with much plausible reasoning. A modern economy is more active when there is more spending within it than when there is less. Therefore, so the reasoning goes, the right prescription is for the Government to spend more money. Since there would be little gain if the Government took away from the people the same money it is going to spend, the Government must pump into the economy money that was not there before.

In practice this means that the Government must run a deficit, and a big one, and finance that deficit by having the banking system create more dollars out of the Government's paper. That is why the President proposes both a tax cut and bigger spending in the same breath.

This is a heart-appealing doctrine. How wonderful it would be if all that was required for prosperity and growth was for the Government just to increase our money supply and spend it. For then the thing would be simplicity itself. Then we could have still more tax cuts and still more spending to make still bigger deficits and we'd have the world by the tail.

But is it true?

Is it true that chronic deficits are harmless? Or that the cure for years of deficits is the greatest peacetime deficit ever planned? Does a nation burdened with an imbalance of international payments, a steady loss of its gold reserve, a heavy burden of defense costs, a public debt larger than the world has ever seen—does it solve all these problems by printing more money to spend abroad as well as at home, making its public debt even larger and giving our creditors more reason to trust the value of our gold than the value of our dollars?

Is it true that the United States has somehow found the magic way to avoid forever the day of retribution which has come at last to every nation before us that has followed such a policy?

Now perhaps all of these things are true, as Dr. Heller and many others tell us. But the point of the public discussion is the question of their truth or falsity, not how many men preach them. Bad medicine remains bad medicine though leeches be prescribed by every doctor in the land.

Report on British Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress considers Presi-

dent Kennedy's program of hospital insurance for the elderly through the social security system, we shall be bombarded with misinformation about the British Health Service and its operations.

Harper's magazine for February has published an article by Prof. Richard M. Titmuss which discusses the cost and efficiency of the British Health Service. I think it is rather pertinent that Professor Titmuss is on the faculty at the University of London as well as the London School of Economics and knows whereof he speaks.

It is interesting to note that under the British Health Service program the traditional relationship between doctor and patient operates in a climate of greater freedom than it did before the program was inaugurated.

I include the article as a part of my remarks and commend it to my colleagues:

[From Harper's magazine, February 1963]

WHAT BRITISH DOCTORS REALLY THINK ABOUT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Richard M. Titmuss)

At the end of a 2 months' visit to the United States, from the West to the East, I am left with one clear impression. The extent and character of misconceptions about the British Health Service are really quite startling, particularly when one remembers our common langauge and democratic values, and our common interest in combining the freedom of doctor and patient in the provision of medical care.

At the same time I encountered a deep sense of frustration about the power of organized medicine in the United States and widespread feelings of helplessness and cynicism in the face of rising medical costs. It is not for me to explain the cause of this disquietude. But were I an American citizen, I would fear for the good name of medicine. In California, for instance, I learned that a young doctor has to pay around $820 a year for malpractice insurance. In Britain the comparable figure is $6.

Since 1948 when the British Health Service Act was adopted, an unbelievable quantity of generalized ink has been spilled on the subject; and it has run into the Atlantic from both sides. During my stay in the United States I heard most of the familiar arguments—that the quality of medical care has deteriorated; that doctors have been turned into minor bureaucrats and are so unhappy about their condition that they are fleeing the country in large numbers; that the general practitioner has lost status; that the Health Service unleashed a torrent of demand and is bankrupting the country.

Leaving aside the more piquant and colorful statements, my purpose here is simply to set the record straight. Some of the major lessons of the Health Service can be illustrated by a rather simple story.

A few years ago I was involved in a medical and sociological study of the structure and functions of general (family) practice in Britain. For 6 months I spent a good part of each day sitting in a doctor's office recording, minute by minute, what took place in each consultation. There was one patient I remember—let us call her Mrs. Smith—who appeared regularly every Monday morning for about 2 months. She was an elderly widow, living alone on her old-age pension, who suffered from chronic heart disease. After full diagnostic investigation, the treatment consisted of a drug containing digitalis and a certain amount of social-work aid.

The core of the matter, however, was to find the right dosage; to adapt the therapy to the biology of the unique individual; to find the level of stabilization; to avoid harmful side effects; to keep Mrs. Smith out of the hospital. This is a usual problem today in the use of many new and potent drugs. To solve it requires regular and frequent contact between doctor and patient.

Mrs. Smith's doctor was asked to comment on the effects of the health service on his practice. "Before the act," he said, "I would have had to carry on a private soliloquy with myself as to whether I could ask Mrs. Smith to see me regularly for a longish period. She might have thought I was more interested in collecting more fees than in the condition of her heart. I did not want her to think this of me—after all, I am a doctor. But unless I could see her often I could not explain all the facts about the action of the drug. We could communicate less—a restriction of the patient's freedom. Now, on the health service, our relationship is more open. I can say what I professionally think."

This doctor was consciously separating the professional and financial elements in his life. Essentially, he was talking about self-respect: his self-respect (the basis of professional behavior); the patient's self-respect (the basis of personal freedom); mutual respect (the basis for effective medical care). Self-realization in modern society depends on the building of a hundred and one such tiny acts of self-respect. We cannot organize them; we can only so arrange our affairs as to make more of them possible.

The single most important effect of the Health Service Act in 1948 was that it abolished the financial barrier between patient and doctor. This was the first principle set down in the wartime coalition Government's white paper of 1944: "to divorce the care of health from questions of personal means or other factors irrelevant to it."

Another basic principle of the health service was to provide medical care that would be "comprehensive" (i.e., meet all of the individual's health needs) and of high quality. This has not been an easy goal to achieve. A major obstacle has been the fact that many of our hospital buildings in Britain are ancient. About 45 percent of them were erected before 1891 and, with Victorian solidity, they were built to last. Hospital construction stopped in 1939 and during the first 10 years of the service little money was spent on new hospitals. This was due partly to the priorities in capital investment given after the war to houses and schools, and partly to the sustained attacks on the health service for being too costly. By the middle 1950's, however, it was found that Britain was spending a lower proportion of its national income on medical care than in 1948. It is now argued that Britain is not spending enough, and the rate of hospital building has been stepped up.

Moreover, 3 months ago the government published a 10-year national plan for hospital development. This envisages the replacement of over 40 percent of all existing hospitals; the construction of many new general hospitals with a total of about 150,000 beds; the closing of many small and specialist hospitals; the eventual abolition of large mental hospitals; and a great expansion in home and community care for the mentally ill and disabled.

Britain's hospitals have been nationalized, which means the distinction between voluntary and public institutions has been virtually wiped out. But this change has not introduced centralized ministerial rule into our hospital system. In practice it meant no more than a reshuffling of the same people who had always run the hospitals—the unpaid volunteers who had acquired some expert knowledge, plus a much higher proportion from the medical profession.

At present, except for a handful of private hospitals and clinics, Britain's three thousand or so hospitals are run by some four to five hundred hospital management committees on which doctors have at least a quarter of the seats (all professional matters are entirely in the hands of doctors). The committees also include local government officials and people who had been governors of voluntary hospitals before 1948.

Since the early 1950s there have been as many unpaid volunteers in health activities as ever, if not more—though, it should be remembered, they now spend very little of their time in the fund-raising which occupies so much of the energies of health volunteers in the United States.

Illustrative of the role of the volunteer in Britain is the National Blood Transfusion Service—an increasingly vital element in modern hospital care, surgery, and highway-casualty treatment. The number of blood donations, freely and voluntarily given by members of the public, has risen steadily from 384,000 in 1948 to 1,024,000 in 1960. The number of effective blood donors rose from 374,000 in 1948 to 854,000 individuals in 1960. This service is also largely run by voluntary organizations and unpaid helpers. Blood transfusions are used in the hospitals without distinguishing between public and private patients. (About 2 percent of the beds in British hospitals are set aside for private patients who pay in full for accommodations and service. In general, the supply of such beds has met the demand for them.)

Most of the medical staffs of all hospitals are paid on a part-time or sessional basis. Of all qualified and practicing British doctors, around 40 percent are full-time salaried. Surprisingly to some people, that is only about 5 percent or so higher than the proportion of full-time salaried doctors in the United States.

So far as the general practitioner or family doctor is concerned, we in Britain have held onto the conception of personal physicians as the first line in medical care. This is contrary to the trend in the States where, I am told, the family doctor is a disappearing category. About one-half of all British medical students now enter general practice. All members of a family are free to choose and change their doctors and some 95 percent of the population now have the family doctor of their choice under the health service. The remaining 5 perecnt or so of the population get medical care privately either by paying doctors' bills directly or, more generally, through membership in nonprofit prepayment schemes. According to the code laid down by the British Medical Association, patients must not go directly to specialists or consultants without first being seen and referred by general practitioners.

Each general practitioner is restricted to a ceiling of 3,500 health service patients—a figure too high in the opinion of many people. In addition, they may have as many private patients as they like. Between 1948 and 1960, the average number of health service patients on doctors' lists fell considerably and is now 2,300.[1]

---

[1] No precise comparison with an American doctor's private practice is possible. Assuming, however, that each patient on the British doctor's panel of 2,300 is seen 4 times a year, this would amount to 9,200 visits annually. It is estimated that a typical general practitioner in the United States sees 25 to 30 patients a day, amounting to 6,000 to 7,000 a year. (See Doctors, Patients, and Health Insurance, by Herman M. and Anne R. Somers. Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1961, pp. 49–50.)—The Editors.

Doctors are paid on a capitation basis, receiving an annual payment for each patient accepted. There is a special "loading" (i.e., an additional payment per capita) to favor doctors with medium-sized lists and to taper off rewards for larger practices. There are also built-in incentives to partnerships and group practices, payments for the training of assistants, special fees for maternity services, for clinic sessions at local maternity and child-welfare centers, for part-time school and factory work, for part-time posts in hospitals, and for new entrants in underdoctored areas.

A particularly important innovation is a payment to doctors who attend postgraduate and refresher courses. One of my more amusing medical friends said recently (in talking about scientific advances in medicine): "If you now go away for the weekend you are out of date on Monday." Last year 13 percent of all general practitioners in Britain attended a postgraduate course and received a public grant to help pay for a substitute. In 1948 the figure was only 5 percent.

At the outset, doctors, being highly organized, did not take kindly to change—whether caused by political, administrative, or scientific factors—and in this respect they are no different from workers in other professions and trade unions exposed to changes induced by technology, cybernetics, and science. But over the years the discontents of the medical profession have diminished.[2] And certainly the health service has brought about a better geographical distribution of doctors. This trend toward territorial justice (as I call it) has been accompanied by a movement for more doctors to work in partnerships and group practice. By 1960 the percentage had risen to just over 70. At the same time general practice has been made more attractive by a policy of throwing open (known as "open access") the X-ray, pathological, and other diagnostic facilities of the hospital. This means that general practitioners have the right to send their patients direct to these departments and to get the reports back quickly.

This policy has helped to avoid the wasteful duplication of expensive diagnostic equipment and to make possible a more rational use of pathologists and other scarce specialists. The complex diagnostic procedures of modern medicine can no longer be successfully interpreted by the average doctor or small local hospital. It is a job for the expert. The health service has been able to deploy more widely the benefits of medicine's technological skills. The removal of financial barriers has aided this process; so too has the removal of political and administrative boundaries. For example, it is possible under the service for a child in the north of Scotland suffering from a rare form of spinal disease to be sent to a London specialist hospital without any bookkeeping or financial problems.

What of the demand for medical care? Of course we still have unmet needs: waiting lists at hospitals (mainly for tonsillectomies and other "cold" surgical cases), inadequate hospital buildings, too many old people in hospitals for chronic illness, not enough nurses, psychiatrists, and other health workers, and so on. What, indeed, is the limit in more prosperous societies to demands for medical care? This is an almost metaphysical question applicable to all Western societies. How then can one judge whether there has been "abuse" of a free-on-demand health service?

So far as the general practitioner is concerned, we can at least say that expressed demands for his services are no higher than they were before 1948. Measured statistically in terms of all consultations (office and home), demand is somewhat lower than in the 1930's—around four consultations a year per patient. Moreover, general practitioners now have fewer night cases, less weekend work, smaller quantities of certificates, forms, and accounts to deal with, and no unpaid bills. Over one-third of all consultations take place in the patient's home—thus helping the family doctor to take account of social factors in diagnosis and treatment. The comparable home visit figure in the States is around 10 percent.

There is thus no evidence of inordinate demands on the family doctor since 1948. The removal of the financial disciplines of the private market has not had the consequences that were feared.

So far as the hospital is concerned, there has been a striking fall in the average length of stay of patients although treatment is free for 98 percent of the population. In Britain as in the United States, some 40 percent of all hospital beds have been occupied by mental patients. However, this picture is changing rapidly thanks to a new and revolutionary Mental Health Act passed in 1959, which makes practically all admissions free and voluntary; and thanks also to the growing use of the mental hospital as a therapeutic short-stay instrument, the development of short-stay mental units in general hospitals, scientific advances in the treatment of schizophrenia, a new research interest in the chemical functioning of the nervous system in relation to mental illness, and the drawing together, clinically and administratively of physical and psychological medicine.

All these trends mean that we can now envisage the disappearance of the vast, outworn, archaic, recumbent mental institutions of the past. Only 20 years ago, by a patient's 11th year of residence in a mental hospital the odds were 100 to 1 against his discharge from the hospital. Today, in Britain, the chances are almost 100 to 1 against a patient's remaining in a mental hospital after 2 years.

This, I think, is one of the most important lessons we have learned since 1948. Without the health service, it would not have been possible to move on a national scale toward the integration of physical and psychological medicine. One could not grow without the other. To separate the two professionally, administratively, and financially—to regard mental illness, organizationally, as a bad risk—is to promote the growth of the institutionalized personality, a dead end for patients, a dead end for doctors.

The corollary of this change in medical care—a shift from the institution to the home—calls for more community care services. Apart from the problems of finance, this, in my view, is the biggest challenge in Britain in the field of medical care.

One criticism of the service that is still heard is that the cost was seriously underestimated. Of course it was. Twenty years ago, when the original estimates were made by the government, no one could predict the scientific advances that have changed the fate of medicine in two decades.

In 1949–50, the first full year of the service, the gross cost to public funds was 3.8 percent of the gross national product. This figure fell slowly to 3.2 in 1955 and has since risen to 3.6 in 1960. (In the United States in 1958–59 total public and private expenditures for medical and health care were estimated at 5.4 percent of the gross national product.) Clearly, Britain has not been overspending on medical care. Public demand for a free service and the rising costs of new drugs have certainly not bankrupted the nation. We have learned, however, that we shall have to spend more on building new hospitals, in training more social workers, and in developing community care services.

We have also learned in Britain to respect the political and trade-union power of the medical profession. The last royal commission on doctors' earnings, reporting in 1960, showed that, compared with other high-income groups, doctors had done well out of the health service. Between the ages of 30 and 65, for example (and disregarding the benefits of a generous pension scheme and heavily subsidized medical training), medical specialists and consultants earned substantially more than accountants, actuaries, lawyers, architects, university teachers, and all university graduates in industry. There is no lack of young people in Britain who want to be doctors. The real problem for the deans of the medical schools has been how to select and how to restrict (as they have done) the number of candidates accepted for training.

It has been alleged recently that over 600 doctors are leaving Britain every year. It is further said they are refugees from "socialized medicine." But such statements fail to point out that these "estimates" include graduates from British medical schools born and brought up overseas (including the United States of America, Canada, Ireland, and many other countries), British doctors working temporarily with the World Health Organization in hospitals and posts in Africa and other parts of the underdeveloped world, and British doctors doing graduate and research work overseas. Wrongly included in these "estimates" (incautiously bandied about by the American Medical Association) are also substantial numbers of British-trained women doctors marrying oversea citizens and emigrating, and many categories of British doctors of both sexes who after a spell abroad return to practice medicine in Britain.

What is more to the point is that despite this "international exchange," the ratio of all types of practicing doctors in Britain per person in the population has risen by 21 percent since 1949. Though we still need more doctors, we have done better than the United States, where the ratio has fallen during the same period.

After 19 months of deliberation a, committee appointed by the British Medical Association to consider recruitment concluded in its report published in May 1962 that it is not prepared to commit itself on the need for more doctors. The report adds that there are more than enough potential recruits of the right caliber to fill the places available at the medical schools.

These conclusions are very different from those of the U.S. Surgeon-General's committee in the 1950 Bane Report. Here it was said that the United States may expect to be 20,000 short, in the next 15 years, of the number of physicians required to maintain the present position—let alone improve it. In other words, the ratio of doctors to patients may worsen by 50 percent. It would thus follow that the United States will be less able to make a contribution to less fortunate countries. If this should happen, the underdeveloped world will be even more desperately undersupplied with doctors, and other countries will be asked to make greater sacrifices to uphold the high traditions of Western medicine to serve the poor.

---

[2] Experts from nine British medical associations completed a 4-year study of the health service in October 1962. This committee found the service essentially sound although a number of operating improvements were recommended. Chiefly, the committee urged a greater voice for physicians in administrative matters and a reduction in the maximum number of health service patients on each general practitioner's list. Concurrently, the committee released the results of a Gallup Poll which showed that 89 percent of the people questioned were satisfied with the health service.

Modern Art Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the incredible hoax and fraud of abstract, impressionist, and dadaistic art is beginning to dawn on the American people. When people are pressured into thinking they see something in nothing because somebody else claims to see something in nothing, this is indeed indicative of a conformist, collectivist, mental illness which could lead to complete subversion of our American way of life.

Many of us are grateful to Jenkin Lloyd Jones for the following splendid article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 4:

TURNING POINT FOR ABSTRACT ART?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

A recent story in the art section of Time magazine was captioned "Ad Absurdum." This may be a milepost, a breakthrough, a turning point. Somebody is beginning to whisper that maybe the emperor doesn't have any clothes on, after all.

The Time article concerned a painting by abstractionist Ad Reinhardt which recently won a $1,000 prize at the Chicago Art Institute. It appears to be all black. But Mr. Reinhardt explains it as "a pure, abstract nonobjective, timeless, spaceless, changeless, relationless, disinterested painting."

In short, $1,000 worth of nothing.

The encouraging thing is that human gullibility may have diminished slightly since an almost equally asinine canvas, entitled "White on White," was received with not merely praise but awe when it was unveiled a few years ago at New York's far-out Museum of Modern Art.

It does seem impossible that absurdity in art can proceed much farther. How can you top the London artist who recently put down a piece of canvas 40 feet long and 14 feet wide, scattered several dozen tubes of assorted oils and a couple of gallons of liquid paint on it, and then drove around on the mess with his sports car? But he was topped by the wealthy art dealer who paid $440 for a 2-square-yard piece of this joke.

Last year the Pasadena (Calif.) Art Museum displayed a collage consisting of a dirty, crumpled-up American flag on which was thrown a punctured inner tube, a rusty door lock, an old wrench, and several pieces of weathered wood. When veterans' organizations protested such abuse of the flag, the muceum directors huffily defended freedom of expression.

And the art critic of the Pasadena Independent Star-News pontificated: "The aims of the artist may be shock, to which the viewer may add anguish or feelings of isolation or strange and unspeakable feelings that well from the unknown labyrinths of the mind." How's that for lofty confusion? We are waiting for one of the Pasadena city trash trucks to back up to the museum and dump in a masterpiece.

At the Brussels Fair the U.S. Government, with incredible stupidity, turned over the selection of its art exhibit to a jury of longhairs that decided that America would display only old primitives or modern nonobjective paintings by artists under 40. Thus, while people from all the world admired the huge Russian works showing heroic fighters at the barricades and happy peasants gathering in the harvest, they came out of the American pavilion puzzled. Did America have no art to show except the unschooled or the incomprehensible?

But if you thought our Brussels fiasco couldn't be exceeded you were wrong. I quote from the gallery guide published at the recent Seattle World's Fair:

"The sculptor and painter now forage imaginatively in the junk yard of a compulsively advancing society. The crushed automobile bodies of Chamberlain, and Stankiewicz's fantastic anatomies made of castoff boiler and machine parts may be considered redemptive acts on behalf of a civilization that refuses to recognize its material splendor and squalor as a spiritual extension of itself. These annihilate the 19th-century posture of art appreciation. In contemporary terms, there is an element of existential risk, a good deal of sheer nerve in these works."

Well, you can say that again. But get the arrogance and the effrontery. The "19th-century posture of art appreciation" has been "annihilated." By whom? Who has destroyed the masters of the last century? Who has obliterated Copley and Constable, Turner and Toulouse Lautrec, Daumier and Degas, Renoir and Rodin, Gauguin and Van Gogh? Not the public.

Al Capp, the comic artist who creates "Li'l Abner," has wryly suggested that the comics are the last refuge of sincere art in America. He says:

"There—and pretty nearly only there—natural forms are not perverted. People and things are represented in the image in which God created them; with their absurdities exaggerted in the funny strips and their grace and beauty emphasized in the romantic strips.

"We live in an age in which art has become a grotesque hoax on the public. Art standards are now largely dictated by critics who jeer at the understandable, by galleries which exhibit the messers and reject the masters. They have bulldozed the public into fearing to admit that they are puzzled and revolted by their newly-elevated demigods of art, from Picasso on down. Exhibitions of abstract art look like rejects from a dy-dee service."

Last month Nikita Khrushchev made headlines by demanding that Soviet artists, experimenting with nonobjectivity, should not have their works shown. He was wrong. There should be room for the display of all art attempts, even clear aberration.

But in the United States it's the other way around. Young objective painters are discouraged. Few American museums will honor or even hang an objective painting that is less than 50 years old. There are no prizes for American artists who still think that beauty and communication are legitimate artistic objectives.

Classic traditions are laughed at by an inbred cabal of art professors, museum curators, paint throwers, amateur welders, junk-gluers and assorted beatniks who have to drown out the voice of commonsense by the thunder of their self-congratulation. The tyranny of the American avant garde is as vicious as the tyranny of Khrushchev.

And so we have descended ad absurdum. And a few people—thank the Lord—are beginning to laugh.

United States Needs Bold New Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, William H. Hessler, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, in a recent editorial called for a sturdy new unity of Western nations. Text of his comment, published December 27, follows:

UNITED STATES NEEDS BOLD NEW POLICY

(By William H. Hessler)

The time is close at hand when the Kennedy administration must undertake a great new venture in foreign policy, or else lose the initiative entirely to the Soviet bloc. The Cuban imbroglio has created an opportunity to seize the initiative.

The swift growth of the European Common Market requires it. The deterioration of the NATO alliance also requires it. And the declining usefulness of the United Nations, for the particular purposes of the Atlantic democracies, augments the need for such initative.

AT OTHER TIMES

Since World War II, the American Government has used constructive imagination of this sort on several occasions. In 1947 Mr. Truman extended U.S. protection and aid to Turkey and Greece. Even before that, the assignment of the 6th Fleet to the Mediterranean established American power in European waters and into the Middle East.

In 1949, Mr. Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson constructed the North Atlantic alliance. The Marshall plan followed, laying the foundations not only for the recovery of West Europe but also for its ultimate organization as a single political and economic entry.

Changes have come at a startling pace in the last 10 years. The economic integration of West Europe has moved very rapidly, but has been restricted to six adjoining nations and has tended to become too protectionist and exclusive. Britain's entry, if it is managed, will help. But it will not in itself prevent the division of the Atlantic community into separate and even antagonistic camps, European and North American. The means must be found to avert the bipolarization.

The deterioration of NATO and especially of Anglo-American relations, which I wrote last Sunday, underscores the imperative need for new American initiative. We cannot afford another Suez affair, estranging America and Britain—or even another Skybolt controversy. Neither can the West afford to let Britain, France, and perhaps yet other countries develop their own nuclear strike forces, outside the structure created for the common defense.

The United Nations continues to be a valuable and in many ways more effective organization. But diluted by so many new recruits from Afro-Asia, it no longer serves its earlier purpose in advancing the foreign policy goals of the Western democracies. The U.N. is less responsive to the leadership of America and the other Atlantic powers, and less able to act when there is a majority agreeable to United States and United Kingdom proposals.

We urgently need a stronger international mechanism, therefore, one undiluted by the great mass of nations, one limited to like-minded peoples. This is not to denigrate the U.N. at all, but merely to say it no longer is as useful as formerly for the special concerns of the Atlantic democracies.

ACT NOT ENOUGH

What might the President and his associates do in 1963 to meet the new crisis of a Western community in disarray? What tools are there at hand, with which to combat this confusion and separatism in the Atlantic world? What can be done in this context to match the scope and constructive value of the Truman doctrine, the NATO treaty or the Marshall plan?

Useful as it may prove, the trade expansion act is not enough. Neither is the stopgap arrangement with Britain on nuclear

weapons. Neither is Mr. Kennedy's offer to help the United Kingdom get into the European Common Market.

To my way of thinking, the right answer is a bold, imaginative bid for Western unity in the form of a greatly broadened North Atlantic alliance—economic and political in scope, as well as military.

Many influential leaders in various countries have committed themselves to a federal structure for the Atlantic community in which most of the power and resources of the free world are concentrated. The hardest work in this direction has been done by Clarence K. Streit, a former newspaperman who has talked and written and lobbied and cajoled for two decades on behalf of Atlantic Union.

The most recent big boost for the idea came from Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, who devoted the last of his Godkin lectures at Harvard to the notion of bringing unity to the free world through a federal system.

NATION CAN'T WAIT

Even if Governor Rockefeller should prove to be the next President, we cannot wait that long for the exercise of U.S. initiative. The several factors I have noted here demand a vigorous and bold effort by the American Government as quickly as a solid groundwork can be laid for a conference of the Atlantic nations.

I do not see how else the free nations ringing the North Atlantic can escape from the dry rot of mutual distrust, the peril of rival economic blocs in Europe and North America, and the strategic weakness of waiting to see what Khrushchev will do next to make up for his setback in Cuba.

We have a little time, because the Communist bloc is also in disarray. The bitter antagonism of China and Russia is sapping the Kremlin's initiative for the moment. But that is all the more reason for moving promptly and achieving a Western unity on a sturdy basis while our two greatest antagonists are preoccupied with their own feud.

Rabbi Arnold A. Lasker's Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to commend to the attention of our colleagues a most thoughtful letter addressed to the President by Rabbi Arnold A. Lasker, of Orange, N.J., who kindly furnished me with a copy. My distinguished constituent's observations deal with major problems that deserve greater consideration than has been given them. As Rabbi Lasker points out, the goals discussed by him depend on us alone, and we should devote adequate resources to their achievement.

Rabbi Lasker's letter reads as follows:

DECEMBER 26, 1962.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was very much impressed by the televised interview concerning your first 2 years as President. I felt a pride in a democratic system which permits such a free-ranging confrontation of the President by spokesmen for an interested and concerned public. While the interview led to an intensification of concern for the future of mankind, your candor and humility bred a feeling of confidence in your leadership.

You correctly spoke of the frustrations which face us as a nation as we try to build for the future in this thermonuclear space age. Yet there are two immediate goals which emerge directly from your statements which depend on us alone.

(1) "Swords into ploughshares".

You pointed out with keen perception the economic pressures which prevent cutbacks in any military spending. In the days after World War I, we spoke of the sinister influences of the "merchants of death". Now the pressures have become more complex, with the vested interests in the maintenance of arms production including, as well, organized labor in the munitions factories, all those dependent on their purchasing power, and their elected Representatives in Congress.

Not only are efforts toward disarmament hampered by fears of economic dislocation, but even military planning is distorted by these economic interests. You seemed genuinely concerned that we shall have to continue "pouring money down the drain" lest we dislocate our economy, achieving only the ability to "overkill" the Soviet Union. And this at a time when there are so many urgent national needs calling for expenditures of funds for productive purposes.

It seems to me that a high priority should therefore be given to plans for what we called in 1945–46 reconversion. In any part of the country where a substantial part of the economy is dependent on defense production, standby plans ought to be drawn up immediately to prepare for absorption of the labor force and for provision of equivalent purchasing power if—in the national interest—it is decided to discontinue total production. Similarly, every time a large contract is awarded for defense needs, concomitant plans ought to be adopted for possible reconversion to normal use of that economic sector.

(2) Avoiding misunderstandings. You brought out with almost frightening frankness the basic problems in human relations that confront us as a nation and you as an individual in dealing with the Soviet Government and its representatives. More than the direct telephone, we need improved skill in communication even when it takes place face to face. Words, we know, are rather imperfect symbols of the actual intentions and values which they attempt to convey. How can we improve methods of arriving at more accurate mutual understanding? Furthermore, with all our improved understanding of human beings, we still have not perfected the skills of living together, either as individuals or as nations.

At a time when you correctly urge national concern for higher education in the engineering sciences, may I respectfully urge considerably increased attention to a crash program for breakthroughs in the behavioral sciences? Now that both you and Mr. Khrushchev agree that military forces have gotten to the point where victory for either side is an impossibility, ought we not concentrate our greatest attention on human relations? Social science, concentrating on problems of human understanding and communication, needs vastly more attention than it has received up to this point.

I close by thanking you for the privilege I have had of listening to you on television and by wishing you and yours a very happy new year.

"Heads I Win, Tails You Lose"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, tax cuts and bigger deficits are a "heads I win, tails you lose" political magic potion. A cynical vote-getting recipe says that the way to win every election is to vote both for every spending bill and also for every tax cut bill.

If the real health of the Nation were not in danger, the best political strategy for the Republicans would be to ask for more spending and bigger tax cut. To say "no" to either spending or a tax cut or both puts the critic in the position of being blamed later for any unemployment and lack of growth problems. To say "yes" merely means you thought of the idea second.

A person given enough rope will hang himself it is said. Perhaps it would be smart politics to give the President everything he wants and then some. One would see the financial rope stretch—probably break. Unfortunately, not only would a man get a political hanging—a country would get an economic hanging.

The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune tells us the one man who is exhilarated about the budget. Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Tribune]

THE LARGE ECONOMY SIZE

President Kennedy assures us in his economic message to Congress that there are conditions to invigorate, opportunities to seize, promises to realize, interests to harmonize, forces to gather, targets to achieve, burdens to ease, balances to redress, frontiers to widen, potentials to fulfill, bases to reinforce, trends to tilt upward, challenges to meet, and even some specific challenges to meet brilliantly.

Indeed, the message seems to offer just about everything except something new to be exhilarated over, especially when one thinks of that $98.8 billion budget.

The three-stage program for tax reduction is pretty much what was expected. Personal income tax rates would go down to a range of from 14 to 65 percent. The 52-percent corporate profits tax would revert to 47 percent. The 30-percent tax on the first $25,000 of a company's profits would drop to 22 percent.

The ultimate tax saving contemplated would be in the neighborhood of $10 billion a year, after taking account of about $3.5 billion in offsetting revenues to be brought about by "selected structural changes." Mr. Kennedy has not defined these changes, nor did he do so in his message. That, of course, would be to invite controversy—and who wants controversy about so happy a matter as tax reductions?

True, there will be a large deficit, but as Mr. Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers has already told us, it will be a good deficit instead of a bad one. Having once promised a balanced budget for the current year, Mr. Kennedy now tells us that our only choice is between two kinds of deficits: deficits "born of waste and weak-

ness" (meaning deficits that weren't planned) and deficits "incurred as we build our future strength" (meaning, of course, those which would result from tax reduction).

If the distinction is not clear, it may help to note that at one point Mr. Kennedy promises "a careful pruning of civilian expenditures," while a large part of his message is devoted to the need for more spending for highways, airways, waterways, railways, unemployment pay, education, and other programs.

If the tax program is carried out as requested, Mr. Kennedy predicts that gross national product will reach an annual rate of between 568 and 588 billion dollars in 1963, thus presumably putting an end to the sluggishness which still exists in our economy, oddly enough, in spite of the substantial recovery which, Mr. Kennedy modestly mentions, "was initiated shortly after I took office."

If the tax program is not enacted as requested, our promised good deficit will become a bad one, and, according to the President's message, we may wind up in a recession. Thus Congress faces the familiar alternatives: it will be blamed if matters don't go as Mr. Kennedy would like; the administration will modestly accept the credit if they do. We are left with a blurred impression of just how targets are going to be achieved and who is going to seize what opportunities, but Mr. Kennedy is exhilarated, if no one else is.

Our Mysterious Congo Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing concern over the situation in the Congo, I thought the following editorial from the Kendallville News-Sun was particularly enlightening. A good many of us wonder what the eventual results will be now that Tshombe and Katanga Province have been brought back under the Adoula government by military means. This editorial expresses the reservations which many thoughtful Americans have about the handling of this situation:

OUR MYSTERIOUS CONGO POLICY

Despite hopes today for a compromise in the Congo civil war, we look in vain for any shreds of logic or justification behind President Kennedy's support of this U.N. aggression.

Our policymakers tell us:

1. The Congo cannot exist economically without the mineral revenues from Katanga.

2. Congo Premier Cyrille Adoula is pro-West and to keep him in power we must support his goal of reunification of the Congo.

3. If we do not support the U.N. drive, Russia will intervene on the side of Adoula and reunify the Congo.

4. Tshombe is a spent political force without popular support, controlled by Belgian financial interests.

No less a man than Dr. Albert Schweitzer, a resident of Africa for nearly 50 years, recently wrote in an angry letter to the Premier of Belgium: "The colonial empire of the Congo no longer exists. There are left two distinct branches of this empire composed of peoples and tribes who, from the time of colonialism forward, have opposed each other. Neither of these two parts of the Congo has rights vis-a-vis the other part; neither had obligations toward the other. They are * * * absolutely independent entities. It follows that no war waged by one of the above parties against the other for purpose of subjugation has the slightest justification in law. It also follows that no foreign state can pretend to have the right to subject one part of the Congo to the other part."

Some are now questioning whether our man, Adoula, is not the central government's Communist-leaning dupe. The Adoula regime has allowed Communist embassies in Leopoldville, closed by its predecessor, to reopen. In recent months the Soviet diplomatic corps has increased from 10 men to 100, while the Russian Ambassador, according to 1 U.S. diplomat, has been "acting as if he was running the show."

Our State Department's arguments are that if we do not support the U.N. drive, Russia will, probably have a basis in fact. But when we consider the above, what will we gain by helping the U.N. to accomplish this dirty work?

Few can deny, we must also admit, that Tshombe is a white man's president. Tshombe, however, kept the peace in Katanga in July of 1960 when the Communist government of Patrice Lumumba permitted a rampage of pillage, murder, and rapine. Now, according to reports, U.N. Ethiopian troops have compelled residents of Elizabethville to hang on their walls pictures of the late Red-tainted rabble rouser.

The U.N. has exceeded its power in Katanga. Some of us still recall that U.N. troops were stationed in Katanga only upon the conditional consent of the local authorities. Consider, if you will, this final quotation from Dr. Schweitzer's letter to the Belgian Premier: "It is inconceivable that we find in our day a foreign nation at war with Katanga in an effort to force it to pay revenues to the rest of the Congo * * *. Reason and justice demand that this foreign state (i.e., the United States) and the United Nations withdraw their troops from Katanga's territory and recognize and respect in the future the independence of this country."

We cannot see how our Government's Congo policies can serve the national interest. We hope that what we fear will be a Kennedy administration failure that can be explained to us by some super Kennedy logic we cannot as yet understand.

Fifty-third Anniversary Salute to the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the 53d anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America is an appropriate time for me to extend my personal greetings and congratulations to this notable organization. The problems which face our Nation are tremendous, but the resources and vitality of our youth working together give us great hope for the future.

Since 1910 the Scout program has offered tremendous opportunities "to practice the right with satisfaction—to practice the wrong with annoyance." Conditions are constantly present in scouting which enable the boy to tell success from failure. In scouting a youth is thrown in contact with men and older boys whose respect he desires. A Scout knows when his conduct pleases or displeases. Conditions in scouting are most favorable for the boy to learn to plan his own activities and to cooperate in a group with purpose.

Scouting makes valuable use, through den, patrol and troop activities, of group enterprises with their attendant possibilities to develop sound habits of conduct. Scouting has wisely taken notice of the physical development of the boy which is one of the great needs of the day.

World progress has given us more freedom, leisure time, and removed many of the restraints of past ages. However, these factors have created an area of greater personal responsibility toward our youth. This Nation should hold in high regard the adults who work so earnestly in scouting to develop strength of character, initiative, physical endurance, and honesty, so that the citizens of tomorrow will be equipped to make full and proper use of the freedoms that are theirs, both as boys and men.

On this 53d anniversary, I urge the Boy Scouts of America to press forward with their projects. The United States and the world need your continued efforts.

Connecticut Poultry Growers Fight for Their Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the largest poultry producing area in the State of Connecticut is in my district, which comprises the eastern part of the State. This industry has been hard hit in Connecticut as a result of mass production and competition from other poultry-producing sections of the country.

Recently the two largest poultry dressing plants in Connecticut merged into one firm, with the result that the broiler growers were left with practically no bargaining opportunities. Consequently, they had no alternative but to organize themselves into a poultry growers cooperative—the first such cooperative in the country—with the purpose of protecting their interests and fighting for their survival through bargaining collectively on prices for their birds.

On January 21, I attended a meeting of poultry growers from eastern Connecticut at Willimantic at which this cooperative, to be known as the Connecticut Poultry Growers Marketing Cooperative Association, was formed. The growers who have joined the coop-

erative or have indicated a willingness to join, represents a total production capacity of more than 4 million birds. Since the total broiler production in the State of Connecticut in 1962 amounted to 13,976,000 birds, the cooperative represents about 30 percent of the broiler production in this State.

The person who spearheaded the formation of this cooperative is Mr. John Laterra, a broiler raiser in North Franklin, New London County. It was at Mr. Laterra's invitation that I attended the meeting, listened to the problems of the poultry growers, and helped them seek a solution to these problems. Among the communities represented at the meeting were Ashford, Mansfield, Baltic, Franklin, Scotland, Woodstock, Chaplin, Uncasville, and others.

Mr. Speaker, in the summer and fall of 1961 a special subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, headed by our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, the Honorable TOM STEED, as chairman, held a series of hearings on small business problems in the poultry industry. In a report dated January 3, 1963, the subcommittee states in its conclusion as follows:

> It is the opinion of the subcommittee that the broiler industry has a prime salable product in great demand, which should command its true value in the marketplace. The unfortunate experience in the past few years, however, has been one of overproduction and subsistent financial returns.

And on page 22 of the same report it is stated:

> So long as broiler production remains in the hands of nongrower interests, overproduction and low prices are bound to result.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this very reason that the poultry growers of my district have combined forces to make certain that their product commands "its true value in the marketplace." In this connection, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of an excellent editorial which appeared in the Willimantic (Conn.) Chronicle, January 26, 1963, under the title "Poultrymen and Economics." While it deals with the Connecticut situation, it should also be of interest to poultry-raising areas in other parts of the country where similar problems exist.

The editorial reads as follows:

POULTRYMEN AND ECONOMICS

The hard realities of 20th century economic life have descended on area poultrymen. The recent merger of the two largest dressing plants in the State has left broiler raisers little or no bargaining opportunities.

American economic history shows many instances where one firm in control of a key process in the production or distribution of a product eventually took over most of the industry. Usually it meant two or three or a dozen giants emerged from thousands of businesses to control the industry. Such has been the case in steel, autos and aluminum.

The small businessman responded by going under, selling out, joining the big outfit, or uniting with other small businessmen on the principle that in unity there is strength. Labor unions were originally formed on the same principle.

In some instances the big outfit was run by men with monopolistic intent. Sometimes they were greedy. But the economics of mass production soon made the big operation a necessity regardless of the intent of the men running the business.

Mass production depends on a low per unit cost. For instance, if one processes 10 chickens in a given period of time and a new process can double that output the new process is usually installed.

New processes usually require a lot of capital the small businessman may not have available. Thus the bigger man buys out the smaller—or puts him out of business.

In forming a new cooperative this week area poultrymen have assumed control on the source of the raw material for the dressing plants.

Even if one firm controls all the dressing facilities in the area, it cannot do business without birds to dress. It appears that the new cooperative will control enough birds so that the dressing plant will have to come to terms.

A spokesman at the meeting of the poultrymen this week said that the dressing plant offered to put a "floor" of 15 cents per pound for birds.

The poultryman said: "We just can't produce chickens for 15 cents per pound. * * * If we want to get more for our broilers, we have to speak with one voice or go under. * * * As soon as they find out we've got 4 million birds then they will come to us."

Without taking a position on the merits of the precise number of cents involved in a fair and reasonable price, it can be said that the poultrymen who joined the cooperative have done a wise thing in the light of 20th century economic trends. Divided they would apparently easily fall. United they will stand.

A marketing cooperative and a dressing firm offer their own check and balance. It would seem that with reasonableness on both sides a fair agreement is readily attainable.

It is well for the poultrymen that the new Second District Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE has taken an interest in their situation. The Congressman is right when he says he was impressed "that you people (poultrymen) are working together as a group to solve your problems and I congratulate you."

One last word. It seems that the poultry industry could use some institutional advertising. How often does anyone hear something like "Thursday is Chicken Day."

The many ways chicken can be eaten and prepared should be brought to the attention of the public. It could boost chicken sales.

A Science Center for Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 1946, which calls for the establishment of a Federal scientific information data processing center.

Obviously, it would be my hope that when this legislation becomes law, such a center would be established in Chicago. This, of course, is a judgment for the Congress.

However, the need for such a center was most eloquently described in an editorial which appeared on February 4 in the Chicago Daily News. I hope this editorial will help stimulate interest in the project which I have proposed.

It is my pleasure to include this excellent editorial from one of America's most responsible and respected newspapers for the information of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

A SCIENCE CENTER FOR CHICAGO

Representative PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, has proposed establishment of a national scientific data processing center in Chicago. It would be the largest and foremost facility of its kind in the Nation.

The need for such a center arises from the staggering volume of scientific information being accumulated at an ever-faster rate. A scientist in search of existing data often finds his task difficult and, sometimes, impossible.

It is not unknown for a research organization to embark on a project even though it feels certain the job has been done before. In some cases, less time and money are required to repeat the research than to dig through mountains of recorded facts.

The waste, frustration and delay thus plaguing the scientific community today have become a serious national problem. In terms of defense and the space race, the problem could become critical.

The only way to store and then quickly recall millions of scientific facts is by electronic machines. There are many such machines in various parts of the country playing a major role in research.

PUCINSKI proposes, not to eliminate these facilities, but to create one supersized central data center where researchers could rapidly obtain information on virtually every scientific subject. Significantly, such a center already exists in Moscow.

PUCINSKI's proposal has generated enthusiastic response among a number of Chicago scientists. The project would certainly raise Chicago's prestige as a center of scientific research and stimulate the city's economic growth.

If Congress shows signs of interest in establishing a data center somewhere in the Nation, Chicago will have to move swiftly and powerfully, for there will be intense competition from other cities. The time to prepare for that eventuality is now.

Science Talent Search—Bronx Student Stuart Grassian Among Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the 40 most promising student-scientists among the nation's high school seniors were named winners of the 22d annual science talent search. Dr. Watson Davis, director of the Science Service announced the winners, selected from among 22,477 contestants, for the Westinghouse science scholarships and awards.

I am pleased and proud, Mr. Speaker, to announce that one of the winners is a resident of my congressional district. He is Stuart Edwin Grassian, a student of the Bronx High School of Science. I

might add that only two schools in the country had more than one winner this year. Both are in New York City: the Bronx High School of Science had four winners, and the Erasmus Hall High School in Brooklyn, had three winners.

Stuart Grassian, age 16, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. David Grassian, 125 East 168th Street, Bronx, N.Y. In his science project, Stuart sought to extend and clarify the mathematical analysis already done on crystalline structures. As a result, he is confident he has established the existence of some fundamental properties not previously revealed about these structures. The crystal nature of solids has contributed to the foundations of solid state physics, which has produced such advances as the transistor. Stuart's interest in mechanical devices has led him to take apart, analyze, and repair such items as a toaster, two typewriters, and a watch. He likes to read books on physics, philosophy, and mathematics. For sports, he plays handball, football, and basketball. When he graduates from Bronx High School of Science, he hopes to attend Harvard University and major in theoretical physics. For a career, he would prefer to do research in the same field.

Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following information about the science talent search:

Designed to discover and develop scientific ability among high school seniors, the science talent search is conducted annually for the Westinghouse science scholarships and awards by Science Clubs of America, administered by Science Service, 1719 N Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

The 40 Washington trip winners of the 22d annual science talent search, among whom $34,250 of Westinghouse science scholarships and awards will be distributed, represent about 1 percent of those who completed entries in this scientific and educational competition.

Nine girls and 31 boys (proportion determined by ratio of boys and girls completing entries) are being invited to Washington, D.C., for an all-expense trip February 27 through March 4, 1963, to attend the Science Talent Institute. Here five winners will be selected by the board of judges to receive one of the following Westinghouse science scholarships: $7,500 ($1,875 a year), $6,000 ($1,500 a year), $5,000 ($1,250 a year), $4,000 ($1,000 a year), $3,000 ($750 a year). The remaining 35 contestants will be given Westinghouse science awards of $250 each.

The trip winners are 15 to 18 years of age and come from 33 cities in 19 States and the District of Columbia. They were picked by the judges from among 22,477 contestants of whom 3,274 completed their entries by taking a science aptitude examination, obtaining recommendations and writing a report on their science project. Completed entries were received from 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Of the 40 22d annual science talent search winners, 32 ranked in the top 5 percent of their graduating class and 23 were first, second, or third. Most of the winners are members of science clubs and many of them are club presidents or other officers. Most of their clubs are affiliated with Science Clubs of America. Girls accounted for 23.3 percent of the entries this year.

Rural Electrification: Strength for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last month, more than 7,300 rural electric and rural telephone cooperative members from the Arctic Circle to the Florida Keys got together for the 21st annual meeting of their National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. During the convention, the largest in NRECA's history, they heard an excellent speech by REA Administrator Norman Clapp in which he outlined the importance of the rural electric cooperatives as a source of strength for America in the past, present, and future.

He stressed that the survival and continued growth of these cooperative systems, which are owned by those they serve, are hinged on the solution of three great problems. The first is the problem of power supply, the second is the problem of territorial integrity, and the third is the problem of rural area development.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have excerpts from Administrator Clapp's speech printed in the RECORD.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—STRENGTH FOR THE FUTURE

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, before the 21st annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on January 15, 1963)

It is always an inspiration to attend one of these great annual meetings of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. It is an inspiration because you are the kind of people you are, acknowledged leaders in rural America, doers of great deeds, and builders of a better way of life in this Nation. More than that, you represent a way of life where doing for one's neighbor is just as important as doing for one's self. You represent the independence and the personal initiative coupled with the spirit of neighborliness and cooperation, which are the indelible marks of America's rural life at its best.

There is inspiration too in the sheer size of this meeting, for it is a reflection of the tremendous job you have done in bringing the blessings of electricity to the once darkened areas of rural America and the massive impact this undertaking has had upon the national life.

No matter how familiar we may be with the REA story, and I know that you are all intimately familiar with it, I am sure that you, just as I, never cease to be amazed at the magnitude of what you have done so successfully against such great odds. With the opportunities and the tools provided through the REA program you have built, in 27 short years, cooperative rural electric systems representing a present investment of $3,800 million. In this investment you have an equity now of $800 million. That equity is your own money, not REA loan money. It is your investment, and it is growing. Your 1,400,000 miles of lines, stretching out across the prairies, crossing mountains, and winding up through isolated valleys, now serve 4,800,000 meters.

These meters represent the service of over 17 million people today, not to count those who have been served at one time or another along these same lines in earlier years, but who have now moved away or passed on.

From the early days when some spokesman in the industry were saying that you and your families would not use 20 kilowatt-hours a month, you have put electricity to work on such a scale that a nationwide average for REA-financed systems is now about 400 kilowatt-hours per month for each residential consumer.

You have literally created a new market for power which was not there before you undertook the task of rural electrification. Today your systems consume an annual total of 37 million kilowatt-hours of energy. This was the input in 1962. Some of that you generated yourself; most of it you purchased. In 1962 you purchased 12,500 million kilowatt-hours from the commercial utility industry and paid a total bill of about $97 million. This is a market you created and one for which you should properly be entitled to their praise and gratitude, not their criticism and hostility.

You created what is now a $1 billion market every year for electric appliances and equipment in rural America where such appliances were useless before you went to work.

You have opened up vast new areas of the Nation for business development where people can live and work in the country with the assurance that electric light and power is there just as well as in the city.

As the needs of our national defense have grown to require a nationwide network of military defense installations in isolated areas, the systems you have built have been ready to serve them where there was no service within reach 27 years ago.

By using electricity boldly you have strengthened the agricultural potential of America, and above all, brought to rural America the same standards of convenience through electricity which once had been restricted to the city.

All this underscores the theme of your meeting, "Rural electrification—important to America's strength."

You have provided more than wires and kilowatts. You have built systems that are dedicated to the principle of area coverage, the principle that neighbors should join together and furnish service to all through their joint efforts and joint support, helping the neighbor away out on the end of the line get his service at the same rate as the one next to the substation. You have formed cooperatives based on the proposition that the maximum benefits of this service are to be shared among all the members.

Your cooperatives recognize the importance of electricity to people, and in recognition of that importance they provide the democratic mechanism by which the people they serve may participate in both the ownership and the government of the systems.

A distinguished American historian, Frederick J. Turner, who incidentally was born in Wisconsin and served on the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, won a place for himself as one of the great American historical scholars by describing and analyzing the effect of frontier life on the shaping of American institutions and life. The cooperative is part of the important legacy that has come to us from the old frontiers of American development. It is one we as a nation will do well to preserve and

strengthen as we move ahead on the new frontiers. The rural electric cooperatives stand today as one of the vital institutions of rural democracy. In a nation of rapidly changing population patterns they offer a means of carrying over into the more complex rural communities of the present and the future the spirit of basic democracy from which they grew.

So it is today that I want to talk to you not so much of the rural electric cooperatives as a source of past strength, or even present strength, but rather as a source of future strength for America.

This implies both the survival and the growth of your electric systems and your cooperative organizations. No one who reads the debates in Congress at the time of the enactment the Rural Electrification Act can doubt for an instant the intent of Congress with respect to the future of your efforts.

Congress did not intend that what you build could remain yours only so long as others in the business did not covet it. I am sure those of you who went from farm to farm in those initial signups did not intend that you were building simply a stopgap system to serve until the power company was ready to take over. And I can assure you that we in REA have no such intent.

When we talk of the rural electric cooperatives as a source of future strength for America, it also implies that what you have done and are doing to provide the benefits of electric service in the areas you have undertaken to serve is not a one-shot deal, but is instead a continuing and growing task and responsibility. It is only common sense that the job of providing electric service for unserved people in rural areas was not completed when the wires were brought to the farm house. The job is then just begun. It is what comes over those wires that lights the lamps, heats the ranges, and turns the motors. The true measure of the benefits to come from that service is to be found in the continuing dependability of the service and in its current cost. This is a job that goes on every minute of every day of every month of every year. Experience shows that it is, moreover, a growing job, for the people in the rural areas served by the REA-financed systems are requiring more electricity every year.

The survival and growth of these cooperative systems you have built are hinged, as I have said on many occasions, on the solution of three great problems. The first is the problem of power supply, the second is the problem of territorial integrity, and the third is the problem of rural area development.

In the field of power supply, REA under this administration, with your help and support, has moved decisively to make available to you your own generation and transmission facilities, if you cannot secure the power you need from other sources on a fully dependable basis, on terms that are fair and do not restrict your right to fully serve your territory, and at a cost at least as economical as you can generate it for yourself. But we are not out to build generating capacity just to build something. Our objective is to help you develop sources of power supply which are adequate and dependable, offering the lowest possible cost, and compatible with the security and effectiveness of the systems you have built.

These objectives should be just as attainable through proper contracts with the commercial utility industry as through contracts with public power sources or from your own generation and transmission facilities. In fact, the technology of the industry is moving so rapidly toward larger scale generation and the economies which flow from it, that the maximum benefits from the industry can come only from a high degree of cooperation and coordination among its various segments—commercial, cooperative, and public.

If the day ever comes when those who direct the destiny of the commercial utility industry recognize that the rural electric cooperatives are here to stay and should serve in their own right the territories they have developed, the door will be opened for solving a wide range of problems between the rural electric cooperatives and the commercial utilities with benefit to both.

Duplication of lines and pirating of consumers, the present hostile propaganda barrages and all the current energies mobilized in unnecessary controversy are a great waste of time and money on both sides. So long as the predatory motives of the commercial utilities remain uppermost and inspire continued attacks on your right to exist and serve effectively in the territories you have developed, you have no alternative except to fight back in self-defense. How much better off we would be if those energies could only be turned to constructive purposes.

The problem of territorial integrity is just as vital to the survival and effectiveness of your systems as is the problem of power supply. If your systems are constantly dismembered and the portions of your service territories where population growth provides the advantages of greater density are eventually lost, you will never be able to bring to the thinner portions of your territories the cost and service advantages which should rightfully be theirs. Likewise, if you are denied the right to serve the larger loads in your service territories, the effectiveness of your systems in serving everyone else is seriously crippled.

REA can provide loan funds and technical assistance in helping you meet the problems of power supply, but in dealing with the problem of territorial integrity the real answers must be found in your respective States. We stand ready to help you in every way we possibly can, but the final outcome is going to depend primarily on your own persuasiveness in winning recognition for the justice of your cause at home.

The stake of the rural electric cooperatives in rural area development is obvious. Your cooperatives are serving rural areas. If the economic base of rural areas is allowed to stagnate and dry up, people move away. This they have already been doing in large numbers. There are 500,000 idle services on the lines of rural electric cooperatives today, meters that once served people who have moved away, houses now empty, farms that have been absorbed by neighboring farms. The economic base of the area served is the business base of the cooperative—if one shrinks so does the other.

On the other hand, if new economic opportunities are provided for people to hold them in the area, it means not only growth for the cooperative in the volume of electricity sold but greater benefits in terms of better service at lower rates, for the electric business is a volume business.

The rural electric cooperatives and REA borrowers in the telephone program have recognized this and are fast becoming an important mainstay in the development of the rural areas development program which Secretary Freeman has pushed with such vigor in the Department of Agriculture. They have likewise become a vital factor in the area redevelopment program of the Federal Government in the rural areas. REA-financed borrowers serve in 95 percent of the rural areas eligible for ARA loan assistance.

REA has been conducting a survey among its borrowers, asking them to report on all rural area development projects which they have successfully assisted to either the construction or operation stage between July 1, 1961, and the present time. Of the 1,785 REA borrowers in both the electric and telephone programs, we have heard from approximately 600 to date. These 600 borrowers report that they have assisted 402 industrial and commercial type rural development projects either in operation now or under construction in their service territories. These projects represent a total investment of about $300 million in rural areas. They will provide direct employment to approximately 30,000 persons in those areas. In addition, they will stimulate indirectly about 22,000 jobs for other people in related businesses in those communities. Of the total investment represented in these projects, approximately $15 million came from Federal sources other than REA, while in excess of $250 million came from private and other non-Federal sources. A projection of these figures to cover all 1,785 REA borrowers would give even higher project, job, and private investment totals than estimated on the basis of the early returns from this survey.

Since the beginning of Secretary Freeman's emphasis on the rural areas development program, REA has approved only 14 industrial and commercial consumer loans from section 5 funds for an aggregate amount of $1,240,000. Experience has shown, however, that the availability of these section 5 loans has been an important asset in stimulating the leadership of the rural electric cooperatives generally in rural areas development and, in instances where legally appropriate and necessary, providing the important last link in the chain of financing where other sources failed.

In addition to these commercial and industrial projects, these 600 REA borrowers report that they have helped communities in their areas launch 187 public facility projects such as hospitals, water systems, and sewerage systems.

I have said it before. I say it again: I firmly believe that what you have built was built to endure, not only as a permanent part of America's great electric industry, but as a living, vital force in the future growth and development of rural America. I am not speaking of REA as a Government agency; REA will continue only so long as you need its assistance. I am speaking, instead, of the electric systems and the cooperative organizations you have built and nurtured. In this critical period ahead, we in REA can be of important assistance in many ways, but in a very real sense the ultimate determination of the survival and effectiveness of the rural electrification cooperative systems will depend on how well you and the thousands, yes, the millions of rural people will serve in, as well as be served by, your cooperatives.

Inter-American Economic Institutions: An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 the members of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce were honored by the presence of a most distinguished guest, the Honorable Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank. Mr. Herrera addressed the chamber on the subject "Inter-American Economic Institutions: An Appraisal." This was a particularly timely and informative message and I take pleasure in presenting it here for the benefit of my colleagues:

INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS: AN APPRAISAL

(Address by Hon. Felipe Herrera)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I have been in Miami many times—like most Latin Americans, I tend to use it as a natural gateway in my comings and goings between this country and those to the south—but no matter how often I come here, I never lose the comfortable feeling of being very much at home. The Hispanic heritage you have preserved so well, your people and architecture, and incomparable climate, confront the Latin American with something of Caracas and Santiago and Mexico City in an alien land, no longer alien because of Miami.

This is my first formal appearance here as President of the Inter-American Development Bank, and I am glad I have deferred it until now. Florida and Miami, and particularly an organization like yours, are where North Americans most closely follow inter-American developments and are best informed on them. In the light of recent developments including the Alliance for Progress which has awakended such great interest throughout the hemisphere, I think I am now in a position to make a better evaluation of inter-American economic institutions, and one more in keeping with your own broad knowledge of the inter-American scene, than would have been possible for me earlier.

There is a good deal of error, and as much of injustice, in the way Latin America's economic and social policies and development agencies are generally regarded. Perhaps the most common accusation is that there are too many inter-American agencies and authorities to permit a rapid and efficient solution of our manifold problems.

I would disagree with this viewpoint. If anything, I would say that there are not enough agencies and authorities to do the job that must be done properly—a job that strains at national boundaries and takes on the proportions of a mighty supranational effort.

Events move at such a dizzying pace that there is only a passing resemblance between our world of today and that of 10 or 20 years ago. We are caught up in an irresistible current of hope and aspiration and change that would have been inconceivable yesterday. One manifestiation of these, in our hemisphere, at least, is the powerful thrust toward more than just coordination and cooperation in our international relations, more than just the association of nations, more than just economic integration, but toward unification—first economic unification, and then political unification—in the truest sense of the word. We are inspired by Europe's example along these lines, and are aided by processes peculiar to our hemisphere.

This trend is something so new and dynamic that it cannot be properly nourished and guided by our inter-American organizational structure of even a few years ago. That structure is now inadequate to meet the challenge that faces it and all of us. There has been a time in the history of all nations when economies were small and isolated, limited by poor communications and the concentration of humanity in villages, towns, and cities. This vested great economic and social power in local and municipal authorities, but as communications improved, as population grew and spread, economies burst their bonds and spread across entire regions and nations, compelling local authority to give way to regional and national authority.

In precisely the same manner, the stage is set for us to progress from nationalism to supranationalism, and forge the true and growing unification of our peoples in their effort to eradicate underdevelopment and poverty, malnutrition and illiteracy, and strengthen our orderly march toward stability and well-being.

Here precisely, is where the need lies for an institution like our Bank. In more than just the financial sense we symbolize and contribute to that process of unification. Our mandate is the integrated economic and social development of our member countries through the united effort of all of them. We are the principal inter-American channel for mobilizing and directing the flow of international resources, harmoniously administered in the name of all our members, for the solution of their common problems.

Our Bank is a place where Latin Americans can lay their economic and social needs and problems before other Americans and encounter a sympathetic response, because all concerned have lived with these needs and problems and have suffered their consequences all their lives. Even more important, it is the place where national needs and problems are considered within the context of Latin America's needs and problems as a whole.

We are, in short, a practical expression of the new internationalism that is taking hold among our peoples. We are also a practical expression of the new approach that characterizes Latin America's political and economic institutions today. When I took office as President of the Bank 3 years ago, I said that being a bank, we were more than a bank. By that I meant that we had the dual obligation of adhering to sound banking principles in our operations to preserve the integrity of the resources entrusted to us, and of tempering our banking philosophy with our ultimate goal: to accelerate economic and social development in Latin America.

I think we have been successful in this respect. I cannot recall one of our loans—and we have made loans totaling more than $624 million in slightly less than 2 years—that has not been of direct or potential benefit to the individual in Latin America. To cite a few examples, we are helping to build 175,000 low-cost houses for almost a million people who never knew the meaning of decent shelter; we are helping to build and improve roads, to open up new areas for development; we are helping to raise health standards and productivity among 17.5 million people, in city and village alike, by financing good water and sanitary systems; our agricultural loans are reclaiming badlands, improving and diversifying production. Loans benefitting 20 universities, colleges, and technical schools will help to give Latin America the research specialists and technicians it needs to carry on its development. Our loans to industry, principally small industry, and electric power projects total more than $150 million.

But let me say something about our resources:

1. For economic development projects, the Bank has subscribed resources of about $960 million. Of this amount, member countries have paid in some $528 million (including the contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of a little more than $146 million). The remaining $432 million makes up the Bank's callable capital. This capital serves to support the bond issues which the Bank sells on the world's capital markets.

We had the immediate acceptance of our first bond issues, aggregating $100 million during 1962, in this country and Europe.

Seventy-five million dollars were underwritten by commercial and investment banks in the United States, and the balance by a consortium of leading Italian banks, at terms so favorable that they compare in every way with those granted to such institutions as the World Bank.

Our bonds have been approved for sale in what amounts to 80 percent of the U.S. financial market. California, Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin have already enacted legislation to this effect, and legislation is presently pending in Illinois, Maryland, Utah, and other jurisdictions.

2. For social development projects, the Bank administers the Social Progress Trust Fund of $394 million, entrusted to us in 1961 by the U.S. Government in the framework of the Alliance for Progress. The purpose of this fund is to finance projects in the fields of land settlement and improve land use, housing for low-income groups, water supply and sanitation, and advanced education. We administer these resources as a trustee, and render an annual accounting of their use to the United States.

We interpreted the action of the United States in selecting us to administer this large sum as a mark of confidence in our Bank, all the more noteworthy because we opened our doors only 6 months before it was taken. We see a ratification of this confidence in the expressed intention of the U. S. Government to enlarge the Social Progress Trust Fund by entrusting another $200 million to us.

Even though, as I have noted, we came into being only a short time before the Alliance for Progress, when the Alliance was promulgated we were in an organizational and operational position to play an immediate and active part in it, and became the Alliance mechanism for mobilizing and directing multilateral resources for Latin American economic and social development.

The goals and methods of the Alliance, as you know, were outlined by a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961. It would not be amiss to review them at this point, as follows:

Mobilization of the full productive capacity of the Latin American countries, with external aid, to accelerate their economic development.

The need to create conditions of greater stability and balance for Latin America's export trade.

The need for a larger Latin American market, obtainable only through economic integration of the Latin American countries;

Accelerating an integrated and equitable economic development by consolidating and expanding representative democracy, to give the community free expression and the means of satisfying its present and future needs.

But perhaps the most important expression of what the Alliance is and does lies in these words of President Kennedy, in his recent State of the Union message:

"I do not underestimate the difficulties that we face in this mutual effort among our close neighbors, but the free states of this hemisphere, working in close collaboration, have begun to make this Alliance a living reality. * * * The men and women of this hemisphere know that the Alliance would not succeed if it were only another name for U.S. handouts—that it can succeed only as the Latin American nations themselves devote their best effort to fulfilling its goals."

Within this scope, the Alliance must be regarded as a statement of policy, and not as a new institution, as is often erroneously thought. It must be looked upon as an effort in which each participant has a mutual obligation to all the others—an obligation to give to the best of its ability, and not merely receive, and make its fullest contribution to the success of this venture.

Such a goal, and with it the goals of Punta del Este, can never be attained if our countries limit their efforts to purely national proportions. There must be regional cooperation and coordination among neighboring countries; continental-wide cooperation and coordination among all the coun-

tries, and, needless to say, cooperation and coordination between the Latin American countries, individually and collectively, and the United States.

This is feasible on a supranational and international basis only through specialized inter-American organs that run the gamut of all our needs—cultural, juridical, technological and agricultural, as well as economic and financial—if order and direction are to be imparted to the solution of our problems. Some of these organs already exist, and others must be created.

The economic and social mechanisms of the inter-American system emerged at different stages in our cooperative evolution, and in response to the needs of the times. Thus, the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Economic and Social Council were born at a moment when political inter-Americanism overshadowed economic inter-Americanism.

ECLA, the Economic Commission for Latin America of the United Nations, stemmed from general concern in that organization in the 1950's over the emerging problems of underdeveloped countries.

Our Inter-American Development Bank, organized early in 1959, was a belated recognition of the need for a regional financial mechanism to complement the activities of existing international organizations.

In 1960, the Act of Bógotá and the concept of the Social Progress Trust Fund were the first expression of the need for cooperative action in meeting Latin America's social problems. The Alliance for Progress and Charter of Punta del Este, a year later, reflected the need for programing and structural reform in Latin America, and led to strengthening the Economic and Social Council and creating the "Nine Wise Men" group to evaluate national policies and programs. Since 1958, the Central American Common Market and Latin American Free Trade Association have responded to the needs of trade and the flux of ideas generated by European integration.

Today, it is essential that we reappraise this machinery and adapt it to the larger and more complex requirements of present economic and social policy in our hemisphere. It may be that the report of President Lieras Camargo and President Kubitschek will shortly show us the way to do this, for these distinguished Americans will certainly lend ear to the appeal of our countries for a system that will lead to more positive action and the solid support of public opinion at all levels.

If you will permit me, I should like to make my own modest contribution in this connection:

1. Some form of Latin American parliament is needed to give proper expression to the broad public opinion of our hemisphere, and not to governments and experts alone, as is now the case. Such a body might be indirectly established by our legislatures, or directly by popular vote in our countries, to become a forum for interpreting the major currents of ideas in Latin America and evaluating hemisphere policy by democratic discussion and debate. In it, public opinion might express itself on such matters of common concern as the orientation of economic relations among our countries, our collective relationship to other regional groups, and our concepts of integrated economic development, to guide our governments, individually and collectively, in putting into practice broader formulas conducive to practical collective unity in the political, economic and cultural spheres.

It is conceivable that this Latin American body might have a permanent group to work in close harmony with a similar group in the Congress of the United States, and thus create a reciprocal mechanism—representative of the essence of democracy and parliamentary institutions—for precisely evaluating the obstacles and possibilities of cooperation between the United States and Latin America. And, as a logical corollary, it might perhaps be complemented to some degree by the participation of management and labor, through their representative organizations, and technology and education, through the universities.

2. Equally essential is a permanent liaison mechanism to fuse the efforts of economic and technical institutions striving for faster and more integrated development in Latin America, something on the order of Europe's Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. A body of this kind could be of inestimable value in arriving at definitions necessary to the most harmonious interaction of regional and national initiatives. It could become the multilateral technical organ wherein the "Alliance for Progress," which, as I have observed, still lacks a well-defined personality, could find its true and dynamic identity. From it would come specific technical recommendations on how to program our development, how to find in common the solution to our vital raw materials problems, how to coordinate our trade and monetary policies, and how to extend our inevitable integration over increasingly shorter periods. It would, in essence, be the higher technical-administrative agency of our multilateral technical cooperation: a sort of general staff for this ambitious operation.

3. Finally, I consider it indispensable that we reactivate the abandoned concept of an inter-American high court, empowered by our governments to hear and resolve litigation and problems deriving from our communal, international existence, especially in commercial, financial and general economic questions.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, these proposals undoubtedly will strike many as visionary and some might wonder that a banker departs from talk of yields and investments and funds to enter into this field that we might call social engineering for the hemisphere.

Precisely because I am a banker, and precisely because of what I have observed in Latin America during the past 4 years, I must conclude that it is useless to talk of trade and investment if we do not simultaneously forge institutional bonds as a basis for our cooperative efforts toward economic development. Let us not forget that the budgets and income of many Latin American countries are smaller than the budgets and income of some large corporations in this country. Yet, an expanse of land that has been nourished by our blood and history commands a much greater devotion and meaning than profit-and-loss statements. As practical men of the Americas, we must recognize that as long as we fail to orient our relations with an eye to destiny, our most cherished ambitions of today, are senseless.

Higher Education Blackjacking and Fiscal Misrepresentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following joint statements issued by the Democratic leaders of the New York State Assembly, Senator Joseph Zaretzki and Assemblyman Anthony J. Travia.

It is almost unbelievable that a State administration would force the city of New York to charge tuition at the city university with the threat that State aid would be withheld unless they did so. This, however, is exactly what has happened. This threat is clearly out of line; it is bad enough that the State university is now going to charge tuition. To force the city of New York to do the same in the city university will deny the opportunity to go to college to many, many of those in the city who need it most and who can least afford to pay tuition for it.

The whole concept of State-supported institutions of higher education is being subverted by this proposal and I believe the Congress should look closely at the Federal assistance programs now in effect for these institutions.

In its efforts to force the city university to "go it alone" without State aid or charge tuition, the government in Albany is merely fulfilling the prophecies of the Democratic minority in the legislature.

The second statement exposes the Governor's breach of faith with the voters in the matter of taxes: He insisted that he would not increase them and yet he has now doubled the motor vehicle tax.

New York's voters will be reminded of these misrepresentations when the next election comes around. Those who live in our cities in New York State will not soon forget the Republican heel on their collective necks.

The statements follow:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1963

Two years ago we warned that Governor Rockefeller was hatching an insidious plot to foist tuition charges on students attending the colleges of the city of New York.

We predicted that in forcing through legislation in 1961 giving the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York the discretion to charge tuition, Governor Rockefeller was preparing the ground for a scheme to coerce the city into imposing tuition at the City University.

We said then that the Republican State administration would use its power to withhold State aid funds to City University and thus attempt to force it to abandon its 115-year-old tuition-free policy.

We are sorry to say today: "We told you so."

Our prediction has become fact. The board of trustees of the State university, in promulgating its decision to impose tuition charges on all students at the State university, has told the City University to conform or suffer the loss of State aid.

Referring to the so-called discretionary power granted the board of higher education with regard to tuition, the State university board of trustees declares that "continuation of this unique arrangement in the city of New York is, therefore, a matter for local determination."

Then comes the blackjack, in these words from the trustees' statement:

"On the other hand, such local determination should not be made possible by payments of State aid in conflict with what now has been determined to be the State university's policy on tuition. The trustees firmly believe that 100 percent of the cost of teacher education programs in the colleges of the city of New York should not be paid by the State at the same time something less than

the full cost of teacher education is being paid by the State in colleges of the State university through imposition of tuition.

"The trustees, therefore, would recommend, again as was pointed out in the master plan addendum that 'in allocating such State financial aid, the tuition policy of the municipal colleges should be considered.'"

The warning is clear: Charge tuition or State aid to City University will be cut off.

If the State's contribution to the support of City University, now approximately $28 million a year, is withheld, the city would have no place to turn, except to the imposition of tuition, which is what this State administration has intended all along.

Free tuition has been a tradition at the city colleges. Permission to charge tuition was not requested by the board of higher education. It was opposed strongly by the mayor of the city of New York, by Dr. Gustave Rosenberg, chairman, and the board of higher education, and by the overwhelming majority of the residents of the city of New York.

Governor Rockefeller rammed the tuition provision for the City University and the State university through by use of the offensive tie-in technique, packaging it with the scholar incentive legislative and the provision creating the City University. By combining these entirely unrelated matters in one bill, the Governor forced members of the legislature who favored the grant to students but opposed tuition at the city colleges to vote for the bill. He rejected our plea to separate the proposals. The Republican majorities defeated Democratic amendments to delete the tuition provision from the scholar incentive legislation.

We have said that we will fight to the utmost to prevent the imposition of tuition in the State university colleges throughout the State. We intend to give the most vigorous support to legislation that would take away from the State university trustees their tuition-imposing power, and to Democratic program legislation that would restore the mandate assuring free tuition at City University.

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1963

The Governor made a solemn pledge to the people of the State of New York that he would not impose new taxes or increase old taxes.

As a man of honor—as a man seeking the highest office in the United States—he must demonstrate a will to keep his word.

A promise to the people is one of the most sacred covenants. Anyone who breaches his promise to the people violates a fundamental principle of democratic government.

During the last campaign, not once, but many times, the Governor denied our charge that he intended to raise taxes immediately after election.

Today our worst fears are realized. More than 5 million car owners are hit again.

Four years ago, immediately after taking office, the Governor imposed a heavy increase in the gasoline tax. Four years later, again soon after taking office, he doubles the motor vehicle tax.

Again, as 4 years ago, the motorist will not be the only one to suffer as a result of the Governor's breach of faith. All holders of any State license—liquor dealers, real estate brokers, bedding manufacturers, barbers—all can expect to be hit by increases in their license taxes.

It is a sad day in New York State politics when anyone can so brazenly and impudently flout his obligation to the people who elected him.

Weekly Newspapers Perform Valuable Service to Their Communities

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, through the years, the weekly newspapers of our Nation have performed—and are continuing to perform—a valuable news and information service adapted to the changing needs of their individual communities. The history of the weekly newspapers of Trempealeau County in my home district in Wisconsin is detailed in an interesting article printed in the January 31, 1963, issue of the Blair Press on the occasion of its 65th anniversary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that article in the RECORD:

BLAIR PRESS EMBARKS ON 65TH YEAR OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

With this issue the Blair Press celebrates the 66th anniversary of its founding. The "baby" of the existing journalism family in Trempealeau County, the Press was begun in 1897 and represents the only city in the county which did not have several competing newspapers in early pioneer days.

More than 30 newspapers have been published at some time in the county. Thirteen of these were in operation during the early 1900's and six of them are in existence now, the Arcadia News Leader, Blair Press, Galesville Republican, Independence News Wave, Osseo Tri-County News and Whitehall Times.

The Blair Press got its start in 1897 when the town was still rebuilding after the devastating fire of 1891. Young Will Asmus of Seymour, Wis., had heard of the plucky spirit displayed by Blair folks when their business places were nothing but blackened ruins and he decided that this would perhaps be a good place to begin a newspaper.

When Asmus arrived in town, there was a school, two Lutheran churches, a Baptist church, a village hall, two banks, a flour mill and the usual number of stores, shops and garages. Businessmen evidently felt the need for a newspaper because many of them purchased sizable ads in the first issue January 21, 1897.

The Press changed hands many times over the next few years. Henry Russell was the second proprietor, who sold out to an employee, Simon Berseng. O. B. Borsheim and Earl F. Hensel were the next owners, followed by A. O. Lokken and Sneider Stout.

The creditors then took over the paper, and publication was probably suspended for a time because the volume number printed on each issue of the Press indicates a 2-year lapse somewhere in the newspaper's history.

The paper was later conducted by Martin Amundson and his son, Omar, who sold to A. H. York. H. C. Kirkpatrick became the owner in 1915. He was succeeded in 1941 by M. A. Jensen who sold to the present owner, Don Huibregtse, in 1954.

The village of Trempealeau, without a newspaper for many years now, has been the home of at least eight publications. The county's first newspaper was turned out there in the spring of 1858. Called the Trempealeau Times, it consisted of a total of four issues which published the Buffalo County tax list. The Trempealeau Banner was issued for a short time that fall.

The printing press and type cases were then sold and their new owners headed for Galesville where the Galesville Transcript, a newspaper devoted to home improvements, was begun. The paper was later moved to Trempealeau where it became the Trempealeau County Record.

The Trempealeau Representative was founded in August of 1859 and was suspended 2 years later.

The Galesville Journal originated in May of 1870 and became the Journal and Record when it absorbed the Trempealeau County Record in 1873. A year later the Journal and Record was sold to several Whitehall men who moved it into their town and began issuing the Trempealeau County Messenger, now the Whitehall Times.

By 1891, the year of the big fire, the Blair department of the paper had developed to such an extent that the paper appeared with the caption Whitehall Times and Blair Banner.

In the meantime, the Trempealeau County Republican was established at Trempealeau in 1873. The Arcadia Leader was begun in July of 1875 and in 1877 the two papers were combined and issued at Arcadia. The name was shortened to Republican Leader of Trempealeau County and was next called the Arcadia Republican and Leader. In 1890 the paper's name was shortened to Arcadia Leader.

The Galesville Independent was established in 1874 and continued until it was absorbed by its competitor, the Galesville Republican, in 1908.

Der Nord Staed, a Norwegian paper, was published in Whitehall in 1877.

Free Press was begun at Trempealeau in 1878. After a year there, its materials were moved to Galesville where the Trempealeau County Democrat was begun. The Democrat continued there for a year and then was moved to Arcadia where it was suspended in 1880.

No records are available that tell of the Blair Bulletin, which was in existence at this time. The Bulletin was absorbed in 1879 by the Independence Weekly News, which had begun a year earlier. In 1892 the News was united with the Independence Wave, a prohibitionist newspaper which was established in 1888. United they became the Independence News-Wave.

The Galesville Republican was the outgrowth of a small job printing plant established by Bert A. Gipple. An employee of the Galesville Independent for several years, Gipple sought to lease or purchase the plant in 1896. When his offer was turned down, he began a shop of his own and soon began printing the Republican.

A mighty war of words was launched in Trempealeau in the early 1900's when three newspapers, each with different political views, were in operation there at the same time.

Founded in 1884 as a labor organ, the Trempealeau Herald was the strongest of the three and was operated well into the 20th century. The Trempealeau Gazette was begun in 1890 as a Sunday paper but was soon revised as a campaign sheet.

The Gazette changed owners in 1903 and when the new proprietor opened up with virile attacks on the former owner, the original owner began the Trempealeau Tribune in self-defense. The Tribune was destroyed by fire in 1904 and the Gazette ceased operations in 1910.

The Arcadian was started in 1895, but was little match for the well-established Leader and was moved to Beacher, Ill., in 1907.

Begun just after the railroad reached Osseo in the summer of 1887 was the Osseo Blade. The plant burned in 1891 but resumed publication for a time.

tries, and, needless to say, cooperation and coordination between the Latin American countries, individually and collectively, and the United States.

This is feasible on a supranational and international basis only through specialized inter-American organs that run the gamut of all our needs—cultural, juridical, technological and agricultural, as well as economic and financial—if order and direction are to be imparted to the solution of our problems. Some of these organs already exist, and others must be created.

The economic and social mechanisms of the inter-American system emerged at different stages in our cooperative evolution, and in response to the needs of the times. Thus, the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Economic and Social Council were born at a moment when political inter-Americanism overshadowed economic inter-Americanism.

ECLA, the Economic Commission for Latin America of the United Nations, stemmed from general concern in that organization in the 1950's over the emerging problems of underdeveloped countries.

Our Inter-American Development Bank, organized early in 1959, was a belated recognition of the need for a regional financial mechanism to complement the activities of existing international organizations.

In 1960, the Act of Bógotá and the concept of the Social Progress Trust Fund were the first expression of the need for cooperative action in meeting Latin America's social problems. The Alliance for Progress and Charter of Punta del Este, a year later, reflected the need for programing and structural reform in Latin America, and led to strengthening the Economic and Social Council and creating the "Nine Wise Men" group to evaluate national policies and programs. Since 1958, the Central American Common Market and Latin American Free Trade Association have responded to the needs of trade and the flux of ideas generated by European integration.

Today, it is essential that we reappraise this machinery and adapt it to the larger and more complex requirements of present economic and social policy in our hemisphere. It may be that the report of President Lleras Camargo and President Kubitschek will shortly show us the way to do this, for these distinguished Americans will certainly lend ear to the appeal of our countries for a system that will lead to more positive action and the solid support of public opinion at all levels.

If you will permit me, I should like to make my own modest contribution in this connection:

1. Some form of Latin American parliament is needed to give proper expression to the broad public opinion of our hemisphere, and not to governments and experts alone, as is now the case. Such a body might be indirectly established by our legislatures, or directly by popular vote in our countries, to become a forum for interpreting the major currents of ideas in Latin America and evaluating hemisphere policy by democratic discussion and debate. In it, public opinion might express itself on such matters of common concern as the orientation of economic relations among our countries, our collective relationship to other regional groups, and our concepts of integrated economic development, to guide our governments, individually and collectively, in putting into practice broader formulas conducive to practical collective unity in the political, economic and cultural spheres.

It is conceivable that this Latin American body might have a permanent group to work in close harmony with a similar group in the Congress of the United States, and thus create a reciprocal mechanism—representative of the essence of democracy and parliamentary institutions—for precisely evaluating the obstacles and possibilities of cooperation between the United States and Latin America. And, as a logical corollary, it might perhaps be complemented to some degree by the participation of management and labor, through their representative organizations, and technology and education, through the universities.

2. Equally essential is a permanent liaison mechanism to fuse the efforts of economic and technical institutions striving for faster and more integrated development in Latin America, something on the order of Europe's Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. A body of this kind could be of inestimable value in arriving at definitions necessary to the most harmonious interaction of regional and national initiatives. It could become the multilateral technical organ wherein the "Alliance for Progress," which, as I have observed, still lacks a well-defined personality, could find its true and dynamic identity. From it would come specific technical recommendations on how to program our development, how to find in common the solution to our vital raw materials problems, how to coordinate our trade and monetary policies, and how to extend our inevitable integration over increasingly shorter periods. It would, in essence, be the higher technical-administrative agency of our multilateral technical cooperation: a sort of general staff for this ambitious operation.

3. Finally, I consider it indispensable that we reactivate the abandoned concept of an inter-American high court, empowered by our governments to hear and resolve litigation and problems deriving from our communal, international existence, especially in commercial, financial and general economic questions.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, these proposals undoubtedly will strike many as visionary and some might wonder that a banker departs from talk of yields and investments and funds to enter into this field that we might call social engineering for the hemisphere.

Precisely because I am a banker, and precisely because of what I have observed in Latin America during the past 4 years, I must conclude that it is useless to talk of trade and investment if we do not simultaneously forge institutional bonds as a basis for our cooperative efforts toward economic development. Let us not forget that the budgets and income of many Latin American countries are smaller than the budgets and income of some large corporations in this country. Yet, an expanse of land that has been nourished by our blood and history commands a much greater devotion and meaning than profit-and-loss statements. As practical men of the Americas, we must recognize that as long as we fail to orient our relations with an eye to destiny, our most cherished ambitions of today, are senseless.

Higher Education Blackjacking and Fiscal Misrepresentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following joint statements issued by the Democratic leaders of the New York State Assembly, Senator Joseph Zaretzki and Assemblyman Anthony J. Travia.

It is almost unbelievable that a State administration would force the city of New York to charge tuition at the city university with the threat that State aid would be withheld unless they did so. This, however, is exactly what has happened. This threat is clearly out of line; it is bad enough that the State university is now going to charge tuition. To force the city of New York to do the same in the city university will deny the opportunity to go to college to many, many of those in the city who need it most and who can least afford to pay tuition for it.

The whole concept of State-supported institutions of higher education is being subverted by this proposal and I believe the Congress should look closely at the Federal assistance programs now in effect for these institutions.

In its efforts to force the city university to "go it alone" without State aid or charge tuition, the government in Albany is merely fulfilling the prophecies of the Democratic minority in the legislature.

The second statement exposes the Governor's breach of faith with the voters in the matter of taxes: He insisted that he would not increase them and yet he has now doubled the motor vehicle tax.

New York's voters will be reminded of these misrepresentations when the next election comes around. Those who live in our cities in New York State will not soon forget the Republican heel on their collective necks.

The statements follow:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1963

Two years ago we warned that Governor Rockefeller was hatching an insidious plot to foist tuition charges on students attending the colleges of the city of New York.

We predicted that in forcing through legislation in 1961 giving the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York the discretion to charge tuition, Governor Rockefeller was preparing the ground for a scheme to coerce the city into imposing tuition at the City University.

We said then that the Republican State administration would use its power to withhold State aid funds to City University and thus attempt to force it to abandon its 115-year-old tuition-free policy.

We are sorry to say today: "We told you so."

Our prediction has become fact. The board of trustees of the State university, in promulgating its decision to impose tuition charges on all students at the State university, has told the City University to conform or suffer the loss of State aid.

Referring to the so-called discretionary power granted the board of higher education with regard to tuition, the State university board of trustees declares that "continuation of this unique arrangement in the city of New York is, therefore, a matter for local determination."

Then comes the blackjack, in these words from the trustees' statement:

"On the other hand, such local determination should not be made possible by payments of State aid in conflict with what now has been determined to be the State university's policy on tuition. The trustees firmly believe that 100 percent of the cost of teacher education programs in the colleges of the city of New York should not be paid by the State at the same time something less than

the full cost of teacher education is being paid by the State in colleges of the State university through imposition of tuition.

"The trustees, therefore, would recommend, again as was pointed out in the master plan addendum that 'in allocating such State financial aid, the tuition policy of the municipal colleges should be considered.'"

The warning is clear: Charge tuition or State aid to City University will be cut off.

If the State's contribution to the support of City University, now approximately $28 million a year, is withheld, the city would have no place to turn, except to the imposition of tuition, which is what this State administration has intended all along.

Free tuition has been a tradition at the city colleges. Permission to charge tuition was not requested by the board of higher education. It was opposed strongly by the mayor of the city of New York, by Dr. Gustave Rosenberg, chairman, and the board of higher education, and by the overwhelming majority of the residents of the city of New York.

Governor Rockefeller rammed the tuition provision for the City University and the State university through by use of the offensive tie-in technique, packaging it with the scholar incentive legislative and the provision creating the City University. By combining these entirely unrelated matters in one bill, the Governor forced members of the legislature who favored the grant to students but opposed tuition at the city colleges to vote for the bill. He rejected our plea to separate the proposals. The Republican majorities defeated Democratic amendments to delete the tuition provision from the scholar incentive legislation.

We have said that we will fight to the utmost to prevent the imposition of tuition in the State university colleges throughout the State. We intend to give the most vigorous support to legislation that would take away from the State university trustees their tuition-imposing power, and to Democratic program legislation that would restore the mandate assuring free tuition at City University.

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1963

The Governor made a solemn pledge to the people of the State of New York that he would not impose new taxes or increase old taxes.

As a man of honor—as a man seeking the highest office in the United States—he must demonstrate a will to keep his word.

A promise to the people is one of the most sacred covenants. Anyone who breaches his promise to the people violates a fundamental principle of democratic government.

During the last campaign, not once, but many times, the Governor denied our charge that he intended to raise taxes immediately after election.

Today our worst fears are realized. More than 5 million car owners are hit again.

Four years ago, immediately after taking office, the Governor imposed a heavy increase in the gasoline tax. Four years later, again soon after taking office, he doubles the motor vehicle tax.

Again, as 4 years ago, the motorist will not be the only one to suffer as a result of the Governor's breach of faith. All holders of any State license—liquor dealers, real estate brokers, bedding manufacturers, barbers—all can expect to be hit by increases in their license taxes.

It is a sad day in New York State politics when anyone can so brazenly and impudently flout his obligation to the people who elected him.

Weekly Newspapers Perform Valuable Service to Their Communities

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, through the years, the weekly newspapers of our Nation have performed—and are continuing to perform—a valuable news and information service adapted to the changing needs of their individual communities. The history of the weekly newspapers of Trempealeau County in my home district in Wisconsin is detailed in an interesting article printed in the January 31, 1963, issue of the Blair Press on the occasion of its 65th anniversary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that article in the RECORD:

BLAIR PRESS EMBARKS ON 65TH YEAR OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

With this issue the Blair Press celebrates the 66th anniversary of its founding. The "baby" of the existing journalism family in Trempealeau County, the Press was begun in 1897 and represents the only city in the county which did not have several competing newspapers in early pioneer days.

More than 30 newspapers have been published at some time in the county. Thirteen of these were in operation during the early 1900's and six of them are in existence now, the Arcadia News Leader, Blair Press, Galesville Republican, Independence News Wave, Osseo Tri-County News and Whitehall Times.

The Blair Press got its start in 1897 when the town was still rebuilding after the devastating fire of 1891. Young Will Asmus of Seymour, Wis., had heard of the plucky spirit displayed by Blair folks when their business places were nothing but blackened ruins and he decided that this would perhaps be a good place to begin a newspaper.

When Asmus arrived in town, there was a school, two Lutheran churches, a Baptist church, a village hall, two banks, a flour mill and the usual number of stores, shops and garages. Businessmen evidently felt the need for a newspaper because many of them purchased sizable ads in the first issue January 21, 1897.

The Press changed hands many times over the next few years. Henry Russell was the second proprietor, who sold out to an employee, Simon Berseng. O. B. Borsheim and Earl F. Hensel were the next owners, followed by A. O. Lokken and Sneider Stout.

The creditors then took over the paper, and publication was probably suspended for a time because the volume number printed on each issue of the Press indicates a 2-year lapse somewhere in the newspaper's history.

The paper was later conducted by Martin Amundson and his son, Omar, who sold to A. H. York. H. C. Kirkpatrick became the owner in 1915. He was succeeded in 1941 by M. A. Jensen who sold to the present owner, Don Huibregtse, in 1954.

The village of Trempealeau, without a newspaper for many years now, has been the home of at least eight publications. The county's first newspaper was turned out there in the spring of 1858. Called the Trempealeau Times, it consisted of a total of four issues which published the Buffalo County tax list. The Trempealeau Banner was issued for a short time that fall.

The printing press and type cases were then sold and their new owners headed for Galesville where the Galesville Transcript, a newspaper devoted to home improvements, was begun. The paper was later moved to Trempealeau where it became the Trempealeau County Record.

The Trempealeau Representative was founded in August of 1859 and was suspended 2 years later.

The Galesville Journal originated in May of 1870 and became the Journal and Record when it absorbed the Trempealeau County Record in 1873. A year later the Journal and Record was sold to several Whitehall men who moved it into their town and began issuing the Trempealeau County Messenger, now the Whitehall Times.

By 1891, the year of the big fire, the Blair department of the paper had developed to such an extent that the paper appeared with the caption Whitehall Times and Blair Banner.

In the meantime, the Trempealeau County Republican was established at Trempealeau in 1873. The Arcadia Leader was begun in July of 1875 and in 1877 the two papers were combined and issued at Arcadia. The name was shortened to Republican Leader of Trempealeau County and was next called the Arcadia Republican and Leader. In 1890 the paper's name was shortened to Arcadia Leader.

The Galesville Independent was established in 1874 and continued until it was absorbed by its competitor, the Galesville Republican, in 1908.

Der Nord Staed, a Norwegian paper, was published in Whitehall in 1877.

Free Press was begun at Trempealeau in 1878. After a year there, its materials were moved to Galesville where the Trempealeau County Democrat was begun. The Democrat continued there for a year and then was moved to Arcadia where it was suspended in 1880.

No records are available that tell of the Blair Bulletin, which was in existence at this time. The Bulletin was absorbed in 1879 by the Independence Weekly News, which had begun a year earlier. In 1892 the News was united with the Independence Wave, a prohibitionist newspaper which was established in 1888. United they became the Independence News-Wave.

The Galesville Republican was the outgrowth of a small job printing plant established by Bert A. Gipple. An employee of the Galesville Independent for several years, Gipple sought to lease or purchase the plant in 1896. When his offer was turned down, he began a shop of his own and soon began printing the Republican.

A mighty war of words was launched in Trempealeau in the early 1900's when three newspapers, each with different political views, were in operation there at the same time.

Founded in 1884 as a labor organ, the Trempealeau Herald was the strongest of the three and was operated well into the 20th century. The Trempealeau Gazette was begun in 1890 as a Sunday paper but was soon revised as a campaign sheet.

The Gazette changed owners in 1903 and when the new proprietor opened up with virile attacks on the former owner, the original owner began the Trempealeau Tribune in self-defense. The Tribune was destroyed by fire in 1904 and the Gazette ceased operations in 1910.

The Arcadian was started in 1895, but was little match for the well-established Leader and was moved to Beacher, Ill., in 1907.

Begun just after the railroad reached Osseo in the summer of 1887 was the Osseo Blade. The plant burned in 1891 but resumed publication for a time.

The Osseo Recorder, which began in 1893, was sold in 1912 when its originator established the Osseo News. The Recorder continude as the Trempealeau County Farmer until 1915 when it was absorbed by the News.

Published in the county from 1891 until 1912, the Wisconsin Good Templar was a temperance paper. The International Good Templar, a 60-page magazine established at London, Canada, in 1888, was published at Iifdependence from 1906 to 1909, when it was moved to Glasgow, Scotland.

The Anzeiger was founded in 1916. The Eleva Herald was published in 1915. During the term of one school superintendent, the Booster was published from 1908 to 1917 to furnish a better communication between superintendent, teachers, and school boards.

Purchased by the Blair Press in 1955, the Ettrick Advance was published at Ettrick for 35 years. It is now a page in each issue of the Press.

No Wonder We're Broke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Arkansas City Traveler. After reading it Congressmen of discerning gifts may be able to deduce some notions of their own why the Nation stands at the brink of fiscal collapse.

NO WONDER WE'RE BROKE

Employer and employee can sit back today and anticipate a tax cut in 1963. They may be jubilant. However, it is doubtful that either party would recommend a reduction in taxes if they were operating the Government.

In the first place, after looking at the balance sheet, which is out of balance, the concerned parties would probably advocate a substantial cut in spending to offset the loss from the tax decrease. Such a plan would save the business. Every citizen should show as much interest in his country.

Many organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, are joining the administration in plugging for a tax cut. There should be greater demands for Government to reduce spending.

It is logically demonstrated that a reduction in income taxes to individuals and corporations would put more money in circulation and thus spur the economy. Illogically though, the advocates are turning a deaf ear to less spending. They are ignoring the financial standing of the United States in view of a huge debt.

The dollar isn't buying as much in this country. Its value in October 1960 was 46.7 cents. Last year in October it was worth 45.7 cents.

This country supports its money with gold. It takes $12 billion to back that folding money. In 1949 the country had $24 billion in gold or 75 percent of the free world's supply. In November 1960 there was $17.9 billion and now it is $16 billion. A loss of $4 billion more would put the Nation at the brink.

One of the national columnists reported recently that Austria has reduced income taxes annually for several years and the result was a boost to the economy. It would be interesting to look at Austria's balance sheet and see if its indebtedness is shameful. It is known that Austria has had the pump primed by the United States.

There is growing complaint that Uncle Sam can't compete with other nations in the area of industrial production. The people who are hurt the most weren't on the firing line when the United States was handing out gifts and loans. Since the war more than $84 billion has gone to other nations in gifts and loans.

The following report may enlighten readers. The title is: "No Wonder We're Broke," and comes from the El Dorado Times:

"This was the title of an article in a recent issue of the Western Voice, a religious publication published in Denver. The editor pointed out the results of a study of the financial status of the Nation were surprising and alarming.

" 'That we are going bankrupt if we maintain our present pace of national spending is clear to any thinking man,' the article declared, then going on to list (from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) the amounts given or loaned to other nations since World War II.

"It is a rather staggering list—and remember these were not gifts to help win the war. They were given since the war, and it is a well known fact it has bought us little friendship.

"Boldly lifting this list from the Abilene Reflector-Chronicle, we publish it here because we believe our readers will want to scan it for themselves.

"Austria, $1,170,100,000; Denmark, $822,200,000; Germany, $4,993,900,000; Iceland, $62,600,000; Italy, $5,517 million; Norway, $1,024,500,000; Portugal, $370,600,000; Sweden, $108,900,000; Yugoslavia, $2,132,400,000; Burma, $93,900,000; China, $3,894,500,000; Indonesia, $558 million; Korea, $4,486,600,000; Malaya, $21,800,000; Thailand, $571,800,000; regional, $316,100,000; Iran, $1,012,500,000; Israel, $709,100,000; Lebanon, $86,100,000; Turkey, $3,094,900,000; Yemen, $11,300,000;

"Afghanistan, $145,700,000; Ceylon, $65,300,000; India, $2,383,300,000; Pakistan, $1,255,700,000; Argentina, $460,500,000; Brazil, $1,376,500,000; Colombia, $249,500,000; Cuba, $52,500,000; Ecuador, $84,300,000; Guatemala, $117,400,000; Honduras, $34,900,000; Nicaragua, $43,500,000; Paraguay, $39,500,000; Uruguay, $72,300,000; West Indies, $11,500,000; regional, $111,100,000; Ghana, $4 million; Liberia, $73,300,000; Morocco, $194,700,000; Somali Republic, $9,100,000; Tunisia, $135,200,000;

"Luxembourg, $1,935,200,000; France, $9,423,600,000; Berlin, $127 million; Ireland, $146,100,000; Netherlands, $2,416 million; Poland, $509,400,000; Spain, $1,470,300,000; United Kingdom, $8,668,300,000; Regional, $2,237,390,000; Cambodia, $263,600,000; Indochina, $1,535 million; Japan, $3,462,500,000; Laos, $301,200,000; Philippines, $1,555,700,000; Vietnam, $1,895,900,000; Greece, $3,073,500,000; Iraq, $65,300,000; Jordan, $230,900,000; Saudi Arabia, $46,600,000; United Arab Republic, $295 million.

"Cento, $23,200,000; Nepal, $39,400,000; regional, $354,200,000; Bolivia, $191,700,000; Chile, $364,600,000; Costa Rica, $68,700,000; Dominican Republic, $8,800,000; El Salvador, $10 million; Haiti, $80,400,000; Mexico, $600 million; Panama, $58,600,000; Peru, $334,300,000; Venezuela, $73,300,000; oversea territories, $4,800,000; Ethiopia, $115 million; Guinea, $3,800,000; Libya, $154 million; Nigeria, $6,200,000; Sudan, $44,100,000; oversea territories, $60,900,000; nonregional, $3,336,200,000; regional, $21,600,000.

"Total all countries, $84,090,800,000."

Capt. John C. Bull: Ocean Explorer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, an assault on the mysteries of the sea was launched February 1 when the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Explorer* sailed from Norfolk, Va., to launch the first phase of an equator-straddling survey of the tropical Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, this ocean exploration ship is commanded by my dear friend, Capt. John C. Bull, of South Carolina, a dedicated and extremely capable officer.

Under his leadership, the *Explorer* will participate in the 11-nation International Cooperative Investigations of the Tropical Atlantic—ICITA—probing the fisheries potential, circulation, water depths, and other dynamic aspects of the Atlantic.

Captain Bull was graduated from The Citadel at Charleston, S.C., class of 1930, and entered the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey immediately following graduation. During World War II, he served on special duty with the Army, and more recently on the staff of the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey as Chief of Officer Personnel.

His 220-foot ship, with a scientic staff of 23, and a crew of 70, will continue their ocean explorations through mid-April.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this an important mission on which Captain Bull has embarked. His ship will enable scientists to glean vital knowledge of the swirling and counterswirling currents in the storm turbulence of the equatorial Atlantic.

Due to the importance of this scientific mission, I would like to insert two articles from the Norfolk Ledger Dispatch that explain in detail this expedition for the information of the Congress:

NEW CAPTAIN READIES SHIP FOR OCEAN SCIENTIFIC DUTIES

(By Donald Moore)

NORFOLK.—A new captain will take the Norfolk-based Coast and Geodetic Survey vessel *Explorer* to sea Friday.

Capt. John C. Bull took over as master of the 220-foot-long *Explorer* in ceremonies here Monday aboard the ship as she lay at her York Street mooring.

The former chief of officer personnel for the C. & G.S. replaced Capt. Edmund L. Jones, who will take over duties at the Norfolk district headquarters here.

Captain Bull's first assignment will be to take part in the 11-nation (including Russia) International Cooperative Investigations of the Tropical Atlantic which will probe the fisheries, circulation, water depths and other dynamic aspects of the Atlantic Ocean. The area covered will be 15° north and south of the Equator and extending from Africa to South America.

The project will include participants from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, France, Ivory

Coast, Japan, Nigeria, Republic of the Congo, and Spain, as well as the Soviet Union and the United States.

The *Explorer*, with a scientific staff of 23 and a crew of 70, will participate in the first phase of the investigations only, known by the code name Equalant I, from February 1 to mid-April.

Plans for the survey, which is expected to cover about 15,000 nautical miles, call for the *Explorer* to make port at Dakar, Senegal, before starting on a long southern leg past Ascension Island to a point about 900 nautical miles south of the Equator.

After a refueling stop at Recife, Brazil, the *Explorer* will retrace her course on a track 30 miles west of the southbound leg.

One reference point 400 miles southwest of Dakar will be investigated by the *Explorer* as well as the Russian ship *Lomonosov*, thus affording an opportunity for scientists of the two countries to compare results.

Some observations, such as depth soundings and magnetic readings, will begin the day the ship leaves Norfolk, but as the *Explorer* nears the African coast operations will be intensified to include studies of bottom sediments, geologic layers, ocean currents, biological specimens, and meteorological data.

In addition to the Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel, scientists from the Commerce Department's Weather Bureau will conduct studies of the atmosphere with radiosonde and pibal (pilot balloon) soundings of wind direction, the latter in connection with artificial satellite studies.

Dr. Gerhard Neumann and Dr. Willard Pierson of New York State University will undertake special studies of the mysterious equatorial countercurrent, while Dr. Eric Hagmeier of Kiel University, West Germany, will direct a very extensive biological program aboard the *Explorer*.

FIVE NATIONS TO STUDY CURRENTS

(By Don Hill)

NORFOLK.—Russia, the United States, and other counrties are joining forces to seek intelligence on an enigmatic territory foreign to them all.

A central figure in the international operation will be the Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Explorer*, the principal vessel in the scientific agency's fleet based at its east coast center in Norfolk.

FUNDAMENTAL FACTS

Altogether, 14 ships from 5 countries will join the mission, a scientific investigation of mysterious phenomena of the Atlantic Ocean at the Equator.

The U.S. Commerce Department will announce Operation Equalant in the next few days. But the Coast Survey officer who will command the *Explorer* outlined the mission Tuesday.

Scientists hope to get fundamental new knowledge of the swirling and counterswirling currents in the storm turbulence of the equatorial Atlantic.

The space age will profit from the studies, too. The Weather Bureau will gather information to go with its artificial satellite studies.

CAPTAIN BULL

Dr. Erik Hagmeier, biologist from Germany's Kiel University, will go along to gather seawater samples and test the fisheries potential of the region. He'll be able to deduce information about the largest of sea creatures by assessing the characteristics of microscopic plankton.

The *Explorer* will be commanded on the 2-month operation by Capt. John C. Bull, former Chief of Officer Personnel of the Coast Survey. Bull will take charge here Monday. The *Explorer* will sail for Dakar, Senegal, February 1, and start operations February 15.

She will be radio central for Equalant, receiving reports from all the other ships in the study except the Red vessels.

According to the plan, all the ships will send reports daily to the National Oceanographic Data Center in Washington.

TO CHANGE ORDERS

Details of the operation have been mapped out carefully. But Captain Bull said the data center coordinator will be able to change orders any time some extraordinary phenomenon requires extra study.

One mystery for which special study has been planned is an equatorial countercurrent. For years, navigators have been radioing their observations to U.S. stations for recording on remarkably accurate current charts. But the currents the sailors see are only on the surface. Countercurrents under the surface are known to exist in many places, such as one that bucks the powerful Gulf Stream. The equatorial submarine flow has never been studied however.

When the *Explorer* crosses this subsurface currents, it will tarry for 2 to 3 days while Dr. Gerhard Neumann, of New York University, gathers data.

TO MEET "LOMONOSOV"

At one point in the study, the *Explorer* will occupy a station with the 7,600-ton Russian ship *Lomonosov*, chief vessel of the Red delegation.

Other countries participating will be Brazil, the Congo, the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, and Argentina.

The *Explorer* will sail from Norfolk to Dakar at maximum practical speed drawing trackline instruments and taking magnetometer readings along the way. The first surveys out of Dakar will require about 5 days and 1,000 miles of steaming.

She will refuel at Freetown, Sierra Leone, and continue the work, heading south. She'll break from the survey and head for Recife, Brazil, where she will refuel about March 9. On March 14, the ship will start to retrace her route in the first half of the survey, gathering the data in reverse direction.

She's expected to return to Norfolk in April.

No End in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the disparity between promise and performance by the administration creates a feeling of hopelessness in the thoughtful citizen. Promises of economy and reduction in personnel have a hollow ring. Greater becomes the distrust of promises because always the Government grows larger. The following poke at promises and personnel policies, published in the Friday, January 25, issue of the Macomb (Ill.) Journal is given here:

NO END IN SIGHT

Just before the House killed the straitjacket Kennedy farm bill during the 87th Congress, Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, expressed his concern with the rising level of employment in the Department of Agriculture.

He offered an amendment to the bill to prohibit employing more Department of Agriculture workers than there are farmers in the United States. His proposal got the biggest laugh of the session, and then lost, 230 to 171, when it came to a vote.

It appears now that the House would have provided an important safeguard if it had passed GRIFFIN's amendment.

Recent Department of Agriculture statistics show that there is now 1 Federal farm Department employee for every 67 farmworkers.

Can it be that the 104,000 persons now employed by the Department of Agriculture eventually will grow to the point where the Government can assign an employee to each farmworker?

Certainly the Kennedy administration has shown little inclination for economy along this line, despite continued assurances that the level of Federal employment will be reduced.

The latest assurance came just last week when President Kennedy promised reduction in personnel as one of the means of offsetting part of the immediate loss of tax revenue.

We've heard that before. Actually Kennedy has added 145,342 jobs since he took office.

Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges suggested a 15-percent cut of personnel in his department one month and then added 1,600 the next month.

The pattern isn't encouraging.

What Is the Real U.S. Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, our allies and friends in Latin America are wondering who is who and what is going on in our policy toward Cuba.

I call attention to an excellent article by the Scripps Howard's Virginia Prewett in yesterday's Daily News, entitled "Which is the Real U.S. Policy?" An authority on Latin America and the OAS, Miss Prewett comments that South and Central American diplomats were told in December not to press action against Castro, as a favor to this country. Since then, our OAS Ambassador De Lesseps Morrison has been speaking of new sanctions through the OAS, but OAS officials know nothing of these new plans. Thus, she reports these speculations by OAS officials:

The possibility that Mr. Morrison has not been kept adequately informed by his assistants, who are not implementing the policy his public statements appear to favor.

Or that he has been delegated to talk tough about Castro for U.S. public opinion, while top U.S. policymakers decide what to do about Cuba.

Or that Mr. Morrison and his staff are themselves as confused about U.S. policy on Castro as the OAS Ambassadors are becoming.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just the OAS Ambassadors who are wondering what our policy toward Cuba is. The American people want to know too.

The article follows:

WHICH IS THE REAL U.S. POLICY?

(By Virginia Prewett)

As our traditional alliances crumble about us—France and Canada following the South

American giant, Brazil, into the doubtful column—the United States is getting into a misunderstanding with still-friendly members of the Organization of American States.

Here are the facts:

The Latin American governments who consider themselves most threatened by Communist Cuba have been very anxious for OAS action against this threat.

In December, U.S. representatives to the OAS quietly asked Latin American ambassadors, as a favor, not to press action against Castro for a while.

This writer has confirmed this at different times with four Latin American OAS ambassadors.

In mid-January, our OAS Ambassador, Mr. de Lesseps Morrison, told me the United States was smiling on a plan for new, stiff sanctions against Castro. The points mentioned were those suggested by Secretary of State Dean Rusk at the Washington foreign ministers' meeting before the Cuban blockade. They envisaged a clampdown against Castro's commerce, oversea finance, and communications.

In mid-January, authoritative OAS sources knew these suggestions only from Mr. Rusk's mention of them.

Ambassador Morrison has discussed these specifics with other reporters, giving the most recent statement on it to the Washington News for publication on February 1. The report leaves the impression that the United States favors the specific sanctions in specific OAS committees.

Latin American ambassadors feel that if Mr. Morrison can discuss OAS plans with the press, they can also. And it is learned that at the point where OAS would normally elaborate the new sanctions against Castro, the December lid is still on.

On February 1, Ambassador Morrison handed the OAS a stiff public statement on Castro's Cuba. But neither he nor any other U.S. representative has rescinded December's gentleman's agreement to suspend action, though Latin Americans are anxiously awaiting it.

OAS diplomats wonder if the United States is preparing to spring the sanctions plan from some unorthodox direction. If so, they ask, why the newspaper previews? Other speculations turn on:

The possibility that Mr. Morrison has not been kept adequately informed by his assistants, who are not implementing the policy his public statements appear to favor.

Or that he has been delegated to talk tough about Castro for U.S. public opinion, while top U.S. policymakers decide what to do about Cuba.

Or that Mr. Morrison and his staff are themselves as confused about U.S. policy on Castro as the OAS ambassadors are becoming.

Tax Reform To Dominate Issues in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial on the subject of the proposed tax reforms written by Mr. Gilbert Crouse in the St. Helens, Oreg., Sentinal-Mist:

TAX REFORM TO DOMINATE ISSUES IN CONGRESS

Of all the current great debates, the greatest—aside, of course, from international problems—now centers around tax policy, the tax system in general, tax reform and, of most immediate concern, tax reduction. Whether this will turn out to be like Mark Twain's weather—something that everybody talks about but no one does anything about—remains to be seen.

Meanwhile, the controversy rages, and the surest bet since Man O'War ran a race is that it's going to be the overridingly dominant domestic issue in Congress.

The pros and cons, and the differences between authoritative views of the diverse and complex problems involved, are many. But so are the agreements. In an effort toward clarification, Life magazine assembled a group of experts and let them talk it out.

Ernest Havemann sums up what they said in the magazine's January 11 issue—and the composite amounts to an impressive, if sometimes confusing, picture. It was quite a group, 16 in number, drawn from banking, government, the universities, business and industry, organized labor, and so on.

Early in his article Havemann traces the brief, but enormously eventful, history of the Federal income tax. Thirty years ago, he points out, there was no tax at all on the first $4,000 of individual income and the peak, no matter how much you earned, was 25 percent.

Now a mere $2,000 of taxable income calls for a 20-percent rate, and at the top a giddy 91 percent applies.

This means, to take a single example, that a $10,000-a-year man with three dependents pays about $1,400 in Federal income taxes. And the corporation rate, on enterprises of any size, has risen in the same short span of time from 12 percent to 52 percent.

Havemann reports that practically all the participants in Life's roundtable on taxation agreed that the existing rates are too high. Here was one place where the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO representatives saw eye to eye. The differences came over the questions of what to do, and how to do it.

Some of the experts, for instance, thought that a tax cut without more or less compensatory cuts in Federal spending (and none of them had much hope of this occurring) would lead to more inflation and a worsening of our international balance-of-payments situation—that is, the gold drain from Fort Knox to Europe. Others thought that need not be the case.

Then, and it is something that should come as a surprise to no one, there was a division as wide as a sea concerning what income groups should profit most from any tax cut. The labor spokesman, with some support, said that the low-income groups should be most favored in this regard. But business spokesmen were in total disagreement, arguing, in Havemann's words, that "* * * there was already so much discrepancy between high- and low-bracket rates as to discourage incentive and threaten the whole free enterprise system."

On the other hand, there was concurrence on points of a general nature: That our tax system is a bad one; that, partly as a result of it, our economy is not living up to its potential; that a tax cut would help to correct the condition (though there were doubters as to this); and that any tax cut, of whatever kind, involves a risk.

"But," adds Havemann, "Almost all the experts, even the opponents of a tax cut, agreed that there is risk 'too' in doing nothing." He also writes, "Nobody spoke up in defense of today's tax structure; the only question was whether to change it now or later."

Some of the participants said that the rate of business profits, as related to production and sales, has been declining, and that this has become a drag on incentive and that, also, the savings available as risk capital have been drying up.

And the head of one of the biggest of American international businesses, Standard Oil of New Jersey, made this down-to-earth observation: "If a tax cut were not to come about, it would have a depressant effect, because * * * everybody is now * * * expecting the cut and just wondering how big it will be."

As to its size, the talk now is in the $6 billion to $10 billion range. All brackets would be affected, with the percentages running, say, from 15 to 65 percent on the taxable base, as against the current 20–91 percent. The corporate rate would be reduced, too.

Whatever the precise figures, and the precise approach, the Life roundtable's feeling was pretty well summed up by a spokesman for a major insurance company, who said: "We need a basic reform of our whole national tax structure: [this is] imperative for the country, and this is the time to take the first steps."

Voluntary Service Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Baltimore Jewish Times, an excellent weekly publication, applauded the efforts of a Minneapolis resident in its lead editorial. The person so lauded was Mrs. Viola Hymes, who is currently president of the National Council of Jewish Women and who is also an influential member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

I am proud to represent a community in which a weekly publication sees beyond its own boundaries to the good that is being performed by men and women in volunteer organizations throughout the country. I have great confidence that the President's Commission on the Status of Women will make an important contribution to the country because it is composed of members of such high caliber. Under unanimous consent, I include the Times editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF SERVICE

All too frequently we wait until a term of office expires, or a lifetime of service ends, before we say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." We humans are quick to scold and gripe and berate; but we forget to praise and commend the jobs well done as they're being done by the people who do them.

We should not let that happen in the case of Mrs. Viola H. Hymes, president of the National Council of Jewish Women and a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. Mrs. Hymes steps down from the council's presidency next March after serving brilliantly in that ca-

pacity since March of 1959. But her 4 years as council president only capped her career as a council member for the past 32 years.

In describing her long service with council, Mrs. Hymes recalls that NCJW was the first organization she joined as a married woman. She and her local unit decided that her professional work as a teacher of speech and English equipped her to be the unit's bulletin editor, and that first year she produced—as she humorously recounts it—"six bulletins and one baby."

Her dedication and hard work as a council member eventually brought her the council's highest office—one which has sent her to all corners of the country bringing inspiration and sound ideas to many council endeavors.

Now, as a valued member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, she brings her wealth of experience as a fine human being—teacher, wife, mother, and service volunteer—to a national commission concerned with woman's role in society today.

In addition to her work as a member of the President's Commission, Mrs. Hymes serves on the Commission's Committee on New and Expanded Services which involves consideration, as detailed by President Kennedy in his Executive order establishing the Commission, of "services that may be required for women as wives, mothers, and workers, including education, counseling, training, home services, and arrangements for care of children during the working day." The scope and variety of subjects included under this topic were so great that consideration of education was delegated to a separate Committee on Education.

Other committees are concerned with employment policies and practices in the Federal Government; employment policies and practices in firms under Government contracts; protective labor legislation; civil and political rights; and social insurance and taxes—all as they particularly affect women in our society.

We are sure Mrs. Hymes is contributing the same wise counsel and lucid thinking to the President's Commission on the Status of Women that she has been making available to the National Council of Jewish Women for so many years. We are also sure that when she steps down from the NCJW's top job next March she will not have to insert an ad in the situations-wanted column of the classified advertising pages in her native Minneapolis newspapers. Rather, it's a good bet that a great clamor will be made for her services.

What of the Americans Held Prisoner?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, may I commend to the attention of my colleagues a letter which was recently published in the State newspaper in my district concerning the handling of the prisoners in Cuba.

This letter merits our attention and publication for two reasons: First, it is a positive, courageous and thought-provoking statement from a dedicated American; and secondly, it was written by a man well qualified to speak on the subject for he himself bears the battlescars of being a prisoner of war during World War II.

The author is the holder of the Purple Heart, the Combat Infantry Badge, and while a prisoner of war his feet became frozen and when liberated he weighed only 91 pounds. This man has earned the right to make such a statement on this important matter which is of such grave concern to all patriotic Americans.

The following letter was written by Mr. Julian R. Stricklin, of West Columbia, S.C., the son of Mrs. Viola R. Stricklin and the late Claude J. Stricklin, a veteran of World War I:

WHAT OF THE AMERICANS HELD PRISONERS?

To the EDITOR OF THE STATE:

I am very much surprised at the American people. Just to think that they have given a big pig such as Castro $53 million worth of ransom for some 1,100 prisoners who are not even Americans.

How about the American prisoners who are there now? What are the American people doing to free them? I don't think they are doing anything and do not intend to do anything about them. They can be sick and helpless, but what do we care? They are only Americans, not refugees.

The American Red Cross has always helped to do something, and I think it has, I personally think that this time it has lagged. The Red Cross stated in the news that it would try to do something for the American prisoners after all the refugees are free.

I am just wondering what our country is? Is it a place for an American to have a home, raise his family, pay his taxes, and be proud to be an American, or is it a country being run by refugees and Communists? I believe Castro has won a big war without firing a shot. The Communists have said that they would rule the United States and somehow they are coming to do just this.

The reason I am writing this letter is that in World War II I was a prisoner of war and no one paid a ransom for me. I had to work while I was a prisoner of war with just a few bites to eat each day. I alone was not the only prisoner at that time. There were thousands more just like myself.

The American Red Cross didn't do too much at this time. Another thing, the American people didn't go around wearing yellow shirts. They held up the Stars and Stripes at that time. Then there was Korea. Many thousands lost their lives and thousands were taken prisoner just over a police action so they said. Did we ransom them out of prison camps?

I think the American people need to wake up and take action on some of these matters that concern them. The first thing that we all need to do is to get on our knees and ask God to help us through our trials and tribulations in all these matters.

By being a member of the American Legion I am deeply concerned about our country. The Legion is fighting hard to blot out this Communist conspiracy throughout the United States. The American people can help if they would only stop and think. Let's all get back to the fact that this beautiful country of ours is our home and we will defend it if necessary. Always hold up the red, white and blue with its 50 stars, namely, Old Glory. Let us show the world that the United States means business in what it has to say about communism.

JULIAN R. STRICKLIN.

WEST COLUMBIA.

Cotton: Tranquilizers Versus Cures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, it would seem sometimes that Congress is not interested in finding a cure for some of our cotton industry ailments, and would continue to administer tranquilizers when cures are needed.

This belief is sustained when one recalls that the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture started early in December 1962 to hold meetings and hearings in an attempt to solve a cotton problem. Legislation proposed by the administration as a solution has been considered at great length. Hearings have been held, reams of testimony taken, and scores of witnesses heard. As of this date, no agreement has been reached. However, may I point out that an esteemed member on the Committee on Agriculture presented an alternate proposal. His proposal received only brief consideration although it received an excellent reception in cotton production and textile manufacturing areas, as evidenced by the following editorial taken from the Charlotte Observer, of Charlotte, N.C.:

COTTON'S TROUBLES NEED SURGERY, NOT FIRST AID

The House Agriculture Committee, after consultation with the White House, is on the verge of recommending that the skin which hides a tumor be painted with iodine.

For 7 years, the United States has sought to treat its domestic cotton ailment with heavy and frequent injections of Government cash, when a major operation or a series of operations is clearly indicated.

Adoption by the Congress of another cotton subsidy, this one to be paid to someone between the grower and manufacturer, will do nothing more than alleviate the pain temporarily.

The subsidy of an undetermined amount going to a still undetermined recipient is described as a means of eliminating the two-price cotton system that injures domestic manufacturers. It will not be an elimination, but a disguise.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican of Illinois, summed it up accurately in these words: "It (the administration bill) is ill-advised and inadequate. At best it would leave both the textile mill and the farmer on an artificial base, subject to changing whims of government and unable to build a sound future in a realistic marketplace."

FINDLEY offered a more sensible proposal than the legislation supported in committee hearings by eight Congressmen from the Carolinas. He suggested a three-year program under which price supports would be decreased gradually to the world price of cotton.

Under the Findley plan, the Government would sell surplus cotton to growers "at an attractive price" in exchange for a 1-year land conserving agreement. It would provide for unrestricted planting after 3 years.

Findley's plan has the advantage of eventually bringing realistic market conditions for cotton with consideration for the

problems of the small and inefficient growers. Unless some kind of a program of gradual transition is adopted, the country will be burdened indefinitely with an inverted pyramid of subsidies reaching ridiculous proportions.

Our opposition to a new subsidy comes with full awareness that textile manufacturers in the country are at a disadvantage in the purchase of cotton. Domestic consumption of cotton has plunged sharply because it is overpriced to the mills. The use of synthetic fibers has soared. Prospects for U.S. export of cotton abroad are poor.

The roots of the problem lie deep in the first subsidy that is paid to cottongrowers. This has the altruistic purpose of helping the small farmer, but it is a veritable bonanza to the largest producers whose lint fills Government warehouses.

Consider the vicious cycle. U.S. consumers must pay higher prices for textile goods because of the artifical costs to mills. When they buy imported goods, they must pay more because of tariffs added to protect the competitiveness of the domestic industry. At the same time, the taxpayer-consumer must subsidize the export of U.S. cotton so that it will sell on the world market. Not long ago there was an abortive effort to further tax textile imports on the basis of their coton content, a cost the consumer would have to pay. Now the man who pays the Government's bills is being asked to ante up again.

The Department of Agriculture conceded last week that it can't endorse the full 8½-cent subsidy on domestic cotton. Six cents is nearer the difference anyway when the shipping costs of exported cotton are taken into account.

Undersecretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy said he believed a subsidy ranging from about 3½ to 5 cents a pound is all that can be budgeted. At his top figure, this would cost the Government $225 million a year on top of the millions being spent on the price support program.

A new subsidy in the cotton program would be nothing more than a feeble excuse for the failure of Congress to face up to its duty.

It must have the political courage to begin the surgery that in a few years would get the Government out of the cotton business, except for the production advice it gives to growers.

Spoon-Fed Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said a short time ago that the problems that were spotlighted by the riots at the stadium on Thanksgiving Day pointed up the need for Congress to appropriate more money. What for? So they can get more modern weapons?

I submit for the consideration of the membership the following editorial which, in my judgment, is the best description of the cause and cure that I have read:

[From the De Land, Fla., Sun News, Jan. 3, 1963]

SPOON-FED GENERATION

You can find a hatful of theories about the causes of juvenile crime. The trouble with most of them is that they seem only partial explanations.

For example, such usually cited factors as poverty, bad housing, broken homes, racial discrimination, and poor schooling obviously don't play any role in the substantial amount of crime committed by well-cared-for youngsters in U.S. suburbs.

The playwright, Arthur Miller, writing not long ago in Harpers, searched hard for a real common thread, one which would bind together juvenile crime not just in this country but all over the world. It runs high in Europe—even in the Soviet Union.

Miller believes he has found the bond. He thinks it is an all-pervading boredom, a strange kind of emptiness of the mind and spirit.

This, he says, is not the boredom of idleness alone, though there can be little doubt that the joblessness of ill-trained youngsters contributes.

The emptiness he speaks of comes from an absence of challenges, a lack of genuine, meaningful conflicts, a failure to test the individual's will and capacity.

The poor man's son sees the Government, with some erratic exceptions, providing welfare checks. The rich man's son sees his father providing cars, television sets, cameras, at the asking.

When does either young man learn he must earn the rewards of life?

In this grand age of excuse and permissiveness, the youth, rich or poor, is forgiven virtually all his errors by the courts, the welfare agencies and social workers, the indulgent parents. Few if any demands are made upon him.

In this situation, it is suggested, he manufactures excitement by venturing into daring and often brutal crime. The senseless assault perhaps makes sense only as a momentary release from boredom.

Parents, indeed the whole adult world, cannot be relieved of heavy responsibility for creating the vacuum in which today's youngsters thresh about—often so wildly. But neither can the young be absolved of blame.

One individual who seems to see things this way recently addressed teenagers through the columns of a Washington newspaper. To young folk bemoaning their sad lot, he wrote:

"Go home, hang the storm windows, paint the woodwork, rake the leaves, shovel the walk, wash the car, learn to cook.

"Help the minister, visit the sick, assist the poor, study your lessons. And when you are through, and not too tired, read a book.

"Your parents do not owe you entertainment. The world does not owe you a living. You owe the world something; your time and energy and your talents, so that no one will be at war or in poverty, or sick, or lonely again.

"In plain simple words, 'grow up.' Quit being a crybaby. Get out of your dream world. Develop a backbone, not a wishbone, and start acting like a man—or a lady."

For parents and children alike, these words make a cracking good reading lesson with which to begin a new year.

We Were Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following account to my colleagues and to all Americans interested in knowing the bare and undiluted facts surrounding the failure of the Cuban invasion. I ask unanimous consent to include the following remarks by Manuel Penabaz in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 14, 1963]

WE WERE BETRAYED—A VETERAN OF THE CUBAN INVASION SPEAKS OUT

(By Manuel Penabaz)

How do Cubans, who fought at the Bay of Pigs, feel about the U.S. role in that fiasco?

This is the story of one Cuban invader, told in his own words.

Manuel Penabaz tells of asurances made by representatives of the U.S. Government that the invasion against Castro would have U.S. support. Then, he relates, just when the invaders needed help most—and might have won—they were told: "We cannot give you any further support."

Many veterans of the invasion, just ransomed from Castro prisons, say they hold no rancor against the United States. But Penabaz says: "We did not fail. We were betrayed."

"Keep advancing. Keep advancing—and wait."

So long as I live, I shall never forget those words. They sounded out from an American ship, from the officer who directed our landing operations at the Bay of Pigs on the coast of Cuba, where 1,500 of us Cubans offered our lives in the hope of liberating our beloved country from the rule of the bearded despot, Fidel Castro, on April 17, 1961.

"Keep advancing and firing. Take the area ahead—and wait."

To us who had struggled ashore from our landing barges, the words "and wait" meant only one thing: "Help is on the way."

When we were recruited for this perilous mission, and during our exhaustive training in Guatemala—even while on the slow, ancient freighters that brought us from our embarkation port in Nicaragua—we were promised the support of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"Over you will be air cover," we were told, "and back of you the Navy and land forces of the United States and other free nations of the Americas. You cannot fail."

We did not fail. We were betrayed.

After 3 days of fighting, we heard again that same American voice that had exhorted us to "keep advancing—and wait." Only this time it said:

"We cannot give you any further support."

The whole invasion operation that had been planned and directed by agencies of the U.S. Government had been abandoned by that Government at the moment when victory could have overthrown Fidel Castro.

Of the 1,500 who began the assault at the Bay of Pigs on that warm April morning, about 100 were killed; 60 later died of wounds, starvation, torture and executions; most of the others were captured.

I was among the lucky. I escaped. Four of my comrades and I found a raft and, after 5 days afloat, were rescued.

Now my surviving comrades of that invasion also have been freed—ransomed from Castro's prison cells. Many of them have told me since their arrival in Miami that their lips are sealed because they have relatives still in Cuba. I, too, have relatives in Cuba. But my lips are not sealed. I will tell the story of what happened at the Bay of Pigs, because I believe that such a mistake must not be made again by any government or people of the free world.

For me, the story of the invasion began in Miami, Fla., when I heard the words: "Recruits are needed—recruits to overthrow Castro."

The Central Intelligence Agency of the U.S. Government, headed by Allen Dulles, was the recruiting and training group for our volunteers.

Several officers of the Central Intelligence Agency were operating in the Miami area, seeking out the leaders among the Cuban exiles, and encouraging them to select the likeliest young men for the adventure. I was told that there would be an invasion of Cuba "fairly early in 1961," backed and supported by the United States.

The first airlifts of volunteers to training camps began in late summer 1960. Any recruits who doubted that the United States was back of the operation were assured that, when we reached our training camps, we would find American officers in charge and there would be the best of American weapons to carry into battle.

Sure enough, when we arrived at Trax Base, high in the mountains of Guatemala, American officers were in charge of the camp, and our weapons were among the best of the United States had to offer.

At Retalhuleu, Guatemala, a splendid airstrip had been laid down by American engineers. All about were huge accumulations of war materiel—aircraft, mortars, tons of bombs, and other ammunition.

Over the whole operation, there was an air of great secrecy. Our instructors, American officers, wore only fatigue uniforms, with no markings. We knew them only by first names. But it was apparent that they were experienced and efficient.

It did not take us long to learn that "Frank," the man who gave the orders for both Americans and Cubans, was a colonel. The American subordinate officers were all experts in their fields. "Ray" was our rifle and pistol instructor. It leaked out that he was from California and a pistol champion. "Sam," chief trainer of the parachutists, was plainly a veteran of many combat jumps. "Nick," from New Mexico, was our instructor for intelligence operations. "Bob" demonstrated all there was to know about mortars and machine guns. "Pat" was a security officer.

There was no secrecy about the CIA man in charge at the camp. He was Frank Bender, a man of German descent who had fought in the French underground during World War II. Bender was everywhere—shuttling back to Miami to check on recruiting, going to Washington and New York to try to bring all the Cuban exile leaders together in one united front.

Trax Base was a regular little city, built by the U.S. Government. It had modern paved streets, electric lights, and barracks for about 500 men. As our numbers grew, we had to disperse to four other training bases.

All the training bases were leased from Roberto Alejo, brother of the Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States and a trusted friend of Guatemalan President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes.

For rifles, we had that infantry workhorse, the M-1 Garrand, firing 8 shots. Officers carried carbines. We learned to use machineguns and bazookas, 57-mm guns and 4.2-inch mortars.

One prized piece of equipment was an electric communications-control center—a device so new that it had never been used in combat. It was manned by six men, who could relay messages to artillery, aircraft, and other combat units. The American officers warned us that it should be destroyed rather than be permitted to fall into the hands of the enemy.

Training was rugged, but we endured it cheerfully. We were preparing to free our land of Marxist dictatorship. We understood that our brigade would be the initial attacking party backed by the might of the United States. There would be ample ammunition to stop Castro's tanks and his land forces. Every effort would be made to win the support of the Cuban people. Exile leaders would be formed into a provisional government and would receive the recognition of the United States and of Latin American countries. Such were our assurances.

Our brigade commander, Col. José Perez San Roman, and his headquarters staff hoped that, before embarking, they could have printed thousands of leaflets to be dropped all over Cuba by planes calling upon the people to rise against their oppressor, Fidel Castro.

At the last moment San Roman was informed that the U.S. Government could not approve this plan.

On the morning of April 10 we were flown to Puerto Cabezas, Nicaragua. At the dock we saw the invasion "fleet" that the CIA had mobilized. There were six ancient craft. Three were Liberty ships of World War II vintage. The other three were old fishing yachts. Most of the officers were Spanish or Cuban, with crews filled out from men of the U.S. merchant marine—among them many drunkards and misfits. We soon discovered that the crews did not want to mix with their live Cuban cargoes, and couldn't have cared less whether the expedition succeeded or failed.

"We carry you, land you, and leave you," a crew member explained. We took this as added assurance that we would be covered by air and naval support, for it was unthinkable to us that any civilized government would send men to battle without ample means either for complete victory or honorable retreat.

On the night of April 11, in moonless darkness, we sailed. On the fourth day at sea, we were given our final briefing on our invasion plan. Each man received a mimeographed copy of the operations in detail. The landings would be made on April 17 at Bahia de Cochinos, the Bay of Pigs, about 90 miles southeast of Havana. Battalions 2 and 5 would land first, at Playa Larga, deep in the bay, under command of Eneido Oliva. All other units would land at Playa Girón. Soon after our landings, the parachutists would drop some 12 miles inland to seize the airport of Jagüey Grande.

On the morning of April 15, planes from the Nicaraguan bases would begin bombing Castro's airfields and hangars, to be followed by heavier strikes on the 16th and 17th. Some of our units would move southeastward to join rebel groups in the Escambray Mountains, and others would move westward to take Havana.

Most important of all, our leaders had been assured of U.S. air cover, the backing of the U.S. Navy, and—if needed—of U.S. land troops as well. No one expected our 1,500 volunteers alone to conquer Castro's forces of 300,000 militia and regulars.

But we did expect that, with our American equipment plus American battle support, we would move inland steadily until we had cut Cuba in two. Castro's forces would then realize resistance was hopeless. Defections would begin and rise like a tide.

Soon we heard the Cuban radio announcing angrily that several planes were bombing the airports of Santiago and Havana and various military bases. We were elated. The bombings by our planes from Nicaragua had gone off on schedule. But Castro's broadcast was followed by a rebroadcast from the United States that chilled us to the bone. It was a speech by President Kennedy in which he affirmed that the United States would maintain a policy of strict neutrality in Cuba's internal affairs. Specifically, said the President, his Government would not intervene in the events shaping up in that island.

"He must say that, to deceive Castro," we finally decided, for all of us had heard Mr. Kennedy, during his campaign for the Presidency, advocate full support of Cubans opposing Castro. Yet doubts assailed me. It was the President speaking now—not the candidate.

On the morning of the 16th we were heartened by the sight of two U.S. destroyers, one on either side of our slow-moving flotilla. They were greeted with cheers. At least, we thought, we would have naval support. And, in case of setback, we would be evacuated and saved from capture.

All through that April 16 we waited for news of the second bombing strike. No news came.

That night we saw the light of Girón Beach, Bay of Pigs, on the horizon, like shimmering pearls. The ships carrying Oliva's units had veered to our right and his men would be landing soon. As the first shots from Playa Larga sounded, I looked at my watch. It was 20 minutes past midnight, April 17. The tragic invasion had begun.

Oliva and his two battalions met little resistance on their landings—only a small patrol of Castro's militia.

Our ships drew up about 1 kilometer, 0.6 of a mile, from the shore and anchored. Landing barges were quickly floated, and all hands began unloading the weapons.

The firing on Playa Larga had ceased. Back and forth from all the ships shuttled the motorized landing barges. As dawn broke, our radios picked up the first message of the American officer, stationed farther out at sea on a U.S. warship. He said:

"The whole bay is ours. The enemy has disappeared."

We learned later that morning that the officer was on the aircraft carrier *Boxer* How comforting to know that the might of the greatest navy in the world was standing by to support this blow for freedom.

Our ship's captain stuck his head out of his cabin and shouted: "The sky is ours, too." Every man raised a cheer, for surely this meant that the bombing of the 15th had destroyed Castro's air force.

WE CHEERED TOO SOON

But we cheered too soon. At 6 a.m., a B-26 bomber flew toward us at low altitude. We supposed it came from our Nicaragua base. But suddenly it swooped low and began firing at the barges unloading their cargoes on the beach.

"Shoot," I shouted to the men still on my ship, the *Atlantico*. There was also firing from other ships. The B-26 sped away. It had given our men their first baptism of fire. But, most important to Castro, the pilot had learned that there was no air cover for the landing.

Two other B-26's appeared from over the sea. Several of our guns started firing. Then the planes identified themselves as ours, from the Nicaragua base. They circled over our landings for a while. Then, with feelings of despair, we saw them head back toward Nicaragua. The pilots said they had fuel enough to cruise over the Bay of Pigs for only about 20 minutes.

Suddenly a Sea Fury appeared. I recognized this British-made fighter plane at once, for Batista had used them against us when I was fighting with Castro in the hills. This one made a pass or two, then zoomed away.

As our landing barge was on its way toward the beach, another Castro B-26 appeared, swooping directly over us. Our guns fired. The plane plunged into the sea.

We waded ashore, through the warm Cuban waters, onto the beach of our native land. Soon we were under terrific fire from several enemy aircraft. Flat on our bellies, many of us crawled into the village of Girón. Some of the inhabitants had fled. Many others ran toward us with welcoming shouts.

HOW PRECIOUS CARGO WAS LOST

I looked back toward our ships. One was in flames and sinking rapidly. It was the Houston—with most of its precious cargo still unloaded. The stacks of mortar shells, the armored trucks, the electronic communications-control center—all were going

down. Another ship burst into flames. It was the *Rio Escondido*. Soon, it too, sank. All the other ships were moving rapidly away. We watched a Sea Fury bring down a B-26 from our base. We asked:

"When will our air cover come? When will those fast U.S. jets go into action?"

The news from Playa Larga was good. Oliva had moved inland, destroying seven enemy tanks and numerous trucks, along with hundreds of enemy soldiers. The news from the parachutists was less hopeful. They had dropped early in the morning, but, for the most part, had landed in the swampy terrain north of the bay. Now they were fighting their way back to join our main force. By midafternoon, we were moving steadily forward.

"Keep advancing. Move inland—and wait" the American officer's voice kept broadcasting.

Late in the day we encountered the first battalions of Castro's militia, advancing among 10 or 12 tanks. How we needed those antitank mines that went down with the *Houston*. But our mortars were ready. We let go our barrage. Our fire was devastating. Castro's poor militiamen fell in heaps. Men? The majority were mere boys—many no more than 14 years of age. Only an insane sadist would have drafted those adolescents to fill his military machine.

As one after another of their tanks were knocked out, the Castro infantry ran like crazy from side to side. Our men got tired of shooting at them. The butchery that went on is impossible to describe. By nightfall, the survivors of Castro's forces were in full retreat.

The U.S. radio "Swan" had kept up a constant chatter all during the day, filled with exaggerated statements that I can now brand as deliberate lies. It said:

"The invaders are steadily advancing on every front.

"Throughout all Cuba, people are joining forces with the underground rebels fighting Fidel Castro.

"Castro's forces are surrendering in droves.

"It is reported that Raul Castro has committed suicide."

That night our men slept in the open, close to the soil of our Cuba. Next morning we ate what rations we could gather from the villagers. We were set for another battle. But all was quiet for a time—except for the quarreling of vultures over the bodies of Castro's slain militiamen.

From Playa Larga, Oliva and his battalions had advanced more than 12 miles, fighting all the way. They had stopped 3,000 of Castro's militia, flanked by Russian tanks and covered by British-made Sea Fury planes. Our units had advanced almost that distance to the northeast. Realizing that our lines were too extended, San Roman ordered them pulled back.

Oliva began his withdrawal to join our forces north of Girón.

By noon of that second day, all officers and men realized it was then or never for victory. We had demoralized Castro's infantry with our deadly mortar and machinegun fire. A few more days of pounding like that, and his forces would be surrendering in droves.

Col. San Roman communicated with the American ship: "Where is our support?" he asked. "We must have jet cover immediately."

The answer he got was nothing new—simply that we should advance and wait.

WE LOOKED IN VAIN FOR AIR SUPPORT

All afternoon the enemy B-26's strafed and bombed us, while we looked in vain for the air support that could have knocked Castro's planes from the sky.

By nightfall, our forces had retreated from the Jagüey Grande area. Despite the terrific punishment from the air, we still held the terrain for 6 miles north of the bay, including the road junction at San Blas. We still stood guard over the airstrip on Giron Beach.

But we were running out of ammunition. Every battalion reported it was running short of mortar shells, and even the small-arms bullets would soon be exhausted.

Meanwhile, from our advanced sentinels, we learned that Castro's forces were concentrating in huge numbers, with scores of tanks, hundreds of cannons and armored trucks, forming a ring of steel around the Bay of Pigs and getting ready to mount an attack.

Not a single plane from our bases had engaged the enemy during that second day of fighting.

At midmorning of the third day, we saw two of our B-26's winging in from over the water. Two Cuban planes zoomed out to meet them—one a Sea Fury, the other an American-made jet fighter—and within seconds our planes fell into the sea.

Soon afterward, three more of our planes flew over the beach and across the battle area. Two left quickly, but the third swooped down and began strafing the advancing Castro columns. Antiaircraft shells converged on that plane and it crashed. We found later that the pilot was Leo Francis Berle of Boston, an American instructor from the Nicaragua base. Early that morning he had learned that the invasion forces were to be abandoned to their fate. Apparently, in anger and frustration, he had determined to uphold his own honor, at least.

One of Oliva's radiomen kept repeating this message: "This is Cuba calling the free countries. We need help in Cuba—now."

Like the coils of a great python, Castro's columns, with thousands of men supported by Russian tanks and bombing planes, were encircling our units and pressing them back toward the beach. We were outnumbered 40 to 1.

There can be no adequate description for the emotions that gripped us as we thought of what those planes on the U.S.S. *Boxer*, those guns on the two destroyers that had escorted us, and all our sunken mines and ammunition could do for us.

Manuel Artime Buesa and I were close by Col. San Roman during the final hours of our defeat. We heard him make his last anguished plea for help.

"Where is our support?" he asked.

From far away in the ocean came the reply:

"We cannot give you any further support. You are on your own."

Quickly, in the anger of a leader forsaken, San Roman replied:

"And you, sir, are a s — — of a b — — —!"

As the coils of Castro's python strangled us, one of our men shouted: "Headquarters says it's every man for himself."

I had resigned myself to being captured when I ran into Rene Salvia, a boyhood friend from my hometown. "Follow me," he shouted. We ran to the beach. Several lifeboats were filling with men and pushing out to sea. Howitzer shells were falling all around us. We spied a rubber raft floating near the shore—one used by frogmen to mark the route for our landing barges. It had an outboard motor and three oars. Rene and I piled into it, followed by Pepin Casals, Gardo Orlando, and Perez Jemenez. The motor refused to start, so we rowed out to sea.

For 4 days we paddled and drifted. About 5 o'clock on the fifth afternoon a freighter, the *Luisse*, bound for Corpus Christi, Tex., plucked us from the sea. Eventually I returned to Miami.

Since then, I have learned much from my friends in the revolutionary council about the invasion at the Bay of Pigs. I have learned that no preparations were made for our cooperation with the underground in Cuba. No campaign of civilian uprising and sabotage had been planned.

Both the U.S. military chiefs and the CIA blandly assumed that there was enough opposition to Fidel Castro inside Cuba to overthrow his regime, once the movement had been sparked by our invasion.

Our exile leaders reflect with great sorrow upon the fact that the U.S. decision to cancel the promised help to our invading forces included also a refusal to rescue our men and prevent their capture. Not even those in lifeboats or struggling in the water could be rescued. American naval personnel at Guantanamo heard our pleas for help, but, on orders from Washington, they could not move a vessel to assist.

It is known that Castro salvaged every item that went down with the *Houston* and the *Rio Escondido*—including our new secret communications system which, doubtless, now has been duplicated by every Communist military command in the world.

NO RANSOM WAS NECESSARY

Fidel Castro convicted 1,179 of the captives of treason. Now his demands for ransom have been met.

From my comrades of the invasion I have had my belief confirmed that no payment of ransom was necessary. The cowardly dictator had his plane all warmed up and waiting during the recent missile crisis, ready to flee the country at the first military move by the United States.

For me and for my comrades, the question still remains unanswered:

Why were we denied the help that would have uprooted the seedbed of Communist power in the Western Hemisphere?

Manuel Penabaz has fought against two Cuban dictators; first, Fulgencio Batista and then Fidel Castro. He tells the story of his life as a revolutionist in these words:

"For me, the story begins while I was a young lawyer in the town of Holguin, in Oriente Province, Cuba.

"My father, Manuel Penabaz, was a liberal member of the Cuban Parliament, advocating reforms to improve education and lift standards of living among the masses. I supported such liberal reforms, and became attorney for labor unions struggling for better wages and working conditions on the sugar plantations of Oriente.

"For these activities, the Batista regime hated my father and me and marked our family for persecution. On 13 different occasions I was thrown into Batista jails, and my house was burned to the ground.

"I struck back by joining the revolutionary forces of Fidel Castro and fought with them all the way from the Sierra Madre to Havana.

"Hardly had we reached Havana in triumph on January 1, 1959, when Fidel Castro revealed himself for what he is: A little dictator in the big arena of the Marxist battle to conquer the whole world.

"Castro ordered me to serve on the revolutionary court, which was a mass-denunciation type of lynching that horrified me and others like me who believed in constitutional rights and safeguards. I refused to serve and was thrown into jail. After 3 days, Fidel's brother, Raul Castro, came in and gave me this choice: 'Penabaz, you must serve as judge in the trials or leave the country.'

"I left, fleeing to Mexico.

"After some months of traveling about, hunting for work, I came to that refuge of so many Cuban exiles—Miami, Fla. There my wife and two children joined me. I worked at odd jobs—anything to make a living—until I heard the call for recruits to overthrow Castro."

When the 1961 invasion at the Bay of Pigs failed, Mr. Penabaz escaped, along with four companions, in a small rubber raft. They were picked up at sea by a passing freighter and made their way back to Miami.

Former Stillwater Resident Receives Medal for Poem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there is something about the nature and climate of Maine that inspires men to take up pen and write movingly and creatively.

Again we find evidence of this phenomena when it is discovered that another Maine man, Mr. Dalmar McPherson, has penned a poem that has won national distinction.

Mr. McPherson's creation issues a clear call that sweeps away the mists of uncertainty that hover over the true character of America.

It issues a clear-cut challenge that rings out for all Americans to hear, and I deem it highly worthy of insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I, therefore, insert into the RECORD an appropriate article from the Penobscot Times that gives due recognition to Mr. McPherson and true representation of his latest work:

FORMER STILLWATER RESIDENT RECEIVES MEDAL FOR POEM

Word has been received by the Penobscot Times that Dalmar S. McPherson, a native of Stillwater, was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal for his poem "Americans—Exporters to Tomorrow." The citation reads as follows: "The trustees, directors, and officers of Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge announce with pleasure the selection of Dalmar S. McPherson by the distinguished national and school awards jury to receive the George Washington Honor Medal for his poem 'Americans—Exporters to Tomorrow,' an outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a better understanding of the American way of life." The national awards announcement was made on George Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1962, at Valley Forge.

Mr. McPherson, the stepson of Mrs. Percy Wentworth, of Orono, was graduated from Old Town High School in 1936. He entered the University of Maine in the class of 1940 and attended 2 years. His college career was interrupted by 4 years of service in the U.S. Army Air Force as medic from October 1941 to December 24, 1945, when he was honorably discharged. During this period he served as first sergeant of a station hospital with 720 men. His tour of duty included both India and China.

Mr. McPherson reentered the University of Maine in February 1946, and was graduated in 1948 with a bachelor of arts degree. He tied with one other person to receive the Kidder scholarship, awarded to the highest ranking student in the junior class. After graduation Mr. McPherson entered into employment with the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. and was manager at Dover-Foxcroft in 1953–54. Then he was transferred to Portland, where he is currently sales manager for the Portland district—from Freeport south and west to New Hampshire territory.

A hobby which Mr. McPherson pursues even more ardently than writing is photography, and he has won prizes in national photo contests. He is one of Maine's best photography hobbyists, having become actively interested in photography in 1938. Many of his pictures, as well as the narrative to accompany them, have been used in Maine Lines, the official publication of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. Mention might well be made that his hobbies have led him to present the Maine and American point of view in a continuing collection of writing and photographs circulated internationally through the medium of the Leica postal portfolios.

Mr. McPherson was the first president of the Maine (State) Association for Retarded Children, later serving as secretary for 1 year. He was also appointed by Governor Muskie to serve on the Maine Committee on Problems of the Mentally Retarded. Mr. McPherson originated the name change from Pownal State School to Pineland Hospital and Training Center, a change which was authorized by the legislature. He is currently editing the monthly bulletin Pineland Progressive for the Pineland Parents & Friends Association.

Mr. and Mrs. McPherson (the former Arline Bernhardt) have two daughters, Barbara and Pamela. The family resides at 58 Gray Road in Gorham, Maine. He himself tells why he wrote "Americans—Exporters to Tomorrow"; "Over the years, especially during Army service in India and China, I grew increasingly aware of how much we have as Americans and how much we could share with the world. The essay is an expression of that awareness.

"I believe one of the most essential needs for Americans today is to develop ways to tell the truth about ourselves and our way of life. I don't think we can go about this by tearing down the other fellow. We have to approach it with the realism of advertising or marketing men who know their product and the way to show it. We have an obligation to ourselves to let the world know what our product is really like.

"Ours is probably the most misunderstood nation in the world—our motives are constantly challenged. The people of other countries often think us crude—even ugly. That picture of our people is not America as we know it.

"One of the greatest events of this year to help dispel the ugly awkward image was the successful orbit of John Glenn for all the world to see and hear. This leap forward, coming from the wake of repeated failures, is a supreme example of the job ahead for Americans. Throughout this man's entire feat runs the thread of closeness to the people. He has sprung from Hometown, America, and the people of the world seem to understand that.

"Today we face a challenge to lift our country's image out of the muddied palette where many others see it, to spread it on a canvas of light and truth and color that represents the real America.

"Whether we meet the challenge may one day be the real measure of this century."

AMERICANS—EXPORTERS TO TOMORROW

(By Dalmar McPherson)

One single word,
one word alone, embodies the Spirit of America.
One word encompasses all that is her greatness,
her immortal way of life.
Bound in her Bill of Rights and
bonded in her Constitution,
that word is Freedom.
In its fullest measure this one word is the spirit of our great Nation.
And the Spirit of America is the basic fundamental of our American Heritage.
It is our richest treasure,
dearly won and Priceless.
It is yet Costless to the poorest man.
Freedom is a Living Trust from God to man,
a trust to be passed on and guarded
with man's life,
for it is the safeguard of Liberty in Life.
Its first cry was sounded in the colonies of a new continent,
and its strength was tested in the storm of struggle
that brought forth this Covenant Nation—
"One Nation, under God."
The Freedom of America found its vitality in a People,
a people blessed
with a land of cool lakes and broad rivers
that formed highways of commerce
from forest to prairie,
a people building
small towns and large cities—
a country and a Way of Life,
a people forming a Government and Nation destined to carry
the Trust and Spirit of Freedom
beyond the cold of Concord and Valley Forge,
beyond the pain of Gettysburg and the tears of Appomattox,
beyond the Meuse-Argonne,
beyond the hard coral of Iwo Jima and hot stream of Burma, yes.
beyond Berlin and beyond even today.
The Freedom of America is deep in the heart and hope of a people determined to carry its Trust
to the unborn children
of an unseen tomorrow.
America's greatness comes because of her Freedom,
and it lives in her Freedom.
We are a people blessed
in God to be free,
and in His image we were created to carry forth His Trust.
How well we perform this task will forever be a measure
of man's history,
for in the lifestream of our Freedom
we carry the seeds of failure
or success
for others and ourselves.
This is the tool with which our forefathers made a Nation.
It is also the tool with which eventually
all the people of the world will toil.
Today we are Free
to use
or misuse
that tool.
The misuse of the tool of Freedom would be an Abdication of our Trust.
Americans and America are free to choose the Individual Way and the Nation's Path.
To each individual, Freedom is Liberty—not a License.
It is a Liberty of Choice,
and we must find our way to choose the right way
alone
and as a Nation.
As a nation we must forever guard this challenge to choose the Right
lest we lose the Right to Choose.
This challenge today is as clear as the choice of Patrick Henry.
It is to convey the cause of Liberty
in a confused and changing world
or
to let Freedom perish in the Spreading Death of Communism.
This is the duty which comes in Mid-Century to our people
in our place in time.
Mankind around the world is looking to America for strength to make its choice.
America must show plainly to those who look from all sides the unfaltering energy of Life in Freedom.
We must show to all men
that the flexible arrow of Freedom will rise higher than the tallest iron curtain.
Our example of Freedom must penetrate behind that curtain and bring Life to the souls of lost men everywhere on earth.

Our is not a short fight
to stir men's blood
or to gain allies in a savage battle.
Rather, we are now called to a greater consistency of purpose
and a greater persistency of effort
than any Nation has yet known.
Our Final Destiny as a Great Nation will be
to give to the men of Little Nations
the right to choose their own Destiny.
Ours is not to impose a way for others.
Ours is to give—and our gift is Freedom.
In Freedom there is Faith
and Hope,
and Charity.
If we are strong in our Faith,
if we fulfill the Hope of mankind,
we will export our Greatest Gift in Charity.
That gift is the Treasure and the Trust
of
Freedom.
It is more than a legacy.
It will be an export—
an export of hope
in the dimension of time,
because This People will be there still
to share God's Trust
with
the Humanity of Tomorrow.

Understanding the American System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed by an article on the need for understanding our American system, written by Herbert P. Buetow, president of the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. of St. Paul, which was published by the Committee for Constitutional Government. By unanimous consent, it is hereby reproduced in the RECORD:

UNDERSTANDING THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

The private enterprise system, absolutely essential for a free and strong America, cannot exist for very long if business and industry loses the support and respect of the American people.

At a time when this Nation stands in appalling need of the fruits of that system, it is disturbing to find that the image of business and industry is declining in the eyes of the American public. Ask yourself how this loss of public affection could occur during the very period in which the contributions of business to the freedom, strength, and happiness of America are at an all-time peak.

The system as a whole is not really being debated. Except for the socialists, surveys show that Americans approve private enterprise. What is being debated are parts of the system: Profits, pricing, bigness, patents, marketing, advertising, and others.

It seems that today the word "profits" has taken on an unfortunate connotation in our economy, almost as if profits were treasonable, rather than reasonable. Profits are essential and should be considered a cost of doing business—just like depreciation. So, too, should profits be recognized as a cost factor to be plowed back for acquisition of new facilities, as well as modernization and replacement. Research spending, always a gamble but necessary for growth, needs adequate profits for its continuance.

There is an erroneous impression that bigness means badness. It was size and willingness to cooperate that turned General Motors, the largest corporation in America, from automotive production to the greatest war-producing plants the world has ever known, to help us win two world wars and preserve our free society. Just think of the contributions, in peacetimes, made by our "big" aircraft companies, along with A.T. & T., in the satellite and space programs.

The pricing of finished products is questioned. When is a price a fair price? A price is fair when a customer willingly offers to pay it. The customer is the judge whether the product or service is worth the price.

What about uniform prices for nearly identical products? Good or bad? The fact that prices for cigarettes, for example, are identical for nearly identical products means that someone in the industry decided to sell his cigarettes at the lowest practical price. That made the price. Others had to follow or price themselves out of the market, unless they could market a superior product at a higher price. That's competition at its best, and another story that needs telling.

Then there is the misconception in the idea that the patent structure should be changed. The day on which our patent laws are weakened will be the day on which the superiority and aggressiveness of research will be inhibited.

How many really appreciate the social function of advertising? The millions of jobs it creates by the mass consumption it activates? How many recognize that production depends on consumption and that consumption depends on successful marketing? That less advertising means less taxpaying business?

These elements of business, profits, pricing, patents, and so on, are vital and essential to the survival of the American economic system. Yet we hear of proposals to change these essentials so much that there wouldn't be much left but the empty shell.

The American people, including the vast majority of our elected and appointed public officials, and the majority of our thought leaders in all areas, are as much in love with the private enterprise system as were the framers of our Constitution. Those within our borders who would deliberately destroy or weaken that system are too few in number and too shy in direct influence to bring this about, except with the unwritten assistance of an army of loyal and well-intentioned Americans.

They get this assistance only because many persons simply do not understand the essentials, the workings of the system, or the philosophy on which it is based. Many have unbounded faith in the system and think it cannot possibly be destroyed, or even injured, another unfortunate result of lack of understanding and the direct cause of much of our crippling legislation.

What can be done about it?

The problem is educational, not political.

It is not enough to be critical of an elective or appointed Government official for advocating a weaker patent system, confiscatory taxes, or more Government limitations on business. Constructive steps should be taken to remind him that public sector spending can only come from private sector earning, and that the long-range effects of slowing down the system will more than offset expected short-range benefits. Isn't it odd that we all believe in private enterprise and in do-it-yourself but, paradoxically, as we watch the weakening of our economic system we do not always rise to its defense, unrealistically waiting for someone else to do it?

The need, then, is for sweeping, convincing, and continuing educational work, persuasive contact with a great majority of the men, women, and children in America, with a realization that the job is a day in, day out, week in, week out, month in, month out, year-round educational job.

The business community, in particular, should support and help promote an understanding of the why of business and private enterprise. It is simple logic that business practitioners should become business missionaries, helping to make converts in every social and economic segment of the American public.

Unless we all help to give this subject the kind of exposure it needs, and unless we begin to communicate our thoughts to others, there should be no surprise if the vacuum we leave is filled with opinions destructive to the American way of life.

Our national economy must be understood in order to continue to exist, and you can help. You can't have the fruits of the system without the system. And you can't afford a weaker system because the size of the golden egg cannot exceed the dimensions of the goose.

A Lover's Quarrel With the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives an article written by a most outstanding newspaper columnist, Miss Mary McGrory, concerning the late Robert Frost whose name will always be in the heart of all those who love poetry.

The article reads as follows:

FROST WAS ENFOLDED INTO THE LIFE OF HIS TIMES

(By Mary McGrory)

Robert Frost was the rarest of beings, a great lyric poet who was honored in his own time as a sage.

He knew nothing of the isolation that genius can impose. He often cited what happened to Homer in contrast to his own fate:

"Seven cities claimed the Homer dead
Through which the living Homer begged his bread."

Robert Frost lacked nothing that the world could give him in the way of recognition or attention. His poetry was loved and understood. So was he.

Success and fame came to him when he was 40 years old and in another country. "A Boy's Will," his first published volume, appeared in England in 1915. Soon afterward he came home to an acclaim that stopped just short of idolatry and lasted for almost half a century.

He was enfolded into the life of his times as are few gravely gifted human beings. He was welcome at the White House and the Kremlin. He was quoted endlessly by John F. Kennedy during his campaign for the Presidency, and he became the first poet in American history to play a part in a Presidential inauguration.

Generations of students knew his rough white thatch, his piercing blue eyes, and his voice that Padraic Colum compared to "an eagle's bark."

Cabinet officers sat worshipfully at his feet and murmured his most famous lines as he spoke them.

He won the Pulitzer Prize for poetry four times. Even Congress, traditionally the last bastion of philistinism, capitulated in 1951 and gave him a gold medal.

His views on poetry, politics, love, death, art, and science were eagerly besought and recorded at hundreds of interviews. His press conferences at the Library of Congress, where he zestfully served several terms as consultant in poetry, were major news events, from which reporters emerged overwhelmed by charm and gnomic utterances.

The old bard would lean back, cross his high-laced shoes, and bemoan the fact that high Government officials didn't consult him about everything.

He provided the Kennedy inaugural with its most poignant moment. He stood up to read a slightly and specially revised version of "The Gift Outright," which he called "my most national poem." But he was blinded by the glare from the snow and faltered. When he finished, he was applauded by thousands and comforted by two Presidents.

Robert Frost relished his celebrity.

When Vermont made him its poet laureate in 1951, he wrote a quatrain which summarized his pleasure:

"Breathes there a bard who isn't moved
To know his verse is understood
And happily more or less approved
By his country and his neighborhood?"

His neighborhood was the world, and he knew it.

The fellow poets who envied his popularity never denied his great gift. He was hailed as the finest American poet since Walt Whitman.

When he recited his most famous lyrics, "On Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening" and "The Road Not Taken," he was, as often as not, accompanied by half the audience:

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep."

Almost any American who did not hear the poet recite these lines heard them from the candidate for the Presidency, John F. Kennedy.

"Something there is that doesn't love a wall" is known the world around.

In an age when poetry meant obscurity, his expression was crystal clear. His themes were of his homeland, New England; birches, and cows.

His poetry had the sweetness and the harshness of the Yankee landscape. It has not been imitated.

He resisted all attempts to draw him into the murky and cryptic imagery that was the vogue when he was young and unknown. His models were Latin lyricists, Theocritus and Catullus.

Ezra Pound, his first patron, tried to lure him into forms like his own. Frost, although unsure and unsung, fought him off. But he repaid Pound's kindness in full 40 years later.

While Pound was confined in St. Elizabeths Hospital after his wartime adventures as a broadcaster for Mussolini, Frost used his enormous prestige with a fellow New Englander, Sherman Adams, then Assistant to President Eisenhower, to set in motion the wheels that led to his release.

Robert Frost's reputation rests primarily on his lyrics, which are so loved and understood. But a young poet, W. D. Snodgrass, has pointed out that he should not be written off as a gentle philosopher.

Some of Frost's more somber poems, "The Death of the Hired Man" and "Home Burial," for instance, are hair raising and show him an an incomparable poet of "bleakness and vacancy."

In his early life Frost knew much bleakness and vacancy. Claimed by New England, he was born in San Francisco, where he lived the first 11 years under the shadow of an erratic father. He was sickly and considered unteachable. When his Scottish-born mother brought him back to her disapproving Yankee in-laws, young Robert worked in a mill and as a hired hand and a cobbler.

He went to Dartmouth University and quit. After he married his high school sweetheart, he went 2 years to Harvard, but was exasperated by academic "busy work" and gave up again. His disgusted grandfather, totally out of sympathy with his desire to write poetry, gave Frost a farm in Derry, N.H., and told him to "go and starve."

Frost, father of a young family, scratched a bare living out of the grudging soil. He saw two of his six children die. He later reproached himself for the bitter life his family knew during those years.

At the age of 38 he had never talked with another poet. Finally, in 1912, he took his brood to England, where "A Boy's Will" was published. Three years later, he came home to write and teach and talk, to the growing approval of his countrymen. He was steadily published, and his books sold more than any poetry in American literary history.

After his wife's death in 1938, he took to what he called "barding around." No bard was ever more warmly received. He received more than 40 honorary degrees. He made poetry lovers of three generations. He was poetry to America.

He kept up with politics and science. He was impressed by science but not dazzled. "The best description of man is the humanities," he said.

He observed keenly the struggle between East and West. He declared: "I would rather perish as Athens than prevail as Sparta."

He hailed the Kennedy administration as launching a new era for poets. He was available, but always his own man. "I want people to stand off, and I want to stand them off," he said.

In "The Lesson for Today," he wrote his own epitaph:

"And were an epitaph my story
I would have a short one ready for my own.
I would have written of me on my stone:
'He had a lover's quarrel with the world.'"

Few quarrels were more lyrically or rewardingly conducted.

Patrick Cudahy, Inc., Packinghouse Workers Show Exemplary Labor-Management Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, statesmanslike relationship between labor and management can bring great benefits to both.

This was admirably demonstrated recently when a Wisconsin firm, Patrick Cudahy, Inc., and the United Packinghouse Workers of America (AFL-CIO) cooperated to avert a threatened closing of the plant, turn losses to profits and save the jobs of some 1,000 workers.

Richard Dickson Cudahy, the able president of the company, and Ralph Helstein, president of the international union, deserve praise for the notable achievement which their vision largely made possible.

The following story from the Chicago Daily News of January 26, 1963, tells the story of this exemplary success:

THE SALVAGING OF 1,000 JOBS—UNION HELPS CUDAHY TRIM FAT, SAVE FIRM—LABOR, MANAGEMENT JOIN FORCES; EVERYONE PROFITS

(By Robert M. Lewin)

Patrick Cudahy Inc., one of the Nation's oldest meat packing firms, is still in business because the union representing its employees and the company jointly tackled a problem.

The company's problem was money losses.

The company's problem gave the union a problem: job losses.

Earnings of the company in Cudahy, a suburban community not far into Wisconsin from Illinois' northern border, began to tumble in the late 1950's.

Red ink that was splashed on company ledgers showed losses of $1 million a year.

The red ink signaled a decision to close the plant and go out of business after 75 years of operation.

Richard Dickson Cudahy, 36, who became president of the company in December 1960 told the union so.

Cudahy, a West Point and Yale University Law School graduate, and a grandson of the late founder of the company, Patrick Cudahy, had left the Chicago law firm of Isham & Beale to run the packing business.

Richard's father, William F. Cudahy, 76, now company chairman and a son of Patrick, had asked Richard to take over as president.

FACES LOSS OF 1,000 JOBS

The Chicago-based AFL-CIO United Packinghouse Workers of America faced the loss of 1,000 jobs for workers it represents.

The union offered to see what it could do to help keep the company going, to save the jobs and to convert losses into profits.

The family-owned company does $80 million-a-year business, selling a large part of its meats and products to major chain supermarkets and food stores.

We will not cut or touch our wage scale, Ralph Helstein, president of the international union, told Richard.

"We are not specifically asking you to," countered Cudahy.

But he emphasized that unless the efficiency of the operations was improved the company was shutting up shop.

No pay and fringe benefits cuts long have been a principle with Helstein—a contract is a contract, he contends.

Recently the pay and benefits of some 2,000 packinghouse workers in southern plants of Armour & Co. and Swift & Co. were cut more than 60 cents an hour after the companies threatened to close their plants.

The AFL-CIO Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, and the National independent, represented the workers. The reductions they agreed to saved the plants and the jobs.

But Helstein and members of his union refused to budge when Wilson & Co. threatened to shut down its Memphis (Tenn.) plant.

It went out of business—putting 350 of Helstein's union members and 110 salaried employes out of work. Wilson paid $325,000 in severance pay.

At Cudahy, employes have worked for many years under an incentive system.

Production standards were set—and the employes would get extra pay for additional output. Seventy-five percent of the em-

ployes work under the incentive system, which the company controlled.

"We were confronted with an abnormally high unit cost," said Cudahy.

"The incentive system got out of whack," added Helstein.

AGREES TO LOWER INCENTIVE RATES

The union agreed to lower incentive rates pending an overhaul of the entire system and a job-by-job study. But Helstein insisted that base and hourly scales remain the same.

John A. Patton and Thaddeus J. Wieczorek, management consultants from Chicago, were called in and given until Jan. 1, this year, to finish the job.

Local 40, representing the employes at the plant, ratified the agreement to overhaul the system.

The Company, whose plant occupies three blocks and has stockyards big enough to handle 25,000 hogs, rearranged its layout and some facilities, but did not install new or automated equipment.

"We made alterations to conform to a more efficient use of manpower," said Cudahy.

As a result of the overhaul, he stressed, incentive employes now average higher earnings than they did before the company took its problem to the union.

"We are operating profitably now," said Cudahy. "We have no thought of going out of business. We are a sound, going concern."

Joseph H. Becker, 53, a Cudahy employee for 33 years and chief steward of Local 40, said, "We're producing more now and earning more—and it's to the benefit of the company and the employees.

"This was a constructive effort by the union and the company," continued Becker. "Otherwise, we'd be on the street. Men in their fourties and fifties probably would never get another job."

Steven G. Wojs, 48, who trims picnic hams and has worked at Cudahy for 27 years, said that he is "making more and producing more."

"I can't complain," he said. "Before, I had more time to stand around. The fellows used to walk around the plant. I'm producing now."

Wojs said that he earns "pretty close to $4 an hour." His gross earnings range from $140 to $160 a week, he added. He said that his base pay is $2.73 an hour.

"If a company isn't making money, you can't stay in business," Wojs continued. "It's on a profitable base now."

Asked whether he now has job security, he replied: "I hope so."

Cudahy said the employees now average $3.31 an hour, including overtime, plus fringe benefits of about 25 percent.

He also said the union contract specifies a minimum basic rate of $2.41 an hour and a maximum basic rate of $3.28. The employees, in addition, get a 4-cent-an-hour cost of living allowance.

The American Meat Institute estimated that of the sales dollar in 1961 for meat products, 12.6 percent went for wages and salaries.

The union estimates that the hourly worker's share is 9 percent.

Helstein said that when the company explained its problem to the union and provided the supporting data, "We were glad to cooperate—this is not a one-way street."

Cudahy said, "It could very well be that this company wouldn't be in existence today if it weren't for the cooperation of the union. The union recognized its own interests in this case, too."

Limitation of Bracero Forcing Mechanization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Limitation of Bracero Forcing Mechanization," a report in the Arizona Daily Star for January 30 of the speech by Deputy Director Max Salazar, New Mexico Employment Security Commission. Mr. Salazar's comments were presented at the National Farm Labor Conference on January 29:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Jan. 30, 1963]

FARM GROUP HEARS EMPLOYMENT OFFICIAL—LIMITATION OF BRACEROS FORCING MECHANIZATION—NEED OF DOMESTIC LABOR IN UNITED STATES IS HELD FADING

(By Tony Fortuno)

Restrictions against the use of braceros on American farms are forcing growers to mechanize and at the same time erasing the need for domestic labor, a New Mexico employment official said yesterday.

"I know I'm not very popular when I make such a statement," Max Salazar said. "I'm persona non grata."

Salazar, deputy director of the New Mexico Employment Security Commission, spoke on the adverse effect of foreign labor programs on domestic workers at the National Farm Labor Conference at the Hiway House Hotel.

"Of all the topics, that is the last one I wanted to be assigned to speak on," he said.

"I remember when there were 29,000 braceros in New Mexico during a peak cotton harvest season, mid-October.

"Last year on October 15, there were only 1,649, and this month only 41," he said.

This year the bracero program will be virtually nonexistent in New Mexico, he stated, adding that the cotton industry in the State is 90 percent mechanized.

"Displacement of labor by machines is not limited to Mexican nationals, but results for all labor when it occurs. Cotton harvest in particular has offered employment at piece rates to many marginal workers, including youth, older workers, and those with physical handicaps," Salazar told his audience.

According to Salazar the forces that have been put in motion to eliminate the use of foreign workers and the problem of adverse affect on domestic laborers, are in the process of also eliminating the need for all manual labor.

Salazar pointed to New Mexico's Mesilla Valley and Texas' El Paso Valley where some $6 million has been invested in mechanical cotton harvesters.

In his speech he reviewed the Government's legislation and actions on the Mexican labor program, since 1948, Salazar said Congress passed Public Law 78 in 1950 to meet basically two objectives:

"Obtain agricultural workers from Mexico to meet peak seasonal labor shortages, and insure that domestic farmworkers would not be adversely affected by employment of Mexicans."

A review 8 years later showed there was less success in meeting the second objective which led to a series of reforms and amendments to the law, tightening the use and number of Mexican nationals in the United States.

The 3-day conference of some 400 State employment officials and Government labor and agricultural officials ends this afternoon.

General Motors Distributes $74,400,000 to Its Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is always gratifying when one hears of the success of a cooperative plan between employees and their employers in solving some of life's day-to-day problems. That 87 percent of eligible employees are participating in the saving stock purchase program of the General Motors Corp. illustrates the temperament of many U.S. citizens desiring to build up a small nest egg. This must certainly have a great deal of influence in their attitude toward further saving and the further purchase of consumers' durable goods. A recent release sets forth the operation of this company-employee cooperation.

DETROIT.—Distribution, January 23, 1963, of approximately $74,400,000 in General Motors common stock, Government bonds, and cash to 58,300 salaried employees in the United States who participated in the 1957 savings fund plan under the corporation's savings-stock purchase program was announced by Frederic G. Donner, General Motors chairman.

This year's distribution represents a return of more than $2.50[1] for every dollar saved by General Motors salaried employees enrolled in the program.

The distribution results from $29,460,000 in savings by employees and $14,730,000 contributed by the corporation, both made during 1957. Under the savings-stock purchase program, General Motors contributes $1 for each $2 of employee savings. Including interest and dividends earned between January 1, 1957, and December 31, 1962, and appreciation in value of General Motors common stock, employees received 918,000 shares of General Motors common stock with a market value of $55,100,000, 554,400 series E bonds of varying denominations with a current value of $16,900,000, and approximately $2,400,000 in cash.

In the 7¼ years since the program began, General Motors salaried employees have saved more than $374 million. Half of the employees' savings is invested in Government bonds and half in General Motors common stock. The corporation's contribution and all dividends are invested entirely in General Motors common stock.

[1] Based on General Motors common stock at $60 per share.

"The savings-stock purchase program has two objectives—to encourage employees to put aside a portion of their income in a systematic manner for future contingencies and to increase the number of employees owning General Motors stock," Mr. Donner said.

"The success of the program is attested by the fact that 87 percent of eligible employees are participating in the savings-stock purchase program, saving an average of 8 percent of salary. Further, as a result of the current distribution, an additional 14,000 employees became new stockholders in the corporation."

Eligible employees may elect to participate in the savings fund plan, under which the current payments are being made, or they may elect to join the retirement thrift plan.

The distribution today was made to participants in the savings fund plan of the class of 1957. This is the third distribution since the plan became effective October 1, 1955. A class is formed each year and matures 5 full years after the year of formation.

Employees participating in the 1957 class of the retirement thrift plan had to their credit at the end of 1962 Government securities with a current market value of about $1,900,000 and a total of 102,000 shares of General Motors common stock. While these amounts will not become payable until the employee retires or otherwise terminates employment, the employee may withdraw securities purchased with his own savings without affecting his right to receive, when his employment terminates, the securities attributable to General Motors contributions.

Under the savings-stock purchase program, all salaried employees with 1 year or more of continuous service are eligible to participate on a voluntary basis. They may save up to 10 percent of their salary.

What Helps One Helps Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, at this time when we are seeking ways to promote comity between the Government, the public interest, and private enterprise, I commend to my colleagues the sage observations of an outstanding American who has led in government, leads in business and always moves in the interests of his party and the public. The following editorial appeared in the Ada, Okla., Evening News:

WHAT HELPS ONE HELPS MANY

While James A. Farley was a member of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Cabinet, we considered him one of the strongest in the Government. Since his retirement from Government service, he has demonstrated that he is one of the able business men of the age.

The former Postmaster General is now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. In this connection he has become acquainted with big business both in this country and in its ramifications throughout the world.

Not long ago he made a talk to the alumni of Iona College in New York. The two following paragraphs contain a bit of business information which may interest you:

"For example, take the recent headlines on big steel. The United States Steel Co. paid in direct wages about $1,600 million. That's fair; 200,000 men work hard for that, every working day. The stockholders get $200 million in dividends; that's fair, too; they take the risk. Their money is first in and last out. Now, I don't care what formal economists say, the workers of United States Steel and the shareholders of United States Steel are partners. And out of that partnership the Government collects in taxes as much as is paid to the stockholders.

"Of course, what is true of United States Steel is true of every major corporation of our country. Their partnerships do not extend only to the one between stockholders and workers. They apply to their suppliers. Thus, United States Steel bought over a billion dollars from smaller businesses last year. These smaller businesses, along with direct wages, account for nearly two-thirds of the expenditures. I cite this to prove that American small business is the partner of the larger corporations. This is true of every major corporation. Of my own, Coca-Cola, for example, we have extended this principle of American economic partnership to over 110 countries, and each of those partnerships proves that the American way is not limited by geographical location. The system of private enterprise, economic partnership, and political freedom can perform a service and show a profit anywhere free men are permitted to operate, which brings me to the point from which I started—that the real values of this life are not material. That flag flying above our heads represents the spirit and the Government of the American people."

Conservation Program Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Wichita Falls Times of January 23, 1963, speaks very highly of the program of conservation proposed this year by the administration.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Conservation is back on the Kennedy administration's agenda this year. The President is said to be determined to get Congress to do two things.

One is to pass a wilderness bill, which the Senate passed by 78 to 8 in 1961. The House could not act on this measure because its Interior Committee offered an unacceptable substitute under terms that limited debate and barred amendments.

The Senate measure would have designated and protected as wilderness about 14 million acres already set aside as such through administrative action, largely by the Forest Service. The task which the adminisration has set for itself is to see that the House can fairly consider something like the Senate's original sound approach.

A second measure which has administration priority involves a land conservation fund—an 8-year, $600 million joint Federal-State program to buy or develop new outdoor recreational facilities. Congress held up this proposal last year because of the protest by boating interests against a proposed $5 minimum tax on boats of more than 14 feet in length. Secretary of Interior Udall suggests that this tax plan will be dropped in favor of an indirect excise levy on boats as they are manufactured.

Between modifications in this bill and an energetic effort for the wilderness project, the administration has at least a fair chance of securing its conservation program. The program itself is the most constructive to be offered in a long time on a matter of vital public interest.

Television Advertising's Role as a Major National Economic Growth Factor—Jericho: The Wall Between Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as the only present Congressman associated with the advertising business, it was my honor to attend the recent Television Bureau's Washington, D.C., showing of "Jericho." Under unanimous consent, I include my remarks at the showing, together with a brief summary of the film, at this point in the RECORD:

I would like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to be with you this morning. Yesterday I saw an advance print of "Jericho," the presentation you are going to see this morning. It is, obviously, aimed at manufacturers and advertisers but I believe the basic message is far broader.

As you know, I am from California. California, like television, is something about which everyone has an opinion, everyone is an expert. However, these opinions about California, just like those about television, are sometimes not quite right, too often reflect a lack of real knowledge or real understanding on the part of the people. California is more than a swimming pool in everyone's backyard just as television is more than a western in every time period.

One of the concepts of today's presentation is the need for those who wish the public to understand something to go to these people and tell them what they wish understood. This is TVB's job as far as television is concerned, and it is one of my jobs as far as California is concerned.

But how do I tell you about my State and my district without taking you there? How can I convince you that California is far more than Hollywood? Big Sur is a beautiful part of my State but it isn't all my State. Smog exists in California, but not every place and not any place all the time.

And so I, as Congressman from the 36th District of California, have something I wish the public understood and better appreciated. I believe that each one of you, regardless of where you are from or the type of company or industry you represent, you too have things you wish more of the public understood and appreciated.

It takes no knowledge at all to be able to say that the most efficient way of going to the public to tell them something is through advertising. The contributions advertising has made to our physical well-being through the distribution of news about new products and new services are well known by those who have cared enough to study advertising and how it works. But I feel that even advertising's best informed friends too often overlook the still more important contribution advertising has made toward the understanding of ideas, concepts, opinions.

When people talk about advertising, they usually refer to the selling of products and

they too seldom think of advertising's ability to promote the understanding of ideas. Without these ideas, I believe our national economy would be far less active, far more static, far less healthy.

We in America have long believed in free speech. The right of free speech, however, carries with it the obligation to express our opinions, to have something to say. Advertising that expresses ideas, that exercises this right of free speech, is advertising in the public interest. It makes us think. It tells us things we should know. It offers us opportunities to debate and question. It keeps us alert and, at the same time, it can act to alert us.

In the presentation you are about to see and which I saw yesterday, there are many examples of how manufacturers have expressed their opinions not only about their products or their industries but about their rights to do business. If you as citizens and as members of our American economy have opinions about your freedom to speak and your freedom to grow, then I urge you to express them.

Silence may be golden but if there is something that needs to be said, silence may be deadly. Silence, to government, may too often stand for agreement or, even worse, no opinion. Without your expressed opinion, government would find it impossible to act as you wish government to act. And one way to express your opinion to government is by expressing it to the public because, as you know, government is the public.

Advertising and television are exciting professions today. I assure you government is too. There is little that can happen today without the involvement of government, advertising, and television. The working together of these basic ways of moving ahead will be an important key to the future of all of us.

"Jericho," today's presentation, has a message. I hope that you will have them too. And, of course, may I take this opportunity to invite you to visit my fair State of California, to see for yourself that California is more than sun glasses, although the view is certainly rosy.

Thank you.

SUMMARY—"JERICHO"—THE WALL BETWEEN US

This is the Television Bureau of Advertising's 1962–63 presentation designed to show industry its need to reach the total public through advertising.

Product manufacturers have long used advertising to sell their own product. Now ingredient product manufacturers are using advertising to sell the products into which their ingredient goes: steel promotes new cars made of steel. And more manufacturers are promoting their entire industry either on their own or through their association (American Gas Association).

The profitability of going to the public through advertising is best seen by combining Fortune magazine's "Top 500 Corporations" with TVB's "Top 100 National Advertisers." Between 1956 and 1961, the top 500 increased sales by 20 percent but net profits by only 1 percent. The top advertisers who went toward the public but kept their distance by spending less than half their budget in television, had a 13 percent increase in sales and a 6 percent increase in profits. The companies that went closest to the public by spending half or more of their advertising budget in television had a 44 percent sales increase and net profits increased 50 percent.

The era when industry could grow without involvement with the public has ended. Growing stockholder lists and increased union strength divide corporate control and yet corporate management retains the responsibility for corporate growth.

This management is learning that what the public thinks of its company will influence the sales of its products sometimes more than what the public thinks of the products themselves. And the same management is finding that television best reaches the total public to create the total impression about product, about company.

There is no one way for corporations to use television to help themselves. As today's presentation was introduced, there is as much opportunity for the small, local, or regional advertiser to buy television in keeping with his budget to cover his area as there is for the national advertiser to cover the Nation. The problem today is finding that management that sees the need to express its opinions to the total public it serves and the appreciation of television as the medium through which to do this.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room 112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

To Still Freedom's Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, in the RECORD is an article written by Harold E. Fey, editor of the Christian Century magazine, which gave reasons why the continued existence of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is detrimental to the Nation's health.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD the text of the January 31, 1963, newsletter of the American Security Council, entitled "To Still Freedom's Voice." This newsletter, as an editor's note on page 1 indicates, was written by our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER, at the request of the American Security Council because of "the renewed vigor of the Communist attack" on the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This newsletter is, I believe, a most effective reply to the article by Mr. Fey and makes it crystal clear why this House should, without question, retain the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In comparing these two articles, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the House consider the relative authority with which the authors speak and also the authority of those who are quoted in or endorse these two articles.

First, I would like to point out that Mr. Fey is not, and never has been, recognized here in this country or anywhere else as an authority on communism and how to fight it. To the contrary, although I am certain that he is not in the least bit pro-Communist, he has naively given his support to a number of Communist fronts.

To bolster the position he takes in his article, Mr. Fey quotes two men, Alan Barth and Telford Taylor. These two men, again, are not recognized as authorities on communism, and such public name as they have is based largely on the fact that they have been outspoken critics of numerous anti-Communist and security measures taken by the U.S. Government and particularly congressional investigations of subversion.

Mr. Fey names some religious leaders who, he says, have called for abolition of the committee. Again, not one of these men is recognized as an authority on communism. On the other hand, religious leaders who do have such recognition, are the authors of well-known books on the subject and famed speakers on it, have indicated their support of the committee by voluntarily testifying before it on various phases of communism. They are—

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the 84-year-old Christian Herald, the most widely circulated interdenominational monthly in the United States; Bishop Fulton Sheen; Dr. S. Andhil Fineberg, community religious consultant of the American Jewish Committee and director of its program against communism; and Dr. Charles W. Lowry, chairman and executive director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.

Numerous other clergymen and religious leaders have endorsed the work of the committee and urged its continuance.

Though, as I said before, Mr. Fey is in no way recognized as an authority on communism, the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on the other hand, is recognized throughout our Nation as a real authority on the subject and how communism should be fought

Moreover, in what he states in his article, he does not stand alone. He is supported by the distinguished officers, members, and consultants of the American Security Council.

Who are these men? I will not take the time to name them all, but do want to mention a few of the names, at least, that are known to every American and also some of those who, because of their scholarly writings on the subject of communism, are recognized not only in this country but abroad as outstanding authorities on the subject: Loyd Wright, former president of the American Bar Association and former Chairman of the Commission on Government Security; Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb; Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, and former special adviser on strategic intelligence to the Air Force; Adm. Felix B. Stump, former commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and chief executive officer of the Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge; Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, of the University of Notre Dame; Edward Ansel Mowrer, the well-known author, columnist, and commentator on national and international affairs; and Dr. William R. Kintner of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.

I could go on, but I believe the few names I have mentioned are sufficient to convince all Americans where the voice of authority, the voice of knowledge, and the voice of America lies on the question of the Committee on Un-American Activities and whether it should be continued by this House.

The newsletter follows:

TO STILL FREEDOM'S VOICE

At the direction of Moscow, one of the most intense Communist drives to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities that has ever been waged is now in full swing.

Top-ranking Communists from more than 20 countries met in Lidice, Czechoslovakia (near Prague), at the end of May 1962, to plan how Communists in various countries could best destroy their enemies and thus pave the way for a Communist victory. Under the title "Anticommunism, the Enemy of Mankind," abridged proceedings of this gathering have been published in the World Marxist Review, the official world Communist directive organ published in Prague in 18 languages.

These proceedings reveal that seven steps were spelled out at this international Communist conference as essential to the victory of communism in the United States. The fourth reads, in part, as follows: "Abolition of the House Un-American Committee."

For months the Communist press and top U.S. party leaders have been exhorting the party faithful to concentrate on abolition activity. Numerous party fronts have been thrown into the campaign. Many thousands of dollars are being spent.

WHAT IS THE PARTY'S ABOLITION STRATEGY?

It is to demand outright abolition of the committee by amending the House rules. Knowing, however, that there is no possibility of achieving this at present, the party is concentrating on a half-a-loaf strategy. It has called for the transfer of the committee's functions to a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and, failing that, a large cut in the committee's appropriation. Either move would drastically impair the committee's operations and, the party hopes, pave the way for its complete destruction.

Representatives LINDSAY and FARBSTEIN, of New York, and ROOSEVELT, of California, have introduced resolutions to transfer the committee's functions to the Judiciary Committee.

The party is now claiming that, as a result of the thousands of telegrams and letters it has caused to be sent to Congressmen and the personal visits to them by about 100 Communists and fellow travelers who were in Washington on the opening days of the new Congress, 84 House Members will vote for these resolutions or to oppose the committee appropriation.

The actual record of the committee—as opposed to the lies about it spread by the Communists with the help of some not so highly principled liberals—reveals what will actually be at stake when these questions come to a vote.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

During the years 1941–62, the Committee on Un-American Activities made 142 legislative recommendations to Congress, 98 without repetition (44 have been repeated to emphasize legislative security gaps and keep these issues alive until effective legislation is enacted).

Forty-two of the committee's recommendations have been enacted into law. (An indication of the soundness of the committee's recommendations: the last Congress enacted 6 bills embodying 7 committee recom-

mendations, and members introduced 113 bills to implement its recommendations.)

The committee has developed information relating to policy rather than legislative problems. At least 13 of its policy recommendations have been put into practice by the executive branch.

The American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics, and Objectives made the following finding, on July 1, 1960, concerning the committee's legislative activity:

"The record of the HCUA and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security is one of accomplishments and achievements despite the fact they have been the targets of inspired propaganda attacks designed to curb their effectiveness. Continuation of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound security legislation."

THE COMMITTEE'S METHODS

The committee has actually been a pacesetter for other committees in the field of refining and improving congressional committee procedures and practices.

As far back as March 1945, at the request of the committee, the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., published a document entitled "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities." This study, based on the Constitution, has since been used by the committee as a guide to its operations and procedures.

The committee was the first House committee to publish rules of procedure (1953). It had followed these rules for several years before publishing them.

During the 84th Congress, the House considered the advisability of authorizing one-man subcommittees (as in the Senate). The counsel of the Committee on Un-American Activities, representing the committee, argued against the proposal so strongly and effectively before the Rules Subcommittee, that the idea was dropped.

The Special Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics, and Objectives of the American Bar Association, after reviewing the committee's hearings some years ago, stated:

"The congressional committees investigating communism, and in particular the House Un-American Activities Committee, have been attacked on the ground that they have engaged in smear campaigns and have invaded the constitutional rights of persons investigated. Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which hearings before that committee have been conducted. * * * We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved. * * *"

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE COMMITTEE AND ITS ACTIVITIES

Because the Communist Party is so intent on destroying the committee, it fights it in every way possible, not only by propaganda and agitation—and even by riots at the committee's hearings—but also in the courts. Invariably, the committee's contempt citations are appealed following conviction. Although the Supreme Court has upset a number of these convictions on technicalities (after lower courts had upheld them), it has repeatedly sustained the constitutionality of the committee, its procedures and actions.

There is no committee of the Congress, actually, which has had its basic constitutionality so thoroughly tested by the courts of this land as has the Committee on Un-American Activities.

WATCHDOG FUNCTION

Legislative oversight—keeping a watchful eye on the administration of the law by the executive branch—is another duty of every congressional committee. The Committee on Un-American Activities' recent investigation of security practices in the National Security Agency—our Government's super-secret code and communications arm—following the defection of two NSA employees to the Soviet Union, demonstrates how it has carried out its duties in this field.

Because of NSA's highly sensitive operations, the committee's hearings were held in 16 secret sessions (a revealing comment on the committee's alleged penchant for headline hunting). When its investigation was completed, the NSA Personnel Director had been fired; the Security Director had "resigned"; 26 employees had been dismissed as sex deviates and 22 reforms in NSA security procedures had been instituted.

THE INFORMING FUNCTION

Revelation, the development of facts (the committee's enemies like to call it "exposure") about conditions affecting the national welfare and the related activities of certain individuals and groups, is an inevitable side effect of congressional hearings. This is as our Founding Fathers intended it to be—so that the Congress would be informed about matters vitally affecting the Nation and could act and vote accordingly.

Almost 4,000 witnesses have testified before the committee during the past 25 years. The overwhelming majority have been Communist Party members, but the number also includes top authorities on communism such as J. Edgar Hoover.

Information developed for the Congress by the committee through its investigations and hearings has been published in 497 separate volumes, occupying 11 feet of shelf space.

Public demand has been such that over 7 million copies of these documents have been distributed—and requests for them are increasing. In 1962, the committee distributed over 456,000 copies of its publications, an alltime annual high.

Alger Hiss, Gerhart Eisler, J. Peters, Harry Dexter White, and Nathan Gregory Silvermaster are just a few of the many persons whose operations as Soviet spies, Comintern agents and infiltrators of high Government posts, have been uncovered by the committee. Its hearings have destroyed the effectiveness of numerous party fronts, infiltration schemes and united front operations.

Committee documents are used as texts and supplemental reading materials in high schools, colleges and seminars, Government agencies, and by foreign governments. They provide speech material for Government officials, civic leaders, educators, and clergymen, as well as Members of Congress and the press. They have been distributed abroad as weapons in the battle for men's minds.

Numerous books on communism, written by recognized scholars and authorities, refer to, quote from, and base their findings on committee hearings and reports.

Abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities—let's face it—means destroying the agency that has developed more security legislation, given the Congress more information about communism, and done more harm to the Communist Party than any other institution, public or private, in this country. To do this at a time when world communism strength is at an alltime high, is suicidal.

I fully appreciate why the Communists, and Moscow, want to destroy the committee. The so-called liberals, though, have me utterly confused.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Cooperative Development of Western Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Frank J. Barry, ranged over a wide field of topics vital to the development of the West in an address to the National Association of Counties meeting in Las Vegas, Nev., on December 12, 1962. Cooperation between the Federal Government and local government is a daily reality often ignored by critics of federalism. In his address Mr. Barry pointed the way for increased cooperation between units of government. His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF SOLICITOR FRANK J. BARRY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE WESTERN REGIONAL DISTRICT MEETING, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, LAS VEGAS, NEV., DECEMBER 12, 1962

It is a pleasure for me to talk with you this morning about federally owned land and water resources. I know you have a very real stake in their future. A complete understanding of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States and their subdivisions is necessary if we are to accomplish our joint objectives which must be the conservation and use of our resources for maximum benefit of all the people.

I am aware that you people are somewhat in the forgotten-man status as far as water is concerned. The cities are concerned mostly with a water supply for domestic and industrial purposes, and irrigation districts are usually organized to work with us on the development of agricultural water. The States, of course, are interested in protection of water rights and also with insuring that the available water resources are utilized to the maximum degree possible.

But you are concerned because you have the primary responsibility for property tax assessment and tax income. Any action affecting publicly owned resources will affect the tax base of the respective counties. An apparent solution would be for the Government to get out of the land and water business entirely, and turn everything over to private ownership and exploitation to become a part of the tax base. Just as good safe driving is dependent on keeping an eye on distant as well as immediate traffic, good government depends on our ability to anticipate the consequences of irrevocable steps taken today.

We had an example of shortsighted resource development in the western expansion following the California gold strike in 1849. The Government was doing everything possible to encourage opening up of the prairie and mountain lands. Not only were our resources exploited merely for the profit of the few, but priceless wealth had been squandered and wasted, and in many areas the land had been irretrievably lost.

It required the positive action of President Theodore Roosevelt, to bring order out of chaos and to awaken America to the need for conservation. It took followup action by other great national leaders to complete the rescue job and to put us on the way to orderly development and use of our resources

for the benefit of the many rather than the few.

President Kennedy fits into this great tradition. In his conservation message to the Congress less than a year ago, he had this to say:

"We depend on our natural resources to sustain us—but in turn, their continued availability must depend on our using them prudently, improving them wisely, and, where possible, restoring them promptly. We must reaffirm our dedication to the sound practices of conservation which can be defined as the wise use of our natural environment; it is, in the final analysis, the highest form of national thrift—the prevention of waste and despoilment while preserving, improving and renewing the quality and usefulness of all our resources."

I can assure you that all of us in the Department of the Interior from Secretary Udall right through to the field people with whom you deal, are working to meet these objectives. In pursuing these objectives, we are working for the best interests of the States and their subdivisions and all the people who make up the West.

One of the most eloquent passages in our statutes is a few lines from the section creating our National Park Service. The reference is to parks and the things of value therein, but the same words could be applied to minerals, and forests, to land and water. The statute says the purpose is to provide for the enjoyment of such values "in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

In the long run, a wise public resource policy will reflect itself in a wider tax base through higher land values and a stimulated economy, and this beautiful rich land of ours will be left unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

The future of all communities depends in great measure on the continuing development not only of the lands immediately surrounding them but also of the lands in their hinterlands. Western communities surrounded by public lands, therefore, have a significant stake in those public lands.

Communities are particularly interested in residential, private commercial and industrial, and public recreation and other public purpose developments. They are especially interested in the more intensive types of development.

Possibly the development most difficult to achieve under existing public land laws is private commercial and industrial. To achieve what is now possible, we have to use a great variety of expensive and time-consuming methods. The main recourse is to exchanges, either directly with the private company involved or with a third party (sometimes a State) who in turn deals with the company. We have experienced some notable successes with this method, but there is much to be desired.

Other methods are sales under the isolated tract and rough- or mountainous-tract law where applicable. This works occasionally. Private legislation is often necessary to solve a particular problem. Other methods include selection of lands by a State for lease or sale to the interested developer.

The Government has a pretty good tool in the townsite laws and even in the Small Tract Act for urban and suburban development, where proper platting of the land and sale of blocks and lots in accordance with the plat will trigger off satisfactory development. The plans for the new Parker townsite in Arizona are based on this premise.

Parker is located within the Colorado River Indian Reservation. Officials and citizens of Parker have urged the reservation of land for expansion of the city and to provide for residential, industrial, and recreational development. A total of 13,737 acres is being considered for withdrawal and disposition under the townsite laws. Layout of the townsite has been prepared by a professional group employed by the city, from plans developed by the Yuma County planning director and approved by the Lower Colorado River Advisory Council. The county has spot-zoned the townsite area to control development after the lots are sold by the Bureau of Land Management.

Making lands available for development for public purposes is one of our easier and more satisfying chores. Here we have the Recreation and Public Purposes Act which gives us wide scope to meet present and prospective needs. The grant of authority to the Secretary of the Interior to make appropriate arrangements and to determine proper charges is rather wide. Under it, we have been able to adjust our lease and sale programs under the act to national policies in the public recreation, public education, and public health fields. Our new programs are proving of great help to those communities actively interested in promoting these developments.

Federal developments, which largely would be related to public recreation, are not being installed as rapidly as many would like. However, indications are for more rapid progress in the future.

An innovation this year was the institution of Federal recreational projects on the national land reserve outside of the C. & C. country in western Oregon. Under the accelerated public works program, 31 projects have been started in Oregon, California, Utah, Nevada, and New Mexico.

As far as water is concerned, let's turn again to a quotation from President Kennedy:

"Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency. * * * Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home and industry. * * * To meet all needs—domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational—we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity."

This responsibility is one we cannot ignore. Here in the West, we are in a never-ending race to keep the usable water supply ahead of demand. If anything, our water resources are even more important than our lands. Without water, land is valueless and the economy dies.

The West is the fastest growing area in the United States. The increasing population is putting an ever greater burden on a water supply which has always been the greatest problem. The location of pioneer cities of the West was determined by the availability of water. If the water hole dried, the community died. This is the inexorable law of the desert—and it hasn't been repealed. In my own State of Arizona, there are evidences of a great Indian civilization which flourished for many years before the white man came . Drought forced the Indians to move away.

But today, there is no place to move. Our Nation and for that matter, all of the world, is becoming so populated that there is no undiscovered and undeveloped territory beckoning and challenging those who have become dissatisfied with their present homes and the communities in which they live, and those who are forced to move by lessening economic opportunities as resources dwindle.

But there is a new frontier, an exciting frontier of thought and action. It is in the planning and development of our water resources to make continued use of our lands and further expansion of our western economy possible. This is the challenge of total, multipurpose use of our available water resources. We must plan to use every drop of water over and over again for every possible purpose from the time it reaches the ground as precipitation until it finds its way to the ocean or transpires into the atmosphere.

There is still a sufficient water supply availably in the Western States as there is elsewhere in the Nation if—and this is a big and very important if—the available supply is put to total use.

This means that we must have sufficient reservoir capacity that water stored in times of flood can be held over and used in times of drought. Our Bureau of Reclamation has always operated on the theory that the best kind of flood control is upstream storage for useful purposes. It means that stored water released through hydroturbines to generate electricity must be used for other downstream purposes, such as irrigation, domestic use and pollution control.

It means that large reservoirs created by reclamation development must also be kept open and usable by the public for recreation purposes. Recreation, including camping, hunting, fishing, boating, swimming and all the other things that go with it, has become big business in the Western States as people enjoy more leisure time. Recreation is definitely coming out of the step-sister class to rank as a major benefit in multipurpose development.

Ask the county assessor in an area in which a new Reclamation reservoir has been created to give you an idea of the assessed valuation of the land and improvements used to take care of the recreationists and you will understand what I am talking about. The story can be repeated over and over again.

We have been negotiating permanent water service contracts for the Kern River project in California. This project was built for flood control and reclamation—with no allocation to recreation. The water users have been operating on interim contracts for the past 8 years. During that period the reservoir behind Isabella Dam—about 30 miles east of Bakersfield—has been responsible for the development of a sizable recreation activity in Kern County.

When we first sat down to negotiate last spring we were surprised to find a representative of the Kern County government present. He was there he said to see to it that our contract assured a minimum recreation pool in Isabella Reservoir. He stated that Kern County now does $50 million of recreation business annually in connection with that project.

Or take a look around you here in Las Vegas. This fabulous oasis in the desert got its impetus toward metropolitan status as a switching point for the long freight trains of materials and supplies bound for Black Canyon during the construction of Hoover Dam, back in the early 1930's. But the world has learned of the attraction of the sun country and so Las Vegas, like other sun cities, is hard put to find sufficient water to support its growing population. Plans are underway to divert more water from Lake Mead for use in the valley. You can imagine what that water will be worth in terms of increased assessed valuation of the property it will benefit.

In efforts to work out the best multiple-use program for water development, we run into the inevitable competition and conflict from various classes of users. One such conflict relates to hydropower development which, by western standards, has a low priority of use but certainly should not be overlooked when it can be incorporated into multipurpose development.

Let me cite an example of this conflict.

Many of you have or will visit Hoover Dam before you leave the Las Vegas area. Some

380 miles upstream, the Bureau of Reclamation is constructing the Glen Canyon Dam, very similar to Hoover in physical statistics and also creating a vast storage reservoir very similar to Hoover.

Between them, they virtually establish complete control of the river with their tremendous capacity, capable of holding more than 4 years' average flow. They pave the way for further development in both the upper and lower river basins. Without them, none of the other structures on the river would be feasible. But since Hoover was completed in the 1930's, there has been an orderly process of Federal river development downstream which has proved of inestimable worth to the millions of people in Arizona, Nevada, and southern California.

There are continuing plans for this development to meet the constantly and rapidly increasing needs of these areas. Development has been temporarily delayed pending the outcome of *Arizona v. California*, which is a lawsuit in the Supreme Court to determine allocation of water in the Lower Colorado River Basin. A decision is expected shortly.

Now that Glen Canyon Dam will soon offer major regulatory and silt control benefits, the next logical step in development of the river is utilization of the stretch between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dams, excluding, of course, Grand Canyon National Park. In this area are two feasible sites, Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon. Regardless of the Supreme Court decision, both of these structures must some day be built to utilize fully the river's resources.

However, competition for the site at Marble Canyon has developed with the filing of a license application by the Arizona Power Authority with the Federal Power Commission. The Arizona Power Authority is seeking to avail itself of all of the advantages of a site which is made feasible only by the upstream construction of Glen Canyon Dam by the United States.

It thereby would take this site out of plans for coordinated comprehensive development and would preempt one of the few remaining sites on the river for a project which would not contribute to the overall development so essential to the Southwest. Such development would take away the essential financial assistance power traditionally gives to water-use features of Federal projects in the West.

Without this assistance from power revenues, there are very few water development projects which could be undertaken by the Federal Government today. Too few people realize that over 92 percent of all reclamation construction expenditures are reimbursable. The West pays its way. We are proud of that fact and want to continue that way. But to do so, we must put the available water to work in every way for the common good and benefit. This we cannot do by piecemeal planning or by construction by competitive agencies or by taking away the bank account provided by power revenues.

A similar situation exists on the Snake River where both public and private utilities are seeking Federal Power Commission licenses to develop a site on the Oregon-Idaho border which is needed for a high multipurpose storage dam for maximum downstream usefulness.

I know that many of you have heard the argument—and on the surface it would appear to be a logical one—that private utility development means more taxes because the private project is taxable where the public one is not. But upon analysis and a closer look, as I have attempted to point up here today, the long-range benefits which accrue from wise multipurpose development so far outstrip the immediate benefits of getting some property on the tax rolls, that there is no comparison.

Let me assure you again that we are aware of the problems you face, that we do want to work with you in working out equitable and reasonable solutions.

But at the same time, we call for your cooperation in taking the long view, to examine the ultimate solution which must be the maximum public benefit for all the people.

Indeed we believe we are charged with a duty to provide for the enjoyment of the natural resources of the United States by people living today, by you, and by the citizens of your counties, but "to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Russian Ambitions in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one of Baltimore's outstanding radio stations, WFBR, conducts a program entitled "Issues in the Air," designed to keep the citizens of Maryland informed about current affairs and their possible effect on the United States and its people.

Last month, WFBR's very able news director, Mr. Lou Corbin, devoted the program to an interview with a prominent citizen of Haiti, who is now in exile in the United States. This individual, Dr. Roger Rigaud, is a lawyer, a soldier, a public administrator, an expert on military intelligence, and an executive with the Haitian National Party. He is well qualified to give us a firsthand report on the situation in Haiti and to evaluate the danger signals which indicate Castro's plans to take over this island republic and bring it into the Communist fold.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this interview in the Appendix of the RECORD and recommend that all Members of the House give serious consideration to Dr. Rigaud's warnings:

WFBR—"ISSUES IN THE AIR," JANUARY 13, 1962

Mr. CORBIN. This is Lou Corbin. Even the practiced eye of the most experienced historian is finding it difficult to unravel and fathom the complex problems of the Caribbean. There was a day when revolutions moved with almost assembly line precision in that area, but they offered little in the way of a threat to the peace of the world and certainly had no perceptible means of changing the balance of world power. This is not the case, however, in our thermonuclear age. As we have seen demonstrated the intrusion of the Communist philosophy in that area has indeed had an impact upon the course of world affairs. With me today is a young man from Haiti. He is a lawyer, a soldier, a public administrator, an expert on military intelligence, and though he is now in exile, he may yet play an important role in the future of his country. We shall sample his sentiments on the situation in Haiti, of course, but we shall also catalog his thoughts on the progress of communism in the sprawling complex of nations which make up the Caribbean frontier. I am delighted to open our microphones to Dr. Roger Rigaud, an executive with the Haitian National Party. Thank you very much, sir, for joining this week's tape-recorded discussion of "Issues in the Air."

Dr. RIGAUD. Mr. Corbin, I would like first of all to thank you on behalf of the oppressed people of Haiti, and all of us now forced to live in exile. I wish to thank you very much for this opportunity to discuss the plight of my country. As far as I am concerned, I am a citizen of Haiti, of course, and my family is still living in Haiti. I have a wife, three sons in Haiti, one son with me in New York, United States, and a daughter, too, in Haiti. I am in exile for 5 years, and since my very arrival in the United States, I have been trying to denounce the brutal tyranny of François Duvalier, the President of Haiti.

Mr. CORBIN. He's presently in power?

Dr. RIGAUD. Yes, he's presently in power.

Mr. CORBIN. Before we get into some of the political aspects of what we will be discussing, your name is French, is it not?

Dr. RIGAUD. My name is French.

Mr. CORBIN. But your native tongue is Creole?

Dr. RIGAUD. Creole, yes.

Mr. CORBIN. Is that a form of French at all?

Dr. RIGAUD. Not very much. But many words, many Creole words, are derived from French.

Mr. CORBIN. Well, now, as you say, the present chief executive of Haiti is President Francois Duvalier. Last October our U.S. Ambassador to Haiti, Raymond Thurston, made this statement: "President Duvalier has Reds or pro-Reds in high Government positions. We also know that the Communists have maintained links with Castro's Cuba and the international base of communism in Mexico; and the longer it goes on, the better is the chance the commies will get control." Dr. Rigaud, is this an accurate assessment by our U.S. Ambassador, and will you tell us a bit about this situation?

Dr. RIGAUD. It is very, very accurate, and the opposition members in exile and within my country have been really surprised and happy that the American Ambassador realizes the danger represented by the continuation of Duvalier in power.

Mr. CORBIN. Where did he make this statement, do you know?

Dr. RIGAUD. He made it in Haiti, in Port-au-Prince.

Mr. CORBIN. What effect did this comment by the U.S. envoy have upon Duvalier?

Dr. RIGAUD. As far as Duvalier is concerned, we really do not know. Of course, we are very sure he did not like it, but that statement came at the proper time, really, as an encouragement for the opposition.

Mr. CORBIN. Who are these Communists who have been placed in high positions?

Dr. RIGAUD. Since he came to power in September 1957, Duvalier has appointed and kept two well-known, card-carrying Communists in key positions in his government. One of them is Jules Blanchet, an economist who was first appointed minister without portfolio. Duvalier was forced to remove him from his Cabinet after Blanchet, on a trip to this country, bitterly attacked the United States and embarrassed Duvalier's government. Blanchet was then appointed Chief of Budget, which is one of the key positions in the Haitian administration.

Mr. CORBIN. Is this man a Moscow-disciplined person?

Dr. RIGAUD. He is a Moscow-disciplined person. The second one is Herve Boyer, who was first appointed Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, and 2 years ago, appointed as Minister of Finance. He is still in that position in the Cabinet.

Mr. CORBIN. Well now, back in 1950, I believe, you were then involved in the National Defense Department in Haiti. Was this situation, the insidious philosophy of communism, manifesting itself in those days?

Dr. RIGAUD. In 1946, because we have to go back to 1946 at the time when the revolution took place in Haiti, the Communist Party was really active and was officially accepted and legal. When Estime came into power, and I was a close friend of Estime, we outlawed the Communist Party. As we operated in such a way that we really discouraged the well-known Communists and forced them to discontinue their work in Haiti. So since that time, there is no official Communist Party in Haiti.

Mr. CORBIN. None recognized?

Dr. RIGAUD. None recognized. But still, some of them, some of the leaders such as Blanchet and others are still living in Haiti. Many of them who left the country in 1947 came back as soon as Duvalier came into power.

Mr. CORBIN. Well, as a Minister of Defence in Haiti, you were probably pretty well documented on who these people were.

Dr. RIGAUD. Yes I was.

Mr. CORBIN. We hear reports that Castro is exporting revolution in the Caribbean. What is meant by this and how is this actually accomplished?

Dr. RIGAUD. It is very easy for Castro to export his communism into Haiti. As far as the Caribbean area is concerned, I know that many riots that happened very recently in Santo Domingo for instance, were inspired by Castro. And just now they have had some trouble in Peru that Castro is responsible for.

Mr. CORBIN. Well, are these actual Cubans who go from the island of Cuba into Haiti?

Dr. RIGAUD. No, for Haiti, for instance, they use Haitians who are living in Cuba. You have to know that we have 70,000 living in Oriente Province of Cuba. That immigration started in 1924, you know, at the time of the sugar boom. But now, we are aware that Castro is using some young Haitians from there who speak Creole fluently as it is spoken in Haiti. He has trained and indoctrinated them and is infiltrating them into Haiti.

Mr. CORBIN. How do they get over there, by small boat?

Dr. RIGAUD. By small boat, fishing boat.

Mr. CORBIN. Well, they are only about 60 miles apart, aren't they?

Dr. RIGAUD. They are only 50 miles apart.

Mr. CORBIN. With Cuba in a reported state of economic exhaustion, where is the source of means for this sort of operation? Does it come from Moscow?

Dr. RIGAUD. Of course, everyone knows it.

Mr. CORBIN. Is President Duvalier aware of this infiltration, and if so, does he encourage it or is he doing something to discourage it?

Dr. RIGAUD. Duvalier never discourages the infiltration and indoctrination of Haiti by communism. In fact, if he can tolerate, not only tolerate but appoint well-known Communists to Cabinet-level positions in his government, that means he is either a Communist or he tolerates communism.

Mr. CORBIN. Doesn't he realize the consequences of this sort of thinking?

Dr. RIGAUD. I do not think he realizes it.

Mr. CORBIN. Course, this could be the end of him.

Dr. RIGAUD. Of course, but I think up to now he is trying to use them, in the hope that he can control them, but it is a very dangerous game, and perhaps he does not know that.

Mr. CORBIN. Famous last words, I can control the Communists. What sort of stature does this man Duvalier have in the OAS, and is the OAS aware of what is happening in Haiti?

Dr. RIGAUD. Yes, the OAS has very recently asked Duvalier to allow a human rights commission to go to Haiti and make an inquiry about what is happening there, but Duvalier refused. The OAS is very aware of the situation in Haiti and all the members of the OAS have witnessed Duvalier's blackmail of the U.S. Government at Punta del Este.

Mr. CORBIN. Well, hasn't something been said about this in public? I mean, why isn't the OAS committee screaming to high heaven about this?

Dr. RIGAUD. Unfortunately it has not been said in public, but we know that the OAS did try to send a committee to Haiti.

Mr. CORBIN. I suppose the Russians are not directly involved themselves. They sort of stay in the background and mastermind this, don't they?

Dr. RIGAUD. Yes, but we know that some 12 months ago Duvalier sent a mission to Moscow to ask for financial support. The answer was, we can send you technicians for propaganda, then we will send you money.

Mr. CORBIN. I think we ought to explain to our listeners that the area we are discussing now could very well become a danger spot every bit as vital to the free world as Cuba is. Is this a correct assessment?

Dr. RIGAUD. Of course, of course.

Mr. CORBIN. Well now, that leads me to this question. As far as Haiti is concerned, has the situation in your judgment reached a point of no return? Is a Castro-like takeover inevitable?

Dr. RIGAUD. I think the situation has reached a point of no return in one respect. And that is that Duvalier will fall. Duvalier will be overthrown, he will be overthrown because the U.S. Government is against him, the people of Haiti are against him, and his own supporters, aware of this situation, will leave him in hopes of saving themselves when that time comes.

Mr. CORBIN. Will the Communists or somebody else come in and effect a military coup d'etat?

Dr. RIGAUD. The army could do it if it had the proper replacement. Or it could be done by a civilian from abroad. The Communists, of course, are against him too, and Castro knows that Duvalier is a bad man, is greedy, is irresponsible; and Castro certainly has his own men to put in his place. So Duvalier has all those forces against him, so he will certainly be overthrown as soon as possible. The danger is who will take power after Duvalier?

Mr. CORBIN. How can we rescue the integrity of Haiti?

Dr. RIGAUD. This is the danger. We have to do something. We have to oppose Communist infiltration by democratic infiltration; we have to oppose Communist propaganda by democratic propaganda; we have to prepare and help all the democratic leaders in exile or within the country to really prepare themselves to take over.

Mr. CORBIN. Is this presently being done?

Dr. RIGAUD. Presently, we are trying, and my fellow countrymen in exile are now getting together. We have a conference going on in New York of all the political leaders in exile. We are also going to invite the exile leaders who are in some Latin American countries like Venezuela, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and Santo Domingo. So the gathering will be very large. The first goal of that conference is to find a solution, not only for the overthrow of Duvalier, because he will be overthrown, but to take power and to fight the extremist elements.

Mr. CORBIN. Isn't it important also to develop a manifestation of political unity so that when the time for takeover is concerned, someone will be there to lead?

Dr. RIGAUD. That is going on now.

Mr. CORBIN. That's another objective of the conference?

Dr. RIGAUD. Yes; it is another objective.

Mr. CORBIN. Your next door neighbor down in that area is the Dominican Republic, is it not?

Dr. RIGAUD. Yes.

Mr. CORBIN. What is your assessment of the new administration of President Juan Bosch?

Dr. RIGAUD. I think that Mr. Bosch made some statement about the United States, and I did not have the opportunity to read it yet. I should read his statement before expressing any opinion.

Mr. CORBIN. From your own personal observations, do you think the Communists have managed a significant intrusion into the life of the Dominican Republic?

Dr. RIGAUD. I know that they try. I was in the Dominican Republic at the time of the riots against the AFL–CIO. I was present when the U.S. Ambassador's car was burned and so was the U.S. flag.

Mr. CORBIN. If the Cubans could get rid of Fidel Castro, this would have a terrific effect upon the political life of Haiti, wouldn't it?

Dr. RIGAUD. Of course, yes.

Mr. CORBIN. How can they do this? Can they do it short of a military invasion?

Dr. RIGAUD. I do not think it is possible to do it short of a military invasion because Castro has been granted the time to strengthen his position militarily.

Mr. CORBIN. Would you imagine the OAS, as such, could first of all agree to mount such an invasion.

Dr. RIGAUD. No. I am a very practical man. If I were the United States I would invade first, then I would explain. And certainly there was the opportunity, during the invasion, to do something for Cuba. I think the U.S. Government missed the boat again.

Mr. CORBIN. There seems to me to be considerable hesitancy on the part of the OAS to seize the initiative militarily. Aside from what leadership they get from the United States, they have been extremely reluctant to manifest themselves in a military way toward Castro. Why is this? Can't they see the consequences in Cuba?

Dr. RIGAUD. Most Latin American governments lack the stability to stand up firmly against Castro. This internal instability is blamed partly on pro-Reds in the governments concerned and lack of effective American leadership. I would like you to answer that because you are an American citizen. But anyway it does seem that the United States was not prepared to cope with such a situation. They should have stopped Castro in the beginning.

Mr. CORBIN. I don't think, frankly, as an American citizen, that we fully realized that we were heading for an international confrontation on Cuba. We probably looked at this whole problem in terms of the days when revolutions were on an assembly-line basis, almost, down there. Do you think Russia would rally to the aid of Castro in the event of an invasion? Wouldn't this be a logistic problem of fantastic proportions for them?

Dr. RIGAUD. I do not think they will do anything.

Mr. CORBIN. I mean, do you imagine that they would produce a thermonuclear reaction?

Dr. RIGAUD. I do not think so. They have too much to lose.

Mr. CORBIN. I mentioned at the outset that there may yet come the day when you might play an important part in the future of Haiti. Is this a personal ambition, and if so, what approach is being made to this objective?

Dr. RIGAUD. I do not really have a personal ambition to fulfill a key position in the future of Haiti; but we are facing a danger, a danger for my country, a danger

for my countrymen, a danger for the future of the Caribbean and the hemisphere, and I do think that if I have the means, I must take the responsibility.

Mr. CORBIN. Do you think that you might be able to be a symbol of the necessary political unity to restore Haiti to an orderly form of democratic procedure?

Dr. RIGAUD. I do not think that's the way. I'm trying for unity. I want unity. I do not think I should be, but I could be, a symbol of that.

Mr. CORBIN. You would be willing to accept the responsibility, however?

Dr. RIGAUD. Of course.

Mr. CORBIN. Well, isn't this something, so to speak, that might be just around the calendar, because I believe there's another deadline coming up in May, and that isn't too long away. Do you think that there will be another election held, or will there be bloodshed before this in Haiti?

Dr. RIGAUD. I do think there will be bloodshed in Haiti before that. I would like to avoid bloodshed in Haiti, but if Duvalier wants to resist, there will be some.

Mr. CORBIN. How many people live in Haiti?

Dr. RIGAUD. 3,700,000.

Mr. CORBIN. How many of them are educated?

Dr. RIGAUD. Only 13 percent.

Mr. CORBIN. How can they possibly make an intelligent choice under the democratic procedures?

Dr. RIGAUD. That's right. That is our biggest problem. We have to educate the people.

Mr. CORBIN. But this is a long-range project, and the Communists will have the long-range advantage. Therefore, if you are a student of logic, you inevitably edge toward the necessity for some sort of military imposition.

Dr. RIGAUD. Not a military imposition, but we need education, and it is not necessary to have some military imposition to have education.

Mr. CORBIN. Is the vast majority of the population illiterate?

Dr. RIGAUD. They are.

Mr. CORBIN. How do they live? How do they work?

Dr. RIGAUD. They make their living, a very limited living, from their crops. Just living from the products of the soil, and Haiti has the highest density population of any country in Latin America.

Mr. CORBIN. Does it appear to you that this vast majority of illiterates could conceivably be led in any direction, or do they have at least a basic sense of values that could rescue Haiti?

Dr. RIGAUD. They have their land, which gives them their values.

Mr. CORBIN. What is their religion?

Dr. RIGAUD. They are Catholic, but they are very superstitious, so Catholicism and voodoo have blended together somewhat in the country.

Mr. CORBIN. How extensive is voodoo?

Dr. RIGAUD. Very extensive among the peasants.

Mr. CORBIN. How do the Communists face this problem of your religious beliefs?

Dr. RIGAUD. The Communists really try to have chaos in Haiti. Duvalier's persecution of the Catholic Church adds to the chaos.

Mr. CORBIN. How do they act toward voodoo? That must give them a fit.

Dr. RIGAUD. You mean the Communists? They do not move against voodoo. It is too ingrained, and, besides, it represents no threat against communism. What they have in mind is to eliminate the church. They are persecuted now, the Catholics, because they know that it is the largest part of the population of Haiti.

Mr. CORBIN. Do they have any native clergy capable of leading them?

Dr. RIGAUD. Yes, they have native clergy. One of them, a bishop, has been exiled by Duvalier. You know that Duvalier expelled one archbishop and two bishops.

Mr. CORBIN. You said your family is in Haiti. Are they safe?

Dr. RIGAUD. Up to now; yes. Of course, one of my sons has been beaten once.

Mr. CORBIN. Do you have communication with them?

Dr. RIGAUD. Very badly.

Mr. CORBIN. Well, the last time you heard from them, they were in relatively safe condition.

Well, I'm sorry to have to tell both of us that our time is up for this edition of "Issues in the Air." I certainly want to thank you, Dr. Roger Rigaud, of Haiti, for giving us the benefit of your personal observations of your country at a perilous time in her history. Good luck, good fortune, and may God bless you in all your future endeavors.

Foresters in Milwaukee Hear Assistant Agriculture Secretary Baker Tell of Rural Renaissance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the decline of rural America and all that that meant in terms of unemployment, underemployment, and the uprooting of families long settled on the land have been a cause of serious concern.

It is, therefore, heartening to hear of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John A. Baker's report of signs of a rural revival.

The account of Mr. Baker's speech in Milwaukee, as reported by the Milwaukee Journal of January 31, 1963, follows:

RURAL RENAISSANCE IN AMERICA DESCRIBED—AGRICULTURE OFFICIAL SAYS GOVERNMENT HELP FOR DEPRESSED AREAS INCREASES

"A big surge of rural renewal—perhaps the beginning of a rural renaissance" brought John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, to Milwaukee Wednesday to address chief foresters of nine North Central States and Federal Forest Service Chiefs of this region.

"I would not be surprised if history recorded the early 1960's as the turning point after a 100-year trend against rural America," he said in an interview.

Baker said that just his presence here was significant of the administration's interest in helping depressed rural areas. "This is the first time a Cabinet or sub-Cabinet official has attended a regional meeting of State foresters," he said.

Such meetings are held annually for discussion of mutual problems, new programs, and technology. The State foresters heard Baker discuss the Federal rural area development (RAD) program at a dinner at the Wisconsin hotel, and continued their meeting Thursday.

FORESTRY IMPORTANT

Baker attributed his presence to the importance of forestry in the RAD program. In the nine-State north central region, he said, eligible counties (those with unemployment) had 47 percent of their land in commercial forests, not including National or State forests.

He said that the Forest Service, because of long-range plans, had done a remarkable job in the accelerated public works program for rural areas.

"The President released the money Friday," said Baker, "and the Forest Service had 1,500 men at work Monday—and 9,000 by the following Friday." He credited State employment services for their cooperation.

Signs of a rural renaissance, he said, were many:

"The Wall Street Journal has taken note of the increase in factory construction in rural communities in the last couple of years.

STATES RESPONDING

"State governments are responding to rural needs—Wisconsin has been ahead, doing more than most. The Federal Government is responding. The Extension Services and the counties all are working together. Every eligible county in Missouri has an RAD committee.

"The Farmers Home Administration, in existence since 1934, last year for the first time made loans for farm forestry.

"The dollar volume of capital investments (many in rural areas) by the Federal Government will be double, in 1964, what it was in 1960."

This included, he said, Forest Service programs and assistance that were of great importance "because more than half of the counties (nationally) designated as labor surplus areas are the heavily wooded counties."

The 17-Year Trend to Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert an address delivered on January 22, 1963, by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif.

THE 17-YEAR TREND TO CASTRO

(By Hon. Clare Boothe Luce)

Is the outcome of the Cuban crisis a defeat or victory for the United States? What hope is there now of liberating Cuba? Was the naval blockade a sign that we are winning or losing the cold war?

I am sure we all agree that the terms "defeat" or "victory" have meaning only in relation to goals, and that we will also agree that the foreign policy goal of the United States since 1946 (the beginning of the cold war) has been to prevent the spreading upon the world of communism.

Consequently, logic requires us to admit that each time the Communists take over a country, or a country voluntarily alines itself with Moscow or Peiping, we are by that many people, and that much territory, further from our goal. Wherever, whenever, or however this happens, we have, have we not, suffered a defeat?

Two weeks ago a conference of world Communist leaders was called to order in East Berlin. In honor of Khrushchev's attendance, East Berlin technicians prepared a goal-trend display. They erected, in the conference hall, a great electrically wired map of the world. While Khrushchev watched, on flashed the figures of the year 1917—and one red bulb lighted up to show the birth of

Soviet Russia, the first Communist nation, numbering over 100 million people. This red beacon stood alone until 1945. Then came 1946, and with each successive year of the cold war new red bulbs came on, while the Red population figures mounted and mounted. They told the cold war facts: Between the time Mr. Truman entered the White House and Mr. Eisenhower left, 17 nations and a billion people were added to the Communist empire—one-third of the world's population. When, in 1960, Mr. Kennedy arrived in his turn to hold aloft the torch of freedom, there were, however, no red bulbs in the American hemisphere. Then came 1962, and on went the last red light. This represented Castro's Cuba—44,000 square more miles and 6 million more people.

According to the AP press account, the Cuban bulb kept flickering on and off for a minute. This caused some deviationist snickering among the Chinese delegates. But it finally settled down to a steady red glow, and thunderous applause came from all the delegates. None doubted that communism had safely reached the shores of its most powerful enemy.

The map further noted that the 2,500 Communist delegates present represent almost 6 million active and organizing Communist Party members in 70 countries outside the Communist empire, who are working hard to turn the whole world into a red light district. Indeed, the largest single Communist Party outside the Iron, Bamboo and now (I suppose we must call it) Sugar Curtain is in Italy, a NATO member country.

In passing, after 17 years of the cold war, dispite several billions of dollars of U.S. postwar economic and military aid, and despite the fact that Italians are enjoying today, as a result of their own efforts, the greatest prosperity they have ever known in all their history, this Communist Party—numbering 1,200,000 voters—shows no sign of weakening. Indeed, only a few weeks ago the Communist Party narrowly missed bringing down the democratic government of Italy, which since 1946 has leaned like the Tower of Pisa toward Moscow.

If this is not a winning trend, for the Communist goal, and a losing trend for the U.S. goal, then surely words, facts, and figures have all lost their meaning.

How has this all come about? Generally speaking, in the same way it came about in Cuba.

A simile comes to my mind from an experiment sometimes done in high school psychology classes. A frog is put in a deep, cool pot of water. He paddles energetically about, looking for something to sit on, and spring from. Then he is taken out, and dropped into a hot pot. At once he groups all his forces and makes a mighty leap out of the pot. Are the students consequently to assume that a frog will always leap to safety out of hot water? Not at all. Another frog is dropped in the cool pot. Then, a burner is lit under the pot, and the water is slowly, slowly heated. Gradually the frog stops paddling and just floats, gasping. In the end the frog is boiled to death—and nary a leap out of him. The psychology of the students watching this experiment is equally interesting. There are squeaks of protest when the first frog is popped into the hot pot, and everybody is happy to see him escape. But they watch the slow boiling of the second frog, fascinated but emotionally indifferent. No doubt they hope he will leap to safety at any moment. But when the frog doesn't seem to care about his own plight, neither do the students.

For those who are interested in the now tried and true political techniques by which Moscow boils little political frogs while the U.S. public watches the pot, I recommend the remarkable account given by James Monahan and Kenneth O. Gilmore in the January issue of Reader's Digest, titled "How the Kremlin Took Cuba."

Mr. Kennedy, before he entered the White House, earnestly warned the American people that the Cuban pot was getting warm, and he promised, if elected, either to pull out the frog, or turn off the burner. In the spring of 1961 he made a spasmodic and ineffectual attempt to do so, called the Cuban invasion. But overnight he was faced with a tremendous fact—the invasion which had been badly planned, would fail unless the United States sent military help. To do so meant the overturn of our 17-year-old policy of not interfering militarily with Moscow's peaceful frog boiling technique, and also, our far older policy of nonmilitary intervention in the political experiments of our Latin American neighbors. This rather belated awareness that if he was going to rescue Cuba he would have to scuttle the whole of U.S. military foreign policy, understandably enough scared Mr. Kennedy into inaction. In any event, what we in America today call the Cuban crisis opened with the Bay of Pigs disaster. It reached its climax with the Naval blockade, and the Kennedy-Khrushchev showdown on the missiles, then turned into a U.N. diplomatic bogdown on negotiations over inspection procedures. It formally closed in early January when U.S.S.R. negotiators met United States negotiators as usual, halfway. They were willing to agree that they were wrong, if we would agree they were right. In short, they agreed to remove the missiles, if we agreed they could keep Cuba.

The net of the blockade was that Khrushchev publicly backed down, and according to U.S. intelligence reports actually took home all of his missiles and bombers—that is, all we had been able to spot by air surveillance. So this—so far as we can tell—restored the nuclear balance of power which Mr. Kennedy had inherited from Mr. Eisenhower. The nuclear football was, in other words, put back again on the West Berlin 50-yard line. Although the restoration of the geographical nuclear status quo can hardly be called a glowing victory, Americans got a good look at the U.S. Navy on television, and also of the color of Mr. Khrushchev's face, which for once matched his political convictions. And no Americans got hurt. All this gave the U.S. people great satisfaction, and consequently increased Mr. Kennedy's domestic political stature—which gave him a lot of satisfaction. But Mr. Kennedy also backed down. The onsite inspection demand was an operative military part of the Kennedy ultimatum. But this demand was dropped in the lap of Ambassador Stevenson, who was quietly set up—for the second time—by Mr. Kennedy to take whatever blame or criticism the American people feel attaches to the second U.S. backdown on a Cuban invasion. Since then missile and inspection issues have been kicked, by Mr. U Thant, under the big, oriental rug the U.N. keeps for pro-Western issues.

When it became obvious to Mr. Khrushchev that we did not intend to invade Cuba whether or not an onsite inspection was granted this also gave the Russians much satisfaction and increased Khrushchev's political stature. In the end bows were taken by Mr. Kennedy to the right, and Mr. Khrushchev to the left for averting a nuclear holocaust which neither of them, nor anybody else, wanted.

Nevertheless, although we have suffered a defeat in Cuba, the naval blockade was a very educational exercise for anybody who can still be educated on United States and U.S.S.R. military and political policies. And some good came of it. Mr. Khrushchev has stopped acting like the terrible tempered "Mr. Nuclear Bangs" for the moment, anyway. He has now admitted to the Communist world that any nuclear funeral will be a joint Washington-Moscow funeral, and yesterday he admitted that nuclear test bans had to be combined with some sort of inspection in Russia. For the rest, it has been no news to the world for 17 years that the United States is a "paper tiger" until her vital interests are directly threatened. But it is news to many of the Communists outside Russia that the U.S.S.R. is a "paper bear" unless her vital interests are threatened. In short, the naval blockade showed the world that for identical reasons, the United States and the U.S.S.R. are equally—and one can now say—mutually determined to avoid any direct military conflict. We are not going to have a nuclear war with one another over Cuba, or Berlin, or for that matter, the moon. Moscow will continue to supply weapons and promote revolutions and brush-fire wars to any small nation that wants to do its own killing, and the United States will arrive to help the defenders, as usual a bit on the freight, with the anti-brush-fire bucket brigade of its technicians. The cold war will, in other words, wag away as usual. I suspect, however, that the Soviets will rely less on limited war, and more on its frog-boiling techniques, which have proved so successful in Cuba.

It also showed with what ease the U.S.S.R. can slip nuclear weapons into any country it controls. It also showed the Latin American nations that their only choice is to work out their political destiny under either the U.S.S.R. or the U.S. nuclear umbrella, and it demonstrated that from here out we have made the nuclear choice for them. It also showed, unhappily, the Communists now have our leave to establish Communist republics anywhere in this hemisphere, so long as these republics remain inoffensive. By inoffensive we mean, of course, militarily incapable of plastering the White House, demolishing the Panama Canal, Cape Canaveral,, or interfering with Mr. and Mrs. America's television reception.

What really got hurt as the immediate result of the blockade was Comrade Castro's feelings. During the blockade he was bumped from the rank of the bearded secular savior of South America to that of a minor Communist prophet. What he thought of, no doubt, as his nuclear weapons, were snatched away from him by Khrushchev. However, the United States has done what it could to smooth down his ruffled feelings and restore his image. In exchange for the Bay of Pigs prisoners Mr. Kennedy promptly gave him $53 million worth of drugs, marketable abroad for about $100 million. The large amounts of opium Castro got were especially soothing, as they can be processed into heroin, smuggled into the United States and sold for gratifying amounts to U.S. crime syndicates. This massive Kennedy aid will allow him to weather Kennedy economic sanctions for a year, anyway. Moreover, Khrushchev promptly signed a 3-year economic agreement with him and has forced all the European satellites to sign other agreements. Moscow will certainly not pull the economic or political rug out from under Cuba. That red light bulb just can't go out now without hurting Khrushchev badly with the home folks, not to say with South America's 270,000 Communist Party members. And to be quite sure that it won't go out, 16,000 Russian technicians have been garrisoned in Cuba to put down any anti-Castro rebellion that arises. Of course they are a dual-purpose outfit. If Castro should at any point prove as troublesome as Russian diplomats claim he is boring, they can also put down Castro.

Meanwhile, Moscow has given Castro the largest and best equipped army in this hemisphere, outside the United States, and will, of course, see that it gets bigger. And Cuba remains as an effective base for Communist hemispheric propaganda, organizing of terrorist activities, and gunrunning.

So long as Cuba confines itself to these so-called inoffensive activities, does the United States have any intention of intervening? Not unless someone can raise, refurbish, and sink the *Maine* again in Manila's harbor. Our policy is now firmly one of peaceful coexistence with hemispheric communism.

For any who still have doubts on this score, there is the concrete evidence of the President's own words. As you all know, the President gave a now-famous, strictly off-the-record, background conference on world affairs to 35 pressmen in Palm Beach on January 2. But there was one British pressman present. And—cricket not being what it used to be in England (nothing is)—whole hunks of it have since appeared in the British press.

Plainly if there are any of you who are not familiar with the contents, you have as much right to know what our President is thinking about Cuba as the English do, not to say the Russians.

The President said the following things: He has no plans to rearm the Cuban rebels, and in fact would restrain anyone who might attempt it, under current conditions; he said his policy is to work for a change in the Communist regime, but that it is not our intention to invade under current conditions, nor to begin a war against Cuba, providing Cuba lives in peace with its neighbors. We are, he said, opposed to Communist control of Cuba and to its intimate association with the Soviet Union, and we hope for a change. So he thinks, he said, that all we can set down now is a general attitude of the United States toward Cuba, and our willingness to support any free choice that the Cuban people make following Castro, and to hold out a hope to the people of Cuba that the United States would be sympathetic for a change.

In short, the President hopes that the boiled frog may still leap out of the pot, even though it is quite clear to everyone that Khrushchev has already had froglegs for dinner. Today the Department of State views Cuba, as it does Hungary, Poland, and East Germany, as just one more captive nation. Most of you don't like this. Well, let's be blunt: We could still invade Cuba, of course, and the Russians would again withdraw. But an invasion now would cost many American lives—perhaps a great many. This, understandably enough, would be very unpopular with Americans. You do remember, don't you, what happened to the Democratic Party when Mr. Truman, with a courage for which he has never been given much credit, stopped the Reds in Korea? It got booted out in the next Presidential election.

The American people want—they terribly want—to stop the Communists. But if Americans get hurt, or even if America gets criticized abroad, in the process they take it out—now isn't this a fact—on the President and party in power. Mr. Kennedy is a brave man, but he is no hero. And like all politicians he is professionally allergic to martyrdom.

Let's face it: Courage in any elected official is almost a contradiction in terms. He must struggle to lead the people up the right path, knowing that he will probably get licked if he doesn't follow them down the wrong one.

Now let us ask our last quesion, but one: Will coexistence with Cuba control the spread of communism into the rest of America? Alas, coexistence is like a woman's girdle: it controls the spread for 1 year—the next she has to buy a bigger girdle. Well, what will control the spread?

We have already agreed that the U.S. policy is, and has been for 17 years, against the use of force as a political or diplomatic weapon and that this policy has had the support of the American people. In other words, today as yesterday, and tomorrow as today, we have no intention of forcibly throwing out the Communists in any country, anywhere, even though a division of Marines could do it. So shall we agree that this leaves us with the same tools we have used for 17 years?—Economic aid to still non-Communist countries, and propaganda. In short, billions of dollars and billions of words—words—words. No one can count the words. But since the cold war began the United States has spent some $97 billion stopping, as the expression goes, communism.

Consequently, today the Government is putting all its South American anti-Communist eggs in the $6 billion Alliance for Progress funds basket. Within the next few years most of them will be scrambled into anti-American omelets, either by the Communists, or right wing military dictatorships. The democratic experiments have already failed in Peru and the Argentine. And despite the democratic facades of some governments and democratic desires of South America's wisest statesmen, the army—or armed police forces—are everywhere in Latin America the politically decisive factors. Most Latin American countries are still run by the law of force, and not by the force of law.

Many Americans, witnessing the astounding success of Marshall plan funds, simply cannot explain why economic aid worked so well in Europe and doesn't seem to work in the so-called underprivileged nations. Europe is old, well organized, and highly literate. To use the President's favorite, though now somewhat overworked word, it is a very "sophisticated" area. Europeans have evolved over centuries an understanding of the political processes of self-government and have tremendous economic and agricultural know-how. These conditions simply do not exist in Latin America.

Not more than 10 percent of the South American population is literate. The church—a conservative influence—has all but entirely lost its influence. The poverty of the masses is abysmal, and the population is increasing enormously. In passing, the control of nuclear energy is apple pie simple in comparison to the control of sexual energy. And no government has as yet invented any reliable onsite inspection procedures for controlling it.

There is a South American tradition—a passionately held one—the tradition of sovereignty. Also, in passing, this is the curse of the southern half of this hemisphere. There is no doubt that a United States of South America could, in a matter of decades, become a strong world power. But there is no tradition of democratic government in the United States or European sense, and of course few democratic institutions to work through. By and large, the social conscience of the rich is feudal. Far too many of the politicians have hardly reached the moral level of our old-style Tammany Hall ward leaders. Given enough U.S. dollars these political leaders can always whip up a few pro-American chowder and and marching clubs for the comfort of visiting Congressmen. But even the most dedicated of them do not know how to instill party loyalty, or party discipline in their own followers—the Communists, of course, excepted.

Moreover, what we would call corruption in the present conditions, far too many South American politicians call commonsense. It is no secret to those who know Latin America that plenty of U.S. aid dollars pass from public to private hands, and then on into private Swiss bank accounts. Many South American politicians feel it is only prudent to carry this sort of personal and family life insurance against the hour of the Communist takeover—which has become somewhat more imminent since the United States abandoned Cuba to Castro. Add that U.S. capital investors did not find the expropriation of a billion dollars of U.S. investments and property in Cuba, or the recent expropriation of U.S. property in Brazil by President Goulart's brother-in-law very encouraging economic omens. And consequently, private U.S. capital investment has fallen off greatly in Latin America.

Is there nothing that our Government can do to make U.S. economic aid to Latin America really pay off in terms of stopping communism? Very little. Today most Latin American politicians have learned the exciting and remunerative art of economic brinksmanship from watching 17-year-old U.S. cold war policies.

If U.S. officials insist that our aid be wisely spent, and that recipient countries make political reforms in behalf of the people, a hulabaloo rises from right to left that the United States wants to interfere in their political affairs, that this is Yankee imperialism, and that it will create more communism. If the United States then says OK, we won't interfere, we'll just cut off aid, this is countered with the threat (and it's no idle one) that the Commies will then surely take over.

The last distinguished American in South America to try this tough line—that is counter economic brinksmanship, was Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Flushed with his triumph of arm twisting his fellow Americans for $53 million of ransom money to Castro, he borrowed Mr. Rusk's shoes and headed, a month ago, for Brazil to twist President Goulart's arm. There he pointed out the fact to Brazilian leaders that Brazil's policy of inflation, and of a constantly unbalanced budget, would, in the end, prove disastrous. Mr. Goulart probably didn't remind him that in these respects, anyway, Brazil is following the American way. All he needed to point out is that there are 50,000 Communists in Brazil, waiting to take over the day the Brazilian economy collapses—which will be the day U.S. aid stops flowing. If there weren't Communists in Brazil, the Brazilians would import them from Cuba. For 17 years the presence of a large Communist Party in any country is a guarantee that it can continue to live beyond its means because U.S. aid will come in. Mr. Kennedy, like all his predecessors, soon caved in—leaving $30 million tied to nothing but promises that things will certainly be put to rights in Brazil—the Communists permitting.

Please do not misunderstand. The fact that much of our aid will be wasted is no reason why the United States should not have a large foreign aid program. I think we should have. But as a matter of honest Christian charity. As the President recently pointed out, we spend only a fraction of our gross national income in helping our world neighbors. The fact is, that if we look sometimes like suckers to ourselves, we look like pikers south of the border, and both views are perfectly correct.

Then who is going to stop the spread of communism? Our best bet is the Russians.

Today the Russians are a nation of 200 million people. Their own domestic living standards are still not worth bragging about, and they have plenty of domestic economic troubles. Economic and military aid to underprivileged Communist nations is even a greater drain on their resources than U.S. aid to non-Communist countries is on ours. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the Communists manage to boil the Brazilian frog, and Brazil went behind what we would certainly all call the "coffee curtain." Well, the Russians would certainly have plenty of coffee to put around their Cuban sugar. The coffee break might even become a Russian institution. This would have the usual effect of slowing up the work,

and producing ulcers. But in exchange for mountains of little black beans—Brazil's main export—the Russians would have to pick up Brazil's colossal fuel and tool bill to keep its industrial plant going, or it would have to dismantle Brazilian industry. In order to do the latter, it would have to do what it has done for Castro, and provide Brazil with inoffensive weapons and garrison it with about 50,000 technicians. You see the 60 million Brazilians wouldn't like communism any better than the 6 million Cubans do, when they'd got it. And if these maintenance bills should fall due in the near future, the Russian people will have to sacrifice their present diet of horse meat and settle for roasted macaws and boiled monkeys. The Brazilian masses, of course, would have to settle for starvation, because the United States would certainly not intervene. If not in next door Cuba, why in far off Brazil?

We now turn to our last thought—the Sino-Russian quarrel. Much is made of the ideological battle which has now burst into the open, between Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev. The real quarrel, as any sensible person knows, has little to do with Marxian dogmas. It has everything to do with China's own desperate needs for military and economic aid, which she is not getting from Russia, and even more with lebensraum, which she also wants desperately for her teeming millions. The nearest vacant spacesare—where else?—Russian Manchuria, Siberia and Yakutah. The Chinese people will be 700 million in another decade. Land is what China wants and needs, and soon must have. The Russians who know, somewhat better than we do, a potential enemy when they see one, have for some time been building up their defenses and their population on their Chinese borders. It is no accident that when they granted us the right to test for nuclear explosions it was on their Chinese border—China's own atomic bomb is just around the corner.

Futhermore, the Russians see with considerable clarity that the current Chinese devotion to so called Leninist ideas of aggressive and militaristic Communist expansion means that China would like to egg the West and the U.S.S.R. into a nuclear conflict. And they also see who would be the ultimate beneficiaries of such a conflict—the vultures, the cockroaches and the rats, and of course the Chinese Communists, who would all get along splendidly.

If the United States only has the wisdom to stay out of the Sino-Russian quarrel, the Communist problem may begin to yield in the next decade or two. The President says that communism bears within itself the seeds of its own disintegration. But what—and who—for that matter, doesn't?

But if Russia comes a real cropper in the next decade, it will be for a good old fashioned thousand of years old reason: Empires who bite off more than they can militarily or economically chew become progressively weaker. And then their neighbors—the Chinese, in this case—if they can find the means to do so, put the bite on them. The logic of Russia's position today is that she too must try to egg us into a war—but a war with Communist China. I predict that a few years from now all Moscow parties and fellow travelers will be encouraging the United States to unleash Chiang. Why fight your enemies, if you can get your other enemies to do the fighting for you?

Meanwhile, the realities of the world political situation are such that the only victories outside the United States this administration can hope to chalk up against Russia now are in space. Or, as the President calls it, for some odd reason, outer space. And if our devotion to our 17-year-old coexistence policy continues, outer-outer space victories will have to do for his last 4 years in office. I offer no objection. No doubt we can afford $40 billion worth of moon-shooting and star-gazing while we wait, reasonably safe, under our nuclear umbrella, for the big Russian-Chinese showdown. Between them they will bury perhaps a score or more unhappy nations like Cuba. But in the end they are more likely to bury each other than to bury the West. That is, on one condition—that we don't develop a policy to prevent it. This can, of course, happen. In view of the outcome of World War II, when a beaten Russia began to snatch the world peace-meal from the strongest military power on earth and has now made us back down in our own hemisphere, let us never underestimate our own capacity to snatch defeat from the fires of victory.

In closing, I see by the papers that a favorite aide of the President, Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has written a book called "The Politics of Hope." No doubt, when the politics of reason do not produce votes, and generally they don't, hope becomes the best possible substitute. Anyway, I'm all for hope, and I'm sure you all are. So on this hopeful note I thank you, and bid you good evening.

See Americana First?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we often hear it said, or implied, that free enterprise and the American Way of Life guarantee every businessman the right to despoil our countryside at will. Because such arguments seem to convince some people it is exceedingly difficult to do anything to prevent the steady destruction of the remaining areas of natural beauty in our land. Similarly, it is almost impossible to enact legislation that will permit motorists to travel our highways and see America first. They may see Americana, but they would not see much of America.

In Arizona we are attempting to enact legislation to provide some protection from billboard blight along our highways. Since this is a problem still faced by most of our States, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial on this subject appearing in the Yuma Daily Sun of Yuma, Ariz.

The editoral follows:

[From the Yuma Daily Sun, Yuma, Ariz., Jan. 29, 1963]

BILLBOARDS ARE SPOILING ARIZONA

In Arizona, where tourism provides a first impression which could result in repeated visits or later demand for housing, that impression is being seriously damaged by visual hucksterism.

This unhappy fact is well documented in the December issue of Arizona Architect, the monthly magazine of the Arizona Society of Architects.

But the damage done to Arizona tourism is only one of the bad aspects of visual hucksterism. The architects' magazine points to two others: the cost to the taxpayer of erecting additional highway signs which are needed to compete with the billboards, and the distinct possibility that the distraction of roadside signs is a contributing cause of traffic accidents.

The answer to this unsightly liability to Arizona's scenery and traffic safety is, of course, State regulation. Is it right to regulate billboards? The Arizona Architect points that the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the principle that the legislature has the power "to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well balanced as well as carefully patrolled."

How excessive signs are costing Arizona taxpayers is detailed by the Arizona Architect: "Excessive commercial signs cause highway departments to erect unnecessarily repetitious warning signs in order to increase the chance that drivers will see markers important to their safety. Particularly is this true of speed reduction signs on the cluttered approaches to most cities and towns. Within cities, traffic departments erect costly and unsightly multiple-signal standards and extra-large back plates to help make warning lights distinguishable from commercial signs."

On the damage to tourism, the magazine says: "All too often, Arizonians are being judged by their visitors as a people carelessly indulgent of an industry that wantonly robs us of our scenic wealth. Most businesses invest private capital to provide the public with specific goods and services to which roads give access. The billboard industry, on the other hand, capitalizes on the public's huge investment in roads, making relatively minor investment of its own capital. Advertising signs and billboards, which not only are parasitic by nature, are a form of unremovable litter that interferes with more interesting, natural, and satisfying views from our roads."

To correct these abuses, the Arizona Scenery Protection Council will propose an effective law this month to the legislature. The council is composed of representatives of garden clubs, women's clubs, architects, landscape architects, conservation groups, and individuals from all walks of life. The aims of the Council have been endorsed by the Arizona Building Contractors, Farm Bureau, and many cattlemen's organizations.

We hope that Yuma County's five spokesmen in the legislature will give their full support to this measure to control flagrant abuses against Arizona's natural beauty.

Let's Find Some Other Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the magazine Country Beautiful which they have entitled, "Focus: On Survival of Individualism."

To me this editorial stresses the need to find some other way than those proposed for our farm problems.

The article follows:

FOCUS: ON SURVIVAL OF INDIVIDUALISM

When most of America is at play on a midsummer Saturday afternoon, the farmer is at work towing a hayrack along a country road; on a warm Sunday night, he is in the barn tending livestock. He rarely complains

about this though, and that makes him unique among men. Here is man in his highest dignity, man aware that he must sweat and toil to gain the just rewards of life.

It is a paradox, however, that this man of dignity must receive some of his just reward in the form of a subsidy through the Government's farm program. For nearly 30 years, the subsidy has been a fact of the farmer's way of life; he cannot yet live without it. Ideally, there should be no subsidies. They rob man of his self-respect. Ideally, too, there should be no wars. It was during the Second World War and the Korean conflict that the farmer was pushed to the high production levels that now cause so much of his overproduction and force the continuing subsidies. However, he's not the only one getting Government help. Some of the most worthy segments of our society are not equipped to stand on their own two feet without a temporary Government crutch. For what we term national interest, we justify high tariffs, a classic form of indirect subsidy that enables the big businessman and the farmer alike to charge more for their products and the workingman to get a better wage; for defense purposes, we shore up various industries with contracts that allow them abnormal profits (note the recent stockpiling investigations); in order to spur the economy, we give tax favors to industries making expansions.

Now comes the Committee for Economic Development (CED), a research group of buinessmen and educators with a well-meaning proposal to reduce Government subsidies to the farms to nothing within 5 years, hitting just one segment of our vast subsidized society. More shocking, however, is the CED proposal to transfer 2 million farm workers—one-third of the farm force—to other careers. To the casual observer, or to one who measures only by way of a bookkeeping balance sheet, the CED plan might sound reasonable. To one, however, who views the problem in its total human scope, the plan is full of dangers:

If it is carried out, we will have moving about aimlessly in our cities thousands of families who were once property owners and participants in the purest form of small business; it will be years before they will again have the pride of owning land and they will likely never again be in business. We will crush the man who exhibits the Nation's most rugged individualism, certainly a spirit that is a built-in bulwark against communism. We will throw men of agrarian skills into a job market which already is glutted.

Within agriculture itself, we will see more and more large corporation farms with the remaining family farms facing hopeless competition. We will find that the men who work the farms will be hired hands who join unions and demand a 40-hour workweek with double time to be paid for harvesting and other essential chores on Saturday and Sunday. We will face the combination of corporate farm monopolies and powerful farm unions which will send consumer food prices up and up. Thus, in our hurried quest to find the most efficient, most economic way to farm, we will have destroyed the very values we have fought to preserve. To tell 2 million farmers and their families to leave their homes and their traditional way of life (and, who is to say which farm is to go and which to stay?) is the rankest kind of regimentation. The farmer must earn his own way. He expects to. He also deserves to reap the rewards for his endeavors, which are no less important to our society than those of the missile worker, the teacher, or the steelworker. Yet, even with Government subsidies, his rewards have lagged. Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman said that the farmer's per capita personal income was $1,378 last year, only 50 percent that of the nonfarmer.

Right now, there are four major farm organizations. They claim to have common purposes; yet, they are separate and expend far too much energy fighting one another. Thus, they weaken their positions. The farm organizations must work together. With the large farm cooperatives, they must develop a system of marketing which will help the individual farmer gain a fairer share of the return from the marketplace. One farm leader must become a catalyst and bring together Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, Farm Bureau President Charles B. Shuman, Farmers Union President James G. Patton, and National Farmers Organization President Oren Lee Staley. Such unity would give the farmer a larger role in determining his own destiny, help solve his problems, and regain for him the dignity he deserves. All America has something at stake here. It is not only "To subsidize or not to subsidize?" Rather it is "Can any small business survive?" History is clear on this point: Wherever safeguards are not set up to protect individual initiative and small businesses, the results are either tyranny or socialism. And it is in such results that Marxism takes its roots.

The Bank Holiday of 1933

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today marked one of the moments of greatest economic distress in the history of our great country.

In an era of growth and stability of our financial institutions, it is hard for us to recall or imagine the virtually complete paralysis of our banking system and the economic chaos of those days three decades ago. Bank failures were occurring all over the Nation at such an alarming rate, that one Governor after another declared bank holidays of varying lengths. On February 4, 1933, Louisiana declared a 1-day holiday. In Michigan, 30 years ago today, Gov. W. A. Comstock issued the first of three proclamations, closing Michigan's banking institutions. By March 2nd, 21 other States had suspended or drastically restricted banking operations. In New York, at 4:20 a.m. on March 4, Governor Lehman, of New York, proclaimed a bank holiday which spread like wildfire across the Nation. This was Inauguration Day for President Roosevelt. Thus, at the time F. D. Roosevelt was being sworn into office there was not a single State in the Union that had not either closed or otherwise restricted its banks. The next day a proclamation by the President of the United States made the holiday universal. Invoking powers granted by the Trading With the Enemy Acts, Roosevelt declared a 4-day national banking holiday, effective March 6, 1933, later extended to March 13. This holiday suspended all transactions in the Federal Reserve and other banks, trust companies, credit unions, and building and loan associations. It also placed an embargo for a like period on the export of gold, silver, and currency, and ordered that gold and silver could be exported or withdrawn only on a license from the Treasury Department.

Nine hours after Congress convened on March 9, 1933, it passed the Emergency Banking Act to validate the banking holiday and the gold embargo and to formulate the procedure for reopening the banks. Added stability was given to many banks by empowering the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy preferred stock in distressed banks. To meet the danger of depositors' runs when the holiday ended, this law also permitted the Federal Reserve banks to lend money even to nonmember State banks.

During the first 3 days after the banking holiday, 4,509 national banks and 567 State member banks opened, representing about 75 percent of all the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. Others were permitted to open according to their state of solvency on a more restricted basis. About 1,000 banks, 5 percent of the Nation's total, remained closed. This drastic experience was, of course, a major factor in the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in June 1933, whose history has been such that nothing remotely similar to the bank failures of the early 1930's has occurred or threatened since.

The lessons we learned during those depressing days produced bold new concepts in the field of banking. These new concepts, which were put into action by National and State legislation, laid the foundation for the stability and public confidence which banking institutions across the country today enjoy. The banking structure of today is a monument to the heroic actions taken 30 years ago.

Many of us believe that without legislation establishing three important Federal agencies we would have had chaos.

These agencies were the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for providing preferred capital and loans where needed; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to restore confidence among bank depositors, and the Home Owners Loan Corporation for taking over slow loans of individuals, primarily mortgages.

But equally important were the many individuals, in both State and National Government, who gave untiringly—and often thanklessly—of their talents in meeting and resolving this emergency.

Most of us are well aware of the contributions made by men such as Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Walter Cummings, the first Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Leo Crowley, who carried the agency through its real development.

Today, however, I should like to talk about another man who played an equally important role in Michigan's noteworthy recovery.

He is Rudolph E. Reichert, former banking commissioner of Michigan from 1927 until February 1936; former president of the Ann Arbor Bank, and now a director of the Ann Arbor Bank.

Mr. Reichert seryed Michigan and the country well during the years of recovery.

He is generally acknowledged as the first man in the United States to conceive the idea of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as a means of restoring faith in banks.

He sold this concept to the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, who piloted the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation law through Congress.

Mr. Reichert also originated the Michigan plan which enabled State-chartered banks to reopen as going concerns rather than suffer through long-drawn-out receiverships.

The emergency banking law of 1933 put Mr. Reichert in control of the State's financial institutions whose assets totaled nearly $2 billion.

It is to his credit that his 2-year stewardship over these institutions was a model in the judicious exercise of power given him under the law.

When Mr. Reichert resigned as Banking Commissioner on February 15, 1936, 214 Michigan banks had been reorganized.

And the records further show that at that time every State bank then operating in Michigan was a No. 1 bank—No. 1 among the four classifications used by Federal agencies.

I am happy to call public attention to this date, and to the service Mr. Reichert and others like him rendered Michigan and the country.

Canada: Handle With Kid Gloves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it would be most inappropriate for Americans to take part in the political controversies which now engage the people of our sister nation to the north, the great Dominion of Canada. Canadians and Americans are great friends. The border between us is open and unguarded except for occasional inspection of automobiles and baggage crossing the national line. We are strongly bound by language, customs, warm friendship and mutual respect.

The current political conflict between Canada and the United States is most unfortunate and will leave wounds in some places which may not be healed for a lnog time. Most Americans regret this and I am sure most Canadians do, too.

Whatever the end of this event might bring, it is the hope of all that strong differences will never come to exist between Canada and the United States. And the United States—big, strong and powerful as it is—must step softly and carefully in its diplomatic relations with our Canadian friends.

I was most impressed with the point and the sentiment expressed in an editorial which recently appeared in the Daily Times Leader of West Point, Miss. The editorial follows:

CANADA: HANDLE WITH KID GLOVES

In diplomacy as in life, a little brother is sensitive to the inflection of a big brother's voice, say nothing of his deliberate blows. In the case of Mexico, we have come to take this into consideration, perhaps because we make allowances for differences in language temperament. With Canada, we are more blunt, perhaps because our common language and many intimate associations make us forget sometimes that we are not one nation and one people.

That could be most upsetting at times. One of those times has just occurred. The United States, convinced by its many tests that an enemy attack on this continent can best be defeated with nuclear warheads for air- and surface-launched antiaircraft missiles and rockets, has been attempting to persuade Canada to abandon conventional warheads and replace them with nuclear weapons. The Canadians resisted.

Then, the other day, the State Department handed the Canadian Ambassador an urgent message on the subject. Shortly after, the text was released to the press. Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, first elected when he exploited anti-American feeling resulting from heavy American investment in Canada, was quick to resent this new pressure. He called it an "unwarranted intrusion" of Canada's sovereignty, and said Canada is a firm equal ally and will not be a "satellite" to be pushed around, or accept external interference in making decisions.

The political implications were plain. Diefenbaker, who has suffered a relapse in popularity since his Conservative Party swept the elections, seized on this sure-fire issue as he had earlier, to whip up anti-American feeling. Politically, he was on sound ground. The one thing Canadians resent is for the United States to step on their toes, no matter how justified we may be, as in this instance, for the common defense. For the moment, the main issue will be forgotten in the anti-American wave.

Even when we are right, we must not forget to be considerate of the other fellow's feelings. This is especially true of Canada, a country larger than the United States in area with only one-tenth our population and an enormous potential yet to be realized. Our nearest and dearest neighbor simply cannot be taken for granted.

Savings and Loan Movement in South America—An Address by Hon. Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of our friends in Latin America is crucial to the United States. In both World War I and World War II an essential factor in our success was that we did have friends to the South. This prevented our enemies from gaining a foothold in the American hemisphere—a foothold that would have done us untold harm.

Basic to the growth and development of Latin America are means to establish a strong middle-class in various Latin American countries. I know of no better way of strengthening the middle-class than to encourage home ownership, and a very important step in the encouragement of home ownership is the promotion of financial institutions which make it possible for people to own their own homes.

In this connection, an exceedingly interesting address was made by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, on January 30, before the International Housing Workshop. In this address, Mr. McMurray dealt with the savings and loan movement in South America. He pointed to the appalling lack of adequate housing in Latin America, and outlined the principal causes in the following words:

> Two primary causes of this situation have been, first, the absence of modern techniques in housing construction, and, second, and not least, the dearth of long-term home-mortgage financing for the building and purchase of homes. At the root of this shortage of available financing has been the lack of such a group of financial intermediaries as the savings and loan associations which we have here.

Chairman McMurray went on to point out:

> Experience both in the United States, with its savings and loan associations, and in Britain and the British Commonwealth, with their similar institutions known as building societies, has given impressive demonstration for many years of the way in which institutions of the savings and loan type can serve the small saver, the home builder, and the ultimate home buyer and owner.

I am also happy to note that Chairman McMurray commented on the need for careful study and consideration of the matter of providing a program of assistance through an organization such as the International Home Loan Bank—a program which I favor.

Mr. McMurray's thoughtful and stimulating address should be widely read. Without objection, I submit it at this point in the RECORD:

THE SAVINGS AND LOAN MOVEMENT IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Joseph P. McMurray [1])

It is truly a privilege of a high order to say a few words today on the savings and loan movement in Latin America.

The very fact that it is now possible to refer to such a movement in that part of our hemisphere which lies to the south of us speaks volumes. Until quite recently, accuracy would have permitted no more than references to surveys, proposals, or beginnings.

It is not so today. The existence of such a movement is attested by the number of countries in which the legal foundations have been laid for systems of these institutions, by the progress which has attended their establishment in a number of those countries, and by the enthusiastic support which was given to the first Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference, held last week in Lima, Peru, and attended by my colleague

[1] Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., before the International Housing Workshop, National Housing Center, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, Jan. 30, 1963, 12:30 p.m.

on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Mr. Joseph J. Williams, Jr., who has given me most favorable reports of its success.

Most of you are not directly connected with savings and loan associations, and I think I should give at least a very brief background statement about them.

The typical savings and loan association is a privately owned operated, locally organized and managed thrift and home-financing institution. It holds itself open to receive savings from members of the public, to whom it pays earnings on those savings periodically, and it invests those funds in long-term loans on homes and other residential properties, including construction loans. The ability with which it performs these functions is illustrated by the fact that the approximately 6 thousand savings and loan associations in this country presently hold such savings in the amount of some $80 billion, their total assets exceeding $93 billion.

While privately owned, and privately operated by their own boards of directors and managers, they are, like banks, examined and supervised by State officials or bodies, or, in the case of those which are federally chartered, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, of which I am chairman. That Board also supervises the Federal Home Loan Banks, which are credit facilities for all Federal associations and for such State-chartered associations as become members. It likewise directs the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures, up to the statutory limit, the savings of members of the public in all Federal associations and in State-chartered associations which avail themselves of this insurance.

No one who attends this workshop will, I am sure, leave without a keen awareness of the appalling lack of adequate housing in Latin America. Two primary causes of this situation have been, first, the absence of modern techniques in housing construction, and, second, and not least, the dearth of long-term home-mortgage financing for the building and purchase of homes. At the root of this shortage of available financing has been the lack of such a group of financial intermediaries as the savings and loan associations which we have here.

Experience both in the United States, with its savings and loan associations, and in Britain and the British Commonwealth, with their similar institutions known as building societies, has given impressive demonstration for many years of the way in which institutions of the savings and loan type can serve the small saver, the homebuilder, and the ultimate home buyer and owner.

The belief that such institutions can fill a similar role in Latin American countries has been a natural outgrowth of that demonstrated success. It has been fostered by the experience in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, where ethnic backgrounds and other factors have been similar to those in Latin America and where, in approximately a decade of savings and loan associations have been established and now have approximately $115 million in assets, they have fully proved their viability both in the savings and in the home financing field.

With this background of experience in this country and elsewhere, a number of the leading personalities in the savings and loan industry of this country, beginning at least as far back as 1958, made surveys of greater or lesser depth in some 12 Latin American countries to sound out the feasibility of the establishment of savings and loan associations in those countries. They did this quite generally under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration and its successor, the Agency for International Development, although in some cases on their own initiative. Outstanding contributions of time and effort were also made to this work by executives and staff of leading savings and loan trade organizations.

Passing from the survey stage, comprehensive legislation has been drafted for many of these countries, and in some five of them there are now associations in operation.

In Chile, within approximately 2 years, according to information received through channels which are unofficial but which I believe to be reliable, there have been established 21 associations with over $16 million in savings and some 22,000 investors, and with approximately 3,000 mortgages approved or in process. In Peru, according to information similarly received, 8 associations are underway, and these associations have generated approximately $2 million in savings and have granted more than 800 loans.

The types of facilities provided have generally paralleled those in this country, with the addition of a facility similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

They have, therefore, generally included four distinct elements. The first is a facility to charter and supervise savings and loan associations. In our country these functions are performed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or, in the case of State-chartered institutions, by the State authorities. The second is a facility with functions similar to those of the Federal home loan banks, to provide funds for the associations for seasonal and emergency needs, as well as additional funds for home lending. The third is a facility similar to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to insure the savings placed in the associations. The fourth is a facility to insure residential mortgages in a manner similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

With the passing of the survey stage, the primary need in the area of what I may call human assistance, as distinguished from financial assistance, is, first, for aid in developing sound patterns of law and regulations, and, second, but second only in point of time, for assistance in the training of executive and operating personnel.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, along with other governmental agencies and the savings and loan associations and their trade organizations, has been happy to be of help in this field.

Thus, the Board provided a member of its legal staff to assist in the development of legislation and regulations in El Salvador. It made available its Director of Federal Home Loan Bank Operations as a member of a two-man team of consultants for the Agency for International Development in connection with the establishment of a savings and loan system in the Dominican Republic. Later, it provided a staff member of its Division of Supervision to serve, with a vice president of one of the Federal home loan banks, in a consultant capacity in the drafting of regulations to implement the newly enacted savings and loan laws in that country. The other Board members and I have made ourselves freely available for consultation by savings and loan officials of interested countries, and have encouraged our staff to do so.

I would not have you conclude that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has been the sole or even the major source of such assistance. The desire to aid our Latin American friends in this respect has been a real grassroots project in the savings and loan industry. The associations themselves and their trade associations, together with the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank, have responded ably and enthusiastically to the need and have sent trained savings and loan personnel on mission after mission to the south, and several associations have opened their offices to on-the-job training of Latin American personnel in the United States.

Perhaps the most dramatic measure has been the recent joint action of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and one of the national savings and loan industry organizations in sponsoring a group of some 30 Peace Corps volunteers who, after a period of training in this country, will assist in the establishment and operation of savings and loan associations in Peru. I am proud to say that one of the members of our examining staff has taken leave from his work with us to become a member of that group and thus contribute the benefit of his specialized skill as an examiner of savings and loan associations.

There is, however, great need in this field not only for human assistance but also for financial assistance, in the form of "seed capital" to aid in the establishment of these new associations. The Inter-American Development Bank and the Agency for International Development have supplied some $40 million in loans for this purpose, but there is need for much more.

For some time now there has been a view on the part of responsible persons, both within and without the savings and loan industry, that the savings and loan associations of this country could themselves provide at least a part of the funds needed for this purpose.

Among other recommendations, it has been felt that such a course would provide an additional element of good will as a people-to-people approach and would afford a just measure of recognition to the savings and loan associations of this country in their furnishing of the technical aid and specialized knowledge which is such a vital part of the operation.

A number of bills were introduced in the last Congress with the general object of providing such assistance through an International Home Loan Bank which would be under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board but would be operated through its own Board of Directors.

This Bank would have authority to sell its shares to savings and loan associations and to savings banks in this country and to provide assistance for the development of similar institutions in underdeveloped countries, either by making direct investments in such institutions or by making its funds available to the central savings and loan facilities in those countries, which in turn would make them available to the individual associations.

While the administration reached the conclusion that it would not favor the enactment of such legislation at that time, it was made clear that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was expected to continue its study of the situation and to continue its cooperation in the rendering of advice and technical assistance in this area, which it has done.

In the present Congress legislation of this nature has been introduced both in the Senate and in the House. In the Senate, sponsorship has been from both sides of the aisle, in the form of a bill by Senator SMATHERS, cosponsored by Senator SPARKMAN, and a bill by Senator DIRKSEN. In the House the sponsorship has been of an equally distinguished nature, including bills by Representative PATMAN and by Representative MULTER of my own State of New York.

I would suggest that these bills deserve the careful study and consideration of all who feel, as I do, that the interests of this country would be aided by the development of a strong element of savers and homeowners in underdeveloped countries, and particularly in Latin America, and by the emergence of an efficient and effective home construction industry in those countries.

A beginning has been made. If we want this movement to flourish it will need the interest and enthusiastic support of people like yourselves and the organizations which you represent. But all our efforts and all

your efforts, in my opinion, will not do the job unless there is set up some sort of an international organization for this specific purpose. I suggest to you that the International Home Loan Bank, or some similarly organized institution, may do the job. The administration and the Congress will be studying it and I respectfully suggest that it also deserves your careful study, deliberation, and action.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during each legislative session representatives from every branch of Government are called upon to attend extra curricular affairs covering a wide range of activities.

The highlight of every session is the annual presidential prayer breakfast, the most recent one being held last Thursday. A beautiful word picture of the occasion follows. It would be impossible to report every detail. Mention should be made, however, of an outstanding musical number. Each one of the more than 1,000 present were thrilled as Jerome Hines, that great Metropolitan Opera star, sang, "How Great Thou Art."

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, Feb. 9, 1963]

BROTHERHOOD: THIS PRAYER BREAKFAST WAS A PERFECT EXAMPLE

(By David Lawrence)

They prayed together Thursday morning—men of all faiths and all parties, men of our Government and other governments.

The Chief Justice of the United States prayed along with the President and Vice President, members of the Cabinet and Members of the Senate and House. Maybe they didn't utter an "official" prayer in the sense in which the term has been used by the Supreme Court in its recent case banning certain prayers in public schools. But it was a prayer by public men asking the help of God in these troubling times and reasserting man's faith in the ever-present God who inspires the minds and hearts of human beings everywhere.

It was an impressive assembly of men and women convened by an organization known as the International Christian Leadership, which has for many years mobilized breakfast groups throughout the country. Designated now as "The Presidential Prayer Breakfast," it has become an annual event. This time it was televised by NBC, and there were coincidentally many similar breakfast meetings held by the Governors of 40 States and by the mayors of several cities.

The language of those who spoke was that of the Christian gospel, but the doctrine of belief in a Supreme Being is embodied in the tenets of the many faiths represented by the 1,000 or more persons in the meeting room. For whether it was the Catholic faith of President Kennedy, or the Jewish faith of Associate Justice Arthur Goldberg of the Supreme Court, or the Protestant faith of Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, who presided, or the Moslem faith of the diplomatic representatives from some of the Asian countries, or the religions of the new African nations whose ambassadors were there, too, the assembly was the nearest thing to a universal brotherhood that could be gathered together in our times. Representatives from the parliaments of Great Britain, France, Sweden, West Germany, and Canada were guests, as well as the Ambassador from Liberia, who is Chairman of the Afro-Asian Committee of the United Nations.

As the President sat there, listening intently to Evangelist Billy Graham, and Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON before reading his own message, it was apparent that the Chief Executive, under strain and tension nowadays, welcomed the chance to relax a few moments in the atmosphere of peace and conciliation reflected in the assembly.

For prayer is not confined to any sect as a mode of articulating inner feeling. It is recognized everywhere as a natural human effort to express dedication to a force above one's self. But rarely, except in the churches, is there occasion for laymen's meetings like this devoted to the idea of prayer. Here was a means of publicizing the significance of prayer and of giving the testimony of men and women of all faiths to its efficacy in everyday life.

When Vice President JOHNSON spoke, he emphasized that, while church and state are separate in America, there is a union of thought and inspiration under God. He made reference to General Washington's order to his troops at Valley Forge to give "the warmest returns of gratitude and piety to the Supreme Author." Mr. JOHNSON then said:

"It is in that spirit that we meet here this morning as Members of Congress, the judiciary and the executive branches of the Government of the United States. Our Constitution separates church and state. We know that separation is a source of our system's strength, but the conscience of our Nation does not call for separation between men of state and faith in a Supreme Being.

Altogether, this Presidential prayer breakfast was one of the most impressive of those held annually for the last 11 years. It is heartening to see Republicans, Democrats, representatives of foreign nations as well as our own—worshipers in every faith—sitting down together and, through the medium of voluntary prayer, seeking divine guidance in an era of trouble and anxiety involving the fate of all mankind.

New Facts on Health Insurance and Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in considering the health care needs of the American people it is essential that we keep up to date with our facts, for both in the health sciences and in the realm of financing health care costs we have been experiencing rapid change and improvement. Our considerations of the areas in which further legislative action on the part of the Federal Government is needed must be predicated upon an understanding of where we are and where we are headed through our private institutions as they operate in conjunction with existing governmental programs on local, State and Federal levels.

The Health Insurance Institute of New York recently came forth with some important information, statistical data on the number of Americans who now have hospital, surgical, regular and major medical expense and loss of income insurance. Further, the institute presents data on the length of hospital stays which is significant in reaching an understanding of the needs of our people.

First is the institute's statement on health insurance coverage and the amount of benefits paid in 1962. Both set new records. Some 140 million Americans, 75 percent of the civilian population, had some form of health insurance protection at the end of 1962. Benefits paid totalled $7.1 billion during the year. Ten years ago slightly under 91 million people had health insurance and benefits paid amounted to just under $2.1 billion. The progress in one decade—50 million more people covered and $5 billion more paid in benefits—shows how fast the health insurance industry is moving to provide for the needs of the country. This article, as issued in the December 1962 institute press release follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE SET NEW HIGHS IN 1962 BOTH IN PERSONS COVERED AND BENEFITS PAID

The health insurance business in 1962 reached new highs both in the number of persons covered and in the amount of benefits paid out, the Health Insurance Institute said today in a review of the past year.

The institute estimated that as of December 31, 1962, some 140 million persons, or 75 percent of the civilian population, were protected by some form of health insurance, an increase of 3.5 million over the record figure of 136,522,000 reached in 1961.

The institute also estimated that health insurance benefit payments during 1962 totaled $7.1 billion, an increase of 11.5 percent over the record $6,397 million paid out in 1961.

The estimated 1962 yearend coverage for each of the five major types of health insurance, said the institute, was 140 million persons protected by hospital expense insurance, 130 million covered by surgical expense insurance, 97 million with regular medical expense insurance, 38 million protected by major medical expense insurance, and 43.5 million covered by loss-of-income insurance.

At the end of 1961, 136,522,000 persons had hospital insurance, 126,940,000 had surgical insurance, 94,209,000 had regular medical insurance, 34,138,000 had major medical insurance, and 43,055,000 had loss-of-income coverage (see table below in cols. 3 and 4).

The American people received the coverage and the benefits from some 1,800 voluntary insuring organizations, including 839 insurance companies, 77 Blue Cross plans, 69 Blue Shield plans, and nearly 800 other health plans, said the institute.

INSURANCE COMPANY BENEFITS

Insurance companies paid more than $3.8 billion of the 1962 benefits, the institute estimated. This figure was up from the nearly $3.5 billion paid out in 1961 and represented more than three times the benefits paid by insurance companies during 1952, a decade earlier.

Payments for hospital expenses formed the largest single portion of health insurance benefits distributed by insurance companies said the institute.

During 1962, hospital expense benefits amounted to an estimated $1.5 billion of the more than $3.8 billion paid to insured persons by the Nation's insurance companies. Other payments during the same period were estimated to be $496 million for sur-

gical expense, and $137 million for regular medical expenses.

An additional amount of benefits for hospital-surgical-medical costs came out of the $684 million paid to persons insured under major medical expense policies.

More than $1 billion in benefits were paid to help replace income lost due to off-the-job illness or injury. This figure includes accidental death and dismemberment benefit payments.

In the past 10 years, phenomenal growth has been recorded by health insurance, declared the institute. At the end of 1952, all insuring organizations covered a grand total of 90,965,000 persons, and during that year, the insuring groups paid out $2,083 million in benefits.

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FIGURES

The health insurance coverage figures for all insuring organizations for December 31, 1961, and the estimated figures for December 31, 1962, are given below:

1961–62 estimate

[*In millions*]

Type of coverage:		
Hospital expense	$136.5	$140.0
Surgical expense	126.9	130.0
Regular medical expense	94.2	97.0
Major medical expense	34.1	43.5
Loss of income	43.1	43.5

The second article, also from the institute's December release, deals with the breadth of coverage. It indicates the number of Americans who are covered by surgical, regular, and major medical insurance as well as hospital insurance, which is the most prevalent. These figures carry through the decade 1951–61. From a total of 85 million persons with hospital insurance in 1951, this number rose to 136.5 million in 1961, and, as noted above, to some 140 million last year. In 1951 76 percent of those who had hospital insurance also had surgical insurance, 32.5 percent of them had regular medical insurance, and 0.1 percent had major medical insurance. In 1961, 93 percent of those with hospital insurance—and this base number had risen in 10 years by over 50 million people—had surgical coverage as well, 69 percent of this higher base figure had regular medical insurance, and 25 percent had major merical coverage. Again these figures show a dramatic increase in private coverage and help set a sounder basis for understanding our health finance needs and how they are being met. Great progress has been made; with the continuing innovation in the health insurance field further progress can be expected both quantitatively and qualitatively. The article on the broader protection now enjoyed by Americans follows:

BROADER PROTECTION SECURED BY PUBLIC

The American public is securing broader health insurance protection for itself against the hospital and medical expenses which result from injury or illness, the Health Insurance Institute said today.

In the decade from 1951 through 1961 there was a sharp rise in the proportion of persons who improved their health insurance protection by covering themselves against more than one type of medical expense, said the institute.

In 1951, some 85 million persons had hospital expense insurance. Of this number, 65 million, or 76 percent, also had surgical expense insurance, and 28 million, or 32.5 percent, had regular medical expense insurance, while 106,000, or 0.1 percent, had major medical expense insurance, stated the institute.

Ten years later, at the end of 1961, the number of Americans with hospital insurance had risen to more than 136 million. Of this number, 127 million, or 93 percent, also were covered against the cost of surgery, and 94 million, or 69 percent, were protected against regular medical expenses, while 34 million, or 25 percent, had major medical coverage.

NEW FIGURES

The institute has estimated, that as of the end of 1962, some 140 million persons had hospital insurance, 130 million had surgical insurance, 97 million had regular medical insurance, 38 million had major medical insurance, and 43.5 million had loss of income insurance.

The institute also estimated that health insurance benefit payments during 1962 totaled $7.1 billion, an 11.5 percent increase over the $6.4 billion paid in 1961.

Following is a table showing the increase in breadth of coverage in the past decade:

Percent of persons with hospital insurance who also have surgical insurance, regular medical insurance, and major medical insurance

Year	Surgical	Regular medical	Major medical
1951	76.0	32.5	0.1
1952	79.7	39.2	.8
1953	83.2	43.9	1.3
1954	84.6	46.6	2.2
1955	85.4	51.6	4.9
1956	87.4	56.0	7.7
1957	89.7	59.1	10.9
1958	90.6	61.3	14.1
1959	91.4	64.6	17.1
1960	91.7	66.3	20.8
1961	93.0	69.0	25.0

The third institute article which I wish to mention deals with the length of hospital stays for our people. Over half of the hospital confinements in this country last less than 6 days; eight out of nine last 14 days or less. The data for this article came from a 2-year study by the U.S. National Health Survey. In the article, which follows, details are given as to the rate of hospital discharges and regional figures on hospitalization. This article follows:

MOST HOSPITAL STAYS UNDER 6 DAYS

Eight out of every nine persons who enter the hospital are discharged in 2 weeks or less, the Health Insurance Institute said today.

The institute added that more than half of those discharged return home after hospital stays of less than 6 days. The institute report was based on an analysis of data from the U.S. National Health Survey, which studied discharges from short-stay hospitals over a 2-year period. Maternity accounted for 30 percent of the female hospitalizations.

The survey found that in an average year nearly 20 million Americans are discharged from hospitals, for a rate of 115 patients for every 1,000 population. The number of days in hospital worked out to 167 million days a year for the total population, with the average length of hospital stay being 8.4 days per person.

The length of hospital stay was 14 days or less for 88.4 percent of those discharged, said the institute. Some 10.9 percent were in hospital for only 1 day, 46.9 were hospitalized from 2 to 5 days, and 30.6 were in hospital from 6 to 14 days.

The institute estimated that at the end of 1962, some 140 million Americans had hospital insurance, an increase of three-and-a-half million in 1 year's time. It also was estimated that health insurance benefits by insurance companies, Blue Cross-Blue Shield and other health care plans last year totaled $7.1 billion.

WOMEN HOSPITALIZED MORE

The National Health Survey revealed that women were hospitalized more frequently than men but stayed for a shorter period of time. Women were hospitalized at a rate of 141 per 1,000 to 88 per 1,000 among men, but stayed about 7 days on the average to nearly 11 days among men. However, when maternity cases are excluded the rate for women drops to 99.

Maternity also played a significant part in the finding that the highest hospitalization rate by age group came in the 25–34 bracket where 172 persons out of every 1,000 in the population were discharged from a hospital in an average year. The lowest rate was among children ages 5 to 14.

By region of the United States, the highest hospitalization rate was in the West where 121 of every 1,000 persons was in hospital during the year. The Midwest had a rate of 118, the South followed with 117, and the Northeast had the lowest, 106.

However, the Northeast had the highest average length of stay in hospital. The people in this region averaged 10.2 days per hospital stay, to 8.5 days for the Midwest, 7.7 days for the West and 7.3 days for the South.

Must Our Sorrow Be in Vain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the January 10 San Marino Tribune in memory of Capt. Kenneth Good, who was fatally injured in Vietnam on January 2, 1963.

The editorial expresses the deep sorrow of San Marino over the loss of Captain Good and the feelings of the community with regard to the reason his life was lost so tragically.

The editorial follows:

MUST OUR SORROW BE IN VAIN?

"Capt. Kenneth Good was killed while out in front * * *." That brief news flash from Vietnam tells the story of why San Marino today is in the doldrums. One of our own has fought his last fight, but his end came in an honorable and noble way.

Today, San Marino is sore at heart. We have been shocked and bruised inwardly by the tragic news.

No greater praise can be given Kenny Good than to say that he was a great American. No higher honor can go to anyone because being a true American is all inclusive.

Since reaching his majority, and we knew him since he entered kindergarten, he has been trained to fight for and protect his country. This he did in a most commendable way.

When the end came he was where all good soldiers want to be—on the firing line of duty.

In these dark, heavy hours, we like to think of the days when he lived. He was a serious-minded, honest, and devoted man.

A true loyal American right down through the core. This is the man we shall always remember in our own mind and in our heart.

His assignment was to aid in the "liberation of an enslaved people." But now we learn the truth after the life of a hometown boy has been sacrificed. Those so-called enslaved people don't want to be liberated.

For this reason, stunned San Marinoans by the score are asking: "Was his a living sacrifice on the altar of appeasement: was he a 'no win policy' victim?"

To us, a heroic, devoted man was held in check or directed by diplomatic controls. This is wrong. It is the old story over again. Our military has wandered afar and deteriorated under inept civilian direction. We pray that some day the whole international picture will be unfolded to the Congress and to us. In the meantime we can only grieve for the loved ones we have lost.

Washington can come up with empty figures showing only a small percentage of losses among our fighting men. But today, and in this instance, we in San Marino do not accept percentages. The measure is one—not 1 percent, but one soldier.

We here are speaking softly, thinking deeply. With an aching heart we join the community in mourning a fallen hero. Our sincere condolences go to his parents, his wife and children, and his sister. The loss to all of us is whole: absolute to him, to his, to us, and to America.

"Soldier, rest."

What's Ahead for Rural America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, this spring wheat farmers will make a decision of vital importance to the entire national economy. In a referendum they will decide whether to institute a new type of program that will support wheat income while reducing surplus and cost, or, in effect, to return to the free market.

The implications of this choice were discussed February 8 by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John A. Baker in a fine address "What's Ahead for Rural America—Rural Renaissance or Rural Recession?" at the Fargo Farm Forum at Fargo, N. Dak.

Citing progress that has been made in the past 2 years in reviving the agricultural economy, Mr. Baker emphasized that the favorable trend can be accelerated or it can be stopped dead in its tracks depending on the results of the wheat referendum.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Baker's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR RURAL AMERICA—RURAL RENAISSANCE OR RURAL RECESSION?

(By John A. Baker)

I'm deeply privileged to have a part in the Fargo Farm Forum. This is the modern version of the old town meeting. It serves democracy in the same invigorating way. It bring us together to discuss public affairs in a spirit of learning and sharing—a spirit that illuminates the most highly charged debates.

And I welcome this opportunity to explore with you the question—what's ahead for the Nation's farmers. It's a question in which you—as citizens of a predominantly agricultural area—and I as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture—have a keen personal and practical interest. It's a question we've been thinking, and reading, and talking about for a good many years.

LONG-TERM FARM GAINS UNDERWAY

The future holds changes that are highly exciting. It holds changes that will be coming along at a much faster rate than any we've seen up to now.

Our people are investing, this year alone, some $17.6 billion of public and private funds in research and development. These are the dynamics of change. And the results will affect all of us—farmers and nonfarmers alike.

A recent report of the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council tells about the changes we may expect in agriculture here in North Dakota and nearby States.

The report is in close agreement with other economic studies by the universities and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These studies document what we have observed firsthand—that the new technology—power equipment, more productive crop varieties and livestock strains, fertilizers, pesticides, and management—will be further improved.

The farm family, now doing work that once required six or seven families, can expect further gains in productive efficiency.

But when we ask what's ahead for the Nation's farmers, there's a corollary question we must also consider.

What do the Nation's farmers ask of the future?

May I express my conviction that farm people share the same goals and aspirations as those of people who do not live on farms; that rural folks want and deserve the better things of life just as does everyone else.

AIMS AND ASPIRATIONS

All of us want higher levels of living. We want homes that meet our family's needs for space, comfort, and beauty. We want health services of high order. And we want churches that challenge us to greatness in spirit and in deeds.

We want schools that spur our children to self-fulfillment. Most of all, we want opportunities for our children to share in an expanding economy and to contribute to it.

One of our proudest heritages in America is the open society—a democracy in which a child from the most humble home can move to eminence. We want our children to share in that heritage and to build on it in coming years.

We want work in which we can turn our skills, talents, and energies to enterprises of value. And we want to be paid for that work at the same rate as other people are paid.

In other words, to be adequate, the farmer's income must meet two standards.

It must measure up to the returns that are assured in trade and industry when labor, capital, and other resources are used with an efficiency equal to that on the farm.

And it must be large enough for the family to ahieve the social objectives, the goals to which all of us aspire.

One other goal of utmost importance. All of us—farmers and those who are not farmers—what to influence our own destiny. We want to shape our future by taking part in groups that can and do, in fact, influence the basic decisions on which our welfare, justice, and achievement depend.

Promising progress toward attainment of these rural aspirations has been underway the past 2 years. Net farm income in 1962 was a billion dollars more than in 1960. This increase in net income amounted to $450 per farm, up in 1962 to $3,525 from $3,075 in 1960. More prosperity on the farm is quickly translated into greater prosperity in towns and cities. The $2½ billion increase in farm gross income over the past 2 years generated an additional 200,000 new employment opportunities in our economy—most of them in rural trading centers and nearby industrial manufacturing areas.

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

Sparked by increased farm income and aided by the nationwide rural areas development program initiated about 2 years ago, rural America is making a great surge forward.

The expanded rural areas development program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and cooperating State agencies, such as the Agricultural Extension Services, Employment Services, vocational education departments, and industrial development commissions, is just getting well underway. But already major gains have been made. Since 1960 services to farmers' cooperatives have been expanded by 20 percent; farm ownership loans to farmers unable to obtain needed credit elsewhere have expanded from $40 million to $200 million; available rural housing funds from Farmers Home Administration have increased from $41 million to $199 million; its insured and direct loans for soil and water improvement and development have increased from $3 million in 1960 to $50 million in 1963; REA loans for generation and transmission facilities owned by farmers' cooperatives have increased from $89 million in 1960 to an expected $278 million in 1963; REA loans for expanding business and industrial enterprises, such as the gravel pit and rock-crushing loan in North Dakota are 5 times larger now than only 3 years ago; in 1963 construction will be completed on 29 more watershed protection projects compared to only 6 in fiscal year 1960; and more importantly, new starts will be made on 60 such projects this year; the President's 1964 budget message recommended a 50-percent increase in funds over 1960 for the highly successful Great Plains conservation program.

RURAL RENAISSANCE

The causes of rural economic stagnation are being overcome. A new spirit of enterprise and growth is being generated. Main Street cash registers are ringing more often and more merrily. Firm foundations for permanent prosperity are being built in rural America, such as fully adequate family farms and rural industrialization. In area after area, we are witnessing a chain reaction of stepped up business activity and improved income and community facilities.

County rural areas development committees are active. Rural housing and farm credit have been stepped up. New local enterprises such as the experimental farmers' cooperative feed lot at Minot, N. Dak., the utilization of Dakota lignite for generation of electric power, the area redevelopment activities in Dakota and Minnesota Indian reservations have been initiated.

In a representative sample of 618 rural counties, total deposits in insured commercial banks rose during 1961 by $408 million or 6 percent. With improved business conditions underway in rural areas the process can be self-accelerating because the increased local funds that are being built up can be used for local investment to spark still more rapid economic growth in rural areas.

Future historians may well record that in these years of the 6th decade of the 20th century we are witnessing a rural renaissance that is reversing the adverse trends of six decades in rural America.

The tide of the times is moving rural. The grain of history moves in our direction.

If we vigorously push forward the favorable forces now underway, rural America will regain the grandeur and dignity that commended the rural life to the Nation's Founding Fathers. Truly, a rural renaissance is underway. It is up to us to keep it moving.

A TIME OF DECISION

But opportunities can be lost if challenges are ignored. Wheat farmers, this spring, in the referendum, will be making an important decision for all of us. A Fargo forum need not be reminded that what happens to wheat, to the price of wheat, and to the income that can be earned in the production and handling of wheat—is mighty important to Fargo and throughout the broad trade area it serves. On wheat farmers' decisions in the referendum could well rest the determining factor whether the rural renaissance and resurgence now underway is pushed forward or is to be stopped in its tracks and reversed to resume a despondent downward trail for rural America.

THE 1963 WHEAT REFERENDUM

The 87th Congress enacted legislation for a long-range wheat program to begin with the 1964 crop. The program is designed to do four things: Bring production into balance with needs; reduce the surpluses built up in the 1950's to prudent reserves; support wheat farmers' incomes at favorable levels; reduce program costs to the American taxpayer.

Wheatgrowers themselves will determine—in a referendum vote to be held in the late spring of this year—whether the program goes into effect.

Changes and improvements in farming practices over the past 40 years have made it possible for the U.S. farmers to obtain harvests without parallel in history.

Yields have steadily increased. Twenty years ago, the yield per harvested acre for the country as a whole was a little more than 16 bushels. Today, it is more than 25 bushels.

Yields that would once have been considered phenomenal are now commonplace. Think how amazed we would have been only a few years ago at the average yield in North Dakota this past year—more than 31 bushels to the acre.

Every sign points to greater increases in wheat yields in the years ahead—not only in North Dakota but throughout the Nation.

Only a few areas in the United States can come near the wheat productivity of this great breadbasket of the world. But almost half of our Nation's farmers are growing wheat. It's true that only one out of three of these farmers grow wheat as a major enterprise. That is, most of them have plantings of less than 15 acres each.

But an economic analysis of the wheat program for 1964 estimates that if the referendum does not carry the required two-thirds majority—if there is no restriction on plantings—nationwide, growers might plant 70 million acres to the crop. Harvested acreage would be around 65 million, compared with 43 million acres in 1962.

That's the prospect when we have overwhelming evidence that farmers can produce more wheat than we can eat, than we can feed, than we can use industrially, than we can market abroad—and more than we can even give away.

I would like to tell you more about this economic analysis because it provides a most instructive source of information about farm income from wheat.

The analysis was made by USDA economists in consultation with a group of economists from the land-grant colleges and universities.

Dr. Norbert Dorow, of North Dakota State University, was one of six economists who accepted Secretary Freeman's invitation to assist the Department in this study. They accepted the invitation to serve as consultants because they believed that an accurate explanation of the features of the new wheat program and the implications of the vote—for or against—would be in the public interest.

These economists tell us that the estimates of what the vote either way will mean to farm income are reasonable. Specifically, a "yes" vote for the program will probably result in a national gross income from wheat of $2.3 billion. A "no" vote will probably total almost a third less—$1.6. A "yes" vote will mean that our wheat stocks are reduced by 150 million bushels. A "no" vote will mean a substantial increase in wheat or feed grain stocks.

I realize there has been some debate about the results of a "no" vote. Some, I understand, are attempting to promise that a no vote will not mean a free market with wheat at a dollar or less. Their claim is based on the belief, or hope, that the Federal Government will rush to set aside the results. As a long-time observer of Government and Congress, I know better than to think anyone is capable of predicting matters of this kind. But it might be useful to consult some experts who are in a position to influence and to judge the course of events. Here is what President Kennedy said on the subject in his farm message to Congress on January 31 of this year: "Net farm income at the end of 1962 was $1.8 billion a year more than it was in 1960. * * * The increase in farm income has generated added business for rural industries and farm communities, putting millions of dollars in Main Street cash registers and adding at least 200,000 jobs to the national economy. * * * The successes of these principles have been made possible by a series of congressional and Executive actions undertaken in the last 2 years. * * * The success of these principles also calls for an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum to be held under the permanent legislation enacted by the Congress last year. If two-thirds of the wheat producers vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing program authorized by that law, the present income of our wheat farms will be protected and the overhanging surpluses of wheat will be further reduced. Failure to approve the wheat program will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports—at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices. I do not believe that anyone who clearly understands the choice would prefer a return to the depression conditions that preceded the initiation of price supports a generation ago. New legislation for wheat is neither necessary nor feasible this year."

Both U.S. Senators of North Dakota and both Minnesota U.S. Senators have made similar statements. They do not expect Congress to take emergency relief action if the referendum fails. Instead, the only prospect is to wait for a year and hold another referendum as provided by law.

The results of the referendum will determine in a very direct way whether the income of the wheat farmer is sustained or is drastically reduced.

For example, on a representative grain-livestock farm in east central North Dakota the economic analysis shows that a vote of "no" on the wheat referendum could mean a loss of $3,500 in farm income.

Under the program, the grower could confidently project an income budget of more than $6,000 after expenses of production. With no program, his income would be less than half of that—not quite $2,500.

These are the estimates that Dr. Dorow and other respected economic consultants believe are reasonable.

Let's take these facts and see how they will affect the rural economy with a favorable vote in the referendum.

Farmers will receive $2 per bushel or more for nearly all of their wheat marketings in 1964.

Prices will be stable and predictable. Consumer prices, as they reflect the cost of wheat, will be the same as in 1962.

The total value of wheat production—and the farm value of wheat production—including diversion payments—will be at the high 1961–62 levels—overall more than $2.3 billion. Relative to other sectors of agriculture, wheat farmers will continue to have a very favorable income.

World markets—influenced by the International Wheat Agreement—will be stable. Negotiations, particularly with the Common Market, leading to satisfactory trade agreements can proceed without the added uncertainty of unstable U.S. wheat prices.

Wheat surpluses will be reduced and the cost to the taxpayer also will be reduced compared with recent years.

Now, let's look for a moment at the results of an unfavorable vote—at the decision which one-third—plus one—of the farmers voting can make.

Farmers will receive about $1 per bushel, on the average, for their wheat.

Farm income will be sharply reduced no matter how you figure it. Gross income from wheat will be $700 million less than with a favorable vote, despite a wheat harvest of 65 million acres.

Net income available for spending for consumer goods and production items will be reduced by a like amount—and by a far greater percentage. Each of you is familiar with the practical effects of such a massive drop in farm income. Spending for capital investment—new tractors, combines, lumber and building material—is cut drastically. Expenditures for consumer items—new appliances, automobiles—also will decline sharply. In addition, there will be more intense competition between the gas bill and the grocery bill for the remaining dollars—there will be too many expenses with too little income to meet them.

To be specific about these matters, it might be interesting and possibly instructive to look at some specific historical examples: In Dickey County, N. Dak., income of a typical wheat-corn livestock family farm dropped in 1961 by 5 percent; retail sales declined 5 percent; in Rawlins County, Kans., cash income of typical winter wheat family farms dropped by 3 percent; retail sales in the county were down 2 percent.

Each of you could multiply these examples from your own experience. The effects of a three-quarters of a billion dollar drop in wheat farmers' incomes would be shattering on Main Street in the towns and cities where wheat producers and their families do their shopping.

Generally, these are small towns with less than 5,000 people. For example, a recent study shows the biggest share of the $1.6 billion in increased farm income during the past year has been spent in towns with populations of less than 5,000 people; $1.1 billion was spent in these towns—a little more than $400 million was spent in towns of between 5,000 and 30,000, and the remainder in larger cities.

The effects of these losses would first be felt in our own home communities but the force would be felt around the world.

INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Let's think, for a moment, about the effect of an unfavorable vote in the wheat referendum would increase wheat production position.

We estimate that a "no" vote on the referendum would increase wheat production to about 1.5 billion bushels. Our normal commercial markets are about 700 million bushels. The food for peace shipments take about 400 million bushels. There will then

be some 300 million bushels of wheat, which we could neither sell abroad nor eat nor give away.

We would face the choice of either breaking our commitments under the International Wheat Agreement or of taking the most extraordinary measures to avoid this action.

We have labored for 20 years to create and strengthen the International Wheat Agreement. The United States and some other exporting countries, together with 36 importing countries, have undertaken to conduct all commercial trade within the agreement price range.

The accumulation of some 300 million bushels of wheat which could be dumped on the world market would seriously impair our position in negotiating with the European Common Market at a critical time. We expect the Common Market to announce its support prices for grain by April of this year. Our efforts to gain access to the market will be seriously hampered if it appears that U.S. wheat growers are preparing to wage cutthroat competition in the world market.

These are the things we hope will be in the back of the wheat grower's mind as he studies the program for 1964.

The referendum is a democratic process. It has been used in U.S. agriculture for many years. It is the device by which the farmer can make the decision that will influence his own destiny. And may I add, his decision in the wheat referendum will influence the destiny of all of rural America, possibly for a long time to come.

The stakes in the wheat referendum and the possibilities and the hopes of extending the rural renaissance now underway were stated in these words by President Kennedy in concluding his farm message to Congress just a week ago yesterday: "With the benefit of new action in these areas, we can continue to narrow the gap between farm income and incomes in other segments of our economy, until the day is reached when efficient farm operators may be more certain of the opportuntiy to earn incomes equivalent to those in comparable nonfarm occupations. We will also continue to reduce the excess stocks of farm commodities and to lighten the burden they impose upon the taxpayer. We will develop further our programs to conserve our resources of land and water, and to redirect their use in order to supply our most essential needs—whether these be for food, timber, or recreation.

"We will intensify our campaign against rural poverty and our drive to build a thriving diversified rural economy. We will continue to encourage the advance of efficiency in agriculture, insuring the continued production of food and fiber at reasonable prices and in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of all Americans, and advancing the cause of economic development and security throughout the free world. A balanced and stable farm economy is essential if we are to meet both domestic and world challenges in the coming years—this program is designed to achieve that kind of farm economy."

A Tribute to the Honorable Barratt O'Hara for 50 Years of Public Service

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the public tribute that this Congress has paid to my good friend and able colleague from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, for his half century of public service has been founded on private admiration released by proper occasion.

I have known Mr. O'HARA for a number of years, and on numerous occasions have worked with him in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in many other capacities. Our relationship has been profitable and inspiring to me. He has always been forthright, honest, and, in a sense, ageless—and his mind is as keen as any man's, regardless of age.

No one can truthfully deny that my colleagues' tributes have been preceded through the years by the recognition of the public, which time and again has reelected Mr. O'HARA to important State and national offices. Such recognition was evident in 1913, when at the age of 30 years he became the youngest Lieutenant Governor in the history of Illinois. And, of course, this recognition was once again demonstrated during last fall's elections, which enabled Mr. O'HARA to begin his sixth term in Congress.

Mr. O'HARA's abilities are especially suited for the House of Representatives, in which the diverse problems and interests of our Nation are examined and resolved. The gentleman from Illinois represents a district of many industries, and peopled by all races and colors, and by many creeds. He has shown much of his talent by successfully caring for the many problems that have arisen in his varied constituency.

To the world Mr. O'HARA has been successful as a lawyer, businessman, administrator, journalist, radio commentator, soldier, legislator, and guardian of the public interest. In addition, to me, and I am sure to my colleagues, he has been a success as a friend.

The Late Honorable James Patrick McGranery

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I knew Jim McGranery for a great number of years. He was a colleague of mine in the House of Representatives and I knew him then and afterwards to be a dedicated, hard-working individual. As a Member of this body, he performed his duties both to his district, his State, and his country in the highest possible fashion. He had a long and distinguished career. He was a lawyer, a Congressman, a judge, and finally he held the highest legal office in the Government of the United States as the Attorney General of this great Nation. Jim McGranery was a self-made man and a real one. I valued his friendship and I will miss him.

I extend to Mrs. McGranery and their children my sincere sympathy and best wishes.

Ten Statements Lincoln Never Uttered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am certain every member of this body is interested in the pursuit of truth and the defeat of error, and yet there are times when I think we are less than diligent in carrying out these objectives. Of late I have noticed in certain publications, and even in the Congress, an eagerness to quote famous personages in support of one's arguments without a corresponding eagerness to establish the accuracy of such quotations.

Last year, for example, I discovered that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carried a widely printed but spurious quotation attributed to Nikita Khrushchev. Even after the fictional nature of this quotation was brought to light there was no attempt on the part of those parties having circulated this false quotaton to correct the record.

Now it develops that 10 axioms attributed to Abraham Lincoln, used frequently to counter demands for economic and social reforms, are also without foundation. The following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, Ariz., merits the attention of all of us:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 4, 1963]

TEN STATEMENTS LINCOLN NEVER UTTERED

In 1916 the Reverend William J. H. Boetcker, of Erie, Pa., wrote 10 axioms. He published them that year and again in 1917, 1938, and 1945. In 1942 the 10 axioms were published by the Committee for Constitutional Government with a credit line to Boetcker and with some loosely parallel statements by Abraham Lincoln on the back. A later edition of this leaflet left off the Boetcker credit, and thus there started in many people's minds the assumption that Lincoln had uttered what was on both sides.

Lincoln Lore, a publication at Fort Wayne, Ind., has set forth to correct the record. It began this task in 1950, but as with other inaccuracies elsewhere in the world, these about Lincoln persist despite denial.

The 10 axioms which Boetcker wrote, and which since have been attributed to Lincoln (and which Lincoln might very well have endorsed, but certainly did not utter) are—

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should be doing for themselves.

The ideas behind Boetcker's axioms undoubtedly were good. Some of them are a trifle oversimplified, but a sympathetic reader can find room to believe them. The only thing about them to which Lincoln researchers object is their attribution to Lincoln, when they should be attributed to Boetcker.

Such attribution is somewhat like attributing "God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb" to the Bible, when actually it is not in the Bible, but is from Sterne's "Sentimental Journey"—though even there, Sterne used it in a manner to imply that he was quoting it from some other, but unnamed, source.

Jaycee Distinguished Service Award to Mr. Jay Rodriguez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding record of service to the welfare and betterment of his community was recognized when Mr. Jay Rodriguez received the Pomona, Calif., Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award for 1962.

The award was presented to Mr. Rodriguez at a joint meeting of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce and the Junior Chamber of Commerce on January 22, 1963.

I would like at this time to add my warmest congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Rodriguez for the honor bestowed on him. It is truly deserved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an item from the January 23 issue of the Pomona Progress-Bulletin concerning the presentation of the award to Mr. Rodriguez:

JAYCEES NAME JAY RODRIGUEZ OUTSTANDING YOUNG MAN OF 1962

Pomona's Outstanding Young Man for 1962 is Jay Rodriguez.

Rodriguez received the Pomona Junior Chamber of Commerce's Distinguished Service Award last night before 300 spectators at the new Brasilia Inn at a joint meeting of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce and the Jaycees.

The Distinguished Service Award was given by City Councilman Harry Faull, who said Rodriguez could be called nothing but "a real nice guy."

Rodriguez, who is employed by the Progress-Bulletin in the display advertising department, won the award for his active participation in many phases of civic life.

Besides being active in the Jaycees, of which he is a director, Rodriguez is a member of the PTA, was a member of the Pomona Optimist Club, worked on the United Fund campaign and on the YMCA membership drive.

Rodriguez worked on the annual chamber of commerce membership drive, worked with the Pomona Beautification Committee in a 2-week paint-up, fix-up, clean-up campaign, and is a year-round member of the Contact Club, an organization also seeking new members for the chamber.

At Mount San Antonio College, Rodriguez has been on the Mount San Antonio Relays Committee and has sold sponsorships and program advertising.

He was cochairman of the valleywide committee for Dr. Ralph Richardson for the office of State superintendent of public instruction.

Rodriguez also was active in the get-out-the-vote drive in that same election.

He was campaign manager for a successful city councilman in La Verne, Mike Morales, who won a 4-year term.

Rodriguez is a member of the junior chamber of commerce board of directors in charge of publicity and all publications, was active in the Miss Pomona pageant, the Christmas parade, the kiddie bar, the Jaycee community fair, and the Jaycee get-out-the-vote drive.

Rodriguez also was chairman of Phil Shepherd night, when the club honored the manager of the Los Angeles County Fair.

He is a member of the Claremont Presbyterian Church, was a member of the Pomona Optimist Club, and worked with the advertising committee for the passage of Pomona school bonds.

Rodriguez lives with his wife, Pat, and two children at 1447 Edgehill Drive, Pomona. He was born and reared in the Pomona Valley, attending La Verne schools, Bonita High School, and Mount San Antonio College.

He was State vice president of the California Junior Chamber of Commerce and a national director of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Rodriguez was in charge of State publications and public relations for the California Jaycees for 2 years, and won the sweepstakes award for the best State newspaper in the Nation from the U.S. Jaycees.

He is personally responsible for chartering four new Jaycee Clubs: Claremont, Palm Desert, Barstow, and Corona.

Will We Awaken?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, there is no group or organization closer to the grassroots of the American people than the editors of the Nation's small-town newspapers. These editors live close to the man in the street, the average man, the plain American, and it is these people who make up the body as well as the heart of cross section America.

More often than through any other source, that which is going on in the minds of the average American is expressed in the editorial columns of their publications. Below is an editorial which appeared a short time ago in the Star-Herald of Kosciusko, Miss., a small paper published in a small town. It reflects the thinking of the average American on the strange direction, or misdirection, if you please, of the United Nations.

In my judgment, the author of this statement has correctly evaluated the situation and suggested an appropriate course of direction. I commend it to the consideration of the Congress. The editorial follows:

WILL WE AWAKEN?

As the years have rolled by since our initial starry-eyed involvement in 1945 with a global fantasy called the United Nations, both the actual injury and the potential peril of our misguided altruism have become increasingly apparent and painful to an ever-increasing number of thoughful Americans.

Looking back on this degrading experience from our inglorious position as the helpless victim of a Cuban bandit is to review a shocking, incomprehensible nightmare.

It is not vainglory, but simple truth, to recall that this Nation emerged from World War II the savior of the free world. And, despite our inordinate investment of blood and treasure in this global conflict, the United States entered the sanctified company of the United Nations as the strongest of all.

But what has happened to us since that day passeth all understanding. Undertaking a "police action" in Korea, we found ourselves involved in a war in which our armies, joined by token forces from a few other U.N. members, were under U.N. command; a war we were not allowed to win, a war in which 125,000 Americans died in vain.

In 1956, after years of encouragement by our radio propagandists, Hungarian patriots rose and beat their Red slavemasters with fists and stones and bottles and a few small arms, but we lacked the courage to help secure their victory and allowed them to be massacred by hordes of Soviet and Red Chinese troops.

We averted our eyes while Mao's forces pillaged and enslaved Tibet, while Nehru took the peaceful, industrious, 400-year-old Portuguese enclave of Goa, and a Communist stooge seized Portuguese Angola. But we have been stirred to action in airlifting U.S. arms to the U.N. "Peace Force" in its ruthless destruction of the hopes and resistance of pro-Western Katanga.

The U.N. it seems, is our Svengali. We have been hypnotized, rendered incapable of acting in our own interest and traditions. We have even given the U.N. a blueprint for the three-stage takeover of the U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force.

Strangely, we are opposing a U.N. grant of $2.1 million to Castro (of which the United States would supply nearly half a million). But if the U.N. bosses approve the plan, says our man Stevenson, "there isn't much that can be done about it."

Isn't there? If we have any spirit or pride left, whatever, we can do what we should have done before Korea. We can get out, and lick our grievous wounds.

Additional Tax Exemption for Taxpayer Supporting a Blind Dependent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1963, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1659, which would grant an additional tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind.

Enactment of this measure, I believe, would represent little in lost revenue to the Federal Treasury, but its enactment would serve to lessen, in some small degree, the tax burdens of those who provide a home and pay for the special needs

of blind persons who are dependent upon them for support.

The blind schoolchild has a need for the various tools and devices which have been developed to aid them in efforts to obtain an education—which will assist immeasurably to offset the handicapping consequences of blindness. For example, a sightless child attending school has a need for a typewriter and a braille writer, for a tape recorder and a supply of tapes.

The blind child must have these special appliances, these special tools and devices if the opportunity to obtain an education is to be more nearly equal to that available to the child with sight.

Until the blind schoolchild has learned to travel alone, he must be escorted to and from school by an adult, or special transportation arrangements must be made for him—and paid for by a taxpaying adult.

The blind schoolchild's need for sighted readers is insatiable—a continuing and ever-increasing cost as they advance through the grades—as, perhaps, he or she attends a college or a university.

Ordinarily, these special needs—the cost of these special requirements—are met by a child's parents. They are met and paid for out of family income.

The married son, already supporting a wife and children, already overburdened and perhaps overwhelmed by mounting family expenses, yet providing financial assistance to a parent who is blind, soon discovers that his parent's needs are not only the usual basic needs—for food, clothing, and shelter—but, the dependent parent by reason of lack of sight, has other equally important requirements which must be met.

Unable to travel alone—to the store or to church, to visit friends, to move at all outside of the familiar surroundings of home—the sightless parent must be accompanied by a sighted guide.

The blind parent may need help in preparing meals and in the performance of other household tasks.

The devoted son or daughter, already burdened with immediate family responsibilities, must somehow manage to meet these special needs of blind parents.

Mr. Speaker, the special needs of which I speak are not limited to the blind schoolchild or to the elderly person who is without sight, they are not attributable to educational activities nor old age; but they are needs peculiar to the circumstances of blindness. They may vary as the age, aspirations, and conditions of individual blind persons vary, but, whatever the situation of the individual blind person may be, they are needs that must be met if those who are blind are to live and function independently, though without sight, in a sight-oriented society.

The legislation which I introduced does not embody a principle foreign to Federal law. For the Congress has already given statutory recognition to the burdensome costs attributable to blindness by providing an additional tax exemption to the person who is blind.

The measure which I am offering would extend this recognition to include those who support dependents who are blind.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, although we may honor those who expend their resources that blind children and blind persons who are dependent upon them may live better lives and commend these people for their generosity and unselfishness, honor is not enough. Commendation is not enough. These people need and merit our help, they need and merit financial help, the kind of financial help that would be provided by enactment of my bill into law.

The Passing of Poets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Robert Frost, a loss to all men, has prompted Columnist George Frazier to write a moving tribute which I want to share with my colleagues. The tribute follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 30, 1963]

THE PASSING OF POETS

(By George Frazier)

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—Now the poets are passing from among us—one day, E. E. Cummings; another, Otto Harbach; and now, Robert Frost—all their lovely flames dying and leaving us diminished, even those of us who profess no partiality for poetry.

But that, of course, is absurd, that anyone should assume that just because he has no taste for poetry, he is immune to it. That is as absurd as saying that just because you know nothing about nuclear physics, you need not worry about being blasted by the bomb. That is a silly thing to say.

For whether or not we happen to respond to their rondelays, poets—true poets, poets whose sounds have the chime of silver—are part of us, their winged words exhalting our spirit, enriching our culture, and becoming the birthright of every baby yet unborn. Nor can we ever escape it, either.

But let us have no nonsense about what is poetry and what is not. That will get us absolutely nowhere, for poetry is not a thing to be talked about in technical terms—or, if it is, then that is the least part of it. That is the skill of it, not the spirit.

For what poetry really is—well, Emily Dickinson said something about poetry being that which makes you go all hot and cold and makes you feel as if the top of your head were coming off. And that does very nicely—or certainly more nicely than does any technical talk about iambic pentameter or anything like that.

For though poetry can be that sort of thing—iambic pentameter or imaganism or dactylic hexameter, a sonnet or a soliloquy—it need not be. Nor, does the mere fact that it is any of those things necessarily make it poetry either. For prose can be poetry, too—just so long as it touches the heart.

So Edward Estlin Cummings, terror of the typesetters though he may have been, was a poet—and no matter about all those exasperating oddities, all the perplexing punctuation, all the aversion to upper case, for when he was going good, when he was graced by the gift that was in him, he could tear you apart with the wonder of his words. A man who can do that is a poet.

And Otto Harbach, who died the other day at the age of 89, was a poet—naturally, not all the time, but at least once in a while, which is more than enough to expect of any man.

And now another poet has departed—a poet, but not, of course, his poetry, for true poetry abides forever. But this one, of all poets, was something special. Robert Frost, dead at the age of 88, was a man of such singular simplicity that he ennobled his art in a way that no one before him—neither Chaucer nor Shakespeare, nor Shelley or Keats or Donne—ever did. By the immense innocence of him, Robert Frost wrote poetry—poetry, that is, in all its implications of the egghead—with the common touch.

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep. But I have promises to keep."

And so on—and, forever and always, there will be the image of the land he loved, of the New England landscape. There is the measure of Robert Frost—the way the magic lingers to summon up beauty, yet without any affection, with all the cadences of the language as refined and made resonant by the King James version.

All day Tuesday, over the radio and the television, they talked about this man, and the mere mention of his name evoked images that will endure the shock of white hair; the craggy face; the glare of the sun blinding him as he tried to read his poem at President Kennedy's inauguration; the wry wisdom of his reactions to Russia; and, as well, of course, all the miracles—"Mending Wall" and "The Death of the Hired Man," and all the rest. And, naturally, they talked, too, about his four Pulitzers.

But prizes are but a pittance, and a poet's pittance no less than anyone else's. For Pearl Buck won the Nobel, did she not—and, almost as preposterously, so did Mr. Steinbeck. So the four Pulitzers that Mr. Frost won do not amount to much—not really. What matters is the way this man touched our lives by the marvelous simplicity of his manner.

"A poem," he said, "begins with a lump in the throat."

And that was so typical. That said it all, and with no nonsense about dialectics, with no deviousness. You think of him—and then you think of all the beatniks who would be bards. And yet it was so like him never to belittle the blasphemies of others. If the Kennedy administration never does anything else, it at least recognized the greatness of the artist as an old man. For in our age, we have, it seems, so little time for poets—for poets, that is, who are ageless in their dedication and honest in their utterances. Robert Frost had what the Spanish call duende. That means the ability to express the maximum in a minimum of words. Mr. Frost had more duende than any man of our time. In honoring him, Mr. Kennedy also honored himself and us.

Old Pro Advises Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

by Inez Robb which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 31, 1963.

OLD PRO ADVISES OPPOSITION

(By Inez Robb)

If the Republicans are willing to leave the selection of their 1964 presidential slate to a master politician whose hand has never lost its cunning, James A. Farley will be happy to oblige.

"Mr. Democrat," his personal dynamism and physical vigor undiminished by his 74 years, believes that the toughest 1964 GOP ticket, i.e., the one that would cause President Kennedy the most difficulty, would consist of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller as top banana and Oregon's bright, attractive young Governor, Mark O. Hatfield, as the vice-presidential hopeful.

Gentleman Jim said as much a few days ago during and after his appearance on a television program. As a member of the panel on that occasion, I got the distinct impression that the elder kingmaker fully expects the occupant of the White House through 1968 to be the present incumbent.

However, Farley believes the Rockefeller-Hatfield ticket would be the strongest the Republicans could put in the field. But if the old pro has respect for what such a GOP ticket could do in 1964, his affection, deep and genuine, is reserved for another Republican institution.

Astounding and unlikely as it may seem to those who remember the bitter presidential campaigns of 1932 and 1936, master-minded by Farley, there has been a rapprochement between himself and the Nation's oldest living ex-President, Herbert C. Hoover.

UNLIKELY PROSPECT

That the mellowing influence of time and tide would ever lead to mutual friendship and respect between these two men would, in the thirties, have seemed the world's most unlikely prospect. Yet when Farley was asked to name the greatest Americans of his acquaintance, he ticked off Franklin D. Roosevelt, former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, former Vice President "Cactus Jack" Garner, Alfred E. Smith, former President Harry Truman and former President Herbert Hoover.

"Hoover is a great American," Farley said with warmth. "History will deal fairly with him," he added, plainly implying that his contemporaries had not always dealt so with the Republican ex-President.

For a quarter of a century after the 1932 campaign that elected Roosevelt to the White House, it was the angry cry of the GOP that the Democrats, no matter who, when or where, always ran against Herbert Hoover. Indeed, the Democrats began running against Hoover in 1929.

Certinly, the primary architect of Democratic victory in the thirties, when the Democrats did indeed run against Hoover on every occasion, was James Aloysius Farley. That the bitterness of those years had faded and that time has wrought friendship between the two men is proof that the age of miracles is still with us.

HE IS NOT BITTER

Is Farley himself bitter that he was denied the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1962, as the crown of his long service to the Democratic Party, or that Young Turks in the State party snubbed him?

"No, of course I'm not bitter," the old pro said promptly. "Bitterness is self-destructive," he explained, and he will have none of it. Then Farley added with a wide smile, "The fact I've never been elected to public office isn't my fault."

In Farley's own discussion of the state of the Union ,he said that unemployment had "plagued" Franklin Roosevelt more than any other issue, as it is now plaguing Kennedy.

The great difference between the New Deal and the New Frontier, he continued, is that Roosevelt was preoccupied in his first years by domestic crises while Kennedy has been preoccupied by international affairs.

"Castro will have to go, and he will go, although I don't know when or how," Mr. Democrat said. And then he prophesied, "From now on, De Gaulle will be President Kennedy's big problem.

Duties of a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article by my friend and colleague, the Honorable EDWARD R. FINNEGAN, on the "Duties of a Congressman." This elucidative presentation of congressional duties, which I know will be of interest to all my colleagues, was prepared by Congressman FINNEGAN for the January meeting of the Chicago alumni chapter of the Phi Alpha Delta legal fraternity of which my son and namesake served as justice. The article follows:

DUTIES OF A CONGRESSMAN

The composition, powers, and duties of the Congress as a whole, and of the respective Houses of Congress, are defined in article I of the Constitution of the United States.

The duties of the individual Member are not so defined but he bears the following responsibilities of office:

1. To represent the interests of the constituents of the district which elected him.

2. To study the many and varied issues confronting the Nation as a whole.

3. To attend regularly the meetings and hearings of the committees to which he may be assigned.

4. To vote conscientiously in the best interests of the people of his district and of the country.

To carry out these responsibilities the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and the 100 Members of the Senate are constantly busy throughout a legislative session.

A Congressman's mail is heavy with thousands of letters from constituents and others interested in particular legislation, in seeking specific information about matters relating to various executive agencies of the Government, in obtaining Government employment, or the advice and assistance of various welfare agencies of the Government. Keeping current with his heavy correspondence by prompt response to the manifold inquiries is in itself a large task for every Member.

In addition, thousands of bills are introduced at each session of the Congress. It is a physical impossibility for each member to know the contents of every one of these bills.

Each Member, however, through his service on one or more of the standing committees (these are permanent as disinguished from special committees) tends to develop into a specialist in the particular field of agriculture or industry, or taxation, etc., depending upon his particular talents and interests and the character of the district he represents. For instance, a Congressman from a district whose principal industry is shipping may seek membership on a committee dealing with rivers and harbors or the merchant marine; another, from a farming district, makes agricultural legislation his principal interest; still another from a heavily industrial section specializes in labor legislation or interstate commerce, and so forth.

This does not mean he ignores or remains uninformed on other important matters, but that he devotes himself mainly to these topics of principal interest to his district. At the same time, however, he must study the most important measures in other fields in order to be prepared to vote intelligently upon proposed laws of national significance.

In such matters it may frequently occur that a member takes a position contrary to the opinion of a substantial segment of voters in his own district; in which case a conscientious Member may risk his own reelection by putting the welfare of the country as a whole above the narrower interest in his own locality. In national affairs, the Members are also influenced by other considerations, such as:

1. The recommendations of the committee entrusted with the study and solution of a particular problem.

2. The position and policy of the political party of which he is a member and on whose platform he stood for reelection.

As U.S. Representative from the Ninth District of Illinois I represent you and some 428,000 other citizens who live on the northside of Chicago within the boundaries of the Ninth Congressional District. I was first elected to Congress in 1960 and stand for reelection every 2 years as must every Member of the House of Representatives. Senators on the other hand are elected for 6-year terms.

This means besides my regular duties as a Member of Congress, I am involved in a campaign every 2 years which consumes a great deal of time, effort, and money on my part and on the part of my friends and supporters.

Globe Asks Kennedy To Stay Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the weekend edition of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for Saturday and Sunday, February 2 and 3, had as its lead editorial a plea for the President to stay strong in his determination to maintain a meaningful American nuclear margin over the Soviets. It pointed in particular to the President's decision to order the resumption of preparations for underground tests in the face of continued Russian construction of an adequately policed nuclear test ban agreement. It noted that previously strong stands of the President have been dissipated and urges that in this case the President "stay strong."

In its work on this subject, the Globe has drawn deeply on the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER]. They could not have chosen a more able or knowledgeable person to rely upon in this field. The gentleman has been unwavering in his efforts to

assure America stays strong militarily in facing the threat of international communism. I would urge that we listen to the words of CRAIG HOSMER and abide by the pleas of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in this area lest we find we have frittered away a nuclear advantage which may well stand between us and the horrors of atomic war. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat editorial follows:

STAY STRONG, MR. PRESIDENT

President Kennedy deserves great credit for ordering resumption of preparations for new underground testing in Nevada.

He unquestionably realizes, even if some of his top-ranking advisers do not, that Russia has no inclination whatsoever, now or in the foreseeable future, to arrive at any agreement on nuclear testing which could even begin to satisfy the minimum security requirements of the United States.

Until the President moved yesterday, following Russian breaking off of the talks, there had been growing fears on both sides of the aisle in Washington that the administration was moving toward an executive-type agreement on nuclear testing which would not require Senate approval, instead of a formal treaty which would require a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Only yesterday, Dr. Edward Teller, the world's leading physicist, and a man of unquestioned patriotism and devotion to his country, warned of a Munich-type nuclear test ban agreement with Russia.

Earlier this week, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California, ranking Republican on the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee, outlined the steady deterioration of our minimum security requirements from 1958 to the present time. This has been a continuing regression in America's demands for meaningful inspection while the Russians have retreated not at all, except for the tentative offer last week of two or three inspections of black boxes.

In actual practice, this would be less than no inspection at all, because they are so unreliable and could so easily be tampered with.

It is only to be hoped that the President's order for the resumption of test plans yesterday is a step toward strength and not a mere gambit toward a meaningless treaty or an executive-type agreement which would result in virtually unilateral disarmament.

Unfortunately, there are many disturbing signs of weakness and accommodation on national strength through testing, and few shows of determination on our side—the President's announcement yesterday being the first of the latter in a long, long time.

The resignation of Arthur Dean as our chief negotiator, under the usual reason of business pressures, leaves many questions to be answered. Ambassador Dean, while having achieved little success, was nevertheless known as a hardminded man whose basic tent was to protect America, not in diluting our strength, or playing the few remaining trump cards in our hand of strength as a deterrent to aggression.

The Russian offer to let us inspect the black boxes brought yelps of joy from the accommodation-minded members of the extreme left in America, both in the press and the State Department, and at the United Nations.

Experts in the field know that the black boxes, though sealed, are far from foolproof. Under the custody of the Soviets alone, they could be moved from one location to another between inspections, and we could never tell the difference.

Even more important, a large bomb could be exploded to mask a second and smaller, but infinitely more important, bomb seconds later. This is one of the great concerns of knowledgeable nuclear physicists.

Regardless of the hopes which feed on will-o'-the wisps emerging from the Soviet-China division, and even including the possibilities that the Chinese may, within the next year, develop a nuclear bomb, though without the means of production or transportation to make it important militarily, the basic fact for America must remain that Russia cannot be trusted on their own word.

There is not a scintilla of evidence to subtract from this basic fact of life today.

Notwithstanding, our position has diminished in the past 5 years until there is virtually nothing left to give.

In 1958, we demanded a minimum of 20 annual on-site inspections. Today, Secretary of State Rusk and the President's personal adviser, Jerome Wiesner, are ecstatic with joy when the Soviets meaninglessly offer two or three neutralist inspections.

Five years ago, we asked for 180 internationally manned and controlled detection stations, and now we have abandoned that entirely.

A half decade ago, we reduced the demand to 19, and now some of the President's advisers are itching to accept the three unmanned tamper-prone "black box" devices on Khrushchev's terms.

Five years ago, there was to be an International Control Commission. Now, our thoughts revolve around having inspections only on the invitation of the suspected cheater, which is about as sensible as asking highwaymen to turn themselves in after they have committed atrocious crimes.

Our earlier demands were for unlimited personnel for all types of inspection, and now we appear almost ready to settle for small groups who could be limited, delayed, or otherwise easily impeded.

This was the background for Dr. Teller's strong warning that the kind of test ban now being negotiated by the United States "would endanger our security and would help the Soviet Union in its plan to conquer the world."

Thus, we praise the President for yesterday's action, while keeping our fingers crossed, which we believe is not unreasonable in light of the President's disheartening backdown, after a brave, though belated, beginning against the Castro cancer in Cuba.

If President Kennedy could only realize how ardently Americans yearn for the type of leadership that he gave in his first employment of a blockade in Cuba, or that President Eisenhower gave when he sent the Marines in to hold Lebanon for the free world, or that President Truman gave when he employed the Marshall plan to save Greece and Turkey, he would maintain strength, and, having conceded so much in the past, hold firm until the Russians agree to meaningful guarantees of the basic security requirements of this country.

Americans of good will everywhere hope and pray that the President will settle for nothing less.

There are many worse things than perfecting nuclear devices, one of which is to have the Russians so much stronger than we that they could dominate the world and make good Khrushchev's boast to bury us.

This is the first, and greatest, circumstance against which President Kennedy must be eternally on guard.

A House Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, over 100 years ago the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, said: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." This philosophy applies to our two great political parties as well as our Nation itself.

In the overall interest of perpetuating and protecting the two-party system of our body politic, my distinguished colleague from the First Congressional District of the State of Washington [Mr. PELLY], is delivering a Lincoln Day speech in my congressional district; embodying a plea for political unity, without which no party can long survive. We all know that from time to time both the Democratic and Republican Parties are beset with factional problems and sectional infighting, such as conservative versus liberal and rightist versus leftist.

In this connection, I believe the content of Congressman PELLY's remarks, which I am including in the RECORD, will interest our colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

The text of the speech is as follows:

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS—1963

(By Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, First Congressional District, State of Washington)

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Republicans, Abraham Lincoln truly belongs to the ages and to Democrats and Republicans alike, but his political philosophy which in life he had lived and practiced especially belongs to the Republican Party.

His statesmanship and principles are ours and certainly are in strong contrast with the New Frontier.

It is only fitting therefore, that we, the members of the Republican Party which he loved and of which he, in 1860, became the first great leader, should pause at this season of his birth, and pay tribute to his memory.

When we Republicans commemorate this birthday of Abraham Lincoln, it is supremely important, it seems to me, to remember that Lincoln's greatness and the reason our Republican Party came into power, was due to courage, courage in meeting the great social, political, and economic issues of that critical period in history.

The same willingness to meet squarely the problems of our time could well dictate today the destiny and success of our party.

I do not imply that stubbornly Republicans should stand for ancient solutions or 100-year-old issues. Nor do I mean we should give blind adherence to views which can be labeled either liberal or conservative. "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present," Lincoln said.

Rather, I refer to fundamental principles. I mean the basic philosophy which was born and associated with Lincoln and which has been cherished and promulgated by our party every since.

The basic belief of Republicans is that the Federal Government should act only when the people are not adequately served by State or local government and the individual's right and capacity to govern himself without the restraints of dictatorship or paternalism. We believe in a system of separation of government powers and checks and balances to protect the equilibrium of power. The government should only do for the people what they cannot do for themselves.

Also we draw a clear line of demarcation in that our party remains undeviatingly the party of Lincoln, the party of ideals, the party of integrity, the party of courage, and may I add, too that we must remain the party of political wisdom. What good are our ideals and principles unless we have the

confidence of the people and are able to win elections so our policies can prosper?

And here, speaking of political wisdom, the one most important single and significant lesson to be learned from Lincoln, from that astute and canny master of reconciling difrences of opinion and healing of the wounds and bruises of dissent, is that to win elections and for our philosophy to prevail, we Republicans must have unity. To win the White House in 1964, there must be unity among us. And the same formula is true with regard to winning our own State house and legislature.

As a minority party, we Republicans cannot afford disunity in our ranks. Unfortunately, the Democrats being numerically stronger can afford disunity in their ranks.

So I emphasize at the start it is a tremendous mistake to indulge in splinter-group thinking and inflexible individual ideas which can only defeat the very convictions which compose our overall common Republican heritage.

In my republicanism it is not heresy to support a Republican candidate even though what he believes does not happen to coincide exactly with each shade and shadow of what I believe; nor do I insist that views of prominent leaders of the party must be the same as mine on all issues, provided, of course, agreement on fundamental objectives is possible.

Let me cite a hypothetical case. Suppose there is disagreement within our party say as between a Republican Senator who is a presidential candidate, for example, and a Republican Governor who is a candidate: call these Republicans either Goldwater or Romney or Rockefeller or any name you want; of course, I am assuming any such presidential hopefuls would fully support our Republican platform and would meticulously carry out the program of a Republican Congress. What if our favorite loses? I say do as Taft did when he gave his full support for General Eisenhower.

The important thing, it seems to me, is for the Republican Party and our legislative representatives in Congress to possess the wisdom to establish a record and write a platform and calling for policies and programs that contain the basic principles on which the majority of Republicans agree. A president, be he liberal or conservative or middle of the road under the Constitution, must follow the laws and will of the duly constituted legislative branch. The Congress is where policy should be properly initiated. As a matter of fact Congress is the place where the issue of socialism will be decided in America.

So, as I say, I hope Republicans will have the political wisdom in 1964, to elect legislators who will indeed preserve and protect our Republic and its free way of life and courageously so, as with Lincoln and meet the issues of 1963 as he met those of his time. With its power of the purse Congress can kill any program or control any executive actions.

Why do I say all this? For one thing, because extreme rightists at a Republican County Convention in Los Angeles the other day threatened to splinter Senator MORTON has warned of a possible third party movement in the South.

At a conservative conference in Washington, D.C., recently, a Republican said, "Once we nominate a candidate, for President, we must close ranks behind him. We have seen the tragedy of division." Yet, according to the press this call for united support drew boos. As for me, I think, provided there were no major differences involved, Lincoln, under such circumstances, would have said, "Let us bind up our wounds and vote Republican." He probably would have told his story about the lost backwoods rider who was caught in a storm. The thunder was terrifying and when a bolt seemed to strike at his very feet he fell on his knees. "Oh Lord," he prayed, "let there be light and not so much noise." We must avoid contention as to which personality or which bandwagon is on the make. Instead, let us work within our political party, as Senator GOLDWATER called on his Republican friends to do in the 1960 Chicago Republican Convention.

Washington State as a matter of record rarely has played an influential part in selecting the Republican candidate for President. That is, our delegations' convention votes, because of the alphabetical situation, are too little and too late.

On the other hand, Washington State Republicans have contributed to party policy. Our most effective influence, of course, has been in electing 6 out of 7 Congressmen. In this respect, we can do better, especially in obtaining representation in the Senate.

Meanwhile, reelection of my colleague, 2 years from now will do more for the promulgation of our principles than maneuvering to influence the State's position in the selection of our Republican candidate for President.

Your Congressman is a Lincoln Republican. Work for him and discourage those who would contribute toward his defeat by intraparty war over who will head the ticket in 1964. That is my advice.

The Santa Ana (Calif.) Register recently published a letter written by a former administrative assistant to Congressman UTT. The writer started by saying he believed in the conservative principles espoused by the proposed conservative party in California. Then he proceeded to show that the splinter movement would be harmful to the very cause for which he was fighting. He pointed out if conservatives join a third party liberals were sure to be nominated on both major tickets and thus a liberal was sure to be elected.

Here is what he wrote about our Republican Party:

"Democrats, when they controlled Congress, ran up 93.4 percent of the national debt. Democrat Congresses approved deficit spending budgets or deficiency appropriations which resulted in deficits during 20 of the last 27 years.

"There were of course some Republicans who voted for some of these spending sprees, just as there were some Democrats who voted against them. But the majority of Democrats voted for them and the great majority of Republicans voted against them.

"The rating given by the Americans for constitutional action proves without any doubt that Republicans in Congress are much more conservative than the Democrats.

"To me this proves that there is a chance of conservatives taking over the Republican Party but only if we use our heads and quit fighting among ourselves."

Let me stress however, that today under a Democratic administration Republicans have a real responsibility, and constructively so, as a minority; we Republicans can write a record during the Kennedy regime which could well help to win the election.

Consider, for example, the part Republicans have played to date in the Cuba episode.

Foreign policy is bipartisan. That is true.

What is meant by bipartisanship?

According to the original grandfather of bipartisanship, Senator Vanderburg, it means foreign policy issues should be debated fully, as he said, down to the water's edge.

I take it he meant, to use a slang phrase, a minority should not get into deep water or go overboard out of partisanship.

Republicans properly were critical of the Kennedy policy of "do nothing" in Cuba. The administration was ignoring a military buildup in Cuba. Deliberately and falsely, the American people were told there was no threat. The press, the Congress, and the people were misinformed—deliberately.

Responsible Republican criticism finally brought action by the administration and it may well be this action, belated as it was, averted a subsequent all-out nuclear holocaust between the Soviets and the free world.

And may I hasten to add, our responsibility to point up the situation in Cuba, that still exists in Cuba, is not over.

Republicans can take pride and you can take pride in your Congressman's part in this, in the restrained and responsible foreign policy role of the Republican congressional minority.

Let me now talk about Republican philosophy and the fundamentals wherein there can be no compromise. "In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves," as Lincoln put it, "Government ought not to interfere."

Take free enterprise: Therein lies our basic Republican philosophy. We steadfastly advocate under all possible circumstances letting the people do the job themselves and spend their own money themselves. We oppose the practice of taking people's money and providing benefits for them that the people could as well provide themselves.

We oppose increased Federal intervention and responsibility for local problems. In contrast the majority of Democrats believe in big government.

President Kennedy's New Frontier request for a Department of Urban Affairs is just such a case at issue.

Lincoln said: "The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution."

We Lincoln Republicans are the party of the Constitution.

"If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never intrust to any hands, but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions." Those are Lincoln's words. And when he was a Member of the House of Representatives in 1848, Lincoln made a speech in which he said: "We hold the true Republican position. In leaving the people's business in their hands, we cannot be wrong."

What our Constitution does, as you know, is place all sovereign power of Government in the people themselves. This power is then in turn vested temporarily, from election to election, in Representatives such as your Congressman and myself.

Under Lincoln's philosophy, under our Republican philosophy, this power under the Constitution must remain in the legislative branch, and not be, as it so often has been yielded, to the executive branch. During the last 30 years, the legislative branch has often yielded this power, especially when a Franklin Roosevelt and now, more than ever, a John F. Kennedy has sought this power. This has been in complete contrast to an earlier President of the United States, who said he would, "Keep steadily in view the limitation as well as the extent of the Executive power—trusting thereby to discharge the functions of my office without transcending its authority."

Under the Constitution sole taxing power is vested in Congress, yet last year President Kennedy asked for standby power to lower taxes. Thank God that power was not granted. Your protection in the Constitution against tyranny is in control over taxes and remaining with Representatives from whom each 2 years you get it back. Yet of late the erosion of legislative powers and the corresponding increase in the powers of the Executive over the years has caused some of us to wonder if Congress is not becoming a rubberstamp.

The Constitution provides no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of an appropriation made by law. In the spending of your tax money, the principle is the same—that control must remain

with the people and in turn all Government spending lawfully must be appropriated by Congress.

Yet Mr. Kennedy has sought billions—more than $30 billion of borrowing authority—back-door spending authority, which bypasses the legislative appropriations process with annual review and approval by Congress.

My great interest has been in organizing congressional resistance to this back-door spending, and with increasing success.

Also, as you will recall, Mr. Kennedy sought standby authority to embark on a massive public works program in the event, so he said, of an impending recession. He asked Congress to forego its regular scrutiny as to the merit of these projects. The President, under this proposal, would have been empowered to decide what and where and when to establish these projects.

Of course, what the President envisaged was an impending political recession and what he sought was power to decide without congressional investigation and approval where and when to construct public works. All this is disregard of the Constitution. That standby spending power represented boondoggling—the power to help elect friends and influence elections.

Happily, Congress rejected this request. And reverting again to taxing power being exclusively under the jurisdiction of the legislative branch, take the Trade Expansion Act. Tariffs, of course, are taxes and the President has obtained, contrary to the Constitution, the power to lower tariffs without the approval of Congress.

Republicans did succeed in amending this bill so that Congress, if the President fails to do so, can implement any recommendations of the Tariff Commission to protect an industry injured by cheap foreign imports.

In almost every piece of legislation requested, the Kennedy administration has sought new and unprecedented power to be transfered to it from the legislative branch. Unfortunately, many such requests have been granted.

Power not only has been transferred by language written into legislation. As Government programs expand and multiply, as agencies have grown in size and number, as appropriations swell until now our budget is bigger than any in history, even in wartime, so the executive branch increases in power and the legislative branch, calling for coequal branches, is weakened. Thus the sovereign power of the people has been lost. Thus the Constitution has been violated.

With the spending of each taxpayers' dollar goes the power to control the conditions under which that dollar can be spent. Increased dollars mean more employees to meddle and administer in the lives of citizens. It means more power of a government over its citizens.

In this connection, some idea of the growth of centralized Federal bureaucracy and executive power can be obtained from budget figures and just plain statistics.

Lincoln said: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Republicans know whither we are tending.

In the first 3 years of the Kennedy administration the deficit will exceed $27 billion.

As the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, said following President's Kennedy's budget message the other day:

"All protestations, all rationalizations, all plausible economic and fiscal theories aside, deficits are by historical fact becoming our way of life * * *."

First let me clear up one point. Are these deficits a matter of national defense costs?

The answer is "No." As Mr. CANNON put it: "We are spending money we don't have, for things we don't need."

The fiscal 1964 budget proposes spending $2 billion more than 1963 for other than national defense programs.

This is a $9 billion increase over 1961 for other than national defense.

The Kennedy deficits are not due to essential programs, but rather for such unnecessary projects such as landing on the moon.

If President Kennedy's budget is adopted, the public debt will reach an alltime high of $315 billion. The present legal debt limit is $308 billion.

Whither are we tending?

Well, one thing is certain, we are tending closer to national insolvency, to economic chaos, and to wage, profit, and price controls, and to the devaluation of the dollar.

The fiscal 1964 estimated budget deficit of $11.9 is completely phony. It predicts far more tax revenue than will come in. Remember, we were going to have a surplus this year? Remember, Mr. Kennedy said so. Now he estimates a red figure of $8.8 billion next June 30. It will exceed $8.8 billion, wait and see.

But the point I set out to make is that every increased taxpayer's dollar given to the executive branch represents that much more growth and power.

In this connection, as a yardstick, following is a 6-year tabulation, year by year, showing a comparison of net budget expenditures:

	Billion
1959	$80
1960	76
1961	81
1962	87
1963	94
1964	98

These are the total expenditures of the Eisenhower administration and were high due to the Democratic "budget busting" Congress.

Compare them with the spending under the Kennedy New Frontier. An average of of $93 billion as against an average of $79 billion.

The Kennedy fiscal 1964 budget calls for 37,000 more Federal employees.

That is an increase, on top of the previous increase in Federal employees since the Kennedy administration came into power which was 147,000. The total increase is 184,000 more Federal employees since the Eisenhower administration.

When Lincoln was President, there were 36,672 Federal employees, which based on the population at that time was 1 employee for each 905 citizens.

Today the ratio is 1 Federal employee for each 73 citizens.

With all the scientific progress, with all the modern machinery and automation, with all this pushbutton age, we have far more Government workers per citizen meddling and snooping and regulating our lives than we did then.

The Government takes more than 30 percent of all money earned by the people and spends it for a lot of programs the Government thinks best for us. With that 30 percent goes 30 percent of our individual liberties under the Constitution. When the Government takes 52 percent of the profit of a small business, that business is more than 50 percent socialized.

But big taxes and big government is not Republican philosophy.

As a matter of fact, during the Eisenhower administration, the number of Government employees was reduced a total of 254,374 employees.

The other day I made the statement, "Khrushchev will never bury us. We will beat him to it ourselves."

Lincoln said about the same thing when he said, "If the United States is ever destroyed, it will be destroyed from within and not from without." He must have had in mind that the power to tax is the power to destroy. And likewise the power to spend is the power to destroy.

How long can the American worker, the American farmer, and the American merchant stand the strain? How long can our Nation and its Treasury and our finances be sustained under the stress of massive deficit spending?

Inflation already has robbed the widow and orphan of more than half the value of social security and insurance once provided by the labor and sweat of a loving father.

The buying power of the so often meager pensions of the elderly retired persons have been cut in half.

The patriotic citizen who purchased a $75 savings bond, at the end of 10 years gets back his $75, plus $25 interest; but the $100 now only buys $50 in goods.

So it has been with the provident and thrifty—who have sought security for their families—their savings have been cut in two by shrinkage in buying power.

This is what the New Deal did. This was what the Fair Deal did. This is what the New Frontier is doing.

But it is not the way under the Constitution bequeathed to us by our Founding Fathers.

Republicanism is the right answer. Fiscal responsibility is the answer.

The principles and philosophy of Abraham Lincoln as they apply to Federal Government administration and programs are the right answer.

Once it was a nation half-slave, half-free. Now it is an entire world that is divided.

If Abraham Lincoln were alive today, courageously he would meet, as we must meet, the issue that our heritage is in grave danger.

He would say again, as he said once before: "We must leave to the future an America that is whole, intact, strong, united—and still the land of freedom."

Fellow Republicans, to that task, hard and tortuous though its achievement may be, you and I for our children's children sake, must dedicate our lives and sacred honor.

To that end we must, and I am sure will, find unity.

Trucking Industry Urges Congress To Delay Railroad Merger Action While Making Suggested Probe of Rail Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the industries vital to the economy of our Nation is the trucking industry. Until very recently, this industry has withheld any public comment with respect to proposed rail mergers. However, on January 16 of this year the executive committee of the American Trucking Associations met and adopted a resolution, urging Congress to delay railway merger action until an investigation of rail wealth is completed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a release issued by the Ameri-

can Trucking Associations, Inc., on January 17, 1963:

TRUCKING INDUSTRY URGES CONGRESS TO DELAY RAILROAD MERGER ACTION WHILE MAKING SUGGESTED PROBE OF RAIL WEALTH

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 17.—The Nation's trucking industry has strongly recommended that Congress investigate the true financial condition of U.S. railroads and urged the lawmakers to prevent further action on proposed rail mergers until the probe is completed.

A resolution adopted by the 100-man executive committee of the American Trucking Associations which met yesterday stated that Congress "should at the very least conduct a thorough investigation of the financial situation of the railroads generally before it accepts what is largely a myth—the claimed financial peril of railroads generally—as a basis for relief which is not needed." The relief sought by the rails is freedom from the regulatory powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission over minimum freight rates on bulk and agricultural commodities.

Until making this first public statement on the proposed rail mergers, the country's organized trucking industry has maintained a hands-off policy because it felt that some of the inefficient roads might be strengthened through proper and intelligent consolidation.

The trucking federation's decision to abandon that attitude, it was stated, is due to the combined goals of the railroad industry to press for mergers and simultaneously campaign to eliminate the ICC's minimum rate control over some 70 percent of the rails' traffic, without being subject to the antitrust laws.

The motor carrier leaders said their recommended investigation would "clearly demonstrate that the great majority of American railroads need no further legislative relief to enable them to compete, fairly and vigorously, in the transportation marketplace.

"Pending completion of the investigation referred to, Congress should maintain the status quo in the merger field," the resolution advocated.

For Congress to adopt any other course, the trucking federation cautioned, would be to "gamble recklessly with the public welfare upon the basis of a completely unsubstantiated wolf cry from only one of several forms of transportation vital to the Nation's welfare."

The fact, in itself, that some of the proposed mergers "contemplate a concentration of industrial power which probably would not be countenanced if they were subject to the general antitrust laws" previously aroused concern but no alarm among the motor carriers generally. They were confident that a "reasonable degree of protection" would be available to other forms of transport which would have to compete with the proposed railroad giants as long as the longstanding power of the ICC to pass on the reasonableness of rail rates remained intact.

However, the ATA body noted that the rails are striving to destroy that ICC power and still retain their virtual immunity from the antitrust laws, including those provisions applicable to mergers.

"In view of this effort by the railroads, our misgivings about rail mergers have become alarm, and we no longer can sit on the sidelines while the railroads develop some of the largest corporations in the United States, free of both the antitrust laws and the milder restraints of the Interstate Commerce Act," the trucking resolution asserted.

A copy of the resolution adopted by the executive committee follows:

THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY'S POSITION ON RAIL MERGERS—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC., JANUARY 16, 1963

The merger movement within the railroad industry has been a matter of concern for some time in the trucking industry, which is made up of a great number of small businesses.

Until now, we have maintained a hands-off policy because we realize that there always has been a great deal of wasteful and unnecessary duplication of railroad facilities, and that some of the inefficient roads might be strengthened through proper and intelligent consolidation.

Nevertheless, we have had serious misgivings about the tremendous corporations which would result from some of the railroad mergers now under consideration. Some of these mergers contemplate a concentration of industrial power which probably would not be countenanced if they were subject to the general antitrust laws. However, the Interstate Commerce Commission has "exclusive and plenary" power with respect to railroad mergers, and the ICC clearly has indicated an inclination to approve them.

A reasonable degree of protection would be available to other forms of transport which would have to compete with the proposed railroad giants as long as the ICC's longstanding power to pass on the reasonableness of railroad rates remained intact.

The railroads, however, are making an all-out effort to strip the ICC of its power to determine the reasonableness of minimum rates on 70 percent of their traffic—all bulk commodities and all agricultural products. They propose that this be done and that they will retain their virtual immunity from the antitrust laws, including those provisions applicable to mergers.

In view of this effort by the railroads, our misgivings about rail mergers have become alarm, and we no longer can sit on the sidelines while the railroads develop some of the largest corporations in the United States, free of both the antitrust laws and the milder restraints of the Interstate Commerce Act.

We reiterate our unequivocal opposition to any proposal to remove the ICC's minimum rate power and if it should be removed in spite of this opposition, we urge that the railroads be subjected to all of the antitrust laws which apply to business generally.

Further, as long as there is any danger that the railroads will succeed in their current efforts to destroy the regulatory effectiveness of the ICC, we must oppose railroad mergers.

The railroads, generally, are basing their case for these giant mergers upon the allegedly precarious financial condition of their entire industry. However, anyone familiar with the facts of commercial life knows that the great majority of the railroads of the country are in excellent financial condition. Before Congress accepts what is largely a myth—the claimed financial peril of railroads generally—as a basis for relief which is not needed, it should, at the very least, conduct a thorough investigation of the financial situation of the railroads generally. Such an investigation, which would bring up-to-date the Wheeler report of 1942, would, we are confident, clearly demonstrate that the great majority of American railroads need no further legislative relief to enable them to compete, fairly and vigorously, in the transportation marketplace. Pending completion of the investigation referred to, Congress should maintain the status quo in the merger field. To adopt any other course is to gamble recklessly with the public welfare upon the basis of a completely unsubstantiated wolf cry from only one of several forms of transportation vital to the Nation's welfare.

Tax Incentive Bill for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday February 7, Political Columnist Gould Lincoln of the Washington Evening Star discussed on the editorial page of that newspaper the tax incentive bill for education which I have introduced in this House.

I ask that the text of Mr. Lincoln's column be printed in the RECORD and commend his thoughts on taxes and education to my colleagues.

SCHOOL AID BY TAX DEDUCTIONS

Federal aid to education in the Kennedy omnibus bill is running into snags. One of the latest is found in the House Committee on Education and Labor, where Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL opened hearings on Monday to continue for 2 weeks and then went away, supposedly to Puerto Rico. But trouble over an education bill in the House Committee is not exactly new. It is merely symptomatic of what may be expected.

There is strong feeling among some Members of Congress, and the committee, that the States and communities should care for public education in this country, not the Federal Government, especially for education in the elementary and secondary schools. Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, has come forward with an alternative for the Kennedy bill. In his program, contained in a bill he has just introduced, are two major provisions. First, tax relief—Federal tax relief—for families with children in college. Second, Federal tax credit for homeowners for that portion of their real property taxes which is used for the maintenance, operation, and construction of public and secondary schools. In this way, Mr. HALL asserts, the tax base on which States and local communities draw for funds to finance education would be increased.

FOR LOCAL DECISION

"Americans," the Congressman says, "have proved they know how to use their money to support schools. It's high time the Federal Government gave their money back to them." It is his purpose to place at the disposal of the people, the States, and the local school districts greater means to handle school needs as those needs are determined at the local level. It is his contention that such a method is not only practical but a far better way of meeting the school needs than having the Federal Government take the money from the States and then hand it back to them for school aid as the Federal Government sees fit. Such a plan, too, would eliminate any possibility of placing the control of education in the hands of the Federal Government. The Kennedy administration insists that Federal control of the schools would not happen under direct Federal aid. But Federal control under grants-in-aid in many activities has grown up, bringing with it vast bureaucratic agencies and a concentration of government in Washington. This is one of the reasons that Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is strongly opposed to the Federal aid to education bill, and a very considerable number of Members of Congress along with him.

VAST EXPANSION POSSIBLE

The education programs under the Kennedy bill would fall under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare, where the Office of Education is already located, with its many divisions. At present this agency largely is committed to research and advice which goes to schools and colleges, although it does direct assistance in federally affected areas and in some colleges. If it were placed in the position of allotting Federal funds for public schools in all 50 States of the Union, its expansion would be tremendous. The Kennedy education bill contains many other programs which would be handled by the Public Health and other services. HEW, indeed, has been enabled to parcel out Federal funds for many kinds of research, some of which are valuable, and some not so much so. Take, for example, a grant of $99,811 to a psychiatrist at the University of Maryland to put some chimpanzees through a 5-year course in binary arithmetic, a new system of reckoning. It is not likely that such an expenditure would be authorized by a State when parceling out its educational funds.

Returning to Congressman HALL's bill in aid of education, he argues that, as of today, "it is obvious that compulsory Federal grants to education financed by higher Federal taxes (the Kennedy bill has a $5.6 billion cost tag attached, covering a period of 4 years) are neither needed nor wanted, as evidenced by the recent push for lower Federal taxes. If State and local governments in some parts of the Nation are unable to keep pace with their school needs, it is because the Federal taxing power has preempted State and local sources of revenue. Hence, the proper solution to this problem is for the Federal Government to restore to local authorities a portion of the tax resources previously usurped."

Mr. HALL's bill would grant a taxpayer additional deductions from his Federal income tax for the expenses of sending children to college, and would provide for deductions from Federal income taxes, based on real property taxes, paid by homeowners, to aid in elementary and secondary education. He has estimates that between $3.4 and $4 billion would become available to local governments as an increased tax base. This, if used, would, he said, take care of all financial problems of American elementary and secondary schools.

Oklahoma's Don McBride Speaks on Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the 44th annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., last week, had many interesting and authoritative speakers who expressed cogent views on the various aspects of the development of our inland water capabilities.

One of these speakers was Oklahoma's own Don McBride who addressed the association on the recreational aspects of the water development program.

Don McBride is one of the most knowledgable persons in America on the value and methods of fully realizing our water resource potential.

For two decades, Don was a chief adviser to the late Senator Robert Kerr. In that capacity, he helped formulate Senator Kerr's great dream of making the Arkansas River navigable. Don McBride helped nourish this dream and today it is one of the most progressive development and conservation programs ever to be attempted.

Don McBride is currently special assistant to Oklahoma's senior Senator MIKE MONRONEY. In this position, he is able to carry out that dream and to explore further its vast potential, as well as to lend valuable counsel to our State's entire congressional delegation.

Don McBride's remarks are being inserted in the RECORD as an authoritative reference on one aspect of inland water development—the recreational potential—which is paving the way to a better life for all Americans:

WHAT IS AHEAD IN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT?—THE RECREATIONAL ASPECT

(By Don McBride)

I congratulate the program committee on the subject of this panel discussion. No effort has greater longevity nor more facets than that of water policy and "What is Ahead in Water Resources Development?"

Your executive vice president has assigned me the subsubject of recreational use and urged me to cover the subject thoroughly—but to limit myself to 15 minutes. Both requirements are impossible. Therefore, in whatever regard I fail, charge the omission to Everett Winter.

Incidentally, since he is the authority on wildlife and my knowledge on the subject is very limited, he further suggested that I omit that subject.

I. GENERAL OPENING STATEMENT

Public recreational use of water resources projects has expanded from a relatively minor byproduct to one of the fully-constituted objective of development. This is a healthy outgrowth of water development; one that will have a beneficial effect on national progress; and one that will have considerable influence in shaping the pattern and pace of future water development.

Both the intrinsic value of water-related recreation and how it can beneficially affect future water development should be more fully understood, and effective use should be made of its potential. The intangible human benefit from outdoor recreation is well recognized. Tangible value, in stimulating new economic opportunities, is becoming broadly known. Now, we are beginning to realize that it has a third benefit, wherein the weight of its economic contribution, and of its growing public support, will aid in solving the economic problems of planning more ideally suited patterns of reservoir location and in justifying acceleration of development in some instances. Anything constructive we can do to nail down future reservoir sites, through recreation helping to justify earlier reservoir construction, will help save economic loss, as well as hasten enjoyment of benefits.

II. DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Public attendance

Growing public demand for recreational use of water facilities is seen in the fantastic rise in attendance figures. The curve goes straight up: from over 46 million visitor days at 191 Corps of Engineers, TVA, and reclamation reservoirs in 1951 to over 175 million on 287 reservoirs in 1960. The annual rate of increase exceeds 10 percent. Since the end of World War II this increase has been about six times the rate of the country's population growth. Attendance at corps reservoirs, alone, increased to 120 million visitor days in 1961, and the figure will undoubtedly be in excess of 130 million for 1962.

The particular appeal of reservoir impoundments is evident by comparing attendance figures for 1960: Federal reservoirs, 175 million; national forests, 93 million; and national parks, 72 million. This comparison has interesting political implication with respect to the conflicts that sometimes have to be resolved where national forest, park, and water development interests appear to be divergent. An interesting aspect of attendance is that a major part of it is in family groups.

2. Evolution of policy

The elements stimulating the demand for recreational use of water projects, including higher income, more leisure time, and wide-scale construction of reservoir systems, had not yet come into being when the pre-World War II increments of river basin development were undertaken.

The great magnitude of the recreational potential, and of public demand for its use, at Federal facilities was not foreseen. Recreation was not one of the purposes for which Congress authorized reservoirs, and adequate provisions were not made for accommodating the postwar explosion in public use. As public pressure grew, legislation and liberalization of Federal policy in the decade after the war ended gave the Federal agencies increasing latitude for accommodating recreational use of the resource. Progressive action was initiated, but it tended to hold Federal responsibility to minimum. Key steps along the way were:

1. The Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended in 1946 and 1954, granted authority for minimum recreational development at Corps of Engineers reservoirs. It established basic policies of open public use of all reservoirs, without charge and of maintaining public access along shores of water areas.

2. The President's Water Resources Policy Commission's report in 1950, followed by Budget Bureau Circular A-47 in 1952, provided for recreation to be considered in project plans, set forth standards for economic evaluation, but established restrictive limitations of Federal fiscal and land-acquisition responsibilities.

3. The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, in 1958, related fish and wildlife conservation to outdoor recreation and further broadened Federal ability to provide for recreation in planning and building water resources projects. However, this act introduced new problems of evaluating benefits and allocating costs, which led to further study in 1959, and the adoption in 1960, of more uniform standards of evaluation.

4. Through the 1950's the Federal agencies prepared master plans for their projects as a framework for present and future development. Experience indicated the need for further definition of policies. This prompted the Corps of Engineers to declare in 1959 that recreation was to be considered as a project objective, rather than a byproduct, and further liberalizing the considerations for incorporating recreation into the project plan and weighing its economic justification. Arrangements were made for expanding the capital investments of State, local and private interests in recreation facilities on corps projects. Steps were taken to expand basic Federal facilities, previously held to minimum requirements.

5. The filing of the Senate Select Water Resources Committee's report early in 1961 brought full-blown recognition of recreation as an objective of water development on a par with other project purposes.

6. The report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, on January 31, 1962, after a 3-year study, provided guidelines for concerted effort to meet soaring public requirements. Outstanding recommendations were that:

(a) Recreation be given full consideration in the planning, design, and construction of water resource projects.

(b) Public agencies assure adequate access to projects by acquiring sufficient access areas and easements across private lands and zoning of shorelines.

7. A new joint policy, enunciated by Interior and the Corps of Engineers in February 1962, called for acquisition of sufficient lands to permit future recreational development in project areas.

8. At the instance of the President, new standards for water resources development evaluation and justification were established and published as Senate Document 97 in May 1962. It nailed down the principal of considering recreation on a par with other objectives of river basin development and further liberalized the criteria for incorporating recreation in river basin and project plans.

9. The Soil Conservation Service was authorized to participate in recreational development in its upstream flood control program in the Agriculture Act of 1962, this on a cost-sharing basis with the sponsoring agency.

10. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1962 extended recreational development to projects instead of reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

3. The future outlook

Trends indicate that both the demands, and the Federal response to them, will grow by leaps and bounds over the next two decades. For example, the Corps of Engineers estimates that the 120 million visitor-days recorded on its 200 projects in 1961 will expand to 300 million visitor-days on 450 reservoirs by 1980.

To meet the country's needs for water storage, for all purposes, will require about double our national reservoir capacity by that time—which will likely add on the order of 18 million acres of land and water surface area to the recreational potential by that time. That is an area on the order of the State of West Virginia in size. The corps envisions that something like $700 million might be invested in the basic public use and access facilities to accommodate public use of the facilities expected to be in being by that time.

Thus, without question, it appears that water resources development offers the best, most economical, and most desirable means of satisfying a great part of the growing public demands for outdoor recreation over the years ahead. Therefore, we can expect that recreation will be a major factor in river basin development.

4. Impact on water development

The general influence inclusion of recreation as a specified purpose, on a par with water conservation, navigation, flood control, power, irrigation, and other purposes, will have on water resources programs is outstandingly good:

1. It brings personal interest in water development programs closer to the rank and file of the people.

2. The costs of providing the Federal facilities essential to protect the recreation resource and provide for public access and use are not large compared to the total water resources investment over the next two decades. For example, the estimated recreation cost, to provide for 300 million daily attendance on Corps of Engineers projects by 1980, comes to but $700 million, out of a total anticipated program cost of over $28 billion. That's less than 2½ percent.

3. Aside from public enjoyment of recreational advantages, the economic gains will be exceedingly high. These are gains in new opportunities for investment, business, and employment, and will be of outstanding value in many of the so-called depressed areas of the country.

In this connection, the State and local agencies and concessionaires are investing on the order of $3 for every $1 of Federal investment in facilities for public recreation on Corps of Engineers reservoirs. Reports on corps reservoirs show that as of January 1962 the corps' investments totaled something like $20 million and non-Federal about $60 million. In addition, there is an unmeasured but undoubtedly comparable, or perhaps greater, private investment in facilities for organized groups, like the Boy Scouts, for instance.

The extent and value of economic activity generated by public recreation in a reservoir are exceedingly great. Various studies indicate the economic impact recreation is having in areas adjacent to Federal projects. A report on Reservoir Recreation and Local Economic Growth, by Mr. Arthur L. Moore of the National Planning Association, published in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report 24, gives some interesting examples. His studies covered counties that were "capital poor" before construction of reservoirs, and showed that reservoir counties have a "notably better economic performance than nonreservoir counties in terms of such broad indicators as population, per capita income, wages, retail trade, and bank deposits."

Lake Texoma, on the Oklahoma-Texas border, for example had 6,740,000 visitors in 1959. The report showed they spent over $17 million for recreation in the five counties adjoining that reservoir. The investment in overnight accommodations in that area totaled over $7¼ million. Private homes around the reservoir were valued at over $10 million. Money spent by visitors starts the process of economic development rolling and then sustains it. An important fact about visitors is their annual recurrence, year after year. Of course, the majority of attendance at Texoma is from people of the area who spend an average of $3.10 per person per day associated with recreational use of the reservoir, as distinguished from the tourists, who spend more. But large numbers of attendance represent tourists. Nearby towns benefit economically in varying degrees, both from the constant recreational use of the reservoir by people of the area and the tourists attracted there. The U.S. Department of Commerce recently stated that the attraction of "a couple of dozen tourists a day throughout the year would be comparable to acquiring a new manufacturing industry with an annual payroll of $100,000." Large numbers of the reservoirs throughout the country, of course, do infinitely better.

4. Adding the weight of recreation to the economic justification of a multiple-purpose reservoir, not only helps the overall benefit-cost ratio in many instances, but also enhances the planning engineer's ability to choose alternative sites which provide a better geographical pattern of reservoir location. It may give him sufficient elbow-room, with respect to cost and site availability, to locate a reservoir more strategically with respect both to its usefulness for flood protection and as a source of water supply. Further, and of great importance, the extensive recreational benefit that will accrue may enable him to justify construction of a reservoir at an earlier date than would be true if he had to wait until economic needs, solely predicated upon flood control or water supply, have developed.

When recreational development is considered part of a project justification and plan, this makes possible the acquisition of the reservoir site before other development takes place, which may mean the difference between having a project and having to forgo all of its benefits. This is just another way that recreation may help to cut down the economic cost of water resource development.

Rufus Woods' Magnificent Pipedream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from Country Beautiful, entitled "Rufus Woods' Magnificent Pipedream."

This delightful article was written by William M. Greene, presently with the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. Mr. Greene was a Russian immigrant and a railroad roundhouse worker in 1928 when he broke into the newspaper business with the Wenatchee Daily World.

RUFUS WOODS' MAGNIFICENT PIPEDREAM

(By William M. Greene)

On a blazing hot August afternoon in 1930 I stood with my boss, Rufus Woods, on a bluff overlooking the broad Columbia River in the desert of central Washington State. Rufus, a stocky, middle-aged man with bushy eyebrows and penetrating eyes, was publisher of the Wenatchee Daily World and had hired me out of a railroad roundhouse as a reporter. Now he had taken me on one of his periodic trips over the desolate territory served by his paper. Around us, as far as the eye could see, was mile upon mile of low rolling hills, dust, and sagebrush.

"One of these days, this desert will bloom like Eden," Rufus said, waving his arm in a wide arc to embrace the dreary scene. "All we need is a big slab of concrete across that river."

I nodded dubiously. Like everyone else on his paper, I was infected by Rufus' dream, but I don't think any of us really shared his faith that a dam would ever be built there. In writing stories in favor of the dam for Rufus, I had come upon a survey of the Columbia Basin by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers which concluded: "All in all, it is a region of desolation where even the most hopeful can find nothing in its future prospects to cheer."

Rufus and a handful of friends had been plugging away for a dam for years, but they weren't making much headway. In fact, his dream was a standing joke with many. "What does a smalltown newspaper publisher know about dams?" people would ask me. Yet Rufus never seemed discouraged. Day after day he wrote about his pipedream, as some people scoffingly called it, and he had all of us on the paper writing about it, too.

"More than a million years ago," he explained to me, "a giant glacier pushed the Columbia River out of its ancient bed and forced it to cut a new channel. Eventually the glacier melted and the river went back to its former course, leaving the abandoned riverbed now called Grand Coulee."

We hiked around it, a huge, dry, boulder-strewn chasm, 52 miles long and 1 to 5 miles across, and gazed in wonder at mute red and green streaked cliffs, some 1,000 feet high, over which once thundered a cataract mightier than Niagara. The dam, Rufus said, should be where the glacier once stemmed the river, so the waters could be stored in the Coulee to irrigate the surrouding land and provide power for new towns and cities.

Rufus' confidence was contagious. He had built his newspaper with the same dogged optimism with which he campaigned for the dam. A poor farm boy from Nebraska he

landed in Wenatchee coming back broke from the Alaska gold rush, and got a newspaper job on a small weekly. He eventually bought the struggling Daily World and built it into a prosperous paper. Rufus was a hustler. His idea of running a paper was to get out and meet people.

He used to take me on many of his trips to the dusty little towns that dotted the big area around Wenatchee. We would walk into the town pool hall and he would announce: "I'm Rufus Woods of the Daily World in Wenatchee. Now you fellows tell me what this town needs and we'll start plugging for it."

It was in this way years before that he ran across the story that was to be the biggest one of his life. Rufus was in the little town of Ephrata in 1918 when he met a friend, Paul Donaldson. Rufus asked the inevitable "Got a story for me?" "I've got a good one," Donaldson said. They went to the office of a lawyer friend, Billy Clapp, where Rufus sat at a typewriter and pecked out a story while the men talked. Donaldson said that he and Clapp and a friend named Gale Matthews had been thinking lately of the feasibility of a dam across the Columbia River at Grand Coulee. This was Rufus' kind of story—big. "If the Almighty could dam the Columbia with a cake of ice," Clapp said, "why couldn't man do it with concrete?" Such a dam could provide water to irrigate the surrounding desert, Donaldson said, and generate power to pay for its cost. Rufus typed away excitedly. The next day he splashed the story in his paper, and from that day on Rufus Woods dedicated himself to getting that dam built. With Clapp and Matthews and a few others, he formed what they called the "dam university" and got studies and data on dams from all over the world.

A contractor named James O'Sullivan joined them and wrote a report saying such a dam was feasible. Rufus talked and wrote about the dam constantly. He told us to work it into our stories on the paper whenever possible. Once when there was a holdup in Wenatchee the story reported, "The robbers were last seen heading toward the site of the proposed Grand Coulee Dam." Rufus was literally "a voice crying in the wilderness," and he made a lot of noise at it.

Opposition to the dam proposal was immediate and overwhelming. Private power interests opposed the idea of a dam and suggested an alternate plan to bring water to Grand Coulee from lakes in Idaho. Gen. George W. Goethals, who built the Panama Canal, signed a report endorsing the rival plan. Critics scoffed that if a dam were built there would be no homes and factories to use its power, and few farms to use its irrigation. Many newspapers eagerly joined in the attack. "Of all the outrages on agriculture * * * we are beginning to think the Columbia Basin project takes the cake," the Farm Journal wrote. "Who wants it? Nobody."

Well, Rufus wanted it and he wasn't giving up. He attended sessions of the State legislature to plump for the dam. He journeyed to Washington to badger Senators and Congressmen. On one of his first trips to the Capital he met with A. P. Davis, head of the U.S. Reclamation Service. "You haven't got a damsite there," Davis told him. Finally, Davis was persuaded to come to Grand Coulee, and Contractor O'Sullivan spent 2 days tramping over the rugged site with him. Davis was converted.

But the fight was long and uphill. For 13 years not a single daily newspaper in the State except Rufus' came out for the dam. The railroads and power companies and big cities all opposed it. The Governor was against it. Even the chamber of commerce in Rufus' hometown of Wenatchee didn't want it.

Little by little the dam idea began to catch on. First a few prominent individuals got behind it. Then farm groups and chambers of commerce began endorsing it. The senior Senator from Washington, Wesley Jones, got a half-million dollar appropriation tacked onto a rivers and harbors bill for a survey of the Columbia by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Finally, a new Governor was elected, and he appointed a Columbia Basin Commission, including Rufus, to push the idea.

However, obstacles remained monumental. Rivalry between the Coulee Dam advocates and its opponents grew more bitter and they even tried to break up each other's meetings. Then, the Army Corps of Engineers, after a long study, ruled in favor of the Grand Coulee plan. Rufus' judgment was vindicated. But the report meant only that the dam was feasible from an engineering standpoint. Whether it was economically sound to build a multimillion dollar project in a remote corner of the country was another thing.

Critics in Congress continued to scoff. "Grand Coulee Dam," Congressman Francis Culkin said, "is the most colossal fraud in the history of America." A delegation of 18 Congressmen came out to inspect the proposed dam site, but opponents of Grand Coulee tried to sabotage the inspection. Rufus had rounded up a crowd of 5,000 people in the barren spot beside the river when the delegation arrived. However, foes of the dam began handing out handbills in the crowd saying that after a half-hour meeting the delegation would move to a place called Dry Falls to discuss another proposed site. They had reckoned without Rufus' stubbornness.

"I see where two meetings have been advertised," he bellowed to the crowd. "Well, this is the only one that will be held."

He and his dam supporters began to outline the Grand Coulee plan to the lawmakers and the big crowd. Midway in their presentation the opponents of the plan began to tell the Congressmen it was time to move on to Dry Falls. But Rufus was prepared. He sent a friend, Ed Southard, to mingle in the crowd and begin calling for the Congressmen to speak. "If there's anything a Congressman likes to do it's speak," he whispered, "That'll keep 'em here."

Southard mixed with the crowd and began calling on the different legislators to talk. When one had spoken, the crowd would start calling for another. In between the speeches by the Congressmen, Rufus and the engineers would sandwich more data on the dam. For hours the delegation listened to facts and figures. Finally, at the end of the meeting, Rufus stood up again. "Now, all in the world we want, Congressmen," he roared, "is a slab of concrete right across there."

When no action was forthcoming from Congress, Rufus went back to Washington to call on President Hoover, whom he revered as "the great engineer." Rufus said the dam should provide power as well as irrigation so that in time it could pay for itself. He reminded Hoover he had once said in a 1926 Seattle speech: "Every drop of water that runs to the sea without yielding its full commercial return to the Nation is an economic waste."

The President was sympathetic to the dam plan but not encouraging. With the country in a depression, he said, he couldn't see where the money to build it would come from. "He seemed tired and discouraged," Rufus told us on his return.

Ironically, the depression was to work in favor of the dam. Although a devout Republican, Rufus got aboard Franklin D. Roosevelt's campaign train, when he came through the State, and told him about Grand Coulee. Roosevelt defeated Hoover and began to look for projects to create employment. Then it happened.

I will never forget that Saturday in April of 1933. It was after 4 in the afternoon and the presses were through with the day's run. A few of us were still in the editorial room. A Western Union messenger boy came in with a telegram for Rufus, and we directed him to the boss' cluttered office.

A few moments later Rufus came out wreathed in smiles. He handed us the yellow slip of paper. It was a telegram from Senator C. C. Dill. President Roosevelt, he said, personally had approved $63 million to start work on Grand Coulee Dam. We were all too stunned to speak. But not Rufus. "I knew it would happen," he said.

Rufus was happy but not satisfied. The money authorized was only enough to start work on a low dam. Rufus thought there should be a high dam, to provide power as well as irrigation. So the campaign went on. Rufus kept pushing and promoting, but met apathy and hostility. When congressional opposition got especially rough, Rufus had us all work overtime to get out a special edition explaining Grand Coulee which he sent to every Congressman. Across it he splashed the headline: "Two Million Wild Horses!" That was the energy, the story explained, that the dam would harness.

The fight got hotter. Many people and papers in his own State still opposed the dam, one editorialist calling it visionary and impractical. If there was anything that made Rufus mad it was to be called a visionary and a dreamer. He was a self-made businessman and a stanch Republican. But he believed that Grand Coulee would not only be a great thing for the country but that it would pay for itself as well.

While the battle raged, work on the dam got underway. In 1933 engineers began digging a 85-acre hole to bedrock. A conveyor belt, fed by a fleet of trucks, hauled 44 million tons of earth a mile and a half over a hill and dumped it into Rattlesnake Canyon.

Not long afterward, even nature joined in complicating the building of the dam. While engineers dug toward bedrock, a great mass of clay began sliding into the excavation. However, the engineers stopped it cold—literally. They froze it. Six miles of pipe were driven through the mass of clay. Then salt water, at zero temperature, was circulated through the pipes freezing the oozing mass until the excavation could be completed.

Finally, in 1936, President Roosevelt approved the high dam and the big slab of concrete, as Rufus called it, began to grow taller. Daily an engineering miracle evolved under our eyes as nearly 9,000 men, from steeplejacks to deep-sea divers, swarmed over the vast dam. The base alone spread over an area nearly three times that covered by the Great Pyramid of Egypt. President Roosevelt visited the dam to inspect the progress. The dam, he said, in a very correct sense was a national undertaking.

Still the battle for funds to complete the dam went on. Rufus appeared again before a congressional committee to appeal for funds. "I have been in Russia twice," he said. "I was there in 1930 when all the wise guys laughed at the building of a dam where there was no population on the Dneiper River. And when I went back 6 years later I found that all of that damsite—all of that power—had been developed. They built at the Dneiper Dam a city of 200,000, virtually built on electrometallurgical processes."

In 1941—23 years after the discouraging uphill battle began—the gigantic task of building the dam was completed. There she stood—"Rufus' pipedream"—the biggest concrete structure on earth. The dam itself

rose as high as a 46-story building, and was more than 12 city blocks across. Behind it, the dam had formed a lake which extends 151 miles to the Canadian border. The mighty waterfall, hurtling over the dam, was higher than towering Victoria Falls in Africa, and double in volume that of Niagara Falls.

"She sure is pretty," Rufus said repeatedly.

A few months after the dam was completed, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor plunged the United States into World War II. While critics had scoffed that there would be no industry to use Grand Coulee's power, the huge dam was hard pressed to supply sufficient power for the Northwest's burgeoning war industries such as the Government aluminum plants in Vancouver, Spokane, and Longview, and the yards turning out Liberty ships at Portland and Vancouver. By March 1944, less than 3 years after the first generator was installed, Grand Coulee was the greatest power producer in the world and was furnishing power for one-third of the aluminum for the Nation's war effort. At this time, it was producing 40 percent of the Pacific Northwest's power demands.

On August 6, 1945, an airplane whose silvery hide had come from an aluminum plant operated by Grand Coulee power dropped an atom bomb (whose plutonium came from the giant atomic works at Hanford, Wash., also a receiver of Grand Coulee power) on Hiroshima, paving the way for the end of World War II.

With the dam completed, Rufus finally had a chance to do some of the things he'd always wanted to do. He spent brief periods with a circus, making people laugh as a clarinet-playing clown. He traveled all over the world. Wherever he went he looked for ideas he felt would help his community and region. In 1950, while in Canada studying the Ontario power system, he died of a heart attack at the age of 72. There wasn't a church in Wenatchee large enough to hold all the people who wanted to pay their last respects, so his final rites were held outside in the park where the old town band used to play when Rufus first came to town as a young man.

Recently I went back on a sentimental pilgrimage to the river where I had stood with Rufus that first day and he had told me that "someday a dam will be built here and the desert will bloom like Eden." Around me, on every hand, I saw the fulfillment of what seemed then like a wild and impossible prophecy. The giant dam I looked down on provided energy for booming new industries.

A $7 million sugar plant had been built at nearby Moses Lake, and a Boeing jet testing facility employing a thousand men was in the same town. Moreover—and the hard-headed Rufus would have loved this—its power is earning more than a million dollars a month, and the project is well on the way to paying for itself. So far, the $542 million project has paid back $86 million of its cost. The repayments are being made on schedule.

Land being irrigated by the dam's stored waters forms the Nation's largest reclamation project, with more than a million acres being reclaimed from the desert to provide homes and farms for an expanding population. The population of the project—in an area three times as large as Connecticut—has more than doubled in the last 10 years, and retail sales have zoomed from $42 to $100 million in the same period. What once was a wasteland of sand and sagebrush is now a checkerboard of fertile fields producing bumper crops of potatoes, wheat, and beans. The 350,000 acres already under cultivation yielded crops with an estimated gross value of over $42 million last year. Waters from the dam have turned the desert into a bird sanctuary and a mecca for sportsmen and vacationers. Where once there were only alkali flats and rattlesnakes there is now a network of sparkling blue lakes. "Rufus' pipedream" has become a a reality.

Peekskill Lincoln Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in the February 9, 1963 edition of the Peekskill Evening Star appeared an article by the city historian, Carlton B. Scofield concerning the establishment of the Peekskill Lincoln Society. As the article indicates, the society was conceived in 1903 and has been popularly held to be the oldest Lincoln Society in America. I was privileged this year to have the honor of presenting a set of Lincoln books to the group which was to be awarded to the school winning first prize in the society's essay contest. It is fitting therefore that on the eve of the birthday of the Great Emancipator, one of our greatest Americans, our first Republican President and a man who is universally revered, that the RECORD should reflect the history of the first organization solely established to pay reverence to the saviour of our Union. Mr. Scofield's article follows:

PEEKSKILL LINCOLN SOCIETY NOT OLDEST IN UNITED STATES

(By Carlton B. Scofield)

It has often been reported, sometimes in printed form, that the Peekskill Lincoln Society is the "oldest in the United States." It is of interest, at least for the historian, to examine this popular claim. The Lincoln Society of Peekskill is, of a surety, one of the oldest and most illustrious Lincoln societies in the United States if not, indeed, the first Lincoln Society.

The first Lincoln Society dinner was held on February 12, 1904, in the Eagle Hotel. The Highland Democrat reported it to be "one of the most brilliant banquets ever given in Peekskill." The society dinners honoring Lincoln were thereafter held in the Eagle Hotel until the year 1924. The hotel was the society's headquarters. In 1910 no dinner was held owing to the death, in January of that year, of the president, Benjamin C. Everingham.

BEGAN IN 1903

Earlier than "February 12, 1904" the historian comes, however, upon the year "1903" in respect to the founding of the Peekskill Lincoln Society. This is the year, "1903," that appeared on the society's letterheads as of later years. In this aspect it may be said that the Lincoln Society was conceived at the time of the July 4, 1903, celebration in Peekskill. A board of directors was then organized. The circumstances were recalled by Homer Anderson, the society's second president, who years later, on February 23, 1924, wrote:

"Benjamin C. Everingham was the founder of the Lincoln Society. He called a meeting of 10 at the office of Mr. Darrow, myself among the number * * *."

"He had been chairman of a committee of 70 for a Fourth of July celebration (1903). I wrote him suggesting that instead of dissolving the committee he resolve it into a permanent organization for the express purpose of observing patriotic holidays. He said it was my letter which led him to conceive a Lincoln Society."

In respect to February 12, 1904, the first dinner program carried the announcement that it was the "First annual Lincoln Dinner, Eagle Hotel, Peekskill, N.Y. February 12, 1904." In a brochure published at one time by the Lincoln Society of Peekskill it is recorded that the society was "founded January 17, 1904, and incorporated November 15, 1906." The certificate of incorporation was recorded in the Office of the Secretary of the State of New York on January 8, 1907.

QUESTION RAISED

Is the Lincoln Society of Peekskill the oldest Lincoln Society in the United States? Answered nearly always in the affirmative, it is my view that the matter of priority is an open question. The answer depends, I think, upon a definition of terms. The Lincoln Society of Peekskill is aware of the question in respect to priority in time. This was brought to the attention of the directors of the society by director Harold D. Mabie in a directors' meeting of February 18, 1957. Mr. Mabie referred to an article which had appeared in the Hudson Dispatch. The article indicated the Jersey City Lincoln Society to be the oldest in the United States. The article was read by the secretary and filed with the society records. It does not appear that the Lincoln Society formally claims to be the oldest Lincoln Society in the United States but that, as stated by a former president, Sheldon A. Cole:

"As you know the society was conceived after a July 4 celebration in 1903. The first dinner was held February 12, 1904."

In any event it is popularly held that the Peekskill society is the oldest in the Nation, and this has been, indeed, recorded in printed stories on many occasions. Once it was brought to the attention of the Evening Star in a letter dated March 7, 1948. The correspondent was Amy W. Hotchkiss, wife of Thomas W. Hotchkiss, a president of the Peekskill Lincoln Society in the year 1937. In her letter to the Star Mrs. Hotchkiss complimented the newspaper on the accuracy which prevailed in the news columns but questioned the statement that, "The Lincoln Society in Peekskill is believed to be the oldest society honoring Lincoln in the country.

FIRST IN NEW YORK

In her letter the correspondent presented her documentation to the contrary, so to speak, and cited her friend, Col. Andrew Beaumont Humphrey, who, with others, inaugurated the Lincoln Society dinners of the National Republican Club of New York City in the year 1886. Mrs. Hotchkiss verified this as correct, it appears. In that year the first Lincoln dinner was held at Delmonico's in New York City. Thereafter the sequence remained unbroken. It is interesting to recall that Peekskill's Chauncey M. Depew was usually a principal speaker at the Delmonico's Lincoln dinners. The National Republican Club of New York was organized on September 25, 1879.

The above in no manner diminishes the honored name of the great Lincoln Society of Peekskill. As an historian, however, it is my view that the claim to dinner priority has not been established.

McNamara Plans Fail To Meet Naval Block Obsolescence Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, block obsolescence of major portions of the U.S. naval fleet is a most serious threat to U.S. seapower and national security. Navy, the magazine of seapower, in its February 1963, issue editorializes on the deficiencies of Defense Secretary McNamara's plans for handling this critical problem as follows:

ON THE NEED FOR NEW SHIPS

In his remarkable 169-page statement of the Nation's military posture and programs before the House Armed Services Committee on January 30, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara had, among other things, this to say:

"I am well aware that the Navy faces a difficult program of 'block obsolescence' and that over half of today's fleet was built during or just shortly after World War II."

That was encouraging as far as it went. But Mr. McNamara wasn't finished. After asserting that support and auxiliary type ships can be maintained for "much longer than 20 years," he added this statement:

"The right solution to the 'block obsolescence' problem is not to rush into a crash program of ship construction now and thereby create another equally serious dilemma for the future. Rather we should overcome the problem gradually over a number of years."

We are not certain what the Secretary means by "crash" or by "gradually," but the suggestion that a vigorous attack on a situation acknowledged to be serious (our aging fleet) must not be undertaken lest we find that we run into the same problem later is a curious one to say the least.

Presumably, Mr. McNamara means that if we build a great many ships in the period of a few years then 20 years later these ships will be wearing out en bloc. This argument presupposes that succeeding administrations are going to make the same mistakes and cut the same corners on shipbuilding programs as previous ones have done since the end of World War II. It presupposes, too, a vast construction program which would eliminate the problem in a couple years. As far as we know, no one in the Navy has advocated such a program.

A gradual program is, of course, the most feasible kind. A House Armed Services Subcommittee last fall recommended a gradual attack on block obsolescence after a lengthy study of the problem. It concluded that if the United States were to have a modern fleet in the 1970's, an annual construction program of 70 ships should be undertaken for the next several years—and then the rate could drop down to 40 or so and still maintain the fleet as a modernized force of approximately 800 ships.

Mr. McNamara, however, apparently has a different conception of gradual. Unfortunately, it will not solve the problem. The new budget (fiscal 1964) calls for only 35 new ships, including six small gun boats. In addition, six Polaris-firing submarines are to be built. Last year, the figure was 34 and in fiscal 1962 it was 36. Conversions and modernizations for the 3 years were 36, 35 and 25.

With a fleet of 836 ships—the number we will have next June 30 and on June 30, 1964—Mr. McNamara's rate of new construction patently will not be enough to keep the fleet modern, based on a 20-year wear out period. The Secretary is a bright one with figures and he is obviously aware of the arithmetic involved. It comes as no surprise, then, that he has begun to attack the 20-year rule of thumb for the life of combatant ships as artificial. Some can stay in the fleet for 30 years or more, he says. Perhaps—but at sharply reduced efficiency both from a cost and combat-readiness point of view.

If the Navy undertook the one carrier every other year program with the expectation that in the odd years it could concentrate on building up its ASW and amphibious forces, it has been rudely upset. This year's new construction budget is $600 million less than last year's.

Mr. McNamara talks of reducing the number of ships in the fleet over the long-haul as improved types come into commission. This might be possible if the new units were nuclear-powered. But incredible as it may seem, not a single new surface ship in the 1964 budget is slated to be nuclear-propelled. Why this is so in view of the highly successful performances of the U.S.S. *Enterprise*, U.S.S. *Long Beach* and U.S.S. *Bainbridge*, the Navy's only three nuclear-powered surface ships, is puzzling. There is still time to make the carrier authorized last year nuclear-powered. And it should be.

It is apparent that no major effort to liquidate the block obsolescence is going to be made in the next couple of years—unless, of course, Congress and the President hear a long and loud demand from the grassroots. Do you think they will?

Resolution of California AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to herewith present the text of a resolution dated July 6, 7, and 8, 1962, by the Department of California AMVETS in convention at Sacramento, Calif. It is self-explanatory.

Because I believe I am aware of the desperate need of the subject of this resolution, I am pleased to call it to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to each of the other distinguished Members of this great legislative body.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.

Whereas the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, find that the veteran population of the Los Angeles Veterans' Administration regional office area is over 1 million veterans; and

Whereas we find that the nearest Federal veterans cemetery is in San Diego; and

Whereas it is estimated the population of this area will double in the next 8 to 10 years, and the cost of land will also increase proportionately; and

Whereas it is felt that this is the largest area in population in the United States of America without a national veterans cemetery, now: Therefore be it

Resolved, That AMVETS assembled in convention at Sacramento, this 7th day of July 1962, do hereby petition the U.S. Congress to pass legislation authorizing the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County, Calif., and appropriating the necessay funds to purchase the property, and to create and maintain said cemetery; and be it further

Resolved, That all California Senators and Congressmen be sent a copy of this resolution with a request for concerted action on their part, and to keep this body informed as to the progression of this request; and be it further

Resolved, That copies be sent to our national convention in New York with a request that the national legislative director be requested to see that necessary legislation is started, and that he use all the good graces of his office, and of AMVETS, to push the request for this national cemetery to a fruitful conclusion.

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by AMVETS, department of California, in convention at Sacramento, July 6, 7, and 8, 1962.

FRANK M. STEPHENS,
Administrative Adjutant.

Abraham Lincoln: 1809–February 12, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, prairie lawyer and national statesman, Abraham Lincoln, we commemorate the anniversary of your birth. Each passing year does not forget you and your full sacrifice in the leadership of our country. Son of the prairie, son of the Prairie State, you became father of the Nation. February 12 will forever be your day, as if every day were not yours in our memory. Philosopher of ageless values, servant of troubled humanity, leader of America, lover of Americans—we remember what your home State friend Carl Sandburg said of you here 4 years ago before a joint session of the U.S. Congress upon the 150th year of your birth:

Mr. SANDBURG. Not often in the story of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm and peace unspeakable and perfect. Here and there across centuries come reports of men alleged to have these contrasts. And the incomparable Abraham Lincoln born 150 years ago this day, is an approach if not a perfect realization of this character. In the time of the April lilacs in the year 1865, on his death, the casket with his body was carried north and west a thousand miles; and the American people wept as never before; bells sobbed, cities wore crepe; people stood in tears and with hats off as the railroad burial car paused in the leading cities of seven States ending its journey at Springfield, Ill., the hometown. During the 4 years he was President, he at times, especially in the first 3 months, took to himself the powers of a dictator; he commanded the most powerful armies till then assembled in modern war-

fare; he enforced conscription of soldiers for the first time in American history; under imperative necessity he abolised the right of habeus corpus; he directed politically and spiritually the wild, massive, turbulent forces let loose in civil war, a war he argued and pleaded for compensated emancipation of the slaves. The slaves were property, they were on the tax books along with horses and cattle, the valuation of each slave written next to his name on the tax assessor's books. Failing to get action on compensated emancipation, as a Chief Executive having war powers he issued the paper by which he declared the slaves to be free under military necessity. In the end nearly $4 million worth of property was taken away from those who were legal owners of it, property confiscated, wiped out as by fire and turned to ashes, at his instigation and executive direction. Chattel property recognized and lawful for 300 years was expropriated, seized without payment.

In the month the war began he told his secretary, John Hay:

"My policy is to have no policy."

Three years later in a letter to a Kentucky friend made public, he confessed plainly:

"I have been controlled by events."

His words at Gettysburg were sacred, yet strange with a color of the familiar: "* * * we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or to detract."

He could have said "the brave Union men." Did he have a purpose in omitting the word "Union?" Was he keeping himself and his utterance clear of the passion that would not be good to look back on when the time came for peace and reconciliation? Did he mean to leave an implication that there were brave Union men and brave Confederate men, living and dead, who had struggled there? We do not know, of a certainty. Was he thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate gray, the father inscribing on the stone over their double grave, "God knows which was right"? We do not know. His changing policies from time to time aimed at saving the Union. In the end his armies won and his Nation became a world power. In August of 1864 he wrote a memorandum that he expected in view of the national situation, he expected to lose the next November election. That month of August was so dark. Sudden military victory brought the tide his way; the vote was 2,200,000 for him and 1,800,000 against him. Among his bitter opponents were such figures as Samuel F. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph, and Cyrus H. McCormick, inventor of the farm reaper. In all its essential propositions the Southern Confederacy had the moral support of powerful, respectable elements throughout the North, probably more than a million voters believing in the justice of the Southern cause. While the war winds howled he insisted that the Mississippi was one river meant to belong to one country, that railroad connection from coast to coast must be pushed through and the Union Pacific Railroad made a reality. While the luck of war wavered and broke and came again, as generals failed and campaigns were lost, he held enough forces of the North together to raise new armies and supply them, until generals were found who made war as victorious war has always been made, with terror, frightfulness, destruction, and on both sides, North and South, valor and sacrifice past words of man to tell. In the mixed shame and blame of the immense wrongs of two crashing civilizations, often with nothing to say, he said nothing, slept not at all, and on occasions he was seen to weep in a way that made weeping appropriate, decent majestic. As he rode alone on horseback near Soldiers Home on the edge of Washington one night his hat was shot off; a son he loved died as he watched at the bed; his wife was accused of betraying information to the enemy, until denials from him were necessary. An Indiana man at the White House heard him say, "Voorhees, don't it seem strange to you that I, who could never so much as cut off the head of a chicken, should be elected, or selected, into the midst of all this blood?" He tried to guide General Nathaniel Prentiss Banks, a Democrat, three times Governor of Massachusetts, in the governing of some 17 of the 48 parishes of Louisiana controlled by the Union armies, an area holding a fourth of the slaves of Louisiana. He would like to see the State recognize the Emancipation Proclamation:

"And while she is at it, I think it would not be objectionable for her to adopt some practical system by which the two races could gradually live themselves out of their old relations to each other, and both come out better prepared for the new. Education for the young blacks should be included in the plan."

To Gov. Michel Hahn, elected in 1864 by a majority of the 11,000 white male voters who had taken the oath of allegiance to the Union, Lincoln wrote:

"Now you are about to have a convention which, among other things, will probably define the elective franchise, I barely suggest for your private consideration, whether some of the colored people may not be let in—as for instance the very intelligent and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks."

Among the million words in the Lincoln utterance record, he interprets himself with a more keen precision than someone else offering to explain him. His simple opening of the house divided speech in 1958 serves for today:

"If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

To his Kentucky friends, Joshua F. Speed, he wrote in 1855:

"Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty."

Infintely tender was his word from a White House balcony to a crowd on the White House lawn:

"I have not willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom."

Or to a military Governor:

"I shall do nothing through malice; what I deal with is too vast for malice."

He wrote for Congress to read on December 1, 1862:

"In times like the present men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity."

Like an ancient psalmist he warned Congress:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

Wanting Congress to break and forget past traditions his words came keen and flashing:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

They are the sort of words that actuated the mind and will of the men who created and navigated that marvel of the sea, the *Nautilus*, and her voyage from Pearl Harbor and under the North Pole icecap.

The people of many other countries take Lincoln now for their own. He belongs to them. He stands for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. "Look where he came from—don't he know all us strugglers and wasn't he a kind of tough struggler all his life right up to the finish?" Something like that you can hear in any nearby neighborhood and across the seas. Millions there are who take him as a personal treasure. He had something they would like to see spread everywhere over the world. Democracy? We cannot say exactly what it is, but he had it. In his blood and bones he carried it. In the breath of his speeches and writings it is there. Popular government? Republican institutions? Government where the people have the say-so, one way or another telling their elected leaders what they want? He had the idea. It is there in the lights and shadows of his personality, a mystery that can be lived but never fully spoken in words.

Our good friend, the poet and playwright, Mark Van Doren, tells us:

"To me, Lincoln seems, in some ways, the most interesting man who ever lived. He was gentle but this gentleness was combined with a terrific toughness, an iron strength."

And how did Lincoln say he would like to be remembered? Something of it is in this present occasion, the atmosphere of this room. His beloved friend, Representative Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, had died in May of 1864, and friends wrote to Lincoln and he replied that the pressure of duties kept him from joining them in efforts for a marble monument to Lovejoy, the last sentence of Lincoln's letter, saying:

"Let him have the marble monument along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty, unselfishly, for all men."

Today we may say, perhaps, that the well-assured and most enduring memorial to Lincoln is invisibly there, today, tomorrow, and for a long time yet to come. It is there in the hearts of lovers of liberty, men and women—this country has always had them in crisis—men and women who understand that wherever there is freedom there have been those who fought, toiled, and sacrificed for it.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman MADDEN, state that he and Chairman HARRIS are introducing the quality stabilization bill in the 88th Congress. I will also sponsor the bill in support of the effort to pass the same as early as possible in the first session. This bill follows the principle of protecting resellers and the public by empowering the manufacturer to safeguard, against defamation, his property rights in his brand name or trademark. A prime purpose of the bill is to protect the public against deterioration of product quality. Such deterioration can be forced by relentless demands for cheap-

ening of labor and materials so as to permit lower and lower retail prices. The consumer little suspects that quality disappears much faster than production costs can be reduced.

The quality stabilization bill is not directed toward any specific class of reseller. It is directed instead toward the protection of property rights in the trademark against destructive, deceptive, unfair practices, regardless of who commits them or where they are committed.

The introduction of the new bill by my distinguished colleagues, who are leaders in this legislation, is a good sign and indicates favorable prospects for passage.

Agonizing Reappraisal—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a very able and enlightening analysis of our foreign aid program, prepared by John C. Love, an attorney of Waukesha, Wis. This discussion is both objective and enlightening. It contains much food for thought.

The article follows:

It is now 15 years since America adopted the Marshall plan of foreign aid to rehabilitate war-torn Western Europe and to strengthen the cause of democracy in its conflict with communism. In the ensuing years we have expanded that program to include the entire world, and there is some talk of putting it on a permanent basis. Since World War II our military and economic assistance to 84 other nations amounts in the aggregate to $101 billion. To mount this program, we not only have deferred or postponed the payment of our own staggering war debt, but have borrowed an additional $40 billion so that now our national debt amounts to, in round numbers, $9 billion per year, a sum which amounts to about $200 annually for each family of four people in America. Our currency has been weakened by the depletion of the gold reserves and by deficit financing. Six billion dollars of gold bullion has been withdrawn from our gold stock and foreign claims against our gold now exceed our total supply of gold on hand. The very existence of the gold standard is in jeopardy. We have just closed the 1962 fiscal year with a deficit of $6.3 million in the national treasury and a larger deficit is planned for fiscal 1963.

This is a high price we are paying for our foreign aid program. The time has come when we must ask ourselves: "Is it worth it?" "Can we afford it?" "Is it accomplishing its purposes and objectives?" The time has come to make the "agonizing reappraisal" of our foreign policy, which was promised some years ago by President Eisenhower.

In foreign countries, American prestige has been so low. We have learned, to our sorrow, that foreign aid is a poor way to win friends and influence people. The recipients of our aid blatantly proclaim their neutralism, with hostility for the United States. Our motives are suspected and distrusted and we are accused of meddling in the internal affairs of the object of our bounty. The presence of our personnel, both military and civilian, and the giving of our aid to foreign lands, seems to provide our enemies with an effective propaganda line which wins fresh converts for communism.

The collective security system which we have set up to encircle and contain communism is of uncertain value. SEATO fell apart at the seams when first put to the test. Our NATO partners fail to meet their quotas and the United States now has 355,000 American soldiers stationed in Western Europe. The practical effect of these measures is that a colossal burden has been shouldered by the American taxpayers, our military strength and might are dispersed all over the world, and we are weakened by long lines of communication and the dispersal of our forces.

While we stagger under the weight of this load, some of our NATO partners, relieved in part of the necessity of military buildup, have become prosperous, and accumulate the gold which is being withdrawn from American gold stocks. France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, and Belgium have increased their gold stocks from $1,854 million in 1950 to $9,435 million in 1960. Our remaining gold stock is down to $16 billion, of which $11½ billion is a minimum legal reserve for our own currency and the remaining $4½ billion are subject to foreign claims payable in gold, amounting in the aggregate to more than $23 billion. The drain continues against our gold stocks and responsible authorities at home and abroad doubt the ability of the United States to stay on the gold standard.

With a mounting Federal deficit and political leadership which proposes tax reduction as a means of stimulating business at a time when the continuance of the gold standard depends on confidence of foreign creditors, the specter of inflation stalks upon the American scene, and there is a very real danger that savings of millions of Americans will be debauched by printing press money unless there is a reversal of policy.

Even more serious is the fact that America's role as the "arsenal of democracy" makes us the first and prime target in case of war. We are the heart of the defense system. The obvious strategy for Russia in case of war with the United States would be to launch intercontinental missiles with atomic warheads over the heads of our allies, directly at the heartland of the United States, the most vital organ in our defense system. We have offered ourselves as a living decoy to draw the fire of the enemy.

Not only is our policy burdensome and fraught with danger, but it is highly provocative and embroils us in every conflict and controversy the world over. We are in hot water most of the time, not merely with Russia, but with our friends as well.

Not only has our policy failed to contain the tide of communism, but communism seems to thrive under the stumulus of containment. While American soldiers guard Europe against Red attack, the Soviets have moved to our very doorstep in Cuba, and construct launching pads with nuclear warheads pointed at the heartland of democracy. While on one hand we appear to have abandoned the Monroe Doctrine, on the other hand, we have assumed the defense of the entire free world.

The time has come when we must recognize the despite our good intentions and our humanitarian motives, foreign military and economic aid as a program for world peace has not been effective to contain communism, on one hand, nor to win friends, converts and allies to the democratic cause, on the other. The time has come to examine the program and determine why it has failed to accomplish its objectives.

The formulation of any foreign policy must necessarily involve the consideration of the impact the policy is likely to have upon the people we choose to help. Whether or not the policy is successful in the accomplishment of its objectives will in a large measure depend upon whether we correctly appraise the impact of our policy on foreign nationals, and adjust our policy to a realistic view of the people with whom we deal. It appears to me that our foreign aid policy fails to give proper weight to infirmities of human nature, common to mankind the world over; namely: It is not in the nature of man to be grateful for help or charity; man is by nature suspicious, especially in interracial dealings when a foreigner comes bearing gifts; nations resent intrusion in their internal affairs; men are proud and want individually and collectively to be dealt with as equals; and men are selfish and in international dealings put national goals and aspirations above principle.

It is not realistic to expect gratitude and friendship from the recipients of foreign aid. Our experience shows that foreign aid neutralizes and alienates the recipient nation. When the recipient has a democratic form of government, it is inevitable that the political party in power of the recipient nation will assume a posture of neutralism or downright antagonism toward the donor to prove to the opposition party and to its citizens in general, that it is not being dominated by the donor government.

When we give foreign aid, it is inevitable that the people of the recipient nations will suspect that the motives of the United States are selfish, either with a view of exploiting them, or of using them as pawns in America's war against communism. We have provided the Communists with an effective propaganda line, which has proved effective again and again and again.

In some ways our policy creates and aggravates the problem. For example, we have failed to recognize that many of the colonial groups are not ready for self-government and we have supported colonial causes for freedom and self-determination both in and out of the United Nations and new nations have been launched in such a state of confusion and anarchy that they are likely to fall ready prey to Communists. Then we take on the burden of setting them up in business and loan them money for a host of projects, most of which are socialistic in concept.

We have failed to recognize that only a relatively few nations are temperamentally suited for democracy. In our thinking we often confuse freedom with democracy. A high degree of freedom and individual liberty may exist constitutionally under an autocratic form of government, which, in much of the world today, is the only form of government which will achieve the stability necessary for the functioning of a capitalistic society. We have championed the cause of democracy in areas that are not ready for democratic self-government and in Cuba we have undermined the Batista dictatorship only to see it supplanted by communism.

We have failed to recognize certain inevitable and chronic aspects of the problem that cannot be solved no matter what we do. The population problem is the most obvious example. By introducing Western methods of sanitation and disease control, the death rate has declined so that the world is involved in a population explosion which transcends all other problems in importance and significance. In the first half of the 19th century the world's population was increasing at the rate of doubling in 135 years. Between 1950 and 1955 the world's population was increasing at a rate which would double the population every 42 years. What does this mean? If this present population trend continues for 420 years there would be 1,000 people for every 1 in being today. In some backward nations where the population has been expanding at a rate which would double the population in 25 years, it would mean

that in 250 years there would be 1,000 times as many people as today.

The difficulty that confronts us stems in part from the fact that we have encouraged economic aspirations which can't be achieved. Discontent doesn't stem so much from poverty as from the failure to achieve the well-being that the subject thinks he is entitled to. We are introducing standards which can't be achieved. Not only shall we be blamed for it but the discontent which follows will make subjects receptive to the utopian promises of the Communists.

Our policy has been to speed up the whole process of social and economic reform. It might be better to study how to slow down the process, until the people are ready to utilize and practice Western methods and ideas.

America's problem in its foreign relations stems partly from American conceit. We want to make the world over in our own image. This doesn't necessarily bring either happiness or prosperity. Who can say that the primitive people are less happy than we? The world doesn't particularly like our ways and our ideas. A more modest appraisal of our success and a willingness to let the world decide whether it wants to adopt or follow our methods and procedures might work better.

America undertakes too much—more than we can afford and by so doing we jeopardize what we have for ourselves and what we have to offer the world in leadership, know-how and example.

Silver Quill Award to Frederick R. Kappel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1963, the National Business Publications held its 12th annual state of the Nation dinner at which I was privileged to be present. The Silver Quill Award presented at this dinner is bestowed each year upon the individual who has rendered distinguished service to the progress of keeping the business community adequately informed thereby contributing to the energies and strength of America. Previous recipients of this award have been former President Hoover, former Vice President Nixon, and former Speakers of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and the late Sam Rayburn. Consequently, I am very pleased and honored that this illustrious company has been joined by one of my constituents, Frederick R. Kappel, of Bronxville, N.Y., who is chairman of the board of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. In accepting the award Mr. Kappel contributed some lucid insights into the problems attendant on communication in our national life which should be of interest of all citizens. Mr. Kappel's timely speech follows:

REMARKS BY FREDERICK R. KAPPEL, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO., AT THE STATE OF THE NATION DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 7, 1963

This is an honor I deeply appreciate for several reasons. The first is that this occasion has come through the years to be such a meaningful event. What makes it so, of course, is all you people who have gathered around. And certainly this gathering is a great tribute to the business publications of the country. We have only to look around this room to realize the importance attached to the business publishing function.

I can't help think, too, of the men who have been honored in previous years. It makes me very proud and also very humble to be associated with such a group. One of its most distinguished members, your guest of honor last year, just sat down a minute ago after saying more about me than I could recognize. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for being so generous in overstating my case.

Another thing that pleases me especially is that this year's award really honors many people and not just me. I have been in the Bell System nearly 39 years. It doesn't take that long to realize that whatever credit we earn is the work of able and devoted men and women all through the business. And it doesn't lessen my personal appreciation, it only increases it, to be able to say on their behalf as well as for myself, thank you for this recognition.

The story of Telstar is a perfect example of what I have just said. Hundreds and hundreds of people have done their absolute best to make this wonderful thing work. This best involves disciplined scientific imagination, great technical proficiency, and the most demanding insistence on quality. But something more is needed too. What is it that invigorates such effort? What fires people up and then pours on the coal?

I think it is the realization that there are great ends to be served, and that every job well done contributes importantly to serving them. By great ends I mean the mastery of space as a new medium for worldwide communications; the creation of a system which, along with ocean cables, will meet fast-growing human needs; the demonstration of continuing American leadership in extending and improving services that, hopefully, will bring together the peoples of all nations.

As matters now stand, Telstar has provided basic assurance that satellite communications are indeed feasible and practical, and that design and construction of commercial satellites, and ground stations to work with them, can now be approached pretty much as a straight engineering project. There is no scientific obstacle to designing a commercial system immediately, and bringing it into being as soon as the satellites could be manufactured and put into orbit, say in 2 or 3 years.

I also mentioned ocean cables. Regarding them, I might say too that in a few years' time, their capabilities for handling all kinds of communications will surely equal those of satellites. It would be a great mistake to think that all the paths of progress are out in space.

The important thing of course is to make the best use of all the opportunities. The incorporators appointed by the President are working hard, as you know, to get the Space Communications Corporation started. Speaking for the Bell System, I will just say again that our wish and hope are to take an active, constructive part in this, and as soon as possible. We want to help build a strong, healthy enterprise that will be a great success.

Now the theme of this meeting tonight has been the challenge of universal communications. And it seems to me this takes us inevitably to the problems of communication in the broad sense, not just the kind I have been talking about, but the whole matter of communicating ideas and purposes of spreading and getting understanding. It is in this effort that the specialized business publications play their important part, not merely as reporters but as lively interpreters of the goals, the achievements, the significant thinking of American industry.

But how can we in business communicate better? And what do we want to communicate anyway?

Several thoughts occur to me.

First, I think business simply must communicate more successfully than it has that the economic growth we are all striving for depends first and foremost on the vitality and drive that is generated in the private sector of the economy, on stimulating and rousing the energies of private enterprise, on encouraging acceptance of risk and the enthusiastic, eager exercise of management skills.

I honestly don't believe the country can get where it wants to go in any other way. Without question these factors have been central to our progress so far. Yet we seem unable to communicate the very philosophy that the country has prospered by. We have watched millions of young people grow up with little or no understanding of the practical economics of business enterprise. We have let profit come to be a dirty word—or a mere technical term in professional economic lingo—while the absolute need for profitability has been clouded over and obscured.

Second, we have big problems in this country and we will not solve them if our aims are small. I said earlier that I thought the driving force behind Telstar was the realization of important ends to be served. If we in business want to instill confidence in others, if we want to inspire people to strive then we must communicate a feeling of purpose, a feeling that what we are doing is deeply and truly important—important to the country and important to the future.

But we can never communicate this kind of feeling just by using words. I don't say words can be dispensed with. Basically, however, business—and government too, for that matter—communicates by how it works. This is age-old doctrine, I realize, but I still can't find a better one. The determination to produce quality, the utmost in value, whatever the product or service may be—this makes work important. This gives dignity to employees, character to the business, lasting substance to investment, and satisfaction to consumers, with attendant public respect. Performance and only performance will largely communicate itself—with the help of words to be sure, but the business that puts on great performance will never need the dictionary to explain it.

As a third point, I think more businesses are learning that by the very act of stating their purposes, they greatly encourage their own effort to achieve them. This involves what I call giving hostages to performance. When you commit yourself to the public plainly, for all to read or hear—well, you are committed. You are out on a limb. You have to stand or fall, and that is a wonderful discipline.

Unhappily, most instances of climbing out on a limb now occur in disputes of various kinds, and involve demands made on others. What I am speaking for here is that we make more demands on ourselves, and make them in public. The words we use to do this might even be the most important in all business communication.

Finally, just a word about communication and agreement. Some people I talk with seem to think these are two sides of the same coin. I don't think so at all. I agree that "communicating" means to listen as well as to talk, but the name of the game is not, "Me, too." After all, one of the main purposes of communication is to make clear when you disagree, and why.

I make this rather obvious point because I hope the theme of this meeting will not carry any of us off into dreamland. We surely need, in this country, broad unity of

purpose. But we shall never arrive at it by pretending to agree when we do not. We shall get there only by continuously testing and prodding each other, by a continuous dialog, as the intellectuals call it. And what I am saying here tonight comes down essentially to this:

First, business needs to do all it can to improve its part in the dialog; and

Second, the foundations for success in this effort must be, as they have always been, good purposes, good will, good faith, and good works.

To the National Business Publications I say again, for myself and equally for my associates in the Bell System—we are deeply grateful for this award. We shall try our best, with your valued and important help, to contribute usefully toward solving problems of communication, in every sense of the word.

Thank you very much.

I'm Afraid—Are You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1963, with several of my colleagues, I was privileged to attend chapel at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado. On this occasion, its chaplain, Col. George Cameron, delivered a most excellent sermon that was both a challenge and an inspiration to these young men who are so directly concerned with the future of our country. Today, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting this sermon into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of plain talking, commonsense, humility before God, a little more of which the modern-day materialistic system could use.

I'M AFRAID—ARE YOU?

This morning I would ask you to use your imagination. Place yourself on a space platform where you could look down and see the geographical outline of our beloved Nation, and as you gaze at it, dream a bit. What are its hopes? What are its possibilities? What is its future?

After you have dreamed for a moment run the clock back and try to picture our Nation as it was, say in the year 1750. At that time you would observe a vast wilderness of forests, mountains, and plains. Little signs of habitation save for a thin line of settlements running along the Atlantic seaboard from southern Maine to the middle of Georgia. Cities were few, possibly four could be mentioned. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston. Charleston was the home of music and literature, the cultural center. Philadelphia was what its name implies, a small friendly place. New York was nothing like the Manhattan of today, its population was not quite 25,000 souls. Boston, at the mouth of the Charles River, was a port and trading center.

The people of the day were rugged individuals, some were farmers, some fishermen, and others small traders. For the most part, they lived in widely separated small towns or villages. Their homes were modest, well built and well kept. All had quite definite reasons for leaving Europe and settling in this new land. A study of their background and history will show that these early settlers have given to us a heritage, a heritage of three fundamental principles upon which we can base our lives:

1. These sturdy folk believed in God. Not only did they believe in God, they chose to actively serve Him. They were a religious people and every community had a beautiful house of worship, churches that were built with the money, the labor, the faith of a people who knew they could not exist without the aid of a Heavenly Father who was a very present help in time of trouble. A Heavenly Father, who cared, who would never desert or forsake them.

2. They believed in work. To live they had to clear the land, build homes, put in the crops, provide schools. There was no time to be lazy. Unemployment insurance and social security were unknown. To live they had to work, to provide for the future they had to work, and they worked and they toiled through the long hours of every day from dawn to dusk.

3. They had a third belief, perhaps even more than a belief, a love, a consuming passion for liberty. Danger was ever present, the Indians were not the best keepers of the peace. Raids did take place, their homes and crops destroyed, their families slaughtered, yet they chose to remain. They were willing to pay the price of blood, sweat, and tears for this cherished liberty. So great was this desire for liberty that years later when their children joined the westward trek, their path could be followed by noting the names of the cities and villages they founded. Today we pass through independence, liberty, and freedom on super highways, places they walked to, to establish.

This is our heritage, a goodly heritage. Our forebears believed in God, in work, in liberty. Let us not consider this heritage lightly or flippantly, like the college student who remarks "so what," but rather let us be deadly serious and earnest, we do live in perilous times, we do face grave danger. At any moment a chain of events may be set off in Europe, Asia, Africa, or even Cuba which could threaten our very existence. We face great dangers, but great as they may be, we face from within an even greater danger. You see we are like the biblical character Samson, strong, yet weak. So strong, no nation on earth could subdue us, yet so weak we can be taken without realizing we have lost.

We have cause for fear, and I am afraid for America. I am afraid of Americans who have become the victims, doped and drugged by unconcern, indifference, complacency. I am afraid of the Americans who think naught of the decay of our national ideals. Those who are embarrassed by flag waving or the mention of duty, honor, country. Those who hold "the country owes me a living" and fail to see that they have a moral obligation to give, to serve their Nation and their fellow man.

I am afraid of Americans who show apathy and indifference to the fact that 4 out of every 10 young men of our Nation are not morally, mentally, or physically qualified for military service.

I am afraid of Americans who could care less about their vote. The ones who say "my vote won't count." Yet in our last general election it was dramatically pointed out to us the importance of a single vote. Charles Evans Hughes went to bed on election eve believing he was elected President of the United States, but when late returns came in from a northern California county, Woodrow Wilson was elected.

I am afraid of Americans, Christians who are indifferent to the moral issues. Those who claim God as Father, but only white men as brothers. Those who in effect say it's all right to do wrong, but wrong to get caught.

I am afraid of Americans who show little concern over matters of belief. Those who say and advocate: It doesn't make any difference what your beliefs are, just as long as you are sincere. Look what Hitler believed, and he was sincere. The cannibals who ate the missionaries were sincere. The East Indians who once threw the baby girls into the river were sincere.

You see, our lives are our beliefs in action. We are, whether we realize it or not, nothing more, nothing less than our beliefs. What we believe must be our concern. Our beliefs must matter.

I am afraid of Americans who are indifferent and unconcerned over the plight of their fellow man. Those, who by their lives would have us believe the parable of the Good Samaritan is a fairy tale and not an eternal truth. Perhaps the best illustration of this attitude was given on the TV program "Candid Camera" this past week. A disheveled down and outer was pictured sleeping in a gutter on a New York street. This man remained there all day, a few passer-by's noticed him but not one stopped to investigate, to offer help, save one man who, late in the afternoon stopped, but only to complain that the so-called derelict was sleeping in his parking space.

Two municipal judges taking part in a Denver radio panel show were queried about what to do after an accident when no one present at the scene of an accident would offer to serve as a witness. Both judges stated the thing to do was to immediately jut down all license plate numbers so that the owner could be subpenaed to appear as a witness. Brotherhood, neighborliness, civic responsibility, God help us if we ever let these qualities slip from us.

I am afraid of Americans who are indifferent and apathetic toward other men who have the courage of their conviction and stand up for what they believe is right. Those who would refer to Christian citizens as odd balls, do-gooders, or hypocrites.

I am afraid of American church members who could care less that our churches are not producing enough young ministers to serve the need of the church, let alone provide for growth and development. When I decided to enter the ministry, a school official and member of my church suggested that I go into something worthy and worthwhile, but not the ministry. There are some churches that are actually "free loaders" in this respect, they depend upon other churches to recruit and provide the clergy for them. Why does this condition exist? Only because of the indifference, the unconcern of church members. This is cause for fear. There is a weakness, you see, when the church grows in membership, increases its giving, enlarges its buildings, but fails to interest and inspire young men as future leaders at the same rate.

There are many reasons for being afraid, but what to do about our fears can never come from a prophet of doom. We would do better to turn again to history. Our historical Bible served as a guide for our forbears, it can be the guide for us. This book transformed the fear of our forbears to faith, it can do the same for us. Listen as it speaks, "Fear not for I am with Thee." "Perfect love casteth out fear." "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil."

Christopher Columbus believed that the earth was round. To prove his belief he set out on a great adventure. Mysteries and storms engulfed him and fears seized the hearts of the men who were with him. They counselled that they turn back as voices sometimes urge us to turn back from our quest for God and rest lazily on our unbelief. Columbus answered back "sail on! sail on!" and when the land appeared they set their feet upon a shore more beautiful

and plentiful than their fondest dreams. Here is belief and a venture. And we who venture on our belief in God will find our hopes confirmed. Belief in God, commitment to Him, assurance of Him and by Him, this is the faith that overcomes the world, that casteth out all fear.

We have no reason to fear if we believe God and in God.

No nation in history has survived if it has turned its back on the moral and spiritual values. We keep these values by our belief in God and in direct ratio to our application to the work he has given us to do, namely, the keeping and accepting the challenge of the Christ.

To endeavor in all to follow his example and to make his teachings the rule of our lives is not easy. It requires consecration and sacrifice and work. Followers of Christ are known as co-laborers * * * workers. When Jesus called his disciples he did not call them to a quiet retreat in the hills, he called them to work. "If any man would come after me let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me." Truly, this was a call to labor, a call to work.

No reason to fear, if we believe in work, our work and His work.

Liberty! We will be the land of the free only as we are the home of the brave. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We have a goodly and Godly heritage. Let us turn to the things that are important, that are permanent, that are real and eternal before it is too late.

We need never fear if God is our King, if work is the core of our character and personality, and if we possess a consuming passion for liberty, for freedom and for independence, and we are willing to pay the price for them.

This is our heritage and when I consider its value, I am no longer afraid, are you?

Part 9: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro, December 15–27, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 9 of my chronology on Cuba and Castro begins with the announcement to the public of Soviet troops remaining in Cuba after our quarantine was officially ended—which announcement became a matter of vital concern to the Nation.

About the middle of December, we were told four "topnotch Soviet combat battalions, complete with armor—and including up to 8,000 crack troops"—were still in Cuba. Some estimates placed the figure as high as 20,000. This recalled to mind that Secretary of State Rusk had informed the 15-nation NATO Council that about 10,000 to 20,000 Soviet troops—definitely military units—plus ground-to-air missiles—were still in Cuba—and all added up to quite a disturbed atmosphere in this country.

And this, in turn, recalled to mind the English divine, Matthew Henry, who said:

Peace is such a precious jewel that I would give anything for it but truth.

The tentative plans for a summit meeting of Khrushchev and Kennedy had to be laid aside—for it was clear there could be no sensible discussion of serious matters when one party to the discussion knew the other party's word was worth less than nothing. Few people were left, of course, who still believed the Soviets words were to be trusted—but conjecturing is quite different from having an unmistakable fact thrust into your face in the sight of the whole world, and this had clearly taken place between Russian diplomats and our President.

Our President was quoted as stating:

Looking back on Cuba, what is of concern is the fact that both governments were so far out of contact, really.

This comment had a pretty hollow ring to the ears of the public. All along most of them had been sure that if there was anyone in this country who had a good contact with the Soviets, and an understanding of what they were doing or capable of doing—and likewise was in a position to make clear to the Soviets how we felt and what we would or would not do—it should have been our President and his foreign policy advisers. Besides, had they not been assured many times that our President had "a sense of history"? And it is not too difficult for any true student of history to learn a great deal about the Soviet's ability to deceive and their complicated maneuverings and zig-zag methods in order to get what they wanted.

While one Republican Senator urged the administration to fully inform the Congress of any commitments made during the Cuban crisis that could affect future actions against the Castro regime—one Democrat senatorial leader agreed that while this should be done for congressional committees directly concerned, he felt hashing over details would not be helpful. Still another Democrat Senator suggested the time was ripe for a nuclear arms ban embracing all of Latin America to be negotiated through the Organization of American States—while many qualified observers felt the time was riper perhaps for our OAS allies to be more completely armed in order to help meet any further crisis in the Western Hemisphere.

So dissension still reigned supreme—in the midst of an atmosphere of thankfulness that the crisis had not turned into something worse—and in the midst of the season of peace and good will to all men.

That this dissension was not confined to the United States soon became clear, however, for we found the Soviet bloc in the midst of some very serious in-fighting. And a grimly comical note was sounded when the Soviets accused Red China and Albania of—of all things—subversive activities.

A giant-size Christmas present—from our capitalistic American citizens and business community—was given to brave Cubans who had risked their lives in an attempt to liberate their homeland from the pitiless grasp of a Communist dictatorship—in the form of a ransom payment to Premier Castro of $52 million worth of food, medicine, and medical supplies. But the Cuban relatives of the ransomed prisoners—who also had been promised their freedom found this would require a sizable ransom on their part—their homes and automobiles. Apparently Premier Castro was astounded and angered that so many seemed anxious to leave their Communist paradise for imperialism's stronghold.

Adlai Stevenson predicted another Cuban crisis in 1963—a verbal uproar by Castro delegates in the United Nations against our American inspection flights over the island of Cuba. But no one in this country could seem to get too upset over this prospect since the U.N. had already weathered many worse crises in its day.

And the Communist talent for twisting facts became even more apparent when Red China launched a 10-day nationwide support-Cuba campaign because of what they termed "Castro's heroic spirit of daring to struggle and daring to win the race of aggressive designs by the United States."

Across the ocean, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer was accused by Khrushchev—to everyone's astonishment—of trying to start a world war over the Cuban crisis. But since Khrushchev had shortly before accused the Red Chinese of this very same thing—this was more or less in the nature of an anticlimax on the newsfronts of the world—and had the effect only of reminding people of the bully husband who was afraid to beat his wife—instead kicked the cat.

The material follows:

PART 9: A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO, DECEMBER 15–27, 1962

December 15, 1962: Four topnotch Soviet combat battalions, with armor and up to 8,000 crack troops, are among the swarm of Russian soldiery still in Cuba, information available yesterday indicates.

The units are part of the overall contingent of Russian infantry, artillery and aviation experts which some estimates place as high as 20,000.

As the buildup in Cuba got underway, the battalions were sent in for the initial mission of defending the ballistic missiles and IL-28 medium jet bombers which Russia shipped to Cuba.

December 16, 1962: Secretary of State Dean Rusk said today there was no magical formula for international accords but expressed hope the Cuban crisis had strengthened prospects for global peace.

"When great powers and lesser powers have lived through a moment of crisis such as the Cuban affair, I believe there is a tendency toward caution," Rusk said. "At least that is what we hope for. But there is no magical formula for world peace."

December 17, 1962: President Kennedy said last night that the Cuban crisis has made it more difficult for the United States to carry out any successful negotiations with the Soviet Union.

Rejecting the thought of a summit conference now, the President said "it is going to be some time before it is possible for us to come to any real understandings with Mr. Khrushchev."

Mr. Kennedy said the Cuban episode made negotiations between the two great powers more difficult because of the Soviet attempt to deceive this country and to change the balance of power in a secret maneuver.

Nevertheless, the President spoke in a reasonably optimistic mood in an unprecedented radio-television interview and said that "we could have a long period of peace" if the Communist leaders devoted their efforts to building their own societies.

He suggested that the misjudgments of the intentions of others, which he said were re-

sponsible for World Wars I and II and the Korean war, may have been reduced as a result of the strong U.S. stand on Cuba.

"Looking back on Cuba, what is of concern is the fact that both Governments were so far out of contact, really," the President said.

"I don't think that we expected that he would put the missiles in Cuba, because it would have seemed such an imprudent action for him to take, as it was later proved.

"Now, he obviously must have thought that he could do it in secret and that the United States would accept it. So that he did not judge our intentions accurately."

December 19, 1962: Russia and Cuba have agreed to an increase in trade in 1963 which will enable Cuba to "overcome the imperialist economic blockade," it was announced here today.

The announcement said full agreement had been reached on main problems of Russian-Cuban trade in 1963 and on questions relating to credits and transports of goods to and from Cuba.

December 20, 1962: Former U.S. Surg. Gen. Leonard Scheele accompanied Negotiator James B. Donovan to Havana today from Miami in an effort to speed liberation of 1,113 Cuba invasion prisoners.

December 20, 1962: Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, said yesterday the Kennedy administration should fully inform Congress of any commitments made during the Cuban crisis that could affect future action against the Castro regime.

December 20, 1962: Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, indicated in a separate interview that he expects the Kennedy administration to review its actions for the congressional committees directly concerned. But he said he sees little to gain in hashing over all the details of a critical period.

"I think the American people are fairly well satisfied with the results obtained in Cuba," he said: "They are aware of the implication of the policy pursued."

The Kennedy administration said yesterday that if the negotiations are successful for the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners it will be due to the private efforts of men and organizations such as James B. Donovan and the American Red Cross.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, today suggested the Organization of American States negotiate a nuclear arms ban embracing all of Latin America.

"The overwhelming majority of the governments and people of Latin America do not want nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles stored on their soil or readied for use in any other part of Latin America," the Senator said in the closing address of the International Arms Control Symposium at the University of Michigan.

Latin America "is ripe for a regional arms control agreement which would prevent the spread of the nuclear arms race to the Western Hemisphere."

December 21, 1962. The release of 1,113 Cuban prisoners held by Premier Fidel Castro for almost 2 years will begin early Sunday morning, December 23. A formal agreement under which the prisoners were ransomed for $53 million in food, medicine, and medical supplies was signed in Havana late yesterday.

December 21, 1962: The President and the Prime Minister met in Nassau from December 18 to December 21. They were accompanied by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. [Robert S.] McNamara, Foreign Secretary Lord Home, the Minister of Defense, Mr. [Peter] Thorneycroft and the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations and Colonies, Mr. [Duncan] Sandys.

The President and the Prime Minister discussed a wide range of topics. They reviewed the state of East-West relations in the aftermath of the October crisis in Cuba, and joined in the hope that a satisfactory resolution of this crisis might open the way to the settlement of other problems outstanding between the West and the Soviet Union.

December 21, 1962: The Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda, in one of the bluntest Moscow attacks on the Peking regime, accused Red China and its ally, Albania, of "subversive activities" that seriously endanger world communism.

Pravda cited recent party congresses in Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Italy where both Red China and Albania came under open attack for opposing Soviet policy in the Cuban crisis.

Pravda said peaceful coexistence has become the "general line" of foreign policy for Russia and its Communist allies because "socialism and communism do not need wars to demonstrate their superiority over capitalism."

December 22, 1962: A U.S. official source said today the first planeload of Cuba invasion prisoners would be flown to Florida about 8:30 eastern standard time, December 23.

Former President Eisenhower believes truth is a far better weapon in the cold war against communism than managed news.

Mr. Eisenhower said he has no reason to think the American people have not been told the truth on the Cuban situation, but he noted that he doesn't know all the facts.

He said he sees no reason why the administration should not now release a full and official version of what happened in the disastrous attempt to invade Cuba in April 1961. The Bay of Pigs invasion is now history, he said, and the official story should have been told long ago.

December 23, 1962: Prime Minister Fidel Castro, in expansive mood, greeted members of the ransom ship *African Pilot* today and jestingly declared a 24-hour state of peace with the United States in observance of the goods-for-prisoners exchange.

The 10,000-ton freighter tied up in Havana Harbor at 2:05 p.m. with $11 million worth of food and drugs as downpayment for the freedom of 1,113 Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion captives.

About 3 hours later, the first flights left a military airbase near Havana carrying liberated prisoners to the United States.

December 23, 1962: United States and Soviet negotiators conferred in an unusual Sunday meeting today but failed to make any progress in their effort to wind up the Cuban crisis by Christmas.

Informed sources said the positions of the two sides remained virtually unchanged following the 2½-hour session held at the Soviet mission headquarters in New York.

The United States was represented by Ambassador Charles W. Yost and Special Representative John J. McCloy. The Soviet delegation was headed by Deputy Foreign Ministers Vasily Kuznetsov and Valerian A. Zorin.

December 24, 1962: Adlai Stevenson, chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations, predicted today there would be another Cuban crisis in 1963—this one a verbal uproar by Castro delegates in the U.N. against continuing American inspection flights over the island dictatorship.

Stevenson said in an interview at his country home near Libertyville, Ill., that he expected the Cubans to attempt to retaliate in the U.N. for the continuing American overflights "which we claim we are entitled to make because of Castro's refusal to give us the right to ground inspection, to which the Russians had acquiesced when they agreed to withdraw their missiles and bombers."

Stevenson said he is convinced that the Soviets have withdrawn all missiles and bombers, but he said "the big problem in the future is to guard against their reintroduction into Cuba."

December 24, 1962: The last of 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners ransomed from Cuban Premier Fidel Castro in a Christmas Eve wrapup of a $53-million airlift to freedom, landed here tonight.

President Kennedy tonight said he was "extremely pleased" that the Cuban prisoners had been released.

In a statement issued here, the President said it was "in the interest of our national principles" that these men had been saved "from a slow death."

December 25, 1962: Agrarian Reform Chief Carlos Rafael Rodriguez has affirmed that Soviet and Czechoslovak aid will enable the Cuban economy to develop at the rate set for next year, the Havana newspaper Hoy reported today.

Rodriguez, president of the Cuban national Agrarian Reform Institute, returned to Havana yesterday from a trip to Moscow and Prague at the head of a Cuban trade delegation.

He told newsmen on his return "this trip has strengthened even more the friendship and cooperation between our respective peoples."

"The results (of the trip) could not be more satisfactory for Cuba since all trade matters for 1963 have been covered," he said.

Premier Fidel Castro switched signals today and told relatives of ransomed invasion prisoners that if they want to go to the United States they must buy their way out of Cuba with their homes and automobiles.

Castro first announced that relatives could obtain an exit permit from Cuba if they presented proof that they were part of the immediate families of invasion prisoners.

Then the offer was changed to exclude all but parents, brothers, wives, and sons when the number of people jamming government offices skyrocketed.

December 26, 1962: The freighter *African Pilot*, packed with 923 Cuban emigrants sailed tonight for Florida. Released by a "Christmas bonus" deal with Fidel Castro, they will rejoin their close relatives, the Bay of Pigs prisoners ransomed earlier this week.

December 26, 1962: Communist China launched a 10-day nationwide support-Cuba campaign today with high praise for Premier Fidel Castro's firmness in the face of what were described as aggressive designs by the United States.

The commentary said the United States "resorted to every means" during the past year to crush the Castro regime. But it failed because of Castro's heroic spirit of daring to struggle and daring to win."

"When the U.S. gunboats bombarded Havana and imposed a military blockage on Cuba, the 7 million Cubans mobilized again and again and armed themselves as one man, preparing resolutely to repulse any aggression from the enemy," the broadcast said.

December 27, 1962: President Kennedy today accepted an invitation from Cuban freedom fighters to inspect their brigade in Miami Saturday and told them he hoped someday to visit a free Cuba.

Manuel Artime, civil head of the brigade, said the President expressed his appreciation "for our heroic efforts which were not only made in behalf of freeing our country but were also in behalf of the free world."

U.S. officials were increasingly optimistic yesterday that 23 Americans long held in Cuban jails may be released.

The optimism was based on reports from lawyer James B. Donovan, who arranged for the return of the Cuban invasion prisoners. Premier Fidel Castro has promised to discuss early release of the Americans, too.

Washington informants said the U.S. Government is also pressing for release of Amer-

icans through the Swiss Embassy in Havana. The Swiss represent U.S. interests in the absence of diplomatic relations between Washington and Havana.

December 27, 1962: Tass reported today that Soviet geologists are looking for oil in Cuba. The dispatch from the official Soviet news agency said they also are prospecting in Cuba for iron, nickel, manganese, copper, and peat.

The dispatch gave this information about other Soviet aid to Fidel Castro's regime:

"The Soviet Union is helping build 16 industrial establishments in the Republic. Three metallurgical works are being reconstructed and enlarged. Two thermal power stations with an aggregate capacity of 300,000 kilowatts are being built. They will start generating in 1964.

"A plant for the manufacture of spares for the machine-building, mining, and sugar industries is scheduled to be commissioned in January 1963."

Tass also said Soviet specialists are helping develop Cuba's fishing industry and agriculture.

December 27, 1962: Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev accused West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer today of trying to start a world war over the Cuban crisis and warned him that West Germany would be snuffed out like a candle in the first few hours of a conflict.

He said Adenauer had tried to torpedo every attempt by the United States and Russia to reach cold war settlements, including Berlin, and said Adenauer was disappointed when the crisis over Cuba was resolved peaceably by both sides making concessions.

Khrushchev leveled the charges in a letter to Adenauer in which the Soviet Premier blamed the West for incidents along the Communist-built wall dividing Berlin.

Khrushchev said that at the time of the Cuban crisis West Germany tried to drive the United States into a corner out of which there was no way but an armed clash.

"All mankind heaved a sigh of relief when both sides, through mutual concessions, blunted the dangerous sharpness of the crisis and prevented the worst," Khrushchev wrote.

Communist Training School in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in the growing controversy as to whether long distance missiles remain in Cuba, there is the danger of ignoring a problem which is perhaps more important.

When President Kennedy negotiated with Khrushchev on the removal of the Russian missiles in October, and early November, 1962, there apparently was some understanding or agreement between them about future invasion of Cuba. On October 30, Pravda stated that the United States had agreed to give "guarantee that no aggression will be made against Cuba by the United States or other countries of the Western Hemisphere."

I sent a telegram to President Kennedy asking, in effect, if such a guarantee would protect the expansion of Russian communism in Cuba. A month later, on November 29, I received a letter in reply to that telegram from Frederick Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, which stated, among other things:

Any United States assurance against an invasion of Cuba will not guarantee communism against the united action of freemen in this hemisphere.

This answer is vague. It is now coming to light that there is a situation in Cuba which is endangering freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, while denying long-distance missiles are in Cuba, admits that there is a buildup of crack combat units of the Russian Army in Cuba, armed with the most modern weapons. He admits that this force of combat troops, in addition to Russian technicians in Cuba, numbers many thousands. Other sources estimate that there are more than 40,000 of these combat troops. This force, also armed with scores of the most modern Russian planes, the Mig-21, is sufficient to have absolute control of Cuba—even against Castro.

Communists also have organized, in Cuba, schools of sabotage, subversion, and revolution. One of the leading instructors is "Che" Guevara, an expert on guerrilla warfare who recently wrote a book on this subject. At least five Russian generals are participating in these schools. Thousands of students are being trained to return to their own countries—Mexico, Brazil, Venezuela, Peru, and other South and Central American countries—to commit sabotage and lead revolutions. On the last day of January, this school graduated 1,017, each of whom is to become an instructor.

These conditions bring to mind the ominous statement and prophecy made more than 15 years ago by Stanley Mikolajczyk, ex-Premier of Poland. He said of Russian communism:

In Russia today men and women of every nation are now being trained and schooled for the day when they will return to their native lands, which they know so intimately, to rule under direct command from Moscow. Stalin trains Frenchmen to rule France, Italians to rule Italy, Englishmen to rule England, Latins to rule the Latin countries, Japanese to rule Japan, Chinese to rule China, Indians to rule India, blacks to rule blacks, and Americans to rule America.

Thus Russia has planted in Cuba a vicious school of Communist revolution, training Mexicans to destroy freedom and rule in Mexico, Peruvians in Peru, Brazilians in Brazil, Haitians in Haiti, Nicaraguans in Nicaragua, just as the Polish Premier said, except that this school is conducted within 90 miles of the United States.

Not only does this vicious and secretive Communist attack on our free neighbors of Latin America threaten Western freedom, but allowing this school to operate under our implied protection wrecks the confidence and faith in the United States as the leader of the free world. Perhaps we are spending an undue amount of time worrying about missiles in Cuba and not enough time worrying about the subversive threat which can be far more dangerous to the free world.

The President is aware of this threat. Under our Constitution the President is the one who must assume leadership and take the appropriate action.

Nurserymen Oppose Changes in Quarantine Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the American Association of Nurserymen at their second legislative conference, held in Chicago on December 18, 1962. The resolution expresses the opposition of the nursery industry to any revisions of quarantine 37 "which would obviate inspection of plant materials at a designated port of entry in the United States."

The resolution was forwarded to me by the Connecticut Nurserymen's Association, whose members believe that loosening the quarantine restrictions may result in the introduction of insect and disease pests from abroad. This is a matter of great concern to nurserymen in Connecticut where nursery farming is a fast-growing activity. Already we have 666 nurseries in our State growing stock on thousands of acres. I believe the Department of Agriculture, and the Plant Quarantine Division in particular, should give serious consideration to the views of this industry.

The Connecticut Nurserymen's Association was organized back in 1907. Its two top officers are from my district. Mr. W. Norman Leghorn, president of the association, is from Cromwell, Conn. Mr. Hendrik Verkade, Jr., the vice president, is from New London, Conn. The association's executive secretary, Mr. Charles Barr, is from West Haven, Conn.

The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

The members of the second legislative conference, sponsored by the American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., assembled in conference at the Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Ill., have viewed with alarm the proposed revision of quarantine 37.

"Whereas there are hundreds of potentially serious insect and disease pests resident in the United States; and

"Whereas the percentage of interceptions of potentially serious pests intercepted at ports of entry increases annually; and

"Whereas eradication of introduced pests is always expensive and frequently impossible; and

"Whereas there is no assurance that plant products frequently used as packing are pest free prior to processing and eventual use; and

"Whereas there could be no assurance that the shipments would not be contaminated en route from the site of origin either in foreign ports or aboard ship: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the undersigned, official representatives of the nursery industry of several States, oppose any change in quarantine 37, which would obviate

inspection of plant materials at a designated port of entry in the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Plant Quarantine Division and the Congressmen and Senators of the individuals listed below."

Cooperation: Key to Water Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, many interesting speakers delivered pertinent remarks at the 44th annual Mississippi Valley Association meeting at St. Louis, Mo., February 3 to 5.

One of the encouraging aspects of this annual meeting was the spirit of cooperation expressed between private individuals and Government officials to further these great programs of water development.

William H. Davis, the chief of the water resources section of the U.S. Public Health Service at Kansas City, Mo., effectively expressed the Government's willingness to cooperate with local governments and individuals.

Mr. Davis' words were reassuring that water quality will be maintained as navigation and water development progress. At this time, I wish to insert Mr. Davis' remarks in the RECORD:

IMPROVING QUALITY THROUGH WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

(By William H. Davis)

Members and friends of the Mississippi Valley Association, I am grateful for the opportunity to blend my voice in harmony with that of your slogan: "America's Voice in Water Resources Development"; to an organization whose goals are so similar to those of the Public Health Service in promoting prosperity, health, and welfare through good quality in our water resources. It is an added pleasure to visit a city that is a good citizen to the tune of $95 million, the value of a sewerage bond issue which was passed by St. Louis to protect the quality of the waters downstream in the Mississippi River.

The name of President Truman on this program adds special significance to our discussion, for it was his signature that launched the Nation's first Water Pollution Control Act some 15 years ago.

Inasmuch as the topic for our panel is "What is Ahead in Water Resource Development?", I propose to describe briefly the background of the Public Health Service in the Water Resources field, the current status of quality protection programs, and to indicate the direction in which we are headed in conjunction with other Federal, State, local, and interstate agencies.

The first Federal water pollution legislation was enacted in the 1890's, primarily to prevent impediments to navigation. Some 15 years later, the Public Health Service Act of 1912 was passed, authorizing investigations of water pollution which might be related to disease. In 1924, there came another law, the Oil Pollution Act. It was concerned with the discharge of oil into coastal waters which was causing damage to aquatic life, harbors, docks, and recreational facilities.

Three times during the 1930's, attempts were made to enact a comprehensive water pollution control law. The 74th Congress nearly enacted such a law in 1936. The 75th Congress actually passed one in 1938, but this was vetoed because of technical defects. In 1940 the 76th Congress almost succeeded in passing a third pollution control law.

War interrupted these attempts, and it was not until 1948 that a bill was finally passed and signed by President Truman, Public Law 845, 80th Congress.

The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was enacted as temporary, experimental legislation, which was to be reviewed after a trial period of 5 years and revised on a basis of experience. It was extended for an additional 3 years to June 30, 1956, by the 82d Congress (Public Law 879).

In 1956 the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 660 84th Cong.), extending and improving the 1948 act, was approved, and this act has now been broadened and greatly strengthened by amendments in Public Law 87-88.

An expanded Federal water pollution control program became one of the first objectives of President Kennedy's administration. In his special message to Congress on natural resources only a month after taking office, President Kennedy endorsed bills introduced by Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma. The President outlined the elements he believed necessary for an effective pollution control program, saying, "Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency. Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home, and industry. To meet all needs, domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational—we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity. In many areas of the country, we need new sources of supply but in all areas, we must protect the supplies we have."

In authorizing a Federal water pollution control program, Congress made it clear that primary responsibility in this field rests with the States, with the Federal Government in a supporting role. Unchanged since the first act of 1948, is the declared policy of Congress "to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution."

Under the acts of 1948 and 1956, the Federal water pollution control program was carried on within the Public Health Service with the primary administrative responsibility lodged in the Surgeon General. The 1961 bill transferred this responsibility to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has designated an Assistant Secretary to represent him in relation to the program's operations and to serve as Chairman of the President's Water Pollution Control Advisory Board.

The water resources in every area must serve many States and municipalities, and must be available for many uses. They can do so in an orderly and efficient manner only if all present and proposed uses and abuses of the water resources are examined, the interrelationships considered, and if the growth pattern of the area is carefully measured. This requires a comprehensive evaluation of socioeconomic trends that may be expected to extend into the long-range future.

Developing a comprehensive water quality management program may require, depending on the size of the basin, from 3 to 8 years, and from $2 million to $12 million. The magnitude and complexity of such comprehensive planning studies requires Federal participation and it was so established in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. These programs are developed in close cooperation with other Federal water resource agencies, and with the State and local authorities concerned.

All viewpoints—national, regional, State, and local, must be considered if planning is to be on a fully comprehensive basis. Thus, it will be based on the expectation of an expanding economy which will provide increasing amounts of goods and services to a growing population, the enhancement of their level of living—and to make available wherever feasible, the substance which the Mississippi Valley Association so aptly refers to as "Water: The Catalyst for Prosperity."

Determining and maintaining water quality appropriate for its many uses is an obvious and inherent part of such comprehensive studies. It is the responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assess the causes of water pollution in these studies, develop agreements for desired water uses, outline pollution control measures, and set up timetables for accomplishing them.

Already underway are programs covering vast areas of the United States: The Arkansas-Red Rivers, the Colorado and the Columbia Basins, the Great Lakes Illinois Waterway Basin, the Delaware estuary, and the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. An intensive investigation of the Ohio River Basin as a joint project with the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of the Army, has been initiated.

A similar study is being considered as a cooperative venture between the Corps of Engineers and the Public Health Service on the Mississippi headwaters; also under preparation at the present time is a plan for the comprehensive investigation and development of the entire Missouri River Basin with initial emphasis on the Kansas, Osage, Gasconade, and Platte Rivers.

The comprehensive programs are in accordance with the resource policies of the Federal Government as pointed out by President Kennedy: "In the past, these policies have overlapped and often conflicted. Funds were wasted on competing efforts. Widely differing standards were applied to measure the Federal contribution to similar projects. Funds and attention devoted to annual appropriations or immediate pressures diverted energies away from long-range planning for national economic growth." And in discussing his goals he said, "This administration accepts the goal urged by the Senate select committee to develop comprehensive river basin plans by 1970, in cooperation with the individual States." This statement was not made lightly.

Last summer, the four Cabinet members who make up the President's Water Resources Council set forth the policies, standards, and procedures to be followed in planning the future use and development of water and related land resources. The objectives of such planning, they said, is to provide the best use, or combination of uses, of water and related land resources to meet all foreseeable short- and long-term needs, with the well-being of all the people as the overriding determinant.

Within the Mississippi Valley Association's 15 districts, the Public Health Service has participated in a variety of quality-oriented water resource development activities including: The U.S. Study Commission, Texas; the U.S. Study Commission, southeast river basins; and the Arkansas-Red River Basin water quality conservation project.

Well underway is the Great Lakes-Illinois River Basin's comprehensive study.

Under consideration for comprehensive development programs over the next decade are the entire basins of the Ohio, Missouri, and

Mississippi Rivers, as well as the Souris River and Red River of the North.

Experience to date has taught us invaluable lessons in basin planning; to name one—that comprehensive planning is a teamwork operation that involves a balanced integration of the several disciplines, including economics, demography, engineering, and political science. Thus, the Public Health Service stands ready to move forward arm in arm with other Federal, State, and local planning agencies to accomplish our goal, as stated to Congress by President Kennedy on March 1, last year, to have sufficient water, sufficiently clean, in the right place at the right time to serve the range of human and industrial needs. By building good quality into our water resource developments of the future, we can assure the Mississippi Valley Association that its slogan may always be "Water: The Catalyst for Prosperity."

Commendation for Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I was privileged to attend a luncheon of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles. The president, Judge Irving Hill, presented his annual report to the members.

It is obvious to me that this segment of the community is fully cognizant of the manner in which it fits into the community as a whole, and I feel it and Judge Hill are to be commended for the high quality of the services offered to the community.

Judge Hill's address follows:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE, BY JUDGE IRVING HILL AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF JEWISH FEDERATION-COUNCIL OF GREATER LOS ANGELES, JANUARY 27, 1963, BEVERLY HILTON HOTEL

This morning you learned a good deal about the work of your organized Jewish community during the last year. I won't duplicate what has already been covered.

Our communuity has gone on apace in 1962 as healthy, active, and vital as ever. I'd like to talk with you this afternoon on a more fundamental subject. Let us examine together, the validity of our Jewish community in relationship to today's world.

Many of us ask ourselves this question: "Is all of the effort and energy which we pour into the activities of the Jewish community really meaningful, when we look at the kind of problems that the world and mankind face?" It's a valid question. We live in a time of great anxiety, fear, and insecurity. Man has devised fiendish weapons of total destruction. The great powers brandish these weapons at each other and race toward the development of even more powerful ones, well knowing that yesterday's weapons—much less today's or tomorrow's—could end civilized life. There is change in the world, accelerating so fast that we are powerless even to keep our knowledge current. We have produced machines so complex that they not only replace human labor in most of the tasks of industry, but they can also evaluate their own performance and correct their own mistakes. As the skills of human hands are displaced, we wonder if we have not created a Frankenstein. In the age of the greatest plenty which the world has ever known, the individual man is sicker at heart, unhappier, more frustrated and more lonely than he has ever been. There is very little, it seems, that any individual can do to control his own destiny. The dark conviction grows that our society has become too complex to be influenced by human actions directed at constructive social change.

In the wake of these perils and frustrations we have seen many people give up. There appears to be a moral breakdown in society: a devil-may-care attitude which pays no heed to traditional values and patterns of living. This irresponsibility and decadence seems to have affected all classes of society and the children as well as the parents. I have painted a gloomy picture. But at the same time, my thesis is hopeful and optimistic. I submit that giving up in the face of hard problems is foreign to the Jewish spirit and tradition. I submit that constructive things can be done toward the solution of even cosmic problems by ordinary human beings like you and me. I submit that we, through our Jewish community, are addressing ourselves, in a small way but an important way, to the real problems of our age.

What is the traditional Jewish response to an apparently hopeless world? We Jews are not new to the many misfortunes which follow in the wake of great historic changes. We are not strangers to the confrontation of what might appear as invincible forces acting upon us. Out of this experience we have forged a set of values which serve as well. Our innermost belief is that life is good and man is perfectible and that he exists in a world wherein he has an ever-expanding opportunity for the exercise of his free will. And with this exercise of free will he has free moral choice. Our tradition tells us that man must be in eternal rebellion against the status quo: That always he has an alternative, the choice of good over evil and right over wrong.

Nor are we permitted, in our Jewish tradition, to throw up our hands and give up. As the Talmud says in "Ethics of Our Fathers"—"It is not incumbent upon thee to complete the task, but neither art thou free to desist from it." We live by the eternal watchword that all is not lost: That problems, even great ones, are solvable, and that man can be the master of his own fate.

These are fine and ringing sentiments to be sure. Now to prove the thesis that we address our life, of and in the Jewish community, to the real ills of the world.

When the second world war ended and the enormity of the holocaust became fully visible, we could begin to assess its cost in human terms. Everywhere was the tragic product of man's inhumanity to man. The DP camps, the endless stream of displaced persons, the expulsion of so-called unwanted peoples—brought millions of humans on the march seeking safety and security. And Jews, as always, led the mournful march.

Here certainly was a problem of first magnitude. Wave after wave of bedraggled Jewish immigrants sought a place to live and to rest. It became our responsibility as a community to gather the vast resources needed for their movement and rehabilition. Almost two million of our kinsmen have been rescued and resettled. But still they come. The burden has been a heavy one. It will remain heavy. But we have accomplished this monumental humanitarian undertaking and it has been one of the proudest chapters in the history of our community. It has succeeded because you and I as individuals did not give up, and decided to pool our efforts. The personal contribution of each of us was small—but multiplied by 60,000 who gave and worked in the cause it was very great indeed. Because you personally called on a few neighbors for the welfare fund, and attended some meetings and had a commitment in your hearts, things have been accomplished which are tangible, real, moving and important. Individuals, acting alone, may be weak and ineffective. But there is immense strength and effectiveness when individuals act in a united community.

What have we done in the struggle for human dignity and human rights? This is an age in which men seek equality and independence. Everywhere colonial peoples and minority groups are astir, determined to free themselves of the shackles of second-class citizenship. In America, surely the most dramatic and important movement of this century is the effort of the Negro to achieve, at long last, a right to vote, an equal opportunity for a job, a decent place to live and a school where his children may learn in the company of their fellow Americans.

Doesn't your heart go out to a James Meredith who tries to learn amid the catcalls and insults of his fellow? Of course it does. Don't you identify with the freedom rider who hunches under the blows of wild-eyed rabble for the right to sit at a lunch counter? Of course you do. Why? Because we Jews have learned well the lessons of history. We know that each man is his brother's keeper and that liberty is in jeopardy everywhere if it is partial, incomplete, or unsafe anywhere. But do we Jews play any part in the Negro's struggle? I submit we do. We were instrumental, in my opinion, in creating the climate for its inevitable success. Our great national agencies, in a quarter century or more of effort, have, I believe, helped to convince this wonderful country that bigotry and discrimination are wrong, and against the national interest, and morally indefensible. We helped not only to make racial intolerance unpopular, but also to enact the basic civil rights laws which have given the impetus to the great push forward of the Negro, the Puerto Rican, and the Mexican-American. We Jews did not lose interest with the elimination of most of the disabilities and discriminations which affect us. The great expertise which the Jewish community has, for a long time has been engaged on the Negro's behalf—because it is the right thing to do and because we have a stake in his victory. Our effort, is locally through the C.R.C. and nationally through the great national agencies, is being felt today in the courts, in the schools, in the halls of Congress, and in the neighborhoods. And of this we can be proud.

Now to another of the world's ills. Surely, there is no more vital work than the repair of mankind's health. If men are sick in body and in mind, they must be cured and our Jewish community has accepted the challenge to do something to accomplish that cure. We have given to this community two great medical institutions, among the finest in the country, open to all, regardless of race, color or creed. Hundreds of our fellow citizens come every day for help. Every day in the laboratories of these hospitals are scientists—of the Jewish community and supported by it—inching forward in man's fight against the maladies that have beset us from the beginning of time.

In the field of mental health we have likewise begun to do our part. We have in recent years erected a new facility, Gateways, to conduct a promising and unprecedented experiment in the field of mental rehabilitation. Are these not also contributions of which we can be proud?

What of employment and employability? As I said earlier, the problem of automation and the need for retraining of workers troubles our age. With it is the problem of fitting for work those casualties of life who are broken in mind or in body. Here, too, your Jewish community is responsive. We are doing something to help. The Jewish

Vocational Service is an outstanding instrument attacking the problems of employment, employability and retraining. Yes, the effort is small in relation to the total problem. But, like the other agencies I have mentioned, it is a contribution, a Jewish contribution, a realistic and intelligent contribution.

Next. What can we do and what have we done about the moral crisis of this age? What of the breakup of families? What about juvenile delinquency and the problem of instilling in our children the sense of self-respect, respect for others, and respect for God's word which is the apparent antidote to the moral decay we see about us? Here your Jewish community moves on many fronts. In dozens of Jewish schools every day, through the direct and substantial help of your community, a great apparatus of Jewish education is at work. It needs strengthening, more resources, and particularly, more children. But it exists and with it comes a real effort to translate into everyday living and into the consciousness of our children, the philosophy, the teachings, and the ethics which can give them a spiritual bulwark against the tribulations of the times. And when our children have gone astray or our families crumble under the pressures, the knowing specialists of the Family Service, the Big Brothers, the Committee for Personal Service, the Jewish Free Loan, and Vista Del Mar are at hand to help. And when there is free time which must be channeled and directed in a Jewish environment and with expert guidance, the resources of the Centers Association are there as our contribution and our aid.

And last, what of the so-called golden years of life? What an anomaly we see. Medicine has given us additional years. But, ironically, for very many, those extra years are a burden and not a blessing. Hard problems of health, housing, family, and friendship cover the gold with tarnish. These older people are people who walk alone, and live alone. More than half of them must get along with an income below prevailing minimum standards. Have we responded to the needs? Your Jewish community has built two excellent homes for the aged, and is now in the process of building a third in the San Fernando Valley. We have begun a new service of referral and coordination. With a top level committee of experts, we are planning for an even broader, multiagency attack on the problem because broader and more forceful action is required.

So here the argument rests. If you will step back from the day-to-day details and take an objective look, I hope you will agree that your Jewish community is in tune with the times. I hope you will say that we have not given up, that we have done a part—small but vital—to make the world a better place, that we do address ourselves, to the basic challenges of life with some reasonable hope of success. Truly, we have not "desisted from the task." Nor shall we desist while the faith of our fathers—and the hopes and visions of that faith—remain within us.

There Is No Protest by Bostonians to NASA Laboratory for Electronic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1963, carried a reprint of a bylined column that recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. The burden of the remarks and column indicated that the proposal of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish an electronics research center in the greater Boston area was quote, "protested by some farsighted Bay Staters."

Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight. Massachusetts and Boston want and welcome the proposed research center. Following the appearance of the Wall Street Journal story, the Boston Globe and Boston Herald sent reporters into the area to find out what basis there was to the assertion that some people in the electronics field were disturbed over locating the center in the greater Boston community. Both newspapers could find no one that opposed the recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the articles of the Boston Globe and Boston Herald in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Feb. 7, 1963]

SPACE CENTER CRITICS?—EVERYONE COULDN'T BE HAPPIER

Massachusetts went on a critic hunt Wednesday—a search for some "Yankee businessmen" who rumoredly are having misgivings about NASA's plans for a $50 million space electronics research center here.

Not a single critic was to be found.

After executive offices of leading electronics firms, educators, business officials and political figures were sounded out, NASA could be assured that no sour notes will be heard in its welcome.

But for a while Wednesday, all the space center hopefuls of the Bay State wore the pained expression of a fighter dealt a low blow.

The rumor of negative rumblings in the Boston research complex was born in a Wall Street Journal story under a Boston dateline.

It stated, "electronic and other scientific Yankee businessmen are looking critically at a proffered Federal gift."

The writer then raised questions which Boston research executives allegedly have been asking generally.

"Will the NASA center perform research which otherwise would be contracted to private industry? Will the center compete with private industry for scientific personnel?

"Is it really needed or will it duplicate facilities or work private industry is doing and thus be a waste of taxpayers' money? Will Government bureaucracy stifle research inspiration?"

Nice questions, but they have already found favorable answers among those in a position to ask them and be concerned about them.

The story had one immediate effect. It sent sparks flying in our electronic industries and tempers flaring elsewhere.

Ephron Catlin, executive vice president of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, felt the story had its roots somewhere in space.

"The story completely misrepresents the true feeling of the vast majority of the business and academic community in this area," he observed.

"Almost the entire area is in favor of the center, and in fact, working for it.

"Indeed, with the electronic lab here, this community will continue to prosper and expand. Without it, we are vulnerable, because this kind of industry is flexible and can move from area to area if it desires to do so."

He then compared the "criticism" to that which arose in slight degree over the Prudential Center a few years ago.

"Then and now," he said, "you have a very small group of persons trying to scuttle something that will be for the good of all of us."

Whoever these critics may be, they couldn't be found among the industrialists.

Henry Harding, president of Laboratory for Electronics, Inc., of Boston, appeared from quotations in the Wall Street Journal story to be among such critics.

But his expanded statements Wednesday proved him to be among the cheerleaders for NASA's laboratory.

The story gave these as his words: "When anything like the proposed NASA center is brought in it has a harmful effect on the men of local companies. As the NASA center builds its staff it is sure to put pressure on research people to move around."

HARDING ALL FOR IT

The effect, however, is far from "harmful." according to a statement from Harding Wednesday night.

"The electronics research center proposed by NASA for the Boston area will have a great effect on New England and can become one of our most valuable assets," he contended.

"I think it is a good beginning toward achievement of the economic stability Massachusetts and New England have been concerned about for so long.

"It is estimated that NASA will spend between $600 million and $900 million for electronic research in fiscal 1964. In effect little of this amount would be accounted for by the NASA Center.

"It is estimated that the Center would account for only $10 million to $20 million of this amount for research projects, exclusive for the $50 million to construct the physical plant.

"When we compare this to the NASA total electronic research budget, we can safely predict that there would be much that local research companies could do to support NASA programs.

"Further, hardware programs in relation to the millions of research dollars could amount to between $1½ billion and $2 billion."

Harding predicted that such sums could enable Boston to increase its share of production awards in support of U.S. space efforts.

He continued: "All in all, then, I look for the NASA Center to be of great benefit to this area."

Surprise and wonderment at the Journal story came from many sources.

Governor Peabody couldn't fathom the alleged source of "worry" among private industry.

"The Wall Street Journal article is somewhat surprising," he asserted. "Just Tuesday I met in Washington with leaders of the Boston business community, the Massachusetts congressional delegation and a spokesman for the academic community and there was complete agreement that the proposed NASA project would prove a tremendous economic boon for the Commonwealth."

The Governor said he is personally convinced "that this is a true space age opportunity not only for Massachusetts but the entire New England economy.

"HUGE BENEFITS SEEN

"I feel that the residual benefits emanating from this one project will go far beyond what even the most optimistic among us can envision."

Private industry worried? Not from what the Governor sees elsewhere in the Nation.

"Additionally," he concludes, "the fact that other parts of the country are evidencing strong interest in this same project gives added proof of its desirabilities here."

James McCormack Jr., retired Air Force major general, now vice president of the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Corp., responded to the story with similar surprise.

"Something is wrong here," he retorted. "There is a misunderstanding.

"Apparently there must be a big gap in understanding of the program." He pointed out that NASA will be doing those things that educators and industrialists of this area have been urging.

And the voice of industrial giants of the electronics field was heard, in unified optimism.

Thomas L. Phillips, executive vice president of Raytheon, said, "We are encouraged by the confidence in the New England area implied by NASA's decision to situate a major research center in the Greater Boston area."

Henry Lehne, senior vice president of Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., and general manager of Sylvania Electronic Systems, said, "We are not critical of NASA's decision to locate the $50 million establishment here in the Baston area.

"It should result in increased business and an even greater number of high-caliber technical personnel working or seeking work in this area."

Officials at Edgerton, Germeshausen and Grier, Inc., another of Boston's nationally famous electronic firms, said they look forward to the NASA Center as an opportunity for future business.

And so it went. Those who have been fighting for the NASA Center were looking for the alleged critics, for "someone to be angry at."

They may exist, but it seems that only New Yorkers can find them.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Feb. 7, 1963]

SPACE CENTER WARNING GIVEN

(By Arthur Stratton)

Greater Boston got a grim warning yesterday that it is confronted with a bitter fight to win the $50 million space electronics research center that it thought was a sure thing.

An overwhelming number of scientists, industrialists, and businessmen, rising up to save the huge economic betterment for the area that President Kennedy proposed 3 weeks ago, lashed out at what appears to be a mysterious undercurrent of opposition.

Congress has yet to approve the proposed center. Community leaders voiced apprehension that it might be fatal for the project if Congress gains the impression the area is not wholeheartedly in favor of it.

Ephron Catlin, chairman of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, who, with an eminent leadership in this agency has made great strides toward giving the area some of the economic benefits of the billions of dollars in space development expenditures, yesterday charged selfish interests were opposing construction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration center here.

This followed a report in the Wall Street Journal that "electronic and other scientific Yankee businessmen are looking critically," at the space center proposal contained in President Kennedy's budget message.

"While no proposal of this magnitude can ever be expected to be unanimously approved," said Catlin, "the vast majority of industrialists, financial community, and the educational complex in this area not only welcome this development but in fact have been working very diligently to secure just such a facility."

SELF-SEEKING GROUP

"If there is any opposition to this development it must be by a small self-seeking group not unlike those who tried to scuttle the Prudential development.

"Certainly, those who run NASA must realize that we in Boston want them here and will do everything we can to help them."

Oddly, the only two names mentioned in the Wall Street Journal piece in support of its contention that a segment of the community wanted to take a second look at the space research center proposal were those of members of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce Space Technical Advisory Committee that has been working mightily to get space projects into the area.

HARDING, WILSON

They were Henry Harding, president of the Laboratory for Electronics, Inc., who is chairman of the committee, and Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, chairman of Allied Research Associates, Inc., and until his retirement about a year ago Deputy Chief of the Air Force Staff for Research and Technology.

Catlin and other members of the chamber group, explaining with astonishment that "no one has worked any harder for this center than Henry Harding," sought to locate him but were thwarted when it was learned he was aboard the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* and not available unless a radiophone call could be put through to him. This the Herald was striving to do last night.

Catlin and other chamber members were dumbfounded because they said Harding was with them in Washington as late as Tuesday night when there was a meeting with the Massachusetts congressional delegation in connection with the space research center.

Harding, they said, never spoke in the tenor contained in the Wall Street Journal piece, and none would believe it last night without talking to their fellow member. One commented that "there's something screwy here somewhere."

General Wilson was reported to be in the air between Boston and Los Angeles when chamber members sought to talk to him.

SHOULD BE CHEERING

Maj.-Gen. James McCormack, vice president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, expressed an opinion there must be some misunderstanding about the research center and laboratory as he was convinced "Massachusetts industry should be cheering.

"This is exactly the sort of thing local industry has been trying to get here," stressed General McCormack. "But for any substantial part of the community to consider it a bad thing certainly would be harmful. The last thing this proposal would do would be to distress industry."

Referring to his belief there must be a misunderstanding, General McCormack said those reported to be objecting could not have checked the intent of the government. That the government was going to hire 2,000 electronic researchers for the project was just not so, he added, with respect to reports the opponents feared the center would compete with private industry for scientific personnel.

RIGHT NEXT

Total employment at the center would be 2,000, General McCormack said, but perhaps not more than 200 of these would be electronic researchers and other technical people, many transferred from other NASA centers. Basically, he explained, the center would be an electronic procurement operation dealing with industry.

It would put the NASA right next door to Massachusetts contractors, it was pointed out. The researchers, he added, would be the necessary underpinning for contract management personnel.

"It would be a wonderful setup for Massachusetts, and anybody taking a close look at it would come to the same conclusion," said General McCormack. "I'm sure it must be a vast misunderstanding. The Greater Boston community is running a grave risk of creating the wrong light in Washington."

The Raytheon Co., the electronic giant in the area, was quick to join the others voicing all-out support of the center. Its head, Charles Francis Adams, is a member of the chamber space committee, and through Thomas L. Phillips, executive vice president, Raytheon last night issued the following:

"We are encouraged by this confidence in the New England area implied by NASA's decision to situate a major research center in the Greater Boston area.

FURTHER GROWTH

"This step can help to insure a further growth of the area's technical and industrial facilities and should lead to further NASA activities for private industry and for our educational institutions".

Milton Greenberg, president of Geophysics Corp., said:

"As a member of the committee, I've been pushing hard to get this thing started. It will be a good thing for the area in the long run, a very good thing.

"The establishment of a laboratory such as this will lead to establishment of still further scientific industries here. It is a step in the right direction.

"It will provide opportunities for businessmen who are on their toes and have something to sell.

"I am sure there are some people who are concerned or worried about it. And they're entitled to their opinion. But I want the NASA laboratory here.

"I know that whatever government facilities have been established, historically, it has been established, historically, it has helped the community. Just look at what is happening around Houston. A thriving community has grown up where there was almost nothing before, just because of the NASA establishment."

Predictions Come True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, through the years Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, has been an effective spokesman for the American free enterprise system. In his column which appears regularly in the Cincinnati, Ohio, Enquirer, he has issued warnings that American industry, agriculture, and labor would suffer irreparable damage as a result of the foreign trade and aid policies of the United States.

As he points out in his column which appeared in the February 4, 1963, issue of the Enquirer, more and more industries are finding that foreign trade is becoming a one-way street; that for a variety of reasons they no longer can compete in the world market.

Mr. Wimmer's column follows:

Readers of this column ought to recall our predictions that no matter how much this country gives away, or how low we drop our tariffs, when it comes to a showdown, Europe, Asia and Latin American countries would "raise their tariffs at the first sign of real competition from American goods."

"Furthermore," we said, "American farm products will be shut off when foreign production is high enough to meet demands; that American controlled subsidiaries of U.S. based corporations will not only absorb much of what we are shipping abroad, but will dump their goods on their home markets

without regard for American jobs, stockholders or the safety of their country."

That day is here: in zinc, lead, typewriters, shirts, cars, computers, ships, machine tools, hams, steel, plywood, watches, textiles, twine, dishes, gloves, shoes, suits, rugs, bicycles, cameras—you name it—and no amount of technology, automation, cybernation, or retraining programs, will change the situation. Said Lindsay Johnson, president of the New Jersey Lead Co.:

"For a decade now, the once hardy breed of lead-zinc miners in the United States has been shouting 'Chloe' into the distant swamp of the Potomac, but without a rewarding answer. They must find her soon, for there seems no other way to avoid extinction of the breed."

He further declared: "Because it is caught in the web of inflation and high labor costs, with no compensating value of its products, the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry is captive within its own borders. It cannot profitably put one pound of its products into the world markets."

In other words, what Lindsay is saying, is that foreign trade is a one-way street with lead and zinc, and it is becoming a one-way street in typewriters, toys, ships, steel, tools, printing equipment, textiles and hundreds of other products over which our mass production methods held mastery for half a century.

Today that leadership is gone, and foreign progress in technology and know-how is passing us up, and, with the help of our own money and experience. We're in for a fight. A fight for survival. And, it all goes back to what we have been saying since 1932, when you could buy 4 pounds of hamburger for a quarter—that "no trade is good trade that isn't fair trade."

Our farmers, for example, want a floor under the prices they receive, and they want the Government to subsidize their shipments abroad, but when they go out to buy, they want everything at a price below a profit return to the wholesalers and retailers with whom they deal, and a catalog has become their Bible. In 30 years they have seen millions of their small farm neighbors lose their hold on the economy, because poultry and other farm products such as chickens, bacon, butter, fruit, milk, et cetera, have been used by the big chains as baits.

It was thus with workers in the factories, mills, newspapers, and other organized businesses who sought higher wages and fringe benefits running into billions, but did everything to force automation where automation might have been delayed; spending their higher wages with the price cutters who are destroying their jobs and opportunities for their own young.

Such human frailties as these have resulted in a record number of congressional hearings and Federal investigations aimed at learning why the free enterprise system is fading out—and how an exchange of goods and services under the conditions of monopoly-socialism and profitless prosperity, is now costing us our shirts. When most businesses were in the hands of independents—huge bureaus, huge taxes, huge investigations, huge unions—were never a threat.

Treasury Deficits, a Discredited Panacea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Economic News of the American Institute for Economic Research, in its November-December 1962 issue, offered some sound thinking on the subject of tax cuts and deficits. Now that we are engaged in the consideration of the President's tax proposals, which would unquestionably generate huge deficits, I think it is well that the comments of the American Institute for Economic Research be once again brought forward and for this reason I am placing it in the CONRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEFICITS, A DISCREDITED PANACEA

That "politics makes strange bedfellows" is commonplace; but that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Walter Reuther should be reported, on the same front page of the New York Times, to be in substantial agreement on a major aspect of economic policy is strange indeed. Apparently the prospect of hard times can have an influence similar to that of politics.

Both the chamber of commerce and Walter Reuther were reported to be urging tax reductions in order to restore prosperity and economic growth. The former suggested a reduction in the amount of $7.5 billion, whereas the latter suggested one of $10 billion. The chamber of commerce recommended general reductions with the largest benefits to corporations and to individuals in the higher tax brackets. On the other hand, Reuther would concentrate the reductions in the middle and lower individual income tax brackets. Both seem to have accepted the widespread notion that tax reductions of the magnitude indicated surely would stimulate the economy, presumably more than temporarily and to the extent of restoring economic growth.

To question the stimulating effects of Treasury deficits is a kind of modern heresy now that the disciples of Lord Keynes dominate the teaching of economics and the higher advisory levels in Government. Many academic economists have asserted that tax reductions would stimulate business activity and that those who do not agree with them simply are unsophisticated tyros who do not understand the implications of the secular revelations propounded by Lord Keynes.

Nevertheless, we doubt that tax reductions of the amounts indicated would restore prosperity and assure economic growth.

Consider the present situation and the causes of existing difficulties. The vast inflationary expansion of the Nation's purchasing media (currency and checking accounts) since 1939 is a matter of record clearly portrayed in our chart showing sources of purchasing media. For more than two decades more inflating was accepted as a way of life.

Two examples will illustrate the types of economic distortion that have been fostered by the prolonged inflatting. Residential construction has been stimulated by decreasing downpayments for homes and by easy credit for home buyers as well as for speculative builders. Great increases in wages in the building industry have been encouraged, and overbuilding has reached the point where apartment vacancies are at unprecedented levels. At anywhere near present construction costs, the market for residential properties appears to be nearly saturated.

Another example is provided by the automobile industry. The urgings of a labor monopoly and expectations of more inflating convinced management that wage scales (including benefits) could be quintupled and that prices could be increased to pay the bill. The now obvious result is retrogression in what could be a rapidly growing industry.

The fact that much of American industry no longer is competitive abroad accounts in substantial part for the gold problem. Foreigners would not demand gold nor would they accumulate dollar demand claims on gold if they could buy American goods at satisfactory prices in world markets. In fact, many American products no longer are competitive even in domestic markets, where imported items are being sold in rapidly increasing quantities.

Will the proposed tax reductions correct the distortions discussed above? Tax reductions would not remedy such difficulties; on the contrary, tax reductions would aggravate the problem if they encouraged labor to demand more and encouraged management to postpone the price reductions so badly needed. Moreover, tax reductions not accompanied by curtailed Government expenditures would increase fears abroad as to the future of the dollar.

Those who advocate larger Treasury deficits, either by increasing expenditures or by reducing taxes, evidently expect that the deficits would be monetized. In other words they assume that the Government would issue new securities and deliver them to the commercial banks in exchange for new credits to Treasury checking accounts. This would only repeat the inflationary practices of the past two decades, practices that obviously did not foster sound and lasting economic growth.

But is there any assurance that such Treasury deficits would be monetized?

In earlier articles we have discussed the great increases in savings and time deposits of the commercial banks this year, occurring well before the May-June decline in stock prices. Evidently Treasury deficits of the size indicated could be financed from increases in current savings. In fact, implying by tax reductions that a serious recession was expected might stimulate more savings instead of more spending for consumer goods. The result could be some deflation if increasing savings offset not only the planned new deficits but also, to some extent, earlier monetizing of Federal debt.

We do not exclude the possibility, however, that Treasury deficits attributable to tax reductions might be monetized with temporary stimulating and further distorting effects on business. More inflating might result, with accompanying encouragement of speculation generally. Many investors, fearing further depreciation of the dollar, might rush to buy stocks, and something like a bull market might be restored, for a few months at least. But we should not expect such a development to be the prelude to sound and vigorous economic growth.

The Nation is confronted with worldwide suspicion that we lack either wisdom in handling our economic problems or moral courage or both. To indulge in tax reductions without reducing Government expenditures would risk a flight from the dollar and might not even obtain the doubtful and temporary planned benefits.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Rockland County Journal-News for January 30, 1963, entitled "And Going Strong," paying tribute to the Honorable James A. Farley:

AND GOING STRONG

Improving with age—and he's still a young fellow—is the elder statesman of the Demo-

cratic Party and Rockland County's particular pride, James A. Farley. He is frequently in the public eye, just a few nights ago appearing on TV as the answer man for a barrage of questions on subjects ranging from his particularly favorite subject, politics to matters of national policy and national interest. Perhaps the view is prejudiced toward a native son, but his answers sparkled for their clarity and good sense.

Most impressive was the ring of honesty and sincerity that went into his answers and his comments. Just as impressive, too, was a total lack of bitterness or rancor toward a Democratic Party leadership that has much too often of recent years bypassed and slighted him. A man of lesser attainment would long since have consigned the party to its proper destination but not Mr. Farley; he continues as the elder statesman of the Democrats, realizing sound advice gained from long experience is as often rejected in politics as in other fields.

Mr. Farley is an acknowledged political expert, yet his fund of wisdom goes into many other fields, as his replies to questions on that TV appearance went into national policy rather than politics. His replies are intelligent, not glib as they are with so many political figures, his tongue running just as fast and as clearly as the keen mind that directs it. The combination is a rare one.

So it's a small wonder Rockland County points with pride to the onetime Stony Point town clerk, the architect of Franklin D. Roosevelt's campaign for President, the former Postmaster General, Mr. Democrat of unswerving loyalty through thick and thin, and above all a man ever mindful of small beginnings and the small community and county that sent him on his way.

A Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was with satisfaction and agreement with its praise that I read of the tribute paid by my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, Representative ROBERT E. JONES, to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN at the recent testimonial to the Senator here in Washington by the Alabama Credit Union League. In an effort to have Congressman JONES' tribute to a splendid champion of the credit union movement, I ask inclusion of this telegraphic message in the RECORD. It reads:

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I deeply regret that a speaking engagement in Alabama prevents me from attending your testimonial dinner in honor of my old friend and colleague Senator SPARKMAN.

I am a faithful reader of the attractive little magazine your league sends to me regularly. From it alone, I know of the high regard you hold for Senator SPARKMAN. However, I honestly feel that I could enhance your esteem for him, high as it is, by recalling for you in person, the innumerable anecdotes and instances in which he revealed his sincere interest in the credit union movement in general and our own Alabama league in particular.

JOHN SPARKMAN and I have often spoken of what a blessing credit unions would have been to us and our people in the so-called good old days, when the word "credit," was only a word in a dictionary, or did not extend beyond the neighborhood grocery store. His pioneering, early championship of the credit union idea sprung from a genuine compassion for everyday people and their problems, which often are due to the simple lack of money and credit.

JOHN SPARKMAN is one of those good legislators who has never looked at people through the bars of the dollar sign.

Again, I regret that I am unable to be with you and recall many of the battles he has fought for you and credit unionism everywhere. Their resounding success is, I know, a source of personal satisfaction to him.

It is highly fitting and proper that you honor him. He has proven himself to be one of the stanchest friends your league has ever had.

BOB JONES.

The Future of Flood Control and Senate Document No. 97

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by Mr. Robert McCaughey, Administrative Assistant to Senator KARL E. MUNDT of South Dakota, and one of the most experienced and capable staff aids in Congress, delivered last week before the 44th annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. McCaughey discusses in some depth the implications of Senate Document No. 97 for more efficient development of our water resources. His remarks will be of considerable interest to all Members who are vitally concerned with the conservation and development of our vital water resources.

The address follows:

THE FUTURE OF FLOOD CONTROL AND SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 97

(Remarks of Robert McCaughey, administrative assistant to Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota)

Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, and fellow Americans I deeply appreciate being invited here today to participate with you in this 44th annual meeting of your great Mississippi Valley Association. As one who comes from a river State like South Dakota, and as assistant to Senator MUNDT who serves on the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee which funds these projects, I have long had many opportunities to work with your executive vice president, Everett Winter, and with James R. (the R stands for river) Smith, your vice president, on many problems of flood control and development of the systems for water control which have and are coming into being in this great Missouri River Basin. Everett Winter, Jim Smith, and others such as Mike Cassidy, from this fine association are dedicated men who are devoting their lives to a program of development of an ever-expanding economy for the betterment of mid-America.

You and I know that flood control in the United States began as a matter of local concern. As America grew from East to West the Federal interest in flood control grew until it has become one of the major public works activities of the Federal Government today. The growth of this Nation and the population explosion in all of the flood plains of these 50 States has caused the flood problems to which you and I devote time, talent, and dollars today. Your association, its officers, members, and staff, Government technicians in the executive branch, and the legislative branch, and others, are constantly planning and working toward the end where we will in one way or another be able to exercise flood control through project construction of the rivers and streams which every year cause untold millions of dollars of damage to our productive acres, our towns, and cities.

Since the early 1800's, when the Federal Government interested itself in flood protection, the determination for such protection have been made on basically three criteria: (1) Abandon or evacuate the area of potential flood; (2) regulation of the flood plain use to accommodate it to flood hazard; and (3) provision of works and measures for flood protection of the area subject to serious floods, or a fourth way which could be a combination of the first three. In my opinion, and it seems the consensus with those with whom I come in contact in Washington, it appears that in providing a solution of a flood problem, the most critical and important decision to be reached is the determination of the proper degree of protection to be provided. Determination of this proper degree of protection is most important because there is the possibility that as a result of flood protection there will be developed from agriculture areas new industrial and urban areas. I have seen this happen in South Dakota. As the result of the flood control project at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., where there were once idle areas there are now sprawling factories or new shopping centers.

Of course, when the Federal Government entered the field of flood control activities this required policy procedures for the planning, authorization, and construction of the contemplated projects. While the procedures set forth under various flood control acts down through the years have perhaps seemed delaying and cumbersome, they have been, in fact, what I like to refer to as "Democracy in a Republic" in action.

Full consideration has been given to the needs of local people, the views of affected States, and the requirements of all agencies of Federal Government which might become involved. In recent years, with the recognition of need for optimum control and use of our water resources, we have integrated with flood control protection the development of navigation, power, irrigation, land enhancement, wildlife development, recreation, municipal water, and many other benefits which can accrue from flood control projects.

Multiple-purpose uses of our projects are now commonplace in the planning and carrying out the complete control and use of the resources of our river basins. We who live in a big river basin know that a fully regulated river would mean no floods. A flood control system capable of providing a high degree of regulation is simply a means of converting floods to a steady flow so that the water will be of greater value for power generation, water supply, pollution abatement, navigation, and all other purposes.

The development over the years of criteria in our flood control acts became the basis of the policies on which projects were planned from infancy and carried through to fruition.

In 1952, however, there developed inside the executive branch of the Government a document which established guidelines for project and flood control development which were, should I say, unpopular with certain agencies of the Government and with the

Congress. In fact, they were so unpopular with the Congress that Congress, itself, initiated studies on criteria in this area in conjunction with the executive branch of the Government.

Resulting from these studies which covered some 5 or 6 years, there emanated a document known as Senate Document No. 97 which sets forth policies, standards, and procedures in the formulation and review of plans for use and development of water and related land resources. These plans and procedures resulted from the study conducted by the Departments of the Army, Interior, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The document, Senate Document No. 97, sets forth only basic policies, standards, and procedures. There is a continuing study still going on which will formulate up-to-date policies, standards, and procedures relating to cost allocation, reimbursement, and cost sharing which must be considered by the departments of Government involved.

While Senate Document No. 97 is related primarily to questions of project formulation and justification with the related matters of cost allocation, repayment, and cost-sharing to be considered later, the document did go far enough in cost allocation to indicate that costs should be allocated to all functions of a project on an equitable basis which enhanced feasibility of given projects.

In my opinion, I feel that while not perfect or the millennium in establishing standardization of policies or procedures for project development, Senate Document No. 97 does create a better atmosphere for achievement of the goal of effective flood control and stream regulation in the years ahead. I say this because Senate Document No. 97 broadens the base of consideration of criteria of items which will increase the potential feasibility of possible flood control projects. It urges, in fact, it demands that studies be made of river basin on a comprehensive basis. It provides for the use of a 100-year period in lieu of the 50-year period previously used in the cost-benefit analysis. The change from the 50- to the 100-year period assuming a 2⅞-percent interest rate which is applicable for the fiscal year under the formula included in Senate Document No. 97 has the same effect as reducing the construction costs of a project by approximately 25 percent. It provides for the recognition of recreation and area redevelopment as part of project functions. Benefits from these will be recognized and costs will be allocated.

Philosophically, Senate Document No. 97 recognizes the objectives of water resource development to include economic development, conservation and well-being of people in the place of the previous objective of economic efficiency. The broadened concept of water resource development, including the additional functions recognized, will require closer and more effective coordination with various State and Federal agencies.

You and I, living in great river basins, are interested in the development of those basins. With this planning amplified and underscored for development of all water resources, it brightens in my opinion the future of river regulation and the streams in the basin and thus more effective flood control. This type of planning brings into play the use of the many multipurpose benefits which control and utilize water and curb its potential course of destructiveness—a plus for future of flood control.

The voice of the people is heard in the planning of projects since the policy requirements and guidelines of Congress are at all times observed and the viewpoints of national, regional, State and local objetcives are considered by congressional committees and evaluated within a framework of national public objectives. The "Democracy in a Republic" at work.

I am told that the coordination between the agencies of Government on project development has improved tremendously and that working arrangements on the various projects for development of all the potential resource from the various projects are most amicable. Thus, under existing law with firm guidelines and coordinated relationships, we are moving forward in the developing of projects which add to our ever-expanding national economy.

The standards for formulation and evaluation of plans are set forth most clearly in this document. I am not going to discuss them individually because those of you who may not be fully familiar with them can obtain this document from your Congressman and study them yourself. I can assure you that they provide for almost every criteria possible in development of projects for control of our water resources. The standards for formulation of plans with regard to all pertinent costs and benefits, both tangible and intangible are clearly set forth. There are understandable definitions of benefits, with a delineation of the types of primary benefits and with standards for their measurement. These include domestic, municipal, and industrial water supply; irrigation benefits; water quality control; electric power; recreation; fish and wildlife and many other benefits for better living today.

I have discussed most briefly a few of the criteria of this document. All of the planning and benefits, in my opinion, point to a brighter future for flood control in the years ahead because of our ever-growing needs for water, for the many benefits possible resulting from control of streams and rivers means better regulation of the waters in the flood plains and the lessening of potential flood damage. An expanding population demanding higher standards of living emphasizes the need for more flood control projects or flood control regulation so that we have recreation, water, acres for food production, and a safeguarding of the interests of all the people.

As I said earlier, while Senate Document No. 97, with all its details of benefits, planning, and suggestion, is neither complete nor perfect; it is a step forward toward the goal of more efficient development of our water resources which is improved flood control procedures. While we now have Senate Document No. 97 as the guidelines for project development programs today, let us not rest on our oars.

Let us in the days and months ahead devote our talents to more and better criteria, which will be needed. I hope this association will continue to take the lead in the continuing development of up-to-date criteria. We should give thought to the fact that with more and more Federal funds involved there is the ever-approaching danger of encroachment of the Federal Government into regulations of our water resource development and basin programs.

I hope this association, along with others, will take the lead in obtaining a full interpretation of the section of Senate Document No. 97 which states: "Formulation and evaluation of plans or alternative plans shall be accomplished in such a way as to permit timely application of standards appropriate to conditions of (a) less than 'full employment' nationally, and (b) chronic and persistent unemployment or underemployment in designated areas."

As you can see, this is language couched in general terms. We certainly do not want our water resource projects pushed by theoretical feasibility into the area of make-work projects.

Flood control and development of our water resources have always been determined on the basis of sound economic feasibility. Let us keep it that way.

I hope that the cooperation we now have at department levels will expand, but I also hope that the ultimate control and dominant voice in the programs which we now have or will have in the future will continue to be yours from the valleys themselves and that you will continue to determine in conjunction with the experts the policies and programs which you feel are the best for your area. I am convinced that local political subdivisions, also organizations such as this one, or other locally formed groups can best determine the programs which will bring to their basin, their State, their hometown, the type of water control development program which will permit the local area to meet their needs and the needs of the Nation by providing essential ingredients for nationwide economic development and growth.

Our office in Washington looks forward to continued cooperation with your fine association.

Thank you and good luck.

The Other Side of the Coin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of confusion has arisen recently over the European Common Market. Charges and countercharges have been made.

In a recent address by the Honorable Herve Alphand at Chambersburg, Pa., the French Ambassador presents interesting facts as they apply to his nation. The following speech was delivered before the Ambassadors' Forum at Wilson College:

FRANCE TODAY AND WORLD AFFAIRS

(Address delivered by H. E. M. Herve Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States to the Ambassadors' Forum, Chambersburg, Pa., February 4, 1963)

French attitudes in two important fields—organization of defense on one hand and construction of a united Europe on the other—have recently raised in the entire world great turmoils. Reading newspapers or listening to the radio I would even say that a kind of storm seems to blow presently over relations among the Western allies. I would like to tell you right away that my deep conviction is that this storm could not bring about the cataclysm already predicted by some.

In many cases indeed people that are disturbed are not fully conscious of the elements of the problem, though they have been clearly presented in the press conference held by the President of the French Republic last January 14. Deliberately or not, some essential parts of the thoughts of General de Gaulle have been either deformed, misinterpreted or misunderstood. In order to straighten up this situation it seems to me necessary to recall some explanations for the benefit of the American public as I have no doubt about its traditional impartiality and friendship for my country. I would like therefore to take the opportunity offered to me today to answer in very simple terms inspired by the actual texts, the questions that many of you have in mind.

It has even been advanced that French policy is throwing doubts on the Alliance; I would not even mention this subject if it were not that very often ridiculous things

are said that find an echo and sometimes even some willing listeners.

The need for the Atlantic alliance has been reaffirmed in the clearest fashion, by General de Gaulle and by our Minister for Foreign Affairs. As long as the peril facing us all exists, no country and especially ours can fight alone a modern war. To have allies is a natural thing for us in the historic period in which live. We know very well, moreover, that American presence and that of her nuclear weapons remain, as our head of state has said, the essential guarantee of world peace.

The debate bears on the shape to give to our indispensable Alliance, on the way of combining our forces and of organizing our strategy. France intends to possess a duly national defense which, when the supreme interests of the country should be at stake, could discourage the blackmail of a possible enemy. Nothing in that is a sign of mistrust toward our allies. France well knows the commitments undertaken but she feels that the circumstances existing today may not be the same 10, 15, or 20 years from now; no one can predict what will be the world's situation in such a distant future. In exceptional cases when our interests would be directly involved although—those of our allies would not be threatened—we must have our own means to reply to that blackmail; this in itself justifies both alliance and independence.

At the same time as France it attempting to create her own atomic force, and I want to emphasize this point, she is not excluding in anyway of course the fact that her forces could be combined with that of similar forces of her allies and before all with the gigantic force of the United States. If she desires to keep in extreme cases the decision to use her own atomic means, she does not refuse at all to cooperate either technically or strategically with her allies, if such is their wish. France's position can be summed up in this way: to the integration of Atlantic forces she prefers a cooperation among allied forces.

She has therefore started building a nuclear armament with her own means. This armament will be modest when compared to yours, but our objectives and our means are more limited than yours. We believe all the same that our force will have from the start a considerable capacity of destruction which will constitute a factor of deterrence compelling a potential aggressor to think twice before striking.

I would add that building a nuclear force with our own means enables us to acquire in a field unknown to us before, an infinitely precious knowledge for the training of our scientists and for the creation of modern industries.

Though we are willing to associate our means with those of our allies, we have not in mind helping such or such a nation to acquire in turn an atomic arsenal. The treaty of cooperation just signed with Germany does not, in our view, include the atomic field. In 1954 Germany took the pledge not to produce herself such an armament, we hope and we believe that she desires to maintain this state of affairs.

Besides, one must recognize that while deploring the existence of an independent French atomic force, the U.S. Government itself accepts it as a fact that does not threaten the Western entente.

On the other hand, criticisms aimed at the European policy of France are more pronounced, especially since the interruption of the Brussels negotiations for the entry of Great Britain in the Common Market.

First of all I would like to go back a little and recall that French initiatives were at the origin of this great movement for European unification. Thanks to our efforts and before all to the improvement of our finances and economy, the first important steps were happily made toward the formation of a European entity of 175 million inhabitants, a very wealthy and prosperous one.

At the very moment we conceived this idea, we did not fail to ask Britain if she wished to join us. That was in 1950, when Mr. Schuman made his first statement about the Coal and Steel Community; at that time Britain, for reasons that were her own and which were related in particular to her ties to the Commonwealth, refused to participate in the negotiation we started with our five partners in Western Europe—Federal Germany, Italy and the countries of the Benelux. At the time we perfectly understood her attitude although we regretted it. Later, European unity went forward to the point of realizing a Common Market aiming at a free trade between the six countries, exchanges of persons and of capital and harmonizing social policies, financial policies, etc. Once more Britain was approached by us, once more she did not feel able to answer our call. But for her part she had created an organization somewhat competitive but different from ours, because it did not involve a common tariff, nor a common policy in the fields that I have just mentioned, and this organization grouped together the most diverse countries of Europe. It was called EFTA.

As a matter of fact, whilst the Common Market was progressing satisfactorily, EFTA remained more or less stagnant. At that point, Britain changed her policy completely and doubtless realizing the success of our endeavor, she asked not to join us, but to study the conditions of her possible admission.

This was very satisfying to us; but from the start of the negotiation we reminded her the rules of the Common Market—the rules of the club established with great pains by the Rome Treaty, and of the operating agreements; we told her that of course we wished to maintain for the new members the rules that the original signatories had imposed upon themselves.

Britain seemed to accept these quite natural terms.

Then, as you know, the negotiation started in Brussels, it has lasted 15 months. It was conducted, I am glad to say, on both sides with entire good faith. But it appeared that in spite of the desire expressed by Great Britain to accept the principle of the Common Market, in many fields and especially in the one concerned with the elimination of the preferences granted by England to the industrial products of the Commonwealth, the structural reforms of British agriculture and the extension to the EFTA countries of the common external tariff, we could not come to an agreement. Our five partners of the Common Market would have liked to carry on the negotiation, but none of them could tell us on what basis. The French Government thought it wiser not to preserve on a road leading to a deadlock, to a more severe and painful crisis than the one we are facing now.

However, and I want to underline it in the clearest manner, the door is not shut on Great Britain. As our Minister for Foreign Affairs was saying recently: "An evolution is taking place in England that should continue. If it has not yet reached the moment when inevitable transformations appear acceptable, this time will come." It is because France is of that opinion that she has proposed as provisional solution the idea of an agreement between the Common Market and Great Britain, which—without going as far as a formal membership—would make it possible for the two sides not only to maintain but also to expand their trade, and for Great Britain to proceed with the indispensable evolution. This view stands, it gives a proof that we do not want to change our policy in regard to Great Britain, our ally for so many years, whom we respect and admire and to whom we are tied by so many memories and shared trials.

In other terms, feeling that for well-known reasons, England was not ready to accept the rules of the Common Market, France offers her an alternative which is a liberal treaty to enable her to maintain and expand her trade with us. In my opinion, there is nothing dramatic in all this, and I believe that some people have a tendency to exaggerate somewhat the so-called gravity of the situation. Those who are attacking our policy say that the interruption of the negotiations between Britain and the six means that Europe is going to shrink upon herself, to isolate herself, and to become a sort of a brake upon world trade expansion. They represent France as trying to create a protectionist and autarchic entity in Europe. This, indeed, is not so at all.

First of all the Rome Treaty itself forbids the establishment of a common custom tariff higher than the average of the national existing tariffs within the six. Secondly, already we have brought about—in regard to outside countries—a reduction of about 30 percent in the tariffs that existed on January 1, 1957, for industrial goods. At the same time, we have suppressed quantitative restrictions on all industrial products which were the chief obstacle to trade. Finally, we are ready to examine the possibilities of negotiating with the United States, with Great Britain, and with all the countries of the free world, trade treaties which, by the play of reciprocal concessions, will make possible new tariff reductions and assure an expansion of trade within the Western community.

It was in that spirit that the Common Market was conceived and it is in that spirit that it is progressing. Quite naturally, like any economic entity existing in the world, it is trying to defend the interests of its members but it has no intention of obstructing the desired development of trade between all nations. It may be that difficulties will arise for some particular products, but this always has been the case, and I am now thinking especially of agricultural products. We do not intend in this field to maintain excessively high prices through subsidies; at the same time, we foresee, and it is our wish that a study be carried out of the means for distributing through international agreements surpluses which weigh so heavily upon the economy and finance of so many countries, on the American as well as on the European continents.

French policy is, therefore, following the great traditions of my country by remaining liberal and by looking toward the rest of the world. Moreover, this is confirmed by the facts. The economic report which a few days ago was sent by President Kennedy to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House notes that the volume of the sales of manufactured products from the United States to the six countries of the Common Market has greatly increased during the last few years, and I am quoting the President: "Total U.S. exports or manufactures to the EEC in the 4 years following 1957, the year before the Rome Treaty went into effect, increased by 70 percent—from $1.1 billion to $1.8 billion, whereas U.S. exports of manufactures to the rest of the world declined by 6 percent."

Our policy has been summed up in a striking way by the following sentences in a speech by the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the National Assembly on January 24. Speaking of the recent agreement concluded by France and Germany which put an end to ambitions which have led to two World Wars and which on two occasions have compelled your sons to fight with ours against tyranny, M. Couve de Murville said this: "Our European partners may, at any time, discuss

with us the terms of their participation to this Franco-German treaty. We have no doubt that one day they will decide to join us. Then, on the basis of a strong economic union, it will be possible to define and to follow a foreign policy and a defense policy which will be truly European. Then Western Europe, which I am hoping Great Britain will have joined without restriction, will have become a coherent political entity capable of fully cooperating with the United States within the framework of the Atlantic alliance and of constituting this balanced element so necessary for a global settlement."

This definition of our policy which has passed somewhat unnoticed in your press deserves to be emphasized. Through a Europe economically and politically united, a Europe to which one day we hope Great Britain will belong by accepting its rules, and through a close cooperation between this Europe and America, we believe we can facilitate the realization of a modus vivendi between East and West which has always been one of the bases of French policy. But to come to this, General de Gaulle has often said, the threat from the East must cease, and a true detente must exist so that we can discuss in a new atmosphere the really serious problems, disarmament, the problem of the aid to be given in common to the developing countries, to those two billion human beings still living in a condition of moral and physical misery and that we, too easily tend to forget.

To maintain a duly national defense, preserve the alliance with America, and safeguard the future of European cooperation, such are our guiding principles. Is there anything strange about those principles? Are they of a nature to engender fear or a lack of confidence? I would not think so.

France who has just granted independence to nearly 20 African nations has no ambition of dominating Europe where she is linked to very old countries by the same civilization. Neither has she the intention of changing the old alliance that for nearly two centuries has united her with the United States of America.

In critical circumstances, for instance when the Soviet Union destroyed the hopes of a summit conference, or when she threatens in Cuba or Berlin, France has always proved to be the most resolute and the most decided among the Allies. Her policy of firmness, her views regarding the organization of Europe and of the Western World, her determination to seek, when the moment comes, a global settlement do not represent only the personal opinions of one prestigious man. They are supported by a freely elected parliament and by the massive votes of her whole people each time this people has been consulted.

Death for Two on Skimpy Pies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are forever being admonished that we accept our heritage too lightly in this great land.

In other words, we take our traditions and blessings almost for granted, so goes the complaint.

This charge may or may not be true, but I would like to take this occasion to illustrate dramatically what can happen to a large population subject to the rule of men rather than to the rule of law. I offer for reproduction at this point an Associated Press news clipping, dateline Moscow, printed in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register for February 6, 1963.

DEATH FOR TWO ON SKIMPY PIES

Moscow—Two Soviet restaurant officials have been ordered shot for serving skimpy pies and charging normal prices, Moscow Radio reported Tuesday.

The radio said the two men operated the railway station restaurant at Sverdlovsk.

They were accused of using an automatic pie frying machine which enabled them to reduce the specified lard content. The difference was allegedly pocketed by the two and more than 50 accomplices. The director alone made about 400 rubles ($444) a month, Moscow said. Accomplices got prison terms of up to 15 years.

This should snap anyone out of complaceny, and remind all citizens that our advantages are indeed tremendous in the United States. Furthermore, that any loss of these freedoms will be directly traceable to our own fault.

We are never coming to this inhuman situation, where property rights are more important than personal liberties, but I did not want this startling news item to go unnoticed. The story proves that ordinary life in the Soviet Union must be so bleak and unattractive that the civilized world's traditional deterrent to theft, imprisonment, is not sufficient. Prison itself does not represent a much crueller fate than everyday existence. Thus, death by firing squad to two men who stole shortening from pies.

Homemakers Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime recently issued a release dramatizing a few of the many problems confronting youth in our Nation's slums, and indicating how the community, under the auspices of Mobilization for Youth, offers advice, service, and friendship to assist in the resolution of such problems. The release follows:

RELEASE BY THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH CRIME

(Chairman: The Attorney General. Members: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Labor.)

Mrs. P. and her five children shared one bed and one blanket. The children couldn't sleep at night because the rats made so much noise.

When a doctor told Mrs. A., a 15-year-old mother, to feed her baby solid foods, she gave him bacon and eggs.

Mrs. L. had a beautifully furnished apartment complete with hi-fi, but no food in the refrigerator.

When the welfare department gave Mrs. M. powdered milk for her children, she threw it away because she didn't know what it was.

These are some of the situations that 15 visiting homemakers have encountered on the lower East Side of New York City. Under the auspices of Mobilization for Youth, a nonprofit organization conducting a variety of programs for young people and their families, these local women help their less experienced neighbors learn to cook, shop, budget, and care for their homes and children.

The homemakers' purpose is not to wait on the women but to help them help themselves. One homemaker took Mrs. P. on a shopping trip and showed her how to save $16 of her $96 monthly welfare check by careful buying in a reputable store. "If I hadn't gone with her," the homemaker said, "Mrs. P. wouldn't have known where to shop, what to buy, how much things cost. The next time she can go by herself with confidence."

This homemaker showed Mrs. P. how to plug up ratholes by hammering tin can covers over them. She also notified the landlord and the welfare department about the rats.

Mrs. A. learned how to feed her baby correctly and how to change its diapers.

Mrs. L. was shown how to budget wisely so she would have enough money for food and necessities, instead of such luxuries as a hi-fi.

Mrs. M. learned what powdered milk was, and how to use it.

Mrs. Gertrude Goldberg, supervisor of the visiting homemakers and a member of the Mobilization for Youth staff, thinks one of the most important results of the program is the increased self-respect of the housewife and the increased respect shown her by her children. "When a mother stands up for her rights to the salesman, the butcher, or anyone else who is trying to pull a fast one, she is setting a positive example for her child to follow," Mrs. Goldberg said.

One homemaker accompanied a woman to a butcher shop. The woman selected several lean pieces of meat, but the butcher gave her fat meat from the back of the counter. The homemaker urged her to demand the pieces she had selected. "Everyone tries to take advantage of poor people," the homemaker said. "But if you stand up for your rights, they will usually respect you and treat you decently."

Another goal of the homemaker program is to make women aware of the services available in their community. When a child is sick, many housewives on the lower East Side do not know where to find a doctor. The homemakers show them where the clinics and hospitals are and how to schedule appointments.

Homemakers also work in cooperation with other Mobilization and social agency programs. Through the Urban Work Corps, a subsidized Mobilization work program, teenagers are employed as babysitters to enable mothers to do their errands, shopping, and visiting. A homemaker referred the unemployed husband of one woman to the Urban Works Corps where he now has a job as a carpenter.

Social workers in Mobilization's neighborhood service centers, managers of public housing projects, and other social agency personnel make requests for the homemaker service. Often, women who have been helped refer their neighbors to the homemakers program.

The lower East Side has been traditionally an area of great social mobility. In the 1800's, streams of European immigrants—

Italians, Irish, Jews, Poles, and Czechs settled there. The Chinese settled in Chinatown, bordering the lower East Side on the west. In this century, many of these groups have moved out, and Negroes and Puerto Ricans have replaced them.

The homemakers are concerned with the problems caused by this mobility. They greet newcomers to the community and try to ease the strangeness by offering advice, services, and friendship. They help the new arrivals move in, show them how to care for household equipment and how to make use of neighborhood facilities. Since most of the homemakers are minority group members themselves, they do not have to overcome language or cultural barriers.

To many of the inhabitants of the area, the school, the housing authority, the welfare department, and the police, loom as great, complex bureaucracies with which they feel powerless to cope. Here the homemakers act as intermediaries between the institutions and the individuals. One woman's refrigerator was broken for 2 weeks, but she was afraid to contact the housing authority. The homemaker made a phone call, and in 2 hours a new refrigerator was installed.

This month, the homemakers are setting up a four-room model apartment, provided at low rent by the housing authority. In the model apartment, homemakers will demonstrate cooking and sewing to groups of local women, will provide a babysitting service, and will teach refurbishing furniture. They will continue their home visits in the neighborhood as well.

The 15 homemakers were selected from over 60 applicants on the basis of their skills, background and personality. Two of them had been on welfare themselves before taking the job.

They went through 2 weeks of training, but as Mrs. Goldberg said, "We learned as much from them as they did from us." At first, the homemakers feared resentment from the women they wanted to help, but they found the women eager to learn and to improve their situations.

The homemaker program is only one part of the total mobilization for youth program, but it embodies the project's basic principle: offering people the opportunity to better themselves through constructive means will build better neighborhoods and prevent delinquency and crime.

Mobilization for youth is a $12 million, 2-year program, supported by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, the Ford Foundation, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the city of New York. Fifteen other cities in the country are in process of planning similar comprehensive delinquency prevention programs, supported by grants under the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961.

A Congressional Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Mesa (Ariz.) Tribune of January 30, 1963, entitled "A Congressional Duty." In view of the discussion and bewilderment engendered by the President's proposed tax program, I thought the suggestion contained in the editorial would be of interest to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

A CONGRESSIONAL DUTY

Some prime examples of Presidential confusion have been cascading out of Washington in recent weeks, as more details of the administration's fiscal program are brought to light.

On the one hand, the President says taxes are a drag on the economy, proposes to cut them and to practice fiscal frugality. On the other, he dumps a vast new spending package in the lap of Congress and practically ignores the fantastic deficit it entails.

The net result has been that the administration's fiscal program has lost all meaning. Even some of the leading members of his own party, including some of the normally political liberals, seem bewildered by it all.

The source of all the confusion is not hard to find. It stems from the diverse suggestions coming to the President from left-liberal politicians, radical professors, immature advisers, and assorted speechwriters.

To whom can the people turn for guidance in such a situation?

The Congress must assert its full authority over the spending and taxing powers of Government and over its fiscal policies.

It is not going too far to say that the Congress should throw out the President's program in its entirety, start from scratch and chart a clear and acceptable course of spending and taxing based on fiscal responsibility and with due attention to the economic laws involved.

Acceptance of the program without basic and drastic changes in its entire concept can only lead the country into further, and possibly disastrous inflation.

Agonizing Reappraisal—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John C. Love, of Waukesha, Wis., has performed a valuable service with his analysis of our foreign aid program. His discussion of that subject includes the following:

We must learn to exploit the weakness of communism as Communists have learned to exploit ours. We must learn from our own experience what will work and what won't work in the ideological war with communism.

Communism does not make people happy because it does not take care of their material needs and it does not give the people the freedom that is universally desired. In the satellite states, Moscow-dominated communism is in square conflict with national aspirations and the desire for freedom and independence, which from time immemorial inspires men to lay down their lives for their country. Eventually the oppressed people will rise against the tyrant. Time is on our side. There is no need to panic.

The failure of communism is attested by the famine and concentration camps behind the Iron Curtain and the closed borders and walled frontiers which confine those who are desperate to escape to freedom, but it is wishful thinking for us to suppose that we can convert Communists by gifts of grain and foodstuffs. It would be sounder policy for the democracies to let the Communists learn from their own mistakes and let the pressures of discontent mount within the prison state to ultimate revolt.

We are engaged in an ideological conflict with communism. Our object is, and should be, to win the hearts and minds of mankind to freedom and democracy, but the touting of the virtues of democracy over the radio beams has proved ineffective. Our propaganda methods should be revised to exploit the weaknesses of communism. Whenever possible, the program should be mounted from within the subject nation. Wherever possible, the nationals of the subject nations should be used on their home front, just as the Communists use the Communist cell in democratic countries.

The development of thermonuclear weapons makes obsolete the concept of military containment of communism. NATO and other defensive alliances fail to protect against the real danger from communism, which is infiltration and takeover from within by revolution or formation of coalition governments.

We must recognize that communism is an ideology, which, like a disease, cannot be fought along fixed lines any more than one can contain a plague with a wall. Our policy of military containment, like the maginot line, gives a feeling of false security, but has little value because it can be flown over by intercontinental missiles and can be breached and outflanked by revolution from within and behind any line that may be drawn. On the other hand, SEATO, NATO, and other military alliances involve us in conflicts throughout the world. With little to be gained by these defensive alliances, we live with a gun pointed at our head and we take solace in the thought that we have told the Russians that if they shoot us, we will shoot them—we hope.

Our policy is faulty because it deals with the Communist menace as an emergency. We should deal with communism on a long-range basis, realizing that time is on our side.

Our policy fails to give proper weight to the weaknesses and problems of communism, namely: That communism collides head on with the nationalistic aspirations of subject peoples; that communism suppresses man's religious instincts and his aspirations for personal liberty the world over. Our policy fails to give people credit for having the will or capacity to make the wise choice of what is good for them and seems to assume that there is no road back from communism and Americans must save the world from eternal servitude and slavery.

Communism has within itself the seed of its own destruction. The most obvious weakness of communism is that communism enslaves. Eventually the Communist dictators will go the way of all foreign despots. There is persuasive evidence that the Russian Communists recognize that international communism conflicts with nationalism and that it is futile to impose communism by military conquest from without. The Communist International and the Cominform have been dissolved. The Communist apparatus the world over has been established along separate nationalistic lines. In the United Nations and all over the world, the Communists support the national aspirations of colonial states. Even in the satellite states, the Communists maintain the form of sovereignty and autonomy. The real danger from communism is from Communist-inspired fifth columns and revolutions and civil war. To be specific, the real danger from communism to the members of our NATO partnership is not a military attack by Russia, but from a Communist takeover by the active Communist parties in France and Italy, or a war of unification between East and West

Germany. The Communists have learned that communism must be geared to the accomplishment of national objectives to succeed. Eventually world communism will be disrupted by the conflicting national interests and rivalry such as divide the free world. This should be one of the premises upon which our foreign policy is planned.

One of the favorable developments of recent years is that Yugoslavia, China, and Albania have defied Moscow and acted with some independence. Our policy of military containment of communism tends to unify the otherwise divisive elements of communism into a common cause and war against the free world.

Not only does our policy unify the Communists, but it stimulates and promotes the Communist cause. The encirclement of Russia and China with the armed might of America, including American-manned air bases and submarine bases pointed at Russia and our military alliances and brush wars have a psychological impact upon communism which is comparable to the impact of the Communist takeover in Cuba upon America. To understand the full import of this criticism of our foreign policy, it should be understood that communism substitutes group motivation and incentives for the aspirations of the individual citizens which is the dominant motivation of a free society. Group motivation is not peculiar to communism, but it has never succeeded for long periods of time as a motivation for work because of the unwillingness of a large proportion of the people of any community to carry their fair share of the load unless they stand to gain by their own effort. However, there is a significant exception: Groups function effectively under the discipline when distressed by fear of a national emergency or when inspired by national or community pride.

With this explanation it should be observed that the cold war supplies communism with the motivation of fear and pride which communism needs to make it work. Our policy provides the stimulus the Communists need to divert the people's attention from their unhappy state and to supply the fervor of patriotism to their daily living. It also unifies the otherwise divergent nationalistic tendency of the Communist leadership in the satellite states.

The cold war has a similar impact upon America, but there is this difference: We don't need this stimulus to make our system work. Nevertheless, the cold war has imposed certain disciplines upon our economic system and appropriates for national defense and foreign aid a constantly increasing share of the fruits of our labor so that we have become an armed camp and function more and more like a commune.

The first line of defense against communism is on the homefront. Our first concern should be to keep America strong and to make democracy succeed by preserving the basic liberties in America and by making America a good place in which to live. Our objectives should be to make America the showcase of democracy and to give the rest of the world an opportunity to see democracy in action. Just as the Russians take promising students from the backward nations to Russia and indoctrinate them and send them back as exponents of the Communist philosophy, we should provide educational opportunties for foreign students either in this country, or in their homelands. If they have the desire and the capacity to adopt our ideas and way of life, they will return and sow the seeds of democracy; if they don't no amount of prodding will succeed. Our object should be to provide leadership trained along democratic lines.

We should continue to show people how to improve their lot; but we shouldn't undertake to do it for them. We should give freely of our knowledge, but not of our substance.

Any foreign aid program should be put and kept on a businesslike basis. It should not be in the form of aid or charity because the receipt of charity is a humiliating experience for the recipient and makes for ill will and jealousy.

Tangible foreign aid should take the form of self-liquidating programs by which the recipient nations pay for our goods in the product of their own agriculture or industry, or out of revenues of the new facility, pledged on a businesslike basis. Such a program does not involve the recipient in the indignity and degradation of charity. In such a program, we deal as equals. It must be recognized that even in such a program, there is danger, because the surest way to lose a friend is to loan him money. Wherever possible, the project should be kept on an exchange basis, exchange of goods and services.

Foreign aid should not be used to subsidize or establish socialistic enterprises. It must be recognized that socialism is the antithesis of freedom and capitalism. The development of socialistic enterprises in foreign countries is a deterrent to the development of a free capitalistic society. The subsidy of state owned and controlled enterprises in foreign lands works directly against our primary objective by providing a climate unfavorable for the development and maintenance of a democratic society.

What the people of the world need is the right of the individual to pursue his own life, liberty and happiness under the framework of a stable government that protects property rights. By property rights is meant the right of the individual to keep and enjoy the fruits of his labor subject, of course, to reasonable restraints imposed by government and the necessary taxes to mount a well-conceived program of social welfare. This is basic. It forms the motivation which is the genesis of most creative and productive labor of man in the economic field. It is the absence of this yeast which dooms communism and socialism to mediocrity and failure. The administration of our State Department should be entrusted to people who believe this is a cornerstone of American economic success.

It is not intended to suggest that America should retreat to a position of isolation. America must continue to support the United Nations and throw the weight of its prestige back of the efforts of the United Nations to bring peace and the development of international law to govern nations in their relationships with one another.

Viewing American foreign policy as a whole, our objectives are good. The problem is to develop a policy which is effective to accomplish those objectives. We should learn from our failures in the past and first of all, we must recognize that our policy has not been effective to accomplish its objectives and that a radical revision is necessary now.

While the foreign aid program is motivated by the generous impulses of the American people and has the commendable objective of winning and holding friends and allies for the cause of democracy, in practical operation it does not work. We must abandon those policies which in practical operation work against us. We can be more helpful to the world in the cause of freedom by treating mankind, the world over, as equals and by putting our relationship on a businesslike basis.

There is need for a general revision of our program with these objectives: The program must be one which we can afford without disturbing the balance of international payments and increasing our national debt. It must be recognized that we cannot afford the present program. Emphasis should be shifted from gifts, grants and loans to education and indoctrination of individuals with our ideals and economic know-how.

It is the American way to achieve group prosperity through the initiative and the success of the individual. Our present policy is subsidizing socialism all over the world. Instead we should exploit the failure and ineptitude of socialism. One way is to let the socialists learn from their own mistakes and failures.

The Berlin wall has become the symbol of slave labor and a prison state, but the fight for freedom must be fought by freedom loving people within each nation. They deserve and need our help, but it is fallacy to suppose that we can win people and nations to democracy by improving their standard of living. Rather, they will turn against us because we don't do enough. They must learn to help themselves. We can show them how, but they must do it themselves.

The Huey Long Murder Case—A Footnote to History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Hermann B. Deutsch, for almost a half century, one of Louisiana's outstanding political reporters, has the competence, the experience, the knowledge and the background to write a book about the last days and assassination of Huey Long.

And Hermann Deutsch has done just that.

On the stands and off the Doubleday Press is "The Huey Long Murder Case," described by the publishers as "the true story of the last days of the Kingfish, culminating in his mysterious and dramatic assassination—based on eyewitness reports."

It is one of the most fascinating and intriguing books I have ever read and that comes from a newspaper reporter who wrote thousands of words on the subject when it all took place. I covered the Louisiana scene and chronicled the details of Huey Long's death, but not until Hermann Deutsch put all pieces together in his newly published book has there ever been unfolded in such detail the happenings of the moment.

I have always maintained that a good district attorney could convict Dr. Carl Weiss of Huey Long's murder and that a good defense attorney could have acquitted him. I am still of the same opinion after reading the objective presentation of the facts by Mr. Deutsch as related to him by eyewitnesses and others closely associated with the shooting. I knew well all the principals in the case. I know their backgrounds and their positions at the time Huey Long was murdered. I was in almost daily contact with them as a reporter. Hermann Deutsch has added to his laurels as a reporter in his treatise on "The Huey Long Murder Case."

I know Hermann Deutsch well. He was a recognized authority and veteran of the political reporting arena when I cut my eyeteeth as a political reporter.

He was a terrific competitor who did not give and asked no quarter in the rough and tumble field of getting the story. We were pitted against each other on many occasions and when I was beaten I felt no shame because a foe well worthy of his mettle had defeated me. Through it all, however, we were and have been close friends and I pause today to pay him tribute for the splendid job he has done on a story which will never die and which will be retold many times although never with such clarity and detail.

Hermann Deutsch for 47 years has been a political reporter, editorial writer and columnist for the newspapers now being issued by the Times-Picayune Publishing Corp. His observations on the contemporary scene appear each afternoon in the States-Item, his reminiscences of what he has witnessed during nearly half a century of active reporting appears each Sunday morning in the Times-Picayune. He knew Huey Long well and is the only surviving member of the press corps which heard and reported the first statewide political speech made by the young Kingfish-to-be on July 4, 1919. The ranks of those of us who covered the Long scene at Baton Rouge, New Orleans, and throughout the State of Louisiana have grown thin. Only a handful remain active in the newspaper business with Hermann Deutsch, such as George W. Healy, Jr., now editor of the Times-Picayune; Frank B. Allen, now managing editor of the New Orleans States-Item; and Bernard Krebs, former managing editor of the Times-Picayune.

And thin too are the ranks of the photographers who took the beatings and suffered the broken cameras too often. Real lens guys like Philip Guarisco, Oscar Valeton, Jimmy Guillot, Bill Sadler, and Wilfred D'Aquin, who shot the picture which broke the Louisiana scandals are still around. Ed Agnelly is gone and Leon Trice, "the noblest Roman of them all," is now one of New Orleans most successful commercial photographers.

Those were the days of excitement and thrills for any reporter worth his salt and those of us whom Hermann Deutsch has described in his most generous personally autographed copy of "The Huey Long Murder Case," "who fit the battle side by side."

In order to get a real objective appraisal of, however, Hermann Deutsch's work I asked my aid, William O. Billiter, who is an excellent newspaper reporter and book reviewer in his own right, and to whom the story of Huey Long and his times are only history, to review "The Huey Long Murder Story." I wanted a reaction from the younger generation of reporters who must tire of hearing about the old days from such as I.

And here is Mr. Billiter's evaluation of the book:

"The Huey Long Murder Case" is fascinating reading, dealing as it does with one of the most sensational and controversial assassinations in American history.

Mr. Deutsch, a veteran and prime caliber newsman, has sifted a ton of facts and a voluminous amount of re-research to relate the bizarre slaying of the U.S. Senator and de facto ruler of Louisiana.

At the very beginning of this work, Mr. Deutsch points out that the life and death of Huey Pierce Long were not items of strictly provincial importance.

Huey Long, during his quicksilver career, reigned with unbelievable power. Mr. Deutsch ably shows how the Kingfish's power extended beyond the State of Louisiana.

Indeed, Mr. Deutsch, as have other chroniclers of Huey Long, compares his rule of Louisiana to that of the Fascists across the ocean. Huey, says Mr. Deutsch, was "a homegrown Fascist with complete dominance over his own State."

This power, Mr. Deutsch avers, was about to be bid for national extension with Huey's expected entrance into the race for the Presidency in 1936.

Huey had become a popular, grassroots idol with his flamboyant espousal of "Share our wealth." On the floor of the U.S. Senate in the summer of 1935—his last speech in the Senate—Huey denounced President Roosevelt and accused the President of cognizance of a plot against Huey's life.

One month later, on September 8, 1935, as the Kingfish strode from the ante room of the Governor's office in the Louisiana State Capitol, a slim young man in a white linen suit came forward.

Within seconds, the young man in the white linen suit, Dr. Car Weiss, Jr., lay dead, his body riddled by shots from Huey's bodyguards.

And the Kingfish of Louisiana—the man who had aimed for the Nation's highest office—was stricken with a wound of the abdomen.

Thirty hours later, Huey P. Long was dead.

Thus started the enigma, the speculation, and the baffling questions.

What prompted young Dr. Weiss, a brilliant and promising physician, to seek vengeance?

Did Dr. Weiss actually fire the fatal bullet?

Under what circumstances did Huey Long actually die?

Whatever became of Huey's campaign chest—estimated by some to be at least a million dollars—after his death?

With the exception of the last question, which is still unsolved, Mr. Deutsch skillfully weighs the evidence and offers his answers and analyses. The net result is provocative, engrossing reading.

Mr. Deutsch, who knew Huey Long well and as a newsman covered the Kingfish from his first political speech to the final turmoil caused by his death, is eminently qualified to analyze "The Huey Long Murder Case."

This book is an excellent footnote to history.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Tribute to Speaker McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday's edition of the Washington Sunday Star featured a lengthy article entitled, "With McCormack, Compromise Works." This was a very splendid article.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK enjoyed the highest esteem and respect of every Member of the House when he was elected Speaker. Yet, with every passing day, his stature and position have steadily increased to an even higher degree. He has deftly and with great kindness exercised the authority placed in him by this House. Above all, he has acted as a statesman, a truly national figure whose paramount concern and passion is for the national interest, which he insists will be made to prevail.

The Washington Sunday Star article touched somewhat on the great heart of the Speaker with which we, his colleagues are so familiar. JOHN MCCORMACK'S abiding concern for men and mankind has guided him through the years to a sure knowledge of man's better interests. He has brought to bear on this his great intellect and leadership instincts. He has made of himself a Speaker at once esteemed, respected, and beloved.

The article follows:

WITH MCCORMACK COMPROMISE WORKS

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Both the office of the Speaker of the House (in capitals) and the Speaker's offices (in the Capitol) have changed in operation and outlook since JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts succeeded the late Sam Rayburn, of Texas a year ago.

History and the House are unlikely soon to accord to anyone the immense influence and personal prestige Mr. Rayburn earned in his remarkable legislative career.

Mr. MCCORMACK, however, already has gained strength, confidence and stature in the difficult job of following Mr. Rayburn in the speakership. Colleagues or congressional observers who tended to downgrade or doubt him when he was elected Speaker on January 10, 1962, underestimated Mr. MCCORMACK'S experience and his close association with Mr. Rayburn.

During the same years Mr. Rayburn was Speaker longer than anyone else in history, Mr. MCCORMACK set a similar record as House majority leader. With reasonably good prospects of continuing as Speaker for several years, he could serve longer than most previous Speakers. More than 20 of the 46 since 1789 occupied that position for 2 years or less.

Putting aside all argument over what Speaker MCCORMACK has done or not done during the last year, however, it is evident that his ways of doing things differ considerably from Mr. Rayburn's.

When Mr. Rayburn died late in 1961 he was 1 month short of his 80th birthday. Mr. MCCORMACK was 71 last December. The two men were trusted friends and effective coworkers, although dissimilar in many respects. Those dissimilarities have become more marked since Mr. MCCORMACK rose from No. 2 to No. 1 man in the House.

SPEAKER'S TRIPLE ROLE

The Speaker necessarily fills a triple role. He presides over and heads the House. He leads his party in the House and is a key legislative and political adviser to the President. And, like all other House Members, he must run for election biennially to represent a congressional district.

Notwithstanding their similarities in the speakership, Mr. MCCORMACK and Mr. Rayburn differ most in the type of leadership itself. Mr. Rayburn built up a benevolent personal power and direction. He exercised it emphatically and usually without serious challenge. Mr. MCCORMACK, as Speaker, encourages a broader based leadership and more of a team operation.

This is not to say Speaker MCCORMACK has relinquished authority and responsibility. Associates describe him as using tact, patience and the "long way around" to influence colleagues and win votes. He hesitates to impose his will to end factional disputes or discipline Democrats who stray from the party reservation in the House.

Speaker MCCORMACK nevertheless has demonstrated that he intends to keep and use the prime powers and prerogatives of his office. He has not stood in the way of a Democratic steering committee or of a Democratic study group composed of about 100 House liberals. But neither has he permitted them to stand in the way of the management of the House and the policymaking work of the Speaker, Majority Leader ALBERT, Party Whip BOGGS and a few other leadership team members.

SOUNDING OUR SENTIMENT

Whatever may be thought of policy and procedures masterminded by Speaker MCCORMACK with the aid of the team, the new modus operandi has shown progress in some areas. The difficult task of sounding out House sentiment on specific bills and issues, for instance, and of determining in advance how individual Members will vote seems to be much more systematic and effective than it was a year ago.

Another significant change has been the decline if not disappearance of the board of education. Speaker Rayburn long maintained that semisecret, informal but often highly decisive institution as an almost daily gathering of a few close allies. It provided relaxed discussion of strategy and a sort of clearinghouse for House information.

In April 1945 the then Vice President Truman was with Speaker Rayburn in the board of education hideaway room on the ground floor of the Capitol when notified of the death of President Roosevelt.

The function, if not the form, of the board of education reportedly has been retained by Speaker MCCORMACK. But the setup and surroundings are different. Speaker MCCORMACK actually conducts more conferences, strategy meetings and what he terms "just social visits." These generally are in one or another of the Speaker's offices in the Capitol, although he likes to drop in at the offices of individual House Members.

WORDS OF PERSUASION

Mr. Rayburn usually could rely on a few well-chosen words of persuasion or on his great prestige to get things done or obtain votes on crucial issues. Mr. MCCORMACK counts more on a talent for compromise, conciliation and reluctance to "knock heads together."

Colleagues, including prominent House Republicans, credit him with a wealth of congressional know-how and varied legislative experience such as his former years of service on the Ways and Means, Science and Astronautics and Un-American Activities Committees.

An associate emphasized also that Mr. MCCORMACK, as majority leader and chief lieutenant to Mr. Rayburn, amassed "a vast backlog of friendship and favors" for hundreds of House Members of both parties.

Whether Speaker MCCORMACK is more attuned to and adept in legislative and political "arrangements" than was Speaker Rayburn is open to question. There have been complaints in some quarters that Mr. MCCORMACK regarded promises and deals as legitimate as long as they were honest.

House struggles last month and in January 1961, over expansion of the Rules Committee perhaps did not answer the question but they point up the "differences of approach" characteristic of Mr. MCCORMACK and Mr. Rayburn.

"DEAL" IS DENIED

Associates of Speaker MCCORMACK deny a deal was made this year to obtain Georgia Democratic delegation votes for the Rules Committee expansion in return for leadership support of Representative LANDRUM, of Georgia, for a place on the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. LANDRUM lost out in the Democratic membership caucus despite leadership backing. A Democratic leader declared he saw no reason to apologize for trying to give some "recognition" to the Georgians for their aid in time of acute need.

In the even more difficult battle over liberalizing or packing of the Rules Committee 2 years ago, Speaker Rayburn performed a parliamentary wonder in a rather different way. Without seeming to say or do very much he managed to get greatly needed votes from reluctant Members of his Texas delegation and also from powerful House veterans and longtime House colleagues such as Representative VINSON, of Georgia.

Speaker MCCORMACK'S relations with the White House differ from those of Speaker Rayburn. In fact, the relations between Mr. Rayburn and the White House were different during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations from those during the first year of the Kennedy administration. He ultimately came to hold higher esteem for Mr. Kennedy as President than as a presidential candidate.

Mr. MCCORMACK, the first Catholic ever to be elected Speaker, did not seem to have the enthusiastic support and confidence of the Kennedy administration a year ago. Today, however, White House aids say—and show—that they owe a great deal to Speaker MCCORMACK for loyalty and hard work in behalf of administration measures.

THE ROUTINE

Meanwhile, back in the House, in the humdrum or hurly-burly of day-by-day congres-

sional activities, Speaker McCormack has to work considerably harder than Speaker Rayburn did.

Speaker McCormack represents a congressional district which includes 16 of the 22 wards in Boston. It has a population of almost 400,000, and a 1960 presidential election voting total of more than 108,000. Mr. Rayburn represented a northeastern Texas district with a population of less than 150,000 and a 1960 voting total of some 45,000.

That accounts in part for the somewhat larger staff and office space Speaker McCormack has. Yet his staff has not been greatly increased from what he had as majority leader. Speaker Rayburn had a staff of seven headed by John W. Holton as administrative assistant. Mr. McCormack today has a staff of 11, of whom 4 are in his Boston office.

Eugene T. Kinnaly, his administrative assistant, is a Bostonian who has been in Washington even longer than Mr. McCormack. He became his top aid when Mr. McCormack first came to Congress in November 1928. For 10 years previously he was with Mr. McCormack's predecessor, the late Representative James Gallivan. Mr. Kinnaly, at 74, has been a congressional staff employee longer than anyone else at the Capitol.

The Speaker's legislative assistant is Dr. Martin Sweig, who has been with him 17 years. Several months ago he became the Speaker's legislative assistant when Mr. Holton resigned to go into private business.

Speaker McCormack has much more extensive and elaborate office space than did Speaker Rayburn. Mr. Rayburn died just as the Speaker's office suite was being made ready for occupancy in the enlarged east front of the Capitol.

From early morning until 6 o'clock or thereafter in the evenings, including Saturdays, Speaker McCormack is at the Capitol dividing his time and activities between his east front office suite and the Speaker's rooms near the entrance to the House Chamber.

Notwithstanding additional administrative and political as well as legislative duties, he has retained his favorite filing system—a lifetime habit of jotting messages and memos on backs of envelopes and slips of paper and stuffing them all in his coat pockets. Yet he seldom is at a loss to find any such material he wants at a moment's notice.

As a young Congressman Mr. McCormack typed many of his letters and maintained pretty much the same long office hours he now has. Aids disclosed that outside of office hours he lately has fallen into the habit of writing letters in longhand to constituents without keeping copies for the office files.

In contrast to the sometimes taciturn or abrupt Speaker Rayburn, Speaker McCormack is talkative and almost always approachable. When he first became Speaker he had to force himself to curtail his corridor chats or interviews.

ORATORY SHORT NOW

He still seems to chafe at being a Speaker who is not supposed to speak very often in the House. His oratory is full of "vigor" and he was one of the most skillful debaters. Except for occasional remarks on the House floor (more than Mr. Rayburn made in recent years) he now must content himself to listen from the Speaker's chair.

At daily news briefings both Speaker McCormack and Speaker Rayburn often displayed more caution than they dispensed news. Speaker McCormack seems to enjoy the occasions more than his predecessor did. He grants more time and is eager to convince reporters that he is not trying to mislead them, even when saying, "no comment" off the record.

In physical appearance, Speaker McCormack is tall, gaunt, white haired, genial, and seemingly restless to be on the move. Speaker Rayburn was short, heavy set, bald, deliberate paced, and soft spoken.

A CIGAR MAN

Speaker McCormack is seldom without a cigar, whereas Speaker Rayburn preferred cigarettes. Speaker McCormack never drinks but does not object to drinking in moderation. Friends recall that in his earlier years in Congress he was a proficient poker player. Speaker Rayburn enjoyed convivial companionship along with an occasional bourbon and branch water. He also found relaxation at some Washington social gatherings.

Speaker and Mrs. McCormack, who have an apartment in the Washington Hotel, now necessarily attend more social and ceremonial gatherings but, as a colleague said, "not many more."

Sartorially, both Mr. McCormack and Mr. Rayburn could be listed among the better dressed Speakers of the House. Although similar in conservative tastes, Mr. McCormack wears dark blue suits replete with vest and gold watch chain. Mr. Rayburn's attire was more varied but he frowned on "coats and pants that don't match."

Despite dissimilarities in ways of doing things, perhaps that sums up their chief similarity as Speakers. The main ambition of both men has been to keep the House in good shape and well matched.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Massachusetts now has several sons holding extremely high positions in the Federal Government, including that of President. All of these high officials profess strong belief in so-called civil rights. They particularly subscribe to the civil right of free speech. I am sure they more particularly subscribe to the right of a visitor to their State being heard on topics of the times and, more especially, when the visitor has entered the State on invitation of its citizens.

It so happened, Mr. Speaker, that the Law School Forum of Harvard University, located in the city of Cambridge—a city noted for its intellectual and courteous people—recently invited the Governor of the State of Mississippi to appear and address the forum. The Honorable Governor accepted the invitation but, before making the long journey to the city of Cambridge, it was announced by some of the municipal authorities that the distinguished visitor would be denied the use of a certain auditorium. The use of this auditorium had been specifically sought by the law school forum.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the sovereign State of Mississippi did not initiate the invitation. It was not his idea to visit the State of Massachusetts, the city of Cambridge, or even Harvard University. He was to be there only on the invitation of reputable people of the State, people who profess belief in so-called civil rights, including the right of free speech. Of course, the denial of the auditorium was an attempt to muffle and insult the Governor.

I need not say more on this subject. It speaks for itself. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record an article on this subject which recently appeared in the Commercial Appeal, a newspaper published in Memphis, Tenn. The article was prepared by a great man and a gifted writer, Mr. Paul Flowers.

It follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Paul Flowers)

When good guys in white hats swap millinery with bad guys in black hats, no wonder confusion mounts on confusion.

Being of the egghead persuasion, maintaining that heresies no matter how subversive ought to be heard, I discover myself in the extraordinary position of coming to the defense of Gov. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi, and biting my thumb at those whited sepulchers of Massachusetts who make clamorous noises about denial of civil rights in the depraved South, particularly my adopted State of Mississippi.

Aware that I will be reminded that another windbaggish New Englander, Ralph Waldo Emerson, quipped that "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds." I submit that an effort to suppress Governor Barnett is more vicious even than suppression of Martin Luther King in Dixie. At least a Governor is a public official, presumably responsible for his words and deeds.

It comes as no surprise that Massachusetts zealots should have tried to put the arm on Governor Barnett, for the Bay State has an appalling tradition of bigotry. We can begin with Roger Williams, hounded out of Salem for what Puritan right thinkers called heresy and dangerous unorthodoxy; run through legalized lynchings of at least 20 persons accused of witchcraft, 1 pressed to death and 19 hanged.

I hope that Governor Barnett, whatever his convictions on present-day civil rights, will discreetly mention these flagrant circumventions in the State of his reluctant hosts.

Moreover, he might remind the world that Massachusetts finally got around to ratifying the Bill of Rights, as set forth in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States on March 2, 1939, practically a century and a half after the amendments had been declared to be in force in 1791.

If Robert Kennedy, and the rest of the royal family are so dedicated to the full enjoyment of civil rights by all people, it must be presumed that they include the Governor of a State who disagrees with them on interpretations of the Constitution.

To be consistent, the Attorney General should stand ready with military protection to guarantee freedom of speech to a dissenter, even to the extent of full scale invasion and proposals to build permanent quarters for troops.

This is not to endorse the theology of Roger Williams, or the social philosophy of Governor Barnett. Rather, it is to ask if there are different rules for enjoyment of civil rights in different States.

It is small consolation to note that the Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union called censorship of the Mississippi Governor regrettable.

Had this happened in Mississippi, to a spokesman for the other extreme of the mixed-up spectrum, anguished protest would have broken out not only in the State which waited until 1939 to ratify the Bill of Rights, but also in New York, that cozy and clamorous sanctuary of liberty, a State which

in 1870 rescinded its ratification of amendment 15, which provided equal rights for all citizens regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Thus history swaps hats on good guys and bad guys.

A Salute to the Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is once again my pleasure and privilege to pay tribute, on the eve of Future Farmers of America Week, to this fine organization which is dedicated to the development of those young adults who will one day be responsible for the expansion and prosperity of American agriculture. In no other single industry in our great country are there more people engaged, and because it does employ more than one-third of America's working force, its effective perpetuation is basic to our continued economic and social stability.

Without a prosperous agricultural industry or the productivity of the American farm, our great urban areas, our other mighty industries, even our business and professional accomplishments, our educational institutions, and our many cultural advantages would perish. Indeed, our entire socioeconomic structure would be altered. Likewise, the prosperity of the farm is contingent upon the health and prosperity of the working men and women, and the solidarity of the industries in our towns and cities, for no one element of our Nation can exist independently of the others. The Future Farmers of America is an organization worthy of our keen interest, continued support, and deepest respect and gratitude, for it provides a proper program of vocational education in agriculture so necessary to the perpetuation of our agricultural industry.

The Future Farmers of America was organized in November 1928 in Kansas City, Mo., as an outgrowth of the ever increasing number of vocational agriculture student organizations all over the country. On August 30, 1950, through enactment of Public Law 740, the 81st Congress granted to the organization a public charter. Under a plan of cooperation between various State boards for vocational education, local high school departments of vocational agriculture, and the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there was initiated a federally aided program of systematic instruction in agriculture and farm mechanics for youths over 14 years of age enrolled in public schools. This organization is an intracurricular activity for young men studying vocational agriculture in public and secondary schools.

Vocational agriculture students—the Future Farmers—learn the rudiments of successful farm production together with the newer, more complex and efficient means that modern science has developed. To this end, soil conservation, marketing, many phases of farm management, the selection, care, maintenance, and operation of modern farm machinery are all covered either in the programs of instruction or dealt with through the activities of the organization itself. Frequently, the boy visits agricultural experiment stations and model farms where he may see the results of new methods and gain knowledge through direct observation and experience.

While the Future Farmers of America provides the technical training that is so necessary to successful farming, it also instills in the young person the ideal of public service. It teaches cooperation with fellow students for individual and community betterment. The youth becomes a good citizen as he becomes a good farmer.

I am proud to be the Representative in Congress of a district which supports many flourishing chapters of the Future Farmers of America. As I travel through the rural communities of my district, I see the many benefits this organization is affording Kentucky's new generation of Future Farmers. To these young men and thousands like them throughout our country belong the "heritage of the past and the strength of the future".

Foreign Affairs Committee of the Rochester Jaycees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week 66 delegates from all 50 States were here in Washington to participate in the second annual governmental affairs seminar sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. The two New York State delegates, Sanford A. Gradinger and Merwyn M. Kroll, both are from my home community of Rochester.

While they were in the Nation's Capital, these two young men met with me to report on the success of the Rochester Jaycees foreign affairs committee, in which they hold positions of leadership. They also described to their fellow Jaycee delegates their unique program of stimulating community interest in world affairs and urged them to implement such a program in their own home communities.

So that my colleagues may have a better understanding of the work being carried on by this committee and its purpose, I commend to their reading the following information, which has been excerpted from the committee's informational booklet, "If We Choose Greatness, We Choose Effort":

"We stand at one of those rare points in history when a nation must choose consciously between greatness and mediocrity. * * * If we choose greatness, as surely we must, we choose effort. * * * Such an effort must have its beginning in the minds and hearts of Americans, and take the form of a clear statement of the meanings and goals of a unique people."—CLINTON ROSSITER, professor of government, Cornell University.

WHY CHOOSE EFFORT?

The fundamental fact which dramatically affects all of us is the monumental struggle which is now being waged between the Communist bloc of nations and the free world. The outcome of the struggle will determine whether men are to be ruled by others or to remain free.

The Communists have said that they will bury us. But this does not necessarily mean military aggression. The Communists are actively engaged in a relentless political, economic, and psychological struggle in all parts of the world. They are using tactics which our Government often finds itself powerless to combat.

The effort must be made by each of us to understand the nature of the Communist threat. In this way we can intelligently direct our congressional representatives to support certain Presidential programs which in the past may have failed for lack of public understanding in foreign affairs.

Popular understanding is essential to the development of a creative foreign policy. It is the responsibility of each individual to make himself knowledgeable in foreign affairs.

WHAT KIND OF EFFORT?

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Rochester Junior Chamber of Commerce is presently organizing the widest possible study of critical problems in American foreign policy. It seeks to organize and supervise 5,000 discussion groups in the local community.

In this way the program is aimed at stimulating interest in world affairs among the citizens of Monroe County so that they may develop the knowledge necessary to exercise a more informed judgment on issues of American foreign policy.

The committee seeks to introduce visitors and students from other countries to the home life of our community by integrating them into the many discussion groups. They will take back to their own countries an image of Americans as serious-minded, dedicated individuals interested in assuming the responsibilities of world leadership. Our citizens will benefit by being exposed to the viewpoints of individuals of diverse backgrounds and cultures.

Once this program is implemented in the Rochester community, it will serve as a model for other communities as part of a national effort which is now underway to build a more concerned and informed American public.

The committee seeks to encourage parents and teachers to create an atmosphere of foreign policy interest in the home and school which will motivate our younger people to take a more active interest in world affairs.

It will inspire our young men and women to seek careers in the diplomatic service, Peace Corps, and State Department, and provide a pool of trained, dedicated individuals from which our future leaders can be chosen.

An organized program of group discussion will motivate people to develop new habits and renew old ones. They will read editorial comments appearing regularly in news-

papers and periodicals throughout the country. They will discuss issues raised in these articles with friends and associates. They will express their points of view by writing, calling, or telegraphing the President, State Department, their Congressmen, newspapers, and radio and television stations.

As William Lederer in "A Nation of Sheep" writes: "The average man or woman can have a powerful effect on the national scene once the realization strikes home that no voice goes unnoticed, particularly if it is raised in an intelligent question, objection, or praise. The unorganized civilian is potentially the greates force of all."

WHERE SHOULD THE EFFORT BEGIN?

The effort should begin by organizing or joining a discussion group composed of 10 to 15 people who meet monthly in each other's homes to discuss issues of American foreign policy. It is not enough merely to listen to lectures. The need is for widespread study of the facts in a given situation and for analysis of alternative courses of action, as if each individual had to decide what was best for the Nation himself.

No attempt is made to arrive at a consensus. The aim is to elicit informed, articulate differences of opinion.

HOW ARE DISCUSSION GROUPS FORMED?

All you need to do as group organizer is contact five or more friends and acquaintances to attend a discussion. The committee will furnish you with a list of additional persons interested in joining discussion groups. You schedule a meeting, invite your group participants, and notify the committee. A member of the committee will address the group at your first meeting.

Discussion groups can also be formed in the existing organizations of churches, schools, corporations, service clubs, and associations. A steering committee should be organized to supervise the formation of groups within the organization.

The committee assigns a moderator to conduct the discussion, a coordinator to assist the group organizer with administrative details, and several students and visitors from other countries. Each participant is asked to purchase a "great decisions series" kit, a set of eight fact sheets on the critical issues of the coming year, which is published by the Foreign Policy Association, a nonpartisan educational agency. The cost of each discussion kit is $1.50.

Each fact sheet kit contains ballots which afford group participants an opportunity to express their opinions on issues presented for discussion. These ballots are tabulated by the committee and the results forwarded to Washington. In addition, a monthly newsletter is mailed to each active member. Membership dues are $1 a year.

WHAT ARE THE TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION?

1. "Common Market: Blueprint for a New Europe?"
2. "Red China and the U.S.S.R.: How Firm an Alliance?"
3. "Algeria: What Future?"
4. "Spain: End of the Franco Era?"
5. "India: Is Democracy Working?"
6. "Laos and Vietnam: Southeast Asia in Danger?"
7. "Alliance for Progress: New Deal for the Americas?"
8. "Peace: What Problems and Prospects?"

The committee designates the topic for discussion each month. You do not have to be an expert to participate in the discussion. However, it is recommended that you read the appropriate "great decision series" fact sheet before each discussion.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the observance of an anniversary of the declaration of independence is an occasion for festivities and celebrations in most countries throughout the world. Today we are observing the 45th anniversary of the gaining of independence by the small Baltic country of Lithuania. Unfortunately we cannot join in a celebration of this occasion with all of our Lithuanian friends. The observance of this day serves more as a reaffirmation of the hope that Americans, and free Lithuanians everywhere, have of seeing the reemergence of a free, independent Lithuania. It will be only then that we would join our Lithuanian friends in joyful and glorious celebration.

The Lithuanians have had a long history of suffering. However, they have continuously emerged from this suffering with pride and victory. The emergence of Lithuania as a nation-state dates back to 1253 when a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned King Mindeugas ruler of the unified principalities. The Lithuanian kingdom extended its domain over territories beyond its borders, including parts of present Byelorussia and of the present Russia S.S.R. Later, when the Lithuanian-Polish union was formed, the dual monarchy's domain was extended to the south and west, establishing a powerful state in the heart of north central Europe. This union, first established as a personal union through the marriage in 1386 of Queen Jadwiga of Poland and Grand Duke Jagiello of Lithuania, was further cemented by the act of Lublin in 1572.

The dissolution of this union came in 1795, when Poland was partitioned and ceased to be an independent state, and Lithuania was annexed by Russia. From this point on Lithuania's fate was to be in the hands of Russian imperialism. The cruel, oppressive policies of the czarists of the 18th century would only be replaced by the refined, but not less cruel, methods of the Soviets of the 20th century.

Taking advantage of the defeat of Germany and of the chaos created by the Russian revolution, a counil of 200 Lithuanian delegates, on February 16, 1918, proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles. This new Lithuanian nation suffered many birth pains in its early days of existence. It was not until July 12, 1920, that Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania, recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging to respect Lithuanian sovereignty. This, however, was only a delaying tactic. For when the opportunity came in 1940, the Soviet Union, in violation of its 1920 treaty obligations, annexed Lithuania.

This day, the 45th anniversary of the emergence of an independent Lithuania, serves not only as an indicator of Soviet disregard for the right of national self-determination, but also as a reminder to the free world that freedom is constantly being threatened. Let us today join our Lithuanian friends in a reaffirmation of the persevering hope that Lithuania will soon be free.

Tribute To Col. Mitchell Wolfson, Outstanding Citizen of Dade and Monroe Counties, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Key West, Fla., have singled out for well-deserved tribute Col. Mitchell Wolfson. Colonel Wolfson has been perpetually active in charitable and civic organizations. He has given unstintingly of his time and resources to improve his community's welfare and raise its esthetic standards.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Members the following editorial from the Key West Citizen. The civic-minded deed attributed therein to Col. Mitchell Wolfson is but a single example from a lifetime of public-spirited activity:

CITIZENS TO HONOR A GREAT MAN

Key West's testimonial dinner to Col. Mitchell Wolfson has the enthusiastic endorsement of this newspaper. It is a fine thing that a community can show its appreciation of an interested citizen's splendid contribution to community improvement during the time such a citizen is in good health and spirits and able to enjoy the homage his fellow citizens pay him.

Mitchell Wolfson is a citizen of Key West, no matter where he votes, or if he does maintain his principal residence in Miami. His major business interests are in Miami and have been for many years, but he has demonstrated fully that his heart is in Key West, where he was born and where he spent his childhood.

Colonel Wolfson's acquisition of the old Geiger house at the corner of Whitehead and Greene Streets, and his conversion, through lavish expenditure of time and money, of that place into the Audubon House, with its magnificent gardens, sparked the many jobs of restoration of historic sites and buildings in Key West. This restoration and reconversion work has done more to make the old island city attractive to tourists than anything that has occurred in years.

It is interesting to think back, a bit, to the days 28 years ago when Key West was flat on its back financially, and the Federal Government through the Works Progress Administration came into town and tried to revive things. A large part of the WPA program was devoted to demonstration of

how restoration work could be done by the people, themselves. Undoubtedly many of the present residents who have taken old homes and rebuilt and improved them—although keeping their essential architectural qualities—first became interested in Key West through the WPA's efforts in the dark days.

But there was no great recognition of the high value of restoration until after Colonel Wolfson came back to his hometown and demonstrated how interesting and beautiful an old building, long neglected and misused, can be made. The Audubon House, above all other structures in Key West, was suited to such a demonstration.

For years appreciative tourists had glanced at it and found it interesting but not available for inspection since it was occupied by its owner, the late Willie Smith, who was ill for many years and unable to maintain its essentially fine appearance and emphasize its points of historic interest.

Old Mallory Square, now delighting tourists and home people alike, undoubtedly was developed more readily, and with quickened interest on the part of the people, because of the demonstration by Colonel Wolfson.

This demonstration has taught the residents of the city something they seemed not to be aware of—i.e., the vast and important economic value to a community of its historic record. At the recent dedicatory ceremony in Mallory Square, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Wakelin praised the work many Key Westers have done in this direction—mentioning the efforts of the Key West Art and Historical Society, in particular, for the restoration and preservation of the East Martello Tower.

The same sort of acclaim has been uttered by Rene d'Harnoncourt, director of the great Modern Museum of Art in New York City, who is now visiting in Key West.

Colonel Wolfson's achievement, however, is that of a single individual who, without asking for donations or special advantages, has created a beautiful museum and garden out of a rundown building and site that was coming close to decay and ruin.

The Citizen hopes and believes that the testimonial dinner to Col. Mitchell Wolfson will be a gay and happy occasion for all who may be fortunate enough to attend—and that it will convince our fellow citizen that we regard him with great affection and gratitude.

Money Will Not Buy Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much more will be said during the months ahead about our foreign aid program. One thing is certain; that is, you do not buy friends.

Under unanimous consent, I present an editorial from the Voice of St. Matthews, a respected weekly newspaper published in my congressional district on this subject:

WITNESS DE GAULLE: $$ WON'T BUY FRIENDSHIP

That there is one of the biggest plays in power politics going on in the world today is quite evident from President Charles de Gaulle's successful attempt to block Britain's entry into the Common Market and a realinement of other Western Common Market nations to block France's designs to dominate the Common Market countries.

What is even more poignant and revealing as to De Gaulle's intention is that he is trying to undercut the U.S. influence, particularly economically, in Western Europe. This probably more than anything else was the cause of his refusal to allow Britain into the Common Market, since Britain's and the U.S. economic interests are tied closely together.

What De Gaulle is doing makes it even plainer that the American dollar has served its purpose in Western Europe, and that friendship cannot indefinitely be purchased by the dollar.

The Common Market nations have become the strongest economic group of nations in the world, all because of the billions of American dollars poured out through the Marshall plan and other foreign aid donations. In essence De Gaulle has told the United States Western Europe doesn't need it any longer, and it is time that France regain its position of world power, even at whatever expense it may cost other nations.

By so doing De Gaulle is living up to a reputation typical of him since 1942 when the Allies had to deal with him as head of the French Government in exile. He was a contrary cuss then and has remained so until this day, trying to recapture the grandeur of France even when his plans were detrimental to proper prosecution of the war.

De Gaulle's attitude to the United States today is typical of the resentment toward the United States since it had assumed world leadership for democratic peoples, even though the United States has poured billions of dollars into the world economy. It is a lesson the United States should long ago have recognized—that it was entirely too soft with its foreign aid program. We need to look at our foreign aid program more closely and issue blunt warnings to those nations who are trying to undercut U.S. power.

The Western countries are not out of the woods yet.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania. However, this freedom was short lived. For in 1940, the Russians forcibly took over the country and unjustly deprived the people of their rights.

In its 22 years of independence, Lithuania showed the world what a proud and industrious people can do. Among the products of these golden years when Lithuanians were free from foreign tyranny were improvements in transportation and education, great strides in land reform and social legislation and remarkable gains in material and spiritual well-being.

The yoke of Soviet imperialism has enslaved Lithuania. Her people have been deported and mass murdered. Religion has been ruthlessly suppressed and freedom obliterated.

But the light of freedom still burns in the hearts of Lithuanians. They have known and gloried in its experience. We Americans must share the struggles of Lithuania for a free future, a future where Lithuania will take its proud place once more among the free nations of the world.

In my home community of Rochester, N.Y., our Lithuanian-Americans have made splendid contributions to the wealth and culture of their adopted land. We are richer for their industry and talent, for their pride and love of freedom.

This Sunday in Rochester, the Lithuanian-American Council, Rochester chapter, will commemorate this anniversary of independence. Their speaker will be Eng. Juozas Miklovas, who last summer escaped from Russian oppression while visiting Paris with a U.S.S.R. excursion. He has been granted permission to live in this country where he is a noble example of the yearning of his people to walk once more in the sunlight of freedom.

To Peter Norkelumas, chapter president, and the members of the Lithuanian-American community in Rochester, we send our greetings on this important occasion. And, we send our heartfelt sympathy to their compatriots in Lithuania. We look forward to the day when we can celebrate their second liberation from Russian misrule.

Tito's Return to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article in the Commonweal, a weekly published in New York City. The piece, which was brought to my attention by one of my friends, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of Latin American history, Marymount College, Arlington, appeared on January 11, 1963.

According to Dr. Thorning, it is important to note that Mr. Alexander Rankovic has emerged as the top contender for Tito's succession. Mr. Rankovic is described in the article as "the actual head of the dreaded UDBA—secret police."

At any rate, it is clear that Tito and Mr. Nikita Khrushchev have come to an understanding. Early in the regime of Mr. Fidel Castro in Cuba, Dr. Thorning emphasized that Mr. Tito was helping and encouraging the Castro brothers. There are still Titoist technicians in Havana.

A policy which was called a "calculated gamble" in 1948 can be reviewed in the light of what is happening in 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITO'S RETURN TO MOSCOW

(By Matthew M. Mestrovic)

(NOTE.—Matthew M. Mestrovic is senior editor of Challenge magazine, published by the Institute of Economic Affairs, and a member of the faculty at New York University.)

Surely President Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia derived profound personal satisfaction from his December trip to Moscow. Not only had he defied Stalin and survived, but he had lived to address an applauding Supreme Soviet, while the remains of the old tyrant had been cast in dishonor from the granite tomb in Red Square. For Tito, who had joined the Communist movement in Russia 44 years ago, the reconciliation with Moscow on his own terms must have been one of the most deeply felt triumphs of a long and eventful life.

Tito's journey to Moscow removed most of the remaining ideological differences between the Soviet and the Yugoslav Communist parties. Just as for some time the two Communist governments have spoken in unison on foreign policy, so in the future their ideological views may become identical.

Tito's Russian sojourn unfolded against the backdrop of two portentous developments, which may have truly shocked world communism; namely, the Cuban crisis and the India-China border conflict. In attacking India, Communist China negated both Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence and Tito's nonalinement. China's aggression drove India closer to the West, after Khrushchev had expended over $800 million in economic assistance to bolster India's neutralism. At the same time, India awoke to the realization that Sukarno, Nkrumah, Tito, and Nasser were fair-weather friends of little help in a time of real crisis.

During the Cuban crisis and the India-China border clashes Yugoslavia closely supported Khrushchev. For instance, following President Kennedy's dramatic revelation that the Soviets were building offensive missile bases in Cuba, Yugoslav propaganda denied the fact and accused the United States of naked and unprovoked aggression. Then, after Khrushchev admitted the presence of the missiles and agreed to their withdrawal, Yugoslav propagandists hailed Khrushchev as the great savior of world peace. During his Moscow sojourn Tito reaffirmed his blanket endorsement of the Soviet Cuban policy.

As for the Chinese aggression against India, Yugoslavia deplored the attack but urged India to accede to Peking's terms for a negotiated settlement of the dispute. The Yugoslavs said that Peking had shown wisdom in offering to withdraw its troops to the 1959 positions. This course of action, however, was rejected by Prime Minister Nehru on the ground that it would leave China in possession of a substantial segment of Indian territory. Incidentally, Belgrade's view of the border dispute coincided with that of Moscow.

Under violent propaganda assaults from Communist China and Albania, Khrushchev sought to rally the support of his European satellites, Yugoslavia, and the Communist parties in the free world. Never at a loss for earthy aphorisms, Khrushchev compared the Albanians to little boys who were given a few kopeks by hoodlums to repeat dirty words in front of their mother.

In this context the December Congress of the Italian Communist Party and the renewed de-Stalinization drives of the Czechoslovak, Bulgarian and East German leaderships appear to have been part of Khrushchev's comprehensive endeavor to consolidate his own position vis-a-vis the Chinese comrades. Tito's trip to Moscow was also designed to shore up Khrushchev's leadership against eroding encounters with Communist China and Albania.

In return for wholehearted support for Khrushchev, Tito undoubtedly obtained concessions. It seems out of the question that Tito has accepted or ever will accept the role of a Gomulka or a Kadar within the Soviet orbit. But, then, Khrushchev made no such demands upon Tito. Khrushchev is willing to accept the Yugoslav Marshal as an elder statesman of communism and a junior partner of the Communist consortium. Having accepted integral Yugoslav sovereignty, Khrushchev has also removed the basis for the long-standing Soviet-Yugoslav dispute.

In Moscow, Tito sought and obtained some Soviet economic assistance for Yugoslavia's faltering economy. For instance, on December 11, Moscow radio announced that the Soviets would help build a power station in Yugoslavia. But such token assistance can hardly compare with the estimated $2½ billion worth of military and economic aid Yugoslavia received from the United States since 1950.

The yearly U.S. grants constituted over half of Yugoslavia's annual budgets. In fact, therefore, Washington underwrote the Titoist experiment and kept the Yugoslav economy from foundering. But for Tito and his colleagues the ideological and political advantages resulting from a close alinement with Moscow by far outweigh the economic benefits of U.S. friendship.

Tito and his associates feel that in the long run economic dependence on, and integration with the West would undermine their Communist dictatorship. Conversely, the rapprochement with Moscow will strengthen the internal Communist rule in Yugoslavia. In addition, Khrushchev has recognized Yugoslavia's complete sovereignty and her right to trade and maintain whatever economic ties she wishes with the non-Communist world, ties which the Yugoslavs keep strengthening with gusto. For instance, a few months ago, in an attempt to bolster her problem-beset tourist business, Yugoslavia signed an agreement with Pan American, conferring on the American company the management of some hotels in Yugoslavia, including the Esplanade in Zagreb, Croatia.

The growing integration of the European Economic Community threatens to close most of Western Europe to Yugoslavia's agricultural exports. Simultaneously, the linking with the Common Market of 18 underdeveloped African colonies may further restrict Yugoslavia's trade possibilities on that continent. In any case, it has by now become amply apparent that the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa, with whom Yugoslavia maintains close political ties, can neither provide a lucrative market for Yugoslavia's inferior industrial goods, nor supply her with the assistance she needs to sustain her faltering industrialization drive.

Confronted with the pressing choice of either altering Yugoslavia's political structure in order to win the economic benefits to be derived from association with the Common Market, or seeking to consolidate the Communist regime through a close alliance with Moscow, Tito has chosen the latter course. While his recent talks with Khrushchev can only reinforce this trend in Yugoslav policies, Tito also seems to have explored the possibility of associating Yugoslavia with Comecon, the Communist bloc's answer to the Common Market.

The specific composition of the Yugoslav delegation which visited Moscow confirmed the fact that Alexander Rankovic, the actual head of the dreadful UDBA (secret police), has emerged as the top contender for Tito's succession. The rapprochement with Moscow further eclipsed Vice President Eduard Kardelj, who spent much time studying Western socialism on protracted visits to the West, and in particular to Britain and the Scandinavian countries.

Both Rankovic and Jovan Veselinov, Tito's other top aid during the mission to Moscow, are Serbs and leaders of the pro-Russian elements within the Yugoslav Communist Party. They are also known to favor increased internal centralism. Thus the cementing of party relations may have profound repercussions on internal Yugoslav developments, and the strengthening of Russo-Yugoslav ties may affect the delicate national rapport within the Yugoslav Communist Party. Latent national antagonism came to the surface during the inconclusive struggle over the new Yugoslav Constitution, which was drawn up in 1962. While the Serbian Communists endeavored to strengthen centralism, the Croats, Slovenes, and Macedonians sought to enhance the autonomy of the six constituent republics of Yugoslavia. These struggles are not forgotten.

As long as Tito remains at the helm he will undoubtedly steer a careful course in both foreign and domestic affairs. A decisive turning point may occur only after Tito passes from the scene and men of lesser stature and ability assume the leadership of Yugoslav communism. Thus, the full effects of the reestablishment of close ties between the Soviet and Yugoslav parties may not become fully apparent for several years.

Although Tito remains the unchallenged dictator of Yugoslavia, Western visitors who saw him recently reported that he had aged considerably and was increasingly unconcerned about many vital areas of Yugoslav life. Tito's growing isolation from domestic developments was revealed in September, when he publicly admitted that he did not know that the 10- to 20-percent charge for service which Yugoslavia instituted several years ago, as a measure to raise the earnings of waiters and hotel employees, was not distributed to the workers. Yet when I visited Yugoslavia in 1961, and again in January of 1962, waiters and hotel employees everywhere loudly complained of this abuse. Everybody seemed to know about it except Tito, who was living in gilded isolation on his Adriatic island retreat.

During the remaining years of Marshal Tito's rule (he is almost 71 now), Yugoslavia will undoubtedly maintain her equivocal course. But the rapprochement effected during the Marshal's recent mission to Moscow, the agreement to strengthen party and economic ties, may help the centralist and pro-Soviet elements within the Yugoslav party eventually to reorient drastically Yugoslav domestic and foreign policies.

Agreement in the Cotton Industry: Craig Smith Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the name of Craig Smith is familiar to all those who are engaged directly or indirectly in the cotton business whether in the farming end or the production of finest cotton fabrics in the world. Thus, when Mr. Smith, president of Avondale Mills, speaks out on cotton

problems, his words should be heard with respect.

I insert hereunder in the RECORD an article by Mr. Smith which recently appeared in the Avondale Sun, the newspaper of Avondale Mills, which is circulated to some 14,000 friends and employees of Avondale Mills regularly:

ALL SEGMENTS OF COTTON INDUSTRY NOW SUPPORT ONE-PRICE COTTON PROGRAM

The National Cotton Council is an organization which represents the cotton farmers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, cottonseed crushers, and cotton mills from North Carolina to California. Before the council can act on any policy matter, there must be a two-thirds affirmative vote by the delegates of each of the six interests, voting separately. This means that one-third plus one of the delegates of any one of the six interests hold the power of veto. Naturally this rule restricts the fields in which the council can operate but keeps the organization together and adds strength when a position is finally taken.

At the annual meeting of the council in El Paso, Tex., last week, a resolution was passed in support of making cotton available to American mills at the same price at which it is now available for export. An implementation of this program means that a Government subsidy, equal to the subsidy paid on exports, must be paid to someone in this country on the part of the crop consumed here.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has a longstanding record of opposition to all forms of Government subsidy and Government interference with private business. This organization has been a bulwark through the years against the trend toward socialization of American agriculture. The basic philosophy of the American Farm Bureau in respect to Government action can be summed up in the three words "Leave us alone." I cannot take issue with the soundness of this principle.

The Farm Bureau is well represented among the farm delegates of the National Cotton Council. Consistent with their basic philosophy, they felt it necessary to oppose a Government subsidy on domestic consumption. This opposition at El Paso was voiced by Walter Randolph, of Alabama.

The export subsidy which we already have, and which is necessary at the present time to hold any export market for raw cotton, plus all of the other artificialities which have been built into our economy in the last quarter century, in my view, make a subsidy on the American-consumed part of the cotton crop completely necessary at the present time. I believe that Mr. Randolph and his associates were sympathetic with this view, although as a matter of principle they felt it necessary to oppose any additional Government subsidy. This opinion is supported by the fact that although Mr. Randolph asked to be recorded as voting against the program, he did not demand a rollcall vote of delegates, as he had a complete right to do, after his opposing resolution lost by a voice vote.

Through a program of research which promises to eradicate the boll weevil, provide effective weed control, prevent shedding, and other important cost-reduction programs, it is possible for the American cotton farmer to reduce his cost to an extent that no Government subsidy will be necessary. I join with the American Farm Bureau in hoping that day will come soon. In the meantime, the elimination of the present two-price cotton program, even though it involves an additional Government subsidy, is essential to the whole cotton industry. I am greatly heartened by the fact that the National Cotton Council can now fully support this objective. I am grateful that the Farm Bureau delegates in the Cotton Council did not feel compelled to make an all-out fight in opposition.

I dare hope that representatives of the great American Farm Bureau Federation will exercise similar restraint while this vitally important program is being considered by the Congress.

Alabama's Military Service Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Col. William J. Macpherson, commandant of the U.S. Army Ordnance Guided Missile School, Redstone Arsenal, recently addressed members of the Birmingham Kiwanis Club. In his speech he summarized for the members of the club the activities of the six Army and Air Force schools located in Alabama. These service schools are making outstanding contributions to our national defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Birmingham Post-Herald account of Colonel Macpherson's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald of Jan. 30, 1963]

MILITARY SERVICE SCHOOLS VALUED AT $319 MILLION

(By Don Cummins)

The combined value of Alabama's military service schools plant and equipment amounts to $319 million.

That's what Col. William J. Macpherson, commandant, U.S. Army Ordnance Guided Missile School, Redstone Arsenal, told Kiwanis Club members here yesterday.

The installations include the Ordnance Guided Missile School; Air University, Montgomery; Craig Air Force Base, Selma; Women's Army Corps Center and School and Chemical Corps School, Ft. McClellan; Army Aviation Center and School, Ft. Rucker, and the ROTC program.

The installations have almost 18,000 military and civilians on their permanent staffs.

They train 41,596 students from throughout the Nation and many foreign nations every year, Colonel Macpherson said.

The payroll for all amounts to $128,606,000 per year.

Macpherson, using a slide presentation, explained the importance of the training program and how the students are trained to keep nine missile systems ready to go at any time.

Another priceless advantage, Macpherson pointed out, is the value to the State of more than 41,000 intelligent young men and women coming to Alabama every year from every State in the Union and many foreign nations.

Programs for entertaining foreign students is international relations at its best, he emphasized.

Macpherson also expressed the opinion that Huntsville was the fastest growing city in the South with the population expanding at the rate of 1,000 persons per month.

He said it is understood in the Huntsville area that the city's population will reach 100,000 by January 1964, and will pass Montgomery in population sometime in 1967—4 years away.

The economic breakdown of the various installations is as follows:

Air University: Employs 7,500 permanent people to train more than 10,000 students yearly. The installation equipment is valued at $114 million with an annual payroll of $58 million.

Fort Rucker: A total of 6,000 permanent employees train more than 10,000 students per year. The center and school has an installed value of almost $72 million with an annual payroll of $51.5 million.

Cemical Corps: The school has an installed value of almost $8 million with 629 permanent employees training 4,800 students per year and an annual payroll of $3.1 million.

Women's Army Corps: Installed value of the school is $8.5 million with a permanent staff of 380 training 4,800 students per year and an annual payroll of $2.6 million.

Craig Air Force Base: The school's plant and aircraft are valued at $46 million. Its staff consists of 1,300 persons training 368 jet pilots per year with a combined payroll of $8.5 million.

Army Ordnance Guided Missile School: This 10-year-old installation has a faculty of 600, a permanent party of 1,800 training 5,000 students per year from all branches of the service and foreign nations.

The plant is valued at $73 million with an annual payroll of $23 million.

The Common Market and the Peoria Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial entitled "The Common Market and the Peoria Area," which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star of February 8, in its entirety in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE COMMON MARKET AND THE PEORIA AREA

The importance to us in the Peoria area in the French-English quarrel on the Common Market lies in the farm question.

France so far has frozen England out of the Common Market, which means that the United States is also blocked out. The Common Market, of course, is an agreement among six countries (France, West Germany, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands) on trade.

If the Common Market says, "We don't want any more American farm products coming in," that will hurt us. We sell $1 billion in farm and fiber goods a year in Common Market countries—and $1 billion is an important piece of business any way you look at it.

We sell 25 percent of our soybeans, 15 percent of our corn, 16 percent of our pork, 13 percent of our condensed milk, and 10 percent of our margarine abroad.

If the Common Market shuts us out by trade barrier, it's going to multiply the agricultural problem here, intensify the unemployment problem (thousands of jobs here are tied to exports), and hurt the overall buying power in this area.

Will the Common Market impose heavy tariffs against us? France expects a 30-percent increase in its own farm production. The political power of the farmer in Europe is enormous. The French believe they will have such big surpluses of their own in 2 years that they will need to export 5 million tons of wheat a year. They certainly may try to close the door on American agriculture.

So the argument that rages from one side of the English Channel to the other has more than a little interest for the Peoria area.

Death of Hugh Gaitskell of Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, all of us were grieved by the untimely death of Hugh Gaitskell. A number of Members of the Senate made statements with reference to his death and have had inserted in the RECORD commentaries and editorials with reference to his record as a political leader and public servant.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on the death of Hugh Gaitskell, which appeared in the Manchester Guardian Weekly, dated January 24, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH OF HUGH GAITSKELL

Hugh Gaiskell's death is a personal, political, and national tragedy. He has died young, at a time when he had at least an even chance of being the next Prime Minister, and when he looked like gaining office after hard years in opposition. In labor's ranks he leaves a gap that cannot be filled quickly—though it must be filled—for he alone of its leaders was known, trusted, and respected far beyond the party. Nationally, the tragedy is that a man of immense courage and integrity has been taken away just when he was most likely to be needed.

He would have been a better Prime Minister than leader of the opposition, because his talents were creative. Already, as Minister of Fuel and briefly an Chancellor of the Exchequer, he had shown his ability for organization and administration. As leader of the opposition, he was more concerned with seeking constructive policies—looking toward the day when Labor would again be in office—than with negatively damning the Government. He was too fair-minded not to see the truth of a situation and he knew that the freedom of any government is circumscribed by events, by its allies, and by its physical resources. He rarely, if ever, took unfair advantage of the license that an opposition can exploit.

Personally, too, it could be said of him that in opposition he was too kind to some of his critics within the party. He never waged the kind of personal warfare that some of his closest colleagues waged against him. In office as Prime Minister he might have changed. His construction of a cabinet would have been uninhibited; he saw little purpose in axing shadows, but he was determined that when it became the government his party should give the country the strongest leadership that it could.

Of his courage, the Bevanite and bomb controversies are ample evidence. To a youthful Chancellor, rapidly promoted over the heads of experienced seniors, the Bevanite campaign against him could have been unnerving. He stood his ground, and his firmness helped him to win the leadership of the party in 1955. Suez was a test from which he emerged well; but as a national leader he did not really stand out until the 1959 election. Then, in spite of one tactical error (the income tax promise), he showed the coolness and good sense that a Prime Minister must have.

The loss of the 1959 election was a disappointment, though not unexpected; it was followed by the bitterest attacks upon him from within the party, ending with the defeat of his defense policy at the Scarborough conference in 1960. He replied with the famous "fight, fight, and fight again"—for which the left has never forgiven him—and by the long struggle to lead labor out of the unilateral wilderness.

His commitment to the Atlantic alliance was complete, though he sought constantly to find ways of promoting harmony between East and West. Disengagement in Europe, a lesser dependence by the West on nuclear weapons, and effective political control over the generals, were for years among the first priorities in his policy. Although he was not an early convert to the nonnuclear club, he was quick to see the danger of letting nuclear weapons spread. The coming of President Kennedy as effective leader of the Western alliance was a great satisfaction to him. The two men got on well together—better, one may surmise, than Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan do—and each found stimulus in the other's brisk intellect. Latterly, Cuba and the Common Market had clouded their respect for each other, but this was a passing phase. As Prime Minister, Hugh Gaitskell would have enjoyed the best of relations with the White House.

It should be said also that he was a friendly and unaffected person. He enjoyed the kind of peaceful and private family life that fortifies a man in public office.

Whoever follows him as labor leader will have to continue along the course he has set—a nondoctrinaire approach to economic and industrial policy, a firm commitment to collective defense and multilateral disarmament, and a readiness to see gradual reform of the Labor Party's structure from within. Any other course will reopen old wounds and drive away sympathetic voters. To follow him cannot be easy; but he has left the Labor Party in its best form since 1950.

The Coming Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a constituent in western South Dakota which I think would be of interest to other Members of Congress and, under unanimous consent, insert a portion of this letter in the RECORD.

The four paragraphs I would like to quote are as follows:

On the coming wheat referendum, as you know, the administration has made it known that they are going to use every Federal employee from Freeman right down to the janitor that sweeps the local ASC office to put this across. We are constantly reminded of the disaster which will sweep across the Nation if we don't go for the full program as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture and, of course, all of this is supported and paid for with tax money.

I am not a wheat farmer and am not personally concerned with the support. The point to which I object is the administration stating their opinion of the outcome as fact. They continually repeat that agriculture is doomed if they don't support the program, many people are convinced by this but they are unable to give any reason other than the statements put out by the administration.

The Federal Government has spent 30 years solving the farm problem and it appears to be as bad or worse than when they started. I think this should be good evidence that their predictions are not always accurate and some measure should be taken to stop this. If the farm people are supposed to decide this, let them make the decision without all this pressure and influence from just one side of the picture.

I have heard an endless number of farmers say that their ASC office can just about put them out of business if they don't get along with them. I think this pressure that is being applied is a lot more serious than many of us realize.

Hon. James Patrick McGranery

SPEECH

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, many fine words of tribute have already been spoken in this House to the memory of James Patrick McGranery, whose sudden death this winter has saddened all who knew him. A number of us remember Jim McGranery as a fellow Representative in the 75th, 76th, 77th, and 78th Congresses. It was my privilege to serve with him when I first joined this distinguished body in the 77th Congress. As the youngest member at that time, I looked to leading Democrats like Jim McGranery for guidance and example. His record as a member of the Committees on Banking and Currency, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Ways and Means was outstanding. But Jim McGranery's service in this House was only one chapter in his long and dedicated public career that dates back to flying as an Army observation pilot in World War I. As a matter of fact he left this House in 1943 at President Roosevelt's request to become assistant to the Attorney General of the United States—an office he was to see again. President Truman awarded him the Nation's Medal of Merit in 1946. Next he served for more than 5 years as a U.S. district judge.

It was early in 1952 that President Truman capped Jim McGranery's career as a public servant by naming him Attorney General of the United States. And following the change of administrations, President Eisenhower appointed him to the Commission on Government Security. Jim McGranery thus served his country in all three branches of Government—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive—and in all three he

won the undying friendship and respect of his colleagues. Yet we must go beyond Government service alone if we are to view the full measure of Jim McGranery's career. He was an outstanding Catholic layman, and received papal decorations from both Pope Pius XII and Pope John XXIII. Aside from the law degree he earned at Temple University, he was awarded honorary degrees by a whole series of outstanding colleges and universities. Furthermore he served on the boards of a number of important civic, charitable and religious organizations. In private life, he was a good friend to many, and a devoted husband and father. I would like at this time to express my most heartfelt condolences to Mrs. McGranery and to their three fine children.

And I would add that the death of Jim McGranery is a great loss to all of us and to his country. For myself, his memory shines as a bright symbol of strong character, warm personality, firm patriotism and dedication to the public interest. He was a man the city of Philadelphia can be proud to call its own, the kind of man that reminds us of that metropolis' nickname, "the city of brotherly love." This House and this Nation can be proud of Jim McGranery, for it is men like him that help make democracy more than a word.

The "65" Programs Keep Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the last Congress I made comment on the "65" insurance programs, pioneered by the State of Connecticut, by which health insurance companies operating in a State are allowed to pool resources and distribute risks to provide more in expensive health insurance for the elderly. Following the Connecticut example have been New York and Massachusetts and other States—Texas, California, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, and Missouri, and I am especially happy to note the last-named State—are now studying the plan.

I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the December 6 issue of the New York Journal of Commerce which comments on the advances which have been made in the New York "65" program and the interest of other States in emulating it. I believe it is important that information on this be widely disseminated so that our people can know of the tremendous progress which our private institutions are making in this field:

OTHER STATES STUDY NEW YORK'S "65" HEALTH PLAN

At least seven States—including Texas, California, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, and Missouri—are considering launching health insurance programs similar to New York "65," according to Morton D. Miller, president of the New York "65" Health Insurance Association.

The final count of New York "65" enrollments was 107,404, more than 7 percent over the predicted quota, he said.

Mr. Miller said the public acceptance of the "65" plans in New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut has stimulated nationwide interest, and it is expected that new "65" plans to provide basic health and major medical coverage for those over 65 will be announced soon.

EXCEEDS QUOTA

"Other States have been watching the reception accorded this low-cost, nonprofit insurance in New York State," Mr. Miller said. The fact that we were able to exceed our projected quota is expected to give a new impetus to development of comparable plans in other parts of the country.

"Despite the fact that the initial enrollment ended only on November 15, we have already had several hundred claims representing hospital and medical charges that would otherwise have been met by the policyholders out of their own limited resources. New York State has about one-tenth of the Nation's population over 65. It is a key State in the '65' programs, and its example will undoubtedly have an important effect on the rest of the country."

This same matter was discussed in the Eastern Underwriter, an insurance publication, which goes into this in some greater detail. I believe it, too, is of interest to those who are interested in moving our country forward in this area:

NEW YORK 65 GOES OVER 100,000—80 PERCENT OF APPLICANTS FROM BROKERS

More than 100,000 New York State residents have enrolled in New York 65, during the initial October 15 to November 15 enrollment period, Morton D. Miller, president of the New York 65 Health Insurance Association, announced.

"This enthusiastic public response from all parts of the State reflects the fact that our program fills a real need," Mr. Miller said. "It marks another forward step on the part of the insurance industry in providing greater protection against the health hazards of old age, at the time when the elderly are more prone to prolonged illness and hospitalization and when their incomes are usually lower. These results could not have been possible without the wholehearted cooperation of insurance agents and brokers throughout the State.

"New York residents who become 65 after November 15 are eligible to enroll in New York 65 within 31 days of their 65th birthday," Mr. Miller pointed out and urged these people to apply through their agents or directly to New York 65 at 101 West 51st Street, New York, N.Y.

"An analysis of over 20,000 of the early enrollments shows that more than half of the applications came from the 70 and overage group. The oldest enrollee will shortly celebrate his 106th birthday. The youngest was 43, the wife of an over-65 applicant, because under the plan the spouses of enrollees may apply for coverage regardles of age.

"About 65 percent of the enrollees are women. This is a somewhat higher ratio of women to men than in the State's population of 65 and over. Only 55 percent of this group are women.

"Major medical coverage, designed to help provide protection against the financially disastrous effects of prolonged illness was purchased by about 60 percent of the enrollees. They purchased this protection either separately or in combination with the basic health and hospital coverage. Basic protection alone was the choice of about 40 percent of the enrollees.

"Every county in the State was included in the enrollments. About 80 percent of them were handled through agents or brokers while the balance of the applications were filed directly.

"Plans for future enrollment periods for New York 65 protection will be announced later. It is anticipated that the success of the New York 65 plan will give a great impetus to the extension of comparable plans for basic health and major medical protection in other States. Connecticut had the first 65 plan which started last year. Massachusetts 65 completed its first enrollment on November 1. Other States now considering such plans include Pennsylvania, Virginia, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, California, and Texas."

The New York 65 Health Insurance Association is a voluntary, nonprofit group composed of 49 leading insurance companies, especially organized for the purpose of offering low-cost health protection to the State's elderly residents in accordance with enabling legislation unanimously passed by the New York Legislature in March.

The Estes Case: A Symptom of Deep Ills in Government Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the close of the last session of the 87th Congress, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], himself a newspaper publisher, prepared and had published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat an analysis of the Billie Sol Estes case and the underlying meaning of this matter read in the context of Government control of agriculture. PAUL FINDLEY has done an excellent job of putting the Estes case into perspective, of showing how our present agricultural programs make such abuses inevitable. More important, however, the gentleman has suggested a path which will lead American agriculture out of the morass into which the proliferation of Government programs and controls in agriculture has forced it. It is a classic example of how unwise Federal programs, built upon false premises, can damage, perhaps fatally, a basically healthy aspect of our private economy. I am placing Congressman FINDLEY's article in the RECORD with my sincerest commendation to him for bringing the facts of the Estes case, and the weaknesses of our farm program, into so clear a focus:

THE REAL MEANING OF THE BILLIE SOL ESTES CASE

(NOTE.—Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, is a member of the House Agriculture Committee and was credited with devising the strategy which defeated the Kennedy administration's plan to impose tighter controls on the production of feed grains. He is publisher of two Illinois weekly newspapers, the Pike County Repub-

lican of Pittsfield and the Independent Press of Griggsville.)

(By Hon. PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois)

The Billie Sol Estes scandal with its disclosures of bribery of Government officials and the callous exploitation of our mismanaged farm programs goes far beyond the plundering by one man. It reaches deep into the very vitals of the Agriculture Department's colossal bureaucracy and our misguided attempts to fix prices and control farmers. For now out of the complexities and confusion, the charges and countercharges, and the tens of thousands of words heard in testimony by at least 14 county, State, and Federal investigating groups, emerges this alarming truth:

The sordid case of Billie Sol Estes is merely the boil on the diseased body of Government-controlled agriculture.

As a Congressman from one of America's large corn-producing areas, I say urgent action must be taken by Congress itself—the very branch whose legislation has invited this terrible abuse to the health of our farm economy.

Even Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, once he had retreated from his early soft pedaling of the case, grimly told Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN'S investigating committee: "The Billie Sol Estes case is but an exterior symptom of an underlying sickness of the farm program in this country."

The germs of this sickness were planted during the depression. But they got their present grip on American agriculture in 1948 when Congress, rather than let the farmer expand his opportunity in the marketplace, clung to the outdated, depression-born system of unrealistically high price supports, whereby the Government tries to guarantee the farmer a price above the market value. Its worthy but misguided aim was basically to insure farmers an adequate income and to protect the small farmer.

Instead, it has done just the opposite. And like a spreading cancer, it has hurt other sections of our economy. Look at the facts. Farm per capita income, according to the Agriculture Department's own figures, averages only $1,373 a year, while nonfarm is $2,345. The most recent figures of the Federal census show that in 9 years a staggering 1,671,659 farms have had to fold up. Hardest hit were those of less than 200 acres.

Added to this record of the failure of Government intervention is the encouragement of unsound farming practices. Farmers live by the Government rulebook rather than their own commonsense. Like businessmen who find their time more profitably spent hunting for tax loopholes instead of new business, many farmers find it more profitable to hunt for ways to beat farm programs, rather than utilizing their land and agricultural know-how to the fullest.

Out in my State of Illinois, for example, farmers for several years planted a class of wheat that was so ill adapted to the Illinois climate it was fit only for Government storage, cheap export or blending. The reason: They could get better yields per acre, and with the Government guaranteeing a profit, this was more important than producing the superior classes of wheat which did not grow as abundantly in Illinois.

In addition, the high cost of surplus stockpiles created by our farm programs has drained off fantastic sums of tax money which could have been better used for more important and pressing national needs. Each year the American taxpayer (farmers are taxpayers too), must fork up nearly $1 billion in storage and handling costs alone on the $7 billion worth of commodities in storage. These yearly storage costs are close to 10 times more than all public and private funds spent on cancer research last year.

During the past decade, this mess in agriculture has become so overwhelming and persistent that the public was becoming hopelessly immune. But now I believe the enormity of the Billie Sol Estes swindle will alert and arouse the public. It proves, as never before, the colossal disgrace of Washington's attempts to manage agriculture, for Estes' whole shoddy career was able to skyrocket only because of Federal price fixing and controls.

Many of my friends and constituents, confused by conflicting interpretations with which they are bombarded almost daily, have asked me, "What is the real meaning of the Billie Sol Estes case?" Is it merely a case of petty corruption, minor bribery, and system beating which can be stopped by tighter controls, as the Kennedy administration claims? Or is it another warning that Government price fixing and controls are nothing more than an open invitation to corruption which will increase as the controls get tighter? I believe it is a warning, which we must heed before it is too late. And to understand it, we must examine the two main fields in which Estes operated: cotton and grains. For these programs have been in effect for years and well illustrate the stupidity of our multibillion-dollar farm program.

The cotton situation: Like other Government price support programs which underwrite the production of wheat, rice, peanuts, and most types of tobacco, the cotton support program guarantees the farmer an artificially fixed price for his crops. During the last 5 years, these subsidies have totaled over $2,500 million—an average of $500 million per year. This looks like a good deal for the farmer, but is it? In accepting Government price guarantees, the farmer must also accept Government control, for without acreage controls farmers would flock to plant all their land in guaranteed crops. Controls—in the form of allotments—are assigned to individual farmers according to formulas based on the amount of their precontrol production. Moreover, these allotments belong to the land; they generally may never be sold separately and they may never be transferred, with one major exception. A 1958 congressional amendment permits farmers to transfer allotments if the Government takes their land for such public uses as parks, highways, military bases, or flood control projects.

What Estes did: He noted that three out of every four farmers displaced by Government land acquisition either retire or go into some other occupation, and they never again use their allotments. The Estes plan was simple: sell these displaced farmers some of his own land in Reeves County, Tex. The farmer then would transfer his cotton allotment to the Estes land and agree that if he did not make his first mortgage payment, the property would revert to Estes, cotton allotment and all. Then the allotment owner, by prearrangement, defaulted on the sales contract and the land and its allotment went to Estes. For his trouble, Estes paid the farmer from $50 to $100, which he called an advance payment on leasing the land. But it was really a boldfaced payment for the cotton allotment.

Estes got a great deal for his money. One of the byproducts of the Government's crop control programs is the creation of a new land value. To illustrate: In west Texas, irrigated land without a cotton allotment is worth only about $50 an acre. But if the land has an allotment, its value jumps as high as $300 an acre. Estes, then, was making a big net profit—as high as $250—on the increased value of each acre.

Significance: The Billie Sol manipulations show that even in the oldest, most tightly controlled farm programs, sharp operators will discover loopholes or even bribe bureaucrats to overlook their violations. For example, after the Estes case broke, the Agriculture Department itself discovered that at least three of its employees in Texas had been authorizing illegal transfer of rice allotments. And during the past decade, the Government's General Accounting Office has discovered dozens of other abuses, ranging from misuse of the soil bank to improper sales of surplus cotton. For each time the Government fixes prices and clamps tighter controls on production, farmers have a harder time making a living, and more and more are tempted to beat the system.

The grain situation: The Government's price support programs have created a tremendous hoard of Government-owned surplus commodities. Last July 1, when the Government closed its books for fiscal 1962, there were more than 1 billion bushels of surplus wheat—a 2-year domestic supply—stashed away in grain elevators throughout the United States. The Government also had stored 1,700 million bushels of corn, 5,100,000 bales of cotton, 341 million pounds of butter, 622 million pounds of dried milk, and tons of such other commodities as tobacco, soybeans, oats, honey, and peanuts.

Here's how price support programs have created this monstrosity. The farmer borrows from the Government in anticipation of future harvests. But the loan is made at an inflated support price. For example, last year Uncle Sam made loans on corn at the rate of $1.20 a bushel. But if the farmer sold his corn on the open market, he would have received an average of only 99 cents a bushel. The Government, however, took the grain at $1.20 a bushel as full payment. And not only did the Government lose part of the money it had loaned, it ended up with multimillion-dollar storage costs. For most of the corn was kept in storage, usually in the same elevators to which the farmer had shipped it at harvesttime.

What Estes did: He exploited the Federal practice of leaving the grain where the farmer put it at harvesttime. He lured farmers into using his elevators by offering them free storage or cutrate fertilizer prices while awaiting Government takeover. And so confident was he that the U.S. Treasury would make up his losses and guarantee him profits in storage payments, that he assigned the earnings from his elevators to his creditors.

So correct was Estes' reasoning that the storage business would pay off that he was able to expand rapidly his storage facilities. Within 3 years, he had six grain elevators, Government grain in them had jumped from 2.3 to 54 million bushels, and he had become the ninth largest warehouseman for Government grain in the entire United States. During that 3-year period, Government payments for Estes' grain storage totaled $11 million.

Significance: Surplus storage has become a big business, for $1 billion a year goes to handle and store the surplus stocks. Competition for these storage contracts is increasing, and so are opportunities for privilege, influence, and corruption, for Agriculture Department regulations provide no competitive basis for awarding storage contracts.

Billie Sol Estes operated in two major fields of the Agriculture Department's complicated programs. Other programs are equally contradictory and open to abuse. Part of the problem is the sheer size of the Agriculture Department. It has grown to such unbelievable proportions it defies the imagination. And herein is perhaps the most fundamental, overlooked reason why Billie Sol got as far as he did.

Just look at our tax-supported Agriculture Department, which spends over $7 billion a year. From a nine-man staff in the basement of the Patent Office Building 100 years ago, it has burgeoned into the largest non-

defense bureaucracy the free world has ever known. From its sprawling headquarters near the Washington Monument, more than 12,000 employees direct the work of another 82,000 spread out in more than 10,000 State and county field offices.

This setup is ready made for the swindler or shady operator. Henry B. Arthur, professor of agriculture and business at the Harvard Business School, summed it up powerfully when he asked recently: "Are the temptations to exploit the system so numerous and is the bureaucratic underbrush so dense as to undermine effective enforcement?"

Billie Sol Estes proved the answer is yes. For here are some of the most flagrant weaknesses of the bureaucracy which provide open invitation to disastrous mistakes and wrongdoing:

Inability to watchdog its own personnel: Only 1 week after Secretary Freeman told the McClellan subcommittee that "no official or employee now in the employ of the Department is known or can reasonablye be believed to have improperly accepted gifts or other favors from Estes," his assurance was exploded. Two Department employees in Oklahoma admitted they had illegally accepted $1,640.80 in "finder's fees" for helping Estes locate cotton allotments.

Moreover, the Department's administrative controls over lower level decisions were so ineffectual that Estes was able to get his cotton allotment transfers approved even after the Agriculture Department had ruled at least three times that such transfers were illegal. In fact, the bulk of the transfers were approved after February 17, 1961, when the regulation was printed in the Federal Register, which goes to all Department field offices.

Bureaucratic lethargy: Two weeks before the Estes case broke into the headlines, a Department official called the Department's internal audit division to check on whether Estes' financial condition was so shaky that his grain storage bond would have to be raised. The audit division 6 months earlier had been assigned to investigate Estes. But the Department said that "an investigation had been started but they had been so snowed under that they hadn't gotten out a report. But they had found no cause for alarm." Had this investigation been properly and swiftly run, it might have turned up the Estes scandal months before it finally broke. Not only was the Agriculture Department slow in probing Estes' financial condition, it also failed to set a deadline for a final check on the disputed cotton deals.

Mismanagement: But worst of all is the fact that the Department was so badly run that Estes was appointed on December 22, 1961, to the influential Cotton Advisory Council, despite an adverse personnel report and only a few hours after the Department decided to cancel his cotton allotment transfers as fraudulent.

Why is all this so serious? Not just because one man or a dozen men took advantage of the system. It is important because the system itself becomes vulnerable when a bureaucracy is handed the power to ration what was once a basic freedom: the right to grow food. And no matter how many reforms the bureaucracy institutes as each new crisis arises, it will still be inherently vulnerable.

The solution: The Government must stop fixing prices and controlling farmers. If we do it gradually to cushion the shock, all American agriculture can be restored to health, and, contrary to fears of control-happy bureaucrats, there will be no farm depression.

1. Get rid of our present surplus grain stocks. It can be done in a sensible, orderly, and direct manner—so the patient can have a happy and speedy convalescence. How? Sell surplus grain back to the farmer at an attractive price—just low enough to get the desired signup—in exchange for the farmers short-term agreement not to plant any of that crop that year and to idle the land he usually planted to it. This would keep market supplies in balance during the sellback period. The farmer would use the Government grain he bought on his own farm or sell it—for enough profit to compensate for idling his land—on the open market.

This plan would get rid of our entire surplus feed grain stocks within 2 years—4 years for some classes of wheat—convert these stocks to cash, end Government storage costs, and return agriculture to the marketplace system.

2. Avoid future surplus buildup by keeping crop loans just enough below the realistic average market price for the preceding 3 years to cushion the farmer against severe price drops, but not give him a guaranteed Government market in normal times.

3. Stop mandatory acreage controls and restore to all Americans the basic right to plant what they want and compete for markets.

Unwise programs to fix prices and control farmers obscure the splendid services rendered for years by the Department of Agriculture, activities like education, conservation, marketing, and health protection, which benefit all Americans.

They also obscure the truly magnificent accomplishments of American farmers. The achievements of free agriculture—and fortunately most U.S. farmers are still unfettered—are the envy of the world. One American farmer produces enough food and fiber for 26 other people and this ratio is steadily rising. In Russia and Red China—where price fixing and controls are universal—one farmer provides for only three others and food shortages are severe.

Besides hobbling fast-buck medicine men like Billie Sol Estes, free agriculture offers many rewards. A program of returning farming to farmers would eventually save you and other taxpayers about $4 billion a year. It would assure a continued supply of food for the housewife, and at a fair price. It wolud be an incentive to farmers to become even more efficient, to develop foreign markets that pay in dollars, and to help provide abundance in a world of want.

Teen Shoplifting as a Major Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Teen Shoplifting as a Major Problem," which appeared in the February 6, 1963, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Kentucky.

The editorial is as follows:

TEEN SHOPLIFTING AS A MAJOR PROBLEM

Down in Anderson, S.C., the other day a discussion panel on teenage shoplifting was held at a Kiwanis Club meeting, and it turned out to be a frank, open, and somewhat alarming discussion of a festering sore which afflicts not only the South Carolina town but a lot of others that we have heard of over the country.

The questions and answers about this form of petty crime, left the Anderson Kiwanians much disturbed, and many said they had not realized the extent to which this particular evil is prevalent.

Many of the thefts of this kind perpetrated by youthful offenders are not reported for one reason or another. Stores that suffer the losses often hesitate to make charges, for there is always the chance of false arrest, or suit brought by irate mothers and fathers who become violently angry at the very thought that one of their children is mentioned in the same breath with theft.

The discussion at Anderson was directed by a respected jurist, Judge Earle Rice, and brought out some disturbing findings. The consensus of opinion was that laxity, negligence, and a "don't care" attitude on the part of many parents are the principal causes of juvenile shoplifting.

"Thrill stealing" was described as a sort of fad among impulsive youngsters who try to keep up with the "gang," and this was given as one cause at the root of this crime, even among boys and girls whose parents provide them with all their needs and even with luxuries. Someone starts the fad, the panelists found, and others come to believe that it is smart and even high style to steal things as trophies, or proof of their daring.

Dr. Cort R. Flint, an Anderson minister, one of the panelists, brought out the fact that he, as counselor to many, had found out that some children steal in order to get revenge against their parents, and some even hope they will be found out, so the grownups will be embarrassed. Another point made was this:

The sad part about this shoplifting is that some parents don't even seem to feel any responsibility or shame about the crimes committed by their children. Some of them laugh and fall back on the old saying that "boys will be boys" and that kind of alibiing.

Eyebrows were lifted at the Kiwanis meeting and there were even a few whistles when Joe Yarbrough, manager of a large chain store in Anderson, made the statement that his firm suffered an estimated loss of $5,000 a year from shoplifting and that this amount was only a fraction of what some other Anderson stores lost through petty stealing.

Eyebrows were lifted, too, when it was brought out that there is a growing inclination by the public to overlook such thefts even when the culprits have been accused and found guilty. Surprisingly, these days, they seem to lose none or little of their "social acceptability."

What needs to be done in Anderson and everywhere else, of course, is for parents to do their children one of the most basic, old-fashioned and greatest favors within their power—drive into their heads the values of absolute honesty and fair dealing, period.

This petty larceny which was discussed at such length in the South Carolina town is a frightening symptom of our times. It stacks up with other symptoms, it should be tossed in, such as the scandal that persons discharged for theft from employers can draw rocking-chair benefits, just the same, and that a bounty upon illegitimacy has built up a racket here and there and everywhere which not only is costing a vast deal of money, but is populating the country with a type of citizen which will be a vast charge upon communities for years in the future.

Hon. Barratt O'Hara

SPEECH

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that we have reached the mid-

dle of February, for the time is arriving for a Cuba speech that all welcome. This speech, in fact, has become something of an institution in this noble Chamber. I refer to the annual remarks of my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, commemorating the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor February 15, 1898. BARRATT O'HARA is a recognized authority on the Spanish-American War that followed that shocking event. He fought bravely in that war, though only a teenager at the time. And he has since fought many other battles, political and otherwise, where invariably you will find him on the side of humanity and basic human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would like today to add a few words of my own to those already recorded in recognition of the 50th anniversary of BARRATT O'HARA's entering public service. It was back in 1913 at the age of 30, that my good friend took office as Illinois' youngest Lieutenant Governor. Already he had accumulated an enviable treasure of worldly experience.

But upon taking a position of public trust half a century ago he began compiling an even more impressive record of dedicated service to his fellow countrymen. Upon taking up the reins of lieutenant governor my distinguished colleague served notice of what the Nation could expect of him by launching a vigorous and penetrating investigation of the disgraceful sweatshop working conditions and pitifully low salaries endured by far too many women and girls in that era. His leadership spurred a nationwide movement for minimum wage laws. This unstinting pursuit of truth and defense of human dignity has been a hallmark of BARRATT O'HARA's career ever since. My good friend and colleague came to Capitol Hill in 1949 at an age when most of us would have been content to settle back and enjoy our memories and pension checks. Yet today, nearly 81 years old, he possesses one of the most sensible and searching minds in this House. He is an outstanding member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and his knowledge of Latin American and African matters in particular is impressive. His judgment on these matters is greatly valued by his colleagues. I can think of few people anywhere whose careers can equal my good friend BARRATT O'HARA's in length and breadth—jungle explorer, brave soldier, journalist, magazine publisher, movie producer and actor, prizefight promoter, radio broadcaster, author of books, brilliant defender of accused criminals, brilliant also as an attorney for the city of Chicago. And since coming to Congress, the sponsor and supporter of much significant legislation. There are far too few men like my good friend BARRATT O'HARA in the world. He is a compassionate human and a loyal, dedicated American. BARRATT O'HARA has addressed the House every year he has been here on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, and I hope we will continue hearing his moving words for many, many years to come.

American Small Business Has an Important Stake in the President's Proposed Tax Reduction and Tax Reform Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in a recent address, has pointed out the importance of the adoption of President Kennedy's proposed tax reduction and tax reform program.

In addressing the Alexandria, Va., Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Horne stated that the President's proposed tax reduction program, if enacted, would enable small business firms to compete on a more equitable basis with larger firms in growth, in securing financing, and in expansion.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the press release summarizing Mr. Horne's address in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Small Business Administrator John E. Horne said last night that the small business community "has a real stake" in the adoption of President Kennedy's proposed tax reduction and reform program.

Speaking at the 56th annual meeting of the Alexandria, Va., Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Horne said that small firms have always experienced greater difficulty than their larger competitors in obtaining financing on reasonable terms, and have thus been forced to rely heavily on internally generated funds. The proposed tax rate reduction, by increasing these funds, would do much to alleviate this disadvantage, he explained.

The SBA Administrator said that by expanding the growth potential of small business enterprises, the proposed tax cuts could help arrest the trend toward purchases of small firms by bigger competitors and would make small firms more attractive both as borrowers and potential investments.

"The hard fact is," Mr. Horne stated, "that for several years our economy has simply not been operating at the levels of which it is capable. Our plants have unused capacity; the unemployment rate has stubbornly resisted our efforts to reduce it to a tolerable point; and our rate of growth has been substantially below the pace which many other nations have experienced, and which is essential if we are to make full use of our resources."

Mr. Horne added that a "broad consensus" has developed among leaders from all sectors of our economy that tax reduction and reform are the tools which will enable us to end this sluggish performance, and to "spur the economy upward toward its true potential."

He said that individual tax cuts will release additional purchasing power and provide the demand necessary to "call forth higher levels of production."

Simultaneously, he said, corporate tax cuts will offer fresh incentives for investment and expansion. As existing business capacity is accelerated and expanded, and as new enterprise is attracted by the increasing market, our growing labor force will become more fully absorbed.

He said that tax reform along the lines President Kennedy has proposed will also make a direct contribution to economic growth by ending tax inequities.

"In my judgment," Mr. Horne said, "the road toward sustained prosperity lies in the direction of such a program of tax reduction and reform."

ONI Report Indicates Continuing Soviet Offensive Plans in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 13, 1963, issue of the Northern Virginia—Arlington—Sun:

ONI REPORT INDICATES CONTINUING SOVIET OFFENSIVE PLANS IN CUBA

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

President Kennedy's soothing claim of the defensive nature of the Russian military buildup in Cuba is flatly contradicted by a Naval Intelligence estimate.

Prepared for the Defense Department and sent to the White House, the alarming ONI estimate frankly reports:

"Retention of these (Soviet) military units in Cuba after the withdrawal of MRBM's (medium range ballistic missiles) would indicate that Moscow has not abandoned the concept of developing Cuba as a strategic Soviet military base."

This intelligence report, based on the Navy's close surveillance of Cuba from the air, the sea, and the Guantanamo Naval Base, warns of the offensive nature of the Russian military construction at Holquin, in eastern Cuba, stating:

"Soviet units are all in areas containing sensitive military installations of prime interest to the Soviets. Three are near the former offensive missile bases, and the fourth is adjacent to the strategically significant airfield at Holquin in eastern Cuba.

"Runways over 10,000 feet long and underground hangars and storage facilities are being built at this field, suggesting the Soviets planned to base long-range aviation bombers and store nuclear weapons there."

In striking contrast to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's disclaimer that "we do not know why Soviet combat troops are in Cuba," the Navy report clearly outlines the sinister mission of these units.

"The introduction into Cuba of Soviet ground combat forces is consistent with a capability not only to defend their sensitive installations against invasion, but also to secure them against 'counterrevolutionary' activity," according to the Navy.

Pointing out the strategic locations of the four "elite" Soviet motorized units on the island, the report contends:

"Their presence also provides the Soviets a potent source of influence on the internal Cuban scene."

Significantly, the Navy report highlights in minute detail the existing gap between the supporting Russian missile equipment that was photographed on the island and what actually was observed on Soviet ships leaving Cuba.

For example: In the case of the IRBM launch rings, which are absolutely necessary

for the actual firing of the missiles, the Navy states bluntly that six were photographed in Cuba but none on ships leaving Cuba. These launch rings, next to the missiles, are considered the most important part of a Soviet IRBM missile complex.

The Navy's unpublished summary of Russian IRBM supporting missile equipment photographed by U.S. surveillance planes in Cuba and the comparison of equipment photographed on Soviet ships leaving Cuba is as follows:

	Photographed in Cuba prior to Nov. 5	Photographed on Soviet ships leaving Cuba
IRBM launch rings	6	None
IRBM erectors	24	4
IRBM launch stands	24	1
Military transporters	33	42
Fuel trailers	31	8
O-der (missile fuel) trailers	71	2
Vans	23	28
Generators	13	1
IRBM propellant trailers	4	2

In pointing out that more missile vans and military transporters were photographed on Soviet ships leaving Cuba than observed on the island, the Navy revealed the fallibility of air surveillance to locate all missile equipment clandestinely brought to the island by the Russians.

Reporting the facts: In his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee, Central Intelligence Director John McCone revealed to Congress for the first time that "the Soviets have brought in approximately 150 coastal defense missiles." He added: "A large number of these cruise missiles are still in storage, which suggests that the Cuban crisis interrupted a Soviet program to construct several more sites. There are probably missiles enough to establish 15 more sites." At present, the Russians have a total of six sites.

U.S. measures to discourage foreign-flag vessels from trading with Cuba have not taken the Soviets by surprise. COMECON, the Communist bloc's Council for Mutual Economic Aid, called a maritime conference to set up a regular shipping service between Cuba and Baltic ports. One meeting took place on November 30 aboard the East German cruise ship *Fritz Heckart*. Representatives of Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, and the U.S.S.R. attended.

Let's Take a Real Look at the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a bylined article in the Newark Star-Ledger for Sunday, December 23, last year, Eric Sevareid offers a suggestion that is definitely in order, let us strip the Peace Corps of the thick layers of public relations verbiage that now hides it and take a long, hard look at what it really is, what it really has done and what it is capable of doing. As Mr. Sevareid notes, the rosy glow of enthusiasm which has long covered foreign aid has now been sufficiently dispelled so that a really searching reevaluation of it—its philosophy and its implementation—can now be made. He questions whether we have yet reached this point in regard to the Peace Corps.

I have the highest regard for the dedicated young people who have offered their skills, and where these were lacking their enthusiasm, to pursue the goals of peace. I think we owe it to them to look into the questions which Mr. Sevareid, and others, have raised about the ability of the Peace Corps to achieve the lofty goals which the Corps' press agentry has already claimed for it. I am placing the Sevareid article in the RECORD in the hope that it will help bring about the searching look into the Peace Corps which would be beneficial both to the conduct of our foreign relations and the work of the Corps itself:

PEACE CORPS RATES A REALISTIC REVIEW OF EFFORT NOW

(By Eric Sevareid)

Americans rush in where angels fear to tread, an occasionally endearing trait which has probably done more good than harm in a bewildered world. But we are also the people who invented the phrase, "check and double-check," although we require an astonishingly long time to practice what we preach.

After a dozen years of fabulous expenditure of money, efforts, and reputations, we are finally to have a severe doublecheck of our foreign aid programs by disinterested inspectors, presided over by the sharp if not lofty mind of Lucius Clay, whose instincts as well as his face bear resemblance to the hawk that sees and pounces quickly and never lets go unless dragged from his quarry.

As a carefree gesture, I would predict that his major exercise in blamelaying will not question the competence of administrators or fieldworkers so much as the capacity of many societies to be developed, in our time and by our methods.

To say that the initial enthusiasm over foreign aid has gone yellow in the leaf is the understatement of the policy season. But while this massive doublecheck is put in motion, we remain in the stage of initial enthusiasm about foreign aid's eager helper, the Peace Corps. Here, again, the cycle will repeat itself, though we shall all, ourselves, be much yellower in the leaf before a realistic appraisal of the Corps comes about, let alone reappraisal.

There is nothing so irresistible as pure intentions backed by pure publicity, and I am aware that in the current atmosphere of euphoric reverence an expressed doubt about the Peace Corps will receive the same treatment as a doubt expressed about virginity.

Amid all the false starts, and semifailures of our manifold world missions, the Peace Corps, at least, is a solid success—so we tell ourselves in vast relief. Senator HUMPHREY, one of its sponsors, has sat in judgment on his own handiwork and finds that the Corps has done an outstanding job, even though its first wave of recruits have barely had time to get the feel and grip of their various tasks abroad.

Of course, it is a success by the criteria so far employed; young men and women flock to join it, foreign governments welcome it (they should, it comes postpaid), and Communists attack it. I would go further and say that giving frustrated American youth a sense of mission and adding to our supply of comprehension of other societies fatten the credit side of the ledger.

Important as are these returns on our investment ($60 million this fiscal year) they remain fringe benefits. In the first place, the work of the Corps has very little more to do with producing peace in this world than with producing war. The long history of peoples, heavily interpenetrated culturally, frequently waging war on one another, undercuts the whole notion of peace preserved by "folks getting to know one another."

More importantly, while the Corps has something to do with spot benefits in a few isolated places, whether in sanitizing drinking water or building culverts, its work has, and can have, very little to do with the fundamental investments, reorganizations and reforms upon which the true and long-term economic development of backward countries depends.

Perhaps the most fruitful field is in the teaching of skills to future agronomists and civil engineers and the like, because no development structure can stand without such underpinning of knowledge. But the end results of such efforts lie far beyond the mistiest horizons; it is impossible, as well as ridiculous, to start proclaiming them now.

If fringe benefits were all that the Corps' originators had in mind, then this should be made clear to the country. If they truly believe in solid, practical, measurable results, then we ought to have a preliminary accounting one day soon, always bearing in mind two things: the cost to the taxpayer and the proportionate good to the country involved.

So far, any taxpayer is entitled to wonder how much, if at all, a country like Brazil, for example, can be changed for the better by the presence of a handful of American youngsters, in the face of an advancing sea of inflation, population tides and hunger among its tens of millions of people. The corspmen now run about 85 or 90 to a country, across the vast, unmeasurable human swamps of Asia and Latin America. Some awareness of the world's size might aid our assessments.

On the argument that the Peace Corps has proved a success, the Government now approaches the idea of a domestic corps for service in our own slums and blighted regions. I won't argue that we should have started there in the first place—this would not have happened, given the absence of glamour.

Jim Woodruff, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I endorse wholeheartedly the very fine expressions contained in the Florida Times-Union of February 6 on Jim Woodruff, Sr. This great leader, who lived in Columbus, Ga., but who belonged to all the South, was the moving force for many years in the drive for more adequate waterway areas in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. His son, Jim Woodruff, Jr., is carrying on the splendid family traditions as head of the Southeast River Basins U.S. Study Commission and in many other important capacities.

The editorial follows:

THE SOUTH OWES MUCH TO LEADERS LIKE WOODRUFF

Simple coincidence dictated that the Levy Soil Conservation District's annual speaking contest in progress at Williston should take place while Georgia and the Southeast mourned the death in Columbus Sunday of James W. Woodruff, Sr., businessman, civic leader, and conservationist.

The subject selected for Williston contestants was "Development of Resources Through Small Watersheds," and there could be no more fitting memorial for the 83-year-old Georgian who, despite extensive private interests, did so much for the conservation of the water and soil resources of his State.

His influence extended beyond Georgia's borders into Florida as a result of his efforts in support of development of the Flint and Chattahoochee, which meet at the southwest of Georgia to form Florida's Apalachicola. The dam erected at the confluence of the two Georgia waterways was named in his honor.

Mr. Woodruff's concern over the closely related problems of developing the State's waterways for commercial navigation and protecting the rich earth from the ravages of floods and slow erosion occupied much of his long career. As early as 1935 he was leading the drive for development of the Flint-Chattahoochee watersheds. He was named chairman of the Georgia Waterway Commission when it was created in 1953.

The many dams, drainage projects and conservation districts which dot the State are tangible results of the vision of men like Mr. Woodruff. Many other Southern leaders have shared his concern, among them Tom Wallace, distinguished editor emeritus of the Louisville, Ky., Times, who has devoted much time and energy to preaching the philosophy of conservation throughout the South. Fifteen years ago Mr. Wallace told a national conference of editorial writers assembled in Louisville that flood control should begin "where rainwater first touches the soil," in a balanced, interdependent plan for protection of all irreplaceable resources. The South owes much to such leaders, and is under continuing obligation to pursue their dream.

The Union County Advocate: 77 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Union County Advocate, of Morganfield, Ky., one of the top ranking weekly newspapers in the State of Kentucky, last week entered its 78th year of publication. This long period of service to the citizens of Union County represents a great deal more than mere factual reporting of news, but is proof of the paper's worthiness in the highest traditions of the press.

Mr. Tyler Munford, publisher of the Union County Advocate, is an outstanding newspaperman, fully cognizant that the weekly newspaper is the backbone of the American press and accepting that challenge with integrity, intelligence, and enthusiasm. He believes that a newspaper's basic function is the dissemination of information, that it has a responsibility to the community it serves, and that it also renders service by arousing the interest of the citizens in broader national issues. In meeting these responsibilities, Mr. Munford's paper provides facts presented without bias, so that the average citizen can exercise his privilege of forming his own opinion.

Tyler Munford is assisted by an exceedingly competent staff, headed by his editor, J. Earle Bell. In addition, he has in the pressroom a group of efficient and dedicated people who know how to put out a good newspaper.

The people of Union County are most fortunate in being served by so capable and conscientious a group as that comprising the staff of the Union County Advocate. The influence which this newspaper has wielded in the past 77 years shall not cease, but shall continue to have its impact upon public life in Union County and throughout the adjoining sections of Kentucky.

I am justifiably proud to be able to place in the RECORD a brief tribute to this fine paper, its publisher, editor, and entire staff.

Theater for All: Birmingham's Town and Gown Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the marvelous phenomena of this age is that art, in all its forms, is accessible to the American people wherever they may be located. This is true largely, of course, because of the ingenious invention of television, but equally impressive is the fact that the arts are presented in live fashion to communities all across our country.

An outstanding illustration of this situation lies with Birmingham's Town and Gown Theater, an established and very professional civic theater group which, 4 years ago, began taking theater to communities all over the State of Alabama. The Town and Gown Theater is now on its fourth State tour. I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues, and to all those who read the RECORD, the ambitious program this group has undertaken, by inserting in the RECORD articles about the group's presentation of "Bus Stop" in the city of Marion in south Alabama and the city of Jasper in the northern part of the State. One article is from the Marion Times Standard and the other from the Daily Mountain Eagle:

"BUS STOP" PLAYS JUDSON TONIGHT

"Bus Stop," the Broadway hit production by William Inge, will be presented at the Judson College Alumnae Auditorium Thursday, January 31, at 8 p.m.

The play is produced by Birmingham's Town and Gown Theater and comes to Marion from Jasper on a tour that takes it throughout Alabama. Tickets for the Marion performance are on sale at Scruggs for Drugs and at the Judson College business office.

The comedy tells the story of eight people snowbound at a bus stop in Kansas. Among them are Bo Decker, a bronco-busting cowhand thrown by love; Cherie, the kidnaped nightclub "chantoosy"; Dr. Lyman, a college professor; Virgil, Bo's sidekick, and Will Masters, sheriff in the town where the snowbound bus waits out the night.

The play blends humor, tenderness and sentiment. Its run on Broadway earned it praise as "the season's most generally satisfactory play."

Town and Gown actors touring with "Bus Stop" are among Alabama's finest. They represent many professions in private life. Among them are college lecturers in theater arts, a program director from a large Birmingham radio station, a supervisor with Southern Bell, a boys' school administrator, a government employee, and a Mobile teacher. All have in common a love of the theater and years of acting experience. By night they tread the boards; by day, they are at their regular tasks.

"Bus Stop" is the second play of the season brought to this section by Town and Gown and presented at Judson College.

Judson College students and Marion Institute cadets making up the stage crew for "Bus Stop" will be eligible to attend the annual Theater Workshop sponsored by Town and Gown in Birmingham this summer.

CONCERT SERIES PRESENTS OPENING NIGHT PERFORMANCE

The Walker College civic concert series' second presentation of the year will be presented Wednesday night at the Central Junior High School auditorium.

In addition to seeing the outstanding play, "Bus Stop," an added thrill will be received from the fact that it is the Town and Gown Theater group's opening night performance of the famous play.

A dress rehearsal was held Tuesday night for a final chance to iron out the flaws in set decoration, costumes, sound, lights, make up, and so on.

Following the dress rehearsal, Betty Caldwell Foley—who portrays Cherie, the female lead in "Bus Stop"—was able to reveal her comments on the group's presentation of the play.

Mrs. Foley said, "Bus Stop has the perfect touch * * * a blend of pathos and humor, and also a nice little message about love. Most of the message is written into the lines of Hubert Harper, who does the Dr. Lyman part."

It was evident that Betty has a very deep respect for the writing of William Inge, who wrote "Bus Stop" for the stage.

The original stage production starred Kim Stanley as Cherie, Betty's part in the play. She has seen Kim portray the role on Broadway, giving her an added chance to put feeling into the play.

In speaking of the author, Mrs. Foley said, "Each of great plays—'Come Back, Little Sheba,' 'Picnic,' 'Dark at the Top of the Stairs,' and 'Bus Stop'—has the remarkable Inge quality of capturing the story of the commonplace people."

The performance will begin Wednesday night at 8 p.m. Admission is by season ticket only, series officials announced.

Achievements and Problems of California Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, in an address last Monday in Los Angeles, Calif., Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, of California, ably and graphically presented to the members of the United Fresh Fruit and

Vegetable Association, meeting in convention, a picture of California agriculture.

Governor Brown's address most impressively portrayed the importance of California farming to the State, the West, and the Nation. His summary of the achievements of our farmers and farm research institutions, which have made California the first State in the Nation in agricultural production, merits an even wider audience, as does his informed discussion of the serious problems with which the farm industry in California is faced. The Governor's discussion of both the challenges and the opportunities of agriculture, arising from the European Common Market, is worthy of thoughtful study by all Members interested in the future of our farm economy. I am inserting the text of Governor Brown's address at this point, and I commend it to your thoughtful attention:

It is an honor and a pleasure to welcome this great convention to California.

If this fine turnout today is any indication, you are going to have a very successful meeting.

To my fellow Californians, friends in agriculture and the packing industry, my congratulations on another record production and marketing year.

And I especially want to congratulate your president, Fran Wilcox. For those of you who do not know this, Fran was recently elected president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the first man from agriculture to hold that job in many years. That's a fine and well-deserved honor.

I hope while you are here that our weather behaves. I know that many of you from back East have begun to wonder whether winter will ever end. I was struck by a headline in your newspaper, the Packer, last week. It said "Rare Week in Texas—No Crisis."

You Texans will be glad to know that I have issued a proclamation declaring it No Crisis Week in California. Let me warn you, however, that this does not extend to any fancy betting you might do at Santa Anita racetrack. Out there, you will have to handle your own crises. And should you leave your "lettuce" there, all I can say is that we need the money—in fact, I've already anticipated it in balancing our budget.

I don't want you to infer from my reference to "no crisis" that we don't have them out here. We do, believe me. Last November a fellow from Washington, D.C., who was something of an expert in crises, tried very hard to give me one. I can tell you that if he'd succeeded, you would have a different keynote speaker today.

I can also tell you that we have learned to live with crises in California. When you have 600,000 new citizens every year, as we have had in the past several years, you have crises popping up all over the State every day of the year.

Agriculture has had its share of them, too, although from the look of our production record last year, it's hard to believe they were very serious.

Our fruit, nut, and vegetable crop production in 1962 was 14 million tons; it was worth $1 billion and it totaled about 300,000 carloads to the fresh markets out of the State.

We produced another $2 billion worth of food and fiber, much of it processed here and then shipped all over the country and to many foreign countries.

And once again our agricultural exports to foreign countries were in the order of $500 million.

Amazing though that record is, our agricultural economists at the University of California assure me that in the next 20 years the overall value of California agriculture should increase from 40 to 45 percent.

I cite those figures not in any boastful way but only to express to all of you our awareness of the importance of agriculture to the economy of this State and the Nation.

And it is to this subject I would like to address myself this morning.

I want to share with you my ideas about what I consider are the major objectives and problems facing agriculture in this State—and other States—today. And I would like to tell you what we here in California are doing about them.

Of first and foremost importance is foreign trade and the Common Market.

The Common Market is at once one of the greatest opportunities and greatest threats to American agriculture.

Who would have thought 10 years ago that our farmers would be studying the transcripts of Charles de Gaulle's press conferences as they do the Farm Journal? Yet that is the case. And for good reason, too. Listen well to Mr. de Gaulle at his now famous press conference of last January 14.

The Common Market, he said, and I quote now, "consists of making a pool of the agricultural products of the entire community, of strictly determining their prices, of forbidding subsidizing, of organizing their consumption between all members, and of making it obligatory for each of these members to pay the community any savings they might make by having foodstuffs brought in from outside instead of consuming those offered by the Common Market."

That's a long sentence but its meaning is clear and ominous, Mr. de Gaulle says that he means to shut out foodstuffs from the Western Hemisphere no matter how cheaply they are offered, no matter whether of better quality, and no matter whether his consumers want them or not.

I say to you this presents a very serious problem to California farmers especially and to American agriculture generally. We already have felt the impact of Mr. de Gaulle's views.

They have cost our citrus industry $1 million; they threaten our prune industry with a duty that will reach 16 percent by 1967; and tariffs on American broilers have more than doubled.

Those are just three examples. There are many others with which most of you are familiar.

Well, what do we do about the Common Market? I can tell you that with a $500 million stake in foreign trade, California does not intend to stand idly by and watch our foreign markets sliced up.

For the last 2 years our economists at the University of California, the State department of agriculture and industrial experts have been intensely studying the expected impact of the Market on California agriculture. Farm organizations and producers have had literally hundreds of meetings and discussions on the subject.

Recently, I took two actions to develop a program for promoting and protecting California agriculture both in dealings with the Common Market and countries involved in negotiations from the President's Trade Expansion Act.

First, I have appointed two producer-shipping committees, one representing importers, the other exporters. These men will meet with economists from the University of California and our State department of agriculture and develop analytical studies of the impact of tariffs and regulations on our commodities. The results of these studies will be presented to our trade negotiators in Washington.

Three members of this association are members of those committees—Joe Margulleas, of San Francisco; Allan Lombard, of Los Angeles, from Sunkist; and Marion Newton, of San Francisco, from DiGiorgio Fruit Co.

Second, I have asked the legislature for a $43,000 appropriation to employ a full-time economist and staff to assist these two committees in their studies. We intend to make a cold, factual case of the effect on California's agricultural economy of all projected trade moves by this country and foreign countries.

We are hopeful too that these committees and their studies will generate ideas on how to build our markets overseas. Although we may have some temporary trade setbacks from the Common Market, we know that rising standards of living around the world will create new demand for our foodstuffs. The products of our farms and food processing plants are the finest in the world, and people want to buy them. If we are frozen out of our old markets, we must seek new ones.

Now, the second thing I would like to discuss with you is the agricultural labor problem.

For most of you this is of greater immediate urgency than the Common Market. You've got to meet a payroll this week but you may not have to meet a tariff until next year. Nevertheless, the labor problem has long-range implications we cannot ignore.

It is the long-range implications I would like to discuss.

From my vantage point as Governor, and as one who listens to the farmer, packers, labor, and the general public, I can tell you that there must be in the immediate years ahead greater concern paid to the farm laborer.

In California, he is paid far better than in nearly every other State in the Union, but he is still at the very bottom of the economic totem pole. And there is no doubt in my mind that we must find ways of upgrading his entire life. He must have better housing, better educational opportuntities for his children, and we must give him fuller employment, not just seasonal work.

And let me make it very plain this morning, gentlemen, that I don't have a pat solution—if you will excuse the pun—for this problem in my back pocket. It is a very, very tough situation for everyone concerned and I am well aware of it.

Recently, my agricultural labor commission made a yearlong study of management-labor problems in California. Although there was no agreement on how all the problems could be solved, there was a general consensus that they existed and were very serious.

The commission made these recommendations:

1. That a national—as opposed to State—minimum wage be established for farmworkers. In this I heartily concur. Areas of high farm wages, such as California, are at a competitive disadvantage with lower farm-wage areas. Such differentials should not exist.

2. Every effort should be made to employ local, domestic workers rather than imported, whether foreign or U.S. workers. Again, I concur. In many areas we have persistent, high unemployment. We must take every step to alleviate these local conditions.

3. The commission also recommended that greater use be made of labor hiring centers; that farmworkers be better trained; that health facilities and working conditions be improved and that employers assume a greater, personal responsibility for hiring and managing farmworkers, rather than relying completely on labor contractors or associations.

In some of those problem areas, Government can be of help. In others, agriculture must assume the responsibility. Where the State can help, seek it out. Believe me, this administration is deeply concerned with agriculture's situation. I want agriculture to

be financially sound and I will do everything within my power to help you meet that objective.

At the same time, we must meet our responsibilities to our workers. The history of our country is that when these responsibilities are abdicated by management and labor, Government steps in. I refer you to the increased Federal involvement in strikes and other regulatory actions of Government in disputes between the public and other elements of our society.

Our final word on labor. If I read the signs right, it appears that Public Law 78 may again be in trouble this year. As you know, it expires this year. If it is not renewed, California next year will have to find 74,000 new workers, the number of Mexican nationals we employed at the harvest peak last year.

I don't need to tell you that most of those braceros were employed in critical crops you are interested in: tomatoes, lettuce, strawberries, citrus, and other fruits and vegetables.

From the short-range view, it is the judgment of most people in agriculture that we should have a 2-year extension of Public Law 78.

My department of employment farm labor experts advise me that we will continue to have a labor shortage and that Public Law 78 is needed to fill the gap in domestic labor.

In this I concur. And I can tell you today that I am going back to Washington tomorrow where I will express that view to the administration and the California congressional delegation.

From the long-range view, it is my judgment that if such an extension is granted by Congress this year, it could very well be the last one. I believe the bracero program is being phased out—and I think it should be.

If it is, we must speed up our programs to develop other reliable labor sources.

And, more importantly, in my estimation, we must speed up our mechanization and automation of agricultural operations in every phase of planting, cultivating, harvesting, and packing.

In this activity, government can be most helpful.

For government must continue to play a leading role in research for agriculture. Individual farmers do not have the resources for it, nor do farm organizations.

In California, we have assumed a large responsibility for research. The University of California agricultural research programs are famous the world over in all phases—mechanization, breeding, disease control, and marketing.

Tomorrow, you will hear from Dr. Daniel Aldrich, the chancellor of our new campus at Irvine and still the director of the university's agricultural program.

I can tell you, if he does not, that we are doing things in research at the university which are unequaled anywhere. And here I want to give credit for the magnificent help we have received from industry. Many of the research programs at the university have been financed by grower organizations and by packers, canners, and distributors.

Has research paid off?

The record of our agricultural production is the only evidence you need to answer that question. California continues to lead the Nation in crop yields.

And we are producing these record crops with fewer and fewer man-hours every year.

This is the trend agriculture is creating in California.

It is creating the greatest abundance of food and fiber in the history of mankind.

It is a beacon of hope to the underdeveloped nations and hungry people of the world.

And it is a ringing declaration of our belief that men in a free society, working together, find no problems insuperable and no goals that cannot be reached by intelligence and hard work.

That, I believe, is the California way, the American way, and the way of the future. Thank you and my sincere best wishes for a most successful convention.

Connecticut Governor Dempsey Proclaims "Maine" Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, February 15 marks the 65th anniversary of the sinking of the Battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Havana. As a result of that tragic event in 1898 and the loss of several hundred American lives, the United States took up arms to help the people of Cuba gain their freedom and independence.

Now, 65 years later, the people of Cuba are once again the victims of oppression and enslavement, only this time it is more ruthless and more dangerous not only to the Cuban people but also to all nations of the Western Hemisphere who are threatened by Communist infiltration and subversion.

The distinguished Governor of Connecticut, the Honorable John Dempsey, has issued a proclamation declaring Friday, February 15, 1963, as Maine Memorial Day in honor of the 226 Americans who lost their lives in Havana harbor 65 years ago. The proclamation also stresses the "sincere underlying friendship between the Cuban and American peoples" and expresses our hope "for an early return of independence and freedom" to the people of Cuba.

The proclamation is signed by Governor Dempsey and by the Honorable Ella T. Grasso, secretary of state of Connecticut. I am very happy to associate myself with the thoughts and sentiments of this proclamation. The text of the proclamation is as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT PROCLAMATION BY GOV. JOHN DEMPSEY

"Sixty-five years ago, on February 15, 1898, the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor after a mysterious explosion. A few days afterward, the United States entered a war on behalf of the oppressed people of Cuba, in order to help them wrest from a foreign power their right to self-government and to freedom.

"The participation by the United States in the Spanish-American War resulted in the emergence of our country onto the scene of international affairs as an important world power.

"Since 1898 Cuba has grown and developed, been granted independence, and subsequently has fallen again before another form of oppression. This new oppression is even more serious and dangerous than the previous slavery and poor treatment suffered by the Cuban people. Today a foreign government attempts to control the minds, hearts and thoughts of the people of Cuba, whose long history is indicative of their deep love of freedom.

"Our entire country, however, looks to the time when the Cuban people, with the help of freedom-loving nations such as ours, can again enjoy the rights of self government and guaranteed justice in their homeland.

"With thoughts of the sincere underlying friendship between the Cuban and American peoples, and with memories of the 226 Americans who died in the sinking of the *Maine*, I hereby designate Friday, February 15, 1963, as Maine Memorial Day.

"May this day be marked with appropriate observances in our schools and public institutions, and may State and National flags be displayed on all public buildings.

"On this day I urge all citizens of the State of Connecticut to recall the commitment of our Nation to the preservation of freedom throughout the world, and the hope of our Nation for an early return of independence and freedom to the peoples on the island of Cuba."

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the Capitol, in Hartford, this first day of February, in the year of our Lord 1963 and of the independence of the United States the 187th.

JOHN DEMPSEY.

By His Excellency's command:

ELLA T. GRASSO,
Secretary of State.

German Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Honorable Franz Thedieck summarized in a speech the events and conditions which took place in the Soviet occupied zone of Germany during 1962. This summary, coming from one so near to the subject of his discussion, contains much interesting information bearing on the German unification question. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that a translation of Mr. Thedieck's speech, entitled "The Climax of the Crisis Not Yet Reached," be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CLIMAX OF THE CRISIS NOT YET REACHED

(Address by Franz Thedieck)

On the last evening of the year 1961, the leading figures of the zone regime assembled in the East Berlin Rathaus for a gala New Year's Eve celebration. Ulbricht was also present. On New Year's Day, "Neues Deutschland" announced that the beginning of the new year, which would be a year of success for socialism, was celebrated in high spirits. One was enraptured by the fact of having built a wall through the capital of Germany—which was an important step forward toward the aim of a final separation of our people.

Has the regime really made an important step forward toward this aim in the year 1962? I think we can answer this question in the negative. On the contrary, the year 1962 was a year of crisis for the Socialist Unity Party. In the last 12 months, the conditions in the Soviet Zone have become more and more critical, and it can be as-

sumed, that this trend will continue in the months to come. The climax of the crisis has not yet been reached.

Let us cast a retrospective glance at this year 1962, which turned out much differently than some had hoped and many had feared. We will remember, that on the occasion of the 15th plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party, Ulbricht proclaimed to his functionaries an amalgamation of the zone economy with that of the Soviet Union. This agreement was reached in a talk between Khrushchev and Ulbricht, and it was typical, that Ulbricht had considered it necessary to withhold the substance of these proceedings from the public. Today, strangely enough, one hear hardly anything about these unusual plans. To be sure, there is talk of a close economic community with the Soviet Union, but all appearances indicate that this question has been set aside. We do not want to make any conjectures about the motives. But it may well be supposed that the readjustments connected with such a plan would present such an encumbrance for the zone economy, that they would be able to be realized only over a long period of time.

In June, the Council for Mutual Economic Aid convened. Here it became apparent that with this instrument, the Soviet Union wanted to reduce the economies of the satellite countries to the ranks of supply industries for Soviet needs. The constant supply crisis during the year 1962 indicated to what a far-reaching degree the zone economy of the Socialist Unity Party had been ruined over the course of 13 years. The propagandists and statisticians of the Soviet Zone have constantly tried to veil these facts during the past years. But at the 17th plenary meeting of the Central Committee which took place at the beginning of October—before the Cuban crisis, as I would like to emphasize—the veil was torn off. Ulbricht and his comrades had to admit that there had been an extraordinary decline in the zone economy. The report of the Central Committee to the assembly of the sixth party day, and the discussion on the occasion of the ratification of the national economic plan for 1963 in the People's Chamber, made it clear even to the most doubtful, that the Socialist Unity Party, in the truest sense of the word, was bankrupt. That is not surprising. For political reasons, the organic, economic bonds of central Germany were destroyed, enterprisers and farmers were expropriated and collectivated, the middle class was smashed, and for separative and autarchic motives, the relations to the economic sphere of West Germany were torn asunder. It must also be added that the Soviet Union, by way of export trade, uses the Soviet-occupied zone in a way that can only be characterized as a clear sign of crass, colonial exploitation. That Ulbricht and his comrades go along with this situation is indicative of their role as compliant instruments of Soviet imperialism.

Not only in the economic field was the year 1962 a great disappointment for the Socialist Unity Party. The Communists had hoped that the erection of the wall would break down the resistance of the population and would bring about a consolidation of the system. In the spring, the large-scale propaganda campaign for the so-called national document was started. The fundamental thesis of this paper states: Two German countries stand hostilely divided against one another. The Socialist Unity Party, applying all means of agitation and of the printed word, set about the task of awakening enthusiasm among the population for the fatherland of the German Democratic Republic. In the numerous gatherings, which were to serve the purpose of propagandizing this so-called national document, the people put up a fight against this thesis and opposed the functionaries with the claim, that for them, the fatherland was still all of Germany. After a few months, the Socialist Unity Party discontinued their barrages in resignation.

The dissatisfaction of the population grew. In addition to a shortage in provisions, the dissatisfaction was given fuel by a series of other regime measures, which can be summed up in the slogan: "More work, less wages." As a result of the setting up of new norms, a painful decrease in wages for a considerable number of wage earners resulted, the consequences of which were so much the more serious, because simultaneously a price increase was effected. In addition, the readjustment of the Soviet Zone economy to fit Soviet needs led to a shutdown of factories, or to a partial shutdown, as well as to a relocation of some factories—all of which resulted in a dismissal of many wage earners. It is no secret that in a large number of Soviet Zone factories it came to sitdown strikes.

When one takes all these factors into consideration, as well as the strict discontinuation of tourist traffic, which has so heavily burdened numerous families, then one can understand that the mood of the population of central Germany must be seen as an extraordinarily strained one. Now, those in power in the Soviet Zone have expressed the desire to strengthen trade with the Federal Republic of Germany, conditioned upon an economic loan from West Germany. We can well interpret this as a proof that the crisis of the zone economy is heading toward a climax and that the Soviet Union either is not willing or is not in a position to help their so-called socialistic brothers. When the desire of the zone government became known, authorities and institutions of the Federal Republic were flooded with a stream of letters from the Soviet-occupied zone. Without exception these letters implored the competent authorities to refuse a loan to Ulbricht under any conditions. We take this unusually impressive assertion of our countrymen's will very seriously. It agrees with our own conviction that we should not contribute in any way to the prolongation of Ulbricht's dictatorship. Only to the degree to which the regime is prepared to revise its totalitarian and separatistic policies, can the expansion of interzone trade be considered. Those in power should not be under the illusion that we would be willing to support them in their suppression of the political will of the central German population. The coming months of the year 1963 will indicate to what degree Ulbricht is really prepared to draw the right conclusions from the bungled—indeed, one could almost say catastrophic—position of his regime. Everything taken into consideration, by the end of this year, the overcoming of some obstacles in the way to freedom for all Germany does not appear quite as unlikely as formerly. Some matters which appeared to be at a deadlock and others which appeared to be unalterable have again become topical. Still other matters, about which some had believed that they would not have been able to withstand the pressure of the wall, have stood the test. Above all, I am thinking about the great spiritual strength of our 17 million countrymen, about their perseverance and resistance and about their tenacious hope that the sky above our fatherland will one day clear. For all this, the Germans in the Federal Republic have to thank them. Their attitude encourages us to pursue unswervingly, with patience and tenacity, also in the year 1963 the great aim of our people to live together in freedom again.

Mississippi Valley Association Hears William Kemp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, at the recent 44th annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, I had the privilege of hearing a penetrating and far-reaching speech by the association's very capable president, William E. Kemp.

President Kemp's remarks graphically illustrate the great progress which has been made in developing and controlling our inland water routes in the past. But equally if not more worthwhile were Mr. Kemp's challenging words about the future of water development.

As president of this great organization, William Kemp has directed his efforts toward developing our great navigation programs providing low-cost means of transportation. However, President Kemp fully realizes that water transportation is not the sole answer. Rather, there must be a partnership for progress in the area of transportation among the barge, railroad and trucking interests.

The development of our great water resources has been a prime objection in my State of Oklahoma as a key to future growth and industrial expansion. In pursuing this objective, we have received considerable help and leadership from the Mississippi Valley Association. President Kemp's address to the association is another outstanding illustration of this impartial leadership, and at this time I wish to place his remarks in the RECORD. The speech is valuable reading for any one interested in the development of our great resources:

A COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION POLICY

(Address by William E. Kemp)

My remarks today will probably go down in the annals of the Mississippi Valley Association as Bill Kemp's farewell speech. During 1962, while I've had the privilege of being the president of this great organization, I've had many satisfactions.

The Congress of the United States during the year that I served as your president appropriated a record amount of money for the development, operation and maintenance of the water resources of this country. The Congress also passed in the last hours of its last session an authorization bill that is most gratifying to our membership. Of course, there were some disappointments in both the appropriation bill and the authorization bill, but by and large they were most satisfying to those of us who have felt that Federal investment in the development of our greatest natural resource was perhaps the best investment the Federal Government could possibly make. More than a billion dollars was appropriated this last year for water resource development, and I am advised that exceeds the total amount of money appropriated for river and harbor, flood control, and other water resource development projects, for the

first 100 years that the Corps of Army Engineers and other Federal agencies were engaged in this type of work.

During this last year we've made great strides in our pollution abatement program, as typified by the 5-to-1 majority by which the city of St. Louis passed the $95 million bond issue to abate pollution in the Mississippi River. Other cities and other communities all over the Middle West have made notable progress in this very important endeavor.

Navigation on my own river, the Missouri River, hit an all time tonnage mark this year in spite of the fact that we still have very serious navigation difficulties on the Missouri River between St. Louis and Kansas City. The great Arkansas Basin development program has proceeded on schedule. The rebuilding of the locks and dams on the Ohio River has progressed satisfactorily. Congress appropriated the money needed to complete the advance engineering and design for the important Cross-Florida Barge Canal. Additional locks were authorized on the Illinois Waterway. It would be without purpose for me to go down the line and recite to you all the achievements of the past year. They have been very great and every member of the Mississippi Valley Association has a right to feel proud of his part in the promotion of the water resource development program in this country, which makes for a better and a stronger America.

On the surface, it looks as though our program is in excellent shape. It may look as though we can from now on, or at least through the year 1963, rest on our laurels. Didn't the Congress refuse last year to pass a toll or user charge bill? Didn't the Congress last year pass in the final hours of its session a very satisfactory merchant marine bill? Haven't our friends interested in irrigation, fared quite well this year? Are we now entitled to sit back and glory in our past achievements and just tell the world how well we have done in the past?

My friends, if there are any among us who feel that this is a time when we can rest, when we can take the position that all is well, I must warn you that you are doing some very dangerous thinking. For 44 years through the organized efforts of the Mississippi Valley Association the citizens representing the professions, agriculture, and practically all industries, have been dedicated to the development and wise use of the water resources of this country.

The multiuse concept of water resource development has always been advocated by the association. This concept has been adopted by Congress and most of the States of the Union. As a result, we have made great strides in flood control, pollution abatement, stabilized stream flow, which has made vast quantities of water available for domestic and industrial purposes, navigation, reclamation, and incidental hydroelectric power.

These benefits are so interlocking that it is impossible to separate them. For example, the great development on the Missouri River is primarily for flood control but the upstream reservoirs impounding about 75 million acre-feet of water, the levees and the bank stabilization works along the river, have made the river navigable. There are no locks on the Missouri River between Yankton, S. Dak., and the confluence of the Missouri and the Mississippi just above St. Louis. The flow of the stream has become more stabilized, and this aids pollution abatement. The impoundment of water will irrigate thousands of fertile, but very dry acres of land. The falling water from these reservoirs will produce a great deal of electricity and the reservoirs are furnishing recreation for literally millions of people.

By uniting the efforts in the past years in the interest of those who were primarily interested in flood control, those who were primarily interested in navigation, those who were primarily interested in the irrigation of arid land, those who were primarily interested in recreation or stream stabilization, domestic and industrial water supply, pollution abatement, and all the other benefits, the Mississippi Valley Association has been able to make tremendous strides that benefit all segments of our society. It is no longer necessary to convince the man who is directly interested in navigation, that he has an interest in flood control. Municipalities and industries interested in a stabilized streamflow and ample water are convinced that they have a common interest with those who are primarily interested in other phases of water resource development.

The multiple-use concept has been of great benefit to the fish and wildlife people, to the people who like to hunt and fish, to the people who needed protection against floods, to the people who wanted low-cost water transportation. In fact, it has been of great benefit to everyone.

A campaign to divide and conquer is now underway. Navigation has been selected as the whipping boy and if this campaign against navigation, sponsored by other modes of transportation, is successful, the beneficiaries of all of these other phases of water resource development are going to suffer.

This threat to navigation is now the most serious problem facing our valley. It involves nothing less than the future functioning of our competitive transportation network of railroads, barge lines and truck lines. It is time we took a closer look at the overall transportation picture.

We have been principally concerned, and still are, with the twin disasters of too much and too little water. This has been a matter of life and death for communities throughout the river valleys. In 44 years of labor, we have made much progress. Our Mississippi and Missouri valleys, we hope, will never again fit the description of Harper's magazine in 1869—as a place "where all the steamboats are aground, and the houses are afloat."

Disastrous floods are still possible, but I think we can say with confidence that they are getting less likely every day. The day-to-day fear of catastrophes is decreasing. But at the same time, the danger to the longer range, no less important benefit of water resource development—a mature and balanced transportation network—is increasing.

At precisely the time when development of our transportation network is yielding significant results, strong moves are on foot to make basic changes. The changes, in our opinion, indicate a lack of understanding of a transportation system geared to best serve the public interest. The proponents of these changes seem to be looking so closely at the trees that they are failing to see the forest. They are failing to look at the overall picture and thus are placing a roadblock in our region's growth.

The proposed changes are well advertised.

1. The imposition of user charges on the rivers. This is a self-defeating move which will handicap our industrial development. The people and industries of the river valleys of mid-America now contribute more to the public treasury in taxes than they receive back in benefits. We don't appreciate being taxed twice.

2. The proposal to remove public control of rate reductions in bulk transportation. This could destroy the present balance which now permits relatively small water carriers, small railroads, and small trucklines to compete with larger railroads and would be certain to bring on a destructive rate war damaging to our valley development.

Last September when I testified before the Senate Commerce Committtee in opposition to S. 3243 I said, "We oppose S. 3243. This bill would deprive the Interstate Commerce Commission of the authority and power it now has to determine that a freight rate is lower than a reasonable minimum rate. This power is the principal means by which the Commission is able to carry out its congressional mandate to preserve the inherent advantage of each mode of transportation and to prevent unfair and destructive competitive practices."

3. A growing lack of understanding on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the need for a balanced rail-barge-truck transportation network. We have had trouble with the Commission before. For decades our western railroads had the short end of the stick in their shares of divisions on freight rates. The eastern railroads, understandably concerned chiefly with building industry in the East, did their best to keep our railroads at a rate disadvantage.

We must measure each of these changes against a single standard: Is it good for the Mississippi Valley?

What is at stake here is very simply the future industrial development of our river valleys. A generation ago our raw materials went to the industrial East for manufacturing and were returned to us as finished products—and we paid the freight both ways. We were, in effect, the colonial dependency of the industrial East.

Things have changed since the Mississippi Valley Association began its work 44 years ago. Many people have called it the most significant single economic change of the past 50 years—the decentralization of our Nation's industrial capacity along the rivers and canals.

Industry has spread a thousand miles down the Ohio and another 1,000 miles along the Gulf Intracoastal Canal. Look around you here in St. Louis. There are 2 million people in the growing St. Louis industrial complex. Further west, in the still undeveloped Missouri Basin, it takes two whole States—Montana and Nebraska—to equal the population around this single city. The growing industry around St. Paul and Minneapolis, the steady growth along the Illinois Waterway, the flourishing of industry in the Baton Rouge-New Orleans area—are all developments of the last generation.

We have the people, we have the resources, but we have only lately begun to develop the mature and balanced transportation complex that we need to transform our undeveloped wealth into jobs, and bank accounts, and factories, and production. We have begun to reduce that long haul of raw materials to the East and the long haul of finished products back.

In the past generation, we have learned some simple facts about transportation. We know, for example, that you can move freight between river points by water cheaper than you can move it on the highway or on the railroads. The difference is so substantial that, if you have water transportation, it means that you can more economically develop your coal resources, your bauxite, your phosphates, your limestone and your sulphur. You can find new expanded markets for your grain. If you don't, some of these resources will remain locked in the land.

We know, too, that water transportation and heavy industry go together. Wherever you look in the United States, the major industrial complexes have access to water transportation. The same is true in Europe.

We know beyond this, that water transportation isn't enough by itself. We must have railroads—and healthy railroads making attractive profits—and healthy truck lines. Goods manufactured in Kansas City or Omaha must be carried to Denver or Oklahoma City by rail or truck.

Most important seems to be the interaction of these three modes of transportation. Industry doesn't seem to want to invest very large sums of money where it is dependent on only one means of transportation. It will invest where there is a mature transportation network, where there are alternative means of transportation.

As a general principle to guide us, therefore, if ever we see one of these means of transportation seriously handicapped—whether it is rail, barge or truck—we know this is bad for the Mississippi Valley.

Out here in the West, we're never very far away from our farmer friends. Hence, we can appreciate one of Aesop's most famous stories about the goose which laid a golden egg.

According to Aesop, the farmer almost threw the egg away thinking someone was playing a trick on him. But he took it home, and soon found to his delight that it was, indeed, gold. Every morning the same thing occurred and he became rich selling his eggs. As he grew rich, he grew greedy; and thinking to get at once all the gold the goose could give, he killed it—and there were no more golden eggs.

This is our problem today. River navigation can be killed and the golden eggs which are making this valley the richest in the world can stop moving forward. The trend to decentralization of the industry of the Nation in our valley could reverse itself.

Our friends in the transportation industry do not make things easy for us. The arguments are complex. When you listen to the railroads, their arguments may seem to make sense. And the bargelines will go over the same ground, and they make sense too. There are a great many arguments which seem to us as pointless as the old problem of how many angels can stand on the point of a pin. And some of our friends seem more interested in winning arguments than developing traffic.

However, we must, amid all the confusion, get the essential facts straight in our heads and keep them straight.

Only occasionally do the key dramas of the valley's industrial development result in newspaper stories. Occasionally a railroad man or a bargeline man will enthusiastically talk about new potential, new possibilities for growth. But on the whole, these dramas are played out without much fanfare.

But it is important for us to know about them.

Some years ago there was a lively fight over the rate on paper from St. Francisville, La., to Chicago. The normal rail rate on paper at that time for that distance was about $20 a ton. A cut was made to $6.72 a ton for multiple cars and a huge new paper plant was established which now supplies most of the paper on which your Time and Life magazines are printed. A new industry for Louisiana, new business for the bargelines and the railroads and a most acceptable golden egg for all concerned.

It may not sound romantic, but there are some people who can get very excited about the transportation costs of pig iron. Pig iron, of course, is basic to the development of any steel-related industry. Not long ago, as a result of barge competition, the rail rate for pig iron from Ashland, Ky., to Kansas City was reduced from $18.81 to $9.86. We were happy with that golden egg.

The Chicago Coal Merchants Association are specific in their interest in maintaining a lively and healthy bargeline goose. Elmer Berg, executive secretary of the association, testifying in 1960, listed rate increases on coal brought to Chicago by rail amounting to 91 percent since World War II. In September 1958 he testified that, to meet barge competition, the railroads established a cut of 50 cents a ton on volume shipments. This golden egg, if you assume about 11 million ton sa year brought to Chicago by rail, is worth $5,500,000 a year to steel and power production complexes in Chicago.

We had an interesting experience with soybeans in southeastern Missouri some years ago. To meet barge-truck competition, substantial rail rate reductions were made, then barge service was suspended—you might say the goose got off the nest. As general increases were granted to the railroads, the rates went up. Now the barges are back in business and rail rates have been reduced again.

In the Louisville area on the Ohio River there is a steadily growing industrial complex. Barges, of course, bring steel down from Pittsburgh. Last year, the rates on pig iron from Neville Island went down from $12.41 a ton to $4.99, a very acceptable golden egg for Louisville.

I have gathered a list of some 27 of these little ICC dramas, all of the past 3 or 4 years, some of them golden eggs worth millions of dollars, some of them relatively minor. But, if you list all the coal, the limestone, the alumina, the paper, the grain, the sulfur, the iron ore, the sugar, the fertilizers, the pipe, the steel plate, and the pig iron that moves by rail at water-compelled rates, you begin to get a glimpse of why industry is reluctant to invest in an area unless there are alternative means of transportation. Literally billions of dollars in investment, production, payrolls, and development depend on having a mature, health transportation service by rail, barge, and truck.

Besides the leverage the water carriers develop on land transportation rates, of course, there is the contribution they make that a land-mode of transportation cannot make—very low rates on bulk commodities. A few rates at random will demonstrate what I mean.

Grain moves by barge from St. Louis to New Orleans at $2.76 a ton. The rail rate is $5.30.

Iron ore moves from New Orleans to St. Louis at $2 a ton; the rail rate is $5.05.

Sugar moves from New Orleans to Chicago by barge at $6.55 a ton; by rail for $13.10.

Sulfur moves from Galveston, Tex., to Pittsburgh by barge for $5.87 a gross ton; by rail for $14.

These are the facts that give industrial development in the Mississippi Valley a very bright potential. But there will be no future unless the national transportation policy continues to guarantee that we have all three means of transportation in full vigor—barge, truck, and rail.

The history of water resource development has been the history of differences of opinion and loud disputes between the Upper Basin interests and the Lower Basin interests, between flood control and reclamation, between navigation and irrigation and the generation of electric power. We are no strangers to controversy in this association. And yet, must we not now be convinced that each benefit is a part of the whole and that we neglect one at the peril of all?

It seems to those who have studied the problem that some people in our Government in Washington, either by new legislation or through the Interstate Commerce Commission, are hellbent on forcing our transportation network to destroy itself.

What's needed today is a new Missouri Compromise—a working out of the problem, not from the railroad point of view, or the barge point of view or the truck point of view, but from the point of view of the best interests of the 23 States of the Mississippi Valley.

The problem did not arise overnight; it will not be solved overnight. Much hard work is needed, but I propose that the development of a new Missouri Compromise in transportation be number one on this Association's agenda from this hour forward.

Is there any substantial hope for cooperation of the different means of transportation? I believe there is.

There are not many of us who read the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations for the Civil Functions of the Department of the Army. They make dry going, but there are some very bright spots in them. On page 239 of the 1963 appropriations volume appears the following quote from MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio, who is proud of the fact that before he was elected to Congress, he worked 22 years for the Pennsylvania Railroad. He knows and understands both sides of the problem. He is here speaking generally in defense of the development of rivers and canals:

"When I first went to Youngstown, Ohio, it was larger than Houston, Tex.

"When I used to be on the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House before I went on this committee, Judge Mansfield, the chairman would ask questions of the railroads. He always asked when the witness went on the stand, 'Can you name a canal that ever harmed a railroad?' The witness would blush and say, 'No.'

"Then he would ask, 'Can you name a canal that failed to help a railroad?'

"The witness would blush and say 'No.'

"The Houston Canal was finally constructed, and today Houston is the seventh largest city in the United States. Youngstown at one time had hundreds of railroad crews and Houston, Tex., has 6 railroads, trunklines, serving Houston, Tex., and she has 400 railroad crews where Youngstown is down to 100. That shows you that water helps the railroads."

If all that is so, why aren't the railroads full partners in this association? Many railroad people individually over the years have been with us.

I recall particularly the attitude of the Illinois Central years ago on some question involving the infant Federal Barge Lines. You can read it in an ICC case in 1922:

"The Illinois Central, of course, recognizes that the barge line offers competition paralleling it on the Mississippi River, but our interests are clearly identified with the people of the Mississippi Valley.

"We have regarded the inauguration of this service on the Mississippi River as more or less experimental. I do not believe anybody knows whether it can be permanent. A great many people have faith in its permanency, but if it is a good thing for the people of the Mississippi Valley, it, in some way, will probably operate as a good thing for the Illinois Central system.

"If it supplies additional transportation that is needed and may be needed in the future that we cannot supply, or if it supplies cheaper transportation than we can supply, and all for the prosperity of the people in that section of the country where our interests are bound up, in some way that will work back to our selfish interests. Perhaps it will increase the population, increase the amount of business that everybody does down in that territory. If it does operate that way, we are going to reap some benefit, too."

In the light of this, I was interested to read in the Tulsa Okla., World for March 10 of last year the point of view of the chairman of the MKT Railroad, Mr. Robert E. Thomas. He is quoted as telling the Arkansas Basin Development Association that the Katy fully supports the development of navigation on the Arkansas River. Mr. Thomas is quoted as saying that the benefits to be gained by the Katy from river navigation will far overshadow the loss, if any, of traffic from so-called water-compelled lower freight rates. The World quotes Mr. Thomas as follows: "New industrial developments will make up for these losses, and we hope to provide something additional for some growth." He predicted that Tulsa

would grow 50 to 75 percent in population in the coming decade.

This is a constructive spirit so different from the usual railroad reaction to river development, but it is based on sound, tested economics.

I think there is a good chance for us to find areas of agreement if we concentrate on what is best for the industrial development of the Mississippi Valley.

If we concentrate on just what some may think is best for the barges, or what is best for the railroads, or what is best for the trucks, we will become permanently mired in controversy.

We may need new laws to correct possible defects in present transportation law, but mainly we need to understand the importance of a mature, balanced transportation network to stimulate the valley's industrial development.

I sound a cautious note of optimism based on the experience of the Mississippi Valley Association. We have in the past reconciled what appeared to be the irreconcilable. We have gone after the facts and informed the public. I think we can do it again—in the interest of the further development of "the world's greatest valley."

I suggest we try.

List of Holders of Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, 1962 was the centennial year of the Congressional Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest reward for valor. In these troubled times, when our security is most often discussed in terms of armaments and weapon systems, it is important to remember that the key to our traditional strength lies not in materials, but in individual men. In the forefront of those men, stand those whose valor has been recognized by awarding to them the Congressional Medal of Honor. As a reminder to all of us, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLDERS OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

ALABAMA

Henry E. Erwin, 1st Lt. Daniel W. Lee, Maj. Van T. Barfoot, Cmdr. Thomas J. Hudner, Col. William R. Lawley, Paul L. Bolden, Wilson D. Watson, Earl D. Gregory.

ARIZONA

Silvestre S. Herrera.

ARKANSAS

Col. John R. Kane, Capt. Maurice L. Britt, Lt. Comdr. Nathan G. Gordon, Rear Adm. Richard N. Antrim, Daniel R. Edwards.

CALIFORNIA

Maj. Gen. William F. Dean, Lt. Col. Raymond Harvey, Walter D. Ehlers, Col. Gregory Boyington, George B. Turner, Rear Adm. George M. Lowry, John F. De Swan, Lt. Col. Kenneth A. Walsh, Capt. Edward A. Bennett, David E. Hayden, Rodolfo P. Hernandez, Comdr. Donald A. Gary, Lt. William Zuiderveld, Lt. Col. James E. Swett, Maj. Audie L. Murphy, Lt. Col. Calvin P. Titus, T. Sgt. Robert S. Kennemore, Brig. Gen. H. H. Hanneken, Chris Carr, Col. Mitchell Paige, Lt. Comdr. Jackson C. Pharris, James E. Karnes, Col. Allen J. Greer (retired), Lt. John W. Finn, Brig. Gen. Rosewell Winans, Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, Phillip C. Katz, Lloyd M. Seibert, Arthur J. Jackson, Capt. Carlos C. Ogden, Lt. William R. Huber, Clarence B. Craft, Maj. Gen. Pierpont M. Hamilton, Vito R. Bertoldo, Beauford T. Anderson, Louis M. Van Iersel, Maj. Edward S. Michael, Thomas A. Pope.

COLORADO

Sfc. Wm. J. Crawford, Capt. David McCampbell, M. Sgt. Thomas E. McCall, Lt. Col. John C. Morgan.

CONNECTICUT

William J. Johnston, John C. Latham, Brig. Gen. Charles A. Lindbergh, M. Sgt. Homer L. Wise, Rear Adm. Lawson P. Ramage, Rear Adm. Herbert E. Schonland, Capt. Michael J. Daly, William A. Soderman.

DELAWARE

James P. Connor.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vice Adm. Joel T. Boone, Donald M. Call, Comdr. Hugh C. Frazer, Brig. Gen. James H. Howard, Lt. Comdr. Edouard V. M. Izac, Gen. David M. Shoup, Gen. Leon W. Johnson, Maj. Gen. E. A. Osterman, Luther Skaggs, Jr.

FLORIDA

Brig. Gen. Eli T. Fryer, James Mills, Lt. Comdr. John Mihalowski, Bernard P. Bell, John Davis, Rear Adm. Samuel G. Fuqua, Berger H. Loman, William Keller, Joseph Quick.

GEORGIA

Maj. Robert P. Nett, Capt. Charles McGaha, Maj. Edw. R. Schowalter, Jr., Desmond T. Doss, John R. McKinney.

IDAHO

David B. Bleak.

ILLINOIS

Harold A. Garman, Russell E. Dunham, Clyde L. Choate, Lt. Col. Joseph McCarthy, Joseph E. Schaefer, Lt. Comdr. Richard M. McCool, Jr., Brig. Gen. William H. Wilbur, Maj. Robert H. Dunlap, Robert E. Gerstung, Gen. C. F. Schilt (retired), John H. Balch, Richard E. Bush.

INDIANA

Melvin E. Biddle, Gerry H. Kisters.

IOWA

S. Sgt. Herschel F. Briles, Arthur O. Beyer, Ralph G. Neppel.

KANSAS

Ralyn M. Hill, Lt. Col. Lewis L. Millet, Pvt. Carlton W. Barrett, Maj. Ernest Childers, John L. Barkley, George Robb.

KENTUCKY

M. Sgt. Paul B. Huff, M. Sgt. Jake W. Lindsey, Ernest E. West.

LOUISIANA

Rear Adm. Thomas J. Ryan, Lt. Col. Jefferson J. DeBlanc.

MAINE

Edward C. Dahlgren.

MARYLAND

Capt. Eugene B. Fluckey, Adm. Bruce McCandless, Paul J. Wiedorfer, Comdr. Arthur M. Preston, Brig. Gen. Chas. D. Roberts, Rear Adm. Adolphus Staton, Adm. Frank J. Fletcher, Lt. Col. Orville Block, Capt. John D. Bulkeley, Col. Justice M. Chambers.

MASSACHUSETTS

Chas. A. MacGillivary, Everett P. Pope, Capt. George L. Street, III, Col. Jay Zeamer, Jr., Lt. William Seach, Comdr. Joseph T. O'Callahan.

MICHIGAN

Oscar G. Johnson, Robert E. Simanek, Francis J. Pierce, Jr., John C. Sjogren, Dirk J. Vlug, Col. Harold A. Furlong, Cpl. Duane E. Dewey, 1st Lt. R. G. Robinson.

MINNESOTA

Mike Colalillo, Donald E. Rudolph, 1st Lt. Richard K. Sorenson.

MISSISSIPPI

Maj. John J. Tominac, James H. Fields, John A. Pittman, James D. Slaton.

MISSOURI

Herbert H. Burr, M. Waldo Hatler, Capt. John H. Leims, Arthur J. Forrest.

MONTANA

Leo J. Powers.

NEBRASKA

Otto D. Schmidt, Lt. Col. Jack Treadwell.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Chas. H. Willey, James M. Burt.

NEW JERSEY

Carl E. Petersen, Stephen R. Gregg, Hector A. Cafferata, Samuel M. Sanpler, 1st. Lt. Francis X. Burke, John W. Meagher, Capt. Carlton R. Rouh, Franklin E. Sigler, Allan L. Eggers, Capt. Freeman V. Horner, Lt. Col. William A. Shomo, Nicholas Oresko, Benjamin Kaufman.

NEW MEXICO

Hiroshi H. Miyamura, Capt. Raymond G. Murphy.

NEW YORK

Reidar Waaler, Richard W. O'Neill, Capt. Bobbie E. Brown, Michael Valente, Maynard H. Smith, Sydney G. Gumpertz, Thomas J. Kelly, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker, Charles W. Shea, Forrest L. Vosler, Francis S. Currey, Tedford H. Cann, Francis J. Clark, Lt. Col. Almond E. Fisher, Peter J. Dalessandro.

NORTH CAROLINA

Max Thompson, Samuel I. Parker, Sgt. Jerry K. Crump, 1st Lt. Jack H. Lucas, Lt. Gen. George P. Hays, Lt. Comdr. Rufus G. Herring.

NORTH DAKOTA

Maj. Frank L. Anders.

OHIO

Forrest E. Everhart, Melvin Mayfield, Rear Adm. Robert W. Cary.

OKLAHOMA

Jack C. Montgomery, John R. Crews, 1st Lt. Ronald E. Rosser.

OREGON

Frank C. High, Robert D. Maxwell, Edward C. Allworth, Capt. Stanley T. Adams, Jacob Volz, Jr., Henry Schauer.

PENNSYLVANIA

S. Sgt. Robert E. Laws, Gino J. Merli, Leonard A. Funk, Jr., Sterling L. Morelock, James H. McDonald, Alton W. Knappenberger, Oscar Schmidt, Jr.

RHODE ISLAND

Thomas Eadie.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Thomas E. Atkins, Maj. Gen. James C. Dozier, Brig. Gen. John T. Kennedy, Donald L. Truesdell, S. Sgt. A. L. McLaughlin.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Brig. Gen. Joseph Foss.

TENNESSEE

Joseph B. Adkinson, William E. Hall, Vernon McGarity, Edward R. Talley, Alvin C. York, Charles H. Coolidge.

TEXAS

Capt. Eli L. Whiteley, Brig. Gen. Robert E. Galer, M. Sgt. Cleto L. Rodriguez, Lucian Adams, Marcario Garcia, 1st Lt. George H. O'Brien, William G. Harrell.

VIRGINIA

Col. Louis H. Wilson, Col. Reginald R. Myers, Col. Charles W. Davis, Vice Adm. Paul F. Foster, Lt. Col. Charles P. Murray, Rear Adm. Richard H. O'Kane, Gen. A. A. Vandergrift, Maj. Gen. Charles E. Kilbourne, Col. Cecil H. Bolton, Jesse W. Covington, Maj. H. A. Commiskey, Sr., Beryl R. Newman, Maj. Ernest H. Dervishian, Lt. Col. William E. Barber, Maj. Lloyd L. Burke.

WASHINGTON

John D. Hawk, Dexter J. Kerstetter, Arnold L. Bjorklund, Robert E. Bonney, M. Sgt. Wolburn K. Ross, Pfc. Alejandro R. Ruiz, Capt. Donald K. Ross, Raymond E. Davis, William C. Horton, Robert E. Bush, Abraham DeSomer, Maj. B. F. Wilson AUS, Retired, Jesse R. Drowley.

WEST VIRGINIA

Stanley Bender, Herschel W. Williams, Henry N. Nickerson.

WISCONSIN

Einar H. Ingman, Jr.

Serving in the Armed Forces outside the continental limits of the United States:

APO CALIFORNIA

Capt. Douglas T. Jacobson, Lt. Col. Robert S. Scott, CWO Harold E. Wilson.

APO NEW YORK

Col. R. G. Davis, Capt. Carl H. Dodd, William R. Charette, James R. Hendrix, M. Sgt. Ernest R. Kouma, Sfc. Jose M. Lopez, 1st Lt. Ola L. Mize, Lt. Col. Carl L. Sitter, Capt. James L. Stone, Col. Keith L. Ware, Capt. H. B. Whittington.

Capt. Joseph C. Ridriguez, Bolivia.

William Badders, Canal Zone.

Col. G. L. Mabry, Jr., Canal Zone.

Harry H. Miller, Costa Rica, C.A.

John L. Smith, France.

Posthumously awarded

ALABAMA

Lt. Col. Aquilla J. Dyess, Sgt. Ross F. Gray, BM1/c. Reinhardt J. Keppler, Pfc. John D. New.

ARKANSAS

Sgt. Gilbert G. Collier, Cpl. Charles L. Gilliland, 1st Lt. Edgar H. Lloyd, Capt. Seymour W. Terry, HM3/c Jack Williams.

CALIFORNIA

Maj. Kenneth D. Bailey, Rear Adm. Daniel J. Callaghan, Capt. John P. Cromwell, Comdr. George F. Davis, Comdr. Samuel D. Dealey, Capt. Reginald R. Desiderio. Comdr. Ernest E. Evans, Pvt. Harold Gonsalves, Pfc. David M. Gonzales, Sgt. Roy M. Harmon, BMC Edwin J. Hill, Sgt. James E. Johnson, 1st Lt. Victor L. Kandle, Pvt. Jack W. Kelso. Lt. jg. John K. Koelsch, Sgt. Daniel P Matthews, Pvt. Harold H. Moon, Jr., Pfc. Sandao S. Munemori, Pfc. Eugene A. Obregon, Rear Adm. Norman Scott, Pfc. William R. Shockley, S. Sgt. William E. Shuck, Jr., Capt. Franklin Van Valkenburgh, 2d Lt. Robert M. Viale, Lt. Comdr. Bruce A. Van Voorhis, S. Sgt. Ysmael R. Villegas, Brig. Gen. Kenneth N. Walker, Pfc. Robert H. Young.

COLORADO

Pvt. Elmer E. Fryar, Pvt. Joe P. Martinez, 1st Lt. Donald D. Pucket, Pfc. Jose F. Valdez.

CONNECTICUT

1st Lt. Lee R. Hartell, Pfc. John D. Magrath, Sgt. Frederick W. Mausert III, RMC Thomas J. Reeves.

DELAWARE

Sgt. William L. Nelson.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Cpl. Lewis K. Bausell, Brig. Gen. Frederick W. Castle, 1st Lt. Robert M. McGovern.

FLORIDA

Pfc. Emory L. Bennett, 2d Lt. Robert E. Femoyer, Hm2c William D. Halyburton Jr., 1st Lt. Baldomero Lopez, Pvt. Robert M. Mo-Tureous, Jr., 1st Lt. Alexander R. Nininger, Jr.

GEORGIA

Cpl. Lee H. Phillips, Pfc. Luther H. Story, Sgt. Clyde Thomason.

HAWAII

Sgt. Leroy A. Mendonca, Pfc. Herbert K. Piliiaau, Pfc. Herbert A. Littleton, Wtc Oscar V. Peterson, Cpl. Dan D. Schoonover, Pvt. Junior N. Van Noy.

ILLINOIS

Wtlc Elmer C. Bigelow, Cpl. John P. Fardy, Pfc. Joe R. Hastings, Pfc. Anthony L. Krotiak, Capt. Edward C. Krzyzowski, Hmlc Fred F. Lester, Capt. Darrell R. Lindsey, GYSET Robert H. McCard, Pfc. Edward J. Moskala, Pvt. Joseph W. Ozbourn, Maj. Louis J. Sebille, 2d Lt. Walter E. Truemper, Pfc. Robert L. Wilson, Pfc. Frank P. Witek.

INDIANA

Cpl. Charles G. Abrell, Pvt. William D. McGee, 2d Lt. Harry J. Michael.

IOWA

2d Lt. Dale E. Christensen, Sfc. Junior D. Edwards, Pfc. John F. Thorson.

KANSAS

Pfc. Richard E. Cowan, Cpl. Jack A. Davenport, T. 5 Forrest E. Peden, Sgt. Grant F. Timmerman.

KENTUCKY

Cpl. John W. Collier, T. Sgt. Morris E. Crain, Pfc. Harold G. Epperson, Pfc. Wesley Phelps, Pfc. David M. Smith, Sgt. John C. Squires.

LOUISIANA

Lt. Col. Don C. Faith, Jr., Sgt. Leroy Johnson, Capt. Arlo L. Olson.

MAINE

Cpl. Clair Goodblood.

MARYLAND

Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, S. Sgt. Isadore S. Jachman, Sgt. William R. Jecelin, R. Adm. Isaac C. Kidd, Maj. Charles J. Loring, Jr., T. Sgt. Frank D. Peregory, Pfc. Carl V. Sheridan, Capt. John S. Walmsley, Jr.

MASSACHUSETTS

1st Lt. Raymond O. Beaudoin, Pfc. William R. Caddy, Cpl. David B. Champagne, Cpl. Gordon M. Craig, S. Sgt. Arthur F. Defranzo, Hm. Richard D. Dewart, Pvt. Eldon H. Johnson, Plt. Sgt. Joseph R. Julian, Sgt. Joseph E. Muller, Pfc. Frederick C. Murphy, Pfc. Ouellette, 1st Lt. John V. Power, Pfc. Ernest W. Prussman, Sfc. Charles W. Turner, Cpl. Joseph Vittori, GY. Sgt. William G. Walsh, Cpl. Edward G. Wilkin.

MEXICO

Pfc. Manuel Perez, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1st Lt. George H. Cannon, Sgt. Darrell S. Cole, Ens. Francis C. Flaherty, Cpl. John Essebagger, Jr., Bm. 1c. Owen F. P. Hammerberg, Sfc. Donald R. Moyer, 2d Lt. Sherrod E. Skinner, Jr., Pfc. William H. Thomas, Pfc. Walter C. Wetzel, 2d Lt. Thomas W. Wigle, 2d Lt. Raymond Zussman.

MINNESOTA

Maj. Henry A. Courtney, Jr., Capt. Richard E. Fleming, Cpl. Louis J. Hauge, Jr., Pfc. Richard E. Kraus, Pfc. James D. La Belle.

MISSISSIPPI

Pfc. James H. Diamond, Pfc. Jack G. Hanson, Pvt. Robert T. Henry, Pfc. Mack A. Jordan.

MISSOURI

Cpl. Lester Hammond, Jr., Pvt. Billie G. Kanell, Pvt. Ova A. Kelley, Sgt. Charles R. Long, Pvt. George Phillips, 2d Lt. Paul F. Riordan, Sgt. Joe C. Specker, Pfc. Richmond G. Wilson.

MONTANA

Capt. William W. Galt, T4g. Laverne Parish.

NEBRASKA

Pvt. Robert D. Booker, Pvt. Dale H. Hansen, Pfc. Edward Gomez, Ens. John J. Parle.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Capt. Harl Pease, Jr.

NEW JERSEY

Pfc. George Benjamin, Jr., Sfc. Nelson V. Brittin, 1st Lt. Samuel S. Coursen, Pfc. John W. Dutko, Sgt. George D. Liddy, Pfc. Martin O. May, Pfc. Francis X. McGraw, Pvt. Nicholas Minere, Sgt. Joseph J. Sadowski, 1st Lt. Richard T. Shea, Jr., Cpl. Horace M. Thorne.

NEW MEXICO

1st. Lt. Alexander Bonnyman, Jr.

NEW YORK

Sgt. Thomas A. Baker, 2d Lt. George W. Boyce, Jr., 2d Lt. John E. Butts, Sgt. Cornelius H. Charlton, Pfc. Charles N. De Glopper, S. Sgt Robert H. Dietz, Pfc. William J. Grabiarz, Pvt. Joseph F. Merrell, Lt. Col. William J. O'Brien, S. Sgt. George Peterson, 1st Lt. Bernard J. Ray, Lt. John J. Powers, 2d Lt. Robert D. Reem, Brig. Gen. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., S. Sgt. Curtis F. Shoup, Pfc. William A. Thompson, Lt. Col. Leon R. Vance, Jr., 1st Lt. Walter J. Will,

NORTH CAROLINA

Sgt. Ray E. Eubanks, Pfc. Charles George, Sgt. Robert A. Owens, Cpl. Henry F. Warner, Maj. Raymond H. Wilkins, S. Sgt. William G. Windrich, Pfc. Bryant H. Womack.

NORTH DAKOTA

Pfc. Henry Gurke.

OHIO

Sgt. Sylverster Antolak, Lt. Col. Addison E. Baker, Pfc. William B. Baugh, Cpl. Charles J. Berry, Pvt. Herbert F. Christian, Pfc. Joseph J. Cicchetti, 2d Lt. Robert Craig, Sgt. Emile Deleau, Jr., Pfc. William A. Foster, T. 5 Lewis R. Hall, Pfc. Patrick L. Kessler, 1st Lt. Harry L. Martin, Pfc. Leonard F. Mason, 2d. Lt. William E. Metzger, Jr., Pfc. Frank J. Petrarca, MM1c Robert R. Scott, Cpl. Tony Stein, Pvt. John R. Towle, Sfc. James R. Ward, S. Sgt. Howard E. Woodford, Pvt. Rodger W. Young.

OKLAHOMA

Sfc. Tony K. Burris, 1st Lt. Donald J. Gott, Capt. Robert M. Hanson, S. Sgt. George D. Keathley, Pvt. Harold G. Kiner, Sgt. Troy A. McGill, Pfc. John N. Reese, Jr., Pfc. Albert E. Schwab.

OREGON

Gy. Sgt. John Basilone, Sfc. Loren R. Kaufman, Pfc. Stuart S. Stryker.

PENNSYLVANIA

S. Sgt. Alvin P. Carey, Cpl. Anthony P. Damato, S. Sgt. Sherwood H. Hallman, Cpl. Harry R. Harr, S. Sgt. Gus J. Kefurt, Pfc. John D. Kelly, T. Sgt. John D. Kelly, 2d Lt. David R. Kingsley, Pvt. Donald R. Lobaugh, S. Sgt. Archibald Mathies, Sgt. John J. McVeigh, Sgt. Harold O. Messerschmidt, S. Sgt. John W. Minick, T5q. John J. Pinder, Jr., Sgt. Donn F. Porter, 2d Lt. George H. Ramer, Pvt. James W. Reese, Capt. Robert E. Roeder, Pfc. Foster J. Sayers, Sfc. William S. Sitman, Cpl. Clifton T. Speicher, S. Sgt. Day G. Turner, 1st Lt. Robert T. Waugh, Sgt. Ellis R. Weicht, T5q. Alfred L. Wilson.

PUERTO RICO

Pfc. Fernando L. Garcia.

RHODE ISLAND

Sgt. William G. Fournier, Pvt. George J. Peters.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Pfc. Charles H. Barker, Pfc. Noah O. Knight, Pfc. William A. McWhorten, Pfc. Furman L. Smith, S. Sgt. Lewis G. Watkins.

TENNESSEE

M. Sgt. Ray E. Duke, Sgt. Elbert L. Kinser, Cpl. William F. Lyell, MM 1/c. John H. Willis.

TEXAS

Lt. Col. Harold W. Bauer, S. Sgt. William J. Bordelon, Maj. Horace S. Carswell, Jr., Lt. Col. Robert G. Cole, Maj. George A. Davis, Jr., 2d Lt. Thomas W. Fowler, S. Sgt. Ambrosio Guillen, 2d Lt. James L. Harris, 1st Lt. William D. Hawkins, 2d Lt. Lloyd H. Hughes, S1c. Johnnie D. Hutchins, HM John E. Kilmer, T4g. Truman Kimbro, 1st Lt. Jack L. Knight, 1st Lt. Raymond L. Knight, 1st Lt. Turney W. Leonard, Pfc. Herman C. Wallace, Cpl. Benito Martinez, 1st Lt. Jack W. Mathis, Maj. Thomas B. McGuire, Jr., 1st Lt. Frank N. Mitchell, Pfc. Whitt L. Moreland, Cpl. Charles F. Pendleton, 1st Lt. James E. Robinson, Jr., Pfc. Charles H. Roan, M. Sgt. Travis E. Watkins,

UTAH

Capt. Mervyn S. Bennion.

VIRGINIA

Col. Demas T. Craw, Maj. Henry T. Elrod, S. Sgt. Archer T. Gammon, HM Francis C. Hammond, 1st Lt. Jimmie W. Monteith, Jr., Lt. Milton E. Ricketts, 2d Lt. Joseph R. Sarnoski.

WASHINGTON

Pfc. Richard B. Anderson, 1st Lt. Frederick F. Henry, Pfc. Joe E. Mann, Pfc. Walter C. Monegan, Jr., S. Sgt. Jack J. Pendleton.

WEST VIRGINIA

T. Sgt. Clinton M. Hedrick, S. Sgt. Jonas E. Kelley, 2d Lt. Darwin K. Kyle, Pfc. Ralph E. Pomeroy, Sgt. Herbert J. Thomas.

WISCONSIN

Pfc. Harold C. Agerholm, 1st Sgt. Elmer J. Burr, Pfc. Stanley R. Christianson, S. Sgt. Gerald J. Endl, T5g. Eric G. Gibson, Sgt. Kenneth E. Gruennert, M. Sgt. Melvin O. Handrich, Maj. John L. Jerstad, S. Sgt. Andrew Miller, Sgt. Charles E. Mower, Sgt. Truman O. Olson, Cpl. Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr., 2d Lt. Jerome A. Sudut.

WYOMING

T. Sgt. Charles F. Carey, Jr., Pfc. Donald J. Ruhl.

Muddying the Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of Prevent World War III—No. 61, Winter 1962–63—published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization located at 24 West 57th Street, New York 19, N.Y., carries an important analysis of Soviet propaganda attempts to confuse the problem of water supply in the Middle East.

Water is the Middle East's most precious commodity. Because all Middle East states need it so badly, it could serve as a factor for close cooperation among them in exploiting the water resources of that area. Unfortunately, a number of Arab governments have tried to play politics on this vital issue which is so important to the livelihoods of their own peoples. While the United States has offered to cooperate in a disinterested fashion, we find that the Soviet Union seeks to stimulate friction and disunity as indicated in their propaganda. This article effectively exposes the distortions to which the Soviets resort in order to further their own ambitions.

The article follows:

MUDDYING THE WATERS

The Soviet publication International Affairs is regarded as one of the more scholarly journals published in Moscow. However, it seems that the Soviet concept of scholarship is relative. By that we mean that the articles in this publication must always fit into the current line of Soviet foreign policy.

For example, it is common knowledge that the Soviets are currently pursuing a pro-Arab line in the Middle East with a fanatical zeal which is so characteristic of Moscow's diplomacy. Such an attitude must necessarily overlook or conceal the shortcomings and threats stemming from Arab policy. A very concrete illustration of how Soviet "objectivity" with regard to the Middle East is practiced, may be found in the September 1962 issue of International Affairs. There, under the feature "Facts and Figures" the editorial board of International Affairs seeks to enlighten its readers on key questions of the day. One of the questions asked is "Why does Israel want to divert the waters of the Jordan?" The very word "divert" loads the question. Nevertheless, International Affairs tries to give the impression that its explanation is based strictly on "facts and figures."

First, the editors of International Affairs inform the inquirer that Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Israel "are interested in utilizing the waters of this small and unnavigable river for irrigation." It is further alleged that the Jordan River "flows along the borders of these countries." Either the editors of International Affairs are abysmally ignorant of the geography of the area involved or—and this is more likely—they are following the Kremlin's directive to shape the facts to meet the objective.

The Jordan River does not at any place touch Lebanon. As for Syria, the most one can say is that the Jordan River runs parallel to the Syrian border and for the first 73 miles of its flow southward the Jordan River flows exclusively inside Israel. In short, if the Syrians were to move on to the Jordan River, they would be committing an aggression against a neighboring state. It is only in the Kingdom of Jordan that the river itself flows after leaving Israel. Therefore, the only two states which are directly concerned with the Jordan River are Israel and the Kingdom of Jordan.

As far as Syria and Lebanon are concerned, both countries possess sufficient water resources. Consequently, they do not require the use of the Jordan waters for irrigation purposes. Even the Kingdom of Jordan has other water resources besides the Jordan River itself. For example, one major tributary to the Jordan River is the Yarmuk River which has a flow amounting to 500 million cubic meters annually. Another 500 million cubic meters of floodwater are wasted each year because the Kingdom of Jordan refuses to cooperate with Israel for conservation purposes. So much for the physical character of the Jordan River.

The next "fact" revealed by International Affairs is that in September 1953 Israel started to build a canal north of the Sea of Galilee "on the river Jordan unilaterally without the consent of the Governments of Syria, Lebanon and Jordan." The operation of the project that was to result from the building of the canal, according to International Affairs, "would clearly lower the level of the Jordan and the people living on its banks in Syria, Lebanon and Jordan will be short of water." Once again, there is repeated the same falsehood, i.e., that the Jordan River touches the banks of Syria and Lebanon.

It is true, as International Affairs states, that Syria lodged a complaint with the Security Council against this contemplated project. International Affairs boasts that it was the Soviet delegate in the Security Council who vetoed the plan. What are the facts? The project was actually a revival of a plan that had been proposed by the British Mandatory Government in 1926. Furthermore, the work on the canal was entirely within Israeli borders. Therefore, Syria had no right to interfere with it since the Syrian borders, we repeat, at no point touch the banks of the Jordan River.

During the Security Council debate, Israel expressed her willingness to adopt binding measures that would protect the irrigation rights of any none-Israelis who might be involved. The facts were so clear that the Security Council proposed a resolution instructing the Chief-of-Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization to protect the rights of individuals who might be affected by the execution of the plan. In short, most of the members of the Security Council supported the project because it did not impinge on Syrian rights and it was indeed the Soviet veto which defeated the resolution. Subsequently, the Secretary General of the U.N., through his experts confirmed the fact that the project was feasible, legal and would protect the rights of any individual non-Israeli.

The third point made by International Affairs alleges that the U.S. Government drew up a project to utilize the waters of the Jordan Valley to settle the conflict between Israel and her neighboring Arab States. This plan, known as the Johnston plan, according to International Affairs, sought to impose a solution on Lebanon, Syria, and the Kingdom of Jordan. We are told by International Affairs that the Arab countries at once perceived the so-called underlying purpose of the plan which gives preference to Israel's interests * * *. Let us examine these facts: According to Webster's dictionary "to impose" means to lay as a charge, duty, command. There is no evidence that Mr. Johnston or his associates brought the Israelis and their neighbors together at pistol point. On the contrary, after 2 years of intensive research, planning and negotiations, the experts, representing the Kingdom of Jordan, Syria, Israel, and Lebanon, agreed on all technical aspects of the plan including the division of the rivers Jordan and Yarmuk.

Mr. Johnston, himself, wrote in 1956 the following: "After 2 years of discussion, technical experts of Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria agreed on every important detail of a unified Jordan plan. But in October 1955, it was rejected for political reasons at a meeting of the Arab League." This is exactly the truth and it is confirmed by the Arabs themselves. Thus, in December 1959, the Cairo Radio admitted that the plan was rejected by the Arab States because they will not agree to recognize Israel's present borders. This is precisely the political rejection having nothing to do with the economic feasibility or justice of the plan itself. Radio Cairo, in another broadcast, explained that the Johnston plan would enable Israel to transform the arid lands of the Negev into agricultural lands. What this all boils down to is simply that the Arabs, spurred on by such firebrands as Nasser, were hoping that by strangulating Israel economically, it would be relatively easy to destroy her physically. Thus, the rejection of the Johnston plan was, in reality, a rejection of peace in the Middle East.

Did the plan give preference to Israel? This is another "fact" put forth by International Affairs. But what is the truth? In the original plan Israel would have received 427 million cubic meters of water to irrigate 104,000 acres. The Kingdom of Jordan, on the other hand, would have received 829 million cubic meters of water to irrigate 120,000 acres. The Johnston plan, through

revisions, was even more generous to the Arabs, for it allocated 60 percent of the waters to them and only 40 percent to Israel. Furthermore, the Sea of Galilee (Lake Tiberias) which, contrary to the impressions given by International Affairs, is entirely within Israeli territory, would no longer be a central storage reservoir, but the Maquarin Dam on the Yarmuk, which lies in the Kingdom of Jordan, would have been increased instead. In this connection, the New York Times (January 2, 1960) wrote that the Johnston plan "was designed to irrigate some 225,000 acres that would also have helped to solve the Arab refugee problem and was approved on the technical level by all four countries. But the Arab States still prefer to impoverish themselves or engage in smaller projects of their own rather than permit Israel to develop. It does not make sense, but such is the Middle Eastern politics."

In its concluding remarks, International Affairs alleges that Israel would never have ventured to seize the waters of the Jordan if it had not been for the support of Western imperialism. Seizure? Whatever use Israel today is making of the Jordan River pertains to that part of the river which flows exclusively within Israel's borders. Just as the word "impose" was used, so does the word "seizure" have an entirely different connotation for the Russians. It should be pointed out that the Kingdom of Jordan is now engaged in diverting the flow of the Yarmuk River before it reaches the Jordan River. While this will lower the Jordan River, Israel has made no protest and recognizes the right of Jordan to use these waters for irrigation purposes.

Water is a precious commodity in the Middle East. It could be a great adhesive that would bind the people living there to work in friendly cooperation for their mutual advantage. However, the intransigence of certain Arab leaders has served as a road block. Consequently, a good part of the precious waters of the Jordan River continue to be wasted. This water is wasted not only by inexcusable neglect, but it is also muddied by the fictional facts and figures of International Affairs.

Federal Mental Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, one of the pioneers in the field of new programs for mental health was the former Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, George M. Leader. I served in the Pennsylvania General Assembly during his administration and know how he worked to advance the Pennsylvania program to cure and rehabilitate the mentally ill. I have included a statement made by former Governor Leader on President Kennedy's mental health program which shows that a former State executive appreciates the efforts of America's Chief Executive in an important area which will benefit the citizens of our country:

FEBRUARY 8, 1963.

HARRISBURG, PA.—Former Gov. George M. Leader today praised President John F. Kennedy's new far-reaching Federal mental health program, calling it "another breakthrough for the forces of the New Frontier."

"In some cases enlightened State government already has made the first inroads, taken the first steps to tear down the veil of secrecy and superstition which too long has impeded full discussion and community awareness of the critical mental health problem.

"President Kennedy, with great sensitivity to the need for human dignity, has shown that the Federal establishment is willing to aid additional States to move forward and to match the records which have been made in all too few cases.

"How valuable it would have been to have had this same national concern to bolster our efforts back in 1955 in Pennsylvania to reverse the official Commonwealth policy toward the mentally ill from one of custodial confinement to one of cure and return to useful living.

"With this major shift and new direction came new hope for Pennsylvania's mentally ill through new, enlightened porgrams of understanding, treatment, education, and cure.

"The progress was not only limited to our State mental institutions, but it spread as well to the communities at large by the development of clinics and clinical programs. As a result, today more and more Pennsylvanians see the mental hospital as a community resource, not as a symbol of isolation and shame," former Governor Leader said.

"This public enlightment toward mental illness—a major breakthrough made at the local level just in the last few years in Pennsylvania—should lend itself ideally to the President's expansive program of prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation which, as outlined by him, has its emphasis on the community level," Leader said.

"The effort by State government to remove the fears and suspicions which the public has harbored against the mentally ill and retarded has paid far-reaching dividends. Statistically, the sharp rise over the past few years in the number of Pennsylvania citizen volunteers who participate in mental hospital programing is dramatic proof that we are moving in the right direction.

"Of course, there is deep satisfaction, too, in knowing that in recent years the new programs have made it possible to treat progressively more patients while achieving a decrease in resident population in Pennsylvania's 18 State mental hospitals.

"Such programs have made it possible for surveys of the Pennsylvania mental health system to conclude that a patient's chances of being discharged from a Pennsylvania mental hospital have improved by one-third over the past decade," Leader said.

"Especially significant, it seems to me, is the President's call for Federal grants for establishment of research centers on mental retardation and human development. Faced with population increases and the backlog of retarded cases waiting for treatment, it becomes more imperative that a shift in emphasis be made to prenatal, maternity, and child care aimed at reducing retardation and dealing with the problems created by it as soon after birth as possible. Inherent in the tools and talent of mental health research are unlimited opportunities for more breakthroughs into the vast unknown areas of mental and emotional disturbances.

"I am heartened by the President's dynamic new program which is a logical progression of many of the efforts pioneered and successfully advanced in Pennsylvania in the past few years. I am confident Pennsylvanians will respond to the President's challenge and accept it in the spirit of humanitarianism I know they possess," the former Governor said.

The School That Cares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that an institution for homeless children can be listed among the major things of which a great city is proud. But to those of us who live in Fort Worth, Tex., the Masonic home and School is a notable exception.

Since 1899 this remarkable institution has been caring for children whose lives have been touched by tragedy, and preparing them to meet the challenge of the world outside.

In the November 1962 issue of Texas Parade magazine, Mr. Preston N. Figley, Jr., unfolds the story of this great institution. I commend the article to my colleagues.

THE SCHOOL THAT CARES

(By Preston N. Figley, Jr.)

For 63 years Masonic Home and School has provided a haven for kids whose lives suddenly have crumbled. Many have become brilliant scholars while living and studying at the unique Fort Worth school; others helped to build a football legend during the depression years.

Every dyed-in-the-wool Texas football fan knows the name. During the 1930's the lean, scrappy kids of little Masonic Home slew giants. They were the mighty mites, a brash band of Davids who toppled such gridiron Goliaths as Wichita Falls and Dallas' Highland Park.

Then, as now, the students were children—and recently grandchildren—of Master Masons of Texas who were dead, divorced, separated, or otherwise unable to provide for the youngsters. Enrollment at the school swelled to over 400 during the difficult depression years.

Today only 193 children—22 of them under school age—live and study at Masonic Home. But the school's 212 acres of gently rolling slopes are dotted with new buildings and more are going up. Masonic Home is in the midst of a great buildup, both educational and physical. Its beautiful chapel, dedicated in 1960, is symbol and centerpiece of that growth.

A 40-bed infirmary was completed this spring. Construction is underway on a $341,000 high school and 500-seat auditorium. Plans are ready for a cottage for preschool children, and thousands of dollars are being spent on new classroom equipment.

It is a program which might cause surprise at a school 10 times the size of Masonic Home.

"Our situation is unusual," says Ray Barber, superintendent of Masonic Home Independent School District. "Where other schools may feel a financial pinch, Masonic Home is soundly supported by almost 250,000 Masons. Yet, where other schools are faced with overcrowding, our current enrollment is less than half our capacity."

In those facts lie the reasons behind Masonic Home's ambitious expansion program. Texas' top Masons know that many children around the State are in dire need of the home's services. These officials are determined to let people know about Masonic Home. When the boys and girls start coming to Fort Worth, the school will be ready—by virtue of its bold development program.

Masonic Home won its reputation for boldness years ago. No example could serve better than the saga of the "Mighty Mites."

When Rusty Russell came to the school in 1927 as principal and coach, there were only two classes of competition in high school football, A and B. Masonic Home was classified in B, spent most of its time playing in A.

In those early years the Mighty Mites, their tattered gear in tow and sack lunches clasped in their fists, used to clamber aboard an old open-bed truck and set out to battle the giants of Texas high school football.

"Those Masonic Home teams came closer to approaching the ultimate desire of a coach than any in my experience," Russell recalled. "I tell you those boys were small physically, but they were big inside. Big."

Almost always outweighed and heavy underdogs, the Mighty Mites soon began knocking off their big city rivals. Enthusiastic fans demanded that Masonic Home be put in class A so they could shoot for the big title.

In 1932 and for 10 years thereafter, by special vote, Masonic Home was embraced by Fort Worth's class A district. The Mites lost in the State finals in 1932 to Corsicana, 0–0, on penetrations, and either won the district title or tied for it all except three times during the next decade. Yet Russell never had more than 90 high school boys from which to build his teams.

The heaviest player on the 1938 team weighed 163 pounds and the team average was 148, but the boys went to the State semifinals before losing to Lubbock in a sandstorm. The uniforms they wore in that game were purchased for them by a team they had beaten.

"We made such an impression on Highland Park (coming from three touchdowns behind to tie and win on penetrations) that their quarterback club bought us a complete set of uniforms," Russell remembered. "We looked pretty ragged when we played their team."

In Russell's 16 seasons at the home, his teams won 127, lost 30 and tied 12. The Masons were forced to step down from major competition in 1943 as the war years depleted enrollment.

In 1961 Masonic Home quit Texas Interscholastic League football play entirely, for lack of sufficient boys to field a team. The move evoked a wave of nostalgic columns in newpapers all over Texas. But the school still has its uniforms, packed away in a dormitory basement, and as soon as the boys come, the Mighty Mites will take to the field once more.

Masonic Home graduates have gone on to star in many sports at various Texas and out-of-State universities. West Point's great all-America Lineman DeWitt Coulter was a Masonic Home boy.

The school also has produced brilliant scholars.

One noted Texan said: "I'm like all the graduates of Masonic Home—sold on the home, the training it gives and the opportunity there. They have something of a controlled situation, resulting in the average graduate being far better prepared from the standpoint of education that the usual high school graduate.

"It's a system where everybody studies and comes pretty near realizing his potential. It's the ideal situation for giving students the maximum in education."

Most graduates go on to college—more than 70 percent. Any student who has the ability to do college work is given the chance, through Masonic or college scholarships and employment aid.

"Students at Masonic Home have to make many of their own decisions from the moment they arrive," the graduate added. "When they leave they have an above-average degree of independence and self-reliance. In addition, they definitely are taught the difference between right and wrong. Very, very few graduates ever get into trouble." (Police and Juvenile Probation Office records support this.)

The graduate who thinks so highly of the educational and moral standards of Masonic Home is Dr. Abner McCall, president of Baylor University. He is one of the many prominent and successful men and women who have passed through the doors of Masonic Home since it opened October 6, 1899. Another is John T. Bean, superintendent of El Paso County schools and a Past Grand Master of Texas Masons.

Founded and maintained by the Grand Lodge of Texas, A.F. & A.M., the institution is supported by interest from the Masons' endowment fund, by an annual assessment paid by Texas Masons to the Grand Lodge, and by donations from Masonic groups and individuals. Many a Texan's will has directed that part or all of his estate go to Masonic Home. The home does not take children for pay.

Three to twelve years old when they arrive, the children eat well, dress well and are exceptionally well cared for in general. They learn early to cooperate in household chores, just as they would in any large family. At mealtime they take turns setting tables, serving and helping in the kitchen. Even at 3, toddlers are taught to pick up their own things. Discipline is not unreasonable, but it is gently firm.

Medical care is excellent. The sparkling new hospital-infirmary has a registered nurse and a practical nurse on duty every day, with physicians and specialists on call.

Academic excellence long has been a trademark of Masonic Home and the current development program stresses important improvement of the curriculum. Strong emphasis is put on a liberal arts education, although business basics are an important part of the program. All students take shorthand and typing, plus 4 years of homemaking for the girls.

A tour of the Masonic Home campus leaves the visitor deeply impressed—not so much with its physical appearance as with the alert, healthy, happy children of the home.

"They come to us from every corner of Texas; children with problems, not problem children," said Superintendent Barber. "Their parents in most cases are divorced, separated or dead—in any case unable to care for the children properly. Frequently they are behind academically.

"They get an education here, certainly. More than that, these kids are loved. They discover that people care about them, and they leave the home chin up and ready to tackle anything."

As for the affection ex-students hold for the institution, Baylor's Dr. McCall puts it simply: "Most of us look upon it as our home."

Masonic Home's far-reaching development program already is being felt, although the school still is rated class B in size.

It has always had a class A heart.

Dual Distribution: A Growing Threat to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest threats to the small business sector of the American economy is the increasing incidence of dual distribution—manufacturers acting both as supplier and competitor to independent retailers, wholesalers, and secondary manufacturers.

The usual designation for this practice is "dual distribution." However, we must not allow ourselves to be misled by this innocuous sounding phrase. Actually, this is vertical integration—vertical integration which enables large firms by virtue of their size and position to take business from small businesses throughout the Nation.

All levels of our economy are affected by this practice.

Retailers find themselves competing with factory outlets carrying the same products at a price below the cost of acquisition for the independent retailer. The independent merchant has only his own operation from which he may make a profit. The manufacturer turned retailer, however, has several levels at which a profit can be produced.

Wholesalers who have spent a lifetime building up trade acceptance for a manufacturer's product find their supplier selling the same product at a lower price to the clientele laboriously built up over a period of years by the independent wholesaler.

Manufacturers and fabricators are encountering this same problem. The firm supplying the raw product or component parts used by the independent in manufacturing or fabricating all too often appears as a direct rival—marketing a similar or identical product.

This is a particularly vexing problem, because it is extremely difficult to eliminate these objectionable practices without doing violence to our traditional economic freedoms. It is a problem which the Subcommittee on Distribution of the Select Committee on Small Business is planning to study once the subcommittee is fully reconstituted.

During the 87th Congress, two bills dealing with this difficult subject were introduced by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG. I am informed that they will be reintroduced during the current session of the 88th Congress.

I share with Senator LONG the conviction that this problem must be dealt with. I also share with the Senator his position of not being wedded to any specific proposals.

I have recently introduced two bills identical to those introduced by Senator LONG during the 87th Congress.

The first is H.R. 3562. This bill applies the principles of the Robinson-Patman Act in requiring that the vertical integrator treat all his customers in the same manner as his own captive manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers.

The second bill, H.R. 3559, recognizes the extreme difficulty, in many instances, of attempting to force the various units of an integrated operation to deal with each other at arm's length. The provisions of the bill require that companies engaged in dual distribution make public operating data on each product and each establishment that is involved in the dual distribution process.

This reporting requirement will allow independent competitors, consumers, and Government antitrust agencies to

determine whether a particular product or establishment is actually being operated for legitimate profitmaking purpose or merely as a device to establish a monopoly.

Our tax laws also reflect the inequitable aspects of dual distribution. For example, under the present law, independent tire dealers must pay the excise tax on tires and tubes at the time they acquire them. In the case of the average dealer, this ties up large amounts of capital, often over a considerable period of time. Retail outlets owned by tire and tube manufacturers, however, are not subject to this requirement. The excise tax on their stock becomes due only at the time of sale. This is clearly inequitable. I have introduced H.R. 3563 to remedy this situation. It would make the tax payable upon delivery to a retail outlet owned by the tire or tube manufacturer in the same manner as is presently required upon sales to independent retailers.

Likewise, in the case of automobile parts and accessories, independent wholesalers are required to pay the Federal excise tax upon their entire stock at the time of acquisition. Integrated wholesale outlets need not pay the tax until a sale is made.

I have introduced H.R. 3564 to extend the same privilege to independent distributors as is presently enjoyed by integrated distributors. Under the terms of this bill, the excise tax on their stock would also be due only upon actual sale. Appropriate measures for the posting of bonds giving full insurance of payment of the tax is included in the bill's provisions.

National President of the Izaak Walton League Endorses Multiple-Use Concept of Public Land Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1963, at a regional meeting of the Izaak Walton League, the League's distinguished President, L. C. (Jack) Binford, made a speech that I believe warrants the attention of all who are interested in public land management. We are all familiar with the objectives and work of the Izaak Walton League and recognize the position of importance that this organization has attained.

I appreciate the constructive position that Mr. Binford has taken in his address. It is an indication of the sense of responsibility that the league and its officers have adopted.

In these days of extremism in connection with the specific provisions recommended for inclusion in legislation for the preservation of wilderness areas, I particularly welcome Mr. Binford's remarks and commend them to all Members to read and consider as background for this legislation. The full text of Mr. Binford's speech follows:

HIGH PLACES

"I need the high places—the mountain heights for the mind, the upland trail for the feet, the singing stream for the heart, and the glorious mountain scene that my eyes may link to my soul." (Marshall Dana, chairman, recreational committee, Columbia interagency committee.)

I want to talk to you about multiple use of public lands with emphasis on a policy of high mountain use approved by the Izaak Walton League, and the place of wilderness in this policy.

We in the Izaak Walton League believe in the multiple use of our public lands and waters. That does not mean all uses must be assigned to every acre or stream or even every water basin, or mountain or forest.

Some areas, because of their predominant value for certain uses should be so classified. Thus we have parks and wilderness, wildlife refuges, and protected shorelines, and restricted waterways.

We do not favor the blocking off of areas for a single or highly limited use, except as such areas fit into an overall, comprehensive program of multiple use.

Probably in theory all the public agencies and conservation groups subscribe to this Izaak Walton League philosophy, but in its interpretation, even within the league, we have differences.

Last year at Portland, Oreg., we again gave our support to the multiple-use concept and went a step further in interpretation of our policy by endorsing the announced high mountain policy of the U.S. Forest Service.

Multiple use is a plan that gives consideration to all land value, particularly water, recreation, forage, wildlife, timber, and was enacted into law for the Forest Service in 1960 and an operational policy of the Bureau of Land Management, similarly termed by that agency "balanced use."

Multiple use, as far as words go, is a term created by the Forest Service, but was only descriptive words to cover the use of the lands being made by the public.

Mining is one of the uses on the public lands, except in National Parks and Monuments. There is a public right to explore and to file mining claims over which the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have no control. Only Congress can limit the right, so mining is a part of multiple use but not a controlled one. In effect, it has priority over all other uses.

Let me give you an example of what could happen under the present mining law.

You who have been in Oregon know of our high regard for Mount Hood that stands majestically between Portland and the sunrise, wearing at its peak a crown of crystal white. Should some prospector discover a mineral just under the crown, he could stake out his claim and cut away the mountain top. No high mountain policy or multiple-use program of the Forest Service could stop him.

Now as far as I know there is no mineral there, but it could happen.

I am sending our public lands committee, chairmaned by Burton W. Marston, a copy of this speech with the suggestion that his group look into this situation.

In response to the public's desire for wilderness areas, the Forest Service since 1924 has established 83 separate tracts of land as wilderness.

The areas total 14½ million acres of land, equal to the combined acreage of New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. Unfortunately, 36 States have no wilderness. Of the 186 million acres of land managed by the Forest Service, the established wilderness areas amount to 8 percent of the total.

Outside of the established wilderness are many high mountain areas, where the principal of multiple use is being applied by plans being developed by the Forest Service.

Some members of the public were unhappy with the application of the multiple-use concept to certain specified situations in Washington and Oregon.

At the request of Supreme Court Justice Douglas and Senator Morse, of Oregon, and Senator Magnuson, of Washington, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman instructed Chief Forester Edward P. Cliff, of the Forest Service, to review and develop a plan for the high mountain areas of Oregon and Washington. Now developed, it has been adopted as controlling by the Secretary of Agriculture and controlling for those States. After being carefully studied, it was league approved.

While not at the present controlling in other States where the Forest Service has lands, I think it can be presumed that its far-reaching guidelines will become operational everywhere having high mountain lands.

To apply the multiple-use concept management must determine resource values—consideration to the needs and desires of people together with environmental factors such as topography, vegetation cover, and other natural features.

Certain resource uses may be assigned high priority for a given area, and others not permitted or modified to favor the principal use.

As an example, water may be the primary use, such as an area set aside for municipal watershed; timber, recreation, grazing, and wildlife uses may be modified to maintain water quality.

In planning for multiple use of its public lands, Forest Service has classified them into four broad resource management associations.

The word "association" can be confusing to us who tend to think of it as a public body or group of people. In our land program we use it in the sense of the association of plantlife to the soil.

In general, plantlife, or shall we say vegetation, varies with altitude.

GRASS-SHRUB RESOURCE ASSOCIATION

At the lower levels grass and sagebrush or other shrubs are common. There are scattered trees. This association occurs mostly in the inland, more arid region.

The area is managed primarily to sustain forage production for livestock and wildlife, with consideration to watershed values. Located closer to road and people, it is of great value for recreation, especially at lakes or articificial water impoundments which frequently are in this association.

PRINCIPAL FOREST ASSOCIATION

Above the grass-shrub association is found the principal forests association to the soil. In coastal areas, especially those having heavy rainfall, many extend down to the ocean level and rivers, crowding out the grass-shrub association.

It contains most of the timber of commercial value, which is managed on a sustained yield basis. Primary emphasis is to sustain production of timber with recognition of associated values of wildlife, grazing, water, and recreation. It is nearest to valleys where the largest cities are found and which require consideration of mass recreational needs.

UPPER FOREST RESOURCE ASSOCIATION

Upper forest association is above the principal forest association and extends almost up to timberline.

It is an area of sloping mountainsides, mountain meadows, streams and lakes. Timber of high elevation species occurs. There are dense thickets of lodgepole pine and spruce of little commercial value. The area is often scenic, having high recreational value. Timber of commercial, but lower

value, occurs, but it is more difficult to log and requires care to protect recreational values.

ALPINE RESOURCE ASSOCIATION

Alpine resource association extends from just below timberline to the crest of the mountains. It is an area of primary importance for recreation having superlative scenery of mountains, glaciers, lakes, meadows, and a rugged plant and animal life.

LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT AREA

Throughout the four associations are found areas of high recreational value, usually along streams or lakes or travel routes. These are given a classification of landscape management area.

HIGH MOUNTAIN AREA—POLICY

Now we are ready to confine our discussion of multiple use to the high moutain area. This includes the landscape management area found in the upper forest resource association and all the alpine association. In Oregon and Washington about one-half of such areas is now classified primitive, wild, and wilderness areas.

Now I shall in a condensed form, tell you why we approve application of the high mountain policy to the high mountain area outside of classified primitive, wild, and wilderness areas. Watershed values are given primary consideration to promote optimum yields.

Lands are managed to maintain or enhance opportunities for more people to have both conventional outdoor recreation and wilderness experience with minimum modification of the landscape so as to maintain a near natural scenic appearance.

Development will include roads, trails, campgrounds, picnic areas, scenic vistas, winter recreational sites, mountain resorts and shelters, all designed to retain scenic qualities, recognizing the needs for both concentrated family recreation and primitive-type use.

Areas which possess wilderness characteristics will be recommended for a wilderness classification, when it serves the highest and best public use.

Wildlife habitat will be maintatined to provide adequate food supply for a predetermined level of wildlife population, and their control will be maintained through the State game and fish departments.

Grazing of livestock will be permitted only if other values can be protected.

Timber will not ordinarily be commercially harvested.

Natural resources of soil, woods, waters, and wildlife have no fixed geographical boundaries. All are subject to movement and change—water and wildlife may do so rapidly, but nonetheless surely the trees and soil are subject to change and movement. No man-made line can stop their change or flow from one area to another.

So with the management of public land, some policy of flexibility is desirable not only to conform to the physical changes of the resource, but to meet the needs of people.

We in the league have on numerous occasions voiced our opposition to any man-made impoundments for water in national parks and monuments. Now in most cases our position is sound, yet we recently proudly displayed in our magazine as a scenic jewel, the Grand Tetons reflected in the manmade irrigation lake. In fact we recreationists bitterly complained last summer at the pulldown of the water level by the owners of the water.

We have in the United States tremendous wilderness areas. They are of two types: One an area classified as wilderness, the 14 million acres I previously mentioned, and others undeveloped, mostly unroaded high mountain country such as covered by the high mountain policy I have been describing.

Some continue to ask: "Why do we need a wilderness bill when we have so much in wilderness plus a declared policy of the Forest Service to maintain the classified wilderness and to add more to it?

Obviously a lot of people think we do not need a wilderness bill. No bill in Congress has been lobbied with such insistence, yet we failed to pass it. In fact a lot of people, not just a few timber operators, are opposed to a wilderness bill.

Yet, nearly all of these people who are opposed, favor wilderness.

Leading exponents of a wilderness bill want a tremendous expansion of classified wilderness, to include not only most of the alpine area but substantial portions of the upper forest resource association and sizable tracts from the principal forest association.

This expansion is naturally opposed by the commercial users and the communities dependent upon the resources found there, espeically the timber resource.

Many sportsmen's groups also oppose such expansion of the wilderness, favoring the management under multiple use. Cattlemen, sheepmen and agriculturalists also join in the opposition to expansion.

Most of the sponsors of wilderness expansion areas insist on roadless areas with exclusion of mass recreational use.

Some of us who use the wilderness think there are too many people there now. Last year after 3 days' horseback riding, I met another solo rider. To my friendly greeting he responded, "Place is getting crowded," and went on his way.

There are no mass numbers in the wilderness areas. Its value to me, and I expect to most wilderness devotees, would be lost if more were there.

The fallacy with wilderness enthusiasts, like myself, is that we want nothing done within the wilderness once the boundaries are delineated.

A prominent psychiatrist has, in a recent speech, pointed out two of the reasons man seeks the wilderness. One, to escape the conscious or subconscious hurts he has suffered at the hand of man. Second, to find God in a form acceptable to him. In each case the wilderness devotee wants an escape to a realm free of manmade objects.

However, as more and more people are attracted to the wilderness, the problem becomes increasingly acute—the press of man himself upon the land.

If the wilderness is to retain the character we hope to find there, management of the land and the people who visit it, is going to become essential.

There is no better illustration than the lakes basin of our Eagle Cap Wilderness of Oregon. This heartland of the Wallowa Mountains holds heather meadows, dozens of alpine lakes, peaks of soaring granite and dolomite that flash in the sun and through forests of gnarled whitebark pine which have withstood snow and gales for centuries.

In a period of 15 years, we have witnessed a form of decay and destruction settling in upon this lakes basin. It might be better called human erosion.

Last year, 9,000 people hiked or rode horseback up the trails of West Fork and Lostine through dust that was almost beyond human endurance. Each year the trails become worse. A dozen, maybe 50 could pass without reducing the thin soil to dust, but not hundreds. To make the wilderness possible, trails of necessity must be treated with something to settle the dust.

Seasons are short in all our alpine areas where wilderness is usually found. At Eagle Cap, the soil is thin and the vegetation in the camp sites is being ground away under the hooves of horses and sole leather.

Around all the favorite campsites by the lake edges, shooting stars and sedges that carpeted the ground are vanishing.

Since there are no designated firepits or fireplaces, campers have spotted the ground in all directions with their fires. The lakes are ringed with black circules where fire has devoured the thin soil and burned to rest on granite.

Horses tied to trees have worn deep rings exposing the root systems. Some of the trees are dying.

Garbage: The ground has been dug so often and rocks overturned in search of a place to hide refuse, that campers now are finding a rich treasure when they try to bury their own garbage.

Sanitation: Like it or not the Forest Service is going to have to put privies in the wilderness.

Where then will man go to find a place free of man and his works—for solace from man's inhumanity or the glory of God?

Overgrazing is a severe problem in the alpine meadows, usually from the packhorses which have carried us there. A dozen horses can ruin a small, wet meadow in a single night.

Drift fences to hold stock, and hitching racks, even a limitation on numbers of horses will have to be considered by management for the wilderness.

In the Eagle Gap wilderness, commercial packers are picking up gunny sacks tied in the trees in which campers are encouraged to put their refuse. Not a very pretty sight but better than defiling the thin soil and landscape.

To prevent despoilment of wilderness at our own hands, we will inevitably be forced to the realization that they require very specialized management.

If we are to have wilderness, more is required than the delineation of boundaries either by Executive order or an act of Congress. As much as a few of us may desire it, no place will be left on earth free of man and his touch. We can only ask that man will manage the earth in harmony with the needs of man.

The mass recreationists do not want an expanded wilderness system if it's going to block access to his ski area or to driving his car to his campsite. Wilderness experience for the masses is going to be found mostly close to a motor vehicle or at the end of a ski lift or a cablecar.

It's going to be hard to pass a wilderness bill. Even a temperately drawn bill will be difficult, for the opposition is either fearful of the wilderness expansion idea of the extremists, or will use it as an excuse to justify opposition.

It is no secret that the timber industry is not too happy about the multiple-use law under which the Forest Service now operates. They don't mind multiple use, but would like to have timber given priority in the evaluations. They have recently indicated their intention to secure the public's support for this view.

I have reminded them that we conservation groups will unite to oppose any priority or tensure of commercial use of the public lands. They remind me that recreationists are asking not only for priority and tenure, but exclusive single use for millions of acres of wilderness.

Unfortunately the wilderness extremists and some preservationists have also been openly critical of the Forest Service multiple-use policy, to which the league subscribes.

Suppose we fail to pass a wilderness bill, our work will not have been in vain. The Forest Service knows that there is a strong public demand for wilderness areas.

For years the Forest Service were virtually the only exponents of wilderness. This belief by the Forest Service along with a few strong voices of other wilderness enthusiasts, resulted in setting aside these millions of classified areas. Now the Forest Service has this high mountain policy that preserves the rest of the high mountain country in a modified wilderness. In fact some of

it will become wilderness, and they know there is public support, not just a few voices for wilderness.

When we started pressing for a wilderness bill, many of us were fearful that pressures on the Park Service might cause them to declassify some of the existing areas. We wanted status for wilderness comparable in permanency to a national park.

We didn't get our congressional enactment, but we have so firmly demonstrated our views that I am sure no pressure from user groups will break the Forest Service classification.

If ardent wilderness exponents would only stop trying to expand present wilderness, I think we could get a bill passed that gives a permanent classification. Remaining areas will still be there. Their management under the high mountain policy will permit their later classification for wilderness if such action is in the public interest.

Some of the conservationists and supporters of a wilderness bill have been vitriolic in denouncing the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for the failure of his group to vote out the bill approved by the Senate.

We in the position of leadership in the league haven't joined in the "hanging in effigy program" for we think that Congressman ASPINALL is a friend of wilderness and will support a bill that meets the league's policy as to multiple use and recreational areas.

There is a conflict in Congress as to who, under the Constitution, has the responsibility for creating special-use areas. Congressman ASPINALL believes it is the responsibility of Congress—while others think it should be delegated to the executive branch. It is to be noted that wilderness we now have has been a creation of the executive department.

In general, we in the league want the wilderness areas we now have under Executive order, given a permanent status, equal to that of national parks.

We want a procedure established by which additional areas could become wilderness either by Executive order or act of Congress.

We do not think approval of States or local area should be a prerequisite.

We do not object to nonrecreational uses in wilderness as long as such use is compatible with the recreational use of the area as wilderness.

Wilderness areas must be managed to protect their naturalness but the management agency must have considerable freedom to carry out this protection and at the same time make the wilderness available to the public.

Within the framework of this policy, we should be able to get sufficient support to pass a wilderness bill.

On December 12, 1962, Congressman ASPINALL said in a little publicized address to the Western Regional District of the National Association of Counties meeting at Las Vegas, Nev., "I believe that it is imperative that added areas be set aside for recreational use; I believe that we should prescribe some wilderness areas; and finally I think that, after considering all possible areas, it is proper, if found to be in the national interest, that areas of public lands be reserved for limited or even single purpose use."

We in the league and Congressman ASPINALL may be very close together.

Some of today's preservationists say the league is soft on wilderness.

Soft. What do they mean—soft. Don't they know that we are the organization that has really done something about wilderness?

It was the league that for these 40 years has been the persistent voice in the ear of the Forest Service for the setting aside of wilderness areas. Not only did we speak words, we talked with our pocketbook. Many of the private land holdings of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in Minnesota were acquired by the league and turned over to the wilderness area at considerably less than our cost.

The league soft on wilderness. Remember what Theodore Roosevelt said, "speak softly and carry a big stick."

Yes, our voice has been soft—but we hold a big stick.

U.S. Air Force School for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last December during a 2-week active duty tour with the 9999th Air Force Reserve Squadron, to visit our civil and military installations in the Panama Canal Zone. One highlight of the visit there was an afternoon spent at the U.S. Air Force School for Latin America, located at Albrook Air Force Base. I found this institution most interesting and worthwhile. It is promoting hemispheric solidarity and loyalty to democratic principles among the officers and men of many Central and South American countries. As such, it is a valuable weapon in the struggle against communism, Castroism, and other alien ideologies which seek to subvert the Republics of Latin America.

In order to better acquaint my colleagues with the U.S. Air Force School for Latin America and the work being done there, I am including an article written on the school by my staff administrator, John H. Sullivan, for the information office of the Second Air Force Reserve Region at Andrews Air Force Base:

BROTHERS UNITED IN LIBERTY

(By John H. Sullivan)

In a crowded auditorium at Albrook Air Force Base, Canal Zone, uniformed military men of 15 nations rose to join in full-throated singing:

"Now of friendly love, of neighbors tried and true, steadfast we stand, united all together. For our liberty, for our loyalty, together we live in glory's splendor."

These were the sentiments expressed. The words, however, were Spanish, for this was the graduation ceremony of the U.S. School for Latin America.

A unique institution, the school's prime mission is to provide training in Air Force specialties for officers and airmen of the Latin American air forces. Its story is one of cooperation between nations of the Western Hemisphere in arming for peace.

The first Air Force training offered in the Canal Zone was on an on-the-job basis and came as the result of a request by a Latin American republic in 1942. The program gradually evolved until the end of World War II found students from 10 American nations attending eight courses.

Known then as the Air School for Central and South America, the institution was disbanded for several years following the war but was reopened in 1947 at the request of nations which had previously participated in the training program.

The school was reestablished under the name USAF School for Latin America and operated under the Panama Air Depot. With the formation of the 5700th Air Base Group at Albrook in 1949, however, the school was made an integral part of it.

One year later, the USAF School for Latin America was reorganized as a separate command directly under the Caribbean Air Command. Since 1947 over 5,070 officers and airmen from 20 different Latin American countries have been graduated.

Under the direction of Col. Thomas L. Crystal, Jr., commandant, the school today offers courses in three areas: electronics-communications, aircraft maintenance and repair, and language skills.

In the electronics-communications sequence, officers and airmen are taught fundamentals of aircraft communications, personnel procedures, and organizational supply and inventory, among other skills.

In the aircraft training area, young Latin Americans are prepared to become aircraft maintenance officers, instrument repairmen, jet mechanics, and the like, in their own native air forces.

These courses, with several exceptions, last 5½ months and consist of 500 hours of classroom work.

The language training division presents a "conversational" English language program which attempts to enable the student to understand and speak basic English upon completion of 100 hours of combined classroom and language laboratory practice.

Recently, the English language instruction was stepped up in intensity. The objective was to allow the students to utilize their English as much as possible outside the classroom and laboratory from their first day at the school.

"It is extremely important that the student gains the ability to communicate with the English-speaking people of the Canal Zone," explained Colonel Crystal.

"This is the only way to achieve a mutual participation in strengthening Western Hemispheric solidarity and a better understanding of our respective cultures, traditions and ways of life. Furthermore, only those who can read English can keep abreast of current developments in areospace, radar, electronics and other rapidly changing technological fields."

The language training program is also equipped to give Spanish and other language courses to military personnel stationed in the Canal Zone and their dependents, the commandant said.

A day in the life of a typical student begins early—5 a.m.—with reveille. Breakfast is served in the school dining hall from 5:30 to 6 a.m., with classes beginning a half hour later. Instruction continues until 12:30 p.m. followed by a 45-minute lunch period and an hour of siesta.

Classes resume at 2:15 p.m. and end with participation in sports. Dinner is served from 5:15 to 6:15 p.m., followed by study or recreation until taps at 10 p.m.

Classes generally consist of from 15 to 30 officers and from 200 to 300 enlisted men. Students are expected to apply themselves to their courses and are sent back to their own countries for lack of application.

Four Latin American Republics have sponsored almost half the students to graduate from the school from 1945 to 1962. They are Venezuela, 623; Colombia, 557; Peru, 520, and Ecuador, 557.

Other participating Latin American nations have been Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatamala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Uruguay, and even Cuba, before Castro.

Six U.S. Air Force officers and 91 airmen are assigned to the school as faculty and support personnel. Assisting them are air force officers and enlisted men from Latin American countries.

Presently instructing at the school are Lt. Calixto Calderon of the Argentine Air Force; Lt. Luis L. Gordillo, Gutamala; Lt. Homero B. Goudet, Venezuela, and Lt. James B. Thomas, Nicaragua.

"These men have been invaluable to the staff and students in their respective career fields," Colonel Crystal noted.

In addition, there are 34 civilians on the school staff. Twenty-six are Panamanian citizens, 18 of whom are members of the school translation section which translates into Spanish selected USAF technical manuals and other English publications required by the school and other governmental agencies.

To fill a basic need at the school the Simon Bolivar Memorial Library was established in 1960. To fill it, public donations of books were solicited throughout the Western Hemisphere as a means of joining North and South America on a common project.

"The campaign was outstandingly successful," Colonel Crystal said. "By January 1962 more than 9,000 books and magazines had been collected. A 2-week drive in Sioux City, Iowa, netted us thousands of volumes."

In addition to the Iowa city, principal donors to this "library of the Americas" have been the Pan American Union, the Air University, the U.S. Air Force Finance Center in Denver, the U.S. Information Agency, and numerous private organizations in many countries.

When completed, the library will consist of Spanish and English collections in three areas: reference, technical, and cultural books. The technical collection will serve students and instructors as curriculum aids. The cultural collection will concentrate on the greatest North and South American literary classics.

"Our greatest need now is for these last two types of books," Colonel Crystal said. He urged that persons interested in contributing, send their books to him at the Simon Bolivar Memorial Library, USAF School for Latin America, Albrook AFB, Canal Zone.

Along with the subject matter taught, USAF School tries to convey to its students ideals of fair play, personal and political liberty, loyalty to country, and hemispheric solidarity.

These sentiments are summed up in the Student's Creed: "I believe in the future that aviation holds for me, for my country, and for the mutual defense of the Americas. As a student of the USAF School for Latin America, I will devote myself to my studies in a manner that will enable me to teach others what I have learned.

"By fulfilling my duties to the best of my abilities, I will increase the integrity of my country and help to maintain the Americas free and united."

Said in unison that day of graduation, December 1962, the creed seemed to be more than just words on the lips of these men from many countries. Its intensity seemed to earn the tribute which came from Maj. Gen. Leland S. Stranathan, U.S. Air Force Commander, Caribbean Air Command, who delivered the commencement address:

"The service each of you renders by helping your people represents true love of the country and loyalty to the Government, and insures that your individual effort will contribute to the great task of building your nation.

"May your efficiency, prestige, and dignity in the accomplishment of your high purposes be the motto of your individual coat of arms. I am certain that with the knowledge you now have and the willingness and determination to progress you will be able to say, to your complete satisfaction, that you are thoroughly fulfilling your duty to your country."

Following the general's speech, the students—each nation, in turn—mounted the stage proudly to receive their certificates. Then they returned to their seats to sit shoulder to shoulder with comrades of other nations.

Their very presence seemed to sing out the final words of the "Hymn to the Americas," song of the U.S. Air Force School in Latin America:

"We are brothers, united in liberty."

Howard M. O'Hara, Fiscal Consultant to the Guam Legislature, Commended for Outstanding Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a personal pleasure to be informed of the recognition of able and effective services discharged by civil servants of the United States of America.

Just recently I have had called to my attention an expression of appreciation and gratitude shown to one such civil servant, Howard M. O'Hara, former fiscal consultant to the legislature, by the members of the Legislature of Guam.

Mr. O'Hara has rendered valiant, able and outstanding service to the people of this far-away Pacific island of the United States of America. He is to be congratulated in the rendition of such services and the people of Guam are to be commended in their recognition of the contributions of this fine personal friend and able public servant. It is gratifying also to know that while showing such recognition for Mr. O'Hara they did not forget his lovely and charming wife, Mrs. Gladys O'Hara, who also has been very devoted to the interest of these fine fellow citizens of ours.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SIXTH GUAM LEGISLATURE, AGANA, GUAM

"Whereas Mr. Howard M. O'Hara, fiscal consultant to the Guam Legislature since 1957, and acting staff director since 1961, has completed his tour on Guam and plans to resume his professional activities elsewhere; and

"Whereas as fiscal consultant, Mr. O'Hara has performed all his duties in an outstanding and highly professional manner, giving to the legislature the benefit of an acute and inquiring fiscal intelligence, thereby benefiting not only the members in their consideration of the complexities of modern American governmental budgets, but also the people of Guam at large who have thus been assured that their tax moneys are appropriated and spent only after careful examination by a highly qualified and dedicated fiscal expert; and

"Whereas not only did Mr. O'Hara serve so ably in the legislative branch of the Government of Guam, he also had an outstanding record as Controller of the Executive Branch of the Government of Guam, thus having devoted his entire time in Guam to the service of its people and thus having benefited both the legislative and executive branches by his expert and detailed knowledge of modern governmental accounting and fiscal responsibility; and

"Whereas Howard M. O'Hara has in addition, by his charm and sincerity, won the hearts of all those with whom he worked, particularly the staff and members of the Guam Legislature, his lovely and charming wife, Mrs. Gladys O'Hara, also having won the devotion of all who knew her; and

"Whereas although the legislature is out of session, the members unanimously deem it appropriate to express and recognize Mr. O'Hara's services and to transmit their best wishes for his future: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby for itself, its members and staff, and on behalf of the people of Guam, express to Howard M. O'Hara, fiscal consultant to the legislature, its sincere commendation and appreciation for the outstanding manner in which he has performed his onerous and highly responsible duties with the legislature of Guam, and does hereby further express to him best wishes for his future success."

In witness whereof, the members of the Sixth Guam Legislature have hereunto subscribed their names this 12th day of October 1962.

A. B. Won Pat, Speaker; M. U. Lujan, Vice Speaker; V. B. Bamba, Legislative Secretary; R. J. Bordallo, A. S. N. Flores, J. C. Okiyama, J. Q. San Miguel, J. C. Castro, J. A. Flores, P. D. Palting, E. S. Terlaje, J. L. Anderson, A. L. Cristobal, W. D. L. Flores, F. T. Ramirez, J. T. M. Toves, G. M. Bamba, J. P. Cruz, J. Muna, J. Q. Sanchez.

Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Nation celebrates the 143d anniversary of the birth of one of our greatest women, Susan B. Anthony.

Since her birth the status of women in American life, and especially in the political life of the country, has been revolutionized. No man or woman in the land played a more vital role in bringing about a national women's movement than did Susan B. Anthony.

Those of us from Rochester, N.Y., where Susan B. Anthony spent many of her active years and where her onetime home has been preserved as an historical landmark, are particularly proud of her and her accomplishments.

She chose the cause of woman suffrage, believed in it and fought resolutely for it. Even when Susan B. Anthony was beyond the age of 80 she continued her campaign across the land to bring women the right to vote. She held steadfastly to the conviction that woman's enfranchisement should be written into the Constitution of the United States. To that end she worked until her death, never to realize in this life that her work had not been in vain.

It was not until 1920, the 100th anniversary of Susan B. Anthony's birth and 14 years following her death, that the 19th amendment to the Federal Constitution was declared in effect, thereby gaining for all American women the

right to cast their ballots in all subsequent elections.

In the crypt of our Capitol Building is a statue of Susan B. Anthony, a gift from American women. The 19th amendment is popularly known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment. Every year brings new recognition of what she did to elevate the position of the women in our country.

We in Rochester recognize that the life of Susan B. Anthony was dedicated to the cause of women throughout America and that her work has borne fruits in every corner of the globe. We are glad to share her memory with all the world.

As we reflect on Susan B. Anthony's life of accomplishment, let us pledge that these accomplishments never are rendered ineffective. The right to vote in free elections is our most precious American heritage. Its strength lies in every citizen's responsibility to exercise this right.

Views of the Proposed Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the reaction in the country to the administration's proposed tax cuts on top of a planned deficit in the neighborhood of $10 billion has been uniformly negative.

This is as it should be, because the American people are not fooled into thinking we can gain prosperity through larger and larger deficits.

While everyone is sick and tired of taxes and we all earnestly desire a tax cut, the American people are not swallowing the classroom theories of the administration spokesmen who have appeared on the Hill so far.

I would like to include a very fine editorial from the Stockman's Journal, published in Omaha, Nebr., and commend the sound thinking therein to my colleagues, especially the comments that "a tax cut is long overdue. We should demand it and get it, but we should have it on morally acceptable grounds."

I would also call to my colleagues' attention a letter from the editor of the Lusk, Wyo., Herald, Mr. Jim Griffith, Jr. This letter is written to his great-great-grandchildren. It was reprinted in the Blair Enterprise, Blair, Nebr. The point clearly made in this letter to Mr. Griffith's great-great-grandchildren is that "in the name of progress we had to get money from someone. We took it from you."

The editorial and letter follow:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Stockman's Journal, Feb. 9, 1963]

WE NEED, AND COULD HAVE, A TAX CUT

A basic point with regard to President Kennedy's proposed tax cut seems to need clarification.

We believe many people reject the idea of a tax cut because their consciences tell them to. They reason—correctly—that it is morally wrong to reduce taxes, keep on spending, and incur a larger and larger Federal debt to be paid off by someone else at some future time. At the same time, their leaders tell them it is impossible to reduce spending. Thus the impression that the possibility of a tax cut is hopeless grows in the public mind.

This, we submit, is deadly, and to be avoided at all costs. We can have a tax cut, and should have one, in the best interest of the people and the Nation. We should demand it, and get it. But we should have it on morally acceptable grounds—that is, in company with a substantial reduction in Federal spending that will equal or even exceed the tax reduction.

To think that a tax cut is impossible is fallacious thinking. To insist that the Federal budget cannot be cut is ridiculous. Both can be done if we stop acting like a bunch of spoiled brats and get down to business. We have been rocked so long in the cradle of inflation, pampered with the powder puff of a patronizing political attitude, and spoiled by promises of pie-in-the-sky so long that we let ourselves be led around like a 2-year-old child by the politicians. They know what we want and they know they can give it to us as long as they can keep us docilely paying out from 25 to 90 percent of our income to have it.

A tax cut is long overdue. The inflationary forces that spurred our national economy after World War II have been spent. For more than 5 years we have been worrying along with a chronic inadequacy of demand in consumer ranks. The heavy tax burden siphons off the money that would keep our economy growing through spending by consumers and investment by business. We suffer along with slow growth, excess capacity to produce, recurring recessions, chronic unemployment, thin profits, and a weakened fiscal position caused by continued deficit financing. All of these things could be helped measurably and—we hope—even cured, by a tax cut that would give the consumer more buying power and business more incentive to invest in new productive capacity, which, in turn, means more jobs.

President Kennedy and his administration are on the right track in proposing a tax cut. But the President has spoiled the good effect of his proposal by simultaneously sending to Congress the biggest peacetime Federal spending budget in history. Obviously he hopes to eat his cake and have it, too. And the American people are wise enough to know that it can't be done.

Why does the President insist on such an unwise course when he could win a place among the great Presidents by attacking this problem in a commonsense manner?

[From the Blair (Nebr.) Enterprise, Feb. 7, 1963]

IT'S NICE OF YOU TO PAY

Jim Griffith, Jr., editor of the Lusk (Wyo.) Herald, has done, we think, a very decent thing. He has written an open letter to his great, great grandchildren in which he—but we'll let him tell it his way:

"To My Great-Great-Grandchildren:

"Inasmuch as we shall never meet, I want to leave you this note of appreciation.

"You see, it was during my lifetime that the leaders of the United States decided to spend some of the tax money that your great grandparents, grandparents, parents and you, and most likely your descendants, would have to pay.

"Thank you for your generosity.

"Our practice of deficit financing was started during a financial depression and was necessary. It was necessary to continue the practice through a great war, called World War II. Following World War II the United States had a period of long prosperity, but we had grown accustomed to spending more tax money than we liked to pay. Rather than paying off what we had borrowed, we decided to let you do it.

"I hope you won't hate the memory of my generation. Mostly, they were darn fine people. They would have liked to leave you the same rich, debt-free heritage that they received, but in the name of progress we had to get money from someone. We took it from you. Thanks.

"With appreciation,

"GREAT-GREAT-GRANDPA JIM."

Saturday Evening Post Endorses Youth Employment and Adult Basic Education Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial published in the February 9, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Unemployment and the Reading Problem."

The editorial notes that one of the most important reasons that many unemployed persons in the United States find difficulty in obtaining jobs is that they are unable to read and write.

The Department of Labor has found that many potential retrainees under the Manpower Retraining Act passed by the last Congress are unable to participate in the retraining programs because they are functional illiterates. In my own congressional district we have a manpower retraining project in being at the present time, and I know that this has already proved to be a problem.

I applaud the Saturday Evening Post therefore for endorsing two measures which will come before Congress this year and which will prove helpful in attacking the problem of unemployment, the youth employment bill and the adult basic education bill.

The editorial follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE READING PROBLEM

Unemployment in the United States continues at a disturbingly high level, about 5.5 percent. In the age of automation it is most severe among the unskilled, causing a nationwide chorus of advice to young people to stay in school. Yet of the 26 million who will come into the labor market during the next decade, nearly one-third, if present trends continue, will not have a high school diploma. The Bureau of Labor statistics reports that the 300,000 increase in unemployed late in 1962 was made up almost entirely of teenagers.

Among several reasons for school dropouts; one of the most important is that the student never really learned to read. In a New York State training school for young lawbreakers one-third of the boys from 12 to 15 could read only at the second-grade level. Dr. Emery Stoops of the University of Southern California says, "Poor reading ability handicaps students in all subjects, poor readers tend to get poor marks, and students with poor marks get discouraged and drop out of

school." Dr. James B. Conant recently reported: "In the slums one finds today an incredibly large percentage of pupils who may properly be designated as slow and very slow readers." In a Negro slum in a large American city, Dr. Conant found 70 percent of the boys and girls over 16 out of school and unemployed. Joblessness for those under 21, he reported, is 2½ times as high as for the whole population. Today there are an estimated three dropouts for every two unskilled jobs—a really alarming figure. Among the poor readers a good proportion have intelligence well above the average.

The dropouts are very likely to become delinquents. Dr. Melitta Schmideberg, a psychiatrist doing research in this field, says, "Reading retardation makes it almost impossible for the delinquent to find a job and unemployment aggravates his delinquency."

In Chicago half of the people on relief are functional illiterates—either they cannot read at all or can read so little as to be useless. Similar facts were unearthed in Detroit and Philadelphia. In some cities those on relief are compelled to study reading. In many communities it is being taught by television, early in the morning; some people who are too proud to join classes are willing to learn in this way.

In regions with very high chronic unemployment, where retraining programs have been instituted, about one-third of the potential retrainees are barred because of illiteracy. In some universities 20 percent of the freshmen have to take remedial reading; obviously the percentage of those who need the remedy is higher among dropouts from elementary or secondary school.

A bitter battle is raging in the educational world over methods used in the United States to teach reading. Few laymen are competent to judge the merits of the battle, but they can see that it is time to abandon prejudices and solve the reading problem.

Arthur S. Trace, Jr., in "What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't," notes that no such difficulty exists in the Soviet Union. Educators who have studied the question report that most Russian children learn to read early and well. The countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia say there is rarely any problem, once a child, or an adult, has been given a chance to learn.

It is embarrassing that the greatest nation on earth should have such a high rate of unemployment that can in large measure be associated with a failure to teach many of our young people anything so fundamental as reading. The 87th Congress passed the Manpower Retraining Act to cope with the problem of training unskilled workers but failed to act on two other important measures: the adult basic education bill and the youth opportunities bill. The 88th Congress should pass both of them.

"Horizon": Story of California Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the general public, service clubs, schools, and all other interested organizations and audiences, the showing of the motion picture entitled "Horizon."

This film was produced by the Council of California Growers, whose organization was founded by the farmers of California for the purpose of creating a better understanding between farming and nonfarming people.

This nonpartisan 28-minute color film portrays a vivid and revealing story of California agriculture and its importance, particularly in the national economy.

It is noteworthy of the growers council that they have taken the time to provide this media to enlighten new generations of our citizens with factual information about California agriculture, and help these young people to better understand the interdependence between urban and rural areas.

Produced as a public service, narrated by Joel McCrea, and praised by the director of agriculture and the California State Board of Agriculture, "Horizon" is considered educational and leaves the viewer with a new concept of the role California agriculture plays in the areas of farming.

Vocational Education in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1, 1963, issue of Washington Report, a weekly publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, there appears a short but very interesting item on vocational education in the State of Connecticut. This item pays tribute to Connecticut which has distinguished itself through its 50-year program of highly specialized training in technical, trade, and industrial education.

Some 7,500 young people in our State are currently receiving training in vocational schools on the high-school level, and some 30,000 other persons are given technical training under the auspices of the State board of education's vocational education division. I agree with the view expressed in the publication that much more needs to be done in this field. This would certainly be a significant factor in decreasing unemployment.

Much credit for these achievements in the field of vocational education in Connecticut is due to Mr. Joseph T. Nerden, director of the division of vocational education, State department of education. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the following brief article from Washington Report:

EDUCATION

Connecticut has distinguished itself through its 50-year program of highly specialized training in technical, trade, and industrial education. Under the supervision of the Connecticut State Board of Education, this vocational school division operates brandnew regional vocational technical institutions offering instruction on the high school level to more than 7,500 young people. Graduation upon completion of 12 grades provides students with high school diplomas. Many of these young people go on to higher education.

In addition to the day school program and an extensive evening program geared to needs of employed craftsmen and apprentices, the division helps to train over 30,000 other individuals in Connecticut.

Another system of highly specialized schools operating as State Technical Institutes, is expanding; several additional schools are now under construction. These provides advanced training and prepare engineers and technicians for associate degrees.

Although some businessmen and educators in other States and communities have developed comprehensive vocational training programs, much more needs to be done in this field.

Statement of Carlton Skinner for Presentation to Senate Committee on Interior Affairs, February 6, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Interior Affairs Committee has been holding hearings on the President's nomination of the Honorable Manuel Guerrero to be Governor of Guam.

The Honorable Carlton Skinner, the first civilian Governor of Guam and presently residing in New York, filed with this committee a statement in support of Mr. Guerrero.

It has been my pleasure to know Mr. Guerrero, and I enjoin with Mr. Skinner in urging that Mr. Guerrero be confirmed in the position to which he has been nominated.

I include in these remarks the following statement made by Mr. Skinner:

STATEMENT OF CARLTON SKINNER FOR PRESENTATION TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 6, 1963

My name is Carlton Skinner. I reside at 347 East 84th Street, New York City. As Governor of Guam from 1949 to 1953 I enjoyed the privilege of appearing before this committee and am aware of the many demands on its time. Therefore, by statement will be brief.

Manuel Guerrero will be an outstanding Governor of Guam. He is able, careful, thoughtful, patient, studious, courageous, diligent, and patriotic. During my term of office as Governor of Guam I worked as closely with him as with any other person in the territory. I found his judgment sound, his sympathy generous, his understanding realistic, and his performance of duty conscientious. As early as 1950 I named him as acting Governor during the occasional enforced absence from the territory both of the Governor and the government secretary. This began for him a dozen years of continuous major responsibility for the sound and proper conduct of governmental affairs in Guam.

Guam is a small and remote territory of the United States with a small population. These facts sometimes deceive the unthinking. Guam is also America's part of the Far East, the show window for democracy in that

enormous area of conflicting ideologies. The success of our Government in providing stable administration, opportunity for all citizens, protection for private enterprise, and support for the common good is watched closely in the foreign nations that rim the Pacific. Add to this the fact that, in the interests of economy and efficiency, all local governmental functions are performed by the territorial government, as well as many Federal functions. The government of Guam embraces the responsibilities of State, county, and city government, school, college, sanitation, and utility districts, harbor board, water supply, and many other services. It provides all civil law enforcement, detention facilities for the local and Federal governments, and space and facilities for the U.S. court and for other Federal functions. In small and large ways, too numerous to mention, it supports and assists the armed services in maintenance of the vital air and naval installations in Guam. It provides logistic help for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific. It provides the passport service for the State Department. The Governor of Guam is first and foremost the President's representative who must at all times keep in mind the national interest.

Manuel Guerrero is fully capable of discharging this complex and important set of responsibilities with honor. In addition, he has a humility and natural understanding of the impact of government on the individual citizen. It is my belief that he views government as a collection of services maintained to do collectively for the people only those things which they are unable or are prevented from doing for themselves. It is my belief that he respects the dignity of the individual human being and recognizes that such dignity can be preserved only if the individual human being is self-reliant and capable of deciding his own problems and determining his own future without the enervation of subjection to bureaucratic institutions. I respectfully urge that this committee recommend his confirmation to the Senate.

Telephone Workers Displeased With Pension System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that telephone workers associated with the Bell System are highly dissatisfied with the pension plans in operation by this company. They are particularly displeased with the practice of the Bell System in deducting one-half of social security payments from the pension payments. I understand that about 100,000 telephone union members from Maine to Maryland are affected.

Recent issues of Union Voice, the monthly publication of the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers, carried articles on this subject. I believe it would be to the benefit of both labor and management associated with the Bell System, as well as to the State of Connecticut and the other East Coast States, if steps were taken to rectify this situation. Perhaps the suggestion of the telephone workers union for "the elimination at the end of 2 years when the company has recovered all they have contributed for the individual pensioner" could be a way toward a solution.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD two brief articles on the subject which appeared in the November and December 1962 issues of the above-mentioned publication. They are as follows:

[From Union Voice, November 1962]

ALLIANCE RESOLVES TO CRACK BELL SYSTEM PENSION BARRIER

The Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions has resolved to press for changes in the current Bell System pension plan. This pronouncement was made at the quarterly conference held by the alliance on October 3 and 4 in Hartford, Conn. The meeting, which was presided over by Alliance President John Shaughnessy, of the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers, was attended by 40 delegates. These people represented about 100,000 independent telephone union members from Maine to Maryland.

For many years, a constant cause of irritation to all telephone workers has been the inadequate Bell System pension plan. This inadequacy has been magnified in recent years as the result of increased living costs and the steady climb of medical care. Telephone unions have tried many times, on an individual basis, to bring about some modifications to this plan but all attempts have met with failure. In fact the last significant improvement was negotiated first by the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers in changing the formula from 10 years to 5 years. This year, the alliance has resolved to take action on this issue in 1963 in the hopes that the energy of about 100,000 independent union members will provide the momentum necessary to force a change. The 1963 pension program outlined by the alliance is as follows:

1. Increase the present pension formula from 1 to 1½ percent.
2. Eliminate the practice of deducting social security from pension payments. This alone would result in a substantial increase to Bell System pensioners.
3. Provide for survivorship clauses in pension plans so that an employee's spouse or children can gain the benefits due the deceased pensioner.
4. Provide liberal allowances for voluntary retirement.
5. Increase the minimum pension.

The alliance also discussed other issues and heard a report from Henry Mayer, alliance counsel, on a proposed Communications Labor Act. This would remove telephone employees from the jurisdiction of the Taft-Hartley and bind both the unions and associated Bell System companies to submit certain issues to a three-man national communications mediation board to be named by the President of the United States. The function of this board would be to act on a dispute concerning changes in pay, rules, or working conditions not adjusted by the parties in conference and any other dispute not referable to arbitration and not adjusted in conference between the parties or where conferences are refused. In supporting the proposal for a Communications Labor Act, Mayer observed that the unions would be giving up the right to strike only in exchange for another right—that of arbitration. He noted that in today's changing, complex society, the trend is toward the abandonment of the strike instrument in favor of the judicial arbitration of a labor dispute. Also inferred from Mayer's talk was the point of view that in the telephone industry the strike itself is apt to be rather ineffective in such a highly automated and mechanized business. Mayer's main theme was that in these changing times telephone union members must reach out and accept such new concepts as the creation of a Communications Labor Act.

The alliance also condemned the current raiding tactics of the Teamsters in New York. Alliance President Shaughnessy defined the Teamsters clearly when he said, "The alliance does not consider the Teamsters' Union as part of the independent labor movement." He went on to observe that the Teamsters are independent in name only and this, he concluded, "is by accident, not design."

[From Union Voice, December 1962]

BELL SYSTEM PRACTICE CUTS PENSION INCOME

For many years, a source of irritation to telephone workers has been the Bell System practice of deducting one-half of social security payments from pension payments. This arrangement has been objected to since its inception and many unions have attempted to stop this practice through negotiations. To this date, none have been successful, but a renewed attempt is in the making as a result of the recent quarterly conference of the Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions. At this meeting, the independent labor movement within the telephone industry placed this objective high on the list of matters to be settled in 1963.

The Bell System, generally, maintains a noncontributory pension plan. All funds needed to support the plan are contributed by the employer from operating expenses. In some companies, a gigantic combination fund is established to take care of both pension and sick payments. Because the individual employee does not contribute to the pension fund, he is accorded no voice in its distribution or administration.

Presently, in the Southern New England, a retiree's pension is based upon his 5 highest years' earnings. Applied to the average annual salary is a percentage figure which represents 1 percent for each year of service. For example, if a retiree has amassed 30 years service and his average wage for his five highest paid years was $6,000 his base pension would be 30 percent of $6,000.

However, the factor of social security is applied at this point which tips the scales in favor of the employer.

During productive years, the workingman contributes a portion of his salary to a social security fund. The Government has also decreed that the employer contribute a like amount on behalf of each worker. It is the contention of the Bell System that since it has contributed one-half of the social security payments for each employee, it is entitled to one-half of the benefits which will be derived. Therefore, each Bell System company deducts one-half of the retiree's social security income from the company-provided pension payment. Based on the above example, the pensioner would be scheduled to receive 30 percent of $6,000 or $1,800 per year. Added to this would be the maximum social security payment of $128 per month or $1,536 per year for a total annual income of $3,336. However, the company deducts one-half of the social security which reduces the pensioner's annual income by $768.

The objection of most unions to this practice of deducting one-half the social security payments from pensions is twofold. First, it is held that the originators of social security never intended employers to recover money which was contributed on behalf of an employee. Secondly, it was never intended that employers regain more money than they have contributed. This is best illustrated by the following figures and the fact that the average life expectancy of a telephone worker who retires at 65 is 76. The

following example is based on a worker who retires in 1962 with 30 years' service:

Contribution: Based on maximum assessments starting in 1937 and ceasing in 1962	$1,289
Employer contribution: Based on above	1,289
Total contributions	2,578
Maximum social security benefits as of January 1962	128
Amount deducted by the company commencing with retirement	64
At the end of the first retirement year, the company has recovered	768
21 months after retirement, the company has recovered	1,344
It the pensioner lives until 76, the company has recovered	8,448

This simple arithmetic indicates to one and all why the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers has and will continue to press for an end to this practice.

If not the complete elimination then at least the elimination at the end of 2 years when the company has recovered all they have contributed for the individual pensioner.

Herb Israel: Voice of the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukee was shocked and saddened recently by the suddent death of Herbert Israel, managing editor of the Milwaukee Times, and a prominent figure in the Milwaukee community.

A veteran newsman, Mr. Israel was for years an effective and respected editorial voice in civic and political affairs. The south side of Milwaukee, in my congressional district, was his special "beat" and there were few important events in the community which escaped his attention.

Personally, I have known Mr. Israel for many years as a good friend and respected counselor. It was to him that I went from time to time on controversial issues that affected our Nation, the State of Wisconsin, and the metropolitan area of Milwaukee. His advice to me was always frank, reasoned, and valuable.

The finest testimony of the high respect in which Mr. Israel was held by our community is contained in the following article from the Milwaukee Times of January 30, 1963:

HERBERT ISRAEL FATALLY STRICKEN

Funeral services for Herbert Matthew Israel, 62, managing editor of the Times, were held Friday, January 25, at Weiss Funeral Home. Cremation, specified in Mr. Israel's will, followed at Wisconsin Memorial Park Cemetery.

Mr. Israel was stricken at North Water and East Erie Streets, Wednesday, January 23, shortly after leaving the Milwaukee Press Club, 125 East Wells Street, where he frequently went for lunch. Death was attributed to a heart attack.

Mr. Israel was born in Two Rivers, Wis., and was brought to Milwaukee when he was about 8 or 9 years old. He graduated from West Division High School in 1918 when he was valedictorian of his class.

Mr. Israel worked about 20 years for the old Wisconsin News when he covered city hall, the courthouse, did rewriting and was on general assignment. For a time at the News he wrote movie reviews.

His connection with motion pictures was a lasting one and at one time or another served the motion picture industry in a variety of capacities. He handled publicity for movie houses and even operated a study service for movie theater operators.

WAS AD MANAGER

For the last 7 years, Mr. Israel had been advertising manager of Samsons Enterprises, 222 East Erie Street.

During the two decades after Mr. Israel's graduation from high school he spent nearly all his time in the newspaper business and formed the vast network of acquaintances, friends and sources that brought him admiration from his fellow newsmen.

Mr. Israel did stray from newspapers for a number of months, though, when he operated a delicatessen for a time. The venture did not prove successful, though, and the lure of newspapers pulled him back to the world of deadlines, harassment by editors and long hours for usually small pay.

When the old Wisconsin News began its decline in 1937, about the time when it changed names and appeared as the Milwaukee News, Mr. Israel left.

He joined the Times in February 1938, when he was listed officially as assistant editor. Through the years, Mr. Israel was officially and unofficially known as the editor, the editor in chief, associate editor, publisher, copublisher, owner and part owner. At the time of his death he officially was managing editor, a title bestowed when the Times changed hands on April 1, 1962, after 74 years in the Towell family.

GOT NEW TITLE

Even in the past few weeks a new title was bestowed on the managing editor. Mail addressed to the associated editor often came to him at the Times' office from Mayor Henry W. Maier's city hall staff.

Practically all of the editorials in the Times since 1938 were written by Mr. Israel. In earlier years, the Times did not run editorials every week but only when issues prompted them. This practice was changed shortly after Mr. Israel started at the Times and weekly editorials became the practice.

Mr. Israel also wrote nearly all of the political news carried by the newspaper as well. One of the managing editor's fondest loves was politics and the people involved therein.

It was this interest that prompted Mr. Israel to write under the name of Matt Hughes and occasionally Hugh Morris.

USED MIDDLE NAME

The name Matt Hughes was derived from Mr. Israel's middle name, Matthew, which divided became Matt * * * Hew.

Hugh Morris was a name chosen by Mr. Israel that represented his flare for the unique and clever. The name, so the story goes, is derived from the word "humerous," thus Hugh Morris.

Through the years at the Times Mr. Israel played a major role in developing the policy of the paper, although the decisions were joint ones, both under the old ownership and the new when W. F. Nackie and William D. Mitchelson bought the firm in April 1962.

Mr. Israel was a member of the Milwaukee Press Club, the Elks, Mitchell Street Advancement Association, South 16th Street-Muskego Avenue Advancement Association, and National Avenue Advancement Association.

He also was associated, through the Times, with the South Division Civic Association, Council of South Side Advancement Associations, Greenfield Avenue Advancement Association, Lincoln Avenue Advancement Association, South 13th Street Association, Bay View Business Men's Association, and the Bay View Inter-Organization Council.

SPOKE FROM SHOULDER

Mr. Israel was in great demand as a speaker and master of ceremonies at South Side functions.

At meetings and dinners he never failed to get a rise out of his audience. He spoke straight from the shoulder and was never afraid to criticize members of his audience if he felt criticism was due. Good-natured ribbing played a big role in his talks and served to make him a sought-after entertainer.

The many condolences offered on Mr. Israel's death were a measure of the esteem in which he was held in Milwaukee.

Mayor Meier said in a statement:

"I have just learned of the death of Herb Israel, a fearless journalist, who, in the years I have known him, earned well-described recognition as Mr. South Side.

"Herb was a man who, throughout a long newspaper career called them as he saw them.

"His articles in the Times often were the most penetrating analyses of the local scene that a Milwaukeean could find.

"His courage, his fire are not often found.

"I am proud that he was a friend of mine and my heart goes out to his family."

DOYNE COMMENTS

John Doyne, Milwaukee County executive, commented:

"All of us in county government have known Herb and his work. We had found him to be an accurate and fair reporter in all his activities. I think we have lost a good newspaperman."

Charles Benson, former manager of the Milwaukee Press Club, said of the managing editor: "He was a very quiet, reserved fellow. All of us at the press club liked him very much."

REGRETS OFFERED

In a statement, issued on behalf of the Mitchell Street Advancement Association, Joseph Dries, executive secretary of the group, said:

"In this era of change and crises, the stability and leveling influence and dedication of Mr. Israel will be greatly missed.

"We deeply regret his passing."

Rabbi Jay R. Brickman, of Congregation Sinai, 8223 North Port Washington Road, of which Mr. Israel was a member, summed up the feelings of the community.

"He was not only a near friend," Rabbi Brickman said at the funeral service Friday, "but was the symbol of integrity. * * * Integrity marked every area of Herb's life. * * *"

The rabbi dwelt at length on the editor's career. "He dealt in words, but did not use them to blind and fool and mislead. What he wrote was the truth. There was no fear in him, no anger in him—only the truth."

ALL WERE DEAR

The rabbi said he was a friend of Mr. Israel's and explained that some people found the man hard to know, but when you met him face to face you knew right away if he liked you or if he didn't.

Every member of the community, big or small, the rabbi said, was dear to Mr. Israel if they were real men.

The 100 and more people who attended the funeral heard that Mr. Israel was not rich in material wealth but had a fortune in life's blessings. He spent his life doing the work that he loved, the rabbi said.

The rabbi pointed out the blessings of life in Mr. Israel's family circle. His love for his wife, Erma L., his son, Jack, of 1016 East Glencoe Place, Bayside, his daughter-in-law and grandson, all went to fill the life of Mr. Israel.

Mr. Israel's quiet word had real impact on the South Side, where he was a respected citizen, the rabbi said.

The greatest tribute, according to the rabbi, was found in his own words: "If I had this life to relive, I would do everything exactly the same way."

"THIS PERFECT MAN"

The rabbi's prayer at the conclusion of the service in the funeral home asked that "God receive his noble soul in perfect love * * * the memory of this perfect man remains with us."

A few of those who paid their respects to Mr. Israel included County Judge Thaddeus J. Pruss, Mayor Maier, County Judge Christ T. Seraphim, County Judge William R. Moser, Circuit Judge Robert M. Curley, City Comptroller John Kalupa, Harold and Ernest Towell, former owners of the Times; Walter G. Wegner, former Milwaukee Sentinel city editor and now business news editor; Alderman Erwin Zillman (ward 17); Charles I. Wesley, president of Wesley Steel Treating Co.; Circuit Judge Elmer W. Roller, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to the above eulogy and the numerous expressions of homage paid to this good friend and able journalist. My wife joins me in extending sincere sympathy to Mrs. Israel and the family.

Did J.F.K. Say Free Flow of News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, has written two editorials on two subjects which are currently of vital interest to all of us. Mr. Dancey presents his views in editorials entitled "Did J.F.K. Say Free Flow of News?" and "Where Were J.F.K.'s Plans for Cuba?" under date of February 3 and February 8, and I respectfully request unanimous consent that they be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Feb. 3, 1963]

DID J.F.K. SAY FREE FLOW OF NEWS?

Every organization operates more by example than by rules, and this simple principle has caused a strange situation in Washington that grates on the instincts of any newsman.

A little string inside keeps twanging away: "Something is wrong. Something is very wrong here."

A good deal, in fact, has been said and written by concerned—even upset—members of the Washington press corps, dealing in detail with stringent "rules" for the press, including such things as the requirement of Government people to report every encounter with a newsman, and the subject of any conversation, plus the injunction to do it quick.

The President was asked about some of these rules in press conferences and pledged himself to the "free flow of information," and said the purpose was to protect intelligence matters—which have always been secret.

But it is not the rules, as such, that cause the trouble. It is the atmosphere they help to create. The President makes another major contribution to this atmosphere by the constant yarns that go the rounds of his calling up reporters, himself, at any and all hours to give them hell, compliment them, or even argue over the choice of a word in some minor detail.

His brother, Bobby, so the stories go, has called reporters, given them the very devil, and told them they were to be "locked out" of any information.

I inquired of one licensing agency about some simple, standard, statistical data that is the public record in any city hall or statehouse in the land and would be opened without hesitation.

ANSWER. "Oh, I couldn't give out that kind of information without the direct authority of the director—and he's out of town."

I pursued the experiment elsewhere in that establishment, making it a point not to ask anything except the kind of public record that is available to any citizen in a normal city.

Repeatedly, they wanted full "identification," plus exactly what information I wanted and what I intended to do with it. Which is none of their business.

One person had the good sense to feel uncomfortable holding out, and went into a lengthy and rambling explanation.

"This isn't like any other city," he explained. I had made no comparison. This was entirely on his own. "Here you try to live up to the rules, but you never know but what the person you deal with may turn out to be a Senator, or a Senator's secretary, or a Senator's brother-in-law, and a little straightforward decision carrying out the rules can end in a big fuss in the Capitol.

"We don't just have to get along with the mayor, who we might know or pretty well know what he wants and expects. Any little thing we do can go up, and up, and all the way up to the President of the United States. We have to be careful."

ANOTHER. "Say we make a decision and something goes wrong. All hell can break loose clear to the White House."

Several times when I left people, their parting remarks were: "Just forget you talked to me."

I called on an old friend in a pretty high position and just gave his secretary my name.

"Are you a friend?" she asked. (Advance, friend, and give the countersign.)

"Yes," I said, and "also a newspaperman if that makes any difference."

"Well," she said, "are you calling as a friend, or as a newspaperman?"

"Let's say as a newspaperman, why?"

"He's in a meeting, and I'd rather not interrupt."

"No need to, just give him my name and number."

"Just a minute sir. Would you mind telling me just what it is you want to talk to him about?"

Well, and so it goes.

An atmosphere has been created in Washington in which a shockingly large number of people dealing with nonsensitive matters, completely, are just plain scared.

One of my nonsensitive friends who was a New Dealer, and who cheered for the New Frontier, now says: "This is a form of McCarthyism in method and tactics. And it may be even more dangerous."

It certainly isn't healthy in any democracy, and a basic tradition is being badly bent.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Feb. 8, 1963]

WHERE WERE J.F.K.'S PLANS FOR CUBA?

The real shock to us, after hearing Defense Secretary McNamara's report Wednesday, is the realization that in the Cuban crisis, not only did the administration withhold from the American people the seriousness of the situation—and even go out of its way to minimize it—but they did not prepare to meet it.

We didn't even have a defensive huddle, apparently, until after we actually saw the ball snapped, and then we hastily improvised a policy and a reaction.

We ran the whole crisis, impromptu, a capella, by the seat of our pants. We tried to invent an invasion plan and make covered preparations for it on the spur of the moment. We maneuvered the fleet into a new concept by radio from Washington catch-as-catch-can.

And we decided what to do only after the facts were overwhelmingly proven as to just exactly where the ball carrier was going.

This is unbelievable and amateurish.

After the Berlin wall caught us completely by surprise and unprepared, we said that this country needs an agency to anticipate possible Soviet moves and do some advance planning for the countermoves.

This seems to be a standard practice in everything but the most critical area of our national life.

The war colleges run tactical problems against Soviet staffs, just as every football team in the country runs its practices with the opposing team assigned to run the other guy's formations and the other guy's plays.

Yet the most critical conflict in the world was run off the tops of the heads of a hastily assembled kitchen cabinet, and the military forces of this country handled in a make-shift manner by a civilian command.

Is a Cuban threat so unexpected that these grave questions could not have been hammered out long before the emergency, and vast preparations made for the tremendous problems of moving ships and men, so that "Plan A," or "Plan B" or "Plan C" could simply be put into operation rather than improvised at the moment?

You can't improvise a defense in football, these days, with 11 men very well, much less affairs that involve thousands.

And this kind of reaction explains why the best we do is hold them to "short yardage." We do not anticipate a play; we don't adjust our forces; and we have not once "red-dogged" and thrown them for a loss.

Those ships should have been in position at least three weeks earlier and perhaps more on the basis of known information, ready to move quickly and automatically into effective "quarantine" positions, without the position give-aways of using radio systems.

The landing craft for invasion should have been sited a month earlier for ready deployment—on signal.

There ought to be established in this Government a special "Politburo," we repeat, whose business it is to pretend they are sitting in the Kremlin and to think up the possible actions they might take from a Russian point of view.

And this should be made up of action people who have had experience with the Soviets, have studied their past and present activities in depth, and who think in terms of physical actions more than in legal or diplomatic terms. That's where we've been caught lying dead in the water with our engines off, twice.

We would like to see a Dwight Eisenhower, Lucius Clay, Admiral Burke, Dean Acheson, Christian Herter, Gen. Mark Clark team—including some long time research professors in this field—advising the Kennedy administration of what they might expect, and by that very function putting them under political pressure to have advance planning made on the alternative reactions.

We flunked in Berlin and they got their wall.

We were lucky as the very devil in Cuba, as we now discover, and they still made a sizable gain at the very least, there, in military potential.

We can't expect to be lucky all the time if we keep making up our plays as we go along.

This isn't a sand lot game we're in.

Woman's New Role in Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the appendix of the RECORD I am pleased to include a speech delivered by my colleague the Honorable CATHERINE MAY to the recent National convention of the NRECA at Las Vegas, Nev. The speech follows:

WOMAN'S NEW ROLE IN RURAL AMERICA

(Address of Representative CATHERINE MAY of Washington State at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association Annual meeting, Las Vegas, Nev., January 14, 1963)

I certainly do appreciate the invitation to participate in your 21st annual meeting. I express this appreciation as a Member of Congress who serves on the House Agriculture Committee which concerns itself, as your organization does, with the problems, the programs, and the potential of the American farmer. An exchange of ideas on a subject of mutual interest is always of mutual benefit. I express this also as one who has the good fortune to have been born and raised in a congressional district which has seen the passage of many milestones in natural resources development which have contributed to the economic welfare of the State of Washington, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation. In addition to being one of the Nation's richest agricultural areas, my eastern half of the State of Washington provides part of the winding home of two great rivers—the Columbia and the Snake. Many magnificent dams, including the Grand Coulee, and great reclamation and irrigation projects are the familiar status symbols to which we point proudly in our part of the State of Washington. It is in this area where you find the huge atomic installation known as the Hanford plant which soon will house a reactor that really will be dual purpose, thanks to a successful battle waged in the last Congress. As one who represents this District in Congress, I feel I am justified in pointing with pride to its wonders, but you in this room can do even more. You not only can point with pride but, on behalf of your organization, claim some of the credit for these developments. The rural electrification program has played a most significant role in this progress in my part of the State, as well as all parts of the State of Washington.

Thus far, I have presented to you my credentials as a wife, mother, homemaker, and Member of Congress from a rural area of our Nation. I make a point of these qualifications because your organiaztion has asked me to participate in this conference by talking about "Woman's New Role in Rural America." I feel it is only fair to warn you that under this title my basic message concerns itself with how desperately participation is needed in helping to solve the problems that are peculiar to those of us who live on the farmlands of America. In an editorial aside, may I say I am well aware that this is a mixed audience today. I not only invite the men to feel perfectly free to listen, but express a wistful hope that some of the message might rub off on them too. Wherever I can find a captive audience, I invariably stress the theme, "Get out of the house and get busy."

In looking back over this series of speeches, I find that about the only thing that has changed about the kind of speech I give on this subject is the urgency, the ever-increasing urgency, which I feel as I present this message to women like yourselves.

So many Americans today seem to be forgetting that they are the Government. In America, you are the Government. Government officials and politicians just work in Washington, D.C., hired by you. You and I are America, and we have got to act like it. We have got to act like it because we are at the greatest worldwide crossroad crisis of all, and that means that active participation in every way possible to help our Nation progress and grow strong and follow the wise road is the moral as well as the citizenship duty of every American. America isn't just any nation. It isn't just one of a family of nations. America is a Nation that has a great mission for the benefit of liberty-loving people everywhere. If America does not stand as a burning beacon of hope for freedom to all the peoples of the world, who are today under tyranny, then it is nothing. And, there you have as briefly as I can express it, my own personal inspiration for constantly urging participation on my fellow Americans.

I suppose that actually the title of my speech today should be "Woman's New Role in the New Rural America," because if participation is to be your role then you must know how to participate effectively. I learned long ago that inspiration is one thing but oftentimes translating it into practical action is another.

Naturally, to participate effectively we must first know what problems need to be solved, come up with some sound ideas for solving them, and then try to get other people to join the cause. And, it is just as important that we pick our cause. By that I mean select an area where we think our own experience and interest and special talents qualify us to help solve the problem most effectively. Most of us in this room, by virtue of the place we live and the work we do, owe our allegiance to the cause of helping to solve the problems of the new rural America so that American agriculture can remain strong. And, make no mistake about it, this is a great and important participation project. Because unless American agriculture remains a balanced force of strength in our economy, as it adjusts to the changes of the modern world, then our Nation cannot remain strong. In just the next 50 years the farmers of this Nation are going to have to find ways to produce food for twice as many mouths as they are feeding today. Yet, in that same period of time, land that is now being used for farming is going to decrease by 50 million acres. We have to solve this problem. What will happen if we don't solve it is written in words of doom on the wall of history. Mr. Khrushchev and Mao tse-Tung are reading those words right now. No civilization no matter what its form of government or what heights it has attained, scientifically and culturally, can survive hunger.

And, what is the look of this new rural America? Well, first of all, it is a paradox of shrinking and expansion. For several decades the farmers have been moving to town and the city folk have been moving to the country. This has resulted in what I call the twilight zone of ruburbia. It is a neither fish or fowl area, bounded on one side by the ever more crowded metropolis and on the other side by the ever less populous farmland. The problems of rural America are no longer confined within the fences around pasture and field. They extend through ruburbia to the city limit sign at the metropolis.

There are others here this week who will talk more in detail and more knowledgeably on what has brought about this new look to the rural area. But, very briefly, I am sure you know it is because in recent years machinery, new scientific methods of planting, fertilizing, harvesting, modern marketing programs and several other factors have made it possible for less farmers to produce more food and fiber. In 1900, 1 out of every 3 workers was engaged in agriculture—today, that proportion has become about 1 in 18. Agriculture has shown a greater increase in productivity than any other sector of our Nation's economy. We have produced two-third's more food and fiber on our farms and, at the same time, have used 25 percent less farm employment and 20 percent less hired farmworkers to do it. The Subcommittee on Family Farms of the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, has been studying this trend for many years. It is reassuring to note that present statistics show that the family farm is still the backbone of American agriculture and bids fair to remain so. But the plain fact is that today it takes less of the family to operate the farm. Larger farm units with less people operating them because this is the efficient way to do it and, I must pause here to confer on REA and the rural electrification program the mixed blessing of credit for this trend because of the major contribution they make to supplanting the plug we used to hitch to the wagon with the plug we shove in the wall. I say mixed blessing because this new look in rural America has brought many new problems that I will touch on in a moment.

As for ruburbia, this is peopled by those who make their living at jobs in the city but make their home on a farm or in a rural area. You know this picture well because almost half of the consumers you now serve are nonfarm, which includes many in those urban areas who live there because they like the joy of country life away from the disadvantages of pavement lawns and concrete gardens. And here again, we find the mixed blessing of change and progress which brings us participation responsibilities brought about by needed adjustment to a population shift.

The problems? You know them well. Rural America is suffering from unemployment, underemployment and low income. Those who have studied this problem are far from in agreement on methods of solution but there is quite general agreement among them on objectives. We must develop better income opportunities for those who have the desire and ability to stay on the farm. We must also develop off-farm rural area opportunities for employment. To do this we must encourage full cooperation from existing private and governmental programs. And, it follows that the job opportunities can be created only if we provide more educational skills to fit our young people in jobs where they are needed. It also follows that we must encourage the development of additional industries, services and trades in rural areas and we can only do this if we make rural communities livable.

I think there is something special about the American who has his roots on the farm. I want to keep his citizenship influence on this Nation in balance with the other types of population. I don't want to keep him on the farm if it is against his will or if it makes him a dependent, but I surely don't want to hurry him off the farm, either.

We are now embarked on three interrelated Federal programs that have great potential for helping us reach the objectives I have listed above. I am speaking of the area development and redevelopment programs and the manpower development and training program. The area development programs are directed to assist in the economic development of those areas plagued by high unemployment and/or low rural income. This assistance offered in the form of loans and grants, technical assistance and

training. The Manpower Development and Training Act is the first direct attempt made by Congress to find a longer range solution to the unemployment problem. It is based on the premise that unemployed workers can and will find jobs when they are qualified to hold them. It applies specifically to the subject I am discussing today because it is designed to train individuals in rural areas for both farm jobs and nonfarm employment. There is not time for me to go into detail on any of these Government programs today. I am sure you will be discussing them in other sessions of your annual meeting. I know that NRECA is already working with Government representatives on these programs. But I do want to say that if these programs are to be successful, they must be based primarily on local leadership and action. Without local cooperation, guidance and action, they won't be worth a plug nickel. And this is where I am going to get into the specifics on the ways that I know you women of rural electrification can help most effectively.

Education: We must see that the schools in our local areas—grade schools, high schools, junior colleges where they exist, vocational schools—are offering a curriculum and a training designed to provide our young people with the skills most needed in their own community or elsewhere in their urban centers. Here is where women can back up their school boards and school organizations in demanding an enriched curriculum or a reemphasized curriculum. Here is where we can bend every influence in persuading our young people not to drop out of high school, or to go to college, or to special vocational training in place of college. Here is where women can work individually and in groups on financial aid through loans or scholarships to help the young people in their rural area train for the jobs where they are so desperately needed.

Area redevelopment: The opportunities in these programs are almost endless. While your husbands are working in public or private organizations, on ways to attract new payroll into a rural area, whether it be a small industry or a process plant or a business agency, you can make a tremendous contribution in helping him sell your community as a good place to live. You know, those management executive boards who make the final decisions on locating a business or a plant or an industry look at a lot of important factors in making this decision. They look at the availability of power, and water, and labor, and land, and they take a good sharp look at the tax situation of this State, but they look at something else, too. They call their top personnel men in and they explain that they are considering a move to a certain area. Those men go home and tell their wives about this proposed move—and what do the wives ask? You know as well as I do. What kind of a town is it? What about the schools? And the Churches? What recreational and social and cultural facilities are there? Is it a pretty town? Will the people be warm and friendly? How about the health facilities? Well, have you taken a good look at your community lately? Would you want to move there? I have talked to many a business executive who said that a decision to choose one location over another many times rested in balance on a nice city park or a swimming pool and a good sewage system.

The rural electric wife: As you can see, I have just touched on a few of the possibilities for participation on your part in your new role in rural America. There are hundreds of other possibilities. And I am very sure that many of you are already engaged in one or more of the community improvement activities that help to improve your area. In this respect, about all I can hope to do is inspire in you a new urgency for getting on with the job and some new reasons for so doing.

Up to now, I have been talking about women fulfilling their responsibilities to the community in many traditional and familiar ways. But I would like to close by speaking on the very special and unique contributions you have to make to rural America because you are the member-owners of the rural electrics. If we are to create job opportunities by attracting new plants and industry into new areas, availability of electric power must keep up with demand. All available sources of power must be encouraged and fostered to grow with this demand. The rural electrification program must keep pace and must stay strong and productive so it can offer its special and unique service of power to rural areas development. To do this it must maintain public support and that can be gained only if there is public understanding. In this respect I think one of our biggest problems is being taken for granted. We have a whole generation of new consumers who just flip the switch. You and I flip that switch, too, but we have the knowledge and the remembrance of what a comparatively recent blessing it is and how hard we fought for this simple privilege. How long has it been since you have seized the opportunity to tell some newcomer or young wife in your area the simple but thrilling story of how electricity came to the farm? How long has it been since you read some of your husband's trade magazines or publications so that you could tell an interesting story using an easy-to-understand example of what keeps a consumer rate low? This is your very special role as a member of the NRECA family. Nobody else can play the part as well as you.

You in this room today represent a very important segment of those electrical utility groups who have developed rural America to its present strength. For this the Nation owes you much—and asks still more. Asks still more in its need for the special skills, knowledge, understanding, and faith you have to give if we are to keep American agriculture strong and growing. God grant you the strength, the wisdom, and the inspiration to make your participation complete and effective.

Income Tax Withholdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, judging from the caliber of a so-called public service announcement being distributed by the Internal Revenue Service, the average taxpayer is assumed to be pretty stupid and unaware of the heavy tax burden he is carrying to pay for his share of the tremendous cost of our Federal spending programs.

This announcement is similar to the animated cartoon used in a popular toothpaste TV commercial with the familiar line, "Look, Ma, no cavities."

In our federally produced commercial, the narrator is shown in the film interviewing Joe Doaks who tells how the boys down at the factory have been separated into two groups, A and B, for the past year. Group A has had "increased withholdings" all year. The scene then changes to Joe Doaks' home and shows him coming in the door holding up his form 1040A card exclaiming, "Look, Ma, no taxes." He then goes on to explain how much happier everyone in group A is because they do not have to pay any taxes and many receive refunds, whereas group B individuals frequently have to pay taxes.

The implication is clear that Joe Doaks and his fortunate friends in group A are paying no Federal income tax. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Joe and his friends in group A have paid more each week through the painless method of additional witholdings, permitting the Government to claim their substantial share of his earnings a little sooner than they might otherwise.

This clearly is another example of misleading advertising, and since the Federal Trade Commission is charged with the responsibility of protecting the American public from fraudulent and misleading advertising, I am referring this matter to that agency for investigation.

To me, this is just another insidious device of the welfare state planners to lull the people into further apathy as to the true cost of government. I hope such false advertising can be kept off the television screens of this Nation.

Public Image of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in "The Ventura County Rancher With Al Tiffany" column in the January 1963 issue of the Broadcaster, monthly publication of the Ventura County Farm Bureau:

THE VENTURA COUNTY RANCHER WITH AL TIFFANY

Have you ever had the feeling that something was not just right but you couldn't put your finger on it? Well, perhaps you have had that feeling about the public image of agriculture.

Public officials, private citizens, and even organizations often refer to the fact that agriculture is our most basic and productive industry and that it contributes the most to our overall economy. It is even said, now and then, that this is an agricultural country and that each of us is a farmer at heart.

But underneath it all one is forced to wonder how much of this is lipservice and just how sincerely it is meant. Now and then a suspicion creeps in that there is an underlying element of criticism.

Traditionally the farmer has been held apart from the rest of the populace—perhaps partly due to his own actions. But it is a truism that the image of the American farmer may take many forms.

One image is the embattled farmer and his defense of his fledgling country during the American Revolution. One is the country bumpkin who was the butt of jokes which required the services of someone who

was not quite bright. Another is the feeder at the public trough living on subsidies, and still another, the cruel taskmaster exacting hard labor from unfortunate peons at starvation wages. Then there is the farmer in his expensive car and the farmer who will enter the exclusive club of millionaires when his land is sold to the subdividers. And there are other images.

But why so many? Why not one composite image? What is it about the farmer which makes him the whipping boy of the jokesters, the hated land baron and the despised benefactor of governmental subsidy?

All this is the usual line of comment. But now a new factor has been added. The farmer is now movable. His farm is not a collection of fields and buildings but an economic factor which can be transferred, willy-nilly, out of the fertile flatlands and up into the foothills, without regard to soil, weather, transportation, water, or any of the things which contribute to the economic success of a farm. Or the farmer is a drain on the public pocketbook, and the workers which he attracts become public charges either in our jails, our hospitals, or on relief.

Rather than being the producer of new wealth which multiplies over and over, benefiting the economy with every turn, he is becoming an enemy of the people. Rather than being given recognition for paying a lion's share of the taxes, he is derided as a public charge and the breeding ground of social and economic ills at the expense of the remainder of the economy.

What sort of cancer is eating at the public consciousness that it can produce such images of agriculture? Let us hope that this is just a passing phase and that it will soon subside and go away.

In the Cuban Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 8, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

IN THE CUBAN CORNER

Perhaps, as Secretary McNamara says, there are no offensive weapons in Cuba, but we don't see how many Americans could be reassured by his elaborate but essentially confused television presentation. The undenied fact remains that at least 17,000 Soviet troops are deployed in Cuba, plus mammoth quantities of modern arms.

Actually, the precise numbers of men and types of weapons are somewhat beside the point. The most unreassuring thing about the whole business is the revelation of how dismally unfinished it is. We had the Soviets on the run, and now it is all too plain that we failed to run them all the way out.

There was no apparent need for this failure. The Government was undoubtedly right to focus its attention on getting the known intermediate-range missiles out of Cuba, and the military-diplomatic operation to that end was excellent. The partial blockade was accompanied by plain warnings of tougher action if the U.S. terms were not met.

But for that very reason the United States was in a perfect position to carry the exercise to its logical conclusion. It should have told Khrushchev to remove every last one of his soldiers and send in not so much as one more rifle, lest he risk the most serious consequences. Everything about the Soviet reactions in October argues that Khrushchev would have complied; indeed, how could he not have, smack up against the full array of U.S. military power?

Why wasn't it done? We suppose in part because of the same mental attitude which has so often bedeviled the United States in dealing with the Soviets, an attitude that in all fairness has been in evidence before as well as during this administration. It is a fear of pushing the enemy too far, of backing the bear into a corner from which it can escape only by attacking. The idea is always to give the Soviets a partial exit or some means of face saving.

As a general theory, this thinking has merit. It is obviously true that we can push the Soviets too far. If we had intervened in Hungary—their own property however illegally taken—they would have had almost no choice but to fight us and no one knows where it would have ended. Or in Berlin, we probably could have gotten away with knocking down the wall when it first went up, but if we had proceeded to take over East Berlin in the bargain, the Soviets couldn't let us do it without a fight. For the Soviets, those would be real corners.

But it is a total misunderstanding of the theory to apply it to Cuba, for Cuba is the exact reverse of those corners. Cuba is our frontyard, and the Soviets were rapidly pushing us into a corner. No matter who was President, the U.S. Government would have to react, and there would have been no reason to expect trouble from the Soviets if we had reacted all the way instead of just halfway. By not following through, we simply invited Khrushchev to go ahead with the present buildup.

Now the situation is immensely more difficult. We can still tell the Soviets to start packing, but we have lost almost all the powerful psychological leverage we enjoyed from Khrushchev's missile retreat in October. Now any U.S. move runs a greater risk of fighting Soviet troops.

Soon or late, one way or another, the business will have to be finished. When the time comes, let us at least have learned the lesson and for once do it right.

Miss Meredith Wood of Penn Yan, N.Y., Is Honored by Being Named New York State Junior Miss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday a lovely, charming, and most talented young lady who lives in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, Miss Meredith Wood, of Penn Yan, N.Y., was chosen for the honor of being New York State Junior Miss. Miss Wood is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Wood, of 114 Burns Terrace, Penn Yan. I know that all of us in the 35th Congressional District are pleased and honored by the selection of this gracious and lovely young lady, and I know that our thoughts and best wishes will go with her as she travels to Mobile, Ala., next month to compete in the 1963 National Junior Miss contest.

I will say to my colleagues here on this floor that New York, the great Empire State, now feels quite confident that with such a talented entrant in the national contest, New York's Junior Miss, Miss Wood, will soon be crowned as Miss America Junior Miss.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following press account from the Geneva Times, of February 11, of the events leading to Miss Wood's selection for this great honor:

MEREDITH WOOD—PENN YAN GIRL CAPTURES CROWN IN STATE JUNIOR MISS CONTEST

PENN YAN.—Blonde, blue-eyed Meredith Wood has been crowned "New York State Junior Miss" in competition in Schenectady Saturday night, and will compete for $6,000 in scholarships in the National Junior Miss Contest in Mobile, Ala., next month.

Meredith, 17-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Wood, of 114 Burns Terrace, was met in Dresden yesterday by a motorcade of Penn Yan Jaycee members, the sponsoring organization, and escorted to the Wagner Hotel for a reception and Coke party.

Wearing the gleaming crown she won in the State contest, Meredith stood in a reception line with her parents, Mayor John E. Buckley, and Jaycee President Donald Flynn and his wife, greeting hundreds of friends and well-wishers.

Fred Fellows, manager of the Geneva Coca Cola Bottling Co., provided Coke for the reception in behalf of his company, Coca Cola, with Bonnie Brooks fashions and Eastman Kodak, are cosponsors of the national contest.

At the State level, Meredith won an immense trophy, a $750 scholarship, a 10-piece wardrobe, and 2 cameras. Just 1 week earlier she won a $100 scholarship when she was acclaimed "Yates County Junior Miss" in competition with seven local nominees. Robert Pepper and Eugene Guild were cochairmen of the local Jaycee contest.

Meredith competed with 20 New York State girls in the Schenectady contest, and was judged in sportswear (blouse and shorts), in a talent contest in which she played the flute, and in an evening gown, together with personal interviews with the judges. Pat Patterson, of Albany, master of ceremonies at the event, also cited Meredith for her talent at the presentation of the trophy. A victory party at the Hotel VanCurler followed the contest. Local Jaycees Ralph Heil and Eugene James attended the State contest.

Contestants were judged on alertness and scholastic achievement, personal interview with the judges, on creative and performing arts, on poise and appearance, and on youth fitness.

Meredith is an honor student at Penn Yan Academy and plans to attend Potsdam University next fall where she will major in music.

What's Wrong in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial published in the New York Times of January 15, 1963, entitled, "What's Wrong in Vietnam?"

The editorial follows:

WHAT'S WRONG IN VIETNAM?

American officials have hastened to contradict pessimistic conclusions from last week's South Vietnamese battle with Vietcong guerrillas. Saigon's troops were reported to have shown a lack of offensive spirit and five American helicopters were shot down. General Harkins, the American commander in South Vietnam, defends the valor and courage of the Vietnamese soldiers. Admiral Felt, U.S. commander for the Pacific, says, after a visit to Saigon, that last week's battle was no harbinger of Vietcong success, as some observers have implied, but that, on the contrary, the South Vietnamese are definitely winning their war against the Communists.

It is worthwhile being reminded that losses in one battle, or even a dozen battles, do not portend loss of the war in South Vietnam. The fact remains, however, that serious defects of political policy and leadership in South Vietnam do seriously hamper the spirit and effectiveness of the South Vietnamese military forces. A defensive reaction to adverse reports about last week's battle should not obscure a deficiency that is well documented and is often cited by Americans on the spot in Vietnam.

Plainly, the South Vietnamese armed forces are not so good and spirited as they might be because a suspicious, dictatorial Government at Saigon must preoccupy itself with preserving itself in power, not just from Communists but from many patriotic Vietnamese who also oppose the Communists.

Loyalty to President Diem is the criterion for preferment among Vietnamese officers rather than ability. It is a situation that is not entirely eradicable in the circumstances that now exist in South Vietnam, but it is one that both the Americans and President Diem should try to alleviate. Last week's battle emphasizes the need for stronger efforts in this direction.

Representative Barratt O'Hara of Illinois

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for many, 50 years is a lifetime, but amongst us today, there is a gentleman from Illinois for whom 50 years is just a milestone in a career dedicated to serving his fellow man. A career, I might add, which I hope will continue for another 50 years. I refer to my very good friend and neighbor from Chicago, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, the able Representative from Illinois' Second District.

Fifty years ago, at the young age of 30, BARRATT was chosen as a candidate for the seat of Lieutenant Governor of Illinois—the youngest man ever to be considered for this important post. Needless to say, the people of Illinois, at the time, recognized his ability, his aggressiveness, and his dedicated spirit toward his country, by electing him to fill this office.

In this capacity he aroused great interest in the slave wages being paid in his State and this interest occasioned the passage of minimum wage laws in several of the States. It marked the beginning of providing decent wages for hard-working people who struggled to hold a place in society.

But this hallmark was not the beginning of his dedication towards the rights of free men, for he served his country well during its struggle in the Spanish-American War and World War I.

He is a man of many abilities. He enjoys a brilliant career as a lawyer—a champion in the defense of the poor and unfortunate. He is also noted as a journalist, author, orator, and businessman.

His career in the House of Representatives did not begin until 1949, but since that time, his many abilities have been of great value to his constituency as well as the Nation.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee he has proven his worth in solving the many problems encompassing this important field. He is a leading authority on African affairs and his knowledge and interest of Latin America have been valuable to our relationships with these world areas.

His success in life cannot be measured by any one outstanding achievement for there have been many accountable to him. He richly deserves the gratitude of our citizenry and I am pleased to have this opportunity to extend my best wishes to him on his golden anniversary of unselfish devotion to his country and neighbors.

May this remarkable record of service continue for many more years for there will always be a need for his wisdom and understanding of the many problems the Nation is confronted with each day.

Ernest Swift: Conservationist Extraordinary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the acknowledged leaders in the conservation field today is my good friend Ernest Swift, who now is semiretired and lives in my home district in Wisconsin. His distinguished career covers many years of service as a conservation warden in Wisconsin, as director of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission, and as executive secretary of the National Wildlife Federation.

A dramatic incident from Mr. Swift's days as a conservation warden was the subject of a recent national television show, which detailed how he apprehended bigtime Chicago hoodlums for their fish and game violations at considerable risk to himself. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Rice Lake Chronotype, of Rice Lake, Wis., which pays tribute to this great conservationist. I would also like to include an article written by Mr. Swift, entitle "The Man With the Badge":

[From the Rice Lake (Wis.) Chronotype]

A DISTINGUISHED RESIDENT

For the first time in history, probably, a Rice Lake man's achievements were made the subject of a national television show when the deeds of Ernest Swift were dramatized Sunday night over the CBS television network.

The show depicted an heroic incident in the life of the local man which occurred a long time ago—1928 to be exact. But it must be stressed that Ernest Swift, who has chosen Rice Lake as his home in retirement, can rest on many laurels other than the incident dramatized Sunday. But, as is the case with most talented and dedicated men, Swift though retired is still not resting.

More than anyone in the United States, probably, Ernest Swift is the most dedicated, emphatic, farsighted, and articulate exponent of conservation of the great and God-given natural resources of this Nation.

He first attracted major attention, true, for his courageous role as a young conservation warden in Sawyer County in apprehending bigtime Chicago hoodlums for their fish and game violations, at considerable physical hazard.

But from there Ernest Swift went forward to become a forthright and unswerving devotee of sound conservation practices in Wisconsin as the State conservation department director. Upon retiring from that position, he foresook the easy life in favor of the responsibility of becoming the executive secretary of the National Wildlife Federation, with headquarters in Washington, D.C. Here again his vigor and dedication won him recognition and acclaim.

Finally, he stepped down from that lofty post and moved to Rice Lake in retirement. But he continues to journey to Madison and to Washington periodically as a consultant and adviser with a wealth of experience and sound counsel. Only recently he was presented a top award by a national forestry association for his contributions to sound forestry management and conservation. His picture appeared in papers throughout the land.

He still serves as conservation adviser for the National Wildlife magazine, writes authoritative articles on conservation for national magazines and, when the occasion demands, can get on his feet and make a persuasive address like he did the other day at Spooner on the question of opening the Chippewa flowage to ice fishing.

Altogether, quite a man, Mr. Swift. America is awakening to the critical need for preservation of its fast shrinking areas of untrammeled, uncontaminated wilderness and it is men like him, cast in the mold of courageous champions, who have been in the forefront of this worthy fight. We're happy to have him with us as a distinguished resident.

THE MAN WITH THE BADGE

(By Ernest Swift)

Pinning a badge on a man does something to him; his mental outlook has to adjust to the responsibility and authority vested in him. The authority to restrict the liberty of fellow citizens should not be taken lightly nor should it be abused. The adjustment will determine a man's ability, self-restraint, judgment, and courage. A badge can expose sadistic qualities formerly unknown or concealed.

A successful lawman must be endowed with certain basic characteristics. Among the most important are judgment and decision; a split-second decisiveness to follow through, and in emergencies, to be able to shoot the works without thought of personal safety. Whereas one rookie can be ruined by a situation of sudden violence, in another

it may spark latent qualities of firmness and leadership.

A successful game warden by nature is an individualist. He enjoys being his own boss, working out his own problems and the competition of matching wits with offenders of the law. He is not just a woods cop, although he must be a crafty manhunter, with the sleuthing ability of a city detective as well as a master craftsman in the woods. He must know the laws he enforces from A to Izzard and be something of a trial lawyer.

In this present day of automobiles and radio, he is beginning to lose affinity with nature; with the woods, fields, and waters. He hikes less, rides more and does not put forth the physical effort of his predecessors; seldom carries a pack or sleeps in the brush.

Too few wardens ever reach their full potential in their own field or the broader field of conservation. They fail through lack of hard work and diligence to master all the many ramifications of the work so necessary for success. This is equally true with other specialists. When a warden allows the job to become routine, he is either slipping or lacks imagination. There is no place for routine in game law enforcement. In addition to knowing all the tricks of the trade in enforcement, the warden should be well grounded in the biological field of fish and game, and have a working knowledge of forestry and land management. All these specialties develop him into the overall field man that he should be. By virtue of these additional attributes he will be less a cop and more of a conservationist; less sadistic and better balanced in humility and humor.

Above all, he must have an intense fever for his work, be fanatically conscientious, indifferent to hours, physical discomforts, poor pay, and public abuse. Many are called, some are chosen, but too few really succeed. There is no better job in the entire field of conservation upon which to build decision and judgment for all specialties than some basic training in law enforcement.

The Post-Dispatch on Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of the Congress, I introduced a bill designed to make more fair the procedures in use for citing individuals for contempt of Congress. I believe our rules are weak in this area for we allow, in the normal case, the same committee of the Congress to be victim, prosecutor, and first judge of the contempt. I question whether a similar procedure instituted in a court of law would meet the requirements of due process.

In an editorial on February 1, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch takes note of my proposal and adds its support to it. I am very pleased that they have done so for I believe this is one of the procedural reforms which can help bring the Congress into better shape to perform its assigned tasks. I especially commend the Post-Dispatch's emphasis on the help this proposal could provide to the Congress. Aside from the very important benefits to those who are charged with contempt, a sounder procedure for the handling of congressional contempt citations will make this form of protection for the Congress far more meaningful. I would urge that the fullest consideration be given this proposal and I am placing the St. Louis-Dispatch editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help explain more fully the purpose and the scope of this bill.

The article follows:

MR. CURTIS' SOUND BILL

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS has offered a bill to revise contempt-of-Congress procedures which we think Congress might well accept. What the Webster Groves Republican offers is a simple change: to establish a kind of screening committee to consider requests for contempt citations from other committees and to refer them to the House or Senate for action if that seems advisable.

Mr. CURTIS points out that the two busy Chambers are hard pressed to consider thoroughly contempt charges offered by various committees. The temptation may be to accept the committee's word for instituting proceedings, but in such cases, the committee is acting as both the injured party and the prosecutor. What is needed is a separate committee to serve as a kind of grand jury. and to give contempt charges the kind of objective study they are unlikely to get from a committee that feels it has been treated contemptuously.

The Curtis proposal would improve the fairness of the contempt proceeding; it might also help Congress. In its last session, the Supreme Court set aside contempt convictions of nine men because the indictments did not state the subject under inquiry when the men were questioned. To some extent this may have been the fault of officers who drew up the indictments, but it is also true that committees on general probing and exposure expeditions sometimes are not certain as to what they are investigating. In such cases, contempt actions can be a waste of time. A committee as suggested by Mr. CURTIS, which might screen out baseless actions would strengthen Congress power to use the contempt proceeding to protect itself.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in a radio broadcast this week I asked some questions that are of grave concern to the residents of the First Wisconsin District and, indeed, to all Americans. Under unanimous consent, I raise those questions here because of the interest of our colleagues in the Congress in this subject and with the hope that someone occuping a position of trust in the White House, or someone with an unclogged pipeline to the White House, will come through with the answers.

Text of the broadcast follows:

Something new has been added to the normally heavy mail load coming into my Washington office. People back home are not only stating their views, they are asking questions. The subject is Cuba. And they're asking questions they should never have had to ask, for information to which they are entitled. They're confused, and small wonder. So are the Members of the Congress.

There are two general areas of confusion and uncertainty. One is of the extent of the continuing Soviet Communist threat in Cuba, centered around what has—or what has not—taken place in Cuba since the President, last October 22, announced the quarantine of Cuba. It has to do with a documented clarification of the military and missile situation in Cuba as it is today. The other has to do with the "deal" to ransom the Bay of Pigs prisoners.

In the next few minutes I want to direct my remarks to the latter category, the payment of blackmail to the Cuban Communist dictator, Castro. Citizens in the First Wisconsin District have written me for information. A survey of their letters indicates that they want to know whether or not our Government is involved, along with private firms and individuals, in this ransom deal, and if so, to what extent?

If the Government is involved, it should not be classified information. Why isn't the public told outright all the facts?

If the Government is not involved, what right do private citizens have to deal with foreign governments?

What is or will be the effect of this action on foreign policy and foreign relations, not alone with Cuba but with other nations?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency underwrite the ransom payment? If it did, by how much?

Has any portion of the payment gone to the Soviet Union?

What concessions, if any, did the Internal Revenue Service make to the contributors?

What concessions, if any, did the Justice Department make in connection with the ransom contributions?

What concessions, if any, did other Federal agencies make in connection with the ransom contributions? Such as the Agriculture Department; the State Department; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Is it true that the drug firms involved not only obtained tax concessions but actually sold their products at wholesale?

If the drug firms made a profit, how much?

Did the first payment of ransom by the United States in its history damage U.S. prestige in other countries?

Did not the United States admit to Communist Fidel Castro's continued authority in Cuba by paying a ransom to him just after he had helped the Kremlin try to get an atomic "drop" on us?

Did not payment of this U.S. ransom fasten the fetters of slavery tighter on the helpless Cuban people?

It's reprehensible that citizens of this free and open society are not given—without asking for it—all the information to which they are entitled.

It is my conviction ,that an appropriate committee on the House call in American officials involved—Attorney General Robert Kennedy, for one—as well as the U.S. firms and other key figures so that the public can be properly informed, for, after all, what we are doing or failing to do in our relationship with Cuba affects each and every one of us personally.

One of the great dangers confronting any people is secrecy on the part of governments where nonclassified matters are concerned. Secrecy creates suspicions, which do much to destroy the faith of the people in even good governments.

This particular action—the Cuban ransom deal—is shrouded in a heavy mist of secrecy. Knowledge is withheld from even those who are elected to represent the people. The people have a right to know the facts, and I call on the proper officials of the executive branch of the Government to provide them.

Goddard Space Flight Center Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1963, a celebration was held at the Goddard Space Flight Center, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the establishment of this Nation's worldwide tracking and data acquisition network. Among the distinguished people present were Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and the Administrator of NASA, James E. Webb. In addition, diplomatic representatives of 16 foreign nations were present as guests of honor. I was particularly pleased to be in attendance at that celebration because of the importance of the network to our total space effort.

A successful national space program is dependent upon a reliable and adequate system of ground instrumentation capable of electronically tracking space vehicles, transmitting command signals, and receiving the telemetered information which is sought. Project Mercury demonstrated the effectiveness of our system to the entire world; everyone will recall that the results of the network's operation were brought into our homes by radio and television during the actual space flights by our astronauts.

Every space flight mission is undertaken in order to gather information. This country's worldwide network of tracking and data acquisition stations is the key to acquiring such information. These facilities are placed all around the globe, and the network provides support to all of NASA's important programs, as well as satisfying the requirements of the Department of Defense. The entire system is an excellent example of effective interagency cooperation.

Twenty-seven oversea facilities which help to make up the system are located in many foreign countries; about two-thirds of those facilities operate with the assistance of foreign nations. Thus, our worldwide tracking system has provided the United States with a great opportunity for international cooperation, and has given friendly countries around the world an important part to play in America's space program.

The following countries that has so generously participated in this great undertaking were represented on this occasion: The Argentine Republic, Australia, the United States of Brazil, Canada, the Republic of Chile, the Republic of Ecuador, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, India, Iran, Japan, the United Mexican States, the Netherlands, the Federation of Nigeria, the Republic of Peru, the Republic of South Africa, and Spain.

During the celebration last week at the Goddard Space Flight Center, the following addresses were made by the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, and by the Administrator of NASA, James E. Webb. I am submitting copies for inclusion in the RECORD because I believe their remarks will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK

Your Excellencies, Congressmen Miller and Fulton, Mr. Webb, Dr. Goett, Commander Schirra, ladies and gentlemen, on touring the Goddard Space Flight Center, many of us may share the reaction of the legendary frontiersman, Daniel Boone, when he was asked if he had ever been lost. He replied: "No, I can't rightly say that I've ever been lost, but I was bewildered once for 3 days."

Man is by nature inquisitive. The challenge of the unknown stimulates him to explore. And of all man's experiences none is more gratifying than discovery. To explore the frontiers of science, medicine, the universe, to uncover the secrets of nature and to harness them for man's betterment—these can be life's most exciting and rewarding achievements.

History is filled with the chronicles of men whose quest for knowledge has led to results that are deeply imprinted on the daily lives of all of us. The early voyages of Vasco da Gama, of Columbus, of Magellan, opened a new epoch in human affairs. Explorations in the world of medicine by Pasteur, Fleming, Banting, and many others have vastly improved the well-being of men. New discoveries along the whole range of scientific frontiers are continually transforming our lives. Each new discovery opens further vistas for exploration, and each seems to accelerate the pace of advance.

I reflect that Peary reached the North Pole as recently as 1909—the same year in which Bleriot made the first flight across the English Channel—and that Amundsen reached the South Pole as recently as 1911, the year after Glenn Curtiss won a prize of $10,000 for flying nonstop all the way from Albany, N.Y., to New York City, a distance of 137 miles.

And now—already—we are seriously engaged in exploring the moon, the planets, and the universe.

Most of the exploration of the surface of the earth was accomplished by small groups of men using relatively simple apparatus. Explorers in times past were often out of sight and even out of mind for long periods of time. And the record of what they saw and learned was often subject to the errors of human impression and recall. Today we have the means of keeping in constant and almost instant touch with our explorers, whether human or mechanical. We can register an astronaut's every physical action and reaction and in some instances advise and assist him in adjusting to circumstances. We can record accurately and instantly his observations, as multiplied by the instrumentation at his command. And, of course, we can do the same for our unmanned explorers. We can correct the course of a satellite millions of miles away. While men were needed to man the tiny *Santa Maria* of Christopher Columbus, we today can send mechanical "Santa Marias" before man himself essays the journey.

We do not wish to dispatch manned or unmanned space missions without doing everything possible to insure their success. To insure both the safety and the fruitful exploitation of the voyage, we must remain in communication with the space traveler. Today we pause to pay tribute to those who have helped us to fulfill the canons of humanity and the obligations of science. We express our gratitude to the 16 nations whose representatives have joined us today—16 nations in which are located the 27 tracking facilities of our peaceful space program. We are proud of the association. This program is a partnership in peace. We think we are creating a heritage for those who follow us in the coming generations in a great exploration for peaceful purposes.

Science has never recognized manmade boundaries. The continued development of science must always rest on an international base, for nature does not play favorites. We 17 nations have embarked on a cooperative effort to expand the knowledge of man to an unprecedented extent. We are doing it in the full glare of light. The world watches us in our successes and our failures. And the whole world will benefit from our discoveries. We seek to publish all the knowledge we uncover. We are making it available to the world scientific community. In this effort, we 17 regard ourselves as agents and trustees for all the inhabitants of this little speck of dust in the universe.

In the 5 years since we began our cooperative tracking program, the pace of discovery has been breathtaking. We are developing a better understanding of the atmospheric and space phenomena which may affect our lives. No one can doubt the benefits of such knowledge to the international community, nor the benefits of many of its byproducts: miniature batteries; ceramics resistant to shock and extreme heat; electronic devices to measure body temperature, and to overcome skipped heartbeats or heart failure; infrared cameras, drills; and the innumerable inventions to come.

And what a future lies ahead for communications by satellites and weather prediction by satellites.

We hope to send spacecraft to many parts of our universe. We wish to pursue our goals in an atmosphere of international cooperation. We wish outer space reserved for peaceful activities.

The United States has on other occasions enunciated its aims in outer space. I should like to repeat them.

We believe outer space should be free for use by all nations consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law generally.

We must improve and extend the regime of law on earth as it applies to man's activities in space.

We must provide for the identification of rights and the peaceful settlement of disputes concerning space activities.

The useful application of space technology, such as communication and meteorological satellites, should be available to all nations needing it and able to make use of it.

Opportunities to participate in space activities should be open to all countries able and willing to cooperate constructively.

The placing in orbit of weapons of mass destruction should be prohibited.

United Nations Resolution No. 1721 of December 1961 embodies many of these principles. The United States will continue to be guided by these principles in our relations with the international community.

Today, the community for tracking embraces 17 nations. Tomorrow, it probably will be joined by additional nations. The United States will welcome broadened participation in its peaceful space efforts. Together we have molded an example in international cooperation dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge which we hope will be emulated in other fields.

As we progress in pursuit of universal knowledge, we shall probably have to consider modifications to our present tracking network in order to meet the ever-changing demands of technology.

But wherever and whenever we cooperate in scientific satellite tracking arrangements, we shall seek to adhere to our practice that the knowledge obtained shall belong to the world scientific community.

We express our pride in what has been achieved together. We look forward to further cooperation. The rewards already

reaped are immense. The promise of the future is boundless.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES E. WEBB AT THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF TRACKING, GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, JANUARY 31, 1963

On this occasion we gather here at the Goddard Space Flight Center to celebrate the fifth anniversary of our worldwide tracking and data acquisition network, consisting of more than 2 dozen stations in 16 countries overseas, which has contributed so effectively to the success of our space science programs and the Mercury flights.

We are deeply honored to have with us the ambassadors and scientific attachés from many of these nations. The importance of this occasion is indicated by the presence here of the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, Dr. Edward C. Welsh; the Director of the Goddard Space Flight Center, Dr. Harry Goett; and our most recent space traveler, Astronaut Wally Schirra. Vice President JOHNSON, represented by Dr. Welsh, has played a major and creative role in our national space program, first as chairman of the Senate Space Committee and, since 1961, as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. Mr. JOHNSON had planned to be with us, but the pressure of Senate business forced him to change his plans at the last minute.

The basic legislative foundation for our space activities, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, stipulated that this country's space activities "should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

This aim was further spelled out to include "cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in work done pursuant to this act and in peaceful applications of the results thereof." The act also specified the widest practicable dissemination of information on civilian space activities and their results.

That concept—wide dissemination of information—is basic to our system of government. It is perhaps even more characteristic of science itself, which in its very essence is international. The sources and reach of science and technology are as widespread as human intelligence and the human need for their benefits.

In space, international cooperation had been growing at a rapidly accelerating rate. I know that many of you here today are already quite familiar with the accomplishments of the year just past, but even so I would like to mention a few of them briefly.

Two international satellites were launched—Ariel, built here at Goddard and carrying six experiments prepared by the United Kingdom, and Alouette, a joint project with Canada, in which the satellite was wholly developed by Canadians. Ariel was designed chiefly to contribute to man's knowledge of the ionosphere by measuring densities and temperatures of electrons and the characteristics, quantity and distribution of ions. It also monitored solar X-rays and ultraviolet light, and studied the relationship between disturbances on the sun and cosmic rays in the earth's vicinity.

Alouette, a so-called topside sounder, also was designed to study the ionosphere, but from above. By "sweeping" radio frequencies across the ionosphere, Alouette measures electron density at various altitudes over almost the entire globe. Of particular interest to Canadian scientists in designing the satellite was the possibility of learning more about the severe and prolonged disturbances that plague radio communications in that nation's northern areas. In other cooperative projects, eight sounding rockets were launched, three in this country and five abroad, in areas of special consequence to the scientific world.

Two active communications satellites, Telstar and Relay, were launched. With these satellites, which demonstrated television, radio and telephone transmissions to Europe and South America, we have begun to lay the basis for a new system of international communications.

In the field of weather satellites, 35 countries are cooperating in weather observations synchronized with the passes of our Tiros weather satellites over their territory. A new system, called the automatic picture transmission subsystem (APT), which we will soon test experimentally will, if successful, ultimately permit local readout of photographs of their own cloud cover by nations over which it passes.

Other international satellites are being prepared. The United States and Italy are working together on the San Marco project which will lead to the launching of an Italian satellite by an Italian launch crew using an American Scout rocket from a platform in the Indian Ocean off the east coast of Africa.

Also, in 1962, arrangements were completed between this country and the Soviet Union which may eventually lead to cooperation in international magnetic survey programs and in the use of weather and communications satellites.

As so many of you know, development of the tracking network involved much more than mere permission from the various countries to establish ground stations on their soil. Many countries are actively participating in the maintenance and operation of the stations. Some of them, indeed, have assumed full responsibility, both technical and financial, for station operations.

We have continued to develop the carefully constructed bilateral program which has broadened the base of international space activity. As a direct result, a number of European countries are developing plans for cooperation in space science. Steps have been taken to form an organization called the European Scientific Research Organization (ESRO), and plans are moving ahead to prepare satellites and space probes for use in astronomical and planetary research.

Another organization, called the European Launch Development Organization (ELDO) is working to develop a European launch capability. The countries participating in ELDO are dividing the engineering tasks among themselves, and will share the financial burden.

Several groups in South America are looking into the possibility of cooperative sounding rocket endeavors.

These cooperative endeavors may very well turn out to be one of the most important results of man's efforts to explore space. Working together with this common purpose, it may be that nations will be less concerned with worldly differences.

International space cooperation offers a splendid opportunity for bringing some of the best minds of many countries to bear upon the difficult problems that confront mankind beyond the earth's atmosphere and on the way to the moon and the planets.

Perhaps you will permit me to say that the great progress made by the United States with manned and unmanned satellites in recent years is of great importance to the whole free world. However, I must say that without the degree of international cooperation that we have received, the knowledge gained would have been much less. Those of you who are actively connected with tracking and data acquisition can indeed be proud of your part in this.

All of us in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration look forward to a continued close association with other nations of the world as man proceeds in his conquest of space.

Retraining: Industry Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the Government programs in the field of retraining, the private efforts along these lines is often ignored, unfortunately so, I might note, since great developments have taken place as a result of forward-looking corporations which have initiated such programs. One of these programs, as developed by the Du Pont Co., was the subject of an article in the Washington World. I believe the approach which Du Pont uses and the work which the company has done deserves attention and for this reason I am placing the article, "Du Pont Job Retraining Plan Pays Off With Few Layoffs," in the RECORD at this point.

DU PONT JOB RETRAINING PLAN PAYS OFF WITH FEW LAYOFFS

While the Federal Government has been spending millions of dollars in attempts to retrain workers replaced by automation, the Du Pont Co. has set out to do a similar job on its own.

The chemical manufacturing company has found it has been able to employ its workers in the wake of automation through a simple constructive device, building new plants near older facilities.

The firm places a new plant for new products near an old plant which is expected to have a decline in employment. The men at the old plant are retrained and then moved into the new building.

Because of Du Pont's process, technological progress does not always mean layoffs. Instead of laying off its workers and employing new personnel, Du Pont seeks to retrain its own employees.

Under such programs, Du Pont has moved from one plant to another—and switched their jobs from making one chemical to manufacturing another—without losing a day's work.

WORKING MODEL

When the company was about to manufacture a new product, isocyanates, it set up a working model of a new plant in the old factory. Fifty workers were selected from various parts of the plant, avoiding a drain on any one operation, and trained for 3 months.

From this nucleus, Du Pont built its staff to manufacture the new chemical.

At its Old Hickory, Tenn., rayon plant, Du Pont in 1959 arranged with the local board of education to provide a staff for evening courses in elementary arithmetic and other courses for 275 workers otherwise threatened with layoff.

UPGRADING SKILLS

Du Pont has also met the job-eliminating challenge of technological improvements within existing plants, mainly by training and retraining to keep upgrading the abilities of its employees, in line with the skills required.

To increase the mobility of its workers, the firm moves its production workers into other jobs for several weeks at a time to broaden their training. When a major shift is necessary, the workers are better equipped to make the move.

Employees at Du Pont's Chambers Works, Deepwater, N.J., who pass an aptitude test can enter an apprentice program to become highly skilled mechanics.

The Lincoln Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln Week commemoration provides a pause in the pace of legislative activities. It is a time when many Members return to their respective districts, sound out local sentiments, and assess the strengths and weaknesses of party organizational machinery.

Especially noteworthy during this Lincoln Day recess have been the comments of my colleague to the south in the State of California, ALPHONZO BELL. Congressman BELL's Lincoln speech, "The Lincoln Legacy," comes directly to grip with the serious problems facing the Republican Party not only in California but in many sections of the United States. Congressman BELL's comments signal the need for a minority party to heed common organizational shortcomings. His speech sets out in the frankest manner the present status and the future prospects of California's Republican Party with particular emphasis on needed organizational reforms.

Without a strong organizational framework, party responsibility factionalizes, deteriorates, and withers. Without strong organizational machinery through which political parties may channel their expression, the viability of a successful two-party system can be seriously jeopardized.

I commend Congressman BELL's address to the attention of my fellow colleagues:

THE LINCOLN LEGACY

My friends and fellow Republicans, for the Nation and for the Republican Party annual ceremonies honoring Abraham Lincoln provide valuable opportunities for reflection.

In 1963, recollection of the tragic divisions and discords which Lincoln surmounted can be especially meaningful to Republicans. In the adversity of Abraham Lincoln there is a lesson for us. In the triumph of Abraham Lincoln there is inspiration for us.

With this lesson and this inspiration in mind I come before you today to speak about Republican victory in California. I know that optimism about victory must make me a suspicious figure in certain circles at this time. Some people are likely to say that in my talk of return to past glory I have become the kind of reactionary Republican that is supposed to give our party a bad name. Others may examine such a radical outlook and say I am not really a Republican at all: I am a Democrat.

Nevertheless, as an advocate of optimism, I am hopeful that you will be tolerant in hearing what I fear is currently a minority point of view in our party. We far-out types, we extremists, have a right to be represented. We must not be eliminated from the organization. In the year 1963 there must be a place in Republican ranks for men and women willing to declare that we are still capable of working together to win in 1964.

So it is to the quality of optimism and to the proposition of victory that I address myself in the moments that I have before you. To do this with any degree of validity I must began by subjecting you to a very unpleasant review of our present situation.

What I have to say will be painful and this is unfortunate because the reserve of morphine available to Republicans in this State has been sharply depleted in recent years. This Lincoln Week finds us not only the minority party in California but the bearers of burdens far greater than minority status ordinarily implies:

We are confronted with the hardship which always plagues the less glamorous minority party in financing continuing internal operations and candidates.

Because success breeds success and failure tends to breed failure, we find difficulty in recruiting new precinct workers and club members and campaign volunteers.

Lacking the discipline that normally comes from dominating elected figures, we are almost helpless in avoiding rolling, public manifestations of factionalism and disunity.

Manifestations of disunity and division inevitably take the form of public attacks on party leaders and so we face the problem of securing and holding vigorous, competent leadership.

Public bickering, inadequate financing, and a recent reputation for losing elections makes it harder for us to attract strong candidates who generate public enthusiasm.

Finally, apart from all of the previously mentioned, we Republicans have lacked and still lack the beneficial rallying call of a consistently clear and forceful national voice leading the opposition to the Kennedy administration.

Each of these challenges is beyond our control except as it relates to our responsibility to the Republican organizational apparatus which I would like now to discuss.

Let us for a moment think of this party of ours as the one indispensable mechanism through which Republican action can be channeled and results obtained. I do not minimize the philosophical differences within our organization, nor do I suggest that interest in philosophy should be subordinated to interest in party structure. I do remind you, however, that all of us are also the caretakers of this extremely complex and absolutely invaluable mechanism by which great things can be done or fail to be done by our Government.

We want to encourage men and women who have strong convictions about party philosophy. We want men and women who have both the ability and the opportunity to express, within our party's framework, the broadest spectrum of responsible opinion. But we also want men and women who recognize that political philosophy must be supported by well integrated, working organization. We need men and women who understand the real nature of the party apparatus in which they must work. I don't believe we have as many of these men and women as we should today.

It is my opinion that a serious factional stalemate exists in the California Republican Party. I suggest that this stalemate is undermining that single part of us which must never be undermined: the organizational mechanism which alone can bring us victory.

Among the factors contributing to this stalemate I would list the following:

1. A splintering of forces which has made some groups vulnerable to the age-old fallacy of being unwilling to work unless they are also in control. This seems to have triggered a chain reaction of dissidence everywhere in California.

2. A blood lust which is keeping some party officials so busy fending off attacks on themselves that they cannot apply their full-time talents to the work of preparing to defeat our real opponents next year.

3. An archaic system of laws which makes it possible for certain members of our central committees to run for and be elected to their official positions each year, yet contribute virtually nothing to the strengthening of the party. I know some areas of this State where district committees do not even meet for 6 months at a time.

4. A regrettably longstanding precedent which seems to work to withhold adequate recognition of Republican Women's Clubs, the Young Republicans, and other volunteer groups, in the important inner policymaking circles of the party. When important groups do not feel they have access to the decisionmaking councils, their method of expression is understandably more public and less temperate.

5. An inherited tradition by which, between the time of Hiram Johnson and 1958, the victories of our party were in fact the victories of personalities who simply allowed us to share in their triumphs. Because of this, some of us retain even today a dangerous taste for personality building as a substitute for strength in the precincts.

6. A distressing lack of compassion by which our defeated standard bearers are often treated as pariahs in our midst. We cannot continue to close our minds to the tremendous contributions which many of these men might still make to our party and our Nation.

My friends, out of the disappointment of defeat inevitably comes the dialog of reconstruction. That dialog is taking place today. Its goal is the finding of the new Republican middle: the area of grace which attracts and holds party workers and donors at one level, while attracting and electing candidates for public office at the other.

Finding this effective new Republican middle in California is not a task for children. If it is going to be accomplished successfully, it is going to have to be done by putting aside childish things. Both in philosophy and organization our assignment of responsibility and trust must go to those enlightened men and women of both liberal and conservative persuasions in our party who recognize that the seed of political success in a democratic society is mature conciliation.

One hundred years ago today, still reeling from the disastrous battle of Stone River and yet to face the debacle at Chancellorsville, Abraham Lincoln must surely have contemplated the problems of creating victory strategy in the midst of discord, defeat and disunity. The triumphs at Gettysburg and Vicksburg which came in the second half of the year, exactly a century ago, were the fruit of organizational and military conciliation. The speech at Gettysburg in July 1863, is an everlasting monument to the gentleness of man, to the strength of gentleness, to the enduring power of the conciliating human spirit.

In a cosmic way Abraham Lincoln, 100 years ago, left his legacy to the Republican Party and to the world.

In 1963 California Republicans must find direction in an environment where there is disagreement, discord, and defeat. We must create a victory strategy. We must here dedicate ourselves to a great task.

That task is not to overwhelm our political allies. It is to out-campaign our political opponents. Our job is not to reduce the size of the Republican platform but to broaden it so that its structure will be large enough to hold and echo the voices of all thoughtful men and women, now and in the future.

Turbulence and strife are in the natural order of things within a political structure. We must recognize discord as an ever present quality which makes the political party system in the United States a unique and indispensable safety valve in our society. We must see the political party as an arena in which men and women are given their first significant opportunity to express themselves

on issues and ideas. We must understand that at the level of party politics the great collision of men and law begins.

But we must also think of political organization as a function of human beings which requires a fundamental sense of unity, a bond of good will and trust. We must understand that only when the gentle side of politics prevails can the rough and tumble of issue discussion have any real meaning.

There is far more to hold Republicans together today than to tear us apart. There is far greater need to build a party organization, an action apparatus which we can all use, than to fight about the control of that apparatus either at the philosophical or organizational levels. We are united in our concern about the direction that the U.S. Government is taking today. We must be united in our belief that we have got to work together if we are to maintain an effective opposition voice in the land. We have to stay together if the Republican Party mechanism is going to produce the majority voice of which we all dream.

So let us here highly resolve that our attention during the years ahead will be on those aspects of party policy which all of us hold in common. Let us focus on the great and long-standing bonds of interest, agreement, and affection which we have for one another.

Henceforward we will discourage rather than encourage division in our ranks. We will not tolerate comment that there is something essentially unwholesome about our so-called conservative wing. And by the same token we will stop bruising and abusing those Republicans who represent with integrity and ability the liberal and moderate viewpoint of our party.

Rather, we will concentrate on the Democrats. We will have much to say about the strange, muddled crisscrossing of events by which historic blunder in Cuba is called historic success.

We will press home the question which leading Democrats are already asking each other in California: Just what implication does the presence of the quarter million dollar election day Democratic slush fund have for the future of free and clean government in our State?

We are going to talk more about the manipulation of national news, and about the circumstances which led our opponents after so many years suddenly to advocate the classic Republican position that confiscatory taxation is a drain on the economy and must be stopped.

My friends, with all that has happened to us and all of the obstacles still in our path, there is hope for the Republican Party. That hope is the truth of our message.

From the time of the first Republican Presidency we have offered to this Nation a restraining voice in the midst of confusion, a courageous voice in the face of challenge.

The need for this voice still exists. The truth of our convictions has been validated across a century of historical experience.

There is a magic in the truth we speak. It will bring us together. Because it is bigger and more important than all of the internal problems which cause us anguish now, it will bring us together.

We can have that great mechanism through which our concerns about the future of the Nation and the world will be projected and acted upon. In a throbbing scientific epoch we can be again that effective, articulate body of Americans which leads in the search for balance between progress and tradition, between the needs of the free human spirit and the requirements of burgeoning society.

A Republican Party which gave the Nation an Abraham Lincoln and a monument to gentleness in an age of war now prepares for its role in a major new chapter in the life of man. Whatever we may accomplish in the years ahead we will accomplish because, during a time of trial, we worked together. We recognized that the real rewards in human life go to those who unite, not divide. This, my friends, our Lincoln legacy.

The Pomona Mall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, last October former Senator William F. Knowland, editor of the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., had occasion to come to the 24th Congressional District which I am honored to represent in Congress.

While he was there, he visited the Pomona Mall. The mall, which has gained national attention, is a nine-block-long shopping center in the heart of the Pomona business district. This improvement is the result of local initiative and resources. No Federal funds were used.

Mr. Knowland was impressed by the mall and the manner in which the project was accomplished and sent a reporter to Pomona to study the mall and report on it to the readers of the Tribune.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the account on the Pomona Mall which subsequently appeared in the Oakland Tribune on January 20, 1963.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Jan. 20, 1963]

(By Ed Salzman)

POMONA.—A city can uplift the economic and esthetic health of its central business district dramatically:

Without seeking a cent of Federal aid.

Without raising property taxes.

Without the city burdening itself with any long-term debt.

And Pomona has proved it.

In this eastern Los Angeles County college community, the superficial key to success is the mall—a half-mile suburban-type shopping center in the heart of the city.

Years ago, Pomona's Second Street was part of the main highway between San Bernardino and Los Angeles.

Today, it is a path only for pedestrians and a dime-a-ride elephant train.

REAL KEY TO DOWNTOWN

Despite the attractiveness and economic accomplishments of the mall, community leaders feel that the real key to downtown Pomona revival was not what was done but how it was done.

Explains City Administrator Fred Sharp: "All cities have beautiful plans. But they're paper dolls. In most other cities the businessmen haven't gotten together and had to cough up the dough to make the plans a reality."

The mall was far from an overnight panacea.

Its beginnings go back as far as the end of World War II.

At that time there wasn't a single public offstreet parking space in central Pomona.

In 1946, the Pomona area was in the midst of the great southern California population explosion. But the central business district was dying from the familiar downtown disease of property deterioration and traffic strangulation.

Pomona started to realize its plight in 1948—much sooner than many American cities afflicted with the same disease.

OFF-STREET PARKING DISTRICTS

The first step was to start providing offstreet parking assessment districts. In all, four districts were formed, and the downtown area now has so many vehicle spaces that it is comparable to a suburban private shopping development.

City planners in Pomona originally proposed the mall almost 10 years ago.

In fact, a test mall was established in 1956. Plants were placed in the middle of Second Street and vehicles were barred for a few days.

Then, the idea hibernated for 4 years while the merchants and property owners concentrated on providing more parking lots, all at their own expense through the assessment districts.

Two years ago, the mall plan was reactivated and presented to the city council with more than 85 percent of the property owners signing the petition in favor of the program.

Asks banker George Stone, sparkplug for the entire downtown project: "Even though this looked like a dream, how could the council turn it down when 85 percent were in favor and willing to pay the bill?"

Stone repeated the last six words—"and willing to pay the bill." A Pomona native, artist Millard Sheets was hired by the council to design the mall. He selected a variety of trees for the street and specified that the primary effect should be mosaic. All store owners are being urged to conform to the mosaic pattern as they rehabilitate their buildings.

While Sheets was at work on the esthetics, Stone, Sharp & Co. realized that one major element was lacking on Second Street—a first-class department store.

LEND SUPPORT

Even owners of existing department stores in Pomona backed them up—one of them in spectacular style.

The city interested the Buffums Corp., which operates stores similar to Oakland's White House, in establishing a big new store on Second Street.

But no suitable site appeared available.

Then along came an offer from the Fedway department store to give up its 1-block parking lot to accommodate Buffums, a potential competitor.

What's more, Fedway sold the lot at what Stone considers a song in order to entice Buffums to Pomona.

The mall was completed in August, and the new Buffums opened on October 1.

Business at Fedway never was better.

Fedway Manager Parker Daughhtee, chairman of the city's mall commission, realized that his company's major problem was competition from a new shopping center established in nearby West Covina.

And he knew that his first goal would be to get more people into Pomona. And if that meant bringing competitor Buffums to the city, he was for it.

The mall cost $640,000. It is financed through assessment district procedures, with each property owner paying off the 25-year bonds on a front-foot basis. The total bill for the average owner with 65 front feet will be $7,000.

When the mall project came up for final adoption, there was only one protest. And Sharp claims that was the result of a family feud rather than opposition to the plan itself.

BUSINESS LIFT

Business in downtown Pomona picked up the day construction was started. All stores

remained open, and apparently all of the city's 75,000 people went to Second Street, to give the workmen moral support. And they spent while they were there.

Stone claims that business is up at least 20 percent over last year. Some stores have reported that revenues have doubled.

The mall's effect on property values is staggering.

Stone pointed to a parcel of land which was recently sold at $1,750 a front foot.

What was it worth before?

Stone thought for a minute and finally answered: "Well you just couldn't sell it."

What Is a Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer is perhaps the most talked-about citizen in our great country. He is praised for his know-how, damned for his abundance, and is the subject of great concern each year in these halls. It occurs to me that perhaps many of us fail to understand just what he is, this enigma of our time. To put this tiller-of-the-land in proper perspective, I respectfully submit an article from the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association as reprinted in the February 15, 1963 edition of the Washington World.

The article follows:

PORTRAIT OF A PARADOX, THE FARMER: EXECUTIVE, EXPERT ON FINANCE, SCIENTIST

(We have been given the answers to "What is a boy?" and "What is a girl?" Now the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association has come up with a definition answering the question, "What is a farmer?")

A farmer is a paradox. He is an overall executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilized attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers, or helping with housework.

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God—a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought—can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might just as well put up with him. He is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fastgrowing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

Project Map of the Ninety-Nines, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently, as an aviation enthusiast, my attention has been called to the lack of small airfields in this country. In studying this matter I find that aviation is not making the progress we would hope for among the younger people of our Nation. Seventy percent of the pilots of this Nation are said to be over 35 years of age.

One of the problems private aviators encounter is the lack of available fields near smaller towns, resorts, and national parks for the use and pleasure, as well as the education, of people who own private planes or have access to private planes, around the country. To be sure, we have built many large and beautiful airports, but they are designed to accommodate the large commercial airplanes, and this is as it should be, but the small airport user has difficulty in securing the facilities he needs for his operations.

Many years ago the great American aviatrix, Amelia Earhart, wrote to the ladies of her day holding pilot certificates. She asked them to join a club and the ladies assembled at Curtis Field, Valley Stream, N.Y., on November 2, 1929. The club was organized under the name of the Ninety-Nines, Inc., 99 ladies having responded to Miss Earhart's letters. The organization still exists and has the best interests of this Nation at heart. It seeks to promote aviation and I salute the efforts of those who carry on this fine work.

Recently, Mrs. Donald M. Thompson of Annandale, Va., presided at the "99" international convention at Princeton, N.J., on July 14, 1962, and presented a project map, which is a part of the ambitions of this organization. I would like to include that article as part of my remarks at this point.

I hope those of us who are interested in aviation will be able to help sponsor these small fields.

PROJECT MAP PRESENTED AT "99" INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION, PRINCETON, N.J., ON JULY 14, 1962

Today, we live in an air age—lots of large airports and big airplanes but few fields for general aviation. Primarily in the past there was a lack of interest by the Federal Aviation Agency and the public in general. During the last several years, we lost 1,200 airports nationally.

To try to reverse this trend, our "99" organization passed a resolution at our last convention in San Diego, Calif., in 1961 to see what could be done to aid general aviation. A committee was appointed to try to carry out the aims of Project Map which stands for more airports. We hope to achieve this aim by linking their development to the national highway plan. When Federal funds are spent for highways, small landing strips could be built along the side of the road near a convenient intersection adjacent to a town. The airports could then be maintained in the same manner as the highways and eating areas adjacent to them are maintained today. The right to build hangars and to sell fuel could be leased to local operators just as the filling stations along the turnpikes are leased. This is not a new idea. Similar ones have been tried from time to time during recent years but not being well supported have had little success. We hope now that the change in the attitude of the people toward aviation and the increase in our technology will make the idea more acceptable.

A number of people concerned with the development of aviation have been interviewed and letters have been written to all of the State aviation directors in the United States. There being no guidelines, each step led to the next. Our first visits to FAA were not encouraging. They were skeptical of our idea because of a previous experience during World War II. At that time, the Bureau of Public Roads built 29 strips such as the ones located at Key Largo, Chincoteague, and other areas. These failed because of isolation and no facilities. These pitfalls we hope to avoid by locating near an intersection of a fairly large town. These airstrips would benefit the towns near which they were located. We all know that business is more apt to come to a locality that has good airport facilities. A study of this is being made by FAA and will be published in the near future.

We regret that there seems to be a general feeling against small airports. Many FAA and State aviation officials favor large, municipally owned airports for three reasons:

1. As a public utility, the airport can gain land through the right of eminent domain.
2. Greater sums of money are available for municipally owned airports.
3. Private owners often sell out.

Now we have in FAA a man who seems to understand the problems of general aviation and to be dedicated and enthusiastic in finding solutions for present difficulties. As special assistant to FAA Administrator N. E. Halaby, it is his job to concentrate on problems within the general aviation field. Needless to say, we were delighted to learn that the assistant is working on a project similar to ours—that something is really being done to stimulate the growth of small airports.

During our conversation, the idea of small landing strips in our national parks and other recreational areas was mentioned. This sounded like an excellent idea to us—one that we in the "99" could get behind and help push. Think of the possibilities that could come out of this idea—more airstrips for general aviation, interesting places for "99" fly-ins, meetings, etc. Let's get behind it and urge our Representatives and Senators to support the idea.

Other ideas are being explored such as a youth introductory flight program with industry's help and aid for privately owned airports.

We learned that one of the ways that we can be most helpful is to visit the different district field engineers throughout the United States and discuss our program with them. What we want to get across to them is the necessity for small airstrips. Many of them have become so involved and dedicated to the multimillion-dollar projects that they have lost sight of general aviation. Remember—they are the ones who make or break the building of small airstrips of ap-

on issues and ideas. We must understand that at the level of party politics the great collision of men and law begins.

But we must also think of political organization as a function of human beings which requires a fundamental sense of unity, a bond of good will and trust. We must understand that only when the gentle side of politics prevails can the rough and tumble of issue discussion have any real meaning.

There is far more to hold Republicans together today than to tear us apart. There is far greater need to build a party organization, an action apparatus which we can all use, than to fight about the control of that apparatus either at the philosophical or organizational levels. We are united in our concern about the direction that the U.S. Government is taking today. We must be united in our belief that we have got to work together if we are to maintain an effective opposition voice in the land. We have to stay together if the Republican Party mechanism is going to produce the majority voice of which we all dream.

So let us here highly resolve that our attention during the years ahead will be on those aspects of party policy which all of us hold in common. Let us focus on the great and long-standing bonds of interest, agreement, and affection which we have for one another.

Henceforward we will discourage rather than encourage division in our ranks. We will not tolerate comment that there is something essentially unwholesome about our so-called conservative wing. And by the same token we will stop bruising and abusing those Republicans who represent with integrity and ability the liberal and moderate viewpoint of our party.

Rather, we will concentrate on the Democrats. We will have much to say about the strange, muddled crisscrossing of events by which historic blunder in Cuba is called historic success.

We will press home the question which leading Democrats are already asking each other in California: Just what implication does the presence of the quarter million dollar election day Democratic slush fund have for the future of free and clean government in our State?

We are going to talk more about the manipulation of national news, and about the circumstances which led our opponents after so many years suddenly to advocate the classic Republican position that confiscatory taxation is a drain on the economy and must be stopped.

My friends, with all that has happened to us and all of the obstacles still in our path, there is hope for the Republican Party. That hope is the truth of our message.

From the time of the first Republican Presidency we have offered to this Nation a restraining voice in the midst of confusion, a courageous voice in the face of challenge.

The need for this voice still exists. The truth of our convictions has been validated across a century of historical experience.

There is a magic in the truth we speak. It will bring us together. Because it is bigger and more important than all of the internal problems which cause us anguish now, it will bring us together.

We can have that great mechanism through which our concerns about the future of the Nation and the world will be projected and acted upon. In a throbbing scientific epoch we can be again that effective, articulate body of Americans which leads in the search for balance between progress and tradition, between the needs of the free human spirit and the requirements of burgeoning society.

A Republican Party which gave the Nation an Abraham Lincoln and a monument to gentleness in an age of war now prepares for its role in a major new chapter in the life of man. Whatever we may accomplish in the years ahead we will accomplish because, during a time of trial, we worked together. We recognized that the real rewards in human life go to those who unite, not divide. This, my friends, our Lincoln legacy.

The Pomona Mall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, last October former Senator William F. Knowland, editor of the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., had occasion to come to the 24th Congressional District which I am honored to represent in Congress.

While he was there, he visited the Pomona Mall. The mall, which has gained national attention, is a nine-block-long shopping center in the heart of the Pomona business district. This improvement is the result of local initiative and resources. No Federal funds were used.

Mr. Knowland was impressed by the mall and the manner in which the project was accomplished and sent a reporter to Pomona to study the mall and report on it to the readers of the Tribune.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the account on the Pomona Mall which subsequently appeared in the Oakland Tribune on January 20, 1963.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Jan. 20, 1963]

(By Ed Salzman)

POMONA.—A city can uplift the economic and esthetic health of its central business district dramatically:

Without seeking a cent of Federal aid.

Without raising property taxes.

Without the city burdening itself with any long-term debt.

And Pomona has proved it.

In this eastern Los Angeles County college community, the superficial key to success is the mall—a half-mile suburban-type shopping center in the heart of the city.

Years ago, Pomona's Second Street was part of the main highway between San Bernardino and Los Angeles.

Today, it is a path only for pedestrians and a dime-a-ride elephant train.

REAL KEY TO DOWNTOWN

Despite the attractiveness and economic accomplishments of the mall, community leaders feel that the real key to downtown Pomona revival was not what was done but how it was done.

Explains City Administrator Fred Sharp: "All cities have beautiful plans. But they're paper dolls. In most other cities the businessmen haven't gotten together and had to cough up the dough to make the plans a reality."

The mall was far from an overnight panacea.

Its beginnings go back as far as the end of World War II.

At that time there wasn't a single public offstreet parking space in central Pomona.

In 1946, the Pomona area was in the midst of the great southern California population explosion. But the central business district was dying from the familiar downtown disease of property deterioration and traffic strangulation.

Pomona started to realize its plight in 1948—much sooner than many American cities afflicted with the same disease.

OFF-STREET PARKING DISTRICTS

The first step was to start providing offstreet parking assessment districts. In all, four districts were formed, and the downtown area now has so many vehicle spaces that it is comparable to a suburban private shopping development.

City planners in Pomona originally proposed the mall almost 10 years ago.

In fact, a test mall was established in 1956. Plants were placed in the middle of Second Street and vehicles were barred for a few days.

Then, the idea hibernated for 4 years while the merchants and property owners concentrated on providing more parking lots, all at their own expense through the assessment districts.

Two years ago, the mall plan was reactivated and presented to the city council with more than 85 percent of the property owners signing the petition in favor of the program.

Asks banker George Stone, sparkplug for the entire downtown project: "Even though this looked like a dream, how could the council turn it down when 85 percent were in favor and willing to pay the bill?"

Stone repeated the last six words—"and willing to pay the bill." A Pomona native, artist Millard Sheets was hired by the council to design the mall. He selected a variety of trees for the street and specified that the primary effect should be mosaic. All store owners are being urged to conform to the mosaic pattern as they rehabilitate their buildings.

While Sheets was at work on the esthetics, Stone, Sharp & Co. realized that one major element was lacking on Second Street—a first-class department store.

LEND SUPPORT

Even owners of existing department stores in Pomona backed them up—one of them in spectacular style.

The city interested the Buffums Corp., which operates stores similar to Oakland's White House, in establishing a big new store on Second Street.

But no suitable site appeared available.

Then along came an offer from the Fedway department store to give up its 1-block parking lot to accommodate Buffums, a potential competitor.

What's more, Fedway sold the lot at what Stone considers a song in order to entice Buffums to Pomona.

The mall was completed in August, and the new Buffums opened on October 1.

Business at Fedway never was better.

Fedway Manager Parker Daughhtee, chairman of the city's mall commission, realized that his company's major problem was competition from a new shopping center established in nearby West Covina.

And he knew that his first goal would be to get more people into Pomona. And if that meant bringing competitor Buffums to the city, he was for it.

The mall cost $640,000. It is financed through assessment district procedures, with each property owner paying off the 25-year bonds on a front-foot basis. The total bill for the average owner with 65 front feet will be $7,000.

When the mall project came up for final adoption, there was only one protest. And Sharp claims that was the result of a family feud rather than opposition to the plan itself.

BUSINESS LIFT

Business in downtown Pomona picked up the day construction was started. All stores

remained open, and apparently all of the city's 75,000 people went to Second Street, to give the workmen moral support. And they spent while they were there.

Stone claims that business is up at least 20 percent over last year. Some stores have reported that revenues have doubled.

The mall's effect on property values is staggering.

Stone pointed to a parcel of land which was recently sold at $1,750 a front foot.

What was it worth before?

Stone thought for a minute and finally answered: "Well you just couldn't sell it."

What Is a Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer is perhaps the most talked-about citizen in our great country. He is praised for his know-how, damned for his abundance, and is the subject of great concern each year in these halls. It occurs to me that perhaps many of us fail to understand just what he is, this enigma of our time. To put this tiller-of-the-land in proper perspective, I respectfully submit an article from the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association as reprinted in the February 15, 1963 edition of the Washington World.

The article follows:

PORTRAIT OF A PARADOX, THE FARMER: EXECUTIVE, EXPERT ON FINANCE, SCIENTIST

(We have been given the answers to "What is a boy?" and "What is a girl?" Now the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association has come up with a definition answering the question, "What is a farmer?")

A farmer is a paradox. He is an overall executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilized attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers, or helping with housework.

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God—a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought—can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might just as well put up with him. He is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fastgrowing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

Project Map of the Ninety-Nines, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently, as an aviation enthusiast, my attention has been called to the lack of small airfields in this country. In studying this matter I find that aviation is not making the progress we would hope for among the younger people of our Nation. Seventy percent of the pilots of this Nation are said to be over 35 years of age.

One of the problems private aviators encounter is the lack of available fields near smaller towns, resorts, and national parks for the use and pleasure, as well as the education, of people who own private planes or have access to private planes, around the country. To be sure, we have built many large and beautiful airports, but they are designed to accommodate the large commercial airplanes, and this is as it should be, but the small airport user has difficulty in securing the facilities he needs for his operations.

Many years ago the great American aviatrix, Amelia Earhart, wrote to the ladies of her day holding pilot certificates. She asked them to join a club and the ladies assembled at Curtis Field, Valley Stream, N.Y., on November 2, 1929. The club was organized under the name of the Ninety-Nines, Inc., 99 ladies having responded to Miss Earhart's letters. The organization still exists and has the best interests of this Nation at heart. It seeks to promote aviation and I salute the efforts of those who carry on this fine work.

Recently, Mrs. Donald M. Thompson of Annandale, Va., presided at the "99" international convention at Princeton, N.J., on July 14, 1962, and presented a project map, which is a part of the ambitions of this organization. I would like to include that article as part of my remarks at this point.

I hope those of us who are interested in aviation will be able to help sponsor these small fields.

PROJECT MAP PRESENTED AT "99" INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION, PRINCETON, N.J., ON JULY 14, 1962

Today, we live in an air age—lots of large airports and big airplanes but few fields for general aviation. Primarily in the past there was a lack of interest by the Federal Aviation Agency and the public in general. During the last several years, we lost 1,200 airports nationally.

To try to reverse this trend, our "99" organization passed a resolution at our last convention in San Diego, Calif., in 1961 to see what could be done to aid general aviation. A committee was appointed to try to carry out the aims of Project Map which stands for more airports. We hope to achieve this aim by linking their development to the national highway plan. When Federal funds are spent for highways, small landing strips could be built along the side of the road near a convenient intersection adjacent to a town. The airports could then be maintained in the same manner as the highways and eating areas adjacent to them are maintained today. The right to build hangars and to sell fuel could be leased to local operators just as the filling stations along the turnpikes are leased. This is not a new idea. Similar ones have been tried from time to time during recent years but not being well supported have had little success. We hope now that the change in the attitude of the people toward aviation and the increase in our technology will make the idea more acceptable.

A number of people concerned with the development of aviation have been interviewed and letters have been written to all of the State aviation directors in the United States. There being no guidelines, each step led to the next. Our first visits to FAA were not encouraging. They were skeptical of our idea because of a previous experience during World War II. At that time, the Bureau of Public Roads built 29 strips such as the ones located at Key Largo, Chincoteague, and other areas. These failed because of isolation and no facilities. These pitfalls we hope to avoid by locating near an intersection of a fairly large town. These airstrips would benefit the towns near which they were located. We all know that business is more apt to come to a locality that has good airport facilities. A study of this is being made by FAA and will be published in the near future.

We regret that there seems to be a general feeling against small airports. Many FAA and State aviation officials favor large, municipally owned airports for three reasons:

1. As a public utility, the airport can gain land through the right of eminent domain.
2. Greater sums of money are available for municipally owned airports.
3. Private owners often sell out.

Now we have in FAA a man who seems to understand the problems of general aviation and to be dedicated and enthusiastic in finding solutions for present difficulties. As special assistant to FAA Administrator N. E. Halaby, it is his job to concentrate on problems within the general aviation field. Needless to say, we were delighted to learn that the assistant is working on a project similar to ours—that something is really being done to stimulate the growth of small airports.

During our conversation, the idea of small landing strips in our national parks and other recreational areas was mentioned. This sounded like an excellent idea to us—one that we in the "99" could get behind and help push. Think of the possibilities that could come out of this idea—more airstrips for general aviation, interesting places for "99" fly-ins, meetings, etc. Let's get behind it and urge our Representatives and Senators to support the idea.

Other ideas are being explored such as a youth introductory flight program with industry's help and aid for privately owned airports.

We learned that one of the ways that we can be most helpful is to visit the different district field engineers throughout the United States and discuss our program with them. What we want to get across to them is the necessity for small airstrips. Many of them have become so involved and dedicated to the multimillion-dollar projects that they have lost sight of general aviation. Remember—they are the ones who make or break the building of small airstrips of ap-

proximately 3,200 feet since they do the recommending to the directors in Washington. Many of the letters from State aviation directors pointed out the fact that it was very difficult for both the States and the local cities to obtain Federal-aid airport moneys for small landing strips and general aviation airports.

Two reasons were given for this. First, the Federal Government had never taken very seriously the matter of a small landing strip program as part of the national airport plan. Priority is usually given to airport projects which require several hundred thousand dollars or more of Federal funds. Hence, the larger the project, the higher the funding priority. Second, the Government seemingly concerns itself about the need for more general aviation airports, but when the chips are down, allocates its money primarily to large airport programs in the various States.

Aviation and the automobile came into being about the same time. The automobile and road network grew hand in hand but the same cannot be said of light airplanes and small landing strips. Something must be done to change the latter condition while there is still available land. Our rapid population growth forseen for the future makes it imperative that something be done now.

Some of the disadvantages stated to our program were:

1. Unique land problem in some States—urbanized, rolling countryside, mountains, etc.
2. Risk of serious accidents due to inattention, fear, or inability to control car.
3. Access to the highway along such a strip would have to be limited in the interest of safety and to avoid confusion and congestion.
4. The unauthorization of the highway commission to act either alone or jointly with another State department to purchase right-of-way for or construct airports.
5. Idea not looked upon with favor by the roadbuilding agencies.
6. Persuading the local governments to sponsor the airport and provide for its maintenance through local crews.

We know that the advantages of our program far outweigh the disadvantages advocated by some people. A few are as follows:

1. A basis for accomplishing our objective—more general aviation airports.
2. Stimulation of the growth of general aviation.
3. Greater community economic growth—more industry, more jobs, etc.
4. Aid in time of national disaster—provide for immediate movement of critical personnel and supplies into the disaster area when all other means of transportation are inoperative.
5. Aid our national defense program.
6. Safety factor for pilots.
7. Airports self-supporting.
8. Pleasure—more airports—more places to go.

It was suggested that our organization, through its individual membership in each State bring our resolution to the attention of the individual U.S. Representatives and U.S. Senators in Washington, D.C. It was pointed out that it takes only a small amendment to existing laws governing the Bureau of Public Roads or the Federal Aviation Agency to allocate a certain percentage of the total appropriation for the purpose of carrying out the objectives in our resolution.

Five States that we know of are actively engaged in an airstrip program on their own. They are: Nebraska, Utah, Alabama, Alaska, and Oklahoma. Nebraska has just allocated $150,000 for 10 airstrips. The communities will be required to pay this sum to the Department of Aeronautics over a 10-year period, interest free. Actually, this will become a revolving fund.

Oklahoma's Turnpike Authority has received authorization to construct two airstrips along the new turnpike southwest from Oklahoma City to the Texas State line. These paved strips, located at Chickasha and Walters, will be used by the light plane pilot who wants to fly in, gas his plane, and have lunch before taking off again.

AOPA and the Utility Airplane Council, Aerospace Industries Association of America have both worked on similar ideas. Both are willing to help us in any way possible. It was pointed out, however, that getting cooperation for such a project is a long, wearingdown process.

In conclusion, we want to remember that it is our privilege to follow these suggestions in aiding general aviation and to do all in our power to see them become realities.

VIRGINIA THOMPSON,
Chairman.
DOROTHY MITCHELL
Assistant Chairman.

Abraham Lincoln—Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we observe the birthdays of two great men who have played important roles in the history of our Nation—Abraham Lincoln, our 16th President, and Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a famous adopted son of our country and a hero of the Revolutionary War.

These two great men, living in different periods, with different backgrounds, shared the same respect for the dignity of man and abiding love for our Nation. Each in his own way helped to make the United States what it is today.

General Kosciuszko was an outstanding military leader, and his gallant participation in our Revolutionary War is impressive because of the fact that in assisting our Nation's struggle for independence he did not hesitate to come to our shores and fight for the principles in which he believed. His devotion to the cause of freedom and liberty should be an inspiration to all of us.

President Lincoln's courageous stand for freedom and union is forever inscribed in the annals of our national history. He led our Nation through a critical and tragic period, preserving the Union and opening the doors to a great future for the United States.

Today we are involved in a great and terrible conflict—the conflict between the free world and communism. As we recall the achievements of these two men, we must reaffirm our determination to strive for freedom and justice for all. Let us express hope that the day will soon come when the people of Poland will regain their full independence. It is our responsibility to take a firm stand and be willing to sacrifice in order that we may preserve our heritage and, inspired by the example of Lincoln and Kosciuszko, we pray that, with God's help, we may have the strength today and in the days to come to live up to that responsibility.

The Country Does Not Need a Foreign Affairs Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a Foreign Affairs Academy run by the Federal Government would neither be needed nor beneficial in training American diplomats. The President has suggested a foggy-bottom West Point. An editorial in the Providence Evening Bulletin states that the skills necessary for becoming a diplomat can be obtained in fine schools around the world and that such a Government school would "indoctrinate rather than educate" thinking Foreign Service officers. More inservice training for U.S. diplomats is necessary and should be made available.

The editorial follows:

THE COUNTRY DOES NOT NEED A FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACADEMY

As a matter of pure bureaucratic logic, nothing could be more obvious:

You have to have a Naval Academy to train sailors.

You need a West Point to train soldiers.

You must have an Air Force Academy to turn out airmen.

Why not a Foreign Affairs Academy for diplomats?

President Kennedy, on the recommendation of an advisory panel, has announced he plans to put that proposition to Congress next year.

Why not a Foreign Service Academy, indeed? We hope the Congress tells Mr. Kennedy why not in no uncertain terms.

Because we don't need it.

Because it would do more harm than good.

We don't need a Foreign Affairs Academy because, unlike the military sciences, training in the many skills that go into the making of a diplomat is available in scores of excellent private and public colleges and universities throughout the Nation—and elsewhere in the world.

A new service academy would do more harm than good because it would tend to tighten the straitjacket of inbred, doctrinaire thinking that already inhibits our diplomatic service. A Federal academy would indoctrinate rather than educate.

If the President is really concerned about the incompetence of American Foreign Service personnel—as he should be—there are better ways to solve the problem.

More opportunities should be given to bright young Foreign Service officers, after a few years of experience abroad, to return to schools at home or abroad for advance work in the fields of their special interest.

More time should be allotted to inservice training, especially at oversea posts. For instance, there has been for many years an outstanding orientation course in New Delhi, operated jointly by the U.S. technical mission in India and the Ford Foundation. Although the United Nations and the British High Commission in Delhi have made enthusiastic use of this course to help their own new people get acquainted with the

country, the U.S. Embassy frequently has been reluctant to spare personnel for the scant 2 weeks the course requires.

More contacts should be developed between Foreign Service officers and scholars in the areas of their special interest.

We need a better educated foreign service, but a Foreign Service Academy is not the way to get it.

Schoolboys and Grown Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an editorial in the Wall Street Journal again pointed out the difficulties the United States and its Treasury is having in the realm of international financing.

Only last year Uncle Sam gave, in effect, IOU's for $2 billion to help enlarge the International Monetary Fund. Unfortunately it was not the dollars of the United States that really counted, but rather the currencies of West Germany, Italy, and France.

This amount may not appear to be much in the overall picture, but it clearly indicates the international situation as it pertains to the American dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the proposed $12 billion deficit for fiscal 1964 is a solution, nor do I believe that we can continue to rob Peter to pay Paul. This subject may not have political sex appeal. Nevertheless, it is a subject I have warned the people of my district about for several years.

Once again I want to bring to the attention of my constituents the fact that the value of our dollar and our gold supply have reached a critical stage. Therefore under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial to which I referred in the RECORD:

SCHOOLBOYS AND GROWN MEN

Since the statute of limitations has long since run out, we suppose we can confess to a schoolboy's bit of financial jugglery during our college days.

One day we discovered we could ease that familiar month's end strain on a student's pocketbook by cashing at the campus bank a check drawn on our hometown bank and repaying the hometown bank by mail with a check on the campus bank. Then we could pay off our roommate, buy a beer, and everything would be lovely as long as the allowance arrived before we had to settle our accounts.

It wasn't until later we learned from horrified elders that this was not only slightly illegal but the way in which some of the great financial conmen—from Ponzi to Billie Sol Estes—came to grief. The more balls in the air the greater the crash when the juggler stubs his toe.

We had almost forgotten this schoolboy's foolishness until we read the other day about the marvelous new device Secretary Dillon and his Treasury colleagues have thought up to ease the strain on this country's foreign accounts, a strain growing greater day by day.

The U.S. Treasury's problem, though vastly more complex, is not unlike that of our schoolboy days. The Treasury is hard pressed by debt and short on funds. True, it can ease its domestic strain by in effect simply printing up more dollars, but the same counterfeiting of foreign currencies is frowned upon. The problem is how to get enough lire, francs, marks, and guilders to meet the demand of foreign creditors, pay our bills abroad and shore up the exchange value of the dollar. Here dollars don't help because there are already too many dollars in the world—that's the cause of the whole trouble.

Mr. Dillon's new device is simplicity itself. The United States has gone hat in hand to the West Germans, the Canadians, the Italians and others and borrowed their currencies. Just recently the U.S. Government got $380 million from several European countries by giving them its interest-bearing I O U's, repayable in 15 to 18 months.

The usefulness of the device is self-evident. The United States can take the borrowed German marks, for example, and use them to pay for goods purchased in West Germany without having to exchange more dollars for marks; for it can use them to pay off other debts due in German marks; or, finally, it can use the marks to buy dollars in the open market, thus shoring up the sagging value of the dollar in the world. This does give us a respite from the exchange problems raised by the balance-of-payments deficit and may ease the strain on our gold supply.

Of course it is a sad comedown for the United States of America. Once the United States was the place to which others came for credit; now we must beg loans, sometimes from the very countries with whom only a few years ago we were at war.

And like so many marvelous devices, there's a catch. These borrowed marks, lire or the like must be paid back with interest in the same currency. This means that 15 to 18 months from now the United States must be in a position to buy marks or reborrow them. All it has bought with its loan is time to get its affairs in order.

Now for the United States to buy the necessary marks to repay the loan would only increase the problem the borrowing was designed to alleviate, unless in the meantime the United States has got that balance-of-payments problem in hand. To reborrow, or extend the loan, will of course extend the relief, but in every such case where loans are turning over every 18 months or so the borrower is prisoner of the lender's generosity.

So the only real relief would be to correct the fundamental disequilibrium in the dollar's balance of payments which makes the borrowing necessary in the first place. Like the schoolboy juggler, all ends well only if the "allowance" arrives in time.

Tossing loans in the air and playing one against the other can be an exhilarating sport. It can also be a dangerous one. The sad part is that it is an unnecessary danger if people manage their financial affairs well, and so a reckless one for grown men to flirt with.

A Tribute to Father Junipero Serra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express my admiration for a man to whom the people of California owe an everlasting debt of grantitude; the man: Father Junipero Serra, a Franciscan missionary and an outstanding figure in the annals of California history.

Entering the Franciscan Order in the year 1730, Father Serra soon became engaged in a noble and praiseworthy undertaking that was to occupy his attention for the remainder of his life.

On July 16, 1769, the San Diego mission was founded, under the authority of the Franciscan Order, and Father Serra became president of the mission. During the next 15 years he served as the guiding force that resulted in the successful occupation of what is today the State of California. During his presidency nine missions were founded. At the close of 1783, 7 months before his death, more than 6,000 Indians were recorded as baptised, while more than 5,000 had been confirmed. Equally astounding was the material progress under the missions, which thrived and prospered under the direction of Father Serra.

This man—Father Serra—was a person of deep faith and boundless trust in God. Of keen mind and indomitable will, he secured the California region to the cause of civilization and in so doing, set the stage for the mighty developments that have since occurred on our Pacific coast, to the wonderment of the world at large.

America's Opportunities in Natural Resources Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I want to bring the attention of all Members of the Congress to the remarks of our distinguished colleague HAROLD T. JOHNSON of California, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on January 15, 1963:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD T. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA AT THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING, LAS VEGAS, NEV., JANUARY 15, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to be here and discuss with you a subject of great interest to me, "America's Opportunities in Natural Resources Development."

America's opportunities for resource development depend largely on how wisely and how well we use our land, our minerals, and our water.

Man's life on earth, regardless of industrial refinements, continues to depend upon the basic raw materials of all life—the sun, soil, water, and minerals.

The utilization we make of our natural resources is vitally important to our economic growth.

In my experiences as a Member of Congress I have seen many foreign nations come to this country in search of assistance. These nations invariably place great dependence upon natural resources, indicating

an awareness of the importance of their development something some of us here at home sometimes forget.

Just a few days ago the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council told President Kennedy that this Nation is challenged to help provide for greater demands for products of water, soil, forests, and minerals, not only for emerging nations, but also for our own low-income areas.

The committee told the President that failure to meet this challenge could result in increased costs and lowered living levels.

The report called for establishment of a central natural resources group to coordinate expanded research programs conducted by the individual U.S. Federal agencies.

Of specific interest to you, as representatives of electrical power agencies, is the recommendation for additional development of low-cost sources of industrial energy. A preliminary look at this report indicates the merit of coordination of research.

In development of our natural resources, long-range planning is important. The two agencies which administer most public lands, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, have initiated long-range development programs calling for intensified resource management to meet the demands of this and future generations for water, timber, livestock grazing, wildlife, and outdoor recreation.

A similar comprehensive program for private lands is the rural areas development program of the Department of Agriculture.

President Kennedy has revitalized this program to develop, through local leadership, all human, economic, and natural resources in economically underdeveloped rural areas.

The Rural Electrification Administration has a major role in seeing that the rural areas have the necessary electrical energy.

Whether we recognize the fact or not, the highly developed economies such as ours continue to consume basic resources at a tremendous rate. We cannot be complacent about this.

Nor can we assume that our treasure chest of natural resources always will be there.

The United States has made great technical advances in utilization of raw materials, but this country is consuming its natural resources 20 percent faster than the rate of our population growth.

Wise utilization of our natural resources is, of course, an important part of the overall picture. Therefore, I would like to touch on some recent developments in this field.

At one time only the primary value of our resources was used. Now many byproducts are recovered and, at the same time, better use is being made of the basic raw material.

One pound of coal, for example, today produces 1.4 kilowatt-hours of electricity in modern generating plants. In 1920 the corresponding output of coal was only about three-tenths of a kilowatt-hour. The energy yield of a pound of fuel consumed today is almost five times what it was 40 years ago.

About one-fourth of the wood fiber now being consumed in the manufacture of woodpulp comes to the mills in the form of woodchip residue from sawmills and veneer mills. Twenty years ago virtually none came from that source, even though we are getting far more from each unit of crude material than ever before.

What is the importance of natural resources to our national economy? I cite this example:

Recent studies measured the total value of raw timber to the consumer. The 1958 harvest of timber, before it was cut from the forests, had a value of $1 billion. Value added to that timber in the course of harvesting, processing, fabrication and secondary manufacture, transportation, and distribution to the consumer amounts to $23 billion.

Concurrently, the growing and protection of the trees cut in that harvest involved 80,000 man-years of employment. The various operations which added value to that raw material, between the forests and the ultimate users, involved more than 3 million man-years of employment.

This single industry represents about 5 percent of our gross national product. The same pattern may be found in other natural resource industries.

Therefore, it must be stressed that whether you are from Connecticut or Alabama, from Michigan or Arizona, the natural resources produced in Washington or in Georgia, in Maine or in Colorado are vitally important to you as an individual.

These are not provincial things, important only to the individual actually on the land producing the raw commodity. Every American home, farm, business, and industry still is dependent upon a constant flow of natural resources. This will always be so.

This brings us to the resources themselves.

Soil and water are the two basic resources and they are closely intertwined. Everything depends upon our fertile soil, and water is the agent which brings the soil to life and permits the development of all our other resources.

Therefore, it is fundamental to all our Nation that the watersheds be protected so that their resources may be developed.

For too long we have assumed that water will be available to meet our every demand.

You turn on the faucet and assume the water will be there, but more and more we are finding instances when the well has run dry. Every part of our Nation has experienced this, whether it be a California farmer whose crops have suffered from lack of mountain water or the New York city dweller whose car is dirty because the faucet ran dry.

Our expanding population and an ever-increasing demand for water for domestic, agricultural, and industrial purposes are placing constantly growing demands on our water supply.

Just since the turn of the century, the estimated daily use for all purposes has risen from 530 gallons per capita to 1,600 gallons per capita daily. The forecast is that it will reach 2,200 gallons by 1975.

In total figures, the daily use of water in the United States has increased from 40 billion gallons at the turn of the century in 1900 to some 265 billion gallons today. The total could reach 600 billion gallons consumed daily by the year 1980. Just how much is 600 billion gallons which this Nation will consume daily in less than 20 years?

Most of you have visited Lake Mead. At that rate it would take only 12 days to drain this tremendous reservoir.

An inseparable partner in the development of water resources is hydroelectric power. This is the cash register of many water projects. To ignore hydroelectric power would be to throw away one of our most valuable assets and also the asset which is the principal means of paying for the vast investment we must make in resource development.

Again, the benefits of this power are not restricted to the immediate area in the vicinity of the powerhouse.

Recent advances in transmission of electrical energy have shown this technically. The distance which direct current energy may be transmitted now is almost unlimited. Economically, it is feasible to deliver power a thousand or more miles from the powerhouse.

I personally think it was a grave mistake to limit the TVA service area to a 150 miles or so. I visualize the day when a transmission grid connects every corner of our Nation and even possibly connects our power network with that of Canada.

When that day comes, there should be adequate power so that every person in this Nation may enjoy the full advantages of electricity in his home, his farm, his business.

I would like to say at this point that the rural electric power cooperatives have done a magnificent job in providing electrical energy to the householders and the farmers of our great Nation.

Sometimes the advantages have come in strange and roundabout ways.

Take, for instance, the case of the Amargosa cooperative here in Nevada. I became interested in this cooperative when it was formed and came to the REA for assistance. It appeared that the cooperative could serve some of the people in California whom I represent.

These people in the Death Valley area never have had electrical service. As the Amargosa cooperative moved ahead, the private power companies suddenly became interested in my people for the first time, I might add.

They applied to serve the area. The California Public Utilities Commission granted the license to the private utility.

Even though Amargosa did not receive the license to serve the area, I am convinced that if it had not been for the interest of this fine REA cooperative the private utilities would never have served these people.

The area still would be without electrical energy.

The rural electric cooperative have done great things for this country since Franklin D. Roosevelt created the REA on May 11, 1935.

I might say that President Roosevelt was following in the footsteps of another great President, the conservation-minded Teddy Roosevelt, who brought to the people of the United States the realization of the urgent necessity of husbanding and utilizing wisely our God-given natural resources.

The cooperative movement came into being shortly thereafter, when the private power utilities failed to respond to the challenge of the times and continued to neglect the rural people of our nation.

Their policy was stated publicly that there were very few farms requiring electricity for major farm purposes that were not already served.

That was a quarter century ago—when 89 percent of the U.S. farms were without electricity.

As a result of the strong cooperative movement the situation has been reversed.

Today, 97.6 percent of the 3,700,000 farms in our country are enjoying the benefits of electrical energy.

You can be proud of this record.

Rural Electrification Administration loans have totaled nearly $4,800 million since REA was first conceived.

One and a half million miles of lines are serving 5 million REA consumers.

You, the leaders of the rural electric cooperative movement, have done a magnificent job in bringing electrical energy to the people of this Nation.

Nine out of every ten agencies participating in the REA program are rural electric cooperatives.

This Nation has a continuing challenge to meet its responsibilities in the development, conservation, and intelligent, balanced utilization of our natural resources.

Through your farsighted efforts on behalf of electrical development you have proven your leadership in the conservation and utilization of one of our most important resources—electrical energy.

You recognize the national importance of this resource.

And, in closing, may I stress that the same holds true for all resources—soil, water, pow-

er, grazing lands, timber, minerals, and all the rest.

These are national, not local, resources.

With the help of leaders such as you this Nation can meet the challenge set before its President just last Thursday.

We can provide for greater demands for the products of our water, our soil, our forests, and minerals, and in so doing we can eliminate poverty and want and we can increase employment.

We can help our neighbors and ourselves to raise our standards of living.

This, to my way of thinking, is the only sure way which we can solve our domestic and international economic and social problems, so important to a stable and peaceful free world.

Thank you.

Alsop's Fables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to feel that the management of news, openly admitted by some sources within the administration in the past, is not confined to straight reporting of events as they happen. A curious pattern has emerged in the ranks of those who label themselves political columnists or analysts. By no means does this pattern appear to apply to the great majority of writers—rather to a few.

In a column appearing in the Washington Post on Monday, February 4, Joseph Alsop, touches on the errors in diplomacy that have multiplied of late within the conduct of our foreign policy. Specifically, he calls attention to the Canadian-United States nuclear arms argument, the Skybolt episode, and the resultant stand taken by De Gaulle. Then he searches unhesitantly for the culprit—and finds it in the State Department organization and administration. Why is it that way? Why, because of the Eisenhower administration.

According to Mr. Alsop, "President Kennedy has not got a State Department." In what may well be the opening shot to remove Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Alsop concludes that Mr. Rusk has no executive leadership, however wise in policy he may be. Further, he has no organization—because during the 8 years preceding Mr. Kennedy's inauguration, the Department was "simultaneously debased and inflated to the point of dropsy." Mind you, this was Mr. Dulles' fault, not that of his successor Christian Herter—for after all, Mr. Herter is now employed by the Kennedy administration is he not?

According to the writer, the people within the administration themselves have two excuses for the failures of the administration in foreign policy and the disorganization of the State Department. First, that the President is his own Secretary of State; second, that the real Secretary of State is McGeorge Bundy, the President's adviser for foreign affairs. Cries Mr. Alsop: "Nonsense." Nothing wrong with policy, just with organization. Nothing wrong with the President's judgment—just those under him.

How reminiscent of columns by certain members of the press following the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Not the President—the CIA; the Eisenhower administration before him. Or consider the Saturday Evening Post article, coauthored by an Alsop, on the "doves and hawks" at the time of the Cuban quarantine decision. A scapegoat in the form of the Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, was set up just in case. Now the new target is much less personal, and, for that reason, presumably more palatable—it is that organization known as the State Department.

Mind you, I am not taking sides on whether any or all of these men or organizations bear part of the blame in any given situation. I simply fail to see how the President himself escapes mention when, for example, he personally took the responsibility for the Bay of Pigs. In the present situation, the Skybolt controversy, Mr. Alsop tells us, raged throughout October and November. Could not a single word from the Chief Executive have ended this public display? Or was he unaware that it was going on, as he was unaware of complaints by Federal employees of pressure to buy tickets to a political fundraising event of recent date? If it was possible, as Mr. Alsop says it was, for the State Department to anticipate the reaction of Mr. de Gaulle to the "questionable"—Mr. Alsop's words—multilateral Polaris arrangement at Nassau, why was it not equally possible for Mr. Kennedy to do so? What information did he lack to make such a judgment?

As for the Canadian episode, regardless of the correctness of the American position—originated under President Eisenhower—the handling of the situation was decidedly amateurish. Mr. Alsop states that "according to authoritative report" Mr. Kennedy is angry at the Canadian blooper, and that heads will roll. If it is the organization, not the man, what heads are on the block? And who or what is this "authoritative report"? The latter, of course, is an extension of the age-old practice whereby a statement is made by someone in authority as background or briefing to the press with the stipulation that his name not be mentioned.

It is unfortunate, however, for the Nation as a whole, and for the press in particular, that the administration has chosen to bestow favors on particular members of the press. Insidious politicking by even the well-meaning among the palace guard of columnists simply adds another weapon to the news management arsenal. Fortunately, Mr. Alsop's latest article was painted in such fairytale black and whites that the American people can be excused if they number it among Alsop's fables.

The column follows:

WHAT HAS GONE WRONG?

(By Joseph Alsop)

According to authoritative report, few bloopers have angered President Kennedy quite so much as the State Department's impulsive intervention in the Canadian Parliament's debate on national defense.

It is not clear who was responsible for yielding to the human, all-too-human temptation to show up Prime Minister Diefenbaker, who clearly deserves it. What is clear—what should have been clear from the first—is that yielding to this temptation only made a bad business worse.

Since the President is angry, it is to be presumed that someone will pay for the blooper. But if the President is wise, he will ask himself whether the fault does not lie deeper than the individual bad judgment of this or that official or policymaker.

The Canadian affair, after all, comes hard on the heels of the Skybolt affair, which was very much more damaging. And the Skybolt affair could have been as easily avoided by a little foresight as the Canadian affair could have been avoided by staying silent.

No supernal powers of prophecy were needed to foresee that the U.S. Government would eventually have to make the offer to share remaining Skybolt development costs with Britain—the offer with which the President in fact opened his Nassau meeting with Prime Minister Macmillan. If that offer had been made at the end of October, there would have been no Skybolt row, for the British would then have had no possible grounds for complaint against the United States.

Instead the Skybolt row raged through November and December, doing this country untold damage with all its allies. And when the cost-sharing offer was at last made at Nassau, it was refused by Prime Minister Macmillan; for the British had decided in the interval that they too did not want Skybolt.

The result, in itself somewhat questionable, was the substitute offer of Polaris missiles for the British Navy. This was wrapped up in the scheme for a multilateral deterrent, which General de Gaulle was blandly invited to join.

Once again, it was predictable that De Gaulle would feel he was being treated lightly. He was duly enraged. And it is at least an even bet that this Nassau-born fury was what drove De Gaulle to cross the important line between obstructing the British entry into the Common Market, which he was already doing, and positively vetoing the British entry, which he thereupon did.

Other cases might be cited. But it is not needful to go further, in order to prove that down deep in the system something is very wrong somewhere. What is wrong is not difficult to spot, either. President Kennedy has not got a State Department.

In Secretary of State Dean Rusk the President has a wise policymaker, but a man with no knack and no taste for executive leadership. Yet executive leadership was desperately needed; for the organization Rusk inherited, which had been the most powerful and creative agency of Government under Harry S. Truman, was already in sorry condition when Rusk took office.

In the era of John Foster Dulles, the effective State Department was contained by the four walls of Dulles' private office; and in this period, for various reasons, the rest of the Department was simultaneously debased and inflated to the point of dropsy. In his short, widely underestimated term in office, Christian A. Herter fought a successful holding action, but that was the best he could manage.

Thus Rusk's task would never have been easy, even for a man with the executive talents of a Dean G. Acheson, a Robert A. Lovett, or a Robert McNamara. Before choosing Rusk, the President made the task harder still, in ways that are too obvious to need naming. A Secretary unable or unwilling to assert executive leadership was then installed in a Department debased, dropsical, and divided. This combination has produced

what we now see—a non-Department of State.

There are good bits, like Gov. Averell Harriman's Far Eastern sector, and there are very bad bits. But the point is that it is all in bits. It is not a unified Department, guided by a common viewpoint imposed by its leader, and working toward a common aim, clearly defined from above. It is a congeries of competing viewpoints contrasting personalities, and conflicting ambitions.

Among the New Frontiersmen, there are two popular excuses for this irrational gap in the middle of an administration otherwise notable for its competence and coherence. It is said that nothing can be done because "the President is his own Secretary of State." Or it is said that "the real Secretary of State" is the President's brilliant and knowledgeable personal chief of staff for foreign affairs, McGeorge Bundy.

But that is nonsense. As the foreign policy record shows, the President, and Bundy too, for that matter, need a Department to work with. As the case of the Defense Department shows, that relationship is far from impossible. And as long as the State Department is really a non-Department, other damaging affairs will follow the Canadian affair, the Skybolt affair, and all the earlier ones, quite possibly with end results calamitous to the President himself.

Evidence Mounts for Action To Isolate Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Communist Cuba has just received a partial shipment of Japanese-made fishing trawlers. The order was placed earlier in Japan by the Cuban Government, and additional trawlers are due to arrive in March. The Japanese merchant fleet continued during the month of January its usual practice of transporting goods to Cuba.

The fishing trawler is one of Fidel Castro's most useful weapons in his campaign to subvert Latin America. He has learned the Soviet trick of using the term "fishing trawler" to describe any vessel whose purpose it is to engage in espionage, the transport of subversive agents, and contraband arms.

The Japanese merchant fleet is also free at any time to continue its usual practice of putting into any U.S. port for cargo, and Japan is only one example of how our allies all over the world trade with us and the Communists in Cuba as well. The most glaring examples of this trade are seen when the ships of nations allied with the United States continue to put into Cuba, their hulls bulging with Communist goods.

The United States does not allow its own vessels to call at Cuban ports. Why should it open its harbors and lucrative commerce to the ships of Cuban traders.

I again urge as I have been doing almost each day the House has been in session that the United States stiffen its recent timid shipping order and crack down on those nations continuing to engage in shipping to Cuba. The only way to accomplish this purpose is to close U.S. ports to the nations who will not cooperate with us.

The Olympic Games of 1968

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 days have been very hectic in the city of Detroit. Charges and countercharges have been flying about as heavily as debris in a tornado. The words "unfit" and "doublecross" have been thrown about as part of the everyday conversation.

This all stems from the fact that the executive board of the U.S. Olympic Committee, in a sudden and drastic move, stripped the city of Detroit of the status given to it last October 15 when Detroit was officially authorized to be the only U.S. city to seek the Olympic games for 1968.

Last Tuesday the Governor of the State of California contacted the executive board of the Olympic Committee, indicating that Detroit was not yet ready for the job of handling the 1968 Olympics, and that Los Angeles would be in a position to do so. In withdrawing its approval of Detroit, the U.S. Olympic Committee opened a back door to have Los Angeles again come into the picture as a bidder for this international sports festival.

In presenting their arguments, the Los Angeles group indicated that their bid should be heard by the full committee which, in essence, would compare to a congressional subcommittee hearing testimony on legislation; and, before action could be taken on the recommendation of a subcommittee, hearings again would have to be held by the full committee in order to approve such legislation.

We in Detroit are angered over the tactics taken by the city of Los Angeles and the State of California. These two jurisdictions are not showing good sportsmanship. It is with great disappointment to me to learn that Detroit's designation as the only American entry in the Olympic program will have to be fought all over again. It is my belief that in the long run, Detroit will be awarded the 1968 Olympic games, but only after a hard and uphill struggle.

Detroit is a dynamic city—it is a sports-minded city. Its citizens have the ambition and the initiative to finance and put on this great spectacle in the world of sports. It is my belief that Detroit will stand up to all of the requirements necessary to put on a good show.

Detroit is centrally located within the confines of the United States. Ten domestic airlines provide direct service between the city of Detroit and the major cities in every section of the country. These lines use Detroit-Wayne Major Metropolitan Airport and Willow Run Airport, both of which are within a half-hour ride of the civic center in downtown Detroit. The Detroit City Airport, 10 minutes from downtown Detroit can be used by special charter flights. Six major railways provide passenger service to Detroit's three terminals, all located in the downtown area. Three interstate and six major U.S. highways connect directly to Detroit's freeway system. It is, therefore, apparent that no matter where you are in the United States, it is only a matter of hours—short hours at that—and you are in the city of Detroit.

The citizens of Detroit have been working over a number of years to lead a Detroit movement for the Olympic games. I am sure that if given the opportunity to proceed with the development of its facilities to host the 1968 games, they will be able to fulfill the requirements of putting on a splendid exhibition.

I believe that the committee, when they meet March 18, will fully consider the merits of the proposal made by the city of Detroit, and will recommend that the original decision remain in effect.

In the past, Detroit has been the unsuccessful bidder before the International Olympic group six times, but the campaign to bring these games to Detroit has continued throughout the ensuing years. I believe that in the name of justice and equity, the international committee reaffirm its position that was won in fair competition with other States.

The final selection for the site for the 1968 Olympic games will be made by the International Olympic Committee at a meeting at Nairobi, Kenya, on October 13, 1963. It is my hope that the argument between two cities of the great United States will not be a detriment to us with the final result being the awarding of the games to a European city, which is very possible. We, in Detroit, intend to press our demands for recognition as the only city recommended for the 1968 Olympic games, and shall take every possible means to have the U.S. Olympic Committee approve Detroit as the site. However, we will do it with good sportsmanship and fair play. Los Angeles, in its action of a few days ago, indicated that they are still a long way from making friends and influencing people, with their unwarranted and unsportsmanlike conduct.

Baptist Message Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Baptist Message of Alexandria, La., on February

7, 1963, carries a message about the tax program which I would like to commend to my colleagues:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY, TAXES, AND TITHES

September 13, 1962, the Baptist Message stated editorially that it had been rumored in Washington that one of the proposals to be made by President Kennedy in 1963 to effect a tax cut would incorporate a reduction of the percentage presently allowed for religious and charitable causes.

It is no longer a rumor, but a live proposal, and if enacted by Congress it is certain to have an adverse effect on contributions to religious groups, colleges, hospitals, and charitable institutions.

One of the first church leaders to comment on the President's plan was T. K. Thompson, director of the National Council of Churches department of stewardship and benevolences, who said "the proposals would undoubtedly make it harder for churches and charities to raise funds, and it's already hard enough.

"The President's recommendations," he said, "had been discussed by him with some philanthropic leaders, most of whom agreed that the changes would have a negative, if not a catastrophic effect on giving."

The President's proposal is a 5-percent floor on itemized deductions to nonprofit groups, which means a taxpayer's total contributions would have to be reduced by 5 percent of his gross income before they could be claimed on the income tax form.

The following is a tax case prepared especially for the Baptist Message by a tax consultant which illustrates the 5-percent reduction.

As the law now stands Joe and Jane Doe with two minor children, earning $5,000 per year, itemizing his deductions.

Contributions:	
Church (tithes) on gross	$500.00
Other charities	10.00
Total	510.00
Interest: Home mortgage interest	172.92
Taxes:	
Louisiana sales tax (from chart)	73.00
Auto tag	3.00
Gasoline tax (320 gal. at 7 cents)	22.40
City property taxes	12.00
Total	110.40
Medical: None this year.	
Other deductions:	
Union dues	36.00
Tax services (Federal and State)	15.00
Total deductions	844.32
Net taxable income	1,755.68
Using same problem above:	
Total itemized deductions	844.32
Less 5 percent of earnings, $5,000	250.00
Net deductions allowable	594.32
Taxable net income then would be	2,005.68

Thus, Joe and Jane Doe's taxable income would amount to $2,005.68 instead of $1,755.68. Under existing tax rates, they would be expected to pay a larger tax. However, since Mr. Kennedy proposes lowering overall tax rules, they would probably end up paying a smaller tax, even with the stricter rule on itemized deductions. But their tax saving would be far less than it might have been had the President decided in his proposal only to cut rates and leave the rules for itemized deduction alone.

The savings, however, for a couple with two children earning $7,500 a year would only be $1.56 a week over the next 3 years.

The irony of the proposal is that a couple using the standard tax form can deduct 10 percent (up to $1,000) even though they do not give one dime to charity, etc. Consequently, they are better off taxwise than the individual who donates.

It would be less than naive to shrug our shoulders and entertain the thought that the new proposal would not hurt churches and denominational causes. Not all tithers or major contributors are prompted or motivated by love in giving. Some give a larger percentage to the church because it is deductible. If the real truth were known, it might be shocking.

The local church and related causes at this time are in no position to experience a financial setback.

According to one authority, "In the decade between 1950 and 1960 farm mortgage indebtedness increased 114.7 percent; nonfarm mortgage debts increased 192.8 percent, and long-term U.S. corporate debt showed an increase of 129.8 percent. During the same decade, however, while the national income increased 75 percent, church indebtedness of Southern Baptists increased 745.8 percent. In 1950 Southern Baptist Church indebtedness equaled only 26.15 percent of our total gifts, but by 1960 our church debt equaled 90.78 percent of our total gifts."

The same source states that "Southern Baptists are spending $28 million more annually for interest on funds borrowed for new church buildings than on the foreign missions program."

The President's proposal in reference to deductions could double or triple the financial burden of many churches.

Colleges and hospitals could suffer an even worse fate in the years ahead, especially at a time when they are struggling to redouble their efforts for special gifts. It could well be the beginning of the end for some.

One thing is certain, it would increase the clamor for Federal aid by a number of religious groups.

By discouraging charitable contributions the President's proposal could inhibit the effectiveness of private charitable institutions and in turn could mean more and more takeover by the Federal Government of the Nation's charitable and welfare efforts.

As a passing comment, if contributions to churches and home mortgage interest are reduced as itemized deductions, it can be interpreted as an attack on the two basic institutions of our Nation, the church and the home, even though it might not be so intended.

The Developing Role of the Vice President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Newhouse newspapers have recently run a series of articles which actually represent a landmark in the public awareness of the developing role of the Vice President of the United States.

This office has emerged from a position in which it was merely a stand-in to the Presidency to a position of influence and authority on the American scene.

The very perceptive author of these articles, Mr. James V. Mathis, has traced this development up to the present time when the office is occupied by the respected and esteemed former majority leader of the Senate of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Under unanimous consent, I include these articles in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Star-Ledger, Newark, N.J., Feb. 3, 1963]

JOHNSON PLAYS KEY ROLE UNNOTICED

(What ever happened to LYNDON B. JOHNSON? How close is he to President Kennedy? What power does he have in the administration? Will he stay on the ticket in 1964? Seek the Presidency in 1968? These and other questions are explored in a three-part series by a reporter, who has observed the Vice President in his many roles for 8 years.)

(By James V. Mathis)

WASHINGTON—At Camp David and all across the East it was 5 a.m. on a frigid Sunday morning. Not even the false dawn had touched the buildings or the fresh snow on the Maryland countryside.

A time for sleep, peace, and recovery in a retreat for Washington officialdom.

But inside one building, a bedlight glowed, and beside it a big, restless man in rumpled pajamas and robe, eyeglasses sometimes askew, worked his way stubbornly through a handful of papers, reading, rereading, sifting, studying, considering, rejecting, and accepting.

RULINGS WORRY

Here in the morning when most people slept, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON worried and prepared for rulings he must make the next day and week in a Senate locked in a rules fight for 3 weeks.

Before him the Vice President had precedents dating back to 1803 on Senate rulings by the Presiding Officer, advisory opinions from his 36 predecessors, and recommendations from Parliamentarians.

There were sheets of thin paper carrying outlines and details of possible questions that might arise, and answers in every contingency: "If Senator (blank) asks * * * " or "If Senator (blank) poses this question * * * "

LONG HOURS

He worked on into the morning, while the sun edged upward and the rising winds puffed at the new snow.

On Monday, when his rulings must come, the sluggish Senate might not stir. But what he said would be in line with Senate rules, precedent, and the Constitution, hewing to that narrowly prescribed constitutional role set aside for the Vice President. The rulings would not poach on the jealously guarded rights of the Senators; they would not be too partisan, yet they would not give comfort to the opposition party.

The fact that LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, Vice President, labored there in the guarded loneliness of a seldom-used Presidential residence in the early hours of a January morning upon his only constitutionally assigned task, illustrates two unappreciated features of the man and the office:

1. JOHNSON, at 54, is energetic and as competitive as ever, will labor mightily to master any task given him.

2. The greatly expanded scope and responsibility of the Vice-Presidency under President Kennedy leave little time for presiding.

OTHER DAYS

Thomas Jefferson once wrote of the Vice-Presidency: "It would give me philosophical evenings in the winter, and rural days in the summer. The second office in the land is honorable and easy."

LYNDON JOHNSON has not found many evenings open for philosophizing, if he were given to it. The press of social demands bars many relaxed days. Everyone wants the President; if not, then the Vice President. The Presidential requests for a stand-in are

endless and compelling, the ceremonies wearing.

He has found precious few rural days in the summer. The interminable sessions, the campaigning, and the missions for the President eat into the periods when he might stand on the caliche soil of Blanco County, Tex., breathing the clear air off the hills.

HARD TASK

The job has been honorable, but not easy.

No other Vice President in history has worked at so many varied and vital assignments involving responsible decisions affecting the Government as has JOHNSON.

Not even Richard M. Nixon, who based his near-miss presidential campaign of 1960 upon 8 years of training as Vice President, worked the range covered by JOHNSON. Nor did Nixon maintain the pace set by JOHNSON.

UNKNOWN WORK

Yet much of JOHNSON's work has been relatively unpublicized, known only to President Kennedy or to those touched by the results.

In a time of rapid movement in international affairs and controversial domestic changes, with an active President in view, many lose sight of JOHNSON, the man a step behind and a breath away from the Presidency.

Now and then someone askas "What ever happened to LYNDON JOHNSON?" and a search that really is not a search begins, and a comparison to the Vice-Presidency and the front row Senate role is made. The comparisons usually do litle justice to JOHNSON.

PUBLICITY GLARE

The offices are different; the glare of publicity fell upon the man on the Senate floor; it shuns the Vice President in search of the President.

The evolving role of the Vice-Presidency, and how JOHNSON fits into it, is the only fair way to judge the man. There can be only one President.

For 125 years, the Vice-Presidency was much as John Adams described it: "The most insignificant office that ever the invention of man contrived or his imagination conceived." He was, in effect, no more than the Presiding Officer of the Senate, a man of little consequence.

The first break in this pattern came when Franklin Roosevelt sent John Nance Garner, another Texan, to Japan and the Philippine Islands as his representative. That was in the 1930's.

GOOD-WILL TOUR

Roosevelt also sent his next Vice President, Henry Wallace, to Latin America on a good-will mission. Later, he appointed Wallace Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, an appointment he was to regret.

The experience of Harry S. Truman, who became an almost totally unprepared President after 80 days as Vice President, really led to the change. Truman later set up the National Security Council and had the Vice President made a member. He realized more than anyone else that the United States could no langer stand the luxury of having a stand-in who required months to learn the new job.

Truman's Vice President, Alben Barkley, served on the Security Council but preferred to work harder at the ceremonial role. He spent his time telling funny stories and delighting audiences throughout the country.

Nixon was the first Vice President to combine his energies, ambitions and talents in an effort to make something of the office. He made trips abroad, ventured slightly into the administrative field, and worked hard shoring up things politically for his party.

President Kennedy, however, gave JOHNSON some genuine authority and activity.

JOHNSON's role today breaks down into these categories:

1. The constitutional role of Presiding Officer, or President of the Senate.
2. The statutory assignments as a member of the National Security Council and the Space and Aeronautics Council.
3. The overseeing and advisory chairmanship of the Peace Corps Advisory Council and the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, both by Executive order.
4. Political campaigning in the various States.
5. Foreign missions, including actual negotiations.
6. By Presidential invitation, he sits in on Cabinet meetings and legislative discussions.

Without question, President Kennedy intended and intends to get the most out of the Vice President.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Feb. 4, 1963]

THE MAN FROM TEXAS—LYNDON TACKLING EVER BIGGER TASKS

(By James V. Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—On Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON's desk last week was a billion dollar question: Should the United States get into the race to build a supersonic air transport or not?

The black folder that contained the proposals was in effect a Presidential assignment to the Space and Aeronautics Council. JOHNSON, by law, is Chairman of the Council.

The President asked that the Council pull together recommendations from the National Space Agency, the Defense Department, the Federal Aviation Agency, and any others interested. Study them, and recommend a course. The decision would be for President Kennedy, but precedent of 2 years indicated he would follow the Space Council's carefully drawn proposal.

HIS SPECIALTY

Space has been a Johnson specialty since Sputnik I shot skyward. He made it so as Senate majority leader by brushing aside Republicans' assertions that he could go ahead, they'd keep their feet on the ground. Space was part of the Kennedy-Johnson pact made as running mates at Los Angeles in 1960. It was one of the first acts amended to give JOHNSON statutory authority to coordinate all activity—subject always to the Presidential nod—in the various agencies.

Today, of course, space is a $7 billion annual Government business and promises to grow.

The Council reviews the proposed budgets and makes long range policy recommendations. Acceleration of the big booster program in 1961 is one recommendation. Others include the basic policy which now governs America's communications satellite program and jurisdictional questions between the agencies.

TEXAS GETS LAB

The value of JOHNSON's position might be indicated by the choice of his home State—Texas—for one of the first big space lab sites. The facility and its work will be invaluable in the economy of the gulf coast.

Yet as much as JOHNSON loves to have a hand in space, he has devoted more time and effort to a down-to-earth field quite new to him: Equal employment opportunity.

The Vice President has always held to two basic points in his approach to minority rights: The right to vote and economic equality. He engineered the 1957 civil rights bill passage through the Senate—the first such act in 80 years to get through Congress. This helped voting freedom. His move into the economic field had been pioneered by Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

DRAW UP ORDER

JOHNSON took the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee at the request of the President and set about improving it. He and Abe Fortas, a prominent Washington attorney and former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, drew up a strong and exacting Executive order. President Kennedy issued it.

The Committee now has authority to cancel all Government contracts if discrimination is found and not discontinued and also enforces antidiscrimination programs within the Government. Firms employing 20 million manufacturing and construction workers that do business with the Federal Government fall under the order. Another 2.5 million Government workers are concerned.

In negotiations during the 2 years, much of it handled personally by the Vice President, the Committee has gotten nondiscrimination pledges from 104 large firms and 117 international unions and 300 locals affiliated with the AFL-CIO. The unions, incidentally, do not fall under the scope of the order.

MANY MORE CASES

In 2 years, JOHNSON's committee has received 1,450 cases, some 500 more than the Nixon committee received in 6 years. Of the cases settled, 71 percent have been found in favor of the complainant.

JOHNSON hasn't hesitated to act personally: He recently made private calls on airline company executives urging successfully that they hire Negro stewardesses. Texas companies, some operated by old JOHNSON friends, have felt the sting of publicity after committee action. The oil and shipbuilding industries were among the first to comply with the new policy.

President Kennedy drew his Vice President into international affairs early in the administration. He made JOHNSON chairman of the Peace Corps Advisory Council, responsible for overseeing the initiation and growth of the favorite new effort in the foreign relations field.

SERVED AS ENVOY

But JOHNSON really blew onto the U.S. diplomatic scene in April 1961 like a Texas whirlwind rolling off the Staked Plains as the President's emissary to Senegal. On the streets of Dakar, JOHNSON fashioned the pattern of crowd-mixing familiar to any political observer. It was that purely American phenomonen, the politician working a crowd.

Wherever he went—and he was to travel to 20 nations in 2 years—JOHNSON left riplets of shock behind. Noble prime ministers of Mideast nations decided to get out and shake hands with the people of the bazaars. The Shah of Iran felt he should get a little closer to the people, adopted Johnson tactics. U.S. diplomats were bewildered and fearful and frequently ignored by the fast-moving JOHNSON.

The striped-pants set in the State Department got another shock when JOHNSON spontaneously invited and carried through an invitation to Bashir Ahmed, a Karachi, Pakistan, camel driver, to visit the United States. Bashir Ahmed came, saw, and was conquered. He went home to spread the story—from a new pickup truck—of the democratic "vice king" of the United States.

CIRCLES WORLD

Then the Vice President, who had made only two or three official trips out of the States as a Congressman, went around the world. His primary stops were in South Vietnam, the Philippines, Formosa, Hong Kong, Thailand, India, and Pakistan. In each country, he negotiated either military or economic agreements—something his predecessors had never done. The reports to President Kennedy helped shape future policies in these countries.

Other assignments followed: To Berlin with a firm pledge of U.S. support as the wall rose; to Sweden for the Dag Hammarskjold funeral; to Jamaica and Puerto Rico; and a

sweep into the Mideast to Lebanon, Iran, Turkey, Cyprus, Greece, and Italy. The last trip was preventive medicine, administered by a JOHNSON growing better at diplomacy with experience.

Recently the Vice President was notified that he'll be sent to Africa in 1963 as a Presidential emissary. The stops and schedules are still to be decided, but he will likely visit many of the new nations that have sprouted from the awakened continent.

Where will the next 2 years lead the Vice President abroad? JOHNSON doesn't know, and does not worry. He'll go at the drop of a Stetson to Chad, Upper Volta, or lower Argentina.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Feb. 5, 1963]

REALISTIC JOHNSON SHUNS DREAMS OF OCCUPYING WHITE HOUSE

(By James V. Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the 37th Vice President of the United States, says flatly that he no longer nourishes the dream of becoming President.

For that matter, he will say, when the time comes to formally make up the 1964 Democratic ticket, he only wants to be given the decision to make as to whether or not he runs for a second time for the second place.

Then he will make up his own mind, cogitating a while.

COMES TO ALL

Such moments, perhaps even hours, must have come to all Vice Presidents. These are days when the load becomes inane and worrisome; when the results of the day do not seem worth the time; when he sees ineptness he cannot correct, and the 6 years until 1968 stretch away leanly.

JOHNSON will say at these times: What more could he want? He has risen from a rural home in Texas hill country to the second political position in the Nation, being twice nominated for President on the way, serving years as a powerful Congressman and Senator.

He has ample money: He and Mrs. Johnson own property worth several millions of dollars. His two daughters need never worry financially. He and his family live in an extraordinary home here. He has five ranches of varied sizes spotted about Texas. And a two-engined plane to reach them.

And important at such moments, he had a nodding acquaintanceship with death from a heart attack. He gets no younger: the Presidential workload is fantastic.

How nice it would be, he thinks, to go back to Texas when he pleases and relax. Perhaps teach a government course at the University of Texas. Or simply put his boot heels on a desk or a railing and talk all afternoon, swapping stories.

Now people who do not know JOHNSON well are likely to walk away at this point, saying here is a man poor mouthing and misleading me. The truth is, when JOHNSON talks so, he means it. At that time.

POLITICS CALL

But the man has built-in political reflexes that take over when the campaign liturgy sounds. Instinct rules; energy revives; eternal hope is resurrected.

Hardly anyone believes JOHNSON won't be around in 1964, barring a really dangerous illness. It is inconceivable that he won't reach for the Presidency in 1968—that office having the magnetism it has.

President Kennedy has said that the 1964 position is JOHNSON'S, if he wants it and assuming that Kennedy is renominated.

Democratic National Committee Chairman John M. Bailey asks: Why break up a winning team? White House staffers, sometimes credited with trying to sideline JOHNSON, now are heard to repeat the same phrase.

TEXAS SOLID

JOHNSON should have Texas solidly behind him. Close friend and associate John Connally is Governor, and is bringing unusual harmony to the party in that State. The Vice President can still talk ham and grits to southerners. Labor is not adverse, perhaps has swung toward JOHNSON. He has worked to build friendly minority consideration, and has succeeded with pocketbook-conscious, Negroes who know his job equality efforts have already meant upwards of $30 million a year more for their people from new jobs alone.

Politically, JOHNSON would seem as potent as ever, perhaps more so. As an illustration of change, not long ago JOHNSON was the principal speaker and guest at party functions in Michigan. Delegates from that State led a noisy rebellion against him in Los Angeles in 1960.

KENNEDY BACKING

No matter who searches, or how long, no one has found any solid indication of dislike, distrust, or inability to get along between the Vice President and President Kennedy. The President believes the Vice President is performing well in a difficult position.

Socially, the Kennedys and Johnsons are together constantly, in and out of the White House. No hint of strain is visible.

On the contrary, there are evidences of warmth and glimpses of a strong bond of friendship and fellowship from the President to this completely dissimilar man who shadows his life: The two swim together, watch movies in mutual discomfort, weary their way through the social amenities.

Beginning at Los Angeles, and continuing right up through the time that this is written, when the President has discussed political and legislative matters with a group, the Vice President has been present. The Vice President is at all legislative breakfasts and lunches, at diplomatic luncheons and dinners, and he has unimpeded access to the President. Some weeks, JOHNSON literally spends half his hours at the White House.

JOHNSON knows his position well. He offers advice when it is asked. At National Security Council meetings, where he is always present, he responds to questions when asked, but maintains his role of observer and adviser.

The public idea of JOHNSON is of a man of aggressiveness and impatience. He is instead a man who can exercise great patience and restraint. He never lunges when a slight movement is the key. The training of years helps in the Vice Presidency. He shies away from any indication of palace politics: Fortunately no question of taking over for an ill or temporarily incapable President has arisen. Should the issue arise, Kennedy and JOHNSON have the procedure settled in advance.

JOHNSON recognizes that traditionally Vice Presidents have had difficulty with White House staffs. In the beginning, JOHNSON had his troubles with the Kennedy train. This has now been cured—no blocks are between him and the President.

Clarence Streit May Yet Be Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Arnold Gingrich, publisher of Esquire magazine, in his February "Publisher's Page" comment, reaches back to a piece he wrote in 1938 in order to underscore the good sense Clarence Streit has been preaching for many years. Streit is the author of the "Union Now" book published over 20 years ago, which for the first time proposed a union of the experienced democracies of the world patterned on our own Federal Union structure.

Mr. Gingrich's article is reprinted below:

[From Esquire magazine, February 1963]

CLARENCE STREIT MAY YET BE RIGHT

In Vienna in the years right after the war, when the Russians were stealing watches, or worse, all over town, there was a saying frequently heard around the cafes that was only superficially meant to be funny. It was to the general effect of "Why can't you make us your 49th State?"

Since then, both Alaska and Hawaii, each farther away than Vienna from some parts of the United States, have come into the Union, and meanwhile the world has been growing steadily smaller with each of a succession of spectacular increases in the speed of both communications and transportation. So maybe the idea isn't half as nutty as it sounded then, at the tables outside the Cafe Mozart, surrounded by the piledup rubble from the gutted opera house.

Two men have said things, in the past year, to make us think that the day of a far greater federal union may be approaching faster than ever before would have seemed either likely or even possible. And the fact that the two men are poles apart politically absolves either of any suspicion of special pleading.

First, on the Fourth of July at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, President Kennedy chose the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence to call for a declaration of interdependence with the nations of Western Europe, proposing a partnership that could serve as a forerunner to an eventual union of all freemen in a world of law and free choice.

A week later, Governor Rockefeller sounded a similar note of federalism for the free, saying that the free nations of the world should band together in a federal form of government in the same way the early American colonies did. (Actually, the Rockefeller statement, while issued after the President's Fourth of July speech, predated it by some months, since it summarized points the New York Governor had made in Harvard lectures early last year.)

More important than which of these two men said it first, though, is the fact that each of them was saying in effect what one man has been saying for the past 24 years, for they were both advocating essentially the sort of thing, as the New York Times put it, that Clarence K. Streit has been advocating for a generation or more.

For even before Wendell Willkie began talking about "one world"—in fact, a half-dozen years earlier—Clarence Streit began his now classic arguments for "union now," beginning with articles written from Geneva, and embodied in book form under that title as long ago as April 1939.

At first, as Geneva correspondent for the New York Times, and ever since as a full-time devotee of the cause of federal union, Clarence Streit with amazing pertinacity and singlemindedness of purpose has dedicated his pen and his purse and his person to the advancement of the idea of Atlantic union and an ultimate federation of the democracies everywhere.

Now, in his late sixties, the odds are becoming much better, paradoxically, that he will live to see the better part of his great dream come true than they have been at any time in the last 25 years. For when as a young

man, just out of his thirties, Clarence Streit began preaching union now, it was to an America still strongly neutralist, and to a Europe still hopelessly divided. Today with both NATO and the Common Market in being, and the economic and political unification of Western Europe more nearly accomplished than anyone could ever have believed, the all-important first step has been taken on the road that leads to union of the Atlantic community, and the eventual federation of the free.

It could be argued, and it has been, that NATO has engendered rather more dissension than it has prevented, and that the Common Market is a rose that has put forth more thorns than petals to date, but the fact that NATO could be established, and that the Inner Six and the Outer Seven could be set up as cooperative trading communities, and that all three of those giant steps could have been taken with either direct aid from the United States of America, as in the case of NATO, or indirect, as a consequence of the Marshall plan, as in the latter two instances, indicates a degree of international cooperation that was unthinkable in the gloomy winter of 1938–39, after the appeasement of Munich and before the invasion of Poland, when Clarence Streit was first trying to peddle his plan.

We know, because we remember—for we were trying to whistle a somewhat similar tune, into the teeth of that same gathering storm. Our own variation on this same theme, as presented on this page in our issue for August 1938, was called "Home Thoughts From a Swiss Veranda," and it went in part as follows:

"The Swiss are the living refutation to the age-old argument that Europeans cannot live happily side by side, as we do in our different States in America. The feeling has always been that national pride, brought up on an age-old diet of fighting and kept in tight nationalistic compartments by language differences, would prevent the possibility of ever working out for Europe the same peaceful federation of states that has worked out so well for America. * * * But the Swiss for over a hundred years have fought neither among themselves nor against outsiders, and that one last war was not of their own making but was wished on them by Napoleon.

"Each Swiss canton has its own crest, its own flag, its own history as a little nation . . . [and] each of these little city-states has far more reason to feel a pull away from most of its federated neighbors than have any of our American States. For one thing they have a separate history reaching back a thousand years. There are more traces, in the decoration of old buildings, the crests on town monuments, even in the flags you see flying over both private and municipal structures, to remind you that you are in Basle, for instance, or in Berne, than to remind you that you are in Switzerland. Local pride is intense and local history is a living thing, with battlements still standing from the medieval times when warfare was the normal state of existence and peace was a rare and exceptional interval. And these, after all, are the only real ingredients of European nationalism. In contrast, how many Americans would know their state seal if they saw it?

"Europe could go to school at the feet of the Swiss. And we ourselves could do with a short postgraduate course in learning from them the applied art of live-and-let-live. And while the Swiss live on in peace and democracy, it is silly to take a defeatist view, and say that there is now left only a Chinaman's choice between the embattled ideologies of communism and fascism. There's hope for the Europeans, as long as they have the Swiss example, whenever they want to take enough time off from their bickerings to give it a trial.

"The 'Swissification' of Europe, which would cost nothing in either men or money, or even, in the long run, in pride, is the obvious answer. Too obvious. Too easy. Europe will take the hard way. The hard way, the horrendously expensive way, the way that all the Europeans now hopelessly consider to be inevitable. That way will come either a red Europe or a white Europe—a Europe bled white."

As prophecy, that has to be scored pretty low, though you could say that Europe was bled white, and that the Marshall plan was the transfusion that was needed to put the color back into its cheeks. But the "Swissification of Europe" isn't too bad a label, even now, for the present and prabably near-future state of the Common Market.

Now, of course, two big questions are still up in the air. One is whether Britain will or won't join the Common Market, and the other is whether the Atlantic Convention, after its Declaration of Paris of more than a year ago, will or can push the idea of the formation of a true Atlantic Community farther along toward a tangible reality than by the mere utterance of words, however resounding.

Streit himself feels that England's membership in the Common Market would merely implement Operation Dumbbell, which is our State Department's long-time term (and apparent hope) for a pair of balanced weights, the United States and United Europe, with a crossbar of partnership connecting them.

He prefers, and obviously hopes to see, a multimember Federal Union, beginning with Atlantic Union now, joining us with Britain and Canada and the NATO nations, while later hoping to add Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Ireland, Austria, Sweden, Switzerland, and some of the stabler Latin American Republics, and ultimately hoping to incorporate into the Federation of the Free all governments which believe that the function of government is to serve the individual, rather than the reverse.

This is a high hope. But it is probably nearer to realization right now, whether or not it first takes the form of partnership, than even he could ever have believed would come to pass in a quarter century—particularly when seen from such a somber vantage point as the one from which he first envisaged it, the ominous war eve of 1938.

If you're interested in his views on this subject, or would like to get his current book, "Freedom's Frontier—Atlantic Union Now" (paperback $1, cloth, Harper's, $3.95), you can write to him in care of Federal Union, Inc., 2700 Ontario Road, Washington 9, D.C.—and we don't know of a subject more deserving of interest, at this tense juncture of world affairs.

We Must Stop Contaminating Our Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "We Must Stop Contaminating Our Water," by Dr. Milton J. E. Senn, director of the Child Study Center at Yale University and one of the Nation's most distinguished children's doctors, which appeared in American Home magazine recently.

The contents of this article should be sufficiently frightening to again bring to mind the need for more aggressive action in abating pollution of our rivers, streams, lakes, and perhaps worse yet, our underground water table.

This article should forcefully bring to the attention of all of our people the need for speedy enactment of legislation along the lines of H.R. 3167 just cosponsored by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN BLATNIK, and me.

WE MUST STOP CONTAMINATING OUR WATER

(By Milton J. E. Senn, M.D., with Evan McLeod Wylie)

(The American Association for the Advancement of Science, an organization of 2 million scientists, has recently urged its members to abandon traditional reluctance to become involved in public issues and voice their opinions on subjects of great national importance. In this challenging article Dr. Milton J. E. Senn, director of the world-famous child study center at Yale University and one of the Nation's most distinguished children's doctors, warns that one of the most vital questions that can be put before the American public is how great is the peril from the polluted waters to which we are being exposed and by what steps can this peril be reduced.)

Very recently I returned to the United States from a global journey that had taken me to 14 countries to study the progress that is being made in improving and safeguarding the health of millions of the world's children. In Europe, in Asia, and in islands of the Pacific Ocean, I had seen striking evidence of the elimination of ancient diseases and the improvement of sanitary conditions. Again and again, I had been reminded of how water must always be of immense concern to physicians because it is potentially one of the chief avenues for the transmission of disease. Yet awaiting me on my desk when I returned to New Haven, Conn., were disturbing reports of the growing health hazards that confront children in America because of contaminated water.

In Long Island, N.Y., the underground water table beneath some of the suburban communities, over which my plane had circled as it returned from overseas, was reported to be so polluted by the mingling of sewage wastes that water drawn from kitchen taps is apt to foam thickly with detergent suds from septic tanks and cesspools. In some instances, families living in homes with TV, two-car garages, and all sorts of other modern conveniences have been reduced to boiling their drinking water and drinking from camping jugs.

Striking closer to home was a report in a medical journal concerning a nearby Connecticut community which is notable for its beautiful old colonial homes and high standard of living. Children in the primary grade school had abruptly been stricken with nausea, fever, vomiting, headaches, and abdominal pains. More than 20 cases had occurred and been diagnosed as infectious hepatitis, a virus disease that attacks the liver.

By astute detective work, a team of Federal and State disease investigators had been able to pinpoint the source of the hepatitis outbreak to drinking fountains in a corridor near the third-grade classroom in the primary school. These drinking fountains were served by two deep wells separated at what was considered to be a safe distance (100 feet) from the underground septic tanks which served as the school's sewage disposal system.

The tracing of Connecticut school infectious hepatitis epidemic to sewage-polluted well water reinforced the growing suspicion

of U.S. Public Health authorities that much of this disease in the country may be moving by contaminated water.

Not long ago an outbreak occurred in a block of adjacent homes in a rural village in Kentucky. The local doctor, suspecting polluted water, summoned public health experts who found the disease was almost certainly spread by the transmission of the hepatitis virus from the septic tank in the backyard of one home to a series of neighboring drinking water wells. When colored marker dye was poured into the plumbing drains of the suspected house, it appeared in water from seven neighboring wells within a very short time—in one instance within 30 hours—even though these wells were from 80 to 200 feet deep.

The same situation, a doctor who reported the epidemic noted, might have occurred in many of the huge suburban areas surrounding our large cities where septic tanks and drinking wells are closely intermingled. But would a suburban doctor, he asked, be as quick to suspect water contamination as the common cause of the epidemic?

The disturbing discoveries about the outbreaks of infectious hepatitis and the distasteful detergent suds problems plaguing many communities should drive home to all of us—physicians, homeowners, and municipal authorities—that perils to family health from polluted water are steadily increasing. We can no longer afford to enjoy the popular illusion that because we live in America our drinking water is safe. In fact, clean water has become one of the Nation's major health problems.

What do we know about polluted water in America in 1962? We know that 100 million Americans get their drinking water from rivers and streams into which 120 million dump their wastes—treated and untreated.

We know that some cities which depend upon rivers for water supplies have such inadequate purification systems that bacterial counts are commonly high in the water mains. In other cities the water is safe but extremely distasteful because of the high chlorination it must undergo to ward off pollution.

We know that aside from the pollution of rivers and streams, there is the contamination of underground water by the billions of gallons of wastes and chemicals poured into the soil by sewage systems, industry, and agriculture. This pollution of underground water is far more serious than that of surface water. Underground water moves slowly. It may take months or even years before evidence of the pollution makes its appearance and it may take many more years for natural forces within the earth to purify it.

Thus, while everyone assumes that scientific barriers protect us from the great waterborne diseases that ravaged nations in the past, more of the earth's water may be contaminated today than at any time in history.

What progress are we making toward protecting ourselves and our children from the known and unknown harmful effects of polluted water? As important as recognizing that a dangerous water problem exists must be understanding that we can do something about it now.

The most immediate concrete action that can be taken is the rigid control and eventual elimination of private septic tanks in the densely populated areas surrounding our cities. In the great postwar rush to these new suburbs, tens of thousands of new homes have been built beyond sewerlines and water mains. Septic tanks have been permitted on small lots in suburban developments involving thousands of homes. It is estimated that 23 million Americans now rely on private septic tanks for sewage disposal and more than one-third of the new homes now being constructed in the United States also will have private septic tanks, despite the growing concern of the public health authorities.

Any sanitation engineer will tell you there is nothing wrong with a septic tank so long as it is in the right place. In a rural setting, in the right kind of soil and water table, with plenty of underground space between it and drinking wells and running streams, it is a safe and effective means of disposing of domestic sewage. But as one Florida sanitary engineer has put it, "The septic tank is a country cousin that came to town and promptly got into trouble."

Widespread use of the tanks in the new suburban regions during the 1950's has revealed they cannot be relied upon to deal effectively with the enormous amount of water wastes poured into them by washing machines, dishwashers, kitchen garbage disposal units, and multiple bathrooms. Nor can they be counted upon to contain and dissolve the new synthetic detergents.

Moreover, studies have shown that more than one-half of the soil in the United States actually is unsuitable for handling septic tank wastes from a large number of homes. The minimum requirement for a three-bedroom modern house is approximately 1,000 square feet of design areas in what sanitary engineers call a 60-minute-soil. Few existing recommendations of local health departments live up to that standard.

When septic tanks are overburdened, overflows of their liquid wastes are apt to appear on the ground above them. Not only do these overflows create offensive odors but they also are a health menace. They may harbor the germs of dysentery, hepatitis, typhoid, and polio. They are also breeding grounds for mosquitoes and other disease-carrying insects. They are, therefore, particularly a threat to children playing on lawns and in backyards.

In various parts of the country, failure of the tanks has created serious pollution problems. Sewage liquids have backed up into homeowners' bathtubs, toilets, and kitchen sinks and flooded whole neighborhoods. In one suburban community outside St. Louis, Missouri, yards and lawns became so flooded with septic tank wastes that families could hardly get their children to school.

Many expanding communities have permitted the installation of septic tanks in new developments on the assumption that adequate centralized sewer systems could be installed later. Instead, they have found themselves trapped by wishful thinking.

Even when tank failures occur, many homeowners, fearing the effect on property values, are reluctant to admit that a problem exists, and refuse to support remedial action by the community. Resistance builds up to floating bond issues and raising taxes to pay for the installation of the sewer system and to the expense and inconvenience of ripping up streets and tearing up lawns, gardens, and shrubbery to install pipelines. But as the health hazard inevitably increases, the eventual cost of installing the centralized sewer systems in established neighborhoods becomes several times what the cost would have been of placing pipes in the undeveloped land.

Mounting evidence of the dangerous inadequacy of septic tanks has appeared in the many suburban communities where undecomposed detergent suds cause drinking water to foam thickly. Extensive research studies by detergent manufacturers indicate that the suds are not injurious to human health. But their presence provides a dramatic warning that sewage also may be making a round trip from sinks and toilets into the septic tank, out into the surrounding soil, and into nearby wells which supply drinking water. No one can be sure what bacteria or virus organisms may accompany the detergent suds on their underground travels since these are not obliging enough to foam, taste, smell, or add color to the water.

As new expressways reach farther out into the country, new suburbs will rise in the 1960's in totally undeveloped rural lands. Along with them must rise thousands of new shopping centers, schools, and industries. Facing up to the fact that septic tanks have no place in such new residential areas is the first task of all Americans. The time has come for homebuilders, municipal authorities, contractors, medical societies, and citizen groups to join together in campaigns to eradicate septic tanks from heavily populated areas and eliminate them from most new homebuilding projects.

If your family dwells in a community with modern centralized sewage and water-supply systems, you may feel that water pollution does not affect you. Yet contaminated water is an acute concern of all public health authorities from coast to coast.

If you live in a city, the rural and woodland reservoirs which provide your water supply may be menaced by pollution from new suburban and exurban developments. The lake and ocean beaches surrounding most of our major cities are frequently closed because of sewage pollution. Health commissioners warn that such beaches may be closed to millions of bathers unless there is diversion and treatment of the sewage which is polluting their waters.

Many of the municipal waste treatment processes in use today were designed for the wastes of 40 years ago. For a growing number of cities they are now inadequate.

Many public health authorities now suspect that viruses may be capable of penetrating municipal water systems. Surgeon General Luther Terry has said, "We are by no means sure that at least some viruses are not slipping through our present water purification and disinfectant processes and entering our water mains."

Few ships and boats afloat, from the myriads of outboard runabouts and cabin cruisers that abound in our lakes, rivers, and coastal waters, to the large freighters and ocean liners that enter our harbors, have any facilities for the treatment and disposal of shipboard sewage. Toilet and galley wastes are simply pumped directly overboard into the water.

Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway has opened the Great Lakes regions to ships from all over the world, communities along the lakes' shores must beware of waterborne diseases brought by these vessels that may find their way into water-supply systems—particularly diseases from other countries which have long been gone from America or never before achieved a foothold here.

Another great menace to our health from polluted water comes from chemical compounds. In the last 20 years at least half a million new chemical compounds have come into existence and at least 10,000 new compounds now are developed each year.

Admittedly, great benefits are derived from these wonders that the chemical industry has given us, but much more research is required of their long-range effects for us to find out how we can live safely while benefiting from them.

As fast as we manufacture these chemicals we put them into use in our private homes and industries and, in most cases, when done with them discharge them into our rivers or streams or into the ground.

Most people have little understanding of the problems these chemicals pose in water contamination. For instance, studies at the U.S. Public Health Service's Robert A. Taft's Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, have revealed that a large number of new and unusual contaminants may be concealed in the average glass of drinking water. Not only do acceptable waste-treatment processes fail to remove many of these con-

taminants, but also water-purification processes are equally ineffective.

Pesticides and herbicides in chemical form now are used by the millions of tons by farmer, factory, and housewife. Sprayed, dusted, and scattered over crops, lawns, and trees, they permeate the soil and underground waters and may survive to reach the rivers, streams, reservoirs from which we obtain our drinking water. Some of these new chemicals have been found to be poisonous to birds and fish. At the present time, any estimate of their deleterious effects on our water supplies must be largely guesswork.

Right now, the new chemicals attracting the most attention among sanitary engineers and public health officials are the synthetic household detergents used in washing dishes and laundry. In the short space of 10 years they have captured about 90 percent of the household market. Almost the entire production—currently billions of pounds annually—is eventually flushed down plumbing lines to be discharged into America's surface and underground waters.

Although they are highly effective cleansers, the synthetic detergents differ radically from the animal fats and oils from which we formerly manufactured our soaps in that they have been found to be resistant to being destroyed or neutralized by natural bacterial processes or chemical treatments. Even the most modern sewage plants, it's been discovered, remove only 50 to 60 percent of detergents from water. Chlorination has no effect on them whatsoever.

Hence, almost all treated sewage still contains a residue of detergents. In many instances, this goes directly into rivers and streams and is used again for drinking water by other communities. Research has revealed that some detergents will last for more than 20 days in running river water—long enough for this water to find its way into dozens of city water supply plants for downstream.

The detergent industry is spending millions of dollars in research to resolve the problems connected with the safe disposal of detergent suds. New products which will bring about the breakdown of detergent chemicals in sewage treatment plants presently are in the testing stage. As of now, there is no economical way of getting the remaining unharmful traces of chemicals out of drinking water.

As our civilization has increased in complexity we have found that we must be on guard against the new dangers that accompany scientific progress. Enough is known about the menace of our water pollution problems to make it clear that all Americans must join in a unified effort to protect our lives and the lives of tomorrow's families. We must clean up the water we are contaminating and plan for clean water in the future. Otherwise, dangerous health conditions will spread across the Nation before 1970.

HOW SAFE IS YOUR WATER SUPPLY?

1. Is there a septic tank problem in your community? What is being done about it now? How stringent are the controls over septic tanks as far as property zoning and new housing are concerned?

More detailed information about the construction and maintenance of septic tanks can be obtained by writing to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., requesting Public Health Service Publication No. 526, "A Manual of Septic Tank Procedure," 35 cents. From the same source for 5 cents you can obtain a leaflet, "Septic Tank Care," U.S. Public Health Service Information Series No. 96.

2. Are detergent suds and foam appearing in your drinking water or in the streams and brooks and other waters of your community? What are State and local sanitation authorities doing about the problems detergents may present to your community?

3. Where does your drinking water come from? How is it purified and protected?

4. Does your community have a modern sewerage disposal plant? Does your local health department feel that it should be enlarged or modernized?

5. Are you familiar with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act which permits cities and towns financial grants for the construction of new sewage plants, for the enforcement of water pollution control, for research and comprehensive water planning for the future? Can the water needs of your own community be aided by the provisions of this act? What additional assistance is also available from your own State government? (A copy of the Federal act may be obtained from: The Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.)

6. Is local industry dumping wastes into your streams, lakes, rivers, or nearby coastal waters? What are the plans to control and purify them?

7. Is there a water pollution problem threatening your lakes or beaches?

8. Are you aware that many organizations are banding together to help campaign against the dangers of polluted water? Among them are the National Wildlife Federation, the League of Women Voters, the Izaak Walton League, the American Municipal Association, the American Fisheries Society, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Your support of their campaigns can be most helpful. For background information to use with your organization, send for free brochure "The Crisis," and other information. Write to National Water Institute, Room 1250, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

9. What are your local newspapers and radio stations doing to bring the water problems of your community to the attention of their readers and listeners? Are the points of view of your local sanitation engineers and board of health and county medical society being properly presented to the public?

10. Does your community have a fully organized clean water program and are you actively supporting it? This program is a new U.S. Public Health Service campaign designed to protect America's rivers and streams from the growing challenge of pollution by obtaining the informed and enthusiastic support of the public in every U.S. community. Interested individuals and organizations can obtain information, films, and additional educational materials about the clean water program, and advice about how to develop their own local campaign by writing to the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control; U.S. Public Health Service; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Service, Washington, D.C.

Part 10: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba (December 28, 1962—January 1, 1963)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, H. L. Mencken once said:

I believe that it is better to tell the truth than a lie. I believe it is better to be free than to be a slave. And I believe it is better to know than to be ignorant.

So much confusion has arisen over the Cuban crisis in this country that it has been easy for people to forget what they read, or the order in which they read it. I felt originally that a chronology on Castro and Cuba would be helpful to the public in evaluating this problem, and the response I have received from various people and organizations, as well as Members of Congress, has reinforced this opinion. Part 10 will close this portion of the chronology for the time being. After the end of February, however, I intend to resume the chronology because the events since the first of the year should also be listed in their order, even if the crisis has been completely solved and peace becomes the order of the day. This, we hope, will become true, but in any case, we should view events as they take place and not confuse their sequence because that sequence can be of utmost importance.

I plan to present a sort of sequal within a few days, which will take our memory back to a much earlier period in American history—which at that time was also concerned with Cuba. This small island, 90 miles off our Florida coast, has managed to assume a most important spot in our national life, and I am fairly sure it will remain important for a long time to come. God speed the day when it will be possible to resume friendly ties with the Cuban people and the Cuban Government, and confidence and trust between our countries will be the normal way of life. This is the prayer and dream of all thinking American men and women.

Part 10 of my chronology begins with an attack on the President and our national foreign policy—in verbal form—by Fidel Castro. When President Kennedy met with Cuban invasion leaders on December 27, Castro accused the President of violating all the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter by "his arrogant gesture" in meeting with these leaders of the Cuban exiles. Perhaps this was "sour grapes" on Castro's part. He may well have remembered his 11-day unofficial visit to the United States on April 19, 1959—when he was invited to come to our country, visit, and tell his story—not by President Eisenhower—but by the American Society of Newspaper Editors. In any event, Castro took his spite out on the remaining relatives of the Cuban prisoners by halting their release from the island, even though he had promised them they could join the Cuban prisoners in the United States by paying a ransom of their homes and automobiles.

President Kennedy also found himself and his foreign policy attacked violently by the Communist newspaper Hoy on December 28, which asserted "by receiving his invasion agents, Kennedy is proclaiming a so-called right of U.S. imperialists to promote, finance, and arm the counterrevolution.

The following day, President Kennedy spoke to a crowd of Cuban exiles and promised that the flag of the Bay of

Pigs Brigade "will be returned" to a "free Havana"—although carefully avoiding stating that the United States would take part in this effort.

Nevertheless, Cuba and Moscow—and even one of the Canadian conservative newspapers—castigated the President for his speech to the Cuban exiles, reminding the public and the world that President Kennedy had promised that the United States would not attack Cuba and would prevent other Latin American countries from attacking her during settlement of the Caribbean crisis.

The Havana radio took this occasion to state that the President "admitted his participation and contribution in all steps related to the indemnification demanded by Cuban revolutionary justice to free the mercenaries"—in spite of official denials that the Government had had any connection with the ransom paid for the Cuban prisoners.

The American public was also informed by Khrushchev about that time—during the course of his interview by the London Daily Express—that mankind was indebted to the policy of reason which triumphed when the Cuban crisis was at its height because—

> Here the danger was removed by way of compromise, according to the principle of "concession for concession" and not, as suggested by certain people in the West, by the "sword against sword" principle.

Khrushchev, being well versed in the art of propaganda—undoubtedly meant to leave the impression with the American people that many secret concessions, about which they had not been informed, had been made to the Soviets by President Kennedy, along with his self-defense against charges of being frightened by the United States into moving his missiles out. That he succeeded in sowing his seeds of doubt is well known—and not mitigated to any great extent by later events.

Guatemala's President Miguel Ydigoras indicated his displeasure and disillusionment with post-Cuban-United States-Soviet policy by announcing that his country would retire from the "front line of the fight against Castro communism." He further explained this action thus:

> We cannot push Guatemala into remaining in the front line, with our rifles besides us ready for the onslaught, when others in the rearguard are engaged in profitable business, such as those who are now dealing commercially with Cuba."

From events which began piling up—it now appeared—falsely or not—that our OAS camaraderie was beginning to come unstuck. It also began to be clear that the propaganda value of our Cuban-Soviet-United States victory was losing its appeal and we were fast reverting to our former status of unpopularity around the world. It reminded us somewhat of the song which goes—"King's horses, King's men, marched up the street and then marched back again."

The American people began wondering out loud just who was handling our foreign policy. It just did not seem possible that one single man could be making so many mistakes—or at least they seemed on the surface to be mistakes—and the surface was just about all they had to go by. Their curiosity was partially satisfied even though their fears were not completely allayed—when it became known that Secretary of State Dean Rusk had many many unofficial helpers in handling foreign policy, although not appointed by him. The public had previously learned, through a December 8 Saturday Evening Post article by Stewart Alsop and Joseph Bartlett that even our National Security Council had been reinforced by what Washington reporters had dubbed the "ExComm"—meaning executive committee. This also was called the Crisis Cabinet and numbered among its nine members the Special White House Aid, McGeorge Bundy (also designated by the Washington grapevine as future successor to Secretary Rusk), the President's brother Bobby Kennedy, and his speechwriter, "alter ego" and General Counsel, Theodore Sorensen. To a degree, this explained some of the confusion in foreign policy perhaps, but not quite the confusion in announcements from Government agencies.

The public, for instance, was informed on October 16, 1962 that almost 5,000 Soviets were stationed in Cuba.

October 28, the U.S. intelligence authorities reported the Russians had achieved full combat readiness for all their medium-range missiles—which had a capability of reaching Washington, D.C., St. Louis, Dallas, and the Panama Canal. This was 6 days after our "quarantine" had been thrown around Cuba, and the day Khrushchev agreed to dismantle and pull out the rockets.

November 7, however, found the number of Soviet troops raised to 8,000 to 13,000. November 20 found the quarantine lifted by President Kennedy.

November 29 found the number of Soviet troops in Cuba reverting a bit, from 8,000 to 10,000.

And December 20 found the number of Soviet troops announced as 9,000 to 15,000.

To jump a bit ahead in my chronology, I must add that January 24 found a figure of 16,000 or 17,000 publicly announced as Soviet military personnel still remaining in Cuba.

This "numbers game"—as it has been called—culminated finally on February 6 when a responsible Member of the Senate stated in a radio-TV appearance that 35,000 Soviet military, commanded by four of the Soviet's top generals, were still in Cuba.

On that same day, Defense Secretary McNamara stated in an unprecedented appearance that there had been 22,000 Russian military personnel in Cuba at the peak of the crisis in November—but that 5,000 had since left—and 17,000 remained. He was backed up in this statement by CIA Director John McCone.

Small wonder that all this, along with other events, left most American citizens feeling as Maurice Maeterlinck, the Belgian author, must have felt when he said:

> The truth that disheartens because it is true is of far more value than the most stimulating of falsehoods.

Part 10 of the chronology follows:

December 28, 1962: Fidel Castro abruptly halted the release of relatives of Cuban invasion prisoners today. At the same time, the Government-controlled radio and press loosed a bitter attack on President Kennedy for honoring the invaders and their leaders.

Cuba gave no official reason for halting the release of relatives. It previously had announced that any who wished to do so were free to leave so long as they turned over their property to the state.

Cuban radio commentators today charged that Mr. Kennedy had violated all the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter by his "arrogant gesture" in meeting with invasion leaders yesterday.

The President was accused of a new act of aggresion against Cuba and of showing "imperialist contempt" for the United Nations.

December 28, 1962: The Communist newspaper Hoy said, "By receiving his invasion agents, Kennedy is proclaiming a so-called right of U.S. imperialists to promote, finance, and arm the counterrevolution."

December 29, 1962: Havana radio charged today that anti-Castro Cuban elements are being transplanted from U.S. soil to Guantanamo Naval Base, for aggression against Cuba.

The news agency said the anti-Castro scheme called for a "direct Yankee attack on Cuba on the pretense of defending the base," the radio related.

The newscast said such thundering assaults would force Cuban soldiers to repel the aggression.

December 29, 1962: In Washington, the Defense Department said the charge was "completely baseless and without foundation."

December 29, 1962: President Kennedy promised a highly emotional crowd of Cuban exiles today that the flag of the Bay of Pigs Brigade "will be returned" to "a free Havana."

Speaking under a hot sun in Miami's Orange Bowl, the President said "it is the strongest wish of the people of this country, as well as the people of this hemisphere, that Cuba shall one day be free again."

When it is, the President declared, the brigade which failed in the Bay of Pigs attack of April 1961 and which was ransomed from Cuban prisons, "will deserve to march at the head of the free columns."

Taking note of the divisions that have plagued the exiles, Mr. Kennedy appealed to them to submerge momentary differences in a united front to keep alive the spirit of the brigade.

Mr. Kennedy thanked the Americans who helped make possible the exchange of prisoners for medicines and foodstuffs.

"Their efforts had a significance beyond the important desire to salvage individual human beings," he said. "For your small brigade is a tangible reaffirmation that the human desire for freedom and independence is essentially unconquerable."

December 29, 1962: The official Soviet news agency Tass said in Moscow last night that President Kennedy's promise of a free Cuba causes "perplexity and concern."

A Tass report of Mr. Kennedy's meeting with the free Bay of Pigs captives quoted the President's promise to return their battle flag to them in a free Havana.

"President Kennedy's bellicose statements at the rally of Cuban counterrevolutionaries cannot but cause perplexity and concern," Tass said.

"It is well known that during the settlement of the Caribbean crisis, President Kennedy promised that the United States would not attack Cuba and would prevent other Latin American countries from attacking her."

December 29, 1962: President Kennedy has expressed the appreciation of the United States for Argentina's cooperation during the recent Cuban crisis.

Kennedy referred to a letter sent by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to Foreign Minister Carlos Muniz expressing "admiration and appreciation for the prompt and resolute manner in which Argentina supported the Organization of American States in carrying out its decisions on the Cuban crisis."

"I want to reemphasize the pride which our forces felt in joining with your destroyers and air units in defense of the Western Hemisphere," Kennedy's letter said.

December 30, 1962: Castro ties new string on prisoner of war kin.

The Cuban Government said today it would permit "all those wanting to leave" to do so only if Pan American Airways resumes flights between Havana and Miami, Fla.

A Pan American spokesman in New York said the airline had little desire to resume normal service to Cuba. He said restrictions and limited travel had resulted in heavy losses on Cuban flights in the past several years.

In commenting on Mr. Kennedy's visit to Miami to greet the returning prisoners, Havana radio said, The President "admitted his participation and contribution in all steps related to the indemnification demanded by Cuban revolutionary justice to free the mercenaries."

December 31, 1962: In an interview with the London Daily Express released by the Tass news agency, Khrushchev said he was convinced that last October's Cuban crisis will "leave a very deep imprint on international relations."

"This was a moment when the sinister shadow of nuclear war raced over the world," he said. "People started looking at questions of war and peace in a new way. If mankind is ushering in 1963 in a peaceful atmosphere, and not amid ruins covered with radioactive dust, it is indebted to the policy of reason, which triumphed when the Cuban crisis was at its height.

"Here the danger was removed by way of compromise, according to the principle of 'concession for concession' and not, as suggested by certain people in the West, by the 'sword against sword' principle," he added.

January 1, 1963: President Miguel Ydigoras said today that his country will retire from what he called "the front line of the fight against Castro communism."

"Of course, we find we are in the whirlpool of international politics," he said. "But we cannot push Guatemala into remaining in the front line, with our rifles beside us ready for the onslaught, when others in the rearguard are engaged in profitable business, such as those who are now dealing commercially with Cuba."

University of Wisconsin Study Discloses That Small Business Is the First Hurt by Tight Money Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include a recent study by the University of Wisconsin on the effect of restrictive monetary policy on bank credit for small business in Wisconsin. The study, part of a comprehensive survey entitled "Attitudes of Wisconsin Bankers Toward Small Business Financing," was conducted under the direction of Dr. James S. Earley, professor of economics, and Dr. John Korbel, assistant professor of economics of the university, under a grant awarded by the Small Business Administration to the Wisconsin State Department of Resource Development. The text of the study follows:

TIGHT MONEY, LOAN RATIOS, AND SMALL BUSINESS LENDING

Whether the adoption of a restrictive monetary policy has a special impact on credit availability to small and new business is a much debated question. The adjustments that Wisconsin bankers make to tight money which affect these two classes of business concerns is presented in this chapter.

LENDING ADJUSTMENTS AFFECTING SMALL AND NEW BUSINESS WHICH BANKERS MADE TO TIGHT MONEY AND RESERVE PRESSURES

The lending adjustments of Wisconsin banks which affect small and new business are generally quite sensitive to a policy of monetary restraint. A large majority of banks respond to the mere fact that such a policy has been put into effect, irrespective of their individual reserve position. Thus, almost two-thirds of the respondents indicated they normally look more closely at size and competitive position of business loan applicants and make fewer loans to young, unseasoned concerns when money is tight, regardless of their reserve positions.

These data are indeed striking. If they are accepted as valid, there can be no question but that tight money has a general, and an adverse, impact on small and new business concerns; nor does it seem that we need hesitate in concluding that this is a differential impact. This seems to be rather harsh treatment for the backbone of American democracy.

An interesting observation is that the percentage of banks making each of the four adjustments which affects small concerns is practically the same as the percentage of banks making the corresponding adjustments which affect new businesses. It is noteworthy however that though there was a tendency for banks to make the same adjustment for both new and small business borrowers, the response to one was not highly associated with the response to the other.

LOAN RATIOS AND BUSINESS LENDING

Presumably, tight money has greater impact on business lending if bankers believe there is a certain percentage of total deposits that total loans should not normally exceed. In view of the data presented, it seems reasonable that this impact would be greater on small and new business: that is, since bankers show a decided tendency to ration out small and new concerns when they feel some extra rationing is called for. The height of these ratios as well as the willingness of banks to adjust them upward in the face of rising loan demand pressures should both bear on the impact of tight money on business lending.

Prevalence and height of maximum loan ratios in Wisconsin banks

Most Wisconsin banks try to keep total loans from exceeding a certain percentage of total deposits. Almost nine-tenths of the respondents indicated their bank had such a policy. Over two-fifths reported 50 as the percentage that total loans should not normally exceed total deposits; slightly over a fourth gave 60 percent as the maximum normal figure; and a tenth gave 55 percent. Thus, more than three-fourths of the responses fell within the range of from 50 through 60 percent. In view of the fact that most banks do have maximum loan ratio policies, it would seem that such policies are likely to affect the availability of bank credit to business. Further, when considered in the light of bankers' apparent propensity to ration out new and small business, it seems likely the impact would be greater on these two types of concerns. However, the reluctance or willingness of bankers to adjust upward from their norm is perhaps as important, or even more so, than the height itself.

Flexibility of maximum loan ratios

Most Wisconsin bankers indicated some flexibility in policies concerning the percentage of total deposits that total loans should not normally exceed. Between a fourth and a fifth fall into each of the two polar classes—never exceed and quite willing to exceed. Although a large majority indicated some flexibility, only 22 percent stated they exercised little or no restraint. This further reinforces the potential impact of tight money on small and new concerns.

PATTERN OF RESPONSES

A clear pattern emerges from the responses concerning the height of maximum loan ratios and their flexibility. Banks which indicated that loans should not normally exceed a relatively small percentage of deposits (less than 50 percent) definitely tended to be the least willing to adjust these norms upward. Banks which indicated an intermediate height (50 to 60 percent) tended to have a moderately flexible policy. The group which indicated that loans should not normally exceed a relatively high percentage of total deposits (60 percent and more) definitely tended to have the most flexible policy toward these ratios.

Though it seems likely that maximum loan ratio policies reinforce the tendency of banks to cull out new and small businesses during periods of monetary restraint, this pattern seems to suggest that their impact is not great compared to the very fact that a restrictive monetary policy has been put into effect. It would appear that these ratios correspond to different degrees of banker aggressiveness. The conservative banker with the low ratio and the rigid policy is probably selective enough to whom he loans that the maximum which he believes this ratio can safely be is not reached too often. On the other hand, the aggressive banker with the high ratio and the most willingness to adjust this ratio upward does not pay much attention to its height.

The fact that there is no relationship between the height of these ratios or their flexibility and the adjustments that bankers made to tight money or reserve pressures which affect either small or new business seems to add support to this conclusion. Banks with high ratios were just as likely to ration out small and new businesses as banks with low ratios.

SUMMARY

1. A large majority of Wisconsin banks tend to ration out small and new business concerns under conditions of tight money. This is done as a matter of course, irrespective of the bank's individual reserve position.

2. Though it appears that maximum loan ratio policies reinforce the tendency of banks to cull out small and new business borrowers during periods of tight money, these policies do not seem to have nearly so great effect on small and new concerns as the mere initiation of a policy of monetary restraint.

Citizens Committee Formed for Outdoor Recreation for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the 88th Congress we will

have opportunity to consider further the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, as submitted to the Congress and the President a year ago.

The bipartisan Commission, created by Public Law 470 of the 85th Congress, was charged with three tasks: First, to inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation; second, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations; third, to make comprehensive information and recommendations leading to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and territories.

The Archives are, of course, filled with reports and recommendations in the public interest but on which someone lacked the persistence to follow through.

This week a number of the distinguished private citizens who served as members of the Commission and its advisory council, together with other interested citizens, announced that they have organized a nonpartisan nationwide citizens committee to assist private enterprise and all levels of government in accomplishing the aims and purposes of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report by helping acquaint the American people with the report's findings and recommendations.

I understand that in their discussions the founding members of the Citizens Committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report have been mindful of the citizens committee for the Hoover report which conducted an educational program on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report of 1949 for elimination of duplication, overlapping and waste in the operations of the Federal Government.

I congratulate those who have had the thought, the foresight, and the persistence to organize this new Citizens Committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report.

I wish them success in their efforts as private citizens to make available to their fellow citizens what they learned during their 3 years as members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission about how all Americans can be assured permanent access to their outdoor heritage.

I am particularly pleased that Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, of Tarrytown, N.Y., who served so ably as Chairman of the Commission, has agreed to serve as honorary chairman of the citizens committee, and that two of my fellow Coloradans will have key roles in the committee's work. They are Joseph W. Penfold, of Wheatridge, Jefferson County, and Frank Gregg, of Denver. Joe Penfold, who served as a member of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and is conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America, is chairman of the citizens committee. Frank Gregg, a former executive director of the Izaak Walton League and most recently a member of the Department of Interior's resources program staff, is executive director and secretary of the new committee. I am pleased also that they will be assisted by William Duddleson, who served as legislative assistant to our late colleague, the Honorable Clem Miller of California, Mr. Duddleson is associate director of the citizens committee.

Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues may be further advised of this commendable enterprise, I include statements of Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Penfold announcing the formation of the Citizens Committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report, together with a press release and fact sheet.

STATEMENT BY LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER ON THE FORMATION OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT—FEBRUARY 5, 1963

Just a year ago the members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission—ORRRC—delivered their report to President Kennedy and the Congress. At that time we said:

"We believe we have put forward a program that will assure the benefits of outdoor recreation for the American people over the next 40 years. It * * * envisions a long-range sustained effort—both public and private."

Looking back over the past 12 months, I believe a good start has been made toward the goal of providing the opportunities for the myriad outdoor recreation wants and needs of the present and future generations of Americans. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and a Cabinet-level Recreation Advisory Council have been set up to perform a crucial job of coordinating Federal programs and assisting the States.

The States are coming to see more clearly their responsibilities in this field. On the local level, citizens and agencies in a number of communities have reacted responsibly for the purpose of safeguarding the open space they have and adding to it. Fish and game, park, recreation and conservation agencies, at all levels of government, are approaching their tasks of serving the public with a new sense of the importance of their work for the well-being of the people. And there is evidence of increasing awareness on the part of private landowners and natural resource industries that their interests and those of the recreation public can, and indeed should, mix.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report alone of course did not bring about these examples of progress which I have cited. What it did do was to help, directly or indirectly, in large or small measure, in all of these actions and attitudes, and many others. It did this by laying out the facts and by spelling out the problems, and by proposing solutions and approaches to solutions of those problems. The half a hundred recommendations made in the report were backed by the authority of the most thorough and objective studies ever made in this field. This was widely recognized.

Also, perhaps for the first time, there was recognition of the full dimension of the subject of outdoor recreation—that it isn't just for fun, that involved in it is the kind of America we have and want to have, and the kind of people we are and are likely to become.

Perhaps the most striking thing that has followed the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report has been the elevation of this entire subject of the outdoors up from the bushes to the treetops. At least it is on its way up there. It belongs up there, on a level with the other values that are so important to our health, education, and welfare.

But a great deal remains to be done. Only a start has been made on that "long-range sustained effort—both public and private."

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission itself, a temporary joint congressional and citizen group, has disbanded as scheduled. The distinguished congressional Members of the Commission are working in the Senate and the House on behalf of outdoor recreation.

Today we are announcing the formation of the Citizens Committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report. It has been organized by a number of interested citizens, including private citizen members of Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The citizens committee is assuming a role which only private citizens can play: To spread the knowledge as to the needs, the opportunities and the means whereby the outdoor recreation potentials of our Nation can be fully realized.

The committee's purpose is to further the aims and objectives of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report. Its task is to educate. The committee will seek the widest possible understanding and practice of the policies and programs advocated in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report.

The committee will publish and distribute various kinds of informative material. A basic publication will spell out the committee's aims, digest the major findings and proposals of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report, "Outdoor Recreation for America," and of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission background studies prepared by many authorities, and give information on how citizens can assist and participate. We will cooperate with other organizations in developing their own programs consistent with the committee's purpose. And we will offer comment when appropriate on public and private proposals and actions involved in or related to outdoor recreation.

The committee's principal effort will be devoted to broadening the base of activity on behalf of and providing more opportunities for outdoor recreation. By "broadening the base" I mean enlisting the support of organizations and individuals that are not principally concerned with outdoor recreation. The committee expects soon to be equipped to cooperate with them and to assist them. It also hopes to work in close cooperation with the many recreation and conservation organizations already doing an effective job.

The Citizens Committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report welcomes the support of all who wish to further the aims of the report. The committee at this stage is small; it has need of additional leadership and the active participation of those who share its purpose. It is the committee's earnest hope that many citizens, many groups, will want to take part in this work. For, to quote from the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report:

"The outdoors lies deep in American tradition. It has had immeasurable impact on the Nation's character and on those who made its history. Today's challenge is to assure all Americans permanent access to their outdoor heritage."

That is a big challenge, worthy of big effort.

Those who met and discussed and founded the committee made an excellent beginning when they chose Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League, to be chairman. It is my pleasure to introduce him to you now.

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH W. PENFOLD ON THE FORMATION OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT—FEBRUARY 5, 1963

Mr. Rockefeller has pointed out that the citizens committee is a logical outgrowth of the studies and recommendations set forth by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. We believe as well that the committee is an essential step toward realizing the commission's policy and program goals.

Thus, in a sense the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission becomes the citizens committee "bible," a reliable guide for us and for all citizens interested in outdoor recreation in reaching our common goals during the next four decades when our population is expected to double while demand for outdoor recreation will at least triple.

The recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission fall into five general categories:

1. A national outdoor recreation policy.
2. Guidelines for the management of outdoor recreation resources.
3. Expansion, modification, and intensification of present programs to meet ever-increasing needs.
4. Establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Federal Government and comparable administrative arrangements at the State level.
5. A Federal program of financial assistance to the States.

The recommended broad policy is simply stated: "It shall be the national policy, through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop, and make accessible to all American people such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment and to assure the physical, cultural, and spiritual benefits of outdoor recreation. Implementation of this policy will require the cooperative participation of all levels of government and private enterprise."

As seen by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the States must play a pivotal role, local government must expand its efforts, individual initiative and private enterprise should continue to be an important force, and should be so encouraged by Government.

Guidelines for management developed by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission include a broad system for classifications. This system has as its purpose not the expansion of outdoor recreation opportunity by standardized, assembly line methods. Quite to the contrary, it emphasizes that each area has its individual recreation potential which should be recognized, and developed in order that it may fill its appropriate place in the national recreation mosaic. For example, the thermal marvels of Yellowstone Park are not similar in recreation-use value to the untapped wilderness resources of Yellowstone's Thorofare section, nor can the two areas be developed or utilized under the same management criteria. The classification system recognizes, however, the similarity of value and potential between the Thorofare area and the Snowmass wilderness in Colorado, and the similarity of value and potential between the geysers of Yellowstone and the Big Spring of Missouri's State park of the same name.

The guidelines recognize similarities in recreation-use potential of high-density areas, the Jones Beaches and the Ocean Citys. It recognizes the varying potentials in the national forests, the public domain lands of the West when administered under the multiple-use and sustained-yield concepts. And it recognizes these potentials irrespective of ownership—Federal, State, local, or private.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission studies demonstrated, beyond all doubt, that a burgeoning population, with pyramiding outdoor recreation needs and desires, will require steady and responsible expansion of existing governmental and private programs; that there is great need for public acquisition of strategically important and unique areas; an even greater need to make better use of the areas already in public ownership or otherwise available for public recreation use, and that there must be secured access to lakes, streams, reservoirs, beaches, and the like which may be available but presently unusable.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Federal Government to serve the essential coordinating job among the score of Federal agencies concerned one way or another in outdoor recreation, to assist States and local governments, to act as a clearinghouse of information, to further badly needed research, to encourage interstate and regional cooperation, and to spearhead development of a nationwide outdoor recreation plan. It is gratifying that the President shortly after he received the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report did establish the interdepartmental Recreation Advisory Council, and the Secretary of the Interior did establish the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Legislation introduced by Senator ANDERSON (S. 20) and Congressman ASPINALL (H.R. 1762), cosponsored by Senators JACKSON, MILLER, METCALF, AIKEN, ENGLE, Representative SAYLOR and others, is now before Congress and would confirm these actions and their national policy implications.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission also recommended a Federal program of grants-in-aid to the States for planning, acquisition and development to stimulate, encourage and assist the States in meeting their responsibilities in the outdoor recreation field. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recognized that outdoor recreation will cost money, far more than is now being spent, and recommended broader programs of recreation user fees and use of general obligation and revenue bonds, in addition to regular appropriations.

In conclusion, may I repeat that the citizens committee has been formed to further public knowledge and understanding of these broad objectives and thus assure a dynamic public opinion which will assist in productive and effective decisions and choices by the public and Government alike.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

WASHINGTON.—Formation of a nationwide citizens committee to help meet the growing outdoor recreation needs of the American people was announced today (February 5) by Laurance S. Rockefeller.

Announcement of the Citizens Committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report was made at a luncheon attended by Members of Congress and the administration, and leaders of civic, conservation and other organizations.

Rockefeller said that since the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) presented its report to President Kennedy and Congress a year ago, a good start had been made "toward the goal of providing for the myriad outdoor recreation wants and needs" of the Nation through the year 2000.

"Perhaps for the first time," he said, "there has been recognition of the full dimension of the subject of outdoor recreation—that it isn't just for fun, that involved in it is the kind of America we have and want to have, and the kind of people we are and are likely to become."

But, recalling that Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission cautioned that a "long-range sustained effort—both public and private" would be required, he declared that " a great deal remains to be done."

Rockefeller served as chairman of Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and is honorary chairman of the new committee. He was joined in the announcement by Joseph W. Penfold, chairman of the new citizens Committee. Penfold is conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America and was a member of Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report contained some 50 recommendations aiming at more effective use of existing outdoor recreation resources and acquisition of new areas, particularly shoreline areas.

The report also urged adoption of a national outdoor recreation policy and called for a classification system—in effect recreation zoning—as a management tool for realizing full potential of recreation lands.

One of its key proposals, calling for establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, was acted upon last spring. A Federal grant-in-aid program of matching funds to States to help plan, acquire and develop recreation areas, was another major recommendation, and is expected to receive consideration by this Congress.

The new committee, Rockefeller said, "Will seek the widest possible understanding and practice of the policies and programs advocated in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report." He said a principal effort will be devoted "to broadening the base of activity" on behalf of outdoor recreation by enlisting the support of organizations and individuals not principally concerned with outdoor recreation.

Rockefeller said the committee will:

(1) Publish and distribute informative material, including digests of Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's 246-page summary report and 27 background study reports, the most thorough and objective studies ever made in this field.

(2) Provide information on how citizens and citizen-groups can assist and participate.

(3) Cooperate with other organizations in developing their own programs consistent with the committee's purpose.

(4) Analyze and offer comment when appropriate on proposals and actions related to outdoor recreation.

"It is the committee's earnest hope that many citizens, many groups, will want to take part in this work * * * to assure all Americans permanent access to their outdoor heritage," Rockefeller said.

Penfold described the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report as a reliable guide for the next four decades when our population is expected to double while outdoor recreation demand will at least triple.

He emphasized that the States must play a pivotal role, local government must expand its efforts and individual initiative and private enterprise should continue to be an important force, and should be so encouraged by government.

He commended President Kennedy and Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall for establishing by Executive order a Cabinet-level interdepartmental Recreation Advisory Council and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation last year shortly after the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report was submitted. He noted that legislation now before Congress would confirm these ac-

tions and their national policy implications.

Referring to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission-recommended grant-in-aid program, he said it would stimulate, encourage, and assist the States in meeting their responsibilities.

He said that Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recognized that outdoor recreation costs money, far more than is now being spent, and recommended fair and reasonable recreation user fees and use of general obligation and revenue bonds in addition to regular appropriations.

The American Conservation Association, a nonprofit organization, has provided initial funds for operation of the new citizens committee. Additional financial support will be sought from interested organizations and individuals.

The new committee is a temporary organization which will be dissolved when its objectives are met.

In addition to Rockefeller and Penfold, four others who served as members of Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission by Presidential appointment are founding members of the citizens committee. They are:

Samuel T. Dana, of Ann Arbor, Mich., dean emeritus of the University of Michigan's School of Natural Resources; Mrs. Orvil E. Dryfoos, of New York, N.Y., associate director of special activities, the New York Times; Bernard L. Orell, of Tacoma, Wash., vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., and M. Frederik Smith, of Newark, N.J., president, Oakland Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Members of Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's advisory council who will serve on the committee are Dr. Ira Gabrielson, of Oakton, Va., president of the Wildlife Management Institute, and Joseph Prendergast, of New York, N.Y., executive director of the National Recreation Association.

The other founding members are Charles A. DeTurk, of Sacramento, Calif., director of the California State Department of Parks and Recreation; Maurice K. Goddard, of Harrisburg, Pa., secretary of the Pennsylvania State Department of Parks and Recreation; Carl O. Gustafson, of New York, N.Y., member of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission; Miss Olga Madar, of Detroit, Mich., United Automobile Workers' director of recreation; Gordon W. Rule, of Washington, D.C., Washington counsel, National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers; George A. Selke, of Portland, Oreg., former chancelor of the University of Montana and former Minnesota State commissioner of conservation; Richard H. Stroud, of Springfield, Va., executive vice president of the Sport Fishing Institute, Washington, D.C., and Harold G. Wilm, of Albany, N.Y., commissioner of the New York State Conservation Department.

In addition to Rockefeller and Penfold, the committee's initial officers are Dr. Gabrielson, Goddard, Orell, Prendergast, and Smith, vice chairmen; Gustafson, treasurer, and Frank Gregg, of Denver, Colo., secretary.

Gregg, who is also the committee's executive director, served with the Department of the Interior's resources program staff during the last 2 years and before that was executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America.

William Duddleson, of Santa Rosa, Calif., legislative assistant to the late Congressman Clem Miller, of California, will serve as associate director of the committee.

The committee's office is at room 616, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

Organized: January 31, 1963, as a committee of the American Conservation Association, Inc., a nonprofit corporation chartered in the State of New York for educational and scientific purposes.

Purpose: To assist generally in accomplishing the aims and purposes of the report to the President and the Congress of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC). The Commission was established by Congress in 1958 to measure outdoor recreation needs and wants, inventory and evaluate the Nation's outdoor recreation resources and recommend means of assuring adequate outdoor recreation opportunity for the American people through the year 2000. The Commission report, "Outdoor Recreation for America," was delivered to President Kennedy and the Congress January 31, 1962.

Membership: To provide a broad base of support for accomplishing the aims and purposes of the Commission, the membership will represent many groups concerned with or affected by outdoor recreation and all areas of the country.

Program: Principal efforts will be directed at dissemination of information about the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report and about the 27 study reports on specific topics prepared by universities, nonprofit research organizations, public agencies, the commission staff and individual authorities. The committee will issue educational and informational materials, work cooperatively with individuals, citizen organizations—particularly those not concerned principally with conservation—and with public officials to assist in developing outdoor recreation programs which will contribute to meeting public needs; sponsor meetings and conferences; and analyze and comment upon proposals and actions which may affect outdoor recreation.

Operating procedures: Policy and program will be established by a 25-member board of managers. An executive committee of the board will provide policy guidance between meetings of the board. The staff will execute policy and program under supervision of the Chairman.

Officers: Honorary chairman, Laurance S. Rockefeller, of Tarrytown, N.Y.; chairman, Joseph W. Penfold, of Alexandria, Va.; vice chairmen: Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, of Oakton, Va., Maurice K. Goddard, of Harrisburg, Pa., Bernard L. Orell, of Tacoma, Wash., Joseph Prendergast, of New York, N.Y., and M. Frederik Smith, of Newark, N.J.; treasurer, Carl O. Gustafson, of New York, N.Y.; secretary, Frank Gregg, of Bethesda, Md. Other founding members of the board of managers: Samuel T. Dana, of Ann Arbor, Mich., Charles A. DeTurk, of Sacramento, Calif., Mrs. Orvil E. Dryfoos, of New York, N.Y., Miss Olga Madar, of Detroit, Mich., Gordon W. Rule, of Washington, D.C., George A. Selke, of Portland, Oreg., Richard H. Stroud, of Springfield, Va., and Harold G. Wilm, of Albany, N.Y.

Staff: Executive director, Frank Gregg; associate director, William Duddleson.

Financing: American Conservation Association, Inc., has provided initial funds. Additional financial support will be sought from interested organizations and individuals.

Duration: The citizens commitee is a temporary organization. It will be dissolved when its objectives are realized.

Juggernaut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that anyone who read of the running down of two small girls, one of whom died, by a runaway truck in Washington, D.C., on the day after Christmas last year was touched both by the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of December 29, 1962, and by the letter which appeared in that newspaper from the father of one of the children, Mike Gorman, of Washington, D.C.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the editorial, "Juggernaut," and Mr. Gorman's letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JUGGERNAUT

We have contrived a wondrous civilization in which men rush about from place to place in motor-propelled vehicles, in which the commerce of the community is carried on by rolling steel behemoths. But we seem sometimes to have forgotten that the community is meant primarily, to sustain human life.

There have been more than 60 human lives snuffed out this year in the District of Columbia by traffic accidents—by the human carelessness in handling harnessed horsepower, this is to say, which lets steel engines run recklessly through the city's streets. This irresponsible folly was dramatized on the day after Christmas when two little girls—8-year-old children—were mowed down by a runaway oil truck in a residential byway where they believed they were safe from the bustle and roar of commercial traffic.

One of the little girls died before she could be taken to a hospital; the other is desperately injured. We do not propose to assess individual blame for this tragedy. Perhaps none of us is wholly free from responsibility, as none of us is wholly free from this kind of threat to his own children. We know only that accidents are caused by human frailty; they occur because we forgot that machines are insensate, that uncontrolled by thinking and responsible minds they will control and crush us—that we employ them only at our peril, and at peril to our fellow men.

This is called the machine age. Infinite effort is expended to furnish fuel for the machines; infinite care is taken to give them freeways and speedways. Have they become masters, not servants? Or have we yet enough control—self-control, this is to say—to govern them responsibly, to keep them at least from devouring our young?

"IF ONE CHILD IS LOST"

In this, the age of the machine, it grows increasingly hard for the human species to survive. More than 50 years ago, Henry Adams wrote of this when he warned that the machine threatened to engulf the humanitarian and religious aspirations of the Western World.

On December 26 my daughter Patricia and her closest friend, Elin Grogan, went down a little alley in quest of a goldfish which Patricia could present to Elin in honor of her eighth birthday that very day. This little alley is a gentle thoroughfare—it is flanked by trees and so numerous are the squirrels that the children of our neighborhood call it "squirrel alley."

The little girls completed their mission and were heading up the alley from Ordway Street when an oil truck roared down the steep incline toward them. This truck was a mindless monster without a driver at the wheel. The driver, who had been having trouble with the drive shaft, parked the machine with the front of the truck facing down the steep, icy incline.

The little girls, both 8 years old, and both very much in love with life, had no chance. As my little girl said to me in a semidelirium after 2½ hours of surgery: "Daddy, it just came right at us. We had no chance."

Although Patricia was badly hurt—her leg had been run over by the truck and her pelvis broken—she struggled to reach her friend

Elin. My little girl, although she has inhabited this earth for a relatively short period of time, knew instinctively that the helping hand of person-to-person is the greatest strength of this democracy, far greater than all the mindless machines, computers, and the military hardware.

As I sat with her the first night after her surgery, she would regain consciousness occasionally and her plea, repeated four times during that frightful night, was: "Daddy, please see that they take care of Elin—she is badly hurt."

I am no stranger to Capitol Hill, and maybe I should be inured to the hardware boys who each year extract billions upon billions of dollars for weapons of destruction. I am not unfamiliar with the highway lobbyists who 3 years ago extracted some $41 billion from the Congress for a 10-year program of building more highways. Many States which have done shabbily by their health and welfare institutions never fail to appropriate enough money to match the enormous Federal contribution for more highways.

I read a newspaper item the other day to the effect that there are 63 million autos and 12,500,000 trucks competing for space on our highways today. One of those trucks killed little Elin Grogan and nearly killed my daughter.

Despite the continued pleadings of the National Safety Council, the slaughter of humans on our highways continues unabated and reached record heights over the past Christmas holiday.

I am deeply grateful to the doctors at Children's Hospital who put my daughter back together again. In this age in which machines and hardware are supreme, they do not rate very highly on the status totem pole. For example, since 1949, we have tried to pass a bill to reduce the critical shortage of doctors by building additional medical schools. It has always gone down to defeat. By way of contrast, we have $41 billion for highways, we will spend $30 billion on a ride to the moon, and our military budget will exceed $50 billion in the coming year. I remember an old quotation: "If one child is lost, America is the less." America is the less today because of the loss of one of the sweetest little children I have ever known.

Out of this tragedy, and out of similar ones which occur every day on our highways, there must come a reassessment of our present values. If we are a country constituted of the people, by the people, and for the people, then I plead with all who own machines and hardware to develop a decent respect for human life. There is in all the mighty machinery we have ever built no ounce of consolation for the Grogan family. However, as I sat with my little girl in the hospital, my mind ran back to a poem called "Deaths of Little Children," written more than a century ago by the English poet Leigh Hunt:

"Those who have lost an infant are never, as it were, without an infant child. They are the only persons who, in one sense, retain it always."

MIKE GORMAN,
Executive Director, National Committee Against Mental Illness.
WASHINGTON.

GI Insurance Dividend: Fictitious Beneficence of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed by the thoughts contained in the following letter I just received from one of our citizens who cautions against the kind of false thinking that can be generated by fictitious beneficence of bureaucracy. Therefore, I commend her letter as thought-provoking reading for the entire membership.

The letter from Miss Mary Jane Larson, of Dixon, Ill., follows:

DIXON, ILL., *February 6, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Since the extra dividend has been returned on GI insurance, I have heard so many people giving the credit to Kennedy. Of course, it conveniently arrived on the day of his message to Congress and with it was a note from him.

These people fail to realize that the dividend is the earnings on the money and must be returned because the Government is not in the insurance business.

In selling insurance we use this actuary illustration: "If 3,000 people, age 37, took out $5,000 worth of 20-pay life which would be $15 million of insurance in force and no other insurance was written, the actual interest income alone would be $4,884,000. If the expense per policy were $30 and the last person of the 3,000 died between 94 and 95 years old and all beneficiaries were paid, there would be $92 million left in the Treasury."

I hope some statement will be made because too many people believe this dividend is the beneficence of Kennedy, not because insurance is a good investment.

I hope you will be able to help in this matter.

Susan and I send you our very best wishes and a salute for the fine job you are doing.

Yours truly,

MARY JANE LARSON.

South Milwaukee: Spectacle City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to another fine community in my congressional district, South Milwaukee, by including an article on the city by William Janz, a reporter for the Milwaukee Sentinel.

South Milwaukee is probably best known throughout our Nation as the site of the annual "Spectacle of Music." This annual event attracts thousands of people from all parts of the United States to South Milwaukee for a colorful pageant and contest of nonprofessional bands, drum and bugle corps and baton twirlers. In past years it has often been my privilege to participate in Spectacle of Music activities.

But more than being spectacle city, South Milwaukee is a thriving, self-contained community of homes and businesses. An attractive city, it is blessed with many civic-minded citizens who wish to see South Milwaukee grow and prosper. It has fine sites for industrial development as well as good land for residential use.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I direct the attention of my colleagues to the following article on this outstanding American community.

The article follows:

SOUTH MILWAUKEE INDEPENDENTLY HEALTHY
(By William Janz)

South Milwaukee is independently healthy. Its only debt to Milwaukee is its name, the name of its main street, Milwaukee Avenue, and a bus route.

South Milwaukee is an unusual suburb in that it has this history of independence.

The city became a suburb only when the population of the central city expanded 10 miles from Milwaukee's downtown area, across what is now St. Francis and Cudahy, to the self-reliant community of South Milwaukee.

The city is proud of its independence. People not only live in South Milwaukee but many of them also work there. They attend their own schools, drink their own water, borrow books from their own city library and can even brag, if they wish, when in plug in a bothtub is pulled. The city and not a metropolitan system has put down a sewer through which the water can drain.

In short, South Milwaukee takes care of its own problems.

The city's attitude toward getting involved in the "metropolitan complex" as Mayor William P. Atkinson likes to call it, is well known. It concerns local patriotism.

One of the most famous incidents demonstrating this attitude involved a mock funeral in South Milwaukee in 1935 when Mr. Consolidation was buried in a black coffin. South Milwaukee has always been a cemetery for suggestions of consolidation.

In 1935, the city was celebrating the centennial of the coming of the first settler to the Oak Creek woods. One of the highlights of the observance was the mock funeral.

A referendum on consolidation of governmental branches has carried in the county 104,708 to 40,319, but the legislature killed the constitutional amendment necessary for unification.

So at an appropriate ceremony in an appropriate city, with many suburban official attending, Mr. Consolidation was buried in South Milwaukee. His death was attributed to "consolidation of the joints" following "a major operation in the State assembly."

"We're independent of every community," Mayor Atkinson said. "This city grew up in the early days as an independent city and a way of doing things was built up, a sort of smalltown attitude that people here like. It's a close arrangement—a close-knit community and not just another metropolitan area, another cog in the wheel."

Though the city's population is now 23,000, Atkinson said that when he or any other official walked down the street "and someone's got a gripe, he says so and we can step in and get the problem settled."

When residents want something done, they approach officials on 10th Avenue, in city hall, or at home. And they get action.

Part of the sanitary sewer system the city now has may be attributed to the fuss property owners put up in 1948 when some of them moved outhouses to their front lawns to dramatize the lack of an essential service.

But that was in 1948. In 1963 South Milwaukee is a self-contained city. It is varied. It is industrial, yet there are beautiful residential areas as fine as any in the county. It has high, sandy bluffs above a thin, white stretch of beach that mixes with the blue of Lake Michigan.

Oak Creek may cause problems in the spring but it is a beautiful, winding waterway through the city and ends in Grant Park, one of the best wooded areas in the county.

The city has an interesting history. South Milwaukee incorporated as a village with only 517 persons in 1892 and as a city in 1897. Only Whitefish Bay and Wauwatosa

preceded. Polish, German, and Hungarian immigrants were attracted to the productive factories that located there.

The construction of the Panama Canal gave a boost to South Milwaukee industry. Some of the steam shovels that helped dig the canal were made by the Bucyrus-Erie Co. of South Milwaukee.

The city was incorporated in the northeast part of the town of Oak Creek. Much of the land earlier had been bought by property owners through Federal land grants at $1.25 an acre, but during the land boom of the early 1890's property sold at up to $1,500 an acre.

Once established, the city moved steadily ahead, gaining its reputation of going it alone. It built its own schools and water utility when others were depending on Milwaukee water, constructed its own sewage disposal plant and library and generally made its presence felt in the metropolitan area of which it tried to remain independent.

It developed the Spectacle of Music that is recognized throughout the country, and the city became known as the Spectacle City. The spectacle is attended each July by thousands of persons and is a great rallying point for citizens with pride in their community.

"We find by doing things ourselves," Mayor Atkinson said, "we get what we want done and we get it done more cheaply. We do things more cheaply for our people than they could have them done as part of a metropolitan complex."

The mayor added that the city is not slowing its progressive independent action. It has good industrial plots and residential land waiting for development. It has a clean city without slums.

The business district built around 10th and Milwaukee Avenues is showing a bit of age but city officials, exerting their leadership, have an urban redevelopment plan well underway. The plan is to rebuild the downtown area at a cost of several million dollars.

The plan envisions a city of perhaps 40,000 persons. Of this city it will be possible to say, "What was done was done by those who lived there for those who live there."

Nebraska Stamina Greatest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, we Nebraskans in the Capital have been rather amused at TV and newspaper accounts of New Frontier aesthetes, caught up by the popular plea for fitness, who are making 50-mile hikes while posturing for publicity.

I say we Midwesterners are somewhat amused because in Nebraska 50 miles is no great shucks of distance. Ranchers in some parts of our State have reportedly grumbled when a neighbor moved in that close, saying the country was just getting "too crowded." Some Nebraska ranches you will recall, are so big it takes 2 days to go to dinner.

To prove my point on how little Nebraskans regard 50-mile strolls, I want to introduce here the story of such a jaunt made by Mrs. Pauline Domico, a Nebraska homemaker and mother of three children.

And before the New Frontier athletes inhabiting the tearooms here start bragging, I want to point out that this housewife made her stroll at the conclusion of a 12-hour working day. What's more, this young lady isn't even walking minded, since, as her copyrighted story in the Lincoln, Nebr., Journal reports, she is much more given to piano playing, writing poetry, or meal preparation.

In fact, if the New Frontier wants to know how men of Nebraska react to 50-mile-hikes may I refer them to the second story below, from the Ord, Nebr., Quiz, on Marine Cpl. Darold Dent, a Nebraskan who hiked 100 miles in 17 hours. It has been rumored Corporal Dent later went dancing after he set this record, but I do not want to boast about that until I have checked it.

I hope this intelligence once and for all stills the fitness clamor being made by the New Frontier, so it can get back to its usual preoccupation with petit fours and powderpuff opposition to socialistic ideologies.

The two articles follow:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal]

APPRECIATING NEBRASKA'S BEAUTY BEST ACCOMPLISHED AT SLOW PACE

(By Pauline Domico)

(Mrs. Pauline Domico, 26, of 444 South 33d, mother of three young children decided to go on 50-mile hike, entirely on her own initiative and her own time. Nothing could change her mind. She left downtown Lincoln alone late Friday afternoon, for her jaunt eastward along Highway 2. Before noon Saturday, exactly 20 hours later, she reached Nebraska City and the Missouri River.)

To really appreciate the particular beauty of Nebraska you have to go slowly.

As I passes the Governor's mansion on my march to the Missouri, I thought of the Governor's interest in developing tourism.

At 14th and Calvert, just as the sun was beginning to set, the sky glowed through a stand of pine trees. The clouds were soft and pink with golden ruffles around the edge.

I was surprised at Highway 2 when I turned east from the sunset. The fields glowed with a reflected rose and farm windows were golden. Round my shoulder in the dusk was a faint rainbow extending from Lincoln behind me to almost directly in front of my proposed route.

A good omen, I decided, breathing a little easier. The forecast had mentioned 2 inches of snow. And February 8 was the anniversary of the blizzard of 1891 which claimed three lives in Nebraska.

It was my daughter's suppertime and my thoughts turned to that for a while. I ate a cheese-on-rye sandwich.

The sun having gone down in its blaze of glory, the landscape took on a misty grey hue with pools of water appearing silver.

Fog swirled about me most of the night. Temperatures lingered in the low thirties.

I was reminded of the tales of pixies and fairies that danced in the mists. It was all very romantic. I ate a candy bar and it occurred to me I hadn't brought along any water.

After 15 offers of rides I quit counting. Many drivers backed up to ask if I wanted a lift. I replied I was on an "endurance hike" and asked them to send me a post card or letter confirming they saw me walking along the highway giving the time and location. Many passed me during the hours when I had little chance otherwise to establish my position.

Saturday morning a new group of waving motorists produced the following observations:

Truck drivers and older gentlemen tend to keep both hands firmly on the steering wheel, making a one-finger salute or beeping by way of greeting. Women and some younger men throw one hand, usually the right, well over their head. The balance of younger men usually give a short wave or beep of the horn.

I counted 5 windmills on the way—4 on the north side of the road and 1 on the south side.

The windmills made me think of the sandhills where my mother's parents homesteaded, bearing and rearing their children in a sod house.

Farm dogs frequently came out to greet me. All were friendly.

The dufflebag I carried as far as Syracuse weighed about 20 pounds. My shoulders and back were becoming sore.

I stopped east of Syracuse, changed shoes, and put on the additional pair of sweat pants and extra sweat shirt as the temperature fell below freezing.

I stashed the dufflebag, extra shoes and flashlight which I found I didn't need, in a marked place to be picked up on my return. The soreness left my shoulders and back.

The hardest part of the journey was between Syracuse and Dunbar. In the wee hours Saturday as there was little diversionary traffic.

Having not slept since 4 a.m. Friday I had a little trouble remaining alert. Finally I stopped and rested for 20 minutes. I decided this was a mistake when I got up again. It's when you stop your muscles become stiff. So long as you continue moving they remain limber.

After sunrise, I had no more trouble with sleep, but found my pace greatly diminished because of stiffness in the back of my leg. I reduced my stride gradually, from about 25 inches to something like 14 inches.

I was about ready to call it a night when traffic began to pick up again and a reporter began checking on my progress. I'm sure my mother is going to have a fit over the pictures of the costume I wore.

I felt great, not at all tired, though a little stiff in the legs within 2 miles of Nebraska City. Traveling very slowly now, for the first time I became chilly and if it hadn't been for the almost constant accompaniment I was given I am not sure I wouldn't have stopped at precisely the 50-mile mark and not tried to go on into town.

I was met at the start of the last mile by a Marine recruiting officer from Omaha who walked with me the last mile. He complained of an aching corn, but I didn't have so much as a blister though the brand new thermal stockings I wore now had a hole at the heel. At the Nebraska City city limits we were met by a number of local dignitaries and halted for some pictures to be taken.

It was a little farfetched to read the Marine recruiting material. On three counts I am ineligible for the Marine Women's Corps—I have a family, I am an inch too short, and I have flat feet.

The trip was lovely. I enjoyed it and looked forward very much to a hot bath and a nap. Unless you are in excellent health and accustomed to daily walking, I don't recommend it. I do think everyone—man, woman, and child in America—ought to walk outdoors daily, maybe 1 to 5 miles depending on age and physical condition.

What prompted me to undertake a 50-mile hike?

Obviously it was the newspaper accounts of President Kennedy's challenge to the Marines to measure up to the standards of fitness required by Teddy Roosevelt. But there were other reasons, too.

I like to walk, and walk to work daily. Maybe it all started before I went to school when doctors recommended tapdancing,

skating, and bicycling as therapy for leg pains resulting from flat feet.

I suppose my younger brother would understand. He set a new record two summers ago by descending to the floor of the Grand Canyon and back up again in something like 17 hours where the previous record had been 32 hours. As far as I know it still stands.

P.S. to J.F.K. If those softie Marines of yours with their hour rest periods and steak dinner intermissions don't measure up—remind them I started after being up and around 12 hours—8 of them under deadlines in a newsroom. The total resting time I took amounted to 20 minutes and I feel that may have been a mistake—and that I am not the athletic sort. By nature I am inclined to pianoplaying, reading, sewing, baking, and writing poetry.

[From the Ord (Nebr.) Quiz]

NEBRASKA MILER CHOPS MARINE HIKING RECORD

Marine Cpl. Darold Dent of Burwell, Nebr., hiked 100 miles in less than 17 hours Tuesday, breaking the 3d Marine Division record and probably the world record for the distance.

He chopped nearly 6 hours off the old record, covered the course in 16 hours, 42 minuates, and 48 seconds. And never raised a blister. He changed from field boots to dress shoes for the last 50 miles. Dent won the 1960 State class B mile run in 4:34.9 seconds.

Johnnie Clem: A Study in Courageous Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the War Between the States produced many heroes on both sides, but few were as unique as Johnnie Clem, the famed drummer boy of Shiloh. The slight, 12-year-old lad who served with distinction in the Union Army caught and held the interest of Americans of his own generation and of the generations that followed. Today, the name of Johnnie Shiloh, as he came to be known, is synonymous with courageous patriotism.

The early life of Johnnie Shiloh was the subject of two television programs seen across the Nation in January. His equally distinguished postwar career is detailed in a story printed in the Galesville Republican of Galesville, Wis., where Johnnie Shiloh, then a lieutenant, served for 3 years as instructor and commander of the cadets at the Galesville University.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have that article printed in the RECORD.

GALESVILLE REMEMBERS JOHNNIE CLEM

In bygone years the Republican has printed many columns about John L. Clem, known the Nation over as the "drummer boy of Shiloh," who for 3 years was a resident of Galesville when serving as commander of the cadets at Galesville University, and in later years attained the rank of major general in the U.S. Army.

Interest in Johnnie, as he was generally known by Galesvilleites more than 80 years ago, was revived Sunday evening, January 21, and last Sunday when Walt Disney, famed TV producer sketched the career of Johnnie in the War between the States 100 and more years ago. Particularly interested were oldsters of the present generation who had followed the Republican's stories.

It's a long tale, but in brief, Johnnie was born in Newark, Ohio, August 13, 1851. At the age of 10, with Union troops passing through and at intervals stopping in his town, he was imbued with the war spirit and eager to enlist as a drummer boy. Eventually, after the death of his mother, he ran away from home and sought enlistment in a regiment. Though then 12 years old, Johnnie was a little chap weighing only 40 pounds. Commander of the regiment laughted at him and told him to wait until he was the size fit for a soldier. Johnnie persisted and hung around until his father was written of his son's whereabouts. Father came, put him aboard a train and started for home. At the first opportunity, Johnnie slipped off the train and made his way back to the regiment. All efforts to persuade him failing, he was provided a uniform, and soon afterward was beating his drum in the bloody carnage in the battle of Shiloh.

In September 1863, Johnnie was in the battle of Chicamauga, in the fray of which he tossed aside his gun when a Confederate colonel astride a horse called out he would ride him down if he didn't surrender. Johnnie's reply was a shot that toppled the rider from his saddle. For his courage and bravery the boy soldier was made a sergeant.

This and other incidents are featured in the Disney TV drama.

Johnnie was discharged from service in September 1864 by order of the Secretary of War, that he might complete his education with a view of becoming a commissioned officer. Prominent generals, headed by U. S. Grant, paid for his tuition at a private school. When General Sherman started off on his famous march to the sea, Hood's Confederate Army attempted to invade Tennessee, whereupon Johnnie ran away from school and joined his old company. When finally discharged he attended another school until President Grant appointed him a second lieutenant in the Regular Army.

In 1878, through the influence of Capt. Alexander A. Arnold, Civil War veteran, a military course was added to Galesville University and the War Department in Washington sent Lieutenant Clem here as instructor and commander of cadets. Possessed of a personality-plus, aside from his military duties he was prominent in the social life of the community.

General Clem died at San Antonio, Tex., May 13, 1917, and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery at Washington, D.C.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Miami and Cuban Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, within the past several years the city of Miami has undergone a tremendous change. Through its portals have passed over 180,000 homeless Cuban exiles seeking refuge from the tyrannical yoke of Castro's Communist regime. While many of the exiles have resettled elsewhere in the United States and abroad, the great majority have remained in the Miami area. Such a gigantic influx of poor, non-English speaking people is certain to cause problems for any city and in this respect Miami is no exception. I add that the reason these people are poor is that they were forced to leave Cuba without being permitted to carry any of their worldly possessions with them. What is unique, however, is the way in which the Cubans have been assimilated into Miami's society and how two divergent groups have learned to live together in harmony and brotherhood.

The story of Miami's transition is well-told in a recent article from the Washington Daily News by the noted writer Richard Starnes.

The remarkable thing about the story of Miami and the Cuban refugees—

Mr. Starnes states, is that what—

could have easily become a squalid chronicle of suspicion, fear and hate, has turned out to be a chapter of contemporary history that all Americans ought to be proud of.

As a tribute to the people responsible for Miami's "success story"—the Cuban exiles and the residents of Miami—I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Starnes' article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIAMI AND CUBAN REFUGEES

(By Richard Starnes)

MIAMI.—Take a city the size of this one (291,688 in the 1960 census) and in 2 years superimpose another city on it—a city largely made up of penniless refugees who speak no English, a city totaling 153,000 people.

These people will immediately become eligible for a Federal dole and surplus food from Federal warehouses, neither of which is available to Miamians. They will compete furiously for jobs in a labor market already badly depressed. They will occupy a huge area of the city and, inevitably, change it into a ghetto where English is seldom heard.

All these things have happened to Miami as the result of the deluge of refugees from Castro's Cuba. There have been, of course, a host of irritants in the wake of this invasion. There have been resentments, and there is still a small, ugly core of prejudice against these people who abandoned their homeland because they loved freedom more.

But the remarkable thing about the story of Miami and the Cuban refugees is the fact that the irritants have been minor and are slowly vanishing, that the incidents are diminishing as understanding grows, that the dismal reservoir of prejudice is no larger than it is. A story that could easily have become a squalid chronicle of suspicion, fear, and hate, has turned out to be a chapter of contemporary history that all Americans ought to be proud of.

The credit for this belongs, of course, principally to the people involved—the people of Miami and the Cuban refugees—with a big assist from the farseeing and compassionate program of assistance set up by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Cuban Refugee Center, which recently celebrated its second birthday anniversary, is directed by Marshall Wise, a HEW official whose field is social security, not refugees.

"I got the job," he told me, "because I somehow got the name for being a close man with a buck. I was managing the social security office here in Miami, and when they called me to set up the refugee program they said, 'We're going to have to spend a lot of money, but we don't want it thrown around, and we don't want any scandal.' "

On the record, HEW's choice of a head man for the refugee program looks good. A lot of money has been spent (more than $71 million in direct cash relief to the refugees, for example) but the accomplishments of the program are genuinely impressive. More than a third of the refugees have been resettled in cities all over the United States. Resettlement is an easy word to say, but a tough job to accomplish.

In many cases it meant teaching English to adults who had never heard it spoken; in all cases it meant finding jobs, transporting families, coaching new communities to accept the refugees. The rate of failure in the resettlement program? Less than 2 percent.

This figure is good testimony to the sort of people who have fled Castro. There are other statistics, equally impressive. No refugee has been involved in a major crime. Juvenile delinquency and illegitimacy (two prime indices of social decay) apparently do not exist among the refugees at all.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week, a number of us paid tribute to the former free Republic of Lithuania on its 45th anniversary of independence.

The following is a proclamation issued by the Governor of the State of Indiana, Hon. Matthew E. Welsh, and the mayor or Gary, Ind., John Visclosky, commemorating the occasion:

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Indianapolis, January 16, 1963.

ALBERT G. VINICK,
President,
PETER INDRIEKAS,
Secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Lake County, Ind., East Chicago, Ind.

GENTLEMEN: It is gratifying to me, as Governor of the State of Indiana, to call to the attention of all citizens that the date, February 16, 1963, will mark the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania which, with other Baltic States, has been ravaged by the forces of communism.

It is apropriate that we join the citizens of our State, of Lithuanian descent, in the observance so significant to them and to all who oppose domination and oppression. We, whose forefathers also fought the battle against tyranny, are happy to unite in the celebration of this memorable event, with the hope that their nation and all nations which have suffered similar plight, may soon rejoice in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF GARY, IND.

"Whereas February 16, 1963, will mark the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

"Whereas the result of the Stalin-Hitler conspiracy, the freedom-loving Lithuanian nation was forcibly deprived of its independence, and subjected to unscrupulous practices of physical, religious, cultural, and economic destruction by the Soviet Union and its single ruling Communist Party; and

"Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to alien domination and oppression, and are determined to regain freedom and independence; and

"Whereas the act of Soviet aggression on Lithuania and other Baltic States has been never recognized by the United States, and as long as America and its democratic form of government survives, there will be hope in Lithuania and all ravaged nations of the earth for a better day to come; and

"Whereas the residents of this State, along with Americans in many other States of our great country, have a bond of sympathy and understanding with their fellow citizens of Lithuanian decent whose native land has been befallen by hard trials and tribulations under the brutal rule of the Kremlin masters: Now, therefore, I, John Visclosky, mayor of the city of Gary, Ind., proclaim Saturday, February 16, 1963, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the city of Gary and do urge all our citizens to give proper recognition to this day of special patriotic significance to their Lithuanian American fellow citizens and to join in such exercises as may be appropriate for the observance of this anniversary."

Dated this 31st day of January 1963.

JOHN VISCLOSKY,
Mayor.

Arlington State College Adjusts to Rapid Growth; Serves Vital Texas Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Dallas Morning News recently published an article on an outstanding Texas educational institution, Arlington State College.

It is a story of a school that was elevated to senior college rank in 1959 and has outstripped its parent school, Texas A. & M., in enrollment, striving in the process to maintain a plant adequate to its increasing needs.

It is a success story in higher education, and a richly deserved tribute to the administration, faculty, and students of an outstanding school.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Helen B. Callaway, captioned "ASC Accustomed to Swift Change" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARLINGTON STATE COLLEGE ACCUSTOMED TO SWIFT CHANGE

(By Helen B. Callaway)

ARLINGTON, TEX.—When the first huge tidal wave of war babies engulfs American universities next September, Arlington State College will probably absorb its flood of freshmen efficiently and serenely.

This is because Arlington State College has grown accustomed to surging growth and swift change—sitting as it does in the heart of the exploding Dallas-Fort Worth population.

In 1952, Arlington State had 1,322 students. By 1957, 4,926 were enrolled. In 1963, 9,197 crowd the classrooms. And the school is braced for 20,000 by 1980.

Ninety percent of its present students come from Dallas and Tarrant Counties.

People who have not noticed Arlington State lately may be astonished to learn that the college has outgrown its strapping father school, Texas A. & M., in enrollment, operates in a $15 million plant on a 100-acre campus, with a current budget of $5,300,000, has millions of dollars worth of buildings under construction in a lively race to keep pace with enrollment, has become one of the major schools of engineering in the Southwest, with some 2,900 engineering majors, has a bigger total enrollment than Southern Methodist University, and almost as many Dallas County students (Arlington State College counts 4,040 from Dallas County, Southern Methodist University 4,230).

Arlington State's young and vigorous administration is headed by 38-year-old President Jack R. Woolf, an engineer by training, with a doctor of philosophy degree from Purdue. A native Texan, Dr. Woolf came to Arlington State College from A. & M.

Other key people in the administration include the deans of the college's two schools—Dr. S. T. Keim, Jr., arts and sciences, and Dr. W. H. Nedderman, engineering.

"People still ask us," says Dr. Woolf, smiling, "when we are going to become a senior college."

Arlington State passed that milestone more than 3 years ago, and the question now is when it will add a graduate school. It is believed to be the Nation's largest senior college without graduate training.

Dr. Woolf believes that the high-quality faculty which Arlington State College has been building up the last few years is fully capable of teaching graduate courses.

A graduate school would be a logical development, he feels.

It is vital in higher education today, President Woolf notes, to "keep your faculty alive."

He explains:

"Your sociology professor needs to do creative writing. Your electrical engineering expert has to be in the swim of an engineers society. Your teacher of English needs to participate in social concerns of his field.

"Research, consulting work and graduate teaching are three of the most important ways to keep a faculty alive." Many on the Arlington State College faculty already serve as consultants to industry, many are engaged in research.

Admittedly, a graduate school is a bit in the future.

"But whether in this way or in some other, we must expand," says Dr. Woolf.

It would have been surprising, perhaps, if this school had not shown tremendous growth of late. Its hometown of Arlington has changed from a village of 7,600 people in 1946 to a city of 54,000.

The growth of Arlington's big sister cities, Dallas and Fort Worth, is well known.

The 3-year-old senior college is geared to the space age and also to the north Texas business and cultural community of which it is a part.

Its officials point out that many professional fields of education thrive best in an urban setting.

"We are sitting right here in the middle of the financial, industrial, commercial, cultural, and population center of the whole Southwest," says Dr. Woolf.

The youngness of the senior college gives it some advantages peculiar to this astronaut age of constant and rapid change—a time when flexibility is becoming vital to survival.

Dr. Cothburn O'Neal, assistant to the president and professor of English, points out:

"We have had a unique opportunity here to staff our college with outstanding people, many of them young. We have little or no deadwood, virtually no entrenched incompetence."

Though perhaps best known for its engineering school with nearly 3,000 students, Arlington State College has an even greater number—3,300—majoring in business administration, a fat division of its arts and science school.

Sweeping changes have been made in the curriculum of both engineering and business administration in recent years—to match the revolutions which have transformed the world of industry.

Dr. Woolf comments:

"One advantage in starting out anew at a time of great change—as our senior college did—is that it is simpler to keep up with the new demands on higher education.

"We have no status quo to impede us, no vested interests to hold us back, no pet courses that could not be streamlined or replaced if necessary."

Emphasis in the business administration degree program, he explains, has shifted from typing-shorthand-bookkeeping to managerial skills.

Instrumentation and creativity now reign in the engineering labs—succeeding the banks of generators and motors which were so long standard equipment for engineering students.

Electronic brains and radio waves are examples of Arlington State College's modern laboratories of engineering.

If the average citizen of Big D and Fort Worth has been unaware of the major new college which has grown up so fast between them, this is not so of big industrial and business interests.

Dr. Nedderman speaks to this point:

"Ling-Temco-Vought maintains an ideal cooperative plan with our school of engineering. The company annually credits outstanding high school seniors, and brings 15 to 30 of them to Arlington State College each year.

"These students alternately go to school full time for a semester and work in the Ling-Temco-Vought plant full time for a semester. Usually, they carry one night course while working, so as not to break the academic continuity.

"At Ling-Temco-Vought they work as part of a team, with engineers engaged in research. They achieve a maturity that most young people do not have by the time of graduation."

A number of other plants in the Dallas-Fort Worth area also have earn-and-learn arrangements with students at Arlington State College.

Dean Nedderman reports that Arlington State College graduates in five engineering specialties—aeronautical, civil, electrical, industrial, mechanical—are sought out by General Electric, Radio Corp. of America, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as firms closer home.

A good percentage of the graduates stay in the Dallas area to work for Ling-Temco-Vought, Texas Instruments, General Motors, Bell Helicopter, Dallas Power & Light Co., Texas Power & Light, General Dynamics, Southwest Airmotive, and other engineer-hungry industries.

"The thing we are proudest of in the school of engineering, though, is the performance of our graduates in well-known graduate schools," says Dean Nedderman.

"This is the acid test as to the caliber of product we are turning out.

"A number of our better students go on to do graduate work at universities from Cal Tech to Purdue, from Iowa State to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Without exception, all have done extremely well."

Arlington State College feels obliged to help meet the Dallas-Fort Worth needs for young business leaders as well as engineers. Here is how President Woolf puts it:

"In Texas, we must have management genius and technical competence to create new business and industry. As a stimulus to the Texas economy, the age of King Cotton and black gold is gone.

"The real need now is for brainpower in banking, insurance, management, science, engineering. A good solid engineer creates 100 jobs by his own ingenuity."

Though best known for engineering and business, Arlington State College believes strongly in a liberal arts and science education as a foundation for any profession—or as a worthy goal in itself.

Dean Keim of arts and sciences says:

"Our school has a basic objective to provide a general education as a basis for professional skills. We have an obligation to provide a liberal education for the 25 percent of our students who want only that."

Even the engineers must study social sciences and the humanities, "so they will assume responsibility for some of the monsters they are creating," says Engineer Woolf.

Quite a few young people choose Arlington State College for premed and prelaw training.

The personality of Arlington State is a bit different from that of most colleges its size.

Its average student is a trifle older and a little more serious about studies. He is less wrapped up in football and the bossa nova—though Arlington State College offers sports and social life a plenty for those who care.

So Arlington State College patterns its academic program to suit its particular kind of student, as well as to meet the economic, scientific, and technological manpower needs of Dallas and Fort Worth.

Its students are mostly big-city residents. Ninety percent are commuters, mostly in their own cars. More than 30 percent carry less than a full academic load because of the demands of a job.

Quite a few have jobs which depend on their continuing their edcuation at Arlington State College.

Because so many students work in the daytime, Arlington State College classes run from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. All are credit courses.

Many Arlington State College students take 7 years to get a degree, and a lot of others never graduate.

A good many young people choose Arlington State College for 2-year courses which equip them for jobs or for further study at other schools.

Enormously popular with employers of Dallas and Fort Worth is Arlington's Technical Institute Division, a 2-year program leading to an associate-in-science diploma.

This division produces engineering technicians, and has 475 students presently enrolled.

"We can place three to five times as many engineering technicians as we can turn out," says Dean Nedderman.

The technicians work with engineers—to keep computers going, operate powerplants, serve as highway construction foremen, supervise factory production lines, and so on.

In the field of art, Arlington State College offers a 2-year program including design, fashion illustrating, and interior decoration. Students who finish this course may either go on into an art career or transfer their credits to North Texas State University, Texas Christian University, or other schools which award an art degree. .

A 2-year program in secretarial skills—including office accounting and operation of office machines—equips girls for office jobs.

Credits in a 2-year architecture course are transferable to any school which offers advanced training in this field.

Many of Arlington State College's growing pains center around the parking problem. More than 6,000 student cars are registered.

Much of the new land being acquired by the college will be devoted to parking—and the master plan calls for another 50 acres to add to the present 100.

"By 1980, we expect to have multistory parking garages," says Dr. Woolf.

"One of the problems of a large school is the time it takes to get between classes. We are seeking to develop a compact building complex."

For example, a four-floor men's dormitory now under construction will eventually rise to seven stories.

Arlington State College is also building a new dormitory for girls, a $2 million science building, and a $1,500,000 library.

Just off the campus, the O'Meara-Chandler Building and Development Co. of Houston is erecting a privately owned 3-story dormitory for 300 to 350 girls—with 2 swimming pools and electric built-in hair dryers.

A $2 million auditorium to seat 6,000 for convocation and 4,000 for stage presentations and indoor games is in Arlington State College's master plan—but it will depend on friends instead of taxpayers. Available State building funds are too desperately needed for classrooms and laboratories.

College officials are quietly approaching individuals, corporations, and foundations in an attempt to raise money to build the auditorium.

Their pitch: The auditorium would add to an Arlington State College education "brilliance which comes from experience in open forum, from cultural attractions, from taking part in scholarly and professional convocations and from the inspiration of great speakers on religious, social, and governmental topics."

Arlington State College's location between two big cities has helped to attract a high-level staff of educators, says Dr. Woolf.

Its faculty of 270 includes a generous number of holders of the Ph. D. degree. While not a perfect yardstick, the Ph. D. has become an accepted measure of academic status in today's world.

More than 40 percent of Arlington State College's science teachers hold Ph. D. degrees—and more than 50 percent of the engineering school faculty.

Arlington State College traces its beginning to 1895.

In that year, a private academy known as Arlington College was opened on the campus.

It was followed by three other private schools—Carlisle Military Academy, Arlington Training School and Arlington Military Academy—before it became a State junior college in 1917 with the name of Grubbs Vocational College.

The junior college became a part of the Texas A. & M. College system.

In 1923, the legislature voted to call the school North Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, a name which stuck for 26 years. Thousands of Texans still think of the school as a cow college.

In 1949, then the largest State-supported junior college in the Southwest, the name was changed to Arlington State College. The school was raised to senior college rank in 1959, and Dr. Woolf became its president the same year, succeeding the late Dr. E. H. Hereford.

Dr. Woolf and his associates have worked overtime to upgrade curriculum, faculty, and plant, to assure high-quality education for its ever-increasing crowds of young scholars.

Women students are increasing at an even faster rate than men, though the ratio is still 5 men to 1 woman student.

Several dozen Negroes are among Arlington State College's 9,197 students, and were integrated without any problem, college officials and students agree.

More significant, perhaps is the peaceful coexistence of thousands of Dallas students and thousands from Fort Worth. No signs of the ancient civic feud between the two cities appear around the campus.

Conceivably, Arlington State College might become the catalyst to transform the ancient rivalry of the neighbor cities into a shared pride in the whole metropolitan area.

President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara Speak on the Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban situation continues to be of concern to Members of Congress and to the Nation as a whole. In this conection, in my weekly newsletter to the people of the Fourth District of Tennessee, I have discussed the Cuban situation and recent developments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my newsletter be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Cuba and its Communist government continue to be the subject of great public interest and concern as the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense this week made statements on our Cuban policy.

The President has taken a firm stand on Cuba. Last October when it became known that Russian weapons designed primarily for offensive purposes had been landed in Cuba and were being deployed, the President ordered a naval blockade of Cuba and demanded that they be withdrawn. These missiles and bombers were dismantled and removed from Cuba.

Since this time the United States has continued our air surveillance of the island with both low-flying aircraft and with high-altitude planes of the U–2 design.

Recently, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in a lengthy report, told the American people that since July 1 of last year more than 400 reconnaissance flights have been flown over Cuba by our U.S. military aircraft and that the photographs taken on these flights, plus other intelligence sources, indicate clearly that the offensive weapons have been removed from Cuba.

In addition to Secretary of Defense McNamara, President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Mr. John McCone, Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, have all stated quite positively that, while we are concerned, they are satisfied that Cuba no longer poses a real military threat to the United States or to other countries in this hemisphere.

In a further action directed against Cuba, President Kennedy has ordered recently a further crackdown on Cuban shipping which will further shrink the already substantially reduced trade with Cuba from the free world.

While partisan attacks are continually being made on the administration because of our Cuban policy, the President has taken a firm stand and is working to strengthen our position while also working toward the removal of all Soviet troops from Cuba—this short of war. In international affairs we generally tend to close ranks at the water's edge, and follow a bipartisan policy of cooperation, however some would use the Cuban situation for partisan attacks and political gain.

Secretary Rusk in a major speech this week in California called for an early withdrawal of the remaining Soviet troops in Cuba and said that the administration is working toward having these troops removed.

"The authorities in Moscow and Havana must recognize that Soviet military elements in Cuba do not insure the peace of Cuba, but poison the atmosphere and increase the dangers," Rusk said. "The sooner this source of potential trouble is eliminated, the better for everyone concerned."

"We in the Western Hemisphere cannot accept as normal any Soviet military presence in this hemisphere," the Secretary said. He asserted that Cuba will not become a base for offensive military operations against the United States or other countries and pledged "the Armed Forces of the United States" to maintain this position.

Littlejohn Family Military Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an interesting letter from Mr. Thomas C.

Littlejohn, Sr., of Cowpens, S.C., was printed in the January 10 issue of the Spartanburg Guide of Spartanburg. It deals with the military record of the Littlejohn family. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLEJOHN MILITARY RECORD

Cantigny is a small village in Northeast France. After the great German offensive in March 1918, the German line ran west to Montdidier and formed a small salient. The First Division was ordered to take the village under the command of Gen. Robert Lee Bullard. The 28th Infantry, under the command of Col. Hanson Ely, took Cantigny on May 28, 1918. That was the first American battle of World War I. The Germans counterattacked for 3 days but failed to retake the village from the Americans. Two hundred and fifty prisoners were taken.

The division went to France in 1917. I served in Company I, 28th Infantry under Captain Tack and Lt. Robert Purdy, Jr. Judge Purdy of Sumter, S.C., said his son was killed in action.

I was awarded the Silver Star, a medal rated third in the U.S. Army, by General Summerall. I was wounded on May 31, 1918, and awarded the purple heart and the Victory Medal. I am rated one of the third most seriously wounded veterans in the United States and in 1959 there was only about 67 men with these degrees of wounds in the United States.

I and Mrs. Littlejohn reside on the Battleground Road, Cowpens, S.C. We have four sons: Joseph A., who served in World War II and was awarded the Purple Heart Medal, and Good Conduct Medal; Joseph A. Littlejohn was pinned down in advance of his men. He pinned down the Germans with about three shots and return to his lines with a partly loaded gun. Dr. Oliver M., who received the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart and Good Conduct Medal; Dr. Oliver M. Littlejohn had a bullet to pierce a hole in his helmet. Dr. Thomas C., Jr., who served in the U.S. Air Service, is entitled to the American Campaign Medal, Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal. Gilbert W., who served in the U.S. Army during the Korean War. He is now captain in the U.S. Army Reserve. He was awarded the Army Occupation Medal.

THOMAS C. LITTLEJOHN, Sr.

COWPENS, S.C.

Address of National Commander Powers at American Legion Law and Order Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the outstanding events in the enriching program of the American Legion in Chicago is the Annual Law and Order Banquet of Chicago Police Post No. 207. National Commander James E. Powers gave recognition to the importance and significance of this law and order banquet by accepting the invitation of the post to be the principal speaker at this year's dinner.

At the request of members of the Chicago Police Post No. 207 for whom I have high esteem because of the contribution they are making to our city and our country, I am extending my remarks to include the complete text of the address of the national commander of the American Legion on this memorable occasion. The address follows:

LAW AND ORDER SPEECH BY JAMES E. POWERS, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE CHICAGO POLICE POST NO. 207, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 12, 1963

Thank you Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my fellow Legionnaires of Chicago Police Post No. 207. I am so very pleased with opportunity to visit with you on the occasion of this now traditional law and order banquet, and to talk to this fine group of Legionnaires whose chosen profession it is to uphold the law of the land and to maintain order in your home community.

This is sworn objective of all Legionnaires everywhere, but for you who wear the badge of honor of law enforcement officers it is a way of life. For the rest of us who wear the badge of honor of the American Legion, it is our duty as citizens to assist you wherever and whenever possible in carrying out your daily tasks.

At the very outset, I wish to make it clear that we believe this to be the duty of every citizen and not only that of the American Legionnaire. Ours is a nation which depends upon the fair and equal dispensation of justice to all her people, regardless of their station in life. The first step in that orderly process which differentiates us from the totalitarian state is the fair and equal enforcement of the law of the land.

The lot of the policeman is not always an easy one. Your every action is subject to public scrutiny through the eyes of our news media, and through your many personal contacts made in the daily conduct of your work. You are the first person every honest and upright citizen seeks when he is in need of assistance. You are avoided like the plague by those shady characters who live on the edge of the law or who make a career of evading it.

The risk of life and limb is an occupational hazard which you have accepted without question. Yours is a paradoxical existence. You are the butt of jokes, the objects of scorn, the target of the sensation seeker. At the same time you are the defender of the weak, the hope of the oppressed, and, in a much broader sense my friends—you are important to freedom.

I say you are important to freedom, because, in the words of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who delivered the keynote address before our 1962 national convention: "Crime and subversion are formidable problems in the United States today because, and only because, there is a dangerous flaw in the Nation's moral armor."

Note well that Mr. Hoover did not say that you are at fault, but I do say that you are important to freedom because you are the Nation's first line of defense against these evil influences which threaten to undermine the moral integrity of America.

I pledge to the law enforcement agencies of this land the full support of the American Legion as we stand at your side in the front lines of this fight. While yours is basically the task of bringing the wrongdoer to justice, we believe that ours is the responsibility of keeping them from becoming wrongdoers in the first place.

Director Hoover further told the assembled convention delegates that ours is "an idealistic nation—a nation ruled by laws, not by men. Yet each year shows new record peaks of crime and lawlessness.

"Crime," he continued, "is a parasite, feeding upon public disinterest and moral lethargy." And he cited some alarming statistics which brought home to all of us the real seriousness of the situation. "This day," he said, "more than 5,200 felonies—4 serious crimes every minute—will be committed across the United States."

He said that since 1946 our national crime totals have more than doubled, and that over the years since 1957 crime totals have risen five times as fast as the rate of population growth, and, even more alarmingly, the group which accounts for the largest increase in our crime rate is among youngsters under 18 years of age.

Somewhere, my friends, we have lost our touch, and I suspect that it is not as law enforcement officer—but as parents—particularly since this tremendous increase in crime rates among our young people is so pronounced.

Obviously the moral standards of the Nation must be shored up. We are in need of a revival of integrity, and a renewed emphasis upon teaching the real values of life and the responsibilities of solid citizenship to our young people—and these responsibilities lie in the home, the church, and the school, where young minds are molded and true character is developed.

In other words, it is the responsibility of every one of us, not only to teach proper standards of conduct and morality, but by our own example to instill in the minds of our young people a clear-cut, black and white difference between right and wrong, and to provide them with the incentive to do right, rather than wrong.

Parental concern for the child and his future transcends the family relationship and enters into the realm of concern for the future of this great Nation of ours. Our youngsters of today are the hope of America of tomorrow, and we adult citizens of today must put our own house in order, for only by so doing can we properly provide our children with a set of standards to live by.

We can no longer afford to be so engrossed with the material things of life in this land of abundance, that we lose all sight of the moral and spiritual values that have made America what she is today. If we continue to indulge ourselves totally in the day-to-day quest of the almighty dollar at the expense of all other facets of life, we may well see the day when this is no longer a land of abundance, but a jungle of fear and a land of lawlessness.

Yet, if anyone still insists on evaluating this situation strictly on a dollars and cents basis it can be pointed out to the materialists that crime in this country now cost the American people about $60 million a day. This figure, of course, gives no consideration to such factors as personal grief, broken homes, mental and physical anguish, and the blight upon American prestige in the family of nations.

Furthermore, we find that where strong moral convictions are lacking, where crime flourishes, and where people are lethargic, that the seeds of communism fall on fertile ground.

We know that the Communist Party, U.S.A., while in open defiance of the law of the land by refusing to register with the Government as an alien agent despite a U.S. Supreme Court ruling upholding the law requiring such registration, continues to spread its insidious propaganda throughout the land. One of their prime targets is the youth of America, as their speakers' bureau of top CPUSA functionaries seek audiences on the campuses of our colleges and universities from coast to coast.

These are matters that should be of vital concern to every American citizen who loves his country and is concerned about the future of America. They are matters of concern to the American Legion—and have been since the founding days of our organization.

The first three points of the immortal preamble to the Legion's constitution, written by our founding fathers, and familiar to every Legionnaire, express our concern in these words:

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

"To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism." These are but the first 3 points of a 10-point code of honor and program of action which the American Legion carries out in the fervent hope and firm belief that by so doing we help perpetuate the ideals and principles upon which America was built and through which she has grown and prospered.

Important to this cause, we believe, is our longstanding position of support and encouragement to the House Un-American Activities Committee. The American Legion has long held that the work of this committee is vital to the security of America, for it provides one of our most authoritative sources of information regarding the activity and the identity of those groups and individuals who would destroy us from within. In the face of well organized and vocal opposition to the continuation of the committee which is working on the 88th Congress, now in session, the American Legion stands firm in its continued support of the committee.

There are those who contend that the work of the committee violates the constitutional rights of certain groups and individuals. In the opinion of the Legion, those who hold this view confuse liberty with license, for we believe the Constitution and the law of the land are instruments for the protection of the innocent, and were never intended to provide a refuge for the guilty.

Yet, we have seen it happen time and again, in courtrooms across the land and before congressional committees, where those who would destroy the Constitution and defy the law, hide behind the protective features of the very documents which they would render useless if but granted the license they seek.

Through our many positive programs of Americanism, the American Legion devotes a substantial part of its total effort to instilling a love of country and a respect for and understanding of the importance of an orderly system of government, and the need for adherence to the laws of God as well as the laws of man.

You Legionnaires know our Americanism program well, for many of you have devoted much personal time and effort to one or more of these projects to insure their success. For the benefit of non-Legionnaires may I cite a few examples of the scope of our program.

During the 1962 American Legion baseball season, some 13,891 teams were certified for Legion championship competition, providing wholesome recreational opportunity for a quarter of a million boys, who, while learning the game of baseball under the direction of American Legionnaires, also learned something about the game of life.

Nearly 27,000 boys participated last year in American Legion Boys State and Boys Nation. These youngsters, who set up and operate their own state and national governments, learn much about our form of government by actually performing the functions of government under our established system.

More than 355,000 high school youngsters competed in our 1962 national oratorical contest, and to be eligible for competition each participant had to be prepared to speak on some phase of the Constitution of the United States. The year 1962 marked the silver anniversary of the contest in which well over 5 million youngsters have competed over the span of a quarter of a century.

Last year, American Legion posts presented more than 27,000 school medal awards, in recognition of outstanding scholarship combined with outstanding citizenship.

During 1961, the latest year for which complete figures are available, American Legion posts sponsored 4,199 Boy Scout units, making the Legion the largest single sponsor of the Boy Scout movement outside the combined churches of America.

We distributed nearly 100,000 copies of "Need a Lift?", our guide to scholarship opportunities which is designed to help deserving young people further their education.

Through our child welfare programs we seek to preserve the sanctity of the home, and to help build strong bodies to house strong minds.

Yes, my friends, we have accomplished a great deal through the years, but we cannot relax our efforts for a great deal remains to be done. If we should rest on our oars at this critical hour in the Nation's history, we would soon find ourselves swept to destruction by the powerful tides of corruption and subversion which we now seek to combat.

To safeguard this America of ours for today and for tomorrow is going to require the continued best efforts of the Nation's law-enforcement officers, of the American Legion, and of all concerned Americans. The battle will not be an easy one, but the victory will be worth the efforrt, and I am confident that the ultimate victory will be ours.

Tribute to Former Senator Knowland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Knowland Named Citizen of Year," published in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of recent date, being a tribute to former Senator William F. Knowland, of California.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLAND NAMED CITIZEN OF YEAR

William F. Knowland, editor and assistant publisher of the Tribune, has been named Oakland's "Outstanding Citizen of 1962" for his longstanding personal efforts in the field of public service.

The announcement was made today by Judge Homer W. Buckley, chairman of the selection committee of the Oakland Inter-Service Club Council and the Oakland Chamber of Commerce, cosponsors of the project.

The award will be presented at a civic banquet Wednesday evening, February 20, at Jack London Hall. The event will serve as a testimonial to Knowland's 13 years of service in the U.S. Senate.

The honor was established by the Inter-Service Club Council in 1948 to give public recognition to citizens who give freely of their time, talents, and funds to civic work and to inspire others to enter this field of service.

In selecting Knowland for the 1962 award, the committee noted that he had a long record of devoted personal service in civic and welfare projects. His nomination, submitted by several groups, included the following citations of his beyond-the-call-of-duty public services in 1962:

"As editor, assistant publisher, and general manager of the Oakland Tribune, he gave leadership and promotion which carried a large number of civic and humanitarian projects to success, including the rapid transit issue, and advanced others including the Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum, Inc., multipurpose facility, the Oakland Museums complex, the United Crusade and the Boy Scouts campaign for new camp facilities. Without this publicity and encouragement, many of these all-important projects would have failed.

"To the solving of Oakland's civic and welfare problems he gave freely of the vast knowledge and experience he attained in a political career that was climaxed by his selection as the majority leader of the world's most powerful body, the U.S. Senate.

"His civic roles in 1962 included: director and member of the executive committee of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce; vice president of Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum, Inc.; chairman of the Regional Committee for Better Service at Oakland International Airport; chairman of the Oakland Central Business District Committee; foreman of the Alameda County Grand Jury; member of the board of directors of California State Chamber of Commerce; member board of governors, Bay Area Council; and key roles in a host of other committees and organizations that worked for a bigger and better Oakland and for the welfare of the citizenry."

Among the past recipients of this award are Willie Osburn, Thad McCarty, Raymond H. Miller, Mrs. Carl E. Whitehouse, Jack Fitzpatrick, the late Henry Kaiser, Jr., Nat Levy, Charles P. Howard, and William Albertoni.

Where Is Our Victory Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 28, 1963. This editorial points out that the "victory" purportedly scored in Cuba has now been wiped out by remounting of a Soviet armed camp atmosphere in Castroland.

The article is as follows:

WHERE IS OUR VICTORY NOW?

President Kennedy has denied that a new Soviet military buildup is under way in Cuba. He thus contradicts Senators KEATING and LAUSCHE, a number of columnists and Cuban exile leaders.

Yet it was much the same sources that warned a deaf America for weeks and months that Russian rockets were pouring into Cuba. Kennedy and his administration sloughed off the reports then as they are doing now. Is the President wrong again?

After hearing Secretary of State Rusk on Friday at a closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator AIKEN of Vermont said he believed, "Russia has built an enormously strong military and political base in Cuba, much stronger than it was 6 months ago."

Senator SYMINGTON also expressed serious concern over the large Soviet air complex in Cuba.

The size and nature of the reported buildup indicate that a successful sneak attack from Cuba could incinerate the Southeastern United States.

Complete congressional investigation should be imperative.

Senator KEATING argues that "official Government sources" confirm his reports. Castro is now "10 times better equipped" militarily than he was last spring, the New York Republican charges.

Russia is building highly sophisticated ground and air defenses, Soviet encampments are being relocated and strengthened, and Soviet experts are directing Cubans in the construction of underground depots, hangars, and runways, according to the New York Times news service. The dispatch also stated Soviet troops are working on other sites closed to Cuban personnel.

Underground hangars are for what, Mr. Kennedy? The answer is apparent.

There are at least 100 MIG fighters in Cuba. They can be fitted with atomic bombs.

The buildup also involves tanks, guns, amphibious vehicles, planes and torpedo boats. When do these become offensive, Mr. Kennedy? When the boats and planes rake a Latin American coast and the amphibians land troops on some Latin shore? Ask any marine if an amphibian is a defensive vehicle?

Cuba is again building up frightening armament, with Castro holding an American pledge not to invade. Where, Mr. President, is our victory now?

Partisan Attacks on Foreign Policy—Bi-Partisan Policy Should Be Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been several vicious attacks upon President Kennedy and his foreign policy. These attacks made during recent political speeches obviously have been for partisan rather than for constructive purposes.

The Nashville Tennessean in a recent edition carried an article by Mr. James Reston of the New York Times News Service, pointing out that the criticism of President Kennedy's foreign policy is getting somewhat out of hand. Reston goes on to show that the unity that has existed behind the President previously has now somewhat disintegrated, not because the President has failed, but because he has been successful in various areas of our Nation's policy of foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

FOREIGN POLICY CRITICS GETTING OUT OF HAND

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The criticism of President Kennedy's foreign policy is now getting a little out of hand.

No doubt mistakes of tactics and even of taste have been made recently over the handling of Cuba, Canada, Britain, and France, but in the broadest sense, the President is in trouble now, not because his major foreign policies have failed but because they are succeeding.

France and Canada are not refusing to accept U.S. nuclear weapons because they feel that Kennedy has weakened the West, but precisely because they think the West is relatively so strong that they can now follow a more independent policy and risk division within the alliance.

The unity that existed behind the President when he risked war to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba has vanished, not because he failed to get the missiles and bombers out, but precisely because he got them out and is now safe to turn around and argue about the secondary issue of the Soviet troops.

Britain did not refuse to accept De Gaulle's terms for entrance into the Common Market because of any weakness in Washington, but precisely because it preferred to go along with the United States and the Atlantic Commmunity rather than with De Gaulle and an inward-looking Europe.

The paradox of the present situation is that everything in the cold war remains about the same as it was at the beginning of the year, yet everything seems different.

De Gaulle was refusing to cooperate with Washington and London on the defense and organization of Europe long before his famous press conference. He has since emphasized and formalized his opposition, but the opposition was there before.

Much the same can be said about Canada. Prime Minister Diefenbaker was refusing to accept the United States nuclear warheads long before the State Department stumbled clumsily into an internal Canadian squabble; the only new thing is that he has now made an election issue out of Washington's awkward efforts to clarify the facts.

This does not mean that formalizing the differences doesn't change anything. As Dean Acheson says, a married couple may separate in private, but it makes a difference if they start fighting in public and head for Reno.

The question now is whether the Kennedy administration could have done anything to avoid the split with De Gaulle, the fight with Canada, and the present situation in Cuba. Much can be said on both sides of all three questions, and the President is certainly not blameless.

He first stumbled into Cuba and then misjudged Moscow's offensive policy there. It may be that he should now be considering a blockade of that island to get the Soviet troops out; that is a matter of opinion. But the critics are going beyond or behind all this to imply what they have not proved; namely, that the President made a deal with Khrushchev to scrap the missile bases in Turkey and Italy; and beyond this, that the Soviets now have offensive missiles hidden in Cuba.

These last are charges of stupidity, bad faith, or worse, and should either be proved or withdrawn. There is plenty of material on the Cuban issue for hard, fair criticism, and Kennedy's handling of the offensive buildup in Cuba justifies plenty of skepticism, but implications of secret deals and concealed weapons confuse and weaken the country unless they are supported with evidence.

The psychology of the opposition to President Kennedy here is clear enough. First, it is the duty of the opposition to oppose. Also, Kennedy clobbered the Republicans in the last presidential campaign with the charge that they had debased the Nation's "prestige" overseas.

In this situation, the Republicans are naturally eager to pounce on him when he roughs up our Canadian neighbors or misjudges De Gaulle's intentions, and all this is fair enough.

But the thing has to be kept in perspective. For the conflict with a nation's enemies is more important than the quarrels with its allies, and on balance, the conflict with the Communists is not going too badly.

None of the apocalyptic horrors of the pessimists about Berlin, the Congo, or Vietnam has transpired. None of Moscow's "inevitable victories" in Africa, southeast Asia, or the Middle East has taken place. If De Gaulle is awkward for Kennedy, Mao Tse-tung is no obedient servant of Khrushchev.

Meanwhile, fear in the Western Alliance has abated, and without fear a whole new set of problems has arisen, requiring new policies and new criticism. Yet the whole alliance is not falling apart and 17,000 Russians are not about to conquer the Western Hemisphere.

"We have to learn to live with these problems in Cuba and elsewhere," the President has said. And this of course, is precisely the difficulty. For the American people don't want to learn to live with their problems or with the Russians, especially in Cuba. They want them to go away, all of them, and immediately, if not sooner.

Cuba a Risky Political Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post appeared an article by Marquis Childs entitled, "Cuba Is Risky Political Issue."

In my judgment, the well written column points out the difficulties attendant to the fact that Cuba today is under the control of the Communists. The problem does not lend itself to easy and simple solutions. The column is very thought-provoking. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of Members of Congress who might not have read it previously.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1963]

CUBA IS RISKY POLITICAL ISSUE

(By Marquis Childs)

American policy makers are currently reviewing every front in the cold war as the premises of only yesterday no longer seem valid. But, above all, in Cuba the review has an urgency that reflects the tangle of politics and power, both national and international, threatening to bring another confrontation at least as grave as that of last October.

The way out is far from clear. President Kennedy in his private correspondence with Chairman Khrushchev has put great emphasis on the danger of allowing up to 17,000 Soviet troops to continue to build up a bastion of communism 90 miles from America's shores.

It is not ruled out that most of these troops will be withdrawn and their departure verified. This is, however, a hope fading fast as time runs out.

On March 18 the President goes to Costa Rica to meet with the six Central American Presidents. The presence in Washington of Venezuela's President Romulo Betancourt points up the peril of subversion exported from the Cuban bastion. It is this peril that underscores the weakness in the administration position.

Put as simply as possible, the facts seem to be: Cuba is not a military threat to the United States and to talk as though it were is a disservice to national unity. But it is a threat to the hemisphere, and with the continuing deterioration in many areas in Latin America this endangers the whole structure that the Alliance for Progress is designed to underwrite.

Therefore, serious consideration is being given to a new resolution to be brought before the Council of the Organization of American States. This would go a step beyond the unanimous OAS declaration of last October in that it would find the presence of Soviet troops to be a danger to the entire hemisphere.

The way would be open for a new blockade of Cuba. The likelihood, according to American officials directly concerned, would be for approval by at least two-thirds of the member states. Five of the twenty-one Latin-American countries—Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Uruguay, and Bolivia—still have diplomatic relations with the Castro regime. They might not go along.

But since this would be a direct confrontation between the two giants, with only an indirect relationship to the hemisphere, they might also support the resolution. They would be saying in effect, "let's you and him fight."

One complication is the presence in this country of close to 200,000 Cubans who have chosen exile rather than endure the tyranny of the Castro regime. They fled leaving all their possessions behind them and often in great danger. But as almost invariably happens they have broken up into bitterly antagonistic factions and their factionalism is reflected in the politics of Cuba in this country.

The exiles range from those who, in effect, demand that the United States take direct military action to restore all property to its previous owners—to those who were with Castro in his sweeping reforms up to the point when the Communists took command. It is not hard for exile spokesmen to get to Members of Congress. They have information out of Cuba which they believe, although from all indications the Russians are guarding their own military enclaves and the only Cubans admitted are laborers carefully screened.

There is an unhappy analogy here with what happened after China fell to communism in 1949–50. Chinese exiles, some of whom had benefited hugely from the graft that accompanied large-scale aid to Chiang Kai-shek, exerted a great influence on American policy. Among a people unfailingly sympathetic to the plight of homeless exiles such pressures work on public opinion and one result is that our own immediate national interest is lost sight of.

This is not to say that the Republicans, and Democrats, attacking the administration on Cuba are misguided or insincere. Senator KENNETH KEATING, the principal critic, was proved right after the Cuban missile crisis broke into the open with the President's speech of October 22.

But another election is always just around the corner and in an era in which domestic issues seem to have been eroded away it is tempting to find a weak spot where emotions can be easily played upon. In the 1960 Kennedy campaign the "missile gap" was an emotional ploy. As we have subsequently learned, the "missile gap" was a myth.

The more Cuba becomes embedded in domestic politics the more difficult it will be to put an end to a situation of the utmost seriousness. With "who lost Cuba?" as a major issue next year, the emotions of the past will obscure the grim realities and necessities of the present.

Milestone in Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today there is being celebrated at the University of Chicago another milestone in the atomic age. The country will never forget the service of that noble group of scientists who, at the University of Chicago, started the development of the mighty force of atomic energy that would develop the future of mankind.

Arthur J. Snider is the able and knowledgeable science writer of the Chicago Daily News. He tells so well the story of today's anniversary observance that I am extending my remarks to include his article, in a recent edition of the Chicago Daily News, as follows:

U. OF C. TO MARK ANOTHER MILESTONE OF ATOMIC AGE—PLAN TO OBSERVE FIRST WEIGHING OF PLUTONIUM

(By Arthur J. Snider)

That Chicago was the birthplace of the first atomic chain reaction is known the world over, but few are aware of another atomic distinction—the purification and weighing of the first manmade element, plutonium.

The production, an amount no larger than a speck of dust, was found to weigh one ten-millionth of an ounce. It would have taken 900,000 such specks to equal the weight of a dime.

From that submicroscopic beginning, the U.S. Government went on to build huge secret plants to process plutonium as the atomic bomb fuel.

This biggest scale-up in history gambled that the chain reaction experiment, to take place some 3 months later, would be successful.

Next Monday, a belated 20th anniversary observance of the first weighing of plutonium will be held on the University of Chicago campus.

Among those to take part in the daylong symposium are the two Nobel prize-winning codiscoverers of plutonium, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, now Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Dr. Edwin M. McMillan, director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley.

Plutonium was discovered at Berkeley in 1941 by Seaborg and his associates. It could not be seen. It was identifiable only by its radioactive characteristics.

Samples of uranium oxide, from which the plutonium was obtained by bombardment in an atom-smashing cyclotron, were sent to the University of Chicago where the wartime Metallurgical Laboratory had been established.

In room 405 of George Herbert Jones Laboratory, 5747 South Ellis, scientists on August 18, 1942, saw through a microscope the first pure compound of plutonium. It was weighed on September 10.

As part of the observance Monday, a plaque will be hung on the door of room 405 to note the event.

Plutonium has made possible the growth of the atomic energy program. Without it, scarce fissionable material would be limited largely to weapons.

The only other significant source of fissionable material is uranium 235, which constitutes less than 1 percent of natural uranium. But much of the remaining 99 percent can be converted into plutonium in a so-called breeder reactor.

The promise of breeder reactors is to increase greatly the available fuel supply, making nuclear electric power more economic.

Last November 28, Argonne National Laboratory achieved the first self-sustaining chain reaction using plutonium as a fuel in power producing.

The 28.7 kilograms of plutonium fuel was more than 10 billion times the amount weighed at the University of Chicago two decades ago.

Plutonium was used in space flight as the "atomic battery" to generate electricity aboard the navigational satellite, Transit IV-A. Plutonium reactors are being looked to as the power source for distant space flights.

"Little Giant" in House—Carl Bert Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, we in Tennessee are very proud of our distinguished majority leader, CARL BERT ALBERT.

There appeared on Thursday, February 14, in the Chattanooga Times, an outstanding newspaper not only of Tennessee but of the Nation as well, a wonderful article relative to our leader. It was so well written that I felt I should bring it to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

"LITTLE GIANT" IN HOUSE—CARL BERT ALBERT

WASHINGTON.—CARL BERT ALBERT, the Democratic majority leader of the House of Representatives, is a quiet, scholarly legislator who seldom raises his voice in vigorous debate. But when he does sound off he packs a load of ammunition that commands the respect of all his colleagues regardless of party affiliation. For he is a Phi Beta Kappa honors winner, a Rhodes scholar with two advanced degrees, a self-taught linguist, a masterly grassroots politician, a tournament bridge player, a serious student of history and a product of a small cotton farm and coal mining background.

Moreover, it is a common saying in the Congress that "nobody's mad at CARL"—a tribute from his fellow Representatives to the fact that he has few if any enemies. And the politicians among them recognize that it's hard to beat a candidate with that kind of record.

He comes from the Little Dixie section of Oklahoma—the southeastern corner of the State, just north of Texas and west of Arkansas. There he is billed as "the little giant from Little Dixie," a reference to the fact that while he is only 5 feet, 4 inches tall, he has a big voice on the hustings and delivers his speeches with a fiery and flamboyant style.

ALBERT was born on May 10, 1908, one of five children of Ernest Homer Albert, a small cotton farmer and coal miner. He was born at McAlester but grew up on the cotton farm near a place then called Bug Tussle,

but now known as Flowery Mound. His father also worked in nearby coal mines.

ALBERT attended Flowery Mound rural school and McAlester High School, where his scholarship and campus activity won him the class presidency. In 1927 he entered the University of Oklahoma to major in political science. He became active in debating and won the National Oratorical Championship of 1928 with a prize of $1,500.

At college he was president of the student council in his senior year. He was chosen for Phi Beta Kappa, honorary scholastic society, and won a Rhodes scholarship which enabled him to study for 3 years at Oxford University, where he took degrees in jurisprudence and in civil law.

He was admitted to the bar in Oklahoma and practiced with the Federal Housing Administration in Oklahoma City. Later he joined the legal staff of the Ohio Oil Co. In 1941 he enlisted in the Army as a private, won a Bronze Star for meritorious service in the Pacific and was discharged in 1946 with the rank of lieutenant colonel. That same year he won election to his congressional seat, with the campaign slogan "From a cabin in the cotton to Congress."

MOVED UP IN 1962

In 1955 he was made majority whip in Congress and in January 1962 he became the majority leader when Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, moved from that post to the speakership of the House on the death of Sam Rayburn of Texas.

ALBERT spends long hours on his job at the Congress, but he enjoys Masonic and Methodist Church affairs when the time allows. For relaxation he plays tournament bridge, reads extensively in history and polishes up his fluent command of Spanish by listening to recordings and reading and practicing the language.

ALBERT dresses conservatively and projects his nonaggressive nature in everything he does. He always seems to have a worried look on his face, but his hair is still brown and his manners are gentle and courteous. Among intimates he exhibits an impressive talent for mimicry.

While on Army duty in Washington in the war years he met and married the former Miss Mary Sue Green Harmon of Columbia, S.C. They have two children, Mary Frances, 14, and David Ernest, 8.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the wars of the 20th century have played a major role in the lives of the world's nations, but for the Lithuanians they have been drastic turning points. After 120 years of subjugation by the Russian czars, this Baltic country emerged from the First World War as an independent nation. The 45th anniversary of this happy event is being celebrated this month. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian Republic did not outlive the peace. For the second time it became a battleground in the struggle between Germans and Russians. After World War I the Lithuanians had been able to free themselves from a Russia torn internally by revolution and weakened by the war effort, but the Russians of 1945 were much more powerful and held Eastern Europe in an iron grip.

Lithuania thus remained under the Russian yoke as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. The story of the postwar period has been one of increasing regimentation imposed by the Central Soviet Government, infiltration by Russians, and suppressions of religious and cultural freedoms. If the First World War meant national liberation for the Lithuanians, the Second World War meant enslavement. This is a lesson which we must all keep in mind as we work toward the establishment of a lasting peace.

Overwhelming Majority of Accidents Are Caused by Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on February 7, 1963, Mr. William H. G. France, president of the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing, Inc., delivered an address before the Beavers' Club at the Detroit Athletic Club. Mr. France, who makes a great contribution to the automobile field, is not only an outstanding citizen, but in the particular area of safety on the highways and matters relating to automobiles, particularly racing cars, he is the preeminent expert that we have in the United States. In his speech Mr. France discussed the numerous reasons why the national image of the automobile industry needs to be changed in regards to accidents. Mr. France stated that the American public should be taught that the overwhelming majority of accidents stems from the drivers themselves and not from any faults of the machines.

Mr. France also expressed the importance and commonsense of advertising automobiles on the strength of their quality and their performance. His remarks are based upon his many years of experience in the field. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF ACCIDENTS ARE CAUSED BY DRIVERS

(Address by William H. G. France)

Mr. President, Mr. Toastmaster, and members of the Beavers, it is a great pleasure to have been invited to meet you, and to be here today, and I want to thank you for having me. Maybe, I needed a change from all the warm Florida weather. Actually, I believe all of us need occasionally to leave our personal vantage points, if for no other reason than to sharpen our perspectives. And, I thank you for giving me that opportunity.

Now, I have a request to make. It's an unusual one, but I believe after you hear it, all of you will agree with me that it is reasonable, and makes a great deal of sense.

I would like to ask that the swimming pool—this one right here along side us—be drained. If not to the bottom, then down to two or three inches.

Let me explain:

I read a speech a few weeks ago, that was delivered to a group of advertising men, which not only scared me, but set me to thinking. Some of you might possibly have heard the speech, or read it in the papers.

The talk was made by a man prominent in the automobile industry, and in it this gentleman almost came to tears over the speed of automobiles and the glamorization of automobiles and their speed. He intimated, if intimated is strong enough a word, that fast cars were unsafe, that fast cars were largely responsible for automobile accidents and fatalities, and that to glamorize a fast car was as dangerous as scattering ground glass in a kindergarten sand lot.

Only passing mention was made of the generally accepted belief that the people who drive cars—not the cars—are responsible for the great majority of accidents. People were safe, sound and sensible, the speech implied, but not cars. Government regulation of cars, Government restriction on automobile manufacturers, were hinted at. More than hinted at.

Well, if the speaker was right—and I am positive he was as wrong as smoking in church—then we must assume that all inanimate objects are dangerous and offer a dire threat to life.

Like this swimming pool. It should be drained to protect people from it. If not drained, then made so shallow that it can't leap up and drown us. It is possible—if the man was right about cars—that the Government will forbid pools that are over 4 inches deep, and a manufacturer of pools who glamorizes them will be punished. The Government might go so far as to order lakes drained, river channels limited to a few feet in depth, wells and springs dried up and bathers allowed to enter the ocean only during low tide.

On the subject of safety, I believe I can say that few men in the country are more concerned with automobile safety than I. As a director of NASCAR racing activities in the United States, I suppose it is believed that speed and more speed is our chief objective. That isn't true. We spend much more time on safety measures, building against accidents, than we do on speed. Frankly, we would be out of business without safety.

In 1962 NASCAR sanctioned, assisted and kept complete records on more than 1,200 competitive racing events all over the country. What do you think the average speed of the winners of these 1,200 races was? Take a guess—150 miles an hour? 120? 100? 95? Nope. Much too high. The average speed in 95 percent of these races was under 60 miles an hour.

On January 20 of this year, NASCAR directed the Riverside, Calif., 500 miles NASCAR road race, which was won by Dan Gurney in a 1963½ Ford. Gurney, one of the world's top drivers, won at a speed under 90 miles per hour (84.9). Every manufacturer in the United States—and I repeat every manufacturer—makes a car that will travel as fast as that.

If they didn't, their cars wouldn't be safe. That's right, wouldn't be safe. A car has to be capable of that speed, or better, to have the horsepower for the acceleration needed to enter and travel on the existing freeways and turnpikes of this country. And these expressways, in the future, are going to require even better performance on the part of American cars.

Gentlemen, something that greatly concerns me is the fact that no one has ever adequately gotten across to the newspapers

of the United States that it is not the car that is dangerous, but the driver. The man behind the wheel is to blame, not the car whose wheel he is behind.

Here is a typical example of how this news is handled. Here is a clipping from my hometown paper—the Daytona Beach News Journal. I found this article buried on the back pages. It is a one-column, three-paragraph story:

"[From the Daytona Beach Evening News, Jan. 17, 1963]

"MAN'S THE CULPRIT

"JACKSONVILLE.—The man, not the machine, was at fault in 98 percent of the traffic accidents in Jacksonville last year.

"That's the verdict of a consolidated police report on the 7,452 accidents in the city during 1962. Poor conduct on the part of the driver was listed on 98 of every 100 accident reports.

"Most frequent violation was failure to yield right-of-way. It showed up on reports of 1,477 accidents. Drinking was listed on 386."

Now, what is true of Jacksonville, is likely true of most American cities.

It seems to me that it is high time the superb engineers and designers of American automobiles should get full and favorable recognition for the magnificent job they are doing, and have been doing for years in the design and powering of American cars. It is time Detroit abandoned the post of whipping boy.

Now because it seems the fashionable thing for one manufacturer to publicly advise other manufacturers how to or not to advertise their products, then perhaps it would be all right for me to make a suggestion that might be acceptable and welcome to all people engaged in the great industry you gentlemen represent and are part of.

I would suggest the automotive industry launch a national advertising campaign using all its vast resources from Detroit to Madison Avenue. The campaign would be simplicity itself, and to the point a proclamation: "National Don't Blame the Car Week."

Such a campaign is needed. It would not only serve the car industry well but it would be a great public service to the people by bringing to their attention what they should have known since the first car hit the road. That is, that as autos are man made, so also are the accidents in which the cars are involved.

The campaign could be glamorized, if you'll pardon the expression, with prizes. For example, the first car owner who could offer documented proof that his car started itself, backed out of the driveway, ran a red light, jumped a sidewalk, ran into a tree and was apprehended for speeding and reckless driving, would be given an all-expense tour around the world.

Other prizes could be given to car owners who were able to positively prove their cars, with no one at the wheel, had done such things as: (1) gotten intoxicated, (2) flipped over while parked, (3) traveled 70 miles an hour in fog or heavy rain, (4) that a car by itself became drowsy and fell asleep on a long straight, and sometimes boring section of the road. Such a prize contest would alert automobile owners to the honest fact that no car, by itself, has ever been arrested for recklessness, foolishness, or just plain lack of commonsense.

Therefore, in view of these well-known facts, would it be considered out of line to request the Automobile Manufacturers' Association to adopt a resolution calling for a campaign such as: "The Car Is Not the Culprit Week" and requesting news media of all types to carry this fact to the public.

During the 15 years I have been associated with NASCAR, we have supervised more than 50,000 competitive events, with an average of 25 cars per event. That figures out to a quarter of a million cars in action. Not only at various speeds, but in races that really "wring" out a car. No part of it is left untested. If there is a weakness in the construction of the machine, it is a mortal cinch to come to the surface.

There have been accidents, yes. Many of them. But I can truthfully say that the study of the accidents by experts has shown that only a small, small part of them were caused by mechanical failure. The great majority of them were caused by bad judgment on the part of the drivers, including expert professional drivers. If these skilled men make mistakes that cause accidents, it is only logical to believe that the average everyday driver makes many, many more mistakes when he is behind the wheel of his car.

Ask any professional driver what he fears most. He won't tell you that it is high speed. He will tell you that the thing he is most afraid of is driving in ordinary traffic in which he has to contend with the ordinary driver.

As for objections to advertising a car upon its quality and performance, I am at a loss to know what an advertiser would advertise if not those very virtues. It's weaknesses? Are you supposed to hide your light under a bushel? I have met a number of advertising men and all of them I have met, I judge, are seekers of the truth. I have known some, in fact, who loved the truth so much they have been known to stretch it, just to be able to have more of it.

Here is a typical example. [Ad.]

Also, some of us recall the popular song of a few years ago about the little car that went beep, beep, down the road and passed a Cadillac. Who's beep, beep was it?

It is human nature for a man to want to buy the product with the highest quality and performance, be it automobiles, washing machines, shotguns, or tea bags. Certainly this is true of Americans. Ours is a country that has never been satisfied with settling for second best.

I wasn't around at the time, but I'd be willing to bet that when our forefathers and their families headed West to settle this country, that they chose the best constructed, best looking covered wagons they could find and afford, and read advertisements to find the strongest, fastest oxen to pull them, and the fastest, prettiest horses to ride themselves.

I have no way of knowing how many accidents there were among the covered wagons—there must have been plenty to judge by present day historical TV westerns—but I am sure that no one ever made a fuss about a man having oxen too fast. And, I doubt if anyone was criticized for having engineered the famous 20 Mule Team—far and away, the most glamorous horsepower ever to cross the Rockies.

Can you imagine a pioneer responding to an ad that went something like this: 1848 model covered wagon and team. One owner. Oxen guaranteed so slow they can't outrun a knockneed Indian. Get one and be cut off at the gulch.

As I say, Americans want top performance for themselves and for their country.

We are competitive and we hate to be licked. President Kennedy recently named General MacArthur to settle the hassle between the AAU and the NCAA so that our chances against Russia in the next Olympic Games would not be jeopardized.

Something along that line might well happen if Russia started building better, faster, more glamorous automobiles than America and started winning all the stock car races. It is entirely possible that a certain Washington official might call a Detroit official and ask how come—and make a vigorous request that something be done about the situation right away—with or without air cover.

In a second or two we are going to have a showing of a picture I brought along. I advise you to fasten your seat belts before the movie begins. Before I forget it, I would like to invite you gentlemen to visit us in Daytona Beach on February 24, when the annual Daytona 500 for late model stock cars will be run on the Speedway.

I am sure that if you attend you will agree with me that there is nothing, nothing wrong with the cars Michigan is building these days.

There will always be criticism, of course, but when I read of some of the complaints—a recent one, in particular—I can't help thinking of the little boy who, having no bat to swing, went around saying baseball was a terrible game and that everyone ought to quit playing it.

Again, thank you for asking me to meet the Beavers. I appreciate it.

Now, let's take a look at some machinery being operated like you never saw it done on private proving grounds.

Student Leftism Stirs Panamanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the capital cities of Latin America there has developed a pattern of using the large universities for purposes not related to education, and these are political. The first acts in many revolutions have been performed by university students, under the leadership of trained agitators posing as students.

In this light, a news story from Panama City, Panama, by Ralph S. Skinner in the January 10, 1963, issue of the Christian Science Monitor is most informative as regards the preparation of future leaders in the Republic of Panama and their attitude toward the United States.

The news story follows:

STUDENT LEFTISM STIRS PANAMANIANS

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

Recent elections at Panama University indicate a leftist orientation of the student body which has alarmed many serious Panamanian citizens.

Winning 60 out of 70 seats in the controlling student organization, the University Reformist Front was the obvious favorite among the 4,000 students at Panama University.

Since this is the only college in Panama, the election indicates that Panama's future businessmen, educators, lawyers, and other professionals now are far left of center in their thinking. It is reported that a definite program is underway to steer them even further away from the democratic process.

The University Reformist Front is considered a radical group of leftwing tendencies. Dr. George Westerman in an editorial in the Panama Tribune wrote, "Its reformist demands are viewed as inspired by other than purely honest motivations. It is argued far and wide that this group is usually influenced by foreign sources."

Student leaders have admitted to this correspondent their training in Castro's Cuba and other anti-American areas. Some for-

eign-trained adults who pose as student leaders are obviously not bona fide students.

Some demands of this reformist group are seen reasonable, such as more government funds for education and less diverted to the pockets of officials, elimination of tuition in public schools, scholarships for deserving students, and more realistic curriculum. This type of demand presumably has the support of the entire student body.

The same university group spearheaded action in a student congress in December to seek the permanent neutralization of the Republic of Panama. The students made a formal request to the Panama Government to have the United Nations proclaim the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Panama and guarantee the neutralization of the Panama Canal.

The students said the Panama Canal was built to bring together all nations for international good and that this could be done only through maintenance of peace and good relations. They contended that the presence of U.S. military forces in the Canal Zone was detrimental to the stated purpose of the Panama Canal and made it a "risk zone" and invited enemy attack.

Some observers here see this student demand as a Communist- or Castro-influenced attempt to get United Nations action to remove long-established U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force establishments from the Canal Zone and to reduce the military influence of the United States in Latin America.

What Goes on in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of January 25, 1963. This editorial discusses the need for an investigation of the administration's handling of the Cuban situation.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT GOES ON IN CUBA?

Americans had hoped that after the forced removal of Soviet offensive weapons from Cuba, the Soviet Government would quietly and gradually reduce also its defensive military manpower and equipment on the big island 90 miles off U.S. shores. Instead, new shipments of arms have gone in, and the sizable remaining Soviet military forces there have been regrouped and their encampments strengthened, and they are teaching Cubans to operate the new equipment.

Information about the new shipments and the new construction comes from Tad Szulc of the New York Times through private reports from Havana, leaks from U.S. Government officials, and from speeches by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York.

In such a vital matter, this is not the best way for the public to become informed. Szulc and KEATING are entitled to credit for their enterprise and outspokenness. But the Government itself ought to be reporting from time to time on the results of the surveillance which it has continued ever since well before last fall's Cuban crisis. The blockade ended November 20. The watch did not. Perhaps the enterprise of Szulc and KEATING will smoke out the administration.

The public has never really had the full story of either the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961 or the confrontation over offensive weapons in 1962. It may take Congress to smoke that out.

There should be an investigation by a responsible committee, preferably the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. A partisan investigation by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, and his Senate Republican Policy Committee is not desirable in this delicate matter. Neither is a rush of everybody to get into the act.

Yet this seems to be what is happening. It's not just DIRKSEN. Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, has scheduled hearings before his Latin American Affairs Subcommittee starting today. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona, plans an investigation by the Armed Services Committee, of which Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia, is chairman and GOLDWATER is a member.

The public needs to know, officially, from official sources, what is going on (with private sources as a supplement and a yardstick). The best way is for a congressional committee to get statements and answers to questions from high administration officials. But one committee is enough.

Renegotiation of Guantanamo Lease a Prime Purpose of Castro and Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Members of the Senate are well aware that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, along with many others of our veterans organizations, have long recognized the fundamental and continuing dangers posed by a Red Cuba. I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to a statement recently made by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Byron Gentry. This statement goes to the heart of the issues involved, pointing out that one of Castro's and Soviet Russia's prime purposes in their Caribbean machinations is to force the United States to renegotiate its lease on the Guantanamo Naval Base. Mr. Gentry rightly points out:

The only thing involved in the issue of U.S. control over Guantanamo Bay is the security of our country and that is not negotiable.

I commend his statement to the Senate's attention. I ask that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO.—Byron B. Gentry, Pasadena, Calif., national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today urged that any negotiations that might be going on between the United States and Russia or Cuba regarding the U.S. base in Guantanamo be immediately halted.

"We firmly believe," Commander Gentry said, "the only thing involved in the issue of the U.S. control over Guantanamo Bay is the security of our country and that is not negotiable."

Commander in Chief Gentry added, "The most persistent demand of the Soviet Union and Castro's Red Cuba since the beginning of the Cuban missile crisis has been for U.S. withdrawal from Guantanamo Bay. There is no doubt but what the diplomatic maneuvering by Russia and Cuba is designed to force the United States to negotiate concerning this base so vital to our security, and that of all of the Americas. It is abundantly clear now, the Communists want the United States out of Guantanamo Bay. They know that full U.S. control of Guantanamo Bay is essential to the defense of the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic approaches to Panama against the increasing encroachment of Red submarines in that area. U.S. withdrawal from Guantanamo would make it virtually impossible for the United States to assure the maintenance of the Atlantic sealanes between North and South America."

Continuing, Commander Gentry said, "The United States has no reason for apologizing to anyone for our position at Guantanamo Bay. We are there by virtue of a freely arrived at treaty between the United States and the Government of Cuba negotiated in 1903. It is particularly noteworthy that these treaty arrangements were reaffirmed by treaty in 1934 between the United States and Cuba. The United States is, in every respect, living up to its obligations under this treaty. The agreement is imperturbable and cannot be terminated unilaterally.

"It is the firm conviction of the VFW that our Nation should resolutely reject every one of these arrogant Communist demands for us to negotiate our use of Guantanamo Bay. If the United States bends to such Red pressure, our Nation will quickly lose the respect it has gained as a result of President Kennedy's direct and forceful handling of the Cuban missile issue.

"To give up Guantanamo would not only be a loss to the United States of this critically important base, but such a loss would be compounded by the fact that as our ships sailed out, Russian submarines would sail in. Guantanamo would quickly become a base from which Soviet submarines could patrol the Caribbean and prowl the U.S. shores of the Gulf of Mexico and our east coast.

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars fully supported President Kennedy's statement, October 1962, that 'we must make it clear to Mr. Castro once and for all that we will defend our naval base at Guantanamo under all circumstances.' "

Youth Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's special message of February 14 on our Nation's youth included a section on youth employment. The President referred to programs which would provide useful jobs and training for young persons who need them. The 1964 budget recommendations include two destinct activities. First, a Youth Conservation Corps would be established, putting young men to work improving our forests and recreation areas. This would initially provide useful training and work for 15,000 youths. Second, the Federal Government will provide half the wages and related costs for young persons employed on local projects that

offer useful work experience in nonprofit community services—such as hospitals, schools, parks and settlement houses. Forty thousand youths can be employed in the first year in this part of the program.

This message by President Kennedy encourages the prospects of expanding the forestry corps program which was established for youth of Pennsylvania in the administration of former Gov. George M. Leader. The supporting material for this legislation was furnished Dr. John O. Reinemann, chief of the probation department of the county court of Philadelphia. The legislation was sponsored by bipartisan effort. I was joined by Representative Thomas Jones of Norristown and former Representative Mary A. Varallo, who is now a councilwoman at large in the city of Philadelphia.

In Philadelphia, Welfare Commissioner Randolph E. Wise guided a youth conservation corps for the past 4 years and I am sure that the Members will be interested in his comments on the program which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on February 16:

PROPOSED U.S. YOUTH CORPS LIKE 4-YEAR-OLD PHILADELPHIA PLAN

The Youth Conservation Corps proposed by President Kennedy parallels in many respects this city's similarly manned organization, established 4 years ago.

The Youth Conservation Corps here offers job opportunities to 300 or more boys from 14 to 17 who, according to Welfare Commissioner Randolph E. Wise, come from economically and socially deprived areas.

Some—but not all—are delinquents.

EARNINGS VARY

The boys earn from 30 to 60 cents an hour, depending upon how well they work. They can earn up to $12 a week for afterschool jobs and $24 a week for full-time work in summer.

Much of their efforts have been directed toward cleaning up Fairmount Park, cutting dead trees and grass, cleaning out underbrush, and the like.

SCRUB CONCOURSES

They also have worked at such city buildings as Riverview, Convention Hall, and branch libraries, where they clean up grounds, pick weeds, and cart out rubbish.

Youth Conservation Corps recruits also have washed city-owned cars, and scrubbed and scraped subway concourses.

The program has been worked out with the board of education and union officials. While active, the boys receive counseling in family relationships, conduct, and budgeting.

Police contacts with the boys have dropped as much as 400 percent.

Aftermath of a Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of January 25, 1963. The following editorial expresses some concern over the aftermath of the maritime strike settlement.

AFTERMATH OF A STRIKE

The dock agreement on the east and gulf coasts slammed the lid of Pandora's box before all the troubles had flown out. It stopped the strike but it did not settle the two central issues. One of these has to do with what is loosely called automation; the other with union monopoly.

Under the settlement the longshoremen will get a wage package increase of about 39 cents an hour, which is pretty hefty. But the basic controversy with the shippers—the size of the crews of dockwallopers—is postponed.

OLD WAY PREVAILS

This is the old featherbedding issue, to use the term of the railroaders. As it is posed by a union, and it has been posed many, many times recently, it means that regardless of improvement in the mechanical means of doing things in a fast-changing world, the old methods of employment should still prevail. The railroads furnish the classic, multisided examples. One of the simplest cases of outrageousness occurs in theaters when a producer has to hire a standby orchestra because in simpler days cheaper musicians played overtures and intermezzi which very few people on their way to the bar ever stayed to hear.

In this time of acute social consciousness, hardly anybody will say that workers displaced by machines should be turned loose to shift for themselves. The population has become too large for easy turnover in employment.

The deadlock can be broken only if employers and employees recognize their mutual responsibilities in the changing scene. Three years ago the shippers and dockworkers in California acknowledged the facts of change and the shippers supplied a fund of about $29 million for pensions and benefits to retire older workers so that the size of dock crews could be reduced in conformance with the improvements in mechanical cargo-handling equipment.

John L. Lewis, presiding over a larger work force, had the power and courage to enact an equivalent deal in the coal mines. Resistance to mechanization was abated, old miners were retired on pensions, new men were discouraged from entering the trade, and the coal was dug with machines and relatively few miners, who received much higher wages.

The eastern dockworkers will argue this issue with their employers next summer; meanwhile, three-quarters of U.S. shipping is moving again under what might be called a truce at higher pay.

But automation is not the only issue raised by the eastern dock strike. The other issue can be posed by asking a question: Why, if New York longshoremen want to strike for more money—or large crews—should they have the power to close the port of Boston, for example, or gulf ports from Galveston to Tampa?

They should not have this power. No union should have the power to tie up this much of the commerce of the United States, or for that matter, the greater part of the transportation or communications or basic production of the United States.

This is the issue of union monopoly. Unions are exempt from the antitrust laws, which forbid industry to conspire to restrain trade and other acts against the public interest. Why should unions have this advantage?

When unions were exempted by law from antitrust actions they were generally regarded as underprivileged in relation to their employers. But they are not any more. They have statutory rights so formidable and definitive that they can dictate management policy in some critical areas, and by extension influence public policy. Two weeks ago, according to Columnist Victor Riesel, Labor Secretary Wirtz told President Kennedy that not only general U.S. commerce but shipping imperative to the well-being of the free world was being badly disrupted by the longshoremen's strike.

TRUCE IS TEMPORARY

Eventually, the pro-labor President of the United States was able to strong-arm the longshoremen and their employers into a temporary settlement. By doing this he may have cooled the anger of members of Congress who had been preparing spot bills to deal with long-term problems. But he did not change the convictions of cooler heads, that union monopolies, which enable the few to affect the well-being or convenience of all, should be curbed.

Union labor has rights which can be defended on constitutional grounds, but union labor is also a minority of the people of the United States. As such it has no right that Congress cannot change to impose its corporate will on everybody. A monopoly is a monopoly, whoever possesses it.

Biting Off More Than Can Be Chewed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 30, 1963. This editorial discusses the deficit financing policies of the New Frontier:

BITING OFF MORE THAN CAN BE CHEWED

It was an adage of an older time that beggars can't be choosers. That has been relegated to the discard of obsolete ideas by the economic theoreticians in Washington. The fashionable assumption now is that a beggar who does enough choosing will eventually promote the opulent society.

So the Kennedy administration, with its plans for spending $99 billion, running a deficit of at least $12 billion, and handing out tax cuts all at once in the next fiscal year, is not deterred from any venture in overspending. The latest is education, the subject of Mr. Kennedy's catch-all proposals yesterday. The cost could be about $5 billion in new outlays.

Yes, says Mr. Kennedy, State and local governments and private institutions have written a remarkable record, and they have, in recent years, devoted sharply increased resources to education. In 20 years the national outlay for education has increased 40 percent.

But, says Mr. Kennedy, this is not enough. Whatever the States, communities, and private institutions have accomplished, the Federal government is not in the act, and it must get into it. There must be grants and loans of every sort, both for the common schools and the colleges, for teachers' salaries, for research in curricular content, for libraries, scholarships, tuition loans, youth conservation activities, etc., etc.—all, of course, "without Federal control."

Withal, Mr. Kennedy says we must "face the fact that the Federal government cannot provide all the financial assistance needed to solve all of the problems men-

tioned," though this is a fact infrequently faced by the government in its multifarious spending activities.

If we are going to face that fact—and it is a good one to face in education as well as in all other matters—it might be well to inquire about two related things:

1. What taxing authority, and what types of income, property, or transactions subject to taxation, are uniquely at the disposal of the Federal government so that it is privileged to produce revenue which the States cannot produce for themselves, providing they are so minded? And if the Federal Government has any such unique access to sources of revenue, why is it that the Government cannot meet the bills for its established activities, let alone those, such as aid to education, which it is constantly seeking to add to the list?

2. Nor is any logical relationship ever found in the supposed inability of the States and communities to finance activities traditionally within their responsibility and the size, scope, and empire building tendencies of the Federal Government. It is precisely because of Federal centralization that the States are poor, so that the argument for aid to education, as for everything else, is that the Government must step in to rectify the very conditions it itself has created.

For these reasons, and because, by Supreme Court definition, the Government may control that which it subsidizes, we hope that Congress will consign the education bill, along with much of the rest of the Kennedy "program," to the ash can. The Government has already bitten off far more than it can possibly chew.

Deficit Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the novel idea proposed by the Kennedy administration that we can spend more and tax less has created all sorts of possibilities. I call my colleagues' attention to the following syndicated article by Mr. Don Whitehead. Obviously this business of not paying one's bills has many pitfalls and for the administration to bury its head in the sand like an ostrich hardly constitutes responsible government.

The article follows:

DEFICIT SPENDING

Memo to my creditors.

GENTLEMEN: If I happen to fall a few years behind in my payments on the mortgage, the car, and the store accounts, I hope you will understand the reason why. We have decided at our house that if deficit financing is good for our Government then it's good enough for us.

I am quite sure that by 1967 our family can begin balancing the household budget. This means, of course, that we'll have deficits in 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966. But by 1968, according to my figuring, we'll be able to make a token payment on any further debts incurred.

Certainly you cannot argue that if deficit financing works for the Federal Government it will not work for you and me. It will stimulate trade, put more people to work, lower the cost of goods, increase profits, and result eventually in a raise in wages for me. All my spending is pegged on the raise which will result from deficit financing—and when that raise is forthcoming then I can pay off all the debts.

Naturally, if all of your customers don't pay their debts, you can't pay your debts. This means your creditors can't pay their creditors which means nobody will be able to pay anybody, including the Internal Revenue Service.

But is this bad? Of course not. It's all a matter of bookkeeping, anyway. Not paying debts will encourage buying. Having no fear of debts, everyone will buy more. Factories will hum on 24-hour shifts. Stores will add more clerks. Railroads will buy more freight cars. Mills will produce more steel, etc. The gross national credit product will soar, and this country really will begin to move.

Eventually, no employer will be able to pay his employees their wages in money. But is that really important? If an employer issues notes promising to pay the wages later, the notes would be as good as money and we could borrow against them at the banks if things got that bad. Besides, the Government could insure the notes like it insures bank accounts.

As for not paying taxes, the Government's business is our business. What the Government has in the Treasury is our money. If we are in debt to the Government we really are in debt only to ourselves. And if I owe money to me, I don't see any need to rush about paying me back.

Look at what we could do in the field of foreign aid. Not having any money, we couldn't make any outright money gifts but we could issue credit. And that's all most of the needy nations want—credit with which to buy the things they need. This way, we would stop the outflow of gold.

If everyone follows this deficit financing plan, it certainly would stop a lot of bickering between husbands and wives over money. My wife has worked out a deficit budget with which she's quite happy because she won't have to depend on me for cash.

I hope you grasp the opportunity and the beauty of deficit financing and that you will encourage all your debtors to follow this sound course which has pushed our country forward for the past 20 years.

I'll be seeing you in 1967.

Multiple-Use and Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am an advocate of the multiple-use concept in the management of our national forests because this concept provides for the recreational needs of our growing population. Among the majority in my congressional district who agree with me is Mr. Ernest Hederick, a member of Local 236, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers.

Mr. Hederick also is a commissioner of the University of Washington Institute of Forest Products and is an expert in the field of forestry. Recently the Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers' Journal carried an article by Mr. Hederick covering all the important improvements made in growing forest trees in Europe and the United States during the past 35 years. The article also raises some questions concerning multiple use and its relationship to recreation.

These questions point out that without multiple use, recreation in our forest would be limited to only a few persons, not to the majority of city dwellers who want to take their families to easily accessible recreational spots available under the multiple-use program.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Hederick's article in the RECORD:

SHOULD ALL THOSE WHO WORK IN THE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY TAKE AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN GROWING TREES?

(By Ernest Hederick)

How long would the industrial and commercial life of our Nation continue without newsprint, paper office supplies, blueprint paper and numerous other materials made from wood fibers? Your job and your community's prosperity depends on trees. Wood is a renewable resource. No other resource can take the place of wood, but wood can substitute for many other resources.

Growing trees is not a new idea. It has been carried on in Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway and Sweden for many, many years. In 1934 Carl Syrac Larson, of Denmark, a noted authority on silvaculture, wrote an article proposing that seed plantations or seed orchards should be established for the production of forest tree seed. Halger Jensen's writings in Sweden during the 1940's outlined plans for reaching practical importance.

For more than 20 years the search has continued for parent trees, plus trees for these seed orchards. Out of the many thousands of trees that have been examined, 3,000 have been selected, certified, and entered on registration book cards. These trees are used for propagation by grafting in seed orchards and in the field. Denmark and Germany, like Sweden, register approved seed stands.

Genetics deal with heredity and evolution of trees. By control of pollination between trees with desirable heritage factors we are able to obtain an improved tree. The development of the hybrid larch in Scotland in 1915 and the hybrid pine in California in 1928 have been incentives to silvaculture the world over by showing with practical examples that it is possible to produce and raise artificially new and better specimen of trees. Russia announced in 1960 that she had produced a fast growing hybrid oak.

What has America done in this field? During the periodic seed years the cone buyers would purchase cones from the cone pickers who picked cones wherever they were available. Usually a tree in its dying years produces large quantities of seed and its cones do not produce the best seedlings.

To assure high quality cones a new system of cone production has been developed in private and national forest programs. Seed orchards are established and the cones are harvested in the same manner as crops. The U.S. Forest Service has established several seed orchards in the fir and hemlock regions of western Washington.

Seed orchards are usually set up in selected, completely logged areas where the land is cleared, and planted with Douglas-fir seedlings. The seedlings grow in the nursery for 2 years and are then transplanted to grow in the nursery for another 3 years. Through fertilization, irrigation, et cetera, the seedlings are intensively managed to assure fast and steady growth.

One year after the transplanting occurs scions are collected from selected trees at the elevation level for which seed is produced. Scion has the same meaning in silvaculture as in fruit culture. Thus a scion is a terminal bud or branch with the

same genetic characteristics as the tree from which it came—its parent.

The scions are grafted by experts who attach the cambium layers together with the result that the stock of a tree growing at 1,000 foot elevation will produce seeds with the characteristics of a perfect tree growing at a 4,000 foot level or other desired heights. The height of the seed trees are kept low so the cones may be picked with ease. Through controlled pollination with man's help and nature's wonders an annual cone or seed crop is produced, a far cry indeed from our old hit-and-miss system.

Artificial pollinations are made by inclosing a section of a branch of the selected tree in a plastic bag. The bag is punctured with a long hypodermic needle and the cone is pollenized with the pollen from the selected tree to be crossed. These are called dam and sire trees.

The main obstacle to tree-improvement breeding is the long breeding cycle of forest trees. Forest trees in the fir and hemlock area develop from seed, to seedling, to maturity in 120 years or more.

Dr. Robert K. Campbell, assistant professor of forest genetics, College of Forestry and Institute of Forest Products, University of Washington, has conducted research in forest genetics for many years. He has been successful in the estimation of genetic gain in wood characteristics of mature trees resulting from seedling selections.

A tree farm is an area of privately owned forest land on which are grown continuous crops of merchantable forest products, under the best known forest management. These practices include intensive protection from fire, insects and disease, planned harvesting, and orderly removal of mature timber crops. To qualify as a certified tree farm, forest land must be operated according to rules which apply over all the United States. This program was started by the Government in 1941.

The American tree farm is similar in many ways to the tree farms (small woodland) in Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway, and Sweden. The main difference is that the Governments in these countries have laws which apply to both public and private land in regard to forest management. In the United States private forest landowners have banded together under an organization known as the National Tree Farms and have established rules pertaining to good forest practices as well as rules regarding fire, disease, and insect control.

The Western Pine Association sponsors tree farms in its region among all timberland owners, large or small. The 12-State western pine region has been in existence for 16 years and now has more than 1,400 tree farms under its jurisdiction totaling about 7 million acres. Western Oregon has 2,597,466 acres and western Washington has 3,504,150 acres in certified tree farms. The large tree farms, regardless of location, are open to the public, free of charge, for hunting, fishing and camping.

Overripe trees grow very slowly. Old-growth forests are easy prey to insects and disease. Proven harvesting methods (selective cutting) removes insect susceptibility in overripe trees and leaves the forest in a healthy growing condition. The danger of bark beetles can largely be reduced by marking for cutting the trees most susceptible to beetle attack.

This is part of the nationwide tree farm program which includes 45 States within whose borders are about 49 million acres of privately owned forest land.

The Weyerhaeuser Co. established the first certified tree farm in the United States. This company now has 12 certified tree farms —8 in the State of Washington and 4 in Oregon. The public enjoys hunting and fishing privileges, and the camp and picnic grounds are maintained by the company.

The Crown-Zellerbach Co. has practiced forestry in Oregon and Washington in some degree for 73 years. In 1889 and subsequent years, old growth cottonwood was harvested along the Willamette River. Crews of men then set out thousands of young cottonwoods along the riverbanks and islands. This company now has five tree farms in Oregon and three in Washington.

The Simpson Co. obtains its raw material from 630,000 acres of timberlands. This company annually reforests about 5,000 acres of timberland through hand planting and aerial seeding. The Simpson Redwood Tree Farm includes cutover and second-growth lands in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties, Calif. It is also operated on a sustained yield basis. In both tree farm areas the company maintains, free for the public use, camp, picnic, and playgrounds.

The Shelton Cooperative sustained yield unit in Mason and Grays Harbor Counties in the State of Washington contains 240,000 acres of company-owned timberland combined with 111,400 acres of U.S. Forest Service land under 100-year management contract signed in 1946. The object of this unique contract, authorized by Public Law 273, the Sustained Yield Act of 1944, is to keep all lands within the Shelton unit in continuous tree production, to stabilize the economy of dependent communities served by the act, and to develop maximum conservation practices.

The U.S. Forest Service operates under the multiple-use program. This means that these public lands are managed so that portions that are best suited and adopted for lumbering, grazing, wildlife, watershed, and recreational purposes are used for such purposes and, through careful planning, two or more uses may be found that are capable of existing together. Water, timber production, and other public welfare requirements can be met on a sustained basis which will support the economy of the Nation.

The Forest Service maintains many good gravel roads in the national forests. Along these roads, forest camps and picnic grounds are established and maintained for the public's use. These camps contain outdoor fireplaces, picnic tables, sanitary facilities, and garbage disposal units. A supply of wood is usually provided, also. From many of these campsites good trails which the Government constructed and maintained lead to lakes or scenic spots.

A city dweller can transport his whole family within a few hours to these forest campgrounds. This is the reason that several million people visit our forest camps in our national forests annually. Most of these people assume that these forest camps are wilderness areas because they may be located 50 miles within the border of the national forest.

The wilderness area under the wilderness bill means primitive area. They contain no roads and no established campgrounds. They can be entered only on foot or with a packhorse. Only those who are physically strong and can carry a pack on their back to supply their needs—usually 90 pounds or more—can use this area.

What price wilderness? How many families would be able to hike many miles into these primitive areas? Can our country afford to take several million acres of workable forest land and make it into a primitive area which will become a breeding ground for pests and disease? What will it cost our tree farms, State school lands, and our National Forest Service to combat the increased menace of pests and disease?

REA: The Deadly Competitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an increasing interest in the Nation's press about the current activities of the Rural Electrification Administration and its tendencies to go beyond the role set out for the agency in the Rural Electrification Act. The Wall Street Journal is the latest to express its concern editorially on Tuesday, February 12, 1963. This editorial calls REA the Deadly Competitor.

There does, however, appear to be a typographical error in the third paragraph of the Wall Street Journal editorial where it refers to "16 percent" of its loans are going to build new generating and transmission lines. The year-end statement put out recently by REA pointed out that "for the second straight year, generation and transmission loans accounted for more than half—55.5 percent in 1962—of the total loans approved."

Notwithstanding this typographical error, I think the editorial is worthwhile reading for every Member of this Chamber as an indication of this growing problem. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement of editorial opinion of the Wall Street Journal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE DEADLY COMPETITOR

The act of 1936 setting up the Rural Electrification Administration authorized the agency to make loans for furnishing electricity to "persons in rural areas." How is it, then, that in the last few years five out of six new REA co-op customers haven't been truly rural at all, but commercial, industrial and nonrural residential?

For one thing, REA activities reflect the changing character of the Nation; farms are fewer, suburbs have sprawled out from the cities into once-rural lands. And REA Administrator Norman Clapp contends that a territory developed by a co-op "in good faith" when it was rural still is co-op territory even though today it may be a vast suburban or industrial complex.

For another, as Hubert Kay notes in an article in the February Fortune magazine, the REA's co-ops have become increasingly aggressive in going after commercial-industrial business. So much so that whereas it once used only 2.5 percent of its loans to build new generating plants and transmission lines it now uses over 16 percent. The REA system's rapid growth as a power-producer has further alarmed already skittish investor-owned power companies which see in REA an ever-expanding power grid with which they cannot forever compete.

For the private utilities pay from 4 to 5 percent for money they need to borrow; the co-ops have the use of Federal funds at 2 percent which the Government borrows at 4 percent. Utilities pay out about 24 cents in taxes of each dollar received, including 13 cents in Federal income tax; co-ops pay no direct Federal taxes at all and, as co-ops,

enjoy preferred State and local tax treatment. And whereas companies are tightly regulated by State and Federal agencies, most co-ops can set their own rates. So the co-ops' competitive advantage is immense.

Now there's one fairly simple way to bring about competition on a more nearly equal basis. And that is to strip the REA co-ops of their protective mantle of subsidies and preferments and thus force them to really compete with private companies. In short, make the REA pay its way in the marketplace.

But as it is, the REA stands as an archtype of a Government agency that not only refuses to die when no longer needed but also uses every unfair means available to kill off its investor-financed competition.

The U.N. Should Not Bail Out Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the United States has urged and taken steps to evoke economic sanctions against the Castro regime in Cuba. It is also well known that the United States has been one of the most vigorous advocates of the United Nations and that the United States has been responsible for keeping the U.N. in a solvent financial condition.

It seems incredible that now the U.N. is going to grant money to the Castro government to build up their agriculture and in effect to improve their economic situation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the penetrating editorial on this subject which appeared recently in the Nashville Banner:

INCREDIBLE JACKASSERY

There is incredible stupidity in the idea that the United States should sanction a U.N. money grant to build up agriculture in Castro's Cuba; and booby hatch arithmetic in attendant assurances that this shot in the arm to bolster that enemy's staggering economy wouldn't cost anything. That the program to that end originates with Paul G. Hoffman, one of our U.N. people, is a fact hardly calculated to redeem it from the tag of further policy jackassery.

The United States foots 40 percent of the bill for the whole U.N. special fund operation, headed by Mr. Hoffman. But if it cost this Nation not a penny, it still would transgress basic considerations of declared policy and good sense.

As long ago as October 1960, the United States clamped down an embargo on shipments to Cuba. To tighten that in the light of developing realities, Washington made motions last October of action to penalize all shipowners transporting Soviet-bloc supplies to that land; and another provision was announced to bar from U.S. ports any ship that on a continuous voyage had delivered nonmilitary Communist cargoes to Cuba.

We have joined other member countries of the Organization of American States in the declaration and policy—enforced by them, too—forbidding business with Castro; on the premise of hemispheric solidarity against an avowed enemy. We have, in short, refused to be a party to the buildup either militarily or economically of a Sovietized Communist foothold; and the climax, though of brief duration, was the naval blockade which recognized the fact, finally, that, yes, Castro's Cuba is an enemy.

By what fantastic reasoning is it now supposed that the people of the United States should pay for, or condone, free gifts to Castro to bail him out?

In the same category of U.N. mischief is UNESCO's newest publication, a gushing tribute to Soviet Russia's virtue, as this propagandic bilge describes it, as a brotherhood of free and equal peoples. For that blurb, to be put in world circulation, Uncle Sam also is tapped for a third of the cost.

It is expensive enough for the United States to finance its own policy operations—as addressed to keeping this Nation and the whole free world secure. It is preposterous to suggest further adventures in financing operations, in any particular, of the enemy.

Both pieces of this highhanded monkey business are under heavy fire in Congress. An accounting is due, by more than Mr. Hoffman, but certainly including him. It is time that somebody exercised the prerogative of advice and consent where policy is concerned.

Milton Smith, of Austin: A Texas Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 32 years ago a young high school graduate came to Austin, Tex., from San Marcos, to engage in business. That was the same year I moved to Austin from El Paso.

Milton Smith's rise as a furniture manufacturer is one of the modern business success stories of Austin. He and his wife are civic and social leaders, as well as being engaged in business in Austin, my hometown. They support good government for the people.

Mr. Dave Shanks, editor of the business section of the daily Austin American, and author of the column, "Viewpoint," printed an account of Mr. Smith's business success under the title "Viewpoint—Milton Smith's Ventures: Now Mattresses Included" in the December 28, 1962 issue of the Austin American. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILTON SMITH'S VENTURES: NOW MATTRESSES INCLUDED

(By Dave Shanks)

Fresh from high school in San Antonio, Milton T. Smith came to Austin to start a furniture upholstery business.

That was 32 years ago, last October 18.

Smith currently is the chief mogul in a furniture manufacturing complex big enough to rank him in the top half dozen Austin employers at his Economy Furniture, Inc., which has its own growthy corporate subsidiary, Dormae Products, Inc.

Dormae this week is showing off a new plant, hailed as the "most modern mattress factory in the Southwest," a 65,000-square-foot manufacturing area and enough display and office space to add up to a 77,000-square-foot plant on McNeil Road, on Austin's North Side.

Significantly, Dormae signed on 2 years ago as a licensee of Serta Associates, Inc., one of the three "bigs" in the national bedding manufacturer's group and makers of the "Perfect Sleeper" mattresses for more than a quarter century.

Technically, Dormae is one of 42 member factories of the Serta group in the United States, Canada, the Philippine Islands and Brazil.

To help show off his new plant, Smith invited Serta's president, J. A. Ferguson of Chicago, and several hundred Dormae retailers, Austin civic officials, and business friends.

Dormae's beginning actually was the one-time Hurley mattress plant at 1101 East Sixth Street, which Smith acquired several years ago. For a time, Dormae was housed in the fire-razed oil mill in East Austin. Then came the new plant on McNeil Road.

The production line techniques will enable Serta Division to produce 800 pieces per day, utilizing 50 employees. The company supplies customers in over 200 counties of Texas, as well as in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Louisiana, and Mexico, using its own fleet of trucks.

About Dormae's future, Serta President Ferguson says the new division probably will be one of Serta's major producers within less than 5 years.

The national bedding manufacturing industry is a big-scale marketing venture, headed by Simmons (a corporate manufacturer) and Serta and Sealy, both of whom are utilizing licensees to manufacture products sold under the Serta and Sealy trade names. Serta has 42 of the plants, Sealy about 35.

Serta was organized in the 1930's by half a dozen mattress makers, whose firms traditionally are small scale. Fifteen years ago, Ferguson came over from Sears to Serta, and he's been running the show for the last several years.

Some industry problems: A new standard-sized bed. The oldtime 39- by 75-inch bed size is a little small. Now, the length is about 80 to 82 inches, mostly because everybody is a little bit taller than they were years ago.

As for Smith, his business seems to keep on growing. Although he doesn't come right out with direct estimates of his employment, Smith's Economy Furniture reportedly hires about 250 persons to make Western Provincial, Smithtowne Maple, Bilt-Rite, and Royal Danish brand name furniture lines, that are marketed in permanent showrooms in Chicago, Dallas, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Atlanta.

Smith is president of Economy. Guy C. Baird is sales manager. At Dormae, Bud Sweazea is general manager.

Facts on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, of January 26, 1963. The following ed-

itorial calls for a complete factual report on the Cuban mess created by the Kennedy administration.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan 26, 1963]

FACTS ON CUBA

The Armed Forces of the United States are commanded by generals and admirals who learned in World War II and in Korea the importance of air cover in an attempted invasion.

Yet we Americans are now told on the highest authority that no air support by U.S. Forces was ever contemplated in the Cuban invasion of 1961. And we are told by the President's brother that the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved the plan.

This is exactly the opposite of the impression the American people have been permitted to entertain these past 21 months. It is contrary to what Cuban rebel leaders say was their understanding at the time.

The story that had been generally accepted until now is that plans had been made to provide U.S. air cover, but that the President called them off.

Members of Congress are distressed by this long-delayed clarification by the Kennedy administration, and we surmise that the Congressmen have a lot of company among their constituents.

It is not enough that the President takes the blame for the failure of the landing. The American people should be told precisely what it is for which he is taking the blame.

Who made the planning errors Who approved them? Were the plans changed, and, if so, at what stage of the invasion were they changed?

The questions press for answers because this country now faces what appears to be another ominous turn of events in Cuba.

Senator KEATING, Republican, of New York, who was the unheeded herald of the Soviet buildup in Cuba last summer and fall, says new, intensive military activity is underway there. It involves many weapons, including fighter planes that can carry nuclear warheads, and torpedo boats that can do the same.

The New York Times Service tells of busy, secret activity of Soviet troops and encampments in Cuba and "highly sophisticated ground and air defenses" now being installed.

By all the signs, something is cooking in Cuba. Yet the President says in effect that all is well. He says only one Russian ship has landed in Havana since October. He says there is no evidence that offensive arms were in its cargo. He says our planes are keeping sharp surveillance. And so on, in reassuring phrases.

But if it takes almost 2 years to get the administration's version of some of the facts about one Cuban crisis, can the American people be sure they are getting all the unadorned facts about Cuba now?

We believe that is a fair question. We believe Members of Congress are fully justified in pressing for the full story of what went on in Cuba in 1961, in 1962 and what is going on in January 1963.

A Realistic View of the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and good friend, Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois, has taken what I consider to be a realistic, though blunt, view of the administration's farm program. I concur with him in that view when he calls the farm program "a masterpiece of Keynesian double talk." For New England the farm program simply means more regulation, higher taxes to pay for it, higher costs of feed for our dairy and poultry producers and higher prices for every consumer.

The Chicago Tribune pushes this analogy of double talk a bit further in an editorial complimenting Congressman MICHEL on his stand. (That editorial makes some interesting points which I know will be of concern to those taking an overall view of this year's proposals.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of February 13, 1963:

DEFENDING THE INDEFENSIBLE

Representative MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, a member of the House Appropriations Committee's agriculture subcommittee, describes President Kennedy's latest pitch for new farm legislation as "phony" and a "masterpiece of Keynesian double talk." In a speech to an Illinois State Chamber of Commerce meeting, Representative MICHEL, observed that although the administration claims credit for substantially boosting farm income, reducing surpluses, and cutting farm program costs to taxpayers, the President maintains that feed grains, dairy products, and cotton are in trouble and must be rescued by more subsidies.

Well, if this appears inconsistent and contradictory, consider what the President is up against. He has taken it upon himself to defend a farm program under which the government pays farmers for not growing crops, while at the same time raising subsides and paying for conservation practices that encourage them to grow crops.

It buys crops to keep prices high, then sells them to depress prices. It tries to promote exports to reduce the surpluses, then sets prices too high to sell them. It reclaims new land for agricultural production under one program and retires land under another.

The President, in other words, is attempting to defend a program that is costly unworkable, and indefensible.

Planned Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of February 7. This article, a reprint from the Wall Street Journal, poses some questions about the so-called "planned deficit" theory of Government financing.

The editorial follows:

WALL STREET JOURNAL WRITER DEBUNKS PLANNED DEFICITS

In arguing for its tax program the Kennedy administration seems to be trying to separate the idea of tax cuts from the thought of the deficits which would accompany them.

It says present taxes are burdensome and should be reduced, which is probably true, but it doesn't any longer claim, as it once did, that deficits themselves would stimulate business.

Nevertheless, the two ideas can't very well be separated, especially when the Government continues to insist that its spending should not be cut. Among some economists, the idea that governmental deficits are stimulants for business is still very much alive.

IT REMAINS UNPROVEN

Yet this claim remains unproven. Apparently it stems from the experiences of great wars, when business operates at capacity, accompanied by large deficits.

However, at such times the Government invades the commercial markets with overwhelmingly enormous demands for goods and services in competition with normal needs—all for the waste of war and regardless of costs.

To see how deficits work in peacetime it is more useful to analyze the results during substantial periods of years, both here and in other countries.

THE TWO PERIODS

Two such periods were the years 1932 to 1940 inclusive, and 1949 to 1962, inclusive. In addition, figures are easily available for some European countries for the 1950's.

There were Federal Government deficits in every one of the 9 years 1932–40. In relation to the then economic size of the Nation, they were quite large, ranging from just under $2 billion to more than $4 billion, figures which even today are regarded as substantial.

In relation to gross national production (GNP) the deficits ranged from 1.3 percent to 5.5 percent, and the average was just slightly less than 4 percent. In spite of these substantial deficits, unemployment in those years ranged from 14.3 percent of the labor force to 24.9 percent, and averaged about 19 percent.

FOUR SURPLUSES, 10 DEFICITS

In the 14 years 1949–62 there were 4 surpluses and 10 deficits. The net total of the deficits and surpluses, matched up against the total of the gross national production figures for all 14 years, shows an average deficit of 0.7 percent of GNP.

In spite of this much smaller relative deficit than in the 1930's the rate of unemployment was far less and remains far less. The range of unemployment was from 2.9 percent of the labor force in the best year to 6.8 percent in the poorest, and the average was 5 percent.

The comparison is a fair one because in the 1930's the deficits, except for a couple of the early ones, were purposeful. The late President Roosevelt publicly proclaimed that it is today's deficit which generates tomorrow's surplus. He meant that deficits would so stimulate business that pretty soon tax collections would rise enough to cover Government spending. It didn't happen that way.

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE

The recent experience of several European nations is also useful. One reason is that their economic growth in recent years has been more rapid than ours. The other is that some of the current advice to us, that we should run big deficits in order to copy their growth rates, comes from over there.

The following comparisons start with the year 1953 because since then the countries cited have benefited only very slightly from foreign aid, mainly in the earlier years of the period. The period covered ends with 1961 because complete figures aren't available for 1962.

enjoy preferred State and local tax treatment. And whereas companies are tightly regulated by State and Federal agencies, most co-ops can set their own rates. So the co-ops' competitive advantage is immense.

Now there's one fairly simple way to bring about competition on a more nearly equal basis. And that is to strip the REA co-ops of their protective mantle of subsidies and preferments and thus force them to really compete with private companies. In short, make the REA pay its way in the marketplace.

But as it is, the REA stands as an archtype of a Government agency that not only refuses to die when no longer needed but also uses every unfair means available to kill off its investor-financed competition.

The U.N. Should Not Bail Out Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the United States has urged and taken steps to evoke economic sanctions against the Castro regime in Cuba. It is also well known that the United States has been one of the most vigorous advocates of the United Nations and that the United States has been responsible for keeping the U.N. in a solvent financial condition.

It seems incredible that now the U.N. is going to grant money to the Castro government to build up their agriculture and in effect to improve their economic situation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the penetrating editorial on this subject which appeared recently in the Nashville Banner:

INCREDIBLE JACKASSERY

There is incredible stupidity in the idea that the United States should sanction a U.N. money grant to build up agriculture in Castro's Cuba; and booby hatch arithmetic in attendant assurances that this shot in the arm to bolster that enemy's staggering economy wouldn't cost anything. That the program to that end originates with Paul G. Hoffman, one of our U.N. people, is a fact hardly calculated to redeem it from the tag of further policy jackassery.

The United States foots 40 percent of the bill for the whole U.N. special fund operation, headed by Mr. Hoffman. But if it cost this Nation not a penny, it still would transgress basic considerations of declared policy and good sense.

As long ago as October 1960, the United States clamped down an embargo on shipments to Cuba. To tighten that in the light of developing realities, Washington made motions last October of action to penalize all shipowners transporting Soviet-bloc supplies to that land; and another provision was announced to bar from U.S. ports any ship that on a continuous voyage had delivered nonmilitary Communist cargoes to Cuba.

We have joined other member countries of the Organization of American States in the declaration and policy—enforced by them, too—forbidding business with Castro; on the premise of hemispheric solidarity against an avowed enemy. We have, in short, refused to be a party to the buildup either militarily or economically of a Sovietized Communist foothold; and the climax, though of brief duration, was the naval blockade which recognized the fact, finally, that, yes, Castro's Cuba is an enemy.

By what fantastic reasoning is it now supposed that the people of the United States should pay for, or condone, free gifts to Castro to bail him out?

In the same category of U.N. mischief is UNESCO's newest publication, a gushing tribute to Soviet Russia's virtue, as this propagandic bilge describes it, as a brotherhood of free and equal peoples. For that blurb, to be put in world circulation, Uncle Sam also is tapped for a third of the cost.

It is expensive enough for the United States to finance its own policy operations—as addressed to keeping this Nation and the whole free world secure. It is preposterous to suggest further adventures in financing operations, in any particular, of the enemy.

Both pieces of this highhanded monkey business are under heavy fire in Congress. An accounting is due, by more than Mr. Hoffman, but certainly including him. It is time that somebody exercised the prerogative of advice and consent where policy is concerned.

Milton Smith, of Austin: A Texas Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 32 years ago a young high school graduate came to Austin, Tex., from San Marcos, to engage in business. That was the same year I moved to Austin from El Paso.

Milton Smith's rise as a furniture manufacturer is one of the modern business success stories of Austin. He and his wife are civic and social leaders, as well as being engaged in business in Austin, my hometown. They support good government for the people.

Mr. Dave Shanks, editor of the business section of the daily Austin American, and author of the column, "Viewpoint," printed an account of Mr. Smith's business success under the title "Viewpoint—Milton Smith's Ventures: Now Mattresses Included" in the December 28, 1962 issue of the Austin American. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILTON SMITH'S VENTURES: NOW MATTRESSES INCLUDED

(By Dave Shanks)

Fresh from high school in San Antonio, Milton T. Smith came to Austin to start a furniture upholstery business.

That was 32 years ago, last October 18.

Smith currently is the chief mogul in a furniture manufacturing complex big enough to rank him in the top half dozen Austin employers at his Economy Furniture, Inc., which has its own growthy corporate subsidiary, Dormae Products, Inc.

Dormae this week is showing off a new plant, hailed as the "most modern mattress factory in the Southwest," a 65,000-square-foot manufacturing area and enough display and office space to add up to a 77,000-square-foot plant on McNeil Road, on Austin's North Side.

Significantly, Dormae signed on 2 years ago as a licensee of Serta Associates, Inc., one of the three "bigs" in the national bedding manufacturer's group and makers of the "Perfect Sleeper" mattresses for more than a quarter century.

Technically, Dormae is one of 42 member factories of the Serta group in the United States, Canada, the Philippine Islands and Brazil.

To help show off his new plant, Smith invited Serta's president, J. A. Ferguson of Chicago, and several hundred Dormae retailers, Austin civic officials, and business friends.

Dormae's beginning actually was the one-time Hurley mattress plant at 1101 East Sixth Street, which Smith acquired several years ago. For a time, Dormae was housed in the fire-razed oil mill in East Austin. Then came the new plant on McNeil Road.

The production line techniques will enable Serta Division to produce 800 pieces per day, utilizing 50 employees. The company supplies customers in over 200 counties of Texas, as well as in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Louisiana, and Mexico, using its own fleet of trucks.

About Dormae's future, Serta President Ferguson says the new division probably will be one of Serta's major producers within less than 5 years.

The national bedding manufacturing industry is a big-scale marketing venture, headed by Simmons (a corporate manufacturer) and Serta and Sealy, both of whom are utilizing licensees to manufacture products sold under the Serta and Sealy trade names. Serta has 42 of the plants, Sealy about 35.

Serta was organized in the 1930's by half a dozen mattress makers, whose firms traditionally are small scale. Fifteen years ago, Ferguson came over from Sears to Serta, and he's been running the show for the last several years.

Some industry problems: A new standard-sized bed. The oldtime 39- by 75-inch bed size is a little small. Now, the length is about 80 to 82 inches, mostly because everybody is a little bit taller than they were years ago.

As for Smith, his business seems to keep on growing. Although he doesn't come right out with direct estimates of his employment, Smith's Economy Furniture reportedly hires about 250 persons to make Western Provincial, Smithtowne Maple, Bilt-Rite, and Royal Danish brand name furniture lines, that are marketed in permanent showrooms in Chicago, Dallas, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Atlanta.

Smith is president of Economy. Guy C. Baird is sales manager. At Dormae, Bud Sweazea is general manager.

Facts on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, of January 26, 1963. The following ed-

itorial calls for a complete factual report on the Cuban mess created by the Kennedy administration.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan 26, 1963]

FACTS ON CUBA

The Armed Forces of the United States are commanded by generals and admirals who learned in World War II and in Korea the importance of air cover in an attempted invasion.

Yet we Americans are now told on the highest authority that no air support by U.S. Forces was ever contemplated in the Cuban invasion of 1961. And we are told by the President's brother that the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved the plan.

This is exactly the opposite of the impression the American people have been permitted to entertain these past 21 months. It is contrary to what Cuban rebel leaders say was their understanding at the time.

The story that had been generally accepted until now is that plans had been made to provide U.S. air cover, but that the President called them off.

Members of Congress are distressed by this long-delayed clarification by the Kennedy administration, and we surmise that the Congressmen have a lot of company among their constituents.

It is not enough that the President takes the blame for the failure of the landing. The American people should be told precisely what it is for which he is taking the blame.

Who made the planning errors Who approved them? Were the plans changed, and, if so, at what stage of the invasion were they changed?

The questions press for answers because this country now faces what appears to be another ominous turn of events in Cuba.

Senator KEATING, Republican, of New York, who was the unheeded herald of the Soviet buildup in Cuba last summer and fall, says new, intensive military activity is underway there. It involves many weapons, including fighter planes that can carry nuclear warheads, and torpedo boats that can do the same.

The New York Times Service tells of busy, secret activity of Soviet troops and encampments in Cuba and "highly sophisticated ground and air defenses" now being installed.

By all the signs, something is cooking in Cuba. Yet the President says in effect that all is well. He says only one Russian ship has landed in Havana since October. He says there is no evidence that offensive arms were in its cargo. He says our planes are keeping sharp surveillance. And so on, in reassuring phrases.

But if it takes almost 2 years to get the administration's version of some of the facts about one Cuban crisis, can the American people be sure they are getting all the unadorned facts about Cuba now?

We believe that is a fair question. We believe Members of Congress are fully justified in pressing for the full story of what went on in Cuba in 1961, in 1962 and what is going on in January 1963.

A Realistic View of the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and good friend, Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois, has taken what I consider to be a realistic, though blunt, view of the administration's farm program. I concur with him in that view when he calls the farm program "a masterpiece of Keynesian double talk." For New England the farm program simply means more regulation, higher taxes to pay for it, higher costs of feed for our dairy and poultry producers and higher prices for every consumer.

The Chicago Tribune pushes this analogy of double talk a bit further in an editorial complimenting Congressman MICHEL on his stand. (That editorial makes some interesting points which I know will be of concern to those taking an overall view of this year's proposals.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of February 13, 1963:

DEFENDING THE INDEFENSIBLE

Representative MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, a member of the House Appropriations Committee's agriculture subcommittee, describes President Kennedy's latest pitch for new farm legislation as "phony" and a "masterpiece of Keynesian double talk." In a speech to an Illinois State Chamber of Commerce meeting, Representative MICHEL, observed that although the administration claims credit for substantially boosting farm income, reducing surpluses, and cutting farm program costs to taxpayers, the President maintains that feed grains, dairy products, and cotton are in trouble and must be rescued by more subsidies.

Well, if this appears inconsistent and contradictory, consider what the President is up against. He has taken it upon himself to defend a farm program under which the government pays farmers for not growing crops, while at the same time raising subsides and paying for conservation practices that encourage them to grow crops.

It buys crops to keep prices high, then sells them to depress prices. It tries to promote exports to reduce the surpluses, then sets prices too high to sell them. It reclaims new land for agricultural production under one program and retires land under another.

The President, in other words, is attempting to defend a program that is costly unworkable, and indefensible.

Planned Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of February 7. This article, a reprint from the Wall Street Journal, poses some questions about the so-called "planned deficit" theory of Government financing.

The editorial follows:

WALL STREET JOURNAL WRITER DEBUNKS PLANNED DEFICITS

In arguing for its tax program the Kennedy administration seems to be trying to separate the idea of tax cuts from the thought of the deficits which would accompany them.

It says present taxes are burdensome and should be reduced, which is probably true, but it doesn't any longer claim, as it once did, that deficits themselves would stimulate business.

Nevertheless, the two ideas can't very well be separated, especially when the Government continues to insist that its spending should not be cut. Among some economists, the idea that governmental deficits are stimulants for business is still very much alive.

IT REMAINS UNPROVEN

Yet this claim remains unproven. Apparently it stems from the experiences of great wars, when business operates at capacity, accompanied by large deficits.

However, at such times the Government invades the commercial markets with overwhelmingly enormous demands for goods and services in competition with normal needs—all for the waste of war and regardless of costs.

To see how deficits work in peacetime it is more useful to analyze the results during substantial periods of years, both here and in other countries.

THE TWO PERIODS

Two such periods were the years 1932 to 1940 inclusive, and 1949 to 1962, inclusive. In addition, figures are easily available for some European countries for the 1950's.

There were Federal Government deficits in every one of the 9 years 1932–40. In relation to the then economic size of the Nation, they were quite large, ranging from just under $2 billion to more than $4 billion, figures which even today are regarded as substantial.

In relation to gross national production (GNP) the deficits ranged from 1.3 percent to 5.5 percent, and the average was just slightly less than 4 percent. In spite of these substantial deficits, unemployment in those years ranged from 14.3 percent of the labor force to 24.9 percent, and averaged about 19 percent.

FOUR SURPLUSES, 10 DEFICITS

In the 14 years 1949–62 there were 4 surpluses and 10 deficits. The net total of the deficits and surpluses, matched up against the total of the gross national production figures for all 14 years, shows an average deficit of 0.7 percent of GNP.

In spite of this much smaller relative deficit than in the 1930's the rate of unemployment was far less and remains far less. The range of unemployment was from 2.9 percent of the labor force in the best year to 6.8 percent in the poorest, and the average was 5 percent.

The comparison is a fair one because in the 1930's the deficits, except for a couple of the early ones, were purposeful. The late President Roosevelt publicly proclaimed that it is today's deficit which generates tomorrow's surplus. He meant that deficits would so stimulate business that pretty soon tax collections would rise enough to cover Government spending. It didn't happen that way.

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE

The recent experience of several European nations is also useful. One reason is that their economic growth in recent years has been more rapid than ours. The other is that some of the current advice to us, that we should run big deficits in order to copy their growth rates, comes from over there.

The following comparisons start with the year 1953 because since then the countries cited have benefited only very slightly from foreign aid, mainly in the earlier years of the period. The period covered ends with 1961 because complete figures aren't available for 1962.

FIGURED BY DEBT

Also governmental deficits are not measured in this case by matching revenues against expenditures, but by how much the outstanding debts rose. This avoids the problem of making sure the various nations use the same accounting methods.

Starting with the United States for a basis of comparison, the increase in debt from 1953 through 1961 amounted to only 0.4 percent of gross national production. In that time the index of industrial production—used as a measure of growth in activity because it isn't affected by price changes—rose from a 1958-base index of 97 to an index of 117, or slightly more than 20 percent.

In the case of France, the increase in debt for the period is 1.7 percent of gross national output; and the gain in industrial production is from 66 to 122, or 85 percent. The deficits have been relatively larger than ours, and the industrial growth much faster, which seems to support the backers of deficits.

IN ITALY, GERMANY

However, in Italy we find the debt rising only 1.3 percent of gross national product and industrial production a full 100 percent, from 70 to 140. The debt expansion is relatively smaller than France's, yet the production gain is bigger.

And when we come to Germany, the debt increase is 0.1 percent of gross national product, an amount clearly of no consequence, while the production gain is 92 percent, a little better than France's and almost as good as Italy's.

Looking at some of the figures for individual years, it is amusing to note how the line of argument can be twisted in two different ways to arrive at precisely opposing conclusions. The widest annual gain in the French production index for the whole period took place from 1959 to 1960. That was also the year in which the French Government's debt showed its smallest increase for the whole period.

HOW IT CAN BE ARGUED

On the basis of these figures it would be possible to argue, in the style of the late President Roosevelt, that it was the deficits of the preceding years which had generated the near-surplus of 1960. But it would also be possible to argue the opposite—that the sounder Government finances of 1960 were what stimulated business.

The real truth, within limits, is probably that business activity has more to do with controlling Government finances than the other way around. That is, it's difficult to balance the budget in depressions, and it ought to be easy when business is good.

Beyond that, the various sets of figures cited above suggest that economic theories regarding what can be accomplished by by planned deficits approach the nonsensical.

Missile Count in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune. It points out some pertinent questions should be asked about the flights over Cuba and their effectiveness in determining whether or not missiles are there.

The editorial follows:

MISSILE COUNT IN CUBA

Onsite inspection in Cuba to verify dismantling of the Soviet missile bases and withdrawal of the missiles was the big issue last October at the height of the Cuban war crisis. President Kennedy at that time insisted on such inspection by the United Nations, in order to be certain that the Russians, who had lied about everything else, actually pulled out their missiles.

Now, as Mr. Kennedy conceded at his recent press conference, onsite inspection is "a dead letter." "There has been none," said the President "and I don't expect to get any." What the United States must rely on as a substitute, he added, is aerial photography. The administration bases its belief that all of the offensive Russian weapons systems have been withdrawn on photographic evidence.

The only way to remove all doubt, John McCone of the Central Intelligence Agency told the Senate, is by inspection of Cuba's network of underground caverns and hidden storage areas. But Fidel Castro, as Mr. Kennedy said, is not about to grant the United States such permission.

Last October 27, in an exchange of letters with Premier Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy gave the impression that the Russian had agreed to U.N. inspection of his missile withdrawal. "As I read your letter," Mr. Kennedy wrote Khrushchev, "the Soviets had agreed to U.N. supervision of the missile pullout."

The President in his communication chose, however, to ignore other aspects of the Khrushchev letter. Khrushchev hedged his U.N. on-site inspection pledge by calling for Castro's approval. He also proposed withdrawal of American missiles from Turkey, a condition that the President ignored, although he has since ordered their removal.

On-site inspection has gradually dribbled into the diplomatic background and finally dropped out of sight, forgotten by all except critics of Mr. Kennedy's actions.

As excellent as is aerial photography, it failed to uncover the arrival in Cuba of Khrushchev's extensive missile system. The missiles were landed secretly and hidden, then made a sudden appearance on the October 14 photographs of the Soviet concrete launching pads.

Forty-two medium-and intermediate-range ballistic missiles and 42 IL–28 nuclear bombers were counted by the photographers leaving Cuba aboard Soviet ships. But only 30 of the missiles had been counted on our above-ground aerial photographs before the Russian pullout. Obviously the "hard" intelligence cameras of our photoreconnaissance planes can't peer inside Castro's caves and underground storage depots. The time for getting onsite inspection in Cuba was when Mr. Kennedy had his guns pointed down Khrushchev's throat.

Farmers Manage Half of Private Business in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted some very interesting statistics relative to the American farmer and would like to share them with my colleagues. These statistics appeared in the February 15, 1963, edition of The Washington World.

The article follows:

FARMERS MANAGE HALF OF PRIVATE BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES

Farmers manage half of all the private business in the United States according to a recent estimate by a noted food economist.

Dr. Karl Brandt, of Stanford University, says that farmers' assets nearly equal the value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

Gross income for farmers in 1961 was $49 billion—nearly as much as the whole U.S. defense budget.

Petroleum Today magazine adds that 4 of every 10 jobs in American private enterprise are, in some way, related to agriculture.

Every farmer keeps 2.5 men busy in town, 1 to supply him and 1½ to process, distribute, and sell his products.

Farmers use four times as much mechanical horsepower as all U.S. factories put together.

Farmers use more petroleum products than any other industry and utilize more electricity than Chicago, Kansas City, Detroit, Houston, and half a dozen other major cities combined.

Address of Hon. Everette MacIntyre, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Everette MacIntyre, former General Counsel of the House Small Business Committee, and now a distinguished Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, recently addressed a meeting of the New York Bar Association on "Fair Advertising Landmarks."

Commissioner MacIntyre sets out the meaning of important cases before the Federal Trade Commission on the 25th anniversary of the Wheeler-Lea Act concerned with unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce.

Mr. Speaker, Under unanimous consent, I include Commissioner MacIntyre's remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT ON FAIR ADVERTISING LANDMARKS

(By Everette MacIntyre)

INTRODUCTION

It is fitting that your meeting today celebrates the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and in that connection commemorates the silver anniversary of the Wheeler-Lea amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act. Indeed, it is a pleasure to participate with you here today in the celebration of the silver anniversary of the Wheeler-Lea Act, the act of March 21, 1938, which so greatly strengthened the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to protect businessmen and the public from false advertising and other deceptive and unfair acts and practices. Everyone recognizes the Wheeler-Lea Act as one of the great landmarks for fair advertising.

FAIR ADVERTISING LANDMARKS

Perhaps the greatest fair advertising landmark of all is the Federal Trade Commission Act as it was originally approved in 1914 and interpreted in some of the early cases, such as Winsted[1] and Algoma.[2] Only when some of the guideposts of that basic statute became obscured by the events of time, as by the decision in the first Raladam case,[3] did it become necessary to spell out, in the Wheeler-Lea Act, what was probably intended by the Congress in the first instance; namely, that consumers as well as businessmen are entitled to be protected from unfair and deceptive advertising and other unfair acts and practices.

Prior to the Wheeler-Lea Act, the Commission's capacity to protect consumers from deceptive practices was only an incident to the businessman's protection against unfair methods of competition. Unless there were competitors and they had suffered actual or potential injury, the Commission could not prohibit a misrepresentation even though it was clearly deceptive to the public.[4]

This does not mean that the Commission was unaware of the consumer or his problem before 1938. The first two cease-and-desist orders ever entered by the Commission prohibited misrepresentttions with regard to composition of sewing thread and textile fabrics for home use. The first cease-and-desist order to be reviewed by the courts involved misrepresentation of food products, sugar, coffee and tea, by one of the Nation's largest retailers. The broad responsibility of the Commission to protect the public was described by the court of review in that case as follows:

"The Commissioners, representing the Government as parens patriae, are to exercise their common sense, as informed by their knowledge of the general idea of unfair trade at common law, and stop all those trade practices that have a capacity or a tendency to injure competitors directly or through deception of purchasers, quite irrespective of whether the specific practices in question have yet been denounced in common-law cases.

The court added that the advertiser's ethical standards were at least as high as those generally prevailing in the commercial world at that time, and that the Commission's order was to be taken more as a general illustration of the better methods to be required in the future rather than a criticism for past conduct.[5]

As early as 1929, it had become apparent to the Commission that misrepresentation embodied in false and misleading advertising was of such volume as to require the giving of special attention to the problem. In that year the Commission established a "special board of investigation" to conduct a continuing survey of newspaper and magazine advertising for the purpose of detecting any claims appearing to be questionable. In 1934 the survey was extended to radio advertising and in 1948 to television when it became a significant advertising medium. The Commission has continued that survey or monitoring of advertising up to the present day as an important part of its activity to prevent false and deceptive advertising.

It thus became established in the very beginning of the Commission's history that positive misrepresentations would be prohibited, if they tended to deceive consumers and if there were competitors likely to lose business as a result of misrepresentations.

With the enactment of the Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1938, consumer protection gained new stature. He was given protection in his own right, not dependent on whether the deceptive practice also had an effect of injuring competitors.

The Wheeler-Lea amendments to section 5 gave the Commission jurisdiction to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, in addition to the unfair methods of competition in commerce which previously were unlawful. Thus this change established another great landmark for fair advertising. It put the consumer on a par with the businessman from the standpoint of entitlement to protection from deceptive practices. At that point, caveat emptor or purchaser beware ceased to be the economic and commercial policy of the United States. From then on, consumers and businessmen could deal with each other on a basis of equality, in the knowledge that use of deceptive practice was against public policy. No longer need the consumer suspect that the businessman was likely, or any more likely than anyone else, to engage in deception. By the same token, the businessman was elevated to a new plane of public responsibility and respect. The new law proclaimed to the world an assurance that the American businessman, like every other American, is assumed to act in a manner which will be honest, nondeceptive, and in the best long-run interests not only of himself but his fellow man.

An equally important constribution of the Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Commission's arsenal was the provision that cease-and-desist orders entered under the Federal Trade Commission Act would become final 60 days after their issuance, whereupon civil penalties of up to $5,000 for each violation could be collected in suit brought on behalf of the United States. Prior to that, the repeat offender was allowed three bites at the apple before he could be penalized for his wrongdoing. His initial violation would lead to issuance of a cease-and-desist order by the Commission. His next violation would result in a decree from a court of appeals that he comply with the Commission's order. His third violation might result in his being held in contempt of the court's decree.

Under the new procedure, he would be subject to penalties for the first violation of the order. Teeth had been put in the Commission's orders. No longer would they be treated merely as a code of ethics or an illustration of better methods required for the future. They were now a command of the Government, to be respected upon first issuance.

Civil penalties were collected under that section during fiscal year 1962 in the record amount of $100,400.

Probably the most important consumer protection feature of the Wheeler-Lea amendments was the addition to the Federal Trade Commission Act of new sections, numbered from 12 through 16, giving the Commission special authority to prevent false advertising of food, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics. Not only could such advertising be attacked through a conventional cease and desist proceeding, but pending the outcome of such proceeding, issuance of injunction by a U.S. district court could be sought, to stop use of the challenged advertisement until the cease and desist proceeding had been brought to conclusion. Additionally, if the advertisement was published with fraudulent intent or if the advertised commodity would be dangerous to health, then upon certification of the facts to the Attorney General a criminal action could be brought to impose punishment by fine up to $5,000 or imprisonment up to 6 months, or both. The jurisdiction of the Commission over advertising of food, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics was broadened so it would not depend upon sales of a falsely advertised product in commerce, but would extend also to the dissemination of false advertising by U.S. mails, or in commerce by any means, or by any means likely to induce a sale in commerce.

An interesting development under the Wheeler-Lea amendments has been the evolution of affirmative disclosure requirements in the advertising or labeling of products.

In one of the first and most definitive of those cases, the Commission's order as affirmed by a court of appeals in 1942 required affirmative labeling of true composition on food serving trays which were made of paper that had been treated to simulate the appearance of wood. The court observed that: "The process used * * * to simulate woods does great credit to the ingenuity of * * * (the manufacturer), and is so skillfully carried out that the physical exhibits shown us in court were distinguishable from the real wooden trays only after the most careful scrutiny. The trays themselves were the best evidence of the possibility of confusion. Without some warning, the trays of themselves are almost certain to deceive the buying public."[6]

The complaint as issued by the Commission in that case was couched in the language of the Wheeler-Lea amendment to section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, charging use of "unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce" with no mention being made of "unfair methods of competition in commerce."

Another landmark complaint issued under section 5 charged that because of consumer preference for domestic products, failure to disclose the foreign origin of imitation pearls constituted "unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce", and the order required that such products not be offered for sale or sold without clearly disclosing the foreign country of origin. In affirming the order, the reviewing court stated:

"We commence our study of the instant case with the knowledge that the Commission may require affirmative disclosures where necessary to prevent deception, and that failure to disclose by mark or label material facts concerning merchandise, which, if known to prospective purchasers, would influence their decisions of whether or not to purchase, is an unfair trade practice violative of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act."[7]

In another leading case, the court of review emphasized that requiring labels to contain affirmative disclosures is intended to protect the ultimate consumer and not merely the middlemen. The product involved in that instance was rayon dresses which simulated the appearance of silk. The court said that the likelihood of consumers' buying the dresses in the belief they were silk justified the Commission in requiring the manufacturer to label them as rayon, "thus prevening distributors from exercising a deception of which the petitioners themselves were not guily."[8] That case, decided in 1952, was of particular significance because it put the force of court decision behind trade practice rules which the Commission had issued in 1937 requiring affirmative disclosure of true composition respecting rayon goods. It also was a significant factor leading to enactment of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act of 1958.

Other Commission orders requiring affirmative disclosures have been upheld in regard to abridgment of books, reprinting of

[1] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Winsted Hosiery Co.*, Sup. Ct. (1922), 258 U.S. 483.

[2] *FTC* v. *Algoma Lumber Co., et al.*, Sup. Ct. (1934), 291 U.S. 67.

[3] *FTC* v. *Raladam Co.*, Sup. Ct. (1931), 283 U.S. 643.

[4] *FTC* v. *Raladam Co.*, supra.

[5] *Sears, Roebuck & Co.* v. *FTC*, CA-7(1919), 258 Fed. 307.

[6] *Haskelite Manufacturing Corp.* v. *FTC*, CA-7 (1942), 127 F. 2d 765.

[7] *L. Heller & Son, Inc., et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-7 (1951), 191 F. 2d 954.

[8] *Mary Muffet, Inc., et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-2 (1952), 194 F. 2d 504.

books or stories under a new title.[9] and the sale of previously used products.[10]

The Supreme Court recently denied certiorari respecting a Commission order requiring that aluminum watch cases which had been treated to simulate the appearance of gold, be marked to disclose that they were not precious metal.[11] This was another case of consequence, as it enforced trade practice rules adopted by the Commission in 1948 requiring affirmative disclosure respecting composition of watch cases deceptive in appearance.

By an action similar in principle the Commission modified an order so as to require that a debt collector not only cease misrepresenting the nature of his business, but also cease distributing written materials which did not disclose the nature of his business.

The order as thus modified was affirmed on court review, the main basis being that failure of the written materials to contain the disclosure required by the order would "cause recipients to take action they would not otherwise have taken."[12]

I think it can be said, then, that the Wheeler-Lea amendment to section 5, by declaring deceptive acts and practices in commerce to be unlawful, extended the protection of consumers from the area of simple misrepresentation to the area of deception practiced through omission or nondisclosure. When the omission or nondisclosure involves a fact material to the consumer's decision of whether or not to engage in commercial dealings, the Commission may act to protect him. In so doing, the Commission has no desire to dictate what goods or services the consumer shall or shall not purchase. Rather, the purpose is to aid him by making sure that he gets what he thinks he is getting.

The disclosure required in the advertising of food, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics under sections 12 through 15 of the act have had a similar evolution.

Section 15, as you know, defines a false advertisement as including one which fails to reveal facts material in the light of representations made in the advertisement or in the light of possible consequences from use of the advertised product. This provision did not fare well on its first court test, in 1950. The Commission had ordered a respondent, Alberty, to cease advertising a mineral preparation as having a beneficial effect upon the blood, except in cases of simple iron-deficiency anemia. The order further required that the product not be offered for tiredness unless limited to tiredness due to simple iron-deficiency anemia, and unless affirmative disclosure be made that tiredness is caused less frequently by simple iron-deficiency anemia than by other causes for which this product would not be an effective treatment or relief. The respondent refused to disclose in advertising of the product for tiredness that the product would usually not be beneficial, and the courts upheld that contention. It seemed abhorrent to the court that the Commission might have power to require an advertiser to disclose, when a fact, that in most cases his product would be useless. The court felt that the Commission had gone too far toward requiring advertisements to be informative and had gone beyond its function of preventing falsity.[13]

Consumer protection activities of the Commission gained significant support from court affirmance of the order in the Koch case of 1953. Disclosures were not involved, but the flagrancy of claims showed a compelling need for action to protect the public. In that case, the Commission's order not only proscribed references to the advertised products' being efficacious in the treatment of cancer, coronary thrombosis, diabetes, meningitis, infantile paralysis, pneumonia, undulant fever, malaria, gonorrhea, and syphilis, but also prohibited claims that the products would be of any benefit in the treatment of any disease of the human body or in animals.[14]

The Alberty decision was specifically overcome in the Wybrant and other hair grower cases, where the courts of appeal beginning in 1959 upheld Commission orders requiring that products not be advertised as efficacious in growing hair or preventing baldness unless it be revealed that the products are of no value in most cases of baldness or excessive hair fall. The courts were furnished with more adequate records in support of the orders against the hair growers because, unlike the Alberty case, the Commission in each of the hair grower cases included a specific finding that failure to make the affirmative disclosure required by the order was in itself deceptive. The orders were affirmed by opinions in which the courts declare that the Commission's authority to require affirmative disclosures were necessary to prevent deception is clearly established.[15]

The requirement that affirmative disclosures be made when a product advertised for a designated disease or condition is of limited effectiveness has been extended to vitamin and vitamin-mineral preparations. Consent orders have been accepted requiring advertisements offering such products for tiredness and nervousness to disclose that in the great majority of persons these symptoms would be due to conditions other than vitamin or mineral deficiency, and that in such cases the product would be of no benefit.[16] The Commission issued a similar order in a litigated case involving such a product designated "Rybutol," noting that medical testimony showed the great majority of persons experiencing tiredness and loss of happiness would have these symptoms as a result of a disease or condition other than vitamin deficiency, and that possibly serious consequences might result from continued self-treatment of such diseases and conditions.[17]

In two pending cases the question has been raised of whether advertising of vitamin-mineral preparations for iron deficiency anemia is deceptive if it fails to disclose that in women beyond the child-bearing age and in men of all ages, iron deficiency anemia is almost invariably due to bleeding from some serious disease or disorder and in the absence of adequate treatment of the underlying cause of the bleeding the use of the preparation may mask the signs and symptoms and thereby permit the progression of such disease or disorder.[18] As these cases are in process of being adjudicated by the Commission, with no conclusion as to final disposition having yet been reached, I will not comment further about them.

I believe the greatest development of the law in deceptive practices before the Commission in the immediate future will entail questions of affirmative disclosure. I think you will see more and more of our cases involving the question of what omissions in advertising and labeling are material enough and deceptive enough to require an affirmative disclosure of facts. Full implementation of this authority of the Commission to prevent deception by requiring affirmative disclosures may obviate the need for a multiplicity of labeling or packaging laws or laws seeking to provide further protection to the public in the sale of particular commodities. The argument might be made that if the practice is deceptive, let the Commission correct it under present law. If no deception is involved, then it may be the practice is not of sufficient importance from the public interest standpoint to warrant its being given further attention.

The jurisdiction conferred upon the Commission by the Wheeler-Lea amendments to prevent false advertising of food, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics, regardless of whether there were sales in interstate commerce, was confirmed by court decisions in 1958. In the first case, a product designated O-Jib-Wa Bitters was advertised extensively in 35 or 40 newspapers throughout the State of Michigan as a curative treatment for arthritis, rheumatism, neuritis, sciatica, and various other ailments. The advertiser was careful not to fill any order from persons located outside Michigan. The Michigan newspapers in which he advertised did have some interstate circulation, and were circulated via the U.S. mails. The court held that jurisdiction of the Commission to prohibit use of the advertising was warranted not only on the basis of interstate circulation of the advertisements, but also their circulation via the U.S. mails.[19] In the second case, Sidney J. Mueller, advertiser of products offered to grow hair, had been operating in several States but, after order to cease and desist was issued, confined his operations within one State. However, he continued to advertise in newspapers which had some interstate circulation and were distributed via the U.S. mails. The court found that the order had been violated because the advertisements had been sent via the U.S. mails and across State lines.[20] He was fined $8,000 for violating the order.[21]

The Commission's jurisdiction to prevent false advertising or other deceptive practices under the Wheeler-Lea Amendments is still limited by the proviso in the original act that proceedings will not be undertaken except when in the public interest. The courts have interpreted that as meaning substantial public interest,[22] which permits the Commission to avoid becoming involved in matters that are essentially private controversies not affecting substantial numbers of the public. The Commission is sometimes criticized for concerning itself with trivial matters, especially in the exercise

---

[9] *Hillman Periodicals, Inc.* v. *FTC*, CA-2 (1949), 174 F. 2d 122; *Bantam Books, Inc.* v. *FTC*, CA-2 (1960), 275 F. 2d 680, cert. den. 364 U.S. 819.

[10] *Royal Oil Corp. et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-4 (1959), 262 F. 2d 741.

[11] *Theodore Kagen Corp. et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-DC (1960), 283 F. 2d 371, cert. den. 365 U.S. 843.

[12] *Mohr et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-9 (1959), 272 F. 2d 401, certiorari denied 362 U.S. 920.

[13] *Alberty et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-DC (1950), 182 F. 2d 36, cert. denied Oct. 9, 1950.

[14] *Koch et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-6 (1953), 206 F. 2d 311.

[15] *Wybrant System Products Corp. et al.* v. *FTC*, CA-2 (1959), 266 F. 2d 571, cert. den. 361 U.S. 883; *Erickson Hair and Scalp Specialist* v. *FTC*, CA-7 (1959), 272 F. 2d 318, cert. den. 362 U.S. 940; and *Ward Laboratories, Inc., et al.* v. FTC, CA-2 (1960), 276 F. 2d 952, cert. den. 364 U.S. 827.

[16] Docket 8151 (July 18, 1961), docket 8397 (Sept. 25, 1961), docket 8398 (Sept. 22, 1961), and Docket C-123 (Apr. 19, 1962).

[17] Docket 8150, Lanolin Plus, Inc., o.c.d. Sept. 12, 1962.

[18] Docket 8523, Hadacol, Inc., et al.; and docket 8547, the J. B. Williams Co., Inc., et al.

[19] *Shafe* v. *F. T. C.*, C.A. 6 (1958), 256 F. 2d 661.

[20] *Sidney J. Mueller* v. *U.S.*, C.A. 5 (1958), 262 F. 2d 443.

[21] *U.S.* v. *Sidney J. Mueller*, U.S. District Court, Southern District, Texas, Houston division, Apr. 10, 1958.

[22] *F.T.C.* v. *Klesner* (Shade Shop case), Supreme Court (1929), 280 U.S. 19.

of its deceptive practices jurisdiction. But I believe you will find if you examine the cases that each of them is important either because of flagrancy of practice or numbers of the public affected. I suppose no one would argue that we should ignore the advertising of a mineral preparation offered as a treatment for arthritis and blindness,[23] even though sales volume may not have been very large. At the other end of the scale, we sometimes have a case in which the claims are not very deceptive, but the volume of advertising and sale of the product is so extensive that even a slight misrepresentation will have a tremendous effect upon the public and upon competition. The top 100 largest advertisers in the United States have been listed.[24] Orders prohibiting use of misrepresentation or deceptive practice have been issued by the Commission against 38, or more than one-third of those 100 companies. A total of 53 such orders have been issued, as 11 of the companies have had 2 or more orders issued against them. Forty-seven of those orders have been issued since the date of the Wheeler-Lea Act, including 10 which were issued during the past 2 years. Eight of the companies are now charged with deceptive practices in nine proceedings pending before the Commission, one company being the subject of two pending actions. Thus the Commission has not overlooked the more important advertisers; neither has it overlooked the smaller advertiser when he was in effect stealing substantial amounts of money from the public.

Under the present organizational setup of the Commission, as adopted July 1, 1961, the investigation and litigation of initial violations occurring under the Wheeler-Lea amendments, especially those involving food, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics, is vested in the Division of Food and Drug Advertising, Bureau of Deceptive Practices. This Division also monitors radio, television, and printed advertising to watch for claims which may be false and misleading. Medical and scientific advice and assistance in such cases is provided by the Division of Scientific Opinions, in the same Bureau. Any field investigation needed is performed by the Bureau of Field Operations. Maintaining and enforcing compliance with cease and desist orders entered in false advertising and other deceptive practice cases, is a function of the Division of Compliance in the Bureau of Deceptive Practices. Courtwork arising from the deceptive practice and other Commission cases is performed by the Division of Appeals, Office of General Counsel. The Bureau of Industry Guidance endeavors to prevent deceptive and other unlawful practices on an industrywide basis, in the field of food and drug advertising as well as other areas.

We at the Commission are grateful for the efforts at self-regulation which have been instituted by business groups, as the prevention of false advertising and other deceptive practices will always, in large measure, be dependent upon such activity.

We are also appreciative of opportunities made available by the bar associations to disseminate widely the views of administrators of the laws through meetings like this, as a possible aid to the better implementation of those laws.

Let me say again that it has been a pleasure to meet with you, and I thank you for your attention.

[23] Consent order accepted Oct. 31, 1961, Docket C-11.

[24] See Advertising Age, Aug. 27, 1962, p. 42.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, a recent refugee from present-day Lithuania brought word that the hope for freedom lives on and that the majority of his fellow countrymen continue to strive for the liberation of their nation. Even after 22 years of brutal subjugation, the spirit of freedom remains in the hearts of a conquered people. That is why we in the United States participate in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day so that the spark will not be extinguished.

After living under Russian tyranny for many centuries, the Lithuanians took the opportunity to proclaim themselves independent when the Bolsheviks, during World War I, seized control of the Russian Government and the Russian Army was forced to withdraw from Lithuanian territory. The German occupying force was sympathetic to the overtures of the people to hold a national congress; and it was this congress which had the courage to proclaim, on February 16, 1918, independence for their country.

Shortly after this declaration was announced, a now-defeated Germany withdrew from the eastern frontiers of Lithuania but still held sway over the western provinces. No sooner had one occupying force withdrawn when another took possession—the Bolsheviks from Russia seized the eastern provinces and withdrew only after a joint Polish-Lithuanian army appeared to free all Lithuanian lands. By 1920 Lithuania was recognized as a sovereign state and was admitted into the League of Nations the following year.

Free Lithuania existed until the outbreak of World War II when German and Russian forces fought once more for possession of its territory. Although resistance was organized against the invading armies, it was soon overwhelmed. Lithuania ceased to be a state when it was forcefully incorporated into the Soviet Union, although the United States has steadfastly refused to recognize this Communist land grab.

Those patriots who fought and died for their country have been eulogized by those who escaped to freedom. Neither have those Lithuanians who remained in their homeland or were exiled to Siberian wastelands been forgotten. The hope for their independence lives on in the hearts of all freedom-loving people of the world. On this day, February 16, we salute these Lithuanians throughout the world and extend to them the wish that their homeland may soon be free.

U.S. Department of Labor: The Workers' Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of Labor is observing its 50th anniversary this year. I think this is a fact worthy of sustained note. The Department has carried on fruitful work in helping to improve the social and economic condition of wage earners in our industrial society. Much more work needs to be done in the forefront of which I am certain the Labor Department, based on its first 50 years, will be stationed.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert an anniversary article by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz which appears in the February 1963, issue of the AFL-CIO Federationist:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR: THE WORKER'S AGENCY

(By W. Willard Wirtz)

"The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."—Act of Congress signed by President Taft on March 4, 1913.

The 50 years of history since March 4, 1913, have been the most turbulent in man's history, filled with revolution, war, and economic depression, but also with great triumph and achievement. The Department of Labor has had an increasingly important role in our national response to these tides of change. Perhaps the central fact of our anniversary celebration is that despite the impact of two world wars and profound scientific changes, the basic commitment of our society—and the Department's statutory share of that commitment—remains toward the individual.

Because the Department's concern is people, and its mandate is spelled in terms of human welfare, its history has a deep significance for our time. Originally an orphan agency of Government grown to cabinet rank only after adventures as a subordinate bureau wandering through the organizational charts of other agencies, the Department has remained relatively small—yet today it has assumed a central responsibility for a major decision we face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?

This is not unlike the questions that through the years have helped shape and form the department. In its formative period, the overriding issues were immigration, child labor, and producing some accurate system by which to measure the changes in jobs and wages and hours and conditions of work. It was from the first the condition of the individual working man and his family that gave the Department its meaning. It was an agency that sought to realize the dream of America held by the immigrants with whom it dealt; its purpose has varied little in the years since.

Yet its constitution has changed several times, almost in exact proportion to the

changes in American life. During World War I, the concerns were primarily with manning the war effort and insuring needed production. In the peace that followed, the Secretaries of Labor considered the evolving technology of mass production and mass manpower needs and sought ways and means by which the security of individual workers could be vouchsafed. With the depression came a proliferation of departmental activities—the national employment service, wages and hours law enforcement, apprenticeship and training, the development of appropriate labor standards. With these changes, some of the older agencies were removed—Immigration and Naturalization, the Children's Bureau, the Mediation and Conciliation Service; none are today a part of the Department. New ones took their place—Employment Security, Labor Standards, Apprenticeship and Training, Wage and Hour, and the like.

The history of the Department is a record of response to change. For this anniversary year, a publication based upon reports of the Secretaries of Labor to the Congress since 1913 will be issued. Reading these texts, one is struck by the similarity of the problems and issues faced by each generation in turn. And one becomes more than ever convinced that tomorrow belongs to those who face the fact of change, who go forward to meet it, who see it as an essential quality of growth.

The problems that were very large in the past may seem small to us now and those we deal with today may lose much of their dimension in the eventful years ahead. The contribution of this agency of Government will continue to grow, however, so long as its tradition of confronting change continues.

That change today is measured in megatons of technological, demographic, political, social, and economic explosion.

As framers of the manpower policies of this Nation, we are challenged to keep pace with the genius of science. Technology is an inexorable force. Every new device is going to be used. What it is not made to alter for the better, it will alter for the worse and it will not wait. It offers the promise of man's fulfillment. We must bring to the architecture of manpower policy the degrees of invention, the ingenuity, the boldness which characterize today's phenomenal rate of scienctific discovery.

Our task is harder than that of the scientist. When he discovers new truth, when the designer completes a new device, his job is done. There is the further responsibility upon us that we must develop those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole. Our task includes the responsibility to persuade, to obtain consent, to overcome the force of inertia which is represented in men's desire as individuals for even the incomplete security they think the status quo gives them.

Nor is it enough to be willing to adjust to change, for that would inevitably mean falling further and further behind until the forces of scientific and technological change which promise man's deliverance become rather the forces of his destruction.

Today, a man's job is also the uncertain product of unpredictable but almost certain change.

Within the next 30 days, 500,000 people will move to new employers, 600,000 to a different line of work, 400,000 to different areas of the country.

This change will be devastating unless we harness it to our own use. If we would make a firm course for change, we must first erect an economy capable of enlarging itself, an economy that offers to each man a meaningful use of his time and talent.

I subscribe to the old-fashioned belief that the best stimulant in the world to an economy is people coming in the doors of stores with money in their pockets. I think that in terms of our particular interest in achieving a full-employment economy, the largest importance attaches to the stimulation of consumer purchasing power.

We can and must do better in approaching the problems of technology. Attention must be given in the private processes of collective bargaining to the problems presented by automation. We are going to have to review our seniority, our job right systems, our employment security programs, our retirement plans to find ways of assuring that a man's rights are not destroyed when he has to move aside for a machine.

Only part of this job can be done privately. The rest of the answer to it is illustrated by the enactment by Congress last summer of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Under this legislation we will undertake to train some 400,000 people in the next 3 years.

We are going to need in this decade alone 5 million more skilled workers than we have presently available. These are job opportunities. We must inventory them. Retraining is being devised on a basis of working back from those and I am sure we can gear the retraining program to previously identifiable job opportunities.

The real answer to the change that is upon us is that nothing will make sense unless we expand the economy to the point where there are another 4 million jobs. There is only one answer to unemployment and that is more jobs.

We have vast unmet needs in this country. Our real wealth in meeting them is the use of the full potential of every single individual who wants to work. When we accomplish this, then we will meet these problems. Retraining is important in doing that and so are many other factors, but we must move the economy on to a faster employment pace.

The vantage of a 50th anniversary is the best one from which to consider this central challenge of continuing change. We do not fact a world war, as we have done twice in the past. We do not face the collapse of an entire economic system, as we once did. We face, rather, the product of success—an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions, deprived itself of that many consumers and come to an impasse of demand. As in the earlier periods, the department will be able to make a contribution to this problem because its central concern remains the person.

He Was Everybody, Grown a Little Taller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week was Lincoln Week, but this centennial year could really be called Lincoln Year. This marks the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Gettysburg Address. In this centennial year were fought many of the trying battles of the Civil War—Chancellorsville, Vicksburg, Gettysburg, Chickamauga, and Chattanooga. These were trying times for Lincoln, and nothing short of Periclean leadership was demanded of the railsplitter.

What kind of man was this statesman from the prairie? My good friend Harvey Phelps, editor of the Carlinville Democrat, tells us that "'he was everybody, grown a little taller" in an editorial that I am proud to have you read:

HE WAS EVERYBODY, GROWN A LITTLE TALLER

Let's skip all the things you've read about him, all the things you've heard too often or too young.

Forget the face on the penny, the statue in Washington, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Gettysburg speech, and look at the big thing.

Why do we love this man, dead long before our time—Abraham Lincoln.

He came out of nowhere special—a log cabin like many another. His folks were nobody special—pleasant, hard-working people. Abe was a smart boy, but not too smart. He could do a good day's work on the farm, though he'd just as soon stand around and talk. He told funny stories. He was strong and kind. He'd never try to hurt you, or cheat you, or fool you.

Young Abe worked at odd jobs and read law books at night. Eventually he found his way into local politics. And it was then that people, listening to his speeches, found there was something special about him.

Abe talked about running a country as if it were something you could do. It was just a matter of people getting along. He had nothing against anybody, rich or poor.

Abe had a way of growing without changing. So it seemed perfectly natural to find him in the White House one day. He was the same Abe Lincoln he'd always been, and yet the most dignified and strongest and the steadiest man anybody had ever known.

He was everybody, grown a little taller—the warm and living product of our American faith that greatness comes out of everywhere when it is free to come.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked a very special anniversary in Lithuanian history. On that day 45 years ago an independent Lithuania again joined the family of nations. One-hundred and twenty years before, in 1795, this once mighty state was greedily partitioned by its powerful neighbors, Prussia, Austria, and Russia. But these years of foreign domination did not stamp out the Lithuanian love for liberty. Revolts during this period against the Russian overlords attested to the failure of the czarist Russification program which sought to stamp out the distinct Lithuanian language, culture and customs.

World War I offered the Lithuanians the opportunity for the realization of their long held dream of independence. In the midst of destruction and impoverishment the freedom loving Lithuanians proclaimed a democratic Republic which they soon defended successfully against foreign encroachment. But their long-awaited and hard-won freedom did not last long. Lithuania's powerful neigh-

bors, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, had no intention of allowing Lithuania to remain independent. In 1939 they again partitioned the land between them and Lithuania once more found itself under Russian domination. Today, the Soviets are again attempting to force the brave Lithuanians into a Russian mold.

We join with the many fine Americans of Lithuanian descent in celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day and in honoring the many Lithuanian patriots who have given their lives that the spirit of a free Lithuania might live and find expression in an independent state. Some day a Republic of Lithuania will surely emerge in which the Lithuanians can again exercise the right of every nation to determine its own destiny.

This Takes the Cake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, although the President only last Wednesday formally proposed creation of a so-called Domestic Peace Corps, I have contended that this program has been off and running for several months, and without specific authorization from Congress.

I have not been alone in this contention. Commenting on a Reporter magazine story, the Dallas Morning News, in an excellent editorial in its February 11 issue, had this to say:

One of the most incredible stories of the year from Washington is told in the current issue of the fortnightly Reporter magazine. It concerns the President's proposed Domestic Peace Corps. If the facts are correct in this story, the administration's handling of this particular project is a flagrant example of the misuse of executive authority and Government funds.

Last month, in his budget message to Congress, the President asked for the authority to create the Domestic Peace Corps. To date, legislation which would permit such a corps to be set up and appropriate funds for its operation has not even been introduced in Congress.

In spite of this, Reporter magazine reveals that the proposed Domestic Peace Corps is already set up, running at full steam and spending a considerable amount of Government funds.

Several months ago, according to the Reporter, the President formed a Cabinet-level study group to draw up plans for the Corps and prepare a report urging its creation. Tom Matthews, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, was loaned to the White House for 6 weeks to write the report.

Two other officials, Don Ellinger and Richard Boone—both of whom are supposedly on the payroll of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime—were also loaned to the Domestic Peace Corps project.

When Congress appropriated the money to pay the salaries of these gentlemen, we can be sure that it was not informed that they would be released from the duties for which they are being paid and transferred to this other job.

Moreover, the specific task which Mr. Ellinger has been assigned—lobbying Congress in behalf of the Corps—is specifically prohibited by law.

The magazine charges that the Domestic Peace Corps has now opened offices a hundred yards from the White House and is currently employing a full-time staff of 25 persons—including 10 executives and 15 office girls.

Secretaries, the article adds, are being paid out of a $1,500 levy on each of the Government agencies that participated in the original study. If true, that comes under the heading of misappropriation of Government funds.

Judging from the people involved, this is not just another example of bureaucracy run rampant which can be blamed on a few overzealous civil servants. It is quite obviously a pet White House project, for which the White House must accept the responsibility.

The President's sister, Mrs. Sargent Shriver, launched the Domestic Peace Corps idea in several speeches back in 1961. According to the Reporter, the project is now under the broad direction of the President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

Full-time director of the project is said to be David Hackett, a former prep-school classmate of the Attorney General, and the office manager, a gentleman named George "Barney" Ross, who, the Reporter notes, "had the good fortune to be on the bridge of the PT109 when it was rammed in the South Pacific some years back." Two of the young ladies in the office served on the campaign staff of Massachusetts Senator EDWARD M. "TEDDY" KENNEDY last year.

During its 2 years in the driver's seat, the Kennedy administration frequently has illustrated a tendency to ignore the rules or make end runs around Congress where a pet project is concerned. If the Reporter is correct, this takes the cake for grabbing the ball, running around Congress and for sheer gall.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence and established a democratic republic. Thus the Lithuanians, who had suffered under Russian autocracy since 1795, became masters of their own destiny and enjoyed freedom in their homeland for the next 20 years. These fruitful decades were followed by events which once again placed Lithuania at the mercy of ruthless conquerors. Since 1944 the Baltic country has been forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union as a constituent republic. Although deprived of their freedom, the Lithuanians are resisting Soviet attempts to stamp out their national integrity. That the Lithuanians will again be free to develop their national heritage is our fervent hope on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Law Enforcement and the U.S. Secret Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, a seldom acknowledged public obligation is the growing debt of gratitude that we owe to the law enforcement agencies of our country. In this regard, the U.S. Secret Service, in particular, must merit our highest commendation for its successful but little-publicized efforts.

In our continuing fight against the forces of crime seeking to erode our public morals and destroy this free society, the Secret Service has indeed played an outstanding role. That this is true is due in no small measure to the outstanding leadership of Hon. James J. Rowley, who, as Chief of the Service, has exemplified the highest ideals of personal loyalty, dedication, and competence.

In an address given on January 30, 1963, before the members of the Maryland Law Enforcement Officers Association in Baltimore, Mr. Rowley reminds us all that the duties and responsibilities of waging the incessant war against crime devolve upon each of us as individual citizens also. Pointing out the tendency to relate all activities, including that of law enforcement, to the growing technological advances of automation, he warns us that the latest automatic techniques, however sophisticated they may appear, are no substitutes for the basic source and strength of our law enforcement machinery—the personal integrity and dedication of the law enforcement official. Whatever latest scientific techniques are available, our ultimate protection as citizens and individuals indeed rests on the loyalty and professional integrity of our law enforcement agencies and officials.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD these timely remarks of Mr. Rowley:

REMARKS OF JAMES J. ROWLEY, CHIEF, U.S. SECRET SERVICE, BEFORE THE MEMBERS OF THE MARYLAND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, BALTIMORE, MD., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1963

Reverend clergy, President Horton, Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Mr. Attorney General Finan, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is a distinct pleasure to be with you this evening and to have the opportunity of addressing the members of the Maryland Law Enforcement Officers Association.

The historical growth and development of Maryland has been synonymous with that of the Federal Government. Your land is steeped in American history. It is only to be expected that you would exert the same influence in law enforcement that you have in your leadership in national affairs.

Duties and responsibilities, as we all know, have a tendency to grow and to develop with the passage of time. Certainly this has been true of the Secret Service. We were established in 1865 as an investigative bureau of the Treasury Department to stop widespread

counterfeiting of the Nation's currency. Over one-third of the Nation's currency was then counterfeit. In a relatively short time counterfeiting was brought under control. In time, other investigative responsibilities were assigned to the Secret Service, many of which were performed for other agencies of the Government.

In 1901 the Secret Service was designated by the Congress to furnish protection for the President of the United States. This occurred shortly after the death of President William McKinley from an assassin's bullet, which was the third such death of an American President over a period of 37 years. Further protective duties were assigned by Congress, so that today the Secret Service also protects the members of the President's immediate family, the Vice President, the President-elect and Vice President-elect.

Our investigative activities continue to represent a major enforcement problem. These include investigation not only of counterfeit currency, but of forged endorsements of Government checks and bonds. In order that you may be better aware of the scope of counterfeting, I would like to point out that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the Secret Service seized more than $3.5 million in counterfeit money before it could be circulated at a loss to the public. By prompt action, we were able to restrict the loss to the public to little more than one-half million. Since 1959 the counterfeiting of our currency has been on the increase. I want to stress, however, that the success of the Secret Service in meeting its protective and investigative responsibilities has been realized through the support and assistance at all levels of law enforcement agencies throughout the country.

I have had very close personal contact with Maryland law enforcement officers over many years, in connection with the travels of our Presidents and first families. From the grim war days of Shangri-la with President Roosevelt, the numerous trips of Presidents Truman and Eisenhower through western Maryland, and the many campaign appearances of our chief executives in this State—including a recent one by President Kennedy—the police agencies of Maryland have always responded vigorously and effectively to our requests for assistance in assuring the safety of our Presidents and first families.

Since assuming the office of Chief, I have become increasingly more aware of their fine cooperation and support of our criminal investigative activities. Needless to say, we value this high degree of cooperation and are most grateful for it.

The State of Maryland is somewhat unique in that full cooperation and understanding exists between all law enforcement agencies. This is as it should be. However, I am constrained to mention that this should be reinforced and continued, for no one law enforcement agency, regardless of size, can afford to stand alone in time of grave emergency or chaos. If it is not prepared to cope with these situations, it will be forced to abdicate its position of responsibility within the community, in which case other forces would assume authority.

Law enforcement organizations must keep alert and informed concerning all subtle attempts—large or small, by individuals or groups who seek to weaken the effectiveness of law enforcement organizations by ridicule, harassment or other insidious means. Remember this well: law enforcement stands as the first line of defense between society and the forces of crime. To the degree that our effectiveness is impaired or restrained, the public is exposed to the inroads of crime.

In our modern society there has been a tendency to relate all activities, including law enforcement, to the principles of automation. While some results have been achieved, we must remain alert to the danger that the human element in law enforcement must not be reduced to a subordinate role. Some theories have been advanced that automation should be directed toward the selection and training of law enforcement officers. Some suggestions should be carefully evaluated. Would they lead toward greater efficiency, or would the law officer become a robot—submerging his identity to conform with mechanical means? An interesting corollary is the recent disclosure that despite nuclear weapons, the foot soldier will continue to play an important part in any future wars, and that conventional weapons will still continue to be a part of our arsenal of defense. I mention this to point out that we should carefully scrutinize proposals to introduce automated methods of recruiting and training police officers, and utilize only those that would efficiently support the law enforcement officer—not supersede him.

Almost daily we observe the intrusion of so-called new concepts of law enforcement. These are often introduced by extravagant words which tend to convey that this is a new science—but when we examine the training programs proposed, it becomes obvious that the only change is in the packaging. The goods remain the same.

We who have chosen law enforcement as our vocation must constantly seek more practical and efficient means of meeting our heightened responsibilities. Primarily, it is our responsibility to maintain law and order and to prevent crime. Due to the unprecedented rise in the crime rate, we find ourselves more often involved in putting out numerous brush fires, while the more important conflagration of major crime increases.

Essentially, crime occurs in a local jurisdiction, whether the offense be a violation of local ordinance, State law or Federal statute. It therefore becomes quite obvious that we must work closely with one another so as to meet our individual and collective responsibilities, and to see that all the facts concerning a criminal and his activities are freely communicated to all appropriate law enforcement agencies. Constant evaluation must be made of all such information so that all law enforcement agencies are familiar with their activities. We must not forget that jurisdictional lines mean nothing to the criminal. With the advantage of improved transportation and communications he can conduct his illegal activities widely and quickly throughout the Nation, and in most cases, may hope to escape detection and apprehension by any one agency. But by concentrating our knowledge through available lines of communication, law enforcement agencies working together can reduce the criminal's successes, and better protect our citizens.

It is understandable that we are all proud of our individual law enforcement agency, be it local, State or Federal, but our approach to better law enforcement makes it imperative that we be mature in our judgment—that we not be, even unconsciously, lured by the glitter of personal acclaim. We must at all times recognize that by a determined effort of all law enforcement agencies, each of us can more effectively meet his own enlarged responsibilities.

In our fight against the forces of crime the assistance and support of the public is not only desirable but essential. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, recently stated: "The Nation's news media have performed superior public service in factually reporting the current shocking crime picture to the people * * *. Fully alerted to the staggering toll of crime, community authorities and civic leaders should lead the fight to halt the lawless hordes who prey on society. No amount of rationalization can justly place this responsibility on the shoulders of law enforcement alone."

It is, therefore, our job to show the public how and why a more intelligent, better trained law enforcement officer, on any level of government, can be more effective in meeting his responsibilities. It is necessary that we maintain our own efficiency at the highest possible point in order to maintain public respect.

I know of no other segment of society whose actions are any more closely scrutinized by the public than our law enforcement agencies and officials. We must realize that all of our official acts are open to this public scrutiny, and that we will be publicly censured if our actions are at any time improper, incorrect, or unethical.

To insure our ability to meet these exacting requirements, we must maintain the highest personal standards, codes of training, and behavior. At this point, it is perhaps appropriate to recall that this month witnessed the 80th anniversay of the Civil Service Act which was signed into law on January 16, 1883. This act has been the foundation of the merit system of employment in the Federal service, without which effective Government could not have been developed. It has assured all Americans that the Federal Government will recruit, train, and develop the best qualified persons available for the public service. Many of our State and local civil service organizations have been inspired by its achievements.

It is likewise essential that law enforcement officers conduct themselves in a manner befitting their professional status. We must operate within the framework of the law and must at all times follow the guidelines established by our courts. For example, it is of paramount importance that we investigate complaints throughly and impartially; that we properly protect the rights of the accused, and that the facts as established by our investigation be sufficient to prove our case in court.

The laws designed to protect the citizen cannot be enforced without his full cooperation. His responsibility to better government requires that he not set himself apart from the conflict between crime and law enforcement. His safety and his interests are very much involved. Clearly he will be the loser should the criminal continue to be successful. It cannot be forgotten that the ultimate target of criminal forces is not law enforcement, but the public itself.

You, as officers and law enforcement officials of Maryland, have a tremendous responsibility to protect the lives and safety of over 3 million residents. The population of your State has increased 30 percent over a 10-year period from 1950 to 1960, yet I am sure you are meeting this increased responsibility with less than a commensurate 30-percent increase in personnel. The manner in which you have met your responsibilities and the reputation you have established as cooperative law enforcement agencies is commendable.

I wish to close by again emphasizing that good law enforcement is our major responsibility, and that we must continue to make the maximum contribution to the maintenance of law and order. We must indeed continue to work together against all the forces of crime and violence which would seek to destroy our free society.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Lithuanians all over the world celebrate the 45th anniversary of

their independence, but their homeland remains under the alien yoke of Soviet communism. Whether in exile or residing in their native land, Lithuanians have set apart this day to reaffirm their devotion to the historic tradition of Lithuanian national independence. Like the Russian czars who tried to impose their way of life on this sturdy little nation before World War I, the Soviet rulers have been unable to erase the memories of Lithuanian language, culture, and religion. Lithuanians recall the congress of 200 citizens which declared a free, independent, and democratic Lithuania in 1918; they recall the civil liberties which that government guaranteed, and the peaceful and constructive role which Lithuania played in international affairs between the two world wars. The independence Lithuania achieved in 1918 marked the fulfillment of ancient aspirations, for during the Middle Ages Lithuania was a great Central European nation. We share the hope of courageous Lithuanians that the renewal of their freedom is not far off. I am proud to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent who yearn for national independence with political and social justice.

Wall Map of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a concurrent resolution today which , if approved by both Houses, will authorize the printing of 59,350 copies of a wall map of the United States. These maps would be prepared cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management and Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior. Its information would also include historical data, concerning public surveys, reservations, and other appropriate dedications of land of the United States. There will be made available 43,900 copies for distribution by Members of the House of Representative, and 15,450 for Members of the Senate. The primary purpose of this resolution is to effect the congressional-type distribution on a single-sheet map. In a similar resolution approved in the 87th Congress, the dimensions of the map were larger than requested in this proposal and necessitated the use of two sheets which had to be pasted together to effect a complete map. Because of the desire of many Members to have the single-sheet type, with the information I have described, I am requesting that the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 574—87th Congress—be suspended. I have written to Secretary Udall about our desires in this matter, and if and when the Congress approves this resolution, I am advised that the Department can begin processing and printing of this important, informative map to satisfy requests of all Members for its need.

Our Popular Pastime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have previously called the attention of the Members of the House to the unusual amount of criticism that is currently being heaped upon the heads of Members of Congress. Some of this criticism is warranted. Unfortunately, some of the criticism seems to stem from a basic lack of appreciation for our system of government with its built-in checks and balances. We live in a streamlined age; perhaps, therefore, it is only natural that some people believe that our present system of constitutional government should be streamlined in order to qualify for the space age. It is my belief that there is a far more basic reason than a simple veneration for tradition that bids us go slowly in changing the basic structure of our Government. As I have already indicated, this is not to imply that all criticism of Congressmen is merely captious or fanciful. I believe personally that in the area of conflict of interest and also in the area of dealing with budgetary matters that some genuine reforms are needed. However, I am just as prepared to firmly defend the role of Congress as one of the three great coordinate branches of our Federal Government.

Also, I must confess to some considerable impatience with those who would condemn all Congressmen because of the faults of a few. Therefore, when I read the following editorial by Mr. Ken Smith, the very capable editor of the Rochelle New Leader, I was immensely reassured. The writer demonstrates, I think, the kind of rational and measured appreciation of the problems of Congress that are all too lacking in some of the current commentary. Therefore, I take pride in commanding the following editorial entitled, "Our Popular Pastime" to my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

OUR POPULAR PASTIME

Criticism of Congress has been a favorite American pastime almost from the time it was created by the Founding Fathers as one of the three branches of the Federal Government.

Through the years Congress has been a favorite target for jokesters and has been a convenient whipping boy for those who were displeased with what the Government was doing or wasn't doing.

We admit that Congress sometimes is funnier than a comic opera and often is as irritating as a spoiled child but we are always forced to the conclusion that any Congress, no matter how bad, is better than none at all.

Most of the responsible criticism of Congress springs from the extremely slow pace at which it moves, the almost constant necessity to compromise, the jealousies that frequently exist, the continual jockeying for political advantage and strict adherence to the seniority rule in committee chairmanships.

All of these complaints have been valid at one time or another but have made little long-range impression on Congress. The House and Senate still follow with little change the rules and traditions that were acquired during the first 100 years of the Republic.

One of the first requirements for being a Congressman is a thick skin for Congress is nearly in a position where it is criticized regardless of what it does.

If Congress quickly puts through a program of legislation asked by the administration it is a rubber stamp Congress. If it fails to do so it is an obstructionist Congress.

If it passes too many new bits of legislation it is a busybody; if the number of bills passed is small it is a do-nothing Congress.

If the Members spend considerable time on junkets or with the folks back home they are criticized for not tending to their business of law making. If they stay in Washington too long they are accused of being out of touch with the folks back home.

If they too closely follow the wishes of the people of their district they are being provincial and neglecting the general interest of their country. If they do not reflect the sentiments of their constituents they are taken to task for flaunting the will of the voters.

If they try to get all the advantages they can for their district they are pork barrelers but if they don't get them they most likely will cease to be Congressmen.

If they adhere strictly to the political party line they are party hacks but if they don't they are political mavericks.

If they yield to any pressure group they are called the captives of the lobbyists but if they oppose legislation in which a strong pressure group is interested they are branded as an enemy of the group and a foe to progress.

If they are free with Government funds they are spendthrifts but if they try to keep spending in check they are accused of putting property rights above human rights.

If they spend a lot of time debating a bill they are called a bunch of windbags but if they push legislation through with little or no debate they are accused of using steamroller tactics.

The 88th Congress, now in session, will be subject to all the usual criticisms and few people—least of all the Congressmen—will be especially concerned.

When this country adopted a representative form of government under a written constitution it was not seeking the most efficient type of rule but rather the type that would be most responsible to the people.

By its very nature Congress is and ought to be a cross section of all the people of the United States. Senators will nearly always reflect the attitudes of their States and Representatives will mirror the people of their district.

There may be times when we think Congress should speak with one voice and reflect the national interest rather than the interest of the part of it they represent.

But until the people want to speak in one voice and submerge their own interests and desires to those of the common good there will be no unanimity in Congress. But then if the people ever reach such a high state of perfection there be little need for goverment in any form except in the fields of international relations and national security.

Fight U.N. Cuban Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 15, 1963.

Today on the floor of the House of Representatives, I have discussed the recent United Nations proposal to give $1.5 million of aid to Communist Cuba.

In addition, I wish to point up my disapproval of the situation concerning UNESCO which is discussed in this editorial. As indicated, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has published a booklet written by two Russians which denounces "colonial oppression" and describes the Soviet Union as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples." This is an additional example of the United States supporting agencies of the United Nations—in this case the United States pays approximately one-third of UNESCO's budget—which are carrying out policies which are not in the interest of the American people. This instance is particularly notable in that the press has so recently been revealing the notorious Soviet persecution of Russian Jews.

This Nation is looked to as the champion of freedom by the captive peoples of the world. We must not permit a situation to continue whereby we are financing the publication of lies about the free world on the one hand and the suppression of truth about Soviet persecution on the other.

The editorial follows:

FIGHT U.N. CUBAN POLICY

The United States is being boxed into a ridiculous position regarding Cuba.

A demand that Russia get its troops out of Cuba because they "poison the atmosphere" was voiced by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a Los Angeles speech Wednesday.

On the same day, his office in Washington was forced to note with regret that the United Nations Special Fund is going ahead with a $1.5 million agricultural aid project to Cuba over U.S. objections. The United States provides 40 percent of the fund's expenses.

This Nation is in a state of undeclared war with Cuba. Fidel Castro has confiscated more than $1 billion worth of American property and has not paid one dime in compensation, as required by civilized standards. He is an international pirate and is exporting insurrection to other Latin countries. The United States has cut off trade with Cuba in items that could help the economy, and has tried to discourage other free nations from trading with Cuba.

Must the United States now stand by helplessly while an agency of the U.N. that could not exist without American support helps Castro build up his economy?

The project is an insult to America.

In another area of U.N. activity, another insult to America and the free world has been revealed. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has published a booklet written by two Russians and which denounces "colonial oppression" and describes the Soviet Union as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples." (At the moment, Russia is notoriously persecuting Jews.) The United States pays one-third of UNESCO's budget.

When the U.N. was founded the United States agreed to pick up a large share of its expenses because the United States was comparatively wealthy and unscarred by World War II as so many other nations were. And the U.N. was born out of an American ideal, peace with justice.

But it was never contemplated by Americans that they would be used to finance activities that are directly counter to America's best interests and foreign policies. The United States may not always be able to have its way on U.N. policies, but it certainly should not feel obliged to finance specific anti-American policies.

If the United States continues to support the U.N. Special Fund after the defiance of U.S. views on Cuba, Congress would well be justified in cutting off any funds for the Special Fund. No other nation in the world would go on supporting a group that so blatantly and cynically ignored its views. (Russia, for example, refused to support the U.N. action in the Congo.)

The incident also is an indication that other nations do not take seriously America's view on Cuba. It's time to impress them differently. The United States must get back to the militant attitude on Cuba it exhibited last October. What, for example, does Rusk propose to do to back up his demand that Russian troops get out of Cuba? America awaits a White House answer on this and the U.N. Special Fund.

The Great Bay State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, both on the National and the State level we hear repeatedly that the proper amount of promotion in the field of tourism can be a tremendous boost to our economy. We in the Federal Government are extremely happy at the emphasis this administration is placing in the U.S. Travel Service's drive to bring visitors to this country. For a long time there was a tendency at all levels of government to treat tourism as sort of a stepchild.

I was happy recently, along with other Members of Congress to visit the "Travel America" Auto Show at the District of Columbia Armory and to see there the exhibits of a number of States promoting the attractions of their particular areas. I was especially proud to see the outstanding exhibit of my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This exhibit arranged by the Massachusetts Department of Commerce, and staffed by a talented group, including a very lovely young lady, Miss Gayle Pope, who is "Miss Massachusetts." I commend the members of the Bay State delegation and both the House and the Senate for the cooperation they gave to the Commonwealth in connection with this show. I was also happy to note that the Governor of Massachusetts, Endicott Peabody, took time from a busy schedule in Washington to appear at the show.

More promotions of this nature will mean more visitors for the various States with the end result that the entire economy will benefit. As a son of Massachusetts, I want to state I was very proud of all the participants in this exhibit.

Aiding the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for all Americans to read the editorial pages of the Washington Evening Star of last Friday, February 15. Appearing on those pages are three excellent commentaries—a Star editorial and columns by William S. White and David Lawrence—on the Cuban aid project of the United Nations Special Fund and the pro-Communist booklet issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Few Americans, I am sure, will be fooled by President Kennedy's feeble argument that U.S. dollars will not be used in the Cuban aid deal. The Special Fund gets 40 percent of its money from the United States. All contributions go into one pot, and to argue that our money will not be used is like saying that you can pour cream from the top of a bottle of homogenized milk.

Following are the Star editorial and the columns by Mr. White and Mr. Lawrence:

HELPING CASTRO

It's been a long time since we've read anything feebler than the disclaimers by the President and by Paul G. Hoffman with respect to the United Nations project to bolster Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba.

Mr. Kennedy brushed off the matter by telling his news conference that no U.S. dollars are going to Cuba, which is an equivocation. Mr. Hoffman, Managing Director of the U.N. Special Fund, said the same thing, and added that maybe Castro won't benefit in the long run.

Maybe not. But the undeniable fact is that the Special Fund, which gets 40 percent of its money from the United States, proposes to put up $1,157,600 to be spent through the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization to help Cuba's farm economy.

This isn't much money as things go these days. But it still is more than $1 million, and to say they are not American dollars is to quibble about a bookkeeping transaction. As long as the United States puts up 40 percent of the Special Fund money it contributes indirectly to the U.N. Cuban investment—an investment which Mr. Hoffman has authorized on a trial basis despite reported strenuous objections from the State Department.

Meanwhile, it is disclosed that another U.N. organization, UNESCO, which gets 31.46 percent of its funds from the State Department, put up the money last year to pay for publication of a Russian-written brochure which denounces "colonialist oppression" by the Western nations and praises the Soviet

Union as "a brotherhood of free and equal peoples."

Well, as someone has said, it's a dizzy world. Mr. Hoffman claims he is confident that Congress will not take any reprisals against U.N. funds, and he may be right. For Congress has demonstrated a remarkable capacity to "take it" when it comes to shelling out American dollars for dubious ventures around the world. And so has the American taxpayer. But there must be a limit somewhere, and this aid-to-Castro foolishness ought to show us where it is.

CUBAN AID: PERVERTING THE U.N.

(By William S. White)

This country's problem in dealing with Castro Cuba has now been further bedeviled by an extraordinarily ham-handed action within the United Nations.

A U.N. suborganization called the Special Fund has chosen this untimely hour in history to award a $1.2 million United Nations agricultural aid project to Fidel Castro. The United States of America provides 40 percent of the total financial support of this fund, of which the managing director, Paul G. Hoffman, is himself an American.

This economic assistance to Mr. Castro, though no doubt small in the great scheme of things, comes precisely at the moment when the highest American policy is directed to the economic destruction of Cuba as an open Soviet military base and a lodgment for Soviet Communist penetration in this hemisphere.

It also comes precisely at the moment when American efforts are directed to explaining to other nations in Latin America that Mr. Castro is an outlaw and that anti-Americanism is not a useful line to take up in this hemisphere. In short, this project could not possibly have been approved at a time more embarrassing to the United States and more suitable to Mr. Castro's book.

Mr. Hoffman is quoted in the curious argument that, anyhow, the money which will go to Mr. Castro will not come directly from American contributions. But this absurd and tasteless affair mocks our whole position that Castro Cuba is consistent threat to what the U.N. is supposed to be, an organization opposed to both open and covert aggression.

STATE DEPARTMENT WARNING

The very note of our State Department regretting this action calls attention to Cuba's "persistent policy of hostility toward its neighbors." It declares, moreover, that Cuba's "support of subversion throughout the hemisphere precludes the establishment there of the normal cooperative relations necessary to the implementation of a United Nations project."

Nevertheless, the thing has been implemented all the same, and with nothing more than a timid objection filed back in 1961 by the U.S. delegation to the United Nations. State Departments informants privately concede that there was nothing in U.N. procedure to have prevented the United States from having demanded, in 1961 or now, that this grant to Mr. Castro be set aside.

They add that it was "apparently our conclusion"—meaning the conclusion of our U.N. delegation in New York—that we could not marshal the required two-thirds vote within the governing council which is supposed to direct the policies of the Special Fund.

NO ROLLCALL

But it is conceded that we never at any point so much as asked for a rollcall or lobbied to raise the necessary majority.

In short, it is perfectly obvious, on the basis of State Department information, that the 17 nations supposedly running this fund are not running it at all but are leaving it to the Managing Director, Paul Hoffman. It is no less obvious that a mere salaried bureaucracy in the U.N. is able, in this instance, to flout the central foreign policy designs of the very country that is carrying the bulk of all the financial load for the agency thus bureaucracy administers.

Finally, it is also perfectly plain that the senior people in the State Department itself are chagrined by this almost incredible episode. How long before the U.S. delegation to the U.N. under Ambassador Adlai Stevenson is made a part of the U.S. Government? How soon will it cease having a foreign policy of its own?

And how long before the U.N. right-or-wrongers, who presently will tolerate no criticism of it at any point for any reason, will realize that the good in this institution will not in the end survive by mere passionate refusals to see the follies that are perverting it out of all rational shape?

THE U.S. AND U.N. AID FOR CUBA—PROPOSAL TO SUSTAIN CASTRO'S REGIME CALLED TURNING POINT FOR ORGANIZATION

(By David Lawrence)

The United Nations has reached a turning point in its history. Sentiment in the United States for withdrawal from the international organization has just been given strong new impetus. For the American people will be asked through Congress to decide whether taxpayers' money shall be channeled into Cuba through the U.N. to help Fidel Castro maintain his inhumane regime. Hundreds of innocent persons have been executed by the gangster government in Havana, yet the U.N. puts its stamp of approval on such a government by furnishing funds to sustain the domestic position of a cruel dictator.

Democrats as well as Republicans have denounced the U.N.'s action on the floor of Congress.

The point is made by President Kennedy that none of the money to be spent in Cuba will come directly from the funds furnished by the United States. But funds can always be redistributed or reallocated to achieve a political objective. The fact remains that the American Government is paying a large share of the expenses of the U.N., and it is no secret that the United States is trying to help liberate the people of Cuba by putting the squeeze on the island's economy. When the U.N. flagrantly ignores the policy of the United States, it brings up the broad question of whether financial aid by American taxpayers shall be extended blindly and without any opportunity to keep the funds from being used to defeat the foreign policy of this country.

U.N. officials argue that they are not interfering in the internal politics of Cuba. But, realistically, anything that bolsters the Cuban economy is an intervention, especially at a moment when the United States is trying, by means of a shipping boycott, to weaken the Castro government and bring about its downfall.

It will be said that the United States cannot expect to influence the actions of an international organization in which it has only one vote. But neither is the American Government obligated to supply money for an organization whose projects run counter to American foreign policies.

The U.N. has been in deep financial trouble lately, and this country has helped out by paying far more than its share of the expenses of the organization. Congress, however—and not the State Department or the White House—has the final say as to how the taxpayers' money shall be loaned or given away. The U.N. bond issue had a tough time getting through Congress last year, and there are renewed expressions of doubt now even about the foreign-aid program in which the United States alone decides how to spend its money. This will cause Congress at least to examine more carefully any legislation that would appropriate money over whose distribution this country has no control.

The argument that America, as a philanthropically minded nation, should help underdeveloped or backward countries will continue to make a certain appeal. At a time, however, when the American people are being asked to incur a Treasury deficit of more than $20 billion, it will doubtless occur to many Members of Congress that this presents a paradox which cannot be easily explained to the voters.

The whole amount to be spent in Cuba by the U.N. for the new project of agricultural development is comparatively small—about $1.2 million. It isn't, however, the sum allocated but the principle which bothers the American Government at this time. The State Department tried to persuade the U.N. officials that it would be an unwise move, but the protest was of no avail. Furthermore, if this project goes through, it will cause hesitation in Congress to approve all other appropriations for the benefit of the United Nations.

Coincidentally with the announcement of the pro-Castro action by the director of the U.N. special fund, a pro-Communist booklet issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has come into the news. This publication extols the alleged social and political equality existing inside the Soviet Union and asserts that Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia "voluntarily joined the Soviet Union" in 1940. Everybody knows that early in World War II the Soviet army by military force seized those three countries, which were then incorporated into the Soviet Union, where they have remained ever since. This action has never been recognized by the United States, Great Britain and many other countries. The assembly of captive European nations, which is composed of political exiles from the Eastern European Communist bloc, has protested against the booklet and calls it Soviet propaganda.

On the Senate floor yesterday, Democratic whip HUBERT HUMPHREY declared that the statement in the U.N. booklet that the Baltic states had voluntarily joined the Soviet Union is pure patent nonsense. He said it was intolerable that such a report should be published by an international organization dedicated to truth and scientific knowledge.

The United Nations is surely in for trouble with American public opinion. For it develops that UNESCO, which issued the booklet, is financed nearly one-third by the people of this country and less than one-sixth by the Soviet Union. Maybe Moscow should pay the whole bill.

Textbook Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of February 6. The editorial discusses the Canadian debacle and identifies it as one of a series of unfortunate events:

TEXTBOOK EXAMPLE

This Nation's intervention in Canada's defense policy might properly be set down as a textbook example of how not to conduct foreign affairs.

As columnist Arthur Krock has pointed out, the diplomatic note which the United States sent was cleared by the White House and was tied directly to the President. It, therefore, cannot be dismissed as a blunder by underlings, which is the usual way of excusing a top executive.

The wording was so blunt that it incited a hostile reaction throughout Canada.

It came at a time when Canada's political parties were conducting their own great debate on defense and their relations with NATO and the United States.

And it probably will lead, not only to the fall of the present Canadian Government of Mr. Diefenbaker, but also to total failure of the plan to place nuclear weapons in Canadian bases.

Nuclear warheads are considered by competent authorities to be essential to the defense of North America. The Canadians have recognized the obligation in principle, but have dragged their feet on actually putting nuclear warheads on the interceptors and bombers and missiles which guard the DEW line early warning system and the arctic approaches to this hemisphere.

As Gen. Curtis LeMay said the other day, there is a close and warm relationship between Canadian and United States military men and no lack of understanding on basic issues, so far as they are concerned.

The lack of understanding has arisen among the political leaders of the two nations. In this situation, a United States reminder of Canada's nuclear obligation certainly would have been proper even at the risk of straining otherwise friendly relations. Our country has a right to prod a reluctant ally.

But to hit a reluctant ally with a sledgehammer blow that created a fury of anti-Americanism and drove a wedge between the two countries was neither proper nor prudent.

Unfortunately, the affront to Canada is not an isolated event. It follows closely a calculated rudeness toward the British in the abrupt termination of the Skybolt missile. It brings to mind the lamentable lack of insight revealed by the administration by its dealings with General de Gaulle.

Perhaps, as the Wall Street Journal wryly suggested the other day, Mr. Kennedy's rough treatment of Roger Blough and United States Steel has become Washington's notion of diplomacy. In any event, it is not the way to win friends and influence allies.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, as an independent nation, no longer exists. Incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940, the territory has been subjected to brutal treatment. Thousands of its inhabitants have been exiled to Siberia. Massacres instigated by Communist authorities have annihilated entire villages, with the death toll for the entire nation running into the thousands. Much of the land has been allotted to Russians who have been settled on Lithuanian territory. The situation is grim and appears hopeless. But recent refugees bring word that the people continue to strive for democratic privileges and, above all, for independence.

Lithuania has existed as a modern nation in this century. Czarist Russia had claimed the land as part of its empire since the 18th century, but the Lithuanian nationals established their own government and declared themselves free and sovereign from Russian rule on February 16, 1918. It is this act on that day which we commemorate as the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence.

Lithuanian nationals scattered throughout the world keep alive the spirit of freedom for their homeland. They remember that those who remained under the oppressive Communist rule once enjoyed rights as freemen. The U.S. Government has refused to recognize the Communist takeover; it has continued to bolster the morale of the people through Voice of America broadcasts.

All of us, then, must do our part to keep alive the spirit of freedom. We call attention to their declaration of independence, their symbol of liberty, and extend to the Lithuanian people the hope that their nation may once more become a part of the world community, free and sovereign. Therefore, I salute the indomitable spirit displayed by these courageous people and their unyielding refusal to submit to the oppression of totalitarianism. Lithuania will always exist as a nation in the minds and hearts of people who recognize the dignity and inherent rights of man.

More Administration Doubletalk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Kennedy administration continues to be one of confusion, misinformation, and doubletalk. For whatever reason the administration cannot develop clear and forthright policies, the result is that we are courting disaster both at home and abroad. Our people are confused, our allies are beginning to mistrust us, and our enemies may well miscalculate our true intentions and push the button for world war III. The President should assume the full responsibility of his office which means making meaningful decisions and standing by them. Our almost total lack of an effective foreign policy is shown in the debacle of Cuba, our shameful loss in Laos, the continuing war in Vietnam where American boys are dying. On the domestic front the indecisiveness of the President is creating one of the worst strike records of recent years, business is being hurt by the proposals and counterproposals and proposals to overturn proposals in the tax field, and the administration continues to flounder from one crisis to another.

To point up the results of this kind of leadership I would like to include as a part of these remarks two editorials from the Wall Street Journal:

A FRIGHT FOR FRIENDS

To no one's great surprise, the end of America's international payments deficit is glimmering ever farther away. Balance was supposed to be restored late this year, but now Treasury Secretary Dillon says it may not come until 1964 or 1965.

At the rate the Government is going, that could be unduly optimistic. Last year the deficit was cut only $500 million from $2.5 billion in 1961. And Washington officials appear to be empty of useful ideas for getting out of this hole.

Mr. Dillon evidently plans to go on doing what he has been doing—make some effort to reduce military spending abroad, sell more U.S. weapons to allies, require more foreign-aid dollars to be spent in this country. None of this is enough; none of it gets to the root of the matter.

So far the Government has also been hoping that the Europeans would continue to cooperate and not do anything to aggravate the deficit. This hope looks considerably less impressive than it did a few weeks ago, with the Western alliance now in such a disheveled state. If De Gaule wanted to give a further demonstration of his anti-Americanism, he could put quite a dent in what's left of our gold stock. Even if he has no such plans, this is an extremely poor time to be weakening confidence in the dollar, which is bound to be the consequence of letting the deficit and gold outflow go on almost unchecked.

Meantime, the only new suggestions being heard fall far short of the mark. George Mitchell, President Kennedy's sole appointee to the Federal Reserve Board, rightly expresses concern about the failure of the payments situation to improve enough to show the world our determination to correct it.

Mr. Mitchell's ideas of correctives are two new steps. One is a special tax incentive for U.S. exporters designed to lower the cost of American goods abroad; yet exports are the brightest part of the payments picture. The other is a special tax on movements of U.S. capital to Europe, aimed at trying to discourage European borrowing here; yet the return from U.S. investments exceeds the outflow.

This second proposal, Mr. Mitchell insists, would not be an outright curb on the exchange of U.S. dollars into European currencies. All the same, it seems clearly headed in the direction of exchange controls, something the Government has opposed until now.

Exchange controls would indeed be an admission of defeat. Moreover, such interference with capital movements would probably give everybody such a scare that it would worsen the whole payments condition.

That, though, is the kind of fix governments get into when they refuse to apply real remedies to their policies. A government, for example, will inflate the money supply for political or other purposes; then, when the inflation is getting out of hand it will slap on wage-price controls in a futile attempt to deal with symptoms. In the same simple-minded way, the time may come when exchange controls are presented as the cure of the payments sickness.

What urgently needs serious analysis and fundamental correction is the Government's entire monetary and fiscal policy at home and abroad. No matter how much the Government tried to blame others for the payments deficit, the fact is that if you remove Government from the calculation, there would be a payments surplus on commercial export and investment accounts. At home the Government is wedded to easy money and

huge planned deficits, which ought to frighten sensible people.

Only the Government can restore the confidence the Government itself has done so much to weaken. But with wild policies like these, the Government can hardly be expected to get the dollar out of trouble.

HANDS ACROSS THE PURPOSES

One of the more fascinating facets of watching Washington these days is observing the curious way in which its right hand and left hand so often work at cross purposes.

Take almost any problem. With its right hand the administration took a vigorous swing at the obstacles blocking a freer trade flow with the rest of the world. The language and intent of the new trade bill to lower trade barriers were impeccable. But when the left hand swung into action the actual result has been more trade barriers.

In its sillier form this protectionism shows up in the new rules cutting Aunt Bessie's tourist purchases abroad and proposals to stop her from sending a $10 Italian necktie home to Uncle John without getting caught in the tolls of the Customs Bureau. More importantly, all the significant trade changes recently have been up not down; a 100-percent increase in tariffs on glass and woolen carpets, still tighter quotas on the importation of foreign oil.

Or take the balance-of-payments problem. You would have to go far to find a better diagnosis of the dollar's troubles in the world than President Kennedy's speech of a year ago. None of its implied promises have been delivered. On the contrary, the actual actions proposed by the President are calculated to aggravate rather than relieve the difficulty—still more easy money at home, a still greater outpouring of U.S. dollars abroad.

But perhaps the best example of this discoordination between promise and deed is in the way Washington is attacking the twin problems of the budget and taxes.

President Kennedy has said, and rightly, that one of the heaviest weights on the economy is the burden of taxes; he has also said that the Government should hold down nondefense expenditures, reduce Government employment and aim its policies toward a balanced budget.

So much for the right hand. But if there exists a reason for high taxes it is high spending; so with the left hand comes the push for not only bigger nondefense spending but new spending for wholly new projects, an increase in the number of Government employees who must be paid out of the taxes of the rest of us. And the aim at a balanced budget is taken by pointing us towards the biggest planned deficit in the history of any country.

Even the tax bill itself shows the same symptoms. The President said that we need to broaden the tax base. Great stress was put on the need for reducing corporate taxes, eliminating the steep progressiveness of the personal income tax and spurring the accumulation of investment capital.

Yet when the promised tax program is presented to Congress it turns out to propose taking a million people off the tax rolls entirely, to keep corporate tax rates "temporarily" higher than they would be in the absence of the "tax relief" bill, increase the steepness with which taxes rise with income, and to deliver new blows at accumulations of capital by putting double taxes on estates and soaking pension funds with stiffer tax treatment.

Nor is this all. It's said on the one hand that private welfare resources are inadequate to meet the Nation's needs, and that people individually are unable to cope with such things as health and education costs—all this as the excuse for more Government spending to meet this need.

So what does the new tax bill do? It makes it harder for most people to give charitably to private welfare, more expensive for them to pay school taxes in their own communities, and takes away the little relief employees did have on their taxes when they are sick.

The examples could be multiplied. One hand tries to smooth the feathers of our allies; the other ruffles them anew, even to the point of toppling a Canadian Government. The current talk of a Russian buildup in Cuba follows hard upon vigorous action that was going to halt the Russian buildup in Cuba.

Whether all this is a fault of superficial thinking, or an attempt to be all things to all men, or merely political fear of pushing consistently in one direction, we can't know. But all too often some sound beginnings have been made to good policies only to be annulled by what comes after. And it is hard to see how such star-crossed purposes can, in the end, serve any purpose at all.

An Outsider Views U.S. Economic Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday January 29, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the course of discussion and reading about pending tax legislation and the general state of the national economy, I found illuminating the views of a distinguished Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal. I ask unanimous consent to introduce in the RECORD an editorial, based on Dr. Myrdal's views, that appeared in the current issue of Labor, a national newspaper published here in Washington by the 18 standard railroad labor organizations. I find it a well-done, concise summary of the views of this widely respected economist.

The editorial follows:

AN OUTSIDER VIEWS U.S. ECONOMIC LAG

Often the view of an outsider on the state of the American economy can be more illuminating than the appraisals of those who are on the spot and may "not see the forest for the trees." A good example can be found in Gunnar Myrdal of Sweden, the internationally known economist who has often written on the American scene.

Recently Myrdal delivered a significant address on the U.S. economy to the 10th anniversary convocation of the Fund for the Republic in New York City. Some of his comments have been publicized, but not too widely. They deserve further circulation. Here are some of the key points made by Myrdal:

"I am inclined to believe that the most important problem in the world today is how to get America out of relative economic stagnation * * *. The present relative stagnation is dangerous to the successful pursuit of America's foreign policy.

"To get America out of the rut of relative stagnation * * * with a rising trend of unemployment will require very much more long-range planning and Government intervention * * *.

"The first obvious policy conclusion is that the Government should take measures which can result in economic expansion. This means it should cause an increase in aggregate demand * * *.

"There is a very large volume of crying needs in America which, if they were translated into effective demand, could sustain rapid economic growth for a long time to come. This cannot be done except by Government intervention on a large scale."

Government intervention, Myrdal says, should include raising the standards of the fifth of the American people "who are officially recognized as falling below the poverty line." Another fifth, he adds, are close to the borderline. "The affluent society is largely a myth, except for a privileged upper stratum," Myrdal adds.

To give more purchasing power to the poor, he urges "a radical reduction of the tax burden" in low-income brackets, a higher minimum wage level, and help to the union movement in organizing the "weaker sections of the labor market."

Also, "the high concentration of poverty among * * * old people, sick people, or families with many children, is a strong reason to expand the system of social security, a field where America is still far behind the countries that are most similar to it in basic values."

Myrdal also calls for greater public investments in training and education to meet the demands of a fast-growing technology. He stresses, too, the need for retraining of older workers who are unemployed, but he makes it clear that "only in an expanding economy" can these retrained workers be absorbed.

He would also "invest much larger resources in schools and hospitals" and slum clearance, among other projects. He asserts that "there is no excuse for a rich country to tolerate huge slums in the big cities and lesser ones in the smaller cities, at the same time that it allows a large part of its manpower and productive resources to go to waste."

Summing up, Myrdal contends that America must not only increase private consumption through tax reduction but also make "very substantial increases in public expenditures" for social needs. If it fails to do all that, and continues to stagnate, then "America is in danger of losing out as the uncontested leader within the Western World."

Oldest Slovak Society in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1962, the oldest Slovak Society in New England celebrated its Diamond Jubilee in Bridgeport, Conn. The occasion was marked by a solemn mass at St. John Nepomucene Church of which the Reverend Albert Tomasko is the pastor. Civic and religious dignitaries present included the Most Reverend Walter B. Curtis, Bishop of Bridgeport, who imparted the blessing of Pope John XXIII.

In recognition of this remarkable and historic occasion I herewith submit for the RECORD an account of the society written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, editor of the Slovak Eagle, official publication of the First Slovak of the Free Eagle.

The article follows:

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF OLDEST SLOVAK SOCIETY IN NEW ENGLAND STATES

(By John C. Sciranka)

On September 30, 1962, the St. John Nepomucene Society, now Leaf 1, of the First Slovak Wreath of the Free Eagle, the oldest Slovak Society in New England States, celebrated its Diamond Jubilee in Bridgeport, Conn. On this occasion this writer recalled that the society was founded on September 7, 1887 and also that next year it will be the 60th anniversary of publishing a Slovak fraternal ritual, called the Obradnik, by one of the former citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., Anton S. Ambrose, who on December 21, 1889, founded the Slovak v Amerike (Slovak American), now the oldest Slovak publication in America still published in Middletown, Pa. Ambrose was one of the founders of the National Slovak Society and its second supreme president.

Having the happy association with this publication and the St. John's Society, I wish to recall that when this society was founded, the gates of immigration to the United States were just widely opened. The wounds of revolution in Slovakia (1848), were still unhealed, but conditions in America after the Civil War in which the Slovaks and other Slavonic groups took part on the side of Lincoln became already normal.

The Slovaks in America had already their newspaper, since the American Slovak Gazette was founded in Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 21, 1886, by two teachers, Ján Slovensky and Julius Wolf.

The founder of the oldest Slovak organization, Peter V. Rovnianek, arrived to the United States on September 5, 1888. His objective was completion of his studies for priesthood in Cleveland, Ohio. Instead, on February 16, 1890, he founded the National Slovak Society in Pittsburgh, Pa., which held its 23d national convention during the Labor Day week in New York City.

In this brief article I wish to point out the following facts: Joseph Sedlar, Joseph Sirovjak, Alex Halkovic, Michael Lozinak, John Mitro, Stephen Grohol, and Paul Dudra, were founders of the mentioned St. John's Society in Bridgeport, Conn., on September 7, 1887. Sedlar, called Big Joe, was a born leader who received his training in the army in Europe and proved it a year later, when on September 2, 1888, the St. Stephen's Slovak Society was founded in Bridgeport, Conn., with 40 members. The first members wore uniforms of forest wardens, known as jagri. They drilled and Sedlar was their drill master.

Physical fitness was on their program 75 years ago although they all did hard manual labor.

On the occasion of this the oldest Slovak fraternal society in New England States, this writer wishes to answer the following pertinent questions with which he and other fraternalists are confronted: Where did these pioneers get the incentive and experience to organize and manage their first Slovak societies in America?

After giving these questions a lot of study, the writer has these answers: The guilds known as "cechy" in Slovakia, gave them incentive and ambition. However, the guilds were only for experienced craftsmen and the great majority of first Slovak immigrants were not skilled craftsmen but simple farmers, yet the dignity of guilds was enough for them even as observers to instill a desire that when they live in a free country, they too will establish their societies along those rules and rituals.

The guilds in Slovakia flourished since the 13th century. The first such guilds were formed in the neighboring Bohemia, now part of Czechoslovakia, in 1318. They were formed first by the tailors. In 1348 a brotherhood of painters was formed in Prague "to the love of God, Mother of God and St. Luke," who is known as a painter and a physician. The members had a privilege to hold a funeral with a parade and candles. Other guilds flourished in the 15th century when there were some 225 various guilds of trades and merchants in Bohemia alone. Slovakia did not remain behind and it had its share of guilds, such as shoemakers and bootmakers, furriers, winegrowers, blacksmiths, ropemakers, etc. Each guild had its special saint and the holy days of patrons were observed with great festivities which custom is still carried on by our fraternals in America. These festivities of guild members were observed and admired by nonmembers, in whom ambitions and desires were created to belong some day to such societies. And this they realized in this free country in their fraternal societies, to which they continually cling. The pioneers insisted and still insist on strict ritual. Although they had no knowledge of Robert's Rules of Order, they conducted their meetings, celebrations and initiations with great solemnity and dignity, which attracted new members. Church services were foremost in their ritual. They often marched in parades and had bands even for funerals of their deceased members. The blessing of guild's banner was the most solemn occasion in Slovakia and that is why our pioneers, after organizing their societies, immediately purchased American and Slovak banners, as I have already described in the July 1962 issue of the Fraternal Monitor and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the 17th century, Slovakia was enriched by the settling of Habans, who are similar to American Quakers. They introduced the manufacture of ceramics, which enriched the commerce and art of Slovakia. This writer found the names of Huver (Hoover) and Pullman among the Habans, especially in Sobotiste, near Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, where their descendants still reside. This was called to the attention of President Herbert C. Hoover way back in 1930 to help establish contact with his ancestors. These Habans also formed guilds, which were the training units for fraternal societies, such as were founded and still continue to prosper in America. The wire-tinkers (drotári) also had their guilds and they became very prosperous having shops in various countries. Some of them financed the Czecho-Slovak Legionnaires in Russia during World War I for the establishment of the new republic. Both Dr. Thomas G. Masaryk, first President of Czecho-Slovakia and Gen. Milan A. Stefanik, Slovak scientist and cofounder of the Republic visited Russia and received aid from these guilds.

In connection with American-Slovak fraternalism and its ritual, credit should be given to the mentioned Anton S. Ambrose, who compiled the Obradnik in 1903. Ambrose came to this country at the age of 15 from Slovakia. His father knew the history of guilds and gave his son the opportunities to learn the American way of life. Ambrose aided Peter V. Rovnianek in founding of the National Slovak Society. He also founded the Slovak newspaper in Plymouth, as mentioned above. Ambrose worked hard for the formation of the first Republic of Czecho-Slovakia and raised in the city of Bridgeport, Conn., with the help of Rev. Andrew E. Komara and Rev. Gaspar J. Panik, both deceased fraternalists, over $75,000, for the million drive headed then by Rev. Joseph Murgas, noted priest-scientist and fraternalist who was commended by six American presidents for his scientific contributions to the progress of America. Ambrose as fraternalist insisted on conducting meetings according to the ritual (Obradnik) and thus leaders were trained for American Slovak fraternalism. We hope that the accomplishments of the former leaders will inspire the present generations to keep up the traditions of fraternalism for better protection and fulfillment of true teaching of brotherhood.

Press Disenchanted With New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Feb. 15, 1963]

PRESS DISENCHANTED WITH NEW FRONTIER

Since our own comments on the disillusion of many liberals with the New Frontier, and the number of "Old Frontiersmen" in Washington these days, the reflection of this situation keeps popping up.

The other day, columnist Jim Bishop, a great reporter with certainly no record of political bias whatever, visited Washington and came away with a column on the bitterness of the whole press gallery in Washington—a group of reporters once enamored of the new, young President and his group.

Holiday magazine is coming out with an appraisal of the Justice Department by a well-known literary figure, Tristram Coffin, whose research struck onto the attitude of lawyers close to the Department and their grave misgivings with the Attorney General's slap-dash "indifference to the restraints of the law" that he is supposed to represent.

Coffin offers one typical quote: "He has a great record in civil rights, but almost no feeling for civil liberties."

Civil rights it should be pointed out has become a kind of cover term for the abuses of the civil rights specifically of Negroes in the South—at least it has become this in Washington.

To genuine liberals, of course, civil rights are still civil rights, and what is really being said here is that Robert Kennedy is all-out for the civil rights of southern Negroes, but has no feeling for civil rights in the broad sense and on broad principles.

These quotes tie in with the comments of experienced professionals about the new "tone" of the various boards and commissions which have such great power over our whole communications, transport, power and other industries in this country—sometimes by resigning board members as have been quoted here before.

This has since been underlined by the investigation imposed on the broadcast industry (slaves to U.S. licensing procedures) by the FCC in Omaha without any apparent purpose except to terrorize the license holders. This was a probe into programing, and far from meeting any public demand for such or public protest against any broadcasting condition in Omaha, it was conducted in defiance of widespread public outcry against such an invasion which even found its way into official protests by public bodies local and State, as well as a host of civil and religious organizations.

The folks who told me that they are afraid the eventual reaction to the arrogant and dictatorial tone growing in Washington will injure them and their political position, too, apparently have reason for their fears.

Americans do react to ruthless, arrogant abuse of power as rapidly as they actually see it in action, and the way things are going more and more Americans are being exposed to it these days.

Kept Men and the Rover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 12. It points out the managed news policies of the administration, and a welcome departure by William McChesney Martin:

KEPT MEN AND THE ROVER

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,—"But my true love's a rover," wrote Erna St. Vincent Millay—not in celebration of Federal Reserve System Chairman William McChesney (Bill) Martin, and his independent testimony before the Joint Cogressional Economic Committee, but that's how the poet's song rang to one fed-up reporter.

All week the consorts and kept men of the New Frontier had been vowing their fidelity and hugging the hearth that warms their egos.

Call fidelity a good thing in matrimony. Praise the ties-that-bind the honest husband and mate. But when you find conformity and brainwashed yea-saying in the intellectual community, look out.

When you find men whose opinions are worthless before a congressional committee unless the views are freely bestowed and believably at variance, give me the loose-footed rover who follows his heart and mind.

It was a sickly and sycophant procession of apron-string economists who sang for their suppers. There was the scholar, Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In order to justify the administration's tax-cut, debt-building, deficit-accepting $99 billion budget, Heller, had to perform an act of matricide upon Mother America.

The old dame has always believed in putting pennies away in the cookie jar for a rainy day. While never being ungenerous to her thriftless sons and scapegrace neighbors overseas, the matriarchal spirit of America has been for thrift, honor, frugality, and solvency.

But Heller couldn't be faithful to his corner in the White House without taking a slam at the old lady who reared us all. So he curled a lip at her.

He spoke against the "Puritan ethic" (although the local press caught him saying "Puritan effort") which is the admonition to pay your debts and shame the Devil who tempts you to pass them on to your children and neighbors.

Other administration house pets mewed and purred their keeper's line. Treasury Secretary Dillon, Commerce Secretary Hodges, Labor Secretary Wirtz, and the President's new man on the Reserve Board, George Mitchell, who could see no danger of inflation in our profligate spending and two-handed borrowing amid the I O U's of a $300 billion national debt.

Only Bill Martin among the Federal-job witnesses to date showed a rollicking unconcern as to where his next bed and breakfast as a Government official would come from.

Not that he had his foot on the automatic opposition button, or was objecting just to object to the President's fiscal plans.

He acknowledged that we have a "helter-skelter array of taxes" and that perhaps it "could be improved and straightened out" by tax reform.

But he didn't go along with the doubling up of a $13,500 million cut in taxes and a planned deficit of $11,900 million for 1964 with future deficits in plain view.

He spoke for a relatively tight-money policy, payoff of debt out of individual and corporate savings rather than by still looser credits.

He said: "The Federal Reserve Board sits under a sword of Damocles with two time bombs"—one, the inflation threat, the other continuing imbalance of international payments.

Martin is not an extremist. He is not a platitudinist about old-fashioned penny-pinching. But among these hog-tied apologists for White House spend and elect, he seemed foot free and nobody owns me.

That's how a man of intellect should always be.

Consideration of Location of Proposed New Customs Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following exchange of correspondence between Mayor Samuel Yorty, of Los Angeles, and Bureau of Customs Commissioner Philip Nichols, Jr., regarding the current stage of consideration of the location of the proposed new customs facility for the Los Angeles area.

It is my sincere hope that this correspondence and the constructive assistance of all interested parties in this matter will bring the problem to an expeditious and agreeable solution.

The correspondence follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. SAM YORTY,
Mayor, City of Los Angeles,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MAYOR YORTY: In our search for a suitable harbor area customhouse site, we are still considering the land made available by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles at Reeves Field, Terminal Island. I am anxious to clarify the exact terms on which this site will be offered to the Government.

There appears to have been some misunderstanding as to the nature of the facilities we plan to provide in the Federal office building in the Los Angeles Civic Center. The reference in my telegram of December 4, 1962, to "an office * * * in downtown area to receive entries and payments" was not intended to imply a two-man facility. We have requested from the General Services Administration sufficient space for 10 offices, totaling 3,250 square feet and employing 19 people, to take care of customs business in the Los Angeles downtown area. (This does not include the appraiser's mail division which will employ approximately 29 people and occupy an area of 29,000 square feet.) The number of persons employed would, of course, be subject to adjustment in relation to the amount of business handled through the downtown office. In any case, it is our intention to provide facilities adequate to handle all entries and payments presented at this office. It would be folly to open an office and not provide personnel to staff it.

With the above in mind, please let me know whether the city of Los Angeles is willing, without conditions precedent or subsequent, to deed the Reeves Field property to the U.S. Government in fee simple for use as a site for the headquarters facility for Customs Collection District No. 27.

Since both Customs and the General Services Administration are anxious to settle on a final choice of site so that concrete plans for construction can be started, I would appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP NICHOLS, Jr.,
Commissioner of Customs.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 8, 1963.

Mr. PHILIP NICHOLAS, Jr.,
Commissioner of Customs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: In reply to your letter of February 5, I am happy to note that you are still considering the Reeves Field Terminal Island location for a harbor area customhouse.

In this regard we have had some encouraging news regarding the tolls for customs cars crossing the Vincent Thomas Bridge. Attached please find a copy of a ruling by the attorney general of the State of California on this matter.

The ruling, briefly, states that customs may apply for a reduced toll prior to the opening of the bridge for traffic. The toll bridge authority may grant a toll reduction for customs cars if it is determined, after study, that such a reduction would not affect the aggregate total revenue needed from the bridge for bond retirement. While this does not constitute the free or token toll arrangement you were hopeful for, it is more of a concession than had been considered possible when legal authorities were first queried on this subject.

Your letter asks if the city of Los Angeles is still willing to deed the Reeves Field property to the Government for a harbor area customs site. The offer of the Reeves Field site is still a valid offer.

While I do not desire to appear to impose flat conditions on said offer, I do wish to reemphasize my request that adequate customs facilities be retained in the central Los Angeles area.

A downtown customs office with 19 employees—as referred to in your letter—would not constitute the adequate facilities required by the persons involved directly with foreign trade in Los Angeles. The objection is not based on the number of employees, but on the inadequacy of such an office to perform the functions required for efficient and prompt handling of import and export transactions.

Your letter states that it is your intention to provide facilities adequate to handle all entries and payments. However, the adequate facilities, which I have previously requested and which have been recently requested by a Los Angeles City Council resolution, involve the entire customs complex.

It is apparent that 19 customs employees in the entry and moneys and accounts divisions would be inadequate to perform functions that now require more than 200 employees in various divisions. Without the availability of the persons in the outside division, and of the records maintained by the liquidating division, and without the readily available services of the appraiser, the handling of customs transactions would

be a very cumbersome process. In effect, this reduction of personnel would make it impossible for foreign traders to transact their business in the downtown area as they are now doing.

This is the important factor as I have repeatedly said; I do not believe persons engaged in customs transactions in the central portion of Los Angeles should be forced to move to the harbor area in order to conduct their business because of refusal of the Federal Government to continue to provide adequate customs services in central Los Angeles, where most customs users are and wish to remain.

The fact that such a move would result in the hampering of foreign trade was recognized on page 9 of your report to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated June 5, 1961, where you stated:

"There can be no doubt that if customs were located at the harbor together with all the other participants in import transactions, it would be more efficient. It may even be conceded that there would be more facility in some intra-custom transactions, if customs alone were moved. But customs would not be more efficient, regarded as a participant in the total flow of import and export documents, and that is the kind of efficiency that needs consideration, unless the function of customs is to obstruct trade, a theory that has of late years not been admitted. Businessmen (except those of the harbor area) refer to a possible move of customs to the harbor in terms of its inconvenience to them. It should not therefore be concluded that the objections of customs are merely altruistic. One proper function of the collector of customs is to encourage the commerce of the port, consistent with protection of the revenues. It does not encourage the commerce of the port to delay and hamper it."

On the same page you also describe what would happen if entries alone were made downtown, as follows:

"If the customhouse were moved arbitrarily to the harbor area, the collector would be confronted with a demand he would find it impossible to resist, that he should at least allow to exist downtown, a counter to receive entries. Otherwise the filing of 9 entries out of 10 would mean a trip of 44 miles. But once this downtown entry division was established it would receive over 90 percent of all the entries made, judging by the comparable figures for export declarations, which can be filed either at San Pedro or downtown. In fiscal 1961 to April 30, 74,381 export declarations were filed downtown, and 5,844 at San Pedro. Thus the collector would have to move most of his entry officers and his money and accounts division back downtown. Because liquidators have to help the entry officers in rush periods, the liquidation division would follow. So far as concerns inside activities, the harbor customhouse would be a shell."

This statement was a clear recognition that the establishment of only an entry division downtown would eventually require the other facilities of the customs complex to be moved back downtown in order to make an effective and efficient operation. It seems to me your observation also indicates an awareness that the adequate facilities required include all the customs services presently available to the foreign trade community in downtown Los Angeles.

The volume of foreign commerce handled by our port and airport is increasing each year. Additional facilities at the harbor can certainly be justified. It is my belief that these additional facilities for the harbor should supplement the adequate facilities required in downtown Los Angeles—not replace them and thereby disrupt our foreign trade community.

It is not my intention, however, to suggest where the headquarters or office of the collector of customs for this district should be located. If it is the desire of customs and the present collector, who is from Long Beach, that this headquarters office be located in the harbor customhouse facility I would certainly have no objection.

Your report of June 5 was made as a result of your personal survey of the situation and presents a fair and complete view of the situation presently existing in Los Angeles. There has been no change in the situation since your 1961 report and no change in the views of the vast majority of customs users.

The harbor area should be given whatever customs services are required and desired for that area and the overwhelming majority of customs users who are concentrated, and desire to remain, in the central area of Los Angeles should be allowed to continue to receive the adequate services which they now receive in the downtown area.

It seems vitally important to me that our port be encouraged to continue to expand—not frustrated or hampered by any relocation of facilities which would adversely affect our international trade.

I hope that the above makes clear my stand on the offer of the Reeves Field Terminal Island site and my specific desires regarding adequate customs facilities that should be retained in the central Los Angeles area.

I cannot understand why the Federal Government hesitates to guarantee adequate facilities in central Los Angeles to serve customs users who do not want to either move or suffer needless inconvenience because of a denial of the adequate facilities in close proximity to their offices.

I sincerely believe we are very near to an agreement satisfactory to all concerned in this matter and I am most happy that the toll problem appears far less formidable than we formerly believed. This is progress. So is your willingness to spell out in more detail the type of service to be maintained in central Los Angeles. All that is needed to conclude the matter satisfactorily to everyone is your unqualified assurance of really adequate facilities based upon need at both the Reeves Field site and in central Los Angeles.

Permit me to take this opportunity to thank you for your patient effort to solve the customs service problem in an all round satisfactory manner.

Sincerely,

SAM YORTY,
Mayor.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, our foreign aid program is known in varying detail throughout the United States. Little known and seldom acknowledged, however, is the fact that other nations are also carrying on similar aid programs. A recent report of the United Nations details the extent of such programs of our allies. Now, Mr. Speaker, I receive a letter from time to time from a constituent wondering whether our foreign aid program is sending the United States to the poorhouse, so to speak. I call attention, therefore, at this time, to a statistic cited by Paul G. Hoffman in his book "World Without Want." Mr. Hoffman points out that the U.S. Government economic aid programs, exclusive of investment in international financial institutions, amounted between 1945 and 1960 to some $50 billion—a large sum, but one which represented less than two-thirds of 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product over the 15-year period. And more than half of this $50 billion sum went to reconstruct mature, but war-ravaged economies of Western European countries. I point this out as a means of placing our aid program in prospective. Under unanimous consent, I include a United Press International news article, appearing in the February 13, 1963, edition of the Washington Post, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

(By Donald R. Shanor)

The U.S. allies, which received billions in U.S. aid to help their postwar recovery, now are aiding poorer nations in public and private aid programs estimated at $5 billion a year.

France is building hospitals, docks, dams, and roads throughout Africa. Scandinavian doctors are training Koreans and Tanganyikans. Japanese experts are teaching Indians and Ceylonese how to process fish. West German funds are helping finance Iran's development plans. British technicians are helping solve health, transport, and industrial problems from Asia to South America.

President Kennedy has asked these nations to shoulder a larger share of the aid burden. There has been little direct response to his appeal since it was made last month, but the amount of aid given the developing nations by the Allies has been expanding annually.

AIMS ARE EXPRESSED

Allied leaders have made it clear that their stake in the development of the new nations is as great as the American stake in the recovery of Europe and Japan in the postwar years. Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda of Japan said at a recent news conference:

"We are not extending economic aid simply because President Kennedy is asking us to. Japan is not behind other advanced countries in extending economic aid.

"I believe that economic aid is the way to prosperity for Japan * * *. By improving the welfare of the developing countries, Japan hopes to strengthen the free world."

The Japanese Foreign Office said Japan's aid would be increased in response to the President's appeal. West Germany and Britain, two of Europe's leaders in the program, already have made expansion plans. But France, Europe's No. 1 source of aid, hopes to cut back in the current year, which may cancel out any other increases.

United Nations figures for 1961, the latest full-year information available, placed France at the head of the public aid list with more than $952 million. West Germany followed with $573 million, and then came Britain with $445 million and Japan with $231.6 million.

PRIVATE SOURCES HELP

These figures are only for government aid. The financial help from private investors in Europe and Japan in that year is estimated at about the same as the government total, or about $2.5 billion.

For comparison purposes, the United States contributed $3.414 billion, according to the U.N. survey, or more than all its allies combined. The Soviet Union and its satel-

lites, it is estimated, spend $1 billion a year on aid.

Britain and France concentrate on helping their former colonies, where they still have strong ties of trade and culture. Japan gives most of its aid to southeast Asia, some of it as reparations for World War II damage to occupied nations.

West Germany, with no recent colonial past, is more flexible in its programs, granting aid to any nation outside the Communist bloc that can show a need, and attaching few strings.

The Common Market Development Fund, which started this year, may be a means of extending this flexibility. France already has made plans to channel more of its aid to Africa through this Fund. The six member nations of the Market will contribute $703 million for a 5-year period.

FRANCE GIVES ESTIMATE

France estimates it has spent $7 billion in aid to its oversea territories, now mostly independent, since 1946, and says it devotes more of its gross national product to aid, 2.41 percent, than any other nation. Britain publishes no comparable figures. West Germany says it has given out $3.8 billion in development aid in the same period.

Besides the United States, France, Britain, West Germany, and Japan provide most of the men and money for these projects. But smaller nations like Israel, Austria, and the Scandinavian countries are playing an important part.

Israel sends experts to many African nations and Iran, passing along the knowledge it has gained in building industry and growing crops in the desert. Denmark hopes to spend 1 percent of its gross national product on aid soon, and has a plan of private fund-raising matched by Government grants.

Austria's program shows the direct link between American aid to Europe and European aid to the underdeveloped nations.

Since 1961, it has agreed to turn over an essential part of its remaining Marshall plan funds to poorer nations. Last year, it lent $5 million of its $40 million of Marshall plan money to India, and plans to repeat this year.

The Russians Are Still There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, never before Cuba has the United States blundered not only militarily and politically but morally as well. The loss of Cuba nearly matches the loss of China, but even China was not protected by the Monroe Doctrine.

In 140 years of the Monroe Doctrine even as mighty a dictator as Napoleon III of France was sent packing from Mexico. But not only did Cuba become Communist, Khrushchev and the Russians walked in and stayed. Discussions of 4 or 40 missiles remaining on Cuba obscure this fundamental fact.

American foreign policy in the Caribbean based on the Monroe Doctrine has been replaced by television public relations, news management, rewritten history, guilty consciences and ransom payments.

Before the Cuban problem can be morally and resolutely tackled, past errors have to be admitted, the blame squarely accepted. Cannot this courage be expected from the executive department?

Instead of weak alibis and sneaky stories, Americans are interested in where we go from here.

The following editorial is from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

DIPLOMACY BY RANSOM

Now that the fantastic barter of $53 million in goods (plus $2,900,000 in cash) for the 1,113 Bay of Pigs prisoners has been completed, what do the American people think of this weird transaction which sounds more like Homer's account of the Trojan war than the 20th century?

Time was when every American schoolboy thrilled with pride on first hearing "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Diplomacy by ransom has now become an American policy and has been increasing as Communist regimes returned to barbarism. Chinese residing in Hong Kong or California are probably still paying regularly just to keep relatives alive in Red China prison camps.

In 1951, the United States itself paid $123,605 to Red Hungary for the return of four of our airmen who had been forced to land on its soil.

Castro's price was even greater than that $30,000 per man, although the actual cost can never be determined in such a complicated transaction. Wholesale prices and retail prices would have to be figured, tax deductions considered, services rendered but not charged for included.

Never in all history, we can be sure, has a mighty nation forked over so much to a little island neighbor to spring its own citizens from the dungeons of a bearded madman.

Apart from that, what do the American people think about how their Government, pretending not to have any part in it, surreptitiously manipulated the transaction?

When talk of ransoming the prisoners was revived several months ago, it became obvious that something big was going on. The committee which sought to raise the $28 million first demanded had given up when it couldn't come even close to it.

If, all of a sudden, $53 million was going to be raised where little part of it could be found before, everyone knew the hand of the U.S. Government was bound to be in it somewhere.

So it was, as now we know.

With the administration afraid to pay blackmail directly because of public and congressional objection, it apparently pulled every string in its vast arsenal of power to get all the goods and money needed contributed by private citizens and corporations.

(Possibly the administration got the idea when it employed Department of Justice pressure to roll back steel prices in 1961 without any legal justification for such action.)

Arranging first with Internal Revenue to permit the contributions to be channeled through the American Red Cross where blackmail could be labeled "charity" for tax deduction purposes, it next got officials in various departments of the Government to line up likely prospects for everything Castro wanted.

Drugs and medical supplies constituted the bulk of his demands, and, boy, oh boy, how the pharmaceutical industry had been softened up for this operation.

The Kefauver committee had been poundnig away at it incessantly with its charges of exorbitant drug prices. The thalidomide scare had brought forth public demand for the most stringent pure food and drugs law.

Much better than a blackjack would be a telephone call from the Department of Justice to get contributions from these sources.

Next in importance to the ransom effort was the transportation industry, always subject to Federal regulation and always having antitrust laws hanging over its head. The enormous supplies contributed by the drug manufacturers would, of course, have to be assembled and transported for free.

The railroads, the truckers, the airlines and shipping companies responded to the Department of Justice's call just as generously as the pharmaceutical industry.

More than 600,000 pounds of cargo was flown by eight domestic airlines, without cost. Nineteen railroads provided 80 boxcars on a special run, without cost. Eight trucking firms moved 420,000 pounds, without cost. Fifteen shipping companies teamed up to provide the ship to move the cargo to Cuba, without cost.

As for the $2,900,000 in cash which Castro demanded at the last moment, its sources haven't been disclosed. It is not difficult to guess that most, if not all of it, came from firms doing business with the Government who were scarcely in a position to say no to their best customer, regardless of their personal feelings toward the ransom.

Attorney General Bobby Kennedy, however, is largely credited with raising the money, which is said to have included a $1 million contribution from one man, a $1 million loan from another.

The American people, we know, are as glad as they can be that the Cuban prisoners have been freed.

They well deserve the accolade of this Nation, which President and Mrs. Kennedy gave them in that moving ceremony in the Orange Bowl at Miami Saturday—the admiration of people the whole world over who prize liberty above all else.

As freedom fighters, they had sailed off with high hope and courage to liberate their homeland—with the blessings of the U.S. Government, which had largely arranged the venture.

And they had been led to the slaughter from Castro's few planes because the air cover they had been promised was not forthcoming from the mightiest air force in the world.

Even so, this was a shameful price the country had to pay for the President's mistake, and this was a shameful way in which our Government skirted its own laws to pay it.

Tides of Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, I had the privilege of speaking before the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York, on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuanian Independence Day falls between Lincoln's and Washington's Birthdays, and should be remembered by all Americans as an occasion when people in another land proclaimed their independence from oppression and tyranny.

In my remarks, I tried to outline some aspects of Lithuanian history and to describe their long struggle for independence. This history will be interesting to my colleagues:

TIDES OF TYRANNY

(By Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY)

For those of us gathered here today and for the more than 2 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, February 16 is indeed a historic occasion, a date which celebrates heroism in the past, and which symbolizes hope for the future. For 45 years Lithuanians whenever they might be have together recalled with patriotic pride that day in 1918 when individual valor brought national victory to a small by ancient land long dominated by despicable despotism. In view of the significance of that day and the solemnity of this occasion, it is indeed a distinct honor for me to join with you in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

The tyranny which enslaves Lithuania today completely overshadows the tyranny which oppressed that country in the past. But we should not forget that the heroic history of Lithuania is at the same time a tragic epic of foreign aggressions repeated so often that, when we consider this history, we might well speak of the incessant "tides of tyranny." February 16, 1918, marks the greatest chapter in this saga, a chapter in which those evil tides emerged from beneath the oppressive waters of tyranny. Today I propose to review briefly this epic struggle of Lithuania to maintain her identity and to defend her independence against centuries of aggression and oppression. Only when we recall these centuries of struggle which produced the victory of 1918, only then do we recognize the full significance of February 16. And only then can we realize the magnitude of the tremendous task which is ours today, the task of turning back and stemming forever these "tides of tyranny."

Lithuania is endowed with two fatal attractions: strategic location and natural wealth. Situated on the shores of the Baltic midway between Berlin and Moscow, Lithuania is a rich land of farms, forests, and lakes—more than 2,000 of them I understand. The very first mention of Lithuania in recorded history—made by Tacitus, the famous Roman historian—was in praise of Lithuanian farming. The fertile soil, the timber, the outlet on the Baltic—each was by itself treasure enough to motivate foreign aggression against Lithuania.

The primary perpetrator of such aggression has always been and remains today just one country: Russia. Long before the Lithuanian tribes were forged into one nation the country was struggling against domination by its Russian neighbors from the east. Finally in the 14th century the people of Lithuania began to turn back these early waves of aggression, waves which were but an ominous warning of later tides to come.

By the end of the 14th century, Lithuania had driven the Russians back to Moscow and had secured for itself the power necessary to protect its territories and traditions. Following the dynastic union with Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a marvelous and mighty state stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north to the Black Sea in the south. Within these boundaries the old and rich culture of the Lithuanian people attained brilliant heights, heights which it would attain again only after similar suffering and struggle. This comparative calm, this peaceful prosperity lasted little more than a century.

By 1500 the Russian tide had ebbed and was now again sweeping back across the northern and central plains of Europe. For 40 of the 90 years between 1492 and 1582 Lithuania found itself at war with the Muscovite aggressors. The czars alleged that Russia desired only an outlet on the Baltic Sea; however, after Peter the Great had taken Riga from Sweden and had built his own window on the Baltic at St. Petersburg, the Russian rulers showed that their appetite for aggression was far from satisfied.

In 1795 this aggression came quickly and brutally to the surface: the shameful third partition of Poland also became the fateful third of our many tides of tyranny, tyranny which was to now completely engulf Lithuania and enslave its people for 123 years.

Not that the people of Lithuania willingly or weakly succumbed to such oppression. Throughout the course of their long history they have fought fiercely to overthrow the repressive rule of the ruthless Russian czars. In 1812 Lithuania experienced a mere moment of relative freedom as Napoleon advanced against Moscow. The fate of that historic campaign has been recorded with stark simplicity upon a monument which still stands in Vilnius. On one side the inscription reads "Napoleon Bonaparte passed this way in 1812 with 400,000 men"; on the other side it continues "Napoleon Bonaparte passed his way in 1812 with 9,000 men." But within 20 years of that setback the winds of freedom were again attempting to sweep back the tides of oppression. In that year of 1831 Lithuanians lent active aid to Poland in a revolution against the heavy hand of Russian reaction and only the brute force of 150,000 Russian troops was capable of quelling their spirited struggle. Thereafter oppression was increased and intensified: Lithuanian lands were confiscated and then delivered into the hands of Russian nobles, the University of Vilnius closed, and finally Russians were everywhere designated to control the government, the army and the church.

When revolution erupted for a third time in 1863–64, the czar finally realized that military might had failed to conquer Lithuania's resistance. Suppressions, hangings, exiles to Siberia, czarist brutality failed to quell the indomitable love of freedom and self-determination of the gallant Lithuanian peoples.

World War I and the Russian revolution furnished the long-sought opportunity for which generations had been striving with such courage and fortitude. With the Proclamation of Independence at Vilnius on February 16, 1918, and the treaty of peace of July 12, 1920, which accorded full recognition as an independent state, Lithuania reemerged to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

During her short-lived independence the country grew, prospered, and left an indelible influence for good upon the onrushing course of world events. Her domestic economy and foreign trade expanded mightily. Long-needed social services were instituted, her cultural life thrived under peaceful surroundings. Education once again became a reality for her people and agriculture her principal industry greatly benefited.

But Lithuanian freedom was tragically shortlived. For in June of 1940 the armies of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany flagrantly violated the canons of international law and the rights of man and brutally subjected the Lithuanian people to a tyranny as cold-blooded and remorseless as any act of aggression committed in this century of total war. The tragic events that followed are too well known ever to be forgotten.

The soul of a proud and great nation lives on beneath the brutal yoke of Soviet tyranny. It lives in the hearts of Lithuanian countrymen who cling to the motherland in the face of Communist enslavement. It lives in our own country where the brave liberty-loving peoples of Lithuanian ancestry have contributed so much to our own national experience and have given so tirelessly of themselves to the communities in which they live. It lives on in the richness and variety of the oldest living European language. It continues to live through the darkness of Soviet oppression keeping a prayerful vigil at the ramparts of national destiny sustaining the light of liberty which must never be extinguished and which will once again burn brightly to herald the arrival of a new dawn of freedom for Lithuania. Only then, will the oppressive "tides of tyranny" be turned back forever.

Observance of 45th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 17, I had the pleasure of addressing a rally of Lithuanians of the Detroit area, and also had the high honor of speaking along with Juliaus Smetonos, the son of the first and only President of the Republic of Lithuania.

This heroic country, swallowed by Russia in 1940 and forced to exist under Communist rule, has many patriots throughout the world struggling to again some day see their homeland free.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted Sunday, on observance of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's independence; a proclamation by Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh designating February 16 as Republic of Lithuania Day, and a proclamation by the Governor of Michigan, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation freed itself from Tsarist Russia domination and proclaimed its independence as a free democratic republic which was ultimately recognized by all of the great powers of the world; and

Whereas during its 22 years of freedom and independence from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania proved itself as a free and independent nation, and

Whereas in spite of agreements to the contrary, the Soviet Union forcibly incorporated Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, thereby depriving the Lithuanian people of their basic human rights and private property; deported those who opposed the sovietization of their homeland and continue the enslavement of Lithuania and the exploitation of its people to this very day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby rededicate ourselves to the cause of liberating Lithuania from the yoke of communism so that she may once again rejoin the family of free nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and for the numerous contributions to, and sympathy for, the cause of Lithuania's never-ending battle to regain its freedom and independence; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the President and Secretary of State of the United States of America to direct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to confront the members of that august body with the facts regarding the Soviet colonization of Estonia, Lat-

via, Lithuania and the other captive nations and at the same time demand that the Soviet Union immediately remove its armed forces from Lithuania and allow the people to establish their own government; and be it also

Resolved, That inasmuch as Lithuania's people, at great personal risk and peril determinedly strive to hear radio broadcasts from the free world, that we earnestly request the Free Europe Committee to make Lithuanian language broadcasts to Soviet occupied Lithuania to demonstrate that Lithuania has not been forgotten and that the United States of America is determined that she will be liberated from Soviet colonization and oppression; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States and copies thereof to the Vice President, Secretary of State, the U.S. Senators and Congressmen of this State, to the United Nations and to the press, radio, and television.

Adopted this 17th day of February 1963 A.D. at Detroit, Mich.

MAYOR'S PROCLAMATION ON REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1963

Whereas on the 16th day of February 1918 the Lithuanian Taryba proclaimed to the world, in the oldest living European language, the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian occupation; and

Whereas during a score of years of independence, Lithuania demonstrated her ability to grow, prosper and advance, and to become an active member of the League of Nations; and

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian origin and ancestry, or in sympathy with its plight, helped Lithuania establish its independence and then contributed generously to the development of its natural resources, industry and life; and

Whereas Lithuania, with her sister republics of Latvia and Estonia, was the first to disappear behind the Iron Curtain, and to suffer and expose the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia, and thus to inform the world of the aims and techniques of communism:

Therefore, I, Jerome P. Cavanagh, mayor of the city of Detroit, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1963 to be Republic of Lithuania Day in Detroit, and urge the people of this city to join with their fellow citizens of Lithuanian ancestry in commemorating the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, dramatizing the heroic hope and prayer that freedom will soon find rebirth in their mother country.

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The year 1918 will live forever in the minds and hearts of the great and courageous people of Lithuania, an ancient country which played such an important role in the development of modern Europe. For it was on February 16, 1918, that Lithuania became a free and independent member of the modern family of nations. This freedom tragically did not last but for 22 years. In June of 1940 the men, women, and children in the little Baltic nation were swallowed up by the totalitarian powers of the Soviet Union.

Significantly, the United States has never recognized this ruthless takeover and today the people of Michigan and the rest of the United States yearn with the free Lithuanians living here that freedom once again will come to their brothers and sisters now enslaved in their native land. Together we will work toward a rebirth of freedom with the knowledge that history teaches us that the spirit of choice is eternal.

Let the freedom enjoyed by the native Lithuanian sons and daughters in Michigan be the beacon which their friends follow. The men and women of Lithuanian descent living within Michigan have made endless contributions in whatever endeavors they have undertaken.

Therefore, I, George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1963, as Lithuanian Independence Day and do urge all citizens of Michigan to join with their Lithuanian neighbors and together rededicate themselves to the cause of freedom for those members of captive nations like Lithuania today.

Foreign Policy Statement by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should, in my view, be acquainted with the foreign policy statement issued on February 9 by the distinguished Governor of New York. Governor Rockefeller has made a number of cogent points with regard to the recent conduct of our foreign relations by the administration. When the Canadian affair follows so closely on the heels of the Skybolt controversy with Great Britain and disputes with France over the organization of NATO defense, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that something is indeed very wrong—both with our foreign policy and with the organizational machinery which implements it.

Bipartisanship in foreign policy has served us well in the decades following World War II. But bipartisanship does not demand that we assent to serious errors in judgment. On the contrary, bipartisanship can only be effective in an atmosphere of constructive criticism and discussion. Governor Rockefeller's sensible and thoughtful approach indicated his understanding of this principle.

Some Members of the House may recall that during the last Congress I was joined by a number of my Republican colleagues in a series of speeches on foreign policy. Our goal was to call attention to serious problems in our foreign relations and to encourage intelligent discussion and analysis by the Congress. This goal is no less important now. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Governor Rockefeller's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I urge all of colleagues to read it and give careful thought to the questions raised:

STATEMENT BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

All Americans concerned about the future of freedom must be deeply worried about the present disarray within the Atlantic Alliance.

In the space of 2 months, the United States has been embroiled in heated and public controversy with Great Britain on the Skybolt issue, with Canada on the nuclear defense of North America, and with France on the organization of Europe and the defense of the Atlantic area.

In less than a year, the American Government has also publicly quarreled with Chancellor Adenauer over negotiations in Berlin, and has affronted the Netherlands by placing expediency over principle in West New Guinea.

Of course, it is the duty of the President of the United States to defend American interests as he conceives them. He must uphold our country's defense and its political and economic interests—if necessary, even against our allies.

In common with all Americans, I want the President to succeed, for if he succeeds, the country succeeds. Last October, in common with all Americans, I strongly supported the President's action in seeking the removal of Soviet missile bases from Cuba.

But by the same token, where it appears that the course the President is pursuing will lead to failure, it is the duty of every concerned citizen to speak out plainly in the national interest, to voice his misgivings, and to suggest alternatives.

We must never lose sight of the fact that one of our most precious assets is the unity of the free nations. Preservation and strengthening of that unity is clearly in the self-interest of the United States.

It is indisputably in the interest of the United States that Western Europe be strong and self-reliant—an interest consistently upheld by two previous administrations since World War II.

It is in the interest of the national security of the United States—and in the interest of Europe—that Europe share in its own defense and work with us for the achievement of positive ends.

While this administration has paid lip-service to these principles, as the President did again at his press conference on February 7, we must realize that an important reason for the disarray in the West is the administration's failure to live up to these principles.

Unity is not achieved by proclamation. A "grand design" does not come into being by enunciating the phrase.

Partnership is not furthered by the sudden and unilateral abrogation, without consultation, of an understanding to supply a weapon around which the strategic forces of our closest ally, Great Britain, were to be built.

Unity is not enhanced by interfering publicly in the sensitive domestic issues of our northern neighbor, Canada.

A grand design is not established by public attacks on the leader of a great and friendly country, France—a leader who, moreover, in Winston Churchill's phrase, "has not always been wrong."

The official and semiofficial criticisms of President de Gaulle as representing obsolete ideas, as seized by Napoleonic visions and determined to make separate deals with the Soviets, are unworthy of the foreign policy of a great country.

It behooves us to remember that this is the man who stood out against Hitler, who restored to France its dignity, who reduced the Communist threat within his country, and who proved to be one of our stanchest friends in the critical hours of the Cuban crisis.

It is not necessary to agree with all of President de Gaulle's actions or formulations. I believe, for example, that he was wrong in vetoing Britain's entry into the Common Market. But we must also face the fact that a policy unable to deal with great men may lack great conceptions.

Strong men are likely to be difficult. They are also likely to prove more reliable friends in times of crises than those who adjust to every passing pressure.

Before engaging in hints about the possibility of separate French deals with the Soviets, we should recall that it was the

present administration which set the precedent.

In 1961, it negotiated with the Soviets over Berlin against the wishes of France and against the better judgment of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The administration then strongly implied that it was ready to enter into arrangements which would involve recognition of Communist Eastern Germany in some form, and thus to weaken our longstanding commitment to German unification.

Since Cuba, there have been several secret exchanges of letters between the President and Premier Khrushchev, of which only those dealing with nuclear testing have become public and then only because Premier Khrushchev released them.

A policy which in the space of less than a year has produced disputes with so many key allies as France, Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada is bound to cause deep concern about the unity of the free world.

My concern, however, is not the past. The urgent need today is to strengthen the community of free nations, based on respect for diversity and the consensus of shared aspirations of free peoples.

This is the great responsibility and challenge before the West. Its realization is being impeded by two great controversies: the organization of nuclear defense, and the organization of Europe—the Common Market.

I will discuss the issue of nuclear defense first, because this issue has torn NATO the longest—and led to the division which contributed to the exclusion of Britain from the Common Market.

I. THE ORGANIZATION OF NUCLEAR DEFENSE

The issue of nuclear defense involves highly complicated technical questions, but the basic point in dispute is relatively simple. The United States has taken the view that the American nuclear arsenal is ample for all purposes of the Alliance. Our European allies have insisted that they must have the possibility to resist with their own nuclear arms the Soviet weapons deployed against them—which they have been told exceed in number those aimed at the United States.

The issue is thus not so much technical as political and psychological. Our European allies—and in this respect Great Britain has held essentially the same view as France—have maintained that they must share in the responsibility for nuclear defense. This was well expressed by Viscount Hailsham of Great Britain in a recent speech in New York in which he said:

"Have the Americans paused to reflect that an alliance in which all the advanced and sophisticated technologies were left to one of the partners, and the rest were relegated to supply a complement of conventional arms in war, and in commerce a modest contribution of Scotch whisky and compact cars * * * would not ultimately succeed in retaining the loyalty of European electors?"

Much of the nuclear controversy has been caused by the tendency of the present administration to use words like "interdependence" while perpetuating in fact the dependence of the Europeans on American-controlled nuclear weapons.

This becomes clear if we examine the proposals which the present administration has made on the issue of nuclear control.

In May 1961 the President, in a speech at Ottawa, offered to commit five nuclear (Polaris) submarines to NATO and subsequently more. A year later, Secretary of Defense McNamara announced that the five submarines had already been committeed to NATO with more to come.

When we consider what this commitment means, we find that it transfers these submarines from an American admiral acting as U.S. commander in chief, Atlantic, to the same American admiral, using the same headquarters, acting as NATO supreme commander, Atlantic.

In other words, the submarines really never left U.S. control. The announced assignment to NATO was only symbolic.

Also in May of 1961, the President announced a willingness to consider a NATO nuclear sea-based force "truly multilateral in ownership and control." Since then, this offer has been repeated on the following conditions:

1. If Europe increased its conventional forces;

2. If Europe came up with an acceptable control system for nuclear weapons;

3. If the crews on the submarines represented different nationalities.

We have repeatedly pointed out, however, that we thought a NATO nuclear force militarily unnecessary.

This offer presented our allies with a serious, if not insoluble, dilemma.

Most of our allies disagree with the U.S. insistence on a conventional buildup to begin with. However, if they carried it out, they would have to increase their defense budgets anywhere from 15 to 40 percent (depending on the country) for the conventional buildup alone. To add to these expenditures the very large additional expenditures needed for a multilateral Polaris force put the political leaders of Europe in the position of having to ask their parliaments for budget increases which were (1) enormous and (2) declared by us to be militarily unnecessary as far as atomic weapons were concerned.

This was politically impossible. No wonder many of our allies questioned whether our offer was meant to be accepted or rejected.

If we turn to the purely military problem, the situation is equally confused. Most U.S. military leaders have serious reservations about relying primarily on a sea-based nuclear force for the defense of the NATO area. Almost all of them consider the notion of submarine crews of mixed nationalities a monstrosity.

It requires 18 months to train a purely American Polaris crew, and up to 12 months just to select it. To force crews of different nationalities to live aboard a submarine for months at a time will present enormous problems of morale.

And what would actually be accomplished? Surely the threat of mutiny is not an appropriate means to arrive at the control of weapons which affect the vital interests of each ally.

Nuclear partnership of the Atlantic Alliance cannot be established through the use of technical gimmicks. It requires a political solution.

With respect to the political control of a multilateral force, the administration's attitude has been equally ambiguous. To begin with, it has really proposed two multilateral forces: (a) one composed of submarines manned by mixed crews of the nonnuclear NATO powers and (b) another composed of the national forces of the nuclear powers, France and Britain together with a United States contribution.

In both instances, we have offered to match the contribution of the European nations. The net effect of this offer would be to leave 95 percent of our nuclear force outside NATO control while all of the nuclear forces of our allies would become subject to multilateral control.

This might not be decisive had we ever offered any idea of what we mean by multilateral control. In effect, we have asked countries which do not possess nuclear submarines, missiles, or warheads to devise a control mechanism for these weapons on a multinational basis.

Considering the difficulty of devising a control mechanism even on a national basis, it is no accident that no progress has been made on the organization of a NATO nuclear force.

Then there is the problem of the U.S. veto. So far, we have insisted on retaining a veto over the use of the nuclear warheads in the projected NATO force. Under such circumstances, if we would want to use nuclear weapons and the European allies were to disagree, the NATO nuclear force would be inactive, but we could still use the nuclear weapons of the Strategic Air Command. If the situation were reversed, no nuclear weapons would be used at all.

In other words, the NATO nuclear force proposed by the present administration is not an act of partnership but a device which would give the Europeans only a negative control over the small NATO nuclear force which we have declared militarily unnecessary.

With respect to the other multilateral force—that composed of national contingents—it is important to understand that the administration has consistently attacked the nuclear programs of our allies. President Kennedy has declared the French national nuclear force dangerous and inimical to the Alliance. Secretary McNamara has used similar words and added strictures of his own. Our allies have bitterly resented this intrusion into what they consider their sovereign concerns as free peoples.

Then following the uproar caused by the unilateral U.S. cancellation of Skybolt, the President at Nassau offered Polaris missiles to Prime Minister Macmillan. The same offer was made to France. In addition, France and Britain were to supply their own warheads and submarines, and assign their nuclear forces to a NATO multilateral force.

This sequence of events created a domestic crisis for the Macmillan government, even though the government accepted our offer. France rejected it.

Before we begin reviling France for this action, we must recognize that the Nassau Agreement is a document of extraordinary ambiguities.

It says nothing about who deploys the submarines; how the multilateral force is to be controlled; how national governments can exercise their control. Indeed, since communication to the submarines must be through American channels, it is not clear how Great Britain can exercise its theoretical right to independent action.

Moreover, France has no warheads for Polaris missiles and no prospects of getting them for years to come. It has no submarines in which to install them.

Finally, almost simultaneously with the offer, President Kennedy was exchanging secret letters with Premier Khrushchev about a nuclear test ban treaty. Had these resulted in a treaty and had France gone along—as we urged—France could never have developed the warheads for the missiles which we were offering.

In these circumstances, should we really have been so surprised that our offer was rejected by De Gaulle?

Is it partnership to offer on a take-it-or-leave-it basis a weapons system about which our ally was not consulted, and under conditions which are extremely nebulous?

Would it not have been more statesmanlike to urge Prime Minister Macmillan to use his influence with France to establish a joint—ultimately European—nuclear force to be coordinated with ours in the defense of NATO?

President deGaulle has not rejected cooperation or coordination. On the contrary, he has explicitly affirmed it.

Before engaging in personal attacks, would it not have been wiser to find out how he proposes to coordinate his forces with ours?

To sum up: I strongly believe in the Atlantic Community. But we will not achieve this goal by technical gimmicks or sharp formulas. The basic problem is political. NATO cannot survive on the basis of mutual distrust. If it is painful for us to be accused of unreliability, it is equally galling for countries with the traditions of Great Britain and France to be thought untrustworthy with respect to the possession of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear issue within NATO has arisen because the strongest of our allies are trying to do what we have so often urged—namely, to share in the responsibility for their own defense. This attitude is in our own interest.

I would therefore urge that we take immediate steps to establish a real nuclear defense partnership with Europe. The internal organization of Europe's nuclear power, including Great Britain's, should be left to the Europeans. Our goal should be to coordinate such a European force with ours through the establishment of a political control body within NATO dealing with nuclear matters for the Alliance as a whole.

II. THE COMMON MARKET

For all of us who have admired Great Britain's historic role, it was a source of regret that its entry into the Common Market was thwarted—even if only temporarily. I disagree that Britain would have been a lukewarm member of the European community. On the contrary, I believe that it would have entered Europe whole-heartedly, and that Europe would have benefitted from its wisdom and courage.

Nevertheless, I have serious doubts about the administration's reaction to this event. I do not discover the specifically American interest that leads us to encourage groupings in Europe designed to isolate France or to present Franco-German amity as dangerous to NATO. It is not in the interest of Britain; it is not in the interest of Europe; and above all it is not in our interest to fragment Europe still further.

It is not in the long-term interest of Britain to be pushed into the Common Market by United States pressure. This will reinforce suspicions of Britain's role. It will in the long run embarass Britain. It may split Europe into pro- and anti-American camps on an issue which is most properly a European concern.

To organize or encourage rival blocs in Europe, to imply that there is a choice between France and the United States, is to jeopardize still further all the achievements of the past decade and a half toward European and Atlantic unity. The result may be a resurgence of nationalism throughout Europe. Such an event would be against our national interests.

Instead of a strong partner, we will have to deal with scores of competing rivalries. The Communists would be tempted to exploit our divisions—and the new nations would lose a vital source of strength.

III. CONCLUSION

The disarray in our relations with Europe calls urgent attention to the need for reexamination of our processes of government in the international field.

Something is wrong if, at a moment when Britain's membership in the Common Market hung delicately in the balance, we canceled Skybolt and thus contributed to the collapse of the Common Market negotiations whose success we so urgently desired.

Something is wrong if at a moment when we should be demonstrating the unity of the alliance, we became embroiled with Canada.

Something is plainly wrong in our relationships with France.

The erratic and vacillating nature of our policies—illustrated by the gimmickry of our proposals for the nuclear defense of NATO—calls attention to the need for a clearer determination of national purposes and a strategy to attain them.

The administration has used toward our allies the same ruthless and precipitate methods employed domestically. These actions have shaken confidence—the most precious asset of any leader of an alliance.

The way to deal with the present crisis in the alliance is to avoid recriminations. We will not establish partnership by talking about it in the abstract. The way to counter third force tendencies is to act so that the advantages of united action will always outweigh the temptations of narrower conceptions. This of course requires that we stop acting like a third force.

The temporary failure of Britain's entry into the Common Market must not produce a paralysis in our Atlantic policy. There are a number of things we can do immediately.

We should propose a comprehensive trade agreement with Britain and the Commonwealth to increase free world trade.

The U.S. Trade Expansion Act of last year granted part of its tariff-cutting power to the President on the assumption of Britain's admission to the Common Market. Now there will be far less use for that power unless the Trade Act is amended—something which the President said last Thursday he "had not planned" to seek but "would support it" if the Congress "shows any disposition to favor it."

It seems to me that this is a point on which the President should take vigorous leadership, rather than await congressional initiative.

It is high time for the alliance to create a political body to set common goals and to develop common policies. Bilateralism is dangerous by whomever practiced.

The leadership of a coalition of free countries is of course always far more exacting than the direction of an empire. But we should always remember that the power and purpose generated by the voluntary cooperation of free societies can never be equaled by the reluctant compliance of nations treated like subjects.

Ambassadors of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago Miss Karen Goebel, of Andrews, Ind., stopped by my office with several other Indiana young people who had been selected by the 4-H Foundation to live in the farm areas of India for several months. These young people were so alert and so enthusiastic that they left a lasting impression on me. To me they typified America's youth at their best. I am inserting a copy of a letter which I recently received from Miss Goebel. Surely we owe these young people a vote of thanks for the far-reaching service they are performing and the good will they are fostering for and on behalf of America.

This is the letter:

DEAR MR. ROUSH: A few months ago I came into India having much the same feeling that Columbus must have had back in 1492. I really didn't know what to expect. My experience as an International Farm Youth Exchange delegate has placed me in situations that I never would have been in otherwise, many of them humorous as well as enlightening.

Our program, sponsored by the 4-H Foundation, is dedicated to bringing world peace through creating understandings between the peoples of our countries. This challenge was even more impressive to me when I arrived here and was sent to West Bengal where the spoken language is Bengali. (There are about 845 different dialects spoken in India; and I haven't quite mastered them.) But gradually, by piecing together my family's English and my bit of Bengali, we came out rather well. Living and working along side my family members has brought about understanding even though complete language communication hasn't been possible. When I left my newly found family in West Bengal it was as though I were really leaving my own family that I'd been with all my life. These sad memories of parting will remain, but more prominent now are the happy memories of the 3 plus weeks we spent together.

The hospitality of the Indian people has been beyond my previous hopes. Their warm kindness and consideration has been wonderful and I've been taken as a family member which is my desire throughout my stay.

Hospitality to Americans, in general is definitely on the increase since we've come to India's aid in facing the Chinese menace. This crisis has brought unity among the Indian people themselves as they stand against the Chinese now. This country has many existing conditions which cause diversity, just as is exemplified by the many languages spoken here.

Living here has shown me some of the problems facing India. Feeding her population of 455 million (crowded into an area 40 percent the size of continental United States) is certainly no easy task. I've been living in the village areas and seeing the farmers work in their small plots, and cultivate with their wooden plows and bullocks. The small farms, sometimes less an 1 acre, was one of the first things that impressed me. But when I stopped to realize that 80 percent of India's people depend on the farm for a living—the small farm size is understandable. The fact that the farmland is divided among the sons upon the father's death also encourages this fragmentation and small plots.

I receive many inquiries about the U.S. success in agriculture. These farmers often feel that our mechanized farming" is responsible for our prosperity. It's quite challenging for the block development and extension programs here to convince the people that they are not victims of impossible circumstances beyond their control. Traditional farming methods are gradually being replaced by improved practices as the farmers become more educated. Much of the machinery, considered essential to the American farmer, isn't practical here because of the small holdings. And since there is such a large population, human power is often very satisfactory, for many of our mechanized tasks. With the lack of industry and the illiteracy percent of 70, manual labor on the farm is often the best means available for making a living. I imagine this picture will gradually change though as industry increases and more persons are utilized there.

It's impossible for me to understand all the complications facing India. But she is a country that is progressing and has great potential from what I've seen. Certainly I'm grateful for the experience I'm gaining and the opportunity to represent Indiana as an IFYE delegate.

My album containing photographs of the United States and my home has been of great value to me. Even when I have diffi-

culty talking to my hosts because of the language differences, my album can speak for me and help break the ice. There's always a particularly big cheer when they turn the page and find the large photograph of the Kennedy family which you gave me. Our President is mighty popular over here, and I certainly appreciate the lovely photograph.

My relatives have all written and explained that you're having a cold, cold winter over on that side of the globe. It's hard to realize that, when over here the temperature is about 90° F. during the day. I'm located right along the Arabian seashore now and enjoying the tropical beauty of the date and coconut palms. It's really snowing over there?

Mother just wrote that Donna Jane Gemmer is coming to your office in Washington. I'm wondering if she has started work there already. We've attended the same Sunday school class for years in Huntington. And right now that place seems so far away, but the time here has gone all too fast and in April I'll be back home. Hoping I can stop in at your office when I return to Washington for my evaluation.

Sincerely,

KAREN GOEBEL.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, arms control negotiations have been conducted almost continuously since December 1945. The dates and individuals who represented the United States are listed below. The question which should be utmost in everyone's mind is: What is the best system—is it an agency which reports to the President or the State Department or an agency which reports to the Congress?

The dates, individuals, and other information is as follows:

LIST OF CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON DISARMAMENT IN WHICH BOTH THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION HAVE PARTICIPATED, DECEMBER 1945 TO THE PRESENT

1. Moscow meeting of Foreign Ministers of United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. (December 16–27, 1945).
2. First session of General Assembly, part 1 (January 10 to February 14, 1946).
3. U.N. Atomic Energy Commission (UNAEC) meetings (June 14 to December 31, 1946).
4. First session of General Assembly, part 2 (October 23 to December 16, 1946).
5. Security Counciti meetings (January 9 to March 10, 1947).
6. UNAEC meetings (March 18 to September 11, 1947).
7. U.N. Commission for Conventional Armaments (CCA) meetings (March 24 to June 25, 1947).
8. Security Council meeting (July 8, 1947).
9. CCA meetings (August 20 to December 16, 1947).
10. Second session of General Assembly (September 16 to November 29, 1947).
11. UNAEC meetings (January 16 to May 17, 1948).
12. Security Council meetings (June 11 to 22, 1948).
13. CCA meetings (July 26 to August 17, 1948).
14. Third session of General Assembly, part 1 (September 21 to December 12, 1948).
15. CCA meetings (February 15 to August 1, 1949).
16. UNAEC meetings (February 18 to July 29, 1949).
17. Third session of General Assembly, part 2 (April 5 to May 18, 1949).
18. Six-Power meetings (August 9 to October 24, 1949).
19. Security Council meetings (September 15 to 16, 1949).
20. Fourth session of General Assembly (September 20 to December 10, 1949).
21. Security Council meetings (October 11 to 18, 1949).
22. Six-power meeting (December 20, 1949, to January 19, 1950).
23. CCA meetings (April 27 to August 9, 1950).
24. Fifth session of General Assembly (September 19 to December 15, 1950).
25. Committee of Twelve meetings (February 14 to September 28, 1951).
26. Sixth session of General Assembly (November 6, 1951, to February 5, 1962).
27. Security Council meeting (January 30, 1952).
28. Disarmament Commission meetings (February 4 to June 24, 1952).
29. Security Council meetings (June 18 to July 9, 1952).
30. Disarmament Commission meetings (August 12 to October 9, 1952).
31. Seventh session of General Assembly, part 1 (October 14 to December 22, 1952).
32. Seventh session of General Assembly, part 2 (February 24 to April 23, 1953).
33. Seventh session of General Assembly, part 3 (August 17 to 28, 1953).
34. Disarmament Commission meeting (August 20, 1953).
35. Eighth session of General Assembly (September 15 to December 9, 1953).
36. Berlin Conference of Foreign Ministers of United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and France (January 25 to February 18, 1954).
37. Disarmament Commission meetings (April 9 to 19, 1954).
38. Disarmament Subcommittee meetings (May 13 to June 22, 1954).
39. Disarmament Commission meetings (July 20 to 29, 1954).
40. Ninth session of General Assembly (September 21 to December 17, 1954).
41. Disarmament Commission meeting (November 19, 1954).
42. Disarmament Subcommittee meeting (December 8, 1954).
43. Disarmament Subcommittee meetings (February 25 to June 1, 1955).
44. Geneva Conference of Heads of Government (July 18 to 23, 1955).
45. Disarmament Subcommittee meetings (August 20 to October 7, 1955).
46. Tenth session of General Assembly (September 20 to December 20, 1955).
47. Geneva Meeting of Foreign Ministers of United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and France (October 27 to November 16, 1955.)
48. Disarmament Commission meeting (January 23, 1956).
49. Disarmament Subcommittee meetings (March 19 to May 4, 1956).
50. Disarmament Commission meetings (July 3 to 16, 1956).
51. Eleventh session of General Assembly (November 12, 1956, to March 8, 1957).
52. Disarmament Commission meeting (December 20, 1956).
53. Disarmament Subcommittee meetings (March 18 to September 6, 1957).
54. Twelfth session of General Assembly (September 17 to December 14, 1957).
55. Disarmament Commission meeting (September 30, 1957).
56. Security Council meetings (April 21 to May 2, 1958).
57. Geneva Conference of Experts To Study Possibility of Detecting Violations of Possible Agreement on Suspension of Nuclear Tests (July 1 to August 21, 1958).
58. Thirteenth session of General Assembly (September 16 to December 13, 1958).
59. Geneva Conference on Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests (October 31, 1958, to January 29, 1962).
60. Geneva Conference of Experts for Study of Possible Measures Which Might Be Helpful in Preventing Surprise Attack and for Preparation of Report Thereon to Governments (November 10 to December 18, 1958).
61. Geneva meeting of Foreign Ministers of United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and France (May 11 to June 20, July 13 to August 5, 1959).
62. Disarmament Commission meeting (September 10, 1959).
63. Fourteenth session of General Assembly (September 15 to December 13, 1959).
64. Washington Antarctic Conference (October 15 to December 1, 1959).
65. Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament (March 15 to April 29, June 7 to 28, 1960).
66. Security Council meetings (May 23 to 27, 1960).
67. Disarmament Commission meeting (August 16 to 18, 1960).
68. Fifteenth session of General Assembly (September 20 to December 20, 1960; March 7 to April 21, 1961).

FORUM AND CHIEF U.S. NEGOTIATOR

Bilateral United States-Soviet talks (June 19 to 30, July 17 to 29, and September 6 to 19, 1961), John J. McCloy.

Sixteenth session of General Assembly (September 19 to December 20, 1961), Adlai E. Stevenson.

Conference of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (March 14 to June 14, July 16 to September 7, November 26 to December 20, 1962), Arthur H. Dean.

Resumed February 12, 1963, William C. Foster.

Seventeenth session of General Assembly (September 18 to December 21, 1962), Adlai E. Stevenson.

Bilateral (United States-U.S.S.R.) talks on nuclear test ban (January 14 to 18, 1963), William C. Foster.

Tripartite (United States-U.S.S.R.-United Kingdom) talks on nuclear test ban (January 22 to 31, 1963), William C. Foster.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES AT PRINCIPAL DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

U.N. COMMISSION ON ATOMIC ENERGY (1946–51)

Original U.S. delegates and advisers:

Representative: Bernard M. Baruch (appointed March 18, 1946; confirmed April 5, 1946.)

Associates: John M. Hancock, aid to Mr. Baruch; Ferdinand Eberstadt; Fred Searls, Jr.; Herbert B. Swope; Richard C. Tolman, scientific adviser; Thomas F. Farrell; John Parks Davis, executive officer.

Legal advisers: Charles Fahy, Department of State; John B. Howard, Department of State; Henry G. Ingraham, Department of State.

The Scientific Panel appointed to assist Dr. Tolman included:

Drs. R. F. Bacher, A. H. Compton, J. R. Oppenheimer, C. A. Thomas, H. C. Urey.

Later representatives to UNAEC:

Year 1947: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Frederick H. Osborn; 20 members.

Year 1948: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Frederick H. Osborn; 17 members.

Year 1949: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Frederick H. Osborn.

Year 1950: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representatives, Frederick H. Osborn (resigned January 31, 1950); John C. Ross, acting (beginning February 1, 1950).

Year 1951: Representative, Warren R. Austin; acting deputy representative, John C. Ross.

UN COMMISSION FOR CONVENTIONAL ARMAMENTS (1947–51)

Year 1947: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Ralph A. Bard.

Year 1948: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Frederick H. Osborn (beginning January 19, 1948).

Year 1949: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representatives, Frederick H. Osborn (resigned April 1, 1949); Frank C. Nash (beginning April 2, 1949).

Year 1950: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Frank C. Nash.

Year 1951: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Frank C. Nash.

UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION (1952–?)

Year 1952: Representative, Warren R. Austin; deputy representative, Benjamin V. Cohen.

Year 1953: Representatives, Warren R. Austin (resigned January 1953); Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. (designated August 19, 1953); deputy representative, Benjamin V. Cohen (resigned January 19, 1953).

Year 1954: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., deputy representative, Morehead Patterson.

Year 1955: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; deputy representative, Harold Stassen (appointed August 2, 1955).

Year 1956: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; deputy representative, Harold Stassen.

Year 1957: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; deputy representative, Harold Stassen (resigned February 14, 1958).

Year 1958: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; deputy representative, James J. Wadsworth.

Year 1959: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; deputy representative, James J. Wadsworth.

Year 1960: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Year 1961: Representative, Adlai E. Stevenson.

U.N. DISARMAMENT SUBCOMMITTEE (1954–57)

Year 1954: Representative, Morehead Patterson.

Year 1955: Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; deputy representative, James J. Wadsworth.

Year 1956: Representative, Harold E. Stassen.

Year 1957: Representative, Harold E. Stassen.

GENEVA EXPERTS CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR TESTS (JULY 1–AUGUST 21, 1958)

Dr. James B. Fisk, Dr. Robert F. Bacher, Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence.

CONFERENCE ON SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR TESTS (OCTOBER 31, 1958–)

October 31, 1958,[1] representative, James J. Wadsworth; deputy representative, Robert F. Bacher. Senior advisers, Charles C. Stelle, State; Lt. Gen. Alfonzo P. Fox, Defense; George M. Kavanagh, AEC.

October 29, 1959,[2] representative, James J. Wadsworth; deputy representative, D. H. Popper.

September 28, 1960,[3] acting representative, Charles C. Stelle; deputy representative, D. H. Popper.

[1] State press release No. 643, Oct. 25, 1958.
[2] Conference document inf./4, Oct. 29, 1959.
[3] Conference document inf./6, Sept. 28, 1960.

March 21, 1961,[4] representative, Arthur H. Dean; deputy representatives, Charles C. Stelle; D. H. Popper.

I. Technical Working Group on the Detection and Identification of High-Altitude Nuclear Explosions (June 22 to July 10, 1959).

Head, Dr. Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky; members, Dr. Sterling A. Colgate; Dr. Allen F. Donovan; Dr. Alvin C. Graves; Mr. Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr.; Dr. Richard Latter; Col. Dent Lay; Dr. Allen M. Peterson; Dr. Kenneth N. Watson.

II. Technical Working Group 2 (November 25 to December 18, 1959).

Head, Dr. James B. Fisk; deputy head, Dr. Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky; members, 21.

III. Seismic Research Program Advisory Group (May 11–30, 1960).

Dr. Frank Press, Mr. Carlton M. Beyer, Dr. Gerald Johnson, Mr. Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., Dr. Richard Latter, Dr. Donald H. Rock, Dr. Carl F. Romney, Mr. Robert C. Scheid, Dr. M. Carl Walske.

SURPRISE ATTACK CONFERENCE (NOVEMBER 10 TO DECEMBER 18, 1958)

William C. Foster, Chairman.

Rear Adm. Paul Dudley, Special Assistant to the Chairman.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky.

Gen. Otto P. Weyland.

Six senior advisers.

TEN-NATION COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (MARCH 15 TO JUNE 28, 1960)

Representative, Fredrick Eaton; deputy representative, Charles C. Stelle.

[4] State press release No. 133, Mar. 14, 1961.

An Appraisal of Inter-American Economic Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, recently Dr. Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, spoke at a meeting of the chamber of commerce in Miami.

Dr. Herrera reported on the activities on the Inter-American Development Bank and its participation in the Alliance for Progress. This portion of the speech alone merits the attention of the Congress.

However, Dr. Herrera went further and made some recommendations which he says will undoubtedly be labeled as "visionary." In view of my long interest in this field of Inter-American relations, I know that in it we particularly need men of vision, and their ideas should be given wide distribution and earnest consideration. For this reason I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this speech which Dr. Herrera made, and I commend it to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS: AN APPRAISAL

(By Felipe Herrera)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I have been in Miami many times—like most Latin Americans, I tend to use it as a natural gateway in my comings and goings between this country and those to the south—but no matter how often I come here, I never lose the comfortable feeling of being very much at home. The Hispanic heritage you have preserved so well, your people and architecture and incomparable climate, confront the Latin American with something of Caracas and Santiago and Mexico City in an alien land, no longer alien because of Miami.

This is my first formal appearance here as President of the Inter-American Development Bank, and I am glad I have deferred it until now. Florida and Miami, and particularly an organization like yours, are where North Americans most closely follow inter-American developments and are best informed on them. In the light of recent developments, including the Alliance for Progress which has awakened such great interest throughout the hemisphere, I think I am now in a position to make a better evaluation of inter-American economic institutions, and one more in keeping with your own broad knowledge of the inter-American scene, than would have been possible for me earlier.

There is a good deal of error, and as much of injustice, in the way Latin America's economic and social policies and development agencies are generally regarded. Perhaps the most common accusation is that there are too many inter-American agencies and authorities to permit a rapid and efficient solution of our manifold problems.

I would disagree with this viewpoint. If anything, I would say that there are not enough agencies and authorities to do the job that must be done properly—a job that strains at national boundaries and takes on the proportions of a mighty supranational effort.

Events move at such a dizzying pace that there is only a passing resemblance between our world of today and that of 10 or 20 years ago. We are caught up in an irrestible current of hope and aspiration and change that would have been inconceivable yesterday. One manifestation of these, in our hemisphere, at least, is the powerful thrust toward more than just coordination and cooperation in our international relations, more than just the association of nations, more than just economic integration, but toward unification—first economic unification, and then political unification—in the truest sense of the world. We are inspired by Europe's example along these lines, and are aided by processes peculiar to our hemisphere.

This trend is something so new and dynamic that it cannot be properly nourished and guided by our inter-American organizational structure of even a few years ago. That structure is now inadequate to meet the challenge that faces it and all of us. There has been a time in the history of all nations when economies were small and isolated, limited by poor communications and the concentration of humanity in villages, towns and cities. This vested great economic and social power in local and municipal authorities, but as communications improved, as population grew and spread, economies burst their bonds and spread across entire regions and nations, compelling local authority to give way to regional and national authority.

In precisely the same manner, the stage is set for us to progress from nationalism to supranationalism, and forge the true and growing unification of our peoples in their effort to eradicate underdevelopment and poverty, malnutrition and illiteracy, and strengthen our orderly march toward stability and well-being.

Here precisely, is where the need lies for an institution like our Bank. In more than just the financial sense we symbolize and contribute to that process of unification. Our mandate is the integrated economic and

social development of our member countries through the united effort of all of them. We are the principal inter-American channel for mobilizing and directing the flow of international resources, harmoniously administered in the name of all our members, for the solution of their common problems.

Our Bank is a place where Latin Americans can lay their economic and social needs and problems before other Americans and encounter a sympathetic response, because all concerned have lived with these needs and problems and have suffered their consequences all their lives. Even more important, it is the place where national needs and problems are considered within the context of Latin America's needs and problems as a whole.

We are, in short, a practical expression of the new internationalism that is taking hold among our peoples. We are also a practical expression of the new approach that characterizes Latin America's political and economic institutions today. When I took office as President of the Bank 3 years ago, I said that being a bank, we were more than a bank. By that I meant that we had the dual obligation of adhering to sound banking principles in our operations to preserve the integrity of the resources entrusted to us, and of tempering our banking philosophy with our ultimate goal; to accelerate economic and social development in Latin America.

I think we have been successful in this respect. I cannot recall one of our loans—and we have made loans totaling more than $624 million in slightly less than 2 years—that has not been of direct or potential benefit to the individual in Latin America. To cite a few examples, we are helping to build 175,000 low-cost houses for almost a million people who never knew the meaning of decent shelter; we are helping to build and improve roads, to open up new areas for development; we are helping to raise health standards and productivity among 17.5 million people, in city and village alike, by financing good water and sanitary systems; our agricultural loans are reclaiming badlands, improving and diversifying production. Loans benefiting 20 universities, colleges, and technical schools will help to give Latin America the research specialists and technicians it needs to carry on its development. Our loans to industry, principally small industry, and electric power projects total more than $150 million.

But let me say something about our resources:

1. For economic development projects, the Bank has subscribed resources of about $960 million. Of this amount, member countries have paid in some $528 million (including the contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of a little more than $146 million). The remaining $432 million makes up the Bank's callable capital. This capital serves to support the bond issues which the Bank sells on the world's capital markets.

We had the immediate acceptance of our first bond issues, aggregating $100 million during 1962, in this country and Europe.

Seventy-five million dollars were underwritten by commercial and investment banks in the United States, and the balance by a consortium of leading Italian banks, at terms so favorable that they compare in every way with those granted to such institutions as the World Bank.

Our bonds have been approved for sale in what amounts to 80 percent of the United States financial market. California, Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin have already enacted legislation to this effect, and legislation is presently pending in Illinois, Maryland, Utah and other jurisdictions.

(2). For social development projects, the Bank administers the Social Progress Trust Fund of $394 million, entrusted to us in 1961 by the U.S. Government in the framework of the Alliance for Progress. The purpose of this Fund is to finance projects in the fields of land settlement and improved land use, housing for low-income groups, water supply and sanitation and advanced education. We administer these resources as a trustee, and render an annual accounting of their use to the United States.

We interpreted the action of the United States in selecting us to administer this large sum as a mark of confidence in our Bank, all the more noteworthy because we opened our doors only 6 months before it was taken. We see a ratification of this confidence in the expressed intention of the U.S. Government to enlarge the Social Progress Trust Fund by entrusting another $200 million to us.

Even though, as I have noted we came into being only a short time before the Alliance for Progress, when the Alliance was promulgated we were in an organizational and operational position to play an immediate and active part in it, and became the Alliance mechanism for mobilizing and directing multilateral resources for Latin American economic and social development.

The goals and methods of the Alliance, as you know, were outlined by a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961. It would not be amiss to review them at this point, as follows:

Mobilization of the full production capacity of the Latin American countries, with external aid, to accelerate their economic development; the need to create conditions of greater stability and balance for Latin America's export trade; the need for a larger Latin American market, obtainable only through economic integration of the Latin American countries; accelerating an integrated and equitable economic development by consolidating and expanding representative democracy, to give the community free expression and the means of satisfying its present and future needs.

But perhaps the most important expression of what the Alliance is and does lies in these words of President Kennedy, in his recent state of the Union message:

"I do not underestimate the difficulties that we face in this mutual effort among our close neighbors, but the free states of this hemisphere, working in close collaboration, have begun to make this Alliance a living reality. The men and women of this hemisphere know that the Alliance would not succeed if it were only another name for U.S. handouts—that it can succeed only as the Latin American nations themselves devote their best effort to fulfilling its goals."

Within this scope, the Alliance must be regarded as a statement of policy, and not as a new institution, as is often erroneously thought. It must be looked upon as an effort in which each participant has a mutual obligation to all the others—an obligation to give to the best of its ability, and not merely receive, and make its fullest contribution to the success of this venture.

Such a goal, and with it the goals of Punta del Este, can never be attained if our countries limit their efforts to purely national proportions. There must be regional cooperation and coordination among neighboring countries; continental-wide cooperation and coordination among all the countries, and, needless to say, cooperation and coordination between the Latin American countries, individually and collectively, and the United States.

This is feasible on a supranational and international basis only through specialized inter-American organs that run the gamut of all our needs—cultural, juridical, technological and agricultural, as well as economic and financial—if order and direction are to be imparted to the solution of our problems. Some of these organs already exist, and others must be created.

The economic and social mechanisms of the inter-American system merged at different stages in our cooperative evolution, and in response to the needs of the times. Thus, the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Economic and Social Council were born at a moment when political inter-Americanism overshadowed economic inter-Americanism.

ECLA, the Economic Commission for Latin America of the United Nations, stemmed from general concern in that Organization in the 1950's over the emerging problems of underdeveloped countries.

Our Inter-American Development Bank, organized early in 1959, was a belated recognition of the need for a regional financial mechanism to complement the activities of existing international organizations.

In 1960 the Act of Bogotá and the concept of the Social Progress Trust Fund were the first expressions of the need for cooperative action in meeting Latin America's social problems. The Alliance for Progress and Charter of Punta del Este, a year later, reflected the need for programing and structural reform in Latin America, and led to strengthening the Economic and Social Council and creating the "nine wise men" group to evaluate national policies and programs. Since 1958 the Central American Common Market and Latin American Free Trade Association have responded to the needs of trade and the flux of ideas generated by European integration.

Today, it is essential that we reappraise this machinery and adapt it to the larger and more complex requirements of present economic and social policy in our hemisphere. It may be that the report of President Lleras Camargo and President Kubitschek will shortly show us the way to do this, for these distinguished Americans will certainly lend ear to the appeal of our countries for a system that will lead to more positive action and the solid support of public opinion at all levels.

If you will permit me, I should like to make my own modest contribution in this connection:

1. Some form of Latin American parliament is needed to give proper expression to the broad public opinion of our hemisphere, and not to governments and experts alone, as is now the case. Such a body might be indirectly established by our legislatures, or directly by popular vote in our countries, to become a forum for interpreting the major currents of ideas in Latin America and evaluating hemisphere policy by democratic discussion and debate. In it, public opinion might express itself on such matters of common concern as the orientation of economic relations among our countries, our collective relationship to other regional groups, and our concepts of integrated economic development, to guide our governments, individually and collectively, in putting into practice broader formulas conducive to practical collective unity in the political, economic, and cultural spheres.

It is conceivable that this Latin American body might have a permanent group to work in close harmony with a similar group in the Congress of the United States, and thus create a reciprocal mechanism—representative of the essence of democracy and parliamentary institutions—for precisely evaluating the obstacles and possibilities of cooperation between the United States and Latin America. And, as a logical corollary, it might perhaps be complemented to some degree by the participation of management

and labor, through their representative organizations, and technology and education, through the universities.

2. Equally essential is a permanent liaison mechanism to fuse the efforts of economic and technical institutions triving for faster and more integrated development in Latin America, something on the order of Europe's Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. A body of this kind could be of inestimate value in arriving at definitions necessary to the most harmonious interaction of regional and national initiatives. It could become the multilaterial technical organ wherein the Alliance for Progress, which as I have observed, still lacks a well-defined personality, could find its true and dynamic identity. From it would come specific technical recommendations on how to program our development, how to find in common the solution to our vital raw materials problems, how to coordinate our trade and monetary policies, and how to extend our inevitable integration over increasingly shorter period. It would, in essence, be the higher technical-administrative agency of our multilateral technical cooperation: a sort of general staff for this ambitious operation.

3. Finally, I consider it indispensable that we reactivate the abandoned concept of an inter-American High Court, empowered by our governments to hear and resolve litigation and problems deriving from our communal, international existence, especially in commercial, financial and general economic questions.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, these proposals undoubtedly will strike may as visionary, and some might wonder that a banker departs from talk of yields and investments and funds to enter into this field that we might call social engineering for the hemisphere.

Precisely because I am a banker, and precisely because of what I have observed in Latin America during the past 4 years, I must conclude that it is useless to talk of trade and investment if we do not simultaneously forge institutional bonds as a basis for our cooperative efforts toward economic development. Let us not forget that the budgets and income of many Latin American countries are smaller than the budgets and income of some large corporations in this country. Yet, an expanse of land that has been nourished by our blood and history commands a much greater devotion and meaning than profit and loss statements. As practical men of the Americas, we must recognize that as long as we fail to orient our relations with an eye to destiny, our most cherished ambitions of today, are senseless.

Annual Observance of Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Ledger, an outstanding weekly newspaper circulated in my district, has extended me the privilege of publishing a message to the community on the observance of Brotherhood Week, which was begun yesterday.

I welcomed this opportunity to express my thoughts on this observance and the special meaning it has for all of us:

Brotherhood Week is a fitting occasion to make a searching examination of how all of us are living up to the American way of life and its ideals. This great Nation has taken its strength from the ability of our citizens to live and work together in the interests of all people, regardless of religious or political faiths.

This special week is dedicated to the purpose of bringing together Christians and Jews in a bond of brotherhood and good fellowship. It also reminds us that prejudice and hate can destroy us and everything we hold dear.

The liberty of freemen and their right to worship God as they see fit is threatened today by godless communism. All of us who believe are called to show by our example of brotherly love that the ugly philosophy of communism is doomed. We must unite in brotherhood. So strong can such brotherhood become that we can defeat the evils of communism, and preserve our religion and our belief in the dignity of man.

Although the actual observance of Brotherhood Week lasts only 7 days, its real meaning should be practiced every day of the year.

FRANK HORTON,
Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, in this same issue of the Jewish Ledger, Donald Wolin, the editor and publisher, has written a very timely editorial. Employing the "coloring book" satire which is so popular today, Mr. Wolin has described in very fundamental terms the divisive influences at work in our society, the unfortunate influences Brotherhood Week seeks to defeat.

I take pleasure in offering this editorial for publication so that my colleagues may also have the privilege of reading this appropriate message:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK COLORING BOOK

This week we are offering you free our nondisposable Brotherhood Week coloring book, complete with a crayon kit containing a generous assortment of colors—white, dark, black, brown, tan, yellow, and other various hues.

Spread out your crayons and turn to page 1.

Sunday: Notice the mother and father and their two children. They are dressed neat and clean. They are going to church. They appreciate the privilege of worshiping in the church of their choice. Color them appreciative. Use any crayon for their hands and face.

Monday: Father is at work. He works in a large office and wears a tie and white shirt. He has a very responsible and important job. There are many other workers in the office. How many different colors can you use in this picture?

Tuesday: Note that this page is divided into two sections. The first panel shows a crowded, dingy classroom in a shabby neighborhood. The second panel is a light, airy classroom in a different neighborhood. The first school is old and dilapidated, while the second is modern and expensive. It should not be difficult to color the students.

Wednesday: Father is home reading the evening newspaper. He is angry, bitter and frustrated. He is reading about ignorant racial outbursts from liberal arts students, Rockwell's Nazis, subtle discrimination in the north. The newspaper is not pleasant to read. Color it everyday. Make father any color. Make him continuously angry, bitter and frustrated.

Thursday: You must use your imagination for this page. Draw a Negro, Jew, Catholic, Rabbi, Priest, and cleaning woman. Ask your friends to do the same without revealing your drawing. Do you find striking similarities? Are you really surprised? You can have a lot of laughs with this page. You can also learn something about yourself. And your friends.

Friday: This family is Jewish. They are going to Friday evening services at their temple or synagogue. This page looks familiar because it is the same one we used on Sunday. Do you find it strange they do not look strange? Color them similar.

Saturday: This is our puzzle page. Mother, father, and children are dressed to go dining. Color them dark. They want to eat in a nice restaurant where they will be genuinely welcome by the owner or headwaiter. They can't seem to find the restaurant. Can you? Do not waste too much time on this page. Color it hopeless.

Notice there are more pages in your book. One for each day of the year. It is impossible to erase or destroy those you tarnish. Be careful how you use your crayons.

Fraternal Order of Eagles Endorses Youth Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the February 1963 issue of the journal Eagle published by the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The editorial entitled, "Double Barreled Conservation," strongly recommends passage of the youth employment bill, of which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, is author as well as a number of Members of the House of Representatives, including myself.

The editorial follows:

DOUBLE BARRELED CONSERVATION

The Fraternal Order of Eagles has a dual interest in one of the highly significant bills which will be considered in the current session of the Congress. The bill, calling for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, is authored by Eagle Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

The bill, which has the support of Eagle President John F. Kennedy, holds double importance for Eagles, because of our organization's longstanding interest in both youth guidence and the protection and preservation of our Nation's natural resources.

A Youth Conservation Corps could be an important step forward in curbing the ever-increasing problem of teenage delinquency. By offering thousands of young men the chance to work in a challenging and rewarding activity, by getting school dropouts off the streets and alleys and into the forests and fields where they can have an opportunity to live in an America they never knew, the Corps will be adding immeasurably to the well-being of our youth.

At the same time these youngsters will be contributing to the future development of our land. By learning and taking part in reforestation, in soil and wildlife preservation, they will be taking their place as useful citizens, doing a productive job, far removed from environments which breed street corner delinquents and reform school candidates.

Senator HUMPHREY's Senate bill No. 1, seeking to preserve two of our most precious national assets, deserves Eagle support. It deserves letters from all Eagles to their Senators and Congressmen asking their help in passing the measure.

Explanation of Public Law 87-297

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

This statement is issued because various articles and editorial comments in the January 20, 1963, edition of the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe about the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and about U.S. arms control and disarmament objectives are inaccurate and would, if left uncorrected, mislead the American people.

In today's world, a strong military establishment is essential. It does not follow, however, that our security can be maintained indefinitely by continuing the present arms race. Our defense budget is so large and the weapons of war are so devastating that safeguarded alternatives to the arms race should be explored.

Congress created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to seek alternatives which would be fully consistent with the security of the United States. Congress gave the Agency three principal tasks:

1. To carry out an extensive program of research in the field of arms control and disarmament;

2. To make recommendations on the basis of this research program to the President and to the heads of the agencies concerned with our national security; and

3. To provide direction and support for U.S. representatives engaged in arms control and disarmament negotiations after decisions establishing our Government's policy have been made by the President in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense and State, the Chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, among others.

Every major arms control proposal which the United States makes during negotiations is considered by all these men in order to assure that it is in the national interest. Any agreement obligating the United States to disarm would have to be approved by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate or a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress as required by section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

The United States, under both Democratic and Republican leadership, has attempted since the end of World War II to secure adequately safeguarded arms control and disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. There is nothing in the histroy of these efforts to indicate that a disarmament accord will come quickly while communism maintains its present goals. There is a possibility, however, that something can be done now to curb the arms race and to reduce the threat of war. Toward these ends, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is exploring such measures as a nuclear test ban agreement and possible measures to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication. At the same time, the Agency is studying broader areas in the hope that Soviet interests in disarmament may, in the future, coincide more closely with ours and be consistent with the security of the United States and the rest of the free world.

Detailed replies to specific statements contained in several articles in the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe are set forth below after the title of the articles:

A. BAN POSSIBLE IN 10 YEARS

1. While the time limitations for the completion of stages I and II of our outline of a proposed disarmament plan are set at 3 years each, there is no time limit set for the completion of stage III. The United States deliberately left open the time for the completion of stage III to assure that the process could be completed only if circumstances guaranteed our continued national security. Moreover, the United States alone would make the determination that it could safely proceed from stage I to stage II and from stage II to stage III if other parties were complying with the agreement and all conditions to protect our security had been met. Thus, while it is theoretically possible that general and complete disarmament might be achieved in 10 years from the ratification of a treaty, the statement in the articles that the United States could be disarmed in less than 10 years is totally unrealistic.

2. The suggestion that an arms control and disarmament treaty could come into effect without approval of the Congress is clearly erroneous. In section 33 of the act, Congress specifically provided that "no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

3. Section 47(b) of the act, authorizing the President to transfer to the Agency any activities or facilities which relate "primarily to arms control and disarmament," requires that such a transfer be made only after a report has been made to Congress and a period of 60 days has elapsed while Congress is in session. Thus, the statutory provision does not give the President carte blanche to transfer funds to the Agency. The purpose of this section of the act was to facilitate the efficient administartion of U.S. arms control and disarmament activities. Such a provision is quite common in legislation that vests existing responsibilities in a new independent agency.

B. LEGION PROBERS FIND JOKERS

This article begins on the falacious premise that the United States might accommodate the Soviet Union by disarming "completely before the U.S.S.R. had a single reduction in unit strength * * *." Department of State publication No. 7277 is cited as authority for the statement.

Publication No. 7277, entitled, "Freedom From War"; the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world is an outline of a plan which proposes balanced and verified arms reductions by all nations in steps and under conditions designed to assure the preservation of our freedom and security . It does not provide for unilateral disarmament. As the arms control and disarmament policy of the United States is developed and elaborated in increasing detail by this Agency, the provisions of section 33 of the act have been, and will continue to be, adhered to in every respect. The Director of the Agency recommends to the President and his principal advisers all significant arms control and disarmament policies. These recommendations are considered by all appropriately interested agencies, as well as the President himself, to determine if they are in our national interest. In the event our country agrees with foreign governments on a proposed treaty that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, the executive branch will then seek the approval of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate or of a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress. The American people are thus assured that any arms control and disarmament agreement which might be entered into by the United States will be, in the considered opinion of the country's highest officials, to the national interest. I am certain that if such a proposed treaty was not in the national interest it would be overwhelmingly disapproved by the entire Congress if submitted as a proposed statute or by the Senate if submitted under the constitutional treaty-making powers of that body.

The analysis of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provided by the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe article is largely inaccurate. Many of the sections of the act are drawn from other statutes which have been in force for years, and they do not provide the Director of the Agency with any greater powers than those given other agency heads. Following is a discussion of the sections of the act which were criticized by the article:

Section 35: The power to "assure cooperation" given to the President by the act does not give him the authority to rule by fiat over private individuals. It simply provides authority to "assure cooperation" between the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and other affected Government agencies. Such a statutory provision is common when there is potential conflict between agencies having overlapping interests. Somewhat similar provisions may be found in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. § 2037(b)) and the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. § 2471(e)). The President's power under the act to resolve differences of opinion between the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and other agencies is, in effect, nothing more than a statutory restatement of the President's existing authority under the Constitution as the head of the executive branch.

Section 41: This subsection authorizes the Director to "enter into agreements with other Government agencies" to secure the services of officers or employees for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This does not, as the article suggests, authorize the Director to "preempt" these agencies. The provision was incorporated into the act in recognition of the fact that these other agencies—particularly the Department of Defense—have personnel who would be of value to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in fulfilling its functions. Although the President would presumably have the power to "assure cooperation" in this area under the provisions of section 35, no such problem has arisen, nor is it anticipated. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has so far maintained a close and harmonious relationship with the Department of Defense and all other agencies and departments concerned with national security. The President's authority to resolve differences of opinion that might arise under this subsection is only what is necessary and appropriate for the head of the executive branch to conduct an effective and efficient administration.

The article raises the further question whether the Director could, under the provisions of section 31(k), utilize the Army to "maintain peace and security" of the American people if they objected to continued disarmament. Section 31(k) contains no such authority; it deals with research that may be undertaken to assure that peace and security among nations is preserved during disarmament.

Section 41(h): The "rulemaking" power of the Director is circumscribed by the restriction that it must be exercised within the authority conferred by the provisions of the act. This authority is found in most legislation establishing governmental agencies. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is, like any other agency, accountable to the Congress if it transcends its rulemaking authority.

Section 41(g): The power of the Director to delegate the authority which he has under the act is identical to that given the directors of many Government agencies. It is given in recognition of the fact that the Director is unable to perform personally all the functions required of him under the act. The Director, of course, delegates this authority to those officers who are qualified to carry out the particular function. It might also be noted that all the officers and other employees of the Agency are subject to stringent security investigation requirements.

Section 43: This provision, allowing the President to exempt the Agency from the provisions of law relating to contracts or expenditures, requires that a prior determination be made by the President that "such action is essential in the interest of U.S. arms control and disarmament and security policy." A similar provision is found in the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2202). The Russians began a series of nuclear tests in the atmosphere on September 1, 1961. Our Government had been negotiating on a nuclear test ban in good faith and had not appropriated funds to immediately begin nuclear testing underground or to begin preparation for testing in the atmosphere. The President rightfully exercised his authority under (42 U.S.C. 2202) of the Atomic Energy Act to protect our national security by authorizing funds to be used to immediately begin nuclear testing. Moreover, legislative history of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act makes it clear that this power is only to be used in "exceptional cases." Such a determination would, of course, be subject to the scrutiny of Congress which could subsequently pass legislation modifying the President's determination. Even if the President should exempt the Agency from a particular provision of law, which he has not done so far, its spending would still be limited to appropriations made by Congress.

Section 45: Subsection (a) of this section provides in part that security requirements for Agency personnel "not be less stringent" than those of the Government agency or agencies having the "highest security restrictions." The security clearance awarded Agency personnel are given only after a most intensive investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Civil Service Commission. The provisions of section 45(b) are merely to assure that Agency personnel be cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission before receiving classified atomic energy data needed in the performance of their duties. This section contains an additional safeguard which requires that the Atomic Energy Commission make an independent finding that the Agency's security procedures and standards are adequate before such information may be received.

Section 46: The general rule set forth in this section is that contractors must retain their pertinent books, documents, papers, and records for 3 years after the final payment has been made by the Government to them under a particular contract. This provision is typical of those found in other acts. The sentence in the act which the article refers to is merely a standard exception of the general rule. This sentence only allows the early destruction of records if both the Director of the Agency and the General Accounting Office concur. It is worth noting, in this respect, that the General Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress and is independent of the executive departments.

Section 49: The Congress did not appropriate any hidden funds for the benefit of the Agency; indeed, it has not yet appropriated the full $10 million which is the maximum authorized under section 49. The appropriation actually made to establish the Agency and carry it through fiscal year 1962 was, with funds transferred from an earlier appropriation, a little over $2 million. This fiscal year Congress appropriated $6.5 million. Subsection (b) allows the allocation or transfer of funds actually appropriated by Congress for the Agency to another agency; not the reverse as suggested in the article.

C. CONTROL SYSTEM IS THEME OF RESEARCH

This article does not refer to research carried on by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It does, however, deal with the important problem of inspection of arms control and disarmament agreements. It is Government policy that workable and adequate inspection and control systems are fundamental to the disarmament process, and U.S. negotiators have insisted upon adequate inspection and verification as an integral part of any disarmament plan. The Congress is in the fullest accord with this point of view.

This insistence upon inspection is dictated by an unwillingness to trust this country's security to Communist promises of compliance. To insure that any inspection is adequate, the Agency is, therefore, exploring a great variety of techniques which will be both effective and acceptable. The study by the Institute for International Order referred to in this article, which the Agency did not sponsor or pay for, is only one of a substantial number of studies which have been undertaken. If and when the United States undertakes an inspection, the Agency will draw upon a fund of knowledge gained through study and research to establish a system which is adequate, acceptable, practicable and protects our national security.

D. PROGRAM COVERS ALL ARMS—EVEN YOURS

The U.S. proposals for the elimination of armaments are confined to those armaments used by "national forces" and do not extend to weapons used for sporting and other legitimate purposes. It is my opinion as well as the opinion of every attorney with whom I have discussed Public Law 87-297, that neither this act or the proposals which the United States has presented in any way transgress the second amendment provisions of the Constitution that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Further, no strained interpretation of the act which violated this amendment would be countenanced by the U.S. courts. If you know of any attorney who interprets this act as described by the article in the Amarillo paper, it would be appreciated if you would send me his name and address.

The article's concern for the proliferation of crime in a disarmed world is misplaced. Even in the event that stage III of the U.S. Treaty Outline for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World were reached, individual nations would remain responsible for combating crime and other internal security matters. In fact, the United States was practically completely disarmed after World War I as our total manpower in our armed services in 1932 was only 132,069 men. It is my firm belief that had an Arms Control Agency been active following World War I, we would not have allowed our armed services to become so weak at that critical period.

I hope the above explanation will be of use to those individuals who are concerned with the security and protection of our Nation as well as clear the air of the inaccurate and misleading comments that have been attached to Public Law 87-297.

Dallas Superior Air Facilities Attract National Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of February 13, 1963, points up once more the fact that Dallas, the area which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is a leader in progress and improvement. Our airport, Love Field, the product of forward looking leadership and private initiative, makes it possible for Dallas to be second to none in air transportation. Our continuing progress in Dallas is a constant reminder of what can be accomplished by the people, without Federal direction and help.

The editorial follows:

SECOND TO NONE

"Dallas is second to none in air transportation," Mrs. Ike Kampmann, of San Antonio, said recently. Thus, the Republican national committeewoman from Texas paid well-deserved tribute to Dallas Love Field as a magnet to attract people and business to this city. Regardless of whether the Republicans try to bring their national convention here, what is significant is this San Antonio civic and political leader is recognizing what too many Dallas citizens overlook: The great economic value of this established, convenient, well-planned and well-operated airport facility.

"Dallas has finer transportation than any other city in the United States except Chicago," a veteran hotel man told the News. "You can get to Dallas quicker and easier from all parts of the continent than to any other city, with that one exception."

This, he explained, is because Dallas has excellent nonstop service, supplemented with good feeder plane service throughout the day and night.

Equally important: "People can get from Love Field to the places they want to go in Dallas easier and faster than at any other city except Kansas City." He said that passengers can get their luggage at the local airport facility as fast as anywhere in the Nation.

This man, who stressed Dallas' unexcelled transportation facilities in talks before 500 organizations last year, mentioned how superior this city's situation is to that in New York and Washington. "You can jet to Washington in 2 hours and 15 minutes, but it will take another 1 hour and 45 minutes to get from Dulles or Friendship Airport and into your hotel room."

Persons flying from New York should allow 2½ hours for getting from their hotel room to Idlewild, in his opinion.

Conventions are only a small part of the business that Love Field builds, even though the 250 meetings scheduled during 1963 will bring millions in business to taxi drivers, restaurants, hotels and hundreds of other local enterprises.

The regional editor of a farm magazine, who must airmail manuscripts to his Philadelphia headquarters for delivery next day, located his office near Dallas Love Field and his home not far away. The field's facilities helped banks of this four-county metropolitan area attain depostis of approximately $3.5 billion at the end of 1962.

Superior air facilities—in the opinion of many Dallas businessmen—rank second to

no other asset, except human leadership, in keeping this city prosperous. To build for the future, we must make sure that Love Field continues to be second to none.

United States-Latin American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD three short articles which deal primarily with United States-Latin American relations, including our Alliance for Progress assistance program.

These articles are written by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, a noted international lawyer of San Antonio, Tex., and an authority on Latin American affairs. He has lived in Mexico and other Latin American countries for a number of years and has a thorough knowledge of their problems. He is a member of the American Society of International Law, the Inter-American Bar Association, the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, the Mexican Academy of International Law, and other organizations. Mr. Orleans is also known as an economist, a writer, and a lecturer.

The articles were written over the past couple of months. Although some of the events, especially those pertaining to Cuba, have undergone considerable change in policy and attitude, the views expressed by Mr. Orleans are still timely. I call particular attention to his article on the Agency for International Development:

[From the Past Commander]

THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In my article "A Latin American Program," which appeared in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5, 1962, I indicated that it is both extremely difficult as well as highly unnecessary to attempt to formulate a completely new Latin American program since it must be recognized that the Alliance for Progress as well as the provisions of the Act for International Development of 1961, in principle, provide a potentially successful formula. In my aforementioned article I touched upon some phases of the Act for International Development, but did not attempt a complete analysis of same due to space limitations.

At this time I would like to attempt to make my readers a little better acquainted with some of the things being done by the Agency for International Development (AID). As part of the technical assistance program administered by AID in developing nations of the world, a contract was awarded to a U.S. firm to provide hospital planning consultant services for two Alliance for Progress hospital projects in Panama; a 3-year contract to Iowa State University to help Uruguay modernize its agriculture; a program to improve the health of people living in the distressed States of northeast Brazil through the construction of small hospitals and large outpatient clinics; a program in Central America to make available to 800,000 first- and second-grade public school children in five Central American Republics free readers for the 1963 school year. These are but a few of the many and varied functions being performed by the AID.

Recently an investment guarantee agreement was concluded with Venezuela making that country the 18th Latin American country to institute the investment guarantee program. Under the provisions of the agreement, the United States, through AID, may now issue investment guarantees of all types for new U.S. investment projects in Venezuela contributing to the economic development of that country. An agreement was signed with Colombia through which AID would make available $30 million when Colombia's proposed exchange reforms are formally adopted, and another $30 million after steps are taken to carry out a fiscal and monetary stabilization program. Funds loaned by AID would finance imports of essential goods and services from the United States and repayment will be in dollars over a period of 40 years. This agreement with Colombia is an example of the new approach to U.S. oversea foreign-aid operations through which loans which are repayable are made on a selective basis instead of the indiscriminate giveaway of funds complained of by critics of foreign aid programs.

There are those who have been impatient by the apparent slowness of AID moving ahead in certain fields. It should be pointed out that since its activation in November 1961, AID has operated under internal orders and regulations derived primarily from its predecessors. Recently AID has launched a comprehensive examination of operating techniques and procedures in order to revise internal orders and regulations to enable the speeding up of the agency's programs and lead to the improvement and modernization of its operating procedures.

The administrative personnel of AID, in my opinion, is constantly improving. David Bell, the new Administrator is a well qualified and extremely competent individual. Efforts are constantly being directed toward the encouragement of greater participation by private enterprise in foreign economic development. AID favors joint-venture type investments with local capital since this type of enterprise is most likely to result in a transfer of entrepreneurial, technical and management skills to the country itself. In taking this position, AID is in accord with the views I expressed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1962, in my "Antidote to Nationalism in Latin America," when I stated that "one of the strongest answers to the loud clamor of the nationalist in every Latin American country is joint ventures." An Assistant Administrator of AID, Mr. Seymour M. Peyser, heads the new Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise. Mr. Peyser has long sought the participation of private enterprise in development projects abroad and has in the past called for a partnership in economic development between AID and private enterprise.

Space does not permit me to cover at this time more phases of the operations of AID but I have attempted to present a limited picture of the vast scope of this agency's operations and its firm desire to effectively perform a service in the best interests of our country in trying to obtain the maximum benefit for the United States as well as the aided nation, in our oversea aid programs.

[From the Past Commander, Nov. 1, 1962]

SELF-DETERMINATION

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In October of this year while I was in Mexico City, Dr. Edmund Gaspar, Secretary General of the Assembly of European Captive Nations, arrived in Mexico in the last stop on a Latin American tour. The assembly is made up of delegates from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslavakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Dr. Gaspar, an exile from Communist Hungary, stated that Mexico has long been a champion of self-determination and a foe of colonial rule and he called upon the government of Mexico to speak out in the United Nations against Russian colonialism in Eastern Europe.

Dr. Gaspar pointed out that his group was asking for the same thing now being given the peoples of Africa, namely freedom. He further stated that while the United Nations is working to end colonial rule in other parts of the world, it is ignoring Europe. He attributed this policy of the U.N. to its fear of causing friction and heating up the cold war, but pointed out that it is the captivity of the people of Eastern Europe which is the main cause of the cold war. Dr. Gaspar very ably maintained that his group is not making outrageous demands but merely asking what the Soviet Union asks in areas ruled by colonial powers, namely, free elections, participation of political parties, and the freeing of political prisoners. He further stated that when the delegates of Canada to the United Nations proposed the Soviet Union apply these principles to the countries it rules, Khrushchev took off his shoes and pounded on the table. Dr. Gaspar called for Mexico's support for a move in the United Nations to investigate Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, and declared that no nation can raise its voice more clearly in favor of self-determination than can Mexico, historically a champion of freedom and independence.

The issue has become so obscure that it can now be asked as to exactly what the U.S. policy is toward the captive nations of Eastern Europe and does the United States feel that these nations are entitled to self-determination or do the "go soft" proponents of U.S. foreign policy want the American people to forget that Russia forcibly occupies numerous countries in Europe that once were independent nations; that these countries are not and never have been historically a part of the Soviet Union but countries which have their own national heritage, speak their own languages, enjoy their own customs, and are not willingly a part of the Soviet state, but are forced to submit to Russian occupation through military force.

To the long list of countries which have lost their independence to the ravenous Russian bear has recently been added Cuba in our own hemisphere and the question still remains unanswered as to just when the United States will take a definite position in this all-important matter of self-determination. The continuous indeterminate U.S. policy toward captive nations and captive people leave these people with no hope and no beacon of light to lead them back to their national sovereignty and independence.

[From the Past Commander, Dec. 1, 1962]

UNITED STATES MUST ADOPT A DOCTRINE OF SELF-PRESERVATION

(By Fred A. Orleans)

An analysis of current developmentss relating to Cuba brings into sharp focus the continuing need by the United States for a "Doctrine of Self-Preservation." Just what has the U.S. Government proclaimed with much fanfare as its Cuba policy? This new policy, from present indications seems to be twofold and is apparently based on a dismantling of the nuclear rocket bases which have been set up in Cuba over the past year and discontinuance by the Communist bloc of shipping offensive weapons into Cuba. Past dealings with the Communists over the years and recently termi-

nating with the U.S. experience in Laos, the present little war going on in Vietnam and the Red Chinese invasion of the borders of their "friends," the Indians, should give some clear indication of the value of a Communist agreement.

Although a step has been made in the right direction, if this step is all the United States intends to do with relations to the Cuban situation, then, in my estimation, we have taken a very weak and dangerous position on Cuba. I assume that in any solution of the Cuban problem, the United States will not overlook the fact that Cuba is occupied by not only Russsian technicians, but admittedly by Communists from other Red bloc nations including Red China. If some of the Russian technicians leave, the status quo is still maintained with little change. If the medium range missile bases are dismantled, the mobile short range bases can still exist well concealed in the inaccessible regions of the country. What, if anything, will be done about the "fishing base" being built for Russian submarines and vessels spying on U.S. rocket tests? What will be done about the guerrillas and arms being exported from Cuba to every country in the Western Hemisphere?

A solution to the Cuban problem which does not include the above and other points too numerous to enumerate at this time, is no solution at all. If the United States calls for nothing but the dismantling of nuclear bases in Cuba and discontinuance of shipment of offensive weapons into that country, we have taken a very weak and dangerous position. We must call for nothing short of the complete elimination of the Communist menace in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere, and we cannot afford to continue the perpetual process of negotiating and compromising with the Communists which will only end when there is nothing further to negotiate or compromise.

In the middle of 1961 in my "United States Needs a Doctrine of Self-Preservation" which subsequently appeared in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I pointed out that the advances of communism must be stopped immediately and neither the United States nor our friends in the Western Hemisphere can wait any longer. In the war we are currently fighting against communism, the Russians are unlikely to send troops to any Latin American country. Their blueprint for taking over the Latin American nations is through subversion from within, then arming the government friendly to them with guns, tanks, planes needed to maintain power. Communists send technicians of all types, but not actually troops in uniform. This leaves the United States out on a limb and brings into sharp focus the need of a new doctrine to replace the outdated, obsolete, and inoperable Monroe Doctrine.

The Russians have set the precedent in their actions toward Hungary in 1956 on the basis that a hostile, non-Communist government in Hungary would constitute a threat to the actual security of Russia. This, in effect, brings into force a new doctrine—the doctrine of self-preservation.

The United States, sooner or later, will have to take whatever steps deemed necessary to eliminate any threat to its security in the Western Hemisphere or face the ultimate danger of being completely isolated.

History has proven time after time that weakness and concessions only lead to the war they are intended to avert, as demonstrated by the classical example of Chamberlain at Munich.

This is not the time for brave words, but the time for brave deeds. This is the time to demonstrate the courage which made America great. This is the time to prove that America can speak softly, but is again carrying a big stick and is prepared to use it.

Panama Requested Canal Annuities 50 Years in Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the days before World War II, when the flow of political news from China was normal, there were many reports of Chinese warlords extorting the payment of taxes far in advance. Little did I then expect to see the time when comparable exactions would be attempted in the Western Hemisphere.

Documents published by the United States in December 1962 reveal that on January 31, 1941, the Ambassador of Panama in Washington officially asked that Panama Canal annuities be paid for 50 years in advance.

The following news story from the December 17, 1962, edition of the Star and Herald of Panama, Republic of Panama, is commended for reading by every Member of the Congress.

STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENTS REVEAL REPUBLIC OF PANAMA ASKED IN 1941 FOR 50-YEAR ADVANCE OF ANNUITIES

WASHINGTON.—U.S. documents published today said the Republic of Panama asked the United States in 1941 to advance to Panama, for the next 50 years, the annuities paid under the Panama Canal Treaty.

The proposition came at a time the United States was seeking use of additional lands, during the early part of 1941, for defense of the Panama Canal.

The annuity at that time was $430,000 a year. It has since been raised to $1,930,000 yearly.

The State Department published documents dealing with diplomatic relations with some of the American Republics in 1941.

Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, said the Ambassador of Panama called on him on January 31, 1941. Carlos N. Brin was mentioned in another document as Ambassador of Panama about that time.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Welles said, felt the United States-Panama Treaty set forth clearly an obligation to make available to the Canal Zone authorities sites outside the zone if required for the defense of the canal.

Welles said he told the Panamanian Ambassador of Roosevelt's views and the suggestion that because "the world situation was grave" speed was important in obtaining use of the sites.

"Finally," Welles reported in a memorandum of his conversation "the President (Roosevelt) requested me to say that when Panama had in this manner compiled with the treaty obligations, this Government would be very glad to consider any suggestions for further cooperation between Panama and the United States which Panama desired to present.

"The Ambassador argued at very great length," Welles said.

He added that he told him that when the United States-Panama Treaty of 1936 was ratified "the then Government of Panama, through its official representatives, had informed me that Panama believed that all of its just aspirations had been fully met. I said it would be an intolerable situation if, with every new administration that came into power in Panama this Government found itself required to pay vast sums to Panama in the nature of new concessions as a means of persuading Panama to carry out her treaty obligations.

"The Ambassador then blandly made the suggestion that the United States advance to Panama all of the canal annuities for the next 50 years. The Ambassador said that in this way the American bondholders could all be paid off and Panama would be able to relieve her economic situation. I said that this situation to my mind was inconceivable and that I could not comprehend the reference to the economic situation of Panama since, to my knowledge, Panama was the only 1 of the 21 American Republics which today was in a highly prosperous situation and that this was due entirely to the work on the canal."

The landsites, of size and number not outlined in the published documents, were provided by Panama within a few weeks, and negotiations were then concluded on various concessions to Panama by the United States, including certain construction and maintenance, and an agreement to seek legislation to cede to Panama certain lands of the Panama Railroad.

"Shifting Sands"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD a very fine article entitled "Shifting Sands" by Dr. Cabel J. King, Sr., editor-emeritus of the Florida Times-Union. Dr. King's comments appeared in the February 12, 1963, issue of the Florida Times-Union, and I think they will be of interest to my colleagues.

Dr. King has dealt effectively with a matter of serious import to Florida and to all coastline areas. This is a difficult problem with which to deal, but it may be of interest to point out that a project is now being discussed between my office and representatives of the University of Florida and of the Department of the Interior for research activities designed to help control beach erosion.

The article follows:

SHIFTING SANDS

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

The Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund, realizing the importance of the conservation of the Florida shores, have released funds to complete a study of ways and means of preserving this asset.

Florida has been fighting with its back to the wall for generations against the inroads of nature upon the long stretches of sandy ocean beaches which are one of the top factors in the building of this commonwealth into one of greatness.

The chief good that has come from this tireless struggle, however, has been to keep alive the hope for an eventual victory. The storms have made their frequent visits as the decades have come and gone, and shifted the sands along the shorelines into deep cuts and gradually pushed those lines deeper and deeper inland.

But the fighting forces are making increasing headway these days toward gaining the upper hand.

We see something comparable to the turn now underway on a statewide basis in what

is happening at Jacksonville's local beaches. Ever since the Federal Government built the jetties to make the deepwater ship channel at the entrance into the St. Johns River the effect has been to create a force of water around those jetties which, at times, has been devasting to the nearby shoreline.

The people whose property has been endangered all the time and greatly damaged on occasions have borne the burden of this horrible imposition by their National Government.

But now President Kennedy has seen fit to authorize the rebuilding of the recently destroyed seawall at Government expenses—which should have been done in the beginning.

The National Government has been similarly derelict in meeting its responsibility to combat nature's attacks upon the shorelines of the Nation.

These shorelines literally belong to the country as a whole, but the Government authorities in Washington—without political party discrimination—have sidestepped their responsibility down through the years, and permitted private interests to buy up and hold under control all but a limited number of narrow beaches where the general public can enjoy itself without paying a high levy for the privilege.

It all adds up to a shameful demonstration of congressional neglect of the citizens' rights.

Meanwhile the public outcry against the practice that has been permitted to become a national crime against the rights of the people has gained strength that is making itself felt in law-passing circles. Evidence of the new trend is becoming increasingly noticeable in both congressional and legislative circles.

Adding promising impetus to this development is the persistent demand of such agencies as the Florida Shore and Beach Preservation Association, which are landing effective and influential blows against the longstanding lawmaking indifference to public rights.

The Florida association is pushing the idea. It has a prefatory note in the "Review of Beach Erosion and Storm Tide Conditions in Florida," published by the engineering school of the University of Florida saying:

"Florida's countless miles of sandy ocean beaches are unquestionably one of the State's greatest natural assets—perhaps the greatest. In scenic value these beautiful beaches have few peers, and no other element of the great outdoors offers an equal variety and quality of recreational opportunities.

"The universal magnetism of the seashore has each year drawn millions of people, resident, and visitor alike, to enjoy its manifold pleasures. Indeed many thousands have eagerly sought out choice bits of the Florida seashore—paying premium prices—as sites for fine homes, luxurious hotels, or simply weekend hideaways.

"All too infrequently, a strip here and there has been set aside as a public bathing beach."

The conservation association is asking Floridians to put their strongest support behind the efforts toward preserving the beaches and shorelines.

Coincidentally, Dean Joseph Weil of the University of Florida School of Engineering, says he plans to ask the next session of the legislature to provide a liberal appropriation of funds to be spent on a broad-scale conservation program.

If the legislators consider Dean Weil's outstanding achievements with the engineering school as indicative of what he can do with the beaches, a plentiful supply of funds will be readily forthcoming for his use.

Another Round in the Russian Oil Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I would like to include a letter received from Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and my letter which is in reply thereto:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: It was with a great deal of interest that I heard of, and later read, your comments at the Mines and Mining Subcommittee meeting, Friday, February 8, 1963, in which you stated "So some of the Russian oil is going down to Venezuela and coming up here."

In view of the statement by Mr. O'Leary, representing the Department of the Interior, that the Department has no knowledge of transshipments out of Venezuela of oil from European and other areas, I would appreciate it if you could furnish me with the details of the information that you have. This is a matter in which we are all interested and I believe it essential for the committee to pursue this aspect of the residual fuel oil imports program and its impact on the domestic coal industry.

In addition to an amplification of your statement concerning Venezuela, I would also like to have details of other information you might have relative to the impact of Russian exports of residual oil, as referred to in your further statement that "one of the things that has come to my attention is that many of the other outlets which the South American countries have for their residual oil in Western Europe, of course, is being taken up by Russian oil."

I will appreciate receiving your reply at an early date so that we may decide whether to hold further committee hearings on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

FEBRUARY 18, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Thank you for your letter of February 13, which I have just received. Later, I expect to present to the House another detailed account of the impact of Russian oil exports on the economy and security of the free world, but meanwhile I hasten to thank you for your suggestion that the committee pursue the matter of Red oil's entry into U.S. markets and its impact on the domestic coal industry.

I consider it incumbent upon Congress to undertake a full disclosure of the international oil trade complex which permits the sworn enemy of this Nation to encroach upon our fuel markets and those of our allies. I have been impressed with miscellaneous studies made from time to time by executive department offices and congressional committees (such as the Bureau of Mines' 1961 "The Soviet 7-Year Plan for Oil"; the Library of Congress' 1961 "Soviet Oil in the Cold War"; prepared for a subcommittee of the Senate Committee of the Judiciary; the same committee's own hearings on "Soviet Oil in East-West Trade"; and the voluminous "Impact of Oil Exports from the Soviet bloc" by the National Petroleum Council).

Yet none has considered Soviet oil's threat to the U.S. coal industry, none has painted up the fact that transshipments of Russian oil have entered our fuel markets, and none has prompted action necessary to meet the challenge.

Even if Red oil exports were not reaching the shores of this country, I believe that their encroachment on markets of the free world would justify your proposed pursuit of the matter. Until current oil trade figures are available, the following information should suffice to activate such an inquiry:

In 1961 imports of crude oil into Brazil from the U.S.S.R. amounted to more than 8 percent of the total admitted from neighboring Venezuela. During that same year Brazil exported more than 1¾ million barrels of oil to the United States. Brazil also exported more than 6 million barrels to the Netherlands Antilles, which in turn ships heavy volumes to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this committee should also look into Italy's oil import and export situation. While I am hopeful that that country's trade philosophy will be revised following the recent death of Enrico Mattei, boss of the Italian State Oil Agency, still it could be the responsibility of this committee to make the determination of our petroleum trade with Italy and all other shippers. In the face of opposition by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Mattei negotiated with Russia for the presentation of great quantities of Soviet oil in exchange for steel tubing to be used for completing the Kremlin's network of oil pipelines.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of last August 20 reported that Mattei admitted that almost 40 percent of Italy's fuel comes from the Soviet bloc. Additional quantities of Russian oil are presumed to reach Italy through transshipment from Egypt, according to a Senate Judiciary Committee study published last June. Keeping these facts in mind, Mr. Chairman, will you please refer to these data from the Bureau of Mines' International Petroleum Trade for June 1962.

In 1961 Italy exported more than half a million barrels of gasoline and more than half a million barrels of residual oil direct to the United States.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the transshipments of oil between Russia and the United States present a problem that must be resolved as soon as possible. For this reason, I urgently request you to pursue this matter promptly.

Included in my statement which I shall prepare for House delivery will be your requested references to my remarks that "one of the things that has come to my attention is that many of the other outlets which the South American countries have for their residual oil in Western Europe, of course, are being taken up by Russian oil."

Mr. Chairman, I am sending this reply to you by special messenger in hopes that you will be able to decide quickly and in the affirmative on the advisability of further hearings. Since President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela will be in this city this week, perhaps it would be possible to persuade him to visit with the committee on the theory that a discussion will prove beneficial to our Nation and his as well. President Betancourt might very well be able to provide information that would enable the United States to place impenetrable barriers against the admission of Red oil without disturbing hemispheric relationships. It would

be enlightening if he would volunteer to answer such question as:

1. What was the full impact of the meetings between Venezulan Minister of Mines and Hydrocarbons and Russian diplomats in Moscow in September 1961?

At that time, Venezuelan Senator Luis Tovar stated that his country had approached the Soviet Union regarding the dumping of Soviet oil in traditionally Venezuelan markets; hence the negotiations in Moscow. If those discussions had any bearing on the transshipment of Russian oil into the United States, this committee should be so apprised.

2. What volume of exports into the United States must Venezuela achieve to satiate her aspirations in this direction, and to what extent does the Russian oil offensive affect the preferred level?

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning last week, it is especially important that this level be established. The report quoted a statement by the Under Secretary of State, who opined that doubts about the oil import control program "have caused and continue to cause problems in our relationship with friendly nations."

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind you that doubts about the residual oil import control program have caused and will continue to cause problems—including poverty and deprivation—among coal miners, railroad workers, and employees of allied industries. Under the circumstances, it would appear mutually beneficial if President Betancourt would express his views on this subject before our committee.

I thank you for your interest in my views, and I trust that you will decide to hold further hearings on this subject in the immediate future—this week if possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

Lithuania Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, February 16th of each year is celebrated by the people of Lithuania, wherever they may be, as the date of their national independence. It is the Lithuanian Fourth of July. This February 16 as for many years past is a joyous one because it reminds them of their heritage and the fact that they are freedom-loving people. It is a sad one because since 1920 that date has been celebrated in absentia in so far as Lithuania's freedom is concerned. Since 1921 Lithuania has been subject to the tyranny of Soviet Russia. Their independence has vanished. It lives in the feelings and the desires of the liberty-loving Lithuanians.

At the present time, as I speak, some 3 million Lithuanians are held in bondage by their stern masters from the Kremlin. At the present time there seems to be little hope for Lithuanian freedom. This is an illusion. Some day, and I hope in the not too distant future, Lithuania will be governed by Lithuanians who will determine the destiny of their nation in accordance with the true wishes and desires of all free men. Until that day arrives I salute the Lithuanian people for thei never ending desire to be free.

Richardson Makes Annual Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to the attention of the membership a stirring Lincoln Day address delivered by the Honorable George C. Richardson of Newark, member of the New Jersey General Assembly, as reported in the New Jersey Herald News of February 16, 1963. As Mr. Richardson, who is my constituent and friend, states:

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, while opportunity ceases to squint its eye at pigmentation of human complexion, emancipation will be a proclamation, but it will not be a fact.

It is a sad and shocking fact that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation the condition of citizenship has not been fully realized for the American Negro. The significant advances made in recent years, particularly during the present administration, are most heartening, but it is evident that the combined action of all branches of government is needed to make the Emancipation Proclamation a living reality.

The article in the New Jersey Herald News follows:

RICHARDSON MAKES ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS

TRENTON.—"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This is my idea of Democracy." Thus Essex County Assemblyman George C. Richardson opened his Lincoln Day speech here on Monday. Excerpts follow:

"Great words that cause a man to search his soul and hone his actions to cut through the obstacles that are before him. These significant words, interwoven, in spirit, in the philosophies of many great men, have lived for over a century and have brought to us in this year 1963 an unimpeachable concept of humanity.

"This proposition was set forth by the lean and gaunt and humble common man, Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States of America. Lincoln was a common man, common in the sense that he was truly of the people. He once said: 'I think God must have loved the common people. He made so many of us.'

"If Mr. Lincoln had given nothing else to our great Nation, although his accomplishments were enumerable, the words 'I would not be a master,' flowing from the high, high office of the President of the United States, are a historic contribution and placed before us no easy task.

"Gentlemen, I suggest, that in setting aside time to observe the birthday of this great leader, Abraham Lincoln, we do a disservice to our purposes if we do not, at challenge of these words and dedicate our every energy to their fulfillment.

"This year Lincoln's Birthday takes on additional implications as we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. Lincoln's deathless words—'then, henceforth, and forever free'—rang throughout the Southland. The illiterate slaves could not read these words. The sophisticated issues of the war were without meaning for them. The years of struggle to make these words real could not be envisioned by them. But [pause], they thoroughly understood the promise. They had been promised freedom by the most influential man in the United States—the President.

"And the time passed. Year by year. Month by month. Week by week. Day by day. It is 100 years later and another influential man, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has this to say in reference to that promise; 'the task is not complete, no American can cease striving until every American, whatever his creed or color, enjoys the rights assigned to all Americans in the Declaration of Independence.'

"The statements of two Presidents, 100 years apart. During these 100 years there have been comparable statements from other great men, no less significant or noble or right. Thus, the promise of freedom is far from lacking in philosophical guidance, but what of deeds and actions.

"Morality is a thing of deeds and actions. Have we as a nation lived up to the moral commitment embodied in the words of our Declaration of Independence? What blow have we, moreover you, struck to insure the absolute freedom of your fellow man?

"At this point, when these questions arise, as sure as night follows day, someone will take comfort in the progress we have made. This person is usually rather vague about this progress, but he is certain, and correctly so, that things are better than they have been. He is generally an advocate of gradualism, known in some quarters as standstillism, and he will remind you that you must be considerate of what the other fellow thinks. Of course, nowhere in any of the historic documents assigning freedom to our citizens is this freedom stated as being contingent on what some other citizen thinks.

"I suppose, by this time, it is rather obvious that I don't intend to make a gentle Lincoln's day address. I don't intend to say things that you would know and I would know aren't true. Time is too short and the man whose birthday we are observing told the truth at the risk of splitting the Nation. I will tell what I believe in my heart to be the truth on this, his birthday.

"I suggest that Lincoln's proclamation did not promise progress: it promised freedom. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON concurred with this opinion when he said: 'While we have in America freed the slave of his chains, we have not freed his heirs of their color.' Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, while opportunity ceases to squint its eye at pigmentation of human complexion, emancipation will be a proclamation—but it will not be a fact."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 16, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

THE LINCOLN PHILOSOPHY

This week, as we observe the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, perhaps it is a good time to rededicate ourselves to the philosophy he gave us, the belief in our freedoms and in the private enterprise system. It is well that we remember his words that "as free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide." Unless we reverse the trend dictated by the policies and porgrams discussed in this newsletter, we may well be close to national suicide. Only by a return to the philosophy of constitutional-limited government can we return to the kind of nation envisioned by Lincoln when he said: "We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business."

UNITED NATIONS AID TO CUBA

The United Nations is going to give $1.2 million of your money to help strengthen communism in Cuba. And the only concern the Kennedy administration has, according to the press, is that this action "may add fuel to the attacks by some Congressmen on its Cuban policies." They are so right. This Congressman, for one, is going to continue to attack policies which are not in the self-interest of the United States and which, in fact, strengthen the sworn enemies of the United States. The latest move by the United Nations to approve a Cuban crop diversification project which will strengthen the agricultural economy of Cuba and make the Communist dictatorship more secure, it is a continuance of a policy which has seen the United States contributing to its own suicide by financing the United Nations so it could in turn finance Communist countries; and by our foolhardy foreign aid contributions to Yugoslavia, Poland and other Communist-dominated nations. The action of the United Nations Special Fund in approving the financing of the agricultural project in Cuba should call for this immediate reaction by the United States: (1) An immediate stop to all payments to the United Nations; (2) our withdrawal from the United Nations; (3) eliminate all foreign aid to Yugoslavia, Poland, and other Communist-dominated or neutral countries supporting our enemies.

THE FEDERAL BUILDING

The record will show that I have done everything reasonably, humanly, and ethically possible to get approval for the Dallas Federal Building. I have never, to my knowledge, made a statement that the Federal Building is not needed. My position has always been and still is that approval for the project should be based on merit—the yardsticks being (1) efficiency, (2) convenience, (3) economy. All Federal agencies and congressional committees which have investigated the project to date have recommended the building. I have now asked for an updated report from both General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office so that we may have at hand the latest figures on actual savings contemplated and a report on how Federal money already invested in site and planning is being protected. As a responsible representative it is my duty to continually check on how the peoples' money is being spent. It is up to the administration and the General Services Administration to either reject the Federal Building as not measuring up to the above-stated yardsticks, or to include it in the budget as first priority of any public works anywhere in the country. I would hope that all of us who have the best interest of Dallas at heart could get together to promote our community and not seize upon every occasion to discredit the efforts of those with whom we disagree politically. It is beyond understanding how the best interest of Dallas is promoted by the continued efforts to use the Federal Building as a weapon to undermine the Congressman from the Fifth District. I say, let's be done with the nitpicking and get on with the business of dealing with the life and death issues facing this Nation, including Dallas.

ADMINISTRATION TAXPROPOSALS PENALIZE THRIFTY

President Kennedy's proposal for a 5-percent floor on itemized tax deductions penalizes the thrifty and conscientious citizen-taxpaper. Under existing law, a taxpayer has the election either (a) to use the standard deduction or (b) to itemize his deductions. The administration's proposal would limit the itemized deductions (after first applying the limitation on medical deductions and a proposed limitation on the casualty loss deduction) to the amount by which the sum of the allowable itemized deductions exceeded 5 percent of the taxpayers' adjusted gross income. The 5-percent floor will reduce the amount deductible on the average by between 20 and 30 percent. In other words, between 20 and 30 percent of the taxpayer's State and local taxes, interest, charitable contributions, medical expense (after a 4-percent floor), casualty losses (after a 4-percent floor), and the other itemized expenses, will not be treated as a deduction from taxable income. This means that a taxpayer using the standard deduction will get proportionately a greater reduction in his tax liability than a taxpayer itemizing these deductions. In the middle income group, this disparity is as follows:

Percentage tax reduction when program fully effective

Annual income	Standard deduction taxpayer	Average itemized deduction taxpayer
	Percent	*Percent*
$5,000	33.3	18.7
$10,000	22.2	15.3
$15,000	20.6	13.9
$20,000	20.4	13.6

The taxpayer with the itemized deductions—the homeowner who pays local taxes and contributes to charity—gets less tax reduction. For example, a married taxpayer having an income of $10,000 from wages and salaries with two dependents, using the standard deduction, would get a tax reduction of almost $304. The same taxpayer, who had itemized deductions of $1,800 would get a tax reduction of only $182.

HOW MANY ARE PENALIZED

It is estimated that 51 million taxable returns will be filed under existing law. Of this 51 million, approximately one-half will use the standard deduction and one-half will itemize their deductions. There are both types of taxpayers in all income groups. In the middle income group, however, between $5,000 and $20,000, about 11½ million taxpayers will use the standard deduction and about 18½ million will itemize deductions. The effect of the 5-percent floor is to give greater relief to the 11½ million at the expense of the 18½ million.

WHO TAKES THE RISK?

The administration will attempt to overcome the argument that there is inequity by showing that all taxpayers will pay less taxes as a result of the package than they would under existing law. Many taxpayers may not object to the disparity within the same income group so long as they are getting a tax reduction. This is a shortsighted view. The administration admittedly proposes tax reduction as a "calculated risk." In other words, it is a gamble. If tax reduction does not produce the miracle of growth that is attributed to it, tax rates will have to be increased. The taxpayer who uses the standard deduction has gambled nothing. He got the benefit of a temporary reduction. However, the taxpayer who itemizes his deductions gambles that tax reduction will result in a balanced budget. He will have given up between one-third and one-fourth of his deductions through the operation of the 5-percent floor. Therefore, if the package fails to produce a miracle, he will be worse off when taxes are increased again. That is why I will continue to fight for effective, equitable tax reform and a corresponding cut in Federal spending to establish fiscal responsibility rather than to depend upon miracles.

Radio and TV reports: Inside Washington—WFAA-TV 1:15 Sunday, regular weekly reports on radio stations KLIF, KSKY, KVIL, and KPCN.

Lincoln's Close Hold on People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1963, there appeared in the Washington Star a column by Ralph McGill commemorating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Mr. McGill, I believe, captures the essence of the Lincoln mystique when he states:

He holds no higher place in our national history than Jefferson or Washington. But none touches us and fills our imagination and affection such as he.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent summary of the qualities of this outstanding human being and to share it with my colleagues and others, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LINCOLN'S CLOSE HOLD ON PEOPLE

It is now 154 years since that February Sunday morning in 1809 when the weary woman, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, rested on a cornhusk bed beneath warm bearskins with her newborn son in a log cabin near Hodgenville, Ky.

The floor was packed-down dirt. One door was hung on leather hinges. One small window let in light. A stick-and-clay chimney carried away the smoke. The land was poor. The living was hard. After 3 years the family moved on. (The cabin is there, with marble about it, and every American who can would do well to mark his roadmap that way at least once.)

The all-too-short years of that baby boy are perhaps the best known secular life story in the world. The romance of it is the explanation. The patience, the strength, the magnanimity of it is another. The writings, the sayings, the great belief in man's ability to govern himself, are other factors which have made him a universal man. It has been a little less than 98 years since the little group of men about a bed in a narrow house at 453 10th Street, across from Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C., heard the tortured breath cease, saw death come to Abraham Lincoln.

No leader of modern times has known so much growth in influence and fame since his death. No President grew more than he in office. None was more beloved or more unjustly hated.

His law partner in Springfield, Ill., William Herndon, wrote of him: "This man, this long, bony, wiry, sad man, floated into our country in 1831 in a frail canoe, down the north fork of the Sangamon River, friendless, penniless, powerless and alone—ragged, struggling for the common necessities of life. This man, this peculiar man, left us in 1861, the President of the United States, backed by friends, power, fame and all human force."

It is not easily understood why Lincoln, of all the great in our history, should reach out to us now with a surer touch and an almost mystic presence. He holds no higher place in our national history than Jefferson or Washington. But none touches us and fills our imagination and affection as does he. Nor is it just Americans who are so moved. More books have been written about him by foreign scholars than any other civil ruler. And no American President has so held the writers of history and biography as he. None has had so inspired a biographer as Carl Sandburg, whose volumes on Lincoln are a masterpiece of moving, poetic narrative.

That Lincoln was wise, strong, patient, compassionate, able, we know. He ended slavery with a stroke of the pen, but he did so only after his plan for a gradual and compensated emancipation had been arrogantly rejected. Had his logical proposals, advanced as early as 1854, been accepted, the Nation would not have lost a million men and set back the national development at least a half a century. His presence speaks to us now to resolve the new crisis with justice.

His Gettysburg address explains him better than anything else. He had always believed in popular government. But at Gettysburg he let us know that all along he had seen the struggle as something more than saving the Union. There must be, he said, a new birth of freedom—the Republic and the freedom for which so many men had died, must serve the future of free man and free government.

He was always the compassionate man. Many in the South hated and abused him. It should not be overlooked that never once in the long, bitter war did he speak even one abusive word of the Southern people. The day of his assassination he was planning for a reunion based on compassion and reality.

There is a lesson for us in this story of Lincoln. Once again the world is watching to see if democracy will vindicate itself.

It is again a testing time to see if men will do their duty not merely for the Republic of this day and year but for the many generations ahead.

The Challenge of Soviet Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding publications that crosses my desk is The Humble Way a magazine published quarterly by the public relations department of the Humble Oil & Refining Co.

In its winter, 1963 edition, an article appears reprinted from the Empire Trust Letter, a publication of the outstanding banking firm—Empire Trust Co. of New York. It is entitled "The Challenge of Soviet Oil."

This article should be of important and current interest to the free world in our economic battle with the Soviet Union, and I am requesting that it be inserted here so that its contents may receive wide circulation.

The article follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET OIL

The cold war has taken a new turn—Russia is seeking a much bigger share of international trade. She is seeking more trade to obtain a hold on the trade lines linking the free nations. To gain more trade, she is using a powerful new weapon.

That weapon is oil.

Why is Russia using oil as its offensive weapon? Chiefly because oil represents the Soviet Union's most marketable export—and the Russians have a surplus of it.

The free world's oil companies can be counted on to hold their own in any struggle for the world's oil markets. They are strong and healthy. They are supplying a demand that is growing steadily.

The petroleum companies also operate a vast distribution and marketing network which guarantees delivery of petroleum products where and when they are needed. With their present and potential resources and facilities to meet the promise of increasing demand, the oil companies continue as a sound investment.

There are, however, the political and cold war sides to the Russian threat. To meet these challenges the free world's oil companies will be helped by the fullest understanding of the situation on the part of the public and the Federal Government.

RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC WEAPON

In the last 6 years, Russia has climbed rapidly to prominence among the oil-producing nations. Today, with a production of about 3.3 million barrels daily, she is second only to the United States (over 7 million barrels daily).

In 1953 Russia exported 35,000 barrels a day to the free world. In 1961 Russian oil exports to free world markets averaged 600,000 barrels daily—by far the largest item in Soviet trade with the free world. In 1965, it is estimated, the Russians could export around 1 million barrels a day to the free world.

With increased exploration and increased production the U.S.S.R. finds herself with an abundance of crude oil. Old centers of Russian oil production such as Baku, are maintaining their production through discovery of new horizons. Rich newer fields in the Urals-Volga region are setting production records. Additional fields have been discovered north of the Caucasus and in Siberia. Wells are tapping promising deposits beneath the Caspian Sea, and along its shores.

Despite her expanding oil production, Russia's internal oil demand has not kept pace. For example, the consumption of gasoline within Russia has been kept down by the small number of automobiles. There are about 4 million motor vehicles in Russia, contrasted with almost 76 million in the United States.

But the booming economies of other nations have proven a tempting market. Free world demand for oil in 1960 (excluding the United States) was 12 percent higher than in 1959. New nations such as Ghana and Pakistan, and older more industrialized nations such as Japan, Italy, and Germany are ideal customers. They need oil for their developing industries and growing economies.

CUTRATE COMPETITION

The needs of these nations can be met by the oil produced within the free world—in North America, South America, and the Middle East. Heavy investments have been made by private industry to supply the energy fuel which will spur economic development of these nations. But when Soviet oil enters the picture it involves more than the mere problem of competition, which comes under the heading of a normal business risk. Russia can disregard the economic considerations which must be respected by its free world competition and there are certain other abnormal underlying factors:

Item: Russian oil is state controlled. The Russians offer it as a full-scale government-to-government deal—not independent-business-to-independent-business. This fact strengthens the concept of government agencies carrying out business—a system in contrast to the traditional Western practice of private enterprise.

Item: With prices set by the state, Russia can sell oil at uneconomic rates, undercutting the prices of Western producers. Russian sales have been made at prices which are actually lower than the total of the lifting costs plus governmental taxes and royalty charges incurred by typical Middle East producers.

Item: Russian losses can be offset by charging higher rates to satellite nations. In 1960 the free world price of Russian crude oil was about 52 percent of the price satellite countries paid for the same oil.

Item: The Russians try to avoid paying for transportation, manufacturing, and marketing facilities in an importing country by getting the use of facilities previously paid for by private companies.

Item: Russia is often willing to accept local money, whether or not it is readily convertible into reliable currencies, in payment for her crude oil. She extends tempting long-range credit items.

Item: Russia has been willing to make barter arrangements. She will trade Russian crude oil for staples produced by other nations: sugar, coffee, rubber, tea, cotton, wool. With industrial nations she trades crude oil for equipment she needs badly within her own borders: pipeline, ships, and complete factories, for example.

The Western oil producing company thus stands faced with a massive competitor who can cut her prices at will and can accept payment in terms that would be impractical and ruinous for private industry.

The worldwide Soviet trade war against us has been well described by U.S. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. He calls it "economic banditry."

THE THREAT CAN GROW

The Soviet economic offensive threatens to get worse. Russia is expanding her merchant fleet. Operating in a time when many tankers are idle around the world, she is actively buying tankers. In Japan, Russia contracted for 200,000 tons of tanker shipping. In Italy, a NATO country committed to defend the West against communism, Russia is having six tankers built.

The Russians are constructing two huge petroleum pipelines. One will be almost 2,500 miles long, and will carry crude oil from the Urals-Volga oil fields in Russia to refineries in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany. Its capacity is expected to be 750,000 barrels of oil a day.

Another pipeline is under construction in Siberia. It will run from the same region to Irkutsk, Siberia, and may be extended later to the Sea of Japan.

These expanded transportation facilities—new tankers and pipelines—will make Soviet oil even more of an economic threat. In addition, both ships and pipelines are then in strategic readiness to supply the Soviets in an international emergency.

SOVIET ECONOMIC GAINS

This year more than half the total exported Soviet oil will be bought by Western nations. Communist successes in the trade war are impressive.

In 1961 Italy imported over 100,000 barrels a day of Russian crude oil and products. This represented over 20 percent of her local

demand. Offered at a low price deliberately designed to undercut Persian Gulf crude oil sales, the Russian oil is being traded for tankers, large-diameter pipe, synthetic rubber, synthetic fibers, citrus fruit—plus such things as entire chemical plants, paper plants, and metal-cutting machines.

Russia recently got a foothold in Spain, one of the most anti-Communist of nations, by trading oil for textile fibers. Since Spain has no diplomatic relations with Russia, a Belgian intermediary was used.

In 1960, Cuba received about 28 million barrels of crude oil (her entire supply) from Russia.

Sweden imports about 20 percent of her oil from Russia.

Finland gets about 80 percent of her oil from Russia. Though next door to Russia, she pays 25 percent more for it than does Sweden.

Iceland receives all of her oil from Russia—in return for fish.

Japan bought about 200 million barrels of Soviet oil in 1961, ordered more for 1962. Much of the Soviet oil will be paid for by Japanese exports of machinery. Japan's deal with Russia also lays the groundwork for future imports of Siberian timber, iron ore and coal. From Japan, Russia also gets large-diameter pipe and tankers which will be used to deliver still more Communist oil to the world.

By buying tankers abroad Russia frees her shipyards to build freighters. These can be used in a competitive drive against the free world's merchant marine, with Russia undercutting prices for freight hauling and thereby gaining a foothold in free-world shipping.

By buying large-diameter pipe and machinery abroad, Russia gets an additional advantage; she frees her metal forming industry to produce missiles, sputniks, or anything else she chooses.

In India, the Russians recently forced free-world oil companies to lower prices offering India Soviet oil at 10 to 20 percent below prevailing world prices. Thus the Soviets delivered a blow at the free world's oil industry merely by cutting prices in a bid; they did not even have to use up any of their own oil to win a trade-war victory.

This is an example of what Mr. Khrushchev meant when he said to Walter Lippmann: "We—the Communists—will make more trouble for you—the Americans—with every passing year."

In Europe Russian crude oil is being imported into the European Common Market area (a trade confederation composed of France, Italy, Belgium, West Germany, Holland and Luxembourg) principally by Italy. This cutrate crude may be made into low-priced oil products and, in turn, can be reexported to other member nations with limited or no restriction under the Common Market trade agreement. This may disrupt the free world's normal European trade, and such disruption again results in benefits to Russia.

PLAN FOR ECONOMIC CONQUEST

At the Second Arab Congress in 1960, the Soviets announced their intention of regaining the oil export standing which they held prior to World War II. During 1930–33, according to E. P. Gurov, director of the Soviet Oil Export Organization, the Soviet share was 19 percent of total Western European countries' oil imports. Russia now is selling to Europe 8 percent of the oil Europe needs.

Thus Russia strikes directly at the economy of the petroleum-producing Arab countries at the same time she woos them with Communist propaganda.

The stepping up of Soviet oil exports is part of a calculated 7-year plan spanning 1959-65. The program calls for continued emphasis on all phases of oil development in Russia from exploration to distribution. Oil production is scheduled to climb from 3 million barrels daily output of 1960 to 5 million barrels daily by 1965. Ambitious as these goals seem, Premier Khrushchev recently announced an even more optimistic goal: production of 7.8 million barrels of oil daily by 1970 tnd 14.2 million barrels of oil daily by 1980.

PAYING THE PIPER

What could happen to those nations which come to rely on the supply of Russian oil? A nation which accepts Russian oil may soon find that it is importing Russian ideas and Communist political influence. Similarly, a nation that ties itself too closely to the Soviets by exporting too many goods to Russia, is more vulnerable to Communist pressure accompanied by threatened loss of market for such goods. The Soviets have often demonstrated how they use economic dependence as a political tool. Khrushchev has said it: "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons."

There may come a day when the Russians no longer need to offer their oil so freely. The Communists' own industrial and consumer demand may climb. Or they may decide to take advantage of the dependence of other nations on their supply. Then the Soviets could raise their prices at will. They could even refuse to supply petroleum. The dependent nations would have two choices: to agree to Russian terms or turn again to the West for their oil. The former choice could mean further expansion of Communist domination. The latter choice would mean a sudden increased demand for free world oil. A nation dependent on Russia for its oil supply may find it difficult to switch to free world sources at a later date. Refineries, pipeline, and other transportation facilities could become so oriented to Russian supply that the transition could not be accomplished without delay.

And in the event of an international emergency, how secure would Western nations be who had relied on Russia for their supply of oil, essential as that fuel is to modern warfare?

It is evident that the United States has a very strong stake in the battle against the Soviet oil challenge. As the leader of the free Western nations, the United States has a duty to make others aware of the dangers which lie in Soviet trade. The inroads made by Soviet oil upon world trade relationships reinforce world tensions. The continuing cold war means emphasis on defense spending and foreign aid as we try to offset the influence of Soviet trade with new and underdeveloped nations. All of these things can mean continued and increasing tax burdens for the American people, and other free world nations.

THE WESTERN DEFENSE

Bearing the burden of any successes gained by the Soviet oil offensive are the western companies which have labored long and hard to develop a reliable flow of petroleum to feed the world's energy needs.

The companies—unlike the Communist government—are subject to economic discipline. They have to pay fair wages. They have to pay royalties to many governments such as those in the Middle East and Venezuela. They have to pay taxes. They have to pay dividends to their stockholders. They have to earn money for new equipment and expanding facilities. They have, in effect, to pay their share of maintaining and increasing the free world's standard of living.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

What can be done to stem the Soviet oil offensive before it becomes a really serious threat to world economic and political balance?

There is no easy solution in sight.

Some ideas are being proposed by various sources:

1. Use such free world organizations as NATO to impress the danger of dependence on Soviet oil on such nations as Italy. To date, some pressure has been brought to bear through American embassies abroad, but efforts to stimulate all consumer countries with a greater understanding of the true nature of the Russian oil threat should increase.

2. More emphasis might be placed on the use of oil as a tool in the foreign-aid programs of the United States. Section 647 of Public Law 87–195 should be carried out. It directs U.S. Government agencies to work with other countries in developing plans for using free world supplies in their development programs.

3. Encourage free world nations to set restriction quotas on the amount of oil imported from the Soviet bloc.

4. Suggest to other countries that, in the event of their trading with Russia, only consumer goods be sent—rather than strategic materials or finished factories that increase the Communist potential for war.

5. Warn all countries against the dangers of the reexport trade in Soviet oil. For instance, a country that refuses to buy directly from the Communists could defeat its own ends by buying, instead, reexported Russian oil from some country that did deal with the Russians.

6. Impress upon the free world's oil-producing countries—particularly Venezuela and those in the Middle East and in Africa—the threat that Russia is to them. Continue the orderly development of the free world's oil reserves in these nations.

7. The U.S. Government should see to it that it has intimate knowledge of the oil industry in every country so that it can meet Soviet intrusions early. Cooperative efforts by a fully informed U.S. Government and the various oil companies can often provide alternatives to the purchase of Soviet oil. Always watch developments closely. There is no telling what moves Russia will make next, and the free world must be prepared to take defensive action no matter what they are.

The Federal Government and the National Petroleum Council are studying the aspects of the situation at the present time. There is real concern over the Soviet oil export policy. Although they can be counted on to hold their own, the free world companies will be helped through a clearer understanding by the American people of the subtleties of the problem.

THE GROWING AWARENESS

A number of persons recently have commented on the Russian oil situation and its serious implications. They summarize admirably what it means.

Said U.S. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois: "Soviet political leaders, engineers, and strategists have discovered the importance of oil as a political and trade weapon, and are now earnestly intent on using oil to the fullest in their conquest of the free world."

Said U.S. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota: "We must always, it seems to me, keep under close scrutiny the shifting trade tactics of the Soviet bloc, to see what kind of defensive measures need be taken against them."

U.S. Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, in a recent speech, called the Nation's attention to the Communist economic threat. A shooting war with Russia, he said, "will probably never come" because we are prepared and the Russians know it. "But," he said, "one war already has been declared * * * an economic war which we do

not yet fully understand * * * I believe this very lack of understanding is our greatest actual danger."

An informed U.S. public * * * and only an informed public * * * is the best reply to the Soviet's declared economic war. It is with that purpose in mind that this article is published. An informed public will make it easier to adopt the right policies and legislation; it will act in the national interest; it will have a broader understanding of the trade war as Russia is waging it against the entire free world.

The Communist goals are unchanging: economic penetration—and resulting disunity—of the free world, and the use of this disunity as a beachhead for political influence.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Multiple Use of Land and Water Resources Important to Overall Economic Well-Being

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the importance of multiple use of land and water resources for the economic well-being of our society is coming more and more to the forefront. The fact that all resources are interdependent is becoming better recognized. Flood control, soil and water conservation, stream pollution abatement, navigation, development of industrial, agricultural, and recreational interests are all in the same package.

This multiple-use concept of land and water resources was effectively outlined by Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, at the sixth annual meeting of the Wabash Valley Association. Administrator Williams set forth a whole packet of tools which are now available to help develop the natural resources of the Wabash River Valley. Some of these tools are new as a result of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. I believe all Members of the Senate will be interested in an up-to-date look at "Multiple Use of Land and Water Resources." Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Williams' address inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MULTIPLE USE OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

(Address by D. A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, at sixth annual meeting of Wabash Valley Association, Lentz Hall, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Ill., February 16, 1963)

It's an honor to have a part in the sixth anual meeting of your organization. The Wabash Valley Association isn't very old, as organizations go, but it has built a national reputation in less than half a decade. This reputation is founded on good works. You are making your mark.

You are making your mark because you are banded together for the highest possible civic purpose: conservation and development of the soil and water resources of one of America's great watersheds.

You are making your mark because you are a cross section of the economy of this great valley—its industries, its businesses, its transportation, its agriculture, its professions, its civic organizations, and its public officials.

You are making your mark because as a group you have recognized that all resources are interdependent; that flood control, soil and water conservation, stream pollution abatement, navigation, development of industrial, agricultural, and recreational interests are all in the same package and cannot be developed separately without regard for each other.

You are making your mark because you have recognized that all people are interdependent; that industry cannot successfully attack the many problems of this great watershed independently, no more so than can agriculture, or business, or State government, or Federal Government.

Perhaps most significant, you have demonstrated you thoroughly understand that land and water problems are of increasing concern to both farm and nonfarm people, and that carefully planned programs to satisfy both rural and urban needs are essential. The interrelationship between farm and nonfarm interests in resource conservation, although a truism from the very beginning, has come to be fully recognized only in recent years. It has come about only through the enlightened leadership of groups like yours.

Today, as your organization has demonstrated, more and more people realize that city conservation problems and farm conservation problems are not separate and distinct problems. They are so interrelated that one can scarcely tell where a rural conservation problem leaves off and an urban conservation problem begins.

More people today realize that just about all of our water falls on the land, for less than 2 percent of the Nation's total area is in lakes or streams, and that three-fourths of this land on which all our rain and snow falls is in private ownership and 60 percent is in farms and ranches. Management, use, manipulation, and development of our water resource, therefore, begins largely on the privately owned lands.

This is the water that grows our crops, provides forage for our livestock. This is the water that carries away soil through surface runoff, that sweeps it into streams and lakes where it creates additional conservation problems. This is the water that serves our cities and our industries. This is the water that floods our valleys and our towns and cities. This is the water that provides all our water-based recreation, our fishing, boating, and swimming. This is the water that provides much of our power. This is the water that feeds our navigable streams.

What more evidence do we need to prove that land and water go hand in hand? That no piece of land is an island, apart from all the land? That no cloudburst or snowstorm is restricted in its effect to the area in which it occurs?

Our growing awareness of the interlocking, interdependence of land and water resources and of rural and urban interests in developing and protecting those resources has come about, I think, in several almost simultaneous phases.

One of these is the greatly increasing nonagricultural use of land to provide space for our expanding population in which to live, to work, and to play. These new users of land almost immediately become involved with firsthand conservation responsibilities. The developer of a housing area, the builder of a factory, and proprietor of a golf course—in fact, every land user in city, suburb, or rural area—is and must be concerned with the soils and the water behavior at his particular site.

More widespread understanding of the watershed aproach is another reason for our improved attitude toward orderly development and management of our renewable natural resources.

Like every other country, the United States is physically a nation of watersheds. Our longest rivers and their tributaries drain large areas. These areas are usually called river basins or drainage basins. Each major river basin is divided into several lesser watersheds, and each of these, in turn, is subdivided progressively into smaller and smaller watersheds down to those where surface waters first begin to collect.

The land and water resources in our watersheds are at once our problem and the base of our economy, for they serve most of our needs.

Use of our watersheds now goes considerably beyond our original uses and purposes. In addition to the production of food, forage, livestock, wood, and wildlife, we now look to our watersheds as the areas in which we can develop agriculture through conservation land use and water management. We look to our watersheds for parks and recreational areas. We want to protect and develop our water supplies and to end stream pollution. We hope to stop the silting of our rivers, harbors, and reservoirs and reduce the tremendous dredging costs. We want to control soil erosion and floods. We hope to build back our farmlands; build back and improve our timber supply; give wildlife a better chance under friendlier conditions; and cut down on the waste and damage of uncontrolled water.

We have come to realize that no two watersheds are exactly alike, that each one is an intricate, complete unit of nature governed by natural principles that men can modify but never abolish or ignore.

We have learned that action taken anywhere in a watershed that affects one resource will inevitably affect other resources. The chains of cause and effect in a watershed are numerous, long, and farreaching. We know that efforts to use, conserve, and develop renewable natural resources without regard for watersheds and natural principles are certain to be costly and are likely to fail.

In addition, we have come to realize that our land and water resources can serve present and future needs of all interests only through application of the principle of multiple use. When storing water, for example, wherever feasible we should provide for all possible uses of an irreplaceable site instead of only a single use. Water supply, flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife, industrial development, irrigation—these are a few of the use combinations possible under the multipurpose principle.

Perhaps most important, in the development of our present enlightened attitude, is the conviction that the ideal arrangement for resource development is a cooperative one involving the community, the State, and, where necessary, the Federal Government.

This three-way partnership has been successfully demonstrated for 25 years in soil conservation districts. Here the State provides legislation, some funds, and the guidance of a State committee. Here the local people themselves organize for conservation work, select their own unpaid leaders, develop their own program. Here the Federal Government, when asked, provides technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service, and various other kinds of assistance, education, cost-sharing and credit through other programs.

The soil conservation district belongs to the local people. They run the show. State and Federal agencies help them carry out their program.

Indiana and Illinois have long been among the national leaders in the soil conservation district movement. Indiana has 85 soil conservation districts and Illinois has 98. I think if you will do a little checking you will find that some of the counties within the Wabash Valley in these States are not in soil conservation districts. The leadership and action programs associated with soil conservation districts are worth careful study in every county. Many of you perhaps know that you are meeting in the Coles County Soil and Water Conservation District whose board chairman is Robert Baker.

The principles of soil conservation districts—local initiative and control—are the heart of the small watershed program, which was authorized by the Congress in 1954 as the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This provides that a small watershed project (up to 250,000 acres) must be initiated by a legally responsible local organization, which is responsible for developing a work plan, carrying it out, and operating and maintaining the project when it is completed. The Federal Government through the Soil Conservation Service, provides technical, cost-sharing and credit assistance.

Some 49 local organizations in the Wabash Valley have applied for assistance in developing small watershed projects. At present, seven have been authorized for operations in Indiana and one in Illinois.

Soil conservation districts and small watershed projects are established tools to help develop the natural resources of the great Wabash Valley. New tools have recently been provided.

The small watershed program, Public Law 566, was amended so it is now possible for the Soil Conservation Service to provide cost-sharing for water-based recreational developments in watershed projects. Funds can be advanced to acquire critical sites for water impoundments. Funds can be advanced to provide municipal and industrial water supply for future use, with repayment by the local organization deferred up to 10 years.

The Congress also authorized changes in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which will permit resource conservation and development projects. When funds are provided, such projects may be established in representative areas of the country. They would, like Public Law 566 projects, be locally initiated and sponsored. They would provide for carrying out a program of land conservation and land use in an area where acceleration of the present conservation activities plus the use of new authorities would provide additional economic opportunities to the people. SCS will have the leadership of this program.

The Congress also authorized a cropland conversion program that provides for long-range land-use adjustment programs at National, State, and county levels. It authorizes, when funds are available, agreements up to 10 years with individual landowners for developing land-use adjustment programs including conversion of presently unneeded or unsuitable croplands to other uses, such as grass or trees. Such long-term agreements with individual farmers and ranchers are to be based on conservation plans developed through soil conservation districts with SCS technical help. This program will be headed by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Congress provided for technical, cost-sharing, and credit assistance in establishing income-producing recreation enterprises on farm and ranch land.

The other new tool provided by the Congress is a rural renewal program under which projects can be developed locally that are aimed at relieving underemployment, strengthening family farming, and developing natural resources to assure permanence of the economic gains achieved. The program will be handled by the Farmers Home Administration.

Soon to be launched is a comprehensive cooperative survey of the Wabash River Basin. The U.S. Department of Agriculture will participate in this survey under the leadership of the Soil Conservation Service. Ed Swain, our State conservationist for Indiana, is now organizing the Department's effort for this broad resources study. The survey, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers and other Federal and State agencies, will be carried on for several years.

In this survey, the Department of Agriculture will give careful consideration to the upstream areas, particularly with respect to present and prospective use and treatment of the land and the management of water, including flood prevention, agricultural water management, municipal and industrial water supply, water quality control, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

This study can pave the way, I think, for significant and far-reaching resource developments that will have tremendous impact on the future of the Wabash Valley.

It can provide a blueprint for the future, a blueprint that will be made up of the worthwhile work now under way, projects proposed, and new types of activities that may be needed. This blueprint will be on a long-range basis, one that looks ahead to future needs as well as present needs. This blueprint can be in effect an overall guide to the present and future needs of the valley and what can be done about them, and how the smaller parts of the whole, many of which are now in progress, can be fitted together to make an attractive and useful whole.

This study can implement the Wabash Valley Compact that was passed by the two State legislatures, approved by the Congress and signed by the Governors of the two States just 3 years ago last month.

The compact, as you know, is an agreement between the two States to formulate a comprehensive plan of development of the resources of the Wabash Valley. It established the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission of 14 members, 7 from each State, who serve without compensation.

You may recall the purpose of this commission, as stated in article I of the compact. The words bear repeating: "Indiana and Illinois find that the Wabash Valley has suffered from a lack of comprehensive planning for the optimal use of its human and natural resources and that underutilization and inadequate benefits from its potential wealth are likely to continue until there is proper organization to encourage and facilitate coordinated development of the Wabash Valley as a region and to relate its agricultural, industrial, commercial, recreational, transportation, development, and other problems to the opportunities in the valley."

That is a long sentence, and it contains a world of meaning. It is at once a brief outline of your problem and a mandate on what needs to be done—in very broad terms of course.

In one of your publications I read recently that widespread flooding, nearly dry channels in late summer and fall, and silt laden and polluted streams characterize your water resources. Your forests contain poor quality scrub trees, weed trees, and trees disfigured and damaged by grazing and fire. Marginal and submarginal farms operated at a loss to the owner indicate a lack of adequate management of your soil and agricultural water resource.

Why is a program of resource management needed in the Wabash Valley? Your interstate commission has provided an excellent answer to that question. Let me quote it: "Of the 82 counties in the Wabash Valley, 32 counties have fewer people living in them today than inhabited these counties in 1900. Adequate resource development will enable these people to make a better living and will stem this migration to regions of greater opportunity.

"In addition to the need for development in the so-called poorer areas of the valley, consideration must be given to the need for providing employment opportunities for the increased number of people who will occupy this region during the next few decades. By the year 2000, the resources of this valley must support more than 7 million people. Present employment opportunities do not provide adequately for half of this number."

The Wabash Valley, it seems to me, is on the brink of realizing its tremendous potential. It is on the brink of moving forward with the basic concepts of rural areas development.

Properly developed, the resources in this great valley, located amid the metropolitan centers of the Midwest, can make it one of the most productive river basins in the world.

The agricultural, commercial, industrial, and recreational potentials are almost without limit.

It is within your power, and the people to follow you, to realize all these potentials fully, and to do so within the lifetime of many of us here. In the hands of the Wabash Valley Association members, the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission, the State governments of Indiana and Illinois, your farmers, your industrialists, your businessmen, your civic leaders, your public officials, your teachers, your clergymen—in all these hands lie a future that is better or a future that will continue to see your people migrate to other areas as you fail in our stewardship.

I believe that in your hands these resources are in safe hands. I believe that the future of the Wabash Valley is indeed a bright one. I wish you well.

The Dilemma of the Shrinking Gold Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, the United States has been perched uncomfortably upon the horns of the dilemma of its shrinking gold reserves. Because it is a politically distasteful matter with no apparent solution it is treated as an ugly stepchild in the Nation's family of fiscal problems.

On the justified premise that many folks do not understand—and therefore are little concerned with the seriousness of our imbalance of payments, it has been vaguely discussed in most of this administration's messages on economic policy. Neither Secretary of the Treasury Dillon nor Secretary of Commerce Hodges would agree in my interrogation of them before the House Ways and Means Committee that there is any direct correlation at present between our domestic budget deficits and our gold reserve woes. It seems to me that every-

one is just too anxious to oversimplify the ultimate solution to a problem which has been getting progressively worse during the past 16 years. In his tax revision message, the President did say that the series of chain reactions which would be resultant in our economy with the adoption of our structural and rate changes would improve our balance and payments. This is, in my considered opinion, wishful thinking which has no basis of fact from our past experience. In fact, recent history would indicate that the effect of a bloated budget combined with shrinking revenues would accelerate rather than slow up the U.S. flow of gold.

Today U.S. gold reserves have tailspinned to a figure of 15.9 billion. The statutory requirement that we maintain $11.6 billion to support our domestic requirements at home leaves us faced with the stark reality that we actually have in reserve beyond this requirement less than $4½ billion in gold reserves against which there are outstanding foreign obligations of more than $22 billion. Economic and fiscal theorists notwithstanding, the U.S. balance of payments will continue to shrink as long as large budget deficits continue. It is an established fact that the confidence or lack of confidence of foreign investors is directly influenced by this Nation's domestic fiscal conduct. We can talk about the gross national product and rate of economic growth—those terms which the economists are tossing about so fashionably these days—but the fact remains that U.S. gold reserves have continued to flow abroad to the tune of more than $10 billion since 1946, during which time we have poured approximately $130 billion into foreign aid.

As some of us predicted a year ago when there was loud clamor for a revision of our trade and tariff policies, we now find ourselves pretty much in the same position as Great Britain. The most ardent proponents of the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962 were very critical of the position taken by me and other less gullible Members of Congress with regard to the program and the glowing harvest predicted. Instead, though we predicated the need for this bill for the entrance of Great Britain in the Common Market, we find that we were simply getting all dressed up to go to a party to which we had not been invited—and President de Gaulle made it quite clear recently that there would be no engraved invitations issued, either. Thus, those who predicted that the trade expansion bill would be the economic cure-all and the one thing that would improve our critical gold reserve situation, must now face the stark reality that it is not always good judgment to theorize or indulge in economic wishful thinking when experience and reality provide the best basis for conclusion.

In the light of recent events associated with the Common Market, we find the same folks theorizing that a tax cut, accompanied by increased Federal expenditures, will ultimately improve our imbalance of payments. Let the record show that there are many of us who do not share the optimism of this theory, for 1, 2, and 3 years from now will undoubtedly prove the need for dealing with the gold reserve problem in a sound fiscal and economical manner.

The 58th Anniversary of Rotary International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this month marks the 58th anniversary of Rotary International. As a past president of Rotary International, my pride in its achievements over the years is understandable. But other Senators, I am sure, have come to know the fine work of this world-reaching organization. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Roswell, N. Mex., Daily Record on February 15, 1963, commending Rotary's service to mankind be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY-EIGHT YEARS OF SERVICE

Rotary International will celebrate its 58th anniversary this month, and from the Fiji Islands to Florida and from Chile to Norway, 11,000 Rotary clubs will be celebrating this anniversary.

The anniversary dates back to 1905 when Paul P. Harris, founder of Rotary, asked three business acquaintances to meet with him to discuss the launching of a new club.

The new club in 1905 was the Rotary Club of Chicago. Since then, Rotary has encircled the globe entirely through the voluntary efforts of men to share the organization's ideals of unselfishness and service with men in other communities. Today there are more than a half million business and professional men who belong to 11,400 Rotary clubs in 128 countries.

What are Rotary aims and goals? What are its programs? It seeks to be of service to communities, to build respect for vocations and professions, to promote international understanding and has many other goals. To promote international understanding, for instance, clubs—including the Roswell club—since 1947 have sent 1,500 students who meet rigid qualifications to study in lands other than their own. They, by addressing clubs and groups during their year abroad and by serving as envoys of good will, have helped the world become more cohesive and peoples to better understand one another.

For instance a U.S. student with at least a BA degree may be sent to Germany. He must be able to speak and write German fluently. A German youth coming to an American university on a Rotary fellowship must speak English fluently.

On the Roswell level, the Roswell Rotary Club has various student programs which have enabled dozens of students to obtain educations who could not have done so otherwise. This is but one of Rotary's activities.

Fellowship ranks high as a factor in the success of Rotary International. It stems from a mutual commitment on the part of Rotarians to simple but significant goals. The development of personal acquaintance is regarded as a means for increasing the opportunities for serving others. The wisdom of this principle is evident in the numerous and varied ways that Rotary clubs and Rotarians improve their communities, their vocations and their countries.

Most civic organizations have worthwhile goals and projects that benefit community, State and Nation. None can surpass the Rotary club in creating better international understanding and better understanding right at home between individuals and groups.

To Rotarians of this city, and to their fellow Rotarians everywhere, we extend our congratulations on the upcoming February anniversary of the organization. May it continue to grow and bring its benefits to more people.

Booklet by U.N. Group Lauds Russ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of this House a United Press International article bearing a Paris dateline which has been brought to my attention by Mr. Thomas N. Golden, a high school teacher in my district. This article reads as follows:

BOOKLET BY U.N. GROUP LAUDS RUSS

(By Elie Maissi)

PARIS, February 13.—A United Nations body, whose largest financial support is given by the U.S. Government, has published a booklet denouncing "colonialist oppression" by Western nations and describing the Soviet Union as "a brotherhood of free and equal peoples," it was learned today.

"It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression," the booklet asserts.

The booklet, entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." was published recently by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), with headquarters in Paris.

UNESCO, a U.N. subsidiary body, has an annual budget of $39,000,000, of which the United States pays nearly one-third. The Soviet Union pays about 15 percent. Britain pays 7.23 percent.

A FOREWORD BY UNESCO

The booklet, bearing a UNESCO symbol on its front cover, is written by two Russians, I. P. Tsamarian, identified as a "doctor of philosophy," and S. L. Ronin, identified as a "doctor of law."

Edmund Rehak, Czech-born Secretary General of the Assembly of Captive Nations of Europe, denounced the booklet as "a brochure of the worst kind of lying Soviet propaganda."

A UNESCO spokesman refused any comment when asked why the international body sponsored and issued this publication.

But a foreword by UNESCO itself said that, as an account of the economic and social condition of the non-Russian populations of the Soviet Union, the booklet "will be found most useful."

BALTIC STORY CHALLENGED

"The unequal treatment of nationalities, colonialist oppression and discrimination on grounds of race or nationality, which still characterize a number of capitalist countries today, are to be explained by the political and social system prevailing in those countries," the booklet asserted.

It described "the successful establishment of full equality of rights between races and nationalities in the U.S.S.R." as "one of the major social triumphs of our day."

Rehak took sharp exception to one passage which stated that "in 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic republics (Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia), which voluntarily joined the union."

Rehak commented "it is notoriously well known, except apparently to UNESCO, that the Baltic States were invaded by the Red army and were simply annexed by the Soviet Union."

I join with my constituent who is neither anti-U.N. nor anti-UNESCO insofar as their purposes are concerned, but we believe that if the conduct of these great bodies is to be opposed to our own national best interests, then perhaps we should take some reevaluation of our position therein.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent and I would like to know by what authority this Government contributes one-third of the cost of publications advancing the causes of godless communism? We would like for all sincere citizens of this country to know that their tax money is being spent this way, and we believe that if the American public is alerted to the Communist propaganda that flows from the Organization as set forth in the above article, that the people would protest the sending of their tax money to such an Organization. My constituent and I oppose the action of this Government in constantly picking up the tab for our enemy's warfare and believe it is high time for the Government of the United States to stop subsidizing our enemies.

Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I know that Members of this body have fond memories of their association only a few years ago with former Senator William Knowland, of California. I think most Members of the Senate share my deep affection for him. All during his service in the Senate he was frank and outspoken and perhaps sometimes a little blunt concerning the issues as he saw them. One could not help but respect him whether you agreed with him or not.

Since leaving the Senate Bill Knowland, I understand, has led a very busy life and has been doing an outstanding job as editor of the Oakland Tribune. Too, only recently he was voted Oakland's outstanding citizen of 1962.

Mr. President, on January 19, 1963, our esteemed former colleague, Bill Knowland, delivered a fine address before the Catholic Press Conference in Los Angeles. I am sure the Members of the Senate will want to read this very sensible, forthright speech. I ask unanimous consent to have this inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, EDITOR, OAKLAND TRIBUNE, BEFORE THE CATHOLIC PRESS CONFERENCE DINNER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JANUARY 19, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Your Eminence, fellow Californians, when our Founding Fathers met at Philadelphia in the Constitutional Convention, it appeared at one time that disagreements would prevent them from accomplishing their mission.

It is recorded in the Journal of the Constitutional Convention that Dr. Benjamin Franklin made a strong plea to start each session with daily prayer. He said:

"The older I become, the more convinced I am that God governs in the affairs of men * * * if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his knowledge, is it likely that an empire can rise without his aid?"

The Constitution was adopted and under it we have grown from a small nation of 3 million in 13 States of the Atlantic seaboard to one of 186 million people in 50 States extending across the continent and out into the Pacific. We are, by far, the most productive nation in the world with substantial obligations in world leadership.

In addition to establishing the form of government under which this growth has taken place, the Constitution guarantees certain basic freedoms. The first amendment to the constitution states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

This freedom of speech and of the press is of vital importance to not only those in the communications field of press, radio, and television but to the public as well.

All of these media have great power and influence. With power must always go responsibility.

A free people must be an informed people.

A great responsibility rests upon all communications media to see that the American people are well informed on matters of international, National, State, and local affairs.

Nor is it sufficient merely to record the events. An understanding of the happening may require background of the "news behind the news."

Editors and commentators must try to maintain a sense of balance. Often I am asked by well-meaning people why the newspapers cannot eliminate crime news. To do so would be a disservice to the people. It would be comparable to a doctor keeping from the patient's family that he had cancer, because it would upset them.

Only an alerted community can take the necessary steps to eliminate corruption or to rally in support of law enforcement departments in upholding law and order.

I do not deny that at times some of our newspapers seem to over-emphasize crime to the point where it seems to dominate the news of the day. When such a situation exists the editors may have lost their sense of balance and of values as to the extent of overlooking or playing down world and local events of more real importance.

With the developments that have taken place in the communications field in the last few decades we have become neighbors to the most remote places in Asia and Africa. An escape over the Communist wall in Berlin is not only written and pictured in the newspapers of the same day in California but the event is also viewed on television and broadcast on radio news reports.

The President of the United States makes his state of the Union address and the text is reported in the Pacific coast afternoon papers of the same day. Millions of Americans and Europeans watch and hear him on television and radio while he is speaking or in rebroadcasts within hours of when he appeared before our Congress.

In the space and atomic age in which we now live, those in the communications field, no less than those in government, must conduct themselves with great responsibility.

Human institutions are not infallible. The press, radio and television organizations have in the past and will in the future make mistakes. In the rapidly moving events of the day sometimes quick decisions or interpretations turn out to be wrong. But this is one of the prices of freedom.

I am concerned, however, by the growing tendency in government (local, State, and National) to keep from the public facts which the public is entitled to have, sometimes officeholders seem to forget that public business is the public's business.

In Washington under both Democratic and Republican administrations there have been a growing tendency to classify material "restricted," "confidential," "secret," or "top secret"; when it does not properly fall into such classifications.

It is more to cover up mistakes of administrators or to save them embarrassment than it is to protect the security or military secrets of the Nation.

This generation witnessed the terrible results when a great nation like pre-World War II Germany was taken over by those who took control of all media of communications and used them for the purpose of carrying out the policies of the Hitler government.

In the Soviet Union and in other areas of the Communist world there is a complete government control over all media of communication. The people read in the newspapers and magazines, see and hear over television and hear over radio only that which is cleared for release by the government.

In my opinion it is not in the interests of free institutions for any government, including our own, to use news as an instrument of national policy.

I do not, of course, refer to the government issuing statements stating its policy or giving background information as to the reasons for actions taken or contemplated.

I do refer to the deliberate misleading of the press and the public. Confidence, like credit, once lost is hard to regain. The confidence of the press and the public has been shaken by lack of candor and misstatements of fact in regard to the Cuban situation.

In reply to an inquiry from a representative of the United Press International about half-truths in statements of Government press releases during the Cuban crisis, Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, at a Sigma Delta Chi dinner in New York said:

"Let me begin by saying that as the Assistant Secretary of Defense I do not comment on anything about the President or the White House. So if we can get that aside and talk to the general point, it would seem to me basic all through history, that a government's right—and by a Government I mean a people, since in our country, in my judgment, the people express, have the right to express and do express every two and every four years what Government they want—that it's inherent in that Government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when

it's going up into a nuclear war. This seems to me basic."

It seems to me that this is a dangerous doctrine.

Government officials may refrain from commenting on an inquiry by representatives of the press or radio but are they justified to put out false information even in this nuclear age?

Should our communications media follow the "Government Line" even if they know or strongly suspect that it is untrue or misleading?

In World War II the newspapers of the Nation placed themselves under a voluntary censorship. They did not mention the sailing of troop transports or even the visits of the President of the United States on "nonpolitical inspection trips" around the country. To many newsmen the latter situation seemed unnecessary in view of the fact that hundreds of thousands of people had seen him in an open car on downtown streets. No mention was made of the first atomic blast in New Mexico though information that something big had happened was available. War correspondents were briefed on campaigns under way and did not violate the confidence placed in them. They knew the general restrictions and understood the reasons why.

We are not now at war. Can a free society make proper judgments on vital policy decisions if facts are withheld from them or false information is given to them?

In a free society operating under a constitutional form of government, can any administration properly advocate a "Papa Knows Best" policy? Can they give or withhold from the people information to which the government believes they should be exposed, or not be exposed?

Is the only difference that Goebbels' intent was bad and ours is good? This is a dangerous doctrine.

I do have faith in the informed judgment of the American people. Given the facts, I believe their reactions can be depended upon in the long run. Lincoln understood this in his observation:

"You can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

The moral and practical question we must confront is whether or not our Government, or any government, has a right to deliberately fool any of our people any time.

Winston Churchill was a great war leader because he gave the British people the bad news as well as the good. He treated them as adults and they responded as such even during Britain's darkest hour.

How we as a Nation respond to the grave challenge ahead may well rest upon what kind of job our public and private schools do in the years ahead.

However, schools alone cannot carry the load. It must be shared with the family and with the church. Our strength as a Nation is not in our material assets, military or industrial. The real strength of our Nation now and in the future is in our spiritual heritage, the foundation of which must come from the home and from the church.

Otherwise we would merely be confronting the materialistic Communist world with the materialism of the free world. Without the added ingredient of divine guidance, we would stand to lose that struggle against a godless and ruthless power. With that ingredient we cannot fail.

The men who founded our republic recognized their dependence upon God. The Declaration of Independence states:

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Later on, in the same document it says:

"We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent States."

George Washington, kneeling in prayer at Valley Forge, and Abraham Lincoln, praying during his lonely vigils during the darkest days of the Civil War, are parts of our heritage we must never forget.

The separation of church and state was never meant to take God out of our lives and out of our Government. Without divine guidance we would not have won our freedom, preserved our Union nor survived the aggressions of dictatorial governments bent on world conquest.

Each of us has a part to play in preserving peace with honor and in maintaining freedom regardless of the cost.

A troubled citizen once asked President Theodore Roosevelt what an individual might do to help solve the problems of that day. President Teddy Roosevelt replied:

"Each one of us must do what he can, with what he has, where he is."

The sum total of this effort in a free society will be irresistible.

All of us have our responsibilities which non of us must shirk. The cumulative effect will be to make our land a beacon of hope to the oppressed people everywhere.

The destiny of America is not to trade people into tyranny but to rescue them from it. We cannot gain security for ourselves by sacrificing the security of others. The realistic men of the Kremlin hope that we will tire of our burdens and be prepared to sacrifice the free people of Berlin or of Formosa or of Korea or of Iran, to buy a temporary respite. In my judgment no American Government will make such a deal and the American people would not tolerate it if it were made.

That is, if they have the facts and know the issues that are involved. With freedom of communications the people will have control over their ultimate destiny. Without it they would become regimented, brainwashed puppets of an all-powerful state.

I have deep convictions that if our people will use the same courage and comonsense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under divine inspiration gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Telstar Repairs: Top Technical Feat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the magnificent technical feat that was accomplished in getting Telstar I back into operation.

I would like to personally congratulate those who participated in this corrective action.

It was a splendid achievement, and in some respects, it seems almost greater than the original launching of Telstar itself.

After being out of operation for over 6 weeks, the world's first privately owned satellite again transmitted television pictures between the United States and Europe on January 4.

And, just as it was done on July 10, 1962, when the communications satellite sent its first television program to the United States and to stations in England and France, the latest episode took place before a watching crowd of reporters and cameramen so they could report to the world what happened.

Getting Telstar I to work again was hailed as a magnificent technical feat. On the January 4 program, A. H. Mumford, engineer in chief, Dollis Hill Research Laboratories, British General Post Office, said:

> Congratulations to my American friends from all your friends in the British Post Office on this magnificent achievement. How wonderful it has been to see once again that historic picture of the Stars and Stripes and all the subsequent pictures which you have transmitted which, to me, seem as good as ever they were.

Restoring Telstar I to working order required highly competent scientific diagnosis and experimentation. More than that, it required some keen detective instincts—not unlike those often exhibited by the fictional Mr. Sherlock Holmes—to ferret out the tiny satellite's difficulties and come up with a remedy.

Although this work was not commented on as widely as the original Telstar launching, the Nation's press gave it much favorable praise.

One cartoonist envisioned the familiar lineman, with his safety belt strapped around Telstar, energetically "fixing the twinkler" as the American public watched.

The Spokane Daily Chronicle, Spokane, Wash.—January 5, page 4—said:

> A repair job on a satellite in space is almost too much to believe, even in times when almost anything is possible. * * * Nevertheless, Telstar's ailing innards have been diagnosed and treated.

The Associated Press—January 4—told how Telstar was cured of its space ailment and noted that "the great new feat of the space age is a service station operating from earth. It cured Telstar, the ocean-hopping television satellite, of a kind of brain fever that had knocked it out of action for 6 weeks since November 23. This service station is no ordinary kind. It is a scientific laboratory."

In New Orleans, the States-Item—January 11, page 8, editorialized "that Bell Telephone Laboratories was able to diagnose the trouble as the satellite whirled about earth is another crowning achievement of U.S. space technology. Following their study of the trouble, scientists last week triggered the necessary impulses that corrected the malfunctioning and Telstar was back in business. It was * * * the type of technical performance that assures America of eventual superiority in space."

The Morning Call in Allentown, Pa.—January 4, page 12—stated:

Private enterprise has reason to be pleased with the contribution it has made to the space program, particularly through the efforts of the investor-owned American Telephone & Telegraph Co. Telstar I, developed and launched entirely at the expense of the A.T. & T. without the use of a single tax dollar, has been in orbit since July 10. For months, until radiation temporarily interfered with the command circuit, it thrilled millions with the conversations and pictures bounced between this country and Europe. Even while its voice was silent, the instruments aboard sent Bell scientists information they now are using to prepare for the launching of a perfected version in spring, again with private funds.

In its editorial, the Bellingham, Wash., Herald—January 6, page 10—remarked:

Well, the details are too technical for us to comprehend, let alone explain. But Telstar has been an inspiring symbol to Europeans of American space communications technology. It's nice to have it back in focus.

Telstar—

Said the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean—January 7—

has been cured by what was described as an electronic aspirin. * * * How marvelous is the technological mind of man.

The Gazette in Alexandria, Va.—January 9—noted that—

The most intriguing thing about this feat is the manner in which it was done. Conditions thought to have silenced the Telstar were duplicated in a model, scientists figured out how to correct the difficulty, a signal to that effect was dispatched, and presto. The prospect of viewing the European equivalent of Mickey Mouse and the Beverly Hillbillies is attractive, all right, but the programs will have to go some to match the fascination of how the Telstar was reactivated.

In Salem, Oreg., the Oregon Journal—January 15, page 10—commented:

Sometimes we are troubled by the ability of data processing equipment and other kinds of electronic gadgets to outperform men in many areas. We fear that humans may some day be relegated to the role of second-class beings. But there is encouragement in the news about Telstar. * * * When man can trick an electronic device and when he can put new knowledge to work in useful ways by improving the device, he is proving he is still the master. We like to think he will always be smarter than a machine.

The Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times—January 22—said:

Technology is reaching almost to the stars. The Bell Telephone Laboratories have achieved another important advance with Telstar * * * [it] has been restored to life. * * * The scientists who summoned Telstar back to life, working with their odd gadgets on earth, have done an amazing job of repair in the heavens.

Time—January 18, page 48—said the task of repairing Telstar I in orbit seemed "wildly improbable."

But * * * the satellite recovered completely from its radiation sickness. Smoothly and precisely, it obeyed normal commands and transmitted TV pictures as crisply as it had when it was young in space.

Business Week—January 12, page 36—called the revival of Telstar "a fantastic story of out-and-out scientific sorcery. Even though they doubted that Telstar I would ever be able to work properly again, never-say-die scientists at A.T. & T.'s Bell Telephone Laboratories kept plugging away. They traced Telstar's troubles to a single tiny transistor in its command circuit, then found a way to bypass the balky transistor."

Electronic News—January 7, page 1—credited Telstar's reactivation to "a successful venture in extraterrestrial electronic troubleshooting and repair."

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists—December, page 38—said Telstar has provided "the strongest testimonial for private enterprise know-how since the 5 cent cigar."

Freedom of Speech and Press in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in the great struggle for men's minds which rages throughout the world today between the forces of freedom and of tyranny, one of the greatest weapons which we possess is our basic freedom of speech and press. Although they, and sometimes we, do not realize it, all dictators operate at a serious disadvantage. They stifle dissent and rely on the ignorance of the people. As history has repeatedly demonstrated, this is an unsure foundation for stable government.

Conversely, our democracy rests upon an informed citizenry, and no right is more fundamental to our way of life than the right to speak or write freely in accordance with one's own beliefs.

Recently an important book was published chronicling the history and importance of this basic freedom. Entitled "Freedom of Speech and Press in America," this book was written by Dr. Edward G. Hudon, assistant librarian at the U.S. Supreme Court. This book presents a scholarly and objective analysis of one of our most treasured rights. Some may disagree with Dr. Hudon's views; none will fail to be stimulated by his thought-provoking comments. He reminds us once again that this right, and freedom in general, "cannot be taken for granted, but must ever be a matter of vigilant concern." This book deserves the attention of all Americans.

Dr. Hudon, is, I am proud to say, a native of Brunswick, Maine. He attended public schools in Brunswick and graduated from Bowdoin College. He then embarked upon a distinguished academic and legal career and has since received four graduate degrees—bachelor of laws and master of laws from Georgetown University, bachelor of science in library science from the Catholic University of America, and doctor of juridical science from the George Washington University. He has held his present position at the Supreme Court since 1947 and has been a frequent contributor to legal periodicals.

The foreword to Dr. Hudon's book was written by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, and I ask unanimous consent to have that foreword printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the foreword was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

Dr. Hudon's book on free speech and free press is in the tradition of the late Zechariah Chafee. His book is in many respects the best analysis in English of the anatomy of our first amendment rights. He gives an overall account, historic and contemporary, that is most revealing to those who seek understanding. This work is indeed a mosaic designed with meticulous care and precision. Honesty with details as well as with substance makes the final product impressive and enduring.

Among those who on one hand proclaim liberty or on the other urge that it be curtailed, there are few who know the heritage they seek to exploit or curtail. Rare indeed are those who have the insight which this book provides. Freedom of press is largely in the hands of moneymakers who either editorialize the news to fit the prejudices of one segment of society or who keep their pages free of contentious issues that might alienate some.

Free speech and free press, not spaceships or automobiles, are the important symbols of Western civilization. In material things the Communist world will in time catch up. But no totalitarian regime can afford free speech and a free press. Ideas are dangerous, the most dangerous in the world, because they are haunting and enduring. Those committed to democracy live dangerously for they stand committed never to still a voice in protest or a pen in rebellion.

In some ways we retreated from that ideal since World War II. This text gives an account of the important events that mark that decline in freedom. But those events are only isolated ones, like peaks in a long range of mountains. Equally important are the community attitudes that acquiesced in these retreats from our constitutional ideal—the default of the pulpit, the spiritual bankruptcy of the press, the ideological shiftlessness of school boards, the disappearance of the adventuresome attitudes of the universities.

It is good that this book is available. To those who read carefully, the highroads as well as the lowroads are made clear. There will be in the next decade no more important subject facing Americans.

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Sir Winston Churchill: An Honorary U.S. Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to submit evidence that strengthens my belief that a majority of young Americans are too busy even to think about getting into trouble.

When we hear so many stories about juvenile delinquency, it is really heartening to receive a letter from a group of young people who are studying their lessons, learning about world affairs, and

informing themselves as to pending legislation in this House.

The text of the letter follows:

Hon. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGAN: We the undersigned, all members of Mr. B. B. Burkhalter's world history class of the Claxton High School, heartily endorse your proposed legislation to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary U.S. citizen.

Yours very truly,

B. B. Burkhalter, Jack Edwards, Wayne Strickland, Carroll Anderson, Benny Powell, Jake Collins, Jim Nease, Buck Anderson, Eva Sue Lightsey, Ida Katzif, Paula Riggs, John Sikes, Dub Bell, Prentice Odom, Charles Altman, Wayne Rushing.

Dr. Banda Installed as Prime Minister of Nyasaland February 1, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a historic event occurred on February 1 at Zomba, when Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda was sworn in as the first Prime Minister of Nyasaland. Dr. Banda is the first African Prime Minister in central and south Africa, and his appointment and installation brings internal self-government to Nyasaland, or, as Dr. Banda prefers, Malawi.

Dr. Banda made an important address at the time of his installation as Prime Minister. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

From my own experience, for I visited Africa as a member of the Senate delegation in 1961, I know how important a role the free and emerging nations of Africa will play, and I recommend to my colleagues a careful study of Dr. Banda's important address. He is one of the capable and intelligent leaders of new Africa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF THE ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE H. KAMUZU, PRIME MINISTER OF NYASALAND

Ministers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, for me, this country and the people of this country, this is a historic and momentous occasion. We are gathered here to be witness to the birth of a nation, the birth of a state, this state of Malawi. His Excellency the Governor has just sworn in the first African government, not only in this, your country, but in central Africa.

Less than 5 years ago I landed at Chileka Airport, called back by my people in this country to fight for them.

When I came here the government of this country was a typical British colonial government. It was a government of civil servants with no elected Africans but with a number of nominated Africans and six elected Europeans. There was a legislative council of 23 members and an executive council of 9. Of the 23 members of the legislative council only 5 were Africans. Of the nine members of the executive council not even one was an African.

To me, to us, this kind of government—5 Africans out of a legislative council of 23 members, not a single African out of an executive council of 9—was not fair, was not just, was not democratic and yet the British claim to be fairminded and democratic people. So, when I landed at Chileka Airport I did not hide from anyone why I had come back home. I stated quite plainly, that is my style, I will not hide anything from my enemies, I am not a hyena who goes about at night.

I came back home to do two things only. To break the stupid Federation and to get self-government for this country.

What I said this few people believed that what I said I had come to do was capable of achievement. Many thought me even mad for saying I had come back home to break their stupid Federation and to get self-government for this country; and I could understand the people in Salisbury were entrenched. In April 1957 someone from Salisbury went to London and came back here boasting that he had arranged with the British Government that their kin had come here to stay, and that the British Government could not legislate. As a matter of fact it was that statement which made those boys and others leave to recall me from Ghana, where I was practicing medicine.

We started our hybrid Government on September 2, 1961, with no experience behind us. Not a single one of us had been a Cabinet Minister before or a member of the executive council, but we'd been 6 months, even less than 6 months in office, and everyone who is not prejudiced against us was admitting it, that we were doing extremely well, exceedingly well.

Therefore, when the Secretary of State came here I asked him for another step in our constitutional advance. According to the Lancaster House Constitution, after trial in working the Constitution, and if everything went well, the two nominated members of the legislative council would come off. So I demanded that. I said to the then Secretary of State: "You yourself admit that we are doing well, everyone says that we are doing very well. Well, I want these two off." He agreed. So one went out in February, another in April. I replaced the one that went out in February by Willie Chokani over there.

There were changes in Britain. Mr. Maudling was transferred, Mr. Butler took his place. Mr. Butler was here in May and when he was here he too admitted that he was pleased we were doing very well. Why should we have these three Government officials? If we are doing very well I want them out. I want full internal self-government now. I must be fair to Mr. Butler, very fair. Whatever others may say or think about or of Mr. Butler, ever since I have known him, ever since I have begun to have any dealing with him at all I have found him a man who is reasonable, understanding and sympathetic.

As everyone knows, in November we were in London and there without much fuss—although there had been all kinds of predictions—we reached complete agreement. The conference was a success and it was agreed there that the three officials were to go. Not only that, but the Governor himself was to cease to preside over the executive council, and that there was to be a Cabinet; the then executive council was to be transformed into a Cabinet with a Prime Minister presiding over that Cabinet, and that the legislative council was to be called the legislative assembly. This morning the Governor has just sworn in that Cabinet, the first African Cabinet not only in Nyasaland but also in central Africa.

On the 19th of December 1962, Mr. Butler stated that the British Government had decided to allow Nyasaland to secede. When he was here last, in fact this very week and before he left Zomba, he held a press conference at Government House. At that press conference he stated that he was going to send a committee to work out the details of the secession of Nyasaland.

We are seceding, no matter what anyone across the Zambezi, thinks about it. And we will be independent. I mean just that, independent. And that is not all. When they brought us into their own schemes, it was a means of keeping the Africans of central Africa down. They did not want this little Nyasaland to become the Gold Coast of central Africa. That's just where they made a mistake. Well, we are seceding. We will be independent, and our independence will start a chain of reaction in central Africa.

I am very, very happy to have with us here, and to welcome leaders from Northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia. I refer to Bwana Kaunda and his team Bwana Nkomo and his team, and representative of the African National Congress. As my great friend Kwame Nkrumah has said for Ghana, I say for this country. To me the freedom and independence of this country is incomplete as long as Northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia are not fully independent. If I seem on the surface silent on the question of Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia, it is not a mark of indifference. In fact, my silence is only apparent and on the surface. In my own way, and by my own methods, I am doing everything possible to influence those who matter in public affairs in Britain and Southern Rhodesia to do justice to my people in Northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia.

What of the Europeans in this country? There are all kinds of stories going about that there is no future for Europeans in this country under an African Government, because I am against Europeans.

So ladies and gentlemen, anyone who tries to spread these stories that Europeans have no future here because I am not in control, because Chiume Chipembere are in control, and Chiume and Chipembere are men of violence, is telling lies. I am not even going to be polite and say termological inexactitudes. No. Lies, lies. Let's be blunt about it. Europeans have a future here, but only on condition, and that condition is this, that they accept African majority government. Any European who realizes this fact, that this is not 1891 but 1963, and that this is Nyasaland or Malawi as I prefer to call it—a blackman's continent—the majority we have the right to rule. Any European who think they can accept that are quite welcome, and I want more of that kind of European because I need their help. I need their help in developing this country. They have the know-how, they have the money, they have the capital, they have the experience. I need all that, but any European who thinks because he is white, he has a white skin, has long hair, is educated and has money and therefore is ordained by God to lord it over us, I say to that European pack up and go now, now, now.

When I speak about Europeans I speak of all Europeans, businessmen, estate owners, civil servants, missionaries. There are some people spreading rumors that the Malawi Government may or will confiscate properties. I want to assure you, those of you who are property owners that we have no such intention. I have never hidden the fact that we do not recognize the validity of little deeds over land in this country. That, I must be frank, but we have no intention of confiscating your property. All we say is that in treating Africans you must be humane.

We need European civil servants and we will need them for some time. All I say is

that civil servants must be civil servants, not politicians. They must be administrators and not legislators, and they must not indulge in any political propaganda openly or secretly among their subordinate Africans and chiefs—that I must make quite clear, because I have my own intelligence you know just as efficient as any.

Missionaries. Again, we are being accused of being anti-Christian, and I am very, very happy to see here church dignatories and I welcome them. I want them to know that all these stories of us being anti-Christian are unfounded. They are malicious in origin. How could we be? Almost all of us in the Government, in the legislative council, and in the MCP are Christian—or the majority of us. We may not go to church every Sunday, but they don't do that in Europe either. Most of us in the Government, in the legislative council, and in the MCP were educated in mission schools, so how could we people who are Christians, or professing Christians at least, who were educated in the mission schools turn around and be against Christianity. We can never be, but we insist on the separation of church and state and on control of education by the state.

I don't think this is the time for me to talk on our role in international affairs, but they will come very soon. I would however like to say one thing. There is a malicious campaign being deliberately propagated or fostered by the Government of the Union of South Africa saying I approve their policy of apartheid, and that I am indifferent to the fate of the Africans of South Africa. Let me tell you ladies and gentlemen, if the Government of the Union of South Africa honestly and sincerely believe that, they have a rude shock coming to them one of these days, because they are living in a fools' paradise. How could I be indifferent to the fate of the Africans of South Africa when fellow Africans are being subjected to the treatment of slaves in their own country and on their own continent of Africa. This is not because I am against the Europeans of South Africa, not because I hate the Europeans of South Africa, but because I am against domination, because I hate domination, domination of one race over another, domination of Europeans over my people, the Africans in any part of this continent.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very, very much for listening to me.

Founding of the 13th Colony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House very properly Tuesday called attention to the birthday anniversary of that great American, President Abraham Lincoln.

But I am afraid that another very important date in the history of these United States was overlooked. That was the founding of the 13th Colony, 230 years ago.

On February 12, 1733, Gen. James Edward Oglethorpe and a group of the most carefully screened settlers to form any New World colony, climbed the bluff at Savannah and established the colony that was to become the State of Georgia. The original territory extended from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River, and thus included the area now occupied by Georgia's daughter States, Alabama and Mississippi.

Georgia is the largest State east of the Mississippi River. She was the fourth State to ratify the Constitution, the third to do so unanimously. She was the starting point for the first steamship to cross an ocean, the SS *Savannah*, and the home today of the world's first nuclear-powered ship, the NS *Savannah*.

Spanish expansion in America was ended forever by Georgians at the Battle of Bloody Marsh in 1742.

Georgia was founded for philanthropic as well as military purposes, and honest, able-bodied men, languishing in English prisons for inability to pay debts, were her first settlers. The first orphans home, Bethesda, was located in Georgia, and the first Protestant Sunday school in America was organized in Savannah.

In Georgia is the largest undrained swamp in the United States, Okefenokee Swamp, and the largest exposed body of granite in North America, Stone Mountain.

Georgia pioneered the peach industry by using refrigeration in shipping peaches. Georgia is the largest naval stores producer in the world, and produces more watermelons than any other State in the Union. Georgia also excels in producing peanuts, pecans and tobacco, and produces more poultry than any State. Georgia has a greater variety of soil products than any other State.

Georgia manufactures paper, aircraft, automobiles, garments, food products, furniture, and other items, and ships them all over the Nation and the world. She has dependable labor, vast hydroelectric power and deep-channel seaports.

The cotton gin was invented in Georgia by Eli Whitney. The first railroad in America was built on a plantation near Savannah. Ether was first used as an anesthetic in Georgia, by Dr. Crawford W. Long. The first ice-manufacturing machine began operation in Georgia in 1844. The Girl Scouts of America was founded in Georgia by Juliette Gordon Low.

As a measure of her progressive nature, Georgia was the first State to require birth registration and the first State to declare that married women have full property rights. Georgia was the first and so far the only State to extend the privilege of voting to 18-year-olds.

The first chartered college in the world for women, Wesleyan College, is in Georgia. The University of Georgia is the first State-chartered university. Also in the field of education, Georgia leads in vocational rehabilitation.

To this Capitol in 1922 came the first woman U.S. Senator, Mrs. Rebecca Felton, of Georgia.

Georgia is a great State. I would like to ask unanimous consent that my remarks be placed in the RECORD in homage to the State I am proud to call home, and the First District of Georgia where, I am proud to say, it all started 230 years ago, in a wilderness peopled by strange Indians, at the top of a bluff on the Savannah River.

National Freedom From Hunger Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the President's proclamation of January 23d, designating the week of March 17 through March 23, 1963, as National Freedom From Hunger Week. I also ask that a statement by the National Citizens Committee for Freedom From Hunger be included following the Presidential proclamation.

The President has urged American citizens in all walks of life to participate in the observance of National Freedom From Hunger Week. America has no more valuable material asset than our abundance of food and fiber. Unfortunately, we live in a world that has not yet solved the dilemma of too much in the midst of too little.

The freedom-from-hunger campaign of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is designed to eliminate chronic food shortages around the globe. This high endeavor deserves the support of us all.

There being no objection, the proclamation and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON NATIONAL FREEDOM FROM HUNGER WEEK

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 23, 1963.

"Whereas the United States, as a member of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, is participating with nearly 100 other countries of the world in the FAO international freedom-from-hunger campaign; and

"Whereas the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation has been established to provide citizen leadership for the campaign in the United States; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by Public Law 87-841, approved October 18, 1962, has authorized this Nation, in furtherance of the international freedom-from-hunger campaign, to be host to the World Food Congress from June 4 to 18, 1963; and

"Whereas the farmers of this Nation have produced an abundance of food for our own people and for sharing with others; and

"Whereas the people of the United States, in sharing our national abundance through their generous support of oversea assistance programs of religious organizations, voluntary agencies, and private groups and foundations, and through food for peace and other governmental programs, have demonstrated their concern with the problem of hunger and malnutrition throughout the world; and

"Whereas there is a need for a rededication of men's minds and hearts to the inspiring possibilities of working together to free the world from hunger: Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week of March 17 through March 23, 1963, as National Freedom From Hunger Week.

"I ask the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation to take national leadership

in planning appropriate observance of this week; and I urge American citizens in all walks of life to participate in the observance of National Freedom From Hunger Week.

"I also ask that all Government departments and agencies which have official responsibilities in the field of food, nutrition, and international relations take appropriate steps to observe, and to cooperate with private groups in observing, National Freedom From Hunger Week."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 22d day of January in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 187th.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM FROM HUNGER

By proclamation, President Kennedy has declared the week of March 17–23 National Freedom From Hunger Week, in which he has invited the participation of all citizens. This week encompasses the date of March 21, which is World Freedom From Hunger Day. It marks the beginning of the sowing season in the Northern Hemisphere and the harvesting season in the Southern. With relation to the church calendar of all great religions, it occurs after Ramadan, before Passover and Easter, and during Lent. Its observance has been promised by world leaders of all religious faiths. The week is a crucial point of the worldwide freedom-from-hunger campaign as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of this program since its inception in 1960 and to call forth greater effort for subsequent phases of the campaign.

The purpose of the week is to rededicate men's minds and hearts to the inspiring possibilities of working together to free the world from hunger. Other purposes include the matter of focusing greater public interest on the problem of world hunger and stimulate more national effort toward the alleviation of that problem through self-help agricultural development in the countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, which suffer from hunger; to provide a suitable climate for the World Food Congress which convenes in the United States during June 4–18, 1963; to foster greater understanding of the United Nations Development Decade, and to provide an opportunity for individual participation.

Plans for this participation in the United States include an appeal to all church leaders to deliver a message on the general theme of world hunger in their services of Sundays, March 17 and 24, and possibly by a special observance on March 21. Postage stamps commemorating World Freedom From Hunger Day will be issued in nearly 100 countries on March 21; the United States will issue a similar stamp on the opening day of the World Food Congress, June 4. An ambassador's dinner program is planned for March 21 in Washington, to which will be invited the representatives of more than 100 countries that will participate in the World Food Congress, along with the representatives of nongovernmental organizations that are interested in the objectives of the foundation. The program will be featured by a simple menu, speeches on the subject of hunger by important world figures, and musical entertainment. This dinner program is symbolic of similar luncheon and dinner programs to be held throughout the United States by educational, civic, and religious groups during the week. A part of these programs should include a contribution to be given in the name of the freedom-from-hunger campaign to some charitable organization for agricultural projects in the developing countries. This carries out a primary objective of the campaign to promote greater agricultural development in areas of underdevelopment.

There are a number of things which individuals and their organizations can do to participate in this activity. These include:

(a) Provide the use of organizational media to publicize the event and distribute freedom-for-hunger literature among your associates.

(b) Invite the cooperation of local newspapers, radio, and TV and furnish them with material on the event.

(c) Plan an unseen-guest luncheon or dinner program. Consider the hungry people of Latin America, Asia, and Africa as your unseen guests. Have a simple menu (possibly include a national dish from one of those countries), invite a local speaker on the theme of world hunger, set up an exhibit and send a contribution to a favorite charity for overseas development work in the name of the freedom-from-hunger campaign.

(d) Arrange an exhibit in a place frequented by the public.

(e) Use freedom-from-hunger seals and special postmark cancellations for business mailings.

(f) Invite the participation of church, school, business, and industrial groups. Even at home you can set an extra place for an unseen guest.

Above all, let us hope that all individuals will share in this program by commiting themselves to some personal action on behalf of the long-range objectives of the campaign. Whether this action be symbolic or concrete, the success of Freedom From Hunger Week depends upon large-scale individual participation.

Citizens are urged to write to this committee at the following address: American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, Inc., 700 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C.

HARRY W. EDWARDS,
Executive Director.

Mass Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently a series of articles appeared in the Jersey City Journal on the subject of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963, which I introduced earlier in this session. The articles were written by Robert Hochstein of the Journal's Washington bureau.

In an editorial accompanying the articles, the paper said that the term "mass transit," which is commonly applied to the bill, is an often-used, frequently misunderstood label. The articles, the editorial continued, would attempt to bring this label into clearer focus and make the meaning "a little better understood."

The first deals with the necessity for improving transportation facilities in metropolitan areas; the second outlines the major provisions of the bill that is designed to meet this critical problem; and the concluding article in the series assesses the bill's chances for passage in this session of Congress.

These articles provide a valuable source of information and also demonstrate that our cities and towns are taking an active interest in this measure which is so important to their future development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jersey City (N.J.) Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer, Feb. 5, 1963]

MASS TRANSIT

The modern usage (perhaps it was accelerated by the development of alphabet agencies during the New Deal) is to think in terms of labels rather than facts. This is a convenient way to think because it diminishes the effort involved. A drawback, however, is that after a time the concept represented by the label tends to become blurred.

The labels begin to mean different things to different people. For instance, when a Russian Communist talks about democracy he means something entirely different than a Texas Congressman, and probably both are quite different from what a New York labor leader would mean by the same term.

One label currently overused so much that its meaning is blurred, is "mass transit." Usually this term appears with reference to Federal legislation introduced by New Jersey's Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS.

So yesterday we began a three-part series which continues today and which gives some of the major facts behind the label "mass transit." The series by a writer in our Washington bureau should make the meaning of the label a little better understood.

[From the Jersey City (N.J.) Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer, Feb. 6, 1963]

U.S. FUNDS NECESSARY FOR LOCAL TRANSIT

(By Robert Hochstein)

(Traffic snarls, parking problems and long hours of commuting—all have focused attention in the United States on the need for improving mass transit facilities. This first of three articles looks at the overall problem of mass transit or—as it has been termed—the transit mess.)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy told Congress in his state of the Union message: "Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of the land—and if local transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities it needs Federal stimulation and assistance."

The Chief Executive was echoing a report made last year by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which approved a bill by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, for a $500-million urban mass transit aid program. The report said in part:

"The committee believes that there is no doubt about the critical need for action on the urban transportation problems of the Nation.

"Every citizen who commutes to work is aware of the serious impact of inadequate and overcrowded existing facilities and the need for immediate action to improve and expand transportation facilities."

The report said the increase in auto usage has resulted in strong competition to mass transit facilities, preventing their efficient and rapid operation. Thus, patronage of these facilities has declined and 152 transit companies have been abandoned throughout the Nation in the past 8 years.

The purpose of the mass transit program, which WILLIAMS introduced for the administration, is to provide Federal grants and loans to State and local authorities, as well as public and private mass transportation

companies, to finance the capital facilities and equipment needed for improvement and extension of transit systems.

The Jersey Senator has introduced the same proposal again this year.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government, under three programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has allocated about $100 million annually for mass transportation assistance.

The main program, which provides grants for local communities, is aimed at a better coordinated approach to the entire urban planning effort through the cooperation of the housing agency and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads.

Grants are made for the preparation of comprehensive transportation surveys, studies and plans designed to facilitate the transportation of persons and goods within an entire urban area.

About $18 million was spent by the Federal Government on this program in the last fiscal year, and an estimated $23,500,000 will be spent in this fiscal year.

Another grant program for which Congress has allocated $25 million a year, is for demonstration projects.

For example, Detroit has received a Federal grant of $224,000 to demonstrate the effect upon transit ridership of an increase in the frequency of service. And the University of Washington has received a $10,000 grant to make a study of the monorail system operating in Seattle.

But the requirement that a community finance one-third the costs of a demonstration project, which must be of general rather than strictly local application, has been a deterrent to participation in this program, according to the committee report. It said: "Many communities, although they can see the possibility of the long-range benefits to them of a demonstration project, have such urgent and immediate need for local capital improvements that they feel that it is impossible for them to use their available funds for such a project."

Finally, there is a $50 million mass transportation loan program. It will expire July 1, 1963, unless legislation extending it is enacted. The Williams bill would provide for continuation of the program.

Loans are made available under this legislation to local communities or public agencies for the acquisition, construction or improvement of facilities and equipment used in mass transportation service.

The loans also may be used for coordinating highway, bus, rail, and parking facilities. The interest rate charged is about 3¾ percent.

But, since municipalities are able to issue bonds at a lower interest rate than that, activity under the program has also been limited.

[From the Jersey City (N.J.) Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer, Feb. 5, 1963]

WILLIAMS BILL: BUSES, TRAINS, PARKING ARE FEDERAL AID TARGETS

(By Robert Hochstein)

(New Jersey's Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS wants Uncle Sam to spend $500 million to help revitalize the Nation's mast transit facilities. This second of three articles on the transit problem details the provisions of WILLIAMS' proposal.)

WASHINGTON.—For the fourth consecutive year, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, is trying to get Congress to enact a program of Federal assistance for urban mass transportation.

He is the chief sponsor of the administration proposal to provide $500 million in matching grants over a 3-year period to assist State and local bodies to construct and improve mass transit facilities.

The grants would be available for such things as the acquisition of land, right-of-way, parking facilities, buses, rail rolling stock, signal equipment, stations, and terminals.

The transit legislation also would provide for continuing the $50 million mass transportation loan program which is due to expire July 1, 1963. The loans are offered to local communities or public agencies for the construction and improvement of facilities and equipment used in mass transit.

Upon enactment of the legislation, grants of $100 million would be authorized, followed by $200 million on July 1, 1964, and another $200 million on July 1, 1965.

The grant money would be made available on a matching basis, with the Federal Government providing up to two-thirds of the "net project cost" and local sources one-third.

The net project cost is defined as that portion of the project's cost which can not be financed from revenues derived from the undertaking.

Private carriers will be eligible to receive grant money but would have to submit their request through local authorities.

This is designed to insure the development of a program for coordinated transportation within a comprehensive plan for the development of the urban area. It would have to be approved by the administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. HHFA is responsible for existing programs to aid mass transit.

For a 3-year period, Federal grants could be made on an emergency basis with less strict planning requirements and with one-half in matching funds rather than two-thirds. It would be done in cases where there is an urgent need for preservation of mass transit facilities.

While the overall program sponsored by WILLIAMS is initially set upon a 3-year basis, it is actually viewed as a continuing, long-range plan.

Up to $30 million of the grant money would be available for research, development and demonstration aimed at all phases of urban mass transportation. This would be an expansion of the $25 million demonstration program already in operation.

In addition, the legislation provides relocation expenses, similar to those paid under the urban renewal program, for families and business displaced by a mass transportation project.

Payments could be up to $200 in the case of an individual and a family and up to $3,000 in the case of a nonprofit organization or a business concern.

The bill requires that the administrator, in making assistance available, consider whether the facilities and equipment to be acquired or built will be designed to prevent and control air pollution.

The measure also provides that prevailing wages will apply to construction work financed with the loans or grants.

Provision is made for the establishment of agencies or other interstate cooperative efforts for comprehensive planning of transportation systems.

Because 26 metropolitan areas extend across State lines, the aim is to foster area-wide solutions to urban problems.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency said in approving the bill last year that its aim is to provide the kind of mass transit facilities necessary for the orderly development of urban communities.

[From the Jersey City (N.J.) Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer, Feb. 6, 1963]

OFFICIALS SAY FEDERAL TRANSIT AID WILL PASS THIS YEAR

(By Robert Hochstein)

(Will Congress help the Nation's cities untangle their traffic jams? This concluding article on mass transit analyzes the legislative problems and outlook.)

WASHINGTON.—The fate of the urban mass transit aid bill, like so many programs before Congress, is intimately tied to the outcome of the fight for the administration's No. 1 priority proposal, the tax cut.

There is always a strong aversion on the part of many lawmakers to launch a new spending program. This is particularly true at a time when Congress is confronted with a record budget and the administration is pressing for a tax cut.

But administration sources indicate they are fairly confident Congress will enact this year at least part of the $500 million mass transit aid legislation which has the President's blessings.

"They may shrink it," an official said, "but we'll get something this time."

The measure does have strong bipartisan backing. It won approval of the Banking and Currency Committees of the Senate and House last year. Had it gotten to the Senate and House floor, the bill might have passed.

But Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee, bottled the proposal up in his committee. He is philosophically opposed to almost all new spending measures.

On the Senate side, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Senate majority leader, was reported to have opposed a transit bill vote in his Chamber unless there was reasonable chance of House action.

Thus, the session came to an end last year without either the House or Senate considering the proposal.

This year the administration plans to push the transit bill early in the session. In addition, it is held unlikely that SMITH will again seek to block consideration of the bill by the House.

The measure has the support of labor, the carriers, and the American Municipal Association as well as the U.S. Conference of Mayors. But the United States Chamber of Commerce has voiced strong opposition to the bill, contending there is no justification for a Federal urban transit program.

Also, the business organization maintains the Federal aid program would have the effect of encouraging Government operation of local transit commuter services and discouraging private operation.

Railroads, however, endorse the legislation as does the American Transit Association, representing about 80 percent of all other mass transportation service provided in the country.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, has strongly opposed the transit aid bill. When the committee approved it last year, he filed a minority opposition report to the bill.

ROBERTSON said it would create a new permanent Federal spending program of "potentially vast dimensions."

"The new Federal spending program under this bill would be one more step in the process of transferring all power and authority to the Federal Government—and eliminating all State and local power and authority," he said.

The views of the chamber of commerce and ROBERTSON reflect the thinking of many lawmakers. But it appears doubtful that there is enough opposition in Congress to put off a Federal transit aid program indefinitely.

Support for this type of legislation has been building up over the past few years. Whether it has reached the proportions to assure passage of the bill this year is uncertain.

But it does appear likely that eventually there will be a Federal mass transit aid program. If even part of the program gets through this session, it would open the door for full-blown assistance at a future date.

Former Representative Paul Kilday in Challenging Post on Court of Military Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Dallas Morning News recently published an excellent story by John Mashek on former Representative Paul J. Kilday, of San Antonio, who is now serving by Presidential appointment on the Court of Military Appeals in Washington. Paul Kilday is carving out a fine judicial career after a very invaluable service in the Congress.

Because of the many friends of Judge Paul Kilday who are aware of his distinguished record of achievement during 23 years as a Congressman from Texas, I ask unanimous consent that this news article, discussing Judge Kilday's new role as a jurist, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPOINTMENT CHANGES PACE FOR KILDAY

(By John Mashek)

WASHINGTON.—The life pace of Paul J. Kilday, of San Antonio, has changed considerably since he made the relatively short move from his bustling congressional office on Capitol Hill to his tomblike chamber in the Court of Military Appeals.

That move was made 15 months ago. After serving a distinguished 23 years in Congress, Kilday was appointed by President Kennedy to a 15-year term on the three-member military court.

The 62-year-old Kilday has satisfactorily made the adjustment to the slower, more contemplative way of life. The challenge of reviewing military-court martials has its rewarding side for an earnest lawyer.

But the memories of Capitol Hill linger on. Pictures, plaques, and other reminders of the years in Congress adorn every wall of Kilday's spacious office in the military court building. He still likes to talk about his years in Congress and is anxious to hear the latest news from it.

In fact, Kilday still keeps up with his old colleagues on the Hill. He had occasional visits there with such friends as Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, senior in the Texas delegation, and Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee on which Kilday served for so long.

It was this experience with the armed services that made Kilday a natural for the appointment to the military court judgeship.

It was also fitting because of Kilday's passionate concern that civilians be in eventual control of the Military Establishment. During his service in Congress, he was watchful of any military power grab that would even tend to undermine civilian management.

The court on which Kilday now sits was created in 1951 because Congress felt that some civilian authority should pass final judgment in criminal convictions of the military. Before that time, the final appeal authority was maintained by the services themselves.

The concept of civilian review became a reality with the establishment of this U.S. Court of Military Appeals, with three judges appointed for staggered 15-year terms at $25,000 annual salary.

The court is duty bound to review any case in which the death penalty is fixed. (It has heard one such case since Kilday joined the court; the verdict was reversed.) It also must review any conviction of a general or flag (admiral) officer in the service.

Most of the court's work stems from appeals—nearly 900 annually—of verdicts in which the penalty was, at a minimum, a bad conduct discharge or a year's imprisonment.

The court accepts, on an average, about 10 percent or 90 cases per year. These normally represent cases in which a strong legal question has been raised or reasonable cause for appeal has been shown.

Before the court even receives a case, it has been reviewed twice—once by a superior commander (usually a 2-star general in the Army) and once by a review board in the Pentagon.

The court dockets are relatively up to date. In his first year on the bench, Kilday wrote 40 opinions. This compares with a maximum 13 opinions by a Supreme Court Justice last year.

Opinions are not reached or written in a breeze. Kilday's process takes him several days and sometimes more than a week if the case record is a voluminous one.

"After a first reading, I usually don't know where I am," Kilday confessed. "After another reading and a study of the briefs, the picture is beginning to come through."

Finally, after further study and deliberation, Kilday writes his opinion in pencil. This version gets another editing before it goes into print.

How does this way of life compare with the hectic existence of a Congressman from a large urban district?

"The court offers a different type of challenge," Kilday answered. "There's no bustle, turmoil or stacks of mail like there was in Congress. And there is a certain satisfaction in working out, forming, and writing an opinion."

Kilday also enjoys watching the young first lieutenants, primarily fresh law school graduates, take on the older majors or lieutenant colonels in oral arguments before the court.

"Rank goes out the window," he said "They are all lawyers trying to establish their cases."

Judge Kilday's brethren on the court of Chief Judge Robert E. Quinn, of Rhode Island, appointed by former President Truman, and Judge Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, appointed by former President Eisenhower.

Kilday replaced Judge George Latimer, a Republican appointee of President Truman's who failed to gain reappointment in 1961 and retired.

In setting up the court, Congress provided that a 2-to-1 political party division would prevail. Quinn and Kilday are Democrats, Ferguson a Republican.

Like the Supreme Court, the military court is frequently sharply divided on some cases, but not along political lines.

It is obvious that Kilday misses his work and his friends in the House—"you couldn't be there as long as I was and not miss it."

But he considers himself fortunate, as a practicing lawyer, to wind up his career on the bench.

"I've got every Federal court decision that's ever been written on that wall over there," he said, pointing proudly to stacks of legal volumes.

Ability and ambition have come naturally in Kilday's family. The judge was one of 12 children born to Irish parents. His father operated a small grocery store.

Five of the Kilday children died in infancy. The other seven rose to prominent positions in various professional fields—politics, religion, law enforcement, military and industry.

Before his election to Congress in 1938, Paul Kilday served for 3 years as chief felony prosecutor in Bexar County. These were during the tough post prohibition years, an era which found prosecutors especially busy in Texas.

From 1938 to 1961, Kilday served in the House. His stature was particularly recognized in the Armed Services Committee. He also was a confidant of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Kilday now promises to follow up a successful political career with judicial accomplishments. Lawyers say his first opinions show evidence of a brilliant, scholarly, and thoughtful mind.

Deficits as a Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled, "Deficits as a Policy," written by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, and published in a recent issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS TIDES: DEFICITS AS A POLICY

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Mr. Kennedy is the first President who has ever openly advocated deficit financing as a policy. He is planning a deficit of $11.9 billion for the fiscal year 1964 and expects deficits in succeeding years. He lumps them all together by calling them a "temporary deficit." Eventually, because of the stimulus that a huge tax cut combined with increased expenditures is expected to give to the economy, these transitional deficits are expected to cure themselves and bring about a surplus.

Taxpayers will uneasily remember that they have heard all this before. They have been hearing it off and on, in fact, ever since the days of the New Deal. "It has taken courage for the Federal Government to go into the red," said Franklin D. Roosevelt on July 8, 1938, "but it has been worth it." Somehow the promises that deficits would bring surpluses have never been kept. We have had 27 deficits in the last 33 years.

Is there any prospect that the theory will work better this time? Before we try to answer that question, let us see what is being proposed.

Mr. Kennedy is proposing that the Federal Government spend in fiscal 1964 more than it has ever before spent in its history, in peace or war. He is asking our administrative expenditures of $98.8 billion. This tops even the $98.4 billion of the peak war year, 1945. In the cash budget (which includes old-age pensions, etc.) he proposes to spend the unparalleled sum of $122.5 billion.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Throughout his budget message the President gives the impression that this record budget is brought about mainly by increased defense expenditures. That thesis cannot be maintained. True, he is proposing defense expenditures for 1964 of the record amount of $55.4 billion. But as total cash expendi-

tures will reach $122.5 billion, this means nondefense expenditures of $67.1 billion.

And nondefense spending has risen faster than defense spending. If we compare 1964 with 1954, we find that while total defense expenditures have increased $8.4 billion, nondefense expenditures have increased $22.9 billion and, counting social security, etc., $42.2 billion.

If Congress is sincerely looking for places where it can cut the budget, it need not look far. It might look at the scheduled expenditures of $4.2 billion for space research (not connected with defense), at the $3.7 billion scheduled for foreign aid, at the $5.8 billion for farm programs, at the $6.7 billion for commerce and transportation, at the $1.1 billion for housing subsidies, at the $6 billion for veterans' programs, and at the glorious $27.4 billion for health, labor, and welfare.

NO FOURTH DIMENSION

The President speaks of all these and many more programs as "a necessary payment on future progress." He insists that others "are for activities which will promote increased productivity and economic growth, yielding substantial benefits in the future." But this is to talk as if the money for these programs came out of some fourth dimension. It is to forget that it is taken away from the taxpayers. It does not "meet more national needs." It causes every taxpaying family to meet fewer of its own needs. It leaves less for private persons and private business to invest in the future, in increased productivity or economic growth.

So far we have taken the budget estimates at face value. But suppose, as there are strong reasons for thinking, that expenditures are even more than $98.8 (or in cash, $122.5) billion; that revenues are less than $86.9 billion, and that the deficit is more than $11.9 billion? This is more than possible. A year ago the President estimated a surplus for the current fiscal year of $500 million. This has now become an expected deficit of $8.8 billion, because expenditures are $1.8 billion more and revenues $7.5 billion less than he estimated.

The budget that Mr. Kennedy has submitted, in brief, is irresponsible. Even if the deficit is no greater than the $11.9 billion he estimates, the course he proposes of raising expenditures and cutting taxes can lead only to more inflation, and will undermine confidence in the world's anchor currency, the dollar.

The Battle With Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, people throughout the country are very much concerned over the high death rate on our highways. Just recently at the third annual Fargo Farm Forum held in Fargo, N. Dak., and sponsored by North Dakota's largest daily newspaper, the Fargo Forum, Miss Laverne Axtman of Rugby, N. Dak., winner of the 4-H speech contest, gave a fine address on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that her remarks be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am pleased to also state to the Senate that one of our distinguished Members, Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, spoke at the same meeting and has told me how much he enjoyed her speech and what a splendid job she did. I am sure Miss Axtman is highly pleased to receive such a compliment from a distinguished Member of this body.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE WITH DEATH

(By Laverne Axtman)

The time—a pleasant summer evening; the place—a typical U.S. highway; the main characters—a group of happy teenagers riding home from a movie. The moon is so bright that the driver yields to the temptation to try to drive without the use of lights. This accomplishment makes him feel superior; and soon he pays less attention to the road and more to the chatter of his friends. Suddenly the concrete structure of an overpass jumps before his eyes. There is a loud screeching of tires, the sickening crunch of metal folding like an accordion, and the spine-chilling screams of human beings in agony. And sudden death.

Every year 30,000 to 40,000 people are killed due to accidents; over 100,000 are permanently disabled; and over 1 million people suffer lesser injuries. This year there was a near-record death toll for the 30-hour Memorial holiday; 97 persons were killed. And yet, we take no more than passing notice of this.

If these 30,000 to 40,000 people who are killed annually were all living in one city, it would equal the size of Minot. Now just imagine, if, within 1 year, the population of Minot were totally annihilated, wiped off the face of the earth. Wouldn't this be a tremendous loss? And yet, every year, this very same number of people is killed on our Nation's highways. The total U.S. casualties for World War II was 1,070,524. The traffic casualties for the same period of time numbered 3,394,000, which is three times as many.

But, you say, what can I do about this? I am only one person. How can I help influence motorists to drive carefully?

Well, there is something you can do. You can become aware of this problem. Awareness encourages caution. There are more than 45 million cars and 10 million trucks on the highways today. If only 50 percent of the drivers of these cars and trucks were aware of the increasing accident problem; and, consequently, drove with more caution, the accident rate would be cut in half.

It doesn't take an extremely intelligent person to become aware of the facts. Any literate person who does any newspaper reading can surely realize through the experience of others that drinking, recklessness, and deep emotions do not mix with driving.

Education is one of the primary factors in good driving. It teaches respect for the laws of man and nature. The best program for mass education is not one that teaches fear of the law, but one that increases understanding of the value of the law.

In Pennsylvania last year, a group of 3,000 high school students were included in a safe-driving experiment. One-half of the group was trained by experienced instructors at a driver's training course. The remaining 1,500 learned by various other methods. At the end of 1 year, these were the results:

The boys with driver's training had 45 percent fewer accidents than those who did not.

The girls with driver's training had 53 percent fewer accidents than those who did not.

This is a very good example of how good training reduces accidents and makes good drivers.

It is the general opinion of today's drivers that cars are safer because of the many modern conveniences called safety devices. But are these devices really safe? Sure, I agree, power steering makes it easier to guide the car, and torsion air springs are simply marvelous for giving a smooth ride. But with all these conveniences to take the worry and trouble out of driving, the driver becomes too relaxed. His reaction time is increased from three-fourths of a second to 1¼ seconds. The one-half-second difference may mean the difference between life or death. Seat belts could prevent four-fifths of the fatalities that would occur if no belts were used. But the seat belt must be used at all times to be effective.

Once again, I will stress these things:

1. Awareness of the increasing accident problem helps prevent it.

2. Education is a primary factor in good driving.

3. Even with the use of safety devices, it is the responsibility of the driver himself to drive carefully.

An automobile is a great and wonderful machine in the hands of a careful driver, but in the hands of one who throws caution to the wind, it becomes a deadly missile.

It is hard to find a surviving accident victim who can bear to talk. It is too late to talk now; all they can do is remember. So today, as we drive along our highways and through our streets, give a thought to those who lie awake nights thinking of the awful moment of the accident. They can't forget; we must not forget.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Indiana Dunes National Lakeshores: A Minute Before Midnight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 20, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the nationwide concern over the fate of the Indiana Dunes has brought forward vigorous appeals to the administration urging that it should exert its full efforts on behalf of saving the dunes.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of February 15 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This editorial points out that the many groups who have strongly supported the bill to create an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore have a right to expect that the park bill will be approved and that this hope must not be shattered.

With Bethlehem's bulldozers busily working to destroy a large part of the dunes, we must exert all possible effort to realize the hope shared by millions that the dunes may be saved.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUNES PARK DOOMED?

It is a minute before midnight for the Indiana Dunes National Park project. The big shovels are biting into the heart of the last remaining sizable remnant of the scenic dunes that could be a wonderful recreation spot on the shores of Lake Michigan for millions of people. Preliminary work for a new steel mill has started.

The Army Corps of Engineers has finally given an approving nod for a $30 million harbor in the heart of the dunes. Built at Federal expense, it would be for the almost exclusive benefit of two steel mills.

Senator NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has joined Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, in reintroducing the latter's bill to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park. President Kennedy last year spoke out strongly in behalf of the park..

The Army Engineers haven't even inspected alternate sites nearby, if another harbor is indeed needed in the area. There is no indication that conditions the Army Engineers set for their approval of a harbor in the midst of the proposed park will be met. Yet one steel company is proceeding on its construction work as if it had not a doubt in the world that the harbor would be built for it at public expense.

There is something mysterious about all this. Senator DOUGLAS, who has led the congressional fight for the park, the regional and national conservation groups that have strongly supported it, and the American public in general seemingly had every assurance that the administration would stand firm on their side. They had a right to expect that the park bill would be approved, despite back-of-the-scenes political and financial maneuvers that did nobody any credit.

That hope must not be shattered. The remnant of the Indiana Dunes must not be lost to public enjoyment. The public welfare and national interest must take precedence.

There Is a Silver Lining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this week's edition of the Newark (N.Y.) Courier-Gazette, a weekly newspaper published in the district I represent, carries an editorial which should be of interest to anyone concerned over the American economy. The editorial directs attention to a recently published article in Tax Review by Dr. W. Allen Wallis, a noted economist and the new president of the University of Rochester. I commend the editorial to the reading of my colleagues:

THERE IS A SILVER LINING

"In our economy, prices are the messages that tell people what ought to be done. If the price of something is high, that is a message to producers to try to produce more and to consumers to try to use less. How high the price is tells how hard to try. The price of raw materials, labor, land, and equipment are the messages that tell how things should be produced, for these prices reflect the amounts of the inputs available and the importance of the alternative uses for them."

Thus writes W. Allen Wallis, president of the University of Rochester, a distinguished economist, in Tax Review, a publication of the Tax Foundation. His words describe the importance of the price system as the foundation on which the free market is based. He says, "If the prices are set other than through free markets, either because of private monopoly or Government intervention, the overall efficiency of the economy is reduced."

Dr. Wallis fears that there is a danger of this happening in this country. He recalls the steel episode of last April when steel, under the guns of the most aggressive kind of Presidential pressure, was forced to rescind a price increase. He feels, personally, that the price increase was a mistake and that it couldn't have been sustained in the market. But that, in his view, is beside the point. The big thing is that the Presidential action was a step, a long step, in the direction of authoritarianism—for "The very root and essence of authoritarianism is the idea that a central government has the authority to determine what is in the national interest, and to pursue that interest as defined by itself through any and all means."

As he sees it, this episode jeopardized the central source of our economic strength. It brought on a fear that we might be in for direct price and wage controls and this, he observes, may have been a major cause of the stock market drop. Far more important is the threat to our system of Government—a system which is basically dependent on the maintenance of the free market and a free economy. And an integral element in that system is the limitation of powers doctrine specified in the Constitution, coupled with disinterested law enforcement. Dr. Wallis quotes a statement made by Charles Reich of the Yale Law School in the very liberal New Republic in which these words are found: "The President has no right to force his economic policies on an unwilling industry without legislation. * * * Freedom has little meaning if it only allows action that responsibility conforms to the President's idea of the national interest."

So much for the danger. Still, Dr. Wallis is hopeful. To quote him once more: "But there is a silver lining. A long step was taken toward authoritarianism, yes; but it leaves a considerable distance yet to be traversed. Second, it was not a step from which there is no turning back. * * * The job before us, then, is to make sure that the turning back occurs. That requires a fuller understanding, by the administration and by the public, of the processes of a free economy, and of the long-run evils of many short-run benefits. Economic education is a difficult challenge but not an insuperable one."

Foreign Exchange Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 20, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the recent report that 20 Ghanaian students and six Ethiopian students have departed from Bulgaria and that a group of Nigerian students is also arranging to leave emphasizes the growing disenchantment of African exchange students with life and education under a Communist regime. This is not the first such exodus—over 100 dissatisfied students from Africa, Asia, and the Near East got out of the Iron Curtain countries about 2 years ago, many of whom were subsequently able to complete their education in free Western countries.

The program for foreign students in the United States presents a marked contrast to that reported in the Communist-bloc countries. Over 60,000 are now studying in the United States, and over 1,400 students from 95 countries are enrolled in Columbia University in New York City. It is especially fortunate that the program provided by that great institution of higher learning has just been released in detail. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the report by John A. B. Faggi, entitled "The Foreign Student Center," Columbia Univer-

sity, for the period February 1961 through August 1962.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN STUDENT CENTER

The university has long been a center for international education. Traditionally, all the faculties have welcomed qualified applicants from around the world; Columbia prides herself on her distinguished foreign alumni. Synchronous with the growth of the American college population in the last decade has been an increasing foreign demand for American higher education, particularly by the young nations of the world community. The rapid increase in the number of foreign students in the United States culminated in the 1961–62 total of about 60,000, of whom more than a tenth were attending institutions of higher learning in the New York metropolitan area. During the year Columbia University counted over 1,400 foreign students from 95 countries exclusive of those enrolled in affiliated divisions (Barnard College and Teachers College).

ORGANIZATION

Thus it was that 2 years ago the university instituted its foreign student center with the intent to reorganize, consolidate, and expand services and facilities for this important group of students who are to be found in every school and division. The center, established on February 1, 1961, as a university unit, comprises three main elements: (1) the university's courses in English for foreigners (formerly the courses offered by the American Language Center and the School of General Studies, which functioned separately): (2) the office of the foreign student adviser; and (3) an expanded and coordinated program of social and cultural activities for the university's foreign students.

THE CURRICULUM

During the spring term of 1961, the curriculum committee (consisting of two senior teachers in the language program and the director of the center) began to reorganize the American Language Center program. The result was an expansion of the former 8-week course to one of term length. Our new plan of having three regular terms—autumn, spring, and summer—was put into operation for the first time during the academic year 1961–62.

The weekly schedule of the new course, "Program in American Language Instruction, Intensive Course," includes 15 hours of classroom instruction, 4 hours of language laboratory drill, two luncheons for the practice of social English, an optional social tea, and either 4 or 5 hours of a new introductory course in American civilization.

The civilization course was given for the first time in the autumn term and is a required part of the intensive language program. It has been organized as a series of topics each of which occupies a week or 2 weeks. The topics include aspects of American history, government, economics, society, science, the arts, and journalism. Meeting every day from 11 to 12, the class hears lectures by members of university departments, and by distinguished persons outside the university—Henry Cowell, the music critic, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and Representative William F. Ryan, were among those who spoke during the past year. In addition the class sees pertinent films and participates in panel and group discussions. The object of the course is not only to introduce foreign students to American customs and culture, but to integrate such study with the language learning process. The American civilization hour is also open to the students who are enrolled in the part-time courses in English for foreigners.

On alternate Fridays the entire class goes on a field trip to such places of interest in the metropolitan area as junior and senior high schools, museums, the stock exchange, city hall, and the New York Times building. The trip program is coordinated with the American civilization program so that when the class, for instance, is having a week of introduction to American journalism the trip is to the offices and plant of the Times.

This new intensive course has been successful. It had a good first year of three terms, well taught and well administered by the staff of the program.

The part-time courses continued to fulfill the objectives of the former general studies program in English for foreigners. The students who take the part-time courses are divided into two main groups, a sizable number who wish to improve their English as an end in itself and who have no intention of working toward an academic degree; and another large group who are intent on fulfilling the university English language requirement as part of their degree program. The administration of this program is a fairly complex operation and requires the steady attention of one of the senior full-time teachers in the center. Courses in grammar, composition, vocabulary, and pronunciation are offered from 9 a.m. until 8:30 p.m., and in either 50-minutes classes (four meetings a week) or 75-minute classes (two meetings a week).

These courses are designed to offer, through levels of increasing difficulty, a sequence culminating in the university's "Freshman English for Foreign Students" course, the only one of these which carries point credit.

The registration in both the intensive and part-time programs during the year was highly satisfactory, as the following figures indicate:

	Intensive course	Part-time course	Total
Autumn term 1961	64	514	578
Spring term 1962	55	539	594
Summer term 1962	60		60
Summer session 1962		341	341
Total	179	1,394	1,573

It is hoped that the registration will increase in both programs as a result of an intensive publicity plan which is now being undertaken.

Starting with the September registration for the academic year 1962–63, the center is to admit students directly to both the intensive course and the part-time course. Previously the registration for the part-time program had been accomplished through the special student application procedure in the school of general studies. If students are to be candidates for the bachelor's degree in the school of general studies or are to take courses other than English for foreigners they must, of course, make application to the appropriate division of the university.

OFFICERS OF INSTRUCTION

During this past year, the combined staffs of the intensive and part-time programs consisted of 47 full- and part-time teachers who are for the most part engaged in advanced degree study at the university. A number of them have had long experience in the teaching of English as a second language, and several have published materials in the field.

The search for a chairman of the program in American language instruction culminated in the appointment of William J. Nemser, effective July 1, 1962. In the spring Professor Nemser devoted a great deal of time and energy to planning for the 1962–63 academic year and it is evident that his leadership will achieve a distinguished program, worthy in every respect of the university.

THE OFFICE OF THE FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISER

This office has been responsible since its founding in 1947 for dealing with the problems of foreign students. Its staff has always been small and its function large. Newly arrived students from abroad are required to report to this office so that their documents can be checked. All foreign students in any division of the university who encounter difficulty in financial, medical, or personal matters are urged to come to the office.

Every September, just before the opening week of the university's registration period, there is an orientation week for new foreign students. The office of the foreign student adviser plays the major role in scheduling the activities. The week's program is intended to acquaint the students with the university's organization, facilities, and fields of instruction. Faculty members and administrative officers from several departments and schools come to speak to the group, which usually numbers about 200. Procedures are explained and questions answered. A reception at which foreign students are greeted by the president of the university ends the week's program.

Beginning with their first orientation session, the students have the assurance that the foreign student adviser's office is a place where they can come for information and attention to all their problems. As the term progresses it becomes increasingly important that there be adequate communication between each student's department or school and the adviser's office, so that all academic action can be noted and the student's record in the adviser's office be kept as complete as possible. It is hoped that in 1962–63 a more regular procedure can be established which would strengthen this communication.

FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS

There are several small accounts traditionally administered by the foreign student adviser. The most important of these are a grand-in-aid fund and a loan fund, each of which contains about $1,500. Support for these accounts has come from the proceeds of the annual world dance festival and from generous contributions made by the Columbia Committee for Community Service. During the past year the funds received an unexpected and gratifying increment: the university student council voted to give its share (over $1,000) of the receipts from the library booksale which took place on the campus in the early spring.

These accounts unfortunately never completely meet the needs that arise during the academic year. Although it would not be expedient for this office to have a financial aid section parallel to that in the office of university admissions and financial aid, the special demands of our foreign students clearly indicate that there is a need for more substantial funds than now exist. Some increase in the loan and grant accounts would better equip the office of the foreign student adviser for its important duty to help students with small sums in emergencies.

Last year a generous pioneering fund was set up by Mr. George Bernheim and a group of his friends who are devoted to the university. The fund is intended to assist the educational career of a foreign student who is registered for a degree in the school of general studies. The award is to be made each year jointly by the director of the center and the dean of the school of general studies. It is clear that other such funds and scholarships would be of inestimable value to international education, since the university does not have central scholarship funds earmarked specifically for foreign students. Too often a student of talent must curtail his program of study because he faces increasing financial difficulties.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

On July 1, 1962, Miss Ann Ritchie (formerly with the Institute of International Education) joined the staff as assistant for social and cultural activities. It will be Miss Ritchie's responsibility during 1962–63 to continue a number of social and cultural functions which have regularly been handled by the foreign student adviser's office, and to plan additional special events which will appeal to the entire foreign student body.

The International Students Club is the official foreign student organization of the university. Those students who have participated in the club in the past have profited from the activities and friendships available to them. The club will be encouraged to enlarge its membership beyond the 50 active participants of this past year, to continue its program of weekly meetings to which speakers on international affairs are invited, and to have a more active social program. To reach the many foreign students in the various divisions of the university with information and notices of interest to them, the club officials are publishing a brief newsletter to be issued at regular intervals.

The world dance festival is an annual campus event which is organized by the International Students Club with the supervision and cooperation of the office of the foreign student adviser. The festival is by now a well-known and popular spring occasion. The audience is made up not only of university students and faculty, but attracts many friends of the university from the neighborhood and the metropolitan area. For weeks before the performance the club members voluntarily devote their spare time to the details of the occasion, and their labors are, they say, rewarded by the knowledge that the proceeds of the affair will go directly into the funds which will assist other foreign students.

For many years the chaplain's office has sponsored foreign student functions in Earl Hall. The center will continue to cooperate with this program and to endorse the excellent home hospitality opportunities made available by the chaplain's assistant for foreign students' work. The center and Earl Hall maintain a close liaison to avoid duplication of effort.

The cordial relationship with International House has been a source of great satisfaction this past year, and we shall continue to encourage our foreign students to seek membership and to participate in the fine programs sponsored by the House.

An addition to the social program during the spring term is a series of weekly teas held by the center in the Dodge Room of Earl Hall. The hostesses are faculty wives who are members of the committee for volunteers, a subcommittee of the Columbia Committee for Community Service. Students in the intensive and part-time language instruction programs are invited, since the main object is to give those students primarily concerned with the study of English the opportunity to converse with ladies of the faculty community and American students from various divisions of the university. This tea program is designed as a prelude to the custom of afternoon tea which will be instituted in the lounge of the center when its building is ready for occupancy.

A BUILDING FOR THE CENTER

Early in the summer of 1963 the foreign student center will move to the building formerly occupied by the school of general studies—the Alumni House of earlier days. For the first time, the center will have a building of its own—attractive, centrally situated, an admirable home for the university's foreign student activities.

In conclusion it need hardly be said again that its 1,400 foreign students place the university in a prominent position among those American universities concerned with offering education to students from abroad. The formation of the foreign student center and the subsequent steps which have been taken to implement it will be of real service to the university and will demonstrate the university's continued devotion to international education. There are important tasks to be done in the near future which will materially assist in this implementation. These include a thorough and widespread campaign of dissemination of information regarding the center's activities, an intensive inquiry into the possibilities of Federal aid under the new Fulbright-Hayes Act, and the exploration of possible sources of foundation and corporation assistance for the expansion of the program in American language instruction, and scholarship aid to foreign students.

Good Citizen and Grandson of U.S. Senator John H. Reagan Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 20, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Reagan Ferguson, a grandson of the late U.S. Senator John H. Reagan died at Palestine, Tex., last December 7, 1962. Reagan Ferguson fought for years for good government in Texas. He was a "chip off the old block," a stanch fighter for progress for the people. He was one of the first to greet me on every trip I made to Palestine, Tex., in the cause of democracy.

Bonner Frizzell, retired superintendent of schools of Palestine, and an author of historical and genealogical works, has prepared some notes on the life of Reagan Ferguson.

I ask unanimous consent that the notes be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that this article from the Palestine, Tex., Herald Press of December 9, 1962, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the notes and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME NOTES ON REAGAN FERGUSON, OF PALESTINE, TEX.

(By Bonner Frizzell)

Steeped in the history and traditions of the South, Reagan Ferguson was a worthy scion of his grandfather, John H. Reagan, Congressman, Postmaster General of the Confederacy, U.S. Senator, and first chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission.

Reagan Ferguson was a loyal and dependable Democrat who had little regard for the sophistries of those who claimed to be Democrats and voted for Republicans. In addresses at political meetings and conventions, he spoke out in behalf of the Democratic Party and derided the casuistries of those who said that they put their country above the party and that they would vote for the man and not the party. He insisted that under our system of choosing public officials, a vote for the man was a vote for the party that nominated the man. He further insisted that voters unwilling to support party nominees should not take part in party primaries and conventions.

As labor representative of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Reagan Ferguson was persuasive and effective in appearances before committees of the Texas Legislature at Austin.

Reagan Ferguson was an ardent baseball fan and rarely missed the Kentucky Derby.

During the summer of 1962, Reagan Ferguson made an extended tour of Europe visiting places of historic interest and observing in particular living conditions of workers.

Reagan Ferguson served several terms on the Palestine school board and was a champion of good schools and well-paid teachers.

In the presidential campaign of 1960, Reagan Ferguson took the lead in establishing area headquarters for Kennedy and JOHNSON. He always gave freely of his time and money in support of all nominees of the Democratic Party.

Reagan Ferguson made available to Dr. Ben Parker, professor of history at Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, valuable letters and documents of John H. Reagan for use in writing his book published in 1962, entitled "Not Without Honor: The Life of John H. Reagan."

The enclosed newspaper account gives the names of Reagan Ferguson's children now living. His oldest son, Jack Ferguson, pilot in the U.S. Air Force in World War II, was killed in a plane crash.

RITES MONDAY FOR REAGAN FERGUSON

Reagan Ferguson, a grandson of Confederate Postmaster General John H. Reagan, died late Friday at his home, 403 South Royall, at the age of 74.

A lifetime resident of Palestine, Mr. Ferguson was a retired railroad conductor. He maintained an active interest in civic and political affairs.

Born January 30, 1888, he was the son of the late Alexander and Betty Reagan Ferguson. He and his late wife, Leila Coats Reagan, celebrated their golden wedding anniversary 2 years ago, just 3 months prior to her death.

Only last Monday, Mr. Ferguson was privileged to attend dedication services for a State office building named for his grandfather, John H. Reagan, in Austin.

Mr. Ferguson was a member of the First Methodist Church and the Palestine Masonic Lodge.

Funeral services are to be held at 3 p.m. Monday in the chapel of the Bailey Funeral Home here with the Reverend John McLean officiating. Burial will follow in the East Hill Cemetery.

Pallbearers are to be A. W. Elkins, Eugene Fish, J. O. DeChaumes, Albert Firebaugh, Emmett Tyree, Drew Kolstad, Henry Davenport, C. W. Jander, Lester Hamilton, and Lloyd Bailey.

Mr. Ferguson is survived by two sons, Reagan Ferguson, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga., and Pat Ferguson of Tyler, and four grandchildren.

Terror at the U.S. Supreme Court Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court in a series of decisions has substituted its own personal social reform ideas for law. As a result, it is difficult if not impossible to bring Negro criminals to justice in some jurisdictions. Washington, D.C., is one of

those jurisdictions where even the district attorney's office frankly admits that the conviction of a Negro criminal is almost impossible.

It is therefore rather ironic that women employees of the Supreme Court are urged by the "learned" Justices to avail themselves of the services of a police escort from the building onto the street to hail a taxi after dark.

Ninety-five percent of the street assaults in the Nation's Capital are committed by Negroes. What hath the Supreme Court wrought?

I include the following article from the February 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report on this subject:

The following appeared in the regular newsletter for employees of the U.S. Supreme Court in Washington:

"As darkness comes * * * women employees are requested to exercise caution in leaving the building. They are urged by Lt. Harry N. Hayes to stop at police headquarters, room 35, for a police escort to the parking lot or out in front for a taxi. This system, now in effect for several years, has proved effective. Women employees, especially when leaving alone after dark, should take advantage of this protection."

Connecticut Firm's Novel Way To Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Sales Management, in its issue of January 18, 1963, published an interesting article about the Gilbertsville Trucking Co., of Rockville, Conn., which is in my congressional district.

Mr. Kenneth Nelson, the president of this company, recently arranged a special traffic seminar to help small companies with their shipping problems. The seminar was held in Worcester, Mass., and was attended by representatives from 90 firms in New England.

Aside from local pride that a constituent from my district is being helpful to business in a very constructive way, I feel that this article deserves wider attention and may prove helpful also to business people in other parts of the country. I am therefore pleased to insert it into the RECORD:

SPONSOR SESSIONS TO CUT BUSINESS?

Over 100 men and women from 90 companies crowded into a small ballroom in a Worcester, Mass., hotel recently. They were there to learn how they could cut down on their shipping costs, at the expense of their host.

Occasion was the first meeting of a five-part traffic seminar, sponsored by Gilbertsville Trucking Co., Inc., Rockville, Conn.

Courses, presented at no charge, were the brainstorm of Kenneth Nelson, president of the trucking firm. His theory was that innumerable small companies must ship their goods to do business, but are not big enough to afford a full-time traffic department. As a result, employees assigned to handle shipments generally are uninformed on the many facets involved in transporting of merchandise.

Nelson approached leading specialists in the various aspects of trucking, with the idea of presenting a seminar directed at smaller shippers. Experts in the preparation of shipments; freight rates; claims, etc., were enthusiastic in their support and readily agreed to head individual courses. Where fees or travel expense were required, Gilbertville picked up the tab.

With instructors secured, broadside invitations were sent out to companies in the Worcester area, picked for the initial seminar. Response (from 111 men and women) was far above expectations, indicating the need for such courses.

In the invitation, Nelson said: "Gilbertville has long felt the need to promote a seminar covering basic traffic knowledge * * * Our program is geared primarily for the firms who do not have a traffic department with trained personnel."

The six courses might sound dull to the average person, but they covered matters of extreme importance to shippers. Included were "The Bill of Lading and Its Importance to the Shipper," "Loss and Damage Claims; Proper Procedures for Filing and Claims Prevention," "The Classification Tariff," and "The Federal Government and Its Interest in Your Shipping Practices."

Physical layout of the seminar room was classroom style, seating six to a table. Upon registration at the door, each participant was given a vinyl briefcase, with a legal-size pad, a scratch pad, ballpoint pen, and a small sheet of gold leaf, to be used to write the recipients' names on the case.

Classes ran from 8 p.m. until 9:30 p.m. Instructors were advised to lay it on the line and pull no punches. As a matter of fact, one distinguished instructor made the bold statement that truckdrivers "couldn't count above 10, and furthermore, couldn't read." Exaggerated as the idea might have been, he put across his point of writing clear bills of lading.

Each class was held on a Tuesday night, on successive weeks. Attendance climbed steadily from the original course, indicating the interest generated. After the first class, the Worcester Area Chamber of Commerce voluntarily called it an outstanding seminar.

At the conclusion of the course, those having 100 percent attendance records were presented with certificates as an indication of their desire to improve knowledge in the field of traffic management.

As a result of the success of the original seminar, Nelson has planned similar ones in Boston, Springfield, Providence, New York, and New Jersey, areas served by his firm.

"Many of the companies represented at the initial program were not customers of Gilbertville Trucking," he reveals. "But we have stimulated interest in the cost-saving aspects of the business."

Although the seminar was not directed to promote Gilbertville, Nelson feels that the good will generated will result in an increase in his business.

"After all," he says, "we offered this course free, to help other companies reduce their cost of operation. No one has done this before, and when the time comes for a firm to pick a shipper, I'm hopeful they'll think of us first."

If the response to the first shippers traffic seminar in New England is any indication, Gilbertville should reap many benefits from appreciative companies whose employees now have a better understanding of the functions they perform.

Are We Going To Lose the Indiana Dunes, a Treasure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 20, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the fact that Bethlehem Steel apparently intends to destroy a large part of a key section of the Indiana Dunes has sorrowed many people.

The concern being built up by the public has been demonstrated in the last few days by editorial comment in the Nation's leading newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post for February 14, 1963, titled "Losing a Treasure" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This editorial is a cogent statement of what the effort to save the Dunes essentially is about, namely, the health of mind and body of our millions of city dwellers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOSING A TREASURE

"The health of the eye," Emerson said, "demands a horizon." Few horizons are more refreshing and replenishing than the Indiana dunes that stretch for a few miles along the shore of Lake Michigan. But what the hand of nature took a millenium to shape, the hand of man is about to turn into an industrial harbor for a complex of steel plants. The bulldozers are already poised, and the cause of saving a precious recreational area for future generations seems as hopeless as repealing the law of gravity.

Yet when and if the bulldozers gouge out the dunes, it will not be because Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS has given up hope. Once again, Mr. DOUGLAS has introduced a bill, endorsed by the Department of the Interior, that would save the dunes as a national lakeshore area. Seventeen Senators have joined with Mr. DOUGLAS in sponsoring this measure, yet the list contains no name from Indiana. With a single honorable exception (Representative RAY J. MADDEN), every Member of Indiana's congressional delegation seems indifferent to the fate of the dunes.

"Payrolls, not picnics," is the slogan, and the bulldozers are about to do their work to rub out what no man can replace. Never mind that alternate sites might be found for the harbor in Lake County or near Michigan City. Never mind that President Kennedy in his last conservation message called for the creation of a national lakeshore park in northern Indiana. When and if the Burns Ditch Harbor is built at a cost of some $25 million in Federal funds, these words from Emerson might be posted at the entrance:

"To the body and mind which have been cramped by noxious work or company, nature is medicinal and restores their tone. The tradesman, the attorney comes out of the din and craft of the street and sees the sky and the words and is a man again. In their eternal calm, he finds himself."

To which the retort of the harbor builders would be, we suppose, "Who is this fellow Emerson? Did he ever meet a payroll?"

Great New Dream for Europe Cause of British Freezeout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, while disagreeing with some of the opinions expressed by Mr. McGeachy in his Financial Post story of February 9 and agreeing with others, I believe he has given all of us some food for thought. The Financial Post story follows at the end of my remarks.

We cannot push out of mind the seriousness of the De Gaulle position, the Canadian governmental crisis, the U.N. decision to give economic aid to Cuba, the continuing floundering in the matter of world trade, America's chronic unemployment, the flight of gold, and the tightening of the noose around American exports and American investments in foreign countries.

Most of the present-day commentators seem to follow a given line as soon as they can distinguish what the line is to be.

All seem afraid of being the Devil's advocate or to appear to be swimming against the current.

One wonders if they are afraid of their own ability to analyze the current events in relationship to the past and the effect upon the future or whether they feel that they are safe "so long as they have the majority to point to as being with them."

Insofar as the Common Market is concerned, not even an 8-year-old would have believed the foolish and unsound propaganda put out for the benefit of the U.S. Congress prior to the passage of the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Personally, while favoring responsible trade and fair trade in the trade picture, I never could understand how this Nation swallowed this trade propaganda hook, line, and sinker.

I pointed out time and again that the Common Market had never really accepted the full text of our trade bill and at no time did this group accept our insistence upon keeping the favored-nation clause.

The Common Market group, in spite of the stories showing a unanimous vote against De Gaulle, still will not buy our trade bill unless we discriminate by quota arrangements and other restrictive covenants against other nations in competition with the Common Market, for our American marketplace. In spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, the only lucrative market for consumer goods in the world today is still the United States.

All of our push for the Common Market acceptance of Great Britain is based upon a political consideration, to consider it from the economic base would bring us to exactly the conclusion reached by De Gaulle, "It won't pay."

This is not meant to absolve France from any blame if the market collapses which would be a major catastrophe in our scheme of things, but to point out that De Gaulle has every reason to object to British entry for purely commercial reasons.

If the British joined the Common Market and still maintain their preference status with the Commonwealth, it will give Britain the benefits of the open market of the Common Market while its own marketplace will be preempted by the preference status of the Commonwealth nations.

Further, if Britain follows our urgings and follows our favored-nation policy with underdeveloped nations as well as Japan, Hong Kong, and other consumer goods producers, the Common Market again finds itself in a bind with their market protected for United States and British goods but the United States and British market open to all comers.

For the past 3 years, as a Member of Congress and heading the committee studying the impact of imports on employment, I have pointed to these simple facts and to the serious unbalance of world employment when trade is based upon selling price with no regard to cost of production and individual country economies.

It must be remembered when dealing in trade that first, last, and always, the making, producing and growing of goods for selling is a commercial venture with profit as its first goal and all other considerations such as diplomacy, defense, philosophy and theory as secondary and all too often used as blinds for the plain unvarnished search for greater profits.

No person will argue with those amongst us who sincerely or selfishly promote world peace and brotherhood, but let us get one point clearly imprinted upon our rather confused minds—trade will not promote, nor can it guarantee, peace or good will unless trade is equitable, fair, and profitable.

Profits alone cannot do other than destroy good will and friendship. No better illustration than De Gaulle's position on Great Britain. In spite of the universal clamor for De Gaulle's scalp, the real truth of the matter is that the first consideration in his decision is the plain and simple commercialism of trade, jobs, currency exchanges, and the power that stems from an expanding economy.

This is not the time to check out item by item the competitive problems that would ensue for France if Great Britain and the United States were admitted carte blanche to the Common Market without joining the club all the way.

"Joining the club" means cutting out our favored-nation clause, commonwealth preferences, selling in the world market with subsidies, tax credits, preferred rates, and currency manipulation.

Someday it may happen, but as for the foreseeable future it is my studied opinion that only two things can happen. We keep out of an all-out agreement with the Common Market as prescribed in the present trade expansion bill or we end up with the most serious domestic economic letdown in our history, plus a worldwide trade debacle that will shake many heads of government from their positions of control.

Our problems can best be understood if we learn a little more about our friends and allies, neighbors and ideologies.

You can call your government any name you wish, a democracy, a monarchy, fascism, communism, or any other catch name and you will end up in the ashcan of yesterday's promises unless you keep your own peoples' welfare first in your deliberations, treaties, and agreements.

This does not mean that you have to take advantage of other nations and their peoples, but rather that in protecting your own economy, you are in fact protecting their welfare.

It is no bargain for the Chinese in Hong Kong to work for a net of 47 cents a day, 10 hours under sweatshop conditions, to make products for the use of Americans, French, Germans or anyone else whose incomes are from 10 to 50 times as much per day for the same work.

We can excuse our policy by saying that we are helping these people who otherwise would have nothing. By the same argument, we can excuse taking the land from our Indians, putting the Africans into slavery since we gave them clothes and shelter which was an improvement over nakedness and ignorance.

Sometimes one wonders how anybody can, in good conscience, promote trade as a builder of good will amongst peoples when we buy the products simply because a foreign worker works for less money and we can use foreign trade both as a wedge to sell—give away—our products not produced overseas while at the same time we can pressure both industry and labor in the consumer goods fields.

This Nation is being pushed into a trade pocket by the importer-exporter groups plus the international investor the same as the New England and Mid-Atlantic States were pushed into a production-labor pocket about 30 years ago when the low costs of the South acted as a magnet for our textile, hosiery and garment industries.

It is accepted by all who study the economics of trade that production will flow to the low-cost areas and distribution will flow to the high-income areas.

That is why the children of Hong Kong and Japan cannot afford the toys and togs of their own industry. The markets in Europe and the United States are more profitable. This is true in every item produced in competition between high-cost and low-cost economies.

Perhaps our world planners fail to realize that the market plan is sustained only by production wages.

When Japanese goods produced for 35 cents an hour replace American-made goods at $2.85 an hour in the American marketplace, they take from the marketplace $2.50 of purchase money which means that soon the market money in the United States dries up and both the Japanese and the U.S. worker find themselves walking the streets unemployed.

When we ship $11 worth of products to Japan, we export 2 hours worth of

U.S. labor—labor roughly 50 percent of cost of production—but when the Japanese ship $11 worth of goods to the United States the same amount of goods would require seven times as much labor in the United States, since Japanese labor only gets one-seventh of our U.S. wage but because of the U.S. production methods, they produce as much per manhour as we do.

In fact, by my own observation, I can vouch for an even greater production per worker in the electronics industry.

Now if we flood our market with these products at lower prices, we buy more products but we cut out more American jobs, the end result has to be unemployment, depressed areas, and overproduction worldwide.

Lately I received a letter from Ed Wimmer of the Independent Retailers of the United States. He tells of visiting a store selling typewriters and found over a hundred foreign makes, but only two American made—the full truth is that some parts of the American makes came from overseas also.

Personally I went shopping for a portable sewing machine with Mrs. Dent. We could not find an American-made machine in three stores; finally located a Singer store with all foreign-made machines except one made in the United States. The U.S. machine was the most expensive by 200 to 300 percent. The others were made in Canada and Great Britain.

In dollars maybe we can compare favorably, but in man-hours of labor we come out a miserable last.

Until a trade program based upon a compensating factor equalizing costs of production is put into worldwide trade agreements, we will have the De Gaulles, the Castros, and all the rest of the disturbing elements that have kept our world in an uproar since the first man had a surplus and tried to sell it.

I cannot agree with the common belief that those of us who promote protectionism for American jobs are narrow and isolationists. The truth of the matter is that we are doing more to insure economic stability both nationally and internationally than those among us who under the guise of good will and free trade are exploiting the workers in every foreign country for exorbitant profits and some governmental greed.

When we buy cheap in a foreign country we are not always assured of keeping the same product cheap in the United States. The last 2 years ought to convince any observer that trade is commercial and most of those who are in the forefront of the free trade and trade expansion are greedy, selfish, mistaken, or misinformed.

For instance, prior to the so-called rebirth of the free trade movement, under the pressure and urgency of the agents of the registered agents of foreign countries such as the firm of George Ball and his associates, Tom Dewey's group, and hundreds of others who are registered as foreign agents representing manufacturers, exporters, importers and foreign governments, we had some privileges as individuals while traveling abroad. For instance we could bring back to the United States up until 1960, $500 worth of foreign purchases. This was reduced to $100 by executive order. We could send back gift packages within a limit of $10, this has been reduced to $1.

Who benefits by these orders? Certainly not the foreign merchant since he would earn a more reasonable profit by retail sales than by sales to exporters. Not the U.S. tourist because he would get a more reasonable price at the foreign source rather than being forced to buy from an American importer who can bring in unlimited amounts. Certainly our Government will not benefit since we are shifting the individual purchase to the bulk purchaser who may pay a little customs, but the volume he brings certainly takes as much gold out of the country in the end. Certainly the American worker or producer does not benefit since the individual purchaser would buy much less in volume for the same amount as an importer and in all probability would buy goods not normally produced in the United States as a sustaining consumer product.

The $1 limit of gift packages can be described as an embargo on individual purchases for the benefit of the profiteering importer and nothing else. The whole trade program is oriented for the benefit of the profiteers when considered from the economic angle.

If we say we are worried about our balance of payments—and we should be—then I would recommend three simple but effective deterrents to the disappearing gold pile:

First. Apply a compensating factor at customhouse, removing all other restrictions, quotas, currency manipulating and customs by adding a compensating tax to equalize costs of competitive goods at customhouse with platform costs United States. This must be a two-way street. We cannot expect the right to bar foreign products with quotas and then subsidize our exports to cut prices in foreign markets and vice versa.

Second. All American travelers change U.S. currency into foreign currency before leaving the United States or upon arrival in the foreign country in all nations where we have counterpart funds and/or where any nation limits its nationals' spending while traveling to the United States.

Third. Enforce restrictions on foreign investments by barring products from these investments being returned to the United States in competition with domestic products—sewing machines and typewriters, and so forth. An investment to help a foreign economy is one thing but an investment made to displace American goods on American shelves is another.

The following feature story on De Gaulle shows how most of us are influenced in our thinking on trade by having angles and issues entering into the picture that treats the trade consideration as a minor consideration.

Behind all the talk of France's grand design let us not hide our own grand design—which has been fostered and developed under the guise of free trade and sold to the American people as well as foreign workers as a sincere effort in behalf of a better place for all of us to live in. There are, of course, many persons who honestly believe in the grand design. However, the facts of life are to the contrary.

True real trade opportunities based upon equity will make a better place for all of us but trade as we know it today is selfish, greedy and above all—benefits those who most practice exploitation of workers.

De Gaulle may be all wrong, but insofar as we Americans are concerned, it will give us a new lease on our industrial life. Any delay in putting the new trade laws into effect will help the American economy and for this, at least, De Gaulle deserves a few kind words.

When De Gaulle and others inside the market who agree with him are pushed off the scene by the international profiteers and exploiters many an American worker will lose his job.

Summing up for the moment before introducing the McGeachy article, let me say without reservation that nothing takes the place of a job to a man who must work for a livelihood.

The dignity of a job cannot be compensated for by relief, handouts, doles, or doubletalk. Next to life itself, the honest man wants to provide a living for himself and his family.

The story that follows may give you an insight into the international picture and show why, as some are saying, "De Gaulle must go":

[From the Financial Post, Feb. 9, 1963]

GREAT NEW DREAM FOR EUROPE CAUSE OF BRITISH FREEZEOUT

(By J. B. McGeachy)

A free vote by the six members of the European Common Market (ECM), if a free vote had been taken, would evidently have gone 5 to 1 in favor of admitting Britain.

De Gaulle's veto worked like the single blackball cast against election of a man to a club. Whether it makes sense to run great alliances on club rules is open to question. There's a possibility that De Gaulle's one-man decision will be reversed.

Meanwhile, ECM as it stands is quite an achievement. To describe it contemptuously as "little Europe" is exactly as silly as it would be to call the United States "little America."

The present ECM and the United States have about the same population. Steel production in 1961: ECM, 80 million tons; United States, 98 million tons. Foreign trade in 1961: ECM, $64 billion; United States, $39 billion. With all the coal, iron, fast-flowing rivers, and other natural resources it needs (except oil), ECM is a very going concern.

If the British want to join, as evidently many of them do, there's no valid commercial reasons for keeping them out. But De Gaulle's main objection was not commercial. It was political and, above all, military.

To consider the political angle first, it's clear that De Gaulle thinks of the Franco-German alliance as the dominant element in ECM. Since France and Germany together have more than half of ECM's inhabitants and wealth, this is not a wholly unreasonable proposition.

The entry of Britain would clearly transform the ECM political scene. It would rule out domination by De Gaulle and Adenauer, or their successors.

Just for this reason the Italians, Dutch, and Belgians fervently want Britain in. They don't relish the prospect of all ECM

decisions being imposed by the Paris-Bonn axis. Also they have a strong faith in Britain as the country, par excellence, able to show others how to run a democracy without going off the rails. There is some merit in that judgment.

Before De Gaulle, who has virtually abolished the French Assembly and possesses more authority than any Frenchman since Napoleon, French parliamentarism was a kind of Gallic farce. As for the Germans, the Hitler period (1933–45) showed how disastrously they could depart from the principle and practice of popular rule through ordinary, decent men.

The smaller powers in ECM don't want to see it gummed up or committed to dangerous courses by French reversion to the political nonsense of 1947–58 or German reversion to rule by a gang of adventurers.

They feel, not without cause, that Britain would be the sober, reliable, experienced partner who could keep the ship on an even keel. So they want Britain in.

But the great debate has a second political angle, about which points of view are far less clearly defined. De Gaulle keeps on referring to Europe as extending "from the Atlantic to the Urals," the mountain range that separates European from Asiatic Russia. What does this mean?

Does De Gaulle seriously envisage the expansion of ECM to include not only the Soviet satellites (East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the rest) but the more populous and richer half of the Soviet Union itself? (What happens to Asian Russia is not indicated.)

De Gaulle apparently does foresee this future for the European union. The vision, as some people think, is simply absurd if not mad; "demented" a London paper calls it.

Yet perhaps it is not more demented than the existing actuality, with Europe split by an Iron Curtain, the Moscow-Washington quarrel still unresolved, and the cold war seemingly destined to go on forever. Surely this state of affairs is about as mad as possible.

We have all got so inured to these political facts that we tend to regard them as eternal verities. De Gaulle, a tough realist in war and politics, does not see the future in this static way. He expects change.

In particular he thinks the world may some day be confronted by the spectacle of a Washington-Moscow axis. This arrangement (often advocated here) could be the best guarantee of peace on earth; but it would evidently demote ECM to junior status. For this reason De Gaulle is against it. He wants to get to Moscow before the Americans get there. (To think about world affairs in Gaullist terms, you have to rid your mind of can't and stand-pattism, and let your imagination roam freely.)

Would Britain in ECM be an obstacle to De Gaulle's seemingly grandiose political designs? It's hard to say. But certainly Britain as an agent of the United States in ECM (the role de Gaulle thinks she would play) would be quite hostile to any scheme for getting the Russians into a European alliance. This could be another reason why de Gaulle wants to keep Britain out.

We come to the military side of the controversy, probably the most important. Walter Lippmann says the debate inside ECM, on Britain joining, was not about trade and tariffs at all; it was about American nuclear power.

To see this point one must bear in mind Britain's "special relationship" with the United States, in this case not sentimentally based on a common language but severely practical. From the United States, Britain has received special aid, in technical know-how and blueprints, in manufacturing its nuclear deterrent. The American McMahon Act was amended to make this possible but France wasn't named as a beneficiary.

The French have felt aggrieved about this ever since. "Why," asked a prominent Frenchman, "is it safe to let that secret information cross the Atlantic but unsafe to let it cross the Channel?" De Gaulle is huffy about Britain's privileged position. But he adds that France has never asked for U.S. nuclear data. He spurns U.S. aid in this form.

And De Gaulle accurately perceives that, at ECM discussions on strategy, Britain would be in an embarrassed or handicapped position. Possessing technical knowledge they could not divulge, could British delegates be candid or useful? Probably not.

Incidentally, one might speculate on whether Britain was kept out of ECM, because, as in honor bound, she refused to share with De Gaulle the nuclear information supplied confidentially by Washington. This is possible. Whether or not it's true may not be known until certain memoirs are published 20 or 40 years hence.

But quite apart from the question of American secrets, De Gaulle is out of tune with Britain on nuclear policy. He thinks that Britain, by tying herself to the American atomic chariot, has lost all independence.

There's evidence to support this opinion, notably the Skybolt incident publicized around the world after the Kennedy-Macmillan talks in Nassau.

When Kennedy told Macmillan that Britain would get Polaris (submarine) missiles from the United States instead of the promised Skybolts, the President probably thought this was just a routine technical decision, of a kind Washington is used to, that all concerned could accept without turning a hair. He had no inkling, or at least no real appreciation, of the size of the political row he would stir up in London.

Britain is committed to building its own nuclear bombs, both atomic and hydrogen, and has accumulated a modest number. After expensive but futile experiments in making missiles, Britain went out of the missile business for good and decided to rely on the United States for the vehicles to carry its bombs.

Macmillan's opposition, the Labor Party, has taken the line that the British nuclear effort is little better than a joke. Could Macmillan produce, the Socialists kept asking, a single Washington quotation to show that the Kennedy administration took this British contribution seriously?

Alas, poor Macmillan could not. Indeed the available Washington opinions (like Dean Acheson's recent article in Foreign Affairs) tend the other way and rather suggest that a hill of beans would be about as much use in a war as Britain's hand-me-down, poor relation's stockpile. But at least Macmillan could point to the U.S. promise of Skybolts. Wasn't that a proof, he could ask, that Washington thought well of Britain's performance?

Then suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, comes the bad news, a political haymaker, perhaps, for Macmillan: no Skybolts, Polaris missiles instead. To use them Britain must spend on submarines at least $1.3 billion she can ill afford. The change compels Macmillan, without prior consultation, to recast his whole defense system. Henry Kissinger, leading U.S. military writer, complains that this was no way to treat the principal ally of the United States, even if Polaris is a better missile than Skybolt. (And who knows if it is? Skybolt had a successful test the very day after the Nassau meeting.)

The theory is that Britain's Polaris-equipped subs will be part of a multinational force under NATO command (which De Gaulle, flatly and no doubt truthfully calls "American command") but that Britain can withdraw them for independent use in case of emergency. But it can readily be shown, as British technical writers have shown, that there are numerous simple ways by which McNamara could inhibit any British action of this kind.

De Gaulle wants neither nuclear know-how nor missiles from the Americans. He was offered Polaris but turned it down. He will build his own missiles (as well as his own bombs). For if, he asks, he went to the enormous expense of building the necessary submarines, and if when they were ready the United States should announce that Polaris must be discarded as obsolete (quite possible), what then? What indeed?

But De Gaulle's questions go deeper. If Western Europe is militarily invaded by the Russians, even with conventional arms, the United States is pledged to attack Russia with nuclear bombs. Is this promise credible? Would the United States, just to defend Western Europe, risk Russian nuclear retaliation on New York, Chicago, Detroit, etc.?

I have searched the literature on this question, raised again by De Gaulle, and found only one answer that looks even plausible. This is the McNamara doctrine that, in the position described, the United States would A-bomb Russian military targets only. It would not attack Russian cities; therefore it would not invite reprisals on American cities.

This doesn't sound reassuring to me. For what about escalation? Once a nuclear war begins, even if limited in the first stage, is it not likely to develop into unlimited bombing and carnage? I'm inclined to believe with General de Gaulle, that the United States would shrink from putting its nuclear arsenal into action if only Western Europe were threatened. And it's impossible not to agree with De Gaulle that Nassau would give the United States the exclusive power to say when and where nuclear weapons should be used.

De Gaulle wants some say for France. He admits that his stock of A-bombs is puny beside the great power accumulations. But France has now the power, through A-bombs carried in bombers, to kill 20 million Russians in a few seconds.

De Gaulle doesn't expect a Soviet invasion of Europe; and he may be right. But, in case it should happen, he believes the capacity to destroy 20 million people (more deaths than Russia suffered in the whole of World War II), would have at least some effect on the aggressor's conduct.

He could be correct in this opinion; but who am I, who is any other civilian, to bandy words on the subject with one of the great military theoreticians of this age, as De Gaulle showed himself to be in his marvelously prescient pre-1939 books.

The purpose of this piece has been elucidation, especially of De Gaulle's point of view which many find baffling or even infuriating. I think he will turn out to be wrong: I think the Atlantic Community will come to pass. Meanwhile, in dealing with De Gaulle on this matter we are not dealing with a madman, fanatic, or French jingo; but with a soldier, strategist, and politician of genius. This should be borne in mind.

Industry in Middletown, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the monthly magazine Connecticut Industry, which is published by the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, published a

brief article in its February issue on a salute-to-industry program held recently in Middletown, located in my congressional district.

The program was a great success. It attracted many visitors from Connecticut and other States, and pointed up the importance of Middletown as an industrial center and the possibilities for the location of new industries there. Some 40 industries from the Middletown area participated in the exhibits, and these companies are listed in the article.

One of the most interesting items in the exhibit was a model of an interplanetary nuclear turbo-electric-powered space vehicle which was built by Model Makers Products, Inc., one of the local companies participating in the exhibit. This model was made for the Connecticut Advanced Nuclear Engineering Laboratory—known as CANEL—a facility of the United Aircraft Corp., which is also located in Middletown.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert this article in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues and to the business community as an example of industrial growth and capability of Connecticut.

The article reads as follows:

MIDDLETOWN SALUTES INDUSTRY

The Greater Middletown Chamber of Commerce honored and emphasized the importance of industry to the Middletown area by conducting a salute to industry program last September, during which some 40 industries participated with displays of their products in the city's downtown store windows. Two overstreet banners announced the program, and a downtown flag exhibit during 1 day of the 6-day program paid tribute to the contributions and accomplishments of local area industries employing some 13,000 persons, with an annual payroll in excess of $75 million.

One of the highpoints of the weeklong salute to industry program was an industrial tour of area facilities and building sites conducted for nearly 100 industrial realtors and brokers from Connecticut and other States in an effort to interest them in recommending the area to their manufacturing clients. This phase of the program was coordinated by the city planning commission with the assistance of State and local organizations.

An added feature designed to accent to all residents the importance of industry to the area was a special 32-page tabloid published by the Middltown Press, entitled "Greater Middletown USA".

The tabloid was, in effect, an industrial panorama which featured products on display, the industrial tour, factory locations, and Middletown tomorrow.

Since there are approximately 300 industries listed for the area, many of which are small one- and two-man shops, it was not possible to show the total picture of the contributions made by manufacturers in the area, since many companies were unable to participate. However, the 40 companies who did exhibit their products were sufficiently large and representative of area industries to give viewers a comprehensive understanding of the importance of industry to the economy of the Greater Middletown area.

Companies who exhibited their products were: Art-Gravure Studios; Auburn Manufacturing Co., Coca-Cola Bottling Co.; Connecticut Light & Power Co.; EIS Automotive Corp.; Formatron Corp.; Garvin Sybil Ceramics; Goodyear Rubber Co.; Hartford Electric Light Co.; Hubbard Hall Chemical Co.; Jarvis Corp.; Jarvis Machine Tools, Inc.; Lyman Gun Sight Corp.; Mastercraft Trailers, Inc.; Michael Kane Brick Co.; Model Makers, Inc.; J. A. Otterbein; Puritron Corp.; Rayco Products, Inc.; Raymond Engineering Laboratories, Inc.; Russell Manufacturing Co.; Safeway Heat Elements, Inc.; Rapidprint Time Recorders, Inc.; Shaw Belting Co.; Southern New England Telephone Co.; Standard Knapp Division of Emhart Manufacturing Co.; Valley Oil Co.; Wilcox-Crittenden Division, North & Judd Manufacturing Co.; Harlow Products Corp.; Ripley Co., Inc.; Rogers Manufacturing Co.; Vinal Regional Vocational Technical School; Durham Manufacturing Co.; Merriam Manufacturing Co.; W. A. Parsons Co.; Lyngrace Manufacturing Co.; American Distilling & Manufacturing Co.; Mitchell Smelting & Refining Co.; and Gong Bell Manufacturing Co.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Support for Britain's Entry Into the Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the future and the success of the European Common Market is of tremendous concern to the people and the Government of the United States. The complete unity of our European allies certainly depends on the success of this partnership of Europe.

I am happy to learn that the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service has adopted a resolution urging Premier Fanfani of Italy to use his influence to persuade France to remove its objections to Great Britain's entry into this alliance.

I am privileged to insert herein a copy of said resolution:

Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, representing 80,000 members—Americans of Italian origin—in city, State, Federal departments, as well as cultural and industrial organizations announced at a regular executive meeting held in New York City this week that the following resolution was unanimously approved and duly adopted by the delegates urging Premier Amintore Fanfani of Italy to use his good offices in supporting Britain's entry into the European Common Market:

"Whereas all Americans have rejoiced at the achievement of Western Europe in binding up the wounds of war and building toward a new age of peace and prosperity; and in particular they rejoice to see Italy reunited in the company of great nations of Europe; they rejoice that Italy, of all these countries, has had the most miraculous recovery—of production in her factories, of employment, and therewith of raised living standards of her people; and

"Whereas the sons of Italy, now citizens of the United States are proud that the United States has throughout played its part in this recovery—through the Marshall aid program, and through working constantly for the unity of Europe; and they believe that final success rests on the completion of this process of European integration; and

"Whereas they know the process is not complete. And now they learn that this great experiment is in danger of breaking down; and

"Whereas on January 14, 1963, General De Gaulle sought to exclude Britain from the partnership of Europe. At the same time he declared himself against the partnership of the new Europe and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved in this situation the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service declare to their Italian brothers their fervent hope,* That Italy will continue to work for the Atlantic Alliance of Europe and the United States of America; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That Europe will not remain the little Europe of De Gaulle, but will embrace all the free nations of the Continent and Britain, whose negotiations for membership had so nearly succeeded; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the declaration of the Italian and British Prime Ministers of February 2, 1963, will rally Italy and all Europe to oppose and resist efforts to divide Europe, or drag it back to the power-mad alinements of the past, and perhaps to war."

A Man Named U Thant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with an article published in the February 10, 1963, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, the national Catholic action weekly. The article is written by Mr. Dale Francis and is entitled "A Man Named U Thant." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAN NAMED U THANT

(By Dale Francis)

A mild-mannered schoolteacher from Burma has become one of the world's most powerful men.

Last October when the President of the United States acted against a threat to the United States, his action was backed unanimously by the Organization of American States. This was the legitimate organization of the Western Hemisphere, the action taken by this body under the leadership of the United States was an action of responsible nations concerned with the welfare of the hemisphere.

Nikita Khrushchev, recognizing the legitimacy of the action of the United States and the OAS, bowed to its demands. He had taken a bold gamble and he recognized he had lost. His attempt to intrude within the Western Hemisphere had failed and he agreed to the demands of the United States and the Organization of American States.

He agreed to remove missile bases he admitted were installed in Cuba by the Soviet Union and under Soviet control. He agreed to onsite inspection to guarantee these missile bases and missles were removed.

Yet today the United States has no real guarantee nuclear missiles have been removed from Cuba. Disturbing reports continue to come out of Cuba. The Soviet buildup continues, armaments are increased, planes capable of delivering nuclear warheads to any city in the United States are flown by nationals of Communist nations in Cuba, and the only guarantee we have there are not nuclear bombs in Cuba is the word of the Soviet Union—and the Soviet Union at first refused even to admit there were missiles in Cuba, denied the existence of them before the United Nations.

MAKER OF WORLD POLICY

The role of the Secretary General of the United Nations is clearly stated by the Charter of the United Nations. He is the administrative officer of the organization. He shall perform the functions entrusted to him by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the other Councils of the United Nations.

Yet U Thant as Secretary General of the United Nations has become a maker of world policy. He has done this quietly but surely and the effect of his actions is changing the world.

At a time when the Cuban crisis was approaching a settlement, U Thant went to Havana to visit Fidel Castro. In 2 days, the Secretary General managed to thwart a settlement agreed upon by the United States, the Organization of American States and the Soviet Union.

The conversations could not have been more revealing of the intrusion of U Thant. He fawned upon Castro, he told him the United States had no right to see by inspection that the withdrawal of the missiles had been carried out. He told Castro he had come to Cuba to present for his approval the negotiations of the United States and the Soviet Union, he suggested he would support Cuba in the demand the United States leave Guantanamo Naval Base.

It is because of U Thant the Cuban situation remains unresolved, that the threat of nuclear destruction still exists within our hemisphere.

THWARTED KATANGA INDEPENDENCE

It was U Thant who made the policy toward Katanga. That the United States openly supported him is to our shame, but the fact remains it was U Thant who established the primary policy.

The dispute between the Congolese Central Government and Katanga was not one without validity on both sides. It was true the Congolese Central Government would find it difficult to survive without the revenues of industrially prosperous Katanga.

But the truth was there was no Congo nation. What was called the Congo was not a natural political entity. It had been established only as the boundary of the imperialistic aggression of Leopold II in the nineteenth century.

When freedom came to what was called the Congo, the Katanganese wanted to be independent. No one who understands the African situation could doubt that had the Katanganese been offered the right of self-determination they would have chosen to be independent.

Few men know the Congo so well as does Dr. Albert Schweitzer, few men are more highly respeoted than this great man. He denounced efforts to force Katanga into the Congolese Central Government as criminal, as a perversion of justice.

Yet U Thant used the armed forces of the United Nations to compel the surrender of the Katanganese. These forces succeeded in a campaign of rape and plunder, murder and blasphemy.

If the world is not asking who this man U Thant is, what does he think, what does

he believe, then the world should be. And if the world does not quickly get an answer then we may one day wake up to discover that the most powerful man in the world is a man who is supposed to administer policy of the U.N. but has become the maker of U.N. policy.

WHAT U THANT THINKS

Fortunately, it is comparatively easy to discover what U Thant thinks. He is a man who has written much and one of the most revealing of all the articles he has written is to be found in almost all metropolitan libraries.

It is an article that appeared in the July 1958 issue of the "Annals of the American Academy of Political Science." It is entitled "A Burmese View of World Tensions." In it U Thant tells us exactly what he believes.

Only a complete text would be sufficient to show the full belief of U Thant. So I will not be misunderstood, his writings do not show him to be a Communist, he says he believes in free institutions, but they do show him to be incredibly naive concerning communism, unable to see a distinction between the forces of the West and the forces of world communism.

He writes, "Fear of the Soviet Union has led the United States, and those who follow her lead, to take a distorted view of the world situation and of the forces that are at work in modern society. The weapons of the Soviet Union are in the first instance economic, social, and ideological; only secondarily are they military."

He goes on to say the Soviet Union had not imposed its will on its neighbors but that those nations had chosen communism. He is a man who obviously is unable to recognize any real difference between the morality of the West and world communism.

This is shown in all that he writes. He believes the United States should recognize Red China, that Red China should be admitted to the United Nations. He is committed to a policy of coexistence.

The United Nations Charter says, "In the performance of their duties the Secretary General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization."

I am not charging U Thant is taking directions from any other nation, but what happens when the Secretary General has strong convictions of his own, convictions that run counter to those of millions of people in the world?

What happens? We have seen what happens—in Cuba, in Katanga, in Goa, in West New Guinea. And what we have seen should chill those who believe in the principles of freedom, who fear a new imperialism carried on by communism and the emerging Socialist nations.

And the man who is playing a key role in this new imperialism is a mild mannered schoolteacher, a Socialist himself, who is one of the most powerful men in the world. His name is U Thant.

Support for an American Ombudsman as an Arm of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently urged Members of Congress, academicians, and others concerned with the improvement of our Government to ponder and discuss the possibility of adapting the successful Scandinavian office of ombudsman to the American scene. An American ombudsman might well increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Congress by standing ready to deal with constituents' problems with the Federal bureaucracy that are referred to his staff by Members.

The Lancaster (Pa.) Intelligencer Journal has supported this view in a recent editorial:

OMBUDSMAN FOR CONGRESS

A Member of Congress, be he a Senator or a Representative, has a full-time job. Sessions are progressively longer, the demands of constituents for help cut in on time for committee meetings, attending hearings, studying up on bills he must vote on. Also, Representatives must somehow keep their political fences back home in repair to face the voters every 2 years, and Senators every 6.

Scandinavian parliaments have found an answer to much of this burden. They have introduced the office of ombudsman. His sole duty is to help constituents who turn to members of parliament for help. Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin Democrat, wants Congress to establish such an office to take some of its load. The ombudsman would be not a single individual, but an office similar to that of the Comptroller General, who is responsible to and advises Congress on financial matters.

The ombudsman would stand ready to aid constituents in such matters as social security, military service, immigration, defense contracts, and the hundred and one other things they want done in Washington. They would apply to their Congressman as at present, and he would decide whether to handle the request personally or refer it to the office of the ombudsman. As one more way to make government work for the citizens, this strikes us as a fine idea, plus the fact that it ought to free Congressmen to give us much better legislative representation.

Federal Budget Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Of Minds and Budgets," published in the Wall Street Journal of February 21, 1963, dealing with the subject of Federal budget policies.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF MINDS AND BUDGETS

A curious thing about the Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits is that it is still not accepted by a number of other governmental entities in managing their own affairs.

No matter how much phoniness may go into some State and local budget balancing acts, considerable importance is nonetheless attached to the principle. The giants of California and New York, which sometimes seem to be racing each other in spending as well as population, try to keep up the appearance of balanced books. Even New York City does so; an unplanned deficit is regarded as a fiscal crisis.

This suggests that State and local politicians, closer to the people than Washington's new economists are, realize the voters wouldn't care for a different policy. The politicians themselves would doubtless feel guilty about deliberately planning big deficits year in and year out. So it is a bit puzzling why what is considered sound policy and politics in certain important governmental units is flouted by the biggest of all.

Actually, plenty of concern can be found in Congress, as in the country, about the Federal deficit way of life. Perhaps as a result, even some administration spokesmen are beginning to sound a little defensive about it—which may or may not be an encouraging sign.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, for one, told the House Ways and Means Committee that the current hope is to achieve a balanced budget in the fiscal period beginning 3 years from this summer. That's a good way off, but at least the man mentioned the possibility.

With that in mind, Mr. Gordon said any tax cuts should be accompanied by efforts to hold down the Government's spending for purposes other than defense and space.

Savings could be made, he indicated, through such means as switching from direct Government loans to private credit whenever possible and generally lowering Government costs and raising efficiency through better management. In addition, of course, the tax cuts themselves are supposed to stimulate the economy so that it will produce much bigger Federal revenues from the lower rates.

If all this is how the Government proposes to balance the budget in some remote future, we fear it adds up to a feeble effort.

Even if some savings attempts were made, and pursued diligently, they could not offset deficits estimated at nearly $9 billion in this fiscal year and nearly $12 billion in the next and Heaven knows what thereafter. And the hope of stimulation through tax cuts, which must deepen deficits initially at least, is hardly enhanced by the complexity and lethargic pace of the proposed program.

No wonder Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, told Mr. Gordon he thinks administration economy talk "isn't going to be believed by the people"; the administration's first 3 fiscal years will have seen a spending rise of around $17 billion. With rising spending and lower taxes, Mr. CURTIS estimated the budget couldn't be balanced until fiscal 1972. For all we know, that may be unduly optimistic.

It certainly can't be balanced until the administration gives convincing proof of abandoning its fetish of deficits of indefinite duration. Almost everybody else in the country knows that running constantly in the red, whether in a family, a business, a local, or a national government, is a policy of folly.

As the International Monetary Fund's managing director, Per Jacobsson, put it, the notion that there should be permanently unbalanced budgets strikes him as "the emanation of permanently unbalanced minds."

Balancing the budget is necessary not for the sake of appearance but for the sake of the integrity of the nation's financial foundations. In Washington as elsewhere, integrity is the key to all. It is the key the people and the Congress must persuade the Government to find.

A Deficit Through the Looking Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the confusion of the ordinary American man in the street facing a larger deficit that is better than a smaller one when deficits themselves are bad—maybe—is well reflected in the Chicago Tribune's lead editorial of January 3 of this year. Perhaps by looking-glass logic the administration feels it can beguile the commonsense of the American people and substitute for it the fuzzy thinking of the President's advisers who either cannot distinguish red from black in the budget or do not feel the difference is significant. The Tribune's editorial, a dialog between Alice and the Mad Hatter, follows:

ALICE AND THE DEFICIT

"Hatter," said Alice, "can you explain Walter W. Heller?"

"Certainly," said the Mad Hatter. "Who is he?"

"He is the Government economist," said Alice, "who said the other day that our $8 billion deficit is bad—he called it a deficit of weakness; but if we increased it by cutting taxes, it would be a good deficit—a deficit of strength. If a deficit is bad, how can a bigger one be good?"

"Simple," said the Hatter. "The deficit we have came by mistake. The Government had planned a surplus. Anything that the Government doesn't plan is bad. The bigger one Mr. Heller is talking about would be created on purpose. Anything the Government plans is good."

"I see," said Alice, although she didn't.

"But that's not what Mr. Heller said. He said that with an $8 billion deficit, factories and workmen are idle, but with a bigger deficit they would be put to work."

"Naturally," said the Hatter. "If you offered me $1 for a hat, it wouldn't be enough. If you offered $2.50, then I, too, would go to work."

"But I don't have a dollar," said Alice.

"That doesn't matter," said the Hatter. "Borrow it."

"From whom?"

"From yourself. Give yourself an I O U, and then, when you collect it, you'll have a dollar that you don't have now."

"But," said Alice, "if borrowing money from myself is good, why isn't it enough to borrow $8 billion a year?"

"Don't be silly," said the Hatter. "We borrowed almost $8 billion last year. How can we move ahead if we keep borrowing only the same amount year after year? Why, the way you talk you'd have us in a depression in 10 minutes."

"But didn't the President tell us last year," asked Alice, "that he wanted the budget to be balanced this year and next year?"

"Last year," said the Hatter, "this year was next year. He never said he would balance the budget this year."

"I'm afraid," said Alice, "that I'm confused."

"You just don't understand economics," said the Hatter. "And by the way, where is that $2.50 you were going to give me?"

The Kennedy Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means 12 typical American income tax cases where President Kennedy's proposals will result not in a tax cut but a tax increase. These cases were taken at random from the files of a certified public accountant, average incomes, average situations, repeated over and over again across the country. The table, as well as the explanation of it, should be revealing to those who think the President is offering all tax cuts:

BALDWIN, N.Y.,
February 13, 1963.

Re proposed Kennedy income tax reduction.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLS: It is most certainly good to know that your able committee is now going over President Kennedy's proposed revision of the Federal income tax with a supposed tax reduction for taxpayers.

I should like very much to be able to appear before your committee at Washington, D.C., to express my views as a tax practitioner, and also to show you from my tax files and cases how and why Mr. Kennedy's proposal is not an income tax cut but, rather, is a tax increase.

Attached hereto is a schedule of typical cases (the first group having salary income only and the second group being a combination of salary and dividends) taken at random from this office's 1962 current income tax returns showing how, in each and every case, the amount of income tax they will pay under the proposed cut will be greater in 1963 than the income tax which they paid in 1962.

You will note that these are all nominal incomes ranging from a gross of $4,343.38 to $11,749.04. You will further note that without exception every one of them will pay more taxes in 1963, this being aside from the $24 increase in the cost of their social security.

Also, in all of the cases stated, there is no additional tax cost reflected by way of tax payable on dividends. None of these cases cited has received any taxable dividends. Were they to receive dividends, each would be paying a minimum of $20 more in income tax.

From the schedule attached you will also note that the smallest taxpayers (those with incomes in the $4,000 figure) are paying a much greater increase than those making more money. In the case of taxpayer No. 4, on a gross income of $4,835.48, you will note that his tax increase amounts to 27.2 percent.

I have gone further in case No. 4 and several of the other cases and also find that during 1964 there will be no tax decrease. By the time 1965 rolls around and their income tax returns are filed, unless the law is changed again, the amount of increase which they are paying in 1963 will gradually be offset and they will just about break even by the end of 1965.

Referring to the salary and dividend group, kindly note in case Nos. 10, 11, and 12 the proportionately large amount in tax costs for 1963 due, not only to the proposed 5-percent disallowance, but to the proposed elimination of the $100 dividend exclusion as well as the 4-percent dividend income credit. If there were some logic to the proposal of President Kennedy and his advisers to decrease taxes and make more money available for spending, then we have here a situation in reverse. Instead of reducing taxes for 1963, the increase in the class of taxpayers cited will take money away from them and make less available to throw into the economy by way of spending. Particularly is this so in the case of example No. 10.

Incidentally, case No. 12 represents a widowed taxpayer whose sole income is from dividends on stocks which her deceased husband left her.

Also, attached hereto as part of this exhibit for your hearing, and for your committee's consideration in determining the merits or lack of merits of President Kennedy's proposal, is a further schedule entitled "Income Tax Calculations" which takes the examples which the administration had published in the papers but shows what the results will be separately for the years 1963, 1964, 1965, and then for an overall total of 3 years.

This office is extremely critical of the administration's presentation of the tax cut since, in the papers, they only showed what the ultimate so-called saving would be for the year 1965. Either maliciously or not they omitted the fact that for 1963 on the average homeowner paying real estate taxes and having a mortgage, there would be an additional tax to pay. This, as you already know, is because of the proposal to disallow as deductions 5 percent of a taxpayer's gross income.

In example No. 1, as taken from the administration's figures, in the case of a taxpayer earning $5,000 gross, you will note that whereas the tax for 1962 is $300, under the 1963 schedule it will be $323.75, or an increase of $23.75. This is aside from any consideration of dividends or the loss of exemption for sick pay.

Further, in example No. 1 representing a $5,000 gross income, the ultimate saving in taxes over a 3-year period against a total tax paid of $900, is $60 to the taxpayer. However, match against this the taxpayer's increased cost of social security, or $72, and with all of the so-called tax reduction, the taxpayer in example No. 1 is still paying $12 more in taxes over a 3-year period.

There is exactly the same situation in example Nos. 2 and 3 for incomes of $10,000 and $15,000. In each case the taxpayer will pay more during 1963 but ultimately will have a slight saving in his contribution to Federal taxes. In example No. 2 the taxpayer will have paid in a total of $3,588 for the 3-year period under 1962 income tax rates. You will note that under the proposed schedules the same taxpayer will have saved the trifling total of $182 in Federal income taxes over the 3-year period, or 5 percent on the total of $3,588 he has paid in.

The same situation exists in example No. 3; that is, on a total of $6,639 paid in during the 3-year period, the taxpayer will save $343 over the 3-year period, or 5.1 percent of the amount paid in.

If the President and the advisers who have fostered these schedules upon him (perhaps without his knowledge of the results) are sincere in their desire to supposedly aid economy through a tax cut, then the question for your committee to decide is, Is the present proposal an honest cut in taxes for Mr. Average Taxpayer of small nominal income, owning a home, paying real estate taxes and mortgage interest, buying his car on time, etc.?

Also, if Mr. Kennedy and the advisers believe that the economy does need a boost, and they feel that reduction of income taxes will do this, then the present tax law cannot in any way help because of the fact, first, that in 1963 the taxpayer will pay more and, secondly, because in the examples given, and in general, the amount of tax reduction is

so small that it is difficult for anyone handling figures to see how it will have any effect upon the economy one way or the other.

Further, this writer cannot go along with any idea which causes a reduction of income taxes to ourselves as income taxpayers, without a corresponding reduction of expenditures by the Government. Probably your statistics already show that there is a great room for reduction of tax money spent abroad without any effect upon the economy of this homefront at all. We leave this up to the wisdom of your committee.

As this office proceeds in preparation of tax returns and conferring with clients, we will be advising them of the effect of the proposed new tax law now in your committee's hands for consideration. We will give them specific figures as mentioned in the cases attached hereto, as well as a copy of the figures, so that, progressively, they can write to your committee to give further examples. We trust that this will not put too much of a burden on your committee but that it will furnish you with the figures you seek, and also will further substantiate your opinions as already surmised.

The writer, like all citizens and taxpayers, appreciates the tremendous work and responsibility of your committee and hopes that you will continue along the good lines that you have in the past.

Also, if you will kindly acknowledge this communication and advise whether or not you should like any further examples it will be very greatly appreciated.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD R. HAFNER.

Additional tax costs, 1963 proposed Federal income tax law—Actual cases from files of Harold R. Hafner, CPA, Baldwin, N.Y.

Case No.	Gross income, 1962	Net income, 1962	5 percent disallowance	1962 tax, actual	1963 proposed tax	Additional cost	Percent of increase over 1962
Salary group only:							
1	$11,749.04	$7,984.01	$587.00	$1,676.48	$1,732.85	$56.37	3.3
2	9,295.30	6,144.85	464.77	1,271.93	1,297.93	26.06	2.0
3	5,710.09	2,535.82	285.55	507.16	526.06	18.90	2.2
4	4,835.48	643.43	241.77	128.69	163.76	35.07	27.2
5	10,130.75	4,188.49	506.54	841.47	897.42	55.95	6.6
6	4,343.38	1,231.73	217.16	246.35	268.03	21.68	8.8
7	8,486.44	5,108.03	424.32	1,128.08	1,178.09	50.01	4.4
8	5,835.12	4,071.06	291.76	858.48	889.33	30.85	3.5
9	10,876.71	6,267.51	543.84	1,298.85	1,340.38	41.53	3.1
Salary and dividend group:							
10	47,102.28	29,944.42	2,355.11	9,433.88	10,237.38	803.50	8.5
11	6,784.42	2,532.27	339.22	506.45	556.58	50.13	9.9
12 [1]	3,932.39	756.55	196.62	0	39.30	39.30	100.0

[1] Represents a widow receiving income purely from interest and dividends.

Income tax calculations

	Present law (1962)	Proposed law				Net difference over 3-year period savings or increase (+)
		Amount	1963	1964	1965	
EXAMPLE NO. 1						
Income	$5,000	$5,000				
Deductions	1,100	1,100				
Total	3,900	3,900				
5-percent disallowance		250				
Total	3,900	4,150				
Less exemptions (4)	2,400	2,400				
Taxable income	1,500	1,750				
Tax calculation (percent)	20		18.5	15.5	14	
Amount of tax	$300		$323.75	$271.25	$245	$60
Increased cost of social security						72
Net increase in tax, 3-year period						+12
EXAMPLE NO. 2						
Income	$10,000	$10,000				
Deductions	1,800	1,800				
Total	8,200	8,200				
5 percent disallowance		500				
Total	8,200	8,700				
Exemptions (4)	2,400	2,400				
Taxable income	5,800	6,300				
Tax calculation (percent)	20–22	18.5	18.5–21	15.5–19	14–18	
Amount of tax	$1,196		$1,233	$1,087	$1,014	$254
Increased cost of social security						72
Net decrease in tax, 3-year period						182
Percent						+5
EXAMPLE NO. 3						
Income	$15,000	$15,000				
Deductions	2,550	2,550				
Total	12,450	12,450				
5-percent disallowance		750				
Total	12,450	13,200				
Exemptions (4)	2,400	2,400				
Taxable income	10,050	10,800				
Tax calculation (percent)	20–26		18.5–25	15.5–22	14–21	
Amount of tax	$2,213		$2,200	$2,026	$1,908	$415
Increased cost of social security						72
Net decrease in tax, 3-year period						343
Percent						+5.1

Reed College Again Rejects National Defense Education Act Loan Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, continuing a firm tradition of academic freedom, Reed College in Portland, Oreg., has again rejected participation in the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act. The decision was taken by faculty members and President Richard H. Sullivan, who states that provisions of the National Defense Education Act affect "a test of political conduct on the basis of one's association, and this is not consistent with the clearest principles of academic freedom." Application for funds would be unlawful and the applicant subject to fine if he is a member of any organization registered or required to register under the McCarran Act. President Sullivan expressed the hope that the discriminatory requirements of the National Defense Education Act will soon be removed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the January issue of the College Bulletin entitled "Reed Again Rejects National Defense Education Act Loan Funds."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REED AGAIN REJECTS NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT LOAN FUNDS

Following a recommendation of the majority of the faculty, President Richard H. Sullivan notified the U.S. Office of Education in November that Reed would not participate in the distribution of student loan funds available under the National Defense Education Act.

Congress amended the act last fall, excising the "disclaimer affidavit," that portion of the act which had caused Reed and 31 other institutions originally to turn down funds in the late 1950's. This is viewed as a real improvement in the act.

However, the faculty recommendation and President Sullivan's decision were based on the fact that the revised act imposed discriminatory requirements on student recipients of Federal funds that are not also imposed on other citizens who are beneficiaries of other Federal programs.

According to President Sullivan, certain provisions of the act affect "a test of political conduct on the basis of one's association, and this is not consistent with the clearest principles of academic freedom."

Under the amended National Defense Education Act, it is unlawful for a student to apply for or use the funds if he is a member of any organization which is registered or required to register under the terms of the Subversive Activities Control Act (McCarran Act).

Students who violate the above conditions of the act concerning membership would be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 and confinement of not more than 5 years.

Faculty members who led the opposition to acceptance of the funds under the amended act consider the conditions established by Congress to be a wedge in the form of thought control of governmental agencies into the academic freedom cherished by institutions of higher education.

President Sullivan said the decision to accept or not to accept the funds would be difficult even if only Government funds were involved. In addition, however, the college is required to provide 10 percent of the total loan funds, and it would thus be making its own funds subject to the same provisions and restrictions.

Reed was eligible for $45,000 in Federal funds under the act this year. The college had filed a provisional application for the funds, subject to revision of the act by Congress.

President Sullivan said "It is the hope of many, including myself, that remaining difficulties in the National Defense Education Act may be further ameliorated either by additional congressional action amending the act or by judicial remedy or clarification." The action will affect the present academic year and 1963–64 funds.

President Sullivan concluded that applying for funds and making them available to students in the fall of 1964 should be regarded as an open possibility, whether or not the present National Defense Education Act provisions are amended by that time.

Proposed Amendments to the Nursery, Stock Plant, and Seed Quarantine No. 37

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last week a group of my constituents came to town to attend a hearing at the Department of Agriculture to discuss the Department of Agriculture's proposed amendments to the nursery, stock plant, and seed quarantine No. 37.

The importation of plants and plant products is regulated under authority of the Plant Quarantine Act of 1912, as amended. The purpose of plant quarantines is to prevent the introduction and spread of pests that threaten our vast agriculture resources. Prior to the promulgation of quarantine 37 on June 1, 1919, the importation of nursery stock had been regulated by a less strict set of rules, but experience had shown that additional protective measures were needed. An important feature of the quarantine was the prohibition of the importation of plants in soil. Soil had been found to carry various pest organisms, including nematodes and plant diseases that cannot be eliminated by fumigation at dosages that are tolerated by plants. For that reason, certain materials were authorized for use as packing to replace the soil which had to be removed from the roots of plants destined for shipment.

Following the end of World War II quarantine 37 was completely revised to give added protection to this country's plant life. The revised quarantine prohibited the entry of a number of specified plants from designated countries because of certain plant diseases and insects. It also required that certain plants be grown under observation for specified periods in postentry quarantine as added insurance that they do not carry diseases.

In 1954 a proposal was made to relax the existing regulations and to permit the importation of plants that had been grown in certain approved materials. A thorough study, including consultation with scientists both in and out of government, suggested that the safeguards contemplated would not give adequate insurance against pest entry, and the proposal was withdrawn.

The current proposed amendment is similar in principle and desired effect to that which was proposed and rejected in 1954. Although there have been certain refinements made in the sanitary practices that would have to be followed in order to qualify foreign plants for shipment to this country, the major proposed revision suggests that the entire operation would be under the supervision of foreign based representatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The suggested change has brought many complaints from members of the nursery industry throughout the United States. I might point out that this industry has traditionally worked closely with, and supported the past quarantine policies of, the Department of Agriculture. However, while certain segments of the industry might fear competition from foreign growers who do not face the same high cost factors in preparing their plants for sale, the industrywide fear is based entirely upon the potential weakening of our quarantine system which this proposal suggests.

Mr. Speaker, I am no technician in the field of agriculture, but I am a landowner who has witnessed the infestation of my trees with elm disease as its devastating blight has gradually reached and swept across our area. I have seen the arrival and destruction caused by the Japanese beetle. I have worked with others to fight the scourge of other grass and plant diseases. It might be well to remind my colleagues of just some examples of the imported pests introduced into the United States prior to the Plant Quarantine Act of 1912: Elm leaf beetle from Europe, 1837; gypsy moth from France, 1869; cotton boll weevil from Mexico, 1892; brown tail moth from Europe, 1897; chestnut blight from Asia, 1897; white pine blister rust from Asia, 1898, and European pine shoot moth from Europe, prior to 1912.

Of far greater significance to the present discussion, however, is the following list of pests accidentally imported since passage of the original Quarantine Act in 1912: Oriental fruit moth from Japan, 1913; Japanese beetle from Japan, 1916; European corn borer from Southern Europe, 1917; pink moth worm from Mexico, 1917; Dutch elm disease from Europe, 1926; Mexican fruit fly from Mexico, 1927; Mediterranean fruit fly from Southern Europe, 1929, and white fringed beetle from South America, 1936.

Moreover, we should not lose sight of the fact that, according to the Department of Agriculture's 1961 annual report, there were a total of 4,010 different insects and 1,313 different diseases of known or potential plant quarantine importance intercepted at U.S. ports of entry during the 1961 fiscal year. The total number of interceptions for the year was 25,575. In addition, hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by public and private sources in an effort to control insect pests and diseases of strictly foreign origin. In many nurseries, preventative spraying is a major cost of operation.

Therefore, when friends of mine, in whose judgment, integrity, and professional knowledge I have confidence, are disturbed that our quarantine restrictions will be weakened, I, too, am disturbed. Frankly, in considering this proposed amendment to quarantine 37, I can't help but ask why it was introduced. What purpose will it serve to aid agriculture or those engaged in its pursuit in this country? In what way will it assist our people? I can only conclude from the study I have been able to give it that it was suggested on behalf of foreign importers who wish to sell their goods in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am an advocate of trade as building good relations between countries, but I see no reasons for us to extend ourselves—particularly at the risk of importing new or existing plant diseases into our country—in order to benefit a part of the world that does not share our desire to exchange agricultural goods on an even par.

But overlooking the considerations of trade entirely, and taking another look at the proposed amendment to quarantine 37, I cannot help but feel this would increase greatly the need for further Agriculture Department employees all over the world, with a resultant unknown future increase in cost to the Department. It was stated by a representative of the Department at the hearing that the cost of these inspectors abroad and

the supervision of the foreign growers, would be borne by the shippers.

I have great respect for the dedicated men and women who serve our Government. I respect their willingness to serve. I respect their integrity. But I would suggest to the Members of this House that we place an employee of our Government in an impossible situation if he must render judgment upon the products of those whom he knows would be paying his salary.

Furthermore, these very inspectors will be working in foreign lands where soil conditions, customs, and methods of doing things vary widely from those in our country. What we are interested in is not so much the manner in which plants are grown but rather the actual condition of the plants themselves when imported into the United States.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that supervisory personnel of the Agriculture Department would have difficulty in the extreme in carrying out their duties in a foreign land, as required under this proposed amendment, without engendering considerable friction with the officials and people of the country in which they were called to serve.

The Department of Agriculture is to be complimented on the hearing which they gave to all interested parties in this matter. Numerous of my colleagues, along with countless representatives of associations in their district, gave testimony. I sincerely hope that these actions on the part of an aroused public will not go unheeded by the Department, that they will reconsider their proposal and, above all, that our efforts to prevent further infestation of our plantlife from outside this country will be continued rather than weakened.

Lake County, Ohio, is known as one of the great nursery centers of the United States. It is in the middle of a large vineyard and rose-growing area. Several representatives of these industries from the area were present at the meeting, and I would like to take this opportunity to register their presence and compliment them upon their activity in registering their opposition to this proposed administrative action by the Agriculture Department: Mr. R. James Schroeder, Mr. Russell V. Champion, Mr. David Dugan, Mr. Jerry Klyn, Mr. H. C. Horton, Mr. Lester Square, and Mr. Edward S. Gilson.

They presented a statement on behalf of the Lake County Nurserymen's Association as well as a letter on behalf of the rose growers, copies of which I include in the RECORD at this point:

The members of the Lake County Nurserymen's Association, representing 100 members and over 4,000 acres of nursery stock in Lake County, Ohio, are deeply concerned with the proposed amendment to quarantine 37.

Whereas the members of this organization are located in an area which is currently quarantined for Japanese beetle, an imported insect, and being thoroughly familiar with the cost of controlling said insect so that our products may be shipped to points outside of the quarantined area, said cost being in addition to the normal costs of controlling insects and diseases in other parts of the country; and

Whereas the members of this organization believe that the controls on imported plants should be tightened rather than loosened in view of the increased number of pests being intercepted at ports of entry; and

Whereas the members of this organization believe that in this locality in particular, if the cost of controlling imported plant insects and diseases increases in the coming years, it will tend to have a crippling financial effect on the nursery industry, which is already burdened with financial problems over which it has little or no control; and

Whereas the introduction of new pests into this country, where they do not have natural enemies, hence requiring more and stronger insecticides, will truly lead us to the inevitable "silent spring": Therefore be it

Resolved, That we of the Lake County Nurserymen's Association oppose the changes to quarantine 37 as they have been set forth in the Federal Registry.

RUSSELL V. CHAMPION, *President*.

MENTOR ROSE GROWERS, INC.,
Mentor, Ohio, December 31, 1962.

Re proposed amendment to quarantine 37.

DIRECTOR OF PLANT QUARANTINE DIVISION,
Agricultural Research Service,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am an officer of our company and have 15 years experience in the growing of ornamental plant material. Our firm is located in an area which has a history that makes it known far and wide as one of the nursery centers of the United States. Presently Lake County is represented by 198 licensed nurserymen, growing on over 4,000 acres.

In this statement I am not only expressing my own opinions, but I also have been granted the authority to have this statement represent the views of many other area nurserymen. To clarify this and for the record, I have here a motion which was passed unanimously by 36 members present at the Lake County Nurserymen's Association meeting of January 9 (the Lake County Nurserymen's Association has 100 members).

Having laid what I hope is a reasonable foundation for your consideration of my opinions, I will proceed.

To wit: Complete disapproval to the proposal to (1) authorize importation of plants grown exclusively in any of the USDA-approved packing materials under the direct supervision of USDA representatives and (2) make it possible to fumigate or otherwise treat such plants in the country of origin under the USDA representative's supervision, with no provision for inspection on arrival in this country.

My reasons:

1. Cost involved:

(a) To do a most complete and efficient job, it will most certainly be necessary to have a tremendous increase of USDA personnel to staff the many points of foreign origin for growing-on and/or shipping plant material to the United States.

(b) Personnel so assigned should by necessity of efficiency, have a qualified command of the particular country's language and customs.

(c) The fringe costs of maintaining such USDA personnel in foreign countries will be considerably above the paid salaries.

(d) The overall total cost related to operating the proposed program of foreign inspection can only be guessed without a detailed study of same. However, after careful consideration, it seems very fair to estimate the cost will run several times the present amount necessary to maintain inspection only at ports of entry. This is especially important when you realize USDA and farm communities continually ask for, and do not receive money for domestic control programs to eradicate imported pests not widely distributed in this country.

2. The end results, i.e., stopping the introduction of any new plant diseases or insects from foreign sources.

(a) In 319.37-16f (new paragraph added) with conditions (1) through (19), are certainly very meritorious in the detailedness necessary even to consider such a new program of inspection. However, in my opinion, this will by its very nature destroy the effectiveness of such a program.

(1) Under those provisions the times and places of inspection will be multiplied hundreds or even thousands of times over our present system.

(2) It lends itself to be influenced by foreign governments or peoples.

(3) Like it or not, it opens a vast area for corruption or graft.

(4) In total, it seems inconceivable that a realistic, prudent-thinking person considering these points, could come to any other judgment than: "The program will abort itself by the very nature of its complexity."

In the preceding outline I offer my strongest reasons for objecting to your Department's proposed changes to quarantine 37. At this point may I express myself as being in harmony with your Department in the broad viewpoint of instituting changes in quarantine 37 that would strengthen its goal of eliminating any future importation of new plant disease or insects.

Having offered negative criticism, may I now suggest something positive for consideration? It is my position that the existing regulations are sufficient, but the present methods of implementation are not sufficiently adequate. Please consider the following suggestions:

1. Increase the Department's personnel to provide for the maximum degree of efficiency pursuant to all means and methods employed in the handling of all imported horticultural or agricultural products; as they move from carrier to isolation to inspection and to fumigation.

2. Institute a training program to (a) increase the efficiency of the mechanics involved, (b) instill a degree of dedication to duty and work the personnel perform as being one of prime importance to the general welfare of the Nation.

3. Provide the proper incentive to reach the goal of dedicated, trained, and efficient personnel by upgrading the pay scale at all levels, with particular emphasis on the key personnel involved.

4. Reexamine the regulations of our neighboring countries (Canada and Mexico), as they pertain to entry of plant material, etc. With the objective being to close any loopholes which tend to circumvent our own regulations, particularly as they pertain to the casual exchange of visitors (both alien and citizens), who possess plant material, etc., and cross into our country at its many points of entry.

In summary I suggest: The proposed changes will be (1) far too costly, (2) goal desired will be less efficiently reached and (3) present regulations under Quarantine 37 should prove to be more adequately sufficient if the necessary moneys are expended to upgrade and train the quality of personnel needed.

One last comment before closing, which has no bearing on the pro or con of the issue involved. As to date I have not read any material submitted by the USDA explaining the reason and/or necessity for the proposed changes. To my knowledge there has been no group within the segment of American horticulture or agriculture that has pressed for these changes. I would like to believe these proposed changes have not been born out of some form of political maneuvering within this Nation and/or with any other nations.

It has been, is now, and shall always be my opinion that the U.S. Department of Agriculture remains a servant to the best

interests of the people it represents; namely, the agricultural and horticultural people and then the populace of the Nation in general.

I believe my views and opinions expressed will add to the mounting tide of objections to the proposed changes in Quarantine 37. This, I sincerely feel, should indicate to this committee the vital interest the nursery industry has in this matter, not only for ourselves, but for the general good of the national interests.

Respectfully yours,

R. JAMES SCHROEDER,
Vice President and Manager.

Foreign Aid and Human Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished physician, lecturer, and author, Dr. Russell V. Lee, of Palo Alto, Calif., is also medical consultant to the Agency for International Development—AID—U.S. Department of State. On December 27, 1962, Dr. Lee delivered to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco an address entitled, "Foreign Aid and Human Lives." I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of this informative and thoughtful address and commend it to the attention of my esteemed colleagues:

FOREIGN AID AND HUMAN LIVES

(By Dr. Russell V. Lee)

The foreign aid program of the United States has not had easy going either at home or abroad. In the last Congress it was subject to violent attack and its appropriation was cut almost $1 billion. This is not the place to discuss the merits of our foreign aid program in reference to our national objectives, although I am one who believes that it has been the most potent single force in keeping the world free from the despotism called communism. The Marshall plan—foreign aid—certainly saved Europe. The Mediterranean basin, ravaged by war, half starved and riddled by disease, is more prosperous than ever before in its long history. It would not have occurred without our aid. Strongly though I feel about the spectacular success of the aid program in keeping people free, I am going to stress another—the purely humanitarian—aspect of our foreign aid program in the age-long fight against disease and death. For under, and as a result of, our foreign aid program there has been achieved the most spectacular life-saving triumph in the history of mankind. Many more lives have been saved than the war destroyed; tremendous reductions in human suffering and fears have been our reward.

Since man emerged from the treetops and achieved through social adaptation what we call civilization, we have been exposed to three great hazards. These are war, pestilence, and starvation. Each of these is the product of the very thing that made the survival of man possible—the social organization that created civilization itself.

The ability to live together, as a family, a clan, a tribe, a nation, also provided the means for an almost limitless increase in the number of men. The kind of social organization represented by these groups immediately freed mankind from most of the menace of wild animals, greatly increased his potential for the acquisition of food through the hunt and the chase, and provided the basis for what is now called the population explosion. But on the other side, this very same organization made possible scientific warfare between the various groups. This potential for waging war has steadily increased in power until now with the nuclear age we have achieved an almost infinite capacity for causing the death of our enemies and perhaps ourselves—this in contrast to the very limited capacity for death and destruction in the conflicts between individuals competing for mates or food. And also the aggregations of men into communities more or less closely associated with each other made possible the transmission of communicable diseases.

The great plagues that have ravished mankind since the dawn of civilization were largely the product of crowding into cities. From ancient times it was known that when the plague struck, the thing to do was to get out into the remote country and stay as far away from other people as possible. So it can be fairly said that pestilence is one of the byproducts of civilization, and in the same way the increase of population to such a tremendous degree puts serious strains upon the food supply; and when by reason of dislocation due to war or natural phenomena crops fail, widespread famine and starvation supervene. But on the cheerful side of this picture, the very processes of civilization also have made possible the alleviation of these great menaces. Hopefully and fondly the association of peoples at the conference table in the United Nations and in other areas where confrontation is possible, may in time lead to abolition of war.

The great increase in the knowledge of agronomy as well as the synthetic production of food has made it possible (although the possibility has not been achieved) to feed the entire population of the world at a completely adequate level. That this has not been achieved is due rather to political upheaval, artificial national boundaries and barriers and economic breakdowns than to an actual lack either of nature or knowledge. But it is in the field of pestilential diseases that the greatest progress has been made, and this has been the result of intellectual achievements made possible by the developments of civilization. It is now fair to state that as a result of the discoveries of this century, most of the great plagues that formerly ravaged mankind can be banished from the face of the earth were we able to bring to bear upon the problem the things that we already know. And we have in addition every expectation that in the future we will acquire still more technical and scientific knowledge to make possible more complete control of these diseases. It is with this phase of the three great human problems that this presentation will chiefly concern itself.

Before one decides whether he is bound, it is well to know where he is. It might be well to make a brief survey of the health conditions of the world. And in doing so one must take cognizance of the fact there there is a new concept in public health today and that is international health. The developments in communication and transportation have banished forever the parochial idea that if we mind our own business in the public health field, this is all we need to do. Health has become and henceforth always will be a matter of international concern, and cooperative international effort is needed for success.

Looking the world over the two great menaces to the health of people are malnutrition and disease (leaving out for the moment the menace of thermonuclear war). Malnutrition is disgracefully widespread and must be taken into account in the consideration of disease because it contributes so greatly to both the severity and the incidence of sickness. It is disgracefully prevalent because, in spite of the enormous increase in population, there is ample food for all; and potentially much greater production could be achieved if the food were needed. The situation under which almost half the people of he world are seriously undernourished should give pause to those who maintain the laissez faire position that the present system is good enough. The fact is great improvement in the economic state of people and great improvement in the distribution of food is urgently needed. This is a chapter in itself and is only brought in because of its bearing on our primary concern which is worldwide disease. What was and is the situation in this field?

In the past, and in many areas still, the great problem is with epidemic, contagious disease—the plagues of the past. Bubonic plague, cholera, dysentery, typhoid, typhus, smallpox, diphtheria were the great killers of the past, are still important, but can be and to a very considerable degree have been controlled. Malaria has always been widespread and very deadly and at present is the leading world health problem. Later it will be used as an example of how our foreign aid program has functioned. After malaria probably enteric disease—largely caused by the fecal contamination of food and water—is of next importance. Next comes tuberculosis, disappearing in the United States but still a terrible menace in South America, Africa, and Asia. These three, with malnutrition, are the principal problems now, though to be sure there is venereal disease, trachoma, yaws, schistosomiasis and many others which have to be met.

The war against malaria is perhaps the best example of how the health component of our foreign aid program operates. And at the end of World War II malaria was unquestionably the most important single disease. It was prevalent all around the Mediterranean and in Asia Minor; it caused between 1 and 2 million deaths a year in India with close to 500 million cases a year. This disease has had almost worldwide distribution. At one time the Mississippi Valley was so riddled with malaria that each farm family kept quinine powder on the breakfast table and took a teaspoonful each day. California, in many areas, particularly in the Sacramento Valley, was terribly infected with a serious form of malaria. The entire Mediterranean Basin from Spain to Lebanon was heavily infected. In certain areas half the population would be infected in 1 year.

Sardinia, Corsica, and the Greek Islands were hotbeds of malaria. The part it played in Roman history is, of course, well known. All this has changed and largely due to the efforts stimulated by the American aid programs from the Marshall plan to the present AID. Now for the first time in history, malaria has disappeared from the Mediterranean Basin and the results in certain areas have been spectacular, spectacular not only in the reduction of morbidity and mortality but in the striking increase in productivity that has resulted from having a labor force that is for the first time free of chills and fever and able to cultivate certain areas that formerly were shunned because of the heavy malaria concentration. This is spectacularly demonstrated in Greece. Since Homeric times Greece has been a country that had to import foodstuffs, particularly cereals. Now that the great swampy areas, so suitable for the propagation of the Anopheles mosquito, have been freed of malaria, rice production has risen to the point where for the first time in history Greece is exporting rice and other grains. The tremendous revival in the prosperity of Italy is in no small measure due to the fact that the terrible drain year by year upon its economy due to malaria has been stopped. This area is now practically free of malaria

and with a moderately continuous effort can be kept so. The same is true of the United States, of course.

Malaria has to all intents and purposes disappeared from this country. As we go east from the Mediterranean Basin, the situation gets a good deal more difficult. In Iran great progress has been made but much remains to be done. The Caspian Littoral, which is the Riviera of Persia, was formerly forbidden for human occupation because of the heavy incidence of malignant malaria. A rather touching story is told of a party given for one of our American doctors who was serving on our malaria aid program. The occasion was the 40th-day birthday of a little girl baby. She was the first baby in this area that had lived for 40 days because that particular form of malaria was tremendously lethal to infants and little children. The survival of this child marked the beginning of a new era and now this area has become a very productive and very healthy one. The problem in Iran has been further complicated by the development in the south of some strains of mosquito that are resistant to DDT and this robs us of one of the most potent weapons for control. It must be said in defense of DDT that in spite of the eloquent articles of Rachel Carson, DDT properly used has been one of the great beneficiaries in the history of mankind. It almost alone has made possible the success of the malaria campaign.

The technique for one method of controlling malaria consists essentially in spraying the habitations at frequent intervals because the mosquitoes come in at night, sit on the walls and then bite the sleeping people carrying the plasmodia from the infected to the healthy. When the walls of the dwellings are sprayed with DDT, the mosquito that is so careless as to sit on the walls dies almost instantly and this residual spray upon the walls lasts several months. If all transmission can be interrupted for a year this way, the total number of cases naturally takes an enormous drop because in time with or without treatment the infected individual no longer becomes infectious. The other method of controlling malaria which was effectively used in the Panama Canal Zone consists in larvacidal methods; that is, methods to kill the hatching mosquitoes in the water in which they breed. This is accomplished, generally speaking, by covering the surfaces of the pools and streams with some kerosene-like fluid or with DDT itself. The petroleum derivitives were used long before DDT was discovered and are quite effective but somewhat expensive. It is necessary to find all the puddles and pools and cover them with oil and the cost is so great as to preclude this method in an area where the incidence is at all high. The residual spraying of the habitations has proven to be completely effective in achieving control when it is properly and rapidly accomplished. The other principal method of controlling malaria is by means of prophylactic medication. This consists of giving everyone in a potentially infected area one or two doses of Kloroquin each week, and as long as this medicine is in the individual, he cannot be infected with malaria. This is the so-called prophylactic medication method, and where it is possible to induce everybody to take the drug and keep it up regularly for a sufficiently long period of time, it is an exceedingly effective method of control, but in general it is much more difficult to apply than the house spraying and because of the difficulty of reaching all the people, it is more expensive. These, however, are the principal methods that have been used in the antimalaria war.

Gong east from Iran the great malaria problem of course was India. When the program really got underway in 1952–53, there were probably as many as 500 million cases of malaria in India each year and there was something in the order of 2 million deaths a year. This means of course that many individuals had more than one infection a year as there are only about 490 million people living in the area. In India at the instigation of a remarkable little woman, Amrit Kaur, and under the leadership of a very remarkable man, Dr. R. D. Ray, a truly major antimalaria campaign was waged. Our contribution consisted in furnishing the DDT or the money for medication and sometimes the medication itself and some of the vehicles and apparatus necessary for spraying, but over the years it was largely the contribution of DDT to the amount of about $6 or $7 million a year that constituted the American aid. There was in addition to this, however, a good deal of technical advice and guidance given by malaria experts attached to the various U.S. operational missions in India. These missions, USOM as they are called, were the agencies through which aid was administered in all parts of the world. In addition to the technical advice and scientific help from USOM, the World Health Organization which has a truly remarkable malaria component, also contributed very greatly to the plan and the validation of the program in India. The campaign was carried out in an amazingly successful way so that practically speaking every house in India has now been sprayed several times. The reduction in the number of cases of malaria has been very gratifying and the deaths which formerly totaled 1 million directly due to malaria and 1 million in which malaria was involved have dropped to nothing. This year malaria will not be included in the causes of death in India.

This is a reduction in mortality such as has never been seen before in the history of mankind and represents perhaps the most spectaular victory in the entire history of man's struggle against disease. A war that cost 2 million lives would create a great deal of attention but here is a war, and curiously the whole program represents a remarkable analogy of methods of warfare, in which 2 million lives per year have been saved and the average American citizen knows absolutely nothing of it. The Indians appreciate what we have done to a much greater degree than the average American realizes. For some reason we are in the habit of expecting fulsome thanks if we do anything. The Indians are not in the habit of passing out such fulsome praise, but they do appreciate our help and when one visits the country one is overwhelmed with expressions of gratitude and appreciation for the part American money and American technical aid has played in the achievement. One often hears the position that the ultimate result is the tremendous increase in the population explosion. This, however, is far more than compensated for by the great increase in productivity of the working group that is no longer riddled by disease. The amount of food produced by these families that are now free of malaria has increased much faster than the population has increased, so the argument that we should stop supporting the AID program because of its effect upon population is not a valid one.

Continuing eastward, the situation in Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam can be summed up by saying that great progress has been made but complete success is by no means yet achieved. There have been remarkably efficient campaigns and they have resulted in great reduction in disease but because of lack of trained personnel, inefficient governmental supervision, graft and corruption, and other causes, not one of these countries has completely achieved eradication. We were very near it in Vietnam before the Viet Cong came down from the north and wrecked the program in many parts of the country. The Philippines have been much more successful than the rest of southeast Asia, and in this area great reductions have been achieved. Malaria is not really important as a problem except in the interior of some of the larger islands which are inhabited by aborigines. However, even these areas are under attack and in the course of the next 5 years malaria in the Philippines should be a thing of the past. Taiwan has achieved complete victory in that malaria has disappeared from this island. The same has also been achieved in South Korea and in Japan; they have shown that such a campaign can be completely successful. Indonesia is way behind but Ceylon has recorded a remarkable victory. At the end of the war, malaria had Ceylon prostrate but now it has practically disappeared. Much progress is being made in Indonesia but the end is still a good many years away. In all of Latin America great progress has been made; 4 or 5 years of concentrated effort should see the end of the warfare in that area. The Pan American Health Organization is working closely with our AID organization and now with the Alliance for Progress getting under full steam, the malaria campaign will undoubtedly be stepped up to a great degree and we can confidently move forward to the time when all malaria will be banished from the Western Hemisphere.

In Africa, however, the problem is immense and at the moment almost insoluble. The house spraying techniques do not apply because vast numbers of the people do not live in houses but sleep naked out in the forests completely exposed to the bites of the mosquitoes. In many parts of central tropical Africa, the incidence of malaria is 100 percent and it is a prime cause of death in children and disability in adults. The campaign in certain areas has been completely successful, however, even under the terribly difficult conditions of Africa and with many available personnel being trained, one can say that the problem is not insoluble. However, this is an area that requires a great deal of planning and quite a different change in political units if success is to be achieved within the next decade.

In summary, malaria has been put far down the list of killers from its previous undisputed No. 1 position and most experts agree that an intensive and coordinated campaign in which local governments, the WHO and the AID organizations are combined could see the end of malaria within 7 to 10 years.

The next great problem in international health is the problem of enteric disease. This includes typhoid and paratyphoid, bacillus and amoebic dysentery, cholera, intestinal parasites such as the various worms—ascaris and the hook worms. Enteric disease exacts a particularly high toll from infants and children but after malaria these diseases are the principal public health problems for adults as well. The control of enteric disease is essentially absurdly simple. It consists merely in keeping clean.

If human feces can be kept out of food, water supplies, and milk, generally speaking the problem of enteric disease can be solved. The problem then resolves itself into two parts—first, to find the carriers of enteric disease, isolate them and cure them so they cannot spread the infection and, second, close all the avenues whereby infection can be carried from an infected individual or a carrier to the food and water supplies of the healthy. The most important factor in solving this relatively simple problem is the provision of clean water. Properly dug and deep wells, properly kept and free of the possibility of surface contamination, and proper disposal of waste products are the two most important elements. The control of flies is an important factor too because the fly carries from sewage the germs of these enteric diseases to the food supplies of the people. So, while it is more important to dispose of sewage in such a way as to render it

impossible of access to flies, eradication of houseflies, which is by no means an impossibility, is also an important part of the campaign against enteric disease. The protection of milk and food from flies and from the dirty fingers of food handlers requires great diligence and particularly requires a high degree of sophistication on health matters. In this country it is quite customary for a good many people to wash their hands after they defecate. Unfortunately, this does not apply to most of the people of the world and in this way the transfer of infected material by the fingers occurs quite frequently. The control of enteric disease can be further aided by vaccination programs particularly against typhoid fever and cholera. This of course protects the individual only and does not have any bearing upon the transmission from person to person.

The detection of carriers comes last. It is difficult, expensive and while important, not nearly so productive of good results as the sanitary measures already described. The matter of the control of enteric disease involves a great deal of engineering. It calls for pipes and pumps and canals and reservoirs and sewers and septic tanks and sewage disposal plants, all of which involve engineering skills. The sanitary engineer, who is not necessarily a doctor, is a most important cog in this machinery. It is largely a matter of spending money if one wants to rid a country or an area of enteric disease, but fortunately the kind of expenditures that are necessary in this program are also very stimulating to the national economy. The people who work stimulate the steel, iron, and machinery industries as well as the cement, chemical, and other construction industries. So while it is expensive, it is also very economically rewarding to free an area of enteric disease. This is particularly demonstrated in that when this is accomplished, industry springs up quite rapidly; industries almost always have a pure water supply and when it is provided, there is almost invariably a great recrudescence of industrial activity and improvement in the economy of the area.

The next most important disease, in terms of numbers and seriousness, is tuberculosis. This entails a completely different type of approach and a completely different technique for its control and eradication from that effective in malaria or enteric disease. It consists of four parts: (1) The detection of the cases. This is best accomplished by mass skin testing or better by mass X-ray examinations of the chest. Sputum examinations are also a method of finding cases but are expensive and miss many that can be found by proper chest X-ray. When cases are found in an infectious state, if possible they should be isolated until they have had sufficient treatment to render them noninfectious. This is the second state in the eradication of TB, i.e., that one puts all the active cases under treatment with three very effective drugs now available for use against TB, namely, streptomycin, isoniazid, and PAS. The combination of these drugs will cure practically all the cases which are not terribly advanced and quickly render practically every case non-infectious; so, the case detection, quickly followed by treatment, is the most important element in the eradication of the disease. Extensive immunization programs with BCG tuberculosis vaccine is also a very useful part of the control program in that it protects a very large percentage of the children from becoming infected. The fourth and last element in the control of TB lies in improvement in the housing and nutrition and the general sanitary conditions of an area. Tuberculosis tends to disappear when crowding is avoided and nutrition is adequate. Tuberculosis has fallen way down as a cause of death in the United States but is a great problem in all Latin America and this is particularly deplorable because we have such effective means for its control. Mass X-ray examinations, however, take trained teams and money; a great deal of health education is necessary to induce people to take their medicine, refrain from spitting on the streets or the floors of their houses, and to consent to isolation until the infectious period is over. However, like many other diseases, we know all we need to know to control TB, and if we apply this knowledge, a decade can see tuberculosis practically disappear from the face of the earth.

There are many other diseases, all less important but all of fascinating interest in this field of international health. Filariasis, the dread elephantiasis of the South Pacific, that caused such consternation among our soldiers stationed in Samoa and Tahiti, has now been practically conquered and where it has been possible to induce people to take the prophylactic drug and to institute a proper program of control, it has almost completely disappeared.

We know all we need to know about the control of venereal disease. The method of transmission is well known, but in spite of all the moralistic propaganda, it seems still to be a very popular activity with many people. However, with the proper use of the new drugs, both syphillis and gonorrhea can be quickly cured. They make the infected ones noninfectious. So case finding and prompt and effective treatment of the active cases can theoretically completely eliminate these very effective inhibitors of human pleasure.

Leprosy, long regarded as the prime example of the loathsome and most dreaded of all diseases, has disappeared from most of the world and can be eliminated everywhere if the same general principles are used as are used in tuberculosis. Unfortunately, this has not happened in some areas and there are places in Africa and Asia where leprosy is actually on the increase due to lack of trained personnel and efficient administration of public health methods. Perhaps even more than tuberculosis, leprosy depends upon bad sanitary conditions and improper nutrition.

Smallpox should not exist. We have known about vaccination for 150 years. Properly applied programs of vaccination properly maintained for just 1 year would mark the end of smallpox for the rest of time. That we have not done this is a great monument to the stupidity and apathy of the human race. It is true that it no longer is a great cause of death, as it once was, but every now and then we have had epidemics reminding us to be vaccinated once more because this is a really effective way of controlling this disease.

There is a long list of other diseases important in public health that now are of prime importance in international health. These are for the technicians and the experts and not for the laymen. It is only important to know that most of the great diseases are now understood; their control is completely possible; but it is necessary that dedicated and devoted international public health men be given the proper financial support and the proper personnel and training to enable them to do the job which should be done.

The organizational pattern in this war against disease varies naturally with the disease, the country and the available resources of people and money. In general, the prime responsibility rests with the Departments of Health of the various countries involved. To these local authorities we give technical advice, technical assistance, and, of course, money. In many places the representatives of the World Health Organization play a very important role, often in cooperation with our missions, frequently bilaterally between the local health authorities and WHO experts. UNICEF enters the picture in many places and in a few countries, such as Nepal, Cambodia, and Laos, as well as in some African countries, both Russia and the United States of America have separate health missions. They seldom, if ever, cooperate. An ultimate objective is to enable the country involved to carry on by itself in the course of time. This has been achieved in a few places already, notably in all of Europe, most of the Mediterranean area, Taiwan, Turkey, and some others.

To achieve this aim requires another component in addition to the health team. This of course is education. Before a country can be left to carry on alone with prospect of success, it must have trained people—people able to replace our experts. To produce these means an educational process; we are deeply involved in this. In fact, the new Chief of the Office of Humane Resources, Dr. Leona Baumgartner, an M.D. and a Public Health person herself, is inclined to believe that perhaps education is the most important component of her problem. We are helping in the founding of new medical schools, one such, done with the very skillful cooperation of the University of California Medical School, is in Indonesia. Others are being established. Students are being brought here for postgraduate training. Professors are being sent out to many schools. Dr. Bruce Jessup, of Palo Alto, is about to go to Iran on such an assignment. I am presently engaged in working out with the Ford Foundation a plan for developing audiovisual teaching techniques in the field of medical education. The Association of American Medical Colleges is involved in this as well. The real hope for the future lies in the educational field, but this, in turn, must often wait for improved economic conditions.

We have only touched on nutrition. It is essential for good health to be well fed. Curiously, the inclusion of prophylactic medication in supplementary foods may be one of the most important ways of combating malaria and some other diseases. Housing is a vital part of health. Overcrowding leads to tuberculosis and other diseases. Economic welfare is tied in with health. The problems are many and are interrelated. Much has been done; much remains to be done.

The great thing to stress is that this, as opposed to war, saves lives and lessens suffering. The potential in our aid program for improving the lot of mankind is thrilling. It may, in fact, be the bridge on which we can cross to the Iron Curtain countries and begin to achieve the cooperation for human betterment without which humanity is doomed. It is not something to deplore; it is a tale that should be often told. Nothing we have ever accomplished has done more good to more people.

The Indiana Deepwater Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a handful of voices from without Indiana cry loud and long against Indiana's proposal to build a deepwater port on Lake Michigan. These voices criticize what is al-

most a unanimous feeling on the part of Hoosiers that a port should be built at Burns Ditch on Lake Michigan.

The people and interests who criticize do so with a selfish spirit. They have become so emotionally involved that they are now distoring facts and stooping to innuendo and inference in their fight to undo what Indiana has accomplished over a long period of years and what Indiana is determined to accomplish in the years to come.

The latest incident is the circulation of an article written by the editorial staff of the Louisville Courier Journal and published February 13, 1963. This article is being circulated on Capitol Hill with the inference that it speaks the gospel truth. Reference is made to the statement that two steel firms would never make a payment of any kind for use of the 300-acre, $30 million harbor. This is absolutely not true.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to paragraph 10 of the agreement between the Indiana Port Commission and Bethlehem Steel Co. which reads as follows:

Bethlehem-owned vessels and other vessels en route to and from Bethlehem's pier and/or the slip referred to in paragraph 9 shall be permitted access to and across the waters of the outer harbor under the same terms and conditions extended to all other vessels and under the same regulations governing all other vessels making use of the Burns Waterway Harbor.

Paragraph 8 of the agreement between the Indiana Board of Public Harbors and Terminals, which is now the Indiana Port Commission, and Midwest Steel Corp., reads as follows:

Midwest shall have the exclusive right in perpetuity to moor or tie up vessels for the purpose of loading or unloading along the full length of the western side slip or channel described in (7) above, and along the full length of the bulkhead or wave absorber referred to in (3), (4), and (5) above, subject only to the payment of a charge for each vessel entering or leaving the port or harbor, which charge shall be reasonable nondiscriminatory in character, and comparable to charges made for other vessels using the port or harbor.

This same article asks what these same companies will do for Indiana? It fails to point out that, among other things, these companies will build plants and facilities which will represent an investment far in excess of $1 billion. By the terms of the agreements referred to above, Bethlehem Steel is obligated to perform certain work on the port itself which is estimated to cost $2 million and Midwest Steel is obligated to likewise perform certain work which is estimated to cost $3.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, we, the people of Indiana, are shocked, we are insulted, we are downright angry because of these outside attempts not just to influence our destiny, but to direct and rule our destiny. I am especially concerned over attempts to mislead my colleagues on this issue of the Indiana Port by "foreigners" who either lack factual information or who are deliberately distorting the facts.

Sentiment Shifts on Federal Aid to Catholic and Private Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a Gallup poll as it appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 10, 1963, entitled "Federal Aid to Catholic and Private Schools."

The results of this poll are very interesting and I would like to bring them to the attention of all Members of Congress:

SENTIMENT SHIFTS ON FEDERAL AID TO CATHOLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

PRINCETON, N.J., February 9.—There has been a sizable shift in sentiment over the last 2 years on whether Federal funds to aid education should go only to public schools or to Catholic and private schools as well.

As of today, the weight of opinion throughout the country (49 percent) holds that any Federal aid should go to help not only public, but Catholic and private schools as well, while a slightly smaller proportion (44 percent) feels that financial aid should be limited to public schools.

To see how the public stands on the school aid issue at this time, Gallup poll reporters asked the identical question of a representative sample of the Nation's adults that was asked nearly 2 years ago:

"If the Federal Government in Washington decides to give money to aid education, should the money go only to public schools, or should the money go to help Catholic and other private schools as well?"

Two years ago, 57 percent of Americans polled felt that Federal aid should go only to public schools.

Here are the current results—with persons of the major religious faiths represented in proportion to the population:

	Percent
Public schools only	44
Catholic, private schools as well	49
No opinion	7

Following are the survey figures of March, 1961:

	Percent
Public schools only	57
Catholic, private schools as well	36
No opinion	7

In taking a stand on the controversial issue 2 years ago, President Kennedy held that Federal aid to parochial schools is unconstitutional, stating that "it is prohibited by the Constitution and the Supreme Court has made that very clear."

Mr. Kennedy, the first Roman Catholic to be elected to the Presidency, took that position in the face of opposition not only of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, but also that of a majority of his fellow Catholic laymen.

The Nation's Protestant voters at that time supported the President's position.

Present survey findings indicate that the change in sentiment on the issue has come largely from Protestants.

Although 50 percent of voters of the Protestant faith feel today that any Federal aid should be limited to public schools, this represents a marked drop from the figure of 63 percent of Protestants who held this view 2 years ago.

Among voters of the Protestant faith reached in the present survey, the vote today on school aid as compared with the vote in March 1961, is as follows:

[In percent]

	February 1963	March 1961
Public schools only	50	63
Catholic, private schools as well	42	29
No opinion	8	8

Although proportionately more Catholics in the present survey favor Government aid for both public and Catholic and other private schools than was the case 2 years ago, the change is less marked than that found among Protestant voters.

The vote of Catholics only:

[In percent]

	February 1963	March 1961
Public schools only	23	28
Catholic, private schools as well	71	66
No opinion	6	6

The Flag of the United States Permanently Available on Postage Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation in the 88th Congress providing for a permanent postage stamp portraying the flag of the United States. This bill, H.R. 3170, has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

This legislation was prompted by a resolution, adopted by the Bishop Eustace General Assembly, Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, of Camden, N.J. I believe this resolution evidences the need for the passage of this type legislation and I, therefore, submit for the perusal of the Members of the House the complete resolution.

I enlist the support of all Members of the House, particularly those of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to support this legislation.

The resolution follows:

THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES PERMANENTLY AVAILABLE ON POSTAGE STAMPS

Whereas the Congress of the United States has seen fit to honor the flag of the United States while unfurled only three times since stamps, or postal adhesives, were first introduced into the postal system in 1847; and

Whereas the flag stamps were issued by the Post Office Department on the Fourth of July on each of the following years: the 48-star flag in 1957; the 49-star flag in 1959, and the 50-star flag in 1960; and

Whereas while the stamps were available for purchase through post offices, patriotic organizations throughout the United States found the likeness of Old Glory unfurled, and as the central subject, most appropriate for their use in correspondence; and

Whereas the aforesaid stamps when issued were of a special or commemorative nature and therefore limited in printing which has made them now obsolete and no longer available for purchase: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Knights of Columbus through their patriotic Fourth Degree Order petition the Congress of the United States to authorize the Postmaster General to have on hand always in the post office in Washington a sufficient supply of stamps bearing the likeness of the Stars and Stripes unfurled, whether of a special issue or ordinary postage stamp issue and of a first-class rate denomination, to satisfy the just demands of patriotic groups or any individual for their use; and be it further

Resolved, That when such a program is resolved that the Postmaster General shall announce at once and thereafter at least once each ensuing year through the Department's post offices that a permanent patriotic stamp service is available upon request at the post office in Washington and/or at its philatelic sales agency in Washington.

JOHN WILLIAM MURPHY,
Navigator, Bishop B. J. Eustace General Assembly, Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus.

WILLIAM D. STILLWELL,
Master, St. Isaac Jogues Province, Second New Jersey District.

(Resolution adopted April 18, 1962, after presentation by the maker, Paul P. Zachary, an officer of the assembly.)

Ban on Foaming Detergents Backed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 2105, would wipe out one important cause of water pollution in this country by banning from interstate commerce after mid-1965 all synthetic detergents that do not meet standards of decomposibility to be set by the Surgeon General. This would not require a costly, inconvenient reversion to soap as the main cleansing agent used by Americans. Rather, it would demand a switch to detergents that do decompose after use. Such decomposible detergents have already been developed in West Germany.

In addition to a great many favorable letters from citizens, private organizations and municipalities throughout the Nation, The Day of New London, Conn., recently wrote this editorial in support of H.R. 2105:

BAN ON DETERGENTS

Drinking water with a head on it is no joke, though the term has been used to get and hold attention before now. Increasingly serious problems with the never-ending, sudsing qualities of various detergents now on the market for anyone to buy and use, cause this phenomenon. It has led to proposed Federal legislation.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS, a Milwaukee Democrat, has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives in Washington which would ban the sale of certain types of detergents. The reason: Even when wash water is disposed of through conventional approved city systems it eventually finds its way into rivers, lakes, and so on. And once it gets there it begins to froth all over again.

Disposal of wash water in country dry well or septic tank installations brings the eternal sudsing qualities to light even sooner. Eventual seepage of detergent-laden wash water into wells gives precisely what was first indicated—drinking water with a head on it.

The difficulty is not confined to this country. It isn't something resulting simply from chemical discoveries, applied to washing powder manufacture and trade, as concerns U.S. residents. A year from now West Germany is going to ban certain hard detergents from all further use, permitting a type which does not give this endless sudsing effect.

Law already on the books in West Germany, Representative REUSS points out, will prohibit further sale of hard detergents after December 31, 1964. Considering the fact that in some sections of the country well contamination is already a very serious problem for householders, regulation of sales of this type of soap substitute plainly is called for.

What To Do About Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy bemoans the fact that his critics on his Cuban policy do not offer a solution.

All the people of the United States want President Kennedy to do is to carry out his campaign pledge of 1960.

In Tuesday's edition of the Washington Daily News, an excellent editorial offers a very sensible solution which can be put into effect now, if President Kennedy has the courage to do it. In this, he would have the overwhelming support of the American people.

The editorial follows:

WHAT TO DO ABOUT CUBA

Mounting public concern over U.S. policy as to Cuba is completely misunderstood, in our opinion, by J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

And he misstates his case when he implies criticism mainly is prompted by partisan Republican motives. High-ranking Democrats also are numbered among the critics.

Senator FULBRIGHT discounts Cuba as a military threat to the United States and there isn't a great deal of argument about that. The 17,000 to 20,000 Soviet troops on the island would be overwhelmed by U.S. forces in event of armed conflict. Repeated emphasis on this military threat, or the lack of it—offensive or defensive missiles—serves merely to distract attention from the real menace of Comunist Cuba.

That menace is the establishment of a hostile foreign power almost within sight of U.S. soil. It is the existence of a Communist police state within the Americas—something President Kennedy once said we would not tolerate.

We do not know why the Soviets maintain this large military force on Cuba but believe it to have two purposes: to hold over the Cuban people the threat of Soviet tanks, as in Hungary, if they try to revolt against the Castro tyranny; to train subversive agents for sabotage and revolution in the Latin American States, carrying explosives and small arms, transshipped from this bristling arms depot.

This subversive campaign isn't a theory. Castro boasts of it. The effects are plain in, for instance, Venezuela where there have been Communist-led riots, dynamitings and most recently, the hijacking of a Venezuelan ship by Communist pirates. Cuba is little more than a rowboat ride from the island of Hispaniola, occupied by the bitterly misruled nation of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, the latter struggling to establish democratic rule after a long generation of vile dictatorship.

These only hint the dangers inherent in a Communist Cuba. The imminent menace extends to the militarily weak, small nations of Central America, to economically troubled Brazil—in fact to most of Latin America.

Among those urging highest priority to forcing the Soviet troops out of Cuba is JOHN STENNIS, a Democrat and head of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee investigating the Cuban military buildup.

He does not urge invasion. In our opinion few would approve that, at least at this time. But there are effective measures the administration could take, short of invasion. These call for tough economic and diplomatic sanctions to isolate Cuba, with reimposition of the blockade as a next-to-last resort.

Naturally these steps involve dangers; but doing nothing, or next to nothing, involves still worse dangers. Basically we think growing U.S. discontent is inspired by a feeling that the administration, after vigorous blockade action, has gone soft on Cuba—that it is submissive to repeated Soviet affront, that it even has relaxed the sternness of measures in preparation before the big missiles were photographed.

By one method or another this increasingly dangerous infection must be rooted out of the Americas and the longer we delay the wider it will spread.

Fino Asks for Referendum on National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release:

FINO ASKS FOR REFERENDUM ON NATIONAL LOTTERY

Congressman PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, No. 1 advocate of a Government-run lottery to reduce taxes, today introduced a bill calling for a national referendum on the question of whether or not the Federal Government should sponsor a national lottery.

Congressman FINO, in urging a referendum on this important question, said:

"Although several nationwide polls have shown that a majority of the American people favor a Federal lottery as a means to cut taxes, fear among Members of Congress that this type of bill is a "hot potato" has prevented legislative consideration.

"Because of this unfounded fear among my colleagues, the taxpayers in this country continue to suffer from the discriminatory and unconscionable taxes imposed upon them.

"Up until now, the voters in the United States who support this painless and voluntary form of taxation have had no direct voice on this tax relief measure.

"In urging a referendum on this vital question, the American voters will be given an opportunity to express their desire with respect to a national lottery.

"I am sure that if the American people are afforded the chance, they will overwhelmingly indicate their approval of this kind of legislation. An expression of approval by a majority of the American voters will be a clear-cut mandate to the Congress to enact a national lottery.

"I urge all unhappy taxpayers to write to their Congressmen and demand full support of this bill."

Insulting Our Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more apparent each day that Americans at the grassroots level are not being duped by the gaseous diffusion which emits from Foggy Bottom, our State Department. That we are not being told the truth in the Cuban fiasco is coming to light more and more. Last fall, Russians in Cuba were technicians. Now they are plainly referred to by this administration as troops. In this maze of contradictions a free press and the American public are gradually piecing together the grand design of appeasement and stupidity which has marked the handling of the Cuban situation from the Bay of Pigs to the present time.

Mr. A. Monroe Courtright, publisher of the Public Opinion, Westerville, Ohio, has written a very sound editorial which penetrates the issue with great clarity and depth. I commend it to my colleagues:

INSULTING OUR INTELLIGENCE

(By A. Monroe Courtright)

I dunno—did you get the same reaction I did as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara put on his television show last week and tried to downgrade the Communist menace now in Cuba?

As he talked and presented his excellent photographs showing how the missile sites had been destroyed since the crisis last October, I noted that each photo's description was ended with the phrase that told us we were not to worry about anything at this particular location.

Why does President Kennedy and his bunch of starry-eyed advisers continue to play the American people for a bunch of suckers and morons?

No intelligent American would disagree with the President's statement that we should not fear an invasion or attack from Cuba by Communist forces. Why then, take great trouble to put such a premise to rest and completely ignore that a Communist base in this hemisphere is of great potential danger to most all South American countries, and when each one falls to communism, our own position becomes that much more vulnerable.

Why try to whitewash the picture and make it appear otherwise?

Only a few weeks back Robert Kennedy, the President's brother who handles the Justice Department along with helping to run our entire Government, stated in a speech that "U.S. air cover was never promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion." The President himself affirmed what Brother Bobby said was right.

And so it was—no intelligent American who had read anything about the Bay of Pigs ever did say that U.S. air cover was promised to the invaders. What WAS promised was an air strike by B-26 planes belonging to the invaders (not U.S. planes), but on that fateful Tuesday morning, President Kennedy himself called off the strike.

Why?

No high Government official denies that the President called off the strike and to this day, no explanation has been given. Instead, platitudinous remarks are made and we are expected to believe them.

However, the most important doubt that kept popping up in my mind during McNamara's whitewashing job concerned the way the Cuban crisis was handled last October.

Is the President's memory so short that he thinks an intelligent American can forget—or overlook—the admitted fact that while a big meeting was being held in the State Department to play down the danger from Cuba, at the same time he and his Council were being briefed by Pentagon officers and being shown photographs of the missile sites in Cuba.

When newspaper reporters brought out the fact that doubletalk was going on, what should happen but that a high official named Sylvester admitted publicly that the news of the crisis had been doctored, and what is even more reprehensive in an American democracy, stated flatly that managed news had been, and would continue to be the policy.

In other words, we'll tell you what we want you to hear, whether or not it's true.

If other Americans are like me—they may tell me what they want me to hear, but they can't make me believe it.

And this is what bugs me about McNamara's TV appearance.

Government officials lied—and admitted they lied—last October.

By what logic do they expect us to believe what we heard from the Secretary of Defense last week? Especially when all of the evidence indicates that he is being used as a part of the big lie too.

When President Kennedy was elected, I wasn't too upset about the change in administration, and, in fact, felt at the time that his enthusiasm and earnestness might be good for our country. Now I'm not only sure that I was wrong—I'm downright scared.

I'm scared because he has surrounded himself with theorists and incompetent advisers who are endangering the future of our country and our very existence by their bumbling and inept planning, especially in the field of foreign affairs.

And mostly of all, I'm scared because a great majority of our citizens don't seem to be concerned enough about it to want to do anything about it.

Maybe I shouldn't be scared—maybe I'm crazy.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, if it had not been for Russian aggression in 1940 Lithuania would be celebrating this week the 45th anniversary of her independence. Instead, only those Lithuanians no longer living in their homeland can freely celebrate this national holiday.

It was on February 16, 1918, that the little Republic declared herself free of the ancient Russian tyranny. Twenty-two years later this freedom was brutally betrayed by a new tyrant, Joseph Stalin.

Yet the memory of liberty survives in Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

Soviet propaganda asserting that these captive peoples rejoice in their slavery to Moscow fools no one.

These nations cannot be rescued from their serfdom at the cost of a third global war, for the price would be too great for humanity to pay. But they will not be forgotten in the free world. Some day, when the Communist empire has crumbled, they will be free again. In the meantime, we take every opportunity to confirm our friendship with Lithuanians everywhere and salute them for their past and future victories.

News Flow Under Pressure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of February 13, 1963:

NEWS FLOW UNDER PRESSURE

Reacting from the continuing bipartisan congressional pressure, the administration is cracking its wall of managed news and as a result Americans are gaining more and more insight into the forces that threatened the Nation several months ago and the capabilities of the men responsible for the Nation's well-being.

In a recent issue, U.S. News & World Report magazine summarized the various estimates of Soviet manpower in Cuba published by Government agencies following the period of crisis. On October 16 one Government agency noted that there were almost 5,000 men of the Soviet armed forces on the island. On November 7 that was increased from 8,000 to 13,000 men. A Government source on November 29 noted that there were 8,000 to 10,000 men in Cuba; by December 20 the figure had increased to 9,000 to 15,000 and on January 24 there were 16,000 to 17,000 Soviets on the island. Then on the February 6 Defense Department briefing, Secretary McNamara said there had been 22,000 Russian military personnel in Cuba during the November peak, but that 5,000 have left and 17,000 remain. On the same day, CIA Director McCone used the same figure.

Even as Government agencies can't seem to get together in their information policies, apparently there are personnel within the agencies who interpret information in a different light than administration policymakers. For it has been revealed that much of the information Sen. Kenneth Keating has been disclosing, both recently and before the Cuban showdown when he correctly estimated Soviet intentions, has been coming from sources within the Government and not, as was first supposed, from Cuban refugees.

Now there is new information regarding the Defense Department's knowledge of the

Cuban-Soviet missile threat. During the nationwide television briefing by Defense Department intelligence specialist John Hughes, the Government revealed that it received its first hard evidence of Soviet missile base construction on October 14. This varies with previous statements that the Government was unaware of Russian intentions until almost a week later.

Yet in a tabulation of U.S. military moves directed toward Cuba, newspaperman Fletcher Knebel writes that "As early as September, Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., head of the Tactical Air Command * * * and his staff had drafted an air offensive plan, should a Cuban airstrike be ordered. General Sweeney briefed Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, on the plan in Washington on September 26, and General LeMay ordered SAC to be battle ready by October 20. By October 10 such Air Force supplies as bombs, rockets, napalm, forklifts, frozen food lockers, folding cots and high explosive 20-millimeter ammunition began moving to Florida by plane, truck and rail. On October 15 the Air Force established a unified command post at Homestead Air Force Base, Fla."

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 120 years, from 1795 until 1917, the Lithuanian people longed for their deliverance from czarist oppression. Then they saw their long-cherished dream come true in 1918. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they were free. Lithuania proclaimed its national independence on February 16, 45 years ago.

Thenceforth for more than two decades these proud Baltic people enjoyed their well-earned independence. They organized a democratic form of government, rebuilt their war-ravaged country, revived their national institutions, and made distinct advances on the social, economic, political, and cultural fronts. Their country grew prosperous and strong. Lithuania thus once more became an honored member of the free community of nations.

Unfortunately, however, the hopeful Republic thus born and reared under the care of patriotic Lithuanians was not to have a long life. In the world turmoil of the late 1930's Lithuania's independence was put in jeopardy. In the fall of 1939, she was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union, and in the summer of 1940 she was incorporated into the Soviet Empire. An independent Lithuanian Republic then ceased to exist.

Ever since the Lithuanian people have been denied freedom in their homeland. During the last war the country was under Nazi occupation for 3 years; in 1944 the equally dreaded Red Army returned, with its commissars and secret police, and there it remains to this day. The hapless Lithuanian people have been cut off from the outside and the country has been forcibly and pitifully estranged from the free world. Such is the unhappy lot of these gallant and gifted Lithuanians. On this 45th anniversary of their Independence Day I know free people everywhere hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny at the earliest possible moment.

Housing for the Elderly an Urgent Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the critical social needs in our country is adequate housing for the elderly. The Portland Housing Authority is completing a 13-story Northwest Tower Apartment which provides an important beginning in meeting the housing needs of our older citizens.

Because of the urban renewal and highway programs adequate housing for the elderly is a critical problem at this time. Highly informative hearings were held last fall in Portland by the Senate Committee on Aging. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and I had the opportunity to view the critical needs and the progress that is being made. This new apartment building in Portland is only a beginning in meeting the need.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over housing legislation, I am particularly aware of the changes in this field. Further action is needed, not only by the Federal Government but also by State and local governments, if this problem is to be solved. Additional funds for Federal low-interest loans should be provided for cities, States, and local units of government.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the progress being made in this field in my home city of Portland, Oreg., and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Progress Refugees," which appeared in the Sunday Oregonian of February 3, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS REFUGEES

One of the new buildings whose completion this year will alter the Portland skyline is the 13-story Northwest Tower, the Portland Housing Authority's project for the housing of elderly, low-income men and women.

The concrete skeleton of the half-finished building, towering over Northwest Portland, is imposing. But the fact is that it scarcely scratches the surface of the problem that prompted its erection.

The Housing Authority's general director, Gene Rossman, told a Portland audience last week that his agency already has almost 600 applications, all qualified, for residence in the building, which will accommodate only one-fourth that number.

And this is not the whole story. A recent survey by the Housing Authority revealed that three out of every four of Portland's 5,000 recipients of old age assistance live in substandard quarters. There are other thousands of oldsters living on minimum social security payments and meager income of various sorts.

Many elderly, low-income couples and individuals live in westside and near-eastside areas, where cheap housing is available within walking distance of services and entertainment. They cannot afford to live elsewhere, if for no other reason than transportation. The Portland Development Commission has found that a surprisingly large number of those displaced by the South Auditorium urban renewal project moved into quarters as near as possible to their former homes. Now, some of these have been jolted out again by the Foothills Freeway right-of-way.

There's the rub. The downtown freeways appear to covet the same neighborhoods enjoyed by the aged renter seeking a decent housekeeping room within easy reach of the stores, the theaters, the libraries and museums. It is an unequal contest, that between the highways and the old men and women. The winner is foreordained. The losers must scatter before the bulldozers, their vulnerable positions made more precarious still by the worry and expense of finding new quarters within their means.

Portland city authorities have taken some steps to help such displaced persons. But state authorities, who have at least equal responsibilities in some circumstances, apparently consider that the human problem is no part of the job of building highways. Neither the city nor the State can overlook the fact that housing for the aged is a problem in large part created by the demands of the times—demands that are altering the faces of our cities. It will not be solved by building low-rent quarters for 150 family units. For the freeway's victims alone will be counted in the thousands within the next few years.

The Numbers Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, almost weekly, there is a new estimate by the Kennedy administration of the numbers of Soviet troops in Cuba. In the February 19 issue of the Washington Daily News an article by Jim Lucas indicates that a majority of the Western Hemisphere countries have fewer men in their armed forces than the Russians have troops in Cuba. I wonder if the American people are as naive as the President of the United States when he says that most of these Russian troops are technicians or defensive.

When will this administration wake up?

HEMISPHERE ARMIES HAVE FEWER MEN THAN REDS IN CUBA

(By Jim G. Lucas)

A majority of Western Hemisphere countries have fewer men in their armed forces than the Russians have troops in Cuba.

Early this month, CIA Director John McCone told the Senate Armed Services Committee there were 17,000 Soviet regular troops in Cuba.

A check today shows that nine hemisphere nations—Bolivia, Costa Rica (which has no

armed forces), Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, and Paraguay—have fewer than 17,000 men under arms.

Seven—Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela—have more. Totals for El Salvador, Honduras, Peru, and Uruguay were not readily available.

TANKS, ETC.

Mr. McCone told Congress some Cuban-based Russians were "manning tanks and other weapons of mobilized, armed units." Others are "specialists in charge of an extensive surface-to-air missile system." Still others are in army, navy, and air force training units, he said.

The United States is deeply concerned about this. President Kennedy has asked the Russians to call their troops home. But the White House and Pentagon insist neither the Soviets nor the Cubans constitute an offensive threat to this country at the moment.

The stated mission of these 17,000 Russians is to advise, train, and equip 275,000 Cubans. Mr. McCone said Castro has 75,000 regulars, 100,000 militiamen, and 100,000 home gaurds. All of these are under more or less continuing mobilization, although the number on duty may vary from week to week and month to month.

This 275,000-man force gives Cuba the second most powerful military machine in the Western Hemisphere—second to the United States with our 2.6 million men in all services. Brazil is right behind Cuba with 250,000, followed by Canada with 126,000, Argentina with 105,000, Mexico with 56,200, and Chile with 45,700.

Cubans not only have the manpower edge over most hemisphere armies, they also have received a lot more modern arms. Although massive Soviet deliveries had slacked off, Mr. McCone told Congress, they had not ceased altogether. He said the Soviets had given Cuba "tanks, field artillery pieces, and jet military aircraft." He said they had built Cuba "an integrated air defense system employing surface-to-air missiles, complex radar, antiaircraft batteries, and jet fighters."

The Cubans, he said, have 24 missile sites, each with 6 launchers for a total of 500 missiles "manned entirely by Soviet personnel." They have 100 Mig jet fighters, including 42 which fly twice the speed of sound, 150 coastal defense missiles on 4 operational sites, 12 guided-missile patrol boats, and 4 mobile armored groups equipped with "advanced type tactical rockets" with ranges of 25 miles.

Other than the United States and possibly Canada, no other American country has such a variety of modern arms.

Whose Victory in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Star, Muncie, Ind.:

WHOSE VICTORY IN CUBA?

Cuba has provided Soviet Russia with a site for early warning radar capable of covering many of the missile sites in the United States.

This is another part of the military victory won by the Reds when they established their Caribbean base. It is another reason to wonder who won a victory when President Kennedy announced his October agreement with Khrushchev.

The Reds now have available a site that is much closer to the continental United States—and the Titan and Minuteman missile batteries—than they have ever had before. A circle of 2,000 miles from Tucson and Phoenix in the West, north past Denver and up into the Dakotas and over the entire Nation east of the Mississippi River.

How early warning radar works can be learned from what is publicly known of American installations. According to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, the two stations at Clear, Alaska, and Thule, Greenland, are now in operation. A third at Flyingsdale, England, will join the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System in a few months. They are at least 3,000 miles from the locations most often mentioned as probable Russian missile sites.

If we can find Russian missiles 3,000 miles away, the Reds can locate ours, from Cuba, over the shorter distance of 2,000 miles. Public testimony to date indicates that the advantage of a few minutes additional time would be invaluable in an exchange of nuclear rockets. The need to get information as quickly as possible about any attack across the North Pole is what caused this country to build the BMEWS line in Alaska, Greenland, and England.

There is no way to know, at this time, whether the Reds will make use of Cuba as an early warning site against missiles in this country. Yet, geography is not subject to change. Why shouldn't the Russians capitalize fully on their advantage? If Khrushchev failed to press his opportunity to the fullest, it would be the first time he has failed to do so.

So—the availability of Cuba as an early warning site next door to the missile batteries of the United States is another important strategic victory for the Kremlin.

Safety or Bureaucracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very thought-provoking editorial from the AOPA Pilot, issue of December 1962. It highlights in very graphic form some of the problems facing the small aircraft owners and pilots in America. I commend it to the Members of Congress:

SAFETY OR BUREAUCRACY?

Before long the FAA will submit its next annual budget for congressional consideration. There is little chance it will reflect any interest in economy; it almost certainly will be higher than the $766 million they got for the current year. As we said in March, the fiscal year 1963 budget almost defies comprehension: it has cost every U.S. man, woman, and child about $4.32, and was more than the cost of the entire U.S. Government for any year from 1789 through 1916.

We expect the FAA's fiscal year 1964 budget to surpass that. They've had a 5-year plan for some time that called for an ultimate of 57,000 employees (they presently have 45,000), and an annual budget of a round billion dollars. Mr. Halaby, himself, expressed concern at this, and recently cut that ultimate goal back to 53,000 employees and $900 million.

It is time for AOPA's membership to take an active, aggressive part in stemming this outpouring of public funds.

First, it is essential that the facts be known. From time to time in the past AOPA has published current statistics showing that general aviation represents over 90 percent of the country's active civil aircraft, and accounts for the great majority of active civil pilots, flying hours, aircraft movements, and whatever other pertinent statistics we can find.

While Mr. Halaby's administration is the first to actively recognize general aviation for the first time, it still is overwhelmingly true that a major percentage of the FAA is slanted toward the jet airliner, gigantic airports, often incredible traffic control concepts based on the handful of jet airliners, and so on.

Despite the fact that the majority of the costliest FAA expenditures are intended primarily to serve this distorted concept, general aviation is nevertheless made an unwilling party to all this. Ultimately, it will be expected to foot a substantial share of the bill if, as we pointed out in March, the Government finally forces through a program of user charges in an effort to offset these incredible costs.

AOPA members must be constantly aware of one overriding fact: general aviation, despite its size, is rarely consulted about these expenditures. Rarely, if ever, are general aviation's representatives asked about general aviation's actual requirements—although all such expenditures are predicated on an arbitrary FAA statement to an unsuspecting Bureau of the Budget, and to congressional appropriations committees themselves, that these expenditures do meet some assumed general aviation requirements. Invariably, they not only are not needed by general aviation, but general aviation actually disagrees with the FAA, and would oppose the expenditures if they were asked. Examples: Dulles Airport (an estimated $175 million), the still unused data processing central computer ($8 million), and miscellaneous millions here and there for such things as a supersonic airliner, emergency arresting gear for jet airliners, visual approach lights for jet airliners, and so on.

Virtually the entire traffic control system—probably the most expensive single section of FAA—is predicated on such distorted assumptions. And whenever anyone, either in the Bureau of the Budget or Congress, questions such expenditures, the answer is the same: "It's essential to safety."

Nowhere in recent Government history, outside of perhaps the Department of Defense, has so much money been taken from the taxpayers in the name of safety. Yet no one, to our knowledge, has ever probed deeply into the facts, and whether the facts justify these colossal expenditures. In the last 10 years, for example, 9,616 people were killed in all segments of civil aviation—including the Grand Canyon and Staten Island collisions. In 1960 alone, twice as many people were killed by falls, 1,700 choked to death on food; 854 died due to medical-surgical mishaps. There were 38,200 people killed and 1,400,000 disabled by motor vehicles in 1961—about four times as many dead as all the people killed in all civil aviation in those 10 years—yet Congress hasn't seen fit to create a Government agency to cope with this slaughter. If the FAA can be justified largely on the basis of an average of 961.6 deaths per year, then certainly the U.S. Government should long ago have reacted violently to just the auto which, in the same 10-year period, killed 379,362 humans.

Midair collisions. The smokescreen that has been thrown up on this one subject has cost an unsuspecting public millions, with no end in sight—unless the public itself starts asking questions. To listen to some talk, one would think there's a daily shower of planes and bodies from the skies. The facts? In that same 10-year yeriod there have been 518 fatalities in all civil aviation due to collisions—including Grand Canyon and Staten Island, and 9 people on the ground. Why, in 1961 alone, 460 people were killed by bicycles.

The time has come for forceful, knowledgeable action by all in general aviation. We absolutely must have reasonable, practical standards of safety. But we must be just as aggressive in protesting to our Representatives in Congress any and all raids on the public purse supposedly made in the name of safety. Every major expenditure requested by the FAA, starting with their next budget, should be carefully scrutinized by knowledgeable people affected by these expenditures, and their Representatives in Congress should be told what items are wasteful, are not required by general aviation, and are not truly needed for the advancement of safety.

Fire Island: A Possible National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the February 1963 issue of National Parks magazine entitled "Fire Island: A Possible National Seashore," by Virginia Bennett Moore.

I believe the article will be of interest not only to natives of New York State, but to concerned people everywhere who are fighting to preserve the few remaining areas of untouched natural beauty. As Miss Moore so accurately states, "The Fire Islanders have been defending their way of life; they have been guarding a priceless heritage for the rest of us." I believe this area should be preserved by the establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore.

The article follows:

FIRE ISLAND: A POSSIBLE NATIONAL SEASHORE

(By Virginia Bennett Moore)

When a hurricane comes, nothing shields the flat, southern shore of New York's populous Long Island from the awesome whims of the Atlantic but a long, narrow, natural sandbar lying several miles offshore, broken in several places by inlets. The makings of this 83-mile sliver of land were dropped between Great South Bay and the ocean some ten thousand years ago by the Pleistocene ice, which also dumped above it Long Island proper.

Of this thin, sandy Long Island barrier beach, the center segment, a 31-mile splinter trending a little to the northeast, is known on the maps and charts as Great South Beach. Otherwise it is Fire Island, fabled as a summer playground, but precious beyond that.

Fire Island's beach is a 200-foot strip of flat, white sand, fine as table salt, sloping gently out to sea and stretching as far, unbroken, as the eye can see. Beachgrass waves on the 20-foot dunetops. You are alone on the landscape except for those two suntanned children and their puppy dancing off in the distance. They have walked 5 miles from the next village, combing for flotsam treasure on what has been called one of five most beautiful beaches on earth.

Inside the dunes is a valley of little desert gardens: of beachgrass, beachpea, beachplum and beach rose; of bearberry, bayberry, ground pine and reindeer moss; sassafras, shadblow and cedar; blueberry, marsh mallow, catbrier and creeper. Tiny wildflowers, mounds of goldenrod; wild cherry, pitch pine and American holly. Everything is low, scrubby, wind bitten, sun bleached, salt silvered—and beautiful.

Halfway down the strip is a quarter-mile tract of virgin forest seated a little below sea level—the Sunken Forest. Some of its holly trees are several hundred years old. Pine needles slipper your feet aromatically as you wander, and there are red maples, red oak, birch and black gum; sarsaparilla, ferns and azalea. Only a weathered sign tells you it is a sanctuary, botanically remarkable, preserved by public-spirited inhabitants from Fire Island's 18 communities "until * * * the most protective form of ownership can be worked out." Birds abound over the island—songbirds, seabirds, shore birds, and a few beachcombing crows. Spring and fall, it is a migratory way station.

Fire Island's 31 miles of beautiful beach connect long chunks of terrain that, sprawling between single houses or clustered cottage communities, is yet largely untouched.

The island is a gift of its geographic isolation and a tribute to the grit of the 35,000 people (with a year-round nucleus of 300) who live there, go there, use it, love it, know it intimately, and preserve it tenderly. Sometimes they represent the fourth or fifth generation of their blood to do so.

For this salty little sandbar is one of the few unpaved splinters of seaside terrain on a road map of the Northeast United States. It is easily reached by way of a 20- to 40-minute boat trip. Its pleasures are open to anyone who will go to Bay Shore, Sayville, or Patchogue, on Long Island, and take the ferry. But there are as yet no provisions for automobiles.

THREAT OF A ROAD

On that fact alone now rides a controversy as to whether the little island will or will not survive as itself; for that which a hundred centuries of rains, tides, bitter northeasters and costly hurricanes have chewed at, but failed to subdue, could fall under the paving machine overnight.

For it has been proposed that a four-lane ocean boulevard be run down the spine of Fire Island—a road needing "the strip of dunes approximately 300 feet wide" as a right-of-way, although over long stretches the entire island is no more than 500 to 700 feet wide.

On a south seas island, such obliteration by asphalt and artifice might represent progress—of a kind. But this island's unspoiled heritage becomes infinitely precious when one remembers that it is a slice of wild beauty but 50 to 80 miles from Manhattan; that within a radius of perhaps a hundred miles lives a hard-pressed one-tenth of our total population, which needs every inch of unspoiled land that can be saved.

The cast of characters in this unfolding drama is divided into two factions. Oddly enough, both want to preserve Fire Island.

The first group is spearheaded by a 15-man temporary State commission on protection and preservation of the Atlantic shorefront—a name which many conservationists consider ironic. The plan for Fire Island is part of a 135-mile oceanfront plan stretching from Staten Island, in New York City, to Montauk, on the end of Long Island. Whatever the merit of the remainder of the plan, the Fire Island portion has come under severe criticism.

Although the Fire Island highway plan is presented as erosion control, the whole problem of Fire Island erosion was already being handled through an Army Corps of Engineers' plan, under preparation since 1954, to dredge sand from the bay, carry it hydraulically by pipe and spout it out on the oceanside of the island to raise beach and dune levels. The plan also called for planting the dunes with beachgrass and for construction of stone jetties to keep the damaging northeast currents from scouring the fill away. This plan is calculated to protect the island against harder storms than any recorded there to date.

Congress has provided funds to begin this work, at least, and the State pledged its share. Came the 3-day March 1962 northeaster, one of the most damaging storms ever to visit the east coast. On the heels of public consternation, New York's Governor Rockefeller appointed the temporary commission to study ocean shorefront erosion. While Fire Island citizens raised small sums among themselves and sandbagged their own crumbling dunes, and the Army Engineers began emergency filling, the commission, studying Fire Island's case, saw the Army plan as a launching pad for a proposal to put a highway on top of the rebuilt dunes.

Why does the shore commission want the Fire Island boulevard? Here in capsule form are the reasons given in its final report, with supplement, approved in July 1962:

1. Safety. The road is needed to preserve Fire Island by helping to hold the dunes in place.

2. Accessibility. The road will make Fire Island accessible to the public.

3. Economy of purpose. The only excuse for spending large public sums on the island is to make it accessible.

The commission's logic, examined, seems to some people to be as unstable as the sands it is meant to pin down. Take the issue of safety and "preservation."

On Hatteras Island, in the Outer Banks of North Carolina—in a situation similar to that of Fire Island—such a road was built well inside protective dunes. In March's northeaster, 10 miles of it washed away, much of the rest flooded. Such a road could hardly be considered safe for mass evacuation, although its merit for that purpose has been cited by the commission.

Would such a road hold the dunes in place? For bathers to get to the beach without having to cross the road, the commission would build underpasses with ascending ramps and high dunes seaward. This information, from their supplementary report, seems to correct an earlier impression that, in a storm, the underpasses might act as so many holes in the dike. It also corrects the impression that the highway is needed to hold down the dunes; for the road must be far enough inland to have "high dunes seaward." Ocean dunes are not occasional sandhills; they are vital seawalls. Thus the road would seemingly not protect the dunes, but the dunes the road.

GREATER ACCESSIBILITY SEEN

The Commission's second point is that the roadway would make Fire Island accessible to the public. Right now, all of Fire Island—except for two or three small places within walking distance of other settlements—is already as accessible as Long Island bus, rail, auto, boat, or seaplane facilities can make it. Further, any day visitor or family from city or county may stroll in from the ferry dock, visit almost any beach, swim, picnic, sightsee, fish, clam, or explore. Visitors who will take the trouble to find out about accommodations may stay

as long as they please. Unlike most places, there are no private-beach, keep-off signs to be seen. The beach is already accessible.

But the oddest point is that the proposed "limited access four-lane ocean boulevard" would have "access to the ocean limited to the people of the (beach-owning Islip and Brookhaven) towns and (Suffolk) county, at their own public park facilities, together with frequent underpass access * * * for (Fire Island) owners of private lands. * * * Access to the ocean for transients (Nassau Countians, other New Yorkers, New Jerseyites, and everybody else) would, of course, be available in the State park facilities at Fire Island State Park." (Parentheses are the author's, the rest the Commission's wording.) When people went to visit what was left of the island by then, they could get to the beach—unless they were Fire Island landholders or their guests—in only one or two of five places. So if the island were more reachable, it would actually be far less accessible than it is right now.

And for 20 miles of expressway connecting nothing more than two public parks—Fire Island State Park and Smith Point Park—the Commission would have to spend eight times what the Army Engineers' plan would cost. The Commission's base cost estimate of $21 million omits so many charges that it is useless. The Fire Island Voters Association, working with the Fire Island Erosion Control Committee, had an independent engineering analysis made of the highway cross section shown in the Commission's report, with total costs coming not to $21 million but to more than $80 million. This is against $11 million for the Army plan covering all of Fire Island's 31 miles.

The island highway plan is opposed by a growing force, however—one which has another idea. It is composed not only of Fire Islanders, whose protests against the highway have been treated as the local reaction of a group jealous of its "privacy." It is also composed of conservationists, naturalists, city and regional planners, sportsmen's groups and business organizations.

The group also numbers Long Island residents in its ranks, and countless thousands of New York metropolitan families who are tired of being smoked, stunk, shoved, shouted, smogged, and squeezed. Defenders also include just about all the other people from coast to coast who have ever visited the little beach and know what it is like; few of these have ever objected to the ferry trip that put them ashore on such a remote and beautiful landscape.

DIFFERENT TREATMENT NEEDED

Those advocating an expressway point to neighboring Jones Beach, a handsome and highly useful piece of planning, as a parallel to Fire Island; but it is not a parallel. For one thing, Jones Beach—which has toll stations, bathhouses, refreshment stands, cafeterias, restaurants, public dining rooms, softball parks, dance pavilions, boardwalk promenades, an outdoor marine theater seating hundreds, acres of planned landscaping, and at least 10 parking fields, some the size of an entire Fire Island village—is about three times as wide as Fire Island. For another, the solution used at Jones Beach in 1934 has been outdated by our population pressures. We need to save a few places where a child can roam freely among nature's beauties and where a man can find his soul again.

Opponents of the road, while not slow to applaud Jones Beach and other user-oriented facilities, recognize instantly that this kind of asphalt urbanity has no place on Fire Island. It is one of our last natural or resource-based recreation areas in the Northeast, where 40 percent of the Nation's population lives on a mere 7 percent of the Nation's land. The area itself offers its own wild pleasures and resources, left to the present much as nature made them, with a minimum of manmade intervention. Many feel that it should remain that way.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, flatly stating that Fire Island "needs a different kind of planning" than that which went into Jones Beach, has said: "My recommendations would be * * * to keep as much of Fire Island as is still possible in its natural state, while at the same time preserving and protecting the area for public recreation."

This is also the viewpoint of those who hope to keep the island unpaved. They hope to see the beaches and unsettled parts of Fire Island made into a national seashore. Said Charles Collingwood, as spokesman for Fire Island to the Commission in July 1962:

"We propose that all major undeveloped areas and the entire area from the dunes south—in other words, the beachfront—be acquired either as a national seashore or as a joint Federal-State shoreline protection area.

"We propose that the areas between Smith Point Park and Fire Island State Park (the theoretical path of the road) be preserved as much as possible in their natural state, with ferry service, campsites, sanitary facilities, et cetera, provided as needed in the best traditions of the National Park Service.

"We propose that the development of Smith Point Park and Fire Island State Park (where there is already provision for roads) be carried on with roads and parking lots located well back of the dunes so that the dunes and beachfront can be maintained in as nearly natural a state as possible." (Parentheses are the author's).

COMMENTS ON PROPOSAL

This kind of proposal has found support in a large section of the press. Said a recent editorial on the subject in the New York Times: "New York and Long Island residents have no shortage now of four-lane roads for such sightseeing as can be done at 50 miles an hour or in bumper-to-bumper traffic."

Sports Illustrated for July 23, 1962, quotes Dr. Robert Cushman Murphy, curator emiritus of the American Museum of Natural History: "Why must we supply traffic arteries to shunt everywhere people who want to sit on their bottoms? Is there no virtue in cherishing something that has to be won by purposeful desire and a little effort?" And again: "It is high time that our society began to recognize the benchmarks (or the waterline) at which the greatest number utterly wipes out the greatest good, once and forever." Added Life editorially: "It is all too easy to equate the public interest with that version of the 'mass interest' which turns out to mean more automobiles and hotdog stands."

THE PARK SERVICE STUDY

Eight years ago the National Park Service first formally recommended taking Fire Island into the national park system after its survey of 3,700 miles of Atlantic and gulf shoreline. A full 8 years ago the Service described the situation in "Our Vanishing Shoreline" as "foreboding."

"Almost every attractive seashore area from Maine to Mexico that is accessible by road has been developed. * * * Inaccessible beach sites, including offshore islands, are almost the only hope for preservation today," the Park Service wrote; and it singled out Fire Island, along with Cape Cod, as exceptionally well suited for preservation.

This form of preservation is not that of the roadbuilders. The argument that land is too costly for parks—although the proposed road would take half of the usable island—has been advanced. It has been argued by those favoring an expressway that enough beach—9 miles—is already public in one way or another; so that, besides acquisition of the Sunken Forest, no more State and no Federal parks are needed. The road faction does, however, recommend that 7 more miles of park be acquired by town, county, and State, the last 4 to be shared with the Federal Government as "a natural wildlife area"—complete with expressway. This done, they say, there is not enough of Fire Island left to bother with making a national seashore.

Actually, 12 miles of the island presently in private ownership is available, not counting the 9 miles of local and State parks. Secretary Udall has recommended that these 12 unsettled miles be made into a national seashore park. But the Secretary can only recommend; he cannot create. Two bills were introduced into the 87th Congress by Representatives LINDSAY and RYAN, both of New York; but no action was taken upon either of them.

It is urgent that the issues at stake be understood. The best-informed critics of the island-paving plan point out that it is not a mere "optional extra" on the seashore plan; it is a dangerous alternative because it would make the seashore plan meaningless. It would take up more than half the island to connect two public parks by 20 miles of roadway, right-of-way, parking areas, accesses, egresses, underpasses and extensive landscaping.

"The freedom of wild lands and their grandeur are interwoven in our history * * * and have strongly influenced the shaping of our national character," a Chief of the U.S. Forest Service has said. "Wilderness is irreplaceable and must not all be lost."

The Fire Islanders have been fighting not for their "privacy," but for their simplicity: many people on the island still happily use cold-water hand pumps and kerosene. They have been defending their way of life; they have been guarding a priceless heritage for the rest of us. But if that heritage is to be forged into a national seashore park, it must be done soon, or the gallant little sandbar's paving stones will have become its gravestones, its cause merely a causeway; its parks, largely parking areas.

A Gun That Sees and Shoots at Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an interesting article from the November–December 1962 issue of Infantry magazine which I am sure will be of interest to all who have the strength and welfare of our Ground Forces at heart, especially in connection with the guerrilla-type operations that are gradually becoming so prevalent.

The article follows:

FEAR NOT THE NIGHT

(By Capt. James E. Stallard)

The darkness of night, full of unknown dangers and mysteries, has been feared by many from childhood until death. In combat, fear of the unknown element at night is pronounced. To the soldier, using only his eyes to find an enemy who is intent upon killing him, fear is very near and real. But should this be the case? No. Darkness is

a blessing to the combat infantryman. With today's rapid progress in the field of infrared radiation and other night vision aids, the soldier is able to fight and protect himself more effectively at night than ever before.

Research in the field of infrared radiation, conduoted by the RCA laboratories during the early days of World War II, led to development of the infrared sniperscope. This device was used in World War II and Korea as a night firing sight for the carbine and the 3.5-inch rocket launcher. It enables the operator to detect and engage targets at night up to a range of 115 meters without the aid of visible light. Presently, there are 16 sniperscopes assigned to the supply and maintenance platoon of the Infantry battle group.

The sniperscope consists of an infrared light source, an electronic telescope, and a power supply. The light source projects a beam of invisible infrared radiation into the target area. Part of the radiation is lost or absorbed, but the remainder is reflected to the telescope, where it is converted to a visual image. The power supply, a 6-volt wet cell battery and a powerpack, provides current for operating the light source and electronic telescope. With continuous operation of the light source, the life of the battery is from 2 to 4 hours. There are many ways the sniperscope can assist the infantryman at night. Primarily, it is a valuable aid in the defense, as Company I, 180th Infantry, found out in the summer of 1952. While occupying a reserve position near Chorwan, Korea, the company received orders to move into position on Outpost 200, in the vicinity of Pork Chop Hill. During a reconnaissance of the area, the commander determined that there were three approaches into the position. Intelligence reports revealed that these approaches were used nightly by enemy patrols attempting to infiltrate the position. When his unit occupied Outpost 200, the commander placed sniperscopes in pairs covering each approach. By working in pairs, the men were able to detect enemy patrols at ranges up to 200 yards. Not once during the 2-week period on line was the position successfully infiltrated.

This example reveals several important factors in the use of the sniperscope. First, when employed in pairs, the scope's range capability is extended because of the increased infrared radiation covering the target area. In this example, the range of the sniperscope was extended 85 meters. Secondly, when employed in pairs, the operators are better able to detect targets against cluttered backgrounds such as foliage. The cross-illumination reduces the glare from vegetation, and objects hidden in the brush appear brighter than their background. When mounted on a weapon firing tracer ammunition, the sniperscope can spot targets for other weapons in the company.

Even though the sniperscope is a valuable aid against surprise attacks, it has disadvantages. Users of the sniperscope in Korea stated that it was too heavy and cumbersome, its usefulness was limited by its range, and the life of its battery was too short. With these and other comments in mind, the Army continued its research and development in this field.

As a result, the infrared weapons sight was developed and adopted to replace the sniperscope. This instrument, designed as a night-firing sight for the M-14 rifle, is capable of being mounted on other weapons, such as the M-60 machinegun and the 106 recoilless rifle. The sight weighs 19 pounds, as compared to the 32 pounds of the sniperscope. The range of the set, still classified, has been greatly increased over that of the sniperscope. There will be 10 sets in headquarters company of the ROAD battalion.

The infrared weapons sight functions in the same manner as the sniperscope and consists basically of the same components. It has an infrared light source, an electronic telescope, and a power supply. Major changes, which resulted in the weight reduction, were made in the power supply. The current for the light source is a lightweight, nickle-cadmium battery that is carried in a canvas case and worn on the operator's belt. With continuous operation of the light source, the life of the battery is from 4 to 6 hours. The power supply for the electronic tube is an integral part of the telescope and consists of a 1½-volt battery and a transistorized transformer circuit. These changes have eliminated the 19-pound power supply that the sniperscope operator had to carry on his back.

Using the infrared light source, both the sniperscope and the infrared weapons sight can signal friendly units. A reconnaissance patrol in Korea, during an extremely dark night, became lost while attempting to locate a friendly outpost several hundred meters in front of its lines. Radio contact was established between the two units, but this was of no value in uniting them. Neither could shout because of enemy patrols in the area. After spending 30 minutes in a futile effort to make contact, the outpost members decided to turn their sniperscopes on. The reconnaissance patrol, using its set, was able to detect the beam of infrared radiation and guide in on the beam. Soon the patrol joined the outpost.

The infrared light source can also guide units during a night attack or withdrawal and assemble small units in a jump area after a night airborne assault. The sniperscope light source is visible to a range of 4 kilometers, while that of the weapons sight can be seen at even greater distances.

The electronic telescope can be used to detect the enemy's use of infrared radiation. Conversely, the enemy can detect our use. To overcome this disadvantage, there has been developed the low-light-level image intensification system. Rather than relying on artificial illumination, this system uses the natural light radiated by the night sky. The image intensifier magnifies the very-low-level light reflected by the target so that a visible image is presented to the operator. Since it does not use an artificial light source, the equipment cannot be detected.

The primary disadvantage of the image intensifier system is that natural illumination varies greatly from one night to the next, causing the effective range to vary, also. Under moonlight conditions, the range of a particular scope might be 2,000 meters, but under overcast skies the range might be 500 meters. This disadvantage is not considered to outweigh the advantage of being nondetectable.

Army Engineers are now developing a small starlight scope using the image intensifier system. This scope, 7 inches long and weighing 3 pounds, will be used as a weapon sight for individual weapons and will have a range of 300 meters. Another device under development is image intensifier goggles which will have a range of approximately 200 meters under starlight conditions. When worn by the soldier, these goggles will permit him to fight, move, observe, and work at night with an efficiency normal only to daylight hours. With the exception of signaling, this type of equipment can be put to the same uses as the sniperscope and the infrared weapons sight.

Now is the time to remove night vision equipment from the supply room shelves, brush away dust, and integrate it in unit training. Properly trained and equipped, the combat infantryman will fear not the night, for no longer can the enemy move unseen under its protection.

Hales Corners, Crossroads for Thousands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the February 11 issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel concerning Hales Corners, Wis., a village in my congressional district. This is another in a series of articles written by William Janz tracing the history and progress of communities in the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

The village of Hales Corners has a long and colorful history. Located at the intersection of three major highways southwest of Milwaukee, the community grew prosperous by providing services to the traffic which streamed through its borders. In frontier days, Hales Corners was an overnight stopping place for the wagon trains and stagecoaches going to and from the city.

In recent years, however, the advent of the automobile brought the community within easy driving distance of the industrial complexes of Milwaukee and West Allis. The village gradually took on a suburban character. When it incorporated in 1952, the community had a population of 1,382. Today, after a decade of constant growth, it has 6,300 residents.

My own association with the citizens of Hales Corners has been a long and pleasant one. They have a commendable community pride and a fine community of which to be proud. In order to further acquaint the House with the accomplishments of Hales Corners, I call to the attention of my colleagues, the following article:

HALES CORNERS STRESSES CROSSROADS COMFORTS

(By William Janz)

Hales Corners began as a crossroads community.

The settlement was first known as Hale's Corners but somewhere in the colorful past of the village the apostrophe was lost.

A New Englander named William Hale settled in the area in 1837 and built a tavern and hotel for Milwaukee travelers. The place was naturally called Hale's Corners.

The apostrophe was assigned to history long ago, along with the tavern, the hotel and Mr. Hale. But the crossroads remain.

The highways in the village make Hales Corners an unusual residential community. Each day thousands more pass through the village than live there, just as travelers did in pioneer days.

The heavy traffic on Highways 100, 45, and 24 cuts into the very heart of the village, yet surprisingly does not disturb its primarily residential character.

Hales Corners has skillfully used the traffic to its own advantage, somewhat like Mr. Hale must have done 125 years ago when he tapped the bung of his first barrel for thirsty travelers.

Access is easy to the village's central shopping area built along the highways. Not

only residents, but travelers stop to shop, along with neighbors from near-by communities.

Most homes are set back from the whir of this world. For those driving home to Hales Corners there is the noise of traffic, the flat concrete streaked by black rubber, a simple turn onto West Denis Avenue or into Hale Park subdivision. Then there is grass and quiet.

"The word 'sidewalk' is frowned upon in Hales Corners," Paul Steinert, former mayor of Waukesha and now village commissioner-clerk, said. "Sidewalks are strictly for the business district."

This attitude has helped convert the village from a small business community into a growing residential suburb.

Though the village wasn't incorporated until 1952, and the demand for suburban housing has since then changed the status of the village, Hales Corners had a long and interesting history before it ever saw its first suburbanite.

Wagon trains and stagecoaches heading toward Milwaukee or just back from the city used to stop overnight in Hales Corners.

The village was an agricultural center. For nearly 100 years, farmers came into Hales Corners each month to buy and exchange goods. These colorful village farmers' fairs ended in 1958.

The fairs had gone on for decades, "unhampered by organization, agreement, or theory," one reporter wrote. "The farmers just came in and the village was theirs. What was sold ranged from potatoes to house dresses to snakes."

According to a June 8, 1939 news story, "drawing a crowd of lean farmers with unbelieving eyes was the snake man, his wares writhing around his neck and creeping inside his shirt. 'Cleaner they are,' he said, 'than birds or cats; much more sanitary, for they have no fur or feathers to shed. * * *'"

The fairs began in the 1860's and were essentially a farmer's market, though later fairs sometimes included Chicago merchants. Some of these men would drive in at dawn on fair day with a load of secondhand vacuum cleaners.

The village was agricultural until well after the invention of the automobile enabled workers in Milwaukee and West Allis to reach open spaces on the county's outskirts.

When the village incorporated in 1952, after an exhaustive study, it had a population of 1,382. Today it has 6,300. A study committee headed by Walter J. Fehr, the first and present village president, recommended incorporating a part of the town of Greenfield.

"We felt a town government was outdated," Fehr said. "There was very indication that towns were dying and we could provide better services for a small area."

Hales Corners leaders chose an area for which they know they could finance services as it developed.

There is a lot of open space in the village, room for both residential and commercial expansion for a future population of 12,000. The village presently has no manufacturing industry, Fehr said, but an area is zoned for it.

"There is quite a bit of optimism about the village," he said. "Village taxes have been held down and we think we can hold them down in the future."

Steinert estimated that 90 percent of the village residents were newcomers who had come out "looking for a place for the children to roam and run with freedom of space and the environment of a small community."

The found this at the crossroads of fast highways, as Hale's travelers did in the 1800's.

Listen to George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow being the birthday of the Father of our Country, I take great pleasure in submitting for the RECORD an excellent article from the March 1963 edition of the Christopher News Notes which is edited by the Reverend Father James Keller, M.M., director of the Christophers, with offices in New York City.

The article follows:

LISTEN TO GEORGE WASHINGTON

When George Washington took the oath as first President of the United States on April 30, 1789, he spontaneously added this four-word prayer of his own: "So help me God,"[1] an invocation still used in official oaths by those taking public office, in courts of justice, and in other legal proceedings.

In the first part of his inaugural address,[2] immediately following the oath, Washington reverently acknowledged our country's dependence on Almighty God:

"It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe—who presides in the council of nations—and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States, a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes."

Seven and a half years later, on September 19, 1796, Washington gave his memorable Farewell Address.[3] In it, he gave public testimony to the importance of "religion and morality" in the conduct of good government: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morally are indispensable supports."

Then in his next sentence he questioned the patriotism of those who would banish religious truth from public affairs:

"In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the destinies of men and citizens."

Continuing in the same vein, Washington maintained that we would endanger the very security and survival of our Nation if we forgot, ignored, or failed to teach the intimate connection between religion and morality:

"Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligations desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.

"Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

LEARN FROM GEORGE WASHINGTON

Few Americans realize how clearly and repeatedly George Washington insisted that our freedom as a nation has its origin in God and will endure only so long as this basic truth is recognized and cherished.

In this limited space, it is possible to cite only a few of the hundreds of expressions of faith made by Washington as a public official. But may these few encourage you to search out more of Washington's words for yourself, as well as to emulate him in blending spiritual and moral values into every facet of American life, e.g.—

1. Take steps to see that the fullness of our patriotic and spiritual heritage is taught in every classroom. Protect every American's "right to know" the words and deeds of great men like Washington. To deprive students of this knowledge is to shortchange them of what is rightfully theirs.

2. Note that Washington's concept of separation of church and state was a healthy, balanced one. While no church was to dominate the state, our dependence on God must be duly recognized, not only privately, but in government and school life as well. It was farthest from his mind that the agnosticism or atheism of a small minority be imposed on the great majority.

3. Champion with vigor and perseverance the profound truth explicitly inscribed in the Declaration of Independence: "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." This was recently reaffirmed by Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark when he wrote in This Week magazine, December 23, 1962: "The Founding Fathers believed devoutly that there was a God and that the unalienable rights of man were rooted—not in the state, nor the legislature, nor in any other human power—but in God alone."

The following expressions of Washington's faith, garnered from his various writings, diaries, and private papers, speak for themselves.

1. FAITH IN THE MIDST OF HARDSHIPS

On June 20, 1775, Washington was commissioned by the First Continental Congress to be commander in chief of the Colonial Army. As was to be the case again and again, he was regarded as the only one who could unite the varied and conflicting interests that threatened the common cause.

Gradually he formed a reasonably disciplined army and after success in Boston, led his troops to hold the strategic areas around New York. Though he was to lose the battle of Long Island, a month later (and just before Congress approved the Declaration of Independence) Washington addressed his troops:

"The time is now near at hand which must probably determine, whether Americans are to be, freemen or slaves; whether they are to have any property they can call their own * * * The fact of unborn millions will now depend, under God, on the courage and conduct of this army * * * Let us therefore rely on the goodness of the cause and the aid of the Supreme Being, in whose hands victory is, to animate and encourage us to great and noble actions."[4]

2. WASHINGTON'S ORDER REGARDING CHAPLAINS

Just 7 days later, on July 9, 1776, Washington implemented the instructions of Congress that the men in his army be provided with spiritual assistance. He issued this order:

'The honorable Continental Congress having been pleased to allow a chaplain to each regiment * * * commanding officers of each regiment are directed to procure chaplains accordingly; persons of good character and exemplary lives—to see that all inferior officers and soliders pay them a suitable respect and attend carefully upon religious exercises. The blessing and protection of Heaven are at all times necessary, but especially so in times of public danger."[5]

Footnotes at end of speech.

3. GRATITUDE DESPITE CALAMITIES

For the next 18 months, reverses, misfortunes, and trials plagued the Commander in Chief. These culminated in the almost unbearable winter at Valley Forge, and defeat at the Battle of Monmouth. Yet his faith and perseverance remained unshaken. In a letter to General Nelson, written on August 20, 1778, he said:

"Providence has been so conspicuous in all this, that he must be worse than an infidel that lacks faith, and more than wicked, that has not gratitude enough to acknowledge his obligations." [6]

4. HUMILITY IN VICTORY

Washington's hope amid defeat was paralleled by his gratitude and humility in success. After the decisive victory at Yorktown, Va., October 19, 1781, he wrote a friend in Connecticut:

"To the great Ruler of Events and not to any service of mine, I ascribe the termination of our contest for liberty. I never considered the fortunate issue of any measure adopted by me in the progress of the Revolution in any other light than as the ordering of divine providence." [7]

5. TRUST DESPITE ALL

Between the cessation of hostilities and the signing of the formal peace treaty, Washington again faced formidable problems. As he pleaded for money to pay and muster out the army, he became seriously disturbed about the weakness of the government then existing under the Articles of Confederation. From his quarters at Newburgh, N.Y., on July 10, 1783, he wrote to his old friend, George Fairfax, then residing in England:

"I unite my prayers most fervently with yours, for wisdom to these United States and have no doubt, after a little while all errors in the present form of government will be corrected * * * but like young heirs come a little prematurely perhaps to a large inheritance it is more than probable they will riot for a while; but * * * this, if it should happen, will work its own cure, as there is virtue at the bottom." [8]

6. RESIGNING HIS COMMISSION

The peace treaty with England was signed on September 3, 1783. A few months later, Washington resigned the commission he had held for 8 years. At noon on December 23, he appeared before Congress and, thinking his years of public service had at last come to an end, he addressed the assembled Members:

"I consider it an indispensable duty to close this last solemn act of my official life, by commending the interests of our dearest country to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendence of them, to His holy keeping." [9]

7. HOME AT LAST

The conditions Washington found when he returned to Mount Vernon were far from ideal. The farm was no longer on a paying basis, and he owed money for taxes. But despite such problems, he was glad to be home. In 1784 he wrote General Knox:

"I feel now, however, as I conceive a weary traveler must do, who, after treading many a painful step, with a heavy burden on his shoulders, is eased of the latter, having reached the goal to which all the former were directed, and from his housetop is looking back, and tracing, with a grateful eye the meanders by which he escaped the quicksands and mires which lay in his way; and into which none but the all-powerful Guide, and Great Disposer of human events, could have prevented his falling." [10]

8. CALLED BACK TO DUTY

Life gradually resumed its normal course at Mount Vernon but, much as he wished it, Washington was not to remain a private citizen. When Congress voted to revise the Articles of Confederation, he departed for Philadelphia and the Constitutional Convention.

The problems were many and difficult. Debt was rampant and foreign creditors were pressing for payment. The large and small States had conflicting interests, as did the industrial North and agricultural South. Washington was considered to be the only man who could guide these diverse interests to a harmonious outcome. The 4 months he served as president of the Convention were bleak, but he tried to keep the delegates aware of the tremendous issues at stake. In one of the two speeches he made, he ended with this wise counsel:

"If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God." [11]

9. UNFLAGGING DEVOTION TO PRINCIPLE

In September of 1787, the new Constitution was presented to the Continental Congress, which in turn recommended that it be submitted to the State legislatures for ratification. For months on end, Washington continued to work day and night for its adoption. He recognized that it was the only way in which the Union could be established on a lasting basis. He wrote Lafayette in France, on May 28, 1788:

"Should everything proceed with harmony and consent according to our actual wishes and expectations; I will confess to you sincerely * * * it will demonstrate as visibly the finger of providence, as any possible event in the course of human affairs can ever designate it." [12]

10. AGAIN HE SACRIFICES HIMSELF

When New Hampshire became the ninth and last State necessary to ratify the Constitution in June 1788, the country once again turned to George Washington, asking him to fill the Chief Executive office provided for under the new government. He was far from eager for the job. He had spent the greater part of his life in public service. His health was not of the best and his finances were in poor condition. (As it turned out, he had to borrow more than $2,000 before going to his inauguration). He was also convinced of his own unworthiness for the job. On August 16, 1788, he wrote Charles Pettit:

"The great searcher of human hearts is my witness, that I have no wish, which aspires beyond the humble and happy lot of living and dying a private citizen on my own farm." [13]

11. IMPARTIAL ADVOCATE OF RELIGION

In January and February of 1789, the electoral college voted and on April 6 Congress met in New York to count the ballots officially. They were unanimous. Two days later Washington once more left Mount Vernon for public life.

A month after his inauguration, Washington avowed his impartial support of "vital religion." Addressing the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in New York City on May 29, 1789, he said:

"I trust the people of every denomination, who demean themselves as good citizens, will have occasion to be convinced, that I shall always strive to prove a faithful and impartial patron of genuine, vital religion." [14]

12. NATIONAL THANKSGIVING DAY

As the first President, Washington was aware that his actions could well become precedents. On October 3, 1789, he proclaimed a national Thanksgiving Day. This was the beginning of a long series of similar Executive orders that have remained part of American life down to the present:

"Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor, and whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint committee requested me to 'commend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness,' now, therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday, the 26th day of November next, to be devoted to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is, or will be." (Ibid., vol. 30, p. 427.)

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Douglas Freeman, "George Washington," vol. 6, p. 192.
[2] "World's Greatest Speeches," (Copeland and Lamm) p. 245.
[3] Ibid., pp. 254–255.
[4] "The Writings of George Washington," (ed. John C. Fitzpatrick) vol. 5, p. 210.
[5] Ibid., vol. 5, p. 244.
[6] Ibid., vol. 12, p. 343.
[7] Joseph Buffington, "The Soul of George Washington," p. 117.
[8] "Writings," op cit., vol. 27, pp. 57–58.
[9] Ibid., vol. 27, p. 285.
[10] Ibid., vol. 27, p. 340.
[11] Freeman, op. cit., vol. 6, p. 98.
[12] Writings, op. cit., vol. 29, p. 506.
[13] Ibid., vol. 30, p. 42.
[14] Ibid., vol. 30, p. 339n.

The Richmond (Va.) Council of the Navy League of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the Richmond (Va.) Council of the Navy League of the United States has been selected as the council of the month for February by the league's official publication, Navy, a magazine of seapower. The Richmond council has done much in my congressional district to promote interest in the work of the Navy and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the recognition given to the organization by the magazine in an article written by Mr. George C. Gilman, executive assistant to the national president of the Navy League:

The Richmond, Va., council, organized in January 1958 with 20 charter members, has had a rapid growth and its present membership totals nearly 500.

During the current fiscal year the council has been in the top 10 for new members every month and, with 170 new members on the rolls since April, its record is bettered only by Chicago and New York. Proud Richmond council members are quick to point out that Richmond's city population is under 300,000 and that the only naval activity in the area is a naval training center.

State President Jacob M. Viener, the man who first suggested forming a council in Richmond in 1957 and who teamed with Judge Moscoe W. Huntley to set it in motion, cites the remarkable espirit de corps which has been shown in the activities and interests of the council members. Very few dropouts have been noted and 95 percent

of the founding members are still active.

Council President Richard A. Velz feels that the organization represents the top caliber individuals in the business and professional life of the city. He also credits the unusual programing of the council as a factor in its growth and continued interest for members.

A feature of the programs has been an annual meeting held at some defense installation in Virginia each spring. The council does not always meet at naval installations. Last year's gathering at Fort Lee, with VIP treatment by the Army and a memorable tour of the complex electronic Washington Area Defense Sector Command, is an example of that type of defense orientation. At Fort Lee, the commanding general turned the Officers Club into a "ship" for the evening reception and dinner, with an Army band playing Navy songs and added touches, such as renaming the floors "decks" to make the Navy feel at home.

Next April the entire council will board a special train, arranged by Navy Leaguer and R.F. & P. President Stuart Shumate, for a VIP tour of Marine facilities at Quantico as guests of the Commandant, MCS. Two years ago the council toured the Naval Weapons Station at Yorktown.

Each year the council schedules its Navy Day program as a joint affair with one of the Richmond civic clubs. Last October, the luncheon was held in conjunction with the Rotary Club and more than 500 attended. A night-before-cancellation of the announced speaker, Navy Secretary Fred Korth, occasioned by the Cuban crisis, called for a quick switch and the District Commandant, Rear Adm. W. F. Petersen, U.S. Navy, rushed to Richmond to address the group.

One of the features of the Navy Day luncheon is the announcement of the award to Richmond's distinguished enlisted reservist of the year and this honor is eagerly sought after by members of Richmond's Reserve units.

An annual event is a cruise down the James River on a destroyer escort with briefings and a tour of the Naval Base at Norfolk, a reception and dinner at the Officers Club. Ninety-three Richmonders made the fall cruise this year, braving high winds and pouring rain, but riding out the storm like old salts.

Another probable annual event has just been inaugurated and this is a council trip to Philadelphia to attend the Army-Navy game. Two railroad cars of Richmond council members, wives, and teenagers, left Richmond at 5:10 a.m., enjoyed refreshments and catered luncheons, cheered Navy to victory, and came back to Richmond at 11 p.m., tired, but unanimous in their desire to repeat, and enlarge, the trip and the delegation in 1963.

The Richmond council has participated in the shipmate program and has an active high-line committee headed by Capt. Joseph Maher. Last year the council took over a local theater for a special performance of "Mister Roberts," preceded by a reception and dinner. More than 400 attended the Navy ball last fall to salute Navy Day and honor naval reservists. The league has also assisted in local Navy projects such as the 50th anniversary of naval aviation and the Waves reunion. They stand ready to assist Navy recruiters; ComFive's special representative in Richmond, Capt. William Thomas, and the naval reserve program at all times. A committee, headed by Capt. B. L. Britton, is now working to seek means of encouraging the Naval Reserve program in Richmond.

One of the top projects of the Richmond council has been support of the Richmond Reserve ship, U.S.S. *Loeser* (DE 680) and special programs were arranged, with suitable publicity, to mark both the callup and the return of the ship during the Berlin cold war callup. State, city, and league officials took part in these ceremonies.

At present the Richmond council is investigating the potential of a Sea Cadet program for Richmond and a committee is working on this possibility. The council expects to have a large delegation at the San Juan convention this spring.

Past presidents of the Richmond council since its founding are: Alex W. Parker, Jacob M. Viener, and Lamont S. Bryan. Past vice presidents include another Richmond council "sparkplug," John Moyler, Jr.

Present Officers are: president, Richard A. Velz; vice presidents, P. Henry Poehler, Edward M. Davis, III, and Austin Brockenbrough; secretary, Heros A. Pohlig; treasurer, Jack N. Herod; judge advocate, William S. Cudlipp, Jr.; chaplain, James W. Clarke, and marine affairs chairman, Robert N. Fricke.

Richmond's council is proud of their past record but they are aiming for continued growth and dedicated to building an ever-widening image of the modern Navy and its part in the defense structure of our Nation. Their desire is to be known as the "doingest council" of the league.

MATS To Require CRAF To Furnish Turbine Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the announcements by the Department of the Air Force this past week with respect to their policies of civil airlift procurement.

During the last session of the 86th Congress, while chairman of a Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift of the Committee on Armed Services, we held extensive hearings on the subject of the military airlift posture with particular emphasis on the participation of the civil airlines. As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee made certain recommendations, among them that civil augmentation airlift be obtained from those carriers whose aircraft were committed to the CRAF program; that participating carriers be contractually committed to partial mobilization of CRAF by the Secretary of Defense when required short of a national emergency; that carriers holding airlift contracts be required to execute agreements with their employees guaranteeing no work stoppages on civil augmentation airlift contracts; and finally, to have or to be firmly obligated to procure modern, long-range, turbine-powered convertible aircraft.

I am happy to note from the policy announcement last week, and from information as to the nature of the contracts which have been entered into between the Air Force and civil airlines, that these recommended objectives are being met. Furthermore, the utilization of 3-year contracts, as proposed by the subcommittee, has stabilized civil airlift procurement and made it possible to attain these objectives. I was further pleased to note in the policy announcement that the Air Force plans, in evaluating future contracts, to take into account the amount of commercial business performed by each carrier in order that we not have carriers dependent upon military contracts. Thus, for our airlift dollars, we are not merely getting economical transportation, but we are acquiring long-range cargo aircraft in our reserve inventory, we are assisting in the promotion of a stabilized industry, able to support itself in time of peace without cost to the Government, but providing a responsive, useful reserve in times of national emergency requirements.

I particularly want to express my appreciation to the Honorable Edward J. Driscoll, Deputy for Transportation and Communications in the Department of the Air Force, for keeping me informed of developments in this matter.

Following is the text of the announcements from the Department of the Air Force:

MATS To Use Turbine-Powered Aircraft for Commercial Airlift Augmentation

New policies governing procurement of international and oversea commercial airlift in support of the Military Air Transport Service beginning with fiscal year 1964 were announced today.

In brief the policies for fiscal year 1964 and beyond are:

(a) Turbine-powered equipment will be used exclusively for MATS movements, except in those areas where it may not be economically or operationally feasible.

(b) Civil carriers will be utilized in their normal area of operation within the policies established by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The only exception from this will be in the event of military necessity.

(c) The fiscal year 1964 procurement will be accomplished by exercising the options for those carriers who have met all terms and conditions of their contracts.

(d) New carriers will not be solicited unless the exercise of options in existing contracts fails to give adequate coverage of requirements.

(e) Carriers either having or hopeful of securing military business are advised that military requirements alone will not support additional acquisition of turbine-powered equipment. Consequently, further augmentation of their fleets should be on the basis of civil sales. This is essential in order to provide adequate expansion in time of an airlife emergency.

(f) In the fiscal year 1965 and subsequent procurements of airlift, awards will take into consideration the success of carriers in expanding their civil business.

These policies are an adjunct to existing ones which were inaugurated in 1961 covering fiscal year 1962 procurements.

The procurement policies are designed to efficiently accomplish the MATS mission and to aid in strengthening the air transportation industry. During the past 2 years the air transportation industry has obtained substantial quantities of turbine-powered equipment. These have been made available, under contractual commitments, to the military for normal peacetime as well as emergency transportation.

Currently there are 13 carriers providing augmentation to MATS. These are composed of three classes: international route carriers, supplemental carriers, and domestic all-cargo carriers. These carriers have a 3-year commitment comprised of a 1-year firm contract with two successive 1-year options. The third year, scheduled to begin in fiscal year 1964, will complete the 3-year cycle.

Before You Decide on Signup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1963 issue of Doane's magazine there is an article entitled "Before You Decide on Signup." This clearly and concisely explains the important factors involved in the present wheat and feed grains programs. I wish to insert the article in its entirety for the benefit of our colleagues:

BEFORE YOU DECIDE ON SIGNUP

It's time to sign up for the 1963 feed grain and spring wheat programs (deadline is March 22). Changes from last year's feed grain program seem to make signup this year more advantageous and profitable at the minimum 20-percent diversion level—less profitable at the maximum 40-percent level.

Wheatgrowers have already revealed their attitude toward the voluntary program offered to them this year. Only 5.2 million acres were diverted in the Winter wheat areas where signup closed December 14. This compares to 11.2 million acres taken out of production under last year's mandatory 10-percent diversion.

One big change in this year's programs which affects the comparisons with last year—growers must divert all that they sign to divert or lose eligibility for loan. USDA now estimates that 20 to 30 percent of last year's 11.2 million acre wheat signup figure was never actually diverted.

Doane economists look for a small increase in corn acreage this year. More corn producers may find it profitable to go into the program at the minimum 20-percent level, but the resulting acreage reduction will be offset by less participation than last year at higher levels. Milo production may be up too, but acreage is expected to remain about stable.

After harvest this year the Government won't sell certificate corn out of CCC storage for less than the national average support price of $1.07 plus storage. Surplus feed grains can't be sold "at the market" as they were the past 2 years, thus the price of corn should remain near loan level throughout the season. The same is true of milo which has an average support of $1.17 per hundredweight. Barley supported at 82 cents per bushel is expected to sell above loan in most western grain deficit areas.

PAYMENT IN KIND A BIG ATTRACTION

Diversion of 20 percent of feed grain base will be profitable to some growers because it qualifies them for the payment in kind which amounts to 18 cents per bushel of corn produced up to their normal yield. The payment in kind on grain sorghum is 29 cents per hundredweight; and on barley, 14 cents per bushel. This is considerably more important to producers than the relatively low acreage diversion payment which they also receive.

The second 20 percent acreage diversion is less profitable, however. By taking this additional land out of production, you save production expenses, but you forfeit the 18 cents per bushel payment in kind which would have been received for the normal yield on this portion of your diverted acres. The loss of payment in kind more than offsets the diversion payment, and your return per bushel or normal yield on all acreage diverted is only about 67 cents. The example at left shows this clearly.

The gross returns from compliance and noncompliance will vary with different yields and production costs. Higher costs and/or lower yields than shown in the example make compliance more desirable. However, producers with significantly lower production costs may be better off to stay out of the program and produce as much corn as possible.

If you variable production costs were only $20 per acre, in contrast to $30 in the example, and diversion maintenance cost was $7 per acre instead of $9, the profit advantage from diversion is canceled out. You would save $400 in production costs by going into the program at the 20-percent level, but would spend $140 on maintenance of the 20 acres of diverted land. This would leave a gross return of $9,613, slightly less than the $9,630 gross return from noncompliance.

It may be best to stay out of the program entirely if your yield index is well below your current yields or those you expect this year. In some cases an index can be adjusted upward if it is too far out of line, but a difference of 20 bushels between the index and actual yield can also reverse the outcome of the example.

For instance, the noncomplier with an actual yield of 105 bushels per acre could expect a gross return of $11,235 (100 acres times 105 bushels times $1.07).

Here's how the minimum complier would fare:

80 acres times 105 bushels times $1.07	$8,988
80 acres times 85 bushels times 18 cents	1,224
20 acres times 85 bushels times ($1.25 divided by 5)	425
Production costs saved (20 acres times $30)	600
Total	11,237
Diverted land maintenance cost	180
Gross return	11,057

If you produce only a small acreage of feed grains—25 acres or less—you can idle the entire acreage and receive a diversion payment equal to 50 percent of the value of your normal yield.

By using the same example as before but reducing the production base to 25 acres, the noncomplier would realize a gross return of $2,408 for sale of his corn crop. The minimum complier who diverted 5 acres would have a gross return of $2,443, while the maximum complier who diverted the entire acreage would have a gross income of only $1,853.

On paper, it looks like the minimum 20-percent diversion is best, but there are several factors other than gross return to consider. Reducing an already small acreage by 20 percent may be impractical. The remaining acreage and the small volume of grain produced might not be worth the effort of producing and handling. At this point, inefficiencies in use of machinery and labor are likely to develop and bin space might be wasted.

Your better choice may be between full production and diversion of the total acreage. Of the gross return from total diversion, $1,328 represents direct payments from the Government and the remaining $525 is savings on production expenses. These represent certain income and savings that you would not have by producing the crop. This income insurance is an important factor to consider, regardless of your acreage, or which alternative seems most profitable now, before the crop is even planted.

For $550 less return, the maximum complier has this insurance. He also may have the opportunity to sell machinery, or delay purchasing new, and labor can be concentrated on other enterprises.

OFFERS TO LIVESTOCK MAN

The livestock feeder has more leeway under this year's program, and it holds quite a bit of promise for him. The payment in kind probably will mean more to him than the diversion payment, so he'll most often be interested in only the 20-percent diversion, even if he is set up to feed all the grain he produces. Based on the example given earlier, he will realize about 92 cents per bushel for the grain he does not produce up to his normal yield (payment in kind plus diversion payment divided by actual yield per acre). If he can buy the additional grain he needs for $1.07 as forecast, then he is actually getting it for 15 cents per bushel. In most cases this is considerably less than his variable production costs would have been.

The alternatives, as they have been compared here for corn, rank about the same for grain sorghum and barley producers. Two differences in the production and marketing pictures for these crops might influence producers' decisions, however.

One is the risk involved. Corn yields are considered more stable on the average than are milo yields, and especially barley yields. Thus there is a greater chance of low barley and milo yields which might make maximum compliance more attractive as a form of income insurance.

Also, barley prices are not as likely to be influenced by the loan level or CCC sales of surplus grain as are corn and milo. Use of a barley market price equal to the loan level for comparing programs would probably be inaccurate. Barley, especially in the Northwest and West, is likely to sell above the loan level at sometime during the crop year.

Whether or not the diversion program looks attractive to you this year from a strictly economical standpoint, the USDA has attempted to make compliance more convenient for 1963.

All the corn, milo or barley you grow this year is eligible for loan, not just production up to the normal yield, as was the case in 1962. This should eliminate the problem many farmers faced last year of having to seal up their "overrun" when it was stored in the same bin with the loan corn.

Another advantage to this year's program is the freedom producers have to dispose of their grain as they see fit, while still drawing the diversion and payment in kind. It's an advantage to the livestock feeder who can go into the program, draw his diversion payment and his payment in kind, then go ahead and feed his grain. Or any grower can sell the grain on the open market if the cash price is above the loan level, or he doesn't want to be troubled with putting his grain under loan.

INSURES AVERAGE WHEAT YIELD

There seems to be little advantage to going into the diversion program with spring wheat unless you are in a high risk area, or have a 10-acre or lower allotment and want to go out of wheat production. Analysis of the fall wheat signup by States shows that higher risk areas, especially those that had poor crops last year, had heavier signup this year than areas where growers are more certain of their yields.

If you expect something less than your normal yield this year, you may be better off to divert at least 20 percent of your allotment. This will depend on your production costs. Doane economists figure the grower with a 30-bushel-per-acre assigned normal yield and $10 per acre production costs would have little to gain from the program except insurance against a below-average yield.

If his actual yield this year turns out to be below 26¾ bushels per acre, he would be ahead to have diverted the maximum 50 percent of his acreage. If his crop yields anywhere between 26¾ and 30½ bushels per acre, 20 percent diversion would be most

profitable. With a yield of 80½ bushels or more, seeding the full allotment figures out best.

Using the same formula for a situation where the grower has a small allotment, compliance looks even less desirable than it does for larger acreages. Yield would have to drop to less than 15½ bushels for diversion to pay where the allotment is 15 acres or less.

These calculations are based on variable production costs. Fixed costs; interest, machinery depreciation, taxes, etc., go on whether wheat is grown or not. No consideration is given to such factors as reduced use of machinery and bins when acreage is cut, or any other advantages or disadvantages an individual producer may encounter by lowering his crop acreage.

Last year the USDA cracked down on the irregular arrangements that some landlords and tenants had worked out to share diversion payments from wheatland. A similar tightening of regulations is expected in the feed grain diversion program this year.

Unless there is a good reason for doing otherwise, the diversion payment should be split in the same way a crop produced on the land would be divided. This may change the outcome of the examples used in this discussion, especially where the proportion of fixed and variable costs charged to the landlord and tenant is not equal. Normally, land diversion has been less desirable for the landlord than for the tenant, because of the greater proportion of fixed costs carried by the landlord.

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM EXAMPLE

Here is a comparison of noncompliance, compliance at the 20-percent level, and compliance at the 40-percent level for corn production in the Midwest. If you know your variable production costs (labor, fuel, seed, fertilizer, etc.) you can use this method to determine the most profitable use of the feed grain program on your own land.

Assume you have: corn production base of 100 acres, yield index of 85 bushels per acre, actual 1963 yield of 90 bushels per acre, support price of $1.25 ($1.07 loan plus 18 cents payment in kind), free market price of $1.07, $30 per acre variable production costs, and $9 per acre maintenance cost on diverted land.

Return to noncomplier: 100 acres times 90 bushels times $1.07 equals $9,630.

Return to minimum complier (20-percent diversion):

80 acres times 90 bushels times $1.07	$7,704
80 acres times 85 bushels times 18 cents	1,224
20 acres times 85 bushels times ($1.25 divided by 5)	425
Production costs saved (20 acres times $30)	600
Total	9,953
Diverted land maintenance cost (20 acres times $9)	180
Gross return	9,773

Return to the maximum complier (40-percent diversion):

60 acres times 90 bushels times $1.07	$5,778
60 acres times 85 bushels times 18 cents	918
20 acres times 85 bushels times ($1.25 divided by 5)	425
20 acres times 85 bushels times ($1.25 divided by 2)	1,063
Production costs saved (40 acres times $30)	1,200
Total	9,384
Diverted land maintenance cost (40 acres times $9)	360
Gross return	9,024

Review of Education and Research in Mental Retardation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the House should take up soon specific parts of the President's program for an advance in the national care of mental illness and mental retardation. One piece of legislation that would help is the bill to provide more opportunities to train physicians and dentists, which I have supported, and which has been before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I know the committee is considering a good bill, and I hope the House can take it up and pass it as evidence of their desire to meet this pressing need.

The President stressed the need for mobilization of all our resources in this area, and for greater research and education. In this connection, I should like to draw to the attention of the House an article describing the program for research in these areas in Connecticut, which has done some outstanding work and which has recognized the serious problems which the President described and is doing something about them. I offer it for the RECORD:

REVIEW OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN MENTAL RETARDATION

(By M. Michael Klaber, Ph. D., director of psychological services, Seaside Regional Center)

The professional and lay public is best acquainted with the community and personal services rendered to the retardate and his family by the Office of Mental Retardation. As over 4,000 retarded children and adults are the direct beneficiaries of care, and many more parents and youngsters avail themselves of the home-strengthening services of the office and its grant-supported affiliates, it is not surprising that the important scientific and educational activities of the staff members do not enjoy the same public acknowledgment extended to the service branches of the office. This brief article is an attempt to show the extent of involvement of the residential centers as educational and scientific agencies.

TWO FACTORS IMPORTANT IN PLANNING

Every comprehensive plan of coping with the problem of mental retardation is dependent on two major factors (1) skilled professional personnel, and (2) basic and applied research opening new vistas of treatment and prevention. President Kennedy has recently alerted the Nation to the extent of the problem. We in Connecticut are fortunate in the sound leadership offered by our staff in their relentless efforts to serve the retarded not only through extensive care but by conducting applied research as well as through their educational programs.

GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

From its very inception the Southbury Training School was conceived as a center of professional training. Thus its original plans included modern medical, laboratory, and hospital facilities. The medical director was drawn from the faculty of Yale University School of Medicine.

The earliest graduate training program in medicine established was in the specialty of pediatrics. Herman Yannet, M.D., director of the program, is currently assistant superintendent-medical of the Southbury Training School and holds a faculty appointment in the department of pediatrics at Yale. Pediatric residents have been receiving special training in the diagnostic problems of mental retardation and in the special medical needs presented by children with neurological damage. Through their stay at the training school, they become more attuned not only to their own specialty but to the comprehensive treatment of the retarded in a large multidisciplinary facility.

A somewhat newer training program is offered by the Southbury Training School in psychiatry. Residents from the nearby Fairfield Hospital are receiving first-hand knowledge of emotional disturbance in an intellectually subnormal population. In cooperation with the department of psychology and their own psychiatric supervisors, they have an opportunity to modify behavioral disturbances associated with convulsive disorders and other disturbances of the central nervous system not usually encountered in a psychiatric hospital.

RESEARCH

An important aspect of the popularity of medical residencies in training schools is active interest of the staff members in research problems. In recent years special attention has centered on genetic deficits among mongoloids. W. Roy Breg, M.D., assistant medical director, Southbury Training School, is conducting an extensive research program involving chromosomal translocations among patients affected by mongolism and has extended his investigations to their normal relatives. This latter aspect of the research is of special promise as the possibility of identifying persons who are carriers of the condition may eventually lead to effective preventive measures.

In line with other important public health problems are investigations revolving around ABO blood group incompatibility and its etiological relationship to mental retardation, the management of convulsive disorders in childhood, the relationship between mental age and bone age, and the creation of a meaningful and useful diagnostic classification system. Such a system is an invaluable and vitally needed aid in the treatment of mentally retarded patients. This climate of active medical research has enhanced the popularity of the medical residencies a great deal.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Both the Mansfield Training School and Hospital and the Southbury Training School have been active in training vitally needed professional personnel psychology. Clinical internships have been available in both schools, and students from many universities have availed themselves of the opportunity to study mental retardation within the framework of our modern institutions. Many of these positions were filled by doctoral candidates in clinical psychology. The University of Connecticut has established a close cooperative program with Mansfield and has used the department of psychological services of that facility intensively. The clinical training program is, however, not confined to local universities; students-in-training have come from many major universities in the United States.

A psychological laboratory supported by Federal funds is actively engaged in basic psychological research at Mansfield. Among its major contributions are studies of discrimination learning among moderately retarded children. These investigations are

carried out under the direction of David Zeaman, Ph. D., professor of psychology at the University of Connecticut, by a staff of graduate fellows and students. While the major contributions of this project so far are essentially of value to the specialist, it is hoped that in the future the results will have direct bearing on learning processes of retarded children.

Other projects undertaken by the psychological staffs are directly related to the everyday problems of institutional administration. A punchcard system collating all pertinent data with respect to a given child, including medical, social, and psychological factors, was devised at Southbury. All residents of the training school have been fully assessed, and valuable population data have thus become readily accessible. Attempts at identifying successful and unsuccessful ward personnel have been made at both schools, and a number of graduate students have completed projects relating to mental retardation under the direction of the staff.

TEACHER EDUCATION

Both Mansfield and Southbury have been serving as preferred training centers for local schools of education for many years. The Southern Connecticut State College has held many courses at Southbury, and its students have practice teaching at both institutions. During the past summers the University of Connecticut has conducted workshops for teachers in special classes at Mansfield.

The utilization of the training school facilities is not limited to classroom personnel. At present a number of psychological examiners receive practical experience at Mansfield, and the staff of the Seaside Regional Center has contributed to graduate education of guidance counselors by demonstrating group counseling through one-way vision observation and closed-circuit television demonstrations at the University of Connecticut.

SOME FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

In the past, institutions had relied on the initiative of the staff and had capitalized on their geographical location in establishing mutually beneficial programs with universities. Thus Southbury has been closely associtaied with Yale and Southern Connecticut State College, both in New Haven. Mansfield has worked on a cooperative basis with the nearby University of Connecticut. Research was carried out independently within the confines of each institution and without the cooperation of a central coordinating agency.

With the creation of the Office of Mental Retardation, statewide research acivities will undoubtedly be undertaken in the future. The addition of the large service list of retardates available to this Office should in itself constitute a major research resource. It seems logical that research in mental retardation will follow the trend of the services. The emphasis will shift from intra-institutional population studies to investigation of children receiving services in the community. Moreover, the expansion of facilities to include regional centers will enable the staff of these agencies to reach a larger number of professionals by instituting regional seminars. The educational and research activities are therefore likely to encompass the State as a whole, and thus serve as a model organization serving a greater number of training programs and investigating the problem of mental retardation on the broadest basis.

What About a National Surveyors Week?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate this month, was an outstanding surveyor as a young man. His training as a surveyor, in fact, was viewed by many who knew him as having helped to form the strong base on which he built a career without parallel in the history of freedom.

Not so well known, I am sure, is the fact that Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we also proudly celebrate this month, was a practicing surveyor for a brief period, after he had fought in the Black Hawk War. Lincoln, who has been called "the greatest of our mighty dead," was forced to discontinue surveying and to sell his transit and other equipment through lack of patronage in the sparsely settled area in which he lived at that time.

Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, who marked out the famous Mason and Dixon Line so vital in our early history were, of course, surveyors.

An interesting article "What About a National Surveyors Week?" by Douglas A. McIntosh, himself a land surveyor, appeared in the January 1963 issue of the magazine the National Surveyor, published here in Washington by Larston D. Farrar, a man well known to many of us in Congress. This article points out that surveyors once were high in public esteem, but have not enjoyed as much prestige as members of other professions in recent years. This is not due, as the author makes clear, to any character deficiency in surveyors, or to any failure of the profession to keep pace with the march of technology or the demands of modern methods. The surveyor is more vital than ever—to everyone who buys or sells a home, a lot, a farm, or builds anything larger than a doghouse.

Mr. McIntosh suggests that surveyors have failed to bring their good works to the attention of the public they serve in a way that will reflect credit upon their profession and the thousands of fine individuals who serve in it. He also recommends methods of achieving this goal.

Because of the universal interest in surveying, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this fine article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT ABOUT A NATIONAL SURVEYORS WEEK?

(By Douglas A. McIntosh)

(Would such a promotion help to dignify the public image of the surveyor and how best could it be worked? The National Surveyor presents this thoughtful proposal, from a noted practicing surveyor, as a project for discussion by surveyors in all sections of the Nation. Your comments—for or against—will be welcomed.)

In recent years, surveyors throughout our country have been waging an ever-intensifying battle for higher standards of education and practice. Connected with this is the subject of recognition, by the general public, of the land surveyor and his role in our modern industrial economy. A most useful means of accomplishing this recognition or awareness, I believe, would be through sponsorship of what could be called a National Surveyors Week.

This would be a week officially designated for the publicizing and promotion of surveyors and surveying, giving the public new insight into the vital role our profession plays in modern life. This type of recognition program might be most effective on a national basis, and it would work equally well on a State or regional basis. However, unless the local surveying association is well organized, this type of promotion might not work out as well on a city or county basis, as it would nationally. Many professional groups—including the engineers—have found this form of "advertising" to be both professionally and ethically acceptable and to provide an effective public awareness program.

To set up, organize, and successfully execute a State or national recognition week is a formidable job. It requires the leadership of many persons and the time and effort of many more.

There are five basic media forms which lend themselves to this type of project: first, radio; second, television; third, personal talks and appearances; fourth, printed material; and fifth, newspapers.

Each of these in turn can be broken down into specific items.

Radio: (1) Spot announcements and news items, and (2) forum or panel discussions or other public service projects.

Television: (1) Spot announcements and news items; (2) short filmed presentation between programs; and (3) forum or panel discussions or other public service projects.

Personal talks and appearances: (1) Proclamation or other official announcement by the President, Governors, mayors, or other important public or political personages; (2) invitational meetings, banquets or dinners with a program properly slanted to the purposes; (3) personal discussions and talks by members of the profession at schools, colleges, meetings, etc.; and (4) displays of maps, pictures, various surveying instruments and tools, and other surveying products, results and material in store windows, bank exhibition rooms, public buildings, etc.

Printed material: (1) Booklets, leaflets, or brochures placed in public buildings, banks, schools, colleges, etc.; (2) printing, distribution and usage of stamps for sealing letters; (3) an attempt to have a U.S. postage stamp printed in recognition of the surveyor and Surveyors' Week; (4) the overprinting of National Surveyors' Week or other slogans on envelopes and other mailing covers; and (5) printing, distribution, and usage of posters for display on bulletin boards and the like.

Newspapers: (1) Nationally syndicated news releases; (2) comments on editorial page; (3) state news; (4) local news; (5) local story on hometown surveyors.

This breakdown is by no means complete, but it does list many of the basic methods of

promotion available. Under any circumstances all promotion and promotional materials should be strictly in good taste and always professional in nature.

The financial costs of a national program are not small nor are they staggeringly high. Much of the publicity is practically free for the asking. All that is required is to take advantage of this on a State and local level, under the overall coordination and supervision of a national committee. To be successful this national committee would require the finest cooperation and chain of command that could be mustered.

Whether it be a State or National program, the majority of the cost and time spent, and the resulting benefits occur at the local level. The overall plan, basic ideas and material furnished by a State or National committee will produce no results without local application. It is the kind of project that, if it is going to be done at all, must be done well. A failure would be worse than nothing.

There is no question but that such a project to be successfully completed would require outside help. The arrangements, contacts, artwork, layout, printing, etc., all require both skill and time beyond that available from the average surveyor. One solution to this would be the engaging of a firm whose business is this type of promotion program.

It is, of course, self evident that to accomplish the task of bringing surveying to the public we cannot depend or rely on the work of 1 week and do nothing the other 51. The materials and ideas generated from this Surveyors' Week are easily adapted to everyday use throughout the year.

As in many things, the first one is the hardest and most expensive. Once the mold is made, it then becomes easier and less costly. This applies equally to the promotion of a National Surveyors' Week. Each successive year's promotion follows this same pattern.

It is not uncommon to select a theme or slogan to emphasize or pinpoint a particular item. Each year's theme should be different and be used in a preplanned logical pattern.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool some of the people all of the time and all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." By bringing surveying to the public we are increasing our exposure to more praise and criticism. This, in turn, increases our responsibilities. If we, as surveyors, cannot assume this new status, which we ourselves have created, then we will find that we are caught in the political and economical process of self-made self-extinction. We will have become guilty of trying to fool all of the people all of the time, ourselves included. Status and respect are not self-proclaimed virtues, but are bestowed upon us by others for what we are.

If such a week is to be considered on a national basis, the only organization now capable of this is the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping. At the annual meeting of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping in Washington, D.C., in March, this proposal could be discussed and perhaps a national committee formed to prepare a report as to whether the congress would wish to undertake such a project, and if so, a plan of organization and accomplishment. If they should decide not to undertake the project, this committee report would still be most useful to State or local groups who might wish to consider such a program.

The Birch Society Aim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Anaheim (Calif.) Bulletin, Tuesday, February 12, 1963. This editorial deals with the aims and goals of the John Birch Society and I challenge anyone to refute the statements made in this editorial. The John Birch Society is a target for every Communist-front organization and the so-called liberals who embrace the Communist ideology, if not the conspiracy. The John Birch Society is the most damaging organization to the un-American activities of the Communist conspiracy and its 400 fronts in America.

The editorial follows:

THE BIRCH SOCIETY AIM

Whether on the National, State, county, or local scene, each time that a group of liberals find their intended programs exposed to the public, immediately they put forth the cry that "This is the result of the John Birch Society."

The John Birch Society was founded for the sole purpose of combating communism. A group of dedicated, alarmed individuals saw that the Government was allowing the processes of propagandizing to alter the attitudes of the general public to accept a status of coexistence, tolerance, and actual submission to Russia. They found that pro-Communists had infiltrated the very top echelons of the Federal Government, mainly in the State Department, and that the actions and desires of the elected officials were not effective in controlling the policies of the Nation.

Through the founding of the Birch Society information, plans, strategy, legislation, and those persons responsible for the takeover became known to the general public. Through the medium of information and education the great powerful middle class were made aware of the ultimate designs of this minority group. They found that under the guise of socialism the United States was being transformed into a dictatorial government dedicated to one worldism and federalism that would be dominated by Russian action in such organizations as the United Nations.

Through the society these persons were informed as to effective action that they as individuals could take that would disrupt and destroy the takeover program. They became informed on the extent of the progress of the communism-socialism activities in all phases of life including the programs for churches, schools, city, county, State, and Federal Government. The educational program has proven highly successful in combating the liberal socialist.

It is natural that the liberals would attempt to destroy their enemy and their one main recourse would be to smear, discredit, and destroy the confidences the people were placing in the reports and actions of the John Birch Society.

The Birch Society has grown, its membership increases due to the authenticity of their reports and the continual proving of the intent of the liberal-Socialist-Communists. They have but one purpose, that of repulsing Communist aggression within the Nation and this would include repulsing this danger in any phase or within any facet of life within the Nation.

Regardless of the smears and discrediting, no court or no investigation has found the John Birch Society established for any other reason.

The U.N.: Wrong About Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, atop the editorial columns of Newsday is the following quotation from Proverbs 29: 18.

Where there is no vision, the people perish.

Vision, always clearer in the bright light of the facts, came to Newsday, I am happy to say, in its lead, full-page length editorial of February 19 entitled "The U.N.: Wrong About Cuba."

The editorial follows rather closely, I am also glad to observe, the general outline of facts which I have been providing to Newsday and its readers for a long time.

A stanch defender, nearly always of the United Nations and openly friendly to this administration, Newsday admirably stated in one paragraph of the editorial the undeniable fact that—

The people of the United States are sick of having a foreign base, whether used for espionage, subversion or masked aggression, just 90 miles off their shore. They regard a Communist Cuba as an insult to our national dignity and an armed Cuba as a positive danger.

Well said.

Newsday says that for the United Nations to be spending $1,100,000 on an agricultural research station in Cuba "comes as a slap in the face to the United States."

Again, well said.

Then this:

Thus, once again, and to its own damage, the administration has given substance to the fears expressed—not by confirming suspicions of hidden missiles and aggressive Russian intentions in Cuba—but by indicating that its left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth.

I am unwilling to agree with all of that paragraph, but I certainly do agree that this administration demonstrated—as it does time and again, day after day—that its left hand knoweth not what its right hand doeth.

And, I certainly agree with the obvious answer to the question put by the last sentence of Newsday's editorial. It asks:

Exactly how can we draw Castro's fangs when the U.N. and some of our responsible officers, are willing to go along with so outrageous a grant of funds?

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Newsday for having seen the light in this matter. It is a matter of some pride with me that I have been casting the light of these facts at Long Island and the Nation for a long, long time.

The full text of the Newsday editorial follows with one paragraph deleted under the rules:

THE U.N.: WRONG ABOUT CUBA

This Nation has faithfully supported the United Nations since its inception; in fact, the United States was the creator of the noble concept of a world parliament. When the Russians repeatedly sought to wreck the U.N. it was the United States that forestalled the disaster. We have loaned money to keep it afloat; we have faithfully paid our assessments when Iron Curtain countries have welshed or delayed. In every respect we have displayed our dedication to this organization.

It thus comes as a slap in the face to find the U.N. preparing to spend $1,100,000 on an agricultural research station in Cuba. For Cuba is our enemy, and by its very nature a dedicated enemy of the peaceful purposes for which the U.N. was founded in 1945. The sum of money involved is perhaps trivial, but by providing it the U.N. is lending its prestige to Fidel Castro, who seeks through subversion and violence to alienate all Latin America and to divide in two the Western Hemisphere.

The money is to come from the U.N. Special Fund, to which the U.S. contributes 40 percent of the total annually. The director of this fund is a fine citizen of the United States, Paul G. Hoffman, but in going along with this grant he is acting with the utmost shortsightedness. He defends it on the ground that only foreign currency and no American money as such will be used to carry out the 5-year project. But of course it is the American contributions that permit this subterfuge to be indulged in. And, as might be expected, Cuba has never even met its $55,000 per year commitment to the Special Fund.

The administration has not covered itself with glory in this sequence of events. The President at his press conference last Thursday swallowed and recited the no-American-money excuse. Other sources have explained that this is a voluntary project, and that each country may specify how its contributions are to be used. Congress, including many Democrats, is infuriated and justly so.

House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, rarely makes a public comment, but in this instance he expressed some views with which we agree:

"I feel the action as unwise, particularly in light of the situation that exists."

* * * * *

The people of the United States are sick of having a foreign base, whether used for espionage, subversion, or masked aggression, just 90 miles off their shore. They regard a Communist Cuba as an insult to our national dignity and an armed Cuba as a positive danger.

In fact while the administration was defending the U.N. grant, one of its own spokesmen was warning of violence to come. Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, has told a House subcommittee:

"The Castro regime has shifted the emphasis of its campaign in Latin America to one of open encouragement of terror as a principal weapon." This has been evidenced by the outbreaks within Venezuela, designed to prevent President Romulo Betancourt from visiting the United States—which did not. It had been further underlined by the hijacking of a Venezuelan freighter and its delivery to Brazilian waters. The Venezuelans of course will get the freighter back, but plainly Castro through such tactics hopes to stir up revolutionists in other countries, and so to disrupt Venezuelan life that the Betancourt government will fall.

Under such circumstances, it is essential that the United States sternly remind the U.N. of the things we have done for that agency, and seek the same support we received at the time of the Korean crisis. Then the U.N. was with us; now the U.N. is apparently in the clouds, neglectful of past obligations.

Cuba as a site for IRBM's may have had its teeth drawn, but Cuba still packs a lot of power as a disruptive force in this hemisphere. Exactly how can we draw Castro's fangs when the U.N. and some of our own responsible officers, are willing to go along with so outrageous a grant of funds?

"John and Martha Turnipseed Sez"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the so-called atomic age which seems to imply that we move at a rapid pace in all directions, and in all that we do. While it is well to keep abreast with the changing times, we must not lose the homespun faculty of realizing that it is the little things in life that mean so much. Let us not find that one day a quick pull on our bootstraps will awaken us to the realization that we do not know where we have been. This philosophy is so well expressed in the column "John Turnipseed" of the January 1963, issue of the Prairie Farmer, I commend it for your reading.

The column is as follows:

JOHN NOTES THAT UNCLE SAM'S BOYS ARE GETTING PESTIFEROUS

We Turnipseeds ain't had much to do with the Federal Guv'ment, what with us bein' half-retired an' livin' mostly on what we was able to put away in better times, but it sure seems like Uncle Sam has been pesterin' us in most every mail this past month.

It 'pears like he must hev a million clerks to keep busy, an' they all put in their time tryin' to figger how they kin bother John Q. Citizen. Mebbe they should lissen to the advice of the wise old lady to the new bride: If the time come when you think you got to kill off your husband, get it over with in a hurry, don't peck him to death.

Well, Uncle Sam's boys in Washington is sure peckin'. I don't do much business with our farm co-op these days on account of I don't farm much, so my patronage refund check which come in the mail the other day was jest $17.84. But what do you know. When I cash my check I got to put my social security number on it on account of the Guv'ment is afraid mebbe I will try to cheat.

Now I am an old hand at turnin' the other cheek, so I didn't let it bother me too much, but a few days later I come home from town an' found my wife Martha sputterin' like a drop of water on a hot stove.

It so happens Martha owns a few shares of stock in her own name, jest enuf to make her a small capitalist, but not enuf to make us rich like some people in Washington I could mention. She got a dividend of $25 an' with it come a notice from the company to right away send in her social security number so they kin report her income to the Guv'ment by number. If she ain't got a number, go git one right away.

Turnipseed, Martha sez, glarin' at me like I was responsible, you're a citizen, why don't you do something about this outrageous monkey business.

Them people in Washington, she sez, are gettin' so persnickety about us ordinary folks, purty soon they will insist every last person has got to wear a license number like a car. They will tattoo it on you front and back so they kin ketch you comin' an' goin'. When they got it tattooed on your behind they will pass a law thet you got to go around with your rear bare so it will show, or mebbe it will be bare anyway because they got all your clothes money.

I don't know when I hev seen Martha so mad. The picture in my mind of people runnin' around with a license number tattooed on their rear end was so funny I started to laugh but thet was the wrong thing to do. Instead of arguin' I decided this was a good time to go out an' clean the henhouse.

President Kennedy's Shameless Political Blackjacking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is a great talker about how we must have higher education of our youth. According to yesterday's Washington Evening Star, in a copyrighted article by Joseph Young, it appears that a young citizen today does not need education to get along in this world. He just has to be a Democrat.

The White House has now taken personal control of 10,000 temporary summer jobs for college students and the requirements will not be ability but what political leader's OK the applicant has received.

Since the parents of Republican students pay taxes which supply the salaries of these 10,000 temporary positions and since Republicans will no longer qualify for these positions, I wonder if President Kennedy is going to rebate a portion of the taxes paid by these American citizens.

It is difficult to believe that a President of the United States would do such things.

The article referred to follows:

WHITE HOUSE TO CONTROL STUDENT JOB PATRONAGE

(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student hails, plus the college he is attending (if any), will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure "coordination" in order that the agencies could make best use of the students' talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to pass civil service exams for clerical, typist, and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

It's no secret that a goodly portion of the summer student jobs are filled on a personal patronage basis each year. Government officials—political and career—have hired their own sons and daughters as well as the children of friends or Members of Congress. However, the CSC has been careful to certify only the top qualifiers on the student trainee exam.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

This year a half dozen bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve the same objective.

In discussing the White House job clearance system, Miss Davies said in was a move to channel the best possible talent to the places in Government where it could be used most effectively.

She said that, for example, if an agency finds that its summer job vacancies are all filled up, a place for a bright student could be found in another Government agency through a coordinated placement system set up in the White House.

Miss Davies refused to answer directly whether the program also involved political patronage, other than saying that there always has been some patronage in summer student jobs in Government.

Presumably, students still will have to pass an exam to get the summer jobs.

Last year's Government summer job program for students was given great emphasis by the administration, with President Kennedy and other top Government officials addressing the students.

Betrayal of Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unjust and inequitable problems in this country today is the two-price cotton system under which American cotton is sold to foreign textile producers at a lower price than the same cotton is made available to American textile mills. Foreign-produced textiles are flooding the domestic American market and U.S. textile mills are thrown into an impossible competitive position. Destruction of a once flourishing industry, impoverishment of the communities which depend upon cotton mills, and dispossession of thousands of American workers who look to this industry for a livelihood are the consequences.

Clearly, this problem is created by calculated Federal policies which have attempted to be all things to all people. The wreckage of an industry is being strewen along the way. There can be little doubt that a continuation of two-price cotton will also bring grave retribution upon the cotton farmer—the group the policy was originally developed to help. With the handwriting on the wall so plainly, we must return to a one-price system for American cotton. In the meantime, we must protect an American industry from further erosion resulting from Government policies. The Federal Government must stop attempting to gloss over this bad situation and address itself to the root problem—two-price cotton.

I wish to call to the attention of the Congress an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, February 17, edition of the Daily Independent of Kannapolis, N.C., which discusses this problem in thoughtful detail. The editorial is as follows:

SUAVE NEW FRONTIER SEDUCES AND BETRAYS COTTON INDUSTRY

There's a bale of cotton in the lobby of Cabarrus Bank & Trust Co. here and another in the reception room at Cannon Mills Co.'s main office.

Inappropriate places for cotton, you might say. But are they? The principal raw material used by Cannon Mills is cotton. Therefore the basis of Kannapolis' economy is cotton and the Kannapolis banks, of which Cabarrus is one, are active middlemen in the commercial operations here that flourish on that economy. It might be a good idea to give your children a look at that cotton. The stuff might be as extinct as the steam locomotive by the time your grandchildren grow up.

The bales were placed in these prominent places to help emphasize the disparity between raw cotton costs for American mills and for their foreign competitors. This is a deadly differential, due to the United States unique system of price supports for the benefit of cottongrowers. It now amounts to $42.50 per bale. In other words American cotton costs American mills about one-third more than American cotton costs foreign mills. This is a flagrant injustice that has already led to the loss of many American jobs and which is sure to bring about the loss of more unless the situation is corrected.

An expedient to give the cotton textile industry some relief from this unfair competitive obstacle without upsetting the grower subsidy system so dear to the hearts of vote-conscious Congressmen was proposed by the industry—through the American Textile Manufacturers Institute's cotton policy committee which is headed by C. A. Cannon, of Kannapolis. It seemed to have the blessings of the Kennedy administration, which had mouthed concern over the plight of the textile workers, but it was emasculated by the House Agriculture Committee. It will be worthless as relief to the industry and its workers in its present form.

The ATMI's executive committee Friday said it was deeply disturbed and disappointed over the committee's failure to endorse the one-price cotton proposal. It took President Kennedy to task for his failure to lend administration support to an equalization of cotton costs between American and foreign mills. Instead of supporting a clear-cut return to a one-price system, as representatives of the industry had been led to believe would be done, the administration supported a provision that would give discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining a spread between the domestic and foreign price. In other words, a continuation of the present system with the price spread perhaps narrowed a little.

Gerald L. Dearing, cotton market expert for the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, puts it a bit more forcefully, and with equal truth:

"The seduction of the cotton industry by the New Frontier ended as all such ill-advised romances end," Dearing wrote, "with betrayal and rejection."

Dearing continued: "No starry-eyed maiden taking her first step down the primrose path was filled with more hope and anticipation than was the cotton industry when it began its affair with the New Frontier.

"The industry feared the New Frontier when it came into its life. It rejected its courtship when the New Frontier sought to shower it with gifts from the public treasury in the form of higher support prices.

"But the New Frontier was wise in the way of wooing. It admitted that it was wrong, that it should not have taken the approach it had taken. It talked of reversing its approach, of undoing the wrong that it had done.

"The industry maintained faith when the promised price reduction in 1962 failed to develop, bolstered by the promise that there would be import restrictions which would make things better. Like the promise of the price cut, the import restrictions were mostly promises and little accomplishment.

"The head of the New Frontier registered indignation that the promises were not fulfilled and he made new promises.

"These included a one-price system for cotton, a revival of the industry and a revitalization of the cotton economy. The industry was enraptured at the prospect, willing to forgive and forget past deceits. It turned against those who maintained that

these, too, were only promises and had no hope of fulfillment. Starry-eyed, it kept its rendezvous that ended with disillusionment, bitterness and self-recrimination.

"The seduction was complete when the administration announced that it had no intention of lowering support prices or of using lower support prices as a weapon to achieve the promises that it had made.

"Rejection came shortly afterward when the House Agriculture Committee sent the legislation which would have fulfilled the promises back to the Cotton Subcommittee for reconsideration.

"When remorse has run its course, it will be interesting to see if the cotton industry admits its error, seeks forgiveness from its friends and strives to build a new life outside the influence of the New Frontier.

"Or is it so enamoured with its betrayer that it will continue its illicit relationship on the terms that its master dictates?"

Strong and bitter words those. But they concern a bitter and desperate situation—underscored by the release of statistics last week by the U.S. Department of Commerce showing that U.S. textile exports hit an alltime low figure during 1962 and that U.S. textile imports reached an alltime high figure in the same period. This was the year during which the New Frontier's widely heralded international agreement on textile imports was in full operation.

The administration has failed to control imports. It has refused to remove one of the shackles that forces American mills to fight import competition with one hand and both feet bound. What next?

Seizure of American Investors' Property in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been urging upon our own Government the necessity of a strong position with those nations which accept our assistance and then seize the properties of American investors.

In my opinion, we should not only refuse aid to any nation which seizes American investors' properties, but we should take every step necessary to assure return of the confiscated property or adequate compensation therefor.

I am aware that an initial step in this direction was taken in the 87th Congress, but the legislation was so watered down at the insistence of the administration that it does not serve the purpose for which it was intended.

I feel so strongly about this matter that yesterday, while President Betancourt of Venezuela was in Washington I sent a telegram to President Kennedy as follows:

Mr. President, you spoke beautiful words in greeting the President of Venezuela yesterday but I would like you to ask him that if he is a friend of the United States why he seizes U.S. investors' property in Venezuela. Why has he seized specifically the property of Chemical Natural Resources, Inc., and Venezuelan Sulphur Corp., C.A.? Ask Mr. Betancourt if this is a friendly act. What has he done to inspire other Americans to invest their money in building plants in his country? How can he seize these properties of American investors and then accept money and loans from the United States? Is this what is called democracy in Venezuela? It is not my attempt to embarrass anyone but these questions should be answered now.

FRANK J. BECKER.

Twice before I have called attention to this matter in the RECORD. Afterward, aid and loans continued to go to Venezuela.

The time has come, in my opinion, to crack down. This seizure in Venezuela is only one of many. I do not see much chance for the Alliance for Progress as long as this kind of thing continues.

Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to submit for consideration of the House an editorial appearing in the February issue of a newspaper called the Republican which emanates from my district. I might add, insofar as I know, this paper is not an official organ of the Republican Party. The editorial is in the form of an open letter to me, as the Congressman from the Third Congressional District of Kentucky.

We do believe that many of our people are concerned deeply about the alienation of our friends, such as Canada, Portugal, France, England, and so forth.

The letter is as follows:

MENTAL HEALTH FOR WHOM?—A REQUEST TO CONGRESSMAN SNYDER

(By William E. Rueff)

We often wonder how our Congressmen keep up with all the New Frontier proposals, allegedly to get this country moving. (Remember, Jack, last year's gross national product was only 4 percent—same as the year before. Old rocking chair got you?) The myriads of legislation are sufficient to drive a conscientious Congressman to the head shrinker's couch. If Jack continues his volley of forward passes, one of the old Norman Thomas bills may sneak through. Not by approval of Congress, but by sheer exhaustion on part of Congress. Now we find Jack proposing mental health; not that we don't need it in these days of government by contradiction, confusion, and crisis.

We suggest that when the mental health bill hits the floor of the House that Congressman SNYDER attach thereto an amendment which will require the U.S. State Department hirelings and noblemen to be the first patients. These people need immediate treatment. We do not know whether Bobby, Jack, or Addlehead has confused them on the Bay of Pigs but only those who would alienate our friends such as Canada, Portugal, France, England, entire Latin America, Belgium, Katanga, and Turkey, then guarantee that Cuba will not be invaded even though missles are pointed at us; cut aid from friends and give aid to Communists or so called neutrals; sending troops against our own people but not Communist Cuba, are the truly insane.

The economic advisers should also be included who would lower taxes and increase expenditures. It is obvious the health program is needed for our New Frontiersmen, and we will probably be able to use this program more than others, since we will be so busy working to pay for the New Frontier that we will eventually fade into the ridiculousness of our State Department—on second thought, GENE, don't forget to include some of the noted journalists such as Walter "Turkey" Lippmann.

Education for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, early this week, February 18, I was scheduled to address the 10th annual meeting of the National Schools Committee of the American Economic Foundation in Atlantic City, N.J. Due to a change in the hearing schedule of the House Ways and Means Committee, bringing the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the stand on Monday, I was unable to be with this distinguished group of educators—State commissioners, superintendents and principals of schools, and teachers—much to my regret.

Mr. Morgan S. A. Reichner, trustee of the American Economic Foundation, graciously took my place on the program and delivered my speech for me. I appreciate his kindness in doing this. The speech which I had prepared dealt with the important question of education for full employment, how we can meet our dual problems of bringing unemployed workers with obsolete skills back into the economic mainstream of our country and of filling the many jobs that now go begging for want of a qualified person to do the tasks demanded. With thanks to Mr. Reichner and the Schools Committee of the American Economic Foundation, I am placing my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EDUCATION FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

(By Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri)

It is strange to find the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare chanting two mournful dirges, one about the 4 million unemployed, the other about the slowdown of many of its important social programs because of lack of trained personnel to man the programs.

However, this is nothing more than a sample of the schizophrenic approach many have taken toward the problems that rapid technological growth creates throughout our entire society. On the one hand, automation, as rapid technological growth is called today, creates unemployment primarily in the unskilled and semiskilled areas and where skills have become obsolete. On the other hand, it creates a demand for new and higher skills in a quantity and quality our society finds hard to fill.

To give the obvious answer, match the skills needed with those who need the skills

is only to pose the problem. The hard realities lie in producing this result.

It is clear that the basic burden rests on those in the field of education and training. The fact that education and training itself is one of the areas where there is a critical shortage of skills should come as no surprise. If anything, it should confirm the diagnosis of our economic ills as growing pains rather than tired blood.

If there were no innovation in our society a man's skill could provide him a livelihood for a lifetime. It is only when an economy is full of innovation that a man's skill becomes obsolete before retirement and he must learn a new one in order to make a living.

An economy which shifts from 90 percent of its people engaged in agriculture to 7 percent in 170 years and at the same time increases its population from 5 million people to 180 million people and provides them with abundance is bound to have growing pains.

From 1950 to 1960, the employed civilian workers in all occupations rose by 5.8 million (55.7 to 61.5). However, in this short period of time 3 million jobs were destroyed and 9 million new ones created to produce the net 6 million.

The 3-million loss came entirely from farmers and farm laborers. The 9 million gain came in the following areas: 2.4 million clerical and kindred workers; 2.3 million professional, technical and kindred workers; 1.1 million service workers except private household; 900,000 craftsmen and foremen; 700,000 each for both categories, sales workers and operatives.

To fill the 9 million new jobs 3 million possibly came from those whose skills became obsolete and the other 6 million from the increased population moving into the work force and from immigration.

However, the obsolescence of skills and the shift out of one skill into another is minimized by these aggregate statistics.

To gain further insight into the upheaval occurring in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, the percentage change in employment of civilian workers by major occupation is helpful. For all occupations, the percentage was 10.4 percent. The breakdown, however, is phenomenal ranging as it does from a plus 47 percent to a minus 42 percent. Here is an itemized breakdown:

	Percent
Professional, technical	+47.0
Clerical and kindred workers	+33.8
Service workers, except private household	+26.7
Private household workers	+22.3
Salesworkers	+18.7
Craftsmen, foremen, etc	+11.8
Managers, officials and proprietors except farm	+7.4
Operatives and kindred workers	+6.4
Laborers except farm and mine	−9.6
Farm laborers and farm foremen	−.2
Farmers and farm managers	−41.9

It can be seen from this that the job of education and training is not just the preparation of the new entrant into the labor force. Increasingly, the job is becoming one of on-the-job training and retraining, night school and adult education.

The job of preparation for the labor force, however, is also undergoing remarkable changes. We still use age 14 as the basis for computing our labor force and yet the average age of entry to the labor force has risen rapidly until it is now over 19. We see the same phenomena revealed in the increasing average length of time our people spend in education. Today the average is almost 4 years of high school.

The problem of training and educating our youth to enter the labor force is not an easy one in a dynamic economy where consumer demand and increased standard of living is constantly changing the pattern of skills in demand. Furthermore, as we move from the age-old economy based upon scarcity to that based upon plenty, we find new laws in operation and old ones acting in strange ways. During the recent hearings of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee studying the legislation which became the Manpower Training Act of 1962 considerable testimony was given to the effect that much of our vocational education has been directed to training our youth in skills which were already obsolete. Obviously, to do a good job of education and training, we must be alert to the changing patterns in our economy. It is for this reason that the Department of Labor's Dictionary of Skills becomes so significant and why it is so important to get it up to date and to keep it up to date. Indeed, we should be looking into the future anticipating the skills that are coming into demand before the time when the demand for them is upon us. This kind of prospective look is entirely possible, because new machines and new ways of doing things take time to develop and those concerned with their development can anticipate with considerable accuracy the number and type of new skills which will become necessary to implement them.

I think the most difficult part of this business of matching the unemployed with the jobs that are going begging lies in understanding that it is a complex rather than a simple operation. Generally speaking, the unemployed in a highly advanced technological society which is moving rapidly into higher technology are concentrated among the unskilled and the semiskilled. Technological advancement tends to produce the higher incident of obsolescense among the simple skilled, the skills requiring brawn as opposed to brain, the new jobs that the technological advancement creates are those requiring skills even higher than the then average prevailing in the society, and these jobs demanding these skills frequently are miles away from the place where a job has been destroyed and they usually are in fields seemingly far removed from that of the abandoned job.

This being the case, there is going to be little of the direct matching of the man seeking a job with the job seeking the man. The hard realities of retraining are these: We must persuade a man who has a job to take night school work or on-the-job training so he can upgrade his skill to take the job going begging. When he takes the new job, his old job is open for someone down the ladder of skills to be persuaded to attend night school or the take on-the-job training to upgrade his skill. Somewhere in the ladder of skills the unskilled, semiskilled, or obsolete skilled unemployed persons will have places open up as the upgrading process operates, provided they can be persuaded to take some vocational training to fit themselves. This also means persuading them of the realities of life, that the coal mines will not reopen to employ more coal miners.

To demonstrate the point of the need for upgrading skills all along the line, I have remarked that a man with two arms who holds down a job too easy for himself which a one-armed man could perform adequately, when he could train for a job which required a fuller use of the talents with which God blessed him, does a disservice to himself, to the one-armed man and to society.

The question has been raised whether or not we won't reach a point in this economic process when we are dealing with untrainables. It is possible, I suppose, for automation to reach a point where there will be very few jobs available for the unskilled. However, I am satisfied that the human being is such an efficient machine, even one with a 50 IQ rating, that there is much meaningful work that can be set up which he can be trained to perform. Certainly, if we set our collective minds to the problem we can solve it.

At any rate, we by no means have reached such a point. High school dropouts although beginning to show up with heavier emphasis on low IQ still are primarily those with adequate IQ's but with low motivation. Frankly, I don't believe there are many real untrainables any more than there are many really permanently disabled people. Society just hasn't grown up to the point where it knows how to train or to rehabilitate.

Once we begin to understand the problem we face—and the beginning of understanding first must come in abandoning that prevalent but false diagnosis of an economy that is growing so fast it has growing pains as one that is tired and sluggish—we can begin to cope with it. I think the Manpower Training Act is a major step forward. However, the most significant thing in the act is the requirement that the Department of Labor and HEW report back to the Congress by March 31, 1963 on the results of the studies in this area. If the Departments come back with that tired and hackneyed solution to all our social ills—throw Federal money at it, I will be gravely disappointed. However, if the report shows a thorough study into the complex problems training and retraining in a dynamic economy presents we will have had a good beginning.

I have suggested that the Education and Labor Committee of the House and the Joint House Senate Economic Committee hold hearings on the report as soon as possible and request knowledgable people in the field of training and retraining, not just those in the academic field, but businessmen and labor leaders who are dealing with the problems all the time, to come before the committees with their criticisms and recommendations.

I have suggested a few areas of immediate legislative reform.

1. Encouraging the mobility of labor through changing the tax definition of "home." Presently a worker's tax home is his principal place of employment, not the place where he owns a house and maintains his family. Thus, when a plant moves and he must follow it or lose his job, the expenses which he incurs living at the place of his job in the period before his family joins him—for example, while the former home is being sold and he is making preparations for them to join him—are not business expenses to him, for he is "home" in the minds of the tax collectors. And his family is a personal expense so their maintenance away from home, as the tax laws define it, is not recognized. A similar situation arises when a worker is sent for an indefinite period of temporary assignment away from his family. I have introduced legislation which would correct this and recognize that a man's home is where he owns a house and maintains his family.

2. Encouraging the upgrading of worker skills through giving tax relief to those who incur the expense of training. We have taken the first substantial step in bringing those, and they are the bulk of our unemployed, who have outdated skills back into the mainstream of the economy in the passage of the Manpower Retraining and Development Act. But they cannot fit into the high skill level jobs which are opening up as our dynamic economy moves forward into new and more complex areas. We must have a general upgrading of skills and to encourage those now employed in the jobs into which retrained workers might fit, they must be given an incentive to move up into even better jobs. Today if one goes out and gets such training, the tax laws look upon it as a personal expense. By a bill which I have introduced, an amount so spent would be a business expense deduction and continued training would be stimulated by this tax incentive.

3. Modifying the unemployment compensation system in the States to encourage retraining. Presently well over half of our States penalize the unemployed worker who seeks retraining by counting him as no longer unemployed when he starts a retraining program. Thus the individual is faced with a dilemma; if he takes the retraining course which may be his only way of getting a new job, his means of support is taken away from him; on the other hand, if he clings to the assistance he is receiving, he may be guaranteeing that he will never develop a marketable skill. Nineteen States and the District of Columbia have taken a different tack, however. Recognizing the problem of obsolete skills they will permit an unemployed worker to remain on the unemployment compensation list while he is in training for a new skill. A further common provision is that the individual may even reject a bona fide job offer and not lose his compensation payments so long as he is in training. I might suggest that a further step should be considered, taking those with obsolete skills off the unemployment compensation lists if they refuse to undertake a retraining program.

Finally, I hope at long last students of this subject will begin to look with a critical eye at our military draft law and the training and retraining they are engaged in. The military services constantly complain and with justification, that the business sector is constantly taking away the men they spend years in training. Certainly it is true that the biggest vocational educational programs being conducted today are the ones conducted by our Military Establishments. Frankly, I think a much better job could be done for the services through the civilian educational sector. But I am primarily concerned about the impact of the draft law upon motivation and education and training our entire youth. The draft law is up for revision this year. If the past is any guide, no one from the field of education will appear before the congressional committees to discuss its impact upon education and training. I will again testify however. I am convinced that the draft law has become a faulty crutch upon which the military rely to procure their personnel. They run a costly operation as the turnover of their personnel reveals. With a careful recruitment program, they could get all the personnel they need and they would be more apt to retain their loyalties and so cut down on the costly turnover rate. Certainly the removal of the sword of Damocles from over the heads of all the youth of our country will result in a much better training and education for the whole society, particularly in these times of great need coming from great change.

Another Dubious First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Arlington (Minn.) Enterprise regards the new recordbreaking budget, particularly the sharp rise in nondefense spending, as a dubious distinction. Editor Louis Kill says it so well that I have requested it be placed in the RECORD for all to see:

ANOTHER DUBIOUS FIRST

Besides submitting the biggest budget in all history, the administration has rung up another dubious distinction. It is far ahead of schedule since even the most extravagant predictions for budgetary growth—made less than a year ago—did not have the budget reaching the $100 billion neighborhood until 1967.

The most disheartening and danger-ridden aspect of the $98.8 billion budget for fiscal 1964, however, is the continuance of the sharp rise in nondefense spending requests. The latter accounts for $43.4 billion which is deplorably close to the $55.4 billion sought for national defense.

A comparison with the previous budgetary high, the $98 billion of the 1944 wartime year, graphically demonstrates the way in which nondefense spending has soared. In that year $81 billion went for defense and only $17 billion for nondefense expenditures.

It is to be hoped that the great majority of Americans will not, repeat, will not get over their shock at the size of the budget without importuning their legislative representatives in Washington to apply some sharp cuts in the nondefense spending area.

Kennedy as Candidate and Kennedy as President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, during the presidential campaign of 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy was quite vocal and positive about the measures necessary to insure the removal of Castro from this hemisphere. The following is what he said at Johnstown, Pa., on October 15, 1960:

Only if we are strong as a nation—strong economically, strong militarily, strong educationally, strong in heart and purpose—can we assure our peace and security in an age where our enemies are overtaking us in missile power, are far surpassing us in broadcasts abroad, have penetrated for the first time into the Middle East and Africa, have outshone our efforts in science and space, and have rolled the Iron Curtain to 90 miles from our shores onto the once friendly island of Cuba.

Mr. Nixon hasn't mentioned Cuba very prominently in this campaign. He talks about standing firm in Berlin, standing firm in the Far East, standing up to Khrushchev, but he never mentions standing firm in Cuba—and if you can't stand up to Castro how can you be expected to stand up to Khrushchev?

Earlier this month, I reviewed the sorry story of how under our very noses, and in part as the result of our own policies, Cuba had moved from a position of good neighbor to a position of bitter enemy. We had been warned that anti-American feeling was rising, that the Communists were taking over the revolution, and that our security would be endangered by a Castro regime.

Mr. Nixon had been to Cuba on one of his famous trips. But Mr. Mikoyan has also been to Cuba. And while Mr. Nixon impressed the Cuban dictator, Batista, who has since been deposed, Mr. Mikoyan impressed Castro and others now in control of the Cuban Government. Mr. Nixon calls his trip experience. But the American people cannot afford many more such experiences.

For the transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations a few minutes from our coast—by jet plane, missile, or submarine—is an incredibly dangerous development to have been permitted by our Republican policy makers. Havana, once a city bursting with admiration for Franklin Roosevelt, the good neighbor, is now a center of Communist press, propaganda, and broadcasts spreading anti-Yankee sentiment throughout Latin America. New groups of revolutionaries are being trained for undercover activities in other countries and the whole Western Hemisphere security system is drastically threatened.

This wouldn't have happened under Franklin Roosevelt, who warned the Nazis in 1940 to stay out of our hemisphere; this wouldn't have happened under Harry Truman who warned the Communists in 1947 to stay out of Greece and Turkey. And this would not have happened in Cuba if the Republican leadership Mr. Nixon represents had taken every step which foresight and experience should have directed them to take—in order to prevent a Communist victory only 90 miles from our shores.

I do not know how Mr. Nixon can talk of firmness in view of his party's record in Cuba. I do not know how he can talk of experience in view of his party's experience in Cuba. I do not know how he can seek the Presidency and avoid explaining what happened in this major foreign policy disaster.

But it did happen—and the question now is, What do we do about Cuba and Castro now? What can a new administration do to end this drift?

The first thing we have to do is let the Cuban people know our determination that they will someday again be free. We did not make clear to the Cubans our devotion to freedom during the brutal reign of the Batista dictatorship—and we are not making our position any clearer under the Castro dictatorship. We have no Cuban Voice of America broadcasts in Spanish at all, and only 1 hour a day in Spanish beamed in general to all Latin America. We must promptly initiate a major broadcast program for Cuba in particular, and more for the Americas in general.

Second, we must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

Third, we must let Mr. Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer and in particular do not intend to be pushed out of our naval base at Guantanamo, or denied fair compensation for American property he has seized.

Fourth, we must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere—and that the Organization of American States will be given real strength and stature to resist any further Communist penetration by whatever means are necessary.

Fifth, and finally, we must strengthen the cause of freedom throughout all Latin America creating an atmosphere where liberty will flourish, and when Cuban communism will be resisted, isolated, and left to die on the vine.

One road to Havana ultimately lies through Rio and Buenos Aires and Mexico City. If the rest of Latin America is unsure of our stand on native dictators as well as Communist dictators; if they feel we are concerned only with our Soviet enemies and not their enemies of poverty, hunger, and disease, if they feel we respond not to their requests but only to Mr. Castro's threats, then the same policies of drift and neglect that preceded Castro's rise to power will continue to weaken our influence and prestige.

We cannot write the Cuban people off as lost. Neither should we drive them inextricably into Soviet hands. But let us make the American Revolution the chief import of Latin America, not the Cuban revolution. And if we do so then someday on the island of Cuba itself, there will be a government constituted to secure the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Either Senator Kennedy then did not know what he was talking about or he deliberately deceived the American people for his own personal, political campaign gains.

In a presidential press conference on February 7, 1963, the following question was propounded and this amazing answer given:

HOPEFUL FOR A FREE CUBA

Question. Mr. President, what chances do you think or do you believe there are of eliminating communism in Cuba within your term?

The PRESIDENT. I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination. I am quite obviously hopeful it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. There are a lot of unpleasant situations in the world today. China is one. It is unfortunate that communism was permitted to come into Cuba. It has been a problem in the last 5 years. We don't know what is going to happen internally. There is no obviously easy solution as to how the Communist movement will be removed. One way, of course, would be by the Cubans themselves, though that is very difficult, given the police setup.

The other way would be by external action. But that is war and we should not regard that as a cheap or easy way to accomplish what we wish. We live with a lot of dangerous situations all over the world. Berlin is one. There are many others. And we live with a good deal of hazard all around the world and have for 15 years. I cannot set down any time in which I can clearly see the end to the Castro regime. I believe it is going to come, but I couldn't possibly give a time limit.

The shocking answer is an undeniable indication that President Kennedy does not know what to do about Cuba. Is it any wonder that our Latin American friends are thinking of the United States as a weakling when it comes to taking any action? If international communism can send military help thousands of miles to maintain its beachhead of destruction in Cuba, why is it that the United States refuses to send military aid to the patriots of freedom only 90 miles from our shores?

Insulting Our Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to invite the attention of Members of the House and other interested persons to an editorial entitled "Insulting Our Intelligence," written by A. Monroe Courtright, the very able editor of the Westerville Public Opinion. The editorial follows:

INSULTING OUR INTELLIGENCE

(By A. Monroe Courtright)

I dunno—did you get the same reaction I did as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara put on his television show last week and tried to downgrade the Communist menace now in Cuba?

As he talked and presented his excellent photographs showing how the missile sites had been destroyed since the crisis last October, I noted that each photo's description was ended with the phrase that told us we were not to worry about anything at this particular location.

Why does President Kennedy and his bunch of starry-eyed advisers continue to play the American people for a bunch of suckers and morons?

No intelligent American would disagree with the President's statement that we should not fear an invasion or attack from Cuba by Communist forces. Why then, take great trouble to put such a premise to rest and completely ignore that a Communist base in this hemisphere is of great potential danger to most all South American countries, and when each one falls to communism, our own position becomes that much more vulnerable.

Why try to whitewash the picture and make it appear otherwise?

Only a few weeks back Robert Kennedy, the President's brother who handles the Justice Department along with helping to run our entire Government, stated in a speech that "U.S. aircover was never promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion." The President himself affirmed what Brother Bobby said was right.

And so it was. No intelligent American who had read anything about the Bay of Pigs ever did say that U.S. aircover was promised to the invaders. What was promised was an airstrike by B-26 planes belonging to the invaders (not U.S. planes), but on that fateful Tuesday morning, President Kennedy himself called off the strike.

Why?

No high Government official denies that the President called off the strike and to this day, no explanation has been given. Instead, platitudinous remarks are made and we are expected to believe them.

However, the most important doubt that kept popping up in my mind during McNamara's whitewashing job concerned the way the Cuban crisis was handled last October.

Is the President's memory so short that he thinks an intelligent American can forget—or overlook—the admitted fact that while a big meeting was being held in the State Department to play down the danger from Cuba, at the same time he and his Council were being briefed by Pentagon officers and being shown photographs of the missile sites in Cuba?

When newspaper reporters brought out the fact that doubletalk was going on, what should happen but that a high official named Sylvester admitted publicly that the news of the crisis had been doctored, and what is even more reprehensive in an American democracy, stated flatly that "managed news" had been, and would continue to be the policy.

In other words, we'll tell you what we want you to hear, whether or not it's true. If other Americans are like me, they may tell me what they want me to hear, but they can't make me believe it.

And this is what bugs me about McNamara's TV appearance. Government officials lied—and admitted they lied—last October.

By what logic do they expect us to believe what we heard from the Secretary of Defense last week? Especially when all of the evidence indicates that he is being used as a part of the big lie too.

When President Kennedy was elected I wasn't too upset about the change in administration, and, in fact, felt at the time that his enthusiasm and earnestness might be good for our country. Now I'm not only sure that I was wrong—I'm downright scared.

I'm scared because he has surrounded himself with theorists and incompetent adviers who are endangering the future of our country and our very existence by their bumbling and inept planning, especially in the field of foreign affairs.

And mostly of all, I'm scared because a great majority of our citizens don't seem to be concerned enough about it to want to do anything about it

Maybe I shouldn't be scared—maybe I'm crazy.

The Shoe Is on the Other Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic politicians who apparently are more interested in their party than in their country are now screaming "foul," because free discussion of our policy in Cuba is being carried on. An editorial in the Washington Evening Star of February 19 and David Lawrence's article in the same paper, the evening following, repudiate the legitimacy of the synthetic and strident voices.

The pity is that when Khrushchev tosses us a crumb, our President gratefully accepts it as if the former were really offering us something. The fact of the matter is that apparently President Kennedy has made another Yalta deal with Khrushchev in which, in my opinion, he has promised the following:

First. We will not invade Cuba.

Second. We will immediately withdraw our missiles around the world.

Third. We will about-face our previously strong, Eisenhower administration position on nuclear testing.

President Kennedy must bear the responsibility for these tragic moves of appeasement.

BAD POLITICS?

In his role as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT doubtless is a qualified judge of what is good and what is bad for American foreign policy. It does not necessarily follow, however, that he also is a competent judge of what is good, or bad, politics.

The Senator from Arkansas has denounced what he calls intemperate and irresponsible Republican criticism of President Kennedy's policies with respect to Cuba and General de Gaulle. He also asserts that this kind of partisanship "is not only bad policy; it is also bad politics."

This is a familiar phrase. But its validity is open to question. It may be true that the GOP has stepped over the line which should separate partisanship from foreign policy. It is also true, however, that the Republican

orators have something going for them in the Cuban "mess" and in the intractability of General de Gaulle.

The truth of this should not be lost upon a man as experienced in politics as is Senator FULBRIGHT. After all, it has been only a bit more than 2 years since Candidate Kennedy was beating the bushes for votes by preaching the doctrine that the Eisenhower administration had made hash of our foreign policy and had wrecked American prestige in the process. We don't recall any complaints from Senator FULBRIGHT that Mr. Kennedy was practicing bad politics at that time. And we can't take his protests very seriously now—especially since Mr. Kennedy and not Mr. Nixon is in residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

KHRUSHCHEV TOSSES US A CRUMB

(By David Lawrence)

Premier Khrushchev has thrown President Kennedy and his critics a crumb—a promised withdrawal of a "few thousand" Soviet troops from Cuba. This is an unsatisfactory answer to the request of the United States that all Russian troops should leave the island and that the Soviets should give up their military base in Cuba. Leading Democrats as well as Republicans in Congress have voiced their dissatisfaction over the inadequacy of the Soviet action.

It is doubtful whether either the President or his critics will let the matter rest with a partial withdrawal of Soviet troops. For there is no way of knowing how many more Russian "civilians" or "technicians" will enter Cuba in the next few weeks to replace those who will have departed.

The congressional criticism has had its effect, however, and will continue. It is unfortunate that Under Secretary of State George Ball and some of the administration spokesmen in Congress recently chose to regard any criticism as partisan and called for bipartisanship. Actually, there has been bipartisanship among the critics. Much of what has been said in Congress in disapproval of the Cuban policy has come from Democrats. A few days ago, Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, Democrat, chairman of a subcommittee on military affairs, expressed the opinion that the criticism had been helpful and that the investigation of our Cuban policy undertaken by his subcommittee "will give strength to the President—and Khrushchev will realize it."

After the announcement of the coming withdrawal of a portion of the Soviet army in Cuba, Senator STENNIS, in a statement, said: "Even though this is an encouraging step, it is only one step. Our policy must be an insistence that they all be withdrawn. This is the only thing that will really remove the menace."

Other Senators in both parties—RUSSELL, of Georgia; LAUSCHE, of Ohio; SMATHERS, of Florida; MANSFIELD, of Montana, all Democrats; and DIRKSEN, of Illinois, AIKEN, of Vermont, and GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Republicans—echoed the same sentiment.

There are currently, of course, some partisans among the critics. These Republicans seem to have learned a lesson from the Democrats, who managed to make Cuba an issue in the 1960 presidential campaign. Those criticisms may have swung enough votes to be a factor in the close race that Mr. Kennedy won over Mr. Nixon. The Democratic presidential nominee's words, therefore, are being reread by some of the Republicans as a lesson in how to succeed in campaigning without really trying to be nonpartisan. Mr. Kennedy, for example, had this to say in a speech at Johnstown, Pa., on October 15, 1960:

"For the transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations a few minutes from our coast—by jet plane, missile, or submarine—is an incredibly dangerous development to have been permitted by our Republican policymakers.

"This wouldn't have happened under Franklin Roosevelt, who warned the Nazis in 1940 to stay out of our hemisphere; this wouldn't have happened under Harry Truman, who warned the Communists in 1947 to stay out of Greece and Turkey."

In another speech, the Democratic candidate included Cuba in six key areas in the world in which he charged that the administration was "reacting too late." He repeatedly declared that American prestige was very low. There were speeches about the alleged "missile gap," and Mr. Kennedy often referred to surveys which, he said, showed that a majority of the people in several countries believed the Soviet Union was "ahead of us militarily and scientifically."

Even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose chairman was Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, Democrat, issued a report on June 28, 1960, criticizing President Eisenhower for having used the U-2 surveillance planes. The committee claimed it didn't have all the information it needed, but then said anyhow: "The development, publication, examination and discussion of information such as this, it seems to the committee, is essential to the democratic process. When carried on responsibly, it can only produce beneficial results, even at critical moments in our foreign affairs. Only through a public airing of the facts can a representative government be held to proper account and its mistakes, if any, identified and corrected."

Many Republicans who in recent weeks have reexamined that paragraph in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee report took it to heart and tried to "air the facts" so as to "produce beneficial results." But Senator FULBRIGHT, nevertheless, has just denounced the Republicans as partisan. The truth is that in the Democratic Party several of the critics have been more severe in the castigation of the Kennedy administration's foreign policy than the Republicans have been.

Maybe if the bipartisan critics keep up their "airing of the facts" they will persuade Premier Khrushchev that American public opinion isn't satisfied with the continuance of a Soviet military base in Cuba and is demanding that it be abolished without further delay.

Critique of the President's Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for the RECORD a paper written by Jim Calland, age 14, a student at University High School in Columbus, Ohio. This young man displays a keen insight on one of the key issues facing this session of Congress, and it certainly is worthy of the attention of the Members. The paper follows:

CRITIQUE OF THE PRESIDENT'S TAX CUT

(By Jim Calland, University High School, Columbus, Ohio)

I am opposed to the tax cut as proposed by the President in his state of the Union message on which he has elaborated in subsequent addresses. If I may paraphrase Samuel Gompers: Economically it is unsound, socially it is wrong, industrially it is an impossibility.

The economic logic behind this says the tax cut will serve as a stimulus to the economy. People will keep more money and will, therefore, be encouraged to spend more money. We will move forward economically. The gross national product will become greater. The Federal Government will receive a smaller percentage of your paycheck, but you will be encouraged to spend more and thus stimulate the economy. The administration hopes to make up the loss in personal income tax with an increased revenue in business taxes.

Let us suppose that Mr. Kennedy is clairvoyant. Let us assume that he had psychic powers and can adequately predict the economic future of 180 million Americans. We shall say that all he has foretold is the gospel truth. Is it the whole truth?

Increased spending with a decreased income is not economically sound. Yes, the administration says, there will be a temporary deficit, but it will ultimately be offset by the increased future revenue. What is this increased future revenue?

If we accept Mr. Kennedy's extrasensory perception, we must assume that there will be a numerical increase in the tax revenue as predicted. There will be a greater number of dollars coming into the Government. This would be all right if the value of the dollar remained fixed, but it does not. What happens is this: Government places its interest-bearing I O U's in the commercial banking systems and receives in return "deposits" which become new money as the Government writes checks against them.

This new unearned money gets its value by diluting the value of all existing money. This new kind of money is not only as bad as greenbacks, it is worse, because (1) it bears interest, and (2) it must be paid back. We have created two additional tax burdens. The first of these is the tax money that is needed each year to pay the interest on the debt. The second burden (still to come) will be the taxes that will have to be collected to pay off the debt. For the tax cut to even bring in an increased amount of revenue, there must be extravagant spending on the part of a good many people.

Let's consider a young couple who have no faith in the long-term future, because the money is not sound, has no intrinsic value, and they rightly expect it to continue to depreciate. There is no use to save money just to see it lose its purchasing power. They begin to think of living for the thrills of the moment, of spending their money almost as fast as they earn it. This encourages the weakening of character. If they cannot win by integrity, honesty, and perserverance, they are tempted to take short cuts. Throughout history, periods of moral disintegration have followed the debasement of the monetary unit.

I am reminded of the words of Abraham Lincoln: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift."

Then there is the idea that this tax cut will help business and industry: This quaint notion is nothing but a fairy tale.

To fully understand the effect of inflation on just the steel industry. Let's consider a 1940 steel plant that cost $25 million. Today the plant has been written off and the company has in reserve the allowed depreciation, $25 million. But now the new plant will cost $60 million. This means that an additional $35 million will have to come from somewhere and that somewhere should be earnings. Because earnings are taxed 52 percent by the Government, the company would have to earn an extra $73 million in order to get the $35 million needed for the new plant. If earnings before taxes are 10 percent of sales, the company would have to

sell an extra $730 million worth of steel to get the extra $35 million.

True, the taxes will be cut, but inflation, as outlined previously, is worse than paying high taxes.

What will the fate of America be? Will Congress pass this tax cut? If we let this happen and if we let the trend continue unrestrained, the United States can become a second-rate Nation.

As Thomas Jefferson has said: "To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude."

Why Let Red Troops Remain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Thursday, February 14, 1963:

WHY LET RED TROOPS REMAIN?

President Kennedy and his top advisers are a timorous lot or they are incompetent as heads of our Government.

There are valid grounds for the administration to insist upon the immediate withdrawal of Russian troops from Cuba. Insistence on the return of Soviet soldiers to Russia rests on the basis of Khrushchev's promises made at the time of the crisis last year.

If President Kennedy had the slightest perception of the soundness and validity of our position, plus a real determination to act, he would have informed Khrushchev long ago that the United States will not tolerate a Soviet base in Cuba or elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere.

The American people will not quit criticizing President Kennedy's uncertain and hesitating course in the Cuban situation.

The administration's attempt to quiet their fears and anxieties by television addresses failed to restore popular faith in a promise to prevent the Soviet Union from making Cuba a base for Communist aggression and terrorism in this hemisphere.

As long as Russians troops, military technicians and offensive weapons remain in Cuba, their presence will be a matter of serious concern to the American people.

No television speech by the President's advisers and no promise about the absence of a Russian threat will allay the apprehension of the people.

Many Americans still doubt whether the administration has given all the details of the Cuban situation to the public.

And a Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee also is unwilling to accept the argument of the Kennedy administration that the Soviet menace and threat in Cuba are gradually fading.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the committee said: "We are going right on. I don't see any lessening of military threat" of Russian men and equipment still in Cuba.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, said that "Cuba is a Soviet base from which they will continue to operate for penetration of Latin America."

If Members of the Congress are concerned over the administration's failure to act, there is every reason why the American people should be disturbed.

Haiti Outlook Is Bleak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Clayton Willis entitled "Haiti Outlook Is Bleak."

The article follows:

HAITI OUTLOOK IS BLEAK

(By Clayton Willis)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI.—Haiti, that lush, tropical land of about 4 million people, is sinking into economic oblivion.

Unemployment, always high in this country with few industrymaking natural resources, climbs daily. One of the reasons: few Americans come here anymore. I can report that the plush, tropical hotels that dot the mountains above this capital city, are empty. This means hundreds of thousands of American dollars are kept out of circulation and put a dent in that all important commodity—employment.

Take a look at the average yearly income of Haitians, who have the lowest standard of living in the Western Hemisphere, and it makes more sense; $70. That's right: $70 a year is the average guy's income in a year.

Most American tourists are scared off because the way Haitian President Francois Duvalier runs his Government. Duvalier is using many of the strongman tactics of a former neighbor who was assassinated May 30, 1961—old Dominican Dictator Generalisimo Rafael Trujillo.

Dr. Duvalier, an American-trained physician turned politician, is partly a victim of circumstances. As many politicians, he got in with the wrong people who are looting the country at will. And Duvalier, who knows his country well—he traveled it many years as a country doctor—has resorted to much of the repression technique that Trujillo mustered up to stay on top for 31 years at the opposite end of this island of Hispaniola.

One Duvalier slogan he knows how to use well. He, Duvalier, says he's a man of the people. To Haitians, who have a color question of their own, this means that he is not of the mulatto group, a minority here, which historically has controlled the politics and the economics of the country.

So, Haiti, with its long history of dictatorships and crippling illiteracy—about 10 percent can read and write—is in a bad way as far as Uncle Sam is concerned. Broke as Haiti is, the U.S. Government isn't expected to give Duvalier much of a boost in the few million dollars it supplies the French- and Creole-speaking country. As President Kennedy recently said in Bogotá, Colombia, the United States is committed against aiding Latin American dictators. In fact, American businessmen in Haiti told me it's obvious Washington is trying to squeeze out Duvalier.

Meanwhile, a few token projects to improve the lot of the Haitian people go on. One, the construction of a town 30 minutes drive north of here is an example of President Duvalier's grandest effort to leave a monument to himself. Named Duvalier-Ville, it is growing at a snail's pace because hapless Dr. Duvalier is having trouble financing it. And American businessmen in Haiti told me they aren't having much part of answer to his predicament.

Give him a fat payoff (one said he was asked for $50,000 and refused to pay it) to build the town; and, of course, in so doing, line the pockets of Government hangers-on.

Maybe the most embarrassing note of all to Duvalier: the huge Peligre Dam has been built 75 miles' drive from this city. It was supposed to supply badly needed hydroelectric power which, it is thought, would attract American industry. But, Duvalier doesn't have the money to buy the generators.

One big hope on the economic horizon: Pan American World Airways is putting up about $600,000 to build a jet airport 10 minutes' drive from this capital city. And, a bright spot on the health scene: Dr. William Larimer Mellon, a courageous, dedicated member of one of America's great industrial families, is doing wonders with his Albert Schweitzer Hospital.

Mellon opened the 50-bed hospital in 1956 some 85 miles from Port-au-Prince, and has since increased it to 120 beds. He was the first nonvoodoo witch doctor in the densely populated and poverty-ridden Artibonite Valley.

When newly sworn-in American Ambassador Raymond L. Thurston reaches Port-au-Prince January 6, he will have one of the toughest assignments in the Caribbean. Among the problems he will find confronting Haiti is that of Communist agents. They are already busy planting the seeds of revolution in Haiti's sun-parched soil.

Washington Interference in State Tax Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture, which has added more than 17,000 employees since January 1961, has decided that among its other futile efforts, it should put some of its employees to work making a survey, at taxpayer expense, of seven Midwest States, and has come up with the recommendation that they depend more on State general sales and income taxes than on property taxes for their revenues.

The spectacle of the Agriculture Department, with its warehouses groaning with surplus commodities, spending $7 billion a year and still producing lower general farm incomes, telling solvent States like Nebraska and South Dakota how to handle their tax money, borders on the fantastic.

Who asked for this survey in Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Colorado?

My colleague, Representative RALPH BEERMANN, Republican, of Nebraska, commented:

Washington bureaucrats have shown no great talent for managing the Federal finances. The economic planners in Washington at this time have the United States in

the position of paying $1 million an hour in interest alone on the national debt.

Senator PETER DOMINICK said:

The political organization of top Democrats believes its members should run the country because they think the American people are too stupid to do it, and they make no bones telling you this.

In these days of deliberate deficits and fiscal folly, perhaps any State that is smart enough to balance its budget each year serves as an infuriating example to the Washington planners.

The Kerr-Mills Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much through the medium of the press, radio, and television relative to medical care for the aged. The Kerr-Mills bill has worked wonders in Tennessee, and although it has been in effect only a short time it has certainly relieved a lot of suffering and has proved its worth to us.

On Friday morning, February 15, there appeared in the Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, an editorial relative to the Kerr-Mills bill. This editorial is so outstanding that I would like to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Feb. 15, 1963]

THE KERR-MILLS ANSWER

There is a good answer to agitation for adding medical care of the aged to the social security program. It is the Kerr-Mills Act which is already on the books. It meets the need of those who have the least resources, the aged without social security incomes.

More use of the Kerr-Mills opportunity should be the objective of those alarmed by the medicare campaign.

The Kerr-Mills Act was signed September 13, 1960, but has been little used. Only a few days ago a publication favoring the medicare plan was able to say of the Kerr-Mills Act that half of the States have still to begin using it at all. Even those that use it hardly touch its possibilities.

New York uses as much Kerr-Mills funds as 21 other States combined. The average payment is $512 in Illinois but a mere $19 a year in Kentucky.

Tennessee is one of the States using Kerr-Mills procedures. In fact the doctors of Tennessee were out in front of the parade with an arrangement for surgery and hospital care, in addition to the charity cases that are a part of all medicine, before the Federal law was adopted.

The Volunteer State picked up the Kerr-Mills plan early and has gradually enlarged the care available. The most recent addition is 90 days of care in a licensed nursing home or a hospital with convalescent facilities.

Applicants for Kerr-Mills benefits are accepted in Tennessee with incomes up to $1,000 a year, or $1,500 for a married couple, including those with real estate having a value up to $10,000. In the beginning they had to pay the first $100 of cost, but that has been lowered to $25.

The State's doctors have asked for the income limits to be raised to $1,500, or $2,500 for a couple.

The Tennessee formula uses about 5 cents from county funds, with 20 cents of State funds and 75 cents of Federal money.

This is a method that looks after those who need it most. There are at least 2.5 million of them in the Nation, outside of the social security program, and ignored in the medicare proposal.

This Kerr-Mills has a great deal of unused potential. It should be put to work.

"Not What You Can Do for Your Country, but What You Can Do for Your Party"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the Washington Star of yesterday is a shocking revelation of the subterfuge this administration will resort to in bypassing civil service rules and regulations and enactments of Congress that were designed to protect our citizens from a Federal spoils system.

No longer will a college student be confident that his application for temporary summer employment will be considered in good faith or that he will be selected on the basis of merit. But rather, the student employment program is being turned into a farce, a sham, and a mockery, in outright violation of all the safeguards and protections that were intended to be afforded to Government employees and job seekers from the spoils system of the past.

Henceforth, it becomes apparent that these summer jobs will be doled out as political plums, based not on ability, need, or deservedness, but instead, simply on the basis of who can supply the best political endorsements to satisfy some political hack in the White House as to how many Democratic votes he can deliver and how many big wheels in the Democratic Party can vouch for him.

Mr. Speaker, I am terribly shocked at the temerity of the White House in taking this action and exercising dictatorial control over a substantial segment of the civil service system, and substituting therefor, a patronage system for more than 10,000 student summer jobs with the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee not to overlook this new Federal spoils system and to demand that the Civil Service Commission do the job it was assigned to do by the Congress.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE TO CONTROL STUDENT JOB PATRONAGE

(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student hails, plus the college he is attending, if any, will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure "coordination" in order that the agencies could make best use of the students talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to pass civil service exams for clerical, typists and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

It's no secret that a goodly portion of the summer student jobs are filled on a personal patronage basis each year. Government officials, political and career, have hired their own sons and daughters as well as the children of friends or Members of Congress. However, the Civil Service Commission has been careful to certify only the top qualifiers on the student trainee exam.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

MOVE BILLS THIS YEAR

This year a half dozen bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve the same objective.

In discussing the White House job clearance system, Mrs. Davies said it was a move to channel the best possible talent to the places in Government where it could be used most effectively.

She said that, for example, if an agency finds that its summer-job vacancies are all filled up, a place for a bright student could be found in another Government agency through a coordinated placement system set up in the White House.

Mrs. Davies refused to answer directly whether the program also involved political patronage, other than saying that there always has been some patronge in summer student jobs in Government.

Presumably, students still have to pass an exam to get the summer jobs.

Last year's Government summer-job program for students was given great emphasis by the administration, with President Kennedy and other top Government officials addressing the students.

Speech by Senator Frank Carlson, Mississippi Valley Association's Annual Meeting Banquet, St. Louis, Mo., February 4, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I bring to the attention of the Members of the House the address given by my colleague the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, senior Senator from Kansas, at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, Mo., on February 4, 1963. Senator CARLSON's long and outstanding public service offers many examples of his interest in soil and water development and conservation. He has devoted much time and effort to develop a constructive program for the Mississippi Valley and its tributaries. Obviously, this has been of great benefit to Kansas. I know all Members will find Senator CARLSON's remarks of interest and of significance. The remarks follow:

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION'S ANNUAL MEETING BANQUET, ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 4, 1963

I am pleased to have the opportunity to address the 44th annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association here in St. Louis. I had this pleasure back in 1947. Since that time, I have also been privileged to work with a large number of your members—your officers and staff people.

I have cooperated with your organization in efforts to carry out the objectives sought in your platform in developing the water resources of the central part of the United States and—for that matter—for the entire Nation.

The Good Book reads, "Where there is no vision people perish." Our Nation has been fortunate in that this organization has not only had the vision, but the courage to carry on a great program of control of water runoff.

Water conservation and utilization is becoming recognized more and more as the No. 1 economic problem in the Nation.

I agree with the language in your 1962 platform, which states that "the management of our natural resources—particularly soil and water—is the foundation on which the future of America will be built."

Our Nation has lost—the U.S. Senate has just lost—and the Mississippi Valley Association has just lost one of their greatest friends, Senator Robert Kerr.

America had no greater leader, dedicated to the continuing search for water answers, than Bob Kerr. He was a personal friend of mine, and I will always feel indebted to him for the splendid support that I received on vital projects in which our Kansas people were interested.

I congratulate your membership from the 23 States which are all—or partly—in the Mississippi Basin—in your dedication to vigorous and aggressive action to further the wise management of these valuable natural resources.

Your association over the years has played a vitally important role in the success attained in this section of our Nation in water resources development. This, of course, includes controlling this great river and its tributaries against the historically wasteful cycle of floods and drouths. This also includes developing this river and its tributaries—where feasible—for navigation—irrigation water to reclaim some of our arid land—water supply for municipal and industrial use—outdoor recreation for millions—stream pollution abatement and the incidental generation of hydroelectric power.

I consider an organization such as yours—with your large membership of dedicated leaders in this section of the country—to be rendering this Nation a great service for its people, its economic betterment, and its security.

In 1925—when I became a Member of the 74th Congress—I was assigned to the Flood Control Committee, under the very able leadership of Will Whittington, of Mississippi.

Can you imagine the irony of a Kansas Member of Congress being appointed to the Flood Control Committee at a time when our State and the Midwest suffered one of its greatest drouths in history?

As I look back on my service on that committee, I feel it was one of the most important assignments that I could have received. Our people were becoming conscious of the need for the control of water runoff for beneficial uses.

As a member of the committee, I helped write the Flood Control Act of 1936, which for the first time in our Nation's history recognized that destructive floods on the rivers of the United States constituted a menace to our national welfare. In my opinion, this was one of the most important steps ever taken. In my opinion, this was truly the beginning of the successful program which is now being carried on in this field.

As a member of the Flood Control Committee, I secured in 1936 the authorization for the appropriation for the Kanopolis Reservoir, which was the first reservoir constructed in the State of Kansas. Now we have a complete network of reservoirs either constructed, partially constructed, or authorized in our State. It has been my privilege to have been associated in securing every one of those projects.

During my years in both Houses of Congress and also as Governor of the State of Kansas, I have watched and supported the program of the Mississippi Valley Association in its development of this great river and its tributaries.

Sometimes it seemed like a long road between floods and flood control, but as congressional approval was given and funds became available, much progress has been made over the last two decades.

I vividly recall the tragic flood of 1951 which occurred in the Kansas Basin and is estimated to have done well over a billion dollars in damage to cities and farms in the lower Kansas Basin, as well as on downstream in the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

I also vividly recall when the Missouri reached record flood stage in 1952 and Omaha and Council Bluffs were miraculously saved from serious flooding. Now, 11 years later, the Missouri River above Kansas City flows on a stop-and-go order from a great chain of dams which extend all the way to Montana. Fort Pack Dam in Montana—built in the thirties—was the first.

As a Member of Congress, I assisted in the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which was built around what is known to conservation-minded people as the Pick-Sloan law, which provided full water resources development for the Missouri Basin.

As Governor of Kansas I had the privilege of working with the interagency committee of the States for an accelerated construction program of this plan. Such important reservoirs as Garrison, Fort Randall, Gavins Point, and Oahe were considered. A sixth, Big Bend, will be ready to store water this summer.

Much progress has been made in the flood control reservoirs and local flood protection projects in the cities in the lower basins, such as the Kansas and Osage-Marais des Cygnes; but there still remains much work to be done on these and many other lower basin tributaries.

These big upstream dams, whose geographical location is in the upper Missouri River country, are by no means limited to the Dakotas and Montana when it comes to distributing the multiple-purpose benefits for which they were designed and are being operated.

Their flood control storage provides varying degrees of security for bustling communities and rich agricultural lands all the way to the Gulf of Mexico. When filled, these reservoirs will store 3 years flow of the Missouri River.

The big block of hydroelectric power they generated last year would run Washington, D.C., and not all the units are yet on the line. This power has led many areas out of the darkness and lighted the way for incoming industry.

Teaming up with the bank stabilization works from Sioux City to the mouth, they are guaranteeing a navigable channel, which—although not yet completed—is setting a new tonnage record every year.

Last year's 2,250,000 tons of commercial freight barged on the Missouri was 43 percent over the 1961 figure. When the 9-foot channel from St. Louis to Sioux City is complete—and this is the key—the 2 million tons will seem small indeed. The huge tonnages hauled on the Mississippi, the Ohio, and other rivers are proof of that. River shippers on the Mississippi and the Ohio have had recent reason to realize what this important operation means to them during the current cold spell which has caused ice jams to virtually shut down this operation.

Perhaps the greatest beneficiaries of river transportation have been the farmers of the Midwest. Not only do feed and fertilizers, molasses, and phosphates arrive at farms from the gulf areas at substantial savings—thanks to river service—but the barges put extra sums of money into the pockets of farmers.

As grain dealers have explained many times, the savings in transportation are passed along to farmers in the form of higher prices. Furthermore, cheap transportation over long distances from the upper Midwest to gulf ports and ports on the Tennessee, give the farmers alternative markets which they never had before the rivers were opened up. This in turn has meant higher prices for the farmers.

The inland waterways have demonstrated their worth as conveyors of our large rockets. Water and plenty of it is needed in the research and manufacture of space vehicles and their accessories. This water and the controlled routes into which it has been channeled would be unavailable were it not provided by natural resource development programs in years gone by.

Our history shows we have leaned heavily on water resources projects in supporting our military might in times of war. The dams in the West generated the vitally needed electricity for the great defense plants of the Pacific coast during World War II. Navy amphibious craft were built in the safety and security of inland shipyards and floated to the coasts on the manmade navigable channels.

The President's Water Resources Policy Commission had this to say about the role of our navigable rivers in its report of 1950:

"The service rendered by inland waterways transportation during World War II demonstrated conclusively that it is of vital importance to national defense. Its performance in contributing to the winning of the war more than justified the confidence of Congress in the Corps of Engineers waterway improvement program prosecuted for and sponsored by the people, and more than repaid the Federal Government for all expenditures of public funds for that program."

Those who would have us abandon the Federal Government's role in developing our rivers and harbors are sending us down the path of economic stagnation and defense deterioration. Just as civilizations were built on water resources development, so too were they lost when their governments failed to keep abreast of this vital need.

The basic purpose and justification for construction of reservoirs by the Corps of Engineers in the Mississippi Basin on tributary streams was, of course, for flood control and navigation. We should never lose sight of this fact to the extent that the flood control storage would ever be encroached upon in years to come. However, some of the so-called fringe benefits are becoming big business. Recreation, for example, is fast becoming an industry on some of the tributary streams. Last year over 6½ million people visited the Corps of Engineers reservoirs in the Missouri River Basin.

Recreation also has its practical side, as it affords an ideal opportunity to supplement, in an enjoyable manner, our physical fitness program.

Although my major and initial interest in this program was in the manner it would affect my home State of Kansas, I recognize full well that the multiple benefits derived from these important projects are of major significance and value.

I have attempted to consistently support this program as we deal with it at the Washington level. To plagiarize a phrase often used, I believe that what is good for Kansas is good for the country—and what is good for the other States is good for Kansas.

I agree with my good friend, Senator ELLENDER, who said, "That is why my temper rises and my blood boils when I hear the all too familiar label of 'pork barrel' placed on public works projects. These shortsighted mudslingers have no conception of the good that flows to our entire Nation as a result of such programs. A channel in New York is deepened, and, as a result, increased trade pours into Pennsylvania. A harbor in Louisiana is completed and there is an increased demand for Iowa corn, Pittsburgh steel, and so on. These are the true end results of public work programs, increased trade and activity which will continue to keep our country great and at the forefront of nations."

This public works program of developing our water resources wisely for future generations is sound capital investment in the future of America. I know of no better place in which we should invest our money, our faith, and our efforts.

One thing that has always disturbed me about the water picture is the fact that there has been such a tremendous lack of coordination. We are polluting on the one hand and trying to unpollute on the other. Often the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing.

I am reminded of a story told by the late Senator Robert Kerr.

There were four boys whose father had just died. They all got together at the time of the funeral and agreed that their father had been very generous to all of them. One of the boys suggested that it might be well for their father to take a little money with him, and as a good will gesture they decided to put some money in the coffin. They agreed that they should put in $125 each. The first three boys each put an envelop containing $125 in their father's coffin, but the fourth brother, who was a little sharper, came along and took the three envelopes and replaced them with one containing his check.

This, I think, symbolizes sometimes the lack of coordination and poor planning we do in dealing with water uses.

It is estimated that before the white man came to this continent the area between Canada and the Gulf of Mexico was inhabited by approximately 1 million Indians. They had the resources of the entire continent at their disposal and approximately 4,000 acres for each man, woman, and child. Yet, quite often, they starved because they lacked the capacity to develop their important natural resources. Today, in this same area, with our increased population, there is said to be approximately 2 acres of cultivated land per person.

We maintain the highest level of living in all of history. This is the result of increased effective development of our natural and human resources.

It has been estimated that by the year 2000 our population might reach over 300 million. This population explosion would leave less than 1½ acres of cultivated land per person.

The Senate appointed a select committee to study our water problems. Two of my good friends and former colleagues—the late Senator Robert Kerr from Oklahoma and my deceased colleague from Kansas, Senator Andrew Schoeppel—served on this important committee.

This study indicates that in the next 20 years the Nation will need to have new reservoirs to provide an additional 332 million acre-feet of storage capacity to provide adequate level flows.

I am convinced that this is more reservoir capacity than has been installed in the United States by all agencies—Federal, State, and private—since we became a Nation. This would mean that it would be necessary to provide reservoir capacity at least 16 million acre-feet a year, which is about double the rate that the Federal Government has been building during the past 5 years.

The following is a quote from a Senate select committee summary report:

"With its abundant supply of good water, and its advanced technology and skills, the United States need never suffer for lack of water. Water shortages can be alleviated. The lack of water need not limit our economic destiny. But positive action must be substituted for complacency.

"There is work to be done—work to develop and use the abundant resources placed in our custody by a generous providence—work to develop the practices and techniques which will permit ever-increasing needs to be filled within the infinite limits of the resources we have.

"The first and most important step toward getting the job done is the development of increased public awareness and understanding of the Nation's water resources problems, of their effects on the Nation's economy, and of the possible ways of solving them. Facilitating this step has been one of the primary objectives of the Select Committee on National Water Resources."

In the 44 years the Mississippi Valley Association has been meeting to assess the growth and needs of our rivers, much has been recorded along the road of progress. But we are just getting started on the road to full and complete control of our water supply. Much remains to be done; but with the Mississippi Valley Association on the sidelines, I am confident the future of our inland waterways is in capable hands.

This has been said many times, but it is worth repeating. The history of every civilization that the world has ever known has been tied to the care and proper use of the nation's water resources.

Babylon, China, the Holy Lands, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and others attained a high degree of prosperity so long as they husbanded their water resources. They all deteriorated when there was not enough water.

The pattern of man's development and the periods of growth and deterioration all followed the same pattern:

Bondage to spiritual faith.
Spiritual faith to great courage.
Courage to liberty.
Liberty to abundance.
Abundance to selfishness.
Selfishness to complacency.
Complacency to apathy.
Apathy to dependency.
Dependency to bondage.

We in America are now in the period of abundance. Where we go from here depends on you and me.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we near the celebration of the birthday of the Father of Our Country, it is fitting and proper that we pause to salute the anniversary of a determined people.

For it was in 1918 that Lithuania shook off 120 years of czarist rule and became free. Hers has been a history of struggle. The light of freedom has temporarily dimmed for Lithuania under the grinding heel of Communist Russia.

We who enjoy freedom join Lithuania in her fight for freedom. We hold resolute the faith that the joys of freedom will again return to that land.

I bring to the attention of the House a booklet issued by UNESCO, an internationally operated organization which continually attacks the United States while drawing 30 percent of its financial lifeline from our Treasury.

This organization has distributed a booklet prepared by two Communists. The booklet claims that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania joined the Communist

world of their own free will. Anyone who knows these people, their fierce pride of homeland, their respect and longing for liberty knows that this is a heartless travesty. Our United Nations delegation undermines the cause of free Lithuania by its inaction in not stopping UNESCO from publishing and distributing this vicious untruth about these Baltic nations.

Through years of Russian and German occupancy, Lithuania has risen from the ashes of oppression with renewed vigor. Let us take a moment as we cherish the memory of a man who did much to bring freedom to us, to express our sympathy and offer our moral and spiritual assistance to these brave people who want simply to live their lives in freedom.

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the educational television effort we have made in South Carolina. I salute Mr. Lynn Kalmbach and others who have worked so hard and so diligently to promote this idea. It has been a great help to our educators and the children trying to learn.

I enclose as a part of my remarks an article from the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., of February 17, 1963. I call attention of the Nation to our program and I hope that we can be of help to the Nation in paving the way to better education through this media.

The article follows:

MILLION VIEWERS—EDUCATIONAL TV INTO THE HOMES

"The two television stations the South Carolina Educational TV Commission plans to put on the air next September will make Educational TV programing available in the homes of almost a million South Carolinians," R. Lynn Kalmbach, general manager of the Educational TV Center, has announced.

The educational TV commission has filed applications for permission to operate channel 29 at Greenville and channel 7 at Charleston.

The Greenville station's signal, because of the favorable location of its transmitter and tower atop Paris Mountain, will serve an area in which 698,261 South Carolinians live, according to 1960 census figures. The coverage pattern includes 10 Piedmont counties, in a radius of 50 miles of the tower.

The Charleston station's signal will cover an area populated by 237,946 people, according to census figures, for a State total of 936-207, Kalmbach said. The Charleston coverage area will be in a radius of 30 miles of the tower in midtown Charleston.

The new Educational TV stations were made possible when facilities were donated outright to the Educational TV Commission by WMRC, Inc., operators of WFBC-TV in Greenville and by WCSC-TV in Charleston. "The donated facilities amounted to about $100,000," Kalmbach said.

"These open-circuit stations will complement our statewide closed-circuit system," Kalmbach said. "They are, of course, limited to transmitting one program at a time and it will take the multi-channel ability of closed-circuit to fully serve the State's schools. The new stations will be a great help in enabling us to begin work in elementary and adult education, however."

The two stations would be fed initially from the Educational TV Center here over a second channel.

"It is my hope that a second channel will be provided on the closed-circuit network for every county in the State," Kalmbach said. The closed-circuit network has a potential of six channels of operation under present plans.

"Schools in the Columbia area already have three closed-circuit channels available," he said. "Thus, they will be in a position next fall to receive such Educational TV courses as driver training, advanced French, junior high school mathematics and electronics, which will not be available to those schools in areas of the State served only by one channel."

"Programing on the open-circuit stations could include courses for elementary schools and colleges as well as a few high school subjects," Kalmbach said.

"Selected programing of a cultural nature will be available for the adult population during the evening hours and on weekends," he said.

The two Educational TV stations will serve areas including 140 junior and senior high schools and 398 elementary schools. High schools in the service area have a student population of 80,429; elementary schools in the service area have a student population of 159,940.

Counties in the coverage patterns of the two Educational TV stations include Abbeville, Anderson, Berkeley, Charleston, Cherokee, Dorchester, Greenville, Greenwood, Laurens, Oconee, Pickens, Union, Spartanburg.

Questioning President's Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of January 28, 1963:

QUESTIONING PRESIDENT'S WORD

A strange spectacle shapes up in the Nation's Capital with the announcement by the chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, JOHN STENNIS, Mississippi Democrat, that an investigation will be held into a purported Soviet military buildup in Cuba.

This would not be unusual except for the fact that the President of the United States, speaking in an open press conference a few days earlier, had said that the buildup was not taking place.

On the surface, it would appear that the Senate of the United States—or an important committee thereof—is questioning the word of the President. You can't read it any other way.

Unfortunately, the record is not on the side of the President.

Days before the so-called Cuban crisis burst full blown on the American public through the medium of a Presidential report to the people, Mr. Kennedy had indicated that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba.

American newsmen, plying their trade in Cuba, had seen and had reported to their readers, the facts about the thousands of Soviet military men in Cuba. Reports on the presence of the Soviet missiles, which eventually caused the President to act, were current long before he called for a quarantine of the island nation and forced a showdown with the Soviet Union.

When Khrushchev took the missiles home—or said he did—the administration set out to put itself in the best possible light in connection with the Cuban crisis.

Soon the public was preoccupied with the ransoming of the prisoners from the Bay of Pigs invasion—but many aspects of that story were left vague.

The next development in the chain of events connected with Cuba came in the denials by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who seems to double as Secretary of State and an administrative assistant to his brother, the President, that air cover ever had been promised the luckless invasion army.

This was a particularly strange bit of business because, for nearly 2 years, the administration had let stand an impression that such assistance had been promised the invaders, but had been withdrawn at the last minute by the President.

While the President willfully assumed responsibility for the failure of the invasion, he had failed to clarify the vital point regarding air cover or to deny the published reports. It is impossible to see how his doing so could have affected the course of events, including the negotiations for the release of the prisoners.

But that, along with Brother Robert's comment that the administration had underestimated the number of Soviet military men on the island because it hadn't been realized how many soldiers the Soviets could pack on a ship, raises many new questions.

Also, his statements on the failure of the invasion create grave doubts about the efficiency of the American military establishment.

To put it bluntly, the explanations and reports coming from the White House simply do not engender confidence. Regrettable as the action may be, it seems that a congressional investigation is in order so that the American people may find out what goes on with respect to Khrushchev's base 90 miles from the coast of Florida.

General Assembly Deciding Whether To Federalize Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article pertaining to school federalization:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY DECIDING WHETHER TO FEDERALIZE SCHOOLS; IF IT FAILS TO REMOVE SCHOOLS FROM PROPERTY TAX, THE CHOICE IS MADE

The process by which governmental power in this country has gravitated to the Federal Government is well known. It has rarely been a case of the Government at Washington grabbing power; again and again local and State governments have failed to

do a job, and in order to get it done the Federal Government had to do it.

There have been some instances in which State and local governments could not do a job. The countering of major depressions is one of them, and we discovered this in the thirties. But in most instances the State and local governments have neglected their duties and the Federal takeover has followed this neglect.

Right now a last-ditch decision is being made whether the Federal Government is to take over the schools of this country—and the decision is being made, not in Washington, but in the State capitals.

In Indiana we have archaic, backbreaking property taxes imposed by local communities upon a minority of their people to pay for schools. These people are not at all those most able to pay; they are the people who have invested their savings in homes and other community improvements and enterprises instead of buying stocks and bonds.

Either the Indiana General Assembly will enact a tax for the operation of its schools that eliminates the property tax for this purpose, or the Federal Government is going to do it—the people will demand that it shall do it.

All of the talk about wanting to preserve the control of schools in the local communities is a lot of hogwash. There is not a recognizable element of truth in it. The local communities today do not run their schools; the State runs them. The State sets the qualification for teachers. The State tells the school how much it must pay a teacher. The State says what textbooks may be used. The State must approve the design and specifications of a school building before it can be built. The State governs the procedures and powers of the local school board. We have State-run schools today. All the community has to do is to pay the bill, and do it through an inadequate, unfair, burdensome, antiquated property tax.

The talk of State aid to schools is both a lie and an insult. Indiana's public schools are State schools which send the bill for their operation to the local community, with the exception of a continually diminishing handout that comes from the gross income tax. Any thought that a little increase in this handout is an answer to today's problem should be forgotten. Either the State of Indiana is going to step up to its responsibility and finance the schools, or the people are ready to say that the Federal Government must take over our schools.

We don't like Federal aid to education because it means Federal control. Federal control is not only an unwelcome centralization of power, but it is contrary to the learning process, which is exploratory in nature and is best served by many systems preserving freedom to experiment. But if the Indiana General Assembly fails to take the schools off the property tax, we shall support the federalization of our schools as the lesser of two evils.

Submarines Versus Surface Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the following editorial which appeared today in the Washington Post:

SUBMARINES VERSUS SURFACE VESSELS

The shift of the Defense Establishment from thermonuclear Polaris submarines to missile-carrying surface vessels as the backbone of the NATO multinational thermonuclear weapons system must be pretty unsettling for our allies.

We persuaded the British that the Skybolt is no good by arguing that a bomber moving at supersonic speed is a sitting duck for the Soviet Union's antiaircraft defenses. So the British agreed to change to the Polaris-armed submarine as a thermonuclear weapon. Now it turns out that we are to offer our other allies missile-carrying surface vessels.

The given wisdom at Nassau was that surface vessels were unsatisfactory. They could be located by the enemy and locked in by the Soviet missile system and destroyed at will because of their slow speed. So the British were told, the carrier had to be submersible. Now, suddenly and unpredictably, the surface vessel is all right. One may be forgiven for suspecting that Soviet missiles are as good as they were 2 months ago and for believing the surface vessel is no more invulnerable than it was then.

It seems to have occurred to the Defense Establishment, quite belatedly, that this vulnerability can be offset by sheer numbers and by concealment. These advantages, to which must be added the enormous advantage of lower construction costs, now recommend the surface vessel. This all sounds very plausible—but no more plausible than it was last December when we told the British that surface ships would not do.

Some people will suspect that the change in position has less to do with a study of weapons than with a study of Congress which might be reluctant to change the McMahon act to permit multinational crews on thermonuclear submarines.

It is to be assumed that the Soviet Union's research and development establishment has been trying to perfect countermeasures for all of our plans as they emerge. This is a new concept of the decoy system and if we long persist in it we may be able to utterly saturate Soviet laboratories.

Defense requirements change very swiftly in our technological age. The Military Establishment must abandon weapons systems and theories that have been rendered obsolete by new discovery and invention. We must fit our plans to the latest scientific disclosures. Let us hope we are not just fitting our scientific disclosures to our latest plans.

Tactics Change in Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith attach an editorial from the Decatur-Herald of February 18, which I feel every Member of the House will want to read, regarding the change in tactics of the administration on the tax bill. I think that most of this has been obvious to those of us in the House. It is good to know that the people back home are beginning to understand what is being done and the danger of this approach to the economy of the country.

We could be talked into a recession by the President.

The editorial follows:

TACTICS CHANGED IN TAX PROGRAM

A barely detectable, but nonetheless significant change has taken place in the Kennedy administration's strategy on its tax reduction and reform proposals.

Previously, the President and his advisers emphasized reduction and reform as necessary to future economic expansion. But in last week's news conference Mr. Kennedy offered his tax programs as recession remedies. "Our plan to prevent a recession this year and the years to come," was how the President put it.

In effect, the administration has shifted to a scare campaign to counter the lukewarm reception the tax proposals have received. Fear of a recession, the Kennedy people apparently believe, will elicit a more enthusiastic response than the economic acceleration appeal has produced.

Obviously there is no logical relationship between the Kennedy programs and the prospect of a recession. In the first place, none of the various statistical indicators used in plotting the course of the economy suggests that a recession is near. More important, the tax reduction plan now before Congress couldn't possibly be enacted in time to avert an economic downturn in 1963.

The tax reduction campaign has not been handled effectively. Tying reduction to reform, as demanded by Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, hurt the tax reduction proposal in Congress.

Then Mr. Kennedy found himself opposed by many people, influential and otherwise, who demanded that a spending cut accompany the tax cut. Finally, many organizations that supported the program originally began to climb down from the bandwagon. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers wanted less emphasis on consumer purchasing power and more on investment stimulation. The AFL–CIO demanded considerably more relief for the lower income brackets.

All of this left the administration to face a hostile Congress without the consensus backing it could once claim. It is no wonder that the President switched tactics.

But a suggestion from the President that a recession might be near is calculated to shake business confidence, and perhaps bring on the very conditions that the Nation must avoid. Moreover, Mr. Kennedy could lessen public confidence in his own fiscal guidance. It was, after all, John F. Kennedy who last year rejected an emergency tax cut on the grounds that the economic indicators—now much improved over what they foretold at that time—were such that a quick cut was unwarranted.

Those who support the tax reduction plan as essential to national growth must sympathize with the President in his present frustration. But the new approach in the long run might be as damaging as tax reduction and reform could be uplifting.

U.S. Prestige and Our Current Disarray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a man-bites-dog twist in today's Washington Daily Post. We all know that the Washington Post is most sympathetic to the New Frontier and President

Kennedy. It is, therefore, most surprising when Murrey Marder, himself a Kennedy sympathizer, pulls no punches in telling the American people the sad state of our foreign affairs and in commenting on the Kennedy administration's deliberate policy of withholding the facts from the American people. The excellent article follows:

ADMINISTRATION STRIVES TO HIDE FRUSTRATIONS

(By Murrey Marder)

For a month now the Kennedy administration has been trying to keep its frustrations over disorder inside the Atlantic alliance from showing in public.

The United States has been in the position of a strapping 6-footer, surprised on a dimly lighted Paris street by a slight fellow, about 4 feet 3 inches, who kicked him violently in the shin.

Glassy eyed with pain, thrown off stride, and gingerly feeling the shin to determine if it was broken, the big fellow has pridefully insisted, "Oh, it's nothing—nothing at all."

The big fellow undoubtedly will continue in the general direction of his planned destination. But he will be walking with a limp.

Administrations, like people, try to operate by plan. But they are also subject to fate, coincidence, or luck, good and bad.

Ill fortune hit the Eisenhower administration hard at the end of its second term, with the U-2 incident, the collapse of the Paris summit conference, and anti-American rioting in Japan.

Similarly, although the present incumbents naturally deny the comparison, misfortune has piled up for the Kennedy administration in recent weeks.

The Nassau conference of President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan in December rebounded to help aggravate Britain's prospects for entering the Common Market. French President Charles de Gaulle in January openly challenged the whole American version of Europe's evolution.

Canadian-American relations erupted in nuclear controversy. Spain tried to put a heavy thumb on the scale of bargaining over renegotiation of American base rights there. Then there was the new flareup over Soviet troops in Cuba.

There is no easy way out of these or a dozen other international harassments for the administration. This was demonstrated by domestic critics' reactions this week to news that the Soviet Union has said it will pull several thousand more troops out of Cuba soon: "One Russian in Cuba is one too many."

As for U.S. relations with its allies, most of the problems that plague the Alliance probably are, from a historian's point of view, growing pains. But that does not make them less painful in the present.

The United States is such a huge figure in the Western World that any ally seeking to demonstrate its strength and independence is almost bound to discomfit the United States. This appears to be part of an inevitable process when a diffusion of power is underway as a result of a maturing world society.

But many observers believe that the administration is inflicting unnecessary wounds on itself by trying to prepare in private tidy solutions to all things, and presenting those solutions as accomplished fact. Too often in recent weeks the results have exploded in the administration's face, when the interplay of world events disjointed the plans.

News that is bottled up too long tends to generate a combustible and an exaggerated force of its own Equally, the same information, disseminated in normal sequence of events, has a foundation-laying effect in reconciling public and national attitudes toward a long-range plan of action.

This principle, had it been followed in the case of the Skybolt affair and the Nassau meeting, in the Canadian-American clash, or even in the case of the Cuban buildup, could have had an ameliorating effect in each case.

Instead, administration methods and the secrecy around them often have defeated administration ends. While the administration has been under domestic attack for managing the news, often it does not manage it very well. Too many times the reaction of President Kennedy and his advisers to news developments is, "How did that get out?" instead of "Why can't we put that out?"

When French President de Gaulle jarred the Atlantic alliance with his blunt press conference of January 14, President Kennedy, in private, was, unsurprisingly, furious. On reflection, however, instructions went out from the White House to react calmly, avoiding anything like John Foster Dulles' famous "agonizing reappraisal." That was a justified response, to avoid compounding the problem. But even a moderate amount of candor was sacrified in carrying out this theme.

President Kennedy himself, in subsequent news conferences, however, found himself hard pressed to comply with his own admonition. But the State Department, dutifully following instruction for the most part, overdid the unconvincing gloss. The disavowals that there was any disruption to the U.S. grand design of foreign policy reached the point where Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, last Sunday rejected the idea that the alliance was in any "disarray," disdaining the description as journalistic

Ball apparently forgot that the word once was used very prominently, with lesser cause, by President Kennedy, in his first state of the Union address in January 1961. He said then, "In Europe our alliances are unfulfilled and in some disarray."

The Kennedy administration recognized this when it came to office. It is even more true now than then.

Imports of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep concern over the implications of a report issued last week by the Office of Emergency Planning on the oil import program as it applies to residual fuel oil.

If the report is accepted by the President it means for all practical purposes the end of the present mandatory import control program on residual oil. This, in itself, would be a sufficiently serious step to cause grave apprehensions on the part of the domestic fuels industry. But, a cause for equal concern is the philosophy implicit in the OEP report to the effect that we no longer need to look to domestic resources for our fuel and energy but, rather, should depend upon sources outside the United States.

I disagree most emphatically with such an approach to the most critical question of fuels and energy sufficiency for the United States, both in times of peace and war.

To follow such a course as proposed by the OEP could, in my opinion, be disastrous for the future.

The unlimited importation of residual fuel oil, as recommended by OEP, would have a devastating effect upon the domestic coal and oil industries, which have been striving so valiantly in recent years to regain their rightful place in the domestic fuels economy. There is no question whatever, should residual import controls be removed, that residual oil from the Caribbean would be imported into the country in unlimited amounts. The east coast of the United States would be the logical outlet for the initial distribution of this oil. It could be sold at prices far below the low level which prevails today so utilities and industrial plants which still use coal as a primary fuel would be forced, because of competitive and economic reasons, to turn to this foreign fuel.

One direct result of such a development would be to delay the development and exploitation of the vast coal reserves in New Mexico and other Western States. The coal industry simply would not have the investment capital available to expand its operations if additional coal markets are lost to this imported waste oil.

But, I am also deeply concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the removal of residual oil import controls would be only the first step toward a completely free trade in all petroleum and petroleum products. Such unlimited oil imports would be a disaster of the first magnitude for the domestic oil industry.

Removal of residual controls, and the flooding of the country by imported residual, will react most unfavorably upon the domestic oil industry. Residual oil comprises about 10 percent of domestic refinery output, and the revenue from this source is important. If the price for domestic residual oil is further depressed through unlimited imports, the picture for the domestic oil industry will become even darker than it is now. Free and unlimited international trade in oil and oil products—which seems to be the ultimate objective of OEP—could very well mean the end of the domestic oil industry as a vital force in the economy. Imported crude oil sells today for about $1 a barrel less than domestic crude, landed at the head of the Houston ship channel. You can imagine what the price differential would be if foreign producers were given unlimited access to the American market and became engaged in an all out war for this lucrative market.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the President will reject the OEP report and its philosophy of free hemispheric trade in oil.

The economy of the Nation, and its very security in time of emergency, is too intimately involved in this whole question for the OEP recommendation and philosophy to be made the national policy on oil imports.

No Need To Soak Taxpayers When Self-Help Plan Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1958, Public Law 85-875 was enacted to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage and assist in the establishment of clubs throughout the United States for young people especially interested in science, a most commendable objective with which all Americans can agree. The act provided that a corporation be granted a charter by Congress to help the Commissioner carry out this assignment and last year, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER introduced legislation to grant this charter to the Science Service, Inc., which has demonstrated most illustriously its fulfillment of the requirements indicated by Public Law 875.

The bill was passed by the House but was not considered on the floor of the Senate. However, Congressman WALTER has again introduced the proposal, H.R. 824, to grant a charter to Science Service, Inc., and I am very hopeful that this legislation will be enacted during the present session of Congress. In this connection, under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial from the Flint, Mich., Journal, of February 17 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since it states so well the excellent reasons for supporting this legislative request:

NO NEED TO SOAK TAXPAYERS WHEN SELF-HELP PLAN WORKS

Flint area students in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools are at work experimenting and preparing exhibits for the seventh annual Flint Science Fair at IMA Auditorium.

The fair is 7 weeks away, but projects are well underway at all schools. In some cases, preparations began last spring soon after the completion of the 1962 Flint Fair. Every exhibit by a budding scientist that will be judged in April will represent months of study, concentration, and hard work.

Last year's award winners received prizes totaling $4,200. The amount will be more this time. Already, seven scholarships worth $3,750 have been announced.

Flint's Fair, as are more than 200 other such local fairs across the country, is sponsored by area public and parochial schools, community service organizations and business and industrial firms with help and encouragement from Science Service, Inc., sponsor of the annual National Science Fair-International to which the Journal sends local award winners.

In 1958, Flint was host to the national fair. More than 30,000 persons attended to marvel at exhibits from 150 fairs in the United States, Japan, and West Germany. It did much to call attention to Flint's ever-expanding educational facilities and programs. It also stimulated greater interest in local science-fair participation and excellence.

From this new interest and continued motivation by Science Service, elementary school fairs were started to promote interschool science activities and increase interest in the annual Flint Fair.

One concrete result was the more than 1,000 individual science projects by Flint area students last year. Of that number 875 were entered in the fair.

Science Service is responsible for motivating youngsters in other ways than through its sponsorship of science fairs. For many years it has promoted the science club movement in our schools, and more recently has conducted science talent searches from coast to coast.

Flint students participating in the talent search and science clubs in Flint-area schools are affiliated with Science Service, which provides literature, project materials and teaching aids at no cost to the schools.

Since it was founded in 1921, Science Service has been assisting in the establishment of such clubs and since 1941 it has broadened its scope to include sponsorship of the science fairs and other programs to foster science interest among this country's youth.

Now a bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives to provide Science Service a Federal charter. The bill, H.R. 824, is identical to the one the House approved last summer only to have it die in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We are in favor of the bill. Its passage would preserve this nonprofit organization which has so successfully encouraged grassroot, self-help programs such as Flint's in schools and communities across the country.

Since 1958 the U.S. Office of Education has been after Congress to establish a Federal program of school science clubs under its direction and to appropriate funds for its operation. It still is eager to take over this program and the supervision of science fairs—at public expense.

We point to the tremendous growth in interest here among students, instructors, parents and local sponsoring agencies since Flint's first science fair was held in 1957 as an example of the excellent job Science Service is doing in helping promote science interest in U.S. schools. Its programs are in more than 20,000 schools in all 50 States.

There is no need for the Government to step in to take over the job at taxpayer expense. In fact, such tax expenditures by the U.S. Office of Education cannot be justified.

We urge passage of the bill to give Science Service a Federal charter so it can continue its work on a nonprofit basis.

Events in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there were many of us in the Congress talking about Cuba and what was happening and long before the President took action last October.

From information which was available to Congress as well as to the White House, we came to the conclusion that the signs of what was being done between Russia and Cuba pointed to the inevitable—that Russia was arming Cuba for offensive purposes.

Gen. Thomas D. White, former commander of the U.S. Air Force and now retired, has written one of the most succinct and direct observations of what has been happening psychologically in this country from the White House down to the lowest citizen. As General White has so well put it, what happened in Cuba, instead of being an eye opener, should be a shocker to those in high position in the Government, as to the implications of what the future holds for us in the long pull with communism.

As General White has again said this "great national orgy of self-congratulation" could result in the greatest miscalculation for disaster in our history. Our naivete in believing that Russia was coming with 15,000 members of the armed forces to plant defensive missiles in Cuba almost brought us to a major disaster.

Constant vigilance is the price of survival in the nuclear age. We may not be as fortunate again as we were in October in Cuba in being able to locate offensive weapons. Our military leadership in the last 24 months has been greatly silenced. Many of us in the Congress hope that the military in the future will speak up when they believe they are right—even though this may not be popular at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

General White's article from Newsweek, January 14, 1963, is herewith appended:

GREAT NATIONAL ORGY OF SELF-CONGRATULATION

(By Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired)

"'Placebo': Any harmless substance, as bread pills, given to humor a patient."—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

Uncle Sam has long been suffering from a severe case of national apathy recently aggravated and climaxed in a high Cuban fever. His most dangerous sequela is overconfidence. As an aftermath of Cuba we may become more offguard than ever, tranquilized by our own nostrums and the propaganda pills constantly fed to us by Dr. Khrushchev.

Our Government acted courageously in the Cuban situation. But that is exactly what I expect the Government of the United States of America to do.

What seems strange to me is that we have been engaged in a great national orgy of self-congratulations. We congratulate ourselves over the confrontation of our sworn enemy who, armed with lethal weapons aimed at the very heart of this country, marched almost openly into our own front yard. It seems to me that rather than congratulate ourselves, we should soberly recognize that Cuba is surely one of the easiest of all the areas and circumstances of possible decisive confrontation with the Soviet Union. Instead of crowing over a 12th-hour decision, we should be taking stock of our national attitudes which permitted the immediate situation to arise in the first place.

I find it especially difficult to understand why our military authorities did not raise the alarm long before October. In my opinion, and I spent many years in the intelligence business, there was enough information to be found in the daily press alone to have led to a military conclusion that the Russians in Cuba were posing a serious threat to the United States.

Surely the stream of Russian ships to Cuba which began last midsummer should have aroused deep suspicion. Could anyone in uniform really have believed that the construction in Havana Harbor was for a fishing fleet? Did the evaluators of Soviet intelligence, who should be chosen for their cynicism, actually give credence to published reports that thousands of Russian troops in Cuba were there for peaceful purpose or that the U.S.S.R. would mount such an effort merely to arm Fidel Castro with defensive missiles? Was not the sum total of in-

dicators enough to raise the alarm long before it was raised?

I am perturbed that, whatever the current arrangement of intelligence organizations, whatever the Department of Defense policies on military expression of views, there should be such evidence of complacency among our professional military watchdogs.

There have been changes in our military intelligence setup, and the military voice has certainly been muted. Nonetheless I am confident that if our highest military authorities had stood up and spoken on this subject, the Commander in Chief would have acted promptly on their warning.

It bothers me also to know that the equipment for launching and guiding certain types of missiles can be hidden readily and that some missiles and aircraft themselves can be transported piecemeal and quickly reassembled. These factors and other clandestine capabilities of the U.S.S.R. in Cuba lead me to believe that as long as there is a Communist government in Cuba, the United States and all of Latin America are in jeopary. Our naivete in beliving otherwise has brought us close to a major disaster.

We may have been "eyeball to eyeball" and, this time the other fellow may have blinked—but maybe he only winked. In any case, we may be sure that he is already plotting a next time. He will continue to feed us propaganda pills to lull our senses and will always be set to administer us a fatal potion. Khrushchev has sworn to bury us. Presumably he would prefer to bury us alive. But if necessary he would gladly bury us dead.

"'Placebo': The opening antiphon of the vespers for the dead."—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

Windfalls in Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial appearing in the Stevens Point Daily Journal, Stevens Point, Wis., attention was called to a mistake made by the Federal Government in designating Portage County in my district a "distressed area." I include that editorial as an example of the confusion that exists in the Federal bureaucracy concerning the proper administration of Federal funds under existing programs:

WINDFALLS IN FEDERAL AID, ALSO DISAPPOINTMENT

There is an old saying that one should never look a gift horse in the mouth. We are reminded of it by what has been transpiring over the past year or so regarding the status of Portage County as a "distressed area," making it eligible for grants of public funds for federally approved local projects.

It has been necessary to take a number of looks in the direction of that gift horse, to get some needed answers. It all started when Portage County, including Stevens Point, was classified as a distressed area on the basis of unemployment figures. But this turned out to be a statistical error and we were removed this week from that classification by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Meanwhile, a number of projects were set up, after local officials were given assurances that the eligibility continued in force, despite the mistake. This has brought a considerable anticipated windfall to the community. It apparently means the city will receive a $100,000 grant to pay about half the cost of a new city garage, and that Portage County may reap a benefit of $485,000, half the estimated cost of a 90-bed addition to the new county infirmary. Believed suspended by the new classification is a city request for $47,500 for half the estimated cost of a sanitary sewer project.

Also under a Federal program, the board of water and sewage commissioners received a grant of $36,300 for a sewage plant project, but lost out on a bid for an additional $27,000.

If local officials have any qualms of conscience as to taking advantage of a technicality that made the city and county eligible for grants, although they should not have been, their composure can be readily restored. They were encouraged by Federal officials to apply for grants despite the uncertain status that clouded the picture, and were assured we were still eligible for benefits under the depressed area assistance programs. In view of these representations, the local projects continued to be submitted.

There was one outstanding development, however, that is disappointing. This involved strenuous work to obtain a large loan—not a grant—for the establishment of a $2,770,000 food processing plant in the Plover area. The firm planned to contract for locally grown potatoes on a major scale. It would have provided steady employment for up to 400 persons, giving the area permanent benefits through this new industry. Local community leaders felt confident that under the formula laid down, the comparatively small sum required to be raised locally could have been obtained.

This project went down the drain, not as the result of the classification change but because Portage County never should have been designated as a distressed area in the first place. The Area Redevelopment Administration said: "We cannot in good conscience approve the expenditure of Federal funds when we know that Portage County would not be entitled to such funds except for the fact that an error had been made." That is the official explanation. We suspect however, that this may not be the real reason, and that other influences may have been at work in Washington to block this business venture with its spotlight on our potato industry.

Throughout the various proceedings, officials have learned something about the devious ways of Federal assistance.

Word is being awaited as to the fate of two other projects in Portage County, a municipal water plant for Junction City and a sewerage system for Rosholt.

H.R. 97, a Bill To Provide Certain Exemptions From Federal Excise Taxes for Nonprofit Organizations for the Blind Which Are Now Provided for Nonprofit Educational Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 88th Congress, I introduced H.R. 97, a bill to exempt nonprofit, voluntary associations and agencies engaged in work for the blind from paying Federal excise taxes.

I sponsored this same measure in the last Congress. I have reintroduced it in this one because I believe these are worthy organizations doing a worthwhile work and deserve the small amount of relief from paying burdensome taxes that the enactment of my bill into law would provide.

Although substantial sums of money are appropriated annually by the Federal and State governments to provide special kinds of training and assistance to the Nation's nearly 400,000 blind persons, these funds are not sufficient to meet the need.

Therefore, there has developed, in just about every community in America, privately established, nonprofit organizations which fill in the gaps in the services provided to blind people by public authority.

These organizations for the blind—perhaps as many as 1,000 of them—serve as centers of activities for the blind. They serve as centers for groups of braille transcribers, volunteers who produce books in raised characters or on records and tapes for college students, or for blind children attending classes in local sighted schools—or even for general reading; these centers offer training in the skills and techniques of blindness; they provide social services, and serve as educational and recreational resources for their numerous blind clients.

Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with these fine institutions, and I am proud to say that one of the very best of them is the Industrial Home for the Blind, located in my district in Brooklyn.

Established nearly three-quarters of a century ago, this organization has gained a worldwide reputation for the pioneering work it has performed in the field of work for the blind.

One of the first to explore the possibilities of magnifier lenses for persons with very limited vision, there has grown within the Industrial Home for the Blind an optical aids service which truly helps the blind to see again.

Those who suffer the double handicapping disabilities of blindness and deafness have received much attention from this highly esteemed Brooklyn institution. Great advances have been made to help these people—shut away from the sights and sounds of the world—to help them achieve a larger measure of fulfillment in their lives.

The Industrial Home for the Blind also maintains a corps of nearly a thousand volunteers who copy textbooks into braille for blind students of all ages and in all manner of educational institutions.

These are but a few of the activities and accomplishments of the justly famous Industrial Home for the Blind. It also provides a great diversity of other services and activities to sightless men, women, and children, not only in our part of New York City and State, but to blind persons throughout the world.

And the Industrial Home for the Blind about which I speak with such familiarity—for I have known of it as far back as I can remember—the Industrial Home

for the Blind which I describe with so much hometown pride—is but one of many similar organizations situated throughout our land, serving blind people in their need, serving them as they strive to function without sight in our sight-structured society.

Financed in their good works by the charitable dollars of America's generous citizenry, these organizations have found it increasingly difficult to operate to the extent necessary to fully meet and satisfy their blind clients' requirements.

These organizations for the blind have felt the heavy burden of mounting costs, not the least of these being the charges imposed upon them as they comply with Federal, State, and local laws, standards, and requirements. And as costs have grown, so too has grown the number and nature of charitable organizations which compete for financial support from Americans.

Many of these enterprises in community kindness which serve the blind raise their funds by a mail appeal—and the increases we made in the postal rates last year have resulted in accelerated costs, in multiplying financial difficulties already threatening a curtailment of services to blind people.

In order to provide these very praiseworthy organizations with a measure of relief from their mounting costs, I have offered a bill, H.R. 97, to exempt them from paying the excise taxes levied upon them by the Federal Government.

My bill, as Federal law, would mean that these philanthropic associations and agencies would be able to make their always-insufficient funds go further in meeting the needs of blind people.

The proposal contained in H.R. 97 is not an effort to make a substantive change in our Federal tax law.

Adoption of my bill would not introduce into the Nation's tax structure a strange and different concept.

Nor would such an exemption from Federal excise taxes be a special privilege bestowed only upon this relatively small number of voluntary organizations operating in the communities of America to serve our sightless fellow citizens.

The exemption from excise taxes which I seek for organizations engaged in work for the blind is already available to educational organizations and institutions—it is available to many thousands of them.

So that my bill would not create a new benefit, but would extend an existing one.

And the extension of this exemption to nonprofit, voluntary associations and agencies serving blind people is consistent with existing law, is in full conformity with the purpose of the present provisions of law relating to exemption of organizations from excise taxes.

For the work of organizations serving blind men and women, blind youth and infants, is an educational activity in the real meaning of the term—for these organizations have as their reason for being the providing of training, counseling, tools, and devices—of providing educational services to blind people that they may learn to live fruitfully and fully, as active and independent participants in all aspects of our Nation's life.

If You Want To Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed by an editorial appearing in the Zion-Benton News, Zion, Ill., which is one of the leading newspapers in my district. The editorial calls attention to the growing Federal spending and the threat to our liberty from expanded Federal activities and controls. The editorial is offered for reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that its timeliness and sober message may come to the attention of Americans throughout the Nation:

IF YOU WANT TO BE FREE

This United States of America is a grand place to live. This is not a platitude, it is a fact. Travel in other countries, no matter which ones—even the best of the others does not provide the average citizen as much.

There are more automobiles in factory parking lots, belonging to factory workers in this country, then there are total number of autos in the five most prosperous countries of Europe.

In foreign countries we have the big rich and the many poor. In the United States there are fewer beg rich and not so many real poor. The majority of our population is in the middle bracket—owning homes, driving cars, using television, owning savings accounts, and living on what foreigners would call the fat of the land.

If the people of the United States want to continue this widespread prosperity, they must realize what brought it about and what will take it away, little by little.

The United States prospered and became the strongest Nation in the world, because it left behind and repudiated big and powerful centralized governments of Europe and the rest of the world. They left behind and repudiated governments which greedily collected taxes up to 25 and 30 percent of the individual's earnings. They left behind governments which controlled the lives, the business and industrial activities of its people.

They set up in America a government which was to do for the people only those things which its people could not do for themselves, as individuals or as a municipality or as a State.

The Federal Government was limited to establish courts to be concerned with maintaining the rights of the States and to interpret the rights of the people under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The Supreme Court was primarily set up to protect the States from the encroachment of Federal Government which was known to the Constitution framers as evil, and which if permitted to grow, would take from the States and from the people the freedom which had been guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The Federal Government was prohibited from buying land except for the minimum necessary to provide Government service. The Federal Government was prohibited from entering into the banking business or any other business. It was to raise and maintain an army and navy sufficient to protect the country. To levy and collect custom duty to provide operating funds for the Federal Government, to create and maintain the value of a national currency with a gold reserve. To the Founding Fathers, well acquainted with the big centralized governments of Europe, this was just about all the power it was willing to give to the Federal Government of this new land dedicated to a new concept.

Without a clear legal right, the Federal Government started buying land, until today it owns and keeps off the tax roll more than 25 percent of the total land area of the Nation.

Without clear legal right the Federal Government entered into the banking business; into the electric power business; into the manufacturing business; into the transportation business through subsidiary and in competition with private enterprise.

The Federal Government assessed an income tax, promised never to exceed 10 percent of anyone's income and never to be applied to one earning less than $10,000 a year. This now takes as much as 90 percent and is held out of the wages of even the lowest paid worker and exceeds the tax collected by any other nation on earth.

As Federal Government has become paternalistic, individual freedom has receded. The right to collect one's pay has been denied by Federal Government—it collects its tax first. The right to spend one's money as one pleased is now denied by the tax collector.

Aid to education and relief has become an important and costly part of government. Public housing now results in 1 of every 60 families in the Nation being housed by the taxpayers. Federal highway construction may be justified under national defense, but public power and public industry competing with private enterprise, losing almost as much money as the irritating income tax takes in, cannot be justified in any manner.

We need to return to a limited Federal Government doing only those things which the Constitution and Bill of Rights specified. Big Government advocates, base all rights to a big, centralized, all powerful government on just one sentence in a constitution obviously designed to limit government, with little attention paid to all other constitutional restrictions. The rely on this one sentence "and to promote the welfare of the Nation."

The Founding Fathers never intended this to mean the establishment of a welfare nation. And if we are to have a prosperous Nation and a free society we had better see that the welfare state is repudiated and repealed. How? By making this desire known to all public officials, especially those in Federal Government.

Mr. Rusk's Costly Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Muncie (Ind.) Evening Press]

MR. RUSK'S COSTLY ERROR

The United States will be a whipping boy from one end of Canada to another from now until April 8. This was assured by the dissolution of the Canadian Parliament and the call for the election of a new government. The man who brought this about was U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

It was the U.S. State Depatment's unprecedented, unfriendly note to Canada about Canadian defense policies that set off the crisis for Prime Minister John Diefenbaker's coalition government in Ottawa.

The position taken in the note—for which Rusk must assume responsibility—was a good and fair position, in the U.S. national interest. Canada has, in truth, been dragging her feet when it comes to full participation in continental defense.

But for a professional diplomat to use the tone the U.S. State Department used was unheard of. One friendly nation does not speak to another as a master might speak to a servant—or did not, until recently. The State Department's Foreign Service officers could have accomplished their aim, if that aim indeed was cooperation of Canada, far more easily and far more surely by quiet, though firmly diplomatic negotiations.

That they used the harsh, almost unfriendly approach almost makes it seem that their goal was not actually mutual defense, but was in fact the defeat of the Diefenbaker government and the elevation of the liberal, Lester Pearson, to the post of Prime Minister.

Whether Pearson's Liberals or Dienfenbaker's Conservatives win in the election April 8, the campaign preceding the vote is certain to be filled with strident criticisms of the United States as an international meddler, a would-be dictator to other sovereign nations, and a bad friend. From people whose ties with the United States have been so close, the anger is hard to take. It is the more so in view of the fact that a little more moderation in language, while not necessarily changing the U.S. position at all, would have avoided the crisis.

If the trouble spurs Canada to greater defense effort, that will be good, and if it brings Washington to a house cleaning among its State Department little fuehrers, that will be better. Rusk's big mistake now would be not cleaning house.

Public-Financed Patents Belong to Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared on February 6, 1963, in the Buffalo Courier-Express. This editorial concerns the regulations which have been proposed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which would turn over to private companies rights to inventions arising from Government contracts.

The proposed patent waiver regulations are an attempt by NASA to circumvent the clear policy of Congress as expressed in the NASA Act of 1958. Section 305(A) of the NASA Act expressly provides for Government ownership of all inventions conceived or developed in the performance of NASA contracts. I might point out that under the act the administrator is permitted to waive title upon an affirmative finding that "the interests of the United States will be served thereby."

I hope that the Members of this body will raise their voices against these proposed regulations.

The editorial follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, Feb. 6, 1963]

PUBLIC-FINANCED PATENTS BELONG TO THE PUBLIC

Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN presents a pretty solid case in his arguments against granting the National Aeronautics and Space Administration more power to assign patents to companies for inventions they develop under Government contracts.

The New York Democrat points out that on two previous occasions Congress has refused to pass legislation which would do approximately what the NASA proposes under its extension of powers. Congressman RYAN claims that such an arrangement would give a virtual monopoly to the big companies which are being financed by the Government in their experiments. Further, this arrangement would squeeze the small contractors out of the space program except for small handouts which might be given to them by the giants in the new and growing industry.

Perhaps NASA officials see definite advantages in their plan which may not be evident to the ordinary citizen-observer. However, they seem to lose sight of the fact that public funds are used to underwrite these experiments and the public should not be asked to foot the bill for patents which will redound to the benefit of private concerns.

We are just scratching the surface of space exploration and each new experiment gives promise of new and greater achievements in opening the secrets of new worlds in this great unexplored universe. Such explorations are being paid for by the people of the United States who should be the ultimate beneficiaries of any potential benefits.

However, these benefits could be easily withheld if the key to their secrets were held exclusively by corporations. It is our opinion that any patents developed at Government expense should revert to the Government and not to a private corporation which was paid well for the experiments that developed these patents. To do otherwise might be construed as a gift of public funds to a private corporation or individual, an act which is barred by law.

Economic Puritanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Richmond News-Leader of February 4. The editorial comments on the American people's distrust of a tax cut if it is to be accompanied by inflation:

AMERICANS CAN'T BE ACCUSED OF ECONOMIC PURITANISM

(By John Chamberlain)

Chairman Walter Heller of the President's Committee of Economic Advisers, blames the basic Puritan ethic of the American people for their fear of an unbalanced Federal budget. This is the sort of accusation that could only be made by somebody who has spent most of his life in a cloister, far from bruising contact with the madding crowd. It is egghead philosophizing from the word "go." Nobody who really knows the American people, who think nothing of loading themselves up as individuals and families with monthly time payments for cars, refrigerators, home mortgages, and even fly-now-pay-later trips abroad, would ever accuse the inhabitants of our split-level suburbias of being economic Puritans.

Actually, what is bothering many citizens these days is something quite different from Puritan scruples about the immorality of Government debt. People are worried, not about the ethical aspects of an unbalanced budget, but about its effectiveness in promoting a quick takeoff to enhanced national prosperity. The big bogey at the moment is the possibility that continued Federal deficits must negate the value of any tax cuts the people may have coming to them. Far from opposing tax cuts in the name of John Calvin, of 16th-century Protestant Geneva, or the Pilgrim Fathers of old Plymouth, people are fearful that the promised reduction in taxes will turn out to be a phony, something that is destined to be made in deteriorating dollars and hence worthless to the end of enabling the citizen to go on with his very un-Puritan spending on a constantly rising standard of living.

Only an occasional individual can quote statistics about the effect of deteriorating dollars and a high-cost domestic economy on international gold movements. But common sense tells most people that there is a connection between fiscal looseness at home and distrust of the dollar abroad. A rotting dollar must, in the end, cause foreign central banks to cash in their balances in American currency for gold. And as the gold hemorrhage goes on, the inflationary impact on the American monetary system must hurt every citizen's ability to buy. Real Puritans, inured to hardship, might not mind this so much. But the very un-Puritanical dweller in a new split-level home who wants a new washing machine, a better car, and the wherewithal to send junior to a good college, must resent it as a personal outrage. This is what makes Dr. Heller's remarks about the "basic Puritan ethics" of the American people so inappropriate as to be laughable.

Committed as they are to an economy of time payments, Americans would not mind seeing their Government go "on the cuff" if they knew that the increase in the Federal debt could be extinguished over the normal short or intermediate cycle that is the rule for private installment buying. This, in effect, is what the administration is promising when it anticipates that a tax cut will so stimulate business that it will produce a budgetary surplus 3 or 4 years hence. But to hope that the economy may be brought into balance by such means involves an act of faith. And how many Congressmen, worried about the ability of their constituents to sustain such faith, will be impressed by the new economists' reasoning?

The faith in the Government's arguments would be tested the moment that the Treasury tried to cover the projected $11.9 billion deficit for the next fiscal year by selling bonds to the people. If the bonds could be disposed of by marketing them to individuals who would set them to one side, they would not be a cause of inflation. But if the Government, to finance an $11.9 billion increase in the national debt, should be reduce to stuffing I O U's into the banking system, where they would swell the money supply, the resulting inflation might shortly cancel every bit of the purchasing power released by tax cuts.

The whole business is necessarily a gamble on a Federal promise that the tax cuts will buy them more than debt-induced in-

flation will snuff out. Whether the people choose to accept the gamble has nothing whatsoever to do with any Puritan ethic. It is purely a question of the odds that an economically un-Puritanical society chooses to accept.

Abraham Lincoln in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the people who attended the annual Lincoln anniversary program, sponsored by the National Capital Region of the Capital Parks Service at the Lincoln Museum in Washington, D.C., on February 10 this year had the pleasure of hearing a scholarly address by Mr. Cornelius W. Heine.

The Lincoln story continues to grow, year by year, and this address by Mr. Heine is an important contribution to the story. It behooves me to call it to the attention of my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I urge that Mr. Heine's remarks, "Abraham Lincoln in Washington" appear in the Appendix of the Record:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN IN WASHINGTON

(By Cornelius W. Heine, at the Lincoln anniversary program, Lincoln Museum, February 10, 1963)

There have been many volumes written on Abraham Lincoln. There is little that is new that we can say about him. Today, we shall but relate some of the incidences connected with his life in Washington. To begin, let our imaginations take us back 102 years to a town in the Midwest.

It was a chill morning of February 11, 1861 in Springfield, Ill. A saddened crowd watched the special train of the Great Westtern Railroad pull slowly away. On the rear platform, a lone and silent figure looked back on the town and the people with whom he had passed 25 years of his life. Abraham Lincoln, President-elect, thus began his journey to Washington to assume a responsibility greater than that which rested upon any man since the time of George Washington.

On the morning of February 23, 1861, amid rumors of assassination plots upon his life, this man from Illinois arrived unannounced in the city of Washington. Unrecognized, Lincoln drove through the streets of Washington to the Willard Hotel.

The Washington of 1861, to which Lincoln came to keep his rendezvous with destiny, was a city rife with rumors, confusion, and fear of an impending crisis. It was a rural-like—almost backward community. Dust and mud were the great scourges. There were but few paved streets. In rainy weather Pennsylvania Avenue turned to mire through which teamsters belabored their horses. But Pennsylvania Avenue was the only lighted way—with its few gas lamps.

Cattle roamed over the pastures of the Mall; and pigs, as well as gentlemen, traveled the streets of Washington. The remains of the old Washington City Canal flowed down the line of present-day Constitution Avenue—and to the south were the broad marshes and flats of the Potomac River—said to be the breeding ground for malaria and typhoid fever which were prevalent in the city.

The Capitol Dome was uncompleted. The Washington Monument stood squat at 154 feet—a long way to go to reach its projected 555½ feet. In this town of broad streets, river flats, and half-completed structures, lived some 60,000 inhabitants. War would soon change the mode of their existence.

When Abraham Lincoln arrived, the Capital was virtually defenseless. It would be a time before Lincoln's order for 75,000 volunteers would go out, and the fall of Sumter would crystallize northern sentiment. Upon his arrival Lincoln was faced with the necessity of appointing his Cabinet and filling many other positions in the executive branch of the Government.

It was in Washington that the very personal characteristics, which were to enshrine Lincoln in the hearts of all Americans, emerged. Lincoln came here resolute to preserve the Union. His strength and every facet of his being was to be tested in the molten crucible of war. At the end, he was to emerge as the man honored today for two great achievements—the preservation of the Union of States and the elimination of human bondage in these United States.

What were the resources which this man called upon to catapult him to leadership in Washington at this time of crisis? In the Bible we read "the simplicity of the just shall guide them." Abraham Lincoln was a simple God-fearing, just man with compassion for his brother. If some thought him to be odd and difficult to understand, perhaps it was because they looked for complexity, rather than simplicity. A pure, simple and steady spirit is not dissipated by a multitude of affairs—and in such a manner Lincoln approached the great task before him, firm in purpose and free from self-seeking.

To sustain himself in the rightness of the course, Mr. Lincoln had an abiding faith in the Government of the United States as founded under the Constitution. He had the hope that that Government under God would have a new birth of freedom.

He once said: "I have often inquired of myself, what great principle or idea it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the motherland, but something in the declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time."

The first summer in Washington and those after, the President lived at the Soldier's Home residence. He would usually spend the days in the White House Office and the War Department, and the evenings at the Soldier's Home residence. At first, he frequently rode alone to and from the residence. One night as he neared the Soldier's Home grounds a shot rang out. Lincoln spurred his horse and reached the Soldier's Home in a gallop. When he looked at his tall hat, a hole was evidence that the shot had been meant for him. When he related the incident to Secretary of War Stanton with little concern, Stanton became excited; and henceforth, Lincoln was always accompanied by a company of cavalry, with sabres drawn and held upright over their shoulders.

Government officials and Congressmen complained that they had difficulty in seeing the President, and yet, he did see so many, many people. Lincoln looked forward to the hours in his office, where he would hear the views, sorrows and troubles of fellow citizens. "God must like the common people, or He would not have made so many of them," Lincoln commented. He called these White House visitor hours his "public opinion baths." Through them, he felt he was better able to sense the mood of the people: to be of assistance to some when all other aid had failed. For above all he wanted to be in tune with the opinions of the common folk.

The President never exercised mercy to defeat justice: however, when there was a conflict between policy and justice, Lincoln was guided by his sense of justice. There were many instances where notes from Abraham Lincoln, written in the White House, sprinkled mercy amid the sorrow and travail of war.

Twice a week, every one who wished to come was admitted to the White House to wait their turn to see the President. On these occasions the President, carefully attired, sat in his armchair and listened patiently to one and all.

One morning in January 1864 a sentence of death was passed on four deserters and approved by the President. As a Cabinet meeting ended in the White House, an usher handed the President a letter from the daughter of one of the condemned men. It read as follows:

"To His Excellency, the President.

"Most Honored and Excellent Sir: How shall a child like me attempt to write to you on such business as this concerning my father, J.W.C., who is sentenced, how can I write it—to be shot. Spare his poor life * * * my mother cannot stand this heavy blow, and will be gone soon also. I am the oldest of five children. I have three sisters under 8 years * * * I could freely give my life to save his."

The usher returned, escorting the lady whose husband was the subject of the letter. Holding the letter in his hand, the President stood and in a kindly voice, said, "I have telegraphed for them not to be executed until I send an order, and I don't intend to send any order."

The demands upon Lincoln's time from the very first by place seekers, advice givers, and others was tremendous. After his first 3 months in the White House the numbers seemed never ending. After a particularly long day, Lincoln was weary and fatigued. At that time, a young officer came to see him—the officer's wife had been drowned and the Secretary of War had refused his request for leave of absence to bury her. Lincoln weary and tired, said, "Am I to have no rest?" and he berated the startled colonel who withdrew stunned by the reception—could this be the kind Father Abraham about whom the stories were legion? That night Lincoln could not sleep. The next morning early, a knock came at the colonel's door—there stood the President. He grasped the officer's hand and said: "I treated you brutally last night, I ask your pardon. I was utterly tired out, badgered to death. I generally become about as savage as a wildcat by Saturday night, drained of the milk of human kindness. I must have seemed to you the very gorilla the rebels paint me. I was very sorry for it when you were gone. I could not sleep a moment last night, so I thought I'd drive into town in the cool of the morning and make it right."

The colonel was given his pass and he left immediately. Here was an insight into the simple human quality of Lincoln's character. "To do what seems weakness in the eyes of the world is to be strong" commented Allen C. Clark of the Columbia Historical Society when he remarked about this Lincoln episode.

As the battles wore on, a great army of wounded encamped in Washington. The city became a vast hospital. Churches, schools, hotels, and Government buildings became the shelters for the shattered and broken bodies of men. In the old Patent Office building among the useful inventions of mankind, there were now thousands of beds containing the victims of another of man's inventions—war. Among these men came Abraham Lincoln frequently. Mrs. Lincoln and the boys Willie and Tad also visited the wounded. A handshake, a smile, a few words of cheer from the tall President was good medicine for the boys. It was sometimes enough to give that needed spark of en-

couragement to young hearts that before could see little happiness in the future. After grasping the hand of the President, a poor fellow's face would lighten up with pleasure. Lincoln never tired of his frequent hospital visits, passing row upon row of beds along the gaslit corridors of makeshift hospitals.

One of the unusual places in which Lincoln found respite from tension was the telegraph office of the War Department. He was there twice a day to read the dispatches from the front. While there, however, he would sit at one of the desks and chat with the telegraphers. It is a little known fact that the entire first draft of the Emancipation Proclamation was written by Lincoln at his favorite desk in the telegraph office.

Lincoln appears to have been a very indulgent parent—this illustrates the human quality of the leader, who could have, as all men do, certain weaknesses. He loved his children dearly, and desired to pour his affection upon them. If he might have spared the rod and spoiled them, was this really such a great fault in a man who daily dealt with Government and Army discipline in war. He was very close to Willie and Tad. They had the run of things, and would often interrupt an official conference for a word with their father. Lincoln used to go to the Joseph Stuntz Toy Shop at 1207 New York Avenue to buy toys for the boys. He sided with Tad in every boyish escapade. One day while at the War Department telegraph office, Tad was diverting himself with dipping his fingers in inkwells and smearing the telegraphers desk. An angered telegrapher picked up the boy and carried him to the President, who was expected to inflict due punishment. Lincoln took the boy in his arms and said, "I don't think they are treating you right here, Tad; we had better go away." With Tad in his arms, he walked away.

It was not long after a visit to one of the hospitals, that one of the great personal tragedies to befall Lincoln in his Washington days occurred. This was the loss of gentle and lovable Willie Lincoln. Both Thomas and Willie became seriously ill. Thomas improved but Willie grew worse, and on February 20, 1862, the 12-year-old boy died in the White House. Before the end, Lincoln sat at Willie's bedside in the presence of a nurse. The nurse, a deeply religious person, was a widow who had lost her husband and two children. Lincoln asked the woman how she bore up under such a sorrow. She told him that she learned to love God more ardently in her days of affliction. The President said, "I am glad to hear you say that. Your experience will help me to bear my afflictions. This is the hardest trial of my life. Why is it? Why is it?

One of Abraham Lincoln's most compelling characteristics exemplified again and again in his Washington days was the love he extended to those who had caused him personal injury. This was true charity, springing from the deepest wellsprings of his soul. It was a love that transcended personalities.

Upon his first days in Washington, Lincoln was surrounded by men who looked upon him with ridicule and envy. His own cabinet was made up of men who, in some respects, thought themselves to be more capable than the President. He knew this, and yet these men, who sat with him at the counsel table in Washington, were, for the most part, men of his own choosing—men on whom he relied for their sense of duty to country and their ability. Their personal attitude toward him, he could pass over, for in his large heart there was little room for petty things. Can we not think of another time in history when the world's greatest teacher was asked a question by one of his disciples. He answered "If a man compels thee to attend him on a mile's journey, go 2 miles with him of thy own accord." Lincoln was always ready to go that extra mile with every man.

Abraham Lincoln had the enviable capacity to overlook personal abuses. He looked beyond the human nature of man and saw in man the hand of God. He saw the dignity of the inner man in every individual, regardless of what were the particular differences in attainments and abilities. A striking illustration of this perhaps greatest of all Lincoln qualities is told in the words of William H. Crook, who was assigned as the President's bodyguard in the closing months of the war. Crook told of the President and he passing a ragged, dirty man in army clothes as they were hurrying to the War Department. The man had evidently been waiting to see the President. The man jumped up and went toward Mr. Lincoln with his story. He had been wounded, was just out of the hospital, and looked forlorn.

He wanted the President to do something and he had papers with him. The President was in a hurry, but he took the papers, and sat down on the curbstone, with the man beside him, to examine them. What a picture—the President of a nation—the Chief Executive sitting on a dusty curbstone with a man in rags. It was so natural for Lincoln to act this way. Though he wore fine clothes and occupied the highest office of the land, he was the same Lincoln who used to sit in the country store in New Salem swapping yarns with flatboatmen, backwoodsmen, and farmers—giving to each due respect When the President had satisfied himself, he smiled reassuringly and told the grateful man to come back the next day; then he would arrange the matter for him. Crook said, "a thing like that said more than man could express. If I could only make people see him as I did," said Crook, "you would never know, from his manner to the plainest or poorest or meanest, that there was the least difference between that poor man and himself; how from that man to the greatest, and all degrees between, the President could meet every man square on the plane where he stood, and speak to him, man to man."

This innate feeling and ability of Lincoln to treat every individual with respect was possible, I believe, because of his inner philosophy—regardless of the differences in particulars between men, Lincoln deeply believed that each was on earth by the will of God—after all, each man from the lowliest to the highest in station, came into the world in the same way, and would leave the world in the same way, and, could one of them add a cubit's growth to his height on his own accord.

Thinking of the future of the country in the closing hours of the great conflict, the President longed for a lasting peace. For this man, who had borne the inner ravages of war, there was malice toward none and charity for all. The peace which Lincoln hoped for was one of spontaneous accord. To him, the cloud had passed; the light shone. For the defeated South he had but one feeling, that of compassion. Had he not said in his first inaugural address, "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies." Even in the midwar period he had said, "We must win this war, but we want to be their friends, and we want the South to be our friends."

The war years were hard on the mind and body of Lincoln. His friends and his family watched his careworn face. But he continued to move about—he visited the hospitals, made his daily trips to the War Department—he conversed with friends and went to the theater—but one of his greatest enjoyments was his conversations with his Illinois friends, who were sometimes shocked at the change in his appearance. They had known his frame of iron and nerves of steel—now they saw the wrinkles on his face and forehead deepen—the laugh of the old days was less frequent. Anxiety, responsibility, care, the injustice of friends wore upon his giant frame; his nerves of steel at times became irritable. He said one day, "I feel as though I shall never be glad any more."

After a long day, Lincoln came into one of the rooms of the White House and, like a tired child, threw himself upon a sofa and shaded his eyes with his hands. He was the complete picture of dejection. Mrs. Lincoln, who was having a dress fitted by a seamstress, was quite concerned. Then Lincoln reached one of his long arms and took a small Bible from the stand nearby—he was soon absorbed in reading. A quarter of an hour later he arose, the dejection was gone; his countenance lighted up. As he walked from the room, the marker rested on Job. Here in the Holy Bible was a resource of inner spiritual strength that never left Lincoln. It was this inner conviction in the divine providence of the Almighty God that gave courage and guidance to Abraham Lincoln then as it had when he was but a young boy lying on a cabin floor in the wilderness.

The war ended. Five days later on Good Friday, April 14, 1865, Lincoln went to the theater seeking rest and relaxation. An assassin's bullet, fired in this building almost a century ago, brought rest to the body and soul of Abraham Lincoln. His work was now done. His appointed time had come. His lessons of love and human kindness remained for us to follow.

FEBRUARY 10, 1963.

On Getting Fired Without Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial by Ed Grady, of Maquoket, Iowa, has called to mind the fact that is never dismissed from the Government service without cause. The phrase, of course, means "without stated cause"; which in turn means for cause one would be embarrassed to state, for a trivial or capricious cause. More seriously, it may mean that one is being fired because he belongs to the wrong political party. This in turn would make possible a revival of the putrid old spoils system, in fact. Mr. Grady's editorial is particularly valuable. It follows:

ON GETTING FIRED WITHOUT CAUSE

(By Ed Grady)

The office manager of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—ASCS—at Decorah in Winneshiek County has been dismissed, as of next March 30—and apparently without cause.

At any rate, the manager, who has held the position since April of 1955, hasn't been given a reason for his upcoming release. The three-member county ASCS committee, according to newspaper accounts of the office manager's departure, is close mouthed.

Jackson County a year ago experienced a similar situation; the ASCS office manager was released and, on the open admission of both the dismissed and the dismissing, "without cause."

These comments and observations are in no way intended to cast an unfavorable, or a critical, light on the county ASCS committee whose responsibility it is to engage and, should the need arise, discharge office managers. In releasing personnel, ASC committeemen are perfectly within their rights doing so without cause. The U.S. Depart-

ment of Agriculture, the ASCS parent organization, stipulates thusly in the rule book.

However, any individual forced to leave his employment, we feel, is entitled to some sort of an explanation—good, bad or indifferent. "We don't want the fellow to have two strikes against him when he tries to get a job elsewhere," one ASCS committeeman commented in connection with the recent removal of an office manager in one Iowa county.

Again we intend no personal reflection—without cause is permitted in the ASCS manual—but such an explanation is at best an extremely feeble one. Logically, if an ASCS office manager is ill equipped, or for whatever reason unable to perform his duties, and is released, it would appear both senseless and dishonest to attempt keeping the facts from such a one's prospective employer. The very least to which the discharged is entitled is a reason—even if its public disclosure is prohibited. Jobseeking with the stigma of "dismissed without cause" attached is a near hopeless and an extremely painful venture.

Allowed, there may be a sound and plausible explanation for the USDA's permitting dismissals without cause. If there is, though, we have yet to hear or see it. Rash judgment it well might be on our part, but we are inclined to think such a regulation is nothing more than the typical bureaucratic dictums we have, for the past 30 years or so, been accustomed to receiving. Whether there is any rhyme or reason to them is immaterial—so long as Washington decrees. Should the innocent, as well as the guilty be made to suffer—poor lad, how sad, too bad.

Another White House Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable to view the consistency with which this administration has used blunt political power in traditional areas of nonpartisan public service. We all recall the attempt to get Agricultural Extension agents into the effort to sell the administration farm program. Efforts at managed news have been a part of this same trend.

A shocking new chapter is being written in this saga which now includes the part-time summer student. A clearance system is being instituted which is nothing more or less than pure politics. Joseph Young outlined this new power grab of the New Frontier in yesterday's Washington Star. The article follows:

WHITE HOUSE TO CONTROL STUDENT JOB PATRONAGE—CIVIL SERVICE NOT TOLD OF MEETING WHICH SET UP CLEARANCE SYSTEM

(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student hails, plus the college he is attending (if any), will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure coordination in order that the agencies could make best use of the students talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to pass civil service exams for clerical, typists, and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

Harry Seidel: A Case Example of Soviet-Communist Stalinist Judicial Brutality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, shortly after last Christmas, in December 1962, the Soviet Zone Supreme Court of Berlin sentenced Harry Seidel, a resident of free West Berlin, to life imprisonment.

His crime was that of assisting his mother, his wife, and child, and other separated families to escape through the prison walls of the Soviet sector of Berlin to be reunited in free West Berlin.

The farcical judicial proceedings are proof that the Soviet-Communist hierarchy cannot comprehend the civilized world's accepted basic elements of justice.

The Soviet criminal proceedings are designed not to mete out justice to its citizens but to create by mass fear and cruelty a subservience and acceptance of Soviet-Comunist political objectives.

The life sentence imposed by the Soviet military power upon citizen Harry Seidel is a cruel, inhuman, excessive punishment. It is a desperate act of revenge against the German people concentrated against a defenseless individual, Harry Seidel.

The sentence of Harry Seidel will never be accepted as final by the German people whether they live in the free world or under Soviet domination.

The American, French, and British Allied Commandants cannot accept this brutal sentence as irrevocable.

The free world is given another cause for insisting upon free elections in all of Berlin and in all of East and West Germany to grant these people self-determination in their form of government.

Dr. Walter Becher, a distinguished member of the Bavarian Legislature has sent me an account of this case. I would like to call this case to the attention of the U.S. Government and to the people of this Nation as an example of the blind cruelty of the Soviet-Communist system of rule.

A short summary of this brutality is contained in the January 8, 1963, edition of "The Bulletin," a weekly publication of the German Federal Government.

The article follows:

WAVE OF SYMPATHY FOR HARRY SEIDEL

Widespread indignation has been aroused in the free part of Germany by the sentence of life imprisonment at hard labor that was imposed by the Soviet Zone's Supreme Court on the 24-year-old West Berliner Harry Seidel.

The verdict was handed down in East Berlin shortly after Christmas, following a 3-day show trial. Harry Seidel, a former cycling champion, had fled from the Soviet Zone to West Berlin on August 13, 1961. Several weeks later he succeeded in getting his wife and child to the West as well. At that time Frau Seidel's mother and four of her sisters and brothers as well as another relative were arrested by the state security authorities in the Soviet Zone for having known about the planned escape. Harry Seidel's mother meanwhile was caught in an attempt to flee and sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment.

Because of these events, Frau Seidel, the younger, declared in West Berlin, her husband began to make a practice of helping people to escape westward, but he never accepted any pay for his assistance, nor did he maintain contacts with any intelligence agencies. He was chiefly concerned with reuniting married couples who had been separated by the wall or ill persons with their next of kin. On November 15, 1962, after his mother was released from prison, he made an attempt to get her through a tunnel from the Soviet Zone to West Berlin. During this attempt he was overpowered by members of the people's police.

A STALINIST LAW

The life sentence imposed on him in the East Berlin trial was based on the Soviet Zone's "Law for the Protection of Peace", which Western jurists have termed a pronouncedly Stalinist law. It stems from the year 1950 and has now for the first time been applied in a case involving assistance in

flight. It is characteristic of this law that under it persons can be condemned for their political opinions even if they have not done anything that could be considered an offense under criminal law in the traditional sense.

Commenting on the trial, the governing mayor of West Berlin, Willy Brandt, declared: "Words fail to express the indignation that one feels at this scandalous sentence of a modern inquisition. I hope the world will rebel against this act of vengeance on the part of Communist rulers."

The Minister for All-German Affairs, Rainer Barzel, said that every freedom-loving person is bound to condemn this sentence of an arbitrary Communist judiciary. He added that the act has once again shown up the Soviet Zone regime as a deeply inhuman, alien rule based on coercion. Johann Baptist Gradl, a prominent member of the CDU party in exile (refugee Christian Democrats), spoke of a "terroristic judgment, as bad as in the worst days of Stalinism".

COMPARISON WITH THIRD REICH

Similarly sharp reactions came from the press of the Federal Republic and West Berlin. The comments of the independent Münchner Merkur are typical. This newspaper termed Seidel a "victim of a viciously intimidating judiciary" and pointed out that the sentence "thrust upon one a comparison with the fate of those who suffered under the despotism of the SS state and its laws." The newspaper continued: "The heirs of Hitler's infamous Volksgericht president, Roland Freisler, now have their seat in East Berlin, where day after day freedom as we know it is trodden underfoot."

The three Allied city commandants of West Berlin also protested against the judgment. An Allied spokesman stated: "The three commandants share the feelings of the people of Berlin, which the governing mayor has voiced, about the inhuman sentence that the highest Soviet Zone court has inflicted upon young Harry Seidel."

Roosevelt and Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, many editorial writers have referred to the fact that the New Frontier is a rehash of the New Deal with a few new Harvard frills as window dressing. However, in recommending to the Nation a planned deficit of over $12 billion, the New Deal would hardly endorse the positions taken by President Kennedy. Dr. Wilfred E. Wooldridge of Springfield, Mo., has called to my attention the following quotation from the speech by former President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered at Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 19, 1932:

If a nation is living within its income its credit is good. If in some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms. But if, like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing up to the limit of the people to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

For Whom the Bell Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will be deeply impressed, as I was, by the words of the editor of the Rock County Star-Herald, of Luverne, Minn., in a warning to America under the heading "For Whom the Bell Tolls." Editor Alan McIntosh calls this a testing time when men of faith, courage, and character are needed to preach a new gospel of selflessness and honesty. I include the editorial with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

No nation ever raced to meet its destiny so lavishly entertained as does America. Laughter is so loud that we can hardly hear the ticking of the clock that spells out the shrinking margin of time left to this country.

As individuals we are plagued with worries. They are only worries about our personal lives and fortunes * * * not about tomorrow for America or about the shrinking heritage we are passing on to our children.

The bell is tolling for America but we cant' hear it because we are laughing so hard at some comic on the "boob tube" that we can't be distracted.

This is the decade when the bell tolls for us because we turned our back on the self-evident truths that helped Americans grow to greatness. We are shunning the austerity of the truth for the elixir of dangerous "pap." We are willing to believe that 2 and 2 make 5.

We are letting the spiritual fires that warmed and protected America during dark and perilous hours dwindle to ashes from neglect.

We are putting our faith in material things, instead of ideals and principles.

We let political and economic charlatans sell us the big lie that huge, steadily mounting debt is a virtuous thing * * * that debt is healthy and to be encouraged.

We are letting the odd balls sell us the idea that anyone who cherishes the copybook maxims of decency, honesty, integrity is a hopeless square who belongs on some psychiatrist's couch.

We are in an era where our consciences have become so calloused we no longer are repulsed by gross dishonesty and corruption in public life and governmental affairs.

We have given our birthright of the ballot box to the politician who promises the most and demands the least.

We have let the peddlers of claptrap and filth replace those who still believe that anyone who is happy is not subnormal.

We are laughing ourselves so silly that we forget the warnings of history—that every great civilization that has fallen crashed from the rottenness of inner decay rather than from assault from without.

We have pampered so many at the public breast that the chances of ever weaning them to independence and self-respect is vanishing. We now have families where the third generation is following the tradition of depending on the Government for a living, who have never earned a nickel for themselves.

The bell tolls for people who are so indifferent that we don't recoil in horror at the thought of electricians striking and stopping our space missile program. This at a time when Russia had put two men in orbit. What wage increases these traitors to America won by their strike will be valueless if Khrushchev ever says to our President that Russia has 10 space platforms hovering over this country. He could say that atomic bombs are armed and ticketed for Duluth, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, Washington, Omaha, Rapid City, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, * * * and there would be nothing we could do about it * * * because we threw away our lead for comfort and exchange the right to strike for the right to perish.

A gloomy attitude? Yes. A defeatist attitude? No.

The bell tolls but we can still win respite if we turn back from the crooked path we have been traveling. We can grope back to the straight paths, those of decency, courage, selflessness, integrity, patriotism.

In time of peril great patriots have traditionally come forward to challenge us to make the necessary sacrifices. The challenges are here * * * the crisis not some far-off distant "manana" but now. The rebirth of America must come from within * * * it can't be legislated by Congress or be promulgated by Presidential edict. This need is greater than partisanship and politics * * * it is a testing time when men of faith, courage, and character are needed to preach a new gospel of selflessness and honesty.

The University of Michigan's Annual Congressional Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, Last evening, it was my privilege to attend the annual congressional dinner of the University of Michigan Club of Washington, D.C.

This event recognizes the service in the Congress of the men and women who received their education and training from the University of Michigan. Michigan can well be proud of the contribution to national affairs over the years and of the service of her alumni not only in the Congress, but in the executive branch of the Federal Government as well.

The following Members of the 88th Congress are either graduates or former students of the University of Michigan:

Senate: CLINTON P. ANDERSON, J. W. FULBRIGHT, PHILIP A. HART, LISTER HILL.

House of Representatives—Michigan: LUCIEN N. NEDZI, GEORGE MEADER, GERALD R. FORD, JR., JAMES G. O'HARA, JAMES HARVEY, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR. (3 years), MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, EDWARD HUTCHINSON, NEIL STAEBLER.

Others; JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana; ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Oregon; ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas; WILLIAM H. HARSHA, of Ohio; CRAIG HOSMER, of California; ROLAND V. LIBONATI, of Illinois; ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont; K. W. STINSON, of Washington.

At the dinner at the Press Club, the president, some of the members of the

board of regents and other officials of the University of Michigan paid tribute to the Congressmen and a response was made on our behalf by the Honorable Robert P. Griffin of the Ninth District of Michigan.

The principal address was given by President Harlan Hatcher. Among other things, he made observations on the contributions the University of Michigan is making in the field of scientific research and development. I think my colleagues would be interested in this information and therefore incorporate this passage of President Hatcher's speech at this point in my remarks:

In this new world which we have created around us, the baccalaureate degree is only a general base for further training in the professional specialties. There are 10,412 students at the University of Michigan this year who have already graduated from college. This almost equals the size of the university at its peak prior to the Second World War. The training which they require is exacting and costly. The faculty required is in short supply and in competition with government, business and industry. Fortunately, the quality of the faculty has attracted the attention and support of the Federal Government in its vast and urgent research program.

The University of Michigan today can point to some 22 different areas of research or centers of excellence, each of which has attracted $1 million or more in nonlegislative funds in one or more of the past 3 years. These centers range from aerospace instrumentation and ballistic missiles radiation analysis to human genetics and seismic detection of nuclear explosions. For every dollar of State appropriated money—some $39 million—the university has added another from other sources to match it. I believe this is not duplicated or equaled by any university in the Nation.

The pressure of these upper and expensive levels of training and research are just as great and relentless as the pressures upon the freshman year of college training. For one of the better terms, I have called this critical need at the top, "the hidden bulge." Knowledge is already so massive, and the skills required to manage our present fashion of living now require high selectivity and diligent and exacting application beyond the baccalaureate level. I do not see how the time required can be significantly shortened. Because of the individual attention required and the intricate apparatus so often needed, I see no way of lessening the cost.

The voluminous and varied projects on which the university is now engaged are tied tightly to our educational departments providing graduate students with income and experience. The faculty, in turn, has the support and the necessary facilities to carry on their intricate up-to-date research, and out of their activities new enterprises spin off into productive business ventures. Twenty-four of these firms are now in the Ann Arbor area. Twelve of them are spin-offs from University of Michigan research, and all of them are related to it in one way or another. They represent an annual dollar volume of over 40 million, and they employ over 2,500 people—most of them with advanced degrees or specialized training. This process also is reaching the critical mass, and prospects for increased activity are bright. This will further attract and hold in the State outstanding intellectual talent.

The Return of the Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, as is our time-honored annual custom in the House, we have heard once more one of the great documents of American history: Washington's Farewell Address to the people of the United States.

It is a speech interwoven with the finer principles of life: patriotism, love, honesty, charity, understanding, responsibility, and humility.

I am sure that all of us here today recognize the equally fundamental importance of those virtues to our life today. So, too, I am sure that we all have personally observed the carelessness, even contempt, that has sometimes shrouded those virtues in our modern society. The majority of our citizens in all walks of life still abide by those principles, but perhaps, as Mr. Brower suggests, they sometimes wonder whether they are going to be trampled by sophisticated cynics.

As the words of our first President still are fresh in our mind, I believe it is especially apt at this moment to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the December edition of the Rutgers University Alumni Monthly. The article was written by Mr. Charles H. Brower, Rutgers 1925, president of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, Inc.

I am sure it will strike a responsive chord here in this Chamber and all across America:

Back in the days before the phrase "Going to his eternal rest" meant getting a job with the Government, Mark Twain arrived in a small town where he was scheduled to make a talk. Noticing that his lecture was poorly billed, he stepped into a store and said:

"Good evening, friend—any entertainment here tonight to help a stranger while away his evening?"

The storekeeper straightened up, wiped his hands and said: "I expect there's going to be a lecture. I've been selling eggs all day."

There have been quite a few changes made since that day. Although the price of eggs may prohibit their use as indoor guided missiles, we have become so well to do as a nation that we have a guilt complex about it. Conformity is sweeping the country. And while more and more people want to get seats in the grandstand, fewer and fewer want to sweat it out down on the field. More and more youngsters who come in looking for jobs are asking, "What can you do for me?" rather than, "What can I do for you?" They want to discuss the extras they're going to get rather than the extras they're going to give. They want to know how cool it is going to be in summer. And how warm in winter. And how safe at all times of the year. And when they go to work, they hasten to hide their light in the security of a committee, where there is safety in numbers. The progress may be slow and the glory may be small, but the work is steady. Their eyes are on the clock rather than on the calendar. The coffee break is more important than the big break.

And more and more girls are more interested in filing their nails than in filing what needs to be filed. The other day I overheard two girls in an elevator (not a Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, Inc., elevator, needless to say), and one said to the other, "Heavens, no, don't learn shorthand. If you can't take dictation, you won't have to stay after 5."

We have always had our share of free loaders in this country. And, as Channing Pollock once said, every generation produces its squad of moderns who march with peashooters against Gibraltar. But only in the past quarter century, it seems to me, has noninvolvement become an accepted way of life. For when we were poor, we had to sweat it out. We couldn't afford detachment from the life and fate of our country. And one of the great dangers of affluence is that it permits such detachment.

I'm going to say quite a bit about a six-letter word. Why six letters? Because modern literature has snapped up all the four- and five-letter words as its own. The only time a novelist uses a long word these days, is when he adds an "ing." So I am going to start on six-letter words.

The word is "square"—s-q-u-a-r-e.

Back in Mark Twain's day, it was one of the finest words in our language, among the top 10 on any lexicographer's hit parade. You gave a man a square deal if you were honest. And you gave him a square meal when he was hungry. You stood foursquare for the right, as you saw it, and square against everything else. When you got out of debt, you were square with the world. And that was when you could look your fellow man square in the eye.

Then a lot of strange characters got hold of this honest, wholesome word, bent it all out of shape and gave it back to our children. Convicts gave it the first twist. To them a square was an inmate who would not conform to the convict code. From the prisons it was flashed across the country on the marihuana circuit of the bopsters and hipsters. Now everyone knows what a square is. He is the man who never learned to get away with it. A Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to. A guy who gets his kicks from trying to do something better than anyone else can. A boob who gets so lost in his work that he has to be reminded to go home. A guy who doesn't have to stop at a bar on his way to the train at night because he's all fired up and full of juice already. A character who doesn't have to spend his evenings puttering in a basement workshop and his weekends scraping the bottom of a boat because he's putting all that elbow grease and steam into doing a satisfying job on the job he's getting paid to do. A fellow who laughs with his belly instead of his upper lip. A slob who still gets all choked up when the band plays "America the Beautiful." A square, and strictly from Squaresville.

His tribe isn't thriving too well in the current climate. He doesn't fit too neatly into the current group of angle players, corner cutters, sharpshooters and goof-offs. He doesn't believe in opening all the packages before Christmas. He doesn't want to fly now and pay later. He's burdened down with old-fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage, and thrift. And he may already be on his way to extinction.

He and all the rest of us are living in a country today that is quite different from the one that we were taught to love. Par-

ents have successfully defended in court their children's right to ignore the flag salute. Faculties and student bodies have found it distasteful to publicly take an oath of loyalty to their country. And the U.S. Military Academy has found it necessary to place a sign beside its parade grounds at West Point reminding spectators that it is customary for men to remove their hats at the passing of the banner that was once unashamedly referred to as "Old Glory."

The force of government is now directed more fully toward the security of the weak than the encouragement of the strong. In business, it is said the way to survive is to emulate the turtle—grow a hard shell and never stick your neck out, just as the young man in the Army was taught by his fellows to keep his mouth shut, his bowels open, and never volunteer.

We have come quite a way since Theodore Roosevelt told us: "Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat."

What has happened to us, I think, is that we have changed from an exporting country to an importing country.

I do not mean that we have let the world drain all of our gold away, although that is bad enough. I do not mean any imbalance of trade; as threatening as that may be. I mean that we have been importing instead of exporting ideas.

The United States of America was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world had ever known. We created and sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility, and freedom. We created and sold the idea of government of the people, by the people, and for the people—an idea that is still being bought today. We exported the idea of freedom of worship, the idea of an unfettered press, the idea that those who are taxed should be represented.

It is hard to find a basic idea that America has exported since you and I were young. We have, I think, bought in the bazaars of Asia Minor the idea that an honest man is either a fool or a liar. From our most mortal enemy we have bought the idea of a strong government for weak people. We have bought abroad the ideas of "let Jack do it," of "What's in it for me?" and the gesture of the neatly shrugged shoulder.

But, most of all, we have been gullible patrons of the export firm of Sigmund Freud, who has sold us the idea that all men are born feeble, that we should abandon our ancient disciplines as too stark for the poor souls that we are, and to seek our salvation through group support. Freud's discovery that man was not adjusted to his world, and could never be truly adjusted, justified the lazy cynic and condemned the square. For if you can't win, what is the use of trying? And here was the first great authority who said you cannot win.

The other day, I am told by a friend, his young son came home from his progressive school proudly exhibiting a book that he had won for excellence in natural history.

"However did you do that?" the delighted father asked.

"The teacher," answered the son, "asked how many legs an ostrich has, and I said three."

"But an ostrich has only two legs," the father protested.

"I know," said the boy, "but I came closest. All the other kids said four."

This may be funny. But it is not so funny that our colleges are loaded today with youngsters who are hardly prepared for high school—kids who cannot do simple arithmetic and who cannot spell simple words. This, too, was an import—the idea that the dull discipline of the three R's was disturbing to litttle Johnny's ego. So we got real scientific and went to work on the poor little kid and his id, with the result that today hardly any school that really is a school is without a class in remedial reading. It would save considerable money if the class were held in the very highest level of our teachers' colleges and were called remedial thinking. For surely we ought by now to know as much as chickens, ducks, and monkeys know—there is no learning without discipline.

Our museums today are exhibiting on their walls paintings by people who never learned to paint. It used to be a sort of joke that you could not tell which was the top and which was the bottom.

But recently a museum did hang a bit of modern art upside down. It was days before it was discovered, and I still do not know how they knew.

Nonbooks are being thrown together and sold by nonwriters who never bothered to learn how to write. And murky poems are being ground out by scraggly poets who sing them to their friends because they are unreadable. Here, for example, is a deathless line that was obviously written in San Francisco: "O man, thee is onion-constructed in hot gabardine."

Life magazine describes our beatnik geniuses as "fruit flies * * * some of the hairiest, scrawnies and most discontented specimens of all time, who not only refuse to sample the seeping juices of American plenty and American advance but scrape their feelers in discordant scorn of any and all who do."

Some of their output is worse than trash; some of it goes beyond making fun of mom and dad and marriage and automatic dishwashers and suburbia. Here are a few lines from a shocking poem about the Crucifixion:

"He was a kind of carpenter
from a square-type place like Galilee
Who said the cat who really laid it on us
all was his Dad."

There is more, but I wouldn't even read it to you.

Always tearing down these days. Never building up. Always knocking. Belittling. Downgrading. A sneer rather than a grin. A mocking laugh rather than a belly laugh. Poking fun at other people rather than at ourselves.

And what, by the way, ever happened to laughter? Once we were a laughing Nation. We laughed easily and deeply. The corn may have been as high as an elephant's eye—but we laughed, and it was good for us. We laughed at Lincoln, and Mark Twain, and Artemus Ward, and Mr. Dooley, and Petroleum V. Nasby. And later we laughed at the gentle humor of such columnists as Don Marquis, F.P.A., and H. I. Phillips. We laughed at Will Rogers, because he made us laugh at ourselves. Remember the sly, dry way he spun that rope and spun those yarns and got off those wonderful quips of his about life in general and politics in particular?

We laughed at Robert Benchley. Remember when a magazine sent him on an assignment to Venice and he wired back, "Streets full of water. Please advise"?

Today I think there is one true comic on the stage and one real humorist writing a column. I am talking about Bob Hope and Art Buchwald. Others are cynical, sly and bitter. We laugh when we are told that everyone but squares knows that Mr. A or Mr. B is funny, but we don't know why we are laughing.

We refer to our humor as sick, sick, sick, and it is, is, is. Mother used to get cards on Mother's Day, expressing in some way the fact that she was loved and wanted. Now if she is lucky she gets a card that shows Whistler's mother flat on her back and a caption that says, "You're not the only one who's off her rocker." Otherwise she may get a card that says, "Want to lose 15 ugly pounds? Then cut off your head."

Mort Sahl, to me, represents the cackling of despair. And even Bob Newhart, clean and clean cut and buttoned down as he is, cannot resist the temptation to give a hotfoot now and then to our national idols.

I claim we need those idols. And I am not going to be amused by a skit in which Lincoln's publicity man tells him "write it on envelops, Abe," or "Why don't you take it easy tonight, Abe, and take in a show?"

Laughter today is stored in Hollywood in cans, just as the gold was once stored at Fort Knox. It is taken out as needed and pasted onto TV films. And the laugh track tips us off when things are funny.

But I want to laugh when I am amused. And I want to decide what I think is funny And this, I suppose, will mark me as a square. And if it does, I will be in pretty good company. For this country was discovered, put together, fought for, and saved by squares. It is easy to prove that Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and almost anyone else you care to include among our national heroes was a square—by simply thinking what he might have said had he not been square.

Nathan Hale: Me spy on those British. Are you trying to be funny? Do you know what they do with the spies they catch? I'll give you a news flash, chum. They hang them.

Paul Revere: What do you mean—me ride through every Middlesex village and town? And in the middle of the night yet. Why pick on me? Am I the only man in Boston with a horse?

Patrick Henry: Sure, I'm for liberty. First, last, and always, but we've got to be a little realistic. We're a pretty small outfit. If we start pushing the British around someone is going to get hurt.

George Washington: Gentlemen, I am honored. But I do wish you would try someone else. Let's say General Gates. I'm just getting things organized at Mount Vernon. Also you might say I had already served my time. Against the French, you know.

Benjamin Franklin: "What we really need as Ambassador to France is a young man. I'm 70 years old. It's time a new generation took over."

It is perhaps a significant fact that what such men actually did say has been quietly sneaked out of our schoolbooks. This Week magazine made a survey recently of school history books issued before 1920, compared with those issued since. Nathan Hale said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," in 11 of the old texts and in only 1 of the new texts.

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death" in 12 out of 14 earlier texts and in only 2 of 45 recent ones.

But John Paul Jones set the record. He said, "I have not yet begun to fight," in nine of the old books and in none of the new ones.

Maybe cutting down a cherry tree is a square thing to do * * * and maybe throwing a dollar across the Rappahannock is a waste of money rather than a test of strength * * * and maybe nobody stands up in boats any more (especially in midwinter) * * * but there are lessons to be learned in all of them, and schoolbooks are for learning.

Maybe these aggressive and nationalistic statements went the way of contact games, which have been largely abandoned on our school grounds. Maybe the educators thought our children would be more interested in Peter Rabbit, who goes hippety-hop. Maybe the Russians are a lot smarter than we think.

Or maybe it is just because these fellows, and all of their fellows, and all of their ideas, are square.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower was President he appointed a Committee on National Goals to decide where we were all going. Perhaps a first step should be a commission on national heritage to make sure that some of us at least remember where we have been.

Arnold Toynbee, the historian, says that of 21 notable civilizations, 19 perished not from external conquest but from the evaporation of belief within.

Today, our country still has a choice. I believe it has already begun to make that choice. I believe it is going back to its old beliefs in such things as ideas, pride, patriotism, loyalty, devotion and even hard work.

We are great believers in statistics in this country—and while the things that really count can never be measured even by the most advanced computers—sheer head-counting seems to indicate that people are beginning to struggle for better things.

Twenty years ago, half of us belonged to churches. Today, 64 percent of us do. It is perfectly possible that the churches are full and the people are empty—but the statistics are on our side.

Sales of classical records have jumped 78 percent in the last 3 years. Advertising, perhaps, but the statistics are on our side.

Millions of people are visiting museums, millions more than a decade ago.

We spent over a billion dollars on books last year, and people are taking 670 million volumes out of our public libraries each year.

There are 50 percent more symphony orchestras than there were 10 years ago. And expenditures on all cultural activities have increased 70 percent in the past 10 years—to a total of more than $3 billion.

You might point out to me that $3 billion spent for culture, stacked up against $50 billion spent for war, still isn't much. But you will have to admit that there is definite movement. And in the right direction too.

Since the turn of the century, the percentage of our population that has graduated from high school is up 10 times. And the percentage that has gone to college is up seven times. And the percentage in higher education who are in there trying to get higher marks is encouragingly higher than it used to be. Yes, there are indications that the day when it's smart to be smart is finally at hand.

But the greatest thing that has happened, of course, is that our Nation has a whole new set of heroes. Named Glenn and Grissom and Shepard. Named Carpenter, Cooper and Schirra. Named Crews and Bock and Twinting; Smith, Sorlie and McIntosh; named Knolle and Hoover. The towns they came from have nice small names: Sparta, Boulder, East Derry, Mitchell, Shawnee, Brownwood.

These lads apparently lived too far from the big city and grew up to be squares. For who but a square would volunteer his life for his country's good?

They are not even ashamed of their feelings.

John Glenn says he gets a funny feeling down inside when he sees the flag go by. Imagine that.

He's proud of his small town, proud of his small college. Proud that he belonged to the Boy Scouts and the YMCA.

I hope that some of him rubs off onto the next generation.

For the forces of conformity are still strong. Too many of us are still sitting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and dare to be square. Because the opposite of square is round, and being round is so much simpler. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy. And we can just roll down the path without any bumps, being careful to stay in the middle, because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

Too many of us know the short cuts, and too few know or care where the path leads. Too few of us dare to leave the path because the path is always the easy way, the way most people go. But there is no path to the future, no path to greatness, no path to progress. No path to outer space or to inner satisfaction.

How shall we fight for personal independence? How shall we avoid the group poop, the vortex of mediocrity, the great nothing of cynical sophistication and bored nonparticipation?

May I suggest that we all join the S.O.S.? The S.O.S.—the Society of Squares. It doesn't even exist but it could. Not a left-wing organization. Not a right-wing organization. Just an organization with wings.

We might have to go underground for awhile to avoid being trampled to death by the coast-to-coast rat-packs of cynical saboteurs and the canned-wit commandos whose devotion is to destruction.

But we would come out.

We might even have a secret handshake consisting mainly of grabbing the other guy's hand as though you meant it and looking him in the eye.

We would be for participation and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication, for laughter and against sniggering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for the honest way against the easy short cut, for a well-done job and against the goof-off, for education and against the pretense of learning, for building and against tearing down, for the boys and girls who excel and against the international bedroom athletes.

We have, at least, the satisfaction of knowing that our problem is not new.

When Benjamin Franklin was told that the war for independence was over, he said, "Say rather the war of the revolution is over—the war for independence has yet to be fought." And today—179 years later—the war for independence has still to be fought.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, February, the shortest month of the year, is usually one of the busiest and this one was no exception. With Congress and its legislative duties, Defense Department briefings almost every day, and important daily requests from constituents, your Congressman has been very busy.

At the invitation of the Secretary of the Air Force, I inspected six major Air Force commands to get a firsthand look at our defense structure. The tour included the defense nerve center at Omaha, Nebr., a SAC alert demonstration at Vandenberg, Calif., a visit to the Atlas missile training site where two crews from Atlas AFB were undergoing training, and NORAD headquarters at Colorado Springs. Seeing our defense systems in operation gives me confidence that the United States is more militarily secure than any time in its history.

I attended a series of high-level secret briefings by Defense Secretary McNamara, and, based on his statements, I am not worried about the future of the manned bomber. The manned bomber will always have its place in our defense structure.

Enclosed with this newsletter is a blue opinion card. In order that I may be aware of the desires of my constituents, please complete the card, apply a stamp, and mail it to me. This helps me to vote according to the wishes of those I serve.

Shortly after pro football star Norman Snead had been hired by the Peace Corps at a salary of $75 per day plus expenses, I protested the hiring. Two days later Corps Director Sargent Shriver announced that Snead would work for nothing, that his hiring had been a mistake. It was gratifying to receive so much mail commending me for my action. It came from 31 States and my own Sixth District. Economy in Government demands constant attention.

The United Nations will give agricultural aid to Cuba, it was recently announced. No U.S. money will be used, but I firmly stand opposed to the U.N. giving Cuba aid in any way, shape, or form until Russia removes its troops, guns, and other weapons. The United States should make no contribution to any United Nations fund which would be used in this manner.

Six Federal agencies plan to spend more than $157 million in the Sixth District during fiscal year 1964. Of this, more than $148 million will be for military installations. In February, two contracts totaling $1.7 million were awarded for construction at Fort Sill. Duncan's Halliburton Field was equipped with a new directional radio range, and a $118,000 loan was approved for Sterling for water and sewer works.

The Post Office Department deserves commendation. I often receive mail addressed simply, "VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Washington, D.C.," but this month I received a letter with the envelope addressed only to "U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C." For faster processing, I urge constituents to at least put my name on the envelope. My address is 1421 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C. Remember, I am only as far away as your telephone. Anytime I may be of service, just phone, wire, or write.

The Right to Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian

(Mich.) Daily Telegram of January 9, 1963.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

An editorial yesterday commented on the unusual news conference conducted by Defense Secretary McNamara to quiet uneasiness about the arms situation in Cuba. Ever since the Kennedy administration admitted it had "managed" some aspects of the news about the Cuban crisis, there have been disquieting rumors of a new Soviet buildup in Cuba. The upshot was that the Defense Secretary told us a great deal the other day about what our Government knows about Cuba and how it got the information. And he remarked that by so doing he may have put some handicaps on the future intelligence activities.

If that be so, the responsibility goes back to the Government and its "managed news" policy. Obviously in times of national crisis the Government cannot tell all it knows. Some information has to be restricted. But this can be done without limiting the information about their Government that the people need to know, have the right to have. For in the successful operation of democratic government the people's right to know is basic. When they do not know what the Government is doing and why, they are uneasy. Confidence in the Government wanes, may even be destroyed.

These observations apply to the local scene. There has been a spirited discussion of the arrangement whereby the Madison Township Fire Department is to take over the furnishing of fire protection to Adrian Township. Some Adrian Township residents are expressing misgivings, publicly and privately. Some are content with the fire protection contract.

But this point stands out: the Adrian Township Board did what it decided was the best thing to do, and most of the people in the township did not know what was going on. The township board presented its constituency with an accomplished fact, the township's own fire department is to be dissolved and the services of the Madison department obtained on a contract basis. Whatever the merits of the new arrangement; whatever the good reasons for making it, these were never presented to the people while the board was making the decision.

In other words, the people did not know. And that in essence is what the squabble is all about. The Adrian Township Board's big mistake was its neglect to let its people know what it proposed doing and why.

Administration Wrong Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs a Cuban exile leader testified yesterday that he had hard evidence that there may be as many as 30,000 to 35,000 Russian troops in Cuba today, not the 17,000 as the administration states. Dr. Manuel deVarona revealed this as indicated in the story in the Washington Evening Star, yesterday:

NEARLY 30,000 RUSSIAN TROOPS IN CUBA, REFUGEE SAYS—ONLY JOINT ACTION LED BY UNITED STATES CAN FREE ISLAND, DEVARONA SAYS

A Cuban exile leader said today that he had hard evidence that there may be as many as 30,000 to 35,000 Russian troops in Cuba today, not 17,000 as the Kennedy administration says.

Dr. Manuel deVarona, speaking through an interpreter, at first said he had received reports on 30,000 to 35,000 Soviet troops there. He testified before a House inter-American Affairs Subcommittee which is inquiring into Cuban subversion in Latin America.

Questioned further by Representative FARBSTEIN, Democrat, of New York, Dr. deVarona said he would make the definite statement that there were more than 17,000 and as many as 30,000.

QUESTION REFUGEES

He said his group questions all refugees coming from Cuba and that there are 5,000 Russian troops in his own province of Camaguey alone.

"The Russians are seen everywhere, in the cities, in the country, at concentration camps," he said through the interpreter, Dr. Nester Carbonell.

In a statement read to the subcommittee by Dr. Carbonell, Dr. deVarona said "only joint military action from abroad, under the leadership of the United States, can liberate Cuba and restore peace to the hemisphere."

In a "supplement" also read to the group, however, he said a naval and air blockade should be imposed on Cuba first, "adequate military assistance" sent to freedom fighters on the island and abroad, with "collective armed action" against Cuba only as a third step "if needed."

ACT THROUGH OAS

Questioned further on the matter, Dr. deVarona said he felt such action should be taken through the Organization of American States, but that if all else fails, the United States has an inherent right of unilateral self-defense and should exercise it.

He emphasized military action only "if necessary," seeming to soften the previous statement.

He said his refugee group has no information that Russian troops have been used to put down any uprisings of Cuban people against Fidel Castro "as yet." He estimated 15 percent of the Cuban people remain loyal to Castro.

Dr. deVarona, who was president of the Cuban Senate in 1950–52, said his son and two brothers took part in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

In one of his "supplements," the Cuban exile said "well-informed sources in Vienna" reported Russia has established secret bases in two Latin American countries, one in the jungles of northwest Brazil and the other in a mountain region of Paraguay.

DIFFICULT TO REACH

Representative MAILLIARD, Republican, of California, said he assumed the countries involved would be aware of this and "I would think the establishment of a military base on someone else's territory would be an act of war."

Dr. deVarona said the reported bases were very difficult to reach and that may be the reason no action has been taken.

Dr. deVarona said the reported impending removal of several thousand Russian troops from Cuba would make little difference in its use as a base for subversion in Latin America, and that removal of all Russian troops should be forced by a blockade.

He said there was a "complete case" of Russian troops which left Havana and later entered the country again through Santiago. He said this was reported by a White Russian who had spoken to the troops and came to the United States several weeks ago.

Asked by Representative GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, if he feels the United States is "doing what we ought to do," the interpreter said, "Dr. deVerona considers that all measures that should be taken are not being taken and sees no decision that has been taken to liberate Cuba."

Miller & Rhoads and Thalhimers, of Richmond, Recognized for Public Service Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, two of the Nation's outstanding department stores, both of which happen to be located in my congressional district, have recently been honored by the National Retail Merchants Association and the Readers Digest for public service programs they have instituted. Miller & Rhoads and Thalhimers of Richmond, Va., have been recognized as semi-final winners for the role the retail industry plays in promoting a better way of life for our citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following comment on the prizewinning projects:

MILLER & RHOADS, INC.

For 10 years Miller and Rhoads have sponsored the Virginia high school forums. These programs feature outstanding students selected from high schools throughout the State together with foreign students attending school in Virginia.

Miller and Rhoads' public relations activities have always been geared to furthering the importance of good citizenship combined with a true recognition of the freedom our country enjoys.

Working with the Student Cooperative Association and Richmond and Roanoke public schools, Miller and Rhoads developed the details of the program, which has proven highly successful.

Not only do Virginia's high school students develop their basic beliefs in the workings of democracy, but the participating foreign students are able to pass along the ideas discussed in the forums when they return to their native countries.

THALHIMERS

Six years ago, Thalhimers in Richmond pioneered in a project designed to acquaint the community with scientifically correct information on the relationship between diet and good health.

This idea of nutrition forums was entirely new and the increased interest in the programs as the years go by has convinced Thalhimers that they are meeting a need in the community.

Although the idea for the forums was conceived by Thalhimers, they felt that they should have a cosponsoring group with established medical prestige, so the Virginia Council on Health and Medical Care joined the project.

The forum has panel discussions among scientists, demonstrations, and slides and films. A question and answer period climaxes every session. Topics include "Special Diet," "Teen-Age Eating Problems," "Food Fads," "Child Nutrition," and "Food and Today's Health."

The nutrition forums are open to the public without charge. Registration begins at 9 a.m. with coffee served to the early arrivals, many of whom are from out of town. There is a luncheon interval of an hour and a half when the guest speakers and the committee are entertained by Thalhimers at a special table in its attractive Richmond Room restaurant.

William Thalhimers, Sr., believes that the nutrition forums are making Richmond and Virginia more conscious of the importance of the right food for good health.

Lessons in Economics by Uncle Sam Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, occasionally a citizen writing to me of his concern about a serious national problem will underline that concern by expressing it in a novel way.

A letter which I received from Mr. Jack Wilson, of Winchester, Mass., is one of these. His letter prompted me to reply in part:

Not only will I speak to your Uncle Sam, but I'll talk to some of his other nephews in Washington who may have some influence, too.

In an effort to influence some of these nephews, I am inserting Mr. Wilson's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WINCHESTER, MASS.,
February 8, 1963.

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORSE: I hate to tell you my troubles, but I have tried everything else I know. I feel that only you can help me now.

I have a dependent relative staying with me who has very little fiscal responsibility. He is very good natured and means well, but he keeps buying presents for my wife and me, and our two children. He charges these presents to my account. When he sees something that he thinks we need he buys it for us. Many of these things are not needed by us and in very few cases are they exactly what we would have bought if we had bought these things ourselves. Because he doesn't work for a living, money doesn't mean too much to him and he tends to buy the first thing he sees and doesn't shop around like I would do if I were purchasing items. He is also quite generous to the poor and needy, but often gives to those he doesn't know who feed him a soft line.

I just received a bill for his last spending spree and it gives me a sick hopeless feeling. I keep thinking how better off I would be if I could just spend that money for the things I want and could give to the people and charities I think are needy. Honestly, he does so much of my spending that I tend not to give money to charity anymore.

He won't listen to me, but he will listen to you because he respects you. Please use your influence to cut the spending habits of my Uncle Sam.

Sincerely,

JACK A. WILSON.

Why Fateful Doubts Persist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Ypsilanti (Mich.) Press of February 1, 1963:

WHY FATEFUL DOUBTS PERSIST

Is the Russian military buildup in Cuba worse now than during last October's crisis?

Are attack missiles hidden in caves?

Few questions are more pertinent today. The Kennedy administration has gone to extreme lengths to deny that they are true. Opponents, including some who have been extremely accurate in past reports, still will not accept the denials.

We frankly don't know which side is right.

We do know, however, that confusion, fear, and refusal to heed the statements by the President and his Defense Secretary are bad things for the country.

And we know one thing further: The administration, in this uncertainty, is hatching its own eggs—eggs that were laid in the handling of announcements last October.

You'll remember the furor raised then—or rather in the wake of the crisis—over the so-called news management employed by the President and the Defense Department.

One key official explained to reporters that news releases were a weapon to be employed at will as one more tool in the Government's arsenal. President Kennedy himself, while emphasizing that he in no way would tolerate interference with freedom of the public to know, saw nothing wrong in the false statements issued as to his purported cold given as the reason for canceling a speaking tour as the crisis came into focus.

In addition, he defended false and misleading official announcements denying the Soviet buildup, some issued almost on the eve of the day he described the extent and seriousness of the crisis.

It was hard to argue then with his contention that the security of the country must come first. On this original premise everyone agreed—including reporters and editors. It was only when you got to the offshoots of the premise that the problem arose, and then it was difficult to dispute success.

It was also difficult to look to the future and cite dangers, for they were all problematical.

But this is the future.

And we are not dealing now in problematicals; we are faced with a situation where a great segment of the population refuses to believe the top officials of the country.

We all want to believe the President and Defense Secretary McNamara. We almost have to believe them.

Yet nagging doubts persist, fed at least subconsciously by the false pronouncements of 4 months ago.

The thing that was overlooked then, we believe, was the fact that it was unnecessary to mislead the public. We felt then and we feel now that the President was right, that he could not announce the details of crisis immediately, that he had to sort fact from fancy, that it was imperative he consult and inform our allies before revealing this country's position publicly.

Nevertheless, he and his official family did not have to resort to misstatements.

All that they needed to do was simply say nothing.

Sure, sudden cancellation of a Presidential speaking tour would have started great speculation. But the reason given, the cold, delayed the speculation only a few hours—if you'll remember, it spread like wildfire through the Capital for days.

Nor was it necessary to deny officially the rumors from Cuba. Spokesmen should simply have refused to comment beyond saying that the administration was investigating and would speak as soon as possible.

Instant coffee may have become a part of our lives, but instant answers are not imperative, no matter how demanding the questions may be.

Granted again, such refusal to comment may spur speculation. But let us repeat once more, the denials in October did absolutely nothing to stop it.

The all-important result, however, would have been that the administration would be clean; it could not be accused of issuing false (remember, this is false, not mistaken) statements.

And when the current fears erupted, honest denials would have been taken at face value.

Confidence must be earned by governments as well as individuals. But once won, its value far exceeds any temporary advantage to be gained from "news management."

That is the big lesson in today's uncertainty.

Apprenticeship and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic advantages that comes to a Member of the House from an election every 2 years is that he is forced to pay closer attention to what is going on in his home State and district. This past year it was to my benefit to become more keenly aware of the great work of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training program. At this time I want to pay tribute to Mr. Edward Goshen, the Director of this program, and the men and women working under him, particularly in the State of Iowa. The acquaintance I have with this Bureau indicates that this is one service in which we can be assured that the taxpayers are getting their money's worth. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be wise when considering new youth programs that we do not forget the very solid and lasting work of the established and proven Bureau of Apprenticeship.

It is my intention to make a speech on the apprenticeship program at a later date. At the present time, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following articles: An editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat, August 25,

1962, by Donald G. Southwood, and an article in the Iowa Business and Industry magazine entitled "Apprentices Sharpen Skills in Factories Across Iowa":

[From the Times-Democrat, Aug. 25, 1962]

COMMUNITY, NATION MUST EXPAND APPRENTICE TRAINING PROGRAMS

In his proclamation issued prior to the beginning of August, Mayor Ray T. O'Brien joined with the President of the United States, the Governor of Iowa, and the mayors of the principal cities throughout the Nation, in designating the month of August as Apprenticeship Month. This was done to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the passage of Public Law 308, which received the Presidential signature on August 16, 1937.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, had its beginning then, and the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, made up of leaders of industry and labor, was appointed to establish standards of apprenticeship for the guidance of local groups sponsoring training through apprenticeship.

During the ensuing years, a great many persons in Davenport and the Quad Cities have given unselfishly of their time in the establishment and guidance of those training programs which have produced most of the highly skilled craftsmen employed in this area today. Technical assistance has been provided through the Bureau's field staff and the facilities of the vocational education department of the Davenport community schools have been placed at their disposal.

Labor and management committees, as well as individual employers, participate in the administration of a variety of apprenticeship training programs, all of which are voluntary systems established according to a similar pattern and closely adhering to industrial needs.

The major task of determining the type and content of training, handling the many personality and disciplinary problems, financing, selecting apprentices for training, keeping progress records, and providing the final local ceremony in recognition of the successful completion of the program of apprenticeship, has fallen to those enlightened people. Credit for the continuation and upgrading of craft training, as well as updating of skills, belongs to them.

These members of the local joint apprenticeship committees, as a rule, serve without monetary reward and, through the expenditure of their time and effort and the sharing of experience, make a tremendous contribution to industry and the local economy.

Certainly no less a contribution is made to the youth of the community by providing opportunities for those with abilities to develop them and to reach their full earning capacity early in life.

Through the committees' efforts and close contact with their trades, the content of the apprenticeship plan is keep abreast of constantly changing technology and the needs of the industry, thereby providing the superior craftsman whose skills are so vital to the expanding economy of this Nation.

Even though a great many persons have worked untiringly in this cause during this quarter century, and immeasurable benefits have been derived from their labors, there remains much to be accomplished.

The ever-quickening pace of our economic life will require an expansion of such training in many fields and it is altogether fitting that in his proclamation, Mayor O'Brien said:

"I urge all employers of skilled workers not now supporting or directly participating in the training of apprentices to take appropriate steps to assure the development of skilled workers in this community; and I urge those who are now training apprentices to strengthen and expand their apprenticeship programs.

"I also invite labor and management in this community to join with the Iowa Apprenticeship Council, the State bureau of labor, and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, as well as other State and Federal agencies interested in apprenticeship training and other employe development to participate actively in the observance of Apprenticeship Month."

As your local apprenticeship representative, I would, therefore, urge all those who employ skilled workers, as well as representatives of labor organizations representing skilled craftsmen, to join in this observance by reviewing their needs and to make use of those facilities available to them to assure the continuance of these skills in such numbers as are necessary to meet the needs of the future.

APPRENTICES SHARPEN SKILLS IN FACTORIES ACROSS IOWA—MORE THAN 335 PROGRAMS INVOLVING 4,700 ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS IN STATE

"In those companies which maintain mechanical shops, the Hubinger Co. (Keokuk) believes the apprenticeship program is a must.

"The craft apprenticeship training program at the Cedar Rapids plant of W. R. Grace & Co.'s Cryovac division is paying big dividends to both the company and to its skilled draft employees.

"In these days when automation and very highly specialized techniques are required in manufacturing, Sheaffer (Fort Madison) finds that the training of highly skilled personnel through the apprenticeship program is very essential."

These are reactions by some Iowa industrialists who are conducting apprenticeship programs. All say the program pays off. Some plan to expand their programs. All recommend it.

Throughout Iowa there are an estimated 4,700 employees engaged in about 335 apprenticeship programs. Since the inception of the program in 1937, approximately 9,300 persons have taken the training.

The Iowa program is an enabling act without mandatory injunctions and is worked out through the U.S. Department of Labor and its Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and through the Iowa commissioner of labor and the Iowa Apprenticeship Council.

In Iowa the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training field offices are located at Des Moines and Davenport. Field staff personnel are available to assist industry in the development and maintenance of programs covering a wide scope of skills.

Inquiries may be directed to Russell V. Kelso, State Supervisor, Room 201, Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Streets, Des Moines.

Let's take a look at some of the company programs now in existence and then return to more details on how the Iowa program works and what it is attempting to achieve.

MAYTAG HAS GOOD PROGRAM

The Maytag Co.'s apprentice program at Newton is tailored to fit the company needs. Company officials said the program has proved invaluable. Skilled trades needs have been met and indications are the program will continue to meet these needs in the future, E. F. Scoutten, vice president, personnel, said.

Indicative of the program's value to the company is the fact that its graduates account for some 40 percent of the total personnel in those crafts covered by Maytag's apprenticeship program.

Maytag's program was initiated in 1948. Company expansion and changing technology were factors in Maytag's decision to institute its own apprenticeship program. Experience has shown that men trained by the company are more inclined to remain with the company long after the training, tending to establish a more stable work force.

Since years of training and much money are invested by the company in the training of skilled tradesmen, this is considered significant. Maytag's program also paid dividends here since records show that more than 75 percent of the program's graduates still are employed with Maytag.

More than 1 of every 10 graduates have been advanced to supervisory positions while some others have gone on to engineering and planning posts within the company.

Apprenticeship training at Maytag is available in seven crafts—tool and diemaker, tool hardener, machine repairman, sheet metalworker, electrician, pipefitter and building mechanic. A course covers 8,000 hours with a trainee devoting over 90 percent of this time to on-the-job training under the guidance of a journeyman and the remaining hours in the classroom. Classes are conducted by company instructors in well-equipped classrooms on company premises and on company time.

Applicants for the program, and there are many whenever an opening is announced, undergo a careful screening process with final selection made by the joint apprenticeship committee comprised of three company and three union representatives.

Maytag requires that men hired for skilled trades posts be either graduates of Maytag's program or an equally qualified training program.

BELIEVES APPRENTICESHIP VITAL

The Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Co., Inc., Burlington, Iowa, believes that an apprenticeship program is necessary and vital to the development of apprentices in all the practical and theoretical aspects of the trade.

Company officials say it preserves and perpetuates the skills essential to true conformity, and builds and maintains the ranks of all-around skilled craftsmen.

The company presently has a time apprenticeship program for pipefitters and tool and diemakers. There is one apprentice to every eight journeymen. The program consists of an 8,000-hour work plan, plus 144 hours per year of related and supplemental instruction such as mathematics and blueprint reading.

The apprenticeship program has been active at the Iowa Ordnance Plant since 1952 and similar programs have been in effect in other Mason & Hanger, Silas Mason Co., facilities throughout the country. The Burlington facility is contractor-operator of the Iowa Ordnance Plant.

BELIEVES COSTS JUSTIFIED

At the Hubinger Co., at Keokuk, the apprenticeship program has been in operation since January 1946.

After 16 years the management feels the results of training have justified the cost of the correspondence courses and the time spent by the training directors on the program.

The training consists of 576 hours of classroom study and 8,000 hours of on-the-job training.

Before the apprenticeship programs, it was possible to hire a mechanic for one of the crafts or transfer one with mechanical aptitude from another department to the craft. But with strict seniority rules, that now is impossible, company officials said.

The union and the company agreed on the apprenticeship program. All applicants for an opening in one of the crafts, are given a series of tests. Then a joint management-labor committee evaluates the applicants. The evaluation is based on test results plus a number of other factors including education, experience, age, work record, etc.

The company feels that the apprenticeship program has paid off and it has made better paid jobs available to many of its employees.

The management said: "In those companies which maintain mechanical shops, the Hubinger Co. believes an apprenticeship program is a 'must'."

At its Cedar Rapids plant, the W. R. Grace & Co.'s Cryovac division feels the craft apprenticeship training program is paying big dividends to both the company and to its skilled craft employees, A. S. Austin, industrial relations manager, said.

The program, instituted in 1961, is now in full swing with 35 men in 6 different crafts receiving intensive on-the-job and off-the-job training in their specialty. The six crafts involved are electrician, electronics, and instruments, machine repairman, machinist, millwright, and pipefitter.

On-the-job training and experience is obtained in the company's modern plant which manufactures flexible plastic bags and films for the Nation's food packaging industry.

USE CORRESPONDENCE STUDY

Off-the-job related instruction began with shop mathematics classes in Jefferson High School and now is being completed with a specially designed program of studies through International Correspondence School.

The company pays all instructional and textbook costs, but all the textbook work is done on the employee's own time.

The program was developed and is being administered by a joint company-union committee with a minimum of assistance from the industrial relations department.

Company officials and participating employees are equally enthusiastic with what is being accomplished. Trainees are experiencing an increasing pride of craftsmanship and at the same time are gaining material rewards in the form of wage increases as they successfully progress in the program.

The company, according to W. E. Woods, manufacturing manager, who was instrumental in development of the present program, has benefited from the higher quality of workmanship, better work habits and reduced load on supervision.

Plant Manager W. J. Seidel endorses the apprenticeship program, pointing out that the company has been able to provide a continued education for its maintenance personnel which not only gives the company valuable benefits through improved work performance, but also keeps its craft employees up to date on modern maintenance techniques and prepares them for the more complex technological manufacturing problems of the future.

SHEAFFER PROGRAM ESSENTIAL

At Sheaffer's Tool & Die Division of W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, four apprentices are employed in the program and the company is considering a fifth. Besides these 4, the number of toolmakers, tool machinists and specialists is 26, making a ratio of 6 to 1.

Said L. B. Holdgrafer, chief tool engineer, "In these days when automation and very highly specialized techniques are required in manufacturing, Sheaffer finds that the training of highly skilled personnel through the apprenticeship program is very essential."

"Their program enables them to inject into these young people not only the merits of the trade but a feeling of participation in the company's progress."

A highlight of the Sheaffer program is the training apprentices get on special equipment such as jig borers, jig grinders, contour milling, Keller duplicating, projectoform grinding, and electrical discharge machining.

Very few toolshops, especially in the Fort Madison area, have such a list of special equipment. This affords Sheaffer's apprentices a high-level advantage in training.

The Master Builders of Iowa, likewise, recognized the apprenticeship program in Iowa as a boon to contractors and constructors.

Joseph C. Piper, administrative assistant at the Master Builders, said the construction industry employed the largest group of skilled workers in the American labor force, constituting almost one-third of all the skilled workers in the country.

As technology advances and as equipment becomes more complex, he said, it is essential that contractors have fully trained craftsmen. Experience has shown that formal apprenticeship training is one of the best ways to acquire the all-around proficiency of a skilled building trades worker.

Working under the watchful eye of a skilled craftsman, the apprentice is given the opportunity to master a trade within a specified period of time, usually 3 or 4 years.

Work assignments become progressively more difficult and are planned to provide experience in every aspect of a trade. This program is generally supplemented by regular formal classroom instruction in related theory.

JOINT COMMITTEES RULE

In order to promote sound apprenticeship training in Iowa, he said, both management and labor devote considerable time and effort to apprenticeship activities. In most areas local joint apprenticeship committees have been established for each of the apprenticeable construction trades. It is their responsibility to prepare effective apprenticeship training standards and to supervise and coordinate the overall training program in their particular locality.

In addition, many management and labor organizations sponsor various other projects to stimulate the quantity and quality of apprenticeship training. One such project is the Iowa Pre-Apprenticeship Bricklayer Training School, which has been conducted annually in the State for a number of years.

This is a concentrated 6- to 8-week course sponsored jointly by the Master Builders of Iowa, the Structural Clay Products Institute, and the Iowa Concrete Masonry Association.

The class is made up of beginning apprentices from all over Iowa and is designed to teach them the fundamentals of the bricklaying trade in order that they will be better able to assimulate their regular apprenticeship training.

BETTER STANDARDS ACHIEVED

The Master Painters and Decorators also are interested in better work standards through the apprenticeship programs.

The best way to maintain a standard of good work is through an effective apprentice training program, Floyd Hayden, secretary of the Master Painters & Decorators Association, said.

In order that there may be continuous activity and progress in the national apprenticeship program in the painting and decorating trade, a national apprenticeship committee was established to serve in an advisory and promotional capacity. This national committee, known as the National Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee, is made up of an equal number of representatives of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America and the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America.

A representative of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, and the Trade and Industrial Education Service, U.S. Office of Education serve as consultants to the committee, he said.

The Master Painter & Decorating Contractors of Des Moines, find that from the inception of their apprenticeship program in 1946, on-the-job training combined with new and up-to-date materials used in the related training classes has produced craftsmen who have complete knowledge of all aspects of this trade and that supervision is down to a minimum, working habits are improved as well as quantity and quality of work.

In the same vein, the Iowa chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association, said "We are well aware of the importance of apprenticeship training in providing skilled manpower to our industry."

Donald D. Clark, secretary-manager, said, "Both labor and management further recognize the guidance and counseling given to our efforts by the bureau of apprenticeship.

"Our office staff and contractor members devote considerable time and energy to the carrying out of our joint apprenticeship program with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Worker locals throughout the State.

It is in this area that both labor and management have an outstanding record of mutual cooperation, he said. "Both contribute their time, talent, and financial resources to every phase of the training of skilled men to meet our growing manpower requirements," he said.

Iowa last month observed the 25th Annual Apprenticeship Month, and Gov. Norman Erbe signed a proclamation recognizing the importance of apprenticeship training in Iowa and the Nation.

EIGHT FUNDAMENTALS OF PROGRAMS

Eight fundamentals for the guidance of employers and labor in developing apprenticeship programs were outlined by the Federal Committee on Apprentice-Training Service. These are its guideposts:

1. The starting age of an apprentice be not less than 16 years.
2. A schedule of work processes in which an apprentice is to receive training and experience on the job.
3. Organized instruction designed to provide the apprentice with knowledge in technical subjects related to his trade. A minimum of 144 hours per year is normally considered necessary.
4. A progressively increasing schedule of wages.
5. Proper supervision of on-the-job training with adequate facilities to train apprentices.
6. Periodic evaluation of the apprentice's progress, both in job performance and related instruction, and the maintenance of appropriate records.
7. Employee-employer cooperation.
8. Recognition for successful completions.

Iowa's program has been going on since 1937, and was greatly augmented and accelerated in 1940 when the Iowa labor commissioner appointed the Iowa Apprenticeship Council, consisting of representatives of management and labor.

This council, in cooperation with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, is the proponent of voluntary apprenticeship based on the eight fundamentals recommended by the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship.

Said Maurice P. Fenton, apprenticeship representative of the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training:

"A major benefit of following the council's recommendations on apprenticeship is that it provides industry, in addition to a highly skilled and versatile work force, with a potential supervisory personnel selected for training according to their aptitudes and leadership qualities, capable of stepping into positions of responsibility and otherwise giving direction to others in the work force."

Specific functions of the Iowa council are to encourage opportunities for youth in the skilled occupations through full utilization of qualified employer facilities and employee participation.

TRAINING BOOKLET FREE

How can an employer tell if his employees need training?

The U.S. Department of Labor has a pamphlet titled, "People, Production, Profits," which shows you how to take an employee inventory and how to determine what training is necessary.

You may get a free copy by writing Russell V. Kelso, State Supervisor, Iowa Apprenticeship Council, Room 201, Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Streets, Des Moines, Iowa.

A Sixth Star for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a few short weeks ago a familiar name once again came before the people of this country as a great man and a great soldier, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was once again called upon to be of service to his country. This time it was as mediator in a dispute which threatened to destroy American amateur athletics. That General MacArthur was called upon comes as no surprise to those who know of his tremendous abilities and his great interest in athletics. That he responded so willingly to undertake a task for his country is only to have been expected from one of his stature.

But this is only the latest in a long series of accomplishments of the man who is in all likelihood the greatest military genius ever produced by our country. The highlights of his career are touched upon in a recent editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, an editorial which also renews the suggestion that the country should further honor MacArthur by creating for him and naming him to the position of six-star General of the Armies. There is precedent for this in the similar honor given Gen. John Pershing, America's military leader in the First World War. This is a matter which well deserves the consideration of the Congress and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat editorial states the case clearly and concisely. I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that it will turn some thought toward this well-deserved honor for General MacArthur:

SIX STARS FOR GENERAL MACARTHUR

The Congress and the American people have given General of the Army Douglas MacArthur almost every high honor within their power except the one which is most meaningful—conferral of the rank of General of the Armies, such as General Pershing held following World War I.

General MacArthur's career defies superlatives.

He was the youngest divisional commander in World War I.

In the tragic days of the depression in the early 1930's, the force of his spirit held together the nucleus of the Army, about which we built to victory in World War II.

As a field marshal in the Philippine Army, he developed an untrained group into a superb fighting force and our valued ally during World War II, which became the core of the resistance during the occupation of the islands by the Japanese.

It was personal allegiance of the Filipino people to Douglas MacArthur, even more than faith in the United States, which kept the hope of liberty alive in those dark days.

He was incomparable at Bataan and Corregidor, where his gallantry was a beacon fire to American patriotism in the disastrous days following Pearl Harbor.

As commander in chief of the Southwest Pacific, he conducted the greatest military operations in the annals of warfare—rolling back the Japanese tide over the vast reaches of the Far Pacific in campaigns that will be studied as models so long as man can read.

These victories—from Australia through New Guinea and the Philippines to Tokyo Bay—were achieved with minimum casualties. There are tens of thousands of Americans who are alive today because of the genius of his tactics.

As supreme commander in Japan, he converted a vicious enemy into one of our warmest friends and allies in a diplomatic triumph which knows no equal for an occupying power.

And again in Korea, General MacArthur's brilliant campaigns, against overwhelming odds, saved South Korea for the free world and showed the enemy that America would stand fast in the face of aggression. How vastly better off we would be today, with the hindsight of history, had General MacArthur's plan for complete victory been accepted.

General MacArthur is not simply a military hero. His farewell to the cadets at West Point last year, "Duty—honor—country," is unquestionably the greatest speech delivered by an American since Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. It shows the infinite grace and wisdom, the compassion, the nobility of purpose of this fine old soldier.

General MacArthur is America's greatest military hero. The Congress recognized this last year by unanimously tendering him the grateful thanks of the Congress and of the American people.

One final accolade remains—and that is to make General MacArthur equal in rank to General Pershing, whose fame, with no derogation of that general of an earlier period, is pale beside that of General MacArthur's.

Through a long career, stretching over almost 65 years, Douglas MacArthur has served his Nation incomparably well. He deserves the highest honors which a grateful country can bestow—not at some future date, but now.

We most ardently hope that President Kennedy will recommend, and that Congress will accord six-star rank to the greatest military hero in our history and one of the truly great men of the 20th century—Douglas MacArthur.

Movieland Wax Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as California takes over the honors and responsibilities of the first State of the Union in population, I wish to draw attention to a remarkable new southern California institution.

The Movieland Wax Museum at Buena Park has become a major entertainment and tourist attraction for millions of visitors to my State from throughout the Nation and the world. An article in the Mainliner magazine of the United Air Lines for February 1963, which is read by millions of air travelers, graphically illustrates the recognition this unique museum has achieved as a hall of fame and shrine for the great entertainment stars of motion pictures and television.

The museum is located in the Orange County District which I am privileged to represent and, along with the famed Disneyland and Knott's Berry Farm and Ghost Town, is helping focus international attention upon this area. Founded by Mr. Allen H. Parkinson of Long Beach, its president, Movieland was dedicated by Miss Mary Pickford on May 4, 1962, "to the artists of the entertainment industry who through their talents and efforts have contributed so much to the enjoyment and understanding of the peoples of the world."

How this worthy goal is being accomplished is ably reported in the Mainliner article which follows:

HOLLYWOOD'S MOVIELAND WAX MUSEUM SALUTES THE STARS

Motion picture stars have often been called the royalty of America. And it's true that public fascination with them equals the fervor with which people in other countries follow the fortunes and doings of royalty. However, the only obvious immortality they have achieved has been in late night television showings of their old movies. Until recently, with the exception of Grauman's Chinese Theater, there wasn't any sort of official-looking, permanent tribute to them comparable to the statues and plaques that immortalize politicians and public officials.

Nine months ago this oversight was corrected with the establishment of the Movieland Wax Museum, a glittering Hollywood hall of fame in Buena Park, Calif. Located near two other popular tourist attractions, Disneyland and Knott's Berry Farm, the museum has swiftly taken its place as a "must" for sightseers in southern California.

More than 75 stars, both past and present, are represented in lifelike wax figures. The figures are presented in scenes from the stars' most memorable movies. Cameras, klieg lights, microphone booms, and overhead catwalks provide a movie studio set atmosphere and a "you are there" feeling to visitors. Fans gasp at the amazingly authentic resemblance in the figures, which were sculptured by artists in England, France, Mexico, Hong Kong, and Hollywood.

Like ghosts from the past, Clark Gable, Humphrey Bogart, James Dean, Rudolph Valentino, Wallace Beery, and many other stars of bygone years stand in costume on the set. Gary Cooper stalks the streets of a western town as the sheriff in "High Noon," and Ward Bond watches for Indians by a wagon wheel.

Present day stars are pleasantly represented by Brigette Bardot, Gina Lollobrigida, Nancy Kwan, and several other delightful examples, as well as some popular male stars.

The museum's founder, Allen H. Parkinson, a prominent businessman and a longtime movie fan, got the idea for the project after visiting Madame Tussaud's Waxworks in London. And some of the spine-chilling exhibits in the museum equal those of the famed Tussaud's. Lon Chaney as the Phantom of the Opera, Vincent Price in an appropriate scene from "House of Wax," and Boris Karloff as Frankenstein looking menacing enough to scare any visitor.

Some of the museum's biggest fans are the movie stars themselves. When they wish to visit the place, the museum's gilded Rolls Royce calls for them—true to Hollywood tradition.

"To Bigotry No Sanction" on Washington Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 22, this Nation will observe the birthday of its first President, the immortal George Washington. On that day we shall pay reverence to him and to his greatest of all achievements the founding of this Nation.

I am today proposing a bill that would authorize the Postmaster General to redesign the 5-cent George Washington stamp, which is in wide usage at this time, in such a way as to incorporate the immortal words of our first President: "To Bigotry No Sanction." I believe this is a most appropriate time for bringing this proposal to the attention of Congress.

The full and exact wording of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to emphasize this Nation's dedication to the dignity of man, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to have the 5-cent George Washington regular postage stamp redesigned so as to incorporate George Washington's immortal words, "To Bigotry No Sanction".

I think it is fitting and proper to imprint these words of Washington on the stamp bearing his likeness. They are just as timely and sound today, 173 years later, as they were when he first expressed them in 1790. The words "To Bigotry No Sanction" have become an integral part of the great American heritage of all times. George Washington's words were contained in a letter he wrote at the time to the Jewish community of Newport, R.I., after he had visited its synagogue, known as the Touro synagogue, which in our day has become a national shrine.

In that historic letter Washington pledged that "the Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, and to persecution no assistance."

Those stirring words enunciate a basic moral and human principle upon which this Nation was founded, upon which it grew to greatness, and upon which it still flourishes nearly two centuries later as a free and independent nation. They emphasize that the American people are fighting for the dignity of man and the attainment of genuine understanding and peace among the nations of the world.

The Founding Fathers of our country recognized that tolerance and mutual respect are principles which are essential to growth, to the happiness and to the prosperity of a nation, if it chooses to wear the colors of democracy. It was for this reason that the first amendment, guaranteeing to the individual the rights of free speech and freedom of thought, of free conscience and the freedom to worship his God, was included in our Constitution.

What was so clear to the Father of our Republic 173 years ago, should be equally clear to us today. There is no justification of any sort for bigotry and intolerance, for persecution and discrimination, against any of our fellow Americans because of race, creed, color, or national origin. Such practices only tend to divide us and to create dissension among our own people at a time when the whole world, especially the oppressed nations suffering under Communist domination, looks to us for guidance and leadership.

It is no coincidence that the people of America honor and revere their first President, George Washington, as a man of integrity, wisdom, and vision. He was firm in his convictions that there was no room for the bigoted and the biased in a land that was being built as a haven of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Thus, religious discrimination and any form of bigoted conduct are inconsistent with Americanism in its purest sense, as expressed by George Washington.

Mr. Speaker, redesigning the Washington stamp to incorporate his famous phrase "To Bigotry No Sanction," would mean rededication to a fundamental American principle of human dignity and decency. This stamp with Washington's stirring words engraved on it would circulate throughout the land and to many other lands, and would serve to prove to people everywhere that we continue to honor our first President and the great principles for which he stood.

"To Bigotry No Sanction," George Washington's early admonition to his countrymen, is truly prophetic in the light of human events of our times. These words will be forever associated with his name. I, therefore, urge Congress to adopt this legislation and thereby authorize the Postmaster General to take appropriate action to have them inscribed on the Washington stamp.

Bold Attack on Twin Tragedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposals for an advance in the field of mental retardation and mental illness to combat these tragic diseases have been the source of a great deal of comment in my State.

One favorable editorial which points out that there is really no alternative to facing up to the possibilities of a broad research and preventive effort, coupled with advances in many sectors, appeared in the Catholic Transcript. I believe it represents a cogent and far-sighted appraisal of this message and the challenge that it poses, and I offer it for the RECORD so that Members may give it consideration:

BOLD ATTACK ON TWIN TRAGEDIES

The President's request to the Congress last week for an unprecedented nationwide program to combat the twin tragedies of mental illness and retardation has been epitomized by one prominent psychiatrist as "all the things we've been talking about through the years, everything that we've been hoping for." The program, he added, is "essential."

For generations now both mental illness and retardation have been among our most critical national problems, touching upon the lives of more people, demanding lengthier treatment, constituting a greater economic burden, for the individual and the country, than any other single condition. At the present time at least 600,000 Americans are confined to psychiatric institutions, and approximately one third that number are in homes for the retarded. Every single year almost 1.5 million are treated for emotional and mental disorders or retardation. Yet the majority of existing facilities are overcrowded and obsolete. As regards mental hospitals particularly, many were built when psychiatry was still young, and are now outdated structures that serve well enough as places of incarceration or retreat, but are generally not conducive to modern therapeutic work. Moreover, the average amount spent on the mentally ill or the retarded has been scandalously low, considering our wealth as a people. "This situation," insists the administration, "has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution."

The main objectives now envisioned are three: (1) intensive basic research into the causes of mental disease and retardation, (2) a strengthening of the "underlying resources of knowledge, and above all, of skilled manpower to mount and sustain our attack on mental disability for many years to come" and (3) a general improvement in the programs and facilities serving both the mentally disturbed and retardates.

One of the President's most dramatic proposals regarding mental illness is the establishment of comprehensive community health centers. Because of recent advances in psychiatric medicine mental patients are expected to get better—most of them are expected to be back with their families, perhaps at their jobs, within a year after becoming ill. Hence, it does not seem right that they should normally be made to leave their own towns or cities to receive treatment. As Dr. Francis J. Braceland said at the American Medical Association Convention in 1955: "There must be a change in the external configurations and internal atmosphere of mental hospitals. Concomitant with it, there must be a change of orientation in the community and particularly of the doctors in community practice * * *. The mental hospital of the future will be a therapeutic community (and) an integral part of the community which it serves. * * * Unfortunately the attitude now exists that the general hospital belongs to the citizens within the community while the mental hospital belongs to that large amorphous entity—the State." The idea, then, is that whereas central hospitals will always be needed, especially for the chronically ill—and Connecticut can be justly proud of the work our own central institutions have done and are now doing—the whole spectrum of psychiatric care should be offered on the community level, if possible.

Similar local facilities are urged with regard to mental retardation. It seems imperative, the President says, that we move quickly from the outmoded use of distant custodial institutions to the concept of community-centered agencies for retardates.

The hope is that such agencies could not only provide adequate inpatient and outpatient care, but could also function as training schools for more experts in mental retardation: physicians, nurses, social workers, therapists and teachers.

Obviously these proposals will require millions of tax dollars to implement. But is there any alternative? Even granting the right and the obligation of lawmakers to discuss in depth and seriously debate the detailed recommendations of the President's message, the principle so clearly enunciated there should be put into practice without delay. Mental illness and retardation do occasion a national sense of guilt.

Federal Bar Association, Capitol Hill Chapter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the newly formed congressional chapter of the Federal Bar Association. The membership of the congressional chapter includes many of the distinguished Members of the House, Senate, staff employees of the Congress, and staff employees of the Library of Congress. Any person of good moral character admitted to practice before a court of record in any of the several States, territories, or possessions of the United States or the District of Columbia who is—or has been employed—in the service of the United States or the District of Columbia, and who is, or was, performing the work of a legislator, judge, lawyer, or member of a quasi-judicial board or commission is eligible for full active membership in the association. Present or former service in the Armed Services involving some legal duties—on active duty or in the Reserves—provides eligibility for membership.

The general purpose of the Federal Bar Association is to advance the science of jurisprudence, to promote the administration of justice, to uphold a high standard for the Federal judiciary, attorneys representing the Government of the United States, and attorneys appearing before courts, departments, and agencies of the United States; to encourage cordial and friendly relations among the members of the legal profession; and to promote the welfare of attorneys employed by the Government of the United States.

Officers of the newly formed chapter are as follows:

President: Thomas P. Kerester, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

First vice president: Ann C. Penning, secretary to Congresswoman MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.

Second vice president: Stewart French, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

General secretary: Frank R. Hammill, Jr., House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Recording secretary: Helen L. Clagett, Library of Congress.

Treasurer: Hubert H. Finzel, Senate Judiciary Committee.

Delegate to the national council: Edward O. McCue III, Joint Committee on Defense Production.

I also wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the first luncheon program being sponsored by the congressional chapter, which I strongly feel merits the interest of all Members of Congress, as well as their staffs. That program, which will be held on February 26, 1963, room 1202, New Senate Office Building, at 12:30 p.m., highlights Roscoe Drummond, a nationally syndicated columnist. Mr. Drummond, well known for his series of articles on congressional reform and reorganization, will speak on the topic "Does Congress Have a Future?"

I cordially invite my colleagues and members of their staff to attend this luncheon and to participate in the question-and-answer period which will follow Mr. Drummond's talk. For general reservations call Hubert H. Finzel, Senate extension 3618; Erwin G. Krasnow, House extension 2836, program chairman; Thomas P. Kerester, joint committee, extension 2400; Vincent A. Doyle, Library of Congress, code 173, extension 722.

Land by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in Newsday, a Long Island daily newspaper, on February 15. This is part of a series performing a public service by pointing out some of the notorious individuals engaged in the mail-order real estate business. This is akin to boiler-room operations in the securities business and should be brought under effective Federal control to protect the public:

LAND BY MAIL: SOME SHADY OLD PROS

(By Robert A. Caro)

The mail-order real estate business, now a nationwide $700-million-a-year boom, numbers among its most prominent practitioners men who have had encounters with the law.

Some of these men have been convicted of felonies, others of minor criminal offenses. Still others have been involved not with the courts but with Federal regulatory agencies. Some of the incidents occurred recently, some as long ago as 1940. The total number of men involved is only a fraction of the total membership of the business, many of whose members are among America's most respected businessmen.

But these few men—and their records were uncovered in a relatively brief investigation by Newsday—include high officers of some of the largest companies in a business which concentrates its "$10 down and $10 a month" pitch on persons nearing retirement. These are the very persons who often are living on fixed-income pensions and social security checks and therefore can least afford the loss of even small amounts of money. Some of the companies give their customers what they're paying for—a retirement homesite in the sun, at relatively low cost. But others appear to be engaging in misrepresentations and near-frauds remarkably similar to those revealed last month by Newsday in the series, "Misery Acres."

Among the names uncovered by Newsday are these:

Herman B. Oberman: In 1940, Oberman, then a Brooklyn lawyer, was president of a Polish-Jewish fraternal organization. He stole $12,800 from its treasury and was convicted of grand larceny. In 1961, Oberman became president and a major stockholder in the American Realty and Petroleum Corp., a promoter of 15 different Florida developments and of the 35,000-acre development called Rio Rancho Estates in Albuquerque, N. Mex. Ohio authorities say ads for one of the Florida developments, Rainbow Lake Estates, "contain representations which tend to defraud purchasers."

Leonard and Julius Rosen: The Rosen brothers were the key men behind the high-pressure Charles Antell Formula 9 promotion of the 1950's. When the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) stepped in to halt what it called misleading and deceptive claims for the shampoo, both brothers were named as targets of the action. Today, Leonard and Julius Rosen are chairman of the board and vice president, respectively, of one of the giants of the mail-order real estate boom, Gulf American Land Corp. The hard-sell promotional practices at Gulf American's Golden Gate Estates in Florida, which helped the company do a whopping $37 million worth of business in 1962, were described in "Misery Acres."

Spurgeon Pickering: Pickering is an old-time con man who has now transferred his activities to the mail-order real estate boom. In 1946, he was convicted of three counts of using the mails to defraud in a hosiery-selling racket. In 1955 and again in 1957, the FTC moved against him and forced him to consent to stop selling a weedlike substance to suburbanites as "the world's most beautiful lawn." His next venture was drilling for oil in Arkansas; in 1957 and 1958, he was named in 13 separate civil suits over bills he had incurred in the drilling operation but had not paid. In 1958, he moved into real estate, buying up 2,200 acres of swampland near Biloxi, Miss., and selling it at $8 down and $8 a month as Gulf Parks Estates. In 10 months, Pickering had peddled off 2,100 homesites. When an observer visited the site in 1959, he found few houses but several "bottomless bogs not fit for human habitation, but ideal for raising mosquitoes or bullfrogs." Pickering later sold Gulf Park Estates to a group of local businessmen, who have turned it into a more fully developed project. Recently, Pickering's name cropped up again, this time in connection with something called Gulf Land Co., which, in one observer's words, "is set up to promote land sales in almost any place" but is currently concentrating on the proposed sale of homesites in Costa Rica.

David F. Koolish: Koolish was indicted a year ago for kicking back money to officials of the Sister Kenny Foundation, a nonprofit corporation to treat polio victims, in order to get contracts to handle the foundation's direct-mail soliciting. Koolish and several associates were alleged to have kept $11 million of the $20 million their mailings raised

for the foundation. Koolish pleaded not guilty and the case is still awaiting grand jury action. Asked if he were a principal in the Harney County Land Development Corp., which is selling off an Oregon tract described as "barren, almost desert land," Koolish said: "I don't care to answer. I have nothing to say. I don't have to answer." Koolish is a principal in the firm.

George S. Groves, Sr.: Now preparing advertising for homesites in the sunny Bahamas as vice president of Bahama Cays Development Co., Ltd., is George S. Groves, Sr. In the chillier atmosphere of New York State, Groves in 1961 was permanently enjoined by the State from selling securities within its borders for "attempting to dupe New York residents into investing in a financial empire (the Collateral Funding Corp.) which was nothing more than a house of cards."

Big Federal Government Seeks To Expand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, during my travels about the Second District of Minnesota last fall, I dropped in on the little shop of the Westbrook Sentinel to find Mr. and Mrs. Russell Bowers hard at work on their weekly chore of putting out the paper. So I have found reading their paper particularly interesting, especially in view of the fact that they do not call themselves Republicans. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following transcript of their views on current issues as discussed in a recent issue:

No matter how much we cry out against the thought, no matter how much we desire to avoid the issue, the fact is always present: Federal Government is big and getting bigger—that is if President Kennedy has his way.

Two Kennedy proposals, if passed by Congress, would deprive local and State government of two more realms of public domain.

Currently being considered by Congress is the fabulous aid to education bill designed, according to the administration, to upgrade educational facilities in the United States.

We will not argue against the supposition that Federal aid would not be in some ways beneficial, but we feel that what may be gained in Federal money we will lose in control of our schools.

Always, when Federal Government crowds into what should be strictly a local problem, the results are the same: Federal money, Federal control. This is to say nothing of the waste that is always present in any Government program of aid.

If the Federal Government aids teacher's salaries, then you can be certain they will determine the standards of teachers; if the Government aids the building of schools, you can rely on the fact they will determine the specifications. From these points it is only a step toward Federal control of the courses of study and by then we will have lost control of the education of our children, a fact which would be sad indeed.

Our second point of concern is the rumbling in the background for another crack at Kennedy's pet medical care for the aged. Here again, in pure form, this proposal has merit, but we feel a program of this type will only ad to the ever-increasing burden of taxes on the younger working population of the United States.

Medical care must be provided for elderly persons in need, but to tax an entire nation to provide service for a very comparative few seems totally unwise.

The administration speaks of a small tax tied to social security deductions as all that is necessary to finance the program. One has only to recall the beginning of the social security program itself to find one good reason to disapprove of the program.

When social security was introduced in Congress many years ago the Nation was told only a very small percentage of a worker's salary would be necessary to finance the venture. Since that time many periodic increases have sent the total over 7 percent and it will continue to rise.

Medicare, or whatever you care to call it, will be a costly program at best. Some foretell it will cost almost twice the present Federal estimates. This huge cost, plus the fact that programs of this nature have not proven overly successful in other countries, would seem to make the whole idea unworkable.

Hon. James P. McGranery

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join the Speaker and my colleagues in this memorial tribute to my very good and longtime friend, the Honorable James P. McGranery. Jim McGranery's widow and family and the entire Nation have suffered a tremendous loss in his unexpected passing. Jim McGranery will not soon be forgotten since he carved a niche in the history of the United States that should be an incentive to all our youth as an example to follow. His public service in his home State of Pennsylvania, as a Member of this House of Representatives, as the Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, as judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and as Attorney General of the United States was of the highest caliber in ability and integrity. The loss of Jim McGranery is bound to be sorely felt by the people of the city of Philadelphia, the people of the State of Pennsylvania and the people of the United States.

It was my privilege to act as an honorary pallbearer at the pontificial requiem Mass which was offered for the repose of Jim McGranery's soul on last December 28 by the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., archbishop of Washington.

The deacon of the Mass was the Right Reverend Monsignor John S. Spence, director of education; and the subdeacon was the Very Reverend James D. Clark, O.S.A., rector of Tolentine Seminary, Illinois. The Archpriest was the Right Reverend Monsignor William J. McDonald, Ph. D., Sc. D., Ed. D., rector of the Catholic University of America. The Right Reverend Monsignor John K. Cartwright, P.A., rector of St. Matthew's Cathedral, delivered the eulogy. Among those in the sanctuary were the Most Reverened Francis J. Furey, D.D., Ph. D., LL.D., auxiliary bishop of Philadelphia, and the Most Reverend Gerald V. McDevitt, D.D., auxiliary bishop of Philadelphia, representing the archbishop of Philadelphia; the Most Reverend J. Carroll McCormick, D.D., bishop of Altoona-Johnstown, Pa.; the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, D.D., auxiliary bishop of Washington; the Right Reverend M. James Fox, O.C.S.O., abbot, Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani, Kentucky; the Right Reverend Alban Boultwood, O.S.B., abbot, St. Anselm's Abbey, Washington, D.C.; the Very Reverend John A. Klekotka, O.S.A., president of Villanova University; the Very Reverend John P. McCormick, S.S., Ph. D., rector, Theological College of the Catholic University of America; and the Right Reverend Monsignor John B. Roeder, chancellor of the archdiocese of Washington. At Arlington, the blessing was given by the Right Reverend M. James Fox, O.C.S.O., abbot, Abbey of our Lady of Gethsemani, Kentucky.

As we know, Jim McGranery served as Attorney General of the United States under President Harry S. Truman. At the time of his passing, former President Truman issued the following statement from Independence, Mo.:

The passing of Jim McGranery was a loss to the country, the community, as well as a personal loss to me. He was an able and devoted public servant, and he always conducted himself in a faithful and forthright manner in his service to his country.

As a judge, he combined courage and compassion by dispensing justice with mercy. As a member of my Cabinet he worked diligently and faithfully in protecting the public interest.

He was a good man, a good friend, and an outstanding citizen. We shall miss him.

I should also like to call attention to the following editorial published in the Catholic Standard, Washington's archdiocesan newspaper under date Friday, December 28, 1962:

HON. JAMES P. MCGRANERY

James P. McGranery was an extraordinarly competent and zealous member of the lay apostolate, though he would have been the first to disclaim any eminence in this regard. In fact, he began his career of service to the church as a boy, nurtured in the ideals of catholic citizenship by his parents, and his life of achievements was spent in devotion to that ideal.

Although James McGranery supported every activity of the church, he was particularly interested in the application of catholic ideals to the civic life of our country. He readily and eagerly responded to every opportunity to be of service to the country—at the local, State, and National level—seeing in such service a contribution to God through his assistance to his fellow citizens. The depth of his religious fevor was expressed in his devotion to this country which was paramount.

Every promotion quickened his readiness to be of service. Any invitation to participate in a good work was a summons. All that was needed was the assurance that the good of the church and the state required his assistance. Such readiness naturally increased the demands, and so there was never any retirement from the requests for service that he so ably fulfilled.

The life of James P. McGranery served not only the country and the Archdioceses

of Philadelphia and Washington but it also afforded an excellent example of Christian citizenship for emulation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that his widow and three children may well be proud of the great and beloved husband and father they lost, and take comfort in the remembrance of such a distinguished head of their fine family.

Indonesia's Financial Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, once again the Republic of Indonesia is in financial trouble, is taking emergency action, and once again the United States has been called on to help out.

The export prices of many of Indonesia's products—principally raw materials—have fluctuated widely and with a downward trend in recent years. At the same time the prices of some of the manufactured goods Indonesia must import have risen; the country's population has expanded rapidly; and development efforts have increased the need for foreign exchange. Indonesia shares these difficulties with many countries which produce primary commodities.

But there are other problems facing Indonesia which are peculiar to that country and which have compounded its economic troubles. Among other things, a very large portion of the Government budget goes for military equipment. Production in many export industries has declined drastically, partly because of unsettled conditions but also partly because of insufficient imports of spare parts and necessary supplies. For similar reasons, industries which produce for domestic consumption also have suffered a decline.

Indonesia has not yet made up its mind where it is going economically. But if Indonesia does not take quick action to expand its production of export products, and to expand production in its import-saving domestic industries, it will have no vehicle to carry it to whatever economic goal it eventually may choose to seek. To expand production may mean, for the immediate future, less emphasis on diversification of its economy, a smaller military budget, and less money spent on urgent social needs; but there appears to be no alternative.

It is heartening to note, therefore, that the Government of the Republic of Indonesia has recognized its straits and appears to be ready to renovate some of its domestic industries by allocating scarce foreign exchange for spare parts and supplies. The United States, it seems, is to help out to the tune of $17 million. There is much else that Indonesia can do, and should do, to cure its ailing economy, in addition to laying in new stocks of industrial inventory goods. If it will do these things, but only if it will do them, then the United States' $17 million can be considered a good investment.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to the following story from the Christian Science Monitor of February 11, 1963, which clarifies many of the developments that have led to Indonesia's present difficulties.

INDONESIA SEEKS ECONOMIC ANSWER

Indonesia has taken steps to ease its economic problem. On foreign exchange, $40 million have been released to import raw materials and spare parts. Further, the U.S. Government has authorized its Agency for International Development to grant a $17 million credit to Indonesia.

It is hoped that all this will help restart the wheels of Indonesia's slackening industry within a few months.

Emphasis on military exertion in the last few years has shown Indonesia its harmful consequences. The nation's economy, lacking investment and nourishment, has reached a low ebb. The chain reaction is social tension.

Nonetheless, efforts toward social uniformity are still being continued, though evidences in private enterprises have proven that individual freedom has led to more success.

Government officials, business managers and personnel, students, teaching staff, university graduates are being politically indoctrinated and militarily trained. It seems the Indonesian Government is pursuing its socialist program along disciplinary lines.

Up to a few months ago this was fruitful when the military succeeded in stopping the rebellions in the countryside. The military upbuilding is also believed to have forced the Dutch to seek a settlement in the West Irian dispute.

In other sectors, however, this leveling discipline has cut short individual initiative. The state enterprises are lagging in production, the redtape is dominating the Government. Industries are being handicapped by shortage of raw material and spare parts.

DISPUTES FREQUENT

The slump in production and pinching inflation are coupled with more frequent labor disputes and increased unemployment. The social effect is creeping dissatisfaction against the Government's policy.

Guerrilla fighters, who had participated in the struggle for independence in 1945–50 are holding reunions. Most of them are now leaders in many fields. At their meetings they are seeking ways how to revive the revolutionary élan.

The Communist and Nationalist Parties demand a new cabinet. This is being interpreted here as disapproving President Sukarno's policy. He had picked out the present cabinet members, who are exclusively responsible to him.

Discontent among the populace has been increased by the contrast of the ebbing standard of living in the countryside and the glittering society life in the big cities, particularly in Jakarta.

HEAVY BURDEN

The Indonesian people and President Sukarno now seem to realize that flaming political speeches cannot keep replacing food and clothing without risking dangers to his personal security.

The maintenance costs and payment of the piled-up military equipment put a heavy burden on the state's finances.

Relief is being held in prospect by announcements that in the 1963 state budget the armed forces expenditures will be reduced from 75 to 47 percent.

Together with the $57 million import program, the budget curb may bring about mitigation, but Indonesia is still fumbling for a basic solution for its economic advance.

How Much Longer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much longer will our citizens be able to endure government? I do not say democracy because it is apparent that if the average citizen knew where his money went he would wonder whether he was still living in a democracy. If the American citizen actually knew that all was not well, he would let loose a vocal protest that would reverberate in the halls of Washington.

The state of our Nation is not bliss and harmony. The governmental and academic planners contemptuously believe they are smarter and more clever than the poor average citizen. This may be true, but if we still live in a land of choice, the people must make the choices—on facts, not fantasy. "Joe Smith" citizen still has a right to make mistakes, but he should not be fooled by others' mistakes. Our Republic was created for Americans who love opportunity and freedom, not for the bureaucratic planners and spenders.

In a day in which government-managed news is becoming more and more a danger to the free press and to free minds, agency press agents blithely swamp the public with accounts about how well they, the planners, are taking care of everybody. To an increasingly disturbing degree everything in government is not necessarily what is but what is made to appear.

Are we the sheep or are we the shepherd?

Government by faith alone is not good citizenship according to this excellent editorial in the February 15 Drovers Journal:

HOW MUCH LONGER?

How much longer will we Americans be willing to play the puppet role, dancing at the end of strings dangled from the fingers of Washington politicans and bureaucrats whose real interests go no deeper than party power and job security (their own jobs, not yours or ours)?

How much longer will we go on believing that the Federal Government, unlike the individual, can square its debts by cutting income or spending more, or both? How much longer will we listen apathetically to all the Washington talk about Government economy when the administration keeps upping the Federal payrolls and beseeching Congress to extend Federal financial aid to all and sundry, from the cradle to the grave, here and in other countries?

How much longer will we condone U.S. Senators and Representatives enjoying jaunty junkets not only here, there, and everywhere about our country, but to foreign lands under the guise of necessary personal observation, while we taxpayers foot the bill

but have no way of knowing what we pay for? How much longer will we go on without protest paying the bill for the congressional franking privilege by which Senators and Representatives avoid paying postage on a great deal of mail that is nothing more than political and party propaganda, or on a "look what I've done" theme, while all of us are stuck with higher postage rates because the Post Office Department is losing money?

How much longer should the various branches of the Federal Government be permitted to print and disseminate—postage free—millions of reams and thousands of pounds of what would be regarded as strictly sales promotion if done by private business or industry?

For example, consider the Department of Agriculture, which in the last couple of months has flooded the mails and gorged the press with so-called news of the fabulously fine job its various divisions have been doing for us, protecting and nourishing us. Granted that they've done all that has been claimed for them, should all of us pay the bill for telling us so, especially just ahead of the time to set their next appropriation?

And what about Mr. Freeman, currently engineering the greatest personal campaign in history in support of administration-backed legislation—the wheat program and upcoming referendum—on the outcome of which hinges not only face for the administration and Mr. Freeman himself, but the future of wheat growers and very possibly all agriculture? Who is paying for treks made by Mr. Freeman and his corps of aids out over the country to make speeches pleading for a "Yes" vote in this referendum? Who is paying for all the other expense which such an all-out effort entails if it isn't all of us? Whether for or against the wheat referendum, and regardless of which, if any, farm program we may believe is best, it is your money and ours that is paying for the effort to put Mr. Freeman's ideas across.

How much longer will we stand by meekly and watch the Federal Government clamp down on management while doing nothing to stop labor from going on strikes that cripple the country's entire economy and even its defense buildup? How much longer will we condone in administration's withholding of information that is vital to the public welfare and telling us that the administration shall decide what news we will or will not get, and even distorting the news on the grounds of national security? Since when should Washington decide what news is good and what news is bad for us?

How much longer will we enjoy our cherished American freedom if these things are permitted to continue and even grow or expand? Isn't it about time that every individual who loves our country, who wants his children to know it as he has known it, and to enjoy the same freedom from harassment that he has enjoyed, stand up and be counted? Has not the time arrived to demand that Congress quit playing us for suckers?

It isn't a job for just a few of us. It's something which it behooves every one of us to do something about. And that something is to let senators and representatives in Washington know that if they want to get back there come the next election, they'd better start voting, not just talking, for economy and their own retention of legislative power, voting against any Federal expenditure that isn't absolutely vital to the country's security and against any unnecessary Federal administrative expense, and especially voting against any and all giveaway programs, domestic or foreign. Above all, demand that they remember that the Constitution of the United States of America is not subject to the whims or interpretations of any one individual, committee or administration.

Blind faith may be commendable in the family pooch, but when the very existence of the family itself is threatened, it's time for the family to act.

Socialism Wonderful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Cheraw Chronicle, Cheraw, S.C., of February 7, 1963. This article courageously points out what many of us on the national level have known for a long time.

Everybody likes to shout about conservatism and socialism, especially the latter when it applies to someone else. I suppose when we first proposed a public school system that there was a cry of socialism.

Because the State and Federal Governments have helped the local governments as they have in the past three decades, we have reached a high point in our prosperity in civilization. When I voted for the area redevelopment legislation, I received some severe criticism but I knew we could use it to help my district, and thanks to the fine people administering that legislation we have been able to help many cities and towns and I am proud of this fact. We have not only helped them improve sanitary facilities, but we have been able to help them attract industry which means jobs, pay-rolls, new houses, stimulated trade, and the like.

The enclosed editorial is an excellent satire on conditions as they exist.

SOCIALISM? AIN'T IT WONDERFUL?

Within the past few days Washington has announced programs of assistance to two communities in Chesterfield County under a law passed by the Congress last fall to help provide employment in labor surplus areas.

The White House told Senator JOHNSTON and Representative HEMPHILL last Tuesday that $120,000 had been earmarked for Chesterfield to help build sewer facilities there, and Saturday a loan application for $83,000 in Cheraw was approved.

In each case the local community must match Federal funds. Mayor Russell Bennett has said the money will enable Cheraw to complete its sewer and water systems and offer such services to everybody in town.

There are many advantages to this program. First, it provides work to people who need it. The grant specifies that under the contract, labor must be recruited from local sources. It is estimated that the project in Chesterfield will provide 245 man-months of employment.

Second, it enables communities without great financial resources to offer their people services they need and deserve. At the same time it provides relief for the local taxpayer.

Third, by helping small towns and rural areas to get these public services and other resources, such as adequate water supplies, the Government puts them in a stronger competitive position for more industry and encourages growth and development.

The accelerated public works program is only one of several that have been provided by the Kennedy administration. Last year legislation was approved under which rural underdeveloped areas could qualify for public assistance, just as urban areas can. Under this program technical assistance, adult education and technical schools, and other facilities have been provided. Low-interest loans have also been granted to Pageland and Jefferson to help them expand their water systems. Officials in both cities say that as a result of these loans, plants that otherwise would have had to move are staying and expanding. Other new industries have shown interest in locating there.

In our opinion, this sort of grant-in-aid program, with its low-interest loans and matching funds, is a proper function of Government, and represents the right way for private enterprise and local government to cooperate with the Federal authority. In each case, the programs are locally directed and controlled.

Some people who are in the habit of calling the New Frontier socialistic and cast a jaundiced eye on any sort of Federal aid seem happy enough to get these local grants.

What's in a name? If this be socialism, ain't it wonderful?

Bob Richards—The One and Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article written by Lyn Nofziger that appeared in the San Diego Union regarding the death of Robert W. Richards, one of the Nation's most distinguished newspapermen:

BOB RICHARDS—THE ONE AND ONLY

Death took Bob Richards the other night, and though the world may be quieter because of it, it won't be any better and it will be a lot duller.

Bob Richards was a breed apart. Like his friends Walter Trohan and Jerry Greene, said yesterday, when it looked like Bob was going to make it, "We can't afford to lose him. There aren't very many more like us around anymore."

And now, for sure, there is one fewer.

Bob was only 5 feet 3 or 4, but he had spent a lifetime successfully whittling the world down to his size.

And it wasn't the world that whipped him. Only death finally beat him. And then it had to kind of sneak around the back way, when Bob appeared to have licked the stroke that hit him suddenly, and catch him with his guard down.

This wasn't just another man on death's list. This was Robert Watt Richards, brash, noisy, perhaps the last of the big spenders, a professional newspaperman who did his job and did it well because he loved it. This was also Robert Richards who would buy you a drink at the drop of a hat, lend you $100 if you needed it, and would fight for you to the end if you worked for him or were his friend.

He wasn't perfect; he wasn't that kind—he couldn't tolerate stupidity, incompetence laziness or bootlicking. And he didn't have much use for a guy who was tight with a dollar.

He was a man of strong prejudices and quick likes and dislikes, but he didn't hesitate to own up to a mistake.

He was a man with a solid sense of humor and a blunt needle of his own, which he jabbed about freely.

He was free, too, with his advice, but he was right so often he could have charged for it.

He hid a streak of morality under a devil-take-the-hindmost facade.

Most of all, he was a man who loved life. He lived for 62 years and he got a full 62 years of living out of his alloted span.

And when he went, he left behind a vacant spot, a spot he filled for 41 years in the Copley Press. And for other times in the hearts of his friends.

The trade will miss him because he was a fine newspaperman. His world will miss him because he was Bob Richards. And there was only one like him.

New Deal Echoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared in the Morning Call, a newspaper published in Allentown, Pa., on February 15, 1963. This article deals with the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, and represents a point of view which certainly should be considered when this matter comes before us:

NEW DEAL ECHOES

To those who remember the lean and hungry years of the great depression, the President's omnibus youth program presented to Congress yesterday has a familiar ring. The principal items have been lifted almost bodily from New Deal emergency measures in an effort to solve some of the sociological problems of the most productive period in this Nation's history.

The Youth Conservation Corps is almost an exact carbon copy of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Only major difference is that then the families of the young recruits received allotment checks and had one less mouth to feed at home.

The hometown corps would be the successor of the old National Youth Administration. Under it, boys and girls in high school and college drew Government pay for a few hours of service after school or between classes. Some did a job. Others soon discovered that once they were on the rolls, the checks usually kept coming even if they forgot to report for their chores.

Altogether, these revived programs would create more than 100,000 new jobs by adding many youngsters still of school age to the already staggering Government payroll. This may be one way of taking a bite out of what the administration lists as the Nation's unemployed. It also is a way of assuring young people that if they can't be bothered about preparing for jobs that are available or beginning work at prevailing wage rates, the Government will support them in the sprawling Federal establishment.

Quite properly, the President argues that this Nation must give its youth every opportunity to develop and use their talents. More of these opportunities are available than ever and not all of them are being used in their full potential.

It seems to us that what a good many of those now on the list need more than these artificial make-work programs of depression years, is the kind of counseling and guidance that will challenge them to prepare for the jobs that are available. Industry is more likely to teach them the importance of working for a dollar than politically secure bureaucrats in Government who haven't learned themselves.

Senator Keating Cannot Be Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, typical of the concern over Cuba which I have found in all parts of the Second District of Minnesota is an editorial in the Worthington Daily Globe which discusses the work of Senator KENNETH KEATING in this field. I wish to insert the Globe editorial by Jim Vance in the RECORD:

SENATOR KEATING CANNOT BE, SHOULD NOT BE, IGNORED

Never in recent memory, at least, has the Nation seen a political figure who duplicates even approximately New York's Senator KENNETH KEATING. Many patterns can be cut from the cloth of respectability and there are accordingly many highly respectable men on the national scene representing all political persuasions. The "Keating pattern" seems unique, however. This white-maned gentleman emerges ever more apparently astute, responsible, sincere, not self-seeking, not partisan for the mere sake of partisanship, and not vindictive. He is a well-meaning and fair-minded patriot.

Men have often emerged into national prominence from the tumultous Chamber of the U.S. Senate. They have often rode on the chariots of national security and the imperiled republic.

But contrast KEATING (and it is a striking contrast) with other Senators who have paraded in these chariots. The comparison with Wisconsin's late Senator Joseph McCarthy is perhaps inevitable.

McCarthy claimed access to exclusive and damaging information ("I have here in my briefcase the names of Communists in the State Department) KEATING reports his information is not exclusive ("All of the information which I have had has come from Government officials or if it has come from other sources, it has been cleared by Government officials before I have spoken"). He does not pretend to have uncommon knowledge ("I don't think it would be of interest to anyone to have me as a witness because what I know is comparatively little compared to what they can get from these other witnesses"). He does not pretend his information is damaging ("It is difficult to know what to do").

McCarthy's invariable suggestion was of things sinister, of official "cover ups," of dupes, and of dereliction.

KEATING sees nothing sinister ("I do not consider there is anything sinister"). He sees no evidence of dereliction ("I am not charging dereliction against anyone. I have every reason to think that those who have the information I have are just as good patriotic Americans as I am"). He does not insist there is some kind of devious "cover up." ("They place a different interpretation on the information than I do," and this "may account for the reluctance on the part of the officials to give Americans all of the facts with regard to the Russian buildup there.")

KEATING will even concede regarding things of which he is uncertain that, "I have no positive evidence."

If this man then is grinding no axes, what is his game? What is he trying to prove?

We are persuaded to take the Senator at his word: "I think the situation in Cuba is very serious." This is a man, claiming no unusual insights or information, who is deeply concerned with a potential and very serious threat to his Nation.

We believe he has made dramatically clear that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY's suggestion that there be an open hearing be instituted immediately. Let no information be withheld. Let no judgment of the information be excluded.

We cannot continue to ignore the urgent but eminently fair reports from the gentleman from New York.

Education Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently the majority members of the Education and Labor Committee agreed to support the omnibus education bill which the administration is backing. In light of this development, I feel that all of our colleagues would be interested in reading an editorial which appeared in the Mankaot (Minn.), Free Press. This editorial summarizes both the reasons why an omnibus bill is the wrong approach to education and also the acceptance of the Federal role in higher education:

EDUCATION AID

Congressman ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota's First District, thinks it will be a mistake for the administration to wrap all its aid to education programs into one bill. He has a good point.

There are many people throughout the United States who oppose Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, but favor it for colleges and universities. There is a good reason for taking this position. Elementary and secondary education is for the purpose of equipping youngsters with the fundamental knowledge needed to get along in society. College degrees, on the other hand, are for the purpose of developing students' specific skills so they can enter into fields where they have superior talent. The former is for the purpose of developing them into useful citizens of the communities in which they were reared. College education prepares young men and women for work anyplace in the Nation.

It makes sense, therefore, to have the Federal Government give assistance on the college and university level. Out of these enrollees will come the national and world leaders.

Certainly, as Congressman QUIE says, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get Congress to approve Federal aid for education at all levels. If it is restricted to colleges and universities, that part of the program stands a good chance of approval. It would be unfortunate to prejudice college assistance because the administration wants to ram home Federal aid on the elementary and secondary level.

Clem Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, our late colleague and friend, Clem Miller, left behind him a worthy gift for all of us in the form of his book, "Member of the House: Letters of a Congressman." As a Member, I especially enjoyed Clem Miller's newsletters because they took the form of miniature studies of the House of Representatives as an institution. Students of the House would do well to study the book.

Dr. Nelson W. Polsby, of Wesleyan University's Department of Government, is one of the country's ablest students of the House. His article, which follows, is both a review of the book and a tribute to the memory of Clem Miller. I commend it to the attention of the Congress.

A VOICE FROM THE FLOOR

(By Nelson W. Polsby)

("Member of the House: Letters of a Congressman," by Clem Miller. Edited, with additional text, by John W. Baker, Scribner's paperback. $2.)

Two weeks after his book was published, Representative Clem Miller perished, at 46, in the wreck of a small airplane high in the mountains of his home district, the First of California, where he was campaigning for his third term in Congress. The book he has left behind is a fitting memorial. It gathers together the newsletters he wrote with characteristic verve and spontaneity to a selected number of friends and neighbors back home. The letters are not the usual pastiche of self-serving comments and stale jokes that many congressmen send out, but thoughtful essays on the way things are in the House of Representatives.

The extraordinary aptness of his portrait of the House, which Miller sketched from month to month during two terms in office, invites generous quotation. Here is how he describes the ways in which multiple demands on a Congressman's time undercut the legislative process on the House floor:

"So much of what occurs on the floor is routine. There are only rare occasions when circumstances demand one's presence. Thus, what is of overriding significance gives way to what is immediate. The competing interests, the endless details of congressional routine, take hold. Members are called to the floor for a quorum call as the afternoon's debate begins. Soon, nearly everyone arrives to answer his name. Most stay for a while, listening, and chatting. Then, inevitably, the drift begins. Pages hurry up and down the aisles with sheaves of messages, calling a Congressman to argue with an executive department on behalf of a constituent, or to tell a garden club delegation why he favors the Shasta daisy for the national flower. Or the Member goes downstairs for lunch, or over to the Senate, or downtown to a conference. Almost without volition, he finds himself back in his office trying to keep up with the mail, interviewing, and being interviewed by a stream of callers. Now, he is too far away to get back to the floor for a teller vote."

Miller's observations draw the reader into the web of the congressman's world, showing why things are as they are instead of the way they ought to be. The supreme value of this lesson is that it should come from a self-confessed liberal idealist who shared most of the policy preferences of those who habitually condemn Congress in the most scathing terms. The author makes it quite clear that the first job of anyone who would deal successfully with Congress is to understand how it really works. And understanding demands an appreciation of the role of ritual, symbol, and precedent in House affairs, a grasp of the reasons for the specialization of functions, and of the necessities for comity among the specialized committees. One can begin to see how it comes to pass that the House is ruled by an oligarchy of elders which fluctuates in size and power depending upon external circumstances. Miller writes of the leaders of the House:

"Yes, they lead, but they lead only because they win. If they cannot be certain of winning, they don't want to go. Latent power, negative power, is so much better than power committed that lacks victory as a capstone. Hence, the legislative timidity of the Congress. Hence the great time lags for the consideration of legislation * * * while the leadership waits for the pressures to build. Hence, the distaste for short cuts * * * distaste for battle just for the sake of battle, distaste for the Discharge Petition, and for Calendar Wednesday, and for the Democratic caucus."

Understanding the House also means seeing its strength as a social institution that educates its young and shows them what they may and may not do. Congressmen share certain experiences that to a degree separate them from other men—the crucible of running for elective office, the rigors of campaigning that bind them together. "These people, these Congressmen," Miller observes, "have all been through the mill. They have returned from the indifferent cruelties of the political wars. They may have been saddened by the failure of friends to understand as much as they were outraged by the indignities suffered from their opponents. Elections are unrelenting and painful."

Those who have survived this ordeal soon acquire a certain wariness about what it takes to get a bill passed: "The Congressman may seek to take the castle by scaling the walls in open combat or by a sapping operation under the moat." A particular tactical problem may require the greatest subtlety. "Here is the choice: If he is silent, perhaps the Senate will restore the item to the bill. If he speaks up and is beaten, he will never get it back. And the chances of winning are better than 500 to 1 against."

Only rarely does an edge of exasperation show through Miller's humorous and tolerant tone, as when he speaks of the problems of keeping the Democratic Party in the House together: "It takes organization. It takes discipline. And these, Democrats do not have in large measure. Discipline works in a democracy if it is understood. Indoctrination and organization are weak on the Democratic side. The Democrats don't meet to talk things over, to be persuaded, to be sold. We don't meet in caucus because leadership fears that it would irreparably breach the tenuous links with the South. So we go our own way * * * the Republicans caucus, lock horns, knock heads, and show up to vote in season and out."

But Miller rarely bothered with recrimination in his search for a formulation that will explain what is actually going on:

"Members will frequently, and even customarily, follow a committee chairman against their own best interests and against the dictates of friendship or reason. The committees with their chairmen are like a string of forts. The northern coalition, as the attackers, are spread out, with poor communication and hence poor coordination. They have no base of power from which to menace the chairmen on the one hand or to discipline their members on the other."

For Clem Miller, the key to politics was understanding, not moralizing. His was a mind that ruminated upon the classic questions of politics: What moves men? What prizes do they covet? When are they hesitant? When bold? What leads them to affection? To animosity? Despite the tragic brevity of his writings and his life, despite the frustrations of just causes lost in the most intractable of political milieux, Clem Miller's book is a salute to the fundamental decency of his colleagues in the House and a testament to the sharpness of his sensibilities and the precision of his mind.

Mailman Making Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the first ambassador the United States accredits to a new nation can establish the image of the United States in that country. Where the new nation is a former colonial territory, a proper image is particularly important and can mean the difference between the succes and failure of our relations with the country.

For this reason alone, the appointment of the Honorable William C. Doherty as U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica was heralded by those who are fortunate to know our Bill Doherty, a great American, truly qualified for the post of representing America, and possessing the qualities and characteristics to have America and American people understood. He is a man devoted to our country, to God, and to our neighbor.

I am now particularly happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an article which appeared in the December 1962 issue of Newsday, monthly magazine of the West Indies.

The article follows:

MAILMAN MAKING GOOD

He arrived on Grace Line's *Santa Rosa* November 24. Even before he presented his credentials to the Governor-General 2 days later at King's House, William C. Doherty, 60, first U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, was winning friends and influencing Jamaicans in typical Dale Carnegie fashion.

Early December he met Prime Minister Bustamante and some of his Cabinet in the Prime Minister's office. A keyhole listener reported: "They all got along like old buddies." Underscoring his earlier endorsement, Busta later said: "I like Mr. Doherty. He speaks the same language that I and my government speak." Busta's language is pro-Jamaican development, pro-Commonwealth, pro-American, pro-West, in that order.

Doherty's stout, well-tailored figure has since become familiar to thousands of common Joes; no longer does anyone need to point him out to them; his common touch is paying off in rapidly mounting popularity.

His revelation that he once edited the house magazine of the National Letter Carriers Association—from whose presidency he resigned to accept the ambassadorship—has

made him one with the Jamaican press boys. When the afternoon tabloid, Star, misinterpreted that portion of his speech to the American Men's Club in which he quite correctly said the stability of Jamaica's Government was due in large measure to the English traditions inherited by a first-rate civil service, he generously accepted a reporters' assurance that it was a genuine mistake.

Wherever he has spoken, he has struck the same warm, inspiring note. Jamaica is a wonderful, hospitable little island on the threshold of great achievement as an independent nation, which the U.S. Government stands ready to assist in every possible way.

His concern for Jamaica's No. 1 problem, unemployment, is as deep and sincere as that of the country's leaders. Says he: "There is no shortcut solution to unemployment in any country. I think Jamaica is following the right course toward a long-term solution."

FIRST EVER

Christmas week he pulled a big surprise on the embassy staff—an all-staff party at the embassy residence on Long Lane, S.A. For the native members, it was the first such party ever; it left them glowing.

To the same venue week later he invited Members of both sides of Parliament and leaders from other sections of the Jamaican community to view the now-famous film in which President Kennedy, interviewed by a top team of three TV men, gives gloves-off answers to questions on America's domestic and foreign policy on a wide range of subjects, and straightens the record on the gigantic role his country plays in bolstering up stabilizing weak economies and keeping world peace.

Quicker than he probably thought or hoped he would, the ex-mailman from the United States has earned in Jamaica a new name which signifies acceptance: "Ambassador Bill."

J.F.K. Tax Bill May Be Flop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Knoxville Journal of February 8, 1963. The editorial comments on grassroots opinion concerning tax cut plans:

J.F.K. TAX BILL MAY BE FLOP

(By Fulton Lewis Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's much-publicized tax bill appears to be the political flop of this new year.

Senators and Congressmen from north and south, east and west, Democrats as well as Republicans, report no grassroots support for the President's program.

A spokesman for New York Republican KEN KEATING, up for Senate reelection next year, says: "We have received no mail in support of the President's budget. The overwhelming majority of letters demand a cut in spending before any cut in taxes."

Massachusetts Senator TED KENNEDY, younger brother of the President, admits that his constituents have shown no great interest in the administration program. "We just haven't received anything," says an aid.

KENNEDY'S Republican colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, reports that virtually all mail received by his office on the tax program asks that spending, not taxes, be reduced first.

Alaska's Senator ERNEST GRUENING, a loyal New Frontiersman, has received almost no letters in support of the tax package. The only mail received, his office reports, favors budget reductions.

PETER DOMINICK, freshman Republican from Colorado, says: "There has been no mail backing the administration tax cut. I have received, however, a good deal of mail from disabled veterans and others living on pensions who point out that the tax cut bill means higher, not lower, taxes for them. Voters of both parties, in all income brackets, have asked me to try and reduce this mammoth budget and I will certainly try."

Kentucky's Senator THRUSTON MORTON, a Republican, says that his mail is running 10 to 1 against a tax cut without a corresponding reduction in spending. Texas' JOHN TOWER estimates his ratio at close to 100 to 1.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican, received one letter informing him that he did not understand modern economics in opposing the tax bill. Neither, apparently, do most of the Senator's constituents. He says that mail is heavy against the tax program. Almost all letters favor cuts in spending.

Little mail is reported by New Jersey's HARRISON WILLIAMS, an administration supporter.

"There have been more letters in support of the animal welfare bill (which would limit the use of animals in medical and scientific research) than in support of the tax cut," says an aid. Almost all letters have urged a reduction in spending by the administration.

Indiana Representative RICHARD ROUDEBUSH says his mail indicates "The administration's proposed tax cut is going over like a lead balloon." He has not received a single letter urging a tax cut without concurrent cuts in spending.

"People seem less worried about the so-called tax cut," he says, "than they are about runaway Federal spending. Many of his constituents," he continues, "have done a little figuring and realize in many cases the 'tax cut' actually will be a tax increase. Despite the lowered rate, the administration proposal will erase many deductions and exemptions allowed under present law.

"Exemption and deductions for charitable contributions, medical expenses, the interest on one's house mortgage, allowances for State income and property taxes paid, and other present benefits will be eliminated or reduced under the administration plan."

Note: There is a sizable tax increase in store for those totally or permanently disabled Americans living on pensions. For example, a person now drawing $30 a week disability benefits pays no tax at all. But under the President's program he would fork over in taxes $216 in 1964 and 1965, and $195 each year after that.

Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, who has completed a personal investigation of the administration bill, says that all retired employees receiving between $900 and $7792 a year would get a tax increase under provisions of the bill. A single retired Government worker, now living on $2361 a year, he says, pays no taxes. Under the new bill, he would be forced to pay $213.76.

The Late Benjamin Eisenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, many people throughout the State of Connecticut were saddened recently by the death of one of our beloved citizens, former State Senator Benjamin Eisenberg, of Willimantic. He died on January 6, 1963, at the age of 70. He was a resident of Willimantic for 55 years, having settled there as a boy of 16.

Ben Eisenberg, as he was popularly known throughout the State, was a personal friend of mine for many years. He was truly a gentleman in politics, a man with a kind heart and enviable record of many noble deeds for all who turned to him for help or advice. His advice was always of the type of a kindly father and mentor. Over the many years of our association I would often turn to him for guidance, and I found him to be helpful and wise.

To those of us in Connecticut who knew him personally his passing is a grievous loss. I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD the fine eulogy delivered at the funeral by Rabbi Amos Edelheit, of Willimantic, as well as three news items which appeared in the Willimantic Chronicle, Norwich Bulletin, and Hartford Courant:

EULOGY OF BENJAMIN EISENBERG AS DELIVERED BY RABBI AMOS EDELHEIT, WILLIMANTIC, CONN., JANUARY 7, 1963

The passing of Benjamin Eisenberg from our midst leaves a void in our community which we cannot hope to replace.

Benjamin Eisenberg's dignity did not come from the dollar or the diploma; it came from an inner feeling for people, all people, and a pubic trust placed in him. He was not a great statesman, but he was a gentleman in politics, in business, in family life. Hundreds of people throughout Connecticut knew this and loved him.

For 35 years he ran Ben's Toggery Shop in Willimantic, Conn. Governors, Senators, the police chief, his customers—they all knew him as "Ben." Main Street, in front of his store was a natural place to discuss a coming election, a campaign, a United Jewish Appeal, or just plain small talk.

Ben represented the 29th State Senatorial District from 1933 to 1935. Later he served as treasurer of the Democratic Town Committee, associate judge and clerk of the old Willimantic police and city court, as registrar of voters and a director of the Willimantic YMCA.

A great and meaningful monument to the memory of Benjamin Eisenberg was his efforts on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal. Almost single handed he carried the burden of this great cause in our community for over 25 years, putting in uncounted hours of hard work.

He was a religious man too. In 1957, the Congregation Sons of Israel Synagogue in Williamantic honored him as "Man of the Year" in tribute to 35 years of dedication. There was a warmth and intimacy that radiated from the inner recesses of his soul. He walked humbly with God and with man.

We shall all miss Ben Eisenberg. The good name that he has left and the achievements of his lifetime of work on behalf of all our citizens will endure as an eternal monument to perpetuate his blessed memory.

[From the Willimantic (Conn.) Willimantic Chronicle, Jan. 7, 1963]

EISENBERG FUNERAL IS HELD—REGISTRAR, FORMER SENATOR

Public officials and civic leaders were among those attending the funeral of Democratic registrar of voters Benjamin Eisenberg here this afternoon.

Services for Eisenberg, a retired businessman, former State senator and former deputy judge of the old Willimantic Police and City Court, were held at the Bank Street synagogue of Temple B'nai Israel. Rabbi Amos Edelheit officiated.

Burial was in the Congregation Sons of Israel Cemetery at Perkins Corner, Mansfield. State Senator Arthur J. Lucas Jr., of Chaplin, represented Gov. John N. Dempsey, at the rites.

A memorial week will be held at the home of his son, Marvin Eisenberg, of 21 Manor Lane, Wapping, where friends may call.

Eisenberg, who was 70, died Sunday at his home at 305 Pleasant Street. He was active until the end, visiting the Chronicle office a couple of days before his death.

He was treasurer of the Windham-Willimantic Democratic Town Committee, a post he held for many years. He also served as clerk of the city and police court, retiring ing in 1957. He also served as member of the city zoning board of appeals and was formerly a member of the board of directors of the Willimantic YMCA.

Eisenberg was president of the synagogue for two terms and its treasurer for many years. He was chairman of the United Jewish Appeal for several years, was a leader in the synagogue's Brotherhood and active in other civic and philanthropic agencies.

During his term as State senator from the 29th district, the nine southern towns of Windham County, in 1933–34, he was chairman of the Senate Aviation Committee. He was reelected registrar for another 2-year-term last November.

FORTY-FIVE YEARS A MERCHANT

Eisenberg had a 45-year career as a merchant here until his retirement due to ill health in November 1958. He operated Ben's Toggery Shop for 37 years. He started his business career by going to work for his father, Samuel Eisenberg, in the old Surprise Store on Jackson Street at the age of 16 and continuing there for 8 years.

For 5 years, from 1916 to 1921 young Eisenberg was on the road as a traveling salesman for a clothing house. Ben's Toggery was first located in the Clark Building, 51 Church Street and moved to Main Street following Eisenberg's election as senator.

The first Main Street location was the present quarters of Ben's Eagle Shoe Store, its home for 6 years. Eisenberg then moved to the Hall Block in 1939, taking over the old Bowman Clothing Store and renovating the front. He maintained that store until his retirement.

Eisenberg was born in Austria and brought to this country as a baby by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Eisenberg. They first settled in Haverstraw, N.Y., and moved to Willimantic in 1908.

In addition to his son, Eisenberg leaves a daughter, Mrs. Milton Case of Bloomfield; five sisters, Mrs. George Miller of West Hartford; Mrs. Thomas Gibson of Willimantic; Mrs. Morris Kalman of Willimantic; Mrs. Louis Pollack of Norwich and Mrs. Morris Brown of New Britain, and five grandchildren.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, Jan. 7, 1963]

DEATH OF FORMER STATE SENATOR BENJAMIN EISENBERG

Former State Senator Benjamin Eisenberg died unexpectedly at his home, 305 Pleasant Street, Sunday morning. A resident of this city for many years, he came from Austria with his parents while a youngster, first settling in Haverstraw, N.Y., and then with the parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Eisenberg, came to Willimantic in 1908.

Ben, then 16, became employed in his father's Surprise Store on Jackson Street, remaining there 8 years. From 1916 to 1921 Eisenberg was a traveling salesman for a clothing house.

In September of the latter year he opened Ben's Toggery Shop at 51 Church Street and continued at this location until 1933 when he moved to Main Street. Later he took over the Bowman clothing store and continued this enterprise until retiring in November 1958. While he had been in failing health, his passing was unexpected.

Eisenberg had long been a faithful member of the Democratic Party serving the 29th district in the State senate, 1933–34. He was town treasurer of the democratic committee for many years, and served as judge and as clerk of the former city and police court on separate occasions. At his death he was democratic registrar of voters.

Eisenberg served as a member of the zoning board of appeals in this city and was chairman of the aviation committee. His other civic interests included being a member of the YMCA board of directors. Long a member of the Congregation Sons of Israel he was its president for 2 terms and treasurer for many years. He has been a leader in its brotherhood and for several years was chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.

Mr. Eisenberg was born February 22, 1892, and is survived by one daughter, Mrs. Milton Case, of Bloomfield, and a son, Marvin Eisenberg, of Wapping; seven grandchildren, five sisters, Mrs. Louis Pollack, Norwich; Mrs. Thomas Gibson, Willimantic; Mrs. Morris Kelman, Willimantic; Mrs. George Miller, Hartford; and Mrs. Morris Brown, of New Britain.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Jan. 7, 1963]

BENJAMIN EISENBERG DIES—FORMER STATE SENATOR

WILLIMANTIC.—Former State Senator Benjamin Eisenberg, 70, retired Willimantic businessman, died Sunday at his home at 305 Pleasant Street.

Eisenberg was State senator in 1933–34, serving as chairman of the aviation committee. He was treasurer of the Democratic Town Committee for many years and was clerk of the city and police court until his retirement in 1957. He also served on the zoning board of appeals.

OPERATED STORE

He operated Ben's Toggery Shop for 37 years before retiring in 1958 because of ill health. Before that, he worked for his father at the old Surprise Store on Jackson Street and was a traveling salesman for a clothing house.

At the time of his death he was Democratic registrar of voters.

Born in Austria, Mr. Eisenberg first settled in Haverstraw, N.Y., and then moved to Willimantic in 1908.

Mr. Eisenberg was president of Congregation Sons of Israel for two terms and its treasurer for many years. He was a leader in the synagogue's brotherhood and chairman for several years of the United Jewish Appeal.

ON YMCA BOARD

He was also a member of the YMCA board of directors and of numerous other civic and philanthropic agencies.

He leaves a son, Marvin Eisenberg, of Wapping; a daughter, Mrs. Milton Case, of Bloomfield; five sisters, Mrs. George Miller, of West Hartford; Mrs. Thomas Gibson, of Willimantic; Mrs. Morris Kalman, of Willimantic; Mrs. Louis Pollack, of Norwich; and Mrs. Morris Brown, of New Britain; and seven grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held this afternoon at 2 at the Congregation Sons of Israel in Willimantic. Rabbi Amos Edelheit will officiate. Burial will be in Congregation Sons of Israel Cemetery, Perkins Corner, Mansfield.

Friends may call during memorial week at the home of his son, Marvin Eisenberg, of 21 Manor Lane, Wapping.

Memorial contributions may be made to the donor's favorite charity.

The Weinstein Mortuary, of Hartford, is in charge of arrangements.

One-Price Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on Friday, February 15 by the executive committee and cotton policy committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiments expressed by this resolution:

STATEMENT BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE REGARDING CURRENT COTTON LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

The American textile industry is deeply disturbed and disappointed over developments of the past week that resulted in a setback of legislation designed to achieve the announced intention of President Kennedy and his administration to "remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system."

The industry's alarm and disappointment is magnified by the resistance of the administration to that portion of the legislation which would have specified that American-grown cotton should be made available to domestic mills at the same price it is made available for export. The administration supported, instead, a provision that would give discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining a spread between the domestic and foreign price.

It is the carefully considered opinion of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute that anything less than a clear-cut return to a one-price system will result in a continuation of the deplorable lack of confidence now prevalent throughout the cotton economy.

So long as the U.S. Government tolerates a policy under which textile mills in Japan, Hong Kong, India, or Europe can buy American-grown cotton at a lower price than domestic mills must pay for the same cotton, there is bound to be distrust, uncertainty and deterioration.

The entire cotton economy, including the millions of people involved with the price-handicapped textile-apparel industry complex, were heartened when President Kennedy announced his intentions to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system last fall.

To informed cotton and textile individuals everywhere, the extent of the inequity is the level of the export subsidy on raw cotton—nothing more and nothing less.

Prior to the export subsidy, American and foreign mills competed for American cotton on an equal basis. We seek only a return to that basis.

Today, the entire raw cotton industry is confronted with one of the most serious emergencies in history. Cotton consumption in the United States is rapidly declining; acreage is being reduced; cotton farm income is suffering; competing fibers and other products are rapidly taking over cotton's mar-

kets; export sales of cotton and cotton products are declining; stocks of cotton are piling up in Government hands at exhorbitant costs; many mills are on short time; payrolls are suffering; confidence in cotton and its future is at an alltime low.

Because the leadership of the entire raw cotton industry, from growing through manufacturing, from New England to California, recognizes this deplorable situation, there is virtually unanimous agreement on a course of action. This agreement was expressed 2 weeks ago when all segments of the industry including farmers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, cottonseed processors, and mill men, participating in the annual meeting of the National Cotton Council, agreed on the need for "* * * action to make U.S. cotton available to American mills at the same price as it is made available to foreign mills under the present law."

With such widespread support this administration has a unique opportunity to reverse the tragic course of this vast agricultural-manufacturing complex, head it in the right direction, and restore to it the confidence that is absolutely essential to the creation of a vital, dynamic enterprise.

But a piecemeal approach will not do the job. It will not generate the necessary levels of increased cotton consumption; it will not materially offset the burdensome portion of imports now occurring specifically because of the unfair cotton pricing system; it will not justify the acreage expansion so essential to efficient and profitable cotton farming. In short, it will not restore confidence.

A discretionary, piecemeal solution will be viewed only as a handout, or a subsidy to the domestic industry. The American textile industry has never been and is not now in favor of a subsidy. It does not want it. Along with the whole raw cotton industry, and many of our friends in the Congress, we reluctantly agree to an equalization payments approach only as the very last recourse to eliminate the intolerable two-price system, thereby gaining a period of time for the cotton economy of this country to make the adjustments that are essential to the development of a sound future.

The American Textile Manufactures Institute restates its firm conviction that a complete return to a one-price system is fundamental both to the cold realities of the current situation and to generating the support necessary to insure legislative action in the immediate future.

We urge upon the administration and the Congress immediate action to insure that an American textile mill, employing American citizens, can buy American cotton at the same price as it is sold abroad.

Cuban Agricultural Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent events and the ever-present threat of communism, I call upon Congress to refuse to appropriate any funds which would be used either directly or indirectly to finance any U.N. project in Cuba or in any other Communist-dominated or controlled country.

The United States is paying 40 percent of the cost of the U.N. Special Fund, the account financing the Cuban agricultural project of the U.N., and there is no way to differentiate between U.S. funds and other funds in this account. If this project is allowed to proceed, the United States will be contributing to the perpetuation of its own foes.

Of what value are so-called economic sanctions, quarantines, and other measures to halt subversion from Cuba if, at the same time, the United Nations finances efforts to enhance the agricultural economy of Cuba?

Such aid as this will merely assist Castro in his efforts to subvert Latin America, it will aid in the spreading of communism throughout the Western Hemisphere and the United States should refrain from giving aid and comfort to any such program by refusing to appropriate the necessary funds for the U.N. Special Fund.

If Congress is going to persist in appropriating money for the U.N. Special Fund, then it should at least place enough strings on such money to assure the U.S. taxpayers that none of their money will be used to assist, in any manner, Communist governments.

What Is a Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, as a result of the reapportionment changes that took place this year in the congressional districts in New York, to represent in this great body one of the most important agricultural districts in the Nation. I am proud indeed to be a farmer's Congressman and I shall continue to work and fight in the future as I have in the past in behalf of the farmers of upstate New York.

As a farmers' Congressman I was greatly impressed with an eloquent editorial I read the other day in the Cato Citizen of Cato, N.Y., for February 7, 1963. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial herewith:

WHAT IS A FARMER?

A farmer is a paradox—he is an overall executive with his home; his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos, and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus; and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good foods, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers or helping with housework.

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agricultural Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him—he is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise,, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

Stock Mart Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, of February 19, 1963:

TAX LAWS TERMED "STOCK MART DANGER"—NEW YORK EXCHANGE PRESIDENT CRITICIZES CAPITAL GAINS LEVY IN BORREGO TALK

BORREGO SPRINGS.—Tax laws affecting investors were one of the triggers in an actual day of panic that struck the Nation's stock markets last May 28, Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, told the annual conference of Copley publishers and executives here yesterday.

While Funston told a reporter that it is unlikely that the market stands in any similar danger today, he said oldtimers in the financial centers of New York found selling just as emotional and fear-ridden on that day as it was during the 1929 crash, with frenzy added to the selling waves by the effect of the capital gains tax.

Funston explained that the major selling was by medium and large, not small, investors who previously were "locked in" from selling stocks because of the existence of the 25-percent maximum tax on long-term capital gains.

When it appeared that the market might sink to new lows, these investors tried to be "the first to reach the door" by selling their stocks, either to conserve their capital or their longstanding profits, or to buy back in at a much lower level which still could allow them a benefit from selling.

Funston said the capital gains tax at its present rate, by its effect in "freezing" ownership of stocks or other investments, not only serves to accentuate market movements but also may be depriving the Government of easily obtainable revenues. "We feel that if the capital gains tax were cut in half the Government would get 2½ times as much revenue from it," he said.

Of President Kennedy's tax revision proposals, Funston said, "You have to give the Government credit for recognizing the stifling effects of the present tax structure on economic growth."

However, he predicted that Congress would insist on cuts in spending before accepting tax cuts of the magnitude suggested, and he also said investors "are going to fight with

all their might" proposed withdrawal of the small tax relief on dividends.

"These provisions were written into existing law in recognition of the fact that stockholding by the general public was needed to finance the Nation's growth, and also to recognize that dividends have been subject to double taxation—once on a company's earnings, and next on its distribution of those earnings."

URGES TAX STUDY

He urged careful study of the whole effect of the capital gains tax at its present rates.

Concerning a current investigation by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the Nation's financial markets, Funston said the staff work by SEC appeared to be knowledgeable and conscientious, and that he felt the results, due soon, would be presented fairly, not sensationally.

Funston predicted that many more persons will continue to be added to the stockholding public, and said California in the next few years may surpass New York in number of individual stockholders.

In his talk to the 60 persons attending the Copley sessions at La Casa del Zorro, Funston good-humoredly fended off requests for predictions as to individual or general stock behavior.

He said he was a prophet without honor in his own household, for he found that Mrs. Funston—a member of 1 of the 20,000 women's investment clubs in the country—was "well known among its membership for being advised by her dentist, not by her husband." Women, he reported, represent 51 percent of the Nation's stockholders.

TELLS OF GROWTH

Funston gave detailed evidence of the fast-growing public participation in the market. The number of individual stockholders has grown from 6.5 million to 17 million in the approximately 11 years since Funston has been president of the exchange. He noted that the commission fees charged by brokers give a definite advantage to the small buyer, while the big buyer gets no volume discount.

Funston took occasion to praise the San Diego Union for what he called "informed and careful" reporting of business and financial news. He said that one of the first news reports winning his favorable attention in his job as president of the exchange, after previous service as a college president, was one prepared by Irvine Reynolds, former financial editor and now chief economist for the Copley newspapers.

How a Laboring Man Looks at the Proposed Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in all of the controversy over the proposed tax cut, I feel that it is important to know how a laboring man feels about it. Mr. Chet Bessenecker, 702⅓ West Third Street, Davenport, Iowa, has expressed himself in a letter which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Bessenecker's letter follows:

This letter will probably not mean much; but I just had to write you in protest to the so-called Kennedy tax cut; in my opinion I think it is very unfair and unsound to the laboring class in which I happen to belong. I think a bill could be passed where the benefit of a tax cut can be equally shared by all working classes, and not 6 percent for the lower bracket and 26 percent for the higher bracket.

I do however want to take this opportunity to thank you in Washington, D.C. for the good, sound government in which we have had in the past; and a wish for continued success and good health in the future.

Thanking you for taking up so much of your valuable time, I remain,

CHET BESSENECKER.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the February 16, 1963, issue of the Michigan Chronicle, an outstanding weekly newspaper of general distribution in the city of Detroit.

It is an excellent article on Brotherhood Week and the need for us all to begin to live together in a time of immense opportunity and fearful peril:

WE MUST LEARN TO LIVE AS BROTHERS

Why Brotherhood Week? Why do we set aside 1 week in a whole year to publicly extol the exalted principles and virtues of brotherhood?

The national observance of Brotherhood Week, February 17 to 24, sponsored for the past 30 years by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, has a simple but significant purpose. That is to serve as a regular reminder of the fundamental importance of the brotherhood of man.

The Biblical concept of man being his brother's keeper is eternal. It transcends all races and religions of mankind. The common origin of world problems is from the continued inability of man to live in harmony or in brotherhood with his neighbor.

The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., warns that we will have to learn to live as brothers or die as fools in global warfare. In international politics, the art and practice of peaceful coexistence is difficult for many countries to understand and master. This is the great challenge facing the world. This is the prime objective of the United Nations—promoting good relations among nations.

Here, in America, Brotherhood Week enables us to take stock of our own frailty in living up to our professed ideals of brotherhood and democracy. These 7 days allow us to take a close look at ourselves to analyze the extent of our own hatred, prejudice, and intolerance.

Brotherhood Week gives us a chance to measure our actual conduct against the principles and goals of our religious faith and political ideology. It is a time to reflect, every man unto himself, a time of individual rededication for the coming year to the practice of—not lipservice to—the great principles of democracy and brotherhood.

All of us—Negro and white, Jew, and Gentile—should begin thinking about dismantling the wall which we have erected within us to keep out those we don't like simply because they are of another color, race, religion or class. If we are to practice true brotherhood, we must learn to judge our friends and all else on the basis of their individual worth. And let us not be too hasty to prejudge or convict groups or individuals on the basis of hearsay evidence or widespread stereotypes. To prejudge is to be prejudiced.

Before the world can be saved from the destructive plague of prejudice, we first must condition our minds to be immune to this poisonous disease.

In order for brotherhood to work throughout the year, we must follow this year's theme: "Brotherhood is democracy at work * * * Believe it. Live it. Support it."

Peace will be secure and life will be richer as soon as this lesson is learned.

An Admiral on Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, of February 19, 1963:

AN ADMIRAL ON TARGET—"FED UP," SAYS BEN MORELL

What is a conservative?

To the liberals, this is a bad word. It denotes somebody who doesn't agree with them that they have found all the answers to all social problems and human miseries.

What is an ultraconservative?

To the liberals, this is a throwback, someone living in a dark age when there were no Arthur Schlesingers or Walter Hellers, and therefore subject to ridicule and abuse.

In view of this it is refreshing to hear someone like Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, USN, retired, who now serves as chairman of the board of trustees for Americans for Constitutional Action. Admiral Moreell is the man who made the war move; his Seabees landed the fighters, tamed the islands, built the airfields, supplied the troops for the great naval and air forces which conquered the Pacific.

But in the idiom of the New Frontier, he is to be derided as an ultraconservative. Well, Admiral Moreell accepts the nomination. "I," he says, "am fed up to here."

He is fed up, he says:

With masterminds who—often unable to administer their own affairs—have no doubt of their ability to manage the United States and the world.

With pseudostatesmen with wishbones for backbones who are masters of surrender, compromise, appeasement, and accommodation.

With self-anointed oracles who insist that differences on foreign policy should stop at the water's edge, and free Americans must not criticize programs initiated by "no win" diplomats.

With Robin Hood government that promises to rob the rich to pay the poor, and with those who would tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect.

With businessmen who have no time or energy to fight for the system that made their business possible.

With farmers who boast of rugged individualism but demand guaranteed incomes, public power, and irrigation.

With educators who profess a belief in personal responsibility and insist on Federal aid to education.

With labor bosses who demand laws which exempt them from responsibilities, grant

them monopoly powers, and the right to practice violence on persons and property.

The admiral was storming, but he was on target.

To him, a conservative is one who tries to follow the trail blazed from tyranny to freedom. He fights to protect the climate of freedom which we inherited and which became the world's cornucopia of spiritual and material blessings, and which over the years poured out its abundance for the needy everywhere.

Now, along the New Frontier, the Constitution is outmoded and so many of the things in which we believe are called incantations from the forgotten past, or wornout slogans, myths, and illusions.

No wonder the admiral is fighting mad.

Our Continued Lack of Foreign Policy Sinks American Prestige Lower and Lower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of White House attempts to censor and control the news media through all sorts of devices and the announced policy of managing the news, we are daily being reminded that the no foreign policy of the timid and fearful Kennedy administration is sinking American prestige lower and lower and encouraging the Soviet Union to increase its propaganda advantage throughout the world. In the nuclear test ban negotiations the administration cannot seem to wait to make more and more concessions to Russia. From our earlier retreat from the position that we would accept no test ban without adequate on-site inspection to the offer to accept 8 or 10 inspections, we are now retreating further toward the Soviet limit of 2 or 3 by announcing that we will accept fewer than 8 and, if the President follows his usual course, we will probably end up by once again unilaterally instituting a self-imposed test ban without any guarantees from the Russians.

In Cuba we continue the farce of trying to smile bravely as we ignore Russian arrogance and expansion there. After the dismal loss of initiative following the brave words of President Kennedy last October, we see the same President trying to hail as a victory a Khrushchev announcement that he may remove a few thousands of his troops from Cuba and this is followed by a plea from our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, that we should not embarrass the Soviet dictator by telling him to get all of his troops and so-called technicians out of this hemisphere because, if we do, the administration fears he may not make even a gesture in our direction.

Mr. Speaker, the President does not reflect the attitude of the American people in his pussyfooting with the Soviets on their invasion of this hemisphere. My mail from Dallas and my personal contacts with the people I have the honor to represent, as well as contact with people in a great number of the States where I have had occasion to appear in the past several weeks, convince me that the No. 1 concern of the American people is Cuba and our lack of initiative in ending the Communist threat to our security posed by the Russian buildup there. The people are perplexed and bordering on being ashamed of an administration showing such a lack of fortitude in the face of Soviet expansion in Cuba. The American people want action within a framework of understandable policy. They know no fear of Soviet threats. The people are aware that our best guarantee against war is a strong America that makes its position clear that we will not back down in the face of aggression and that we have the means and the will to fight, if necessary, in defense of our freedom and those who believe in and are willing to stand with us in the cause of freedom.

According to the U.S. News & World Report of February 25, 1963, in the field of issues of national importance, Cuba and taxes dominate. I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, a roundup of editorial opinion taken from an article from U.S. News & World Report on the "Strange Mood of America Today." These quotes relate directly to the feeling concerning Cuba:

"Cuba is one thing that has the people aroused," says Albert A. McFarlin, editor of the News in Hays, Kans. "There is a feeling that the administration is not leveling with them on the Cuban deal. There's also a feeling that we have muffed the ball twice in Cuba—at the Bay of Pigs, and then again last October. The general feeling, I think, is that the United States should go into Cuba, kick Castro out, and send the Russians home."

Comments the editor of a newspaper in Wisconsin: "What worries the people here is the feeling that there is too much secrecy about what is going on in Cuba. They are baffled. They want to know more facts. They want to know what the Russians are doing there. They certainly don't trust Khrushchev and they are uneasy, because they have the impression that Kennedy may be attempting some kind of secret diplomacy with Khrushchev."

In Mount Vernon, Ohio, says an editor of the News, Fred Lorey, "You hear more talk about Soviet Cuba than about anything else. The fact that Russia has a powerful base on our doorstep is a matter of primary concern."

SOMEBODY LYING?

"The feeling here on Cuba is that somebody is lying," says Bill Bentley, business manager of the Constitution Press, in Lawton, Okla. "The administration says things are this way, and the Republicans say things are the other way. We're anxious to find out where the truth does lie."

In Yakima, Wash., reports Charles Massey, executive editor of the Herald and Republic newspapers, "People question whether they are getting the truth about Cuba, or if administration announcements are controlled news."

"A tighter blockade" of Cuba would be favored by the people of Tyler, Tex., says William E. Dozier, editor of the Tyler Courier-Times.

Developments in Cuba "have left many people confused, bewildered, and split, largely along political lines," reports John N. Popham, general managing editor of the Chattanooga Times in Tennessee.

"I don't detect any sentiment to invade Cuba, or anything like that," says James Wilson, publisher of the Times Herald, in Carroll, Iowa. "People seem to have the feeling that it's a long way from us."

But in South Carolina, says one editor there: "Cuba is uppermost in people's minds. They don't like the idea of a Communist base so close by, whether it's offensive or defensive."

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include an editorial from the Dallas Times Herald and one from the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune on the ridiculous proposal of the United Nations to help the agricultural economy of Cuba in an effort to strengthen the Castro Communist dictatorship. I would also like to include an article written by Ken Thompson, of the Dallas Morning News, on the Bay of Pigs fiasco in an attempt to cut through the contradictory and misleading reports which continue to come from the administration and its spokesmen:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, Feb. 15, 1963]

U.N. SPECIAL FUND AID TO CUBA IGNORES U.S. STAND FOR LIBERTY

The determination of the U.N. Special Fund to spend $1,157,000 on an agricultural research station in Cuba—despite U.S. protests—should indicate once and for all that this organization does not stand for the interests and institutions of freedom as we understand the term.

It should indicate also that this arm of the United Nations is determined to push projects contrary to the interests of the free world—in Cuba now, elsewhere later.

From here it looks as though only the cause of communism would benefit from this project.

The decision on the long-delayed agricultural station comes while this country is trying to get Soviet troops out of Cuba and is still concerned over the buildup of Cuba as a base from which the Communists intend to spread terrorism through Latin America.

Our Government has protested the use of funds for such a purpose by the U.N. agency. But apparently that made little difference.

Furthermore, the explanation offered to appease irate Americans makes no sense at all. If our officials swallow it they ought to have their heads examined. Our guess is that a lot of U.S. Congressmen won't swallow it.

The explanation offered by Paul G. Hoffman, an American who is Managing Director of the Fund, is that "we will not use one single American dollar on the project."

It makes no difference whether he says American dollars are being used. The United States has contributed 40 percent—or $99 million of the $247 million—spent by this U.N. Special Fund on various projects.

Switching funds from other countries to finance this project simply means that more U.S. dollars and less money from elsewhere

would be required for other projects elsewhere.

The United Nations has found a good thing in the United States. That is the U.S. dollar.

A great deal of the world is getting the benefit of U.S. dollars by the simple expedient of having the rest of the world vote to spend the money, to be contributed on a proportionate basis by the member nations of the U.N. and its agencies. That proportional basis of contributions means that the United States pays by far the biggest single part of the bill.

We can protest. We can bluster. We can plead.

But until our Congress acts to cut off the flow of dollars into the various U.N. funds, our protests will go unheeded.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Feb. 14, 1963]

THE U.N. AND CUBA

The plan afoot to succor our enemy, Cuba, by the United Nations granting them a loan to haul them out of their economic hole occurs to us as tantamount to slipping pistols into Jesse James' jail.

The United Nations was founded originally on the unique basis of separate and independent nations which believed, despite their theories of government, they could exist beside each other without overt subversion of one to the other.

The American public—and most of the other Western nations—subscribed to this viewpoint. At the time of the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, this view was paramount.

Shortly afterward, however, the Western nations found that insidious as well as overt subversion was forthcoming from the nations involved in the Communist conspiracy as it ground under its heel most of the nations of Eastern Europe.

The United Nations, though, remained in the minds of most of us—perhaps naively—the best instrument for opposites to live together, if not in harmony, at least in counterpoint.

For a long time now, the United Nations has not accepted this principle. And more has been the pity as Western Europe has progressed and Eastern Europe has been groping for better areas of trade as well as influence.

These factors set the stage for our difficulties today. Now the United Nations has announced uncompromisingly that it intends to lend Cuba money in which to allow Cuba to attempt to become self-sufficient economically.

This plan is not new. The United States has fought it since its inception after the Castro takeover, as have the other nations of the West.

It must be remembered that Cuba is only 90 miles from our shores and it is within our sphere of influence as enunciated in the Monroe Doctrine.

Other considerations also enter into the U.N. plan. At least as far as the United States is concerned.

After all, the United States supports the United Nations almost to the hilt of its operating costs. Sure, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France, as well as several other nations contribute in cascading choruses. But the real burden is ours. That is the financial burden alone.

Consider this: Who supported the abortive operation in Katanga? The United States, by $10 million a month. Who has supported the situation in the Middle East by almost the same tab? The United States.

Are we always going to be patsies? Can we not at some time and at some place say to the United Nations that, If you are not going to consider our national interests, then why call upon us always to bail you out of the hole?

Cuba, as we know—or should know, cannot be considered anything but a puppet of Russia. We still do not have the truth about everything that is going on in that small island.

Consequently, we have a serious, fair, and remaining interest in what Cuba does or what is done for Cuba, whether by the United Nations or by Cuba's current mentor, Russia.

It is in our national interest to curb efforts of the United Nations in attempting to improve Cuban economic plans.

Once Cuba gains a viable economy it can dictate to other nations in Latin America, which are closely watching the powerplay between the United States and the United Nations at the moment.

We would say this. And we mean this. That if the United Nations—which we support almost whole and entire at the present time—believes it should subvert our national interests and, indeed, our national security today, then we must withdraw.

These are hard words. But our legacy—from Monroe to Wilson to Eisenhower to John F. Kennedy—already forecloses on any other choice.

This whole situation seems to narrow down today to a position where it is either us—meaning the United States—or them, meaning the creatures of communism.

This unfortunately happens to be the only choice.

U.S. sources have said that we intend to fight the U.N. gambit for aid to Cuba, but what the administration will do remains to be seen.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Feb. 5, 1963]

CONTRADICTIONS ON AIR COVER

(By Ken Thompson)

Maybe we're belaboring the issue of whether or not the U.S. Government—and President Kennedy in particular—promised air support and cover to the Cuban invasion forces at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. But this much is obvious: Someone is not telling the truth. And the truth should be told.

On Friday, January 11, Jose Perez San Roman, commander of Brigade 2506, made a trek to Washington to issue a statement from Attorney General Robert Kennedy's office. In his statement, San Roman flatly denied that the invasion forces he commanded had ever been promised air support by the U.S. Government.

Coming as it does from perhaps the most important single individual who participated in the invasion, San Roman's statement has become extremely useful in what appears to be an obvious campaign to rewrite history and to absolve the administration of its share of the blame for the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Both the Attorney General and the President have leaned heavily on San Roman's statement in their own more recent public remarks denying that air support had been promised, then withdrawn.

Validity of San Roman's testimony in behalf of the administration, however, has now been completely discredited by the weekly magazine, U.S. News & World Report.

In its February 4 issue, the magazine has printed a number of excerpts from the transcript of radio messages sent from the Bay of Pigs by San Roman to the invaders' home base in Nacaragua, where American representatives were in charge.

Following are a few of those messages, sent during 3 days of fighting, April 17–19, 1961:

"Must have jet support." "Where is our jet cover?" "Request air knockout artillery as soon as possible." "Where is our jet cover gone to?" "Did not receive help from air cover." "Can't you throw something into this vital point in the battle? Anything. Just let pilots loose." "Do you people realize how desperate the situation is?" "Do you back us or quit?" "All we want is low jet cover and jet close support." "I need it badly or cannot survive." "Please don't desert us." "Where is promised air cover?"

Note that last reference to "promised" air cover. If the air cover was not promised, at least San Roman thought it was back in April 1961—and a million contradictory statements issued today from the Attorney General's office by San Roman won't change that fact.

Note also that San Roman made constant reference to "jet" cover in these messages to American authorities in Nicaragua.

The Cuban invasion force had no jet planes. The only jetplanes which could have been available were U.S. planes.

Both the President and the Attorney General have implied that confusion over the issue of air cover hinges on a misunderstanding, that the invaders had been promised air cover in the form of their own planes, but thought they were going to have U.S. planes supporting them. In his statement 3 weeks ago, San Roman said the U.S. air cover was not promised because "we had our own planes."

His constant references to "jet" cover in the messages sent to Nicaragua make it clear that San Roman was looking for promised support from U.S. planes, not his own.

One of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, Fermin DeGoicoechea, who hit the beach with San Roman in April, 1961, was in Dallas recently. In an interview with this writer, he offered an explanation for San Roman's fantastic reversal.

San Roman, he says, hopes that another invasion can be launched to oust Castro from Cuba. But he fears that such an invasion would be impossible if the brigade which he commanded is broken up. Considerable pressure has been applied by the administration to do just that.

DeGoicoechea believes that San Roman may have agreed to help the administration provide a means to whitewash its own responsibility for the Bay of Pigs fiasco—in exchange for a promise to keep the brigade intact.

Whether this explanation fits the case or not is of little importance. The fact remains that San Roman's testimony in behalf of the administration has been discredited. And the administration's own explanation of what really happened at the Bay of Pigs becomes just that much harder to believe.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by Senator Morton to Georgia Press Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent and pointed address delivered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] to the Georgia Press Institute, at Athens, Ga., on February 21, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORTON TO GEORGIA PRESS INSTITUTE, CONVENED IN ATHENS, GA., FEBRUARY 21, 1963

Your profession and mine have a problem in common these days. We are becoming obsolete. News and legislation are being fully automated. There is a giant new machine that grinds out both commodities; grinds them out, serves them up, ties a bib around your neck, spoon feeds you, and even sends a doctor around to examine you if the diet happens to disagree with you.

The newspaperman is expected to pass the package along to his readers. The legislator is expected to pass the package along to his constituents. The linotype machine and the legislative machine, in this grand design, can both be replaced by rubberstamps.

The machine is the executive branch of the Government. And your old friend Arthur Sylvester, who used to be a newspaperman himself, is one of its chief operators. I'm sure you remember the development of his blueprint. It started in October, when a number of conscientious newspapermen suddenly realized that news of the Cuban crisis was being controlled by a system of censorship tighter even than that of the Second World War. At least during that war newsmen often were taken into the Government's confidence.

Arthur Sylvester had a different view. Remember his classic explanation? "News generated by actions of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has in the application of military force and related forces to the solution of political problems, or to the application of international political pressure. In the kind of world we live in the generation of news by actions taken by the Government becomes one weapon in a strained situation. The results, in my opinion justify the methods we used."

Two months later Sylvester was still sticking to his weapons of news management. This time he made a public statement that should be tacked up in every news room—either as a grim reminder or as a replacement for the usual creed of the journalist. He said that "it would seem to me basic, all through history, that it's an inherent government right, if necessary, to lie to save itself * * *."

On another occasion Sylvester elaborated this truth-strangling policy to the Air Force Association in Nevada. He said that Air Force public relations officers must manage news to keep it in harmony with the actions of the President and his top advisers.

Now I don't question for a moment the right of a government to protect vital military security secrets. We have plenty of laws to cover that and we also have the conscience of your profession. In the Second World War, for instance, many reporters were entrusted with military secrets and they kept them. But a deliberate policy of lying is something else again.

It is also something else again when Government policy, as it did at both the State Department and the Defense Department during the Cuban crisis—and as it still does at Defense—requires officials to check in with the boss every time a reporter drops around.

Arthur Krock, the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times and the respected dean of the Washington press corps, recently had this comment on muzzling by memo:

"There is a basic functional conflict involved. The responsible press is trained to recognize, and will not publish, news inimical to national security. The press knows that international crises do and must enlarge this category. But if and when a government has shown a tendency to inflate the category, and also virtually polices the contacts of officials with news reporters, both press and public are denied the legitimate information which, as the President himself acknowledged * * * 'any administration must depend on as a check on its own actions'."

That's a fine statement and, as Mr. Krock meant it, its quotation of the President is ironic. I can't recall any administration in our history that has seemed less interested in checks on its own actions than this one.

In Look magazine last August another famous newsman, Fletcher Knebel, compiled this bill of particulars. It's an overflowing menu of kingly Kennedy reactions to reporters trying to do their jobs.

Hear the charges:

"Kennedy personally has called down at least six Washington correspondents either for their writings or for their publications."

"Three Kennedy administration officials have threatened to sue newspapers."

"Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has reproved at least four newspapermen for stories he disliked."

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation questioned six newspapermen in connection with stories concerning policies of the Kennedy administration."

"Pentagon security officials quizzed three correspondents."

"The White House canceled 22 subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune."

"Administration officials, reporters charge, put the freeze on some reporters who had offended them."

"White House Special Counsel Theodore C. Sorenson has reprimanded some newspapermen."

"White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger has rebuked about a dozen reporters for their stories."

"White House Aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a Pulitzer Prize historian, called one columnist an idiot."

"Even the Kennedy women have gotten into the act. Ethel Kennedy, wife of the Attorney General, and Mrs. Jean Smith, sister of the President, braced one correspondent for his story about dunkings in the Bob Kennedy swimming pool."

"What amazes many in the huge Washington newspaper fraternity in the Kennedy era is not the fact of White House disenchantment, but the volume, extent, and dexterity of its expression. Never before have so few bawled out so many so often for so little. Says Merriman Smith, of United Press International, the senior White House correspondent, 'Every administration develops Potomac sunburn sooner or later. The main difference with the Kennedy people is that their hypersensitivity developed so early. One reason is the close attention they pay to everything written about them. How they can spot an obscure paragraph in a paper of 3,000 circulation 2,000 miles away is beyond me. They must have a thousand little gnomes reading the papers for them.' "

Its attitude toward the press is just one example, but it covers virtually the whole scale of executive excess. It descends to the pettiness of canceling subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune when that paper's needle got too sharp. It includes the barrage of pressures we keep hearing about against newspapers in Florida which insist on printing news of the Cuba buildup in the face of White House denials of such a buildup.

It included the ridiculous but actually ominous request some months ago for voluntary self-censorship of the American press, a censorship that was couched in terms so vague that even the comic strips and the advice to the lovelorn columns could be included according to the sensitivity of a bureaucrat's feelings.

And it included what, to me, remains one of the most appalling misuses of government power on record—the incident in which the FBI was sent to rout reporters from their beds in the small hours of the morning to check the sources of their stories on Kennedy's steel crisis.

There is some drama and considerable danger in all of those incidents. There is another example of executive news management, that is far more subtle and every bit as disturbing. It involves the manipulation of facts and figures—the sort of offense for which bookkeepers can go to jail but for which bureaucrats don't seem called upon to pay at all.

As some of us recall rather vividly, there was an election last year. One of the hot issues involved was that of employment, or lack of it. Many a candidate was running on the administration's record in that area. In October, with all the precision of a military maneuver, the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, released his regular report on employment.

In an election period it was a blockbuster. It said that "over 4,500,000 more Americans have jobs than when this administration took office in January 1961." It said that unemployment was, and again I quote, "over 2 million less than in January of 1961."

No one can accurately count just how many votes those statements were worth. If they were true they were worth votes. They deserved it. If they were true.

Now you saw those figures. A lot of you undoubtedly used them. A lot of legislators used them in considering their positions as well as in appealing for votes. After all, they were Government figures. And we've come to accept Government figures as something just about sacred.

And so we went into the election and you went into your newspapers with that inspiring batch of statistics. After the voting was over, Secretary Wirtz had a little confession to make. It turns out that he hadn't really checked those figures quite as closely as he should have. Just an error, he said. No political motivation. So sorry.

Let's look at the slight errors. Remember that the official certified pasteurized, cauterized, sanitized Government figures showed 4½ million more Americans at work than when the administration took over.

Well, the actual figure turned out to be 1,224,000 almost exactly the sort of labor force increase we have been experiencing right along through normal growth in our population and markets. The little error was a little error of more than 200 percent—that's all.

What about the other figure, of 2 million less unemployed. That was a slight error too. The correct figure, the figure we got on second thought, after the elections were over, turned out to be 784,000—again, nothing startling. Of course, we have to admit that the second figure was pretty near perfect on a relative scale of New Frontier mathematics. It was slightly less than 100 percent wrong.

In Kennedyland, as in Disneyland, a 100 percent slip from reality is scarcely anything to get excited about. We should expect it.

That was an example of rewriting the present. What about rewriting history? That, too, is a function of the well-oiled machine that is attempting to operate a government by handout.

In one case it also involved a clear exposition of the theory that there is one set of rules for the ordinary people and another set altogether for the Kennedys.

You will recall that another of the big stories you weren't permitted to cover was the action in the Bay of Pigs. Four high-ranking officials of the Government were assigned the job of investigating the reasons for its failure. They were pledged to secrecy. Last month one of them broke that pledge. But it was all right, his name was Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy. In the face of an accumulation of evidence that would have impressed a mere mortal, he blandly said that the invasion simply hadn't been promised any air cover. His real thrust, of course, was that story after story pinning the responsibility for withdrawal of air support on Brother Jack's shoulders were all wrong. Kennedys can do no wrong. The invasion fiasco was all the fault of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA.

The main point here, however, is that Bobby broke the secrecy pledge. His brother backed him up, of course. But the others involved in the investigation are still wearing their muzzles.

When you can control the truth as tightly as that, who can say that the muzzle doesn't fit almost everyone in one way or another? A group of editors who recalled the President mentioning air cover in a private interview have been blandly told that their memories are faulty. No such mention was made. Where can you find truth in a situation like that?

What about the famous Saturday Evening Post article on the Cuban affair. Most of us probably remember it chiefly for its none-too-subtle stabbing of Adlai Stevenson. Personally, I think that was just a secondary matter. The real significance is in who wrote the story and what it was based upon. The authors were Stew Alsop and Charlie Bartlett, the latter being a close friend of the President and the man who introduced him to Jackie. The main burden of the story portrayed the President and his advisers as a magnificent team, operating flawlessly to face down the foe. It included access to information of such a high order of secrecy that other reporters might have reasonably expected a flying call from the FBI. Certainly it involved more sensitive areas than those that brought the FBI to reporters during the Kennedy steel crisis. But not in this case. Kennedys, you must remember, can do no wrong nor, apparently can their friends.

Much of this whole question, it seems to me, involves this kingly concept of right, of always being right, of always appearing right. It's no longer all the news that's fit to print—now it's all the news that fits the Kennedy image.

Part of that image, so far as Bobby is concerned, has been bent under the eight-wheel weight of the Teamster's Union. Brother Jack once said that any competent Attorney General could clap Jimmy Hoffa in jail. But then he appointed Bobby.

This year, in Nashville Bobby was still trying to get the job done. You know what happened. The Nashville Banner obtained a report that an attempt had been made to tamper the jury. The Banner didn't have any more reason than Bobby for wanting to see Hoffa get off the hook. But its journalistic mission and even reputation were directly challenged. Bobby directly applied pressure to keep the Banner from printing its story. The Banner refused.

The point was the same. It was the Kennedy image that was at stake and the facts had to fit.

I said at the outset that our problem was one in common. We both have our troubles in this era of executive excess.

You recall the story of the psychiatrist who admitted a beautiful blond patient into his inner sanctum. After an amorous interlude, he said, "that takes care of my problem—now what's yours?"

Well, I certainly haven't taken care of your problem, but I'd like to touch on mine. Actually it's still your problem because it is a problem in the whole structure of representative government.

Again, executive excess sums it up. The same sort of executive excess that permits bureaucrats to presume to tell you what to print, when to print it, and even how to interpret it.

Until right now there has been pretty general agreement that the success of our form of government rests on the balance of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

But things have changed. We have some fellows in Washington who equate checks and balances with brakes—brakes on their vehicle of executive pride and power.

James McGregor Burns, a biographer of both Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, has just recently called the Congress a stumbling block to democracy.

The President himself insisted that the rules of the House of Representatives had to be changed so as to not interfere with his programs, his powers, his desires.

The Budget Director has told the Congress that its Members can't consider the budget properly because they "fragment" it by dividing it into receipts and expenditures. Only the President, he says, can view the budget properly.

What's that leave for the Congress or the Senate? If the budget is opposed, or trimmed, the Congress and the Senate stand accused of obstructionism. Actually, of course, they should stand complimented for representing their own constituencies and their own consciences.

The administration's education bill is now before us. It's an omnibus bill, a fully packed grab bag of administration plans. Some of its items may be fine, others may not. Senators and Congressmen are supposed to exercise some judgment in these matters. But not in this case. The administration prefers that the bill be considered as a total piece of legislation. Take it or leave it. The Executive has spoken.

When Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court with men who would bend to his executive will there was an outcry that rocked the country. There should be a similar outcry now against the attempts to pack the executive with so much excessive power that all the other branches of Government are subordinated.

When the Congress refused to pass a bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs, the President tried his best to override their wishes by establishing a department by Executive order. His first attempt didn't work but the pressure is still on, experts are still collecting in the executive offices. Most importantly, it showed a trend or tendency—a trend or tendency away from legislative government and toward executive government.

Rooted in the urban affairs proposal also was another extension of Executive excess—the notion that the great cities of America should be cut away from their State moorings and hauled into the Federal harbor.

Perhaps we could be excused for shrugging off these Executive excesses. One by one they seem relatively innocent. Together they are far from it. And nowhere is this more alarmingly apparent than in the life-or-death matters of our national security.

Key members of congressional committees recently awoke to read newspaper stories describing our negotiations to remove missile bases from Turkey and Italy; negotiations based upon Executive decisions. Just a few weeks earlier Khrushchev's demands that we remove those missiles in return for his removel of missiles from Cuba had been hooted down as another Munich. But suddenly, without consultation and without the opportunity to obtain congressional expressions, the Munich was underway, prettied up with a new set of clothes supposed to represent modernization of our weapons systems. Even if Polaris is considered sufficient, extra insurance in Italy and Turkey won't hurt.

The Nassau agreement with Prime Minister Macmillan was another example of negotiation in sunny secrecy, of decisions which affect us all but which were arrived at quickly, perhaps precipitously by the Executive alone. Perhaps Congress should feel no pain at being left out of that one, however. The President's own Secretary of State, or at least the man who carries the title, wasn't even present. Maybe that was a simple division of labor. The President took on the job of imperiling Mr. Macmillan's government and the Secretary of State was held in reserve to do the same sort of job on Canada's Prime Minister.

When, if ever a disarmament agreement finally is reached, one wonders what razzle-dazzle of public relations will be used to break the news to the American people and their representatives in Congress. What are the guidelines for disarmament? I hope they are clearer, more solid, and more definitive than the shifting sands of the Executive's statements and press releases on the subject.

But where, instead, are the policymolding position papers on disarmament being written? Many of them are coming from the special, private research corporations which, through contracts with the executive branch, are springing up like mushrooms, or toadstools, in Washington today.

The excuse for these groups is simple. Government can't pay the salaries needed to get top rate men, it's said. So the private corporations are founded, with massive Government contracts, to provide the thinkers who wouldn't work for ordinary wages. These policy technicians have become virtually a counterpart government, responsible to no constituency but fully integrated into the Executive's excessive power structure.

This shadow government is just another way around Congress, another way toward an all-powerful Presidency no longer harnessed to Government institutions responsible for their decisions but free to use the whole Nation as the guinea pig for special theories and special interests.

Other Presidents have had their kitchen cabinets, even their shadow cabinets. This one is the first to have a shadow government.

Of course, there are excuses aplenty for this Executive excess. One is that our society has become so complex it can no longer rely on the cumbersome machinery of representative government to get its job done. There seems to be some magic mathematical limit on individual responsibility.

Planning is another magical excuse word. Our society is said to be so interdependent that it can't rely on individual responsibility to accomplish the integrated planning needed to get us moving.

I think those excuses are nonsense. The root of the growing tree of Executive power is simply distrust of the people.

The New Frontier is simply a frontier of fear—fear that people can no longer manage their own lives, fear that they might take some course other than that plotted and planned in the all-wise, all-knowing ivory tower.

Taxes are described in this new philosophy as not merely a means to raise revenues but as a way to distribute income. The free market doesn't do a good enough job. People spend their money on the wrong things. The solution? Simple, let the Government take the money and spend it for you.

It's really ironic. In this period of our history, since the turn of the century anyway, our average incomes have doubled and doubled again. Our individual education has grown from a grade school average to a high school average and is now approaching a full college average.

Nevertheless, we find that the prevailing theory is that we are not smart enough to handle our own affairs. We must be protected from ourselves.

We can't insure ourselves against sickness or old age. The Government must do it and do it all, without options, given its way.

We can't build our own schools in our own communities. The Federal Government must do it for us.

We can't settle our own affairs in business and industry, the Federal Government must alone is wise enough.

We can't raise prices, we can't lower prices, we can't work short hours, we can't work long hours. We can't be trusted even to take someone to lunch for a business chat.

That's the nub of it. Mistrust of the people.

One of the administration's economic oracles spelled it out in a book when he wrote that "the marginal tax dollar has currently a much higher social utility than the marginal pay-envelope dollar. The former goes to schools; the latter into tail fins." The author was Alvin Hansen, professor emeritus of political economy at Harvard.

Simple, isn't it? Government is wise. Individuals are foolish.

Nobody denies that some people do act foolishly. Even people in government act foolishly. Even Senators do—although rarely.

But today we see public policy based upon the sweeping assumption that most people would behave foolishly if left to their own devices and not herded by government.

The picture is alarming. Parents would stop sending their children to school and then they'd stop building schools. Everybody over 50 would be ground down under the poverty induced by a misspent youth. Our cities would lie in rubble because the residents wouldn't have enough sense or money to keep them up. The countryside would be a tangle of weeds because there would be no one to tell the farmers what to grow. Detroit would be making cars 50 feet long, costing $50,000 which would be sold in great numbers to the 6 or 7 bloated millionaires who had made billions by merging railroads and forcing everyone to buy high cost steel. Why there might even be some extremists in our midst who would hold meetings to criticize the Soviet Union.

Far fetched? It may sound so, but it is precisely this sort of mistrust of the individual that lies behind every attempt to usurp the power of the people in order to protect the people.

I prefer, and I think most Americans either do or will, when given a clear choice, prefer the sort of government envisioned by the late Supreme Court Justice Jackson when he said, "It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizens from falling into error; it is the function of the citizens to keep the Government from falling into error."

Fortunately, we can still do this. The Congress may be unpopular in some quarters, but it is still there. And you still elect it. You, in particular, are involved, because you still cover those elections and can accord to them the importance they deserve.

This is not a partisan matter. My good friend, the late great Democratic Senator Robert Kerr was alert to it when he said that he honored the President but he honored the wishes of the people of Oklahoma more.

He was sensitive to it also when he obtained a virtually unprecedented unanimous vote from his colleagues to try to prevent the President from administering the public works funds as a tool of political pressure.

Our challenge today is to the structure of our government, its entire system of checks and balances, not just to one party or another. The Presidency is fast becoming a party unto itself, aloof, alone, lordly, and disdainful of the individual. Rule by machine has been a disgrace in some of our major cities. But rule by machine is becoming a crisis in our capital. The population explosion may be a peril elsewhere in the world but it is the power explosion in Washington that is the peril here.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the great goal of our liberty. We must not now, on pretexts of efficiency or new problems and new answers abandon that goal and substitute in its place government of the Executive, by the Executive and for the Executive—or, to put it bluntly, government of the Kennedys, by the Kennedys, and for the Kennedys.

GOP Wins Election Despite Tax Bait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, of February 10, 1963:

GOP WINS ELECTION DESPITE TAX BAIT

WASHINGTON.—Just as under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, a congressional by election in California proved that tax reduction is not necessarily potent in bidding for popular votes.

In the face of President Kennedy's proposal of a $13.5 billion lop-off of citizen liability to the Federal Treasury, the California seat vacated by the death of Representative Clem Miller, Democrat, was won by DON CLAUSEN, Republican.

The vote was 79,340 for CLAUSEN to 65,817 for William F. Grader, his Democratic opponent.

Easily the issue most emphasized in the election was President Kennedy's message asking $98.8 billion for the next fiscal year, as against an estimated $11.9 billion current deficit and request for a tax cut of $13.5 billion spread over 3 years.

Quite evidently, that financial proposal did not go well with the 365,281 population of the California First District, hugging the Pacific Coast from San Francisco to the Oregon border.

Federal tax cuts within memory, 1948 and 1954, also did no good at the polls.

The 80th Congress (the first controlled by the Republicans since the 1920's) set out to cut taxes.

In 1948, with presidential nominating conventions close at hand, both Houses passed a $5 billion tax reduction and overrode Truman's veto.

Even so, the Nation's voters reelected President Truman and returned Democratic majorities to both Houses of Congress.

When the Republicans returned to power in 1953, President Eisenhower and Congress passed tax packages revising downward excises on personal apparel and home appliances and reducing income tax rates.

Election of Representative CLAUSEN raises to four the Republican gain in the House of Representatives and raises the Republican membership from California to 14, against 24 Democrats.

Employment of Mature Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this article, written by Mr. Elmer L. Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., demonstrates how the author's organization is making efforts to help our senior citizens lead useful and productive lives according to their capabilities. It seems to me that it demonstrates several attitudes and procedures that the Federal Government and private industry should consider relative to employment of senior citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Employment of Mature Women" from the October 1962 issue of Retirement Life describing the special capabilities a mature woman brings to her job.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT OF MATURE WOMEN

(By Elmer L. Winter, president, Manpower, Inc.)

Today's mature woman should treat age as an asset when seeking employment.

Despite some overhanging prejudices which remain to be dispelled, women past 50—and even well into the sixties—can

find jobs, if they know where and how to look.

During my years as president of the world's largest temporary help and business service firm, I have become aware of the needs of mature workers and of their desire to work. The age barrier is rapidly crumbling, but the older would-be employees should realize that some unfounded criticisms still exist.

Chief objections heard are: poor performance; difficulties in training and adjustment; inability to get along with fellow workers; absenteeism, and undependability.

Information gathered by Manpower, Inc., and the National Association of Manufacturers shows there is no validity to these objections, but awareness of them can aid the mature job hunter in two ways: her self-confidence will increase; and she can assist in dislodging the myths about older workers.

A survey of 3,100 companies, conducted by the NAM, disclosed that the mature worker takes special pride in performing well, that she trains with concentration and adjusts well, that she is less likely than her younger coworkers to become involved in office bickering, that she is absent no more (and often less because of a more stable life), and that her dependability ranks high when compared with that of other employees.

In my book, "A Woman's Guide to Earning a Good Living," I offer these suggestions to the mature worker contemplating a position:

Never feel embarrassed about your age. It can be turned into a distinct asset for you.

Be careful of your appearance. Neat, simple clothes, a figure under control, a firm handshake, good posture, and a quiet manner will count in your favor more than the mere statistic of your birth will count against you.

Be especially careful when filling in your application. Accuracy, neatness, and full information will make a good impression.

Using these basic suggestions as your guide to approaching a prospective employer, try these questions to determine your availability. Ask yourself:

"Will I be physically able to hold down the job I want?" (A physical examination within the past 6 months is a must.)

"Have I had (or do I need) training or retraining?

"Have I decided why I want to work?

"Have I investigated thoroughly (if I'm over 65) how a job will affect my social security payments?"

When assessing your background, consider the volunteer work you have done. Through work in church and civic groups, the PTA, scout leadership, or the myriad of other volunteer jobs available, you probably have developed skills and experience an employer wants. Thousands of older women have been placed in positions on the basis of their volunteer accomplishments.

If you have not worked for a period of time, or wish to try something new, it's a good idea to consult an expert in vocational guidance—generally available at vocational or high schools, in State employment offices or in private professional offices. These experts, at little or no cost, will test you to ascertain your fitness for the work you want and you then can determine whether and how much training you need. You might also consult your local Manpower, Inc., office about the possibilities open to you in the temporary help field, since part-time or periodic employment are often especially suited to the mature worker.

Refresher courses are good—both for technical and psychological reasons. A poor impression is made if you act unsure of your skill as a typist, for example, and it is excellent salesmanship to know the answer when asked, "How many words per minute?"

Courses, covering a variety of areas, are available in most sizable communities. Check with your local schools, colleges, Y's, and business institutes. You will find the type of training you want at a reasonable price. And don't be concerned about your age; you'll find many in the same age bracket when you get to class.

At this point you should ask yourself, "Why do I want to work?" Are you eager and interested in obtaining gainful employment? Do you feel that you have something to contribute, something to give of yourself?

Most mature women, whose family and other responsibilities are diminished, answer these questions with a resounding "Yes." Thanks to advances in health, improvement in household aids, and perhaps foremost, an altered mental attitude toward age, women in their fifties and sixties are rarin' to go. If you feel you have this mental outlook and are interested in playing a more active role, you've answered the "why" of working and should prove an asset to whatever firm you join.

The next step is to determine exactly what job you want. The Women's Division of the U.S. Department of Labor reports the best areas for mature women to seek employment are: offices, hotels, schools and institutions, the apparel market, restaurants, hospitals, beauty salons and retail stores.

Since you've earlier assessed your basic skills, look to these fields for the specific position which best suits you. Remember, the ability to choose a job which can best utilize your talents is important—to you as well as to your employer.

Briefly, we should consider how working will affect any social security benefits you are receiving or expect to receive shortly. Consult your local Social Security office. Here you will learn how much you can earn, when and how it will affect your benefits. You will also receive assistance in planning work which will still allow you to collect what's coming to you.

Decide now where you should seek employment by:

Checking your local newspaper help wanted ads.

Consulting your local Manpower, Inc., office.

Applying to local employment agencies, the State employment service, the Young Women's Christian Association, Knights of Columbus, or similar organizations.

Writing letters of application and making personal visits to possible employers.

The principal guide for the older worker, I believe, should always be to: turn maturity into an asset; feel certain of what you can do and train to do it as well as you can; make certain that the job you accept it one where you will, in every sense, fit into the picture.

If you can keep these guides in mind when job hunting, you're ready to go to work regardless of the year of your birth.

A Challenge to New England Outdoor Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Executive Director Thomas L. Kimball, of the National Wildlife Federation at the Silver Anniversary Sportsmen's Show Dinner of the New England Outdoor Writers Association on January 19, 1963, at the Hotel Kenmore, Boston, Mass.

The article is entitled "A Challenge to New England Outdoor Writers," but it might more correctly be denominated "Pollution: Blight to Our Nation and Shame to the Inadequate Efforts of the Public Health Service":

A CHALLENGE TO NEW ENGLAND OUTDOOR WRITERS

(NOTE.—Address by Executive Director Thomas L. Kimball at the silver anniversary Sportsmen's Show dinner of the New England Outdoor Writers Association, 7 p.m., January 19, 1963, Hotel Kenmore, Boston, Mass. Mr. Kimball is a former director of the Arizona and Colorado State Game and Fish Departments and is a graduate of Brigham Young University.)

President Beatrice, Miss Carson, gentlemen, please accept my thanks for the kind invitation to meet with you this evening. Such opportunities to enjoy Down East hospitality, New England seafood, and conversations with people whose opinions shape the thinking of millions of citizens are all too rare.

If you'll excuse me, I'd like to start things off by making a couple of personal observations. First, we all lost a good friend and respected leader when this State's division of fisheries and game director, Charley McLaughlin, passed away a few days ago. His untimely death dealt conservation in Massachusetts a blow from which it will take some time to recover. Charley's loss and the recent retirement of Roland Cobb, the respected commissioner of the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Game, have created a temporary leadership vacuum hereabouts.

You and I know there must be well-qualified men available to fill these responsible positions, and you molders of public opinion must see to it that good men are chosen.

As Interior Secretary Udall is fond of saying, this is the decade of the quiet crisis in conservation. Our State administrators—caught as they are between a too-apathetic public, which wants State services without providing State employees with adequate compensation, and a Federal bureaucracy that is ready to step in when the State falters—must be men of iron who will come forward with dynamic, forward-looking programs and see them through. I wish you luck. Replacing Charley and Roland will be most difficult.

Second, the National Wildlife Federation is deeply indebted to all of you for your assistance this past fall in getting the word out to New England outdoor enthusiasts that we were about to publish a new magazine and enlist individual associate members. Our initial membership campaign has been a grand success, and the credit for this goes in large measure to you.

At the risk of overlooking others who have helped us as much, I am going to make a special point of thanking Brother Henry Moore, of the Boston Herald, for his efforts along these lines which, we know, brought us hundreds of inquiries.

The charter issue of National Wildlife magazine was mailed to some 68,221 associate members, and the second issue, now just coming off the press, probably will go to over 70,000 conservation-conscious Americans. Thanks for your help.

Now to get down to business, New England is in the hot glare of the national conservation spotlight. Recent surveys of outdoor recreation needs have dramatized the fact that, while Uncle Sam has hundreds of millions of acres in public ownership, most of these acres are a long, long way from the county's centers of population. What's needed, say the planners, are public recreation areas near the people—within 50 miles of their homes. Their findings seem to indicate that the acquisition of a thousand acres of public beach or forest smack in the

middle of a northeastern urban area will add more to the Nation's welfare than the addition of another million acres to some far-flung Federal holding on the lone prairie.

Will these precious green acres be set aside in time? In large measure, it will be up to you to convince your readers that recreation land acquisition programs such as that so successfully initiated in New York State recently must be put into high gear soon or the chance will be gone.

One segment of our outdoor recreation-seeking public should be especially concerned about the future of its favorite sport—the hunters. Suburban sprawl is closing the gaps between cities, rolling over the fields and forests and eliminating thousands of acres of productive upland game coverts. The draining and filling of coastal marshes for trash dumps, industrial installations and homesites is tightening the noose around the neck of our duck populations. Pollution of our surface waters with sewage, industrial wastes, synthetic detergents, agricultural chemicals, oil, and silt is turning once-productive lake margins, river bottoms, and coastal marshes into open sewers—biological deserts where once the waterfowl, muskrats, beavers, otters, minks, raccoons, and other water-lovers dwelt. New highways and flood control dams are burying acre after acre of hunting land under concrete or deep water. As farm fields under cultivation get larger, game-sheltering shrubby fence rows become fewer in number. As training operations are intensified on military bases, public access to these huge, publicly owner tracts is denied.

The continued application of agricultural chemicals to New England fields, forests and marshes is upsetting natural wildlife food chains and resulting in the building up of concentrations of complex organic residues of who-knows-what long-range effect in the soil and water supplies.

If I were a New England gunner, I doubt if I'd eat the woodcock I shot anymore. Studies by Bruce S. Wright at the University of New Brunswick have shown that the meat of woodcock, which feed on earthworms which concentrate chemical poisons in their bodies, contains more DDT than I'm going to knowingly expose myself to.

The meat of deer and elk taken in Montana forests after aerial spraying was conducted also has been found to contain several parts per million of DDT, as have the carcasses of California pheasants.

And then, what potential hunting land is left is posted by landowners fed up with the disgusting behavior of a few gun-toting vandals—bums who, unless they are reported, apprehended, convicted, fined, and denied the right to hunt again for at least a year, will continue to give the traditional and health-restoring sport of recreational hunting an undeserved black eye.

Will public hunting still be an important form of outdoor recreation in New England when the 21st century rolls around? It will if you outdoor writers inspire the citizenry to demand high-caliber sportsmanship on the part of the hunters; intensive rural zoning and interagency coordination to keep productive acres as free as possible of the encroaching adjuncts of civilization and life-destroying chemical poisons; and a dedicated team of State game management specialists who will find ways to make the remnant hunting lands most productive and perhaps even find game birds and animals to fit habitats vacated by native species because of manmade changes.

To achieve these goals in crowded New England, you may have to call for stepped-up game law enforcement. You may need to make it harder to obtain a hunting license, to keep those who have poor vision or are unfamiliar with firearms out of the field. State laws requiring the approval of mass pesticide application programs, highway reroutings, and dam construction plans by State conservation departments may be needed. You know what your States need better than I.

But I do know that some changes will be called for. In this modern world, only the adaptable survive. New problems—population pressures, pesticides, pollution—must be met with new laws and new programs. You men are in an excellent position to spot the problems—and to suggest how they can best be solved.

Not that New England hasn't come up with a lot of good solutions to tough natural resources management problems, both old and new. It has. You can be proud of them. They include Connecticut's pioneer pesticide control law which gives the fish and game agency a chance to review applications for permits to conduct aerial pesticide spraying. They include Massachusetts' new marine fuel tax law which earmarks a percentage of the State gasoline tax for the purchase of access to public waters and for other boating and fishing improvements in the Bay State. Massachusetts' 95 municipal conservation commissions, thriving under the guidance of Hank Foster, the State's able natural resources department commisisoner, are proving that open-spaces preservation and watershed protection programs can be successfully conducted at the grassroots level without the necessity of Federal funding and control. And the Bay State's laws making the wearing of day-glow red or orange by deer hunters mandatory and requiring a certificate of firearms competency of youthful hunters before they can obtain licenses certainly seem to be saving lives. The "bonus scaup" rule this past duck season, which provided eastern gunners with additional sport, came at the request of New England game administrators.

I could go on patting you on the back, and you deserve it. But let's look at the job still ahead of us.

One continuing problem of great concern to conservationists is the so-called chemicals-in-the-environment threat to all life. Included under this heading are chemical pesticides as well as all the other toxic pollutants which befoul our air, land, and water. The importance of this threat was brought to the country's attention by Miss Rachel Carson recently in her book, "Silent Spring."

I'm sure you've all been receiving National Wildlife Federation releases stating our view that more education, more research, and more controls are needed to cope with the pesticides problem. Research people must find safer ways to apply existing chemicals, new chemicals toxic only to the target species, and effective nonchemical pest controls. Closer checking of new chemicals prior to their registration to determine their effects on fish and wildlife is needed, and concentrated chemicals should be dispensed on a prescriptionlike basis only to qualified persons, to avoid accidents.

The general public must be convinced that, while the use of insecticides and other chemical poisons may be the easy way out temporarily, it may cause real, long-range problems. Insects become resistant, beneficial as well as pest species are eliminated, soil and water supplies are contaminated, and prolonged exposure to pesticides may cause cancer and other forms of ill health.

The alternative to the chemicals-only approach is to work with nature, not against it. Fertile soil, good seed, and adequate water will eliminate crabgrass more permanently than poisons; tight bug screens and old-fashioned sanitary housekeeping will cut down on rodent and insect problems in the home without the necessity of resorting often to sprays. Birds can be encouraged to nest in one's yard and help keep the garden bug population down.

New techniques including the sterilization of male insects with chemicals or radiation, the use of chemical attractants and repellants, and the decimation of exotic pests by the introduction of their natural predators or diseases are paying off—with no chemical pesticide residues to worry about.

In this connection, I urge all of you join with the National Wildlife Federation and its State affiliates this March in promoting the 1963 observance of National Wildlife Week. The theme this year will be, "Chemical Pesticides Are Poison—Handle With Care." Your State Wildlife Week chairmen will be getting in touch with you shortly in this regard. I know we can count on your help on the important pesticides problem—a problem which not only sportsmen but every outdoor enthusiast wants to see solved.

Turning to another conservation problem that might hit close to home in New England, let's think for a minute about water pollution. This is an old one, but we're getting farther behind the eightball with it every year.

The "Second Annual Report on Municipal Waste Treatment Needs," dated January 1, 1962, disclosed a backlog of 5,290 communities serving 45 million people, requiring new sewage treatment plants, plant enlargements, or additional treatment. This was a net increase of 163 communities over the preceding year—communities serving 250,000 people.

On July 6, 1962, Gordon E. McCallum, Assistant Surgeon General in charge of water pollution abatement, confirmed these figures and frankly admitted the United States continues to lose ground in its fight against water pollution in spite of an expenditure of $2.1 billion in building needed facilities.

This $2 billion represents a 30-percent increase in construction over any previous year.

I would like to suggest where we might start in an effort to reverse the trend and produce more positive results in the fight for clean water.

A change in the approach and attitude of agencies and individuals responsible for water development programs is drastically needed. Too many of our major river basin developments are justified by citing the need for tremendous amounts of stored water for quality control. This is a polite expression more acceptable in parlor discussions than the more descriptive phrase of "pollution dilution."

The Surgeon General and the medical doctors in charge of the Federal pollution abatement programs, and the State health departments, seem to think in terms of how much filth a waterway can carry before it endangers public health. No matter what the pollution load in the supply, if water can be filtered and chlorine-treated so that epidemics are not too frequent—so that dysentery, polio, or other water-borne diseases are limited—or if you drink a glass of water and it doesn't kill you within 48 hours—a major accomplishment has been achieved.

Modern public and personal health techniques emphasize preventive medicine, and it is high time we practice preventive pollution control. Emphasis must be shifted to prohibiting all sources of water pollution from dumping their wastes and filth into our lakes and streams. This approach would not only benefit the public health of the citizenry, but would provide clean water for a multiplicity of other uses: good water to irrigate our farms and croplands, clean water for industrial growth, clean water to provide the environment for aquatic vegetation and associated organisms necessary to supply a bountiful sport and commercial fishery, and clean water for water-oriented recreation activities such as swimming, picnicking, camping and boating.

While there may be notable exceptions to the rule, the war against water pollution is being lost, and the States and local governments must accept the major share of

responsibility for that failure. In the minds of most people, there is no better reason for Federal intervention than the inability or unwillingness of local and State authorities to give the American people the clean waters they demand.

Congress recognized this fact when it enacted, in 1961, Public Law 87-88, increasing Federal construction grants, authorizing seven regional laboratories for research, investigation, and training; and extending Federal law enforcement to intrastate waters.

At the same time this law was passed, congressional committees were expressing displeasure with the manner in which the Federal water pollution abatement program was being managed. The Public Health Service was not presenting its budget, so Congress nor anyone else could tell exactly how much of the funds appropriated were actually to be spent on water pollution abatement programs.

The Water Pollution Control Division was buried in a maze of Federal bureaucracy—first as one of 178 branches, then upgraded to one of 31 divisions of the 4 bureaus within the U.S. Public Health Service. In this day and age of bureaucracy and "status" this could be compared to bringing this important program out of the subbasement and upgrading it to the basement.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers, whose primary responsibility in the water management field involves flood control and navigation, enjoys full "bureau" status and reports directly to the Secretary of the Army.

The Bureau of Reclamation's water management prerogatives lie in power development and irrigation. It, too, has full "bureau" status and reports to the Secretary of the Interior.

It is really an insult to the intelligence of thoughtful Americans that the most important water program of all—pollution abatement—is smothered by the bureaucracy of the Public Health Service, stifled by the empire building of medical doctors, and relegated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to a status of minor importance in the Federal establishment.

Conservationists in general have been completely disillusioned by the administration of the water pollution control program by an hierarchy of medical doctors and the lack of aggressive leaderships necessary to clean our waters. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The Good Book has a better axiom: "By their fruits ye shall know them." I refer again to the fact that we are falling farther behind each year in the effort to abate water pollution.

Facing up to the fact that aggressive leadership at the Federal level was lacking, the President's Water Pollution Advisory Board, in a momentous decision in St. Louis recently, passed a resolution that the Water Pollution Control Division be made a separate administration outside the control of the Public Health Service, and reporting directly to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President's Committee is supported in this recommendation by practically all national conservation organizations. The Izaak Walton League, Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the National Wildlife Federation, and the labor movement (AFL-CIO) support this approach to organization at the Federal level, as well as the American Municipal Association.

The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, Congressman from Minnesota's Eighth District, and chairman of the powerful House Committee on Public Works, supports an independent Water Pollution Control Administration, and a bill to this effect, authored by him, is to be introduced into the current session of Congress.

As I said last December 6 in Chicago, before the State and Interstate Pollution Control Administrators, I am firmly convinced the people of this great democracy want clean waters and they want some progress toward achievement now. Falling farther behind in water pollution abatement will be tolerated no longer. We must and will have clean and pure lakes, streams, rivers, and waterways even if it means Federal encroachment into areas where local or State authorities have failed to accomplish objectives within a reasonable length of time; even if it means that when the foul and murky polluted waters of our Nation finally clear, they will expose the shattered careers of of those Federal and State officials who had responsibility and opportunity to achieve the stated objectives, the accomplishment of which eluded them somehow because of petty partisan politics, empire building jurisdictional disputes, or in general the lack of those leadership qualities necessary to get the job done.

One postscript: As your president, Mr. Beatrice, noted when requesting me to speak on the subject of pollution, water pollution problems in seaboard States involve not only fresh water but salt water. The world is small and getting smaller, and communities can no longer just pipe their sewage and other wastes into the ocean and forget them. This was brought to my attention recently during discussions of various ways to dispose of sewage from the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. One means suggested was simply to pipe the treatment plant effluent around the Potomac Tidal Basin to the Chesapeake Bay. This proposal was not considered seriously because no one wanted to risk polluting productive Chesapeake Bay.

Probably one of the saddest aspects of coastal and offshore pollution concerns the dumping of oil by ships and the resultant destruction of countless thousands of ducks and seabirds. Several national conservation organizations are working closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on this problem, and the Service, in turn, is working with the U.S. State Department on amendments to strengthen the 1954 International Convention on Oil Disposal by Ships which may be ratified by Congress soon. The most important of these has to do with the providing of port facilities to dispose of oily wastes.

By interspersing so-called think-pieces on these conservation problems between your regular columns on "who's catching what where," you'll be doing both yourselves and the general public a favor. Thoughtful readers will be attracted to your column, and will, in turn, take action to resolve the many natural resources management problems which confront us today.

Before I close, I would like to bring to your attention the fact that the National Wildlife Federation's six New England affiliate organizations—Massachusetts Conservation Council, Connecticut State League of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc., Maine Natural Resources Council, Federated Sportsmen's Clubs of New Hampshire, Inc., Rhode Island Wildlife Federation, Inc., Vermont Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.—exist to work on the State level on such conservation problems as we have discussed this evening, and that our northeastern field representative, Dr. John D. Bulger, of Pulaski, N.Y., works closely with these groups constantly to improve their effectiveness.

Should you be interested in the reasons behind my views on the proposed northeast flyway—I prefer species management to the creation of a new flyway—or any other conservation topic of interest, I will be glad to answer your questions. As any rate, I have enjoyed talking to you, and wish the New England Outdoor Writers Association success in all its endeavors. Thank you.

Dr. Richard B. Roberts' Views on Nuclear Testing

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing has received and distributed a series of papers on the question of nuclear testing in order that the Congress and the public might be better informed on this vital subject. It is preparing for distribution a compilation of arguments for and against a test ban treaty. To insure a balance in the experts' papers between authorities who might be for or against a test ban, papers were solicited from three experts nominated by the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy. Dr. James Killian, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, former science advisor to President Eisenhower, one of those solicited, regretted that he had become "out of date on the whole nuclear test problem" and did not have the time to do the research necessary to write a paper within the time set for submission. Dr. I. I. Rabi, physics department, Columbia University, has not yet replied. The paper solicited from Dr. Richard B. Roberts, a prominent physicist of the department of terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington, has been received. Of particular interest is Dr. Roberts' opinion that should the Soviets wish to avoid the restrictions of a test ban treaty they might be expected to do so under conditions of open abrogation rather than clandestine testing. Dr. Roberts' paper follows:

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN

(By Richard B. Roberts)

The attention which you are directing toward the test ban is well deserved. The issues are complex and the facts needed to form a considered judgment are not readily available. You will be doing a great service to the Nation if you can bring before the public the careful and objective analysis of the pros and cons given in the statement sent to your committee by Mr. William C. Foster.

Just as a bargain cannot be clearly to the sole advantage of the buyer or the seller, any arms control measure will involve compromises. These measures must provide mutual benefits. If they were clearly to the one-sided advantage of the United States they would induce no controversy at home but they would be clearly unacceptable to Russia. The decision whether or not any measure is in the interest of the United States must therefore depend upon a careful weighing of the advantages and hazards.

Individual enthusiasts who do not carry the responsibility for decision often fail to make such a balanced judgment. They frequently overemphasize one or another aspect of testing and ignore all others. The hazards to health from fallout are real, but at one time they were exaggerated. At present the risks of a test ban are being equally exaggerated by proponents of continued testing.

These well-meaning advisors seem to appreciate that the invention of fusion weapons which might be cheap and which could spread into irresponsible hands would be

dangerous to the United States. Furthermore, they agree that continued testing will accelerate this unwanted and unmanageable development. They do not seem to understand that a test ban would at least deter testing and postpone the advent of fusion weapons. Finally, they imply that the new dangers arising from fusion weapons could be neutralized if the United States also added fusion weapons to its arsenal. They fail to recognize that there would be no compensating value to the United States. We already have ample supplies of fission weapons; fusion weapons could add little to our strategic power. All of their worries were considered in Mr. Foster's analysis but were put into proper perspective.

In addition, the advocates of testing emphasize the peaceful uses of clean nuclear explosives and are in frantic haste to obtain them. In my opinion we have greater need for time to assimilate the present revolution in technology than need for any new innovations. If, however, they think industrial fusion power is desirable and important it is surprising that they did not suggest an open international development. Instead they seem to prefer secret national programs which would allow Russia to obtain the greatest advantage from its closed society.

Clandestine testing does not appear to be an attractive policy for any nation. Such a program would be costly and cumbersome. The tests would be restricted to underground shots which have limits to their utility. Seismic detection has improved rapidly in the past few years and there is no reason to believe that this progress has reached any fundamental limit. New information gathering systems such as reconnaissance satellites are in development. Finally, extensive clandestine testing is likely to come to the attention of our usual intelligence system. There is no reason to believe that evasion could be guaranteed for any significant series of tests.

As long as the test ban includes the right to make a small number of on-site inspections (mainly to provide incontestable evidence of events already known) the Soviets can be expected to choose open abrogation rather than clandestine tests if they decide to resume testing. Past experience has shown that Russia did not bother with elaborate concealment as was frequently predicted, but carried out its tests in defiance of world opinion.

In summary, I cannot agree with the advice given you by some of my fellow physicists. As weapons specialists they overemphasize the importance of further refinements in weapons. Other features which are equally important must also be considered. Therefore, I find that the evaluation made by the responsible leaders of the Government is more valid and convincing because it is based on broader grounds. The importance of the test ban is long range and symbolic. It would serve as a practical demonstration that mutually beneficial arms control measures, leading toward a safer world, can be negotiated.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, friends of freedom throughout the world commemorated the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's independence as a nation. This tiny but proud country fell under the yoke of Communist oppression on the 15th of June 1940. Unfortunately, Lithuania was one of the first sovereign states to fall prey to Russian imperialism. Its bondage is a vivid example of Red colonialism.

By remembering Lithuania's day of national independence, we not only strike a blow for freedom but keep the flame of hope alive for those living behind the Iron Curtain. I wish to commend the Lithuanian American Information Center of New York City and, in my own congressional district, the American Lithuanian Citizens Club and the United American-Lithuanian Relief Fund for their energetic efforts to advance the cause of freedom for their friends and relatives now in Communist captivity.

Just West of Illinois Is a Good Place To Be—Address by Prof. Leslie W. Dunlap, Director of University Libraries, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues will recall the article by Philip Roth in the December 1962 issue of Esquire magazine in which Mr. Roth has some unkind things to say about my native State of Iowa.

Rather than dismiss Mr. Roth as a brash outlander who is writing more from the demands of his pocketbook than he is from the demands of his heart, native Iowans and adopted sons have rushed to the defense of this fair State, its people, its mores, and its culture.

In this defense we have become all the more proud of some of the wonderful things for which Iowa stands—excellence in higher education; some of the finest food in the Nation; our contributions to the culture of the world through the Grant Woods, the Meredith Willsons, the Octave Thanets, the Susan Glaspells, the Phil Stongs, the Frederick Bissells, the Bix Beiderbeckes, the Margaret Roberts and others; those people the Nation respects—the Herbert Hoovers, the James Van Allens; our high literacy rate; our tolerance toward minorities—of which Mr. Roth is one—and many more characteristics which have enriched the life of America and people who have added to its stature.

Of all of those who have come to the defense of Iowa, none has done it more eloquently than a man who had adopted Iowa because it is something special, Mr. Leslie Dunlap, director of the university libraries at the State University of Iowa. A speech which Mr. Dunlap made recently has been reprinted in the Iowa City Press Citizen and I feel that Mr. Dunlap's remarks should have further circulation by appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his remarks at this time:

JUST WEST OF ILLINOIS IS A GOOD PLACE TO BE

(Address by Prof. Leslie W. Dunlap)

After being asked to speak, I thought about what I could say which might be of interest to a group of music librarians meeting in Iowa, and I decided to talk about working and living in this State. I should explain at the outset that I, too, am new to Iowa, but this makes it easier for me to deny the imputation that the land which produces corn and hogs necessarily possesses a corny culture.

Americans always have been hurt by critical comments implying cultural lag. You probably can point to hackneyed statements regarding the failure of our country to produce a Mozart or a Verdi just as students of American literary history are familiar with the contemptuous queries of Sidney Smith which appeared in 1820 in the Edinburgh Review: "In the four quarters of the globe, who reads an American book, or goes to an American play, or looks at an American picture or statue?"

Smith's example was followed in the 19th century by visitors to our shores, but haughtiness of this sort is out of fashion in the 20th. The vogue of today is for our countrymen who live on either coast to belittle the cultural achievements of the Midwest. Iowa has received recently more than its share of such abuse, and I am moved to frame an answer.

An especially annoying indictment of this locality by Philip Roth appeared in the December 1962 issue of Esquire in an article which, if you read, you did not believe, otherwise, you would not be here today. My title comes from Philip Roth's first line, "Iowa Is Just West of Illinois." and the last line in the same paragraph reads. "I have as much trouble naming Western States as naming birds and flowers." Truly, a pitiful admission from a professional writer.

Philip Roth was born in 1933 in Newark, N.J., and he attended Bucknell University and the University of Chicago before he became, in 1960, a lecturer in the University of Iowa Writer's Workshop.

During his 2-year residence in Iowa City, Roth did not read regularly an Iowa paper, nor, if we may judge from his article, did he travel in Iowa except to and from Chicago. Roth's title, "Iowa, a Very Far Country, indeed," suggests that he deals with this State and its people, but he does not go beyond Iowa City and the nearby Amana colonies and his complaints are largely those of disaffected graduate students from urban centers in the East.

Roth's indictment of life in Iowa City is long and varied. His night life was restricted to dining at George's Pizza Palace followed by art movies where he and his wife munched on butternut crunch. Afterward, they visited Kenneys, which features varied domestic and foreign brews and poor illumination. If we can believe Roth in his article, the university's crowded schedule of plays, lectures, and concerts never lured him, nor did he seek refuge in our main library building which is open 6 nights a week until 2 o'clock in the morning. The only mention he makes of our library is to liken the appearance of the shelves in the State liquor store to our bookstacks. But this resemblance is not apt, because the shelves in the library are open while those in the liquor store are discreetly closed.

Roth rails at Iowa's liquor laws—which, by the way, may soon be changed since our Governor-elect made "liquor by the drink" a successful campaign issue—and he was not amused by the bibulous oddities which sur-

round us. Roth pins the label of "creeping socialism" on Iowa's State owned and operated liquor stores, and he found the multiple forms to be beyond his comprehension.

Local news items in the Iowa City paper and the undisguised Republicanism of the Des Moines Register drove Roth to subscribe to the New York Times. Since the Times understandably does not reach Iowa City until several days after issuance, Roth's sense of chronology often became confused, and he was overwhelmed when he returned from a trip out of town and found a mountain of newspapers since he had failed to cancel his subscription.

At this point, the reader of the December issue of Esquire is likely to conclude that Roth's complaint simply is that Iowa City bears little resemblance to New York and its environs, but this he surely knew before he came.

A fairer picture of this "Very Far Country" would delineate Iowa's distinctive weaknesses and strengths. For 5 years in a row, Iowa cattle feeders have won the coveted blue ribbon for the best steer shown at the International Live Stock Exposition in Chicago, and 2 years ago this State unveiled the most successful embezzler in the annals of American finance—the 58-year-old daughter of a banker in northwest Iowa who had endeared herself to her fellow townsmen through benefactions with their money.

The curbs on our highways—placed there to keep erosive waters off adjoining fields—are a hazard and a disgrace, and our drinking water in the spring has a vile odor and taste which cannot be concealed in strong coffee or tea. For the water which we drink—and you are drinking today—comes from the Iowa River, and the spring thaws yield a runoff from the fields which must be treated with large amounts of chlorine. The prospect of drinking water from a nearby river was new to me when I came to Iowa City but it certainly is better to drink from a river than to empty waste in it.

In my view, the chief problem which confronts Iowa is to create a government which will fairly reflect recent population shifts from farms to urban communities within the State. Unless this is done, Iowa will continue to suffer an unrepresentative legislature, and her people, particularly her young people, will feel that their birthright has slipped away and will seek it in greener pastures.

On the other side of the ledger, Iowa possesses a bountiful, tillable soil which makes it one of the chief food producing areas in the world. Newcomers are told that they are likely to gain 10 pounds in their first year, and most of us paid this or a higher price. This State also has enviable water resources in the Mississippi and Missouri and Sioux Rivers which form her eastern and western boundaries, and in the many tributaries which have carved deep valleys into the countryside.

Iowa is at the crossroads of America insofar as the center of population and main transportation routes are concerned, and the prospects for healthy economic growth are bright if the governmental structure undergoes the overdue transformation.

The greatest resource of any region is its people, and of these there are 2¾ million in Iowa plus hundreds of thousands in Chicago, Minneapolis, New York City, and Long Beach, Calif. The residents who are distributed fairly evenly over the State, stem from hardy stocks of northern Europeans who came principally to make a better living. Their industry frequently brought prosperity and sometimes wealth, much of which has been plowed back into the support of Iowa's 27 4-year colleges, innumerable churches, and varied municipal enterprises.

The real leaders in the social and economic life in this community are much more visible than I have found them to be elsewhere, and members of this "in group" are characterized by an invariable desire to be helpful. Occasionally one hears, "You can't do that in Iowa," but a fairer picture reveals a "show me" attitude which rightly must be satisfied before it will embrace an innovation proposed by an Illinoisan—which I am not, but I am often thought to be since I moved to Iowa from Illinois.

The candor of Iowans is refreshing: I recall the welcome which the mayor of Mason City extended to librarians at a conference of the Iowa Library Association in his city. After encouraging the conferees to pursue their deliberations regardless of the minutes left on parking meters, the mayor explained that his city had no courtesy tags for visitors; "However," he added, "if any of you receive a ticket, I shall be glad to fix it for you."

Iowans may not be more honest than other Americans, yet this is the first place I have lived where I leave my car to be repaired or serviced confident that what is needed will be done—this and nothing more.

As to music in Iowa, I know little more than I read in the papers which Philip Roth could not abide. During Thanksgiving week, Charles Treger, an associate professor of music in this university and a member of the Iowa string quartet which will play for you, won the Weiniawski solo violin competition in Poland; and 18 teenagers in Iowa City, members of the Charles Treger or James Dixon fan clubs, joined in honoring their teachers in a concert of works by Tchaikovsky, Mozart, and Bach.

During the same week, the 16th annual State high school music festival was held in Des Moines. More than 1,000 teenagers participated: 269 in the band, 202 in the orchestra, and 600 in the chorus. Their concert in the vast and barny KRNT theater was a sellout, and a video tape was televised the next day under the cosponsorship of the American Dairy Association and the Iowa Dairy Industry Commission. This recalls melodies beloved in "River City," especially "76 Trombones," but this is only the beginning.

The university which is proud to be your host supports the Scottish Highlanders, the largest bagpipe band in the world, a group of 75 young women who play the pipes and drums and dance above crossed swords and on a raised drum at football games. And once every 4 years this group travels to Europe where, according to Iowa papers, the kilted lassies win the plaudits and hearts of large audiences on the Continent and in Scotland itself. Every loyal Hawkeye relished the inevitable triumph of our bonnie Highlanders over Bailee Frank Magee in the now celebrated "Aberdeen Incident."

The story goes like this: On their quadrennial trips to Europe, each Highlander pays her own major expenses, but bills resulting from extra travel for concerts are guaranteed by the host cities. During their 1952 trip, the Scottish Tourist Board offered visits and performances by the Highlanders to a number of cities if the local authorities would provide transportation from Edinburgh and return and for meals and lodging for the girls. When this proposal was presented to the Aberdeen City Council, Councilman Frank Magee objected that Iowa Highlanders would "turn out to be a group of chorus girls playing be-bop on the bagpipes," and the council voted not to invite the girls to appear.

Six Aberdeen businessmen gallantly furnished the requisite guarantee; and the girls, clad in kilts of three tartans, red and blue blouses, and Highland feather bonnets or Glengarry caps, piped and drummed themselves across Pittodrie soccer field. Twenty-thousand citizens of Aberdeen had parted with something between a shilling and a pound to enjoy the sport. The Aberdeen Military Band opened with "The Star Spangled Banner," and the Highlanders piped, sang, and danced 12 numbers, including Scottish airs, Ravel's "Bolero", and finally, "God Save the King."

As the Highlanders marched off the field, the Aberdeen Military Band struck up, "Will Ye Nae Come Back Again?" And 20,000 Scots joined in the song. Dour Frank Magee and several highly regarded Scottish pipe majors belittled the musicianship of our brave Highlanders, but their voices went unheard amid the acclamation. And I assure you that their base cavils were not reported in Hawkeyeland.

In truth, just west of Illinois is a good place to be, and we who live here want our colleagues in the Music Library Association to enjoy our visit. Please call on us if we may help in any special way.

Dallas High School Debate Team Defeats 117 Rivals in Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce the victory of a debate team from Jesuit High School in Dallas last weekend in the National Invitational High School Cherry Blossom Tournament sponsored by Georgetown University. The Jesuit High School students, Rick Atkinson and Jim Turner, competed against 117 other high schools, public and private, representing 20 States. The debate topic was "That the United States Should Provide a Common Market for the Western Hemisphere." The Jesuit team took the affirmative side in the final debate, but debated both sides of the question in the course of the tournament. Jim Turner also won an award as third highest ranking speaker out of all the orators in the tournament.

Mr. Speaker, this achievement by a team representing one of our fine Dallas high schools is another indication of the fine record of Dallas County. It is natural for Dallas to lead. Our people have always prided themselves on getting things done and as a result we have one of the greatest metropolitan areas of the Nation. Our achievements in industry, retailing, education, and cultural activities are a constant wonder to people everywhere. It always gives me great satisfaction to announce the achievements of Dallas people and to call attention to the fact that our progress as a community, in every field, is done through the efforts of our own people.

That success in scholastic achievement is not confined to one Dallas high school was stressed by Rev. Father Herlong, of Jesuit, talking of the friendly rivalry between the various school debate teams. He said the Dallas students have a close

bond with one another. He told how this was demonstrated last year in an intercity debate in which Bryan Adams, a public high school, and Jesuit competed. Jesuit was declared the winner and when the announcement was made, the whole Bryan Adams team stood up and cheered. Father Herlong paid tribute to Bryan Adams as well as Garland High School and said they are both on a par with Jesuit and he feels that in last week's tournament they would have done as well and perhaps even better than Jesuit.

Incidently, on a personal note, Father Herlong is a distant cousin of our colleague, Congressman SID HERLONG, of Florida.

"Shared Time as I See It"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, there was recently a "meeting of the minds" of five people concerning a very important issue in American education. These five have a common heritage, and two of them are from my district. Since I consider the article to be of national interest regardless of whether there is agreement or disagreement concerning all the contents, I, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, include the article "Shared Time as I See It."

The article follows:

SHARED TIME AS I SEE IT

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director, American Federation of Teachers)

INTRODUCTION

I am honored today to discuss shared time with four dear, old friends from Missouri. These gentlemen have been educational leaders in their fields for years. These are: Dr. W. W. Carpenter, professor emeritus of education of the University of Missouri, who assisted in the development of the postwar Japanese school system; Mr. R. F. Wood, professor emeritus of American history and government of Central Missouri State College, who was one of the writers of the modern Missouri constitution; Dr. Calvin E. Harbin, professor of education of Fort Hays State College and a consultant of many educational programs in Kansas; and Dr. August M. Hintz, pastor, North Shore Baptist Church, Chicago, and a leader in the American Baptist Convention.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Dr. CARPENTER. Does "shared time" have a dictionary definition?

Answer. "Shared time'" is too new in educational terminology to have a dictionary definition, even though it has existed in isolated places for many years. At our second conference in New York, on November 12, a definition was given that included many of the essential concepts. The definition voiced there was that shared time is "an educational system sanctioned by law which permits parents to enroll their children in both public and nonpublic schools at the same time."

Mr. WOOD. Do you consider "shared time" the same as dismissed or released time?

Answer. No, it is different than either dismissed or released time.

Dr. HARBIN. How did you become a party to this issue of "shared time"?

Answer. My two studies, entitled "Historical Justification for Federal Aid to Education" and "Some Constitutional Prohibitions Against Financial Aid to Private Schools," interested the Committee on Religious and Public Education and the Committee on Weekday Religious Education, who invited me to New York City to discuss shared time with them.

Dr. HINTZ. How many conferences have been held by your committee in New York?

Answer. The first conference was held in October of 1961 and the second conference was held in November of 1962.

Mr. WOOD. How representative would you say your committee is?

Answer. I would answer that by quoting from an article of mine entitled "Shared Time: A New Approach in American Education," which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 1, 1962. "Fifty-nine public educators, religious leaders, and private educators met to discuss a new approach in American education. The group included the superintendents of schools of three large cities, a former U.S. Commissioner of Education, a leader in the Roman Catholic church, similar leaders in the Lutheran and Methodist churches, a well-known Jewish lawyer and writer, an editor of a major educational publication, a major administrator of a large university, and a major general."

Dr. HINTZ. Why hasn't the public been more completely informed concerning these meetings?

Answer. I would answer that by again quoting from the same article as follows: "Each came as an individual. The meeting was held without news releases and each returned to tell the story as fully as he desired."

Dr. CARPENTER. Why did each of you go as individuals and not as representatives of organizations?

Answer. Most of the organizations took no official action, because it was deemed desirable first to have adequate discussion of the issues. I would further add that the American Federation of Teachers has still taken no action, and this is common among the groups.

Mr. WOOD. You mentioned that shared time has existed in isolated places in the Nation for some time. Can you be specific about this?

Answer. Yes. There has been a program in operation in the area of Pittsburgh, Pa., since 1912. This program still exists in Allegheny County and in Pittsburgh. Programs have existed in Hartford, Conn., and Hamilton, Ohio.

Dr. CARPENTER. I am concerned about the terminology "educational system sanctioned by law." Have there been any statutory provisions made to take care of this concept?

Answer. There is a difference of opinion as to the answer to this question, as far as the participants were concerned. The Department of School Superintendents of the National Catholic Education Association recently prepared a summary concerning this point, and it was quoted at the meeting. The summary listed Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, as States permitting shared time. Also, they listed 10 States where shared time is not permitted, and this list included Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Utah. Finally, in the third category, they listed four States that had no statutory provisions for "shared time." These are: Louisiana, Maine, Missouri, and New Jersey.

I take exception to their summary, however, because it contains only the opinions of Catholic school superintendents in those States, and these statutes were enacted before shared time was an issue. You will recall that we have had several U.S. Supreme Court cases where the Justices would go back and study the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States, and quite often the Justices have come to the conclusion that the framers of the Constitution had no intent as far as certain modern concepts were concerned. It would be about the same as expecting you to tell me what next week's newspaper is going to say. "Shared time," to my thinking, is a new concept in the minds of most people and has not been thought of sufficiently to be provided in the statutes of our States.

Dr. HINTZ. Then you are questioning whether it is an "educational system sanctioned by law"?

Answer. Yes.

Dr. HARBIN. If it is not an "educational system sanctioned by law," should it be?

Answer. I do not consider it necessary to be sanctioned by law. I realize I have become involved in a controversy that dates back to Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, often expressed in terms of strict construction versus loose construction. I happen to share Mr. Hamilton's idea that loose construction is much more desirable as a constitutional concept. In the case of "shared time," I thus think it might be unwise to make it a statutory provision.

Mr. WOOD. How would you then expect shared time to expand as an educational concept?

Answer. First, I would assume that anything that provides for the general welfare would not be unconstitutional unless and until challenged and a decision handed down. In other words, as long as we have no provision for shared time, and as long as it may improve the educational product and does not contravene any ruling of the State department of education, it would not be unconstitutional unless and until challenged and an opinion handed down by the attorney general, or a decision by the court.

Second, in school law, you will recall, that a section of cases is built around the concept of "extra legal" and a number of important principles have been resolved by the use of this concept. Extra legal may be illustrated along the line of discretion. Yakel wrote, "The Legal Control of the Administration of Public School Expenditures," in 1929, and illustrates this principle as follows: "Discretion granted to boards of education. * * * Once a power has been given to a board of education to do any particular thing, the courts have been inclined to give it rather broad powers of discretion, and usually the courts will not interfere unless there is a "clear abuse of discretion." It is ample for shared time to be given the status of extra legal.

Dr. CARPENTER. Can "shared time" solve the impasse that currently exists concerning pupils relating to Federal aid to education?

Answer. Yes. I think it has great possibilities in this area; because if shared time becomes a national principle, it will reduce the financial obligations of parochial schools and thus reduce their interest in securing Federal aid to education, and at the same time, would increase the obligation of the public schools and thus increase their opportunities for securing additional Federal aid.

Dr. HARBIN. How would this work?

Answer. The concept of shared time does not mean the same to all people, but it is my interpretation that when we refer to the definition "permit parents to enroll their children in both public and nonpublic schools at the same time," we mean, children attending private schools can be enrolled to

attend public schools a part of each day and take such courses as homemaking, industrial arts, and physical education. This would reduce the number of courses being offered by the private schools and thus permit them to have some relief from the current heavy financial burden they have at present. At the same time, the public schools would be assuming additional responsibilities and thus have a higher priority on the tax dollar.

Dr. CARPENTER. May I return to the use of the term "aid"? To me the word "aid" is poorly chosen and in my writings, I always use "participation."

Answer. I believe your point is well taken. In the 1958 edition of "Survey of Teachers' Salaries," I said, on page 3: "Also, the term 'Federal aid to education' should be changed to 'Federal participation in education.' As many people think of any program where the word 'aid' is used as somewhat of a relief situation, and certainly this should not be true in education." I have, however, used the terms "Federal aid" and "State aid" in this discussion for the benefit of the lay public.

Mr. WOOD. Do you conceive that shared time might work the opposite, that is, permit the children in the public schools to attend the private schools a part of each day?

Answer. No. I think this would require legislation, and I would doubt that the legislation would be constitutional. Furthermore, it would be unfair to place additional financial burdens on private schools, because, I believe, it is clearly unconstitutional to provide State aid for private schools. This is outlined in my study entitled, "Some Constitutional Prohibitions Against Financial Aid to Private Schools."

Dr. CARPENTER. Are there other concepts than financial in considering shared time?

Answer. Yes. I believe one of them is the chance to reduce class size in private schools. We note that the current class size in public schools is too high and studies indicate that it is much higher in private schools. I call your attention to my study entitled, "The Limitation of Class Size."

Dr. HARBIN. What then, do you consider the proper class size?

Answer. Class size should be held at no more than 25 pupils, and this should not be an average.

Mr. WOOD. What would be another advantage?

Answer. It would reduce competition and create cooperation between public and private schools. At the present time, the children who attend private schools in a given community live in a different world from those who attend public schools. There is very little meeting of the minds between the two groups and where there is no close intercourse between groups, there is a danger to our free society. We need the support of private schools in voting bond issues and school levies. At the same time, we need the support of graduates of public schools to promote legislation guaranteeing the right of parents to send their children to the schools of their choice.

Dr. CARPENTER. Can you see other advantages?

Answer. Yes. At least one additional one of these is in the area of curriculum improvement. Since quality education must always be an important factor in American education, we must constantly be improving our product. You probably read the article in U.S. News & World Report, dated December 17, 1962, entitled, "Are Europe's Schools Actually Better Than Those in the United States?" You will recall that, in this article, five European countries were studied. These were: Great Britain, France, West Germany, U.S.S.R., and Switzerland, and that the United States outranked these other nations in three of the four categories. Since, however, there is constant pressure to improve the product in each of the countries, we must do likewise here in America.

I would conceive that we could have Federal moneys for further experimentation in education in the subjects that the public schools would teach all the children.

Dr. HARBIN. Has the National Government shown any concern for shared time?

Answer. Yes. Congressman POWELL, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, called a preliminary meeting in November of 1962, in New York, to discuss the idea; and more recently, he has said that he plans for his congressional committee to study it carefully in 1963. Also, his committee has published "Pioneer Ideas in Education," and a section, where I am quoted, is entitled "Shared Time."

Dr. CARPENTER. Before we close this discussion, I desire to say that I have never publicly advocated Federal or State support of the education of non-public-school children. However, I have always believed that in our democracy we must educate all of the children of all of our people. In 1928, I wrote a long article on "The Rights and Privileges of American Schoolchildren."

Answer. I believe your statement is another reason for shared time.

CONCLUSIONS

Gentlemen, it has been an honor to discuss "shared time" with you. I firmly believe it has become a common educational theory and that it may became an educational principle that will solve the current impasse in the Congress concerning additional Federal participation in education.

Responsibility in Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the State and interstate water pollution control administrators meeting at the Sheraton-Chicago Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on December 6, 1962.

In this excellent speech Secretary Quigley apprizes the State adminstrators of not only the need for vigor by their respective State agencies, but also advises wisely and in the public interest of the basic policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the Federal Government under Public Law 660 and its amendments, that the Federal Government by law shall and should enter into areas where interstate pollution is rampant to initiate proceedings for the abatement of that pollution.

It is speeches like this which will do much to lay to rest misunderstandings about Federal authority and responsibility under the water pollution control law of these United States.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES M. QUIGLEY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Gentlemen, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak to you. I have accepted your invitation in good faith. I have every reason to believe that the invitation extended by your officers represents a good faith effort on their part to improve something that is usually referred to as Federal-State relations in matters of water pollution control. It is in this same spirit that I have accepted and for this same purpose that I have come.

Having said that I am here primarily to make what contribution I can toward improving Federal-State relations in the field of water pollution control, let me hasten to add that I am not entirely certain what it is I seek to improve. Federal-State relations is one of those catchall phrases that seems to mean so many things to so many people that I am not sure what it does mean. Too often I have observed that the term "Federal-State relations" is used in a strictly negative sense. Federal-State relations is the reason given why we at HEW should not do this, or why we should not do it the way we had planned or why we should not do it at this time. Until Blutcher Poole asked me to come to this meeting I can't recall anybody ever using Federal-State relations as a basis for my doing anything. Always it has been a reason for not acting or an excuse for inaction.

Needless to say, I appreciate this positive development and trust that by this meeting we will all be able to make a substantial contribution toward improving Federal-State relations in a program area of mutual interest.

If this meeting is to have positive results I think that it is absolutely essential that the balance of today be devoted to a frank and honest discussion of the problems we face. If such discussions are not achieved, then, I submit, I will be wasting my time here, you will be wasting yours, and all of us will be wasting the taxpayers' money which was spent to bring us here.

To avoid any such abuse of the poor taxpayer and, in the interest of getting such a discussion started, I would like at this time to speak my mind frankly.

I have already indicated that I am not at all sure what people mean when they talk about Federal-State relations. Perhaps, then, the most important contribution I could make to this discussion is to state what I believe is or should be encompassed by the phrase "Federal-State relations" when it is used in connection with the matters of our mutual interest—water pollution control.

The first and most essential ingredient to a workable formula for good Federal-State relations in this area is a clear recognition by everybody concerned at both the State and Federal level that both the States and the Federal Government are involved in water pollution control matters.

This, as you are well aware, was not always so. I am not unmindful that many of you resisted, some rather vigorously, the idea of the Federal Government becoming involved in a matter which traditionally you had handled at the State and local level. You had every right to fight such a fight. But, let's face it, that fight is now over and done. The Federal Government is in the water pollution control business. In the year 1962 this is the plain unvarnished fact.

It is around this unvarnished, though for some of you, perhaps, unpleasant fact that any question of Federal-State relations must center. If you refuse to accept this fact, if your efforts are directed to fighting a rear guard action against what Congress has done, if you deem it your role to set up

pockets of resistance against Federal action, or if you are willing to have the Federal Government come into your State only on your terms then, indeed, the going is going to be rough for all of us.

If, every time the Federal Government attempts to carry out its responsibilities in the field of water pollution control which involves your State, you consider it to be your function to quibble over every technicality and to take advantage of every dilatory tactic your lawyers can dream up, then neither the cause of Federal-State relations or of water pollution control are likely to be advanced very quickly or very smoothly.

And I think you will agree with me that the spectacle of a State walking out on a Federal water pollution control conference or of an interstate agency, acting more on the basis of rumor and suspicion rather than knowledge and fact, passing a formal resolution denouncing the Federal Government can hardly be construed as conduct calculated to improve Federal-State relations.

Yet is is in the face of such recent actions that we are here assembled to discuss ways and means of improving Federal-State relations in the field of water pollution control. Let me be blunt, I interpret such actions as coming much closer to an open declaration of war against the Federal Government than a pledge to work together as allies in a mutual effort to defeat the common enemy of dirty water.

We are—or at least we should be—in this fight together.

If the Federal Government is in the water pollution control business it does not follow that the States are out of it. Quite the contrary: the act of Congress which projected the Federal Government into water pollution matters clearly spelled out that it is "the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the states in preventing and controlling water pollution." I know of no person in either the legislative or executive branch of your Federal Government who is in disaccord with that policy. I know of no act by any individual within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that has been in violation of this policy of States' rights and states' responsibilities. If you know of any, I would appreciate it if you would bring it to my attention immediately.

Even if there were no clearly expressed congressional policy there would be no desire on the part of the Federal Government to nudge anybody out of the water pollution control field. Commonsense dictates that whatever the Federal Government accomplishes in this area it can never do more than supplement what the States are doing. This is true not just in water pollution matters but in all well conceived programs of Federal aid. The vast Federal highway construction program did not put the States out of the business of building and maintaining a road system. The Hill-Burton program of Federal aid for hospital construction did not relieve the States and local communities of maintaining hospitals. A basket full of Federal aid to education programs, including the Land-Grant College Act, the GI bill of rights, the Federal impact legislation and the National Defense Education Act, has left unshaken the basic local responsibility for American education.

In water pollution, as in all of these other matters, a good Federal program is one which complements and supplements what the States are doing. I am interested in having a good Federal water pollution program.

Another observation that I might dare to make is that in dealing with some people who are involved at the State level with water pollution control matters, I sometimes come away with the feeling that for them the mere existence of a Federal program in this area is something which they consider as a personal affront. It is almost as if Congress insulted them personally when they put the Federal program on the statute books.

Let's be frank; many Members of Congress—myself included—voted for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in 1956 because they were of the view that the States were not doing the job as adequately and as effectively as it needed to be done. But this was a conclusion which was reached, not on the basis of personalities, but in the face of some rather self-evident facts. First, these facts showed that a number of States, but unfortunately a limited number, has truly effective programs of water pollution control. Second, even those States that had basically sound programs had their full share of problems arising from inadequate budgets, a limited number of qualified personnel, and the unpleasant but undeniable fact of life that some of the biggest polluters in their State were also some of the State's biggest industries and municipalities against whom the bringing of an effective pollution abatement action was an extremely difficult assignment from whatever way you wanted to look at it—including politics. And, third, there was congressional recognition that the most effective State program was likely to leave undone a great deal that needed to be accomplished if this Nation was to adequately reclaim and protect its limited supply of clean water.

It was in the face of such facts as these and not out of any personal peek that Congress acted and, in my judgment, wisely and well. If you believe that water pollution control is a matter that can be handled at the State and local level, or if you believe that where a joint State action is necessary, it can be handled effectively through interstate company arrangements, I agree with you. But if you believe that these are matters that can only be handled by the States individually or in compact, then I do not agree.

I do not believe, for example, that the rate of construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities would have tripled in this country in the last 6 years without the tremendous boost it was given by the grants program Congress wrote into the law in 1956. Nor are we likely to find the solution to our yet unsolved pollution problems without the kind of extensive and expensive research which Congress has recognized must be underwritten to a considerable extent by your Federal Government. I am sure that there are people, some here at this meeting perhaps, who do not share these beliefs. But I rather suspect that even our severest critic would concede that through the use of the grant mechanism, your Federal Government is now making a substantial contribution toward cleaning up the polluted waters of this Nation and that the kind of research necessary to assure our country the almost unlimited supply of fresh, clean water that its future needs will demand can only come about if the Federal Government continues to assume the lion share of the ever increasing cost of this research.

But these are the parts of our program about which we hear little or no criticism. We can be pretty popular at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as long as all we do is hand out money for grants for construction or grants for research, but these cheers sometimes turn to jeers when we attempt to carry out our responsibilities in the enforcement field.

This is understandable. Cops are seldom the most popular people in a community. But good policemen worry more about doing their duty than improving their popularity and their communities are all the better for it. In water pollution, it is much the same. The key to an effective water pollution control program is enforcement. Research is necessary; grants for construction are helpful but unless they are accompanied by a vigorous enforcement program, the job, in my judgment, is never going to get done the way it must be done.

Because of the time limitation I will endeavor to confine the balance of my remarks to enforcement procedures under the Federal act. If I gage accurately the complaints addressed to this phase of our program they appear to be twofold. First, nobody seems to like the idea of enforcement and, in the second place, everybody seems to especially dislike the way we go about it. The term "conference" seems to have become a dirty word in the lexicon of most State people. I get the impression that you people at the State level really would not mind the Federal Government exercising its enforcement authority in water pollution matters if only we were nice enough to do it without calling a conference.

The perfect example of this apparent mental block regarding the conference approach is to be found in Resolution 4 which, as I understand it, was considered and adopted at the Interstate Conference on Water Problems which you attended yesterday. Let me read from the key paragraph of that resolution. It says: "Whereas, there has been rising concern over instances in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has initiated enforcement proceedings under enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act without full consultation with the State and interstate agencies to determine the nature and extent of their respective programs in the affected areas: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That procedures under the enforcement provisions of the Federal statute shall not be invoked without full prior consultation between Federal, State, and interstate authorities in the areas concerned and without giving such State and interstate authorities full opportunity to carry out a control program which is mutually acceptable."

Now I don't know who drafted that resolution and, as a consequence, whose toes I might be stepping on when I comment that, in my judgment, the person who wrote that resolution either (1) never read the Federal law, or (2) read it and doesn't understand it, or (3) read it, understood it an is now somehow, by the passage of this resolution, seeking to repeal the law as Congress passed it.

Let me quote for your benefit the key provision of that law: "The Secretary shall call * * * a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originated is occurring."

I would point out two things about the law. First, the language is mandatory. The Secretary is required to call a conference whenever he has persuasive evidence that interstate pollution of a harmful nature is occurring. Second, the purpose of calling a conference is to achieve the very objective set forth in the resolution adopted yesterday which I have just quoted. The reason for the conference is to have full consultation with the State and interstate agencies concerned to determine, first, the facts and, second, the nature and extent of any interstate pollution and, finally, to determine the kind and extent of the abatement programs in the affected areas which are being carried out by the industries, local government, the States, or interstate agencies.

I would point out that Congress might have directed that the first step the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would take in an enforcement proceeding would be the convening of a formal administrative hearing.

Or they could have directed that when the Secretary had evidence of interstate pollu-

tion he would immediately turn the matter over to the Justice Department to begin a court proceeding. Instead, Congress wisely rejected both of these approaches and determined instead to use the conference technique which, as many of you are well aware, has worked with considerable success under a number of State water pollution control programs.

Inherent in the resolution which the interstate conference on water problems adopted yesterday and, I suspect, in other criticisms that have been directed at our Department in this area is, I submit, a gross misunderstanding, and a complete misrepresentation of what is embodied in the conference technique which Congress wrote into the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Judging by some of the reactions, one gets the impression that in the minds of some State officials that the calling of a conference by the Secretary is tantamount to an indictment of malfeasance or misfeasance in office by the State officials in the affected areas. Nothing could be further from the truth. The decision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to call a water pollution conference means nothing more than that he has had brought to his attention evidence which indicates that harmful pollution of an interstate nature is occurring. The calling of such a conference does not mean that the Secretary, or anybody in his Department, has found this to be the fact and the convening of such a conference does not mean that anybody is being accused of anything. The basic purpose of the conference is to bring together all of the interested parties, public and private, to informally review the situation and to make a determination of what the facts are and to consider what additional corrective steps might be taken to abate any interstate pollution which the conferees agree exists.

The conference concerns itself with such questions as: Is there pollution? If so, is it interstate in nature? If it is interstate in nature, is it having an adverse effect on the health or welfare of persons in a State other than where the pollution originated? If the answers to any of these questions prove to be in the negative the conference adjourns because it lacks both the facts and the law to justify its further continuation. If, on the other hand, the answers to these questions are in the affirmative the conference then directs its attention to what steps are being taken—by industries, by the municipalities, by the States or by the interstate agencies to correct the situation and what additional steps might be taken. If this is not full consultation with the State and interstate agencies then I don't know what it is.

I trust that I have demonstrated by my presence here today that I am sincerely interested in promoting the best possible Federal-State relations in the field of water pollution control. I am interested in achieving this goal, first, because Congress has imposed such a responsibility on our Department; second, because this is the only sensible approach to the problem. Only by working together, only by supplementing and complementing each other's efforts can we hope to achieve the kind of water pollution control in this country that we must have to assure this Nation's future needs for clean water.

To this end, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pledges its full cooperation to work with the States and the interstate agencies to accomplish the basic purposes of the Federal water pollution control law.

This is not something that we insist can only be done on our terms, nor, however, anxious we may be to achieve results, are we ready to do it on your terms. This is something that we both must do under the terms which Congress clearly set forth for all of us to follow. If you will, allow us to do what Congress has directed us to do without heaping coals of criticism on our heads. If, instead, you will cooperate with us in helping to meet our departmental responsibilities you may be surprised to learn that a substantial part of that responsibility is to help you meet your own responsibility. I am confident that you will discover, as a number of States already have, that the conference technique as embodied in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is not a painful and degrading experience for State and interstate water pollution control agencies but rather a helpful devise for focusing public attention on problems you have long struggled with alone; an effective way to highlight the efforts you have already made to meet these problems and a helpful means to enable you to mount an even greater effort to abate pollution in your area of responsibility.

Federal-State relations is a two-way street. In this instance we in the Federal Government are ready, willing, and anxious to go as far down this street as we possibly can. How far we can is not for you to decide or for us to decide. This is something that has been determined by the Congress. We sincerely hope that you will meet us halfway.

After This Manner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it has become a tradition for Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly, of the Long Beach, Calif., Press-Telegram, to write the Christmas lead editorial for that newspaper. As far as I know, she is the only person whose byline has ever appeared in that paper's editorial column.

Mrs. Kelly's message which appeared in the Press-Telegram on Christmas Day, 1962, contains moving words which have meaning all through the year and not just during the Christmas season. I have asked that they be reproduced at this time as a reminder of thoughts which should not be reserved alone for that time of the year.

Other people share my appreciation of Mrs. Kelly's Christmas editorial. Each year she receives many letters from friends all over the world who include Members of Congress, ambassadors and their wives, governmental dignitaries, military men and others. They tell her that they find comfort in her words. It is most interesting, I think, that some of the people who write her are of other faiths but all express a stanch belief in God.

At a time, when we are menaced by communism even in our own hemisphere, it is meaningful that freedom-loving people cherish their religious faith.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

AFTER THIS MANNER

(By Virginia Weldon Kelly)

Christmas is the season of lights when man should experience joy, peace, truth, and love. In 1962, torn by confusion and fear, many humbly ask God the question: "What is man that Thou are mindful of him?"

The late Dr. Carl Jung wrote that if we know that God is all that matters we can avoid concentrating on unimportant goals. He also wrote that modern dictators and the misery they bring stem from superintellectuals who have robbed man of his faith and awareness of the presence of God.

Jesus answers these problems. In the Sermon on the Mount He said: "Ye are the light of the world" and "After this manner pray ye: Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name."

A reverence for Jesus' teachings, and their application to human dignity, sustained the Founding Fathers of this country. General Washington asked for and received Bibles for his starving troops at Valley Forge. Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, wrote that acknowledging God in our governmental ceremonials does not interfere with separation of church and state.

John Adams, our second President, said that whatever he achieved in life, he owed to his lifelong habit of reading the Bible daily.

Jesus instructed us to praise our Creator. Before He accomplished His healing miracles, and in all of His earthly ministry, Jesus never failed to give thanks to His Father.

Jesus healed or fed any person without asking if that person was worthy in society's judgment. He knew each person's value to God. Our smallest act of kindness for any person is done for our Lord. If we followed His example of unfailing compassion, would not this be our sweetest Christmas gift for Jesus?

Our loving wish is that you will place your cares before the Christ child, knowing that He will give you courage and comfort as He walks with you daily.

Remembering that you are children of the King, may you treasure Jesus' words: "He that believeth in Me shall have everlasting life."

All but American People Were in on Administration Deal With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is now apparent to the American people what was evidently known by many in foreign countries, last October, that there was a deal with Khrushchev on taking some of his missiles out of Cuba. I wonder what we have agreed to trade for the Soviet dictator's latest sop, the removal of a few of his soldiers from Cuba? When is President Kennedy going to stop his headlong retreat and stand up to the Soviets—after we have given up Florida or other parts of the Southeastern United States? Surely it is time Congress calls for a complete account by the President as to where he is headed and what promises he has given the Kremlin. As to how widely the October deal was known, I would like to call attention to the following column written by Henry J. Taylor for United Features Syndicate, Inc., and which appeared in the Dallas Morning News:

NATO PEOPLE SEE EXTORTION RELOAD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

MONTREAL.—The best foreign channel to America's secrets is NATO, in Paris. During our October Cuba crisis this was the source of Turkey's leak to President de Gaulle about President Kennedy's agreement with Khrushchev to take our missiles out of Turkey if Khrushchev would remove his from Cuba.

Khrushchev put his missiles in Cuba as a bargaining tool. They allowed him to name his blackmail price for the crisis "solution"—and we paid it, although this is still vehemently denied by the White House.

The NATO leak stated that Mr. Kennedy signaled Khrushchev that nothing could be done officially about the Kremlin's demanded swap (except to deny its acceptance) but not to worry about our missiles in Turkey. The reported quote is: "I'll take care of those."

OCTOBER 22—AMERICA'S MUNICH?

In truth, on the basis of this October information through Turkey, we did not stand up to Khrushchev when the chips were down. Instead, October 22 was America's Munich.

By January this was confirmed by our removal of the missiles from Turkey. The alibi was that these Jupiters are "obsolete." But Jupiters are not obsolete on several other NATO frontiers. And to avoid the embarrassment that would surely accompany their removal from Turkey—except that the secret deal was made—we would have kept them there even had they been flintlock blunderbusses.

Now NATO members see Khrushchev demanding his second payment in our October Munich. For one famous trouble with paying blackmail is that the extortioner doesn't let you stop. Among profesional extortionists this is known as the reload.

The Soviet forces left behind in Cuba are Khrushchev's "reload"; his second bargaining tool, designed to squeeze us in Berlin.

The United States-British-French level of forces there is now approximately 13,000 men. Khrushchev says they are inside the Soviet defense periphery. He has 17,000 troops (or more) inside our defense periphery, with a possible forthcoming reduction down to the level of our Berlin contingent.

TYPICAL KREMLIN CAPER

Canadians note Khrushchev's reheating of his Berlin-Berlin-Berlin cry in the February 9 interview with Toronto publisher Roy Thomson and a delegation of British-Canadian businessmen, a typical Kremlin redirection of attention onto that riven place.

Mr. Kennedy has stated repeatedly that Allied contingents will stay in Berlin—in fact, that all of Berlin must remain a free area. But when Khrushchev built the wall we did not knock it down. Moreover, Mr. Kennedy is no more emphatically on record about Berlin than he was—"we will not tolerate, we will not hesitate"—about keeping communism out of Cuba and also about forbidding a Soviet military lodgment there.

Although seldom realized, Canada is represented on the Allied Berlin military mission. And sources here wonder how Mr. Kennedy can pay the second price for America's October Munich—a swap of the Allied forces in Berlin for Khrushchev's withdrawal of his forces from Cuba. Perhaps this might not meet too much British-French resistance. It might even be welcomed by President de Gaulle and, to a lesser degree, in London. But one hurdle Canadians see, and inquire about, is American public opinion. The underlying truth that this was a swap, and a second swap at that, would surely emerge.

SECRETS SHARED BY 600 FOREIGNERS

NATO enters even more broadly than in its case of the missile leak from Turkey. Representatives of 14 nations, including Canada, sit in Paris with our Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter. The United States must constantly answer classified questions there about such policies as Berlin. In varying degrees all 14 nations are cut in. Each Ambassador relays information to his own capital; it goes to his Cabinet, generally to a defense committee, and frequently to varying parliamentary groups as here in Canada. This totals about 600 foreign diplomats, politicians, and soldiers sprawling from Ankara and Oslo to Ottawa.

Our public is told (only) that we are trying to get Khrushchev's troops out of Cuba in due course. But a NATO leak has already occurred describing Khrushchev's price involving Berlin as his "reload" in our October Munich.

Canadian sources believe this undisclosed reload problem now fits in our White House like a swollen finger in a glove.

Northwest Power Preference Bill, H.R. 994

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 I introduced H.R. 994 which provides for preference to be given to Northwest consumers of power produced by the Bonneville Power Administration in the Northwest States.

My distinguished colleague, Congressman JACK WESTLAND, from the Second Congressional District in the State of Washington, on the same day, introduced H.R. 1160 which provides for the same preference to be given Northwest consumers.

The House of Representatives of the State of Washington is now in session in Olympia, Wash., and on February 14, 1963, passed a resolution endorsing these bills.

As you can see, there are 62 members of the house of representatives who sponsored this resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

(Resolution by Representatives Max Wedekind, Daniel J. Evans, Horace W. Bozarth, Morrill F. Folsom, Jack H. Rogers, Walt Reese, Arnie Bergh, William E. Young, Roy Mundy, H. D. "Herb" Hadley, Norman B. Ackley, Robert G. Earley, J. J. Gallagher, Bob McDougall, Eric D. Braun, Alfred E. Leland, C. G. Witherbee, Dwight S. Hawley, Henry Backstrom, Edward F. Harris, William J. S. May, Robert F. Goldsworthy, Ann T. O'Donnell, Audley F. Mahaffey, Ray Olsen, Mrs. Douglas (Gladys) Kirk, Keith H. Campbell, Gus Lybecker, Charles Moon, Mrs. Frances G. Swayze, James L. McFadden, (Miss) Ella Wintler, Robert M. Schaefer, Slade Gorton, Jack L. Burtch, Donald W. Moss, Eric O. Anderson, Harry A. Siler, Dan Jolly, Cecil C. Clark, Mildred E. Henry, Damon R. Canfield, Arlie U. DeJarnatt, Thomas L. Copeland, Charles R. Savage, Don Eldridge, John L. O'Brien, Elmer C. Huntley, Drennan "Mac" McElroy, H. Maurice Ahlquist, Elmer E. Johnston, Robert F. Brachtenbach, Leonard A. Sawyer, William C. Klein, Samuel J. Smith, K. O. Rosenberg, William "Bill" Chatalas, Avery Garrett, and W. J. (Joe) Beierlein:)

Whereas, our Congresswoman, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, has introduced in the 88th Congress a measure designated as H.R. 994 to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in this region and to guarantee consumers of electricity in other regions reciprocal priority; and

Whereas it is essential that the resources of this State and region be preserved and protected in order to assure the proper economic growth of this section of the Nation and to promote the economic well-being of our citizens; and

Whereas the abundant hydroelectric power resource of the Pacific Northwest is a major asset to the area and provides assurance for expansion of industrial activity and consequent additional employment opportunity which is vital to needs of our burgeoning population; and

Whereas proper utilization and development of our resources and economy demands that all possible hydroelectric power be available for such purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That this body respectfully petitions that the 88th Congress of the United States enact the necessary legislation embodied in H.R. 994 and thereby insure to the peoples of the Pacific Northwest that there will be full and adequate opportunity to properly promote our resource wealth in the best interest of all the people of this region of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

Chances of Union Not Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, John F. Schmidt, of Peoria, recently wrote me that chances of international union by the free countries of the West have actually improved since the De Gaulle-Britain debacle if the President would only take the initiative. Mr. Schmidt is a leading Peoria attorney and was coauthor with Owen J. Roberts and Clarence Streit of "The New Federalist."

Text of his letter follows:

PEORIA, ILL.,
January 30, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: While it certainly looks as though President de Gaulle's veto of Britain's application for Common Market membership has split the free world, it is evident to me that this prima facie disaster can be turned into a wonderful opportunity.

This is no time for rashness, such as a threatened retreat to isolationism or timid, half measures. Now is the time to strike out boldly with the courage demonstrated by our Founding Fathers. I wish that you, sir, would call a constitutional convention of delegates of our NATO friends, right away. If France sends delegates, fine. If not, we go on without them and form a genuine international union of free peoples—which France would then join in self-defense.

The Communists have said for years that the capitalist nations could never cooperate because of conflicting interests and competition for markets. The Rome treaty (EEC) had begun to make Communist theory look silly. De Gaulle's action now will give communism a tremendous boost all over the world, making them harder to deal with all over, and especially in Cuba and Berlin. We need to show them a unity of purpose that will convince them and the cynics that Western civilization is not finished, but instead, has a new vitality and dedication to freedom.

In addition, Mr. President, complete candor should convince you that your administration so far has been no howling success. Our economy lags, we lost the Cuban skirmish, and our prestige is nothing to boast of. If you want to avoid the dubious distinction of the worst President the United States has ever had (or maybe even the last one), you had better come up with something in the great American tradition—instead of just another round of still bigger Federal budgets, bigger Federal deficits, bigger unemployment lists, bigger Government payrolls, and still greater Communist victories.

It may be later than we think.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SCHMIDT,

Attorney at Law, and Coauthor With Owen J. Roberts and Clarence K. Streit of "The New Federalist."

Seton Hall Dentist Has Mail-Order Business in Detection of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, cancer is one of the most dreaded diseases known to mankind. Annually, thousands of people die from this disease who might have lived had their malignancies been detected in time.

Until medical research provides mankind with a cure for this killer, every effort must be made to increase public awareness of the necessity for early recognition and proper treatment for cancer.

Dr. John Manhold, Jr., of the Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentristy, which is located in Jersey City, N.J., in my congressional district, has for several years played an important role in cancer detection. I commend him for his dedicated service and under unanimous consent I insert a February 12, 1963, Hudson Dispatch article concerning Seton Hall and Dr. Manhold's work in the RECORD:

SETON HALL DENTIST HAS MAIL-ORDER BUSINESS IN DETECTION OF CANCER

Most people get letters, bills, and advertising circulars in the mail. Dr. John J. Manhold, Jr., of Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry, Jersey City, receives all these and something more—cancer cells.

Every day, family dentists and oral surgeons from throughout the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area send an average of a dozen small brown cardboard tubes to the dental school's department of oral diagnosis and pathology.

Inside each tube is a glass vial containing a fragment of human tissue, taken by an alert dentist from the mouth of an unsuspecting patient. It could be that the patient was merely making his semiannual dental visit, expecting only to have his teeth cleaned, when a suspicious condition was discovered.

The biopsies are sent to Dr. Manhold, chairman of the department, for diagnosis as to possible malignancy. Technicians in the department's biopsy service prepare the specimens for microscopic analysis by Dr. Manhold and his associates, and the verdict is returned in 10 days or less.

When a malignancy is strongly suspected by the referring dentist and a prompt reply is requested, the diagnosis is first telephoned and then mailed back in 24 to 48 hours. A nominal sum is charged for the service.

Seton Hall's tissue diagnosis service was started by Dr. Manhold in September 1957, with a fund grant from the National Institutes of Health. It has grown from 289 specimens received in 1958 to 659 samples last year—a total of 2,510 biopsies analyzed up to this January.

THREE PERCENT CANCEROUS

Of these, about 80 were found to be either cancerous or premalignant—an average of about 3 percent. "This is rather interesting," Dr. Manhold notes, "since some 3 percent of all cancer deaths are believed to originate in the mouth and surrounding area."

About 2 dozen dentists and oral surgeons send in most of the biopsies received by the diagnostic service, Dr. Manhold's records show. "About 30 percent of the samples come from New York City doctors, and the rest are from elsewhere in the metropolitan areas, some from as far away as Philadelphia, Trenton, and Stamford.

Dr. Manhold, who received his doctor of dental medicine degree from Harvard University in 1940 and also has a master's degree in psychology from Washington University in St. Louis, places great importance on "the increasing awareness on the part of both the public and the dental profession in the fight against cancer."

"Early recognition is the only cure thus far for cancer," the pathology professor stresses. "Spotting the disease early enough to take effective action is the biggest part of the fight.

Diminishing Tax Returns From Federal Lands in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by James Parsons, of Sandpoint, Idaho, published in the Sandpoint News-Bulletin, a newspaper of general circulation in northern Idaho:

The Idaho Legislature is worrying over its biennial financial problems. It should be giving some serious consideration to a money problem that is worsening.

It is that about 63 percent of the land in Idaho is not only successfully evading paying its share of taxes, but is actually managing to pay less and less every year.

This land is the approximately 33,560,000 acres of the State's total of 53,440,000 acres that is in Federal ownership. The Federal land best able to pay a fair share of our tax bills—and the land doing the best job of evading such payment—is that in our 16 national forests. These forests contain 74 percent of Idaho's commercial timberlands, and, generally speaking, Uncle Sam's timberlands are the State's best.

National forest lands make an in-lieu-of-tax return to the counties where they are located. This is supposed to be 25 percent of national forest receipts. Paradoxically, however, returns to counties have been going down even though forest receipts went up. This is what should be of sober concern to not only legislators but the public generally. Those working for larger appropriations for education might well be especially concerned, because a fixed percentage of the 25 percent return is earmarked for schools.

The principal reason the 25 percent share of national forest receipts allotted to counties in lieu of taxes keeps getting smaller is because the Forest Service more and more is doing one of two things or both: (1) Withholding larger amounts for stand improvement; and (2) increasing demands on successful timber sale bidders to pay for stumpage in work instead of cash.

A hypothetical case comes to mind as the result of recent announcement that, during 1962, operators constructed 668 miles of forest roads in region 1. These are system roads which the Forest Service locates, engineers, and for which it sets construction standards. These roads cost $5,000 to $10,000 a mile, with $7,000 probably a fair average.

Cost of the 668 miles thus totaled $4,676,000. There have been numerous and continuing complaints that the Forest Service is demanding roads of higher, costlier standards than are needed for timber removal. Responsible operators have estimated costs generally are at least 25 percent high.

What this means to local county road and school budgets is that 25 percent of $4,676,000 is $1,169,000, a sum which did not find its way in cash to the Federal Treasury. In-lieu-of-tax payments thus were lowered by several hundred thousand dollars.

The board of school trustees at Libby in Lincoln County, Mont., made a study which illustrates what is going on. From 1952 through 1961, stumpage receipts from national forests in the county increased 11 percent. The in-lieu-of-tax return to the county for road and school purposes did not go up a corresponding 11 percent, however. It actually decreased 30 percent.

The reason is that the Forest Service increased stand improvement withholdings 181 percent. The loss to the county had to be made up by increasing the average tax obligation on the three major private forest land ownerships by 45 percent.

Despite increased receipts in the north Idaho national forests last year, returns to some counties were half or less than the preceding year's payments. This has a serious effect on local governmental units which necessarily must depend on a fairly stable level of revenues. Whether times are good or bad, private property must meet its tax obligations and cannot fluctuate wildly from year to year as national forest payments do.

Congress' original intent was that 25 percent of gross forest receipts should be returned to counties in lieu of taxes. Then it gave the Forest Service authority to first deduct a flat 10 percent for road and trail work. Then it gave the agency permission to make withholdings for stand improvement under the K-V law. These have been increasing at a tremendous pace.

The Forest Service has gone a step further. More and more, its timber sale contracts are requiring higher and costlier road standards, erosion control, grass seeding, felling of snag and cull trees, etc. The more of these things the successful bidder is required to do, the less he pays the Government in cash for stumpage. So the return to the Federal Treasury shrinks, and so does the county 25 percent.

We who live in public lands counties are being penalized and in effect made to pay a

disproportionate tax bill. We are footing an unfair share of the cost of maintaining the national forests—which are for the benefit of all the people of the Nation and not just us.

Day by day, the Forest Service by its present practices is chipping away at our school and road funds. The simple fact is that our best timberlands aren't shouldering anywhere near their fair share of the tax load—so the rest of us have to make up the difference.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, late last month, the 31st of January, the Republican members of the House Judiciary Committe and other interested minority Members of this body offered a constructive amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The New York Times, in its edition of February 5 published outside the New York area, makes comment on the bill and on the strong backing which it has in the Republican Party. It offers some very forward-looking provisions which are noted—the upgrading of the Civil Rights Commission and permission for it to go into the second half of the right to vote, the right to have your vote counted honestly; aid in the effectuation of the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision of 1954; an educational standard to overcome literacy tests. All of these are substantial measures, not shadow or headline-grabbing hollow gestures. I trust that we shall be able to get action on these proposals early in this Congress.

The New York Times editorial follows:

SIGNS OF LIFE

Signs of life are stirring in unexpected places: for example, on the Republican side of the House of Representatives. A group of Republicans, including Representative LINDSAY, of New York, has come forward with the best civil rights bill of which we have had a glimpse thus far in 1963. It would make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; give it additional funds to investigate vote frauds; authorize the Attorney General to institute civil suits in behalf of young people denied admission to public schools because of their race, and make 6 years of education (in a school where instruction was primarily in English) proof of sufficient literacy and intelligence for voting. All this contrasts handsomely with the one extremely modest civil rights reform mentioned briefly by President Kennedy in his state of the Union message.

It may be said, of course, that this is simply a political move, designed to embarrass the Democratic majority and the Kennedy administration. But let us note a point or two. In the first place, the new Republican bill has responsible party backing: it has the support of the House Republican leader, of the chairman of the Republican conference, and of the top-ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee. In the second place, the bill embodies ercommendations made in the national platform of the Republican Party. And in the third place, if this is a move designed to embarrass the Democratic majority and the Kennedy administration, the easiest way for the Democratic majority and the Kennedy administration to get unembarrassed is to produce a similarly good bill and act on it.

Once More the President Violates the Constitution in Sidestepping Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, is it not about time for Congress to call a halt to the constant violation by the President of the constitutional separation of powers? Evidently, President Kennedy is of the opinion that only he has the wisdom to make decisions and regards the Constitution as a mere scrap of paper not binding upon him. His abuse of the use of Executive orders to bypass Congress was evident from the first order he issued upon becoming President in ordering the purchase of foods not in surplus in clear violation of the law. He has continued his disregard of his constitutional restraints by setting up and putting into operation the Peace Corps and then presenting the bill to Congress, in his several housing orders designed to control private property and intrude the Federal Government where it has no business, and now we find him establishing a new agency, spending Federal funds without authority and openly flaunting congressional jurisdiction. I refer to his setting up a Domestic Peace Corps, fully staffed and with projects underway. Mr. Speaker, unless we put an immediate stop to the disregard of the Constitution by the President, there may come a day, and soon, when he decides he no longer needs Congress and will openly assume the dictatorship to which his course is surely leading. The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News should be carefully read by every Member of Congress as well as all those who are concerned with maintaining our system of government:

THIS TAKES THE CAKE

One of the most incredible stories of the year from Washington is told in the current issue of the fortnightly Reporter magazine. It concerns the President's proposed Domestic Peace Corps. If the facts are correct in this story, the administration's handling of this particular project is a flagrant example of the misuse of Executive authority and Government funds.

Last month, in his budget message to Congress, the President asked for the authority to create the Domestic Peace Corps. To date, legislation which would permit such a corps to be set up and appropriate funds for its operation has not even been introduced in Congress.

In spite of this, Reporter magazine reveals that the proposed Domestic Peace Corps is already set up, running at full steam and spending a considerable amount of Government funds.

Several months ago, according to the Reporter, the President formed a Cabinet-level study group to draw up plans for the Corps and prepare a report urging its creation. Tom Matthews, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, was loaned to the White House for 6 weeks to write the report.

Two other officials, Don Ellinger and Richard Boone—both of whom are supposedly on the payroll of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime—were also loaned to the Domestic Peace Corps project.

When Congress appropriated the money to pay the salaries of these gentlemen, we can be sure that it was not informed that they would be released from the duties for which they are being paid and transferred to this other job.

Moreover, the specific task which Mr. Ellinger has been assigned—lobbying Congress in behalf of the Corps—is specifically prohibited by law.

The magazine charges that the Domestic Peace Corps has now opened offices 100 yards from the White House and is currently employing a full-time staff of 25 persons—including 10 executives and 15 office girls.

Secretaries, the article adds, are being paid out of a $1,500 levy on each of the Government agencies that participated in the original study. If true, that comes under the heading of misappropriation of Government funds.

Judging from the people involved, this is not just another example of bureaucracy run rampant which can be blamed on a few overzealous civil servants. It is quite obviously a pet White House project, for which the White House must accept the responsibility.

The President's sister, Mrs. Sargent Shriver, launched the Domestic Peace Corps idea in several speeches back in 1961. According to the Reporter, the project is now under the broad direction of the President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

Full-time Director of the project is said to be David Hackett, a former prep school classmate of the Attorney General, and the office manager a gentleman named George "Barney" Ross, who, the Reporter notes, "had the good fortune to be on the bridge of the PT-109 when it was rammed in the South Pacific some years back." Two of the young ladies in the office served on the campaign staff of Massachusetts Senator EDWARD M. "TEDDY" KENNEDY last year.

During its 2 years in the driver's seat, the Kennedy administration frequently has illustrated a tendency to ignore the rules or make end runs around Congress where a pet project is concerned. If the Reporter is correct, this takes the cake for grabbing the ball, running around Congress and for sheer gall.

Voice of America's Loomis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 8 the Voice of America dedicated a new transmitter facility at Greenville, N.C. This event has substantial significance in terms of increased capabilities of the U.S. Information Agency to perform the function assigned to it by Congress.

It also speaks well for the work of the Voice of America under its director, Mr. Henry Loomis, a man of dedication who has made real contributions to the program.

The new facility in Greenville has a total power capacity of 4,800,000 watts. This one facility doubles the shortwave power of all Voice of America facilities around the globe. It greatly strengthens our signal to the Voice of America relay stations in Europe, North Africa, and the Mediterranean. It enables the Voice of America to deliver a good signal from the United States to Moscow if necessary. This advantage will provide more strength to help overcome Soviet jamming of our broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.

The transmitter is the fruition of plans conceived and presented to the Congress in 1958 as a means to strengthen the Voice of America system to assure that the United States gets its message to the peoples of the world at least with technical clarity. It would matter little what we say if what we say cannot be heard.

This program has been executed by Henry Loomis, a valued career officer of Government who has provided leadership, stimulation, and sheer drive to attain this important goal.

Americans can now look with pride on the North Carolina facility in the knowledge that it has made the United States competitive with the rest of the world in this all-important aspect of the cold war.

Following is the letter addressed to Henry Loomis, Director of Broadcasting Service of the U.S. Information Agency, from Edward R. Murrow, Director of USIA, on the occasion of Mr. Loomis being given the USIA Award for Distinguished Service on February 8, 1963:

DEAR HENRY: Allow me to exercise the prerogative of the Director and speak, at one and the same time, on both my own and the U.S. Information Agency's behalf.

For both, I say you my thanks for the outstanding performance which has won you the Distinguished Service Award.

The plan which you evolved, and have since guided, for the modernization of the facilities of the Voice of America, has enabled this Agency to communicate with the peoples of the world with significantly increased effectiveness.

That this has involved so many facets of your leadership, that this has required a continuing and deep commitment of you, we are all aware. We are equally aware of this Government's and this Agency's indebtedness to you for a job superbly done.

The pride of accomplishment that must be yours is not your sole reward, for that accomplishment has won the esteem and gratitude of all of your colleagues.

And, on their behalf, I say again—congratulations.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. MURROW.

What's Going on in New York State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two items which may be of interest to those who have been puzzled and confused by developments taking place in New York State.

One of them is an editorial by the distinguished editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal, a paper that supported Mr. Rockefeller for reelection last year but which still has the courage to call a spade a spade.

The other is a press release recently issued by our colleague, the distinguished dean of the New York congressional delegation, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER.

The articles follow:

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, Jan. 31, 1963]

LOOK WHO'S TALKING

(By Alexander F. Jones)

Speaking before the New York State Publishers Association, Governor Rockefeller was sharply critical of the President Kennedy record in Cuba.

"I am old-fashioned enough to believe that no political leader has the right to fool any of the people any of the time, either by withholding legitimate public information, by false or misleading statements, or by managing the news," he said.

"There is a philosophy, all too popular in high places, that the public cannot be told the whole truth about the international situation because the people might panic—this is fundamentally and dangerously wrong because it grossly underestimates the intelligence of the American people, thus threatening the very foundations of democracy."

Governor Rockefeller should know all about such matters for he is presently engaged in one of the most arrogant and most shocking efforts in betrayal of his solemn promises that I have encountered in 50 years of political observation.

All during his campaign for reelection, Governor Rockefeller promised the people of New York he would hold the line on taxes—under no circumstances would he increase taxes.

Robert Morgenthau, Democratic opponent of the Governor, charged this claim was a specious one and that the Governor and his fiscal advisers were even then planning new special taxes.

This Morgenthau charge was widely discredited, including in this space, for Nelson A. Rockefeller had given his personal word on this matter.

But no sooner were the polls closed than reports started that special assessments would have to be made made to balance the proposed budget.

I have waited until that budget was submitted to the legislature to be sure those reports were true. It appeared such a brazen betrayal of solemn promises it did not seem conceivable a responsible executive could be guilty of such perfidy.

But sure enough there is confirmation that the Rockefeller administration intends to assess automobile owners drastic increases in registration fees to raise some $48 million for budget balancing purposes.

It is the Rockefeller contention that this is not really a tax increase.

What is it then?

In fact, what is a tax?

My dictionary says it is a levy by Government on individuals and business organizations for the purpose of raising revenue.

The fact that not every citizen of New York would have to pay it is not an answer. No citizen has to pay every tax imposed by Government—a noncarowner does not pay a gasoline tax or a nonsmoker a cigarette levy.

The increase in this automobile registration fee proposal is as much of a tax increase on more than 5 million automobile owners as any other State levy.

The great shock and disappointment in this development, to me, is not the tax money involved, although that is a considerable item, but in the man who makes it.

It brings up the question of who Nelson Rockefeller thinks he is to charge the President of not telling the American people the whole truth about Cuba? President Kennedy confessed his error.

What is Governor Rockefeller's own record in making solemn campaign promises on taxes and secretly planning to impose them?

So far as personal integrity is concerned just where does that leave him?

Could it be that the Rockefeller attack on President Kennedy is an effort to draw the attention of New York citizens away from his own perfidy—for perfidy it is.

With the record having been placed on the books where there can be no refutation of the fact, just how much faith should be put in future promises from the Albany executive mansion?

That is a question for every citizen to answer to his own satisfaction.

For me, the answer is my faith in the gentleman's political integrity is at an alltime low.

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 11, 1963

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and dean of the 20-member New York State Democratic delegation, today warned Governor Rockefeller not to let his personal ambition endanger U.S. interest as a world power. He accused Rockefeller of mouthing "partisan, political bunk" in recent forays outside New York.

Chairman CELLER's statement follows:

"Apparently Governor Rockefeller is already on the bandwagon for the Republican presidential nomination and he is following the usual pattern of opposing the administration's policy just for the sake of his party's obstructionism and his personal opportunism.

"His criticisms of the Kennedy tax proposal and the Kennedy foreign policy, far from being constructive, objective criticism, is pure partisan, political bunk.

"It is unfortunate that, during these parlous times when it is most difficult to shape foreign policy, the Governor would in a flamboyant way attack the President and make our interest as a world power tenuous, instead of stronger.

"He attacks President Kennedy's tax reduction plan, so urgently needed to give a fillip to our economy, whereas he in New York State, despite promises to the contrary, jacks up taxes, license fees, and college tuition.

"I am sure the American public is not going to be fooled with the Rockefeller kind of nonsense."

A View of De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the quarrel, both political and economic, between France on the one hand and the United States and Great Britain has been voluminously placed before the American people in recent days by press, radio, and television. The issue is not

a minor one—it affects root and branch the heart of our foreign policy design, the military-security underpinnings of our alliances, and, domestically for example, the well-being of a substantial segment of agriculture.

In all this discussion there has been a preponderance of opinion with anti-Gaullist overtones. Under unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article by Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post, that appeared in that newspaper February 15, 1963. I found it a valuable addition to the discussion, particularly as it gives a fuller measure to one of our era's heroic figures.

The article follows:

A VIEW OF DE GAULLE—THE MAN WHO HAS STOOD ALONE

(By Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post)

Could General de Gaulle be right in his veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market? Could he be right in insisting that France develop an independent nuclear deterrent? Could he be right in insisting that a truly strong Europe must be free and independent of the United States?

If De Gaulle is right, almost all the leading statesmen of Britain and America are wrong, and the preponderant voices of Anglo-American journalism are speaking in equal error.

This will not be the first time in history in which a minority voice has spoken sense, while the dissenting multitude has been in disarray. In the 1930's, Winston Churchill stood alone while warning of the Nazi menace and the handful of premature anti-Communists were ridiculed when they assailed the barbarism of Stalin.

Standing alone is not new for De Gaulle. In 1940–45 he held out against the powerful stubbornness of President Roosevelt. De Gaulle insisted that the West needed a France restored to dignity, washed clean of despair, and not a semipuppet France dependent on American alms and good intentions.

When the immobilism of the Fourth Republic suspended effective French politics, De Gaulle invoked the rarest kind of courage for a public man, he left the unreal world of Paris and stayed for 13 years in contemplative isolation. He risked being passed over by history rather than sullying its pages by engaging in make-believe.

When De Gaulle returned in 1958, he moved again in loneliness. He felt the doubts and suspicious of the Anglo-American press which at times showed a willingness to find him guilty by association with the ultranationalists who thrust him into power. He felt the scorn of being ignored when he asked Eisenhower to give France a seat in NATO equal in dignity to Britain's seat.

It will seem curious to succeeding generations that De Gaulle's actual record from 1958 to 1962 was so quickly forgotten in 1963. For to the surprise of his critics, he liquidated a fatally dangerous war in Algeria which none of his French opposition had been able to oppose with effectiveness. He began to bring back to Europe a French army which was essential to any nonnuclear defense of Western Europe. He supported the growth and development of the Common Market (which began only after De Gaulle's return to power). And over Berlin—the most critical test of the West's challenge by communism—De Gaulle stood resolutely against concession.

If there's one thing remarkable above all others about this Frenchman, it is the extent of Anglo-American misunderstanding of his purposes. Again and again we have been mistaken about him. In 1941 the State Department libeled his brave forces as the so-called Free French. In 1945 he was ridiculed as a mystic rebuilding the soul of France (as though this was not an essential source of the soul of all Western civilization). When he remained aloof from the folly of the Fourth Republic, he was written off as a man whom history had passed by. And so on, until this very day.

Paradox plays a vital role in human life. The paradox of Anglo-American blindness about De Gaulle lies in our refusal to learn from our errors. Again and again we have misjudged this man. Our diplomats and journalists call his purposes old fashioned, unreal, and even evil. They do this without adequately studying his careful writing, although De Gualle is one of the greatest writers of sense and style among Western statesmen since Abraham Lincoln.

Faced by the largeness of De Gaulle, even the most sensitive of men can temporarily lose perspective. Thus, in the Washington Post last Sunday, Prof. Louis J. Halle wrote about De Gaulle: "He has this remarkable virtue, that * * * we all know precisely where he stands."

We all know? What proof is there of this unanimous agreement about the complicated mind of Charles de Gaulle?

In fact, the views of the Anglo-American community are in considerable disagreement. One senior U.S. official in Europe is so dislodged as to liken De Gaulle's firmness of purpose to Hitler's demonic attempt to destroy the world. A minority of more astute observers—Walter Lippmann is an example—remind us that De Gaulle has consistently supported the highest Western ideals.

What has sent the usually perceptive Professor Halle into writing exaggerated rhetoric is plain to see. De Gaulle has struck the Anglo-American community on its most exposed nerve.

For 17 years the United States has followed a policy not unlike Lenin's zigzag strategy. U.S. policy has been to zig toward developing a strong Europe, then always to zag back toward the myth of a special relation with Britain.

The resilient power of this rhythm was shown this past year. It began with Prime Minister Macmillan's decision to join the Common Market.

To American eyes this was a brave decision by Britain to join Europe.

That it was brave there can be no question. For Macmillan was setting out to reverse England's long, proud history of being of Europe but not in Europe. The Prime Minister's own party, already in electoral troubles, was sharply divided. The real problems of the Commonwealth countries stirred the deepest and most ancient feelings of British loyalty. And the opposition Labor Party seemed destined to play politics against this crucial step toward Britain's new road to greatness.

All that was clear to America. We knew, as one knows about familial activities, how difficult and yet how essential Macmillan's course was. We knew he was moving, as fast and as far as he thought he could, to weld Britain into a strong Europe as a step toward the interdependence of an Atlantic community.

But to French eyes, especially to De Gaulle's eyes, the situation was less clear. The French remember that Britain stayed aloof from the Schuman plan, the first effective step toward creating a new Europe. They remember that British opposition helped kill the European army of 1953, and so recreated the Wehrmacht and the possibility of German renascence. They remember the hostility of the British negotiators, David Eccles and Reginald Maudling, in 1958 when Britain refused to join the Common Market at its inception. They remember the papier mache EFTA which Britain patched together in an attempt to outflank the Market.

What seemed to Anglo-American observers a resolute British attempt to adjust its situation to the Common Market seemed to the French an attempt to dilute the new Europe. It seemed to them an attempt to weaken the Common Market's greatest potential for helping to strengthen peace and civilization in the nuclear age.

For the Common Market is not a static tariff schedule, nor a bare-bones economic formula for finding material affluence. It is a growing and a stirring by a new type of men—men of the late 20th century—who are intent on transforming the nation-states of the 19th century which have caused a century of war.

The new American Trade Act, President Kennedy's greatest achievement of 1962, is fully effective only if Britain joins the Common Market. For only then does the provision for totally abolishing many tariffs become operative. To us and to the British that is eminently sensible. But to the French this appeared in part as further evidence of American pressure to wring further concessions out of the Market in favor of Britain. And the American pressure seemed to be demonstrated by the behavior of France's five European partners. France stood, by and large, for defending the fundamentals of the Treaty of Rome. But the other five Market members seemed willing to dilute the treaty to entice Britain into membership. In terms of U.S. history, it was as though 11 of the 13 Colonies had wanted to bribe New York into the new Union by offering her exemption from the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

Then, at the most critical moment in the long Common Market negotiations, America and Britain announced the Pact of Nassau. This bilateral agreement—negotiated without any consultation with Europeans—probably shaped De Gaulle's present intransigence. It must have seemed to him a blunt Anglo-American assertion that Britain's special relation with the United States was a fundamental part of our foreign policy.

One consequence of the Pact of Nassau, given French policy, was that Britain alone would be helped by the United States to achieve the only real sovereignty of the modern age—an independent nuclear deterrent.

Again there is paradox. De Gaulle's force de frappe represents a modest, obsolescent, airplane-delivered, nuclear deterrent. It could be of only limited use to avert limited blackmail. But to the Anglo-American mind it sometimes seemed a greater threat to mankind than Soviet ICBM's.

Britain, on the other hand, is to be given not a limited deterrent, but a modern weapon system probably capable of launching a nuclear holocaust through the next decade.

It was against this set of circumstances that De Gaulle reacted. He would not now see Europe distorted by having it grant special status to a half-European Britain. There was for him ample evidence that we—whom De Gaulle calls Anglo-Saxons—were intent on creating an American-British superiority over Europe.

This is what De Gaulle is courageously (stubbornly if you will) standing against. At least he may be. For none of us is any more a mindreader than is Professor Halle. And to change Halle's rhetoric: "De Gaulle has this remarkable virtue, that we do not all know precisely where he stands."

He may be making a decent stand for the creation of a strong and independent Europe. Not a Europe opposing the United States. But a Europe strong enough, free enough and dignified enough to make a voluntary partnership with the United States toward the beginning of an Atlantic Community.

What is De Gaulle's destiny? It may be that this "old man" will have enough youth to prevent Western Europe's becoming insecure and unsure of herself as a partial American satellite. It may be De Gaulle's destiny to drain away the latent and dangerous militarism of Germany into a continental polity having some of the melting pot checks and balances of America. It may be De Gaulle's role to foster a European strength which is essential to counter communism's expansion.

And how could this fit the destiny of that young man Kennedy, now so restlessly disturbed by De Gaulle's interruption of the Anglo-American dreams of interdependence of the West?

It may just be that what the old man builds will permit the young man to grasp that goal of peace which twice in this century eluded Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

Don Marshall, Jersey Journal Reporter, Receives Heywood Broun Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1960, the Jersey Journal, in my congressional district, discovered that James Fair, Jr., a Negro citizen of Bayonne, N.J., had been arrested in a rural Georgia county, convicted without a jury or the help of a lawyer, and sentenced to die—all within a period of 48 hours.

Don Marshall, a veteran reporter on the Jersey Journal, checked into the story and began working to secure justice for Fair. Over 2 years passed during which Marshall and the Jersey Journal printed more than 100 stories and 15 editorials about the case.

Finally, on July 18, 1962, Fair was released as a freeman.

Recently, Don Marshall was honored by the Heywood Broun Memorial Awards Committee for his work in helping to free James Fair, Jr. I wish to add my commendation to this coveted American Newspaper Guild award. I worked with Don Marshall in the attempt to free Fair, and I can testify that he is fully deserving of the honor.

Knowing Don Marshall, I am sure he agrees with the sentiments expressed in the Jersey Journal editorial concerning the award:

> An honorable mention in the Heywood Broun competition is a handsome recognition for Reporter Marshall. But the awareness of having contributed something to the better administration of American justice is an even greater prize.

I would also like to commend the Jersey Journal and its editor, Eugene Farrell, for their role in the campaign to free Fair. At no time did the Jersey Journal express any opinion regarding Fair's guilt or innocence. At all times the newspaper's campaign emphasized that its sole interest was in the constitutional rights of a fellow American to a trial by jury with his own lawyer to plead his case.

The Jersey Journal and Reporter Don Marshall performed in the highest traditions of American journalism in the Fair case, and the decision was in keeping with the highest traditions of American justice.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article entitled "Journal Reporter Cited for Work in Fair Case" and an editorial entitled "Prize Winner," both from the February 20, 1963, edition of the Jersey Journal, in the RECORD.

The article and editorial follow:

DON MARSHALL, JOURNAL REPORTER, CITED FOR WORK IN FAIR CASE

(By Edward Kulik)

Don Marshall, veteran Jersey Journal reporter, was cited today by the Heywood Broun Memorial Awards Committee for his work in helping to free a Bayonne man unjustly sentenced to death in Georgia.

The coveted awards, sponsored by the American Newspaper Guild, are presented each year to journalists whose work reflects the traditions of the late crusading newspaper columnist, Heywood Broun.

The citation to Marshall climaxed 26 months of work on the case of James Fair, of Bayonne, a 24-year-old Navy veteran, arrested May 17, 1960, in Early County, Ga., and sentenced to death for the rape-murder of an 8-year-old Negro girl.

Fair, a Negro, who had been arrested in the rural southern county, convicted without a jury or the help of a lawyer, and sentenced to die—all within the period of about 48 hours.

Marshall, a lifelong resident of Bayonne, chanced to hear of the case and became intrigued at the speed and circumstances under which Fair had been tried and sentenced to death.

Checking into the story, he found that the records showed that Fair had waived his right to counsel and to a jury trial and had pleaded guilty.

Marshall knew that under New Jersey law a defendant in a murder case could not normally plead guilty or waive vital constitutional rights. Suspecting that Fair had been denied his constitutional rights, he took the case to the Jersey Journal's editor, Eugene Farrell, and received support for a further investigation.

Backed by the Jersey Journal, he enlisted the aid of Congressman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER and, after preliminary investigation revealed some unusual facets of the case, obtained a stay of execution from the Governor of Georgia.

Months of intensive work, hundreds of telephone calls, plus daily stories often backed by editorials in the Jersey Journal, contributed in obtaining a new trial for James Fair by order of the Supreme Court of Georgia.

When news of the new trial appeared in the Jersey Journal, Marshall received the Hudson County Press Club's Public Service Award and the Paul Tobenkin National Award. He was also presented with the Outstanding American of the Year Award by the Jersey City Independence Day Committee.

Neither Marshall nor the Jersey Journal rested on their laurels, however. Knowing that a new trial was not in itself a guarantee of Justice, Marshall went back to his telephone and his typewriter, and also spoke at rallies and meetings to obtain additional funds for Fair's defense.

Despite lengthy delays of the new trial, Marshall persisted in seeking justice for Fair until, about 26 months later, the case was thrown out of court and James Fair was free.

A reporter for the Jersey Journal for 14 years, Marshall at 49 has been a radio-movie syndicated columnist, worked for a while as a press agent for New York and Hollywood stars, including Roy Rogers and Brenda Joyce and also did a stint at Billboard magazine as a show business reporter-reviewer.

He came to the Jersey Journal as Bayonne correspondent in 1948 and is currently on special assignment as a reporter for the Hudson County Science Fair sponsored by the Jersey Journal with Jersey City State College.

Born and educated in Bayonne, he and his wife, the former Florence Isaacson, live at 89 West 26th Street. Married in 1947, they are parishioners of St. Henry's Roman Catholic Church and have two daughters; Carole, 20, a junior at Notre Dame, Staten Island, and Joan, 19, a sophomore majoring in French at New York University.

PRIZE WINNER

For this newspaper and Reporter Don Marshall, the big prize came the day Georgia's Supreme Court said it would not allow a man to be executed on the basis of a few minutes of court proceeding in which he had no legal representation.

The day James Fair, of Bayonne, was sentenced to death without benefit of a lawyer or a jury, and on nothing more than his frightened guilty plea before a back-county judge, a sheriff, and a clerk—we were shocked. We were shocked not because the proceeding was illegal; it was not. We were shocked because such a proceeding still could be legal in the United States.

Don Marshall, who broke the story, went to work with a will on getting to the facts that lay behind it. Ultimately, enough was adduced to lead to a stay of execution and then a new trial.

To the everlasting credit of the State of Georgia, its supreme court was no less critical than we of the proceeding which nearly sent a frightened Negro outsider to the electric chair. Thus, the James Fair story not only saved him from execution but brought about a new rule which strengthens Georgia's justice from now on.

An honorable mention in the Heywood Broun competition is a handsome recognition for Reporter Marshall. But the awareness of having contributed something to the better administration of American justice is an even greater prize.

Lithuanian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, February 17, 1963, exercises were held, attended by more than 600 persons, representing 36 Lithuanian groups, in the Church Hall of Our Lady of Vilna Parish, in Worcester, Mass., commemorating the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Honorary cochairmen of the meeting were the Reverend John Bakanas, administrator of St. Casimir's Church, and the Reverend Michael F. Tamulevicius, administrator of Our Lady of Vilna Church; the chairman of the program committee was Mr. Vytautas Macys, and the vice chairman was Mr. Charles V. Jonaitis.

The Reverend Vaclovas Martinkus, of Providence, R.I., a priest who spent many

years in both free and occupied Lithuania, spoke to the gathering.

The meeting adopted resolutions thanking the U.S. Government for supporting the cause of Lithuanian independence and urging action to stop the colonization of Eastern Europe by the Soviet Union.

It was my privilege, in company with Anthony J. Miller, Esq., a prominent attorney in our area of Lithuanian descent, to address the meeting.

I have been requested to include here a copy of the resolutions that were adopted, as well as the addreses delivered by myself and Mr. Miller, and they follow:

LITHUANIAN RESOLUTIONS

Having assembled at Our Lady of Vilna Parish Hall, Worcester, Mass., on February 17, 1963, to commemorate the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, the members of the committee, as well as the members of both Lithuanian parishes in Worcester, St. Casimir's, and Our Lady of Vilna, and of Lithuanian-American community of Worcester, comprising in all 36 Lithuanian groups, unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

"Whereas the people and the Government of the United States believe in inalienable principles of individual and national freedom and dignity as enunciated in our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Atlantic Charter, and the Charter of the United Nations; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, in pursuance of secret agreement between Stalin and Hitler in 1940, invaded, occupied, and subjugated three independent Baltic States: Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

"Whereas Soviet occupational forces—Red army and secret police—have conducted and continue to conduct an elaborate plan of genocide, aiming at destruction of the peoples of these three Baltic nations by executions and mass deportations to remote regions of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union through her representatives in the United Nations and at other international forums has been posing as the protector of all subjugated peoples, especially former colonies in Africa and Asia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Americans of Lithuanian descent in Worcester, do hereby express our gratitude to the Government of the United States of America for its support of Lithuania's cause for freedom and for its refusal to recognize the occupation and illegal annexation of Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—by the Soviet Union; and

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent, are determined and united to uphold the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their liberation and national independence; and

Resolved, That the Government of the United States approve or endorse no agreement which would in any manner accede to the outgrowth of any past, present, or future Soviet aggressive action; and

Resolved, That the Government of the United States take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the Soviet Union's policy of colonialism in Eastern Europe and to force the Soviet Union to withdraw its occupational forces from the Baltic States; and

Resolved, That the copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Jonn F. Kennedy; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. representative of the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall and the Honorable Edward M. Kennedy; the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D. Donohue, and to the press.

VYTAUTAS MACYS,
Chairman.
VIOLITA MATULEVICIUS,
Secretary.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 17, 1963

As a neighbor and friend, and as your Representative in the U.S. Congress, I feel honored again to join you in your annual ceremony commemorating the birth of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. That memorable day marked the end of over a hundred years of suffering by the Lithuanian people under a hostile foreign rule.

For the next 22 years, until June 15, 1940, Lithuania was a free and self-governing country. On this occasion, I think it most fitting that we remind ourselves and the world of some of the accomplishments of the Lithuanian people in this comparatively short period.

During these 22 years, the number of primary schools was increased from 677 to 2,696. Over 100 secondary schools were constructed, and more than 4,000 advanced students were enrolled in the University of Kaunas.

Every city of Lithuania of more than 5,000 inhabitants supported opera seasons and gave all who wished a chance to hear the world's greatest operas and artists. Throughout the country there were special schools for music, art, and the ballet. Industry and commerce reached heights never before attained in a country of such small population, which at the time was 3 million. Practically everyone with any ambition owned his own home or his own farm.

In brief summary, this is the remarkable record of the people and the Government of Lithuania in the 22 years of their freedom and independence. However, that glorious record was suddenly and cruelly terminated on June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union violated all of its treaty commitments with Lithuania and the Communist Red army moved in to dominate the country and its people.

When we briefly recall the past heroic history of Lithuania and her brave people, we can easily understand why she will and she must with our help and the help of God regain her freedom.

In going back into that history we find that when the Tartar hordes came out of the east attempting to overwhelm all of Europe, the Lithuanians organized and hurled back the brutal invaders.

Again, when the Huns and Germanic tribes came from the west, with threats against their freedom, the Lithuanian people bravely rallied again and made the enemy retreat. Truly, the Lithuanians have been a vital force for freedom in Europe, and their descendants coming to this country, numbering well over a million, have made a tremendous contribution to the preservation of American liberty. As one who has lived among Lithuanians throughout my life, I can personally testify to that fact.

We are certain, therefore, from the past history of the Lithuanian people, that although they may be persecuted and their land devastated, the courageous soul and spirit of their great nation lives on.

The basic characteristic of the Lithuanian people is devotion to freedom, and that characteristic is indestructible.

Today, on the 45th anniversary of the independence of this valiant country, we extend our message of hope to the people of Lithuania, realizing notwithstanding that it is not enough to just offer hope, we must show them that we are as resolute as they are in the fight against the Communist enemy.

As long as we keep alive the shameful truth about Communist treatment of Lithuania, we keep alive the hopes of the Lithuanian people for eventual freedom and independence.

Let us remember that a tyrannical regime founded on falsehoods and terror cannot last, because it sows the seeds of its own destruction.

May we pray that the divine providence will speed that day of destruction of Communist tyranny in Lithuania and that a new day of freedom will dawn, and that its people will enjoy liberty and peace and take its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

ADDRESS OF ANTHONY J. MILLER, ESQ.

As an American citizen of Lithuanian decent, I am particularly proud and privileged to join with our good Congressman, HAROLD DONOHUE, in this program commemorating the 45th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

While this occasion necessarily reminds us that Lithuania is today suffering under the cruel hardships of Communist Russian imperialism we are not speaking here with any thought whatever of giving up the fight or abandoning hope that our native Lithuania and her good people will eventually be freed.

We are, rather, conducting this ceremony in order to voice our righteous protest against Communist tyranny and to exert our best efforts in giving heart to our courageous Lithuanian people for the continuation of their brave struggle against the Russian dictator. Our confidence for the future of Lithuania is based in great part upon our knowledge of her past history.

Although we are sad about the current situation in Lithuania we have no cause to despair. Repeatedly, through her history, our people have proved they can, and they will, eventually overcome the temporary tyranny of any oppressor.

The Christian faith, which in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism is still with her today. It gives her people the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. You and I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is a passion for liberty and freedom which can never die. You and I are also aware that there is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

We further realize that the principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration of the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter is a hollow mockery in the present supression of the Lithuanian people. Lithuania is now undergoing terrible hardships at the unholy hands and under the iron heel of the directors of atheistic communism.

That is why we here and other Lithuanians throughout the country and the world are gathered, at this time, to renew our vow to persevere in working for the independence of our homeland. Here in this great Nation I earnestly believe that most of our fellow Americans are becoming increasingly concerned about the present fate of Lithuania, which stands in accusing testimony to our failure to live and act according to the principles for which Americans have fought and died in two World Wars.

World War II was fought with the clear understanding and purpose that common victory would bring restoration of self-government and territorial integrity to the suppressed nations of the world. Can anyone conceive of these objectives being achieved until that solemn pledge has been carried out.

The larger world powers, including this country, are not fulfilling their highest obligations as long as peaceful and freedom-

loving peoples are permitted to be cruelly dominated by Russian dictatorship.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, under Communist terror, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to reestablish the great basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples. In simple justice, all free nations must continue to insist that the Lithuanian people are permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

On this occasion we ourselves must be rededicated to the persevering revelation and presentation, to the world, of the facts and the truth about oppressed Lithuania so that the United Nations will accept and carry out the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania.

In this cause I know we will continue to have the complete support of our fellow Americans and all freedom-loving people throughout the world. I am sure they will join in our efforts and our prayers that our homeland may soon be freee to live again in the spirit of her ancient motto—"Be What May, Lithuania Will Always Stay."

Can Anything Good Come Out of Hollywood?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article which appeared in the January 1963 issue of the Crusader, published in Valley Forge, Pa., entitled "Can Anything Good Come Out of Hollywood?"

I believe this article, which discusses some of the wholesome pictures coming out from Hollywood, in refreshing contrast to much of the publicity about Hollywood, will be of interest to many Members of Congress.

The article follows:

CAN ANYTHING GOOD COME OUT OF HOLLYWOOD?—AN AMERICAN BAPTIST WHO IS ON THE SCENE EVERYDAY DARES TO ANSWER "YES"

(By Frederick L. Essex, director of the Department of Radio and Television, Division of Communication of the American Baptist Convention)

"Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" It was an honest question asked by Nathanael and must have reflected the prevalent attitudes of the people. Evidently Nazareth was not looked upon with much favor for the answer given was neither "yes" or "no" but rather, "Come and see."

A modern paraphrasing might be, "Can anything good come out of Hollywood?" It is an honest question asked by concerned people and reflects a criticism, not unjustified, but one deserving of an answer more definitive than "yes" or "no." Come and see.

Headlines and magazine articles still attempt to find an answer for the untimely death of Marilyn Monroe. Elizabeth Taylor has been the subject of public judgment. The excess violence and emphasis of sex on the screen, for the sake of violence and sex, has raised the ire of many. The detailing of personal lives as defined by the publicists of Hollywood personalities have led many to shake their heads.

If the negative aspects were the only product of the motion picture capital, the answer would be "No." But from the beginning of recorded time the public has savored the ills of mankind, assumed the attitude of righteous indignation with a dash of understanding when necessary and then waited for the next sensational story to appear. The good side of the public face is seldom reported for it is seldom of interest. However, there is another side of Hollywood, and it is good.

The successful marriages, the civic spirit, the active church participation of many members of the film world seldom rate a line of copy. There was little said when Geoffrey M. Shurlock, Motion Picture Code administrator, wrote in a recent report to Eric Johnston that "An analysis of the most recent 100 scripts submitted to the code shows none on gangsterism, juvenile delinquency, dope addiction, or abortion." He then went on to say, "Only 6 out of these 100 scripts are really bothersome and we're getting such good cooperation from producers that I'm sure all the problems will be resolved from the code's standpoint before these are seen by the public."

Such pictures as "The Music Man," "The Miracle Worker," and "The Wonderful World of the Brothers Grimm," to run the danger of mentioning only a few, are pictures the entire family will enjoy and are a credit to the industry.

There are pictures that present situations to which the Christian should speak, for they portray in a highly entertaining way the deep problems that beset people. For example:

Should the parents of a daughter permit her to marry if she has a mind of a 12-year-old? That was the basic conflict in "The Light in the Piazza."

What has the Christian church to say now to a society that has in its power the tools of extinction through the hydrogen bombs? One can't escape the question after seeing the English-produced film "The Day the Earth Caught Fire."

What is the witness of the church to the people caught in the abyss of liquor, dope, and promiscuity as they frantically search for the basic values of life, honest love, and the acceptance of the individual? The sordid situation was exposed in "Sweet Bird of Youth."

The answers are our concern and responsibility. Hollywood, through pictures such as these, has offered a showcase to reveal human need in the stark light of reality. To produce such pictures requires a perception and insight not generally credited to the motion picture industry.

Comparatively little will ever be known of the painstaking research and demand for accuracy George Stevens has required for his forthcoming production of "The Greatest Story Ever Told." The clergymen who are invited to the studio often anticipate the visit with a degree of apprehension for they have an honest concern for pictures biblical in theme. It is especially so when the picture is of the Christ. Such anxiety is usually short lived when they are confronted with the copious preparation for the extraordinary work.

Mr. Stevens has said he does not want to tell the story of Jesus from the standpoint of a biographical documentary. He is interested in portraying what he calls, "the themes of Jesus": What was it that caused men to follow the Man of Nazareth? Wherein was His strength that brought people to Him? What was it about the Man that threatened and shook the throne of Rome?

When the picture is released about a year and a half hence, many who see it will sit in judgment. They will bring to "The Greatest Story Ever Told" the preconceived ideas rooted in the teachings of their church. This is to be anticipated and understood. Yet, if they are able to sublimate their individual persuasions, they will marvel at the unfolding drama of what is truly the greatest story ever told—and told through the creative genius of sensitive men in Hollywood.

There is another side to Hollywood not as bright. The public reaction to many pictures produced in recent years has been felt where it hurts most—the box office. It has been said the theaters have lost the family trade. In an attempt to overcome the situation some producers tried to shock the people into the theater, and then proceeded to shock them out.

There is a housecleaning job to be done but it should be self-regulated and not Government controlled. While it is difficult to get two people to agree exactly on the steps to take, the consensus points to the need for better product on the screen and to the need for support of a good product. Such improvement will not happen overnight. The public will have to be genuinely convinced the picture they pay to see will be worth their time and money before the habit of regular theater attendance is reestablished.

But the signs are encouraging. The motion picture screen will always remain the most powerful medium to mirror life—it's joys, sorrows, strengths, and weaknesses. A true portrait of life must maintain a careful balance of these factors. It must not center on the sordid condition of man. True, the scales have been tipped out of balance in recent years but the pendulum is rapidly and surely swinging back. And it's like a breath of spring to behold.

The day is approaching when we can ask, not with a sense of uneasiness but in confidence: Can anything good come out of Hollywood?

The answer will be affirmative.

True Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Jimmie O. Hanson, has written to me to point out that true Americanism includes the refusal on the part of businessmen and individuals to purchase items produced by Communist manufactures. I believe this letter will be of interest of Members of Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD:

JANUARY 27, 1963.

Hon. JACK WESTLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WESTLAND: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1963, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT of California, under extension of remarks, entered a letter from the president of London Lamps of Los Angeles to Mr. M. Kramer, of Johannesburg, South Africa.

In his remarks, Mr. ROOSEVELT commended London Lamps for their courageous action in refusing to do business with firms in that counrty due to South Africa's aparthied policy. To quote Mr. ROOSEVELT "London Lamps has demonstrated the spirit of true Americanism."

Mr. ROOSEVELT's remarks and London Lamps' letter fail to mention one very im-

portant aspect of Americanism and leave some questions unanswered in my mind. The questions are: Does London Lamps refuse to buy cutglass table lamps and chandeliers from Communist Czechoslovakia, Communist East Germany and Communist Yugoslavia? Do the officers of London Lamps refuse to trade with merchants that sell canned hams and sausages from Communist Poland? Do they refuse to trade with American merchants that [illegible] handbags, wines, and brooms from Co[illegible]t Hungary, Christmas ornaments from Bulgaria, candies, rums, lobster, and shrimp from Communist Cuba? All of these articles and many more are produced with slave labor in Communist slave states at such a low cost that American companies cannot compete with them. The profits gained from these sales are used by the Communist slave masters to further subjugate the slaves that are forced to produce them. Let us not forget that true Americanism also includes these things.

Respectfully,

JIMMIE O. HANSON.

Commission Looks Into Opportunities for Women in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the facts that was made abundantly clear in a conference on job opportunities for women sponsored by the President's Commission on the Status of Women last fall was that restrictions still exist against qualified women in our economy.

An article by Stephen Habbe, of the division of personnel administration of the magazine, Management Record, records the proceedings of that conference in a highly objective manner.

Because there are so many misconceptions in our society about women in employment, I commend to my colleagues Mr. Habbe's factual presentation of the Commission-sponsored conference.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include "Opportunities for Women in Industry" in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN IN INDUSTRY

If anyone attending the Conference on Employment Opportunities for Women in Private Industry last month in Washington had entertained the thought that women now are equal partners with men in business, the chances are good that he would have left the meeting with a changed viewpoint. Plainly, the consensus of the conference was that women are being discriminated against today in many areas of business life.

The conference was called by the President's Commission on the Status of Women. The Commission was established by President Kennedy, December 14, 1961, and has been directed to make its final report by October 1, 1963.

Some 200 representatives of industry, education, government, and civic groups attended the Washington meeting under the chairmanship of Dr. Richard A. Lester, of Princeton University. A plenary session, addressed by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, and others, was followed by five small discussion meetings.

The group of some 50 persons that met under the leadership of Frank Pace, Jr., of the General Dynamics Corp., on "The Limitations of Women's Employment and Advancement and Ways of Reducing Such Limitations" probably produced the discussion of greatest interest to members of the business community.[1] Much of what follows is related to topics deliberated by this group. The purpose of this article is to highlight the thinking of the participants about women's current status in business.

WOMEN IN ALL JOBS

It is common knowledge that notable improvements in the status of women in business have been made during the 20th century. While it cannot be claimed that they now have achieved full partnership with men, neither can it be charged that they are being exploited as they once were.

Some 23.5 million women are now at work in this country, representing about one-third of the gainfully employed. Many have risen above the level of beginners' jobs. They are found in almost all positions in all departments of companies.[2]

The equal-pay-for-equal-work philosophy is widely accepted. Laws in 22 States and 40 percent of collective bargaining agreements bar pay differentials by sex. Personnel practices based strictly on ability and merit are widely espoused by management.

Are these things enough?

It was the sense of the Washington meeting that these things are not enough. It was agreed that there is more to be done.

BARRIERS TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN

Although millions of women are at work, it is claimed that, for the most part, they are in "women's jobs"—domestic service, public school teaching, nursing, beauty parlor and restaurant work, and in semiskilled office and shop positions. These are the jobs that few men want. Often women are preferred for them because they will work for less money. The conferees discussed a number of the reasons why companies sometimes are slow to hire women for "men's jobs."

One longstanding argument is that women seldom plan to make a career in business and therefore cannot be taken seriously. It is true that almost all young women expect to marry and have a family, perhaps after working a few years. For them, a job may be nothing more than a profitable way to fill in the time between school and marriage. Yet, the conferees pointed out, some of these women possess needed skills, and it is more than likely that a number of them will return to work after their children are grown.

Today men live longer than they did in the past and women live even longer. Many women with grown children are still young and interested in working. This was not the case a mere 50 years ago, and it alters the picture. Yet the fact remains that the average woman will be out of the labor market for approximately 25 years, and this is a barrier to her employment.[3]

Moreover, if, as seems likely, the employment of many women will be divided into two widely separated periods, it follows that two training programs will be required. This means added costs and raises another barrier.

For some women, however, work is much more than a stopgap. Some do not marry and others combine their careers with marriage. Unfortunately, it is impossible for the employment interviewer to determine if the young lady applicant beside his desk will stay with the company 4 months or 40 years, if hired. While he is similarly in the dark when he hires a young man, he at least knows that the chances that he will remain with the company are considerably better.

Prejudice against women in business still is widespread and is at the root of most of the trouble, noted the conference participants. By long tradition in this country, man is the head of the family and its chief breadwinner. Anything that disturbs this concept is likely to set off a violent reaction. Thus, it is often claimed, the entrance of women in large numbers into the labor market threatens our very way of life. The cry gets the loudest when it appears that women are getting jobs that men need to support their families.

The conferees answered that, while such things are bound to happen in a free economy, the women primarily want to fill gaps in employment. They feel their skills are different from men's and that the skills of both are needed. They do not wish to add to any labor surplus, and feel people are mistaken who claim that all unemployment could be abolished if jobs were given to men only.

All sorts of reasons are advanced why women should not be promoted. It is claimed they are too emotional, that they don't think like men, that they are absent too much, that they can't travel freely, that men object to being under their supervision, and so on. The panel emphasized that while, undoubtedly, these things are true of some women, it's unfair to penalize all women because of them.

The discussions further noted that, ironically, the very laws that were designed to protect the interests of women workers when they were put on the books now sometimes stand in the way of their employment and advancement in business. State labor laws relating to maximum daily and weekly hours are examples.

THE BALANCE SHEET

In defense of business it can be said that there is a basis for some of the discrimination. (Where there are valid grounds for differentiating between a male and a female applicant or worker, it would seem unfair to use the word "discrimination" at all.) But the practices of business may be questioned wherever no basis for discrimination exists. In a true democracy, the argument goes, only ability and merit should count.

Everyone who wishes should have equal opportunity to find work and to succeed in work. Women are needed in business along with men, the argument continues, and the contributions of all Americans may be required to keep this country strong in the

[1] Subjects discussed by the other groups were "Vocational Guidance, Training, and Other Ways of Encouraging More Effective Use of the Talents of Women"; "Part-Time Employment and Other Arrangements for Married Women To Resume Employment"; "Opportunities For Female Employment in Particular Industries Under Government Contracts"; and "Compensation of Women Workers, Including Methods of Obtaining Equal Pay."

[2] Women are presidents and vice presidents of banks, heads of department stores, editors of magazines and newspapers, managers and officers of public relations firms, real estate companies, radio and TV stations. Women have made distinguished contributions in research, engineering, and various scientific fields. Yet the actual number of women in supervisory and executive positions remains quite small.

[3] A pattern that seems to be developing for thousands of women is approximately as follows: Complete high school at 18; work 2 years; raise family from age 20 to age 45; and then reenter the labor market. The average woman leaving college today, it has been estimated, will work 25 years.

days ahead. Let us make full and effective use of our manpower and our womanpower resources, say the proponents of this view.

How is discrimination that is arbitrary, capricious, and usually rooted in prejudice to be overcome? The conferees gave two answers: by law and by persuasion. Both means could help. But there was no doubting that the conference looked to persuasion as much the better way.

STEPHEN HABBE,
Division of Personnel Administration.

Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a civil rights bill today. This measure is identical to bills introduced by other Members of the minority, including the Republicans of the House Judiciary Committee.

The observance of Brotherhood Week seems to be a particularly fitting time for the introduction of a measure which would extend greater legal protection to a large body of American citizens.

This is a sensible bill and one that I feel should be enacted by this Congress. It offers a positive program to carry out the mandates of the 1960 Republican platform.

In presenting this bill, I would like to call attention to the Republican Party's record of action in the field of civil rights. It is our party which has spearheaded every major civil rights measure in the last century.

I think it is well to review the provisions of this legislation. The bill calls for permanently establishing the Civil Rights Commission. The Commission would be given additional authority to investigate vote frauds; instructing the Census Bureau to compile voting statistics from every State on the basis of race, color, and national origin, authorizing the Attorney General to institute action on behalf of a citizen denied admission to a nonsegregated public school, after the person complaining has exhausted his State's legal remedies; giving the Federal Government permission to offer technical assistance to States an localities to aid them in desegregating their public schools; creating a Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment discrimination by any business or union engaged in Government contract work; presuming that, if otherwise qualified to vote in a Federal election, citizens with a sixth-grade education have sufficient literacy.

Opportunity for education, for the right to vote, and for the right to a job without discrimination is a great American heritage. I urge all my colleagues who believe in the protection and preservation of these principles to support this bill and work for its passage.

Forest Products Research in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GILLIS W. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the serious need for an expanded program of forest products research in the South.

As you are aware, 41 percent of this Nation's commercial timberland is in the South and produces more than 50 percent of the total sawlog growth of this country.

Ninety-one percent of the forest property is privately owned. Seventy-four percent is owned by farmers, cattlemen, lawyers, schoolteachers, doctors, and investors from all walks of life. Only 9 percent is owned by Government agencies.

Thirty-seven million acres of forest land in the South is under a high degree of scientific management by private owners.

Tree planting and direct seeding have restored over 1 million acres of bare, cutover land, to forests in Louisiana alone since 1952. Effective forest-fire control has added twice this amount to the land area now supporting a new crop of second-growth timber. The same is more or less true for at least eight other Southern States.

During the 1940-55 period, the South produced 10 to 12 billion board feet of lumber annually. In 1956, 16,000 sawmills closed down in the South and 63,000 men lost their jobs. In 1961, forest industry employment in my State of Louisiana dropped by 3,000 in a single year and is still declining.

Today the South is producing only 6 billion board feet of lumber—one-half the 1940 level—yet we have twice as much sawtimber today as we had 15 years ago.

The lumber industry, in the past, has consumed 50 percent of all timber cut in the South. This has traditionally been the ultimate market for the final forest crop.

In Louisiana 120,000 citizens own timberland. For the most part they are managing these lands in an intelligent manner, and as a consequence, growth now exceeds use by 200 percent. The same is more or less true for east Texas, south Arkansas, and west Mississippi.

Markets for timber in this region generally are depressed—in some areas there is no market at all.

Timber values cannot remain at present low levels without seriously damaging reforestation investments made by our people. Unless some action is taken to develop better markets for wood, 20 years of reforestation efforts by private landowners will be placed in jeopardy.

This would not be in the best interest of our Nation. The U.S. Forest Service has stated publicly that the future wood needs of our Nation can only be met if the forest lands of the South are brought to a high level of productivity.

I have discussed this matter with the forestry leaders of my State. They stand solidly against any plan of Federal subsidies to maintain timber growth on private lands—yet they do feel that the Federal Government has an important role to play.

New knowledge through forest products research can restore profits to existing forest industry and create new ones, thereby strengthening timber values.

We have recently witnessed the development of new wood glues and glueing techniques which have led to the manufacture of laminated wood beams, superior in many respects to steel, laminated 2 by 4 studs which will not twist or warp, and, quite recently, plywood from southern pine veneers.

All this has come from scientific research. These are solid cornerstones upon which new and substantial timber values will be built. Intensified forest products research offers the only real opportunity for healthy markets. This we must have in order to maintain the profit motive. The profit motive is the only force which will keep private landowners interested in growing a forest crop.

The 87th Congress, recognizing the need for such a program in the South, appropriated $450,000 for initial construction of a $900,000 forest research laboratory at Alexandria, La.

Funds for the completion of this laboratory are omitted in current budget recommendations. I am requesting the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Interior and Related Agencies to include $450,000 for the completion of this laboratory. It is my hope that each of you will weight carefully the need for this facility and support appropriations necessary for its early completion.

Public Service Assails Udall's Faith Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, here is another link in the chain of facts that the bureaucracy is determined to carry out a giant federalized power scheme. This time the Secretary of the Interior is using the familiar pressure tactics with the power and prestige of his office to influence public opinion and a pending decision by Colorado's public utilities commission in opposition to private power. Interior's Bureau of Reclamation and Agriculture's Rural Electrification Administration obviously are ganging up on the Public Service Co. in a program contrary to the traditional view-

point of Congress; namely, that Federal funds should not be used to construct steamplants for the purpose of firming up a Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric project. The real purpose is to bypass Congress and build what in reality is a Bureau of Reclamation steamplant financed by REA funds.

The need is ever more pressing now for Congress to step in and take greater control of these power agencies. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram, letter, and statement by President R. T. Person, Public Service Co. of Colorado, and related news articles in the Denver Post on February 6 and 7, 1963, will bear me out:

FEBRUARY 7, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As president of Colorado's largest taxpaying corporation I respectfully protest the statements attributed to the Secretary of the Interior in Denver, Colo., on February 6, 1963.

I am astonished that the Secretary of Interior would use the power and prestige of his Federal office to attempt to publicly influence the decision of a quasi-judicial State body like the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado on a matter such as the proposed Colorado-Ute REA steam-electric plant. This is a State matter to be determined under Colorado law and I believe it is highly improper for the Secretary to inject himself and the prestige of his office into this controversy.

A press clipping and my statement in response is being mailed to your attention.

Very respectfully yours,
R. T. PERSON,
Public Service Co. of Colorado.

PUBLIC SERVICE CO.
OF COLORADO,
Denver, Colo., February 7, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a confirmation of the telegram I sent you on February 7, along with the other material I said would follow.

The actions of the Secretary of the Interior in this particular case represent, in my opinion, a serious intervention of the Federal Government into the affairs of the State of Colorado. The statements and claims, with regard to our company, attributed to the Secretary in this clipping are not in keeping with the dignity and prestige of his office.

I sincerely believe this is a very serious matter that should be called to your attention.

Very respectfully yours,
R. T. PERSON,
President.

R. T. PERSON, PRESIDENT, PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF COLORADO, COMMENTING ON SECRETARY UDALL'S STATEMENT CONCERNING THE HAYDEN PLANT

"I am astonished that the Secretary of the Interior would lend the stature of his office to the pressure tactics which are being used by many in an effort to influence the decision of a quasi-judicial body, the Public Utilities Commission of Colorado, concerning the authorization of the proposed Colorado-Ute REA powerplant. This is a State matter to be determined under Colorado law and I believe it is highly improper for the Secretary to inject himself and the prestige of his office into this matter."

With respect to the statements of bad faith contained in Mr. Udall's recent interview, Person unequivocably denied that these was any possible indication of bad faith on the part of his company in recent dealings with the Bureau of Reclamation. "To the contrary," he asserted, "at the time negotiations were being conducted and contracts signed between the Bureau and Public Service Co., the Bureau was well aware of our opposition, since officials of our company were appearing before Congress expressing opposition to the use of REA funds to construct the Colorado-Ute REA electric plant. In this testimony we pointed out that this plant was totally and wholly unnecessary, and a waste of taxpayer funds."

"Moreover," Person continued, "our opposition was of public record in the State of Colorado in the form of a written protest to the Public Utilities Commission prior to the time that the Bureau of Reclamation and Colorado-Ute entered into a contract with respect to the Hayden plant."

Person pointed out that the decision in this case is a constitutional duty and function of the Public Utilities Commission of Colorado. Their sole responsibility is to determine whether the proposed project is in the public interest of the citizens of the State of Colorado. This the Commission must do regardless of any protests or lack of protest by Public Service Co. or any other interested person.

"The Secretary's statement clearly proves what has long been our contention—that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Rural Electrification Administration are embarking upon a program contrary to the traditional viewpoint of Congress, namely that Federal funds should not be used to construct steamplants for the purpose of firming up a Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric project. It further indicates that the real purpose behind the Hayden plant is to bypass Congress and build what in reality is a Bureau of Reclamation steamplant financed by REA funds.

"Insofar as resource development is concerned, Public Service Co. of Colorado yields to no firm or individual with respect to the coal resources of the State. For example, our coal consumption during the year 1962 was equivalent to approximately one-third of the total coal production of the State and amounted to approximately 1,100,000 tons.

"With respect to the construction of an REA plant in New Mexico, such a plan has long been a matter of general information and the consideration of the Hayden plant has no relationship whatsoever. The Plains G. & T. REA Cooperative in New Mexico stated their intention long ago to build a plant in northern New Mexico. I might add that this plant, in my opinion, is no more needed than is the Hayden plant in Colorado, and would represent another waste of taxpayer funds. The fact of the matter is that the Hayden plant is a part of a giant federalized power scheme, affecting not only Colorado but the entire United States.

"Statements have recently been made that if Colorado rejects the Colorado-Ute plant, the proposal would be transferred to Wyoming. This is further evidence of the pressure tactics being used to attempt to influence the decision of the Colorado commission. Construction of such a plant in Wyoming would be even less practical for Colorado-Ute's system and their member cooperatives than the Hayden plant."

Person said that Public Service Co. would continue to present before any proper agency what it felt was in the public interests of its 400,000 electric consumers regardless of whether it met with the pleasure or displeasure of the Secretary of the Interior. He added, "I firmly believe purely local matters should be determined by appropriate officials of the State of Colorado."

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 6, 1963]

INTERIOR CHIEF ASSAILS POWER FIRMS' STAND

(By Bert Hanna)

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall on a mission to Denver, Tuesday, bluntly accused the Public Service Co. of Colorado, and Western Colorado Power Co. of "bad faith and selfishness" in their efforts to block an REA thermal electric generating plant on coal fields at Hayden, Colo.

Udall, in an interview with the Denver Post, warned that if Colorado doesn't get the plant "it will still certainly be built, possibly in Wyoming or New Mexico."

"In that case, Colorado will have lost a great economic asset and a means of development of some of its enormous coal reserves," he said.

Public Service and Western Colorado Power, the latter a wholly owned subsidiary of Utah Power & Light Co. of Salt Lake City, resisted the granting of a permit to build the plant in protracted hearings before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission.

The permit is sought by Colorado-Ute Electric Association of Montrose, which has approved REA loans and other financing for the $30.5 million plant and transmission system.

The plant, besides supplying electricity for member rural electrict co-ops of Colorado-Ute, would be integrated with the vast hydroelectric system of the Colorado River Storage Project under a contract with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

INTERIOR CONCERNED

That is why the U.S. Interior Department has such a vital interest in the endeavor and why it is concerned with the protracted delay in State approval, Udall said.

Udall charged that, contrary to the claims of the opposing investor-owned utilities, the plan for an integrated coal electric plant was known to all interested parties, including the utilities, more than a year ago.

He said "the cards were on the table" when his department entered into agreements and signed contracts with private utilities of this region for a cooperative transmission system in which both the Government and utilities would share in wheeling of power.

"We know that such a plant as that at Hayden would do the best job in providing additional revenues for the upper Colorado River Basin fund," he continued, "affording tremendous savings in transmission costs.

"The Hayden plant was an integral part of our overall plan considered a year ago when we made basic contracts for integration of our system with the utilities.

"Now, had I known that the Utah Light & Power subsidiary (Western) and Public Service would take such a position of blind obstructionism, that might have made a great deal of difference in the agreements we made with them at that time.

"They get their part of the agreement and then they move over and try to block an essential part of the overall plan. I say that is an element of bad faith and selfishness."

SEES BENEFITS

The fiery, blunt Cabinet officer also ridiculed the utilities' claim that they would be harmed through unfair competition of public power in construction of the Hayden facility.

"I cannot see that any legitimate interest would be injured," he said. "In fact, all power groups would be benefited."

Moreover, Udall said, the recent analysis by Felix L. Sparks, Colorado director of natural resources, on benefits from the Hayden plant is correct.

Sparks stated that the facility ultimately would provide some $200 million in savings to

the upper basin fund for the benefit of participating reclamation projects in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico, besides low-cost power to members of Colorado-Ute.

"Our own experts in the Bureau of Reclamation have drawn the same conclusions," Udall said.

As to charges of the private companies that the Reclamation Bureau entered into improper agreements to further an REA project in behalf of reclamation project power, Udall said:

"Our Department is working very closely with the Department of Agriculture in resource fields. (REA is in the Agriculture Department.) There is nothing at all irregular or out of the way in our getting together on common goals and objectives.

"In fact we have gotten together on a similar plan to develop electrical energy through an REA project on lignite fields of North Dakota, which will firm up power for the Missouri Valley system."

OTHER VIEWS

In a press conference later, Udall expressed these opinions on other resource and conservation matters:

He believes stockmen ultimately will go along with a reasonable increase in grazing fees on public lands under his Department to help provide funds for needed soil conservation measures.

A new policy in granting of rights-of-way to private utilities for powerlines across public lands, specifying that excess power be made available to the Federal Government, is not oppressive but is sound business. Utilities are resisting the order and hearings are scheduled.

Authorization of a new Youth Conservation Corps in this session of Congress is one of the most important programs of President Kennedy. Such a corps, similar to the CCC of the depression years of the 1930's, could accomplish invaluable conservation work besides helping the Nation's youth.

It is doubtful if an acceptable wilderness bill can pass in this session of Congress until next year and the outlook is not bright for early approval of a new Canyonlands National Park in Utah, one of Udall's major park goals. However, other new national parks and recreational areas will be established.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 7, 1963]

PUBLIC SERVICE ASSAILS UDALL'S FAITH CHARGE

(By Bert Hanna)

Robert T. Person, president of Public Service Co. of Colorado, protested Thursday to President Kennedy about conduct of Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall in his attacks on Public Service stemming from the proposed REA electric plant at Hayden, Colo.

"I am astonished that the Secretary of Interior would use the power and prestige of his Federal office to attempt to publicly influence the decision of a quasi-judicial State body such as the Public Utilities Commission of Colorado," Person wired the President.

Person took the action on the basis of statements made to the Denver Post by Udall in a visit to Denver in which he accused both Public Service and Western Colorado Power Co. of Montrose, Colo., of bad faith and selfishness.

The two companies have fought for months to thwart the granting of a permit for the $30.5 million plant and transmission system proposed by Colorado-Ute Electric Association of Montrose on coal fields in the Hayden area of Routt County. A decision by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission is awaited.

"As president of Colorado's largest taxpaying corporation, I respectfully protest the statements attributed to the Secretary of the Interior in Denver on February 6," Person's telegram to Kennedy said.

"This is a State matter to be determined under Colorado law, and I believe it is highly improper for the Secretary to inject himself and the prestige of his office into this controversy.

"A press clipping (from the Denver Post) and my statement in response is being mailed to your attention."

CHARGE REJECTED

In his statement, Person rejected Udall's charge of "bad faith" on the part of his company in recent dealings with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

This concerned an agreement to integrate the transmission system of the $1 billion Colorado River storage project with the Colorado-Ute Hayden thermal plant. Udall claimed the plan was known to Public Service and other utilities of this region when the Interior Department entered into storage project wheeling agreements with the utilities a year ago.

"To the contrary," Person said, "at the time negotiations were conducted and contracts signed between the Bureau and Public Service Co., the Bureau was well aware of our opposition. * * * Officials of our company were appearing before Congress expressing opposition to use of REA funds to construct the Colorado-Ute REA electric plant.

"Moreover, our opposition was of public record in Colorado in the form of a written protest to the public utilities commission prior to the time the Bureau of Reclamation and Colorado-Ute entered into a contract with respect to the Hayden plant."

Western Colorado Power, subsidiary of Utah Power & Light Co., also issued a statement blasting Udall.

"The fact of the matter is that the Hayden plant is part of a giant federalized power scheme—affecting not only Colorado but the entire United States," Person said in his statement.

Person's statement emphasized that the decision in the Hayden plant case is a constitutional duty and function of the Colorado public utilities commission.

"The secretary's statement clearly proves what has long been our contention—that the Bureau of Reclamation and Rural Electrification Administration are embarking upon a program contrary to the traditional viewpoint of Congress—namely that Federal funds should not be used to construct steam plants to firm up a bureau hydroelectric project.

"It further indicates that the real purpose behind the Hayden plant is to bypass Congress and build what in reality is a Bureau of Reclamation steamplant financed by REA funds."

In response to Udall's charge that his company is trying to impede resource development in Colorado, Person said his company "yields to no firm or individual with respect to the coal resources of the State"—equivalent to one-third of the total coal production of the State in 1962.

Udall had stated that if the plant is lost to Colorado, it will certainly be built, probably in Wyoming or New Mexico.

NO RELATIONSHIP

A plan for building such a plant in New Mexico, Person said, has long been a matter of general information and the consideration of the Hayden plant has no relationship whatsoever.

"The Plains Generation and Transmission REA Cooperative in New Mexico stated its intention long ago to build a plant in northern New Mexico," said Person.

As to Udall's suggestion that the plant may be transferred to Wyoming as urged by Wyoming Senator GALE MCGEE (Democrat), Person called this "further evidence of the pressure tactics being used to attempt to influence the decision of the Colorado commission."

Construction of such a plant in Wyoming would be even less practical for Colorado-Ute's system and its member cooperatives than the Hayden plant, he contended.

The Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Council of Economic Advisers has apparently convinced the President that a tax cut—which will result in a $12 billion planned deficit—is all that is needed to get the country moving again. I am encouraged to see that this fuzzy thinking is not shared by all our Nation's economists. The opposite view has been very well stated—with supporting facts—by Dr. Jules Backman, research professor of economics, New York University, in an article entitled "Economic Incentives" appearing in the Wall Street Journal, February 19, 1963. I am inserting this article in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent so to do:

THE TAX CUT PROPOSAL PROVIDES AN INADEQUATE STIMULUS

(By Jules Backman)

On several occasions, President Kennedy has emphasized the need to increase incentives by reducing taxes. Such a program is long overdue. However, the proposed tax reduction program does not meet this objective. It is largely designed to increase the purchasing power available to lower and middle income groups.

A modest increase in corporate incentives is proposed while the reductions in rates on high personal incomes are offset in large part by changes in the handling of deductions. These reforms threaten to negate the possible favorable effects of lower tax rates. The stimulus to incentives accordingly appears to be inadequate.

At the same time, the magnitude of the problem faced by the economy appears to be exaggerated by the Council of Economic Advisers. Thus, while unemployment is too high, it is important to place this situation in proper perspective. Between 1957, when the unemployment rate was 4.3 percent, and 1962, the labor force increased by 4,065,000 while the volume of unemployment rose by 1,076,000. Despite the displacement of labor accompanying automation, there was a net increase of 3 million jobs in this 5-year period.

Our problem has been how to create about 1 million more jobs over a 5-year period. Incidentally, the average weekly hours in manufacturing industries increased from 39.8 in 1957 to 40.4 in 1962. If there had not been this increase in hours, mainly at overtime rates, the required number of new jobs would be less than 1 million. Against this total must be offset an apparent small withdrawal from the labor force.

A ROUGH WEAPON

The Council of Economic Advisers in the "Economic Report of the President" has presented a detailed rationalization of the proposed tax program. The CEA seems to assume that fiscal policy is a tool with a fine

cutting edge so that it can determine exactly at what dollar of gross national product it becomes restrictive. Actually, fiscal policy is a very rough weapon whose use can be accompanied by unpredictable effects.

The CEA estimated that if economic activity had reached a level that would reduce the unemployment rate to 4 percent the Federal budget would have shown a surplus of $8 billion on the basis of 1961 experience. This is the claimed drag on the economy. Nevertheless, a tax reduction of $13.5 billion has been proposed Does this mean that if a 4-percent unemployment rate is achieved we would continue to have a large budgetary dificit? At what level of economic activity would compensatory fiscal policy compensate by yielding a surplus?

To emphasize the importance of fiscal policy the CEA makes some rather strained interpretations of past experience. For example, the CEA states, "While the tax cuts of 1954 helped considerably in rescuing the economy from the recesion, it should be recognized that had they gone into effect earlier, the recession of 1953–54 might have been completely avoided." This is an amazing speculation in light of the 1948 experience reported one page earlier in its report. Taxes were cut in April 1948, or 7 months prior to the peak of the cycle. Nevertheless, the 1949 recession developed. If the enactment of the 1948 tax cut did not prevent the 1949 recession, on what basis can the Council speculate that a tax cut in 1953 might have made it possible to avoid the 1954 recession?

DEFICIT ROSE BY 50 PERCENT

Incidentally, the CEA describes the 1953–54 fiscal policy as having been contractionary and alleges it was a major cause of the recession. In the second quarter of 1953 the seasonally adjusted annual rate of Federal deficit in the national income and product accounts was $7 billion. (This budgetary system, now much in favor in Washington, attempts to measure the current impact of Federal transactions on national income and output.) By the fourth quarter of 1953 the deficit was $11.8 billion and in the first quarter of 1954 it was at the rate of $10.6 billion. Thus, the alleged contractionary policy was accompanied by an increase of some 50 percent in the budgetary defict. It would be interesting to know how much larger the deficit would have had to be for it to have been expansionary rather than contractionary.

Moreover, this explanation of the 1954 recession ignores the fact that there was a swing of $5.8 billion in inventories (from an accumulation of $3.1 billion at annual rates in the second quarter of 1953 to liquidation of $2.7 billion in the second quarter of 1954).

In the 1930's fiscal policy is described as having been moderately expansionary for the decade as a whole. Between 1931 and 1939 the Federal budgetary deficits were equal to 3.4 percent of national income. The CEA report states, "Unemployment melted away very rapidly when military needs began in 1941 to lead the large budget deficits" and that "moderate dosages (of deficits) in the early stages (of the war economy) quickly solved an unemployment problem which had seemed insoluble for 10 year years." The Council goes on to say, "This was not because the expenditures happened to be military in nature—any expenditures, private or public, on the same scale would have expanded demand and put men back to work." This is quite a statement.

Actually, in 1941 the Federal deficit on the national income basis was $5.1 billion or 4.9 percent of national income. This figure was 1.5 percentage points larger than the average of 3.4 percent in the 1930's and actually lower than in 1934 and 1936.

Unemployment was sharply reduced in 1941 because of all of the anticipations which became operative in an incipient war economy, not because of budget deficits per se. It is apparent nonsense to say that expenditures for our military program in that environment had the same effects as any other type of expenditures. If those Federal expenditures had been made for public works, for example, there would have not developed the consumer buying spree, business investment in plant and equipment, and other developments associated with a war economy.

The attempt to seek support for the present program from that earlier experience by attributing the resulting drop in unemployment to budget deficits does not square with the facts. It represents an amazing misinerpretation of the forces operating in a war economy.

PASSIVE RED INK

The CEA also attempts to distinguish between deficits which occur in the Federal budget because of a decline in economic activity and deficits resulting from other developments. It describes the former as "passive deficits" and states, "It is not the deficits as such that provide stimulus. Only reductions in tax rates or increases in expenditures have an actively stimulating role." The CEA then describes the deficits of the past few years as passive.

But the recent deficits have, in fact, resulted from an increase in Government spending to which the CEA attributes an actively stimulating role. Between fiscal 1961 and fiscal 1963, total Government expenditures have increased by almost $13 billion and the deficit by $5 billion, in terms of the regular administrative budget. The increase in the deficit during this period did not reflect declining revenues, since revenues actually rose by $8 billion. What the CEA really means is that these revenues did not rise as much as it had anticipated with its overoptimistic forecast of a year ago. But a mistake in forecasting does not change the fact that Government spending has risen sharply and continues to point higher. According to the CEA's philosophy, the result should have been stimulating rather than passive.

Regardless of how it comes about, the projected deficit of $12 billion represents money that the Federal Government must obtain to pay its bills. In the ordinary course of events such funds are obtained from sources which tend to be inflationary.

The Council attempts to explain away one aspect of inflationary borrowing by suggesting that sometimes the sale of Government bonds to commercial banks is considered per se expansionary, while the sale of bonds directly to the public is considered neutral. But this distinction is not a reliable guide. It then goes on to note that if the banks "have to unload other securities on the public to make room for the new securities" that this is a different situation from that which prevails where bank reserves and deposits rise correspondingly.

ROLE OF RESERVES

Although this statement is true, it has no real meaning under the present circumstances. The banks have around $300 million in excess reserves. They can acquire additional quantities of Government securities without liquidating their present holdings of other securities. Under such conditions, the purchase of Government securities by the commercial banks (increasing Government deposits in the banks) would tend to be inflationary even though total bank reserves do not increase. It is not necessary for both bank reserves and deposits to rise for an inflationary increase in deposits to take place.

Dr. Walter Heller has described as a Puritan ethic the concern of many persons over a tax cut during a period when the economy is operating at a record high level and the Federal budget is in the red by some $12 billion. Regardless of whether he calls it a passive deficit, a stimulating deficit or any other kind of deficit, his prescription to stimulate growth is to increase the deficit. As Gertrude Stein might have said, a deficit is a deficit is a deficit. Personally, I prefer the Puritan ethic to the spendthrift ethic so prevalent in this country.

We must have a cut in taxes to increase incentives but this cut can be more modest than that proposed. The opportunity to make profits is the main motivating force in our economy and is the most potent means of creating job opportunities. It is important to keep in mind that tax adjustments to increase incentives can be effective within the framework of a balanced budget. Tax cuts should be accompanied by reductions in Government spending. The time is long past since we should have used a meat ax on farm expenditures, the public works pork barrel and some of our foreign aid (military and economic) programs. It is time to end politics as usual. We can improve incentives and cut Government spending at the same time.

What the country needs is bigger incentives, not bigger deficits.

Address by the Honorable Hale Boggs, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the splendid speech delivered by one of the Democratic leaders of the House, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, our party's majority whip, last Wednesday to a capacity audience at the National Capital Democratic Club at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel.

I have known HALE BOGGS for many years, and I have always had the highest regard for him and for the service he is rendering to our country. His dynamic, forceful, and positive speech this week demonstrated more than my own words can express just what a superb whip he is for the Democratic Party in the House and what a dedicated public servant he is to the United States. What impressed most about his address was its constructive and positive tone, and its optimistic outlook for the future of this great country of ours. HALE BOGGS has always been a positive leader in the House, one who looks with expectation, hope, and optimism on the future development and growth of America. He, like the late Speaker Rayburn, has faith in the future of our country, faith in our young people who are growing to adulthood today, faith that they will continue to carry the mantle with courage and strength for freemen everywhere. In short, Mr. Speaker, HALE BOGGS is the kind of leader which the United States needs to keep our country strong, and to guard her against any attempted encroachments by the Sino-Soviet system on our freedom and our democratic way of life.

Unlike some persons in responsible posts in our Government today, HALE

BOGGS does not, and never has taken, the pessimistic, negative approach to the many grave problems which face the United States as the leader of the free world. The thoughts he expressed so eloquently in his speech last Wednesday are dynamic proof of the strong character and nature of this man.

I am proud to serve with HALE BOGGS—he is a great credit to his district in Louisiana; he is credit to our State and to the United States, and among the leaders of the free world, he is held in high esteem by all who know him or know of his reputation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the highlights—paraphrased—of Congressman BOGGS' address to members and their guests at the National Capital Democratic Club:

GIST OF SPEECH BY HON. HALE BOGGS BEFORE THE NATIONAL CAPITAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, FEBRUARY 20, 1963

"We are in the process of welding together the Democratic Party as a national party," Congressman HALE BOGGS began his speech last Wednesday.

"In the 87th Congress, we won many crucial votes, and enacted several pieces of legislation, without much support from the Republicans. We did not have to compromise, or beg them to vote with us," he said.

The Louisiana Congressman stated that the country will see more of this (i.e., Democratic unity) in the 88th Congress. We are going to pass a constructive program, despite the fact that we will get more harping from the Republicans than last year.

BOGGS declared that President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON are dedicated to maintaining and preserving the integrity and the strength of our country.

He cited the fact that this Democratic administration has enacted more constructive legislation for the benefit of the growth and proper utilization of our natural resources than any other administration in the past three decades. BOGGS noted the authorization of three new seashore parks as national parks: One in Texas; another in California, and the third in Massachusetts.

The Congressman also pointed to the Fryingpan project, the San Juan project, and the water and air pollution legislation as further examples of constructive legislation.

He said that rivers and harbors projects are moving ahead, are progressing at a phenomenal rate; he talked of the great value of the Atchafalaya Basin project, which is maintaining the Mississippi River on its present course, and thus averting disaster for the ports of New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and the entire lower Misissippi Valley.

For the first time, BOGGS pointed out, our country is experimenting in a serious way with converting saline water into fresh water, and noted that this will mean so much not only to the people of our Nation, but to those of all the world.

The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 was passed by a Democratic vote in the closing days of the 87th Congress, he stated; thus far, subdivisions of the State of Louisiana have filed applications for these funds totaling $120 million, and a total of $2 billion has been applied for by political subdivisions in the 50 States of the Union.

To the charge that the Democratic Party, and this administration, is antibusiness, BOGGS cited the pending case of a proposed merger between the Eastern Airlines and American Airlines, and pointed out that the Justice Department is not opposed to this merger, but rather the other competing airlines are opposed to it. "Is this antibusiness?" he said.

This administration is totally and completely dedicated to the strengthening of the free enterprise system; the Federal Government has a big stake in the success of business, he added.

He then cited a Wall Street Journal story of February 20, in which so many industries, including the railroads, the airlines, the farm equipment companies, and others, had increased their volume of business and their profits by great percentages in the fourth quarter of 1962, as compared to the last quarter of 1961.

Despite this growth, BOGGS said, this administration feels that our country's business and industry should do more in terms of economic growth and development.

Of our Nation's proposed budget for defense and space fiscal 1964, BOGGS said that he would agree to a cut of these budgets to some degree if this could be done without harming the safety of the United States and the free world; however, he stated that he doubted any cuts could be made in these areas. The Republicans' suggestions in this area are inconsistent because some of them are calling for cuts in the defense budget, and at the same time, they are demanding "action" (implying military action) with regard to Cuba.

He noted that the Republican administration under President Eisenhower had depended solely on a nuclear deterrent defense of our country; that if the United States was going to enter war, it must be a nuclear war, with full nuclear retaliation. He said this Democratic administration has a substitute—an alternative—for our nuclear deterrent, and that has taken the form of highly trained, skillful guerrilla troops, many of whom are fighting in Vietnam today and doing a superb job there. In the space arena, BOGGS declared that if the United States would announce that we were abandoning the space race, we would lose our leadership of the free world, and the Soviet Union would conquer us and the free world with ease.

Today the United States has 190 million people, and we are growing at an annual rate of approximately the same number of people as are now living in my State of Louisiana—i.e., more than three and a half million people. Each year our economy must be dynamic enough, aggressive enough, to absorb into the labor force about 3 million new workers. Today, in the sugarcane fields of Louisiana, 1 man-hour is equivalent to about 43,000 man-hours in southeast Asia—and this is due to the great technological advance we have made in the use of all kinds of farm equipment and machinery.

Furthermore, BOGGS pointed out, the rice industry in Louisiana is conducted almost entirely with machinery, and very little labor.

In the educational field, BOGGS stated that the education of the Nation's youth should be a joint responsibility—that it is a major enterprise of the Nation. In today's world, you cannot compete in the realm of space, engineeering, sciences of all kinds, without a thorough education.

With regard to the Peace Corps, our young people have transferred the innate idealism of our country to the peoples of nations all over the world. He promoted the creation of the Youth Conservation Corps, the National Service Corps, the proposed program for mental health and retarded children, and others.

"This is not a (tax) program to increase deficits, but one to decrease deficits," BOGGS declared of the administration's tax proposals.

He cited our Nation's deficits of today as: The more than $50 billion in unused industrial capacity; the more than 5 million men who are unemployed.

The Louisiana Congressman averred that if we properly utilize the unused capacity in our country (i.e., industrial and labor capacity), coupled with lower taxes, we will stimulate the economy, and produce more revenue and greater profits, thus producing more revenue to operate the Federal Government. He cited the huge Eisenhower deficit in fiscal 1959—about $13 billion—and explained how it happened. By permitting the individual consumers, and the corporate taxpayers to have more money to spend and to invest, the economy will grow, and more jobs, greater payrolls, etc., will result. This moderate program by the Democratic administration is basic fundamental free enterprise doctrine.

To do as the Republicans suggest, and cut spending drastically, would in fact depress the economy, and the country would be faced with higher deficits, BOGGS stated.

He said the investment tax credit of 7 percent, enacted last year (1962) already has stimulated industry, and has helped the economy.

"I am proud to work with the President, and for him, and I don't apologize for it anywhere in the United States," BOGGS added.

The Democratic Party will continue to be the party of action—the party that gets things done for our country. The fundamental concept of the Democratic Party is that our country must continue to move forward, and I assure you that our party will do just that.

School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor issue of February 11, 1963, pointed out some of the reasons which cause school dropouts. Lack of vocational training is one of those mentioned from a study of 1,251 students who dropped out of high school as reported by the Tucson Community Council. The article rightly points the finger also at the home and employers who lure the student away from school with what, to him, are irresistible temptations. I think that studies like this make the problem a little easier to understand and do something about.

The article follows:

WHAT CAUSES SCHOOL DROPOUTS?

(By the education editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

Automobiles. Inadequate vocational training. These are the two most frequently mentioned reasons why so many students drop out of school.

Study after study has revealed a direct correlation between ownership of a car and dropping out of school. The latest report which has come to the attention of this editor is from Tucson, Ariz. The Tucson Community Council found that of the 1,251 students who dropped out of high school last year, nearly half of these dropouts owned automobiles.

One year when I was teaching the sixth grade, I had in my class a husky young man who was waiting eagerly for his 16th birthday. He had spent 2 years in each grade along the way without having learned to read. He learned to read that year, but confided to me that he still wouldn't be staying on in school after January 19.

WORK AFTER SCHOOL

"You see, Ma'am, I've been working nights in a garage, and I just about got this here car paid for, and soon's I'm 16 I can work full time. You sure were nice to teach me to read, and if it weren't for you I wouldn't be able to pass my driver's test."

True to his word, he drove to school on his birthday with a present of a package of chewing gum for each of his teachers. (He must have surmised that the attention we gave to removing his during school hours made us addicts.) He timed his arrival with recess and his former sixth-grade classmates crowded around to get a look at his "hopped up" Chevy.

His case is different from many since he was able to earn the money for his car while he was going to school. For many of the dropouts, their reason for leaving school is to have enough time to earn the money to pay for an automobile, and incidentally all the freedom that goes with wheels—a current teenage term for a car.

But what my young student didn't realize was that what made him employable was his youth, inexperience, and willingness to do the routine jobs. These very qualities he would soon grow out of, and he would then be replaced by another school dropout, leaving him unemployed, uneducated, and an economically unsound risk. What's more, he would probably not be able to keep his automobile.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The list of what's wrong with most vocational training programs is long, and too often accurate: not professional enough; too little time given to specific training; teachers are themselves unskilled; only the highly skilled trades are taught; program doesn't start soon eough (grade 9 in most high schools); methods and materials are old-fashioned; insufficient variety of course offerings; skills taught do not meet community needs.

The same report from the Tucson Community Council alleges that Tucson area employers think vocational training offered by the local high schools does not meet their requirements. The 1961–62 Directory of Trade and Industrial Training Programs in Public Schools shows that Tucson Senior High School offers courses in: aircraft powerplant mechanics, auto mechanics, carpentry, machine shop, general printing, and combination welding. If it is true that the training is not comprehensive enough, it would also appear that the variety is sparse.

A few of the usual training courses given in the other high schools which are not given at Tucson Senior High School are: commercial cooking, foundry work, furniture making and repair, industrial cooperative training, distributive education, photography, plumbing, and radio and television service and repair.

WHOSE FAULT?

One of these two reasons for school dropouts—automobiles and inadequate vocational training—can be corrected by the schools; the other must be corrected by the home and the community.

The schools are not responsible for students' automobiles. While it may be a good thing for a 16-year-old to be able to drive a car and have a license to do so, it may not be best for him to own an automobile. Parents who want their children to stay in school should be cautious about permitting them to own or operate automobiles. Parents who want their children to stay in school should be cautious about letting their children hold down unskilled jobs for money which they are allowed to spend at their own discretion. If young people who have dropped out of school are finding paying jobs in your community, perhaps their employers are the cause of the dropout.

Are young people being exploited in your community only to wind up on relief in later years when their education proves to be inadequate for the demands?

SCHOOL'S JOB

But the schools are responsible for the amount and quality of vocational training. It is their responsibility to teach those crafts and skills which are most needed, to teach them in such a way that any educable student can be fitted for employment, to provide an atmosphere for learning in which not only the college-oriented student is comfortable but where the future laborer develops a pride in his accomplishments as well as in himself.

Education is, of course, the answer to the school dropout problem.

The home and community must be educated not to lure the student away from school with, what to him, are irresistible temptations. The school must educate its students to want to stay in school, and must give them an education tailored to fit their needs and the needs of their community.

Lincoln in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of this House have just returned from their home States where they participated in programs and celebrations of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. I have been in my own home State, Indiana, which was the home of Abraham Lincoln for some 14 years.

This year Lincoln's birthday had a special significance for Indiana, for on that day was published an excellent book on the life of Lincoln in Indiana. This book, "Lincoln's Boyhood—A Chronicle of His Indiana Years," is by Capt. Francis M. Van Natter, a native of the area he wrote and studied about for many years.

I would like to invite the attention of the House to this new study which should appeal to anyone interested in Abraham Lincoln or in the qualities of character which have gone into the building of this Nation by its leaders. Captain Van Natter unfortunately died before his book came off the press; he had spent more than a quarter of a century in research and travel, covering every mile of Lincoln's Indiana years and exploring the sources of information in libraries, private collections, historical archives, local, State, and Federal sources and other places which might have information bearing on the Indiana chronicle. This book was published by Public Affairs Press, 419 New Jersey Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Captain Van Natter was a devoted Lincoln scholar as well as a patriotic and dedicated American. He was a hero in World War I where he won the Silver Star with oak leaf cluster for bravery in action. He was seriously wounded at the second battle of Marne and suffered wounds which were to disable him permanently. He also served on the staff of Gen. John J. Pershing and was chief of the diplomatic courier service in the Balkans during the postwar days of the peace conference.

Captain Van Natter made exhaustive studies of Lincoln. He devoted much time to public service activities, including veterans' organizations, and in Washington to the Indiana State Society and as a member of the Washington Civic Symphony. I mention these facts about the author to give a setting to the devotion of the author who was not only a loyal constituent but a close friend as well.

The book "Lincoln's Boyhood" has been received with warm praise by those who are best equipped to judge its merit—Indiana newspaper editors. While I will not take time to quote extensively, I would like to mention two timely comments.

Lincoln saw his first printing press in the office of the old Western Sun newspaper at Vincennes, Ind. Last week the Vincennes Sun-Commercial praised the Van Natter book, saying:

> It is an intriguing book. It pictures in detail the Indiana of those early days as Lincoln knew it. It emphasizes the miracle of Lincoln who from a lowly birth and a boyhood in primitive land of forest and rivers climbed to immortality, revered as no other American save George Washington.

In another part of the State the Huntington Press-Herald said editorially:

> The years of painstaking research bear fruit in the publication of Captain Van Natter's book * * *. The freshness of the interest-gripping narrative is undobutedly in the sureness of the author's mastery of his facts. Every chapter reveals he did not go to library shelves to cull the writings of others for the fabric of his book, but bit by bit himself hunted out elusive details wherever they led him. The reader is aware from first page to last that the author has shared his own experience with the Lincoln story in Indiana.
>
> There will be among his readers those who rejoice that in this book there is no concession to present-day supersophistication. Captain Van Natter has written of a youth who trod the wilderness paths of Indiana on his way to becoming a national hero. To the captain, Lincoln is a hero and the years in Indiana helped make him so. There is nothing of apology in his book that he so believes and so writes. It is good in these times to read a book like this.

Many fine comments have been received about the book and I commend this chronicle to anyone interested in Lincoln. Before concluding I would like to invite the attention of the Members to the closing chapter of the book, "Lasting Impressions." This sums up the impact of the Indiana years on the future President and sets forth in a fine way the reasons why we in Indiana feel that we can lay a strong claim to helping build the character of one of our greatest Presidents.

I should like to add that this work has an extraordinary list of sources and a fine bibliography for those interested in further study of Lincoln and the Indiana years.

Frank Vessels, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Grim Reaper has moved in his inevitable and ruthless fashion and cut from the ranks of the living an outstanding citizen and personality of Orange County, Frank Vessels, Sr. The finger of tragedy has touched not only those near and dear to him but also those privileged to call him friend. Among the legion so privileged I count myself one.

It was my observation that Frank chose his friends because he respected them; not because he agreed with them. In turn he did not seek approbation but rather respect. He was a man who met life on its own terms neither giving quarter nor asking it. His was not the quality of diplomacy but rather the aggressive persistence of competition leavened by a high sense of sportsmanship. He fought hard for himself and his ambitions with effectiveness and with honor. He loved his family and was loyal to his friends. He spoke always with candor but seldom with rancor.

Frank Vessel's climb to success was "Operation Bootstraps." He was born September 22, 1898, at Elizabethtown, Ky. When he came to San Bernardino in 1921 he brought with him the traditional love of horses and the heritage of racing for the improvement of the breed. In that year he met and married Grace Hagey and to their union was born one son, Frank, Jr. After Frank Vessels had worked himself up from a roughneck in the oilfields of southern California to ownership of an oil construction company he purchased, in 1946, a 475-acre ranch at Los Alamitos and he went to work on the realization of his dream for a racecourse for the quarter horse breeders in the Western United States. On Sunday, August 3, 1947, Frank held his first meet—a betless race for his friends and neighbors.

In December of 1951, the first racing with parimutuel betting was held at Los Alamitos and the purses were $50 put up by the horsemen themselves. Last year the same track held a futurity race with a purse of $205,000—the largest in the history of California racing.

Mr. Vessels is properly described as the father of quarterhorse racing in western United States. For 7 years he was president of the Pacific Coast Quarterhorse Association and past president of the Pacific Coast Quarterhorse Racing Association and he is a past president of the American Quarterhorse Association. Besides his interest in racing Mr. Vessels has been a supporter of many charitable activities and he was the principal supporter of the Los Alamitos Youth Center. He has been often honored. In 1962 he was named Orange County "Man of the Year" by the Orange County Press Association. Only last week he was cited by the board of supervisors of Orange County for his outstanding work for charity and for youth.

He was a very successful businessman having interest in a number of construction companies in the oilfield construction, particularly. And besides being principal stockholder, chairman of the board, and founder of the Los Alamitos racecourse, he headed the Vessels Land & Development Co. and owned a western clothing store in Long Beach.

The passing of Frank Vessels, Sr., will leave a substantial empty place in the county and community in which he lived. That space will be for some time a vivid reminder of the big citizen who helped make the county what it is today. He gave it some of the character, color, and flavor that makes for identity and creates pride. Many are those who will miss the warm hospitality he extended to a wide range of acquaintances from every walk of life at the Vessels' ranch.

In the shadow of his recent departure it is almost an impossible task to express the sympathy which will match the grief his family now must bear. Our sincere condolences and deep regrets go to his warm and wonderful wife and to those members of his family whose loss transcends that felt by those not privileged this close relationship.

The Washington Economy at the New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, of interest to all Members of Congress who are charged with the well-being of this Capital City should be an address which Maj. Gen. George Olmsted—U.S. Air Reserve, retired—delivered on "The Washington Economy at the New Year" at a luncheon meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade on Tuesday, January 29.

There are some amazing facts and figures in his remarks it would do all of us well to study to learn how far we have come in the past 10 years and whither we might be going in the decade ahead. I am sure my colleagues will find these remarks exciting reading. I consider it a privilege to place General Olmsted's address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address follows:

THE WASHINGTON ECONOMY AT THE NEW YEAR

(Address by Maj. Gen. George Olmsted, U.S. Army Reserve, retired; president and chairman, International Bank; president, Financial General Corp., Washington, D.C., at luncheon meeting, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, Tuesday, January 29, 1963)

Elbert Hubbard described the art of forecasting as "to observe that which has passed, and guess it will happen again."

Commenting on the recent book on the business outlook for 1963 published by the National Industrial Conference Board, the Wall Street Journal said, in part: "Forecasting has come a long way since Roman seers foretold the future by examining the entrails of dead pigeons especially slain for this purpose. But for all the scientific trappings of modern forecasting—computers, elaborate formulas, sophisticated index numbers, reams of statistics—the hard independence of the independent variables must be reckoned with, and the facile assumption of other things being equal rarely is reliable."

In charting a course that the economy of the Greater Washington area may take as it moves along in 1963, I did not use the pigeon method nor use a crystal ball, tea leaves, or computers. I cannot lay claim to any special powers of economic clairvoyance. It would indeed be presumptuous of me or anyone else to pretend to predict exact developments during 1963.

As we all are associated with businesses that have a sizable stake in the future of this Washington area, however, we have to know something of the trends that are shaping the future here so that we can use our judgment and experience in our own planning.

My purpose here today, therefore, is to share with you some thoughts about those trends that I believe are significant in planning ahead during 1963 and beyond.

I would like to cover three bases in this discussion of the Greater Washington economy: (1) Overall trends; (2) specific developments; (3) outline of prospects.

My discussion deals, of course, with the general market concept of the Greater Washington area, the District itself, Montgomery, and Prince Georges County of Maryland, as well as the northern Virginia territory, including Alexandria, Arlington County, Fairfax County, and Falls Church.

OVERALL TRENDS

Let us look quickly at the most significant economic changes and trends in this area, as reported for the past decade of 1950–60.

Over half a million people were added to the population. The number rose from 1.46 million to just over 2 million—an increase of 36.7 percent.

Households increased from 405,000 to nearly 600,000—averaging about 18,700 additional households every year.

Spendable income increased nearly $1 million a day during the 10 years. It climbed from $2.1 to $5.6 billion yearly. This is an increase of 165 percent—or over $350 million every year.

Average family income here is over $7,600 a year—having increased from $4,357 in 1950—leading all urbanized areas in the country.

Government pay increases ranged from 32 percent to nearly 45 percent.

The number of diplomatic missions increased 37.5 percent, from 72 to 99. The number of officers of these missions was up 47.5 percent from 847 to 1,250.

Tourists into the area increased from 4 million a year to 7 million. Their expenditures rose from $150 to $370 million a year.

The number of air passengers handled at the Washington National Airport went from 1.6 million a year to 4.8 million—almost three times as many.

These trends indicate the directions and the rapidity in which this Greater Washington area is moving. Let us now take a closer look at a profile of this area so that we get a better understanding of it in terms of market goods and services.

GREATER WASHINGTON MARKET

The Washington metropolitan area is one of the most dynamic and fastest growing markets in the United States. It is a concentrated area with 2 million consumers, accounting for nearly $6 billion of personal income, and almost $3 billion in retail sales.

Among the Nation's top metropolitan areas Washington ranks 10th in size of population, having moved up from 16th in 1930. It ranks second in the percentage of population growth in the 1930–60 period.

This area has a larger percentage of adults in the higher educational levels than any other major metropolitan section in the country. With our 14 colleges and universities we are a leading center of education.

Also, among all the major metropolitan areas in the United States, this area ranks 1st in income per household, 8th in net buying income and total retail sales, and 10th in the number of households.

Eighty-seven percent of the occupied dwelling units have a telephone available, 75 percent have automobiles, and 25 percent have air conditioners.

In short, we have a picture here of an expanding market with more people coming in every year, with growing income and purchasing power, and the urge to spend money on the conveniences and equipment that make for higher living standards.

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENTS

Three specific developments that will exert a growing influence over the future in this area are the shift to the suburbs, the greater rise in the rate of private over Government employment, and the emergence of the area as a major industrial and financial center.

While population in the Washington metropolitan area climbed 40 percent between 1950 and 1960, the percentage of people living in the District dropped from 54½ percent to 38 percent of the total. Present trends show continuing population gains in both sections through 1970—rising from the present 2 million to 2.57 million by 1970. The experts estimate that by 1970 the suburbs will account for over 68 percent while the District will have less than 32 percent of the residents.

Federal Government employment as well as income has, of course, continued to grow here, but it is significant that private employment has been growing at a faster rate. A report of your economic development committee showed that in the years between 1954 and 1962 Federal Government civilian employment increased 8.4 percent while private employment jumped 36.3 percent. More than 518 new organizations and firms were established here in these few years, including 124 scientific research companies, 91 national regional offices, 40 manufacturing plants, 25 wholesale and distribution firms, 18 transportation companies, and 49 finance, insurance, and real estate businesses.

To appreciate how far Washington is moving to become a major business and financial center, it is only necessary to drive around the streets of the District and the suburbs. On every hand you will see new office buildings and plants being constructed.

Alexandria alone offers an example of the type of expansion taking place in our suburbs. A new city has been shaping up in the western part of that community with an $11-million shopping center on a 45-acre plot surrounded by high-rise apartments with 5,370 units. Another new shopping center with new apartments providing 1,689 units is also on the way. Four industrial parks are in the process of development along the south side of Duke Street and west of the city limits. Other housing and commercial units are planned along Shirley Highway, Seminary Road, and Beauregard Street.

In the District itself, among many others, our own activities offer an example of the expansion taking place. We recently completed a new 12-story modern office building at the corner of 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. It is known as the First National Bank Building, named after the First National Bank of Washington, which is a member of our banking group. The building now houses the headquarters of our International Bank, Financial General Corp., and the related companies and divisions. Total assets of all the banks and concerns affiliated with our organizations are now in excess of $1 billion.

Our new building, the moving to Washington of our banking-insurance and industrial headquarters, and the increasing number of our banks in this area, now 12, all give evidence of our confidence in Washington's future as a rising business and financial center.

OUTLINE OF PROSPECTS

Out of this review of present trends and recent developments, I believe we can see the outlines for a promising outlook for the Washington area in 1963 and beyond.

All of us know, of course, that we face a good many problems in the city and suburbs, and in our own businesses. It would be foolhardy to leave the impression that all is well with the world, the Nation, our city and our own affairs. We know full well that events and developments anywhere in the world have a way of touching the lives and fortunes of each of us. We know that what happens on the Hill, in the White House, and in the Government offices, often reaches down into our industries and businesses.

No one of us is wise enough—or foolish enough—to predict what will happen in these or other places of power and influence.

Surely, Admiral Strauss appreciates the dangers of forecasting in the light of the so-called independent variables. It is my belief, however, that all of us can make our own individual and group judgments on the prospects for our businesses if we know and understand the directions of the economic forces that dominate the environment in which we must carry on our daily tasks in the days ahead.

In this entire discussion I have avoided the mention of tax and budget problems. Whatever changes there may be in tax rates or expenditure levels, and whether you agree or disagree with them, your own efforts and your own performance will be the primary factors in determining whether 1963 is a good year for you.

I think we can agree that 1963 economic prospects for the Washington area are bright because: (1) Population increases will continue; (2) employment should show gains; (3) business and financial expansion will go on; (4) housing and other construction will exceed the national average; (5) retail sales will rise; (6) banking will grow; (7) the new Dulles Airport will increase the international air traffic, stimulate the economy of the nearby communities and provide several thousand new jobs.

On the cautious side, I must point out there is a growing body of thinking that in the residential, apartment and office building field, the current rate of expansion may be moving too rapidly and that a slowdown or setback may be ahead. Should this be true, it would adversely affect other areas of the economy. Quite obviously, an awareness and proper evaluation of the danger signals is an integral and most important element of forward planning.

I believe the year ahead will separate the men from the boys in the management of business. I think this is true for the country as a whole as well as for our own community. Quick and easy profit for ineffective managements will tend to evaporate. In these days of increasing competition, both domestic and foreign, more than ever there will be a premium for the enterprise and skill of able management.

So much for the outlook as we see it today. In conclusion, I would like to offer you a little blueprint for the future of our area. To create a blueprint we must start with an objective or mission in our mind. America is the greatest country in the world. It should be our mission as Washingtonians to make this city the greatest capital. I have reviewed some of the many factors that we have working for us in this mission. Now let me name a few that we do not have but should set ourselves to attain.

1. Washington needs a billion-dollar bank, one or more, with a very active foreign department. Washington is the political capital of the free world and the domicile of many great public pools of capital. In order to become a leading factor in the private international financial field, as we should, we must have one or more larger banks prominent throughout the free world area.

2. Washington is and will be the center for placing billions of dollars of contracts in the advance technology and space field. Unlike southern California, the Boston area and quite recently Pittsburgh, we have not yet mobilized the technical educational capabilities of our fine local universities and colleges. This we must do in order to advance Washington's stature as a center for the development of the brains to manage tomorrow's light industries specializing in advanced technology.

3. The art of community planning must be advanced through the coordination of the many fine organizations now engaged here in this work. Controlled and directed growth can be a community asset. Growth uncontrolled and undirected can be like a cancer. Education, transportation, recreation and community services, in these fields and others, our blueprint for development requires much more planning and much more effective effort.

4. And, finally, our community blueprint, as well as that for every other community and our country, as well, must include the element of sound fiscal management without which all plans and programs for the future will be doomed to failure.

Let us then, challenged by the opportunities that are before us, inspired by a mission yet to be accomplished, face the new year with courage and confidence.

First Fruits of West New Guinea Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sydney, Australia, Morning Herald of February 13, 1963, entitled "First Fruits of West New Guinea Appeasement." This editorial is an example of the feeling which continues in Australia against the West New Guinea settlement, but which has been well hidden by the press of the United States.

It has not taken long for the Western Powers' appeasement of Indonesia over West New Guinea to bear its inevitable fruit. President Sukarno has drawn the same conclusion as other dictators before him—that any price will be paid for peace, and that therefore territorial ambitions can be achieved by the threat of war. Hence the summoning by the Indonesian Foreign Minister of a special press conference to deliver the insolent pronouncement that, if Britain and Malaya persist with their plans to form the Malaysian Federation, they will

face the prospect of armed conflict with Indonesia.

Significantly, there was no indication of Indonesian hostility to the Malaysia project before the surrender of West New Guinea in the face of the deployment of armed force. It is only now, when Indonesia has witnessed the fear of war over West New Guinea displayed by Britain and the United States and the pusillanimity of Australian policy, that President Sukarno has allowed his patience to become exhausted. What sinister ghosts stirred in the corridors of history when Dr. Subandrio declared, "We do not want a conflict with anyone, but you cannot ignore our feelings."

The Indonesian Government's purpose is clear. It is to blackmail Britain into granting immediate independence to the three weak states of northern Borneo outside the framework of Malaysia in order that they may be isolated from the protection of Malaya. Thus isolated, the three states can be absorbed by Indonesia at leisure, and President Sukarno's aim of making the whole of Borneo an Indonesian province will be achieved. It is not for nothing that Djakarta proclaims the brotherhood between the peoples of northern and Indonesian Borneo; it is not for nothing that Dr. Subandrio talks of the difficulty of restraining the Indonesian masses from liberating their brothers.

The technique of confrontation which was so successful in the West New Guinea dispute is being faithfully followed. Indonesian fears of Dutch hostility have now become fears of Malayan hostility; there is the same provocative patrolling of the frontier; there is the same talk of an anticolonial mission; there is the same sabre rattling. Just as "volunteers" massed to liberate West New Guinea, so now volunteers are massed on the borders of the current territorial objective.

There is every reason to expect that the next step will also follow the New Guinea pattern—armed intrusion, the physical phase of "confrontation." This is the final testing time, and must be recognized as such by Britain and, equally importantly, by Australia. If military blackmail is allowed to succeed again, Indonesian victory in Borneo will be followed, as the night the day, by further territorial demands. The lesson that dictators' appetites grow with what they feed on should have been learned by now. Another southeast Asian Munich will bring the turn of Australian New Guinea inexorably nearer.

Opportunity for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette in an editorial finds appealing the President's recommendations for a Youth Conservation Corps and a Community Youth Corps. It concludes by recommending prompt and favorable consideration in Congress.

I insert the entire editorial for your consideration:

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH

In a special message to Congress on the problems of youth, President Kennedy last week reminded Americans that, while this Nation is still a great land in which to be born, some young people today are faced with restricted opportunities and mounting difficulties. To emphasize his meaning, the President pointed out that childhood health defects are higher than need be, that juvenile delinquency is rising, that 40 percent more young people will enter the job market in the 1960's than in the previous decade, that 7.5 million of these young jobseekers will be school dropouts unprepared for anything except a diminishing number of unskilled labor openings.

Though the President envisioned the States and local communities as having the primary responsibility for protecting and promoting the interests of children and youth, he urged Congress to enable the Federal Government to play a supporting role by:

Establishing a Youth Conservation Corps (patterned somewhat along the lines of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's) and a Community Youth Corps.

Setting up a National Service Corps, as a domestic extension of the Peace Corps concept, to provide volunteer workers—including older people as well as youths—for hospitals and mental health centers, Indian reservations, migrant work camps, urban and rural slum areas.

Expanding the Peace Corps' authorized strength from 9,000 to 13,000.

Extension for 3 years of the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1961, which was designed to aid communities in demonstration projects for prevention, control, and treatment of delinquency.

The most appealing of the President's recommendations are those for a Youth Conservation Corps and a Community Youth Corps. As provided for in the administration's $100 million youth employment bill, the YCC would put young men to work improving national parks, national forests, and other national recreational areas. The first year's enlistment would be limited to 15,000, but enrollment would rise to a maximum of 60,000 in 5 years with the corps open to boys from 16 to 21, who would sign up for a minimum of 6 months and a maximum of 2 years. The entire YCC cost would be borne by the Federal Government.

Under the Community Youth Corps plan, young people would be employed in local projects that offer useful work experience in nonprofit community services such as schools, parks, settlement houses, and hospitals. The Federal Government would pay half the cost of the 3-year CYC program, which would employ 40,000 youths the first year.

In view of the acuteness of the dropout and the unemployment problems of youth, including those in this area, the youth employment bill should get prompt and favorable consideration in Congress.

San Francisco Trade Center To Expand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in these times of international stresses and tensions, the trade center, which provides facilities for exhibiting both domestic and foreign goods, is an important means of bridging the gap between nations. More cooperative economic relations throughout the world cannot help but bring us one step nearer to permanent peace. Therefore, in tribute to the splendid achievements of the San Francisco Trade Center, I request permission to insert into the RECORD the following news item, appearing in the San Francisco Examiner, entitled "San Francisco Trade Center To Expand" which appeared on January 28, 1963.

I offer my hearty congratulations to the many men and women who have devoted themselves loyally and steadfastly to the success of this trade center. I cannot name them all but would like to pay special tribute to Mr. Adolph Schuman, Mr. George Killion, and Mr. Cyril Magnin whose leadership has brought acclaim to this center and San Francisco.

The article follows:

SAN FRANCISCO TRADE CENTER TO EXPAND

The internationally famed San Francisco World Trade Center has established itself on the solid ground of success.

J. Monroe Sullivan, executive director of the World Trade Center Authority, which operates the center in the Ferry Building, has announced a 98-percent rental and is looking around for more room.

SUCCESS EVIDENT

Success of the center is evident from the number of delegations from other cities which have visited San Francisco preparatory to establishing similar centers in their areas.

David Rockefeller headed a delegation from the New York Port Authority recently. Sydney, Australia, sent out a group just before Christmas. Cleveland, Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, and the State of Florida have all initiated correspondence.

The San Francisco center, which operates on a budget of $79,000 from the San Francisco Port Authority, presents a year-round exposition of domestic and foreign products.

It also offers all the variety of services from communications to interpreters to traders doing business in world commerce.

CLUB BUSY

The World Trade Club, headed by George Killian, president of American President Lines, is a favorite gathering place for northern Californians engaged in shipping of foreign trade. It is also the site of dinners and international conferences for visiting dignitaries on U.S. State Department, State of California, or private business.

Another outstanding feature of the World Trade Center are the libraries which contain books and pamphlets dealing with all departments of foreign trade. Chief among the libraries is the Captain Dollar World Trade Library donated by the Dollar Shipping Co.

Mrs. Jeanne Nichols, librarian and her staff, research these publications, loan books to tenants of the center and to members of the World Trade Club and answer inquiries from the general public free of charge.

The Other Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the crisis that has just erupted in Canada in recent days, it might be advisable for all of us to read some arguments posed by those in Canada who agree with the position of the present government in Canada.

This crisis has been developing for a long time. Of my own knowledge I can say that it has been smoldering for many months.

There are some who believe that our people have been agitating, behind the scenes, for a showdown in the Canadian Government.

I am more interested in trying to find out all the arguments pro and con and believe a service can be rendered to the Congress by repeating a special feature story in the Financial Post of Toronto, Canada.

The article is by Maj. Gen. W. H. S. Macklin, long a fiery critic of Canadian defense policies.

The major general bluntly and repeatedly has said, "Canada should refuse all nuclear weapons. This nation should concentrate on a build-up and modernization of useful conventionally armed forces.

"The colossal waste arising out of an unsound defense policy continues unabated."

Mr. Speaker, from the above quoted statement, it is easy to see that in spite of the rather heavy chorus of opposition to the Premier's opposition, there appears to be another side to the argument.

Without comment other than to recommend its reading and study to all Members of the Congress, the following statement was made by Maj. Gen. W. H. S. Macklin in the December 15 issue of the Financial Post:

National defense is one of the most urgent and certainly the most costly of the many problems facing our Government. But the paralysis that throttles a grievously divided parliament has precluded any sensible or sustained debate on the subject.

The Government has announced an "austerity" cut of more than $80 million in the current defense budget. All that this appears to mean is:

Service families will stay longer in Europe.

Senior officers will travel economy class.

Building programs will be canceled or curtailed.

The army will bungle along with equipment designed in the age of the model-T Ford and remain immobile for lack of airlift.

But the colossal and iniquitous waste arising out of unsound and worthless defense policy continues unabated.

We will get nowhere in this endless defense debate until we recognize the drastic limitation of the nuclear bomb in political and military strategy. I am convinced the bomb can never be useful except as a deterrent, and then only against nuclear war. There is plenty of evidence the West already has far more deterrent than necessary.

Canada should refuse to put the bomb into our armory. Instead, this nation should support President Kennedy's policy of expanding and modernizing NATO's conventional strength.

To be specific we should:

Unify our uncoordinated armed services.

Increase the army contribution to NATO from a token brigade to at least a division.

Give this larger force modern equipment.

Compel the RCAF to abandon its worthless Bomarcs and interceptors, and if the United States insists on keeping these it should pay for them.

Also require the RCAF to produce the airlift needed to make the army mobile, or let the army do this itself.

And the RCAF should provide adequate tactical air support for the army, which it never has done.

OUR DEFENSE POLICY "MADE IN U.S.A."

For 10 years what has passed for a Canadian defense policy has been formulated in the United States and largely dominated by the aggressive and warlike theories of the U.S. Air Force.

This was made obvious during the recent Cuban crisis. Our Government was accused of timidity in refusing to arm Canadian forces with nuclear bombs forthwith, and of being too slow in alerting the Canadian component of Norad.

Yet the U.S. Government acted in the Cuban crisis without prior consultation with us, and still woodenly insists all nuclear bombs must remain under U.S. control. Talk of joint control is mere eyewash without amendment by an act of Congress.

Canada has opened itself to criticism for only one reason—the Government long ago made the astounding and grievous blunder of ordering a whole series of weapons needing nuclear rockets or warheads to make them effective, and subsequently refused to arm them accordingly. Thus the Cabinet has placed itself in an impossibly inconsistent position.

Politically there is only one factor in favor of arming Canadian forces with nuclear bombs. The Americans, swayed to a dangenerous degree by their own Air Force, and allied interests, want us to do it.

Apart from that, there are most potent arguments, both domestic and international, against this course, especially with the bombs under American control.

The only pertinent question therefore is this: Are these weapons in Canadian forces such an important military requirement that we must accept them despite all other considerations?

I say they are not, and that their acquisition will not increase the strategic strength of NATO, nor of fortress America, by one whit.

There are two distinct classes of nuclear weapons under discussion:

Those to arm the Bomarc missile and the Voodoo interceptor, which are wholly weapons of Norad.

Those for the Honest John Army rocket, and the F-104 strike-reconnaissance aircraft, which are wholly weapons of NATO.

Most neutralists lump Norad and NATO together and want no part of either. Actually there is little or no relation between the two.

Norad is not, as many think, intended to defend our cities. It is for the warning and protection of the U.S. airbases, and is thus simply a component of the American nuclear deterrent. It is an adjunct of the U.S. Strategic Air Force, which is by far the most costly and powerful military force ever built by anybody, anywhere.

This mighty air force is not now, and never was, under command of NATO. The Americans have withheld it from NATO, and President Kennedy himself controls it. NATO is a mainly military alliance for the defense of the whole Western World, and all of its members have some say in its control.

The mournful truth is that the American policy to which we have adhered—and whose proponents imperiously press us to accept nuclear weapons—is based on two Pentagon hypotheses, both of which are false:

"The U.S. deterrent in North America must be guarded by a direct military defense, and we can have this if only we spend enough money on it."

In pursuit of this theory Canada has sunk billions, and the United States probably tens of billions of dollars into Norad. Yet the resulting system has never been able to protect the nuclear bases on this continent from attack, whether by manned bombers or by missile. Still less can it defend our cities.

The hydrogen bomb is far too big, and a mere few dozen accurately delivered on North America would put the survivors back close to the Stone Age. No defense has been, or can be, devised to prevent this.

In 10 years the RCAF has run through—and discarded—a whole series of jet interceptor aircraft whose cost has run to billions. There was the Vampire, several types of Sabre, six sorts of CF-100, and the luckless, untried Arrow.

There are the three radar chains, and all were obsolete before they were finished. There is the Bomarc missile, deficient in range, even against bombers, and helpless against the missile.

In our civil defense exercise Tocsin "B," a year ago, it was assumed that Canada was attacked by a fleet of bombers and a handful of missiles. The official result of this single simulated raid: Obliteration of 15 cities, with 2.6 million dead and 1 million injured, plus deadly fallout on others. Toronto had 600,000 dead and Ottawa 175,000.

This was not defense within any accepted meaning of the word. It was an acknowledgment of the utter worthlessness of Norad as a military instrument.

We have just survived a near panic as a result of some 40 or so missiles, and as many obsolescent bombers, put into Cuba by Russia. Norad, alerted or not, could do nothing to alleviate these dangers. Besides, the U.S.S.R has 450 submarines, none built for fishing, and it is most likely that some already have nuclear missiles aboard.

Norad only purports to defend the North American portion of the great ring of U.S. nuclear bases around the world, and is actually no more than an impotent creature of the Pentagon.

For about 11 years our 12 air squadrons in Europe have been purely defensive, equipped with nothing but jet interceptors. Now, with no debate in Parliament, and negligible public comprehension, four are simply being disbanded, and the other eight re-equipped with the F-104 designed for offensive nuclear strikes.

How can this be done if the interceptors were useful and needed? The answer, they never had any significant usefulness.

"We can fight another major war along the lines of World War II, but using tactical nuclear bombs to replace deficiencies in manpower."

Yet, I do not know of any responsible statesman who does not believe that a nuclear war rapidly will become a full-scale exchange of H-bombs, with near total destruction of both sides.

Certainly our Government has reiterated many times that our sole reliance is on deterrence, and the former defense minister gloomily told Parliament that "all these weapons we are getting will fail the moment they are used."

So I repeat: We never will improve our defense policy until we admit the nuclear bomb is merely a deterrent, effective only to deter against nuclear war and good for nothing else.

Some $250,000 million invested by the United States in their nuclear Air Force has not prevented the establishment of a Communist state 90 miles from Florida.

If the bomb is ever used both sides will perish miserably. We cannot wage a nuclear war and survive it.

How much deterrent do we need? It is absolutely certain the United States now has, and always has had, far more nuclear striking power than Russia. The president of the Scientific American magazine puts the ratio at probably more than five to one. The Assistant Secretary of Defense in Washington asserts their nuclear devices are now numbered in tens of thousands. There is no missile gap and never was one.

There is also a powerful British deterrent, stated by the Secretary of State for Air in London to be enough by itself to dissuade Russia from a nuclear assault for years to come.

This combined deterrent is dispersed in bases around the world, and in speedy, nuclear-driven submarines. Ex-President Eisenhower said categorically that it can neither be destroyed nor made impotent.

Why then, this hysterical insistence from Washington that these bombs—under U.S. management—must be thrust into the hands of our forces, making us a nuclear power without even authority to use the force thereby conferred? They would add nothing to the efficacy, nor to the much talked of credibility of the existing deterrent, and this action on our part would be a military nonsense.

U.S. AIR FORCE AIM IS TO DESTROY SOVIET UNION

One reason for the American pressure, I submit, is the belief, especially in the U.S. Air Force, that its present preponderance of nuclear power should be used forthwith to disarm Russia by destroying the Russian deterrent.

In their confidence that this business would end with Russia obliterated and the United States surviving, these people would accept the staggering damage to life and property that Russia could inflict in the process. They think a nuclear-armed Canada would aid their survival, and they ignore the fearful results to us and to the rest of the world.

There is little evidence this dangerous war party will prevail in the councils of the U.S. administration, but it has managed to justify the maintenance of immense superiority on the pretext that there must be enough nuclear offensive power left after a hypothetical first strike by the enemy to smash him.

That argument disregards the fact that an enemy so heavily outmatched can hardly be seriously contemplating such a first strike. Indeed, the American fear of this contingency seems to me to verge on the pathological.

As I said at the outset, I think there is a sensible alternative to nuclear arms for Canada. When President Kennedy took office he found the theory of "massive retaliation," of which the nuclear bomb is the instrument, was almost totally dominant in the strategy of the United States and NATO. At the same time NATO was deplorably deficient in the numbers and power of its conventional forces, and this was very recently confirmed by its commander, General Norstadt.

Kennedy also knew Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, had resigned in protest at these conditions.

The President at once began striving to downgrade the nuclear element of his strategy and to enhance all other methods of combating Communist aggressions. He recalled General Taylor and has raised him to the highest post in the military hierarchy. In these efforts he has faced fanatical opposition from his own air force and its allied industries.

What Canada obviously should do now is get behind President Kennedy in this new policy, abjure nuclear weapons, and concentrate on producing useful, conventionally armed forces.

If the advocates of the everlasting nuclear buildup and the first strike get their way, there will be other cases like Cuba of Communist infiltration into the free world and we may end up like Samson who, in rage and despair, pulled the roof down on himself as well as on his enemies because he had no other strategy left.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Washington's Birthday Address by Senator Stennis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Virginia Chapter, Sons of the Revolution, all members of which are descendants of officers in the Army of George Washington, celebrated the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country last Friday evening in Richmond, and the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was the guest speaker. I was privileged to introduce Senator STENNIS and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my introduction and the brilliant speech he made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the introduction and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSISSIPPI, BY SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, AT DINNER MEETING OF SONS OF REVOLUTION, RICHMOND, VA., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

Nearly 16 years ago, JOHN STENNIS promised the people of Mississippi that if they elected him to the U.S. Senate, he would "plow a straight furrow right down to the end of the row."

As we all know, Mississippians elected this former State legislator, district attorney, and circuit judge, in 1947 to represent that State in the Senate and we have all benefited because he has kept his plow deep and his furrow straight.

In the Senate, he has compiled a record of diligent, dedicated, and devoted public service, and has honored the seat which Jefferson Davis occupied, when he was a Senator from Mississippi.

Your speaker tonight is a ranking member of the Armed Services, Appropriations, and the Space Committees of the Senate. Two years ago, he was given the key assignment as chairman of the powerful Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the "watchdog" committee that oversees our national defense program. At the present time, he is conducting hearings on the conflicting reports about the buildup of Soviet military forces in Cuba to determine the true facts about that threat to our national security. He is the most qualified man I know for that vital assignment.

While the name STENNIS is synonomous with national defense and military preparedness, he is also an authority on constitutional law. He serves as permanent captain of one of the three southern teams organized in the Senate to lead the fight to protect the sovereign rights of the States and to preserve southern traditions and constitutional government. Last year, he played a key role in the defeat in the Senate, after weeks of debate, of vicious legislation to abolish the literacy test established by Mississippi and 20 other States as one of the qualifications for voting. An encroachment on the rights of the States to determine these qualifications. Only a few weeks ago, he was one of those leading our successful battle to preserve rule 22 and the right to engage in extended debate in the Senate, thus assuring our right to be heard and to protect our people against vicious and ill-advised legislation. He was one of three authors of the southern manifesto, and this declaration of constitutional principles, signed by more than 100 Members of the Congress, remains unchallenged as the most forceful statement of the position of the South.

He has been frequently mentioned as a future Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Former President Eisenhower named him as one of three Democrats qualified to serve as President of the United States.

JOHN STENNIS is esteemed and respected by his Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats.

And I am proud to say that Virginia had a major role in the career of JOHN STENNIS, for it was in our State that he obtained his legal education and spent 3 key years of his life. Anyone elected to membership in the University of Virginia chapter of Phi Beta Kappa has earned that honor. Senator STENNIS is truly Virginia's third Senator.

It is with gratitude and pride that I present to you a truly great American, a distinguished statesman, U.S. Senator JOHN STENNIS.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi)

It is a special pleasure for me to be with you tonight in celebration of the 231st anniversary of the birth of Gen. George Washington.

The tributes paid to George Washington are legion. Perhaps the best known is that expressed by Gen. Henry Lee when he characterized his beloved fellow Virginian as "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Having spent some fond years at the university at Charlottesville, I developed a great admiration for the wisdom of the Sage of Monticello. The keen insight of Thomas Jefferson into men and governments has helped shape the destiny of this country. It was he who fought to preserve the integrity of the States in our Union—and would that there were more modern-day Jeffersons to help regain that measure of respect for the sovereignty of the States that he struggled so hard to establish in the founding days of this Republic.

And it was Thomas Jefferson, who, to my way of thinking, paid the highest tribute of all to his friend, George Washington. Jefferson said:

"His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives or interest or consanguinity, or friendship or hatred, being able to bias his decision."

This observation indicates the sensitive regard of Washington to the public trust implicit in the office of the President. He abhorred any possible violation of this trust by the suggestion of interest or bias in the administration of this office. This fine example set by our first President should be closely followed by Chief Executives of our time and future times.

Jefferson continued:

"He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man. * * * On the whole his character was, in its mass, perfect * * * in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

Certainly it is most fitting and proper that we meet together tonight to consider this great man of history. He is indeed a man of history, for he, like all history, teaches great lessons to succeeding generations.

I want to speak to you tonight about Washington as a symbol—a symbol of liberty—and a symbol of the fundamentals of our democratic way of life. When we speak of Washington as a symbol, however, we must never lose sight of his very human qualities. He was no god—but a humble servant of humanity and the country which he helped to establish. He was no military genius, though he was one of the ablest field commanders and army administrators in all history. He was no intellectual, but a man of simple, yet methodical judgment.

As a symbol of liberty, Washington is best seen as the commander in chief of the Continental Army. Through his inspired leadership of this ill-equipped, ill-trained, but magnificently motivated Army, he wrenched from the most powerful military force of that day the victory which gave us our liberty.

When I think of Washington as the leader of the Revolutionary Army, I see in my mind's eye two great paintings. The one showing General Washington at the bow of a boat on a bleak night, his jaw firmly set and a determined gaze fixed upon the objective, crossing the Delaware River. A picture portraying with all of the artist's power the determination and courage of this great leader. And then I see the magnificent study in compassion, showing Washington at Valley Forge. These two paintings show us the full measure of George Washington as a military commander.

All of the greatness of this man cannot be seen on the battlefield, however, or even on the great field of honor at Yorktown. His service to his country did not end with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. To my mind, it had just begun.

As commander in chief of the Continental Army, he held the balance of power in this emerging Nation. His success in gaining victory firmly fixed him in the minds and hearts of his countrymen. With a discontented army still in arms and with no real government in existence, Washington was the only source of authority and law that had anything more than a local influence. There was the matter of the long overdue pay for the Army and the adjustments to peaceful ways, both fermenting unrest among the men in arms. Early in 1783, petitions were circulated by the officers denouncing the constituted authorities and expressing the impatience of the young officers for their just rewards. As the feelings reached the fever pitch, General Washington appeared before his assembled officers and received their petitions. He took from his uniform a letter just received from a Member of Congress explaining the delays of the young Government and its good faith. He started to read the letter, but faltered. He paused, reached into his pocket, took out his new spectacles, and put them on. "Gentle-

men," he said, "you must pardon me for I have grown gray in your service and now find myself growing blind." How petty must the problems of that group seemed by comparison. This simple observation quelled what might have been a mutiny within the Continental Army against the newly formed Government.

Repeatedly, Washington was suggested as the head of a monarchy to be established in the place of a republican government. Col. Lewis Nicola, leading a group of the staff officers of the Continental Army, proposed this idea to their commander in chief. When he heard this, he expressed pain that such an idea existed among his colleagues. He said:

"I am much at a loss to conceive what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to an address which to me seems big with the greatest mischief that can befall my country. * * * Let me conjure you, if you have any regard for your country, concern for yourself or posterity, or respect for me, to banish these thoughts from your mind."

Isn't it ironic that the man who became our first President could have become a king? There is a real lesson in humility in this—one which all his successors to this high office might well ponder. The greatness in a man is best seen when he refuses to assume power which would be detrimental to the best interests of those he serves.

As he shrank in distress from the idea of ruling his fellows as a monarch, so did Washington recoil from acceptance of lesser emolument pressed upon him by grateful contemporaries. A good example is a gift to him by his native State of Virginia in gratitude for his services to the State and the Nation. The gift was 100 shares of James River Co. stock. Washington donated this canal company stock to Liberty Hall Academy in the heart of the valley of Virginia, which thereupon bestowed upon him the title of "Patron of the arts and literature." This donation is significant in showing his attitude toward education and significant in the history of the small school which eventually became Washington and Lee University. This donation was the first large gift of securities to a college in the United States. It sustained the college through some of its most difficult years, and it inspired other gifts to this and other schools.

The university still derives annual financial support from George Washington's gift, which, in 1928, was merged with the university's general endowment and reinvested, and now yields over $2,000 per year.

Washington and Lee University's historian, Dr. Ollinger Crenshaw, writes of Washington's gift:

"Perhaps the gift of George Washington to Liberty Hall Academy in 1796 was exceeded in importance to the school's development only by the appointment of Gen. R. E. Lee to its presidency in 1865. Not only did the income from President Washington's donation come as a godsend to an institution which had desperately striven to maintain itself, but the academy's future became interwoven with the name of the father of his country."

We in the United States have a rich heritage in the institutions of our Government, beginning with the Declaration of Independence * * * an indictment against a despotic monarchy, but yet we see in this document the aspirations of a people determined to govern themselves. This will of the people for self-government is manifested in that greatest of all charters of freedom, our Constitution, which established the framework of a form of government unparalleled in the long history of mankind.

The stamp and thread of Washington can be seen in these two great instruments of freedom. Indeed, it was Washington who presided over the Convention in Philadelphia which gave us the Constitution. He used his great influence to bring about its ratification, writing many letters and even engaging in debate with the opponents of ratification. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe made this sharp appraisal of the role Washington played in the ratification of the Constitution:

"Be assured [General Washington's] influence carried this Government."

In my opinion, Washington never rose to greater heights than he did in certain remarks at the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

The suggestion was that as an adequate part would be rejected anyway, that an extreme makeshift proposal should be quickly adopted.

He said: "Too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

History's brightest pages record no achievements more illustrious than those of the Founding Fathers of our Nation, and none more calculated to instill pride and patriotism. How often do we turn for inspiration to the men of those troubled Revolutionary times, replete with example after example of rarest courage. They wrote and proclaimed the Declaration of Independence with no army and pitiable resources. Indeed, when they fired the first shot at Lexington, they had no army. And after victory at Yorktown, and for a good number of years thereafter, they had no effective government. Yet with foresight and fortitude they wrote the Constitution of the United States, founded on high principle but adopted with doubt and apprehension that its noble purposes might never be achieved. Thus, a feeble nation of free people embarked on its uncertain course, but on the way to growth and development beyond their highest dreams and beyond precedent.

What made the difference? What was it that set the ship of state off on its magnificent voyage to greatness and achievements unmatched in all history? Many fearless and determined patriots contributed, but we are mindful that it was the leadership and great spirit of George Washington that made the difference.

Having fought to gain freedom from the oppression of George III and nurtured the establishment of a republican government through the Constitution, it was only natural that Washington should counsel Congress upon leaving the office of president. His farewell address is not only a stirring valedictory of our first president, but it carries many profound truths in it which are applicable even today.

In its contemporary setting, the address was made at a time when our Nation was still in the stage of its early development. Each of the Thirteen Colonies had been a political entity. They had joined together in a common cause * * * the war for their independence. Under the Articles of Confederation, the separate status of each State was preserved and they delegated only certain areas within which Congress could act for their collective good. There had to be a great deal of blending and compromise to weld these 13 sovereignties into a union. It required all of the statesmanship imaginable to accomplish this feat. We are indeed fortunate that destiny provided that statesman in the person of our first President.

But now the Father of our Country was relinquishing the helm of the ship of state.

What was the counsel of this great American?

First, he set the pattern by clearly stating the bedrock principle of our Government. "The basis of our political system," he said, "is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government." He had led many men into the supreme sacrifice that Americans might be the arbiters of their political institutions. He did not lightly regard the role of the individual citizen, through his freely elected representatives, to determine the course that his country should take.

Washington strongly advised his people as follows:

"Toward the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthown."

Heeding this advice of George Washington, Senator ROBERTSON and I, together with many of our colleagues in the Senate, have recently fought to preserve the tradition of debate in the Senate. This rule was invoked to assure protection for minorities in this country; but those who would impose cloture to this body say that it stifles not only the President's program, but legislation sought in behalf of minority groups. Is this not a specious pretext for an innovation which George Washington sagely counseled against?

He further speaks of caution in making changes with this admonition:

"In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion."

How do you think the hypothetical economic theories concocted in the Harvard traditions of Messrs. Heller and Schlesinger would fare in the light of Washington's admonition here? If there has ever been a more graphic illustration of the very thing which Washington cautions us against it is the theoretical approach of these two intellectuals to solving our country's economic dilemma. Somehow I feel that the American public will be intelligent enough to see through the fiscal mania which has been proposed for our consideration at this session. Your distinguished Senator and my good friend, HARRY BYRD, has not been taken in by this scheme. And I am proud to say that there are many of our colleagues who also will act to resist this unproven and highly dangerous change in the fiscal affairs of the country.

Washington emphasized the vital importance of the defined powers of government and pointed to the departmentalization of powers in our own constitutional government. He said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another."

Chief Justice Warren would have been better advised to give due regard to these pointed words from our first President, rather than the opinion of the Swedish sociologist, Gunder Myrdal, in his leading of the Supreme Court in its unprecedented legislative decision in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. Even Chief Justice Marshall with his rather liberal view would have reeled at the usurpation of the prero-

gative of Congress in the school desegregation decision.

Thus, George Washington counseled an infant nation—a nation which he helped to establish, a nation which he led as its first President for two terms. He was a man of true greatness. His first thought was always of his duty to his country. This principle motivated him to become the great commander in chief of the Continental Army—to reluctantly assume the Office of President and to decline a third term in this high office. His greatness lay in his selfless adherence to that which he knew to be right.

Let us apply some of these principles to the Cuban situation. We all know that this is one of the more critical and crucial problems of our time.

We all welcomed the announcement that the Soviets would withdraw several thousand troops from Cuba. This is only as a limited step in the right direction. Neither this withdrawal nor any other partial withdrawal should be considered as a final solution of the basic Cuban problem and threat.

The basic problem, and the real threat to the Americas, lies in the fact that international communism now has a firm foothold in the Western Hemisphere. The "Made in Moscow" government is in Cuba for the primary purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America. We know that it is here to stay—if we permit it to do so.

Public debate during the past few weeks has focused largely on whether Khrushchev has or has not withdrawn his offensive weapons from Cuba. Certainly, this is important. None of us can afford to be unconcerned about the threat of missiles and planes which can rain nuclear death and destruction on us in a matter of minutes. However, we must not allow our attention to be preoccupied entirely by an overly meticulous concern about whether the military threat to us has been increased or decreased fractionally by the introduction or withdrawal of certain types or numbers of weapons. If we do we may very well fail to face up to the proposition that, regardless of how many or how few troops support it, the alien and antidemocratic government now being maintained in Cuba by Russian armed soldiers is in and of itself the real and basic threat to the peace and security of the American Republics. International communism at our very doorstep, without regard to the supporting weaponry, is offensive to me, and, I believe, to a majority of my fellow Americans.

I am not primarily concerned over the exact number of troops Khrushchev has in Cuba. Even ten would be too many. I believe that it is the fact that the Russian Bear now stands astride the unhappy island of Cuba which most troubles the average American. The American people are disturbed and uneasy because they know that we cannot live with this menace indefinitely.

Therefore, they want to be assured that our responsible officials recognize the problem and recognize also that it will not just disappear with the passage of time. They want to be convinced that we have the national will and purpose to do everything within our power to wipe out all Soviet-dominated governments in this hemisphere and that we have a firm and hard plan and policy to accomplish this.

In short, I believe that our people take the same position which the Congress itself took when it adopted Senate Joint Resolution 230 last October 3. In adopting this resolution we in Congress expressly reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine and declared that we were "determined to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere." The resolution declared we were "determined to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of any externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States."

The American people ask only, I believe, that we adhere to this resolution and that we demonstrate once again that the historic Monroe Doctrine is still an integral part of our national policy and that we do, in fact, consider any attempt by foreign powers "to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security."

When these things are done—and when our people are convinced that our Nation is still strong, resolute, vigorous, determined, and above all, unafraid—I know that the patriotic people of this Nation will unite four square behind the Government as they have always done in times of national crisis.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, in the real course of its inquiry, will develop all of the facts and I hope that it can make a real and tangible contribution in shaping a hard and firm policy which will finally rid the Americas of this cancerous communistic growth.

This is no time for despair. Fear has no place in our thinking. We have every reason to face the future with faith in our form of government and in our ability to make it work. Endowed as we are with individual liberty and our national resources, with faith in a Higher Power and a determination to do our part, we shall meet and conquer the problems of our time. May God sustain us as we go.

Senator Williams Lauds Year 2000 Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, a notable effort to educate the voters regarding the issues is being undertaken by the League of Women Voters in the Washington metropolitan area. Each month seven local leagues cooperate to produce the television series "Up for Decision" dealing with governmental problems of interest to the area. In a recent program Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, gave his views on the year 2000 plan for this area.

League panelists on the program dealing with regional planning were Mrs. Robert T. Andrews, Fairfax County, Va.; Mrs. Geoffrey J. Lanning, Arlington County, Va.; Mrs. Richard T. Atkinson, District of Columbia; and Mrs. William J. Shickler, Prince Georges County. Mrs. Irwin C. Hannum, of Prince Georges County, was moderator. Mrs. R. C. Barrett, of Montgomery County, is the general chairman; the producer for this program was Mrs. Robert Wolf, of Prince Georges County, assisted by Mrs. Robert T. Curtis, of Falls Church, Va.

I am pleased to insert a Washington Post article, of January 24, 1963, dealing with this program in the RECORD:

SENATOR WILLIAMS LAUDS YEAR 2000 PLAN

The year 2000 plan for metropolitan Washington has gained a supporter in the U.S. Senate.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, hailed the proposal as "the kind of foresighted thinking we will want in this area in the years to come."

But he said it was unrealistic to expect the creation of some "superagency" to carry out the program.

"Local governing units are very conservative in changing their nature and pooling their governmental jurisdiction. I feel what we'll have to do is just take existing governmental units and try to find ways to relate them," he said.

The year 2000 plan calls for growth of the area along transportation corridors radiating out from Washington, with wedges of open space separating them. The plan is endorsed by most area planners, Government leaders, and President Kennedy.

WILLIAMS said revitalization of downtown Washington can take place "if there is effective, efficient, reliable—perhaps even comfortable—mass transportation serving the suburbs and feeding the central city."

"The Federal Government can induce local communities to work together on common problems by making money and planning assistance available," he said.

The Senator, who has introduced legislation that would provide mass transportation grants to urban areas, spoke on WETA-TV's "Up for Decision."

Promotion of Former Gov. Sid McMath, of Arkansas, to the Rank of Brigadier General in the Marine Corps Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, notified the former Governor of Arkansas, the Honorable Sidney E. McMath, that he had been selected for promotion to brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve.

General McMath is now the third general in the Marine Corps Reserve, and this is in itself a testimony to the great distinction of this fine officer and public official.

In the Arkansas Gazette of February 7 there is a fine editorial entitled "General McMath."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Feb. 7, 1963.]

GENERAL MCMATH

The Marine Corps has been as important as politics in the life of former Governor Sid McMath, and his promotion to the rank of brigadier general in the Marine Reserve must bring a great deal of pleasure to him, as it does to us.

Mr. McMath has been a good citizen of Arkansas as a civilian, in the years since he has been out of public office as well as during the time he served as Governor. When issues have arisen in the public sphere, Mr. McMath has been there to help fight them out, scarcely mindful of the

wounds and scars that political life has inflicted upon him.

Only Marines can judge such things, we suppose, but we would guess that Sid McMath is as formidable a Marine officer as he is a political leader. His decorations, his war record, and the rank he is now being accorded, suggest that Mr. McMath very well exemplifies the ideal of the tough, resourceful, and talented "leatherneck."

Cuban Aid Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of late in criticism of the decision of the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to proceed with an agricultural aid project for the Soviet Union's Cuban satellite. The project should have been criticized. I hope it will not stop until Director Paul Hoffman and other administrators of this fund withdraw the commitment. If the commitment is not withdrawn then the United States should withdraw all of its contributions to and support of the United Nations.

On this subject I include as a part of my remarks the comment of Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, as follows:

CUBAN AID PROJECT

The U.N.-firsters will have a difficult time ahead. The first week of February brought out the fact that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), to which the United States is the largest financial contributor, had published a booklet denouncing "colonialist oppression" by Western countries and describing Soviet Russia as "a brotherhood of free and equal peoples."

No sooner had this outrageous piece of pro-Soviet propaganda been released by UNESCO than it was learned that the U.N. Special Fund will proceed with a $3 million agricultural aid project for the Soviet Union's Cuban satellite. The United States, which contributes 40 percent of the Fund's financial resources, rightly protested against this outrage. But this was not sufficient to deter the U.N. Special Fund or its American-born Managing Director, Paul G. Hoffman. It is pure subterfuge for Mr. Hoffman to say this will not involve U.S. dollars. Everyone knows that is not so.

The project involves the establishment of an agricultural experiment station in Havana Province that will be of assistance to Red Cuba's collective farm operation. The U.S. Government very properly takes the stand that this project constitutes aid and comfort for an enemy of freedom, for a regime that cruelly treats its own people and threatens all the free nations of the Americas.

Mr. Hoffman, who holds American citizenship, thus far has paid no respect to the feelings of the United States in this matter. He has been quoted as saying: "The day anyone can pressure me successfully, that day I walk out." What is shocking is that Mr. Hoffman has not felt the obligation to walk out of a U.N. organization that wants to send U.S. taxpayers' money to a Russian satellite that menaces the United States.

It is not the amount of money that is to go to Fidel Castro. If it were one dollar, it would be too much. What counts is the principle of the thing. And the principle is that the people of the United States should not be asked to contribute a single dime to the bloody Castro dictatorship.

It is especially ironical that the U.N. Special Fund wants to subsidize an agricultural project. Who will be the beneficiaries of foodstuffs grown under the program? Not the Cuban people, certainly, not the Cubans languishing in Castro's dungeons. But there are 17,000 or more Russian soldiers in Cuba, and they are well fed. The Russian conquerors have everything. No doubt the U.N. could help produce more vegetables for the Russian field kitchens.

The U.N. aid project for Cuba may be the straw that breaks the camel's back. Only weeks ago, millions of Americans were profoundly indignant that they were in effect subsidizing the U.N.'s war against anti-Communists in Katanga. They could not do anything about that. But the U.N. plan to send money to Cuba is too much for Americans.

Already there is before Congress a resolution that calls for a complete cutoff of U.S. funds to the United Nations if the U.N. Special Fund persists in aiding Fidel Castro and his Russian masters. Such a resolution should enjoy the widest support in the Congress from both parties.

If there is one issue on which all good Americans feel strongly, it is the Cuban issue. It should be clear that the U.S. public will not countenance financial aid to the man and the regime that is our sworn enemy. The American people would not for an instant tolerate direct financial assistance to Fidel Castro. It is certain that if they know what is going on, they will not stand by while the U.N. Special Fund is used as a secret pipeline to provide a Russian satellite in the Caribbean with money furnished by the people of the United States.

Congress, as the source of operating funds for all Government projects, should proceed to issue an ultimatum to the United Nations: "No money for Castro, or else." If the U.N. Special Fund refuses to halt financial aid to a Red dictator, then the United Nations stands exposed as a mere front organization and financial pipeline for the Soviet world conspiracy.

Now is the time for Congress to act, and to repudiate Paul Hoffman at the same time. For Mr. Hoffman, Congress should have one word: "Shame."

Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the most important matters which will come before the Congress again this year is agriculture legislation. The President has sent Congress his message. It is now our responsibility to enact sound legislation. Two Missouri newspapers, the Springfield Leader-Press and the Daily Dunklin Democrat, recently published thoughtful editorials concerning the President's agriculture program. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield Leader-Press, Feb. 1, 1963]

IT'S WORTH A TRY

There wasn't a surprise in the whole package of farm program proposals President Kennedy submitted to Congress yesterday.

True, Mr. Kennedy reversed his stand of a year ago by asking for legislation to encourage voluntary rather than mandatory production cutbacks in American agriculture. But that wasn't surprising—the administration indicated some time ago it would probably try this approach.

The two phases of his program that will most affect southwest Missouri are those dealing with dairying and with grains. As for feed grains, the proposals are virtually the same as for the program in effect the past 2 years. There is nothing compulsory about it; a farmer can participate or not, but if he does participate, he is paid for reducing his feed grain acreage.

The fact that this program has worked well, that surpluses have been reduced by it, could be influential in Congress' consideration of the rest of the program which, in the main, employs the same principle.

As for wheat, the President threw the full weight of his office into a plea for farmers to adopt the wheat program to be submitted to growers in a referendum this year. This is the real gambling issue of the whole package.

On its outcome, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman may be staking his career in the Cabinet—it has been said that defeat may cost his job. And the American Farm Bureau Federation may be gambling more than it reckons against it. Defeat could cost the Farm Bureau considerably in prestige.

But Farm Bureau will not be easily defeated. Not more than two or three other organizations in America spend as much for lobbying, and the Farm Bureau voice has always been strong in Congress.

On the other hand, all the other major farm organizations — National Farmers Union, the Grange and the National Farmers Organization—are working just as hard for the wheat referendum to carry. Most important of all—if the propaganda smoke doesn't hide the facts—farmers will most likely receive no more than $1 to $1.25 a bushel for wheat if the referendum is defeated; will get $2 or more if it carries. The National Association of Wheat Growers and National Federation of Grain Cooperatives also have added their endorsement to the program.

In any case, this could provide a crucial test of how Congress will treat the rest of Mr. Kennedy's program for voluntary controls.

As for dairying, a similar program was proposed. The only compulsion for production cutbacks, if the legislation is enacted, would be that of price. The cooperator, reducing production, would receive substantially more for his milk than would the dairyman who refuses to participate.

This newspaper favored mandatory controls when they were proposed; but they were beaten. Now here is a program that has been demonstrated as workable to a certain extent. The thought of even further deflated farm prices and what they could do to an agricultural area like southwest Missouri is enough to demand our support of the new program.

There is still another angle: President Kennedy feels this program may whack as much as $200 to $300 million from the cost

of the farm program in the next year or so; but even if it doesn't, the old program has been proven a failure, and its continuance could benefit only grain storage men and processors, not public nor farmer.

What's the matter with attempting something new and promising after two decades of failure with our present farm program?

[From the Daily Dunklin Democrat, Feb. 6, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM PROGRAM

The President's farm message for 1963 is startling in its contrast to the sweeping system of Government production controls proposed by the Kennedy administration in other years. Voluntary instead of compulsory measures are now recommended.

The President's message last week contained few and only modest requests. The tenor of the message was optimistic. Farm income is up, he reported, and surpluses are down.

The President took occasion to put in a vigorous plug for a "yes" vote by farmers on the wheat referendum later this year, suggesting that failure to approve the program may mean a return to "depression conditions."

The main programs on which the President has asked Congress for action are those covering cotton, feed grains, and dairying.

The proposed cotton program is designed to "promote sustained and expanding markets for U.S. cotton," according to the President.

American cotton mills now have to pay the domestic support price for cotton of 31.88 cents a pound, while the same cotton sells on the world market for 24 cents a pound or less.

The Government pays the price difference for cotton exported in a subsidy in order to make it possible for American cotton to compete in foreign trade. The President proposes Government payments "which will reduce the cost of the cotton to domestic mills by an amount sufficient to eliminate the inequity of the present two-price system." He has also proposed that cotton growers be permitted to exceed their present acreage allotment up to 20 percent with cotton grown for export "at the world price." This means without domestic price supports. The object is to aid small- and medium-size farmers whose normal allowed acreage is insufficient from an economic standpoint.

The feed-grain proposal is more or less an extension of the present program. Only the proposals for cotton and dairy support are new, both materially affect the agricultural incomes of southern Missouri.

Enactment of these three programs would, it is estimated by the administration, result in a saving of between $300 million and $500 million a year. Total cost of the program now is $6,600 million as set forth in the 1964 budget.

The President also called for a new dairy program. Price supporting of dairy surpluses is now costing the Government more than $500 million a year, with more than 300 million pounds of surplus butter in storage.

The President has proposed a plan which he says will discourage overproduction, boost dairy income and reduce the retail price of butter by as much as 10 cents a pound. What the President has suggested is a "voluntary supply management" program under which dairymen who voluntarily agree to limit their marketing of milk would receive a Government payment in addition to the regular price support. This would mean, in effect, increased price support in return for a cutback in marketing of surplus milk.

The problem of feed grains is less this year than previously because of substantial reductions in surpluses. Acreage sown to feed grains has been reduced by nearly 30 million acres since 1961 under the present program. If 15 to 18 million additional acres are diverted to other uses, the President believes the crisis will be over and supply and demand will be in balance.

Other points of the Chief Executive's message included an expansion of the food stamp program into all areas of the Nation where conditions warrant its establishment; federally insured loans for rural housing; vocational and educational training for rural citizens unable to afford it; and certain expansions of present programs for water, land-use adjustment and electricity.

The President was able to report a substantial improvement in net farm income, up $1.8 billion from 1960; gross farm income in 1962 was up $3.5 billion over the 1960 total. Average net income per farm has risen 21 percent, from $3,044 to $3,690, "the highest level in our history," the chief executive noted.

At the same time, Government stockpiles of surplus grain have been reduced by 929 million bushels from the 1961 peak; savings in storage costs of nearly $1 billion are "already assured," he reported, in the 2-year reduction of feed-grain surpluses.

The voluntary programs outlined by the President are wise, in view of the improving farm situation and the growing reluctance of Congress to enact mandatory plans. As the present feed grain program has demonstrated, the Government can induce farmers to cut production if it offers sufficient inducement. It would appear from the President's program that sufficient inducements can be forthcoming if Congress will follow the Chief Executive's programs. The cotton program offered by the President is sound, for it permits the farmer to expand his acreage and salvage some lost markets at home. Continued reduction of feed grain surpluses will help restore a normal market; surplus dairy products and the cost of their storage must be reduced, and once again the President's program offers hope that this can be accomplished.

Despite opposition from some quarters, the President has pointed the way to further improvements in the Nation's agricultural economy with his new recommendations; the Congress would do well to listen to an administration that has not only professed an interest in the income of the farmer but has effectively worked to improve it.

Local Communities and the States Must Meet School Needs To Avoid Federal Education Octopus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy put 24 separate proposals dealing with everything from elementary to graduate school Federal aid to education into one big omnibus request. The President thus issued an open invitation to the Congress, with his message giving the program a label of high priority, for an immediate creation of a new bureaucratic octopus to cost during the first 3 years a total of $4.6 billion.

Since the President's Federal aid to education request was received by the Congress I have tried to point out in my own State that we must adequately support our schools on the local and State level or the Federal Government will take over the function of financing education with the inevitable creation of a bureaucratic octopus similar to the powerful and ever-growing Agriculture Department that regiments our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission to do so, I include at this point the text of a letter dated February 21, 1963, to members of the Washington State Legislature urging adequate local and State support of schools to avoid having them under the control of a Federal agency:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1963.

To the Members of the Washington State Legislature, Olympia, Wash.

DEAR FRIENDS: The purpose of this letter is twofold; first, to express my keen appreciation for the courtesies afforded me when in Olympia recently, and second, to expand and point up more specifically the views that I offered in addressing the senate and house of the State legislature on that occasion.

As to the first point, it was certainly gratifying to observe firsthand the conscientious, objective, and responsible way in which members of the State legislature are fulfilling their responsibilities. Certainly, Washington State's public interest should have priority over partisan advantage in the conduct of political duties.

Now, as to the second point—you will recall that my remarks to the legislature took notice of Federal preemption of major sources of money and the upset in National-State equilibrium which the Supreme Court of the United States vested in the States such as our State of Washington, when, contrary to earlier interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, in 1937 in a series of decisions, the Federal Government obtained unlimited power to tax and spend for the general welfare. Thereby, we created a grey area of responsibility with subsequent Federal legislation requiring matching funds, which often added to our State's financial difficulty in meeting normal public service needs.

In other words, often the Federal Government, by intervening in such important areas as education, has increased rather than provided relief for your difficulty.

You may recall my saying to the Washington State Legislature, in all frankness, that in my view Government is best which is closest to the people. I spoke for retaining on the State and community level the control and management of our schools.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is the best example of what happens when a Federal agency takes over local and State problems. In 1933 the Federal Government began a new program of assisting our farmers. The resultant Federal control and regimentation is generally understood. To maintain the Federal Government octopus of bureaucracy in fiscal 1964, the administration has said it will need 121,583 Government employees and the cost to the taxpayers of the agricultural program is estimated as $8.4 billion. This is nearly five times the amount required to operate the Department of Agriculture 10 years ago and 49 times the amount when the farm program began.

Meanwhile, the number of farmers has been diminishing and, as I say, the program indicates what might happen if the Federal Government under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, takes over the major responsibility for public education.

Certainly, as I said, State financing problems will increase if local communities fail

to vote special school levies when, from time to time, there are crises due to population growth and special local education needs. In turn, then, if the States fail to provide regularly through adequate budgetary appropriations for schools, then the pressure for the Federal Government to take over this responsibility will increase, and thereby the danger of centralized Federal control over the schooling of American children is increased.

People laugh when some of us suggest that we could have a situation here in America such as with Adolph Hitler in Germany through thought control over young people. But rather than recite history or speculate over the future, it is easier to point up the present, such as with the Federal agricultural program.

However, I never fail to point out the importance of local communities meeting their school needs, as with the 9.8-mill school levy decision that the voters of Seattle face on Tuesday, March 12.

As for the State legislature, I have not studied the current budget, but I would be hopeful that enabling legislation to expand the community college program is being considered favorably.

I know the Legislative Interim Committee on Education in its 1962 report recommended "that the numerical limitations on community colleges be eliminated" and bills to accomplish this have been introduced. Frankly, this strikes me as extremely important. In the First Congressional District, in the Shoreline School District, there are plans for such a project and I believe the necessary financial measures for it were voted a year ago. So, please count me as being in strong support of removing the limit on the number of such colleges which can be established.

Reverting again to the general subject of education, let me emphasize again my belief that if the citizens reject extra tax burdens when and wherever local school boards find it necessary to go to the people for additional funds, there will inevitably evolve more pressure for more money at higher levels of Government. Furthermore, as you know, in such event, and wherever the Federal Government is called upon to expend funds, it must, under a Supreme Court decision, look to the way that such expenditures are made. In other words, if the parents of our school children, through their local school boards, desire to preserve their power of decision over the education of their children, and not turn the management over to a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.—similar to the farm program—then the local community, and of course the State, also, must support their schools adequately.

Again, expressing appreciation for your courtesy in allowing me to address the House and Senate of the Washington State Legislature to outline my understanding of our community of interests between our respective legislatures, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress.

Educational Television Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in the fall of last year, the New York-New Jersey Educational Television Station WNDT went on the air for the first time with regular programing, and has since then won the type of acclaim described in the attached article from the fall 1962 edition of the National Educational Television News Quarterly. Those of us who believe that educational television has a bright future of service ahead, look to the new VHF channel in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area to help point the way. I think that the article would be of interest to my colleagues, and so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WNDT WINS NEW YORK AUDIENCE, CRITICS, AFTER STRIKE DELAYS REGULAR PROGRAMING

For the past 6 weeks, WNDT has been acquainting television critics and residents of the New York metropolitan area with something people in most cities had already known—a new kind of television comes from the set when it can carry the broadcasts of an educational station.

An auspicious inaugural broadcast, with Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow, took place September 16. In keeping with the station's turbulent history during the period when it was being acquired for educational use, WNDT then went off the air, closed down by a labor dispute.

The differences stemmed from questions of union jurisdiction over certain nonprofessional performers, such as professors, physicians, and others who appear on the station. The station and union finally agreed 13 days later to hold an election in 6 months to decide whether certain nonprofessional employees wished to be union members.

WNDT is on the air 5 days a week from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m. or later. It broadcasts programs for schools during the school day, followed by teacher training, and programs for children in the late afternoon. During the evening it carries NET videotape and film programs as well as local public affairs programs on the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut area, college courses, and adult informational programs.

During the Cuban crisis, the station carried live reports of the proceedings at the United Nations.

The station has won favorable comment from the critics and from a variety of audiences.

Surveys by rating services indicate that WNDT's coverage of U.N. sessions during the Cuban crisis was watched by 610,000 persons. A 1-hour program containing four short films with Charlie Chaplin reached an audience of 245,000. Evening programs generally were estimated to have an audience of 80,000 persons.

Jack Gould, television critic of the New York Times, had this reaction: "Richard D. Heffner, vice president and general manager of WNDT, has done superbly in starting a new station at one fell swoop. Admittedly, he began with a tremendous headstart in having access to the backlog of TV programing prepared over the years by the fourth network, NET. But helpful as NET can be, one vital function of channel 13 is to do its own local programing."

The critic then cited "The World at 10," a nightly half-hour in which one of a wide variety of available experts is interviewed for informed interpretation of the day's outstanding event; weekly discussions of books and foreign affairs; and "an answer to the prayers of parents of the very young for civilized television at the supper hour."

Mr. Gould continued, "Much of the channel 13 schedule bears a strong resemblance to the best of the weekend public service presentations offered by the networks and the more progressive independent stations. The so-called intellectual ghetto of the Saturday and Sunday daylight hours has been dissolved for the New York viewer by the simple expedient of establishing a station that is not economically forced to concur in its perpetuation.

NEW CHOICE FOR VIEWER

"The immediate accomplishment of channel 13 in New York television has been the institution of an element of genuine choice in programing where it has always been most keenly missing: in prime evening time on weekdays, when every set owner, no matter his taste, normally does most of his television viewing.

"NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE SEEN

"After a random sampling of the initial days of the new station, it is clear that no viewer would want to do without either type of television, commercial or noncommercial. Seeing Pablo Casals at rehearsal is one treat from California, but watching the playoff between the Dodgers and the Giants is assuredly another.

"Channel 13 assumes a national significance because it is in the nature of a laboratory to show that in the long run the way to richer TV lies in affirmative steps to broaden the medium's base and not in indictments and defenses of the status quo."

A Scouting History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Gazette-Mail, Morristown, Tenn., Thursday, February 21, 1963, regarding Morristown's Eagle Scout Troop 90.

Morristown's troop 90, chartered in 1937, has one of the most outstanding records of any troop in the Nation. I want to take this opportunity of commending the members—present and former—of this troop for their devotion to duty and the people of Morristown for their help in suporting such a worthwhile movement. At the same time, I want to pay tribute not only to the living but also to the members who have passed away.

The owners and publishers, John E. Helms, Jr., and C. O. Helms, and editor, John E. Helms, III, and business manager W. O. Helms, are to be congratulated on their interest in scouting and their continued interest in the people of Morristown and vicinity. My congratulations also to the fine newspaper they are publishing.

The article follows:

[From the Daily Gazette-Mail (Morristown, Tenn.), Feb. 21, 1963]

A SCOUTING HISTORY

Morristown's troop 90 is known as the Eagle troop since it has produced more Eagle Scouts than all other district troops put together.

Chartered here a quarter century ago in 1937, troop 90 has an illustrious history which has now been permanently recorded by its former scoutmaster, H. C. "Sonny" Evans, in an interesting little booklet.

Of the 448 boys who were members of troop 90 from its inception up to the present, 51 attained eagledom, Scouting's top rank. This figures out to well over 10 percent, an amazing record for any Scout troop in the country, we'd say.

At least 3 of troop 90's 51 Eagles are dead:

Leroy Hayter (the very first Eagle), Tommy Horner, and Max Slome.

"Sonny" Evans has obviously put much time and research into this compendium of Morristown Scouting. It will be treasured by the members and families of this now venerable troop.

Democratic Ideals and Institutions Taught by Milwaukee Professor Golightly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, truly fantastic increases in scientific knowledge, in world population, and in the power of weapons of mass destruction are changing radically the old framework of our thinking. The philosophic assumptions underlying our democratic ideals and institutions are being challenged by great events as well as by men. It is, therefore, especially necessary for us to think deeply about democracy and particularly about our democracy.

Just such profound consideration is being fostered in Milwaukee by means of a televised course in philosophy, centered on the understanding of our democratic ideals and institutions. This excellent program, which is coming into the homes of many citizens hitherto unconcerned with philosophy, is being conducted by Dr. Cornelius L. Golightly, professor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.

Professor Golightly has a remarkable breadth of experience as an educator, writer, and political and social leader. This wide experience and his erudition make this course an attractive opportunity for a large number of people to deepen their understanding of democracy.

The course consists of eight half-hour informal television commentaries by Professor Golightly and two television panel discussions with other members of the University of Wisconsin faculty. The student's study guide, which was prepared by Professor Golightly, is a handbook with background notes, commentaries, and pertinent questions for Americans to think about and talk about with their friends.

Works to read include the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Thoreau, and Thomas Jefferson, who are primarily literary or political figures, of Thorstein Veblen, because his economic writings illustrate the influence of his philosophical studies, of Walter Lippmann, and of academic philosophers such as T. V. Smith and John Dewey.

Dr. Golightly's course is one that commends itself to the attention of educational programers throughout the country.

Addresses Given on Occasion of Presentation of 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet, January 23, 1963: Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, Jean Monnet, and a Letter from President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 1962 Freedom Award, which is presented annually by Freedom House, was presented on January 23, 1963, to Jean Monnet of France.

Because of present discussions of the state of the Western alliance and because of the great contributions which Jean Monnet has made to the building of that alliance, I believe that Members of Congress will find particularly interesting the speeches which were delivered by a number of distinguished Americans on this occasion.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the texts of the addresses made by Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, and by Jean Monnet together with the text of a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy.

I should like first, however, to include at this point an editor's note concerning the Freedom House dinner which was published in the February 1963 issue of the journal, Freedom and Union. This issue of Freedom and Union carries the texts of these several addresses.

FULL TEXT OF FREEDOM HOUSE DINNER—MONNET, GAINING FREEDOM AWARD, UPHOLDS HIS PLAN FOR UNITED KINGDOM JOINING SIX AND ATLANTIC UNITY AGAINST DE GAULLE—BALL GIVES HIM J.F.K.'S BACKING

High drama marked the presentation of the 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet by Freedom House in New York City January 23. Only 9 days before its long-announced dinner for him, the basic strategy for European and Atlantic unification he had long led in developing was jeopardized by President de Gaulle at his press conference in Paris January 14, whose text we give on page 9. Most jeopardized were such essential parts as British entry into the Common Market and the concepts embodied in President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act and Atlantic partnership speech July 4.

The upheaval was basic and world shaking indeed, for reasons we seek to clarify in our editorial on page 1. Mr. Monnet almost canceled his trip to New York for the dinner, but ended by coming there to make his most important public statement after the upset—answering De Gaulle without naming him.

All this served to magnify the already great interest in his speech, and the preceding ones by George Ball, Under Secretary of State (who read a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy), former Secretary of State Christian Herter, now the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and columnist Walter Lippmann. To hear them, a distinguished crowd of some 1,400 packed the ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria; and press and TV-radio widely reported them. There follows the text of these speeches, in the order made. On page 25 we add a much fuller exposition of the views of Mr. Herter, a key figure in the coming acts in this drama * * *.—EDITORS.

ROSCOE DRUMMOND, CHAIRMAN, FREEDOM HOUSE, PRESIDING

I welcome you to the company of Freedom House and thank you for joining us in doing honor to the foremost European of our time, a great citizen of France who, more than any of his compatriots, strides with the tide of history.

I offer a brief word about Freedom House itself. In the dark days before Pearl Harbor, Freedom House grew out of the organizations of citizens who were deeply concerned about the mood of Americans who tended to regard Hitler and the Nazi threat to freedom as something about which we could be neutral. And we are not neutral today, when freedom is under more deadly attack than ever before.

Freedom House is an educational and service organization created to help preserve and strengthen our free society. Through the commitment of the time and talent of its board of directors and a contributing membership throughout the country, Freedom House has managed to carry its message to the American people in many ways—its message that today the real enemies are those who would bury freedom, and that in this struggle there is no alternative to the proposition—and the goal—that freemen shall prevail.

Liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats are comfortable under the roof of Freedom House, because within the framework of divergent judgments of how our ends can best be achieved, there is fundamental agreement.

The freedom award has been presented each year since 1943. Its first recipient, Walter Lippmann, will follow me soon on tonight's program in honor of Jean Monnet. Others on this platform who have previously received the freedom award are Gen. Lucius Clay, Dr. James Conant, Paul Hoffman, and David Lilienthal. The roster of previous recipients also includes Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Dean Acheson, Bernard Baruch, Gen. George Marshall, Edward R. Murrow, Sir Winston Churchill, and Mayor Willy Brandt. Tonight, Jean Monnet honors us by his visit and his acceptance of the freedom award, symbolizing our recognition of his great contribution to freedom.

MONNET TO PREVAIL

(By Walter Lippmann)

My friendship with Jean Monnet goes back to the early days of the League of Nations. Even then he was already launched on his great career. Amidst the violence and the tumult of the 20th century he stands out as the most constructive of the peacemakers.

He has spent his life in a persevering and persistent, in an ingenious and resourceful, labor of planning and negotiation and persuasion. In all his projects and enterprises there has been one central theme, which is how to induce and cajole men to work together for their own good. He has not asked men to be angels and saints, he has asked them to be sensible. He has not preached to

them and he has never allowed himself to use the resounding generalities about peace and the unity of mankind. But he has been and he is now, at the summit of his career, the most effective planner and engineer of human unity whom we have known in our time.

I am presuming on a long friendship when I say a few words, not about what he has done, but about what he represents.

The principle of his work has been that peace and prosperity will come as men become enlightened in the pursuit of their interests. This is, I believe, the first article of the democratic credo—that enlightenment is possible and will produce the good life. The democratic credo does not say that men are born to govern themselves. It says that they can learn to govern themselves. And then, when education has enlightened the people, most of them will see that they can realize their own best private interest by working with and not against the enlightened public interest. This may be, as many think it is, a naive faith. I myself have wondered about it in some of the dark times we have lived through, and it may be that the good society can be realized on this earth only if mankind is reborn.

Jean Monnet has been a witness to the democratic faith—which is that there is a rational order in human affairs wherever and whenever men listen to reason and obey it. This faith in the paramountcy of reason is the source of that dauntless optimism which has made Jean Monnet so persevering—many of us would at times have said so stubborn—but so remarkably able to get done what he wants to do.

I am only too well aware that these are anxious days for all who are concerned with the great projects which he has initiated. This country is most concerned with them and with the unanswered questions of how the European Community will come to terms with its partners and allies in the Western World, and beyond them with its rivals in the Eastern World. All will depend, I imagine, on whether in the negotiations across the channel, and then across the Atlantic, those who will make the decisions can conceive the future as closed and restrictive or as open and inclusive.

Enough of the faith and stubbornness of Jean Monnet has rubbed off on me so that I venture to say that there is no doubt as to whether the open conception will prevail over the closed. In the end it will prevail. What we are anxious about these days is when and how soon it will prevail, whether we are to be set backward into separatism and division with all the wastes and the dangers that go with them or whether we can move forward toward greater unity in a progressively free world.

PARTNERSHIP CANNOT REMAIN FINAL OBJECTIVE OF EUROPE AND AMERICA—DEEPER TIE AHEAD

(By Christian A. Herter)

We have come here tonight to welcome and to honor a man who symbolizes for us in a very special way the new Europe that is coming into being.

Jean Monnet is in a real sense one of the principal founding fathers of this Europe. He is, at one and the same time, the foremost private citizen of the European community and also an undisputed son of France. In this dual citizenship he embodies a quality which is essential for everyone of us who wishes to contribute to strengthening the free world. Those of us who are on this side of the Atlantic must learn to live in the same moment as genuine Americans and also as citizens of the whole Atlantic area in our cares and outlook.

We are accustomed to welcoming distinguished French gentlemen to our shores, but seldom have we extended a warmer welcome than we do tonight to Jean Monnet. Many of his predecessors in the 17th and 18th centuries helped to bring a new world into being in North America, and some of them contributed decisively to the establishment of this Republic. But Monnet has dared to undertake a far more formidable task than was ever undertaken by even the most distinguished of his predecessors. They explored and settled a virgin continent unbound by the traditions of the past, while he has called a new world into being in an old world bound by centuries of tradition.

It is an ironic and impressive fact that, if one looks for the newest frontier in the Western World, he will find it not in North America but in Western Europe. Jean Monnet is the most authentic new frontiersman of our time. He, more than most other men, understands the secret of how the miracle of remaking Europe was wrought.

What Jean Monnet has done, if he will permit me to say so, was to recognize and take advantage of one of those rare moments in history when it is possible to recreate society and build institutions better adapted to the requirements of the 20th century. He would be the first to recognize that his achievement has been possible only because the tides of human affairs were running in the direction of what he wanted.

After World War I it was evident that Europe must unite or run the risk of decline. The chance to unite came after World War II. That chance was seized and success appears probable.

But the forces of history are working over a wider area than Western Europe. What has been true of the Continent since 1918 is now true of the whole North Atlantic area. We have learned our lesson. The Atlantic area must achieve greater unity or we will be progressively weakened until eventually we lose our freedom. Unity of free men and of free societies is the price of survival as well as of liberty.

There is, of course, nothing inevitable about our achieving the unity necessary for survival. We know, however, that centuries of human struggle and suffering have produced the unique opportunity that now lies before us. Further, we believe that the achievement of this unity is in the nature of things and that the forces of history are working toward this end. We also know that the moment of opportunity could pass and that Western society could succumb once more to the barbarians hammering at our gates if people like ourselves in America and Western Europe are not equal to the task.

Progress has been made. There is an operating military alliance, though a good deal remains to be done if it is to become as effective as it should be.

On July 4 last, the President defined the relationship between the new Europe that is coming into being and the United States as one of active partnership. The practice of partnership involves, as a first major step, the establishment of trade relations between the two partners that will serve their common interests, as well as the interests of each, to the maximum degree possible.

Partnership, however, good as it is, can never remain the ultimate and final objective of Europe and America. The forces of history are working toward a broader and deeper relationship than that. We are all (Europeans and Americans alike) heirs of the same great cultural heritage with similar views about the nature and destiny of man and the character of human society. In other words, we already belong to each other. Our task in the years ahead is to find out how to express the reality of this fact in institutional terms.

Some of us in this country prefer to talk about the future in terms of an Atlantic Community. I know that our European friends shy away from this phrase because for them the word "community" has already acquired a clear and precise meaning—technical, economic, and political—as the emerging structure of their continent. In short, they feel that the use of the word has already been preempted by Europe and that its use here to describe our ultimate goal merely produces confusion of thought and intention.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY—GOAL TOWARD WHICH JEAN MONNET LEADS

At the same time, for many Americans, "community" is such a good word to describe relationships between people that I suspect some of us will continue to use it. I am a New Englander. In New England we say "community" when we are thinking about a society in which people live together as good neighbors, with a common recognition of the supremacy of law, and sharing the benefits of varied economic and political institutions while united by their common cultural heritage and by their feeling of a common destiny. It is in this sense that I speak of the Atlantic community—a goal toward which Jean Monnet's path leads.

The path to that community or partnership, if you prefer, will at times be steep and hazardous. The road upon which we have embarked will not be easy. Setbacks of the kind we are now witnessing are perhaps to be expected. It is inherent in a free society that men should differ on matters of policy between those who see their proper interests or the interests of their respective nations in different terms. At times these differences may well appear to be irreconcilable but I am confident that with the momentum already achieved we will overcome these differences.

History does not consist of a stream of events flowing at the same rate of speed. History unfolds by fits and starts. In the course of our human pilgrimage, sometimes centuries have passed by without there existing much possibility of creative change. Then a moment comes when change is possible if men are at hand who are willing to take advantage of it. Such a moment, thanks to Jean Monnet, is now with us.

MR. EUROPE CAN BECOME A MAJORITY

(By George W. Ball)

First of all, I am serving as a courier to deliver a letter from the President of the United States to Jean Monnet, and I would like to read this letter [printed at end of speech].

And now, if I may, let me add a few personal observations about a man whom it has been my great fortune to know for 20 years. All who have enjoyed the close friendship of Jean Monnet—and our number is legion—can recount innumerable incidents to illustrate his qualities as a friend—his generosity and compassion, his warmth and thoughtfulness, his genuine concern for the problems of others.

But Jean Monnet would be impatient with me were I to pursue this theme tonight. No man has ever cared less for personal adulation and he has not come here for that purpose. Jean Monnet has not flown across the Atlantic at a time of crisis to receive personal honor but rather to participate in honoring and explaining those ideas of which he is a symbol in the hope that they may be even better understood.

ATLANTIC TIE MOST SIGNIFICANT

So tonight I shall not speak of Jean Monnet, that warm, gallant, and modest friend from Cognac. Neither shall I seek to expound his ideas, for he will do that much better himself. Rather I shall say a few words about that almost legendary figure of

epic stature who has become known to an admiring world as Mr. Europe.

Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe, it seems to me, because he is preeminently a modern man. More deeply than any of us he has perceived the central discord of our complex time—the discord between our technology, on the one hand, with its rapid pace of advance and its requirements of scope and scale, and, on the other hand, the institutional arrangements under which we live, so slow to change and so often parochial in character. The consequences of this discord are familiar to all of us. They are evident in the problems we deal with every day—the problems of our cities, of our schools, and of our transportation systems—not to mention our newspapers. But they find their most significant expression in the relations between the peoples of the Atlantic world, where defense is indivisible, where economic life is interdependent, and where the major political decisions must of necessity be taken in concert if the full strength of the free world is to be effectively mobilized against a common danger.

OBSOLETE, FIERCELY HELD IDEAS

Because Jean Monnet has seen this fact with crystal clarity he has striven to transform the nation states of Europe into a new unity, not merely to end forever the frictions that more than once have embroiled the whole world in sanguinary conflict but to enable Europe to contribute its full potential to the shaping of a better world. And at the same time he has sought to promote between Europe and the United States that close cooperation which can give real content and meaning to the Atlantic partnership.

These objectives have represented no utopian dream. Jean Monnet is indubitably hardheaded and pragmatic, but he recognizes a compelling logic in world affairs.

I have called Jean Monnet a modern man, but this does not mean that he is unaware or disdainful of the past. Indeed he has, I think, a profound sense of the meaning of history and of the deep forces it has generated. He has had the insight to recognize that history is not a static affair, not the constant replaying of old themes, but a flow of events which, if man is to survive, must be channeled in directions that meet the requirements of an evolving new age.

He has, therefore, never been tempted into the unhappy error—induced by a nostalgic longing for a world that never was—of seeking to recapture the past. He has not sought to unfurl ancient banners, reinstate old forms, revive the vanished symbols that beglamored the centuries gone by. Instead he has pursued the more relevant purpose of bending men's efforts toward a nobler future.

It is because Jean Monnet so clearly perceives the nature of the great tidal forces at work in the world that he is sturdily immune to transient disappointments. I have been with him on more than one occasion when the movement of new ideas has seemed to many of us irrevocably halted by the abrupt intrusion of obsolete—yet fiercely held—ideas that echoed a distant and earlier age. Invariably—and sometimes almost alone—Jean Monnet has remained undismayed. At such moments of crisis his reaction is always the same. "What has happened, has happened," he is inclined to say, "but it does not affect anything fundamental. The important point is for us not to be deflected, not to lose momentum. We must go forward. We may alter our tactics but never our main objectives."

MONNET AN INCORRIGIBLE OPTIMIST

It is because of this apparent imperturbability that Jean Monnet is known—to the admiration of his friends and the exasperation of his opponents—as an incorrigible optimist. This attitude of mind does not stem from any panglossian idea that all is the best in the best of all possible worlds, but rather from a dauntless faith in the logic of events and the essential rationality of man—a faith in the ineluctable direction of deeply moving forces. Jean Monnet is an optimist because he is a practical man with a passionate desire to get things done—and for such a man optimism is the only useful working hypothesis.

As a practical man he pursues his purposes in a most practical way—a way that is peculiarly his own. Mr. Walter Lippmann has just spoken of him as a man who can "induce and cajole men to work together for their own good." To say it in other words, Jean Monnet is the supreme practitioner of the art of personal diplomacy. And he practices that art with unfailing perception of the loci of power and with an extraordinary singlemindedness.

Optimism works for him because he accepts opponents but not defeat. I still remember a book he once gave me—the story of an Arab prince who, in a time of troubles, went out to the desert to find the wisdom of the ages. The prince returned from his sojourn with this motto:

May God bless even my enemies.
For they too are a means to my end.

[Applause.]

It is by the vital force of his deep convictions, in short, that Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe—the keeper of the conscience of a continent. And he has demonstrated anew the ancient adage that a resolute man, plus the truth, can become a majority.

ESSENTIAL UNITED KINGDOM JOIN MARKET

(By Jean Monnet)

I am moved and embarrassed by what Mr. Lippmann, Mr. Herter, and Mr. Ball have said. I shall not try to answer them.

I am very honored to receive from the board of trustees of Freedom House the Freedom Award at your hands today. That you are giving this award to a European is a proof of the deep community of mind and feeling that unite the people of Europe and North America.

I am convinced this feeling is rooted in our common civilization, the essence of which is its tradition of freedom. This freedom truly is the main issue between the two ways of approaching life that compete for men's minds today.

So many people have written and spoken about liberty more thoroughly than I can that I want to limit myself to what seems to me the most important and urgent practical problem confronting the West and its tradition of freedom, the one that requires action from us today.

The worst enemies of freedom have been, and still are, the spirit of domination and its consquences, the threat of war.

While within our frontiers we have organized liberty and, by mutual consent, maintained the rule of law that largely eliminates the spirit of domination, internationally we are still maintaining peace by force.

Now we must go beyond national frontiers and create new forms of relationships between countries.

The next step ahead of us must clearly be to complete the unity of Europe including Britain [applause], and gradually develop a strong partnership of equals between the United States and Europe. [Applause.]

PEACE AND FREEDOM

These are essential for the organization of peace in the world and the maintenance of freedom.

For, as we progress toward the unity of the West, we will create the conditions favoring a lasting peace between the West and the Soviet Union.

Naturally, the process of putting these great aims into practice involves great changes in the form of relationships now existing between our nations. This brings us up against difficulties.

I would like to talk of the one that looms largest over us all at this moment. It is more than important, it is essential that Britain should join our European Community under the same conditions as the present members. The negotiations have been going on too long but they can be rapidly concluded.

We must remember that on fundamental issues, as two world wars have proved, Britain is part of Europe.

People in Britain and on the Continent must free their minds of the obsolete and static idea that Britain, because an island, is bound to be insular, that she does not belong to Europe and that her commercial policies and interests will keep her forever apart from the natural trend toward European unity.

Entry into Europe would be good for Britain, for Europe, for the West and for world peace. [Applause.]

I still hope and believe, like most people in the Six, that the negotiations on Britain's entry into Europe will succeed.

Those who have had anything to do with European unity known from their own experience that the difficulties encountered at any moment do not matter so long as the objective is kept clearly in view.

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC UNITY

The world has recently become aware of the success of European economic unity, and people everywhere see political unity emerging in Europe. But this sudden awareness has concealed the 12 years of work, and often of serious trouble, that lie behind the achievement.

When the treaty for the European Defense Community was rejected in 1954, most competent observers thought unity in Europe was dead and buried. And yet the progress we have made during the last 12 years shows that, despite all the difficulties, we are on the way.

The countries of continental Europe—France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux—are uniting in a European Economic Community of nearly 200 million people.

Germany and France, which have struggled to dominate one another for centuries, are now coming together, accepting the fact that they have the same destiny. In the European Economic Community they are pursuing a common course of action which is gradually transforming their mutual relations and the outlook of their peoples. They have even been considering closer cooperation in all fields. I have no doubt that France, which has been, from the start, a founder of European unity, will follow this course. [Applause.]

Why is this profound change taking place?

It is because the countries of the European Community have agreed that their economic problems which, in the past, were national responsibilities, have now become common responsibilities and being common, unite them instead of dividing them.

It is because they have established common rules and common institutions that they can do the job.

It is because each of the steps they have taken one after another, as circumstances allowed, have been designed to further the same objective.

The European Coal and Steel Community which was the beginning of all this enterprise, was not set up just to pool coal and steel, but as a first step on the way to European union.

THE COMMON MARKET

The Common Market has not been created just to build a better system of exchanging goods, or to create a new power. We have had, and have, as our objectives, essentially

the creation of a united Europe and the elimination between nations and their peoples of the spirit of domination that has brought the world close to destruction many times.

To produce such a change, it was essential to eliminate the feeling of discrimination between nations that was the inevitable consequence of the many European wars.

To begin to unite Europe only 5 years after the war, it was vital that everyone should see that there were no more victors or vanquished, but only partners equal before the common law.

The institutions of the Common Market work in such a way that discrimination between European nations has now been ended.

The independent European Commission is the authority empowered to propose the economic policies of the Community. The national governments whose representatives sit in the Council of Ministers, decide on the common policies proposed by the Commission according to the rules and spirit of the Rome Treaty. In a widening field its decisions no longer require unanimity.

The attitudes of the people of Europe are rapidly changing. The peoples of these Community countries, the producers, the farmers, labor and the members of the professions, have become partners in change and are taking on the same Community outlook.

In fact when you look at it, they are the same people as they have been for centuries, but their attitudes toward one another have changed.

This is the process of civilization itself.

This process is taking us faster and further than anyone would have dared to hope after the war.

Britain's request to enter the European union is one sign of it.

Another is your President's speech on the last 4th of July, where he called for a partnership of equals between the United States of America and the European Community. You are now preparing to negotiate new trade links across the Atlantic which must serve the interests of the world as a whole.

AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR EUROPEAN UNITY

Ever since the Marshal plan, and the Schuman plan, American support for European unity has never faltered.

I can testify from my own experience that this support has been invaluable in bringing European unity to the point where it is today. For once, the most powerful country in the world has helped others to unite instead of adopting the old principle of divide and rule.

But during all those years, the United States took her decisions alone. Now the partnership means a new form of relations.

Let me read to you what the Action Committee of the United States of Europe said on this matter in its joint declaration of June 26 last:

"The partnership between America and a united Europe must be a relationship of two separate but equally powerful entities, each bearing its share of common responsibilities in the world. This partnership is natural and inevitable because the peoples of Europe and America share the same civilization based on freedom and conduct their public life in accordance with common democratic principles."

I think this has implications for defense which, with the entry of Britain into the Common Market, is the main problem that looms over the great debate in the West.

We must recognize in this nuclear age, that while making every effort to disarm, we must pursue and improve our common defense with all its political implications on both sides of the Atlantic.

Europe and America must both acknowledge that neither of us is defending a particular country, that we are all defending our common civilization. [Applause.]

You, in the United States, must realize that the claims of Europe to share common responsibility and authority for decisions on defense, including the nuclear weapons, is natural since any decision involves the very existence of the European peoples.

EUROPE'S SHARE OF DEFENSE

On the other hand, I think the Europeans must understand that the nuclear terror is indivisible and that they too must shoulder an adequate share of the common defense.

Today, however, the countries of the Atlantic Alliance have such divergent views of their immediate interests that a common approach to the problem has to be developed if agreement is to be achieved.

To achieve the partnership between Europe and America, we must create an increasingly common interest by acting in common on a growing number of questions. When sufficient points of common interest have been created, a degree of community in defense will be accepted that today appears utopian.

In my opinion, while progress on defense must be sought continuously, the field where results can be most promptly obtained is the economic one.

There are urgent problems which neither Europe nor America can settle alone. These are, to my mind, the monetary stability of the West, the organization of agriculture in an increasingly industrial world, help to the developing countries to speed their growth and, of course, the freeing of trade to be negotiated between yourselves and the Common Market.

I realize that economic partnership will not automatically lead to a partnership for defense. In Europe too, the Common Market alone is not enough to create political union. But without the Common Market, political union would never have been raised as a practical issue. Similarly, the creation of the rules and institutions needed to build up the economic partnership between the United States and Europe will change the context for dealing with defense. It will then appear in a new light on both sides of the Atlantic.

The unity of Europe and its partnership with the United States will not only change the relationship between us, it will fundamentally change the relationship of the West with the Soviet Union.

As long as Russia believes the West can be divided, it will be tempted to upset the balance of power in its favor.

As we organize new forms of relationship between the Western nations, we will be showing ourselves, the Soviet Union and the rest of the world, that as a result of the union of Europe and its partnership with the United States, the West cannot be divided.

The conditions will then exist for establishing the basis of lasting peace between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

I believe this development can come much faster than we imagine today. My hope is based on my experience of European unity. This experience has been that once people are convinced a new situation is inevitable, they adapt themselves to it spontaneously and by doing so, hasten the process itself.

This is the most helpful road to the creation of peace today, and to the consolidation of freedom. [Ovation.]

UNITED STATES, EUROPE DEFEND COMMON CIVILIZATION

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 22, 1963.

His Excellency JEAN MONNET,
President, Action Committee for the United States of Europe.

DEAR MR. MONNET: I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance—and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic world.

For centuries, emperors, kings, and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than 20 years than it had done before in a thousand. You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of United States policy, for we have recognized with you that in unity lies strength. And we have also recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, working in full and effective partnership, can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16 in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that "Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization." The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Our Faith and the Problems of a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention of the Senate to the thought provoking sermon by the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral on January 27. Dean Sayre, in this sermon speaks of our living religion and in the need to relate our faith to the problems of a changing world. I commend it to the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON PREACHED IN WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL BY THE VERY REVEREND FRANCIS B. SAYRE, JR., DEAN, JANUARY 27, 1963

John 3: 8: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell where it cometh, and whither it goeth: So is everyone that is born of the Spirit."

There is a liberation in those words—more than we know—a setting free from the plaster cast of conventionality; a breathing, joy-

ous life escaped from the fetters of dread anxiety and of dull undermining morality. This was the radiance carried by the pilgrim kings from Bethlehem back to their dim lit countries. And this is the message we have to proclaim at Epiphany to the motionless world: of Christ as the holiness of God come to unchain us from the twisting track of history and the tidy commonplaces of custom.

Even before Christ was born, there occasionally came to people glimpses of what God must be like, and what it would be like to live alongside of Him. Jesus remembered the day, and quoted it from the Old Testament to His diciples: When David was fleeing from the wrath of King Saul, he rushed into the temple and demanded bread from the altar, holy bread like our communion waters, meant only for the priest to eat in prayer and piety. But David was desperately hungry, and the priest gave him the bread, breaking the law to meet the human need. "That's what God's spirit is like," said Jesus. He loves man's soul more than the Sabbath Day.

Nevertheless, it came as a hard truth to those ancient Jews. They loved their taboos, the neat little trays into which they froze their ethics like ice cubes in separate compartments. Life is manageable when you can assume that all is orderly and known, and few like to be disturbed by a brandnew idea, or a lurking doubt in the depths, or a revolution in art or the body politic—much less by the near proximity of a sovereign God. King Saul, jealous of the law. had the compassionate priest put to death. Yet, as Jesus recollected, God had nonetheless prevailed. Saul and David played hide and seek all around the hills of Palestine in their rivalry for the throne of Israel. There they were, vivid in the Bible story, acting out the prehistoric role of man in all his wars both hot and cold. What other way has man ever known than to stalk his enemy and organize his force with all the wiles of human cunning? But when the denouement came, and David caught Saul sleeping in a cave, then struck God with love—that eternal weapon that bloweth where it listeth, shattering even the fiercest hot of passion or weld of slavery.

"Kill him," urged David's men. "Not so," said David, "for God anointed him to be king." He cut off the hem of Saul's cloak instead. And when the king saw how love had spared his life, he loved in return. So was Israel preserved from fratricidal war by the breakthrough of that holy care which alone can confound the suicidal pattern of man's lonely way.

Israel remembered her preservation. She did not fail to record it in her holy writ. And yet she soon forgot that it had come by the whisper of God in those warrior hearts. In retrospect it's always so easy to ascribe deliverance to reason, or a chance of history, or some other index in man's little catalogs of explanation.

It will be interesting to see, to take an example from our own day, what Senate investigators make of the Cuba crisis of 3 months ago. What pedestrian accounts will the post mortem substitute for the President's act of shining courage in that fateful hour? For however bright may flash the redeeming light in the awful darkness of lonely decision, it will forever afterward be obscured by the self-vaunting dissection of those who explain it away, leaving only the dross of their own borrowed wisdom.

How prone we are—all of us—to try and plot the Spirit of God as if it were the orbit of some satellite, predictable and peripheral, revolving around ourselves! So, when God's Son was born, so long yearned for yet still unexpected, people couldn't make Him out. He broke every pattern. He came not as a king, but a helpless babe. His followers neither fasted nor kept the laws of food. Men were healed on the forbidden Sabbath; and when Jesus was hungry, He picked an ear of corn in a field, to the scandal of all good Sabbatarians. You weren't supposed to be traveling on Sunday.

So strange to the people of God was the freedom of the Son of God that, as the Lesson tells us this morning, His enemies at once set about destroying Him, while His friends thought He was demented. But Jesus Himself went straight to the heart of the whole misunderstanding when He said to the people that of all the sins in the world, only one could not be forgiven, and that is the sin against the Holy Ghost.

What is that sin? It is the sin of which clay-bound man has ever been guilty through all the ages: the sin against freedom, when he freezes the boundless newness of God into the deathly oldness of finite familiarity. In each breath of life the Devil beckons always with the illusion that somehow he can trap God, pour His Holy Spirit into our little pigeonholes of thought, catch Him on the wheel of known experience, and make a dictionary of His holiness for our shelf of reference books—to be used or not according to the purpose of the moment.

See how we ourselves are convicted of this rebelliousness against the Holy Ghost! Is not this a nation of overage Puritans, which however much it may have rejected the narrow Calvinism of its New England forbears, yet still tends to stuff unformed destiny into molds of moralism. It hankers after the black and white. It is often capable of adulterating a fact or massacring history, to fit a preconceived image of right and wrong, and thinks it "Christian," too, to be so idealistic, so arbitrary in her ethic.

Nothing could be further from God's spirit—blowing, blowing so disturbingly where it listeth! The Christian ethic, unlike the Jewish, does not lie in being good, in following a preset regimen of righteousness; it rests rather upon that holy creativity of God which can neither be bounded nor enclosed, which is the womb out of which all things are born, all things forgiven, and all redeemed. We are chained to no commandment, but strive to "be perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect." Perfection is our ethic. And perfection knows no compartments, no little halfway houses, no catalog of better and worse. We follow after God himself, who walketh where He wills, and often into places that seem very strange to us.

It is that strangeness which bothers so many timid ones—the mystery of the unfamiliar, which the world rejects. We cannot abide it. John Birchers with their shallow inventory of truth and falsehood; the myriad denominational pockets in which we fondle, and isolate, little broken bits of revelation; little private popes we make ourselves, each one, to defend the walls we build around our personal predilections, however piously we define them. All this is the sin against the Holy Spirit—because at bottom we are unready to submit ourselves to the moving, living life of God whose work of creation is never finished, and whose saving mercy is ever astonishing, never predictable, and is deeply humbling to our every pride.

Have you ever really considered the unutterable paradox that must inevitably result when God's infinity cuts across earthly finitude? Everything is topsy-turvy when Christ is born. Everything is redefined, and not by the logic of man, but by the unfolding mystery of God. Blessed is the man who, like a hunter in the snow, can follow the footprint of God's Spirit as He wends His holy way, silently in the forest of life. Can you make out the track there in history, there in your own life?

Perhaps you'll allow me to presume to point to the trail in a place or two where the scent is hot. Take the Ecumenical Council in Rome, for example. There, surely, marches God's Holy Spirit. For an ancient church, so outwardly prosperous, so historically successful, to look so deeply inward and consider changing the habits of a whole millennium, to face the fact that the Constaninian epoch is over, in which the Christian cause was allied to the civil state and sought to penetrate by law the fabric of society—in Rome we are witnessing an arresting honesty. It is too soon to say, but it may well be that the Roman church is girding itself to enter the brandnew age that is at hand: an age of space; an age of the as yet unknown; an age, perhaps, of new liberation from man. And our Roman brethren are facing it with faith, ready it may be to cast off some of the wordly props that by now have so circumscribed her narrow way. Have we Protestants equally as much faith as to be ready really to follow God's leading, wherever it may blow? A good way to test our readiness would be to ask ourselves this question: suppose, in succeeding meetings of the present council, the Roman church so cleansed itself of her divisive and arrogant securities as to commit herself sincerely to the Holy Spirit. Would we be humble or truthful enough to acknowledge that the reformation had thereby been fulfilled, and the way opened for our reunion with Catholic brothers, now that the spirit is freed once more? Of would we defy God's spirit so far as to deny that He could reform a church which we failed to correct—and so persist in our own narrow and separate way?

Who, then, dares be born of the spirit in a day so racked and anxious for lack of it? What strange anomalies must we be prepared to meet when God's life is woven into our own on that great loom of redemption. Sometimes peace is best kept by soldiers, as just now in the Congo. Sometimes God's love for His children is more clearly reflected in U.S. marshals than by prayerful Christians in Oxford, Miss. Sometimes, when there is no room at the urbane inn, we have to seek for love at the back door—in an unsuspected shed; on a shameful cross; in a darkened forest; or a disillusioned hope. For God's spirit bloweth where it listeth, is not shut up in familiar booths or even handsome churches, but walks before us, ever fresh, ever new, ever ready to bestow that holy freedom which is the very image of God and the life of man.

"Not I liveth," said St. Paul, "but Christ liveth in me."

The 45th Anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my insertion of remarks, I am pleased to include for the information of the House a very timely and informative speech delivered by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interin of Lithuania at a commemoration of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. His talk was delivered in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1963:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the consular corps, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor

and a great pleasure for me to be with you today, and I must begin by thanking you most sincerely for the kind invitation which brought me here. Several times in the past few years I had wanted to visit Lithuanians and their friends on the west coast, and finally I have the great happiness of being with you as we commemorate the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

For just a moment, I would like to share with you the thoughts that strike me as a first-time visitor to Los Angeles. One of the things that affects my imagination most deeply is the vast energy and dedication whereby the American frontier was extended from the east coast, where I have lived for some years now, to this City of Angels on the shores of the Pacific Ocean. The thought of a pioneer toiling bravely to reach the Rocky Mountains, the Sierra Nevadas, the desert, pausing in a lonely clearing uninhabited by men—all this thrills the imagination. This kind of initiative and self-possession, however, is familiar to me and to you in a different way, because these traits of boldness and courage are part of the story of Lithuania; and it is that story which has gathered us here today.

The American pioneer, as has often been pointed out, pursued a dream on the western horizon with an almost relentless passion. Even before the gold rush years, the eminent French visitor, Alexis de Tocqueville, was amazed by the speed with which this westward migration was taking place, and he said:

"It would be difficult to describe the avidity with which the American rushes forward to secure this immense booty that fortune offers. * * * He is unimpressed by the silence of the woods; the approach of beasts of prey does not disturb him, for he is goaded onwards by a passion stronger than the love of life. Before him lies a boundless continent, and he urges onward as if time pressed and he was afraid of finding no room for his exertions."

One of the principal characteristics of this relentless drive westward is particularly important, and many authors have commented on it at length. Briefly, it seems that the American pioneer, alone in the silence and challenge of the frontier, could easily imagine that he was leaving the east entirely behind him, and that a literally new world lay ahead. His ancestors, who had originally reached the Eastern United States from their native Europe, had never ventured as far as this pioneer, and he could well imagine that he no longer had any ties left with the Europe whence his ancestors sprang. He was, he could assume, a new man, the so-called American Adam who no longer had a historical past or a geographical origin. There was only the future, and the far horizon to conquer; everything lay ahead.

This was, no doubt, a splendid dream, and it brought vast numbers of settlers to the shores of the Pacific. The boundless continent of which De Tocqueville had spoken was finally circumscribed. But the content of that dream of historical and geographical detachment, if I may twist a few Shakespearean words, was "such stuff as dreams are made on," and that dream soon vanished "into thin air." Already when I was a little boy in Pennsylvania shortly after the turn of the century, the children of the American pioneers were learning that they could not entirely divorce themselves from European events. And even though, for several years following the First World War, America could still attempt to avoid the "foreign entanglements" against which George Washington had warned, the outcome was inevitable. One of the most graphic illustrations of that outcome is the fact that the United Nations was formed on this very west coast of the United States, a west coast which was once thought by its settlers to be at the farthest possible removed from Europe.

The world has grown even smaller in the years since the Second World War. Anyone who lives on this west coast today knows that, farther to the west, there lie Korea, Vietnam, Laos, China, India—and the list could be expanded. There is not an area of the world west of Los Angeles that does not bear directly upon the happiness of every inhabitant of Los Angeles. And if we look back far to the east, whence came the ancestors of the men who settled this west coast, we see a Europe confronted with a new and evermore terrible enemy, with Berlin as one focal point of that conflict. If we try to see what lies in the future, inevitably we focus on the menace of imperialistic world communism, which threatens that very pursuit of happiness within a free society which led to the establishment of this great city of Los Angeles. And those of us in this room today can add one further dimension of experience to that glance eastward and westward: if we look to the east, we see our homeland of Lithuania, cruelly subjugated for over 20 years by the ruthless tyrants of the Kremlin; if we look to the west, we see Siberia, land of deportations and genocide, a terribly tangible demonstration of that disregard for the dignity of the human person which is central to the Communist credo. There is, in other words, no escape from the struggle in which all freedom-loving peoples are involved; the struggle surrounds us on all sides. The protagonists in the struggle are all peoples who believe in human liberty, peace and justice and are willing to dedicate their efforts to the attainment of those ends. The struggle against deceit and treachery, however, is a long and arduous one, and this can easily be seen if one reviews for a moment the events surrounding the barbarous absorption of Lithuania into the control of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania became a sacrifice to an infamous accord between Hitler and Stalin. When Soviet treachery materialized in the aggressive act of occupation, the first to protest were Lithuania's representatives abroad, while the first foreign reaction was the condemnation of the aggression by U.S. Acting Secretary of State Sumner Wells. Thus, the Lithuanian cause was from the very beginning projected into an international arena. From that time on, the Soviets have repeatedly attempted to present the supposed incorporation of Lithuania as a free choice of the people. It has thus become part of the Lithuanian struggle to regain freedom and independence that such a clumsy lie be unmasked, and that the facts behind the Soviet occupation of Lithuania be accurately revealed as an ill-concealed act of criminal aggression on the part of the Kremlin. The efforts of Lithuanians living in the free world have long been dedicated to a full and accurate presentation of the facts, and their efforts were saliently supported when a U.S. congressional committee under the direction of Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin investigated the Soviet aggression in the Baltic States and came to this conclusion:

"The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R. Any claims by the U.S.S.R. that the elections conducted by them in July 1940 were free and voluntary (or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal) are false and without foundation in fact."

In the light of all the evidence, the Soviet action in the Baltic States has become one of the clearest examples of Soviet aggression and neo-colonialism. Even though the Soviets have tried to achieve recognition of the status quo in the Baltic States, the free world has seen their attempts as only a continuation of the series of clumsy lies to which the free world is now accustomed. Other nations of the free world have joined with the United States in refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States, realizing that the expression of any such sanction, whether directly or indirectly, would be tantamount to the awarding of a prize for unprecedented disregard of international agreements and the principles of justice and peace among nations. This position has great political and legal significance, for it enables Lithuanian representatives to continue their duties and the defense of Lithuanian rights and interests.

Even a Soviet representative such as Litvinov did not fail to note the significance of the nonrecognition policy, for he said:

"It would be quite wrong * * * to assert that resolutions on nonrecognition are in themselves devoid of any particular value. While such resolutions have in every case a certain moral significance, and give satisfaction to public opinion, they also cause the aggressor some preoccupations and inconveniences, as is evident by the efforts which aggressors usually make to obtain recognition of their conquests, if only in an indirect way. But, according to circumstances, nonrecognition may be of vast importance, not only morally, but also politically—particularly when the victim of aggression itself continues to fight for its independence and for the integrity of its territory. In such cases, the recognition of the results of violent aggression or the abandonment of the policy of nonrecognition, would be equivalent to abbetting the aggressor directly, and to stabbing his victim in the back by discouraging and demoralizing it." (League of Nations Official Journal, 1938, pp. 340–341.)

Finally, I might note in this respect that the refusal of Western nations to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States conforms to an old principle of law, namely that unjust actions do not have just consequencies. Ex injuria jus non oritur. It is with regard for this principle, as well as for the other considerations I have mentioned, that the Lithuanian diplomatic representatives maintain the just aspirations of Lithuania to freedom and independence. And part of their task has repeatedly been that of combating Soviet attempts to achieve indirect recognition of the illegal situation in Lithuania and the other Baltic States. This task has been carried on in conjunction with the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and the American Lithuanian Council, as well as other organizations which perform special functions related to the common task confronting Lithuanians living in the free world.

In this struggle for justice, the Lithuanian people have many good friends, and it is my pleasure to mention some of them here. I speak first of all of Mayor Samuel Yorty of Los Angeles, who has often demonstrated a keen awareness of the effort involved in combating Communist propaganda and treachery. We are most grateful to him for his official proclamation in connection with this commemoration, and for the ceremony whereby the Lithuanian flag was raised in honor at city hall this morning. We also cherish the presence here today of the distinguished dean of the Los Angeles Consular Corps, Dr. Mong-ping Lee, the Consul General of China; and the Consul General of Canada, the Honorable George R. Paterson and Mrs. Paterson. Lithuanians everywhere are particularly grateful for the friendship of the Chinese people, who are also engaged in a struggle to regain their rightful freedom and territorial sovereignty. We deeply appreciate the numerous occasions on which the Chinese representative at the United Nations has espoused the Lithuanian

cause, at a time when the official voice of the Lithuanian people is silenced in that body. And Lithuanians are also grateful to the government and people of Canada for having made possible the reestablishment of an Acting Consul General in Canada. We are also very happy to have with us today the last American Minister to Lithuania before the forcible Soviet occupation, Dr. Owen J. C. Norem and Mrs. Norem. I happened to be the first person to greet Dr. Norem officially when he arrived in Lithuania, and so I am very hapy, during this visit, to renew an acquaintance of long standing. In days when such travel was difficult, Prof. Malbone Graham twice visited Lithuania, and has always been a great friend of our country; he has also dedicated much effort to numerous scholarly writings on Lithuania. He is not able to be with us today because of illness, and I know that I express the desire of all of us in wishing him a speedy recovery.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the Lithuanians who gather here today do not stand alone; they have friends who share their aspirations for a better world in which justice will be the cornerstone of individual and national liberty. This kind of alliance is a natural one by virtue of our goals, but it can never be taken for granted. The solidarity that the free world is ever seeking to strengthen is the result, not of idle maxims chanted, but of difficult lessons clearly learned. Just as the descendants of the American pioneer learned through bitter experience that freedom-loving peoples must stand together, so too have freedom-loving peoples learned that mere noble desires and aspirations do not guarantee peace and happiness. The tragic fate of Lithuania is one of the clearest examples of this. Even where dedicated men gave of all their energies to build a free and independent Lithuania, their noble work was overwhelmed by treachery and ruthless greed. And the reason is simple: evil men have an unlimited number of means available whereby to achieve nefarious ends, whereas seekers after justice have but a narrow path of principle and faith to follow.

Yet in spite of this, all of us gathered here are determined to believe in justice, and to work for it. It is only the strong of mind and heart who are able to believe perseveringly in justice—who are able to set aside doubts and fears, and to see truly that mankind's yearning for peace and freedom is rarely rewarded overnight. And even when peace and freedom are achieved, they cannot be maintained without courage and hard work. As Erasmus once said, "God indeed preserves the ship, but the mariner conducts it into harbor." And it is above all faith in a just cause which enables men to persevere, in spite of obstacles, in the noble quest for a better world.

Neither the Hitlerite nor the Soviet occupation has dimmed the Lithuanian people's bright hope of freedom. History teaches that tyrants may have temporary success in defeating just aspirations, but in the end they fall to very low depths indeed. Such, even in our own time, is the paradoxical fate of Josef Stalin. His removal from honored interment to an obscure grave by the Kremlin wall shows quite well that justice has a habit of burying its own undertakers. And this pattern will persist as long as men are willing to fight and die for the freedom which is synonymous with life for them—whether at Thermopylae or Bunker Hill or Budapest or the Berlin wall or the forests of Lithuania.

This is a year of anniversaries. Not only do we mark the 45th year since Lithuania's Declaration of Independence in modern times, but also the 710th anniversary of the foundation of the kingdom of Lithuania under King Mindaugas. And at the same time that we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the great Lithuanian uprising against czarist domination. The pattern of liberty and justice is woven firmly into the lives of Lithuanians. Though they now experience "the perilous night," as did Francis Scott Key, they know that the day will come and that, "with the dawn's early light," their flag will still be there. Long may it wave.

In closing, I would like to read to you the text of a letter for which Lithuanians everywhere will be grateful. It speaks for itself. It is in connection with this anniversary, and I am happy that it reached me in time for me to read it to you:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1963.

"DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: Permit me to convey, in the name of the Government and the people of the United States, the warm regard of this country for the Lithuanian nation on the occasion of its 45th anniversary of independent statehood. Americans remain strongly convinced that your people, like all other nations, are entitled to freedom and national self-determination. For this reason our Government continues not to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania in the Soviet Union. We are confident that the proven devotion of Lithuanians to liberty and justice, with which many of them have enriched our own shores, will serve their nation well in its efforts to achieve the eventual restoration of its rights.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Trade Issue Is Not Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, when the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was passed many believed that this legislation settled the trade question for 5 years, since the act was passed for a 5-year period.

Yet, it should have been clear that an issue of this kind cannot be expected to lie dormant for a 5-year period. Already events have upset some of last year's calculations, notably with respect to the Common Market.

The passage of the trade bill was accomplished under conditions that sidestepped the problems faced by many of our industries that are menaced by import competition. The escape clause of the previous legislation was greatly weakened and the adjustment assistance provision of the new act appears to be a dead letter. The administrative provisions are exceedingly complicated. In any event workers do not relish displacement by imports so that they can be retrained or relocated by the Government. New jobs are not opened by retraining.

Why imports should have priority over domestic employment has never been satisfactorily explained. The reason usually given is the maintenance of friendly relations with other countries. This indicates a weak posture and there is no evidence that it will pay off in any case.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a little pamphlet that examines the position of the U.S. economy in the face of the international competitive forces and what this means to economic growth and expansion in this country, especially as a means of overcoming the employment problem.

This study opens some very serious doubts about the possibility of meeting this problem under our new trade policy. The analysis, with its statistical support, addresses itself to the causes of our relative economic lag and is very persuasive in its conclusion that rising and anticipated import competition represents a powerful deterrent to greater growth and more employment at home.

I commend this study for perusal by all Members because of the light it throws on our current economic situation. The pamphlet, prepared by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, is given below under leave to extend my remarks:

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962—ITS POTENTIAL INDUSTRICIDAL ASPECTS EXAMINED

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The Trade Expansion Act has delivered into the hands of the President an instrument with a potential power of mutilating our domestic economy and reversing American industrial leadership of the world. If used to its fullest range in reducing our tariff it will accelerate the banishment of economically strategic segments of our industries, decimate jobs, and visit a blight on domestic industrial profits and their regenerative function.

The besetting immobility and ingrowing stagnation of our economy will be confirmed, entrenched, and reinforced. Other parts of the world will prosper and grow, as we once grew, while we stand still or shrink and decline. We will have delivered our heritage into their hands. We, on our part, will be overburdened with unemployment, taxation, and governmental controls to a degree never previously witnessed or contemplated, and will either reverse the trade policy or accept a new world order with the United States as a secondary power or seek strength through suppression of freedom and establishment of a dictatorship.

The instrumentality is in being. Will we use it intemperately or will we have wiser second thoughts?

These are dire pronouncements and should not be uttered without substantiating reasons and a bank of clear supporting data. It is the purpose here to supply both.

The American economy has indeed shown disturbing symptoms of anemia in the past 5 years while the European and Japanese economies, previously much less dynamic and vigorous than ours, have prospered and grown very impressively. Their example has so amazed us that we have hastened to jump to some untenable conclusions, based on dangerously false analogies. Characteristically and unreflectively those who advocate dismantlement of our tariff have concluded that what was good for Europe would also be good for us, although their affliction was wholly different from ours. Their economics differed and still differs in some basic aspects from that of the United States.

The medicine that was and is good for Europe would therefore not necessarily be good for us. It would in some basic elements be perniciously harmful and yet the Trade Expansion Act has filled the shelves of our apothecary with heavy dosages of this medicine.

Why would the prescriptions of the Trade Expansion Act, if carried out substantially in accordance with the authorizations con-

tained in it, confront our economy with unwholesome and destructive conditions?

It will be necessary to trace the antecedents of the whole trade program and its own past effect on industry before assessing the probable effects of the new act, should its tariff-slicing powers be implemented fully.

The American industrial supremacy was itself the product of unique factors and forces. Given rich resources and great areas of undeveloped land, such as marked the United States even in its early history; given settlers who brought with them the virtues of competence, willingness to work, discipline, courage, ambition, honesty, and a strong penchant for self-reliance and freedom, so amply reflected by our pioneers; and given a government that governed without oppression and, with some notable exceptions, gave free rein to initiative and pursuit of opportunity, it could be expected that a strong nation, based on a strong economy, would be built.

This, indeed, is what the American people achieved.

Alexander Hamilton envisioned a diversified industrial economy that would not suffer from the curse of excessive specialization, such as often afflicted and still afflicts one-crop or one-industry economies.

The imposition of a protective tariff helped the initiation and development of new industries. The British monarchy had hoped to maintain us as a predominantly agrarian economy, offering a good market for British manufacturers. After the War of 1812, we recognized the weakness that came from lack of industry, and the Tariff Act of 1816 was put forward as a frankly protectionist measure designed to promote our industrialization. This policy was maintained, with variations, throughout the remainder of the 19th century and well into the 20th.

During this long period of development the groundwork was laid for the most phenomenal blossoming of industry that had been witnessed by mankind. This culminated during the first quarter of the 20th century in mass production and a level of wages high enough to provide the purchasing power necessary to absorb the vast output of our factories.

We had in the meantime with a clear vision of economic forces come to appreciate the value of competition and had as far back as 1890 passed the Sherman Antitrust Act. This was implemented in the second decade of the new century by the Clayton and the Federal Trade Commission Acts and later by the Robinson-Patman Act. Our faith in competition was nourished by the vision of low costs as the best means of bringing goods within the reach of the buying power of the people, and by the perception of unfairness of competition as the destroyer of competition itself. Therefore we would not tolerate monopoly if we could prevent it, since monopoly makes possible the maintenance of prices higher than necessary. It could also lead to enrichment of the few and impoverishment of the many. This was alien to our political and economic philosophy. Later we were to extend the concept of fairness of competition to the field of wages.

The vision of mass production as a means of lowering unit costs, thus tapping a greater market that was itself enriched by higher wages, a vision generally ascribed to Henry Ford, found growing acceptance after World War I, and in the 1920's was extended to many industries. It moved so rapidly that in conjunction with loose practices in the field of credit and finance and the world economic distortions caused by World War I we crashed spectacularly and ignominously in 1929 and then sank into a sobering depression, attended by rebellious reactions.

The Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 became an amazingly handy and ready scapegoat or whipping boy even though it was enacted 8 months after the debacle. It absorbed an unbelievable quantity of bile, abuse and venom. The practice of belaboring this act became a habit and bore witness to the lack of penetration and short mental radius of our economic "thinkers" of the time. There was a superabundance of emotion such as inevitably accumulates with deep economic frustration and consumer want.

The great depression in a short time fathered two diametrically opposed economic courses, one resulting in higher costs and the other in lowering our economic defenses. The first expressed the bitter reaction against the loose practices that fed the boom of the twenties; and laissez faire (noninterference by Government) became a hated economic concept. It shouted that controls must be established. Industry must be regulated. Much governmental planning must underpin the private economy. Moreover, cushions must be put in place to assure softer landing henceforth in the event of another crash. The other was the trade agreement program. It unabashedly cried that the tariff must come down even though it was a regulatory measure and even though in time tariff reduction would undermine the first course and bring it to a crisis.

As a result of the first course there broke upon the economy a vast array of regulatory measures reaching their hands and fingers into all the principal sectors of the economy, such as wages, hours, and working conditions; farm output and prices; stock issues and stock market practices; banking; unemployment, old-age pensions, etc. Restriction of immigration was continued as a defense against a chronic labor surplus and resultant low wages. Many other overt interferences with the free market system were instituted and carried out, usually with the effect of raising production costs.

The free enterprise system was to be a publicly regulated system. This ferment and the movement could be regarded as universal but for the one exception.

This exception was reserved for the scapegoat, i.e., the tariff. It had not yet been beaten and bruised sufficiently to propitiate the tutelary demons that ruled over popular emotions.

Tariffs, except those serving purely revenue purposes, are, of course, one of the recognized means of regulating import competition, as are also import quotas. In a period of feverish regulation the tariff should have been welcomed as a blood brother. Moreover, it had served the country well for more than a century. It had, to be sure, been the center of much controversy, but never had it been reduced more than a few years when it was restored again. Never had it been cast aside completely.

But now, off with its head. This was in 1934. The same drums that beat for the NRA, the AAA, the SEC, FDIC, etc., all of them instruments of regulation, nevertheless went into rhapsodical flourishes accompanied by clarions announcing a new day, when the Trade Agreements Act was passed.

Yet this act was antiregulatory, and its effects would be countervailing. It was to loosen the grip of regulation on imports. We were to move toward free trade by dismantling our controls over foreign competition and incidentally increasing our vulnerability to it, while we tightened domestic controls over internal competition and created some very important new competitive controls such as outlawry of child labor, banishment of the sweatshop by enactment of wage and hour laws and provision of social security, thus generally running up costs of production.

These measures represented the extension of the concept of fairness of competition to the wage field. Labor saw itself undermined by the unfair competition that unfair employers used against the fair ones. Therefore the unfair practices were to be outlawed by establishment of minimum wage standards.

It also became public policy to support and implement efforts of labor to improve its lot, be it through higher wages, shorter hours, better working conditions or fringe benefits. This is not to say that this was or was not sound policy. We are concerned with facts that are among the components of our subsequent international competitive position and that represented governmental interference with the free market as surely and definitely as the tariff.

We reached the threshold of World War II still intent on defeating unemployment and increasing purchasing power through governmental controls and in general cushioning the economy by instituting more welfare measures and stricter controls of the private economy. The outbreak of the war interrupted the march toward a peacetime economy regulated by a powerful central government.

When the war was ended the 1930's and their worries were apparently gone with it. The United States was confronted with a new world. Not only had the balance of political and military power in the world shifted ominously but the scientific discoveries and the technological advances achieved during the war confronted us with new and in many respects unfamiliar problems. The world, moreover, was a broken world, seeking to rise from the rubble and debris left by the war.

Financially we had also been catapulted onto a new dimension. The war had left us with an unprecedented burden of debts and our tax burden never subsided to its prewar level. This heavy overhead plus the costs of social legislation inevitably came to rest on industry as higher costs of production.

Nevertheless in the field of international trade we were still in the prewar world even though we had reduced our tariff substantially; that is to say we had done nothing outwardly to offset our growing, if still hidden, competitive disadvantages—indeed quite the opposite. The policy of helping the war-devastated countries to rebuild themselves (UNRRA and the Marshall plan), did hasten our own economic recovery and indeed loaded our industries with unprecedented peacetime demand. We bridged the feared chasm between war's end and the resumption of peacetime operations without a tremor. Not only was unemployment no longer a problem. Shortages were experienced in many lines and price controls were maintained for a period after the war lest prices run away with us into an era of all-consuming inflation.

After 3 or 4 years we came to a temporary catchup, a slight recession; but then the Korean outbreak launched us on a new wave of public expenditures and higher taxes. The cold war has since kept us on this plateau, with an upward slope.

Meantime some massive shifts of economic factors silently worked their transformation, but had not yet fully surfaced. The United States was still assumed to be unique in the economic world through its mass production, its high-wage system and its great consumer purchasing power. This still set us apart from the rest of the world. We were far ahead in the technology of production and in agricutural efficiency. We were also far above all other countries but Canada in the high level of our wages. Our high rate of productivity generally assured us unit costs low enough to compete with the low-wage countries, at least so long as they were still engaged in rehabilitation and the satisfaction of pent-up demand, and also so long as our exports were primed by foreign economic aid under the Marshall plan and its successors.

Meantime we insisted on continuing the trade policy adopted during the great de-

pression. However, here, too, a transformation was clearly visible. We shifted from a trade policy of bilateralism to one of multilateralism after the war. We moved from congressional control of our trade toward a goal, first of Executive control, and then international control.

The first step in this new departure was the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed in 1947 by 22 countries and the ill-fated effort to establish the International Trade Organization which was begun in 1945 and failed in 1950 before the Congress. While the object remained one of decontrolling trade by individual nations and the lowering of trade barriers, international control became clearly visible as the ultimate goal. Such control might reach far into the inner management of national economies by the simple process of instituting international planning of the disposition of agricultural, industrial and mineral resources of the world—at least outside of the Communist sphere. It might uproot some industries or let them die while promoting others as the planners might dictate. The ITO failure in 1950 was succeeded by a second effort to set up an international trade organization in 1955, to be known as the OTC (Organization for Trade Cooperation). This failed before Congress in 1957; but in 1961 our Senate ratified U.S. membership in the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) and this country is now a full-fledged member.

In the center of this transformation was the State Department and the philosophy that had entrenched itself behind its bulwarks during the war years.

Ten or twelve years after the end of the war the war-torn countries began to emerge from their downbeaten condition and toward the end of the 1950–60 decade Europe and Japan not only had recovered but had arrived on the threshold of an unprecedented economic expansion. Meantime they had received tens of billions of dollars worth of modern machinery and equipment from us, much of it under our foreign aid program, and had rebuilt and reequipped many of their wrecked factories. They also made a minute study of the American production system by sending thousands of productivity teams to this country to learn our method.

They had become impressed during the war by the industrial might of the United States and were ready to take our medicine; and they took it in copious doses, including movement toward mass markets, but left out one prime ingredient; namely, the high-wage component of the formula. Because they had been drained of dollars we supplemented our aid by further reducing our tariff in 1949, 1951, 1955, and 1958. "Trade, not aid" was the slogan. In other words, during these years when the other countries greatly improved their competitive position, we not only heaped costs on our industries but dismantled existing economic defenses; i.e., the tariff. Since 1934 our tariff had been slashed an average of about 80 percent.

One fact now began to emerge, much as the silt and deposits of generations emerge from the bottom of a lake when its waters are drained away. The effects of historic economic compartmentalization showed themselves in bold outlines and the characteristic low-wage levels of various national areas became visible alongside of the American mesa or tableland towering on visibly higher levels.

Competitively our position was revealed as having become highly exposed as a result of the two forces, already mentioned, that had worked their opposite effects over a period of a quarter century. Our public debt, moreover, had risen to some $290 billion. Wages that had raced upward shortly after the end of the war continued on a steep rise for more than a decade.

Average manufacturing wages in this country rose from $1.01 per hour (including overtime) in 1945 to $2.32 in 1961. This was, of course, accompanied by rising productivity per man-hour. Wholesale prices (all commodities) rose from an index of 68.8 in 1945 to 119.1 in 1961. ("Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962," tables 305 and 459). In other words, while manufacturing wages rose 130 percent wholesale prices rose 68 percent. Consumer prices of all items went from 76.9 to 127.8 during the same period, or 66 percent. This was an indication both of higher productivity and higher real wages; and meant a rising standard of living. Also it meant, despite many modifications and burdens, clinging to the system of production that brought this country to the economic forefront in the world.

Today the future of this system is menaced.

The new Trade Act represents potentially a lethal weapon aimed at its heart.

Let us focus on the reasons of our vulnerability. We have hitherto dwelt principally on the origin and growth of our great industrial strength. We shall see that the besetting economic lull in this country is omnious indeed.

The "U.S. Statistical Abstract of 1962," table 1246, drawing on the "Statistical Yearbook of the United Nations," gives the index of our volume of manufacturing and mining production in 1955 as 106 and in 1961 as only 112 (1953 equals 100).

The same index shows Europe moving from 119 to 161 during the same period. The Common Market countries did a little better, rising from 123 to 178. East and southeast Asia moved from 123 to 266.

This record of comparative expansion demonstrates dramatically and unfavorably the relative stagnation of our economy in recent years, formerly the most dynamic in the world. While we moved upward 6 points, Europe advanced 42 points. The Common Market 55 points, and east and southeast Asia 143 points. It also reflects the ready economic response of the other countries to the infusion of our technology, manufacturing methods, and business philosophy into their hitherto pedestrian systems.

We, of course, began from a much higher base, but our upward movement has been the most startling retarded among the industrial nations of the world during the past 6 or 7 years.

Statesmen have been baffled, economists have laid their thousand analyses on false premises and politicians have in the majority followed the path of least resistance, opened up for them by the State Department, the one group that knew its goal. Its compass was set in 1945 and its direction remains the same.

The low coefficient of expansion to which we have fallen will force a reassessment of our postwar economic course, particularly as it has been affected by and is coming increasingly under the influence of international relations. This is the source of the blight.

We have wobbled through problem after problem and while not solving them, have postponed their final confrontation by shifting the burden through irresolution and eternal evasion on the shoulders of the Treasury and the taxpayer. Our vaunted export surplus, for example, is almost wholly a product of subsidization and foreign aid. Nearly all progress toward conquest of the balance-of-payment difficulties is similarly attributable to juggling rather than to a cure.

Now, however, we are faced with hard realities that will no longer yield to postponement, escape devices and shifting of responsibility.

What are these realities?

We have already pointed to the rising productivity of other countries, to their adherence to low wages, to our towering costs, burdensome public debt and snail-paced economic expansion. We have also hinted at the exposure of our system to foreign competitive forces that to us are something new and intractable.

The one stubborn and encompassing reality, however, that menaces our system, North and South, East and West, is the residual fact that our system is not providing sufficient job openings to avoid a crushing burden of unemployment. This hard fact reflects the outcome of our burdens and policies and remains after all explanations, all cheerful but unfounded hopes, and all evasions are exhausted. This is particularly distressing when our population growth sends a million or more new hands to the employment offices each year looking for work, and when mechanization and automation disgorge possibly that many again each year from jobs already held.

Here is a pressure that will not long be contained. Its potentials in mischief are incalculable. Its explosive credentials, with their implications for our very economic and political system, have been witnessed elsewhere and cannot be brushed aside.

A few statistical facts will demonstrate the magnitude of the problem.

Total production workers employed in all manufacturing industries declined from 12,523,000 in 1950 to 12,046,000 in 1961. During the same period our population grew from 151,868,000 to 183,043,000 or 20.5 percent. Had the jobs of production workers expanded equally, our manufacturing industries would have employed 2,560,000 more workers rather than 500,000 fewer.

Inasmuch as employment in some of our manufacturing industries, i.e., a few growth industries, expanded during this period, it follows that the decline in others was much sharper than the average would indicate.

A short tabulation will demonstrate the divergence of different industries in employment trends:

Loss of production workers in selected manufacturing industries

	1950	1961	Loss	Decline
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Percent*
Textile mill products	1,169	793	376	32.2
Motor vehicles and equipment	677	493	184	27.2
Sawmills and planing mills	424	244	180	42.5
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	587	482	105	18.0
Iron and steel foundries	196	156	40	20.4
Leather and leather products	355	319	36	10.0
Petroleum refining	140	107	33	23.6
Cutlery, hand tools, and general hardware	133	101	32	24.1
Wooden containers	60	37	23	38.3
Household furniture	241	221	20	8.3
Jewelry, silverware, and plated ware	46	33	13	28.3
Costume jewelry, buttons, and notions	57	43	14	24.6
Total	4,085	3,029	1,056	25.8

Source: "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1962, table 291.

The 12 industries listed in the table registered a decline of 25 percent in the number of production workers employed. Had they kept pace with the population increase they would have added 20 percent or slightly over 800,000. Adding the actual decline of over a million, the lag was therefore over 1.8 million in these 12 industries alone.

Unless these displacements were absorbed elsewhere they necessarily helped swell the unemployment roll.

As already noted, however, some manufacturing industries did gain in employment of production workers from 1950 to 1961. A list is shown below:

Manufacturing industries showing an employment gain, 1950–61

	1950	1961	Gain	Increase
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Percent*
Electrical equipment and supplies, including electronics and television	770	964	194	25.2
Aircraft and parts	209	378	169	80.9
Printing and publishing, including newspapers	494	596	102	20.6
Fabricated metal products	172	230	58	33.7
Ship and boat building and repairing	72	118	46	63.9
Chemicals and allied products	461	506	45	9.8
Instruments and related products	184	221	32	16.9
Rubber and miscellaneous plastic	252	280	28	11.1
Metalworking machinery and equipment	159	180	21	13.2
Men's, boys' furnishings and work clothing	253	274	21	8.3
Meat products	241	254	13	5.4
Total	3,272	4,001	729	22.3

Source: "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1962, table 291.

Obviously the gains, while exceeding slightly the population growth of 20.5 percent, nevertheless failed to absorb the reduction registered in the other industries. The combined lag was slightly over a million in employment of production workers.

When we turn from production workers in manufacturing industries to nonproduction workers in these industries we find a considerable gain. These were among the office workers, research and sales personnel, etc. The number of nonmanufacturing workers rose from 2,718,000 in 1950 to 4,222,000 in 1961, a gain of 1.5 million. This was a gain of 55.5 percent and exceeded the 20.5 percent needed to equal the population growth, by 947,000.

What then was the outlook for employment in other fields, i.e., the nonmanufacturing fields, such as the service, trade and professional activities?

Impressive gains were indeed registered in these fields.

The gains in employment in the commercial, trade and professional fields, i.e., outside of manufacturing, went far toward the absorption of the unemployed. These gains were very impressive:

Employment gains in commercial, service, and professional fields

	1950	1961	Gain	
			Number	Percent
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
State and local government	4,098	6,549	2,451	59.8
Retail trade	6,868	8,359	1,491	21.7
Service and miscellaneous (hotels, medical, hospitals, advertising, laundries, motion pictures, etc.)	5,382	7,514	2,132	39.6
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1,919	2,748	829	43.2
Military personnel on active duty	1,481	2,518	1,037	70.0
Teachers (public elementary and secondary)	913	1,408	495	54.2
Wholesale trade	2,518	3,007	489	19.4
Federal Government	1,928	2,281	353	18.3
Total	25,107	34,384	9,277	36.9

Source: "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1962, table 291.

This increase outstripped the population growth by 16.4 percentage points. The 20.5 percent increase in population from 1950 to 1961 would have called for an increase of the 25,107,000 in the commercial, professional, trade, and service fields in 1950 to 30.2 million in 1961. The actual jump to 34.38 million therefore absorbed 4.2 million more than the population growth called for.

In the manufacturing industries, already reviewed, we find a deficiency, when counting all workers and not only production workers, of 2.1 million workers in relation to population growth. The increase in workers (including office workers) was from 15.2 million in 1950 to 16.2 million in 1961 ("Statistical Abstract, 1962," p. 220, table 291). This fell short of the 3.1 million called for by the population increase of 20.5 percent, by the 2.1 million mentioned above.

This deficiency brings down the 4.2 million surplus jobs cited in the next to the preceding paragraph to 2.1 million.

The remainder of the economy unfortunately discharged additional workers. The principal source of worker displacement was our agriculture. The yield per acre increased so precipitately since 1950 that a greater farm output was produced in 1960 and 1961 than the much larger number of farm workers produced in 1950. We gained both a surplus of unemployment and a surplus of farm products.

Farm employment in 1950 stood at 9.92 million workers ("Statistical Abstract, 1962" p. 236, table 311). In 1961 it was 6.99 million. This represented a shrinkage of slightly less than 3 million in 11 years. To keep abreast of the population increase would have required adding 2.03 million workers during this period. Added to the actual shinkage our agriculture fell short by 5 million of hiring its share of workers on the basis of population.

This deficit more than erases the surplus of 2.1 million generated by the increased employment in the commercial, service, and professional occupations. The residual unemployment was therefore 2.9 million (i.e., 5 million minus 2.1 million).

Unfortunately, some other activities also disgorged workers. Mining employment declined form 901,000 in 1950 to 667,000 in 1961, a drop of 234,000. Coal mining was by far the greatest contributor because of the doubling of output per man-hour of coal mined during that period.

Railroad transportation dropped from 1,391,000 to 819,000 for a decline of 572,000.

However, contract construction rose by 427,000 to 2,760,000. Motor freight and storage added another 256,000. (See "Statistical Abstract, 1962," table 291.)

In sum, the number of workers in mining, contract construction and transportation, and public utilities rose by only 82,000 during the period under discussion from a base of 7,268,000 in 1950. To equal the population growth would have required hiring 1,488,000. The lag was therefore 1,406,000. Added to the residual lag of 2.9 million the total lag therefore came to 4.3 million in 1961.

Since we have included active military personnel, which expanded by 1,037,000 from 1950 to 1961 and since this exceeded the ratio of population growth by 522,000, the latter sum should be added to the 4.3 million lag shown in the preceding paragraph. The lag would then rise to 4.8 million. This conforms closely to the civilian unemployment shown from 1961 in the "Statistical Abstract of 1962," page 217, table 283, where the total for that year is given as 4,806,000.

The unpalatable message from these statistics is that our economy has lost its elasticity in the field of employment while output of both industrial and agricultural products continues to rise. This fact shouts at top decibel that "economic growth," i.e., expansion in output does not necessarily equate with rising employment.

It also shouts that in order to create employment we must have greater new investment in plant capacity and equipment than we have had. Simply replacing existing machinery with more productive machinery does not add to employment. It subtracts. That is its purpose.

Why then does not our capital flow into plant expansion, new plants, new products, and new ventures as freely as in the past?

Has American industry fallen into a posture of timidity? Does it shrink where it ventured before? Some observers would have it so; but the facts contradict such an assessment. We have only to look at the activity of American capital in foreign fields.

Even before the new Trade Act was passed, many of our industries that had previously enjoyed a high degree of immunity to import competition had come to feel the impact of the great change: namely, lowered tariff protection, hand in hand with a lively step-up in foreign productivity. As a result the outflow of investments so characteristic of the past 3 or 4 years, got underway. Jobs were generated overseas rather than in this country. The foreign pastures looked and were greener.

Since 1957 capital investment in this country has dipped, and only in 1962 has it shown a rebound to the level of 5 years ago.

Even so, the "Survey of Current Business" published by the U.S. Department of Commerce (September 1962 issue, p. 5) says:

"When allowance is made for price increases over the intervening period the physical volume of new plant and equipment to

be purchased this year (1962) will fall short of the 1957 acquisitions."

Table 664, page 499, of that publication shows the following business expenditures for new plant and equipment in the United States:

[In billions of dollars]

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Total	36.96	30.53	32.54	35.68	34.37	37.16
Manufacturing only	15.96	11.43	12.07	14.48	13.68	14.90

This shows an actual decline in the outlay for manufacturing facilities from 1957 to 1962, without allowing for rising prices. Moreover, the 1962 figure represents an estimate that now appears to be somewhat optimistic.

A distinct increase did occur in the combined outlays in the fields of communication, trade, service, finance, and construction. (This was in the same areas in which employment rose so sharply.) These outlays rose from $10.4 billion in 1957 to an estimated $13 billion in 1962 and are not a part of the outlay for "manufacturing only". This climb would be in keeping with the employment expansion registered in these fields.

We have already adverted to the low expansion experienced in the volume of manufacturing and mining production in the United States compared with the experience in other countries. Our domestic expansion, to recall, ran a poor third.

If we turn now to our investments abroad in recent years we will find a much more lively performance than at home. Quoting again from the "Survey of Current Business" (September 1962, p. 17), we quickly detect the contrast between our own domestic and foreign activities:

"U.S. companies with direct foreign investments report that they expect to spend $4.8 billion to expand or improve their plant and equipment abroad in 1962, compared with $4.2 billion in 1961."

"In 1962, U.S. manufacturing companies for the third successive year spent, or anticipated spending, larger sums for plant and equipment abroad."

"For the first time, Germany ranks highest in capital outlays (i.e., U.S. capital) with expected expenditures of $432 million in 1962 (318 million in 1961)."

On page 22 of the same publication the following statement appears:

"In 1961 sales by United States-owned manufacturing companies abroad reached $25½ billion, a rise of $2 billion in the year and some 40 percent over the amount reported in 1957 when the collection of these data began."

Output of U.S.-owned companies reached $10.7 billion in Europe in 1961, an increase of 15 percent over 1960 and 70 percent over 1957.

Another measure of expansion that has a bearing on domestic employment may be found in our export trends compared with our oversea activity. The source already quoted says (p. 23):

"In the period since 1957, production in selected industries in the U.S.-owned manufacturing plants abroad rose by more than 40 percent, while in the same period exports from the United States of the same commodities advanced by less than 10 percent."

The selected industries in 1961 referred to in the quotation accounted for sales of $17.7 billion of the total of $25.6 billion sales of U.S.-owned companies abroad.

These reports of the activity of U.S. private capital investments abroad belie any impression that American business enterprise has become tired, soft, or timid. Given a reasonable chance, American capital will repeat its dynamic expansive performance of the past within this country.

That American business enterprise has indeed not reached a state of decadence is also solidly sustained by investment and employment trends in important segments of the domestic economy itself. We have already presented tables that show the handsome increase in employment in the nonmanufacturing, the nonmining and the nonagricultural fields; i.e., in trade, commercial, service, and professional activities; and we have also seen that capital investments in these fields increased nearly 30 percent since 1957 whereas such investments in manufacturing enterprises actually declined over 6 percent during the same period.

Why this contrast?

The group in which the higher flow of investment into new plant and equipment took place from 1957–62 consisted of trade, service, finance, and construction ("Statistical Abstract, 1962," p. 499).

It is noteworthy that these fields (exclusive of manufacturing, mining, and agriculture), such as insurance, real estate, brokerage, school teaching, State and local government, wholesale and retail trade, etc., are free of import competition. Wholesale and retail trade may, in fact, be stimulated by imports.

In these fields our capital was not hesitant, nor did employment lag. In fact as a group they ran well ahead of population increase in employment. (Unfortunately these activities are not the basic generators of employment. Each production job generates more than two of the nonproduction jobs. Trade has no comparable job-generating capacity. Readymade competitive goods brought into the country bypass the job-producing processes here and at the same time discourage domestic production.)

In April 1962 analysts of the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) in a report laid the slow economic growth in the United States to "inadequate pressure of demand." The report continued:

"Rapid economic growth will not take place unless an adequate pressure of demand on productive resources is maintained. Maintenance of such pressure is within the control of governments, at least in the larger countries."

The question, of course, is, What creates demand?

Then the report hits the nail on the head. It says:

"The first and basic condition for growth is that private firms should want to grow, and this, in turn, depends on their having confidence, which is later justified by events, that certain conditions will be satisfied."

The role of confidence is recognized as basic to expansion. The report continues:

"They [the private firms] need to be confident that they will be able to dispose of increases in output at a profit and that they will be able to find the means, particularly labor, which are required for growth."

The emphasis on confidence is sometimes thought to be overdone. Yet it seems clear enough that it would be only looping folly to expand capacity of production in the absence of confidence that the increased output not only could be sold but sold at a profit when the expansion is completed.

Is there an influence on the American economic scene that induces lack of confidence that increased output can be sold and sold at a profit?

Whatever other influences may be at hand, one that exerts a heavy negative pull is rising import competition. Scores of industries in this country are confronted by a sufficient volume of import competition, that by its very growth in the past few years, has demonstrated its market-capturing capacity, to give pause to any industrial management when it considers expansion of existing capacity.

Will it be able to sell its increased output at a profit?

When imports have risen year after year for 3 or 4 years and continue to rise and when they take away the rising demand flowing from population growth and even more, from what source would optimism rise?

"Ah," it will be said, "the American manufacturer must become more efficient. He must trim costs, streamline his production, install more modern machinery and equipment."

Thus costs could no doubt be reduced; but at the expense of what? Labor offers the only real source of cost reduction. This then would mean fewer workers, and employment would shrink.

"Yes," it will be countered, "but lower costs mean lower prices and lower prices will mean greater sales and greater sales mean more employment."

Ah, there's the rub.

Unfortunately the theory will not ravel so beautifully. The lower prices resulting from laborsaving installations will be necessary to meet the competition, to hold to the present level of sales; not to expand them. This is the price paid to stay alive, not to expand. Even so, imports may still increase, as has been experienced countless times. Theoretical economics collapses on the hard rocks of reality.

Under such circumstances the very system of production that led this country to its phenomenal industrial lead in the world will be badly crippled. If we keep in mind that it was based on and nurtured by a particular combination that was unique to this country, we can better appreciate that it cannot survive in the present competitive and international political climate, induced by a steady State Department policy, without measures that will assure fairness of import competition.

The scene in which our system germinated and grew included rich resources, as already mentioned, a population possessing capabilities equal to the occasion, dominated by the vision of low prices as a means of opening a mass market through mass production; fair competition, absorbent purchasing power (principally in the form of good wages and good profits), freedom of movement, private ownership, money incentive, a stable, nonoppressive government and a tariff that prevented external forces from upsetting the unique combination.

Remove any of these elements and the system will deteriorate and ultimately collapse.

This bears a close analogy to human physiology. Among the vital organs are the heart, the lungs, the liver, the kidneys, etc. If all these organs function well the health of the body will be good. Impair the normal function of any one or more of them and health will deteriorate.

The same may be said of our economic system. Cripple, upset or impair the normal function of any vital element of the system that has led the world in production and it too will lose its stamina and will deteriorate. One of the sustaining elements of our system, as already noted, is not only competition but fairness of competition. Another is the lowering of production costs and the opening of a mass market for consumer goods by reaching the lower income part of our market.

The two go hand in hand. This is to say, competition, i.e., fair competition, is necessary to assure a ready flow of goods without blockages. It is also necessary as a support for the function of good wages, to prevent their breakdown as a source of purchasing power. This calls for prevention of unfair competition from "sweatshop" wages or those having the same disruptive qualities.

Under these circumstances in the past our industry could be quite sure that if it introduced labor-saving machinery the benefits in the form of lower prices would soon reach the consumers and the market would expand and production would be stimulated. Before long more rather than less employment would result, unless the goods were of a kind for which the demand is inelastic.

Today these two elements are plagued with trouble. To be clear, one is the element of fair competition and the other, the function of low prices as the key to rising competition. While fairness of competition at home is reasonably assured, fairness of import competition has been escaping through the loophole of tariff reductions and the failure of a remedy. While we legislated in this country to assure freedom from monopoly and then outlawed unfairness in wage competition, we could not and cannot legislate minimum wages for other countries. We can only regulate import competition through tariffs and quotas; and the ground rules of our besetting international policies are by way of banishing these instruments. In other words, what labor so proudly hailed in this country (i.e., fairness of wage competition) as a bulwark against cutthroat and sweatshop type of domestic competition is to stop at the outer national boundaries.

This very taboo against assurance of fairness of import competition has had negative effects on the other prime element of our successful system; namely, the fruits of low prices. This was and is the heart of the very effort to achieve mass consumption and therefore full employment. Since the benefits of laborsaving installations are derived precisely from the lower prices to which they lead under free but fair competition, resulting in greater consumption, naturally we cannot get these benefits if the lower prices either do not materialize, or materialize under conditions that deprive us of their benefits. This—mark the words—is what happens when domestic prices are lowered (in response to higher productivity) if the lowered prices are chased by equally low or still lower prices on competing imports. Even if the market is broadened, under these circumstances the increased consumption is supplied largely by imports and our displaced labor is left looking for the jobs that otherwise would have materialized in increased manufacturing in this country.

Below is a table based on indexes of output per man-hour for selected industries as given in the "Statistical Abstract, 1962," page 229, comparing 1960 or 1961 with 1950:

	1950 index	1960 index	1961 index	Increase	
				Percent	Year
NONMANUFACTURING					
Coal mining	63.0	115.3	129.4	105.4	1961
Copper (recoverable metal)	97.1	106.2	110.0	13.3	1961
Railroad transportation	71.1	111.1	119.7	68.3	1961
MANUFACTURING					
Basic steel	84.8	[1] 107.4		21.0	1959
Canning and preserving	75.7	106.0		40.0	1960
Confectionery	71.7	106.4		48.4	1960
Flour and grain mill products	69.7	104.0		49.9	1960
Hosiery	81.7	100.9		23.5	1960
Malt liquor	77.8	108.3		39.2	1960
Paper and pulp	78.4	109.3		39.4	1960
Petroleum refining	68.3	114.1		67.0	1960
Synthetic fibers	51.9	114.6		120.8	1960
Copper, lead, and zinc refining	77.8	101.2		30.1	1960
Tobacco products	81.4	112.7	118.3	45.3	1961
Cigars only	65.4	121.4	128.8	96.9	1961

[1] 1959.

From this table it can be seen that the increase in labor productivity is highly variable from industry to industry, ranging in the manufacturing group from 21 percent in basic steel to 120.8 percent in synthetic fibers. (The steel figure is for 1959 rather than 1960 or 1961.) The average increase for all manufacturing industries from 1950 to 1961 (prel.) was 32.1 percent ("Statistical Abstract, 1962," table 301), or 3 percent per year.

That the most efficient operations in terms of increase in output per man-hour did not lead to increased employment as it should if the theory of market expansion through lower costs had been effective, is readily demonstrated by a few examples. In coal mining the output per man-hour more than doubled from 1950 to 1960; i.e., it rose from an index of 63 to 129.4.

While this sharp increase in productivity or "efficiency" did not lead to a sharp decline in prices, the average price at the mine did fall from $4.75 per ton (1951–55) to $ 4.65 in 1961. Considering the general price increase this was more substantial than the figures indicate.

Did this then lead to a great increase in consumption and, if so, did employment also increase? No. Imports of residual fuel oil at still lower prices and competition from oil and gas at lower prices stood in the way.

Actually coal consumption declined from 494 million tons in 1950 to 398 million tons in 1960.

What happened to employment? It dropped from 483,239 in 1950 to 189,679 in 1960.

Do these facts destroy the theory of efficiency as a job creator? Not necessarily. Other facts interposed themselves. Petroleum and natural gas and imports of residual fuel oil became substitutes for coal.

They were all cheaper, at least in important consuming areas, just as imports are in most other fields.

Did employment then gain sufficiently in these other industries to make up for the loss in coal? In petroleum refining, employment actually declined from 218,000 to 203,000. In gas companies and systems ("Statistical Abstract," 1962, p. 222) employment did rise during this period, going up by 35,000 workers; but this was not enough to offset the loss in coal employment. Imports of petroleum and petroleum products, including residual fuel oil, increased sharply during the decade and led in 1958 to the imposition of an import quota. This measure moderated the harm that otherwise would have crippled the industry.

In the steel industry, output per man-hour increased 21 percent from 1950–59 ("Statistical Abstact," 1962, p. 229). This neither led to lower prices nor to increased employment. Countervailing factors were at work, including possibly imperfect competition and a strong bargaining position of labor. Import tonnage in 1958 surpassed exports and has held this position.

This industry did expand, moving from a capacity of 99.9 million tons in 1950 to 148.5 million tons in 1960, or about 50 percent. Production reached its high point in 1955 at 117 million tons and then fell back. In 1960 and 1961 it was 99 and 98 million tons, respectively.

Employment fell by 105,000 during the decade, a drop of 18 percent. However, both wages and prices raced upward, steel prices by 50.3 percent and wages in the industry by 70 percent.

Other examples could be cited, notably the textile industry, to show that rising productivity does not necessarily result in higher employment through the roundabout process of lower costs and resulting higher consumer demand, particularly when import competition forces greater mechanization and then still gobbles up the expanding market, if any. (The demand for some products is notoriously inelastic as in the case of many food products so that lower prices do not in all cases open greater markets. Increased demand in such cases depends on population increase. Imports then represent a direct subtraction of what domestic producers may supply.)

We may be sure that when import competition has grown appreciably and bids fair to increase yet more, the investment climate within the affected industries will not be conducive to plant expansion. It may indeed be conducive to outlays for modern replacement machinery and equipment as a means of assuring a better competitive standing, but this will not lead to higher employment; in fact, quite the opposite. Herein lies one of the profoundest fallacies of today's economic thinking. Instead of leading to greater employment as is so confidently asserted, greater investment in modern machinery and equipment may have the opposite effect, even while increasing output. This is true particularly, as already mentioned when the pressure for such equipment comes from import competition, i.e., when the incentive is simply to reduce costs in order to remain competitive.

When import competition reaches into more fields, as it has done in recent years, and as it may be expected to do in the future, the likelihood of industrial expansion in this country will be contracted. It is true that investment may flow into new products and new processes in the hope of gaining at least a temporary lead but such possibilities are necessarily limited. The system would always be on the run, so to speak, because our new products are now soon produced overseas at lower prices and shipped into this country.

The new Trade Act will greatly increase domestic investment hazards, if it is carried out. The lure to go overseas will be all the greater. Much of the industrial investment here will be of the type designed to remain competitive and will shrink employment.

The pulse-raising thought that this country will find vast new markets in Europe for durable consumer goods and for agricultural exports is almost wholly illustory. American participation there will be through investments made within Europe. Today, it is estimated, about 22 percent of the automobiles manufactured in Europe are made by American companies located in Europe. A similar development in hundreds of other products is already well underway.

Imports elements of our agricultural exports will collide with the farm price-support system in the Common Market and will find it to be a stone wall even as our farm system also virtually excludes imports of wheat and cotton.

Any notion that we can open the European market to us by opening wider our market to European goods through 50 and 100 percent tariff cuts is one of the tragedies of wishful thinking and of escapism that have held us entrapped now for some years. The further reduction of our tariff would represent a backward step from efforts to establish fairness of wage competition, an endeavor to which, on the domestic side, we have devoted very extensive legislative and other efforts. The key to the puzzle is to be found in the philosophy that is deeply imbedded in the State Department. This philosophy regards concern over fairness of import competition as irrelevant and a negative factor in its efforts to establish international control over our trade. Since such fairness of competition is, however, a veritable hormone promoting our growth, its destruction will have far-reaching retrogressive consequences.

The operation of our system in keeping with its past expansive characteristics will be suspended until prices can again respond to greater productivity by passing to consumers the lower costs. This cannot happen so long as imports are ready and able to capture all or a great part of the expanding market, and that is what we have been inviting them to do. Now we have extended the invitation and made it more attractive.

We are condemned to chase the now receding rainbow of our accustomed system wherein more productive machinery meant lower costs, lower costs in turn meant lower prices, lower prices meant vastly greater consumption and this in turn meant more employment. Until we extend the principle of fairness of competition to foreign wages and foreign costs as they strike this market, either through tariffs or quotas or both, the current stagnation of our system will not only endure but will afflict us more deeply.

Remove this menace, among some companion astringents, and our economy will recapture its spirited vigor and become as competitive as ever. Either that or we move downward with our wages and profits and with our working conditions, bag and baggage, to meet the lower economic levels prevailing abroad. We can then start the 20th century over again, on a new track laid by the State Department, with a destination of its own.

Poultry Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, only a relatively few Pasteurs, Curies, Darwins, Salks, and Sabins, have illuminated man's struggle against illness.

Less well known but nonetheless dedicated, was the late Arthur D. Goldhaft, V.M.D., who studied the diseases of animals with the realization that animal disease is the cause of much human illness.

Dr. Goldhaft's findings, and the subsequent work of members of his family, at the Vineland Poultry Laboratories, which he founded, have also provided a basis for further studies to reduce hunger in man.

Dr. Goldhaft's achievements serve as an example of what is being done in the field of scientific research for the betterment of man's health and his freedom to use the potential foodstuffs which are at his disposal.

Moreover, Dr. Goldhaft's dedication to his work serves as an example of what a man can do to rise above his background—in Dr. Goldhaft's own words, "a slum life, a life in the streets"— to accomplish something of use to mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article concerning Dr. Goldhaft, appearing in the Newark Sunday News magazine under the title "Jersey Veterinarian Pioneered Poultry Research," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JERSEY VETERINARIAN PIONEERED POULTRY RESEARCH

Because a Philadelphia youth (who, in his own words, lived "a slum life, a life in the streets") because a New Jersey veterinarian and then specialized in fighting poultry diseases, the health of all mankind has benefited.

From the research work of the late Arthur D. Goldhaft, V.M.D., has come a variety of vaccines which protect human beings against many diseases. They are produced because eggs provide the nutrients for the vaccine to develop.

Dr. Goldhaft, who was born in 1885 and died in 1960, began his work when he established a veterinary office 40 years ago in Vineland, Cumberland County. In that poultry-raising area he saw flock after flock of ducks ravaged by mysterious illneses, and epidemics of fowl pox ruin the egg-producing abilities of chickens for several months a year.

Like farmers in the area and throughout the world he was puzzled and deeply troubled by the illnesses. In the end, he realized, animal diseases posed but another danger to man's well-being.

Almost immediately he devoted himself to finding cures and preventive medicines for poultry diseases. He founded the Vineland poultry laboratories and pioneered in devising mass production techniques for manufacturing drugs and serums.

From a 2-room, 2-person operation the laboratories have grown to include many buildings with more than 100 employees in Vineland, branches throughout the country and new labs being opened overseas.

Born in Philadelphia shortly after his parents came to this country from Russia, Dr. Goldhaft was one of a score of American leaders who emerged from urban slums festering with problems aggravated by wave after wave of immigrants.

His family lived "amidst the crowded little ghetto streets, in a couple of dingy rooms." His father worked intermittently in a matzo bakery and as a peddler. His mother was much in demand as an experienced midwife.

As Dr. Goldhaft recalled in his autobiography, "The Golden Egg," his youth "was slum life, a life in the streets * * * Mama was always crying 'Alter, Alter, a street bum. What will become of you? They will send you across the river.' Across the river was jail."

His youthful pursuits included a try at back-alley dice, hawking newspapers and Saturday evening fights for $5 or so, in McGough's stable.

Dr. Goldhaft might have been submerged in the slum had he not been taken in tow by a family benefactor and enrolled at the Baron de Hirsch Agricultural School.

The school was located in Woodbine, a small town near Vineland. The institute, Woodbine and several neighboring communities were founded by groups of Russian Jewish immigrants with the aid of Baron de Hirsch, a wealthy French businessman.

Such experimental communities were based on the hope that one way to improve the lot of downtrodden Jewish immigrants was to take them out of urban slums back to the soil and an agricultural life. Although it was not highly successful, the movement had a profound effect on many individuals who later gained prominence.

Dr. Goldhaft saw the school as "a combination of prep school, academy, with even a touch of orphanage * * * emphasizing both work and study." He later attended the University of Pennsylvania Veterinary School and married a Philadelphia girl, Florence Mirsky, in 1908. After graduating in 1911, he established practice in Philadelphia, and moved to Vineland later.

Attempting to devise remedies and techniques for treating animals on a large scale, Dr. Goldhaft chanced upon an effective way to manufacture fowl pox vaccine. The discovery spurred a lifelong career developing serums for other diseases.

"We had troubles at first," recalled Mrs. Goldhaft, "but Arthur was very much the optimist. In the beginning we worked together starting out in the basement of our house in town."

In the 1920's the family home and laboratory moved from the center of Vineland, to a 40-acre tract off Landis Avenue, where (according to Mrs. Goldhaft) "the work grew year after year, building after building." Dr. Goldhaft worked closely for many years with Dr. Frederick R. Beaudette of the Rutgers Agricultural School who was responsible for much basic poultry research.

Increasingly Dr. Goldhaft traveled throughout the country, explaining how to use modern techniques and drugs for improving poultry raising. He also became an avid supporter of numerous civic and philanthropic enterprises.

Now his work is carried on by his widow; his son, Dr. Tevis Goldhaft; his daughter, Dr. Helen Goldhaft Wernicoff, and her husband, Dr. Nathan Wernicoff. All of the children are graduates of Cornell University Veterinary School.

The laboratories develop and produce various vaccines, drugs, lotions, and powders for treating anything from skin infections to bronchitis. Automatic vaccinators, drug proportioners, and other equipment have also been designed and produced by the firm.

Fertilized eggs from 6,000 carefully raised leghorns provide the environment as well as the stuff of several important vaccines produced at the laboratories, Dr. Tevis Goldhaft said. He explained that the egg provides a marvelously disease-free environment in addition to the living cells needed for growing vaccine materials.

Some vaccines are actually disease organisms which, when injected in small amounts or in weakened condition into the body, stimulate a protective reaction and development of immunity to the disease itself. The process is comparable to smallpox immunization for humans.

First tried in 1934 by the elder Dr. Goldhaft, the process of growing some of the vaccines in eggs has proven highly successful. In 1945, after a 7-year campaign by Dr. Goldhaft, the Federal Government adopted this method for certain vaccines.

Up to 20,000 eggs a week are innoculated with tiny amounts of vaccine which flourish in the egg's protected environment, Dr. Goldhaft said. Batches of several thousand

eggs at a time are incubated anywhere from 48 to 120 hours. The vaccine is extracted from the egg tissue and can be produced in either powder or liquid form.

The staff attempts to keep the labs as disease free as the inside of a healthy egg. The eggs, rooms, equipment, and uniforms are color coded to prevent mixture and pollution of vaccines. Formaldehyde and sterilizers are much in evidence. Separate outside entrances are provided for rooms where critical work is done.

Although many of the steps require skilled hands, much automatic equipment is used on the modern farm-factory. Automatically timed conveyor belts carry feed to the chickens; drinking water is treated with nutrients and drugs by machine. Large incubators holding several thousand eggs are also used—plus the usual paraphernalia of mailing, bottling, labeling, business—and even offset printing—machines.

Dr. Goldhaft saw in his work with poultry examples of the human condition. "Maybe the chicken, more than any animal around us, shows us how human beings behave and misbehave in society," he wrote in his autobiography. "For as I began to watch the flocks, I saw things that reminded me of the primitive way life regulated itself in the slum streets of my childhood."

He also saw direct applications of his research for human betterment such as growing vaccines against influenza or in the hunt for cancer and leukemia cures through research with poultry.

His work has been applauded more for its engineering and inventive skill than theoretical brilliance, but the praise of government, scientific, and agricultural officials has been high.

As the simple plaque in the entrance of the Vineland Poultry Laboratories says, Dr. Goldhaft "helped light a candle in mankind's search for freedom from hunger."

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the ironies of postwar international developments is the contrast between the progressive liberation of colonial peoples by their European metropoles and the increasing subjection of the peoples in the Soviet empire. It is somewhat misleading to apply the label of "colonialism" to the Soviet form of expansion. Within the Soviet orbit there is a wide range from the fairly liberal and independent-minded Poland to the completely subjugated national minorities within the U.S.S.R. The case of Lithuania and the two other Baltic countries certainly fits into the latter category. Their situation is all the more painful because of the brutal manner in which they were taken over by the Russians.

There can be no denying that the methods of colonization during the 19th century and the early years of this century were often less than civilized. Nor can one refute that the motives of the European powers were frequently selfish ones of power rivalries. Yet in many cases there was a higher purpose—one of bringing the benefits of Western civilization to backward people, of the "white man's burden." The process of decolonization has been marked by the realization that this partronizing attitude is not the best way to promote the development of these areas, however much they can profitably learn from the more advanced Western countries. But the essential fact to recall is that the colonizing powers did not consider the peoples and territories which they took over as independent entities with recognized status and rights in the family of nations. These peoples and territories are now gradually earning this recognition as they free themselves and become nations. Against this background the perfidious Soviet takeover of Lithuania and the other Baltic republics during World War II is all the more distasteful. For the Soviets had signed a peace treaty with Lithuania in 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation and renouncing forever all rights of sovereignty. Yet in the early days of World War II the Kremlin imposed its will on the little republic and absorbed it into the U.S.S.R. The Soviets' ruthless disregard of the rights of an independent nation is the lesson of the Lithuanian case. It is a bitter lesson for the Lithuanians, who on February 16 observed the 45th anniversary of their national independence day.

Savings Became Almost Worthless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, February 19, issue of Birmingham (Ala.), Post-Herald. This editorial discusses in a very pertinent way the question of fiscal responsibility, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

SAVINGS BECAME ALMOST WORTHLESS

In developing a program for taxation and spending, President Kennedy, it seems to us, is pulled two ways:

One by his instinctive commonsense which prompted him to admit, at his last press conference, that he is concerned at both the size of the debt and the size of the prospective deficit.

The other by addicts of the "new" economics among his advisers who urge him to spend more while taxing less and never mind where the money is coming from.

About how far he would have to go to appease this funny money wing is indicated by a statement filed by Leon H. Keyserling with the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

Mr. Keyserling, who was head of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisors, termed the Kennedy program "very small but sent out to do a giant's job." This despite the deficit of just under $12 billion estimated for next year.

"I favor," said Mr. Keyserling, "a deliberate enlargement of the Federal budget deficit * * * there is imperative need for much higher Federal outlays." Specifically, he would spend "about $3 billion" more than the President asks for the next year and about $16 billion extra for 1966. Combined with the tax cut he favors, the result would be "a deliberately contrived net increase in the Federal deficit" of $10 billion to $11 billion next year.

We suggest for reading in this connection a section near the close of Edmond Taylor's excellent new book, "The Fall of the Dynasties." We quote from page 393:

"The German mark had already lost one-fourth of its value during the war. (Our note—the American dollar has lost more than half of its value in the last 25 years.) The strain of reparations payments—about one-eighth of the national income annually—contributed to its dizzy postwar decline * * * in November 1921, the mark could be changed at 200 to the dollar. By November 1923, the rate had climbed to 4 billion marks to the dollar. At the peak of inflation the price of one copy of a daily newspaper rose to 200 million marks. An ordinary postage stamp cost 12 billion marks.

"Insurance policies, savings deposits and government bonds became almost worthless. Those who had practiced thrift and prudence and the lifelong restraint on which they are based were turned into paupers. Those who had gambled and squandered and borrowed beyond their means often grew rich overnight.

"With their faith in the value of money—and in the traditional virtues associated with money making—destroyed, the middle classes lost a great part of their trust not only in government but in society, in God, in the basic decencies of life itself.

"The new poor of the German middle classes might or might not actually starve—some very nearly did so—but they felt themselves threatened with a slow suffocation of their self-esteem through the social demotion to pauper or at best proletarian status. It is hardly surprising that they turned savage and gave Hitler the mass following he needed to convert his lunatic-fringe movement into a revolutionary menace."

Oil Journal Editorial Says President's Tax Program Hurts Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Oil and Gas Journal of February 4, 1963, points out clearly the jokers in President Kennedy's tax proposals. While promising tax cuts, the plan will eventually end up costing most of our taxpayers more and, instead of being an incentive to business, it will, in the case of the oil industry, prove to be a further deterrent to moving our economy ahead.

The editorial follows:

NO FREE LUNCH

Anyone who isn't confused about President Kennedy's new tax plan just doesn't understand the facts.

He made it sound real simple at the beginning: Business is stagnant because taxes are too high. So we'll cut taxes, let people keep more of their own money, and get the economy moving.

But then we get to the fine print. He's going to cut tax rates, but eliminate most of the exemptions. So what the Government magnanimously give you with the right hand it will largely take away with the left. You'll be keeping more of your own money only until income-tax day and then you'll have to fork it over.

Some people will pay less total tax, and this is expected to stimulate the economy. But others will discover that they are paying more, and their stimulus will be of the minus variety. Maybe the stimulus will come from trying to anticipate the net effect of all this on various lines of business.

The whole purpose of this tax rejiggering, the administration admits, is to get more money in circulation so that in a couple of years the Government can siphon off more of it to support bigger Federal spending programs. In the meantime the Government is to be on an austerity program.

Well, now the austerity budget is out, and any resemblance to the austerity programs most oil companies have been on for the past several years is purely imaginary. Uncle Sam is going to economize by reducing his income and increasing his spending. Quite a few individuals and businesses have tried that plan with less than glowing success.

Of course this will increase the Federal deficit, which is already up in the astronomical figures. But the President says that this is all right because there are two kinds of deficits: the bad kind that comes from waste and weakness and the good kind that comes from strength, and we have the good kind.

Will you run that past us again, please, Mr. President? We didn't quite get it the first time.

Now we come to his plan for stimulating the oil business by tax reform. He's not against the 27½-percent depletion allowance, no indeed. He's simply going to change the accounting rules so that most producers won't be able to get anywhere near 27½ percent. Depletion is retained in principle but denied in practice.

We must continue to foster the development of our mineral industries, he says, so he socks oil with a tax increase of $280 million. For the general economy the formula is cut taxes or face a slump. Oil is already in a slump, so its taxes get boosted.

The only people who don't find all this a bit confusing seem to be the administration's economists. They must be a different breed. Certainly their concept of economizing differs from that of corporation comptrollers. The kind of economy practiced in the Federal budget doesn't seem to work in our household budget.

These Federal fiscal wizards work on the theory that we can spend ourselves into prosperity and growth. A few years ago the oil industry was spending freely in anticipation of growth; but when the growth slowed down it cut its spending to keep outgo under income. Maybe somebody in Washington will explain to oil men how they can get moving by spending more than they take in when higher taxes leave them even less to spend.

Guess we were born 30 years too soon. This modern-day economics is beyond our grasp—economizing by being extravagant, a good kind of deficit, prosperity by cutting income and increasing outgo, reducing taxes by raising them, getting more for less.

When we went to school, the kind of economics being taught could be boiled down to one sentence: "There ain't no such thing as a free lunch."

Terror in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared a few days ago in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal, dealing with the present crime situation in the Nation's Capital. This editorial was reprinted in the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald of Tuesday, February 19, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

TERROR IN WASHINGTON

It is inconceivable that the Capital City of the United States of America could become a haven for wanton lawlessness and immorality. Yet it has.

Among 16 American cities with from 500,000 to 1 million people, Washington last year ranked first in aggravated assaults, fourth in murders, second in robberies, and sixth in housebreaking.

In comparison with the 1958–60 average, Washington crime in 1961 rose 41 percent, three times the national average.

Among girls in the 12 to 15 age group in public schools during the last school year there were 265 illegitimate births. In 1961, for Washington as a whole, 210 of every 1,000 live births were illegitimate. The Capital outranks every other large American city in illegitimate births.

As Reporter Morris Cunningham has observed in three articles just published by the Commercial-Appeal, Washington is finally waking up to its chaotic situation. Now the entire Nation must be dragged from apathetic slumber.

The District of Columbia is supported by all taxpayers in two ways: Congress allocates about $30 million yearly for operation of the city government; also, much of the income of Washington residents is received from Federal payrolls. Every American taxpayer has a stake in Washington, and a responsibility for its welfare.

President Kennedy has recognized that the city is suffering from "social unrest." Other responsible leaders have begun to try to correct a disgraceful blight.

Washington's troubles began in 1954, with school integration. Negro population jumped from 35.4 percent in 1950 to 54.8 percent in 1960. It may go to 75 percent by 1970.

At this point, 83.4 percent of all public school children in the Capital are Negro. Of all arrests for serious crimes there last year, 84.6 percent were Negroes.

As Negro population has increased in the city and its schools, many whites have moved to suburbs in neighboring States.

Recent months have brought a rash of stories of attacks on streets, intrusions into homes, and the infamous Thanksgiving Day race riot in District of Columbia Stadium, when almost 500 persons, mostly whites, were injured by rowdy Negroes.

Leaders, including some Negroes, are joining in hunting a way to beat the crimewave.

The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, said recently: "Nothing could portend even worse things for the future than to treat malignancy as if it were nothing but growing pains. * * * The undeniable fact is that terrorism grips all sections of the most important city of the world."

He added: "The time has come to bear down heavily on today's hooliganism and to determine now from henceforth that lawless offenders with all their threatening bravado, regardless of race, shall be confronted with swift punishment for the greater safety of the innocent on which they prey."

There is hope in that attitude. But it must reach into courts which have been overly lenient, and into Congress which is directly responsible for the governing of Washington, if it is to become the dominant attitude.

The Question Answers Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, very often in the heat of legislative debate, the question arises as to at what point Government regulation, control and supervision become helpful or harmful to groups and individuals affected by legislation or executive decisions.

From time to time we have had discussion over Government dictating the use of certain products. The subject is covered in a concise, clear fashion by the Blue Island Sun-Standard of January 31, which I place into the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

THE QUESTION ANSWERS ITSELF

Several years ago it was proposed that the Federal Government control the end use of fuels. That rather formidable phrase simply means that Government would decide what fuels could be used for what purpose. The impetus came from fuel producers who, in the existing competitive economy, had been losing markets to other fuels, notably oil.

No legislative action has so far been taken. But the drive for end-use control continues. So some things said by a special group of energy experts appointed by the 87th Congress, which spent almost a year of research in the matter, deserve repeating.

It said: "Competition among fuels has been a factor in making America an energy-intensive economy. * * * Such competition provides the product—fuels in this case—at the least cost to the public." End-use regulation, obviously, would end such competition.

The group also dealt with the argument that the Government should act to prevent loss of jobs and investment resulting from competition by limiting that competition.

It said: "The Nation could have evolved a policy to maintain wagon transport, the ice industry, kerosene lamps, the wood fireplace, or the cottage weaver. In these and other examples constructive displacement caused a dislocation of employees and a dissipation of investment. Against this can be measured the benefits of today's modern mass transportation, modern refrigeration, dependable and healthful illumination, central heating, and miracle fabrics and plastics."

The point is plain: Can we, by Government edict, afford to stop progress, and can we

afford to have a Government agency, not the consumer, decide what we can and cannot buy and use? This, clearly, is one of those questions that answers itself.

Tax Proposal Would Defeat Stated Purpose of Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, much concern is being voiced by many persons about the effect of the tax proposal to put a 5-percent floor under certain tax deductible items. On February 19, the following editorial appeared in the Flint (Mich.) Journal on this particular provision which I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress who will shortly be making a decision in this vital matter. This brief editorial summarizes most effectively a very important aspect of the proposed change. This should cause us to ponder about the overall economic significance of proposals that could discourage people from making charitable contributions, not to say the tremendous problems which would be encountered by those institutions and organizations depending on generous gifts.

TAX PROPOSAL WOULD DEFEAT STATED PURPOSE OF PROGRAM

Stated purpose of the administration's tax cut proposal is to stimulate spending. But at least one item in the proposal would have just the opposite effect. It would encourage persons to curtail some of their spending.

The provision is that which would put a 5-percent floor under certain tax deductible items. For instance, contributions to charity, interest payments, medical expenses, taxes which fall below 5 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income would be disallowed.

The significance of this hasn't been digested by the taxpayers yet. But already churches, colleges, and other charitable institutions are objecting to the provision. They understand how its adoption would work against them. Personal contributions could be expected to be reduced sharply.

This is a case in which those who contribute to such worthwhile institutions and programs would be discriminated against.

Persons who use a short tax form and do not itemize deductions take advantage of an automatic deduction, whether they have made contributions to charity or not, whether they have paid heavy interest or not, whether they have been hit by heavy medical bills or not, or whether their property taxes are high or not. Those who do contribute large amounts or pay heavily in any of the other areas are denied the first 5 percent of income in figuring deductions.

A good example of the injustice of the proposal is offered by J. A. Livingston, writing in the Detroit News:

"Take two taxpayers, each with income of $20,000. One man has negligible deductions, say $200. He's entitled to a standard deduction of $1,000. He gains $800.

"Now take the second taxpayer. He has heavy interest payments, heavy medical expenses, and makes liberal contributions to charity. Let's assume his itemized deductions come to $2,000.

"Under the President's plan he winds up in the same place as the first taxpayer. He's not permitted to deduct the first 5 percent of his income. That leaves only $1,000 to deduct. He loses $1,000 in deductions."

In other words, the man with the heavy financial load is given no more tax credit than the one who had inconsequential medical bills, taxes, interest, etc., and who made no contributions to charity.

In the words of Eldredge Hiller, executive director of the American Association of Fund Raising Councils, the new rule would "tend to inhibit philanthropy."

It would do more than that. It would defeat the very purpose for which the tax program supposedly was designed—encourage spending.

Surveying for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the biggest jobs facing many of the underdeveloped nations of the world is the construction of roads and irrigation projects. Competent surveyors are essential to this work.

The January 1963 issue of the National Surveyor, a magazine published in Washington by Larston D. Farrar, carried an article written by Mildred Hall concerning the work of the Peace Corps in furnishing needed surveyors. It is particularly appropriate this week that we note the contribution of surveyors to the great work of the Peace Corps. George Washington, our first President, was a surveyor. It is not surprising that surveyors should be among the vanguard of this effort to serve mankind. Among this group of selfless American surveyors who have gone to the far corners of the world to sell democracy is a young Missourian, Eugene Schreiber.

Our Nation can be proud of the devoted service rendered to the cause of freedom and peace by the men and women, young and old, who have joined the Peace Corps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Surveying for Peace" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEYING FOR PEACE

(By Mildred Hall)

Eugene Schreiber, a surveyor from University City, Mo., now a Peace Corps man in Tanganyika, Africa, writes home: "We feel we're fortunate. The work is up our alley, the people have been wonderful, and most of all, we can't escape the feeling that we're at the right place at the right time."

In faraway, underdeveloped countries, surveyors are playing a critical role in the U.S. Peace Corps. Their job is to build roads and to build friendship.

Some open up feeder roads from villages locked deep in the interior of the African bush; some design patterns of irrigation to water-starved farmland, or map location for barriers to devastating floodwaters. At the same time, the Peace Corps volunteer opens up new paths of communication between the Americans and the people of the host country.

The volunteers are there by request of the host government, but some of their people, long isolated in the depths of an African or or Asian or South American country, may not take kindly to the new arrivals at first.

The problems the volunteers meet are not the kind answered in textbooks or even in the long, careful training preceding their 2-year stay.

Struck in the back by a fish, hurled by an irate villager in the marketplace, one volunteer refused to allow the man to be punished by his own police. Instead, the Peace Corps man shook his hand, and in his own native Swahili, congratulated him on his independence. This kind of instant diplomacy is not found in standard diplomatic lore.

On the lighter side, the volunteers may be called on to celebrate the birth of a new baby—or a new African country. Allen Tamura, 23, of Pasadena, Calif., was made an honorary member of the Gogo tribe in Tanganyika as a result of bringing an expectant Gogo mother over bad roads to the safety of a hospital. Eugene Schreiber, of University City, Mo., and a party of 35 surveyors and engineers, witnessed the color and gaiety of the Uhuru celebrations, marking the birth of Africa's 22d independent nation since World War II.

Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, tells the National Surveyor: "The Peace Corps is proud of its surveyors. They are doing a needed job and doing it well."

The actual work of the Peace Corps surveyor goes far beyond run of the mill surveying. It adds new facets to the dangerous and adventurous work surveyors perform all over the world in both civilian and defense capacities. The volunteer's opportunities are as new and exciting as his problems.

A word about the Peace Corps program: The Executive order to set up the Corps was signed in March 1961. Director Shriver and a Peace Corps team swung around the world on an intensive safari to tell the Peace Corps story, and by December 31, 1962, projects calling for almost 5,000 volunteers had been requested by 40 countries.

No less amazing was the response of Americans to the call of the Peace Corps. The volunteer's course of training is rigorous. If he has military duty coming up, he receives no exemption for his 2-year stint in the corps of peace. He receives only enough allowance for his keep, plus a salary of $75 a month due him on separation—for a grand total of $1,800 if he remains for the full 2 years, which most do.

Jules Pagano, director of the professional and technical division in the public affairs office of the Peace Corps outlines the requirements bluntly: "He must learn to speak the language of his hosts, Swahili, Thai, Urdu, Bengali, French, Spanish and even perfect English. He must eat their food, sleep in their houses and live under their laws without diplomatic immunity. Beyond this, he must have the necessary skills and experience to perform his job."

While the work of the Peace Corps surveyor is not for the fainthearted, it is also not for the impatient or short-tempered. It is for the man who wants to learn, as well as to teach. It is not only for the highly educated specialist, but also for the man of practical know-how with machinery and construction, who never went beyond high school.

The Peace Corps man above all must be a teacher, a communicator. He may have to explain many times over, the ways of his work to men living deep in the interiors of countries hundreds of years behind modern civilization—where transport is still on foot or mule; where rain washes out all ordinary roads that could connect him with his fellows in the next village, or open the next

river port or city to the rice, tea, or rubber he farms.

The Peace Corps surveyor's job in Tanganyika or Malaya is to help the native farmer in the predominantly agricultural countries to reach a market on new roads that will let him sell the product of his farming. It means a better standard of physical and mental life for him and his family.

Tanganyika is a typical surveyor project, Peace Corps Director Shriver points out. "These surveyors work hard. They have little time for recreation; every 2 or 3 weeks they move camp. They live in tents deep in the bush country, and they often have to carve a passage through the undergrowth."

They have little time for writing home about their exploits. Those nearer metropolitan centers report back on the tedium, and the patience needed to get things done when officialdom must be consulted. Peace Corpsman Bill Reder writes from East Pakistan: "In the course of a year, I think we have had 92,000 meetings and cups of tea. That's how you get things done in Pakistan—over tea."

The new frontiers opened by the Peace Corps volunteers may also be the last frontiers of superb opportunity for personal initiative. One surveyor was caleld upon to put through a road that would have required six bridges over a winding river. He found it simpler to change the course of the river, and produced a better access road, with fewer bridges and culverts.

Despite dangers, physical rigors, strange new ways and problems, more than 4,000 volunteers, both men and women, have gone into the work, and many more are applying or in training. The Corpsman always knows that he is responding to a need, and always at the invitation of the host country. Also, he goes strictly as a civilian, with no military connection.

An example of a recent request for surveyors, is a project in Malaya that will need 21 surveyors in land-use survey teams.

To the adventurous, the description of the Federation of Malaya begins as irresistibly as the route of the old sailing clippers voyaging East: it is a country bounded by the South China Sea, the Straits of Johore, the Strait of Malaca, the Andaman Sea, and on the north, by Thailand.

Getting down to the practical, Jules Pagano, who has a year-round job of recruiting new trainees, announces that some of the work in Malaya will be cadastral survey, access road location and design, secondary road location and alinement, and siting and developing of irrigation canals.

The door is wide open to volunteers—and queries are welcome. They go to Jules Pagano, director of professional, technical, and labor division, Peace Corps, Washington, D.C.

He reminds surveyors that although most people associate the Peace Corps with youthful America, anyone over 18 years of age is eligible, right up through the sixties and even into the seventies, if he qualifies. Married men may go and take their wives, if there are no dependent children under 18, and if the wife can perform some needed Peace Corps function, from teaching languages to nursing, in the same project.

No one can make a career of being a Peace Corpsman, because the 2-year tenure is the limit in all but a few cases where the work may need a time extension to complete. On return to America, the volunteer is helped to find a job. Some go into Government, some into foreign service, some teach, other go back into industry. Surveyor-engineer Bill Hein, of Santa Clara, Calif., gave up a $10,000 a year job in his hometown to work in East Pakistan, where he is District Engineer and also teaches at the university in Rajshahi. He also married here—a Peace Corps volunteer, Judy Huneke.

The need for surveyors is urgent, immediate, and seemingly endless. Twenty-two volunteers have gone out to North Borneo and Sarawak, where there are over a million people, and less than 800 miles of paved roads, and about 640 miles of paths. Feeder roads are critically needed here, Jules Pagano points out. The volunteers here will also teach, train and share their skills with their fellow workers.

In his own way, the Peace Corps surveyor puts a dent in the iron curtain. "In Malaya, one of the few countries in the Far East to have conquered Communist infiltration, two road surveyors are clearing routes through virgin jungle. Where Communist guerrillas once stalked in the night, Malayan citizens will be able to travel in freedom and comfort, their communities linked together in a new pattern of communication."

The effectiveness of the Peace Corps has brought cries of pain from the Soviets. They urge Africans: "Beware of Peace Corps, for those countries which have accepted it have started to regret."

Spokesmen for countries served by the Peace Corps do not share this point of view. A. H. Jamal, Cabinet Minister of Public Works in Tanganyika, writes: "Roads to us mean, if I may say so, practically everything. The Peace Corps volunteers are rending assistance at a time and in a country where it is most timely and very much needed." Alberto Camargo, President of Colombia, terms the Peace Corps: "The finest way in which the United States could prove to the humble people of this and other lands that the primary purpose of its international aid program is to build a better life in all the free world's villages and neighborhoods."

Director Sargent Shriver, speaking recently to the National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago, said: "The Peace Corps has shown what Americans will do when they are challenged by high purpose. * * * Thousands of them volunteered to serve even in the days when skeptics and cynics ridiculed the Peace Corps as a 'beatnik boondoggle,' and a 'kiddie korps.'"

After a scant 2 years of work, the Peace Corps has so impressed our own countrymen, that 21 Senators have proposed a Peace Corps medal to honor the extraordinary acts of valor performed by men and women volunteers. Many other Senators are expected to cosponsor the bill, S. 289, to reward the acts of "great courage and resourcefulness" of the Peace Corps.

Some of the American surveyors now working overseas, and some who will be returning next summer with accounts of their 2 years, include—

Bill Reder, of Long Island City, N.Y., now in east Pakistan, Asia.

James R. Belisle, formerly with Naval Ordinance Test Station at China Lake, Calif., now on farm-to-market survey in the bush country of Tanganyika, Africa.

James Allen, from Bunker Hill, Ill., now in Boliva, South America.

Daniel Angel, from Denver Colo., now in Pakistan.

Harry Baltzer, of Alepena, S. Dak., in Pakistan.

William A. Russell, of Forest Knolls, Calif., in Pakistan.

Richard R. Smith, of Pacific City, Oreg., in Pakistan.

James N. Brock, of Freeport, Ill., in North Borneo, Africa.

Randall M. Sherman of Bridegwater, Mass., a hydrological surveyor, in North Borneo.

William Francis Hein, of Santa Clara, Calif., in east Pakistan.

Eugene Joseph Schreiber, of University City, Mo., in Tanganyika.

Edward G. Chalker, of Chester, Conn., now in Titiribi, Antioquia, Colombia.

Ernest A. Phillips, of Forestville, Conn., in Pohang, Malaya.

Will We Act in Time in the Dollar Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are not facing up to the growing dollar crisis. As the pressures on our gold increase and the dollar crisis deepens, our actions will be dictated more and more by force of circumstances. Now, while there is still time and opportunity, we should get our financial house in order.

Here is an excellent review of the dollar crisis written recently by George H. Arris, for the Providence Journal-Bulletin:

THE DOLLAR CRISIS

(By George H. Arris)

The Washington administration's recent pronouncement that the country's unfavorable payments balance will not be erased this year, as hoped, has generated a new wave of concern for the dollar.

Yet, fundamentally, the circumstances responsible for dollar troubles up to now have not changed a great deal.

We continue, as we have for several years, to spend, invest, lend, and give away more money abroad than we get back—and we go on paying out gold to make up the difference.

Inexorably, the day draws closer when we must choose between politically unpalatable increases in interest rates and sound economic policy to save the dollar.

The gold reserve required by law to backstop currency must be no less than 25 percent. It is down to 32 percent and still declining.

If we hit bottom, we have a number of choices. Either we notify the rest of the world that we no longer will pay our international debts in gold. Or we devaluate the dollar. Or we forget the 25 percent reserve requirement, put the dollar on a paper base and go on using up what gold is left to pay international obligations. Whatever the choice, this will be the end of the dollar as an international currency.

Will we act in time? Or will we be forced into one of these choices by crisis? These are good questions, for we have a way in this country of skipping blithely through national problems less complicated than gold, only to find ourselves suddenly on the brink of real trouble.

In the case of the dollar and gold, the issue is clear cut. It is political expediency versus orthodox monetary procedure. It is a question of trying to take more cupsful of water out of the bucket than you put in.

For some time, this country has clung through thick and thin to a soft money policy, an easy interest rate policy. If you doubt the political potency of the argument for such a policy, toss the notion of stiffening interest rates into the Congress and stand back for the explosion.

The popular theory about low interest rates is that economic expansion is fostered, although it doesn't always work this way. It can and has worked at the bottom of a recession. It has not worked for the last year and a half when the economy has remained sluggish on a relatively high plateau. Nonetheless, there probably are few in Washington who would not argue loud and long that hardening interest rates now would depress an economy that's none too vigorous.

Even so, the lateral development of the President's proposed high budget deficit, tied to his demand for a tax cut, may bring on

higher interest rates regardless of opposition, if the Federal Reserve fulfills its regulatory role.

The budget deficit as visualized is basically inflationary. A vast amount of new money would be created—the potential for all inflations. The degree of inflation, if any, remains debatable, for it depends to a major degree on how the deficit is financed, how the money is spent, and the speed of spending.

Should inflation begin, however, the Reserve would move in to damp it down. The law under which it operates requires this action.

At present, low interest rates in the United States vis-a-vis interest rates abroad result in a balance-of-payments deficit. This is complicated to explain, perhaps, for it gets deeply into the intricacies of international banking. It goes well beyond the mere question of hot money flowing to areas of highest interest rate return. It is rooted in the fact that the payments ledger must balance. If gold is going out one door, assets of another kind must come in via another door to maintain balance.

For reasons of monetary equilibrium, these assets should be foreign assets. The only other way to achieve balance is to increase holdings in the central banking system of domestic assets, these being commonly U.S. Treasury securities. Doing this doesn't solve the payments problem. It does stave off the day of reckoning, and at the same time it keeps money easy and interest rates low through the simple process of feeding central bank funds into the money stream, where they multiply several times in the credit process.

Not oblivious to the consequences of a continuing drain on gold, the Washington administration is trying to wipe out the deficit by requiring that much foreign aid cash must be spent in this country and by pushing for more export trade. But these actions strike at symptoms rather than monetary causes of the problem.

The Federal Reserve defends its position as regulator of credit flow both in domestic and international accounts. It has obligations both ways, and it says quite rightly, that it has been able to keep interest rates fairly high on international levels but low at home. Even here, the struggle is with symptoms, not causes.

Like any bank or individual, the United States cannot go on borrowing from the international window. Foreign creditor countries have substantial amounts of dollars on deposit in this country, more than we can pay off in gold if they demand it. We owe this. But we continue building up the debt by virtue of a continuing payments deficit. This can go on only so long before creditors become doubtful of ability to pay—and demand their money.

Higher interest rates would eliminate the payments deficit in time by increasing foreign assets in this country and balancing the ledger, although some argue to the contrary and politicians deplore the depressing impact they claim would hit the economy at home.

That's where we stand. We shoulder off a monetary reckoning until some future tomorrow, fighting off gold loss through a series of skirmishes with symptoms rather than causes.

A crisis doesn't appear imminent. It could come within 5 years unless monetary policies change. But as we Americans look at things, crises hurt only when they occur, not when you think about them.

Diminishing Open Land Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Dr. Firman Bear, formerly of Rutgers University, has published an article in the Rutgers Alumni Monthly, describing his views on the problem of diminishing open land areas in this country, with special attention to that land falling to industrial and urban development. His words are especially cogent to an urban society increasingly troubled by the need for open space within reach of our large population and industrial centers. I think that it would be of interest to my colleagues to examine his views, and so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVENTURES WITH SPACE—A SOIL SCIENTIST PLEADS FOR MORE AND BETTER PLANNING TO CONSERVE THE EARTH'S NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Firman E. Bear)

(Dr. Firman E. Bear, professor emeritus of agricultural chemistry in the College of Agriculture, is editor of Soil Science, a scientific journal of international repute. Following is the text of the keynote address he delivered before the Conference on Multiple Use of Watershed and Wetland Resources held at the College of Agriculture last spring.)

A surprisingly large number of people are contemplating the possibilities of pioneering on the Moon or on Mars, Venus or some other planetary body farther out in space. Efforts are being made to communicate with any manlike mortals who may have evolved on nearby planets or who may have migrated there from one of the planets of the many millions of suns other than ours where the civilizations that may have developed may be far more advanced than the one we have on earth.

But many more promising opportunities with space other than in it are available to us much nearer home. Some months ago the editor of the New York Times was moved to comment on this subject: "Research in the domain of space, so newly opened up before man's imagination, is important," he said, "but the basic problems of humanity still lie here on earth, and it is toward their solution that the bulk of man's ingenuity must still be directed. One may wonder if many Soviet people do not reflect privately on the obvious disparity between their country's great achievements in space travel and its archaic domestic transportation system. * * * And, from the point of view of humanity as a whole, it is clear that the fight against disease, hunger and ignorance requires far more resources directed toward terrestrial research and action than does the conquest of that inhospitable void we call space."

We are a long way from having fully explored the planet on which we live, with its 36,400 million acres of land and 86,400 million acres of water. Vast areas of earth, such as the cold, bleak Arctic regions of Canada and Siberia, the hot, humid equatorial regions of central Africa, the almost impenetrable jungles through which the Amazon River of South America flows for a distance of 4,000 miles, and the vast areas of desert in north Africa and central Australia, are virtually unknown to man.

Notwithstanding that some 3 billion people now inhabit the earth, we still have 12 acres of land and 30 acres of water per person. And even though much of this land is too rocky or too mountainous, too wet or too dry, or too hot or too cold for crop or livestock production, we should be able to meet the food needs and space desires of many more billions of people. Yet to accomplish this is no simple problem.

World population is increasing at the rate of about 1.6 percent a year and, if this continues, we shall soon have a lot more people to deal with than we have now. And this applies equally to the United States of America where, until recently, we have had very large areas of land over which we could expand without thought of the consequences or any need for conservation measures.

We look with sympathy at the disease and misery of the many millions of people in the more densely populated parts of the earth. Many of these people go to bed hungry at night. But we would do well to be looking farther ahead in this country where already many people live under substandard conditions. All of this points to the great need to put much more effort into the conservation, for much more effective use, of the renewable natural resources of this great land of ours. Here we work from the known to the unknown. In outer space the order is reversed.

Our interest is now being increasingly drawn to these renewable natural resources. They consist of: soil, water and air, croplands, grasslands and forests, livestock, fish and wildlife, and recreational areas, scenic views, and esthetic values. The primary aim of those who have to do with the conservation of these resources is that of protecting them against misuse and of making them far more productive and useful than they are today. We hope to make this an ever more productive, beautiful, and satisfying country in which to live.

We are still pioneering in a wonderfully rich and productive country. Our mainland 48 States is made up of 1,905 million acres of land and 29 million acres of water. We have 4 million acres more in Hawaii and 365 million acres in Alaska. But already near chaotic conditions exist in the urban-suburban complexes, extending out to the limits of commuting distances from our great metropolitan centers and along the shores of our rivers, lakes, and oceans.

The city has been likened to an octopus, with its tentacles stretching out along the radial highways and railroads. An octopus emits a dark, smelly fluid, analogous to smog and sewage. The importance of keeping such developments under control and of setting aside plenty of open space for fresh air and for recreation is apparent.

No matter where it is, land is valuable, as are the lakes and other waters contained within it and around it. Land provides standing room for the plants and animals man wants to grow. It provides a place where he can live and work. As matters now stand in the United States, we have about 10 acres of land and one-thirtieth acre of water per person for those living within the confines of the 48 mainland States. But our population is increasing at the rate of 1 every 11 seconds, over 5 a minute, about 325 an hour, 8,000 a day, 56,000 a week, and 3

million a year. This is equivalent to a city of 60,000 in every 1 of the 50 States every year. And as these people spread out around the cities and across the country they overrun large areas of land, including yearly about 1½ million acres of good agricultural land.

Notwithstanding the great need for planning, relatively little of it is being done. Almost every State has laws that would enable it to classify land into districts for agriculture, forestry, industry, business residence, and recreation. Rightly done, such classification would reserve the most fertile land for farming, put system into the use of the remaining land, reduce the cost of essential services, maintain an economic base for local business, make communities attractive, and protect property values and tax bases. But many things that should be done are not politically feasible. This means that conservationists have to serve as public defenders of the people in their strivings for the good life.

The starting point in our conservation efforts is a detailed soil survey that classifies the land in relation to the use or uses to which it could best be put. This permits picking out the areas that should be kept in agriculture and of choosing the best locations in the remaining areas for commercial enterprises, housing developments, playgrounds, parks, service areas, recreation, and systematic forestry. Such a survey aids planners, engineers, architects, builders, landscapers, and prospective homeowners against unfavorable conditions for their purposes. Among other things, it pinpoints the areas with high watertables and those that are subject to flooding.

Many people fail to realize the need for planning to insure the best use of land, and those who do are often not adequately trained to undertake such planning. More and better college curriculums designed to prepare men and women for community planning as careers are badly needed. More attention needs to be given to educating the public as to the need for planning and as to what can be done about it. Governmental agencies should provide supplemental services to community planners. It has been suggested that as much as 1½ percent of all moneys derived from taxation should be set aside to cover the costs of such planning.

More barriers must be raised against diversion of publicly owned open spaces to other uses. Hard-won parks suffer losses of sites for schools, hospitals and restaurants. Entire city recreation squares have been black-topped for auto parking. Heavily traveled highways have been pushed through city parks. What is good for automobiles is believed to be good for the people, whether they ride in them or not.

New Jersey presents one of the Nation's most troublesome spots in relation to the use of its land. The 1960 census showed a population of 6,067,000. Immediately to the east is New York City with 7,782,000 people and immediately to the west is Philadelphia with 2,603,000 more. Thus, as of 1960, we were in the center of 16,452,000 people on a land area, for the State and cities, of 5,096,000 acres. This is one-eleventh of the mainland population of the United States on one three-hundred-and-eighty-fifth of its land area. More of these people are having more leisure time and their mobility is increasing. The National Recreation Association has recommended that 10 acres be set aside for local parks for every 1,000 people in a community. The suggestion was made that 5 percent of the land area in suburban areas be reserved for open space and 10 percent in urban centers.

New Jersey has made real progress in setting land and water areas aside for recreational purposes. The green acres program, under the direction of the State's department of conservation and economic development, should be of great benefit in the days ahead. This provides $60 million for the purchase of land, of which $20 million is allocated for matching by municipal and county units in proportion to present population.

The Delaware River Commission, under the leadership of James E. Wright, newly appointed executive director, joins the efforts of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and the Federal Government in a projected $93 million "park and recreation planners' dream." This calls for damming the Delaware River 7 miles north of the Water Gap to form a reservoir 30 miles long, a mile wide, and 100 feet deep that, with other contemplated developments, will serve by 1965 about 25 million people in the 4-State area.

Acting in conjunction with Connecticut and New York, the New Jersey Legislature has just passed, and Governor Hughes has just signed a regional advisory act. This permits the governing body of any local unit of the State to join forces with any other local unit of this or any other State in a regional approach to the solution of the problem of urban growth and development.

What New Jersey has not done to date is to give adequate consideration to protecting its best agricultural lands against encroachment. These agricultural lands provide wide expanses of open space that give the passers-by the feeling of not being hemmed in by structures. These farmed areas are almost as important for their open-space value as for their agricultural value. But farmers are asked to provide this open space free of charge. And, as industrial and city developments approach their land and increase its sale value, with taxes to correspond, farmers have good reason for selling, notwithstanding their desire to continue farming and their sense of guilt that their good farming land will be lost forever for the purposes to which it should be restricted.

Consideration might well be given to the possibilities of purchasing easements that would pay the farmer for the contribution he is making to the people who drive by his place, enjoying the open space, beautiful orchards, fine fields of crops, and attractive livestock provided for their pleasure. Property is a bundle of rights: rights to own, sell, give away, enjoy, view, develop and use, or even to misuse. The public may acquire one or more of these rights, rather than all of them, by gift, purchase, voluntary agreement, or condemnation. By purchasing an easement for protection of scenic values and against the building of obstructions, such as is being done around airports and water supplies, the State can reduce the farmer's tax load and help keep him on the land.

Many people seem to believe that New Jersey's agriculture is doomed to disappear, the State being taken over almost completely by industrial, highway, and suburban developments. But one of the things that impresses the man who looks into it is the amount of good land that is being permitted to grow up to weeds, brush, and scrub trees. Of the 4,813,000 acres of land in the State, 19 percent is now cropland, three percent is pasture, and 23 percent is woodland and forest. In a soil and water conservation needs inventory that was made by our soil scientists it was pointed out that over 1 million of our more than 2 million acres of woodlots and forests are underlain by land that could be put to agricultural use, much of this land being better for agricultural purposes than some of that now being farmed. Most of this land is located in the central and southern part of the State.

We should be making a determined effort to keep agriculture on the best farming land in the State and to expand it, meanwhile developing nonagricultural land up to its full potentialities for other purposes. Plenty of land would remain for these other purposes. Multiple use of much of the land has many possibilities. Also, we can readily expand upward into the space we are familiar with and can take much more advantage of. Finally, the earth has 3,959 miles of depth, of which only about 4 miles has been explored.

We need to catalog all the agencies of the Federal, State, county, and municipal governments that are operating in the making of the best use of our land and water resources. And this should include all the private agencies that sell their services in this capacity. This would be another good starting point for the greatly enlarged effort that needs to be made if we are to protect our descendants against our own follies in the use of: soil, water, and air; croplands, grasslands, and forests; livestock, fish, and wildlife; and recreation areas, scenic views, and esthetic values.

Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the increasingly serious problem of residual oil imports to the economy of New England should demand our continuing attention. Two excellent articles that have appeared recently describe the nature of the impasse that we have reached. One, by Donald R. Larrabee, printed in the Northampton (Mass.) Daily Hamshire Gazette, Friday, February 22, states clearly that the matter rests in the hands of the President. Mr. Larrabee points out that the President, as U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, urged not only a relaxation but a complete termination of the quotas which were ordered by the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago and have been costing New England $30 million a year.

The second article, from the North Adams Transcript, February 18, 1963, describes the crisis in Venezuela, and how that crisis would be eased and how at the same time the United States could help that country counter the threat of Castroism throughout the Americas. The lifting of residual oil imports would greatly aid Venezuela, the United States, and New England.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Northampton (Mass.) Daily Hampshire Gazette, Feb. 22, 1963]

IT'S KENNEDY'S MOVE ON RESIDUAL OIL ISSUE

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—The problem of residential fuel oil import controls, costly to New England and of questionable value to the national security, has been skirted by President Kennedy almost since he assumed office. It is a touchy one, in the extreme, from a domestic political standpoint, and it has foreign policy overtones.

Now, after almost 2 years' study, the Office of Emergency Planning has filed a report with the White House recommending a careful and meaningful relaxation of the residual oil import restrictions. Under the trade law, the President can ignore the report, order a relaxation or a complete lifting of the quotas. As Senator COTTON, Republican, of New Hampshire, has put it, "It's his move."

There is ample evidence that the President didn't need the OEP report to learn that (1) the quotas add to the fuel costs of consumers and industries in New England; (2) the Defense Department and numerous other Federal agencies have long felt they should be terminated in the national interest; (3) they are not needed for the national security; and (4) they have provided no real relief to the coal industry.

As a Senator from Massachusetts, Kennedy joined with his New England colleagues in petitions to President Eisenhower to remove the restrictions. He supported all these points and urged not only a relaxation but a complete termination of the quotas which were ordered by the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago.

The OEP investigation, demanded by New England industries and Congressmen, was launched in May 1961 and has been followed up by numerous appeals from the region's congressional delegations for executive action. Of late, these included a joint letter from all New England Senators, signed by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, among others, requesting an end to the controls which, it has been estimated, have cost New England $30 million more a year.

The White House reply, generally, has been that the OEP was studying the matter and nothing could be done until the official report was filed. The OEP study, submitted last week, was promptly interpreted by New England lawmakers of both political parties as ample justification for a complete termination of the quotas. Senator COTTON said it gave the President all the tools he needs to remove the lid.

Unfortunately, perhaps, the OEP report did not spell out the extent of the relaxation the agency feels is needed. However, it broadly supported the basic arguments of the New Englanders that national security does not require the restrictions, that the quotas have irritated our relations with friendly nations and have stifled the economies of such major suppliers as Venezuela and the Netherland Antilles, and that cutting residual oil imports would be of only marginal assistance to the U.S. coal industry unless they were at levels which would impose inordinate burdens on consumers and the operation of the economy.

A bitter fight has been waged by the politically powerful coal industry which has a well-staffed lobby in Washington. The industry contends, of course, that the imports have cut into traditional markets for coal and endanger security by preventing expansion of production capacity for any emergency.

Government experts state, on the other hand, that coal producing areas have suffered mostly because of technical developments, the conversion of railroads from coal-fired steam engines to diesel locomotives, the increased use of oil and gas, especially by the import-dependent east coast industries, to heat boilers, and various other patterns of change in fuel uses.

As a final argument, New England Senators have repeatedly reminded the President that removal of the quotas would be consistant with his vigorous support of free trade and trade expansion.

Stacked against New England's relatively small congressional delegation are an estimated 100 Members of Congress from the depressed coal-producing States who, as a matter of political necessity, must fight the OEP recommendations. Many are members of the President's own political party. This underscores and compounds the dilemma facing the President because the specter of unemployment remains one of the knottiest problems of the Kennedy administration at midterm.

[From the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript, Feb. 18, 1963]

VENEZUELA: OIL AND VIOLENCE

(By Managing Editor Philip A. Lee)

Every time President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela, survives another crisis it is fashionable to say that the air has been cleared. One cynic remarked recently, "If the air is cleared much more, we will all suffocate on tear gas."

Crisis is endemic in Venezuela. Betancourt has come through attempted assassination, sabotage, and virtually every other tactic of violence. During his first year and a half of office after the free and apparently honest elections of December 1958, the principal threats were rightwing plots, particularly among the military. Now the conservatives appear to have become reconciled to, if not enamored of, their non-Communist leftist President.

But with the rise of Castro in Cuba, the emphasis has shifted. Venezuela is clearly a principal target of communism and Castroism in the Western Hemisphere. Only last month, one of Havana's old-time Communists, Blas Roca, told a visiting Venezuelan delegation that after the overthrow of Betancourt: "We will then cease to be the solitary nation in the Caribbean to stand facing the Yankee imperialists and we will have a nation united with us on the continent of South America.

The recent demonstrations of Venezuelans, including the hijacking of a Venezuelan ship by Communists, appear to be aimed at causing President Betancourt to cancel his scheduled visit to Washington this week. This is ostensibly to repay the visit to Caracas by President and Mrs. Kennedy in December 1961. But it is inspired by more than international sociability.

In a sense President Betancourt's presence in Washington means as much to the Secretary of the Interior as it does to the Secretary of State. The question is import controls on residual oil, of which Venezuela is a principal exporter. Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, in a virtually unreported speech in the closing days of the last Congress disclosed how oil amendments were kept from debate on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. LONG said that talks with Kennedy and other administration officials had assured him that the oil import quota program would be continued and tightened. Domestic producers would be assured of their proportionate share of the increase market.

President Kennedy in December announced changes in the formula for crude oil imports that Venezuelans say will cost their country about 50,000 to 60,000 barrels a day in exports to the United States. Secretary of the Interior Udall on January 30 permitted residual oil imports to rise by 17,808 barrels per day retroactive to last April 1. President Betancourt is expected to urge Kennedy further to remove residual oil restrictions as compensation for the loss in crude exports. Venezuela, which produces a particularly heavy crude oil, ships virtually all the residual oil used here.

On the domestic scene, the battle is between coal-producing States—Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Kentucky—and east coast fuel-consuming States. Our own Massachusetts is one of the most vocal of the latter, and Kennedy as a Senator wrote a letter fully supporting the removal of petroleum import quotas. This, of course, is not binding on the man who is now President of the United States. Nevertheless, Betancourt is symbolically important as the successor to a rightwing military dictatorship. It is reasonable to assume his travel will turn out to be not entirely in vain. Certainly we in Massachusetts hope so.

Portland's Lincoln Club Hears Sage Advice from Congressman Tupper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER], recently addressed the Portland Lincoln Club. His pointed advice caught the attention of the Portland Press Herald, which printed an excellent editorial, which I am pleased to present for the RECORD.

Thanks to the work of such public servants as the gentleman from Maine, the Republican Party is fulfilling its responsibilities to the people in a realistic and progressive manner.

The editorial follows:

PORTLAND'S LINCOLN CLUB HEARS SAGE ADVICE FROM CONGRESSMAN TUPPER

Portland's Lincoln Club, in its annual homage to the Great Emancipator, met on Saturday night and had good reason to be pleased at the record turnout of faithful Republicans. The audience heard Gov. John Reed, we note approvingly, staunchly defend the difficult budget he has tendered the legislature; it heard Mr. Fred Scribner pay his respects to the administration now in power. There were other addresses and a number of salutations and recognitions and so forth.

There was also another speech, abbreviated by the lateness of the hour, delivered by an officeholder whose success at the polls, while not an accident, was still not contrived or encouraged by the party apparatus. Yet while U.S. Representative STANLEY TUPPER, of the new First District, does not bear the blessing of the Maine GOP oligarchy, he offered advice from a background of hard personnel experience and astute observation that the party would do well to heed.

Representative TUPPER enjoys the fairly remarkable distinction of taking a count of nine on the canvas as the result of a reshuffling of congressional district seats, and then by a series of the sort of events that makes politics so fascinating, vaulting securely into the House of Representatives.

This is not quite in line with the accepted technique of succeeding in politics. But he does share with others who have overcome vicissitudes of a Lincolnesque character the conviction that for parties and political candidates to succeed, they must stand for something. Representative TUPPER stands for something in contrast to being against almost everything. He fears, as he said Saturday night, that his party will suffer unless it adopts, on the State and the national level, too, a positive approach to public questions keyed to the people's genuine needs and aspirations.

The Congressman feels, in addition, that adoption of a constructive attitude will help Republicans build their strength among three significant groups—young voters, the exemplars of intellectual thought in our schools and colleges and universities, and the ranks of the workers.

These three groups are now heavily impregnated by Democratic doctrine, and for very good reasons. Whatever one may think of the New Frontier and other accompaniments of this administration at Washington, the Democratic Party is activist and strongly populist. It wants to move, it wants to

solve problems, it is intuitively keyed to what people seek in the way of social welfare, and it has won the allegiance of working people and racial and religious minorities.

But a good many Republicans, Representative TUPPER among them, also share these concerns. With another election hardly 18 months away it will profit Maine Republicans to heed their First District Congressman's advice.

Court of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the local community newspapers of our country provide a yeoman service in directing the attention of their readers at the truly grassroots level of America to issues and proposals which are of paramount importance. Recently, the Illinois General Assembly, now in session, debated three resolutions described as States' rights measures, including one to set up a court of the Union.

The interest in this proposal is nationwide, and as an indication of grassroots sentiment, I place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the February 7 edition of the Chicago Heights Star, dealing with this vital and provocative subject:

PROPOSED COURT OF THE UNION

One of three States rights resolutions introduced in the general assembly by Representative Warren Wood, of Plainfield, calls for setting up a court of the Union. Similar resolutions seeking an amendment to the U.S. Constitution on the subject are being introduced in other legislatures throughout the Nation.

Principal purpose of the new court would be to review actions in which the Federal Supreme Court is deemed to have usurped the right of the States to govern themselves. The manner of convening the court—upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary—and the provision that concurrence by a majority of the entire court be required to reverse a decision would tend to discourage capricious maneuvers. Perhaps a greater deterrent is desirable.

The court of the Union would be made up of the chief justices of the supreme courts in the various States. Three-quarters of them would comprise a quorum, but the necessary majority concurrence would be based on the maximum of 50.

We do not expect the court of this type will be established in the near future, and we doubt that its most enthusiastic petitioners entertain serious hopes for immediate success.

However, consideration of some such checkrein on the Nation's highest tribunal is not without merit.

It is possible that some future Chief Executive might be able to fill enough Supreme Court vacancies to make that august body an instrument for centralizing virtually all authority in Washington. Or the Court could invade the field of legislation by the very manner in which its opinions were worded.

Such extremes are not particularly probable, but if the time should arrive it would be expedient to have at least the threat of some other court of last resort. The resolution introduced in the State legislatures serves notice that a safeguard against whimsical interpretations of the Constitution may be within reach.

Texas Manufacturers Association Prefers Baker-Herlong Approach to Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of our people are concerned with the haphazard and hurriedly drawn tax proposals submitted by President Kennedy. My mail indicates that people in every walk of life are overwhelmingly opposed to the President's tax program. The following resolution passed by the Texas Manufacturers Association points out the inadequacies of the President's program and supports, instead, the Baker-Herlong approach which I have had the privilege to cosponsor:

RESOLUTION ON TAXATION

The President has recommended to the Congress that the Internal Revenue Act be amended. His proposal would reduce rates on personal and corporate income taxes. The loss in revenue as a result of these reductions would be overcome, in part, by closing loopholes, eliminating established deductions, and otherwise closing escape gaps in the present law.

In the same message, the President proposed that expenditures be reduced, but failed to indicate how this was to be accomplished. On the other hand, in other sections of his report, he did recommend increases in appropriations. The net result of this is another and larger deficit, estimated variously from $11 billion to $16 billion.

Business economists do not believe the tax program as proposed would provide the alleged incentive for long-range economic growth and industrial expansion.

On the other hand, many economists and business executives believe that the Herlong-Baker tax reform bill pending in the Congress would, if enacted into law, provide these incentives for at least a decade.

The Herlong-Baker tax reform bill is not a new, nor hurriedly conceived, approach to our Nation's tax problem. It was initially introduced in the middle fifties. It has been revised and reintroduced at intervals since conception, but remains essentially the same.

The Herlong-Baker bill is not so drastic in its immediate impact. Its program of tax reduction would be spread over a longer period of time (5 years) and, therefore, would not create the large deficit in the next fiscal year.

The Herlong-Baker bill would provide the tax relief in areas that would result in creating more investment capital essential to growth and expansion, as well as in other areas.

The bill would do more to encourage Federal economy than the announced administration program, because it links tax reduction to Federal spending after the first 2 years.

The Herlong-Baker bill is premised on a recognized and accepted principle among the business community that the best stimulus for economic growth is the availability of funds for investment in job-making enterprises rather than upon the Keynesian theory that economic growth stems only from increased consumer spending, which may be from existing consumers only. The investment principle creates more consumers; and, therefore, in the end serves the purpose of creating more consumption, broader markets, while providing incentives for growth, whereas the Keynesian, consumer only, approach may not result in creating any new jobs at all.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Texas Manufacturers Association respectfully urges the Texas delegation in the National Congress to utilize their every influence to secure the enactment into law of the Herlong-Baker tax reform bill.

Witness our hands at Dallas, Tex., this the 25th day of January 1963.

RICHARD E. WHITE,
President.

Attest:

ED C. BURRIS,
Secretary.

Cynicism and the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News under date of January 21, 1963:

CYNICISM AND THE AGED

For 2 years now, the Kerr-Mills Act has been providing funds for medical care for the aged under a State-Federal program. Now, it seems, the Social Security Administration is quietly putting the brakes on the program as a means of promoting the administration's medicare program.

In a 15-page report on its activities, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plugged medicare, but generally ignored the fact that the number of aged who received benefits under Kerr-Mills had risen from 46,000 in 1961 to 101,000 in 1962.

The official line is still that there is no help for the aged indigent when they become ill, and that the only answer is to provide certain kinds of medical payments under the social security system.

John Troan of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, reported that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was too busy to supply personnel to help the American Hospital Association organize action to improve Kerr-Mills benefits, and to secure enactment of laws that would extend the program to 25 States and the District of Columbia, not now covered.

The question arises: Is HEW really concerned about the medical needs of the aged when it neglects to extend what help is now available for the political purpose of promoting a substitute program favored by the administration? Or is HEW callously dragging its feet, ignoring a law that Congress enacted giving HEW responsibility for helping the elderly with their medical needs?

Medicare is a strange proposal, which would tax some citizens to pay the medical bills for some specific other citizens, who

have made no contribution to social security for this purpose. It would pay some medical expenses, but not others, and would confer charity on those who need it and those who do not need it alike.

Kerr-Mills can be challenged on the grounds that medical care for the indigent always has been available, and Federal programs are not needed. But at least it contains none of the rank discrimination against some taxpayers, and does not pay bills for those able to pay their own.

Kerr-Mills is the law. HEW is obligated to administer it, not sabotage it.

Golf in San Diego, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, my membership in this House spans only a little more than 6 weeks. But in conversations with many colleagues—and mostly by listening—I have become aware of a consuming interest among them which transcends political lines.

I refer to their widespread passion for the game of golf.

These Members will be interested, I feel certain, in the views of a prominent golf course architect, Eddie Ault, of Washington, D.C., following a trip he made to a convention of golf course superintendents held in my home city of San Diego, Calif. For an account of Mr. Ault's observations we are indebted to the sports section of the Washington Post for Saturday, February 23.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert that article into the RECORD, together with an invitation to my golfing colleagues to include San Diego in future vacation plans. It seems unnecessary to add that the game is played there in all seasons of the year.

The article follows:

WITH TREE-LINED FAIRWAYS WEST COAST SETS STYLE IN TIGHTER GOLF COURSES

(By Maury Fitzgerald)

Washington's Golf Course Architect Eddie Ault played 18 courses in California and one in Mexico on a recent trip to the National Golf Course Superintendent's meeting at San Diego and was amazed at the compactness of most west coast courses.

Ault said most courses designed in Washington, New York and other cities recommended 140 acres as a minimum, but in California, because of the extreme value of the land, most courses near metropolitan areas are limited to 95 and 100 acres. Ault said that fairways are narrow and tree lined. Some of the fairways measure only 20 yards from rough to rough.

Ault, who designed such fine courses as Baltimore's Turf Valley and Island View near Sterling, Va., pointed out that most fairways in this part of the country are 40 to 60 yards in width.

Cottonwood and eucalyptus trees are used to line the fairways on most of the California courses. The heavy growth of trees is used primarily to protect closely paralleling fairways. The trees leave an impression the courses are larger than they really are.

Ault said the most impressive course he visited was Torrey Pines Country Club near LaJolla. This course, only a short hop from San Diego, is built high above the Pacific and resembles famed Pebble Beach.

"Torrey Pines," Ault said, "is not one of the smaller courses by any means. It is a real championship course, and, in time, will probably rate alongside such California beauties as Pebble Beach and Cypress Point."

Torrey Pines was the site of a challenge match with Sam Snead and Doug Sanders playing Arnold Palmer and Gary Player. The match is to be televised Sunday, March 3.

Another course that impressed Ault was the Tijuana public links in Mexico. It is a 20-minute drive from San Diego and 90 percent of the players there come from California.

Golf on the west coast is mushrooming. In San Diego alone, Ault says 12 new courses were completed in the last 2 years and 12 more are under construction. Newest course in San Diego is the Bonita Golf Club, built on 105 acres.

Ault said the San Diego area gives a golfer a greater variety of courses than any other section of the country. "Out there," Ault points out, "you can play in the mountains, in a valley, by the seaside or on the desert without having to drive a great distance from the city."

Mayor Goodman of Baltimore Supports Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Mayor Goodman, of Baltimore, is supporting the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. A recent article in the Baltimore Sun reported that the city of Baltimore was ready to participate in this program.

I would like to include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MAYOR BACKS YOUTH PLAN—FIFTY-FIVE THOUSAND JOBS WOULD STEM FROM DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROPOSAL

Mayor Goodman yesterday urged the Maryland delegation to Congress to give full support to President Kennedy's proposed Youth Conservation Corps.

He said he hoped Baltimore could be the first city to participate.

On Thursday, the President sent a special message to Congress proposing the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to put young men to work improving the Nation's forests and recreation areas. This would provide employment for about 15,000 youths.

GOVERNMENT AID

As a second phase of the programs, the Government would provide "half the wages and related costs for young persons employed on local projects that offer useful work experience in nonprofit community services * * * such as hospital, schools, parks, and settlement houses."

The President said 40,000 youths could be employed the first year in that part of the program. For the first year, the program would cost about $100 million.

FOR THE UNWANTED

President Kennedy said there was a need for the Youth Conservation Corps because unemployment among young workers is two and a half times the national average. During the 1960's, an estimated total of 7,500,000 students will drop out of school and enter the labor market unprepared for any work except as laborers.

The new program would be designed for the "unemployed, the unskilled, the unwanted."

Mayor Goodman said yesterday that "idle youth on our city streets create a host of problems." He pointed out that the child population is increasing and, at the same time, a larger proportion of that population is getting into trouble."

The mayor said he is assigning his assistant, Stanley Z. Mazer, to the development of the city's participation if the President's Youth Employment Opportunity Act is passed. The act includes provisions for the Youth Conservation Corps.

COORDINATION UNDERWAY

Mr. Mazer assumed the job last month of coordinating programs of "human renewal." He spent 2 days in Washington last week talking to members of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Mayor Goodman said: "I fully agree with the President that the Youth Employment Opportunities Act will give many thousands of currently unemployed young people a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services and to acquire skills and work experience. It will give them a solid start in their work life."

Mr. Kennedy Contradicts His Own Economic Thesis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Providence Evening Bulletin on January 22 pointed up the degree to which President Kennedy contradicts his own economic theories. In an editorial, the Bulletin said:

President Kennedy continues to contradict his own arguments as he trips over the fundamental illogic of a deficit budget that calls for reducing revenues while spending is increasing.

Repeating the assurances which he gave in his state of the Union and budget messages, the President declared in his economic report Monday that he does not fear a recession in 1964. "The decade ahead presents a most favorable gathering of forces for economic progress," Mr. Kennedy said. "I do not expect a fifth postwar recession to interrupt our progress. We approach the issue of tax revision, not in an atmosphere of haste and panic brought on by recession, but in a period of relative calm."

Having thus firmly disposed of recession fears, the President proceeded to resurrect this specter, warning:

"If we were to slide into recession through failure to act on taxes, the cash deficit for next year would be larger without the tax reduction than the estimated deficit with tax reduction."

Well, which is it, Mr. President? Shall we appraise your $11.9 billion deficit budget in the light of your assurance that recession is behind us? Or shall we be panicked into accepting rash tax cut proposals because if we don't, a recession may drive us even deeper into debt?

The President can't argue it both ways, any more than he can argue on the one hand that now is the time to cut taxes "when no military crisis strains our resources," and on the other hand call for record peacetime military outlays, as he has done in his earlier messages.

The fact is, as the President's military budget so eloquently argues, we are in a period of crisis that puts a heavy drain on our national resources. Barring a serious recession which would call for emergency measures, we cannot at this time afford a drastic tax cut. In his economic report, the President again has denied that such a recession is here or is in sight.

It is characteristic of the curious logic that the President has employed in boosting his tax proposals that he has suggested reducing revenues, rather than cutting expenditures as a means of minimizing the deficit. Indeed, having expressed his concern that the 1964 deficit might be even larger than estimated, the President went on to suggest new spending—for transportation, jobless pay and education.

Finally, the President who once told his fellow Americans to "ask not what America can do for you," and who warned this Nation's enemies that we would "pay any price, bear any burden * * * to assure the survival * * * of liberty, now tells the world:

"The citizen serves his country's interest by supporting income tax reductions."

God save America!

Fifteenth Anniversary of Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed another milestone in the history of the Soviet Russian colonial empire. Yesterday marked the 15th anniversary of the takeover of Czechoslovakia by the Communists. They remain in control today, backed as always by Russian troops.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America continues to keep alive the spirit of Czech freedom for Americans with their heritage in Czechoslovakia and others throughout the free world who share their concern over the plight of the people in Czechoslovakia.

The council has called attention to the tragic situation in which unreasonably heavy duties are placed on packages sent from America to Czech people. For example, the council reports that there is a duty of 50 crowns—approximately $7—on a kilo of used clothing, about 2.2 pounds. This duty of 50 crowns is in a society where the average office worker receives 6 crowns an hour and farmworkers as little as 12 crowns a day.

The council asks why American authorities allow this blackmail to continue, for it is a pure and simple device to secure American dollars for use in international trade.

Indeed, many in this country wonder about the present policies toward all the captive nations in the Soviet colonial empire. What is behind the reluctance and even opposition to congressional resolutions to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations? What is behind the weak proclamations during Captive Nations Week? Why are we afraid to assert ourselves in our position as leader of the free world?

Many of us in the Congress hope that the executive branch will move ahead in this field. It is the executive that is charged with foreign policy, but it becomes increasingly apparent that foreign policy toward the captive nations question is being handled with no more ability than our foreign relations with Canada, Portugal, Britain, and other old friends.

On this occasion, when we mark the Czech people's 15th year under Communist rule, we all hope that future U.S. actions will inspire the Czech people and the peoples of all the captive nations to continue their opposition to Russian communism. We hope they can find in our foreign policies some ray of hope and encouragement for their cause. We hope they will continue to find reason to believe that this Nation—now and in the future—believes that the people of each country on the earth should be allowed free and open elections and determination of their own destiny.

Medicare Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, once again the administration has submitted its plan to bring hospital care under social security for people over 65. Dr. L. Q. Pang, of Honolulu, has sent me a copy of a letter which he has sent to his patients explaining the content of this measure. Considering the President's latest proposal, I hope those who want to really understand this program and its possible effects will read Dr. Pang's letter:

To: All my patients and friends.

From: L. Q. Pang, M.D.

I have been greatly disturbed by all the untrue statements made by politicians about medicare for the aged under social security. After spending some time explaining the facts to some of my patients, their immediate reaction was one of despair. Some of the typical statements have been. "Why don't they tell us all these facts? I think you doctors should explain to your patients about the bad and dangerous features of this bill." I don't have the time to spend 20 to 30 minutes explaining this bill to every patient, so I am taking this opportunity to explain to each and every one of you by mail. I hope that you will take time to read this because it will affect everyone and your pocketbook.

First, let me emphasize to you that I am in favor of medical aid to the aged but only under the proper method and sound financing. Medicare under social security definitely is not the proper method and the financing is not sound. This, I will explain later in this letter.

At present, there are two existing Federal laws providing medical care for the elderly:

1. Old age assistance which pays every cent of doctors' fees, drugs, hospital and medical cost for 2½ million aged persons who are not self-supporting. Some 1,300 persons each month in Hawaii receive help under this program.

2. The Kerr-Mills assistance bill takes care of elderly persons of modest income who are self-supporting but cannot pay their medical bills. Hawaii has an excellent Kerr-Mills program functioning. In the past fiscal year, 765 elderly persons in Hawaii received Kerr-Mills medical aid. This leaves a large group of people with modest income who are not eligible for old-age or Kerr-Mills aid and who may need help toward their medical expenses.

The administration proposes to take care of the medical problem of the aged by taxing all workers under social security, their employers, and the self-employed so as to pay a small portion of the medical expenses of the aged, 65 years and over, regardless of whether they need it or not. The social security taxes would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent on employees and a like amount on employers. In addition, maximum wages against which the tax would apply would be increased to $5,200 (now $4,800).

This plan offers the following: (1) 90 days of hospitalization per illness toward which the patient pays $10 per day for 9 days or a minimum of $20 and a maximum of $90; (2) 180 days in hospital-affiliated nursing homes; (3) 240 home health visits per year; (4) plus outpatient diagnostic service toward which patients pay $20 per study.

Note that this plan does not pay for physician's and surgeon's care, private nursing services, physical therapy, and related services except those customarily provided in a hospital. It does not provide diagnostic and preventive services except outpatient services.

You can readily see that the benefits offered are very meager. It would cover only 20 to 30 percent of the total cost per illness. For example, a person who had an appendectomy would have to pay $50 to $70 for 5 to 7 days of hospitalization and $150 to $200 for the surgeon's fee—a total of $200 to $270. And that is only for that one illness. Suppose that patient gets sick again that year. With that $200 to $270, one could get a wonderful ordinary medical plan plus a major medical expense policy which would pay nearly all one's medical expense per year.

Furthermore, there is some difference of opinion as to what the administration's plan would cost. The social planners say that the plan will cost a little over $1 billion for the first year. The private insurance companies which have years of experience in medical insurance say that the plan will cost over $2½ billion the first year and will reach $4 to $5 billion per year in 2 years.

Who will have to pay for the increased cost? You and your children and grandchildren. How? By an increase in the social security rate. Eventually the social security will extract 10 percent of the worker's wages to pay for this program. (Belgium 16 percent, France 19½ percent, Germany 23.6 percent.) The social security tax will eventually be greater than the Federal income tax you pay.

Why should the young people be burdened by this extra tax at a period when they need all their dollars—worth only about 60 cents—to take care of their present needs and the expense of caring for and educating their children? The taxes already are too high. The net result is that everyone will have to turn more and more to the Federal Government for help. And if that continues, we will eventually wind up as a socialistic state (a cousin of communism).

But the thing that alarms me most and scares the daylights out of any thinking per-

son is the report on the social security system appearing in the July 2, 1962, issue of the U.S. News & World Report (I have several copies in my office which I can show you), which shows that our social security system is already in jeopardy. The present social security fund is now facing a deficit of $320 billion—more than the entire Federal debt incurred mainly in three wars. Someone will have to pay for this deficit. Who? You. And your children and your grandchildren and great-grandchildren. It would be a shame when you reach the age of 65 years and find that the social security fund you expected to draw is nil or practically worthless. If the social security system is already in a deficit, why should we add another burden on it with medicare for the aged? It will be the story of the last straw which broke the camel's back. If we don't watch out, we will wake up one day and find out that the savings in social security we had been expecting to use when we reach 65 years of age is gone or reduced substantially. To make up for it, the Government may have to either abandon the project or make up the deficit by again increasing the rate. More weight on you and your children and your children's children to bear. When I explained this to several oldsters, they exclaimed, "My gosh. I don't want anything to do with the plan and hurt my children and grandchildren."

Can we prevent this from happening? The answer is "Yes." How? By sending to Congress men who understand fiscal (money) responsibility and who will vote against medicare under the social security system. We should never risk our retirement funds by adding on a burden that is an unknown amount.

There are many other reasons why the administration's plan is bad. They are as follows:

1. It provides medical benefits for those who need no help. Why should you pay for a Rockefeller or a Henry Ford?

2. It puts the burden of costs solely on wage earners and employers, regardless of their income or ability to pay. A laborer making $5,000 a year would pay as much tax as a rich man making $50,000 to $100,000 a year. Even the blind, the handicapped, the domestic worker or part-time student worker would be taxed to pay for health care of the well-to-do.

3. It only pays a limited part of the expenses (20 to 30 percent).

You might then ask, "Are there any other or better methods of financing the health care of the aged?" The answer is "Yes." There are many other bills and proposals in Congress right now that are being reviewed. Our own Senator HIRAM FONG has introduced a plan in Congress that will provide a health insurance plan financed from the general funds that would cover the entire cost of diagnostic and preventive services and short-term illness and 80 percent of the costs of any long-term major or catastrophic illness. There are also other plans. Sooner or later, there will be an incorporation of all these plans and we can expect a plan that will really cover the medical expenses of the aged.

One patient asked me, "Why is the Kennedy administration so in a hurry to try and pass this program against the wishes of the majority of the people?" I don't know the real answer, but I suspect that it is to pay back a political debt and for political expediency to get the votes of the 16 million oldsters. To me, to play politics with the health of these older people is plain lousy and to drill them into thinking that their medical needs will be adequately taken care of by this method is a cruel hoax.

I apologize for the length of this letter, but it is the only way I can fully explain this matter to you. Remember, we must stop this mad and foolhardy plan. The only way we can do it is to vote for men to represent us in Congress who will vote against the administration's plan.

In the Name of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, Thursday, February 21, 1963, regarding the need for a Federal Department of Facts.

Mr. George Kelly, editor of the editorial page of the Johnson City Press-Chronicle and one of the outstanding editorial writers of the Nation, presents a very fine suggestion in the creation of a Department of Facts. I thought that his editorial should be made available to the other Members of Congress and to all of the people. Carl A. Jones and the members of his staff are to be commended for the fine newspaper they are publishing.

The editorial follows:

[From the Press-Chronicle, Johnson City, Tenn., Feb. 21, 1963]

IN THE NAME OF TRUTH

Goodness knows, the Federal Government is too big.

The Press-Chronicle believes it could be cut down several sizes without affecting any essential service.

Usually we take the dimmest of views when it is proposed that a new agency or bureau be added. However, we admit that there are exceptions. One occurs now, the suggestion of someone that the Government needs a new department—a department of facts.

At first blush, that sounds like gobbledygook, but it intrigues us.

The idea comes from the experience of labor and management in the steel industry. After the long strike in that industry in 1959, a human relations committee was established with both labor and company officials participating. Skeptics forecast a short life for it, but it has confounded them.

It devotes itself to finding a basis for mutual understanding of many complex problems, such as what the real cost is of company medical insurance and how certain work rules affect worker efficiency and company output.

According to the Wall Street Journal, this committee has had important success in developing a body of agreed, accepted facts in many controversial matters.

The industry's new approach, a cooperative search for solid information instead of an emotional hollering contest at contract time, deserves to be applied in many sectors of public life.

The Federal budget is one. It is perennially a storm center of political controversy.

Countless politicians, eager to be heard by their constituents, tend to engulf the budget dispute in a fog of misstatement and misunderstanding.

Congressmen do not tinker much with the defense and space budgets. They can gesture patriotically against a backdrop of these astronomical figures, not troubling to mention that their own States and districts are often prime beneficiaries.

The rest of the budget can be heavily assaulted. By any fair measure it keeps getting bigger, and so does the number of Federal employees.

But seldom do the lawmakers—and the general voting public—have a reasonable understanding as to how much of this growth, if any, is justified and how much is not.

A Congressman asserts that Agriculture Department is adding hundreds of new people to "spy on farmers." Agriculture replies that its additional people are meat inspectors and forest service workers, needed to police rising number of meat plants and to watch over national parks increasingly flooded with visitors.

Now either this is so or it is not. The truth is ascertainable. And we ought to have some kind of impartial, responsible joint Government group which can lay the facts on the line.

Politics is never going to stop at the Budget Bureau's door, nor should it. But at least we ought to take out the debating arena that kind of wild-flailing argument which is grounded in misinformation and ignorance.

So how about a department of facts?

Where To Find Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement by one of the most successful men in this country, Samuel Goldwyn.

Many people today in our education system constantly talk about security. I am sure that Mr. Goldwyn's statement is indicative of the success of America. Our country was built by the spirit of Samuel Goldwyn and other men of the same courage and convictions. The teaching of this philosophy in our schools and our society would do more to continue the building of America than anything I know.

The statement follows:

WHERE TO FIND SECURITY

(By Samuel Goldwyn)

"Self-trust is the first secret of success."—EMERSON.

People are always looking for security, as they have been doing since time immemorial.

Security is a wonderful thing—but where do you find it?

A long, long time ago I concluded that when you looked to someone else for it you were looking in the wrong direction. The greatest security a person can have comes from within himself, not from the outside. Nothing anyone can do for you can begin to match what you can do for yourself.

Fifty years ago I gave up the security of an extremely well paying job to enter an entirely new and different field, because I believed in what I wanted to do and in my own ability to do it. In that half century, I have given everything I had inside me to making motion pictures, and as it turned out, it has paid off in inner and external security of a most real kind.

Suppose I had failed? Well, I think it would still have been the correct move. Sooner or later I would have found my right path in life and it is only by daring to fail that one builds the courage and ability to succeed later on.

If you give to your work—whatever it may be—every bit of your enthusiasm, talent, energy, and determination you will find an inner strength and security that can never be taken away from you. You will also find something you can enjoy now and every day of your life, instead of waiting for some far-off future.

That is why my advice to young people is: "Don't dream about security—make it for yourself, out of yourself. Dare to believe in yourself—and act accordingly. If you do, both your present and your future are secure."

Significant Goal of St. Mary's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my alma mater, St. Mary's College, in California is celebrating its centennial year. This school has traditionally focused on the liberal arts and this is reflected in its centennial year theme, which is "The Liberal Arts: Language of Free Men."

The achievements of this great educational institution in meeting the challenges of our times through its liberal arts curriculum, has been highlighted in an editorial in the Morning News of San Leandro, Calif.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following most significant editorial:

SIGNIFICANT GOAL OF ST. MARY'S

In Moraga Valley, among the rolling foothills of Contra Costa County, lies St. Mary's College, which this year is celebrating its centennial.

It is a small college when compared to our great State universities. But it has issued a call to all thoughtful men on the occasion of its hundredth birthday and is attracting national and international attention through its curriculum in the liberal arts.

The college has chosen as its centennial theme: "The Liberal Arts: Language of Free Men."

St. Mary's College includes, as part of the required curriculum, world classics seminars which consist in the close reading and free discussion of the original writings of the world's greatest thinkers. In addition, St. Mary's is helping to set the pace in the United States by being one of the few colleges that has an experimental integrated liberal arts curriculum in the classic tradition, teaching select students to discover from original sources the relationship between all fields of knowledge as well as fulfill a major in a specific discipline.

St. Mary's College is building a bridge of understanding between science and the humanities. Its graduates become leaders better able to communicate with all groups of a society in danger of becoming so specialized that the learned in one field are incapable of understanding those of another.

This particular college and others devoted to the liberal disciplines are important to us all in the struggle for understanding and brotherhood.

Science studied in isolation can and does flourish in dictatorships, in totalitarian regimes. But liberal arts—never. Totalitarianism depends upon narrow education. A liberal arts curriculum helps achieve an appreciation of the most important and abiding values of Western civilization.

If only a few institutions of higher learning develop their own curricula along similar lines, the impact upon America's future and the future of civilized man will be significant.

Powell, the Official Favorite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, as a body, has been under continual criticism in the press, partly motivated by the abdication of congressional powers to the executive branch and the other motivation being the official and unofficial activities of individual Members.

There has been much written and discussed about the policies and behavior of the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In a prepared statement the other day, the gentleman from New York attempted to rebut the charges leveled against him in the other body by the Senator from Delaware, and in addition, he attempted to answer all of his critics by accusing them of racial prejudice.

Obviously, this personal whitewash attempt is difficult to reconcile with the official records. The political factors revolving around the gentleman from New York and his prestige have been thoroughly discussed throughout the country. The Congress has an obligation to provide its effectiveness and one of the ways that this can be accomplished is by proper behavior on the part of all of its Members.

The entire subject matter to which I refer has been effectively discussed in the news media, and a brief, concise, and clear presentation appeared in the Chicago Daily News of February 7, which I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point:

POWELL, THE OFFICIAL FAVORITE

Except at election time, Congressmen generally band together for the protection of the system and their perquisites under it. It is rare indeed, therefore, that one attacks another with the outraged fury that Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, turned on Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York.

It is almost as rare that such a deservedly fiery denunciation of a Congressman also becomes an indictment of the administration. As a Negro leader, POWELL enjoys enormous political power, and he exploits it shamelessly.

His foreign junkets at taxpayers' expense have been well publicized, but Senator WILLIAMS produced new evidence even more scandalous, since they involve administrative favors. He noted, for instance, that the IRS continues to carry POWELL on its books as a delinquent in taxes, including fraud penalties, for 1949 through 1955, although he has been continuously employed in Congress at a handsome salary.

WILLIAMS said the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare placed at the disposal of POWELL $250,000 from funds appropriated to fight juvenile delinquency. In view of POWELL's record, this displays an astonishing confidence that he would make nonpolitical use of the money. At rates as low as 3.13 percent, POWELL and associates obtained Government loans to finance a housing development and to purchase hotels.

It is well that the public should be aware of these matters. WILLIAMS is too optimistic however, if he hopes to bring about the defeat of POWELL. This is not the first disclosure of his practices, but his continued popularity suggests that his constituents react with approval and envy, rather than resentment. We would have hoped that the Kennedy administration would take a broader view of the public interest.

Why Not Get Down to the Facts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial from one of America's finest newspapers, namely, the Tablet published in Brooklyn, N.Y.

This editorial from the issue of February 14 "Why Not Get Down to the Facts?" speaks for itself and is indicative of exactly what I have been talking about for a long time. I am certain if this were done everyone in this country would be much better off.

The editorial follows:

WHY NOT GET DOWN TO THE FACTS?

Anyone who has watched Secretary McNamara's televised effort to explain how the Red missile menace was dismantled in Cuba, and viewed and heard the other reports on the defensive—as opposed to offensive—weapons, and learned of the presence of thousands of Red troops in Cuba—must have been confused and bewildered.

How anyone could understand, or come to an optimistic conclusion, after watching the Pentagon drama, we don't know. Most of the aerial reconnaissance photographs taken before and after the missiles were, as alleged, carried home were difficult to understand. Many of the pictures were not clear; they were given far more credit for deciphering objects than the viewer could see. Pictures snapped at low levels were, to be sure, clear and revealing but there were too many close-up views of the missiles in place, and then endeavoring to compare them with an excess of far-away and fuzzy abandoned sites, proved nothing. There would have been some value if the camera used the same missile site, giving a before and after view.

But this is neither here nor there. The undenied fact is that the Soviet has 17,000 armed men 90 miles from American shores and large quantities of weapons including planes. What is the sense of describing these troops or the weapons as "defensive?" And even if so, what are they defending and against whom?

The precise number of Red troops in Cuba is not all important, neither is the offensive or defensive type of the very large quantity of arms. The point is that Moscow is transforming Cuba into a strong military base, irrespective of whether or not long-range

missile and IL-28 bombers have been hauled away. And it is important as to what the Soviet intends to do with the "defensive" weapons and the well-armed and well-disciplined combat forces on the island. Why are they there and for what purpose? Those are the important questions.

The most unreassuring thing about the whole business is the revelation of how dismally unfinished it is. We had the Soviet on the run, and now it is all too plain that we failed to run them all the way.

There was no apparent need for this failure. The Government was undoubtedly right to focus its attention on getting the known intermediate-range missiles out of Cuba, and the military diplomatic operation to that end was excellent. The partial blockade was accompanied by plain warnings of tougher action if the U.S. terms were not met.

But for that very reason the United States was in a perfect position to carry the exercise to its logical conclusion. It should have told Khrushchev to remove every last one of his soldiers and send in not so much as one more rifle, lest he risk the most serious consequences. Everything about the Soviet reactions in October argues that Khrushchev would have complied; indeed, how could he not have, smack up against the full array of U.S. military power?

Why was'nt it done? We suppose in part because of the same mental attitude which has so often bedeviled the United States in dealing with the Soviets, an attitude that in all fairness has been in evidence before as well as during this administration. It is a fear of pushing the enemy too far, of backing the bear into a corner from which it can escape only by attacking. The idea is always to give the Soviet a partial exit or some means of facesaving.

If that was the reason for not completing the job we must confess it has made our present situation much more difficult. Now our risk is great and we have lost the psychological advantage which we enjoyed last fall.

Dallas Mortgage Bankers Oppose President Kennedy's Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Members of Congress informed as to the attitude of important segments of our population concerning the President's tax proposal, I am including as a part of these remarks a resolution passed by the Dallas Mortgage Bankers Association at Dallas, Tex.:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DALLAS MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION ON FEBRUARY 11, 1963

Whereas the President's proposed tax program will provide for tax reduction to the American taxpayer, and

Whereas this program will now further provide for tax reforms which include the following:

1. A taxpayer who itemizes his deductions will be able to deduct these expenses only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of his adjusted gross income.

2. Taxation of the appreciated value of property at death or when transferred as a gift.

3. Proposal to tax as ordinary income the gain on the sale of real estate held for investment or used in trade or business to the extent of depreciation taken.

Whereas the proposed tax program provides for reductions in base tax rates, the American citizen will lose his encouragement to own his home that results from his right to deduct taxes and interest before computing his income tax (except deductions exceeding 5 percent of his adjusted gross income). Likewise, the good citizen who contributes generously to his church, charitable organizations, and the like would similarly be penalized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the Dallas Mortgage Bankers Association protest these changes to the present tax regulations which would penalize the American homeowners and property owners.

The Success Story of Tobacco Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly during the past 2 years, the administration has pointed to tobacco and cotton as success stories in supply management. Cotton is now in the worst fix in its long history, and a recent report by U.S. Department of Agriculture economists raises considerable doubt as to the success of supply management of tobacco.

The artificial stimulus of Government control has had harmful effects on American tobacco quality, not only since the introduction of the new chemical—MH-30—but in previous years as well. Police-State controls, such as have been commonplace in tobacco for many years, put the emphasis on volume production and as a result, quality suffers.

This is one of the reasons why American tobacco has not kept pace with the rest of the world in capturing its fair portion of world markets.

In tobacco as in other commodities, experience should suggest a return to the discipline of the marketplace as being best for producer and consumer alike.

The following article which appeared in the February 23 issue of the Washington Post is a remarkable commentary on the success story of supply management in tobacco:

SOME ODOR PRODUCED BY TOBACCO PROGRAM

(By Julius Duscha)

The Government's once highly touted tobacco program is starting to come apart like a roll-your-own cigarette.

Not only has there been an increase in surplus tobacco; Government policies have encouraged the production of poor-quality tobacco.

Per capita consumption of tobacco declined slightly in 1962 in the United States for the first time in 9 years.

The decrease is attributed by Department of Agriculture experts to poor-quality tobacco as much as to increasing concern over the effects of smoking on a person's health.

SUBSIDY PROGRAM BLAMED

These facts are documented in a highly unusual report quietly issued this week by the Agriculture Department, where for both political and economic reasons tobacco is an extremely touchy subject.

The report was prepared by a committee of seven Agriculture Department economists.

They bluntly concluded that Department subsidy programs are largely responsible for the poor-quality tobacco that is flooding the auction markets.

For more than 20 years tobacco production has been carefully controlled under the most rigid restrictions.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and many Members of Congress have frequently held up the tobacco program as an example of how surplus farm production can be controlled.

But in recent years tobacco farmers have been increasing their per-acre production to try to make more money in the face of rising costs.

More than 500,000 farms grow tobacco on tiny plots of only a few acres in 16 States. The principal tobacco States are North Carolina, Kentucky, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Connecticut.

The biggest tobacco State is North Carolina, which gets 70 percent of its cash from income from tobacco.

The chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, HAROLD D. COOLEY, is from North Carolina, and the Agriculture Department generally is exceedingly careful in what it says about the tobacco program to avoid antagonizing COOLEY.

To circumvent the acreage restrictions on tobacco, farmers have been planting their crops closer and pouring fertilizer on their land to get a greater yield from each acre.

In addition, farmers have been using a new chemical, maleic hydrazide, or MH-30, to inhibit the growth of suckers or unwanted sprouts on tobacco plants.

QUALITY IS AFFECTED

Before the chemical came into wide use farmers had to pinch off the sprouts. That is a slow, laborious and backbreaking job. It takes 32 hours to do this on a single acre of tobacco.

But, the Agriculture Department economists noted in their report, the chemical adversely affects the quality of the tobacco.

A spokesman for a major tobacco company said at a recent Agriculture Department hearing that "we * * * would not knowingly or willingly consider marketing a new cigarette which had a consumer acceptance level as low as that indicated for cigarettes made from a tobacco treated with maleic hydrazide."

Hospital Care for Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would authorize hospital care for Gold Star Mothers at Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is my feeling that it is our Government's obligation to care for those who have suffered in battle, and also for their dependents and survivors which they have left behind.

These brave mothers raised sons and daughters to be good citizens and to give their lives, if necessary, to defend this great country of ours. We ought to do

more for them than to pay honor and tribute on special holidays.

Many of these Gold Star Mothers are in need. My bill in permitting them to avail themselves of such medical care would not jeopardize the availability of facilities for the furnishing of hospital care to veterans.

The Agency That Isn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the executive branch of Government is operated in complete disregard for the intent of Congress in many fields, but certainly some of the most brazen actions of the Kennedy administration occur when it places programs into being before receiving congressional authorization or funds.

The latest example of this is in the creation of the so-called Domestic Peace Corps, which is evidently operating by Executive blessing without any official approval of the Congress.

This situation is very effectively and clearly presented by the Chicago Sun-Times' editorial of February 9, and I place it into the RECORD at this point, urging all Members of Congress who have interest and respect for their membership in an independent legislative body to give it careful attention.

The editorial follows:

THE AGENCY THAT ISN'T

If you should be in Washington with an overpowering urge to make a telephone call and you should happen to call DUnkirk 2-3961 (or you can call from here, the area code is 202; it will please Illinois Bell Telephone) you will be answered by a nice feminine voice advising you that you are connected with the Domestic Peace Corps. Should you ask for employment the pleasant voice will tell you to fill out Government standard form 57, found at any post office, and mail it in with a covering letter. The man in charge of the Domestic Peace Corps is Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who has two brothers somewhere in Government.

The strange thing about this telephone call is that you are talking to a Government agency that will accept your application for employment—but the agency does not exist. Congress has passed no legislation creating a Domestic Peace Corps.

But there it is. As large as life. Staffed with 25 people, all of whom are being paid. Equipped with telephones, desks, typewriters, paper, carbon paper, paper clips, waste baskets, in and out baskets and all the other necessities of a functioning office. Yet they do not exist. Someone is paying for all this. Someone is paying the rent on the third floor offices of the Domestic Peace Corps at 736 Jackson Place in Washington, D.C. They may not exist but payrolls are being met, fringe benefits honored and vacations being earned. And we'll warrant there are expense accounts being honored. But the Domestic Peace Corps doesn't exist, as a Government agency.

When the idea of a Domestic Peace Corps was first broached in December—it was called a "National Service Corps" at that time—this newspaper objected to the concept as an expensive ($10 million to start), unnecessary intrusion of Government into the daily functions and responsibilities of local communities. There is considerable feeling in both Houses of the Congress along the same lines.

The Domestic Peace Corps is not an agency of the Government; no enabling legislation has been offered. But in preparation for the day when it is offered there is an office, there are people, there is an organization chart, there are lobbyists—there is even a public relations program in force.

For an agency of the Government that doesn't even exist the Domestic Peace Corps shows remarkable signs of life. By the time the New Frontier gets around to offering legislation to make it legal it may be too strong to thwart, too strong to deny. Certainly it is a sterling example of New Frontier bureaucracy.

Birmingham Citizens Awarded Patriot Recognition Citations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, three outstanding citizens of my hometown of Birmingham, Ala., have just been awarded Vigilant Patriot Recognition Citations by the All-American Conference To Combat Communism. They are Mr. E. L. Holland, Jr., editor of the Birmingham News; Mrs. Margaret D. Sizemore, dean of women at Howard College; and Miss Marie Dick, a 13-year-old student at Woodlawn High School in Birmingham.

I insert herewith a copy of the article from the Birmingham News which gives the details of these awards and cites the reasons these three outstanding American citizens were selected for this honor.

We in Alabama are proud of these, our fellow citizens, and want the Nation to be aware of the contribution they have made to the effort to combat communism, our adversary:

EDITOR, EDUCATOR, STUDENT, WIN HONOR

E. L. Holland, jr., editorial page editor of the Birmingham News, a Birmingham educator and a ninth-grade student have been awarded Vigilant Patriot Recognition Citations by the All American Conference To Combat Communism.

Honored with Holland were Mrs. Margaret D. Sizemore, dean of women at Howard College, and Marie Dick.

The All-American Conference is supported by 45 national veterans, fraternal, civic, women's and youth organizations with a total of 50 million members.

An editorial series, "What Can I Do To Stop Communism," began in the News December 25, 1962, won the recognition for Holland.

Mrs. Sizemore was awarded a citation for her address, "Wake Me When It Is Over." It was the first in a series of lectures on the dangers of communism sponsored by the Business and Professional Men's Association of Homewood.

Marie Dick wrote an essay, "Communism: Its Growth and Threat to the Free World," which won her the national honor.

The 13-year-old girl won the top award in the junior division of the Birmingham News oratorical contest last year. She attends Woodlawn High School.

The first award in the 1962 VPR program was given to Jenkin L. Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, for his speech, "Who Is Tampering With the Soul of America?" Veterans of Foreign Wars also received special recognition.

Dandridge, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Friday, February 15, 1963, regarding Dandridge, Tenn.

Dandridge, Tenn., is the county seat of Jefferson County, one of the most beautiful and picturesque counties in all of the United States. The charming village of Dandridge located in eastern Tennessee is the only place named for the first President's wife, Martha Dandridge Washington.

The article follows:

HISTORY TREADS SOFTLY IN TENNESSEE—SMALL VILLAGE NAMED FOR FIRST "FIRST LADY"

(By Ashton Chapman)

Although nearly every State in the Union has a city or town—and sometimes a county as well—named Washington, this charming village on U.S. 70–25W in eastern Tennessee, 29 miles east of Knoxville, is the only place named for the first President's wife, Martha Dandridge Washington.

As early as 1783 families began coming down the valleys from Virginia and across the Great Smoky Mountains from North Carolina to settle in a bend of the French Broad River. When it was laid out in 1792, the name Dandridge, in honor of the first "First Lady," was chosen for their town by the residents.

SAVED BY APPEAL

The city of Washington, Pa., once bore the name Dandridge Town, in honor of Martha Dandridge Washington. She and the General were each given building lots by the city council, but the city's name was later changed to Washington. This left, in the entire county, only this picturesque Tennessee village to retain Martha's maiden name down through the years.

The town, with a present population of 830, owes its continued existence to action following an appeal made directly to the President when it was learned Dandridge would be covered by Douglas Lake, one of the Tennessee Valley Authority's chain of huge multiple-purpose reservoirs.

Of native stone and thousands of tons of earth, the restraining dike is not an unpleasing addition to the landscape of tree-clad hills looking toward the broad blue waters of the lake.

INQUIRIES MADE

Some of the homes in Dandridge, more than a century and a half old, are of sun-baked brick, others are of white-frame construction. Their wide front doors, street-facing dormers, massive gable-end chimneys, and other dignified architectural features resemble those found in some of the less

pretentious houses of Colonial Williamsburg, Va.

During the current 4-year observance of the Civil War centennial many visitors inquired about the Battle of Dandridge, a minor but strategically important engagement. The graves of Civil War soldiers and ones in the small Revolutionary War cemetery are carefully tended.

The courthouse is set amid ancient oaks. Dandridge has been the county seat ever since Jefferson County was designated in 1792 by William Blount while he was Governor, Superintendent of Indian Affairs of the territory south of the Ohio River. Later, Blount, a native North Carolinian, became prominent politically in Tennessee, and one of its counties bears his name.

The Dandridge Museum attracts visitors all through the year because of its rather extensive exhibits of Indian artifacts, pioneer implements and utensils, old firearms, Civil War relics, and well-preserved documents, letters, and newspapers.

Hanging in a prominent position is the license issued in 1806 by Jefferson County to David Crockett for his marriage to Polly Findlay.

About 10 miles west of Dandridge is the tiny community of Dumplin where a peace treaty was signed between the whites and the Cherokee Tribe. Dumplin was on the Great Indian Warpath, a route indicated by markers at various points in eastern Tennessee. This trail was used by the early settlers of Dandridge before there were any other roads in the area.

POWDER MILL SITE

Douglas Dam is only 9 miles from Dandridge via Tennessee Route 66. On this road, about 7 miles west of Dandridge, is the site of McSpadden's powder mill. Gunpowder made here was loaded on flatboats for the long, tortuous journey to New Orleans via the French Broad, Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers, arriving in time to be used by Gen. Andrew Jackson's forces in the Battle of New Orleans.

Blind Texas Girl Assumes Peace Corps Teaching Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star of February 20, 1963, published an article about an outstanding young Texas woman Peace Corps volunteer. Her name is Marilyn D. Brandt. She is from San Antonio, Tex., and has recently been appointed to a new Peace Corps project in the Dominican Republic.

She is blind and will teach the blind to read.

I ask unanimous consent that the article captioned "Blind Girl, 23, Starts Duty With Peace Corps," be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a source of inspiration to all who read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLIND GIRL, 23, STARTS DUTY WITH PEACE CORPS

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—A diminutive girl who didn't let blindness keep her from becoming a teacher is the Peace Corps' first blind volunteer.

She's Marilyn D. Brandt, 23. She arrived Sunday at Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic to begin her new job.

Officials in Washington announced yesterday she had been accepted by the Corps.

"It was kind of a hurry-up deal," her mother, Mrs. Day Brandt, said last night. "They needed somebody who could read and teach braille."

PARENTS BOTH TEACHERS

Marilyn's parents have been public school teachers for more than two decades. The father also is a rancher. San Antonio has been their home since their daughter was 6. She was born at New Braunfels, Tex.

As a child Marilyn had limited vision but glaucoma (hardening of the eyeballs) caused total blindness when she was 13.

"But it has never seemed to bother her," Mrs. Brandt said. "She was a good student, making all A's and B's in college, and she finished practice teaching for her certificate last spring."

Miss Brandt, who is just over 5 feet tall and weighs 100 pounds, was graduated from the Texas School for the Blind at Austin in 1957 and took a bachelor of science degree from Southwest Texas College at San Marcos. She was a member of the student senate and several honor fraternities.

WASHINGTON CALLS

In applying for the Peace Corps last summer, she cited knowledge of Spanish, special attention to English and social studies, plus her braille training.

A telephone call from Washington in October, before she completed a fall semester's work on her master's degree, advised that the Peace Corps had a job. She passed a test in San Antonio and reported for training at the Experiment in International Living at Putney, Vt.

Miss Brandt was one of 28 volunteers flown to Santo Domingo.

"We talked to her last Friday while she was in Puerto Rico but haven't heard from her since," the mother said. "She was real thrilled. I know she's going to have lots more to tell us."

Fifty Years of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, of February 25, 1963, entitled "Fifty Years of Taxes":

FIFTY YEARS OF TAXES

Today the Federal income tax is a half century old. It is remarkable to consider that the act of 1913 provided for a very simple tax formula: a 1-percent normal tax on incomes and a surtax on incomes of more than $20,000. The surtax was simple, also; it ranged from 1 percent on a $20,000 income to a maximum of 6 prcent on an income of $200,000.

By 1952 income taxes had reached the highest point ever in this country. The normal tax was 6 percent, and the surtax ranged from 22.2 percent on incomes below $2,000 to 92 percent on incomes over $200,000.

As the taxes have increased, the tax forms have proliferated. Perhaps it is ironic that in this golden anniversary year of the Federal income tax an accountant in Denver, working on his income tax, suddenly went berserk. He shot three policemen, almost caused a riot, and finally took to running about on rooftops, where he was captured.

Most taxpayers who wrestle each year with the tax forms would consider his conduct as almost normal. Other than the regrettable inflicting of superficial flesh wounds on three police officers, most taxpayers feel that a romp on a roof is par for the course after 2 hours with the income tax form.

Our Dim View of the Income-Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us have found out that almost everyone has an opinion on the President's proposed tax cut. No doubt this is because whatever changes are made will affect every adult in our country filing a tax return. I would like to share with my colleagues of the House an interesting and rather unique reaction to the President's recommendations which appeared in the Davison, Mich., Index of February 14. The editorial is as follows:

OUR DIM VIEW OF THE INCOME-TAX CUT

The Index may well be the last newspaper in America to have a comment on the income-tax revision that Mr. Kennedy is proposing. The other day a friend flattered us no end by asking us what we thought of it. That's a pretty heady thing, to be asked for an opinion, and we can resist no longer.

We haven't got very excited about the matter, for deep down we feel when all the dust is settled in Washington, we'll wind up with the same total tax bite as we have now. There is little indication of economy in Washington, and we'll pay the bill sooner or later, in one way or another.

First off, we think a tax cut should be made without tying it to the budget. This seems to contradict what we said in the previous paragraph, but there may be some greater restraint on Congress to spend if its income is first of all sliced. It's a chance, at least, and worth taking.

The provisions for cutting the top tax brackets from 91 percent down to 65 percent is long overdue. You can't expect the wealthy to risk capital, to start new enterprises, to invest money with hope of making profit when the Government takes 91 cents out of each dollar. The rate reductions could well go right down the line, but the top ones are the most distorted.

Just as a personal favor, we wish they'd stop yipping about closing the tax loopholes as though the perfectly legal deductions now in the law were something sinister. It's Washington's way of using the language to kid people. Instead of saying they're raising certain parts of your tax, they say they're closing loopholes, and expect nobody to have the nerve to object.

The Kennedy administration is 2 years old, and it is still promising to cut the income tax, which drains off more of the Nation's earnings in proportion than does the income tax of any other country in the world. Last summer, the President said the cuts would take effect January 1, this year; they'd be retroactive to that date when passed by the

Congress. Now the talk is that part of the proposed cuts will start July 1, 1963, and then some more July 1, 1964, for private taxpayers. Thus, even in 1964, you'd get the benefit of only half a year of the full cut. Corporations would wait until 1965 for the full benefits.

The carrot still dangles far in front of our nose. Almost too far to make our mouth water. If we ever catch up with the carrot, we fear it will be shriveled and tasteless.

When our friend asked us what we thought about the tax bill, we hope he wasn't looking for a cheeky answer.

Resolution by City Council of Trussville, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, herewith, a resolution adopted on February 12, 1963, by the City Council of the City of Trussville, Ala., on behalf of the citizens and taxpayers of that community. This resolution is commended to the careful study and attention of the Members of the House as it bears on a matter of great concern to people all over this country:

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Trussville, Ala., on behalf of our citizens and taxpayers, That the Congress of the United States be requested to do everything in its power to eliminate the needless and extravagant ways of some of its Members in pleasure junkets throughout the world, pertaining to unrelated domestic and international problems confronting this great Nation of ours;

Whereas this was brought about by unfavorable publicity, through our news media and broadcast throughout the world, of the activities of some of your colleagues with reference to family employment, transportation of private vehicles, and outright pleasure trips at the taxpayers' expense, as well as certain income tax privileges as are not enjoyed by the rank and file American citizen, at a time when we have the highest peacetime budget in the history of our great Nation; and

Whereas realizing full well that those who obtain high public office are pledged and privileged to serve and not to be served by any American citizen, we feel that gross advantage has been taken by some Members of the Congress of the United States in this regard; and

Whereas we further feel that such actions are derogatory, discriminatory, and unfair to the conscientious Congressmen and their colleagues in the Senate who have demonstrated without question their love and devotion to honest government without special privileges from the citizens of our great country; that these actions undermine the public confidence in these dedicated officials and will lead eventually to the downfall of our democratic way of life.

Therefore, we, the members of the City Council of the City of Trussville, Ala., request that every effort be made by the conscientious Members of our Senate and our Congress to eradicate now and forevermore these unearned liberties from the whim of the aforementioned irresponsible public servants.

Adopted this 12th day of February 1963.

JAMES W. BARR,
Mayor.

New Agricultural Cropland Conservation Program Inaugurated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday I had the distinct honor of participating in the first ceremony signing up the first farmer in the new agricultural cropland conversion program inaugurated.

Those of us living in this area of Pennsylvania welcome this development. We believe this program will live up to its promise of putting land to use other than continuing to harvest crops already in surplus production.

We see great possibilities for a tie-in to the proposed Youth Conservation Corps proposal. Working together we may be able to kill two birds with one stone—we can cut farm surplus while at the same time help the unemployed youth of our Nation to become assimilated into the work force of our Nation.

The details of the ceremony follow:

NEW AGRICULTURAL CROPLAND CONVERSION PROGRAM INAUGURATED

At a special ceremony held in the Westmoreland County Agricultural Stabilization Conservation Service office this morning, a new cropland conversion program which was authorized by Congress, as a part of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962, the first participating farmer in the Nation was signed up. This program is based on a new long-range concept of land use adjustment. Under the program, farmers who divert land from row crops and tame hay to pasture, farm forests, water storage facilities, wildlife habitat, or other recreational facilities will be eligible for adjustment payments and cost-share assistance in carrying out needed conservation practices.

The first farm, which was signed up both in the State and Nation at this special ceremony, was a farm operated by Jess A. Hays, Route No. 1, Acme, Pa. The farm contains a total of 189 acres of land, of which 101 is cropland that will be retired under the program. This land will be retired from production under a 10-year agreement for which Mr. Hays will receive adjustment payments totaling about $5,060.60. It is Mr. Hays' intention to convert the entire farm into recreational facilities, which might possibly consist of a lake for boating and fishing purposes, the establishment of a golf course, or other allied recreational facilities.

This program is part of a test program being conducted in the Nation with 5 counties in Pennsylvania being approved to operate the program in 1963, and 36 additional counties in 12 other States. The counties approved in Pennsylvania are Bedford, Fayette, Fulton, Somerset, and Westmoreland Counties. Since a major objective of the program is to divert agricultural cropland into nonagricultural uses, such as the development of recreational facilities, the five counties selected were approved because they are adjacent to the heavily populated sector of southwestern Pennsylvania where the need for additional recreational facilities is urgent. These counties were felt to be logical choices for the operation of this type program. The program also allows farmers to enjoy the benefits of supplemental income from the use of any recreational facilities established. Such additional income also makes a contribution to the prosperity of rural areas, and at the same time, provides our city people with outlets for recreational purposes.

Farmers desiring to participate in this program with the intention of converting agricultural cropland to recreational purposes, are also eligible to receive loans from the Farmers Home Administration, if funds are not available through regular commercial loan channels. An FHA representative is generally available in each county of the State.

Planned land-use adjustments and conservation practices needed under the conversion program, must be worked out in conjunction with plans developed with the Soil Conservation Service technician. The plan is a mutual agreement worked out by the farmer and the SCS technician.

The success and development of this test program will undoubtedly be studied closely by Congress in determining the future course of any long-range land-use adjustment program.

On hand to witness the first signup were Congressman John A. Dent, of Westmoreland County; Gardner Smith, deputy director of the Northeast Area ASCS office, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Earl S. Keim, judge of the Common Pleas Court; Howard R. Porter, chairman of the State ASC committee; Levi B. Silvis, chairman, Raymond Young, vice chairman, and Charles Kepple, regular member of the Westmoreland County ASC Committee; D. W. Rugh, soil conservation district director; Merril Watson, district FHA representative.

Coal's Role for the Future Bright—Its Present Problems Are Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal's Role for the Future Bright—Its Present Problems Are Great," which appeared in the February 14, 1963, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.:

COAL'S ROLE FOR THE FUTURE BRIGHT—ITS PRESENT PROBLEMS ARE GREAT

"America is poised on the threshold of a magnificent future. This future will make enormous demands upon the country's reserves of energy fuels. To help America experience its maximum potential, all the fossil fuels—especially coal—will be needed. The country cannot afford to risk its great promised future by neglecting its greatest natural energy resource—bitiminous coal."

The above quotation is the foreword of an interesting brochure just arrived from Na-

tional Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Washington, D.C., an organization which fends for coal in the national capital and whose work is of high consequence to Hopkins County and others in the field, State, and Nation which produce the black diamond.

"Coal—America's Primary Energy Fuel" is the title of the well arranged and handsomely printed booklet. It is devoted—and properly so—to the theme that coal, as a reasonably priced, always dependable energy fuel, made possible the industrial supremacy that we know and are proud of in America today.

But what is less well known, the work reminds the Nation, is that America's vast deposits of low cost coal for energy are its only hope of maintaining supremacy of productive capacity and a superior living standard in the world of tomorrow.

The brochure points out that this is a matter of simple economics. Coal, in contrast to other fuels, is still in almost inexhaustible supply, and the prospects are that it will be available at very reasonable prices for many years to come. And exciting new breakthroughs in the technology of coal transportation and carbochemistry now taking place mean that coal before many years can regain its place as the prime energy source of the Nation.

Always the cost of transporting coal has been a big factor in dictating the size of its sales territory and therefore the size of its work force (we toss this in on our own), but now, we are told by the authors of the brochure:

The costs of transporting coal's energy to market will be lower in the future because of at least three developments of recent years.

One is the unitized or integrated train, which will move great tonnages of coal as a unit and at passenger train schedules from mine to major market centers.

A second is the new ability to transmit coal-produced electricity at very high voltages from mine-mouth utility plants through electric distribution systems to large consumption centers.

A third, already successfully in operation, is the ability to transport coal, either as a semi-liquid slurry or pulverized and mixed with oil, through pipelines.

We are reminded, too, in this forecast of coal's future, that research now well underway also promises to create vast new markets for coal in the manufacture of gas and liquid fuels now produced from petroleum. Encouraging progress toward production of 100 octane gasoline from coal at a competitive cost has been reported, for example, and all these projects point up anew the fact that the coal industry is in an unusual position.

Coal has a bright future, but its present is perilous. Bituminous production currently is averaging around 420 million tons a year, and a market for perhaps twice this amount is predicted within the next two decades.

Yet, production has fallen from 631 million tons in 1947 to its present rate. And it is deemed essential that the industry operate at 500 million tons annually if plant and equipment are to be kept in satisfactory condition and if an adequate labor force is to be maintained.

Residual waste oil and other problems confronted by coal are discussed adequately in the Coal Policy Conference brochure, from which we will reprint the closing quotation, one from Standard & Poor's:

"The strength of the American economy is still importantly based upon coal. This mineral is still the principal fuel used in generating the tremendous quantities of low-cost electric power so necessary for industry, commerce and a high standard of personal living. It is an indispensable element in large-scale economic production of steel, cement and many chemicals. It is one of the few natural resources in which the United States is still a net exporter because of extensive research and comparatively cheap mining costs."

Coal, we will toss in on our own, is somewhat in the position of Mark Twain and the weather. Everybody complains about the weather, Twain once said, but nobody does anything about it. Similarly, everybody is aware of the poor deal which coal gets in the matter of Washington quotas of foreign waste oil, but nobody really does anything about it—except to increase at intervals the quota of waste oil permitted to be dumped on our shores.

The High Cost of Running the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from my longtime esteemed friend, from Red Oak, Iowa, Oscar Wenstrand, who like millions of others is deeply concerned about the high cost of running the Government.

He has set out a program which he feels we should follow, and since he is a keen student of government and politics, I desire to make it available to the broad list of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This happens to be the most comprehensive plan which has appeared in my mail, but I want to say to this House that my daily receipt of letters from pleaders all over the country is staggering.

They do not know where or how the budget can be cut, but they want it slashed considerably.

This is not the first time I have taken the floor to expound on economy, nor will it be the last. But when a sincere earnest man like Oscar Wenstrand writes me a thoughtful letter like the one following, I want everyone to have the advantage of his thinking:

MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOLDIERS AND SAILORS RELIEF COMMISSION,
Red Oak, Iowa, November 10, 1962.

HON. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, Ezra, Iowa

DEAR FRIEND BEN: Your letter of the 9th, a not of appreciation, came duly to hand. I called Connie but he wasn't in. Will convey your message to him later.

Since your reelection, I have been irresistably drawn back to the John Taber letter to you of date October 3 wherein he states: "It is a lonely task trying to save America from the spenders, it is going to be 'chiefly' up to you to remind 'your' people of your valiant efforts to keep Government expenditures down."

I have quoted the two words "chiefly" and "your." I would rephrase Mr. Taber's sage and sound advice, as follows: "It is going to be 'chiefly' up to you to remind 'all' people of the necessity and urgency to curb needless exepnditures and to give fair consideration to meritorius objects required of our Federal government under the framework of our Constitution and the combined wisdom of our Congress."

The thought in Mr. Taber's letter, leads to an appraisal of the trend of our present operation of the National Government. America is at a critical crossroad on the fundamental and basic principle of just what is our Union. What is our present concept of our Union as approved by Jefferson and Lincoln? Have we lost our concept of the ideal in government held by our Founding Fathers when they built our frame and pattern of government? Shall we courageously say and act to uphold a government of law and not of men? Admit that oft it is advisable, and sometimes absolutely necessary, to have a strong and effective central government, what safeguards or patterns of limitations do the people of the United States need to make invulnerable the 10th amendment to our Constitution which states unequivocally that " all powers not granted to the Federal are reserved in and held by the States or the people."

How does the thought suggested in Mr. Taber's letter, fit into the complex demands of our National Government in a progressive and modern age? Mr. Taber, I am sure, does not condemn spending for meritorius Federal objects, properly the concern of the Federal Government. It is power politics that is suspect; whether partisan, designing minorities or just plain moneygrabbers, large or small. How can the Appropriation Committee do much about needless spending? Not as much as we'd like. The majority is slanted toward the party in power, so won't do much lest it be accused of wrecking its own party, to the benefit of opponents. So, it is up to the minority on the committee to do the screening. Every item for appropriation, from birdseed to interstellar space activity must pass through, as I understand it, two screenings; namely, authorization and appropriation. In each, I take it, there will be (1) a skeletal outline by proponent; (2) documentation; (3) declaration of object, showing; (a) need; (b) policy and fiscal management; (c) general benefit; and (d) policy as to local benefits. Taking No. 3, with subdivisions (a), (b), (c) and (d) into consideration, the tremendous responsibility of the ranking Republican member of that committee becomes apparent, as stated by Mr. Taber. I feel that you are humble enough to learn and strong enough to assume such responsibility. But that responsibility also carries a corresponding duty and, I feel, an opportunity on your part to do something for the American people. You must answer that question—will you merely serve your time, or has Ben Jensen the capacity to accept a challenge to do something beneficial for America?

How can you best fortify yourself to meet such a challenge? Appraise certain values and set your goal, some of which should be:

1. As stated by your distinguished colleague, Dr. Judd, of Minnesota, that: "Religious heritage led Americans to 'voluntary federation under law, the best set of political ideas and social values ever put together in one place in the history of the world.'"

2. Get your concept solidly fixed that our National Government is a union, called the United States of America, created, ordained, and empowered by the sovereign States to perform certain delegated functions, reserving to themselves or the people the unlimited reservoir of sovereignty and powers flowing from it, as stated in the 10th amendment.

3. That implied powers to the National Government should not arrogantly nor arbitrarily be given by either the executive nor the judicial, nor by any subagency of either.

4. That when any agency wants additional power, interpretation or restriction, let them come to Congress for the solution.

5. Let Congress express a projected policy when desirable, but never be able to bind a future Congress.

With such guideposts, (a) resolve that in its appropriate fields, we must strengthen

our National Government. Admit that it is supreme as to national defense, international approach and contact, and in interstate commerce and communication. Also, (b) grasp that unless specifically delegated to the Federal Government by amendment 10, the reservoir of all our rights as free men, in life and livelihood, in education, social conduct and religion is in the respective sovereign States or the people. If a change seems desirable let it be made through constitutional processes as provided by law. Don't circumvent. Thus anchored, a minority leader in the Appropriations Committee cannot only shape sound financial responsibility but can clarify the framework and operation of our National Government that could be of lasting benefit to our country for a hundred years.

How? Not through you personally nor your staff, for you'll all be busier than ever through the extra work entailed by you being the ranking party member of your important committee, but put another on your staff which I would call by the innocuous title of file clerk-liaison contact. It would be his job to establish and have contact—have a pipeline if you please—from all over the country to watch if the National Government goes beyond its delegated field so as to threaten the storehouse of rights in the States or the people, all to the end of keeping the Union, as formed by the States, unshackled and free. In other words, to combat creeping, crawling centralism from becoming a national octopus whether called or acting as fascism, socialism, communism, or dictatorship. We're drifting—it is worth a try.

In my many enjoyable contacts in the Legion, I have had the privilege of meeting a mighty fine cross section of America. The past few years I've been on the National Executive Committee of the American Legion Founders. Our main objective, like yours as a Legionnaire, is for God and country, and then we have added, "for an adequate national defense." As individuals we may be Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, Democrat or Republican, north or south, east or west, but in our discussions and for the welfare of our beloved country, we are just plain citizens who love our country and its pattern of government. We don't like the creeping centralism; nor do you. What can be done to curb it? Go to the people. Outside of—what I call—a lunatic fringe in the New York area and some of the west coast, Americans are loyal and don't want a change in our form of government. The soundest and most pronounced expression for our present constituted Government comes from the Midwest and the South. If and when centralism becomes threatening, it is this area that is going to preserve the Government of our Founding Fathers. You reply, it's a big job. Yes, but you rely on the counsel from this area and you, as a committee member, can be instrumental to procure: (1) Greater value out of appropriations for necessary Federal expenditures; (2) keep the Federal Government strengthened in its field; (3) make America strong through its 48 sovereign States, and, incidentally; (4) if the party of your choice comes out for such, it can gain control of the House and the executive. The trend is here—we need a leader.

If through a liaison agency of your staff, citizens can rally around your banner in your fight against centralism and for soundness in fiscal policy, you will capture the sound thinkers of America, even the East and the west.

You cannot do this by yourself. Claim on your time is too persistent. You have your committee meetings—your office, the social bird dogging for the Seventh of Iowa—requirement to be in the well for rollcall or vote, and above all else, you need freedom to concentrate on issues to try to vote intelligently. But you can take time to evaluate and direct the work of a contact man. It will be of value to you as ranking party member of your committee and for our whole beloved country.

It will cost a few thousand dollars but I am sure such a contact man can assist you in saving many more millions as you've done in the past. But greater compensation will be for everybody in America if you can get the United States back to the pattern of government charted for us 180 years ago. Renew faith in eternal values for our own beautiful land, and have such values to share with the rest of the world. You'll earn a credit of good statesmanship.

I hope I haven't overburdened you with the thoughts that arose out of Mr. Taber's fine letter (and well deserved too, believe me) and that as you meet the thousand and one complexities of a growing and progressive America, you may take heart in the well-wishes of your predecessor, able and sound patriarch that he is, and that you have your friends and all good citizens pulling for you and wishing you personal and official success. Greetings to you and yours.

More power to you, Ben.

Most cordially,

OSCAR WENSTRAND.

Safety on the Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in my district at Daytona Beach, Fla., is located the national headquarters for the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing, better known as NASCAR. The president of this association is my good friend, Bill France.

Bill and this organization have done a tremendous job not only in bringing a high grade of entertainment to the public but have devoted an extraordinary amount of time to the study of making automobiles safer. As a result of these studies and the extensive tests that have been made by this organization, they have reached the conclusion that accidents are caused by people more than by machines.

In this connection, Bill France made a talk before the Beavers Club at the Detroit Athletic Club on February 7, 1963, in which he makes this point very forcibly. Under unanimous consent, I include his speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. President, Mr. Toastmaster, and members of the Beavers, it is a great pleasure to have been invited to meet you, and to be here today, and I want to thank you for having me. Maybe, I needed a change from all the warm Florida weather. Actually, I believe all of us need occasionally to leave our personal vantage points, if for no other reason than to sharpen our perspective. And, I thank you for giving me that opportunity.

Now, I have a request to make. It's an unusual one, but I believe after you hear it, all of you will agree with me that it is reasonable, and makes a great deal of sense.

I would like to ask that the swimming pool—this one right here along side of us—be drained. If not to the bottom, then down to 2 or 3 inches.

Let me explain: I read a speech a few weeks ago, that was delivered to a group of advertising men, which not only scared me, but set me to thinking. Some of you might possibly have heard the speech, or read it in the papers. The talk was made by a man prominent in the automobile industry, and in it this gentleman almost came to tears over the speed of automobiles and the glamorization of automobiles and their speed. He intimated—if intimated is strong enough a word—that fast cars were unsafe, that fast cars were largely responsible for automobile accidents and fatalities, and that to glamorize a fast car was as dangerous as scattering ground glass in a kindergarten sand lot.

Only passing mention was made of the generally accepted belief that the people who drive cars—not the cars—are responsible for the great majority of accidents. People were safe, sound, and sensible, the speech implied, but not cars. Government regulation of cars, Government restriction on automobile manufacturers, were hinted at—more than hinted at.

Well, if the speaker was right—and I am positive he was as wrong as smoking in church—then we must assume that all inanimate objects are dangerous and offer a dire threat to life.

Like this swimming pool. It should be drained to protect people from it. If not drained, them made so shallow that it can't leap up and drown us. It is possible—if the man was right about cars—that the Government will forbid pools that are over 4 inches deep, and a manufacturer of pools who glamorizes them will be punished. The Government might go so far as to order lakes drained, river channels limited to a few feet in depth, wells and springs dried up, and bathers allowed to enter the ocean only during low tide.

On the subject of safety, I believe I can say that few men in the country are more concerned with automobile safety than I. As a director of NASCAR racing activities in the United States, I suppose it is believed that speed and more speed is our chief object. That isn't true. We spend much more time on safety measures, building against accidents, than we do on speed. Frankly, we would be out of business without safety.

In 1962 NASCAR sanctioned, assisted and kept complete records on more than 1,200 competitive racing events all over the country. What do you think the average speed of the winners of these 1,200 races was? Take a guess—150 miles an hour?—120?—100?—95? Nope; much too high. The average speed in 95 percent of these races was under 60 miles an hour.

On January 20 of this year, NASCAR directed the Riverside, Calif., 500 miles NASCAR road race, which was won by Dan Gurney in a 1963½ Ford. Gurney, one of the world's top drivers, won at a speed under 90 miles per hour (84.9). Every manufacturer in the United States—and I repeat every manufacturer—makes a car that will travel as fast as that.

If they didn't, their cars wouldn't be safe. That's right, wouldn't be safe. A car has to be capable of that speed, or better, to have the horsepower for the acceleration needed to enter and travel on the existing freeways and turnpikes of this country. And these expressways, in the future, are going to require even better performance on the part of American cars.

Gentlemen, something that greatly concerns me is the fact that no one has ever adequately gotten across to the newspapers of the United States that it is not the car that is dangerous, but the driver. The man behind the wheel is to blame, not the car whose wheel he is behind.

Here is a typical example of how this news is handled. Here is a clipping from my

hometown paper, the Daytona Beach News Journal. I found this article buried on the back pages. It is a one column, three paragraph story:

"MAN'S THE CULPRIT

"JACKSONVILLE.—The man, not the machine, was at fault in 98 percent of the traffic accidents in Jacksonville last year.

"That's the verdict of a consolidated police report on the 7,452 accidents in the city during 1962. Poor conduct on the part of the driver was listed on 98 of every 100 accident reports.

"Most frequent violation was failure to yield right of way. It showed up on reports of 1,477 accidents. Drinking was listed on 386."

Now, what is true of Jacksonville, is likely true of most American cities. It seems to me that it is high time the superb engineers and designers of American automobiles should get full and favorable recognition for the magnificent job they are doing, and have been doing for years in the design and powering of American cars. It is time Detroit abandoned the post of whipping boy.

Now because it seems the fashionable thing for one manufacturer to publicly advise other manufacturers how to or not to advertise their products, then perhaps it would be allright for me to make a suggestion that might be acceptable and welcome to all people engaged in the great industry you gentlemen represent and are part of.

I would suggest the automotive industry launch a national advertising campaign using all its vast resources from Detroit to Madison Avenue. The Campaign would be simplicity itself, and to the point a proclaation: "National Don't Blame the Car Week."

Such a campaign is needed. It would not only serve the car industry well but it would be a great public service to the people by bringing to their attention what they should have known since the first car hit the road. That is, that as autos are manmade, so also are the accidents in which the cars are involved.

The campaign could be glamorized, if you'll pardon the expression, with prizes. For example: The first car owner who could offer documented proof that his car started itself, backed out of the driveway, ran a red light, jumped a sidewalk, ran into a tree and was apprehended for speeding and reckless driving, would be given an all expense tour around the world.

Other prizes could be given to car owners who were able to positively prove their cars, with no one at the wheel, had done such things as: (1) Gotten intoxicated; (2) flipped over while parked; (3) traveled 70 miles an hour in fog or heavy rain; (4) that a car by itself became drowsy and fell asleep on a long, straight, and sometimes boring section of the road.

Such a prize contest would alert automobile owners to the honest fact that no car, by itself, has ever been arrested for recklessness, foolishness, or just plain lack of commonsense.

Therefore, in view of these well-known facts, would it be considered out of line to request the Automobile Manufacturers' Association to adopt a resolution calling for a campaign such as: "The Car Is Not the Culprit Week," and requesting news media of all types to carry this fact to the public.

During the 15 years I have been associated with NASCAR, we have supervised more than 50,000 competitive events, with an average of 25 cars per event. That figures out to a quarter of a million cars in action. Not only at various speeds, but in races that really wring out a car. No part of it is left untested. If there is a weakness in the construction of the machine, it is a mortal cinch to come to the surface.

There have been accidents, yes. Many of them. But I can truthfully say that the study of the accidents by experts has shown that only a small, small part of them were caused by mechanical failure. The great majority of them were caused by the bad judgment on the part of the drivers, including expert professional drivers. If these skilled men make mistakes that cause accidents, it is only logical to believe that the average every day driver makes many, many more mistakes when he is behind the wheel of his car.

Ask any professional driver what he fears most. He won't tell you that it is high speed. He will tell you that the thing he is most afraid of is driving in ordinary traffic in which he has to contend with the ordinary driver.

As for objections to advertising a car upon its quality and performance, I am at a loss to know what an advertiser would advertise if not those very virtues. It's weaknesses? Are you supposed to hide your light under a bushel? I have met a number of advertising men and all of them I have met, I judge, are seekers of the truth. I have known some, in fact, who loved the truth so much they have been known to stretch it, just to be able to have more of it.

Also, some of us recall the popular song of a few years ago about the little car that went beep, beep, down the road and passed a Cadillac. Who's beep, beep, was it?

It is human nature for a man to want to buy the product with the highest quality and performance, be it automobiles, washing machines, shotguns, or tea bags. Certainly this is true of Americans. Ours is a country that has never been satisfied with settling for second best.

I wasn't around at the time, but I'd be willing to bet that when our forefathers and their families headed west to settle this country, that they chose the best constructed, best looking covered wagons they could find and afford, and read advertisements to find the strongest, fastest oxens to pull them, and the fastest, prettiest horses to ride themselves.

I have no way of knowing how many accidents there were among the covered wagons—there must have been plenty to judge by present-day historical TV westerns—but I am sure that no one ever made a fuss about a man having oxen too fast. And, I doubt if anyone was criticized for having engineered the famous 20-mule team—far and away, the most glamorous horsepower ever to cross the Rockies.

Can you imagine a pioneer responding to an ad that went something like this: 1848 model covered wagon and team; one owner; oxen guaranteed so slow they can't outrun a knock-kneed Indian. Get one and be cut off at the gulch.

As I say, Americans want top performance for themselves and for their country. We are competitive and we hate to be licked. President Kennedy recently named General MacArthur to settle the hassle between the AAU and the NCAA so that our chances against Russia in the next Olympic Games would not be jeopardized.

Something along that line might well happen if Russia started building better, faster, more glamorous automobiles than America and started winning all the stock care races. It is entirely possible that a certain Washington official might call a Detroit official and ask how come—and make a vigorous request that something be done about the situation right away—with or without air cover.

In a second or two we are going to have a showing of a picture I brought along. I advise you to fasten your seat belts before the movie begins. Before I forget it, I would like to invite you gentlemen to visit us in Daytona Beach on February 24, when the annual Daytona 500 for late model stock cars will be run on the speedway.

I am sure that if you attend you will agree with me that there is nothing—nothing—wrong with the cars Michigan is building these days.

There will always be criticism, of course; but when I read of some of the complaints—a recent one, in particular—I can't help thinking of the little boy who, having no bat to swing, went around saying baseball was a terrible game and that everyone ought to quit playing it.

Again, thank you for asking me to meet the Beavers. I appreciate it. Now, let's take a look at some machinery being operated like you never saw it done on private proving grounds.

George Washington Up to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorials from the Chicago Tribune of February 22, 1963, entitled, "George Washington Up to Date" and "Come See, Some Say."

The editorials follow:

GEORGE WASHINGTON UP TO DATE

(A dialog between the Father of his Country and his successors of the New Frontier. Washington speaks first.)

"If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect.

"In time of peace, prepare for war."

Hurry to Geneva and get a permanent nuclear test ban and a treaty for general disarmament. Nikita's letting us coexist, isn't he?

"Those redcoats came at us up Bunker Hill with muskets in their hands."

Those were purely defensive weapons, as in Cuba.

"I have favored a declaration of independence since early in October 1775."

The Declaration of Independence is no longer good enough for the modern world, and I will say here and now that the United States will be ready for a declaration of interdependence with a United Europe.

"After a little while all errors in the present form of government will be corrected * * * but like young heirs come a little prematurely perhaps to a large inheritance, it is more than probable they will riot for a while."

We're a young crowd and we're taking over the country.

"Father, I cannot tell a lie."

News is weaponry and we shall manage it.

"The time is near at hand which must probably determine whether Americans are to be freemen or slaves; whether they are to have any property they can call their own."

Our budget's only $98.8 billion. What's mine is mine and what's yours is mine, too.

"Resist with care the spirit of innovation * * * which will impair the energy of the system, and thus undermine what cannot be directly overthrown."

Let's have some sophisticated dialog. Everything is different now.

"Remember * * * that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and

opinion, exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion."

We've got a theory, according to the New Economics, that by planning a deficit of $12 billion we'll get the country moving again.

"The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

I shall be a strong President, exercising the fullest powers of the Office—all that are specified and some that are not.

"Cherish public credit. Avoid likewise the accumulation of debt * * * not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

George, you're a square. Don't you know the difference between deficits of weakness and deficits of strength? We're going to raise the debt limit to $320 billion, maybe $325, this year.

"The great rule of conduct, in regard to foreign nations, is to have with them as little political connection as possible."

We're allied with 42 nations in 6 treaties. Whoops.

"As for traitors and enemy agents, with great pleasure I will root out such abominable pests of society."

Our men, Congressmen JIMMY ROOSEVELT and MANNY CELLER, can be counted on to try to kill off the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"With great surprise and astonishment, I have read the sentiments (that the army wishes to crown me king). No occurrence in the war has given me more painful sensations."

Just Bobby and me, and Teddy makes three, we're happy in our blue heaven.

COME SEE, COME SAY

Opposite the main entrance of Tribune Tower we have assembled a display of various awards to the Chicago Tribune in recent years for achievements in various fields. These parchment certificates and loving cups repay inspection. They are instructive reminders of the diverse services constantly provided by a great newspaper.

Here are awards from the newspaper profession—Pulitzer Prizes for cartooning and reporting; from the Associated Press, the Inland Daily Press Association, the Inter-American Press Association; from associated golf writers, photographers, and travel writers. Here are a "golden antler" award from the Elks, for promoting love of flag and country, and a "Mercury award" from the American Legion, for campaigning against inflation. Here are citations from Government—from Army and Navy, from the State Commission on Human Relations,, even from the Internal Revenue Service (for helping, not altogether cheerfully, to administer the tax laws). We have been thanked by the National Association for Mental Health, a school for the blind, the National Safety Council, and Goodwill Industries. Even the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission took notice of our good works.

This is all very gratifying, of course. But what we value even more than all the documents and sideboard ornaments is the dialog our readers carry on with us. This editorial has two purposes—the lesser, to invite all who can to stop by and contemplate the gavel award of the American Bar Association and other trophies; the greater, to encourage again our readers to let us know how they respond to the Tribune, whether the word an individual has for us is flattering or faultfinding.

We cannot undertake to write back to those who write to us, but we want our readers to know that every bouquet (and every brickbat) mailed to the Chicago Tribune is received with close attention.

Roosevelt Williams Is County Boy of Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, much concern is being expressed nationwide relative to the status of the young adolescents of our Nation.

Sociological studies by various groups, both public and private, are constantly coming up with new theories on how the younger generation can be aided on its way to maturity. Each day the newspapers present stories of the wrongdoings of our teenagers.

Consequently, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I am able to insert in the RECORD a newspaper clipping from the Oakland Tribune of Oakland, Calif., which tells the story of a young man who has overcome the difficult hurdles of his age group and has won the award of boy of the year in Alameda County. His story is a model for other young boys to follow.

Furthermore, the program which resulted in Roosevelt Williams being honored for his achievement is one that could well succeed in every community in this Nation, and the two sponsors of this program, the Pacific Telephone Co., and the Boys Club of America, are to be complimented for their endeavors on behalf of youth.

The article appeared on January 24 and is as follows:

ROOSEVELT WILLIAMS IS COUNTY BOY OF YEAR

Roosevelt Williams, 16, a Castlemont High School student leader with a talent for music and a yen for mathematics is Alameda County's boy of the year.

Williams, the eldest of six children, won the title, and a $150 U.S. savings bond, Wednesday at the first annual Alameda County Youth Citizenship Award luncheon in the Leamington Hotel.

Runners-up in the contest, in which 5,000 Alameda County Boys Club members participated, were Jerry Stormoen, 16, of Alameda, and Michael Warman, 16, of San Leandro.

Williams, son of Mrs. Florence Williams of 1279 79th Avenue, has been a member of the East Oakland Boys' Club for the past 5 years.

Last summer he worked as a Red Cross volunteer in Oakland hospitals.

At Castlemont, Williams maintains a B average, is president of the Tri-Masters Music Club, a member of the Concert and Math Clubs, plays first viola in the school orchestra and is head yell leader.

Last year, he served as sophomore class president.

The two runners-up in the contest, cosponsored by the Pacific Telephone Co. and the Boys' Clubs of America, won statuettes and $100 bonds.

Jerry Stormoen, son of Mrs. Marian Stormoen of 1900 Chestnut Street, has been a member of the Alameda Boys Club for 4 years, and has been named the club's craftsman of the year and athlete of the month.

Michael Warman, son of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Warman of 328 Suffolk Drive, has been a member of the San Leandro Boys Club since 1957. He is also active in school, church and boys club projects.

The awards were presetned by Arthur C. Latno, Jr., East Bay division manager of Pacific Telephone.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 23, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

TIMID AND FEARFUL LEADERSHIP COSTING U.S. PRESTIGE

The week's news is frightening to every American citizen concerned with the future of the United States. More and more the American people are becoming deeply concerned with the timidity and almost childish fear of the President to make decisions. The result is that the prestige of the United States has never been lower. Our allies are losing confidence in us because they are not sure they can depend on us. Some results of the President's confused policies, or rather lack of policy: (1) De Gaulle's insistence on Europe going it alone without depending on the United States; (2) the collapse of the Diefenbaker government in Canada and a rise in anti-American feeling which is jeopardizing our entire defense perimeter in the north; (3) increased unrest in Latin America with more bold action by Communists openly swearing allegiance to Castro and the Soviet Union; (4) the hesitancy of Italy and Spain to renew our bases or to permit the establishment of bases for Polaris submarines; (5) a tougher attitude by Khrushchev and renewed arrogance on the part of the Soviet Union in the nuclear test ban treaty talks and in its cynical offer to remove several thousand Russian troops from Cuba sometime.

The President's cautious reaction to the Mig attack on an American boat is not what this world so badly needs. A strong policy statement, dealing from strength, that we will protect American lives, property, freedom, and way of life from any and all encroachments—that any attack on us will result in instant and deadly retaliation. Such a position is our only hope to stop aborning the "war by miscalculation"—some other nation miscalculating the American people by thinking the weak posture of our President represents the people. I say we are not weak, not afraid, nor cautious, nor watchfully waiting when it comes to our way of life. We know we are right, and will brook no opposition. "Give me liberty or give me death," is not an old-fashioned homily, but a present, vibrant truth. So it is that we can reasonably question our future conduct when our own leadership confuses and bewilders us. Think how uncertain other nations must be as they see us successfully attacked; as we fail to make any attempt to follow up the shot across the bow of a ship that disregards us; when we let a dictator who threatens to bring us ruin keep a military and subversive bastion in our hemisphere; see him get a promise from our leader of no attack; and watch him work to subvert other Latin and South American countries, some of which will fall in future months if we do nothing now. So we see the Keynsian socialism continue its course toward full subjugation of our economy at home and communism continue to advance abroad.

The failure of President Kennedy to act is increasing the danger to the United States. At a time when bold, brave leadership is needed, our country finds itself headed by a

party machine whose energies are being spent in political maneuvering, reckless domestic experiments, and complete refusal to enunciate a foreign policy to protect our country and preserve freedom. The one ray of hope is that the people, from my observation across the country, are far ahead of the administration and it may be that public opinion will force the administration into a role of national leadership in spite of itself. In the meantime, it is up to Congress to do all possible to strengthen the country and preserve our free institutions.

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR INCREASE IN DEBT CEILING

Here we go again. As expected and as I predicted last year, President Kennedy is now calling upon Congress for a further increase in the debt ceiling. So long as Federal spending is uncurtailed, there will be no limit to the debt ceiling as America continues on its reckless course toward fiscal collapse and national suicide. The temporary increase in the public debt limit, as enacted during the last Congress, and which I opposed, provides as follows: (1) $308 billion to March 31, 1963; (2) $305 billion April 1 to June 24, 1963; (3) $300 billion June 25 to June 30, 1963. The administration has requested that the ceiling of $308 billion be extended to June 30, 1963. Otherwise, the administration will be confronted with a decrease of $9 billion in the debt ceiling on April 1 and another decrease of $5 billion on June 24. In effect, an extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond April 1, 1963, is the equivalent of a $311 billion ceiling on an annual basis. An extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond June 25, 1963, is the equivalent of a $316 billion ceiling on an annual basis. Hearings on the President's request will begin before my Committee on Ways and Means next Wednesday, February 28. This is just another example of the failure of the Kennedy administration to face fiscal facts. I warned last year when I voted against increasing the debt ceiling that we would be called upon to push it higher unless the President made some effort to cut spending. We know now, too, that another debt increase will be requested by J.F.K. later this year. Instead, he has presented us with the biggest peacetime budget in history, $98.8 billion. His refusal to even attempt to practice some discipline in spending the peoples' money can only result in bigger deficits, continued pressure for an expanding public debt, and the inevitable climax, national bankruptcy.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN CONTRADICTORY AND SELF-DEFEATING

In hearings this week before the Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax scheme, one of the Nation's top tax experts confirmed my charge that the Kennedy plan is contradictory and self-defeating. Dan Throop Smith, tax expert of the Eisenhower administration, denounced the Kennedy tax proposals as a "bitter disappointment." He said, "by concentrating the bulk of tax cuts in the lower brackets to increase disposable income, the program has adopted the most expensive and the least effective way of stimulating expansion." Mr. Smith also condemned President Kennedy's plans for increasing the Federal deficit. "The proposal for a net $10.3 billion cut in revenues on top of a prospective current deficit of $9 billion is a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being," Smith said, bearing out my prediction that if we follow President Kennedy's fiscal policies we will devalue our currency. Smith concluded his testimony with this damaging statement in pointing up the complete fallacy of President Kennedy's tax proposals: "The most serious error in the entire program is that when the parts are put together they contradict the standard of fairness stated by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time nullify much of the economic benefit which might be achieved."

In my opinion the President's tax proposals could be likened to a doctor who prescribes the wrong prescription (his unworkable tax proposals) after making a wrong diagnosis (that the American economy needs more government). In a bland statement the President then says, "those who oppose the program must take the responsibility for any deterioration in the economy which might come about over the next months." In other words, the doctor, having prescribed the wrong prescription for the wrong illness, now says that if the patient dies it will be because he refused to take the medicine. What is really needed for economic growth is less government, less spending, and tax cuts in stable dollars.

JUNKETING MEMBER'S ACTIVITIES NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF CONGRESS

Under the protocol procedures of Congress, Members of one body are not supposed to criticize those of the other body. Indeed, Members of the House are not supposed to note by name another member or to question his integrity or honesty. However, Members of Congress have a responsibility to the people to maintain the integrity of the Congress of the United States. Under the Constitution, Congress is the sole judge of the conduct of its membership. It is our duty to call attention to known indiscretions so that unethical practices are stopped by the House or Senate, or the people be given the facts so that they may properly discipline a Senator or Representative who abuses the power of his office. In recent weeks, the newspapers have reported the activities of one Member of the House and attention has been called to some of his practices by a Member of the Senate. He is now attempting to discredit all Congressmen by his own indiscretions. Fortunately, he is the exception, not the rule—nor can there be any excuse or justification for misuse of public funds by Members of Congress. The vast majority of the Members of Congress are extremely conscientious in doing their work and in discharging their responsibilities as representatives of the people. To charge them all with irresponsible action and mishandling of the people's money is to seriously impair the image of Congress and of the American people because a Congressman usually represents the people who elect him, and fortunately, for our system of government, Congress and the people are morally strong, honest, and dedicated. The danger in the twin policies of a weak administration which refuses to stand up to international gangsters, and in downgrading the image of Congress by unworthy deeds, is that it encourages the lawless and criminal element within our country. Hoodlums, seeing the success of Khrushchev and Castro and being given the impression that disregard of honesty and integrity is the rule in Congress, are made bold in defiance of our conventions and laws. Strict adherence by Congress and the people to our moral codes of ethics is the only hope this free Nation will survive these times of peril.

Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army facility immediately adjacent to the city of Leavenworth was first established as an Army outpost in 1827. As the development of the plains country pushed westward, Fort Leavenworth served in turn as a Military Establishment for controlling Indian warfare, a cavalry school and finally as an advanced school for general officers commencing in 1881.

In both its capacity as an Army post and as an advanced school, it has rendered great service to the defense and military posture of this Nation. It would not be feasible to attempt to name all of the well-known military heroes who have served at this post on a tour of duty or as students, instructors, or commandants of the school itself. Categorically, I could say that almost every name that is prominently inscribed in the military accomplishments of this country at sometime in his career had a tour of duty at this historic Army post.

Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson commenced his assignment as commandant of the school in September 1960. In 3 short years he has gained both the respect and admiration not only of the military personnel who have served under his command but in addition of the entire civilian community of the city of Leavenworth. Although this post has historically enjoyed pleasant relations with the city, I think perhaps General Johnson has taken a greater personal interest in the problems of the city than any of his predecessors. Like those who have preceded him, he has made every attempt to coordinate, so far as was feasible, the military and economic administration of the fort with the planning and the management of the affairs of the city. He will be leaving the city of Leavenworth soon after the graduation of the 1963 class for an assignment of greater responsibility with the Department of the Army here in Washington.

His friends of Leavenworth recognize that General Johnson can perhaps better serve his country in his new assignment but note his leaving with sincere regret. At the same time we all join in extending our very best wishes to General Johnson in his new military assignment. As a manifestation of the appreciation of the city of Leavenworth to the great public service that General Johnson has rendered while serving as commandant of the school, a most unusual joint resolution was adopted by separate groups of citizens of Leavenworth and presented to him at a special recognition dinner on February 15. Under unanimous consent I include this resolution and the names of the persons signing it for the several organizations, in the RECORD in order that the generosity of his service to the city, far beyond his military obligation, may be publicly appreciated and preserved:

JOINT RESOLUTION ISSUED BY AND FOR THE CITIZENS OF LEAVENWORTH, KANS., FEBRUARY 15, 1963

Resolved, That it is with deep regret that the city of Leavenworth and its citizens have received the news that Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson will leave his command at Fort Leavenworth for a new assignment in Washington on February 25, 1963. Having witnessed General Johnson's exceptional ability at work, it should not have been unexpected to see him moved prior to a normal period of duty; nevertheless, the action was met with surprise, mingled with regret.

The city of Leavenworth has seen many commanding generals at Fort Leavenworth. None have captured the esteem, respect, and

downright admiration of the citizens of Leavenworth as General Johnson has. Several came close, but did not reach General Johnson's mark.

General Johnson's devotion of time and talent to what may be called civic affairs has been little short of amazing. No native civilian could have done more to promote the welfare of Leavenworth.

What we in Leavenworth think of General Johnson may best be summarized by the following editorial published in the Leavenworth Times February 1, 1963:

"WE LOSE AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

"The Leavenworth community will lose an outstanding citizen the last of this month when Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, commandant of the Command and General Staff College and commanding general of Fort Leavenworth, leaves for a new assignment at the Pentagon.

"To say that General Johnson is popular is to use a trite expression but Webster's dictionary defines popular as 'a person having many friends,' and certainly the general has a multitude of friends in both Leavenworth and Fort Leavenworth.

"In the city he took an active part in civic and social affairs. He served on committees, both as member and chairman, for projects devoted to the welfare of the community. For this work he was given a Man of the Hour award by the chamber of commerce last year.

"At the fort he has been active in school and Boy Scout work and was awarded the Silver Beaver, one of scouting's top awards by the Kaw Council. Park College conferred an honorary doctor of education degree in recognition of his work in public relations.

General Johnson had already established himself as a top military leader before his assignment to Fort Leavenworth and it didn't take long for people in this area to recognize his leadership in civic affairs. He has been in demand as a speaker in the Midwest because of his forceful presentations of world and military affairs in words that are easily understood.

Because of his success in getting things done and securing cooperation within the combined community of the two Leavenworths, he leaves a tough mark to shoot at for his successor, Major General Harry J. Lemley, Jr. Both generals will start their new assignments with best wishes for continued success by friends and coworkers here."

J. F. MITCHELL,
Mayor, City of Leavenworth.
IVAN J. MEYER,
President, Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce.
IVAN E. MARSHALL,
President, Central Trades and Labor Council.
MILTON H. STROH,
Secretary-Treasurer, Central Trades and Labor Council.
EDWARD F. LARKIN,
Public Relations Officer, National Federation of Federal Employees, Local 49.
ALFRED E. MICHAEL,
President, National Federation of Federal Employees, Local 49.

AATSEEL Fills a Vacuum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an article prepared by Dr. Arthur P. Coleman on the establishment and the goals of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages. Dr. Coleman is a former president of Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa., and is now visiting lecturer of Russian at the University of Arizona. In our rapidly diminishing universe the existence of any language barrier is of serious import to our own Nation, and the means to alleviate this condition, as set forth in Dr. Coleman's presentation, should be of great interest to everyone.

The article follows:

AATSEEL FILLS A VACUUM

(Prepared by Arthur Prudden Coleman, visiting lecturer in Russian, University of Arizona, for the founding meeting of the proposed Arizona chapter of AATSEEL, January 18, 1963, University of Arizona.)

The American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, known now officially as ATTSEEL of the U.S.A., Inc., was founded at Indianapolis in late December, 1941, 3 weeks after Pearl Harbor, by members of the Slavic group of the Modern Language Association. Among those who took this step, jointly and with unanimity of purpose, were: Dr. Arthur P. Coleman, now visiting lecturer in Russian at the University of Arizona; Jules Bernard; Dr. Jacob Ornstein, now in the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington; and Dr. Edmund Zawacki, Department of Slavic Languages, University of Wisconsin.

The inciting factor in the founding was a telegram received from Prof. Nikander Strelsky of Vassar College. The telegram was sent 2 weeks after Pearl Harbor and read as follows:

"Prof. A. P. Coleman,
"Care M.L.A.,
"Hotel Clayton, Indianapolis, Ind.:
"Triple effort publicize unlimited opportunities our field now and post bellum. * * * World crisis demands all-out effort. Anything else reproaches our group existence."

Armed with this challenging call to arms, Dr. Coleman forthwith consulted in Indianapolis with Prof. Robert Herndon Fife of Columbia University, chairman of the Modern Foreign Language Study of the American Council on Education. Dr. Fife pointed out that the Modern Language Association was not the place to carry on promotion work as teachers of Slavic languages, as it existed primarily to encourage research. He advised, therefore, the formation of an association for Slavic teachers similar to those existing for teachers of French, German, Italian and Spanish-Portuguese. Dr. Coleman brought this suggestion before the above group, that is the Slavic Group of the MLA, and the group responded with enthusiasm, giving Dr. Coleman authorization to proceed with the organization of such an association.

Dr. Coleman, then teaching at Columbia University, selected the name which the association still bears: The American Association of Teachers of Slavic Languages, the "languages" being added at the insistence of Prof. George Rapall Noyes, pioneer in the teaching of Slavic, at the University of California, to avoid going over into disciplines like history. Moreover AATSEEL was to represent teachers. Researchers were still to center in the Slavic group of MLA.

At first the association grew very slowly, due to war restrictions and difficulty of transportation, and the first president, Professor Noyes, became justifiably discouraged. On the other hand, there were favorable factors at work: (1) in the thick of World War II the U.S. Government began more and more to rely on AATSEEL for the recruitment of civilian and military personnel with a knowledge of the languages of Eastern Europe; and (2) the number of colleges in the United States offering Slavic languages was increasing rapidly. For example, in 1941 Russian was being taught at 18 colleges and universities, whereas by V–J Day in 1945 the figure was 155—a tremendous increase. Thirdly, a highly successful local meeting, the only kind we could have in those days because of the ban on national conventions issued by the Office of Defense Transportation, was held at Columbia University on December 30, 1942, to discuss problems of teaching the second year of Russian. The meeting resulted in the formation of a New York chapter of AATSEEL. By 1950 the number of State chapters had grown to 20, scattered from New Hampshire to California, from Michigan to Florida.

Seeing no possibility of a national meeting and relying on the small sum of $68 which we had in the treasury, in September 1943 Mrs. Coleman brought out the first issue of an AATSEEL Bulletin. From that date to this, under changing names, an AATSEEL Bulletin (now Journal) has been published without interruption four times a year, and now has become the most important vehicle of contact among teachers of Slavic and East European languages. For 5 years the Bulletin was published at Columbia, then later under the editorship of Prof. William E. Langebartel at Temple University, for a time at Indiana University, and now at the University of Wisconsin, Prof. J. T. Shaw, editor.

After heading the infant organization for 2 years, Professor Noyes retired in December 1943 to the executive council, where he remained in office for 5 years. He was succeeded as president by Prof. Samuel H. Cross of Harvard University, now deceased. Dr. Coleman continued as secretary-treasurer until September 1949, when he became president. In 1943 AATSEEL won its first important national victory for the profession by intervening with the regents of the University of Wisconsin to help save the Polish work there, pointing out the importance of all teaching in our field. The happy result was not only the retention of the teaching of Polish, but expansion into the present very active department of Slavic languages.

In December 1944, with the clouds of war beginning to disperse, we were finally allowed to have our first national meeting. This was held in New York. Overjoyed to meet each other personally at last, a hundred members participated in a program which began with a reception in the office of Mayor Fiorello La Guardia, who, we were surprised to learn, could himself speak a Slavic language, Slovene, in fact. The program ended with a most rewarding discussion on the use of radio in the teaching of languages, held in the palatial conference room of the National Broadcasting Corp., with Dr. James Rowland Angell, former president of Yale University presiding. At this meeting the Honorable John Dyneley Prince, nestor of Slavic studies at Columbia University, made the last speech of his long career in scholarship and diplomacy, discussing with us his unique method of teaching languages by the direct method.

In December 1945 we met at the University of Chicago under the presidency of Prof. George Bobrinskoy, reviewing the many contributions of AATSEEL members to the winning of World War II. In December 1946 our meeting in Washington was centered largely around cooperation with the Library of Congress.

In Detroit in December 1947 AATSEEL became the first among national professional organizations to vote that in the future all national officers must sign the non-Communist affidavit of the National Labor Relations Board. Our founding member, Prof. Edmund Zawacki, presided over the stimulating sessions, which filled all 4 days to the brim.

Later annual meetings have been held in various centers, one even, in September 1949, in California, at the University of California in Los Angeles and at Stanford University, with Prof. Oleg Maslenikov of the University of California in Berkeley presiding.

Now fully of age, in its 21st year, AATSEEL met this past December (1962) in Washington, D.C., looking ahead to continued service in the field of language teaching. Right now it would appear that the great need, the place where AATSEEL's services are most needed, is in the area of high school language instruction. In public and private high schools Russian teaching is making enormous strides, but materials are lacking and techniques not developed. In a way the teaching of Russian in high schools is today where college and university teaching of the language was when AATSEEL began its work. Much needs to be done if we are to hold the gains already won and if our fine young teachers, many of whom learned the language in the Army or Navy Lanugage School, are not to become discouraged. The latest techniques of language teaching must be used and the possibilities of teaching by radio and TV must be explored. The language laboratory must be expanded. The future is bright, if we but work hard and make it our own.

West German Measures To Prevent Detergent Pollution Furnishes Example to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 2105, provides the means for ending the pollution of our streams and ground water by synthetic detergents which do not decompose readily. It would forbid the sale in interstate commerce after June 30, 1965 of synthetic detergents which do not meet standards of decomposibility to be prescribed by the Surgeon General.

I call attention to the seriousness of the detergent pollution problem, particularly in the areas that now face or are threatened with water shortages.

One aspect of the enforcement of the legislation I propose is the testing procedure adopted to determine the extent to which detergents will decompose. The following article from the February 18 issue of Chemical and Engineering News contains a useful explanation of the testing system adopted in West Germany:

The article follows:

SYNDET TESTING COULD FOLLOW GERMAN LEAD

Syndet biodegradability is picking up steam in U.S. political arenas. Congress has its first proposed bill on the subject and some State legislatures are becoming more active. The ultimate extent of such legislation, as well as its passage, is still much in doubt. But operating and test procedures will undoubtedly take on greater and greater importance as such legislation comes to a head. An idea of one direction procedures could possibly take comes from West Germany.

Indeed, in introducing his bill to Congress, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, stated that the bill "would essentially adopt the successful approach used in West Germany." The proposed bill, H.R. 2105 (C. & E.N., January 28, part 1, p. 23), specifies that the Surgeon General shall set standards of decomposability for detergents which will assure that all detergents imported into the United States or shipped in interstate commerce after June 30, 1965, "will decompose quickly and completely after use." The Surgeon General shall set up specific methods by which detergents shall be tested to determine if they conform to standards.

The West German Government also had to set up an acceptable test system for checking out syndets before it could enforce its detergent control legislation. The law specifies that biodegradability of anionic detergents in washing and cleaning compounds must be at least 80 percent (arithmetic mean). The system, devised by an advisory committee, for testing biodegradability is, in effect, a lab-scale waste treatment plant.

ACTIVATED SLUDGE USED

Synthetic effluent containing the syndet under test is metered into an aeration tank where it passes through activated sludge and is degraded. Slurry from the aeration tank passes to a settling tank. Settled sludge is pumped back to the aeration tank, while clarified runoff from the system overflows into a collecting tank.

After the sludge has adapted to the detergent under test, usually about 8 days, daily determinations of detergent content of untreated and treated effluents are made and percentage degradation computed. These determinations are made for 21 days, not including the adapting period. The arithmetic mean of the values is taken as the biodegradability of the material. The detergent analysis is based on the reaction of methylene blue with anionic detergents. The resulting detergent-dye complex is extracted with chloroform and analyzed photometrically at 650 mμ. This laboratory test is said to correlate well with full-scale treatment plants.

The West German ordinance also calls for checking sludge activity every 2 days by determining the potassium permanganate requirement of the synthetic waste water in and out of the aeration tank. In a properly operating system, the permanganate requirement of the synthetic effluent is reduced significantly on passing through the activated sludge. This decrease should become constant once the sludge has adapted to a given detergent and the test system is lined out. Thus, the permanganate test serves as a running system check.

Also specified in the ordinance are various other routine tests. These include determining soap content of tested detergent material, the amount of dissolved oxygen in the aeration tank, and the quantity of dry material, both organic and inert, in the activated sludge. Decomposability of soap is set at 100 percent in computing detergent degradability.

Synthetic effluent is made from a nutrient and a detergent solution. The material should be made up fresh daily. The synthetic effluent is prepared by mixing 1 liter of nutrient solution and an amount of detergent solution containing 480 milligrams of anionactive detergent reacting as methylene blue active substance (MBAS). The ordinance requires an immediate control analysis of the synthetic effluent using methylene blue.

The nutrient solution consists of 1 liter of drinking water in which are dissolved 3,750 milligrams, peptone, 2,500 milligrams meat extract, 650 milligrams urea, 150 milligrams sodium chloride, 100 milligrams calcium chloride dihydrate,, and 50 milligrams magnesium sulfate heptahydrate.

Before starting the test, the aeration and settling tanks are filled with synthetic effluent. The settling tank is positioned so that its overflow matches the water level in the aeration tank. Flow of synthetic effluent is set at 1 liter per hour. Air feed to the aeration tank is adjusted to give thorough mixing and a dissolved oxygen content of at least 2 milligrams per liter. Decrease MBAS content of the synthetic effluent passing through the test system is calculated daily from analysis of the inlet and outlet material using the methylene blue procedure. By comparing the analyses, percentage degradation can be figured.

TESTING LABS

Although the detergent act is Federal law, enforcement is left to the German states. The states most likely won't set up individual test labs, but labs will probably be established in such cities as Cologne, Frankfurt, and Munich. Right now, detergent makers are submitting samples of candidate detergents to a Government agency for test. But big manufacturers will probably eventually set up their own system based on the official procedure.

The next question seems to be standardization in Europe. Switzerland is already working up regulations based on the German system. And last December, the scientific research directorate for scientific affairs of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development met in Paris to consider water pollution and detergent problems.

In West Germany the job of determining analytical procedures was given to an advisory group called the general committee for detergents and water. It had been formed in 1960 and is sponsored by the ministry for atomic energy and water resources (recently renamed Ministry for Scientific Research) and the Federal center for hydrology under the transportation ministry. Members of the advisory committee come from interested groups, such as detergent makers, public health officials, and sewage treatment experts, from all the West German states and Berlin.

The analytical procedures devised are spelled out in an appendix to the ordinance, and the effective date for enforcement is October 1, 1964. The ordinance applies to washing powders for linen and laundry, washing compounds for fine laundry, supplementary products such as soaking, bleaching, and rinsing compositions, and dishwashing and scouring powders. Main offender in Germany is tetrapropylene benzene sulfonate (TPBS), which has about 85 percent of the West German market. Under normal West German water purification procedure, only about 25 percent of TPBS present in detergents is degraded.

Resolution in Support of House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention and to the attention of all the Members of this great legislative body the text of a very timely resolution adopted by the

City Council of the City of Maywood, 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., supporting the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which I am a member. It follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MAYWOOD EXPRESSING ITS SUPPORT OF THE WORK OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas the City Council of the City of Maywood, Calif., has heretofore expressed its support of the work and activities of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas said committee has diligently continued its efforts to expose the activities of various individuals and organizations whose activities are harmful to the American way of life; and

Whereas this council wishes to reaffirm its support of said committee: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Maywood does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of Maywood, Calif., hereby reaffirms its support and approval of the work of the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities and extends to said committee, through the chairman thereof, the sincere gratitude of this council for the efforts of said committee to protect the United States from subversive elements.

SEC. 2. That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, Congressman, representing the 23d Congressional District, a member of said committee.

SEC. 3. The city clerk of the city of Maywood shall certify to the adoption of this resolution and thenceforth and thereafter the same shall be in full force and effect.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 13th day of February 1963.

VERN K. TENNIS,
Mayor.

Attest:

ISABEL L. DEDMORE,
City Clerk.

I, Isabel L. Dedmore, city clerk of the city of Maywood, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, being Resolution No. 1907, was passed by the City Council of the City of Maywood, signed by the mayor of said city and attested by the city clerk, all at a regular meeting of the city council held on the 13th day of February 1963, and that the same was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Awalt, Kearney, Case, Sampler, Mayor Tennis.

Nays: Councilmen, none.

Absent: Councilmen, none.

ISABEL L. DEDMORE,
City Clerk.

I, Isabel L. Dedmore, city clerk of the city of Maywood, do hereby certify the above and foregoing to be a true, correct, and complete copy of Resolution No. 1907, adopted by the City Council of the City of Maywood on 13th day of February 1963, as the same appears on file and of record in my office.

ISABEL L. DEDMORE,
City Clerk.

Grand Design: Civilians Overrule Military on Weapons for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable speculation of late over the roles played by the military and the civilian advisers to the President in matters of state and matters of military importance.

The most succinct and lucid commentary on this situation that has come to my attention is contained in an editorial appearing in the February 10 edition of the Shreveport Times in an editorial by Editor Don Ewing.

I insert it in today's RECORD in the hope that many of my colleagues will take a few minutes to study what this editorial has to say. The import is clear and worthy of our serious study:

GRAND DESIGN: CIVILIANS OVERRULE MILITARY ON WEAPONS FOR WAR

(On last December 31, President Kennedy held a closed doors press conference, from which the transcript later "leaked," at which he said the United States would assume greater leadership and authority in world affairs, although this would "hurt" some of our free world allies. Various economic, political, and military programs evolving from the Washington administration since then are being called grand designs. The Times Thursday discussed effects of some of this policy on friendly foreign governments. Today we discuss the currently evolving military grand design.)

For such evaluation and interpretation as each individual reader may wish to give, these facts should be kept in mind in considering President Kennedy's decision to scrap 105 U.S. nuclear missiles and their bases in Europe:

1. In a letter dated last October 28 to President Kennedy, Khrushchev said he would remove his missiles from Cuba if the United States would remove its missiles from Turkey.

2. The White House denied that Khrushchev's later agreement to remove his missiles from Cuba was based on a deal as to Turkey.

3. Ten weeks later, President Kennedy revealed that 15 U.S. Jupiter missiles in Turkey, 30 Jupiter missiles in Italy, and 60 Thor missiles in England and their bases would be dismantled, with Polaris submarines replacing them—reportedly 5 to 7 Polaris subs for the British Isles area and 4 to 6 for the Mediterranean Sea.

NINETY PERCENT NUCLEAR CUT

Dr. Stefan Possony, noted Stanford University nuclear weapons scientist, states in a study of U.S. nuclear firepower that we have the capacity to deliver 1,000 megatons of nuclear destruction against an enemy through our present missiles. (One megaton equals 1 million tons of TNT; 1,000 megatons equal 1 billion tons of TNT.) The U.S. Air Force is given a potential capacity of delivery of nuclear bombs through manned bombers that would bring our total to about 10,000 megatons—10 billion TNT tons.

But the manned bomber capacity of the Air Force (but not the manned plane activity) now is being phased out under orders of Defense Secretary McNamara, approved by President Kennedy. By 1967–68, we no longer will have manned bomber nuclear striking power. For the first time since a period following World War I, the United States does not have a single bomber under construction.

If Dr. Possony basically is correct, the abandonment of our manned bomber nuclear striking power would reduce the present megatonnage of American nuclear firepower capacity by 90 percent—9,000 out of 10,000 megatons.

This would mean a net and permanent 90-percent reduction. Polaris submarines would be placed in ocean areas where nuclear missiles are withdrawn from land areas. Khrushchev would have a huge psychological victory in proclaiming to the world that he forced the United States to abandon many of its missile bases inside European nations.

However, the Polaris submarine construction program is not known to have been increased with scrapping of the Jupiter-Thor missile sites in Europe and presumably the 42 Polaris subs eventually to be in action simply would be spread thinner around the globe. More than half of the proposed Polaris submarines are yet to be constructed, and the whole fleet is not expected to be available for action until around the end of 1967. There is also demand in some military quarters that if Polaris is to be the substitute for the missiles being scrapped in Turkey, Polaris submarines should be stationed in the Black Sea—the 350-mile-wide area between Turkey and Russia—just as Khrushchev has his atomic and rocket submarines in the Caribbean, off our coasts.

SKYBOLT, RS–70 DROPPED

In addition to scrapping its nuclear-carrying manned bomber strength, the United States has abandoned the Skybolt—the nuclear missile delivered to within 1,000 miles of its target by long range bombers and then turned loose on its own. We also have abandoned the RS–70 supersonic and robot brain electronic bomber which would seek out targets, aim nuclear missiles, and fire them to certain hits in a matter of seconds.

The so-called mobility of the Polaris—as a vaunted preventive of sudden destruction by an enemy launching a sneak nuclear missile attack—fades into insignificance in comparison to the mobility we are abandoning: Some 650 nuclear-armed 1,000-miles-an-hour bombers always on alert now, and the Skybolt and RS–70 in the future; plus another 1,000 bombers available but not on immediate alert.

All of this, Congressman EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, ranking Democratic member of the House Armed Forces Committee, says will mean that we have abandoned our multiplicity of methods of delivery of nuclear destruction to rely entirely on only two systems of delivery; the Polaris submarine, operable only in oceans; and the Minuteman long range missile, fired from concrete underground bins in the United States.

And this, Congressman HÉBERT told the Times, is like a football team with a whole raft of superstar, triple-threat backfield men, informing the other team that it will run no plays except forward passes; that the foe can deploy its entire defense accordingly, with certainty that there never will be a line buck or an end run, a quarterback sneak or a double reverse, or even a quick kick.

In other words, Russia can plan its defenses against only two systems of nuclear attack instead of against several coming from land, air and sea, and from every direction.

OPPOSED BY JOINT CHIEFS

This grand design for both American military power and military power for the Western World—the free world—may be exactly what should be done. There is no effort here to say whether it is right or worng. But there should be a lot of consideration of who made the decisions for this military grand design, for the U.S. military certainly did not.

Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee (now withheld from publication pending security clearance, but with some nonsecurity portions being made known) shows that the Joint Chiefs of Staff previous to the present Joint Chiefs of Staff personnel unanimously favored continuation of the RS–70 program over Secretary McNamara's order to scrap it.

Then, President Kennedy made retired Gen. Maxwell Taylor Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Secretary McNamara at once called for a review of the previous RS–70 Joint Chiefs decision. (This is the first time a retired general ever has been appointed Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In active service, General Taylor was a vigor-

ously outspoken opponent of General Eisenhower's policy of an all-powerful manned-bomber Air Force. He wants the ground Army to be supreme in all phases of the armed services.)

The Joint Chiefs of Staff reviewed the RS-70 and came up with the three active Chiefs of Staff—Army, Navy and Air Force—again unanimously in favor of continuation of the RS-70; this despite vigorous opposition from Chairman Taylor. The latter favored scrapping the RS-70.

Then came the Skybolt decision. Again the active Joint Chiefs were unanimous to go on with the Skybolt. Retired General Taylor again opposed. Secretary McNamara ordered the Skybolt abandoned, and RS-70 halted.

CIVILIANS TOP THE MILITARY

House Armed Services Committee testimony shows that the advisers on whom Secretary McNamara based his own decision were mostly the young civilians with which he has permeated the Defense Department in high posts—men described by retired four-star Gen. Thomas White, former Air Force Chief of Staff, as junior whiz kids as compared to the senior college professors who make up President Kennedy's White House advisory staff.

Recommendations by these often immature Pentagon gentlemen overrode decisions of four-star admirals and generals who gained stars and decorations as combat commanders in World War II or Korea or both. And these are decisions on what weapons our fighting forces should have to fight wars—not matters of military theory or hypothesis.

Letting civilians overrule generals on types of weapons with which the generals and their armies must fight is, Congressman HÉBERT said, like having the best doctors in the world diagnose a case and then calling in lawyers to prescribe for the patient.

But that is the military grand design now being carried out in Washington.

Congress created the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the top military advisory body to the President and the Secretary of Defense. In the American tradition, the President and Secretary have authority over the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the constitutional civilian authority being over the military. But the President and the Secretary always are expected to accept decisions of the military on purely tactical and technical matters, such as weaponry.

Congress gave this now abused authority to the Secretary of Defense. It is time for Congress to take it back.

Doesn't Make Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the proposed tax reductions:

DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

Everyone, needless to say, would like to pay less in Federal taxes which, in many cases, have reached or are near, confiscatory levels. But not everyone believes that tax reduction now, in the light of current prospects and conditions, makes sense.

President Charles B. Shuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, is among them. Speaking before the federation's recent convention, he expressed the opinion that tax reduction without a corresponding reduction in Government spending would be irresponsible.

Attractive as a tax reduction is, this point of view must be given full consideration. It is true that some top officials of the Government, who are concerned with tax policy, now argue that deficits are not necessarily breeders of inflation. Maybe so—but their arguments are contravened by the hard experience of the postwar years. Perhaps ever-increasing deficits—of 10, 15, 20 billion dollars a year—would not produce more inflation in a time when there is idle plant capacity and substantial unemployment. But what of the time—that the Government is working for—when the plants are all busy and we have full employment?

The ranks of those, in and out of Congress, who are convinced that reduced spending is a prerequisite of sound and safe tax reduction, are growing fast. They should—and we hope it keeps up.

Champion of the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about a distinguished economist and dedicated servant to the public interest, Dr. Joseph M. Klamon, who has served 40 years as a teacher of economics and business law, much of it at Washington University, St. Louis.

A man of this stature deserves the plaudits of all for his excellent efforts on behalf of the people.

The article follows:

CHAMPION OF THE CONSUMER

(By George Monaghan)

Dedicated. That's the best way to describe Prof. Joseph M. Klamon and his devotion to the American free enterprise system.

After nearly 40 years as a teacher of economics and business law—32 of them at Washington University—his stand for the free market never has weakened.

And it never will.

Dean Ross Trump, of the university's business school, says it is largely through Professor Klamon's efforts that Missouri today remains an island in a sea of "fair trade" States.

And surveys indicate that the State's unique status has paid off in lower retail prices than in surrounding fair trade areas.

But the battle to maintain a free market is neverending. As Professor Klamon says: "The trouble is that we never seem to have as many practicing free enterprisers as we have professing free enterprisers."

People want values when they buy, he observed, "but when they sell, they want a controlled and regulated market."

CONSTANT DANGER

"Fair trade" and other forms of fixing floors on retail prices are a constant danger to the free market. A national fair trade bill could cost the consumer more than $2 million a year in higher prices, Dr. Klamon has said.

If fair trade comes before this Congress—and Dr. Klamon thinks it will—he'll be there to fight it. As in the past, he will be stating his views as a member of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Consumers Federation.

The battle of fair trade, under a variety of names, goes back a long way, and it is sure to go on in the future. As long as he is able, Dr. Klamon will carry on his fight against it.

If you would go back 30 years, you'd find that "Jumpin' Joe" Klamon, as his students have always called him, was even then fighting the battle of the consumer.

In the 1930's he was fighting for a better break in prices of milk, butter, bread, eggs, and coal.

Just this week, he rose to the consumer's defense again in a sharply worded protest against a proposed elimination of pasteurization dates on milk bottle caps. He called for the resignation of the city health commissioner, who had indicated approval of the bill introduced in the board of aldermen.

HAS THE FACTS

Facts, figures and learning are his weapons, and he uses them with scholarly authority. Look at his record:

In 1922, at age 21, he earned his law degree at Washington University after working his way through school.

Two years later he received his master of arts degree at Yale; a year after that, still at Yale, a doctor of jurisprudence. By 1927, he had his Ph. D. from Yale.

There's more. During those degree-earning years he was:

Tutor at Yale, 1922 to 1924; chairman of the department of economics, William and Mary College, 1925; lecturer and visiting professor, Temple University, 1924–25; instructor in the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, 1926 and 1927.

In 2 years at Yale he took three degrees. That's a distinction few—if any—in the long history of that institution can claim.

During the next 2 years he was professor of economics at Carnegie Institute and Pittsburgh University.

Then, in 1929, he returned to Washington University, this time as a teacher.

STUDENT FAVORITE

In those days, Dr. Klamon wore a small mustache and, in his pictures anyway, looked the part of a no-nonsense schoolmaster.

Today, he still has the prominent jaw and his students will tell you he can still growl, but there's a kind and tolerant look that keeps coming back.

He's always been a great favorite of students. Not long ago he was the first to receive the Faculty Award of the University's chapter of Alpha Kappa Psi, a business fraternity.

There are few in the university who have served longer than Dr. Klamon, and there are none in the business school, where the second in line is Dr. Carl Dauten. He is a former Klamon student.

The Nation was deep in depression when Dr. Klamon came to Washington University, and he was stoking the fires for a change in the Nation's administration. (Today, he counts himself among the admirers of former President Hoover.)

He rapped economics teachers for not being sufficiently articulate in controversial areas involving the public. He condemned the sales tax as a deterrent to spending and a tax on consumption. And he was one of 180 economists who petitioned the President in 1932 against the Hawley-Smoot tariff.

But the real action began after 1933 with the creation of consumers councils under the National Recovery Act.

UNPAID ADVISER

Dr. Klamon became unpaid economic adviser for the St. Louis council.

In November 1933 he charged that milk distributors here had advanced their prices out of all proportion to the prices paid to the farmer.

In December of the same year, before a meeting of the consumers milk commission in city hall, he charged that dairy concerns were exploiting the farmer and consumer under a milk marketing agreement.

In June 1934 he was urging the mayor to establish "milk stations" for sale of milk to the needy at reduced prices.

Then, in October 1936, Dr. Klamon fired one of the opening shots for adoption of the United States standard milk ordinance. It went off with a loud bang.

He demanded that the Director of Public Welfare of the city prove his statement that the persent milk ordinance was a good one—or resign his position.

With the Consumers Council taking a strong stand in the campaign, he charged the city's health was endangered daily by the "use of the present supply which may be adequately termed bacterial soup rather than milk."

Mrs. Marion Weir, an early council leader, said Dr. Klamon was among those who helped Dr. Joseph H. Bredeck, city health commissioner push the city's standard milk law.

PRICES DROP

Again during the 1930's, when coal price-fixer went to work under the wings of the NRA's Blue Eagle, Dr. Klamon was among council members like Mrs. Rose Kerber and Father William F. Mullally who fought them.

The repercussions of that battle were felt all the way to Washington, D.C., but prices dropped as a result.

His adversaries learned in those days—as they do today—that Dr. Klamon is a man who gets to the heart of a matter with annoying speed—and hits hard when he gets there.

He is roughest when it comes to tampering with the free market.

During a hearing before a House committee in February 1952, Dr. Klamon charged that lobbyists had "moved with the precision of a Panzer division" to get fair trade bills passed in 45 states.

VERBAL EXCHANGE

A Congressman from Colorado, himself a former State legislator, didn't like that.

Listen to the exchange:

"It is government by Western Union and government by lobby. They have threatened you. They have coerced you," says Dr. Klamon.

"Then I take it from your statement," says the Congressman, "that every legislator in the 45 states who voted for."

Dr. Klamon finishes it for him: "were subject to the same pressure."

"And went ahead and followed the lead of the lobbyists and not the people * * * That's your interpretation of it?"

"That is a fact and I am prepared to prove it." Then came the barrage of facts and figures.

Minutes later the same Congressman asked the professor: "I want to know whether or not you have ever gave thought to becoming a candidate and representing all those people you talk about?"

The answer was quick and final:

"I have not. But if I were a Congressman there are terms upon which I would not want a public office and this bill represents those terms."

VARIED CAUSES

If you talk with Dr. Klamon about politics and economics you'll come away with a variety of names identified with a variety of ideas and causes, many of them conflicting.

You'll hear Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Hamilton the aristocrat, and Tom Paine the revolutionary. You'll hear Woodrow Wilson, Senators William Borah, George Norris, and Robert LaFollette.

And you'll hear of Representative Thomas Curtis, Senator Paul Douglas, Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Lawrence K. Roos, and the late Representative John J. Cochran.

Men he admires are a curious mixture of Federalists, agrarian democrats, progressives, Democrats, Republicans, conservatives and liberals.

If you ask Dr. Klamon whether it's possible to agree with such variety, he'll tell you it is.

"I don't pay much attention to those labels, Democrat, Republican, liberal, and conservative.

"For one thing you must recognize that politics is not a science. It is an art. It is the art of reconciling conflicting group interests. It is Hegel's idea of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis."

Take HARRY FLOOD BYRD. "He believes in absolute financial integrity. That is paramount. At the same time we must not close our eyes to reality. We must be receptive to ideas that do not impair a sound currency and do not smack of collectivism."

DELUDE OURSELVES

In the economic arena, Dr. Klamon will tell you:

"We should stop deluding ourselves. Either we want competition and price freedom, or we want restraint of trade and price fixing."

And if it's the latter, then "we should repeal the Federal antitrust laws * * * and perhaps apologize to the 16 electrical companies who recently pleaded guilty to antitrust violations."

In short, Dr. Klamon is no Keynesian economist. He's an Adam Smith man first and last. He rejects "all 57 varieties of socialism" and defines a Communist "as a Socialist who is more ruthless and in a bigger hurry."

But the United States, he says, still has plenty of room for improvement—"Would that we could get the type of effort and brains in the social sciences that we have in other sciences."

Dr. Klamon first of all is a teacher whose "bark is bigger than his bite" his students say. He is also one of the Nation's leading labor arbitrators.

THE OTHER SIDE

He is an undeviating proponent of civil rights and liberties.

But there is another side.

He is a family man. His wife, Rose, is a former student of his; his son, Lawrence, an assistant to the Secretary of Defense; his daughter, Barbara, an anthropology student at the University of Pennsylvania; and his younger sons, Bill and Don, Washington University students.

Here is a man who could talk "family" until the sun goes down, and who drinks his coffee from a giant cup labeled "Pop."

Here is a man who loves graham crackers and milk, the theater, Vladimir Golschmann, and who plays first base on the faculty baseball team despite his 61 years.

"When they made Joe Klamon," says his colleague Dr. Carl Dauten, "they threw the pattern away."

Trust Among Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Sunday Visitor that sets forth the position of Pope John on world cooperation and peace.

The article follows:

TRUST AMONG NATIONS

(By Rev. John F. Cronin, S.S.)

Pope John ends the third part of his far-reaching social encyclical with some thoughts on world cooperation for the sake of peace. He begins with a clear summary of the need for nations to work together, and then progresses to a study of the obstacles they face in this task. He concludes with the proposition that peace cannot exist without trust, and trust must be based on recognition of the moral order. Thus there must be religious, as well as political and economic foundations of world tranquility.

The Pope stresses scientific and technical progress as factors in making nations more and more interdependent. "As a rule no single commonwealth has sufficient resources at its command to solve the more important scientific, technical, economic, social, political, and cultural problems which confront it at the present time. These problems are necessarily the concern of a whole group of nations, and possibly of the whole world."

It is true, of course, that individual nations may enjoy a high degree of culture and civilization. These states may have a large and industrious population, an advanced economic structure, great natural resources, and extensive territories. "Yet, even so, in isolation from the rest of the world they are quite incapable of finding an adequate solution to their major problems. * * * That is why international understanding and co-operation are so necessary." Nations help themselves only insofar as they succeed in helping one another. Mutual development and perfection are the keynotes to progress.

PEACE AND COOPERATION

Catholics who are reluctant to follow the lead of the papacy in adopting an international outlook may argue that the statements quoted above deal with secular matters, not propositions of morals and religion. Yet all the modern popes have spoken with one voice in stressing the intimate relationship between peace—certainly a moral concept—and the establishment of close political and economic ties among nations. The world of religion and morality does not exist in a vacuum. It is strongly affected by the social and material conditions of mankind. Indeed, this is the basic reason why the church has a social teaching.

When men of various religions and cultural backgrounds try to set up political and social organs for international cooperation, the resulting institutions will have many imperfections. This should surprise no one, since even God's church, in its human manifestations, shows the limitations that result from original sin. Those who love an ideal do not use the flaws that show up in its concrete forms as excuses to attack or abandon the ideal itself. Rather, human failures are a challenge to renewal and perfection in our unending quest to make ideals realities in this life.

Men who abandoned the church because of its human imperfections have been called heretics in traditional theology. A similar mental attitude can lead to isolationism in international affairs. One can always find limitations in alliances, in international organizations, and in proposals for peace. These flaws can be used as excuses to attack the whole concept of cooperation as impractical. Others, more loyal to the ideals propounded by the papacy, will acknowledge weaknesses in various world groups, but will seek to conserve the good and to inhibit the evil in such agencies.

No one could accuse Pope John of a lack of realism in urging international cooperation. He faces frankly the inability of many modern men, especially the leaders of na-

tions, to bring about the foundations of world order. "The root of such inability is not to be sought in scientific, technical or economic reasons, but in the absence of mutual trust. Men, and consequently states, are in mortal fear of each other." Each fears that the other is planning conquest, so each organizes defenses and builds up munitions of war as a deterrent against the would-be aggressor.

DENY MORAL ORDER

The result of all this is a "vast expenditure of human energy and natural resources on projects which are disruptive of human society rather than beneficial to it; while a growing uneasiness gnaws at men's hearts and makes them less responsive to the call of nobler enterprises." Behind these fears are ideological differences among nations, and more especially between their rulers. Some leaders of nations deny the very existence of a moral order which is absolute, universal, and equally binding upon all. "And where the same law of justice is not adhered to by all, men cannot hope to come to open and full agreement on vital issues."

The Pope notes that both sides (clearly referring to the cold war) speak of justice and the demands of justice, but these words frequently take on different or opposite meanings according to which side uses them. In such cases, the very appeal to justice often serve only to increase tensions. Consequently the belief arises that the only way to secure rights and interests is through the use of force. The one path out of this impasse is recognition of, and respect for, the moral order. But the moral order in turn has no existence except in God. Cut off from God, it must necessarily disintegrate.

Man is not just a material organism. He also has a soul and he is endowed with reason and freedom. By his very nature he demands a moral and religious order, and it is this order which has the greatest validity in the solution of problems relating to his life as an individual and as a member of society, and problems concerning individual states and their interrelations. It is true that some men, dazzled by the spectacle of scientific and technical triumph, feel that they can rely merely on human powers and yet construct a livable civilization.

But a more realistic view of modern progress notes that science, without God, creates difficulties that could destroy mankind. We have released almost limitless energies from the atom, but only morality can teach us to control the use of these forces. Those who face up to these facts realize then the supreme importance of spiritual and moral values, if scientific and technical progress is to be used in the service of civilization, and not involve the whole human race in irremediable disaster.

The Pope also notes that material progress alone does not satisfy the real needs of mankind. Men in wealthier nations find dissatisfaction with material goods, and they are rapidly losing the illusion that wealth makes an earthly paradise. Men are becoming more and more conscious of their rights as human beings, rights which are universal and inviolable; and they are aspiring to more just and more human relations with their fellows. As one reads this passage, one feels that the encyclical is accurately describing conditions in our own United States. Here we have built great prosperity, but we also suffer from much disillusionment and uneasiness. And we are becoming increasingly sensitive to human rights, especially in the case of Negro Americans and others who have not shared properly and equitably in what we describe as the good life.

The encyclical concludes this analysis with the hopeful observation that all this turmoil makes the modern man more deeply aware of his own limitations and creates in him a striving for spiritual values. "All of which encourages us in the hope that individuals and nations will one day learn to unite in a spirit of sincere understanding and profitable cooperation."

We have mostly refrained from comment upon this lengthy papal analysis of the present-day problem of peace, so as to present these views as a unified whole. Now we may note the daring Christian optimism of Pope John. On the one hand, he states frankly that the root of international tensions is a lack of truth, and that this in turn springs from a failure to acknowledge God and the moral order. In the Communist world, this is rooted mainly in the atheism of communism. In both worlds, it is increased by the worship of science, technology, and material progress as substitutes for the life of the spirit.

If only this were said, we would have a message tinged with deepest pessimism. The Communist world explicitly rejects God and pursues science and technology. The world of free nations, either allied against communism or standing aloof in neutralism, seems more bemused by the pursuit of wealth than the pursuit of goodness and virtue. Yet those who concentrate exclusively upon these depressing factors forget the image of God in the very nature of man. Our minds cannot always be deluded by what is false. Our wills are not going to remain content with evil. Our feelings will revolt against what is shabby and unworthy.

SPIRIT OF RENEWAL

The very spirit of renewal and growth so manifest in Vatican Council II will in turn affect the secular world as well. Stalin once asked facetiously of the Pope: How many armed divisions does he command? Stalin's successors, confronted with severe internal turbulence in the Communist world, are being forced to realize the limitations of a purely material concept of the universe.

Pope John does not speak despairingly when he says that real peace is impossible without acknowledgement of God and the moral order. On the contrary, he strongly believes that the fears of the modern world, and the frightful evils it confronts, will awaken in mankind the need for God and the search for God.

We do not lack tangible evidence that such a process of renewal is underway. The frightening prospect of world communism has caused moral as well as military reactions in the free world. Europe is starting to bury its age-old antagonism in the Common Market and its promise of political federation. Asia, Africa, and Latin America are no longer merely quaint stopping places for the world tourist. The are now challenges to the modern science and technology to eradicate preventible poverty, ignorance, and disease. Within the United States we have made dramatic progress in uncovering and remedying racial discrimination. The idea of personal service to those in need—so central to the Christian doctrine of charity—is stressed in our Peace Corps and the proposed Domestic Service Corps.

There is darkness in the modern world, and much fear. But there is also light and hope. It is clear that Pope John believes that light will triumph over darkness, and that hope will drive out the hatreds that thrive on fear. But this blessed result will not come automatically. Christians must work to make this a better world. To achieve this, the encyclical calls for "The Rebuilding of a Social Order Based on Truth, Justice, and Love." This is the theme of the fourth and concluding part of christianity and social progress.

Is Ellender Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been sent a copy of an editorial taken from the Daily Reveille, written and edited by the students of Louisiana State University. It is entitled "Is ELLENDER Wrong," and deals with the recent criticism by the illustrious senior Senator from Louisiana, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of the foreign aid program.

I wholly subscribe to the sentiments expressed by Student-Writer Colin Chisholm when he writes:

ELLENDER, in a few choice words, said what probably a good majority of Americans have been thinking for many years, that African nations are simply not ready for self-government.

This editorial has so impressed me that I would like to insert it here in the RECORD for all my colleagues to read. Mr. Chisholm has struck a chord of logic here that it would behoove us all to ponder. Without qualification, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Louisiana.

The editorial follows:

IS ELLENDER WRONG?

(By Colin Chisholm)

Louisiana's Senator ALLEN ELLENDER has received a great deal of nationwide criticism lately for statements he made in a recent tour of the African Continent.

Heads of state in three African nations have even gone so far as to ban our Senator from touring their countries.

Here at home, ELLENDER has been condemned throughout the Northeast and the West for questioning the ability of the Africans and their readiness for self-government.

ELLENDER has been accused of everything from tearing apart Afro-American diplomatic relations to misappropriating a U.S. Air Force jet plane. All this has been the result of one thing: The man who said the supposedly derogatory things about the new African states was following an old American tradition of, as Red Skelton used to say adroitly, calling them the way he sees them.

ELLENDER, in a few choice words, said what probably a good majority of Americans have been thinking for many years, that African nations are simply not ready for self-government.

The trouble with ELLENDER's statement, regardless of Drew Pearson's theory, seems not to lie in what ELLENDER said, but in ELLENDER himself. ELLENDER is a southern Senator.

Drew Pearson claimed in a recent column the fact that ELLENDER's being a Senator from a Southern State had no bearing on the issue, as the African dignitaries had no way of knowing the Senator as a legislator from the South or as a representative of any other geographical region of the country.

How can Pearson be so naive? All the average African would have to do is tune to the nearest outlet of Radio Moscow, assuming of course he had a radio. If not, we would imagine the local representatives of the Kremlin would have seen to it that loudspeakers were set up well in advance of the ELLENDER sojourn to give the people the

full background of Senator ELLENDER as well as his area of the United States.

How can America as a whole condemn ELLENDER when they have only to pick up any edition of any paper in the country and see, glaring on the front page, the stories of Africa today?

One can hardly turn on a radio or television set without hearing the same things over and over, Moise Tshombe, Katanga, breakaway province, Elizabethville, scorched earth, "U.N. Congo forces killed or were killed today."

And with all of this bloodshed in the daily headlines of the past several years, are we as Americans supposed to sit back and ignore the facts and say, "Yes, truly the African nations are ready for self-government"?

When we as Americans become so naive that we can ignore the simple facts and condemn one of our fellow Americans—and a well respected one at that—for simply stating facts; if we can allow this American to be brought to scorn throughout the country in the press, radio, and television, and even on the floor of the U.S. Senate itself, then it is time to wonder if it is only the Africans who are not ready to govern themselves.

Youth Employment Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me, as a sponsor of the Youth Employment Act of 1963, that the House Subcommittee on General Education under its able chairman, the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, is moving so rapidly on this important legislation. This program offers a most constructive approach to an urgent national problem, and I urge its early approval by the Congress.

It is encouraging to note that so many groups and organizations have initiated local programs designed to encourage students to complete their education so that they may become useful members of our society. A most worthwhile plan that could well be adopted by other firms throughout the country has been inaugurated by Bamberger's stores in New Jersey. The plan is described in the following articles in the Newark papers of February 21:

SQUAD SIGNS TWO DROPOUTS

Bamberger's New Jersey last night signed up the first two members of its "diploma squad" in a program geared to encourage high school dropouts to return to school.

The program is coordinated with high school guidance officials to offer part-time employment in any of Bamberger's New Jersey stores to "college material" dropouts. Under the plan the dropout would be required to return to high school and continue his studies. Employment would then be offered evenings and on Saturdays, according to Mrs. Marjorie Geerlofs, Bam's personnel administrator.

Signed up last night before a gathering of local high school guidance and State employment agency representatives were James Epps of 572 Hunterdon Street, who formerly attended South Side High School and Guillermo Fabregat of 14 Clark Street, who formerly went to Barringer.

Speaking before the group, Mrs. Geerlofs said "the real teeth in the program is that employment will be given only if the individual returns to and remains in school."

She added: "This means the student must maintain satisfactory grades and attendance and perform his job satisfactorily."

The only high school dropouts eligible for the program, said Mrs. Geerlofs, are those recommended by high school guidance counselors. The candidate also must have the consent of his parents.

BAM'S OFFERS TRAINING PLAN FOR DROPOUTS

A novel program of assistance to high school dropouts who have college qualifications was begun in Newark yesterday by Bamberger's New Jersey. Joseph Costello, Newark store manager, hired two youngsters on a part-time basis provided they continue their high school education.

The new hiring program, dubbed "Bamburger's diploma squad," is designed to encourage qualified youngsters to continue their educations, a company spokesman said.

HIRE SELECT FEW

He said all eight Bamberger's stores will begin hiring a select few of the 50,000 teenagers in New Jersey who have dropped out of school and are unemployed.

But those being offered employment will have to be recommended by their school guidance counselor on the basis of test scores and scholastic records.

Under the arrangement, each of the stores has agreed to employ youngsters who quit or are quitting school provided their records indicate they can finish high school and enter college.

But the part-time student employee would be fired if he leaves school.

"We are not creating any jobs for these dropouts," Costello explained. "We will fill our regular vacancies with them, but the youngsters must be recommended by their school counselors."

TWO NEWARKERS

Two Newarkers who began working for Bamberger's under the new arrangement are James Epps, 18, of 527 Hunterdon Street, and Guillermo Fabregat, 17, of 14 Clark Street. Both boys were planning to leave school for economic reasons.

Epps is a messenger in the mail room and Fabregat is a stock boy.

The real teeth in the program is that the individual will be employed only if he remains in school, maintains satisfactory grades, and performs his job well," said Mrs. Marjorie Geerlofs, personnel administrator for Bamberger's.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 45th anniversary of Estonian independence, and I am honored to join my fellow Americans in observing this important milestone in the life of a brave captive nation.

It was on February 24, 1918, that the Estonian National Council declared that "as of today Estonia within its historical and ethnic boundaries, is proclaimed an independent, democratic republic." Since 1710 when Peter I conquered their homeland the Estonians had been living under the Russian yoke. Independence came after many uprisings and brutal reprisals, including the important 1905 revolution.

After Estonia's liberation the Russians tried to restore their control of the new republic. The Communists staged an unsuccessful coup in 1924 and were outlawed. They went underground, however, to continue their subversive propaganda and espionage. The Soviets aggressive designs were finally realized in 1940 when they seized control of Estonia in violation of their pledges to respect Estonian sovereignty and to abstain from interference in the internal affairs of the country. Shortly Estonia was invaded by Nazi Germany and then reoccupied by the Red army in 1944. Since then the Estonians have been forcibly maintained as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

During its 20-year period of independence Estonia developed a stable and well-balanced economy, founded on the principles of private enterprise and initiative. But the expropriation and sovietization policies of the Kremlin destroyed the economic structure of independent Estonia and forced it into the economic mold of the Soviet Union. Estonia's farms were collectivized and its workers subjected to a 20th-century version of medieval serfdom.

The forcible annexation of Estonia and her Baltic neighbors is a bitter reminder of the dangers of Soviet totalitarianism. Although Estonia has fallen victim to Communist tyranny, the Estonian people are determined to resist their oppressors. On this anniversary we reaffirm our refusal to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic peoples and express our faith in their ultimate victory over tyranny.

They Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there could be no better demonstration of the universal desire of Americans for higher education than the response to my bill to provide income tax deductions for college expenses.

A brief explanation of H.R. 3392 carried by the wire services a few days ago has brought me letters from men and women from coast to coast.

Their letters spell out the details of their difficulties in financing college study for themselves or their children. Each story is different, but through them all runs the theme of sacrifice, saving, hard work and determination to carry on if it is at all possible. Unfortunately, some tell of failure. To all of them the dollars that would be saved by H.R. 3392 would mean a great deal. To many it would mean the difference between success and failure.

I would like to include with my remarks the following editorial from a New Jersey newspaper, similar to editorials that have appeared in many other States.

THEY NEED HELP

Among the Nation's unsung heroes are those parents who, despite modest means and the high cost of higher education, manage to pay their children's way through college. They are the middle-income families who are not considered needy enough to receive financial help, but who are nevertheless unable to absorb the expense of a college education without considerable sacrifice and in some cases going into debt.

To the aid of this forgotten group comes Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, with a bill which would make college expenses up to $1,000 a year deductible for income tax purposes. This could mean the difference between balanced and unbalanced budgets for many families, and considering the deductions allowed for business expenses, even under the Internal Revenue Service's tightened ground rules, it does not seem overly liberal.

At a time when leaders of government science, and industry are appealing for better educated citizenry, such tax relief as that proposed by Representative Bow appears not only justified, but long overdue.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the President has again placed the question of medical care for those of our citizens 65 years of age or older in a position of first importance before Congress. None of the proponents of the Federal Government assuming a greater degree of responsibility in providing medical care to people beyond the age of 65 had ever quite identified why this particular age group was entitled to a greater degree of recognition by the Federal Government than other age groups. But, there seems to be considerable political appeal in being sympathetic with the problems of older people. The President's proposal obviously does not solve the entire problem inasmuch as his program would be limited to older people eligible for social security and obviously an immediate inequity results because all people eligible for social security are not necessarily financially unable to take care of themselves. This is to say nothing of some 3½ million people 65 years of age or older who are not covered by social security and would not benefit.

Proponents of an expanded program of medical care for older people are prone to emphasize that it is degrading for older people to be required to, in effect, take a "pauper's oath" in order to be eligible for assistance. In my State of North Dakota where the Kerr-Mills program has been implemented it seems that this is hardly a factual contention. In North Dakota a single individual with an income not exceeding $1,200 is eligible and a couple with an income not in excess of $1,800. In the way of additional assets an applicant may own a home and up to 2 acres of land in town and a house and up to 160 acres of land contiguous to the house if it is in a rural area. In addition to this applicants may own personal property of a total value not to exceed $2,500 of which not more than $500 may be in cash in the case of a single person or $1,000 in the case of a married couple. Stocks and bonds are considered the same as cash. It hardly seems that anyone with this much property should be considered a pauper and this, of course, is exactly what the Kerr-Mills bill was designed to prevent. The program meets the needs of those older people who are not welfare cases when medical and hospital costs develop which would shortly deplete assets which would take care of normal living expenses.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in a recent newsletter, the President is rather inconsistent in his continual emphasis on the need for tax reduction while at the same time he advocates a medical care program which would substantially increase taxes. Proponents of medical care to the aged rather carefully refrain, as they talk about free medical care, from mentioning the increase of one-eighth of 1 percent additional contribution which will be made by both employer and employee of all those covered by social security in the event the President's medicare program would be enacted into law. This increase applies to every dollar of income for those on social security up to a total of $5,200 per year instead of the current $4,800 per year. This program like all other free Government programs is being paid for by someone. In the instance of medical care the incongruity is that those who will be paying the bill will be to a large extent those who can least afford it.

Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence had some interesting observations on Federal medical care for older citizens in a recent editorial and, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HAND IN MEDICAL CARE—ADMINISTRATION PLAN CRITICIZED AS LIKELY TO INTENSIFY SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

(By David Lawrence)

It's going to be harder to get a doctor when you are sick, harder to get into a hospital, and harder to take care of the young as well as the old who become ill in the future—if the Federal Government intervenes in the field of medical care as just recommended to Congress by President Kennedy.

Time was when, if you were sick, you could get a doctor to come to your home. Today most patients have to go to the doctor's office except when gravely ill.

There simply aren't enough doctors now. This is primarily because medical aid is covered in part by private insurance plans that make it less costly. Persons who used to take care of minor ailments themselves often seek medical aid nowadays. The insurance idea, itself, is a good one. But until the shortage of doctors produced by the existing plans is overcome, the proposed intervention by the Federal Government with free medical care for certain age groups will only intensify the problem for almost everybody. Elderly persons require individual care and continuous observation, but if there is a shortage of physicians, these patients will be neglected, no matter how much of the bill the Government is willing to pay.

It's good politics, of course, for any President to champion social-welfare legislation, but free medical attention for millions of citizens will constitute, in the field of welfare benefits, the biggest single expense imposed on all the people.

Taxes are to be raised to finance the medical plan proposed by the President. Not only will everybody's social security rates go up, but the tax will be imposed on the first $5,200 of salary instead of the current figure of $4,800 a year. The purpose, of course, is to collect about $10 billion more over the next 5 years. Just what this does to the administration program for a tax cut is not readily calculated, but it is another example of how the much-talked-about tax cut is rapidly turning into a tax rise.

With the objective of the President's plan—to provide medical care for the aged—there will be little dissent. But the question really is whether those families which can afford to take care of their own aged members shall be required to pay taxes to support a plan in which their own relatives—though able to afford the medical care—would get it at Government expense.

The medical care agitation will, moreover, raise false hopes. The proposed plan doesn't cover medical treatment but mostly the charges for hospitalization and related services. The political value, however, of proclaiming "medical care for the aged" will continue to be there, and it's politics that's really back of the whole crusade.

The vast majority of doctors are vehemently opposed to the new plan. They feel it will demoralize the whole system of medical care in America, and they ought to know. They constitute a dedicated profession. They are on call in serious cases at the hospitals or at private homes day and night. They must be precise in their findings, because errors can be fatal.

The members of the profession are men and women who know medical conditions in this country and are familiar also with what "socialized medicine" has meant in various other countries. They fear that the new plan some day will result in "socialized medicine"—a scheme in which the Government runs the medical-care programs, pays the fees of doctors, and standardizes their incomes. The administration denies that its plan will ever bring "socialized medicine," but the doctors know that, if the medical profession is overwhelmed with cases due to the free service programs provided by the Government, the demand on the time of all doctors will be so great that the Government will have to step in to try to bring order out of the chaos that will ensue.

Nobody objects to better medical care for the aged, as well as for everybody else, but there are serious differences of opinion as to whether those who seek to make political capital of the issue will produce frustration in the medical profession and a lowering of the high standards of medical care which have long prevailed in America.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the observance of an anniversary of the declaration of independence is an occasion for

festivities and celebrations in most countries throughout the world. Yesterday we observed the 45th anniversary of the gaining of independence by the small Baltic country of Estonia. It is unfortunate that we cannot join in a celebration of this occasion with all our Estonian friends. The observance of this day serves more as a reaffirmation of the hope that Americans, and free Estonians everywhere, have of seeing the reemergence of a free indenpendent Estonia. It will only be then that we would join our Estonian friends in a joyful and glorious celebration.

Being a small nation Estonia has, for most of its modern history, been subjected to foreign rule. Its domination by Sweden was only replaced by Russian czarist rule. The realization of the national goal, nurtured throughout the centuries in the hearts of all Estonians, was finally achieved when Russia was in the chaos of a revolution. The Estonians proclaimed their independence on February 24, 1918. With the attainment of independence the Estonians undertook the responsibilities as citizens of a free nation and succeeded in not only rebuilding their devastated and ruined country, but also in advancing in all phases of national activity. However, the ever present Russian threat, now in the clothing of Soviet imperialism, brought about the annexation of Estonia by the U.S.S.R. in 1940.

In spite of all the odds against them, these hearty and valiant people, mindful of the hardships their ancestors went through to achieve independence, have not given up hope that their country will again be free. We admire this persevering hope and on this anniversary we reaffirm our determination never to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic nations and express our hope and prayer for their liberation.

Art Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, for the ardent followers of Art Hoppe's columns in the San Francisco Chronicle, I wish to insert the following articles which appeared on February 8, February 12, and February 14, 1963:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 8, 1963]

TOPPLING: THE NEW FRIENDLY FUN GAME

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Our State Department, as you know, put out a press release the other day saying our good neighbor, Canada, wasn't being very neighborly, not wishing to accept our hydrogen bombs. And this, of course, toppled the Canadian Government.

So now the Canadians are very sore at us. Mainly because we toppled them with a press release. I don't blame them. How does it look? We could at least have toppled them with something heavier. Like a diplomatic note.

Naturally, we're saying, "Ooops, sorry. It slipped." And, as usual, the heads of at least 12 departments in Washington nobly accepted full responsibility for the error. And each, as usual, then promptly leaked the name of the guy who really did it. Which sure fixed him.

But this time I've scored a coup. I've got the only source in the State Department who's not merely taking full responsibility. He's relishing it. That's Mr. J. Youngblade Saltonbiddle, chief of the toppling section.

"A smashing technological breakthrough," said Mr. Saltonbiddle, leaning back in his leather swivel chair and expansively unbuttoning the top button of his three-button jacket. "Never have we managed an all-out topple with a single press release before."

A marvelous feat, I agreed. But why Canada? "Well, actually," he said, frowning, "we'd been working on Cuba and the alphabetizer slipped a notch. However, the success which instantly followed this mishap is positive proof of a theory we at State have long held."

What's that? "Why," he said, "it's obviously far less tediously ticklish to topple a friendly government than an unfriendly one."

Good Lord, of course. I said, I'd noticed State's earlier experiments in this field. "Yes," he said proudly, "our recent work with our friends in NATO may bear fruit any day now."

We're toppling Mr. de Gaulle? Great. "Oh, my, no," he said. Mr. de Gaulle's far too unfriendly. I was thinking of our efforts on Mr. Macmillan. He's tottering. One more speech by Mr. Acheson should do it, I think."

Spectacular, I said. But why does the theory work so well? "Oh, that's simple," he said. "Unfriendly governments, such as Cuba, pay little heed to our unfriendly press releases and speeches. Indeed, they tend to unite the unfriendly people behind their unfriendly leaders. But friendly governments on the other hand. * * * Ah, this Canadian success, if properly understood, opens vast new challenges."

Like what? "Think of the friendliest government you know," he said, the gleam of a true scientist in his eyes. And with that he handed me a press release headed: "Error-Prone Kennedy Administration a Pushover."

Well, it just goes to show you. Mr. Saltonbiddle scores a success in his field and now he wants to topple the head of another department. Just like any other official in Washington. It gives them a sense of power. Of course, while toppling's fun, pretty soon they begin to run out of friends to topple.

And so, come to think of it, are we.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 12, 1963]

JUST PLAIN JACK FITS YOU FINE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time once again for another visit with "Just Plain Jack" the true-to-life story of a young man's unending struggle to build a better world. Through pushups.

As we join Just Plain Jack today he and The beautiful society girl he married are presiding over a family meeting of the Brandywine Historical & Chin-ups Club in the historical Historical room. Which is very historical.

JACK. Everybody hiked his 50 miles this morning? Great. Never saw you all looking better. Bobby, throw a bucket of water on Portly Pierre. I want him to sit up so I can see how much better he looks.

PORTLY PIERRE (spluttering). I did 107, Chief. Out of my office, down the hall, twice around the east wing playpen and (triumphantly) here I am. Still alive. And I counted every step.

JACK (irritably). Miles, Pierre, 50 miles.

PIERRE. Miles. (He faints again.)

JACK. When he revives, I'll see that he does 50 miles. In a straight line. But now, to business. As you know, this note from Teddy Roosevelt we found in the archives promoting 50-mile hikes has been a smash. It's enhanced our vigorous image, but with a sweeping concept of history tossed in. Nothing finer. But now we need a followup. (Rubbing his hands.) What other notes on physical activities have we found in the archives of our glorious former Presidents?

BOBBY. Well, George Dillon got one out of Washington's scrapbooks and he's been down all day tossing dollars into the river.

JACK (frowning). I don't think that's so hot for our image. We need a treasurer with a better arm.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL (handing Jack a yellowed parchment). Look, Bunny. Isn't this wonderful? It's a note from Martha Washington to George saying, "Every colonial dame should be able to do 10 miles on water skis while standing on her head." At last, I shall be an asset to you.

JACK (examining the parchment). I don't like to call this forgery, Dear. But why is it on your stationery?

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL (sobbing). I just wanted to be a help to you. Ever since the day I fumbled on that triple reverse, I've felt the romance was going out of our marriage.

SARGE (interrupting). How about this, Chief? It's a letter from Cal Coolidge telling his Mom how he swallowed 47 live goldfish in college while doing the black bottom. Want me to call the Aquarium? And Arthur Murray's?

JACK (shaking his head). It would alienate the goldfish lovers.

TEDDY. Here's one. But all it says is: "General McClellan, you have given me the shaft.—A. Lincoln.

JACK (delightedly). That's it. The Marines may outhike us. But in this sport, they'll be patsies. I know my team. And after the Marines there's Adlai and United States Steel and Congress and * * * Oh, this will sweep the country.

Will shafting sweep the country? As usual? Will Jack's team be successful at shafting? Despite its limited experiences? What are you, some kind of nut?

So tune in to our next heart-warming episode. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, folks, remember: When you're feeling low, when skies are grey, when you wish you had what it takes to be fit for facing life—think of Just Plain Jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 14, 1963]

JUST PLAIN JACK (SO WHO NEEDS IT?)

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We were going to have another episode of that warmhearted television series, "Just Plain Jack," this morning. But the scenario writers have vanished.

Armed with recent clippings, they locked themselves in the script room. Ten hours later, when the door was forced, the room was empty of all but overturned chairs and broken furniture. The only clues were an open window and scraps of rumpled paper which appear to be the rough draft of a script with authors' working notes.

After piecing things together, police said they suspected a foul play. It follows.

We open on Just Plain Jack talking to Bobby. "We all must be physically fit to face the challenge of the sixties with vigor," says Jack. "And would you mind tying my shoe for me, Bobby. I can't bend over. My back, you know." (Is this believable?)

Bobby gets mad. Jack gets mad. Jack tells Bobby to go take a hike. Bobby goes home to his wife, Ethel, who is expecting. She is expecting a baseball team. (Believable?) Bobby tells her he is going to start taking long walks. Ethel says thank goodness.

Meanwhile, Teddy's wife, Joan (gets confusing here), lands on the cover of Look. Inside is her inside story. Joan confides Jack can't pick up his son, Jack, Junior, the way Teddy can pick up his son, Teddy, Junior. So there.

Portly Pierre, Jack's faithful family retainer, is outraged. "It's only that his (Jack's) son is getting heavier," says Pierre. (Getting heavier than what?) Teddy's son? (Clarify here.)

In inside story, Joan also says the beautiful society girl Jack married wears a wig In fact, says Joan, she wears three wigs. (All at once? Explain.) Pierre's co-worker, Pamela, is outraged. "That's a personal question," says Pamela. (Does Pamela wear wig? Does Pierre? Check. May be future episode here.)

Then Joan confides delicately to Look that Teddy is expecting, too. In fact he's expecting a baseball team. Just like Ethel. "He says if his mother hadn't had nine, I would not have him," says Joan. (Very believable here.) But so far, Teddy has only pitcher and catcher. "We've been married 4 years," Joan tells Look, "and Ted can't understand why we don't have four children." (Unbelievable. Teddy is 31 years old.)

(Maybe bring in scene here where Teddy comes home from office and says he's going for long walk. As usual. Joan, blushing, whispers in his ear, explaining things. "Oh," says Teddy. "So that's it." And he looks longingly from Joan to his hiking shoes, thus symbolizing raging inner conflict.)

But here, the scenario dissolves into gibberish. There's something about a grand finale with nine baseball teams, all wearing wigs, hiking off into the sunset in a salute to our new great national pastime. Then comes a key clue: a note, triple underlined in blood, saying: ("But which is new great national pastime? Producing blisters? Or baseball teams? They're incompatible.")

So it's obvious what happened to our scenario writers. They committed suicide. Because they couldn't resolve this awful conflict in the plot. Nonsense. "Chacun a son gout," I always say. Which means I doubt hiking will ever become our great national pastime.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Facts and Fiction About Municipal Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of a talk given recently before the Rotary Club of Buffalo, N.Y., by Mr. Robert D. Sipprell, executive director of the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority.

In a clear and objective manner, Mr. Sipprell explained how municipal housing has operated in Buffalo over the past 25 years, and its contribution toward good housing today.

Mr. Sipprell's talk follows:

FACTS AND FICTION ABOUT MUNICIPAL HOUSING

(By Robert D. Sipprell)

Twenty-five years ago last September, the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 went into effect and launched a publicly supported housing program that was born amidst controversy and has lived with it for a quarter of a century. Nowhere within the domestic issues of this country has an undertaking of such relatively small proportions generated such a large area of debate.

Like many other public enterprises emerging from the era of the 1930's, public low-rent housing had an economic motivation in that such Government-sponsored construction would generate employment and prime the pumps, so to speak, for the construction industry. And this it did to some extent. But public housing contained a unique combination of both economic and social objectives, and to the latter we must hang the tail of controversy.

The social objective was to eliminate slums and substandard housing as far as possible, and to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income. One additional clause, however, was the key to this objective—that such housing was to be made available at rents the low-income families could afford. To make this possible, a direct housing subsidy was authorized to be paid in cash by the Federal Government to the local housing authorities participating in the program. Here is the source of one of the great myths of public housing.

Despite its 25 years of existence, local housing developments are frequently referred to as "Federal projects." This is a gross misconception. The fact that Federal funds support the program through subsidies, just as it does in many other activities where the public interest has legislative recognition, does not mean abdication of local ownership, control or initiative. All of the public housing developments in the city of Buffalo are owned, controlled and operated by the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority in its capacity as a public corporation. Just as mythical as the concept of total Federal bureaucracy is the notion that housing subsidies come from a bottomless barrel. The fact is that such subsidies are quite limited and a matter of contractual definition. Public housing can be subsidized only to the extent of assisting with debt service on local housing authority bonds issued for the capital construction costs. The annual expense of operation, management, maintenance and administration must be met by the rent revenue from tenant families. In other words, the public housing tenants themselves are paying all costs except the debt service portion met by subsidies. The city makes no appropriation for the housing authority in its budget nor is it called upon to make any cash outlay for public housing operations.

It was mentioned earlier that nowhere within the domestic issues of this country has an undertaking of such relatively small proportions generated such a large area of debate. I say this for two reasons. First, there is little more than 500,000 public housing units in the entire Nation (1 percent of total housing units) and in the current fiscal year about 30,000 new public housing units will have been put under construction which is about 2 percent of the total residential housing starts for the whole country. Secondly, the total annual Federal expenditure for low-rent housing subsidies, to give shelter to human beings of low-income, is far less than the appropriations to protect wildlife; it is less than the cost of putting one spaceship on the moon; it cannot compare with the public cost of purchasing and storing surplus food for price supports to the farmers; and it's a pittance in relation to the millions now flowing into urban renewal efforts. This is not to suggest that such Federal interests are less important. But it does suggest that the public conscience and the largess of the Federal purse might occasionally warrant some examination in terms of human values.

While the low-rent housing program at the national level may be of small magnitude, in the arena of a local community such as Buffalo, it is not a small business operation. The Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority holds the title and deed to 15 housing developments, in the city of Buffalo, which represent $60 million worth of real estate. These developments, constructed over the past 25 years, contain more than 6,500 apartments and if you were to count the heads of the occupants, it would be a population somewhat larger than the villages of Hamburg, Orchard Park and East Aurora combined. The authority currently has approximately $53 million of local housing authority bonds outstanding on which annual interest and amortization is being paid with the assistance of Federal and State subsidies. From our 6,500 or more tenants we have an annual rent revenue of $4 million. Being a public corporation and, therefore, a nonprofit organization, all of this revenue goes back into the economy of the local area by way of wages to 350 employees, contracts and purchases to local businesses for maintenance work and materials, equipment replacements, and various other services. About 10 percent of the revenue goes to the municipality as a payment in lieu of taxes.

The housing authority by statute is a tax exempt body. But the housing authority is the only public authority or public agency of any kind, to my knowledge, that makes a payment in lieu of taxes for such services as are rendered by the municipality. As of June 1962 we had advanced gross payments in lieu of taxes totaling more than $4 million. I might say in this connection that we also pay the full rate for water consumption, the same as any property owner, and our full share of sewer costs, the same as any property owner. As an independent agency, we ourselves are tenants in the city hall and pay the going rate for office space in that building.

I have mentioned these economic and business aspects of the authority's operations only because I know from personal contacts that many persons have a hazy understanding of the authority's status in the structure of the community. I would like to depart now from such references and talk about the people we serve and the issues for the future.

The 6,500 apartments that we now operate have provided shelter for about 5 times that many families over the years due to turnover and an average tenancy of about 5 years for any one family. Contrary to opinions I have heard expressed occasionally, we are currently maintaining a 98-percent occupancy in our total program. The annual turnover, however, is about 15 percent so that each year about 1,000 families move out and 1,000 new tenants move in. As you can quickly calculate, we have a sizable group of graduates or alumni—taking some liberties with the term. In fact, the man sitting next to you might be one of our graduates who in leaner years found public housing a haven for decent shelter for his family within his limited income. There are a number of doctors, lawyers, businessmen, and prominent public figures today who were tenants of ours 15 to 25 years ago. There are many young families at present in our various developments who will grow out of their current economic stress and fill the role of future prominent citizens. This is part of what public housing is for, but unfortunately all existing low-income families will not achieve this success. Experience teaches us that for every family that improves its economic status, there is another to take its place who either temporarily or permanently have less than it takes to acquire standard housing in the private market.

We are dedicated to serving those families or individuals who are at or near the lowest income strait in the metropolitan area. Precisely what this means in dollars varies from time to time just as the plateau of national personal income varies and the cost of living changes. We reexamine the specific income group we should serve about once every 2 years. Let me give you an example of the changes that have occurred. In 1939, a year often used as the base for cost index, the Authority's policy said families eligible for public housing must have an annual income less than $1,500. Today such maximum income limits for admission range from $3,600 for a couple without children to $6,600 for a family of eight or more persons. Yet in the face of this range of eligibility, the median annual income of all of our tenants last year was $2,609. This median level indicates there were as many tenant families with incomes below $2,600 a year as there were above that figure.

It is not sufficient to characterize families in low-rent housing only in terms of their incomes. There are other factors. It is perhaps redundant to point out to this audience that we serve families of any race, creed, color or national origin. At the present time 62 percent of the public housing units in Buffalo are occupied by white families, 37 percent occupied by Negro families and 1 per-

cent are occupied by families of Puerto Rican origin. Other characteristics of the low-income tenant are perhaps more significant. For instance, 46 percent of our tenants are what we call standard families—composed of mother, father, and children; 20 percent are so-called broken families—only one parent in the household; and 34 percent are adults only—meaning elderly single persons or couples. The most striking change in the past 6 years is the increase in elderly tenants, rising from 13 percent in 1954 to 34 percent in 1962. It may come as a surprise to some of you, but only 18 percent of our exciting public housing tenants are dependent solely on public relief for a livelihood.

The mere fact that we deal with the low-income strata of the population should make it obvious that we are aware of the many social problems that exist. I am not referring to the old chestnuts about keeping coal in the bathtub or framing a picture in the toilet seat not knowing what else it was for. Such things are pure fantasy and never have occurred. I am speaking rather of the social maladjustments, domestic discord, and human relations generally. But we are compelled to recognize that all are human beings in our society, some less equipped perhaps than others to cope with modern living. The vast majority, nevertheless, have the same hopes and aspirations as you and I. The principal difference is the degree to which each is equipped with the tools for living in today's urban environment. Such basic tools may be economic, physical, intellectual, educational, or spiritual or any combination that influences the molding of social structure.

You are all familiar, I know, with the lines from Shakespeare that say something about "all the world is a stage and all the men and women merely players." The playwright may have been reflecting on the religious doctrine that all men are created equal and that inequality, in whatever form, is man made, from the day he walked, by his own actions, by his environment, by his opportunities, or by examples of leadership. Public housing is but a speck on the horizon in its efforts to provide some equality of housing for low-income families. Good housing, as important as it is, will not by itself change anyone's whole standard of living. We have had a 25-year laboratory test to prove it. There must be a companion emphasis on education, occupational training, rehabilitative social welfare services, strong law enforcement, and a forceful mission by religious institutions to enlarge their spiritual influence. These are not housing functions but rather total community responsibilities and very important ones.

The city of Buffalo has made considerable gains, over the past 10 years, in eradicating substandard housing. Yet there still remains more than 17,000 housing units in serious substandard condition, most of which is located in the so-called core area of the city. Slum clearance and the correction of substandard conditions is no longer the sole province of public housing. It is being attacked on a much broader front through urban renewal. In its early stages, urban renewal is a tearing down process causing the displacement of hundreds of families. Unfortunately such displacement is usually the lower income groups and minority groups. The process could be likened to dropping a pebble in the pond and watching the concentric water rings move outward and outward until they disappear. I trust no one of intelligence, however, has the foolish notion that families displaced from the city core area will move outward and outward until they disappear. There must be positive planning for the permanent relocation of such families in decent standard housing and the social services attendant thereto. This may be accomplished by utilization of existing residential structures, by rehabilitation or by new construction. But if the planning in this respect is not positive, and simply left to natural forces, every step forward may prove to be two steps backward in terms of long-range goals.

The housing authority has a cooperative relationship to urban renewal and the low-rent housing units in the city of Buffalo are a distinct asset. The public housing formula can be adapted to a variety of housing functions either for temporary or long-term use. We need a housing inventory that is flexible and adjustable as demands and conditions may indicate, even to the point of liquidation of certain public housing from time to time as local planning may direct and the public interest served. The local housing authority, at the present time, has active plans only for filling a very special void—housing specifically designed for the elderly. This we hope to accomplish in small developments in various parts of the city to avoid concentration and to better serve the elderly in familiar surroundings.

Most of you in this room have a high regard, I am sure, for the Buffalo area and its future. I would urge you as individuals to discard the traditional fault of many citizens who say, "Let George do it, this is not my problem." I use the term "George" symbolically in case you might think I was referring to my brother. But seriously, you have an obligation to contribute to housing and planning decisions. There is no better way than to participate in such organizations as the Redevelopment Foundation, the City Planning Association, Community Welfare Agencies, neighborhood councils, church groups, or whatever is available where your voice can be heard and you can become a part of decisions on community rebuilding. If you don't, you will have no one to blame but yourself if the city of Buffalo 10 years from now is not to your liking.

Kennedy Needs a Direct Phone Not to Moscow, but to Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following column by Victor Lasky. This is the first of Mr. Lasky's columns to be distributed by the North American Newspaper Alliance. As the North American Newspaper Alliance serves over a hundred of the Nation's newspapers, many more Americans will now have access to the timely and penetrating reporting of one of the country's leading columnists. His is a welcome voice across the land:

TO THE POINT: KENNEDY NEEDS A DIRECT PHONE NOT TO MOSCOW, BUT TO PARIS

(By Victor Lasky)

The Republicans have just been handed a powerful issue for 1964. And that is the apparent inability of President Kennedy to function as the leader of the free world. From Ottawa to Karachi, thanks to incredible diplomatic ineptness, U.S. prestige appears to have toppled to a new low.

And it wasn't long ago that President Kennedy thought prestige was of crucial importance. In fact, he based much of his 1960 campaign on the theme that the image of the United States had deteriorated vastly under Eisenhower and that, if elected, he intended to reverse that trend.

The weather has abruptly changed in Washington from the high buoyancy of the post-Cuba-crisis days. Wherever one looks, the Western alliance appears to be in disarray. To begin with, there was the debacle in Brussels. In vetoing Britain's entry into the Common Market, General de Gaulle has blocked—if not wrecked—President Kennedy's grand design for an Atlantic community with the United States in the driver's seat.

Then all of a sudden we found ourselves in an unseemly row with our indispensable close neighbor Canada. Prime Minister Diefenbaker has publicly warned Washington not to consider Canada as part of the New Frontier—a direct slap at President Kennedy.

In Paris, De Gaulle not so privately refers to the President as "Jacques L'Enfant"—Jack the infant. A West German official, visiting the United States, privately told a group of newsmen, "most Europeans do not take your President too seriously."

COCKY AND ARROGANT

Why this crisis in confidence in President Kennedy?

Only a few months ago, Mr. Kennedy seemed to be on top of the world. He had scored what appeared to be an impressive victory over Khrushchev in Cuba. He became cocky and—in European eyes—arrogant. European leaders were outraged when Mr. Kennedy, at a Palm Beach background briefing for newsmen, let it be known that the United States intends to pursue its own role in world affairs even at the expense of treading on allied toes. "America is not out to win a popularity contest," was one version of Kennedy's words.

The President has repeatedly gone out of his way to irritate our allies. There was his disregard of European interests in such areas as the Congo. Over the protests of knowledgeable Europeans, the President authorized a United Nations military adventure aimed at smashing a pro-Western regime in Katanga. "Kennedy will undoubtedly be applauded by the world's neutrals," commented Le Monde, of Paris, "but is showing how little regard he has for his allies."

Then there was the President's decision to hamper, or restrict, the growth of a truly independent nuclear deterrent in Europe. In London (where Whitehall announced it would develop its own air-launched missile to fill the gap left by U.S. cancellation of Skybolt), a British official commented: "The day has long gone when the American President sneezed and Europe caught pneumonia. If the United States now intends to place relations with the Afro-Asians, and even the Soviet Union, ahead of relations with Europe, the reaction on this side of the water is apt to be 'thank God for De Gaulle.' "

DOESN'T SEE GREATNESS

Let's get to the point. Charles de Gaulle is today the most important spokesman for the new Europe. On the world stage he has emerged as at least the equal of President Kennedy. And no one knows that unpleasant fact better than John F. Kennedy who seeks to go down in history as the greatest of American Presidents. But le general refuses to play ball. He has yet to see any greatness in the young man from Hyannisport. He is unwilling to entrust the future of France—and the Europe which he now dominates—to the trigger finger of a youth responsible for the incredible fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. And who can really blame him?

It has been difficult for De Gaulle to take the Kennedy administration very seriously. While Mr. Kennedy keeps saying that the

threat in Cuba has diminished, the Soviet military buildup continues for all who want to see. And when the President was asserting the indivisibility of the NATO Alliance, U.S. diplomats were engaged in bilateral, secret negotiations with the Soviets. Suspicious Europeans began to ask if the United States was about to make a deal with Moscow over Europe's head.

Much of French public opinion does not trust the New Frontier's adventures—or misadventures—in diplomacy. "An atomic Yalta is shaping up," headlined the rightwing anti-Gaullist Paris L'Aurore. And the leftwing anti-Gaullist weekly L'Express observed: "Let no one have any illusion about it—France is behind De Gaulle."

French hostility toward President Kennedy is not surprising. The French have long memories and it is indeed difficult for them to forget Kennedy's Francophobia over the years. As a Congressman, Mr. Kennedy pursued a vigorously anti-French line on Indo-China and, later as a Senator, he made Algerian independence his issue. On another occasion he went so far as to suggest that French possession of atomic weapons was more dangerous to the United States than those of the Soviet Union.

WHERE'S THE OPPOSITION

As the pro-alliance Paris La Croix put it: "Instead of a direct telephone between the White House and the Kremlin, what seems more essential is a permanent line between Europe and the United States."

Curiously, the Republicans have failed to make any real impact in their criticism of administration failings.

Nevertheless, the job of the loyal opposition is to oppose. The Democrats did a superb job of opposing the Eisenhower administration. Who could ever forget the uproar which followed the ill-fated U-2 mission over the Soviet Union? And remember when then Senator Kennedy urged President Eisenhower to express regrets to Comrade Khrushchev over the unfortunate episode?

Among many Republicans there is the feeling that now may not be the time to rock the boat. But, as a prominent partisan put it, just a few years ago, "Bipartisanship does not mean—and was never meant to mean—rubberstamping of every Executive blunder without debate."

The man who said this was none other than John F. Kennedy.

Income Tax Deduction for Contributions to Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following house resolution adopted by the 73d Illinois General Assembly allowing income tax deductions of a specified percent for contributions to educational institutions:

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, 73D GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Offered by Messrs. P. J. Miller, McAvoy, Wall, Elward, Loughran, Hannigan, Granata, and Capuzi)

Whereas the education of every child in our Nation is an investment in our greatest natural resource, our children; and

Whereas the schools of our Nation, both public and private, are in great need of financial aid; and

Whereas direct governmental financial aid to private schools is extremely limited by the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United States of America be hereby memorialized to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as follows:

1. Allow each taxpayer an income tax deduction of a specified percent of his income for his contributions to educational institutions; except that a deduction shall not be allowed for contributions to any school, or school district or other school boundary which (a) does not meet the minimum management or educational standards set by the State in which the school, or school district or other school boundary is located, or (b) which discriminates in the admission of students on the basis of race or color, or (c) which segregates admitted students on the basis of race or color.

2. Each taxpayer claiming a deduction for contributions to educational institutions be required (a) to identify each school, or school district or other school boundary, to which contributions were made; (b) to indicate the amount of the contribution to each school, school district or other school boundary, and (c) to enclose a signed receipt from each donee, or a money order receipt identifying the donee as the payee of the order, or a processed check or draft identifying the donee as the payee.

Resolved, further, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the present Congress of the United States, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Illinois.

FREDERIC B. SELIKE,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
JOHN W. LEWIS, Jr.,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

(Adopted by the house, February 13, 1963.)

"Don't Pack ASC," Farmers Say 3 to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, a question currently making the rounds today is this: What should be the makeup and purpose of the agricultural stabilization and Conservation Committees at the State and county levels?

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman appears to believe that these committees should be composed of individuals who believe in and will support the various agricultural programs conceived by the Department of Agriculture.

On the other hand, a poll taken this month of 3,500 farmers revealed that there were heavy percentages of these farmers who believed that the committees should be made up of individuals with independent views who were free of influence by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, as a partial answer to this question, I submit to the RECORD an article entitled "Don't Pack ASC," as it appeared in the March 1963, issue of the Farm Journal:

"DON'T PACK ASC," FARMERS SAY 3 TO 1

"If you ever stirred up a nest of hornets, you did it with your article on ASC committees," says C. T. Daube, of Indiana.

And apparently it did. Not only did more than 3,500 farmers vote on the three questions posed last month (February, p. 38) but many wrote long letters to get a few things off the chests."

Two things are plain:

1. These farmers do not agree with Secretary Freeman's study group that ASC committeemen should be limited to those who favor and will promote farm programs.

2. They do not want to see the Secretary of Agriculture have more authority over ASC committees.

Nationally, 77 percent of those voting said "no" to the first question; 79 percent said "no" to the second question, and 57 percent voted "no" on question No. 3. (Regional differences are given below.)

Take that first question: Should only those who favor current farm programs serve as committeemen?

"Yes," says a farmer from Red Oak, Iowa, who argues that anyone elected to a committee should try to promote the program and work for it.

"I can't understand how any farmer can conscientiously administer a program he is strongly against," says another Iowan, Roy Simonson.

However, 77 percent of those when sent ballots feel otherwise. "We need the checks and balances of committeemen who do not swallow 100 percent the farm programs they administer," writes Orville Backens, of Wisconsin.

Committeemen should also represent those who don't participate, believes Roger Currier of Minnesota.

Sam Smith, Jr., of Louisiana points out that "when Congress passes a law that the President doesn't like, he isn't required to resign—but simply to administer the law. So why should a committeeman have to resign?"

Clyde Beeby, Oklahoma, a committeeman for several years, says: "I feel that I should represent those who elect me, not be a push button for whoever happens to be Secretary of Agriculture."

Adds a Kansas farmer: ASC committeemen should be loyal to their area and electors—first. If the program fails an area, they should oppose it.

Don't give the Secretary of Agriculture more authority over ASC committees than he now has, say 79 percent of those who wrote in.

"We've got to keep some control in the hands of farmers, or the ASC will become just a propaganda branch of the USDA," says an Iowa farmer.

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Rippe of Kansas offer: "We need to control the politically appointed Secretary of Agriculture some way. What better way than to elect the local ASC? Otherwise, farmers, being a minority group, have no way to show their disapproval."

"If a committeeman doesn't do right, his fellow farmers will remove him the following year," reminds Sam Smith.

And Carl Idland, Montana, says: "I don't believe that someone who is appointed should have the authority to dismiss men who are elected."

Although 43 percent approved of county USDA councils that would report to Washington, D.C., not many expressed themselves strongly on either side of the question.

Some thought a county council of the right kind might be a good idea. For instance, "one composed of outstanding farmers and businessmen of the county; but

there shouldn't be any paid employees of Government on it," suggests Merritt Fermer, South Dakota.

"This could well turn into an organization to influence legislation," believes J. E. Brown of Ohio. "It smells like an attempt to build a political machine," agrees G. H. of Illinois.

[In percent]

	United States	East	Central	Southeast	Southwest	West
1. Should ASC committeemen be limited to those who favor and will promote current farm programs?						
Yes	23	21	27	22	15	12
No	77	79	73	78	85	88
2. Should the Secretary of Agriculture's authority over ASC commitees be strengthened?						
Yes	21	14	25	19	20	10
No	79	86	75	81	80	90
3. Should we have USDA county councils to report to the Secretary, Congress, and others on local conditions and problems?						
Yes	43	37	46	44	33	37
No	57	63	54	56	67	63

President Taft Recommended Submission of Income Tax Constitutional Amendment to States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the News-Democrat, Belleville, Ill., on Saturday, February 23, 1963, entitled "A Half Century Later," marking the 50th year of Federal income tax:

A HALF CENTURY LATER

Secretary of State Philander C. Knox issued his proclamation of February 25, 1913, and the 16th amendment was declared to have been ratified by the required 36 States. Thereupon Congress was authorized by the Constitution to enact that unloved levy, the individual income tax, which will be 50 years old Monday.

Actually, the history of the income tax in America goes back to 1643, when Massachusetts levied a faculty tax. The faculty theory holds that every man should contribute to the public burdens according to his ability.

The Federal Government adopted an income tax in 1862 to help finance the Civil War. This among other things called for withholding tax on dividends and interest paid out by banks, trust companies, railroads, savings institutions, and insurance companies. The Supreme Court in a unanimous decision of 1880 called this tax constitutional. However, the levy had been abandoned in 1872.

Subsequently, demand from the South and West for a more equitable distribution of the tax burden caused the inclusion in a tariff bill of 1894 a 2-percent tax on all incomes over $4,000. The income tax provision was immediately attacked in the courts. It was finally ruled unconstitutional as a direct levy as well as on other counts in 1895.

But considerable support for the taxation of wealth as such had been building. A constitutional amendment was the only way of accomplishing this in view of the ruling of the high bench as then constituted. The Democratic platform in 1908 endorsed an income tax amendment, and it was widely supported by the progressive wing of the Republican Party. President Taft eventually recommended submission of an amendment to the States.

Both House and Senate approved the necessary resolution in 1909 by overwhelming majorities. The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, S. E. Payne, however, had passionately opposed the tax, saying it would make us a nation of liars, that it was a tax upon the income of the honest men and an exemption, to a greater or lesser extent, on the income of rascals.

Tempers ran high in the States. In the Virginia Legislature, Senator Richard E. Byrd, father of U.S. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, declared: "A hand from Washington will be stretched out and placed upon every man's business; the eye of the Federal inspector will be in every man's countinghouse." How the elder Byrd would have shuddered at the vision of Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin's computers.

The passions of the early days of the century obviously were aroused by principles, not pelf.

In the first year of the income tax the married taxpayer with two dependents and an annual income of $10,000 had to send $60 to the Federal Government. His son's tax bill today—provided the circumstances are the same—is $1,372.

Deficits as a Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Newsweek of February 4, 1963:

DEFICITS AS A POLICY

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Mr. Kennedy is the first President who has ever openly advocated deficit financing as a policy. He is planning a deficit of $11.9 billion for the fiscal year 1964 and expects deficits in succeeding years. He lumps them all together by calling them a temporary deficit. Eventually, because of the stimulus that a huge tax cut combined with increased expenditures is expected to give to the economy, these transitional deficits are expected to cure themselves and bring about a surplus.

Taxpayers will uneasily remember that they have heard all this before. They have been hearing it off and on, in fact, ever since the days of the New Deal. "It has taken courage for the Federal Government to go into the red," said Franklin D. Roosevelt on July 8, 1938, "but it has been worth it." Somehow the promises that deficits would bring surpluses have never been kept. We have had 27 deficits in the last 33 years.

Is there any prospect that the theory will work better this time? Before we try to answer that question, let us see what is being proposed.

Mr. Kennedy is proposing that the Federal Government spend in fiscal 1964 more than it has ever before spent in its history, in peace or war. He is asking for administrative expenditures of $98.8 billion. This tops even the $98.4 billion of the peak war year, 1945. In the cash budget (which includes old-age pensions, etc.) he proposes to spend the unparalleled sum of $122.5 billion.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Throughout his budget message the President gives the impression that this record budget is brought about mainly by increased defense expenditures. That thesis cannot be maintained. True, he is proposing defense expenditures for 1964 of the record amount of $55.4 billion. But as total cash expenditures will reach $122.5 billion, this means nondefense expenditures of $67.1 billion.

And nondefense spending has risen faster than defense spending. If we compare 1964 with 1954, we find that, while total defense expenditures have increased $8.4 billion, nondefense expenditures have increased $22.9 billion and, counting social security, etc., $42.2 billion.

If Congress is sincerely looking for places where it can cut the budget, it need not look far. It might look at the scheduled expenditures of $4.2 billion for space research (not connected with defense), at the $3.7 billion scheduled for foreign aid, at the $5.8 billion for farm programs, at the $6.7 billion for commerce and transportation, at the $1.1 billion for housing subsidies, at the $6 billion for veterans' programs, and at the glorious $27.4 billion for health, labor, and welfare.

NO FOURTH DIMENSION

The President speaks of all these and many more programs as "a necessary payment on future progress." He insists that others "are for activities which will promote increased productivity and economic growth, yielding substantial benefits in the future." But this is to talk as if the money for these programs came out of some fourth dimension. It is to forget that it is taken away from the taxpayers. It does not meet more national needs. It causes every taxpaying family to meet fewer of its own needs. It leaves less for private persons and private business to invest in the future, in increased productivity or economic growth.

So far we have taken the budget estimates at face value. But suppose, as there are strong reasons for thinking, that expenditures are even more than $98.8 (or in cash, $122.5) billion; that revenues are less than $86.9 billion, and that the deficit is more than $11.9 billion? This is more than possible. A year ago the President estimated a surplus for the current fiscal year of $500 million. This has now become an expected deficit of $8.8 billion, because expenditures are $1.8 billion more and revenues $7.5 billion less than he estimated.

The budget that Mr. Kennedy has submitted, in brief, is irresponsible. Even if the deficit is no greater than the $11.9 billion he estimates, the course he proposes of raising expenditures and cutting taxes can lead only to more inflation, and will undermine confidence in the world's anchor currency, the dollar.

The Narcotic Problem: A Challenge to Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article written by Dr. Howard B. Miller, of Fair Lawn, N.J. It represents a point of view which merits consideration:

SUMMARY OF THE NARCOTIC PROBLEM: A CHALLENGE TO PHYSICIANS

(By Howard B. Miller, M.D.)

Narcotic addicts are sick people and deserve and need physician's care. It is now time for all of us to face and appreciate the fact and to transfer this responsibility back to the medical profession. Police control of the addict is unwarranted. Policemen are our law enforcers, but they are not physicians—why, then, should the problem of addiction be entrusted to them. Certainly they can, and should, control the traffic in narcotics as far as the supply and sale of it is concerned—but they are not qualified to determine our attitudes and treatment of the addict himself.

This peculiar situation is not new in history—a short time ago the insane were policed, chained, and beaten before courageous men smashed the prejudice which existed. Freed from the threat of police action, physicians were then able to cope with the problem—the development and growth of psychiatry resulted—to benefit all mankind. Today, the distortion in interpretation of existing laws keeps the narcotic problem in a similar position.

The United States today has the greatest problem of narcotic addiction of any Western country. Social and medical studies show our approach to the problem is deficient in all respects—90 percent of patients become readdicted within 6 months of so-called treatment in Federal institutions and no local community responsibility and care exists on any adequately functioning level.

The Harrison Act of 1914 was intended as a revenue measure, prescribing taxes and licenses. It properly stated that narcotics could be prescribed for medical purposes. The law was enforced by the Revenue Department until 1930, when a separate Bureau of Narcotics was established. The Harrison Act was never intended to keep the ill addict from physicians' care—only distortion and misinformation resulted in this monstrous development.

To emphasize the extent of this distortion, I would like to cite three interviews which have recently occurred.

1. In a recent interview, S. Bernard Wortis, M.D., dean of the New York University School of Medicine, noted that narcotic addiction is the only disease with its accompanying physiological and mental disturbances that the physician is forbidden to treat under penalty of law.

2. In a personal correspondence with Dr. Henry A. Davidson, of the Journal of the New Jersey Medical Society, Dr. Davidson stated that physicians "would not treat addicts because they were told not to do so—this is why they report the addict to the police officers." He emphasized that all physicians knew the addict was a sick person but were afraid to treat him.

3. In a recent interview (February 1963) Dr. James V. Lowry, Assistant Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, spoke at a symposium on narcotics and the law at the first Inter-American Conference on Legal Medicine and Forensic Science, held in Puerto Rico, and is summarized as follows:

"In the United States, jails are open to addicts, but hospitals are commonly not." He compared the present availability of hospital treatment for addiction "with that for mental illness a century ago."

"Many addicts, Dr. Lowry said, are too ill to overcome the compulsion of addiction and seek treatment. But if facilities were available such addicts could be involuntarily hospitalized." He warned, however, that unless hospitals are available for actual treatment, civil commitment laws are "useless legal instruments." They are, he said, "devices for imprisonment under another name." He added "Neither medicine nor law should make hospitalization for the treatment of drug addiction a dogma unchecked by controlled research on other methods of treatment." Emphasizing that it is a mistake to overestimate the significance of relapse, he said, "Relapses, even to the point of readdiction, call for treatment directed to the cause and prevention of further relapses. Relapse does not mean once an addict, always an addict, there are recoveries even after numerous relapses. Whether it becomes readdiction or only a temporary setback may depend entirely upon how it is treated. Dr. Lowry also said that while legislative bodies have been enacting tougher laws against sellers of narcotics, humane prosecutors often accept lesser pleas—of a misdemeanor instead of a felony—from small sellers whose principal crime is their own addiction to drugs."

A thorough study of the reports stemming from the operation of narcotic clinics from 1919–23, was undertaken by a committee of the Council on Mental Health and Narcotics in 1955. The establishment of these clinics were highly criticized. However, after cutting through a morass of conflicting statements, they evolved with the conclusion that the reports were prejudiced and biased. The supposed detrimental results from those clinics; namely, that it increased the traffic in drugs, seemed to be based largely on opinions of police officers. The narcotics committee felt the clinics never had a chance to establish their true worth and value.

Certain prejudices exist to hinder us, and therefore, it is urgent to stress the following:

RELATION TO MORALS AND CRIME

1. Opiates, in themselves, do not cause physical decay or degeneration of the moral fiber. It is only when the addicted person is forced to seek his drugs from underworld sources that criminal acts follow.

2. The crimes of addicts are usually directed against property (theft and robbery), rather than crimes against persons (assault, rape, etc.).

3. Opiates, in themselves, do not incite persons to commit violent crimes which they would not commit without the drug. The fact that some criminals use opiates is not evidence that the drug caused antisocial acts. Narcotics deaden rather than create aggressive drives. The antisocial acts committed result from the need to obtain the means to allay the symptoms caused by their physiological as well as need for narcotics.

Recent biological and biochemistry studies emphasize that the narcotic drugs are chemically intimately related to the actual metabolic activities of the human cell. It is now revealed that many drugs (which have previously been felt to be addicting because of a physchological defect in the personality of the sufferer) actually have a chemical structure which allows them to slip into the chemical functions of the cell itself. Thus the addict is truly physiologically dependent on the drug, and, because of this new biological need, a real physiological dependence is created. Therefore much medical, as well as psychological research is sorely needed to clarify all these factors, and physicians must be made free in order to cope with them.

The legal and medical professions are now beginning to be alerted to this national threat and to grapple with it. An exact definition of the framework wherein police control and medical control functions is needed, and the haziness of the dividing lines to be clearly determined.

The addict must be treated, not prosecuted. He is to be recognized as an ill person and not as a criminal. Our human understanding, and knowledge and compassion should be utilized to guide the addict to our hospitals—not to force him into the underworld and eventual disgrace and oblivion. Valuable citizens, capable of much worth can be then salvaged and restored to their proper place in our society.

Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Norman M. Clapp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, delivered the principal address at the annual meeting of the Tarheel Electric Membership Association on February 19, 1963, in Raleigh, N.C.

This address, in my opinion, is the best explanation of the total rural electrification program as it applies to the present situation that I have heard. His address recognizes the problems of rural electrification particularly in North Carolina, but since these are typical of the problems throughout the Nation, the thought has occurred to me that all Members of Congress have the benefit of the thoughts in this speech, therefore it should be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STRENGTHENING RURAL AREAS

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration)

Two years ago, here in Raleigh at your 1961 annual meeting, I made my first speech as Administrator of REA. Just days before that meeting my appointment by the President had been confirmed by the U.S. Senate, and I had taken the oath of office.

These past 2 years I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with you, to appraise your individual systems, to study your plans for the future, and to get to know many of you personally. The record shows that these have been years of progress for you, and most of you have been setting in motion further steps which commit your growth in resources to greater benefits for your members and progress for your State and local communities.

North Carolina is building upon its well-earned reputation as one of the more progressive States in the Nation. Its rural elctric systems are playing a most important role in that forward progress. Your systems are competently directed and managed by resourceful people. You have a vigorous statewide association. Through the North Carolina Rural Electric Authority your State

government has contributed immensely to the total program here.

GREATEST BOON TO FARMER

The late, great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn of Texas, was quoted in a magazine article shortly before his death as saying that rural electrification has proven "the greatest boon to the farmer that I have ever seen." Speaker Rayburn was describing the elements that have contributed to America's phenomenal growth during his tenure in the Congress.

Electric power has proven a boon to farmers and to city people alike, not just as a convenience—and it is that—but because without power business and industry cannot flourish and grow; without power community facilities, new jobs, and better incomes cannot be developed.

Prior to 1935, when an entire segment of our economy—our rural areas—was deprived of a source of electric power, this neglect became a matter of national concern. As a result, the Congress of the United States proclaimed it to be our national policy to foster the availability of power to every American, to those in the country as well as those in the city, to those in low-density areas as well as areas of higher density. When the existing industry found too many Americans lived beyond the zones of profitable service, new approaches and new methods were introduced to see that the job was accomplished, with or without profit.

To show you how little the electrical industry of that day understood the problem when REA was established as a vehicle to implement that policy, leading spokesmen for the private power industry wrote REA's first Administrator, Morris Cooke, that "there are few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served." This was in 1936, when about 1 farm in 10 had central station service and when here in North Carolina it was only 1 farm in 20.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION HELPS ALL CONSUMERS

Farm people, even those living in the more sparsely settled areas, have demonstrated that all farms require electricity for major farm operations, and that when it is available, everyone benefits. Since passage of the Rural Electrification Act, agriculture has outstripped every other basic industry in productivity gains. There has been no more significant factor in the achievement of this Nation's unparalled standard of living than the shrinking percentage of the wage earner's take-home pay required for food costs, thus releasing more for his other needs and the comforts and conveniences of life.

The tremendous growth in farm output per man-hour is money in the pocket for consumers, but it dries up jobs on the farm at a rate that is creating serious economic problems in our rural areas. Back in 1935, it took 1 farmworker to feed and clothe every 10 Americans. Today 1 farmworker does all that for 27 people.

To the extent that alternate employment cannot be developed to offset the attrition in the farm ranks, people are forced into the ranks of the unemployed or the underemployed, or they move into the already overcrowded urban employment market. Displaced from the farm, often too old, and usually lacking in the skills required to compete effectively for employment in the urban labor market, this outmigration is no sound solution.

Unless job opportunities can be developed in rural areas, the drying up of the population base threatens the existence of Main Street. And with jobs for only 1 out of 10 rural high school graduates in farming, the young people who offer greatest hope for effective development of these areas are being forced to move away to find their future elsewhere.

There is a need for better public understanding, not only of the particular problems confronting our rural areas, but also of the importance of what the Nation's rural electric systems are doing to effectively contribute to a solution.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT DEPENDS ON POWER

There are many keys to the economic development of an area. Transportation, power, communications, and basic community facilities are among them. Everyone knows the importance of good roads to rural areas. Development of power and communications service has been just as vital. The development now taking place in many rural areas right here in North Carolina would not have been possible if your cooperatives had not brought electric power to them.

A concern of the Congress and the objective of the REA program has been to bring electric service to the rural areas at rates and terms comparable to rates and terms in urban areas, measuring up to the same high standards of availability, service, and convenience. The attainment of this objective, in view of the many handicaps inherent in service to more sparsely settled areas, has required special treatment and different methods.

If we are to see that these areas have every opportunity to develop and grow, this is still the task confronting the rural electrification program. It is true that lines have been built out into these areas. But this hardware in itself is not enough. Ample power, dependable service, and competitive rates must be offered. If we fail now to press rural electrification forward to the full accomplishments of its original objectives—if we settle for only partial service or high-cost service in rural areas, we will be accepting a basic handicap which will inevitably postpone, if not ultimately prevent, the full development of our rural areas.

SYSTEMS ARE LOCALLY OWNED

Here in North Carolina you have organized 33 cooperatives which brought electric service to vast portions of the State that just a few years ago were in darkness. Your cooperatives serve 212,000 consumers. REA has loaned you $130 million to assist in the construction of your systems, but they are your systems and by now you have repaid $43 million of the REA loans and have an investment of your own in your systems amounting to $26 million.

This is your investment. When people start talking about taking it away, it does not mean taking it away from REA; it means taking it away from you. It means taking more than the investment itself away from you; it means taking away the voice you have in setting the policy and standards for your own electric service through a cooperative system that belongs to the people served.

The job you have done here in North Carolina in opening up rural areas to greater economic development, the job others like you have done in the rural electrification movement across America, has added immeasurably to our national strength and well-being already.

But there is more to come. These cooperative organizations you have created, these electric systems you have built, are priceless assets in the accelerated development of the rural communities of your State.

It would be tragic folly to let them be dismembered to suit the profit motives of the commercial public utilities.

You are not taking anything away from them. You are serving only in territories they passed up and left unserved. Now here in North Carolina, as elsewhere in the Nation, after you have developed these territories, the companies that once passed them by now want to take them away from you—or at least the more promising portions of them.

This is business, some will say. It may be business, but it is not fair play.

Nor is it good public policy to allow it, for if you and your systems are going to be able to do your best job in getting electric service at low rates to rural areas generally, you must be able to retain the more populated portions of your service territories where unit costs are lower to offset the higher unit costs of service in the thinner rural areas.

Most people these days come from urban areas where they share the cost of service with an average of more than 30 other consumers on a mile of power line. Unfortunately they do not realize that REA-financed rural systems average only 0.1 as many consumers, or 3.3, on a mile of line. They do not realize that rural systems do not have the advantages of large commercial and industrial accounts on a scale comparable to the opportunities of the urban utilities. Consumer income is lower too in the rural areas. This affects the revenue collected from each mile of investment, and in 1961, for instance, rural electric systems averaged only $414 of revenue per mile of line compared with an average of $6,580 enjoyed by the commercial utilities.

Here in North Carolina you have one-fourth as many consumers per mile as do the commercial systems and you average about one-eighth the revenue per mile.

RURAL CAPITAL COSTS ARE HIGHER

Fewer consumers contributing toward cost of service affects the share each must carry of the overall cost. Low-cost and long-term financing is a lifesaver to the rural system, but, even at 2 percent, interest is a substantial increment in the rate. For instance, in 1960, interest on long-term debt for the REA-financed systems took 7.7 percent of total revenue, while this interest cost to the class A and class B utilities averaged 6.1 percent of revenue.

It is apparent then, that even at the 2-percent interest rate, interest cost takes a greater share of revenue. Any increase in the rate would widen the disadvantage, and further impede the efforts of the rural systems to reduce the cost of power.

If the cooperative rural systems were to be forced to give up those portions of their territories in which the unit costs of service have been eased by the good fortune of population growth, this disparity would continue and worsen. And its effect would be to penalize the rural areas through higher electric rates and to stifle their economic development. Such a course would continually shortchange the rural people of this State or any other State where rural electric cooperatives are serving any substantial number of people. To allow this, in my judgment, is not sound public policy.

The survival and growth of the rural electric systems you have built in the service of rural America are hinged on the solution of three great problems: power supply, territorial integrity, and rural area development.

A BIG MARKET FOR POWER

With 43 percent of the cost of providing service chargeable to wholesale power, it is important that these costs be as low as practical. The major part of these requirements—84 percent—are now being provided by private and public suppliers, with the balance being supplied through facilities owned by the rural electric systems.

REA has always taken the position that where cooperatives can purchase their supply through favorable contracts, there is no need for owning their own generating and transmission facilities. Your electric systems are important customers of the power companies, a market, incidentally, that you developed. Here in North Carolina I understand your purchases now amount to $10 million annually.

Somewhere in the Nation this spring, perhaps in North Carolina, an REA borrower submitting his monthly power payment will be turning over the billionth dollar in such

payments to the commercial companies since the program got underway. This is a sizable amount of business, a volume that should win you praise and appreciation as a valued customer.

The answers to problems of territorial recognition must be solved by the respective States. Such territorial integrity for rural electric systems has been achieved in a number of States as they have won recognition for the justice of their cause.

Low wholesale power rates and the continued right to serve their territories provide a workable base for rural electric systems in working toward full economic development of their areas.

I am pleased with reports of the effective program being developed by rural electric systems in North Carolina. While many of you are just getting underway in this work, those of you who have been active have contributed to statewide successes that are impressive. Directors, managers, and employees are active both in local and area developmental councils. Some have served on State committees.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT MEANS JOBS

Projects already completed through local effort, as reported to us in a survey of borrowers, have provided almost 2,000 additional jobs in your service areas in the 18-month period. Many of you have improved local community services—often a necessary first step to developing business and industrial potential. Many of these completed projects are agriculturally oriented, which is all to the good. These include, among others, feed mills, egg, strawberry, and poultry processing plants. Other projects center around local recreational development, a highly logical activity in almost every part of North Carolina. You have developed textile, plastic, toy, hosiery, metal stamping companies, and a number of others. For your individual and cooperative contributions to these developments, I congratulate you.

Here in North Carolina you are part of a broadening drive by rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation to dig in and exercise sustaining leadership in this field. The REA survey of results of the first 18 months is not the proof of the pudding; but a taste of what can be done. We know this must be just the start.

In March 1961 Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman began directing the forces of the Department, including REA, toward improving the income of family farms and to the creation of nonfarm income in rural areas. Through the new Office of Rural Area Development, the various activities of the Department in the field of development are being coordinated toward the basic objectives of the program.

In REA we have a small but expert staff assigned to rural area development work to assist our electric and telephone borrowers requesting help both in the fields of technical assistance and credit finding assistance. In addition, REA has a special financing tool within its own authority that offers limited but important help.

SECTION 5 DESIGNED TO HELP LOCAL AREAS

When the Rural Electrification Act was written in 1936, Congress recognized that it would be shortsighted to build electric facilities if they should not be used because consumers could not pay for the wiring, appliances, and equipment needed to put electricity to work. Under section 5 of the act, REA can make loans to its electric borrowers for relending to their consumers for these purposes.

While the volume of section 5 loans has been small over the years, the loan program has attracted wiring contractors, appliance dealers, water system manufacturers, and many others to the rural market. Experience has shown that once tested under section 5 financing, the industry usually takes the initiative to follow up with service, including private financing. The availability of section 5 loans to promote business and industrial projects is similarly proving to be an important asset in stimulating leadership of the rural electric systems in rural area development.

The evidence is mounting that once a project gets underway it can attract substantial local and other private capital to make it successful. REA section 5 loans, and loans through the various Federal lending agencies, are proving to be seed money in stimulating private investment.

In only 14 instances has REA approved section 5 loans for industrial and commercial development for an aggregate amount of $1,240,000. These are the cases where no other sources are available, and the financing of electric machinery or equipment provides the important last link in the chain of financing.

LEADS TO LARGE LOCAL PARTICIPATION

Recently REA surveyed its electric and telephone borrowers to determine the projects which they have successfully assisted either in the construction or operation state between July 1, 1961, and yearend 1962. The first 600 borrowers to report indicated that they have assisted 402 industrial and commercial type rural development projects with a total investment of about $300 million. These projects will provide direct employment to about 30,000 persons in these areas. Experience indicates that another 22,000 related jobs would result indirectly from added direct employment. Only about one-fifth of 1 percent of the total capital required in these projects came from REA. Five-sixths of the total capital came from non-Federal sources. A projection of these figures over all 1,795 borrowers would give even higher project, job, and private investments totals. In addition to the commercial and industrial projects, these 600 REA borrowers reported they have helped communities in their areas launch 187 public facility projects such as hospitals, water systems and sewerage systems.

The findings of this survey are a substantial indication that REA borrowers are proving a valuable asset—not just a rural reserve force, but front rank battlers to improve conditions in rural America.

It is good for America that you are there. It is good for North Carolina to keep you there.

Which Hand Has the M and M's?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Farmington (Ill.) Bugle.

This weekly newspaper is published and edited by two young men, Howard Fields and Lowell Rinker. Citizens of Fulton County are proud of these fine youthful Americans and appreciate the contributions they are making toward a better community and a better America.

I am sure many of us agree with the thoughts expressed in this editorial:

WHICH HAND HAS THE M AND M'S?

There is much speculation going on about now on the issue of whether there is another buildup of arms underway in Cuba.

We confess we do not know any more about the situation than Senator KEATING or Secretary of Defense McNamara.

We do believe, however, that any thought or opinion of the situation must take into consideration two episodes out of very recent history.

No. 1 is that just prior to the so-called Cuban crisis last fall, when similar accusations were made, President Kennedy and his administration denied that there was a military buildup of arms in Cuba. That denial turned out to be false and action belated.

No. 2 is the fact that shortly after the crisis had ebbed, the administration admitted to manipulation of the press releases during the crisis to veil the seriousness of the situation. The situation was so serious, in fact, that the United States had actually considered a nuclear attack on the missile bases being erected at that time in Cuba.

We are not the only ones who remember the two cited incidents and we are not the only ones who do not trust the news releases emanating from the White House today.

So, what is the real situation in Cuba? Who knows. The Federal Government is the only one in the position to know all the facts, but it cannot be trusted at this point to let us, the people it serves, know what is going on.

Patronage at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of February 21, 1963:

PATRONAGE AT A PRICE

("The Democratic administration will establish and enforce a code of ethics to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service and to make it more attractive to the ablest men and women," 1960 Democratic platform.)

Now, the above is a passel of mighty pretty words which, canned in July 1960, may become downright indigestible in July 1963. That's the time of year when Washington is invaded by all those bright young students who spend the summer picking up a few bucks working for, and learning about, their Government.

This summer, Federal Columnist Joe Young tells us, they are going to learn more than they bargained for. They are going to be indoctrinated into the political-boss system, known otherwise simply as patronage. And their lessons are coming from the very Olympia of plum dispensaries, the White House.

Somebody there, we are told, is going to save the Civil Service Commission the trouble of deciding what students will work where. Being set up at the White House level is a sort of super employment service, unhampered by rules and regulations, to which agency personnel officials have been told they should channel all job applications. Avowedly, this system will guarantee that the talents of each applicant will be used to best advantage. But it doesn't take a political genius to perceive that the talents of a worthy Democrat's son may just happen to be more worthy than those of a misguided outsider.

No exception in the White House lottery is planned for a select group of student

trainees who expect to make Government their careers. These are the young men and women the Government hopes to attract "to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service." But it wouldn't be too surprising if the trainees, after learning the true facts of political life, packed up their shattered ideals and departed forever.

Learn About the FHA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the following article from the February 1963, issue of the Gulf Coast Lumberman, to the attention of my colleagues. It describes the background and wonderful work of a dedicated public servant, Mr. Neal Pickett, of Houston, Tex. The article, "FHA District Director Neal Pickett's Advice to Lumbermen: 'Learn About the FHA,' " follows:

FHA DISTRICT DIRECTOR NEAL PICKETT'S ADVICE TO LUMBERMEN: LEARN ABOUT THE FHA

The year was 1935—hot, dusty, depression year. A year of the New Deal and Will Rogers. A year of economic crisis for our country.

In Texas, a young man was starting his first year as executive vice president of the Lumbermen's Association of Texas—oldest and largest trade association in the State.

One of his first tasks was to help sell a new Government program to the retail lumber dealers across the State. The program was a new mortgage insurance plan evolved by a recently established Government agency—the Federal Housing Administration. The young LAT executive and a repsentative from the Washington office of the FHA traveled across the entire State explaining the new program to lumber dealers.

Today, the former LAT executive is director of the Houston district of FHA—and he says his early experiences with lumbermen have proved invaluable in his current job.

His name is C. A. "Neal" Pickett, a hard-hitting dynamo who keeps his office running like a perfectly tuned business machine.

After you've talked about the FHA with Neal Pickett, you know he's a man who likes his job. More important, you know he's sold on what the FHA does to spur progress. And you're a bit pleased at his appreciation and understanding of the importance of profits—essential to the success of almost any undertaking.

Pickett expresses his philosophy this way: "Our fellow citizens are entitled to decent, livable homes at a cost they can pay—and the businessmen who bring a family together with a home of their choice are just as strongly entitled to a fair profit for their efforts."

Neal Pickett went on to become mayor of Houston after leaving his job as executive vice president of the LAT in 1941. People are still taking political potshots at him, but he brushes them aside and keeps moving forward. As a former officeholder himself, and as a brother-in-law of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH (Mrs. Pickett is Senator YARBOROUGH'S sister), Neal Pickett knows what it means to have disgruntled politicians sniping at him.

"It's all part of the game," he says, "and the tributes a Government worker receives more than offsets the occasional political bricks hurled in his direction."

The tributes have been coming fast and frequent since Pickett was named district FHA director in July 1961.

Most of the testimonials point out the increased speed and efficiency of the Houston office since Pickett took over. Here's an example, from an executive in the South's largest mortgage company:

"In the past 2 weeks, I have submitted two cases to FHA for loan approval. Both cases were approved 3 days later.

"This very fine service undoubtedly reflects a competent and efficient organization.

"I would personally like to thank you and your organization for such fine service. It is not only a service to our firm, but also those we serve. Thank you again for your time and cooperation."

Pickett himself is happier about the speed with which his office handles loan requests than any other single accomplishment.

"The processing has been reduced from 7 or 8 weeks to 7 or 8 days," Pickett says. "This alone saves taxpayers a lot of money. One of the main reasons for speed in this office is the fine cooperation we get from Housing and Home Finance Agency offices in other cities."

The Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—the parent agency of FHA—was in Houston last month. Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the HHFA, gave the feature address at the annual banquet of the Houston Negro Chamber of Commerce.

At the conclusion of his address, Dr. Weaver (holder of a Ph. D. from Harvard) said:

"No group in these United States can prosper for long unless we all prosper.

"Thus, as the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, I am a servant of all the people of the United States. My concerns are a healthy expanding homebuilding industry, renewal and revitalization of our urban areas, better and more adequate community facilities for all parts of the Nation, and greater choices in shelter for all Americans.

"A nation as great as ours deserves no less. We are fortunate in that our dreams of comfort can come true. Let us work together for their realization."

In a press conference prior to his address, Dr. Weaver also made these observations:

Regarding the recent Executive order of the President on withholding Government-insured loans when there is racial or religious discrimination—"There has been a great deal of vocal opposition, but so far there have been no adverse effects whatever from this Executive order."

Regarding the urban renewal program—"This program will be accelerated considerably in the next few years. We now have some successful projects under our belt, and the potential of the program is now being fully realized. We are over the hump in urban renewal. It's been shown that this program can and will work."

About Houston's rate of growth: "Houston is a city which one of these days probably will make Los Angeles feel second class."

About homes for the elderly: "The volume of homes for our senior citizens has quadrupled because of loan insurance through the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Concerning the future of Government-insured loans: "Ordinary or conventional type of construction will level off in 1967, so we need to beef up for more Government-insured housing of all types."

What does all this mean to lumbermen in Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas, and New Mexico?

It means lumbermen should become thoroughly familiar with the FHA program.

Neal Pickett says: "The importance of the retail lumber dealer and the lumber manufacturer familiarizing himself with the various FHA fact sheets and other documents cannot be overemphasized. A visit to the nearest office of the FHA could well be one of the best investments in time that a lumberman could make."

Pickett is particularly enthusiastic about the future of the new home remodeling program—203-K—and housing for the elderly.

"The expected tax cut will have a good effect because it will put money into the pockets of people who will more than likely use a lot of the money for new housing or remodeling," Pickett says.

Another of Pickett's favorites is the FHA low-cost housing for small towns and outlying areas, section 203-i of the National Housing Act.

"One of the most gratifying things about the FHA is that a man used to be about 32 years old before he could even think about buying a home," Pickett explains. "Now, with Government-insured loans, people of 21 can get married one month and buy a home the next."

The year 1962 was the third best year in history in the amount of FHA-insured loans in the 37 east Texas counties covered by Pickett's office. Some 5,206 loans were insured on single housing units for a total of $63,789,000. This compares with 1961 when 4,427 units were insured for $53,359,000. In addition, Pickett's district office did about $8 million worth of other projects in 1962—apartments, nursing homes, housing for the elderly.

Perhaps one reason why Pickett's office is so efficient is because the bulk of his job involves administration, and Pickett has been an administrator most of his life. A native of Houston, he was raised in Brazoria, Tex., and finished high school in Beaumont. After attending the University of Texas from 1922 to 1926, he was named manager of the Mount Pleasant, Tex., Chamber of Commerce. In 1930, he started work as manager of the Insurance Exchange of Houston, then became LAT executive vice president.

After 6 years with the LAT, he was elected mayor of Houston, serving 2 years in this tough, responsible job. In 1943, he joined the American Red Cross and served in military welfare posts in the European theater. He received awards from the Governments of Belgium, Holland, and the United States as a result of his war efforts.

From 1946 until July 1961, when he was named district director of the FHA, Pickett obtained more experience in the mortgage business, serving as vice president of Realty Mortgage Corp. in Houston.

In all his background and experience, Pickett treasures his association with lumbermen more than any other. And he would like to see lumbermen everywhere realize full benefit from the FHA.

A trip to your nearest FHA office could be one of the most rewarding visits of your life.

Foreign Polls Squelched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Island Argus of February 22, 1963:

FOREIGN POLLS SQUELCHED

President Kennedy has left himself open to some sharp criticism by suppressing for-

eign opinion polls taken by the U.S. Information Agency. In 1960 while campaigning for the Presidency he criticized the Eisenhower administration for not revealing polls showing a decline in U.S. prestige. After he was elected he caused the polls to be made public.

The excuse for withholding the present surveys is that they involve a new technique and include classified material obtained from U.S. ambassadors.

We doubt that the public will accept this explanation. We are sure the Republicans won't. It would be possible to release the polls with the classified part left out.

We never did think this country should be greatly concerned with foreign street polls. But if the public was entitled to see the polls in 1960, it has the same right today.

The Administration Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Charles E. McCarthy, of Madelia, Minn., ran across an editorial by John S. Knight, publisher and editor of the Knight Newspapers, on the administration's tax proposal, and sent it along to me with the following comment:

If a small tax cut and a small increase in deficit is desirable, then a large tax cut and a much larger deficit should be more desirable. I am sure you and I could not run our farms on the Heller-Kennedy philosophy of finance.

I wish to include the Knight editorial in the RECORD:

I don't understand why there has been no great outcry against the administration's proposed tax legislation from the privately endowed universities, churches, cultural projects, and charities which stand to lose most from the restrictions on individual contributions.

The new bill says that taxpayers may deduct interest on mortgages and gifts to charity only in amounts which exceed 5 percent of total income.

This means that many contributors who now give away 20 percent of their incomes will get no tax deductions on the first 5 percent.

So the givers in the middle and upper tax brackets can be expected to take a hard look at the amounts they have been contributing to education and charity before renewing old commitments or making new ones.

If the administration's recommendations are adopted by Congress, money raising campaigns such as the United Givers Fund will be confronted with a serious problem.

Large contemplated gifts to colleges and universities are sure to be reviewed.

Another proposal that would levy capital gains taxes on personal gifts and estates in addition to present gift and estate taxes will cause many wealthy men and women to reconsider their gift programs.

"But," you may say, "this applies only to a minority of the people. The small giver will not be seriously affected."

True enough. Yet the record shows that were it not for the larger contributions to charity and our educational institutions, fundraising drives and compaigns for capital improvements wouldn't stand a chance of success.

Harvard, in its $82.5 million program for Harvard College, obtained 27,000 contributions. But a relative handful of gifts—712 in the range of $10,000 plus—produced close to $70 million and of these, 130 gifts of $100,000 plus brought in more than $57,300,000.

Cornell's present centennial campaign for $73,200,000 contemplates 15 gifts of a million or more and 115 contributions of $100,000 to $1 million.

Apologists for the new tax recommendations point out that big donors could give 30 percent of their incomes, instead of the present 20 percent.

But when the large contributor figures out that he will get no deductions on the first 5 percent and that he is facing a new capital gains tax on appreciated securities at time of gift or death, his program for giving immediately becomes more conservative.

We all recognize that there is political mileage in a "soak the rich" philosophy of government. The rich are relatively few in number and seldom swing an election. And no harm can come to the wealthy politicians whose money is socked away in government or municipal securities.

Yet it is the investors who provide the capital for industrial and business growth. To be sure, they invest with the hope of reward.

But were it not for these investments, plant expansion would be at a standstill with unemployment becoming a far more serious problem than at present.

When Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon says that people objecting to the 5-percent floor on deductions are afraid of imaginary demons, he is talking through his hat. But this is nothing new for Mr. Dillon who has yet to be right.

Another feature of the proposed tax bill which will cut down on charitable contributions is repeal of the $50 exclusion and the 4-percent credit on dividends.

When a company earns a profit, Uncle Sam takes away 32 percent in taxes. Then when the same company declares a dividend, the shareholder again pays taxes on the distributed earnings.

Some years ago, the $50 exclusion and the 4 percent credit on dividend income was passed by Congress to remedy in a small way the injustice of double taxation. The Kennedy bill would deny even these minor benefits.

At first glance, the suggested reductions in individual tax rates are appealing.

But a careful reading of the whole tax bill reveals that what is given with one Federal hand is then snatched away by the other.

The power to strike these dubious provisions from the tax bill under consideration is in the hands of your elected Representatives in Washington.

If they don't hear from you, Congress will be justified in believing that the Nation has succumbed completely to the tax theorists who would change the nature of our society and sap the vitality of an economic system which, to date, has been able to shoulder a disproportionate share of the world's burdens.

I don't understand why Under Secretary of State George Ball thinks Americans should stop all this talking about Cuba. Mr. Ball says the administration has tried at all times to tell the facts as we saw them.

That's just the point, Mr. Under Secretary. The people were not given all the facts, and that is precisely what troubles them now.

Why the administration can seriously hope to encourage additional private investment in certain sections of Latin America where U.S.-owned properties are being hampered in their operations by leftist influences.

Poultry Federation Commends Congressman G. Elliott Hagan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, the following well-deserved tribute from the Georgia Poultry Federation to one of my esteemed colleagues, G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Member of Congress from the First District of Georgia, is too fine not to be made a permanent record of Congress. I am glad to have the privilege of calling it to the attention of the entire membership of the House of Representatives:

RESOLUTION OF ANNUAL MEETING, GEORGIA POULTRY FEDERATION, ATLANTA, GA., FEBRUARY 13, 1963

Whereas Hon. HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, has created a Poultry Subcommittee and appointed Hon. ELLIOTT HAGAN, of Georgia's First District, as chairman; and

Whereas Hon. ELLIOTT HAGAN has written his name in Georgia history and won his way into the hearts of Georgians for many years, as an exceptional high school student in Sylvania, as an outstanding student at the University of Georgia where his many honors included president of the senior class and president of Demosthenian Literary Society, as a tireless worker for numerous worthwhile causes; and

Whereas Congressman HAGAN's impressive record of public service began with his election to the general assembly at the age of 23 and included five terms in the house and one in the State senate; and

Whereas Congressman HAGAN has a thorough understanding of Georgia's problems and a real desire to be of service to his district, State, and Nation; and

Whereas Congressman HAGAN, his executive secretary Ronald Ginn, and other members of the staff, are among the hardest workers in the Nation's Capital; and

Whereas Congressman HAGAN has proved himself to be an effective and influential Member of Congress with an even greater potential as his seniority grows; and

Whereas the poultry industry has had a phenomenal growth in Georgia and the United States, and now represents over $500 million a year to the State and over $6 billion a year to the Nation; and

Whereas the progress and development of the industry has continued to give the consumer quality products at lower prices; and

Whereas it is appropriate for Georgia's ELLIOTT HAGAN to head a subcommittee of such importance to his country, State, and district: Be it now therefore

Resolved, That the Georgia Poultry Federation in annual membership meeting in Atlanta, Ga., on February 13, 1963, does hereby commend Congressman COOLEY on his action in establishing a separate subcommittee for poultry; be it further

Resolved, That the Georgia Poultry Federation does commend the appointment of Congressman ELLIOTT HAGAN as chairman of the Poultry Subcommittee; be it further

Resolved, That the Georgia Poultry Federation does congratulate Congressman HAGAN on his appointment and express our sincere thanks for his many past efforts for the poultry industry and for his capable service in the U.S. Congress.

C. F. CLEGG,
President.

ABIT MASSEY,
Executive Secretary.

Franchise Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly alarmed over the activities of the Justice Department against several of the larger manufacturers regarding the method in which they have handled their franchise relations with their dealers. I can only draw a single and disturbing conclusion: that the Government is endeavoring to destroy these relationships and open to a completely unbridled, uncontrolled, and jungle warfare in the merchandising of high-priced, high-quality products as a replacement of a present system that has worked admirably well for the dealer, the factory, and the consumer over the last half century or more.

The Wall Street Journal recently carried a story on this situation on its front page. I think this article should be required reading here in the Congress and I would like all my colleagues to read it. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, make this article a part of the RECORD:

FRANCHISE FIGHT: U.S. MOUNTS ANTITRUST ATTACK AGAINST FIXING OF DEALERS' AREAS, PRICES—WHITE MOTOR CASE IS TO GO BEFORE HIGH COURT TODAY—SHOE, TOOL FIRMS AFFECTED—IMPACT ON MARKETING SYSTEM?

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—One of the Nation's most widely used marketing arrangements, a presumed bulwark of business competition, is drawing the fire of Federal antitrusters as leading instead to curbs on competition.

This is the franchise system, through which an independent businessman contracts to sell brand-name goods or services under the banner of a well-known national concern.

The antitrust policemen claim restrictions in franchise contracts often tend to undermine the merchant's independence and make him a tool of the bigger company. Among other things, it's said, certain franchise operators illegally attempt to free their dealers from competing with one another—by establishing common prices for all or by granting dealers territorial monopolies.

In rebuttal, some accused franchisers deny they impose such restrictions. Others, while conceding the restrictions exist maintain they're neither illegal nor an interference with competition in general. In fact, it's contended, some insulation of dealers against competition from other sellers of their own brand of merchandise may strengthen them to compete against rival makes.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, FTC ACT

Nevertheless, both the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission are directing intensive legal barrages at what they consider franchising abuses in such diverse fields as the auto, truck, air-conditioning, mattress, hardware, floor-covering, and shoe industries. Right now both agencies are pressing several additional investigations in other fields, and the FTC already is readying charges against a large ice cream franchiser.

A key case testing the legality of certain restrictions in truckmaking White Motor Co.'s franchise agreements with dealers will be argued before the Supreme Court today. The Court's decision is due some time before adjournment in June, and if the verdict favors the Government prosecutors, it could encourage a broader attack.

The antitrusters insist they're not challenging the franchise system as such, but the vigor and sweep of the Government's attack are sending shudders through the many industries affected.

Says William Rosenberg, president of the International Franchise Association, which represents scores of franchisers: "Unless the legal problems are resolved, and the Government recognizes the value of franchising as the best method to perpetuate and expand small business in America, then we, the franchisers, will always be skating on the thin ice of uncertainty."

FILLING STATIONS, DANCE STUDIOS

The franchising trend has had a far-reaching impact. Nowadays the housewife may well spend a whole day going from one franchised business to another: The filling station, coin-operated laundry, supermarket, doughnut shop, roadside restaurant, dance studio, ice cream stand and hardware, paint, furniture or drug stores.

While franchising dates back several decades—the Rexall drug chain began in the early 1900's to grant franchises to independent druggists—the real boom came after World War II; many returning GI's decided then they'd rather develop their own businesses than work for wages. Loans backed by the Veterans' Administration and later by the Small Business Administration provided the capital.

Federal antitrusters have long watched for manufacturers' attempts to fix prices at which their franchised dealers sell products. But the bulk of Federal prosecution of suspected abuses has come within the last two decades, and especially in the past few years.

The FTC perhaps summed up Government objections in ruling unlawful the franchise system, restricting prices and markets, used by the Sandura Co. of Jenkintown, Pa., to distribute its Sandran vinyl floor coverings. That system, the Commission said, "consists, in substance and effect, of the alinement of many separate independent businesses into a structure directed by (Sandura) almost as completely as if all were centrally owned; this is the antithesis of free competition." On these grounds, the FTC recently ordered Sandura to stop assigning exclusive sales territories to Sandran dealers, limiting customers to whom its products may be resold and establishing resale prices.

SANDURA'S DEFENSE

But the order has been appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Cincinnati. Sandura argues that as a small company vying with big rivals it must give its distributors some protection from intra-brand competition if they are to survive. One of the five FTC Commissioners, Everette MacIntyre, agrees. He said Sandura adopted its territorially restrictive exclusive dealerships as an emergency measure to get reestablished after coming close to insolvency and vitally needed this device to compete with its larger rivals.

This and other pending cases will surely be affected by the Supreme Court decision in the White Motor suit. The Justice Department charges that the company's franchise agreements violated antitrust law by providing for fixed prices at which wholesale distributors could sell White trucks to franchised dealers; by restricting sales territories; and by forbidding franchises to sell, except with written permission, to Federal and State agencies and to certain large commercial buyers—customers that were for the most part reserved for the manufacturer. A Federal district court has upheld the Justice Department's position.

A key question in the case now is whether the Government must prove that the granting of exclusive sales territories or the setting of dealer prices unlawfully restrict competition, or whether it may simply show that such practices prevail and obtain a court order against them, as it did in the White suit in the district court. The company firmly denies such restrictions are illegal in themselves. If the Supreme Court upholds the lower court, which took the view that the territorial and price restrictions were illegal on their face, the effect could be a death blow to contracts restricting franchised dealers to well-defined markets or setting their prices.

Meantime, the antitrusters are plowing ahead on other franchise cases. Now being tried in a Federal court in Los Angeles is a case that could have a shattering impact on auto marketing. Justice Department antitrusters have charged General Motors Corp., three Southern California Chevrolet dealer associations and four Chevrolet officials with illegally conspiring to pressure franchised Chevy dealers to cease selling new cars to non-franchised discount dealers. All the defendants deny the charges. A Government victory could bring a surge in discount sales of many major car makes, with a corresponding weakening of franchised new car dealer operations.

In a case now being appealed to the FTC commissioners, a hearing examiner has ruled that Brown Shoe Co. of St. Louis unlawfully restrained competition by requiring franchised retailers not to handle competing footwear and to adhere to retail prices established by Brown. The company denies imposing these restrictions.

The FTC has already held unlawful the franchise arrangements employed by Snap-on Tools Corp. of Kenosha, Wis. Through its franchises, Snap-on Tools set resale prices for its hardware and automotive-testing equipment, restricted sales territories and customers to whom its dealers could sell and forbade dealers to engage in a similar business for at least 1 year after termination of their franchise contracts. The company, while reporting it has abandoned its price maintenance program, contends its exclusive territorial agreements are essential to orderly marketing of its products. It has appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago; a decision is expected soon.

COMPETITION CURB CHARGED

In the pretrial stage in a Federal court in Buffalo is a Justice Department suit charging the York Corp., a Borg-Warner Corp. subsidiary, with illegally requiring its franchised distributors of air-conditioning equipment to agree to contracts limiting both sales territories and customers and forbidding the dealers to compete with York in selling to the Federal Government. The company's answer is not yet known.

But lawyers are looking hardest at the case before the Supreme Court. When White Motor admitted its contracts restrict sales territories, customers and sometimes prices, a Federal court in Ohio refused to let the company try to justify these practices when it ruled such limitations are a curb on competition and illegal in themselves.

At the Government's request, the court adopted a tough standard never before applied to contracts between a manufacturer and independent distributors. This is the so-called per se rule, which assumes that competition has been restrained unlawfully and thus trial is unnecessary. This has in the past been reserved for certain antitrust infractions which the courts considered indefensible, as when competitors got together secretly to fix prices or divvy up markets. If the Supreme Court upholds this approach in the White case, chances are this will establish precedent for its application in all cases of this type.

HANDLING OF CASE CHALLENGED

In a brief filed with the Supreme Court, White challenges the lower court's handling of the case. The company complains it was

denied its day in court and "is being victimized by the effort of the (Justice Department's Antitrust Division to create simple rules of thumb that will enable wholesale prosecution without regard for the resulting consequences."

The FTC has not ruled that territorial and customer restrictions are unlawful in themselves, White notes, and such practices have been repeatedly upheld by State and Federal courts. If such limitations are sometimes unjustifiable, this can only be determined after a thorough trial, the truckmaker declares.

White contends, too, that many of its 300-odd distributors and dealers might refuse to continue under the White banner if they spent gobs of money to develop particular markets and then saw other White dealers with smaller overhead snatch these customers away. White says it insulates its franchises from intrabrand competition so they can be strong enough to compete effectively with such large competitors as General Motors and Ford.

The Justice Department retorts that one major premise underlying the antitrust laws is that the most efficient distribution of goods will result from competition both between different brands and between dealers handling the same brand. "And this system works in the marketplace," insists one Government lawyer. "Chevrolet sales have doubtless been spurred," he says, "by the vigorous competition among Chevy dealers in any one city for new-car customers; they compete on both price and service and partly because of such competition are able to attract buyers away from other automobile makes."

Medicare, Still a False Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Island Argus of February 22, 1963:

MEDICARE, STILL A FALSE HOPE

The administration's program for the elderly, submitted yesterday by President Kennedy, headed for serious trouble today in Congress. The heart of the program is still compulsory hospital care—misnamed medicare—tied to social security, which the Senate defeated last year, 52 to 48, and which the Ways and Means Committee stalled in the House.

It is subject to the same objections as last year, except that the opponents are strengthened by increasing coverage of the elderly by private insurance plans, providing increasing evidence that Government compulsion is not needed in this field.

There is also the Kerr-Mills program for persons of limited means, offering unlimited health care in States where it is adopted, with the Federal Government providing half the cost. Although this program has not been widely utilized, it is still available.

The Kennedy program would provide so little coverage that it is difficult to view it as anything but a foot in the door to socialized medicine. There is a new optional clause under which social security clients might get up to 180 days of hospital care instead of 90, but the bill still doesn't cover surgery or medical costs or long hospital confinements. It is fantastic to suppose that adequate health coverage could be provided by a quarter-cent deduction in payrolls, or $13 each yearly for employer and employee.

The bill, limited as it is, wouldn't extend its meager benefits to all the elderly, overlooking about 3 million not included in social security.

It spurns a suggestion of so-called liberal Republicans that an optional plan be included, allowing social security clients to take their benefits via private insurance, and that those not covered by social security be protected by direct Treasury payments.

But very few of the elderly are overlooked completely in the President's program, which includes 36 proposals in all for helping them, with tax concessions, group housing incentives, a directive requiring that age not be a bar to employment in Federal agencies, and so on. Some of these have merit and will receive the sympathetic consideration of Congress. But if this is to be done the main proposal, the compulsory health insurance, should get a quick brushoff. It is a cruel delusion.

Tax Credit for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the February 18 Mankato Free Press comments on the tax credit plan for higher education provided for in bills introduced recently by me and my Republican colleagues of the Minnesota delegation.

This editorial should be brought to the attention of the House, and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

TAX CREDIT

The aid-to-education bill proposed by Minnesota's four Republican Congressmen isn't a new plan. As many as 30 Members of Congress have proposed each session for several years a system whereby the parents of college students would get tax credit for the amount of money they spent each year on their children's higher education. The proposal frequently meets with determined opposition from people who do not have sons or daughters in college. They say it isn't their responsibility to educate other people's children.

But what we are talking about in any aid-to-education bill is using public money to educate our young people. It seems a bit more sensible to give parents tax credit when they are spending a substantial amount of money each year to send their children to college than just to dip into the public funds.

The tax credit plan which in no way would repay a parent for amount of money a college education costs would serve as an incentive to individuals to try to send their children to college. This type of individual initiative is what we are in danger of losing through our inexorable march toward a socialist state. If there is any way in which we can induce people to spend their own money on things they are rapidly becoming accustomed to having the government pay for them, it will be a definite gain.

It is difficult to tell at this time whether the tax credit plan to aid parents of college students will get congressional approval. But no matter what happens to it, it is an approach to the problem that encourages individuals to pay their own bills.

As We See It—Woodland Daily Democrat Evaluates Troop Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Woodland Daily Democrat for February 6, 1963, on the new book, "March to Calumny," by Albert D. Biderman:

CALUMNY AFTERMATH

Whether a social study can ever make the best-seller list is a question. But such a new book, "March to Calumny," by Albert D. Biderman is out to achieve such sales.

Mr. Biderman's work is a careful review of how American prisoners captured in Korea really behaved in prison camp.

Everyone will recall, all too well, what the general impression was: That soft living and insufficient indoctrination in democracy had made our captured troops highly susceptible to brainwashing; that a high percentage of them succumbed to Communist propaganda.

The true story, uncovered by a trained sociologist with broad war experience, is that out of some 4,000 prisoners only 12—which comes out to a percentage figure of 0.0003—succumbed to brainwashing.

Collaboration with their captors, reported to be very widespread, turns out to have been nothing more than the inconsequential little gestures all prisoners in all wars from time immemorial have adopted to keep from being abused and pushed around.

In other words, U.S. marines, soldiers, and airmen captured in Korea conducted themselves with just as much courage and fortitude as their forebears in our Armed Forces since the time of the Revolution have demonstrated.

Despite its limited nature, we never engaged in a meaner, dirtier, more uncomfortable war than that which was fought from Pusan to the Yalu River.

It is high time that those who had the misfortune to become prisoners of war there were vindicated of the unfounded charge that many were spineless, weak, un-American collaborators.

But what is perhaps even more important is that this unjustified calumny is largely responsible for the upsurge in recent years of the supercharged individuals and organizations self-appointed to rescue the Nation from its lethargic patriotism.

Starting with the false premise that the Korean war had proven our Armed Forces to be insufficiently dedicated to the Nation and to democratic institutions, the movement began with the demand that the Defense Department more thoroughly inculcate our troops with patriotic fervor.

Gen. Edwin Walker, who demonstrated his brand of Americanism at Oxford, Miss., is one product of this crusade.

From this spread the campaign to arouse the whole civil populace to an awareness of communism and to exalted heights of patriotism.

Properly to educate the public as to the evils of communism, and to the ruthless designs of the world leaders of communism, and to instill a deep and abiding love of country, is, of course, a noble and praiseworthy objective.

But this has been distorted by chauvinists and reactionaries with other axes to grind. By equating all progressivism with socialism and socialism with communism, they have made a mockery of teaching true patriotism

and true devotion to the democratic processes.

It may help to restore our perspective to have it at least made clear that there was nothing in the behavior of our Korean prisoners of war to prove that the American people, or their Armed Forces, have in the least weakened in their devotion to the highest traditional ideals of the Nation.

Excerpts From an Address by Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn in Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding speakers of the House, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of the Third District of South Carolina, made a timely and thought-provoking address in Atlanta, Ga., at a joint meeting of the Alabama-Florida, Carolinas, and Georgia Cotton Ginners Associations and the Southeastern Gin Suppliers Exhibit at the Biltmore Hotel on February 11.

Because of the clarity with which the statements are made expressing the problems of agriculture in the Southeast and in America, I recommend to all Members the excerpts from the address set out hereafter:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN DORN

Mr. President, I could not do justice to any occasion in Atlanta or anywhere in Georgia without paying tribute to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL. He is not just Georgia's Senator, but the South's leader and spokesman. He is our Senator, and we are equally proud of his guidance and able leadership. I know of no delegation to the Congress superior to that of Georgia in both the House and the Senate.

Georgia's illustrious junior Senator, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, has from time to time introduced the nationally known Talmadge farm bill. The farm bill of Senator TALMADGE warrants the earnest consideration of Congress and the American people. Senator TALMADGE's bill has much merit. It is far superior to the farm programs of the past which resulted in forcing the family-size farmer from the land and making the American farmer less competitive in the markets of the world. Senator TALMADGE advocates a completely "fresh start" in the field of farm legislation. He is convinced his farm plan could reach the following desired objectives: (1) Let the farmer farm; (2) guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income; and (3) place American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices.

The farm problem is this Nation's No. 1 domestic headache. The situation is bad and gradually gets worse. In a comparatively few short years, we have seen our farm population, nationwide, go from 40 percent to a dangerously low today of approximately 11 percent—dangerous because I know of no great civilization in the history of the world with only 11 percent of its population living on the farm. Where have these people gone? Many of them are receiving welfare in the great cities of this Nation. Juvenile delinquency and crime have skyrocketed. The stage is being set for socialism and Government regulation of every act of the individual. Federal Government farm programs which have sponsored mass exodus from the land, surpluses, scandals, and big corporation farming were born in the minds of a strange assortment of young, theoretical attorneys namely: Alger Hiss, Nathan Witt, Frank Shea, Rex Tugwell, Lee Pressman, Henry A. Wallace, and Felix Frankfurther. These gentlemen wrote the first Agricultural Adjustment Act in the 1930's. These brilliant young eggheads launched this Nation into the farm mess we are in today—a farm program where industrialists, corporate farms, and even foreign combines get Federal price supports to the detriment of the family-size farmer.

In considering any farm program in the United States, we should remind ourselves of the fact that every single country in the world is increasing its farm acreage. Farmers are encouraged in the rest of the world to grow more and more. In many countries, such as Rhodesia and Turkey, farmers are extended tax advantages and tax exemptions to grow more and more; while the farmers in the United States are regimented, controlled, harassed, and denied the privilege of growing and expanding. I am reliably informed that Soviet Russia has increased her cultivated acres more than a hundred million acres in the last few years. Red China is desperately, relentlessly, expanding its farm acreage. Someday we will be faced with Communist farm products invading the markets of the world at fantastically low prices. This is not a bright picture; however, it must be faced.

Our farm problems cannot be solved by subsidizing our farmers to go out of business while we subsidize other segments of our economy to stay in business and to expand.

The family-size farmer is the backbone of America. The family-size farm philosophy is one of independence, individual initiative, and opportunity. This philosophy has been the foundation stone of our American way of life. Upon this foundation we built the highest standard of living in all history.

I still believe there is a future in agriculture in the Southeast. I believe there is a future in cotton. I believe there is a future for the family-size farmer in the Southeast.

The future of cotton in the South is inevitably tied in with cattle and pine trees. We must resist control of our infant cattle industry by resisting feed grain controls. If the Secretary of Agriculture controls feed grains, he can and will limit our growing cattle industry. Likewise, if the Secretary of Agriculture is given the power to confiscate farmland for recreation and is given dictatorial power over every action of the farmer, he can and will control the production of pine trees. In order to grow cotton profitably in the Southeast, we must have a free hand in cattle and tree farming. With this diversified approach, we can stay in the cotton business.

The Talmadge plan could well be the solution to our farm problem, and failing of enactment, I see no alternative as a solution but the gradual elimination of acreage controls and price supports. We must in some way eliminate the two-price cotton system so that our great textile industry will continue to buy and consume cotton. The greatest consumer of the American farmer's cotton is the American textile industry. This industry cannot continue to consume 70 percent of all cotton grown in the United States under the present two-price cotton system. This system hurts both the farmer and causes unemployment in the mills.

We must accelerate our research program on boll weevil control and weed and grass control. This in turn will reduce production costs and will put cotton in a more competitive position. Cost of producing cotton has always been high and shortage of labor continues to increase production costs.

The "grassy cotton" program for loan rates to farmers should be continued.

As long as we continue to have allotments, farmers should be provided with a reasonable floor under the price of cotton.

We should endorse and support the program of the National Cotton Council of America. I know they will continue to find new ways of using cotton and cottonseed products. They have made much progress in their research program designed to lower the cost of cotton production. It is predicted that the present program of the National Cotton Council will decrease the cost of producing cotton by 10 to 30 percent. They are making fantastic progress to control boll rot, insects and disease, chemical control of grass, and so on. If their program is fully realized, then we can gradually eliminate controls and price supports, and cotton will be competitive in the world market.

Two-thirds of our cotton crop used to be exported abroad. We must recapture our foreign market. The program of the National Cotton Council will, in a few years, permit our cotton farmers to compete in the world market.

We should vigorously oppose any proposed revisions to existing law with respect to allocation of cotton acreage to States that would cause the Southeast to receive any less percentage of the national allotment than it received in 1962 under the existing law.

Bishop James A. McNulty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate time to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to His Excellency Most Reverend James A. McNulty of the chancery of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Paterson. It appeared in the Newark Sunday Star-Ledger, February 17, 1963, and was written by Charles Sullivan. Bishop McNulty's many admirers of all religious faiths will miss him and we all wish him well in his new assignment.

My attention was called to the following article by John C. Sciranka who has compiled a list of Slovak parishes in the Paterson, N.J., area:

BISHOP MCNULTY: A MAN ON THE GO

(By Charles Sullivan)

Bishop James A. McNulty, of Paterson, is 63, but he's a man who gets around.

When it was announced last week by the Vatican he was being transferred to Buffalo, it turned out he was at that moment fighting his way through the mountains of Bolivia.

A spokesman for the chancery of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Paterson, when told of the bishop's new assignment, was taken by surprise. Then said:

"I know you would like to talk to him but the bishop is somewhere between La Paz and Caranabi, 100 miles into the hill country and a 3-day journey at best.

"He's going to dedicate a mission there."

This was understandable to those who followed Bishop McNulty's rise from the rank of curate in Jersey City.

Days were few that the bishop didn't think of missionary work or charity and follow up his zealous ideas with vigorous action.

It was how the Caranabi mission story unfolded.

The Most Reverend Thomas Manning, the Franciscan bishop at La Paz, needed priests.

Neighboring South American countries were being jolted by Communist rioting and Bishop Manning was resting his hopes on keeping the natives free through education.

Bishop Manning and Bishop McNulty were not new acquaintances. Both were raised in Jersey and Bishop Manning knew how his fellow prelate felt about mission work.

Bishop Manning made his request and 12 priests from Bishop McNulty's diocese volunteered for the job. Three were chosen.

Today, 11 months after the priests arrived in Bolivia, Bishop McNulty is scheduled to dedicate the Caranabi mission.

The task is a fitting example of one of Bishop McNulty's favorite gospels. "Charity should triumph among all peoples."

Bishop McNulty was born in New York City, January 15, 1900.

He was brought to Montclair by his late parents, Mr. and Mrs. William McNulty, in 1902. There were six children in the family but he and his brother, John, the late monsignor and president of Seton Hall University, were closest.

The two attended Immaculate Conception Grammar School, Montclair; Seton Hall Prep, Seton Hall College, and Immaculate Conception Seminary in Darlington before going to Louvain University in Belgium.

They received holy orders there and it was during this time Bishop McNulty and Bishop Fulton Sheen of New York began an association which grew into a lasting friendship.

Bishop Sheen, national director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, was doing graduate work at the famed university.

It could have been early exchanges between the two which developed in Bishop McNulty a keen understanding of human nature and humility never tinged with vanity.

Bishop McNulty was installed as head of the Paterson Diocese in May of 1953.

He was the third prelate to assume the post.

He listened to Bishop Sheen deliver the sermon that day in which he said his associate had taken the "path of spiritual sanctification; shepherding more than administrating."

It was a just appraisal.

Bishop McNulty was only a young assistant pastor in St. Joseph's Church, Jersey City, when he served as chaplain of Hudson County Jail.

In following years, during which time he served St. Bridget's parish, Newark, he organized the Catholic Youth Organization.

He was a leader in founding a clinic for alcoholics and, with a consuming desire to build and develop, he equipped the Paterson Diocese with three new schools and expanded a fourth.

In Paterson, he set up the Mount Carmel Guild Social Service Center. He welcomed the lay missionary society, Association for International Development, and established headquarters for the organization at 374 Grand Street.

He was also instrumental in setting up missions for Spanish-speaking people, mostly Puerto Ricans.

He also was a representative on press media and communications at the Ecumenical Council. In 1951, he founded the Newark Archdiocesan newspaper "The Advocate," and with his radio and television experience he was well qualified on all subjects.

As a personal tribute, he was selected as the supreme chaplain of the Ancient Order of Hibernians with membership in Canada and the United States.

Probably, however, one of the greatest fruitions for Bishop McNulty was on July 2, 1961, when he celebrated a Pontifical Mass in St. Mary's Church in Passaic.

The Mass was offered during the annual pilgrimage in honor of Saints Cyril and Methodius held by the eastern district of the Slovak Catholic Federation.

It was transmitted to "Iron Curtain" countries by Radio Free Europe.

Bishop McNulty, it was learned, was also planning another special Mass on May 1.

This one would have celebrated the silver jubilee of the founding of the Paterson Diocese in 1938 by Bishop Thomas H. McLaughlin.

Mr. Kennedy's News Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Krock, the distinguished columnist for the New York Times, has written for the March issue of Fortune magazine a detailed exposition of how the administration has doctored, or, to use the official term, "managed" the flow of news emanating from the executive branch. Mr. Krock has performed a public service by not only bringing this matter to public attention, but by documenting his charges, and I, therefore, include the entire article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MR. KENNEDY'S MANAGEMENT OF THE NEWS

(By Arthur Krock)

(NOTE.—Arthur Krock climbed to his eminent Washington point of view along a road paved with solid journalistic accomplishment. A native Kentuckian, he first covered the National Capital for the Louisville Times when William Howard Taft was in the White House. After a term as the paper's editor-in-chief, and another with Publisher Joseph Pulitzer, of the New York World, he joined the New York Times editorial board in 1927. As chief of the Times' Washington bureau from 1932 to 1953, he won two Pulitzer prizes, had exclusive interviews with Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and earned respect, as well, for depth reporting on political philosophy and the law. Krock, 76, now devotes himself to his Times column of news commentary, "In the Nation." During New Deal days he became a close friend of Joseph P. Kennedy, and it was he who persuaded young Jack Kennedy to publish his 1940 Harvard thesis as a book, "Why England Slept.")

Every President after Jefferson has professed agreement with Jefferson's concept that the freedom of the American press to print its version of the facts, background, and likely consequences of human events was a constitutional principle permanently reserved from any form of interference by government. Consequently Jefferson denounced as a violation of this principle either direct or indirect attempts by government to do what in current parlance has become known as management of the news.

Yet few Presidents have not used their personal influence and the publicity processes of government, as these were enlarged, perfected, and expertized, to turn the news into channels that would best irrigate their political pastures.

It is normal for a President to view himself as the incarnation of the national interest. And because most Chief Executives have been professional politicians, it is normal for them to conclude that any political injury to them or their party that news presentation inflicts is an injury to this national interest. For do they not behold it every morning in the shaving mirror?

However, on the strength of almost 50 years of reporting, executive editing, and editorial commentary on the news, most of it in Washington, I would make two general judgments on the management of the news by the present President and—on its understanding of his will and attitude—by his administration as a whole:

1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been enforced more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press. Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West New Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. Charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war. Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration. And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is "furious." (But nobody gets fired.)

In my professional lexicon, active management of the news by Government consists of attempts by any official unit or individual in an area of authority to influence the presentation of the news. This can be done by suppression, concealment, distortion, and false weighting of the facts to which the public is entitled (this excludes the areas in which national security is plainly or potentially involved). It can be done through threats, or implication of threats, of shutting off legitimate sources of information to reporters who have dug out facts whose publication embarrasses Government for personal, policy, or political reasons. Or it can even be involved in the requirement that information will only be given off the record. Under this last restriction, the news account, though derived from official sources, must be passed on to the readers without the imprint of authority and responsibility, and is open to repudiation by its very source if repudiation becomes expedient.

Management of the news by indirection, though pursued to the same purpose as active management, requires a far wider definition. One principal form that it takes in the present administration is social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators—many more than ever got this treatment in the past—by the President and his high-level subordinates.

THE CHOSEN FEW

President Kennedy reads more newspapers regularly than any predecessor appears to

have done. And his bristling sensitiveness to critical analysis has not been exceeded by that of any previous occupant of the White House. Consequently, selective personal patronage is another form of news management by indirection that is highly in favor. Mr. Kennedy's operation is in even more striking contrast to its large previous employment for the same purpose by the President of the New Deal and the Second World War. Roosevelt granted only one exclusive interview, which in the trade means authority for direct attribution to the President, including some passages in quotation marks, of the product of the interview.

The precedent shattered by Roosevelt was then so firm that at his subsequent news conference the protest of the Washington corps of correspondents broke out with such force that Roosevelt promised he would never grant another such interview as he had given to the Washington correspondent of the New York Times. And he never did, although on a few occasions he did receive journalists privately, including my brilliant colleague Anne O'Hare McCormick, who reported his thinking authoritatively.

President Truman characteristically rejected a similar protest against an exclusive interview he gave for publication to the same correspondent for the same newspaper; he would, he said, repeat this action any time he chose to do so. When, however, he again resolved that choice affirmatively, a few months later, he ruled that the plainly visible source be lightly veiled.

During his 8 years in the White House, President Eisenhower all but eliminated this controversial element of special treatment of reporters that Mr. Kennedy has practiced with such skill, profit, and immunity from resentment. I don't know whether the General was following this course on the counsel of his press secretary, James C. Hagerty, or whether his policy reflected the concept that evenhanded fairness to all was especially imposed on the President of the United States.

But whatever was General Eisenhower's guide, it disappeared from presidential press relations the moment John F. Kennedy entered the White House.

THE AWESOME AURA

In the new administration, the quotable exclusive interview has ceased to be a rarity. But Mr. Kennedy prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office. The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity. The considerable proportions of this new type of indirect news management are sufficiently illustrated by the following brief calendar of President Kennedy's announced meetings with press groups in 1961 and 1962:

In 1961: Luncheon in May with eight Florida editors. Same month, a private reception and candid exchanges with a group of journalists from the U.S.S.R., chaperoned by H. E. Salisbury, former Moscow correspondent of the New York Times. Luncheon in October with an enthralled congeries of New Jersey newspaper publishers. Same month, luncheon for 24 publishers and news executives from the State of Washington. In November, a 2-hour interview (for publication in Soviet Russia and thence throughout the world) with Izvestia's editor Adzhubei, who is also Premier Khrushchev's son-in-law. In December, administration of this flattering unction by a White House luncheon for 25 Minnesota newspaper executives.

In 1962: A group of editors and publishers, guests of the President at the midday meal on January 23. On January 30, Adzhubei, again in the brilliant limelight of select White House hospitality, with his wife, nee Khrushchev, as Mr. Kennedy's luncheon guests.

Twenty-three news executives from Michigan on March 16; 11 publishers from Idaho on June 15, followed by several professional brethren from Colorado on June 22; on August 2 an invitational briefing of the President by 4 of the 12 American editors who had recently toured the U.S.S.R. and interviewed Premier Khrushchev; next day an informal Presidential exchange of views at luncheon with 25 California journalists; this repeated on August 10 for Utah members of the same craft; and on the night of December 17, the TV rocking-chair hour—unprecedented in format and audience magnitude, and the product of favorable publicity—during which three cooperative network reporters and the President informally discussed world problems and Government policies.

To this crowded catalog only one additional item is needed to demonstrate that the most intensive indirect effort by any President of the United States to manage the news has been John F. Kennedy's devoted wooing of the press. Susceptibility being an endearing human weakness from which even the sternest sense of duty cannot be expected wholly to immunize the press, I have myself on occasion been infused with the warmth of goodwill engendered by this courtship by a suitor of such charm and unique public distinction.

A CALL FOR THE FBI

It is when news-management policy is put down in departmental directives that it becomes more recognizable as an affront to Jefferson. Few more illustrations of direct management should be required than the informational directives prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden.

As Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester frankly pointed out, management of the news of the activties of the Military Establishment is one of the weapons essential to national security, a weapon made more vital to our arsenal by the current world tensions than ever before. But its proper use in a democracy is the limited one of concealing from the enemy the military plans and movements by means of which power is created to force his retreat or subjugation. The improper use is as propaganda in behalf of the establishment, to inflate success or gloss over error after both the military plans and movements have been revealed to the enemy in action. But this is one of the ways in which the weapon has been employed in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba.

The State Department's direct attempt to manage the news lacked the justification for the Pentagon's that was candidly conceded by Sylvester, and had the additional factor of assuring the suppression of information to which the people are entitled and which offers no threat to national security. The Assistant Secretary in Charge of Public Information directed all personnel that requests from the press for news, or for guidance in evaluating this, could be supplied only under one of two conditions. In the event, not necessarily certain, that the official to whom the request was made was authorized to entertain it, and in the further event that the subject of the inquiry was not already classified—top secret, secret, confidential, and whatnot—this official could discuss the matter involved provided that (1) an official colleague was also present, or that (2) the subject discussed was at once made known to the Assistant Secretary's office.

The result, of course, was sharply to reduce the transmission to the American people of objective and informed analysis of actions in foreign policy and international situations to which these actions were addressed. Moreover, it had become well known by this time that President Kennedy was prone to turn loose the FBI in a search for the official source of any published information that appeared in a form displeasing to him for one reason or another, especially when the publication was in the nature of an unmanaged leak. (Managed leaks are everyday occurrences on the New Frontier.)

Although the State Department directive was subsequently canceled after protests from correspondents, its effects are bound to persist in the prevailing climate. Suppression, inquisitions by the amorphous FBI, and even the bureaucratic infighting involved in intradepartmental surveillance are part of the product of direct management of a kind of news that could not successfully be tortured into even reasonable resemblance to disclosures of real or potential peril to the national interest.

INTO THE ECONOMIC SPHERE

More subtle, perhaps, is the management of economic news on which so much of the business world increasingly depends. President F. D. Roosevelt instituted the system, obviously justified by the circumstances, of management of the news of national financing by the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board. Under the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and now the Kennedy administrations these activities were improperly extended to the Bureau of the Budget, with some subsequent glaring examples of abuse.

Last year President Kennedy and his fiscal and economic subordinates announced a prospective balance of the budget that informed reporters could almost surely demonstrate would be a deficit. But the standard of responsible journalism required the reporter (and hence the headline writer) to lead off, and lengthily, with what Government had asserted; and to avoid the charge of coloring the news by subordinating in his account the facts in plain disproof. Thereby high journalistic standards are exploited by Government to create a false first impression on the public, and first impressions are always difficult, and often impossible, for the truth to overtake.

All administrations, since the marriage of the handout and the mimeograph, which provides instant and profuse production, have learned and employed the trick of issuing handouts at a time when (1) devotedly objective reporters of the printed press, to which there are few exceptions in Washington, and (2) such as may exist in the Government-licensed electronic news media, have no time to check the handout in the dispatch that summarizes the handout. For example, President Kennedy announced the investigation of the raw-material stockpile glut at 6 p.m. in a suddenly summoned news conference. Consequently, the TV-radio broadcasts that night and the dispatches in the next morning's newspapers were limited to the circulation of charges, made for political effect, that reporters had been given no opportunity to analyze or check for factual accuracy or political motives.

Perhaps the sterling example of this direct news management by timing was provided by the administration's announcement of a decision to review the delicate issue of oil imports. The handout, designed to assure the support of the President's trade expansion bill by the late Senator Kerr, of Oklahoma, was distributed to the press on the train returning to Washington from the Army-Navy game at Philadelphia in December 1961 on a Saturday, a day when all concerned well knew the newspapers must go early to bed.

One increasingly popular method of management of economic news is the denial off

the record (so that the reporter is obliged to present them as anonymous) of the trend of the economy that solid statistics plainly demonstrate. By this means the reporter cannot identify the official prevaricator, even though his editor has given him the latitude of proving the prevarication in the same news item. The current product of this system is that, though the balance-of-payments problem is visibly growing worse, and the economic growth is lagging for reasons other than those officially given, the reporter nevertheless continues to be forced to controvert on his own authority statements made for publication that carry the weight of the Government imprint.

THE PHANTOM RETURNS

The most familiar technique of direct and deliberate Government management of news came most visibly into the open with the invention by President Coolidge of the White House spokesman—the concept being to protect the President, who was, of course, this very spokesman, from any untoward consequences of even his laconic replies to questions that also, in those days, were either planted or submitted in writing in advance. But though President Eisenhower junked this discreditable artifice by allowing full motion-picture coverage and subsequent full TV releases of his news conferences, President Kennedy at Palm Beach recently reverted to it in a question-and-answer session with the newsmen on special assignment there, by requiring that the views he expressed could be attributed only to that phantom figure described as the highest authority. This compelled them to present as a matter of their own knowledge that the President feels so-and-so, when actually he was the authority for the assertion.

In view of Mr. Kennedy's numerous manifestoes, in the 1960 campaign and thereafter, on the responsibility of the President to face the American people in propria persona and eye to eye, this was a depressing retreat from visibility of his direct management of the news.

Many more instances of news management can be cited from the record. But I believe I can rest my case with confidence after noting only these few others:

Item: After spending 3 months in a vain request for access to a classified history of Government stockpiling, subject to conditions imposed on what might be made public, a reporter of the current Senate investigation of this inventory was finally allowed to see the book. But he was forbidden to publish a scrap of what the history revealed.

Item: The official releases of information in the areas of nuclear and space exploration are not determined on whether the American public that pays is entitled to the facts. Nor is safeguarding the national security the determining factor, though this is always the explanation for concealment. The controlling policy factor is whether the release will or will not improve our world image, and give this Government a lead in the psychological sector of the cold war. On these considerations, reporters were barred from a Nevada testing series they had previously been allowed to observe. And, reversing the procedure of the Eisenhower administration, official confirmation is now refused of Soviet spacecraft launchings or the list of Soviet objects in orbit.

Item: The Council of Economic Advisers commissioned the Brookings Institution to make, at taxpayers' expense, a study in depth of the balance-of-payments problem. This was delivered on January 15. The administration has thus far declined even to summarize its contents for public information.

WHERE THE ONUS RESTS

But it is the indirect methods—previously described here in part—by which management of the news is chiefly being accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator. Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase, "managing the purveyors of the news." And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself.

Declaration of Policy and Resolutions of the Colorado Mining Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the declaration of policy and resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the National Western Mining Conference and the Colorado Mining Association held in Denver this month. I am sure that this statement of policy and these resolutions will be of great interest to everyone interested in our domestic mining industry:

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL WESTERN MINING CONFERENCE AND COLORADO MINING ASSOCIATION

The safety and security of the Nation and the well-being of the people of the Rocky Mountain region and of the Nation at large are of primary importance to the mineral industries. In like manner, the well-being of the people of the Nation is largely centered upon an active, healthy mining industry.

Mining is and always has been a basic industry. All new wealth comes from the earth. Mining know-how should not be lost if our Nation is to survive and maintain the standards of living which are the envy of the world.

The searching out, exploring and developing of mineral resources provides direct employment to our population, and makes possible a tax base for the operation of local and State government and assists materially our Federal Government. It provides employment for numerous other industries, including all those engaged in manufacturing pursuits who furnish supplies and materials for mining operations; a ready market for farm and ranch products, transportation facilities of all kinds, power consumption, and the utilization of professional talents of technically trained people in law, engineering, geology, and numerous other scientific pursuits.

We again commend the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy and the Atomic Energy Committee for working closely with the production phase of the uranium industry. Teamwork is of the utmost importance in working out the difficulties which are confronted by the industry under the plans recently announced for the post-1966 period by the Commission. We pledge our support to the committee and the Commission in helping, aiding, and assisting not only the independent operators but the integrated and uranium mill operators as well.

We are firmly of the opinion that the industry should continue to present its views through the State mining organizations in the various States in which uranium production takes place; that these associations should coordinate their activities through the National Western Mining Conference and the American Mining Congress, as well as the Atomic Forum, for encouragement and direction of long-range productive capacity. It is obvious that increased utilization of nuclear fuels and new applications for uranium usage, developing use of research and a broadening of the atomic energy program must include adequate assurances to the production branches of the industry for future supplies of raw materials.

We commend Gov. John Love, of the State of Colorado, and the general assembly on the proposal to abolish the department of natural resources which has been an expensive, inconclusive, and wasteful experiment. We feel that cooperation among the various natural resources agencies, the water conservation board, the mineral resources board, and the metal mining fund board, can and should continue and that each agency should pursue the interest originally intended.

We generally agree with and acknowledge the program of the American Mining Congress as being consistent with the welfare of the industry and the Nation at large. We support the declaration of policy of that organization, adopted at San Francisco on September 24, 1962.

To the end that the Colorado Mining Association and the National Western Mining Conference may make their position clear, we adopt the following resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS

1. We favor the continuation of the original functions of the metal mining fund board and the mineral resources board and urge a revival of the former program of cooperation with the mining industry consistent with the purposes for which such agencies were created. We support the recommendation of the Governor of the State of Colorado regarding such restoration with proper coordination of mineral policy with his office.

2. We concur with the philosophy of multiple use of the public lands and to this end oppose any Executive order, rule, or regulation, or any act of Congress contrary to the concept of the greatest use of our public lands. To this end we feel that withdrawals from the public domain should be reviewed and reduced where they contain lands in excess of the current need as announced by the withdrawal order.

3. The system established by the general mining laws for the location and patenting of mining claims has proven successful and encouraged the development of the mineral resources of our Nation through private initiative and enterprise. Attempts to alter this system are contrary to the national welfare. We reiterate the belief that the general mining laws, while possibly subject to some modification, should not be repealed or subjected to any major change.

4. We are opposed to any interpretation by the executive branch of our Government which distorts or disregards long-standing precedents developed by judicial decisions under the general mining laws. We are opposed to the exercise of executive power which may administratively interpret the law contrary to that announced by the courts and question decisions of the Interior Department and its Bureau of Land Management which are contrary to the principles of mining law or to the theory propounded by the courts.

5. We are opposed to the extension of executive and bureaucratic power and therefore oppose any extension by the U.S. Bureau of Mines of its mine inspection program.

The cooperation between the Bureau of Mines and the various State inspection agencies has been a salutary and progressive method of achieving mine safety. Since the institution of the Federal coal mining inspection program, various State mine inspection programs which covered the field of mine inspection, have not progressed as anticipated. There should be cooperation with the Bureau of Mines information program and the active inspection of mines by the various State agencies. We are opposed to depletion of these activities through proposed Federal intervention.

6. We adopt the recommendations of the American Mining Congress with respect to gold and silver as follows:

AS TO GOLD

(a) Current efforts to preserve the Nation's gold reserves be intensified.

(b) The gold standard be restored, with the dollar and other major currencies redefined in terms of gold and made freely convertible.

(c) Treasury sales to industry be discontinued, pending restoration of the gold standard, so that a free market in gold for industrial purposes can be established.

(d) A program of bonus payments be authorized as an interim measure to stimulate domestic production of gold and prevent complete destruction of the gold mining industry.

AS TO SILVER

(a) The Treasury Department be commended for terminating sales of Treasury silver to industrial users.

(b) The Nation's remaining stock of monetary silver be conserved by obtaining the silver required for coinage from the open market.

(c) The special tax on silver transactions, now clearly an unwarranted burden, be removed in the interest of stimulating increased production to meet the expanding needs of both the Treasury and industry.

(d) Proposals to authorize the issuance of Federal Reserve notes of $1 and $2 denominations be rejected.

We adopt these recommendations because stable money is indispensable to our country and will not long remain possible without a change in the value of gold unless fiscal responsibility is demonstrated by our Treasury. We are well aware of the difference between reserves and liabilities against the gold reserves of the United States and feel that a reevaluation of our gold policy is urgent and necessary to reduce the dangers of the United States becoming a second-class economic power.

7. We recommend the recent activity of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Atomic Energy Commission which has fostered a closer working relationship with the uranium industry. However, time is running against the industry's growing need for guidance in planning an orderly transition into the post-1966 period.

8. We shall continue to oppose measures which discourage, prevent or make more difficult or expensive honest efforts to obtain the money to finance mining ventures and projects. Proper recognition must be given to the particular needs of our industry. We support reasonable measures designed to prevent misrepresentation, misapplication of funds and bad-faith practices in the field of mine financing. The industry will continue to proffer suggestions and help to all branches of Government on matters of common concern, to insure that only measures which are sound and businesslike are adopted.

9. We recommend that the Department of Interior join the mining industry in an effort to strengthen and extend loan and other programs to encourage exploration and development of mineral resources, and engage in a joint study to determine the best plan for integration and coordination of mining research, and for making available the results of such research efforts for use by the mining industry in assuring an adequate supply of minerals and metals for our future needs.

10. We urge the Congress of the United States to treat mining as other industries and allow them tax treatment as is allowed other industries, and urge the following:

(a) Exploration expenditures, similar to other research expenditures, should be fully deductible and present limitations on deductibility of exploration expenditures should be removed. The present high income tax rates should be reduced to restore adequate incentives for investment risk, economic effort, and initiative. Their reduction will benefit the economy and yield increased revenues to the Government. The limited allowance now made to stockholders on dividends with respect to taxes paid by the corporation should be increased. The depletion allowed to a mining corporation should be carried through to the stockholder on an adequate and equitable basis. Intercorporate dividends should not be doubly taxed. Our tax laws should be amended to recognize that most capital gains during period of inflation of the dollar are a reflection of such inflation rather than taxable income.

(b) The income tax laws of the United States should encourage the economic development of underdeveloped countries by private capital, rather than through the use of Government funds at the expense of our taxpayers. Profits of foreign subsidiaries should be taxed only when they are distributed, and attempts to eliminate so-called tax havens should not penalize legitimate foreign business. Where protection of domestic production against imports is necessary, it should be provided by means other than a differential treatment in the income tax laws.

(c) Adequate depletion allowances must be provided for the mining industry. The public interest has been well served for more than 30 years by depletion allowances which recognize that eventually a mineral deposit is exhausted and that cost of developing the deposit is not the sale consideration, but that to create wealth from the ground it is necessary that the wealth be husbanded and not taxed away.

11. The current stockpile objectives for strategic minerals and metals, recently made public, in some cases seem wholly unrealistic. This indicates the urgent necessity for congressional redefinition of stockpile purposes and periodic reappraisals of stockpile objectives. Such redefinition and reappraisal should take into account not only military requirements, but also civilian needs in the event of a major emergency or conflict and requirements for postwar rehabilitation. We must also anticipate that our stockpiles will be called upon to meet similar needs on the part of our allies.

12. Congress should adopt a sound national fuels policy, declaring that all domestic energy industries shall be permitted and encouraged to maintain levels of productive strength that will enable them, in peace and in war, to satisfy the energy needs of the economy.

13. Our country is blessed with natural strength in coal. Coal's ready accessibility at economic costs is necessary for the continued development and security of the Nation. The proposed national fuels policy should be implemented by all necessary steps, including the following:

(a) Adoption of sound economic and conservation principles governing the sale and distribution of energy fuels.

(b) Liberalizing the percentage depletion allowance for coal and lignite, in recognition of the greatly increased replacement cost of coal mines.

(c) Adequate mandatory restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil, crude pertoleum and refined products.

(d) A requirement that all Government agencies make fuel selection only after fair, impartial evaluation of present and anticipated fuel costs and availability, based on modernized practices with their attendant economies.

(e) The fostering of lower cost transportation of coal.

(f) Aid from the executive branch in developing expanded export markets for coal and in improving means of transportation into such market.

(g) Provision of adequate funds for coal rsearch by the Department of the Interior.

14. We commend the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Atomic Energy Committee for their cooperation and forward-looking programs with respect to uranium industries, and we particularly extend our heart-felt appreciation for the understanding and wise guidance this program has received from Mr. Jesse Johnson.

15. We have reviewed and studied the Saylor bill, 87th Congress, H.R. 12913, which we understand is being reintroduced in the 88th Congress. We wish to point out that the bill contains the seeds of abdication by the Congress of its power over the public lands by vesting it in the representatives of the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management. This bill contains within it characteristics which eventually would cause the mining law to be administered as the policy of the hearing examiner rather than the policy of the Congress or of the executive department of our Government, as has been seen by the late decisions of the Department of the Interior.

16. We believe that no reclamation project should interfere with the development of mineral resources; and, we urge deferral of projects until the exhaustion of the minerals or proof that no minerals exist.

In the event of a contest initiated by the Government as to a mining claim in a reclamation project, we believe that in the event of flooding or other inaccessibility the mining claim is entitled to a presumption of valid discovery.

17. The domestic lead and zinc mining industry continues to deteriorate contrary to the national interest and a sound industry economy and national security program. We recommend the executive department of the U.S. Government act pursuant to the recommendations of the Tariff Commission and limit excessive imports of lead and zinc; and, that the peril point provision of the Tariff Acts be implemented.

18. The retention of congressional control over national stockpiles and the stockpiling program is necessary to the end that disposal of surplus metals in the stockpile not cause further and violent depression in the domestic mining industry.

The National Western Mining Conference and Colorado Mining Association see the advent of a new era of cooperation between the industry and its support by the Colorado congressional delegation. We specifically commend Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK for their support of gold legislation. The outstanding achievement of Congressman ASPINALL as chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is well known throughout the industry, and we thank him for his monumental efforts in our behalf. We, in like manner, thank Congressmen ROGERS, CHENOWETH, and BROTZMAN for their efforts in our behalf.

The National Western Mining Conference and Colorado Mining Association extend their heartfelt and great appreciation for the work of Mr. Robert S. Palmer in his unselfish and highly effective support of the western mining industry for these many years.

Still a Soviet Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing realization throughout the Nation that there have been many premature claims made by the administration in regard to the extent of the Soviet Union's withdrawal from Cuba. In fact, the administration's all-out efforts to minimize the extent of the Soviet Union's commitment in Cuba have served, instead, to underscore the magnitude and seriousness of the military buildup and the threat this presents to other nations in Latin America.

The Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News recently placed the Cuban situation in its proper perspective in an editorial of February 21, 1963, entitled "Still a Soviet Base." The editorial reads as follows:

STILL A SOVIET BASE

Soviet Russia apparently has indicated it will withdraw some of its estimated 17,000 troops from Cuba by mid-March, and the administration insists there has been no deal whatever in obtaining this much of a Soviet contribution to the relief of international tensions.

While we wait to learn, if we can, what the partial withdrawing amounts to, it will be well to keep minds firmly fixed on two key questions of basic Soviet intent.

1. Is Khrushchev still determined to maintain Cuba as a permanent and secure Soviet base, committing whatever force is needed to keep Castro both in power and in a puppet relationship to Russia?

2. Is he still determined to exploit the Cuban base for such mischief in this hemisphere as he can stir up—especially to use it as the stronghold from which to distribute materiel and trained manpower for a growing campaign of subversion against other Latin American governments?

If the answer to both question is yes—as we have no reason to doubt it is—then any minor ups and downs in any given week's intelligence estimate of how many Russians are in Cuba become relatively insignificant.

Even the 17,000 figure currently in vogue here is an intelligence guess that could be off target by several or many thousand. So withdrawal of a shipload or two of Russians could still leave Cuba with as many Soviet troops as most of us think are there now. Any conspicuous withdrawal now, moreover, could be offset at any time by a gradual and covert replacement of the same numbers.

Whatever assurance it may have conveyed as to the removal of Soviet offensive missiles, the recent McNamara intelligence briefing on the continuing Soviet military presence in Cuba left no doubt that the Russions had established what was intended as a permanent base there.

The Russians, in short, give no sign whatever of being about to liquidate their Cuban base—and until they do, we will have no reason for doubting the uses to which they show every determination to put it, primarily as a secure base for the clandestine supply of materiel for rebellion against and trained experts for subversion of other Latin governments.

So let's withhold cheers for any partial withdrawal of Soviet troops from Cuba not only until it actually happens but until we can be sure it portends something significant.

Why the Lag in Military Space Development?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register:

WHY THE LAG IN MILITARY SPACE DEVELOPMENT?

What is holding the United States back in the development of military defenses in space?

It cannot be because there is no need for such defenses. As Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, points out in his article, if the "increasing space capabilities on the part of the U.S.S.R. are coupled with their announced objective of world domination, we have more than sufficient cause to stimulate an even more energetic space program for our national defense." Dr. I. A. Getting, president of the Aerospace Corp., said recently that "in the exploitation of space we appear to be risking unilateral disarmament."

It cannot be for lack of funds. Journal and Register Editor James J. Haggerty, Jr., reports and analyzes the vast sums being carried in the budget for all space purposes.

It cannot be for lack of interest or concern on the part of the Armed Forces nor a lack of skill and experience in the services. The articles in this issue by the Navy's Rear Adm. J. P. Monroe and the Army's Lt. Gen. Dwight E. Beach, and the comprehensive Air Force report we will publish next week from Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, reveal the deep interest and concern of these leaders in the utilization of space for the carrying out of their missions. As to experience, it must be remembered that it was the military services who initiated and developed all our early space activities and that they are still indispensable to all the Nation's space work.

The answer lies in the administration and the top management of the Department of Defense. As Space Editor Haggerty put it in last week's issue, "the military proposes, DOD disposes." Dr. Edward Teller, one of the Nation's top scientists, told a conference last autumn that the cautious approach being taken by the Defense Department and NASA will result in the United States losing more ground in its space race with the U.S.S.R.

The DOD attitude was frankly expounded by Assistant Defense Secretary John H. Rubel in October when he branded as a doctrinal abstraction the statement that weapons that will operate and the missions that will be performed in space will therefore, be extensions of those with which we are familiar.

Perhaps the weapons and missions in space will not be extensions of those with which we are familiar, but we will not know this, nor the directions they will take, until the military is permitted to go forward with space projects of a definitely military character.

It is strange that the United States today is prepared to defend itself on land, on and under the sea, and in the air—but not in space.

We seem to be living in a dream world wherein aggressors may attack us on land, sea, or air, but where space is reserved for peaceful exploration.

The belief in such a dream world is, of course, poppycock. Our leaders refuse to accept the Russians' word in matters of disarmament on earth—they insist on inspection. Yet they placidly operate as though the Russians won't arm in space—an area in which they have never denied they were arming.

The DOD reluctance to go forward with a real space program is a deadly serious matter. We hope that when the Armed Services Committees hold their posture hearings and the Appropriations Committees consider space funds they will make clear to DOD leaders their determination that we shall be militarily prepared in space.

Indignation and Disgust for Many of Our Shortcomings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a constituent of mine is of interest because it shows the indignation and disgust that many patriotic people feel for many of our shortcomings.

Mr. Speaker, we had better pay heed to these rumblings before representative government perishes from the earth:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Some questions one irate citizen would like answered.

WHY

If a big business leader (Blough) raises the price of his product—a move dictated by the economics of the situation—does the President of the United States publicly denounce him and bring intense pressure on his company (United States Steel) to rescind the price raise? But when a pipsqueak labor leader, drunk with his own powers, calls an unwarranted strike against the press of the Nation's greatest city, and cripples the economy of the city, why do not the politicos and Government agencies denounce that labor leader and his union? And why not compulsory arbitration for all labor disputes?

Do we pour American blood and American wealth into some southeast Asian swampland to fight communism when, according to our own Army officers, the natives of that land refuse to fight at all?

And why don't we stop subsidizing Mr. Nasser who uses our money to subsidize his own private revolutions and denounces us to the bargain?

Most sincerely,

MAX ERNEST HECHT.

FEBRUARY 22, 1963.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Of course, you may insert my irate letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That day when an American becomes timorous of criticizing his Chief Executive that will be the day when that American will inadvertently be putting out the "welcome"

mat for a Communist commissar or a Nazi gauleiter.

Incidentally, I may add that at times I disagree with some of your views, but I do respect your integrity and the dignity with which you justify them, and without any of the moralistic claptrap as is the wont of some of your colleagues.

Thank you.

Most sincerely yours,

MAX ERNEST HECHT.

The Best Youth Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Members of this House the following editorial of Sunday, February 17, 1963, from the Joplin (Mo.) Globe written by Mr. Rex Newman, an expert observer of the American scene and a former Washington reporter.

Mr. Newman's editorial reflects the feelings of the midwest district which I represent here. It condemns the planned Federal service corps for youth and points out that we can best serve our youth by arranging to leave them less debt and less bureaucracy. And it notes that the home, church, school, YMCA, and Boy and Girl Scouts already have demonstrated their ability to develop American youth:

THE BEST YOUTH CORPS

President Kennedy has sent to Congress another scatter-shot message aimed at further enfolding the youth of the land into our giant and still growing complex of paternalistic bureaucracy. We think the parents of America, through Congress, should reject it.

A much better way to give our youth a better chance would be to start dismantling some of this costly, tax-eating bureaucracy so as to leave them a heritage of less debt and greater unincumbered opportunity.

To teach the youth of the Nation dependence upon Government rather than to encourage individual enterprise is morally wrong, economically unhealthy and nationally weakening. Moreover, the need for it is a theoretical myth.

To undertake to regiment American youths under Youth Conservation Corps, Hometown Corps, Domestic Peace Corps, and whatever else the dreamy minds of bureaucratic do-gooders may conjure up is to confess failure of individual opportunity under free enterprise.

This we categorically dispute. This Nation still abounds in limitless opportunity. Government today, sadly enough, does more to hinder than to encourage it. Nevertheless, we submit that any youth sound of mind and body can with determination, perseverance and encouragement in the home and the local community find his niche in gainful employment. He doesn't need Federal indoctrination in the false political theory of subsidized security.

Indeed, instead of Federal corps of various and sundry labels, the best "corps" we can think of as a solid foundation for youth training still are the home, the school, the church, and the established local youth groups such as the YMCA and the Boy Scouts.

Let's show confidence in our youths by giving them a chance to demonstrate their own self-reliance.

The Refugees—And Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, legitimate words of wisdom and sound observations rarely grow old and it is with this thought in mind that I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of Friday, January 4, dealing with the Siberian refugees who were ejected from the American Embassy in Moscow.

That incident is certainly a blot on the ability and integrity of the American personnel at the Embassy in Moscow but more importantly at the moment, the method of handling this incident is still before us, since it is consistent with the administration policy of managed news. For this reason, I have inserted this editorial into the RECORD, feeling it is important in its emphasis on the latter point as well as on the original incident:

THE REFUGEES—AND MANAGED NEWS

The case of the 32 Siberian peasants who traveled 2,000 miles to take refuge in the American Embassy in Moscow and who were turned over to the Russians almost immediately is a tragic tale.

The right of political asylum in an embassy does not exist anywhere except in Latin America, according to experts in international law. No embassy in Europe or the United States has any legal right to harbor anyone. (The case of Cardinal Mindszenty is a historic exception.) The American Embassy was acting in accordance with international law in turning the refugees over to their own government—as the Russian Embassy in Washington would have to act if Americans tried to take refuge there. To refuse to release them would be a violation of international law.

While the officials of the American Embassy in Moscow acted in accordance with the dictates of international law in turning the Siberian peasants back to their own government, there is no excuse for the actions these same embassy officials took to manage the news of the event.

The Embassy officials first barred American newsmen from the Embassy. Then a wooden barrier was erected by the American Embassy so the refugees could be transferred from the embassy building into a Russian bus without being seen. Russian policemen on U.S. Embassy grounds threatened American newsmen with confiscation of their cameras if they dared to take pictures of the refugees.

The attitude of the American Embassy officials in this instance seemed to be pro-Russian instead of pro-American. They seemed more interested in cooperating with the Russians than in letting America know what was happening.

This is not an inconsistent attitude of late. More and more we seem to be arriving at a situation where the Government of the United States—and its lesser officials—insist on managing the news as they see fit. An NBC reporter in Berlin charges U.S. officials with censoring the news and intimidating American reporters. This is a serious charge and merits a serious answer.

The State Department's reply to this charge is merely arrogant. A spokesman for the State Department said: "The policy of U.S. officials in Bonn, Berlin, and Washington is to provide information to the press and public as speedily and forthcomingly as the U.S. and allied interests allow."

Certainly it is time to remind these officials that there is in existence a document known as the Constitution of the United States. There is a first amendment to this Constitution that reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress or grievances."

This means that the people have the right to know what is going on. That right must be honored.

The Candy Twins: LaVona and LaVelda Rowe of Iowa City, Iowa, Please Capital's Sweet Tooth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to tell my colleagues about the Candy Twins, two constituents and longtime friends of mine who visited the Nation's Capital recently. They are Misses LaVona and LaVelda Rowe, identical twins born and raised in Iowa City, Iowa.

The lovely Rowe sisters, who were my guests here in Washington several years ago, are representing the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute on a 6-month tour of the United States. They have already visited some 30 cities from San Antonio to Boston. Being somewhat familiar with always-on-the-go political campaigns, I sympathize with and congratulate the girls for the useful work they are doing.

To give you some idea of the tour, I would like to point out a few of the things the Candy Twins did in Washington when they were here. They visited such places as Junior Village, the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club, homes for the aged, children's, veterans' and general hospitals—and dispensed candy everywhere they went. Valentine candy was presented at the White House to the First Family.

LaVona and LaVelda also appeared on radio and television interviews to discuss questions concerning candy and health. They pointed out the growing popularity of the "candy break" for plant and office workers, and the recognition of candy's quick-energy value by athletic coaches, medical authorities and military leaders. Candy's ability to promote alertness has been recognized by the National Safety Council as a safety factor in preventing highway fatigue. Incidentally, exhaustive research is currently being conducted on this question by the Institute of Traffic and Transportation Engineering, Los Angeles, under a grant from the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute.

The twins discussed how candy can be utilized in a weight-control plan, noting

that confections often do not add many calories—a hard candy, for example, provides but 14 calories. The girls also suggested ways in which homemakers can create chocolate and candy centerpieces for luncheons, dinners, holidays, and parties.

In conjunction with the twins' visit here a local group calling itself the Capital Candy Twins Committee sponsored a twin contest. Five-pound boxes of fine chocolate candy were awarded to parents of twins born during the visit of the Candy Twins; to date six twice-blessed prizewinners have received their sweet awards.

Candy, of course, is one of our most familiar foods. In addition to tasting mighty good, candy satisfies the biological need to provide energy giving nutrients quickly and easily. Thanks to technological achievements and a sound agricultural base, the United States is the largest candy producer in the world.

Many ingredients are used to make confectionery products. The candy industry draws upon exotic fruit and nut trees, cacao tree plantations, roots and herbs, dairy lands, sugar fields, and corn for its raw materials. Raised in and representing an agricultural area, I am well aware of the close relationship between the candy industry and agriculture.

For example, many of my constituents grow corn, and a portion of their crop eventually finds its way into all kinds of confections. Corn wet millers located in and around my district process corn kernels into corn starch, corn sirups, and sugars, all of which are important ingredients in candy. As a matter of fact, products from corn comprise 20 to 30 percent of the total weight of confectionery products.

And so the Candy Twins are telling the story of candy from one coast to the other. From a personal point of view, I can think of no one I would rather hear that story from than LaVona and LaVelda. Not only are they charming and intelligent, but they also qualify for their task by virtue of having had nurses training as well as experience at retail candy counters as salesgirls.

By way of background information, the Rowe sisters attended Iowa City grade and high school and then enrolled in the State University of Iowa, both taking a premed course. They were, incidentally, classmates of my daughter Dorothy. But after 2 years of study the girls decided they were simply not cut out to be doctors and turned their efforts for 3 additional years of study to a new field—news photography.

Their first photographic assignment was as Iowa City correspondents for WMT-TV, Cedar Rapids, and United Press-International News, Davenport. Other jobs followed with Iowa newspapers and television stations. Before their present candy tour began the girls, fully accredited members of the National Press Photographers Association, were staff photographers for the Chicago Daily News.

That the twins look very much alike is apparent to anyone who has had the pleasure of meeting them. Some years ago a professor of zoology concluded from a series of tests that the Rowe sisters were one of America's most identical set of twins. I recall that back in 1960 these young ladies were chosen as "Miss Iowa City"—a neat trick that resulted from the inability of the beauty contest judges to tell them apart.

I salute the Rowe twins for their efforts in behalf of candy, and I wish them success in their careers.

USIA Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the U.S. Information Agency has agreed to make available to the appropriate committees of the Congress all information about its polling activities throughout the world. The agency also will make the information available to the public within the limits necessarily imposed by the requirements of national security.

Ever since USIA was established in 1953, the agency has been taking polls and making surveys of the attitudes of people in countries covered by USIA activities. But the results of the surveys were withheld, not only from the public but even from the Congress. This withholding became an issue in the 1960 presidential campaign. The question was brought up again about a week ago.

Following a series of meetings with subcommittee representatives during the past week, and after extensive discussions within the executive agencies involved, USIA Director Edward R. Murrow has worked out a system for public and congressional access to information about poll results. I believe the system is an important recognition of the public's right to Government information. And it is an even more important recognition of the fact that the Congress, in order to legislate governmental policies, must know, without unnecessary restriction, how the administration is carrying out these policies. The USIA deserves commendation from those of us who have been fighting for a free flow of Government information for wiping out 10 years of secrecy which covered polling activities.

Mr. Murrow's letter outlining the policy on access to USIA foreign public opinion polls follows:

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, February 25, 1963.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MOSS: In response to your letter of February 18, 1963, I am pleased to attach herewith our new policy with regard to the availability of USIA foreign public opinion polls. As you will recognize, the policy represents a significant departure from prior practice and is in line with this administration's continuing effort to assure that widest possible availability to the Congress of governmental information.

The new policy is the result of intensive executive consideration and a most useful discussion Mr. Wilson and Mr. Plesent of this Agency had with you, Congressmen Meader and Fascell and Mr. Archibald on February 21. We appreciate the understanding you and your colleagues gave to the sensitive nature of much of the polling material. As we explained, opinion data is valuable only if it is accurate. We attempt to get an honest count by not identifying the U.S. Government as sponsoring our polls. Such identification could well terminate our ability to make these polls. Embarrassment to the government of the country in which the poll was taken and a less open and candid response from the people interviewed would lead to that result. Indeed, the release of certain information which is embarrassing to the host country or to ourselves could seriously compromise our diplomatic position. These reasons underlie the previous policy and the remaining limitations on availability under the new policy.

I am certain you and your colleagues in Congress also appreciate the fact that opinion data is but one of many sources of information available to the Government. Hence, unrestricted release of just a portion of the whole could tend to misinform rather than inform.

I trust that you and the Members of Congress will accept our attached policy as an important new step taken by this administration and will in the carrying out of this new arrangement work with us to protect the various interests involved.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. MURROW.

USIA POLICY CONCERNING AVAILABILITY OF ITS FOREIGN PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

1. Foreign public opinion polls bearing the classification "Confidential" and the contracts under which such polls were taken will, upon request by the chairman of the appropriate committees or sucommittees of the Congress, be made available to the requesting chairman and the ranking minority member of such comittees or subcommittees. This availability will be made with the understanding that the material furnished will not appear in the records of the committees or subcommittees nor in any way be made public.

2. Polls bearing the classification "Confidential" will be declassified automatically 2 years after their completion unless at that time the interests of national security require them to remain classified. The declasified polls will be available at any time upon request of Members of Congress or the press.

3. Polls bearing the designation "Official Use Only" will, upon request by the chairman of the appropriate committees or subcommittees of the Congress, be made available to the members of such committees or subcommittees. This availability will be made with the understanding that the material furnished will not appear in the records of the committees or subcommittees nor in any way be made public. One year from the completion of these polls, they will be available at any time upon request of Members of Congress or the press.

4. Since USIA lacks authority to disseminate classified material originating in other agencies of Government, documents in which such classified material is integrated with our polls will not be made available. The polls contained in such documents will be isolated from the other classified material and treated in accordance with points 1, 2, and 3 above.

Homeowner Protection for Maryland Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1597, as I originally introduced it, would merely have continued a right which hundreds of thousands of Maryland homeowners have enjoyed for decades.

I realize that the Maryland ground rent system is a subject which is unfamiliar to most of my colleagues, and this is understandable since only five States have ground rent arrangements. But it is a way of life to most of the citizens of my great State of Maryland.

Briefly stated, it is a system whereby the home buyer defers paying a portion of the purchase price of his property. Instead of paying for the land, he pays interest on it at the rate of 6 percent annually. As a result of this system, Baltimore and Maryland have one of the largest percentages of homeowners in the country.

Because the ground rent is interest, the Treasury Department has always regarded it as such for income tax purposes and the Maryland homeowners paying it have been permitted to deduct such payments for Federal income tax purposes.

On the other side of the coin we have the homebuilder who usually creates the ground rent, and defers paying taxes on that portion of the purchase price on which the homeowner defers payment, until such time as he actually receives his money.

In recent years the Treasury Department objected to this practice and attempted to collect taxes from the builder on the full amount of the purchase price of the property, including that portion deferred by the homeowner and paid as ground rent. A suit was filed on at least two occasions and the courts in both instances sustained the builders.

Having been thwarted in its attempt to tax the builder at the time of sale, the Treasury Department then attempted to tax the small homeowner—in contradiction of its own longstanding policy.

It was because of this action that I introduced H.R. 1597 to protect the small homeowners of Baltimore and Maryland. Unfortunately, the Treasury Department was opposed to my bill and succeeded in having it amended to require the builders to pay taxes on the full amount of the purchase price of the property, including the deferred amount, at the time of the sale.

Thus, in effect, the Treasury Department seeks to accomplish by legislation what it was unable to do by the judicial process.

As much as I deplore the injustice done to the builders by this bill as amended, the alternative injustice to the homeowners would be even worse. For this reason I am supporting H.R. 1597 as it was amended by the Ways and Means Committee—but I am doing so in the hope that the Senate will restore the original language to my bill so that we in Congress will not take away from the builders what they have already won in the courts.

With this understanding, I urge my colleagues to support this measure—and I would like to stress again that it only affects the citizens of Maryland. Incidentally, this bill is identical to the one passed by the House last year.

Calendar of Events, March 1963, National Gallery of Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the calendar of events for March 1963 of the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: Jacques Callot: A selection of prints from the collections of Rudolph L. Baumfeld and Lessing J. Rosenwald. Central gallery. Through March 17.

Recent publication: Callot: A selection of prints from the collections of Rudolph L. Baumfeld and Lessing J. Rosenwald. Exhibition catalog, 48 pages 10 by 7½ inches with prefaces by John Walker and Lessing J. Rosenwald; introduction by Elizabeth Mongan; 48 illustrations, $1.50 postpaid.

New reproductions: 11 by 14 inches color reproductions. Canaletto, "The Square of St. Mark's"; Chase, "A Friendly Call"; De Heem, "Vase of Flowers," 25 cents each postpaid.

Twelfth annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts: On March 3 John W. Pope-Hennessy, keeper of the department of architecture and sculpture, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, England, will begin a series of six consecutive Sunday lectures on "The Artist and the Individual: Some Aspects of the Renaissance Portrait."

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 3

Painting of the week:[1] Bellows, "Both Members of This Club" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 66, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Reynolds and Gainsborough; rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: The Cult of Personality" (12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts). Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Natasha Litvin, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 4, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 10

Painting of the week:[1] Jacques-Louis David; "Napoleon in His Study" (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 56, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Boucher and Fragonard; rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: Humanism and the Portrait" (12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts). Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 11, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 17

Painting of the week:[2] Chardin, "The Attentive Nurse" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 54, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Courbet and Manet, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: The Motions of the Mind," 12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts. Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: The Feldman String Quartet, Gloria Whitehurst Philips, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 18, THROUGH SUNDAY MARCH 24

Painting of the week:[2] El Greco, "Christ Cleansing the Temple" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 30, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Monet and Renoir, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: The Princely Portrait," 12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts. Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Aline Van Barentzen, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 31

Painting of the week: Corot, "Forest of Fontainebleau" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 90, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Cézanne and Braque, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

[1] All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

[2] 11- by 14-inch reproduction with text for sale, 15 cents postpaid. (Special price this week only. Regularly 25 cents.)

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: Imagine and Emblem" (12th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts), guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Joel Krosnick, cellist, David Garvey and Charles Wuorinen, pianists, East Garden Court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, Republic 7-4215, extension 272.

Ten Years of Progress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of Prevent World War III—No. 61, winter, 1962–63—published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization located at 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., carries a detailed analysis of the accomplishments and lack of accomplishments of the present Egyptian Government over the past 10 years. The article deals with the domestic and foreign policies of the Cairo government. Because of our own country's vital stake in the Middle East, the educational value of this article should be of help to all Americans who want to be well informed on this subject. It follows:

TEN YEARS OF PROGRESS?

(By Albert Simard)

This past summer marked the 10th anniversary of what President Nasser alludes to as the "Egyptian revolution." His use of the term "revolution" is designed to impress upon the world that, when he and a group of dissatisfied Egyptian officers seized power in 1952, they brought the millennium to the Egyptian peasants. However, the record is not as romantic nor as world shaking as President Nasser and company would have us believe.

POWER GRAB

In reality, Nasser's accession to power was the result of a coup d'etat in which one power-hungry group was replaced by another. As for principles and goals, Nasser's officer corps was just as barren as the clique which had been supporting the Farouk monarchy. As the London Times (July 18, 1962) wrote, the "free officers" engineered their coup "with only the haziest idea about what they were trying to build." Thus, the new regime was set up on a sort of makeshift basis without any profound theoretical principles to guide it, and even today it more or less operates in the same way.

Nevertheless, there are publicists in the West who portray the Nasser movement and its works as a profound reformation of Egyptian society. Indeed, our U.S. Ambassador to Cairo, Dr. John E. Badeau, has equated the impact on the Middle East of Nasser's coup d'etat with the French Revolution's influence on Western Europe. Mr. Geoffrey Godsell, assistant oversea editor of the Christian Science Monitor, contends that the Nasser movement brought about a deep-going reorganization of Egyptian life. Nasser, Mr. Godsell writes, "has at least done enough in Egypt to establish his reputation as a social reformer. He has done more for the common people of Egypt than has any other ruler or political leader in that country in modern times." Mr. Godsell describes President Nasser as "the champion of Arab socialism." Finally, he contends that Nasser "is more closely identified than any other leader" with the "Arab social and economic revolution." (Christian Science Monitor, September 1962.)

These are challenging allegations which must be carefully scrutinized, for if our evaluation of Nasser's accomplishments is based on wishful thinking or superficial evidence, then it is bound to produce unrealistic policies toward the Middle East which can only inflict more damage on our position there.

When Mr. Godsell asserts that Nasser has done more for the Egyptian masses than any other ruler in modern times, he is not revealing a sensational fact. To put it another way, it would be mighty difficult for any successor regime to the previous corrupt Egyptian governments to do worse and, for that matter, it would take relatively little for the new regime to do better. The miseries of the Egyptian masses were at rock bottom. There was no place for Nasser to move but up. Yet, having conceded this, one must be careful not to exaggerate the present regime's positive accomplishments.

ECONOMIC STAGNATION

What is precisely the present state of Egypt? In a survey of the economic situation of the Middle Eastern states in 1961, the authoritative publication Middle Eastern Affairs (March 1962) reports that insofar as Egypt is concerned "there was no evidence that the new social welfare measures had directly benefited the mass of workers, or even that the 9-year-old agrarian reform had raised the peasants' living standards to any noticeable degree." This conclusion is confirmed by another authoritative publication, the London Financial Times (July 26, 1962) which tells us that the conditions of Egypt's 20 million peasants and laborers "have hardly altered yet." According to the New York Times correspondent in Cairo (July 22, 1962) the agrarian reform program is caught on a treadmill. Since 1952 the Egyptian population has risen by more than 10 million. It is now 27 million. The very increase in population will probably nullify whatever gains are made from the reclamation of land if and when the Aswan Dam is completed. Even today, the New York Times correspondent writes: "millions of farmworkers still have no farms and cannot have because there is little more land to distribute."

Most of the Egyptian farmworkers earn no more than about the equivalent of 23 cents a day. Nasser has claimed that he is building schools and clinics in the rural villages at a rate of one a day. As one writer points out, at that rate "it will take almost 40 years to meet the needs of Egypt's 14,000 villages." In recent months the Egyptian Government has proposed to raise the daily minimum for urban workers to the equivalent of about 56 cents. No wonder that the New York Times reporter writes that "the spirit of the revolution has never filtered down to the fellahin." The Egyptian Government likes to boast that the peasants are no longer victimized by oppressive landlords. Actually, the peasants have exchanged one oppressor for another in the person of Nasser's bureaucrats.

The lot of the Egyptian worker is hardly any better than that of the peasant. Here is a description which is perhaps more revealing than statistics: "The wiry little men who toil all day on fine new buildings must be one of the biggest economic assets a developing country could have. They contrive, somehow, to sustain their energies largely on bread, onions and glasses of tea; at night, spreading tattered blankets on a heap of sand, they sleep on the building sites themselves" (London Financial Times, July 26, 1962).

ENDLESS CRISES

It should be pointed out, too, that despite the grandiose programs for industrialization, there is still widespread underemployment. The publication Middle Eastern Affairs estimates that these projects have produced work for only 42,000 persons. Eventually, 193,000 workers will be absorbed in industry. However, this is a drop in the bucket when one considers that the annual rate of population growth is around 600,000.

The Egyptian Government has given a great deal of publicity to its development plans and its nationalization measures. By resorting to outright seizure of private property, the Government was able to acquire assets valued at more than $1 billion. The State has clamped a strict control over the entire economy and is squeezing out the independent entrepreneur. But nationalization per se does not equal progress. In the Egyptian case it is destroying private initiative and discouraging investments. Indeed, as a result of Nasser's socalistic program, it is estimated that more than $1 billion has fled Egypt. Moreover, it is a fact that technicians and other persons possessing knowhow and who could be extremely useful for developing the Egyptian economy, are discouraged from contributing their talents under the present conditions of oppression and terror. The London Daily Mirror (Oct. 18, 1962) reported that Egyptians are now afraid to talk to strangers. Its Cairo correspondent wrote that the government's secret police "have recently increased their watch over foreigners to the point where there is one police spy for every 20 hotel guests."

The Egyptian economy is shaky and burdened by internal perpetual crises. This is reflected in the continued decrease in the value of the Egyptian pound. It is also reflected in Egypt's mounting trade deficit and her inability to obtain many of the necessary materials for the economy.

Of course, President Nasser can boast that Egypt's industrial plant is now producing about $1,600 million worth of goods annually. This is more than twice the production output in 1952. Nevertheless, the average per capita income remains as one of the lowest in the world, namely $118 per year. Yet, even this seemingly impressive increase in industrial output could have never been achieved without outside help. From the United States, Egypt has received aid totaling $707 million and prospects are favorable for an additional $500 million over the next few years. The Soviet Union has committed itself to a sum totaling $920 million—about one-third for military equipment. Thus, one can really concede one genuine success on the part of Nasser, namely, through blackmail and bluff he has been able to gain huge sums from the two major world protagonists. Perhaps this is what Mr. Nasser means when he talks about "Arab socialism."

The crises-ridden Egyptian economy, its failure to really meet the needs of the Egyptian masses is further manifested in the lives of the people. President Nasser proclaims that his policy is one of "search for dignity" of his people. Yet, illiteracy is widespread. It is true that health clinics are being constructed but the traditional diseases of the Egyptian masses associated with poverty and backwardness, are as rampant as they ever were.

OTHER BURDENS

Besides these burdens the Egyptians are saddled with what the London Financial Times calls a sluggish bureaucracy and a professional army of at least 100,000 men. Even Nasser himself has officially recognized the typical Government bureaucrat who is "an arrogant, indifferent, and underpaid paperpusher who must never treat the plain citizens as an equal" (New York Times, Sept. 23, 1962). Being underpaid, the bureaucrat makes up the difference in more shady ways.

Thus, the Times reports that "the Cairo civil servant has become feared and hated by his fellow Egyptians." He has also become "the most envied of men." Nasser has been compelled to admit that the "Government machinery had failed to give the public the impression that it was at their service." What an admission after 10 years of reform. There is no doubt that President Nasser will endeavor to correct the public's present impression of his bureaucrats but one cannot be sanguine about real reform in that area. After all, the bureaucracy totals over 288,000. It is in truth Nasser's prop and support. To put these people to honest and productive work would be equivalent to cutting his own throat.

Similar conditions are found in the Egyptian armed forces. There is no question but that the average Egyptian who is drafted, is patriotic. However, the army holds a greater inducement than mere flag waving. Those who join it know that they will be fed much better than their friends at home. Yet, the average Egyptian is obliged from the sweat of his brow to support this huge military establishment. It may not be good economy to maintain this armed force but, as Egyptian spokesmen have said, "the army is good for morale." If by morale one means that it constantly reminds the Egyptian fellahins of their gratitude toward President Nasser, then we can certainly understand its usefulness. However, the real bureaucracy within the army will be found among the officer cliques who surround Nasser. It is they who employ the army to further buttress their privileges. This, the average fellahin knows full well. But under the present reign of terror he must carry these parasites, too. As one writer recently stated, "social reform under Nasserism is distorted and stunted, since it is designed primarily for demagogic effect and the creation of new positions of economic control and power for the members of the ruling clique."

NASSER'S NEIGHBORS

This analysis would not be complete without examining briefly Nasser's revolution in terms of its impact on Egypt's neighbors. It is true that Nasser has many well-wishers in other Arab countries. One must concede, too, that in the beginning Nasser was regarded by many Arabs as a genuine worker for the welfare and progress of all Arabs. But the passage of time has worn away these hopes and illusions. Today, the Nasser regime is virtually at war with every one of its Arab neighbors. The real face of Cairo's views on Arab welfare was unmasked last year when the Syrian people rose in revolt and smashed the much vaunted United Arab Republic. Prevent World War III has dealt with this episode in detail. However, it is worthwhile to remember the basic reasons why the Syrians revolted. Prof. George Lenczowski of the University of California, writing in Current History (April 1962), sums up Syria's grievances in these words: "However, the rulers of Egypt abused their confidence and exploited the union for selfish purposes. Instead of cooperating and consulting on the basis of equality, they acted arbitrarily, imposing their will, restricting freedom, establishing a police state and ruining Syria's economy. In their perversion of the ideal they turned a deaf ear to Syrian pleas for justice and moderation."

President Nasser has never reconciled himself to this courageous defiance of his tyranny and constantly strives to subvert Syrian independence. His agents have conducted a vicious terroristic campaign against Syria. Meanwhile, Cairo propagandists are constantly predicting that the Syrians will suffer political and economic chaos due to the break. The fact is that Syria's economy is improving all the time and this has further infuriated the Cario Government. Cairo activities became so blatant that the Syrian Government was finally obliged to call Nasser to account before the Arab League which ironically is a creature of Egyptian policy. The exposé of Nasser's conspiracy was so overwhelming that the Egyptian representative at the league could not reply but instead threatened to pull out. Thus, in the very league which Nasser has used for his own imperialistic purposes, he was put on the carpet and exposed before all of the other Arab States. Surely this is a case of Nasser being hoisted by his own petard. It is interesting to note that not one of the other Arab States at this league meeting in the late summer of this year came to Nasser's defense. Their silence is as significant as Syria's charges.

GROWING CONFLICT

It is safe to say that Syria's complaints against Cairo at the emergency meeting of the Arab League could have been raised by Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq. Thus, in a very real sense the Syrian charges against Egypt were an indictment by other leading Arab States. It is for this reason that some Arab governments are taking steps to defend themselves against the insatiable ambitions of the Cairo Government. Egypt is becoming more and more isolated. "Other rulers who once trembled at Cairo's threats, now defy Nasser" (Newsweek, Sept. 10, 1962). There are closer bonds being forged between Syria and Iraq. Saudi Arabia and Jordan recently agreed to merge their military forces and coordinate economic policies. As the New York Times reported, this agreement reflected "continued bitterness toward President Nasser." (Aug. 30, 1962.)

The growing opposition to Egypt's imperialistic policies is no longer a secret. The New York Times correspondent, writing from Lebanon on September 22, 1962, noted these facts. "The conflict," he wrote, "between President Nasser of Egypt and the anti-Nasser forces in other parts of the Middle East is on the rise." The same correspondent further stated that this development should concern the United States because Middle East politicians were becoming convinced that the United States is backing Nasser whereas, according to this correspondent, the State Department is not backing Nasser, "merely not opposing him." This semantic exercise is too subtle and sophisticated for the intended Arab victims of Nasser's ruthless policies.

Only recently Saudi Arabia broke off diplomatic relations with Cairo charging the UAR with bombing Saudi Arabian villages. Will Jordan be next? How will they regard the hundreds of millions of dollars being poured into Nasser's coffers? Will they not conclude that the United States is in effect supporting Cairo in its imperialistic drive?

From the foregoing it is clear that the accomplishments of the Egyptian revolution are far from impressive. There were many Americans who were impressed with Fascist Italy because Mussolini made sure that the trains ran on time. There were other Americans who were impressed with Hitler's Germany because the Fuehrer gave employment to all, ignoring, of course, that this prosperity was based on war production. Let us remember those lessons so that we can distinguish between progress and propaganda. The notion that the Nasser regime represents the wave of the future for the Arab people is a myth which can only do great harm to the interests of the United States if it is accepted as a fact by our own policymakers.

Growth in the 1950's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the charges most frequently leveled by then Senator John Kennedy during the 1960 presidential campaign was that of economic stagnation and lagging standards of living during the decade of the 1950's. This charge, along with that of a missile gap, became common reading fare during the long weeks between the conventions and November. Indeed, it was even so during the preconvention period when the Senator absented himself from Washington to tour the country seeking delegate votes.

The missile gap sham died early in the new administration. Hardly had the last vote been counted than our defense structure took on a healthy new aspect that had somehow escaped the view of the campaigning Senator. The incoming administration soon made it official; we did not have the missile gap problem which had been so proclaimed from St. Louis, Minneapolis, New York, Indianapolis and elsewhere throughout the country.

We have had to wait somewhat longer to get the administration to contradict itself on the claims of Candidate Kennedy as to a lagging rate of growth in our standard of living. Yet, in a release for Sunday, November 18, 1962, newspapers, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals a study in seven leading American cities. This study points "clearly to a continuing and substantial increase in the Nation's standard of living, an increase which accelerated rapidly during the past decade as incomes rose more rapidly than the cost of living."

The full text of the release follows:

WIRTZ RELEASES BLS STUDIES REVEALING RISING LIVING STANDARDS

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz said today that new Bureau of Labor Statistics studies of consumer expenditures and buying patterns in seven American cities point clearly to "a continuing and substantial increase in the Nation's standard of living, an increase which accelerated rapidly during the past decade as incomes rose more rapidly than the cost of living."

The studies cover a 1960–61 comprehensive survey conducted in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, New York City, San Francisco, and Washington.

"It is a measure of both the fruits and the potential of our free economy," Wirtz said, "that the residents of these seven cities enjoyed an increase in their real purchasing power, over the past decade, of from 20 to 40 percent. This is what was revealed in the BLS examination of consumer expenditures based on income remaining after payment of personal taxes, and after adjustment for the increase in consumer prices over the decade."

The reports shows that average income after taxes ranged from $5,412 in Atlanta to $6,869 in Boston, and that families spent around 86 to 95 percent of this income in current consumption. What is of considerably more importance, however, is that a significantly smaller share of consumer spending went into the three basic expenses of food, shelter, and clothing in 1960 than in 1950. Total expenditures for these items dropped from about 62 percent of the 1950 consumer dollar to only about 55 percent in 1960.

That portion of living expenses allocated for food stood at 23 to 26 percent in 1960, reflecting a significant proportional decease from 1950. There was also continuation of the long-term historical decrease in expenditures devoted to clothing, with a drop from a range of 11 to 14 percent to one of 9 to 11 percent.

Dramatically moving upward in a majority of cities surveyed was family home ownership. In these, the increase was by about a full third among all the families surveyed. Each of the seven cities surveyed reflected greatly increased outlays for personal insurance, ranging from 56 percent in Chicago to 144 percent in Detroit. And also in all of the cities, the proportion of after-tax income going to gifts and contributions increased. In four, the increase exceeded increases in expendable income.

Particularly indicative, too, of the Nation's changing buying patterns, the survey revealed that 7 to 8 of every 10 families in these cities reported coverage under some type of health insurance plan.

"These and other facts uncovered in the survey point clearly to a continuing and substantial increase in the Nation's standard of living," Wirtz said. "They should also serve us as a pointed reminder of an unacceptable contrast in American life today that there still exists in our most abundant society areas of severe want. Until that contrast is eliminated, our satisfaction with the results of studies such as these must be limited."

Wirtz said that the reports for the seven cities will form a foundation for a new and comprehensive Department of Labor program to study and report on living conditions throughout the Nation. As additional information becomes available from a large number of other cities scheduled for survey, it is hoped that the Department will be able to provide a continuing and accurate reflection of the changing economic conditions affecting all urban consumers. Wirtz added that in undertaking the new program, the Department was reassuming a function it had long carried out prior to World War II. "The broad picture revealed by these surveys," he said, "should provide us with a significant new indicator of our economic life and an important new tool in the formulation of economic policy."

Tax Reduction for Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in one of the recent Presidential messages, the White House propaganda machine turned full blast in support of the so-called medicare proposal which is more accurately labeled by observers as socialized medicine. We are told that this is an urgent program, absolutely needed by our elder citizens.

If the administration feels legitimate concern with the condition of our elder citizens, it would include in the tax bill now before the Congress proper relief rather than to insist upon a program which would bring regimentation and interference, rather than the needed adjustments.

In conjunction with the Illinois Senator, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, I have introduced a proposal to exempt persons 60 years of age or over from the capital gains tax on the sale of their homes. These bills were introduced in the previous session but did not receive committee consideration.

I was especially pleased to note that one of the outstanding publications of the Chicago metropolitan area, the Chicago Heights Star, provided favorable editorial comment on this tax relief measure in its Thursday, January 31, issue. Under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial into the RECORD at this point:

TAX RELIEF FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Illinois Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN has again introduced a proposal to exempt from the capital gains tax persons 60 years of age or older who sell their homes. Under its terms, the older citizens would pay no tax on the profit realized from the sale of their residence, provided they had owned it for 5 years or longer.

At present, the homeowner is taxed at the rate of 25 percent of the increase in the selling price over the original purchase price.

The effort to change this for those over 60 makes such good sense that it is unreasonable to expect it to succeed in this age of governmental nonsense.

In the first place, the increase in the selling price over the original cost of a home is in most cases a paper profit, resulting entirely from inflation and the consequent reduction in the value of the dollars received. This is particularly true among older people who bought their homes in the era of the 5-cent cup of coffee. To tax this phantom profit is to confiscate part of what belongs to them.

In case of the older persons selling their homes, it is also true that most of them are moving into apartments or other quarters rather than buying new dwellings. Thus there is no escaping the tax through this channel.

The proposal will nonethless encounter trouble among demagogs who want government largess conferred upon voters in more direct form.

Another deficiency in the Dirksen proposal, in the current political climate, is that it requires no new bureaucracy to place it in operation. After a leveling-off period during President Eisenhower's two terms, new armies of payrollers have been attached to the Federal Government under the present administration, suggesting a thorough appreciation of the fact that votes come from the precincts.

So you can expect to hear continued emotional appeals for easing the burden on older citizens, for Federal aid to education, and every imaginable form of paternalistic government. But you can rest assured that most of the schemes will not propose so simple and inexpensive a vehicle as special tax relief to achieve the goal. And those that do provide for so sensible an approach will face tough sledding.

A View of De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the relationship between journalism—the reporting of contemporary history—and history itself is often overlooked in the rush to meet daily deadlines. The appended article by Philip L. Graham, entitled "A View of De Gaulle" is illustrative of the great value to be derived from the kind of thoughtful commentary which puts news in the prospective of history.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A VIEW OF DE GAULLE—THE MAN WHO HAS STOOD ALONE

(By Philip L. Graham)

Could General De Gaulle be right is his veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market? Could he be right in insisting that France develop an independent nuclear deterrent? Could he be right in insisting that a truly strong Europe must be free and independent of the United States?

If De Gaulle is right, almost all the leading statesmen of Britain and America are wrong, and the preponderant voices of Anglo-American journalism are speaking in equal error.

This will not be the first time in history in which a minority voice has spoken sense, while the dissenting multitude has been in dissarray. In the 1930's, Winston Churchill stood alone while warning of the Nazi menace and the handful of premature anti-Communists were ridiculed when they assailed the barbarism of Stalin.

Standing alone is not new for De Gaulle. In 1940–45, he held out against the powerful stubbornness of President Roosevelt. De Gaulle insisted that the West needed a France restored to dignity, washed clean of despair, and not a semipuppet France dependent on American alms and good intentions.

When the immobilism of the Fourth Republic suspended effective French politics, De Gaulle invoked the rarest kind of courage for a public man, he left the unreal world of Paris and stayed for 13 years in contemplative isolation. He risked being passed over by history rather than sullying its pages by engaging in make believe.

When De Gaulle returned in 1958, he moved again in loneliness. He felt the doubts and suspicions of the Anglo-American press which at times showed a willingness to find him guilty by association with the ultranationalists who thrust him into power. He felt the scorn of being ignored when he asked Eisenhower to give France a seat in NATO equal in dignity to Britain's seat.

It will seem curious to succeeding generations that De Gaulle's actual record from 1958 to 1962 was so quickly forgotten in 1963. For to the surprise of his critics, he liquidated a fatally dangerous war in Algeria which none of his French oppositions had been able to oppose with effectiveness. He began to bring back to Europe a French army which was essential to any nonnuclear defense of Western Europe. He supported the growth and development of the Common Market (which began only after De Gaulle's return to power). And over Berlin—the most

critical test of the West's challenge by communism—De Gaulle stood resolutely against concession.

If there's one thing remarkable above all others about this Frenchman, it is the extent of Anglo-American misunderstanding of his purposes. Again and again we have been mistaken about him. In 1941 the State Department libeled his brave forces as the "so-called free French." In 1945 he was ridiculed as a mystic rebuilding the soul of France (as though this was not an essential source of the soul of all Western civilization). When he remained aloof from the folly of the Fourth Republic, he was written off as a man whom history had passed by. And so on, until this very day.

Paradox plays a vital role in human life. The paradox of Anglo-American blindness about De Gaulle lies in our refusal to learn from our errors. Again and again we have misjudged this man. Our diplomats and journalists call his purposes old-fashioned, unreal, and even evil. They do this without adequately studying his careful writing, although De Gaulle is one of the greatest writers of sense and style among western statesmen since Abraham Lincoln.

Faced by the largeness of De Galle, even the most sensitive of men can temporarily lose perspective. Thus, in the Washington Post last Sunday, Prof. Louis J. Halle wrote about De Gaulle: "He has this remarkable virtue, that 'we' all know precisely where he stands."

We "all" know? What proof is there of this unanimous agreement about the complicated mind of Charles de Gaulle?

In fact, the views of the Anglo-American community are in considerable disagreement. One senior U.S. official in Europe is so dislodged as to liken De Gaulle's firmness of purpose to Hitler's demonic attempt to destroy the world. A minority of more astute observers—Walter Lippmann is an example—remind us that De Gaulle has consistently supported the highest Western ideals.

What has sent the usually perceptive Professor Halle into writing exaggerated rhetoric is plain to see. De Gaulle has struck the Anglo-American community on its most exposed nerve.

For 17 years the United States has followed a policy not unlike Lenin's "zigzag" strategy. U.S. policy has been to "zig" toward developing a strong Europe, then always to "zag" back toward the myth of a "special relation" with Britain.

The resilient power of this rhythm was shown this past year. It began with Prime Minister Macmillan's decision to join the Common Market.

To American eyes this was a brave decision by Britain to "join Europe."

That it was brave there can be no question. For Macmillan was setting out to reverse England's long, proud history of being "of" Europe but not "in" Europe. The Prime Minister's own party, already in electoral troubles, was sharply divided. The real problems of the Commonwealth countries stirred the deepest and most ancient feelings of British loyalty. And the opposition Labor Party seemed destined to play politics against this cruical step toward Britian's new road to greatness.

All that was clear to America. We knew, as one knows about familial activities, how difficult and yet how essential Macmillian's course was. We knew he was moving, as fast and as far as he thought he could, to weld Britain into a strong Europe as a step toward the interdependence of an Atlantic Community.

But to French eyes, especially to De Gaulle's eyes, the situation was less clear. The French remember that Britain stayed aloof from the Schuman plan, the first effective step toward creating a new Europe. They remember that British opposition helped kill the European army of 1953, and so recreated the Wehrmacht and the possibility of German renascence. They remember the hostility of the British negotiators, David Eccles and Reginald Maudling, in 1958 when Britain refused to join the Common Market at its inception. They remember the papier mache EFTA which Britain patched together in an attempt to outflank the Market.

What seemed to Anglo-American observers a resolute British attempt to adjust its situation to the Common Market seemed to the French an attempt to dilute the new Europe. It seemed to them an attempt to weaken the Common Market's greatest potential for helping to strengthen peace and civilization in the nuclear age.

For the Common Market is not a static tariff schedule, nor a bare-bones economic formula for finding material affluence. It is a growing and a stirring by a new type of men—men of the late 20th century—who are intent on transforming the nation-states of the 19th century which have caused a century of war.

The new American Trade Act, President Kennedy's greatest achievement of 1962, is fully effective only if Britain joins the Common Market. For only then does the provision for totally abolishing many tariffs become operative. To us and to the British that is eminently sensible. But to the French this appeared in part as further evidence of American pressure to wring further concessions out of the Market in favor of Britain. And the American pressure seemed to be demonstrated by the behavior of France's five European partners. France stood, by and large, for defending the fundamentals of the Treaty of Rome. But the other five Market members seemed willing to dilute the treaty to entice Britain into membership. In terms of U.S. history, it was as though 11 of the 13 Colonies had wanted to bribe New York into the new Union by offering her exemption from the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

Then, at the most critical moment in the long Common Market negotiations, America and Britain announced the Pact of Nassau. This bilateral agreement, negotiated without any consultation with Europeans, probably shaped De Gaulle's present intransigence. It must have seemed to him a blunt Anglo-American assertion that Britain's special relation with the United States was a fundamental part of our foreign policy.

One consequence of the pact of Nassau, given French policy, was that Britain alone would be helped by the United States to achieve the only real sovereignty of the modern age, an independent nuclear deterrent.

Again there is paradox. De Gaulle's force de frappe represents a modest, obsolescent, airplane-delivered, nuclear deterrent. It could be of only limited use to avert limited blackmail. But to the Anglo-American mind it sometimes seemed a greater threat to mankind than Soviet ICBM's.

Britain, on the other hand, is to be given not a limited deterrent, but a modern weapon system probably capable of launching a nuclear holocaust through the next decade.

It was against this set of circumstances that De Gaulle reacted. He would not now see Europe distorted by having it grant special status to a half-European Britain. There was for him ample evidence that we—whom De Gaulle calls Anglo-Saxons—were intent on creating an American-British superiority over Europe.

This is what De Gaulle is courageously (stubbornly if you will) standing against. At least he may be. For none of us is any more a mind reader than is Professor Halle. And to change Halle's rhetoric: "De Gaulle has this remarkable virtue, that we do not all know precisely where he stands."

He may be making a decent stand for the creation of a strong and independent Europe. Not a Europe opposing the United States. But a Europe strong enough, free enough, and dignified enough to make a voluntary partnership with the United States toward the beginning of an Atlantic community.

What is De Gaulle's destiny? It may be that this old man will have enough youth to prevent Western Europe's becoming insecure and unsure of herself as a partial American satellite. It may be De Gaulle's destiny to drain away the latent and dangerous militarism of Germany into a continental polity having some of the melting-pot checks and balances of America. It may be De Gaulle's role to foster a European strength which is essential to counter communism's expansion.

And how could this fit the destiny of that "young man" Kennedy, now so restlessly disturbed by De Gaulle's interruption of the Anglo-American dreams of interdependence of the West?

It may just be that what the "old man" builds will permit the "young man" to grasp that goal of peace which twice in this century eluded Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Backs Antidetergent Pollution Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern throughout the country over detergent pollution of our streams and ground water. There is bubbling, foaming evidence everywhere that the problem is getting worse.

This has been reflected in widespread support for my bill—H.R. 2105—to end detergent pollution by banning from interstate commerce, after mid-1965, detergents which do not meet standards of decomposibility to be prescribed by the Surgeon General.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has recently set forth a brief but weighty argument for enactment of the bill:

RIDDING WATER OF DETERGENTS

Regulation of detergents so they can be removed from drinking water is proposed by Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, on terms which seem to us to be fair to all concerned. Detergents that can be decomposed by bacterial action or in water treatment plants—as those presently in use in this country cannot—have been developed both in West Germany and the United States. So the problem, as Mr. REUSS says, is not one of technique. It is one of protecting the producer against unfair competition in view of the somewhat higher cost of the decomposable product.

The Reuss bill would solve this problem by authorizing the Surgeon General to prescribe standards of decomposability for all detergents sold in interstate commerce or imported, with provisions of seizure, injunctions, and prosecutions in case of violation. It is modeled on a law enacted by the legislature of the West German Government in September 1961 banning noncomposable detergents after December 1964. Representative REUSS would allow 2½ years for the regulations he proposes to take hold, with an effective date of June 30, 1965.

Whether detergents are or are not harmful in drinking water is still unknown. There is no proof that they are, but nobody is keen on drinking detergents, and they are building up in our water supply at a rate of 5 percent increase a year. It is certainly desirable to call a halt to this process at some point and Representative REUSS' way sounds to us like a good one.

Experience of Private Enterprise Versus Centralized Planning: Let's Take the Hint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev seeks solutions to his problems by turning away from centralized planning while we are asked to adopt centralized planning.

The experience of Khrushchev with centralized planning only indicates that experience is the best teacher unless you are of the Kennedy "more-clever-than-thou" school.

"Let's Take the Hint," says the Chicago Tribune:

LET'S TAKE THE HINT

Plagued by the problem of how to get the Russian economy moving, Mr. Khrushchev has taken a few more important steps toward capitalism and free enterprise. The program under which farmers have been freed from central planning and control, and permitted to earn a few rubles on their own, is being extended to industry.

Under a plan drawn up by a Ukrainian economist, Y. G. Liberman, factory managers are to have more independence in running their plants, and those whose plants earn a profit will be entitled to part of it as a personal bonus.

Here is added proof that the Kremlin's boasts about industrial growth, frequently quoted in Mr. Kennedy's campaign for the Presidency, are misleading if not false. Under centralized planning, Russia's economy has proved unable to adjust to the country's needs, and Khrushchev knows it. When a plant manager's only goal is to meet quotas and requirements set in Moscow, he will do it by any means he can. He will produce shoddy goods and goods which nobody wants. It isn't his worry if they pile up unsold.

In Liberman's words, "what is profitable for society must be profitable for each enterprise"—a view which is startlingly reminiscent of capitalistic statements such as "what's good for General Motors is good for the country." Central planning can be reduced to a minimum, according to Liberman, without violating true Socialist principles. Had he dared talk this way a few years ago, Professor Liberman would long since have taken up residence in Siberia.

It's pleasant, of course, to watch Mr. Khrushchev try to lubricate his sticky and overmanaged machine with injections of free enterprise. But let's not forget that for every frantic step he takes away from centralized planning, we are being asked to take another step toward it. Almost every new program offered by the Kennedy administration calls for the intrusion of Federal authority into some new area of our life. And this can be done, we're told, without violating the principles of free enterprise.

The parallel is too close to overlook. Let's take the hint. When you're heading for a lunchroom and see a fellow rushing out of it in acute gastric distress, it is advisable to think twice before going in.

The Salvation of the Softwood Lumber Industry: Increased Manufacturing and Marketing Efficiency

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 17, 1963, issue of a very fine newspaper published in my congressional district, the Eugene Register-Guard. The opinions in this editorial, which just came into my hands, are almost identical to those I expressed last Thursday on the floor during the discussion by a number of members of the softwood lumber industry and the recent Tariff Commission decision. I am gratified that this influential paper has chosen to take such a sensible stand. I hope that the industry itself will adopt and promote this point of view, and that the Federal Government will continue to do whatever it can to assist the industry in meeting the Canadian competition.

The editorial follows:

TO MAKE THE MOST OF A BAD SITUATION

With United States-Canadian relations already strained, it comes as no surprise that the Tariff Commission has turned down ideas that imports of Canadian softwood lumber be artificially restricted.

Even were Washington and Ottawa getting along better, it would be difficult to justify either tariff boosts or import quotas on lumber entering this country from Canada. The United States, as the world's great champion of less restricted international trade, would be hard-pressed to explain why Canadian lumber imports should be curbed at the same time U.S. representatives are beginning a momentous battle to breach trade, would be hard pressed to explain why Market area, and elsewhere.

The economic interest of the Pacific Northwest and other U.S. lumber-producing regions would be served if Canadian lumber imports were cut back. But the national interest would suffer.

Accordingly, representatives of the U.S. lumber industry should now quit chasing rainbows which have no pots of gold at the end of them. Instead, they should concentrate efforts upon attainable objectives of realistic benefit to their industry. Coastal mills which ship by water routes could be further benefited by additional amendments to or complete repeal of the Jones Act which, in effect, forces U.S. lumber producers to help subsidize this Nation's merchant marine. Some inland mills, particularly smaller ones, might be assisted by renewed efforts to restore delay-in-transit privileges they formerly had when making rail adjustments of their wares. A case, at least, can be made for restoration of these privileges—on the basis that they continue to be enjoyed by shippers of many other commodities and industrial products.

And, of course, there remain a number of lumber industry complaints to be argued further in regard to U.S. Forest Service marketing policies and procedures. One example: In view of the multipurpose public forests management principle, it is reasonable to think that purchasers of public timber should be assisted with more public funds when they build access roads which, at the Government's insistence, must be suitable for recreation travel as well as log trucking.

The Tariff Commission opined that the main reason for the marketing disadvantage at which U.S. lumbermen find themselves is the relatively high cost of stumpage in this country. This situation may be improved, temporarilly, as Federal agencies hasten the marketing of tremendous amounts of Pacific Northwest timber felled in last October's hurricane. But it is long-range solutions which the lumber industry needs for stability. And, in spite of all efforts to find such solutions, it remains probable that U.S. mills will be plagued by Canadian competition throughout the foreseeable future. More mills in this country may be forced out of business; more U.S. lumber industry capital may be shifted into British Columbia where cheap logs are abundant.

Wherever it is being unjustly hampered by Government policies, this country's lumber industry has good reason to complain and to fight for better treatment. In addition to this, however, the industry—and communities dependent upon it—must recognize that increased manufacturing and marketing efficiency offers the best hope that Canadian competition can be met. The salvation of the U.S. lumber industry, as presently constituted, depends largely upon offsetting, and not upon attempts to nullify, advantages which inherently belong to Canada.

House Joint Resolution 279: National Harmony Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution (H.J. Res. 279) to designate the 6-day period, beginning April 15, 1963, as National Harmony Week. Further, the resolution would authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of National Harmony Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In offering this resolution, I wish to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. This nonprofit, fraternal organization is dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. Its more than 650 chapters in all 50 States and most of the Provinces of Canada comprise over 30,000 members.

I am proud to note that this year's international president of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of

Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., S. Wayne Floor, is a resident of my home community of Rochester, N.Y. and a constituent of the district I am privileged to represent in Congress.

I hope my colleagues will give favorable consideration to the resolution.

What Unseen Hands Direct a United States Policy Which Continues To Give Victories to Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before it is too late and our beloved country is completely destroyed through the machinations of behind-the-scenes planners in the State Department, I implore Congress to get on with the business of a thorough investigation of the Department of State, its policies and its personnel. What dire consequences await this Republic if we fail to root out the planners who are not planning in the self-interest of the United States may be seen in the following article written by Dr. Robert Morris:

HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

(By Robert Morris)

A very discerning friend of mine was recently cataloging the vivid contrasts between the brave declarations of intention of the Presidents of the United States and other official spokesmen and the rather abject actions that have proven to be our actual accomplishments over the last decade.

When the current President first took office 2 years ago he stated that we could not tolerate a Soviet satellite at our doorstep. Not only have we tolerated it but we have watched it grow to a monstrosity many times its size then.

Secretaries of State and gala supporting casts met with leaders of the OAS at Rio de Janeiro, at Caracas, at Punta del Este and at other capitals of Latin American since 1947 and solemly pledged not to allow communism to set foot on Western Hemisphere soil. These treaties are a mockery now—flouted and defied—and instead of enforcing them we change the patent meaning of the firm resolutions to a sickly resolve to confine the foothold to Cuba.

Our Secretary of Defense declares that we have no proof that Castro is exporting his revolution to other Latin American countries but his words trail off into an announcement of Castro agents pirating a Venezuelan ship and sabotaging industrial installations in that target country.

Our Secretary of State tells us that communism in the hemisphere is not negotiable and we precede to negotiate with Mikoyan and other bloody Soviet murderers over Cuba.

We insist that our belated quarantine around Cuba would be lifted only after "on-site inspection." The quarantine was lifted without such inspection.

We reject, with a flourish, Khrushchev's demand that we dismantle our Turkish missile bases. We then proceed not only to announce the dismantling of these very bases in Turkey but in Italy as well and then, as if for good measure, declare we will pull out our nuclear bombers in the next 16 months and withdraw support troops from Europe.

These and other agonizing contrasts have become a hallmark of American policy. They are painfully dismissed as inconsistencies.

What should be pointed out is that President Kennedy, I am sure, was sincere when he made that buoyant observation that a Soviet satellite should not prevail at our doorsteps. It was his policy planners who did not share his high resolve. What inconsistency there is—and it is great—lies not in the different acts of the elected officials but rather in the contrast of outlook between these officials and the policy planners.

The policyplanners have an underlying program, all worked out, for a merger of the United States with our Soviet enemy whom these planners do not acknowledge to be an enemy. These planners will never accept a plan or resolve to eliminate Soviet power unless it moves at an aggressive rate, more accelerated than that called for by some still mysterious slide rule of theirs. When this happens they temporarily leave their drawingboards but resume their stance as soon as the misunderstanding is corrected.

As I write this, the Congress is storming at the U.N. grant of $3 million in agricultural aid to Castro. The leaders of the executive branch are wringing their hands because it is politically embarrassing but the planners are silent. They know it is policy and are waiting until the storm abates to carry on.

This precise situation occurred in 1957 after the Hungarian explosion. The gambit used then was identical. While our elected leaders were still livid denouncing the savagery of Khrushchev and Mikoyan for slaughtering the Hungarians, the FAO, a specialized agency of the U.N. quietly slipped through a farm grant to dictator Kadar in about the same amount that the American Paul G. Hoffman is slipping through to castro. Our State Department then as now said they could do nothing about it, it was the U.N. and not the United States acting.

I was with a Senate committee then and we tried to learn who was engineering the seemingly inconsistent act of granting aid to the Soviets in Hungary at the very time official Washington was denouncing them. It was, I suspected then, a guideline being hoisted lest some of the wavering planners accept the flamboyant statements of the elected leaders against communism as a change of policy.

Of course that proved to be the case. Kadar, like Gomulka, Tito, and Sukarno before him, received the FAO grant and others followed. The Hungarian inquiry is now even off the U.N. agenda and the distinction, fabricated at times of emergency to silence the clamor, of no U.S. funds being expressly allocated to a particular grant is no longer necessary there. Hungary is back in the groove.

One of the best gages of our policy toward Cuba will be found in the assignment of personnel who have taken a stand on Castro. Ambassadors Robert C. Hill, Arthur Gardner, Earl Smith, Whiting Willauer, and Policy Planner Ray Leddy all took a firm stand against Castro, while the State Department was favoring his accent to power. The first three are retired from service. Willauer, a brilliant and courageous diplomat, has been dismissed and died recently of a broken heart. Ray Leddy is at the Carlisle Barracks in Pennsylvania. On the other hand William Weiland and Ambassador Philip Bonsal and others who opposed these people are in the midst of planning in official Washington.

Like the FAO grant in 1957, this personnel design is the true guideline to policy. The discerning will recognize it. The Senators and the Congressmen in Washington should know that Paul G. Hoffman's grant to Castro will be the guideline too, to our policy toward Cuba unless they demand the shakeup in the policy agencies that is so long overdue. Paul G. Hoffman, I am sure, is not persona non grata among the planners. He has been their friend.

Financial Shambles Being Created in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following joint statement of the New York State Democratic legislative leaders Senator Joseph Zaretzki and Assemblyman Anthony J. Travia.

This statement, dated February 15, demonstrates the methods being used in Albany to create a mythical pay-as-you-go image.

The statement follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

The new system devised by Governor Rockefeller to finance State university construction in 1963–64 and beyond is another reflection of his fiscal juggling concerning his increased deficit financing budget operations.

This subterfuge may cost the taxpayers of the State as much as $800 million more for State university buildings that will be erected during the next 10 years than it would if construction were financed from the $250 million higher education bond fund, approved by the voters in 1957.

The Governor has been and continues to be shockingly devious about this highly important plan to change the traditional method of financing State university construction. He is being deliberately devious in order that the public not see through this additional pay-as-you-go sham. This is another of his slick, ball-juggling acts. As reported by the press, the combination involved this time would be the State university income fund, the State university construction fund, and either the State housing finance agency or the State employees retirement system—or both.

If either the housing finance agency or the employees' retirement system are to be the mechanism through which the Governor borrows sufficient money annually to defray State university construction costs, it may well cost the voters 1 percent interest more for the money borrowed than if financing were through the voter-approved higher education bond fund. The reason for this is that bonds issued from the higher education bond fund are backed by the full faith and credit of the State, whereas housing finance agency bonds are not, and a higher rate of interest is ordinarily demanded when the State's credit is not behind bonds issued by State authorities.

Moreover, bonds thus far issued from the higher education bond fund have been for periods of but 15 and 20 years and it is unlikely the State comptroller would permit their issuance for longer periods. However, newspaper reports have indicated the Governor's intention of issuing housing finance

agency bonds for periods of 20 and 30 years—if in fact he can legally use this agency's bonds for State university purposes.

If the State will borrow $1 billion for State university construction over the next 10 years and if the bonds are issued for 20 years, an increase of 1 percent in the interest rate would cost the taxpayers more than $100 million extra.

And if the Governor issued 30-year housing finance agency bonds, as reported likely by the press, the interest rate being 1 percent higher than that obtainable if 20-year bonds were issued from the higher education bond fund, the taxpayers would pay $330 million in additional interest costs.

And if one compares 30-year housing finance agency bonds with 15-year higher education bonds, the latter being the life of the last such bonds issued by the State comptroller, the added cost to the taxpayers would be over $400 million because of the 1 percent differential in interest costs between the two types of bonds. Thus the people of the State would be paying more than $400 million extra in interest charges for State university construction because Governor Rockefeller hides the fact that he is deficit financing State university construction. If he were truthful, he would not resort to the costlier hocus-pocus he has in mind but would, instead, bond finance for higher education facilities in the voter-approved way through the higher education bond fund.

Moreover, the rate of interest would unquestionably be at least 2 percent higher if the Governor borrowed the money for his construction program from the State retirement system. As administrator of the moneys in this fund, the State comptroller is required to secure as high a rate of interest on his investments for State employees as he can and that means a minimum 4.5 percent rate at this time. To demonstrate the truth of this, one need but examine the 1963–1964 State budget (p. 726) to note that the Governor is now paying between 4.5 and 4.75 percent, the going rate, for money borrowed from the retirement system, with approval of the State comptroller, to finance his extensive campus site building program. This would double the cost from $400 to $800 million.

All this maneuvering is designed by the Governor to hide his borowing through creation of front agencies and to conceal the fact that he will use the general funds of the State to pay off the bonds—all in a desperate and deceitful effort to preserve the myth of pay-as-you-go, no matter at what cost to the taxpayer.

Child-Care Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the bill—H.R. 2085—introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., to allow income tax deduction for child-care expenses in cases of women deserted by their husbands. A similar bill passed the House in the 87th Congress but did not get through the Senate.

The Internal Revenue Code, as now worded, requires a "legally separated" status to justify such a deduction by a mother who has been deserted by her husband. Some mothers who did take deductions for their children are required to refund the money to the tax office. There are a good many such cases in the country where mothers are employed to support themselves and their children, and the whereabouts of their husbands are unknown.

The bill imposes certain suitable conditions in order to give proper status to the mother. She must have been deserted by her husband; not know his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year, and must have applied to a court to compel him to pay support.

I am pleased that the bill passed the House today, and I hope that the Senate takes early action. This amendment to the Internal Revenue Code will do justice to many deserving citizens.

Management of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question of news suppression and benevolent censorship that the Kennedy administration has been practicing for 2 years has finally become a national issue, since the press and other communications media have finally seen fit to inform the public that managed news has been a consistent product of the Washington scene for 2 years.

This morning's Chicago Tribune, in two editorials, discusses the question of management of the press, as well as managed interpretation of history that the President recently saw fit to practice. I insert both of these editorials into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

We in the legislative branch of Government have personally experienced many instances where the same deliberate obstruction of information is practiced against us by executive department bureaucrats, just as it has been so effectively practiced in suppressing public knowledge. To effectively function as an independent branch of the Government, exercising our authority, prerogatives and jurisdiction in our checks and balances is to obtain legitimate information upon request from the executive branch.

Since the Kennedy administration has seen fit to violate the very spirit of the relationship between Congress and the Executive, it is my hope that the public uproar over news management will develop to the benefit of the Congress as well.

The editorials follow:

INSULT TO THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS

What Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, has said about the Kennedy administration's management of the news has been said before by this newspaper and scores of others. Mr. Krock's barbed remarks are given added point by his longstanding friendship with the President and the Kennedy family.

In 50 years in Washington, Mr. Krock says, he has seen nothing that approaches the Kennedy policy of news management. It is unequaled in cynicism, boldness, and subtlety. It is done deliberately. It is brazenly described in departmental papers from the Pentagon and the Office of the Secretary of State, and is flung at the people and the press in terms which constitute a deliberate affront.

Mr. Krock says that this kind of controlled news can be justified only when it is intended to conceal from an enemy military plans or movements to force his retreat or defeat. But this excuse is unavailable, for the country, though it teeters on an uncertain pledge of peace, is not at war.

The real purpose of administration news management, Mr. Krock suggests, is something quite different. What the administration seeks to do is to envelop the people in a massive propaganda "in behalf of the establishment, to inflate success or gloss over error."

This technique reached its full development with the Cuban confrontation, when the military plans and movements of the United States had been made clear to the enemy in action. Mr. Krock says that in this instance "news as weaponry" was employed primarily to delude the American people into the belief that a "half-won showdown" was really an administration victory over the Soviet Union.

Mr. Krock states that Mr. Kennedy himself has been the "most brilliant operator" in the field of manipulated news. He is incessantly engaged in a selling job on news reporters, television and radio broadcasters, commentators, editors, publishers, and network executives. The social flattery of the treatment leaves the subjects "in a state of protracted enchantment," so that the doings of the administration are frequently reflected in "a continent-wide glow" and the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity is lost by the wayside.

With much of this analysis we can agree. The Chicago Tribune, however, has never been a sucker for snow jobs and blandishments. We shall go on calling the shots as we see them, and we shall continue to remind our readers that there is a conscious and purposeful attempt by the administration to control the news, to color the news, and to manipulate the news for the greater political glory of the Kennedy administration, so that the first Washington casualty is the truth.

A TOUCH OF MANAGED HISTORY

President Kennedy turned to history yesterday for an example of the dramatic economic growth which he, and indeed most everybody in the country, would like to revive today. But instead of going on to examine the fiscal policies under which this growth took place, Mr. Kennedy closed the history book and substituted his own improvised program for tax cuts and deficit spending.

A century ago, he told a symposium of the American Bankers Association, we were in roughly the same position as the countries we think of as developing or underdeveloped today. Our per capita income, he said, was roughly comparable to that in Chile today. Our dependence on farming, our literacy, our railroad development, and our life expectancy, he said, could be compared to those existing today in the Philippines, Ceylon, India, and Zanzibar.

No other nation in the history of the world, he said, has experienced a period of economic growth such as the United States entered into after the Civil War.

Mr. Kennedy may be exaggerating our backwardness at the time of the Civil War.

We doubt that India, whose only recent military triumph has been the conquest of Goa, could have provided the industrial strength necessary to win our Civil War. We see no sign in Ceylon or any other underdeveloped country of the inventive genius which was apparent in this country well before the Civil War.

More shocking is Mr. Kennedy's thorough disregard of the fiscal record of the years between 1865 and 1890, during which our most rapid growth took place.

True, taxes were cut after the Civil War and Mr. Kennedy urges a tax cut today. But here the similarity ends.

The tax cut after the Civil War reduced government revenues from $558 million in 1866 to $371 million in 1869, and they remained roughly the same for 30 years—until 1899. Our revenue from taxes under Mr. Kennedy's proposed budget would still be double what it was in the peak year of World War II, only 18 years ago.

Government spending was reduced from a Civil War peak of $1.3 billion, in 1865, to an average of about $340 million, which prevailed until after 1890. Mr. Kennedy proposes to spend more next year than was spent in the peak year of World War II.

The Federal Government had a surplus every year from 1866 to 1894. It has had a deficit almost every year since World War II.

The Federal debt was reduced from $2.7 billion in 1866 to $1.1 billion in 1890. The debt is substantially higher now than it was at the end of World War II.

Mr. Kennedy justifies his higher spending and higher debt on the growth in the country's population and production. Yet between 1865 and 1890, when government spending remained constant, population and gross national product both more than doubled.

When a government adopts a policy of managed news, it is perhaps inevitable that it will try to manage history a little in the process. But no Congressman, after even the most cursory research, can possibly think that the Kennedy program resembles the government policies of the last century.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure, as a newly appointed member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to be in attendance and testify this forenoon at a meeting of the House Rules Committee which met in public session to receive testimony relating to the proposed resolution offered by Messrs. ROOSEVELT, LINDSAY, and FARBSTEIN, to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to transfer its functions to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am pleased to learn that following the public hearing, the Rules Committee agreed to table the resolution. Because of the limitation of time, I was not in a position to extend my remarks in opposition to the proposed resolution. I now avail myself of the opportunity to state my views.

I have long since reached the conclusion that it is of the utmost importance to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee. The evidence indicates that this view is shared by the overwhelming number of the Members of Congress and of the American people.

During the past 3 months, I am advised by the staff of the committee, countless petitions have been received at its office—presented by many, many thousands of American citizens expressing to Congress their great concern as to the action that might be taken pursuant to the proposal of a small minority to weaken the committee by altering its composition as a standing committee. Indeed, on the morning of the hearing—in just 1 day—the committee received from all parts of the country more than 500 telegrams expressing this same concern and urging the Congress in its wisdom to continue the House committee as a standing committee.

In the overall picture of the fight against communism, as we assess it in the world today, the most significant change is that Communist power has grown tremendously, reaching into all corners of the earth and threatening new conquests by daily aggressions. In the years that have passed since the adoption of the Reorganization Act of 1946, which established the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee, hundreds of millions of people, and nation after nation, have fallen under the Communist yoke. This is the situation as it exists beyond the boundaries of the United States.

At the same time, within the United States, there has been a significant decrease in Communist strength. Needless to say, the United States would be in a most difficult position today if a weakening of this internal grouping of the world Communist conspiracy had not taken place.

What has brought about this change—the weakening of the party within the United States while, at the same time, its power has increased beyond our borders? Various factors—some external, such as the Korean war, the cold war, the Hungarian revolution, and the exposure of Stalin's crimes; certain internal developments, such as the prosecutions of the Communist Party leaders under the Smith Act, and proceedings against the party and its members before the Subversive Activities Control Board—have undoubtedly played a role in reducing the party's strength within the country.

At the same time, serious students of the problem and well-informed observers have agreed that the Committee on Un-American Activities through its investigations and hearings, and the legislation it has devised—such as the Internal Security Act—the information it has given to the Congress and the American people, have played a major, though by no means the sole, role in bringing about this decline in Communist strength within our own country, so that we can meet our responsibilities with united and concerted strength.

This is concrete evidence of the quality of the committee's work. It would seem to me to be most unwise at the very time we are confronted with such strong evidence of the committee's effectiveness in combating communism, to abolish the committee and turn its functions over to a newly created subcommittee lacking the experience, background, and know-how on this subject. Is it logical to dump a winner and pin our hopes on an unknown? Quite obviously the House Rules Committee, after hearing the testimony, has reached a sound conclusion. I commend them for their decision.

Moreover, it is most important that we approach the problems involved in subversion as a united Congress and a united people. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a bipartisan committee. It is not constructed—as is the Committee on the Judiciary—to reflect the requirements of partisan politics. The membership on the Committee on Un-American Activities is divided equally between the members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, with the exception of the chairman who represents the majority party. The committee has functioned as a bipartisan committee and it can function as such only by maintaining its independence as a standing committee of the Congress. As such it has met its responsibilities and commands the confidence of the Congress and the American people. Created by a far-sighted Congress, extended today by the decision of the Rules Committee, its existence continues unimpaired. This decision will be applauded throughout the entire Nation.

Persistent Price Fixers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on the so-called quality stabilization bill, which appeared in the February 19, 1963, issue of the Pittsburgh Press.

The article follows:

PERSISTENT PRICE FIXERS

Once more, as in every session of Congress, the price fixers are pressing their case.

Again the so-called quality stabilization bill has been introduced. This is the former fair competitive practices bill. These terms are a coverup for the real purpose, which is to permit price fixing by law—a practice forbidden by a host of other laws.

The bill would enable a manufacturer to set prices retailers would be obliged to charge the consumers. This is supposed to stop injurious marketing practices, to protect the family retailer, to reestablish economic fair-play. In actual effect it would stop price competition and raise retail prices.

The so-called quality stabilization act is offered as an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act. This act has a primary purpose of discouraging price fixing, and encouraging free competitive prices. The quality stabilization amendment would reverse the whole idea.

Congress has been rejecting this price-fixing proposal for maybe 50 years. Despite the pretentious language of the latest bill, Congress has no reason to change its attitude. On the contrary.

State Progress in Retraining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the Republican policy committee's study, "Operation Employment" and the discussion of the Manpower Retraining and Development Act, one point of importance was the attitude of States toward the encouragement of skill retraining. One of the keys to this encouragement is permitting individuals undergoing retraining to continue receiving unemployment compensation benefits, if otherwise eligible for them. There are two schools of thought on this. The older view is that when an unemployed worker goes into a retraining program he is no longer unemployed and his benefits can be terminated. In effect, this makes retraining impossible for one who must rely on his unemployment benefits to support himself and his family and freezes him into what may be an obsolete skill. The newer view, which has been adopted by 19 States and the District of Columbia, permits benefits to continue while the worker attends a qualified retraining course, and indeed, even a bona fide offer of employment may be refused by one undergoing such training without the loss of benefits.

The Department of Labor's Monthly Labor Review for November 1962 commented on the progress which has been made in this area of State legislative encouragement of retraining to meet our country's unemployment problems.

This comment follows:

TRAINING

"Alaska and Delaware continued the trend of the 1961 legislatures by amending their laws to permit an otherwise eligible individual to continue to receive unemployment benefits while attending an approved training or retraining course. Moreover, an offer of suitable work will not disqualify the individual from receipt of benefits if the offer is refused during the period of training or if the job would prevent him from completing the course. There are now 20 States whose laws or formal interpretations specifically permit the payment of benefits to individuals undergoing approved training.[1]

"The District of Columbia law was amended to disqualify any individual from receiving benefits for any week with respect to which he failed, without good cause, to attend a recommended training or retraining course which is available at public expense. Before the amendment, such a disqualification applied to individuals under 21 years, and the recommended courses were limited to those offered by vocational or other schools.

"The New York provision permitting an individual to receive benefits during periods of training or retraining was amended to specify the labor market conditions which must exist before the industrial commissioner of the New York Department of Labor may decide that a claimant does not have employment opportunities for which he may be fitted by earlier training and experience."

[1] Alaska, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, West Virginia, by statute; and Connecticut, Maryland, and Washington, by interpretation.

Milwaukee Democrats Adopt Statement on Jobs and Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the county council of the Democratic Party of Milwaukee County has recently adpoted a "Statement on Jobs and Markets."

The statement, which was hammered out by the party's platform committee under the leadership of Manuel Gottlieb and adopted unanimously by the council, follows:

1. Under 8 years of Republican administration our rate of economic growth in terms of national income slipped, recessions came more frequently and the level of unemployment steadily rose.

2. As yet, efforts of the Kennedy administration to reverse the slowdown and to step up our rate of growth have only been partially successful.

3. We repudiate the notion upheld by Big Business and the Republican Party that acceleration of our economic growth will mean or will produce inflation.

4. We asert that we are able to reverse slowdown and that we do not need to adjust to it by discouraging admissions to the labor force and encouraging premature retirement.

5. A stimulation of economic growth—or reversal of slowdown—means more jobs for our jobseekers, fuller weekly paychecks and larger profits through larger volumes for our businessmen.

6. Economic growth will be stimulated when new markets are developed because of augmented demand for the products of our industry and work.

7. We can seek for these new markets an augmented demand in two different directions (a) by seeking to expand our exports of goods or capital to meet the needs for industrial products in foreign countries, (b) by forming new currents of domestic demand for goods or services by households, business firms and Government agencies in our own country.

8. Pursuit of foreign markets would involve the strategy of becoming more competitive, relaxing trade restrictions and reducing tariff levels at home and abroad, utilizing our political power to expand exports of our products or to open up favorable spheres for investment of capital.

9. Pursuit of domestic markets would involve (a) use of the great power of the public credit to finance public works or housing programs or cross-the-board tax reductions which will increase disposable incomes of households and business firms alike and remove tax roadblocks to recovery, (b) increase of the lending power of commercial banks to permit them to meet the financial needs of accelerated economic growth, (c) control of the movement of gold or adjustment of its price to a level consistent with accelerated economic growth and full employment.

10. We favor the strategy of expanding domestic markets while steadily trading more freely with all peoples.

The Death Penalty Should Be Abolished—Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the earliest days of our Nation the Federal Government has taken the lead in protecting the human rights of its citizens. The several States have retained ultimate jurisdiction over their individual residents, but certain areas of the law have been defined and amplified by the Congress as being of benefit to all of the people.

I believe that the time has come for Congress to again lead the way in an area of human rights; I believe that Congress should now abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions except the armed services. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 545, to accomplish this purpose. It has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. The arguments against the continuation of legalized murder are many and practical. The most important are that it does not serve as a deterrent to crime, and it does not permit the correction of error. I need hardly add that no human institution is free from error.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the February 10, 1963, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle:

KOESTLER'S BOOK IS FINE STUDY OF DEATH PENALTY

(By Celestine Sibley)

The question of the electrocution of children is up before the Georgia Legislature once more and once more with high hopes I have pulled Arthur Koestler's "Reflections on Hanging" out of the shelf and press it upon anybody who will read it. It was published in 1957 by Macmillan.

Mr. Koestler, who is a gifted novelist with such books as "Darkness at Noon" and "Arrival and Departure" to his credit, did the mammoth job of research on this book out of admitted prejudice.

He spent 3 months under sentence of death as a suspected spy during the civil war in Spain in 1937 and he emerged from prison with what he calls a vested interest in capital punishment.

While admitting his bias he defends his facts and figures and contends, rightly, I think, that as long as the facts and figures are right and the quotes are undistorted then in context there's nothing wrong with having one's heart and spleen in his pleadings.

Believe Mr. Koestler's facts and figures. He took pains to document them from the beginning of the 18th century, when under the so-called Bloody Code there were more

than 200 offenses in England punishable by death, to the present time.

Early felonies included such things as stealing turnips, poaching, associating with gypsies, damaging fishponds, picking pockets, and shoplifting.

Read, and grow actively ill at his description, of the macabre, coldblooded politeness of present-day executions which he says, contrary to officialdom, is not always quick and expeditious.

But Mr. Koestler, despite having his heart and spleen in his subject, is by no means sentimental, propelled along by emotion and feeling. He contends that capital punishment isn't practical, in that it has been proven no deterrent to crime and that in countries where it has been abolished the crime rate actually dropped.

He cites the fallibility of the penal system over and over again, and we have in my own State, Georgia, the case of James Foster to remind us that sometimes the innocent are convicted. The death penalty is the only one that cannot be rescinded and made right after it has been imposed.

It is a citizen's responsibility, putting an end to what Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo a generation ago called the grim reproach of legalized murder.

We would do well to abolish the death penalty for teenagers in all States and better to abolish the death penalty for all. It has not served us well. Georgia has more murders and more electrocutions than any other State.

Edmund Cahn, writing the preface in Mr. Koestler's book, says it for us:

"We who live as free citizens in a democratic society are responsible for capital punishment imposed by our law. Every day the penal codes draw their validity from our name, the executions are ordered by our authority, and the rope or electric current or lethal gas is bought with our tax money.

"There is no one else: it is we who arranged, through hired deputies, for pulling the lever or pressing the button.

"As the moral responsibility is ours, so too is the political power to object and prevent. If we resolve that capital punishment is not civilized enough for America, we can unite and abolish it. The task requires only dedication and courage.

"Who, living under these skies, dares not hope? America may yet fulfill its earliest vision and every State become worthy of the just, the understanding and the compassionate."

Happiness Must Be Earned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following copy from the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in the February 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report, should be read by all freedom loving Americans. It reminds us that no government can guarantee happiness, only the right to seek happiness. Too many of our people today are becoming imbued with the idea that the guarantee of happiness is a right, forgetting that happiness must be bred within the individual and cannot be superimposed by any outside force. Any attempt by a government to give to its people some kind of happiness means a subsequent loss of freedom, and without freedom no man can be truly happy.

The article follows:

LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

When you read the Declaration of Independence (and every one of us should) read it all. Too many Americans think it guarantees them life, liberty, and happiness. Not at all—only the pursuit of happiness.

No one but a selfish child thinks he has the right to happiness. Adults know it has to be deserved, earned—and the only way to earn it is to contribute more to the world than you take.

If you are a worker, you produce enough to pay your wage plus enough to pay for the machine, without which you would have no job.

If you're a businessman, you produce enough to pay your workmen a fair wage, enough for an incentive return to your stockholders whose savings built the company, and enough for your share of necessary taxes to protect your country.

If you're a politician you work first for the good of your country, not your party or yourself.

That is the honest way to happiness as every intelligent adult knows. Anything seized in any other way is grasping greed, of which any self-respecting American should be ashamed.

Is it useless to hope for that kind of Americanism? We don't think so.

Fiscal Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, sweeping new health plans are proposed, but a fiscal health plan is not among them. Congress and the people, however, are looking forward to a health bill for the treatment of fiscal insanity.

The following editorial is from the Illinois State Journal of Springfield:

NEBULOUS PROJECTS—GRANDIOSE HEALTH PLAN

The administration's proposals for a national health program, financed by taxes, are so complex that President Kennedy is presenting them to the public in three sections.

In his initial special message on health, the President asked legislation to aid the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. A day later he talked about the Nation's general health needs. He submitted a third message on his plans for providing medical care to the aged through social security payments.

His programs to combat illness and mental retardation would require $31,300,000 in additional Federal funds in the ensuing fiscal year. States would be asked to participate with matching funds. The cost of the general health recommendations were not spelled out. But next year's budget sets up $1.6 billion for such purposes.

The President's general health measures would include such nebulous projects as an enforcement authority to control interstate air pollution. That would be a neat trick, if he or anyone else could do it.

What else would the country get if Congress buys Mr. Kennedy's three-dimensional health program?

There would be hundreds of new community mental health centers; 10 new centers for research on mental retardation; a bureau of environmental health to check into air, water and food pollution; programs of additional care for expectant mothers and infants; aid for students studying medicine and nursing; more Federal funds for expanding and replacing all types of hospitals and medical schools.

And, of course, there would be socialized medical care for the aged.

Mr. Kennedy is an optimistic man. But even he must realize that Congress will reject such an overall grandiose scheme that would make every American a virtual ward of the Federal Government in matters of health.

There is no doubt about the necessity for improvements in the many-faceted fields of national health in a physical sense. The President, however, in his eagerness to capitalize on political aspects of physical health, again is ignoring another area of health—that is, fiscal health.

The Wall Street Journal said: "In this instance, it's up to Congress to determine from the spate of health plans before it how much more strain on its financial health the Nation can stand before serious illness sets in."

Americans will continue to look after their own health without further Government supervision if Mr. Kennedy will care for the Nation's fiscal health.

A Report on Communism in Czechoslovakia as Told to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, I insert, under unanimous consent, into the RECORD at this point, "A Report on Communism in Czechoslovakia" as told to Americans and reported by the organization.

This report is concise, factual, upsetting and most meaningful in that it dramatizes the weakness and failure, as well as the oppression of Communist governments.

The report follows:

A REPORT ON COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AS TOLD TO AMERICANS

Fifteen years ago, on February 24, 1948, Communists took over Czechoslovakia with Soviet assistance, under the personal supervision of Moscow's hatchetman Valerian Zorin, the recent troublemaker at the United Nations. At first, the Communists made an effort to bluff the free world into believing that the seizure had been an act of a free people. Now that pretense is no longer necessary, the Communists brazenly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the democratic government and how much they depended on Soviet help.

What communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia and how much it has changed their lives is born out in thousands of letters received by American relatives. The Czechoslovak National Council of America, an organization of Americans of Czechoslovak descent, with headquarters in Chicago and branches in a number of cities, has made a study of personal mail from Czechoslovakia and on the basis of this information concludes that Christmas 1962 in Czechoslovakia was the worst since 1945, the first postwar

Christmas when the country was left bare by the Nazis.

In their letters, Czechoslovak citizens complain: "If one is not young enough and strong enough to queue up for hours from very early morning for a ration of 4 ounces of butter and 1 pound of margarine, there is nothing left within a few hours. Electricity is shut off early. Prague streets are dark. Trains are unheated. There is a fuel shortage. In the mining town of Kladno near Prague, people stood in line for 20 pounds of coal, which they had to carry home in sacks, when and if they got any. Water pipes are frozen, but former plumbers are not allowed to take house calls and repair the damage; instead, people must wait until a government agency assigns a workman to the job. Since industry, farms, business, and professions have all been expropriated without compensation by the government and are government owned and operated, government agencies alone decide what should be done, by whom, for whom, and when, if at all. Consequently, the average citizen waits for weeks for the repair of pipes, furnace, roof or crumbling wall. Should he wish to repair it himself, he is not given the material with which to do it, not even a bag of cement.

Service to customers is also very poor as there is no business competition and personal initiative. One waits for weeks, even for months, for a suit to be cleaned and shoes to be resoled. The quality of goods is far inferior to what it used to be. Despite the fact that every able-bodied, and not so able-bodied, man and woman are hard at work, there is a scarcity of almost everything and the prices of consumer goods are very high.

The reason for this is Red Czechoslovakia's foreign policy: acting as a spearhead for the Soviet Union, the Prague regime gives considerable economic aid to the underdeveloped and neutralist countries the Soviets are trying to woo to their side. This is why the Prague regime has been supplying Castro with food, considerable technical aid and arms. In return, Czechoslovakia has received some unwanted Cuban sugar, for Czechoslovakia herself has always been a heavy exporter of beet sugar.

Most of all, people lament the loss of freedom in their letters to American friends: "There is work for everyone, but that is all we have. Nothing is as it used to be. We have only our memories." Families with young children are afraid to attend church in their home town because their son and daughter would be barred from a higher school of learning and from a better job. The letters reflect the weariness, apathy and despair of the writer.

American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. It would be simple for a daughter to send a warm sweater to her mother in Czechoslovakia who writes: "My room is unheated and it is so cold that I stay in bed and cry myself to sleep. A wool sweater is not to be had and a cotton sweater isn't worth anything."

The Communists have made it impossible, however, for Americans to send gift packages by placing in 1961 an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty of 50 crowns on a kilo of used clothing (approximately $7 for 2.2 pounds; hourly wage of average office worker is 6 crowns; of farm worker as little as 12 crowns a day).

The Red regime has a definite purpose in mind: To squeeze dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy Czechoslovak relatives, they must send dollars to the Red regime with which Czechoslovak citizens can then buy Czechoslovak goods, if and when available, in a Government store called Tuzex.

The Red regime then has dollars for anti-American propaganda and Communist subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. In view of these facts, it is hard to understand why our Government is so careful to observe strictly all the niceties and why it has not restricted the Red government monopoly which bars American goods. After all, we are in a strong position, for we have the dollars. We could insist, for instance, on gift packages of American goods (limited in size and value) if we continue to send dollars (unlimited, so far) and to travel to Czechoslovakia with unlimited spending money. In order to curtail the flow of American dollars abroad, the United States limits its citizens on how much they can bring back into this country duty free and exacts other limitations on its citizens as well. Why not set up reciprocity regulations or limitations when dealing with the Reds?

So far, Americans of Czechoslovakia have been asking this question in vain.

The Hard Shell on Budget Busting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recent remarks of Dr. Seymour Harris, professor of economics at Harvard University and a senior consultant to Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, epitomize the Kennedy administration's approach to the popularization of deficit spending. In the light of the recent tax cut proposals and the administration's reliance on deficit spending to spur economic growth, Dr. Harris stresses the need of a "better informed" public which in turn would offer "less resistance to the type of unbalanced budget that President Kennedy has submitted."

Furthermore Dr. Walter Heller, chief economic adviser to the President, recently spoke of the American "Puritan ethic," which resists the concept of spending more than one earns. Dr. Heller also expressed the idea that Americans should be educated out of this old-fashioned regard for fiscal responsibility. In regard to the comments of both Dr. Harris and Dr. Heller, a program designed to "better inform" the public appears as an attempt to brainwash the American public into accepting the administration's program of "planned" deficits.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask that the article appearing in the Boston Herald on January 24, 1963, reporting Dr. Harris' views, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HARRIS URGES MORE LIGHT ON DEFICIT FINANCE

(By Michael C. Jensen)

Harvard University's prominent political economist yesterday called on his fellow economists to do a better job of explaining deficit budget theory to the public.

Dr. Seymour E. Harris, senior consultant to Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, told the Herald the Nation's economists haven't done a very good job spelling out the whys and wherefores of an unbalanced budget.

Harris said that popular books and magazine articles on the subject, written by economists in terms the layman can understand could help solve the problem.

Harris thinks that if the public were better informed about deficit financing there would be less resistance to the type of unbalanced budget that President Kennedy has submitted.

"One of the difficulties," said Harris, "is that most people are in debt themselves for consumer goods, and they feel it is wrong under these circumstances to borrow.

"They transfer this same feeling to the Government. What they don't realize is that there is a difference between Government and personal spending."

Harris has been an advocate of deficits as a necessary means for stimulating growth and dealing with excessive unemployment.

Even while noting the need for more careful explanation by economists of the fiscal facts, Harris said he felt that increasingly more persons have a grasp of Government deficit economies.

"Business groups and labor unions have made progress in explaining the problem," he said.

Harris, who himself has published more than 35 books, would like to see more letters to the editor written by knowledgeable economists.

"We need more salesmen like Keynes," he said. John Maynard Keynes was the most famous spokesman for what is today considered liberal economic theory.

Mutual United States-Russian Nuclear Strike Could Cost From 40 to 80 Million American Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in the furor over France's announced independent nuclear policy, the following comprehensive article by Richard Fryklund in the February 17 Evening Star is an interesting treatment of our defense capabilities:

MUTUAL UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN NUCLEAR STRIKE COULD COST FROM 40 TO 80 MILLION AMERICAN LIVES

(By Richard Fryklund)

If the Communists were to attack Europe tomorrow, and if the NATO forces couldn't stop them, and if President Kennedy were then to surprise Russia with a massive missile and bomber attack, and if the surviving Russian missiles and bombers were to be hurled against the United States, at least 40 million Americans, and possibly 80 million, would die.

This is a new estimate by top Pentagon officials of Russia's ability to hit back after a successful strike by the United States.

Many persons familiar with the estimate—and some, like President de Gaulle, who have simply used their own judgment—say the President would not deliberately sacrifice 40 to 80 million American lives in an effort to save Europe.

The question of whether he would push the button or not is becoming a serious political, military, and foreign policy issue. The Senate Armed Services Committee will examine it this week when it begins its annual military posture hearings.

Since 1949, when the NATO treaty was signed, the United States has been pledged

to regard an attack on Europe as an attack on the United States.

American leaders have said repeatedly that this specifically would include a strike directly against Russia by our long-range missiles and bombers.

This pledge was easy to make in 1949. We could hit Russia with A-bombs, but Russia could not retaliate effectively.

NEW INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATES

Even when Russia developed nuclear weapons and built long-range bombers she could not force the United States to change its policy.

Presidents Truman and Eisenhower were confident that a massive American strike would destroy much of the relatively small Russian force on the ground and that our anti-aircraft defenses would intercept the bulk of what survived.

President Kennedy, until recently, could be just as confident.

Late last year, however, new intelligence estimates undercut this confidence. Officials reported that the Soviet Union is operating a substantial number of missile-carrying submarines in the Atlantic and Pacific.

These are not Polaris-type ships. They are a mixed bag of nuclear-powered and diesel-powered submarines, each carrying from two to six missiles, some of them ballistic missiles, some pilotless bombers.

Our estimate of the numbers involved is classified. But the latest edition of Jane's Fighting Ships lists 41 missile subs in operation or fitting out. They can carry at least 151 missiles capable of dropping hydrogen warheads on American cities within 300 miles of the coasts.

ESTIMATES NOW HIGHER

Actual American intelligence estimates of Russian missile subs credit them with a much higher number today.

These submarine forces could not be destroyed in a sudden blow. Nor does the United States have defensive forces that could stop incoming Russian missiles.

Therefore, even though we could count on destroying most of the Russian bomber force and land-based ICBM's (which are standing exposed on pads pinpointed by our intelligence), the submarine missiles would surely survive and would be used to retaliate against American cities.

Knowing this, could President Kennedy use our long-range bombers and missiles in the defense of Europe? Can our historic policy endure?

The President indicated in his Valentine Day press conference that the policy still stands.

"The loss of Western Europe would be destructive to the interests of the United States," he said. "So we feel that there is no question that these long-range [nuclear] weapons would be used to protect the security of Western Europe."

M'NAMARA LINE DIFFERS

Defense Secretary McNamara, however, told Congress this month that Russia—at some unspecified time in the future—will have undersea and hardened missiles that we will not be able to destroy.

He made it clear that the United States will not be able to use our long-range missiles and bombers on behalf of our allies in this coming era of mutual deterrence (as he called it).

In fact, Pentagon officials say Mr. McNamara deliberately painted this grim picture in order to knock the crutch of our Strategic Air Command from under the Europeans and force them to think of a more feasible defense.

He was talking about the future, but there are those who are convinced that the era of mutual deterrence has already arrived.

Some administration officials believe that no matter what the President says or plans today he would not be able to force himself to push the button and doom 40 to 80 million Americans.

Other officials, just as competent to evaluate the situation, say that there still are desperate situations where the President would order our long-range weapons used.

MATTER OF JUDGMENT

It is a matter of judgment, then, whether we can afford to trade those lives for the defense of Europe.

Strangely enough there is no official definition in the Government of "acceptable" wartime death and destruction. No one has calculated for the President's guidance a cutoff point in carnage—even though the President conceivably may have to decide some day what is and is not "acceptable."

But even if 40 million dead are acceptable today, the Russians, according to Mr. McNamara, will have enough hidden missiles in the future to raise that figure substantially.

By 1967, Mr. McNamara told Congressmen in closed sessions this month, the Russians will have at least 500 long-range missiles, more than half of them carried on submarines, and possibly as many as 1,000.

Whatever the number—and such estimates have been vastly wrong in the past—the Russians are fully capable of building a hidden missile force within 4 years that will be able to ride out an American strike during a European war and then kill 100 to 150 million Americans in retaliation.

U.S. RETALIATION

The United States would be able to do even more damage to the Soviet Union, of course, even on a second strike.

Therefore, it would be irrational for either side to strike. The era of mutual deterrence—sometimes called "thermonuclear stalemate"—will have arrived well before 1967 if it hasn't already.

Administration spokesmen insist that in any discussion of how we will defend ourselves and help defend Europe in this era, these are the basic facts of American defense policy that must be kept in mind:

First, we are determined to maintain a wide margin of superiority in long-range nuclear weapons. Our edge is at least 4 to 1 over Russia today in all categories of missiles and bombers. Plans through 1968 call for a minimum edge of 2 to 1.

Second, the administration believes that thermonuclear wars will still be possible, by irrational act or miscalculation of our enemies even if not by rational design. Therefore, we must be prepared to fight with these weapons someday. Deterrence alone is not enough.

Third, if we ever do use these weapons we will try to avoid killing enemy civilians provided the enemy tries to spare ours.

NONNUCLEAR WARFARE

Fourth, all of our vital interests around the world will be defended, but wherever possible with nonnuclear weapons.

Fifth, even Europe can be defended with nonnuclear weapons if the Europeans make a rather modest effort to improve their forces.

Sixth, we will continue to be ready to use small battlefield nuclear weapons, particularly in Europe, until the nonnuclear buildup is completed.

Seventh, we will maintain research and development efforts at an optimum rate in an attempt to beat the Russians to any new discovery which will permit one side to destroy the hardened and hidden missiles of the other or to intercept these missiles before they have exploded over their targets.

CONTROVERSIAL POLICIES

These policy considerations, which have not yet been made clear to the public, are controversial.

The Air Force disputes them within the Pentagon, and conservatives in both parties dispute them outside.

The Republican congressional committee charged last week that Mr. McNamara "outlined what amounted to plants to pull the 'nuclear teeth' of America's defenses. In the view of some congressional and military authorities, the new strategy well could invite a Soviet attack in the not too distant future and seriously limit our response."

Senator THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, says that the new policy abandons strategic superiority for nuclear parity.

The "opening battle" on the policy changes "promises to be one of the most controversial subjects before the Congress this session," Senator THURMOND said.

PROBABLE COURSE SEEN

When Mr. McNamara and his top military and civilian advisers testify before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the dispute probably will go something like this:

Mr. McNamara will say that the administration is giving up nothing in defense—is, in fact, adding both nuclear and nonnuclear weapons. But the administration is facing the fact that unless some unexpected breakthrough in research occurs there will be a standoff in thermonuclear war.

He will deny that he is seeking stalemate or parity or a deterrence only posture. He will challenge his critics to show how they would destroy the hidden enemy weapons and how they would survive a counterattack.

Mr. McNamara's top advisers say he has defense, not disarmament, on his mind, but many of his supporters believe the new policy will in fact lead to low-risk disarmament.

If we cannot destroy the Russian hidden weapons even with a force three times larger than that planned—as Mr. McNamara has said—then we need not build even on the planned scale, the disarmament argument goes.

WIESNER'S VIEWS CITED

The President's science adviser, Jerome B. Wiesner, has often said that mutual deterrence will permit us to reduce our missile force to a few hundred secure, second-strike weapons.

We now plan to build at least 1,500 land-based ICBM's and 565 submarine-based (Polaris) missiles.

Air Force spokesmen, if they are asked by congressional committees, will say that they fear we will drift into an unsafe disarmament posture.

Here is the Air Force argument:

We could maintain our present margin of superiority in long-range weapons if we tried, and we could keep our policy of using these weapons in the defense of Europe. We must build more missiles, add the RS-70 superbomber or some substitute, and put a much greater effort into research.

With sufficient effort we could avoid a nuclear stalemate.

Furthermore, the Air Force argument continues, we cannot defend our interests without a wide range of nuclear weapons. The administration is accepting stalemate in long-range weapons and may well take small nuclear weapons out of Europe and encourage the Russians to attack.

CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS

Conventional weapons cannot stop the Communists even if we build to the present NATO force goals, the Air Force says.

The McNamara reply, supported in most details by Army and Navy spokesmen, will be that a nonnuclear defense—backed up by the existence of nuclear weapons—will be able to defend Europe.

NATO now has 25 divisions at its disposal, Mr. McNamara has told Congress in closed session, and is building toward about 30. The divisions will exist in 2 years and will be first class in quality and have excellent support organizations in a few more.

These divisions will be backed up by about 30 divisions in reserve. This includes a large European reserve force plus several American standing divisions based in the United States.

The Russians have a larger force at their disposal but U.S. experts estimate that during a massive attack on Europe they could not sustain much more than about 60 divisions on the Central European front.

APPROACHING EQUALITY

Therefore, Mr. McNamara says, we are approaching equality with Russia even in nonnuclear forces available for Europe's defense.

Furthermore, he believes Russia's economic and political problems, her troubles with the satellites plus the presence of 400,000 American soldiers in Europe and the nuclear weapons available to them will deter any deliberate Russian attack.

If there is an accidental war, the West can meet it with the nonnuclear forces that already exist.

The defense of the West is going through an awkward stage. The old policy of small conventional forces and a massive thermonuclear threat is making less and less sense to the world's leaders.

The President and Mr. McNamara have the difficult job of easing the West into a new posture without permitting the appearance of a weakened resolve or diminishing forces.

Tax Rates Makes Slaves of American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of our income tax system, with the present high rate of taxation, serves to remind us that, like it or not, we have fallen into the trap predicted by Karl Marx in prophesying the fall of the capitalist system. As we indulge in reckless Federal spending which will cause an ever-increasing tax burden, it may be well that we pause to think about the following study of the First National City Bank of New York which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of February 25, 1963.

The article follows:

AFTER 50 YEARS OF A RISING INCOME TAX

The reform that has the most to commend it in terms of equity and common sense, but the least in terms of political appeal, is a reduction in the personal income tax progression.

The present rate structure starts at 20 percent and rises in 23 quick steps all the way to 91 percent—so far as we know, the roughest income tax rate in all the world.

In the steep climb to this punitive levy, applicable to taxable income beyond $200,000, the Federal Government takes 26 percent of taxable income above $4,000, 50 percent above $16,000, and 65 percent above $32,000.

The President has proposed that the 91 percent be cut to 65 percent, an upper limit widely accepted by proponents of rate reform. This is about as high as most other countries go in taxing increments of income. Other rates would be cut more or less proportionately.

While the severity of the present rates is mitigated by innumerable special provisions, three points stand clearly in favor of reform:

First, it is offensive to American conceptions of personal liberty and justice to ask a man to give up so much of the fruits of additional effort.

Unreasonable exactions are linked with despotism, not freedom.

Our war for independence was fought to be rid of the "multitude of new offices" and swarms of officers sent to "harass our people, and eat out their substance."

Second, the steep rate progression poaches upon the rewards for working hard and accepting additional responsibility.

It undermines private capital accumulation, wrecks the normal working of compound interest, and tells enterprising people that it is less useful to build taxable income than to search out ways to get around the tax laws and limit their tax liabilities.

Being human, people respond to this perversion of incentive.

Third, the higher personal income tax rates do not in fact produce significant amounts of revenue. They drive potential income away. In other words, the rates run well beyond the point of diminishing returns.

Reduced rates, given time, would benefit the revenues.

How did we ever come to accept this lopsided rate structure? Income taxation became established as a permanent source of revenue by the 16th amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1913.

Following British example, rates in excess of 50 percent were invoked during World War I, and continued through 1922. After cutbacks by 1924 to a top of 25 percent, applicable to income beyond $100,000, even steeper increases were put in force during the great depression and World War II. The top rate was jumped to 63 percent in 1932, 79 percent in 1936, 88 percent in 1942, and 94 percent in 1944.

Interestingly, the top rate in some of these earlier years applied only to income beyond $1 million or $5 million. Now there is not enough income out yonder to warrant carrying the progression beyond $200,000. A ceiling on the percentage of total tax to taxable income makes 87 percent the marginal tax rate on taxable income beyond $629,500.

We have never gotten very far away from the extreme rate progression invoked during the World War II emergency. In fact, the present structure is even harsher than the one in force during that war because the shrinkage in the value of the dollar has raised the effective rates.

Rates were shaved in 1946 and 1948 to a scale of 16.6 to 82.13 percent but moved up again during the Korean war to a range running from 22.2 to 92 percent, effective in 1952–53. The present range, from 20 to 91 percent, has been in force since 1954.

The chart (on page 76) gives a picture of the rate progressions in force in 1913, 1925–28, 1932–33, 1948–49, and 1954 to date, as well as that proposed for 1965. The slightly higher rates in force during the latter years of World War II and during the Korean war are not shown on the chart; they follow along so closely with the schedule now in force that they would scarcely be distinguishable.

STILL AN EMERGENCY STRUCTURE

In short, we are still living with an emergency structure jerry-built in the depression—when "soak the rich" was a popular cry—and during World War II and the Korean war. The wartime rates reflect an effort to restrain private investment; their retention saps the strength of the Nation and its ability to wage today's cold war.

If we should want to make equality of income and wealth a central goal of our society, and stifle growth and initiative, we should by all means keep the present rate structure.

The Socialist-Communist ideal of a classless, egalitarian society has an emotional appeal to many people, including some Americans. But this kind of society does not work—as the Russians have learned the hard way.

We could still strive for this goal, but at the cost of giving up our claim to world leadership and our priceless heritage as a land of opportunity and of individual rights.

The growing popularity of tax-free handouts of public funds—robbing selected Peter to pay collectivist Paul—is one of the most disturbing features of present-day American life.

By accident, if not by design, we have fallen in with a tax structure that breaks down the motive power of our economy, individual effort, and enterprise.

Karl Marx was right when, in the Communist Manifesto, he foresaw the possibility of using the "heavy progressive or graduated income tax" as the means of making "despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production."

But the people as a whole have never endorsed the kinds of tax rates we have in our system. In a survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion earlier this year, it was found that the public would cut rates further than the administration proposes.

Nevertheless, flattening out the steps will encounter resistance. No doubt it will be described as "a gift to the rich."

The calculation may be offered that a cut in the top personal income tax rate from 91 to 65 percent will make a dollar of income after tax in this bracket worth 35 cents instead of 9 cents, while most taxpayers will have to be content with an increase of 5 or 10 cents per dollar of taxable income.

It is strange that anyone should talk of an income tax reduction as a "gift". The implication is that what people earn is not theirs but the property of government.

If we want to maintain our form of society, and the freedom of people to save and build great enterprises, we must think straight on questions of property rights. What a man earns is fundamentally his own—subject to reasonable tax levies to support essential Government services.

If we view the matter any other way, we deprive him not only of property, but also of incentive for earning income and opportunity for accumulating property. And that is where our tax system has gone sour. We need strong incentives, not to avoid taxes as now, but to work and to build enterprises that create jobs.

We do not need bigger Federal deficits and bigger supplies of money to raise the levels of effort and production and the rate of growth of our economy.

We can gain these ends by tax reforms that will make it more inviting for people to take jobs and employers to hire them. Then we can get balanced increase of production and consumption at a stable price level.

RESTORING INCENTIVE

The object of cutting back the income tax progression is neither to give anything away nor to increase the deficit. It is to restore incentive to earn more.

A person who can make $15,000, $30,000, or $50,000 a year is a rare individual. We need more of these individuals, and more incentive for others to work to successively higher levels of income and responsibility.

The prospect of becoming a slave to income tax at an early age, and at a comparatively moderate income level, is not inviting. Contrary to most impressions, a high tax bracket today does not mean that a man is rich; it may simply mean that he is being prevented from becoming rich.

An unmarried Congressman with no other income but his Government salary may find himself in the 56-percent tax bracket. But that does not make him rich in terms of accumulated property. All that is certain

is that he has more than $7,000 of income tax liabilities and many nondeductible expenditures which society expects a person in his position to shoulder. The doctor, lawyer, plant superintendent—community leaders all over the country—are in the same boat.

As a matter of fact, a man or woman who actually is wealthy has better opportunities, as by judicious gifts of property, to keep income out of the higher brackets. We have growing up a whole new generation of people who, while making good money, have never had a fair chance to realize the aim of financial independence.

Successful people in business, the arts, and professions do have some property, but it is apt to be limited to their homes, the accouterments of modern living, rights to pensions upon retirement, and rights to insurance benefits on death. These assets are not available for taking a flyer in business.

Many crocodile tears are shed for small business these days. But how can a small individual enterprise grow—the normal way, out of reinvested profits—when the 50-percent rate takes effect at a taxable income level of $16,000?

Certainly, it would be easier for people to climb the ladder of success if the income tax steps were not so steep. The step to 50 percent is the hardest. It is at this point, if not sooner, that people weary at the prospect of working for the primary benefit of Government and reconsider the value of attempting to earn additional taxable income. By unconscionable greed, Government debilitates the energies of its people, the progress of the Nation, and its own revenue flow.

The First Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, happily for the public the White House has reversed itself so that there will continue to be press coverage of social events at the White House. The early announcement that social reporters would hereafter be banned created a considerable stir among the social reporters who have done a dedicated job of portraying the first family in a way heretofore seldom undertaken.

The justification for the social reporters' initial wrath has been carefully presented by the Nation's foremost and dedicated social reporter, Betty Beale, whose writings have in themselves created a history of America that has brought alive some of the perfunctory duties and responsibilities of the most important job in the world. Miss Beale's discussion should be recorded and is well worth the attention of Members of Congress so that continued reporting of official events at the White House shall be available to the public.

The article follows:

WE ARE ONLY WRITING HISTORY OF OUR TIME

(By Betty Beale)

The social press of Washington is at a loss to understand the reason behind the sudden midterm concern about press coverage at White House receptions.

It was announced on Wednesday that thereafter reporters of the social scene would be allowed to remain at receptions only long enough to watch the guests arrive from a distance and witness the descent down the stairs of the presidential party.

By Thursday afternoon, when the diplomatic reception took place, the ruling had been changed again due to protests, and the reporters were allowed to mingle with the guests as usual. But the fact that such a ban was considered at all produced openmouthed astonishment among those who have covered these parties for years.

Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said when he announced the clampdown that this was a return to the custom of the Eisenhower administration, but someone must have misinformed him. Society reporters were not only allowed to cover all the traditional official White House receptions during the Eisenhower administration as well as the Truman administration, but we received engraved invitations to the parties.

The report that appeared in a national news magazine right after the Kennedy's first White House party that reporters were allowed to mingle with the guests for the first time was 100 percent erroneous. We always mingled with the guests at such parties.

This columnist can speak from first-hand experience only as far back as the Truman administration. But Miss Katharine M. Brooks, who previously covered such affairs for the Star, said that speaking from her own experience and that of her mother, except for a period during the Theodore Roosevelt administration, writers of the social scene have been treated as guests at all the traditional official White House receptions all the way back to McKinley's time. That is when Miss Brooks' mother, the late Mrs. Hobart Brooks, began her social reporting. And for all those parties they received engraved invitations which are still treasured today just as we have saved those we received from the Harry Trumans and the Dwight D. Eisenhowers.

When President and Mrs. Kennedy dispensed with the historic custom of sending engraved invitations to social reporters, there was, of course, some grumbling. But it was quickly forgotten in a wave of admiration for their several gracious innovations.

For instance, on evenings when they attended the musicales that followed state dinners, the press were not kept waiting in the front hall until everyone else had been seated in the East Room before they were invited to sit in the rear of the room, as had been the case during the Eisenhower regime.

The Eisenhowers did this because they always had their dinner guests enter the ballroom in a fast-paced procession of couples, and if the scribes were within speaking distance of the procession, everybody in it stopped and shook hands with them. The press got their chance to talk to the guests after the musicale, when everyone went into the dining room for champagne.

But the Kennedys made the journalists feel wonderfully welcome by being invited to have coffee and liqueurs with the others, and by being invited to enter the ballroom at the same time everyone else went in. And I shall never forget the feeling of gratitude and appreciation all the newswomen felt and expressed the night President Kennedy brought President Prado of Peru over to the group of them and introduced each one, as any proper party host would do. The pro-Kennedy stories soared in number from that one single act.

Indeed, if President and Mrs. Kennedy could count on receiving from political reporters and columnists and feature writers the kind of press they have received from social reporters and columnists, they would have nothing to worry about.

This is why Pierre Salinger's announcement caused openmouthed astonishment. No occupants of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue during the past two or three decades at least, have received more glowing tributes on their social and cultural activities than John and Jacqueline Kennedy.

Society reporters were the first to interpret to an interested Nation the new, natural, easy elegance and warmth that prevailed at the White House. They were the first to heap praise on the new presidential pair for making the White House a mecca for the intellectual and artistic greats of America. They stood behind the First Lady in her attempt to make the Executive Mansion a more beautiful and authentic residence, and they told millions of U.S. citizens that it was all for the good. They became Mrs. Kennedy's weekly, sometimes daily, channels for stimulating an interest in culture throughout the country. They helped fan the new excitement that sold thousands of White House catalogs, increased the number of tourists and even brought in a historic work of art now and then.

Why would President and Mrs. Kennedy want to do anything that would dampen this enthusiasm? What happened to make two people who love historic tradition consider taking such an unprecedented step? This is the $64,000 question.

The only explanation offered came from the First Lady's press secretary, Pamela Turnure, who suggested that possibly the press was not going to be allowed to mingle with the guests in the future because of some of the women asking probing questions that made White House guests uncomfortable.

This seems hardly logical inasmuch as there have been only four types of traditional receptions since the Kennedys took over. They are the diplomatic, the congressional, the judicial and the military, and all four are peopled by officials society reporters are exposed to week in and week out.

The judiciary and military are proverbially such bad news sources that questions are rarely put to them anywhere, and diplomats and Members of Congress are so in favor of good relations with the press they are most generous with their own invitations as well as expressions of opinion for quotation.

Indeed, the proposed absence of reporters at the diplomatic reception Thursday was greeted with disappointment by ambassadors. Newspaper stories recording the President's or First Lady's gracious comments about their countries are invariably clipped and sent home.

A year ago newswomen were called to the White House and asked not to interview out-of-town White House guests because some of them had complained that they spent so much time talking to reporters they did not have time themselves to mingle with the Washington VIP's. The suggestion of this columnist that pencilled notetaking in the White House be eliminated to avoid the appearance of interviews was rejected, but newswomen made a definite effort afterward to make only the kind of interested conversation everyone tries to make at any party. If any single newswoman failed to abide by this rule at a Kennedy party, it should not reflect on the whole group.

One could understand the new concern if some of the reporters had succeeded in eliciting from top officials National Security Council secrets about the Cuban crisis and publishing same to the deglorification of the administration. But these reporters have been guilty of no such serious leaks.

It is true that occasionally a question is put to someone that might seem a bit abrupt in polite society, but it should hardly be cause for concern, for no more astounding remarks or surprising acts can be found than in polite society. The more secure people are,

socially, the more they say and do as they wish. Besides, comments to reporters can always be put off the record.

So all the worry about social coverage that seems to come up in almost every new administration is for naught. People are people and they will talk about the hot topics of the day whether they are gathered for a levee of Louis XIV or an inaugural of Abraham Lincoln.

This is what you expect in the kind of sophisticate society that surrounds a chief of government. This is what gives to history social, political, and personal color. We are simply chronicling the manners, customs, and personalities of our times, and it is unthinkable that this chronicling should be eliminated at our "court" the drawing rooms of the President of the United States.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

What Is Going on?—The People Want To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union:

WHAT IS GOING ON?—THE PEOPLE WANT TO KNOW

Silence is revealing. The longer the Kennedy administration refuses to satisfactorily deny reports of secret letters passing between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, and of secret agreements regarding Cuba, the more the people are becoming convinced they must be true.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, for one, has demanded that the administration disclose whether it has made a secret agreement with Russia, and again, he is answered with nothing.

Little, too, has been heard lately from Premier Khrushchev, and all we have had in recent days in a secondhand report of a hazy promise that yes, indeed, the Soviet Union will pull some of its troops out of Cuba at sometime or other in the future.

Even if this was down in black and white, it wouldn't have much meaning, in view of the Premier's past performances in deception and intrigue.

There is an uneasy feeling in the country, a brooding sense of vital events moving just beyond the range of vision, of deals and counterdeals behind a curtain of mistrust of the people.

The administration to this day has not made public the letters exchanged with Premier Khrushchev at the height of the Cuban crisis. We do not know the extent of the promise that we would not invade Cuba, if Russia withdrew certain of its weapons, or, for that matter, the full extent of the Russian commitments, if any. The missiles presumably are gone, but a mighty Communist military machine remains in Cuba, to train and supply Communist subversion throughout Latin America.

There have been hints of more letters passing between the two leaders. The administration says that the immediate Russian threat has receded.

If a deal has been made, if we have agreed to abandon missile sites, or to eliminate some of our foreign bases, or to reduce the number of our troops on foreign soil in some kind of a disengagement, keeping it secret has many advantages for the administration.

It was trapped good last time. It believed the assurances of Premier Khrushchev that he wouldn't do any such terrible thing as put nuclear missiles on Cuba.

This time, if Premier Khrushchev traps the administration again, maybe nobody will even know it.

But this is not a political game. It is fire and death and the fate of humanity. What is going on? What are we telling our enemy? The people have a right to know—and silence can only hide what somebody doesn't want the people to know.

The Softwood Lumber Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my colleague from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Members of this honorable body, in amplifying some of their remarks regarding the deplorable lumber situation in my district in California and in the area of the Pacific Northwest generally. I want to associate myself with these remarks and compliment the gentlemen for the accuracy of their comments. Further, I should like to point out to other Members of Congress that appeals are made regarding the lumber industry problems on a fully bipartisan basis. It can be said that in this instance, we "walk down the aisle together" in an all-out effort to alert other Members as to the seriousness of the economic plight of our major industry. Three of the counties of my district, Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino, are consistently in the chronic unemployment or so-called depressed areas. The contribution of the lumber industry to their respective economies ranges from 50 to 70 percent. So when the lumber market is hit—the entire economy of these counties is sick.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intent to join Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WESTLAND and others concerned with the plight of the lumber industry—in introducing a bill to provide that FHA insured housing shall use American lumber. Much has been said about buy American. I can think of no better way to give the people of our great lumber industry a much needed shot in the arm than by recognizing their problems and encouraging passage of the aforementioned type of legislation. I just returned from my district and some of the people there feel they are a pawn for the Trade Expansion Act. When we say buy American, let us practice what we preach.

The forest products industry is the Nation's fourth largest. Entire regions are dependent on the products of forest and rangelands. Our Government must understand that the national interest is not served if, in the management of Federal lands, the neglect of private forestry, or the conduct of foreign policy, local communities are bankrupted.

Address by Fred F. A. Jacobson Before the State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by Mr. Fred F. A. Jacobson, editor of the German-American News, at the Agricultural and Technical Institute of Delhi, N.Y., in my congressional district.

This very erudite and interesting lecture brings out many of the problems produced by the new giant in our midst, the Common Market.

While we may not agree with all of Mr. Jacobson's conclusions, we can certainly learn a great deal from his vast store of knowledge on the subject both at home and abroad.

The address follows:

ADDRESS PRESENTED TO THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTITUTE, DELHI, N.Y., BY FRED F. A. JACOBSON

Let me say at the outset—in order to clear up any false impressions—that notwithstanding what happened in Brussels on January 29, 2 weeks ago, there is still a Common Market. Economically speaking it is the same Common Market that existed some months ago when Professor Kruger extended to me his kind invitation to speak here, particularly on the economic effects of the Common Market on the United States. So, in order to bring the Common Market closer to home, let me start off tonight by telling you about one question, a strange question, that I received just recently. It came from the public relations office of Volkswagen of America which is the American subsidiary of the German automobile company. The gentleman asked me what the duty was on poultry imported into Germany last year. Now that does seem to be a rather strange question to come from a representative of the world's third largest automobile manufacturer. But this is the story behind it.

As you may know, about 6 months ago the Common Market countries—Italy, France, Luxembourg, Belgium, Holland, and Germany—began to adjust their agricultural tariffs and, as a result, the tariff charged by Germany on poultry entering from the United States went up from 10.6 to 17 percent. Now there is quite a large poultry industry in Georgia. Apparently these chicken farmers have been good customers for Volkswagen trucks and now that they are beginning to feel the impact of the higher duty, they turned to their Volkswagen dealer and said, "We have been buying trucks from you, yet your country is raising its tariffs." So the dealer, not knowing what to do with the situation, turned to the Volkswagen headquarters' organization in New Jersey and asked what could be done. Well I don't know how much even as large a company as Volkswag-

en, which is very much interested in world trade—it exports half of its output—can do for the poultry industry in Georgia, but it does illustrate how the Common Market is reaching into unsuspected areas of our economy in the United States. I doubt whether anyone can answer the poultry growers' complaint and convince them that this is most likely only a temporary setback and that the Common Market is for them—as well as for you—a great opportunity.

The setback is temporary because in anticipation of the higher duty, German importers had placed huge orders and filled all available refrigerated storage space to capacity. To be sure, poultry from other Common Market countries is now entering Germany at more advantageous tariff rates, but poultry continues to enjoy an expanding market and just last week the Common Market reduced the tariff on poultry again to the United States and other third countries. Over the years it has been one of the fastest growing exports to Germany from the United States. As German prosperity increased and the channels for refrigerated distribution were improved and expanded, particularly with the increased number of freezer units in stores, more and more American poultry became available and more was sold to a public that could afford more of the better things in life—and in Europe American poultry is one of those things. Apparently European farmers have lacked the know-how or means to produce a quality in poultry that we take for granted here.

But beyond the immediate benefits that these exports have represented to German stomachs and American pocketbooks, there are many others. Selling refrigerated foods is a relatively new idea in Germany as well as elsewhere in Europe. It is not only a matter of know-how adopted from the United States, but also a business insofar as, for instance, many of the refrigerated store fixtures are either made by American companies in Germany or produced according to American licenses. And so it is today that when you walk into a German supermarket—and they are mushrooming all over the country—that you will feel very much at home, not only in seeing the familiar fixtures but in seeing foods in familiar packages with familiar names.

What I have tried to illustrate here merely on the basis of poultry, is to what extent American industry has benefited through (1) exporting to Germany, (2) manufacturing in the Federal Republic or (3) licensing European manufacturers to produce American goods for which royalties are paid to the U.S. licensor. German consumers have thus been helped considerably in coming closer to an American standard of living. But the question remains: How much better will business conditions be when the Common Market takes its full effect? Judging once again on the basis of poultry and merely on the basis of poultry, the past months have not been too good, but with other than agricultural products it's another story.

Let us take it from the beginning and examine what the Common Market is and will be. To do so, I would like to touch upon certain highlights in order to give you a well-rounded picture of the Common Market you will encounter. First of all, I'd like to say that the economic development of the Common Market has succeeded in achieving a situation that numerous wars of the past were never able to solve; namely, the amity between France and Germany which has been called the backbone of the new Europe. As you know, this friendship was formalized in the form of a treaty by Adenauer and De Gaulle last month. It is interesting to note that as of 2 years ago France is Germany's largest trading partner. Indeed, the economic development or togetherness, if you will, of the six Common Market nations proves to be the foundation of the political ideal of a United States of Europe, which the signers of the Treaty of Rome, the Common Market agreement, had in mind when they inked their economic pact in 1957.

You must keep in mind that the European Common Market is not just a trade association or a customs union. Its eventual common external tariff toward other countries is merely one aspect of its function. It is surprising to many people, when they visit Brussels today, the headquarters of the Common Market, to find a government like organization with many departments, few of which ever get into the newspapers here. After all, harmonizing the six separate economies, as the treaty specifies, takes on many forms as for instance, the harmonization of taxes. This is one of the current problems felt in particular by the German steel industry because producers of French steel get a rebate on part of the taxes they have paid on exported products and because of this rebate are able to deliver certain grades of steel in Germany at a lower price than German producers can. Until the recent rise in French steel prices some French steel was selling more cheaply in the Ruhr than German steel produced locally. A harmonization of taxes within the Common Market would eliminate these discrepancies but by no means all. For this reason, harmonization of wages and labor conditions is a goal of the Common Market. This includes social security and other fringe benefits so that ultimately all manufacturers in the Common Market will have about equal labor costs. To this end, studies were recently completed for 10 major industries in the Common Market to show not only what the wage scale was in each of the 6 countries but what additional payments were made by the employers for social security and fringe benefits. There exist considerable discrepancies now.

Among the other goals for harmonization in the Common Market is freedom of movement for labor so that a German worker can go to Italy and still have the same social security benefits available that he had in Germany. The same freedom is to be accorded also to manufacturers so that they may set up production or distribution facilities in partner countries without being treated as a foreign enterprise. The same applies to those offering services like insurance, wholesaling, etc. Another goal of the Common Market is to equalize wages between men and women and of course the complicated adjustment of the agricultural economies has already started. There are also provisions to adopt a common currency and common financial conditions, the freedom of movement of capital. There are also provisions to harmonize the transportation systems and laws, as for instance uniform truck standards, etc., so that a 3-ton truck from Germany does not find its way barred into the Netherlands because Holland has a 2-ton limit.

Integration of the economies of the six nations also takes other forms. The European Coal and Steel Community created in 1953 by an agreement of 1951 actually predates the Common Market. There is also the European Atomic Energy Community established along with the Common Market in 1957. Its research and operations are geared to the needs of the six nations. Powerplants being established under the aegis will help the Community to meet its growing needs for electric power which will exceed the capacity of coal- and oil-fueled plants by about 1970–75.

I should also mention that in addition to the executive arm of the Common Market, the Commission and the Council of Ministers which administer these programs, there exists a judicial branch headquartered in Luxembourg and a Parliament in Strasbourg. It is especially interesting and a reflection of the political ideal that the Common Market represents, that the seating in the 142-member Parliament is not arranged by country but by political affiliation.

And so you see the Common Market will be a supranational organization in many respects and it was this fact, that some of the sovereign powers would have to be relinquished, aside from the Commonwealth and agricultural problems, that caused Great Britain to stay out of the formation of the Common Market initially. Only recently it decided that it couldn't afford to stay out. Its economy has lagged behind the pace set by the Common Market countries. Working inside its own Commonwealth tariff walls, its industry began to lag behind the competitive conditions outside. Its markets on the European Continent were in danger also because British products would have to hurdle the Common Market tariff in order to compete with the expanding internal trade within the European Economic Community.

Moreover, you must keep in mind that there is one prevailing trend that applies to Great Britain as well as to the United States; namely, that trade among industrial countries continues to expand in volume, while trade with raw material nations continues to drop. Thus Great Britain as well as the United States needs the industrial countries of the Common Market as trading partners. Certainly the Trade Expansion Act represents a recognition of this trend.

Finished goods now represent 40 percent of U.S. imports as against 20 percent a decade ago. Similarly U.S. exports now consist of 55 percent of finished products compared to 40 percent 10 years ago.

The trend to a greater exchange of finished products has also been evident in Europe. Its greater share of world trade is almost entirely due to the expanded commercial exchange among its nations. At the same time the countries whose trade relies primarily on the export of raw materials saw their share of the world market drastically reduced. Thus the classic trade pattern represented by the exchange of raw material for industrial products is rapidly disappearing. For Great Britain, particularly because it is so export-dependent, it was and still is therefore necessary to join the Common Market in order to maintain its prominent position in the stream of world trade. Of course, along with Great Britain, the other six European Free Trade Association countries will also be interested in joining the Common Market. Some of these have also applied for membership, others for association. Association is being sought as a politically more tenable position by such neutrals as Sweden, Austria and Switzerland. What form this association will take depends largely on the type of association sought by these countries, since the Treaty of Rome does not define association. Therefore the Common Market will have to pass on each application. Greece has just become an associate member.

It has also to be kept in mind that the Common Market is not just confined to Europe. Former colonies in Africa and elsewhere, 24 countries in all, are also associated with the European Economic Community. In view of their rising importance their association has now been renegotiated and is expected to be signed this month. It is for their benefit and other associates in the Pacific and Antarctica that the Common Market established a $730 million aid fund (Germany $246 million) in order to assist these nations in their growth. Altogether the associates, not counting Greece, occupy nearly 5 million square miles and have a population of 53 million.

Now let's get back closer to our poultry question again and consider the U.S. position in reference to the Common Market. We have to keep in mind first of all that the

Common Market, as it is now, has nearly as large a population as the United States and that ultimately traffic of goods and people will move among the 6 nations on the same basis that traffic now moves between the 50 States of the United States. This change is now taking place and evident most dramatically in the increased internal trade of products because tariff barriers among the six countries have been lowered by 50 percent and import quotas are gradually being eliminated. A department store in Paris recently dramatized these new trade conditions when it exhibited hundreds of consumer goods from the Benelux nations and Germany and Italy that formerly were not readily available in France. This promotion of Common Market exchange also takes other forms now. There was for instance recently a very successful exhibition of German cheeses in France in order to introduce the French to these particular German delicacies. Based on the success of this promotion, the French brought their cheeses for the Germans to taste and along with this promotion they brought pictures of Brigitte Bardot which caused one German newspaper to comment to the effect that Germany can compete in cheeses but not in cheesecake.

In any case it is clear that manufacturers in the six nations whether they produce consumer or industrial goods are no longer working in a national market, plus exports, but a Common Market of 170 million consumers plus exports.

They are thus able to adopt mass production techniques as practiced and pioneered in the United States. This is one of the reasons why the exports of American machinery to Europe continue to increase. Even at this stage, the U.S. Trade Mission, which recently returned from Germany, was able to report that Germany industrialized as it is, still represents a growing market for automated American machinery. Another reason why such machinery is needed is the shortage of labor throughout the Common Market. In Germany where the boom has recently slackened slightly, there is even now a shortage, in spite of some 700,000 foreign workers now employed by German industry. This shortage in the labor supply hampers the expansion of production and makes it all the more necessary for manufacturers to rationalize plants and equipment. Another factor spurring these investments is the rise in wages throughout the Common Market. In Germany it has amounted to over 21 percent in the last 2 years; therefore, in order to keep the prices of goods down, manufacturers had to increase the productivity per man by installing better U.S. machinery. Nevertheless, productivity has not kept pace and the cost of goods has increased. To be sure the population has been able to afford the higher prices because incomes are higher but at the same time imported goods have become more competitive with domestic products. Thus, on the basis of this prosperity, generated in part by the Common Market, and the rise in prices of German goods, imports are becoming increasingly competitive. Moreover, in order to participate in this booming economy and eliminate the cost of transportation as well as tariffs, American manufacturers have been swarming into the Common Market to set up manufacturing operations by themselves or as joint ventures with European producers. Altogether these investments in the EEC now amount to $2.6 billion of which over 1 billion is in Germany. Currently the Common Market is the biggest magnet for U.S. investments abroad and you may have seen the report recently that many American companies are earning more abroad than at home. In addition, many American manufacturers who wanted to forgo the investments needed to establish in the EEC and felt that local producers would be as well equipped to handle distribution, promotion, and sales have profitted by granting licenses to manufacturers there. These are some of the ways in which the United States is now profitting from the Common Market.

But what will happen as this economic integration continues? As seen from Russia it is being viewed with alarm for the Common Market shatters not only the theories prevalent on the other side of the Iron Curtain, but the success of the Common Market and, to be sure, the inclusion of Great Britain will eliminate any possibility that a divide-and-conquer policy would have a chance in Western Europe, because the Common Market countries have already found their strength in union and not only strength but a way of life that represents a very much higher standard of living than that of former years.

Now, it is true that the tariff of the Common Market represents an approximate average of what was charged by each of the six individual countries before. As a result, some of the tariffs faced by U.S. manufacturers exporting to Germany which maintained a low tariff level, will be higher. But not only will the demand for American goods continue to increase for reasons we discussed earlier, such as prosperity, mass markets, and industrialization, but the National Trade Expansion Act provides means whereby concessions will be made by both parties, the Common Market and the United States, even if Great Britain does not join. You will recall, however, that the Trade Expansion Act was formulated on the basis that Great Britain would be in the Common Market and, therefore, the concessions that can now be made are somewhat limited. New legislation has, however, been introduced in Congress to broaden the scope of the act.

As we have seen, trade increases as countries industrialize in the same way as industrialization is now increasing business and raising the standard of living in our Southern States. By virtue of this fact, the prospects are also good for American industry in its trade with the Common Market which is a highly industrialized area. Furthermore, this exchange will not only continue to bring us the direct profits from exports but also those from imports. Yes, we do profit from imports. Would we ever have had compacts if it had not been for the success of European small cars in the U.S. market? Would our steel mills have begun to modernize as they are doing now? Imports not only regenerate industries by virtue of the competition they offer but they also create direct benefits in terms of the work and income they provide for shipping, freight forwarders, dockers, truckers, the wholesalers and retailers, and those that service imports. Moreover, they yield taxes for the Federal, State, and municipal governments. They also stimulate business. For instance, German manufacturers of binoculars found that when retailers in the Federal Republic added less expensive Japanese models to their selection, interest in binoculars was stimulated among a group of consumers that would have never considered buying any binoculars heretofore because they were too expensive. However, when these new customers came into the store and saw not only the Japanese models but also the domestic varieties, many bought the latter and as a result the sale of German binoculars increased. In short, the international arena stimulates competition and produces for the consumer and for the economies the utmost benefits. You will be going into a business world that is not only becoming increasingly internationally oriented but will also be ultimately internationally integrated on an economic basis. Already there are companies, particularly in the automotive and office machinery fields, which assemble their products from components made in a number of countries. Uncommon as such arrangements may be for most American companies, you may soon find them as common as the Common Market, which, after all, is an ideal, not only from the standpoint of business opportunities but more importantly from the viewpoint of the peaceful coexistence of man.

Thank you.

Cause and Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Galesburg (Ill.) Register-Mail of February 20, 1963:

CAUSE AND CURE

The greatest excuse for every Federal program is that a problem exists, and it won't just disappear by itself. As Congress can legislate in just about any field it chooses, it usually gets requests for authority and money to tackle almost every job.

All too often the Federal Government is the cause, or part of the cause, of the problem, but this fact is seldom considered.

Congress will be asked to approve a little $8 million item in the new Commerce Department budget to assist industry in financing research in new products. Yet, Secretary Hodges himself placed his finger on an important cause of the lag when he cited the fact that the space and defense programs were syphoning qualified people away from just such research. This being so, what does the administration desire? Should personnel be taken from the space or defense programs? The only other place they exist is in the labs that are now doing the kind of research the Government seems to want to encourage. In this case, can tax money solve the problem?

Farmers are having a hard time selling butter, cotton and other products, and so the Agriculture Department wants to increase its spending. But the problem really is that these products are pegged above world prices by the same Agriculture Department. So high are they, in fact, that it has just been reported that people on relief eat almost twice as much butter, which they get for nothing, as those who pay the taxes to buy butter for those on relief.

As the Government reaches out for more programs to spend money on, reports dribble in about how it is taking care of present responsibilities. The National Education Association, for example, wants the Federal Government to get into local education up to its bureaucratic ears. Meanwhile, the National Education Association complains that the Federal education programs for servicemen's families overseas are ill run, ill equipped, and that it grossly underpays teachers.

Sober critics offer the news that the reform we are trying to impose on Latin America through the Alliance for Progress is chasing native capital into refuges outside those lands faster than we send capital in.

One way to avoid that unavoidable $11 billion deficit seems to suggest itself. Just cut all programs which fail to accomplish their purpose, and don't start any new ones in fields where the Government has already demonstrated its ineffectiveness.

Opportunities Available to GE Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on one of my recent trips to Syracuse I visited General Electric's Electronics Park where 16,000 people are employed. During my visit I went to one of the classes established for the benefit of employees—a class which provides them with education and training to help move them ahead in their own jobs or prepare them for other work.

I was not only impressed but delighted to see the activities which were carried on. So that other Members of Congress may see what industry can do to help its employees I am inserting a recent article from the General Electric News which details the opportunities available to GE employees:

ONE OF EVERY FIVE SYRACUSE GE'ERS ENROLLS IN CLASSES

Nearly one out of every five Syracuse General Electric employees is going to school this fall to extend his general education or improve his working skills.

Approximately 3,000 employees have signed up for courses most of which are scheduled to get underway within the next few days.

Classes include some 80 technical courses conducted by the company for technicians, engineering, and professional personnel; a group of nontechnical company-sponsored courses in such subjects as "Conference Leadership" and "Professional Business Management," apprentice training program courses, manufacturing training program courses, courses administered under the self-development program for hourly employees, and others conducted by University College, Syracuse University, LeMoyne College, and Community College.

W. E. Wendt, technical and profesional education administrator, EPCRO, reports that approximately 1,600 employees have enrolled in 80 technical courses conducted by the company in such subjects as "Fundamentals of Digital Computer Programing," "Numerical Methods and Math Analysis," and "Transistor Circuits." This represents an increased enrollment of 33 percent over last year.

Wendt indicated that openings still exist in many technical classes. Employees interested should contact their department technical education specialist.

In the nontechnical area, eight classes in "Effective Presentation" with a total enrollment of 104 students representing all Syracuse GE departments began September 10. Two reading development classes, with 25 GE students in each, are scheduled to get underway at LeMoyne College next week.

Beulah Larkin, who coordinates these nontechnical courses, also announced that 24 employees are enrolled in two classes of "Conference Leadership," 20 others in "Practical Politics," 20 in "Professional Business Management," and 20 in "Effective Oral Communication."

Seventy-nine apprentices began their fall schedule of 2-hour classes 3 nights a week on September 10. The 15 instructors for these courses are all Syracuse GE employees.

The manufacturing studies series conducted under the manufacturing training program is now underway. A total of 148 students are enrolled in the 17 courses of the three-year series. Fifty-seven other GE employees are utilized as instructors of these classes.

Classes conducted under the self-development program for hourly employees began the week of September 17.

Ralph H. Vanoss, administrator of the self-development program, revealed that 27 are enrolled in the 16-week "Blueprint Reading and Wiring" course, 82 others in the 20-week Basic Electricity Part I course, and 32 in Basic Electronics Part I. Basic Electronics is also a 20-week course.

In addition to these company-sponsored courses, hundreds of other employees are attending courses at University College, Syracuse University, LeMoyne College, and Community College.

Some are utilizing the company's tuition refund program, under which GE pays part of the cost upon satisfactory completion of job related courses. Others are attending classes of their choice on their own.

Petition for Continuation of the Reserve Officer Training Corps on the High School Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out to this House before the deep concern felt by myself and the fine people of the district I represent here about the Defense Department plan to eliminate the high school ROTC program.

As the House knows, the Committee on Armed Forces of which I am a member, is investigating the situation under a charge from Chairman CARL VINSON, the distinguished dean of this House.

Today, in order to further illustrate to the House the deep feelings for the ROTC of the young men now training in it, I include under unanimous consent, in the RECORD a petition from the ROTC detachment of Carthage, Mo., Senior High School. The following petition to the Congress was signed by 148 ROTC cadets from that school.

These American boys are not harassed by the ROTC as some spokesmen have suggested. They are patriotic Americans willing to do their part for this Nation and glad to be trained to do that.

Here is their petition:

PETITION FOR CONTINUATION OF ROTC, CARTHAGE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, CARTHAGE, MO., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

Whereas the ROTC program as presently organized is both beneficial to its participants as well as to the community as a whole;

Whereas the ROTC program as presently organized serves to stimulate interest in the military sciences and provide a knowledge of basic military subjects which benefits the participant as well as the Nation when he enters the Armed Forces;

Whereas the present proposal to eliminate Junior Division ROTC fails to consider the many intangible values of the present program which cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents, but rather in overall benefit to the Nation;

Whereas in addition to the above, the ROTC program instills in the cadet a sense of pride, respect for authority, and honesty which contributes to the overall molding of his character: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the undersigned, That we go on record opposing any action by the Government eliminating such program and be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, the Honorable EDWARD V. LONG, Members of the U.S. Senate from Missouri and to the Honorable DURWOOD HALL, Representative in Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, February 21, 1963, I had the good fortune to attend a meeting held in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School to discuss the issue of the Supreme Court decision of June 24, 1962, barring prayer in the New York State schools.

The speaker at that particular meeting was our colleague, the Honorable HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, of Wisconsin. The title of his address "This Nation Under God."

I sat during the course of Mr. SCHADEBERG's address completely enthralled and greatly informed. It was the finest talk I have ever heard on this subject.

Believing that every Member should have the opportunity of at least reading this address, I am taking the liberty of inserting it herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THIS NATION UNDER GOD

It was just last week that our Nation paused briefly to pay tribute to one of its greatest leaders and 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. It was just a short distance from where we are meeting tonight that this loved and honored man delivered a short memorial known as the Gettysburg Address. It has become one of humanity's greatest utterances, not merely because it was brief and simple in style but because each phrase portrays a truth that is lasting and significant. From this immortal speech, which lasted but a brief 2 minutes, I quote from the last few lines:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in va'n." (End of quote.) And what, ladies and gentlemen, was the task to which Mr. Lincoln insisted they were to dedicate themselves? It was this, and I now use his closing words, "That this Nation, under God," not merely a nation of men believing only in themselves or in some material ideal, but that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that

government of the people; by the people; for the people shall not perish from the earth."

When Mr. Lincoln said, "This Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom," he was not trying to be rhetorical. It was not a religious gesture (a tipping of his hat, so to speak) to Almighty God. He illustrated quite clearly his belief in the origin and meaning of life—namely that it was conceived by God and that, to find fulfillment, life must be lived under God.

He was saying to the people he so deeply loved and who had borne so heavy a burden that life is not meaningless; that the universe is not like a ship without a rudder, left to move aimlessly over the sea, but that there is a divinity that shapes our ends, roughhew them how we will. In these immortal words Lincoln reveals that he had a deep and abiding knowledge and understanding of truth.

Lincoln lived in a period of history in which communications and transportation were rather primitive compared to the communications and transportation of our day. In his day Lincoln, living in Springfield, Ill., approximately 1,000 miles from Washington, said, "This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Today we live in a community of nations in which our most remote enemy is closer to us in time and in terms of transportation and communication than Washington was from Springfield, Ill., in Lincoln's day and it is as true of our community of nations as it was then of the sovereign States of this Nation, that "this community of nations cannot survive half slave and half free."

It is no secret to you, I am sure, that we are today engaged in a worldwide struggle which will decide the destiny of civilization for the next thousand years. We are at war, sometimes hot (though we prefer not to call it war), and sometimes cold, meaning simply that there is no military action, but it is war, nonetheless. We are engaged in a war to decide whether the people of the world shall be free, as certainly is the intention of God, the Creator, or whether they shall be enslaved to some degree under a Marxist, atheist philosophy that translated into political expression is what is variously called the welfare state or the Socialist state or the Communist state.

Every political decision made in Washington by the President; every decision made by State Department; by the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate; and nearly every decision handed down by the Supreme Court of our land, either directly or indirectly, and if indirectly, very seldom remotely, is related to the basic issue before us. All people of the world who love freedom—which means all but the selfish few who seek the prestige of personal power—have an intense interest, if not understanding, in the decisions that are made.

It was Thomas Payne in 1776 who said, "These are times which try men's souls." Nothing could better describe the times in which we live in 1963 and in which our children will be forced to mature in the next few decades and in which many of us will be living out our sunset years. These days—these years—this decade is indeed a time that "tries men's souls." It is because we are in a very present period of decision-making, of worldwide importance; being forced to deal politically with men representing governments, not of the will of the people, but forced upon them by brute power—men who have no sense of right or wrong, who have no basis for moral judgment—men who live by the law of the jungle, kill or be killed—that it is imperative that we as a nation understand our privileged position among nations; that we understand our responsibilities as spokesman for the free world.

As a people of a nation whose economic and social and political life historically has reflected the philosophical position that God is the Creator of all things and all life, it is imperative that we understand three things:

(1) It is imperative that we understand that man's peculiar relationship to his Creator as the one creation in all of God's marvelous creations—made in God's image—sets man apart from the rest of the animal world and gives to man certain unquestionable rights. This is clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

These rights referred to in the Declaration of Independence are not just social or political conveniences granted to us by the State. They are neither a favor nor a mutually arrived at contract. They are basic premises upon which men accept the authority of government. And they are arrived at not as a result of discussion or barter, but as a result of faith in a God who is Creator.

I insist that there is a lot of nonsense today about rights. In speaking to people throughout the Nation I come across some who say that faith in God has nothing to do with our rights; that there were among certain of our early political forefathers those who had no faith in God. With this I disagree. The truth is that while some of our early forefathers may not have accepted the theological position of a particular denomination of the church or of an ecclesiastical order, they were definitely convinced and convicted in their faith in Almighty God.

Our rights as a people of a free nation come to us even as science comes to us, in what I call a theological frame. It is our peculiar relationship to God as a creature, created, if you will, in His image—and incidentally it is a spiritual relationship, because God is a spirit and being created in His image, we are spiritual creatures—which endows us with unalienable, intangible, irrevocable rights. Unless we believe we are created by God and thus endowed by God with rights, our rights become a mere social utility, or a political commodity to be given to us or taken from us at the whim and passion of those who happen to control the state.

We of the Judeo-Christian tradition believe in the cherished doctrine of the sanctity and sacredness of personality, simply because we are God's creation.

Several years ago I drove from Wisconsin to Colorado. I came through a community in which I saw a rather poorly written sign posted along the side of the street where considerable trash and debris had been dumped. This sign read, "No more trespassing allowed." The owner of the property had had his fill. He could stand no more. He saw the results of those who had run roughshod over his property.

When the philosophers of the 16th and 17th centuries expressed the concept of rights as that given by God, and not by man, they were not discovering a new truth. They were simply restating the truth of Scripture; namely, that because man is a child of God, no one dare trespass on human personality without trespassing on God. I am of the firm conviction that in these trying days in which we are engaged in a worldwide war for keeps with atheistic communism, it is high time we as a nation put a sign to be read by all throughout the world, "No more trespassing on human personality." The sign must also be clearly visible to all in America for it is useless to try to save freedom throughout the world if by default or indifference or ignorance or misdirected tolerance we should lose it here, for we are as yet the home base of freedom for all.

I know of no more confusing and dangerous detour we could take than that of imposing upon this Nation, and especially upon this Nation's schools, a legalistic demand which emanates from a purely legalistic interpretation of our Constitution, that the mention of the name of God and the right to pray in public or outside of the church shall be denied our people. Criminals and gangsters are sometimes set free because of some legalistic interpretation of a law or a ruling. To free such men, clearly and unquestionably guilty of committing crime, may defy all sense of justice and run counter to all the intent of those who framed the law and all who abide by it but because it is legal it becomes an established fact. What I am trying to say is that just because an act is legal it becomes an established fact. What I am trying to say is that just because an act is legal it does not make that act moral or desirable. This is the danger of creating a world community under law devoid of basic moral foundations to undergird that law.

Now this is in a sense what is happening to our freedom.

Because there has developed in the past few decades among some who would be leaders of our Nation an assumption that constitutional government is out of date and cannot meet the needs of our society, catapulted overnight into a space age which demands answers today for tomorrow's questions, we hear rather strange and frightening suggestions being spread among us falsely as irrefutable fact. Suggestions, such as:

(a) Our Constitution is outmoded because it was written for an agrarian age, or

(b) Our Constitution is not adequate to meet the challenge of the sixties.

This kind of talk indicates a growing tendency to repudiate the influence of God in human affairs and to replace it by human knowledge of the physical sciences which we are told is the key to all progress.

We are witnessing before our very eyes, and it is so brash in its efforts we will not believe what we see, a coldly calculated attempt to destroy the importance and effectiveness of one of history's greatest documents of freedom—the Constitution of the United States. Over the years the basic intent of our Constitution is being: (1) circumvented out of authority by Executive order; (2) legislated out of authority by the legislative branches of our Government; interpreted out of authority by the judicial branch—our Supreme Court. The late ruling by the Supreme Court on the issue of prayer in the public schools of New York is but one of many examples. The decision could have been conveniently delayed because so many important matters are pending before the Court. Though legally, and perhaps technically, correct the decision was most unfortunate coming as it did in this time when we are so bitterly engaged in this worldwide struggle for the minds of man. Freedom is on the scaffold. It is most important that careless and itchy fingers, no matter how nobly guided by high ideal, not be allowed to trip the trap to bring freedom to an untimely death.

I return you to my initial statement that it is imperative for our survival that we understand man's peculiar relationship to his Creator as God's crowning creation, that gives the individual his unquestionable or unalienable rights.

Second, it is imperative that we as a people of this free Nation under God understand clearly that with these rights we have received from God we have also a moral responsibility. It is precisely because God created us in His image to be free—to be individuals with free choice—that no man

dare live carelessly or indifferently. No man has a moral right to squander his life with impunity, for if he toys with his freedom, then he may very well lose it. Our freedom does not exempt us from life. He who claims a right, must also accept his responsibility to destiny. There are many in our day who jump at the idea of possessing these rights, but who are not willing to accept responsibility commensurate with these rights.

One reason freedom finds itself today in its present plight is that we have developed in our Nation a philosophy which is certainly foreign to us and would have been extremely repulsive to our forefathers—that is that there is no such thing as individual responsibility. We have come to a period in history in which we are evading our individual responsibility by placing the blame for all our difficulties on the collection group, either as the community, society as a whole, or government. So, we look for government to provide us with all the answers to our difficulties.

Before his death in 1910, William Graham Sumner, while serving as professor of political and social science at Yale, edited an almanac entitled "The Forgotten Man's Almanac". In it appears this statement:

"The social and political philosophy which has been spread abroad has nourished a doctrine that if a man wants anything which he has not got it is the fault of somebody else who ought to be found and compelled to give it to him."

To many people today, and this certainly is true for those in our Federal Government agencies, no one person is ever at fault. The guilt is society's and therefore nobody's. All blame can be traced to our economic system, or to bad plumbing, or to a defective school system, or to an inadequate home situation, or to unemployment, or to bad teeth, or to greedy businessmen, or to crooked labor leaders, or what have you. So the Government must spend and spend, ever taking more from your paycheck and mine and charging the rest off to our children, in order to provide more and more things for people because the individual is never to blame for any of his problems.

We have come to a period in our history—tragic as it is—in which we assume that individuals are more to be pitied than to be challenged or blamed. Whenever a man finds himself in trouble, it is because he is a victim of poverty or bad companions or of a traumatic experience at birth or the sinister powers of the unconscious over which he has no control. Our solution is to forgive all, make it impossible for him to fail, and thus impossible for him to learn by experience, and then to pour his neighbors' wealth into his coffers so he can continue to involve himself in more trouble. Our philosophy seems to be that since we cannot really know all the factors that enter into a man's life, no one should ever be blamed for anything.

You see this is all tied up with our basic faith in God and our willingness or unwillingness to accept the premise that He created us in His image. By our failure or unwillingness to make the individual responsible for his own destiny and by our insistence that impersonal government shall assume these responsibilities, we are saying, in effect, that man far from being created in the image of God is nothing more significant than tumble weed blown helplessly about by every wind or influence. If we continue on our present course that exiles us as individuals from responsibilities, the future holds nothing for us but a collectivism that will drag all men down to a common level—a level below which we, as children of God, believe is reserved not for man, created in the image of God, but for the animal of the field.

We are not puppets of fate or victims of vast impersonal forces beyond human control. The politician in office, who many times cannot adequately handle his own affairs is certainly not in a better position to give adequate answers to problems of the people—problems that vary in the different segments of our society and physical geography. We as individuals are endowed with the creative freedom of God, our Maker. We are free to take a hand in determining our own destiny—whether for good or evil.

I like the words of the poet who wrote these simple lines which summarize so clearly this thought:

Life is a jig saw puzzle
  Its pieces are jagged and torn.
We piece it together with weeping
  'till sometimes it's faded and worn.

A bright bit of sunset we fashion
  A home where wee children wait;
Where flowers are blooming and twinning
  And love meets with love at the gate.

Some pieces are drab, unenticing.
  How gladly we fling them away.
But there's a place for each fragment
  And the picture is needing the gray.

No extra pieces are given,
  The rose and the gray interlace
And lovely the picture presented
  When each finds its proper place.

Sometimes there's a storm on the ocean
  And the ships are all wearied with gale.
But storms have their beauty completed
  When met with firm courage and sail.

Life is a jig saw puzzle
  Cut by the Master's hand
And each little turn and each corner
  Is a part of the love He has planned.

So please put it together with patience
  Why should we whimper or wail?
If we blindly mix up the pattern
  Should we blame the Lord if we fail?

It is imperative that we understand that with the acceptance of unalienable rights we must also accept moral responsibility.

And, third, it is imperative that we understand that it is immoral to surrender basic freedoms and fundamental rights. If God has clothed us with dignity—created us in His own image—set us in the world with the ability and with an innate will to grapple with life's problems, then, to abdicate or to transfer these freedoms and rights to the group or to government is immoral. It is in a sense to forfeit the soul.

There are those in our day in high places and low who are so presumptuous as to assume for themselves the rights God has given to each individual man. They play at being God, but because they have neither God's wisdom nor insight, they in time bring only misery and failure. This is the threat of the totalitarian state. This is the threat in the earliest form of the socialist state or the welfare state. Once man relinquishes his individual God-given rights and responsibilities to government for any reason at all, he is on the road to abdicating his heritage as the crowning creature of God's creation—he is on the road to allowing himself, as the mere cattle in the field, to be fed and milked.

Many in our Nation seem to think that the totalitarian state is something for Europe or Asia or South America—that we here in the United States have some kind of a natural immunity to it—no matter what we do or fail to do or what course we take. There is, however, only one thing that stands between us and a totalitarian government and that is the concept of the meaning of life under God, of which I have been speaking. This is why it is so very important that we as a free people do not allow to go by unnoticed or unchallenged the vicious, howbe it, well-meaning attempts, under the guise of protecting the rights of a small minority, to take from the vast majority the right to instill in society at every level, the basic concept of God as Creator and Giver of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This is why it is so important that we do not allow ourselves as free people to fall victim to those who believe that men and the physical sciences have all the answers to our problems. If we lose our grasp on the concept of God as Creator; of man possessing dignity and unalienable rights; of individual responsibility for his own destiny—if we are willing to try to substitute some synthetic creation of government for the fundamental rights of man or to insist that government assume what are our individual responsibilities we shall surely lose our freedom. The time has come for us to obey the command given to the Galatians, "Stand up and be ye separate, thus saith the Lord."

It is a fact worth pondering as we study history that when men of evil design contemplated and succeeded in enslaving a people, faith in God and the church were the first and bitterest points of attack and that in the struggle to remain free the main resistance to totalitarian evil came not from the universities, the centers of science, not from corporations, the centers of profit, not from trade unions, dealing solely with the material aspects of society, but from the churches, the centers of faith, and more directly from men of faith themselves. Faith and freedom are inseparable. They are codefendants. Destroy faith in God and you destroy freedom as we know it. Destroy freedom and you destroy the faith in God out of which we have our concept of the dignity of man.

I opened my remarks with words from Lincoln and I close my remarks with a paraphrase of the last sentence of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. It is my fervent prayer that, "This Nation under God"—and I hasten to add "this world under God"—"shall have a new birth of freedom for unless we do, government of the people, by the people, and for the people will perish from the earth."

A Presidential Policy of Prudent Invisibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the very eminent columnist Arthur Krock appeared in the western edition of the New York Times under the dateline of February 18, and the newsletter was reprinted in Washington, D.C., by Human Events.

The article is written with Mr. Krock's usual objectiveness and knowledge of government.

It does appear, however, that if the Democrat members of the Cabinet and Senate have to assume responsibility for all the mistakes of the Executive, it may not be long before the average citizen may decide that they are too incompetent to carry on the business of governing a great nation.

The article follows:

IN THE NATION—A PRESIDENTIAL POLICY OF PRUDENT INVISIBILITY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—The clear design of recent maneuvers of the administration and its congressional spokesmen has been to transfer

from the shoulders of the President to others the responsibility he shares for a couple of bad Executive blunders. The cooperation displayed in this endeavor to persuade the American people that Mr. Kennedy was not deeply involved in these blunders has been a heart-warming show of personal, political, and a disturbing suggestion of press devotion. But it was nevertheless at the expense of the public interest.

Solid examples are provided by: (1) the playing down of the basic liability of the White House for the public censure of the Diefenbaker government in Canada in a statement issued by the State Department on a Canadian Government policy which was being concurrently debated in the Parliament at Ottawa; and (2) by the general acceptance of Senator MANSFIELD's loyal assumption of full responsibility for the unsuccessful effort to pack the Senate Finance Committee to improve the prospects of Kennedy's proposed new tax legislation.

The effectiveness of these maneuvers in creating the general public impressions which were there objectives is manifest in the bulk of the subsequent press and TV-radio references to the official statement addressed to Canada and to the lost battle to pack the Senate Finance Committee. Almost invariably the first is attributed solely to the State Department. And little or no attempt has been made to put before the people readily procurable evidence that the White House—which Senator MANSFIELD depicted as standing aloof—was an eager, active and adequately authorized partner in the committee-packing enterprise.

CLEARANCE OBTAINED

Under the checking procedures of foreign policy pronouncements established by Mr. Kennedy, the State Department "clears with the White House" documents of obviously major importance, such as the public rebuke of the Diefenbaker government. The chief of this clearance office is the President's national security assistant, McGeorge Bundy, and it is conceded he performed this function in this instance. That made the White House, operating under a system the President substituted for General Eisenhower's, the principal authority for the release in the form it was issued. But, even accepting the actively propagated version of his staff, that it failed to brief Mr. Kennedy before taking the kind of major decisions he used to criticize General Eisenhower for leaving to subordinates and therefore being a deliberately invisible President, the exclusive attribution of the pronouncement to the State Department is misleading as well as unfair.

2. According to Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD, he thought up himself the whole notion of packing the Senate Finance Committee; laid it before a conference of the President with Democratic congressional leaders; whereupon Mr. Kennedy remarked that what to do about it was the business of MANSFIELD and the Senate, not of the Executive. Yet Democratic colleagues of Senator RUSSELL say flatly that the President sent for him to ask support of the Mansfield proposal, and was refused; that another Democratic Senator, a very close personal friend of Mr. Kennedy, got the same summons for the same reason with the same result; that another Democratic Senator had proposed the packing plan to the President before MANSFIELD had; and that a dozen or so White House legislative agents at the Capitol were very busy lobbying for the committee packing with members of the Democratic steering committee before they rejected it, 10 to 5.

HINTS OF PRESSURES

There have been published hints of these pressures, in such comments, for instance, as the Washington Star's that "It would be out of character for Senator MANSFIELD to be initiating a move to pack any Senate committee." This is at least an understatement of MANSFIELD's revealed concepts of his leadership function and of the intent of the division of Federal power in the Constitution. But there has been remarkably sparse publicity of the inside Executive operations described by other Democratic Senators and related above, though this has been the talk of the Senate cloakrooms, which usually becomes promptly known to the Press Gallery—where estimates of its degree of reliability are very sound indeed.

An important reason, of course, why the steering committee rejected the packing proposals is that it is becoming an administration tactic when legislation the President is particularly pressing faces difficulty from Democratic members of a committee.

Dairy Farmers Should Know About the Wheat Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial in the Mountain Grove, Mo., Tri-County News was called to my attention by Mr. Maurice Covert, of Houston, Mo. The article calls attention to the "two horses" being ridden by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. I believe the editorial illustrates the frustration felt by dairy farmers in southwest Missouri with respect to the Secretary's administration of our wheat and dairy programs.

The editorial follows:

DAIRY FARMERS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE WHEAT PROGRAM

Even the casual observer is becoming aware that the wheat program is not just another farm program in the eyes of Secretary Freeman and the present administration. While it is not our intention to discuss the good or bad aspects of Secretary Freeman's plan, nevertheless farmers in southwest Missouri, as well as throughout the Midwest, should carefully examine how this Government-sponsored program will affect them.

Without question, an unprecedented information campaign is being carried on by Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture, to inform the farmers of the absolute necessity of enacting this legislation.

We are only repeating what is being said all over this country as carried by the press and radio, that Secretary Freeman feels the future of all farm programs hinge on the outcome of the administration approved wheat plan.

This paper is not setting itself up as an expert in agricultural matters, and we do not know whether the plan should be approved by the farmers, or whether it should be disapproved; we do know that the dairy farmers in Southwest Missouri, and we presume the dairy farmers throughout the great milk producing region of the Midwest, are heavy users of feed grains.

We could not criticize any farm program that has as its objective, payment of a reasonable price covering the farmer's cost of production for the farm products that he raises and upon which the sale of, makes up his source of income.

From what we gather, the object of the wheat program is to see that the people who raise wheat receive a fair price for what they raise and sell, and apparently it is the goal of Secretary Freeman to see that all farmers who produce feed grains receive such a price for what they raise and sell.

This question has come to mind; how does the wheat program and how do other feed grain programs proposed by the administration affect the dairy farmers of the Southwest Missouri, who have to buy the feed and account for its cost in the price that they receive for the milk they sell?

We have been watching with interest some of the articles that Tom Ellis, farm editor of the Springfield newspapers, has been running relating to Missouri dairy farmers' problems, concerning low prices for their milk. From what we gather from Mr. Ellis' articles, the price of fluid milk under Secretary Freeman's Federal milk program is a very touchy matter to the Secretary, particularly in Missouri.

Maybe we are confused, if so we are sure we have lots of company, but, it appears to us that the low milk prices that Missouri dairy farmers are receiving for fluid milk are the entire responsibility of Secretary Freeman. We can't understand, and apparently neither can the Missouri commissioner of agriculture, how Secretary Freeman can declare that party prices, which are stated to be currently about 11½ cents a quart, are too much for the processor and handlers of milk, including the cooperatives, to pay Missouri dairy farmers, and to add to the confusion, according to the information we have read, the Secretary doesn't have evidence based on Missouri feed prices and the economic conditions in Missouri to substantiate the low price he has fixed for Missouri milk.

We doubt that any consumers of milk would be as unfair as to object to Missouri dairy farmers received at least 11½ cents a quart for the high quality milk they produce, and even out of the 11½ cents a quart, the dairy farmer has to pay the cost of delivering it to the processors' door in St. Louis or other metropolitan areas of Missouri where the milk is being processed.

Under our new modern technique, the question just runs through our minds, how will Missouri dairy farmers, and for that matter, how will any dairy farmer in the Midwest, who according to our information are in the same fix as a result of Secretary Freeman's fixing their low milk prices, feel about his wheat program.

We can see that if the Secretary did take into consideration the dairy farmer's cost of feeds when he determined a minimum price that the processors must pay him for milk, and if he did fix a price to the dairy farmers that would reflect properly cost of dairy feeds, then without question dairy farmers would want the framers who grow wheat to receive a fair price for their wheat.

From what information we have gained, Secretary Freeman is riding two horses; he tells Missouri dairy farmers and Midwest dairy farmers that he knows they are not receiving enough for their milk, and he wants to help them get a fair and reasonable price, yet his official actions which are a matter of public record, find that he is the one who is fixing the price they get.

From the newspapers it would appear that the powerful Farm Bureau is taking the Secretary on with no holds barred. We are not sure whether this is a political program or a farm program, but it measures up to be a dilly any way you look at it.

We couldn't be critical of Missouri dairy farmers being somewhat suspicious of any Government plan that would increase their feed cost, in view of the fact that he tells the handlers of milk what is a fair price for them to pay dairy farmers.

Obviously, the Secretary can't explain to the dairy farmers in Missouri and to the many communities in this State that it is the consumer's fault and that 11½ cents a quart for milk is a price that the consumer

would think was unfair for the farmers to receive. He can't blame the Republicans because he is the one that is fixing the price; we doubt that he can even get his Democratic colleagues in Missouri to agree that 11½ cents a quart is too high a price for him to let the farmers have for milk.

Some of the astute political observers will no doubt watch the Farm Bureau to see if they start courting dairy farmers to oppose Freeman's wheat plan.

If logic counts for anything, it would not be hard to make a pretty convincing case that Secretary Freeman is waging a political campaign instead of being a representative of the farmers, and all they would have to do is use the Secretary's own public record, in the administration of milk orders to prove their point.

No doubt they could tell the dairy farmers that if the Secretary actually was interested in farmers, he wouldn't do what he has done to them, fixing low milk prices.

Now, we don't want to inject any politics, but it would be interesting to see Secretary Freeman and the present Democratic administration explain why Secretary Freeman feels that parity is an unreasonable price for dairy farmers to receive for milk in the Midwest.

Surely, there are no Republicans in Congress that would read anything into the fact that dairy farmers in Mississippi receive a price under Federal orders fixed by Mr. Freeman in excess of parity, and that the farmers in North Carolina are getting a price exceeding parity—while Secretary Freeman declares it is unreasonable to permit Midwest dairy farmers to get parity prices. Surely, no Republican would be so low as to think that the Secretary was playing politics just because Congressman COOLEY of North Carolina, is chairman of the House Agricultural Committee and that Senator ELLENDER, of Mississippi, just happens to be chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee.

We have always thought that if farmers could sell what they raise for a parity price that such price would enable them to receive a just return on a par or level with that of the rest of all Americans. No wonder the Missouri commissioner of agriculture objects to Secretary Freeman declaring that a parity price is too much for Missouri farmers.

We could subscribe to the theory that how a man really thinks can best be determined by the deeds he performs—not what he says, but what he does.

Government Takeover in Grain Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, to understand more fully why the USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation needs still more money beyond its present $14.5 billion fund, I present here statistics showing the degree to which Uncle Sam has taken over feed grain merchandising in recent years.

Twenty-five years ago, the entire feed grain carryover of the United States was owned privately—on farms, in country elevators or terminal markets.

Today—an alltime high—88.5 percent of feed grain carryover is handled by Uncle Sam.

Here is the shocking story of Government takeover of what historically has been a private enterprise activity. It naturally follows that, as Government assumes greater responsibility for grain merchandising, more cash is needed.

The attached table shows the total feed grain stocks over the past 25 years, the stocks owned by CCC and other stocks. Feed grain stocks are counted, in this case, as of October 1 for corn and sorghum and as of July 1 for oats and barley:

Total feed grains carryover at the beginning of marketing year

Year beginning—	Government stocks [1]	Other stocks	Total	Government stocks as a percentage of total
	Million tons	*Million tons*	*Million tons*	*Percentage*
1937	(2)	3.8	3.8	0
1938	1.3	13.0	14.3	9.1
1939	7.2	13.5	20.7	34.8
1940	13.2	9.6	22.8	57.9
1941	11.3	11.8	23.1	48.9
1942	5.5	13.0	18.5	29.7
1943	.4	17.4	17.8	2.2
1944	.2	11.4	11.6	1.7
1945	.3	14.6	14.9	2.0
1946	(2)	10.9	10.9	0
1947	.3	13.5	13.8	2.2
1948	(2)	7.8	7.8	0
1949	15.3	15.1	30.4	50.3
1950	20.9	9.6	30.5	68.5
1951	14.8	13.8	28.6	51.7
1952	9.0	11.1	20.1	44.8
1953	16.6	10.4	27.0	61.5
1954	22.6	9.1	31.7	71.3
1955	29.7	9.4	39.1	76.0
1956	34.7	8.5	43.2	80.3
1957	40.8	8.0	48.8	83.6
1958	49.7	9.3	59.0	84.2
1959	58.0	9.5	67.5	85.9
1960	65.7	8.9	74.6	88.1
1961 [3]	74.7	10.0	84.7	88.2
1962 [4]	60.5	10.5	71.0	88.5

[1] Owned by CCC and old crop grain under loan.
[2] Less than 50,000 bushels.
[3] Preliminary.
[4] Source: FDS-196.

Source: Grain and feed statistics through 1961, Statistical Bulletin No. 159, revised June 1962.

A Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, independent retailers in all fields are being relentlessly liquidated by monopoly producing price cutting known as customer-bait pricing.

There are a number of reasons for the decline of independent retailing. But I think the inability of the small storekeeper to sell, at a fair profit, the famous brand-name products which are his bread and butter, must come at, or near, the top of these reasons.

The quality stabilization bill which I introduce today will not cure customer-bait pricing, but its enactment most assuredly will help curb it.

The quality stabilization bill reflects free enterprise at its enlightened best. It enables the manufacturers, if they wish, to guard the reputation of their brand names. It would restore fair, yet competitive, pricing to the marketplace, and would cost neither the Government nor the consumer a single penny.

Address by Gilbert Durbin at the Louisiana Sugarcane-O-Rama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the sugarcane industry is one of the most vital industries for the continued economic growth and prosperity of my State of Louisiana, particularly in the Second Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, and the third district, so ably represented by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, EDWIN WILLIS.

Congressman WILLIS and I had the honor and pleasure earlier this month to participate in the program for the Louisiana Sugarcane-O-Rama, a salute to our State's sugar industry and to B. C. Thompson, founder of the Thompson Machinery Co. at Thibodaux. Mr. Thompson has been a pioneer in the advancement and growth of the sugarcane industry through his leadership in producing modern sugarcane equipment; today his company is a division of Lamb Industries, Inc., of Toledo, Ohio; and Edward Lamb, chairman of the board of Lamb Industries, joined in the tribute paid to Mr. Thompson. Mr. Lamb was accompanied to Thibodaux for the Sugarcane-O-Rama by Everett Sisson, president of Lamb Industries. Mr. Thompson received accolades from Messrs. Lamb and Sisson; from Mr. T. M. Barker, president of the Lafourche Parish Police Jury and president of the American Sugarcane League; from Mr. E. J. Thiac, president of the Thompson Machinery Division, and many others. The Honorable Leonard H. Greenburg, former district attorney of Lafourche and Terrebonne Parishes, was master of ceremonies for the program on Saturday, February 9. A giant display of sugarcane equipment was held on Sunday, and industry clinics were conducted on both days.

Both the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] and I addressed the audience; and I am proud to note that my colleague, ED WILLIS, pointed out the fact that a short 15 years ago, both Louisiana and Florida combined produced a total of 500,000 tons of sugarcane a year, whereas today the two States are producing more than double that tonnage annually. Mr. WILLIS stated, however, that Louisana must continue to go forward in raising its cane production. In praising the Thompson Machinery Division of Lamb Industries, he said that research and mechanization of equipment has enabled the Louisiana sugar industry to compete on a favorable footing with the cheap labor

utilized in foreign countries. However, the Third District Congressman noted that there is still much to be achieved in the price and distribution areas.

Among the many fine speeches delivered at the Sugarcane-O-Rama was the address by Gilbert Durbin, vice president and general manager of the American Sugar Cane League, who cited for us the splendid progress and prosperity now being enjoyed by the Louisiana sugar industry and its canegrowers. I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this informative speech by Mr. Durbin, a leader in the continuing development and growth of the sugarcane industry in my State.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY GILBERT DURBIN AT THE LOUISIANA SUGARCANE-O-RAMA

On behalf of the American Sugar Cane League, I want to express appreciation to Thomson Machinery Co. for the very important part this company has played in the improvement of the Louisiana sugar industry. It is unpleasant to speculate upon what the condition of the industry would now be, if there had been no B. C. Thomson. His amazing insight allows him to understand our current problems, and his great foresight permits him to see problems of the future. He has solved many of these problems by use of his inventive talents. We have admired and profited from his courage to invest and risk his money in working on new things for our industry.

Also, on behalf of the league, I want to thank our congressional delegation for the splendid job they did in getting Congress to enact the amendments to the Sugar Act last year. That was just one of many times in past years in which our delegation has been successful in obtaining passage of legislation helpful to the Louisiana sugar industry. Other sugar areas and groups are envious of Louisiana, because we have the best congressional delegation in Washington.

We are quite proud of the Louisiana sugar industry, and we constantly strive to improve it. Substantial progress has been made toward that end. Our 1962 crop, which amounted to 470,000 tons of sugar, raw value, would have been considered better than a normal crop 10 years ago. What's so unusual about that? Well, it's the fact that we made 470,000 tons of sugar in spite of the worst weather of this century. In January 1962, the temperature in the cane area dropped lower than it had been at any time since 1899. Then we had a drought during our growing season and another record breaking freeze in December before all the cane was harvested. It is my considered opinion that, with normal weather, Louisiana should produce in excess of 550,000 tons of sugar this year.

The Louisiana sugar industry makes a very sizable and important contribution to the economy of our area, our State, and our Nation. We grow sugarcane in 19 parishes. On most of the 2,500 sugarcane farms, cane is the only cash crop. Therefore, sugarcane is most important to the operators and owners of these farms.

Louisiana sugarcane is a source of income for 20,000 fieldworkers and 4,500 employees of the 46 cane factories in the State. There are several thousand other workers in the seven sugar refineries in Louisiana, others in the Celotex plant in Marrero, the bagasse hardboard plant at Vacherie, and the bagasse paper mill at Lockport. You can add to that the workers engaged in transporting sugarcane, sugar, molasses, and bagasse.

That is not all, by any means. Consider (1) those who manufacture, sell, and repair the machinery and equipment used by Louisiana cane farms and factories and (2) those who produce and sell the fertilizer, insecticides, herbicides, oil, gasoline, grease, L-P gas, and natural gas we use.

Louisiana cane growers spend each year: $1 million for weed control chemicals; $1 million for insecticides, most of which are formulated in Louisiana; $2 million for fertilizer, most of which is manufactured in Louisiana; $22 for labor, performed primarily by resident workers; $2,500,000 for oil, gas, and grease, produced in Louisiana; $12 million for new machinery (much of it manufactured in Louisiana), maintenance, and repairs; and $1,300,000 for insurance.

Louisiana cane processors spend each year: $3,750,000 for transportation of sugarcane—all from within Louisiana; $1,250,000 for transportation of raw sugar to refiners—mostly within Louisiana; $9 million for labor—mostly Louisiana citizens; $5 million for new machinery and materials for machinery repair; $1 million for insurance; $1,500,000 for fuel—Louisiana natural gas; $1,500,000 for chemicals and other supplies.

Those who derive some economic benefit from the Louisiana sugar industry form an almost endless chain. We would, of course, include the owners and employees of grocery stores, department stores, drugstores, filling stations, garages, banks, and a variety of other establishments.

The value of a normal crop of Louisiana sugarcane is about as follows:

Growers receive $45 million for cane. First processing adds $25 million to value of crop, making the value of crop at first processing level $70 million. Refining of raw sugar adds $30 million to value of crop, making the value of crop at the refined level $100 million. Distribution services add $20 million to value of crop, making the value of the crop at the retail level $120 million.

The figures I have cited do not include amounts added to the value of blackstrap by the incorporation of blackstrap in mixed feeds or its use in manufacture of alcohol and other products. Also, the figures do not take into account the increase in the value of bagasse when it is processed into paper, building boards, and other products.

Some of our Louisiana sugar people think our industry is not appreciated by the general public. I doubt that this is true. Much publicity is given to the new industries moving into our section of the State. This is natural, because new things make news; but this does not mean that our old, established industries have been forgotten. However, I do agree that all of us should take advantage of every opportunity to remind others that the Louisiana sugar industry is making a vital contribution to the economy of this area and we expect to continue doing so.

Our future is bright. Research is the basis for all progress, including our progress—and we have a good research program. We have a good system of keeping farmers advised of the results of research—and, most important of all, we have progressive farmers who are willing to apply the new methods developed by research.

Farm machinery developers and manufacturers such as Thomson Machinery Co. will play an important part in the future of the Louisiana sugar industry. There are many possibilities for further improvement in the efficiency of sugarcane production through the use of improved machinery. I'm sure we will see some examples of this today.

Contrary to some people's opinion, there is more land in the sugarcane area which can be used for sugarcane production. Much of this land would have to be cleared and properly drained. In some instances, protection levees would have to be built and pumping systems would have to be installed. Perhaps an expenditure of $150 to $200 per acre will be required to bring some of this land into production. Even so, this cost of making unproductive land productive would seem to be justified, particularly in a case where the grower can handle more cane with his present equipment.

Much of the land now in cane production can be made more productive by cut crowning or turtle backing and by precision land grading. These earth-moving practices cost quite a bit of money, but they are a good investment when properly done. Many of you will vouch for that statement.

Our greatest prospects for increased yields of cane and sugar per acre probably depend upon the development of new cane varieties. In 1957, our cane breeding program was increased tremendously in size and improved in quality. We should now have a better chance to obtain cane varieties superior to any we have ever had before. Preliminary tests indicate we will not be disappointed, but we must wait a few more years to be sure.

Time does not permit a discussion of the many other types of research underway, but we do have a well rounded research program. Many excellent Federal and State scientists along with members of our industry are engaged in carrying out a wide variety of experiments. It is impossible to predict with certainty the results of research; but we are sure that discoveries beneficial to our industry will come from some of the experiments now underway.

I'm optimistic about the future of the Louisiana sugar industry. I'm sure you are, too.

Our Challenges Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an interesting, profound, and informative address made at a communion breakfast in Washington, D.C., on February 24, 1963, by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, president of Gulf Research & Development Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa.

The views of General Trudeau are worthy of deep consideration by every American.

The address follows:

OUR CHALLENGES TODAY

We meet here today when another birthday of the Father of our Nation has just been celebrated with much to be thankful for as our country resists the vicious challenges of communism and atheism. Again the torch of liberty and freedom is being lighted anew after the sometimes uncertain vagaries of our national meanderings these last years from the paths established by those gallant Americans who built our heritage. Greater even than the response of our leaders is the alertness of our people in their readiness to repulse the challenge.

Let us remember that the principles our forefathers stood for in peace and war are freshly challenged every day. They must be fought for and won, again and again through continuous, dedicated struggle. They can never be taken for granted. Already one-third of the world's peoples are enslaved in the chains of Sino-Soviet communism, and the lengthening shadows of its tentacles threaten as many more.

Talk of liberty and freedom is common throughout this Republic, yet today, despite the storm clouds over Cuba, there are indications that too many Americans still fail

to realize fully how much is really at stake if we fail to win the present struggle and suffer the loss of these blessings that are still the hope of free men everywhere. We would be stronger and better Americans if we kept ever present in heart and mind not only the epic days and deeds of our gallant forebearers and of our immortal great—but more importantly, as they did—the realizations of how bounteous divine providence has been to us and what the real issues are in the world struggle today. Without the continued guidance and blessing of the Almighty, all this vast edifice of might, power, and prosperity of which we boast will crumble to nothing, and the eroding of our foundations are matters of grave concern to many today.

The rededication of ourselves and our sons and daughters to the resurrection and advancement of those sterling principles that made our civilization and our Nation great is truly one of the primary tasks facing all Americans today. The law of life is one of struggle. All the animal and vegetable world knows this. There is a cross mankind is destined to bear as long as the world exists, and it will never be made of foam rubber. Neither will the psychiatrist's couch ever replace it. We don't need tranquilizers to ignore our problems. We need a moral adrenaline to stimulate us to solve them. After years of dilatory tactics, the dawn of reality seems to arrive, then fade, then surge again.

We are engaged in a struggle for the hearts and minds of men, and for their souls as well. In things material and military, the competition is very real because both sides possess vast power. In the struggle for the spirit and the mind, however, we have the decisive power if we will but apply it. From the time of Adam and Eve until now, mankind has recognized and revered the power and omnipotence of a Supreme Being, call Him what you will.

Now we are faced by a godless conspiracy emanating from Moscow and Peiping, where belief in the power of the Almighty is being stamped out as an opiate of the people, in order to force them to succumb to slavery amicably. The masters of iniquity know, as Nero did, that the human spirit welded to a faith in God above cannot be conquered. They know that faith in a stimulant and not an opiate, and that the miserable ideology they seek to advance cannot succeed in the face of dynamic and determined spiritual advancement.

We have been so blessed in this favored segment of the world that material comforts have become the opiate of our people. Growing up in an educational atmosphere where many of our people by design avoid consideration of the moral and spiritual values so vital to our children and our civilization, it is no wonder that, as life continues, the material comforts available increasingly obscure the importance of the only philosophy which gives real meaning to life itself—the code of Christianity. The bulk of our people are still shocked, however, that a simple, daily tribute to God cannot be paid by our children in school without argument and legal acrobatics.

We have gotten so it is difficult for many to differentiate between our standard of living and our way of life.

Our standard of living is not enhanced by gadgets for "the man—or woman—who has everything" as the ads say; nor is our way of life elevated by "payola." I can think of no single quality more needed today than real individual integrity based on our Christian code of ethics in every facet of our life.

The American way of life, based on a belief in the dignity of man, faith in God, and in freedom and justice for all, was clearly spelled out by George Washington and our founders. To enjoy these blessings, millions and millions of people of every creed and color have sought the protective arm and guiding light of the Statue of Liberty and today, though less than 200 years old, we stand as the patriarch of all freedom-loving people everywhere. This is why we must lead; this is what we have to protect, and project to other less fortunate lands and peoples.

Our standard of living is something else. Our collective talents, energized by easy access to great resources, free enterprise, and advantages stemming from our creed and our system have given us material benefits in excess of any other people in this world. Today, in a world shrunken by marvels of communication and transportation, the advent of new problems and new relationships is forcing a reassessment and reevaluation of many factors that have come to be accepted as immutable. Many see the problems; none, the solutions. But that by no means implies the problems can be tucked away in the attic with grandfather's favorite old carriage lamps for posterity. Great change is upon us.

We can't resign from the human race, nor can we ignore the challenge of this new era except at deadly peril to all we hold dear.

While the major challenge now facing us, and the forces of freedom everywhere, is world communism or Marxist socialism, at the same time there is another challenge—really a wonderful opportunity to which we must respond—the rising tide of expectations in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

These two challenges are occurring at a time when change is more rapid and meaningful than in any period during the past 500 years. This situation is typified by not only the dramatic fading of the boundaries of empires, but by ever-increasing rapidity of obsolescence in commercial products and even military weapons, and by ventures beyond the longstanding frontiers of space.

Let me comment briefly on some of the problems in Latin America where the early Carmelites carried the torch of Christianity 400 years ago. Here is about the fastest growing area in the world. By the turn of the century its population will be approaching 600 million people, about twice the estimated figure for the United States and Canada combined. These people are basically Catholic and, therefore, anti-Communist. Our missionaries and assistance are vital if this tradition is to prevail and become meaningful, and I have noted with great satisfaction the increased efforts of the church in this regard. Many of our young men with vocations for the priesthood serve, or will be serving, there or in Africa or the far reaches of Asia. All the vocations and all the orders doing God's work will never meet more than minimum needs however. While the priest in our country is father of his parish, psychiatrist, psychologist, and businessman—or is involved in the field of education in the arts or sciences; the missionary in many of the world's remote places is not only the country doctor serving the spiritual, mental, and physical needs of native people—but also judge, engineer, teacher, agricultural agent, and banker even when his material and personal assets are most austere.

In connection with the culture, the traditions, the religions of the people in these areas, we must always remember the tremendous aspirations they have and the fantastic difficulties they must resolve. Much of what they hope to acquire by tomorrow they have learned about through the increasingly rapid means of communication and transportation that we developed. I might mention here the very bad influence of some of our American motion pictures, for example, which show low moral standards, a profligate waste of talent and resources, and luxuries which none of us really need here, but which they want now. And, of course, with television this can be aggravated unless our films and tapes are better selected. This is one of the reasons we need to develop communications satellites so that we can project, through good television, the true image of America to all parts of the world.

Now, the aspirations of these people—who want by tomorrow what we have today—have been greatly increased, stimulated if you will, by the Communists who claim that they can produce luxury for all—quickly and cheaply. The fact that the Communists cannot deliver is seldom perceived or questioned until it is too late. As long as emergent peoples think, or want to think the Communists can deliver, then they are willing to take the red road of socialism and communism to dictatorship. They say to the West: "We have not progressed in the past decades under your system so we might as well try the Communist way. It cannot be worse." But, of course, it can be worse, much worse, but they will not know it until they have sold out, too late.

These are real problems. They are our problems too, and our leaders must be even more concerned with how to solve them.

So far, I have discussed briefly two phenomena of our times, world communism and the rising tide of expectations.

There is a third phenomenon, the explosion that is taking place in science and technology. Science, as you know is not quite 500 years old, dating back to the printing press and such other developments as the art of navigation. Modern technology is only about half of that, dating back to the early days of the industrial revolution. Yet, consider this, while the entire recorded history of man is about 5,000 years old, it is only in the last century, or 2 percent of recorded time, that 90 percent of all the advances that have ever been made in science and technology have taken place. Look at it another way: of all the people who have ever lived on this earth since Adam and Eve, who have been knowledgeable through native intellect, training, or education in the fields of science and technology, 90 percent are alive today. The growth of science and technology today is no longer a straight-line progression, but rather an exponential curve with an ever-rising rate and none can forecast the apex.

So these are more of the problems we face.

Certainly, we must find solutions to our own and the free world's problems by every means short of resort to force or, much worse yet, surrender.

Unfortunately, the only deterrent the masters of the Kremlin understand and respect is strength in every field. Our determined course, then, must be to refurbish our national image in every way in all the farflung areas of the world and concurrently to devote an adequate share of our scientific and technological effort to outpointing the Reds in every field of endeavor. Even great power is useless, however, unless the determination to apply it when necessary is forthcoming in a timely manner.

And this brings me back full circle to my original contention that courage, selflessness, and determination must be ever-increasingly stimulated in this great land of ours if the fog of fear and the clouds of complacency that so obscure the horizon are to be swept away by the freshening breeze of an awakened America.

The answer as to how we meet our challenges today and how each one of us measures up to his responsibilities must be inculcated better in the home, the church, the school. In these institutions our ancestors were imbued with the sterling qualities and sense of values that enabled them to fight for the harder right rather than surrender to the easier wrong. They could all straddle a horse, but they seldom

straddled an issue. What is happening to us? Certainly the eagles of victory will not perch long on our shoulders if we fail to prove our worthiness to carry forward those great moral principles for which our forefathers struggled, knowing they represent the most cherished goals of mankind.

At times I think we as a people are so proud of our heritage that we are careless of our destiny, forgetting that

Except the Lord build the house,
They labour in vain that build it:
Except the Lord keep the city,
The watchman waketh but in vain.

In days of old, the Roman battle cry was "Pro aris et pro facis," "For our altars and our firesides." When the Romans shortened this cry to simply "For our firesides," they buried their altars and insured their own doom.

Today the problem is not, "Shall we accept a willingness to sacrifice?" because sooner or later we must. The question is, "How and when shall we accept it and what do we do about it?"

Our readiness to meet the spiritual as well as the political, military, psychological, technological, and economic challenges of communism must be of the highest order. This means a nationwide effort to constantly reevaluate the Communist multiple threat against us and insure a dynamic, vigorous strategy to meet it. It will not be solved by black boxes.

We must realize in this age of great change that time is of the essence and that faith, and not fear—courage, not complacency—patriotism, not patronage, and sacrifice, not selfishness; are the keys to our survival.

The kind of spirit, dedication, and courage that we must have today was clearly demonstrated in a story you may have heard about the Connecticut State Legislature back in the 18th century. Those were still times of deeprooted superstitions and beliefs about all of the forces of nature. When the sun darkened from a total eclipse of the moon, the good citizens of Hartford thought that the Day of Judgment was at hand. The legislature was in session that day, and the members, some of them panic-stricken, began to rush about excitedly. The speaker of the house stilled the commotion and brought order. Then he raised his voice above the babbling and shouted: "This darkness does not matter unless it means the end of the world. And if the world is indeed ending, I choose to meet my Maker while doing my duty. Therefore I ask that candles be brought * * * so that this house can continue its business."

As good Americans and good Catholics, no other code can be countenanced by us and we must beware of the irreligious, the atheist, the agnostic, the Communist, the Socialist, and the weak and cowardly, who would compromise on Christian principles and invite the Trojan horse of so-called peaceful coexistence within our gates.

We must likewise beware of the arrogant intellectual who is now convinced that the world had no Creator but merely evolved from hydrogen gas. This still leaves completely unanswered the question, "Who made hydrogen gas?"

Despite Huxley and Bertrand Russell, we can be thankful there are still a host of brilliant minds throughout the fabric of our society who believe as you and I, that:

True learning is with reverence crowned.
And science walks with humble feet.
To seek the God that faith has found.

I'm sure there are many other reasons why we should count our blessings as we break bread together after paying homage to our God and I am happy for the opportunity to join you in saying so today. Let our gratitude for past blessings bolster our determination to face the future with faith and high resolve to conquer the formidable challenges of our time.

Thank you very much.

Quo Vadis Civicus—Quo Vadis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following article written by Edmund M. Socec of Augusta, Maine, entitled "Quo Vadis Civicus—Quo Vadis?" deserves the attention of all Members of the House. Whether or not my colleagues find themselves in agreement with Mr. Socec's analysis or conclusions, I am certain that each Member reading this article will conclude it was a most worthwhile investment of his valuable time.

The article follows:

QUO VADIS CIVICUS—QUO VADIS?

At either end of the spectrum of life, we are more receptive to some things that bear repeating, such as the Ten Commandments or the slogan, "Drive carefully, the life you save may be your own". Today, too many of us are so harried by the exigencies of life that we lose sight of the trends of government, unless these are brought together into focus. We do see bits and pieces in the press, but it is difficult to place them in their proper perspective, or give them meaningful interpretation. We may uneasily sense some incipient disorders, but it is difficult to spell them out as there is such a multiplicity of opinion. In the certainty of censure, I must nevertheless attempt to catalyze some of these thoughts. It may be pure temerity on my part, true enough, but I am so troubled that I must try to do so.

Basically, I think, far too many of us seem to have a dearth of understanding of the philosophy of government, the interplay of international economy upon government itself, thus, upon our daily lives as a result. Both our internal and external economies are not as rosy as they may look by a cursory reading of published quarterly statistics. I feel that we are judging these figures by the past velocity of our internal economy, rather than by studying some of the danger signals that are now flying in all earnest. Despite optimistic forecasts from all sides for the immediate future, there are far too many dangerous negatives for us to be complacent. I shall, therefore, deliberately adopt the negative in order to sound another serious note of warning.

From leaders of the free world, then its bankers, and more lately, the military bulwark of the free world, we have become a debtor nation. The full meaning of this has not yet penetrated the public's thinking. Our gold supply is being depleted in proportion to our prestige abroad, for as I have written previously, we are the rich Americans for all the world to see. Correspondingly then, the world is assessing our prestige at a lower level quite steadily for it continues to demand our gold instead of expressing its faith in this country by not doing so. Smaller nations with lesser populations and resources are now hedging, as the giant falters and stumbles. Formerly weak countries now demand to be heard as our equals, and occasionally with some justification. The black nations in the United Nations feel impelled to flaunt their nakedness, while insisting upon parity and allowing us to foot their bills, while being more or less gracious about it.

Whittling the giant down to size may be a purely human reaction for our allies and the black nations, but they should remember that their very growth or emancipation since World War II could not have taken place without the United States. Both Marshall plan and foreign aid stem from us and America created a formidable defense barrier for them during this time, as well. If our European friends take the Soviets for granted and feel that the next war will be over their heads, directly between the two greater powers, they should remember that this might have been true only so long as we remain the great power we have made ourselves. Were NATO to be left only to European powers, with America forced to retire troops and missiles in part because of the effect of balance of payments deficits, our friends might suddenly be faced with some difficult problems. Their own economic boom could suddenly turn very sour, with the added nonproductive military expenditures they would have to make. Any military expenditures is nonproductive, per se, and America has been the arsenal of the free world during and since the last war. These nonproductive efforts have been a stupendous drain on the earnings of the American people and our national debt is now passing all bounds of fiscal responsibility as a result. If it is true that we have made many grave errors, our allies have also benefited rather handsomely from our efforts. Time alone will tell whether our allies will consider our errors of the past serious enough to withhold statesmanlike support in our time of trial. In justice to them, we must also recall that they have supported us temporarily in ways not understood by the public, such as with somewhat risky currency swaps of recent times—since this administration took office.

Mr. Kennedy has a difficult gamble to face. Either the gold problem can be faced early in 1963, in the hope that it will be forgotten by election time in 1964, or, it can be swept under the rug for the time being and suddenly rear its head and become a truly overwhelming issue just before election. If we are to judge by past performance and timing, I rather suspect that this administration will speculate upon the lack of economic knowledge of the American people. It may attempt to encompass a statutory election date, and international political and monetary problems, to its ultimate disfavor of course. In the meantime, however, an election may have been won, thus allowing the present group of thinkers 4 more years in office. If this theory is correct and the repercussions were purely domestic, we could still handle the problem in our own way, over the long run, through the interplay of our form of government, despite the temporary ill effects and difficult economic readjustments. Unfortunately, this is no longer the case nor is it possible today. We are no longer a self-sufficient island unto ourselves, guarded by oceans and depending solely upon our own domestic markets, huge as they still are, in comparison to those of other nations.

If we admit to being in a cold war, we must be able to fully describe our efforts, whether these be good or bad, factually or only theoretically effective. If these include substantial aid to Soviet Poland, over $3 billion to Soviet Yugoslavia, similar huge amounts to neutralists like India, a $3 million yacht to Ethiopia among other items, we cannot resent the skepticism of our Allies. Foreign governments see us spending in 1962 alone more than the total and combined incomes of everyone living west of the Missis-

sippi River. They see this administration running a deficit of about $110 million every week since to took office, much of this huge amount being of a nonmilitary nature. They are aware of the fantastic boondoggle of the Alliance for Progress in South America, well intentioned as it may originally have been. They also see us giving aid to those who just turn around and give similar amounts to the United Nations, in order to barely hold their memberships. They know of the perfectly incredible Laos stupidity and recall vividly the Bay of Pigs, the tractor deal and the present contemptuous blackmail plot for the release of those prisoners.

Only the self-hypnosis of the doctrinaires in Washington can possibly justify this type of expenditures of public funds. Such follies merely destroy the very faith of the world in our fiscal integrity as a nation, through pure and utterly damaging ridicule. Obviously, this makes it most difficult for our Allies to understand the demands we must now make upon them. Cutting back is never easy; it has first to be demonstrated as being truly necessary. Let us also remember that we preached "good housekeeping" to our friends, while we seem unable to follow our own good advice. Their national pride will not let them forget this too easily, France especially.

I have pointed out in previous articles that this administration inherited some very fundamental problems, many of them dating back some 30-odd years or longer. The balance-of-payments problem is only one of them, but one which could have enormous impact upon us all in time to come. At the end of December 1962, it seems we shall face 1963 with about $1 billion less gold than we had at the start of the year. You will note that this is over and above the prepayments made by several of our allies, and in spite of the many currency swaps made by the Treasury in more recent months, in an attempt to hold onto our dwindling supply of gold bullion. If these currency swaps, the forward and the spot transactions, have been useful so far, they have been helped by some fortuitous circumstances operating in our favor. The very policy itself is dangerous when applied in the volume it has been. It only emphasizes to foreign central banks that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve are acting in near desperation, rather than from simple, stabilizing strength as provided under the 1944 Bretton Woods agreement. However, you look at it, the solid fact remains that we will probably be out of free gold by election time in 1964, if not long before. Therefore, we may be compelled to revaluate the U.S. dollar, whether we wish to or not. The prepayments and currency swaps must be credited to our friends, as a significantly helpful gesture. This is mentioned again, in all justice to them.

The matter of revaluation contains more misconceptions in the public mind; for one thing, it does not mean inflation, as a direct consequence. Revaluation of the currency has been used for centuries by many now defunct governments. For a period of time it permits any political administration to take advantage of the public's lack of knowledge of economic problems. In a small country, with minor resources and small population, this advantage can run from a few months to a year, as an example. For larger nations, with greater populations and resources, this advantage can actually last for a number of years, depending upon the lack of public information and the external economic pressures.

One of the principal factors involved is the type of economy of the nation affected, if you consider it as an economic unit rather than at the international level. Assuming that a small nation's exports make up say 25 percent of its GNP, revaluation, either up or down, will make for tremendous economic impact on its productive capacity and may cause serious internal political repercussions. In the United States, however, we have been historically self-contained so far. Both production and sales have been largely internal, while exports amount roughly to only 5 percent of GNP during the present year of 1962. As long as we are not in direct competition in foreign markets for our economic survival, we can manage fairly well in our own domestic markets alone. These have thus far been sufficiently large to absorb the output of our productive capacity. Please note the "thus far" qualification.

Today, however, we find ourselves faced with perfectly tremendous over capacity in nearly every line of business you care to mention. From war shortages, another buildup during the Korean war, then the filling of the pent-up civilian demands, we have now retrogressed to the point where we have to deliberately create demand to keep productive capacity going, even at a lowered level. We have created this artificial demand, largely by abuse of the credit system, by mortgaging the productive and earning capacity of the consumer for years to come and during very uncertain economic circumstances. This is anything but sound economics for the long term.

At this writing, we may well have passed the point of created demand. Production has been slowly dropping, in toto, with consequent price cuts growing in number and competition for the consumer dollar becoming well nigh intolerable in certain industries. We'll not even mention the profits squeeze here, as this item is only too well known to most of us. Nevertheless, as created demand is based upon credit, any serious economic or political shock would have immediate adverse effects which could trigger a chain reaction of unforeseen consequences at the moment. This deliberate long term abuse of credit, and this alone, can easily prove to be the major constrictive force involved in the chain reaction I mention.

Bearing this in mind, what we have heretofore considered an unimportant 5 percent in exports, these loom larger, as our traditional internal markets constrict, through the saturation of even created demands. When these exports dwindle again next year the impact will be greater still. If on top of this we add a sizable increase in low cost imports next year, we find our traditional internal markets constricting still more rapidly, in relation to our total domestic productive capacity. Outside of very predictible unemployment increases, the ultimate reactions are debatable as yet, but they are not encouraging for the short terms.

This country is historically conditioned to constant change; this is an integral part of our heritage; we both want and expect change. What I am attempting to show here is that we may suddenly be subjected to unexpected economic forces and their consequent internal political reactions. In the last 15 years or so, we have seen severe curtailments in various industries, but those were balanced by equal gains in others. If textiles were subjected to competing man-made fibers and imports, steel to aluminum and plastics, for instance, the net for this country was a gain in jobs and total productivity. Technological achievements in themselves augur well for the future, but what is the future, how many years hence, and what is to happen between tomorrow and this indeterminate future? I am not examining the long-term future; that is for the next generation to do.

I do, however, question the short term, the period of necessary adjustments. For this unpredictable area in time, I am suggesting extreme caution for any lending institution, and for those entrusted with the funds of dependents. The FDIC can readily turn out to be a lure and a delusion, if you consider that their reserves constitute roughly 1 percent or less of the total insured deposits, so-called, and that they cover 96 percent of all banks, while basing their loss-experience only on the last 10 boom years. With the battle of the interest rates going on between banks of various types, I wonder a bit about the actual liquidity of some of them. I quite realize that I am raising an important point and that I am writing against the popular trend in expressing these views. Nevertheless, accounts receivable does not invariably mean they are collectible; far from it. Just take a good look at the recent jump in bankruptcy rates. Furthermore, should the so-called middle class be substantially diminished through a negative chain reaction, the long range political implications will be incalculable. This is the group which spells internal political stability, as well as ultimate social progress. This is a tough sociological factor seldom broached in public print.

A factor new to us has been recently introduced to complicate our own problems even more. Many of the low-cost nations, with enormous aggregate productive capacity in plant and equipment, much of it more modern than ours due to Marshall plan aid, are also experiencing overproduction problems. The one factor which seems to be emerging is the concept of world prices for finished goods and commodities. Meanwhile, we are still doing business at the traditional domestic levels of wages, standards of living, and business habits, within the framework of the home market idea. Besides this, we are being subjected to increasing limitations by the Federal Government on many fronts, while foreign governments instead are desperately trying to free themselves of their traditional limitations in order to help in their economic development. A perfectly cogent example of this is the forthcoming merger of virtually all European national airlines into an air union. They propose using single, cooperative facilities, while actually integrating all their financial accounts into a central one. In comparison, consider the plight of our railroads, which should normally merge into solid economic units, instead of being dominated by governmental regulations and militant labor unions. A European air union is also a prime example of what I refer to above as world pricing, versus the domestic pricing we are used to so far.

We could remain an island of domestic prosperity as long as other nations were ineffective, both politically and economically. Now, though, precisely the contrary is in the process of happening. The very fulcrum of the problem lies between the standards of living in the high- and the low-cost nations, all of which have excess capacity and a grow-in gone. The low-cost nations have over-employment (labor imports) while we have underemployment at the moment. The low-cost nations can still afford to get down to normal employment, while our unemployment can only increase. Under the circumstances, the chain reaction I mentioned before can very well take place in this country, while affecting others to a lesser degree, or for a shorter period of time, in the long run. The old saying that "if Wall Street gets a cold, Europe catches pneumonia" is still true for the immediate or acute stage; it may no longer be true for the long run.

I rather fearfully suspect that too many of our official economists are basing their optimistic figures on the factor of our present economic momentum, the velocity of our economy, while largely ignoring the negative signs I am trying to point out here, as the counteracting forces. This momentum factor has been exceedingly deceptive in the past. Examining the momentum of abuses is unpopular, but it can prove fruitful for the short term. I wonder whether the uneasiness felt in many quarters is reflected in the growing cash position of many indi-

viduals and businesses? This uneasiness is still more instinctive than reasoned in most cases. What is to be the reaction when instinctive uneasiness turns to reasoned mistrust? Another drastic stock market break? Even more voluntary bankruptcies? The negative chain reaction I mentioned?

In any assessment of the domestic economy, we must now consider the effects of the Trade Expansion Act, fostered by this administration and passed by the Congress, perhaps somewhat reluctantly. Substantial give-and-take is a firm prerequisite in international trade, but as a result some of our industries may be forced into some temporarily painful readjustments, due to world pricing. Should these readjustments come about by internal economics, these would be serious enough, but we could and would recover from them in due time and within our bounds. However, if purely intellectual and doctrinaire policies prevail, over and above the normal interplay of domestic and international economics, we could become afflicted with organic industrial disruptions, causing in turn a complete change in our form of government in the future—the long term.

In this respect, there may be already some straws-in-the-wind, tending to outline this trend. Controlled restrictions of the news is only one of the more obvious. But consider that in the next 3 to 5 years, a very substantial percentage of the population in the United States will be 25 years of age, or thereabouts. Add a completely crass ignorance, national in scope, of the realities and facts concerning the rest of our civilized world, including those black nations which have not even graduated. With an estimated half of our total population seriously lacking in political experience and knowledge, on top of a probable transition period in world economy, you have the ingredients for a serious internal political change. Comments concerning the middle class on the previous page become even more cogent in this perspective.

Other countries now own most of our gold reserves, so that we now suddenly discover that the paper dollars are in a fateful race between printing-press-inflation and business-collapse-deflation. As I see it, the latter is preferable to the former, as under deflation we could still maintain some form of control in our economy. It would be a shock, but we would in time readjust to it, without too great a loss to our political liberties. With printing-press-inflation, the many historical precedents only point to a basic change in the form of government or some domestic form of dictatorship. In the United States this would not necessarily be what we have known as facistic or socialistic by name, but it must perforce to be of some monolithic nature, regardless of the name it finally takes. I sincerely feel we are approaching a most trying period in the history of this country, no matter which administration or political party is in power. This administration inherited the acute stage of basic fiscal and political problems. The fact remains that it is this administration which will have to make harsh internal decisions. These have now become absolutely compelling, primarily in the field of tax reform, but coupled with corresponding deep slashes in Federal expenditures; unfortunately, these inevitably have political repercussions against the political party in power at the time.

Nevertheless, this would be good statesmanship, but human nature being what it is, I suspect this to be a fond hope rather than potential reality. Both here and abroad, politicologists being what they are and human too, they may prefer to temporize and sweep things under the rug, instead of facing up to the fundamentals. If it is true that "Everyone loves a winner," we may also have to learn the bitter truth that we might be the temporary losers at this stage of the game of history. Long years of abuses in both the fiscal and financial structures of the economy are going to have to be paid for in one form or another, whether we like it or not. The patient is physiologically ill now, through the ministrations of social seers whose well-meaning directives are plausible, only to those completely lacking in experience. The common man may delight in and demand these plausibilities; he may elect those seers at his will and pleasure, according to the Constitution. What the common man forgets is that there are mighty slim pickings in the Constitution, to guarantee him against the effects of international political economy. World prices, high versus low cost nations, narrowing time lapses, accelerated technology, etc., all these, and many other factors, help to shape the broad movements in economics and history. The common man, poor devil, is somewhat ineffective in such broad movements, no matter how high predatory politicologists have inflated his ego in recent years. The common man becomes merely "common" when he abandons self-reliance, civic pride and its attendant duties and stops using his native intelligence. Nearly 2,000 years ago, the Romans found out there was a stiff price tag to the spend-and-elect philosophy of government. We may have to learn this all over again in our day and age, while the common man is invariably the greatest loser of all. But, who will tell him this? The politicologists?

Being merely human, we all tend to think in terms of our age and our generation. We forget that it is a continuing process, completely interrelated, except in our own individual minds. The new era boys of 1929 were right, but they forgot that this era had first to be digested economically before it could come into actual being. If a child is conceived, it must be born before it becomes a human being, and it is born in pain. The new era boomed in the end, beyond fondest dreams, but during the transition a price was paid. If those of our age and generation discovered the crystal set in radio, lived through the model A Ford and two World Wars, the younger generation must have its time in turn. They, too, must be given their time of glory in exploration, and they are doing the job. They, too, must learn the pain of knowledge and the price of experience. We cannot remake the world; we can only live in it and change as it does, each within our times. If an optimistic booster has his functons, so has the conservative. The older ones among us must exercise the wisdom bought at the cost of our years; we must make what attempts we can to help those who are yet too young to have paid the price we did.

As I complete this article, I seemingly do not come to an easy conclusion, an accepted ending, leaving the reader with an easy mind; this was not my intent. However much you may disagree with me, I have put into words for all to read, some of the unpopular things that could happen to us in the near future, unless the people of this country react intelligently. In the final analysis, much of what happens one way or another may depend largely upon the amount of intestinal fortitude we show in expressing our dissent to unsound, unpatriotic policies and principles. Every man must contribute to the society he believes in by doing his own best work, in the best way he can, but work and strive he must to the very limit of his ability. Unfortunately, today at least, this description would only fit a very "uncommon man" indeed. Should a terminal punchline be required for a modicum of conformity, then that is the one.

Comments on the Battle of Gettysburg by Dr. Chester W. Heathcote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this is the centennial anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and I am exceedingly fortunate in having in my congressional district a competent authority on the subject in the person of Dr. Charles William Heathcote, emeritus professor of history at West Chester State College, West Chester, Pa.

Dr. Heathcote has prepared a detailed paper on the battle and has added his comments on the dedication of the national cemetery at Gettysburg which was the occasion for Lincoln's famed address. Dr. Heathcote's fine article, included and made a part of these remarks, follows:

THE CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG, JULY 1, 2, 3, 1863, AND LINCOLN'S DEDICATORY ADDRESS AT GETTYSBURG, NOVEMBER 19, 1863

(By Charles William Heathcote, Ph. D., S.T.D., head, department of history, emeritus, West Chester State College, West Chester, Pa.)

PRELUDE

After Lee, the Confederate commander, defeated Hooker, the commander of the Union Army, in the Battle of Chancellorsville, May 1–2, 1863, the decision was made by the Confederate leaders to invade the North and thus end the war. Lee eventually moved his army up the rich Cumberland Valley into Pennsylvania. This position placed Lee west of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Hooker started to move his Union Army east of the Blue Ridge Mountains, keeping in a parellel position with the Confederate Army. On June 27, Hooker brought his army to Frederick, Md., when he requested the War Department for the addition of the 10,000 Union troops at Harper's Ferry to be united with his army. The request was refused, whereupon Hooker resigned his command. President Lincoln promptly appointed Gen. George Gordon Meade, commander of the 5th Corps, Army of the Potomac, to command the Union Army. Meade accepted the command. On June 29, Meade established his headquarters at Taneytown, Md., about 12 miles south of Gettysburg. The major portion of the Union Army was located in this area. By June 30, Lee's forces were in the Chambersburg section about 25 miles from Gettysburg. Lee had his headquarters at Greenwood on the Chambersburg road about 15 miles from Gettysburg.

FIRST DAY'S BATTLE, GETTYSBURG, JULY 1, 1863

The Union leaders learned the Confederate forces were established along the Chambersburg road beyond Gettysburg. General Buford's Union cavalry were also established along the same road beyond Gettysburg. He found the enemy in considerable numbers, whereupon Buford placed his troops in battle formation. Later Confederate troops were ordered to move along the same road in order to find out the strength of the Union forces. In a short time the battle was joined and the struggle of Gettysburg was a reality. The Union troops were outnumbered and Buford sent word to General Reynolds to bring his forces to Buford's aid. When Reynolds arrived he was arranging his

troops in the McPherson woods area, he was killed by a Confederate sharpshooter. He was a most able officer and he was missed in the struggle. Then the Union troops drove back the Confederates and captured a large number of prisoners.

When General Howard arrived on the field he took command and after careful study realized the Union troops were outnumbered. He sent orders to Union forces located near the area for reinforcements to be sent immediately.

About this time the Confederates made a heavy attack upon the Union lines which were driven back through Gettysburg which resulted in the loss of all gains made earlier in the day. Later under the direction of Generals Hancock and Howard the Union line was well established on Cemetery, Culp's Hill and East Cemetery Hill. General Meade at Taneytown, Md., was made cognizant of the Union position.

In the meantime General Lee, commander of the Confederate Army arrived upon the field from Cashtown also located on the Chambersburg Road.

SECOND DAY'S BATTLE, JULY 2, 1863

General Meade arrived at the scene of the battle from Taneytown at 1 a.m., July 2. When he came he had complete understanding of the location of the Union lines from messages he had received from his officers and from careful study he made of the map. He established his headquarters at the Leister house near the 2d Corps of the Union Army, General Meade's line of troops extended from Spangler's Spring near Culp's Hill, Cemetery Hill to the Round Tops. As soon as it was light, Meade made careful inspection of his position which he decided to hold in order to fight defensively or offensively depending upon conditions as the battle was waged. Meade realized the importance of holding the Round Tops as they formed an anchor position for the Union troops. As the struggle progressed later in the day, General Warren was ordered to carefully examine the condition about the Round Tops, with the result that he placed sufficient Union forces to hold and guard this important position.

In the meantime General Lee established the Confederate line so that it followed almost the direct position of the Union location except it began from Benner's Hill beyond Culp's Hill, extended through Gettysburg out Seminary Ridge near the Round Tops, Lee's attack was directed against the Union forces at Cemetery and Culp's Hill, but it failed. In the afternoon the fighting was teriffic, particularly in the endeavor of the Confederates to capture Big and Little Round Top which were so important for Meade's position, but the Union forces held them.

The struggle was also carried through the area known as the Peach Orchard and the Wheat Field. Devil's Den was held by the enemy, and the base of Big Round Top was secured by Lee's troops but the Union forces held the enemy above the base. The fighting continued into the night but Lee failed to break the Union line.

THIRD DAY'S BATTLE, JULY 3, 1863

The struggle began with an attack upon the Confederates established near Spangler's Spring and Culp's Hill with the result that the enemy was driven out and the Union line was established more firmly.

Meade called a meeting of his superior at his headquarters concerning Lee's probable plan of attack. The opinion prevailed that since Lee failed to destroy the right and left wings of the Union Army, that likely he would make a terrific attack upon the center. Consequently, Meade ordered every preparation made to meet the eventuality. An unusual calm settled over the battle area, which was broken later by the firing of two signal guns from the Confederate lines. At once, the Confederate cannon began to pour shells into the Union lines. The Union cannon replied immediately. For more than an hour the artillery duel continued. Then Meade ordered the firing to cease in order to cool the guns, bring up replacements and new supplies of ammunition. Lee seems to have been under the impression that the Union cannon were silenced. Meade expected that the time had come for the Confederate attack. He was not mistaken.

Pickett's division was ordered to attack the Union forces. As they marched forward, the Union artillery was ordered to hold their fire until the enemy came in close range. The Union batteries opened with deadly effect. The musketry fire upon the advancing troops was likewise effective. Pickett directed the charge against the Union position where a clump of trees was conspicuous. Here a few men of the attacking forces reached this position, and the spot came to be known as "The High Water Mark" as the farthest point reached by the Confederates in this titanic struggle. To commemorate the position a very unique marker was established. It represents an open book on which is stated it is the farthest point reached by the Confederates in this struggle.

As the attack moved on, the Confederate cavalry was massed in the sector between the York and Hanover roads about 3 miles east of Gettysburg which is known as the east cavalry field, the Confederates timed this attack during Pickett's charge in order to aid in destroying Mead's army. The Confederate cavalry numbered about 7,000 and the Union cavalry about 5,000. In this struggle the Union cavalry was located in the area to protect the rear center of the Union lines. As the cavalry of the Confederates attacked the Union cavalry, Generals Gregg and Custer of the Union Cavalry met the onslaught and drove the Confederates from the field.

After Pickett's charge was stopped, having suffered heavy losses, the remnants of the division joined Lee's main army. This condition ended the Battle of Gettysburg. Lee in the meantime gave the order to retreat and in due course the Confederates returned to Virginia. Meade ordered the Union cavalry to pursue the retreating Confederates but no important battle took place. Meade lacked reserve forces to make an effective pursuit. In time the Union forces found the enemy again in Virginia. The Union army won an important victory. However the losses on each side were heavy. The figures in general are: Union army numbered 80,000; killed, wounded, and missing as casualties, 23,000; Confederate army numbered 75,000, and casualties about 27,000.

THE ETERNAL LIGHT-THE PEACE MEMORIAL

As a fitting climax to the 75th reunion of Confederates and Union veterans on July 3, 1938, The Eternal Light-The Peace Memorial was dedicated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The memorial is located on Oak Hill about 1 mile northeast of Gettysburg. Two challenging statements appear on the front part of The Eternal Light-The Peace Memorial "An enduring light to guide us in units and fellowship," "Peace eternal—nation united."

THE NATIONAL CEMETERY—PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S DEDICATORY ADDRESS, NOVEMBER 19, 1863

Shortly after the Battle of Gettysburg, Hon. A. G. Curtin, Governor of Pennsylvania, came to Gettysburg in order to see what could be done to aid the wounded at Gettysburg. He appointed Attorney David Wills as his special representative. A board of commissioners was also organized to establish a national cemetery to honor the heroic dead of the battle. The 18 loyal States supported the plan. Attorney Wills purchased land suitable for the national cemetery. When the commission organized, they chose Wills president. The cemetery composed 17 acres on Cemetery Hill. At the apex of the triangular lines of the Union Army, William Saunders, of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., laid out the cemetery.

Wills also had the authority to arrange suitable services for the dedication of the cemetery. The Honorable Edward Everett, a well known clergyman and educator, accepted the invitation to deliver the oration. However, he suggested the date October 23, 1863, which was set for the services, be changed to November 19, 1863, which was agreeable to the commission. Then President Lincoln was invited to deliver the dedicatory address, which he accepted. In the national cemetery is a monument erected which is known as the soldiers' monument, which also marks the spot where Lincoln stood on November 19, 1863, when he delivered his immortal dedicatory address. The monument is a tribute of the Nation to the sons who gave their lives to save their country and also a tribute to Lincoln for his immortal address. Around the base are four figures symbolical of War, History, Peace, and Plenty. The monument is surmounted by a marble statue representing Victory. The historical significance of the statue is self-evident.

A short distance to the south of the Soldiers Monument is another beautiful marker somewhat semicircular and in the background is a bust of Lincoln in bronze which rests firmly on a pedestal. The remarkable artistic workmanship of the face of Lincoln is the study one finds as the light plays upon it. To the right of the bust also in bronze is Lincoln's immortal address. To the left likewise in bronze is a copy of the invitation to Lincoln to deliver the dedicatory address. This truly is the dedicatory marker.

President Lincoln and his official group left Washington on November 18, proceeded to Baltimore, then to Hanover Junction and to Gettysburg. Wills had Lincoln as his guest and the Wills home was centrally located on the square. Before Lincoln arrived in Gettysburg his speech was not completed, for he had written but one page. The President had clearly in his mind what he proposed to write as he was motivated by our heritage. He knew the tremendous loss of life in this struggle and the sacrifices of families who gave their sons to save the Nation. He realized that the dedication was for all citizens. His speech was written in simple and inspiring language. It is a poem in its content, because it is a vision for all people.

When Lincoln left Washington he had the one part of the speech written on paper of the Executive Mansion. During the early evening as a guest of Wills he was unable to retire to his room to complete his address. Later when he retired he asked Wills for several sheets of paper in order to finish writing his speech. Wills gave him several sheets of the legal size paper such as he used. Lincoln finished his speech and then retired for the night. In the morning he copied his speech for the dedicatory exercises.

DAY OF DEDICATION

The day of dedication dawned clear and beautiful. The streets were crowded with people. It was estimated at least 10,000 persons were assembled at the place of dedication. Edward Everett, the orator of the occasion, spoke more than an hour. Then Chief Marshal Lamon introduced the President, who received an enthusiastic greeting. He held his manuscript within each hand and spoke forcefully and clearly. In the delivery of his address, he inserted two words extemporaneously—after This Nation—"Under God." His speech took a short time to deliver. There was no applause after his speech. Large numbers of people thought it was not finished and many in that great audience did not realize it was finished until he sat down. Dr. Baugher, who was presi-

dent of Pennsylvania College, now Gettysburg College, was also seated on the platform, in order to pronounce the benediction at the close of the services, heard Dr. Everett say to Lincoln, "I spent many weeks in preparing my address and used more than an hour in delivering it, but your speech of a few minutes will live long after mine will have been forgotten. Everett's words were prophetic and true.

Some of the papers in New York and Philadelphia inserted the word "applause" in the printed copy, but others did not follow this pattern. Without doubt the newspapers which inserted "applause" did so to be considerate for the President. At this time two newspapers were published in Gettysburg and one of them inserted "applause" in the speech and the other one did not. Large numbers of people who followed the address with care were pleased and inspired by the words. They realized that the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's immortal address were inseparable and at the same time one was incomplete without the other.

At the close of a busy day, but a memorable one in Gettysburg, Lincoln returned to Washington to continue anew the struggle for peace and unity in the Nation. The speech without a doubt made a deep impression on his mind as he was willing to produce several copies of it in the next 2 years. Lincoln was likewise dedicated anew to his task as well as to the services of the soldiers who rested in the national cemetery.

"Whiz Kids" Versus Military Men: Who Is Shaping Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from U.S. News & World Report of March 4, 1963:

"WHIZ KIDS" VERSUS MILITARY MEN: WHO IS SHAPING DEFENSE?

(NOTE.—Key decisions about U.S. defenses are coming out of the Pentagon with a rush, bringing into issue the role of a new type of civlian expert. Seasoned military men feel they have been shunted to the sidelines, replaced by young scientists who shape strategy with electronic computers. Now Congress is taking a close look at the whole system.)

Sharp controversy is boiling up in Washington over new U.S. defense strategy, and the growing influence of "whiz kids" in the Pentagon.

At the heart of the controversy is this key question:

Are military decisions now completely out of the hands of professional soldiers and in the hands of young scientists—the so-called "whiz kids"—with topheavy reliance on electronic computers to shape strategy?

Military men see themselves as being driven to the sidelines, replaced by computers, with their opinions either unsolicited or largely ignored.

Decisions on how to spend $50 billion a year on defense are said to be largely in the hands of young civilians lacking in practical experience.

Weapons are being chosen for future wars, it is said, and grand strategy is being made by young men who have never heard a rifle fired in anger.

TIME OF DECISION

A new and sweeping nuclear war plan has just been described to Congress by Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense. If implemented, it will set the course of U.S. defenses for many years to come.

Suddenly, senior officers, military analysts, and others are questioning that strategy and how it was formulated. Concern is growing in Congress. On February 19 Chairman JOHN C. STENNIS of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee left a meeting with Mr. McNamara saying he was unconvinced of the wisdom of a decision to phase out big bombers and to cancel the Skybolt airborne missile.

One senior officer expressed his concern in these words:

"If Mr. McNamara's young scientists follow the trends now established, the United States will deteriorate to a second-rate military power in 10 years.

"That sounds extreme, but it's true. They are giving us a strategy of 'nuclear stalemate' based on a limited number of big missiles. When the B-52 bomber wears out, there will be no more manned bombers to provide flexibility. Aircraft carriers, the backbone of the Navy, will disappear. The Army will not have either the airlift or the sealift that it needs to move its forces in a hurry. And basic weapons will be overstandardized in all three services."

"WHIZ KIDS": A CLOSE LOOK

Such criticism, heard in the Pentagon and elsewhere, is not aimed directly at Secretary McNamara but at the "whiz kids" he has put into positions of power.

Their influence at this time is seen as growing. Their number is increasing as well.

The hard core of original "whiz kids" was brought into the Pentagon 2 years ago as Assistant Secretaries of Defense, Special Assistants and as Directors and Deputy Directors of agencies. But several hundred more civilians have been added since then.

Most of these newer civilian experts have come straight from college campuses. Some of them work on a part-time basis at $75 a day.

These civilians, sometimes called the bow-tie boys" by military men, are regarded as alert and well educated. Nearly all are in their thirties and most have advanced degrees. None is reported to have a real military background.

Their symbol is the electronic computer, into which thousands of facts and figures can be poured, and out of which a logical comparison of two or more weapons or techniques can be drawn.

To get their facts and figures, these civilians fan out over the Pentagon and sometimes over the country. Interviews with military men are held in some cases. More often, memos are sent to the Armed Services requesting a set of figures or background on some problem, usually on a few days' notice.

FALLACY IN FIGURES?

Rarely are professional military men asked to give opinions on any problem under review. Criticism of this method, as a result, is strong. Said one military officer:

"Not one in a hundred civilians has any knowledge of the military realities. As a result they ask naive questions, make unrealistic assumptions and, worst of all, try to simplify into statistics for their computers things that are widely variable and not subject to simple statistical analysis."

Once collected, the facts and figures are processed, usually in a digital computer, in a process known as operational analysis. This stems from earlier attempts by the British to work out complex problems in World War II. It has become the standard technique for shaping the pattern of U.S. defenses now.

A Pentagon officer, in recent days, made this comment: "Operational analysis is great stuff if you use a little experience and military judgment with it. But it's the sort of thing that, badly handled, could easily duplicate 'human errors' such as the Maginot Line, the superbattleships at the end of World War II, and the B-36 bomber. None of them panned out in practice."

FIRST VICTIM: AIR FORCE

The "whiz kids" have just won their biggest victory so far, over the Air Force, and now are setting their sights on the Navy.

The victory over the Air Force was over not only that service, but over the almost unanimous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, considerable technical advice from private industry, and over the British Government.

Secretary McNamara, it turns out, relied on the strong recommendation of the "whiz kids" to delete two big items from the new arms budget:

Skybolt, a $3 billion airborne-missile program, was killed outright. The recommendation to kill it reportedly came from a civilian team headed by one of the oldest of the "whiz kids," John H. Rubel, 42. He is an Assistant Secretary of Defense and an expert in industrial computers.

The RS-70, planned as a supersonic jet bomber, also has been killed. Only token development of three XB-70 jets is provided for. In this case the recommendation that was followed came from Dr. Harold Brown, widely regarded as the No. 1 "whiz kid." At 35, he is Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Defense Department.

Others playing key roles in recent decisions are Dr. Alain C. Enthoven, 32, who recommended that the United States put more money behind the Minuteman and Polaris missiles, and Henry S. Rowen, 37, one of the architects of the new mutual deterrence nuclear strategy outlined by Mr. McNamara.

A BROAD SWATH

The Skybolt and RS-70 programs were only the largest of 600 major items requested by military services this year and killed by Secretary McNamara on the advice of his teams of specialists. The total value of these deleted programs: $13 billion.

Next major project to be undertaken by the "whiz kids" is a long look at the big ships of the U.S. Navy.

A special board is starting to look into the question of the cost and capability of the fleet in relation to the cost of defending it against air attack. Indications are that the future of attack-type aircraft carriers, other large surface ships, and even nuclear submarines of the non-Polaris type, is at stake.

APPLAUSE, TOO

Not all military men object to the work of the civilian experts. Some see them as a necessary adjunct to military decision-making. Younger officers, especially, maintain that battlefield experience is no longer of overriding importance in an age of nuclear missiles.

The civilian experts, too, appear to be mellowing as they become entrenched. They no longer appear to be openly disdainful of slower thinking generals and admirals. Their criticisms are less open and their approach often less abrupt.

"The 'whiz kids' may be getting more mellow," one officer reported, "but they are getting more powerful all the time, and I'm sincerely afraid of where it is leading. What do you suppose would happen if Secretary McNamara weren't around to hold them down?"

SOME INDUSTRY EXECUTIVES COMMENTS ON "WHIZ KIDS"

A senior engineer on the west coast: "The basic gripe about McNamara's 'whiz kids' is that they want to be considered experts on everything.

"They can be brilliant in certain areas, but almost irrational in others.

"They have technical arrogance."

Vice president of an aircraft firm: "The 'whiz kids' now have got the Air Force beaten down, and they are starting on the Navy. One report we get is that they believe carriers are carrying too many planes. Their theory is that, since today's planes carry nuclear bombs, fewer are needed. They suggested a 25-percent cut in planes without regard for the tactical problems, such as penetrating to targets."

Executive of east coast firm: "McNamara is reported to have said he has never been proved wrong in a major decision in his business career. I'm just suspicious of anyone who would say something like that.

"The Secretary and his bright young aids are getting too much influence. They too often overrule the men with long tactical and military experience."

A midwestern manufacturer: "McNamara would like to see this business (defense production) run like the auto business. But that will take considerable time.

"From our point of view, a big problem is that we no longer can sit down with military men and make plans or discuss future needs. The plain fact is the military no longer makes the decisions on which weapons they will use on the battlefield. They have to wait and be told by 'the bow-tie boys'."

The president of a big western firm: "McNamara has gathered the decisionmaking process into his own shop. He is a strong man. He concludes that important decisions should not be taken by any one individual service.

"With that approach, with his superb confidence in himself, you don't find the Pentagon taking much advice from industry."

An executive in a middle-sized firm: "There's no doubt McNamara has improved efficiency in weapons procurement. The question is whether the bright boys give enough weight to the accumulated experience of trained military men."

Cancer Research Results Relevant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the battle against the dreaded disease, cancer, is being fought in laboratories, research centers, and hospitals throughout the Nation. The Federal Government, the American Cancer Society, and other public and private organizations and agencies are involved in the sponsorship of extensive research efforts to find a breakthrough in bringing cancer under control.

Dr. Alvin Sarachek, chairman of the biology department at the University of Wichita, Kans., is one of the scientists engaged in a basic research project which could provide important information leading to a breakthrough. Some of Dr. Sarachek's research efforts are financed through Federal research grants, and some by the American Cancer Society.

It is fitting that we pay tribute to men such as Dr. Sarachek who take the time to combine teaching assignments with many hours in the laboratory.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report from the University of Wichita Alumni magazine published in January 1963, entitled "Cancer Research Results Relevant":

CANCER RESEARCH RESULTS RELEVANT

New hope for a breakthrough in cancer research could be the result of work being performed by Dr. Alvin Sarachek, head of the Wichita University Biology Department.

So relevant is his research that Dr. Sarachek has received grants from both the American Cancer Society and the Department of the Navy's Office of Naval Research. The two grants, totaling approximately $40,000, will enable the professor to study further the "genetics of the cell division process in candida albicans."

According to Dr. Sarachek, candida albicans is a yeast found in the mouths of most people and is occasionally a disease producing organism. It has the ability to grow either by forming additional cells or simply by each cell increasing in size.

Don Kordis, executive secretary of the Sedgwick County (Kans.) American Cancer Society unit, said the national office of the Society is especially interested in Dr. Sarachek's work. "The results of his research could lead us to a significant key in our fight against cancer," he said.

By using radiation to alter the ability of the yeast cells to divide or reproduce, Dr. Sarachek believes his research should contribute to an understanding of the chain of chemical processes which may regulate cell division. Cancer, in its most fundamental aspect, is characterized by abnormal growth and division of cells.

"Cancer," Sarachek stated, "is an enormously complex problem, and any information on the mechanism of normal cell division has immediate bearing upon our understanding of this disease."

In discussing his research work, the quiet-spoken biology department head explained that the most unique property of the living organism is its ability to reproduce. He pointed out that the basic unit of life is the cell which reproduces by the process of cell division. "Although this cell division process has been the object of study for almost 100 years, very little is known of the biochemical processes that underlie this phenomenon," he said.

Explaining further, he said all biochemical reactions in the living cell are directed by hereditary factors called genes. "If a gene is altered or inactive the specific process it causes or controls is thereby altered or stopped." The professor added that a great deal has been learned about cellular chemistry by intentionally inactivating genes (i.e. creating genetic mutants) by determining how the chemical activities of the cell have been altered or stopped.

In his research Dr. Sarachek will use radiation to alter the genes. He will then look for cells that have lost the ability to divide but are still capable of growing. By identifying the biochemical changes which occur in these radiation altered cells, it should be possible to determine the chain of chemical processes that specifically regulate cell division.

The results of his research to date have been published in several professional journals.

"Research takes time," Sarachek answered in regard to a question asking him how long his particular research might take. "No one can predict where or when the significant answers will be found."

The grant by the American Cancer Society for $3,900 is the fourth grant made to Sarachek by the ACS for a total of $14,400. The Navy grant awarded to the WU professor is to cover a 3-year period and totals $35,814. It is the second grant Dr. Sarachek has received from the Navy Department directed toward cancer research for an overall total of $51,314.

Dr. Sarachek has been a member of the WU faculty since 1958. He attended Central High School, Kansas City, Mo., before attending the University of Kansas City where he received both his bachelor of arts and master's degrees.

Sarachek was an instructor at the University of Kansas City for 1 year and worked in the Army Medical Research Laboratory, Fort Knox, Ky., during his Army tour before receiving the doctorate degree from Kansas State University in 1958.

His wife, Norma, is also a chemist.

The Faith of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Newsweek, March 4, 1963:

THE FAITH OF THE FBI

(By Raymond Moley)

As J. Edgar Hoover is completing four decades of service as chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it might be suggested that the letters FBI could stand for fidelity, bravery, and intelligence. For scores of FBI men in fierce and sometimes bloody encounters have shown rare courage. And on other occasions the fine intelligence of Hoover's men has outwitted and frustrated the sharpest crooks in the underworld and the elite among alien subversives.

But what most distinguishes the career of J. Edgar Hoover is his fidelity to the limited function of his organization and to constitutional restrictions. Americans should remind themselves from time to time that the FBI is largely an investigative agency. It does not prosecute. It does not judge. It finds the facts and submits them to agencies responsible for doing something about them. The FBI lets facts speak for themselves.

This concentration of function has marked J. Edgar Hoover as more than a super detective, more than an uncommonly capable executive, more than a protector of American security against alien enemies. He has the essential qualities of a statesman. For true statesmanship is found in an individual who when in power understands the limitations within which that power should be prudently used. He can live with power without succumbing to its narcotic effect.

NO POLITICS

In a government where the expansion of authority and the growth of the establishment are the rule, the FBI has provided a luminous expectation, its size has grown to 16,000 employees, but every addition has been made in response to congressional action on urgent problems.

On many occasions Hoover has been asked to step beyond the limits of his assigned duties and literally take over functions of a State or county prosecutor or police force. Often this demand has been accompanied by great political pressure. Unusual integrity and discretion have resisted such pressure.

Serving under this sixth President, Hoover has survived 12 Attorneys General. In 1933, when party control in the executive depart-

ment changed, the political nabobs around Roosevelt demanded his job for this or that ambitious police chief of their ilk. Attorney General Cummings asked for time, and after a month demanded and received Presidential authorization to keep Hoover where he had been and where he is now.

LIBERTY PROTECTED

After the sad days of the Department of Justice under Harry Daugherty, Harlan F. Stone was appointed Attorney General in 1924. The bureau in which Hoover was a young subordinate was ridden with politics and encumbered with bureaucratic hacks. Stone offered Hoover the job of rehabilitation. Hoover made a condition of his acceptance that the bureau should be completely divorced from politics, that he should be responsible only to the Attorney General, that appointments should require high standards of merit, and that promotions should be determined only on proven ability.

Stone, never a demonstrative man, said coldly that he would have made the offer only with that in mind. "That's all. Good day."

Hoover transformed the bureau into a "tight ship." He emphasized quality rather than quantity in employing operatives. New procedures were introduced. Fresh methods of operation were determined. Scientific methods built up over the years have had incredible usefulness.

As long as Hoover or the Hoover tradition is on guard, Americans need not fear the perils of a police state. He has said: "The secret of crime eradication lies not in a national police force but in solidarity and the linking of all law-enforcement agencies." He has gained that solidarity, better called cooperation, by never usurping but in helping local, State, and other Federal authorities through mutual respect and trust.

Finally, he and his extraordinary staff have indefatigably guarded the liberties of Americans against the hot blood of overzealous pursuers of alleged wrongdoing. He has kept in mind the old rule that not only must there be guardians, but that someone must guard the guardians.

Health and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, much has been written for and against Federal aid to education and medical care for the aged under social security. It has always seemed to me that much of the argument has been lost in excessive use of words. The average person simply does not have the time to pour over volumes of statements and then try to analyze what has been said.

The following editorial from the Toledo (Ohio) Times has the merit of brevity and, I think, pinpoints the arguments against these controversial subjects. I recommend it for those who have been looking for a brief but highly satisfactory statement of position:

HEALTH AND EDUCATION

The drive for Federal aid to education and medical care for the aged is under way again with the same tired, old argument that the schools and the old folks simply can't get along without it. This so obviously is not the case that it hardly deserves to be dignified by repeated rebuttal. But, we suppose, as long as the administration keeps harping on the theme, it's up to somebody to point the flaws.

Let's take education first. We are told that the public school systems of the land can't cope with the population explosion, that they have exhausted their resources, that unless the Federal Government steps in they are lost.

These are the same generalities that were advanced in the mid-1950's when the population explosion was first detected. What has happened in the meantime? Well, public school enrollment has jumped by a third—from not quite 30 million to more than 40 million—between 1954–55 and the 1962–63 school year. But local spending for public education has almost doubled, from $9.6 billion to an estimated $19 billion. Spending per pupil has gone from $322 a year to $432. Whereas the pupil-teacher ratio was 30 to 1 back in 1955, it is 27 to 1 now.

And these great strides, and continuing progress, have been taken without Federal aid. It is not unlikely that is the very reason they have been taken.

Now for this crying need for Federal medical care. According to the Health Insurance Institute, privately owned hospital, surgical and medical expense policies paid out $19.5 million a day last year, compared to $5.7 million in 1952. The total benefits in 1962, moreover, $7.1 billion, represented an 11.5 percent increase over 1961.

The coverage? According to the institute, by the end of 1962 some 140 million Americans had hospitalization insurance, 130 million had surgical expense policies, 97 million had regular medical insurance, 38 million had major medical insurance and 43.5 million had loss of income policies.

Why should the Federal Government assume a private responsibility that Americans can—and obviously are—meeting? The role of the Federal Government properly is to provide those services that individuals cannot provide. It should stick to that, and leave our private lives to us.

Big Jim's Problem: Always a Bridesmaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Denver Post of February 4, 1963:

BIG JIM'S PROBLEM: ALWAYS A BRIDESMAID

Big Jim Farley, an old stalwart of the Democratic Party of the United States, made a mild nostalgic complaint about his lot on television not long ago, when asked why he had never run for elective office in all his 30 years in national and New York State politics.

Farley noted that he would gladly have run for the U.S. Senate in 1956, except that his Democratic peers in New York did not seem to want him. He also would have run for Governor in 1962 against Nelson Rockefeller, except that Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York, the great panjandrum of New York's democracy, would not permit it.

What Farley has pointed up, in his remarks, is the basic conundrum of American party politics: how does a good man get busy in a party and hope to achieve high office.

Farley's problem, of course, was exacerbated by the fact that he has been around for a very long time, and has thus been able to collect his share of political enemies within his own party.

But the problem is both real and age-old in American politics. Many are the men, from Alexander Hamilton to Robert A. Taft, who were somehow eased out of the electoral picture at the key moments.

Daniel Webster is another of those greats who never achieved the ambition of his life, which was to run for the Presidency. Hundreds of other good and even great men have missed chances at that high office over the years.

Farley's statement might seem to be an indictment of the way party politics are played in the United States, and in a sense it is true that partisan politics puts a premium on "politicking", and luck in the search for high office. But that is no indictment of the system, for if we did not have political parties we would be considerably worse off than we are with the ones we have.

Farley's remark, however, should be a numbing reminder to all of us that luck does play a very important part in the achievement of success in government and even business. Farley has been a most successful man. He was a very successful politician in those days when he manipulated the Democratic Party for Franklin Roosevelt. He left active Democratic politics to go into business, in the Coca-Cola Co., and has enjoyed much success there, too.

But Farley, by 1956, had arrived at a point in political life where too many people could think of too many reasons to oppose him. He need not worry for his place in history, however. It is as secure as that of any of the other great names in the history of politics.

De Gaulle Knows—Do We?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, which appropriately emphasizes the importance of the administration coming forth with some specific approaches toward healing what appears to be a break in Western unity:

DE GAULLE KNOWS—DO WE?

The popular way to view French President De Gaulle these days is as the victim of a great delusion. No question that he is wrapped up in a dream of a great "new Europe," and it probably is a mistaken one. Yet there is some basis for belief that traditional world groupings are breaking up.

The U.S. system of alliances built so laboriously by Secretaries Dulles and Acheson in the postwar period appear to be crumbling. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) is seldom heard of these days, having failed badly to meet the Communist threat in its area. The Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), formerly the Baghdad Pact group, is shot through with holes. Now the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is under threat, with past and current French refusals to provide its support.

Partly this is a result of the supposed lessening threat from the Soviet Union, which is plagued with its own deteriorating al-

liances. Also, it can be attributed partly to the lessening need by the United States for foreign bases, as American intercontinental missile strength grows.

Another factor that is not yet fully weighed but seems likely to cause more changes is what Defense Secretary McNamara calls "mutual deterrence" and others have labeled "mutual invulnerability"—the fact that soon both the United States and U.S.S.R. will be incapable of destroying enough of each other's strategic nuclear forces to prevent retaliatory action. This would remove any existing premium on a "first strike" and create a U.S.-Soviet nuclear stalemate.

So, a realinement of world forces is beginning. And De Gaulle, with his usual long-range view, recognizes this—even though, in U.S. thinking, his reaction to it is wrong and dangerous.

U.S. policy has been, and still is, built on Western unity and on the belief in European gratitude for American defense of their interests. Now De Gaulle has destroyed the latter concept.

The United States must move to repair the breaks in Western unity by whatever means it can. One is the proposed "multilateral nuclear force" plan being rushed upon Europe. Another is the development of new relationships with other European allies, even if De Gaulle will not go along.

Without question, the Western World is at one of the great watersheds of history; De Gaulle has simply given events a shove. The test of U.S. leadership is whether this Nation can develop the proper response to prevent the French scheme of a "third force" from becoming a fact.

In his press conference last week, President Kennedy reiterated his determination to pursue the course of rebuilding the unity of European and Atlantic powers. But he offered no new approaches.

De Gaulle knows where he is going. The question is whether Mr. Kennedy does.

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues, and people throughout the country, are becoming increasingly concerned with the attitude of the Kennedy administration toward public information and the proper functions of news media.

The following article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 24, 1963, is a particularly good expression of that concern.

MANAGED NEWS STILL HAUNTS NEW FRONTIER

(By Robert W. Smith)

The prickly issue of news management apparently is going to be the burr under saddles on the New Frontier for a long time. Chief Wrangler (Jack) Kennedy was braced on the subject again at his press conference this week by a sharp-tongued woman correspondent who asked him what he thought he was doing, scolded him for it, and told him to stop.

In the same conference, the President was asked about U.S. Government-sponsored opinion polls abroad which are being kept secret for policy reasons. His squirming on that hook and the lame excuses he offered—quite as lame as the executive privilege excuse of the Eisenhower news managers—will provoke anew those people who remember what dramatic use Candidate Kennedy made of his predecessor's similar suppression of opinion poll results in the 1960 campaign.

Quite outside the political arena, however, are arising some inappropriate defenders of the administration's philosophy of news, or information, control. In some quarters of the press, apologists have appeared, and in liberal academic circles, which surely should be the last place to harbor defenders of censorship and suppression.

Two defensive agruments are advanced: First, just about everyone, including other Presidents, has done or tried to do the same thing; second, at moments of great national peril it is not only the right but the duty of a government to suppress information whose release might increase that peril.

The first hardly warrants notice. This sort of argument is no more a defense of the Kennedy administration in this instance than it was for Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL last week when he pointed to other Congressmen to excuse his free-spending, frivolous junketing abroad.

The second is a canny gambit, since it concentrates attention on the hours leading up to Mr. Kennedy's Cuban blockade proclamation and ultimatum to the Russians last October 27. And all responsible newsmen admit that there are times when secrecy and surprise are of such importance to national security that suppression of information is altogether right and proper; before the invasion of Europe, for example.

But that merely distracts attention from other spaces of time, weeks or even months, when no valid excuse can be offered for New Frontier efforts to arouse, tranquilize, or otherwise mold public opinion by management of information legitimately in the public domain. One thinks of the weeks before the Cuban crisis came to its eyeball-to-eyeball stage, for example. Or of the postcrisis period when the administration had to be pressured into Secretary of Defense McNamara's reluctant, if effective, appearance at that televised press conference.

The silly business about the opinion polls is more important as an indication of the administration's thinking than for the substance of the polls themselves.

Apparently the point cannot be made often enough to drive home to New Frontiersmen the damage which news management does to the Government's word in the eyes of its citizens. Let the managers look to France for a case in point.

The French radio and television system is government owned, and the De Gaulle government has used it so long and so hamhandedly to manage the information given the French people that today, a recent study reveals, not 1 Frenchman in 10 believes the radio and TV news. Almost a third of all Frenchmen get their news via Radio Luxembourg or Europe No. 1 (TV).

That's a fair sample of what always happens wherever it is forgotten that the press is not an official instrument but a tool of the people for persistently prying information out of always-reluctant governments.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the 45th anniversary of the founding of the independent Republic of Lithuania. This heroic people was first formed into a nation 710 years ago. In the long history of Lithuania, the succession of tyrants from both East and West which she has endured has only fanned her desire for liberty. Oppression and brutality have been their almost daily companions. So has their love of freedom and their readiness to die in its defense. Lithuania stands as an inspiring example to all of us who are charged with leading the fight for freedom. It is fitting that we salute her and give her our assurances that we have not forgotten.

Creative Genius Deserves a Tax Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, our very capable colleague, JOHN S. MONAGAN, of Connecticut, has renewed his legislative effort to provide assistance where it counts most to the Nation's corps of creative geniuses, including actors, artists, writers, painters, athletes and others whose income follows no definite pattern.

The tax reform measure, H.R. 3095, filed by Mr. MONAGAN, and now before the House Ways and Means Committee, will establish a new formula to permit creative artists to average their income over a period of 5 years for tax purposes and those of us who are aware of the inequities now suffered by these victims of uncertain incomes applaud his efforts in this direction. Mr. MONAGAN has had a deep and abiding interest in the arts and he has shared this interest with his charming wife, Rosemary. I am convinced that his efforts are deserving of our support just as I am convinced that creative arts should have the opportunity of balancing off years of meager income with a year of success and plenty in determining tax obligations.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial on the Monagan bill which appeared in the February 5, 1963, edition of the Waterbury, Conn., Republican.

MONAGAN'S TAX BILL

It's high time the U.S. Internal Revenue Service stopped persecuting creativity.

U.S. Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN has filed a tax reform measure (H.R. 3095) in the 88th Congress that strikes a familiar and responsive chord.

Representative MONAGAN and family have always evinced an interest in the arts, and now the Fifth District Congressman is sponsoring legislation which would show that the Federal Government is not exactly hostile to American creativity.

The artists, actors, writers, painters and illustrators who reside in the Fifth Congressional District can offer telling testimony to the plight of creative artists which the Monagan bill would alleviate.

What H.R. 3095 would do would be to provide a tax formula for creators which would correct present inequities. Specifically, the Monagan bill would establish a 5-year period over which a creator could average his income

if in any one year such income exceeded 150 percent of the 5-year average.

Representative MONAGAN's bill should be considered in any comprehensive tax reform program enacted by Congress. While the number of American taxpayers it would affect might be small, the importance it would have in the cultural life of the Nation would be of a magnitude beyond mere numbers.

The Government should take the tax brake off creative artists with fluctuating incomes. In editorials in April 1961 and February 1962 we argued that creators should be given tax considerations at least equal to inventors and oilmen.

This is what happens: A man doesn't turn out novels or plays or landscape paintings like washing machine gears. Frequently a writer will spend 5 years groaning over a novel, years in which he is in no way protected by Federal employment regulations, unemployment benefits, etc. At the end of 5 years, by living on publishers' advances—if lucky—or by sheer material ingenuity, his book gets on the market.

For perhaps 10 months or a year, it sells well and the author enjoys the somewhat rare experience of receiving checks. And then the Internal Revenue Service steps in and wallops him with one of those sky-high percentile brackets because he made a lot of money in 1 year. The fact that the writer had little or no income in the 5 years the book was in gestation, or that he may have a greatly reduced income in the next 5 years or such time that his next work is published, is ignored by current regulations.

One result of this tax attitude, at least for the relatively few prosperous artists, has been to send them scurrying to foreign tax havens. Another has been to place a virtual penalty on prolificacy. A writer or painter, for example, may withhold his works because to sell them all in 1 year would incur a crushing tax burden.

Another approach to this problem which Representative MONAGAN might consider would be to tax incomes from works of art on a capital gains basis instead of as ordinary income. Oil men get a 27 percent depletion allowance and Congress is acrawl with oil industry lobbyists.

A Congressman who supports those who may be right, but have not organized might, stands applauded.

Bobby Kennedy in 1968: The Buildup Has Begun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from U.S. News & World Report of March 4, 1963:

BOBBY KENNEDY IN 1968: THE BUILDUP HAS BEGUN

A prominent playwright, long a personal friend of President Kennedy, now says the machinery is in motion to elect Attorney General Robert Kennedy to the White House in 1968.

Gore Vidal, writing in the March issue of Esquire magazine, assumes John F. Kennedy's second term, then turns to the campaign that will follow, and concludes:

"Bobby will have the support of the Kennedy political machine, easily the most effective in the history of the country. It is slick and up to date; every public-relations angle from comic books to feature-length films will be exploited. Backed by the President and the machine, with an image already floodlit by favorable publicity, one cannot imagine any Democrat seriously opposing Bobby at the 1968 convention."

Mr. Vidal, himself active in politics, has visited President Kennedy a number of times since 1960. Discussing Robert Kennedy's future role, the author says: "The buildup for 1968 has begun. It now follows a familiar pattern."

Mr. Vidal cites Robert Kennedy's books, his world travels, his civil-rights activities, and other elements as factors in a campaign to give him wide appeal.

"There is no doubt," he writes, "that when Bobby goes before the convention in 1968 he will seem beautifully qualified and from the point of view of sheer experience, he will be qualified. But there are flaws in his persona hard to disguise. For one thing, it will take a public relations genius to make his appear lovable. He is not. His obvious characteristics are energy, vindictiveness, and a simple-mindedness about human motives which may yet bring him down. To Bobby the world is black or white. Them and us. He has none of his brother's human ease; or charity."

Politics First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is strange that those who approved constructive criticism when we had a Republican President toe the party line when the President is of the Democratic Party.

Henry J. Taylor, in last Monday's Washington Daily News, discussed just such a situation:

FULBRIGHT AND CUBA

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, fire in his TV eye, tells critics of the Kennedy-Cuba policy not to rock the boat. Riddle: What boat?

The Cuba policy is not a policy, it is a disaster.

Senator FULBRIGHT's current rebuff to inquiring people typifies exactly the kind of speechmaking that has us trapped and allows such manipulated news to function.

It takes advantage of the fact that our public's memory is short. Senator FULBRIGHT's tragic wrongheadedness about Cuba was widely publicized at the time of the Bay of Pigs. How many remember it today?

Whatever we are doing in Cuba is making more leeway than headway in bucking the wind. And any politician in either party who says "Don't rock the boat" as if we were securely meeting this peril is performing a distraction from our drift onto the shoals.

Senator FULBRIGHT's part in all this is sadly typical. Right about the Nazi menace, but never equally right about the Soviet, he has been dead wrong about Cuba from the very beginning.

He opposed any kind of intervention there unless we could waltz in with a group of Latin American states, as if our country could order such a tidy state of affairs. In the absence of "collective security," Senator FULBRIGHT preferred to take his chances on Castro. That is the record.

However, we do not have collective security in Latin America. We have collective insecurity. We are wise to be attached to the princaple, as in NATO. But there is no NATO in Latin America and depending on collective security whenever this involves numerous weak and shaky countries means we flounder into exactly what Senator FULBRIGHT helped to give us in Cuba.

When the Arkansan discovered that even a trickle of intervention was moving toward the Bay of Pigs he, among others, demanded that the White House stop our indispensable part in it, call off the U.S. air cover over the beaches, and back away from even the incredibly fragile plans. Senator FULBRIGHT, who now says, "Don't rock the boat," has much to answer for in this.

He is on record as follows: "I am sure that if American Armed Forces were used unilaterally the reaction elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere would be so severe that we would lose more in other countries than we could gain in Cuba."

How could America conceivably lose more in other countries than we have lost throughout Latin America and by the subsequent Soviet military lodgement 90 miles from our shores?

The whole perilous situation, nevertheless, has been reduced to a well-planned press campaign devised and carried out to achieve a clearly defined psychological end, viz, that all is under control.

Khrushchev is not being fooled. Cuba-based Red subversives in Venezuela, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, etc., are not being fooled.

Our "don't rock the boat" politicians are cooing to the world's most dangerous dove.

Voters and Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as we, the Congress, prepare to act on the appropriation requests of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, we should give deep thought to the expressions contained in a recent editorial of the Newark (N.J.) Evening News. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now place that editorial in the RECORD.

VOTERS AND BUDGETS

Public officials often blame the spiraling cost of Government on public demands for increased service. This claim must be regarded with some reserve in view of what happens annually in New Jersey's school budget elections.

Of 272 budgets submitted in 13 northern and central New Jersey counties, 69 were rejected by the voters. In Bergen County, 17 out of 66 went down; in Morris, 14 out of 38. Voters set a Middlesex record with nine rejections. Seven were vetoed in Passaic. In some municipalities such a thing had never happened before.

These disapproving voters are not enemies of education. They want their children to have good schools. But they have to earn the money paid out in taxes for school support and they are not being unreasonable

when they demand a dollars' worth of education for their tax dollar. In fact, when the rejected budgets are properly trimmed they almost always pass when resubmitted.

New Jersey taxpayers appear to be less tolerant of uninterrupted rises in government costs than some public officials think. Their prudent approach to school budgets inspires interesting speculation about what would happen to a lot of municipal budgets—the State budget, too—if they had to be submitted to referendum.

And maybe they ought to be.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial, plus the actions of New Jersey voters, inspires me to ask: What would happen if our ever-mounting Federal budgets were submitted directly to the voters for approval or rejection?

The 15th Anniversary of the Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 24th was the 15th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia. The wretchedness of life under the Red regime needs no particular review at this time. It is well known, and Czechoslovakia is not alone among the nations of the world who suffer life under communism. She is but one of a tragic list of oppressed nations, all of which stand as cruel illustrations of the harshness, moral bankruptcy, and utter inability of the Communist system to meet the economic or spiritual needs of mankind.

An example of the complete callousness of the Red regime in Prague is its current practice of extorting American dollars from American citizens who have relatives in Czechoslovakia. This is a practice which Members of Congress should know about and which, in my opinion, our Government should stop.

Because of the economic misery in Czechoslovakia, American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. The Communists are making this impossible, however, by placing an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty on used clothing.

The purpose is to extort dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy relatives and friends, they must send dollars with which Czechoslovakian citizens can buy Czechoslovakian goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

Through this process, the Red regime accumulates dollars which it uses to spread anti-American propaganda and to promote subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world.

Our balance-of-payments problems are so severe that we restrict the amount of goods our own citizens can bring back duty free. It is folly, Mr. Speaker, to tolerate this open leak of dollars, which not only further weakens the international position of the dollar, but directly fills the coffers of our enemies. Let us put a stop to this either by sending the direct transfer of American dollars to the Communist regimes or by insisting that gift packages of American goods be allowed to go directly to needy citizens of those countries.

U.S. Orchestra Players Sing an Unhappy Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th Congress, the Select Subcommittee on Education, of which I was the chairman, conducted investigative hearings into the economic conditions in the performing arts. We undertook the investigation under authority of a resolution sponsored by our colleague, the Honorable ROBERT N. GIAIMO.

We found that the future of fine arts in the United States is in great danger because of the necessity for performers to earn a living. The economic conditions are concisely summarized in an article by Paul Affelder in the National Observer for January 28 of this year. This article has just been brought to my attention, and I include it as a part of my remarks:

UNDERPAID PIPERS—U.S. ORCHESTRA PLAYERS SING AN UNHAPPY SONG

In Philadelphia, union musicians and Philadelphia Orchestra officials haggled over the date when contract talks for next season should begin. The dispute led to cancellation of a 5-week Latin American tour; set for last summer.

In Fort Wayne, Ind., union musicians boycotted the Fort Wayne Philharmonic's first four concerts of the season, on grounds they wouldn't play with non-union members. With the issue settled, the union players are slated to return to the orchestra this week.

In Chicago cancellation of the Chicago Symphony's 1962–63 season was narrowly averted last fall (it was announced then rescinded) when union musicians staged a concerted campaign for higher pay.

These recent developments underscore what musical observers have known for some time: American musicians, long unhappy with their financial lot, are becoming restless.

Sometimes their restlessness has become a major issue.. A year before the Chicago dispute, for instance, the Metropolitan Opera canceled its 1961–62 season in the midst of a musicians' pay wrangle, then reset it when the issue was settled.

At about the same time, a strike by members of the Philadelphia Orchestra caused its season to begin 2 weeks late, and a similar walkout by the New York Philharmonic's musicians brought a week's interruption in its concerts.

THEY OPERATE AT A LOSS

In each of these disputes, the musicians received more money—but not as much as they'd asked. This wasn't a matter of niggardliness, but of two hard facts in American music making: Nearly all symphony orchestras and opera companies operate at a loss, and the musicians who play in them are underpaid compared with many other lines of work.

Orchestral balance sheets are frightening things. Salaries to artists and other personnel, rental of auditoriums, fees for performances of modern compositions, and many other expenses far outweigh income from ticket sales. Tickets, in fact, seldom account for more than 50 percent of maintenance costs—and never balance them, even with consistently full houses.

Take the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, for example. Last year its total receipts (all but about $30,000 of them from ticket sales) were $452,291. This figure didn't cover even the $480,235 the orchestra spent on salaries for musicians and conductors, plus fees for guest artists and new music. On top of that outlay were expenses for such items as rent, office salaries, and advertising, making a total expenditure of $786,147.

WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM

The upshot is that Minneapolis, like most of the Nation's orchestras, must make up its resulting $333,856 deficit from sources like special events, donations from the general public, income from endowment funds, or subsidies from cities, counties, or States. Subsidies, while growing, still are small: The largest reported in a recent survey were $130,000 annual grants to the orchestras of Baltimore and Buffalo.

This obviously puts a crimp in the amount of money available to pay musicians. The most pertinent statistics have been compiled by the American Symphony Orchestra League, which surveys conditions in the country's 1,200-odd orchestras. Approximately one-third of these orchestras are in cities with less than 50,000 population.

Exclusive of college groups, the league breaks down the Nation's orchestras into three categories—"community," "metropolitan," and "major."

The average musician in a community orchestra—there are 900 such groups, operating on annual budgets of less than $100,000—is an amateur. But a few key positions are held by professionals. It's estimated that some 6,600 professionals play in such orchestras—about 12 percent of the orchestral total membership—and receive an average $300 a year.

THE PLAYERS' BACKGROUND

These professionals obviously depend on other employment for their principal income, though many would be full-time musicians if they could earn a living in the field. Many of them are music teachers. Their backgrounds are varied: Some are young, beginning players; others are former full-time players who gave up full-time performing for financial reasons; still others prepared for music as a career but never pursued it.

The metropolitan orchestras don't pay too much better. There are 21 of them, operating on annual budgets between $100,000 and $250,000. They're in larger cities than the community orchestras—places like New Haven, Omaha, Providence, San Diego, and Honolulu—and play longer seasons and more ambitious programs.

"We estimate," says Orchestra League Executive Secretary Helen M. Thompson, "that among the 1,800 musicians playing in the 21 metropolitan orchestras, there are at least 1,400 who are qualified and seek to earn their main income from the performance of music. On the average, they receive about $1,000 a year in playing fees in the metropolitan orchestras."

Finally, there are 26 major American orchestras. They function on more-or-less full time, pay their musicians on a weekly

basis under contract, and operate with budgets ranging from $250,000 to more than $2 million. Their players' average annual salary during the 1961–62 season: $4,512, ranging from $1,200 to over $15,000 for a few top players.

THE CONTRASTS IN PAY

By contrast, the National Education Association says the current national average pay for teachers is $5,275. The national average salary for factory workers in the durable goods industries also is above $5,200.

A couple of examples help illustrate the musicians' plaint. The average member of the Minneapolis Symphony, for instance, takes home $161 weekly over a 30-week season, plus about $300 a year in recording fees. For this he gives three concerts a week and takes part in five rehearsals. In addition, of course, he devotes a number of hours to individual practice. Most players earn additional money by private teaching, and turn to nonmusical occupations during the summer.

Members of the orchestral big four—the Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia Orchestras, and the New York Philharmonic—do considerably better. The Chicago Symphony's average player, for instance, makes an average $245 weekly over a 33-week season, which includes a week's vacation. (The season will increase to 40 weeks in 1964–65, together with a small pay boost.) He also is paid for a 7-week summer season.

The Nation's most enviable pay, from the musician's standpoint, is Boston's. In the Boston Symphony the average weekly salary is around $235 for a 49-week season, winter and summer, and is augmented by around $1,000 in annual recording fees. Performers also have a pension plan, life insurance, and other extras.

The players don't have to do outside work, says orchestra manager Thomas D. Perry, Jr., "since the minimum salary is somewhat over $8,500 and with extras runs to $10,000, more or less. Of course, it is correspondingly more for 80 percent of the players who are paid above the minimum."

For most orchestral musicians, however, the Boston situation is little more than a dream. Says Joseph Levine, conductor of the Omaha Symphony Orchestra, in a recent issue of Music Journal magazine: "The music profession holds out a bleak prospect to the budding musician of tomorrow.

"The very, very few, the geniuses, will hit the big time and as America's favorites, the winners, will be offered rich rewards. The rest will fit into a backdrop of discouragement and frustration in a society which treats them with indifference, and often contempt."

PAUL AFFELDER.

Alabama Honors Mother Annunciata Janeway, O.S.B.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the education of America's youth to meet the great demands of the space age is the most challenging task facing our Nation today, particularly in view of the incessant pressure by the Sino-Soviet system to impose its tyrannical form of government upon the free peoples of the world.

For this reason, it is a great pleasure for me to join in the salute and the recent tribute paid to a magnificent educator in the State of Alabama, Mother Annunciata Janeway, O.S.B. For her 68 years' service of teaching students at Sacred Heart College in Cullman, Ala., Mother Annunciata Janeway last month was presented a citation of appreciation from the then Governor John Patterson, of Alabama. Mayor W. R. Griffin, of Cullman, also presented this wonderful nun, who at 84 is still teaching Latin at Sacred Heart, with a citation for her great service to the education of our young people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD, first, the news story about the ceremony in honor of Mother Annunciata, followed by the citations from Governor Patterson and Mayor Griffin, and Mother Annunciata's response on receiving this tribute.

The copy follows:

GOVERNOR HONORS MOTHER ANNUNCIATA

A citation of appreciation for her more than 68 years' service as a teacher to the students of Alabama, was presented to Mother Annunciata Janeway, O.S.B., in behalf of Gov. John Patterson Monday morning. It is believed that her teaching record has rarely if ever been equalled in the history of American education.

Before the combined student bodies of Sacred Heart College and Sacred Heart Academy, civic dignitaries, Benedictine Sisters, college officials, religious leaders, including Rt. Rev. Abbot Bede Luibel, O.S.B., and members of the faculties of both institutions, Mother Annunciata was presented the Governor's citation of appreciation from Mr. James Berry, president of the Cullman City Council.

The tiny nun, nearing 85 and still teaching Latin at the college, was escorted to the college auditorium stage by Sister Mary Lourdes Michel, O.S.B., dean of the college, and Miss Mary Agnes Davidson, of Doraville, Ga., and president of the student body. A thundering ovation greeted Mother Annunciata as she took her place on the stage and again after she accepted the citation from Councilman Berry.

The invocation was given by Rt. Rev. Abbot Bede Luibel, O.S.B., of St. Bernard Abbey and representing St. Bernard College.

A huge bouquet of red roses was presented on behalf of the combined student bodies by Miss Davidson, followed by words of appreciation from prominent Cullman civic leaders.

Mr. Charles Bond, who introduced the guests, read an official letter of commendation and appreciation from Mayor William R. Griffin, of Cullman, and presented it to the honoree.

Mrs. Henry F. Arnold, copublisher of the Cullman Tribune and prominent clubwoman and civic leader, congratulated Mother Annunciata on her years of service remarking that "the city's oldest business firm congratulates you." Mr. Mark Miller, editor of the Daily Times-Democrat, offered congratulations and best wishes in behalf of his newspaper and wished her many more years of continued success.

Mr. Edgar Turner represented the Board of Education of the Cullman Public Schools citing Mother Annunciata's many years of service to the city and to education and of her selfless devotion to the ideals and advancement of education. Mrs. Lee Hesterley, supervisor of instruction for the Cullman County school system, pointed out the contribution of Sacred Heart College, the sisters, and of Mother Annunciata in particular, for their role in educating a large percentage of the teachers in the Cullman County school system and praised her for her untiring efforts.

Mr. H. M. Hulgan, district manager of Liberty National Life Insurance Co., and a member of the board of the Chamber of Commerce of Cullman County, extended best wishes and congratulations on behalf of chamber of commerce members.

Mother Mary Susan Sevier, O.S.B., president of the college, welcomed all visiting dignitaries for the happy occasion and expressed her deep love and appreciation to Mother Annunciata and of the great love, admiration, and devotion of all of the members of the Community for Mother.

Sister Mary Lourdes Michel, dean of the college, expressed her appreciation for the tireless efforts of Mother Annunciata and read a brief poem entitled "Ode To An Aged Nun."

Also on the platform for the occasion were Sister Martina Schaeffers, O.S.B., principal of Sacred Heart Academy, and Rev. Gerald Bray, O.S.B., chaplain for the college.

A reception for the guests was held in the college dining hall and was presided over by the college president, Mother Mary Susan. She was assisted by Sister Scholastica Warkman, O.S.B.

CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA, OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Whereas teaching is one of the noblest professions and certainly one of the most courageous and dedicated teachers in Alabama is Mother Mary Annunciata Janeway, O.S.B., of Sacred Heart Junior College, in Cullman, of which she was first president; and

Whereas Mother Janeway is now in her 68th year as a schoolteacher—a record of service rarely if ever before equaled; and

Whereas she has taught continuously since the fall of 1894, when she moved from her home in Pennsylvania to San Antonio, Fla., and passed the Florida State teachers' examination at the age of 15; and

Whereas because of the great need for teachers, she continued her school duties after joining the Benedictine Order of Sisters and during her postulancy and novitiate training; and

Whereas after serving as principal and only teacher of a one-room Florida school—reached daily by horse and buggy—she moved to Alabama in 1898, teaching at Catholic schools at Tuscumbia, Sheffield, Birmingham, and Cullman; and

Whereas in 1920 Mother Janeway became principal of Sacred Heart Academy at Cullman and in 1940 she founded Sacred Heart College, a 2-year women's college, and although there was only 11 students the first year, the college now has more than 200 students, 26 faculty members, a 202-acre campus including its own Lake Maurus and 7 large buildings, the latest of which is a modern women's dormitory, Janeway Hall; and

Whereas Mother Janeway, who holds an A.B. degree from the University of Notre Dame where she has also done graduate work, has worked constantly to build Sacred Heart College and still teaches Latin; and

Whereas she believes education to be "the highest possible culture of intellect, heart and will," and although she will soon be 84, Mother Janeway remains active in the cause of education: "I shall never retire while there is work to be done and God gives me the strength to do for others": Now, therefore,

I, John Patterson, Governor of Alabama, do hereby award this certificate of appreciation to Mother Annunciata Janeway for her

steadfast devotion to the teaching profession, for her interest and concern for our youth, and for her consistent efforts to make ours a better State in which to live and work.

[SEAL] JOHN PATTERSON,
Governor.

Attest:

BETTYE FRINK,
Secretary of State.

CULLMAN, ALA.,
January 14, 1963.

In recognition of the outstanding service to the community, to the city of Cullman, and to Sacred Heart Junior College, the city of Cullman hereby pays tribute to Mother Annunciata Janeway and expresses the thanks and best wishes to her for her many years of service to the youth she has served.

May her devotion to her chosen field of education and religion be a challenge to those who follow in her footsteps. Her loyalty and her friendship to those of us who are acquainted with her means so much to us, and we cherish that friendship.

Her many years of devotion to Sacred Heart Junior College has been a great incentive to all of us, and it is with genuine pride that we recognize her many talents on this day.

Most sincerely,

WM. R. GRIFFIN,
Mayor.

MOTHER ANNUNCIATA'S RESPONSE

This great honor and recognition on the part of the Honorable John Patterson, Governor of Alabama, is accepted not only for myself, but also for my community and for our institutions. Personally or individually, I have done nothing worthy of special attention. The efforts of all our dedicated Sisters are directed toward the same goal, an eternal purpose—that is, educate the young to lead good and useful lives here on earth and thus be made worthy to enjoy an eternal life with God.

The kindness and goodness of our retiring Governor, John Patterson, by showing appreciation of the work of an aged nun, are sincerely appreciated by all of us, united in the same lifework.

Let us join the multitudes who today are thanking John Patterson for the services to our State. At the same time we wish him for the future, success in further endeavors and well-earned leisure. His name will go down today in our archives as one of the memorable men of our Southland.

My thanks to you also, Mr. James Berry, for your part in delivering this citation.

The Free World's Power Vacuum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, there is one inescapable factor exerting pressure on every instrument of our seapower. That is the relatively unnoticed total wet war which we must wage concurrently with the highly publicized cold war and our competition with the Soviet Union in missiles and the race to the moon. The wet war involves every element of the use of the seas—naval power, merchant marine, oceanographic research, and the fishing industry.

The Soviets fully recognize the importance of the sea—both to the free world and to the Communist bloc. Soviet seapower is modern and it is growing. They have a large fleet of cruisers and destroyers, most of which were built since World War II. Their force of over 400 submarines have the mission of fencing us off from our allies. About 100 modern Soviet oceanographic research ships are conducting the most extensive underwater research program in the world. They have almost 900 oceangoing merchant ships and they intend to triple their merchant capacity by 1970. Armadas of automated Soviet fishing vessels can now be seen in fishing grounds all over the world.

It is of prime significance that this nation which occupies the world's largest single land mass should give so much attention to the sea. The total wet war is real. It goes deep into all aspects of seapower. It is a war we cannot afford to lose.

Yet, the U.S. seapower structure is now faced with a serious power vacuum—the Afro-Asian Ocean. Mr. John G. Norris, widely known military writer for the Washington Post, recently discussed this power vacuum in the February issue of Navy, the Magazine of Sea Power. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Norris' important article in the RECORD:

THE WORLD'S POWER VACUUM

(By John G. Norris)

Last November, when Red Chinese troops routed Indian forces in the Himalayas and threatened to pour down into the Assam plains, American warships were dispatched swiftly southwestward through the South China Sea.

The specter of Communist armies sweeping through to the Bay of Bengal had so aroused Washington officials that it was decided to move a powerful task force of the U.S. 7th Fleet into the Indian Ocean.

Before the warships reached the Straits of Malacca, orders from the Pentagon turned them back. The high command had decided it was not needed after all. The American weapons airlift had dramatically demonstrated American support of India and the surprise Peiping cease-fire order followed. Only in a dire emergency could the thinly stretched 7th Fleet take on added responsibilities out of its assigned area.

NAVAL POWER TO FILL VACUUM

The unpublicized 7th Fleet movement is worthy of mention for one major reason. It graphically calls attention to the power vacuum in the Indian Ocean and adjoining areas, as well as to the strategic advantages of putting a permanent U.S. carrier-amphibious task fleet there.

For should China launch a new offensive against India, threatening the entire subcontinent, or should the Sino-Soviet bloc move elsewhere in vast areas where Western military strength has little other reach, American naval power could be a vital factor in containing such aggression.

U.S. seapower, in the past, has proved a trump card in meeting Red expansionist moves, particularly in the peninsulas and offshore islands of the Eurasian Continent. Inchon and Quemoy demonstrated this.

Today the U.S. Navy can react quickly to threats in Western Asia, from Siberia to Thailand, as well as in the Mediterranean and Caribbean. But it might find difficulty in responding to crises in some other potential trouble spots. It strength is limited and should more than one crisis develop at one time, particularly in that half of the world stretching from Singapore to the Congo, there could be serious consequences.

NEW MAPS AND MISSIONS

For American naval power now is concentrated in the Pacific, North Atlantic, Caribbean and Mediterranean, where the United States long has had vital interests.

But there have been major changes in the map of the world since the end of the last great war, in 1945, changes which have produced new military problems and potential commitments for the United States.

They exist largely in what many regular naval officers choose to refer to as the Afro-Asian Ocean. In World War I, the United States had a "one ocean Navy", relying on the Panama Canal to shift warships from the Atlantic to the Pacific as strategy demanded.

In World War II, a "two ocean Navy" was built and has been maintained. It now dominates the areas mentioned above, and is flexible enough to stretch over the globe. But there are power gaps, and many naval officers feel a "three ocean Navy" is needed to meet new challenges imposed in the Indian and South Atlantic—or Afro-Asian—oceans bordering on south Asia, Africa, and south America.

THE AFRO-ASIAN PEOPLE

More than 40 new nations now exist in south Asia and Africa which were ruled from London, Paris, The Hague, and Brussels on V-J Day. Some are a primary source of vital raw materials needed by the West, and many are involved in the cold war, wavering between Communist and democratic influence.

Most of them border on the Afro-Asian Ocean and their population centers are close to the sea. Two-thirds of the capitals of the many political entities which have coastlines along the 10,000-mile stretch from Gibraltar around the Cape of Good Hope to the Gulf of Aden are either seaports or are within 100 miles of the ocean.

For the most part, interior communications are sparse. There are not many good jet airfields and almost no fixed military bases are available to the West in "Black Africa."

The situation is somewhat comparable in south Asia—west of Malaya—although here there is the added factor of potential Communist land invasions of Iran, India, Burma, and other countries. Britain still maintains bases in Aden and Singapore, but nothing in the intervening nearly 4,000 miles.

THE ROLE FOR SEAPOWER

All this indicates clearly the important role that seapower could play in future crises in Africa and south Asia. Any Communist move into the peninsulas of south Asia would present Russia or China with the classic disadvantages of a landpower fighting a superior seapower. And the Soviet could reach trouble spots in Africa only with airpower.

U.S. land-based airpower, including airlift, could be very important in meeting any threat in the vast Afro-Asia area, but the shortage of Western military bases there presents logistics problems of great magnitude.

For example, the highly publicized American weapons airlift last fall accounted for only 10 percent of the military equipment delivered to the hard-pressed Indians. The other 90 percent of the tonnage of ammunition, weapons, and other material was moved to India from the United States by sea.

Supplying any American military operations in the area would involve vast supplies

of petroleum, ammunition, and other materials moved by sea. American aircraft carrier and Marine amphibious forces would be prominently in the forefront in such a situation.

NOT MUCH ON STATION

What has the U.S. Navy available in the area?

First, there is the Middle East Force, consisting of a seaplane tender and two destroyers, which shows the flag largely in the Red Sea. It is hardly an impressive demonstration of American armed might. Then, there are annual tours by a small squadron of Navy ships to African ports—another show-the-flag effort.

The 7th Fleet, of course, is a mighty armada of 125 ships and 650 planes, built around 3 attack aircraft carrier task forces, an amphibious force and an antisubmarine carrier hunter-killer unit. Three U.S. Army and one Marine Corps division, a Marine air wing, and powerful U.S. Air Force wings on well-supplied Pacific island or continental bases give real substance to American armed might facing Russia and China.

But the threat—from embattled Vietnam to North Korea, which reportedly is bolstering its armed forces—is such that the 7th Fleet cannot take on a huge additional area beyond southeast Asia.

In the Mediterranean is the 6th Fleet of some 50 ships and 200 planes, built around 2 attack aircraft carriers and an embarked Marine battalion landing team. It, too, is barely sufficient for the task assigned. Furthermore, in case of war in the Indian Ocean, the Suez Canal might be closed by Egypt and in any case it is not wide enough to pass the big new American carriers.

SPREAD THINNER AND THINNER

Should American warships be needed in the Afro-Asian Ocean, calls would be made upon the 1st and 2d Fleets in home waters. But periodic peacetime operations, like the Dominic atomic tests or Mercury astronaut operations, have tied up almost every available Navy destroyer and other ships. During the Cuban crisis, ships were pulled out of yard overhaul to go to sea.

All this means that Navy admirals, while fully recognizing the need for an Indian and South Atlantic Fleet to protect vital American interests in those newly important areas, feel strongly that it cannot be done today without a major expansion of the U.S. Fleet.

The practical, political prospects of getting administration and congressional approval for the kind of increase in the fleet needed is so unlikely that few speak out for it. The Navy hasn't been able to get a big enough shipbuilding appropriation—despite additions in the past 2 years—to replace the present obsolescent fleet, much less make a pitch for a substantial increase.

For an Afro-Asian fleet would total some 27 ships. It should have at least one attack aircraft carrier, under Navy thinking, plus an antisubmarine carrier, a Marine battalion landing team and amphibious force, and supporting destroyers and logistics vessels. To maintain this size fleet on station would require perhaps 75 ships, allowing for rotation, overhaul, etc. They would cost about $1.5 billion to build and about $500 million a year to man and maintain.

While this is a present barrier to the proposal, many naval officers are convinced that such a fleet is not only necessary, but will be approved and established in time.

Jewish Memorial Hospital's Response to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Jewish Memorial Hospital of New York City on the magnificent way in which the hospital responded to the terrible emergency resulting from the boiler explosion at the New York Telephone Co. Inwood office in my district last October. The tragedy of the disaster would have been infinitely worse had it not been for the quick and selfless response of Jewish Memorial's administration and staff.

The following account by Louis Miller, director of the hospital, which appeared in the November 1962 issue of Modern Hospital describes the help extended by Jewish Memorial to 69 of the accident victims:

BOILER EXPLODES DISASTER PLAN INTO ACTION

(By Louis Miller)

The first anybody at Jewish Memorial Hospital, New York, knew about the boiler explosion at the New York Telephone Co. on October 3 was when a police officer rushed into the lobby shortly after noon asking for doctors to come to the telephone company to care for the injured.

It happened that I had just stepped into the lobby when the officer arrived; I called our chief resident and had three house staff physicians sent to the disaster scene in the police car.

From that point on, the disaster plan which had been worked out on paper at Jewish Memorial Hospital early in World War II swept into action.

Immediately behind the first police car came another, this one bringing two badly burned women. They were sent to the emergency room by elevator, instead of being driven around to the emergency entrance.

The first order of business was to call the director of surgery, inform him of the accident, and ask him to take charge of setting up the medical services. We proceeded to the emergency room together and, within 30 minutes, more than 40 patients were brought in by ambulance or car. The hospital telephone operator called the offices of all members of the surgical staff. Some were in the building and came to the emergency room for orders.

While this was going on, members of the administrative staff set up the eighth floor solarium with civil defense cots, emergency beds, stretchers, and all the mattresses in our mattress room. Within 15 minutes we were prepared to care for 50 patients, and within half an hour, 40 physicians were in the house and had been assigned their duties by the director of surgery.

The hematology, blood bank, and laboratory staffs were immediately available. The laboratory set up its unit in the recovery room where all typing and crossmatching were promptly done. The use of disposable syringes and needles made it much easier to do the injections.

The Presbyterian Hospital Medical Center sent a team of doctors, headed by a member of the surgical staff and emergency service, to help us if we needed it. They brought blood and plasma with them, but we were well supplied with both blood and plasma from our own blood bank.

The recovery room was cleared of all surgical cases, who were sent to their own beds, and the room was made available for the more seriously injured explosion victims.

Four surgical teams were assigned to various areas—the emergency room, solarium, operating room, and recovery room. All nurses who could be spared from their floor duties were sent to the various areas, and all employees on duty—social service, maintenance, housekeeping, laundry—assisted in getting patients to the areas assigned to them by the director. One elevator was taken off general service and plied between the basement and the seventh and eighth floors to transport patients. Equipment and supplies, linens, blankets, drugs, and surgical supplies were dispatched by a third elevator.

Every employee acted as though this were a common occurrence as each one did the task given him by the head of the team assigned to that unit. The director of surgery remained at the emergency room entrance to make immediate decisions as to where each patient was to go, using a lipstick to mark the patients' foreheads with the unit to which they were to be taken. Within an hour, 69 patients were brought in and were given immediate attention.

The absence of hysteria in such a situation is almost unbelievable. However, there was none, and I attribute this mostly to the fact that each patient was seen immediately and taken by one of our employees to the area assigned.

The solarium was used for minute examinations, cleaning of traumatized areas, and suturing cuts.

All patients received injections against infection and those who were thus treated were seated in the roofgarden adjoining the solarium where all identification and records were prepared. The badly burned cases were sent to the operating room or recovery room immediately, and all burn cases were assigned to one team. Other badly injured patients were brought to the recovery room where two teams were working.

One of the most important aspects of the treatment of an accident such as this is the presence of social workers to assist in caring for the patients' needs in relation to their family problems. Wherever possible, all patients were put in rooms together—for psychological reasons as well as to facilitate their treatment.

The dietary department provided coffee, tea, and milk, which was served while examinations were being done. The X-ray department brought the portable X-ray machine to the solarium where most of the patients were being examined; 134 X-ray films were used during the examining period.

Because this accident occurred during the Jewish holy week, we were fortunate to have some vacant beds; our occupancy for medical and surgical cases is usually about 95 percent.

Normally most of the patients admitted would of necessity have to be transferred to other institutions, which were ready and standing by. However, we managed to admit 21 patients, including 3 in the recovery

room who could not be moved owing to their many injuries. Several of these patients later had surgery and were returned to the recovery room.

The director of psychiatry was brought in to see several patients; he also quietly examined all patients who were admitted and found that 50 percent needed treatment for various reasons. Psychiatric treatment was therefore ordered for all patients by the director of surgery.

As a result of the large percentage of patients needing psychiatric treatment, it was decided to have a complete survey by the psychiatric service of all patients admitted, treated and sent home. This survey is now being put into motion and all patients not admitted are being brought back to be observed by the psychiatrists.

Support for Truth in Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 702, the truth-in-lending bill, to require the full disclosure of credit charges. The following resolution supporting this proposal was recently adopted by the Credit Union National Association, Inc.:

CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: Below is a resolution of thanks passed by the executive committee of the Credit Union National Association in appreciation for your support of truth-in-lending legislation. The Credit Union National Association will do all that is possible to help in this legislative effort.

"Whereas Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of the U.S. House of Representatives on January 9, 1963, introduced a bill to require the full disclosure of financial charges in connection with the extension of credit, this legislation commonly known as the truth-in-lending bill; and

"Whereas similar legislation has also been introduced in the U.S. Senate; and

"Whereas the credit union movement has always insisted that the users of credit are entitled as a matter of right to know all of the charges for the money they borrow; and

"Whereas the consumer credit field today presents a hopelessly bewildering picture as a result of the lack of uniformity in the methods of quoting interest rates by various lenders: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the executive committee of the Credit Union National Association, meeting in Washington, D.C., February 8, 1963,* That the Credit Union National Association, in behalf of the 21,000 credit unions in the United States and over 13 million members, express its warm appreciation to Mr. MULTER and his colleagues in the House and Senate for their introduction of truth-in-lending legislation and for their selfless efforts to bring reason and light to the consumer lending field; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Credit Union National Association pledge its full support to secure enactment of a truth-in-lending bill and urge each of its member leagues to do likewise."

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM A. DASH,
Director, Washington Office.

Rear Adm. R. K. James, U.S. Navy, Earns Nation's Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Navy's Chief of its Bureau of Ships occupies one of the most responsible positions in the Government of the United States. No matter how great the skill and how high the courage of the men who man the ships of the U.S. Navy, unless those ships are the most modern, advanced, and efficient we can build, and unless their state of materiel readiness is at all times maintained efficiently, our Nation cannot keep vital control of the seas.

As Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Rear Adm. R. K. James, U.S. Navy, has brilliantly executed the responsibility to provide and maintain such a fleet. He has done so under difficult circumstances. Funding has been a constant problem. The underway time of the fleet due to emergency situations in Cuba, the Far East, and elsewhere has complicated the situation. The sheer magnitude and cost of swiftly developing technologies in naval warfare have presented Admiral James with difficulties never before faced so acutely by his predecessors. Indeed, the Nation does owe a deep debt of gratitude to this dedicated naval officer for his magnificent contributions to the defense and security of the United States of America.

Recognition of Admiral James' accomplishment recently has been noted in the Long Beach Press-Telegram newspaper in the form of the following article by Columnist Virginia Kelly:

ADMIRAL JAMES WORLD'S MOST POWERFUL SHIP MAGNATE

(By Virginia Kelly)

(NOTE.—Admiral James commanded the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, 1955–58.)

In the continuing crisis with Cuba, the U.S. Navy is playing a complex and important role. Vital to the Navy's remarkable performance are her surface and underwater ships which must be constructed for safety, performance, the latest scientific advances, and for economy of operation and building.

In this connotation, Rear Adm. Ralph K. "Jimmy" James, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, might be described as the world's most powerful shipping magnate.

He is directly responsible for the administration and execution of a combined annual budget which totaled $4.5 billion in 1963.

As Chief of the Bureau of Ships, he administers not only the 3,500-man installation in Washington but all of the Navy's 115,000-man shipbuilding industrial complex.

Admiral James is charged with scheduling, supervising, and administering ship design, research, construction, and repair of naval ships in the United States and overseas, including nuclear and conventional powered ships. The Navy's annual ship construction and conversion program of 50 ships and repair of up to 1,000 ships is only a part of Admiral James' responsibility.

His duty includes policy direction and administration of 11 major naval shipyards, 4 overseas small shipyards, 7 independent ship research and development laboratories, and 15 Navy shipbuilding supervisors in private yards which build naval ships.

He initiated a ship cost-reduction program which effectively reduced operating costs of more than $250 million in 3 years.

Americans know that Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, as assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion; and Manager of Naval Reactors, Division of Reactors of the Atomic Energy Commission, has played an important role in developing nuclear propulsion. Few Americans know, however, that the Navy Bureau of Ships, its present Chief, Admiral James, and his predecessors are responsible for the missiles, hull arrangements, and complex machinery of nuclear submarines and other nuclear ships.

During Admiral James' tenure the sonar capabilities of both Polaris and attack submarines have been greatly improved.

Navigational precision of high order has been achieved in the Navy's late submarines. A scientific accomplishment of magnitude is the missile system of the Polaris submarines developed by the Special Projects Office in the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Thirty-five Polaris submarines have been authorized. Seventeen have been launched, and ten are in operation.

The newest class of Polaris submarines are of 7,000 tons, comparable in size to World War II cruisers.

The Bureau of Ships has completed 35 guided missile ships now deployed in the fleet. In addition to the nuclear-powered submarines, the nuclear-powered surface ships, the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach*, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, and the guided missile frigate *Bainbridge* have joined the fleet.

Proposed Merger of Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned about the impact the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central Railroad will have on many of my constituents.

Though only one of those railroads, the Pennsylvania, operates in Maryland, I have reservations regarding the monopoly implications of this proposed merger. Railroad freight traffic now routed over other railroads competing with the Pennsylvania system in Maryland may be diverted away from us. To mention just one possible result, a great deal of traffic now passing through our State to the port of Baltimore could be taken away from us.

I am not alone in my concern about the possible adverse effects of this proposed merger. In the city of Cumberland, an important rail and manufacturing center in northwest Maryland, the mayor and city council have adopted a resolution concerning this proposed merger.

The text of their resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF CUMBERLAND

Whereas an application is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission to merge the New York Central Railroad Co. into the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; and

Whereas said application further contemplates that the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Rail-

road Co., which is now controlled by the New York Central Railroad Co., be controlled by the merged company; and

Whereas the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Western Maryland Railway Co., and the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. provide railroad service to the Cumberland area; and

Whereas the railroad service provided by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Western Maryland Railway Co. into the Cumberland area on traffic received from and delivered to the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Co. is far superior to that provided by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. on traffic to and from said railroad; and

Whereas the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Co. interchanges large amounts of freight traffic with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and the Western Maryland Railway Co. in active competition with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; and

Whereas the control of the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Co. by the merged company will result in the diversion to the merged company of such competitive traffic to the detriment of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Western Maryland Railway Co.; and

Whereas such diversion will ultimately deprive industries in the Cumberland area of the superior rail service which they now receive; and

Whereas such diversion will result in a reduction in the number of railroad and industrial employees in the Cumberland area, further aggravating the serious unemployment situation already existing; and

Whereas such diversion will ultimately reduce the value of railroad operating properties for tax assessment purposes and result in a loss of tax revenue to the city of Cumberland, Allegany County and the State of Maryland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the mayor and City Council of Cumberland hereby requests the Interstate Commerce Commission to require, in the event it approves the merger of the New York Central Railroad Co. into the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., that the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Co. remain independent of the merged company in order to prevent the Cumberland area from suffering deterioration of rail service, loss of employment and reduced tax revenue which would result from control of the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Co. by the merged company; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission by Mr. W. L. Wilson, when he appears as witness for the Cumberland Chamber of Commerce in these proceedings, and to such other parties as may appear to have an interest in the matter.

The Berlin Wall Is a Barrier to the Exchange of Ideas, Trade, and People—And the Exclusion of American Poultry From the Common Market Is a Violation of the Principle of Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the exclusion of American poultry products from the Common Market is no less a violation of the principle of free trade than the Berlin wall.

I include herewith for the information of my colleagues an editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal of February 25, and a recent press release of mine on this subject:

DELMARVA BIRDS NEED TO TRAVEL

A major tenet of the European Common Market has been that agriculture in the six nations needs tariff protection if it is to reach its full potential for feeding Western Europe. One of the imports saddled with a stiff duty is poultry. Delmarva broiler growers are therefore unhappy.

After a conference that U.S. Representative McDOWELL and Congressmen from other poultry states had with the President, word came that Mr. Kennedy would see that an American complaint was lodged with the Common Market's Council of Ministers in Brussels.

Negotiations on matters of this kind are important to the Common Market as well as to U.S. agriculture. Those European countries have a stake in trade with the United States. They cannot hope to be so self-sufficient in all important commodities and manufactures that they can risk raising unnecessary barriers against any single import.

Certainly the broiler industry in the Delmarva Peninsula must protest any new action that puts more of a squeeze on profits. Growers cannot well stand the kind of prices—as low as 16 cents a pound live weight—that have been afflicting the industry for a long time here.

In this country, of course, there is the internal trouble of overproduction. You'd think the huge American market would insure profits for the American poultry industry, with all the promotional means at its disposal. But the overproduction in chickens is a hard fact. While it continues, the export of poultry is critically important.

We'll say this for the Delmarva poultry industry: It has taken a stanch position against U.S. artificial controls of production. Since tariffs are another kind of articial control, there is a genuine consistency in the present effort for lowered Common Market tariffs on poultry.

It is not as if European poultrymen can really compete with Delmarva growers. Mr. McDOWELL has told of taking a good look at the kind of birds raised in Europe. They weren't much to look at, running loose around the farmer's yard, the way they used to do in Delaware. On the table they just couldn't compare with a Sussex County bird that goes 3 pounds at 8 or 9 weeks of age.

The point is that Europeans would learn to eat more poultry if they could buy better quality birds.

The farm-raised Senator BOGGS has also voiced concern about the Common Market's poultry tariffs. What does Senator WILLIAMS think about it? As another farm-bred delegate in Washington, as a feed dealer in Millsboro, he has often fought a good fight for the Delmarva poultry industry especially when it comes to purchases by the U.S. Government for the Armed Forces.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., Democrat, of Delaware, in a meeting with President Kennedy at the White House today expressed great concern with the Common Market restrictions designed to exclude U.S. poultry, including Delmarva poultry, from the European market.

Congressman McDOWELL told President Kennedy that: "Any curtailment of our poultry export markets because of trade restrictions imposed by the Common Market will certainly have undesirable effects on the Delaware poultry industry and the Delaware economy in general."

Congressman McDOWELL told President Kennedy: "While our trade representatives now appearing before the European Economic Commission in Brussels are trying to make a case for our poultry industry, our position in this matter should be forcefully set forth so as to insure reasonable access for our agricultural products to the European Common Market area."

Congressman McDOWELL's complete statement follows: "Since August 1962, when nation members of the European Economic Community implemented its common agricultural policy, I have observed with serious concern the effect of this policy on certain U.S. agricultural exports. Our poultry and wheat flour exports have been adversely affected and there will be important impacts therefrom as to our feed grain and rice exports.

"Of immediate concern to me which I emphasized in a meeting with President Kennedy this morning is the restrictive effects of this policy as it relates to the export of Delaware poultry products.

"A new array of import charges and tariffs, applicable only to imports from nonmembers of the Common Market have clearly been unfavorable to the U.S. poultry industry. In West Germany, our major poultry market, the new import charges, even omitting any charges between the invoice and gate price which might be levied, amounts to more than 30 percent ad valorem, as compared with a previous duty of 15.9 percent. Other restrictive policies, including the gate or minimum price arrangements have been equally onerous.

"I explained to President Kennedy that the export market is a valuable market for Delaware and for Delmarva broilers. This export market has been developed despite numerous barriers against U.S. poultry such as import bans, often under the disguise of sanitary or disease control measures, and the restricting of dollars for the purpose of buying U.S. poultry. However, it was my feeling that aggressive promotion by the U.S. poultry industry, and the fact that U.S. poultry is of superior quality, attractively packaged and available at prices often below that of domestic poultry, has made possible a growing export market for the United States.

"In 1955, U.S. exports of poultry meat amounted to only 28 million pounds; this has grown to over 135 million pounds in 1962. Any curtailment of our poultry export markets because of trade restrictions imposed by the Common Market will certainly have undesirable effects on the Delaware poultry industry and the Delaware economy in general.

"While our trade representatives now appearing before the European Economic Commission in Brussels are trying to make a case for our poultry industry, I urged President Kennedy today to have our position in this matter forcefully set forth so as to insure reasonable access for our agricultural products to the European Common Market area.

"The obvious effect of these Common Market restrictions is to exclude U.S. agricultural exports and to preempt unto the Common Market countries themselves as much of the market as they choose despite the competitve position of our products or the uneconomic nature of their domestic production.

"The Common Market, by these proposals, intends to exclude competition and create a captive market rather than expand trade. Through the combination of actions which restrict our current poultry exports, I view this matter as the bellwether which may symbolize other actions by the EEC in the agricultural field.

"The Berlin wall symbolizes the barrier which exists today and which prevents the exchange of free ideas, free trade, and the movement of freemen; a tariff wall among free nations endangers the spirit of Western unity which we have encouraged as the goal of the Common Market. The issue involved

here is one of principle and a reasonable and fair solution must be reached promptly if our relationship with the Common Market is to grow and flourish."

A Day With Their Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a praiseworthy program developed a year ago by the Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., Boy Scout organization, whereby the hardest working Eagle Scout in the county was rewarded with a trip to Washington to spend a day with his Congressman. This was an extension of their town and county scouts in government program to the Federal level, and so far as I know is the first Boy Scout group in the country to develop this program.

It was such an enjoyable and rewarding experience for the young man, Eagle Scout John Weiner, of Huntington, N.Y., and for me, that when I was asked again this year whether I would be willing to take another Eagle Scout under my wing for a day, I looked forward with the greatest of pleasure to his arrival. Two Eagle Scouts, James Boardman, of Aquebogue, N.Y., and Ernest Trubig, of Lindenhurst, N.Y., arrived on February 19 for a day with their respective Representatives.

Into a single day we crowded visits to the Smithsonian, the FBI, the Supreme Court, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, luncheon at the Capitol, and a tour of the House and Senate.

Along the way we squeezed in a quick briefing on how our laws are made, and let our Eagle Scouts absorb as much as they could of the flavor of the Nation's Capital.

Although the boys only expected to have 1 day, their plane was grounded that night and they had to remain in Washington another 24 hours. Their host, Mr. Harry Jones, of the national Boy Scout organization, was able to take them to the luncheon for Astronaut John Glenn given by the Washington Board of Trade, and to the assignment of his famous space capsule to the Smithsonian Institution, and to meet President Kennedy and the President of Venezuela. I think I can safely say that Eagle Scouts James Boardman and Ernest Trubig have had an unforgettable experience, and one that should be made available to the most distinguished Eagle Scout in each congressional district in the years to come.

The concept of a day in Washington with their Congressman for outstanding Eagle Scouts is one I shall continue to foster, and it has already caught the imagination of the national Boy Scout organization. I hope its worth and possibilities will so impress my colleagues in the House that they will want to make similar arrangements with the Boy Scout organization back home, and in 1964 guide an outstanding Eagle Scout through the mazes of the National Government just as the two Members representing Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., had the privilege of doing last week.

National Debt Will Keep Going Up Unless We Cut Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings on increasing the debt ceiling. Regardless of promises by the Kennedy administration to hold the line, regardless of how much we are told we are only voting for a temporary increase, the public debt grows and grows and is a permanent feature of our national life. I am afraid there is no such thing as a temporary increase.

Somewhere, somehow and soon, we must face our responsibility and put an absolute ceiling on the public debt. Of course this will mean an absolute ceiling on Federal spending. Unless we do this soon, we may be too late and our whole economy will collapse under the weight of an unmanageable public debt.

As food for though I would like to include as a part of these remarks a timely editorial by Frank Langston, news analyst of the Dallas Times Herald:

KEEPING THE DEBT WITHIN ITS LIMITS

(By Frank Langston)

Any way you look at it, $308 billion is a lot of money. So is $305 billion, or even $285 billion.

And no matter how big a borrower may be or how good a credit rating he has, that's a lot of money to owe.

Suppose all the money on deposit in all the banks in Dallas County at the end of the holiday season were stacked up in one huge vault somewhere. It would come to $3.12 billion.

Now back to that big debt. It would take all the money on deposit in the banks of 99 more counties—plus all the money on deposit in the banks of 986 more counties just like Dallas—to add up to $308 billion.

And, of course, there just aren't that many counties with that much money on deposit. It would take whatever bigger counties could be found plus a lot of smaller ones to make up the difference.

But who owes any such amount?

Nobody but you and me and the 179 million other Americans.

That $308 billion is the national debt limit.

NEARING LIMIT NOW

The Federal debt is pretty close to that figure right now and prospects are dim for reducing it in the immediate future.

All this adds up to the next big squabble in Washington—starting this week. Before it is over we'll hear a lot about the administration's policies and practices and about living within our means as a nation.

The Kennedy administration's tax woes and spending policies likely will get a thorough going-over as Congress takes up the President's request to continue the national debt limit at the current level.

The debt limit, of course, is the legally established point beyond which the U.S. Treasury is not allowed to issue securities to obtain spending money. The limit now is $308 billion. But it is scheduled to drop back to $305 billion on April 1 and continue declining to $285 billion on July 1.

COULDN'T PAY THE BILLS

The trouble is that even that much debt won't provide enough cash to pay the bills the Federal Government has incurred or will incur under present plans. Those bills are for everything from bombers and missiles and tanks to carbon sheets and paper clips, from aid to Laos and Yugoslavia to fighting forest fires in Idaho.

Conservative Congressmen of both parties, who already have criticized the President's budget proposal and his tax program, are expected to be at least as critical of the debt limit extension plan.

Government officials who have to handle the debt say the figure must be kept at $308 billion for the rest of fiscal 1963, which ends June 30. The reason is that the Government's existing debt and planned spending programs make it impossible to reduce the debt to $285 billion by the end of June. They estimate a debt of about $303.5 billion by then and a $315.6 billion deficit by June 30, 1964.

So Mr. Kennedy has asked an extension of the $308 billion figure, and for 1964 he is expected to ask that it be raised again.

Many Congressmen, mostly conservatives, say they have had their fill of ever-increasing Government spending and budget deficits. And they are prepared to argue vigorously against a debt limit increase.

But will they refuse to grant it? That's the real question.

LOST AFTER HARD FIGHT

They have argued strongly before and in 1962 lost only after a hard fight.

But this year they are unusually sensitive to taxes and spending. The President's tax reduction and reform program would cost the Government $10.3 billion in lost revenues when in full effect and the administration's budget for fiscal 1964 would be $11.9 billion in the red if Congress approves the Kennedy spending program.

Congressmen opposing the extension of the current debt limit contend a lower ceiling will force the administration to cut spending.

Treasury officials say the debt limit won't halt spending and point to past performance.

Whatever Congress decides to spend the Treasury must find funds to cover. If tax revenues are not adequate it must resort to deficit financing if it does not repudiate some debts. If the debt limit prevents borrowing with its own securities, it can obtain money—to some extent and at higher cost—by sale of other Government agency securities.

Meanwhile, though, it's going to be interesting to see how the debt limit fight develops over Federal spending policy.

The 15th Anniversary of Red Coup d' Etat in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago yesterday Czechoslovakia, historical-

ly a nation of freedom-loving people fell under the heels of communism. Just before the coup in Czechoslovakia, the Communist attempted to deceive the free world into believing that these people wanted the new Marxism order.

Not that the pretense is neither necessary nor feasible the Communist International bluntly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the free Republic.

But, despite a decade of Soviet terror, shortages, and enslavement the mass of the Czech people are still bitterly anti-Communist.

In the United States there are many who are from Czechoslovakia who still have ties in the homeland. Together we shall look for the day when Czech people will dispose of the Communists who are keeping them in continuous economic and political slavery.

The spirit of the Czech people may temporarily be damper by the lack of the force that would be necessary to remove these shackles of communism.

But as long as there remains the spark of freedom within the hearts and souls of the Czechs, the day of reckoning is sure to come.

Other nations, such as Poland, Hungary, and East Germany have suffered the same fate as Czechoslovakia. In the hearts of all people who have enjoyed the material and esthetic benefits of the free way of life will remain the hope of and the desire to regain it, probably at the cost of human life. But someday it will be achieved and the spirit of freedom in the souls of the Soviet satellite nations will endeavor overall.

Let us start working toward this ultimate goal by implementing the following recommendations of the Czechoslovakia Society of America:

I. PARITY IN ALL THINGS

Americans should be able to send free gift packages to friends if limited to the personal use of a family. As the U.S. Government permits its citizens to spend in Czechoslovakia, or to send any amount of dollars to Czechoslovakia, the Prague regime should at least permit its citizens to receive small gift packages of American goods.

II. PARITY IN VISITORS

As practically all Americans wishing to visit Czechoslovakia are given an American passport and thousands of them have gone there last year and this year, Czechoslovak relatives should be allowed by their regime to visit American families as guests. Under present conditions, only those Czechoslovaks, handpicked by the Prague regime for special reasons, come to the United States.

III. PARITY AGAIN

For every Czechoslovak film shown here, we ask that an American film appear on the screen in Czechoslovakia, a film showing life in the United States as it really is.

We suggest that a closer check be kept on films brought here by private individuals, intended for public showing, and that the Censors Board include on its staff an adviser with a thorough knowledge of the wiles of communism. Communist propaganda is far too subtle, and it is not enough to know a foreign language. The Czechoslovak National Council of America offers its services gratis in Chicago, New York, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, D.C., Cedar Rapids, etc.

IV. PARITY IN NEWS INFORMATION

Inasmuch as this country permits Communist and proregime newspapers to be published in Czech and Slovak and to be sent to Czechoslovakia as representing American public opinion, and inasmuch as this country also permits neswpapers, magazines, and books from behind the Iron Curtain to be delivered and sold here through various agencies and bookstores, we ask for the same privilege.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, with the help of other organizations of Americans of Czechoslovak descent would launch a magazine drive and send to Czechoslovakia thousands of issues of magazines—other than political, about everyday life in America. The Czechoslovak public is eager for the magazines, and we would supply them gratis.

Resolution by the American Lithuanian Citizens of Norwood, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place into the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the American Lithuanian Citizens of Norwood, Mass., in conjunction with a program commemorating the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

Realizing the interest of many Members in the cause of restoration of freedom for Lithuania and the other captive nations of Europe, I direct particular attention to this resolution, and especially its calling upon the United States to take the lead in strengthening the hopes of the captives of communism for restoration of their freedom.

The resolution follows:

We Lithuanians, citizens of the United States, living in Norwood, Mass., and its vicinity, have gathered today, the 17th of February, 1963, in the St. George Parish Hall to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

Joyfully and with pride we realize the significance of that day for the Lithuanian nation—after such long hardship, suffering, and degradation it finally reached its goal of independence. Again, we grieve that the aggressive neighbor Russia, and its Communist regime, have occupied the land of our fathers and taken all freedom away from our brothers. Imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain, they have no one to whom they can turn for help. They are being destroyed both spiritually and physically not only in their own land but in labor camps in Siberia as well. Lithuanians are without rights, their lives engulfed in hopeless slavery.

We Lithuanians, the brothers and sisters of those who are enslaved, will not desist in our fight for Lithuanian freedom. In the name of truth and right, we call on the conscience of the free world; freedom for Lithuania and all occupied nations.

We rejoice that the President of the United States, in his speech at the opening of the 88th Congress, showed his concern for the ending of old and increasing Red colonization. We are happy that resolutions for a committee to investigate the case of the occupied nations has again arisen in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Together with those who are enslaved, we wait for the time when the colonies under Red imperialism will begin to be liberated. We trust in the fairness of the conscience of the world and of the United Nations, that it will measure all with the same rule, the Red colonies as well as the old.

We have resolved today, to address the Government of the United States of America: (1) to strengthen the hopes of the occupied nations for independence; (2) to ask the President of the United States and the Committee for Free Europe to include programs in the Lithuanian language, and to transmit them to Lithuania; (3) to demand of the United Nations, and of the international conferences, that the Soviet occupation of Lithuania be ended; and the inhabitants be permitted to decide upon their own form of government.

We thank the Government of the United States, the Senate, and the House of Representatives for their support of the morale of the Lithuanian people in their hard struggle for freedom.

WILLIAM KUDIRKA,
Meeting Chairman.
ADAM TUMAS,
Secretary.

Kennedy Recession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the President's tax message of January 24 he stated "my recommendation for early revision of our tax structure is not motivated by any imminent recession." Last Monday, President Kennedy told the American Bankers Association that if the Congress did not vote a tax cut, a recession would be forthcoming.

Where is all this brave talk that Senator Kennedy spouted during the 1960 campaign, about a minimum income of $7,000 for every American family?

It would be well for the President to coordinate with his Secretary of the Treasury who, when he testified before the Committee on Ways and Means, said a tax cut and tax revision would have to be enacted "in one piece."

Perhaps President Kennedy's course in economics at the London School of Economics did not serve him too well. An excellent editorial in yesterday's Washington Daily News is very much in point.

The editorial follows:

J.F.K. AND HIS BUGABOOS

As opposition and differences of opinion over President Kennedy's tax-cut program continue to grow, the President seems to be getting more and more persistent.

He proposed the tax-cut-spend-more idea at first as a supposed means of adding to the pace of economic growth. Now he flatly predicts a recession if he doesn't have his way.

He insisted at first that reforms in the tax laws must go along with any tax reduction. Now he is willing to scrap the reform program.

He now demands those who oppose the tax cut come up with a solution of their own. Many have—cut taxes by reducing spending.

In his discussion of this topic before a symposium of the American Bankers Asso-

ciation, Mr. Kennedy lashed out at heated talk about budget increases, at partisan talk about swollen payrolls, at exasperated talk about bigger deficits, at rash talk about the debt burden.

In his 1964 budget, the President proposes to hike spending $11 billion over 1962 not counting new programs for which no cost estimates have been offered, by $22 billion over 1960. If some taxpayers feel heated about this, it is understandable.

At the end of 1960, just before Mr. Kennedy took office, the executive payroll of the Government was $2.38 million. In his new budget, he proposes to raise this to $2.57 million—a gain of $219,000. If these are partisan figures, they are his.

At the end of the fiscal year in which Mr. Kennedy took office, the deficit was $3.8 billion. The next year, governed entirely by him, the deficit was $6.3 billion. He estimates it will be $8.8 billion by June 30. And he has budgeted for a 1964 deficit of $11.9 billion If this gives rise to exasperated talk it could come from a frustrated sense of budget responsibility

As for rash talk about the debt—look at it. It was $269 billion at the end of World War II. It was $286 billion in 1960. Mr. Kennedy plans a debt of $315.6 billion in another 16 months.

The President concedes general confidence is essential to a thriving economy. He talks of fiscal prudence. Fiscal prudence is a stimulant to confidence. But we have not had it—and it is not in sight.

Our Best Friends Are Mad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the February 2 issue of the Jackson Daily News published a cogent editorial on the record of the current administration, and I include it as a part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

OUR BEST FRIENDS ARE MAD

These United States are more and more finding themselves with a National Government more unique in its history than any since 1776.

Here is an administration determined by its world-publicized pronouncements, its very actions proof positive of meddling in practically every other country's affairs, while its own people suffer by consequence.

Headlines are now proclaiming this country's determination to unify Europe, force social position and civilized stature on savage African tribes, while sending American soldiers and even Peace Corpsmen all over the world to enforce a philosophy of life completely contrary to these heretofore undreamed and unpronounceable areas. There is a frightening comparison to this in what took place in our own State and is still going on through military occupation.

We have seen this proud Nation subjected to blackmail and ransom payments to a despotic Cuban Government because of the miserable mistakes by self-appointed diplomats dealing with an outlaw enemy.

Thousands upon thousands of people are receiving State and Government welfare and surplus commodities simply because they are either too indolent or deliberately too sorry to support themselves or their children.

But for these leeches upon the community, there are many, many good people who cannot qualify under Government standards for a few necessities of life because they have enough self-respect to try and provide a living—meager as it might be—for their families. Many could make ends meet if it were not for income taxes, that go to remote areas of the globe.

As a bitter consequence, their children do without school lunches because they can't afford the quarter for a simple meal and still provide shoes and clothing in order to attend classes with some shred of decency and self-respect.

We find our Government demanding that foreign nations—in most cases unfriendly and contemptuous of us anyway—accept millions of our dollars, our food, and our supplies while our very own people do without.

The philosophy of the Federal Government, aided by promise of minority bloc voting support, intimidated by threat of financial duress through boycott and mass buying resistance, is apparently dedicated to forcing a new social future based on theory and experiment.

Washington's fanatical determination to force race upon race, mix social levels one-with another, dictate through edict and unrestrained executive orders how, where, and under what circumstances free Americans may live and labor, is becoming more and more oppressive to many more areas.

For the first time in many years, this country finds itself with fewer friends among foreign powers, less respect for its national word of honor, and practically no genuine belief in the bland assurances by too-rank officials.

Outright accusations of news manipulation, censorship or complete suppression, are daily occurrences. And in spite of official sources to the contrary, instances continually crop up to prove without doubt, the American public is being fed what the administration wants them to believe, think, and accept. We are losing historic allies such as England, France, and even Canada is mad at us.

Somewhere along this line there must be a reckoning and accounting before black midnight catches us.

Cotton: Two Wongs Don't Make a White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will a subsidy to subsidize sudsidy sufferers be a new program of the Department of Agriture as the SSS—Subsidy Sufferers Service—joins the CCC—Constant Crises in Cotton?

A short but sharp letter I received well indicates how ludicrous a new round of unprecedented cotton subsidies would be:

AKRON, OHIO, *February 22, 1963.*

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. FINDLEY: As I understand it the overburdened American taxpayer is currently paying approximately $500 million a year for the subsidy to support the price of raw cotton. It is now proposed that this same unfortunate pay an additional $300 million for a subsidy to offset the high price of cotton resulting from the first subsidy. Waste at its ultimate. Spending $300 million to nullify the effects of $500 million spent.

In fact the situation seems to be very similar to the currently popular story regarding the Chinese gentleman named Wong who exclaimed when his wife gave birth to a Caucasian baby "Two Wongs don't make a white."

One of the unfortunates.

L. R. SCHOTT.

P.S.—This letter was also sent to Representatives HOEVEN, QUIE, BELCHER, and MAY.

The Influence of Foreign Markets on Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., convention luncheon, California and Nevada manufacturers of carbonated beverages, Jack Tar Hotel, San Francisco, February 11, 1963:

THE INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN MARKETS ON YOUR BUSINESS

(Address by James A. Farley)

I have assigned to me a subject which normally will empty any hall. Few speakers have become popular and few politicians have ridden to success on discussions of foreign trade. But we are professionals in that field and we also are by necessity observers of the vast international struggle which is now worldwide. So we know that foreign economics is not a dismal abyss of figures. It is a major front in a world power struggle.

To untrained observers this is not always apparent. It looks as though American foreign trade was an affair of steel or sugar, Coca-Cola, my own company, or of cotton goods, of oil and of radios—a host of humdrum items. We, of course, know better. The exports we send abroad, and the imports we must take into our own market, represent life or death, progress or depression, comfort or starvation, in many parts of the world. They also represent, in the United States, full employment, or men without jobs; communities at work, or communities in distress. Taken both ways, they represent the growth or world economy—or possibly its recession.

As political observers, we know that recession means trouble anywhere. And in countries which are not advanced and are always close to the hunger line it may mean disorder, revolution, killing. Don't ever tell me that foreign trade is a dull subject.

We are just entering a new and difficult phase in this business of world trade. The bases of it are not unhappy. But they do require some very solid and heavy headwork, and we all have to help.

Briefly, what happened was this. When World War II ended, practically the entire world was in distress—except the United States. We emerged with nearly double our war productions, in fact, we produced about half of the manufactured products of the entire world though we have only 6 percent of the population. Every other country was engaged in trying to get a level of consump-

tion which made it possible for them to begin. Their plants were destroyed, the organizations in bad shape, their production in distress. The vision of General Marshall, then Secretary of State, under the leadership of former President Harry S. Truman, initiated the Mashall plan of foreign aid, primarily, as it turned out, to Western Europe. You will recall that he had hoped that the Soviet Union would collaborate and incidentally get some of the aid. Stalin decided against that. He was not collaborating with anyone; he consciously began the cold war; he refused to allow foreign aid to the Iron Curtain countries. By consequence, the bulk of our foreign aid went to Western Europe, with some portions left over for Asia and India and an unfortunately tiny fraction for Latin America.

The plan worked. Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain particularly benefited. They rebuilt their factories, they retooled their plants, in some cases they learned American methods of production. In other cases they invented new methods themselves. As of now, we can say, susbtantially, that the Western European nations are better equipped economically than they ever have been in their history. Now they are producing, not merely for their own consumption but for export as well.

This means, of course, that in the hour of their success and ours, for it is in considerable part an American achievement, Western Europe now becomes our competitor. There is nothing wrong about this. It was foreseen by every student of the Marshall plan operation. It was assumed that the problem of worldwide production and competition would have to be met when it arose. Now it has arisen.

The standard of living in these countries has improved to a point where it is at least comparable to the United States. If you go to France, Germany, or even Italy, in the summertime you will see that steadily increasing numbers of European families now have their little cars; they go on vacations and travel; they send their children to summer camps; they do very much what Americans do. This is what an increase of production has meant to them. But while they are doing that they are casting about for means to export, partly so that they can import, chiefly raw materials which they need. So, they seek markets for their exports and, of course, the greatest market is the United States.

This is why in 1963 we see uncompleted wage-and-hour negotiations between American labor and American industry with a new factor added. If the price goes above a certain level, Belgian, French, German, and English manufactures based on it will come here and sell at a price cheaper than our own. We are moving, in other words, into a complex situation where the American level is not the only thing to be considered.

But while all this was going on a much larger area of the world, with a great many more people in it, was not going ahead so fast. This is partly perhaps because the American Marshall Plan flow was not so great in these countries. It was also because many of these countries were not well organized politically and because they were not yet prepared by public education to become productive, and to distribute their income wisely enough so that they had large markets of their own. In some cases, we were dealing with countries who by geography or by custom had only a single product, as Chile depends on copper, as Cuba depends on sugar, as Brazil depends, principally, on coffee, and as Venezuela depends on oil. The growing production in Western Europe and the high level of production in the United States did not affect them. They could consume a great deal more of European and American production than they do but they did not have an effective way of paying for it. They therefore do the only thing they can from their point of view; they severely limit their imports, which is another way of saying that they will not buy our exports, or Europe's either. They prefer to manufacture, frequently, at a far higher cost, in their own countries rather than buy at a lower cost from us. They do that because they haven't the foreign exchange to pay for imports in the first place and, anyhow, their people want jobs in factories. So, as the saying goes, the underdeveloped countries want to industrialize. But they discovered that even to industrialize means that they have to import, at least for a while. They do not have foreign exchange to pay for these imports so they have to seek credit.

Then comes the next development with which we all are familiar. American, and now European, companies come to these areas and offer to establish plants. These proposals are usually well received, at least at first. The next best thing to having a motorcar company of your own, which is difficult without capital, is to have a foreign motorcar company build and operate a plant in your country. This gives jobs. If the company can use local materials it means an added local market in the country. This is the first great phase and it is here that we can be of solid use. Brazil, for instance, cannot export coffee for everything she needs—people do not drink that much coffee. Brazilian capital plus the know-how may not be available at the time to build, let us say, a chemical plant. An American or European company, having the capital can, however, build a chemical plant in Brazil, employing local people and using local products and can sell these products in the Brazilian market which, by the way, is one of the largest and most rapidly growing in the world.

There are some who contend that this is bad for the American export trade. If Brazil, for instance, either builds a chemical plant of her own or accepts building of such a plant by an American company she will not buy as much American chemicals as she did before. So, say some, you are cutting your own throat when you help to industrialize another country.

This is simply not true. Brazil, of course, will have more chemicals if she manufactures some of her own. But if she did not manufacture them she still would not buy American chemicals, for the simple reason that she could not afford to. The top limit on American exports is what the countries to whom we sell can pay and there is no way out of it. Or, rather, not much of a way out. The United States can lend Brazil a certain amount of money for exports, which increases her capacity to buy for a while. But, obviously, this does not go on forever. Also, the U.S. Government is slowly coming to the point where it is going to need its resources here. So it is far sounder for us all to help Brazil, or any other country you choose, to get a good industrial system of its own. The statistical fact is that it is the highly industrialized countries that are the best customers for the export trade.

This, I think, is the first lesson we have to learn. Wherever any of us can assist a country to produce manufactured goods in its own region we have helped them and have helped ourselves. This is particularly true where we help a one-product country like Cuba with its sugar, or Brazil with its coffee, to diversify its product. It is why foreign aid, so-called, if properly handled should leave the countries where it is used with more industrial production than before. They will be stabler, more prosperous countries and, over the years, they will be better customers of ours.

Now I am past the stage where I swallow platitudes whole. I have been told, you have been told, that we always ought to let markets seek their own level and let natural balances work out. This is a splendid trick if you can do it. But the fact is that in my lifetime it has not happended. We have these balances before World War I; for practical purposes we have not had them since, save for very short intervals. Today we cannot have them at all, because half the world is not run on a free market basis. The Soviet Union and China have a planned economy, not a free market economy, and between them they account for more than one-third of the whole population of the world. Most of Western Europe operates on a planned economy—a fact which few Americans really understand. Rightly or wrongly, in the year 1963 more of the world would rather trust its life to planned economy than to the chances of a free and fluctuating market. Time may prove them wrong, but so far it has not. The United States, Canada and a few other countries still believe or claim they believe in a free market system, but they are in the minority.

That is why you have in Europe a highly planned economy in coal and steel—they call it the Coal and Steel Community. It is why the European Common Market is planning its economy today.

Let us face it, we don't want a free market economy either. At this point, I expect you will want to try me for heresy. But my company has a great deal to do with sugar and in the United States sugar is planned under an act of Congress so that domestic producers will have so much, and we are allowed to import an added amount from other countries to the end that the sugar produced and imported shall about equal the consumption demand. Face it again, the oil industry is one of the most highly planned in the United States, if not in the world. The Bureau of Mines estimates the consumption; the American oil wells are allowed to produce about enough with imports to supply that consumption—and import quotas have been imposed so that the total supply of oil in the country and coming into it will equal the demand.

If this isn't planned economy I don't know what is. If the sugar industry and the oil industry here will not risk a free market economy why should you expect that the European steel industry or the Brazilian coffee industry will accept a free market? The point that I make is that we are living in a world which in great measure has been planning its economy and proposes to go on doing that. The highly producing countries do it because they cannot stand alternate times of boom and bust. The underdeveloped countries do it because they have not enough resources in the first place and want to steer more of these resources into industry and capital construction, and away from mere consumption. You and I may not like this planned economy movement. But I am too old and you are too smart not to face facts. Anyhow, none of us can change those facts. We had best learn to live in a world that does exist instead of crying because the 19th century came to an end over 60 years ago. This is the main thrust of the point I wanted to make here. I wanted to drive in the fact that we are living as exporters in a world which is increasingly planned, and that Americans, though they deny it, are doing as much planning as anybody else, and that we should, therefore, be more hospitable to the idea of economic planning than has been the case thus far. But I cannot close without going a little farther. What do we do with this situation besides thinking about it?

Well, the first thing we do is to take a good long constructively critical look at the policies of the U.S. Government. You will find, if you examine it, that slowly the U.S. Government is moving toward planning in international economics. It proposed a

measure of planned economic development in the Near East after the crisis when our Marines were in Libya. This was a major change in policy. It changed the entire atmosphere of the Middle Eastern discussion. Again, under heavy pounding, a measure of economic planning was proposed for Latin America, and a committee of the Pan American bloc worked on this task. When we are called on, as some day we will be, to followup on our initiative in the Near East, we ought to support that. This is one tangible thing we can do.

Next, we are in for a rakeover of our foreign aid program. I personally believe in foreign aid, but I also think it could be done a great deal better. Foreign aid is not a handout here, there, or elsewhere, to buy a friend; you don't buy friends. It is not even a device to fight the Communists—though it should work that way too. Foreign aid is really a method by which we supply capital and facilities for underdeveloped countries to increase their own productivity, in the belief, very nearly a certainty, that as they increase their own production the exchange between their countries and ours will increase. Since this business of exporting goods and getting something done with them is our precise business we ought to have as good informed judgment on what is done as anyone else.

Finally, we can think about our own particular lines of business, the Coca-Cola Co., with which I am associated, has systematically tried to have as much manufacture in foreign countries as possible. Many American businessmen can explore that possibility. While we are doing it we can also explore the possibilities of creating markets here for the goods which these countries must export to pay their debts and to pay for what they buy from us.

I think some commonsense applied to this problem will not be wasted. We are, in theory, in business to make money for our stockholders and ourselves. But, in fact, we can make and have a right to make those profits only if we can arrange to do something solidly useful for our country and for the countries overseas, whose needs we supply. If we put our heads together and combine our thinking and our resources and are not scared to death of the thinking done in the rest of the world I think we shall discover that the growing problems of international trade are not insoluble.

We are, if you like, traders. But the business of trading is the business of seeing that the production of the world meets the needs of the world. If we do that we can face our consciences as well as our balance sheets.

The Golden Years?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, hardly a day passes without a letter or two coming across my desk calling to my attention the problem of our senior citizens, and always the question is asked, "When will Congress take action and approve an effective medical insurance plan?" The following editorial which apeared in the Newark Star Ledger on February 25 again points up the problem:

THE GOLDEN YEARS?

President Kennedy is making another attempt to ease the financial burden of our ailing elderly citizens. He's asking Congress to approve a hospital insurance plan that would be financed through social security payments.

The new welfare package that Mr. Kennedy has assembled is similar in many respects to the plan that failed to pass Congress by one vote. It goes beyond the provisions of the old plan by offering proposals to improve housing, employment opportunities and economic security.

The problem of caring for our senior citizens is an old one. It has become more acute as medical science finds ways of extending man's life span. This was noted by Mr. Kennedy in his message accompanying his proposal:

"Never before in our history have we had so many senior citizens. But it is not enough for a great nation to have added new years to life. Our objective must also be to add new life to those years."

We hear much of the golden years. This sounds pleasant to the ear, but to many of our elderly in straitened circumstances they are more likely to be the grim years. They could be lightened considerably if the President and Congress could get together on an effective medical insurance plan.

A National Solution to the Detergent Pollution Problem Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that localities experience in trying to prevent detergent pollution is pointed up in a recent article by United Press International Reporter Daniel Rapoport. The adoption of a national approach to the problem through the passage of H.R. 2105 will assure that communities all over the country will no longer have to battle against a buildup of foaming detergents. H.R. 2105 would ban from interstate commerce after June 1965, detergents that do not meet standards of decomposibility to be set up by the Surgeon General.

The article by Mr. Rapoport contains a concise statement of the problem and the proposed solution:

A NATIONAL SOLUTION TO THE DETERGENT POLLUTION PROBLEM IS NEEDED

(By Daniel Rapoport)

WASHINGTON.—Hamlet's castle at Elsinor and the city of Altoona, Pa., have a problem in common.

Both are battling suds from detergents.

At present both are losing the fight. But Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Milwaukee, is hopeful that with a little help from Congress, Altoona, and perhaps many more communities, can win.

REUSS has opened a personal and legislative campaign to make all American communities safe from frothy, mountainous detergent foam which is fouling up water and sewage systems and polluting streams.

DERIVATIVE IS CAUSE

The culprit, he says, is a petroleum derivative used in the manufacture of most detergents which came into their own here and in Europe after World War II. Unlike soaps made from animal fats, they do not decompose in sewage systems or septic tanks.

As a result, the foam builds up in treatment plants and rivers and lakes. In some areas it even finds its way into the drinking water.

REUSS says studies have shown that the foam can kill fish or drive them from their streams and lakes, but that the major danger is fouled water supplies and clogged sewage systems.

Even while REUSS was getting his campaign off the ground, the Maryland Water Pollution Control Commission was issuing new antidetergent rules, effective next January 1. They will require coin launderies, carwashing establishments, and kindred businesses to stop flushing untreated detergents into streams, sewers, and septic tanks. This means those affected must install filtering plants which cost at least $3,500 each. Private homes will not be affected.

REUSS made his first move by introducing a bill that would forbid use of detergents as they are composed today. By 1965, detergents sold in the United States or imported would have to decompose in sewage systems "reasonably quick and completely." The U.S. Surgeon General would set the standards.

SAW SAME IN EUROPE

REUSS says he has been bothered by the problem for a long time. Last year he traveled through Europe and saw some illuminating sights.

In Denmark, where Shakespeare set his tragedy, "Hamlet," REUSS said:

"At Elsinore, for example, where Prince Hamlet confronted the ghost of his murdered father on the rampart overlooking the sea, I saw what seemed to be either the ghost's ectoplasm or a gigantic iceberg come down from the north. By all the logic of oceanography, there could not be an iceberg there, and sure enough, there was not. The iceberg was a mountain of detergent foam, floating serenely along on the water."

REUSS has an impressive file to prove that he has researched his subject thoroughly. He has examples of detergent foaming in areas such as Suffolk County, on Long Island, Starved Rock Park in Illinois, Benton Harbor, Mich., and, of course, Altoona.

ARE HEALTH HAZARD

The Congressman feels that detergents are not only esthetically unpleasing, but are an actual health hazard. They not only contribute to the pollution of water supplies, he claims, but prevent other sewage from being treated.

He points to the detergent makers as the people who could cure the problem if they followed the example set by their counterparts in West Germany. He maintains that the German manufacturers—confronted with a law similar to his bill—devised a detergent in which 80 percent of it disintegrates. Furthere, he says, the product is only slightly more expensive to produce.

The American detergent manufacturers take sharp exception to most of what REUSS holds to be self-evident. They say his proposals are both impractical and unnecessary. In addition, according to the Soap & Detergent Manufacturers Association, the foam is a symptom of pollution, and not pollution itself. (REUSS disputes this point and has some backing from the Public Health Service.)

The association also asserts that the industry is conducting a $5 million annual antifoam research program.

The Public Health Service is very much aware of detergents. But the agency looks upon them as part of the overall problem of water pollution. And since it can't do anything about changing the form in which detergents are manufactured, it is trying to do something about them once they enter a sewage system.

Part of the plan, ironically, would involve using detergent properties as a cleansing agent—removing other pollutants from a water supply as well as eventually removing itself.

Economy Takes More Than Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a recent editorial from the Troy Record newspaper, Troy, N.Y., entitled "Economy Takes More Than Talk." I fully concur with the opinion expressed in the editorial, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that it might be a further reminder of the necessity and the urgency to curb needless expenditures. It places the responsibility where it belongs, on the Congress. The President may propose, but Congress must dispose.

The editorial is as follows:

ECONOMY TAKES MORE THAN TALK

The tumult and shouting that followed introductoin of a $98,800 million budget and the prediction that changes in the tax system would produce a total deficit of $11,900 million has now quieted. It may be an appropriate time to offer the reminder that economy takes more than talk.

Supposing for a moment that Congress was sincerely devoted to the cause of economy—and that at times seems a dangerous assumption—the road it must travel is a difficult one. In any given year Congress may vote appropriations which will not actually be spent for several years.

It is estimated that even if the new Congress refused to appropriate 1 cent for Government operations during the fiscal year beginning July 1 various Government agencies would have $87 billion available to spend from previously-approved appropriations.

In addition to appropriations made years in advance there are certain inescapable expenditures. The interest on the public debt is at an irreducible minimum of $10,100 million. Much of the projected $5,500 million spending for veterans programs involves compensation and pension payments the Government is legally bound to make. Federal grants for State relief programs require an outlay of $3 billion while the Government outlay for agricultural price support programs is also fixed by law.

The record of previous Congresses also points out a tendency to expand on administration spending proposals. The proposed Federal pay raise introduced by the administration last year and estimated to cost $633 million was raised to $895 million in Congress. Agricultural conservation payments pegged at $150 million by the administration were increased to $250 million by the legislative branch. Congress rejected administration plans to reduce spending on National Guard and Reserve programs and voted additional funds for the RS-70 reconnaissance bomber and the Dyna-Soar glider programs. Finally Congress voted a $2,300 million "pork barrel" bill for rivers and harbors work in the closing days of the session.

What the record indicates is that if Congress really wants to practice economy and not just talk about it there is only one way to do the job. It must be done on a long-term basis and must be accompanied by an insistence on either cutting back or refusing to expand existing Government programs. When this happens the tumult and shouting about economy will have some meaning.

New York Fiscal Misrepresentation: Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1963, I placed in the RECORD a joint statement of the New York State Democratic legislative leaders, Senator Zaretzki and Assemblyman Travia. The statement concerned the Governor's proposal to increase the motor vehicle tax, even though he had clearly stated in his campaign for reelection that he would not raise taxes.

The following joint statement by the same two State legislative leaders concerns the Governor's further attempts to justify this gross misrepresentation. It is interesting to note in this connection that in the Governor's last budget request he called this motor vehicle tax, a tax. He now quibbles that it is not a tax but a fee. Tax or fee it is money out of the taxpayer's pocket.

The joint statement of Senator Zaretzki and Assemblyman Travia follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

The "compromise" motor vehicle tax increase legislation suggested by the Governor is no compromise. He still intends to gouge his $48 million increase out of the taxpaying public. It is a clear attempt to saddle the small car owner with the entire load. This is another example of his soak-the-poor policy.

Let's immediately call this proposal exactly what it is—the Cadillac bill.

Under the terms of the ridiculous compromise, if the one fee is set at $26, the Cadillac and other big-car owners will not pay a single cent more than they have been paying. If the single fee is set at $25, they will in fact pay 5 percent less.

The small car owner, however, will pay an increase ranging up to 225 percent if the fee is set at $26 and 213 percent if it is established at $25. Thus, the taxpayer who cannot afford a higher priced car or who has purposely gone to the compact and small car field as an economy measure will be stripped of his short-lived savings and will foot the entire $48 million bill under this proposal. This is scandalously highhanded treatment and must be vigorously opposed and defeated on its face.

But sight must also not be lost of the fact that there can be no compromise with deception at all, and no motor vehicle tax hike can be accepted.

Last October the Governor gave his preelection promise not to increase taxes if he were reelected, and he must be made to live up to that promise for the sake of citizen respect for the integrity of the office of Governor of New York State.

The public knows the Governor reneged on his solemn promise, and now there is proof that he was being deliberately deceptive during last fall's campaign. For the Governor's own legislative leader, Speaker Carlino, documented that himself, if inadvertently, just this past Sunday with his remark to reporters, and we quote, "Raising charges for liquor licenses and auto registrations has been discussed for 2 years." Discussed by and with whom? Certainly not by the Governor with the public. Instead, by the Governor in consort with his inner sanctum of executive and legislative advisers.

We ask, where was the Governor's courage last fall when he had these tax increases in his back pocket and blandly told the voters he had no intention of raising taxes during his entire second term? Deception is no substitute for courage.

Full Military Honors for 11 Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, today a group burial service with full military honors for 11 young Americans who died in the crash of a B-25 bomber during World War II in New Guinea was held at the Arlington National Cemetery. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish services were conducted in the Fort Myer chapel and the services then moved to the gravesite at section 34, Arlington National Cemetery. The three chaplains officiating were Lt. Col. Harry P. Henderson, U.S. Air Force, Protestant; Capt. Thomas J. Moran, U.S. Air Force, Catholic; and Capt. Ervin Preis, U.S. Army, Jewish.

Taking part in the ceremony were: A one-platoon honor escort from the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry—The Old Guard—Fort Myer, Va.; music by the U.S. Army Band; two caissons drawn by horses; three volleys by seven-man firing party; the playing of "Taps" by bugler.

The names of men are as follows: Sgt. Jack E. Beals, West Hollywood, Fla.; S. Sgt. Marvin Culbreth, Dearing, Ga.; Sgt. Harold B. Davis, Zanesville, Ohio; Lt. Angelo C. Dellisante, Corning, N.Y.; Sgt. Charlie L. Fann, Murfreesboro, Tenn.; Lt. Walter R. Gerry, East Providence, R.I.; Sgt. Raymond F. Greene, Norwood, Mass.; Cpl. Edward R. Howard, Hingham, Mass.; Capt. Rudolph W. Johnson, Jr., Muskegon, Mich.; Sgt. Milton S. Miller, Bridgeport, Conn.; and Capt. Lamar S. Russell, Goldhill, N.C.

Members of the families who attended are: Mrs. Mildred E. Thomas, mother of Jack E. Beals; Mr. Elbert D. Culbreth, brother of Marvin E. Culbreth; John B. Davis, father of Harold B. Davis; Philip B. Dellisante, brother of Angelo C. Dellisante; Mr. Houston Fann, father of Charlie L. Fann; Walter R. Gerry, father of Walter R. Gerry; Maude R.

Greene, mother of Raymond F. Greene; Carol Robinson, sister of Edward R. Howard; Rudolph W. Johnson, Sr., father of Rudolph W. Johnson, Jr.; Minna B. Miller, sister of Milton S. Miller; and Beulah S. Russell, mother of Lamar S. Russell.

Also in attendance were: Mr. and Mrs. Richard Greene of Norwood, Mass., and Mr. Leslie Greene of Racine, Wis.

These brave young Americans gave their full measure of devotion to our country. Their remains are in two caskets buried in the same grave. Protestant, Catholic and Jewish boys who died together that this Nation of ours might live. One headstone bearing the name of each young man will mark the final resting place in the Arlington National Cemetery. No words of mine could adequately send out the message or lesson to our countrymen that has been laid down by these fine young Americans. I know the entire Nation mourns their loss.

Benefits and Burdens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal recently published a letter from one of my constituents on the subject of Federal spending. I found the letter so articulate on this much-discussed subject, that I offer it for your consideration.

The letter follows:

BENEFITS AND BURDENS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In your sustained attack on Federal Government spending, why not use a rifle rather than a blunderbuss?

Once again you have editorialized with your eyes glued to the lower half of your bifocals. You quote the President's statement that "The quality of American life must keep pace with the quantity of American goods" (Custodian of Quality," January 16). Then you say: "Fair enough, but by what magic is the Federal Government able to improve the quality of life merely by spending money?"

Let me show you how.

In the west end of downtown Sacramento, we are witnessing a transformation of what used to be a depressed and depressing slum-like neighborhood into an area of great beauty and utility. Private corporations, as well as Government agencies, are pouring millions of additional dollars into new construction in the redevelopment area. Yet without the lure and aid of Federal grants, this mammoth project would still be a dream.

Similarly Federal aid has made a working and expanding reality of the vast California Central Valley project with its dams and irrigation canals. People of the Nation and the world are now fed and clothed by the output of this valley.

Likewise Federal funds have helped provide a network of superhighways for the city, State, and Nation. In July, a federally financed new deepwater ship channel will link Sacramento to the Pacific Ocean. Thus fruits of the valley will soon be reaching millions at reduced transportation cost and industry will have room to expand.

It is nonsensical to say that these improvements and undertakings could, should, and would be accomplished by local governments or private firms. You know they would not.

On the other hand, no thinking person assumes that these Federal benefits are free. However, it is evident that people—psychologically being what they are—and local taxing and borrowing limits being what they are, only the mechanics of Federal financing do in fact effectively harness national energies and consequently develop resources which are beyond strictly local capacities. Never forget that State boundaries are man-made political lines. They simply do not define the limits of economic and social needs in the U.S. free market area.

Ultimately we, and maybe our children's children, will pay for the federally financed improvements. But it is much better to enjoy the benefits and to endure the burdens, than to be relieved of the burdens and be deprived of the benefits as well.

NORBERT J. MIETUS.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Red Troops in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I call to your attention and that of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives an article which appeared in the Boston Herald on Tuesday, February 12, 1963, regarding Red troops in Cuba.

It reads as follows:

RED TROOPS IN CUBA

Is what Under Secretary of State George W. Ball calls the hectoring of the administration on the Cuba issue being overdone? We suspect that it is.

The administration has satisfied most of its critics that Soviet nuclear weapons have been withdrawn from the Red-held island. Complaints now are being directed chiefly at the 17,000-or-so Soviet troops that remain as "instructors."

Premier Khrushchev has promised that they, too, will be removed "in due course." And President Kennedy is trying to hurry the process.

But is it something that has to be done this week or this month? Is the timing of their departure—provided they do depart—important enough to justify another ultimatum and another exchange of nuclear threats? We doubt it.

A hundred years ago, while the United States was torn by Civil War, France set up a puppet government in Mexico under Maximilian of Hapsburg and supported it with 30,000 French troops. As soon as the Confederacy was defeated the United States demanded that Napoleon III get his troops out of there and backed up the demand by sending General Sheridan to the border.

But it was the beginning of 1866 before Napoleon came up with an "in due course" promise, and it was more than a year after that before the last French soldiers moved out of Mexico. And we didn't feel it necessary to go to war with France or Mexico in the interim.

The Monroe Doctrine does not by precedent demand an instant retort from us.

If any hard evidence develops that the Soviet troops in Cuba are being readied for offensive operations, or even that they are digging in to stay, the United States may be forced to act. But the President insists that neither of these conditions now exists. He is moving in an orderly way to get the interlopers removed. For the moment that should be enough.

The hectoring should stop.

President Kennedy's Socialized Medicine Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are aptly aware of the fact that the New Frontier is confused in almost every department. President Kennedy's new, socialized medicine proposal is no different. It is going to cost more money and the hard-working man will have to pay the bill.

An excellent article by Lyle C. Wilson in the February 25 issue of the Washington Daily News, and an editorial in the same paper of the same date, spell out what recipients of the President's impractical plan will have to pay for inferior medical care:

ONLY WAY IS UP

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

There will be bitter dispute over President Kennedy's new medicare bill. But there is one rather appalling factor about which there cannot be much dispute, if any.

It is this: The cost of medical and related benefits proposed for our senior citizens would go up and up and up some more. There is a top limit, no doubt. But it is not yet in sight.

The cost must go up because that is the way it must be with a graduated tax. The record will show that graduated taxes sometimes go down but that more frequently, and usually, they go up, and steeply. This has been true of the personal income tax rates. For example: In 1930, the personal income tax did not apply to income under $4,000. On income between $4,000 and $6,000, in 1930 the rate was 1½ percent. The 1962 rate was 26 percent.

In 1937–39, the social security tax rate was 1 percent each on employee and employer up to a maximum of $3,000 annual earnings. In 1962 each paid 3⅛ percent on maximum earnings of $4,800. On January 1, 1963, the social security tax for each was hiked to 3⅝ percent on $4,800. The employee who paid $150 in 1962 will pay $174 this year, an increase of $24. Ditto for the employer.

Barring changes by Congress, this rate will hold through 1965. In 1966 the rate will go to 4⅛ percent each on employer and employee. In 1968 and thereafter the rate will be 4⅝ percent.

The proposal Mr. Kennedy sent to Congress last week would require an immediate additional increase of one-fourth of 1 percent and would raise the maximum of taxable income to $5,200. In the light of the record of the graduated tax for whatever purpose, it scarcely can be argued that the rate increase proposed by the President is any more than merely a beginning of a tax spiral in behalf of persons 65 years of age and over.

Bewildered citizens groping for knowledge about the U.S. tax maze should write to Tax Foundation, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Center, New York 20, N.Y., ask for a copy of the Foundation pamphlet, "Reconstructing the Federal Tax System" a guide to the issue. The pamphlet makes some interesting observations about graduated payroll taxes:

"Payroll taxes are a large and growing part of the Federal tax bill. These levies unquestionably use up taxpaying capacity. The payroll taxes now on the books leave no doubt that workers and employers face increasing burdens."

No doubt is right. It is estimated that social security benefits of $1 billion are being paid monthly to about 17 million persons and that the number of beneficiaries steadily will increase. There now are about 25 million Americans 65 and older.

When the right man comes along to organize these millions into the political powerhouse they could become, the pressure for higher social security taxes will be irresistible. These senior citizens do, literally, get something for nothing from the Government. The billions being distributed to the old folk are contributed by the younger working citizens.

The political hazard of voting against new payroll taxes for the benefit of millions of senior citizens who can vote is too obvious to require elaboration.

PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS FOR MEDICARE

We see nothing wrong in principle with a national health insurance program under social security, provided it is desired by a substantial majority and provided it is properly financed.

A major weakness in programs advanced in the past has been disagreement, by billions of dollars, as to what such a plan might cost. That weakness remains in the slightly revised proposal submitted to Congress last week by President Kennedy.

"Medicare" is a misnomer for this project. It proposes hospital care only: Up to 45 days free or up to 180 days if the patient pays part, plus nursing home care or nursing service at private residence. It wouldn't pay doctor bills.

In an effort to meet charges of socialized medicine the President emphasized: "It would not hinder in any way the freedom of choice of doctor, hospital or nurse. It would not specify in any way the kind of medical or health care or treatment to be provided by the doctors."

To finance the plan it is proposed to increase payroll deductions by one-fourth of 1 percent for employee and employer. The base for deductions also would be raised, from the present $4,800 to $5,200 a year.

This would mean a maximum contribution per employee of $26 a year, estimated to produce a little less than $1.5 billion the first year. Congress should investigate closely to determine whether that would pay even part of the bill.

The President places the present cost of broad (private) health insurance coverage for an aged couple at $400 a year. There are 17.5 million aged 65 or over so that suggests a cost around $7 billion a year—a sum equal to roughly half of present total social security payments. The President does not suggest broad coverage, merely hospitalization, but that is the big item in medical care, particularly for the elderly.

There isn't much new in the President's proposal. It is substantially the same plan which failed to pass last year, partly because of the doubts we have expressed here. Any such plan should be self-financing through payroll deductions high enough to pay the bills. It is to the direct personal interest of everyone on social security that that fund be kept solvent.

Victory Price in the Congo Haunts United States, United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the news management policy of the administration not only events relating to Cuba but the entire field of foreign affairs is subject to administration actions which are not revealed to the American public, nor, for that matter to congressional committees.

There are numerous unanswered questions relating to the Congo situation that administration spokesmen refuse to discuss. This leads us with no alternative but to read between the lines in an attempt to arrive at a practical analysis.

Such an analysis was made by Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, in a report which appeared in the Monday, February 18 edition of the Chicago Tribune. I place this commentary on the United States, U.N. and Congo into the RECORD at this point.

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, February 17—What price victory in the Congo is a question that is haunting the United Nations and the American State Department.

The defeat of Moise Tshombe, whose greatest crime, perhaps, was friendship for the West, has left the Congo in a state of near chaos, which Congelese leaders say can only be solved by time and money. The time may stretch into years and the money into millions of dollars—free American dollars, naturally.

Some experts estimate it may take 30 to 40 years to restore the Congo, unless former Belgian civil servants return, which is not likely. United Nations and United States officials are just beginning to learn the size of the task confronting them. The job is complicated by some of the ambitious and questionable ventures which Premier Adoula is undertaking despite the prostration and strife in the Congo.

An immediate fear is that Angola, west African Portuguese colony, may become another Congo if Adoula has his way. The Premier has established a camp 75 miles north of Thysville, where guerrillas are being trained to invade Angola. These would set up a state in hope of taking over all of Angola as the Congolese took over Katanga, against the will of its people.

In March 1961, terrorists from the Congo invaded Angola with fire and sword, sparing neither the aged nor women and children. The Portuguese drove the terrorists out, but the United States voted against Portugal in United Nations on Angola.

U.S. NEGROES IRKED AT AFRO-ASIAN BLOC

Premier Salazar, of Portugal, who has maintained peace in his country for 30 years, was so infuriated that he was persuaded, only after much argument, not to withdraw from NATO and not to oust America from bases in the Azores. The United States tempered its anti-Portuguese stand somewhat, partly because it does not want to lose the Azores bases and partly because American Negroes are losing patience with the United Nations Afro-Asian bloc.

Afro-Asians are trying to make Angola the target of a sacred crusade against colonialism, but the drive has Communist overtones. Ben Bella, pro-Red leader of Algeria, is assisting. Tunisians have trained guerrillas, and Nkrumah, the pro-Red Ghana dictator, has promised help. Fidel Castro last month said the united force of the Marxist camp should fight in Angola, Vietnam, and Latin America.

Communists are divided as to whether to give their support to Holden Roberto, leader of the 1961 terrorists, or Mario de Andrade, another Angolan dissident. Ben Bella dedicated an Andrade camp in Algeria, where he pledged aid to drive Portugal from Angola. Premier Adoula has blessed Roberto, who claims to head an Angolan Government-in-exile.

ACTIONS OF U.S.-BACKED ADOULA PROTESTED

Portugal has complained bitterly about the guerrilla training camp which Adoula, whom the United States put in power, has established. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has replied that he cannot tell Adoula what to do, but it is obvious Adoula cannot act without American financial backing. As of last June 30 the American contribution was $115 million to United Nations military operations in the Congo and about $100 million in other aid to the Congo. More millions have gone since that date.

Moreover, the United States is giving food and money to Ben Bella, Tunisia, Ghana, and other members of the anti-Portuguese bloc. Portugal is not impressed by the State Department's disclaimer of responsibility for Adoula, holding that the United States is financing a prime Communist objective, the prospective invasion of Angola.

If Angola should be invaded and another new African nation should be established, the United States will have to pick up the financial pieces of an area even less ready for self-government than the Congo. U.N. prestige fell as a result of its Congo operations. If it should undertake similar action in Angola, it would drop even further, if that is possible.

The United Nations and the United States would prefer a breathing spell before undertaking any new African ventures. The question is whether pro-Communists and neutralists against the United States will let them have one.

Per Jacobsson on Economic Growth: Reality or Political Palatability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal, quoting from a speech by Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund, explodes the myth fostered by this administration that the more rapid growth rates of the European economies are the result of liberal fiscal and monetary policies.

Discussing the role of monetary policies adopted by the European countries, Mr. Jacobsson noted:

Looking back through history, countries who have maintained relatively stable monetary conditions, so that people know they are dealing with a sound currency, have

derived distinct advantages from such an achievement. Confidence in currencies is a plant of slow growth.

The highest growth rates, Mr. Jacobsson has pointed out, have been enjoyed by those European countries in which the main task of monetary policy has been to restrain inflationary pressures—without relying either on deficit spending or easy money.

Mr. Jacobsson also discussed what Lord Keynes might have thought about the current economic situation in the United States. Mr. Jacobsson pointed out that it will not do to pick out of the Keynesian recommendations those which seem palatable, such as deficit spending, and neglect those which are not so widely attractive, such as the maintenance of stable wages. He charged that the productivity guidelines laid down last year by the Council of Economic Advisers is not what Keynes would have thought we needed in the present situation.

It is, indeed, gratifying to find an economic statesman of the caliber of Mr. Jacobsson who, as the Journal says, refuses to make either Europe's experience or Lord Keynes say what they did not say in order to rationalize current policies that politicians want to adopt for political reasons.

Under unanimous consent I include this editorial from the February 26 issue of the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD, as follows:

PAP AND PALATABILITY

It's quite the rage these days in the wonderful world of Washington economics to point with alarm at the more rapid growth rates of the European economies, and the fashionable explanation for this is that these countries have followed more liberal economic policies than we.

This comparison with Europe is, indeed, one of the chief arguments put forward by the President's economic advisers for proposing more Government spending, bigger deficits and easier money policies to get the country moving again.

So neither the President nor Chairman Heller of his economic council should be too happy with the remarks yesterday of Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund, about this European growth and the lessons to be drawn from it.

In the first place, Mr. Jacobsson is not alarmed by the statistics of relative growth. "Countries which are already highly industrialized," he sagely observed, "have greater difficulties in attaining very high rates of growth."

He explained that Europe's growth rate is in large part due to the destruction of the war, which meant that it started from a low point, and to the enormous pent-up demand and to the willingness of labor to work hard, thus increasing productivity faster than wage costs.

Running even more contrary to fashion were some of his remarks about the monetary and fiscal policies adopted by the European countries which, in his opinion, contributed heavily to the miracle of their postwar recovery.

"Looking back through history," he said, "countries who have maintained relatively stable monetary conditions, so that people know they are dealing with a sound currency, have derived distinct advantages from such an achievement. Confidence in currencies is a plant of slow growth."

In recent history, he noted, the European countries which have had the highest growth rates recognized that, the main task of monetary policy in this period has been to restrain inflationary pressures, relying neither on deficit spending or easy money. In fact, there was the need to establish and maintain confidence in the currency, and the efforts made in this direction became as a matter of fact more and more successful.

Specifically, he cited the cautious monetary policies of West Germany (from the beginning), we would call them conservative policies, and the coincidence that Italy and France did not begin their rapid progress until each had got its budgetary and monetary policies under firm control.

One interesting part of this testimony is that Mr. Jacobsson himself is no reactionary critic of U.S. economic policy. He takes at least an indulgent view toward recent U.S. deficits, both in domestic spending and in the foreign balance of payments. And he is not one to dismiss Keynesian theories about the Government's role in managing the economy.

Yet what he said about Lord Keynes must be equally disturbing to Washington's neo-Keynesians:

"Keynes, it is true, was in favor of an increase in demand, but in this connection it should not be forgotten that he measured liquidity in money wages, and prescribed in times of marked unemployment that money wages would have to be kept stable for the unemployment to be reduced. This is an essential part of Keynes' teaching."

To which he added bluntly: "It will not do to pick out of the Keynesian recommendations those which seem palatable, such as deficit spending, and neglect those which are not so widely attractive, such as the maintenance of stable wages."

And in effect this is what he charges against the so-called productivity guidelines laid down last year by the President's Economic Council. These guidelines, in his view, "sought not stable money wages but a moderation in wage increases." To which he retorts: "This is not what Keynes thought would be needed, it will not lead to the same reduction in unemployment as would be achieved by the maintenance of stable wages."

All in all, we would say, Washington will not find Mr. Jacobsson's remarks very palatable. For he refuses to make either Europe's experience or Lord Keynes say what they did not say in order to rationalize current policies that politicians want to adopt for political reasons.

But when the country's well-being depends so much on the economic doctrines it feeds upon, surely it is better to have them a little unpalatable than stewed from political pap.

The Washington Post Discusses a New Dairy Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that the existing dairy program is not working. Farmers' incomes, which it is supposed at least to maintain, are falling. Prices of milk products are high and consumption per capita is declining, although this is not entirely a result of the price levels. And taxpayers are paying heavily for an unnecessary accumulation of surplus milk products.

In H.R. 3978, an alternative program is offered that will benefit farmers by providing higher incomes, consumers through lower prices of milk products, and taxpayers through a lower cost of the program.

The program will work by lowering the price support level and, for participating farmers, granting income supports equal to the difference between the actual price they received for manufacturing milk and what they would have received if they had been able to sell at 90 percent of parity. To receive the income support payments, farmers would have to agree to reduce milk marketings by 10 percent.

The Washington Post recently discussed the approach embodied in H.R. 3978:

SURPLUS BUTTER MOUNTAIN

President Kennedy in his recent farm message presented a graphic account of how the present dairy price-support programs work to the disadvantage of the taxpayer, the consumer and the dairy farmer. The price of milk and its derivative products is now supported through the purchase of excess supplies by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the enforcement of 83 Federal marketing orders which set minimum prices for about one-half of the fluid milk sold in the country. While the direct costs of supporting the price of "manufacturing milk," that used in the production of dairy products, soared from $278 million in 1961 to nearly $600 million in 1962, the income of dairy farmers declined by more than $100 million. Meanwhile the surpluses are mounting. "We have," said the President, "over 300 million pounds of butter in storage, enough to provide a year's supply of all the fats consumed by the people of Korea."

Is there a more rational alternative to these policies under which a mountain of surplus butter has accumulated while annual consumption has fallen to a low of a little more than 6 pounds per capita? The administration in the last session of Congress endorsed a measure offering the dairy farmers a choice between voluntary production controls with high price supports or no production controls with a much lower level of price supports. But this program was not enacted because of the deep split within the industry. Producers of milk which goes principally into manufacturing want across-the-board production controls which would limit competition from those producers whose primary function is to supply the large, federally controlled fluid milk markets. The Federal market area producers favor quotas on fluid milk but unlimited production of manufacturing milk since they rely on the manufacturing milk market as an outlet for their surpluses.

While it cannot resolve the dairy dilemma, a recent proposal by Representative HENRY S. REUSS would go far in reducing both the direct and indirect costs of the dairy price-support programs. This plan would provide income subsidies for the operators of family-size farms who agree to reduce their sales of manufacturing milk by 10 percent. The payments would be equivalent to the difference between the market price and 90 percent of the parity price. As the same time the level at which the Government purchases manufacturing milk would drop from 75 to 65 percent of parity, or from $3.14 to $2.72 per hundredweight.

REUSS estimates that his plan would result in a direct saving of $38 million for the Treasury and an indirect saving of $162 million for consumers as a result of a 12-cent-per-pound drop in the price of butter.

This sensible plan merits the strong support of the administration, but even if it

were enacted, thorny problems would remain. Until the elaborate system of Federal controls which has been operative in the fluid milk markets for 30 years is either drastically modified or abolished, the surpluses of manufacturing milk will persist. And while high price supports contribute to the decline of butter consumption, the widespread and perhaps unjustifiable fear of cholesterol must also be taken into account.

These factors and the stubborn political resistance constitute a formidable barrier to the adoption of more rational policies. Perhaps the butter mountain will have to become much larger before an aroused public opinion compels action.

The U.S. Government Dollar Is Not a Foreign Cure-All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, money is what money can buy, but there are some things that money cannot buy—even foreign aid dollars from Washington.

Economic development in Latin America, for example, requires technical skills and business policy learning by Latin Americans and an improvement in attitudes toward business by Latin America in general before direct dollar aids can create anything.

The following editorial is from the Illinois State Register of Springfield:

U.S. DOLLARS NOT ENOUGH TO SOLVE LATIN-AMERICAN ILLS

Clare Boothe Luce, former legislator and Ambassador to Italy, has viewed President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program in Latin America and found it wanting.

Writing in McCall's magazine, she said that if the program's success rests on its ability to raise living standards to overcome the threat of communism, "the Alliance for Progress faces an all but impossible task."

Our Government's dollars alone, she believes, will not solve the myriad problems evolving from human and material conditions. "Unemployment and underemployment are massive * * * the majority of the people lives in dire poverty * * * the rich pay relatively light taxes and are often disgracefully indifferent to the condition of the poor."

Mrs. Luce perhaps has a point. An outpouring of American dollars is not enough to curb Latin America's economic disorders. Latin Americans, disturbed by Fidel Castro's Cuba and U.S. failure to oust the Cuban dictator, are transferring their money to this country and other foreign nations.

Frank Brandenburg, senior economist of the National Planning Association, wrote: "Private businessmen (in Latin America) exhibited fear, not of what the U.S. Government would do, but of inaction in the event that Castroism seized hold of their own destinies."

William Giandoni, Latin American editor, Copley News Service, said Brandenburg also fears the Alliance for Progress tends to regard the role of private business as of minor importance.

A general improvement in the business climate in Latin America is necessary before the Alliance for Progress or any similar program can become effective.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Calls for Development of an Adequate Nationwide Transportation System in Speech Before American Road Builders' Association—Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia, Addresses 61st Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 61st annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association, a national organization devoted to the advocacy of adequate highway and airport programs, has just concluded its sessions in Chicago, Ill.

The meeting this year was of particular interest because it was held in conjunction with the construction equipment and exposition road show which, I am told, was the largest industrial exhibit in the world. Without question, it was of tremendous significance. The exhibits covered an area equivalent to that of 13 football fields. It was attended by more than 100,000 people including some 7,000 foreign visitors.

Aside from its impressive size the show was meaningful in that it clearly illustrated the great strides which have been made in the technology of equipment design. The increased productivity of modern machines accounts for a very important part in keeping the unit costs of highway construction at a low level.

The problems and progress of the highway program were discussed from many different approaches during the meeting of the ARBA.

The highway legislative situation was ably presented by my good friend and former House colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, and by the energetic ranking minority of that subcommittee, the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

It was inspiring to hear from such outstanding leaders as John C. Mackie, the Michigan State highway commissioner who is the 1963 president of the American Association of Highways Officials; Ralph R. Bartelsmeyer, who has recently completed a distinguished term of service as chief engineer of the Illinois Division of Highways, and W. A. Bugge, the noted director of highways of the State of Washington.

I gained an insight on the thinking of the highway industry from W. K. Cox, who is the president of the Construction Industrial Manufacturers Association and vice president of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., and from Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, the capable executive vice president of the American Road Builders' Association.

A high spot of the convention, the Annual Road Builders' Luncheon, was addressed by the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges.

I was particularly happy to be present to see the annual American Road Builders' Association Award presented to Nello L. Teer, Jr., president of the Nello L. Teer Co. of Durham, N.C., a firm which is among the world's leaders in highway construction. I was most pleased that the founder of that outstanding company, Nello L. Teer, Sr., was also present, as was the Federal Highway Administrator, Rex M. Whitton, and many other distinguished leaders representing both government and industry.

Secretary Hodges delivered an outstanding speech which contained a message which should be read by every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Hodges' speech at the 61st annual meeting of the American Road Builders' Association be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, Mr. President, I request that there be printed at the conclusion of Secretary Hodges' address my own remarks delivered at the opening session of the convention.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER H. HODGES PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT A LUNCHEON OF THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, PALMER HOUSE HOTEL, CHICAGO, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

When Nello Teer asked me to come to Chicago for the American Road Builders' Association convention, he suggested as a topic, "Trends Threatening To Curtail Motor Vehicle Use and Highway Development."

The Department of Commerce, however, is responsible for promoting the health of the Nation's entire transportation system and not just its roads. Since there are trends threatening the development of our whole transportation system, I think it would be properly responsive to your subject to talk with you as transportation men and not just as roadbuilders.

We do not have to look far to discover why the Federal Government is concerned with transportation. The industry makes a huge contribution to the national economy. It is estimated that the cost of passenger and freight transportation, including the private automobile, presently is more than $100 billion a year, or nearly one-fifth of our gross national product. It is further estimated that this cost will rise above $150 billion before 1980.

The influence of the transportation industry, however, goes far beyond these dollar figures. It affects the cost of every item we produce, and thus is vital to our country's economic growth at home and abroad.

The Federal Government estimated that it will spend nearly $5 billion in transport-oriented operations in fiscal 1964. At the Department of Commerce better than 85 percent of the funds we will administer in fiscal 1964 are for transportation. This includes more than $3 billion in the highway trust fund, but even out of the Department's general fund we spend nearly half for transportation, mainly maritime subsidies.

Yet, despite the fact that the public is spending more for transportation facilities and equipment than ever before in history, transportation is not serving—let me repeat, not serving—as well as it should or as well as it could.

Millions of dollars in business are lost in central city districts because of traffic congestion.

Common carriers, which are the backbone of our transportation system and vital to the welfare of small business, specially, are getting less and less of the total intercity freight shipments.

In spite of increasing subsidies, our merchant marine's share of world shipping is declining at a time when we are trying to expand our oversea commerce.

And finally, many of our railroads, airlines and trucking firms are operating at losses, or with profits that are unhealthily small.

The present state of affairs has been some time in the making. An abundance of studies in the past have pointed to the problems of transportation, but not until last year was an effort made to present a comprehensive program for the functioning of the transportation complex as an efficient whole.

Until now attention has been concentrated on strengthening a particular mode of transport, generally for sound historical reasons. The past decade, for example, has seen an intensification of highway construction. I don't mean in any way to deprecate this activity—our need for better roads has been and still is great. We still have much to do to build a highway network adequate to our domestic commerce and defense requirements.

As I mentioned before we shall spend well over $3 billion for highways in fiscal 1964. Much of this money will go toward completion of the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. More than 14,000 miles are now open to traffic and construction is underway on another 4,300. Roadbuilding in 1962 involved about 10,000 individual firms. Highway construction costs, exclusive of engineering and rights-of-way, involved an estimated $5.6 billion. We have tightened our audit and investigations program to insure that the most efficient and honest use of funds is made. This is a story in itself.

We are continuing our safety and research projects. We have to go no farther than last year's record 41,000 traffic fatalities to find the reason why we are so concerned with safety.

Within the last year or so, two specific organizations have been set up to improve Government's role in traffic safety—one is the Bureau of Public Roads Office of Highway Safety, the other is the Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Commerce. These two groups plus participating mem-

bers offer scientific, technical and educational aid to groups in and out of Government to promote traffic safety.

We have established a Federal drivers' register, which keeps track of all drivers whose licenses have been suspended for drunken driving or involvement in fatal accidents. States participate voluntarily in this program, and to date only four States have not taken part. Two of these holdouts are expected to participate in the very near future. We also have a program with the States to promote uniformity in signs, signals, and markings to end accident-causing confusion.

We have further expanded educational and training services to States, and have programs to stimulate and coordinate traffic research.

We are proud of our accomplishments in these areas, but we must also face the problems arising in integrating highways into the overall transportation complex. It is fortunate that we can see them and hopefully act on them now—not later when solutions would be much harder to effect.

Perhaps the most immediate and vexing problem facing us is urban transportation. Traffic snarls result in millions of dollars in lost business and time, not to mention frayed tempers and raw nerves.

The difficulty in finding a solution, it seems to me, has been that in pursuing their parochial interests, the various factions have failed to state the problem—and the problem is how to move goods and passengers in the fastest, most economical, and most comfortable manner that is acceptable to the user, the customer so to speak.

We must not only make the best possible use of each mode of transportation, but find the best combinations of modes—we need, in short, an integrated, rather than a fragmented approach. This may call for some thinking of the national interest, rather than local or modal concerns.

The problems of urban transportation are going to grow rather than diminish with time. The population of the United States will soar to 214 million by 1970. One hundred and fifty million of these will be concentrated in urban areas.

An important step toward an integrated approach to these problems was taken in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962.

First, the act allows a State to use Federal-aid secondary funds on extensions of the system that pass through urban areas. This permits increased flexibility of financing arrangements and promotes improvements in such areas, particularly those having important feeder routes on the secondary system.

Second, the act requires assurance from the State highway department that relocation advisory assistance will be provided for the relocation of families displaced by acquisition or clearance of rights-of-way for any Federal-aid highway.

The loss of taxable property for a freeway right-of-way creates real problems for city officials. We are actively promoting the use of air space over freeways, and have adopted procedures and standards which would permit States and cities to utilize space above and below freeways to build parking facilities, apartments, stores, public buildings, and even parks and playgrounds.

Third, and most important, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to cooperate with the States in the development of long-range highway plans and programs coordinated with plans for improving other affected forms of transportation. This provision will encourage transportation planning and improve the quality of urban planning generally. It will not delay the current Federal-aid highway program. Urban areas of 50,000 or more must have plans in process by July 1, 1965 to be eligible for Federal participation in costs of projects.

At last, I think we have made a move toward curing the illness rather than treating the symptoms.

Urban congestion is acute, and therefore, has occupied much of our immediate attention, but other problems are shaping up, and our hope is that together we can attend to these before they become too serious.

We expect to have ready for submission to Congress within 60 days the Department of Commerce recommendations for possible changes in the present weight and size limitations for vehicles using the Interstate System.

Here again the task is not easy. While physical characteristics of highways, such as width of lanes, the ability to withstand heavy axle weights, and other criteria are important, we must also evaluate weights and sizes in terms of the economics of truck transportation. We must provide the combination that will result in the most efficient and effective standards for highway vehicles.

The need to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative methods and standards must be extended throughout our transportation system. The interlocking nature of urban planning, highways, and truck sizes carries on through railroads, waterways, and air transport. The parts must mesh if the machine is to run properly.

For this reason the administration has formulated a basic transportation policy. Briefly what President Kennedy has called for is greater reliance on competition and less on regulation, consistent policies of taxation and user charges, increased research for equipment and systems.

Much of the weakness in transportation today can be traced to the existing Federal regulatory policies. As the President said, in his transportation message to Congress last year, "A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology or the parallel change in the structure of competition."

The unequal application of present regulatory laws impedes competition and leads to a host of inconsistencies.

Coal, petroleum, grain, and other bulk commodities move by barge over inland waterways completely without regulation, but the same commodities moving by rail or common carrier truck are completely regulated.

Hauling buttermilk is exempt from regulation, but the same truck hauling chocolate milk over the same route between the same points is regulated. Powdered milk is exempt but condensed milk is not. And there are many other such inconsistencies.

There is in the legislative machinery right now a most important bill. It would assure all carriers the right to ship containers and vehicles on other carriers at rates available to noncarrier shippers.

The object, of course, is to encourage coordination among the various agencies of transportation, to assure shippers better and cheaper service. One result would be to stimulate the growing piggy-back technique, which eliminates much of the cost and time loss of repeated loadings and unloadings.

Another purpose is to further the growth of containerization, which promises to cut transportation costs considerably and is one of the exciting developments in the field.

A trend appears to be developing to standardize containers in sizes of 4 by 8, 8 by 8, 8 by 10, and 8 by 20. If these do become standard sizes we must give consideration to how these can be effectively moved by all modes of transportation. It would affect the trucking industry, for example, because piggyback trailers are really nothing but containers.

Developing these new techniques, however, depends to a large extent on allowing all carriers equal rights to use them rather than regulating some and penalizing others.

Inequities persist, too, in our policies toward taxes and user charges.

For example, the Federal Government now spends about $500 million a year on the airways system and this expenditure continues to grow. Yet, airlines pay only a small portion of this public costs in the form of user charges. Passengers pay a 5-percent user charge on their tickets, and there is no tax on air freight. A 2-cent-per-gallon charge is levied on the fuel for reciprocal engine airplanes, but there is no fuel tax for the big, fast, efficient jets.

The public has invested more than $2 billion in the inland waterways system and continues to spend at the rate of about $70 million a year. Yet, inland waterway operators pay no user charge for this publicly provided facility.

I am happy to say that the highway trust fund which supplies all of the Federal-aid highway funds for construction is set up to allocate construction costs as nearly as possible in relation to user benefits. Revenues from the fund are derived from motor fuel taxes, rubber taxes, use taxes for heavy vehicles, and taxes on new trucks, buses, and trailers.

Our aim is to bring costs in a similar fashion more into line with user benefits in other segments of industry. We hope to establish equity in terms of taxes and regulation and allow free enterprise as free a rein as possible. For it is through competition we feel we can best get the lowest possible shipper costs and the most effective service.

Competition gives us more than efficiency for a static situation. It sharpens our awareness for the pressures of change. It requires that we not only keep up with a rapidly moving world, but that we anticipate and precipitate change in the constant desire to forge ahead.

It is important that we move with purpose—blind change for its own sake is inadequate. Only through the various forms of well reasoned research can planned change be accomplished in a way that will produce the kind of transportation system that will be responsive to the economic and social requirements of the future.

In his transportation message, President Kennedy said, "To understand the increasingly complex transportation problems of the future, to identify the relationships of social, economic, administrative, and technical factors involved, to translate scientific knowledge into transportation engineering practice, to weigh the merits of alternative systems, and to formulate new, improved, and consistent policies—we need information that can evolve only from a vigorous, continuous, and coordinated programs of research. Yet, in the field of transportation where we have many unfulfilled opportunities, research has been fragmented, unsteady, inadequate in scope and balance."

In the long view, I don't think we can commit ourselves too firmly to any mode of transportation, to any process of manufacture, to the use of any material, or engineering procedure. Research is pointing to new high strength, low cost, durable materials, new sources of power, new types of vehicles. The jet airplane is fairly new on the scene, and investigations are underway for commercial aircraft to fly at three times the speed of sound. A nuclear-powered merchant ship is operational, and a hydrofoil ship has been built. A variety of surface effect vehicles are in the experimental stage. And who is to say that something will not follow that sounds incredible now?

The President said, "Taking advantage of new techniques that would provide convenience and efficiency, we must consider the

impact of different forms of transportation investment on economic development; we must combine and integrate systems to take advantage of the maximum benefits of each mode of travel; we must consider the Nation's transportation network as an articulated and closely linked system rather than an uncoordinated set of independent entities."

The Department of Commerce has been given the job of developing a comprehensive transportation research program for the Government for later consideration by the Congress.

Our Commerce Department's Census Bureau is undertaking a survey of all transportation to fill in the gaps of present knowledge, especially with respect to private trucking.

Our Bureau of Public Roads has been using research for many years to aid it in planning and building the world's finest intercity network of highways. It is now reemphasizing its work and has undertaken the complex job of evaluating the relation of highway planning to mass transportation by rail or express bus, and to city planning.

I cannot stress too much the importance of accomplishing these goals. Transportation is tightly tied to public policy. Transportation is the catalyst that makes our economy work. It affects economic growth, it is a determining fact or in the price of every commodity we produce, consume, and export. It is a vital cog in our defense machinery. An inefficient transportation system can render inefficient every vital aspect of our country's life.

We've made a start on a long, continuing, complex, and difficult job. It is going to take the best techniques and cooperation of Government and private enterprise to put and keep our transportation program at the high level our country requires.

But I feel that Government is facing up to the overall problems of our transportation industry with more realism than it has in the past. With your help we will build an industry that is responsive to our Nation's growth needs, economically and socially.

Keep up your good work and thank you for letting me be with you today.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ROADS, U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, AT AFTERNOON SESSION OF ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN ROAD BUILDER'S ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 25, 1963

On several occasions during the past 4 years I have been invited to address national conventions of the American Road Builders Association, contractor groups, and affiliated State units of ARBA. For the most part, I have spoken on subjects such as the role of the citizen in public affairs and the relations of the businessman and his Government.

I intend to speak here more specifically of problems in the area of concern of the roadbuilders and of the highway planners and administrators.

First, however, I should say that in the Senate, and especially in our Public Works Committee, we have felt in a keen official and a deep personal way the losses of Senators Dennis Chavez of New Mexico and Robert Kerr of Oklahoma in recent weeks. They were policymakers and leaders of action in highway matters in the Congress. Our new chairman, the capable Senator PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan, and others will carry on. None of us is indispensable, but our success and the progress we seek to effectuate by our decisions and actions will be all the more assured by our drawing on the experiences we acquired while serving under the expert leadership of our predecessors.

There has been a minimum of partisanship on the Public Works Committee and on the Public Roads Subcommittee. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, is the ranking Republican member and brings to his duties a commendable diligence. In this respect, I acknowledge and commend the productivity of the Subcommittee on Public Roads during the 86th and 87th Congresses under the chairmanship of Senator MCNAMARA. It was a privilege to have served with him, Senator COOPER, and other colleagues on that subcommittee. I am sure we will continue to labor cooperatively.

Concerning the important question of coordinate but separate branches of our Government—especially as relate to administration of public roads matters—I have some positive opinions. Between the legislators and the administrators in the public roads agencies of the executive branches of both State and Federal Governments there should be mutual understanding, mutual respect, and helpful liaison in the public interest.

Those in the executive establishment responsible for public roads administration receive from the legislative branch outlines of policy in the broadest possible terms.

I stress the word "broad" in speaking of most legislative policy declarations and authorizations passed on to the executive. This is as it should be. The legislative branch must not straitjacket the executive branch. By and large, I do not believe there is straitjacketing in any substantial degree.

But it does seem that occasionally there are some legislators in the State assemblies or in the Federal Congress who exceed the bounds of what I consider to be propriety on the one hand and constitutional requirements on the other hand. I refer to those members of legislative bodies who seem neither to respect nor to subscribe to the concept of coordinate but separate branches of government. I believe there are legislators and staffs of legislative bodies who abuse the relationship between the executive and legislative authority—especially in the area of public roads. This condition is deplored.

A legislator does not have a right to seek to administer the law or laws which stem from legislative action. That is a usurpation of power because administration is a duty reserved for the executive branch by constitutional provision and in statutes brought into being under the Constitution.

Furthermore, I believe a legislator or a legislative body or a legislative committee staff should not seek and should not attempt to take over law enforcement authority which is specifically a responsibility of the executive branch. Yet, this sometimes happens. And, I assure you, I believe a legislator or any group of legislators or any legislative body or any legislative committee staff should not infringe on the judicial branch by seeking to be prosecutor, judge, and jury. But, unfortunately, this, too, sometimes occurs.

There are also instances wherein some among our fellow citizens expect—even demand—that their legislative representatives shall transgress on the authority reserved by the Constitution or specific statutes for the executive branch or for the judiciary.

Citizens who have complaints against administration should first direct their objections to the executive. They should not complain to the legislative representatives or committees unless and until they are prepared to suggest and support valid, reasonable, and responsible changes in existing law—or to recommend new statutes relating to conditions and circumstances apparently not covered by law.

If citizens have complaints to lodge against the legality of an administrative action and they cannot bring about correction within the structure of the executive branch where responsibility reposes, the proper course for those citizens to follow is to seek appropriate judicial review and/or action.

It is the responsibility of citizens as well as legislators, executives and administrators, and jurists to keep their actions within the framework of our constitutional system of coordinate but separate branches of the Government. Nowhere does this seem to be more necessary than in public roads matters.

In spite of some distracting influences there has been much substantial progress in the implementation of the public roads program authorized by the Highway Act of 1956. And there has been sound progressiveness in the American Road Builders Association, too, since 1956. That was the year during which the knowledgeable and efficient executive vice president of this association, Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, became head of the organization's administrative staff. I share a view ably expressed recently that much of the current prominence which the association holds in the highway world is attributable to his conscientious leadership. And General Prentiss' deputy, Burton F. Miller, has contributed effectively to the American Road Builders Association leadership effort. His was a significant article for our magazine recently on the subject "Teamwork in Constructive Progress." I share his comment that technological advancements in the highway field are speeding highway planning, construction, and maintenance and are creating better, more efficient roads for a traveling America.

There are, of course, capable and dedicated administrators, planners, researchers, and engineers in the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce. It is pleasant to have their cooperation and a privilege to cooperate with them.

I believe citizens can agree that in view of the high capital investment required for construction of the Interstate and Defense Highway System and the substantial maintenance charges which devolve on the States, our highways in that system necessarily must be designed for a long service life. In fact, Bureau of Public Roads analysts have estimated a service life of 80 to 100 years for Interstate System grading, 35 years for surfacing, and 65 to 75 years for structures. It seems to me that where evidence accumulates that the estimated traffic for 1975 approaches a breakover point, it would be wise to provide now for either the additional lanes required to take care of traffic needs projected beyond the 1975 period or at least make those provisions necessary to assure that the structures being included in highway projects will continue to have useful life spans. It certainly would be tragic to permit structures to become obsolete early in their life because of insufficient rights-of-way, lack of control of access, or because of other reasons.

I understand that what actually has happened in some instances is that new sections of highways which have only recently been completed, and which were designed on the basis of the estimated 1975 traffic load, already are carrying traffic equal to that which had been anticipated to develop no sooner than 1975. Based on these experiences, steps should be taken to assure that sections of highways now being constructed will continue to be of optimum use beyond 1975.

The importance of the longevity of the highways is apparent to the most casual observer. Consequently, there is much interest in obtaining assurances of quality construction. And this interest is displayed not only by State and Federal highway officials but, also, by State legislative committees, by committees of the Congress, and by the public at large.

This concern generates demands that each stage of construction be subjected to thorough and expert inspection.

From a technicial standpoint, the informed consensus seems to be that inspection procedures and nondestructive testing have improved and will continue to improve

with more emphasis on measuring devices utilizing radioisotopes and various applications in the field of electronics and sonics. The technical tools are available now to measure construction performance with micrometer exactness. There is no real doubt that technological advances in this field will enhance the building of better highways at lower costs to the taxpayers.

I share the view that it must be accepted as fact and as a practical consideration that highways cannot be constructed under degrees of exactness comparable to laboratory control. Indeed, there must be leeway allowed in order to meet working conditions actually encountered in field operations. This should be clear, even to the layman. But there should be no lessening of quality, nor lowering of standards. Perhaps the correct approach would be the placing of more reliability on field decisions and allowing greater acceptance of reasonable variations from the technical specifications.

Unless procedures permit prompt and firm decisions by field engineers, it is conceivable—even probable—that the highway program would be bogged in greater degree under a maze of indecision and the proverbial red-tape. This consequence would prove to be extremely costly for the taxpayers.

Insofar as inspections are concerned, there would appear to be a demand for and an ability to perform them precisely and with prompt results. But in informed circles I hear two dominant questions. They are:

1. What tolerances can be permitted in the various construction operations without loss of quality in the finished product?

2. What inspections are necessary and desirable to make certain that the work has been accomplished within the required tolerances?

In spite of the fact that the State, as the instrumentality contracting for the highways, bears the primary inspection responsibility, we hear numerous demands that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads must conduct extensive physical inspections of every Federal-aid project—and especially the Interstate System projects—to make certain that full value is received for every Federal-aid dollar allocated and expended.

If the Bureau of Public Roads inspects in the interest of every Federal dollar involved and if the State checks on behalf of every State dollar, it would appear that there would be costly duplicate inspections at every stage of construction. There are few if any instances in which duplication of effort is not wasteful. In the matter of the types of inspections under discussion, duplications patently result in many excessive and mostly unnecessary delays and much confusion. This reflects in the high costs to the taxpayers and extra expense imposed on the contractor.

For more than 40 years highways have been built successfully within the framework of the Federal-State partnership—and this certainly should continue.

I reemphasize a point about which I have consulted with segments of the highway industry. It is this:

If we are to achieve throughout the United States the acceleration of the roadbuilding program called for by our transportation and economic needs, we must reinstate at every level a vigorous Federal-State-industry partnership and the sense of mutual trust that such a relationship implies.

By and large, the partners are working well together, notwithstanding some disrupting influences.

There is need for Federal cooperation with the agencies of the States. This does not necessitate duplications, and it certainly does not imply and should not countenance undue and unnecessary Federal controls.

I have the positive feeling that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, headed by Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton—who had long experience as a State administrator and understands the State point of view—really has no designs on a so-called takeover. In fact, under Administrator Whitton, it is my belief that the Bureau is exerting leadership to strengthen the partnership concept.

One of the most promising developments in this area is the formation of a task force within the Research and Development Division of the Bureau of Public Roads to work with the State highway departments and with industry to explore the whole problem of permissible tolerances and inspection procedures.

The consensus of informed persons, as I interpret it, is that the approach being followed is based on the fact that the testing of samples taken at random provides data which can be plotted on a curve, and an analysis of which determines whether or not a given standard of quality has been met. I would be inclined to the more lenient interpretation that in using this approach it does not follow that a job is categorized as a failure because a few samples may fall below the lower limit of specified tolerances. Shouldn't the whole curve be considered?

Early completion of the work of the task force in the Bureau's Research and Development Division is a matter of urgency. Acceptance by the States of recommended tolerances to be brought forth likewise is an urgent matter.

I am informed that planning and construction delays have reached proportions in many areas which are costly not only to the taxpayers but also are threatening the stability of the contracting industry.

Highway contractors should find acceptance of workable tolerances to be of significance to their work and beneficial to their operations.

Experts assure me that new inspection and testing techniques, coupled with engineering judgment of high order, will promote decisions on the spot, so to speak, and will thus eliminate many costly delays, as well as speed the process of approving estimates for payment.

Close cooperation between State and Federal authorities and between government and industry is, of course, essential to success through these approaches.

I am gratified that the American Road Builders Association has a committee at work to provide industry participation in and support for this project undergoing study by the Bureau's research and development task force.

The interest of our Public Works Committee in the matter of new materials and new uses of materials, new equipment and new methods employed in construction has been demonstrated by the activities during the past year in connection with the compiling of seven committee prints dealing with the subject of new materials, new design methods, etc., in public works construction. One of the outstanding presentations which the committee received was prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with others. It has shown very clearly and concisely the high degree of technical refinement that is being employed in highways construction in this country. It is my hope that we can expand this study by conferences with representatives of industry and that eventually we can publish a composite report which will point up specific areas where additional research may be helpful in improving public works structures.

In summary, I emphasize the belief that important contributions can be made—indeed, must be made—to three vitally necessary goals, namely:

1. Maintenance of a Federal-aid highway program—and I underscore the fact that it must be an aid program—conducted by the States, rather than one which would be a Federal highway program with aid to the States unfortunately deemphasized.

2. Improved and duplication-free inspection which would have the positive result of strengthening public confidence in the integrity of the highway program.

3. Elimination of project and construction delays costly both to the taxpayers and to the contractors.

It is my hope that this year will be one during which the administrators can devote their efforts to administering—the engineers to engineering—the roadbuilders to building—the paving contractors to paving—and the highway and safety researchers to their important investigations and development.

I trust there will be a minimum of requirement on the time of those in the public road agencies and those in the private sector of road construction for response to legislative inquiries and legislative hearings.

In the absence of objection—to use legislative parlance—I will close, as I did the last ARBA convention I had the privilege of addressing, with these admonitions and assurances:

There is an overriding requirement that there be full recognition of the fact that this Nation's road construction needs are among our most urgent domestic problems. But these needs can be and will be fulfilled—and the blight of accounts of alleged and/or actual wrong-doing will be overcome—if we unite to promote a harmonious Federal-State-industry partnership. I call for a partnership for progress—one guided by men to match our times.

Malaysian Federation in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for a Federation of Malaysia—a federation which would combine Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, North Borneo, and the Sultanate of Brunei—is scheduled to become reality on August 31 of this year.

Already, however, the formation of Malaysia—a federation which would bring together 10 million people and a rich abundance of important natural resources—is being opposed by two important countries of the South China Sea: the Philippines and Indonesia.

The reasons for this opposition, the development of the Malaysian concept, and the importance of these events for both U.S. policy and peace in this explosive area of the world were brought pointedly to my attention during my tour of the Far East last year.

Mr. Speaker, many of these factors have been given an excellent discussion in an article by Warren Unna which appeared in the Washington Post on February 17, and I believe that our colleagues will find Mr. Unna's article of value.

The article follows:

THE IMPENDING BIRTH OF MALAYSIA IS IN REAL JEOPARDY

(By Warren Unna)

The South China Sea is bubbling with trouble these days as Britain, Malaya, Indo-

nesia, and the Philippines await the start of the new Federation of Malaysia, scheduled for August 31.

Britain and Malaya, creators of the Malaysian concept, are determined to see it born. Indonesia and the Philippines, each of which has ambitions of its own for Malaysia's North Borneo component, now seem equally determined to see that Malaysia is not born. And the Communist elements in both Indonesia and Singapore, sensing that Malaysia promises new stability for the shores of the South China Sea, are doing their best to back the Indonesian and Philippine opposition.

What makes the Malaysian situation so critical today is that words have sharpened into threats, troops of both Indonesia and Britain have been moved from reserve status to alert and the inertial momentum that sometimes makes war inevitable conceivably could be already under way.

Moreover, a good many of Indonesia's neighbors are becoming increasingly disturbed over the stockpile of $1 billion in Soviet military equipment Indonesia acquired last year. Djakarta's campaign for Netherlands New Guinea (West Irian) was settled peacefully before the armaments were used.

United Nations Secretary General U Thant warned last month that the situation needs careful watching. And he lost no time in dispatching U.N. Under Secretary C. V. Narasimhan to southeast Asia to do some of that watching.

Malaysia originally was conceived of by Britain as an especially felicitous way of abdicating from an outmoded, unwanted colonialism while still hanging on to her naval base in Singapore, the last great British military outpost in Asia now protecting the Queen's commercial interests all the way up to Hong Kong.

The idea was to link one independent ex-British colony, Malaya, with three current British colonies, Singapore, Sarawak, and North Borneo, and one small British-protected state, the Sultanate of Brunei, into a federation that would continue to enjoy a British military umbrella.

Malaysia was first publicly proposed by Malaya's Prime Minister, the Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra.

The normal expectation might have been for Malaya which achieved its independence from Britain in 1957, to combine with Singapore, the city-island at Malaya's southern tip which provides the natural port outlet for processing and shipping Malaya's rubber, tea, and tin. Vastly overpopulated Singapore, the size of 10 Manhattans, in turn has had need of the Malayan hinterland to grow its food, start revenue-producing industries, and perhaps siphon off some of its people.

But the normal expectation refused to jell into practicality.

The Tunku foresaw that if he merged Malaya's 6.8 million people, 2.5 million of whom are of Chinese origin, with Singapore's 1.6 million, all but 400,000 of whom are of Chinese origin, his easygoing, slower producing Malayans soon would be both outnumbered and outpaced.

Moreover, the Tunku and his Malayan people are stanchly anti-Communist. The Chinese-Malayans, abandoned to separate schools, separate language, and separate culture by British colonial administration, have shown considerable sympathy of late for homeland identification propaganda from Communist China.

But when the British and the Tunku hit upon adding North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei—all of which have only small Chinese minorities—into a Federation of Malaysia, the right merging mixture was achieved through dilution.

RICH ECONOMIC AREA

The new Federation of Malaysia, if it succeeds in birth, will have some 10 million people, of whom just a little more than one-third will be of Chinese origin. It will encompass some 130,000 square miles (about the size of New Mexico and Massachusetts combined) and assemble under one economic flag a fantastically rich assortment of tin, rubber, tea, copra, palm oil, petroleum, timber, and gold-bearing areas.

The Tunku also found it possible to agree that a British-SEATO naval base in Singapore would not prove inconsistent with Malaya's present anti-Communist version of nonalinement.

And it is thought that even Singapore's leftists will be loath to demonstrate against a Western military bastion which provides so many lucrative jobs for Singapore's Chinese.

The prospect of Malaysia has not proved so felicitous to Indonesia and its President Sukarno, though.

Sukarno has not yet resolved his country's economic chaos. Now that Indonesia has regained West Irian from the Netherlands, the only colonial remnants left in the Indonesian archipelago to distract the Indonesians from their economic woes are Portugal's half of the island of Timor in the south, and Britain's bequest to Malaysia—Brunei, North Borneo, and Sarawak—in the north. Brunei, North Borneo, and Sarawak hold a minor partnership with Indonesia on the island of Borneo.

Indonesia undoubtedly has been annoyed with the prospect of having this northern section foreclosed from its irridentist hopes by the formation of Malaysia. It might be a bit awkward for Indonesia, an ex-colony itself, to have to press its claim against three partners in a newly independent Malaysia.

There are other factors involved in Indonesia's opposition to the birth of Malaysia. Indonesia has not forgotten that both Malaya and Singapore provided a haven for her rebels in the bitter anti-Sukarno anti-Communist rebellion that began in 1958. There long has been a cultural competition between Indonesia and Malaya, which speak the same language. And there has been a personality competition between Sukarno and the Tunku who, to put it bluntly, hate each other's guts. Overriding all these Malaysian opposition factors is the Partai Kommunis Indonesia (PKI), the largest Communist Party outside the Sino-Soviet sphere.

The prospect of Malaysia has not proved so glittering to the Philippines either, or at least to its President, Diosdado Macapagal.

Macapagal, when a junior official in the Philippine Foreign Ministry, became an expert on the ancient claim of the Filipino heirs of the Sultan of Sulu to British North Borneo. After he became president, Macapagal converted a private family claim into a major national foreign policy issue.

While it is true that the Filipinos had some serious worries about smuggling and the possibility of Communist infiltration from the North Borneo area, it also is true that the Philippine Government never before had considered the North Borneo claim important enough to take a stand on it. Macapagal, curiously, made his claim just after the U.S. Congress, on a first go-round had failed to approve a $73 million war damage compensation bill for the Philippines. Macapagal has been in a cantankerous mood since, although Congress reconsidered and approved the bill.

Macapagal also cannot be too happy over the snub he received from both Britain and Malaya when he asked that the Philippines be included in a "Greater Malaysia."

Considering this background opposition to Malaysia from Indonesia and the Philippines, what happened in Brunei in December should not have been too surprising.

A 34-year-old Indonesian-educated veterinary surgeon named Sheik A. M. Azahari started a revolt in Brunei aimed at capturing the Sultan, removing Brunei from the proposed Federation of Malaysia and, instead, grouping Brunei, North Borneo and Sarawak into "the Unitary State of Kalimantan Utara (North Borneo)."

Although Azahari headed Brunei's largest and leftist Ra-ayat Party, he "led" the revolt from a Manila hotel room. And his "secret army" was reportedly both trained and assisted on the Indonesian side of the Borneo border by volunteers from the Partai Kommunis Indonesia.

What might have been dismissed as self-serving accusations from both Britain and Malaya soon gained substance from Sukarno himself. "What is happening in Brunei has something to do with new emerging forces, and the movement will come out as a victor," Sukarno told Yugoslav Vice President Edvard Kardelj at a Djakarta banquet. Sukarno's Ambassador to the Philippines, Nazir Pamontjak, next declared it a logical step for Indonesia to support the Brunei revolutionaries' "struggle for independence."

Then came Indonesian accusations that Malaysia was neocolonialism, meaning that in Indonesia's book, the continuance of a British defense treaty and a British naval base at Singapore negated any pretense of independence.

Since then, the step-up of accusations and actions has been more acute. For instance:

Indonesian Foreign Minister Subandrio last month warned of a political confrontation with Malaya, a country whose leaders he proclaimed, were henchmen of the imperialists. "Confrontation" was the term the Indonesians used last year when they began getting tough with the Dutch on relinquishing West Irian.

The Indonesian Army Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Achmad Jani, an officer much admired by the West, restrained two divisions of "volunteers" in Indonesian Borneo at the beginning of this month with the words: "We must be coolheaded and wait for orders before taking any action."

Philippine President Macapagal, in his state of the Union message, came out full force against Malaysia, adopted the Indonesian term of neocolonialism and accused Malaya of trying to bring communism right up to the Philippines' front door. His remark came just after a Philippine anti-Malaysian delegation to London had been told of the importance of Singapore as a SEATO naval base.

Air Marshal Sir Hector McGregor, head of Britain's Far East Air Force, told reporters 10 days ago that Indonesian bombers twice had been picked up on radar flying directly toward Singapore as part of its (Indonesia's) policy of confrontation. And in Britain itself, a brigade of troops was put on readiness to reinforce the southeast Asia garrisons.

Malaya's Tunku on February 8 announced: "I am 60 today and outside and inside of me I am all peace. But if they (the Indonesians) ever dare to fight us, then we will accept the challenge. This time we really mean business."

Subandrio last week reported that physical conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia now is almost unavoidable unless Malaya changes its hostile attitude. And Subandrio went on to question whether Malaya hadn't joined an international conspiracy against Indonesia.

Last Wednesday, Malaya's Deputy Prime Minister and Defense Minister, Tunku Abdul Razak, ordered a national defense build-up against Indonesia which, he said, has become "a threat to the security of the country."

On Thursday, President Sukarno told a Djakarta rally: "We don't want Malaysia around us. We know it is encirclement. Malaysia is to save imperialism." And Sukarno warned that Indonesia was prepared for an "economic confrontation" as well as a political one, which presumably ment an attempt to reroute Indonesia's trade from Malaya and Singapore.

Meanwhile in Singapore, Prime Minister

Lee Kuan Yew, who has committed his city-state to Malaysia despite his party's having only a minority share of Legislative Assembly seats, decided the outspoken endorsement of the Brunei rebels by Singapore's Barisan Socialis (Socialist Front) made that party too big a risk to tolerate. Lee ordered the arrest of some 111 Communists and fellow travelers.

Now it well may be true that Malaysia represent a hasty package of expediency on the part of both Britain and Malaya and this package could come undone by internal opposition from within the proposed federation, notably from the strong leftist party in Sarawak.

It also may well be true that Malaya's Tunku now is appalled at the ruckus Malaysia has stirred and secretly yearns for the earlier years when he thought his Malaya should remain nonalined from Singaport and the rest of the area.

It also may well be true that Indonesia, now the world's fifth most populous nation and one of the wealthiest in natural resources, eventually will be the biggest fish in the South China Sea.

But until that event occurs through natural evolution, Britain feels herself committed to protect her excolonies and preserve her considerable commercial interests in southeast Asia. And this presumably was the message delivered by Fred Warner, chief of the British Foreign Office's southeast Asian section, who slipped quietly into Washington last week for some grim huddles.

With Britain determined to protect and preserve, and quite militarily able to, what about Indonesia?

Indonesia still has all that $1 billion worth of Soviet military equipment lying around unused. She still has the huge military force she built up to fight the rebellions of a few years back and the war for West Irian which didn't have to be fought. And Indonesia is the first to be aware that the reason that war didn't have to be fought was that she got just as stubborn as her old Dutch masters and forced a backdown.

Will Indonesia's memory of success be precedent for the future against Britain and Malaysia? Is the muscleflexing used so successfully for West Irian yesterday going to be repeated for North Borneo today? For Portugal's Timor tomorrow? For Australia's remaining half of New Guinea (an "East Irian") and Indonesia's Malay "brothers" in Malaya itself the day after tomorrow?

These, reportedly, are some of the questions President Kennedy is pondering now in regard to U.S. policy for the South China Sea area. Mr. Kennedy last year committed the United States to helping Indonesia in its claim for West Irian because he foresaw a military confrontation of Indonesia and the Netherlands—and then perhaps the Soviet Union and the United States—if West Irian wasn't settled peacefully.

But the United States may find that the bubbling in the South China Sea these days over Malaysia, with the attendant threats and troop movements, make a peaceful solution even more difficult to come by.

State Department Explains Incident to Jewish Telegraphic Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a letter from the State Department to an officer of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

Earlier this month I reported to the Senate that Mr. Milton Friedman, Washington correspondent for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, had been denied access to a background briefing session in the State Department on Near Eastern affairs.

I objected to this incident both because it was a reflection on the integrity of a fine news correspondent and because it was another instance of an attempt at news management.

The Department's letter confirms the facts in this matter and then goes on to say:

When Mr. Friedman subsequently inquired about the briefing he was told that it was limited to those who had been invited. This should have been handled more wisely. Once he had made known his interest in the subject he should have been invited to attend the briefing. I regret that he was not.

I am pleased that the State Department accepts the responsibility for this incident and implies that it will not happen again. This should be called to the attention of the many other agencies of our Government which make wide use of secret briefings for selected members of the press. It should remind them that the American people have the right to know what their Government is doing and that arbitrary selection of reporters for briefings frequently lend themselves to abuses of this sort.

I ask unanimous consent that the State Department's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an editorial which appeared in the Jewish Times of February 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 21, 1963.

Mr. PHILIP SLOMOVITZ,
Vice President, Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SLOMOVITZ: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter concerning the alleged exclusion of Mr. Milton Friedman, Washington correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, from a State Department background briefing. At the Secretary's request I have looked into the incident and can assure you that no affront to Mr. Friedman or to the Jewish Telegraph Agency was intended. Nevertheless a misunderstanding occurred, and I welcome this opportunity to explain the circumstances which apparently occasioned it.

As you are no doubt aware, State Department background briefings are held from time to time on subjects of current interest. These are not considered a substitute for one-the-record press conferences, but I am convinced that most reporters consider them a useful way to obtain information when a more formal briefing cannot be arranged. Invitations to backgrounders, as you probably know, are likely to range from the all inclusive downward to a handful of correspondents who have a special interest in a subject or who have been seeking individual interviews with an official whose schedule does not leave room for a half dozen or more individual interviews. Attendance at backgrounders is often limited, since it would be impractical in most cases to invite the 211 correspondents accredited to the Department.

The background briefing in the present case concerned the resignation of Dr. Joseph E. Johnson as special representative of the Palestine Conciliation Commission. It was set up by the Deputy Public Affairs Adviser of the Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs with the concurrence of the Bureau of Public Affairs, and was given by Mr. Robert C. Strong, Director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs. A small number of reporters were invited representing major American newspapers and wire services, namely: New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Baltimore Sun, Washington Post, Washington Star, Time magazine, Associated Press, and United Press International. The principle followed in compiling this list was to invite correspondents who cover the Department regularly and who had been asking questions virtually every day about the Johnson matter. When Mr. Friedman subsequently inquired about the briefing he was told that it was limited to those who had been invited. This should have been handled more wisely; once he had made known his interest in the subject he should have been invited to attend the briefing. I regret that he was not.

In talking with Mr. Friedman, Mr. Strong explained that he had not determined who was to be invited to the briefing. Mr. Strong then mentioned an article written by Mr. Friedman a short time ago. Mr. Strong questioned the accuracy of the report on which the article was based and offered the services of his office for the purpose of checking such reports in the future. There was no connection between this part of the discussion and the fact that Mr. Friedman was not invited to the background briefing. You may be sure that the Bureau of Public Affairs, the Office of Near Eastern Affairs, and Mr. Strong would be most happy to see Mr. Friedman or any other representative of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency at any time.

Your kind words on the good relations you have had with the Bureau of Public Affairs and with the news office are much appreciated. I shall pass on your friendly comment to Linc White and Joe Reap.

Sincerely,

ROBERT MANNING.

LET'S HAVE THE FACTS

When will our State Department become cognizant of the true facts and cease playing up to the Arabs while shunning its friendly ally in the Middle East—the democracy of Israel? This week the State Department's true position toward Israel once again was witnessed. The latest insult to Jewry by the State Department came when it barred Milton Friedman, a reporter for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, from a background briefing on the Middle East. The excuse given was trite: Friedman was prevented from attending the briefing because he was regarded as a "foreign agent." This is ridiculous.

However, U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, was among the first to assail the State Department's action. SCOTT, in a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said he objected strongly to "this kind of news management, and this reflection upon the integrity of a fine news correspondent." SCOTT deserves the admiration of American Jews for his constant battle against those political forces in the United States which still want to bend over backwards for the Arabs.

The State Department briefing was about refugee problems in the Middle East, which this newspaper has been informed is near settlement. The close relationship between Israel and the United States is supposed to lead to the settlement of the Arab refugee conflict that has kept the Middle East in the state of near war for many years. Barring the press does not solve the problems. Last year this newspaper was barred from an opening dinner of the Allied Jewish Appeal on the pretext that Moshe Sharrett would reveal secret information concerning Jewish refugees. This type of action only shows the public someone is trying to hide something. Let's get the facts out.

Government Fiscal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Dr. Deane W. Malott, president of Cornell University, before the Executives Club of Chicago, Ill., on February 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONAL PRONOUN—FIRST PERSON SINGULAR

(By Dean W. Malott)

Perhaps it is a part of the softening process of the American people in a day of munificent living, perhaps it is a result of the nerve-shattering tensions of a revolutionary age; but whatever the cause, the individual American citizen is not adequately bearing the burdens of his citizenship nor shouldering the leadership upon which our freedom must rest.

"They" in Washington are completely removed from our sense of personal responsibility, and if the Government in power happens to be of a political party not of our choice, we scarcely credit it with either intelligence or integrity. We grit our teeth and hope to weather through, until some brighter dawn brings back the ability, the honesty, and the wisdom for the proper management of our affairs.

Yet Henry Clay, long, long ago pointed out this danger: "The great principle," he said, "is that the majority must govern, from which there can be no appeal but the sword. That majority ought to govern wisely, equitably, moderately, and constitutionally; but govern it must."

I am persuaded that no free way of life can survive without the dedicated will and concern of a vast proportion of the citizens, the average voters of the Republic. This was the idea that Aristotle himself propounded, in ancient times—that one need not be an expert in order to exercise sound judgment in public affairs.

Yet the human race learns slowly. In the long history of civilization, freedom has more often been lost by carelessness and selfishness than by the force of conquering armies. Strongholds of free men have gone down more often by the erosion of indifference, tracing the way from the individual initiative out of which free societies are born to the bread and circuses which they demand as a public right in the last stages of their decline.

Our Government is run by elected officers beholden to the citizens; they continue in office only as long as they satisfy the electorate, and it was Mr. Dooley, long ago, who observed that "even the Supreme Coort Jistices listin to the iliction retarns." Therefore, if we do not constantly and articulately make known our beliefs, our desires, our concerns, we have abdicated our citizenship more surely than by not voting at all.

We have an interesting opportunity for observation, for in the last two decades we have lived under both Democratic and Republican leadership; the trends of Government have scarcely been distinguishable between the two. Each comes in under the blandishments of cutting costs, increasing efficiency, reducing taxes, lessening the impact of centralization of Government. But nothing of the kind happens.

The Government costs increase; deficits mount; and the ghost of Parkinson lurks through the corridors of Government everywhere.

The Federal budget this present year is a thumping $93 billion affair, approaching the greatest annual cost during World War II, and nearly three times the cost during the postwar low in 1948. The estimated budget expenditures are up some $11 billion over the figure of 2 years ago. The public debt at $295 billion is a half of the estimated gross national product for 1963.

If you have not looked at the budget of the U.S. Government, you are remiss in your duties of citizenship and have missed an opportunity to raise your blood pressure. It is a fantastic volume, showing how, almost unseen and unnoted by the people, the tentacle of gargantuan government ever encroach and permeate into each facet of our lives.

While 63 cents of every budget dollar goes to national defense, foreign aid, the program in space, 10 cents to fixed interest charges, and 6 cents to veterans' pensions, all costs of Government are ont the rapid rise.

A random perusal of the budget shows the trend. Costs of the U.S. Information Agency are up from $132 million in 1961 to an estimated $158 million for fiscal 1963. The Botanic Garden's costs have risen from $352,000 in 1961 to $489,000 for 1963. I wonder why. Fish and Wildlife Resources, which cost the American taxpayer $34 million just 10 years ago, will cost you $103 million in 1963. Is this necessary?

Salaries and wages in the Federal Trade Commission were $6,700,000 in 1961; this year, $9,610,000. Probably this is for the further harassment of the business community.

It requires nearly $600,000 more now than 2 years ago to operate the compliance activities of the Mexican farm labor program in the Bureau of Employment Security. Surely this activity is not that important.

The newly created Commission on Civil Rights requires $995,000, while the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations had a budget of $144,000 in 1961; of $375,000 at present. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has gone from $546,000 2 years ago to $730,000 at present. Up and up and up. The Commission of Fine Arts to advise the President on matters of architecture, sculpture, and painting cost us $22,000 in 1956; $69,000 in 1961; $80,000 in 1963. And the cost of the judiciary division of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has doubled in the last 7 years. Is there a reasonable justification? One wonders.

The Government's program to stimulate travel to the United States cost the taxpayer $517,000 in 1961; nearly $900,000 in 1963. Yet blocked currency impedes the travel from most countries.

The national school lunch program has gone from $155 million in 1961 to $170 million in 1963—just for the Federal Government's share.

Funds solely for the collection and study of basic information concerning rivers and harbors, flood control, and shore protection are up from $12 million in 1961 to $18,400,000 today, an increase in 2 years of more than 50 percent just to obtain information to plan further expenditures.

We are spending over $1 million a year in salaries for White House Police, and the expenses of the National Park Service have gone up nearly $20 million in 2 years.

Federal aid to education, a governmental function which some of us in education hold of dubious validity, has gone from $91 million in 1953 to $2,400 million in 1963, without the American people or the Congress ever having acted on the specific policy proposal at all. It has mostly been activated under the guise of achieving some other social, economic, or political objective. Total expenditures for Federal research and development programs of all sorts now total $11,500 million, up nearly $3 billion in 2 years.

Expenditures on many a front to aid State and local governments are now just under $10 billion; and interest on the public debt is now running at a rate of $9,400 million a year.

Nor is this indicative of the whole, sad story; it was Maurice H. Stans, then Director of the Federal Budget, speaking before this very club 3 years ago, who pointed out that the national debt is not all that we owe. Accrued and accruing liabilities or previous expenditure authorizations in many an area amounted to, even then, if added to the exposed debt, the gargantuan figure of $750 billion—an unbelievable c.o.d. against the American people of tomorrow.

Government accounting and fiscal complexities defy complete analysis by a mere layman. But the perusal of the Federal budget shows that the U.S. governmental departments conduct thousands of businesses, and there are many crossruffs. The Department of Agriculture pays farmers to take land out of production; the Bureau of Reclamation spends many a dollar to add to the country's productive capacity.

And to top off our fiscal incompetence and irresponsibility, the President of the United States now proposes to the Congress a Federal operating budget for fiscal 1964 just under $100 billion, which will probably prove in fact to be much higher—largest budget in the history of the Nation, and a planned increase of $4.5 billion over the current one. While in the present year the budget as originally presented indicated a $500 million surplus, the deficit is now estimated at just under $9 billion, and for fiscal 1964 will be little short of $12 billion as now estimated. Where it will end, no one knows.

While $100 billion is a difficult concept to grasp, a recent news periodical points out that it is 50 times more than the budget for the first year of World War I, and 11 times the total of the most expensive peacetime year of the New Deal. The next year's budget also is as great as the total cost of Government from 1789 through 1930.

Into this fantastic situation is thrust the ideology of a tax cut; very simply stated, we cut taxes, increase the gargantuan debt, and proceed to borrow from the taxpayer the loss in revenue thus sustained. It simply will not work; no nation and no person ever achieved prosperity by profligate spending. Economy lies down the road of cutting costs, at which point a tax reduction may be feasible, if we are content not to reduce our Federal debt, and to continue to pay the huge and continuing interest charges on the existing indebtedness of nearly $300 billion.

Dr. Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, tells us we must recognize as facts of life that a tax cut is essential, that costs will rise, and the Federal deficits will increase. President Kennedy is definitely planning a deficit as specific public policy, to create a transitional pump priming, a function uneasily reminiscent of New Deal philosophy. We recall we have heard the whole story before, but the history of past decades shows with certainty that deficits have never created surpluses, and they never will.

The reported statements that the gargantuan expenditures and deficits are the result of defense demands simply are not true. Defense accounts for far less than half of the budget, while in the last decade expenses for other purposes have zoomed to the stratosphere, including a triumphant figure of $27.5 billion for health, labor, and welfare. The whole picture is one of fiscal irresponsibility.

I accept no such postulate that rapidly rising costs and mounting deficits are inevitable, nor do I believe a major reduction of Government costs to be impossible, given the articulate will of the American people in demanding a sound fiscal policy.

And after the proposed tax cut, what happens next year, if the promised abracadabra of increasing prosperity and the promised balanced budget arising from the wishful thinking of our cosmic planners somehow fail to materialize? Greater Federal controls—you can count upon it—will then be put forward as the next step on the way to a blissful utopia. The whole kit and caboodle make no sense at all.

Now let us turn briefly to the great field of labor. Here again we are not living up to our citizenship responsibilities. Inexcusable featherbedding and obsolete and disastrous labor contracts are continued with political connivance or at least passive acceptance, while the whole apparatus of Federal Government again and again causes labor settlements which wink at practices detrimental to the free enterprise system and to the American stockholders upon whom the burden of waste and extravagance falls. Automation is impeded, the cost-price squeeze is accentuated, and the fiber of the American workingman is demoralized and undermined. Look at the railroads. A basic day in railroading continues to be 100 miles of travel; all else is overtime. Yet 100 miles can be accomplished in as little as 90 minutes. Surplus manpower lolls throughout industry under long-outmoded union contracts. The Congress of the United States is unwilling or unable to pay the political price of intelligent overhauling of labor laws, and of holding labor unions accountable as responsible units in our society.

This problem of the rising power of labor unions, and rising labor costs, is a drain upon American enterprise as debilitating as inordinate taxes, and is merely another evidence of the compounding profligacy of a government which we somehow are not holding accountable.

There is an inevitable partnership between Government and labor and industry; each must know its limits and its responsibilities. All must work together. But change has been too rapid for the maintenance of stability. Government encroaches more and more, and, in the field of labor disputes, the Secretary of Labor establishes as a permanent governmental responsibility the personal settlement of labor strikes, with the prestige and power of the Presidency behind him in his efforts. Labor in turn finds itself fearful and concerned as industrial changeover affects the rights, the security, and the future of workers who have put in long years of dedicated service in occupations utilizing techniques which are fast becoming outmoded in the wake of new developments. Management, in the process, finds itself more and more limited in the moves it can make in behalf of industrial solvency. These are all matters which in the long run must be determined by the citizens of the Nation, developing sound policies for the future of the economy.

Another field of negligence lies in the vast field of international expenditures, largely under the Agency for International Development, where we find fastened upon us, as a continuing way of life, vast expenditures for lugging along nearly every nation on earth.

Shortly after World War II the Marshall plan emerged as an ingenious and generous temporary measure to salvage the war-ravaged economy of our European allies and enemies alike. But the policy has now spread over the globe, to take care not only of the sophisticated industrial nations of the earth, but all of the little principalities from Zamboanga to Timbuktu.

We dance attendance upon all the yearnings of peoples everywhere, and are reminded by our leaders in Washington that to curtail these expenses would be a major disaster. We are somehow made to feel that our Founding Fathers from the very outset expected to make over the world in our image and at our continuing and perpetual expense. On this policy for nearly two decades we have lavished billions across the globe, and yet America's reputation has never been lower around the globe than at this very moment. Still we continue the idea that emerging nations, inexperienced and often inept, can be shored up by a golden stream of American dollars and that communism will retreat under the impact of American money.

But we are capricious about it. American servicemen are dying in far-off Vietnam under some vague policy of containing communism, but we fail to curb a dangerous buildup in Cuba, only 90 miles off our shores, and in ready access of all the struggling and often volatile governments in Latin America. In October our Federal administration discovered that national and world sentiment was far ahead of the cautious and uncertain Washington bureaucracy, but after a single forthright action we slipped again into note-writing, explanations, and justifications, to the uncertainty and embarrassment of the American people. The inspections we demanded in October have somehow been quietly allowed to lapse, circumvented by the wily old fox in the Kremlin.

We are deluded perhaps by the indifference of our prosperity. Mr. Paul Miller, president of the Associated Press, speaking at Cornell recently, reminded us of the warning of the late Justice Brandeis who, out of the wealth of a lifetime of critical observations, pointed out: "Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding.

These words are ageless in their warning to the American people, through all the decades of our democracy.

Yet the expenditures go on and on. I have recently returned from a visit to one of the small African states. There I talked to the AID Director, an officer of one of America's great corporations when he is home and in his right mind.

When I talked to him he was a frustrated individual. He found when he took over a few months ago that he had men on his staff who had not done a lick of work—one in 14 months, the other in almost 2 years—but he was unable to find, in the maze of civil service regulations, a way to drop them. Even to get them transferred would, he was told, take months of negotiation. Further, he was ordered to spend all the money allocated to his agency during the fiscal period, because the Government would find it difficut to continue its fiscal demands upon the Congress if significant surpluses remained.

As I talked to him he was confronted with the necessity of building modern high schools out in the jungle—buildings designed at home by U.S. architects as though they were to be built in Dayton or Indianapolis. These plans called for modern domestic science laboratories and gymnasiums, adequate for more students than are likely to be available in that country for years to come. And after walking to school for miles through the African bush, the young student scarcely finds a modern gymnasium an essential educational need.

Misguided bureaucracy continues to try to transplant, full fledged and at colossal waste, America's mid-20th-century civilization upon those who are living today in the same manner as their ancestors did thousands of years ago.

But, you will say, surely I intend to do more than to complain—one of the most indolent and profitless pursuits known to man. I do indeed. I have specific suggestions for you in the world of affairs, and for us in higher education.

For your part, you should be about the task of formulating Government policy by all the tools available to American citizens. You should be enlisting each one of you, scores of people to keep in persistent touch with your elected representatives in the Congress, and all others in places of responsibility where contact may be obtained. This is an effective influence too often neglected. Business, labor, and Government need intercommunication. As the President of a great New York bank recently expressed it: "On the golf course, around the bridge table, at the cocktail party, businessmen talk to other businessmen; labor leaders with other labor leaders; Government officials with other Government officials. Often, each group is unaware that it is on a kind of closed-circuit hookup, exchanging the same interpretations, the same opinions, the same viewpoints. Too seldom do the three groups sit down together, and then often in an atmosphere lacking in candor."

If even 25 percent of the business leaders would undertake active involvement in the political and civic affairs throughout the Nation, what a difference it would make. The business entrepreneur is a man of decision, a realist in the analysis of facts, forthright in his ability to make judgments based upon them. He is used to hard decisions; he cannot survive on equivocal ones. The country is not obtaining the advantages of these qualities in sufficient quantities to influence the course of national events.

It was Benjamin Franklin who predicted, at the close of the Constitutional Convention, that the Federal Union "can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

And I submit that the lethargy of the business community, in participating in political affairs and in the formulation of political principles, is a form of corruption as great as that engaged in by the most overt of self-seeking politicians.

As for higher education, the problem is clear. To create a literate citizenry, broadly educated to command the tolerance, the selflessness, the clear thinking, the dedication needed to help guide the Republic, is our greatest challenge.

I have often maintained that our civilization will never fail because of lack of trained scientists, or of a shortage of trained engineers, or of skilled biologists and physicians; we leap ahead of the frontiers of knowledge almost continuously in these areas.

We lag, however, in the management of our Government as it grows and grows, feeding upon our substance, commandeering funds which should be used for the development of free-enterprise ventures, and tending ever toward the dead level of mediocrity in our every effort.

But if education is to fulfill this particular mission, it must have your forthright backing and aggressive help. The emphasis upon science and technology is partially of your own fostering, in the salaries you offer such trainees and the requirements your personnel officers place upon us. Too few of you come to us and say we want young men broadly educated in political science, in history, in economics, and in articulateness in the written and spoken word.

The social sciences in some of our universities tend to be overly weighted by leftist teachers, promoting the coming of untried utopias. Too few are espousing the positive and proven values of our democratic society. And all the while liberal doctrines are being proclaimed by lecturers constantly at work over university circuits, while the conservative element has few spokesmen willing to give time and attention to the task.

Fortunately, university administrators are giving increasing attention to the strengthening of the liberal arts to those subjects in

the humanities and social sciences which create the whole man. We are becoming more skeptical that brains alone, as evidenced by a straight-A transcript, envisage all of the qualities we seek in our matriculants.

Sheer intellect may be encased in a mighty peculiar personality, in one, who may, to be sure, bring inlightened knowledge in some limited sphere, but may never have the ability for public leadership, or extend his talents unselfishly to the complex and basic problems of our democracy.

In the American university curriculums, there is too much specialization, too much vocationalism, professional courses displacing too many opportunities for basic study in the liberal arts. There is too little time for comparative government, for world history, for Western civilization, for adequate facility in foreign language, for human relations, and for all of the cultural exposures, which provide assurance and poise, judgment, and the selection of the best in life. Education, broad education, for hundreds of thousands of people, is the first order of business today. "They" will never bring it about. It is the responsibility of each one of us—the first person, singular—to put his shoulders to the task.

I close with the words of Abraham Lincoln, recently quoted by John S. Knight, which should be indelibly before each one of us today: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

The Path of Dishonor Is Now Legal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a great editorial which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, on Wednesday, February 20. It is entitled "The Path of Dishonor Is Now Legal." It refers to the decision of the Supreme Court in setting up a haven for the Nation's domestic enemies and offenders against the public conscience:

THE PATH OF DISHONOR IS NOW LEGAL

By the accustomed narrow 5-to-4 division, the Supreme Court's liberal majority once more has indulged in legalistic hairsplitting to set up a haven for the Nation's domestic enemies and offenders against the public conscience.

The Court invalidated two acts of Congress intended to strip American citizenship from persons who leave the country to avoid military service.

Invoking the same philosophy which it has used to throw a cloak of respectability around pinks, fellow travelers, and fifth amendment patriots, and to handcuff those seeking to strengthen the Nation's internal defenses, the Court majority held that the laws denied the draft dodger the safeguards guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Congress, the majority opinion said, cannot take away citizenship without due process of law guaranteed by the fifth and sixth amendments.

Thus the Court once more distorts the spirit of the Constitution to give a new and strained meaning to its words. The sacred guarantees of the Bill of Rights long since have been ignored by the Court in their intended application to the protection of the law-abiding citizen against abuse by strong-arm government. Their new purpose, in the liberals' view, is to protect those who hold those safeguards in contempt and reject the obligations they imply.

The protection of the Bill of Rights was never intended to provide a shell of immunity to those who would destroy the Nation by boring from within. The draft dodger who demonstrates his moral bankruptcy by fleeing the country to evade the responsibilities of citizenship has no legitimate claim to its rights.

In striking contrast to the immorality here defended is the high purpose and dedication of Cuban veterans of the Bay of Pigs disaster who have volunteered for induction into the U.S. Armed Forces next week in Miami.

The Cuban veterans, who legally owe the United States nothing, recognize that the right to fight for freedom, under whatever flag, is a high privilege rather than a burdensome obligation.

The Nation can only hope that its strength and security lie in those who respond to the call to service in such a spirit, and that relatively few are so devoid of principle as to follow the path of dishonor and moral decay legalized by the Supreme Court.

Presidents of State Broadcasters Associations Set Forth Resolution Calling for Appointment of a Dedicated and Experienced Broadcaster to Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in my belief, the vast majority of thoughtful citizens supports the contention that some form of judicious regulation is required in radio and television broadcasting. Careful scrutiny of programing and practices in these two vast mass media is a safeguard for the public and for the industry alike, and has resulted in the high standard of entertainment and information which comes each day into millions of American homes.

The governmental regulatory agency charged with overseeing the activities of radio and television broadcasters is the Federal Communications Commission composed of a board of six experienced public servants, plus the Chairman of the Commission. Within the industry itself there is also an effective and public spirited group which is energetic in its efforts to promote broadcasting of the highest quality and value: the various associations of State broadcasters.

During their Eighth Annual Conference of State Association Presidents here in Washington this week, representatives from all over the Nation gathered to discuss problems and progress in the field of radio and television broadcasting. As a product of their intense concern for impartial and informed regulation of the field, these eminent leaders set forth a resolution in which they brought to the attention of the President of the United States a needed improvement in the structure of the Federal Communications Commission.

The resolution, signed by presidents of State broadcasting associations from 41 States, calls for the appointment to the FCC of an experienced and dedicated practical broadcaster who has had extensive personal experience in all phases of radio and TV programing and management. The State broadcasters, representing, in effect, some 3,000 stations, expressed the thought that such an appointment would make for "a sense of balance, and a broad expertise in the regulation of this vitally important medium of communication."

My good friend, Mel S. Burka, program director of station WTIP in Charleston, W. Va., and also president of the West Virginia Broadcasters Association, Inc., informs me that the resolution represents the feeling of the management of 59 radio and TV stations in our State alone. He goes on to point out that it is not an attempt to "pack" the Commission, but rather, an effort to insure that the Commission will have at its disposal the considered judgment of a devoted, knowledgeable management executive.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution approved by the representatives of State broadcasters associations gathered at the Eighth Annual Conference of State Association Presidents be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The undersigned representatives of State broadcasters associations gathered at the Eighth Annual Conference of State Association Presidents do respectfully call to the attention of the President of the United States that none of his appointees to the Federal Communications Commission has been a person with special training and experience in the broadcast profession. The need to maintain a sense of balance, and for broad expertise in the regulation of this vitally important medium of communication, makes it advisable and desirable that serious consideration be given to the appointment of a qualified broadcaster to the next vacancy that occurs on the Federal Communications Commission.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 27, 1963.*

Inside Charles de Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I seldom place in the Appendix of the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles and editorials. But, under unanimous consent, I am placing in today's Appendix an editorial which in my opinion justifies the consideration of all the Members.

This editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., is in my opinion the best analysis of President de Gaulle's action in vetoing the entrance of Great Britain into the European Common Market that I have seen.

In the opinion of Mr. Hearst, and I certainly share that opinion, this action of President de Gaulle is one of the most damaging acts of any of our allies in the free world at a time when we need unity against the common foe.

This recent action of President de Gaulle coupled with his denial of NATO bases and withdrawal of the French fleet from NATO cooperation is an act of egotism and ingratitude which is difficult to explain in the face of the common danger of communism.

It is a divisive wedge in the free world alliance. It can only be of aid and comfort, unintentionally of course, to those who would have long ago despoiled the freedom of the French people—a freedom purchased with thousands and thousands of British and American lives in World War I and in World War II.

The editorial follows:

INSIDE CHARLES DE GAULLE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Now that Gen. Charles de Gaulle has snarled the works of the Western alliance with a heave of his oversized shoe, it's natural and proper to ask, "How did we get here and where do we go?"

You can't say "le grand Charlie" didn't warn us. Long before he took the big step of blackballing Britain's application for the Common Market, he'd been consistently taking anti-British—and anti-American—attitudes.

To penetrate the reasoning inside De Gaulle's elevated head, it is necessary to trace events back to the grim days of 1940 when France was defeated and occupied by the Germans. De Gaulle found haven and arms in defiant Britain.

In his determination to restore his prostrate country to freedom and greatness, the signs of his future intransigence sprouted early. He rapidly showed his stubbornness—and sheer orneriness—in the high councils of Allied strategy, causing a despairing Winston Churchill to declare that "the heaviest cross I have to bear is the cross of Lorraine."

Another time an exasperated Churchill reportedly stormed at him:

"You claim to be France. You are not France. I do not recognize you as France."

When Japan as well as Germany had been crushed, De Gaulle visited the United States, and said: "Without you, the great American people—there would be no future for Europe and Asia, but only intolerable servitude."

In November 1945 he was named President-Premier and ruled in his majestic fashion until January 1946. Then he abruptly resigned because of an uproar in the Chamber of Deputies over his defense budget and retired in splendid isolation to his quiet native village of Colombey-des-Deus Eglises.

Without him, France degenerated into chaos. Tourists used to say: "We're going to London to see the changing of the guard, then to Paris to see the changing of the government."

But political insanity—and the bloody revolt in Algeria—weren't funny for France. In 1958 le grand Charlie was summoned back into office by a desperate people.

His prestige was never greater. France handed him just about everything he asked for in the way of political power. Washington and London breathed a little easier; the Western alliance, depending so much on the status of France, seemed safer than ever.

Then startling events began to take place. They occurred against a background of rumbles from De Gaulle, that went something like:

"Europe can only find peace in an association among Slavs, Germans, Guals, and Latins" and "I am often wrong in what I do; I am never wrong in what I foresee" and (regarding a proposed visit to the United States, "I will come when I have something to say."

Successively, following his accession to power, De Gaulle amazed the organizers of Western defense by:

Withholding permission for the United States to stock atomic warheads on French soil—thus forcing 200 to 300 U.S. fighter-bombers out of France and the abandonment of some air bases there;

Removing part of the French fleet from NATO control;

Refusing further integration of French troops with NATO;

Barring NATO intermediate range missiles from France.

De Gaulle was behaving like a national leader with command over a huge, nuclear-equipped army, air force, and navy. In truth, France was—and still is—in deplorably weak military condition.

A new term, "the third force," began its rounds. De Gaulle had a plan indeed: a French-led continental alliance, bearing remarkable similarities to the notions of Napoleon Bonaparte.

John Foster Dulles huffily reminded De Gaulle that arrangements for the installation of NATO's IRBM's had been made before his return to office. Gen. Nathan Twining said France was not living up to her NATO commitments. Later Secretary of State Christian Herter warned: "We (the United States) made our original commitment to NATO on the basis of an integrated defense system."

In Bonn, Chancellor Adenauer was reported disturbed over De Gaulle's attitude. An official there remarked: "What alliance? All we see of France's contribution are the uniforms of high-ranking officers at Supreme HQ." Another warned again "special egoistic interest within the alliance."

From Britain, the attitude was: "De Gaulle is losing sight of the political aims of NATO."

The danger signals, therefore, have been up for years. Only a De Gaulle with his unquestionable patriotism—and magnificent gall—could have gotten away with it for so long.

It strikes me—with apologies to a better than fair general, Julius Caesar—that De Gaulle is divided in three parts: one part patriotism, one part emotionalism, one part egotism. In this present crisis it would be a mistake to think of him as some kind of a nut or something. He has a mystique that links a recovered grandeur of France inseparably with the immortal glory of De Gaulle—but it is a mystique supported by cold, hard intelligence and an implacable and audacious resolve.

Such being the case, let's consider first why De Gaulle ticks the way he does.

For one thing, Britain made a big mistake in boycotting the meeting in Rome in 1957 which produced the Treaty of Rome, and which in turn led to the formation of the European Economic Community (the Common Market). Britain could have been a member then by invitation. Instead, she subsequently set up the European Free Trade Association, which came to be known as the Outer Seven, a rival group to the Common Market or Inner Six.

Britain made a second mistake in 1957 by declining to come to France's assistance when her gold and dollar reserves were at a very low ebb. The memory of that must linger on.

Another point of friction is agriculture. Without secured exports of agricultural surpluses, France's balance-of-payments position very probably would be in the red. She is already heavily subsidizing her farmers—much as we are—and farm exports to the Common Market are considered vital.

It is De Gaulle's position that these exports would be jeopardized by Britain's entry into the Common Market because the concessions Britain is seeking—as part of her commonwealth ties—are in the area of agricultural exports. Similarly the Common Market threatens U.S. agricultural exports, which to Western Europe have amounted to $1 billion worth of trade a year.

But if Britain blundered in 1957, De Gaulle has made a far worse booboo in 1963.

After 15 months of negotiations, he has blackballed Britain's entry into the Common Market at a time when the other five members (West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Italy) were working for it; when it was on the verge of becoming a fact.

In so doing he has imposed a strain on the Inner Six alliance. He has gone against the concept of a unified Europe joined in an entente cordiale with the United States, such as has been expressed by his own great countryman, Jean Monnet, "father of the Common Market." He has aroused the dismay of that foremost European statesman, Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak, of West Germany's Foreign Minister Schroeder and Economics Minister Erhard, of the Dutchman, Dr. Sicco Mansholt, vice president of the Common Market's executive body, and of Italy's Premier Fanfani.

De Gaulle wants a Europe dominated by France, with other European nations in the role of vassals or satellites, and with American and British influences reduced to an irreducible minimum. The other members of the Inner Six, who thought at Rome that this was going to be a partnership of equals, now are beginning to understand bitterly that De Gaulle has other ideas.

He is also forcing a reevaluation of President Kennedy's trade expansion program, because a Common Market without Britain will qualify for fewer concessions than one with Britain in it. And yet, by paradox, he must be continuing to count on America's military protection. A Europe dominated by France could not possibly defend itself alone against Communist conquest.

And so he is gambling that in a showdown we would defend Western Europe because it is our self-interest to do so, and he is probably right. But this does not mean we need continue pouring our taxpayers' dollars in there, particularly since in the last decade U.S. gold holdings dropped more than $12 billion, while those on the Continent rose $17 billion. De Gaulle ought to reflect on that, too.

Finally, the Common Market is not the only viable organization. The European Free Trade Association is alive. So is the British Commonwealth. So is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. So is the Western European Union. So is the general agreement on tariff and trade.

Any of these, and particularly a combination of some of them, could force De Gaulle into a reevaluation of De Gaulle. It seems to be a fact that he has accomplished what he did not want to accomplish—reinforced the desirability of a fully united Europe, including Britain, in alliance with the United States.

His victory at Brussels, in other words, contains the seeds of his defeat. It is my own belief that he cannot win.

Salem, Oreg., a City Which Believes in Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, physical fitness and good health are essential to the well-being and strength of our Nation. It is indeed gratifying that President Kennedy and his administration have stimulated public awareness and physical fitness.

Salem, Oreg.'s nationally known city school recreation program was featured in the February 17 issue of This Week magazine, a Sunday supplement carried in many newspapers across the Nation.

It is a pleasure to salute Salem officials, Dr. George J. Sirnio, director of the city school recreation department, City Manager Kent Mathewson, and Superintendent of Schools Charles Schmidt, who are responsible for the success of this program. As a former physical education instructor I know how important this program is, and I commend the excellent article to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled, "How Your Whole Town Can Keep Fit," written by Bud Wilkinson, special consultant to the President on youth fitness.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW YOUR WHOLE TOWN CAN KEEP FIT

(By Bud Wilkinson)

The letter was from a 12-year-old boy in Ohio. "Dear Sir," it began, "My friends and I saw you talk on TV and we want to get physically fit. We tried to play baseball on the school ground, but they ran us off and said we might break a window. The older boys are always using the regular fields. We like to play basketball, but we are too young to get in the high school and it's closed in the summer anyway. I think that is a bad deal, don't you? There isn't even any place to swim around here. Would you please ask President Kennedy to do something about it?"

Dozens of letters similar to this one are received every week by the President's Council on Youth Fitness. They indicate an appalling waste of America's abundant recreational resources at a time when we are concerned about physical fitness.

Girls say no one cares about them. Mothers grow indignant about the lack of supervision on playgrounds. Fathers wonder why they should pay thousands of dollars for school gymnasiums and swimming pools which their children can use for only a few hours a day 180 days a year.

THE CLOSED-DOOR POLICY

The most frequent complaint of all is that the schools have what amounts to a closed-door policy toward adults.

Just last week we heard from an angry father in North Carolina: "Fitness ends at 5 o'clock in our town. A lot of adults would like to go for a swim in the evenings, but the school doors are locked. Aren't the schools public buildings?"

A mother in Colorado shares the young man's resentment. "All I ever hear is kids, kids, kids," she wrote. "Well, my kids can run rings around me. The school teaches them to swim, dance, play tennis, and I don't know what all. What about me? Why doesn't someone teach me to swim, or just how to lose a few pounds? The only way I can get into a gym is to pay."

A man in Wisconsin says the answer is closer cooperation between schools and cities. "They tell us to keep fit," he said, "but the doors are locked and the lights turned out for everyone except athletes. If the town and the schools would pool their resources, we could have something for everyone. Why don't they get together?

Well, that's exactly what they have done in Salem, Oregon's bustling State capital. For less than $1 per year per person, this community of 85,000 runs a year-round recreation program which offers something for everyone, from the budding baseball star to the creaking croquet veteran.

Housewives and businessmen sweat off surplus poundage at the Y's. Young husbands play church league volleyball or basketball in school gyms. Boys and girls learn to swim or play tennis 5 days a week at the city's pools and courts. There are classes in rhythmic dance for women and girls. When there's snow on the ground, the city blocks off several streets for sledding.

How did Salem's program get rolling? Back during World War I the kids were complaining about a lack of something to do (which proves they haven't changed much). School officials got together and decided to keep their activity rooms and gymnasiums open in the evenings, on weekends and during the summer. From that meager beginning in 1917, Salem's recreational program has grown into a joint city-school enterprise which will spend more than $70,000 this year. The city and the school district each put up half of the budget.

Dr. George J. Sirnio, a man with a long background in physical education and athletics, is the present director of the City-School Recreation Department, which was formed in 1934. He, City Manager Kent Mathewson and Superintendent of Schools Charles Schmidt are the policymaking group, and they have an advisory committee for each recreational activity. The city and the school pool their facilities and personnel.

SCHOOLS ARE FOR EVERYONE

"It's just good economic sense," Dr. Sirnio has said. "A school plant is the largest investment most small cities ever make, so why shouldn't everyone use it?"

Last year 34 school properties and 25 city facilities were utilized in Salem's program. The school facilities included gymnasiums, playing fields, music rooms, classrooms, 10 libraries, and playgrounds. The city chipped in with two outdoor pools, lighted baseball and softball diamonds, a community building, and tennis courts.

Eleven playgrounds for younger children were open 55 days during the summer, and the average daily attendance was 2,000. College-trained supervisors—many of them schoolteachers—were on hand from 9 to 4, instructing the children in games, exercise, and arts and crafts.

The 2 pools were open 85 days and attendance averaged 1,400. For 5 days a week there were free children's lessons in the morning, free adult lessons during the noon hour, and paid recreational swimming in the afternoon and evening. Everyone can swim free on Saturday.

In Salem, which has fewer than 100,000 people, more than 1,500 boys play baseball for nearly 100 teams. To put it another way, Salem fields enough teams to take care of every boy who shows up for practice.

THEY PICK UP THE TABS

The churches, business firms, and service clubs sponsor most of the team activities, picking up the tabs for uniforms and equipment. During the winter months, approximately 60 basketball teams and a dozen volleyball squads use the school gyms. In addition to the baseball teams, there are some 80 softball teams—most of them for adults—in summer leagues.

Salem's schools have excellent intramural and afterschool sports programs as well as comprehensive health and physical-education programs for all grades. Twenty-one elementary schools have supervised afterschool activities for 40 days in the spring and 40 days in the fall. As many as 80 kids show up at each site to participate in such inseason sports as flag football, soccer, archery, and track. Elementary schools with gymnasiums are open for basketball during the winter months.

CARRYOVER INTEREST

"We're finding that the people who have been through this program have a tremendous carryover interest in sports and recreation," says Dr. Sirnio. "We had three golf courses, but three more have been built in the last 2 years.

"And every year more adults are taking up swimming, archery, tennis, volleyball, and softball."

Other towns can do what Salem has done: make full, year-round use of all the available recreation facilities. Some would have to get local and State laws changed before the schools could be used in the summer, or by adults, but legislators are sensitive to public pressure. It's certainly worth a try, in dividends of fitness and fun for the whole family.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, debated the medicare issue with Dr. Annis of the American Medical Association. Congressman THOMPSON's speech is so lucid and persuasive that it should be made available to all Members of the Congress.

In his speech, the Congressman quotes a brief poem concerning a disease, the symptoms of which we have seen in congressional lobbies all too often. It goes as follows:

If you make a diagnosis
Of the medical psychosis
That is now identifiable as AMA disease,
You would find that hypertension
Is induced by any mention
Of a method whereby patients could afford
their doctor's fees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Students and faculty of the University of Illinois, ladies and gentlemen—it is a pleasure and an honor for me to be here tonight. It is a pleasure because I will be talking about one of the most significant and humane pieces of social legislation in the Na-

tion's history. It is an honor because I can defend and advocate this great measure to you.

I am talking about the proposal—introduced in the Congress again this year—to provide our elderly with adequate insurance under social security against unmanageable hospital costs.

My opponent this evening is not only a speaker trained to smooth perfection since college debating days, he is also a doctor. And as such, I thought he might appreciate this little poem which appeared in the Reporter magazine several years back. It goes like this:

"If you make a diagnosis
Of the medical psychosis
That is now identifiable as AMA disease,
You would find that hypertension
Is induced by any mention
Of a method whereby patients could afford
their doctors' fees."

Of course, we are not talking about doctors' fees this evening. We are talking about hospital costs. We are talking about our aged population, which is a low-income group with extra-high health needs and inadequate means of paying for care. We are talking about a measure which proposes to do something about this sorry situation.

The tart little poem I cited does serve a purpose. In a crisp manner it isolates the major source of opposition to this much-needed social legislation.

That opposition comes from the doctors' trade union—the American Medical Association. It is the only group with a professional speaker-president touring the country criticizing this measure. The workers of the Nation, who pay into social security, are not up in arms against this program—they are for it. The workers' employers have not seen fit to mount such a campaign of obstructionism, nor the hospitals, nor the insurance industry.

And so I am glad that it is the AMA which is representing the negative side in this debate.

It has been less than 2 years since Dr. Annis assumed his first official position in the AMA. But in that time as chairman of the speakers' bureau and now as president-elect he has spoken widely and too often irresponsibly on the subject of health insurance for the aged.

I think it is now high time to have a close look at some of the charges being leveled by Dr. Annis this evening and in the recent past.

The first problem to consider is why there has been such concerted effort in the last several years by the Kennedy administration, concerned Congressmen, and private citizens to provide the aged with social security hospital insurance. Are the aged a low-income group? Do they have high health costs? Are they having trouble meeting these costs?

According to Dr. Annis the answer is "No" once, "No" twice, and "No" again. In a speech last month to the Economic Club of Detroit, Dr. Annis had this to say about the financial status of the aged:

"Turn to your own University of Michigan. Its recent survey committee reported that great majorities and great numbers of our senior citizens are well able to provide for themselves. Think among those of your own membership and the members of the community beyond the age of 65 who are still among the sultans of industry."

Now I submit that a person with a cash income of $20 a week is hardly a sultan of anything. Twenty dollars a week equals $1,000 a year and that, my friends, is the annual cash income of more than half the 17½ million elderly citizens of this affluent society.

That figure is the latest estimate of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

But let us look at the University of Michigan report which led Dr. Annis to the extraordinary conclusion that our aged possess the luxuries of sultans.

The report found (and I quote): "Not only do older spending units have substantially lower incomes than younger ones, but low incomes are commonly temporary among young families and permanent among the aged."

Dr. Annis, who has eight children, has tried to confuse the issue by saying 90 percent of his family has income of less than $500.

He knows perfectly well that in the over-65 age group three-quarters of all families consist of two persons. And the median income for them in 1960 was $2,530.

Do the aged have extra high health costs? A year ago Dr. Annis told the Senate Special Committee on Aging that "most of our senior citizens are healthy and require little medical attention."

Not according to the U.S. national health survey.

The survey shows that 9 out of 10 aged can expect to be hospitalized at least once during their retirement, 2 out of 3 aged at least twice and 1 out of 3 at least 3 times.

Moreover the aged can expect their hospital stays to be at least twice as long as those of younger people and their bills to be twice as large. An elderly person will get an average bill of $700 for his hospital stay. For those 300,000 aged who annually must spend more than 30 days in hospitals, the average bill will be in excess of $1,000.

These expenses have zoomed all out of proportion with the income of the aged since Social Security was passed in the 1930's. In the decade of the fifties alone, medical costs went up by 36 percent and hospitalization rose by 65 percent. Where hospital costs were $9 a day in 1946, they are now around $35 a day.

These figures have spiralled for a number of reasons. In part, because all prices have risen; in part because hospitals are catching up with prevailing wage levels. But mostly it is because of the tremendous strides made in curative medicine, much of it due to Government-financed research. Of this we are very proud.

We are proud enough to want our aged to share in these new benefits. At the moment, too many of them cannot. The increased expense of medicine has caused a major breach in the economic protection we seek to provide to the elderly. A nation which cherishes the values of independence and self-reliance, and which has undertaken to maintain these values through a far-reaching system of social insurance, can hardly afford to leave this breach unclosed.

But just as Dr. Annis doesn't believe the aged are a low-income group, just as he doesn't believe they have higher than average medical expenses, so doesn't he believe they have any trouble meeting their bills.

In his statement to the Senate Special Aging Committee, Dr. Annis said all but the completely indigent can provide for their own health care needs through voluntary insurance plans.

Would that were the case. The said fact is that half the aged who must pay an average hospital bill of $700 have their savings wiped out. They must then beg from relatives or borrow from banks at high rates because they are poor credit risks. In about one case out of five, they must go to public welfare or charity agencies for help.

The Massachusetts General Hospital reported in 1961 that one-third of its annual deficit is accounted for by unpaid bills of the aged.

Hearings of the Senate Special Aging Committee—held around the country—are full of tragic tales that might enlighten Dr. Annis to the true plight of the elderly.

But does Dr. Annis really think our aged can adequately meet their health bills? Does Dr. Annis consider it sufficient that 4 out of 10 older families have either no liquid assets or less than $200 in such assets?

I doubt it, because I do not think Dr. Annis considers doctors that much different from other people who have retired. Why then did medical economics—a magazine for which Dr. Annis has served as editor-at-large—recently offer this piece of retirement advice to physicians: Do not set your financial sights far below the $200,000 nest-egg needed for old-age security or you will be in trouble. I ask the doctor if there isn't a notable difference between $200,000 and $200?

Dr. Annis believes the aged can be neatly split into two groups—those who are so indigent they need a handout and those so wealthy they can afford any size medical bill.

The former are well provided for, according to Dr. Annis, by State welfare agencies and Kerr-Mills programs.

The latter find what little assistance they need in the high-premium, small benefit private health insurance that is available to the aged. Let us look at these suppositions.

The Kerr-Mills Act—passed in 1960—has two parts. The first is an increase in a 10-year-old program of Federal support of medical care for recipients of old-age assistance—usually referred to as OAA. The second part is a new Federal-State program of medical assistance for the aged—known as MAA. MAA was meant to provide relief for a whole new segment of the aged, who can be described as "medically needy."

These are persons whose income and resources are too high to qualify them for OAA public assistance but still too low to meet the costs of medical care.

It is obvious that MAA was meant as a specialized supplement to hard-pressed and flagging State welfare programs. It is thus absurdly misleading for Dr. Annis to state (and I quote) "That under the terms of the Kerr-Mills law any State can set up any provision to provide any and all total medical care for its senior citizens."

Kerr-Mills has not even been able to do the much smaller task assigned to it: To date only 25 States and 3 territories have enacted Kerr-Mills programs and of these only 3 or 4 States can be said to have comprehensive plans. Most States simply do not have the funds to match Federal grants. Thus half the States have no programs and 21 other States have totally inadequate ones.

The inequities of the Kerr-Mills system are appalling. In November three States received 70 percent of the Federal matching funds. The three States—New York, California, and Massachusetts—had 63 percent of all recipients, made 72 percent of the payments, although they had only 22 percent of the Nation's aged population.

Among the poorer States struggling to create the illusion of adequate Kerr-Mills programs we find such things as the following: Eligibility limited to individuals with annual incomes of less than $1,200 or $1,500. Hospital care limited to 6 days per admission in one State, 10 days per year in another and in several States care is provided only in life endangering or sight endangering cases.

What is perhaps most disappointing of all is the gradually emerging fact that the States are not using MAA to help a new group of the aged—the medically needy. Instead they are switching former recipients of OAA to MAA. Thus the States benefit because of the larger Federal payments in the latter program. As of September 75,987 former OAA recipients had been switched to MAA plans. In Massachusetts, the welfare director estimated he has saved $15 million by such transfers.

Furthermore, Kerr-Mills is proving to be—in the words of the New York Times—"An administrative monstrosity." This is no wonder. There are 25 different programs—one for each State. There is the need for annual appropriation of funds by each State and the Federal Government. And most of all there is the means test. To check out an applicant for MAA, to shuffle through all his records, to quiz his relatives, to completely strip away his dignity costs about $40 a person each time and some persons must be tested more than once.

It is no wonder that Tennessee is spending more on red tape than on MAA benefits; it is no wonder that in 1961 the cost of administering the MAA program in Kentucky was 124 percent of the amount paid for medical expenses and it is no wonder that it costs Oregon 38 cents for every $1 of benefits.

And is it any wonder that the other 25 States are hesitant to adopt Kerr-Mills?

Dr. Annis used to say that all our States—including his own, Florida—would shortly have MAA programs. He has had to change his tune. In recent speeches, he has been claiming that those States which don't have MAA programs don't need them—including Florida.

Which States don't need these programs? Rich ones that have them like New York, California, and Massachusetts or lower income States which don't have MAA like Mississippi, North Carolina, and Florida? The rich States already had adequate programs before MAA: the poor States still don't.

Let us take Dr. Annis' Florida for example. In testimony before the Senate Special Aging Committee, the doctor said, "Florida is presently implementing the aim and objective of the Kerr-Mills law, namely to provide medical and/or surgical care when necessary to any of our senior citizens."

Now I submit that it is difficult to be too bountiful to any and all your senior citizens when Florida has the most strict residence requirement permitted by Federal law.

A person who has not lived in Florida at least 5 years cannot expect any help through the Old-Age Assistance program—this from a State that gains so much from being a retirement center. A University of Florida economist told the Senate committee that retirement income provides Florida the same kind of expenditures as tourism: It is money in a sense that comes in from outside. Apparently Florida is happy to have its economy bolstered by retired people spending money there but it stacks its welfare against them.

There is more to be said about the Florida OOA program. Only 11 percent of the State's aged receive OOA, even though a very large proportion of the elderly couples there have less than $2,500 a year income and a majority of widows have less than $1,000.

These are the conditions that lead Dr. Annis to tell us that Florida doesn't need a Kerr-Mills MAA program, much less anything else.

Dr. Annis' other supposition is that all the aged who are not indigent can afford private insurance policies which provide adequate coverage. Can they afford these policies and are they adequate?

A little over half the aged have private insurance now. Dr. Annis says that 80 to 90 percent will have it by 1970. Beside the fact that those presently covered have inadequate policies for the most part, the projected growth figures of Dr. Annis are preposterous. They are even higher than those of the insurance industry.

The doctor knows that the aged who have not been signed up in the 5-year crash program to extend coverage to the elderly are the highest cost risks and those least able to pay for insurance.

Half of those with insurance now have Blue Cross, and Blue Cross says it cannot afford to sell any more to the aged at present prices. Blue Cross premiums have already gone up 83 percent in the last 12 years.

The State of Washington provides a grim example of what Blue Cross is presently offering the aged. There, a couple can get health insurance for $27.50 a month—or $334 a year. This huge sum doesn't include Blue Shield.

And this huge sum doesn't cover preexisting conditions; or hernia, cardiac, vascular, cancerous or tumorous conditions until after 12 months of coverage. Thankfully, most Blue Cross plans for the aged cost less even if they don't offer more. The average around the country for an elderly couple is $144 a year.

The private insurance companies are doing little better. The much heralded noncancellable plans for the aged usually have a safety catch. The Connecticut Plan, for example, has annual and lifetime maximums, which makes the noncancellable face dubious indeed. Furthermore, there is a $100 deductible, 20 percent coinsurance, the cost of excluded medical items and for this package a couple would be asked to pay $408 a year and up.

Paid-up-at-age-65 plans aren't much help either. Couples nearing retirement can't afford them and the benefits offered are meaningless to younger people, because the amount of insurance bought might be worthless in 20 years upon retirement if hospital charges go up 500 percent as they have in the past 20 years.

This situation is not the fault of the insurance companies. There is simply no way for profitmaking organizations with small numbers of policyholders relative to the social security system to cover the aged without charging extravagant fees.

If private insurance would concentrate on covering those under 65 who are, as a whole, good risks and offering supplementary coverage to the aged, there would be more than enough business. Life insurance has had its greatest growth since social security was enacted. The same will be true of health insurance, once hospital coverage for the aged is added to social security.

The social security approach has the support of a majority of Americans. Poll after poll shows it. The approach has recently been copied by Republicans in the Senate. It has received endorsement from such solid Republicans as Marian Folson, former Secretary of HEW under Eisenhower and from Ike's special advisor Arthur Larson. Conservative-oriented magazines, including Life, Time, and Business Week, have plunked for it. And just last week in a letter to the Senate Special Aging Committee, the Saturday Evening Post joined the growing list of endorsers.

What are these substantial people and organizations endorsing? They are backing a program which would provide 90 days of hospital care, 180 days of care in a skilled nursing home, 240 home health visits and diagnostic services rendered by the outpatient departments of hospitals.

They are backing a program that would cover nearly 100 percent of those over 65.

They are endorsing a program that would be financed by a one-fourth of 1 percent increase in the social security payroll tax.

They are endorsing a program that will cost the highest paid eligible worker $17.16 a year and the average-paid worker $12 a year. Put those figures next to the $144, the $408 annual cost of private plans.

The social security mechanism can handle the aged's hospital insurance needs at reasonable rates because of the number in the system and because the system is so efficiently run. Administrative costs run at about 3 percent of every dollar handled compared with the 50 percent and up costs of private and Kerr-Mills programs.

Social security health insurance is not intended to cover everything, as Dr. Annis has often said. There is, for example, a $90 deductible, there are time limits—though liberal—for any one illness and there are no funds for doctors' bills or drugs. These conservative aspects of the program are, to my mind, as important as the liberal ones.

Congress is charged by the Constitution to "promote the general welfare," not "provide for it." This plan, like social security itself, is a floor program on which people can build to meet their own standards through additional savings and supplemental insurance.

This program has singled out hospital costs because these are the least budgetable, most catastrophic health costs confronting the aged. By insuring the elderly against the financial ravages of serious illness, we remove the haunting fear that they will suddenly be turned from self-sufficient citizens into applicants for alms. In short, we add a sense of security, a measure of dignity and a new dimension of happiness to their retirement years.

But it would be more accurate to say they do this for themselves.

For the essential characteristic—the real genius—of the social security mechanism, is that every American can pay during his working years for benefits after he retires. As the Supreme Court has said, social security allows everyman to earn a retirement unmarred by economic dependency. It has become one of his unalienable rights.

These features of the system have never particularly impressed Dr. Annis or the AMA. They are opposing this health insurance plan with many of the same arguments and much of the same phraseology they originally displayed in opposing social security, in opposing Blue Cross and in opposing benefit programs for Government employees.

Dr. Annis' charges, implications and innuendos against the program are too numerous to answer in full. But his major attacks should not go unanswered.

He has sought to undermine confidence in the whole social security system by claiming the Supreme Court has ruled it isn't insurance. The Court has done just the opposite. Dr. Annis always fails to mention that he refers to the opinion of an Eisenhower Solicitor General arguing in the case, Fleming versus Nestor.

The Court's ruling in that case reads as follows:

"The social security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to spend money in aid of the general welfare."

Dr. Annis has further sought to undermine confidence in social security by suggesting that it is financially unsound. In Detroit he pointed out that the system is presently unfunded by $330 billion and concluded with what sounded suspiciously like a call for repeal of social security. He said, "the day is coming when we are going to have to take a second look at this system."

Dr. Annis has twisted a known and obvious fact when he discloses that social security does not maintain the reserve that an insurance company with the same liability would have to maintain. To build such a reserve would be unnecessary and foolish, for unlike an insurance company the Government does not have to reckon on going out of business.

The financing of social security is too long a story to go into here, but the method of financing has been studied again and again by distinguished experts and each time—

most recently in 1959—it has been given a clean bill of health.

Dr. Annis has sought to instill the fear of Government control of medicine. He knows the legislation in question specifically forbids Government control of any kind over the practice of medicine. He knows that the accrediting and admitting procedures for hospitals were written into the bill at the urging of the American Hospital Association. He knows that Government has no control over those procedures. He knows that 38,000 of the 50,000 physicians he charges will be controlled by the Government are actually interns and residents on salary at the hospitals.

Dr. Annis has sought to instill the fear that patients will lose their freedom of choice. He knows that this measure is only a means of paying the bills. Patients will choose their doctors, follow their advice and go to the hospitals of their choice as they always have in the past. It is Kerr-Mills that takes away a patient's freedom. For under this act, he can be assigned to any welfare or county hospital that the State chooses.

Dr. Annis has sought to stir up class antagonism by raising the specter of a hoard of rich people benefiting from this program. I ask what rich people? Three-tenths of 1 percent of those over 65 have incomes of $50,000 or more and only 3 percent have incomes of $10,000 or more.

To ferret out the wealthy would require a degrading means test that would weigh just as degradingly on the other 97 percent of the aged. And as we have learned from Kerr-Mills experience, a means test would cost more to operate than it would save for the program by excluding the wealthy. The rich are already doing pretty well by the Government. In the top tax bracket, 91 percent of medical expenses can be written off as tax deductions.

And finally Dr. Annis invariably raises the specter of socialism. This program is socialistic, he says, and is only an entering wedge to very broad Government health insurance.

Except for the aged, our population is well taken care of by private health insurance. This program is meant to meet a particular need and it is a complete program. In itself, the program has nothing to do with socialism. It provides for insurance, not care; the Government does not own the hospitals which do provide care nor does it employ the doctors who prescribe care.

I have always considered this accusation the most revealing of the AMA's true feelings. It shows what they are really concerned about * * * not the condition of the aged but the slim chance that in some future time someone might want to socialize the AMA. Thus they obstruct a good and needed program because of a bad and unfounded fear.

And they have the gall to attribute their selfish motivation to those of us who back social security health insurance for the elderly. Well, they are wrong. We have not the slightest interest in the bogus issue of socializing medicine. But we are vitally committed to providing adequate health insurance to the aged as a matter of right and not on the basis of indigence. We believe that as many people as possible should be spared the degrading need for public assistance. The American Medical Association thinks that a means test and public assistance should be acceptable to everyone. This is our difference.

Thank you.

"Washington Cover-Up"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent address delivered by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, of the Washington bureau of the Cowles Publications, at the University of Oregon on February 15, 1963.

Mr. Mollenhoff, author of the book "Washington Cover-Up," calls attention to the vital role of Congress in keeping a check on the power of the executive branch of Government. He further calls attention to the problem of news management and the insidious use of the doctrine of "Executive privilege" to bar Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the press from records and testimony.

Individual Members of Congress are gravely concerned over this problem as it grew in the Eisenhower administration and is now being enlarged in the Kennedy administration. It is time all Members of Congress become concerned over the efforts of the executive branch to bar access to Government records.

This plea for "full support to Congress in asserting its right to investigate Government activities" is something every Member of the House and Senate must heed if this form of government is not to be impaired.

Following is Mr. Mollenhoff's address:

"WASHINGTON COVER-UP"

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Much has changed in the newspaper world in the 50 years since Eric W. Allen founded the Department of Journalism at the University of Oregon. Reporters and editors are better educated than in the period of even 25 or 30 years ago. There has been a specialization on many of our larger newspapers that is regarded by some observers as a tremendous step in giving the public a better understanding of such fields as education, science and labor. Certainly, most local newspaper staffs are better equipped today to report and analyze the activities of local and State governments than they were in 1912. Much credit for this progress belongs to men like Eric Allen.

However, there is real reason for asking if the newspapers are keeping pace with the national and international problems that confront our society. These problems involve both bigness and complexity. They are best illustrated by a simple reference to the tremendous increase in Federal responsibilities and Federal expenditures.

In 1912, Federal expenditures were less than $1 billion—$689,881,000 to be exact. Recently, President Kennedy has proposed a budget of $98.8 billion, and it could easily soar over the $100 billion mark. More than $50 billion of the Federal spending will be for defense. This means it will be spent behind a heavy curtain of military security that will prevent the press and the public from examining many of the decisions of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

There can be little doubt, we have reached the point where it is impossible for any newspaper reporter, or any group of reporters, to engage in a comprehensive analysis of Government spending. The size of the spending is staggering. The complexity of the laws and regulations is overwhelming. The powers assumed by the executive branch are almost unbounded.

Yet, somehow we must manage to examine and criticize this mammoth Federal Government if we are to carry out our assignment in the American democracy. Somehow, we must find the means to expose corruption or favoritism even if it involves areas where the Defense Department may seek to use false claims of "military security" for a shield. Somehow, we must oppose the arbitrary and arrogant use of authority within the huge bureaucratic agencies. Somehow, we must keep all channels of information open unless the real military security of our Nation is at stake. And even in those areas where genuine military security can be claimed, we must assure ourselves that the Congress has provided an effective check on the use of arbitrary power by the executive branch.

Bound up in these press responsibilities is the most vital issue of our time: Can the United States fight effectively in the long-range cold war, and also continue to function as a real democracy?

The newspapers of the United States must carry a heavy responsibility, if not the major responsibility, in the determination of how that question will be answered in the next 10 or 20 years ahead of us. Newspaper editors and reporters must be able to understand the problem of obtaining information from Government. They must know all the avenues for obtaining information, and must recognize when those avenues are being barricaded. They must recognize when a false claim of military security is used to cover up matters that are simply embarrassing to the executive branch.

It is not enough for our editorial pages to shout freedom of information or news management with a fervor. It can be relatively easy to deplore the news managers on a well-publicized Federal case where others have led the way. However, it is more important that you be able to do your own analysis of Government operations to expose the unjustified secrecy that slips into Government agencies under many different guises.

Many journalism schools and many professional newspaper ogranizations are doing a laudable job of trying to promote a greater interest in depth knowledge of Government information problems. However, the effort is still far from successful.

It is unfortunate that deep splits have developed in the ranks of the working newsmen that tend to hurt the entire cause. One group tends to scoff at the resolutions passed by freedom of information committees as being ineffective. This group may point to an enthusiastic resolution supporter who does not follow through in his daily operations. There is the claim that all that is needed is good reporting to break through any of the information barriers.

Such feuding tends to weaken the newspapers on an issue upon which they should be united. There is no doubt that good aggressive reporters and editors can do a great deal to break through news barriers. However, when the problem becomes national in scope, there is also the need for strong and unified support from other newspapers and from professional organizations.

It is seldom that one reporter or one newspaper can break through a secrecy wall on the national level if there is not general newspaper support. It is even more difficult if there is active opposition from well-known but poorly informed national columnists.

Fortunately, most of the columnists are reasonably well informed on this issue, but some are not. One well-known columnist screamed about news management but a short time later supported a total arbitrary secrecy in a claim of Executive privilege.

How could he complain that an administration was engaged in news management by putting out favorable press releases, and then defend that administration for arbitrarily barring Congress from investigating behind the self-serving declarations in the news releases. Some might contend that the man was forsaking journalistic principles to promote the things he felt were expedient.

He was not dishonest. It was worse than that. He simply does not know Government operations. He writes the big picture, second-guessing the President, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State on all types of broad policy issues. Yet, I know from considerable personal experience that he is unfamiliar with the detailed little pictures that are necessary if one is to draw sweeping conclusions on the so-called big picture.

This columnist had no understanding of the laws, regulations, or court decisions involved in the problem of executive privilege. Secrecy was wrong one week because it interfered with a story he was pursuing. Broader secrecy was acceptable the next week because it seemed to bar information from a Senator he did not like.

Over a period of years, I believe that the activities of our journalism schools and our professional newspaper organizations can do a lot to eradicate or minimize such misleading commentary.

As far as the overall information picture is concerned, I do not want to be an alarmist. However, I do want to express concern over a number of actions in the Kennedy administration that deal with the information policy. Some are mere extensions of the Eisenhower administration's policies, and some seem to carry the New Frontier stamp.

I do not believe we are faced with public officials who want to interfere with the rights of a free press or the proper operations of our democracy. However, this does not mean that I believe we can count on the good intentions or the self-serving statements of any administration. The President and others charged with the responsibility for military defense can easily rationalize steps to bar the press or Congress from embarrassing information. The political aspirations of nearly every high official in the executive branch tend to make it easy to justify press releases that give an overly optimistic picture of how well government is being administered.

The men heading our Government may have the best interests of the press at heart, but it is cause for concern when Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester starts to talk of "an inherent right to lie" about defense matters. This is particularly troublesome when it is accompanied by a directive which makes it necessary for all civilian and military officials at the Pentagon to report all conversations with reporters before the close of business each day.

Take such pronouncements in context with other developments in recent years, and it is apparent why newsmen should be giving more serious study to the laws and practices on Government information. Just review some examples:

When an Air Force navigator was crippled for life in a bomber crash, the Air Force denied him Government records he needed to press a damage claim.

When a Government investigator displeased his superiors with a report on misuse of U.S. foreign aid to Cambodia, the State Department refused him access to his own personnel records which, he claimed, would show he was railroaded out of his job.

The Defense Department refused to allow a Senate committee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

The State Department refused Congress access to records containing evidence of fraud in foreign aid spending in Laos and Peru.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Budget used an arbitrary secrecy ruling to hide a conflict of interest which made a multimillion-dollar power contract illegal.

A State Department official refused to give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a copy of a controversial foreign relations planning paper.

High State Department officials accused a foreign government representative of bribery, but refused to produce documents or testimony to support the charge.

Even a Government agency, the General Accounting Office, was denied access to official Navy, Air Force, and State Department records despite a specific law giving GAO such right of access.

These are not examples of what might happen in the United States under an all-powerful authoritarian executive branch of Government. These are only a few of the cases demonstrating what has happened in the American democracy in recent years under an arbitrary claim of a right to unlimited secrecy.

This unlimited secrecy has been promoted under the term "Executive privilege." Through a simple self-serving declaration that the public interest is involved, officials of the executive branch have pulled down the broad secrecy curtain. The public, the press, the Congress, and even the courts are barred from records of testimony from Government officials or records of official acts.

President Eisenhower claimed his administration could bar Congress and the GAO from any records or testimony containing advice of high level officials.

President Kennedy has taken the Eisenhower thesis and extended it to declaring that he will not allow the questioning of "subordinate officials of our career service" on their official acts.

Executive branch officials admit there is hardly a paper of importance in any executive agency that does not include the opinions, conclusions or recommendations to qualify for an "Executive privilege" secrecy stamp.

The result is a doctrine that disregards the law, flies in the face of court decisions, scoffs at the right of the public to be informed and arrogantly rejects the processes of Congress.

In its simplest form, it is a proclamation that the executive branch cannot be challenged in its invocation of total secrecy. It strips away, or diminishes, the constitutional right of the Congress to investigate the administration of laws.

Neither the Eisenhower administration nor the Kennedy administration has used the ultimate power inherent in the "Executive privilege" doctrine. Total application of this doctrine would create a public uproar for it would be executive tyranny. Both administrations have made much information available that might have been hidden by Executive privilege, and in some cases information was revealed that was against the political interests of the administration in power. However, in many of these cases, the executive branch officials had no real choice for there was already enough information in the public domain to make a coverup impractical.

It would have been poor politics for the Kennedy administration to have tried to use Executive privilege to pull down the secrecy curtain on the Billie Sol Estes case. When the McClellan committee started its investigation of Estes in April there had already been an exposure of large segments of the Estes case by a Texas newspaper and by Texas Attorney General Will Wilson.

Use of executive privilege at that point would have meant political disaster for Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. Pulling down a secrecy curtain in the face of strong evidence of fraud would have been similar to claiming the fifth amendment. Freeman couldn't afford secrecy in the face of evidence indicating fraud or favoritism. The Kennedy administration couldn't afford to face a charge of cover-up on the first major scandal problem.

The Kennedy administration opened the records for Chairman McClellan, and for a House Subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina. Investigative reports were made available to the press and to the Senate and House investigators. High level officials testified on their opinions, conclusions and recommendations in the cotton allotment decisions that favored Billie Sol Estes, and on the decisions that resulted in Estes being named to the National Cotton Advisory Board.

Low level officials testified in detail on their dealings with Estes. Nothing was withheld, the administration claimed.

The open Government policy in the Estes case was a complete reversal of form for the Kennedy administration. Less than 2 months earlier, President Kennedy had given his approval to a Defense Department decision to refuse to allow a Senate Armed Service subcommittee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara used the secrecy of Executive privilege to block the Stennis subcommittee from questioning the censors on specific changes in speeches of high ranking military officers.

On February 8, 1962, President Kennedy wrote to McNamara:

"I have concluded that it would be contrary to the public interest to make available any information which would enable the subcommittee to identify and hold accountable any individual with respect to any particular speech that he has reviewed.

"I therefore direct you, and all personnel under the jurisdiction of your Department, not to give any testimony or produce any documents which would disclose any such information."

President Kennedy did not contend that the national security of the country might be jeopardized in the questioning of the censors. He did not contend that Defense or State secrets of a highly classified nature might be involved. This would have been ludicrous.

So, the President simply gave his view that it was "in the public interest" and the secrecy of executive privilege was claimed.

It was politically practical to assert a claim of unlimited secrecy in the censors hearings because Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, was the major opposition. Senator THURMOND held a position on racial and economic matters which had little national appeal, and he was regarded as a symbol of extreme rightwing thinking. It was Senator THURMOND who contended that the Pentagon and State Department censors were watering down the speeches of generals and admirals, and were in essence pursuing a no-win philosophy. The Defense and State Departments denied the allegation, and the Armed Services Subcommittee, under Chairman JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, was established to

do a full investigation of the controversial blue penciling.

The Defense Department made copies of the public speeches available, and McNamara and others testified on the general policy under which censors operated. However, the important question was how the policies were interpreted and applied by the actual censors. That question was never answered because the claim of executive privilege was used to avoid pinpointing of responsibility for specific actions.

This was not a wild and free-swinging investigation under an irresponsible chairman. This was not a committee operating outside of its jurisdiction, and engaging in abusive treatment of witnesses. It was a properly authorized subcommittee of the Senate Armed Service Committee, it was operating within its jurisdiction, asking for Government records and asking questions that were pertinent to the inquiry.

McNamara declared that the Congress would have to content itself with his self-serving declaration—his high-level handouts—and would be prevented from going behind his assertions. Amazingly, the editorial cheers for McNamara were deafening. He was cheered because he was defying Senator THURMOND.

The question of whether Senator THURMOND was right or wrong in his conclusions on the censors was not important. He had the right to be wrong, as long as he conducted himself in a proper manner, and asked pertinent questions in a legitimate investigation. He had fully as much right to ask questions as any member of the press, and he had a right to expect answers that were truthful.

The press should examine its performance in this case as it considers information policies that were adopted later by McNamara and Sylvester. The press forgot principles for the moment in the interest of kicking a Senator who held an unpopular view. The press also forgot its own long-time self-interest.

McNamara was arbitrary, he was defiant of the power of Congress, and he was crowned a hero. Was it any wonder that he and Sylvester were confident in seeking the maximum in their more recent news managing ventures in connection with the Cuban affair? Was it any wonder Pentagon officials and the White House believed it was possible to adopt the Sylvester directive to control press contacts at the Pentagon?

Pentagon reporters have characterized the Sylvester directive on press contacts as a "Gestapo" tactic. They comment that they feel the Sylvester directive, if implemented, will have the potential for shutting off legitimate dissent on policy matters that have nothing to do with national security. Even if the order is not fully implemented, it is felt it will be a club over the heads of military and civilian personnel. It is a formal order, and can be used as a basis for disciplinary action at the times when the McNamara team wants to use it to curb dissent.

Defense Secretary McNamara may want to run the Defense Department in the best and most efficient manner. We can credit him with wanting to achieve the maximum military strength for the minimum expenditure. We can assume that he believes his policies are in the best interest of the Nation. However, the same thing could have been said for most of our past Secretaries of Defense and their military chiefs.

The present administration did not accept the Eisenhower administration's assessment of its achievements. In fact, President Kennedy and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were sharply critical of the defense policies of President Eisenhower. Since assuming office, they have stressed that the Eisenhower administration policies resulted in what they believed to be serious military weaknesses. They have assured us that Defense Secretary McNamara and General Taylor have been working feverishly and have repaired many of the weaknesses in our defense armor.

The men who are now leading our Nation did not want us to accept the self-serving declarations of the Eisenhower administration on our defense posture. Now they contend that what they found demonstrated the former policies were wrong.

Are we now to assume that we have finally found that infallible team composed of men who will instinctively know what is best for us? Are we to assume that McNamara, only 2 years in the job, can produce the right answers on complex problems of defense without the benefit of dissent or public debate?

The press should be insistent that the Sylvester directive is wiped off the books. The effectiveness of the press in opposing the directive will depend upon its persistence. While it has been encouraging to see the Nation's press genuinely irritated over the Sylvester order and the attitudes that surround it, it is doubtful that this fury will continue.

If there is sharp and continued criticism, I have no doubt the Sylvester order will eventually be modified or withdrawn.

However, if the Nation's newspapers follow a characteristic pattern, the fury will soon give way to a few mild protests, and these will in turn give way to a whimpering acceptance of the chains. The short attention span of many newspapers will mean that the Sylvester directive will be forgotten, and the high-level handout collecting that goes with it will become an accepted part of the Washington news-gathering picture.

The press has an obligation to rip the Sylvester directive apart at every opportunity, not only because it is bad, but because it can become the pattern for further similar directives if it survives.

Past history should pretty well demonstrate that the executive branch does not do a good job of investigating itself. This is particularly true of the Military Establishment. It was the Congress that revealed the scandals involving Gen. Benny Meyers. It was the Congress that pulled loose the scandals involving Harry (the hat) Lev and the New York procurement office. It was the Congress that produced the "chamber of horrors" on military buying practices generally. It was the Congress that revealed the details of the classic military corruption and mismanagement, in the construction of an airstrip at Fort Lee, Va.

These scandals were actually being hidden or disregarded by the Pentagon until the Congress stepped in and forced aggressive action. Our thinking on future problems should be keyed to these documented studies of the past.

We should remember that the Symington Armed Services Subcommittee has demonstrated that several billions of dollars were wasted in the stockpiling of strategic and critical material. A vast curtain of secrecy covered the stockpile purchasing and the political letters and questionable decisions that went into the creation of that $9 billion stockpile.

By now the lesson should be clear. Government secrecy has been used to hide corruption, mismanagement, and arbitrary abuse of power.

However, we must accept some secrecy as necessary to cover some military matters and some diplomatic negotiations. (Also, some secrecy is provided by law, such as in the income-tax field.)

Our job is to see that the secrecy is limited to the areas clearly defined by laws and regulations. Even in the areas of military security and diplomatic negotiations there must be an avenue for review by proper committees of Congress and by the General Accounting Office.

Today we have four basic information problem areas:

1. The common news management in which an administration releases information that is most favorable to its activities, and makes it difficult to obtain contrary facts.

2. Such special directives as the Sylvester order of October 27, 1962, to control all press contacts at the Pentagon.

3. The misuse of military security classifications to cover up mistakes of judgment, malfeasance, and incompetence on the part of an incumbent administration.

4. The arbitrary and unlimited secrecy claim inherent in the Executive privilege doctrine as stated by President Eisenhower and carried on by President Kennedy.

Of all these problems, I am least concerned about simple news management as it is usually defined. Usually this term refers to the timing and wording of Government press releases to put the best foot forward for the incumbent administration. I am concerned only when the administration insists we accept these self-serving declarations, and then refuses to allow us to go behind them.

I am most gravely concerned about the Executive privilege doctrine. This doctrine is a naked claim to unlimited secrecy on the whim of the executive branch. It has been used to bar the press, the public, the Congress, and the General Accounting Office from examining Government business. It has been used to hide scandals and mismanagement in our regulatory agencies, in the foreign aid program, and in the Defense Department.

There is one thing that every citizen can do, and that every newspaper should do, in opposing the Washington coverup.

Give full support to Congress in asserting its right to investigate Government activities and Government spending.

I am not advocating that you should agree with the conclusions that any or all committees of Congress may reach in an investigation. I do suggest that you support the full right of Congress to call for documents and testimony in properly authorized investigations of Government activities.

The executive branch of the Government has grown more powerful year after year, and it seems unlikely that this power will be cut. It may be that a powerful executive is needed in dealing with the problems of the cold war.

However, I do not believe that many of us would suggest that this great power that is lodged in the President and his official family should go unchecked. If that power is unchecked then we will have lost one of the most important aspects of our form of government—the checks and balances.

The Congress represents the only effective check on the executive branch. All legislative power resides in the Congress, and this means the power to pass laws, to investigate to see how the laws are being administered, and to investigate to determine if new laws are needed.

Every curtailment of the right of Congress to investigate is a curtailment of the right of the press to learn about the operations of government. This is a curtailment of the public's right to know.

Congress may have its scoundrels, its scandals, and its abuses. But it is well to remember that Congress is a bipartisan body. It has within it the representatives of every shade of political thinking in our society from extreme liberal to extreme conservative. This diversity of thought is the strength of our Congress, and it is the real strenght of our system of government. It is our only protection against the arbitrary

and unauthorized use of power by the powerful executive branch that exists today.

In the last few weeks, I have read all of the earlier Eric Allen memorial lectures. They covered a wide range of interests, as diverse as were the interests of the men who gave them. However, it did seem to me that through them all ran one dominant theme—one basic belief:

Freedom of the press exists only to provide for reporting and commentary on public affairs. We are true to our profession only as we work to provide the light that makes the democratic process more effective.

It cannot be emphasized too often that our basic responsibility is governmental affairs. It was encouraging to see that all of your past Eric Allen speakers were in agreement on this point. In one way or another, each of them sought to demonstrate that the comics, gossip columns, fashions, sports, and puzzles—necessary as they may be in making mass appeal—are not the press activities the framers of our Constitution had in mind in guaranteeing a free press.

I believe Eric Allen would have found something of value in each of those earlier lectures, and I am sure he would have found the compiled lectures carried an inspiration greater than any single one.

We need a full measure of inspiration, as well as perspiration, to handle our responsibilities in these days of $100 billion budgets. We need a persistent devotion to our tasks if we are to understand and control the high cost of Government secrecy at the city, county, State, or Federal level.

The future of democracy is contingent upon whether we can subordinate political partisanship and petty differences for basic principles. This is the least we can do to honor the memory of men like Eric Allen.

Our Best Investment in the Arab World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Best Investment in the Arab World," written by Robert Littell. The article deals with the American University at Beirut.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR BEST INVESTMENT IN THE ARAB WORLD

(By Robert Littell)

Several years ago Damascus, the capital of Syria, was in the throes of one of its periodic coups d'etat. The cabinet ministers were in jail, the frontier closed. Before a desk at police headquarters stood an American businessman and former government official, Harold B. Hoskins, asking to be allowed to leave the country. "As a consultant for the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey," he said, "I must go to Amman, in Jordan, as soon as possible." The police official remained unmoved. "Besides," continued the American, "I am a lieutenant colonel in the Army of the United States." "I am sorry, colonel," was the answer, "but we have our orders."

"Would your orders," asked Hoskins, playing his last card, "apply to me as chairman of the board of trustees of the AUB?" The Syrian official's face lit up. "Ah. The AUB. That's different." In 2 minutes Hoskins had his permit to cross the border into Jordan.

"AUB": for countless Arabs these three letters are a password more magical than the might of American arms or the wealth and power of American oil. They stand for the American University of Beirut. Founded by former Congregational and Presbyterian missionaries almost a century ago, it is a proud nonsectarian outpost of unfettered scholarship, and a rock of free teaching and thinking in the whirlpool of the Middle East.

The American University of Beirut's campus, in the capital of the Lebanese Republic, is framed between snowcapped mountains and a warm blue sea. Here a faculty of 542, two thirds of them Arabs, teach the sciences and the arts, medicine, agriculture, and engineering, to 2,843 students, born in 54 countries from Afghanistan to Zanzibar and professing 22 varieties of religious faith. More than 600 of the students are women; about a hundred are Americans. The majority are Arabs by race and tongue, representing a vast hinterland of 66 million people newly awakened to their problems and their potentialities.

Into the body of this Arab world the American University of Beirut has poured, since the end of World War II, a transfusion of more than 5,000 graduates. Probably no other educational institution has had a greater influence on the Arab revival, or opened Eastern windows wider to the West. The university is the alma mater of countless Arab leaders. At the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, 19 of the delegates were graduates of AUB; one of them, statesman-philosopher Charles Malik, later presided over the U.N.'s 13th General Assembly. A recent partial roster of distinguished American University of Beirut alumni listed seven premiers, a dozen ambassadors or ministers, and as many cabinet members.

For decades there have been American University of Beirut men on practically every rung of the public and professional ladders throughout the Middle East, and far beyond it. Recent American University of Beirut alumni bulletins mention the chief of police of the oil-rich sheikhdom of Bahrein, the head of Baghdad's nuclear-research center, the manager of the Istanbul Hilton, the U.N.'s top economist in the Congo. Graduates of the engineering school are practicing in at least 20 countries. Arab-born American University of Beirut men are teaching with distinction at Princeton, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Cornell, Vanderbilt, and Washington. There is an active branch of the American University of Beirut Alumni Association in São Paulo, Brazil.

A man like the Lebanese engineer-politician-writer Emile Bustani, 1929, would be outstanding in any country. With the energy of a young bull and a mind stropped keen as tool steel, he rules CAT (Contracting and Trading Co.), which he founded and which employs some 17,000 people and builds bridges, factories, refineries, pipelines, and apartment houses, from Karachi to Libya, and Ankara to West Africa. His alma mater, Bustani believes, represents the greatest achievement of the American people outside their own country.

The American University of Beirut campus is a happy mixture of East and West, of tradition and modernity. The Victorian sandstone of the missionary era blends with the space geometry of the engineering school buildings. Palms, banyans, jacarandas, and even more exotic trees shade a stream of alert, serious young people carrying slide rules and biology books to a meal of fattoush or chicken moghrabieh in the cafeteria. There are no fraternities, no hazing, no freshman skullcaps—indeed, no juvenile rah-rah of any sort.

On the paths which wind down past the playing fields to the university's private beach, one hears a medley of languages. While Arabic predominates, English is the only common tongue for Iranians, Afghans, Pakistanis, Cypriots, Ethiopians. English is the language of instruction.

The presence of women students from the Arab and other Middle Eastern countries betokens a mighty revolution—still in process—in which the American University of Beirut has played a decisive part. Coeds were first admitted to the school of nursing in 1905, to the schools of pharmacy and dentistry in 1921, and to all academic subjects in 1925. The next year, the medical school welcomed its first Middle Eastern woman candidate for an M.D.: Edma E. Abuchdid, now a prominent Beirut gynecologist and obstetrician.

The women graduates have made notable contributions to Middle Eastern life. In Abadan, for example, the oil boom of the late 1940's attracted people from all over the Middle East, to live in unsanitary shacks and horrible shantytowns. Among the hovels a lone woman in a white apron—Qudsiyyah Ashraf—organized first-aid tents, a soup kitchen, a kindergarten, a maternity-care center. She was, of course, an American University of Beirut graduate, as was Elizabeth Nasir, who, while working in the Palestinian Ministry of Social Affairs, founded a shelter for derelict, half-orphaned little girls. By training them for household service, she has rescued them from a probable life of begging and eventual prostitution. All she did, Miss Nasir says, "was to apply the noble ideas I learned at the university."

The idea of service to one's neighbors begins early at the American University of Beirut. Freshmen become members of the civic welfare league, and get firsthand knowledge of community social problems. As juniors and seniors they teach night school, help drain malarial swamps, clean up slums or bring the light of modern methods to village farmers.

Famous for its pioneering is the American University of Beirut faculty of medical science, which has launched a program to develop a complete new medical center, with improved facilities for teaching and research. But even with its present facilities, a team of six surgeons and cardiologists, five of them American University of Beirut graduates, has recently performed the first open-heart operations in the Middle East.

Every May, at a three-day assembly which has become the Middle East's most important medical event, the American University of Beirut is host to several hundred physicians, scientists, and pharmacists, come to hear papers read by specialists from all over the world.

In those same weeks before commencement, visitors of another kind descend discretely upon the campus: emissaries from businesses, banks, and oil companies in search of talent. A man from the British Council comes with offers of postgraduate study in England; agents of Emile Bustani's Contracting & Trading Co. look around the engineering school for promising mice; an official from Nigeria seeks to enroll 40 teachers for his country.

From the beginning the American University of Beirut has relied on private support—gifts from foundations, from American friends, from graduates. Grants have been received from the Rockefeller Bros. Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others.

More than half the students need and receive financial help of some sort. Every year there are a few like Fayez Khassawneh, whose Bedouin grandfather traveled from a black tent pitched on the rim of the desert to see him graduate. Or like Mohammed Saffouri, who for many months walked daily the 3 miles between American University of Beirut's prep school and his Palestinian refu-

gee camp. In his last year at the American University of Beirut he got straight A's; he is now a promising physicist at Cal Tech.

The American University of Beirut began its existence in 1866 as the "Syrian Protestant College," under a charter granted by the board of regents of the State of New York. For 79 years, with the inspired guidance, first of the founder-president, the Reverend Daniel Bliss, then of his son Howard, then of Howard's son-in-law Bayard Dodge, who retired in 1947, Syrian Protestant College grew slowly, sturdily, adding buildings, faculty, students. It weathered all of Lebanon's political upheavals; it endured Turkish rule, a famine, four epidemics of cholera, inflation, aerial bombardment, and two great wars. After the last of these it was granted an amendment to its charter and became the American University of Beirut.

The American University of Beirut is respected in the Arab world because it has not proselytized, either for the religion of its founders or for the political system of its American supporters. It has refused to be an instrument of national policy, it has avoided "intellectual colonialism," it has never tried to impose American culture.

When Nadim Dimechkie a former Lebanese Ambassador to Washington, was asked why he approved of having so American an institution as the American University of Beirut in the heart of his country, he replied, "Because I was never required to study American history there."

"No student," says Prof. Nabih Amin Faris, of American University of Beirut's faculty of arts and sciences, "can for long remain immune to the new aggressive ideologies unless we take the risks involved in any liberal education and endow him with the power and the will and the courage to think for himself."

We Americans cannot buy friends abroad by giving them a college education any more than we can buy them with wheat or tractors or tanks. But if we teach them to think freely, clearly, in the long run they will be on the side that believes in liberty of thought and choice, in the dignity and value of the individual, in the interdependence of all the nations of this rapidly shrinking world.

Dispelling Some Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article written by my colleague, the Honorable JACK WESTLAND, of Washington State's Second District.

We who represent districts in which the American softwood lumber industry is sick and in real trouble are trying to help prevent the demise of that industry.

For one thing we seek a quota on imports from Canada. By quota we mean a 6-percent limit based on the total imports of 1960–61 and 1962. It should be pointed out that Canada now imposes a tariff averaging 10 percent on any lumber imported into Canada from the United States.

We do not mind sharing our good market but not to the extent of killing off our producers.

The article follows:

DISPELLING SOME FOG

(By Hon. JACK WESTLAND, of Washington)

After his death, Argus' eyes were transferred to the peacock's tail and his name was given to the Pacific Northwest's magazine of news, comment, opinion, and occasional mythology.

It isn't difficult to find each in the stimulating January 25 issue, including a bit of mythology on page 1 headlined "Sound Lumber Industry Explodes Myth of Woe, Chaos."

The unidentified author of the article should ask for a bonus from Argus Publisher Thomas H. Meadowcroft, who is also listed as a director of MacMillan, Bloedal, & Powell River, Ltd., one of Canada's largest timber producers.

The Argus said, among other things, that "lumber industry profits in 1962 have risen sharply, and are exceeded by only 1 year in the past 6." Well, now I find that the latest figures from the quarterly reports of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission show that corporate net profits as a percentage of sales after income taxes in the lumber and wood products industry amounted to 2.1 percent in 1962. The comparable figure for all manufacturing industries was about 4.6 percent.

Profits in the lumber industry in 1961 were 2 percent, in 1960 they were 1.7 percent, in 1959 were 4.1 percent, in 1958 ran 3.1 percent and in 1957 were 2.3 percent. To suggest that there were sharp increases in profits for the timber industry in 1962 or that it was a good profit year is not supported by the facts.

Also, the Argus reflects considerable confusion concerning the composition of the lumbermen's economic survival committee, which was formed under the leadership of the Dwyer Lumber Co., and the Simpson Timber Co.—not Georgia-Pacific Corp., mentioned in the article.

Contrary to the Argus statement, no petitioners before the U.S. Tariff Commission withdrew their names from the petition. Several lumber industry associations which were included on the mailing list of the lumbermen's economic survival committee clarified their relationship with the committee in a statement before the Commission.

Every major association representing softwood producers in the United States appeared and testified before the Tariff Commission. This included the Southern Pine Association. The Argus article erroneously said that the Southern Pine Association was "conspicuous by its absence."

According to the article, "The Portland-based lumber associations, representing only 1.5 percent of U.S. sawmills but financially dominating the National Lumber Manufacturers Association through the weight of its [sic] production and its dues, succeeded in getting National's money at the tariff hearing to support the lumbermen's economic survival committee." It is true that the Western Pine Association and the West Coast Lumbermen's Association have their offices in Portland, Oreg. What the article failed to indicate is that these two associations represent mills in every lumber-producing State west of the Mississippi River, and whose members account for at least 60 percent of all production of softwood lumber in the western region of the United States.

Contrary to the impression created by the Argus, the National Association of Home Builders did not appear before the Tariff Commission. It did file a statement with the Commission several weeks after the hearings ended, thereby avoiding interrogation on the assertions made in the statement. The article also suggested that the distributors of lumber in America appeared in force before the Commission in opposition to the domestic lumber producers' position. Nothing could be further from the truth.

A small group of lumber wholesalers from the New York-New England area did appear, but concentrated its testimony on lumber consumed in the United States which moves by water. The vast majority of wholesalers in the United States did not express their views at the Tariff hearings, except as they coincided with the views of the manufacturers.

The Argus said "Prices in December were higher than at any time in the past 3 years." Let's look at the facts. The wholesale price index for lumber, reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that the price index for 1962 on softwood was 95.5, while the preliminary December figure reached only 95.1. This compares to the 1958 index of 96.6, the 1959 index of 105, a 1960 index of 98.6 and a 1961 index of 93.5.

The most significant indication of whether or not domestic producers of lumber could supply all domestic softwood lumber needs is the fact that in 1959 domestic manufacturers of lumber produced 30.5 billion board feet of softwood lumber. In 1961 the United States used 30 billion board feet of softwood lumber and in 1962 used 30.9 billion board feet. It is only fair to assume that the mills producing lumber in 1959 could have supplied all the domestic needs for lumber in 1960, 1961, and 1962, without Canadian importation of softwood lumber into the United States. Consequently, the Argus statement, "We need natural resources and Canada needs manufacturers. Our lumber industry and lumber users need heavy Canadian supply if conservation plans are to work," is not supported by the evidence.

I want to point out that in 1962 consumption of softwood lumber in the United States increased by approximately 850 million board feet. Canadian shipments of softwood lumber into the United States captured 680 million board feet of this increase, or 80 percent.

How has waterborne shipments of lumber from British Columbia hurt west coast lumbermen? In 1952, 82.59 percent of the timber shipped to the U.S. Atlantic coast came from Oregon, California, and Washington, while 17.41 percent came from British Columbia. During 1962, shipments from the west coast amounted to about 38 percent compared to 62 percent for British Columbia. The British Columbia percentage was up from 57 percent in 1961.

The increase in British Columbia waterborne shipments between 1952 and 1962 was 629 million board feet, and means a gain to British Columbia over the 10-year period of 6,290 direct lumber industry jobs. This constitutes the direct employment opportunity loss to the Pacific Northwest. If you add service and community employment, British Columbia gains in the U.S. east coast market means a lost opportunity for 15,735 jobs and income equivalent of a city of more than 60,000 persons.

Canadian lumber can be shipped in foreign bottoms at a much cheaper rate than lumber from Washington State. This is one of the reasons British Columbia has captured so much of our east coast market. To help remedy the situation, I have introduced H.R. 3124 which would amend the Jones Act to allow shipments between the west coast and the east coast in foreign-flag ships if the industry can show it is losing a substantial portion of its business to foreign competitors because of the difference in shipping costs between foreign and American ships.

I believe that all the American lumberman asks is a chance to compete on an equal

basis. I think my bill would help give him this opportunity.

Even though I disagree with the Argus in this instance I defend its right to publish the article even though the publisher's father-in-law and brother-in-law are also listed as directors of MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River Ltd. a $300 million a year Canadian lumber concern. But I would suggest changing the masthead from the Argus to the Cyclops. One eye in focus might be more effective than 100 out of focus.

United States-Panama Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article recently written by George Natanson, entitle "United States-Panama Tension Eases Under Operation Friendship."

I commend the reading of this article to Members of the Congress, pointing out that it is worthwhile and really the best way we have to establish better relationships with our neighbors to the south.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-PANAMA TENSION EASES UNDER OPERATION FRIENDSHIP

(By George Natanson)

PANAMA CITY.—Until a year ago the streets of Panama City echoed with cries of "Go home, gringo."

One still hears such shouts, but rarely, and tensions are being relaxed between the Republic of Panama and the United States-controlled Canal Zone.

Differences exist, but they are being worked out over the conference table instead of in the streets, where in November 1959, anti-United States riots broke out.

Much of the credit for this improvement must go to a U.S. Army project called "Operation Friendship."

The idea behind the project is simple: Promote understanding between Panamanians and residents of the U.S. Zone. And it is not a one-way street.

While U.S. military personnel and residents of the Canal Zone are urged to learn Spanish and get better acquainted with their Panamanian neighbors, the Panamanians, especially the press, are encouraged to cooperate.

Operation Friendship has proved so successful that it is now thought of as a pilot project for use in the Alliance for Progress. It has been recommended also for other areas of the world where there is a concentration of U.S. troops or American business enterprise.

The plan is the handiwork of Maj. Gen. Theodore F. Bogart, commanding general, U.S. Army, Caribbean.

When Bogart took over here in June 1960, he was dismayed to find that U.S. relations with Panama had hit bottom. With the cooperation of the U.S. Ambassador, Joseph S. Farland, and the Canal Zone Governor, Robert J. Fleming, Operation Friendship was launched a month later.

A call went out for volunteer soldiers to apply their military skills to civil projects. Soon small groups of GI's were adopting whole villages, helping to build schools, dig wells, and construct roads.

But it was no giveaway program. Panamanians worked alongside the soldiers, learning U.S. skills and getting to know the men who for so many years had been represented to them as the oppressor.

At the same time the Panamanians, including the nation's president, began organizing sightseeing tours.

The president often throws open the Government Palace to GI visitors and their wives.

U.S. information offices here began sending out press releases and other material to the country's Spanish language press in Spanish instead of English as before.

Wives of servicemen are volunteering for hospital duty in Panama. Some soldiers have become so engrossed in the villages where they've worked they return on leave to teach English or special skills.

Army bands, which had to spend weeks learning Latin tunes, regularly go on tour throughout the Republic, and are in great demand.

The University of Panama, especially its law school, has long been a source of much anti-U.S. feeling. But Thomas Marmon, staff judge advocate at Army headquarters here, regularly invites law students into the zone for discussions of U.S. law and points of difference between it and Panamanian law.

A simple lead pencil has become a major weapon in fighting misunderstanding.

Pencils are not easy to come by for Panama's 167,000 schoolchildren, so U.S. Army Capt. John A. Leonard, Jr., wrote letters to schools in the New England area, asking for pencils of any kind. They began to pour in by return mail and it is estimated that by now the number has reached into the millions.

The soldiers once chipped in $80 to buy a seed bull for a small village. Another time more than $3,000 was collected to provide a delicate heart operation in the States for a Panamanian girl.

Still the trouble hasn't disappeared entirely in Panama. Only recently a minor flareup occurred when some Panamanian students objected to the U.S. Government's choice of a name for the new bridge spanning the Panama Canal. The students wanted "Bridge of the Americas," because it symbolically joined the two continents. The United States chose "Thatcher Ferry Bridge," in honor of a former U.S. Zone Governor.

Privately, many American residents were in favor of "Bridge of the Americas."

Former Panamanian President Roberto F. Chiari said last year in a letter to General Bogart, "Your efforts, as well as those of all the North Americans and Panamanians of clear vision and good will, are of special significance in these crucial moments of international relations."

The Upper Mississippi: River on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Old Man River has quite a life story, but still has plenty of life.

The upper Mississippi in the area of Quincy, Ill., is in the heart of the Mark Twain and Huckleberry Finn country, and the river now, as then, is important to the Nation.

The following article from the Quincy Herald-Whig reports a talk about the river by William H. Klingner:

ENGINEER RECOUNTS IMPRESSIVE STORY OF OLD MAN RIVER

The mighty Mississippi River, rolling past Quincy on its way to the Gulf of Mexico, was the reason for Quincy's founding and is still probably our biggest asset. Despite that fact, and despite the great revival of interest in the river during the last decade or so, there are many Quincyans who know little about the river, in final analysis.

One group of Quincyans, however, the members of Rotary Club, recently learned a great deal about the Mississippi when William H. Klingner, head of the local civil engineering firm of W. H. Klingner & Associates, gave a fact-packed talk to the club.

His subject was the "Operation and Control of the Mississippi River by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army." And his audience, besides getting a comprehensive account of U.S. engineer battles with the big river since 1820, heard quite a bit about the river itself, its importance to the Nation and the world.

Hard to control: Those of us who grew up here on the banks of the Mississippi, while possessively proud of the big river and perhaps aware of its importance to us as a never-failing source of water, a wonderful source of recreation, and an important part of the transportation network of the Nation, forget at times the vastness of the river and its tributaries. Klingner put that in perspective again.

Although three other rivers, the Amazon, Congo, and Nile, have larger watersheds, he said, the Mississippi watershed is nevertheless huge. It drains 41 percent of the Nation, an area embracing nearly a million and a quarter square miles and covering all, or parts, of 31 States, as well as two provinces of Canada. Waters from as far east as New York State and as far west as Montana eventually pour into the Mississippi.

Klingner emphasized the importance of the river as a means of travel and transportation since the earliest days white men began to settle along it. He told of early explorers and traders in canoes, of early keelboat traffic, and of the early steamboat travel which began in 1812 and grew fantastically until the Civil War.

From the earliest days man found the Mississippi had a violent will of it own. It flooded lands for miles in those untamed days, spreading out over the lowlands like a great, untamed sea. Its snags and sandbars wrecked steamboats. It cut new channels for itself and abandoned old ones.

Efforts to control the river, Klingner said, began at New Orleans nearly a century before the river received any attention in its upper reaches. That first effort was a levee around New Orleans, built about 1727. Less than 10 years later there were levees on both sides of the river for some 30 miles north of New Orleans. And in 1743 it was decreed settlers must complete their levees by January 1, 1744, or forfeit lands to the French crown.

We have been building new levees, or enlarging old ones, ever since.

In the immediate Quincy area alone, said Klingner, who serves as engineer for most drainage districts hereabouts, there are now more than 200,000 acres of rich bottomland protected by levees.

Eventful century: Klinger briefly recited some of the glamorous highlights of steamboat travel before it began to wane later in the 19th century. He told of the speed and luxury of some of the famous packets, of the comparatively short life but high financial return of most steamboats.

Local pride could be felt in the performance of one of the fastest of the upper river packets, the 300-foot side-wheeler *Gem City*, which made a record 5½-day round trip between St. Louis and St. Paul.

The decline of steamboating, Klingner went on, was due not only to the competition of railroads and other travel, but to the fact that the upper river was inadequate and tricky, subject to low water in summer and barred by ice in winter. Even when the new day in river transportation dawned, with growing barge tow traffic, the upper river—from St. Louis to St. Paul—did not begin to come into its own until the 9-foot channel project approved in 1930 became actuality through the canalization of the river by means of channel control dams such as Quincy's lock and dam 21.

In 1930, the year the 9-foot channel project was approved, records show only 527,000 tons of cargo moved on the upper river. But from the day the channel control operation began freight tonnage increased every year. Last year a new record of 11,525,620 tons of cargo moved through the Rock Island district, 10,525,620 tons of it locked through the Quincy lock.

The U.S. Engineer Corps got into the business of river channel improvement and flood control as early as 1820, Klingner said. It began a never-ending task of snag removal in 1824. But it was a quarter of a century later that it really got into flood control.

Now, more than a century afterward, the Army Engineers have not taught the big river to sit up, roll over, or play dead. Man probably never will completely harness a river so big, so willful. But that there has been tremendous improvement in man's efforts to control the river is obvious to all who have paid attention to the Mississippi for even 2 or 3 decades. Klingner made this clear as he recited the manner in which the channel control dams have maintained the upper river's 9-foot channel, and in the way such new flood control measures as the reservoirs on the Des Moines and Iowa Rivers will reduce future floods.

Reducing floods. Only one of these, the Coralville Reservoir on the Iowa River, has had an opportunity to demonstrate its value, but in 1960 its holding power was credited with lowering crest stages of the great 1960 flood in this area by a foot and a half. That flood, incidentally, was the greatest since records have been kept on the upper river, even with the beneficient effects of the Coralville Reservoir.

When the Red Rock and Sailorville Reservoirs on the Des Moines River became operative, said Klingner, they, together with the Coralville Reservoir, will be able to hold down the crest of a flood here by 4 feet.

Meantime, Klingner conceded, the river will continue to resist efforts to tame it, and eventually higher levees and other measures will be needed. But man, through the U.S. Engineer Corps, has succeeded pretty well in stabilizing the channel itself and restraining the great river in all but its very angriest moods.

"The flood control work, together with the control of the mighty Mississippi in this area," Klingner concluded, "not only serves the purpose of protecting a great artery of commerce to the Midwest and to the world, but also the levees and related flood control work protect the righest agricultural lands in all the world."

Many of us will add selfishly that it's nice having the big river at our door, too—for boating, fishing, and hunting, and just to be seen in its varied moods.

A Politician's Report on the State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at a luncheon at the Detroit Press Club, Detroit, Mich., on February 22, 1963:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., AT A LUNCHEON AT THE DETROIT PRESS CLUB, DETROIT, MICH., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

I give myself the luxury once in a while of making a politician's report on the state of the Union. I support the present Government but I am not in it. I have no inside information and could not use it if I had. I am not an expert either on economics or foreign affairs and don't pretend to be. I do claim to have had experience in politics and business. In its larger aspect, the means knowing about how the American public feels about a good many things. As you know, I travel a great deal, both in the United States and out of it, and on the strength of my observations I venture this report.

The United States at the moment is well off. It is running at fair business levels and 1963 will be a good year. Almost all the country will be a little better fed and a little better housed, and a little better clothed and have a little more money to spend than last year. I foresee neither booms nor bumps in the immediate future. This is as it ought to be.

And yet, there is a certain uneasiness. Though 1963 will be a good year, it will not be quite good enough. The American population keeps on growing. Being American, it wants every year to be rather better than the last. The more people, the more work has to be done. Also there are more legitimate hopes. A country that could rack up $550 billion of gross national product last year and hopes for more than $570 billion this year has a right to raise its sights. It has a right, for example, to ask why some parts—happily small—of the American community are in poverty. We have one such area in New York. It can also ask why about 5 percent of our labor force is unemployed.

This is evidence of prosperity, not of distress. When I started in public life, many years ago, views were different. Poverty was supposed to be inevitable for a good many people. Unemployment was a chronic disease. A man in public life who suggested that these were unnecessary and could be cured would have been thought of as a lunatic. Today we know more about economics than we did and we know enough about the production of the United States seriously to consider measures for diminishing both poverty and unemployment. The younger men here will live to see the day when both are under control.

I am, of course, a Democrat and I like to think the Democratic Party has been foremost in thinking how this amazing country of ours could spread its benefits and its economic product so that everyone willing to work could share it. There are some signs that we have been even converting Republicans so that some of them are beginning to think that way too. But we are still far out ahead.

The desire for the next step forward is part of a slight uneasiness I find in the country. There is good reason for it. The American public—which has a lot more brains than its gets credit for—knows that the country is now, as businessmen say, "integrated." The whole machine goes up or down together. Prosperity in one part of the country means a measure of prosperity in most places. Distress in any section is likely to spread to others. In the company I know most about—since I work for it—we know very well that we are dealing with one country, not with assorted parts. Over the years, section by section and state by state I have seen most parts of it move into a single main stream of American business, American employment and American life.

But this always brings with it a concern. That concern is whether the great machine will keep on turning over at the same rate, will keep on turning out the product, setting up the jobs, distributing purchasing power widely enough and evenly enough and fast enough so that its rate of growth continues. Increasingly whether we like it or not this depends on sound government policies and on sound cooperation with them by business and by labor.

President Kennedy has just proposed a careful program for speeding up the American economic machine. He is right in proposing it and his program is a good one. Analyzed, it proposes to pump about $10 billion a year or more of purchasing power into the American public. Part of this comes through lowering of income taxes that will mean more buying by consumers and, of course, more demand for the product of industry. Part of it—reduction in corporate tax rates—will mean more resources for American concerns to increase or revamp their plants or for new enterprises. This means more capital. Taken together, this should speed up the whole vast enterprise.

Rightly, the program leaves it to consumers to determine how they want to spend their money and to businessmen to determine where the new capital should be put. I think it will be successful, and over a period of time, I think it will generate more taxes out of higher output and payrolls and turnover than it costs in a 1- or 2-year deficit. Details will, of course, be argued over and no doubt should be. But the main outlines of the economic program stand up.

This I am glad to note is not a program to relieve distress. It is a program to increase prosperity. It is not a shot in the dark. We have the experience of a couple of other countries—notably Japan—who tackled the problem this way and were successful. I think the President's program will pass and I think the results will be good and I am glad that a Democratic administration proposed it.

The other subject on which there is uneasiness is that of foreign affairs. Here none of us are feeling comfortable; certainly I am not. I suspect that the administration is not feeling comfortable either. President Kennedy has been right in bluntly telling the American public that this will be a long, long job. And yet, having watched international affairs for a good many years I am optimistic over the long pull.

Let us take a square look at the situation. A few years ago when I had to talk about these things, the world was divided into two camps. One, the Communist camp, accepted Moscow as its leader and master.

The other was an alliance grouped around the United States. These two great groups were both bound to loosen up.

The Communist world was the first to begin to disintegrate. China, becoming Communist 13 years ago, had no desire to play second fiddle to Moscow. As soon as she became strong enough she insisted on an equal position. In the past few months she has frankly broken with Moscow. She has been pushing her own imperialist interest; everywhere she could and especially in Asia. Sooner or later she will be in frank conflict with the Soviet Union. They are neighbors in Asia. The Soviet Union has empty land there and Red China has more people than she can use. The two Communist countries are not in open conflict. It looks certain that they will be. Meanwhile the Communist countries in the middle are beginning to fly off in various directions. The Iron Curtain countries in Europe would exit at once if they could. They stick to Moscow chiefly because Russian arms are either in them or within arm's reach. Yugoslavia is traveling a course of her own. In Asia the smaller countries are already under attack as in Vietnam. There is even competition between Moscow and Red China for top position in some of these countries, for instance Laos.

Whether this conflict will do us much good, I do not know. But it does mean that, for the moment, we are not faced with a single united enemy. I don't personally think that their differences will help us too much. Red China says she wants a war with the United States—fortunately she is not able to make one. Moscow says they do not want a war with us—but will settle for peaceful coexistence. That means in plain language they do not want a nuclear war. They will try to conquer everything they can in Europe and Latin America by arming, financing, stirring up internal civil wars and sending their people to help. You are just as dead if you are killed in a peaceful coexistence civil war as if you were killed in a formally declared one. We therefore have to be prepared for all contingencies.

The danger is great just now in Latin America. In 1959 and 1960 Cuba became Communist. She became and now is almost entirely dependent on the Soviet Union. She received Soviet arms and the equivalent of two, perhaps understrength, Russian divisions of Russian soldiers. The crisis of last October pushed the Soviet missile bases out of Cuba and I think, though I do not know, made it unlikely that for the time being Cuba will be a rocket base. But the Communists under the domination of the Soviet Union hold Cuba, only 90 miles off our coast; Russian occupation forces are there and the Soviet Union has armed the place.

These armies are said to be defensive. They will stop being defensive as soon as they can be used against any neighboring state. The Cuban Communists have already announced that they intend to attack Venezuela and (I am quoting the Cuban Communist leader Blas Roca) "when we get the oil and iron of Venezuela we will set Latin America afire". As long as there is a Communist regime in Cuba, armed and supplied by the Soviet warmakers, none of us can feel easy. The present situation cannot last indefinitely. So far as we are concerned, Cuba can have any kind of social system the Cubans want, though we might not think much of it. But a Cuba which insists on being an enemy of the United States, armed by the Soviet Union, occupied by Russian soldiers, announcing that it is a forward base against the United States, and that it plans to attack Latin America, that is a real danger and a real problem. The country is uneasy—it will continue to be uneasy until this threat is over.

Meanwhile, as you see, there are arguments within the North Atlantic Alliance. Perhaps I am too optimistic. But I think that these are more apparent than real. The North Atlantic treaty countries, notably, Germany, France, Great Britain and the United States, and our northern neighbor Canada, are free. They are democratic. They have politicians and policies. They can and do and will continue to argue with each other and with us. Each has its own opinion of the place it should have in the world and will try to attain it.

This leads easily to quarrels. But below the squabble there is a single continuing condition. The strengths and the prosperity of all arises from their ability to get on with each other and with us. In final event, this factor determines the course of politics. We will not always agree on precise forms and measures. Small issues may create great irritation and great noise. Meanwhile the main currents of business, of economics of the welfare of labor, and of the course of development keep right on rolling. Steadily they tend to unite us. Even the current quarrels for common markets, and distribution of military force, prove that fact. If we were not working so closely together these quarrels would never arise. If the grand alliance were to break up no one in it—except ourselves—would have enough strength left to quarrel with anybody about anything.

We are passing through a difficult phase now. But I don't think it will last long. Men, especially old ones, come and go. Elections change policies, in Europe as well as in the United States. The people in these countries have not abandoned their commonsense. So I think solutions will be found, point by point and area by area. It will take time and patience and great commonsense. I think the base of common action and common interest is so much greater than the base of division that we shall find our way through.

Meantime the United States is developing internally with more speed than you would think. Somebody said that we had had a capitalist revolution here, and this is the fact. The system we now have is not the same as the system we had when I was a boy. It is not the same as the system we had to revamp in 1933. It is definitely an American system based on democracy and on free enterprise, gathered together and steered by national purpose. The system had to evolve. It could not—and cannot—stand still while scientists are changing every kitchen, every plant and every factory. The Communists claimed that they had a great new development. The United States has already made communism obsolete. It has, in freedom, done more for more people over a longer period of time and a larger area than any system in history. It still has a long distance to go. But, being a free country, and living under democracy, it has kept right on going there. If any member in this audience is my age, let him think back to his own boyhood, and of conditions as he knew them then. Then let him think of the youngsters of today and the conditions as they are now. You wouldn't want "the good old days" back. If they came back you would probably want to call the police and have them shut down. The possibilities before the United States now are almost unlimited. What we need are brains and the imagination to use them.

And what we see now will seem as limited and strange to our grandchildren as past dreams to us. Some 30 years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt dreamed of a country whose national income was $90 billion a year. Today we are talking of a country whose income is $600 billion a year. Even allowing for the difference in the value of money caused by World War II we have in front of us an economy four times as big as Roosevelt's dream and eight times as big as the reality of 1933. And we are only at the beginning of the road.

The uneasiness of the American public lies chiefly in the realm of foreign affairs. There they know that our very success puts the Communist world to shame. They cannot equal us. They cannot, under communism, give their people what the American system gives to its poorest. They can only be jealous—and in that jealousy lies our greatest danger.

I know that the American public is uneasy—it ought to be. There is no escape from it until in God's good time the cold war is ended, and the danger of nuclear warfare is ended. That will take a long time. But I think the United States is moving as safely as it can. The Cuban crisis of last October made clear that this country has the resolution to meet any contingency in case of necessity. We shall, I am afraid, have other crises, and some of them, especially in Latin America, may come in the next year or two. I cannot tell. But I think they will be met and I think over the years that the safety of the United States will be maintained.

This, I am clear, is what the American public wants. It is what as a politician and a businessman I think it ought to want. I am clear that the men now at the helm want this also and that they are entitled to our wholehearted support.

Florida Yankee Sparks Quiet Latin Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Miami Herald entitled "Florida Yankee Sparks Quiet Latin Revolution." This article concerns Mr. Arthur Courshon, of Miami, and his work in the establishment of savings and loan associations in Latin America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 10, 1963]

BATTLING INFLATION TO CREATE HOMES: FLORIDA YANKEE SPARKS QUIET LATIN REVOLUTION

(By James Russell)

The slow-moving Alliance for Progress might learn a lesson from a virtually unheralded U.S. advisory program that, in less than 5 years, has changed the spending and saving habits of thousands of people in Chile.

But more than that, it has helped arrest one of the wildest inflations in the Western Hemisphere and has made homeowners of Latin Americans who previously had little or no hope of ever owning the place they lived in.

No U.S. Government bureaucrat engineered this feat. Practically the whole program is the brainchild and the achievement of an outspoken Miami Beach savings and loan executive who takes a curious delight in pursuing ambitious projects that pay him nothing more than standard Government consultants' fees.

The Yankee sparkplug of Chile's new savings and loan system is Arthur Courshon, 41, a World War II bomber pilot who is chair-

man of the board of directors of Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association.

This impressive title would suggest that Courshon spends all his working hours in the big cushioned chair of his panelled office on Miami Beach or in a board room conferring about lofty economic matters.

Instead, much of his time is spent touring Latin American countries, writing voluminous reports for congressional committees, and serving on such unlikely boards as the Sam Rayburn Foundation and the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission—to which President Kennedy recently named him.

But Courshon's pet project is the Chilean savings and loan system. He started it in 1958, acting as technical adviser to the U.S. operations mission in Santiago.

What he found on his first trip to Chile would have discouraged many a man, however noble his purpose.

"Chile was still in the grip of a runaway inflation," Courshon wrote in a report to a Senate subcommittee. "It destroyed any incentive on the part of the people to save in Chilean currency and destroyed any business incentive to make long-term loans for housing or any other purpose."

The average interest rate then, on a 1-year loan, was 17 percent a year, of which 11 percent was aimed at covering the erosion of the currency by inflation. Houses just weren't being built. Nobody could borrow money on a long-term basis.

Courshon, working with Chileans, devised a plan that tied dividend rates on savings and interest rates on home loans to an inflationary index, much in the way some unions in the United States have escalator clauses in wage contracts.

This provided the incentive needed to make Chileans put money in savings accounts, which, in turn, built up a supply of mortgage money for home loans. The plan actually worked—and worked well.

Since its start from scratch less than 5 years ago, 22 savings and loan associations have sprung up in Chile. Last year they loaned out more than $10 million that financed more than 3,100 homes. Some mortgage loans were made for 20 years and interest rates ran around 6 percent—which is what they are in the United States.

It is not the wealthy class that is doing most of the borrowing. The average borrower and home buyer earns less than $200 a month. Through the savings program and other measures, Chile's rampant inflation has slowed to a more respectable level.

Direction of the program was done on the spot by a Washington, Federal executive, Mario Schram, who next month will complete a 2-year stay in South American Republic. Courshon still shuttles back and forth between Miami and Chile keeping tabs on the project. He also brings Chileans to Miami to train them in U.S. savings and loan techniques. Six of them are doing that very thing here this week.

The program has been no easy task. Courshon had to overcome a traditional Latin "manana" (wait until tomorrow) attitude as well as an inflation problem.

He used a method that many an American businessman in Latin America is reluctant to follow for fear of ruffling the Latins' feelings. Courshon is direct, determined and doesn't mind sacrificing a little tact and diplomacy to get action.

When a Chilean savings and loan official suggested that Chile not be called an "underdeveloped country" in a Courshon report to Washington, he stood his ground.

"That's a word they understand in Washington," he explained. "If I substituted something else, it might serve the cause of diplomacy, but it wouldn't get my point across to the people who have the authority."

Having proved by deeds that privately-financed home ownership is feasible in Chile, Courshon now is urging similar programs for other nations the United States is helping.

His latest comprehensive report to a congressional committee, this one to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN's subcommittee on housing, asks for creation of an International Home Loan Bank that would help create savings and loan firms in other "underdeveloped countries of the world."

An Address of Congressman Horace R. Kornegay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, HORACE KORNEGAY, made a timely and thought-provoking address at a dinner sponsored by the Wake County Young Democratic Club honoring Democratic members of the North Carolina General Assembly, which I was permitted to attend. The address was delivered on the eve of the convening of the 1963 Legislature in North Carolina's new State House at Raleigh.

Because of the challenge to all lawmakers contained in this address, I recommend it to all Members of this body.

The address follows:

TALK BEFORE THE 1963 DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE DINNER, WAKE COUNTY YDC, RALEIGH, N.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1963, BY THE HONORABLE HORACE R. KORNEGAY

It is a distinct pleasure and privilege to be here with you tonight as guest of the Wake County Young Democratic Club at this 1963 legislative dinner honoring the 147-man Democratic delegation in the 1963 General Assembly of North Carolina.

To the returning veterans this occasion is a great and genial homecoming. To those of you who are serving in the State legislature for the first time, let me say that I have a warm fellow feeling for you. For as you have journeyed to Raleigh for your first term, it was just 2 years ago that I journeyed up to Washington, in cold and sleet and snow, to embark upon a similar experience in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Now being an ancient veteran of one 2-year term in the Congress, however, I look back on those days with a mixture of relief and nostalgia—relief that I survived them intact, and nostalgia because being a freshman carried certain concessions and courtesies. You weren't supposed to know anything, so allowances were made for you. After that first term, however, these amenities cease. It's like being the "lap baby" for 2 years and suddenly being thrust into the role of the "knee baby" where you have to fend for yourselves in the cold world.

I am sure that your veteran colleagues in the general assembly will patiently lead you newcomers into the right corridors, the right customs, and the established procedures, and that you will emerge from this session experienced solons—that fine old word which derives from the name of an Athenian lawgiver of the sixth century, B.C., and which means a "wise man, a skilled legislator" in present day usage.

I know of no greater accolade I would rather earn than to be considered a skilled legislator. The science of law giving is an exact one, and the path to its accomplishment is a thorny one, strewn with the bleached bones of many good men who have tried and failed.

To be a legislator is to wear two hats, for even as you are a legislator, you are also a representative. In this dule role, therefore, you are to participate in an important, exciting, and unique experience—that of being an integral part in the functioning of a representative government—the very essence of democracy at work.

There are certain fundamental principles recognized in our system of representative government, and one is that a government derives its just power from the consent of the governed. Thus the legislative powers of our great State of North Carolina are delegated to it by the people, and this becomes an operative principle in the institution of representation. The best form of self-government is representative government, whereby those who make the public laws are chosen periodically by the people and remain accountable to them, and whereby the people have the final and very effective means of making their representatives accountable to them, and that is by giving them the hatchet at the next election, if they do not believe they have been well represented.

Thus when we speak of government by the consent of the governed, we mean that this consent is achieved by the indirect participation of the people in the very process of the formulation of the law. At the very minimum, the people are called on to think through the issues of legislation and arrive at their own conclusion on them and communicate to their duly elected representatives.

So you are going to be hearing from the people—make no mistake about that. And if you think the people speak with one clear, clarion call, as with one voice, the veterans in the general assembly here can emphatically tell you that it just ain't so. You are here by the grace of God and the Democratic Party to represent your constituency. But here again is a jolting thought—the party does not always speak a clarion, unfractured call. We're all a family of good and true Democrats here tonight. But if we all had exactly the same thoughts and the identical philosophy of government, down to the most minute detail, we would be little more than rubber-stamps and the label would inevitably become greater than the man and greater than the laws the man is here to make.

So now we must conclude that you successful candidates to the general assembly actually wear three hats—the hat of the legislator, the hat of the representative, and the hat of the party you represent. It sounds like one big happy family, but the veterans among you know that it isn't always the coziest of togetherness with all those hats on the hatrack.

We often hear—what is good for this or good for that is good for the country.

What is good for the country, for its economic well-being, for its international stature, for its internal welfare, security, and defense is a question so thought provoking and so nearly imponderable that its solution can not automatically be equated with one group, one area, one district, one thought pattern. Just as here in our great State of North Carolina, the larger good of the whole State transcends the consideration of what is good for one county or one senatorial district. It is a larger canvas and requires a lot of brushes to paint properly.

By the same token, the larger good of the Democratic Party paramounts any group or individual preferences. This is no time to

complain of wounded feelings or hurt pride, but it is the time for all Democrats to follow the example of Philip of Macedonia, by forming a phalanx welded together in a common mission of dedicated service to the people of North Carolina. Let unity be our password and victory our cause.

What I would like to leave with you tonight is the thought that as good Democrats we owe allegiance to our great party, as representatives we owe allegiance to our constituency, as lawgivers we owe allegiance to the very best that is in ourselves to do for our people, our State, and for its government, whose greatness lies in the fact that it is a government of laws and not of men.

And if these considerations do not always mesh together in a perfect whole, with a single objective, if there are dissident opinions, and times of confusion as to what is right in the final essence, let us draw upon the wisdom of that great statesman of England, Edmund Burke, in the year 1774:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

"But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure, no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

This session of the North Carolina General Assembly which begins tomorrow is a very significant session. As we enter upon our tercentenary year commemorating the issuance of the Carolina Charter, we look back at our first 300 years and see the unbelievable progress we have attained albeit through unbelievable hardships. We look ahead to the next 300, veiled in the mists of the future.

You, whom we honor here tonight, are the recipients of a noble legacy—built and acquired by the generations of dedicated and future looking Democratic legislators who have preceded you in these positions of great trust. From their legislative pens came the laws which made North Carolina the envy of many and gained her the respect of all of her sister States. Her accomplishments are legion, and point particularly to our vast and well balanced highway system; the enormous growth of our industry; our humane and ever increasing concern for the mentally ill and handicapped; and by all means, our herculean efforts in the field of public education for which tremendous credit should go to our farsighted and courageous Governor, Terry Sanford. Yes, you, the 1963 General Assembly, are inheriting a great tradition of statesmanship which was nurtured with a passion for progress and a zealous striving for excellence.

That is your challenge and we are confident that you will acquit yourselves well in the carrying out of these heavy responsibilities. For what you do here in the next few months will have great meaning for the future of North Carolina.

I have not yet had opportunity to learn what the beautiful new State House contains in the way of inspiring inscriptions. But in the chamber of the House of Representatives in Washington there is only one quotation, as such, and this is a plaster plaque inscribed with a quotation from Daniel Webster directly over the Speaker's rostrum, which reads as follows:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

These stirring words are often a great comfort to me, as well as a challenge, and may they also be to you in your consideration of the land of the old North State and what is best for her, now and in the future.

It goes without saying that the North Carolina delegation in the U.S. Congress is eager to be of assistance in every appropriate way to you who serve our State in the legislative halls in Raleigh. There are many areas of Federal-State cooperation where we can labor together for the good of the country and the State. I hope we will have the freest communication and exchange of ideas on these matters of vital interest to all of us.

And now I thank you for the privilege of being with you tonight and I wish for you a productive and highly successful general assembly for this 300th year in North Carolina.

Policy on Residual Oil Imports Hurt Prospects for Coal, Newspaper Editors Claim in Quoting From Speech by Senator Randolph, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on February 19, 1963, I discussed in this form a "Memorandum for the President" released on February 13, 1963, by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and in which the latter recommended to the Chief Executive that our Government's program of controls of imports of residual fuel oil be further relaxed. I stated in detail reasons why I disagreed with the OEP recommendation for "relaxation" of controls on the waste residuals of foreign petroleum refineries. And I pointed out especially that apparently the OEP director either overlooked or misunderstood the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which deals specifically with the relation of a healthy national economy to the overall national security.

Those of us from coal-producing States opposing additional increases in the level of residual fuel oil imports are not talking about Government assistance. We are concerned with and asking for protection against excessive dumping of a foreign waste product on the domestic fuels market. And we are urging an equitable stabilization of the import quota program which will allow for long-range investment planning and development in coal and related industries.

The concern growing out of the severe domestic problems of numerous areas of interior States—especially those of the Appalachian bituminous coal producing region—as residual oil imports continue to be increased for the eastern seaboard States is demonstrated in communications and petitions from citizens and legislative bodies of the affected areas. Editorial comment in newspapers is becoming more forceful. It is appropriate to note, too, that there is growing impatience.

Mr. President, I call attention to a February 21, 1963, editorial, "Residual Oil," in the Bluefield (W. Va.) Sunset News-Observer, and to a February 23, 1963, editorial, "Policy on Residual Oil Imports Hurts Prospects for Coal," in the Johnston (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunset News-Observer, Bluefield, W. Va., Feb. 21, 1963]

RESIDUAL OIL

Seators RANDOLPH and BYRD of West Virginia are thoroughly justified in the strong words they have been using and the strong position they have taken, along with West Virginia Members of Congress, in their fight to block the recommendation of the Office of Emergency Planning for a further relaxation of import quotas on residual oil.

West Virginians expect better of the Kennedy administration than that. Regardless of international considerations or east coast economic and political pressures, West Virginia's coal industry should not be penalized further.

The people of the coal areas were slapped in the face by the Eisenhower administration on this issue. They got no help from the Republicans in their efforts to dam the flow of residual oil. Our Representatives should not let the White House forget this political fact.

Senator RANDOLPH stated coal's case forcefully and effectively in his Senate speech Tuesday. He pointed out that not only does the waste oil cause coalfield unemployment, the loss of tonnage royalties puts added burdens on the United Mine Workers' welfare fund upon which so many depend; it hurts railroad workers and stockholders; it cuts into municipal and county tax revenues; and, worse, it endangers the national security.

The Senator made other excellent points. He said the OEP's proposal is not in line with the President's own stated policies on national security, nor is it in line with the interest he has expressed in helping West Virginia.

He said the Trade Expansion Act, under which the Director of the OEP is an adviser to the President on imports, "uses mandatory not permissive language when it provides that the Director and the President shall recognize the close relation of the economic welfare of the Nation to our national security.

"It further provides that they shall take into consideration the impact of foreign competition on the economic welfare of individual domestic industries, as well as any substantial unemployment, decrease in revenues of Government, or other serious effects, in determining whether weakening of our internal economy by imports may impair the national security."

The importation of residual oil, the waste product of foreign refineries, by underselling coal and taking its markets, does these things. Under the Kennedy administration, residual quotas have already been increased sufficiently to displace 8.3 million tons of coal.

Now, additional relaxation of controls is being considered, and even complete decontrol for electric utilities has been proposed.

All the members of the West Virginia delegation in Washington have protested to the White House. They should continue to raise cain, and they should be joined by leaders from other affected coal areas. The strongest possible case must be presented to the President.

If that fails, immediate legislative curbs on the waste oil should be sought. Senator RANDOLPH, in a communication to the President last week, left no doubt that he would seek such a protection amendment to the Trade Act, which up to now he has supported.

As President Stephen F. Dunn of the National Coal Association said, the Office of Emergency Planning is, indeed, "planning an emergency" for the coal industry in its recommendations.

What is clearly needed is not a relaxation of the oil quotas, but an immediate and sharp tightening up, instead.

[From the Tribune-Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., Feb. 23, 1963]

POLICY ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS HURTS PROSPECTS FOR COAL

Earlier this month, the director of the Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President sent President Kennedy a memorandum recommending "a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls" on residual fuel imports. Earlier, the Secretary of the Interior had authorized an increase in quotas for the first quarter of this year. And Venezuelan President Betancourt, on his visit here, is expected to ask for higher quotas for his country, one of the primary sources of our residual oil imports.

Last Tuesday Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, took issue with rising imports of residual oil, which is what is left after gasoline and lighter oils have been distilled from crude oil—a product that has been described as the sawdust of the oil industry. He cited a portion of the Trade Expansion Act which declares that the director of the Office of Emergency Planning and the President shall consider domestic production needed for defense, and the manner in which imports affect such production. The law states that they shall also "recognize the close relation of the economic welfare of the Nation to our national security, and shall take into consideration the impact of foreign competition on the economic welfare of individual domestic industries; and any substantial unemployment, decrease in revenues of Government, loss of skills or investment, or other serious effects resulting from the displacement of any domestic products by excessive imports shall be considered, without excluding other factors, in determining whether such weakening of our internal economy may impair the national security."

Senator RANDOLPH speaks for a State which is interested, like this one, in the preservation of the coal industry. "We are concerned," he said, "with Government protection against excessive dumping of a foreign waste product on the domestic fuel market." The recent increase in the residual-oil quota brings it, he said, 36 million barrels annually above the 1960 quota, equivalent to 8.3 million tons of coal or the annual work of 3,300 miners.

The Senator urged stabilization of these imports to allow for "long-range investment planning and development in the coal industry and related industries." The rising population of the east coast, he said, and the projected increase in generation of electricity would greatly increase the use of coal. "This," said Senator RANDOLPH, "is the market from which we must not be foreclosed due to a temporary and perhaps expedient interpretation of the Trade Expansion Act."

He spoke of new methods of rail transport of coal, at lower cost; of the exciting and dramatic development of long-line extra-high voltage transmission, of which the recently announced mine-mouth powerplant near Indiana, linked to the east coast by powerlines, is a prime example.

"These are just some of the plans which the coal and electrical generating industries have for increasing the distribution and decreasing the cost of electrical power," said Senator RANDOLPH. "These creative efforts must not be placed in jeopardy by such a shortsighted expediency as the relaxation of controls on residual oil imports."

In a letter to President Kennedy, which he introduced into his Senate speech, Senator RANDOLPH declared that the OEP report and recommendations "constitute an invitation to Atlantic seaboard electric utilities from Florida to Maine, as well as other large industrial fuel consumers, to design their present plant expansions and their future new fuel burning facilities to exclude domestic coal and to rely on the residual waste product of foreign refineries."

But the memorandum, he said, "is silent concerning the fact of and the dangers of possible further sabotage and internal changes in the governments and policies of the countries which are the foreign sources of supply." He also spoke of the effect of imports on the Nation's adverse balance of international payments, and the consequent drain on its gold supply.

In the House, Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR of this district and Representative JOHN H. DENT of Westmoreland County have been actively opposing expanded imports of residual oil. Representative SAYLOR has asked an inquiry into the possibility that Soviet oil sent to Italy, Brazil, and other countries may be transshipped to the United States, and has cited its impact on the markets of the free world.

There is a great difference between freeing legitimate trade among nations, and permitting the "dumping" of what is essentially a waste product on this country in such a way as to impair or destroy a basic and very essential industry.

Recalling the virtual elimination of foreign oil imports as a result of submarine activities in World War II, this is a subject which President Kennedy must look into very closely before creating too great dependence upon a fuel which could easily and readily be shut off in some new emergency.

The Soviet Union has many times more submarines than Hitler ever had, and if it should construct a submarine base in the Caribbean * * *.

To Preserve Our Freedoms We Must Defend Our Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered by Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, past president, American Bar Association, before the annual meeting of the Frederick Bar Association, at the Francis Scott Key Hotel in Frederick, Md., on February 25, 1963, about the vital role of the Supreme Court of the United States in our system of government. Mr. Rhyne's speech entitled "To Preserve Our Freedoms We Must Defend Our Courts," is herewith appended:

TO PRESERVE OUR FREEDOMS WE MUST DEFEND OUR COURTS

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

I am highly honored to be privileged to speak to you about the vital role of the Supreme Court of the United States in our system of government.

Our whole system of government can be summed up in the three words "rule of law," and the great paramount purpose of our system in the four words "individual liberty under law." We pride ourselves on the fact that we have a "government of laws and not of men" but men are required to run our Government. The acts and actions of men are constantly examined and measured against our constitutional guarantees. It is our courts which do most of this examination and measuring. Our courts are therefore the most important organ in the maintenance of our whole system of government. When personal freedom and individual liberties diminish and disappear in other nations one always finds this to occur in proportion to the decline in independence of the courts. This stark fact underlines the tremendous importance to all of us of our courts, especially our Supreme Court of the United States.

The most recent action to "clip the wings" of the U.S. Supreme Court is the ridiculous proposal by the General Assembly of the States recommending a supercourt composed of the 50 State supreme court chief justices to sit in review of all judgments involving States' rights such as legislative reapportionment. While only one State legislature, Florida, has approved this irrational proposal, it is up to we lawyers to point out the dangers involved in destroying the U.S. Supreme Court so as to head off any further approvals.

Our system of government is dependent upon and no stronger than our courts. And our courts are no stronger than the strength of the public's confidence in them. The current irresponsible criticism directed chiefly at the U.S. Supreme Court makes this a most appropriate time to seek your help in speaking out to maintain public confidence in our courts as an institution of government. It is unfortunate that much of this criticism is of such a scurrilous character that if left unrefuted it may lead to disrespect and loss of confidence in all law, all courts, and our entire system of government under law.

There is a true saying that "evil grows when good men do nothing." A great evil is abroad in our land due to these recently organized assaults on our U.S. Supreme Court and some of its members. In addition to the unsound proposal of a 50-judge super court, the recently conducted essay contest seeking reasons for impeachment of our great Chief Justice, and the highly publicized signs in Atlanta calling for his impeachment must be answered and their great public injury exposed. The false implication that reasons for impeachment exist makes these attacks most reprehensible. We of the bar who follow every word uttered by the Justices most carefully, as we must do to present cases there, know how false this innuendo is but we have trouble in getting any newspaper to print our defense of the Court and its members. Charges are "news"—defense and denial are evidently not.

The preamble of the "Canons of Professional Ethics" as promulgated by the American Bar Association provides:

"In America, where the stability of courts and of all departments of government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system of establishing and dispensing justice be developed to

a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration."

Our Government was established with three separate branches specifically to create a balance of power. The checks which each of these branches has on the others are our best insurance that the absolute power necessary to form a tyranny will never vest in any one branch. If the American public loses its respect for our courts, one-third of our governmental system of checks and balances will be stripped of its power. This is axiomatic, for no organ has power absent either respect or fear; and fear has never been an arm of democracy. If one of our three branches of Government may be destroyed, none are safe. For if our Federal courts are undermined our State courts will also be destroyed.

Unless our court system can maintain its position of dignity and respect in the eyes of our public, the foundation of our way of life is in danger. The truth inherent in this reasoning is sufficiently grave to merit our thoughtful, objective consideration. Personal reactions and personal judgment as to any individual decision of any court must be laid aside and the grave problem of the current situation considered.

Canon No. 1 of the American Bar Association's "Canons of Professional Ethics" provides in part: "Judges, not being wholly free to defend themselves, are peculiarly entitled to receive the support of the bar against unjust criticism and clamor."

Judges of our courts speak publicly only in the discharge of their judicial function. These men have given up the right to criticize in order that the rest of us might be secure in that right. But we have no such restraint upon us. It is, therefore, up to us to speak up in defense of our courts as an institution of government. Our duty is to see to it that our people have the correct facts and a proper appreciation of the place of the courts in our system of government.

We cannot be content merely to note the comforting fact that an institution which has survived the petulance and displeasure of a Jefferson, a Jackson, a Truman, and two Roosevelts—to say nothing of the tirades of lesser men—almost certainly has the strength and vitality to survive present attacks. We have our own obligations to discharge, and it is important that we not fail in those obligations.

We as a people may talk loud and strong of our rights and liberties, but our rights are as nothing without a redress and protection in the courts. Chief Justice Marshall so truly said:

"The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside, it passes upon his property, his reputation, his life, his all."

Under our system of government the Court must decide great issues upon which our people are often greatly divided. And do not therefore be shocked that the Court itself is just as often divided. These men, though Justices, are human beings. They have wives and children just as we do. They experience human reactions to the ups and downs of life just as we do. They even make mistakes as we do. Do not expect their judicial robes to transform them into supermen.

The important thing to put in proper focus is that under our system of government decisions must be made if that system is to operate, and the Court is our organ of government to make those decisions. Recall the paralysis of our country under the Articles of Confederation due in part to absence of an organ to decide great issues. Look at the impotency of the United Nations today due in part to lack of acceptance and use of the World Court. Then ponder the success of the European Economic Community where the European Court of Justice is deciding over 50 cases a year, thus insuring progress and avoiding the stagnation of stalemate which flows from lack of such a decisionmaking process.

But let me confine my remarks tonight to the United States rather than the world community. In this area we have plenty to discuss. Certain issues which have come before the Supreme Court recently have been highly controversial. The segregation cases, regardless of their resolution, were bound to offend the convictions of an appreciable portion of our population. The internal security decisions grappled with the basic conflict between the rights of the individual and the necessary powers of the sovereign in the field of security. Again public opinion was bound to be divided. But what case in the Supreme Court is not highly controversial and highly important?

There are no easy cases in the Supreme Court of the United States. It gets only the most difficult of all cases. But the more important the case, the more nicely balanced the conflicting interests involved, the more essential it is that criticism and debate concerning the ultimate decision be conducted on a high plane.

I pause to point out that the Supreme Court considers some 2,000 cases per year. It hears oral argument and writes extensive opinions in more than 100 of these cases. Because of its important position at the apex of our system for the administration of justice it is essential that the Court confine itself to the great issues, the most important cases, and not waste its time on cases of no great consequence or otherwise it would not have adequate time to devote to its great function of deciding the major issues which come before it in a steady flow and which must be decided if our system of government is to work. We have 50 State supreme courts and 11 Federal circuit courts of appeal, as well as many other intermediate appellate courts in our country, where everyone is assured of an opportunity to have alleged errors of our thousands of trial courts corrected. So please understand that not every case can be, or should be, considered or heard orally by the Supreme Court. I believe the Court does an outstanding job of selection of the cases it should hear.

Defense of our judiciary as an institution of government must not and should not interfere with or impair the right and duty of any man to express reasoned criticism of any decision of any court he believes to be erroneous. There is certainly nothing wrong with criticism of judicial decisions. Many great advances in our jurisprudence have stemmed from the reasoned criticism of judicial decisions. And that the Court should from time to time reexamine the basis of some of its decisions and reverse long-standing precedents is not surprising. It would be surprising if the Court did not. As the Court itself has said, "Repeated error is still error." And the Court has never claimed to be infallible. I would say that the instances of such reversals of precedents are extremely rare. The stability of our law flowing from its decisions as a precedent is therefore not impaired by those rare instances.

All of us are somewhat familiar with the overall history of the Supreme Court of the United States. In its decisions one can trace most of the significant social, political, and economic trends and developments of our Nation. The Court began its role as a resolver of great national issues in the classic case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*. The majority opinion by Mr. Chief Justice John Marshall stated that conflict between a Federal statute and our Constitution must be resolved in favor of the Constitution, the supreme law of the land. Although this declaration was actually mere dictum, it was widely accepted as controlling on the power of the Court to rule on the validity of Federal statutes.

Opponents lashed out at the language of the opinion. Many eminent men, among them President Jefferson, were extremely critical. They took the position that each branch of the Government had the exclusive power to pass on its own authority. Rational grounds were advanced for this argument. Certainly many persons must have considered the decision that the judiciary could overrule the legislature to be a violent misuse of judicial authority. Yet, now we look upon *Marbury* v. *Madison* as the very cornerstone of constitutional law. Absent this review of constitutionality of Federal legislation, the basic rights and freedoms we prize would be unprotected. The "gross usurpation of 1803" is the "genius of John Marshall" today.

McCulloch v. *Maryland* introduced a line of decisions in which the Court established the supremacy of the Federal Government in certain areas of power. Each infringement of States' activity and each addition to Federal powers brought forth a new barrage of criticism. So vehement and bitter were the feelings that several plans were suggested to limit or transfer the appellate jurisdiction of the Court, where validity of statutes were involved. A number of eminent persons, including Senators and Representatives, joined in this crusade; but, fortunately, wiser heads prevailed. We now recognize the value of most of these decisions. All sections of our great Nation have pulled together in time of emergency. Our commerce has not been hampered by duties, taxes or retaliatory measures between our States. The Court's interpretations of our Constitution, even in the face of violent opposition at the time when made, have made us nationally strong today.

The equality of man has always been a contentious issue. Every American reads in grade school how the Supreme Court returned Dred Scott to slavery. The hue and cry which arose from the abolitionists then was equal to any modern attack by segregation forces. President Lincoln was extremely displeased with the decision. But he made a statement which we would all do well to ponder. He said:

"We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it."

This was the position of a man willing to shelve his personal disappointment rather than lead an attack as he said against "our whole republican system of government—a blow which if successful would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy, and violence."

This must be our position as thoughtful Americans. We must take the lead in upholding respect for our judicial system. Fight particular decisions if you believe they are erroneous. Endeavor to have them overruled. But we must not disparage the status of our courts as an institution of government by blanket attack upon the courts as an institution and especially by personal attacks upon justices or judges.

It is needless to continue tracing the history of the Supreme Court in support of the thesis herein stated. It is well known to all. Never a decade has passed that some great controversial economic, political, or moral issue has not been resolved by the Court. Time has proved many of the decisions to be not only correct but brilliant. Others were later seen to be shortsighted or shallow and were overruled. But would we have it otherwise?

Would it be better to have as our High Court of Justice a board of nine pacifiers whose chief function is to concede some basic value here (and withhold a little justice there) in an effort to appease a minimum of, say, 90 percent of the public? Or would we have nine legal minds, human men, not gods, who wrestle with the great judicial

issues of our day and resolve them to the best of their ability?

Is our first concern that every decision be correct, important as this is? The answer is clearly no. It is more important that we have independent judges, free to decide unfettered by outside pressures. If unpopular decisions can result in loss of appellate jurisdiction or irresponsible charges of impeachment against judges, how can we hope that fear of consequences of decisions—or what is even worse, political corruption—may not seep into and rush the scales of justice?

These are critical times. The forces of communism are constantly trying to undermine our institutions. One of their principal goals is to create distrust and dissention within our Nation—to make us doubt our way of life. Certainly this is no time for our own people to add impetus to the Communist attack. And let us never forget that no institution in our Government is so directly opposed to the concept of a supreme state as our courts. The rule of law and the supreme state cannot coexist. Supremacy of law over government insures freedom of man. That supremacy is insured by our independent judiciary. Destroy that independence and our freedoms are dead.

All Americans must be reminded of our priceless heritage of freedom under law. In our daily life we see the great principles of democracy applied by our court system. We tend to take them for granted. But whenever we stop and think, we must recognize that not one of our priceless freedoms—speech, religion, press, even criticism of government—would be safe without the final safeguard of the courts. The Supreme Court has been our bulwark of ultimate protection for the weak, the oppressed, the minorities and the unpopular. Our whole future as a nation, and as a people, depends upon the maintenance of this independent judiciary to preserve the rights of our people.

In closing it is well to stress again that I am not here urging that our court system or our Supreme Court is above censure. No organ of government is. None of our institutions are perfect, including our courts. As Mr. Justice David Brewer of the Supreme Court said in 1898:

"It is a mistake to suppose that the Supreme Court is either honored or helped by being spoken of as beyond criticism."

But there is a vast difference between criticism stemming from constructive analysis of particular decisions and the uninformed, misleading statements and insults and proposals which are sometime being hurled currently. As President Lincoln suggested, time spent in ranting and raving would be better used working to establish the fallacy of the unpopular holding. But no degree of disagreement justifies degrading the foremost protection of our finest heritage—freedom under law—a protection only the courts can guarantee.

Public understanding of our courts and their supreme importance to each American is vital to the future of our Nation. Our American people have traditionally been ready to respect their courts and to look to them as the ultimate guardians of the liberties of our people. We must maintain that tradition to maintain those liberties. "Justice" as Daniel Webster said, "is the greatest interest of man on earth. It is the ligament which holds civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands, and so long as it is duly honored, there is a foundation for social security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our race."

To insure justice in our land, we must do all in our power to preserve the respect of the public for our courts. The stake of the public at large in this matter is tremendous. A respected and strong judiciary is essential to maintain our system of freedom under law. Maintenance of that freedom is essential to the continued liberty of our people and the continued liberty of our people is essential to the future of free peoples everywhere.

The Colorful Senator Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the most colorful Senators who ever served in this body was Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana. Mr. Wheeler has written a very interesting and indeed thrilling autobiography, in collaboration with Mr. Paul F. Healy. I ask unanimous consent that two reviews of his autobiography may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YANKEE FROM WEST WALKED WITH GIANTS

(Reviewed by James Rowe, a Washington attorney who served as administrative assistant to President Roosevelt. Mr. Rowe was born and reared in Montana)

("Yankee From the West," by Burton K. Wheeler with Paul F. Healy.)

Perhaps it is nostalgia to look back down the years and say, "They were giants in those days." Still, the Senators of the thirties do appear much larger than life. Norris, Walsh, of Montana, the La Follettes, Jimmy Byrnes, Wagner, Hugo Black—those were tall and handsome men, truculent, talented, and able.

One of the best of them, former Senator Wheeler, now has written his memoirs, with Paul Healy, the talented correspondent of the New York News. After a New England boyhood in Massachusetts, they take him through his early Montana campaigns, his four Senate terms, to his defeat in 1946, and end with his career as a successful Washington lawyer.

In between they are often incredible, controversial, cantankerous, and melodramatic. Such a career would have no attraction for the faint of heart.

This "son of the wild jackass," as the handful of tough western progressive Senators were labeled, worked his way through Michigan Law School as a book salesman. He then toured the West looking for a law office. Two card sharks inveigled him into a poker game in Butte, Mont., and took every penny he had.

It was the best investment Burt Wheeler ever made. He had to start his law practice in the tough copper-mining town of Butte. In those days, the Anaconda Copper Co. ran Montana politics ruthlessly.

To this day, Wheeler still does not know whether he was naive or plain stubborn. In any event, he would not be shoved around. He found himself in the State legislature battling against "The Company" for the workingman and farmer.

Senator Walsh made him a U.S. attorney. But "B.K." refused to join the World War I hysteria so prevalent in the Western States. His insistence on civil liberties cost him his job.

By 1920, in alliance with the agrarian Non-Partisan League, Wheeler had captured the Democratic nomination for Governor. The campaign was the most bitter, violent, and rough that a State which still takes its politics more seriously than Kentucky has ever seen. One long night, Wheeler hid in a boxcar to save himself from lynching. And once again "The Company" defeated him.

Two years later, with a strengthened phalanx of workers and farmers and aided by a depression, Wheeler was elected to the U.S. Senate. He immediately joined the Western progressives led by Norris and the elder La Follette. Wheeler quickly investigated Attorney General Daugherty, whom Coolidge had to remove. For his pains he was twice indicted by the Department of Justice but won both cases.

When John W. Davis received the Democratic nomination in 1924, the Montana progressive bolted, running for Vice President on a third-party ticket with La Follette.

He was the first prominent politician to announce for Roosevelt and campaigned strongly for him in 1932. Thus began the curiously complex relationship between the powerful President and the proud and independent Senator from the West. Whatever the reasons, it is this reviewer's personal conviction they never really liked or trusted each other, though each had for the other a grudging but strong respect.

When he was on F.D.R.'s side, Wheeler was a mighty ally. His brilliant skill in driving President Roosevelt's public utility holding company bill through the Congress in 1935 is evidence enough. When he fought the President, he was an equally dangerous adversary, and it is fair comment that he was the only man who ever beat "The Champ" in a fair fight, as he did in the Supreme Court fight of 1937.

The Montana Senator was always the favorite of the young New Dealers in the President's camp. There was much talk among them of Wheeler for Vice President in 1940 and 1944. Certainly, Wheeler was approached, as he recounts in his autobiography. But the outbreak of World War II in Europe had made the two men irreconcilable.

Mr. Roosevelt was "interventionist," clearly so after the fall of France. Wheeler, in the labels of the day, was strongly "isolationist" and "America First."

In 1946 Wheeler found he was in serious trouble back home. As he himself says, "liberalism" had become synonymous with "internationalism." Mr. Roosevelt, by then dead, had always been tremendously popular in Montana. Labor turned against this labor Senator, despite his perfect voting record. He was beaten in the Democratic primary.

So ended the fascinating public career of a determined man who fought always for what he believed was right, with an appalling but admirable disregard for where the votes were.

To the bitter end of his public life, he always fought the privileged, was always for the common man. In 1924, when the Democratic leadership threatened to oust him for running on a third-party ticket he replied, "I will not bend my knee, nor mend my ways."

He never did.

LIFE AND TIMES OF A POLITICAL HELL-RAISER FROM MONTANA

(By Cabell Phillips)

("Yankee From the West," by Burton K. Wheeler with Paul F. Healy.)

Political science majors these days are being taught that one of the great epochs of American politics was the 20-odd years between the close of World War I and the beginning of World War II. In that historically short period the United States was transformed from an agricultural to an industrial society; from an insular parochialism to the threshold, at least, of a responsible internationalism; from an attitude of

laissez-faire between citizen and government to the acknowledged dependency of a welfare state.

For such a transformation there had to be "giants in the earth," men with the vigor, courage, and ambition to fight for or against the revolutionary upheavals of the times. Though this is a just-passed generation, monuments to many of them already stand—to Wilson, Roosevelt, Lodge, La Follette, Borah, Hiram Johnson, Huey Long, George Norris, and others.

Happily, a few of these giants still live on to bridge the widening gap between what seems a banal today and a glamorous yesterday. One of the most notable, as well as one of the most articulate, is Burton K. Wheeler, a political hell-raiser out of Montana who stamped his distinctive imprint on a score of the most vital and flammable national issues of three decades. His memoir, "Yankee From the West," written in collaboration with Paul F. Healy, is as exciting and fast-paced as a battle diary, and as revealing of the intricacies of practical politics as a field manual. Here is the raw material from which half a dozen "Advise and Consents" could be extracted, for Burt Wheeler's Senate career put him in the midst of some of the most dramatic episodes of chicanery, intrigue, human weakness, and human nobility this Capital City has ever known.

Wheeler was a hard-nosed political pro who worked his way up through the ranks of the Democratic Party in Montana and came close to being lynched in his first try for the Governorship. As a freshman Senator, he was a principal scourge of "the Ohio gang," and drove Harding's corrupt Attorney General, Harry Daugherty, out of office. He was one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's earliest backers for the Presidency, and a main legislative wheelhorse for the New Deal. Yet he masterminded the most stunning political setback F.D.R. ever suffered, the defeat of his effort to "pack" the Supreme Court. Wheeler hankered for the Presidential nomination in 1940, and stood as good a chance as any of getting it until Roosevelt himself decided to go for a third term.

He was an idealist, too, with stubborn principles on which he would not yield. As a fledgling lawyer in Butte, he was one of the few with courage enough to defend strikers and labor leaders in court and to challenge the political prerogatives of the awesome Anaconda Copper Mining Co. As U.S. attorney during World War I he was ostracized as a suspected traitor because he would not be swept along by the prevalent tide of spy hysteria. His political gods were men of the stripe of Theodore Roosevelt, George Norris and William E. Borah, and in 1924 he ran as the Vice-Presidential candidate with Wisconsin's "Fighting Bob" La Follette on the Progressive ticket. He was one of the Nation's most prominent and effective liberals in the Senate, yet he did not hesitate to let that proud image be clouded by his implacable opposition to American involvement in World War II.

He has never retreated from that stand, and it is probable today, if the average reader recalls Wheeler at all, he has the Senator labeled as an "America Firster" and a reactionary rather than as the liberal crusader for, say, recognition of the Soviet Union and passage of the Securities and Exchange Act.

Senator Wheeler is now past 80, but he is still actively engaged in the practice of law, and he is not an unfamiliar sight on the streets of downtown Washington. Tall, erect, his hair a sandy gray, he still looks out on the world through his gold-rimmed glasses with the slightly belligerent and incredulous glare of the skeptical prosecutor. This is the role, one suspects, brought over from the formative rought-and-tumble days in Butte, which most significantly shaped his career. This was the talent he used to hammer Harry Daugherty into the ground, to make his case in the court-packing fight, and to come close to paralyzing this Nation's program of aiding Britain in the months before Pearl Harbor. He recounts these exploits with some of the verbal relish and convenient logic of a man accustomed to swaying juries.

The joy of this book for anyone with a taste for politics lies in its wealth of lively and significant detail—and for this we probably have Paul Healy, the collaborator, to thank. A first-rate Washington reporter for the New York Daily News, he has taken a mass of diaries, letters, clippings, and extensive personal interviews with Senator Wheeler and organized them skillfully and unobtrusively into a well-knit, well-paced, and well-modulated personal narrative. What results is an absorbing and illuminating look into the political life of a topflight politician.

Americanism Award to Hon. George M. Wallhauser, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of the House to an article carried in the February 21, 1963, edition of the News-Record of Maplewood and South Orange, N.J.

This article relates in detail the ceremonies held in the presentation of the South Mountain Lodge, B'nai B'rith, Americanism Award to our distingushed colleague, the Honorable GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER of the 12th District of New Jersey.

It is a most significant award given by an outstanding organization. Founded in New York in 1843, B'nai B'rith is the Nation's oldest service organization and one which has distinguished itself in service to people of all faiths throughout its history.

The article follows:

B'NAI B'RITH HONOR GIVEN TO WALLHAUSER

Representative GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER of Maplewood was presented the Americanism Award of South Mountain Lodge, B'nai B'rith, and tributes from lodge and other civic leaders Tuesday night before an audience of 175 persons at Congregation Beth El, South Orange.

Mr. WALLHAUSER, Representative of the 12th Congressional District, said in accepting the award that he had held important in his life the "American dream—to give others something of ourselves."

He also paid tribute to his family and the wonderful people with whom he said he had worked in civic, and business and government life. He said he was humble and grateful for the award.

Senator Nelson Stamler, State senator from Union County, presented the award, which the lodge has awarded annually since 1955. Mr. WALLHAUSER was cited for his exceptional record of community service and civic activity.

Mr. WALLHAUSER praised the lodge and B'nai B'rith, saying it had rendered "service to all faiths for more than a century." B'nai B'rith, whose motto is "Harmony, Benevolence, Brotherly Love," was founded in 1843.

Former Representative Robert W. Kean, whom Mr. WALLHAUSER succeeded as 12th District Congressman, was the speaker. He said the Maplewoodian had "constantly used his abilities for the public good." Tracing Mr. WALLHAUSER's public career through his terms as Congressman, Mr. Kean said the 12th District required a man who would "vote his own conscience, letting the chips fall where they may."

"GEORGE WALLHAUSER doesn't favor change for change sake, but he's not afraid to change," said Mr. Kean. "I'm proud of his record as a liberal-minded representative of this district."

Mrs. Wallhauser was presented a dozen red roses by Dr. Allen Brotman, chairman of the lodge's Americanism awards committee. Dr. Brotman also delivered a brief welcoming talk to the audience, many of whom had had difficulty getting to Beth El in Tuesday night's snow and rain.

Alfred Rappaport, lodge president, spoke the words of greeting.

Mr. Wallhauser, a native of Newark, moved with his family to Maplewood in 1930, and served as planning board chairman, member of the township committee, and head of the building committees for the new main and Hilton branch libraries. He's also been active in recreation and American Legion activities in the township.

A member of the boards of directors of the Maplewood Bank & Trust Co. and the Maplewood Savings & Loan Association, Mr. Wallhauser is vice president and treasurer of the United States Realty & Investment Co., Newark.

He is treasurer of the National Family Service Association, as well as a member of the board of directors.

He and his wife, Isabel, have two sons.

Dr. Ralph Emerson Davis, pastor of Morrow Memorial Church, Maplewood, gave the invocation and benediction.

A color guard from Post 220, American Legion, presented the colors, and a salute to the flag was led by Post Commander Thomas Magliaro.

Harold Klein sang a number of selections.

The eight previous winners of the lodge's award have been William F. Tompkins, Edw. H. Austin, William J. Orchard, Esty Foster, Gregory Hewlett, Dr. Joseph I. Echikson, O. Vincent McNany and Abraham H. Puder.

The Wrong Way To Go About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond:

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS—THE WRONG WAY TO GO ABOUT IT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Enough has come out about the proposed Domestic Peace Corps to cause many Members of Congress to stop, look, and question.

Nearly everybody loves the Peace Corps. It has wide public support. It is popular with Congress. It is doing good work. It is well managed. It would be a shame to have the Peace Corps, which is well applied abroad, misapplied within the United States.

I am not suggesting that there are no need and no opportunities for a national service agency to help the States and local communities cope with social problems.

I am suggesting that a federally financed, federally managed domestic Peace Corps is the wrong way to go about it and that this new kind of thrust by the National Government into State and local responsibilities will rightly alienate congressional support, at least as now conceived.

There are two crucial defects in the administration bill which would set up a domestic Peace Corps.

1. The administration offers no clear provision for shared financing. This would be dangerous. State and local agencies should bear part of the cost of every project from the beginning with perhaps an exception for migratory workers. This should be a precondition for Federal assistance.

2. The administration bill would leave it wholly to the judgment—or the whim—of the administrator to decide where the domestic Peace Corps would be deployed.

When the foreign Peace Corps was created, it was placed directly under the White House because only the President has constitutional responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy. It was given a very flexible mandate.

A domestic Peace Corps could be reasonably put under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and should be given a very clear and precise mandate in order that we do not back into a wholesale Federal intervention in the States.

Recruitment of volunteer workers, as proposed by the President's Study Group on National Voluntary Services, would be one of its best functions.

"A national service program (domestic Peace Corps) could help resolve the paradox that exists within this country," says the President's Study Group. "The United States is the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, yet within it there live millions of its citizens who desperately need help."

This is true. I am suggesting that Federal assistance ought to be deeply imbedded in local initiative and tied, in part, to local financing.

Young Citizens in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year the week of March 2 through 9 has been set aside as National 4-H Club Week and once again it is a pleasure to salute these clubs which are dedicated to the development of multiple programs serving many varying needs. The 4-H Club work does indeed belong to the people and rightfully inspires a reaffirmation of our faith in our country when we realize the vital part such organizations play in preparing our youth of today for their mature responsibilities of tomorrow.

The phenomenal growth of the system of 4-H Clubs, initiated in the early years of this century, is due to a dynamic program of education functioning through our State land-grant colleges and universities in cooperation with the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. In addition to this leadership at the national level, the State extension services provide helpful direction as do the more than 307,750 unpaid volunteer local leaders who are assisted by about 114,960 older club boys and girls designated as junior leaders. Working together also for the betterment of the 4-H movement are two nongovernment organizations, the National 4-H Club Foundation and the National 4-H Service Committee.

Ample proof of the effectiveness and wisdom in providing Federal funds to assist in conducting 4-H Club work is found in the fact that, since 1914, when Federal legislation was passed for this purpose, nearly 22,830,400 different young people have participated in this "learn by doing" program.

The widespread changes in agricultural technology have created new 4-H needs and these needs are being met squarely by these young people who now have a breakdown of 51 percent from farm homes; 29 percent from rural nonfarm homes; and 20 percent from urban localities. Present-day challenges make it neither possible nor desirable for all farm youth to stay on farms and accordingly, rural members and others are trained to become well-rounded citizens equipped to earn and serve in many fields. The number of projects available to 4-H'ers range from about 25 in some States to approximately 100 in others and constitute an incredibly diversified group of programs which have had and will continue to have far-reaching benefits individually and collectively at every level.

In view of today's urgent need for worldwide understanding between the people of all nations, it is indeed gratifying that the National 4-H Club Foundation conducts an international people-to-people program through its International Farm Youth Exchange and its Peace Corps projects. Each year, approximately 115 U.S. delegates from the Youth Exchange are sent abroad to contribute to the social and economic growth and expansion of some 65 countries. In like manner, the same number of young people are brought to this country under this program designed to promote an exchange of ideas, aims and purposes.

More and more it becomes evident that our Nation, and indeed the world, needs youth organizations such as the 4-H Clubs, because, if the United States is to lead the free world down the road to a lasting peace, our youth must be adequately prepared to meet the challenges which tomorrow holds.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is a pleasure as well as a privilege to salute this outstanding organization which has well earned worldwide commendation for past achievements and I am sure has the best wishes of all of us for continuing successes in its many fine and worthwhile endeavors.

Bob Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK R. MILLER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on March 6 of this year, leading citizens of Iowa will gather in Cedar Rapids, to pay tribute to one of Iowa's outstanding young men, Mr. Bob Jones. The junior chamber of commerce has charge of the arrangements for this tribute to one of its most distinguished alumni.

Bob Jones was born on December 18, 1923, at Decatur, Ill. His family moved to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in 1932—the same year, I may add, that I moved with my family from Illinois to Sioux City. Bob attended Cornell College and the Carnegie Institute of Technology. During World War II, he spent 2 years in the South Pacific, with the Army Signal Corps. He completed his academic training at the State University of Iowa, where he graduated with honors.

Bob Jones entered the business world, and began his community service as a member of the junior chamber of commerce. His career with the jaycees included the presidency of both the Cedar Rapids and the State of Iowa organizations and the national vice presidency. In 1952, he was recognized as Iowa's outstanding young man. Since that time he has continued his interest in and his work for community projects and good government at all levels.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Cedar Rapids Gazette. They are entitled, respectively, "Outstanding Young Man" and "Youth Is Served"; and they add their praise of Bob Jones' record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTSTANDING YOUNG MAN

Cedar Rapids always has been proud of its own and that goes for the latest citizen to win a coveted honor—Mr. C. Robert Jones.

Bob Jones was named by the Iowa Junior Chamber of Commerce as the outstanding young man in Iowa in 1952. That means the outstanding young man under 35 years of age.

This is a real honor because the competition is open to any and all young men who qualify from the standpoint of age alone. They do not have to be members of the junior chamber; they don't have to be white, black, or brown; they don't have to hold any certain beliefs; they don't have to belong to any particular church and their ancestry is of no concern. The only thing they have to be is male and 35 or under with a notable record of community service.

Those who know Bob Jones are fully aware that he qualifies. In his relatively short time on this earth—29 years to be exact—he has made lasting contributions to his community, his State, and his Nation. His work as chairman of the recent 10 outstanding young men's banquet in Cedar Rapids showed the thoroughness with which he undertakes any civic assignment and demonstrated that he is capable of attaining even greater heights as long as he desires to give of himself to public service.

It is significant, we think, that the State award for the outstanding young man is made by an organization composed of young men and that the selection is arrived at by a committee of young men, all 35 or under. Thus, before a winner can be named, his record must undergo careful scrutiny by a jury of those in his own age bracket. Under those conditions, the honor takes on even more meaning for no one has more severe critics than those of his own generation.

Bob Jones was deserving of the honor bestowed on him and he will wear it well. Let's hope his record will serve as an example

to others who have much to contribute to community betterment.

YOUTH IS SERVED

For the last 2 years Cedar Rapids has had a worthy ambassador traveling throughout the State and the Middle West in C. R. "Bob" Jones, in his capacity as a civic worker for the junior chamber of commerce.

He served as president of the Iowa Junior Chamber of Commerce during the year ended June 30, 1956, and on this June 30 he will complete a year as 1 of the 10 vice presidents of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

As a spokesman for the organization he has addressed many Jaycee "bosses' night" gatherings, along with other types of meetings, and at these affairs he has emphasized the importance of giving young men—in their late twenties and early thirties—increasingly greater responsibilities in business.

According to a story in the business news section Sunday, Bob's words have not fallen on deaf ears. At 33—just 2 years from the end of the Jaycee trail which is limited by a maximum age—Bob has been named general manager of the Laurence Press Co., where he has been employed for the last 9 years.

We'll venture that his words have played a part, too, in plans that have elevated other young men to more responsible positions in communities where he has appeared over the last 2 years. He has been a good ambassador for our city and our State.

Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have just issued a report to my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Arizona on a legislative questionnaire which I distributed recently, results of which have now been tabulated. I believe this indication of opinion in my district may be of considerable interest to our colleagues.

The report follows:

THE PEOPLE SPEAK: A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN ARIZONA ON CONGRESSMAN UDALL'S 1963 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a report on a very successful and encouraging experiment. Just before Congress convened, I prepared and mailed a 22-question legislative questionnaire. The response has been most encouraging and rewarding. This is my report on the returns.

About 11,000 questionnaires were distributed, nearly all of them in the Second Congressional District, although a few were mailed in from Districts 1 and 3 and are included in the tabulations. Out of 11,000 mailed, 2,547, or 23 percent, were returned—a somewhat greater return than other Congressmen have experienced with similar questionnaires.

We are sometimes led to believe that Arizonians are apathetic on public issues; I now have clear evidence this is not true. Many who received the questionnaire not only have replied but enclosed thoughtful letters or additional comments. I have read all of these letters and found much to think about. Arizonians apparently want to be consulted in this way. All of 96 percent thought the questionnaire a good idea—and one enthusiastic reader urged me to sponsor a law requiring every Representative to poll his registered voters once a year.

The complete results are tabulated below. In summary form the results show:

Strong support for continued membership in the United Nations, 80 percent.

Substantial support for foreign aid as a tool in the cold war struggle against communism, 60 percent.

Solid support for six new Kennedy programs—the Peace Corps, 78 percent; Domestic Peace Corps, 57 percent; Alliance for Progress, 78.5 percent; Youth Conservation Corps, 73 percent; medicare, 54 percent; and the wilderness system, 73 percent.

Opposition to farm subsidies, 66 percent; a World War I pension, 73 percent; Federal aid for teachers' salaries, 55 percent; Federal aid for private and parochial schools, 76.7 percent; and a Department of Urban Affairs, 47.5 percent.

Support for present or increased expenditures in all 11 categories of spending, but by relatively narrow margins in the case of military assistance, 57.7 percent, and veterans' benefits 53.8 percent.

HOW THE QUESTIONNAIRE WAS DISTRIBUTED

I wish I could have distributed this questionnaire to every voter in my district. Staff and financial considerations made this impossible. Many people have asked how the distribution was handled. Here is the answer:

The initial mailing went to my regular mailing list, made up of businessmen, schoolteachers, clergymen, the rosters of many civic organizations, and innumerable people who have asked to receive my newsletters. I have taken pains to see that this list is representative of my district as a whole, not just members of my own party. From time to time, including a special "Christmas present" offer last December, I have publicly invited constituents to request inclusion on my mailing list.

When the initial mailing was made I issued a news release informing newspapers, radio, and television stations that interested persons could obtain copies of the questionnaire by writing my Washington office. Approximately 2,000 additional questionnaires were distributed as a result of this announcement.

While the tabulation has now been completed, I want to renew my invitation to all interested constituents to send me their names for inclusion on my mailing list. This will enable them to receive my regular newsletters and such future questionnaires as I may find it possible to issue.

WAS THIS A SCIENTIFIC POLL?

During the period when questionnaires were being received here, the Arizona Republic in Phoenix kindly offered to reprint it in its columns. I was delighted to give my consent to this proposal. Also, the Tucson Daily Citizen covered a few of the same subjects in a questionnaire which it drafted. I commend the editors of both papers for stimulating interest in the issues of 1963, and their published findings have been noted.

Since the results below differ rather markedly from some of the results received by the Republic and Citizen (while others are markedly similar), many will ask: just how scientific and how accurate were the three polls? Of course, the answer is that none of the three was based on scientifically selected samples of the public, and I specifically make no such claim for mine.

The only citizens whose opinions were counted were those who took the time to reply; all of us are grateful for this interest, and I think it of tremendous significance that so many felt strongly enough to complete one or more of the three questionnaires.

While many of these questionnaires were sent in by people who voted against me and generally do not agree with my stand on issues, I think it should be recognized that those who agree with a polling organization are, generally speaking, more inclined to participate in such a mail survey than those who disagree with the organization. This principle would likely apply in a general way to all three polls.

This tendency is reflected in my mail. Several people clipped the two newspaper polls and sent them to me, saying, "I want you, not the Arizona Republic, to have my opinion," etc. Conversely, one lady sent back my questionnaire, remarking, "I am a Republican, and I don't want you to have my opinions." I think both these attitudes are unfortunate, but they illustrate the general tendency I have described.

In weighing the accuracy of the opinion sample obtained in my own survey, I am comforted by two factors:

The voter registration in my district is 68 percent Democratic as against a combined total of 32 percent for Republicans and independents. Of those returning my questionnaire, 68.7 percent identified themselves as Democrats, 31.3 percent as Republicans of independents.

After the results were tabulated, I checked them against recent Gallup poll findings of national opinion on a few selected issues. Here are the comparisons:

Membership in United Nations: Gallup poll, February 18, 1962, stay in, 90 percent; get out, 5 percent; no opinion, 5 percent. Udall questionnaire, stay in, 80 percent; get out, 18 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

Domestic Peace Corps: Gallup poll, November 22, 1962, approve, 62 percent; disapprove, 22 percent; no opinion, 16 percent. Udall questionnaire, approve, 57 percent; disapprove, 31 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

Youth Conservation Corps: Gallup poll, approve, 79 percent; disapprove, 16 percent; no opinion, 5 percent. Udall questionnaire, approve, 73 percent; disapprove, 22.6 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

Foreign aid: Gallup poll, July 3, 1962, approve, 58 percent; disapprove, 30 percent; no opinion, 12 percent. Udall questionnaire, approve, 60 percent; disapprove, *; no opinion, *.

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF SUCH A POLL?

Dr. George Gallup, founder and director of the Gallup poll, places little value on surveys such as I have just conducted. He said recently that the 20 percent who may reply do not really represent a cross section of the electorate" and that they tend to be the better educated people higher up on the economic ladder. He recalled the famous Literary Digest debacle of 1936 when that magazine predicted the election of Alf Landon to the Presidency; on that occasion, he said, the fault lay in polling too heavily in the upper economic groups. Of Congressmen who make surveys such as mine, he said, "If they set out to misinform themselves, they couldn't do a better job of it."

What, then, is the value of such a survey as this? I think there are several things to be said for it:

(1) Opinions thus expressed give a Congressman a broader sweep of constituent thinking than he is likely to receive in his regular mail.

(2) Studying individual responses can be quite revealing. For example, if the Alliance for Progress receives substantial support from both those who oppose foreign aid and those who support it (which happened to be the case), the alliance may be regarded as enjoying broad support among the electorate.

(3) Such a survey gives people an opportunity, not just to pull a lever and vote for a candidate, but to register their views on legislative matters. In this survey a great many of the 2,500 respondents expressed

*Other choices not comparable.

their thoughts to their Congressman for the very first time.

In the end, of course, a Congressman is expected to acquaint himself more thoroughly than can any constituent with the merits of legislative proposals. We elect Congressmen on the basis of their education, experience, and judgment—and we expect them to use that judgment in deciding public questions. As you, Congressman, I don't intend to take an opinion poll every time I have to make a decision. However, I value your opinions, and I want to do the best job I can to represent you in the Congress. I believe this questionnaire will help me do this.

To all of you who participated in this survey, and especially to the volunteers who helped me tabulate the returns, I want to express my deep gratitude.

Following are the results, expressed in percentages. After each question please check the answer which is closest to your view.

(1) United Nations: Should the United States stay in or get out of the United Nations? Stay in, 80 percent; get out, 18 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

(2) Red China: Do you favor or oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations? Favor, 20 percent; oppose, 74 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(3) Peace Corps: Do you favor or oppose the Peace Corps? Favor, 78.5 percent; oppose, 13.7 percent; no opinion, 7.8 percent.

(4) Domestic Peace Corps: Would you favor or oppose a domestic Peace Corps whose volunteer members would perform similar functions in our own country? Favor, 57 percent; oppose, 31 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

(5) Fallout shelters: Would you favor or oppose Federal assistance for an expanded program to build public and private fallout shelters? Favor, 31.2 percent; oppose, 56.8 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

(6) Foreign aid: Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing your opinion of foreign aid? You can't buy friends; foreign aid is a total waste of money and the whole program should be ended at once, 17.8 percent; foreign aid is OK for our military allies and countries which support us in the United Nations, but neutral or uncommitted nations shouldn't get help, 22.2 percent; foreign aid is a tool in the cold war struggle against communism; it should be used wherever the President and Congress think it will contribute to our national security and strengthen the free world, 60 percent.

(7) Alliance for Progress: One part of our foreign aid program is the Alliance for Progress, a 10-year program to help Latin American countries head off communism by improving living standards and broadening democratic government. In general, do you favor or oppose the Alliance for Progress? Favor, 78.5 percent; oppose, 15.5 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(8) Kennedy support: In general, do you believe Congress should give greater, less, or about the same support as it gave last year to President Kennedy's program? Greater, 46.4 percent; less, 13.4 percent, about the same, 30.2 percent.

(9) Medicare: President Kennedy has asked for a "medicare" bill which would pay a part of hospital bills for persons over 65. No doctor bills would be covered. The plan would be financed by a $1 per month increase in employees' social security deductions and a similar increase in contributions of employers. In general, would you favor or oppose a plan of this kind? Favor, 54 percent; oppose, 40 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(10) Aid to education: (a) Do you favor or oppose increased Federal aid to the States for elementary and high school construction? Favor, 56.2 percent; oppose, 40.2 percent; no opinion, 3.6 percent. (b) Do you favor or oppose increased Federal aid to the States for teachers' salaries? Favor, 38.1 percent; oppose, 55 percent; no opinion, 6.9 percent. (c) If Congress decides to increase Federal financial aid to public elementary and high schools, would you favor or oppose giving similar Federal aid to private and parochial schools? Favor, 18.8 percent; oppose, 76.7 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(11) Urban affairs: In 1962 President Kennedy asked Congress to authorize a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Proponents point out that the new Department would add no new Government functions but would bring together related functions now scattered in various agencies for more effective handling of this Nation's mounting urban problems. Opponents argue that establishing the new Department would further concentrate power in Washington and threaten cities with Federal domination. Would you favor or oppose establishment of this new Department? Favor, 39.5 percent; oppose, 47.5 percent; no opinion, 13 percent.

(12) Youth Conservation Corps: It has been proposed that Congress establish a Youth Conservation Corps (somewhat similar to the CCC's of the 1930's) providing a 3-year program of public service employment and training for young men and women 16 to 22. Would you favor or oppose such a program? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 22.5 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(13) Wilderness system: The wilderness bill would set aside about 15 million acres of forest lands already owned by the Federal Government (including about 600,000 acres in Arizona) to be preserved in its natural state as a national wilderness system. Opponents urge multiple use of Federal forest lands and contend that mining, timber, and cattle industries would be damaged by this legislation. Proponents say existing commercial uses would continue and assert we have a duty to set aside at least this 1 percent of our Nation's land area for future generations to enjoy. Do you favor or oppose the wilderness bill? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 22.5 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(14) Farm subsidies: Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe Federal farm legislation should take (choose one): Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by two-thirds of farmers voting in referendum, 20.7 percent. Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate, 13.3 percent. Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc., 66 percent.

(15) World War I pension: A bill before Congress proposes to grant most veterans of World War I a pension of $102 per month regardless of need or disability, provided the veteran served 90 days in the Armed Forces. The pension is estimated to cost $11 billion. Do you favor or oppose this pension? Favor, 16.4 percent; oppose, 73 percent; no opinion, 10.6 percent.

(16) Income taxes: If income tax rates are cut by Congress, should the main reductions go to individuals with low incomes, 30 percent; all individual taxpayers in both high and low brackets, 25 percent; both corporations and individual taxpayers, 45 percent.

(17) Federal budget: This fiscal year Federal tax collections seem likely to fall short of Federal expenditures by about $7.8 billion. (a) If expenditures could be reduced to balance the budget, would you favor this course, or would you favor the deficit as a means of stimulating the economy? Balanced budget, 60 percent; deficit to stimulate economy, 32 percent; no opinion, 8 percent. (b) If expenditures cannot be reduced sufficiently to balance the budget, would you favor an increase in your taxes of 4 to 5 percent to avoid a deficit? Favor, 31.1 percent; oppose, 60 percent; no opinion, 8.9 percent.

(18) Federal spending: In general, should Congress spend more, less, or about the same as last year for these programs:

Fiscal 1963 expenditures	Program	Spend more	Spend less	About same
Billions				
$52.7	National security	17.0	28.0	55.0
2.4	Space programs	25.5	30.0	44.5
5.4	Veterans' benefits	12.3	46.2	41.5
1.3	Reclamation, parks, forests and reclamation.	30.0	18.0	52.0
1.3	Military assistance to allies for mutual defense.	9.0	42.3	48.7
1.0	Development loans and grants to new and underdeveloped countries.	18.0	39.0	43.0
.4	Supporting assistance to protect U.S. security interests abroad.	20.7	26.8	52.5
.5	Alliance for Progress	25.3	27.0	47.7
1.3	Federal aid to education.	38.4	32.0	29.6
1.9	Medical research, aid for hospital construction, welfare.	40.2	21.1	38.7
2.8	Aid to aged, blind, dependent children.	40.7	13.7	45.7

(19) The economy: Generally speaking, do you think you and your family are better off, or worse off, financially than you were 5 years ago? Better, 45.5 percent; worse, 18.8 percent; about the same, 35.7 percent.

(20) Television: As our children grow up today they are exposed to almost constant advertising for beer, wine, and cigarettes on radio and television. Many parents believe such advertising cannot help but shape psychological attitudes of children toward use of these products. Would you favor or oppose legislation to prohibit such commercials before 8 p.m. local time? Favor, 55.6 percent; oppose, 34 percent; no opinion, 10.4 percent.

(21) Party identification: Do you consider yourself a Democrat, 68.7 percent; Republican, 17.7 percent; independent, 13.6 percent.

(22) Questionnaires: Do you think questionnaires like this one are a good idea? Yes, 96 percent; no, 2 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

As to Motives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial "As To Motives," in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial appeared in the February 23 issue of the Parson (Kans.) Sun and was written by the editor, Clyde M. Reed. The editorial is another indictment of the administration's determination to place perpetuity in office above the needs of

the Nation. Mr. Reed, son of the late Senator Clyde M. Reed, was recently the recipient of the William Allen White Award, the highest journalistic honor that the State of Kansas has to offer.

The editorial follows:

[From the Parson (Kans.) Sun, Feb. 23, 1963]

AS TO MOTIVES

Politics is not only Washington's principal indoor sport but also its only occupation, a condition which has existed from the founding of the Republic.

As hardened as it is to the ways of politics, Washington must view today's 100-proof brand as the most potent of all political tonics ever offered it.

The tragedy of it all is that the Kennedy administration is confusing political perpetuity with national leadership. It is proposing for the sake of the next election rather than for the fulfillment of the Nation's needs.

We have, therefore, a tax-reduction bill which is not a tax-reduction bill at all, but a strange and complex document which contains conflicting economic theories and rides off in all directions at the same time.

We have, too, a medical plan for the aged which even the administration recognizes has not the slightest chance of passage this year but nevertheless is presented as a gaudily-wrapped package with an eye on the voting strength of a growing segment of the population.

We have, in all, many grandiose schemes offered as ballot bait to the Nation and its economic, racial and sectional blocs. We are told that planned budget deficits are not to be deplored but should be embraced as the harbinger of a new and bright age.

The Kennedy administration overlooks the important fact that leadership is based on accomplishment, not promise. While there is much to be found wrong with the details of its legislative proposals, even more to be questioned are its motives in offering them.

A New Spirit in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press recently carried an editorial that calls attention to the spirit within Pennsylvania to revitalize our Commonwealth's economic strength and vitality. It commented thoughtfully on the proposal by the Pennsylvania Railroad to cut freight rates for hauling coal.

"This is enterprise at work," says the Press, "the kind of enterprise that can help both the railroads and coal-producing areas."

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the Pittsburgh Press editorial of February 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BACK ON THE TRACK

One of the most refreshing economic developments in many years is the decision of the Pennsylvania Railroad to seek Interstate Commerce Commission permission to cut freight rates for hauling coal from western Pennsylvania to the east coast by about $1.50 a ton.

The ICC should quickly give its approval, both to the Pennsy's plan and to a probable similar reduction by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. For this is enterprise at work, and it is the kind of enterprise that can help both the railroads and the coal-producing areas they serve.

It is no secret that both the Pennsy and the B. & O. have been doing poorly, financially, and that the coal areas of western Pennsylvania contain some of the most severely depressed communities in the Nation.

We still have a lot of coal hereabouts and we have the men and machines to dig it. There is no doubt that the east coast market wants the coal. The Pennsy's proposed rate cut would put the pieces of this economic problem together to the benefit of all concerned.

The recent announcement of the construction in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia of steamplants to generate power for eastern utilities showed the need for more coal, for that plan will use this area's coal resources to send power cheaply by wire.

There are plans afoot to build a coal pipeline to send slurry (coal mixed with water) to the east coast and thus reduce the transportation cost. And it is possible that these plans had something to do with the railroad's decision to cut rates.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia only the other day in its Monthly Review laid Pennsylvania's economic difficulties to the falling off of the coal trade. It may be observed also that the condition the bank notes is one of long standing. This State began losing eastern markets many years ago when Virginia and West Virginia coal, hauled by water from Hampton Roads, Va., began invading eastern markets.

Coal still is the biggest generator of low-cost electric power. It has lost some markets to oil and gas and atomic energy is getting into power generation, mostly on an experimental basis. But for the foreseeable future coal is the main fuel, and the big eastern utilities building the new powerplants in this area have bet their investments on this.

In cutting rates, the Pennsylvania is expressing its determination to fight for its markets. It can be the start of the way back not only for the railroad but for the many communities of the coal areas which badly need an upturn. It can mean reopening jobs for rail workers, coal miners, equipment makers and workers in allied industries. That, at least, will be the hope of all of us.

Resolution Adopted by Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by Detroit Lithuanian organizations at Western High School, Detroit, Mich., on Sunday, February 17, 1963, wherein Lithuanian-Americans of the Greater Detroit area adopted a resolution urging that the Soviet Union forthwith withdraw its armed forces and agents from the sacred boundaries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and other captive nations and that the people of those ancient lands be permitted to reestablish their own free governments under the sound principles of self-determination.

This is a matter in which all freemen, I am sure, agree and one on which the survival of all of us may depend.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS

On the occasion of the observance of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, held at Western High School, in Detroit, Mich., on Sunday, February 17, 1963, the Lithuanian-Americans of the Greater Detroit metropolitan area adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation freed itself from czarist Russia domination and proclaimed its independence as a free democratic republic which was ultimately recognized by all of the great powers of the world; and

"Whereas during its 22 years of freedom and independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania proved itself as a free and independent nation; and

"Whereas in spite of agreements to the contrary, the Soviet Union forcibly incorporated Lithuania into the Nation of Soviet Socialist Republics, thereby depriving the Lithuanian people of their basic human rights and private property; deported those who opposed the sovietization of their homeland and continue the enslavement of Lithuania and the exploitation of its people to this very day: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we hereby rededicate ourselves to the cause of liberating Lithuania from the yoke of communism so that she may once again rejoin the family of free nations; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and for the numerous contributions to, and sympathy for, the cause of Lithuania's never-ending battle to regain its freedom and independence; be it also further

"*Resolved*, That we petition the President and Secretary of State of the United States of America to direct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to confront the members of that august body with the facts regarding the Soviet colonization of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the other captive nations and at the same time demand that the Soviet Union immediately remove its armed forces from Lithuania and allow the people to establish their own government; be it also

"*Resolved*, That inasmuch as Lithuania's people, at great personal risk and peril determindly strive to hear radio broadcasts from the free world, that we earnestly request the Free Europe Committee to make Lithuanian language broadcasts to Soviet-occupied Lithuania to demonstrate that Lithuania has not been forgotten and that the United States of America is determined that she will be liberated from Soviet colonialization and oppression; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, and copies thereof to the Vice President, Secretary of State, the U.S. Senators and Congressmen of this State, to the United Nations, and to the press, radio, and television."

ALGIS ZAPARECKIS,
Chairman.
VLADAS VISKANTAS,
Secretary.

(Adopted this 17th day of February A.D. 1963, at Detroit, Mich.)

New York Fiscal Misrepresentation—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most articulate spokesmen of the Democratic Party in New York is the chairman of the Democratic State Committee, William H. McKeon. In the following address which Mr. McKeon delivered before a dinner meeting of the Clyde Democratic Committee, Clyde, N.Y., on February 16, 1963, he suggests the cause of Governor Rockefeller's frantic efforts to pull a fiscally responsible rabbit out of a hat.

Mr. McKeon's remarks follow:

It has become increasingly apparent that Governor Rockefeller is prepared to let New York State go down the drain to further his own personal political ambitions.

While the State's economy has been stagnant, with aggrieved pockets of chronic unemployment scarring the map of upstate New York, he has persistently boycotted Federal programs of assistance.

While he talks wishfully of the progress made under his first term administration, the fact is that it will be recorded in history that Governor Rockefeller was directing the destinies of the great Empire State when it lost its century-and-a-half of national preeminence and slipped into a second-ranking position.

While he arrogantly pulls fictitious figures out of the air to cite economic growth which, if true, would almost automatically mean a mass influx into New York State of Americans from all over this Nation, the fact is that industry has been fleeing from the State.

While the Nation is developing new ways to stimulate the economy, New York stands still and falls farther behind. A business magazine recently reported that, in the matter of increase of personal income, only 4 States of 50 moved upward at a slower pace that New York.

While the competing nations of the world have been moving ahead to broaden the opportunities for more and higher education, New York State stands with Mississippi at the bottom of the higher education pile. Of the 50 States, New York is 49th in per capita aid to higher education. Only Mississippi is lower.

And into this unhappy picture the Rockefeller administration injects the question of taxes—in the form of tuition fees where none existed before. This will serve to reduce opportunities for education at a time when there is a crying and obvious need to increase and broaden these opportunities.

But our Republican Governor apparently is unconcerned about education and other matters of vital interest to the residents of this State—unless he can reap some personal political gain from them.

President Kennedy is preparing to reduce Federal taxes to stimulate the national economy. The facts are simple: the economy of New York State is in much greater need of stimulation than the national economy.

So what does Governor Rockefeller plan to do to stimulate our State's dragging economy?

His answer is to attempt to break a campaign pledge—his answer is to raise taxes. He has tried to pin a different label on them in an attempt to becloud and confuse—but whatever he calls it, a tax increase is a tax increase and a tax increase means that the State government's fingers are going to be dipping into your pocket and taking more of your money.

Governor Rockefeller made a solemn pledge during last year's campaign not to raise taxes. He repeated this promise many times. Republicans running for office in every part of the State echoed the Governor's promise. They campaigned on this promise and, where they were successful, they were elected on the Republican promise not to raise taxes.

Now the Governor seeks to renege, to abandon this promise by using semantics and saying he is not proposing to raise taxes—merely fees. This is as phony as the pay-as-you-go myth he is pretending to preserve to further his own personal political ambitions.

For a man who aspires to seek the Presidency, this is, at best, questionable conduct.

The issue here is not one of when automobile registration taxes were last raised; the issue here is one of trust, of redeeming pledges solemnly made. Certainly the Governor know last fall—he knew when he first took office—exactly when registration taxes were last increased.

But you—and the Governor—can rest assured that the Democratic Party intends to redeem its pledge. We promised after last fall's election to cooperate with the Republican administration—when it moved in the interests of all the people. But we also promised to present the people's side of the case when the GOP moved for special interests—and purely personal political gain.

This we have done—and will continue to do.

The Democratic members of the State senate and assembly will oppose this onerous increase in taxation Governor Rockefeller seeks to impose to protect a personal political image he seeks to project beyond the borders of New York State.

The facts and figures are there for all to see and examine. For 4 years, in each budget message of his first term of office, Governor Rockefeller described automobile registration income as taxes.

Last year and again this year—and most assuredly next year—this Republican Governor has been, is, and will resort to a variety of gimmicks, one-shot revenue windfalls and other fiscal hocus-pocus to preserve a political slogan. To digress, for a moment, Al Smith described it best many years ago when he said pay as you go meant that you don't pay and you don't go.

To paraphrase from the Al Smith days, let me add that for New York State fiscal catastrophe is just around the corner.

While the State may be able to get by with fiscal finagling for another budget or two, the experts are rapidly coming to agreement on this: The State will be in serious fiscal trouble in 1964–65.

I'm sure that you are as aware as is Governor Rockefeller that 1964 is a presidential election year. Is it any wonder that the feeling is growing that Governor Rockefeller, pegging everything to carry him safely to that year, is apparently prepared to let New York State go down the drain to further his own political ambition?

The Case of Britain's Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 I introduced a health security bill, H.R. 4172, to provide payment for hospital and related services to our senior citizens.

President Kennedy has pointed out that nearly 1 out of every 10 Americans are 65 years or older. This means 17.5 million persons. By 1980, it is expected that this figure will rise to 25 million. For far too many of these Americans, as the President has so graphically stated, the later years are not "golden age ones." Chronic and expensive illness, anxiety and, yes, even want, are their lot.

Is there a need? Well, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare informed me recently that after 65 a total of 9 out of 10 persons are hospitalized at least once, 2 out of 3 at least twice and 1 out of 3 at least three times. Hospitalization, according to these statistics, lasts longer. Hospitalized persons over 65 on the average stay twice as long as younger persons—14.9 days compared to 7.6 days for those younger.

The average annual income received by aged couples is half that of younger two-person families, as President Kennedy has pointed out in his recent message to the Congress on care for the elderly. About half of those over 65 living alone receive $1,000 or less a year, and three-fourths receive less than $2,000 a year. About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than $1,000. Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their home, of less than $5,000. The main source of income for the great majority of those above 65 is one or more public benefit programs. Seven out of 10 (or 12.5 million persons) now receive social security insurance payments, averaging about $76 a month for a retired worker, $66 for a widow, and $129 for an aged worker and his wife. One out of eight—2.5 million Americans—are on public assistance, averaging about $60 a month a person, supplemented by medicare payments averaging about $15 a month. This is the sobering picture that President Kennedy drew in his message.

Half the aged couples reporting hospitaliation in 1957 during a national health survey had medical bills of more than $700. This figure is estimated at between $800 and $900 today. In 10 years, hospital room rates have doubled—from $15.26 in 1950 to $32.23 in 1960. And the survey showed that only 57 percent of the aged beneficiary couples in 1957 could meet all medical bills by themselves.

Back in the late 1800's Germany, then a new nation-state, established a plan of old-age assistance. Other industrial nations of the West have done likewise. Today the United States, the most affluent of the industrial nations, has no adequate system of national health insurance. Private insurance plans are in operation. This is a commendable development. The recently enacted Kerr-Mills Act is also a step, although in my view, a small one. I think it shocking that there is not established in our beloved Nation adequate provision for the care and treatment and financing of the ills of our aged who have served their country so well.

Over the years each attempt within Congress to establish an adequate plan has been met with outraged cries from the established vested interests in medi-

cine. Occasionally, these interests import an affluent Fleet Street physician from Great Britain to tell horror stories about the national health service plan operation in that country. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce an article that appeared in November 1963 in the Sunday magaine of the New York Times which should lay the ghost.

The article follows:

THE CASE FOR BRITAIN'S HEALTH SERVICE

(By Kenneth Robinson)

LONDON.—Socialized medicine in Britain is seldom out of the news for long. Just the other day yet another probe into the National Health Service made the headlines. This time the report came from a special committee of 40 of Britain's top doctors, appointed by the medical profession itself and headed by Sir Arthur Porritt, a leading surgeon. After a leisurely 4 years' study the committee made, as expected, a number of criticisms, particularly of the service's method of organization. But on the main issue it reported that basically the concept of a comprehensive National Health Service was sound.

The service has now operated for 14 years. No longer regarded as experimental, it is now part of the social pattern of Britain in the sixties. How is it faring?

Americans are not always accurately informed about the National Health Service, and in medical circles at least one can discern a predisposition to believe the worst. It is said that the service does not work, that it is unacceptable to doctors and public alike, that it is on the verge of collapse. Given the will, it is not too difficult for American doctors to believe these things. There has always been a steady trickle of disgruntled British doctors prepared to cross the Atlantic and air their complaints about the service. They have found American organizations all too ready to sponsor them and medical audiences eager to listen. It is assumed that the views they express are broadly typical, since the case for the Health Service has largely gone by default.

As a result, a considerable body of myth has grown up around Britain's health services. In what follows I have set forth the principal myths—and the realities that all too few Americans are aware of.

Freedom of choice, for doctor and patient alike, has been the first casualty of the national health program. The patient, so runs the myth, can no longer choose his doctor, but is obliged to go to one selected for him by the Government.

In fact, a patient may go on the list of any doctor, and has hardly any more difficulty in changing his doctor than he had before the Health Service existed. All he need do is to obtain from any post office a list of doctors practicing in his neighborhood, choose any name he likes and transfer accordingly. There is a simple form to be signed—mainly for the purpose of adjusting remuneration between the two doctors concerned, based on the number of patients on their lists—but that is all.

No doctor is forced to accept a particular patient, but they rarely refuse. In cases of difficulty the local executive council, a body of doctors and laymen administering the general-practitioner services, will always help. When specialist treatment at a hospital is involved, the doctor is free to select the specialist and the patient equally free to demand another if he is dissatisfied with the first.

The general practitioner working in the Health Service has, it is true, lost some elements of freedom, even if he has gained others. He is, for example, no longer free to take up practice wherever he wishes. One of the achievements of the N.H.S. has been the leveling of disparities in doctor-patient ratios over the country as a whole. In areas where there are already sufficient, or more than sufficient, doctors, additional practices are prohibited. Here a new doctor can only replace one already established, on retirement or death. But the same doctor would be encouraged to start a new practice in an under-doctored part of the country.

British doctors are underpaid.

Remuneration was for some years a sore point with the profession. On two occasions since the service began, the Government, which has to find the money for medical salaries, referred the problem to an independent body. Each time a substantial increase was recommended, and implemented. Now a permanent review committee, acceptable to the profession and the Government, has been set up and everyone hopes that the periodical wrangles about remunerations are at an end.

Today the doctor in Britain is better paid than most other professions. He seems likely at least to maintain his economic status and his differentials vis-a-vis other professional groups. Now that medical practices are no longer bought and sold, a generous state superannuation scheme takes care of the doctor's retirement.

The British doctor can use only those drugs which the Government allows.

The doctor's clinical freedom remains basically unimpaired. He can treat his patient exactly as he thinks best and may prescribe whatever drugs he considers necessary. He is in theory subject to two limitations. Where a nonproprietary equivalent to a branded drug exists he is asked, but not compelled, to prescribe the former. Should his prescribing habits involve the service in substantially greater expense than those of comparable practitioners over a period, he may be called upon to explain. He can be, but very rarely is, fined if he persists without good reason.

Moreover, had the British Ministry of Health possessed even the same control over drugs as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, there might be some hundreds fewer deformed babies in Britain today. While Dr. Frances Kelsey was able to withhold thalidomide from the American medical profession, it was freely used in Britain for more than a year, with tragic consequences for many pregnant women. This unhappy experience has sparked a demand that the British Government should now seek powers similar to those of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

In America it is widely believed that the National Health Service has damaged, if not destroyed, the traditional character of the doctor-patient relationship.

Most British doctors would take a contrary view. They regard the elimination of the fee for service not as a handicap but as a positive advantage to doctor-patient relations, like the removal of a barrier. To be able to prescribe treatment without any thought of the patient's capacity to pay is for many doctors an immeasurable relief. They actively dislike having to collect from a patient the occasional small charge for a prescription they dispense themselves, or for some certificate which involves a fee.

Many an older doctor, mindful of the bad debts he habitually incurred, welcomes the assured income and the security the state provides. It has been said that, whereas previously the doctor had a direct financial interest in his patients' illnesses, under the health service system of remuneration it pays him to keep them well.

Treatment being free, there is widespread abuse of the service. Patients clutter up the doctor's office with trivial and time-wasting complaints.

Under any system the hypochondriac will waste the doctor's time, but there is little evidence to show that the problem is any more acute in Britain than elsewhere. Undoubtedly abuses took place in the early years of the health service, but doctors would generally agree that such abuses have been reduced to manageable proportions.

It is worth looking at the reverse side of this coin. The minor symptoms of today may be the serious illness of tomorrow. There is much to be said for a system which encourages a patient to seek treatment in the early stages of illness rather than to delay beyond the danger point for fear of incurring expense he cannot easily afford.

The British doctor has to work for the Government or not at all.

American doctors often learn with some surprise that their British counterparts are free to engage in private practice to any extent they wish. The general practitioner may have as many private patients as he chooses, and a few—mainly practicing in the more fashionable parts of London—do not participate at all in the health service.

If a specialist wishes to leave time for private practice, he can seek a part-time appointment at a State hospital. He will be paid a salary in proportion to the number of NHS sessions he undertakes. He may use the hospital's facilities to the full for his private patients, and there will probably be private-pay beds to which he can admit them. In fact, there are more than twice as many part-time as whole-time consultants in the service today.

Because of the failings of the Health Service, more and more people are opting to become private patients.

The facts are less simple. There are in Britain one or two private sickness-insurance schemes similar to the Blue Cross and Blue Shield which cover private hospitalization expenses and specialists' fees. The largest of them, the British United Provident Association, claims something like a tenfold increase in membership over a dozen years. This still means less than a million members, not even 1 in 50 of the population.

One would expect to find a parallel increase in the number of private-pay beds in hospitals to meet the new demand. In fact, the number of such beds in NHS hospitals has actually fallen in the past 12 years by a thousand, or roughly one-sixth. They represent just over 1 percent of the total hospital beds, and their occupation rate by private patients is only 50 percent on average. Nor has there been any increase in private nursing home accommodation. There is certainly no evidence of an increase in private hospitalization.

Among general practitioners, any estimate of the extent of private practice can only be pure guesswork. No reliable figures exist. But there is this significant figure: Some 98 percent of the population of Britain are National Health Service patients registered with general practitioners. There is little evidence that the British are dissatisfied and opting out of the Health Service.

The nationalization of medicine is driving doctors out of Britain.

It is true that there is a shortage of doctors in Britain, not yet critical but serious enough in some areas and in some specialties. The shortage is due in part to a Government miscalculation some years ago in trying to assess the required intake of medical students; in part to a failure to increase the number of medical schools; and hardly at all to the emigration of doctors allegedly fleeing from the Health Service, about which a good deal of nonsense has been spoken and written.

There has always been a certain flow of young British-trained doctors to America and the Commonwealth, many of whom return after a year or two, just as there is a traditional flow in the opposite direction of doctors seeking post-graduate experience in Britain. No firm evidence can be found of

any significant change in this pattern attributable to the Health Service.

Statistics of a kind have been quoted in support of the mass-emigration theory, notably by a much-publicized medical lecturer recently in the United States. In this connection a certain Commonwealth Health Minister said that, so far as his own country was concerned, the quoted figures on immigrant British doctors contained a margin of error around 800 percent.

British doctors, submerged in bureaucracy and redtape, spend most of their time filling in Government forms. Administration is topheavy, and the cost of the Service is soaring out of control.

In any public service some form filling is unavoidable, if only to permit the exercise of financial control, the collection of statistics, and the keeping of proper records. No doctor need spend more than an hour or so a week on paperwork of this kind. This is, incidentally, only a fraction of the paperwork involved in private practice, which requires the booking and charging of each item of service.

The administration expenses of the National Health Service are remarkably low, amounting to rather less than 3 percent, a figure which few commercial undertakings could match. The overall cost of the National Health Service represents in gross terms around 5 percent of Britain's national income. This is similar to the expenditure of comparable European countries on health, and rather less than the United States spends.

Admittedly the cost has risen since the Service started, to the current gross figure of more than £800 million per year. The increase is mainly due to rises in prices and salaries. Expenditure is closely controlled at the center and in recent years growth, in the sense of new developments, has been limited to about 2 percent per year. Of the gross cost, nearly three-quarters is met by national and local taxation, less than a fifth by weekly contributions from workers and employers to the National Insurance Fund and only about one-twentieth by direct charges to patients for items such as drug prescriptions (2 shillings each, irrespective of cost), dentures, and spectacles.

Hospital waiting lists are longer and no new hospitals have been built.

In some areas waiting lists look disturbingly large, but as a guide to unsatisfied demand for hospital treatment they are misleading. Many names appear on more than one list and lists are not kept systematically up to date. Efforts are now being made to analyze lists in some areas in order to discover a more accurate picture of genuine needs, but it is safe to say that they comprise mainly nonurgent cases. For emergencies and urgent cases there is seldom any serious delay in arranging hospitalization.

So far Britain has built few new hospitals since the health service came into being. In the early postwar years, capital expenditure was strictly controlled because of the limited building resources available and the excessive demands made upon them. Priority was given to the building of houses, schools, and factories. During these years many hospitals were modernized and some expanded, in what was essentially a patching-up operation. Planning of an up-to-date hospital service went ahead meanwhile. Now that resources are less limited, the Government has adopted a hospital construction plan on an unprecedented scale. In the next 10 years more than £500 million will be spent on the building of 90 new hospitals and the major remodeling of 134 others.

To say that much foreign criticism of Britain's Health Service is ill informed and unfounded is not to deny that the service has weaknesses. Some of these have been referred to above. There is a shortage not only of doctors but of nurses and ancillary professional workers of every kind. The dental services in particular are seriously undermanned. The standard of dental health remains far below that of the United States.

The salary-fixing arrangements are unsatisfactory and fail to command the confidence of the staffs. Professional salaries, other than those of doctors, are generally inadequate and recruitment suffers in consequence. Medical research, though of a high quality, compares most unfavorably in volume with the U.S. contribution.

Finally, though everyone agrees that the patient must come first, a good deal remains to be done to secure this. Despite the extensive adoption of appointments systems, both for hospital outpatients and in doctors' offices, patients are often kept waiting unnecessarily long before seeing the doctor.

The service has already much positive achievement to its credit. Developments in psychiatric care, in which Britain has played a leading role, owe much to the national health service and the new stimuli it provided. Medical resources are more equitably distributed over the nation as a whole, because the system encourages the planning of services to match needs.

Above all, Britain's is a democratic service. Local planning policy and management are in the hands not of remote bureaucrats but of local men and women, mostly laymen, giving dedicated service without financial reward. These are the members of the regional boards, the hospital management committees, the executive councils.

Conceived and introduced by a Labor Government, the health service has been administered for 11 years of the 14 years of its existence by Conservative Governments. Save in matters of detail, it is no longer even a political issue. It is an accepted part of the social fabric of Britain, and no political party would contemplate its dismantling. Any idea that the public is disenchanted, or that the service is in danger of collapse, can be dismissed out of hand.

Though the medical profession bitterly opposed the scheme before its introduction, the great majority of doctors now participate happily and with enthusiasm. Some grumble now and then; a few, mainly among the older ones, are openly hostile. Perhaps it is unfortunate so many of these find their way onto lecture platforms in the United States.

The principle underlying the national health service is the individual's right of access to health and to the best medical treatment available regardless of his ability to pay. The financial burden of ill health is shared among the people as a whole. If this is socialized medicine—a phrase, incidentally, hardly ever heard in Britain—then it is what the British people want.

Americans may feel differently, though if they want medicare enough it will come, despite medical opposition. But they are entitled to know the facts about Britain's health service. What they seem to be getting is a hotch-potch of myths and half-truths, concocted for medicopolitical purposes and designed to obscure the reality.

Izaak Walton League Backs Shift to Decomposable Detergents Required by H.R. 2105

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, conservation and sporting organizations throughout the Nation have been particularly concerned with the harmful effects of pollution from the synthetic detergents that resist decomposition.

H.R. 2105, which I introduced last January, would ban from interstate commerce, after June 1965, detergents which do not meet standards of decomposability to be set by the Surgeon General. This would require the detergent industry to shift to newer synthetic detergents that decompose after use.

The Izaak Walton League of America in a resolution has urged the transition that would be required under H.R. 2105. The resolution follows:

HARMFUL EFFECTS OF DETERGENTS

Whereas detergents now have very wide domestic and industrial use in America; and

Whereas many recently introduced detergents are extremely resistant to biological deterioration, cause serious foaming problems, and leave harmful effluents in our streams, soils, and ground water; and

Whereas this problem of disposal is becoming more acute each year, especially near large centers of population; and

Whereas adequate research has not yet made it possible to avoid and prevent the harmful effects upon public water supply systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled this 23d day of June 1962, at Portland, Oreg., request the manufacturers to withdraw from sale at the earliest possible moment such detergents and replace them with products that will not cause the undesirable conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That proper Federal and State agencies give immediate consideration to preventing the sale of the stable-type detergents.

"Zero Defects" Program of Martin Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last year I had the pleasure of introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on the "Zero Defects" program inaugurated by the Martin Co., of Orlando, Fla. This program is designed to inspire all the employees of the Martin Co., which is engaged in our vital defense missile effort, to strive for perfection in their work.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Appendix of the RECORD an additional editorial and article from the Orlando Star and the Boston Herald indicating that the "Zero Defects" program is catching on with other defense contractors.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD IDEA CATCHES ON

The General Electric Flight Propulsion Division and its 6,500 employees of West Lynn, Mass., launched an important new program on Monday to set perfection as its goal in production.

This is the latest manufacturing firm to follow the lead of the Martin Co., of Orlando which launched the original "zero de-

fects" program here last July to establish a new quality standard for the aerospace industry.

The General Electric Co., sent men here to study the Martin program which aims to get it done right the first time. They were so impressed by the program and its results that they worked out a similar program and launched it this week with a bang on Monday. Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY and Massachusetts Governor Peabody were on hand for the launching of the project.

Success of the original "zero defects" program here at the Martin Co., has attracted international attention and has been used widely as a basis for similar projects. High praise for the Orlando plan has come from such well-known firms as Rolls-Royce, Ltd. "The 'zero defects' program is the best I have yet seen," said a Rolls-Royce official.

The Martin Co. is delighted with the success of the program. Plant rejects have been cut by an unbelievable 25 percent and scrap costs have been slashed a hefty 30 percent. Individual employees have been setting new high records for perfection. Typical is the record of one on-the-line employee who has hand soldered more than 4,000 electrical connections for the Bullpup missile since last August without a single defect. The program emphasizes the importance of the work of every employee high and low and a spirit of pride is instilled in every member of the great Martin team.

The "zero defects" idea has caught on with the suppliers and subcontractors of Martin with most gratifying results. An example is the Dev-Tek Corp. of Orlando which has delivered 32,500 printed circuits without a single reject.

And this ambitious program which sets perfection as its achievable goal has done much to strengthen the Nation in its defense effort while saving untold dollars for the American taxpayer. The more this project is copied the more value it will be to the Nation.

ZERO DEFECTS PROGRAM SCORES

The Orlando division of Martin Co. has announced the results of its quality assurance program—"zero defecits." The program was originated by Martin—the aerospace division of Martin Marietta Corp.—just 7 months ago.

Because of its tremendous success in terms of higher quality, lower rejects, and time and money saved by elimination of considerable rework, the "zero defects" program is rapidly being picked up by other aerospace companies and the military services.

Since July 1962 when Martin-Orlando kicked off the "zero defects" program with its more than 10,000 defense industry employees, success of the program—in preventing defects—has been beyond all expectations.

Here are just some of the results:

Entire Pershing ground support sets have been delivered to the U.S. Army without defects in either hardware or documentation.

Overall plant reject (defective hardware and documentation) rate has dropped 25 percent as compared with the same period in 1961.

Scrap costs have been reduced 30 percent as compared to the same period in 1961.

There have been numerous individual achievements throughout the plant. For example: A solderer on the Bullpup manufacturing line has hand soldered over 4,000 electrical connections without a defect since August 1.

A total of 30 Coral "A" receivers for Bullpup missiles were manufactured without a single defect. This complex device has 583 hand-soldered joints. Total possible errors in soldering alone amounts to 17,490.

In the structural tool manufacturing department the acceptable quality level of 4 percent rejects has been cut to less than 2 percent since the start of the "zero defects" program.

The "zero defects" program has caught the attention of many vendors and subcontractors. Their results have been equally gratifying. For example, the Dev-Tek Corp. of Orlando, a small business firm, has delivered more than 32,500 printed circuit boards without a single reject since inception of its Martin-inspired "zero defects" program.

General Electric's Flight Propulsion Laboratory at West Lynn, Mass., kicked off a "zero defects" program yesterday with its 6,500 employees.

Martin's "zero defects" program is based on the premise that mistakes are caused by two things: lack of knowledge and lack of attention. Lack of knowledge can be corrected through tried and true means, but lack of attention is an attitude problem which must be corrected by the employee.

It is this attitude which Martin is seeking to correct through a three-pronged "zero defects" program which attacks the fallacy that humans "are supposed to err," motivates people to do better and directs those motivated people to achieve a goal of "zero defects" through defect prevention.

Col. David Marcus, 1902-48

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News, a publication with wide circulation in my congressional district in memory of the late Col. David Marcus:

COL. DAVID MARCUS, 1902–48

(By Abe E. Eisenstein)

February 22, Washington's Birthday, marks the 61st anniversary of the birth of the late native East Side youngster, Brooklynite, West Pointer, superior athlete, noted lawyer and prominent New Yorker, outstanding government and city official, a dogooder and courageous man, one of our heroes of our times in America and modern Israel, famed World War II veteran, first Israel Army general under the pseudonym of Michael Stone, a great soldier, a truly dedicated man with a warm and dynamic personality—the colorful Col. David "Mickey" Marcus.

David Daniel Marcus, son of the late Mordecai and Leah (Gold) Marcus, freedom-loving immigrant parents from the Ghetto of Jassy, Rumania, was born on the fifth floor, rear, of an old tenement house at 103 Hester Street. He was one of six children, four boys and two girls. His father had a pushcart vegetable stand and later acquired a small vegetable store. The sudden death of Mordecai Marcus made it necessary for the family to move into an old Brooklyn tenement at 354 Powell Street.

East Side boy, Public School 109, Talmud Torah School, Hebrew Educational Society, Educational Alliance, Boys' High School (excellent in his studies and was a star baseball and football player), CCNY, U.S. Military Academy (brilliant student, intercollegiate welterweight boxing champion, gymnast, and class of 1924), Brooklyn Law School (class of 1927) alumnus, Attorney David Marcus married Emma Chaison, a school teacher, on July 3, 1927. His ever faithful wife now resides at 485 Westminster Road, Brooklyn.

He was the first American to get a look at Dachau, where the Nazis slaughtered thousands of his fellow Jews ("The bodies were still piled up like cordwood, after that, I didn't need any more lessons in the importance of a Jewish state.")

Colonel Marcus was killed in Jerusalem on June 10, 1948 (Sivan 3) and was buried among the military immortals at West Point. In his 46-year span, he had a most colorful career. His friends came from every walk of life and from every faith and creed.

He was the recipient of many decorations from the United States, the British Empire, New York State, others, and posthumously the Israeli Order of Independence. On June 10, 1954, Mayor Robert F. Wagner proclaimed Thursday as Col. David Marcus Memorial Day, and in Brooklyn, July 28, 1956, the dedication of the Col. David Marcus Junior High School 263 took place. In Israel, in his honor was created the Kibbutz Mishmar David; the David Military Library at Sarafand; the Colonel Marcus stamp, and Camp Marcus on Mt. Carmel in Haifa. At West Point, the Colonel Marcus Memorial Award is made annually by the Marcus Foundation to the outstanding boxer of the graduating class.

Author Ted Berkman recounts "Marcus' heroic feats as fighter, intellectual, and leader of men," in his 321-page book, "Cast a Giant Shadow." Once read, reread, he could never be forgotten.

A birthday salute to the memory of a great American and "soldier of humanity"—Col. David "Mickey" Marcus—who helped preserve freedom for our Nation, and was a distinguished hero of Israel's war of liberation.

Republicans Turn Backward as They Plan Strategy for 1964 Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Republican Members of Congress seem to have enjoyed their Lincoln Day jaunts back home. Although the press has not reported very much that they said about Abraham Lincoln, it has given great prominence to their remarks about Cuba.

It is typical and true to form that modern-day Republican politicians turn backward for guidance. Cuba and Kennedy to these Republican strategists are synonymous with Korea and Truman. They forget that Rockefeller does not have a white horse and he is only a Governor, not a general.

The following column by Drew Pearson in the Washington Post on Monday, February 25, will be interesting to refer to the day after election in November 1964:

ROCKEFELLER BEHIND CUBA UPROAR?

(By Drew Pearson)

If you want to understand the reasons for the frenzied clamor on Capitol Hill regarding Cuba, you have to know what's going on behind the scenes in Republican politics.

No. 1. It's virtually certain that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York will be the

Republican candidate for President. He has made plans to set up a working staff immediately; has told intimates he will definitely enter the primary in New Hampshire, a State in which he went to college and serves on the Dartmouth Board of Trustees; will also enter the Wisconsin primary.

No. 2. Rockefeller has picked Cuba and foreign affairs as his chief campaign weapon against President Kennedy, with civil rights as his second.

This is the real reason why Senator JACK JAVITS of New York flabbergasted his civil rights friends in the Senate by making a petty gripe against an insignificant ruling by Vice President JOHNSON to adjourn after the filibustering rules vote. Later JAVITS, a fairminded Senator but under no obligation to the Governor of New York, came to see JOHNSON privately and apologized.

No apology has come from the other New York Senator, KEN KEATING of Rochester, for the rabble-rousing speeches he has made on Cuba. KEATING is a smart lawyer and, in the past, a decent Senator. He was not a McCarthy admirer. However, his inflammatory speeches on Cuba have reminded senatorial colleagues of Joe McCarthy in his heyday.

JUST ONE MISSILE

A minority of Republican Senators has joined the Keating wolfpack on Cuba in the same spirit that the late Bob Taft supported McCarthy. When McCarthy was claiming there were "205 card-carrying Communists known to Dean Acheson" in the State Department, every fairminded Republican knew this could not be true. But Taft told a GOP meeting: "Suppose he finds just one Communist—we'll have Truman on the run."

Likewise, every Republican Senator knows today that all offensive Soviet missiles are almost certainly removed from Cuba. But they argue privately: "Suppose KEATING finds just one—we'll have Kennedy on the run."

What most people outside Senate cloakrooms don't know, however, is that when KEATING speaks. It's KEATING's voice but Rockefeller's mastermind. The two men are extremely close. They ran together on the same ticket in 1958, when Keating didn't really want to run, didn't really expect to win. Rockefeller support and Rockefeller money helped him win. And the two will probably be running together again in 1964, one for the Senate, the other for President.

Meanwhile, KEATING has sent his ghost writer, ace newsman Hugh Morrow, formerly of the Saturday Evening Post, to help Rocky in Albany, and the Governor is on the phone to KEATING more or less every other day.

PULLING THE GOP RUG

Real fact is that Kennedy has won some amazing victories in Cuba. Few diplomatic observers really expected Khrushchev to start pulling troops out of Cuba. But he did—another victory for Kennedy. But every victory he wins helps pull the rug out from under Rockefeller's strategy; so the howl from the war claque in Congress becomes more frenzied. It could also become dangerous.

The danger is that too much warmongering in the Senate will heal one of the most important rifts ever to occur in the Communist world—that between Russia and Red China. Or it could knock the props out from under Khrushchev's moderate policy and reinstate the tough tactics of the Red Army.

These cross currents inside the Communist world can shift rapidly. If they shift for the worse, there could be real danger of war. And if the United States is at war in 1964, Nelson Rockefeller won't have a prayer of winning. The United States has never been known to defeat a Democratic war President—especially when he's pushed into war by Republicans.

Dunlop Workers Accept Revision in Pay Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, labor and industry both are faced today with never-ending changes that must be dealt with if they are to continue to exist.

New materials, automation, changing demands of the buying public, competition, operating costs, and many other factors must be kept in focus by management, while labor keeps its eye on its own needs in the face of rising costs of living, changing social patterns, and so forth.

Labor-management unity too often receives insufficient attention, and I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of Congress and the American people a recent example of responsible coordination which occurred in my home community of Buffalo, N.Y.

As a result, production workers in the plant of the Dunlop Tire & Rubber Corp. have voted 6 to 1 in favor of accepting a significant revision in their labor-grade rate structure, with the aim of helping to improve their employer's competitive cost position.

Ed Kelly, a labor reporter for the Buffalo Evening News, explained this union action in detail on February 22, 1963, as follows:

DUNLOP WORKERS ACCEPT REVISION IN PAY STRUCTURE—VOTE IS 641 TO 106 IN MOVE TO IMPROVE TONAWANDA PLANT'S COMPETITIVE POSITION

(By Ed Kelly)

Production workers in the Dunlop Tire & Rubber Corp.'s town of Tonawanda plant have voted 6 to 1 to accept a revision in their labor-grade pay structure to improve their employer's competitive cost position.

Louis DiVito, president of local 135, United Rubber Workers (AFL-CIO), said the members approved the revision, 641 to 106, in daylong secret balloting Thursday. The total vote represents nearly all the current work force.

The company and union had disclosed earlier this week that they had reviewed the incentive program and other local issues designed to improve competitive costs.

Proposals growing out of this review were explained to the union membership Tuesday and Wednesday, with the ballot on acceptance or rejection set for Thursday.

RECOMMENDED BY BOARD

The 11-member executive board of the local union had unanimously recommended adoption of the new plan.

After the union's report on the balloting, J. M. Billane, president of the Dunlop plant, declared:

"On behalf of management, I welcome this sensible and responsible action on the part of the workers and employees involved in this comprehensive reorganization of the tire division.

"It was the first and fundamental step in a program which will increase sales and employment in 1963. I am optimistic about the company's progress in both the near- and the long-term future."

The Dunlop president said he was "particularly glad that the time has at last arrived" when he could "effectively scotch all the rumors which had been circulated about the company."

NOT GOING OUT OF CITY

Mr. Billane added:

"We are not going out of this city and we are not going out of the tire business. We are going to be competitive and we are going forward from here on."

As he announced the outcome of the URW membership vote, Local President DiVito declared:

"The leadership of local 135 is happy to see that the union membership, on the basis of Thursday's vote, agreed overwhelmingly with the local's executive board in acting responsibly upon the new labor-grade rate structure as vital to the continuation and improvement of the Dunlop operation in our area."

HERE FOR 40 YEARS

"As responsible leaders in the trade union movement, we must protect by all honorable means the jobs and security of our members.

"This action taken by local 135 does just that by insuring not only that a company which for 40 years has been a member of our industrial community will remain here, but also that it will be possible for that company to secure new business, which can only further improve and protect the job future of nearly 1,000 members of the United Rubber Workers Union on the Niagara Frontier."

The Dunlop operation annually pumps an estimated $17.5 million into this area's economic life through payroll, purchases and taxes.

Cuban Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the return of Cuban refugees to a land of freedom—to the United States of America—from their own Communist-controlled country was an act of mercy, an act of love, joined in by so many businesses and industries and individual citizens of our Nation. Among the companies which contributed its facilities, its manpower and its resources was one of America's great companies—the United Fruit Co. Mr. Speaker, this progressive company was founded by the late Samuel Zemurray, and in its years of development and in its work in Central America, United Fruit has contributed immeasurably to the economic growth and prosperity of those countries, and to the health and welfare of their peoples.

In aiding Cuban refugees to come to the United States, the United Fruit Co. not only contributed $400,000 worth of food, but also it donated its ship, the SS *Santo Cerro*, to carry to Cuba approximately 1,900 tons of children's foods and medicines, and then to bring some 750 Cuban citizens back to America and land them at Port Everglades, Fla. En route from Havana to Port Everglades, the company's stewards prepared and served two hot meals for the Cubans on

board. The United Fruit Co. employees were ably assisted in their work by American Red Cross staffers and a Red Cross medical team.

Mr. Speaker, this is a prime example of the humanitarian spirit which moves the American people in all walks of life, from all professions and businesses and industries, to join together in a spirit of harmony to aid oppressed and underprivileged people. The United Fruit Co. has displayed the true Christian spirit by its act of generosity and kindness. America can, and should, be proud of companies like United Fruit for just such humanitarian actions. I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a news release on the heralded trip of the S.S. *Santo Cerro*, which reveals its splendid work. The copy follows:

ABOARD SS "SANTO CERRO" AT SEA, February 13.—Cuban refugees en route to the United States got their first generous portion of American hospitality just a few minutes after this Red Cross mercy ship left Cuban waters for Port Everglades, Fla.

The ship left Havana at 6:39 p.m. on the return leg of a journey that began in Baltimore on February 7. The United Fruit Co. vessel brought to Cuba over 1,900 tons of childrens' foods and medicines (worth $2.5 million) donated by American firms as part of the exchange of the Bay of Pigs prisoners.

At 8:30 this morning the first of the 750 persons granted exit permits by the Cuban Government began arriving at the pier in Havana. They started to board about 1 p.m.

A Red Cross medical team arrived by plane from Miami shortly before noon to find that the crew and three ARC staff members who came to Cuba abroad the ship had already made extensive arrangements for the care of the refugees in the four cargo holds.

The United Fruit Co., which contributed $400,000 of the food cargo as well as donating the ship to the Red Cross, prepared to feed two hot meals during the approximately 14-hour crossing. The ship stewards added an extra meal of soup and fruit for those who arrived early and had to wait out the day.

Two of several litter cases on board ship were among almost the very last to arrive, brought to the pier after 6 p.m. in Cuban Red Cross ambulances. While awaiting the ship's departure, passengers settled in holds on cots and blankets the American Red Cross had flown from Miami or read magazines from the outdoor library set up on the afterdeck by the crew.

Virtually every member of the crew, from Capt. Edmond McIntyre to the engineroom gang, assisted with the passengers. They helped to bring aboard the aged, the very young, and the 10 stretcher cases. They continued to help the Red Cross doctor and nurses throughout the voyage.

The refugees, youngest of whom is 10-day-old Jauer Esetev, include 282 men, 304 women, and 160 children—and 5 pet dogs.

They were all below deck when the ship left Havana. The chief engineer, Romon Bermudez, kept up a running account of the departure in Spanish. Each announcement was greeted with mixed tears and cheers. The final announcement that the *Santo Cerro* had left Cuban waters produced the most emotional outburst.

The refugees sang the Cuban national anthem. They cheered the United States and the Red Cross. They gave a special cheer for Mrs. Louise Zavalydriga, ARC nurse's aid from Miami, who was making her third voyage aboard an ARC mercy ship between Havana and Port Everglades. With a tearful smile, she told fellow ARC workers that "No matter how often you do this, you can never take it for granted when you give this kind of help to people."

After the ship was well out at sea, United Fruit Co. stewards served all refugees with beef stew, rice and beans, cream pie, coffee, milk, and apples. Mess lines were set up on deck and in the holds. Volunteers from among the passengers carried food to those who were too old or infirm to climb the steep ladders out of the holds.

Most of the children went to bed early, rocked to sleep as this "night boat to freedom" rolled northward through the choppy waters of the Florida Strait.

Up in the steward's department, crew members worked through the night preparing a hot breakfast for the refugees.

Enterprise Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial appearing in the Garden City News on Thursday, February 21, 1963. This public service editorial appears to me to present a worthwhile idea, which I believe worthy of the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Its text is as follows:

ENTERPRISE DAY

In an address last week before the New York State Bankers Association, Dr. James F. Bender, professor of business administration at Adelphi College, advanced an idea which we loudly applaud.

He advocated that the bankers' associations in each of the 50 States take the leadership in establishing one day in the year to be observed as Enterprise Day.

"Because we sometimes forget that competitive enterprise nurtures, better than any other economic climate, the protection and advancement of the dignity of the individual as well as his material welfare," Dr. Bender said, "it would be good to pause nationally once a year, as we do on Labor Day, to pay respect to enterprise."

We agree wholeheartedly. An entire generation in this country has been spoon fed by starry-eyed and sometimes cockeyed economists to such an extent that this generation has no idea of what private competitive enterprise has done to create what is called the American way of life.

An entire generation has been conditioned to the thinking of those who are doing their best to make the United States of America a welfare state. Private competitive enterprise has been ridiculed as old hat. It is surprising how many young people today honestly believe that Government owes them a living.

This Nation observes all sorts of weeks that promote various kinds of merchandise or movements—some worthy, others questionable. So, it seems to us that one day in the year could be devoted to recognizing private enterprise for what it is—the thing that has made this Nation great.

We hope the bankers will move ahead in a positive manner to make Dr. Bender's idea become a reality.

Discrimination Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded commemorating brotherhood week which serves as an extremely useful purpose in calling attention to the prejudices which often hinder the proper use of talent in our great Nation. The lesson of brotherhood week is one of toleration and understanding—virtues which we all must practice.

The Des Plaines Valley News, an independent community publication serving a substantial number of Cook County south suburban communities, in its issue of Thursday, February 21, carried a thought-provoking editorial discussing some of the historical background in discrimination.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial into the RECORD at this point, feeling that it is a thoughtful and helpful commentary on a problem which not only faces the United States but all peoples throughout the world:

[From the Des Plaines (Ill.) Valley News, Feb. 21, 1963]

DISCRIMINATION THEORY

"We have been called black monkeys and jungle people and treated like dirt," stated one of the 300 young Ghanaians leaving Communist Bulgaria in disgust over the treatment handed his people in that country.

One African student stated, "There was more discrimination in this Communist country than could be in any of the so-called capitalistic countries * * * people used to spit out before us on buses and trains."

Soviets long used a racial discrimination theme as a weapon to sway the African and underprivileged into communistic lines.

However, the incidents show that Russia has as much, if not more racial and religious discrimination than any other nation. Our own Argo residents that have visited Moscow, Russia, or smaller cities under Soviet control report that they seldom encounter a Negro or a Jew.

In Russia, citizens need a police pass in order to travel from one part of the country to another, even for visits. This is similar to requiring that police approve passes of persons living in Detroit to visit in Chicago. Only one nation uses atheism as its official policy—Russia. Thus the "no discrimination" statements that the Russians have officially released during the past decades are more lies than truths.

Discrimination is a form of hostility which an individual acquires. It is the distrust of the stranger, or a fancied enemy.

Remember during World War I, the treatment handed those of German nationality, and in World War II, the treatment handed the American-Japanese citizens residing in California. Or treatment accorded our own American Indians who were forced to reside in "reservations"?

Each race, at one time or another, was the target of hostility. The Italian because a few of his race became gangsters, the Jew because of the heritage of distrust, the Mexican because of the few that were lazy, the American Indian because a few liked the taste of whiskey, the Polish race because a few were slow and stubborn.

In the day when Casear ruled, the blond captives from Britain and Norway took the highest prices on the slave market.

If the Negro complains that he is bound in a "ghetto" due to discrimination, let him look at the American Indian, or the "Chinatown" within any large city. It is the American Indian who has a real case for treatment accorded his kind, as he had been forced to live in "reservations" since the West became populated.

Look at any large city today. You will find areas where numerous Germans live, another where numerous Swedes live, another where Italians live, another where Czech people live, another where Greeks reside.

Together, the groups helped America become the leader of civilization. Each race contributed its best talent toward that strength, thus assuring supremacy.

No one race can criticize another for slum housing, for within each nationality there are some that by their individual nature don't give a hoot how their homes look.

It is the opinion of many scholars that if the Negro were given the right to live where they chose, the same result would have been gained, as those of the same racial background tend to group together naturally, due to their religion, their customs, their beliefs and mannerisms. A Swede living in "Chinatown" section would most assuredly feel out of place.

When living in foreign nations, Americans tend to group themselves into American colonies or compounds. In a sense they are grouping themselves in a "ghetto." Naturally a few part with the main group, but national festivities usually finds all Americans together.

It is important that one views discrimination as an expression of hostility rather than a fact, for man's nature is such that any stranger is bound to look queer or suspicious until association proves the doubt cleared.

People who are the most prejudiced are those who had least contact with the group they dislike. This is true regardless of color or race or creed. The stranger always finds it difficult to make his home in a new neighborhood until he becomes acquainted.

No law can change an attitude, for this is taught. The majority attitude is the toughest to crack.

Every race, nationality, and religious group produced men of worth. Every one produced scoundrels.

The remainder of us are between. Thus in observance of Brotherhood Week, February 17–24, let us explore our prejudices; perhaps we shall find merely signs of hostility against the stranger, or a fancied enemy.

Each star in the sky looks alike. Yet, each is different in size, in shape, in color, in rotation, to its place in the universe. Each is dependent on another.

Man, too, is like a star.

Quiet as a Mouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is most discouraging that the President of the United States can be increasingly brutal to the businessmen of the country when they do not do his bidding and yet, when it comes to enemy No. 1 to the freedom of the world, Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy is as quiet as a mouse. It is no wonder we no longer hear any more about current prestige polls, about our posture in the eyes of the world, and why we are losing the respect of our friends because of our program of appeasement of Khrushchev.

David Lawrence, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, fully discusses our weak position.

The article follows:

ANSWERING MOSCOW'S WAR THREAT—U.S. FAILURE TO REBUT MALINOVSKY WITH FACTS ON CUBA IS CRITICIZED

(By David Lawrence)

Tens of millions of dollars are appropriated annually to get America's story before the court of world opinion. Yet, when a golden opportunity comes to put the Moscow aggressor on the spot, it is deliberately ignored.

The defense minister of the Soviet Government, Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky, made a startling speech last Friday to an audience of 6,000 in the Kremlin palace. Seated beside him, nodding approval, was Premier Khrushchev. Mr. Malinovsky said:

"We would like to warn the aggressive circles of the United States that an attack on the Cuban republic would mean a third world war."

But who sent into Cuba those offensive missiles and weapons, together with at least 17,000 troops and technicians? No satisfactory explanation of the presence of this hostile armament and forces to operate it has been made by Moscow.

Should the American Government continue to remain silent, or should it present the facts comprehensively to the world and formally accuse the Soviet Government of a threatened aggression against the United States and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere? Does the latest Soviet declaration mean that the United States must give up all plans to take any action against Cuba, even when American lives and property may be endangered, or when evidence is uncovered that Cuba is being used as a base to export guerrillas and arms to other Latin-American countries to start revolutions there?

If any governments is guilty of threatening to start a third world war, it is the Soviet regime, which is still active in trying to overthrow governments in the Western Hemisphere. The whole world has an acute interest, of course, in the effects of any conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. A direct threat, however, now has been made by the Soviet Government that it plans to engage in a world war even if the United States seeks merely to protect its own interests in this hemisphere.

World opinion could certainly be mobilized by a statement of all the facts showing what a dangerous step toward aggression was taken only a few months ago by the Soviet Union when its missiles were sent to Cuba. The Russian people themselves would understand the nature of the blunder made by their rulers if the facts were emphasized again and again so that they would inevitably penetrate the Iron Curtain.

Public opinion is a tremendously powerful factor in international affairs. It is the principal weapon of moral force. And when the facts can be convincingly presented to show exactly what the Soviets threatened to do in Cuba, it seems unfortunate that a "warning" such as the minister of defense made in Moscow last week is brushed aside and no public reply is made.

The U.S. Information Agency, which has the task of distributing America's story throughout the world, can hardly be blamed. It is told what to say by the President or by the Secretary of State. If the official word is to ignore a speech such as Mr. Malinovsky made, the USIA will remain muzzled.

The mystery is why nothing has been said in rebuttal by any high official in the Government here. President Kennedy was at Palm Beach over the weekend, but he must have read the news dispatches. He could have set in motion the whole process of reply making. He could have taken cognizance of the Russian threat in a formal statement which might have given in detail the steps taken by the Soviet Union in the last few months that constitute a threat of world conflict.

Why wasn't anything said or done here? The only conclusion is that maybe the Adlai Stevenson philosophy still prevails. He said the other day in a speech in Chicago that he would not be surprised if Mr. Khrushchev ultimately removes his troops from Cuba as promised "unless we make it too embarrassing for him to back down again."

But the embarrassment is one-sided. While fear of offending the sensibilities of the men in the Kremlin seems to be part of the reasoning in Washington, no such fear of offending the United States appears to bother the Moscow government.

The Soviets have given the world a dramatic example of potential aggression. Maybe it was considered tactful to keep quiet about this for a few weeks during the crisis last October, but now that the Soviet Government through an official spokesman, the Minister of Defense, has voiced a threat of a third world war, it is difficult to understand why the Government here need remain silent.

Is the U.S. Government to be intimidated by such threats? Or will it proceed to denounce the Moscow statement and put the blame for any future conflict where it belongs—on the shoulders of the men who deliberately sent to Cuba missiles and bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons to the United States from the island, only 90 miles away from our southeastern shores? Congress might do better to debate the failure of the White House and State Department to put America's story across to the world than to spend so much time on internal bickering.

District of Columbia School Counselors Overwhelmed by Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the American Personnel and Guidance Association to insert the following article from the Washington Post of February 17, 1963, representing many of the social problems facing guidance counselors throughout the country, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1963]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL COUNSELORS OVERWHELMED BY WORK—ONE SERVES 1,200 PUPILS

(By Susanna McBee)

Phoebe C. Beath arrived 15 minutes early the other day to her job as the only counselor for the 1,200 students at Washington's Hart Junior High School.

She had hardly removed her coat when a mother came in with a doctor's note saying her son had been diagnosed as having a schizoid personality.

Since the boy would be out of school several months, Mrs. Beath agreed to get advance assignments from his teachers and arrange for a visiting instructor to help him with homework.

After a few more phone calls and a conference with the school's mathematics coordinator, Mrs. Beath settled down to a routine day serving as combination health adviser, social worker, job finder, psychologist, tester, academic counselor, and friend to students with all sorts of problems.

She is one of the District schools' 83 counselors (including seven on temporary duty). The school system had requested 43 more to provide some in schools without any and others in schools such as Hart, where the pupil load is staggering. However, the President is requesting only six in his 1964 budget.

The first student Mrs. Beath saw was a white boy named Peter. He had average ability but was in the basic, or lowest, track because of his poor reading.

Mrs. Beath told Peter, who had been fighting with another boy, that she had arranged for him to get additional reading instruction and that he should help his classmates maintain good behavior.

Next came Rachel, a Negro girl who is one of 160 Hart students receiving free lunches. Mrs. Beath had to fill out a form so that the schools would get reimbursed for the lunch.

In asking the name of the girl's mother and her social worker and how long her family had been on public assistance, Mrs. Beath discovered Rachel's speech was almost incomprehensible and that she had been arguing with her teacher.

The counselor made sure that Rachel would see a speech teacher and that she would try to control her temper.

"I don't handle the punishment end of discipline problems," Mrs. Beath told a reporter, "but I try to find their causes. We do need a social worker very much because she would be able to go to the home of our problem children. However, I contact the case workers for our children on public assistance."

Just then a small foreign student entered. She smiled shyly, revealing some distended front teeth. She told Mrs. Beath that the school dentist was going to remove the teeth.

When she left, Mrs. Beath explained that the Urban Service Corps had arranged for the girl's dental work. "She didn't ask for help," the counselor said. "I saw her in the cafeteria and she couldn't eat very well. She'll be pretty when her teeth are fixed."

It was 10:06 a.m. A tall Negro youth entered, and Mrs. Beath gave him a gray jacket. "It's a little short, but it's warmer than the one you had," she told him. The jacket came from the PTA clothes collection.

He left as the phone rang. It was a counselor from another school, and Mrs. Beath discussed how Hart is stepping up its antidropout program.

While she was talking, a white eighth grader named Phil entered. He was a high IQ but was not doing well in the honors track; so Mrs. Beath had placed him in the regular track. "I can do the work better now," he told her. After he left, she explained that the boy has no father and that she is trying to get a Kiwanis Club member to take an interest in him.

Another white boy, whom school officials termed "a potential scientific genius," sat down and discussed his failure in English and mathematics. He told Mrs. Beath his parents had agreed that he should go into the regular track for all subjects except science. "You can count on me to do better," he promised.

Just then a social worker from Junior Village came in with Janice, a 15-year-old Negro girl who would look only at the floor.

Janice, who wore a scarf around her head and who doodled on her book cover while the adults talked, had left school in October after refusing to talk to her classmates and teachers. A psychiatrist had recommended that she be given psychiatric treatment at District of Columbia General Hospital.

But for some reason Janice had not been admitted to the hospital, and Mrs. Beath had the difficult task of finding a place for her in school.

PROMISES HELP

"We're going to help you," she told Janice. "We're going to put you in a small class. A basic class is the best we can do. It has 30 pupils in it."

The social worker asked, "What do you call a big class?"

Janice kept her head down despite the social worker's pleas for her to answer Mrs. Beath's questions. Mrs. Beath called for two girls to get Janice's books and show her to her class.

The counselor said Janice would be taking art and music besides academic subjects.

"That'll be nice," said the social worker.

But Janice's doodling became more frenzied.

Then a girl came to take Janice to her class. She would not say hello to the girl. As she walked out, flanked by the girl and the social worker, Janice started to cry.

Mrs. Beath said Janice never knew her father and that her mother is ill and periodically deserted the girl. Janice has lived at Junior Village for several months.

It was 11 a.m. and time for Mrs. Beath's cafeteria duty. It was a time for exercise, too, as she soon found out. Since it was raining and the students could not play outside, they were more rambunctious than usual.

In less than an hour, she chased two boys who ran out of the cafeteria, tried to find out who punched another boy in the nose, stopped a fight in an aisle, blew her whistle at a boy who was trying to grab a girl's purse, and wrote down the names of four boys caught smoking by another teacher.

During her own lunch period, she described a multitude of other functions a counselor performs in a system where many schools are becoming so large that they seem like factories.

EMERGENCY BASIS

"I really operate on an emergency basis, seeing students mainly when they have problems," she said. When an addition at Hart is completed in 1964, the school will have 1,600 to 1,700 students.

After lunch she stopped by Janice's basic class. At last the girl spoke to her. "I don't like my class," she said. Later her teacher told Mrs. Beath that Janice had cried throughout the period.

That afternoon, between testing three students and discussing classroom problems with three others, Mrs. Beath called the schools' special services division about Janice. When she hung up, she said school officials plan to contact the District's Child Welfare Division and produce further evidence of Janice's need for psychiatric treatment.

Soon it was 3 p.m. She had given a boy who insisted on quitting school some material about jobs, had conferred with a visiting instructor, and had discussed several handicapped children at the Vocational Rehabilitation Center.

Then it was time to attend a meeting on how to improve students' reading ability. Afterward, there was more paperwork. Some of it she took home. The next day's work would require a lot of preparation.

Public Service in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Anthony J. Celebrezze, distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at a dinner held February 22, 1963, at the Woman's National Democratic Club.

Secretary Celebrezze has brought to Washington with him an outstanding record of public service and interest in Government. He has been characterized throughout his governmental service by not only efficiency but also by humanity.

His comments at that time are particularly appropriate to the vast problems in which the United States finds itself today. The remarks of Secretary Celebrezze appropriately reflect the need for a Government which not only is interested in economy but which is concerned with the intelligent and humane solutions of the multitude of problems facing our people today.

The address follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE IN GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the dinner of the Woman's National Democratic Club, Washington, D.C., Friday, February 22, 1963)

I am pleased to note that this is a bipartisan occasion—the 231st anniversary of George Washington's birth. The Republicans customarily gather on Lincoln's Birthday, and we Democrats pay faithful annual tribute to the genius of Jefferson and Jackson. But Washington was a unique figure in American political annals. First in so many things, he bears the unusual distinction of being the first—and also the last—President to be elected outside the party system.

Politics was very much alive, of course, even under Washington's administration, and the two-party system that marks the structure of American politics was already in the making. It was in Washington's first term that Jefferson and Madison took their famous botanical expedition through the Northern States and planted the seeds of the great national party that is parent to our own. Since then, throughout the years, men and democracy have been tested by our politics, and time has proved the system worthy.

Some 80 years ago, the great English historian, James Bryce, comparing American politicians with their counterparts in Europe, described two categories of politicians—those of the "inner circle" and those of the "outer circle." What he found remarkable in America was that the membership of both the inner and outer circles was relatively larger here and, therefore, more representative than in most European states. Whereas in Europe the "inner circle"—the people who devoted their full time to politics—was made up of only a small number of individuals, usually men of independent means and aristocratic background, in America the profession of politics attracted thousands of people from all walks of life. And, more importantly, the American "outer

circle"—in which he placed all who work for the party without pay and without seeking office—he found came nearer to including the whole country here than it did in England.

This is not the usual conception of the ins and outs in politics, but it is a refreshing one, and it is a mark of American democracy that we have reason to be proud of.

Politics has a special meaning for Americans. Some call it the science of government. Others, more poetically, call it the art of freedom. Pragmatists like to call it the art of the possible. But whatever you call it—by fair name or foul—it comes down finally to the act of responding individually to the obligations of self-government. And whether one counts oneself a member of the inner circle or the outer circle, every American is, or should be, a politician. Over the age of 21, everyone should be an active politician, letting his voice be heard at least through his vote.

I have found also that there are plenty of active politicians under the age of 21. I have been surprised and gratified by the number of letters I have been getting from schoolchildren. I like to get these letters. They don't tell me how to run the Department. They ask me what I do.

And from these younger citizens I sometimes get a pretty good idea of what's being taught in the schools around the country. I can say, for example, with a fair degree of accuracy, that during the past 6 weeks a lot of ninth graders have been studying the Cabinet, and I'm sure that a lot of class reports have been given on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This is as it should be, and I am glad that in this country schoolchildren can feel free to ask a member of the Cabinet just what it is that he does. I make a special effort to answer these letters because I feel a special obligation to these youngsters who will become the responsible politicians of tomorrow.

I am glad, too, that they care about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In spite of our rather long and specific title, there is widespread misconception about what we do and how we do it. A lot of people don't realize, for example, that nearly 90 percent of the Department's appropriations are passed on to the States, educational and scientific institutions, and hospitals and individuals in the form of grants—for public assistance, for medical research, for aid to education, for water pollution control, and a host of other projects in which State, local, Federal, and nongovernmental energies and resources are combined to promote the general welfare.

Because the work of our Department directly affects the lives of so many millions of people in so many different ways, any single impression of HEW is bound to be colored as much by what is opinion as by what is fact.

One of my staff members tells about his 5-year-old daughter who asked him what his job was. He found it somewhat difficult to put this into 5-year-old terms, but he went on at some length about how the Department looks after all the people in the country—how we try to keep people from getting sick, how we try to protect the food they eat and the medicine they take, how we try to see that everyone has enough to eat, how we want to make sure that everyone has a chance to go to school. The child was visibly impressed. A few days later the father overheard his daughter telling another child, "My daddy's better than your daddy—he takes care of everybody, just like God."

Unfortunately, like the 5-year-old, too many grownups share that mistaken impression. At one extreme are the anti-Federal forces who oppose all national programs in health, education, and welfare. Their view is that we have gone too far in the caretaking role. At the other extreme are the absolute paternalists who think we are not fatherly enough.

Both extremes, I think, have a narrow, cramped view of the needs and problems of our society. One clings to an ideal that may have been possible in a simpler, bygone age—the belief that each of us can stand entirely alone. But today, in a world that is changed by fantastic advances in science and technology, such a belief is as obsolete as the Pony Express.

The "let-the-Government-do-everything" school is equally shortsighted. Its followers show too little faith in the ability of man to adapt to new conditions, to meet new challenges. In their rush to take care of all his material neds, they forget his most basic need for self-respect and self-reliance and would rob him of the great happiness—the intense personal satisfaction—that comes from independence, growth, and achievement.

Neither approach would benefit society. With one we would flounder; with the other we would grow flabby. But between the two there is a path that will lead to social progress—a way that would sacrifice neither security nor independence—a way that would enhance both the dignity of the individual and the strength of the Nation.

And it is this path that the Kennedy administration is following.

In public welfare, for example our goal is to provide opportunities for independence to all who need them. For youth and adults who are handicapped by lack of education, by physical or mental disabilities, by social and economic pressures beyond their control, the dole is being exchanged for a bootstrap, so that they can help themselves.

We are also examining the causes of dependency and are looking for ways to cure or prevent them. Disease and poverty, ignorance and idleness are social ills that—like cancer—will respond to treatment if caught in time.

Our experiences over the past quarter of a century have amply demonstrated the soundness of the social security approach to establishing a floor of economic independence for people beyond their working years. When this independence is threatened by the high cost of hospital and related health care—as it is today—we feel it is time to add another plank to social security, to give people the means of insuring themselves against the pauperism that can quickly result from the heavy expenses of illness in the later years of life. This would not intrude upon individual freedom and dignity. Instead, it would make them possible.

The inadequacies of education, at a time when we are confronted with increasing demands for a more broadly and more highly eduacted population, have brought us face to face with a national crisis of major proportions.

Here, while respecting the prerogative of the States and local communities to control the education of our youth, we have proposed Federal assistance to selected areas of need where it is most appropriate and where it can be most useful.

We can no longer ignore the need for emergency classroom construction and aid to teachers' salaries in the public schools, for revitalized vocational education programs, for broadened opportunities in higher education, for expanded college facilities, for improving the quality of teaching, for meeting the special needs of handicapped children, and for expanded opportunities for adult education. These are among the nationwide needs which the Federal Government can properly help to meet. Indeed, it will be failing in its responsibility if it does not come forward to meet them.

And there are still other national problems that are waiting solution. There is mental retardation which needlessly blights the lives of millions of Americans. There is the problem of accidents which are the leading cause of death for young people up to the age of 35. There are the costly and debilitating problems of alcoholism and drug addiction which strike alike at rich and poor and have too long been shrouded with mystery and misunderstanding. There is the matter of air pollution and the harmful effects of manmade chemicals on man himself and his environment.

These are problems which George Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton could scarcely foresee. Yet they saw the need for a national government that would be strong enough to withstand the strain which accompanies any real progress—a government which would be strong enough to protect the whole body of the people—one that would be able to promote the general welfare without threat to individual freedom.

To be sure, the National Government cannot do these things alone. Nor was it ever intended that it should. We are a pluralistic society, a government of, by, and for the people, and all of us share in the responsibility of keeping our Nation free and strong.

But the stimulus for social progress must rise from each one of us as responsible individuals. It must come from our public conscience. It must respond to public needs. It must pull together our multiple resources and convert them into action.

The big job ahead is a job for all of us—every individual, every level of government, labor, management, professional organizations, welfare and civic groups, the technicians, and the man on the street.

Most basically, it is a job for politics—for the inner circle and the outer circle—because nothing at all will happen if we sit still.

We can't afford to sit still, and we don't intend to sit still. The past, for all its grandeur, is behind us. The present—tomorrow—will slip into the past. From the past and the present we must mold the future. We are responsible for its shape, its condition, and the promises that it holds for all mankind.

It is the job of politics to anticipate the future, to seek out opportunities for progress and to propel the Nation forward.

It is the job of politics to resolve the differences that divide and tend to immobilize us.

It is the job of politics to convert ideas into energy and energy into action, so that progress is possible and the future can be secure.

Politics, in turn, is led by parties, each of which has chosen a different path to the future.

Today, we know where we are going, and, with your help and the help of millions of others throughout the country, we will get there. We have purpose, we have energy, we have leadership.

These are three of the essential elements of progress, but there is still a fourth, and that is action.

When we can galvanize our forces into action, only then can we say that we, as a party, and we, as politicians, and as citizens have fulfilled our responsibilities to the Nation—and to ourselves.

I am confident that we will not be found remiss.

Communist Threat in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all the Members of the House share

my concern regarding reports that the arms and troops sent to Cuba by the Russians will be used to bring other Latin American nations into the Communist fold. I think we also agree that the United States cannot tolerate this situation.

It is doubtful that we realize just how serious this problem is at the present time, but there are people who have first-hand information regarding the ways in which Castro is working to achieve his objective. The words of these informed officials should be carefully considered by all of us now—before it is too late.

The Baltimore Afro-American and the Baltimore Sun reporters have had personal interviews with such an enlightened official of Haiti, Dr. Roger Rigaud. Under unanimous consent, I include these articles at this point in the RECORD and urge all Members of the House to carefully consider Dr. Rigaud's timely warnings:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 25, 1963]

U.S. AID ASKED IN OUSTER OF HAITI REGIME

An exiled Haitian political leader last night called for U.S. aid in toppling his country's dictatorship, but said that strong organization is needed to insure the birth of a democratic government.

Dr. Roger Rigaud, a former member of the Haitian Cabinet who was in Baltimore visiting friends, said in an interview that native Haitians are now being trained in Cuba and sent to their homeland to prepare for a leftist takeover.

Dr. Rigaud asserted that there are enough pro-Western leaders in and outside Haiti to form a democratic government, "but we have to organize."

COLLAPSE REPORTED NEAR

Recent reports from the island nation have suggested the 5-year dictatorship of President Francois Duvalier is about to collapse, and that Duvalier may leave the island this spring.

Dr. Rigaud, who has been in exile in the United States since 1958, was not confident that the Duvalier regime will fall so quickly under present circumstances.

But he indicated that "it will collapse without American foreign aid * * * once we are organized.

"The United States has given $40 million in aid to Haiti since Duvalier took power," he said.

"But the State Department people who have helped Duvalier for so long do not want to recognize * * * that he is a man without allegiance to Western ideals."

TRAINING 70,000

Dr. Rigaud said Cuba is training some of the 70,000 Haitians that now live on the Communist island, to facilitate a leftist takeover in Haiti.

"These people, or their parents, went to Cuba in 1924, when unemployment was high in Haiti," he explained.

"I saw some of them in 1955. They all speak Creole (the native language of Haiti), and many still have relatives in Haiti, whom they can return to as agents.

"These are the people Castro is training and sending into Haiti to organize leftist support," he asserted.

"And the peasants, who have no education, are easily swayed. That is why we must be strongly organized."

Dr. Rigaud went on to describe President Duvalier as an orphan of the Communist bloc, full of Marxist-Leninist ideals without opportunity to express his views.

The paradox of Communist Cuba subverting a government headed by a dictator who secretly is a Communist, was explained by Dr. Rigaud in the following manner:

"He could not stay in power without foreign aid and Moscow apparently was not willing to invest heavily in a country without any advanced industry."

NOTHING TO TAKE OVER

"Russian technicians could take over the operation of Cuba's industry. In Haiti there is nothing to take over. We are an agricultural nation.

"So Duvalier did not proclaim his views, and turned to the United States for aid, just as Castro did in the beginning," he said.

However, he continued, Moscow is willing to see a Marxist-Leninist regime established in Haiti "through Cuba * * * by native cadres trained to build communism" in a primitive country in the process of developing.

These cadres would gain the Russians another foothold in the Caribbean without the political or economic price of direct involvement, he said.

[From the Baltimore Afro-American, Jan. 19, 1963]

HAITI SEEN AS NEXT CASTRO TROUBLE SPOT

(By George W. Collins)

Haiti is destined to become the next stronghold of Castro communism in the Caribbean, a former Haitian government official in exile predicted here last week.

Dr. Roger Rigaud, 49, leader of the Haitian Nationalist, underground movement, made the prediction while promising to overthrow the regime of President Francoise Duvalier, dictator of the island country.

"Duvalier will be destroyed," Dr. Rigaud vowed. "Of this I have no doubt. But what worries me is whether the underground will beat Castro to it."

In an interview with the Afro while visiting Baltimore last week, Dr. Rigaud said many of the 70,000 Haitians now naturalized as Cuban citizens, are returning to Haiti.

They are blindly loyal to Premier Fidel Castro and are dedicated to the proposition of delivering Haiti into the hands of the bearded dictator, the rebel leader declared.

His countrymen were attracted to Cuba by the sugarcane boon, which gave the man opportunity to "at least" earn bread, "something they didn't get under Duvalier," Dr. Rigaud added.

"To them Castro is their savior and they will do anything he wants them to," the former Cabinet minister went on.

President Duvalier, who ascended to power in 1957 when former President Paul E. Magloire was ousted, is an unwitting partner to the Communist takeover, according to Dr. Rigaud.

"He already has lead country to ruin. The economy has completely collapsed. All technicians have fled the country just as most former Government officials.

"Illiteracy, poverty, and corruption are all that's left of once great land," the undergroun dleader said, shaking his head.

"Now Duvalier is giving it to the Communists," he added.

The President and tyrant, has appointed known Reds in key Government positions, Dr. Rigaud said.

They are Jules Blanche and Henve Boyer, Budget Chief and Minister of Finance, respectively, according to the freedom fighter.

U.S. Ambassador to Haiti, Raymond Thruston, confirmed this last month when he announced that President Duvalier has known Communists in his Cabinet.

Dr. Rigaurd declared that Mr. Duvalier and Premier Castro are close friends and have been since the former entered a secret agreement with the Cuban dictator following an equally secret visit to Cuba last year.

Castro's brother Raul spent a week in Haiti laying the groundwork for the Red coup, Dr. Rigaud declared.

Dr. Rigaud, who has lived in exile since 1957, said there is only one way to save his country from the hands of the Communists—that the underground rebellion must succeed.

Dr. Rigaud has been selected as official spokesman for the movement and has traveled extensively, spreading propaganda and soliciting support. He says the movement now is more popular than ever.

He's a graduate of St. Louis DeGonzaga University where he said he earned his undergraduate degree and his master and doctor degrees from the university's schools of law and commerce.

While seeking aid and support in this area, Dr. Rigaud also was interviewed by Lou Corbin of WFBR radio, which broadcast his views on its "Issues in the Air" program twice Sunday.

Dr. Rigaud said President Duvalier has squandered U.S. aid and has designated himself as President each time an election was scheduled to be held.

"He has corrupted the army, police, and all other agencies of government to the point where a few soldiers and key officials can live in luxury while most Haitians can hardly earn $5 per year," Dr. Rigaud declared bitterly.

The rebel leader predicted that "there will be bloodshed in Haiti by next May." That's when elections are scheduled he said, and the Nationalists are planning the revolution to coincide with the election.

"We have no choice," he said, "and if we don't succeed, the Communists will."

After leaving the Haitian Army as a lieutenant in 1937, Dr. Rigaud said he held several Government posts before being forced into exile.

From 1942 until 1952, he served as general secretary of the National Defense and Interior Departments, prefect (equivalent to governor), Inspector General of Border Frontier, General Inspector of Legation and Consulates, Minister of the Departments of Interior and Defense and delegate, he reported. His family is still in Haiti.

A committee of Haitian underground leaders was formed in this area last week, he said, and is made up of freedom fighters in exile here and other countries.

Kennedy Policies Hurt Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of February 18, 1963:

KENNEDY POLICIES HURT ECONOMY—PLANNED BUDGET DEFICIT, TAX REFORMS SEEN CAUSING UNCERTAINTY IN BUSINESS

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has just told the country that his tax proposals must be adopted by Congress to prevent a recession. But, due largely to psychological factors, the recession has already begun. The only question now is how deep it is going to get and how long it will last.

The recession started when the President announced that he was deliberately planning a budget deficit in addition to the deficit al-

ready being incurred. Momentum was added when the President declared that, coincidentally, taxes would be raised by so-called reforms and that the reduction in tax rates would be spread over 3 years.

This combination of giving and then taking away much of what is given frightened business, especially since there was no sign of any policy to stop the spending spree of the Government. Projects that could readily be postponed—new appropriations—were urged just the same by the President, irrespective of their impact on the fiscal condition of the country.

Today labor calls the tax program inadequate. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce favors a tax cut but insists on a reduction in Government spending as well. Economists are nervous. Investors are cautious.

Tax changes of major proportions involving a planned deficit are similar to a surgical operation. Sometimes the patient gets worse and sometimes he recovers. But nobody ever plans an operation on the body that he really doesn't need—or a deficit that he can't afford.

A tax cut by itself would be a stimulus to business. But if unaccompanied by corresponding savings of a substantial amount in the budget, it causes fear of inflation. This means upward price changes and instability due to a decline in the purchasing power of the dollar.

What has happened in the last 30 days is that, upon reading the President's tax proposals, business became confused. Uncertainty developed. Hesitation is an inevitable sequel. Only those expenditures in which commitments have already been made are carried out. Anything that can be deferred is postponed indefinitely. A wait-and-see attitude ensues. Business doesn't usually operate on a 3-year basis, and neither do most individuals. It's the 10 or 12 months ahead that constitute the main horizon.

Tax cuts are always helpful, but they can be ruinous to the fiscal soundness of the Nation unless expenses are cut, too. It may be puritanic, as one of Mr. Kennedy's advisers termed it, to balance the budget, but the American people want to see a trend in that direction instead of away from it.

The President often asks critics for alternatives. A program of tax cuts plus a program of economies in spending appears to be the only answer to Mr. Kennedy's dilemma. Tax reforms should be postponed. Most important of all now is the necessity for the administration to recognize the danger and meet it at once before the recession intensifies.

A persuasive example of how dangerous tax reform can be is already available. The Democratic Party in Congress is just as much responsible for the blunder in this case as is the President. Carelessly and without weighing the consequences, Congress passed the new law on expense-account deductions, phrased in vague language. The Treasury has recently interpreted these vague phrases, and this has brought depression in the restaurant and hotel business. But, it will be said, that's a small part of the economy. The facts, however, prove how short-sighted such a view can be.

For over the week end Clyde Davis, president of the Chicago Livestock Exchange, made a speech in Chicago declaring that cattle prices have suffered their worst setback in years. He said a wide combination of developments has hit the cattle and beef market almost simultaneously in the last 3 months. The dock strike hurt, too, Foreign beef came in last year at a record-breaking pace. Finally tax rulings curbed business dinners and entertainment expenses in business, which in turn caused a cut in the buying of top beef by some of the higher-priced restaurants and hotels. It was the straw that broke the cattle market's back. Mr. Davis said:

"The tax ruling on expense accounts makes it more difficult to wine and dine customers. This development is becoming a more important factor in the depressed beef markets."

Certainly cheating on expense accounts is reprehensible, but the Government ought surely to be able to catch up with fraud without penalizing innocent citizens and injuring the cattle business, the hotel business, the restaurant business, and related trades and industries.

This is but one illustration. Already churches, colleges, and other charitable institutions are worried about contributions because of the 5 percent floor on individual tax deductions. Far from stimulating consumer spending, the administration's program may cause the citizen to stop some of his spending.

To keep the people uncertain about tax rates and reforms proposals, the quicker the new recession will end. There is time enough in periods of prosperity to make reforms. What is immediately urgent is to stop the new recession in its tracks.

Plain Talk on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of restoring freedom to the Cuban people, I would like to emphasize the value of the service performed by the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. This Maryland educator, author, and diplomate was the first university professor to identify the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raúl, for what they were and are. In other words, while many other intellectuals were loud in their applause for Fidel and Raúl Castro, Dr. Thorning was recording the facts about their background and previous record.

Moreover, on September 26, 1962, when many U.S. officials were unaware of what was transpiring in Fidel Castro's Cuba, Dr. Thorning gave an address in the Visitation Academy, Frederick, in which he clearly outlined the status of Cuba as "a stationary aircraft carrier for Red fascism." The Maryland priest-scholar added that Chairman Nikita Khrushchev, "upon consolidation of his empire in Cuba," would be "threatening to unleash thermonuclear annihilation upon the White House and State Department."

More than 2 years ago, Dr. Thorning called for the recognition of a Cuban Government-in-exile and a courageous decision to halt Soviet tankers on the high seas. It is his judgment that, sooner or later, the dangers inherent in a program of rhetoric, rather than action, must be faced. He is confident that Fidel Castro's Cuba, situated on the periphery of Mr. Khrushchev's Soviet empire, is too far away and too difficult to defend for the Kremlin bosses to risk everything gained in the past 40 years. Without oil and other petroleum products, the whole economy of Castro's Cuba is bound to grind to a halt.

On October 20, 1962, 2 days before President John F. Kennedy delivered his speech on the Cuban situation, Human Events, a Washington newsletter, quoted the following statement by Dr. Thorning:

Castro's Cuba is a missile and rocket base for the ever-expanding Soviet empire. Now it is time to consider any and all measures that can stop the flow of Soviet oil into the Soviet-armed camp immediately off our shores.

He added:

To talk about the difference between defensive and offensive weapons in the current crisis is to forget that threats, backed by armed might, are an essential element in Soviet conquest.

On October 21, 1962, the Register System of Newspapers, with headquarters in Denver, Colo., carried Dr. Thorning's advice in its national edition. The editorial, captioned "Plain Talk on Cuba," reads as follows:

PLAIN TALK ON CUBA

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, who predicted the abortive Communist putsch in Guatemala in 1954, months before it happened, was one of the few students of inter-American affairs never fooled by Castro, and who predicted Red Chinese intervention in Cuba, declared in a recent address that "White House and State Department officials must seize the initiative within the next 6 months or else accept the status of second-rate factors in the life-and-death struggle now taking place on a global scale."

The Maryland educator, who knows his history as few commentators do, made this telling point:

Cuba is a missile and rocket base for the ever-expanding Soviet Empire. Hitler never dared to move into the Caribbean except with Nazi submarines. Thanks to our own airbases in Cuba, Hitler's undersea raiders were sunk within sight of the Florida coast.

"Now it is time to consider any and all measures that can stop the flow of Soviet oil into the Soviet armed camp immediately off our shores. In another 6 months, Nikita Khrushchev, upon consolidation of his empire in Cuba, will be threatening to unleash thermonuclear annihilation upon the White House and State Department unless we agree to internationalize the Panama Canal. The dilemma our policymakers face is clear. Either continue a program of withdrawal, retreat, and eventual surrender of vital positions; or advance upon the Cuban spearhead of Soviet aggression."

Father Thorning, who has yet to be proved wrong, believes that a courageous decision to halt Soviet tankers on the high seas, even as we halted Nazi ships even before our declaration of war on Germany, will prove to all the world that Khrushchev's challenge has been understood and accepted. "Sooner or later, the dangers inherent in a program of action, rather than rhetoric, must be faced."

To this we add that we know what mere rhetoric cannot do. It cannot save Cuba. The law of self-defense is the natural law, the law of God.

The Result of Lavish Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Result of Lavish Spending" which appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESULT OF LAVISH SPENDING

The Keynes-Keyserling-Kennedy theories of spending ourselves into prosperity are a thousand years old. And the results haven't changed.

Philip K. Hitti, in his "Syria, a Short History," says of the Tulunid and Ikhshidid dynasties (A.D. 935–969):

"Both made lavish use of state moneys to curry favor with their subjects and thereby ruined the treasuries."

Trimester Plan for Secondary Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been deeply concerned with the ever-increasing burden imposed upon property owners by reason of the levy of a tax on real estate for educational purposes. With an easing of that load in mind I have examined with considerable interest the possibility of a greater utilization of existing plants by an extension of the school day, the school week, and particularly the school year. Plainly put, this would mean processing more students through a given facility and could and should result in increased compensation to teachers, who would assume additional duties and longer hours. It would, by the same tokens, obviate the ever-recurring demand for additional schoolrooms, laboratories, shops, and so forth.

One of my valued constituents, Mr. Bruce O. McCracken of Berwyn, Pa., has prepared a paper on this subject which I am pleased to submit and make a part of these remarks:

THE TRIMESTER PLAN IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Better education is an accepted must throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, however more of the same seems to be the accepted educational theme. More children, more schoolrooms, more teachers, more frills and, of course, more taxes. The time has come when we must examine the resources being utilized in light of the educational benefits being acquired by the students. The basic resources being consumed are tax dollars as they provide instructor and supervisory talents, facilities, and services; and the students' own valuable time, while the benefits being acquired can be measured only in terms of our collective educational accomplishments on a regional basis. For the purpose of this discussion, let us limit our thoughts to the secondary school years, grades 9 through 12, and assume that better utilization of our resources can provide a better education for our children.

Since many searching side excursions have been made in arriving at my conclusions, let me record them without much substantiation at this time, leaving the justification to be established on a point-by-point basis in a later paper or in personal discussions.

The drive for better schools is universally accepted if we discount those who question the existence of unnecessary educational frills. The efforts of those who strive for better schools are beset by the problems of too many children for existing facilities, inadequate schools in which to conduct classes, a shortage of qualified teachers, and inadequate funds to pay better salaries to teachers and school employees, etc., all of which significantly increase school budgets.

These conditions dictate higher taxation rates and, where possible, the development of a larger tax base to help distribute the tax burden. Past increases in the size of approved annual budgets and the successive increases in annual taxes stand at mute evidence of the inescapable obligations discharged by school directors. The present approach to secondary school education must be examined to find some means of attaining greater efficiency.

One plan for improving efficiency in our secondary schools could be modeled after the trimester system, utilized at the University of Pittsburgh since September 1959. In brief, this plan envisions three 15-week periods of instruction per year. A brief examination of the "School Laws of Pennsylvania," as presented in bulletin 2, dated December 1957, reveals that an instructional year consists of some 990 hours. Assuming the existing year could be subdivided into two equal parts, the half year would consist of 495 hours. With the previous definition of a 990-hour instructional year or 495-hour instructional half-year, the problem is to investigate the benefits to be gained by a 50-percent increase in instruction per year.

A 6¾-hour school day for a 15-week period would yield 506 hours of instruction time per trimester. The current school day at the Conestoga High School in the Paoli area school jointure is 6¼ hours. These facts are mentioned only to show the general feasibility of the proposal and not to suggest that this is the most suitable length for a school day. School administrative officials intimately acquainted with preparing school schedules should determine the best arrangement of class periods to optimize the benefits of the trimester plan.

Assuming, if we may, some degree of feasibility to the plan, let us examine its potentialities in solving some of our more critical problems. They are: classroom shortages, teacher shortages, higher teacher salaries, inadequately prepared college students, excessively heavy tax burdens, etc.

CLASSROOM SHORTAGES

The capacity of any school, at a given time, is determined by the number of instructional classrooms and the number of students that can be accommodated by each classroom. For the sake of this discussion, let us assume that we have a 4-year high school with 48 instructional classrooms, each of which can accommodate 25 pupils. Hence, the capacity of the school is 1,200 students. During a school year, each of those students normally would be given two 495-hour periods of instruction. Under a trimester plan, this same number of students could be given 50 percent more schooling, which immediately suggests the possibility of an accelerated program. In actual practice, two primary conditions could prevail throughout the year, both of which would materially alter classroom requirements.

Let us analyze the conditions where all students desire to accelerate their high school education by attending eight consecutive trimesters, covering a period of 2⅔ years. If the school population was such that there were 300 students for each grade or each year's student population, 2⅔ years student population would equal 800 students. Under these conditions, the 800 students would require only 32 instead of 48 instructional classrooms. Thus, we have a reduction in classroom needs of 16 for a 33⅓-percent decrease in classroom needs.

It is highly doubtful that all students would desire to complete their high school education in eight consecutive trimesters. Therefore, we should analyze the condition where the student body all desire to attend two trimesters per year and vacation during the other trimester. Assuming one-third of the student body would be absent from school during each trimester, the student body in attendance at any time would again be 800; hence, the same 32 instructional classrooms would be required for the current level of instruction and the same 33⅓-percent saving in classroom needs would exist.

It can be concluded, therefore, that any given high school could accommodate up to 50 perecnt more students, if a trimester program were adopted providing a relatively uniform number of students were in attendance during each of the trimesters of each year.

TEACHER SHORTAGES

The problem of teacher requirements is slightly different from that of classroom requirements, because a teacher should teach no more than a properly established number of instructional periods per day. If the instructional day is not increased in length, then the number of teachers required should remain the same. The current schoolday at the Conestoga High School in the Paoli Area School Jointure is 6¼ hours. This day is the same as the hypothetical day discussed earlier in the paper, so we should be able to assume a requirement for one-third less teachers, with the same teaching load. If the current teaching load is excessive, one could reduce the current teaching load as a step toward improving the quality of instruction.

HIGHER TEACHER SALARIES

A person who works a straight 40-hour week during 50 weeks per year, which allows 2 weeks vacation and eight paid holidays, works 1,936 hours per year. This, on a trimester basis, would be 645 hours. Most professional employees work something in excess of an 8-hour day which, to a degree, justifies the payment of a salary during slack work periods. The trimester plan could be compared as to hours of work with any other professional position, providing the hours of work fall within 500 to 700 hours per trimester. There is no doubt that a teaching requirement could be established to implement a trimester plan, consequently, the salaries of the lesser number of required teachers could be raised to the current industry level with a substantial saving in overall dollars budgeted for teacher salaries.

INADEQUATELY PREPARED COLLEGE STUDENTS

The secondary education of students all too often is geared to the abilities of the mediocre student, and the highly industrious student has little or no sound method by which he can complete the required program in a lesser period of time or complete a more comprehensive study program in the normal 4-year period. Both of these possibilities would be available to the dedicated student in a trimester program without depriving any student the opportunity of completing a minimum course in the normal high school period. The below average student would have the opportunity to take a lesser academic load or repeat up to 50 percent of his courses providing he were willing to attend 12 consecutive trimesters during a 4-year period. It is recognized that some administrative problems may result from these options; however, the problems could hardly be classified as insurmountable.

The benefits to all students in planning and in executing his own study program would relegate the administrative problems to minor significance. The principal advantage to the educational system would be that higher standards could be established and maintained without causing any student to lose more than 1 year's progress for having failed a course.

EXCESSIVELY HEAVY TAX BURDENS

The actual burden of taxes is hard to assess. For some people, doubling their taxes offers no problem—not even a slight inconvenience. To others who are already having financial problems, the same increase in taxes could well mean bankruptcy and a sheriff's sale. One thing is certain—the higher the taxes, the more sheriff's sales there will be. Lower or more stable taxes is a desirable goal providing equal or better benefits can be derived therefrom. The aforementioned and briefly discussed critical problems certainly provide basic thoughts for further examination. Our dedicated elected and appointed officials should be able to contribute substantial detail to these thoughts and take such action as is necessary to clear away the encumbering obstacles. This having been accomplished, any school district that was hard pressed could adopt the trimester plan as an economic means of meeting their obligations.

Red Rule Ruse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I inserted into the RECORD a report on Czechoslovakia compiled by the Czechoslovak National Council of America. It reported on the deteriorating conditions under the oppressive Communist regime, and detailed the ineffectiveness of Communist government in meeting the needs of its population.

I was especially gratified that an outstanding community newspaper in my district—the La Grange Suburban Life—also took note of this report. I am inserting the editorial into the RECORD as evidence of the growing nationwide interest in the suffering of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and the need for understanding within our own Government in pointing out the deficiencies of communism, rather than to blunder from crisis to crisis in response to Soviet pressure.

The editorial follows:

RED RULE RUSE

Old-country Czechs and their American relatives will be looking at Sunday with a great deal of sorrow. It is the 15th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia.

With Soviet assistance the domination is complete. At first the Reds atempted to deceive the world by solemnly declaring that the seizure was an act of a free people.

Because their hokum fooled no one the Communists now brazenly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the democratic government and how much they depended on Soviet help to do so.

Life in Czechoslovakia today is revealed in portions of letters by Czechs to American friends and relatives which have been compiled by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

If one is not young nor strong enough to queue up for hours from early morning for a ration of 4 ounces of butter and a pound of margarine she must go without.

Electricity is shut off early. Prague streets are dark. Trains are unheated. There is a fuel shortage.

In the mining town of Kladno, near Prague, people stand in line for 20 pounds of coal which they carry home in sacks, if they have sacks.

Water pipes are frozen, but former plumbers are not allowed to take house calls and repair the damage. People must wait until a government agency assigns a workman.

Since industry, farms, businesses, and professions have all been expropriated without compensation and are government owned and operated, agencies alone decide what should be done, by whom, for whom, and when, if at all.

Service to customers is poor as there is no business competition and personal initiative. One waits for weeks or months for a suit to be cleaned and shoes to be resoled. Quality is inferior.

Despite the fact that everyone who can is hard at work there is a scarcity of almost everything and prices are high, above the means of the average person.

The reason for this is the foreign policy of the Red Prague regime. Considerable economic aid is given to underdeveloped and neutral countries the Soviets are trying to woo.

For example, Castro is receiving Czech food, technical aid, and arms. In return Czechoslovakia is getting Cuban sugar, which it needs like it needs another hobnailed boot. The country has always been a heavy exporter of beet sugar.

But most of all the people lament their loss of freedom, a gift we have, take for granted, and treat lightly.

There's a lesson to be learned in the plight of Czechoslovakia and that of every Communist-dominated country.

The 1963 Armed Forces Chess Championship Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American Chess Foundation has recently announced its plans for the 1963 Armed Forces chess champion tournament to be held in Washington from October 12 to 19. This is one of the many fine programs that the foundation has established to encourage Americans to play chess, an ancient and fascinating game which has educational as well as recreational value. The Armed Forces program originated 4 years ago when the foundation, a nonprofit organization, received a grant from Thomas Emery, a World War I marine and internationally known chess player.

Since its initiation the program has been expanded to encourage participation by more members of our Armed Forces. This year there will be a special effort made to encourage players who have never entered competitions to earn ratings in order to be eligible to be considered for the Washington tournament.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the announcement of the coming tournament by the foundation which sponsors this program with the approval of the Department of Defense and the cooperation of the U.S. Chess Federation and the United Service Organizations.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1963 ARMED FORCES CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP TOURNAMENT

Outstanding chess players of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard will meet in Washington, October 12–19, 1963, for the fourth annual Armed Forces Chess Championship Tournament, it was announced today by the American Chess Foundation which sponsors the program with the approval of the Department of Defense and the cooperation of the U.S. Chess Federation and the United Service Organization (USO).

Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, will again head the honorary committee of flag officers. The other military services will be represented by Maj. Gen. Joe C. Lambert, the Adjutant General of the Army; Capt. (flag officer selectee) D. G. Irvine, assistant chief of naval personnel for education and training; Brig. Gen. Henry C. Huglin, USAF, Assistant Chief of Staff, North American Defense Command; and Rear Adm. George A. Knudsen, chief of personnel, U.S. Coast Guard.

Each of the military departments will issue instructions for the selection of their contenders for the 1963 championship. Five will be named by the Army, five will come from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and five will be selected in an Air Force tournament at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, August 26–31.

The chess awards program in the Armed Forces was initiated 4 years ago on a grant to the American Chess Foundation by Thomas Emery, World War I marine and internationally known chess player. The Armed Forces Chess Championship Trophy, which bears his name, is now held by the Army. In the 1962 tournament Army players placed first and second, Navy third, and two Air Force finalists tied for fourth.

In announcing the Honorary Committee and 1963 plans, the sponsors' spokesman, President Walter J. Fried of the American Chess Foundation, reported increasingly gratifying progress in the effort to develop and recognize star chess players in the Armed Forces. Much credit is due, he said, to the interest and encouragement expressed by civilian and military leaders who are aware of the educational and training value of chess as a recreational activity or intellectual exercise. In this connection he referred to a letter from Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara which read, in part:

"As a sometime chess player I can share your respect for the game as an educational tool as well as a recreational activity, in that it can be used to teach the importance of evaluating alternatives before making a decision.

"Obviously, this is a capability which should be developed, for individual as well as national consideration. Your organization has made a notable contribution by providing incentives for the development of this capability.

"The success attained in 1962 indicates that our educational and recreational authorities of the military services have taken appropriate action to generate interest and participate with a view toward producing more and better chess players. I am sure

these authorities will continue to cooperate in the future."

On the basis of this and similarly encouraging comments from members of the honorary committee and from other authorities in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as the Treasury Department on behalf of the Coast Guard, the sponsors anticipate that there will be more members of the services, commissioned and enlisted, in more class competitions during 1963 than ever before. This forecast stems from the knowledge that there are thousands of chess players in our defense forces at any time and as the game is inexpensive and easy to learn, becoming more complex as the player develops skill, more thousands are learning to play.

The sponsors are also aware of the fact that there are many exceptionally skilled players who for one reason or another have never played in competitions which would entitle them to U.S. Chess Federation ratings. A special effort will be made this year to encourage such unrated players to enter tournaments in their commands or in neighboring communities where there are chess clubs or similar groups, so that they may earn ratings which can be considered in the selection of finalists for the Washington tournament. Anyone on active duty in the Armed Forces is eligible to participate in the chess awards program.

Costs of the championship tournament are borne by the American Chess Foundation, as are the per diem expenses of the participants. In addition to the permanent Thomas Emery Championship Trophy, now held by the Army, the foundation provides silver cups for the players placing first, second, and third; silver medalions for all other finalists; and special recognition for the commands represented by the winners. Additionally, the Navy Times makes special awards to the top-ranking Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard players.

The American Chess Foundation is a chartered, nonprofit, educational organization, established to encourage Americans to play chess, to increase public understanding of the potentialities of this ancient game for intellectual development and scientific training purposes, and to produce formidable contenders for national and international honors.

Additional information regarding cooperation or participation in the Armed Forces Chess Awards program may be obtained from special service officers at military and naval commands, from local or regional representatives of the U.S. Chess Federation and the U.S.O., from the chess project officers at Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard headquarters in Washington, or from Sideny Wallach, Executive Director American Chess Foundation, 1372 Broadway, New York 18, N.Y.

(Names and addresses of the chess project officers and of the regional vice presidents of the U.S. Chess Federation are attached.)

ARMED FORCES CHESS PROJECT OFFICERS—1963

Miss Pat Abernethy, Recreation Section (AGPNPS), Personnel Services Support Division, The Adjutant General's Office, U.S. Army, Washington, D.C. (Oxford 5-5483).

Mr. Benny G. Lewis, Recreation Branch, Bureau of Naval Personnel, (Department of the Navy, 1804 Arlington Annex, Washington, D.C. (Oxford 4-1313).

Maj. Shelton D. Kem, Special Services Branch, Directorate of Military Personnel, U.S. Air Force, 1402 Building T-8, Washington, D.C. (Oxford 6-9391).

Maj. R. J. Randolph, Jr., Recreation Section, Special Services Branch, Personnel Department, U.S. Marine Corps, Henderson Hall, Washington, D.C. (Oxford 4-2450).

Lt. Comdr. James Randall, Chief, Special Services, U.S. Coast Guard, 1300 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. (Worth 4-2647).

U.S. CHESS FEDERATION—REGIONAL VICE PRESIDENTS—1963

New England: William H. C. Newberry, 233 Elm Street, West Haven, Conn.; James A. Burgess, 329 Adams, Dorchester, Mass.; Eli Bourdon, 1195 Hampden Street, Holyoke, Mass.

Eastern: Charles A. Keyser, 55 Laurel Avenue, Bloomfield, N.J.; David Hoffman, 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Allen Kaufman, 22-14 150th Street, Whitestone, N.Y.

Mid-Atlantic: Col. John D. Matheson, USA retired, 1512 North Highland, Arlington, Va.; Mordecai Treblow, 434 West Street, Bloomsburg, Pa.; William M. Byland, 1610 Bigelow Apartments, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Southern: Dr. Stuart Noblin, 805 Yarmouth Road, Raleigh, N.C.; Joseph G. Sullivan, Jr., 230 North Purdue, apartment 102, Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Prof. Lanneau L. Foster, 4600 Trenholm Road, Columbia, S.C.

Great Lakes: John J. O'Keefe, 1905 Cambridge Road, Ann Arbor, Mich.; F. W. Bauer, Box 98, New Burlington, Ohio; Dr. Howard Gaba, 17,238 Ohio, Detroit, Mich.

North Central: Frank Skoff, 4833 North Avers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Eva Aronson, 4058 Oketo Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. George V. D. Tiers, 165 South Cleveland Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

Southwestern: C. Harold Bone, 108 West Bayshore Drive, Baytown, Tex.; John R. Beitling, 3533 Genesee Street, Kansas City, Mo.; Juan J. Reid, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Pacific area: Henry Gross, 3544 Webster Street, San Francisco, Calif.; R. S. Vandenburg, 2316 Regan Avenue, Boise, Idaho; Mabel Burlingame, 2401 El Camino Real, Redwood City, Calif.

Extension of Impacted-Areas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to extend for 4 years the Federal aid to education bill for impacted areas. Massachusetts has received over $38 million in payments from the Federal grant to its school systems under the Impacted Area Act.

I have personally observed the significant assistance to schools in my congressional district resulting from Federal payments under the impacted-area law. The money received in cash benefits to the people of the Seventh Congressional District has amounted to approximately $2½ million. This in no small measure aided in keeping the local taxes from climbing higher than they are now. It seems clear to me that there is no logical reason why the Federal Government should not continue to reimburse local communities for taxes lost to municipalities from tax-free Federal installations.

Many of the provisions of the impacted-areas law will expire on June 30 of this year. This law must be extended if our school districts are to continue to provide necessary school services to schoolchildren residing in areas heavily impacted by Government employees. Action on my bill should be taken promptly so that school administrators may know what funds are available to them in planning their budget for the coming year. Without the assurance of Federal aid these school officials cannot make firm commitments for expenditures after June 1963.

New York City Public Schools Start Italian Language Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in New York City we have one of the finest advanced educational programs in the Nation. This is further evidenced by pilot projects in foreign languages in the elementary schools. To this program has now been added the study of the Italian language.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on this project from the February 1963 newsletter of the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc.

The article follows:

[From the FIADO Newsletter, February 1963]

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS START ITALIAN LANGUAGE STUDY

(Published by the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc.)

Three elementary public schools of the city of New York have begun instruction in the Italian language, it has been announced by Assistant Superintendent Truda T. Weil in charge of the foreign language program at the elementary level. The introduction of Italian fulfills a promise made by Dr. John B. King, deputy superintendent of schools, in September of 1962 to the officers of the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations that instruction in Italian would be included in the elementary school language laboratories experiment in the 1963 winter-spring semester.

The organized Italian classes are at Public School 41, 3352 Olinville Avenue, Bronx, Mary Zingaro, teacher; Public School 76, 900 Adee Avenue, Bronx, Rachael Troncone, teacher; and Public School 177, Avenue P and West First Street, Brooklyn, Iris Ida, teacher.

Board of education plans to extend the program in September 1963 to Public Schools 8 and 41 in Staten Island and the teachers will shortly be undergoing intensive training for teaching Italian.

The funds for this elementary school pilot project are shared equally by the city of New York and the Federal Government under allocations made available through the National Defense Education Act. The laboratories contain booths for each student with special equipment for listening and responding, tapes, phonograph records, and other devices. The program serves gifted children in grades 4, 5 and 6 and will be used by approximately 6,500 pupils for evaluation purposes.

Last September, four public school pilot laboratories in French and Spanish started in Public School 98, Manhattan; Public Schools 16 and 208 in Brooklyn; and Public School 173 in Queens. It was upon learning

that Italian had been excluded in the first experimental programs that the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations urged Dr. King to recommend instruction in Italian. Other communities with large Italian ethnic populations are expected to press for participation of the teaching of Italian in grade schools.

The New York school system is probably the first large American city to use laboratories to teach foreign languages in the elementary grades.

On higher levels, the language laboratory program has operated in New York City since 1959. It includes 24 laboratories in senior high schools and 12 laboratories in junior high schools, serving a total of 10,000 students, a board of education spokesman said.

Gordon Johnson Tells of Peace Corps Success in Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the work of the Peace Corps in the developing nations of Latin America, Asia, and Africa is full of success stories.

I recently received one from a friend, Gordon Johnson, who lives in Colombia. The report he gives so well illustrates the accomplishments of the dedicated and inspired members of the Peace Corps that I would like to share it with the House. An excerpt from his letter follows:

PEACE CORPS SUCCESS IN COLOMBIA

I arrived down here in Colombia last May with the mistaken notion, based on comments from friends in the States and some business associates in Bogotá, that, although Peace Corps people had hearts of gold, their usefulness in solving the basic problems they encounter in Latin America was quite limited. That their book learnin' about the social, political, philosophical problems is immense, but very little technical ability was available to solve immediately the agrarian and industrial reform programs. As one man put it: "They don't come down here to teach. They come down to learn."

It's so wonderful, in this case, to learn that I was wrong; that "expert" Gordon Johnson could learn from the Peace Corps, not teach, and that U.S. friends and Colombian business associates, although correct about hearts of gold, were incorrect about usefulness.

This Peace Corps boy, Terry Adcock, from Texas, has moved in on a very important problem that our company is afflicted with: low-quality coke for melting our iron. He has uncovered a source of cheap byproduct chemicals locally which can be used to purify coke at a cost of about 10 pesos per ton rather than the $10 per ton which it would cost if were to import the calcium chloride, which the book says we should be using.

He has set up a backyard laboratory for checking the uniformity of quality of the coke being produced; so that it doesn't go from real good to real bad. And, most important, he is training the local producers of coke in the why's and how's of these techniques so that they will be able to carry on after he returns to the States. This he has done, by moving up into the hills, where the coal for the coke is mined, and living with the problem.

Guys like this can and will prevent what happened in São Paulo, Brazil, a couple of years ago: The importation of the only coke they considered usable; that delightful stuff that only we enlightened gringos are capable of producing—from Philadelphia.

Keep up the good work that you and your fellow Members of the House are doing, HENRY. Send us lots of Terry Adcocks.

Springs Cotton Mills Makes Significant Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1963, in the city of New York, the Springs Mills, Inc., dedicated a building which marked a significant milestone in textile progress and textile foresight. In the heart of the garment district of New York, a South Carolina family, the Springs family, which has contributed its talents, its provisions, its know-how, its largess, and its love for the people who work in the Springs Mills in Lancaster, Chester, Fort Mill, and Kershaw, S.C., through the Springs Mills, Inc., had erected a magnificent and beautiful building, a credit to the ingenuity of this great family, a credit to South Carolina, the real recipients of their provision, and a credit to the city of New York.

I thought it significant as I sat in the audience attending the dedication ceremonies that we South Carolinians could pioneer in the garment district of New York what others have failed to pioneer.

The 21-story hexagonal building, with an exterior of aluminum and green tinted glass, is located at 104 West 40th Street, New York. Its beauty in design and appointment, is not only modern in every sense of the word, but evidences the courage, the determination, the imagination of the Springs Mills organization, its purpose as a significant part of the industry in the present, and the promise of leadership in the future. I was privileged to sit by one of the architects, Mr. Abramovitz, of the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz, and I hastened to compliment him on his work. He explained to me that the first floor will be a beautiful thoroughfare, between 39th and 40th Streets, and those who pass through will have the benefit of seeing the interior of this building and exhibits, giving information as to the beauty and fine texture of Springmaid products.

After the celebration, we were privileged to go on a tour of the second, third, fourth, and fifth floors, which will be occupied by the Springs Mills, Inc., organization. The interior equals the beauty of the design of the exterior. Everywhere we found employees happy in their new quarters, exhibiting the pride and hospitality that we have come to know of people who are privileged to work in the Springs Cotton Mills throughout South Carolina and elsewhere.

I felt it a privilege to be a guest and I know every other person felt the same way.

This is another monument to the late great and beloved Col. Elliott Springs, and to his family. I know they were and are proud of this culmination of his ingenuity. I listened with rapt attention to the remarks of President Hugh William Close, son-in-law of Colonel Springs, who today is the kind of magnificent and courageous leader in the textile industry that all admire and respect.

Under leave to extend my remarks I intend to include the remarks of President Close and the remarks of our beloved Gov. Donald Russell. Before I do, I want to point out a significant statement in the remarks of President Close:

> We are known as the largest producers of cotton cloth in the world. We are determined to keep that position, and we will continue to expand, with or without support from the Government. But, in order to do so we will need to go further into man-made fibers.

We have endeavored to warn those who grow cotton in this country that the two-price cotton system cannot continue to give cotton a position of favor in the textile plants of America. This significant statement by President Close tells us what the two-price cotton system is doing to force the textile mills of this Nation into the use of manmade fibers instead of cotton. The statement speaks for itself.

I enclose an article from the Columbia, S.C., State, of February 23, 1963, about the opening. I also include the remarks of President Close and the dedicatory address of the Honorable Donald Russell, Governor of the State of South Carolina:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Feb. 23, 1963]

SPRINGS COTTON MILLS WILL OPEN SKYSCRAPER

(By Ron Wenzell)

FORT MILL.—A long list of South Carolina dignitaries headed by Gov. Donald S. Russell will be in New York City next Wednesday for dedication ceremonies of the Springs Cotton Mills new skyscraper headquarters.

Governor Russell will make the dedicatory address at special ceremonies in the marble lobby of the 21-story hexagonal building.

Presiding at the dedication will be Hugh W. Close, president of Springs Mills and the Springs Cotton Mills.

The current Miss America, Jacquelyn Mayer, will be on hand to cut a gold ribbon officially opening the building and Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister emeritus of Christ Church Methodist of New York City, will pronounce the invocation.

The building, which wears an aluminum exterior with green-tinted glass, is located at 104 West 40th Street in the heart of New York's textile district.

It stretches an entire block between Broadway and Sixth Avenue adjacent to Bryant Park and has lobby entrances on 39th and 40th Streets.

Spring Mills will occupy the second, third, fourth and fifth floors of the 212,000-square-foot structure. The other 17 floors will be leased to companies in the textile trade and related fields.

An unusual feature of the building is a floating spiral stairway connecting the sec-

ond and third floors. The stairway winds around a central, tapered steel shaft supporting the treads.

Adding to the effect of the main reception area is a serpentine wall of vertical butternut wood paneling.

Charles F. Marshall, vice president of the Springs Cotton Mills in charge of engineering, supervised construction of the building. The architects were Harrison & Abramovitz, of New York, and George A. Fuller, of New York, was the builder. Beeston & Patterson, another New York firm, was in charge of interior design and planning.

The New York headquarters is one of four major building projects announced by the Springs organization in recent months.

A $1.5 million all-concrete warehouse was completed at Fort Lawn in September and two 40,000 spindle cotton mills are now under construction at Fort Lawn. The first is scheduled for completion in July and the other in September. Total cost for the mills will be about $15 million.

Among those attending the dedication ceremonies at New York will be: Governor and Mrs. Russell, South Carolina; Lt. Gov. and Mrs. Robert E. McNair; former South Carolina Governor and U.S. Secretary of State James F. Byrnes and Mrs. Byrnes; Congressman Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina Fifth District, the Honorable Paul R. Screvane, president of the New York City Council, Mrs. Close and Mrs. Frances Ley Springs, widow of Col. Elliott White Springs, president of the Springs organization for a quarter century until his death in 1959.

Other special guests include: State Senator Frank L. Roddey, of Lancaster County; State Senator Wilburg Grant, of Chester County, and State Senator Robert W. Hayes, of York County.

Five mayors, Luther G. Patterson, of Fort Mill; Ledelle Steele of Lancaster; R. D. Wilson, of Chester; Arthur Jones, of Kershaw; and W. R. Rhue of Fort Lawn and three chamber of commerce presidents, Joe P. Simpson, of Lancaster; Garrett Mobley, of Kershaw; and Bayles Mack, of Fort Mill, and Emmett Brunson, Jr., president of the Chester County Board of Commerce and Development.

REMARKS OF SOUTH CAROLINA GOV. DONALD RUSSELL

Mr. Close, officials of the Springs organization, and distinguished guests, we South Carolinians have journeyed to this fine metropolis of the North to help celebrate a milestone in the history of a South Carolina business firm. This sleek, modern edifice, rising from the sidewalks of midtown Manhattan, is an inspiring addition to the New York City skyline. No doubt it means much to America's famed financial and business center.

It means as much, or more, to South Carolina. For it signifies the tremendous successes achieved by one of our own, native industrial citizens. The products that will be merchandised from these headquarters are produced by the skillful talents of South Carolina workers.

In recent years, South Carolina and its neighbors in the Southeast have exerted tremendous efforts for industrialization. We have looked to the prosperous States of the North and Midwest and asked your business executives to consider South Carolina as a place for possible expansion. We have done this because we want our people to share fully in the prosperity of America. We want South Carolinians and southerners to have opportunity and challenge, the same opportunity and challenge that other Americans enjoy.

But there are those who create their own opportunities—and the Springs organization is a brilliant example of that. The history of this company tells us that it is possible for the South to do more in "up by the boostraps" progress. By this I mean that regional capital and regional brainpower can combine to provide new opportunities for southern people. We want to invite industrial expansion from other sections of the Nation. We need the new ideas, the new viewpoints, and the fresh vigor that come with people from beyond the borders of our State. But we in the South must not depend solely on the rest of the country to supply funds and ingenuity. We can hasten our achievement of the good life of the future by seizing opportunity when it arises locally and by creating opportunity when it is absent. We must act boldly—taking risks—and, in the manner of Springs Mills, build so that we can contribute to the rest of the Nation.

Even as we gather here to dedicate the New York headquarters building of Springs Mills, the executives of the Springs organization have outlined new areas of endeavor to insure its future growth. Here is an important example of the initiative and foresight which can come from southern minds, and which will be needed with ever-increasing intensity if we are to gain our rightful place in the economic framework of the United States.

Today is a proud day indeed for South Carolina, for we see one of our own business concerns helping to build a finer New York City. We want those who occupy this building to prosper and achieve great things. Many wonderful South Carolinians are depending on sales made in New York to preserve their production jobs in South Carolina.

The Springs Cotton Mills employs 12,500 persons in South Carolina. It pays wages exceeding $48 million per year. It has invested in South Carolina approximately $59 million in the last 10 years alone for modernization, expansion, new facilities and new machinery. It produces more than 500 million yards of finished cloth per year. It has sales of nearly $200 million per year. In 1961, Springs paid approximately 10 percent of the total corporate tax received by the State of South Carolina, ranking first as an industrial taxpayer in the State.

You can easily see that South Carolina has a real stake in the welfare of this company. So, too, does New York. Together Americans here and back home form a team that contributes to the well-being of all.

This partnership, as it were, of North and South is good. It is one of the things that makes our Nation great.

On this occasion, I pray that we shall all enjoy the mutual blessings of prosperity for ages to come.

Mr. Close, to you and to all the members of the Springs Corporate family—workers, salesmen, and executives—I extend my sincerest wishes for even greater successes in future years.

REMARKS OF HUGH WILLIAM CLOSE, PRESIDENT OF SPRINGS MILLS, INC.

Today is one of major significance to all Springs employees. After many years of growth we've reached the point where we enter a new phase of expansion in new surroundings and with new, modern plans for development in our second 75 years.

This building was envisioned by Col. Elliott Springs some time before his death in 1959, and he instructed Mr. Robert Amory to look for a proper location. This site was selected and the property purchased.

We engaged Harrison & Abramovitz as architects, and Messrs. Harrison, Abramovitz, Jack Hayes, and many others devoted their energies to the project of designing a unique, prestige office building on this L-shaped lot—a most difficult task. They struggled and brought forth these results which I believe you will agree couldn't be improved on.

George A. Fuller & Co. agreed to construct our building. The Maxine Elliott Theater was torn down, excavations were begun. However, as of last May, just 9 months ago, there was no steel above ground. We were scheduled to move during January 1963, but it just didn't seem possible. In fact many bets were made, and many hats and meals lost when we did move in on January 25. Because of the speed with which it went up, our building is spoken of in the construction trade as the "Miracle on 40th Street"—we owe more than a vote of thanks to Messrs. Crandall, Daley, Murphy, Cashman, etc., for their considerable contribution.

Our offices, which you will tour shortly, were designed by the firm of Beeston & Patterson. I think the results are outstanding. I believe you'll agree that Charles Beeston, Rushmore Patterson, Charles Murray, and others also outdid themselves.

Literally, hundreds of people are responsible for the success of this project. But none deserves as much credit as our "field general" and "whip carrier." I'd like to give special recognition to the man who coordinated this whole program from the first shovelful of dirt to the topping out from the stockroom to the executive bathroom. He has been loved and hated—depending upon the progress of the work, but he has been more than successful. I want in particular to salute our vice president and chief engineer of the Springs Cotton Mills, Mr. Charles F. Marshall.

Years of careful planning, astute financing, efficient manufacturing, aggressive and imaginative merchandising, and a continuing determination to keep Springs at the top of the industry, have brought us to this milestone. We can thank my forward-thinking predecessor, the renowned Col. Elliott Springs, for putting us in this enviable position. It is now our responsibility to "take the ball," and make our second 75 years just as successful.

We have the tools, our plants are modern, we have the capital, and our employees are loyal and able in all fields. We will complete two new cotton mills this year, and have just started on a major expansion of our finishing facilities. The success of all these manufacturing assets is dependent on our modern marketing ability.

Our new offices which you see here give our excellent selling organization the modern attractive efficient base they need to continue our progress. We are now known as the largest producers of cotton cloth in the world. We are determined to continue in that position in spite of the administration's failure to carry out its promise to eliminate the grossly unfair two-price cotton system. President Kennedy says we have a "unique burden," but he and the Congress have done nothing but increase that burden in spite of vigorous efforts on the part of a few individuals such as Congressman HEMPHILL who has consistently fought for fair treatment of our industry.

We will continue to expand, with or without support from the Government. But, in order to do so we will need to go further and further into manmade fibers. Springs is starting a synthetic program immediately. And we are studying several other avenues of textile diversification, both domestically and abroad. We are also further diversifying our organization by having Springs Mills, Inc., factor all of the sales of the Springs Cotton Mills, effective next Monday, March 4, 1963.

We are young for all our 75 years. We have the plants and the people to do the job for the future. Despite current obstacles, we're confident of success.

A Letter to Senators and Congressmen From Two Very Young Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from two of my youngest constituents, which I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only for the sheer enjoyment of all of you, but for the warm and rich feeling which I hope you will all receive from its pure simplicity. It is gratifying to know that our efforts in Congress are heralded by the very young, and that in these children, the leaders of tomorrow, we can see an example of the great future potential of our Nation.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX.
February 11, 1963.

DEAR SENATEMEN AND CONGRESSMEN: We can't be to your party tonight, Mom said there will be a lot of talkin and we'd be up too late. So, we want to write you a letter and maybe Dad will take it to you.

We don't understand everything that your job is, up in Washington, but from what we hear grownups say it must be just about the most hardest and biggest jobs in the world.

Our dad told us that when he was a young man and even had hair, that there was a big war and our United States had to drop A-bombs on other countries to stop the big war, and he said it was part of your job to try to stop our grownups from having fights with grownups from other countries; but, he said too, that if a big fight started that it was your job to see that our side had the best guns and bombs and not be caught sleeping.

We like to see rockets go way up in the sky. We watch them make trails in the sky nearly every day. We like to hear the airplanes make the big boom way up high. We're lucky to live in a place with so much blue sky, sunshine, and big flat places for things to land—it snows sometimes.

Dad says that you men are the ones who help send rockets and airplanes to our range to be tried out. He says that if the rockets and airplanes don't fly here that it will be a long, long time before the rest of the empty houses on our street will have other kids livin in them. It sure gets lonesome. Mom said that she could buy us the new shoes because dad rented two of our houses. If you had anything to do with that, thank you.

Our folks tell us not to expect somethin for nuthin, but they tell us too that if you get something good to sell, don't be bashful to tell people. From what everyone says we've got the best place in the whole world to fly rockets and land space capsules.

Dad told mom that you men in Washington sent part of his income tax money up to the Mescalero Indian Reservation to build some lakes so we can go fishing. Boy, we sure like fishing. Thanks.

We found out that you're going to send some more income-tax money to our town to help build a big dike up by the mountain. We won't be able to play in the water in the street anymore when it rains, but we heard a man say that it would stop water from getting in people's houses. That is good.

We went to a PTA meeting with Mom the other night and a man told how the Washington Congress helped build the nice school buildings we have in our town. The man said without your help us kids might be going to school in tents. That wouldn't be much fun. Thank you.

Dad says that you men are the ones that help older boys go to West Point and other military schools. He said you have been good about helping boys around here. We don't know many of these boys but we know Charlie Moore and thanks for helping him. We sure like Charlie. He'll make a good general.

When we were in the hospital they told us you even helped build that. It sure is nice.

You must be the busiest men in the world to help our State so much. We saw a man on TV that said that Congress had to look after the youth of tomorrow and keep our country free like George Washington did. If we're the youth of tomorrow, thanks for doing a good job.

In our prayers tonight we're going to ask God to help you.

Thanks again.

AUBREY DUNN, Jr.
K. O. DUNN.

P.S.—Santa brought us a moon base, with radar and space rockets, and satellites. Bet the grownups would sure like to have a real one here by next Christmas.

Clothing for the Community of Taraco, Peru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a few days ago I spoke to this body about the exploits of a group of students from Northwest Community College in Powell, Wyo. These students joined the current craze for 50-mile hikes but with one vital difference. They marched to emphasize the need for clothing for the community of Taraco, Peru, where a former college student body president is now a member of the Peace Corps.

Since I spoke to the Senate I have received accounts in the Powell Tribune concerning the march and a list of those who participated. Mr. President, this effort resulted in the collection of more than a ton of clothing. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Powell Tribune, an editorial from that paper and a list of participants be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Powell (Wyo.) Tribune of Feb. 19, 1963]

THORMAHLEN DOES 50 IN 10:42 HOURS—SUNDAY 50-MILE HIKE NETS TON OF CLOTHING

An estimated 45 students from Northwest Community College and Powell High School started lifting them up and putting them down on a 50-mile President's physical fitness march to Cody at 5 a.m. Sunday. Some 15 hours and 20 minutes later eight of them had crossed the finish line and the rest had called it quits.

Leading the pack was Bob Thormahlen, 27, an agriculture major at NWCC who was way out in front with a total elapsed time of 10 hours and 42 minutes.

At the end of the long, stretched-out column were two pretty NWCC coeds, one of them the sister of the boy who got the whole thing started. Romona VandeVeegaete, 19, of Powell, and Mary Ann "Gidget" O'Brien, 18, of Nassau, Bahama Islands, made the trip in 15 hours and 20 minutes. They were the only girls that made it.

Several weeks back Walt VandeVeegaete, serving with the Peace Corps in Taraco, Peru, wrote a former political science teacher of his at NWCC, John Hinckley, and asked if he would see what could be done about getting clothing for the natives of the village he was serving in.

Hinckley turned the job over to the student body of the college and the drive was kicked off. But it didn't do too well. It needed publicity Then the 50-mile hikes started sweeping the Nation.

It was a natural. At first 70 students signed up to go, but at 5 a.m. Sunday only 45 showed up. Three miles from Powell, on their way out, three dropped out. By Ralston a couple more decided hiking wasn't in their line, and by the time the group reached Cody 12 had secured rides back to Powell before entering the city.

But the trip was worth it. Waiting for the group was nearly one-half ton of clothing for their efforts in Cody. Powell people to date have added at least another half ton, and the drive is still going. Clothing is being accepted at NWCC and Hugo's Drive In on Coulter Avenue.

The original plan was to haul the clothes back to Powell on their backs. One look at the load and they all agreed it was too much and the clothes were hauled back to Powell in a pickup.

POWELL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT MAKES IT

Second across the line was Martin Timmons, 18, son of Mr. and Mrs. H. M. Timmons, of Powell. The Powell senior made the trip in 11 hours and 15 minutes.

Timmons said he didn't really know why he did it. He said he guessed to help out with the clothing drive, but mainly just to see if he could do it.

Asked if he would like to try the trip again sometime, the foot-weary youngster replied he wasn't going to do any walking for a long time.

Thormahlen, the winner, expressed about the same feelings on the subject of further walking. He said he didn't realize he was making such good time until he hit Cody.

"I took a 20-minute rest in Cody and started right back," Thormahlen said.

SENATOR M'GEE PRAISES STUDENTS

Senator GALE MCGEE hailed the 50-mile clothing march of the eight students as "an admirable combination of youthful exuberance and humanitarian dedication."

"I think that Wyoming can be proud that her students have made something worthwhile out of what would otherwise be just a rather exhausting stunt," he said.

He continued, "Those who fear that Americans have become soft and selfish had better take a good look at these Wyoming youngsters. The frontier spirit is still very much in evidence."

NAME OTHERS WHO FINISH HIKE

Between Thormahlen and the girls, four other students from the college made it across the line. They were Ron Groathouse of Pavillion, Michael Brabec of Deaver, John Jolly of Lovell, and Ken Syndergaard, of Powell.

[From the Powell (Wyo.) Tribune, of Feb. 19, 1963]

FRONTIER'S STILL HERE

The young people at Northwest Community College in Powell still have the frontier spirit of our early homesteaders.

At least some of them without adequate physical preparation, launched on a 50-mile walk marathon for a humanitarian purpose—to secure publicity for their project to accumulate sufficient clothing to send to Peru in answer to the plea of former classmate, Walter VandeVeegaete, now in the Peace Corps.

Letters from VandeVeegaete came to Keith Baird at the Polecat Printery and to John Hinckley, political science instructor at Northwest Community College, advising winter would be coming to Peru in a few months and clothing was badly needed in his community of Taraco. At that time, The Tribune publicized VandeVeegaete's letters.

But—there was no followup. No community organization got hold of the project to give it the needed boost. Professor Hinckley then laid the need before some of his students. They were enthusiastic. They wanted to help.

Then—along came J.F.K.'s fitness fad—and they grabbed it. Mayor Hugh Smith of Cody promised clothing from Cody, if college students would make the walk. They got the clothing—a whole half-ton load and this added to what they already have in Powell should make a ton or more ready for shipment to Peru.

Who's going to pay the freight on the clothing to Peru is the next question. Candidates or organizations step up front.

Those students who fell by the wayside because of blistered feet or cramped ligaments are no less heroes to the cause than those who completed the 50-mile walk. We hope no student is permanently injured by this effort.

Some would look on the whole episode as foolishness. Perhaps it was. However, in this jaded day of humanitarian causes, it sometimes takes a Madison Avenue publicity project to reach the minds and hearts of our citizens. And, if you neglected to get your clothing out before on this project—there is still time. Take it to Hugo's Drive-In, or to the college.

Out of the twoscore or more who started, two young women and six young men completed the 50-mile course.

Strangely enough, those who started the trip and those who finished the trip were not necessarily conditioned athletes or physical education majors.

They were a cross-section of the student body. They gave the project the publicity—the emphasis, to collect clothing for VandeVeegaete's plea.

Now readers, it's your turn. Let's get this clothing on the road to Peru.

Finalists order of finish

	Time
Robert Thormahlen	10 hours 42 minutes.
Martin Timmons	About 11½ hours.
Mike Brabec	About 12¼ hours.
Ron Groathouse	About 13 hours.
Ken Syndergaard	About 13½ hours.
John Jolley	About 14¼ hours.
Mary Ann O'Brien	15 hours 25 minutes.
Romona Vande Veegaete	15 hours 25 minutes.

Class	Area of study	Participants	Distance	School	Town
			Miles		
Freshman	Engineering	Edward Anderson	35	Northwest Community College	Powell.
Do	Teaching, secretarial	John Aylward	10	do	Chicago, Ill.
Sophomore	Teaching music	Tom Barber	25	do	Powell.
Do	Science education	Kay Beaver	25	do	Do.
Freshman	Business administration	Linda Blevins	25	do	Do.
Sophomore	Agricultural science	Mike Brabec	50	do	Deaver.
Do	Teaching, elementary	Minnie Colman	25	do	Cody.
		Dale Clifton	21		
		Wayne Dawson	25	do	Powell.
Freshman	Prelaw	Gene Fertig	40	do	Meeteetse.
Do	Physical education and agriculture.	Harold Farmer	25	Faculty	Powell.
Do	Education	Kenneth Good	25	Northwest Community College	Do.
Sophomore	Teaching, elementary	Joyce Green	1½	do	Do.
Do	Business administration	Ronald Groathouse	50	do	Pavillion.
Do	Engineering	Jerry Hettinger	25	do	Garland.
Freshman	Agriculture	Bill Holman	20	do	Cody.
		Harold Huggins	10		
Sophomore	Science	Edward Johnson	25	Northwest Community College	Garland.
Freshman	Liberal arts	John Jolley	50	do	Lovell.
Do	Business administration	Dave Kolesky	25	do	Bethlehem, Pa.
Do	Agriculture	Dale Kasinger	21	do	Powell.
Do	Business administration	Richard Krajczar	25	do	Freemansburg, Pa.
		John Kopp	45	On service leave	Powell.
Sophomore	Art education	Mitchial Lange	35	Northwest Community College	Do.
Do	Physical education	Paul Lewis	40	do	Cody.
Freshman	Education	Ann Neeley	25	do	Powell.
Do	Engineering	Dale Nordby	25	do	Do.
Sophomore	Arts and science	Patti Osborne	18	do	Garland.
Freshman	Agriculture	Orin Otto	35	do	Powell.
Sophomore	Teaching, secretarial	Mary Ann O'Brien	50	do	Nassau, New Providence, Bahamas.
Do	Education	Wally Petrie	25	do	Holstein, Nebr.
Freshman	Engineering	Nancy Pattison	1½	do	Pavillion.
Sophomore	Education	Susan Roderick	31	do	Powell.
Do	do	Larry Rockhold	21	do	Do.
Freshman	Wildlife management	Clark Stafford	40	do	Cody.
Do	Agriculture	Jim Shepard	25	do	Do.
Sophomore	Business administration	Sidney Smith	25	do	Powell.
Freshman	Education	Douglas Shumway	25	do	Do.
	History and English	Melvin Smith	25	Faculty	Do.
Freshman	Education	Kenneth Syndergaard	50	Northwest Community College	Do.
Sophomore	Agriculture	Robert Thormahlen	50	do	Do.
		Martin Timmons	50	Powell High School	Do.
Freshman	Engineering	Russell Underwood	25	Northwest Community College	Do.
Sophomore	Speech teaching	Ramona Vandeveegeate	50	do	Do.
Do	Business administration	Terry Wehrer	15	do	Do.
Do	Engineering	Russell Wiedekemp	31	do	Do.
			1,345		

A Fitting Tribute to Speaker McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a very touching tribute to our beloved Speaker, Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, by Barnee Breeskin upon introducing him as guest of honor at the Mardi Gras Ball at the Sheraton-Park Hotel on February 23:

Escorting our queen now is a man all America is proud to claim as her own, and whose unselfishness and devotion to public life has been a far-reaching influence to the leadership of the entire free world.

A man who personifies the American tradition that every individual shall have the opportunity to rise to whatever heights his talents will permit.

A man who, though he has risen to the second most powerful office in our land, has never ceased to speak, and to labor, for the less fortunate, among us, from whose ranks he, himself, came in the beginning.

A loyal, patriotic, dedicated American who has laid a life of incredible energy at the altar of public service.

A husband who has made a poem of more than 40 years of marriage.

This man once said, "I would like to be remembered as a great man and a good man, but if I had to choose, I would choose to be a good man."

My friends, that choice he does not have to make, for his life has been both good, and great.

A man whom we all love, trust, and admire * * * a truly great American * * * the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

A Transportation Plan for Metropolitan Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the January 1963 issue of American Motorist, a publication of the American Automobile Association.

The National Capital Transportation Agency issued its report to the President last November 1. It is supposed to publish the detailed recommendations and justifications in March and those who are concerned about the problem of mass transit in Washington look forward to seeing them.

The article follows:

REACTION

When the National Capital Transportation Agency sent its "Recommendations for Transportation in the National Capital Region" to the President, late last year, reaction to the proposals made therein was sharp and immediate.

For it was at once obvious that the recommendations were drastic * * * some said even unrealistically drastic. First, the National Capital Transportation Agency wanted to reduce the highway building programs in our area. Second, it proposed to establish here a fixed-rail transit-dominated transportation system.

It should be noted that, to date, something is lacking in the National Capital Transportation Agency approach to the problems of moving goods and people throughout our area. The report did not in any way substantiate its recommendations with figures and technical data * * * which will be contained in a subsequent report, not yet released. The report made no attempt to answer some of the most vital questions the Agency must have realized would have to be answered before any final decision could be made by anyone, whether Government official or private citizen.

Let us state, again and right here, the AAA's position on the transportation needs of the Washington metropolitan area. The AAA favors a balanced transportation system consisting of rail transit, highways which will carry transit buses, private autos, and commercial vehicles, and adequate parking for all vehicles, at the downtown terminus. No one segment of the system should be allowed to take precedence over the others. They are all important.

The newspapers and radio stations of the area were quick to see the serious shortcomings in the recommendations. Publications which had previously been indifferent, or even antagonistic, to AAA's pleas awakened to the real danger of overemphasis on subway and deemphasis on the highway system.

After enthusiastically reporting in its news columns on the proposed eight-line rail transit-subway system recommended in the report, the Washington Star took an editorial look at the proposals and qualified its enthusiasm.

From the Star of November 4, 1962:

"Whatever may be said of it—and it is apparent that a great many things will be—the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency does not suffer from any lack of confidence. Its grandiose $793 million subway crisscrossing the downtown and shooting off in all directions to the suburbs, would, if it were built, by a fine thing for Washington. No one disputes the fact that some superior form of transit is needed. * * * But to assert, as the National Capital Transportation Agency does, that commuters would choose to use this system in sufficient numbers to pay its entire capital and operating costs over the next 40 years is an astounding claim. There is no precedent in experience elsewhere to support it. To justify it, the National Capital Transportation Agency must supply more elaborating detail than its report contains.

"The section of the plan dealing with highways is another matter. For the National Capital Transportation Agency here has done more than simply curtail certain parts of the regional freeway system which has been carefully developed and generally approved for years. It has cut the heart out of this system—to such a degree, in fact, that the question arises as to whether the true intent might not be to make auomobile congestion so clearly intolerable, through inadequate highways, that commuters would have no alternative but to seek other forms of transportation that exist only on paper.

"The report says * * * that a Three Sisters Bridge is unnecessary. * * * What is the source of traffic estimates which allegedly support this assumption? How many automobiles will there be in relation to 'adequate' bridge capacity? How many people will use the transit line and where will they come from? The report does not say. This information is expected later on from the National Capital Transportation Agency.

"The most urgent question now, however, concerns the status of those currently-authorized highway projects which are in conflict with the National Capital Transportation Agency plan. In the face of mounting traffic, can the Washington area afford to hold up these projects for an indefinite period while awaiting a decision on a transit plan which may or may not be authorized by Congress and which, in any event, would not be operable for years? We do not think so."

The Washington Post immediately reported and commented upon the cutback in road construction, and devoted considerable editorial space to the program.

From the Post of October 27, a week before the report was released:

"In the Transportation Agency's report, it is already clear, we shall find the most optimistic and the most ambitious case that can be made for rail transit in Washington. This degree of advocacy is permissible, no doubt, so long as everyone realizes that he is reading advocacy. * * * The absence of a precedent is no reason, in itself, why this double feat [attract riders from their automobiles and return a sufficiently large operating profit to balance capital investment] cannot be carried out in Washington. Even if it might not succeed, that is no reason for not trying. * * * The time for caution arrives when their forecasts of extraordinary subway efficiency are used to attack the highway construction program. The city ought not to remove new highways from its building schedules before it has solid evidence in hand that they will not be needed."

Then, after the report had been released; the Post, November 2:

"The point to remember, in reading this report, is that the Transportation Agency hypothesizes a vastly more efficient subway than any now in existence. The question to ask is whether the city ought to reduce radically its highway construction schedules right away on faith that this subway would fulfill its designers' great hopes when it is completed in the middle 1970's. * * * If the Transportation Agency should be wrong and if its rail cars should prove less spectacularly popular than it forecasts, its planning would result in an economic and cultural disaster for Washington.

"The danger lies in the commuters' third choice. In the short run, he must either drive his car or ride the public transit. But in the long run, and that is what we are talking about, then he has a third choice. He can stay out of the city altogether. Employers * * * have already demonstrated their willingness to remove themselves to the suburbs, and these employers even include the Federal agencies the putative anchor of the downtown employment projection."

In another Post editorial:

"There should be no need to say that the National Capital Transportation Agency proposals will have to stand or fall on their merits. Any thought (by Mr. Stolzenbach or by anyone else) that the prospects for an elaborate rail-transit system might be enhanced by delaying highway construction until automobile congestion becomes intolerable is childishly ridiculous."

A special kind of editorial appeared on the front page of the Bethesda Tribune, a suburban daily, speaking for all the suburbs around the Nation's Capital.

From the Tribune of December 7, 1962:

"In all the torrent of reports, plans, and controversy concerning freeways for the city of Washington, far too little attention has been paid to the vital interest of suburbanites in adequate transportation for the entire metropolitan area. For many of us living outside the District line, trips to the city are a necessity, either for earning a living or doing business. Adequate transportation means both public and private transportation. For full service we need a certain amount of fixed-rail transit to aid in handling the rush-hour commuters together with a system of freeways serving buses and passenger cars around the clock. * * * There is need in our area for both rail and highway facilities. The money for the freeways is at hand, waiting to be spent. Money for a rapid rail system is dependent on future actions by Congress. Let's hope that eventually there will be a rail system in the area. Meanwhile, let us go forward with all speed in building the freeways so long overdue."

In a series of terse, to-the-point radio editorials, station WMAL made the following points between November 6 and December 1:

November 6: "The National Capital Transportation Agency has finally spoken its piece. We wish it had said more. * * * The Transportation Agency will release more information in a couple of months which will go into greater detail. But, currently, there is no demonstration the transit plan will work."

November 7: "Whether people will ride the rapid transit is one key to the validity of proposals by the National Capital Transportation Agency. Would people prefer to drive? The Transportation Agency indicates that high-income commuters are more likely to drive. * * * It seems to be a contradiction, therefore, to discover that two rail lines are proposed to run through Montgomery County, which has the highest per capita income in the Nation. Perhaps the Transportation Agency can support these proposals, but it doesn't do so in its report. * * *"

November 29: "The recent report by the National Capital Transportation Agency specifically cut out the proposed bridge across the Potomac at Three Sisters. * * * This deletion was based on the Agency traffic estimates which fail to show a need for the bridge, despite the fact that experts in both the District and Virginia highway departments believe the bridge to be necessary. * * * The District wants to complete the Potomac River Freeway up to Georgetown University. The Virginia highway department has decided to build to Route 266 into Spout Run Parkway on the south bank of the Potomac.

Both projects require connection via Three Sisters. Considering when these proposals were made, we think they demonstrate the faith of both highway departments in previous studies and traffic estimates. Further, it serves notice on the National Capital Transportation Agency that it will have to demonstrate the validity of its new conclusions and plans."

December 1: "It goes without saying to hope the supporting data is released quickly. However, it is important that it be thorough and complete. If the Transportation Agency fails to provide complete supporting data, it could be attacked by its opponents so vigorously that its plan may be lost."

And so on. Each newspaper and radio station has demonstrated that it has the best interests of the community as a whole in mind. Each has been fair and tried to point out that, while something must be done, it must not be done without supporting evidence. The question about the evidence keeps recurring, again and again: Can National Capital Transportation Agency possibly justify the cutback in highway construction? If so, where is the supporting data? What are the sources of the information on which its recommendations are based?

Until these questions are settled by the issuance of National Capital Transportation Agency's technical data sometime in the future, the community can make no judgment.

When the data is in and judgments are made, the answer the community is given by its experts and savants had better be right, or we are in real trouble.

Congressman and Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest recently in the problem of timing and contracts. Richard L. Lyons, the distinguished political analyst of the Washington Post, is to be commended for his excellent work in trying to put the matter into perspective. I am sure that my colleagues would like his excellent commentary included as part of the official RECORD.

The article follows:

TIPOFFS LET CONGRESSMEN ACCEPT CONTRACTS CREDIT—DEMOCRATS GET THE BREAKS

(By Richard L. Lyons)

The way it must look to constituents, their Congressmen are living marvels at landing fat Government contracts for their communities. Alas, all this is just part of a time-honored political illusion.

It works this way: When the Pentagon awards a contract or some other agency makes a grant, word is first flashed to the Members of Congress so they can announce the joyous news. Nowadays they try to find a Democrat to tell first. In Eisenhower days, Republicans got the break.

It doesn't matter that the Congressman may never have heard of the project. He telephones it to his local newspapers, which must report it as coming from the Congressman because the news is not generally released until he has had sufficient head start.

Federal aid is big news in most communities. After reading a few stories beginning "Congressman Blank announced today that the Navy has awarded a $5 million contract to * * *," voters might get the idea their man is a real ball of fire and should be reelected.

STANDARDS FOLLOWED

Congressmen spend a lot of time helping their constituents get a share of the Federal pie. But most of the awards would be made the same way if there were no Congressmen. Contracts, hopefully, are awarded on the basis of fixed standards, not contacts.

Civil servants in the administration say the practice of notifying Congressmen first is designed to save them from the embarrassment of being called by constituents to confirm an award they never knew about.

This would explain a simultaneous announcement to Congress, the contractor, and the public. It doesn't explain advance tipoffs of up to 4 days given to Congressmen ahead of the public, or the head start given members of the administration's party over the opposition.

MISTAKES CAN HAPPEN

Politicians in the administration make no bones about the fact that they have worked hard to educate agency officials to get the news to Democrats first. It is not without its headaches, they concede. Inevitably, an occasional muff sends the news first to a Republican who can profit from it. Sometimes feuding Democrats from the same State fight over getting the first tip.

The practice has been refined to the point that when a reporter following a tip recently asked a Washington area company if it had received a defense contract of newsworthy proportions, he was told it was true but that no details could be released until a Congressman had put out a press release. When it came, the release was a one-paragraph item containing little information beyond the name of the Congressman and the company and the money involved.

Most politicians probably accept all this as part of the game. The "ins" help their friends where they can. But some Republicans are screaming in protest that they didn't play the game as roughly as Democrats are playing it now.

OPPOSITION HEARD

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, said he thinks the practice of having Congressmen announce contract awards is bad, regardless of which party is in power, and even potentially corrupting. A businessman may get the idea that a Congressman can get him a contract, said CURTIS, and may contribute campaign funds in the hope that he will.

Representative CHARLES M. MATHIAS, Republican, of Maryland, complained about the practice in a House speech recently. He called it a confidence game in which the people's money is used to bamboozle them on a national scale into thinking their Congressmen are performing great feats.

MATHIAS was unhappy because when a Silver Spring company which he had been trying to help for 2 years finally received a Navy contract, the announcement was given to freshman Representative CARLTON R. SICKLES, who as Congressman at large was the only Democratic House Member who could claim any connection with MATHIAS' district. Furthermore, the announcement waited until a picture was taken of SICKLES congratulating the president of the lucky company.

Massachusetts Republican Congressmen have been near apoplexy ever since Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY rode into town on his campaign pledge that he "can do more for Massachusetts." Republicans said all the announcements were funneled through TEDDY and it looked as though he singlehandedly had won $100 million worth of Federal aid for Massachusetts before he was sworn in.

Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts, once received an announcement about a project for his district with an attached message stating: "You have a 4-day lead on this story." When his staff excitedly telephoned it to the local newspapers, they found TED KENNEDY had announced it the day before.

Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Republican, of Michigan, senior Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the defense budget, said he discovered last year that every time he tried to get such news out he found Michigan's Democratic Senators had beaten him to it.

FORD said he started noting the time of day these "advance" notices reached him—always hand delivered, sometimes by a commissioned officer, he said. He found they invariably came just too late for the deadline of afternoon newspapers in his district, but usually reached the Senators just in time to make it.

FORD finally sent off a sharp note to the Pentagon suggesting it was a waste of manpower to hand deliver notes that did him no good. They still come late.

Elderly Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Thursday 35 Senators joined me in introducing the administration's hospital insurance for the aged proposal. I would hope that as we proceed in the discussion of this important matter that we would do so with reasonableness and without acrimony.

A very fine article appeared in the Baltimore Sun on February 22 on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I should point out that in discussing the benefits, the editorial indicated that the benefits for hospital care could reach 90 days. Under the bill introduced on Thursday, the hospital care benefits range from 45 days with no deductible through 90 days with a maximum deductible of $90, or up to 180 days of hospital care with a deductible amounting to about $92.50.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELDERLY HEALTH CARE

Because the administration's bill providing for hospital and nursing care for the aged under social security failed of passage by Congress last year, the President's renewed request for such legislation is already being referred to in some dispatches as old hat. To the extent that Congressmen are familiar with the proposals perhaps it is. But the inference that because this particular plan was rejected (in the Senate by one vote) the problem has somehow been solved would be woefully wrong. There are in the United States today more than 17 million people over 65. As the President noted, the average single elderly person today lives on $20 a week, which runs out rapidly in necessary outlays for food, shelter, utilities and clothes. And the existing Kerr-Mills Act, providing some assistance to the indigent and medically indigent, is operative in only half the States—and affects only a little over half a million people.

In short, the problem of providing adequate hospital and nursing care without throwing prodigious burdens upon the children and relatives of the aged is still very much with us. To meet the need, the President recommends a program under which the costs would be financed by an additional tax of one quarter of 1 percent on both employer and employee on the first $5,200 of annual earnings. Major benefits would include up to 90 days of hospital care a year—with the patient paying $10 a day for the first 9 days to discourage casual and unnecessary hospitalization—and up to 180 days of care in a nursing home after transfer from a hospital.

The plan differs from that offered last year in a few essentials, notably a provision for coverage of the 1 person in 10 who reaches 65 but is not under social security and an alternative deductible provision to allow for somewhat longer hospital stays with the patient paying more of the cost Whether it is the right solution or whether some compromise in which the Federal Government played less of a role and voluntary groups did more may be open to debate. But before the debate starts up again it would be well to emphasize that some such plan is not socialized medicine; it provides only hospital and nursing care with limited diagnostic services, but does not cover regular medical and surgical fees or subject the medical profession to any sort of governmental control.

If this much can be granted by all concerned, the discussion of ways and means of bridging the gap between the limited means of the elderly and their need for tremendously costly hospital and nursing services can move ahead with more sense and less blind passion on both sides.

GOP Nuclear Test Panel Releases Second Report

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House conference committee on nuclear testing has prepared a summary of arguments pro and con regarding the wisdom of entering into any test ban agreement with the Soviet Union at this time. Assistance in preparing the compilation was obtained from such diverse organizations as the American Security Council and the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy. Most of the arguments pro and con listed in the report were contained in nine "expert's papers" submitted to the committee during the past 3 weeks by nationally known scientific and geopolitical experts.

The committee objective in its second report is to provide a fair statement of the issues as a guide for widespread and informed public discussion of the question of nuclear test bans in general. In its first report, the committee called on all Members of Congress to assume responsibility for encouraging such a public discussion, declaring "vital questions of U.S. national security are involved and Americans have a right to make their voices heard." It also called upon the Kennedy administration to declassify and disseminate seismic detection and other data pertinent to overall examination of the test ban issue.

The nuclear testing committee will continue to examine evidence before it and issue reports from time to time on the progress of the Geneva test ban negotiations.

These reports will be fair, but the constant retreats and concessions by Disarmament Administration Chief William C. Foster at the negotiating table must be expected to become the subject of the committee's very critical comment.

The second report is as follows:

SECOND REPORT TO THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE BY ITS COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR TESTING

In its first report your commitee described the prime U.S. objective of national survival as in direct conflict with communism's goal of worldwide domination. We expressed the valued judgment that a superior U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation is required to deter the Communists from initiating nuclear war to gain their objective quickly.

From this background the first report began examining whether the proposition of a nuclear test ban treaty could reduce the world's risks inherent in present conditions without creating new or different risks which would leave matters in a state worse than before.

Because Communists cannot be trusted to keep their treaty commitments, the first report specified certain minimum safeguards which must be contained in any nuclear test ban treaty. These are: (1) reasonable machinery to detect possible violations; (2) reasonable opportunity to inspect to determine if cheating has occured; and, (3) consequences not fatal to the victim if either cheating or surprise abrogation occurs.

The basis of present test ban negotiation between the United States, U.S.S.R. and United Kingdom were examined by the first report, found wanting in these safeguards, and demand was made upon the administration to upgrade the U.S. negotiating position. So far, this has not been done. On the contrary, more concessions to Soviet demands have been announced.

Demand also was made for declassification and dissemination of all seismic and other data required for informed public discussion of the test ban question. The basis for this demand was that the security and future of the Nation is concerned and, therefore, the people have a right to be informed and make their voices heard.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled public hearings early in March at which administration officials will testify concerning seismic detection. Whether this will amount to "a quick peek under the clean side of the rug" or forthright disclosures of limitations as well as capabilities in seismic detection remeains to be seen.

On the general question of whether any test ban treaty at all at the present time is in the national interest, the first report recommended Members of Congress of both parties assume responsibility to encourage widespread public discussion. It so recommended because test ban negotiations have dragged on for 5 listless years during which the Soviets twice have gained substantial advantages by surprise resumption of testing.

If Americans decide a treaty is in the national interest, it will facilitate achieving one. If they decide otherwise, it will facilitate breaking off negotiations. Informed, widespread public discussion is required to reach a decision.

As a guide for leading public discussion your committee promised to Members of Congress a summary of the arguments for and against a test ban treaty. It is set forth below. In compiling these arguments, your committee gratefully acknowledges the assistance and cooperation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy, the American Security Council, and the nine scientific and geopolitical experts who submitted expert's papers to your committee.

In evaluating test ban "pro" and "con" positions it must be kept in mind they pertain not to the inadequate and dangerous range of treaty terms now under negotiation, but to a hypothetical "enforceable" treaty—that is, one under terms of which cheating is less likely to occur than compliance. If such a treaty is achieveable it must be assumed the Soviet Union agrees to it because it finds it in its own national interest to do so. The reasonableness of such an assumption is not here examined. But respecting it, two relevant questions should be in mind while evaluating the "pro" and "con" arguments: (1) In what respects do Soviet national interests in this subject differ from our own?; (2) under what circumstances, if at all, does Marxist-Leninist dogma permit Communist leaders voluntarily to forego a means of achieving worldwide domination?

The compilation of "pro" and "con" positions follow:

I

Test ban treaty will slow the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries

Pro: Eleven nations in addition to those already possessing nuclear weapons (United States, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and France) have the necessary economic base, industrial capacity, and skilled manpower to launch at least a primitive program for nuclear weapons "in the near future," according to a recent study by Christopher Hohenemser. Among them are China, East Germany, and West Germany. The spread of nuclear weapons to any additional nations multiplies the chances of accidental war, tends to undermine existing military strategies, and increases the number of parties that must be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached. Nuclear testing is necessary before a nation can produce these weapons without outside assistance. While a test ban would not automatically prevent other nations from testing, the provision that additional governments should adhere to the agreement gives the original parties an opportunity to exert pressure at least on their own allies.

Con: The magnitude of present difficulties between the United States and France illustrates the naive of any belief that one nation can handle another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons. Red China amply has demonstrated its absolute refusal to be handled by the U.S.S.R. Attempts by the United States to handle its European allies by exerting pressure on them could strain NATO to the breaking point. The only practical way to control the danger of accidental war is to prevent the proliferation of nuclear warhead delivery systems. If a nuclear power is forced to develop its own characteristic national delivery system, then a mischiefmaking attacker may be identified and the attacked nation need not respond on the assumption general war has been initiated. This discrimination cannot be made from the explosion of a warhead—it can be made very quickly from the characteristics of the delivery vehicle which carried it. Similar reasoning applies to matters of military strategies and achieving arms control agreements.

II

Test ban treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons

Pro: According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster: "Without a treaty and with continued unlimited testing on both sides, there would be further increases by both in the efficiency of weapons at the higher yield end of the scale. Our advantage in small-weight, high-yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would enhance their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would eventually be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. Overall, the trend would be toward equality between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

"With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. The U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unsettled or undiscovered by both sides. The development of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period."

Con: There is no real assurance the United States has superiority in usable tactical weapons and Mr. Foster does not claim it for high-yield weapons. The Soviets have announced solution of the missile defense problem. Thus a test ban runs the risk of freezing U.S. technology in a position of inferiority. As the potential defender against an aggressor's first strike, U.S. national security can be based only on superiority in weaponry, particularly in anti-ICBM defense, which has not been achieved and can only be achieved by further coordinated development of both antimissile warheads and rockets to carry them.

If, as Mr. Foster argues, the United States presently has weapons superiority, then it exists because U.S. laboratories are able to win over U.S.S.R. laboratories in open competition. Mr. Foster's statement that under conditions of nontesting "our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period" implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Thus inevitably at some time the United States will become "second best." What happens then?

III

Test ban treaty will "open up" Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent

Pro: A test ban which includes provision for some detection machinery and onsite inspection in the Soviet Union has potential significance for progress in other areas of arms control and disarmament and for future relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. It would give both sides experience with inspection and permit us to appraise their cooperation, and, in the light of that appraisal, to estimate the cooperation which might be forthcoming in the verification of more significant agreements. It might also serve to "open" the Soviet Union to some extent and to help diminish the Soviets' fear that effective control is another name for espionage. It could lead to the development of a basis for confidence in other agreements.

Con: It is idle to think that a small number of stations and inspections on Soviet soil will have any significant impact upon the structure or attitudes of Soviet society. Certainly what the U.S.S.R. now seems to have in mind is considerably less than the United States originally had envisaged—and too little to accomplish this purpose. What is more, if the United States, in the interest of pious hopes now accepts a diluted, token version of international inspection to save face as it enters upon a treaty, the precedent which it will set will not be at all valuable, but highly dangerous and prejudicial to free world security in the future. Further, freezing present seismic detection technology into treaty terms will kill off development of detection devices which could be the future basis of a treaty in which genuine confidence could be placed.

IV

Test ban treaty will eliminate additional fallout

Pro: A test ban treaty should lead to the elimination of whatever danger exists from fallout from United States and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere.

Con: Only a treaty banning atmospheric testing is required to accomplish this end.

The United States stands ready to enter such a treaty, but the U.S.S.R. refuses—until it agrees, fallout from testing is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

V

Test ban treaty will create international good feeling and promote arms control and disarmament

Pro: In democratic countries, one of the main factors producing a sense of helplessness on the part of citizens has been the magnitude of the arms race. To people throughout the world who have passively observed the years of deadlock in disarmament negotiations a nuclear test ban agreement would restore a measure of confidence in the ability of governments to solve the complex problems of the nuclear-missile age. This confidence, once established, will facilitate the achievement of broader arms control and disarmament agreements. The test ban treaty is the significant first step toward resolution of nations' differences without war.

Con: Conclusion of a treaty in the near future almost certainly would lead to a popular overestimation of its political benefits and an underestimation of the strategic-military dangers which might lurk within it. It would likely generate euphoric pressures for speedy progress on disarmament schemes involving control arrangements which fall below the threshold of reliability required by national and international security interests. Western nations have learned to their regret that in a world divided by profound political ideological differences the manufacture of artificial goodwill can be productive of the most unwholesome consequences. Communists will enter no agreement which does not give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

VI

Test ban treaty risk from surprise abrogation is small

Pro: Secret preparations and surprise abrogation by the Soviets after a few years might leave us as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test. However, we can and will avoid this by a national policy to maintain readiness to test and to provide the funds necessary for this and for the incentive program necessary to keep competent scientists at work in the laboratories. This will minimize any possibility of a long Soviet headstart if the treaty breaks down.

Con: This is dangerously wishful thinking. There simply are no incentives our society can offer which will cause our creative scientists to stay with a dead end program. The Soviet society can arbitrarily assign its most creative minds to secret nuclear research and stimulate them with the reminder that article 49-o of the Soviet Constitution authorizes abrogation of any international agreement or treaty at any time unilaterally. The Soviets would gain a long lead, lengthened further by delays inherent in a democracy's decisionmaking machinery for test resumption.

VII

Test ban risk from possible cheating is small

Pro: Many important nuclear weapons principles can be studied with explosions of less than 3 kilotons and larger ones can be muffled by favorable underground formations or artificial decoupling. Such explosions may go undetected by the test ban treaty detection machinery.

However, such clandestine underground testing would be unsatisfactory for learning the kind of things which might change the military balance against us. According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster, little improvement in yield-to-weight ratios can be expected and pure fusion weapons would not be a great advantage to us because primarily they constitute only a cheaper substitute for weapons already in our stockpile. Moreover, testing in natural formations which muffle explosions is risky because it may produce a detectable surface depression, while artificial decoupling is time consuming and expensive.

Con: As stated by Mr. Foster, pure fusion weapons could be developed by clandestine underground testing below detectable yields. This would give the Soviets overwhelming nuclear superiority in both tactical weapons and antimissile warheads which can be used safely over their own country because they do not produce fallout. Yielding effective antimissile capability to the Soviets would nullify our retaliatory capacity and drastically change the military balance against us. The same is true with respect to fallout-free tactical weapons.

Additionally, unless and until we achieve fallout-free tactical pure fusion weapons, we do not possess weapons which are feasible and effective to use for the defense of our NATO and other allies against invasion of their homelands. Abandoning development of such weapons, when its drastic self-defense implications are realized, will surely place unbearable strain on the NATO alliance.

VIII

Miscellaneous arguments against test ban

The committee found the following additional arguments against a test ban treaty at the present time among the expert's papers which were not subject to classification under the preceding "Pro" and "Con" headings:

1. Defense Secretary McNamara recently testified to Congress that the Soviet Union is engaged on a large scale "hardening" program for its missile bases. This can only be met by U.S. retaliatory weapons of much greater yield than we now possess. We must test and achieve them, otherwise our retaliatory capacity will be too weak to deter the Kremlin.

2. Nuclear weaponry is a new science. So far it has produced weapons which are incapable of discrimination in their deadly effects. The field of weapons development ahead is toward discrimination in both yield and effects. Although war, if it should ever come, can never be made humane, it can be made considerably less inhumane if refinement of nuclear weapons is allowed to proceed.

3. Should cheating under a treaty be really known to occur, but not be proveable according to treaty terms, resultant tensions and apprehensions would create conditions more unstable and dangerous than the absence of any treaty at all.

4. Nuclear technology is here to stay. No treaty can foresee or limit future technological developments in nuclear physics. They cannot be frozen through the legal device of a treaty any more successfully than were earlier attempts to outlaw the science of medicine by dictatorial fiat. Nuclear tech-

nology is wedded to delivery systems and to defense systems. These stand at an early point on the development curve. No nation can afford for long to observe inhibitions on its national security interests, therefore no test ban treaty can be expected long to survive.

5. The operators of any system of detection or inspection will tend to become dominated by one or the other parties to the treaty, or just plain sloppy in their work, so the achievement of an enforceable treaty is no more than a dangerous illusion.

6. As a general proposition no treaty will cause the Soviets to do what they would not do in the absence of a treaty. The history of treaties entered into with the Soviet Union demonstrates that they bind, inhibit, or deter only the non-Soviet signatories. The Soviets, therefore, want and will sign a test ban treaty only if they calculate that it will give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Chairman.
LESLIE C. ARENDS.
WILLIAM E. MILLER.
MELVIN R. LAIRD.
CHARLES E. GOODELL.

Ex officio:

CHARLES A. HALLECK.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
GERALD R. FORD.

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial in the December 16, 1962, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune pointed out the need for balancing our desires for more and improved highways with the preservation of natural resources.

The editorial referred specifically to the problem of highway construction and damage to fishing streams. S. 468, cosponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and me, is designed to meet this problem as it relates to Federal-aid highway construction.

Our "Save Our Streams" legislation would require approval by the Secretary of the Interior of plans and specifications for Federal-aid highway construction that affects fish, wildlife, and recreation.

The Salt Lake Tribune editorial mentioned a survey I am conducting to determine the position of State fish and game officials with regard to my proposal.

Shortly after the adjournment of the 87th Congress, Mr. President, I sent questionnaires to fish and game management officers in each of the 50 States. Forty-six of the States have answered my questionnaire to date. Of the 46, 37 have responded affirmatively to the question, "Do you feel that additional legislation at the Federal or State levels is necessary to bring about a satisfactory degree of coordination of highway and wildlife conservation interests and objectives in your State?"

The results of my survey have convinced me that legislation is needed in this area if we are to preserve our national heritage of fish, wildlife, and recreation resources for future generations.

There is wide agreement among fish and game management officials regarding the need for legislation relating to this problem. This is a problem that we cannot afford to continue to ignore. Highway construction is taking its toll in permanent destruction of many superb fishing streams.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROADS VERSUS FISH AGAIN

Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, is seeking State-by-State information on the effects of highway construction on fish, wildlife, and recreation resources. Results of the survey, being conducted largely through State fish and game offices, will be submitted to the Senate Public Works Committee.

Presumably the survey will support Senator METCALF's proposal to require approval by the Secretary of Interior of all Federal-aid highway plans which involve fish, wildlife, and recreation.

A cause celebre in the conflict between the roadbuilders and esthetic-minded conservationists is the reconstruction of U.S. Highway 89 through Utah's scenic Logan Canyon in Cache National Forest. The second stretch of highway work along the Logan River (4.2 miles) was held up late last year pending a satisfactory agreement between the U.S. Forest Service, which must issue a permit before the road project can continue, and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads which seems to set policy in the construction of such Federal-aid projects.

METCALF reports that some fish and game officials confess their inability to persuade highway planners that streambeds should not be destroyed by new roads, and that gravel should not be dredged from streams for construction purposes.

The survey indicates that the Bureau of Public Roads will not approve extra costs involved in sparing streams and natural scenic areas. The Bureau, in turn, reports that the public has not indicated it would accept the additional costs. Senator METCALF has expressed hopes of breaking down the bureaucratic roadblock.

Utah conservationists should make known to congressional delegates and others their insistence that sports and esthetic values be preserved without unduly obstructing necessary construction work. Long-range planning is needed to minimize waste and damage to natural resources.

Building an Urban America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, spoke on Monday, February 25, 1963, on urban housing before 500 delegates of the 32d National Housing Conference, in Washington, D.C.

I was present when Senator WILLIAMS delivered his address on the problems and goals in the vital field of housing and found his speech enlightening and impressive. I request that the contents be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

BUILDING AN URBAN AMERICA

Since you all know that this is not expected to be what we call a housing year, I think this might be a good time to step back to take a broader look at some of the things going on in the development of an urban America.

You know, whenever I dip into the literature on urban living, I am always struck by the fact that fashions change in our attitudes here almost as often as they do in the field of dress designing.

One day we hear that our cities are doomed to a fate of creeping chaos and decay, that our monolithic suburbs will spread like amebae until they cover the face of the earth.

But as soon as enough people begin to agree, those elusive members of the urban establishment—always alert to new opinion-molding opportunities—begin to herald the dawn of a new and glorious urban age.

After all, isn't the Manhattan skyline breathtaking to behold? Doesn't Kalamazoo have a permanent pedestrian mall? We know that the city of Rochester has Victor Gruen and his specially designed downtown shopping center.

And isn't it true, as the always provocative Mr. Moses has written, that all the "little identical suburban boxes of average people represent a measure of success unheard of by hundreds of millions on other continents?"

If I may be pardoned a simple-minded observation on this running debate between our urban bears and our urban bulls, it seems clear that we have come quite a long way in building a better society for our citizens. And it seems equally clear that we have quite a way left to go before we achieve the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family—to say nothing of achieving communities that are both beautiful and just.

I think we can fairly say that there has been much expansiveness, physical improvement and prosperity in our urban endeavors—but almost no grandeur, no recognition that our surroundings are the outward reflection of our inner self-esteem.

The real question, however, is not how well or poorly we have done.

The question is where we are going.

THE GAPS AND THE GOAL

There are several ways of approaching this question. For one thing, we can try to measure the gap between what needs to be done and our present rate of progress.

In the field of housing, we know we are building about 1.4 million units a year, which must be stepped up to 2 million a year if we are to meet the needs of the 10 million new households that will be formed by 1970, and if we are to handle the additional influx of farm families into the urban areas, compensate for the houses that will be demolished, and eliminate the million and a half totally dilapidated and unredeemable housing units in the country.

In transportation, we know that we have about 70 million registered vehicles on the road today in the United States. In just 15 short years, this number is expected to rise to well over 115 million. Obviously we have a need for the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System.

Since outdoor recreation demand for Federal land and water resources alone will double by 1970, we must expand our park and

recreation facilities, with the help of the open-space program for urban areas and the President's new land and water conservation fund.

Our transit is deteriorating at the very time traffic congestion is becoming increasingly intolerable, and the magnitude of the problem certainly calls for the all-out effort that the administration's $500 million transit bill would trigger.

We have far more acres of slumland than we have cleared under the urban renewal program. We have far more ill-housed low-income families than we are providing homes for under the public housing and other moderate income housing programs. In fact, right here in Washington, there is a waiting list of about 4,000 for public housing at the present time. Yet only 29,000 units have been put under construction throughout the entire country since passage of the 1961 Housing Act.

And so it goes down the list.

But while we have to keep measuring the needs and present performance, and while we have to formulate legislative goals to fill the gap, pass the bills, administer the programs, clear the land, pour the concrete, and build the buildings, this is not enough.

At some point we have to step back and look at our work, what it all adds up to, where it is all leading us.

We need to because our individual efforts are not ends unto themselves. Building highways is not an end. Nor is clearing a slum, building a home, or acquiring a park.

They are all means to an end—the enjoyment of a better, more just, and fuller life by all the people who live and work in our urban communities.

If we are to achieve that goal, we must look beyond our immediate interests and broaden our horizons.

Above all, we must begin facing the hard issues involved in building a better urban America.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

And the hardest issue of all is the problem of racial and minority group discrimination. It permeates almost all our urban development activities.

The suburbs have become the pure white collars around central cities, which are rapidly becoming vast ghettos for Negroes and other outcast minority groups.

This overriding social problem compels us to ask ourselves: How many L.P.A.'s have presided over projects in our cities the purpose of which was more Negro removal than urban renewal?

How many times has the problem of discrimination rather than the goal of decent housing in a suitable environment led to the construction of stacks of high-rise public housing projects, concentrating thousands upon thousands of low-income and problem-ridden families in a wholly unnatural and isolated environment?

How many of our public transit systems are in trouble today because upper income breadwinners have fled to faraway suburbs and would rather endure the agony of traffic congestion in the privacy of their cars than ride with the lower class in a public conveyance?

RELOCATION

Another hard issue is the question of relocation. You really have to get out and talk to the people who have been caught in the maelstrom of massive change in our cities to appreciate the enormous impact forced relocation can have on these people, especially the elderly.

In the last few months I had an opportunity to do just that during the hearings we held around the country on the relocation problems of the elderly.

As a matter of fact, just last Friday I went down to a shanty town in Fairfax County in Virginia on what you might call a voluntary domestic peace corps mission to see if we could help fix up the shacks at least temporarily so that these Negro families would not have to be evicted immediately with no place else to go, because of violations of the building and health codes.

During our hearings on the west coast we talked to a 74-year-old man who was living in one of those 50-cent-a-night hotels in a skid row area, scheduled to be cleared by an urban renewal project.

We asked him where he would go when the hotel was torn down, and he replied, matter-of-factly, that he'd "go back under the bridge."

The thing that became clear to me from these hearings is that we really don't know very much about the people we are displacing through various Government actions. We don't know what the people are like, what their special needs may be, what their ties to the neighborhood are, and so forth.

As a result, the efforts we do make in relocation are often poorly geared to the needs of these people.

They don't take into account the fact that the forced relocation of these people can be a traumatic experience, especially for the elderly and people living in ethnic neighborhoods where the social ties are particularly strong.

As a matter of fact, I am forced to say that in far too many instances where relocation assistance is required, the officials do not treat the task of relocating people into decent housing in a suitable environment as a primary and positive objective of enlightened public policy. On the contrary, too many officials regard it as a plain nuisance, another cumbersome task to be dispensed with as quickly and painlessly as possible.

Needless to say, we have also been exceedingly remiss at the Federal level.

Because of the patchwork quality of our Federal laws, we have produced grossly inequitable situations where a family displaced by an urban renewal project gets a payment for moving expenses, advisory assistance and the assurance of safe, decent, and sanitary housing, while a family across the street, displaced by a public housing project or a Federal office building might get nothing but a kick in the pants.

For that reason, I intend to introduce legislation shortly to achieve uniformity in our relocation policies in the Federal programs that displace families.

PLANNING AND WORKABLE PROGRAMS

Next we come to the question of workable programs and comprehensive planning—and how we all worship at the altar of these two principles.

But who does not know of instances where communities have gotten Federal aid to hire an outside consultant to come in with his standard master plan—suitable for all purposes and all occasions—so that the community can then qualify for other Federal assistance?

Who does not know of instances when communities lying right in the path of explosive urban growth have seized upon comprehensive planning as a way of rationalizing the status quo, instead of as a way to honestly meet the problems of urban growth?

How many times has that most sacred of all forms of planning—regional planning—consisted of pasting together all the separate local plans on one big new regional map?

And how many housing and redevelopment agencies have fussed and fumed over the delays of their individual projects because the workable program requirements have not been met—requirements which must be met if individual housing or renewal projects are to have any real meaning and lasting value to the community?

And how many workable programs are themselves hollow documents, offered with a wink and accepted with a grimace for the sake of getting the project under way?

My point is simply that it is very easy to go through the form and motion in planning and developing workable programs without really facing up to the host of difficult issues floating like icebergs just beneath the surface.

URBAN LAND POLICY

Another very important area in which we have done almost nothing is the development of rational and effective urban land use policies.

Our metropolitan areas are exploding outward at a fantastic rate, wasting land in the most profligate way, compounding our transportation problems, driving costs for essential public facilities and services up to unnecessarily high levels, and pushing the open space of our countryside farther and farther away from more and more people.

The bold new world has become almost an endless maze of curvilinear streets and split-level houses, until no man is an entity, but merely a cipher in a vast environment.

Is it any wonder that people seem so apethic about what goes on around them?

I personally believe there are two values that are extremely important to us all as individuals.

One is a sense of identity with the community.

While this sense of identity still exists in some of our more prosperous and insular suburban communities, there are vast stretches in our metropolitan areas, especially in the gray areas, where a person might just as well say: "I live in town X which lies somewhere between towns Y and Z and you can tell when you get there if you look closely enough for the city limits sign that's located in the empty lot with all the billboards in it, right across the street from the gas station."

THE OTHER VALUE IS THE FREEDOM OF CHOICE

We tend to forget that the one great advantage to the organization of society into cities is choice—the choice of jobs that it offers, the choice of friends, the choice of shops, the choice of theaters, restaurants, cultural events, housing, sports, recreation. In short, the choice of diversity.

While the technological developments of transportation, the telephone, television and so forth, have expanded the range of our living and working environment without too much sacrifice in the freedom of choice, it seems clear to me that there are limits to this expansion, and always will be. When we go beyond these limits, we gravely restrict this freedom of choice.

There are a whole host of forces at work which are propelling our living environment out over the landscape, forces over which we, as individuals, do not have very much control.

For example, in my own State two-thirds of the vacant land within a 50-mile radius of New York City is zoned for single-family homes on half-acre lots or larger. Half of the land is zoned for 1-acre lots or larger.

This illustration is typical of just one of the many forces that are contributing to the chaotic dispersal of the urban environment.

Despite this, we have yet to develop at any level of Government effective urban land use policies which would guide and shape the pattern of growth so as to preserve the maximum amount of choice for the maximum number of people.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

I could go on to the problems we face in bringing the polluters of our air and our water to task, the problems we face in controlling those who are desecrating the face of our cities with atrocious architecture and

other works of appalling ugliness, from roadside slums to overhead utility lines. We could talk about how we are going to get anything more than lip service on the question of achieving coordination and cooperation among the innumerable political jurisdictions of our metropolitan areas in matters affecting the region as a whole.

These are just some of the issues we need to bring out into the open and look at squarely.

It was for that reason I wrote President Kennedy last December to urge that he hold a White House conference on urban problems—which has never before been held, despite the fact that two-thirds of the Nation's population is vitally affected by these problems. In fact, not since 1931 has there been a Presidential conference on the subject of housing, which is a major component of every community's environment.

Incidentally, I am delighted to see the leadership that the national housing conference has taken in urging such a conference.

My greatest hope is that a White House conference would help rally public concern for the problems of urban development so that we may hope for the day when we can say of this country's urban areas what Samuel Johnson said long ago of his city: "When a man is tired of London, he is tired of life."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Farmers: The Real Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the plight of the American farmer is a matter of drastic importance to every thinking citizen. The farm problem has remained unsolved for over 40 years now, and once again in this session the Congress will grapple with this vital issue. Mr. Peter Dorner, an agricultural economist at the University of Wisconsin, has written in the Nation, February 9, 1963, an article setting forth some of the basic facets of this problem that I think it is important the American people understand. While I do not agree necessarily with all of the proposals Mr. Dorner sets forth for solving the problems, I do believe that his statement of the problems as such is most illuminating. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS: THE REAL SURPLUS

(By Peter Dorner)

Each year Congress struggles with a seemingly insoluble dilemma known as the farm problem, a controversial public issue since the 1920's. Since then, numerous solutions have been proposed and many farm programs enacted. But the problem persists.

Fundamentally, the problem is one of economic reorganization. There are too many farmers on too many farms that are too small for profitable operation with modern machine technology. With shrinking profit margins per unit of output (declining prices and rising costs), income per farmer can be increased only by expanding the volume of sales. Productivity per farmworker is increased in large measure by investments in modern equipment. The productive potential of the equipment, in turn, is realized—and the farmer's income improved—by enlarging the farm. In recent years almost one-half of all land sales have been for farm enlargement purposes. Consequently, the number of farms declined over 30 percent in the 1950's.

Significantly, this reorganization of agriculture is more or less limited by the rate at which farmers are retiring. Once established, a farm family finds it increasingly difficult to leave the farm. With present high unemployment rates, opportunities for a farmer unskilled in industrial work are not very great. Given these conditions, we cannot expect a short-term solution. An industry consisting of more than 3 million firms, where mergers depend largely on family retirements, cannot be reorganized in a few short years; the process may take another generation or more.

Agriculture is involved in a technological revolution that is still gaining momentum. For example, in 1820, each farmworker could produce enough food for himself and four others. This figure was doubled by 1920; it was again doubled between 1920 and 1950. By 1961, each farmworker produced enough for himself and 26 others. It appears that the next doubling, therefore, will be achieved in a mere 15 years.

Present economic organization in farming is inconsistent with this new technology, and until this situation is remedied, effective production control will be difficult to achieve. It is only reasonable, therefore, to expect that farm surpluses will continue for many years. Production control is difficult for two reasons:

1. The enormous thrust of new machine technology, which can be employed efficiently only as output is expanded. This technology is developed outside the farm sector (farm-supply corporations and public experiment stations) and is available to all farmers. Some farmers can enlarge their farms and utilize the new technology effectively. But even those tied to small acreage are under great pressure to adopt the new techniques in an attempt to maintain their relative income position.

2. The great range of technological and farm-size conditions existing within any type of farming area. Over two-thirds of all commercial farms in this country have gross sales of less than $10,000 per year. Most of these are too small for economical operation with modern machine methods. Such farmers will find it difficult to accept major cutbacks in production, since they are striving for (and, in some cases, near to achieving) a size of unit which gives them a good income. And enlargement, as pointed out above, is possible only as some farmers retire and make land available for expansion.

Farm-support programs directed at raising prices to offset the losses resulting from effective production control are misdirected. The farm problem is not fudamentally a price problem; it is one of economic reorganization. Where reorganization is attained, the present price level, or even a lower one, may be quite satisfactory. Effective production control will also become feasible as reorganization becomes more widespread. Thus the degree of compulsion—and, consequently, of effectiveness—acceptable in a production-control program becomes a function of the progress in economic reorganization. On this basis, we should expect wider acceptance of an effective control program for wheat, where reorganization has progressed very rapidly, than for dairy farming, where the new technologies have yet to make their full impact.

A current view is that government is not providing farmers with enough withholding power, and the results are surpluses and declining prices. Experience of other industries is cited (e.g., steel and automobiles) to show that they meet the same problem by simply holding idle an appropriate proportion of their excess capacity. Agriculture, it is said, should follow this example.

Up to a point, the argument is valid. But pressing the analogy too far ignores the fact that the manufacturers of steel and automobiles have at present an economic organization consistent with their production technology. Thus an unqualified parallel between agriculture and these industries is unwarranted.

Price supports and production control must indeed be looked upon as the long-range programs. They will become more effective than they have been only after much of the present diversity in organizational circumstances has been reduced. Even then, they still will be required, since the differences in the competitive structure between farming and manufacturing will likely remain. In the meantime, programs directed at the farmers' price-income problem can be no more than a holding action to alleviate as much as possible the painful reorganization adjustments that must be made. We must continue to control production as best we can, but we should not expect a quick solution.

It follows that a reduction in farm-program costs is unlikely. These costs cannot really be eliminated; they can only be shifted from one group in society to another. Greater reliance on free-market forces and lower prices shifts the burden to the farmer-producer. A movement in the direction of more rigid production controls and higher prices shifts the cost onto the consumer's grocery bill. In the latter case, while Government costs of supporting farm prices would be reduced, Government costs of maintaining prevent volume of exports would be increased. Over one-half of all agricultural exports are already subsidized; with higher domestic prices, subsidies would then go up.

Present policy shifts part of the cost of farm-support programs to the consumer through higher prices at the store; another part is shifted to the U.S. Treasury to be paid from taxes. This is a reasonable arrangement, quite consistent with our basic principle of progressive taxation. Shifting the entire cost to consumers via the grocery bill would be regressive—a disproportionate share being borne by the lower income groups. By shifting a significant part of the cost onto the general taxpaying public, the progressive principle operates—payment in accordance with ability to pay.

Actually, present preoccupation with reducing the Government cost of farm programs is misdirected effort—although, of course, it would be welcomed if all Government expenditures could be reduced. Paying taxes is an onerous task. But this is not the issue. The real question is whether Government price-support programs, when added to the consumer's grocery bill, have resulted in a disproportionate increase in the price of farm products.

In 1950, the cost per person of farm products at farm prices was $187. In 1960, it was $189, an increase of slightly over 1 percent. This is a negligible increase in light of the greater 1960 per capita consumption of total farm products, and especially the increase in high-value foods like meats.

Government costs of farm-price supporting activities need to be added. The accounting procedures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture do not permit an easy separation of the net costs associated with these activities. The following estimating procedure gives the maximum figure.

Annual costs fluctuate and I have therefore taken an average of the last 7 fiscal years, 1956–62. The average annual cost of farm-income stabilization and food-for-peace over this period was $4.1 billion. (It is, of course, debatable whether food-for-peace costs should be charged against our food bill; but, as indicated, I am interested in showing a maximum figure.) Dividing this figure by the 1959 population of 177 million (the midpoint in the 7-year average) gives a cost of $23 per person per year. Assuming

no Government costs for 1950 (again liberalizing the estimate, since there were some costs involved), the appropriate comparison of the cost per person of farm products at farm prices plus Government costs is $187 for 1950 and $212 for 1960. This represents a 13.3 percent increase.

During the last decade, the consumer price index increased from 100 (1947–49) to 126.5 in 1960. Farm prices actually declined, and the cost of food per person, including Government costs, rose only half as fast as the general consumer price level—this, to repeat, in spite of increased quantities and much improved quality of food purchased. Food, priced at the farm, has been the only major deflationary influence throughout the decade. Store prices have indeed gone up, but these price increases are not to be associated with the unprocessed farm products, but with the marketing services added between farmer and consumer.

This is not a defense of particular farm programs or the methods used for supporting farm incomes. Yet, if the above interpretation of the farm problem is valid, substantial Government costs in one form or another will be incurred for some years to come.

These costs must be evaluated in the light of the above facts. They are analogous in many respects to unemployment compensation in the nonfarm sector. In both cases, they represent the cost of maintaining production capacity in excess of that required to meet demand at present prices and patterns of income distribution.

In industry, the excess capacity takes the form of idle plants and unemployed workers. Here, costs are shared by the individual firm, the laborer, the general public through taxation, and the consuming public via the price level which, in the industrial economy of administered prices, reflects the cost of maintaining excess capacity. This is precisely the way costs are shared in maintaining the excess farm capacity, although the proportionate shares are different.

In farming, the excess capacity also appears in part as idle plant (land in the soil bank and feed grain program) and underemployed workers; but a large part appears in the form of surplus commodities. Industry, with greater control through economic concentration and with an economic organization consistent with its technology, has the ability to idle capacity before products are forthcoming. This is also the intent of farm programs, but the biological nature of agricultural production, the wide geographic dispersion of many small firms and the great diversity in farm size and technical levels of production make control more difficult.

Some will deny the validity of this analogy. Unemployment compensation has always been considered a temporary payment in time of recession or movement between jobs. But we need to reevaluate this concept. Investment in new technology displaces workers in industry as well as in agriculture. Nonagricultural employment is rising, but unemployment is not declining significantly. In the 1960's, there will be almost double the 1950 annual total of new workers entering the labor force. Unemployment has been near or over 6 percent since the 1958 recession.

Farm-program costs and unemployment-compensation costs have had similar growth patterns over the last decade. In the early 1950's, both were well under $1 billion annually; by the latter 1950's and early 1960's, they each rose to over $3 billion. These high levels of unemployment are, of course, unacceptable and should be reduced. But we are moving into a new technological era in both industry and farming in which our capacity to produce commodities is enlarged primarily by investment in machine technology rather than expansion of jobs for workers. At present, our ability to economize labor seems to exceed our ability to create new jobs.

Unemployment costs, like the cost of farm programs, can be avoided only by placing the burden on the group directly involved. But this is not eliminating the cost; it is merely shifting the burden and altering the consequences. Our basic approach has been to share these costs widely since, unlike the days of our frontier experience, individuals are no longer capable of controlling the conditions necessary for their full employment.

The basic bottleneck in solving the farm problem is the rate of adjustment and reorganization in agriculture. Can this process be speeded up?

If unemployment were reduced and more city jobs opened up, more farmers might make their farms available for the enlargement of those remaining. Modification in farm-credit arrangements, with some system of shared ownership as in industry, would make it possible for farmers to acquire land thus made available. There are still too many small farms being transferred as operating units which should be combined with existing farms. New credit arrangements could be devised which would favor the buyer who needed the land for enlarging his unit and discriminate against the buyer who is interested in becoming established on a unit that is now or soon will be too small for effective operation.

It has been suggested that the Government pay individuals and families on small farms to move out of agriculture. This is a theoretical possibility, and a move in the right direction, but it is not a practical alternative. A politician is reluctant to vote for funds to be used for moving people out of his district.

The above measures are directed primarily at reorganization within agriculture. But there are accompanying problems. First and foremost is the education of rural youth. Most of the young people now on farms will have to seek jobs in the cities. Unskilled labor will become increasingly superfluous in our age of mechanization and automation. These young people must be assured of a high-quality education. Likewise, those who remain to run the large farms of the future will need a better education than many of our rural schools presently provide. With declining population, increased financial aid to rural communities may be necessary to provide the better schooling.

A fundamental question must now be posed: Why deplete the population in small rural communities and add to the crowded conditions in the cities? How do we rationalize this with present unemployment rates at unacceptably high levels? Since subsidies from public funds are necessary in either case, isn't it better to subsidize people on farms rather than to uproot them and then have to subsidize them in the city?

These questions help to clarify the underlying problem. The fact is that the farm problem is only a small part of a much larger difficulty. The larger task is one of devising procedures of income distribution consistent with a productive system increasingly dominated by machine techniques.

In spite of the apparent illogic, there is no real alternative to urbanization. In the first place, the movement to the cities has been proceeding rapidly, not by any coercion, but through the voluntary choices of individuals. Problems associated with reversing these trends would be much more difficult of solution and would require even more drastic social and institutional change than those required for adjusting to present trends. But, more important, I believe that when we deal with the complex problem of institutional change, we cannot move very far beyond our present experience. The urban-industrial sector is the growing sector of our society. The problem of unemployment will likely increase and require some new arrangements even in the absence of pressures added by farmers moving to the cities. Institutional modifications must and will come at the point of greatest pressure—in the cities. Since the farm problem is only a small part of this larger problem, we cannot hope to solve it by holding people on the farm. Paradoxical though it may seem, a solution to the farm problem is dependent on institutional change in the city.

Institutional change is always peripheral and marginal. We proceed by small steps and never get far ahead of our traditional ways of doing things. Rather than moving from our present rural experience, it is certainly a smaller, more acceptable step to move from our present urban-industrial experience in meeting the problems posed by a society of abundance. Here we have unemployment compensation that can be extended, a minimum wage that can be increased, work time that can be shortened, adult educational facilities that can be expanded, etc. Farm people cannot live, or solve their problems, in isolation and apart from this main stream of American life. They must in some way become attached to those institutional arrangements whose modification and evolution hold promise for meeting the challenge of our age. This challenge is basically one of legitimatizing new means for sharing the national wealth, which is increasingly produced by machines rather than by human labor.

The implications of this view of our farm dilemma may be difficult to accept. We have been told that the farm problem can be solved, that surpluses can be controlled, that farm incomes can be improved, that Government costs can be reduced, that the family farm can be preserved—and that consumers can still have an abundance of cheap food. All this, if only the right farm policy were adopted. But these are inconsistent and unrealistic objectives.

A deep-rooted custom in American life, growing out of our frontier experience, is to solve problems rather than learning to live with them. But, like the cold war, the farm problem must be lived with. There is no solution in the short run. Positive action is needed in the area of institutional modification which will permit evolution of a new system consistent with an age of abundance rather than with an age of scarcity.

Stricter Controls by CAB Required in Hazardous Flying Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Members of the House is called to a television editorial by Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news of WTVJ, channel 4, Miami, and carried by that station on Monday, February 18. This editorial is so timely and of such import that I wish to spread it on the RECORD:

NEEDED: TIGHTER GRIP ON AIRLINE CONTROLS

The Civil Aeronautics Board has begun a painstaking investigation of the broken, scattered wreckage of what once was an airplane in an effort to determine what caused the 720–B jetliner to crumple into the Everglades last Tuesday afternoon.

It will probably be weeks before any results will be announced.

Over the weekend, the CAB released a tape recording of the conversation between the pilot of Northwest flight 705 and Miami air traffic controllers. The weather at takeoff was squally with overcast at the field—a

squall line was moving south over the peninsula with violent wind activity in some sections—east of Tampa a tornadic wind had sliced a roof off a house.

The pilot of 705 (Northwest Orient plane) was concerned about the weather prior to takeoff. Once in the air, Miami control relayed the weather picture as seen on radar. Listen to one portion of the recording which indicates the plane was encountering turbulence as it gained altitude:

Tower: "Northwest 705, say again—what is your altitude?"

Northwest 705: "We're out of nine, now."

Tower: "Out of 9,000; Roger. Can you turn right now?"

Northwest 705: "Negative, you vectored us right into that moderate to heavy turbulence—we're out of 10 now. We'll turn right as soon as we can."

Tower: "Northwest 705, the vector (flight path) I gave you was to the least turbulent area that I have indicated on the scope. Stand by."

Northwest 705: "OK. You better run the rest of them off the other way."

Seconds later, the last words from 705 were unintelligible—followed by the words, "No. 2." Whether this referred to trouble with engine 2 is not definitely known.

It is known that bad weather surrounded Miami during this period. Under FAA rules, the pilot is the final judge on whether to take off unless the visibility is under a quarter mile. The pilot uses his judgment along with observing minimum flying regulations of his airline. The FAA says it feels unable to make this final decision because it can't determine the capabilities and experience of the pilot at the controls nor the equipment aboard the airplane. The FAA merely informs the pilot as to the weather information at hand—from then on the decision is his.

Last Tuesday afternoon, some pilots decided to take off, while others decided to remain grounded for up to 1 hour and 15 minutes while the worst of the weather passed over. It hasn't been positively established that weather caused the crash of 705. But it would seem that the CAB might give consideration to revising present regulations governing minimum takeoff requirements so that an overdose of caution is always exercised before an aircraft is allowed to leave the ground in potentially hazardous weather.

Freedom of the Press Is Not Easy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, many people agree with freedom of the press only as long as the press agrees with them. But freedom of speech and freedom of the press mean more than simply an editor's right to agree and not to disagree.

The editor of a newspaper has a difficult responsibility in protecting his right to speak. Political and economic pressures are applied to influence the press.

Politically, members of the press have been quarantined and cajoled; news has been manipulated and withheld. The Kennedy administration has tried to play the master controlling role in public press relations.

Economically, many individuals attempt to control newspaper policy. To resist these economic threats and yet survive is not easy for the newspaper.

The following editorial in the Pike County Republican, by Allan A. Seiler, comments on a Missouri editor's observations. It well states the problem of any smalltown newspaper:

THE LONG AND SHORT OF IT

(By Allan A. Seiler)

This week the stated authorship at the top is a long stretch of the truth. Instead, we have resorted to the pastepot and scissors. It doesn't happen too often, and that is probably the reader's loss.

But we picked up an editorial from the Gallatin (Mo.) North Missourian that puts a case well. There is probably not a single newspaper editor, including this one, who has not at one time or another thought the same thing. The Missouri editor tells "how it happens":

"A few days ago the editor received a letter from one of his newspaper's readers and advertisers, a substantial booster of this country.

"The letter said its author believed in supporting a newspaper that takes a stand on the issues of the times, but that a recent editorial expression differed so far from his thinking that he, in good conscience could no longer support this newspaper. He ordered his advertising stopped.

"This is a prime example of how freedom of expression and the exchange of frank opinion has all but ceased in the hometown press of America. This is why so few smalltown newspaper editors hazard to express editorial opinion on controversial matters.

"They simply cannot afford to irritate and offend advertisers, because there are so few of them left.

"It is a sad reflection of the times we are in and of the sincerity of purpose of so many self-proclaimed disciples of press freedom."

In the Missouri editor's opinion, "It all boils down to one simple fact. Many people approve of freedom of expression so long as it coincides with their own thinking. But once the views expressed become contrary to their own, they find that freedom of the press is a burden far too hard and costly to bear.

"By this individual's own action he has contributed further to the destruction of a valuable freedom he professed to cherish as if, indeed, it would be possible for one person to see eye to eye with every person on every issue.

"It's like economy. Everybody's for it—especially if it affects somebody else.

"Writing thought-provoking editorials is hard work. Trying to achieve peace of mind with some of the things you've felt compelled to put down on paper is not a simple task."

The Gallatin editor speaks for many newspapers when he concludes, "When the time comes that this editor can no longer write how and what he feels about conditions in his own community, without worrying too much about where the money is coming from to meet the bills, a golden era will have come to an end in Gallatin. Sadly, it is an era which has already ended in far too many communities in this land."

Tribute to Col. Mitchell Wolfson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of Florida's outstanding and constructive citizens is Col. Mitchell Wolfson, of Miami. Recently the town of his birth, Key West, paid him the honor long due him, by setting aside a day when his friends could see him and eulogize him. On that day the Key West Citizen, an outstanding Florida newspaper, published an editorial paying him high tribute. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS TO HONOR A GREAT MAN

Key West's testimonial dinner to Col. Mitchell Wolfson has the enthusiastic endorsement of this newspaper. It is a fine thing that a community can show its appreciation of an interested citizen's splendid contribution to community improvement during the time such a citizen is in good health and spirits and able to enjoy the homage his fellow-citizens pay him.

Mitchell Wolfson is a citizen of Key West, no matter where he votes, or if he does maintain his principal residence in Miami. His major business interests are in Miami and have been for many years; but he has demonstrated fully that his heart is in Key West, where he was born and where he spent his childhood.

Colonel Wolfson's acquisition of the old Geiger house at the corner of Whitehead and Greene Streets, and his conversion—through lavish expenditure of time and money—of that place into the Audubon House, with its magnificent gardens—sparked the many jobs of restoration of historic sites and buildings in Key West. This restoration and reconversion work has done more to make the Old Island City attractive to tourists than anything that has occurred in years.

It is interesting to think back, a bit, to the days 28 years ago when Key West was flat on its back financially, and the Federal Government through the Works Progress Administration came into town and tried to revive things. A large part of the WPA program was devoted to demonstration of how restoration work could be done by the people, themselves. Undoubtedly many of the present residents who have taken old homes and rebuilt and improved them—although keeping their essential architectural qualities—first became interested in Key West through the WPA's efforts in the dark days.

But there was no great recognition of the high value of restoration until after Colonel Wolfson came back to his hometown and demonstrated how interesting and beautiful an old building, long neglected and misused, can be made. The Audubon House, above all other structures in Key West, was suited to such a demonstration.

For years appreciative tourists had glanced at it and found it interesting but not available for inspection since it was occupied by its owner, the late Willie Smith, who was ill for many years and unable to maintain its essentially fine appearanec and emphasize its points of historic interest.

Old Mallory Square, now delighting tourists and home people alike, undoubtedly was developed more readily, and with quickened interest on the part of the people, because of the demonstration by Colonel Wolfson.

This demonstration has taught the residents of the city something they seemed not to be aware; i.e., the vast and important economic value to a community of its historic record. At the recent dedicatory ceremony in Mallory Square, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Wakelin praised the work many Key Westers have done in this direction—mentioning the efforts of the Key West Art and Historical Society, in particular, for the restoration and preservation of the East Martello Tower.

The same sort of acclaim has been uttered by Rene d'Harnoncourt, director of the great Modern Museum of Art in New York City, who is now visiting in Key West.

Colonel Wolfson's achievement, however, is that of a single individual who, without asking for donations or special advantages, has created a beautiful museum and garden out of a rundown building and site that was coming close to decay and ruin.

The Citizen hopes and believes that the testimonial dinner to Col. Mitchell Wolfson will be a gay and happy occasion for all who may be fortunate enough to attend—and that it will convince our fellow citizen that we regard him with great affection and gratitude.

Domestic Peace Corps Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, articles have appeared in recent newspapers of the Scripps-Howard chain on the Domestic Peace Corps test which has lately been under attack. The staff writer, Robert Dietsch, has in my opinion done a fine job of reporting objectively on this matter, and in the belief that these articles will be of interest to my colleagues, I am inserting one of February 22 from the Memphis Press-Scimitar and another of February 23 from the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, Feb. 22, 1963]

FIRST LOCAL PEACE CORPS—IN POWELL'S HARLEM

(By Robert Dietsch)

NEW YORK.—This country's first Domestic Peace Corps men—27 in all—are young (average age 22), vigorous, energetic, and serious.

They come from 21 States, but unlike their overseas counterparts the world they're preparing to better is close at hand. Right outside the front door of their headquarters, in fact—right in the middle of a teeming, smelly, squalid, rundown, crime-ridden, delinquency-filled section of America called Harlem.

In 5 weeks, the 27 will graduate and go to work.

Where their endeavors will end, or how, nobody seems to know today.

The Domestic Peace Corps history dates back to a bill passed by Congress in 1961—the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act. The Corps' godfather is Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the controversial Negro Congressman whose district includes Harlem.

That he persuaded the Kennedy administration, 5 months ago, to allocate $250,000 to "test the feasibility of a Domestic Peace Corps" is freely admitted by a Powell assistant and temporary executive director of the Corps, 47-year-old Livingstone L. Wingate.

Snaps Wingate: "Sure ADAM got us the money. How does a community get a grant, or a dam, or a big contract except through its Congressman?

"Besides, this is the worst juvenile delinquency spot in America. The $250,000 initial grant is just a drop in the bucket; we'll need millions if Harlem's problems are to be solved."

Actually, the money went to an organization known as Associated Community Teams, Inc. (ACT), managed by a 16-man board which includes POWELL. Another Harlem-headquartered group, Harlem Youth Opportunities, got a $230,000 Government "planning and research" grant. Both organizations talk of merging activities.

At any rate, after 5 months of organization, confusion, and recruitment, a Domestic Peace Corps is off and running.

The corpsmen train on two floors of a spruced-up building adjacent to POWELL'S Abyssinian Baptist Church.

A cream-and-brown sign identifies "Domestic Peace Corps" headquarters.

Inside is a combination of bustle, happy faces, serious conferences. Corps men zip up and down stairs; a few watch TV in a makeshift student lounge. ACT instructors and executives stride along serious-faced; their hands are full of paperwork.

All faces are black, except for two big men moving a desk.

Wingate says his "only disappointment to date" is failure to include white persons among Corps men. He hopes to include 35 men and women in the second class, says he has applications from whites at Harvard and Radcliffe colleges among others.

After 2 months of training, the 27 pioneers will be assigned to social agencies and hospitals in Harlem. They'll get $2 a day spending money and $75 a month pay after they complete a year's service—the period they signed up for.

"We've spent $90,000 so far," Wingate says. He hopes to get another $125,000 grant under the 1961 law (and presumably with POWELL'S help, he will).

By the end of the year, Wingate says ACT will go after a multimillion-dollar grant. "How can they refuse the money?" Fast-talking Wingate asks. "Central Harlem ranks at the top in narcotic violation arrests, admissions to mental hospitals, infant mortality and other troubles."

President Kennedy, of course, is asking Congress to approve a National Service Corps—the administration's name for its domestic peace corps. If Congress approves, will the Harlem corps be integrated into the nationwide organization?

"Perhaps," says Wingate.

Will political opposition to POWELL kill future grants?

"Look around this neighborhood," answers Wingate.

"The lower East Side in New York got $12½ million in Federal money for rehabilitation. It's a dream neighborhood compared to central Harlem.

"Why shouldn't we get the money?"

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post and Times-Star, Feb. 23, 1963]

PEACE CORPS AT HOME—FIRST GROUP IN TRAINING AT HARLEM

(By Robert Dietsch)

NEW YORK.—This country's first Domestic Peace Corps men—27 in all—are young (average age: 22), vigorous, energetic, and serious.

They come from 21 States, but unlike their oversea Peace Corps counterparts, the world they are preparing to better is close at hand. Right outside the front door of their headquarters, in fact—right in the middle of a teeming, smelly, crime-riddened, delinquency-filled section of America called Harlem.

In 5 weeks, the 27 will graduate and go to work.

Where their endeavors will end, or how, nobody seems to know today.

The Domestic Peace Corps history dates back to a bill passed by Congress in 1961—the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act. The Corps' godfather is Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the controversial Negro Congressman.

That he persuaded the Kennedy administration 5 months ago to allocate $250,000 to "test the feasibility of a Domestic Peace Corps" is freely admitted by a POWELL assistant and temporary executive director of the Corps, 47-year-old Livingston L. Wingate.

Snaps Wingate:

"Sure ADAM got us the money. How does a community get a grant, or a dam, or a big contract except through its Congressman?

"Besides, this is the worst juvenile delinquency spot in America. The $250,000 initial grant is just a drop in the bucket; we'll need millions if Harlem's problems are to be solved."

Actually, the money went to an organization known as Associated Community Teams, Inc. (ACT), managed by a 16-man board which includes POWELL. Another group, Harlem Youth Opportunities, got a $230,000 Government planning and research grant. Both organizations talk of merging activities.

At any rate a domestic peace corps is off and running. The corpsmen train on two floors of a spruced-up building adjacent to POWELL'S Abyssinian Baptist Church.

Inside, Peace Corps headquarters is a combination of bustle, happy faces, serious conferences. Corpsmen zip up and down stairs; a few watch TV in a makeshift student lounge. All faces are black, except for two big men moving a desk.

Wingate says his "only disappointment to date" is persons among corpsmen.

A posted notice tells the Corps' schedule:

From physical education at 7:15 a.m. to study 12 hours later. Between are lectures ("How To Work With Individuals," "The Negro in Urban Culture"), group discussion and field trips ("be ready with a term paper on 'The Blacks,' an off-Broadway play").

After 2 months of training, the 27 Corps pioneers will be assigned to social agencies and hospitals in Harlem. They'll get $2 a day spending money and $75 a month pay after they complete a year's service—the period they signed up for.

As Wingate explained it, Domestic Corps men will be a nucleus to recruit, train, advise, even encourage an "urban service corps" composed of young men and women from the Harlem area. The objective: To uplift these urban service corpsmen in training and education so they can find jobs.

Over everything, apparently, hangs the question of money.

"We've spent $90,000 so far," Wingate says. He hopes to get another $125,000 grant under the 1961 law (and presumably with POWELL'S help, he will).

By the end of the year, Wingate says ACT will go after a multimillion-dollar grant. "How can they refuse the money?" fast-talking Wingate asks. "Central Harlem ranks at the top in narcotic violation arrests, admissions to mental hospitals, infant mortality, and other troubles."

What Is 8 Percent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Is 8 Percent?" which was published today in the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS 8 PERCENT?

Suppose you borrow $1,000 for 12 months at 8 percent interest. There are three ways you ordinarily would be charged:

1. You get $1,000 immediately from the lender and you repay it at the end of 12 months, plus $80 interest. This is called simple interest and you have paid 8 percent.

2. You borrow $1,000 at 8 percent, but the interest is deducted in advance, so you get only $920. Actually you're paying $80 on $920, which amounts to about 9 percent. This is called a discount loan, meaning simple interest is deducted from the principal.

3. You borrow $1,000 at 8 percent and agree to pay it back in 12 monthly payments of $83.33. Because you start paying the loan back immediately, you don't have the use of $1,000 for 12 months; in fact, you have the use, on an average, of only about $541 for the year. So you're paying $80 on the use of $541 which amounts to about 15 percent. This is called flat rate interest. If the interest was deducted first, so that you would receive $920, and you paid $83.33 monthly, your rate of interest would be about 17 percent.—The Farm Journal.

Eminent American Astronomer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the November 1962 issue of a Russian journal called Nature contained an article praising an outstanding American astronomer, the late Prof. William Wallace Campbell. The article was written by A. A. Mikhailov, director of the Soviet Union's Pulkovo Observatory in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Professor Campbell.

This article was translated by Dr. Leo Goldberg, Higgins professor of astronomy, Harvard College Observatory, and a member of the Space Science Board, National Academy of Sciences. As Dr. Goldberg stated in his letter to me:

The article is a rather nice tribute to a great American by an eminent Soviet astronomer and illustrates the international character of science as an area of human activity in which the same truths are valid for citizens of all countries no matter what the color of their skin or politics.

I am proud to say that, for several years during the 1920's, Professor Campbell was the president of the University of California. Among his many achievements, he served as president of the International Astronomical Union and later as president of the National Academy of Sciences. Professor Campbell was a truly distinguished scientist who was respected throughout the world. I am submitting the article below for inclusion in the RECORD as I believe it will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF WILLIAM WALLACE CAMPBELL

Unlike many scientists who entered science by complicated paths, overcoming various difficulties of fortune, good luck attended Campbell. He was born in the United States of America in the State of Ohio, in a family of farmers, in the year 1862. After completing high school, he entered the University of Michigan engineering school in Ann Arbor. Having been carried away by reading Newcomb's "Popular Astronomy," which was first published in 1878, he began to attend lectures in astronomy by Professor Schaeberle, and this decided his fate. After finishing the university with a diploma in engineering, W. W. Campbell decided to become an astronomer. But not finding a position in this specialty, he accepted an offer of employment in the department of mathematics of the University of Colorado, in the small town of Boulder. In 2 years he returned to the University of Michigan as a lecturer in astronomy and assistant at the observatory.

Here W. W. Campbell began to teach practical astronomy, and in the evenings he occupied himself with observations of the apparitions of comets and with calculations of their orbits. By 1888, he had published his first major scientific work, a determination of the definitive orbit of the comet 1885 III, after which followed a series of papers dealing with micrometric measurements and calculations of the orbits of other comets.

His lectures served as a basis for a course in practical astronomy, published first in 1891 and again in 1899. Being more concise and clearer of purpose than the famous course by Chauvenet, Campbell's manual fully answered the requirements of geodesists and engineers.

In the summer of 1890, young Campbell took a vacation at the recently completed Lick Observatory, near San Francisco, which then possessed the most powerful refractor-telescope in the world. Here he made a great impression by his ability and enthusiasm and was invited to take up the post of astronomer replacing J. Keeler, who was transferring as director of the Allegheny Observatory. As successor to J. Keeler, Campbell took over a visual spectroscope attached to the 36-inch refractor, with which he investigated the spectra of comets, variable stars and stars with bright lines, of the Wolf-Rayet type. He also attempted to detect lines of water vapor in the spectrum of Mars, comparing the intensity of waterlines in the spectrum of the planet with those in the spectrum of the moon. Not observing any differences, he correctly concluded that if there is water vapor in the atmosphere of Mars, its quantity is insignificantly small by comparison with the atmosphere of the earth. This conclusion was subsequently fully confirmed by the application of the much more sensitive photographic method of observation.

At this time, the determination of the line-of-sight velocities of the stars by the Doppler principle—by the displacement of spectral lines—came to be a highly pressing matter. This new method was introduced by Keeler at the Lick Observatory and by A. A. Belopolsky at the Pulkovo Observatory. Keeler measured the line-of-sight velocities of 14 nebulae and 3 bright stars, but for a large number of stars the brightness was not sufficient. It became clear to Campbell that visual measurements could provide neither the desired accuracy nor the possibility of investigating the motions of stars fainter than the first magnitude. Only the advent of photography could enlarge the possibility of using the new approach in the investigation of stellar systems. The first successful steps in this direction were taken in 1888–91 by H. C. Vogel and J. Scheiner at the Potsdam Astrophysical Observatory, but the modesty of their equipment did not permit them to develop this method. More successful were the observations of Belopolsky at Pulkovo, one of the pioneers in the determination of the line-of-sight velocities of stars.

With his arrival at the Lick Observatory, Campbell decided to devote himself mainly to this new and important problem. It was clear to him that the visual method of determining line-of-sight velocities was inadequate both qualitatively and quantitatively. Soon after, he was able to order a three-prism spectrograph from an American firm, but the field was so new that several years were required for modifications and improvements of the instrument before a spectrogram of irreproachable quality could be obtained. The accuracy of the determination of line-of-sight velocities was increased by a factor of 10, and, in addition, it became possible to observe much fainter stars. So considerable a success made it possible to organize a broad program of observation of all stars brighter than magnitude 5.5 which subsequently was completed. In 30 years, Campbell and his assistants obtained more than 25,000 spectrograms and determined the line-of-sight velocities of 2,770 stars.

Up to 1898, the number of known spectroscopic binary or double stars amounted to 13, of which several were discovered at the Pulkovo Observatory by A. A. Belopolsky. Within the next few years Campbell succeeded in adding 31 additional stars, and altogether with his assistants discovered 339 spectroscopic double stars. As a result, he came to the correct conclusion that no less than one out of every five stars is a spectroscopic double star—a fact which is highly important for gaining knowledge of the laws of stellar evolution.

In 1901 Campbell accepted the post of director of the Lick Observatory and this allowed him more latitude in expanding the spectroscopic investigation of the stars. The determination of line-of-sight velocities of stars continued to remain for him the main problem, but it was for him only a means and not an end. The latter consisted of the investigation of the structure of stellar systems by studying the motions of stars. He illuminated this problem very fully and comprehensively in a large monograph "Stellar Motions," published in 1913. This was a period of transition, when the systematic character of the motions of stars had already been discovered, and interpreted by J. Kapteyn as two stellar streams, moving in opposite directions, but mutually intermingled, and interpreted by K. Schwarzschild as an ellipsoidal distribution of stellar velocities. Continued study of the general configuration of the distribution of stars in space was limited on the whole to the so-called local system, i.e., to the stars nearest the sun, relative to which the motion of the solar system was rather well determined. The direction of this motion had been derived chiefly from the proper motions of the stars, and the velocity from the line-of-sight velocities, most accurately of all by Campbell himself.

At this time the absorption in interstellar space had still not been adequately studied. For this reason one could not arrive at correct conclusions about the forms and dimensions of stellar groups, which would make possible the separation of our galaxy from other similar systems in space, which appeared in the form of spiral and other types of extragalactic nebulae. Only at the end of the twenties and in the thirties of the current century did these questions receive definitive answers on the basis of many-sided studies of a large assemblage of material of which the line-of-sight velocities amounted to a considerable and important part. A fact of such fundamental significance as galactic rotation was discovered chiefly on the basis of this study of the systematic character of line-of-sight velocities.

The Lick Observatory in California is situated at 37° north latitude and therefore close to one quarter of the entire celestial sphere around the south pole of the earth is inaccessible to observation there. In this connection, it is necessary, for the goals of stellar statistics and the solution of the problems just mentioned, to have data for the entire sky. Therefore, even in the first years of his directorship, Campbell organized a temporary station of the Lick Observatory in the capital of Chile—Santiago, where in the

interval of a few years the line-of-sight velocities of southern stars were determined, and large numbers of spectroscopic double stars were discovered.

In addition to the spectroscopic investigation of the stars, Campbell did great work in connection with the observation of total solar eclipses. For this purpose, he organized and took part in a number of expeditions, journeying to different countries. In an interval of 2 to 3 seconds, when the disk of the moon has already fully covered the solar photosphere, but has still not succeeded in covering the chromosphere, one observes the so-called flash spectrum—the spectral lines, having been dark up to this point, suddenly flash out as bright stripes against the background of the disappearing continuous spectrum. Observations of this phenomenon make possible the detailed study, both qualitatively and quantitatively, of the chemical composition and physical state of the material at different levels of the chromosphere. But the observation of the flash spectrum presents great difficulties as a consequence of the short duration of the phenomenon and the rapidly changing spectrum. Campbell invented a method of registering the flash spectrum on a moving photographic plate, which made it possible to trace in great detail the changes in the spectrum with the height of the visible portion of the chromosphere. He applied this method to the observation of the eclipse of 1898 in India; thereupon it began to be adopted successfully by other observers during a whole series of subsequent eclipses.

Great interest was attached to the observation of the eclipse of September 21, 1922, on the uninhabited northwestern shore of Australia. Yet in 1915, Einstein had, on the basis of the general theory of relativity, come to the conclusion that a light ray passing close to a large gravitational mass will deviate from propagation in a straight line, as if attracted to the mass, and besides the deviation will be twice as great as in the case of purely Newtonian attraction. To verify this conclusion by observation is possible only at the time of a total solar eclipse, when rays of light from distant stars pass by the sun and are deviated under the influence of the gravitation of the enormous solar mass, since all other masses within the confines not only of the earth but also of the entire solar system are too small to have a noticeable effect. As a result, stars, visible around the eclipsed sun, must appear to us to be displaced from their normal positions by an amount of 1.75/r seconds of arc, where r is the apparent angular distance of the star from the center of the sun, in units of the angular solar radius. The "Einstein Effect" was observed for the first time by two English expeditions at the time of the eclipse of 1919. However, the number of stars photographed was not great and the performance of the apparatus caused doubt.

The expedition of the Lick Observatory in 1922 under the direction of Campbell was equipped with four astrographs, of which two had a large field and a sufficiently long focal distance. The positions of 92 stars were determined with them. Measurement of the displacements gave almost complete agreement with theory. And to this day this observation remains unsurpassed for the accuracy of the results and the number of stars photographed.

In 1922–25 Campbell served as president of the International Astronomical Union, a scientific organization organized after the First World War. Campbell had taken an active part in its formation. In 1923 he accepted the post of president of the great University of California. In 1930, he went into retirement, for reasons of health and age, but soon was elected president of the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, a position he held until 1935. Campbell died on June 14, 1938.

This was a distinguished scientist, an excellent organizer of scientific work, an administrator, clearly visualizing the goals of scientific investigation, firmly and consistently proceeding to their realization, a man of commonsense, of great energy and will, directing a series of great scientific endeavors. Clearness of purpose and the pursuit of the highest accuracy in astronomical observations, their fullest utilization for the progress of science, the mobilization of all forces and abilities for the solution of given problems—such were the fundamental traits of his character.

A. A. MIKHAILOV,
Director, Pulkovo Observatory; Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

The Wayward Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, since December 9, New York City has been without seven major daily newspapers. The printers union is on strike at four, and the publishers have refused to publish the other three. The issues in this labor dispute are very complicated, and I hope they will be resolved soon. The situation has engendered a great deal of comment and criticism. I want to call the attention of the House to an article by A. J. Liebling, one of America's most perceptive writers, which appeared in the January 26 issue of the New Yorker magazine.

As Mr. Liebling points out, the impression has been created with the public that New Yorkers are without daily newspapers because of the strike by the printers union. The fact is that out of New York's seven major daily newspapers, only four were struck by the union. The publishers of the three unstruck dailies decided that in their own interest they would lock out their employees, close down and withhold newspapers from the public.

Because of space limitations, I cannot include all of Mr. Liebling's article; however, the major part of the article follows:

THE WAYWARD PRESS

The Sunday, January 13, issue of the New York Standard prefigured the American newspaper of the future, once we have been reduced to a single newspaper ownership in each city. (There are only 58 towns and cities in all the United States where more than a single ownership persists; all the rest have gone the way of monopoly.) New York with 7 papers of 6 different ownerships—although this is a decline from 15 papers within my own reading lifetime—alone maintained at least a surface appearance of that variety which is essential to a healthy journalistic life. Then, when the printers union struck four of the papers—the Times, the News, the Journal-American, and the World-Telegram—and the three others refused to publish, all disappeared from the kiosks. That was on December 9; on January 6, the Standard appeared as the sole remplaçant, like a wind-blown weed growing a crack in a bombed street. It thus inherited, temporarily and without payment, the monopoly position for which Samuel I. Newhouse recently paid $42 million in much smaller New Orleans and offered over $40 million in Omaha, where he was turned down.

OFFERS AND DEMANDS

The Standard, a product of opportunism, disclaims any intention of continuing after the other papers come back—for one thing, its scratch staff consists almost entirely of regular members of theirs—but in the meanwhile it provides a glimpse of what is likely to happen within a couple of decades: the January 13 issue consisted of 120 tabloid pages, 110 of them advertising, which should have brought in between $100,000 and $150,000 at its current page rates. If the stoppage lasts until February 1, the Standard's publishers should clear the expenses of starting the paper and begin to make money seriously. The 10 other pages included news, amusements, a book review, a couple of byline columns, sports, stock tables, fashions, and television listings. They were all gobbled up with gratitude by readers who had been reduced to a diet of out-of-town newspapers, supplemented by specialized organs like the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce, which carried a few smatterings of general news crammed in among such headlines as "Utilities Fear Regulation" and "Hogs Active in Chicago." (The Journal of Commerce at first entranced me with its ship cards, listing the ports of call of freighters with names as exotic as their destinations, but since December 23, when the longshoremen called their own strike, even the ship cards have gone blank. The Wall Street Journal's column of humorous quips, "Pepper * * * and Salt," began to pall after 3½ weeks, although it had seemed as funny as all get-out in the beginning. A typical joke was about how a single man's life is just "one undarned thing after another.") New Yorkers' forced experience with out-of-town newspapers left them with a full appreciation of John Macy's 40-year-old dictum in "Civilization in the United States": "On the whole, the American newspaper is amazingly uniform from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oreg." The respects in which they are not uniform, however, are those that readers care most about—the identity of the persons mentioned in the obituaries, for example. To me, the most striking proof of the inadequacy of electronic media for the communication of essential facts was that until I read about the rise in postal rates in the Standard I was unaware that one had been in the making.

I am sure that it must have been mentioned often on the air, but the trouble with television and radio news is that you have to be there at the moment the announcer says it, and unless you have gout, you may be somewhere else. The ads and the modicum of news offered by the Standard constitute the public-utility function of a newspaper.

The Standard's wholesale capture of advertising should at any rate reassure Editor & Publisher, the timid handmaiden of the newspaper industry, which in its issue of January 5 feared that newspaper readers and advertisers might lose the habit and that the press might perish, its charms forgotten like those of the Buffalo Bill Wild West Show:

For the last 4 weeks, metropolitan New Yorkers have been without their usual newspaper reading fare and have been subjected to a barrage of substitutes. Neither the newspapers imported from other cities nor the makeshift dailies that have sprung up in New York have adequately taken the place of the struck papers. In fact, they might be doing irreparable damage to the reputation of newspapers, both in the city and nationwide, instead of performing a service for newspaper-starved New York. How long will it be before New Yorkers, without their choice of several excellent morning and afternoon newspapers, compare what they

once had with what they have now and decide it isn't worth the price? Once these readers are lost to newspapers—out of the newspaper habit—will they ever buy one again? Is it possible that after several weeks and months of living on capsulized news from radio, television, and other substitute sources they may decide it is adequate? And if the former reader also happens to be an advertiser, will he be a former advertiser also?

After a couple more Cassandrine paragraphs, Editor & Publisher wound up, "Congress couldn't do it. The President of the United States couldn't do it. Even the courts can't do it. Only a striking union abetted by other unions can close down the newspapers in the Nation's largest city, not to mention the newspapers in the Nation's eighth largest city." (The Cleveland papers are also shut down.) The publishers can do it, too, as those of the Herald Tribune, the Post, and the Mirror have proved.

What disquiets me more than the possibility that newspapers qua newspapers will disappear is the increasing uniformity of the survivors as they wait to coalesce. The stoppage has illuminated this, just as the conjugal reaction to a stranger's interference illuminates the essential solidarity of a loving couple. The competition among the six New York ownerships has proved a pale and sometime thing compared to the competition of all of them against all of their employees. It seems naive now for Bertram Powers, the leader of the striking printers, to have offered the financially weaker papers a separate peace—or separate individual peaces—when he struck the Times and the News and the Journal and the World-Telegram. The Hearsts, for example, own both the unstruck, because deemed "weak," Mirror and the struck, because deemed strong, Journal-American. It is hard to imagine them running one of their papers while a strike is on against the other. As for the Herald Tribune and the Post, at a more competitive period in newspaper history they might have been expected to run, restoring their failing strength with the Christmas advertising revenues made available to them by the printers' generosity. They had ground not merely to hold but to make up if they were ever to get back into contention with their rivals. Their loyalty to their rivals, who are also their prospective purchasers when the pinch comes, was touching. It is all very sad, because the surest way for the seven papers to anesthetize the public to future monopoly is to make it evident that they are already alike. Even a sham battle might have improved public opinion of all seven. (Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, the publisher of the Post, and John Hay Whitney, the publisher of the Tribune, if we are to adopt Editor & Publisher's point of view, might also have done their colleagues a favor by continuing to print, and so making sure that the public would not lose the habit of newspaper reading.)

As for who is to blame for the weary length that the stoppage has attained, I can give no judgment beyond juxtaposing headlines in the Guild Reporter, the organ of the American Newspaper Guild, and in Editor & Publisher:

Guild Reporter: "New York Publishers Shunning Compromise in Stoppage."

Editor & Publisher: "Publishers Accuse Union in Stalemate."

I have a personal hunch, too, that Amory H. Bradford, the spokesman for the Publishers' Association of New York City, and Bertram A. Powers, the printers' president, both suffer from the overcompensation that frequently afflicts boys with flossy first names, requiring them to fight so often to defend their schoolyard dignity that fighting becomes an adult habit. (For a negotiator, I should always prefer somebody named Jack or Mac.) As for the issues in the strike against the four strong papers, I can only say that, as a habitual employee, I would, if offered a choice on a 6-to-5, pick 'em basis, naturally take Mr. Powers' position. As for the causes of the strike, which are, naturally, quite distinct from the issues (an issue may be minuscular; a determination to fight over it is a cause), I found the report of the three-judge board of public accountability astonishingly informative. I say astonishingly because I had first read of their findings in news stories published by the Standard, the Wall Street Journal, the Brooklyn Eagle, and the Journal of Commerce. All of these papers excerpted from the much fuller excerpts sent out by the Associated Press and United Press International, and all of them deformed the content.

The Wall Street Journal wrote, "The report said the printers didn't present their total demands until 15 minutes before their old contract expired," but did not reprint, "It was not until 6:40 on the evening of December 7 [with the strike set for 2 a.m. December 8] that the publishers made a complete offer to the printers. That offer totaled, in increased benefits and costs, $9.20 per man per week," including 55 cents a week in cash for the first year. (The employer, in strike stories, always offers and the union demands. A publisher, for example, never demands that the union men agree to work for a four-bit raise; the union never offers to work for more.)

None of the papers that I saw quoted in full even the excerpts that UPI furnished from the supplemental opinion filed by Judge Joseph E. O'Grady, the only member of the panel with much labor experience. (He used to be city labor commissioner.) All three of the judges named to the board—Harold R. Medina, David W. Peck, and O'Grady—signed the full report, but O'Grady also issued a supplemental report, excerpts from which follow:

The newspaper publishers sought to maintain the pattern of bargaining carried on for some years and which had proven reasonably acceptable and successful to them. Mr. Powers was determined to break that pattern, because his members had become dissatisfied with the results of that pattern of bargaining.

I do not believe that I can find fault with either position, and I have not even attempted a moral judgment of which one had the equities on its side. It was inevitable that two such diametrically opposite positions, each supported by a strong protagonist, would result in a strike. To have prevented such a result, one side would have had to abandon its fundamental position. Neither did, and the result was a strike. How long the parties will continue to test their strength and positions I do not know. However, I believe that both forces will have to give some ground before a settlement will be reached. I do not think that either is in the position of bringing the other to his knees.

That is about the way I read the situation. Forty years ago, Macy, in that symposium that so perturbed young American intellectuals at that time, wrote, "Almost invariably, the news of a strike is, if not falsified, so shaped as to be unfavorable to the workers," and this has been a particularly bad one journalistically, because it is a newspaper strike reported by ancillary or makeshift newspapers, which have the ready excuse of insufficiency or inexperience to cite for their omissions. (The Wall Street Journal, though, expresses pretensions to more serious quality.) The Times, ironically, would have covered the strike and the stoppage more thoroughly. It would surely have at least published the full text of the unofficial factfinding report and Judge O'Grady's supplementary opinion.

The reporting has been notably deficient, too, in exploiting obvious lines of inquiry. The Wall Street Journal, in the four-line sixth paragraph of its stoppage story on December 19, for example, reported, "The newspapers have a strike-insurance fund said to cover a 29-day strike. [The existence of this fund had been previously reported in both the Timid Handmaiden and the Guild Reporter.] The insurance covers only cost of maintaining skeleton crews and upkeep of idle equipment, however." But this highly significant feature of the situation was then dropped from notice, not to reappear even on the expiration of the 29 days, on January 6. How did this affect the prospects for settlement? The expiration coincided—although I read no comment on the coincidence—with the appointment by the mayor, the Governor, and the Secretary of Labor of the three-judge "blasting" board, and preceded by less than a week the announcement of the suspended newspapers of a cut in the salaries of non-union non-locked-out personnel, and the first offer by the publishers of a slight raise over the work-for-55 cents demand. Nor was there any inquiry into whether the Herald Tribune, the Post, and the Mirror, which were acknowledged to be losing money before they quit publication, actually cut their losses by ducking out or whether, after the 29-day period, they would lose more by staying out and paying overhead than by going into business again. Yet these are surely interesting matters; the mutual aid arrangements of the unions whose members refuse to cross picket lines or are locked out has come in for a great deal of publicity, the consistent implication being that they, as distinguished from the newspapers, are ganging up. And how about the publisher of the Post, who announced soon after she stopped the paper—again according to the Wall Street Journal—that "a long shutdown might put the liberal Post out of business"? How long? I would say it's time for a checkup. And how about the effect on the strikers' resolve of their approaching eligibility for New York State unemployment insurance, which begins, for workers made idle by a labor dispute, at 8 weeks? The stoppage is past its sixth week now. On none of these points do we see any of the bright speculation that papers carry about, for example, the next baseball season or the future of Yemen. The subject is too sacred.

The conflict between union work rules, designed to conserve jobs, and automation, designed to decrease them, is not, apparently, a major, direct issue in this row, though it may be the cause of it. The object of automation on newspapers is not to increase production, which would be quite senseless unless the papers could abruptly increase circulation, but to increase efficiency, and thus income. And the fight—because complete newspaper automation is not yet ready to be introduced—resembles those obstinate and bloody intertrench combats of the First World War, whose declared object was to establish dominance over the enemy before the big push began. Big pushes, though seldom, did begin and usually bogged down, like the automated electric train in the Times Square-Grand Central shuttle, over which the Times editorial page was willing to go to war with the Transport Workers Union when the thing was introduced a year ago. "The impartial arbitrator has made an incredible, incomprehensible decision," the Times editorialized when the arbitrator, Theodore Kheel, ordered the transit authority to postpone putting the robot train into service. Then, when the dispute was settled by installing a motorman on the train for a 6-month trial period, the Times said, "The transit authority paid a stiff price * * * for retaining the clear legal right it had always had to automate." The only trouble with all this is that the train does not run consistently, and is still operating under dual control, with the motorman ready to put her on manual when she stops dead between stations, which is often. "Against a labor demagog who recognizes neither law, contract, nor his union's pledged word," the Times said, like Patrick Henry ordering

beer, "the Wagner administration should carry this arbitration decision to court on appeal as a matter of principle worth defending to a finish," and, earlier, "Mr. Quill cannot be allowed to bluster this shuttle train to a stop." But the car, like the papers, stopped dead.—A. J. LIEBLING.

Liberalism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the fact that the so-called liberals of our political life in this country have been usurping the real meaning of that term is beginning to get through to the American people. They are realizing, as the Europeans have for many years, that the end result of the phony liberal proposals will destroy freedom instead of extending and protecting it. More Americans are speaking out on this bold theft of a word and the twisting of it to mean something it never was meant to mean. The most articulate argument I have read thus far is one made by our brilliant colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. This appears in the Penn State University magazine Critique January issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TODAY'S LIBERALS," BETTER CALLED 20th CENTURY TORIES

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota)

"All down the ages the fight of the true liberals has been to take power from the executive and give it to the legislative branch. Now the so-called liberals want to give more power to the executive."—Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat of Montana.

Nobody familiar with the political history of this Republic during the past three decades can deny that Burt Wheeler, of Montana, is rightfully one of the great fighting liberals of this era. It is likewise pertinent that Wheeler's liberalism was demonstrated on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in his public career rather than in the safe, serene atmosphere of a college classroom or the impersonal and untested philippics of a book. Senator Wheeler expressed his convictions in public debate with a consistent courage that made him an effective advocate willing to wager his reputation and political future on the logic and wisdom of his viewpoints.

As a consequence, when former Senator Wheeler speaks of today's "liberalism" and the curious and irrational projects which its present day disciples advocate, he speaks as an authority on what comprises genuine liberalism in public life and what principles and concepts give validity to the term liberal as a political philosophy. Thus, he serves the Nation well when he bluntly calls attention that our latter-day "liberals" have deserted the traditional liberal crusade and have, strangely enough, associated themselves with power drives similar to those of the Tories of early America.

It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as liberals today, while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government in the United States, might be described more accurately as the 20th century Tories.

Somewhere along the line these Tories have lost confidence in the American people and have, by some curious form of self-delusionment, convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want. Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals, Tories, in fact, continue to chip away at the power, the rights, and the free choice of the people while transferring to bigtime politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny. This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and Tory governments. The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, deserts, and abilities. They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for the common defense and the responsibility of the Central Government only to promote the general welfare as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Our wise and prudent constitutional forefathers used the English language carefully and thoughtfully. They evaluated and weighed every word before it was enshrined in our great charter of freedom. It was with specific purpose and prudent forethought that they drew the distinction between the terms "promote" and "provide" * * * it was not by accident that they did not connect the phrases dealing with the common defense and the general welfare by the conjunction "and" * * * they deliberately emphasized their conception of the vast difference between the Federal responsibilities for the common defense and the promoting of the general welfare. The programs and projects which our modern liberals espouse would eliminate that difference and shift to the Federal state the same responsibilities and authority for the general welfare that are rightly exercised by it in protecting the common defense and maintaining the national security.

By placing their primary confidence and trust in the bigtime politicians, instead of in the people our Government was designed to serve—not control—these illegitimate liberals would receive a golden age of toryism when the king, the Federal Government, "could do no wrong." It would seem that Hitler and Mussolini, Stalin and Khrushchev should have disproved that naive assumption during the lifetimes of most of those hiding the desire for increased political power behind a mask of liberal concepts and phrases which either they do not understand or refuse to implement.

During the past 25 or 30 years, the growing influence of those I prefer to designate as "20th century Tories" instead of identifying them as "liberal," to which they claim, but repudiate by their actions, while embracing with their adjectives, has made an important, and in the main, unfortunate impact upon our national destiny. During this era, we have been following a global drift toward the overcentralization of government and the glorification of the central politician over the rights and privileges of the individual citizen.

Some 24 years ago when I first came to Congress, an oldtimer told me that a good political axiom for reelection was to remember that "economic conditions determine political decisions." He recommended that a candidate identify himself and/or his party with every upswing of economic conditions, with full employment, good profits, and happy living conditions. A great many voters, he argued, vote for the candidates whom they believe to be associated with their economic well-being. I believe there was some truth to his observations and, perhaps, his formula for victory still has a validity. During the intervening years, however, many new issues have come into play and new political alinements, the influence of big city political machines, labor organizations, ethnic groups, and other developments have tended to blunt the truism that "economic conditions determine political decisions."

Today we confront a comparatively new political axiom which has unquestioned validity and which all Americans should recognize when deciding their personal preference for either a steadily expanding power for the Federal Government, which means personal power for politicians, elected or appointed to Federal positions, or for a return to the concepts of keeping the Federal Government subject to the desires and controls of the voting citizens. This latter-day axiom is the converse of the earlier axiom. It now is stated, "political decisions determine economic conditions." Federal taxes are now so high that any alteration has a vital impact on business; inflation has gained so much headway that adding any further increase could destroy the base of many successful economic enterprises; new and mighty regulatory agencies and commissions in Washington hold life or death power over many economic activities. Even the sharp verbal expression of Federal displeasure drove the steel industry into ignominious and discredited defeat.

We live in an era of big government with big powers. We are witnessing a shift toward an authoritarian American state in which big politicians hold the whip and in which "who you know" in Government circles seems likely to replace "what you know." As yet, this consolidated central state is neither Socialist nor Communist nor Fascist in nature. But, neither is there anything remotely liberal about its nature or its design. It is big time politics in action, and regardless of which "ism" it eventually embraces or which embraces it, it would be a careless student of history who could not envision the possibility that our basic American concepts of private ownership, reward of merit, self-determination, and effective control of the politicians by the people are being threatened.

This switch of emphasis and the glorification and exaltation of the Federal politician at the expense of the private citizen is a deplorable change. It is the more deplorable because it has been promoted by a sustained drive for concentrated political power led by self-designated liberals who have practiced a semantic sham unprecedented in political history. The one notable exception must be those masters of doubletalk, the Russian Communists, whose standard stock in trade is to talk of "democracy" when they mean "dictatorship," to talk of "coexistence" when they mean "capitulation" and to talk of the "peoples' rights" when they mean the "politicians' privileges." It is a sham because it espouses the same type of proposals for expanding political controls over the people as advocated by the reactionaries, the tories, and the royalists of a century or two ago.

The true, tried, and tested liberal of history and of today is the private citizen or

public official who advocates the maintenance or extension of individual liberties free alike from the power and the encroachments of an economic or political monopoly. It is the danger, and the presence, of a political monopoly and of programs moving toward that ugly goal which is the blind spot in the thinking of our latter-day liberals who are so busy looking at the problems of our times that they fail to see the even greater perils created by their proposals for solution.

Analyzed from the political standpoint of the predominant political performance of the members of each major party, one must conclude that the Republican Party, by supporting the concept that the size of Government should be reduced rather than expanded is far more identified with the great American liberal ideal than is the Democratic Party. And the always ready and willing handmaiden of the Democratic Party, Americans for Democratic Action, is no more liberal in concept or progressive in action than a Scotsman playing poker in an Edinburgh club.

Our American dream has evolved from the idealistic concept that proper ethics, sound morals, good judgment, prudent economy, and wise decisions are not the exclusive monopoly of those holding public positions of power and authority in Washington. It is an ideal our current pretenders to the liberal label seem entirely unable to comprehend or to accept. While the Republican Party has excelled its major adversary in clinging to this liberal ideal which has had its greatest fruition on American soil and which has provided more happiness for more people and greater individual liberties than man has attained in any other era or area of human history, it must be admitted that among Republicans, also, there are some who have succumbed to the seductive concept that the people must be pushed around by their political officials rather than have them retain the power and push the politicians toward the goals which they desire.

It is not, however, the purpose of this discourse to identify basic Republicanism with true liberalism nor to stigmatize all Democrats as people seeking personal and political power after the manner of Tories. Rather, it is my purpose to point up the forensic fakery involved in trying to identify a candidate, a party, or a cause involved in seeking more power over more people through Central Government, with any realistic, accurate, honest, or historic relationship with liberalism unless the relationship is to show how these linguistic liberals differ so sharply and so deeply from the programs and philosophies of such recognized liberals as Jefferson, Wilson, and Wheeler.

One of the great responsibilities of any administration in this country is to protect and wisely use what we usually term "the American system." To me, the American system means that system which seeks to provide a maximum of opportunity and freedom for our individual citizens. It is no more abstruse nor complicated than that. It is a system which manifests confidence in its people, and it is a system which has produced results unequaled and unexcelled by any other, any place, any time.

Those who would change our American system so as to place the basic responsibility for progress in the hands of Federal politicians instead of with the local citizens and governments are turning back the clock of history. Just as there is nothing liberal about such drives for increased political power in concentrated hands, there is also nothing new or novel in their proposals.

If one were to accept the pratings of the current crop of self-appointed liberals as providing courses of action and programs of progress which are, in fact, liberal in nature, one would logically be forced to the conclusion that the greatest liberals of current history are such advocates of concentrated power as Khrushchev, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Salazar, and Castro. Each of these promised the more abundant life, better schooling, better health, better economic opportunities, and greater well-being to their people. Each sought to provide them by reducing the areas of self-determination and free choice enjoyed by the private citizen and by expanding the areas of control and power enjoyed by the politicans in the capital cities of their lands. Each failed to achieve the degrees of well-being and human happiness enjoyed by the peoples of free countries where even the right to err in judgment is an inherent part of any system which provides unlimited rights to succeed and to aspire. To those who argue that it is not our system which has made America so outstanding but rather something else—our temperature, our resources, our good fortune, or our great complex population—it should be pointed out that West Germany has employed this system with spectacular success and even such formerly backward countries as the Philippines and Japan are making it work.

How, then, can one recognize an actual liberal in the great American tradition and in conformity with the true meaning of the term as shaped by the flow of human history everywhere? Obviously, not by accepting the unsupported boast of an ambitious politician who proclaims, "I am a liberal" much as Louis XIV boasted, "L'etat c'est moi". A real liberal must be tested by his actions, by his programs, by his goals, and by his methods just as we test the veracity and worth of any sloganeer or propagandist who hopes to persuade us by his rhetoric rather than his reason. The wisdom of Emerson is as sound now as it was when he wrote his immortal observation that what you do speaks so loudly that no one can hear what you say.

Let us apply that what-you-do test to today's misleading or misled liberals rather than limiting ourselves to an artless acceptance of their what-you-say pronouncements. There is available for each of us a test which every intelligent and thoughtful citizen should use to decide whether any public proposal or public personality is in fact liberal in conception and nature. We need not become involved in a battle of semantics or in a controversy over terminology. Simply stated, a man or a program is appropriately described as liberal if identified with circumscribing excesive power over the people from any source whether it be concentrated economic, political, or hereditary power. On the other hand, if any man or program is identified with expanding and increasing the power of politicians or economic tycoons over the average citizen, that smacks of reactionism, Toryism, and has no place anywhere in the dictionary of valid liberalism.

This yardstick of good government, this do-it-yourself test of whether a political party, an individual citizen, or a proposed change is in fact liberal in nature, can be employed by applying the following tests to any given circumstance:

(1) Does the proposal expand individual freedom or does it expand the power and authority of the central state?

(2) Does the proposal give a greater choice to the greatest number or does it give greater dicisions to be made by a steadily decreasing number of politicians at the top?

(3) Does it enlarge the powers and opportunities of all individual citizens to determine their own destiny or does it give greater power and additional opportunity to politicians at the Federal level to determine the destiny of all citizens?

After examining a public proposal or a suggested reform; after analyzing the speeches, votes, and positions of a politician or a public figure; after studying the recommendations of an organization, a political party, or a reform group, and after asking the foregoing questions and relating your honest answers to the steps which have been advocated, you will know whether what it proposed is actually liberal, or reactionary, and paternalistic in conception. With the clarification of its character, one can still be for or against a proposal or consider it wise or unwise, but it will be assured that no literate and prudent citizen will be found supporting an issue or a cause on the pretext that it is liberal when in fact it is demonstrably a step backward toward the eras of the overpowering central state.

Since 1776, the march of human freedom in this Republic has been in the direction of expanding and protecting the rights of self-determination by each individual citizen. We have been happily moving toward a more effective implementation of the goals set out in our Declaration of Independence and in the Preamble to our Constitution. We have been endeavoring to extend the vote to all our citizens; to correct imbalances of political power between urban and rural areas; to reform our electoral college system so that every citizen shall have the right to exercise equitable authority through the vote he casts for a President.

But, the ebb tide of freedom is in motion in our country. It is imperative that we seriously question ourselves as to whether, in our impatience to get things done and to bring about improvements, we may be destroying a system of checks and balances which has helped shape the basic formula by which in less than 200 years, we have developed a system so successful that no other country has remotely approximated it. Not only have we provided more happiness and more opportunity for more people than the world has ever see but we are today also contributing to the support of over 80 less fortunate—or perhaps less prudent—countries in the world.

We have done all this under a constitutional charter of freedom which provides for the most liberal government in the world, one in which the wishes, the desires, and the ideals of the people can predominate. The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free rein—uncontrollable by the politicians of his time and place. Let us not reduce that light of liberty to a mere smudgepot of low-level security by casting aside our traditions in reckless pursuit of illusionary goals that require a subjugation of the individual to achieve the false promises of any form of authoritative or totalitarian government. Let us examine each new proposal with an analytic test rather than accepting or rejecting it because of a political label or the mistaken notion that because it is noble in objective it must be liberal in nature.

All Americans are challenged these days—but the greatest challenge is to the real American liberal of 1962. If he is true to the liberal traditions of the past, the liberal heritage which is his as an American, he can not embrace concepts of collectivism or of centralized controls which would have been as much anathema to Thomas Jefferson as they are to the real constitutional libertarians of today.

Red Gamble Held Gain for West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following Associated Press article has been brought to my attention by a constituent, and I feel it should be a matter of interest to this House:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal, Feb. 24, 1963]

RED GAMBLE HELD A GAIN FOR WEST

WICHITA, FALLS, TEX., February 23.—Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said Saturday night that Russia has lost its gamble to extend the Communist empire into the Western Hemisphere.

JOHNSON said in a speech to a dinner audience that the year 1962 is likely to be pin pointed "as one of the decisive turning points in the cold war and of the whole long struggle between freedom and tyranny."

He continued: "First, after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists gambled desperately in an attempt to extend their armed empire across the oceans to the Western Hemisphere. They gambled greatly—and they lost."

LEADERSHIP DEFIED

"Second, after that failure, the Russian Communists turned back to an empire in which—for the first time since communism came into existence—they found their own leadership and control defied and challenged by the Chinese Communists. And the whole myth of Communist unity exploded."

JOHNSON said that when the Soviets moved missiles into Cuba they found themselves facing the hard reality of an American ready, an America prepared, an America resolute.

"In the face of that preparedness and resolve, the forces of communism backed away.

"But there is one vital point which I believe needs to be brought home. The American strength which Khrushchev faced in Cuba—the strength which has held the line against aggression through all these years of the cold war—is not solely the strength of arms and planes and missiles and bombs."

SOLIDARITY CITED

"The greater strength which has carried us through these years of peril is the strength of this country's political system—the system of which all of us are part and to which each of us adds or subtracts strength and solidarity."

JOHNSON said the country needs to recognize that partisanship is not "the end-all and be-all of citizenship."

"In our national history, there are no heroes who made their names as partisans," he said. "The only men remembered—the only men worth remembering—have always been those who have placed the country above party and principle above partisanship. We shall have lost the keystone from the arch of our national strength if ever our values are otherwise."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that the Vice President has miscalculated when he makes the statement that Russia has gambled in the Western Hemisphere and lost. Khrushchev declared to all the world after he had withdrawn 42 missiles from Cuba that they had scored a major victory in Cuba and since we know that it is basic Communist strategy to take three steps forward and one or two steps back in their advancing—it would certainly seem that in view of the no-invasion guarantee which it is reported Mr. Khrushchev received, it can hardly be said that the Russians lost in this hemisphere.

Second. The Vice President is quoted as saying that 1962 is likely to be pinpointed as one of the decisive turning points of the cold war, and I will ask in which direction, and in whose favor? Is there anything to indicate that the Communists have had any reversals of any significance?

Third. The phrase "after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists" is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. It certainly is tragic that the Vice President of the United States should feel that communism has been contained during the last 15 years. A call to the Library of Congress today indicates that 15 years ago approximately 330 million people lived under communism and today approximately 1,059 million are living behind the Iron Curtain or in the satellite countries. Can this be construed as containment?

Fourth. The Vice President seems to take comfort, as do many, in some supposed cleavage between the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists. I quite frankly cannot take much comfort in any disagreement as to methods and do not feel that a disagreement in methods can in any way indicate a break in Communist objectives. It has been repeatedly indicated by both of the Communist empires that it should be understood that they would stand together and they both look forward to the day when they will joyfully shovel the last spadeful of dirt on the grave of capitalism.

The Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists may scrapple over methods, but they are both unswervingly and unrelentlessly committed to the same objective, world conquest and world domination.

An Evaluation of the Common Market and American Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, our very able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] recently wrote an article on "New York, The Common Market, and World Trade," for the February 1963 issue of County Government, a journal of opinion and discussion on matters affecting New York State. Mr. DEROUNIAN's remarks, based upon his close study and hard work during the discussion of the Trade Expansion Act of the last Congress, well deserve the close attention of all of those interested in this important matter. To share these ideas with the Congress and the country, I am placing the gentleman's article, "New York, The Common Market and World Trade," in the RECORD at this point.

NEW YORK, THE COMMON MARKET, AND WORLD TRADE

(By STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN)

Despite the fact that I have great respect for Luther H. Hodges, our present U.S. Secretary of Commerce, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to answer in a somewhat critical manner the article written by him in the December issue of this magazine. While Mr. Hodges took an extremely optimistic view of the European Economic Community (popularly known as the Common Market)—and I wish he could be proven right in his optimism—I feel that his views resembled those of a man in an ivory tower. Everything is not rosy with the Common Market as far as the United States is concerned.

First let me touch on our trading situation with Europe prior to the evolution of the Common Market and during this period of transition. (One must keep in mind that the entire Common Market scheme of trade restrictions has not yet been fully implemented.) Although tariffs have always been an obstacle to U.S. manufacturers attempting to create markets in the countries of Europe, they were by no means the greatest hurdle they had to overcome. Restrictions other than tariffs, so-called administrative restrictions, have for a long time retarded the growth of U.S. markets abroad. I make direct reference to restrictions such as the horsepower use tax in France, the restrictions against the importation of coal into Great Britain, the ban against the importation of watch parts into Switzerland and prohibitions against the importation of dairy products into the Scandinavan countries.

Although our negotiators have in many instances been successful in bargaining down prohibitive tariffs against U.S. products, at the same time they have devoted little or no time toward administrative restrictions. In essence this has meant that while our U.S. representatives to trade negotiations have been able to obtain more equitable tariff rates on U.S. products, in many cases these reduced rates have offered little incentive to our domestic producers as other restrictions still prohibited anything resembling a freer flow of trade.

Since the formation of the Common Market there has been little indication that the member nations in combination will tend to take any positive action with respect to prohibitive administrative restrictions. From all indications their only intent is to create common trade barriers and to lower these trade barriers only for those products which they desperately need. Moreover, there is little guarantee that once Common Market sources for these needed products are developed that even these beneficial rates will not be raised. From all indications their goal is as self-sufficient a Europe as is possible. In the opinion of many, the Common Market has at least the potential of becoming one of the most restrictive trade cartels in modern times. What one must understand about the Common Market is that for those within its walls such an arrangement can be most beneficial. Member nations under the Common Market will tear down traditional trade barriers. They will promote both the free flow of labor and capital throughout its member nations. On the other hand, in joining together they are at the same time raising a common wall against the rest of the free world.

This is not to say that we can not make some inroads through this wall, but at what expense? For example, prior to the formation of the Common Market the bulk of our automobile exports were shipped to Germany and to the Benelux countries where there was a tariff of 18 percent. The Common Market initially proposed an external tariff of 29 percent. As a result of further concessions on our part, this initial tariff was reduced to 22 percent. However, U.S. automobile exporters, as a result of the formation of the Common Market, are faced with a higher rate of duty than was heretofore applicable to the bulk of their exports—despite our bargaining efforts and additional concessions.

The case of automobiles is not an isolated one. When the full effect of the Common Market's external tariff wall is realized, other U.S. products will have to find their way into Europe under higher tariffs than those presently enjoyed. This averaging of the tariff rates of member nations, in many cases, will close present markets and open no new ones.

Our negotiators have bargained away U.S. rates to a point where there are only four

major trading nations in the free world that have rates lower than our own. The Common Market rates when they are fully implemented will, on the average, be considerably higher than ours. Based on weighted averages, only West Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, and Denmark have lower average industrial tariffs. West Germany is already a member of the Common Market so in reality under Common Market averaging this leaves only three nations with rates lower than ours. Moreover, there is talk that even these three nations may become members of the Common Market in the future. Where does this leave us? To answer my own question, this leaves us with very little to bargain with. To lower Common Market external tariff rates back to pre-Common Market levels we will have to lower our rates even further. This will open no new markets, only preserve old ones. At this point it becomes questionable whether our domestic industries can stand the increased competition at home that such action is bound to bring, for it goes without saying that in almost all cases we will have to give additional concessions via lower rates on European goods coming into the United States of America.

Agricultural products are another area of grave concern. The Common Market has proposed a system of variable import fees. These fees will slide up and down, thereby tending to keep the prices of imported agricultural products somewhat above the prices of corresponding Common Market agricultural products. This is meant to encourage the European farmer (including the inefficient farmer) to produce more—with the end objective a self-sufficient Europe.

The implementation of these variable import fees by the Common Market could cost us millions of dollars in the near future, particularly in the product areas of food grains, poultry, eggs, fresh fruit, and vegetables. In the long run, as the Common Market becomes self-sufficient and the European farmer more and more efficient we might well find ourselves pitted against Europe in cutthroat competition for other world markets. In a time when we have large farm surpluses, agricultural price supports and other costly Government subsidies to agriculture, such action presents a real threat and a triple threat at that—to the farmer, the consumer, and the taxpayer. Moreover, it is not too difficult to imagine what this will do to our present unfavorable balance of payments, which is out of balance in great part because of the tremendous expense of maintaining oversea military installations and the foreign aid program—activities which directly and indirectly are of great benefit to our European neighbors.

To summarize, so far I have attempted to show that restrictions other than tariffs present a serious threat to U.S. industry marketing, or hoping to market, abroad. A threat, I might add, to which this administration gives little voice or understanding. Those of us who worked on drafting the final trade bill understood the problem. That is why the bill as it became law contained a section that gives the President expressed power to act against nations or groupings of nations that make use of discriminatory import restrictions.

Also I have discussed the threatened hardships of the averaging method of arriving at uniform external tariffs by the Common Market. It appears that little is to be done about this right away. It has been stated that it will be 1964 before any new trade negotiations will be entered into. Our last round of trade negotiations took approximately 18 months. Using this past experience as a measuring rod, it will be late 1965 or 1966 before any new agreements with the Common Market or our other trading partners would become effective. By this time Europe may be self-sufficient in many areas of production and we will be shut out of much-needed markets.

As if this ought to be enough of a concern, it is only half of our problem. Remove all trade barriers and in many product areas the U.S. manufacturer still could not compete in foreign markets. Here at home we are in, and for the past several years have been in, a period of inflation and increased national debt. Inflation raises domestic prices, stimulates imports, reduces exports and employment, and reduces our gold reserves. A growing national debt shakes business confidence—businessmen are less likely to speculate in times of uncertainty. A growing national debt requires additional debt monetization, which takes money out of circulation that could well be used for consumption and business investment. Our present debt of roughly $300 billion includes interest on that debt of about $9.5 billion. Debt management is rapidly becoming an overpowering problem spurred by the inherent threat of increased inflation.

Furthermore, our present tax structure does not offer the proper incentives for modernization and expansion of American plants and equipment. Granted, within the last year depreciation, schedules have been somewhat liberalized and the 7-percent investment credit was instituted. These, however, are not the kind of sweeping reforms that are so desperately needed. At most they are only mild attempts by the New Frontier to appeal to business.

The Federal budget should be brought into balance. This is not something which can be put off for some indefinite future time. Even the Kennedy administration has given credence to the concept of a balanced budget. However, and this is where we have a parting of the way, they maintain that the budget should be balanced over the cycle and not fiscal year by fiscal year. Even conceding the concept of a balanced budget over a cycle, unless the cycle is to run into infinity there has not been, and will be no balancing. Over the past 33 years we have experienced 27 deficits (current fiscal 1963 included). While our too few surpluses of the past have only been slight or marginal, our deficits have been deep and alarming. In this current fiscal year we are faced with an expected budget deficit of almost $8 billion. It will be much larger if there is a tax cut without an accompanying cut in Federal spending. Nonessential, nondefense spending should be cut, and there is even some indication that defense spending could be trimmed without seriously threatening our national defense or space projects. The 100,000 and some employees that the Kennedy administration has added to the Federal payrolls should be cut. Federal budgets which are more nearly in balance would help to reduce our nation debt and debt-management problem, and curb the threat of more inflation. Secondly, they would go far toward reinstating the confidence that both domestic business and foreign interests seem to lack in our somewhat shaky economy.

The yearly productivity gains of domestic industry should be used primarily to reduce prices, and not to increase wages. Between 1953 and 1960 wages in the United States rose by 31 percent while productivity rose by only 15 percent. In comparison with other industrial nations of the free world, our ratio of wage increases to productivity gains is most unfavorable. Productivity gains used to reduce the price of goods would tend to stimulate consumption and employment, increase exports, and in the end increase the real wages and income of all.

In conclusion, it is incumbent that the Kennedy administration toughen up its foreign trade policy. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which those of us on the Ways and Means Committee worked closely on, has the potential of becoming a fine and rewarding trade program. However, standing alone it is only a paper document. The act needs to be implemented by men who understand its purposes. It needs the force and enthusiasm of a persuasive and aggressive administration. Beyond this, we need trade negotiators who will "bring home the bacon" by protecting American interests.

Concurrently, we need greater domestic economic stability. More specifically, we need balanced budgets, more incentives for the business community to invest and expand, productivity gains which reduce prices—bringing about more competitive prices for American goods in foreign markets.

During its first 2 years in office this administration has shown little understanding of our problems—domestic and foreign. We need positive action not indecision coupled with empty promises. We need an administration that concerns itself with our immediate and foreseeable problems and is not off chasing rainbows.

Address of Archbishop of Chicago at National Conference on Religion and Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the current issue of Our Sunday Visitor, "The Nation's Unfinished Business," by Albert Cardinal Meyer:

THE NATION'S UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(By Albert Cardinal Meyer)

(NOTE.—Earlier this year, a historic meeting, the National Conference on Religion and Race was held in Chicago. Here clergy and laity of all faiths and races in the United States met and urged efforts by churches to end racial prejudice in our Nation. We present here excerpts from an address given to this meeting by Albert Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago.)

At the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation we find ourselves seized with the Nation's unfinished business. We have not yet completely bridged a deep cleft that two centuries of slave economy inflicted upon our society.

The deepest cleft, the distance between master and slave, was not just the distance between the rich and the poor, between the civilized and uncivilized, the learned and the unlearned, the fortunate and the unfortunate. The gulf that separated master and slave under the regime abolished by President Lincoln's proclamation was none other than the difference between human personality, with all its rights and privileges, and the condition of a being—human in appearance and form, emotion, spiritual capacities—but totally deprived of any inherent rights, or dignities save those which were gratuitously accorded to him by his master.

ELEMENTARY RIGHTS

It was the difference between a human being, however poor, however degraded, and that of a mere chattel. In many cases this being was honored, even loved, yet he remained stripped of those elementary rights which are the mark of our humanity itself.

The history of Negro people in the United States in the hundred years that have elapsed between the Emancipation Procla-

mation and the present day is one of gradually and painfully shaking off persistent remnants of those shackles with which they were once shamefully bound.

Great progress has been made. There exists today not a single vocation or profession in the United States in which some men and women of the Negro people are not found. Yet despite all progress, the process of liberation remains partially unfulfilled.

We do not need to travel to any particular part of our country in order to verify the truth of the last assertion. We need only look at the racial problems which confront us in the cities of our Northeast, of the Great Lakes, and of the far western regions, to realize the extent of the work that still confronts us.

The unresolved race question is indeed a pathological infection in our social and political economy. It is also an obstacle to a right conscience before God. Our whole future as a nation and as a religious people may be determined by what we do about the race problem in the next few years.

THE ULTIMATE TEST

Careful and responsible thinkers refer to racism as the core of many of our problems today. What we do about it is the ultimate test of our vaunted democratic way of life. More than this, however, it is the ultimate test of our understanding of Christianity, as expressed in the words of the Divine Master: "By this will all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13, 35).

This unfinished business, therefore, is the gravest kind of challenge to all who believe in a loving Creator, to all who honor His revelation through the ages, to all who feel a deep moral concern for the human person whose integrity He has committed to the conscience of the struggling human race.

How can any of us claim to possess a deep love of the human family, and yet be unconcerned about prevailing racial attitudes that directly militate against the family, and against its very existence as a basic institution of our human society?

I am sure all of you will agree with me that nothing is more foolish or illogical than to take the difficulty or complexity of our unfinished business as an excuse for inaction. To take this attitude, would be, indeed, to tempt the Lord.

Our Heavenly Father himself, so familiar with our inconsistencies and weaknesses, must wonder when He sees the almost infinite skill, resourcefulness and delicacy of operation by which our astronauts succeed in launching and guiding tiny capsules through boundless space; yet apparently we are unable to banish prejudice and gross ignorance and cruel racial injustice from our communities.

On the contrary, the presence and the complexity of our difficulties are a call to action, to concrete and determined action. No action, however, can be divorced from the principles which inspire it.

Let us, then, frankly acknowledge that we are dealing here with a moral and religious issue, as the Catholic Bishops of the United States said in their statement of 1958: "The heart of the race question is moral and religious."

The Holy Bible, though it centers in the record of God's call to man and man's response to God, sheds a guiding light on the investigation of man's action in human society and on the principles which must govern all men in their human dealings with one another. Sacred Scripture, therefore, sheds white light on the principles of human relations.

MEN ARE EQUAL

Men are equal in God's plan and all can participate in the fulness of His blessings. Human nature is to be fulfilled divinely in membership in God's own family. This plan of God, as described in the Scriptures, is the gratuitous fulfillment of man. In it all men are called to an exalted, divine dignity, and all men are equally impotent to fulfill themselves.

God fulfills man, and men are to be united in charity as brothers in the family of God. In this light man's nature contains a potency for equality on the divine level, which consecrates a natural right to equality on the human level. For the Christian, both in the Old and the New Covenants, God has envisioned the unity and equality of all men in His plan of salvation.

I shall not attempt here to spell out the Biblical passages which illustrate this statement. Suffice it to say that we are committed to the proposition that all men are equal in the sight of God; that is, they are created by God, and in the faith of Christian life, they are redeemed by His Divine Son; they are ennobled by the law of God, and God desires them as His friends in the eternity of Heaven.

This fact confers upon all men human dignity and human rights. Men are unequal in talent and achievement; they differ in culture and personal characteristics. Some are saintly, some seem to be evil, most are men of good will, though beset with human frailty. On the basis of personal differences we may distinguish among our fellow men, remembering always the admonition: "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

But discrimination based on the accidental fact of race or color, regardless of personal qualities or achievement, is as such injurious to human rights and cannot be reconciled with the truth that God has created all men with equal rights and equal dignity.

It is easy to proclaim moral issues, but experience teaches us that mistaken or misguided attempts to deal with such issues can land us ultimately in a situation precisely the opposite of that first intended.

So, too, in the field of interracial relations, white citizens' councils, black muslim movements, and all separatist efforts lead not to man discovering his own true nobility, not to man raising his head in equality, but rather man raising his fist in inequality, in terror, in demoralizing antagonism.

ACTION NEEDED

What is needed is the kind of action which takes into account the whole nature of man, the demands of his personality, and the necessary integrity of his social institutions, and is determined to spare no effort that this personality and these institutions may be honored. Our homes, our hospitals, our professional organizations and practices, our schools and colleges, our real estate operations, our police protection, in short all forms of public association and activity are involved. The two particularly urgent, massive questions that face all who attempt to foresee the future of our large city communities are:

First, the future of our urban youth in the matter of employment and training for useful, honorable careers, and, second, the vexed question of residential segregation, with all its implications in the field of home life, family morals, and community peace and friendship.

Is there more that we can do to end unfair job discrimination based on race, religion, national origin? Have we done all that we could even within our own institutions to open up employment opportunities to qualified minority group personnel, to go out of our way to create incentive for those who need it most, and thus build up in youth a desire for learning and technical skills?

Again we observe the spread of urban neighborhoods that have been abandoned by their former owners—either through fear of minority groups or various types of economic and social pressure. We see the consequent growth of the segregated Negro area, as the old neighborhoods are solidly populated by Negroes. We know the tension, and sometimes violence, that accompanies this transition—and the difficulties of maintaining peace, law, and order in the community.

Are we to continue to see fear and panic seize the white community in areas facing racial change? Will we see homeowners continue to yield to the professional manipulators of the panic button and to the ruthless blockbusters?

Or can the force of religion be used more effectively to prepare for change, to help create community organizations which grow, not from fear, but from pride and stewardship over property, as well as from the spirit of neighborliness and openness to all who will maintain community standards?

At the same time can religion help more effectively to establish the spirit and practice of open occupancy for an entire metropolitan area such as our own—because this is the only good atmosphere for our young people—white and Negro alike—and because this will relieve the pressures that generate panic, flight, and desperation?

The types of action which suggest themselves as most effective are not something startling new or original. Rather, they represent a brief summary of what experience has already taught in the matter of race relations and interracial cooperation, and is most likely to lead to definite results in the near future.

For, we are not dealing with abstract propositions, but with living, suffering, and hoping human beings; with parents and children, with husbands and wives, with the young and the aged, with the healthy and the sick, with oldline Americans and recent immigrants.

First of all, we have to work together. The problems that now confront us in our great cities are too manifold and too deep rooted in human passions and misunderstandings for any one of our great religious bodies to deal with them alone.

Indeed, I think it is only fair to expect that by our joint action we shall learn better to understand one another. There is no surer way for the various religious bodies who love a common Father than to unite in studying and meeting our common responsibilities and the needs of our troubled fellow citizens.

The unfinished business of the Emancipation Proclamation demands that we remove the last vestiges of injustice, legal inequality, and discrimination from our communities, our parishes, our schools, and other public institutions. We shall not relax in that task until the work is completed, and the stain of racial inequality removed from our Nation and our cities.

A WIDER SENSE

But we can speak of unfinished business in a much deeper and wider sense, which is that of setting free the constructive, creative power of the Negro people of the country. It is a question not merely of avoiding and banishing racial injustices. Our goal is a much higher one: to set free, for the glory of God, as well as for the good of our Nation and of the world, the gifts, the talents—as yet hardly plumbed—spiritual and cultural—of all sections of our human community.

Only God our Lord knows what spiritual forces are waiting to be released, if we have but the faith and the love to do so. The coming of in-migrant or immigrant racial groups to our local communities often poses problems, but the problems are not agonizing and overwhelming if the newcomers are our brothers. The newcomers bear gifts, if we have the intelligence and the imagination to help them develop them.

Appendix

The 50th Anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during the 50 years since its formal organization on March 4, 1913, the U.S. Department of Labor has faithfully and fully discharged its mission to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." The Department has served equally both organized and unorganized labor in accordance with the best interests of the American people as a whole, and has been directly responsible for much beneficial change which has been achieved.

It is altogether fitting that we, as a nation, should pause to pay tribute to the U.S. Department of Labor as it marks the completion of a half-century of service in the public interest. As a member of the President's Committee for the Department of Labor 50th Anniversary Year, I am gratified to note that popular recognition of the meaningful contributions of the Department has been widespread and sincere. Citizens realize the importance and desirability of a well-conceived and effective governmental agency staffed by experienced and dedicated experts who seek to promote healthy cooperation and justice in areas of labor-management concern.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and earlier, as a member of the Labor Committee in the House of Representatives under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman, it has been my responsibility to aid in the drafting and passage of significant legislation designed to support the efforts of the Department of Labor and advance the well-being of American working men and women. Much has been achieved in creating safer and more healthful working conditions, workman's compensation and rehabilitation benefits, sound labor standards, unemployment insurance, impartial mediation, and many other functions which have created in America the healthiest working climate in the world.

During the New Deal administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a Member of the House of Representatives I was privileged to support a number of far-reaching measures which were instrumental in strengthening and raising the status of labor. Although trade unionism had been previously established in the United States it was under legislation of the New Deal era that the employer was first enjoined from interfering with the workers' right to organize; moreover, the employer was additionally obligated to recognize unions and to bargain with them in good faith. These provisions came into being under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, often termed the Magna Carta of labor, and was one of the New Deal's major contributions to economic and social justice.

Two other pieces of meaningful legislation enacted during this period were, the Government Contracts Act of 1936, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The first required that persons employed by Government contractors must be paid not less than the standard minimum wage determined by the Secretary of Labor; while the latter established the principle of a universal floor under wages and a universal standard for hours in interstate commerce. It is interesting to note that the concept that the worker has the right to share in the benefits flowing from America's rising capacity to produce enjoyed its greatest legislative implementation during the New Deal.

And, it has become abundantly clear that the Department of Labor, through its many and diverse functions, has been instrumental in seeking more effective application of the Employment Act of 1946. This monumental piece of legislation was, according to the respected economist Gerhard Colm, "an expression of the peoples determination that appropriate Government policies would be used to avert depressions and unemployment. It was, in a way, an expression of confidence that a satisfactory economic performance could be accomplished within the framework of a free society; not through a policy of laissez faire, but through deliberate economic and fiscal measures."

It is in the areas of formulating and implementing these measures to uphold the performance of the economy as a whole that the Department of Labor has exhibited outstanding and consistent leadership. The Department has effectively demonstrated that we can, through diligent and imaginative effort, achieve the goals of the Employment Act of 1946, namely: To reach maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The battle is far from over, however, and many challenges must be overcome before we realize the full intent of the Employment Act. Our country is engaged in a worldwide effort to prove that an economy based on free enterprise and free institutions can be adapted to fit the needs of a complex industrial society. Deliberate governmental policies, programs and implementation will be required, and it is in this area that the U.S. Department of Labor will continue to serve the American people as it has for the past 50 years.

The Department will aid in the drafting of legislation, it will regulate the administration of law, it will mediate labor disputes, and will act as a factfinding and statistical service. But, most important, it will serve to protect the interest of American workers and American employers, and through them, it will safeguard every citizen of this Nation.

Let us join in offering heartiest congratulations to the Department on this, its 50th anniversary. May the next half-century prove even more fruitful.

College Fraternities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, while not a member of Beta Theta Pi, I was greatly impressed by a statement of this fraternity's national president, Dr. Seth R. Brooks, appearing in a recent issue of the Beta Theta Pi magazine. Dr. Brooks is a deeply religious man, one who knows and appreciates the many good points of the fraternity system.

The American college fraternities have contributed much to the development of their individual members and to their respective schools. They are all based upon the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Those behind the movement to destroy the American college fraternity should in the words of Dr. Brooks, be answered by "Physician, heal thyself."

The article follows:

COLLEGE FRATERNITIES

Once again fraternities are coming under the lash of those who hate them and would, if they could, decimate them.

A special feature in the New York Times magazine was written by a David Boroff. The writer told of the death knell to fraternities at Williams College and elsewhere.

A President Eddy, of Chatham College for Women, delivered an address calling for elimination of "the wornout system of fraternities." His theme seemed to be, "get rid of fraternities, or higher education cannot succeed."

In regard to the first writer, one wonders about the experience of the author. Did he ever belong to a real chapter where men had high regard for each other, worked for high scholarships, developed men in leadership, and were gripped by the noblest ideals? Did he ever have membership in a great and good fraternity? Did he ever serve as an officer or a trustee of a fraternity, which was ceaselessly busy to quicken and inspire young men to useful and honorable living?

The second writer reminds one of the position of many religious fanatics. Men have said, "If this dogma isn't believed, religion has no validity." Others once said, "If the Volstead Act is repealed, there is no hope for Christianity."

Any person has the right to say, "If this dogma or article of the creed isn't professed, religion is not valid for me." No one has the right so to speak for all other men.

Fraternities may be considered an abomination for the person so believing. However, no person has the right to say that fraternities are an abomination for total education and all other persons or that if fraternities are not abolished, university and college life are doomed.

The whole caste of demons is brought on to the state again. Fraternities are undemocratic. Fraternities have wild parties. Fraternities take too much of a student's time. Fraternities do not foster high grades.

How can fraternities be undemocratic when legislatures and college administrations have ruled there can be no restrictive clauses? (Can't men and women select their own friends, colleges, churches, President, Governor, Senator?) No real fraternity officer sanctions wild parties. What goes on in dormitories and student apartments without a word from university or press? How about the time taken by athletics and social action groups? Why not mention the high scholastic record of many fraternities and fraternity chapters?

Can all the outstanding men and women in this Nation who had a great fraternity experience, loved and still love their fraternity, serve it for decades without money or price be so wrong? No, they cannot be. They have had nothing to say against nonfraternity colleges or persons. They have been the victims of the most bitter prejudice and animosity based on half-truths of almost any group in our land.

Were higher education today more certain of its own case and more sure where it is going or wants to go, perhaps there would be more willingness on the part of fraternity leaders to take educational leaders as the law and the prophet.

The best answer to the person who cries for the burial of fraternities is, "Physician, heal thyself."

Too much of what ails an institution of learning is passed on to fraternity row as an incurable malady.

Yours in kai,

SETH R. BROOKS,
St. Lawrence, Class of 1922, President of Beta Theta Pi.

Needs of Our Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, shortly this Congress will be acting to meet the needs of our veterans.

Peter L. Dye, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, put the problem very well when he appeared before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee recently.

I ask unanimous consent to have Commander Dye's testimony inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD so that his summation of the needs of those who served may be known by all who benefited.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PETER L. DYE, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, TO THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 7, 1963

The Disabled American Veterans wishes to take this opportunity to express appreciation to the members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for arranging this hearing today for the purpose of presenting our legislative program. We are impressed with the fact that so many of the former members of this committee have chosen to continue to serve the veterans of this Nation. We also want the new members of this committee to know that their service to the veterans of this country will always be viewed with gratitude by our organization. We have previously sent letters of thanks to the members of the committee as well as the other Members of Congress for passing the compensation increase bill which affected 2 million service-connected disabled veterans during the last session of Congress. Mr. Chairman, we personally wish to thank the members of this committee who initiated this much-needed piece of legislation.

As the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I approach this meeting with a great sense of responsibility. My feelings of responsibility are magnified by the knowledge that the needs and desires of the 210,000 wartime disabled who are members of our organization are reflected in the legislative program adopted at our last national convention in Atlantic City, N.J. My statement this morning is more than just a personal presentation; it is a reflection of what our organization feels to be necessary for the welfare of our country's 2 million disabled veterans and for their dependents.

The No. 1 legislative objective of the Disabled American Veterans this year is the proposal to establish a Court of Veterans Appeals for disallowed veterans' claims. It is the considered opinion of this organization that all veterans should have recourse to all three branches of the Government. I am referring to the fact that veterans are denied the opportunity to exercise the right of remedy through the judicial system of our Government in the adjudicative process of claims for veterans' benefits. We subscribe to the concept that veterans' benefits be administered by one agency and one agency only. We do not believe that any authority now vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, nor the Veterans' Administration, as a single agency for the adjudication of veterans' claims, will be diminished in any manner by the proposal to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals. This organization is in favor of judicial review because it will provide another avenue for the disabled veteran to obtain his just and equitable benefits. Judicial review will allow those men who have been denied benefits and have exhausted all avenues of appellate consideration by the Veterans' Administration, an opportunity of presenting their cases to a Court of Veterans' Appeals. We have asked that this bill be considered because of the restriction under present law. Section 211 of title 38, United States Code, provides that the decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on any question of law or fact concerning a claim for benefits or payments under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such decision. (Exceptions are secs. 784, 1661, and 1761 of title 38, United States Code.)

The law governing the granting of service connection at the present time has both a presumption of soundness at induction and a presumption of aggravation of a preexisting disease or injury which are rebuttable only by clear and unmistakable evidence or sound medical principles as distinguished from medical judgment. The burden of proof is on the Veterans' Administration to rebut these presumptions by the showing of affirmative and specific evidence. Thus, it is readily evident that the question involved is not only the interpretation of the law, but also the probative value of the evidence in file at the time the claim is adjudicated.

Too often statutory presumption operating in favor of the veteran has been pushed aside. The legal presumption cannot be overcome by a finding of fact that is not specific as to degree and is not based upon affirmative evidence. In too many instances the Veterans' Administration has merely presumed that a certain degree of disability was manifest prior to induction into military service. We feel that too many current decisions are based on medical judgment which is not proper under present law.

The Board of Appeals, which is the court of final jurisdiction, is made up of men with years of regional office rating experience. Their thinking is schooled along the same lines as the so-called lower court. In other words, under present procedure, the final decision is by a board having the same outlook and approach as the board of original jurisdiction. Actually, therefore, the case is merely decided by a Veterans' Administration board sitting in a different town.

The issue, as we see it, is pure law against medical opinion or other influences based on policy or speculation.

It is our belief that a Court of Veterans' Appeals would provide a new, fresh look strictly within the evidentary framework of the law.

Our second major legislative objective is a proposal which will enable service-connected wartime disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation (when rated less than total) and in addition draw a proportionate amount of non-service-connected pension when they are simultaneously eligible to receive both benefits. Current provisions make it necessary for wartime service-connected disabled veterans to waive their monthly compensation payments in order to receive a greater monthly benefit of pension. The majority of veterans whose service-connected disability is rated 40 percent or less can receive a greater monthly benefit by electing to receive pension when entitlement has been established. Service-connected disabled veterans rated at more than 40 percent receive no benefit whatsoever from the pension laws.

The history of governmental provisions for compensation based on service-incurred disability is specific as to the basic justification. From the beginning there has been a clear purpose to compensate the veteran as far as can practicably be determined for the resultant handicaps he took back into civil life. Compensation is provided as an earned right, over and above all else, including any civil adjustment. Specific provisions are included to prevent any reduction in the rate of compensation for individual success in overcoming the handicaps of any disease or injury. It will be noted that the promulgators of the laws and regulations recognize that complete compensation was not practicable as every human factor cannot possibly be considered. For example: Many of the service-connected veterans have been subjected to major operations, blast concussions, tropical diseases, starvation and deprivations while prisoners of war, extended period without proper sleep or sanitation, and many other circumstances unpreventable because of wartime combat conditions. These situations have caused serious limitations upon the minds and bodies of dis-

abled veterans who have returned to civil life.

It is generally accepted that major operations for wartime injuries and severe disabilities shorten the span of life and the disabled veteran's vocational longevity. Consequently, we have service-connected men handicapped by disease and injury who obviously could never be fully compensated either in the field of individual endeavor or in ordinary social intercourse.

These service-connected disabled veterans meet all the tests of need set out in the pension law the same as any other veteran who incurred no disease or injury in the military service and who may have served for only a brief period of time.

The service-connected disabled veteran is confronted by a decision that no part of the normal pension plan can be his without waiving his disability compensation. This seems entirely unreasonable. For these reasons and many others we ask that most serious consideration be given to our proposal which would allow the service-connected disabled veteran to continue to receive his disability compensation and in addition draw a proportionate amount of his non-service-connected pension when simultaneously entitled to both benefits.

Our third legislative objective concerns a special problem that has been developing for severely disabled men and that is the need for educational assistance for their minor children.

At the present time there are approximately 89,000 veterans whose wartime service-connected disabilities have been adjudicated as rendering them 100 percent disabled. This number is, of course, only a small percentage of those who have service-connected disabilities. The total number is nearly 2 million.

Studies have shown that the median earning for this group is approximately $850 per year. Obviously these men are generally reduced to accepting menial and often unpleasant jobs, if they are able to secure employment at all. If this 100 percent disabled individual is lucky enough to get a job of some sort commensurate with his severe disability, his compensation of $3,000 per year when added to the median earning of $850 per year would be only $3,850. Compare this to the median income per family in the United States which is $5,737 per year as reported by the Government. This means that the total amount available for the support of his family and education of his minor children is nearly $1,900 per year less than that of the average American family. This is in the face of a 4.3-percent rise in the consumer price index in the past 22 months. Further, it should be obvious that wage increases for this group just do not increase as they do in the competitive labor market. To put it bluntly, these disabled veterans must take unskilled jobs which no one really wants. They simply do not have enough funds to give their minor children a reasonable chance for an education that will provide them with the necessary skills to compete in this competitive labor field. At this very moment there are thousands of young people unable to get a job simply because they are unskilled and untrained. This deprivation of opportunity means that a reservoir of talent must remain untapped because of the misfortune of having been born in an era in which no consideration is given to the plight of a child of a totally disabled veteran. What better way presents itself than to provide these youths with means to become useful citizens and to contribute to the future strength of our country? We feel strongly that these children should have priority over any others when additional Federal funds are expended for educational purposes. Our bill would remedy this situation.

One of our bills introduced the first day of the current session of Congress provides additional compensation for dependents of service-connected veterans rated by the Veterans Administration as not less than 40-percent disabled. This group is composed of 154,000 disabled veterans whose disabilities include such conditions as amputation of a foot, enucleation of an eye, removal of three-fourths of the stomach, severe back conditions, and many other disabilities which make it difficult for these veterans to find and retain suitable gainful employment consistent with their disability. This is working a particular hardship especially when he has two or three and/or more dependents.

We believe an additional amount of compensation for dependents is amply justified and fair and would overcome some of the financial hardships with which they are faced today.

Also one of our objectives is the reopening of national service life insurance for a limited period of time. We will insist that any bill approved for this purpose include a provision to waive the consideration of any service-connected disability in order for the veteran to meet the good health requirements of the policy.

We feel that if the Government is to make insurance available to anyone, it should include those who would otherwise be insurable except for the disabilities incurred in the defense of our country.

We are gravely concerned about the need for increased rates in death compensation for the surviving widow, dependent parents and minor children of veterans who died from wartime service-connected disabilities. The death compensation rates for this group have not been increased since January 1, 1957, even though the cost of living increased over 6 percent during this period. We feel that a substantial raise in compensation is in order and we will actively support legislation which will bring about the desired result. Dependent parents are in dire need of additional assistance due to their advanced age and the rapidly rising cost of living. We recommend that both the income limitations and the monthly rate of compensation be increased to allow the dependent parents to finish out their lives in more reasonably comfortable circumstances.

It is noted that President Kennedy's recent budget message recommended an increase in benefits to this most worthy group.

High on our legislative list is the hospital and medical program administered by the Veterans' Administration for both the service-connected veteran and those with none-service-connected disabilities who cannot defray the cost of hospitalization. We look upon the hospital program as one of the most important benefits accorded to the sick and needy veterans of this country. We are pleased that the Veterans' Administration will continue to conduct a research program designed to improve methods of diagnosis and treatment and to carry on an education and training program to improve the professional competence of the hospital staff. The Veterans' Administration's medical research program has contributed greatly not only to the health of veterans but to the advancement of medical science everywhere.

We believe that comprehensive plans should be expedited to care for the chronically ill and aged veterans of our wars. There still continues to be many veterans with permanent or chronic disabilities who are unable to earn a living and who have no financial resources for self support.

The Veterans' Administration's domiciliary program provides a place where they may live in dignity while they are being rehabilitated for return to their own communities.

We have noted with interest the pilot project of the restoration center at Hines, Ill., and are especially hopeful that this project will be highly successful. We hope that the restoration centers will be another link in the chain of Veterans' Administration facilities to rehabilitate the veteran rather than a program to eliminate or replace domiciliary centers.

Mr. Chairman, the Disabled American Veterans is not unmindful of the many demands which are made upon your committee for benefits. You have stated repeatedly and your committee has demonstrated that it believes first consideration should go to the service-connected disabled veteran. We are all in agreement that the veterans' hospital and medical program is one of the major and finest benefits available to veterans. DAV appreciates the diligence and attention which this committee has given to the hospital program over the years and we are especially pleased that the program initiated several years ago to modernize and renovate the Veterans Administration hospital system is progressing satisfactorily.

In view of the many demands for increased benefits we realize that priorities must be established. We believe and we think the American public supports the belief that the needs of the service-connected disabled veteran come first. Benefits for surviving widows, children, and dependent parents deserve high priority. The medical program is most important to the service-connected veteran, but it also represents a most important area of benefit for the non-service-connected veteran.

We believe the needs of the service-connected veteran widows, children, and dependent parents, should be met before the Congress responds to the very large demands being made for the non-service-connected programs.

Mr. Chairman, the DAV wishes you and the committee members to know that we sincerely appreciate the courtesy and cooperation shown to us by your very efficient and capable committee staff.

Each of you are invited to use the services of our national service officers on any problem you may have with veterans' claims. Our national service officers are located in each of the Veterans Administration regional and district offices in the United States. We have a Washington staff who cover the board of appeals, civil service and employment matters, insurance, military and naval affairs, and special cases at the veterans' benefits office and they are also available to you. Mr. Charles L. Huber, the national director of legislation or Mr. Irving Peltz, the national service director, are only as far away as your telephone. Please call in if we can assist you in any way.

This presentation has covered some of our legislative objectives and we are attaching the balance of the legislative resolutions adopted at our last national convention in Atlantic City, N.J., which covers our entire legislative program. We ask that they be entered in the record.

Thank you.

How About Establishing a U.S. Department of Facts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the

February 20, 1963, Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune. With the increasing management of the news here in our Nation's Capital, it is no wonder that newspapers in many parts of our country are giving thoughtful consideration to a U.S. Department of Facts:

Labor and management in the steel industry have come up with an idea which may not only reduce strife in that field but could have much broader application in public affairs.

After the marathon steel strike of 1959, a human relations committee was established with both labor and company officials participating. Skeptics forecast a short, unproductive life for the committee, but it has confounded them.

It devotes itself to finding a basis for mutual understanding of many complex problems besetting the industry, such as what the real cost is of company medical insurance and how certain work rules affect worker efficiency and company output.

According to a Wall Street Journal report, this committee has had important beginning success in developing a body of agreed, accepted facts in many potentially explosive matters.

The idea for the group was born in the 1959 strike, when negotiators realized that both sides were arguing heatedly over issues neither one really knew enough about.

The industry's new approach, a cooperative search for solid information instead of an emotional hollering contest at contract times, deserves to be applied in many sectors of public life.

The Federal budget is one. It is perennially a storm center of political controversy.

Countless politicians, eager to prove their bent for economy, tend to engulf the budget dispute in a fog of misstatement and misunderstanding.

Members of Congress do not tinker much with the defense and space budget. They can posture patriotically against a backdrop of these astronomical figures, not troubling to mention their own States and districts are often prime beneficiaries of these outlays.

The rest of the budget can be heavily assaulted. By any fair measure it keeps getting bigger, and so does the number of Federal employees.

But seldom if ever do the lawmakers—and the general voting public—have a reasonable understanding as to how much of this growth, if any, is justified and how much is not.

A Congressman asserts that the Agriculture Department is adding hundreds of new people to "spy on farmers." The Department replies that its additional people are meat inspectors and forest service workers, needed to police rising numbers of meat plants and to watch over national forests increasingly flooded with visitors.

Now either this is so or it is not. The truth is ascertainable. And we ought to have some kind of impartial, responsible joint Government group which can lay the facts on the line.

Politics is never going to stop at the Budget Bureau's door, nor should it. But at least we ought to take out of the debating arena that kind of wild-flailing argument which is grounded in misinformation and ignorance.

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on January 24, 1963, I introduced on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] S. 468, a bill to amend the United States Code relating to highways to help protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources during construction of Federal-aid highways.

An article in the December 12, 1962, issue of the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune underscored the importance of this save-our-streams legislation.

The article stated that changes in stream channels during highway and railroad construction are having adverse effects on fish habitat in north central Montana.

In fact, the article said, "Any time a stream channel is changed from its natural state, trout production and fishing deteriorate."

The Tribune article relates a tragic story that is being repeated over and over again in many parts of our country. It is a warning that we must heed or many of our precious fishing streams and rivers and the recreation opportunities they provide will be lost to us forever.

Mr. President, the bill the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and I introduced would help us save our streams by meeting the problem as it relates to Federal-aid highways. I ask unanimous consent that the Great Falls Tribune article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREAM SHIFT INJURIOUS TO FISHING

Altering of fishing streams by highway and railroad construction and other unnatural means apparently is producing adverse effects in many north central Montana rivers and creeks.

H. Max Stone, district information officer for the Montana Fish and Game Department, said this conclusion was reached by department personnel as a result of recent tests using electrical fish-shocking machines.

NUMEROUS CAUSES

Railroad and highway construction, urban and industrial development projects and agricultural activities are responsible for changing many miles of good trout streams. How these activities decrease the trout stream resource of Montana is a question answered by the "Edison Spinner" or fish-shocking generator, Stone said.

Sections of several streams were sampled to determine trout populations both before and after channel alterations were made. Here are some results:

In Belt Creek, four trout over 6 inches in length were found in unchanged stream channels compared to none in altered sections.

Sheep Creek produced 12 trout and 44 whitefish in unchanged sections compared to none for both species in altered sections.

Otter Creek had 18 trout over 6 inches in length before stream channel alterations compared with two trout after channel changes.

Beaver Creek in the Bear Paw Mountains, contained 17 trout over 6 inches long in unchanged stream areas and none in altered portions.

WHAT IT MEANS

This means that any time a stream channel is changed from its natural state, trout production and fishing deteriorate, Stone said.

"The future stream trout fishing in Montant is going to be dependent upon the attitude and actions of fisherman and the people of Montana. Thirty-eight miles of four streams named have been lost so far as trout fishing is concerned," Stone concluded.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day of Save Your Vision Week and I would not like it to pass without a word of commendation for the work of our optometrists who sponsor this observance annually through their professional society, the American Optometric Association.

Largely through the efforts of our 18,000 practicing optometrists this Nation has the highest standards of vision care in the world. How important this is we realize when we consider that more than 80 percent of our knowledge comes to us through that most precious sense of all, our vision.

To those Members of Congress who are or have been the beneficiaries of optometric services, there should be little need for emphasizing the importance of good vision in our daily pursuits. However, we are apt to take this for granted. And yet, when we break, lose, or leave our glasses at home, we find our productivity—and disposition—greatly impaired. We become different persons, with newly imposed limitations of mobility and accomplishment until our eyeglasses are again at hand and our keenness of vision restored.

Among our duties as representatives of this great Nation are the promotion and development of its free enterprise system. Its continued progress depends in part on how efficiently its operations are conducted. Better vision contributes considerably to such efficiency, so therefore I wish to voice our appreciation to the American Optometric Association and its State affiliates for their public educational programs which alert all of us to the latest techniques and procedures of optometric care. Surely the efficiency of our productive and educational systems has been raised by attention to such care.

Because of the excellent services of our 18,000 optometrists, 60 million American men, women, and children are getting more out of life and giving more to others in both work and play.

There are some 400 optometrists commissioned in our armed services who are making an outstanding contribution to our national defense. America is indebted to its professional vision specialists for their contributions to our total well being.

Yet, there is a great unmet need, for statistical evidence has come to my attention that two out of three adults have inefficient vision which can handicap their work and personal job advancement opportunities.

During National Save Your Vision Week, it is proper that we recognize both our high vision standards and our unmet vision needs.

We should always be mindful of the fact that our modern pace of living is making ever-increasing demands on our vision capabilities.

U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has been discussion on the floor of the Senate of the recent meeting of the U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, held in Geneva, Switzerland, between February 4 and 20. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, chairman of the board of Xerox Corp., dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW U.N. CONFERENCE ATTACKED WORLD POVERTY

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

"The simple fact is that we have learned a great deal more from them than they have learned from us."

That comment by one of the U.S. delegates to the U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less-Developed Areas, held in Geneva, Switzerland, between February 4 and 20, summarized for a number of us the most dramatic result of the Conference.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to UNCSAT (the pondorous formal title led to the even less pronouncable abbreviation), I participated in the sessions from February 9 to 16.

The Conference was set up by the U.N. as an unprecedented global effort to help mobilize the accumulated experience and resources of the more developed nations in launching a full-scale attack against the illiteracy, hunger, disease, and poverty of the less developed areas.

To Geneva came some 1,500 delegates from 80 countries. Among them were foremost governmental officials, scientists, technical experts, educational, medical, and other leaders.

The purpose of the conference was not to make recommendations to governments or to come to decisions regarding policy. Rather, it was to focus attention on practical means for accelerating the development of the less developed areas through effective application of science, technology, and other advances of the more fully developed societies.

LITTLE GOBBLEDEGOOK

Frankly, I went to the conference with some real questions. Would it be too large to be manageable? Would there be too many academic dissertations and abstruse discussions in which experts would talk only to other experts in the unintelligible gobbledegook of their expertise? Could such a conference involving Communist and non-Communist representatives—and held at precisely the same time as the disarmament conference a stone's throw away—submerge the cold war long enough to concentrate on programs to help the millions of human beings in need?

On just about every count, I found the conference more successful and effective than I had anticipated.

The U.S. delegation—led with immense skill and judgment by Dr. Walsh McDermott, Cornell Medical School professor—included Jerome Weisner, special assistant to the President for science and technology; Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Jonathan Bingham, Ambassador to the U.N. Economic and Social Council; Frank Coffin, Deputy Administrator of Agency for International Development (AID); Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator for Human Resources of AID; Detlev Bronk, president of the Rockefeller Institute; Dr. I. Rabi, Nobel prize-winning physicist; Dr. Margaret Mead, associate curator of the American Museum of Natural History; Dr. Max Millikan, director of the center of international studies at MIT, and Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

The delegation worked hard and long and I believe it is fair to say that its impact on the conference was greater than that of any other.

COLDWAR SQUELCHED

At the outset there were some on our delegation who plumped for playing one-upmanship with the Russians—meet every Russian parry, answer every Soviet point, counter every Russian maneuver. But it soon was recognized that this should not be our role. When at the opening plenary session, chief Russian delegate Federov launched into some cold war pyrotechnics, Weisner, following him to the platform, won widespread laughter and applause with the simple introductory sentence:

"It is good to be here at this non-political conference to discuss true science."

As time went on, it became clear to all of us that the 400 delegates from the underdeveloped nations had their eyes on the U.S. in formulating their own objectives and aspirations.

Time and again their representatives would tell us in informal talks that their nations were trying to emulate the kind of progress we had achieved and would like to accomplish some of those things for themselves. But, they emphasized, they wanted to do so in their own way, in their own time, and in their own social and economic tradition.

And in understanding this, we all were learning a good deal of lasting significance:

1. We learned directly and personally about the real problems which confront these underdeveloped countries and how we must think about them in trying to arrive at solutions.

2. We learned that much of what we know and which is of real consequence to the rich areas of the earth is almost meaningless to the vast poor areas in which men still barely survive by tilling the soil with hoe and primitive plow (it makes little sense to talk of harnessing sound and space to men whose lives are spent harnessing water buffalo.)

3. We learned how little technology alone or money alone or aid programs alone could do to solve the problems or meet the needs, and that the challenge is one that can only be dealt with effectively in terms of the economies, the mores, the social customs, the ways of life of the countries we are trying to help to help themselves.

(4) We learned in an unforgettable way that the best way to exchange knowledge is to "wrap it up in a person," that the most effective method by which to transfer information and experience is on a person-to-person and people-to-people basis.

BUSINESS HELP

One area in which the conference and especially our American participation might well have been bolstered, it seems to me, would have been in having more representatives of American business and industry.

A number of the delegates from other countries—including some from the Communist bloc—made the point that there were relatively few American business leaders in attendance and yet the implementation of many of the objectives would require precisely the techniques and experience developed by American industry.

Whenever and wherever I could, I tried to make clear that American business and industry were ready to help the advance of the less-developed areas of the world with their science, technology, and accumulated skills, and that out of the Geneva conference might come some real guidance as to ways in which American Government, business, industry, and labor might join together to help meet the needs of the less-developed countries.

Before I left Geneva, I summed up my own observations for our American delegation. It seemed to me the whole theme could well lie in this sentence from Arnold Toynbee:

"Our age will be well remembered not for its horrifying crimes or its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation in history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

Federal Inventions Administrations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which if passed will be known as the Federal Inventions Administration Act.

The bill prescribes a national policy with respect to the encouragement of invention by employees of the Government and its contractors, the result of which would be many contributions to the advancement of the Nation's welfare. It aims to achieve this objective by providing for the simplified administration in the public interest of the property rights to inventions resulting from research or development which is financed at least in part through the expenditure of public funds.

In many respects the bill represents a compromise between the extreme views voiced by various individuals in congressional hearings which have been held in recent years. The bill provides that in every case the Government would obtain a royalty-free, nonexclusive license to use any invention arising from a Government-sponsored research or development project. Title to each such invention and any patents covering it would remain with the inventor or his assignee subject to one condition: Instead of just owning the patent and optionally doing nothing about the invention, he has to put it into commercial use either on his own or by licensing someone else to make, use or sell it. The patent owner has 5 years within which to do this after the patent issues, and if he fails to do it by then the Government can step in, take back title to the patent, and reas-

sign it to someone who gives assurances he will put the invention into public use.

The cardinal objectives of the bill are to get into actual circulation as many as possible of the inventions which stem from Government-sponsored research, and to encourage qualified contractors to seek Government contracts. It should eliminate the objections which many concerns have had with respect to the policies of such agencies as the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration whose enabling statutes require that almost all inventions made in the performance of their contracts be assigned to the Government. Contractors who have been clamoring that they should be allowed to hold on to the patent rights will get them, but they will not be able to suppress them. In recognition of the public's interest in those inventions, which public funds helped to make possible, the inventions will have to be "put to work" publicly.

Government employees who make inventions will be treated in the same way as Government contractors. They can keep or assign title to their inventions, but within the stated time interval they also must establish that the inventions have been publicly utilized or forfeit their right to keep title. This provision should help the Government agencies to recruit and retain scientific and technical personnel who might otherwise be tempted to leave the Government for higher paying positions in industry.

Another feature of the bill is the proviso that any Government contractor who seeks to take advantage of the title-retention rights which it provides must install an approved award and rewards program. According to that program, any of the contractor's employees making an invention while working on the Government contract will be eligible to receive cash rewards for his efforts. This provision is similar in some respects to laws now in force in some European countries which require all employers to give their employee-inventors a share of the profits derived from their inventions over and above any normal salary considerations which may be in effect. Such awards programs are, of course, not unknown in the United States, as many domestic corporations have used such means for years in order to stimulate the inventive activity of their personnel.

Administration of the proposed law would be entrusted to an Office of Federal Inventions, established in the Department of Commerce. The single Office and Government-wide administration of a uniform law should effect tremendous economies, as it would make unnecessary the comparable offices now functioning in practically every Government department and agency for the purpose of settling matters dealing with inventions made by Government employees and contractors.

Senator Jackson's Foresight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a few days ago Adm. Hyman Rickover wrote, saying the sea trials of the U.S.S. *Lafayette* were successful.

The *Lafayette* is our 29th nuclear submarine.

It is the 11th equipped to fire Polaris missiles.

She also is the largest submarine ever built.

But Admiral Rickover's letter reminded me of the column which Scripps-Howard staff writer Marshall McNeil wrote on January 30 in the Washington Daily News. His words also mentioned the accomplishment of, recalled history, and stressed the part which my colleague from Washington, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, played in getting the nuclear submarine-Polaris program underway and maintaining it on a realistic basis.

I ask the unanimous consent to have Marshall McNeil's article reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON URGED POLARIS PLAN 6 YEARS AGO

(By Marshall McNeil)

Six years ago farsighted young Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, called loudly for 100 Polaris missile subs to arm us with "ballistic seapower."

Today he repeated that demand.

Then, not many seemed to listen.

Today, having seen nearly everything he forecast come true about the need for reliance by the free world on the Polaris, Senator JACKSON stood by his guns, although the Pentagon plans for a fleet of only 41 of these underwater, atomic-powered, nuclear-armed missile systems.

BELIEF

The man who better than most is fully entitled to say, "I told you so," believes:

"We and our allies in concert should have at least 100 Polaris missile subs, because:

"Hidden, widely deployed, ever on the move, the Polaris system can make our allies better able to stand up to threats of ballistic blackmail from Moscow.

"The Polaris system gives our allies a sea-based alternative to a land-based deterrent force and reduces the danger to home territories.

"Many of our allies are experienced seafaring nations, which Russia is not, and they have the capability and know-how to share with us in building and operating the Polaris system.

"The mobility and deployment possibilities of Polaris make it a tool to back up diplomatic moves."

On May 27, 1957, Senator JACKSON made his first big Senate speech on the Polaris.

"Britain," he said, "is a comparatively tiny country. Her cities could not escape from a Soviet air-atomic attack directed at British bases.

"The problem would be different if Britain were primarily defended by a force of submarine-based missiles. For purposes of defense, Britain would no longer be a tiny country. Tens of thousands of square miles would be added to its defense base."

NASSAU PACT

On December 21, 1962, in the Nassau Pact, President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan agreed to share our Polaris missile system as a substitute for untried Skybolt, thus building for Europe and Britain a new deterrent.

On May 27, 1957, Senator JACKSON said:

"We and our North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies are now reviewing present strategy for the defense of Europe. Might not a water-based missile force go far to meet our needs? It could provide a maximum deterrent to Moscow. It would constitute a rational method of self-defense in the ballistic era. Is it not possible that the bonds of the NATO alliance could now be strengthened by a cooperative program to develop and support a sea-based missile force?"

Senator JACKSON, who wants to see "more and more nuclear forces at sea," could say "I told you so" on another score: In 1956 he wrote the Navy suggesting it send a nuclear submarine under the Arctic icepack. Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, told his staff, "Let's really look into this."

On August 8, 1958, the White House announced the polar ice breakthrough of the nuclear submarine Nautilus.

An Achievement Without Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, in this era it appears to me that little attention is paid to the good that goes on around us. This is particularly true as concerns the deeds of our youth.

With this thought in mind, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Montclair (N.J.) Times, an outstanding weekly newspaper in my congressional district.

This editorial tells of the actions and deeds of 15-year-old Frank Schait, of Montclair, N.J., and the item carries the heading "An Achievement Without Precedent." I am sure that all who read this editorial will agree wholeheartedly with the accolades bestowed upon Frank Schait by the editor of the Montclair Times.

The people of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey are proud of Frank Schait's work and his accomplishments.

The editorial follows:

AN ACHIEVEMENT WITHOUT PRECEDENT

Great humanitarians give the world a double gift: the direct good they do and the inspiration their dedication generates, lighting others along similar paths. Thus, Dr.

Albert Schweitzer's influence radiates in an ever-widening circle from his jungle compound at Lambarene. Thus, the late Dr. Tom Dooley, who drew his inspiration from Dr. Schweitzer, lives on in the work of those whose imagination caught fire from the tremendous amount of good he was able to pack into his tragically short life.

A striking example of this can be found right here in Montclair in the person of a 15-year-old boy. Frank Schait, now a ninth grader at Mount Hebron, found his hero when he discovered Dr. Dooley more than a year ago. And Frank did more than dream the long, long thought of youth about his idol. He set out immediately to do something to help. First, he raised several hundred dollars through various enterprises; then, not content with this, he launched a much more ambitious venture—a benefit concert at South Mountain Arena, starring the Kingston Trio. This event, on February 17, drew a large and enthusiastic audience and netted thousands of dollars for the Dooley Foundation and Medico, which carries on the late doctor's work in Asia.

This young teenager has also served his cause in ways that cannot be calculated in dollars and cents. His enthusiasm has, in turn, inspired others, and a New Jersey chapter of the Dooley Foundation is being organized, in large part due to his efforts. What he has done would do credit to a man of any age; for a 15-year-old, it is an achievement almost without precedent.

Our congratulations, Frank—keep up the good work.

Two Perils for the Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by William S. White entitled, "Two Perils for the Tax Program."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 27, 1963]

TWO PERILS FOR THE TAX PROGRAM

(By William S. White)

President Kennedy's highest priority for this session of Congress, his tax cut bill to stimulate business, is endangered now by two vastly different forces.

One is the great complex of finance and industry represented by the American Bankers Association, which is not opposed to tax reductions as such but which fears the built-in Federal deficit they would bring in the absence of a reduction in all Federal expenditures.

The President has just met the men of the American Bankers Association here in a mutually grave and mutually courteous seminar to examine the great problem. And they have parted in mutually respectful agreement to disagree responsibly and as adults: They have parted in civility.

The other danger has been raised in the Senate by Democrats who tirelessly proclaim themselves to be the most pro-Kennedy of all possible Kennedy Democrats. And this danger is without any civility at all and absolutely innocent of any touch of adult reasonableness. This is the bitter chaos within the Democratic side of the Senate which for 7 weeks has been fanned by a handful of ultraliberal Democrats whose determination to change the rules and power balances to suit their personal wishes has now ended in foredoomed failure—and in manifest injury to any and all parts of the Kennedy legislative program.

Because of them the Senate for these 7 weeks has not turned a legislative wheel, on taxes or anything else. Indeed, only now has it been possible to form those legislative committees, normally formed in the early days of January, which must now so belatedly start to begin to grapple with the legislative business of Congress.

The ultraliberals, led by Senators JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, set out first to waste weeks in demanding a curb on free debate. Predictably losing this, they proceeded to challenge their own party leadership and the vast majority of their own Democratic colleagues by attempts to pack Senate committees to their own private liking.

Notably, their goal was the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee, which will now be fortunate if it is able to act at all on the President's tax bill before fall.

Turned back by their own people in the Democratic caucus, the ultraliberals next chose to appeal to the whole Senate, endlessly crying out for "majority rule." This final test they managed to lose by a margin of nearly four to one. They marshaled 17 votes to the 68 cast against them. These 17 men formed the majority for which they spoke, in the most pettily irresponsible action taken by a splinter group against its party, its own party leadership, and its own chamber within at least three decades. And it was all done under the slogan of "protecting" the Kennedy program from being "smothered, crippled, and impeded."

A Senator who must be presumed to be somewhat interested in the Kennedy program of his brother, the President, did not see it this way. Senator TED KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, joined the 67 others in opposing this tinpot putsch against orderly procedure in the Senate.

One result of it all, apart from that of bringing the Senate to a dead halt for nearly 2 months, has been that this tiny, rule-or-ruin minority has fouled its own Democratic nest as it has not been fouled in many years. Another has been to compromise the capacity of the patient and moderate Senate Democratic Leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, to lead any kind of reasonably united party in behalf of the President.

Nothing ever done or likely to be done by his Republican opposition will have such punishing consequences for the President as this ugly episode caused by men whose persistent ineffectuality as legislators has led them to look everywhere but within themselves—to cry foul against the rules, the umpire, the playing field, or whatever—for the real reasons for that ineffectuality.

Congressmen Cast Cynical Eye on U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a column by Ralph De Toledano. Mr. De Toledano reveals the behind-the-scene attitude of many Congressmen toward the United Nations and its un-American activities:

The article follows:

CONGRESSMEN CAST CYNICAL EYE ON U.N.

WASHINGTON.—I have been taking a quiet poll of congressional sentiment on the United Nations. I find that those Senators and Representatives with whom I have spoken feel (1) that the U.N. is becoming a pernicious influence in world affairs, (2) that the United States would be wise to withdraw everything but token support, and (3) that the legislators would rather cut out their tongues than express these sentiments on the floor of House or Senate.

There is a basic conviction that the U.N. means us no good, that it has served as a forum for Soviet propaganda and a field for Communist maneuvers. That the United States is picking up the largest share of the tab for U.N. operations is a fact that few forget as they walk the Halls of Congress.

The U.N. role in Katanga, in suppressing the rightful aspirations of an independent people to remain out of the clutches of the corrupt and chaotic Central Congolese Government, has not been forgotten. Neither, for that matter, has Secretary-General U Thant's inability to win the respect of even so small a dictator as Fidel Castro.

In short, they have seen the United Nations used repeatedly as a tool of anti-American forces, increasingly dominated by a combination of Communist and neutralist countries—many of whom fail to pay their dues and assessments.

This antagonism and opposition, however, are expressed only in a scattering of speeches and in much grumbling in congressional offices and/or cloakrooms. Whether they will admit it or not, most legislators here are convinced that any open and concerted move to pull the United States out of the U.N., or to curtail the activities of this embryonic world government—will result in trouble at the polls. I would venture to say that a sizable majority of the American people do not care a hoot about the U.N. But those who do care have by some mighty fancy sleight-of-hand led our Representatives in the Congress to believe that the U.N. is sacrosanct.

In the past months, however, the situation has begun to change. The defeat of Republican Representative Walter Judd of Minnesota—hailed so gleefully by the administration—may be a costly loss to those in the White House and at the State Department who include the U.N. in their nightly prayers. Judd did yeoman work on Capitol Hill to restrain anti-U.N. forces in Congress. Without him, many of the younger legislators who followed his lead have begun to drift into the anti-United Nations camp.

The brazen attempt of UNESCO, an arm of the U.N., to act as a propaganda machine for the Soviet Union may, moreover, be the cause for the first open revolt in congressional ranks. The United States pays a third of UNESCO's annual $40 million budget. The U.S.S.R. pays roughly one-seventh. Yet UNESCO has used its funds to subsidize the writing and publication of a pamphlet which whitewashes the Soviet record and beats the drums for communism.

This pamphlet, months old, has suddenly been discovered by the Congress. And some of the more bitter Members of that body are asking why the Soviet invasion and annexation of the Baltic Republics—not recognized by the United States—should be described in the UNESCO pamphlet as a voluntary restoration of Soviet rule.

It is still too early to say that Congress will vote for U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. But if the present sentiment continues, appropriations for the U.N. included in the current mammoth Kennedy budget will be drastically pruned.

Need for Control of Demonstrations Against Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. David Lawrence, the distinguished news columnist and editor of U.S. News & World Report, has written an excellent column analyzing the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision which attempted to usurp from the State of South Carolina its police power to preserve the peace. The column has been printed in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., March 3, 1963, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULING UNDERLINES NEED FOR CURBS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—On Monday of last week, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that 187 persons arrested in Columbia, S.C., for "breach of the peace" were merely exercising their rights of free speech when they engaged in a picketing demonstration against segregation, and that, even though city officials thought a riot was imminent, the police should, in effect, have waited until someone got hurt before recognizing it officially as a riot.

On Tuesday of last week, the United Press International carried a dispatch from Miami, Fla., as follows:

"An American Nazi wearing a khaki uniform and swastika armpatch was hauled off to jail today when his picketing at the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith drew an angry crowd.

"Police said if 21-year-old David Howard Peterson, of Minneapolis, had not been taken into protective custody, violence would have erupted in the crowd of 150 that gathered shortly after the picketing began.

"Peterson, who admitted being a member of the American Nazi party, carried a sign saying: 'Communism is Jewish, ADL (Anti-Defamation League) is Jew secret police.' "

Maybe the Miami Police didn't have time to read the Supreme Court decision. Maybe they were not yet aware that the law of the land now is that name-calling, defamation of any race or religion, or incitement to violence cannot be stopped by arrests until fighting actually starts and injuries or deaths occur.

Justice Tom Clark, who was the only member of the high court to uphold the doctine that a threat of violence can be checked by the police, had this to say in his dissenting opinion on Monday:

"To say that the police may not intervene until the riot has occurred is like keeping out the doctor until the patient dies."

Justice Stewart, speaking for the majority of the highest court in the land, said:

"The State courts have held that the petitioners' conduct constituted breach of the peace under State law, and we may accept their decision as binding upon us to that extent. But it nevertheless remains our duty in a case such as this to make an independent examination of the whole record. And it is clear to us that in arresting, convicting, and punishing the petitioners under the circumstances disclosed by this record, South Carolina infringed the petitioners' constitutionally protected rights of free speech, free assembly, and freedom to petition for redress of their grievances."

The episode took place on the grounds of the State House while the Legislature was actually in session. Justice Clark studied the same record and testimony. He pointed out that nearly 200 demonstrators marched with placards bearing slogans such as "Down With Segregation" and "You May Jail Our Bodies But Not Our Souls," and then proceeded to stir up the trouble. He added:

"The activity continued for approximately 45 minutes during the busy noon-hour period, while a crowd of some 300 persons congregated in front of the State House and around the area directly in front of its entrance, known as the 'horseshoe,' which was used for vehicular as well as pedestrian ingress and egress. During this time there were no efforts made by the city officials to hinder the petitioners in their rights of free speech and assembly; rather, the police directed their efforts to the traffic problems resulting from petitioners' activities.

"It was only after the large crowd had gathered, among which the city manager and chief of police recognized potential troublemakers, and which together with the students had become massed on and around the 'horseshoe' so closely that vehicular and pedestrian traffic was materially impeded, that any action against the petitioners was taken.

"Then city manager, in what both the State intermediate and (State) supreme court found to be the utmost good faith, decided that danger to peace and safety was imminent. Even at this juncture no orders were issued by the city manager for the police to break up the crowd, now about 500 persons, and no arrests were made. Instead, he approached the recognized leader of the petitioners and requested him to tell the various groups of petitioners to disperse within 15 minutes, failing which they would be arrested.

"Even though the city manager might have been honestly mistaken as to the imminence of danger this was certainly a reasonable request by the city's top executive officer in an effort to avoid a public brawl. But the response of petitioners and their leader was defiance rather than cooperation."

Justice Clark noted that for the next 15 minutes the petitioners "conducted what the South Carolina Supreme Court found to be 'a noisy demonstration in defiance of (the dispersal) orders.' "

The basic question is whether the local police have a right to prevent a riot or whether they must wait until casualties actually occur. The American people have always felt that local disturbances are for the States and cities to handle.

The only available remedy now is the passage by Congress of a law taking away from the Supreme Court of the United States any right to consider cases involving a breach of the peace when a State supreme court has already passed on the issues involved. There is precedent for this type of legislation.

The Constitution itself specifically gives Congress the right to pass a law limiting or removing appellate jurisdiction from the Supreme Court of the United States in such cases as the lawmakers may deem desirable.

State's Briefing Cause for Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Tustin (Calif.) News on February 21. This editorial deals with the regional briefing conducted by the State Department. The recent so-called briefing held in Los Angeles was simply the continuation of the "snow job" constantly carried on by the various Departments of our Government to sell the American people on the frightening programs launched by the present administration, which include the no-win policy and piecemeal surrender of this great Republic. My mail indicates that the public is not buying this.

The editorial follows:

STATE'S BRIEFING CAUSE FOR CONCERN

The Tustin News team covering the State Department's regional foreign policy conference last week in Los Angeles has reported the nameless speakers faithfully in other pages of this issue.

As usual in current establishments practice, newsmen are asked not to attribute any quote to any individual. This gives him the desired anonymity, we assume, so taxpayers cannot write their comments to Congress concerning some State Department functionary's mental outlook.

Although our reporter, John Hardy, has covered the conclave as it happened and we have printed same, this is the time and place where we analyze this "briefing conference."

The first question we ask the State Department boys is, Why don't we quote any individual's name? Can't you trust these public servants to give the facts as they see them? Is the public not entitled to know who said what?

For example, one official quoted in the news story today says U Thant, U.N. Secretary General, following the Cuba crisis "helped to mediate a means of withdrawal of Russian troops [in Cuba]."

This might mean something to the nonreader, nonthinker.

U Thant helped mediate means but not withdrawal. He asked. That's all he did. Please, Mr. Khrushchev, won't you take the Red troops out of Cuba? That is what it boiled down to, we recall. However, the same Russian soldiery is still in Cuba and getting more precocious in strength. So how can we agree with the same State Department official that "the Soviets responded to his appeal"? All they did was talk after listening. Actually, the Russians were scared stiff an angry America would go ashore with Marines and "clobber" the Castro regime whose leaders' airplanes were warming for flight out of Cuba at the time.

Excusing the U.N. rape of Katanga as justified by the Security Council, the same official reported that troops were used there recently because the Congo situation posed a dire threat to international peace and security. If this is or was true, what status do we give Cuba? Is it a Shangri-la with no ulterior motives toward any person or nation?

What about self-determination for a country? Why have we never accepted the principle of self-determination? Woodrow Wilson and other American Presidents favored this. Add to that the official's statement, "Remember, Tshombe does not speak for Katanga—Tshombe has agreed to accept a unified Congo all along." This seems somewhat in contrast to the facts, does it not? We thought Tshombe wanted Katanga to play with its own marbles rather than lose them by confiscation of a unified Congo. And, curiously, we were of the opinion Tshombe did and does speak for Katanga.

But the best funny that came out of the State Department briefing was the comment by a woman, identified as a mistress of cere-

monies, when she replied to a question by asking if dictatorship and socialism were not contradictory. This expert from State should be advised that it's the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; it was the Nation Socialist government that was the Nazi Party's outlet. Are these two examples contradictory?

We must get back to the record, it seems. We recall the comment in relationship to Fabian Socialism, which terms that type of socialism the "dictatorship of the salariat" whereas communism is alleged to be the "dictatorship of the proletariat." Both are socialist, both borrow from the Fabian Socialist maestros such as John Maynard Keynes, Bernard Shaw, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Bertrand Russell. Shaw's writings mention that when his group came to power there would have to be some folk put to death—in a kindly manner—to allow the new order to proceed.

We are glad we sent a coverage team to the State Department conference as it gives us an audience participation opportunity. We are happy to run the report as our news scribe heard it. It appears to us if you read his report and this interpretive editorial you'll find a few questions in your mind. We had hoped that State would present the meat of the coconut at the briefing. As it happens, it was only more "kickapoo" joy juice.

Proposed Honorary U.S. Citizenship for Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the movement to declare the Honorable Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States has received eloquent impetus from many sources.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials endorsing the pending measure to confer citizenship upon this great free world statesman. One of the editorials was published in the Danville (Pa.) News of January 19; the other editorial was published today in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Danville News, Danville, Pa., Jan. 19, 1963]

WHY NOT HONORARY CITIZENSHIP FOR ENGLAND'S WINNIE CHURCHILL?

There is a move afoot in Congress to have Sir Winston Churchill, the Englishman who led his country through the horror of World War II, declared an honorary citizen of the United States.

A congressional resolution to that affect has been introduced by Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, of Ohio, and cosponsored by Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, also of Ohio, and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Not since the famed Lafayette, it is believed, has this Nation conferred the mantle of honorary citizenship on a foreigner, although Churchill, it should be noted, has been made an honorary citizen of at least 10 American cities and 1 country.

Churchill, as most folks know, is pretty near half American anyway—his mother, the late and beautiful Jennie Jerome was born in New York, and Brooklyn, at that.

To the millions of Americans who used the British Isles as a launching pad into Europe during World War II, Winnie Churchill—the cigar stuck in his mouth and the fingers raised in the V for victory salute—was England, and England was Winnie.

He was the symbol of a proud Royal Air Force in the early days of the war, which was too stubborn to know it was beaten, and which eventually chased Hitler's mighty Luftwaffe out of the skies.

He was the symbol of Conventry, and the unsung army of civilians who trekked into London each day from miles around to clean up the debris left by Nazi V-1's and V-2's, and then returned home to their jobs and families.

He was the bulldog leader of a country of bulldogs, determined in defeat and magnificent in victory, who said they would not be whipped, and were not.

Churchill was and still is all these things and more to millions of Americans who remember him and his countrymen.

He should be made one of us, even if only honorary.

We would gain much from the spirit and vigor which courses through the soul of the doughty old Britisher.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 4, 1963]

HONORING SIR WINSTON

Now that Sir Winston Churchill has indicated that he would be delighted to accept honorary U.S. citizenship, Congress should act with all speed to bestow the honor. Since Sir Winston had said in 1958 that he might be disposed to decline such a "remarkable compliment," there had been some understandable hesitation on Capitol Hill. With the great British statesman now declaring that he would be "deeply moved by such an honor," it would be ungracious of Congress not to grant what almost every American citizen would like to bestow.

It is not, of course, a matter of trying to claim for the United States this great leader who did so much to save the free world. To be sure, the American people do lay some claim to him because his mother was an American, and there is a feeling in many countries that Churchill, like Lincoln, belongs to the ages. But there is no thought here of rivaling Britian in Sir Winston's allegiance or affections. Rather, the movement to confer honorary citizenship upon him reflects a general desire to pay tribute to a great Briton who has rendered immeasurable service to mankind.

Nor are the obligations of American citizenship involved. What would be conferred upon the revered former Prime Minister of Britain would be all the honors of American citizenship and none of its responsibilities. Whether or not he would ever come to these shores to accept the honor would naturally be left to his own discretion and would have to be governed in any event by the state of his health. The only question that should concern Congress is the prompt completion of a gracious gesture that will convey to Sir Winston the warmth of the American feeling toward him. Nothing short of unanimous approval in both the House and Senate will do justice to the occasion.

Social Welfare in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which describes certain practices that are both socially destructive and unnecessary in a well-managed welfare program:

I am going to tell you a true story of one of the most shocking incidents that has ever been brought to my attention. Shocking because it was sanctioned and ordered by officials elected by the people to uphold the law.

Disgraceful and brutal because it was directed against defenseless, poverty-stricken mothers and innocent children. Doubly shocking because it happened in these United States of America where the right of the individual in his home is supposed to have protection by constitutional guarantee.

But those on social welfare in California will not find it shocking when they learn that a county board of supervisors was responsible for this outrage. The needy have long been subjected to the violation of their rights from this source. This incident happened in Alameda County, Calif. Now here's the story:

BEFORE DAWN

Hours before dawn on a cold January, in this year of our Lord 1963 morning while the good citizens of the city of Oakland were deep in sleep, a raid was launched by 80 county welfare workers under the direction of their boss Harold Kehoe, county welfare director. This raid was being conducted in the poorer section of Oakland, in the tenements, in the shacks and in rundown apartments, occupied by young mothers and children who, because of poverty and destitution, were receiving public assistance.

SUSPECT

It seems there is a State law that if there is a male, whether husband or friend, living in the same quarters occupied by a mother and her children receiving aid, this must be reported to the welfare department, if the aid was not originally granted with the knowledge that a member of the male sex was around.

The mores of our society are such that all females are suspect. It is doubly so when the female is young; has one or more children; legitimate or otherwise; lost her husband through death or desertion; is impoverished and for reasons beyond her control has to apply for aid in order to provide for herself and children.

Unfortunately in the human mind and heart there exists both good and evil. When evil predominates in a person it is only natural he thinks of others in this light, especially of those dependent upon his whims for their pittance. In the mind of this kind of man, a young mother on aid to the needy children's program, could be nothing but a prostitute or a female of loose morals.

With this reasoning we can only assume that the majority of the five members of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors who ordered this raid against these young mothers with babies, are not men of pure heart but men who would use their power in an evil way.

The Alameda County Board of Supervisors in questioning the morals of the females of their county, issued orders to Harold Kehoe, their county welfare director, who after a conference with his staff selected 500 homes to be raided. He called in his welfare workers—briefed them in detail on how to gain entrance into the homes and break down their doors. The hour was set. When that hour arrived the raid was on. Eighty county welfare workers pledged to do or die for the ideals of purity, so ably represented by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors.

In squads and in the early morning hours, these welfare workers leaned on doorbells, hammered and kicked on doors until they were assured they had awakened the family

by the crying of the children and the frightened sleepy voice of the mother asking "Who is it?" Only to be answered by a heavy authoritative male voice "We are from the welfare office—we demand you let us in, if you don't we'll stop your aid." This followed by a shocked silence—nothing but the whimpering of the frightened children could be heard. Over this din, the quavering voice of the mother asked: "But why? For God's sake, why are you here at this hour?" The answer from the outside, in a louder and sharper masculine voice "You have a man in your house—that's why." Bewildered mothers fumbling at door chains, opened up their doors to let in four or five men and women along with an icy blast of cold air, causing her to pull her bathrobe closer to her neck while her little children clutched her robe for safety and screamed with fear, watching these interlopers dashing from room to room opening closets and looking under beds, seeking the presence of a man.

Finding no man in the apartment the raiders pounded questions at the bewildered mother and her children, jotted down notes and finally stomped out, slamming the door and were on their way to the next victim.

FIVE HUNDRED HOMES

While 500 homes were on the raiders' list, they only gained entry into 378 of them. According to County Welfare Director Harold Kehoe, 37 unreported men were found in these homes. While this report is highly questionable it is small return for the effort and expense put out by the county. Kehoe said, "No one was hit or hurt in the raids and they would be continued."

How much of a struggle Kehoe expected from frightened sleepy mothers and crying children—is not known. Yet there was great dissatisfaction among the welfare workers themselves, who resented being cast in the roll of night raiders without the hoods of the Klu Klux Klan to conceal their identity.

Benny Parrish, a partially blind worker, who has been with the welfare department for 2 years, was fired after he refused to make the visits as ordered. He said the home visits were against his principles.

Parrish said the home "raids," designed to detect abuses will serve only to destroy the effectiveness of welfare workers.

"These unscheduled visits are an infringement upon the privacy of these people," Parrish declared. "It implies these people are guilty of fraud. There is sufficient existing structure to guard against fraud."

WORKERS PROTEST

Two social welfare workers, Milton Vonier of Richmond and Mrs. Voreen Connelly of Berkeley, resigned in protest. Mrs. Connelly said her resignation was prompted by her belief existing regulations are adequate.

"I am not against fraud investigation," she said, "but I feel that early morning calls on cases in which there is no suspicion of fraud would destroy any kind of rapport the social worker may have with the recipient and make rehabilitation efforts and removal from welfare rolls virtually impossible."

Harold Wilson, president of the Eastbay Municipal Employee's Association, branded the operation a violation of civil liberties and american traditions.

Representatives of the Academy of Certified Social Workers protested the "raid" and the Golden Gate chapter of the National Association of Social Workers of San Francisco charged that hundreds of innocent families will suffer in the effort to uncover a few indiscretions.

Kent Pursel, chairman of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, said board members are determined to implement the welfare investigations. The other members of the board are: John D. Murphy, Leland W. Sweeney, Emanuel P. Razeto, and Robert E. Hannon.

HATRED AND FURY

The action by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors was highly praised by the Kern County Property Owners Association, where the home "raids" originated.

The needy children program was conceived for the purpose of giving the underprivileged an opportunity to live without starvation and receive an education so when they grow up they would become useful members of society.

In the midst of all this hatred and fury, not a single thought was given to the effect this would have on the children. They completely disregarded that it is experiences such as these, impressed upon tender minds, that can do nothing else but cause the development of juvenile delinquents.

These police state tactics in Alameda County against helpless children are not isolated incidents. It has happened in other California counties. Also citizen vigilante committees, with the blessings of the county supervisors, have been organized to harass and intimidate needy aged and blind recipient in Butte, Tulare, San Joaquin, Sacramento, and other counties.

GEORGE MCLAIN,
Chairman, California League of Senior Citizens.

The School Prayer Decision: Where Is It Taking Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last Thursday, Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School delivered the William H. Leary lecture at the University of Utah Law School. Excerpts from this speech were printed in yesterday's Sunday Star.

I have not always agreed with Dean Griswold. In fact, on many issues I have disagreed with him vigorously. However, I believe that in this lecture Dean Griswold has shown a real grasp of the meaning and purpose of the first amendment, and a real grasp of the fundamentals of local self-government lying at the heart of our Federal system; which is based more on its pragmatic success than on its doctrinaire perfection. Dean Griswold's comments about absolutes, and their lack of meaning in a human world of real people, reminds me of Bishop Pike's testimony before the Judiciary Committee last summer where he argued for the "middle way."

Mr. Justice Holmes said the same thing, I think, in *Hudson County Water Company* v. *McCarter* at 209 U.S. 349, 355:

All rights tend to declare themselves absolute to their logical extreme. Yet all in fact are limited by the neighborhood of principles of policy which are other than those on which the particular right is founded, and which become strong enough to hold their own when a certain point is reached.

I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts from Dean Griswold's speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCHOOL PRAYER DECISION: WHERE IS IT TAKING US?

A discussion of the Supreme Court decision in the school prayer case last year and its implications on all traces of religion in public activities was contained in an address Thursday by Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard University Law School. He was delivering the William H. Leary lecture at the University of Utah Law School. From the speech the Star has extracted passages to show the heart of his argument:

An institution charged with the role which the Supreme Court has successfully filled for so many years is entitled to our respect and understanding. If one criticizes the Court (as people have always done in the past, and should continue to do in the future), it should be essentially for the purpose of trying to contribute to that respect and to that understanding. The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay. Criticism of decisions of the Court or opinions of its members should be offered as an effort to repay that debt, and with the thought that conscientious criticism may be an aid to the Court in carrying out its difficult and essential task. It is in that spirit that my remarks are offered.

A TEXT CITED

A number of years ago I saw in the Saturday Review a little item which may serve as a text for my remarks.

It reads as follows:

"In the land of Absolute, where everyone and everything is perfect, there is no light at night.

"The annals of the Absolutians record that they once discovered the electric light, but as is known, the perfect electric light burns in a perfect vacuum.

"Absolute is in the dark."

Abosolutes are likely to be phantoms, eluding our grasp. Even if we think we have embraced them, they are likely to be misleading. If we start from absolute premises, we may find that we only oversimplify our problems and thus reach unsound results. It may well be that absolutes are the greatest hindrance to sound and and useful thought—in law, as in other fields of human knowledge. I would like to suggest that the Supreme Court has, in recent years, been engaged in certain types of cases, in a species of absolutism in its reasoning, which is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light. It is, I think, a thoroughly unsatisfactory form of judging.

The most extreme form of the absolutist position has been taken by Mr. Justice Black, particularly in certain extra-judicial pronouncements. Thus, in his James Madison lecture at New York University, he said: "It is my belief that there are 'absolutes' in our Bill of Rights, and that they were put there on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be 'absolutes.' "

And he reiterated this, and extended it in a publicized interview in which he dealt specifically with the first amendment, which you will recall, reads in the following terms:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceable to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Justice Black lays great stress on the words "no law" in the opening phrase which says: "Congress shall make no law." Just to make it clear that he would not be misunderstood, he went on to say that laws about libel and slander are invalid. And he added: "I have an idea there are some

absolutes. I do not think I am far in that respect from the Holy Scriptures."

THE NEW YORK CASE

Within the last year, a case came before the Supreme Court which directly involved the interpretation and application of the first amendment. This was the New York school prayer case. Its name is *Engel v. Vitale*. It involved a prayer formulated by the State board of regents in New York, and recommended by them for use in the schools of that State. The prayer, in its entirety, was as follows:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The Court, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Black, held that the reciting of this prayer in the public schools of New York violated the Constitution. It was, the Court held, an "establishment of religion," forbidden by the first amendment. Five of his colleagues joined with him. Mr. Justice Stewart dissented. Justice Douglas wrote a concurring opinion which, though differing some in his reasoning, showed the absolutist approach. He recounted all of the ways in which governmental bodies now finance some activity with a religious element or overtone: Chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services; compulsory chapel at the service academies, and religious services in Federal hospitals and prisons; religious proclamations by the President; "In God we trust" on our money; Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia; and many other things, including exemption from the Federal income tax and postal privileges for religious organizations. All of this is bad, according to Justice Douglas. After recognizing that "Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with" such things, he said, summarily, and absolutely: "Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." It's as simple as that. They are all bad. And perhaps they are if the absolutist approach to such matters can be accepted as sound. These are the lengths to which absolutism takes us.

LOOK AT THE WORDING

But is it all as clear as this? Do words convey such positive and overpowering meaning? Is there no room whatever for thought or consideration? Perhaps it would be worthwhile just to look carefully at the words of the first amendment, in all its majesty. I will not yield to any Justice of the Supreme Court in my respect for those words, or, in my conception of their importance not merely in our history but in their present function and worth in helping us to preserve a free Nation. But what do they say? "Congress shall make no law."

Congress had made no law in the Engel case; no law of Congress was in any way involved.

What is it that Congress can make no law about? It is an establishment of religion. What does that term mean? That takes some construing, too. Certainly there was much history behind the phrase. Not only did England (and Scotland) have an established church, but there were established churches in a number of the States at the time the first amendment was adopted. And they were something very different from a regents' recommended prayer. It takes a measure of construction to bring this prayer within the no-establishment clause. "No law" may well mean no law.

But "establishment of religion" might mean establishment of religion; and those who wrote the establishment of religion clause might be rather perplexed by the use which has been made of it in 1962. "No law" means no law. It is as simple as that—that is, if one ignores the other words which are involved in the task, such as "Congress," "establishment of religion," "the free exercise thereof," and "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." I do not say that these are meaningless words. I do suggest they are words which require construction, which are by no means absolute in form or content, and that to ignore them under the guise of the absolutist approach is to fail to recognize and perform the most significant and fundamental part of the task of judging.

UNFORTUNATE MOVE

Let me now turn to another aspect of the matter. I think it was unfortunate that the question involved in the Engel case was ever thought of as a matter for judicial decision, that it was unfortunate that the Court decided the case, one way or the other, and that the unhappy situation resulted solely from the absolutist position which the Court has taken.

What do I mean by this? I have in mind at least two separate lines of thought. One is the fact that we have a tradition, a spiritual and cultural tradition, of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution itself, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect. The other is that there are some matters which are essentially local in nature, important matters, but nonetheless matters to be worked out by the people themselves in their own communities, when no basic rights of others are impaired.

First, as to the long tradition. It is not clear as a matter of historical fact that this was a Christian Nation? Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchison, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian Nation, having developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought. Nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion.

PROVISIONS OF SWEEP

It is perfectly true that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These are great provisions, of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: Chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces, chapels in prisons, "in God we trust" on our money, to mention only a few. Must all of these things be rigorously extripated in order to satisfy a constitutional absolutism?

Does our deep-seated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religon—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the Founders that it would. It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history. I do not believe that the contentions now made would occur to any man who could free himself from an absolute approach to the problem.

MATTERS FOR COMMUNITIES

Now let me turn to the other point—that there are some matters which should be settled on the local level, in each community, and should not become great Supreme Court cases. The prayer involved in the Engel case was not compulsory. As the Supreme Court itself recited, no pupil was compelled "to join in the prayer over his or his parents' objection." This, to me, is crucial. If any student was compelled to join against his conviction, this would present a serious and justiciable question, akin to that presented in the flag salute case. The Supreme Court did not give sufficient weight to this fact, in my opinion, and relied heavily on such things as the history of the Book of Common Prayer, which, under various acts of Parliament, was compulsory on all.

COMMUNITY DETERMINATION

Where there is no compulsion, what happens if these matters are left to the determination of each community? In New York, this determination was made by the elected authorities of the school district. It was, indeed, a fact that a large number of the school districts in New York did not adopt the so-called regents' prayer. Where such a decision was reached, there can surely be no constitutional objection on the ground that it was a decision locally arrived at, or that it amounts to an "establishment" of "no religion." But, suppose that in a particular school district, as in New Hyde Park, it was determined that the prayer should be used as a part of the opening exercises of the school day. Remember that it is not compulsory. No pupil is compelled to participate. Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? This would suggest that no school can have a pledge of allegiance to the flag if any student does not wish to join.

This is a country of religious toleration. That is a great consequence of our history embodied in the first amendment. But does religious toleration mean religious sterility? I wonder why it should be thought that it does. This is a Christian country, in origin, history, tradition, and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics, I think it can be said, that it developed its notion of toleration. No one in this country can be required to have any particular form of religious belief, and no one can suffer legal discrimination because he has or does not have any particular religious belief. But does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition? The Moslem who comes here may worship as he pleases, and may hold public office without discrimination. That is as it should be. But why should it follow that he can require others to give up their Christian tradition merely because he is a tolerated and welcomed member of the community?

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Though we have a considerable common cultural heritage, there have always been minority groups in our country. This, I am sure, has been healthy and educational for all concerned. We have surely gained from having a less homogeneous population. Of course, the rights of all, especially those of minorities, must be protected and preserved. But does that require that the majority, where there is such a majority, must give up its cultural heritage and tradition? Why?

Let us consider the Jewish child, or the Catholic child, or the nonbeliever, or the Congregationalist, or the Quaker. He, either alone, or with a few or many others of his views, attends a public school, whose school district, by local action, has prescribed the regents' prayer. When the prayer is recited, if this child or his parents feel that he cannot participate, he may stand or sit, in respectful attention, while the other children take part in the ceremony. Or he may leave the room. It is said that this is bad, because it sets him apart from other children. It is even said that there is an element of compulsion in this—what the Supreme Court has called an indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform.

But is this the way it should be looked at? The child of a nonconforming or a minority group is, to be sure, different in his beliefs.

That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable and educational for him to learn and observe this, in the atmosphere of the school—not so much that he is different, as that other children are different from him? And is it not desirable that, at the same time, he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted? No compulsion is put upon him. He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and to respect what they feel is significant to them.

SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE

Is this not a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the majority group? They experience the values of their own culture; but they also see that there are others who do not accept those values, and that they are wholly tolerated in their nonacceptance Learning tolerance for other persons, no matter how different, and respect for their beliefs, may be an important part of American education, and wholly consistent with the first amendment. No one would think otherwise were it not for parents who take an absolutist approach to the problem, perhaps encouraged by the absolutist expressions of justices of the Supreme Court, on and off the bench.

It is appropriate here to say something about the problems of the Sunday law cases. Because of the absolutist approach, these cases were very hard for the court, when I think they should have been quite easy—as is evidenced, I believe, by the fact that no such question was ever raised for 150 years after the adoption of the first amendment. It is true that many of the State statutes were a hodgepodge, full of inconsistencies and contradictions. But it is perfectly plain that the observance of Sunday has religious roots and origins. This is equally plain as to the observance of Christmas and Thanksgiving. Is that bad? Are these things not all part of our history, our culture, our heritage, our tradition? Must we give them all up because of a newly found absolutist approach to a problem which cannot possibly be resolved wisely in absolutist terms?

THE DAY OF REST

A day of rest is very deeply seated in all societies. Generally, as in our culture, it has an origin which is at least partially religious. But it has a wider basis than that. And it is a thing, good in itself, which loses much of its good unless it is observed by all on the same basis. If a majority of the people want to observe Sunday as a day on which ordinary work is not performed, even though there may be some religious motivation in picking that day, I find it hard to see that there is anything wrong or oppressive in making that law applicable to all members of the community—as long as the persons who do not care to observe Sunday themselves are not compelled to do anything.

Cannot much the same thing be said for Thanksgiving and Christmas, and Christmas carols in the school, and simple, thoughtfully chosen Bible readings, and Christmas decorations in public places, and all the many other things which are a happy part of the culture and tradition of a large portion of our society?

TOLERATION BY MINORITIES

In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities, who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant, too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves, and nothing is done which they cannot wait out, or pass respectfully by, without their own personal participation, if they do not want to give it? Is it not a travesty that we have brought ourselves, through an essentially thought-denying absolutist approach, to the point where such things as chaplains in our prisons, or chapels in our military academies, can be seriously and solemnly raised as threats to the religious freedom which is guaranteed by the first amendment—as made applicable to the States, in very general terms, by the 14th amendment? In saying this, I am fully mindful of the rights of those who have or profess no religion, and who are surely entitled to the same respect as anyone else—and should themselves give the same respectful regard to the rights of other citizens, accepting reasonable arrangements made in this area by the majority, with no compulsion on them to participate.

Leadership Press Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years the leadership press conferences of the minority party have received a great deal of public attention. Certainly the minority leadership should be commended for making itself available each week to answer questions of the press. As the elected leaders of the minority party, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative CHARLES HALLECK have a responsibility to meet the press at least once a week.

Many people in my congressional district have asked me when they can see the "Ev and Charlie Show." I have tried to explain that there was no such TV show but my words have sometimes been questioned. On February 22, 1963, Mr. Lawrence Laurent had a very interesting column in the Washington Post. I commend this column to the attention of the House. Certainly it seems as if the mythical "Ev and Charlie Show" has a much higher rating than the weekly "Mike and Mac Show" in front of the White House.

Mr. Laurent's column follows:

EV AND CHARLIE DO MYTH THE TOP 10

(By Lawrence LAURENT)

Now, repeat after me, slowly: "There is no 'Ev and Charlie Show.' "

If this word gets around, quickly, life will be more serene and happy for Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana. Things will swing better, also, for the Nation's television editors and those poor souls at television stations who must answer questions telephoned by the viewers.

There simply is no such television program. It is not weekly. It is not televised. What's more, DIRKSEN and HALLECK resent it being called a show.

What does exist is an irregularly scheduled meeting of DIRKSEN and HALLECK with members of the press, radio, and television. Newsreel cameras film the sessions for possible use on television and tape recordings are made for broadcast at the pleasure of network and station editors.

If the participants are lucky, filmed excerpts, lasting but briefly, make the evening TV and radio news reports.

"Ev and CHARLIE" is becoming one of the great modern myths of broadcasting. No nonexistent program ever had more publicity.

At the offices of DIRKSEN and HALLECK are hundreds of written requests for "tickets to the show." Even Congressmen have inquired about the day and time of the telecasts.

Television editors, including this one, receive letters charging them with neglect of the program listings and occasionally, of having omitted the "program" because of political prejudice.

The confusion is certainly understandable. Time magazine has referred to DIRKSEN and HALLECK, "who appear on TV weekly in what has come to be known as 'The Ev and Charlie Show.' " The Reporter has written about "a weekly televised meeting with the press." The Washington Daily News has called it a Republican TV spectacular and the astute Lyle C. Wilson, of United Press International, has written that the "show's Nielsen (audience rating) is slipping."

Research turns up references to this television show in other publications such as the Baltimore Sun, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Herald Tribune, the Chicago Sun-Times.

Two years ago, with the arrival of the New Frontier and the beginning of live TV coverage of the President's news conferences, DIRKSEN (as Senate minority leader) and HALLECK (his counterpart in the House) announced they would also meet the press. Their name for the session: "The Leadership Conference."

To Robert C. Albright, of the Washington Post, goes the distinction of referring to "The Leadership Conference" as "The Ev and Charlie Show." Albright, however, pointed out that it wasn't scheduled on any network or station.

The following week, President Kennedy used "The Ev and Charlie Show" phrase in response to a question at a news conference. Thus, was the myth created.

One person who called the Washington Post insisted he had watched "The Ev and Charlie Show" every week in Chicago. Of course, there are also eyewitnesses to the activities of the Loch Ness monster.

"The Leadership Conference" is supported by a staff of two persons, Miss Zora Kukic and Robert Humphreys, and the cost to the Republican Party for staff, postage, and office supplies is $40,000 a year. Postage costs have been high, what with all those ticket requests and demands for time and station.

Development and Present Needs of City of Milford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there recently came to my attention an article by Ross B. Baxter, executive director of the Milford Chamber of Commerce, which appeared in a recent edition of the Milford Citizen.

This article eloquently portrays the proper role of a community and it analyzes the past development and present needs of the fine city of Milford, Conn.

I believe that this article could be profitably read by all of us and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTITUDES OF GROWTH CITED

(By Ross B. Baxter)

Cities are like people. Milford has a physical body, its buildings and its land. It has a spiritual body which is the collective attitudes of its population toward life, progress and change.

Like a person, a city may be optimistic, pessimistic, beautiful or plain, happy or sad, healthy, sick, wise or unwise, rich, poor, concerned or unconcerned. Each city is different from the rest of all the cities as each person is different from all other persons.

Each city having its own personality must then be analyzed separately. It's a very personal thing, city analysis and what remedies one city's ills cannot always be applied to another city in whole. Each city is a separate patient.

This may seem to imply that all cities are sick and need help. This isn't true, of course, but as each of us as individuals can improve our personality, so too can any city improve its position among other cities and like humans in any organized society, cities are in constant competition with each other.

"Survival of the fittest" is still a valid, though somewhat overworked, cliche. Cities that deliver what people and industrial, service and retail establishments want, grow to greater heights of achievement; cultural, spiritual, social, and material.

Milford is in competition with other cities and we, as part of the population, have our counterpart in each city across this Nation, we have a responsibility to make this city of Milford a better place for man to live in all the areas of human need; spiritual, social material, and cultural.

Each of us, channeling our efforts through various organizations, can work in these areas and improve the city. An organized populace can literally lift a community by its bootstraps to greater heights of realization of that goal universally regarded as good: human happiness.

Specifically Milford's growth statistics look very good alongside those of other, larger communities. Milford peacefully slumbered until 1946, when it awoke as a bear comes out from hibernation. It has continued to grow in terms of population, industry, service, and retail business since that time.

Planners say the role of the city has constantly changed. Cities originally came about because of the need for defense. Soon they came for reasons of commerce and trade, then mass production made concentrations of people necessary. The planners tell us the city of tomorrow will be a distribution center of goods and services.

Milford's growth has stemmed from all of these facets. Milford was first formed for protection in a new land in 1639; then for commerce and trade in the 1700's; finally the factory age and an improved transportation system made it a bedroom town for the booming factories of Bridgeport and New Haven during the Second World War. Milford still retains much of the "bedroom town" atmosphere.

Finally, Milford was discovered by the entrepreneur; factories have come and are coming to Milford. Retail and wholesaling are fast becoming one of the most important aspects of Milford's economy.

Milford's position of "in betweenness" in relation to the 325,000-person retail market of Bridgeport and the 300,000-person market in New Haven makes it an ideal location, served as it is by three major transportation arteries, to locate a distribution center. Milford is a giant step ahead of the role cities are to play in the future. We are already an important factor in the distribution field.

Milford is growing and can achieve much greater prosperity in terms of plant location, retail activity and population growth if we, as organizations and individuals, dedicate ourselves to overt participation in programs for a better community.

These organizations can be most any group of individuals, who band together for a specific purpose. That purpose can be seemingly removed far afield from what many would think of in terms of community betterment.

A garden club, a great book discussion group, even a foreign affairs seminar can contribute to Milford. A garden club could undertake to beautify public land in Milford. Beauty is important to us as human beings.

A study of the classics could awaken in us all that is the real meaning of life. A foreign affairs seminar can stimulate an awareness of the world around us, important if we are to realize our opportunities and our obligations to our fellowman.

A hard straightforward and objective view of some of our attitudes in Milford must be taken. "We have grown too fast," "we have too many people, we have too many kids that need growing up and educating" are complaints heard daily.

What other reason does Milford or any other city have to exist as a body politic other than as a place for people to live? This is the only basis for a community; there is no other.

We must accept the challenge of growth and meet it. It is not an obligation but a privilege to serve man whenever, wherever, however we can. We must cease to consider Milford's children to be educated as a burden. They are the opportunity of tomorrow.

We can help illuminate their minds and instill within them those concepts of freedom, liberty and responsibility which are vital to the continuance and growth of Western thought.

This is not to say there should be extravagance or waste in our public school system. When such is found it should be exposed and stopped. There should be available, however, whatever tools are needed to perform the job of education.

Growth brings with it responsibilities. There can not be a $10 million rise in the grand list without an increase in the community's responsibilities. Growth and responsibilities are inseparable.

Milford is on the way up. Community cooperation is essential to smooth the road of progress. Attitudes reflecting thoughtfulness and resilience to meet disorderly growth (and rarely is growth orderly, outside theory) and its challenges is the order of the day.

Anything less will inhibit the ecstatic joy that should come from being part of a thriving, growing and up-coming community. After all, would we rather see Milford tobagganing downhill?

The Merchant Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Presidential Envoy Livingston T. Merchant will start on a tour of NATO capitals in an effort to win support for a multilateral NATO nuclear force. The plan calls for missile-launching surface ships, manned by mixed crews drawn from NATO countries.

It seems to me that America's shift in policy toward such a force was motivated by international politics, not by military or defense considerations. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am less than enthusiastic about the idea.

On February 28, in the Washington Post, there appeared an editorial and three articles concerning Mr. Merchant's mission and the proposed multilateral NATO nuclear force. I agree with the Post editorial concerning the difficulty of Mr. Merchant's mission, but I do not agree with the final implication, even if it is termed "a bolder alternative policy," that we should relinquish a part of our national sovereignty to NATO or any other multination or multilateral group.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial and the articles in the RECORD:

MERCHANT'S MISSION

It is doubtful if any diplomat ever has embarked upon a mission more difficult than that which has been given to Livingston Merchant who has been sent to Europe to try to work out some sort of a multilateral or multinational control of NATO thermonuclear weapons.

The problem is not merely that of reconciling an American and a European view. Within the European community there are differences of opinion that are very great. Perhaps the many signs of growing European integration have deceived us a little as to the diminished vitality of the national sentiments that still survive—not only in France, but elsewhere as well. We have assumed that the tide running toward European unity was such that nothing could hold it back; but like natural tides, it is possible that nothing can hasten it forward either.

All alliances in history have had difficulty, but no earlier alliance had to cope with the vagaries of thermonuclear power. Previous allies had access to common weapons systems of the day; but the difference between conventional arms and nuclear arms is so great, problems of sharing are of an entirely different character.

For a time this country was content to indicate its willingness to consider any proposals of its allies for sharing thermonuclear control. Not surprisingly, they were not forthcoming, partly because of this country's near-monopoly of information on the employment of the weapons. Now we have embarked on a more affirmative policy, but it is just as well to face up to how difficult it will be to carry it out to the satisfaction of our allies.

Perhaps the real problem is that the difficult issues are neither essentially military nor exclusively European but are in point of fact, political and worldwide. Were the larger problems solved, or soluble in peacetime, the strictly mechanical problems might be reduced to irrelevance. The larger problems involve alterations of conventional notions of sovereignty so profound that opinions born in the age of nation-states will first have to be greatly altered. The Merchant mission may turn out to be chiefly that of so plainly confronting both Europe and the United States with the insurmountable obstacles to accord, under the old structure, that the minds of statesmen will be prepared for a bolder alternative policy.

MISSION TO EUROPE—MERCHANT UNDER RESTRAINT IN SELLING JOB

(By Murrey Marder)

In the search for a solution to nuclear sharing in the 15-nation alliance, the United States is in the position of a salesman sent on the road with orders to try to satisfy the

customer even at the risk of losing a sale.

No one is certain just what will come out of the present mission to Europe of Presidential envoy Livingston T. Merchant to explore the problem of developing a NATO atomic force.

If Merchant succeeds in eliciting much interest in developing a North Atlantic Treaty Organization nuclear force, composed of crews of several nations operating mixed-manned surface missile ships, the more tortuous task of developing the force will have only begun.

Should the venture fail, with a European conclusion that the NATO nuclear force idea is too costly, complex and unwieldy, and NATO would be better off leaving the nuclear weaponry issue where it is—largely in American hands—some administration officials would at least be equally pleased.

To those in the administration who would be undismayed by such an outcome, it could be a blessing in disguise.

This, they believe, could finally represent a voluntary European conclusion that the U.S. finger should remain in the trigger of the West's main nuclear arsenal. To this school of thought, that would resolve, at least for the time being, and on the most logical military grounds, the frenetic debate now going on in the alliance.

Others at high level inside the administration disagree.

They are convinced that nothing would be resolved by such an inconclusive termination. They believe that the debate would continue, interminably, with divisive erosion, until some more equitable division of nuclear responsibilities is found.

In the end, this group of officials believes, the European members of NATO can have a feeling of genuine security inside the Atlantic alliance only if they are actual participants in its ultimate decisions of peace or thermonuclear war.

Whichever viewpoint proves right, the debate is continuing in a sea of semantic gobbledygook that even confuses many of the participants.

As a result of the hastily improvised Nassau Pact, announced on December 21 by President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, three things were set in motion:

1. An agreement by the United States to sell Britain Polaris nuclear-tipped missiles, and to help Britain develop nuclear-powered submarines to launch them. This was a bilateral arrangement.

2. An Anglo-American agreement at Nassau to start the creation of a NATO atomic force with Britain (contributing bombers) and the United States (contributing Polaris submarines) assigning to NATO part of their existing nuclear forces. Other members of NATO would put into this grouping some of their planes and missiles equipped to use American nuclear warheads. This would be a multinational force; each nuclear nation (the United States, Britain, and now only hypothetically France) would have final say on firing its own weapons.

3. A truer NATO atomic force, called a multilateral force. It would be composed of the multinational American and British forces listed in point 2, plus mixed-manned missile-launching surface ships, each crewed by men drawn from those nations that would pay for such a force.

While American officials say that in this ultimate, multilateral force, NATO itself would control the mixed-manned ships and missiles, it is now American policy for the United States and other nuclear powers to retain their veto on the use of their nuclear warheads in this force also.

This decision to retain the veto has been pinned down by congressional insistence. The administration would prefer to stress this as little as possible, for it serves to magnify French and other European suspicions that the United States is presenting only another facade of nuclear partnership.

The American counterargument is that within a multilateral force command of five or six participating nations there would be agreed guidelines on when and how nuclear weapons would be fired. This, it is argued, minimizes the veto issue. But it is at least debatable whether prearranged guidelines can be established in advance to meet real war threats, despite the planners' insistence that this is no serious problem.

The United States is trying to avoid saying out loud that while the European nations like to protest the American nuclear veto, they also like to hide behind it.

In a showdown, most European nations are less likely to trust one another's decisions on war or peace than they are likely to trust the American judgment. This virtually rules out any attempt to devise a formula to decide on using nuclear weapons by a majority or two-thirds vote in a control organ, even if there were no U.S. veto power, American officials maintain.

But what the United States prefers to keep muted in the debate is that even if a NATO multilateral force is created, the preponderant nuclear power of the West would remain outside it.

The vast land-based missile systems of the United States, as well as its airborne nuclear strike capacity, and much of its nuclear seaborne strike power, would continue under sole American control. This, in the end, may be the biggest physical, and psychological barrier to any limited nuclear-sharing agreement.

U.S. A-FORCE PLANNING LACKS BODY, FRENCH FEEL

(By Waverley Root)

PARIS, February 27.—"The American proposals for the establishment of a multilateral nuclear force are characterized chiefly by lack of precision," a French source commented today.

This reaction was registered after presentation of the United States project to a closed session of the NATO Council this morning by President Kennedy's special envoy to deal with this subject, Livingston Merchant, and U.S Ambassador to European Organizations Thomas K. Finletter.

According to the French, all questions about specific details of the multilateral force, or for that matter about the content of the Nassau agreement between the United States and Britain, which gave birth to it, are met with the reply, "that remains to be worked out."

The Europeans are reported to have the impression that the United States hopes they will help it out by proposing themselves some detailed formula or formulas that may permit establishing multilateral defense.

COMPARISON IS MADE

"The situation is a little but like the Marshall plan period," one observer said, "when the United States asked Europe to say what she needed and what she wanted. But this time we are being asked to put flesh on the skeleton provided by Washington, where your statesmen are apparently baffled by the obstacles in the way of turning what looked like a brilliant idea into a practical reality.

"The trouble with passing the buck to us in this case is that we don't know just where your stop signs are located. We have the impression that almost anything we might suggest would be turned down by Congress or the Pentagon."

France, it is suggested here, would be willing to to consider going into a multinational—not multilateral—joint atomic force with the United States and Britain, but only on condition of complete equality.

This means that if the United States is to have a veto on independent French use of nuclear weapons, then France must have a veto on independent United States use of nuclear weapons. The French do not believe this would be acceptable to the United States.

DIFFERENCE IN TERMS

The difference between multinational and multilateral forces in the present context is that "multinational" implies joint action by allied but separate and independent national forces, while "multilateral" means an integrated arm, including such characteristics as crews of mixed nationalities on missile-carrying craft, under common command.

There is at present little likelihood that France will consent to merge her nascent atomic force in an international group from which she could not withdraw it at will and within which she could not issue direct orders to her component.

The French do not believe they are alone in feeling that so far the United States has failed to produce any proposition acceptable to NATO members, including West Germany and Italy, which have expressed agreement in principle with the multilateral force project.

They think that even the British are going to find it difficult to implement the Nassau understanding—especially as their will to do so may be considerably diminished if a Labor government comes in at the next elections.

SUPPORT FOR VIEW

This view is supported by a statement that George Brown, Labor's second in command, made at Monday's meeting here of the presidents of the Western European Union's Parliamentary Assembly. Brown said that in his opinion the multilateral force "either represents a contradiction in terms or risks ending in a disaster."

The French attitude toward the present American policy is a little like its attitude toward the British Macmillan policy.

President Charles de Gaulle's exclusion of the British from the Common Market is said to have been motivated partly by a belief that the Conservative Party's days are numbered, and that as labor has shown considerable hostility toward British entry into the Common Market, it is not opportune to open the doors to an England that might prove a disturbing influence once inside under the direction of a recalcitrant government. Therefore they decided to await an evolution of British policy before acting on her Common Market entry.

In somewhat similar fashion, the French are remarking that their atomic force is expected to reach fruition about 1970 and to develop during the following decade. They note that when De Gaulle's term ends in 1965, the chances are that either he or a successor handpicked by him will assume the Presidency for another 7 years, providing continuity in French policy well into the atomic force period.

SEEM WILLING TO WAIT

"But your President goes out of office in 2 years," they add, "even if he is reelected, that gives you only 6 years more of the same administration, against 9 for us."

Apparently the French think they can sit pat and wait for a change of heart in Washington, also.

The other NATO countries may be less resistant, but they seem nevertheless disappointed in the thin content of Livingston Merchant's briefcase. They tend to believe that he has been sent to Europe to negotiate tied hand and foot by restrictions from various sources so tightly that he has no freedom to maneuver.

In a valiant effort to score some progress nevertheless, Merchant on Sunday will start on a tour of key NATO capitals, beginning with Rome. To put full force behind the

American effort, Ambassador Finletter will accomany him on this recruiting rally.

BRITISH DENY OPPOSING MIXED-CREW A-FORCE

LONDON, February 27.—A Foreign Office spokesman today described as utter nonsense a Washington dispatch to the Times of London saying Britain has shown unwillingness to take part in the proposed NATO mixed-crew atomic sea force.

The spokesman pointed out that British Defense Minister Peter Thorneycroft told the House of Commons last month that the government was considering how it could contribute to such a force.

Thorneycroft said, "We attach importance to the multinational element, and we are considering how best to support our allies either by the manning or in support facilities."

The Foreign Office position can be developed with national contingents, which could be withdrawn, and with mixed contingents, which would be irrevocably committed to NATO. The Times report said that because of the extra cost, the British might not join in the mixed or multimanned force.

It is clear that British military circles are eager to concentrate on a NATO command made up of strictly national contributions of atomic capacity and have little enthusiasm for the American-sponsored project of mixed crews.

Mr. Speaker, after having read these articles and the editorial I began to wonder just what we are trying to do. Perhaps a Solomon could figure out this exercise in futility, but I cannot. I do not believe the French or the British—despite any British denials as the headline suggested in the last article—have any more enthusiasm than I do for this proposal.

Where's the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Anaheim (Calif.) Bulletin, dated February 22, 1963. This editorial is an indictment against the managed-news program of the administration which was so devastatingly attacked by Arthur Krock in a recent article in Fortune magazine. Mr. Krock is considered the dean of American journalists.

The editorial follows:

WHERE'S THE TRUTH?

It has always been considered disrespectful to insinuate that the President of the United States is "lying." This man, supposedly, is above the normal level of ordinary man and not to be placed in a position of having to hide his intent or his actions. When a President of this Nation does assume this position then he has lost his effectiveness to govern and represent the Nation.

President Kennedy is not truthfully acknowledging conditions in Cuba. Either he is not being truthfully informed or he has reason to hide actual conditions. If he were certain of his statements that Russia has removed all missiles and withdrawn her troops; if he were certain that there is not a continued buildup of Russian power, he would not hesitate to prove his beliefs by demanding on-the-spot inspections.

He evades the truth continually. He must receive the same reports as the entire Nation; it cannot be possible that he listens only to his advisers.

Representative DON BRUCE, of Indiana, reported to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that he had received information from the "highest authority" that: "highly placed officials in Cuba from several major Western Powers friendly to the United States counted the unloading from Soviet vessels in Cuba of 82 to 88 Soviet missiles."

Ydigoras Fuentes, President of Guatemala, forwarded information through Dr. Carlos Todd, head of the much-respected Cuban Information Service, that there is no question that Soviet submarines (presumably based in that "fishing port" in Cuba) are "loading arms and men" onto the South American continent.

These reports are discredited, not verified and those attempting to inform the administration are generally personally smeared to ruin their effectiveness in future reportings.

There is talk that President Kennedy made an agreement with Khrushchev that he will not interfere with his activities in Cuba; that Cuba will become the basis for future agreements that will involve "trades" in settling the West Berlin situation or be involved in the disarmament agreements.

From the surface it would seem we have a President who is scared to death of Russian threats; a President who completely discounts the abilities or desires of his own people to defend themselves; a President who feels that the people are completely incapable of deciding the type of government or way of life they desire; and a President who has sealed himself off from contact with those whom he is supposed to be representing as official head of this Nation.

Lies have a strange way of coming to the surface. When they do someone suffers, and in this case it will be the entire Nation.

A Welfare Plum Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Newsweek, February 25, 1963:

PERSPECTIVE—A WELFARE PLUM TREE

(By Raymond Moley)

Certain incontestable facts which apply to President Kennedy and his brother Robert should go a long way in explaining their proposal to establish a national service corps. While neither has ever directly confronted the realities of life with which less fortunate boys contend in their youth, both are, from what they say, exceedingly warmhearted. Furthermore, except in the tumult of political campaigns, neither has ever been engaged in the local life of the great cities, grappling, as local authorities must, with community problems. Both are dedicated politicians whose success in 1960 shows that they overlook no opportunity to build a following among the less fortunate denizens of our Nation. Finally, both are determined to expand Federal power far beyond its present limits.

The antennas of warmhearted people who have had little experience in social problems vibrate violently because some people are poor, wayless, and often wayward. They want to do something without delay and with little consideration of the practical limitations which confront general social amelioration. If these considerations are joined to a thrust for political power, the way becomes clear, just as it appeared to Harry Hopkins 25 years ago, to use social welfare as a means to that end.

FIRST BLOOM

The proposal for a national service corps found a chance to run an acknowledged pilot operation when the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act was passed in 1961 with an appropriation of $30 million to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

No doubt, this plum tree caught the eye of the Reverend ADAM CALYTON POWELL, whose heart throbs with compassion for his flock and its offspring. A nonprofit outfit in New York City with $9,000 of local funds was allocated $250,000 of Federal money for a so-called domestic peace corps operation. Now there is evidence upon which we may be able to judge what will happen if the nationwide plan is adopted.

Senator FRANK LAUSCHE has detailed this example of Federal irresponsibility and extravagance. In the organizational budget, salaries include: project director, $14,000; Peace Corps program coordinator, $13,000; senior research director, $13,000; recruitment coordinator, $10,000; chief of training program, $13,000, and numerous other high-salaried positions. As Senator LAUSCHE says, if such salaries are applied to units throughout the country, they "will work havoc with local and State salary schedules." He adds: "The proposed nonprofit corporation would rent what is supposed to be office space in a church. The owner of the church is the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center, Inc. The rental to be paid is $17,000 a year for a space that has been unoccupied."

IMPLICATIONS

Two days before, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS complained that Federal agencies are competing to see who can shovel the most money out to POWELL's activities and by doing so curry favor with the political power in Harlem and chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee. Senator WILLIAMS documented other activities of the Congressman which have drawn national attention.

The implications of the New York project are clear. It outlines the intent of building up a Federal political machine through Federal patronage and intervention into State and local welfare concerns. Sentor LAUSCHE makes the solid point that in the field of delinquency the work of more than 2 million citizens touches the problem directly—social and welfare work, teaching, recreational welfare work, and law enforcement. "Thus, without the parents, we have 1 worker to every 13 juveniles."

Robert Kennedy's staff study shows clearly not only that there could be indoctrination of volunteers but that an important aspect of the program involves Federal participation, through the Corps, in the educational system of the country.

Judging by the multitude of his proposals and his many delineations of gruesome conditions across the Nation, John F. Kennedy looks upon the United States, to borrow a phrase, as his personal slum project.

Are We Being Surrounded?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that Americans are beginning to ask if we are being surrounded. International developments of the last several months are not encouraging; they are in fact frightening when the total picture is considered.

I do not suggest that we allow ourselves to be frightened by these developments, but a realistic appraisal of our new position must be the foundation of any new policies designed to push back the advancing Communist tide before it engulfs us.

The following editorial from the March 3, 1963, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer expresses the concern of sober-minded citizens:

ARE WE BEING SURROUNDED?

When it became evident, a number of years ago, that communism was arising from the ashes of World War II like a voracious monster, the United States was forced to adopt a policy of containment—one that would not molest Soviet Russia or Red China, but would check them from an unbridled career of imperialism such as the world has never known before.

This policy of containment, shored up judiciously by several military pacts and supplemented by economic and military aid to threatened nations, worked remarkably well until relatively recent years.

But where is it now?

UPON WHAT MEAT HATH CAESAR FED?

For some time, Nikita Khrushchev has ranted about being surrounded by American bases, and called West Berlin a "bone in my throat." But as long as we stood our ground, the boss of the Communist camp obviously didn't want to risk any military involvement with the United States.

Now he talks about hurling 100-megaton hydrogen bombs at the United States. He warns that if we touch Cuba, or Red China, or East Germany, or any Communist puppet, the U.S.S.R. will plunge its rockets upon our cities and soil.

Upon what meat hath this Caesar fed?

The meat that always emboldens dictators—compromise, concession, timidity.

When the late Robert Frost, a great poet but not a political man, visited Moscow some months ago, he was told by Khrushchev: "The United States is too liberal to fight."

KHRUSHCHEV UNIMPRESSED AT VIENNA MEETING

There had been basis for this deadly assumption.

Astute reporters said that the burly Russian dictator was unimpressed by President Kennedy at their meeting in Vienna. Whatever his personal impression may have been, we can discount it in Mr. Kennedy's favor because he was not well at the time. He was suffering from his back ailment; he had been through a long and arduous quest of the presidency, and his advisers obviously had not prepared him for the harsh challenge with which Khrushchev was to confront him.

But in the practical matters that count, things have been going better for Khrushchev ever since. The walling off of East Berlin was begun as a tentative measure. Had there been a reaction such as Sir Winston Churchill gave when a similar ruse was tried in Austria, this matter would have ended there. But we did nothing. So the wall was made permanent—illegally—and refugees who tried to scale it were shot in the cruelest of circumstances.

When Castro's Communists had only a fragile hold on Cuba—and a modicum of help from the United States could have turned the Bay of Pigs invasion into a liberation of the island—Khrushchev said in so many words that he had no intention to, and could not, maintain a Communist base there 10,000 miles away.

What has happened since that great stage-managed victory for the United States on the eve of the last congressional elections?

Seemingly Khrushchev has decided that the gate is open for a worldwide Communist expansion—that whatever he does, we will find some words to excuse it. Like defensive weapons.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk said at a conference in Texas that "a Soviet military presence on that island (Cuba) cannot be accepted."

He, or someone else, probably will be saying the same thing when Russia uses the big airfields in West Africa to push new beachheads in to South America.

Our oversea bases are being dismantled. One political gaucherie after another has riddled the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and we are even at odds with the Canadian government. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is crumbling.

As a British statesman said the other day, our blind colonial policies must have been a delight to the Kremlin. The probable next prime minister of England says: "Don't talk to me about Polaris or Skybolt—I want neither." The probable next prime minister of Canada has been noted for his coexistence policies and favoritism of allowing Red China to join the party.

The Organization of American States, which promptly rallied to our side when it appeared we would take some action to remove or at least quarantine Castro, is bound to become progressively less eager to act the longer we tolerate the Russian presence in Cuba, and the more Communist terrorists are indoctrinated and trained in Havana for operations throughout the hemisphere.

Meanwhile, we are making no more transcontinental bombers, no more supersonic planes of any appreciable size. When the B-52's and the B-58's wear out, they will be gone. Squadrons of our B-47s are being brought back from oversea bases. Our Jupiter and Thor rocket installations are being dismantled. Obsolete? Perhaps. But at the same time, better rockets than the Russians smuggled into Cuba.

Take a look about. Are we now being surrounded? Who or what brought us so far, so fast?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include my Washington Report of February 27 dealing with the Operation Water Moccasin III. Since the report was written, the Army has revealed the various nations involved.

While I concur in the training of our allied officers in jungle warfare. the emphasis of my objection lies with the imposition of this training upon the population living within this 1½-million-acre area.

The training should be carried out within the enclave of our military reservation. The towns and villages should not be subjected to military law.

A similar operation was carried on in California in the summer of 1951 and was billed as a United Nations takevover, and the civilian population which refused to cooperate were threatened with prosecution.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

Now hear this and listen well. By the time this Washington Report reaches you, there will be underway one of the most fantastic and, to me, truly frightening, military maneuvers ever to be held in the United States. It is called Exercise Water Moccasin III, and is just as deadly. These maneuvers will be held on a 2,500-square-mile area of 1,500,000 acres, covering all of four counties and parts of four other counties in the State of Georgia, just south of Savannah. It will include the participation of 16 foreign allied nations and involves guerrila warfare, psychological warfare, and counterinsurgency.

The area, for lack of a better name, will be called the mythical country of Claxtonia, a free world nation. Claxtonia is to be invaded by foreign guerrilla troops, whose goal is to take over that mythical country. Opposing troops will be brought in by parachute drop in an effort to resist this invasion. It seems impossible to get much information on these maneuvers from the Pentagon intelligence, which denies any knowledge of this operation. Those in the know refuse to identify the 16 foreign allied nations involved, nor can we determine the number of troops involved. They may be members of NATO, SEATO, or CENTO.

A form sheet came to my desk in response to many inquiries, but I cannot tell from this sheet which department issued it. The memo indicates that the operation will include 600 personnel. Other authoritative sources say there will be 3,000 personnel. If there are only 600, that would be one man for every 2,500 acres, which is ridiculous on the face of it.

The cities, towns, and villages, and the rural inhabitants of Claxtonia, are supposed to participate in this operation and will be targets of intensive propaganda campaigns by the invaders and by the counterinsurgency troops. This intensive propaganda campaign will be carried on by three local radio stations which will be supporting the counterinsurgent guerrillas of Claxtonia, and by two radio stations in Savannah supporting the invading guerrillas. The inhabitants of Claxtonia have been requested to take sides. Having done so, they are to house, feed, keep and aid the guerrillas of their choice and transport them to ambush sites. The various cities are to either accept or impel the invaders. The psychological effect on American citizens placed in this position will be enormous. These maneuvers will last for about 3 weeks. Signs have been posted throughout the area in five different languages. There will be foreign observers as well as a U.N. contingent.

It is my belief that this operation comes squarely under Article 43 of the United Nations Charter. This, of course, will be vehemently denied by the State Department, as was everything else that happened in Cuba, the truth notwithstanding.

We do not know whether African troops will be involved or not, but we do know that

there is a large contingent of barefooted Africans that have been moved into Cuba for training in guerrilla warfare. I would like to quote a few lines from 13-year-old Anna Maria Delgado, who escaped from Cuba:

"I went to a church school. They closed it about a year ago. The Russians and all sorts of foreigners moved in * * * Then about 3 weeks ago, these Africans came. They're all over the place * * * Men and women too. They put them in my school. It looked like a whole tribe. * * * "I was terrified of them. They're savages. I heard one of them beat a woman.

"They're always barefooted and they wear short skirts that come just above their knees. They have big rings in their ears and noses.

"They talk funny and nobody understands what they're saying. * * *

"They can't go out on the streets unless some militiamen go with them. Everybody's afraid of them. I wouldn't go near them."

Who brought these Africans to Cuba? Was it the United Nations? Was it Russia? Or was it the United States? And are they being trained for the forthcoming invasion of peaceful Angola, which, with the knowledge and consent of the U.N., has been subjected to murder, pillage and rape from bases in the central Congo? Instead of bringing peace to the world, the U.N. has brought war, and it has brought disgrace upon the United States.

With the subjugation of Katanga, you can look forward to seeing the U.N. move its "peaceful" forces into Angola, Northern Rhodesia, Mozambique, and the Republic of South Africa, simply because these countries desire self-determination rather than to be subjected to the communist-infested United Nations.

The 1962 American Success Story Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to pay tribute to Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls, a fellow Georgian who is the recipient of a 1962 American Success Story Award presented annually by the Free Enterprise Awards Association of New York.

These awards go to men and women of our country whose success stories symbolize the success possible to everyone under free enterprise democracy such as that which we enjoy in the United States.

All of Georgia, particularly her business associates and many friends, are proud of Mrs. Sauls for the contributions she has made to her State and local community. Here is truly a success story, and I wish to join with others in saluting her.

In accepting the award, Mrs. Sauls said with great truth:

Free enterprise is the only economic system that gives each of us the right to be what we want to be, including the right a woman has to make business or homemaking a career.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of Mrs. Sauls' award be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1962 AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

NEW YORK CITY.—The 1962 American Success Story Awards were presented today by the Free Enterprise Awards Association to two women and eight men as examples of the success possible under America's free enterprise democracy. They rose from the ranks to own or head giant industries starting as reporter, farmer, teacher, laborer, a Russian immigrant, a woman "stogie" roller, and other odd jobs. All praised the American democratic system and its freedoms for making their success possible.

Presentation of FEAA's 11th annual awards were made at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel by Free Enterprise Awards Association awards chairman, Talbot T. Speer, who rose to own a Maryland newspaper chain, one of America's oldest papers, the 235-year-old Maryland Gazette and the Baltimore Business Forms, Inc. Mr. Speer read the citations which stated that the recipients had "* * * won an enduring place in the history of American endeavor by achieving success despite adversity through industry, sacrifice and ethics, symbolizing the success possible under our free enterprise system." He cited them for their dedicated work in civic, religious, and philanthropic causes and contributions to their fields.

Mr. Speer declared that the Berlin wall was a 25-mile monument attesting to the failure of Russia's despotic system and pointed out that the recipients success stories were proof, by comparison, that the American democratic system was best and that it gave spiritual and material success to all. "The only walls we build are for homes and industries to raise our highest standard of living, still higher," declared Mr. Speer. He warned that the Berlin wall and the Cuban crisis prove that the totalitarian ideologies would desperately use any inhuman means to wipe out democratic nations and urged all people who wish to maintain their liberty to join the conflict between human dignity and slavery.

The Free Enterprise Awards Association was chartered by New York State in 1952 and approved by the Supreme Court. With leaders in all fields it carries out its charter duties "to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American free enterprise democracy" through "morale defense" projects to bolster the faith of all people in the American democratic system.

MRS. MAE B. SAULS

Mrs. Sauls is president of the William L. Bonnell Co., Inc., of Newnan, Ga. A native of Lexington, Ky., she spent her childhood in Ohio. She was secretary and a research worker at Batelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio. She earned degrees at Ohio State and Western Reserve Universities and devoted 16 years to working with, advising and helping her husband, William L. Bonnell, founder of the company. Together they developed metal and aluminum trim and other extrusions and made the Trimedge line of decorative mouldings world famous, including their Bon-Vue Storefronts, Bon-Voyage marine specialties, Carpet-Guard, Bon-L-Gold Finish, Bon-Dee sink frames and Koil-Pak. When Mr. Bonnell died in 1960, she was unanimously elected president and chief executive officer. She courageously and capably introduced new products and equipment, doubled plant capacity, and expanded sales areas. Today under the guiding genius of Mrs. Sauls, Bonnell is the world's largest independent aluminum-extruding firm, with 7 acres of plant area under one roof, employing 1,100 people with nationwide branches, export divisions, and 67 Trimedge franchise distributors grossing $30 million in sales. She is treasurer of World Friendships, Inc., president of Lennob, Inc., and member of the International Council of Industrial Editors and other organizations.

She has been cited for her pioneering in decorative trim extrusions which have beautified and strengthened millions of products and her devoted work to the American Red Cross, YMCA, youth, church, and other community causes.

German Journalist's Berlin Wall Story Provocative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last summer while I was in Germany attending a meeting of the political clubs of the Lutheran Evangelical Society, I had the pleasure of meeting and talking with Günter Marquard, a German political journalist.

A few weeks after I returned to Washington, I received a letter from Mr. Marquard in which he enclosed a commentary on the incident of August 18, 1962, when an 18-year-old East Berlin construction worker was shot and left to bleed to death near the Berlin wall.

Since the translation of the commentary was just completed, I have been unable until now to bring it to the attention of the Senate. However, even though the incident described took place several months ago, I thought perhaps the Members of the Senate might be interested in reading Mr. Marquard's thought-provoking comments on the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the translation of the commentary printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation (German)]

(By Günter Marquard)

On Friday, August 18, just 1 week after the anniversary of the erection of the Berlin wall, during an escape attempt of the two 18-year-old East Berlin construction workers, one of the escapees was shot to death by the East Berlin border guard. Critically wounded, he lay for more than 1 hour near the wall until the Communist border guards finally removed the dead man. The incident occurred in an immediate neighborhood of Checkpoint Charlie, the crossing point for foreigners on Friedrich Strasse. The critically wounded had already passed two barbed wire entanglements and lay just 1 meter away from the West Berlin territory, on the eastern side of the wall. His cry of pain and his desperate calls for help were heard in West Berlin.

West Berlin policemen, who hurried to the spot, unsuccessfully tried to throw first aid material to the wounded man. In this moment, tear gas grenades were thrown from the East side. This was nearly 1 hour after the shots. Since the incident occurred in the immediate neighborhood of Checkpoint

Charlie, at which the American military police does the checking, the American officer on duty was informed about the case. He came with a patrol and watched the scene from the West Berlin side. The Germans present urged him to do what was impossible to the Berliners, and, using the privilege granted to him when wearing an American uniform, to go to the Eastern sector and help [the wounded].

The young officer may have seriously considered what was humanly possible in his situation and, perhaps, what was his duty as human being, and what he thought he was entitled to do according to the orders received. Surely, he must have considered whether he could act even without an order, for purely human reasons. Possibly, the burden of his duty was too great for him. He said a word which, ever since, has been repeated again and again, and which might have contributed to the fact that, in the following days, the demonstrations and the excitement turned not only, and not exclusively against the East. The young officer said: "This is not our problem"; he said it and went away.

Immediately, he informed his superiors about the incident and probably hinted at a possibility of a first-aid service, but he did not find a single superior officer who would take responsibility for it and who would give a proper order. So far the facts of the matter.

The entire incident, from shooting to the dying of the escapee, took place in full publicity. During the hour, several hundreds of witnesses gathered there. They all lived through the incident and were compelled, in helpless rage, to see the results of the Soviet shooting order given to their border guards; they also were to experience that all the humanity they felt in themselves, all willingness to help and all humanitarian responsibility, could not be made effective.

Just a few hours later, some unknown young people put up a cross at this spot with a single inscription: "We accuse." Since then, the stream of visitors who place flowers at the wooden cross, flows without interruption. Old and young Berliners, West German visitors and foreigners, among them a youth choir from the United States, have visited the place. On Friday, when the escapee Peter Fechter died, these young Americans were in Berlin. I hope, they will tell the people in their home country, that the anger of the Berliners especially the young ones, which broke through the demonstrations on the succeeding days, was not directed against the Allies, but against all people of the world, who hesitate, for good or bad reasons, to do what man should do, no matter what the price.

While, in the following lines, I intend to put a stress on matters which are of great concern to the Berliners, their Western Allies and, in general, to all people of the Western World, I do not forget for a moment, that the reason why we, here on location, must deal with these questions, and the responsibility for all the human sorrow which we experience here in these days, lies with the Communist tyrants beyond the wall. But it is so that, all of us here in Berlin, young or old, have gotten used, and resigned ourselves to the fact that we cannot expect from those people any humanity, understanding, or even mere feelings which should be expected, as normal, of people with moral standards in spite of their political differences.

The Swiss newspaper Die Tat [Action], in commenting on the murder of the escapee, recalled an old psychological truth, that even the warmest friendship, when it feels disappointed, can easily reverse itself.

From the experience of the years following 1947, I have learned to believe that such extremely cordial friendship does exist between the Berliners and the Americans in Berlin. But there is a danger here which we must face. Since the end of war, and particularly since the time of the blockade, the Berliners have maintained this trust in America. The air bridge was regarded by the Berliners not only as a political feature; it was, first of all, accepted as an act of humanity, accomplished by every single participating American for every single Berliner. Neither the air bridge pilot who helped, nor the Berliner who was helped, knew each other. Yet, a personal relationship, even if anonymous, had developed between the members of the two groups. It is this relationship which grew out of sentiment, rather than a rational resolution about the political belonging to the West, that is now endangered.

It is true that the French and the British have also had a good mutual relationship with Berlin. However, this was rather a relationship of mutual respect based on a rational consideration. On the other hand, a feeling of sympathy [friendship] had developed in respect to the Americans jovially called "our Amies" by the Berliners. It is this feeling that can suffer as a consequence of such events as those which took place on the occasion of the death of the refugee Peter Fechter.

During the past days, I studied many American newspapers. In one of them, the Journal American, I found a remark which, in my opinion, well fits the matter. The magazine wrote: "The terrible incident was probably typical for the fact that the United States, in big political issues takes occasionally a firm position, but in small, purely human matters, remains irresolute."

For professional reasons, I was repeatedly present at the political demonstrations at Checkpoint Charlie, during the days that followed the escapee murder. From what I saw myself, I believe to have sufficient evidence to judge what had happened and who caused it. It was, for the most part, young people, pupils, students, and young workers, who simply were not able to get into their heads that what had happened should be quietly accepted.

In those days, there was no lack of activity, especially on the part of the acting mayor of Berlin, Willy Brandt, and appeals were made, calling for prudence. But, I think that it must be difficult for anyone, even for old and prudent ones, to have to experience incidents such as those which had taken place there, and to have to keep quiet without getting a moral shock. This is even more true with young people. Things which have been going on in their city for over 15 years, have made them politically extremely alert. Also, they are very active, a fact which the world has repeatedly noted with great praise during the past years, on the occasion of their mass demonstrations on May 1, or at the Schoeneberger City Hall during the visits of Vice President JOHNSON and Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

However, a spirit and attitude, such as the Berliners have often shown, cannot be channeled. One cannot press the button and make this human behavior effective or cut it off. Either it does exist and its spontaneous manifestations must be taken into consideration, or it does not exist any more, and that would mean the first step toward a dangerous resignation.

Something else has also to be considered in this connection, a matter which in your country, might be difficult to feel, but perhaps could be grasped by reasoning. It is something that is connected with our attempt to overcome our political past of the years of Hitler-dictatorship. In all our spiritual encounters with our own past by our young people to whom I also belong, the nearly accusing question to our older generation comes again and again: "What have you done to prevent Hitler's advent; what have you done to remove him; why did you keep silent to everything, including the murder of Jews?"

Many young people, surely not the worst ones, are willing to accept the displeasure of also directing such questions to themselves. They keep asking themselves and their fellow citizens: "What have we done, what are we doing, and what can we do to prevent us from being also guilty of keeping quiet about similar deplorable conditions in our immediate surrounding, before our own door?" They feel an obligation to do something about it, the more so, and particularly so, since they themselves live in the free part of our country, in West Berlin, although close to, but not under the Eastern dictatorship, and therefore are in the position to act according to their own conscience.

Many of the young demonstrators to whom I talked, have expressed this way of thinking, perhaps in different words, and they stressed that their primary purpose was to urge their Western allies and their American friends to get more actively engaged in behalf of humanity.

We all know that we cannot change conditions. We all accept the fact that we have no right to draw our friends into incalculable conflicts. But many of us are of the opinion that the closeness of the events does not necessarily make us see things less correctly.

In the past years we were able to observe and to learn that the Soviets are masters in double dealing. On one side, they try, on the government level, not to let the talks break up; on the other hand, they continue to create situations at the lowest level, at the places which are useful for them. I think that we should learn from this kind of behavior. In order to avoid greater conflicts, we should do what the American Government does, i.e., continue the talks in the hope that agreement can be reached. But also, we should not fail to do things, there on location, which are vital for the strengthening of our own position. Nobody charges the United States with double dealing just because it conducts disarmament talks and, at the same time, does what is necessary for the security of its country and its allies. To transfer these tactics into other fields of the East-West controversy, for example to Berlin, would mean to give a larger scope of allowance to our own activities which are so important primarily in psychological aspect.

While the Soviets keep claiming their rights derived e.g., from the Four-Power Statute of Berlin, at the same time having made their own obligations nearly completely null and void, the West is still trying not only to maintain its rights but also to fulfill its obligations even when these obligations put a unilateral burden on the West. This refers, e.g., to the tolerating of the Communist supervision over the railroad line located in West Berlin.

The West explains its own way by the possibility of a serious, military conflict. I do not know whether you will agree with me if I give you my opinion on this point. If this serious conflict which neither of us desires, should come, it will come not as an accident. It will not be the result of local clashes, not even the result of some shooting in Berlin. Should it come, it will come when the Soviets will want it to come. As President Kennedy stressed last fall and again this spring, the decision whether there should be war, is up to the Soviets.

If this is true, then neither will a firm reaction, possibly even a pressure of Western measures, cause the conflict, nor will a behavior which is called by the East defensive and inactive, prevent such a conflict.

In the past days, there was no lack of good advice for the Berliners, mostly in foreign press. As long as this advice appeals to reasonableness, we accept it. As far as it shows misjudgment of the real motives of the demonstrations, we regret it. But when it contains statements like those in the British paper Guardian, we take it as an

offense. Among other things, it was suggested there, that we, the West Berliners, should use our energy for planting flowers and establishing playgrounds on our side of the wall, rather than for demonstrations. Surely, such a suggestion was not made with malice, but it strikes our people here as a cynical one.

The author of this suggestion obviously has no sympathy with the grave inner conflicts from which, e.g., those West Berlin policemen have to suffer who are on duty by the wall or at the barbed wire entanglements. They showed an admirable self-restraint, although they must have felt almost as the defenders of the wall which they hate themselves. What they had to feel as human beings and what they had expected to do, was unbearable. Those policemen who, not only for human reasons but also for reasons of their professional ethos are destined to give aid to everybody who is in danger even when this rendering of help is possible only under the risk of their own health and life, had to endure the fact that murder was committed before their eyes. Even after the shooting, they were not allowed to help. They were not allowed to help although each of them would have been charged with and declared guilty of a failure to render help if they had acted in this way under different circumstances.

A Viennese newspaper colleague wrote recently: "Coexistence with the shame of the wall will always carry a twofold danger: that one part of the population will morally disarm and resign themselves to a coexistence with communism; and that the other part will feel an urge to gain with force what seems to be unachievable by way of negotiations. To preserve the morals of one part and the patience of the other, will only be possible when the Western protecting powers conceive their protective task in its full scope, and when over 2 million West Berliners are not only given guarantees for the event of the big conflict, but are also given assurances that they will not be left helpless in facing the wall in such small questions of everyday life, as the case of the killed worker Peter Fechter."

What I mean here, does not concern the determination of the United States, if need be, to protect our existence with its full weight. We all believe in the assurances to this effect and are deeply convinced of their seriousness, as, in my opinion, basically also Moscow does. Yet we must have the feeling that the West has not only assumed a hedgehog-like position, but also conducts an offensive policy. The "three essentials" announced by President Kennedy, are violated when the West tolerates a condition in which Berlin's vitality is lowered through continuous high tension and possibly by the decrease of trust in the West. It may be that, in the battlefield of the "three essentials" there are a few points left which can be attacked by the Soviets and changed at their will. But taken psychologically, the battlefield of the "three essentials" has shrunk for the West to zero.

In conclusion, let me touch upon one more point which found an unseemingly wide attention in foreign press, apparently also in the United States, although, in the Berlin demonstrations it was a nearly unnoticed random event. It is surely unavoidable that, during demonstrations when feelings run high as it was here, a few rowdies must be present. And surely, there must have been some Communists among the demonstrators who attempted to provoke trouble.

It was from among those elements that the call "Ami go home" came, the call which was given too much attention by the foreign press. I can well understand that this call has a bad sound for the Americans all over the world. And surely, this call would have been fit to arouse bitter feelings among them if it would have been cried out loud and seriously in Berlin where it caused so much ado. There, where this call was heard, insofar it wasn't used by provokers, it was nothing else than a translation of a phrase which is used in a dispute with a good friend, when one says: "Scram, man." To draw political consequences from this is, in my opinion, not only quite wrong, but also fit exclusively to benefit our common foe.

Let us realize that, if during the incident which lead to the death of Peter Fechter, some unknown American soldier would have intervened, perhaps even without any success, he would have been the hero of the day, the idol of the Berliners. If that one person would have acted that way, neither the Germans, the Berliners nor the Americans in their entirety would have been different, or perhaps better people. Neither would the politics in Washington, Bonn or Berlin been different or better. But the response would have been joy and a feeling of togetherness.

Yet, because no American did it (although the legal status offered him a possibility to do it), and those who later criticized this fact were legally forbidden to do it themselves and in fact were barred by the police from breaking through to East Berlin, there was locally a change in sentiments. It took as little as that to cause this.

These momentary sentiments must be noticed, of course. But they cannot become a basis for politics. They are surely too small to defeat the feelings of friendship or the considerations of political reasoning on both sides: on yours and ours.

Allow me to draw a comparison. In connection with the events of August 13, last year, there was a great deal of disappointment in Berlin, also about the attitude of our Federal Government in Bonn. Many bitter words were said and, when Chancellor Adenauer came to Berlin several weeks later, he was booed at by some people. During the present demonstrations, rocks were hurled at the West Berlin police. But it does not mean at all that these two incidents allow a conclusion that the Berliners are anti-German just because they booed Adenauer, or that they are anti-Berlin just because rocks were thrown at the West Berlin police. Equally, single bad words against individual Americans, which can be understood only in connection with the given situation, cannot mean that, all of a sudden the West Berliners turned anti-American. And it is surely a much greater nonsense, when apparently some foreign correspondents mistook these critical but deplorable remarks for possibly growing sympathies of West Berliners for the East, for Mr. Ulbricht, and Mr. Khrushchev, for the murderers of the escapee, Peter Fechter.

It was my intention to write you all this in order to make you realize the way of thinking of many of my countrymen here on the spot. Perhaps, you will find time and, in a few quiet moments, give some thoughts to some notions contained in my letter. I am satisfied that, if you do that, you will better grasp our situation and understand many things which occurred or were said in Berlin in recent days.

May I thank you very much for giving your attention to my letter. Should you use these thoughts and the enclosed pictures concerning the events, in the circles of your friends in your own State, or in talks with newspapermen or radio people, it would make me very happy, because I am convinced that all the above would contribute to our better mutual understanding in spite of the burden of the events through which we have to live together.

(Translated by George Starosolsky, January 4, 1963.)

The Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor published in the Greenfield (Ind.) News and written by H. D. Henley of Carthage, Ind., within my 10th District:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Respected friends, we hear more and more of that famous document that is more honored in the breach than in the observance—the Monroe Doctrine.

On Tuesday, December 2, 1823, President Monroe sent a long message to the 18th Congress, dealing with many things, a "state of the Union" message. We have set down some of the important points of the Message, quite in context.

"* * * meeting in you a new Congress, I deem it proper to present this view of public affairs in greater detail than might otherwise be necessary. * * * The people being with us exclusively the sovereign, it is indispensable that full information be laid before them on all important subjects, to enable them to exercise that high power with complete effect. If kept in the dark, they must be incompetent to it. We are all liable to error, and those who are engaged in the management of public affairs are more subject to excitement and to be led astray by their particular interests and passions, than the great body of our constituents, who, living at home, in the pursuits of their ordinary avocations, are calm but deeply interested spectators of events, and of the conduct of those who are parties to them. To the people, every department of the Government and every individual in each, are responsible, and the more full their information, the better they can judge of the wisdom of the policy pursued, and of the conduct of each in regard to it. From their dispassionate judgment, much aid will always be obtained, while their approbation will form the greatest incentive, and the most gratifying reward for virtuous actions, and the dread of their censure the best security against the abuse of their confidence (that thought is so alien to the present incumbents in Washington as to require no further comments.)

"* * * A precise knowledge of our relations with foreign powers, as respects our negotiations and transactions with each, is thought to be particularly necessary. Equaly necessary it is, that we should form a just estimate of our resources, revenue" but why go on—let's impeach Monroe for such outlandish suggestions.

Monroe continues that by prudence in spending and by establishing a sinking fund to payoff the consolidated debts of the Revolutionary War, we will be practically debt free in a dozen years. (Hang him.)

"* * * In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so." (don't forget that). "We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety" (this

last paragraph is supposed to be the "Monroe Doctrine."

If we editorialize that the "grand design" was that since we stayed out of European quarrels, therefore we had a right to demand that the Europeans stay out of our backyard. Of course, some will yell "Yaah—post hoc, ergo propter hoc." Nevertheless, the above was the thought underlying our firm stand until Woodrow assayed to "make the world safe for democracy." Now it is anybody's interpretation.

Yes, this is old stuff and outdated. The New Deal, 25 years ago characterized all unbelievers as belonging to the "horse and buggy" days. But Monroe belonged to the "horse sans buggy" days; to wit: The next day after his message, Wednesday, December 3, 1823, the Senate authorized one Mountjoy Bayley to arrange for horses for the use of the Senate.—H. D. Henley.

He Preserves Bunyan's Nature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, my executive press secretary, Mrs. Audrey Hagen, reminded me this week of the tremendously important public information job being performed across this country by our weekly newspaper editors and publishers by pointing out an article in the Publishers' Auxiliary, known as the newspaperman's newspaper.

The March 2, 1963, issue of the Auxiliary selected a man from my congressional district as "editor of the week." He is Lee Oberg of the Blackduck (Minn.) American, and typifies the weekly editor in much of our country, a man dedicated to his Nation through service to his community.

The article follows:

HE PRESERVES BUNYAN'S NATURE

(By Marion Tureck)

The legend of Paul Bunyan dominates northern Minnesota. In Blackduck, population 765, Lee Oberg works to preserve the tall timbers that the mighty lumberjack felled with a sure swing. Oberg doesn't have Paul's blue ox, Babe, to help him, but he does have a weekly paper, the Blackduck (Minn.) American.

Its pages are jammed with columns on the outdoors; the paper was one of the first to feature a special fire prevention edition. Oberg has worked with the State and Federal Forest Services for the past 15 years to prepare their special annual editions. Last April, he was selected as Minnesota's outstanding editor-conservationist for 1962.

All three—Oberg, the paper and the trees—grew together. Lumbermen made Blackduck their headquarters back in 1901 when Oberg's father, Ernest founded the American. Oberg's birth beat the army press, by 50 days.

From his dad, Oberg learned to fish and sail and he learned about newspapers. The two went into partnership in 1930, replacing the Washington handset press with a Linotype. Eleven years later they moved into a new building.

The logging community is now a center for farming and dairies. As Oberg told the auxiliary, "Working for a newspaper, you find yourself working in the community as well, from which I have derived a lot of satisfaction."

It must have given Oberg a great deal of that satisfaction to help acquire Pine Tree State Park for Blackduck. As a boy he helped preserve it from forest fires. He once homesteaded in the Pine Island area north of Blackduck. As handy with a gun as Bunyan was with an ax, Oberg shot a moose, distributing the meat among settlers. At that time the only way it could be preserved was to cook it or to "put it down."

Oberg recalls, "Although I tried other things in my early teens, I came back to journalism."

A Blackduck fireman for 25 years, Oberg and 22 Minnesota newsmen went to the White House in 1961, to give President Kennedy their ideas on putting out some world fires.

Oberg got a chance to see some of that world when he and his wife accompanied the Minneapolis aquatennial queen on a tour of three Scandinavian countries. Oberg was the first weekly editor to be selected for the honor.

Currently a second vice president of the Minnesota Press Association, he represented Minnesota, as he and editors from 17 other States toured Ontario, Canada.

Paul Bunyan was a legend; luckily Lee Oberg is not.

State Responsibility Today: Governor Rockefeller's Inaugural Address, January 1, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1963, in his second inaugural address, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York emphasized the importance of State responsibility in the smooth functioning of our Union. Governor Rockefeller's speech was a clear and inspiring statement of the philosophy that the States must meet their own economic and social needs and call upon the Federal Government for leadership and action, only as they display and practice such leadership themselves.

Governor Rockefeller's program for New York State in the coming years is a practical expression of the philosophy of States' rights and responsibility. His fourfold program includes extension and improvement of the opportunities for higher education; expansion and updating of training to meet the challenge of automation; dedication to continued sound economic growth and expansion of job opportunities in the State; and greater emphasis on more and better research and development.

Governor Rockefeller has set forth a program that shows what the States can do under vigorous and imaginative leadership. Under unanimous consent, I include his inaugural address, outlining his program and his philosophy in the RECORD at this point:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, JANUARY 1, 1963

This is an historic anniversary. Just 100 years ago, on January 1, in 1863, the Emancipation Proclamation became law and humany slavery was abolished in our land.

In the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln, all Americans were "thenceforward, and forever free."

This great document of human liberty was promulgated at a time when the cause of union and of freedom itself was in perilous trial; but its very pronouncement then served notice of the strength and courage of freemen, and their determination that human justice and equality should prevail.

We are met at a time when freedom again is on trial—when our very way of life is challenged not only through military aggression, but in the marketplace, in the factories, on the farms, in the laboratories of science, and in the schools.

This is an all-encompassing struggle—a competition for the minds and hearts of men in which human dignity, freedom, and equal opportunity are the stakes.

It is a contest in which irresolution or lack of vigilance invites disaster.

It is a contest that summons the fullest participation of all major elements of our society—the individual, the family, the church, the community, the State and the Nation.

It requires the closest cooperation and mutual confidence of labor, of agriculture, of the professions, of business and of government.

In the fullest sense it demands that we demonstrate our faith by performance—not merely the feasibility of our professions but their concrete reality in daily living.

New York, from the inception of this Nation, has been in the vanguard of the States in the fight for freedom, for human dignity, and for equal opportunity. And I pledge you my every effort to keep it there.

We know that these words—freedom, dignity, and opportunity—the trinity of liberty—are inseparable. We know the potency of the ideas they express—concepts so powerful that the most ruthless totalitarian dictatorships must give them lipservice to survive.

We know that if these words are not to be mere hollow phrases, they must be rooted into the fabric of our society—and that this society must provide the economic basis for individual opportunity and social growth.

We know also that as New Yorkers we have contributed to and shared in the development of the American system which has grown and prospered for almost 200 years—a brilliant monument to the wisdom of our country's founders and its historical leadership.

This American system has had the adaptability required to span in space our growth from 13 small States on the Atlantic seaboard to a mighty nation of 50 States astride a continent.

It has had the flexibility needed to span through time our evolution from an uncomplicated society of a few million people predominantly farmers and frontiersmen scattered over the land, to the most complex society on earth today.

It has proven as well its ability to span our psychological transformation from an isolationist people, preoccupied with the internal development of the country, to a people demonstrating responsible awareness and concern for our nation's role as world leader.

In terms of broad historical perspective, every political, social, and economic system, including our own, takes on the nature of an experiment—an experiment continually being tested by trial and error.

The quality of any such experiment is determined by the quality of the government that conducts it. And the quality of government is determined by the quality of its purposes.

The viability of the American system is rooted in the nobility of the purposes which the Founding Fathers set out to achieve when they fashioned our American credo and gave

it the flesh and blood they gave it in our representative system of balanced government.

Both historically and currently, the American system is based upon a fundamental, revolutionary idea: The importance of the individual human being and of his right to grow and develop to his full potential.

What has happened in America—chiefly within the last 50 years and only as a result of manifold struggles—is that logical projections have been and are being developed from this idea and applied to the full range of 20th century life—economic, social, psychological, as well as political.

The common good is no longer just a political matter involving governments. It is vitally affected by economic and social patterns. So they, too, must reflect the common good—under the sanction of social pressures which express themselves in attitudes of social responsibility and civic conscience, backed only when necessary by governmental laws and actions.

The continuing success of our American system, in my opinion, has rested chiefly on two interdependent factors which have given it a unique character.

The first of these is the concept of freedom as opportunity. Compared to other societies, ours is an open society to a very high degree.

Opportunities for education and career advancement are ever more widely available.

The individual man and woman enjoy a degree of human dignity unprecedented in any other part of the world.

The social mobility possible in America is still unprecedented, extending to the dignity of those who labor, giving the workingman a self-respect greater than that of any workingman in the world.

Admittedly, however, there are imperfections which must be removed. We must strive even more ceaselessly to extend these opportunities and this dignity to every member of all groups in our society, no matter what his race, color, religion, origin, or status. Only in this way can we attain the accomplishment of the American idea.

There is a second factor, however, which has made for the flexibility and greatness of our American system. We Americans are so accustomed to talking about individual rights that sometimes we overlook the other basic concept. It is that we in America view freedom as responsibility.

This responsibility begins, of course, at the level of the individual citizen. It requires emphasis on self-reliance and the dignity of work. It includes his duty to respect the rights of others. It extends as well to those obligations of his which have to do with civic participation.

It is the duty of every citizen not only to cast his ballot, but to cast it as wisely as he can—and this is not always easy.

There is a danger that the voter may mistake words for substance, panaceas for basic solutions, and be deluded by slogans and labels such as conservative, liberal and progressive. Life can be oversimplified—made all black or all white. Conservative, liberal and progressive are not mutually exclusive concepts. There are important elements of basic values in all three.

We should respect conservatism—because we know the measureless value that is our heritage to save, to cherish and to enrich—because we believe that everything that is soundly built for the future is built in the present on the foundations of the past.

We should respect liberalism—because we should be more concerned with the opportunities of tomorrow than in the record of yesterday—because out of the past and the present a better future can and must evolve.

And we should respect a progressive point of view—because the opportunities and challenges, facing us now and in the future, are of such size and scope that we can never halt and say: "Our labor is done"—because we believe in stable, ordered change and human progress—in the perfectibility of the individual human being and of the human society.

The flourishing of the American system requires a sense of responsibility, not only on the part of individual citizens, but especially on the part of America's leadership. I am not speaking alone of political leaders, but of the leaders of all phases of our society as well.

To the extent that they do not exercise their power and influence in the direction of the common good, they are undermining the very system that has given them that power and influence.

This requirement begins, it seems to me, with the elemental personal characteristics of sincerity and honesty, candor and integrity.

These are old-fashioned virtues that we associate with the men who formed this Nation and upon which the Nation was founded.

I believe that political leaders today must demonstrate the same personal integrity and accept the obligation to insure that the governments they lead also operate with integrity—and that this includes the concept of fiscal integrity.

I believe that political leaders have the affirmative duty ruthlessly to prune out wasteful and nonessential expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

I believe that political leaders, at all levels, have an obligation to preserve and to strengthen the Federal system devised by our Founding Fathers.

This system joins our States in a Nation that allows a sharing of sovereignty, the promotion of diversity within unity, and the assurance of government close to the people.

I believe that to preserve this system there are certain basic principles we must adhere to. The local community can justly appeal to the State for help in meeting its economic and social needs only if it does all in its own power to satisfy these human wants at the local level.

The States within our national union, in turn, should call for vigorous Federal leadership and action in areas of concern to the States only as they display and practice such leadership themselves. For the guarding of States' rights requires, before all else, the meeting of States' responsibilities.

And so it is in the largest of our neighborhoods—the world itself. We can lead the forces and extend the frontiers of freedom everywhere only as we practice this freedom—with responsibility—in our own national life.

This freedom must be a chain in which all men ultimately touch hands. Within this concept of freedom, one can speak of the equality of nations and the rule of law only as he practices this equality where he lives.

On this day four years ago, I pledged my every effort that the government of this State would serve the well-being of all—that we would work for new opportunity, for economic growth that would secure and enhance the well-being of all the people.

Thanks to the efforts of dedicated men and women, we have brought New York State to a new and historic threshold of opportunity.

Therefore we are not here merely to look pridefully on the past—but confidently toward the future.

For this inauguration—this beginning—should and must signify more than the start of a new term of office. It must mean the beginning of a new stage of growth and progress, shared by all the people of New York State.

Our efforts in the immediate years ahead will be directed especially to four areas:

1. Improvement and extension of the opportunities for higher education for all;

2. Expansion and up-dating of facilities for training to meet the challenges of automation and the opportunities of a revolution in technology;

3. All-out dedication to a further acceleration of sound economic growth and expansion of job opportunities which are basic to a fuller life for all the people;

4. Greater emphasis on improving the quality and quantity of research and development activities to assure the building of our future in the years ahead.

These steps are fundamental and interrelated factors that are necessary for the dynamic growth of our society. They are essential as well to the fulfillment of the people's aspirations for better housing, health, cultural and recreational opportunities—and, most importantly for true equality of opportunity for all.

And above all, I pledge that I will continue to strive for the best ways to preserve and strengthen our American system—the best means to insure an ever richer fulfillment of the American dream and the aspirations of Americans.

No individuals or groups should be neglected; all should be included, whatever their racial, religious or national origin, whether young or old, whether businessmen, or farmers, whether blue-collar workers, white-collar workers, or professional people.

Every American has not only the right—but the duty—to participate in shaping the destiny of our American society.

It is in dedication to the realization of these goals that I ask your continued assistance. With the guidance of Almighty God I swear to serve the people of the State of New York to the best of my ability.

Slave Labor Camps in Sovietized Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter Becher, a distinguished member of the Bavarian Legislature, has asked me to call to the attention of the people of the United States, a descriptive account of the slave labor camps in Sovietized East Germany.

The January 16, 1963, edition of the Bulletin, published under the auspices of the German Federal Government, reviews the brutalities and inhumanities inflicted upon the German people by the Soviet-Communist dominated Ulbricht regime in East Germany.

A condensation of this article follows:

SLAVE CAMPS IN SOVIETIZED GERMANY

Fifteen thousand political prisoners are held under most inhuman conditions in Soviet-Communist occupied Germany.

More than 2,000 political prisoners are held in the Bautzen slave labor camp. These prisoners are part of a planned Sovietized economic production system. It relies upon mass terrorism and a constant replenishment of slave labor to produce slave labor products at a cheap price to fulfill the regime's economic targets.

In the Brandenburg prison, there are 2,000 prisoners. More than 80 percent of them have been sentenced not for crimes but for political disobedience. The warden

of this prison is Major Ackermann. He is notorious for his criminal sadistic ill-treatment of prisoners. These prisoners are exploited to produce parts for the "people's tractor works."

More than 1,000 prisoners are confined in the Torgau prison; more than 2,000 in the Waldheim labor prison.

Thousands of East German citizens are imprisoned in Halle, Erfurt, Magdeburg, and Butzow-Dreibergen.

The womens' prison on Barnim Street in East Berlin contains thousands of women and children who are suspected of preparing to escape or have otherwise failed to wholly accept the Communist political dogma.

The children of political prisoners are taken from the parents and are often comingled with juvenile delinquents and submental children. The childrens' prisons are located in Kipsdorf, Hummelshain, Konigsstein and Wismar.

Many of the political prisoners are imprisoned without judicial hearings or court sentences. The Communist Party officials are authorized to send uncooperative citizens to slave labor camps for "labor training", without trial. Political penal labor camps are located at Rudersdorf, Rostock, Lubben I and Lubben II.

The common political infractions of these political prisoners are an expressed refusal to accept the Ulbricht Communist regime, or an expressed belief in the reunification of Germany.

Mass fear psychosis, combined with slave labor and the deprivation of freedom, in Soviet-Communist occupied Germany is still a stark sad reality.

The time has come for the United Nations to expose and focus world opinion on the barbaric treatment of political noncooperative citizens in Sovietized East Germany. Our U.S. representatives to the United Nations should take the initiative in compelling a full disclosure and exposure of the barbaric punishment inflicted upon innocent citizens, simply for their failure to fully cooperate politically with the Soviet puppet regime of Ulbricht.

The British Medical System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Callanan recently made a speech before the public health section of the Commonwealth Club of California.

Dr. Callanan is now a practicing surgeon in San Francisco. He is a graduate of the University College of Dublin and practiced 9 years under the British medical system, of which time he spent 7 years as a hospital surgeon.

Excerpts from his remarks as published by the Commonwealth Club of California appear as follows:

WHEN ENGLISHMAN REALLY SICK, HE SEEKS PRIVATE PRACTITIONER

"It is not true that 85 percent of British doctors and patients are satisfied with socialized medicine," Dr. John Callanan said addressing the club's public health section (Dr. Frank Stiles, chairman) on British socialized medicine. He continued:

"Bevin recognized that the economic strength of private medicine was based upon the right of the private physician to sell or pass on his practice to a successor. So, by striking out this right, he took away the independence of the medical profession.

"Bevin ignored the average practitioner, but set the older doctors up for life and promised younger doctors 1,000 pounds a year. With the backing of these two groups, Bevin split the medical profession to get what he wanted.

"The second thing he did was to make private doctors too much of an expense for most people to afford. Only 5 percent of the total population, at last reports, were employing their own doctors.

"However, today, when people in Britain feel they have something seriously wrong with them they usually get a private practitioner, or ask for a consultation.

"Medicine there is now conducted by a group which makes rules, from which there is no appeal—unless a patient wishes to go to the national director of medicine, or through the courts, a very expensive and time-consuming process. Even then, one doctor, to cite a famous instance, carried his case clear to the House of Lords and got the case reversed; but, despite this official decision, 18 months later the doctor had not been reinstated.

"Except as to insurance examinations, a doctor is not permitted to do more than one type of work. It is illegal to transfer from one of the three general types of medical practice to another—from hospital practice to general practice, for example.

"When a patient, who has not been treated by his own private practitioner while in the hospital, leaves the hospital and returns to the care of his own practitioner, necessary information on what has happened to the patient while in the hospital may not reach his personal doctor for weeks.

"The young doctor is faced by uncertainty as to what will happen to him at the end of each year's contract—until he has achieved a status, and thereby perhaps obtained a 2-, 3-, 4-, or even a 6-year contract.

"One result is that (as there are not now enough full-time consultants to handle the work) young doctors (and also doctors past middle age who have not obtained the economic status to which they are entitled) are used for advanced services, but only paid for less important work than that which they actually handle. There are several hundred doctors between 40 and 60 who are underpaid.

"There is today a high percentage of foreign medical students being trained in Britain and later given important hospital positions. In some British cities over half the doctors are from India, Pakistan, and Mediterranean countries. In this employment of foreign doctors, Western Germany has the same problem as England."

No Peace With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to see that the growing menace of Communist Cuba finally has penetrated the Washington Post's ivy towers. One of the most unyielding advocates of a soft international policy, the Post this morning ran as its lead editorial a realistic appraisal of the role the United States must assume in the Cuban situation. Since this newspaper often serves as advance man for administration action, this may be a welcome harbinger of a tougher U.S. approach to an increasingly tough and dangerous problem.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

NO PEACE WITH CUBA

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. That is the meaning of the events of the past week—whether they relate to disclosures of Cuba's role in training subversive forces in neighboring countries or to the movement of Soviet personnel from Cuban ports. No one will ever be sure how much subversion is going on and, in spite of the efficacy of aerial surveillance, no one can be certain how large are the remaining Soviet forces.

The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace. The threat to the security and peace will rise and fall as their own precautions are extended or contracted. There is every present indication that no country can afford to allow its guard to relax.

As long as Cuba remains a center from which Communist infiltration is carried on, it cannot expect the United States or any of its other neighbors to make any firm pledge against the invasion of Cuba. The day may arrive when these belligerent operations will reach a level of military significance to which there will be no appropriate response but military operations. To make sure that this pitch of activity is not achieved in total secrecy the scrutiny of operations on the island must be maintained at the highest level.

The Western Hemisphere must live in danger while this situation persists. The precautions necessary to contain this threat are so onerous, disagreeable, and unsettling that the United States will be under continuous pressure to take arms against this "sea of trouble" and end it. Were there any assurance that it could indeed be ended by extreme measures, it would be harder to resist such counsels. There is, however, no assurance that even this dangerous alternative would end the crisis. It might only start a greater crisis.

There is no easy escape from the Cuban nuisance. There is no present alternative to the maintenance of a high state of readiness for extreme action, a continuous scrutiny of Cuban measures for signs of increasing hostility, an unremitting readiness to defend any threatened country in the hemisphere. All that we can be sure of for the moment is that as long as this regime lasts, there can be no real peace.

Talk Doesn't Impress Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the niceties of diplomatic language, many Americans believe that our spokesmen should speak in unmistakable terms about our determination to resist Communist aggression and Communist inroads into the Western Hemisphere. In fact many of us believe that we are courting disaster when we do not make our will in these matters clearly and explicitly known. Many a tragedy has re-

sulted because an aggressor miscalculated the strength and determination of another country.

If we cannot give a forthright statement of our position, then we are inviting the Communists to nibble away at the free world, ending eventually in the disaster of total war or the disaster of total surrender. Plain speaking, in other words, is an important weapon in maintaining the peace.

In this connection the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star reflects the thinking of a great many Americans:

TALK DOESN'T IMPRESS REDS

One of the reasons Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev continues to be bombastic is that he finds more talk than action in American policy, and even the talk is often unconvincing.

His experience with the Cuba blockade crisis cannot have changed Khrushchev's belief very much. On the contrary it must have strengthened his estimate of American cold war determination. President Kennedy talked a good blockade. But the actual action turned out to be pretty mild.

The President talked tough demands. But he settled quite eagerly much less than demanded. What's more he accepted Moscow and Havana announcements and some staged evidence as adequate demonstration that the comprised demands had been met.

Now Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has made a declaration which is widely interpreted as a new warning to Khrushchev not to embark on any military combat adventures in Cuba, not even merely to help Fidel Castro put down an internal revolt. But on close examination McNamara's statement is more weak than strong.

What he said in answer to a question about help to quell a revolt, was this: "I think that this administration indicated before that we will not accept combat operations by Soviet military personnel in this hemisphere.

This statement really skirted the question rather than answering it directly and strongly. It would have been much more effective if the secretary had managed to overlook his feeling that the question was repetitious, and had made an unequivocal statement that any military action by the Soviets would be opposed with military force. At least there then would need be no doubt as to what was meant.

Khrushchev indulges in this sort of play with words, too. His recent speech which was interpreted as a bellicose promise to leap to the defense of Cuba with a nuclear assault against America did not really say that at all. He just promised to "come to the aid" of Cuba, without directly specifying the kind of aid. But he did it in such a way as to encourage a leap to the conclusion that he was talking about a nuclear world war.

Because of the very fact that Khrushchev uses this propaganda technique for his own purposes, it is important that the United States speak more directly and more exactly. It is most dangerous to leave Khrushchev room to assume that Washington officials are making the same kind of subtly hedged promises—leaving the same kind of room for backing away—as he does.

The reason for the striking initial success of the Cuba blockade was that a first it seemed to be a blunt and clear action which left no room for misunderstanding of American intent. The reason that initial success collapsed into a very dubious "victory" was that as the action progressed the clearness of intent soon gave way to the old wavering and cautions dickering.

America needs a clear and unequivocal stand, expressed in terms that cannot be misunderstood.

Davenporter's Voice Gives Pleasure to Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be amazed by the vitality and areas of interest of some of our senior citizens. To put these people on the shelf when they reach age 60 or 65 is to do them a disservice and to rob their communities of a manpower pool which is ready to tackle anything.

A case in point is Mrs. Agnes Delarue of Davenport, Iowa, who has served as my congressional committeewoman for Scott County, Iowa, since I have been in Congress. Mrs. Delarue will soon be 73. She is of the pioneer stock which first settled Scott County and I would say that next to her family and friends, the welfare and progress of this community with which her family has been associated for over a century are dearest to her heart.

She has given a lifetime of service to the Republican Party, working in those areas where there is not a great deal of glory, only hard work and dedication. They are the areas, however, where elections are won and lost—the precinct levels where voters must be kept informed about the issues and the candidates and motivated to get to the polls.

Besides keeping busy in party politics, Mrs. Delarue is continually finding other things to do so that she can help her fellowman and make his lot easier and more enjoyable. Her latest venture is to make tape recordings for the blind. The Davenport (Iowa) Times recently carried a news account of this activity. With the thought that it may inspire other senior citizens to remain active and use their God-given talents in rewarding tasks, I wish to bring this account to the attention of my colleagues and their constituents. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this story, "Davenporter's Voice Gives Pleasure to the Blind," appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DAVENPORT'S VOICE GIVES PLEASURE TO BLIND

(By Keith Prescott)

Small children who live in a world of darkness settle themselves close to the tape recorder at school at Vinton to hear a pleasant voice recite some of the stories dear to the very young.

The voice belongs to Mrs. Agnes C. Delarue of 1229 Scott Street, Davenport, who spends many hours a day in her home making tape recordings of books chosen for use of the blind by either the Vinton School or the Library of Congress.

This fascinating job of recording such favorite children's works as "Stories of Iowa for Boys and Girls," by Mahan & Gallagher is carried on by Mrs. Delarue and many other Iowans as a local project of the Temple Emanuel Sisterhood.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Mrs. Delarue, who is one of the city's most active Republican Party workers, was auditioned by the Sisterhood for the position which brings many hours of pleasure to the blind.

A recording of her voice was forwarded to the Library of Congress in Washington where officials appeared very pleased with the results.

A tape recorder was sent to Mrs. Delarue by the Iowa Commission for the Blind in Des Moines along with a supply of tape and three children's books to be used for her first assignment.

"THE POTOMAC"

The Library of Congress recently sent Mrs. Delarue "The Potomac," one of the Rivers of America series, for recording on tape for use of the blind in the national library.

Mrs. Delarue who has not yet started the task of recording the lengthy volume, believes the project may require at least four of the large 1,800-foot tapes she uses in her unusual work.

Said Mrs. Delarue of the nonpaying task she has undertaken for the benefit of the blind: "This gives me an opportunity to really demonstrate my love for children and for those who have to depend on a little help from others."

Mrs. Delarue, who is approaching her 73d birthday, has been a Republican precinct committeewoman for 41 years.

She also serves as congressional committeewoman for Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Davenport and assists the Congressman in interviewing candidates for the academies.

The School Prayer Decision: Where Is It Taking Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of March 3, 1963:

THE SCHOOL PRAYER DECISION: WHERE IS IT TAKING US?

(NOTE.—A discussion of the Supreme Court decision in the school prayer case last year and its implications on all traces of religion in public activities was contained in an address Thursday by Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard University Law School. He was delivering the William H. Leary lecture at the University of Utah Law School. From the speech the Star has extracted passages to show the heart of his argument.)

An institution charged with the role which the Supreme Court has successfully filled for so many years is entitled to our respect and understanding. If one criticizes the Court (as people have always done in the past, and should continue to do in the future), it should be essentially for the purpose of trying to contribute to that respect and to that understanding. The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay. Criticism of decisions of the Court or opinions of its members should be offered as an effort to repay that debt, and with the thought that conscientious criticism may be an aid to the Court in carrying out its difficult and essential task. It is in that spirit that my remarks are offered.

A TEXT CITED

A number of years ago I saw in the Saturday Review a little item which may serve as a text for my remarks.

It reads as follows: "In the land of Absolute, where everyone and everything is perfect, there is no light at night.

"The annals of the Absolutions record that they once discovered the electric light, but as is known, the perfect electric light burns in a perfect vacuum.

"Absolute is in the dark."

Absolutes are likely to be phantoms, eluding our grasp. Even if we think we have embraced them, they are likely to be misleading. If we start from absolute premises, we may find that we only oversimplify our problems and thus reach unsound results. It may well be that absolutes are the greatest hindrance to sound and useful thought—in law, as in other fields of human knowledge. I would like to suggest that the Supreme Court has, in recent years, been engaged in certain types of cases, in a species of absolutism in its reasoning, which is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light. It is, I think, a thoroughly unsatisfactory form of judging.

The most extreme form of the absolutist position has been taken by Mr. Justice Black, particularly in certain extrajudicial pronouncements. Thus, in his James Madison lecture at New York University, he said: "It is my belief that there are 'absolutes' in our Bill of Rights, and that they were put there on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be 'absolutes.' "

And he reiterated this, and extended it in a publicized interview in which he dealt specifically with the first amendment, which you will recall, reads in the following terms:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Justice Black lays great stress on the words "no law" in the opening phrase which says: "Congress shall make no law * * *." Just to make it clear that he would not be misunderstood, he went on to say that laws about libel and slander are invalid. And he added: "I have an idea there are some absolutes. I do not think I am far in that respect from the Holy Scriptures."

THE NEW YORK CASE

Within the last year, a case came before the Supreme Court which directly involved the interpretation and application of the first amendment. This was the New York school prayer case. Its name is *Engel* v. *Vitale*. It involved a prayer formulated by the State board of regents in New York, and recommended by them for use in the schools of that State. The prayer, in its entirety, was as follows:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The Court, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Black, held that the reciting of this prayer in the public schools of New York violated the Constitution. It was, the Court held, an "establishment of religion," forbidden by the first amendment. Five of his colleagues joined with him. Mr. Justice Stewart dissented. Justice Douglas wrote a concurring opinion which, though differing some in his reasoning, showed the absolutist approach. He recounted all the ways in which governmental bodies now finance some activity with a religious element or overtone: "Chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services"; "compulsory chapel at the service academies, and religious services * * * in Federal hospitals and prisons"; "religions proclamations" by the President; "'In God We Trust'" on our money; "Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia"; and many other things, including exemption from "the Federal income tax" and "postal privileges" for "religious organizations." All of this is bad, according to Justice Douglas. After recognizing that "Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with" such things, he said, summarily, and absolutely: "Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." It's as simple as that. They are all bad. And perhaps they are if the absolutist approach to such matters can be accepted as sound. These are the lengths to which absolutism takes us.

LOOK AT THE WORDING

But is it all as clear as this? Do words convey such positive and overpowering meaning? Is there no room whatever for thought or consideration? Perhaps it would be worth while just to look carefully at the words of the first amendment, in all its majesty. I will not yield to any Justice of the Supreme Court in my respect for those words, or, in my conception of their importance not merely in our history but in their present function and worth in helping us to preserve a free Nation. But what do they say? "Congress shall make no law. . . ."

Congress had made no law in the Engel case; no law of Congress was in any way involved.

What is it that Congress can make no law about? It is "an establishment of religion." What does that term mean? That takes some construing, too. Certainly there was much history behind the phrase. Not only did England (and Scotland) have an established church, but there were established churches in a number of the States at the time the first amendment was adopted. And they were something very different from a regents' recommended prayer. It takes a measure of construction to bring this prayer within the no-establishment clause. "No law" may well mean no law.

But "establishment of religion" might mean establishment of religion; and those who wrote the "establishment of religion" clause might be rather perplexed by the use which has been made of it in 1962. "No law" means no law. It is as simple as that—that is, if one ignores the other words which are involved in the task, such as "Congress," "establishment of religion," "the free exercise thereof," and "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." I do not say that these are meaningless words. I do suggest they are words which require construction, which are by no means absolute in form or content, and that to ignore them under the guise of the absolutist approach is to fail to recognize and perform the most significant and fundamental part of the task of judging.

UNFORTUNATE MOVE

Let me now turn to another aspect of the matter. I think it was unfortunate that the question involved in the Engel case was ever thought of as a matter for judicial decision, that it was unfortunate that the Court decided the case, one way or the other, and that this unhappy situation resulted solely from the absolutist position which the Court has taken.

What do I mean by this? I have in mind at least two separate lines of thought. One is the fact that we have a tradition, a spiritual and cultural tradition, of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution itself, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect. The other is that there are some matters which are essentially local in nature, important matters, but nonetheless matters to be worked out by the people themselves in their own communities, when no basic rights of others are impaired.

First, as to the long tradition. Is it not clear as a matter of historical fact that this was a Christian nation? Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchison, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian nation, having developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought. Nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion.

PROVISIONS OF SWEEP

It is perfectly true that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These are great provisions, of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: Chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces, chapels in prisons, "In God We Trust" on our money, to mention only a few. Must all of these things be rigorously extirpated in order to satisfy a constitutional absolutism?

Does our deep-seated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the Founders that it would. It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history. I do not believe that the contentions now made would occur to any man who could free himself from an absolute approach to the problem.

MATTERS FOR COMMUNITIES

Now let me turn to the other point—that there are some matters which should be settled on the local level, in each community, and should not become great Supreme Court cases. The prayer involved in the Engel case was not compulsory. As the Supreme Court itself recited, no pupil was compelled "to join in the prayer over his or his parents' objection." This, to me, is crucial. If any student was compelled to join against his conviction, this would present a serious and justiciable question, akin to that presented in the flag salute case. The Supreme Court did not give sufficient weight to this fact, in my opinion, and relied heavily on such things as the history of the Book of Common Prayer, which, under various acts of Parliament, was compulsory on all.

COMMUNITY DETERMINATION

Where there is no compulsion, what happens if these matters are left to the determination of each community? In New York, this determination was made by the elected authorities of the school district. It was, indeed, a fact that a large number of the school districts in New York did not adopt the so-called regents' prayer. Where such a decision was reached, there can surely be no constitutional objection on the ground that it was a decision locally arrived at, or that it amounts to an establishment of "no religion." But, suppose that in a particular school district, as in New Hyde Park, it was determined that the prayer should be used as a part of the opening exercises of the school day. Remember that it is not compulsory. No pupil is compelled to participate. Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? This would suggest that no school can have a pledge of allegiance to the flag if any student does not wish to join.

This is a country of religious toleration. That is a great consequence of our history embodied in the first amendment. But does religious toleration mean religious sterility? I wonder why it should be thought that it does. This is a Christian country, in origin, history, tradition and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics, I think it can be said, that it developed its notion of

toleration. No one in this country can be required to have any particular form of religious belief, and no one can suffer legal discrimination because he has or does not have any particular religious belief. But does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition? The Moslem who comes here may worship as he pleases, and may hold public office without discrimination. That is as it should be. But why should it follow that he can require others to give up their Christian tradition merely because he is a tolerated and welcomed member of the community?

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Though we have a considerable common cultural heritage, there have always been minority groups in our country. This, I am sure, has been healthy and educational for all concerned. We have surely gained from having a less homogeneous population. Of course, the rights of all, especially those of minorities, must be protected and preserved. But does that require that the majority, where there is such a majority, must give up its cultural heritage and tradition? Why?

Let us consider the Jewish child, or the Catholic child, or the nonbeliever, or the Congregationalist, or the Quaker. He, either alone, or with a few or many others of his views, attends a public school, whose school district, by local action, has prescribed the regents' prayer. When the prayer is recited, if this child or his parents feel that he cannot participate, he may stand or sit, in respectful attention, while the other children take part in the ceremony. Or he may leave the room. It is said that this is bad, because it sets him apart from other children. It is even said that there is an element of compulsion in this—what the Supreme Court has called an "indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform."

But is this the way it should be looked at? The child of a nonconforming or a minority group is, to be sure, different in his beliefs. That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable, and educational, for him to learn and observe this, in the atmosphere of the school—not so much that he is different, as that other children are different from him? And is it not desirable that, at the same time, he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted? No compulsion is put upon him. He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and to respect what they feel is significant to them.

SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE

Is this not a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the majority group? They experience the values of their own culture; but they also see that there are others who do not accept those values, and that they are wholly tolerated in their nonacceptance. Learning tolerance for other persons, no matter how different, and respect for their beliefs, may be an important part of American education, and wholly consistent with the first amendment. No one would think otherwise were it not for parents who take an absolutist approach to the problem, perhaps encouraged by the absolutist expressions of justices of the Supreme Court, on and off the bench.

It is appropriate here to say something about the problems of the Sunday law cases. Because of the absolutist approach, these cases were very hard for the court, when I think they should have been quite easy—as is evidenced, I believe, by the fact that no such question was ever raised for a hundred and fifty years after the adoption of the first amendment. It is true that many of the State statutes were a hodgepodge, full of inconsistencies and contradictions. But it is perfectly plain that the observance of Sunday has religious roots and origins. This is equally plain as to the observance of Christmas and Thanksgiving. Is that bad? Are these things not all part of our history, our culture, our heritage, our tradition? Must we give them all up because of a newly found absolutist approach to a problem which cannot possibly be resolved wisely in absolutist terms?

THE DAY OF REST

A day of rest is very deeply seated in all societies. Generally, as in our culture, it has an origin which is at least partially religious. But it has a wider basis than that. And it is a thing, good in itself, which loses much of its good unless it is observed by all on the same basis. If a majority of the people want to observe Sunday as a day on which ordinary work is not performed, even though there may be some religious motivation in picking that day, I find it hard to see that there is anything wrong or oppressive in making that law applicable to all members of the community—as long as the persons who do not care to observe Sunday themselves are not compelled to do anything.

Cannot much the same thing be said for Thanksgiving and Christmas, and Christmas carols in the school, and simple, thoughtfully chosen Bible readings, and Christmas decorations in public places, and all the many other things which are a happy part of the culture and tradition of a large portion of our society?

TOLERATION BY MINORITIES

In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities, who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant, too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves, and nothing is done which they cannot wait out, or pass respectfully by, without their our personal participation, if they do not want to give it? Is it not a travesty that we have brought ourselves, through an essentially thought-denying absolutist approach, to the point where such things as chaplains in our prisons, or chapels in our military academies, can be seriously and solemnly raised as threats to the religious freedom which is guaranteed by the first amendment—as made applicable to the States, in very general terms, by the fourteenth amendment? In saying this, I am fully mindful of the rights of those who have or profess no religion, and who are surely entitled to the same respect as anyone else—and should themselves give the same respectful regard to the rights of other citizens, accepting reasonable arrangements made in this area by the majority, with no compulsion on them to participate.

Bulgarian Liberation Day, March 3, 1878

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarians were masters of a mighty kingdom in the Balkans during the late Middle Ages, and formed a formidable force which was a decisive factor in that region's affairs. But early in the 15th century their kingdom was overrun by the Ottoman Turks and they lost their independence. Thenceforth for some 400 years these sturdy and rugged people lived under Ottoman sultans without losing sight of their objective and without relinquishing their right to freedom and national independence. In 1878 they at last attained their goal at the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. The peace treaty signed on March 3 of 1878 guaranteed Bulgaria's independence.

That historic event of 85 years ago became a national holiday for the Bulgarian people, ushering in a new era in their modern history. Since then, however, their history has been compounded of happiness with misfortune, joy with tragedy. They were dragged into the First World War and fought on the side of the defeated powers. If in this they were unfortunate, they were even less fortunate in the last war. Much against their wishes, they were drawn into that war and again they fought on the side of the losers. In the end they were saddled with a Communist government and placed behind the Iron Curtain.

Today they are separated and sealed off from the free world. For all practical purposes Bulgaria is part of the Soviet Union and its people are pawns in the hands of their Bolshevik bosses. For almost two decades these proud and gallant fighters of southeastern Europe have been suffering under the unrelenting yoke of Communist tyranny. But these brave fighters for freedom have not forgotten the momentous event of 85 years ago, their liberation day. Though they are not free to celebrate it in their homeland, here we observe it, and I gladly join my friends among the Bulgarian-Americans on this 85th anniversary of that historic event, Bulgarian Liberation Day.

Plumbicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which was published recently in the Box Elder News-Journal of Brigham City, Utah. This editorial, while written in a humorous vein, contains a lot of good commonsense. The editorial follows:

PREPARE NOW

Now that the medicare program is well on its way to enactment, we should start considering the plumbicare proposal. What is plumbicare, you ask?

Plumbicare is a plan by which we can save, through social security, for our old-age plumbing bills. It is a known fact that people over 65 have more plumbing trouble than do younger people.

Under the plumbicare plan, all of the plumbing bills of those over 65 would be paid. The whole thing would be financed by social security. We all know that many

senior citizens are poverty-stricken, and we would not want them to be faced by staggering plumbing bills in their twilight years.

If we can unite our brethren in Washington and force passage of plumbicare, the way will be clear for electricare, autocare, teeveecare, and then the ultimate goal of our welfare state, embalmicare.

Space and the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Kansas City Star an editorial headed "Space Must Fight for Budget Dollars," which we thought was good enough to share with other Members of Congress and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After a week of posture hearings by the House Space Committee, listening to the heads of NASA, it is apparent that the opening sentence of the editorial below is quite correct. Space will be in for some careful scrutiny before the present authorization hearings are completed. Let us hope the Members will not be against the program simply because they have no constituents on the moon. They should remember all space dollars are spent right here on earth in our own United States.

We like the comment of the editorial which refers to the space program as a national objective and that retreat from this objective would be risky. Our space program is now moving along with considerable momentum. We should not lose the impetus that we have already gained. To our way of thinking, it is of the greatest importance that someone having an American name should be the first man on the moon, rather than someone with a Russian name for all subsequent history to contemplate. Every school child knows about Columbus and his accomplishment. Let us make sure that some American name like Glenn or Carpenter or Cooper will be honored and remembered throughout all history as the man to be first on the moon.

As the Administrator of NASA recently said:

Our space program is not out of control. It has a brake as well as a throttle.

A careful study of the administration budget for space will be made by the committee and there may be some reductions but as the following editorial so well points out, the space appropriation should not become the scapegoat of the budget:

SPACE MUST FIGHT FOR BUDGET DOLLARS

The fiscal honeymoon is over for the space agency.

The hard fact was apparent when the House Committee on Science and Astronautics opened its budget hearings this week. Space no longer occupies the position of the sacred cow that it once held when Congress was discussing money. Indeed, you can almost foresee its development into a scientific equivalent of the foreign aid program. Lawmakers who once argued, "I have no constituents in Pakistan," may be tempted to reason that they also have no constituents on the moon.

It is a false line of reasoning. But obviously, Congress is under a great deal of pressure from the people back home to cut the President's proposed budget. It will seek the targets that are as remote as possible from local interests. Foreign aid is one of them. Space may join it.

For the next fiscal year, the agency seeks $5.7 billion, a sizable increase over the $3.6 billion to be spent this year. The large share goes to the lunar landing program. Actually, the space budget for other research projects was trimmed in the budget review process before the final document went to Capitol Hill. It remains for Congress to determine whether it can be trimmed farther.

Clearly, the Nation is committed to the proposition of placing a man on the moon in this decade. It is a national objective, and retreat from it would be risky. Yet the problems of the budget are great, too. Each project must be weighed carefully against the advantage to the United States.

We regard a sound and ambitious space program as essential, but the realistic attitude toward dollars for satellites is, we believe, healthy. It would be something else if the space appropriation becomes the new scapegoat of the budget.

Arizona House Memorial 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Arizona House of Representatives calling for immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust":

HOUSE MEMORIAL 1

(A memorial urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust")

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Whereas Public Law 140, enacted by the 84th Congress, and approved by the President of the United States on July 11, 1955, provided that all U.S. currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; the intent of the U.S. Congress is clear and this law is hereby quoted below:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription 'In God We Trust,' and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

"Approved July 11, 1955"; and

Whereas 8 years have elapsed since the enactment of this law by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas as recently as the fiscal year 1962, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing delivered 193,960,000 silver certificates, series 1935 G, without the inscription; and

Whereas it appears that the use of currency without the inscription, "In God We Trust," gives aid and comfort to those nations which pursue the atheistic Communist ideology:

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays, that the Congress of the United States authorize the appropriate officials and agencies of the Federal Government to order the cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust."

Adopted by the house on February 8, 1963.

Approved by the Governor, February 8, 1963.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 8, 1963.

The Path to West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 1963 issue of Army Information Digest contains an interesting article by Maj. Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, entitled "Should I Compete for a West Point Nomination?" I call this article to the attention of this body and ask that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, as I feel that it contains much useful information for those of us who are assigned the important responsibility of making appointments to the service academies.

I might point out, Mr. President, that we in South Carolina are very proud that General Westmoreland is a native of our State and an outstanding product of the U.S. Military Academy. He has a distinguished record of military service in time of war and peace, and I predict that as a result of this service and the outstanding record that he is making as Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy that he will one day serve as Army Chief of Staff. General Westmoreland makes reference in this article to two cadets who served as first captains of the cadet corps in the classes of 1961 and 1962. I am pleased to point out that General Westmoreland himself served in this capacity with honor and distinction while he was a cadet at the Academy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD I COMPETE FOR A WEST POINT NOMINATION?

(By Gen. W. C. Westmoreland)

The interested young soldier must answer for himself. If he is interested in becoming a professional officer of the Regular Army through the challenge and opportunity offered by West Point, he will want to consider competing for nomination.

The Academy is not an end in itself—it is a means toward a career in the profession of arms. As stated in Army regulations, its purpose is "to instruct and train the Corps of Cadets so that each graduate will have those qualities and attributes essential for progressive and continued development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Regular Army."

From its beginning in 1802, the Military Academy has produced men ready and able to serve their country and protect the Nation's security. The motto of the Academy—duty, honor, country—has been, and will continue to be, a soldierly creed for the American man-at-arms.

West Point offers a tough, fully-accredited 4-year course of instruction leading to a bachelor of science degree and a regular commission as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army. Because of its high academic standards and exacting physical education programs, West Point is selective in its admissions process.

Although there is no exact way of measuring a young man's potential as a cadet, experience indicates that cadets who are the most successful have certain qualities: scholarship—a high academic standing in high school and excellent scores on standardized tests of scholastic aptitude and achievement; good moral character; physical fitness; motivation for a military career, and leadership potential, as measured by past activities and present ability to get along with his associates.

The backgrounds of the 807 cadets who entered the U.S. Military Academy in July 1962 are illustrative:

	Number	Percent
Valedictorian or salutatorian	87	10.8
President of student body or senior class	116	14.5
Editor of school publication	87	10.8
Athletic team captain	232	28.9
All-State or all-conference athletic award winner	170	21.2
Debate team member	124	15.5
Boys' State delegate	161	20.1
Club president	299	37.3
Eagle Scout	101	12.6
Semester or more of college prior to entering USMA	238	29.7

Such outstanding young men are sought by all educational institutions as well as by business and industry. It is in the national interest that the Military Academy continue to get its share of these exceptional young men and provide to them the rare opportunity offered by its comprehensive program emphasizing overall excellence.

Experience shows that the enlisted ranks of the U.S. Army and other Armed Services are good sources for this kind of man. The outstanding records of Gen. Paul D. Harkins, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, and Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin are evidence of this. All entered West Point from the enlisted ranks.

Among recent graduates who entered West Point on a Regular Army (competitive) appointment was Harold M. Hannon, Jr., cadet first captain and brigade commander in the class of 1961. In the class of '62, the Cadet First Captain and Brigade Commander, James R. Ellis, had 1½ years of enlisted service before entering the Military Academy. Both Hannon and Ellis attended the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School before entering West Point.

The pace of instruction at West Point is rapid and courses are rigorous. About 30 of every 100 entering cadets leave before graduation. Approximately 15 percent of these losses are due to academic failure; the remainder leave through resignation, dismissal or for other reasons.

In the accomplishment of its mission, the Military Academy concentrates on the mental, moral, physical, and military development of the individual cadet.

The academic program offers a balanced education in arts and sciences, based on an undergraduate curiculum weighted approximately 60 percent in the mathematics-science-engineering field and 40 percent in the social sciences-humanities area.

The honor code at West Point, one of the most cherished possessions of the Corps of Cadets, is implemented by the cadets and serves as the keystone in developing integrity and a sense of honor.

The Academy's physical education program is designed to develop strong, agile soldiers who can cope with the rigors of an active career. It includes a strenuous well-rounded course in body building and competitive sports. Group, team, and individual sports such as gymnastics, boxing, wrestling, swimming, soccer, football, track, basketball, and lacrosse are part of the program. Tennis, golf, squash, and handball are taught in order that the cadet can continue in sports throughout an active career as an officer.

The military training received at West Point provides the cadet with a solid professional foundation on which he can build a technical proficiency at postgraduate civilian and service schools. Discipline is a marked part of cadet life. The Academy, however, is more interested in the development of self-discipline than in mass discipline.

The young man who asks the question, "Should I compete for a West Point nomination?" will find a number of reasons for seeking admission to West Point in order to follow a military career. He will—

Receive a broad and outstanding education;

Establish and continue associations with men of high principle, men dedicated to the ideals for which this Nation stands;

Serve his country and play a role in its history;

Receive the satisfaction of being entrusted with ever-increasing responsibilities in an honorable and respected profession at a relatively youthful age;

Be given the opportunity for advanced study. Some 60 percent or more of graduates will continue their studies toward a master's or doctor's degree in some 30 major fields of study at leading universities.

Travel as a representative of his country and observe at first hand the problems, cultures, and peoples throughout the world.

The man who asks the question will find the answer within himself. If he has the interest and personal desire to compete—to be challenged—he should seek candidacy.

Detailed information concerning application procedures for military personnel seeking nomination to the U.S. Military Academy are contained in AR 350-55, with changes. Additionally, West Point encourages anyone interested to write directly for informational materials to Admissions Division, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

West Point seeks young men from the Regular and Reserve ranks who are ready, willing, and able to respond to the challenge it offers to build fitness for leadership—fitness, in all areas of human development, to lead the American soldier. The young man who seeks admission to the Military Academy should be aware of the opportunity and the challenge of the West Point program. He should anticipate the demands and satisfactions of an Army career.

Congress Has Been Maligned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Arthur Maass, professor of government at Harvard University, appeared in the Washington Post of March 3.

The subject of reforming the Congress is certainly not new. It started in the presidency of George Washington, and will continue, we hope, long after we have passed from this scene.

Mr. Maass brings out a very interesting point when he states:

Most of Congress' present rules were adopted in this century, and a great many reforms have been made since World War II.

This is indeed very recent, as history is reckoned.

Mr. Maass gives us facts and while he does defend the Congress, he does not think that it is any more perfect than any other human institution, and I am sure he believes it is still subject to reform and perfecting.

What we should strive for more and more is a Congress that will legislate and an executive branch that will execute the legislation. We do not have this today.

The article follows:

A DEBATE ON LEGISLATIVE REFORM—CONGRESS HAS BEEN MALIGNED

(By Arthur Maass)

(NOTE.—Professor of government at Harvard University, Maass has worked for the National Resources Planning Board and the Budget Bureau, has been a consultant to the Secretary of Interior and TVA and was a member of President Kennedy's academic brain trust before the 1960 campaign.)

"When the 88th Congress assembles in January, it should turn first to self-reform, to revising its rules for conducting the Nation's legislative business." Newspaper readers have been told this repeatedly since the 87th Congress adjourned last October. We could assume, then, that the need for legislative reform is well understood.

To the contrary, this need, though widely believed, is poorly sensed because so much exaggeration and misinformation about Congress passes for intelligence. Two examples will illustrate this view.

First, Congress is held responsible for all the ills of the legislative process. Yet Congress is only one participant in a process usually initiated by the Executive. It is the President who sets the agenda for action by the legislature.

Often when Congress is criticized for concerning itself with picayune details, it is these very details that have been served up by the Executive. Even the pork barrel, which many consider a prototype of misspent congressional energies, if not misconduct, originates in the Executive, for Congress seldom authorizes projects that have not been recommended by the President.

Now, one might argue that the Executive provides the pieces of pork for the barrel because Congress wants it that way. But the initiative in the legislative process is the

President's, and if he preferred some form of general legislation in the resources field to the authorization of individual projects, he could propose it. Yet since World War II no such initiative has been taken, with the possible exception of President Truman's proposals for Columbia and Missouri Valley authorities.

A second misconception is that Congress has doggedly resisted change. (The Washington Post speaks of "the antiquated, medieval-minded procedures" of the House.) Perhaps all Government institutions resist change, but the organizations and procedures of the Legislature have been no more resistant than those of the bureaucracy or of the courts.

Most of Congress' present rules were adopted in this century, and a great many reforms have been made since World War II. The committee structure of both the House and the Senate have been reorganized completely; professional staffs have been provided for all committees; the House tried and then rejected a new procedure, the 21st day rule, to bypass its Rules Committee.

Moreover, Congress has refined and used extensively a new technique, the legislative veto, to check on how the executive uses its discretionary power. With this technique available, it has granted the executive greater discretion than it would have otherwise.

Also, Congress tried, and when it was found defective discarded, a new procedure for handling money matters: the single appropriations bill. The Senate Democrats have modified the seniority rule, providing that freshman Senators may sit on one committee of their choice. By shortening the terms of authorizations and through investigations, the legislative committees have taken an active role in overseeing the conduct of Government programs.

As a result, they have given a different, often more sympathetic, review of executive programs than have the appropriations committees and have staged public debates on important issues previously not aired adequately, as in the annual authorization bills for missiles, aircraft, and ships.

Finally, Congress has legislated in three areas requiring the organization of new committees. In two of these atomic energy and General Economic Affairs, Congress has experimented with joint House-Senate committees.

The period since World War II has been exciting for observers of Congress just because the rate of innovation has been so high. Lest anyone doubts the Legislature's interest in, or capacity for, change, read the debates on the annual foreign aid authorization bills. In 1961, for example, Congress argued over annual versus long-term authorizations, annual versus long-term appropriations, the legislative veto, use of the concurrent resolution to terminate programs, methods of reporting to Congress, auditing and inspecting and the meaning of all of these for organization and procedure of both Houses of Congress.

Why do so many misconceptions about our Legislature persist? Why does Congress have a worse reputation than it deserves?

First, Congress, unlike the executive, operates in a goldfish bowl. Almost every step of the congressional decision process is open to public scrutiny, whereas quite often only the final and polished step of the Executive decision process is known. If a Member of Congress asks a stupid question or proposes an offbeat solution in a public hearing, this is reported and reflects on him, on his committee, and on Congress.

Who knows how many stupid questions and offbeat solutions are proposed in meetings of the National Security Council and in the proceedings by which most Executive decisions are reached? A misguided amendment to a bill is adopted in a subcommittee, and full publicity is given to this action, as it should be; yet the chances are good that the amendment will be dropped in the full committee, or on the floor, or in the other House and the conference. An equally misguided proposal made in the early stages of the Executive decision process and later dropped is seldom known and reported.

Where, as in Congress, all steps in the decision process are reported, there is a heavy obligation on the reporters to construct the whole from its parts. But this is not easy, and in my opinion few reporters of national politics have shown that they have the necessary interest and skill to do so.

The daily reports of the 87th Congress made it appear to many as a catastrophe. Yet with a hindsight view of its accomplishments, we can judge it a smashing success. In the area of foreign and security affairs, Congress approved the defense buildup, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, the Alliance for Progress, an expansion of the food-for-peace program and the important Trade Act.

In the domestic area it passed, among others, the most comprehensive housing program in our history; the area redevelopment, manpower retraining, and emergency public works programs; an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25; expansion of the social security system, including lowering the male retirement age to 62; complete revision of the public assistance programs; an increase in postal rates; revision of civil service and other Federal salary systems, which some consider the most significant legislation in this area in more than a quarter century; new tax incentives for capital investments; drug controls; authorization of the communications satellite program; three seashore parks, and repeal of the disclaimer affadavit in the Federal scholarship and loan programs.

I do not ignore Congress' failure to act on education, medical care for the aged, a Department of Urban Affairs, certain tax reforms, and the wilderness bill. But much more of Congress' unpopular image stems from temporary crises in the legislative histories of the bills finally passed in good form.

A second and related reason for misconceptions and excessive criticism of the Legislature is simply that, compared with the executive, Congress has a bad press. In large part this is due to its open operations and to its pluralistic organization. No one would expect Congress to be able to match the President's centralized and powerful press mechanism; at the same time, Congress as a whole suffers from not having one.

Congress suffers also from what appears to be a double standard for reporting the conduct of public servants. If an Assistant Secretary of State attends the Folies Bergére while participating in a Paris international conference, this is not likely to be reported. If it is, it will be with understanding.

If a Member of Congress sees the same girlie show while on official committee business in Paris, this will be reported, and in a muckracking style.

Finally, basic principles of our national system of Government are poorly taught and poorly understood, and this is the fault of American political scientists among others. We all learned in ninth-grade civics that all legislative powers are vested in Congress, and all executive and administrative powers in the President and departments, and that these assignments of power may be modified somewhat by what we called checks and balances.

And in the introductory college course in public administration we learned as a first rule that Congress should not interfere with the administrative processes of Government.

Yet these principles, however qualified, are not the basic precepts of our National Government, and the resultant misunderstanding generally reflects unfavorably on Congress. In fact, the dominant influence in the legislative process is not normally Congress but the President; this is not because the President has a veto power, but because he may assume, with some few exceptions, the initiative in the legislative process.

For this reason the President should be given considerable credit for legislative successes and indeed he is. He should also be given credit for many, if not most, of the so-called failings. But here we are inconsistent and more likely to lay the full blame on the legislature. Also we are inclined to condemn Congress and congressional committees for sticking their fingers into the administrative process.

Yet one of the most important tasks for an elected legislature is to oversee the administrative process. We have never been willing to rely solely on the elected Chief Executive, the courts, or professional standards of the Civil Service to hold the bureaucracy accountable. Just as the President participates in the legislative process of our Government, so Congress plays a legitimate and important role in the administrative process.

Congress, then, is often badly misjudged. However, this does not mean that there is no need for reform. Congress, for example, has been overexuberant in using its new device the legislative veto, for granting broad discretion to the Executive and retaining control over its application in specific cases.

The veto needs to be brought under control by intelligent analysis that leads to the setting of criteria for its proper use. For instance, authority to use the veto probably should not rest with a congressional committee, as happened when a House committee blocked the Defense Department's attempt to close the 18th century ropewalk at the Boston Navy Yard.

Instead, the veto should be exercised by one or both Houses of Congress. But the analysis needed to make distinctions of this type obviously cannot start from erroneous views about Congress.

In Delaware; 103 Local PTA Groups and 38,000 Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, February marked the 17th annual Founders Day of the Delaware Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mrs. William J. Alsentzer has been president of the Delaware Congress of Parents and Teachers for a number of years and has contributed much to its present influence.

I include here as part of my remarks an article by Dorothea T. Apgar from the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal of February 28, 1963:

PTA EXECUTIVE SECRETARY URGES GREATER PARTICIPATION

(By Dorothea T. Apgar)

Mrs. William J. Alsentzer is marking her eighth anniversary with the Delaware Congress of Parents and Teachers.

This month also marks the 17th annual Founders Day of the Delaware, congress which is being celebrated today in Dover.

In February 1954, Mrs. Alsentzer created the post of executive secretary for the Delaware PTA, and she has remained in that position ever since. It came about through a suggestion of James Snowden, who was then president of the State PTA.

A good friend of the Alsentzers, he told them that the organization needed someone to take charge, and remarked that Vivian Alsentzer would be great in the job.

Although she took the job as a fill-in, she became so wrapped up in the work she has just kept on with it. The Alsentzers have turned over the use of the basement to the Delaware PTA as an office, and they have donated both space and equipment as their special contribution to the PTA.

The Delaware Congress is fortunate in having many active male members, and it is one of the few State PTA organizations to be headed by a man. Mrs. Alsentzer laughs about the sensation she made at the national convention in Chicago some years ago with nine male delegates.

C. Edmund Maag is current president.

Vivian Alsentzer has been a dedicated PTA member since 1947. She joined the local organization even before her oldest child was ready for school. This is a procedure she suggests for all parents whose children will be entering public school.

A small pretty woman with brown eyes and a chic hairdo, Mrs. Alsentzer talks with obvious zest about the PTA. She says that many people do not realize the scope of the organization, which is involved indirectly with the welfare of the whole State through its concern for the children.

This is the sole business of the PTA, and its most important objective is the education of young people, she points out. Unfortunately, apathy toward the PTA is its biggest problem. Too many people step aside to let someone else do the work.

Every parent should have a thinking concern for Delaware schools, she says. She believes strongly that the logical place for this concern is the parent-teacher-organization.

There are 103 local PTA groups in Delaware, and about 38,000 members. Needless to say, Mrs. Alsentzer has a full time job on her hands. She also works with the Extension Division of the University of Delaware in conjunction with PTA-oriented interests, and sometimes she previews education films for use at meetings.

Right now she is deep in details for the forthcoming State convention which will be held April 5 and 6 at John Dickinson High School. Such subjects as curriculum in the schools, problems of children and youth, guidance programs and relationship of the local PTA to the local school board will be discussed.

The State PTA sometimes makes recommendations to the State school board after studying the values of a proposal or suggestion. Guards at crossings and extra fire escapes are just two aids to school children which have resulted from PTA study and recommendations.

When something concerning school children is brought to the attention of the PTA by a questioning parent, a committee is forming to evaluate the conditions from all sides. After due consideration the PTA will make a statement or recommendation either pro or con, or perhaps suggest certain changes.

Mrs. Alsentzer's interest in the PTA led her to related service in other organizations. She served on the advisory committee of the Youth Services Commission and has been on the board of the YMCA. She has also served on the YW education committee.

The whole family is active in the YW-YMCA. Daughter Shelly and younger son Jerry (both students at John Dickinson) have been day camp counselor as the YMCA summer camp, and they take part in after school activities at the Y during the winter.

The older Alsentzer son is Bill Jr., a junior at Duke University, where he was a National Merit Scholarship winner. Mr. Alsentzer, who is with Atlas Chemical Co., has just completed 7 years on the Henry C. Conrad School Board. The Alsentzers area closely knit family, with home and school taking priority in interests.

Vivian Alsentzer says that young mothers should keep themselves informed about their community, and should arrange their time so they can give some sort of service. In this way they will have an interest to turn to as their children grow older.

"You must grow with your children," she says. Parents can't advise their children if they are not themselves informed, she points out. A firm believer in community service, she says that mothers owe it to themselves to become involved in some form of commitment. It should however, be an interest that supplements family life. The PTA is ideal in this respect, she suggests.

Active Vivian Alsentzer went to Beacom Business College and was secretary to the general manager of the Darco Corp. before her marriage. She also worked in the office of John G. Leach, vice president of Beacom. She had a good example of keeping active from her mother, Mrs. Harold Guy, who recently retired as manager of the Culver Flower Shop in the Hotel Du Pont.

The areas covered by the PTA are so broad that there is an interest for everyone, Mrs. Alsentzer says. Panel discussions, small committee groups and the opportunity to work with parents in other walks of life provide a demonstration of democracy at work, she adds.

Report of Platform and Principles of the California Republican State Central Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the platform and principles of the California Republican State Central Committee as prepared under the able direction of Houston I. Flournoy, a Negro member of the California Assembly from the 49th district. It should be noted that Mr. Flournoy is one of the most respected legislators in our State and is a well informed and active member of the constitutional amendments, education, municipal and county government, social welfare, and water committees of the California State Legislature. His ability and dedication as a legislator is commanding increased attention among all Californians.

The platform follows:

REPORT OF PLATFORM AND PRINCIPLES COMMITTEE

HUGH I. FLOURNOY,
Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your committee on platform and principles reports the following statement of basic republicanism unanimously adopted by the members of the committee:

In these times of moral and political crisis, it is our responsibility to reaffirm certain eternal truths. As Republicans, we believe in the basic following principles:

(1) God is the source of the rights and freedoms of the individual, and the primary responsibility of government is to protect and preserve these rights and freedoms.

(2) Faith in the individual is the true foundation of our national strength, and the proper function of government is to do for the people only those things that have to be done but cannot be done by the individuals for themselves.

(3) Freedom is not divisible, political freedom being dependent on economic freedom as the basis for individual choice and incentive in our economic system, the greatest and most productive the world has ever known.

(4) Complete centralizing of power destroys liberty and encourages tyranny, but disperaion and decentralization of governmental power insure the freedom of each individual citizen.

(5) Prudent and responsible governmental fiscal policy and practice are essential to the economic and political well-being of the Nation, State, and individual.

(6) All men are possessed of equal human dignity and are entitled to equality under the law, with equality of both opportunity and responsibility.

(7) The threat of the evil of communism must be met and overcome by a determination to achieve victory for the free way of life.

In addition, the committee decided that it ought to undertake the responsibility of exploratory efforts in the development of platform recommendations for the State Republican convention in 1964. In the process, the platform committee charged the chairman with developing the means whereby the platform committee either in full committee, or in subcommittee, could facilitate the widest possible representation of views upon public problems facing the State of California. It was urged, if possible, that the committee conduct public hearings in various parts of the State where interested citizens and associations, could present, for the consideration of the committee, their views on the public policy needs of the State of California. The committee emphasized that such hearings should be open for the widest possible expression of opinion, and should not be limited in any way, to purely representation of local Republican organizations, and officials.

The ultimate objective of these hearings would be to provide the platform committee with the basis for thoughtful and informed consideration of recommendations for the Republican platform when considered by the State convention in 1964.

Respectfully submitted.

HUGH FLOURNOY.

Who's Lucky?—People Rewrite Kennedys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Herald of February 19, 1963:

WHO'S LUCKY?—PEOPLE REWRITE KENNEDYS

(By Holmes Alexander)

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.—"Those Kennedys are mighty lucky to have the American people," observed Vernon J. Veritas, the old truth-teller, on his snowy tour of the Western States.

"Without the American people to go over the Kennedys' homework, they'd probably have worse grades than James Meredith made in his first term at Ole Miss."

EAR TO GRASSROOTS

Mr. Veritas better not talk that way. He wouldn't get his victuals back yonder at the White House door where all the soothsayers are supposed to be fed these days. He better reverse that statement of his. Weren't the American people supposed to be grateful for all the Kennedys had done—rather than the other way round?

"That's what you hear from the Georgetown set, but a trip to the grassroots makes a man see it a little differently," declared Veritas, who cannot tell a lie. "The Kennedys weren't going to bother about all those Russian troops and technicians in Cuba until the American people began to hear the facts and began to formulate some opinions.

"There's all that nonsense in February just as there was in October about Cuba being a 'defensive' position only. But, then and now, the people have seen it otherwise, and the administration policy has changed pronto. The administration at last is asking Khrushchev when he intends to take those Soviet gunmen away."

TV FOR SALE

Mr. Veritas must believe that this turnabout was a policy of popular demand rather than administration wisdom.

"What else?" ejaculated Veritas. "If it weren't for a few not-for-sale TV programs like 'Meet the Press,' and a solitary stalwart or so like Senator KEN KEATING, there's no doubt that the Kennedys would have botched up the Cuban crisis in 1963 after having almost won it in 1962."

Well, if memory serves, the Kennedys needed some urging in 1962 to make up their minds about Cuba. If Mr. Veritas was developing a thesis, the New Frontier scribbles down its foreign policies, but the folks back home have got to go over the hen-scratch proposals and rewrite them into making sense.

You'd have a hard time finding much creative and sustained leadership in the White House if this is what's happening. Wasn't J.F.K. the sustained and creative leader we used to read about in war, peace, and politics?

TRUTHTELLER

"That's what we read about," agreed Veritas, a compulsive truthteller, East or West. "But in war, I can't find out from any of the biographies of JFK that he ever aimed a torpedo from PT-109 against the enemy. He cruised around, he got shot at, he got rammed, he swam for his life and saved some other lives—but as a PT skipper did he ever sink a shot into the foe?"

Well, maybe J.F.K. is better at peacetime pursuits than * * *.

"You'd have a hard time finding it in the record," insisted Veritas. "Congress rewrote or rejected practically every major Kennedy proposal in the last session. The people themselves have started blue-pencilling the new tax-cut program. It isn't entirely unheard of, you know, for somebody not named Kennedy to write Kennedy examination papers, and to have a formative hand on Kennedy books * * *."

Was Mr. Veritas trying to say that?

"I was only saying that the Kennedys owe the American people a lot of thanks," declared Vernon J. Veritas. "I just think it's a good time to be asking—who ought to be grateful to whom?"

Midland College a Leader in National Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include a feature article from the magazine of the Midlands, a supplement to the Omaha World-Herald of Sunday, March 3. This article, entitled "Talking Politics at Midland," details the outstanding program of Midland College in Fremont, Nebr., in the field of national and international issues.

This college lies in the district of our colleague from Nebraska, Mr. BEERMANN, and I know he is proud of its work. Indeed, this article mentions the national awards which have come to Midland College for its long leadership in Association of International Relations Clubs.

The article follows:

TALKING POLITICS AT MIDLAND—STUDENTS TAKING ACTIVE PART AT FREMONT COLLEGE

(By Robert Houston)

FREMONT, NEBR.—Small college and university campuses may find most of the political zeal concentrated in a hard little core of leftist students who are receptive to the Socialist ideology.

There are exceptions to this in the corn and cattle country of the Middlewest, and one of the shining examples is Midland College.

This small college with an enrollment of 600 has none of those fanatics, but there is a surprising number of students who have a day-to-day awareness of what's going on in government, not only internationally and nationally, but even on the State and local levels.

Students undoubtedly have caught some of these sparks of interest from teachers, for the majority of Midland's faculty likewise has shown a lively interest in government.

One of the liveliest is Dr. William F. Zimmerman, academic vice president whose class subjects are American government, European government, and English history.

Dr. Zimmerman is a Democrat of conservative stripe. More than half of the faculty are Republicans, but they get along most amiably. Midland graduate, Dr. Zimmerman obtained his master's at the University of Nebraska and Ph. D. degree at Cornell University, then joined the Midland faculty in 1928.

A VERY ACTIVE CLUB

One major stimulant to the collective interest at Midland dates back to 1938, when the International Relations Club was founded on the campus with the aid of Dr. Zimmerman.

This organization, a chapter of the Association of International Relations Clubs, is marking its 25th anniversary at Midland, and one evidence that it is still flourishing is its membership roll of 175—almost one-third of the student body.

The Midland group has been a leader in the national organization.

"A Midland student, William Christensen, was the first president of the national association," says Dr. Zimmerman. "Our campus has twice been host to the association's convention and we have been cited for outstanding work several times. Midland's Dr. Orville H. Zabel, chairman of the department of history, is one of the association's two national faculty advisers.

"The Midland chapter brings in speakers for monthly meetings which are well attended. There is more interest here in national affairs than you normally find on a campus."

ELECTION INTEREST

At election time, there is regularly a stir of activity on the Midland campus. Members of the International Relations Club move to get out the vote.

Allen Beermann, a Midland graduate of 1962 who now is a freshman in law at Creighton University, says that there is a surprising interest among the students in local issues.

Three years ago, he recalls, students even got behind the candidacy of a Midland faculty member, James W. Miller, for the office of justice of the peace. Mr. Miller won election; but a year ago he was fatally injured in an auto accident.

"Midland students," Mr. Beermann believes, "are sound in their political thinking. Most of them have thoughts and opinions about Federal, State, and local government. There are discussions about politics in dormitories, and attendance is high at the International Relations Club meetings. A large percentage of students vote in local elections"

Mr. Beermann added that "students are aware of the implications of big government and deficit spending. They look on them as things to be watched."

Mr. Beermann, a cousin of Nebraska Congressman RALPH BEERMANN, was a vice president of the International Relations Club while at Midland.

During the last 4 years, there has been a strong and active Republican Club among students on the campus, and efforts have been made recently to form a Democratic club.

GAINS UNAPPRECIATED

Dr. Zimmerman declares that "the interest of most American college youth in politics is almost nil. He's too preoccupied with youth culture. This simply means that his interest is devoted almost entirely to a very limited time span of youth, living and thinking as if there were no past and no future.

"If we don't take an interest in democracy as young folks, it automatically follows that democracy will be weakened as a political institution during our older adult years."

Dr. Zimmerman says that our whole society takes the political gains of the past too much for granted, a dangerous oversight.

He says he agrees with the poet Walt Whitman, who contended that democracy is perpetually involved in an adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society. This adjustment is never perfectly and finally attained, but remains a problem that we must solve again and again.

"Every generation must experience this problem," he asserted. "It is impossible to transmit ideas of stable government as one transmits monetary gifts."

The Midland educator says there is much less emphasis placed on our heroes of the past because we take our political traditions for granted.

"So many school books don't mention our early patriots—men who used to have a prominent place in our histories. More should be said about men such as Nathan Hale, who regretted he had but one life to give to his country, or Patrick Henry, who cried, 'Give me liberty or give me death,' or the great naval hero, John Paul Jones.

"Some texts don't tell about the Presidents we had who were determined to pay off or reduce the national debt. I think it's very necessary to have that in a time when there are leaders who advocate deficit spending."

HEROES DOWNGRADED

Dr. Zimmerman also points out that there has been a growing literature downgrading the Nation's past heroes.

"In the 1920's, authors began to undress their subjects in biographies. Washington and Lincoln are classic examples of the great men who were left rather cold and naked by authors striving to expose human weaknesses.

"No matter how good a person has been, you are going to destroy him as a hero if you concentrate on his failings.

"Just recently, however, Astronaut John Glenn has emerged as something of a hero in the American tradition—he's a man with real depth, a man of God, a man who is proud of his citizenship.

"The sociologist, the political scientist, the philosopher and literature teacher as well as the history teacher have the chance to acquaint students with the democratic traditions of our country."

Dr. Zimmerman declares that educators are traditionally more liberal than the average citizen because they live in a world of ideas.

"But," he adds, "whenever you have too much liberalism, you find there's too little or no communication between the educators and the rest of the community."

He says that campus schedules often make it difficult for a professor to participate in community affairs.

"And if you're a teacher, you are likely to be frowned upon if you take any interest in government through an established political party," he said. "When I was asked to be a candidate for the city council here some 25 years ago, the governing body of the college at that time felt it unwise. Now many faculty members do participate in local politics."

In Fremont, efforts are made to bring educators, students and the community together. A "Youth Asks Business Week" will be held this month. Panels of businessmen will meet with classes at Midland College and the high schools in Fremont to answer questions chiefly of a political or economic nature asked by the students.

During National Education Week the last 2 years, businessmen and homemakers have been invited individually to be guests in school classes, followed by lunch.

THE DECLARATION

Dr. Zimmerman is a coauthor with two Fremont councilmen, Eugene C. Buch and Edward A. Jaksha, of the Fremont Chamber of Commerce's widely publicized "A Declaration of Independence From Federal Dependence."

The document states a belief that the "present trend in political thinking and fiscal policy will ultimately destroy our free institutions and the savings of our people and our children," and that "our Nation's strength lies in local, county, and State government, by citizens using local, county, and State funds, and that under the trend of the present political philosophy our people are slowly and surely being lulled to sleep and deprived of their substance."

The Midland educator declares that the role of the educator is to help make young people aware of their heritage of the past and inspire them to offer a share of their time for public service.

"One of the best examples of this that I know of is Robert G. Simmons of Lincoln, who has just retired after serving more than 20 years as a justice of the Nebraska Supreme Court," he said. "Judge Simmons tithed his time for civic and churchwork. If this were our ideal we'd really be moving."

Our best defense against communism, in Dr. Zimmerman's opinion, is a knowledge of our democratic system and its heritage, factual discussions, and participation in community affairs.

Last winter, the Zimmermans joined with other interested Fremont couples in the formation of study groups to take up the subject of "freedom versus communism."

"It was amazing how much interest there was in serious study," he remarked. "All of the members did homework that was assigned plus reading on their own. During 8 weeks, there was a new discussion leader for each session."

Dr. Zimmerman says that communism strangles the intellect and human values. Logically, its only hope in a free country like the United States is that "democratic institutions will deteriorate, making an easy conquest possible with a minimum of struggle."

Independence Day of Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, the Republic of Morocco celebrated the anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Hassan II; and His Excellency, the Moroccan Ambassador to the United States, Ali Benjelloun.

Late last year, yet another momentous event of modern reform occurred in independent Morocco when the King promulgated a constitution whereby the Moroccan people would be able to take part in the governing of their country. This constitution, promised to the people by the late and great King, Mohammed V, and now fulfilled by his son, Hassan II, the present ruler, established the King as hereditary chief executive and a parliament. It also created all people of Morocco equal, with no discrimination against any minority. Women were given equal rights with men.

The constitution is the culmination of the democratic processes of law initiated when Morocco achieved its independence from the French on March 2, 1956. On that date, the French Government rescinded the Treaty of Fez of March 30, 1912, which had established the French protectorate, and had recognized the independence of Morocco. The French protectorate had ended an independent kingdom which had been founded by the Arabs in the eighth century. At one time, the Moroccan cities of Fez and Marrakesh were considered to be the most prominent seats of learning in the world. The Moroccans were unable to stem the tide of French expansionism, though, and fell prey to colonial rule. Resistance persisted, however, and became an active force to contend with when the French deposed their beloved Sultan, Mohammed V, in 1953. At this time the entire nation rose up against the French and demanded independence. Three years of bitter struggle were to ensue before sovereignty was achieved.

Since its independence, the country has progressed toward modernization. Faced with a 92-percent illiteracy rate, the Government has placed emphasis on education projects. By the end of this year, all children of primary school age will be enrolled in schools. Agriculture and industry have also been stressed to relieve the rampant unemployment situation. Morocco is now the world's second largest producer and leading exporter of phosphates. A new 5-year plan has inaugurated several irrigation projects to reclaim new lands for agriculture development.

Relations with the United States have been amicable. The U.S. Government has aided the Moroccan people at times when the need was great. The drought of 1961 and the Agadir earthquake were only two disasters for which we extended a helping hand. Hassan II is expected in this country in the near future to continue the furtherance of these friendly relations.

In its own sphere of influence, the King is attempting to establish closer collaboration between the countries of north Africa—Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco—thus creating a union more able to compete successfully with other nations of the world. He is also assuming a position of stature among the other African nations. It is his dream that Morocco may once more resume the leadership that it once held before French intervention.

We in the United States recognize the accomplishments of the people of Morocco and salute them on their independence day anniversary. It is with sincere expectations that the relations between our two countries remain amicable, that they may prove to be a symbol to other nations in promoting world peace.

Amendment to Administrative Expenses Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which is aimed at correcting an inequality in the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

The act provides that appropriations for the departments shall be available for travel and transportation expenses of student trainees when promoted upon completion of college work to positions for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage.

Ostensibly, the act provides authority for all student trainees who, upon graduation are placed in shortage category positions. Actually, a small group of trainees, approximately 50 each year, are excluded from coverage. Although assuming full professional status upon graduation, these trainees do not, at that time, receive a promotion to a higher grade. These are the trainees covered by special training agreements between their employing agencies and the Civil Service Commission. These agreements are desirable, because of

critical shortages in some occupations, to provide for more rapid advancements of trainees. This small group has, prior to graduation, already reached the grade level to which the majority of the trainees are promoted at the time of graduation.

This perfecting amendment to the Administrative Expenses Act is intended to provide the same authority for payment to all student trainees, whether or not a promotion to a higher grade level at the time of graduation is involved. Enactment of this amendment will affect very few employees but will remove a potential source of irritation over unequal treatment of two groups of employees.

The annual cost of the transportation expenses provided for by this amendment is estimated to be between $15,000 and $20,000. This does not represent any increase in Federal expenditures over earlier cost estimates for this purpose since Public Law 86-587 was enacted on the assumption that all student trainees moving into shortage category positions upon graduation would be eligible to receive these payments.

End the REA Co-op Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the list of those concerned about the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration gets longer with each passing day. The latest to be added to this list seems to be the President's own special committee headed by Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon on Federal lending programs.

The Chicago Tribune recently carried an editorial about this report entitled "End the REA Co-op Subsidies" in which it was stated:

> The report asserts that legally fixed, maximum interest rates on such things as Government home and rural power loan programs should be scrapped. Moreover, it recommends that where Government interest rates are below private rates, the Government charge should vary at least as much as current Treasury borrowing costs.

The Tribune concludes that:

> With at least a $12 billion deficit confronting us, the need to cut Federal spending to the bone is obvious. Subsidies to the REA co-ops are wasteful and serve no useful purpose.

Mr. Speaker, because of the timeliness of this editorial and the importance which should be given to the report on Federal lending activities made by the President's special committee, I sincerely commend it to my good friends in this Chamber. In order that each of us may have the chance to see this editorial, I ask unanimous consent to have it appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 18, 1963]

END THE REA CO-OP SUBSIDIES

A Presidential committee headed by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon has written a report that may be expected to bring anguished yelps from the rural co-op lobby pack. The report asserts that legally fixed, maximum interest rates on such things as Government home and rural power loan programs should be scrapped. Moreover, it recommends that where Government interest rates, are below private rates, the Government charge should vary at least as much as current Treasury borrowing costs.

This is a particular and well-deserved poke at the Rural Electrification Administration. The REA is the long-coddled outfit that makes loans to cooperatives at 2 percent, which is only about half the rate paid by the Government on money it borrows to make the loans. Over the 35-year period of these loans, this is a subsidy estimated to amount to about three-quarters of the loan itself.

Through such low interest Government financing, not to mention exemption from Federal taxation, the co-ops enjoy a substantial competitive advantage over privately owned, tax-paying utilities.

Virtually all farms and other rural customers in areas served by the co-ops now have electric service. More than half of the total power sales of REA systems now are being made to nonfarm users, who comprise more than 80 percent of the new power customers being added to the systems.

Back in 1955 the Hoover Commission recommended that, because of the great advance in farm electrification, the time has arrived for the reorganization of the REA into a self-supporting institution securing its own financing from private sources." Nothing came of this recommendation, although the Eisenhower administration in 1959 proposed raising interests rates to REA co-ops to about 4 percent.

This latest recommendation from Secretary Dillon's committee is likely to be greeted with the same apathy. The administration has demonstrated that the REA is one of its pets by proposing $425 million of funds for it in fiscal 1964, compared with appropriations of 400 millions this year and actual expenditures of 245 millions in 1962. Officials already have said that no specific legislation to end Government loans will come from the administration as a result of the Dillon report.

Taxpayers should put the heat on Congress to see that such legislation is introduced. With at least $12 billion deficit confronting us, the need to cut Federal spending to the bone is obvious. Subsidies to the REA co-ops are wasteful and serve no useful purpose.

Delaware 4-H Club Delegates to the 33d National 4-H Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this week marks National 4-H Club Week with particular focus upon the conspicuous activities of some two million young men and women who belong to more than 94,000 clubs in urban, suburban, and rural areas throughout the United States and Puerto Rico.

This year's 4-H week observance is keyed to citizenship goals for members, with special emphasis on career exploration and the value of making wise vocational choices. Open to boys and girls from 10 to 19 years of age, 4-H Club activities embrace both urban and rural interests. Development of leadership qualities, special skills, and a sense of community responsibility are among the fundamental objectives of 4-H Clubs.

Four Delaware 4-H Club members have been selected to represent the First State at the 33d National 4-H Conference to be held in Washington, D.C., next month. I join with other Delawareans in a salute to 4-H members and leaders in Delaware and throughout the Nation; their efforts in behalf of a better and greater America deserve our commendation and our support.

I include herewith an article from the March 1 issue of the Harrington Journal of Harrington, Del., which provides a short profile on the background of the four Delaware delegates who are Miss Helen Grampp of Dover; Miss Jean Ann Tucker of Greenwood; Mr. George Nickle of Newark; and Mr. Franklin Melson of Bridgeville, Del.

The article follows:

4-H CONFERENCE DELEGATES NAMED

Four Delaware 4-H Club members have been selected to represent the State at the 33d National 4-H Conference to be held in Washington, D.C., April 20 to 26, according to James O. Baker, State 4-H leader.

The quartet includes Helen Grampp, Dover; Jean Ann Tucker, Greenwood; George Nickle, Newark, and Franklin Melson, Bridgeville.

Their selection is announced in conjunction with National 4-H Club Week which will be observed March 2 through 9 throughout the country.

The delegates were selected on the basis of their 4-H records, leadership abilities, and citizenship activities, Baker said. The four will attend a citizenship workshop where they will study American heritage and analyze the responsibilities that go along with it. In conjunction with this, they will also visit the Smithsonian Institue and the National Art Galleries and will tour many of the historical shrines in Washington.

Helen Grampp, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Chris Grampp, is a 9-year veteran of 4-H club work. During this time, she has received many 4-H honors, highlighted by a trip to National 4-H Club Congress in 1961. Helen served as a counselor at the Delaware State 4-H camp last year and is a freshman at the University of Delaware.

Jean Ann Tucker, daughter of Mrs. Carl Tucker, is a senior at Greenwood High School, and has been a 4-H member for 9 years. She has carried 33 4-H projects for which she has received 10 county medals. In addition, she enters county demonstration and judging events each year, and has gone on to several State contests. She is now serving as junior leader of her club, and is president of the Sussex County 4-H Council.

Franklin Melson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Melson, is also a 9-year 4-H'er. He has carried 20 different projects, and has earned 12 county medals for outstanding work. He attended National 4-H Congress in 1961. Frank has participated in demonstration contests for 3 years and has judged field crops or vegetables on the State level 9 times, earning several awards for his work.

A freshman at the University of Delaware, he serves as junior leader of his club.

George Nickle, Jr., has been active in 4-H Club work for 10 years, during which he has won several county awards and a State award in his home grounds beautification projects. He also has taken part in the Delaware flower show, the State fair and the county. Also active in school and community events, he attended a White House conference in Washington, D.C., was national chairman of the student branch of the March of Dimes, and last year was one of the twin city exchange students from Newark to LaGroz, France. The son of Mr. and Mrs. George Nickle, he is a freshman at Appalachian State Teachers College, Boone, N.C.

"These young people personify the high ideals of 4-H membership," Baker commented in announcing their selection. "In addition to the 30 different projects available to both rural and urban members, 4-H provides an opportunity for young people to work together to become good citizens."

With the theme of this year's National 4-H Club Week as "4-H Young Citizens in Action," Delaware's more than 2,000 4-H members will visit the State capital holding parent night programs, making 4-H exhibits and speaking to various civic clubs throughout the State. In addition, a representative group of members will visit the State capital where they will tour the State house, hall of records, legislative hall and State museum.

Climaxing Delaware's observance of National 4-Club Week will be a statewide square dance Saturday evening, March 9, at Capital Grange in Dover. All 4-H Club members in Delaware have been invited to attend.

National Aquarium To Be Educational Water World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Victor Cohn, of the Minneapolis Tribune, entitled "National Aquarium To Be Educational Water World."

The article follows:

NATIONAL AQUARIUM TO BE EDUCATIONAL WATER WORLD

(By Victor Cohn)

The proposed National Aquarium, sponsored by Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, will be unusual, a true education in world of the sea, representing a dream of its chief planner, Athelstan Spilhaus.

Thousands of Americans will walk "under the sea" if a new dream of dreamer Athelstan Spilhaus comes true.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has named him head of an advisory board to plan a new national aquarium.

Spilhaus is University of Minnesota technology dean, with new note as a science dramatizer after 16 successful months running the U.S. Science Exhibit at the Seattle, Wash., World's Fair.

He is also an oceanographer, a science focused on water and oceans.

"I told the Secretary I wasn't interested in an ordinary aquarium," Spilhaus said Saturday.

"I'm not interested in a bunch of disconnected tanks to which fish are unaccustomed—with square people looking in at fish in square tanks. I am interested if instead of an aquarium we can build a 'world of water,' a place where we can tell the whole story of water and all the life in it."

VISITOR WILL WALK INSIDE OF TUNNELS

If Spilhaus has his way, the visitor to the "National Water World"—to be completed around 1967 in Washington, D.C.—will walk inside tunnels beneath the ocean world.

Sharks, porpoises, whales and a thousand other species will swim, float and crawl around him.

He will see them as part of a walk or ramble that will start on a "mountain top," where the earth receives the first drops of water. He will follow the water as it runs through streams, ponds and rivers to the sea.

"There we'll have life on the seashore, which is the most fascinating of all," Spilhaus said.

"Then we'll give the visitor the illusion of walking under the sea and through submerged reefs. At the surface he'll see the green plants, the plankton, that fix the sunlight, starting the life chain.

"Then we'll take him down to see the primitive barnacles that were found at the bottom of the sea, down 7 miles."

WILL OBSERVE FISH RESPOND TO STIMULI

He will see, according to Spilhaus' thinking, fish responding to many stimuli. "You could press a button and sound a recording of a dolphin's feeding call, and see him come swimming."

These things become possible, Spilhaus said, because Congress in October voted $10 million for a national aquarium.

It did it after several members derided it as an unneeded "glass house for fish."

The aquarium was called the "personal pet" of Representative MICHAEL KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, No. 2 power on the House Appropriations Committee. KIRWAN insisted on the aquarium before going along with items other Congressmen wanted before October 13 adjournment.

"I don't even know KIRWAN," Spilhaus said. "I kept entirely out of the politics.

"I told Udall, 'I don't want to get into the business of whether or not you should build this. But if you do I'd love a hand in it.'

"Actually I think anybody who says this is not a good use of public money is crazy.

SCIENCE FAIR COST WAS WELL WORTH IT

"Some people felt the same way about the Government's spending $10 million on the Seattle science exhibit. Seven million people saw it. It cost about the same amount per visitor as it costs to keep a child in school half a day.

"That's a very economical way of educating people about science. This will be the same.

"And it will educate in more than science." For example, he said:

"We can tell the story of water waste and pollution, and perhaps develop some conscience. We can show how we can control floods, which are crazy.

"We really should not let one drop of water return to the sea except through many cycles, while we use and reuse it.

"We can show the origins of the oceans. We can take you full circle to show how water is evaporated from the sea by the sun, and brought back by rain and snow to the mountain top."

Spilhaus has enlisted Charles Eames—famous California designer of the familiar rounded plastic "Eames chairs" and many other things—as design aid.

Hope Starts Here—The Story of Heart Research at the State University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the College of Medicine at the State University of Iowa is renowned for the quality of its research in many fields but the work which is now being done in the area of cardiovascular diseases is especially worthy of note.

Mr. Bill Wundram, Sunday editor of the Sunday Times-Democrat of Davenport, Iowa, has written a fine account of this important work at Iowa's College of Medicine. I feel it appropriate to call it to the attention of my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Wundram's story, "Hope Starts Here," in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Feb. 17, 1963]

HOPE STARTS HERE

(By Bill Wundram)

(Editor's note.—Musty, linen-wrapped mummies have provided evidence that heart disease has probably plagued man since the very beginning of his existence. Yet, a concerted medical attack on the problem began only a bare 15 years ago. Today, research by hundreds of scientists is considered the most powerful single defense in the battle, and one of its most important fronts is at the State University of Iowa. During February's "Heart Month," the Sunday Times-Democrat offers this special report on heart research at SUI.)

IOWA CITY, IOWA.—They work with strange-sounding names that you cannot understand, much less pronounce * * * names like "afferent pathways of active reflex vasodilatation" or "the effects of vasco-constrictor drugs (like epinephrine) upon the veins." They spend months feeding shrimp to rabbits, and then tediously watch radio-tagged particles of fat and cholesterol course through the bodies of the animals.

They patiently study the hearts of the woodchuck, the ground squirrel and the reptile to unlock secrets of the pacemaker, which generates contraction stimuli in the heart.

You may not understand their work, for it is as complex and as detailed as the mysteries of the heart itself. But they are researchers here, and they are a lifeline for you. Their absorbing studies may some day save or extend your life.

Extend your life?

Listen to the words last week of the president of the American Heart Association, the organization whose research work is directly tied to efforts of SUI scientists:

"The total picture for the man in the prime of life has become brighter * * * this is hopeful news for us all. The death rate of middle-aged men from cardiovascular disease has declined 6 percent since 1950 to mark the first relatively sustained improvement we have seen."

Speaking was Dr. James V. Warren, of Columbus, Ohio, at a conference of medical specialists.

THE GREAT RISE IN RESEARCH

The great strides in heart research have been made in a period that seems nearly as brief as a heartbeat itself, considering the thousands of years that man has been afflicted with heart disease.

"Cardiovascular research as we know it today did not exist in 1947—a scant 15 years ago," says Iowa City's Dr. Lewis E. January, professor of internal medicine at University Hospitals.

"In 1947, only a dozen scientists in the Nation were doing full-time research on cardiovascular diseases," added the soft-spoken physician. "Why, right now we have half that many on heart research at the University of Iowa."

A major part of the heart research at SUI is sponsored by the Iowa Heart Association. This year, nearly $50,000 has been allocated for grants to scientists working there and at Iowa State University, Ames, according to Dr. A. B. Hendricks of Davenport, chairman of the research committee for the State group.

What is this research accomplishing?

Walk through the cardiovascular research laboratory at University Hospitals here.

Ben. G. Zimmerman, a young Ph. D. is studying the effects of vasoconstrictor drugs upon viens in different organs of the dog. The veins are an important segment of the cardiovascular system. When veins become small in size—that is, when they constrict due to drugs—the organs they drain may swell with fluid. This may alter the function of the organ. The constriction of veins in the body may also indirectly increase the amount of blood pumped by the heart.

"This research, we believe, will lead to a better understanding of the overall effect of drugs on the veins and will contribute information on the reactions of veins of man in health and in disease," says Dr. Zimmerman.

Heart research is difficult, demanding, complicated. Consider the work of Michael Brody, another Ph.D at the State University of Iowa:

Blood pressure is in a large part controlled by a small area (vasomotor center) in the lower portion of the brain. This area activates the nerves whose function is the regulation of blood vessel size. The activity of the vasomotor area is regulated by impulses coming into the brain from several areas in the body which sense changes in blood pressure. For example, when pressure is elevated, impulses are sent to the brain which reduce the activity of the vasomotor center. This ultimately results in an increase in vessel size which tends to offset the pressure elevation.

TO DETERMINE THE MECHANISMS

"We are studying," continues Dr. Brody, "the interactions between the impulses coming into the vasomotor center since different types of vasodilatation are obtained from different pressure-sensing areas. We are also attempting to determine the mechanisms by which the vasomotor area integrates the variety of impulses which it receives and thus effectively controls blood pressure."

Dr. January, who is Iowa chairman of this year's heart fund campaign of the Iowa Heart Association, and also chairman of the Council on Clinical Cardiology of the American Heart Association, points out that new drugs and surgical procedures developed through research can now control nearly all forms of high blood pressure. "But," he warns, "much more remains to be learned about the disease and better ways to manage it are being sought."

What of fats in the foods we eat?

The stubborn disease called arteriosclerosis results in the death of some 700,000 Americans each year from heart attacks and strokes. Before 1950, it was considered to be an inevitable degenerative disease.

"We no longer believe this," emphasizes Dr. January. "Fat in the food we eat, cigarettes, sex hormones, emotional tension, lazy habits of exercise and heredity are all suspect and under study. However, a dent in the outlook for coronary and stroke victims has been made through weight control, sensible exercise, newer drugs, anticoagulant regimens, and the best diagnostic and rehabilitation measures in the history of mankind."

Shrimp, the cocktail hour delicacy, has been the subject of intensive dietary research by Dr. William E. Connor, M.D., of the university's college of medicine.

"I have been carrying on a lengthy experiment testing the value of shrimp in the diet generally and particularly in the cases of cardiovascular disease," explains Dr. Connor.

A SHRIMP DIET FOR MR. RABBIT

"We designed a diet containing a considerable quantity of shrimp and fed it to rabbits for a period of many months. Because shrimp contains certain fats considered desirable in the regulation of blood fats, we wished to make a study in rabbits to see if another constituent of shrimp, its cholesterol content, might counteract and mitigate against its beneficial qualities. After the period of shrimp feeding, blood from these rabbits was obtained and analyzed for the blood fats. These were found to be greatly elevated. The arteries and hearts of these rabbits contained large deposits of cholesterol."

"Another aspect of our work," he continues, "has been to follow radio-tagged particles of fat and cholesterol throughout the bodies of the animals after the administration of these substances in the diet."

By using a device called a liquid scintilation counter, Dr. Connor was able to determine the presence of radio-tagged cholesterol substance. He found that after a period of cholesterol in the diet, animals have this substance in many of the tissues, including the heart, the arteries, the liver, and some of the endocrine glands.

Dr. Connor, whose research work has been financed by the Scott County chapter of the Iowa Heart Association, is quick to add, "While in the case of rabbits, the shrimp diet was not too desirable, we cannot necessarily put the findings as applicable to man * * * no, not by any means at this moment can we. But in rabbits, the diet produced lesions and elevated blood fats."

UNCOVER DRUG DIFFICULTY

There is considerable research in drugs at SUI. In recent months, Dr. William R. Wilson, working in the Cardiovascular Research Laboratories, conducted a controlled study of a new blood pressure lowering drug. He and his colleagues discovered that this new compound produced striking increases in the blood sugar of some patients who have diabetes. As a result of these findings, this drug will not be available for prescription sales to the public as a blood pressure lowering drug.

For months, G. Edgar Folk, Ph. D., has been working with isolated hearts in a study concerned with comparisons of the physiological behavior of different kinds of hearts. The hearts of hibernating animals are being studied, with a goal of determining whether the main difference in the hibernator's heart and the usual mammalian heart lies in the pacemaker (which generates contraction-stimuli) or in the heart fibers which do the work of the heart.

A continuing study of the hemolysin streptolysin, S, which is produced by a bacterium, streptococcus, is in progress by Dr. Irvin S. Snyder, Ph. D., at SUI. It has been previously shown that this hemolyisn is produced in largest amounts by the streptococcus thought to be involved in rheumatic fever.

The progress in aiding those with congenital defects is especially heartening at university hospitals.

"One out of every 120 babies in born with a heart defect," says Dr. January. There was a time not long ago when nothing could be done except classify the defect as probably congenital. Today, 85 percent of them can be cured or improved by surgery. The first such operation was done in 1938 on one of the simple defects, but most of the advances have come since 1950.

A DREAM THAT HAS COME TRUE

"In 1950, a heart-lung machine to allow surgery within the open heart was a dream. Today, the machine is commonplace at major medical centers. The SUI heart-lung machine, developed with American Heart Association funds, has now been used in about 500 operations."

As Dr. January talks, his words become more and more animated and he describes the progress of the immediate past and the miraclelike hopes for the future.

"Many corrective operations are now done on rheumatically damaged heart valves. Now, we are entering upon the phase of replacing heart valves with ingenious plastic substitutes. It is now possible, in some cases to graft in whole new arteries to replace worn out or ruptured ones, and a transistorized device called a pacemaker can be implanted in the body to restore the heart's ability to beat rhythmically and regularly."

Mass Transit Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who favors mass-transit legislation, I was pleased to learn of the statement adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council at its recent meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla. This statement, released by the Railway Labor Executives' Association on February 21, 1963, follows:

The AFL-CIO will support legislation for Federal grants to assist in development of urban mass transportation programs. The need for such programs is obvious. Equally obvious, however, is the need for the protection of collective bargaining rights and for fair and equitable arrangements to protect employee interests adversely affected as a result of such programs. We will insist that such provisions be contained in any bill that is passed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I also wish to include the resolution adopted by the council at this meeting with respect to control of the B. & O. Railroad by the Chesapeake & Ohio:

RESOLUTION ON C. & O. CONTROL OF B. & O.

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission, despite mounting opposition throughout the Nation and in Congress to the current unprecedented effort by railroad management to contract railroad plant and services through mergers, has nevertheless, with three Commissioners dissenting, seen fit to approve the application of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad to control the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; and

Whereas this action follows previous refusal by the Commission to consolidate this case with other pending eastern railroad merger applications, thus resulting in a record which is totally barren of evidence concerning the effects of this acquisition upon other railroads in the region; and

Whereas as Commissioner Tucker has pointed out in his dissent, the B. & O.'s financial condition did not warrant an immediate decision on the proposal when weighed against the other public interest factors; and

Whereas as the dissenting Commissioners state so well, the ICC's action in deciding railroad merger and consolidation applications on a case-by-case basis, not only ignores the interest of other railroads in the areas, but also ignores the resultant effect of proposed mergers upon the economy of the communities affected; and

Whereas the effect of the control of the B. & O. by the C. & O. would have such far-reaching adverse effects upon other railroads that the ICC decision thus tends, in effect to prejudge the other pending merger applications; and

Whereas the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes and the Railway Labor Executives' Association have filed a suit in the U.S. District Court at Detroit to set aside the ICC order approving the acquisition of the B. & O. by the C. & O. on the primary ground that there is no evidence in the record of the case as to the effects which this acquisition will have on other railroads; and

Whereas such a finding by the Commission prior to approval of the merger is a requirement of section 5(2)(c) of the Interstate Comemrce Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (1) The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations does hereby unanimously deplore the action of a majority of the Interstate Commerce Commission in authorizing acquisition of control of the B. & O. by the C. & O. on the basis of an incomplete and inadequate record; and

(2) We call upon President Kennedy and the Attorney General to back up the two appointees of this administration, Commissioners Tucker and Bush, and Commissioner Webb in their joint effort to protect the public interest as evidenced by their dissenting opinions in this case, by directing the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice to join in the pending court test of the Commission's action and to vigorously support the efforts of the plaintiffs to overturn the capricious action of a majority of the Interstate Commerce Commission in approving C. & O. control of the B. & O. without consideration of all the facts which form a part of the overriding public interest.

Facts From Fables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Washington debate over tax cuts, tax reforms, Federal spending, deficits, and debt ceiling increases in intensity, it would be practical for us to use age-old wisdom and experience in analyzing the present differences of opinion.

The Austinite, a weekly community newspaper in Chicago, in its issue of February 27, provided its readers with a unique review of age-old comments as applied to present matters under discussion. I place this editorial into the RECORD, feeling it will at least merit the appreciation of Members of Congress:

FACTS FROM FABLES

It's often said there is nothing new under the sun. This appears to be true, especially in the realm of advice. So instead of trying to pontificate on today's subject of tax cuts without cost cuts, let's take a look at a few parables Aesop came up with some 2,000 years ago and see if the points are still valid today.

THE ANTS AND THE GRASSHOPPER

"The ants were employing a fine winter's day in drying grain collected in the summertime. A grasshopper, perishing with famine, passed by and earnestly begged for a little food. The ants inquired of him, 'Why did you not treasure up food during the summer?' He replied, 'I had not leisure enough. I passed the days in singing.'

"They then said in derision: 'If you were foolish enough to sing all the summer, you must dance supperless to bed in the winter.' "

THE THIRSTY PIGEON

"A pigeon, oppressed by excessive thirst, saw a goblet of water painted on a signboard. Not supposing it to be only a picture, she flew towards it with a loud whirr and unwittingly dashed against the signboard and jarred herself terribly. Having broken her wings by the blow, she fell to the ground and was caught by one of the bystanders.

"Zeal should not outrun discretion."

THE MAN AND HIS TWO SWEETHEARTS

"A middle-aged man, whose hair had begun to turn grey, courted two women at the same time. One of them was young; and the other, well advanced in years. The elder woman, ashamed to be courted by a man younger than herself, made a point, whenever her admirer visited her, to pull out some portion of his black hairs. The younger, on the contrary, not wishing to become the wife of an old man, was equally zealous in removing every grey hair she could find. Thus it came to pass, that between them both he very soon found that he had not a hair left on his head.

"Those who seek to please everybody please nobody."

In summing up our thoughts on the money management of our national household, a much younger man than Aesop put it more succinctly. Benjamin Franklin said, "He that goes a borrowing goes a sorrowing."

Byron Fish Describes Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a good friend, Byron Fish, literally had millions of interested readers looking over his shoulder as he sat down to describe the scenic beauty of Washington State for the March issue of Reader's Digest magazine.

Of course, he had much to write about, and I ask unanimous consent to have both the Digest's publicity story and Byron Fish's article entered in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST ARTICLE PRAISES WASHINGTON STATE SCENERY

Washington State is described as "a breathtaking, eye-widening collection of topographical amazements" in a six-page article in the March issue of the Reader's Digest, largest circulating magazine in the world.

Byron Fish, Seattle newspaperman and author, wrote the article titled, "Washington State—America's Scenic Storeroom." It is illustrated with full color photographs made by Bob and Ira Spring of Mount Ranier, a Mount Baker ski lift, North Head Lighthouse at the mouth of the Columbia River and the Emmons Glacier.

A specially bound copy of the issue was presented to Governor Albert Rosellini by Don Willis, of Seattle, Digest representative in the Northwest. The U.S. circulation of the magazine is more than 13 million and with later publication in foreign editions the article will appear in over 23 million copies in 13 languages.

Fish, Seattle Times columnist, has been a member of the city council of Normandy Park, a Seattle suburb, since 1956 and mayor there since 1960. A journalism graduate of the University of Washington, he was a war correspondent in Korea and has written 300 magazine articles.

Bob and Ira Spring, twin brothers who live in Edmonds, another suburb of Seattle, have made more than 27,000 pictures since they went into photography together after World War II. About 15,000 have been taken in Washington State.

Besides many major magazines, their work has appeared in seven books published by the Superior Publishing Co., of Seattle. Fish wrote the text for four, "Puget Sound," "Adventuring on the Columbia," "This Is Oregon" and "This Is Washington." The last was drawn on for material for the current Digest article.

Other books of Spring photographs are "High Adventure" and "Mount Ranier" with text by their wives, Patricia and Norma, and "High Worlds" with text by Harvey Manning. The twin brothers were born in Jamestown, N.Y., but moved to Shelton, Wash., as boys. Ira was an Air Force photographer and Bob served overseas with a field hospital in World War II.

WASHINGTON STATE—AMERICA'S SCENIC STOREROOM

(By Byron Fish)

It seems that when the other 47 States were put together—long before Alaska and Hawaii joined the family—the leftovers were stacked in the northwest corner of the landscape. Result: Washington, smallest among Western States, is a breathtaking, eye-widening collection of topographical amazements.

It took some planning to fit them all in. There were glaciers and sand dunes, cactus, and bits of damp jungle growth. There was unused rockbound coast from New England, a leftover length of Grand Canyon. Also to be given consideration were some southern swamps, southwest buttes, midwest prairies and arctic botany—not to mention scores of islands and five snowcapped volcanic peaks. By the time the job was finished Washington wound up with samples of just about everything.

The coast, folded into accordion pleats, stretches about 1,700 miles, counting what was placed around Puget Sound. The inland sea is where most of the islands went, including 172 in the San Juan group.

If you like a change of scene but don't like to travel long distances, consider Washington's Olympic Peninsula. It is a modest spur jutting into the Pacific, but it has as many changes in climate and terrain as a whole continent.

The peninsula is a low platform with a jagged mountain range in its middle. Damp winds move inland from the Pacific, collide with the mountains and, at the highest altitude, their moisture turns to snow. This falls on the glaciers and keeps them alive.

Below the ice are alpine meadows and the stunted trees of timberline. Next on the slopes comes a belt of medium-sized trees, then forests of tall, heavy timber. Farther down in the lowlands, where it stays relatively warm and as much as 150 inches of rain fall per year, everything grows to giant size and is festooned with a southern moss.

Thus a whole cycle of nature occurs—ocean moisture to icefields that feed rivers that flow back to the ocean. Their courses run through many zones—from subarctic to almost tropical growth. In few, if any, other places on earth does this continental process happen in such a small space.

A couple of summers ago we met a pair of tourists who had entered Washington by way of Spokane, on the eastern border. As they drove west, they expected the low mountains to grow into snowtopped peaks, the open pine woods to change to thick forests. Instead, the trees disappeared and the earth flattened, first to rolling wheatfields, then to an irrigated plain. At the end of 160 miles they came to brown hills, sagebrush, and lava-walled coulees, where they perspired in desert heat.

"What's all this talk about the 'Evergreen State'?" they inquired.

"Patience," we reassured them. "Go on another 50 miles."

Within an hour they were beginning their climb over the Cascade Mountains, a cloud-stopping barrier that splits Washington north to south and creates vast differences in climate, natural growth, and fauna, both wild and human. Not even a highway crosses this 100-mile-wide barrier at its northern end.

On each side of the big range sits a clutter of miscellaneous scenery. The recipe for the east-side mixture calls for about 50 million years of preparation. Boil uncountable tons of rock to liquid. Pour in successive layers until it is a mile or 2 deep. Fold the north part into a mass of mountains (the Kettle River Range and the Huckleberry Mountains, among others) and leave the rest flat (the Columbia Basin). Cool with five or six ice ages, melting the last one at the edge of the mountains. This will run off in the most gigantic river of all time. It will erode canyons, 1,000 to 1,600 feet deep, right through the basin lava beds. When this flood is reduced to a trickle, it will be the Columbia—still one of the mightiest rivers on the continent—and it will continue relentlessly to cut its own gorge.

If you wait long enough, the volcanic ash and lava on top of the basin will turn into rich soil—but a lot of good that does under the hot sun, without water. Turn-of-the-century pioneers left a scattering of beaten ranches as monuments to drought.

Where to get water? Block the Columbia with the Grand Coulee Dam. Man's largest concrete structure, it was designed eventually to provide enough water to irrigate 1 million arid acres in the basin. It produces the second biggest dam electric jolt in the Nation (almost 2 million kilowatts). And it also provides a never-ending tourist attraction.

Among the ancient byproducts of the Great Basin cookout are many animal and tree fossils in the coulee walls; and the world's largest petrified forest, in a State park at Vantage.

As the Washington landscape varies, so do its people. Former Scandinavians are at home in the fishing boats and the lumber camps. Wandering cowboys have settled in cattle country. Midwest wheat ranchers have discovered soil with a record yield. Tarheels from North Carolina now set their hounds to baying after raccoons in the Cascade foothills. Even the original inhabitants could not be classified simply as "Indians." Those east of the Cascades were plains tribes with horses, beads, and mat lodges, who battled the settlers in approved TV fashion. Those on the coast were fishermen who traveled in canoes, built cedar-plank houses, and carved totem poles.

In Washington, when they talk about "the mountain," they mean 14,408-foot Mount Rainier; it rates the way Fuji does in Japan. Other peaks also receive due homage: in the north, Mount Baker; in the south, Mount Adams and Mount St. Helens. These are training ground for mountaineers who intend to conquer peaks in northern Canada, Alaska, or the Himalayas. Up on the glaciers, skiers ski right into summer, wearing shorts and sunglasses. They hold a ski meet at Mount Baker in July.

As is true everywhere, Washington's urban areas are rapidly expanding. But along with metropolis there is still space in all forms—ocean and inland seas, glaciers and desert, mountain and plain, forest wilderness, and uninhabited islands. Perhaps nowhere else in the world can one have such wide choice of natural treasures, so quickly.

A Memo to USDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter from Mr. Charles F. Morgan, Jr., Sumner, Iowa, to Mr. John Duncan, Under Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, which appeared in the March 2, 1963 issue of the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman:

A MEMO TO USDA

From: Charles F. Morgan, Jr., Sumner, Iowa.
To: John Duncan, Under Secretary of Agriculture, USDA.

Whereas, the USDA, under Orville Freeman, has seen fit to pursue a philosophy of flat pricing of corn by areas in our Nation, accomplishing this, by the governmental use of reduced rail rates under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, we therefore make a protest of contention that such action is Socialistic in nature and completely rejects the recognition of free markets: therefore, be it

Resolved, That we in good faith and in a line of reasoning in direct correlation with your philosophies, do hereby and now request that USDA give careful thought and consideration to the below projection and if possible react favorably to our approach in the interest of more complete Government-planned agriculture.

Whereas, the USDA has seen fit to provide for the South Atlantic region of the United States to receive a discriminatory price concession on corn of approximately 4 cents per bushel and;

Whereas, this South Atlantic region, which is your home region, Mr. Duncan, now raises approximately 11 million turkeys, your price discrimination will save the South Atlantic turkey growers about one-half million dollars in cost of production; and

Whereas, the mean temperature of Iowa is 48 degrees Fahrenheit and the mean temperature of Georgia is 64 degrees Fahrenheit, thus a differential of 16 degrees Fahrenheit and, therefore, such temperature differential causes Iowa turkey growers to disburse 5 cents per poult as a brooding expense of fuel versus an approximate 2 cents per poult fuel expense in Georgia, and

Further, in view of the fact that some 9 million turkeys are grown in Iowa, we feel that in order to better socialize turkey growing, that your department of the USDA should take steps to disburse in two equal payments $180,000 (difference between cost of brooding in Iowa and the cost of brooding in the South Atlantic region), made payable to Iowa turkey growers.

Further, whereas, the sun shines in Iowa only 210 days per year but the same sun shines 270 days per year in Georgia we project to your consideration a proposal whereby Iowa turkey growers are compensated for vitamin D (sunshine vitamin) which we must purchase and which, of course, adds to our expense of growing turkeys, but which the State of Georgia gets more of free from nature's source, the sun.

Furthermore, whereas, it is a reasonable premise to assume that such temperature and climatic variables do exist, would it not be feasible for the USDA to take immediate steps to see whether or not, in line with good planned agricultural economics, it might be possible to see if we could change, by methods and means now unknown, the climatic conditions of our universe so that we can more nearly approach the Utopia of complete Government planned agriculture?

I trust that this letter will convey to you the message that we farm people who are actively engaged in agriculture are aware and cognizant of all the actions of your department and we will continue to search diligently for your motives.

The Basis of European Economic Growth: A German View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a myth being fostered by the Kennedy administration is that deficit financing has been largely responsible for the rapid rates of growth experienced by leading Western European nations in the 1950's.

An editorial in the December 5 Wall Street Journal quotes Dr. Hermann Abs, managing director of Frankfurt's Deutsch Bank, who explodes this notion. Dr. Abs makes clear that neither the Federal or State budgets of West Germany were in deficit positions during the last decade. On the contrary, he said, West Germany's phenomenal growth resulted largely from Government programs of special depreciation allowances to basic industries for investment purposes and tax measures, including a substantial reduction in corporation taxes on distributed profits. In addition, the Central Bank's credit policy was extremely conservative and restricted. When Germany did adopt more liberal policies, Dr. Abs said, an immediate slowdown in her growth rate was noted, and industrial profit margins dropped substantially. In the words of Dr. Abs, a so-called liberal policy was a fundamental mistake.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial from the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD:

AN ANSWER FROM ABROAD

One of the more fashionable ideas around Washington of late has been the doctrine that the tremendous postwar recovery of Europe has been due to the comparatively large deficit-financing of nations like France and West Germany.

The popularity of this doctrine is understandable. It would provide a nice rationalization for the still bigger U.S. Government deficits which, from the looks of things, we are going to get anyway. What better retort to stubborn objectors than to be able to say, See what wonderful things big deficits did for the prosperity of Europe?

Well, the doctrine is neither factually accurate nor logically persuasive, but because of the differences between U.S. and European bookkeeping its advocates have been able to muddy up the waters. So it's useful now to have one of the leading bankers of West Germany inject some refreshing clarity into the discussion.

Speaking for his own country, Dr. Hermann Abs, managing director of Frankfurt's Deutsche Bank, told the American Bankers Association convention that for the past decade "neither the Federal nor the state budgets were in deficit positions—whatever accounting methods one might apply. On the contrary, there were often surpluses instead, and yet Germany had one of the most outstanding rates of economic growth within Europe between the years 1959 and 1960."

So much for the alleged fact that the Germans did all they did by virtue of virtuous deficits. To what, then, can one attribute West Germany's phenomenal growth record?

Dr. Abs is no simple-minded man in search of a single answer. He notes many contributing factors, from the U.S. aid extended to West German after the war to the restraint exercised by trade unions (refreshing thought there, too) in their demands for higher wages unrelated to productivity. He gives credit, too, to government planning and assistance.

But it was government planning with a difference. A decade ago the German Government granted special depreciation allowances to basic industries for investment purposes. Special tax measures were adopted for industrial concerns, including a substantial reduction in corporation taxes on distributed profits.

Meanwhile, says Dr. Abs, "the credit policy of the Central Bank in those years was extremely conservative and restricted." And he adds that "if there had been deficit spending in Germany at that time, most likely excessive price increases, on all fronts like those in the subsidized building or housing sector, would not have been avoidable."

If this correlation of a "conservative and restricted" money policy with rapid economic growth seems shocking to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, they must be even more stunned by Dr. Abs' account of what happened when Germany did briefly flirt with more liberal policies.

By 1960 Germany had gotten so prosperous it was embarrassing and had brought on the problem of a surplus in its balance of payments. So the Government lowered interest rates, revalued the mark and "instead of slowing down Government spending" increased it to a peak—partly, Dr. Abs suggests, to help the government win an election, a thing not unheard of in this country.

All this was a "fundamental mistake" and the result was a slowdown in the growth rate, a decline in the profit margins of industry with a consequent drop in new investments and new difficulties for German industries in foreign trade.

Dr. Abs said his knowledge was "too limited" to inject himself into the U.S. argument about the virtues of deficit financing. But for Americans less inhibited about their conclusions from the German experience, he did offer the lesson of his own country.

"Deficit spending," he said, "if applied during the period of 1950 to 1960, would have prevented the German economy to grow as it did grow."

We hope the Council of Economic Advisers was listening.

"The United Nations in Crisis: Cuba and the Congo"—An Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Before the 1963 Mid-Atlantic Model General Assembly, Washington, D.C., February 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address by Richard N. Gardner, the able Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, which was delivered before the Mid-Atlantic Model General Assembly held at Washington, D.C., on February 23, 1963.

The text of Mr. Gardner's address follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS IN CRISIS: CUBA AND THE CONGO

I don't know which group causes us the most trouble in Washington these days—the uncritical admirers of the United Nations or the uncritical opponents of the United Nations.

When I say uncritical admirers of the United Nations, I mean those people who are always writing us to say: "Naughty boys—you have bypassed the U.N." They want the United Nations to do everything.

These people remind me of the tribal chief who came to the General Assembly some years ago to complain that the British were oppressing him because they would not let him keep his 100 wives. One veteran U.N. delegate rose in his full dignity and said: "This is not a fit subject for the United Nations. Let this man keep his 100 wives—and let the ravages of nature teach him the error of his ways."

The uncritical opponents of the United Nations are those who are never satisfied no matter what the U.N. does. I have in mind one critic who wrote me 3 months ago to say that the United Nations was a failure because it was too weak to deal with Tshombe. Now he is writing to complain that the U.N. is too strong and has become a "superstate."

Like the uncritical admirers, the uncritical opponents of the U.N. feel under no obligation to base their opinions on facts. As Stephen Leacock said: "It's not what people don't know that causes all the trouble, it's what they do know that ain't so."

We in Washington try to steer a course between these two extremes. We look upon the United Nations in a hard and practical way as a means of promoting our national self-interest. This statement should not shock anyone, because this is the way that other countries look upon the United Nations—as a means of promoting their own national self-interest.

The United Nations is not a substitute for national interest, but rather a place where nations work together to promote their national interests on those matters where they cannot get adequate results by acting alone.

These general observations are familiar to you. Let us test them in two of the great crises of the last year: Cuba and the Congo.

THE CUBAN CRISIS

The Cuban crisis was a particularly eloquent illustration of the U.N.'s threefold value to the United States as a place for debate, negotiation, and action—once the power and determination of the United States and its allies had been demonstrated in the quarantine.

As a place for debate, the United Nations enabled us to build support for our Cuban policy in the most dramatic and effective way. You will all remember what Mr. Zorin said before millions on TV—that the Soviets had no need to put missiles into Cuba and that the U.S. evidence of the missile sites was manufactured by the CIA. We countered by showing pictures of the missile sites in the Security Council. Shortly thereafter Khrushchev admitted the presence of the missiles and agreed to withdraw them.

This public exposure of Soviet duplicity had a tremendous impact in building support for the quarantine and other aspects of our Cuban policy. Even though the Cuban matter was considered in the Security Council, it affected the course of the General Assembly and turned the general opinion of mankind in our favor on a number of other subjects. We could not have achieved this result with anything like such success if we had been obliged to show our pictures and tell our story separately in 109 different countries.

As a place for negotiation, the United Nations was scarcely less important to us. The Secretary-General served as a useful go-between in negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

To begin with he helped avoid an armed clash at sea between the Soviets and ourselves when he proposed that Soviet ships stay clear of our quarantine fleet. If the Soviets needed an out, they could find it in responding to a U.N. appeal, and not admitting publicly they were responding to U.S. power.

As a place for action, the United Nations demonstrated its potential for the future. Khrushchev agreed to U.N. inspection on the spot. He could never have agreed to U.S. inspection. Then Castro refused and branded Communist Cuba as unwilling to cooperate with the world peace organization.

The fact that the United Nations was willing and able to perform the inspection role in Cuba and that this was agreed to between the United States and the Soviet Union had a twofold value: the United Nations demonstrated a potential of considerable importance for the future, and Castro was put in the position of defying not just U.S. inspection but U.N. inspection, thereby leaving inspection to our own resources.

THE CONGO CRISIS

Let us turn now from Cuba to the Congo. Some people still ask: What is the United Nations doing in the Congo and why is the United States supporting it?

To answer this question it is useful to recall the choice that confronted the United States in the Congo in the summer of 1960. The alternatives open to the United States were clear.

We could do nothing—in which case the Congo would wallow in chaos and bloodshed and the Soviet bloc would be free to move in to pick up the remains.

We could intervene directly—and trigger a confrontation in the heart of Africa of the great powers—a confrontation which could lead to another "Spanish civil war" and be the prelude to a wider conflict.

Or we could do what we in fact did—give assistance to the Congo through the United Nations.

I think the judgment of history will be that the use of the United Nations in the Congo was the least dangerous of the three dangerous alternatives confronting the United States and the world at large in the summer of 1960.

Most Americans recognize the merit of these arguments. Yet a number of specific questions about the Congo are still raised.

LEGALITY OF U.N. ACTION IN CONGO

Some people ask: Was the United Nations action in the Congo legal? The answer is yes, for three reasons:

First, the Government of the Congo asked for the United Nations to come in.

Second, the Security Council authorized the U.N. to go in with a mandate to maintain law and order—a mandate which was subsequently expanded into a mandate to prevent civil war, protect the Congo's territorial integrity, and remove the foreign mercenaries.

Third, the military actions of the U.N. force were taken in pursuit of these mandates and in self-defense.

It is well to remember that the recent fighting which culminated in the end of the secession of Katanga began on Christmas eve when drunken Katangese soldiers attacked a U.N. command post. This was the culmination of a long series of harassments of the U.N. soldiers designed to cut them off from one another and from their supplies and communications.

I think it is a generally accepted principle of both domestic and international law that a cop who is lawfully on the beat has a right to defend himself against attack.

As a part of this legal question, there are people who ask: Isn't this intervention in the internal affairs of the Congo? The answer is no again, for at least two reasons:

First, the Congo asked for the U.N. to come in.

Second, this was not an internal matter—there was a clear threat to international peace and security because of the actual or potential involvement of outside powers.

Still other people ask: Doesn't this violate traditional United States support for the principle of self-determination? The answer is no, for at least three reasons:

First, there is no absolute principle of self-determination. We fought a civil war to deny it. We have recognized both at home and abroad the dangers of Balkinization. Suppose the mayor of a Texas town which happened to have most of the oil in Texas decided to secede from the State and take the oil with him. I don't suppose that would be permitted by the people of Texas or by the people of the United States. The application of the principle of self-determination in the Congo without any qualification would mean the creation of some 20 tribal states and the disintegration of the whole into disorder and chaos.

Second, even according to the standards of self-determination, Tshombe could not pretend to speak for the Katanga. As you know, he was the leader of the Lunda tribe, one of several tribes in Katanga. The Lundas are a minority in numbers and occupy less than half of the land area of Katanga. Tshombe is strongly opposed by the Baluba tribe in the north. In the only popular election in Katanga, his party gained only 25 seats in a 60-seat assembly. The parliamentary group which supported him during the last 2 years was a rump parliament lacking full Baluba representation. We may also note that the United Nations forces were greeted with open arms when they entered Jadotville and Kolwezi in the heart of Tshombe's tribal area.

Third, Tshombe was estopped from pleading the principle of self-determination when he agreed to accept a single Congolese state. He did this at the Brussels roundtable conference of January 1960, before the Belgians left. He has done it on numerous occasions since. He did it as recently as last fall when he accepted the conciliation plan of the United Nations.

THE CONGO AND MISSISSIPPI

There are people who will concede all these things but say: "Very well, but where will this United Nations business stop? Isn't the Congo a precedent for the U.N. going into Mississippi?"

The answer is "No" again, for three reasons:

First, we would not ask the United Nations to come into Mississippi.

Second, if others insisted on bringing the U.N. into Mississippi, we could prevent this from getting the necessary votes.

Third, by no stretch of the imagination can the situation in Mississippi be regarded as a threat to international peace and security.

Finally, there are those who are satisfied on these legal and moral questions, but ask: "Wouldn't our national interest have been served better by supporting Tshombe?" The answers is "No" because—

The central government under Adoula is moderate and pro-Western.

Tshombe supporters have been working with the leftists to destroy the central government.

Tshombe had no support in black Africa and very little anywhere else. No country has ever recognized Katanga separatism.

The secession of Katanga under Tshombe would have ended moderate government in the Congo and would have precipitated the disintegration of the country into tribal groupings with maximum opportunity for the Communists to come in.

In short, the efforts of Tshombe to set up a separate regime in Katanga played into the hands of communism.

Now the military phase of the U.N. operation in the Congo has passed. The phase of nation building has begun. A U.S. mission to the Congo under Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, has just returned with proposals for the economic reconstruction of the Congo under U.N. auspices. In the economic tasks ahead for the Congo the United Nations can play a role which no single nation could play alone without compromising Congolese independence and making the Congo a subject of cold war controversy.

U.N. SPECIAL FUND AND CUBA

The moral of this story is not that the United Nations is perfect. Indeed, there are a number of things that are done at the U.N. with which we do not agree. During the last 2 weeks we have had a dramatic illustration of this in the decision of the U.N. Special Fund to proceed—albeit on a tentative basis—with an agricultural research project in Cuba.

This project was approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund in May 1961. It calls for an allocation of $1,157,000 from the Special Fund to assist in the expansion of an agricultural experimental station in Santiago de la Vegas.

The U.S. Government did everything consistent with the U.N. Charter to oppose this project. We oppose any source of aid and comfort to the Castro regime. We argued that special fund assistance to Cuba at this time could not be justified under the economic and technical criteria of the Special Fund's charter, in view of the chaos in Cuban agriculture which has resulted from the application of Communist techniques and the subordination of the economic and social welfare of the Cuban people to the narrow political aims of the Castro regime.

Our arguments, I am sorry to say, did not receive the necessary support in the Governing Council. Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Managing Director of the Fund, concluded that he had no choice but to proceed with the project on a tentative basis. In the next few months he will send several experts to determine whether or not conditions in Cuba will permit the project to proceed and it is possible that the actual operation of the project will not go forward when representatives of the Fund have the opportunity to take an up-to-date reading of conditions on the spot.

The Special Fund project in Cuba is an example of a U.N. action with which we do not agree. But it is well in these matters to keep our eyes on the big picture. The Special Fund, like all U.N. economic agencies, is prohibited by its charter from making decisions on political grounds. The failure of other U.N. members to support us in our opposition to the Cuban project came not out of any solicitude for Cuba but out of the fear that stopping this project would jeopardize other projects to which the Soviet Union and other countries have objected. The special fund has 11 projects totaling $7.5 million in Korea, Vietnam, and free China which the Soviets do not like—and which are being carried out today despite their misgiving.

The fact is that the U.N. Special Fund has been a great asset to the free world through its efforts to promote the material basis for free institutions. Even on the narrowest of political calculations the free world has got more out of the Special Fund than it has put in, while the reverse is true of the Communist bloc.

The bloc countries have contributed some $7 million to the Special Fund; with this project in Cuba added to two previous projects in Poland they will have received $3 million in return. If you add Yugoslavia, Communist contributions add up to $8 million, projects in Communist countries to $6 million. Out of the 288 Special Fund projects so far authorized, 282 have been in non-Communist countries. In financial terms, some $248 million of the grand total of $254 million of Fund projects—over 97 percent—go to the non-Communist world.

It would be tragic if our dissatisfaction with the project in Cuba were to destroy our support for the Special Fund. It would be the height of folly to sacrifice the 97 percent of its work we do like for the 3 percent we do not like. We do not bench a baseball player who is batting .970, nor fire a football coach because he loses one game in thirty.

The price of participating in any political institution is that you cannot get your way all of the time. We cannot expect to get our way all of the time in the United Nations. There will be entries on the debit as well as on the credit side of the ledger. The central question is whether the credits exceed the debits—whether looking at the balance sheet as a whole the institution is making a net contribution to our national interest. The U.S. Government continues to believe that the answer to that question is overwhelmingly in the affirmative.

TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

Let me stress once again, however, that we are not entirely satisfied with the United Nations. We want to make it better.

In specific terms, we want to—

Strengthen the independence of the Secretariat against the attacks of the Soviet Union who have never accepted article 100 in principle or in practice.

Improve the method of financing peacekeeping operations and make defaulting members pay up.

Increase the efficiency of the U.N.'s economic and social work, particularly through more effective coordination of the specialized agencies.

Strengthen the U.N.'s capacity to settle future disputes—first, through preventive diplomacy to keep disputes from erupting into violence and, second, through peacekeeping actions to contain those disputes from widening into a global conflict.

In this last ambition, we must learn from the Congo experience to strengthen the U.N.'s future peacekeeping operations. We must improve the training, supply, financing, intelligence, public relations, and command and control of U.N. military operations.

We want to do these latter things not only for their own sake but as a means of promoting general and complete disarmament. For the fact is that nations will never be willing to eliminate or even radically reduce their arms until they have some substitute means of protecting their territorial integrity and defending their vital interest.

In an age when the Soviet Union and the United States have in their arsenals weapons each of which have the destructive power of all the bombs dropped in the Second World War, in an age when we face the prospect that no matter how many weapons one side might build neither side could escape unimaginable destruction in a nuclear holocaust—in such an age there is no rational alternative but to develop a civilized system of collective security under the aegis of the United Nations.

In Cuba, in the Congo, and elsewhere, the United Nations has acted—in the words of a distinguished commentator—not as a world superstate, but as a world public utility. If it did not exist, it would have to be invented.

GOP Economy Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the first newspaper comments on the Republican appropriations committee task force to reduce the Federal budget is an excellent column by Peter Edson which I wish to include with my remarks.

As Mr. Edson points out, we hope to have the support of economy-minded Members from both sides of the aisle, for we hope that the citizens generally and the Members of Congress are not divided along partisan lines when they view with apprehension the constant increase in Government spending.

The Edson article follows:

GOP ECONOMY DRIVE

(By Peter Edson)

Spearhead for the Republican drive to cut from $10 to $15 billion from President Kennedy's $108 billion budget for next year is Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Canton, Ohio, and other GOP members of the House Appropriations Committee.

Representative Bow and his group will operate under Republican congressional leaders but they will seek support for their budget cutting from economy-minded Democrats. Republicans realize they can't succeed in this operation without Democratic votes. But they played this coalition crisscross game in cutting Truman administration budgets in the 80th Congress and they think they can do it again.

If the Republicans and their Democratic kindred spirits can make major cuts in next year's budget, they believe it will help justify the tax cut both parties want. But the President's tax reform program is left out of the operation.

Maurice Stans, President Eisenhower's last Budget Bureau Director, has done the research job and compiled the figures which will be used as basis for the Republican-planned cuts. Mr. Stans will not take an active part in the operation but stay in the background as an adviser.

During the past month or so he has been commuting from his Los Angeles home to Washington while making an item-by-item and line-by-line analysis of the Kennedy budget.

Cutting the President's request for $108 billion in new obligational authority by from $10 to $15 billion would mean an $83 to $98 billion new obligational authority. The resulting cut in spending for the year beginning next July 1 would be from $4 to $6 billion. This would make an administrative expenditure budget of from $93 to $95 billion in place of the President's $99 billion.

Possible economies suggested by Mr. Stans do not represent an across-the-board percentage cut. Reductions are considered possible for every major item in the budget, however, including even national defense and exploration of our outer space.

While no figures have been given out, it is believed that defense cuts will be sought at a little lower percentage figure than for most of the civilian agencies. For smaller agencies, where cuts of less than $500,000 are considered possible, they are indicated as nominal and no great effort will be made to pare them down.

The space program would definitely be cut back so as to slow down the program and bring it under tighter, more efficient control. The expressed idea is to take the frenzy out of the present crash program. The $40 billion estimated total cost of putting men on the moon would remain. Whether the mission would be accomplished by 1970 or maybe 1975 isn't considered important.

One of the points Republicans are emphasizing in planning these cuts is that they will not result in an austere budget.

Their idea is to stop budget growth for a few years and stabilize expenditures so that the economy can catch up. If this isn't done, Republicans say the budget won't be balanced for years.

They point out that President Eisenhower submitted an $81 billion new obligational authority budget for fiscal 1962. President Kennedy's $108 billion budget for 1964 is a 34-percent increase in 2 years.

"What we need," says one Republican, "is an adding machine on the President's desk so he can keep track of the cost of all the new programs he is asking for."

The Republicans want to stop nonemergency public works and put a moratorium on new projects not essential to security. Government construction—$7 billion in 1962 is estimated at $9 billion for 1964 under the Kennedy budget.

Government civilian employment would be cut back by the GOP economy drive, but it is said this will not endanger national security or public welfare. The idea is to cut the planned 500,000 increase of Government personnel from 2.5 to 2.7 million military and 2.3 to 2.6 million civilians by June 30, 1964.

Cessna's Important Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Cessna Aircraft Co., of Wichita Kans., last week achieved an important milestone in its history when it delivered its 50,000th airplane. It is appropriate that we recognize the achievements of this aircraft company for it has grown into the world's largest manufacturer of business, pleasure and utility aircraft in the true American tradition of free enterprise.

It was Clyde V. Cessna, a farmer-mechanic from Kansas, who founded this company in 1927. Cessna built his first airplane in 1911 and for the next 16 years barnstormed through the Midwest, making constant modifications on his original aircraft during the off seasons.

From this modest beginning, Cessna has grown to its place of prominence in the American aviation industry. Dwane L. Wallace became president and general manager of the company in 1936. Only one other firm in the Nation has had a total production of more than 50,000 aircraft.

In addition to its prominent role in the private plane market, Cessna has made important contributions to the military posture of our Nation. During World War II the United States and Royal Canadian Air Forces purchased 5,402 twin-engine T-50 Bobcats and 750 gliders were built by Cessna at its Hutchinson, Kans., plant for the Normandy invasion.

The Korean war again brought Cessna into manufacture of military products. Today it continues to serve as a parts subcontractor for several of this Nation's major weapons systems. The company's military division is producing the twin-jet T-37, which is the first airplane in which the U.S. Air Force student pilots receive flight training; the O-1E—L-19E—liaison-observation plane, more than 3,300 of which have been delivered to the U.S. Army since 1950; and the transporter-erector container for the Minuteman missile.

The Cessna story exemplifies the strength of the free enterprise system in America. It is a story of determined and aggressive effort by both management and employees working together. Hard work and perseverance have resulted in Cessna's prominence in the aircraft industry.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Evening Eagle & Beacon published February 25, 1963:

CESSNA'S IMPORTANT MILESTONE

Behind the announcement that Cessna Aircraft Co., will deliver its 50,000th airplane today is a story of remarkable achievement over the years by a few men who per-

sisted with their business dreams even when prospects for success were dim.

In 1931 business conditions were bad, for airplane makers as well as everybody else. Clyde Cessna's company was only 4 years old when it had to close its doors; but through 1931, 1932, and 1933 the pioneer Wichita airplane builder and his son, Eldon, talked stockholders into keeping their plant so it could open again when conditions permitted. For a time gliders were built, along with a few experimental planes.

In the mid-1930's, when Dwane Wallace took over ownership and management, the company began its long, uphill climb. By World War II it was ready to perform in a major way for the U.S. war effort, turning out 5,402 T-50 Bobcat twin-engine trainers for the Army Air Corps.

Again, after war production ceased, the future looked dark. From $70 million in sales in 1943 (all military), the company's sales fell to $6 million in 1946. So, the company turned to other products, particularly furniture.

But perseverance and hard work kept the company going when others were giving up, and by 1952 the furniture production could be halted, for military and civilian aircraft production again was picking up. Since then, the climb has been steadily upward, until now Cessna is the world's largest producer of aircraft.

Wichitans salute Cessna and Dwane Wallace and all the stockholders and 5,000-plus employees who have reached an important milestone on this day.

Noted Scientist Dr. von Karman Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently awarded the new U.S. National Science Medal to Theodore von Karman. Dr. von Karman is a great scientist and one of our most useful citizens. His aerodynamic theories have meant much to the progress of aviation and space exploration. He is particularly revered at Arnold Engineering Development Center, which is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and which is one of the Nation's major aerodynamic research centers. Dr. von Karman has contributed much to scientific research at this important Center of the U.S. Air Force. In fact, the Air Force has designated one of its important test facilities as the Von Karman Test Chamber at Arnold Center in Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor in a recent editorial has praised Dr. von Karman for his outstanding work and congratulates him on his receipt of the National Science Medal. I join in congratulating Dr. von Karman and under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

VON KARMAN SETS A STANDARD

We congratulate Theodore von Karman on receipt of the U.S. new National Science Medal.

Yet, in so doing, we also realize that it is he who lends honor and stature to the award by becoming its first recipient.

The Hungarian-born, naturalized American citizen ranks among the scientific giants of our time. His aerodynamic theories are fundamental to the air age.

As President Kennedy aptly observed in making the award, there is "no one else who so completely represents all areas involved in this medal—science, engineering, and education."

Authorized by Congress in 1959, up to 20 such medals a year can be granted to bestow national honor for outstanding scientific achievement. We are glad to see this channel for recognition begin to be used.

In selecting the much-honored aerodynamicist as the first medalist, the President has marked the award as one of great distinction. Future medalists, even though they may not have the long-established fame of a Von Karman, will know that the standard of achievement for which they are honored is high.

With this precedent established, the White House now should quickly seek out others deserving of the award whether they already have some formal professional recognition or not.

Vigorous yet tasteful use of the authority to grant a number of medals each year would do much to encourage a high level of American scientific endeavor.

District of Columbia Schools and Their Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday edition of the Washington Post editorialized on the condition of the public schools in the District of Columbia. I wish to commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SHAME! SHAME! SHAME!

Washington now has before it a full, focused picture of its public schools. The picture is presented in Superintendent Carl Hansen's latest report: "Our Schools and Their Prospects." It is a picture which can be looked at only with bitter shame and consternation and dismay.

The report convicts this community of calious neglect of its children. There is not a category in which the schools are not inadequate to the children's needs. The report is prickly with damning statistics. Forty percent of the elementary school buildings in the system are more than half a century old. Three out of four elementary schoolchildren are in buildings taxed beyond their efficient capacity. There are now 2,648 students on double shifts. More than two-thirds of the elementary students are in classes with more than 30 students, 19,566 in classes of 35 or more. A third of the system's teachers are temporary—that is, not fully qualified. Counselors, clerical help, librarians, psychiatrists, special classroom teachers are tragically lacking throughout the system.

If such conditions were disclosed in any self-governing community, the elected school board responsible for them would be thrown out of office at the next election. But the school board here is not responsible for them. Neither is the superintendent. He has pointed time and time again to the desperate needs of the school system. And the school board has given him support. The District Commissioners, it is fair to say, have done what little they can to help. But the truth is they are all helpless.

The blame for the current situation must be laid at the door of a Congress which refused to let the District of Columbia cope with its own problems and refuses at the same time to deal with those problems effectively. Members of the Congress, largely indifferent to District affairs, have allowed the children of this community to be despoiled and cheated—have allowed the House District Committee to treat these children as pawns in a wicked game designed to prove that desegregation cannot succeed.

The evils, inequities, and inadequacies of the District schools are breeding juvenile delinquency and racial strife and social decay. To discuss local school problems in terms of whether to administer corporal punishment to the victims of these problems is to waste time on an irrelevancy.

The schools are producing troubled children far faster than the rod or whip can subdue them. By withholding from children in desperate need the healing help which modern understanding of childhood could provide, by denying to children from wretchedly deprived homes the kind of teaching that could foster their native gifts, by threatening to crush instead of assuage a rebelliousness the children themselves cannot understand, against conditions they had no share in creating, by offering hostility where only kindness can avail, Washington is generating its own destruction as a community.

The children in Washington's schools are Washington's children. Washington is responsible for them. If they are delinquent, it is the community's delinquency that has helped to make them so. Let us stop trying to punish them for our sins and let us begin instead to demand for them their birthright as Americans.

William Attwood, Ambassador to Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is fortunate in having William Attwood as its Ambassador to Guinea. Guinea, part of Franch speaking Africa, is a young country. It has had its share of troubles, as any vibrant, new nation does, but it has met those difficulties sensibly and courageously.

The Communists early mounted a drive in Guinea, and for awhile the new government and the forces of moderation in Guinea were in peril. But the Soviets overplayed their hand. Their Communist front runners unmasked themselves and revealed that you don't get Soviet aid without Soviet Communist rule. The Communists underestimated the intelligence of the people of Guinea, and they underestimated the

toughness and effectiveness of Ambassador William Attwood.

Ambassador Attwood, fluent in French and long accustomed to living in other lands, has toured every inch of Guinea and has won the country's admiration and respect. The Ambassador's lovely wife, Sim, is equally an effective force for the United State in Guinea. She has sacrificed much and undergone hardship. Life in Guinea is not easy, but she stays at her husband's side to share his burdens, and to ease the burdens of a new and proud nation whose main contact with the United States is the Attwoods. Bill Attwood contracted a bad case of polio while on duty in Guinea. He and Sim together fought it down, and went back to work.

Recently Ralph McGill wrote a piece in the Washington Star about the Attwoods. He was impressed with their dedicated work, and well he might have been. "Thanks to the Attwoods," writes Ralph McGill, "the hundreds of almost inaccessible villages of Guinea have been visited and have seen the American flag flying from the Ambassador's jeep."

A few years ago, before his present assignment, Bill Attwood, after years of traveling and living abroad as a foreign correspondent, wrote a book about the United States of America entitled "Still the Most Exciting Country." The title speaks for itself. It is their love for America that propels Bill and Sim Attwood to do what they do for Guinea. With the permission of the House I am including Ralph McGill's article in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST AID AT THE U.S. EMBASSY

(By Ralph McGill)

CONAKRY, GUINEA.—It was just after breakfast that a tall, solemn African with a big-eyed, attractive little girl came to the terrace of the home of U.S. Ambassador William Atwood. He spoke politely in French. The tiny, slender girl, of about 5 years, took us all in with her somewhat fearful eyes.

She had, it developed, two badly infected ears. They had been pierced for rings, and a dirty string had been looped through each. Infection followed. Her ears were swollen about the lobes and pus pockets had formed behind each. The father knew that the Ambassador's wife did volunteer work at the hospital. He had brought his young daughter.

Mrs. Atwood went to her quickly, spoke to her, and sat her on a bench on the terrace. She then went into the house and returned with cotton, a bottle of antiseptic wash, and some antibiotic salve. The child sat quietly, her eyes large with apprehension of pain, while the Ambassador's wife carefully cleaned the infected areas, drained the pus from the boil-like swellings, and after another gentle but thorough antiseptic cleansing, applied the antibiotic salve. The father was then informed that when the ears of any other children were pierced, only strings which had been soaked in alcohol should be used to keep them opened, and that the piercing instrument also should be dipped in it. He thanked her, took the little girl's hand and walked away. The next morning she was back. The ears were much better. They got careful dressing.

Two days each week Mrs. Atwood and Mrs. Eugene Abrams, wife of the Embassy development officer, work as volunteer aids in the Conakry hospital. They help deliver babies, scrub beds, patients, and do all work usually done by hospital aids. The Ambassador and the staff are popular and respected because they have earned it. It is relatively a small group, and to me it seems overworked. But it is dedicated and makes intelligent, understanding contact with the life of Guineans.

The Ambassador has traveled over most of the country, visiting where no automobiles have been. The roads traveled are often mere tracks between which grasses and weeds grow as high as the car itself. It is necessary to carry food and sleeping bags along. But the hundreds of villages have been visited and have seen the American flag flying from the Ambassador's jeep. They are a friendly pepole, eager to learn, and appreciative of respect and understanding.

Communication and education are imperative problems. But here everything is a necessity. This is more ironic because Guinea potentially is one of the richest countries in Africa. It has one-third of the world's known reserves of high grade bauxite. Many of its mountains are heavy with iron ore. Along the beaches are huge deposits of volcanic-looking stone. Much of it seems to be almost pure iron.

But Guinea was perhaps the most neglected of the French colonies. Certainly this was true of education, roads and communications. The Soviet bloc has been busy, hoping to make a satellite of Guinea because of her desperate need for almost everything. But while Soviet aid still is being accepted, its barter aspects are hurting the economy and doing damage to the balance of trade. Other nations also are giving aid. That of the United States is relatively small, but has a high degree of sincerity and grassroots help. Here almost everything that is done seems a drop in the bucket. But drops can fill buckets. Nowhere is United States aid getting so much for its dollars as in Africa—and especially in Guinea.

Intelligent Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important editorial which appeared in the western edition of the New York Times on February 25, 1963. The editorial points out the pressing need for a joint congressional watchdog committee on intelligence. Since the Cuban crisis last October the desirability of such a committee has become increasingly apparent. I have reintroduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 145, which would establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. The New York Times editorial provides excellent arguments for the passage of this measure this session.

The editorial follows:

INTELLIGENT INTELLIGENCE

The adequacy of the Nation's intelligence services is again being scrutinized by Congress, as a byproduct of the continuing Cuban crisis. The inquiry of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, coincides by chance with the publication of an article by Allen Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in which Mr. Dulles takes his familiar stand against any further congressional controls over the Agency.

We think—as we have often said before—that Mr. Dulles is mistaken in this stand. The establishment of a carefully selected joint congressional watchdog committee on intelligence whose functions would approximate those of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, would provide important control over activities that are rooted in secrecy and conducted without benefit of the normal restraints and restrictions of democratic government.

Intelligence is a cornerstone upon which effective policy must be built. But intelligence agencies should not, themselves make policy, as they have sometimes done in the past. And the power they wield, which derives primarily from secrecy, is so great that it must be effectively monitored.

Such a joint committee should not be limited to supervision of the CIA alone. It should supervise the entire intelligence community for adequacy, effectiveness, and abuse. This control is all the more important now, since there are glaring gaps—for which no responsibility has been publicly assessed—in the intelligence picture presented to the Nation for last September and early October, when the Russian missile emplacement program in Cuba was at its height.

It is particularly important to weigh the effects on American intelligence capabilities of the recent enforced merger in the Pentagon of the three service agencies into a monolithic Defense Intelligence Agency. Senator STENNIS' committee will presumably find out whether this merger impaired intelligence collection or, even worse, facilitated the distortion of intelligence by top policymakers so that their evaluation of intelligence would accord with their preconceived policy. A joint congressional committee on intelligence, composed of carefully selected members of both parties and both Houses, would provide a continuing examination and control of all intelligence facilities, something that recent history shows is badly needed.

White House To Lose Humor and Buoyancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, of whom I am especially proud, is Miss Letitia Baldrige, Secretary to Mrs. John F. Kennedy. It is no secret that "Tish" Baldrige has done one of the most remarkable jobs in Washington, filling a demanding post with diplomacy, skill, and effectiveness. She has brought both beauty and brains to her job and has been a credit to the White House, to New York City, and to the congressional district from which she comes.

Recently, Miss Baldrige's resignation as secretary to the First Lady was announced simultaneously with her appointment as an executive of the Chicago Merchandise Mart. She will bring the same distinction to this position as she has to all others.

I am pleased also that Miss Baldrige will be succeeded in her White House

position by another constituent of mine—Miss Nancy Tuckerman. Miss Tuckerman is a splendid choice. Her appointment promises that the high standards set by Miss Baldrige will be maintained. Miss Tuckerman also brings brains and beauty to the job and will be a diplomatic and highly competent assistant.

Two fine articles about the Misses Baldrige and Tuckerman, written by Betty Beale and Daisy Cleland, recently appeared in the Evening Star. With the Speaker's permission I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure that my colleagues join me in wishing both of these ladies success and happiness in their new endeavors:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE TO LOSE HUMOR AND BUOYANCY

(By Betty Beale)

No resignation of any White House personnel within the memory of this writer has caused the general gloom that "Tish" Baldridge's has. Few people in the political picture have ever been as popular as Mrs. Kennedy's social secretary.

Comments of sincere regret over her forthcoming departure were made by everybody from high ranking administration officials and other White House personnel to diplomats, men and women in the press corps, and dozens of people in Washington society.

Said the wife of an ambassador when she heard the news, "Can this be true? I am distressed to hear it."

Said a newswoman, "When her appointment was first announced I looked forward to her gaiety and charm and to those beautiful table settings she did so well for Tiffany, and she lived up to her advance billing. A great deal of humor and buoyancy is going out of the White House."

Said another, "No matter how mad I might get at the White House, it melted away when I saw 'Tish.' "

Said a very high official, "She's one of the best things that ever happened to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue."

As for her reasons for leaving the most glamorous residence in America, "Tish" said, "I have been a social secretary for 9 years and this is a step forward, and also a chance to get back into the international field which has always been my love. I was going off to Italy in January, 1961, to open my own public relations firm when Mrs. Kennedy offered me this job." Intimate friends believe that she made the decision at least 2 months ago.

She will have an executive job with Chicago's Merchandise Mart, which is owned by Joseph P. Kennedy, and "will travel abroad all the time," she said. It will give her a chance to use her languages. About the only chance she has now, chuckled Tish, is when she's talking to the chef.

She will move to Chicago, "But I will always come back here," she said, "I really love Washington and everybody in it."

It's mutual.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 21, 1963]

"TISH" BALDRIGE IS LEAVING JOB

(By Daisy Cleland)

Letitia Baldrige, social secretary to Mrs. John F. Kennedy, is leaving her White House job as of the end of May.

Miss Baldrige, who will take an executive position in the Chicago Merchandise Mart complex, owned by Joseph P. Kennedy, the President's father, came in with the New Frontier.

While she has been considered an excellent social secretary to the White House and one who has masterminded social events more glamorous and imaginative than ever produced by a President and First Lady, it has been questioned for the past several months whether there has been friction between "Tish" Baldrige and some of the "palace guard."

Miss Baldrige came to the White House as a "natural" for the Kennedy ideas and expectations.

SAME SCHOOLS

She went to Miss Porter's School in Farmington, Conn., with Mrs. Kennedy (although 2 years ahead); she was on hand at Vassar when the First Lady began her college career, and later when the former Jacqueline Bouvier was studying in France, Miss Baldrige had started her career as social secretary to Mrs. David Bruce, whose husband was then U.S. Ambassador to France.

In addition, Miss Baldrige was personal and social secretary to Clare Boothe Luce when she was our Ambassador to Rome. She knows languages, menus, has humor and got a written tribute from the brilliant Mrs. Luce who said "I will never think of the villa (our Embassy in Rome) without thinking, with love and admiration of you, and of the dear contribution you made to my happiness, comfort and success in Rome."

SUCCESSOR PICKED

The replacement for Miss Baldrige is Miss Nancy Tuckerman, of New York.

Miss Tuckerman's background again blends with Mrs. Kennedy.

Both attended the Chapin School in New York and were roommates at Miss Porter's school. Both "came out" in 1947, were friends at East Hampton, Long Island, and each likes travel abroad.

Miss Tuckerman is reported to be "the short member of the family, with ash blond hair, huge blue eyes, tremendous chic, and a shy manner." She said in New York last night she was "surprised, interested, and excited" about the new job, and then added "I really don't particularly know how to run dinners or answer letters."

Mrs. Kennedy's former schoolmate was obviously picked for the job by the First Lady and with an extra pat on the back from Tish Baldrige.

Miss Tuckerman was invited to a White House state dinner one night and then a "job conference" the next morning.

She attended the dinner given by President and Mrs. Kennedy on January 21 in honor of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Chief Justice of the United States and their wives. The following morning she was picked up, by prearrangement, at the residence of her aunt and uncle, for an interview with Mrs. Kennedy which was followed by an offer of the job. On the White House dinner list for the evening before she was merely listed as "Miss Nancy Tuckerman, New York, school friend." Her name was 80th on the list.

Mrs. Jerauld Wright, wife of Admiral Wright, described her duties as an aunt when Nancy went off to the state dinner.

"She went off to the White House with her Uncle Jerry driving and with a borrowed piece of jewelry and small mink from me. We woke her early for her trip back to the White House the next morning and then she came back with something to mull over."

Miss Tuckerman is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Roger Tuckerman, of Farmington, and the granddaughter of Mrs. Phillips Thompson of Farmington. Her older sister is Mrs. John Gay, of Tuxedo Park, N.Y., and her brother, Roger Wolcott Tuckerman, who lives in New York, is married to Caryn Ryan, who once lived here. The latter's parents are the late Clendenin Ryan and Mrs. Ryan, who lives in New York. She is also distantly related to the Walter Tuckerman family, well-known in Washintgon social circles.

"Tish" Baldridge, the author of a best seller written about her days with Mrs. Luce in Rome, was first named as Mrs. Kennedy's press secretary and she held a gay free-for-all press conference that few newswomen will forget.

Not only did she state she was sure Mrs. Kennedy's love of art might permit hanging paintings over paintings to be sure the modern school was represented, but she added in discussing the entertaining of club women the phrase of "vast hordes of women" and then changed the wordage with a grin to "I mean, large groups of interesting ladies."

SIDETRACKED FROM PRESS

Apparently the ease and humor of "Tish" was a fear for the Kennedys and their dealings with the press. The young woman, who knows so much about protocol, was cut off from the press.

In her role she has produced "stages" that the White House will find hard to come by—a dinner at Mount Vernon, complete with five courses and a symphony orchestra; a dinner with Nobel Prize winners where the President could state that there had never been so much talent and brilliance under the White House roof at one time since a night there when "Thomas Jefferson dined alone."

Miss Tuckerman states that it will be "exciting and interesting to work with her (Mrs. Kennedy), but I wish I had written 'Roman Candle'."

A Police State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, at the rate we are going, someday in the near future, I could be seized and flown away without bond, bail, or contact with relatives, for placing this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We must take special care in our great crusade for freedom and justice for all people that we do not trample justice into the dust. Likewise, while fighting Communist totalitarianism in the world, let us make sure we do not adopt Gestapo and totalitarian tactics here at home.

I commend to the attention of the Congress the excellent and timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 24, 1963:

GENERAL WALKER CLEARED

The Department of Justice appears to have reached the end of the road in its attempt to prosecute former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker in connection with last year's riot at the University of Mississippi.

This has been a strange business. After his appearance on the campus during the riot, in the course of which he made a disputed speech, General Walker was charged with insurrection, seditious conspiracy, conspiracy to impede and injure officers of the United States, and with assaulting, resisting and impeding officers. It sounded pretty serious—and for a time it was.

After being assured he would be released upon posting $100,000 bond, an excessive sum, General Walker was flown from Mis-

sissippi to a Federal prison hospital in Missouri. When he got there, he learned for the first time that he was to be held for mental examination for a period of from 60 to 90 days, and that he would not be released on bond.

This stemmed from a decision in Washington, presumably in the Department of Justice. A prison psychiatrist in the Nation's Capital forwarded a flimsy affidavit to the U.S. Attorney in Mississippi, who in turn presented it to a Federal judge. The latter thereupon signed an order directing that General Walker be held for examination to determine whether he was mentally competent to stand trial. Thus, a man who had been assured in Mississippi that he would be eligible for bond in Missouri found himself, instead, in a mental institution—and this on the basis of a statement by a psychiatrist who had never examined him and a ruling by a Federal judge who had never seen him.

In this situation, there would have been little hope for a man without friends or means. General Walker, however, was able to obtain a writ of habeas corpus and then post his bond, which had been reduced to $50,000.

In due course he was returned to Mississippi and found competent to stand trial by the same judge who had committed him. Incidentally, this judge, who had not seen General Walker prior to the commitment, said his observation of the man at the subsequent sanity hearing convinced him he was competent to stand trial—which, of course, he was.

The next step was for the Government to present the charges and its evidence to a Federal grand jury. The jurors refused to return any indictment against the former general, and now the charges have been dropped.

Unless new evidence should be turned up, this, we suppose, ends the case against General Walker. But he can consider himself lucky. He could be just getting out of, or even still be confined in, a Federal mental hospital. And this on the basis of something a Government psychiatrist had read in the newspapers and deduced from certain unidentified sources.

Protest Elimination of High School ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Defense Department to discontinue the high school ROTC program is of deep concern to me, and it is difficult to understand why the Department feels we should abandon a program that has been so effective from the standpoint of military leadership, sound citizenship and devotion to country.

In urging the continuation of this program, I speak from firsthand information concerning the outstanding work at the Gloucester High School in Gloucester, Mass. And to quote from an editorial in the Gloucester Times of Monday, February 11, 1963:

So smoothly has the ROTC functioned that in many ways it has been a department of the school. In addition to military science classes and drill periods, it has taught manners, provided community services and if it ends, it will leave gaps in the school program and in the community. Without professional soldiers as instructors the Gloucester cadet unit won't be the same. Gloucester has had excellent professors of military science—officers and gentlemen. They were active in the whole school program as well as in performing military duties.

The reasons in favor of continuing the high school ROTC program and rejecting the Pentagon proposal are persuasively and pointedly expressed in a recent statement, released to the press by Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Commander Gentry, who is well known to many Members of Congress, is nationally recognized for his efforts to further the cause of good citizenship, particularly on the part of our Nation's youth on whom so much will depend in future years.

This statement with the enclosed letter by Commander Gentry to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, constitutes another of the many examples of the constructive work the Veterans of Foreign Wars, under the leadership of Commander Gentry, is doing in strengthening our Nation.

The views of Commander Gentry reflect a deep understanding of the need for continuing the high school ROTC training program and his thoughts constitute a persuasive rebuttal to the Pentagon's plans to scuttle this time-proven and necessary program, which has done so much in helping make better citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the press release which includes the letter from VFW Commander in Chief Byron B. Gentry to Secretary of Defense McNamara.

The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Byron B. Gentry of Pasadena, Calif., today protested plans for discontinuing high school ROTC training.

"The Pentagon decision to eliminate high school ROTC training is a move in the wrong direction," Commander Gentry said. "The VFW believes that the program should be expanded rather than eliminated. At a time when there are so many divisive influences on our young men of high school age, at a time when it is so vitally necessary to instill a sense of responsibility in our youth, and particularly when such vast sums are being spent throughout the United States to combat juvenile delinquency and to help our young people become good citizens, it doesn't make sense that the long-established ROTC system in the high schools should be swept away."

Referring to the argument that the system provides for only a relatively small number of high school students, Commander Gentry emphasized that "Just because the system is small is no reason for it to be destroyed. There is a need for the high school ROTC and it should be expanded greatly. The cost of the system," Commander Gentry said, "is, according to the Pentagon, about $5 million a year. While this is, of course, a large amount of money, it is, in terms of the national budget, extremely small—about the cost of one medium-sized fizzle at Cape Canaveral. The high school ROTC system, even in its restricted size today, helps make good citizens. This is something we need more of, not less."

Concluding, Commander Gentry said, "The VFW urges that the Department of Defense cancel its plan to eliminate the high school ROTC system. Accordingly, I have, on behalf of the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, sent the following letter to the Secretary of Defense:

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The purpose of this letter is to inform you, on behalf of the 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans comprising the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of our deep concern over the announcement of plans to terminate the high school ROTC system. The VFW recognizes that the system is of relatively small scope, but we also recognize that the principle of the system is right in that it contributes to better citizenship. This the VFW believes to be of transcendant importance, particularly in these times when our young people of high school age are exposed to so many unfavorable influences.

It is the firm conviction of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the high school ROTC program should be expanded on a national scale. Consequently, its elimination is a serious step in the wrong direction.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is not unmindful of the need for reasonable economy in government. But we have long held that the citizens of our Nation will gladly assume whatever financial burden is necessary to make our Nation strong in these perilous times. Accordingly, the VFW does not consider that the current cost of the high school ROTC system, reportedly about $5 million, justifies its elimination. Such an expenditure, rather, is an investment in citizenship and a strong America.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars respectfully urges cancellation of the announced plans to terminate the high school ROTC system.

Sincerely,

BYRON B. GENTRY,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Statement by Hon. Jacob H. Gilbert, 22d District of New York, Before Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Education and Labor, concerning the important subject of assistance to the youth of our Nation:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak on a subject which is of vast importance and which should be of great concern to all of us—assistance to the youth of our Nation.

My bill, H.R. 2396, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps is before you for consideration. May I say at the outset, that I am also heartily in favor of another bill before you, based upon the President's recommendations, to provide jobs for youths in the city as well as in the countryside, the Youth Employment Act.

It is a tragic fact that there is a lost generation growing up in our great country with no skills and little hope; that there are about 700,000 young people looking for

jobs; jobs are unavailable to them; a high percentage are school dropouts, who need the opportunity to work if they are to be saved from a life of delinquency and crime.

Mobilization for Youth on New York's Lower East Side, which operates under grants from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, is probably one of the most far-reaching programs to help school dropouts and other problem youths; it has proved conclusively that youths want to work; that they prefer employment to idleness and the evils created by idleness; they need to feel useful and wanted.

The Youth Conservation Corps has aroused great interest among school and youth officials and the youth of our Nation; it would put young men to work in our National and State forests, tackling the $8 billion backlog of needed conservation work. Ten hours' weekly training and basic educational skills would be provided, and the complex tools and equipment the young men would use in their work would provide them with many skills needed in industry today.

The number of school dropouts, in urban and rural areas both, has reached tremendous proportions. Communities cannot meet the problems alone; the fullest Federal assistance possible is required if we are to meet the problem in a constructive manner and if we are to develop and conserve the human resources represented by the army of young people now denied employment and usefulness. Many thousands of young people exist under terrible conditions in the slums of our cities; many belong to minority groups and suffer from discrimination and lack of job opportunities; they live without hope and their futures are bleak. Certainly, these countless young people are to be given a helping hand and hope for a brighter future, the gratification brought by employment, and the opportunity to take their places as working, respected, members of their communities To take a boy out of an atmosphere of defeat and slum existence and to place him under the guidance of people who care about him, is to provide him with hope and incentive.

It was recently pointed out in hearings on this question that the $100 million annual cost of the program advocated by the President amounted to only what our Nation spends on defense in a matter of hours. To what avail is it to create for ourselves the strongest nation in the world, from a military standpoint, when we permit our very foundations to crumble—for the future strength of our Nation is truly dependent upon our youth; our young people are our future. No money must be spared, no efforts curtailed in what must be our aim now—to help and save our young people from idleness and feelings of rejection and futility, to assist them along the path of industrious living and good citizenship, to give them pride in their heritage as citizens of our great Nation.

The duty of this Congress is clear and I urge your committee to take favorable action without delay, so that the Congress can enact this greatly needed and important measure and work can go forward under the programs provided, as soon as possible.

The People and the Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to all of us in the Congress and I understand the facts of life are beginning to sink in at the White House, that the public is not responding favorably to the tax cuts and reform package submitted by the administration, especially when they relate it to the $12 billion deficit and another increase in the national debt.

The Chicago Sun-Times discusses the reaction of the people of the United States to the tax cut in a very profound editorial on Wednesday, February 27, which under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD.

The conclusion reached by this editorial is that the peoples' opinion basically reflects an unwillingness to accept a tax cut while spending is increased and a rising debt encouraged. I certainly hope the Members of Congress have their ear to the subject and appreciate, and I hope agree with the commonsense of the American people.

The editorial follows:

THE PEOPLE AND THE TAX CUT

The returns are in from the grassroots and President Kennedy finds himself arguing for his tax cut scheme before an American electorate that is unconvinced, unsympathetic or downright hostile toward the plan. He has satisfied neither the business community nor labor; his plan for tax reform has caused apprehension among charitable and educational institutions as well as homeowners paying off mortgages. And there is a fundamental objection over which a large part of the citizenry broods—the Government should not cut taxes when it can't pay its bills with current tax collections.

This was the background for Mr. Kennedy's defensive appearance Monday before the American Bankers' Association symposium in Washington. He again argued that his tax cut plan was needed to ward off recession; he challenged his critics to come up with a better plan; he backed away from that part of his own plan calling for tax reforms saying he'd give it up if Congress would vote for $10 billion in tax cuts.

So the picture comes into focus. Mr. Kennedy wants more than anything else—more than long overdue changes in the tax laws to make them fairer and simpler or to encourage investment to create more jobs—a distribution of money, especially to those in the lower income groups, through a cut in taxes. He insists that this will spur the economy, ward off recession, eventually increase Government tax collections and thus some time in the future bring the Government budget back into balance. Meantime, he promises to keep the budget as low as possible, but new White House spending plans keep going up to Capitol Hill.

Mr. Kennedy appears to be relying more on charism than on economics in making his case. If his panacea was as sound and as sure as he wants the Nation to believe, there would certainly be a real groundswell of public support for it, led by men of knowledge and experience in national finances. But there is no such groundswell. Mr. Kennedy is reduced to arguing that unless he gets his way a recession will result. Part of this argument is based on the fact that the American economy is not growing fast enough—it's growing slower percentagewise than Europe's. Another speaker before the bankers' symposium examined this argument.

Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund, pointed out that Europe started at a low point with a war-damaged economy; it had an enormous pentup demand. This, combined with a "willingness of labor to work hard"—increasing productivity faster than wage costs—gave Europe a fast rate of growth. Moreover, he said, those nations that had highest growth rates recognized that "the main task of monetary policy in this period has been to restrain inflationary pressures." They relied neither on deficit spending nor easy money.

Mr. Kennedy urgues for deficit spending. He says that this country must retain prosperity by going deeper into debt. He argues that a few dollars more in every one's pocket will keep the economy moving ahead and solve all present and future problems. The American people simply find this hard to believe. Most of them, we suspect, believe the Government ought to reduce its expenses if it feels a need to cut taxes.

If Federal spending is not reduced, what should the Government do about taxes? A survey of its readers taken by the Tucson Daily Citizen brought this result:

Leave taxes as they are: 48 percent.

Cut them in an effort to stimulate the economy: 17 percent.

Increase them to avoid a deficit, providing the increase doesn't exceed 5 percent: 29 percent.

Admittedly this is not a scientific survey and the people polled are not economists. But it represents plain people's opinion. They cannot reconcile cutting income while going deeper in debt. If this be a puritan ethic, so be it.

The Dangers of Increased Imports of Residual Fuel Oil and Increased Imports Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, imports of residual fuel oil into the United States have increased greatly. This has resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of income. Increasing imports have been a contributing factor in creating numerous areas of unemployment throughout the coal and oil producing sectors of the Nation.

Not only have the imports of all forms of residual fuel oil increased, but also, the quotas have been raised several times on imports of residual fuel oil used only for fuel which have been under mandatory import control by quota since April 1, 1959—except for amounts withdrawn from bonded warehouses for ship supplies or for export. In addition, overland imports from Canada and Mexico are exempt from control.

Imports of all types of residual fuel oil rose from 36.5 million barrels in 1944 to 182 million barrels in 1958, and, in spite of import quotas, under the mandatory control program, inaugurated in 1959, the import of 232.9 million barrels of residual oil in 1961 represents an increase of 50.9 million barrels over 1958.

Total imports and import quotas are still zooming upward. This has recently been sharply brought to notice, because on January 30, 1963, quotas were increased to allow imports of an additional 6.5 million barrels before March 30, 1963.

Import quotas have been changed several times. They have risen, for example, from 343,347 barrels per day for the period from April 1–June 30, 1959,

to 507,497 barrels daily from April 1, 1962 to January 30, 1963, and to 525,408 barrels a day as announced January 30, 1963, by the Oil Import Administration. The press release inferred that the additional 18,011 barrels daily could be retroactive back to April 1, 1962.

Reportedly, it has been calculated that the increase in the quota from 154 million barrels in 1960 to an estimated 190 million barrels per year via the recent quota rise will permit an increase of 36 million barrels of imports annually which in itself is equal, for example, to the displacement of 8.3 million tons of coal, and loss of the equivalent of 3,300 coal miner's jobs.

On February 13, 1963, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning recommended that in the interest of national security and the attainment of Western Hemisphere objectives there should be a relaxation of controls on residual fuel oil imports. Some individuals and organizations have vigorously disagreed with that recommendation, stressing, among other things, that healthy industries, and greater job security in the United States are more vital national security considerations. Furthermore, these criticisms emphasize that we should not take lightly, or ignore, the omnious threats of Communist takeover of governments or the sabotage of industries in Central and South America from which we import 90 percent of our residual fuel oil.

It is high time we considered seriously the rising tide of residual fuel oil imports and their effects on our national security here at home, and the maintenance of our free economy and the economic and social well-being of our people.

Our Constitution—Citadel of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me today to call to the attention of my colleagues an award-winning essay on the Constitution by my constituent, Dennis I. Sweet, an 11th grade student at John Muir High School in Pasadena, Calif. The Pasadena Unit of Pro-America, sponsor of the essay contest, states that Dennis, with his composition, has presented their organization a superlative 13th birthday present. I agree.

The essay follows:

OUR CONSTITUTION: CITADEL OF FREEDOM

The architects of our Government, our forefathers, cemented the building blocks of the lessons of history with the mortar of reason to erect a monument to freedom and the dignity of man. This, of course, is our Federal Constitution.

But is it really a citadel, an impregnable fortress which casts its encompassing shadow over the destiny of our land? I think not. To me our Constitution is a beacon light, a lighthouse destined to guide our Nation past the shoals of despotism and anarchy.

This guiding factor of the Constitution is readily evident in the study of the document. A masterpiece of simplicity, the Constitution is more remarkable for what it does not say than what it outlines. The framers created a document flexible enough to avoid constant change, and yet resolute enough so as to form a lasting monument to the ideals of freedom and liberty.

The simplicity of the document is the principal reason for its flexibility—and hence its endurance. The Constitution is not primarily concerned with elaborating the numerous powers, duties and intricacies of government; it is concerned, however, with limiting that government. The reason for this is close at hand. It is no further, in fact, than the very history which created our Nation. This was the struggle between despotism and the rights of man.

The lesson of that history is this: Throughout the annals of time, government has proved the instrument for thwarting the liberties of man. This is because government gives certain men the power to regulate the lives of others. The most important lesson of history is that power, no matter how small at first, has a corrupting influence on man. The history of every dictatorship has been the story of how a little power made the despot hungry for more.

The framers of the Constitution certainly learned that lesson. Not only were they students of history, they were victims of it. Our very existence as a nation was a result of the concentration of too much power in a single authority. This, then, is essentially what the Constitution is: "a system of restraints against the natural tendency of government to expand in the direction of absolutism."

The main points of the Constitution are simple elaborations on this theme. First there is the careful limitation of the Federal Government's power to specific, delegated duties. This essentially limits our Government to the legitimate functions of maintaining order, providing for defense, administering justice, and insuring the free interchange of commodities. Truly unique and important to American Government is the careful division of this Federal Government into three equal branches, with a system of checks and balances to preserve this equality. Another asset to this limitation is the tortuous, but wise, amendment procedures of article V. Of most importance, though, is the specific delegation of the powers not granted the Federal Government to the States, and hence closer to the individual people.

It has been said that "Every dogma has its day, but ideals are eternal." What could be more eternal than the ideals of the dignity of man as an individual, master of his own fate? In this respect the Constitution has earned eternity—the eternity of the idealistic interpretation of the nature of man.

And yet, what of today? Where is our limited government, limited so as to give the individual as much unlimited freedom as possible? Today the individual is confronted by Federal regulations, obstacles, and even competition in every phase of his life. Our limited government has become, in the words of the Chicago Tribune, the "biggest landowner, property manager, renter, mover and hauler, medical clinician, lender, insurer, mortgage broker, employer, debtor, taxer and spender in all history."

Is this the fault of the Constitution? Has the "citadel" failed to guard our freedoms? Of course not! The Constitution cannot guard—it can only guide. It is we who are at fault. We have neglected our freedoms. We have elected men to pilot our Ship of State who have ignored the Constitution's guiding light. Because of this, we are in troubled waters. It is evident that only a return to the couse of limited constitutional government will regain our freedoms. And yet, the Constitution alone cannot save us. It can only guide us. It is up to us, as individuals, to regain our freedoms, for aren't we still the masters of our fate—the captains of our country's destiny?

The Story of $98 Billion Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Marshall plan and certain additional foreign aid programs have been beneficial in certain aspects for our country as well as—for our allies—recipient nations. However, the time has come when a closer look and reappraisal of foreign aid must be taken.

Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in an editorial recently pointed out that more and more foreign aid to more and more countries ad infinitum is not the answer to our international problems and certainly is bringing a strain upon this Nations financial resources.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE STORY OF $98 BILLION

Since foreign aid was introduced in 1948, in the form of the Marshall plan, it has undergone vast changes as to size and specific purpose—its total estimated cost to date $98 billion. It still is growing as an almost indiscriminate handout of American taxpayer dollars; and there is, insofar as its advocates are concerned, no end in sight.

What has it accomplished, and what can it accomplish, beyond further drains on the U.S. Treasury? In view of demands for more and more of it, there is necessity to know the score on this outpouring.

A medicine reasonably beneficial in cases of a specific malady is not necessarily a cure-all for every affliction under Heaven; notwithstanding which, political doctors have prescribed this one for every complaint on the international scene (more than 80 nations on the list), from fiscal anemia to the neutrals' help-us-or-we'll-go-Communist hysterics. From the delivery room of newborn nations to the wailing walls of the underdeveloped adults, Uncle Sam has rushed financial attendance; the theory being that there was nothing wrong on that cosmic scale of politics or economics that a sufficient outpouring of free dollars couldn't cure.

To ascertain and present "The Story of $98 Billion," the U.S. News & World Report recently interviewed Dr. D. A. Fitzgerald, former deputy director of the International Cooperation Administration; whose career has been, since 1948 and until last August, associated with that program. His frank assessment is that while the Marshall plan was a practical success—achieving its purpose—he could not say that there are comparable successes in other phases of the overall operation.

Explaining the success of that initial undertaking, he cites the objective to which

it was addressed: European recovery. "The Europeans had the skills and the managerial ability * * * a relatively well-trained human resource, by and large, and this is vitally important."

The same principle and explanation apply to the case of Japan: "It was the same story there as in Europe. They've got trained people. They've got good technicians. They've got the ambition, the drive. They knew where they were going."

The medicine as a stimulant worked.

The contrast, as Dr. Fitzgerald emphasizes, is between recovery purposes and development programs undertaken by such perpetual endowment to build whole political and economic systems from scratch.

The Marshall plan succeeded because, as a lift to the war-shattered economies of its recipients, it was put in hands that knew how to use it—and did use it, with visibly constructive results. There were responsible governments for the most part, addressed to the reasoned necessity of recovery, and sensitive to their own obligations of self-help.

Ironically enough, foreign aid indiscriminately used, creates its own policy problems—and subsequent animosities in the recipient countries. For when and if eventually cut off, it brings political crises there, to which the donor must respond by turning it on again.

How long, then? Right now, Congress again is considering that question—for the Kennedy budget (of massive imbalance) contains it as a fixture; and any phasing out mentioned by its administrants is far less substantial than the phasing in.

Dr. Fitzgerald remarks only that "we're in it for a long time." He mentions "at least 25 years or more, in my opinion, for many countries."

Recognizing, however, the necessity of more U.S. control of foreign aid programing in such underdeveloped lands as India, he concludes: "My own opinion is that we, the United States, have not been sufficiently aggressive in commenting on and in questioning some of these plans. You know, sometimes it is very difficult to give money away effectively."

Somebody could add, for appropriate emphasis by Congress in surveying foreign aid ad infinitum, that raising the money for this perpetual outpouring entails considerable difficulty, too.

Congress and Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, on Friday, March 1, 1963, entitled "Congress and Contracts."

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS AND CONTRACTS

The practice of letting favored Congressmen announce the award of Government contracts in their districts may have some partisan advantages, but the cost is high in terms of the longrun public confidence. Of course Senators and Members of the House are delighted to make known that so many millions of dollars will be spent in their States or districts because their constituents will assume that the announcer has wielded a potent influence in the matter. The difficulty with the practice is that such an inference is often false, and that if it were true it would suggest a scandal.

The official policy of the Defense Department is the antithesis of favoritism. It provides: "Our first and paramount objective is to acquire weapons and materiel which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative and delivery requirements—at the lowest overall cost. Whenever our specifications are sufficiently precise, we must obtain competition through formal advertised bidding procedures as required by law." But when the Department announces the awarding of contracts through Democratic Congressmen and denies a comparable privilege to Republican Congressmen, it seems to fly into the face of its own policy.

The effect on Congressmen is likely to be especially unfortunate. Certainly it tends to intensify the pressures on the Department from legislators who want a larger share of the huge defense budget spent in their districts. The net effect is to encourage legislators to think of defense expenditures, not in terms of the maximum national security, but in terms of swinging lucrative contracts to their hometowns.

Instead of cultivating the impression of a cozy liaison between the Defense Department and Members of Congress in the letting of contracts, Congress ought to be strengthening the safeguards against special influence and favoritism. Senator CASE of New Jersey has proposed a bill requiring that all ex parte communications in regard to defense or space contracts by persons other than the bidder be recorded for public inspection. He would also require, in the case of negotiated contracts, the disclosure of the basis on which the contract was made, except for classified information, and set up a House-Senate watchdog committee to review such contracts.

This is the direction in which Congress ought to be moving. With billions of dollars flowing from the Treasury to defense and space contractors, it is of the utmost importance to avoid favoritism and even the appearance of using defense projects as political bait.

Andrew J. Sordoni

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday one of the most outstanding and illustrious citizens of my congressional district passed away, the Honorable Andrew J. Sordoni. I am indeed most saddened by the death of Senator Sordoni whom I knew well for many years. Mrs. Flood joins with me in extending our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Sordoni and the family. As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the newsstory from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Wednesday, February 27, 1963, as well as an editorial from the same newspaper announcing and commenting upon the passing of Senator Sordoni, as well as an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Thursday, February 28, 1963.

The newsstory and editorials follow:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Feb. 27, 1963]

NOTED INDUSTRIALIST PASSES AWAY IN SLEEP AT MIAMI BEACH

Former State Senator Andrew J. Sordoni, 76, a leader in numerous community, State and National organizations died this morning at 7 at his winter home, 5600 North Bay Road, Miami Beach, Fla. The family physician, Dr. D. Ward White, of Miami, pronounced him dead of a heart attack.

Senator Sordoni's wife, the former Ruth Ann Speece of Forty Fort, found her husband dead this morning when she went to awaken him. She summoned the senator's executive secretary, Miss Helen Foster, who called Dr. White.

With him besides his wife was his daughter, Mrs. Joseph Sekera, of Dallas. Mrs. Sordoni and Mrs. Sekera are expected in Wilkes-Barre late Thursday.

His son, Andrew J. Sordoni, Jr., was in Philadelphia attending a board meeting of the United Gas Improvement Co. When word reached Wilkes-Barre of the senator's death the younger Mrs. Sordoni immediately contacted her husband and he returned home to make arrangements for the funeral.

The senator's body will arrive in Philadelphia tomorrow and will be removed to the Kniffen Funeral Home, 465 South Main Street, this city, where there will be viewing Friday afternoon from 2 to 4 and Friday evening from 7 to 9. Because the large number of out-of-town associates who will be arriving later, a special viewing will be held at First Presbyterian Church, city, Saturday from 11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. Funeral services will be conducted in the church at 2 p.m. Saturday by the pastor, the Reverend Jule Ayers, D.D. Interment will be private at the convenience of the family.

PHONED HERE YESTERDAY

Although he had been ill with a heart ailment for some time, Senator Sordoni kept in daily contact with his various enterprises. Yesterday morning, he telephoned here and checked with the various managers and department heads concerning business matters.

Last November 4, Senator Sordoni and his wife left to spend the winter in Florida, as he had done for many yeras. He was planning a return to Wilkes-Barre in April. He usually spent the spring and summer at his home at Harveys Lake. During the fall, he resided in his 14th floor apartment at Hotel Sterling.

He was chairman of the board of the Sordoni Enterprises which include Sordoni Construction Co., a string of hotels and the Commonwealth Telephone. During his career he was a State senator, State secretary of commerce and president of the American Automobile Association.

Senator Sordoni served as chairman of the board of Sordoni Enterprises for 8 years after being president for many years. Since then, his son, Andrew J. Sordoni, Jr., of Forty Fort, has been president of the organization. He was on the boards of directors of more than 60 organizations.

Surviving, besides his wife and son, are a daughter, Mrs. Mary Sekera, of Dallas, wife of Joseph Sekera, installation superintendent of the Commonwealth Telephone Co., Dallas, and a member of the board of directors; eight grandchildren, Andrew J., III, George, William and Stephen Sordoni; Toni Ann, Andrew Joseph and twins, Donna Lee and Roxanne Sekera; two sisters, Mrs. Roy Walter, of Forty Fort, and Mrs. Royce Gilbert, Umatilla, Fla.

The body will be brought to the Kniffen Funeral Home, 465 South Main Street, Wilkes-Barre.

Born in Nanticoke on February 11, 1887, Mr. Sordoni was the youngest of 12 children of the late Nicholas and Mary Sordoni. His

father, a native of Italy and one of Garibaldi's first 1,000 soldiers, came to America in 1867. His mother, Mary, who came from Genoa, Italy, was an interpreter at Luzerne County Courthouse for 33 years.

As a boy, Mr. Sordoni worked in the mines as a mule driver. At the age of 17, he enlisted in the U.S. Army and served as a private in the Coast Artillery from 1904 to 1907.

In 1910, he was married and immediately thereafter started in business for himself with a team of horses borrowed from his father. He worked 12 to 16 hours a day hauling coal, removing ashes, digging cellars, and other small jobs.

Shortly afterward, he became an independent contractor with a small office in Forty Fort. After a time, he got into the electric line construction field and later in building construction, first as Andrew J. Sordoni, contractor, and later as the Sordoni Construction Company.

IN CABINET OF FINE

In 1951, Gov. John S. Fine selected Mr. Sordoni to be secretary of commerce and he remained in that post until 1954. As head of the department of commerce, he was a member of many organizations. He served as chairman of the State planning board, State aeronautics commission, Pennsylvania Industrial and Construction Exposition and Pennsylvania Anthracite Committee. He was also a member of the State athletic commission in 1951.

His interest in the rapidly growing automobile age was awakened in the early 1920's and in those early years he was a staunch advocate of the construction of an adequate highway system. This led to his interest in motor club work of which he was a member since 1919, and since 1924 he had been a director of Wyoming Valley Motor Club. He was president of the club from 1942 to 1954 and was again elected president in 1956.

PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

Senator Sordoni became active in the American Automobile Association a number of years ago and became its senior vice president in 1953. He was elected president of the American Automobile Association in 1954 and served until 1956. He was a member of the American Automobile Association finance and investment committee and policy resolutions committee and chairman of its international relations committee. He had been a trustee of the American Automobile Association Safety Foundation since 1947.

He was also a member of the World Touring and Automobile Organization of London, England; former vice president and executive committee member of Federation of Inter-American Automobile Clubs of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and a member of the Antique Automobile Club.

He became a life member of the Pennsylvania Motor Federation executive committee in 1939; was elected a director in 1940 and served as president from 1945 to 1954. He had also been a director of Luzerne County Chapter, Pennsylvania Motor Truck Federation, since 1947.

In 1951, he served as chairman of the Pennsylvania State Cancer Crusade and the same year was honorary chairman of the Luzerne County Heart Fund campaign. He also served on local and State boards of the Crippled Children's Association..

A member of Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club since 1920, he was its president in 1927. During World War II, he served as chairman of the War Production Board for Luzerne County.

He was trustee of the Dr. Leo Spears Chiropractic Sanitarium, Denver, Colo. In May 1957, he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Chiropractic from the National College of Chiropractic, Chicago, Ill.

He was associated with the Samuel H. Kress Foundation of New York City, having been a trustee since 1949, and a vice president since 1955.

He was a director of the U.S. Independent Telephone Association; member of Keystone Chapter, Telephone Pioneer Association, Erie; member of the board of governors of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; member of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association Casualty Insurance Co., Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association Fire Insurance Co.; past director of the State chamber of commerce.

He entered electric and telephone line construction work more than 40 years ago and did work for many of the large utilities. He expanded into the general construction field in 1925. Since then, his firm has become known throughout the country and his equipment can be seen throughout the Northeastern United States.

As Mr. Sordoni's interests broadened, so too did the Sordoni Enterprises, which now include the Sterling Hotels System comprising the Americus and Hamilton Hotels, Allentown; Altamont Hotel, Hazleton; Hotel Sterling, Wilkes-Barre; Montrose Inn, Montrose, and the Arlington Hotel, Binghampton. It also includes the Commonwealth Telephone Co., Harveys Lake Light Co., Sterling Engineering & Manufacturing Co., National Tree Surgeons, Public Service of Pennsylvania, Sterling Farms, and the Andrew J. Sordoni Foundation. In these enterprises he employed an average of 5,000 employees.

He obtained Commonwealth Telephone Co. in 1928, when it had about 6,000 subscribers, old worn-out manual equipment, and an outside plant, badly in need of repair and replacement. Today, Commonwealth has more than 50,000 subscribers and with more than 75 percent of its territory automatic dial operation. It is the 3d largest independent telephone company in Pennsylvania and 30th in size of more than 5,100 independent companies in the Nation.

ELECTED TO STATE SENATE

Active in Republican politics for many years, his first public office was as a Forty Fort councilman. He served from 1912 to 1924, and was president for a time. In 1926, he was elected senator from the 20th senatorial district and held that post until 1938.

A member of First Presbyterian Church, Wilkes-Barre, Mr. Sordoni was a 33d degree Mason. He was a member of Wyoming Lodge 468, F. & A. M.; Dieu le Veut Commandery 45, Knights Templar; Shekinah Royal Arch Chapter 182; Keystone Consistory; Irem Temple, Irem Temple Country Club, Shrine Club of Greater Wilkes-Barre, and the Royal Order of Jesters, Binghampton.

Mr. Sordoni had been active in Harveys Lake affairs for a long period. A director of the Harveys Lake Protective Association since 1925, he served eight terms as president and he was chief of the Daniel C. Roberts Fire Co. from 1925 to 1953.

FLORIDA AFFILIATION

In Florida, Mr. Sordoni took an active part in the civic and fraternal life. His Miami Beach memberships included: Board of governors, of Committee of 100; member of Miami Heart Institute, trustee of Miami Beach Taxpayers' Association; board of governors of Surf Club, member of LaGorce Country Club and honorary member of the Tatem Surf Club. He was also a charter member of the Hialeah and the Boca Raton Hotel and Club, Boca Raton.

Bucknell University, of which he had been a trustee since 1928, granted him a doctor of laws degree at its 100th commencement in 1950, while Lafayette College gave him the degree of doctor of humane letters in 1953. He was also a member of Sigma Chi Fraternity at Bucknell.

Senator Sordoni served on the board of trustees of Wilkes College and was elected second vice chairman of the board in 1960.

He was president of Wyoming Valley Hospital from 1941 to 1954, and had been a director from 1936 to 1954, and a trustee since 1956.

A director of the chamber of commerce since 1918, he was president in 1922–23. He was a member of the Committee of 100, Community Chest Board; former trustee of the YWCA, former director of the Wyoming Valley Veterans Building, Inc., and director of Luzerne County Manufacturers' Association.

He was an honorary member of the Order of Sons of Italy; past honorary trustee, Italian Historical Society of America; member of Second Army Advisory Committee for Luzerne County, Grand Central Art Galleries of New York, Metropolitan Club, New York City; Union League, Philadelphia; Pan American Society of the United States; Pennsylvania Society, New York; TWA Ambassador Club, United Airlines 100,000 Mile Club, Pennsylvania Hotels Association, of which he was a former director; Hotel Greeters of America, Inter-American Hotel Association; director of Pennsylvania National Horse Show.

He was also a member of Skytop Club; POS of A, Kingston; Legion of Honor, Wilkes-Barre District; Franklin Club, Eagles, Elks and Moose, all of Wilkes-Barre.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Feb. 27, 1963]

ANDREW SORDONI, 1887–1963

The death of Andrew J. Sordoni at his winter home in Miami Beach today writes finis to a life that constitutes one of the most exciting success stories the community has known in its long and eventful history, although in a broader sense he will live indefinitely through Sordoni Enterprises and good works that will go on for generations. As in the case of many illustrious figures, his influence will not end with the grave, but will continue as a powerful force for good and as a source of inspiration to contemporaries and to those who will come after them.

The youngest of 12 children, this native son of Nanticoke had no place to go but up when he came into the world under modest circumstances. Although he was lacking in material things, he had two assets he prized above all else—his mother and father. Of them, he once said: "I owe what artistic appreciation I have to my father; and to my mother, I owe the determination to do that which is right."

He idolized his mother who, for 33 years, was a court interpreter in Luzerne County courthouse. From her teachings, his character was molded; from her, he acquired industry and integrity, qualities that were to assert themselves daily in the 76 years that were alloted to him. They were the foundation on which he built his amazing career as an industrialist, philanthropist, and public servant whose interests were international in scope, although the principal impact of his life was felt in greater Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and the United States.

So many things entered into the development of the Andrew Sordoni we knew in the past quarter century that it is not possible to enumerate them all. Perhaps next to his parents, his wife, and close associates, one of the most important factors was a tour of duty with the Army for 3 years. It was there he learned the lessons of discipline and leadership that were to play so important a role in all his activities. The dynamic personality that emerged from the Armed Forces in 1907 was of incalculable value in the ensuing half century.

An organizer and builder, he always shared credit for his success with others.

"It has been the friendships, accomplishments, and comradeship, in whatever we have attempted to do together, that mean so much more to me than any other measure

of success," he once told associates. "Men and women, such as you, are the nucleus of organizations and by your example have shown the way others might follow in our footsteps. Any success that we may claim, we've achieved together. That is what has made it all the more worth while."

On another occasion, he observed: "A man is known by the company he keeps and a company by the men it keeps. To me, an ounce of loyalty is worth a pound of cleverness."

Another of the stimulating observations that provided a key to his character was: "My mind is so clear because I change it often. You know, if you have a dollar, and I have a dollar, and we exchange dollars, we still each have a dollar. But, if you have an idea, and I have an idea, and we exchange ideas, we each have two ideas."

Andrew Sordoni never forgot his friends, especially those who gave him a helping hand. His appreciation found expression in many ways, especially in the Sordoni Foundation, one of his pet enterprises; in the State senate and in the cabinet of Governor Fine as secretary of commerce; in his art collection which he shared with the public at Hotel Sterling; and in a multitude of extra curricular activities like the Motor Club, the Wyoming Valley Hospital, and the organizations in which he played a leading role.

The honors that came to him, like doctorates from colleges, the 33d degree from the Masons, and the Brotherhood Award this month, among scores of others, he took in stride, accepting them not so much as recognition but as a challenge.

But why go on? Andrew Sordoni is gone and his community and his country mourn a distinguished son and valiant spirit who left the world a better place than he found it on February 11, 1887, when he was born.

The senator's reaction to it all was summed up in these words in commenting on an editorial that appeared in this newspaper on the occasion of his 70th birthday anniversary: "Where, oh where, but in America could this have happened? Most wonderful is our heritage. I am most grateful."

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record, Feb. 28, 1963]

THE MARK OF A MAN—ANDREW J. SORDONI

Less than 2 weeks before his passing, Andrew J. Sordoni was one of three distinguished citizens who received the Wyoming Valley Brotherhood Roundtable Award.

Unable to attend under his physician's orders, he sent a note from Florida to his son, Jack, who represented him at the dinner.

"Tell them," he wrote, "that this is one of the highest honors ever bestowed me, because it comes from my friends; and in honoring me, they honor my mother and my father."

With these few words, in what was to prove to be his last public utterance, Andrew Sordoni summed up the personal feelings which have characterized his fruitful life—as an organizer, builder, and leader of men.

It was indicative of a long and able career of dedication to pursuits, public and private, which have been indelibly marked with the stamp of his wisdom, initiative, and deep sense of feeling for others, his friends and associates.

Despite all the State, national, and international honors bestowed upon him during his lifetime in spheres of business, civic affairs, social, religious, and education work, Senator Sordoni always took greatest pride when he was singled out at home for distinction.

In 1949, Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club, in naming him Citizen of the Year, presented a plaque with this inscription, which he always treasured:

"Successful in many and varied fields, owner of 15 business enterprises, a leader in civic, community, State, and national organizations, a farmer of distinction with thousands of acres of one of this Nation's most progressive dairy farms, Andrew Sordoni, above all else, marvelously exemplifies the freedom and opportunity a man is given in this great country of ours."

From humble beginnings to the pinnacle of success as founder of extensive enterprises employing upwards of 5,000 persons, Senator Sordoni remained a human and warm person because as a boy he knew what it was to work long hours for very little but the necessities of life.

He was born in Nanticoke, the youngest of 12 children. His father, Nicholas, a native of Italy, came from a wealthy old family in Venice. Of his mother, Mary, a remarkable and astute woman, the Senator often remarked that her early teachings provided the guiding principles which molded his entire life.

While his senatorship and later, his appointment as secretary of commerce under Governor Fine, highlighted his political career, foremost among his interests had been his deep interest and enthusiastic work on behalf of motorists. This began, as a local pundit once put it, "from time time in his youth when he'd arouse his neighbors in Forty Fort with the roar of his one-cylinder motorcycle as he'd leave for work shortly after daybreak."

Over the years, he served as president of the Wyoming Valley Motor Club and for 8 years of the State body, the Pennsylvania Motor Federation, culminating, in 1955–56, with his ascension as president of the 5-million-member American Automobile Association, which duties carried him on tours of major countries of the world.

Still another side of Senator Sordoni was represented by the Sordoni Foundation, which he established for charitable and educational purposes, and through this has flowed many of his philanthropies, modestly, without public notice.

One of the highlights of his career came with the celebration of the golden anniversary of Sordoni Enterprises, when he stated to his employees: "Our strength, the strength of many, is only as strong as each of us individually. As Americans, opportunities are ours in abundance, yet the very freedom that makes it so is our sacred trust. You and I are heavy investors in the fast-changing times. We can keep pace only if we are aware of and squarely meet our responsibilities. I feel a great pride in having a set of standards that have weathered a half century and have not been found wanting."

Thus again, in his own words, Senator Sordoni put forth his philosophy of life—a philosophy marked by ambition, integrity, loyalty, and a driving energy which composed the mold of this man's stature.

Quarantine Legality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Eustace Seligman, Esq., is a distinguished international lawyer, a member of the New York law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, and a constituent of mine who I am very proud to represent in Congress. Mr. Seligman has written a most interesting article on "The Legality of U.S. Quarantine Action in Cuba," which appears in the most recent Issue of the American Bar Association Journal. His analysis is a clear statement of why the U.S. action was consistent both with the United Nation's Charter and with established principles of international law.

Mr. Seligman's article will be of great interest to my colleagues in the Congress, and I include it herewith:

THE LEGALITY OF U.S. QUARANTINE ACTION UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(By Eustace Seligman)

The question of whether the quarantine action taken by the United States was or was not a violation of its obligations under the U.N. Charter is one of great importance, and not merely to lawyers. We profess to believe in sanctity of obligations, we demand that of other nations, and yet we hear it frequently stated in connection with the Cuban quarantine that, since our national security was involved, we could not be deterred by legal niceties.

Was our action in imposing the quarantine of this nature in violation of our written word? It is believed not, for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE 2(4) OF THE CHARTER

The basic restriction on the use of force in the U.N. Charter is article 2(4). The article does not expressly prohibit all use of force—but only force of specific kinds. It reads as follows:

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

In order for a use of force to come within the prohibition of article 2(4) it must be of a kind enumerated unless the enumeration is to be deemed surplusage and ignored, which would appear to be unjustified by any sound rule of construction.

As is stated in Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law," 1958, at page 151:

"This, in effect, was the construction which the United Kingdom agent, Sir Eric Beckett, sought to place on the article in contending before the International Court of Justice in the Corfu Channel case that 'Operation Retail,' the subsequent minesweeping operation, was not contrary to Article 2(4). He said:

" 'But our action on the 12th/13th November threatened neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of Albania. Albania suffered thereby neither territorial loss nor any part of its political independence.'

"As previously indicated, the finding of the Court, against the United Kingdom on this point, made no specific reference either to this argument or indeed to article 2(4)."

Writers on international law have expressed conflicting views on the question. However, Bowett, after weighing them, concludes at page 152:

"Despite these reasons it is submitted that, the phrase having been included, it must be given its plain meaning. Moreover, to give it its plain meaning coincides with the limitations on the obligation of nonintervention which traditional international law recognizes."

Unless article 2(4) is construed to prevent all use of force, it is difficult to conceive of any use of force which would be more clearly excluded from the scope of article 2(4) than a quarantine to prevent the introduction of offensive weapons. The quarantine was not a use of force—

(a) Against the territorial integrity of Cuba, or

(b) Against the political independence of Cuba, or

(c) In any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations—of

which the paramount one under article 1 is to maintain peace and security—the objective of the quarantine.

It would, therefore, appear that under the sound construction of article 2(4), which has heretofore been advocated by Britain, the U.S. quarantine did not violate its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

SELF-DEFENSE

Even if article 2(4) could be construed to include in its prohibition the use of force involved in a quarantine, it is well recognized that it cannot properly be construed to prohibit a quarantine or any other use of force, if carried out in self-defense.

This question is full discussed in Bowett, in the work cited, who concludes at page 186:

"For these reasons we would maintain that the obligation assumed under article 2(4) is in no way inconsistent with the right of self-defense recognized in international law."

However, the use of the words "armed attack" in article 51 of the charter raises a further question as to whether the charter as a whole should be construed to forbid "anticipatory" self-defense—that is, action prior to an actual armed attack. Article 51 reads as follows:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

There is a full discussion of this question also in Bowett, who concludes at page 191:

"It is not believed, therefore, that article 51 restricts the traditional right of self-defense so as to exclude action taken against an imminent danger but before an armed attack occurs. In our view such a restriction is both unnecessary and inconsistent with article 2(4) which forbids not only force but the threat of force, and, furthermore, it is a restriction which bears no relation to the realities of a situation which may arise prior to an actual attack and call for self-defense immediately if it is to be of any avail at all. No state can be expected to await an initial attack which in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence."

The traditional right of self-defense which it is believed was preserved by the charter has been described by Westlake, International Law, second edition 1910, part I, page 312, as follows:

"A state may defend itself, by preventive means if in its conscientious judgment necessary, against attack by another state, threat of attack, or preparations or other conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended. In so doing it will be acting in a manner intrinsically defensive even though externally aggressive."

From this it follows that the legality of the quarantine depends upon whether it was an act of genuine self-defense even though anticipatory, or in fact an unprovoked act of aggression. The answer to this is clear: The conveying to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet powers of offensive weapons was the initiating cause which led to the U.S. reaction and was a threat to U.S. security. The unprovoked and unjustified secret installation of offensive nuclear weapons in an area previously free from them and close to another state, creates a threat to such other state justifying under the right of self-defense the use of force in order to cause their removal.

Applying the test laid down by Westlake quoted above, the installation of such weapons under all the attendants circumstances, including Castro's threats against Guantanamo and various Latin American countries, was conduct "from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended." Who outside the Kremlin knows what the purpose was of secretly building up nuclear offensive weapons in Cuba, located so as to be able to bypass our DEW line radar detective network? Was another Pearl Harbor planned? Or was it intended once the installation was completed to deliver to us an utimatum to withdraw from West Berlin, Europe, Turkey or elsewhere? Surely the possibility of this was sufficiently great so as to justify our taking immediate action to remove the danger.

Furthermore, the limited nature of the U.S. reaction confirms that it was defensive only and solely designed to eliminate the threat to its security caused by the introduction of the offensive weapons. Consequently, the quarantine was not an act of aggression prohibited by the obligations we have entered into when we signed the U.N. Charter.

One of the problems raised by the claim of self-defense is the difficulty of deciding when it is false and when legitimate. The justification of anticipatory self-defense has frequently been falsely advanced—as in the case of Hitler's claim in September 1939 that Germany had been attacked by Polish troops. This, however, is no reason for denying reliance upon it when it is in fact justified.

The United Nations Charter has endeavored to solve this problem by recognizing the necessity of an immediate unilateral decision by a threatened state of when and how to react, but under article 51 requires it to report immediately to the Security Council the action taken. This is clearly set forth in Oppenheim's International Law, eighth edition, 1957, edited by Lauterpacht, volume 1, at page 299:

"The reason of the thing, of course, makes it necessary for every state to judge for itself, in the first instance, whether a case of necessity in self-defense has arisen. But, unless the notion of self-preservation is to be eliminated as a legal conception, or unless it is used as a cloak for concealing deliberate breaches of the law, it is obvious that the question of the legality of action taken in self-preservation is suitable for determination and must ultimately be determined by a judicial authority or by a political body, like the Security Council of the United Nations, acting in a judicial capacity. The charter lays down expressly that measures taken in the exercise of the right of self-defense must be immediately reported to the Security Council."

This obligation to report to the Security Council was complied with by the United States.

Oppenheim (op. cit. p. 299) gives the following example of the exercise of the right of anticipatory self-defense, of a far more extreme nature than the quarantine:

"After the peace of Tilsit of 1807, the British Government was cognizant of a secret article of this treaty, according to which Denmark should, in certain circumstances, be coerced into declaring war against Great Britain, and France should be enabled to seize the Danish fleet so as to make use of it against Great Britain. As Denmark was not capable of defending herself against an attack of the French Army in North Germany under Bernadotte and Davoust, who had orders to invade Denmark, the British Government requested Denmark to deliver up her fleet to the custody of Great Britain, and promised to restore it after the war. Denmark, however, refused to comply with the British demands; whereupon the British considered that a case of necessity in self-defense had arisen, shelled Copenhagen, and seized the Danish fleet."

In a footnote Lauterpacht states that:

"The action of Great Britain in this case, while condemned by most continental writers, is approved by many British and American writers."

One of the British writers who states that this action is justifiable in our opinion is Westlake.

Two other arguments should be considered in connection with our reliance on self-defense. First, it has been urged that the Russian-Cuban action was not a threat of the use of force, but itself justified by self-defense of Cuba to prevent a U.S. invasion. This contention is clearly fictitious. The Castro regime has been in power for almost 4 years and yet no attempt has been made by U.S. forces to invade the island. On several occasions Cuba has appealed to the Security Council to ask protection against a threatened invasion, but has never been able to adduce and evidence in support of its claim. Finally, proof conclusive of its falsity was furnished when at the time of the landing at the Bay of Pigs by the returning Cubans we refused to give them the assistance of our Air Force which they desired.

Second, it has been suggested that if the position of the United States is sound, it follows that the action which the United States took in establishing a base in Turkey was similarly a threat to the peace in violation of the charter.

This suggestion is without merit for the following reasons:

The action we took in Turkey was not the initiating action of an aggressive nature, but our response to the prior aggressive steps taken by Russia in its expansionist program, and was of a defensive nature. As has been well stated by Mr. Frank Altschul, vice president of the Council on Foreign Relations, in a letter to the New York Times of October 29, 1962:

"There are few things less in keeping with our national tradition or desires than to have, in time of peace, armed forces of the United States stationed far from home at distant points around the globe. Yet we have felt obliged to break with tradition and preference in response to Soviet conduct, which has, ever since the fall of Czechoslovakia, in and out of the United Nations carried the conviction that the Soviet Union has in no sense placed limits on its well-advertised determination to spread its dominion to the farthest corners of the earth.

"Our bases, accordingly, represented an important, if by no means the only, contribution we have made to the defense of the non-Soviet world against the overweening ambitions of the Kremlin.

"The Soviet missile base in Cuba, on the other hand, is of quite a different character. 'Our history,' as Mr. Kennedy said in his eloquent address, 'unlike the Soviet's since the end of World War II, demonstrates we have no desire to conquer or dominate any other nation or impose our system on its people.'

"The masters of the Kremlin know as well as we do that the missile base, so furtively under construction in Cuba, cannot possibly be regarded as essential either to the defense of the Soviet Union or Cuba. Located close to our shores, it is purely aggressive in nature and furnishes evidence that the Soviet Union still regards the threat of a nuclear holocaust as a useful instrument for advancing Soviet objectives."

THE ACTION OF THE O.A.S.

It has been suggested by our State Department that there is a different legal basis for the quarantine in the resolution adopted on October 23, 1962, by the Council of the O.A.S. authorizing action which would include and go beyond the quarantine. The argument advanced is that the charter specifically recognizes regional organizations and assigns to them an important place in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations in that article 52(1) states that—

"Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or

agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

It is urged that this article gives to regional organizations the right to use force collectively for the removal of threats to the peace in their region in a situation where an individual state would not have the right to use force.

This position seems to be of doubtful validity. Certainly the wording of article 52(1) above quoted gives it no support. Nor do the debates at the San Francisco Conference and the discussion there of the Act of Chapultepec support the suggested construction, for that act specifically provided only for the collective use of force to prevent or repel aggression.

It would therefore seem that under the charter the resolution of the OAS would not justify the quarantine action by the United States if it had not been justified, absent the resolution.

The resolution does, however, have very real weight on the issue of the validity of the contention of the United States that the quarantine was in fact an act of self-defense. Instead of relying on a unilateral decision of the United States that it was acting in self-defense, there is now the unanimous judgment of the 20 members of the OAS after considering the evidence that the peace of the continent was threatened and that the United States and the other members should take necessary action including the use of armed force to stop the flow of offensive missiles into Cuba.

In addition the resolution of the OAS furnishes convincing refutation to the asserted claim referred to above, that the United States was contemplating an invasion of Cuba to overthrow Castro and that the installation of even offensive weapons was defensive and not a threat of aggression. Surely it could not be claimed that the 20 members of the OAS all contemplated joining in an invasion of Cuba; nor could they have believed that the United States had such a plan in mind when the resolution of October 23 was adopted by them. On the contrary, this resolution constitutes their unanimous judgment that this excuse for the introduction of missiles in Cuba is unjustified.

This action of the OAS is thus of the greatest importance in confirming that the quarantine was an act of self-defense and that the action of the United States was not in violation of its obligation under the charter.

FTC Chairman Rand Dixon Explains Interesting Historical Aspects of Our Antitrust Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, one of Tennessee's distinguished citizens, Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, made a most interesting address last Friday, dealing with antitrust laws that the Congress has enacted during the past 75 years. In his speech he points out—in a most persuasive manner—various reasons why our antitrust laws are so important to our economy and to our way of life. Moreover, explains Chairman Dixon, these laws are of tremendous benefit to businessmen themselves.

Believing firmly that the Members of Congress will find this address highly informative as well as interesting, I include it under unanimous consent in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRADE REGULATION LAWS—MAGNA CARTA OF FREE ENTERPRISE

When Wil Daniels, your legislative counsel, invited me to address you, I explained that because of the apparel industry litigation now pending before the Commission, it would be inappropriate for me to publicly discuss any of the issues raised there. But he insisted that you would like to have me anyway, and that I could talk about anything I wanted to. With an offer like that, how could I refuse? It isn't every day that I can earn my dinner so easily and pleasantly. In fact, appearing here today is so heavily loaded on the side of pleasure—beginning with the fact that it's warm here in Miami and unpleasantly cold in Washington—that I feel almost guilty about leaving my desk and calling it business.

This feeling is heightened, of course, by the fact that yours is a group that appears to have little need for my services as an adviser on antitrust and trade regulation matters. Indeed, the coat and suit industry has distinguished itself in so many ways that my first inclination is to say "Bravo. Keep up the good work," and then sit down. As a matter of fact, I can think of at least two reasons why it would be a good idea to do just that: It would be in accord with that ancient maxim "quit while you're ahead," and, because there are so few virtues in a speaker that are appreciated quite as much as brevity, it would probably win me an award as speaker of the year.

But seriously, I do want to tell you that it is a real pleasure to address this particular group. First, I am an ardent admirer of your remarkable record in the labor relations field. This Board, the industry's spokesman, is itself something of a wonder: an industrywide governing group that includes representatives of both management and labor. And, secondly, I am even more pleased with your devotion to the principles and the practice of vigorous but fair competition. With 1,600 members (comprising some 90 percent of the coat and suit industry), you are, of course, a classic example of the small business group. Competition, I am told, is flourishing nicely.

In an atmosphere as congenial as this one, it would be inappropriate, of course, for me to hold forth on the negative aspects of antitrust and trade regulation. So I have left at home my "fire and brimstone" sermon, the one I use when addressing groups that are known to have departed rather widely from the straight and narrow path of antitrust compliance. The sermon you are about to hear is my other one—the one I reserve for speeches to those groups that, at the very least, are with me in principle. This group, I believe, goes beyond that. I believe you actually practice what I preach.

But just as the preacher does not address himself solely to the sinners in his flock, lest the faithful become less so from sheer lack of continuing inspiration, I think it is quite appropriate to discuss with you a principle that the business community at large has never seemed to grasp fully. This is the fact that the antitrust and trade regulation laws are not shackles on the free enterprise system, but simply a tool for striking off the chains that some businessmen insist upon forging for their fellows. It is no exaggeration to say—as the title of this speech declares—that this body of law is no less than the magna carta of free enterprise. I say this because an excellent case can be made for the proposition that, if the people of this country, through their elected representatives in Congress, has not seen fit to enact these laws, we could very well be living today under the restrictive cartel system that flourished in Europe in the years preceding World War II, or under some form of public ownership of industry that would be even less congenial to our democratic institutions.

It may seem at first blush that it is a contradiction in terms to say that the trade "regulation" laws are designed to increase the liberty of those to whom they are directed. But there is no such contradiction in fact. Red lights placed at busy intersections may seem irksome to those who like to live dangerously. But to those of us who value life and limb, those traffic signals represent simply the efforts of a well-disposed local government to keep us as free as possible from traffic dangers. It is, in short, the old principle of distinguishing between liberty and license—between freedom and anarchy.

Hence the antitrust and trade regulation laws were conceived not in hostility to the principles of laissez-faire capitalism, but in direct support of it. Just as it would be absurd to say that traffic lights were placed at intersections for the purpose of impeding the flow of automobiles, so it is equally unsound to say that laws prohibiting the destruction of competition are themselves designed to hinder the system they protect. On the contrary, the antitrust and trade regulation laws are conservative measures in every meaningful sense of that term—they were intended not to alter the existing economic order but to preserve it and protect it from forces hostile to its continued existence.

In order to appreciate the profound conservatism of these laws, one need only reflect for a moment on the economic and political history that gave rise to them. Capitalism itself, of course, is a comparatively recent development. Prior to the industrial revolution that produced it, wealth was produced and distributed by one of two basic methods: (1) by sovereign command, as in Soviet Russia today, and (2) by custom and tradition, as in medieval Europe where each man automatically followed the trade of his father. The latter system, which was the immediate predecessor in Europe of capitalism, was often regulated in the full sense of that word. In France, for example, a regulation promulgated by Colbert sought to curb the weaving industry's undue tendency toward initiative by requiring that fabrics woven in particular towns were to contain a precise number of threads, neither more nor less. At Avalon, fabrics were to contain 1,376 threads—no more and no less.[1] And in England, at the behest of the button-makers guild, a law was passed imposing a fine on tailers who made cloth buttons and on consumers who wore them.[2]

The industrial revolution with its burgeoning factories and mass-production machinery burst all of these bonds with a wrench that shook society to its very foundations. In the place of the master craftsman and his one or two apprentices, there suddenly emerged the capitalist with his hundreds of employees and fortunes made almost overnight. Richard Arkwright, who invented (or stole) the spinning throstle, is said to have left, on his death in 1792, an estate valued at £500,000.[3] As a young man he had been apprenticed to a barber.

Footnotes at end of speech.

When capitalism first appeared on the scene, there were some very grave doubts as to its respectability. It was untidy, for one thing. Pushy merchants like Arkwright were scrambling all over each other in pursuit of what was regarded by the more genteel folk as naked greed. And there were some definite misgivings about this sort of activity on moral and religious grounds, purely aside from the rather distressing social consequences that were emerging from the conversion of the rural yeoman-class into urban factory workers.

In short, capitalism was in need of a philosopher—a thinking man who could explain to the world what was so plainly evident to its practitioners; namely, that it was, by its nature, not only the most efficient but the fairest economic system ever devised.

Adam Smith, the first great economist, did just that. In 1776—the same year that the Declaration of Independence was signed in America—he published a book that remains to this day as the bible of laissez-faire capitalism. The Wealth of Nations,[4] however, was even more than that. It was no less than an economic declaration of independence. It set forth a number of economic principles or laws that, in the context of the feudal economic system capitalism was then replacing in Europe, was no less revolutionary than—and, indeed, was quite parallel to—those set forth in that bold political document to which John Hancock had set his name with such a flourish. All men, while not necessarily equal in talents, must be afforded equal economic opportunities. All men must be left free to pursue whatever economic activities they might choose. They must be free to make any product they like, sell it to anyone they choose, and charge for it any price they desire.

The great economist promised that, if these imperatives were obeyed, his economic system—which we now call "free enterprise," or capitalism—would cause the wealth of nations to multiply to such an extent that one could well visualize a future in which hunger and privation would be nothing but a memory of a darker age. And Dr. Smith, professor of moral philosophy at England's Glasgow University, was not a utopian dreamer. He demonstrated that a completely free market—one in which each man was left to pursue his own private gain—would yield the most astonishing economic and social results.

Those results were generally these: (1) prices are automatically set at a level that is reasonably related to costs; (2) productive resources are allocated in the most efficient manner; (3) innovation in technology is encouraged; and (4) society's total wealth is distributed among its individual members according to their respective contributions to production.

The most familiar of these is of course the matter of prices. As Adam Smith put it, the only natural price is a competitive price. Consumers, eager to make their limited number of dollars buy as much goods as possible, shop carefully to see which seller of a particular product will accept the lowest price. By way of illustration, it is said that housewives will desert one grocery store and take their patronage to another in order to make a saving of only 1 cent on a 30-cent can of peaches. And the record in one antitrust case showed that a gasoline service station, by cutting its retail price only a few cents per gallon (with the help of a discriminatory concession from its supplier), increased monthly volume of sales by some 500 percent—from approximately 6,000 to some 30,000 gallons per month. Thus competing sellers, in their efforts to sell more volume, are constantly lowering their prices toward Adam Smith's competitive price—which, as he put it, is "the lowest which the sellers can commonly afford to take, and at the same time continue their business."[5]

It will be observed that here the consumer is indeed king. Free to spend his money where he likes, for anything he desires, the consumer plays the tune and those who would entice him to part from his dollars must constantly exert themselves to satisfy his slightest whim. That same consumer, however, in his role as producer of wealth and thus as a seller of his own products or his own labor, must then dance to other men's music.

A further basic premise in the system is the assumption that every man possesses that very characteristic that was first thought to render the entire capitalistic system suspect—plain, unadorned selfishness or greed. So fundamental to the system was this particular character trait that, without it, the invisible hand that guided it could not have operated. Dr. Smith, a shrewd student of human nature, never suspected for a moment that the system would break down for lack of human acquisitiveness. His much-quoted observation on this point is no less true today than it was nearly 200 years ago when he wrote it:

"It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity, but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages."[6]

The great paradox of it all, however, was the fact that this economic free-for-all, this undignified scrambling of men for wealth, would yield the best possible results not only for the individual pursuing his own selfish gain but for his society at large. The more successful a man showed himself at meeting the impersonal demands of this free marketplace—that is, the greater skill he displayed in making a better product at a cheaper price—the larger would grow not only his own personal wealth but that of society as well. After all, wealth lies not in gold coins, but in material goods that have a use value to human beings. The distribution of more and better goods, at lower prices, obviously enriches the consuming public that has only so many dollars to spend. Thus capitalism, with Adam Smith's bold pen strokes, acquired, in addition to its other qualities, a moral stature as well. The successful businessman today enjoys a most enviable public image.

We come now to the villain in the economic story. In 1848—while the American "Forty-Niners" were sharpening their pickaxes in preparation for the rush to the Western gold fields—there appeared in Europe an angry document entitled "The Communist Manifesto." It was followed in 1867 by the first volume of its author's monumental book called "Das Kapital."[7]

In it, Karl Marx declared unequivocally that capitalism was doomed—that it carried within it the seeds of its own destruction. Its principal defect, as he saw it, aside from a moral injustice he found in its somewhat uneven distribution among individuals of the total wealth produced, was an inevitable tendency toward monopoly. When monopoly came, as it surely would, he said, the oppression of the people would become so great that the latter would arise, cast off their chains, and install the dictatorship of the proletariat as the owners of all productive wealth.

As it turned out, the first part of this observation was not so far-fetched as it had then seemed. Indeed, Adam Smith himself, much to the chagrin of businessmen both then and now, had commented on the regrettable frequency with which the free enterprizers of 18th century England sought to rid themselves of the burden of competition by engaging in conspiracies to fix prices. Dr. Smith said:

"People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices."[8]

This is not, however, a shortcoming of the free enterprise system itself. Rather, it is a flaw in those who claim to be practitioners of the system. In reality, of course, when an industry abandons competition and fixes its prices by conspiracy, they are no longer engaged in free enterprise at all. Weary of free enterprise's hard law of competition, they have erected for themselves a haven of "private socialism." With competition eliminated, prices can be fixed at artificially high prices, inefficient producers can continue to prosper, and products of poor quality can be foisted off on the public. In short, all of the abuses of one-firm monopoly can be practiced. Gone is the "invisible hand" of Adam Smith's automatic regulator, competition. The whole machine is thrown out of kilter. With prices set above the natural, or competitive, price, demand will ultimately fall. The members of the conspiracy, instead of reducing their high prices, will simply cut down on production. In order to do this, they'll have to lay off a portion of their working force. This unemployment, in turn, will eliminate the purchasing power of those persons, including, of course, their power to buy the products of other sellers as well as the products of the producer that laid them off. Those other sellers, finding their sales dropping, will similarly contract production by laying off a part of their labor force. Contraction in one industry thus spreads in ripples throughout the whole economy, spiraling lower and lower.

Monopoly is plainly not an integral part of free enterprise. It is, instead, a cancer on the body of the system. It destroys the efficiency that competition creates. It holds productive wealth in an industry that does not need it, and withholds it from some other industry that needs it badly. It diverts consumer dollars from other industries.

A simple illustration can be found in the aftermath of the 1961 price-fixing cases in the electrical equipment industry. It was recently reported that prices there have now fallen to 22 percent below their 1958 levels.[9] One industry spokesman explained it this way: "To combat the price collapse, our manufacturing costs and expenses have been reduced more than would have been thought possible just a few years ago." Another executive in the industry commented that "we're becoming tremendously efficient and pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps."[10] The cutting of manufacturing costs and expenses—becoming "tremendously efficient"—is of course precisely the thing competition is supposed to accomplish in theory, and actually does, as this illustration shows, accomplish in practice.

Even more interesting here, however, is the factor that caused the industry to develop this sudden thirst for low-cost, efficient production—the return to competition in pricing. When conspiracy was adandoned, and prices were allowed to fall to their natural, competitive level, purchasers of electrical equipment paid 22 percent less than they had formerly paid. This 22 percent thus saved from their yearly bill for electrical equipment can be passed on to consumers of electricity. Those consumers, in turn, will now have more money to spend for such goods as suits and coats. Thus it is that when one industry eliminates competition and raises its prices, it is doing more than just defrauding the particular consumers who buy its product. It is taking money that those consumers would have otherwise spent, at least in part, on other

Footnotes at end of speech.

products, say, coats and suits. In short, an industry that flouts the law in this regard has succeeded in getting more than its fair share of the consumer's dollar—it has gotten, in addition to its own just share, a portion that should have gone to businessmen in other industries.

Communist theory, as noted, had predicted that monopolies would flourish in any capitalist economy, and that they would ultimately undermine and cause the collapse of the entire system. But there was one development Marx failed to anticipate—it did not occur to him that the freemen of a capitalist society would have the ingenuity and the strength to prune from the system the disease of monopoly without killing the patient itself. This we did with our antitrust and trade regulation laws.

The story of the growth of the trusts following the Civil War and throughout the latter half of the 19th century is an old one. Suffice it to say here that, by the year 1890, a number of our major industries were completely dominated by one or a few firms. And their behavior was, to put it conservatively, antisocial. The public was being robbed and, what is more, it knew it was being robbed. Rumbles from the people were heard in Congress. On the floor of the Senate, Senator Sherman pointed to the handwriting on the wall in these words:

"Sir, now the people of the United States, as well as of other countries, are feeling the power and grasp of these combinations, and are demanding of every legislature and of Congress a remedy of this evil. * * * You must heed their appeal or be ready for the Socialist, the Communist, and the nihilist." [11]

Congress was not ready for the Socialist or the Communist. It heard the appeal of the people. The result was the Sherman Act of 1890. Monopolization, whether accomplished by a single firm or by several acting in combination, was made a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment. And those acts that lead to monopolization—conspiracies to eliminate competition—were similarly made a crime.

Subsequently, in 1914, Congress passed two more laws designed to supplement the Sherman Act. These were the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act. The first of these, the Federal Trade Commission Act, created the Commission and directed it to prevent "unfair methods of competition." Defined very broadly, an unfair method of competition is either an outright restraint of trade that would also violate the Sherman Act, or it is an incipient restraint of trade—a tiger cub, whose stripes have not yet begun to show. Congress, seeing the difficulties of trying to slay the beast after it had become full grown, hoped to stop it in its infancy. In later years, the statute was amended to include, in addition to unfair methods of competition, the offense called "unfair or deceptive acts or practices." False and deceptive advertising, of course, is an example of the thing prohibited here. While designed particularly to protect the consumer from this kind of fraud, that amendment was in fact a great aid to competitors of the man who insisted on practicing deceptions. By those false claims for his product, the offender diverted to himself consumer dollars that would otherwise have gone to his honest competitors. The law, by prohibiting this sort of thing, encourages competitors to focus their efforts on such socially desirable skills as making a better product, selling it at a lower price, and promoting it more imaginatively, rather than on such dishonorable skills as dreaming up phony ads.

The Clayton Act, the 1914 companion statute to the Federal Trade Commission Act, dealt with four practices: (1) price discrimination; (2) exclusive dealing; (3) stock acquisitions; and (4) interlocking directorates. The section that dealt with price discrimination—section 2—was amended in 1936, as you well know, by the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act. The stock acquisition section—section 7—was recently amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act so as to make it more effective.

Considering this body of law collectively, it has only two objectives: (1) To encourage competition, and (2) to require that the competition thus nurtured is conducted in a reasonably fair manner, without recourse to such patently unfair devices as deception and discrimination. There is, as I have previously mentioned, no inconsistency between these two objectives. Competition that employs these various unfair devices, like wanton automobile driving, becomes manslaughter. It kills the contestants and thus ends the game itself.

There remains, of course, the always difficult question of how effective the antitrust laws have actually been in preserving competition and the free enterprise system of which it is an integral part. Some critics point to the high degrees of concentration in a number of our industries and conclude that these laws have accomplished very little to stop these embryo monopolies. They make a pretty persuasive case for the proposition that, in those industries that the economists call oligopolies—those dominated by only a few firms—competition is not what it should be.

The problem here is plain enough. In an industry where 90 percent of the total production is made by the "Big Four," price competition of the sort that flourishes in industries where there are 800 firms seems to fold its tent and silently steal away. But the remedy is not nearly so clear as the problem.

And whatever may be the shortcomings of the antitrust and trade regulation laws, one thing is plain enough—they eliminated some of the cruder tools of the would-be monopolist and placed definite limits on how far he might go in destroying his competition. Certainly these laws can make the modest claim that they tempered the trend toward industrial concentration in this country, and thus hampered, if they did not stop entirely, the building of actual monopolies. No major industrial firm is known to have a larger percentage share of its market than the 50-odd percent enjoyed by General Motors in the automobile field.

And there is another certainty we can point to: our citizens did not, as the Marxists had predicted, get poorer and madder. On the contrary, the very opposite occurred: the American worker today is the richest the world has ever known. And there is no indication that he is particularly mad about this fact.

This is, however, no time for resting on our oars. We cannot afford to ignore the fact that we are confronted with significant domestic and international problems. One of these is meeting the challenge of alien economic ideologies. In the smugness of our past successes, we came to believe that our country, conceived in and dedicated to both economic and political liberty, was virtually indestructible. Now we find ourselves, in the words of Lincoln, "testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and dedicated, can long endure." It will endure if, and only if, we remember the hard lesson that our strength lies not alone in the fact that we are free, but in the manner in which we choose to exercise that freedom. In its own way, the Federal Trade Commission will do everything it can to assure American businessmen that, as they roll up their sleeves to do the job, they will encounter no artificial restraints put in their path to enrich someone else at their expense. Nobody, neither the public nor a private cartel group, is going to tell you that you can't make cloth buttons, or that your cloth must have 1,376 threads in it.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Heilbroner, The Wordly Philosophers 14 (1953).
[2] Id., 22.
[3] Id., 55.
[4] Smith, "The Wealth of Nations" (1776), (modern library ed., 1937).
[5] Id., 61.
[6] Id., 14.
[7] Marx, "Das Kapital" (1867).
[8] Smith, op. cit. supra note 4, at 128.
[9] Barron's, Oct. 29, 1962, p. 3.
[10] Ibid.
[11] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2460 (1890).

Delaware's Famed Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, Near Wilmington, Opens Lecture Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Delaware's famed Winterthur Museum, located 6 miles north of Wilmington, opens its spring lecture series on March 5 at 8:15 p.m. in the Garden Pavilion.

The speaker will be Dr. Edgar P. Richardson, director of the Winterthur Museum, Dr. Edgar P. Richardson, and his topic will be "The American Dream of Antiquity."

I would like to urge everyone interested in American antiques to visit this unique and splendid museum.

Delawareans are most hospitable, and have, along with other Americans a deep interest in our culture.

This is evidenced not only by the Winterthur Museum, but also by the Hagley Museum, the Delaware Art Center, Old Swedes Church, Old Town Hall, the Hendrickson House, and other landmarks in the State.

I include herewith some background information which may be of interest to those planning to come to Delaware this spring or this summer:

[From the Morning News, Wilmington, Del., Feb. 28, 1963]

WINTERTHUR LECTURE TO OPEN SERIES

The director of the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur museum will be the first speaker in a spring lecture series of the museum.

He is Dr. Edgar P. Richardson and his topic will be "The American Dream of Antiquity." The program will take place on March 5 at 8:15 p.m. in the Garden Pavilion.

On March 12, Robert C. Smith, professor of the history of art at the University of Pennsylvania and a Winterthur research associate, will speak on "The American Paneled Room, 1700–1780."

Hugh Honour, former curator of Temple Newsom House, Leeds, England, will speak on "18th Century Chinoiseries: The Vision of Cathay" on March 19.

"Elizabethan Art in England and America" will be the topic of the final lecture on March 26 by Frank H. Sommer III, head of the Libraries Division at Winterthur.

THE HENRY FRANCIS DU PONT WINTERTHUR MUSEUM

In 1927 Henry Francis du Pont began to build the Winterthur Museum by installing in his family home woodwork from old houses from New Hampshire to North Carolina. These rooms he furnished with American antiques which he had been collecting for many years, arranging them as they might have stood in the homes where they were originally used. Convinced that individuals and nations take their greatest inspiration through the continued remembrance of a glorious past," he worked with the purpose of showing Americans the way early Americans lived, as well as our country's rich tradition of craftsmanship in architecture and household arts.

As he collected and built, the museum, which remained his residence until 1951, grew to about 100 period rooms covering the domestic scene from 1640 to 1840. In the words of the museum's first curator, the late Joseph Downs, "In rooms as they originally stood, here are 200 years of domestic architecture, furniture, ceramics, metalwork, textiles, paintings, and prints chosen with the most meticulous regard for their quality and fitness of location, and assembled with impeccable taste. * * * Winterthur represents the largest and richest assemblage of American decorative arts, especially furniture, ever brought together."

The house at Winterthur from which the museum has grown was built in 1839 by James Antoine Bidermann and was named by him for the city of Winterthur, Switzerland, where his family had lived. Bidermann had married the great aunt of Henry Francis du Pont in 1816, and the house remained in the Du Pont family until 1951, when it was deeded to the Winterthur Corp., an educational and charitable foundation established in 1930. The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum was formally opened to the public on October 30, 1951. The new south wing was opened in 1960.

As an integral part of its activities, the Winterthur Museum conducts an educational and research program designed to promote an appreciation of American cultural and artistic achievement and a broad understanding of our civilization. This program includes a continuing study of the objects in the ever-growing collection; the assembling of documentary material, both original papers and microfilm copies; and, in cooperation with the University of Delaware, a 2-year graduate program leading to the degree of Master of Arts, under which program 10 students study each year on fellowships made possible by generous grants of funds from individuals and foundations.

Flowers, trees, and shrubs in vast varitey, growing in naturalized woodlands and on rolling hillsides, are a sight of great beauty each spring in the Winterthur Gardens of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Francis du Pont.

From early April through late June, these world-famous gardens of over 30 acres present a continuous display of blossoms which include almost every plant which will grow in Delaware. Although the gardens were laid out with meticulous care and are the product of a great creative effort, they appear as natural growth among the native trees and shrubs which have been preserved. Color and form are the hallmarks of the Winterthur Gardens.

In developing the gardens to their present size and beauty, Mr. Du Pont has combined vision, patience, and an artist's sense of color with his vast horticultural knowledge. He has planned the Gardens himself, studied them, and continues to work to achieve harmonious blendings of color and tone.

The tanbark walks and turf paths, on which directional barriers are changed almost daily to guide visitors to the areas of best bloom, lead from one vista to another, each spectacular in itself while, at the same time, forming an integral part of the landscape. A woodland walk winds through native ferns, laurel and wild flowers.

There are over two hundred species and varieties of azaleas at Winterthur among the thousands of these shrubs for which the gardens are noted. Other types of plants number high in the hundreds and range from low ground covers to towering oaks, tulip trees, and evergreens.

Early in April, Korean azaleas and corylopsis, under-planted with corydalis and hellebores, bloom with forsythia, primulas, and early magnolias. The chaenomeles walk, cherry trees, and great drifts of narcissi blossom by midmonth; crabapple trees viburnums, and late magnolias follow.

Azaleas and dogwood trees flower everywhere in the gardens in May, with the Kurume azaleas in the woods and thousands of scillas at their height by the middle of the month. Lilacs, rhododendrons, peonies, and tree peonies are also in blossom, with primulas, chionanthus, deutzias, weigelas, and philadelphus blooming later.

June brings the blossoms of Chugai azaleas, Japanese dogwood trees, lilac species, late philadelphus, spireas, native azaleas, and lilies in great variety. The primulas are in flower until the end of the month.

For 5 weeks, also, during "Winterthur in the Spring" a selection of period rooms in the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum will be open without advance appointment, and may be seen in conjunction with the gardens.

[From the Evening Journal (Wilmington, Del.), Feb. 28, 1963]

ATTENDANCE AT ART CENTER JUMPS BY 5,000 IN YEAR

A total of 27,886 visitors during the 1961–62 season gave the Delaware Art Center an increase of 5,000 over the preceding year.

The total includes those for the changing gallery exhibits, the concerts, movies, and lectures, as well as shows sponsored by the youth program at the center.

Of the four art shows with the highest popular appeal in the last 10 years, two were held in the 1961–62 season.

The shows drawing the biggest crowds were:

One-man show of the works of Andrew Wyeth for 27 days in 1956, visited by 14,451 persons or an average of 535 per day.

The 29th International Salon of Photography, February 1962, on view 25 days with 4,544 or 182 persons a day.

Works of Frank Schoonover, 25 days in October, 1962, with 3,487 viewers or an average day attendance of 135.5.

"Lyricism in Abstract Art" shown concurrently with "Provincetown: A Painter's Place," 22 days in January 1963, with 3,038 attending, an average of 138 a day.

High attendance figures do not necessarily mean people are gaining more knowledge of art, but does indicate a greater interest and curiosity.

Shows with the largest community interest have been those of the works of Andrew Wyeth and Frank Schoonover. Schoonover has been a well-known teacher and artist in this area for many years with a huge following and reputation.

The Andrew Wyeth exhibt of 1956 was his first one-man museum effort. It attracted widespread national attention for this reason, and also because the artist had gained recognition both in the United States and abroad.

The 29th International Salon of Photography is sponsored annually by the Delaware Camera Club. Not only does it attract photography enthusiasts, but it is the only judged international display of photography in the Delaware-Pennsylvania area.

"Lyricism in Abstract Art" and "Provincetown: A Painter's Place" were both circulating exhibits from the American Federation of Art. They gave the public a chance to view the examples of an abstract movement in painting which has swept the art world.

Whether in agreement with this form or not, the community took the opportunity to see firsthald this work by recognized proponents of the abstract-expressionist group.

Increasing classes of schoolchildren have been encouraged to visit the art center by the docent service provided by the Junior League of Wilmington.

The docents are trained guides who take school as well as other interested groups through the exhibits. This program is expanding and docents now go to the schools which have scheduled tours to talk to the children in preparation for the art show they will be seeing.

Two exhibtions now being shown at the center are Edwin Dickinson's paintings and the 30th International Salon of Photography.

The center, at 2301 Kentmere Parkway, is open to the public with no admission charge on weekdays from 10 to 5; Sundays, 2 to 6.

Taxpayer's Burdens: State and Federal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers are very concerned about the drain on their paychecks to cover the cost of Federal and State programs. One of my constituents has written stating his objections to some specific programs and spelling out the time he worked for the Government.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues and constituents the tax computations and the pro rata division among State and Federal Governments. It appears that we, at the Federal level, have the greatest opportunity to reduce the tax burden.

The letter follows:

A TAXPAYER'S BURDENS: STATE AND FEDERAL

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

The Honorable BURT L. TALCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALCOTT: I note with grim interest in the news Wednesday, February 13, that the United States "regrets U.N. Cuban aid," and I also note that the feeling is "that nothing can be done about it." In the news datelined Thursday, February 14, it is noted that you lawmakers have voiced sharp protests. More power to you.

It is indeed a sad state of affairs when this magnificent country of our lets itself be maneuvered into a corner over such a matter as this. I understand that the United States (we taxpayers) are contributing 40 percent of the cost of underwriting this aid. I have only one comment to make, and that is to let the Russians pay for this project—they don't pony up for items they dislike, so why should we?

This is the first time I have ever sat down and actually voiced my opinion over the way things are going, but I have just finished making out my income tax. For the first time in my life, I decided to figure out just what the Federal, State, and county govern-

ments tap me for in the line of taxes; $1,206.65 is withheld for Federal income tax, social security, and State unemployment for a total of 15.67 percent. Federal taxes otherwise account for another $37.36 that I can account for, for a total of 16.16 percent. State and local taxes account for another $539.02 for a grand total of $1,783.03 or 23.15 percent.

This is quite a sum of cash and it means I work almost 3 full months to take care of Federal, State, and local taxes before I start working for myself and family.

It would seem to me that it is about time the citizens of our country, and the people of other nations stopped asking our Government (we taxpayers) for handouts and learned to stand on their own feet. Every dollar saved and every unnecessary expenditure done away with will bring us that much nearer to a balanced budget and lower taxes. A business (and our Government is a business) can't forever be run on deficit financing—it will go bankrupt just as surely as if you and I tried to run my household and yours by the same manner.

Foundations With Tax Umbrellas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Select Committee on Small Business, during the last session of Congress, made a limited study of some of the thousands of tax-exempt foundations throughout the country. A subcommittee of the Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress is continuing an investigation of this study with particular reference to the impact of their activities upon small business.

In the February issue of the Progressive, Mr. Marvin Caplin has written a most informative article regarding this study, and under unanimous consent I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOUNDATIONS WITH TAX UMBRELLAS

(By Marvin Caplan)

If appearance suggests vocation, one might believe that Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, defends the interests of small business because he looks like the sterotype of a small businessman. A scant-haired plump, spectacled gentleman of benign expression, Mr. PATMAN bears a marked resemblance to such actors as the late Guy Kibbee, who used to portray "The Small-Town Banker" or "Your Friendly Neighborhood Druggist."

In his 34 years in Congress, and as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business alfmost continuously since its inception, WRIGHT PATMAN has distinguished himself by his championship of the little fellow. Now, at 69, undaunted by the relentless growth of monopoly despite his opposition, he is engaged in a contest against one of the great economic forces in this country, the thousands of tax-exempt foundations and their billions of dollars in assets.

Chairman PATMAN calls the big ones "giants with tax umbrellas." He admits that many of them have done superb philanthropic work. But what concerns him is the extent to which some of them may be using their privileged tax positions to help giant corporations squeeze out small competitors and build new concentrations of economic power. He sees the big foundations as "a force in our society second only to that of the Government itself." "The possibility exists," he says, "that a large part of American industry will eventually be in the hands of the foundations."

Acting on his own (there were subsequent protests from Republican members of the Small Business Committee), Mr. PATMAN understook in August 1961, a new study, "The Impact Upon Small Business of the Activities and Conduct of Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts." The fruits of this prodigious endeavor are just beginning to be displayed in public. During the 87th Congress, he released the first two parts of his interim report. In January, he issued a third section. Other parts are still to come. Sometime during the year, the Small Business Committee, which sanctioned the investigation after its Mr. PATMAN began it, is scheduled to hold public hearings to evaluate any wrongdoing he thinks he has discovered.

The study has so far examined 524 foundations out of a total of 45,124 known to exist. The first part of the study is concerned with their receipts; the second, with their assets; the third, with their disbursements. Accompanying the lengthy tables is a voluminous commentary, from which one may pick or choose among hundreds of examples of what Mr. PATMAN suspects is chicanery.

On the basis of what he has found, Mr. PATMAN called first for an immediate moratorium on granting any more Federal tax exemptions. Now, he wants many additional restrictions, including a 25-year limit on the life of foundations and a new Government agency to regulate them. The Congressman, who likes to enumerate, gave Congress five reasons for these drastic proposals.

First. Laxness and irresponsibility on the part of the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. PATMAN contends that the tremendous increase in the number and size of foundations has outrun the machinery for control. While Internal Revenue Service figures show an increase from 12,295 in 1952 to more than 45,000 foundations by 1960. H. A. Olsher, the director of the study and an old friend of Mr. PATMAN'S, says there may be hundreds or thousands of others operating, unknown to the Treasury Department.

Second. A widespread disregard of the Treasury's filing regulations, in spite of fines and jail terms that could be imposed. Among the forms made out by foundations there were incomplete and illegible ones, cases of faulty accounting and faulty appraisal of assets, and instances of foundations that somehow never got around to filing the required forms. For example, the Rutherford B. Hayes and Lucy W. Hayes Foundation of Spiegel Grove, Ohio (assets, $1,123,512) has been operating on a tax-exempt basis since 1926, according to the report. But it did not file its application for tax exemption until 1961, some 35 years later.

Third. Mr. PATMAN charges that there have been unreasonable accumulations of income, something the foundation laws expressly forbid. At a time when the administration is considering a tax cut, and the Federal Government faces a possible revenue loss for fiscal 1963 of $1,245 million because of last year's tax measure, Mr. PATMAN finds that the 524 foundations in his study removed more than $7 billion of their assets out of the reach of tax collectors between 1951 and 1960.

He gives a suggestive illustration of how much tax revenue may be lost because of inadequate supervision. Out of 570,000 tax-exempt returns filed by organizations between January 1, 1958, and June 30, 1960, there were 13,024 classified for audit. But only 5,300 of the returns were audited. This audit of less than 1 percent yielded $2.7 million in additional taxes and penalties, and resulted in 203 recommendations that tax-exempt status be revoked.

Fourth. There are indications, Representative PATMAN charges, that many charitable foundations are being used for purposes that have nothing to do with charity. They are used as devices to control businesses; for lending money; for trading in securities and thus evading the capital gains tax, and for building business empires beyond the reach of existing law.

Fifth. By not paying taxes, the foundations increase the taxes the rest of us have to pay. What should be their burden, Mr. PATMAN claims, is shifted "to people who are obliged to work for a living, to the widow with a cottage instead of a palace, to businessmen and to the farmer." He has the audacity to suggest that Congress consider taxing the foundations as a new source of revenue.

In support of these charges, the report offers an abundance of specific cases. Unfortunately, many of them are presented in rather disorganized fashion. Yet after examing Mr. PATMAN'S meandering exposition and supporting data, it is hard not to agree with his inferences that there are foundations, and big ones, which appear to be reaping business advantage from their tax-exempt position, and that some of them have participated in lending, and stock transactions, which ought to be examined more closely.

One of the report's most detailed chronicles of alleged abuses concerns the complicated relationships between the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, of Miami Beach, Fla., on the one hand, and the Hughes Tool Co. and Hughes Aircraft Co., on the other. Even in the preliminary form in which Mr. PATMAN presents it, the Hughes case seems destined to become a major test case in his investigation.

Since its incorporation in 1953, the Medical Institute has been involved in a number of transactions with the two Hughes business firms, according to Mr. PATMAN. These transactions have brought it control of valuable tool company assets, and ownership of 100 percent of Hughes Aircraft stock. Mr. Hughes is the Institute's sole trustee.

The result of this "ring around rosy," Mr. PATMAN suggested, was to save Howard Hughes some $15 million that might otherwise have been subject to renegotiation with the Government on his defense contracts. In a subsequenct letter to Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin, Mr. PATMAN advanced similar charges. He suggested, too, that some $76,955,000 represents unreasonably accumulated assets, either for Hughes Aircraft or the Institute. If the money belongs to the Institute, he asks, does not that mean it has violated its tax-exempt status?

Mr. PATMAN also wants to know why the Internal Revenue Service, on June 1, 1955, denied the Institute's application for tax-exempt status, on the grounds that the Hughes organization was merely a device for siphoning off taxable income, and then on March 1, 1957, reversed itself and granted exemption. In his letter to Mr. Caplin, he raises a number of questions about the whole Hughes arrangement. He considers the answers he has received so far as unresponsive.

The Institute is only one example of a foundation that appears to be deeply involved in business. The Patman report says 108 of the 524 foundations under study own 10 to 100 percent of the stock in a variety of enterprises. Mr. PATMAN finds tax-exempt institutions competing with commercial research institutes and educational testing services. He finds them involved in a variety of manufacturing enterprises, retail stores, restaurants, and services.

Some of the financial arrangements examined in the report seem to warrant Mr. PATMAN's suspicious view of them. In St. Paul, Minn., for instance, three foundations have been buying gas stations and commercial buildings and leasing them back to the sellers: Pure Oil Co., Cities Service Oil Co., General Electric Co., and F. W. Woolworth. As a result, Mr. PATMAN says, these big corporations can expand without having to go into the money market for capital—an advantage not enjoyed by independent service station operators and small retail stores.

Mr. PATMAN also claims that the foundations are deeply involved in money lending. The only restraint on this activity, he says, is that the loans must carry a reasonable rate of interest. Sometimes, the Patman report finds, the foundation loans are made to their donors and associates. In one instance, it charges, the Ford Foundation made loans that conflicted with Government policy. Between March 1, 1961, and February 1, 1962, the Foundation is reported to have made 10 loans totaling $33 million to governments, banks, and private companies in foreign countries. "This was at a time when our Government was trying desperately to reduce the deficit in our balance of [international] payments," the study observes.

Mr. PATMAN also wants to know why some of the Ford Foundation's loans appear to have been made at a preferential rate. Why, he asks, was the Duke Power Co., of Charlotte, N.C., charged only 2.65 percent interest on a $3 million, 20-year loan while other borrowers paid 6½ percent?

Mr. PATMAN's delineation of abuses suggests that foundations were used by former Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon, and by the Ford interests, among others, to avoid estate taxes. It suggests they have been used in a variety of stock transactions and in several corporate proxy fights.

His analysis of their disbursements shows that the 534 foundations used only 50 percent of their total receipts for contributions and 10 percent for expenses, leaving them, Mr. Olsher says, in businessmen's parlance, a neat profit of 40 percent.

After leading congressional and other readers of his committee report through the maze of transactions he has examined so far, Mr. PATMAN says has is still unable to establish accurately the total number of foundations and their holdings. One of the difficulties in determining their assets, he claims, is the discrepancy between the actual market values of their property and the values they assign to them in their books. He estimates the total book value of the 524 foundations he has studied to be about $10.2 billion. But he believes the properties are probably worth a great deal more than that.

Here are some examples:

The 31,910,296 shares of class A stock held by the Ford Foundation on September 30, 1960, had a market value of $2 billion instead of the $1.4 billion entered on the balance sheet.

The Altman Foundation, as of December 31, 1960, owned 84.59 percent of the capital stock of B. Altman & Co., the New York department store. The foundation valued the stock at $9,091,970 when, as of January 31, 1961, the foundation's real equity in B. Altman's net assets was $32,579,732.

Other assets, such as land, real estate, inventories, patents, equipment, or works of art, are sometimes omitted. For example, the balance sheet of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation of New York does not list paintings, valued at $23.3 million, which are on loan to museums or held in temporary storage.

The Carnegie Corp., has assigned a $1 value to land and buildings at two Manhattan addresses. The Howard Hughes Medical Institute lists at $1 a leasehold which the institute estimates to be worth $17,500,000.

This display of high-level accounting and high finance, and of arrogance (some of the foundations did not answer his first request for information and he had to issue subpenas), has moved Chairman PATMAN to indignation. He looks upon the growing power of the tax-free giants and is resolved that "they should not be allowed to crush small business."

Representative PATMAN's preliminary investigation has brought him criticism. While there have been no direct repercussions from foundations, there have been private complaints to other Congressmen from worried foundations in their constituencies. At least two Republican colleagues have protested the Patman investigation. Representative THOMAS CURTIS, Missouri Republican, who serves on the Joint Economic Committee which Mr. PATMAN also heads, has called the unilateral investigation "extraordinary" and challenged him to disclose what private group has been financing it. (Mr. PATMAN denied there was any private backing.) Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, Kansas Republican, has complained that he and other minority members of the Small Business Committee have had no chance to participate in the study. He accused the chairman of running the committee "like it was the CIA." (Mr. PATMAN, perhaps in response to this criticism, did obtain a resolution from the committee authorizing the investigation—after it had been going on for nearly 6 months.)

During the past summer, the New York Times took issue with Mr. PATMAN. Its most serious charge was his "studied omission of the constructive role played by foundations." While it conceded he had uncovered evidence of tax dodging and other abuses, the Times contended that the institutions which engaged in such practices were a small percentage of the total and that Representative PATMAN, by focusing on abuses, was indulging in a form of guilt by association and in a blanket condemnation of all foundations. The Times added that he was exaggerating the total number of foundations. Instead of 45,000 foundations, the Times said there were only about 15,000 in the foundation category, the remainder being civic, educational, or religious institutions. Mr. Olsher, director of the Patman study, reports that the 45,124 figure was supplied by the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. PATMAN has told the House there might be 100,000 foundations, and he would not be surprised if there were as many as 250,000.

Within foundation circles, there is evidence to suggest that the investigation is not unjustified. The Foundation Library Center in New York, a nonprofit organization which collects and disseminates information in the foundation field, observed in its November 1962 bulletin that by using his subpena power, "Mr. PATMAN has gathered a good deal of data otherwise unavailable. His requests for official information have helped alert Treasury authorities to possible and actual abuses and have also helped to liberalize Treasury rules as to public access to information." But, it adds, some of Mr. PATMAN's conclusions, and a few of his statistics, are mistaken.

Critics of the investigation have claimed that the 524 foundations in the Patman study are the biggest ones, controlling 90 percent of all foundation assets. But PATMAN's investigations say their evidence does not show this to be true.

As he goes on with the study, new avenues of exploration present themselves. In addition to asking Mr. Caplin to check into the Howard Hughes matter, Mr. PATMAN has gone back to the 524 foundations and asked them submit details of their stock transactions during the first half of 1962. He wants to determine if they played any part in triggering the stock market plunge of last May and, as a committee memo puts it, profited later by purchasing stock at lower prices. While incoming replies show large capital gains were made through stock sales, the role the foundations played in the slump is still far from clear. Their market transactions will probably furnish material for a future section of Mr. PATMAN's interim report.

Already the investigation has had a reforming effect. As a direct result of it, the Internal Revenue Service has proposed regulations that would require foundations to give a much fuller account of their assets and financial dealings and make their returns more readily accessible for public inspection.

The White House has become interested in the investigation. An interagency group, under Deputy Special Counsel Meyer Feldman, has been set up to study Mr. PATMAN's evidence and charges. Even without White House support, Mr. PATMAN is in a strong position to carry on his probe. He is respected on the Hill for being a thorough student of whatever economic matter he investigates. His long years of service lend weight to his determinations. And his recent ascendancy to the chairmanship of the House Banking Committee also strengthens his hand.

One close observer of Texas politics suggests that part of the Congressman's motive in undertaking the investigation may be personal. A Texas foundation, he contends, financed the Dixiecrat opposition to Mr. PATMAN in 1948–50, and supposedly he then saw at first hand how foundation power can be misused.

However, in a search for his motives, Mr. PATMAN's record indicates that it is not necessary to go beyond his declared intention to protect small business. That has been one of the ruling concerns of his long career. The voice he raises in support of free enterprise is gallant—and nostalgic. During a floor exchange with Representative CURTIS on the foundation probe, he recalled a time when the little towns had fine little businesses, local department stores, hardware stores, restaurants, banks, and similar places of business that could be operated by local people. But today, the big concerns have gone into all the local towns and have either bought out these local concerns or squeezed them out through abuses of power.

Representative PATMAN cannot bring back the days when small, independent businesses dominated the economy. But surely something can be gained in the public interest if through his persistence there is a public airing of the tax and economic abuses permitted some foundations, an airing followed by any corrective legislation that may be needed. If nothing blocks his intent to carry on the foundation inquiry, the new Congress may provide one of the most dramatic hearing confrontations in years, between WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, apostle of small business, and Howard Hughes, that mysterious magnate of big business.

Department of Defense Pay Bill: Some Provisions Are Good, Others Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the information bulletin for February issued by the Empire Chapter of the Disabled Officers Association:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PAY BILL: SOME PROVISIONS ARE GOOD, OTHERS BAD

Please forgive us for devoting most of this issue of our bulletin to the pending pay bill which is so important to the Government, those now on active duty, those considering the military service as a career, and those who have been retired from active duty.

We agree with principles proclaimed by the President, Secretary of Defense McNamara, many Members of Congress, and others who have studied the problems. Some of the terms of the proposed bill (H.R. 3006) depart from these fundamental principles and should be amended.

We agree with Mr. McNamara's statements to the House Armed Services Committee that—

"There should be an immediate adjustment in military pay scales and in certain allowances to bring them into better balance with Government civilian pay scales and those in private industry, and to reflect rises in the cost of living since the last pay adjustment, to increase the attractiveness of military service as a career, and to correct certain inequities in the present structure.

"Pay of retirees should be related to the cost of living so that retired personnel or their dependents are not penalized by changes in price levels."

"Historically, adjustment of retirement pay has been linked to changes in basic pay rates of the Active Forces."

"One hundred years of precedent, and the absence of any 'notice' had led military retirees to believe that their retirement pay would continue to be based on active duty rates."

We agree with the provisions of the bill which provide for an approximate 14 percent increase of active duty pay. If such increase is justified, and we believe it is, retirement pay should be similarly increased. But the proposed bill grants a mere 5-percent increase in retirement pay.

The devastating effect of inflation, evident in many quarters, has substantially increased the cost of living, correspondingly reduced the value of the dollar, and has been responsible for undermining the security of many retired individuals and widows who must live on fixed income. The cost of living has increased substantially over the last 10 or 15 years. The same articles cost considerably more today because the dollar has lost a great deal of its purchasing power.

The Consumer's Price Index continued to rise following World War II. There was no decline in prices such as had occurred after earlier wars.

At the end of 1960, the Consumer's Price Index was 27.5 percent above the 1947–49 average.

"The problem of maintaining an adequate and stable income in the retirement years concerns not only the individual but the whole society as well"—Robert W. Kean, chairman, National Advisory Committee, 1961 White House Conference on Aging.

Mr. McNamara says that retirement pay should be examined annually to adjust it to cost of living increases. Having examined the present cost of living, he determined that active duty pay should be increased about 14 percent. For the same reason, retirement pay should be increased concomitantly. It is obviously unfair to say that retirees are entitled to a lesser cost of living increase than active duty personnel.

Mr. McNamara says that the retired pay situation presents "some of the most vexing problems of the military compensation system." The Government and the retirees will continue to be vexed by the present bill's differential formula.

We recommend the immediate destruction of this vexing problem by amending the bill to provide (as was done historically and traditionally) that the adjustment of active duty pay provided by this bill and any such future adjustment shall effect the same adjustment in retirement pay.

As was provided in an earlier law—retirement pay shall be based on the same active duty base pay the retiree would receive if he were still on active duty.

Independence Day of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, the Republic of Ghana will celebrate the sixth anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah; and His Excellency, the Ghana Chargé d'Affaires ad interim to the United States, Osei Tutu.

The birth of the Republic of Ghana on March 6, 1957, stirred the imagination of all the world, for Ghana was the first of the countries of sub-Saharan Africa to achieve independence after World War II. Ghana's hard-won privilege was also an immense responsibility, for the eyes of all peoples, independent and dependent, great and small, rich and poor, were turned toward the former British colony on the West Coast of Africa. Would Ghana make a go of it? Could her political institutions survive or would they be destroyed by old tribal rivalries? Could she develop her economy sufficiently to achieve a satisfactory living standard for her whole population?

These questions are no longer asked. Ghana has made a go of it. Ghana has become a leading nation of Africa, indeed of the neutral world. In the council chambers of the United Nations the Ghanaian Ambassador is listened to carefully as one of the chief spokesmen of the nonalined nations. Within the African Continent Ghana has been one of the stanchest advocates of pan-Africanism. Under the able and dedicated leadership of President Kwame Nkrumah, the Republic of Ghana has developed a deep national consciousness; the pessimists who predicted that the newly independent nation would soon be torn asunder by tribal rivalries vastly underestimated the capabilities of Ghana's President and the sincere devotion which he was able to inspire in the hearts of the Ghanaian people.

Economically Ghana is progressing admirably. Although Ghana is a comparatively small country—smaller than our State of Wyoming—it is centrally located in west Africa and is endowed with significant natural resources. Ghana is handy to the sealanes of the South Atlantic and to some of the African Continent's busiest highways and airlines. Its forests are rich in hardwoods such as mahogany, and the country is well endowed with mineral wealth. Gold, Ghana's most important mineral, has been one of the country's leading exports for over 400 years; Ghana was, in fact, formerly called the Gold Coast because of its trade in gold dust. Manganese and bauxite are also important export products. But it is cocoa which is Ghana's chief moneymaker. Ghana produces over one-third of the world's cocoa crop, of which American manufacturers purchase approximately 23 percent. As for manufacturing, Ghana has many flourishing small-scale industries in such fields as palm oil extracting, furniture making, and ivory working. Development plans called for the further expansion of industry and for broadening the economic base of the country. The Volta River dam and hydroelectric project, which the United States is helping to finance, will be an additional spur to Ghana's economy, for it will provide hydroelectric power for refining the country's vast bauxite resources into aluminum.

The old Ghana, which was a flourishing west African kingdom in the medieval ages, would be proud of the new Republic of Ghana. Ghana's per capita income is one of the highest in Africa. Her political leadership is able. Her people are industrious. The Ghanaian national flag is an accurate symbol of the new Ghana: its three horizontal stripes of red represent the blood and sweat of those who worked for independence; the gold stripe, the wealth of the country; and the green, its forests and farms. The five-pointed black star in the center of the gold stripe is the lodestar of African freedom.

On this 6th anniversary of independence, we salute Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah and the people of Ghana; we wish them continued prosperity in the future.

Delaware State Senator John E. Reilly, Sr., Is Mourned as a Great Commoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Delaware has suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of State Senator John E. Reilly, Sr., of Wilmington, Del.

It was said of Senator Reilly, and well said, that "he loves people and he enjoys doing things for people."

A friend of his wrote a letter to the newspapers at the time of his death declaring:

AN IRREPARABLE LOSS

Delaware has suffered an irreparable loss. The shades of death have settled upon one of her most beloved sons.

The long weary hours of pain and burden have ended for John Reilly, but his indomitable spirit lives on in the hearts of those who knew and loved him.

He was a genial, friendly man given to the simple lasting wisdom gained in the rough

and tumble of the political arena, which was his native habitat.

It was his basic honesty and his heartfelt consideration for the common people that endeared him to all of us. His place will long remain empty, and we shall miss him. Delaware will never be quite the same without John Reilly.

PAUL DOLAN,
Professor.

NEWARK, *February 27.*

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith two articles from the newspapers which show the love which Delawareans had for Senator Reilly.

A great Democrat, Senator Reilly served with memorable distinction in the Delaware House of Representatives and since 1949 in the senate of the general assembly.

He has passed to the land where all is bright—where falls no shadow—where there is no pain; where those who meet part no more, and those long parted meet again.

The articles follow:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Feb. 28, 1963]

JACK REILLY: THE GREAT COMMONER

(By Bill Frank)

This is how we got the news—that Jack Reilly had died.

A few minutes after 1 o'clock on Tuesday, Dick Rinard, city editor of the Evening Journal, called me over to his desk.

"Jack Reilly just died," he said.

I thanked Dick for telling me. As I walked from his desk to my cubbyhole—across the breadth of the newsroom, I could hear men telling one another—"Jack Reilly just died."

One man whispered, "God bless him."

Another man said, "Well—his pain and suffering are over."

Still another commented, "You'll never find another man like him."

We're really a strange crew—we newspaper men here on Orange Street.

We have all kinds of beliefs, backgrounds, a multiple variety of political convictions and evaluations of the great men and the not-so-great in our community.

Rarely do you find the fellows around here anywhere near unanimity on anything but—

When it came to Jack Reilly, these so-called cynics, skeptics and what-have-you are all of the same opinion:

"Jack Reilly was a real man; whence comes such another?"

I won't say that there was surprise in this news shop when the word got around that Jack Reilly was dead.

We all know what he had been going through lately. We realized what his wife and family had been experiencing.

Death brought him final peace and release from the terrible disease that had attacked him.

But all of us wondered, in our way, just what Wilmington would be like with Jack Reilly gone. * * * What will the General Assembly be like? Who will take up the cudgels for the underdog?

The point I want to make is that when a man in public life has the respect, admiration and even love of everyone in a newsroom, you can bet your last buck that this is no ordinary man.

Back in the summer of 1960, there was a movement to make Jack Reilly mayor of Wilmington.

And on August 3 of that year—with that old cigar of his in one hand and his $200 required fee in the other, he filed for reelection to the State senate—for his fourth term.

Reilly confided to the press:

"It was a big relief to some of the boys. They were scared I might try for mayor.

"I tell you I had a time ducking it. They were working on me right up to the last minute, but I figured I'd be able to do a better job in the legislature."

He took a deep puff on that cigar of his and added, "I'm afraid of some of the things that might happen down there in Dover—if they caught me out of my seat. So—I guess I'll go back."

The newspapers referred to Jack Reilly as "the old smoke eater," since he had once been a fireman. Some writers characterized him as a "cigar chomping, gravel-voiced legislator."

He told Dick Sanger in the summer of 1960, when Sanger was writing a column:

"I don't have nothing against these remarks. But you fellows forgot to mention that I have 22 grandchildren. Alice (that's Mrs. Reilly) isn't going to like that. She makes a project out of those kids. I'm only the chairman of the finance committee, and without a vote."

They say that Jack Reilly wasn't an orator. Well, let me say that when he talked you knew what he had in mind.

He communicated, and very clearly at that.

He never went to high school, but he knew all about the economics of a family on the East Side trying to make both ends meet.

He never saw the inside of a swanky public relations suite, but he sure had the best public relations any politician could dream of.

I doubt if he ever wrote a speech in advance, but when he was called on to speak he just shifted that cigar and spoke from the heart. I wish more politicians could do that.

Stubborn? He could match that legendary Missouri mule, and quite often it was a good thing for the forces of good against the army of the indifferent.

It will be many, many years before people stop talking about Jack Reilly. He will be referred to time and again in political circles, among labor organizations, charitable groups, and social welfare cliques. Newsmen will keep saying, "Now back in the days when Jack Reilly was alive * * *."

What was the secret of Jack Reilly?

Cy Liberman, Morning News reporter, summed it all up one day when he wrote:

"He loves people, and he enjoys doing things for people."

Jack Reilly didn't mumble the Golden Rule in his lifetime. He lived it.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 28, 1963]

SENATOR REILLY SERVICES TO BE HELD ON SATURDAY

Solemn requiem mass for State Senator John E. Reilly, Sr., will be offered in St. Mary's Catholic Church, Sixth and Pine Streets, Saturday at 10:30 a.m.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph A. Enright, pastor of St. Mary's, will celebrate the mass. The Most Reverend Michael W. Hyle, bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Wilmington, will preside at the mass and give absolution.

The sermon will be preached by the Reverend Andrew J. White, pastor of St. Peter's Church, New Castle.

Senator Reilly, 69, died in St. Francis Hospital Tuesday.

Internment will be in Cathedral Cemetery. Friends may call at the Salesianum School auditorium, 18th and Broom Streets, tomorrow evening after 7.

In lieu of flowers, the family suggests contributions to the St. Francis Hospital Building Fund.

Active pallbearers will be Clayton S. Harrison, Jr., Republican city chairman; Judge Robert H. Wahl, Judge Sidney J. Clark, Robert F. Kelly, Joseph Rossiter and Francis A. Burke.

Honorary pallbearers are: Gov. Elbert N. Carvel; Lt. Gov. Eugene Lammot; Senate President pro tempore Curtis W. Steen; House Speaker Sherman W. Tribbitt; Elisha C. Dukes, secretary of state; Mayor John E. Babiarz; William J. McClafferty, Jr., city council president; Harry B. Roberts, Levy Court, president; Clifford Pryor, Francis E. Holliday, and Samuel W. Keenan, all of the New Castle County Board of Assessment.

Also U.S. Representative Harris B. McDowell, Jr., U.S. Senators John J. Williams and J. Caleb Boggs; William S. Potter, Democratic national committeeman; John M. Conway, Democratic state chairman; Michael A. Poppiti, city Democratic chairman; Frank O'Donnell; Col. John P. Ferguson, superintendent of Delaware State Police; John J. Smith, chief of police; Maurice K. Clark, chief engineer of the bureau of fire; Clement J. Lemon, of the Delaware Labor Council, and Nutter D. Marvel.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am herewith submitting the text of my newsletter, "Washington Report" of March 2, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH, 2, 1963.

VITAL ISSUES DISCUSSED IN HOUSE THIS WEEK

In the first full week of House sessions this year, a number of vital issues were discussed. To keep you abreast of how your Representative is participating in debate on the problems we face, I am including in this newsletter excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my remarks on various problems:

On Monday, February 25, Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, of New York, took the floor to challenge President Kennedy's demand for bipartisan approval of all his actions in foreign policy. My part of the discussion follows:

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word 'bipartisan.' My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word 'bipartisan' as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

"Mr. BECKER. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the *n*th degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in

Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

"Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

"Mr. BECKER. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I think we should make the people understand why.

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

"Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield.

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

"Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star 'Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News.' I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the RECORD."

Tuesday, February 26, several Republican Members defended the integrity of Congress against one Member charged with indiscretions in connection with junketing.

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

"Mr. ALGER. I, too, want to joint with the gentleman and thank him for having the courage as well as the forthrightness to say what needed to be said. And so that my colleagues understand, even as each of us, of course, is responsible for his own conduct, and I have the honor as has each other Member to represent some mighty fine people, I put my views on this in the RECORD yesterday at page 144 with reference to the expenditures made by one of the Members of this body when he was overseas.

"It is my further contention that there are times when the Members of this body not only must travel the world but should travel all over the world when we have so many commitments abroad, but there are many trips that might very well be curtailed. I am going into my 9th year here. I have not been called upon to travel abroad. I hope some day if I can make any contribution to the matter then under consideration I may have the opportunity, but I do not intend to be reckless.

"I am sure there are many others who will say that the conduct of one of our colleagues does not speak for the rest of us in this body. Certainly it does not speak for the Member from the Fifth District of Texas. I join with others who feel that we should do whatever housecleaning is necessary when this body is not properly represented, as the representatives of the people not only of Texas but throughout the United States."

The House voted on Wednesday, February 27, a $508,172,000 appropriation to continue Public Law 480 for disposing of agricultural products. The bill passed 254 to 154. In debate I said:

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to House Joint Resolution 284, supplement appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, is very basic. Public Law 480 has become not just a means of disposing of surplus foods, but a reason for continuing the piling up of surpluses. The tail is wagging the dog. An emergency program has become self-perpetuating. Further, this program is really a foreign aid program, yet has seldom been so considered except incidentally in totaling yearly aid. The abuse or misuse of taxpayers' money is best seen on those many occasions when we have shipped these foods to Communist countries.

"Nor is there much to commend the generating of counterpart funds. We get no pay, except in local currency that must be used locally, and which has been subject to much abuse.

"Finally, the Federal Government is not intended to be in the business of feeding people. It is unconstitutional."

One of our fine Dallas high schools won high honors in a debate tournament in the Nation's Capital and I was pleased to call attention to the achievement in this insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"DALLAS HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TEAM DEFEATS 117 RIVALS IN TOURNAMENT

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 21, 1963)

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce the victory of a debate team from Jesuit High School in Dallas last weekend in the National Invitational High School Cherry Blossom Tournament sponsored by Georgetown University. The Jesuit High School students, Rick Atkinson and Jim Turner, competed against 117 other high schools, public and private, representing 20 States. The debate topic was "That the United States Should Provide a Common Market for the Western Hemisphere." The Jesuit team took the affirmative side in the final debate, but debated both sides of the question in the course of the tournament. Jim Turner also won an award as third highest ranking speaker out of all the orators in the tournament.

"Mr. Speaker, this achievement by a team representing one of our fine Dallas high schools is another indication of the fine record of Dallas County. It is natural for Dallas to lead. Our people have always prided themselves on getting things done and as a result we have one of the greatest metropolitan areas of the Nation. Our achievements in industry, retailing, education, and cultural activities are a constant wonder to people everywhere. It always gives me great satisfaction to announce the achievements of Dallas people and to call attention to the fact that our progress as a community, in every field, is done through the efforts of our own people.

"That success in scholastic achievement is not confined to one Dallas high school was stressed by Rev. Father Herlong, of Jesuit, talking of the friendly rivalry between the various school debate teams. He said the Dallas students have a close bond with one another. He told how this was demonstrated last year in an intercity debate in which Byran Adams, a public high school, and Jesuit competed. Jesuit was declared the winner and when the announcement was made, the whole Bryan Adams team stood up and cheered. Father Herlong paid tribute to Bryan Adams as well as Garland High School and said they are both on a par with Jesuit and he feels that in last week's tournament they would have done as well and perhaps even better than Jesuit.

"Incidentally, on a personal note, Father Herlong is a distant cousin of our colleague, Congressman SID HERLONG, of Florida."

In a continuing effort to arouse a sense of rededication to basic American principles, I included in the RECORD some remarks on a truth too often overlooked in the Declaration of Independence:

"HAPPINESS MUST BE EARNED

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 21, 1963)

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following copy from the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in the February 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report, should be read by all freedom-loving Americans. It reminds us that no government can guarantee happiness, only the right to seek happiness. Too many our our people today are becoming imbued with the idea that the guarantee of happiness is a right, forgetting the happiness must be bred within the individual and cannot be superimposed by any outside force. Any attempt by a government to give to its people some kind of happiness means a subsequent loss of freedom, and without freedom no man can be truly happy.

"The article follows:

"'*Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*

"'When you read the Declaration of Independence (and everyone of us should) read it all. Too many Americans think it guarantees them life, liberty, and happiness. Not at all—only the pursuit of happiness.

"'No one but a selfish child thinks he has the right to happiness. Adults know it has to be deserved, earned—and the only way to earn it is to contribute more to the world than you take.

"'If you are a worker, you produce enough to pay your wage plus enough to pay for the machine, without which you would have no job.

"'If you're a businessman, you produce enough to pay your workman a fair wage, enough for an incentive return to your stockholders whose savings built the company, and enough for your share of necessary taxes to protect your country.

"'If you're a politician you work first for the good of your country, not your party or yourself.

"'That is the honest way to happiness as every intelligent adult knows. Anything seized in any other way is grasping greed, of which any self-respecting American should be ashamed.

"'Is it useless to hope for that kind of Americanism? We don't think so.'"

These excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are just a sampling of the week's work of a Member of Congress. In addition to debate on the floor, most of my time this week was spent in committee where we continued the hearings on the President's tax proposals and on his request for an extension of the increase in the debt ceiling.

Witness after witness, under my questioning and that of my Republican colleagues on the committee, have been forced to admit the proposals of the President, if enacted into law, will retard, not accelerate our economy. I continued to hammer home the fact that while tax cuts are necessary and justified, they will be completely meaningless unless a substantial cut is made in Federal spending. Without reduced spending a $10 to $20 billion tax cut will cause inflationary pressures which will mean higher prices, lower dividends on investments and savings, higher insurance premiums, and in the end the great majority of our people will have less money to spend, and business growth will be hindered, not helped.

Name the Glen Canyon Dam the Fred T. Colter Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent memorial by the Arizona State Senate requesting the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior to take appropriate action to name the Glen Canyon Dam the Fred T. Colter Dam:

STATE OF ARIZONA SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 1 REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION TO NAME THE GLEN CANYON DAM THE FRED T. COLTER DAM

To the Congress of the United States of America and the Secretary of the Department of Interior:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The Honorable Fred T. Colter, a native Arizonian, distinguished himself by his civic and political activities throughout his life up until the time of his death.

Mr. Colter was born in the village of Nutrioso, Apache County, Arizona. In addition to being an established rancher, he participated in Arizona political activities and was instrumental in developing not only the Constitution of Arizona but many of the laws which make up the Arizona Revised Statutes.

Fred T. Colter was a member of the Constitutional Convention which met in Phoenix, Arizona, in 1910. Mr. Colter, along with former Governor Osborne, had the distinction of being one of the youngest members of the Constitutional Convention. Moreover, he served the citizens of this State as State Senator and Representative and also in other county offices.

The interest of Fred T. Colter in the development of Arizona was maintained by him throughout his life. He became interested in the utilization of water from the Colorado River and pushed his program forward relentlessly for many years. For their time, his ideas relating to the use of water appeared visionary but as the years passed it was realized that he had proposed a practical program of water utilization.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1. That in honor of Fred T. Colter, a person of established eminence, the Glen Canyon Dam be hereafter named the "Fred T. Colter Dam."

2. That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior recognize the achievements of Fred T. Colter and his importance in development of the State of Arizona, and take appropriate action which would result in changing the name of the Glen Canyon Dam to the Fred T. Colter Dam.

3. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona be directed to transmit a certified copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Interior, and to each Member of the Arizona congressional delegation.

Passed the Senate February 27, 1962.

Passed the House March 17, 1962.

Approved by the Governor March 22, 1962.

Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State March 22, 1962.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

U.N. Conference—Linowitz' Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished resident of the district I am privileged to represent, Sol M. Linowitz, of Rochester, N.Y., was a member of this country's delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas held recently in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. Linowitz, an attorney, is chairman of the board of Xerox Corp., a trustee of the University of Rochester, New York State president of the American Association for the United Nations and an officer in many civic organizations.

In a recent edition of the Rochester Times-Union, Mr. Linowitz wrote a report on the U.N. Conference, as a guest columnist for Paul Miller, editor and publisher. We can learn much from Mr. Linowitz's observations. I take pleasure in offering them for the attention of my colleagues:

HOW U.N. CONFERENCE ATTACKED WORLD POVERTY

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

"The simple fact is that we have learned a great deal more from them than they have learned from us."

That comment by one of the U.S. delegates to the U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas held in Geneva, Switzerland, between February 4 and 20 summarized for a number of us the most dramatic result of the Conference.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to UNCSAT (the ponderous formal title led to the even less pronounceable abbreviation), I participated in the sessions from February 9–16.

The Conference was set up by the U.N. as an unprecedented global effort to help mobilize the accumulated experience and resources of the more developed nations in launching a full-scale attack against the illiteracy, hunger, disease, and poverty of the less developed areas.

To Geneva came some 1,500 delegates from 80 countries. Among them were foremost governmental officials, scientists, technical experts, educational, medical, and other leaders.

The purpose of the Conference was not to make recommendations to governments or to come to decisions regarding policy. Rather, it was to focus attention on practical means for accelerating the development of the less developed areas through effective application of science, technology, and other advances of the more fully developed societies.

LITTLE GOBBLEDEGOOK

Frankly, I went to the Conference with some real questions. Would it be too large to be manageable? Would there be too many academic dissertions and abstruse discussions in which experts would talk only to other experts in the unintelligible gobbledegook of their expertise? Could such a Conference involving Communist and non-Communist representatives—and held at precisely the same time as the Disarmament Conference a stone's throw away—submerge the cold war long enough to concentrate on programs to help the millions of human beings in need?

On just about every count, I found the Conference more successful and effective than I had anticipated.

The U.S. delegation—led with immense skill and judgment by Dr. Walsh McDermott, Cornell Medical School professor—included Jerome Wiesner, special assistant to the President for Science and Technology; Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations; Jonathan Bingham, Ambassador to the U.N. Economic and Social Council; Frank Coffin, Deputy Administrator of Agency for International Development (AID); Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator for Human Resources of AID; Detlev Bronk, president of the Rockefeller Institute; Dr. I. Rabi, Nobel prize-winning physicist; Dr. Margaret Mead, associate curator of the American Museum of Natural History; Dr. Max Millikan, director of the Center of International Studies at M.I.T., and Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

The delegation worked hard and long and I believe it is fair to say that its impact on the Conference was greater than that of any other.

COLD WAR SQUELCHED

At the outset there were some on our delegation who plumped for playing one-upmanship with the Russians—meet every Russian parry, answer every Soviet point, counter every Russian maneuver. But it soon was recognized that this should not be our role. When at the opening plenary session, chief Russian delegate, Federov, launched into some cold war pyrotechnics, Wiesner, following him to the platform, won widespread laughter and applause with the simple introductory sentence:

"It is good to be here at this nonpolitical Conference to discuss true science."

As time went on, it became clear to all of us that the 400 delegates from the underdeveloped nations had their eyes on the United States in formulating their own objectives and aspirations.

Time and again their representatives would tell us in informal talks that their nations were trying to emulate the kind of progress we had achieved and would like to accomplish some of those things for themselves. But, they emphasized, they wanted to do so in their own way, in their own time, and in their own social and economic tradition.

And in understanding this, we all were learning a good deal of lasting significance:

1. We learned directly and personally about the real problems which confront these underdeveloped countries and how we must think about them in trying to arrive at solutions.

2. We learned that much of what we know and which is of real consequence to the rich areas of the earth is almost meaningless to the vast poor areas in which men still barely survive by tilling the soil with hoe and primitive plow (it makes little sense to talk of harnessing sound and space to men whose lives are spent harnessing water buffalo).

3. We learned how little technology alone or money alone or aid programs alone could do to solve the problems or meet the needs, and that the challenge is one that can only be dealt with effectively in terms of the economies, the mores, the social customs, the ways of life of the countries we are trying to help to help themselves.

4. We learned in an unforgettable way that the best way to exchange knowledge is to wrap it up in a person, that the most effective method by which to transfer information and experience is on a person-to-person and people-to-people basis.

BUSINESS HELP

One area in which the Conference and especially our American participation might well have been bolstered, it seems to me, would have been in having more representatives of American business and industry.

A number of the delegates from other countries—including some from the Communist bloc—made the point that there were relatively few American business leaders in attendance and yet the implementation of many of the objectives would require precisely the techniques and experience developed by American industry.

Whenever and wherever I could, I tried to make clear that American business and industry were ready to help the advance of the less developed areas of the world with their science, technology, and accumulated skills, and that out of the Geneva Conference might come some real guidance as to ways in which American government, business, industry and labor might join together to help meet the needs of the less developed countries.

Before I left Geneva, I summed up my own observations for our American delegation. It seemed to me the whole theme could well lie in this sentence from Arnold Toynbee:

"Our age will be well remembered not for its horrifying crimes or its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation in history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

Macauley's Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, some 100 years ago the great British thinker and famed writer, Macauley, in one of his writings issued a stern forbidding warning to the Government and the people of the United States.

This warning is so realistic and timely today that I think it is well worth repeating for the possible benefit of the House and the country.

It goes as follows:

Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when a society

has entered on this downward process, either civilization or liberty must perish.

Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of Government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century, as the Roman Empire was in the 5th: with this difference, that the Huns and vandals who ravished the Roman Empire came from without and that your Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country and by your own institutions.

While I do not agree that either the American Constitution or our political institutions are inadequate to cope with present conditions, I firmly believe that it is imperative for us to pause and take account of present conditions and trends in the Nation and then move with all practicable speed to strengthen and reinforce our institutions, where this is deemed necessary, so that they may resist the incessant clamors and impacts of subversive and softening ideas and destructive movements and be streamlined and modernized, where the need may be shown, to cope with and solve the challenging problems of our rapidly changing, growing country and the world.

To preserve intact our cherished freedoms, and at the same time adapt our Government and economic system to the needs of the present, should not be too difficult a task for our great democracy, experienced as it is in the affairs and techniques of Government.

But we must tackle this important task before our free institutions are overwhelmed by the whirlwind of radical thought and movements that literally besiege us, and before, by the sheer force of events, we succumb to the tides of moral, social, and political disintegration which godless materialism is sweeping across the world.

Insult Us at Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, although the President recently stated he had given instructions for our Armed Forces to shoot back, apparently he did not mean with live bullets.

A very disturbing and disgusting report of our apparent policy is given in the story by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in yesterday's Long Island Daily Press. These directions, if true, hardly bring respect to this great Nation:

SHRIMP BOAT NOT THE FIRST JET INCIDENT

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—That shrimp boat attack is only one of a number of Mig incidents in the open waters between the United States and Communist-ruled Cuba.

Prior to that, on at least six occasions Migs buzzed U.S. naval patrol planes flying surveillance missions in this troubled area. The last of these deliberately provocative episodes occurred February 18—just 2 days before the gunfire assault on the unarmed and disabled shrimper.

Full reports on each of the aggressive buzzing incidents were made to the President, State Department, and Pentagon. In each instance public disclosure was banned by direct White House edict.

The shrimp boat attack became known only because newsmen and Members of Congress were tipped off about it and began demanding the facts. Only after the White House, State, and Defense Departments were bombarded with questions did they admit what they had suppressed for more than 24 hours.

While the naval patrol planes are armed, they did not fire at the buzzing Migs. The U.S. pilots did that under stringent orders not to use their weapons unless fired upon.

Military authorities are convinced there is a direct relation between the buzzing incidents and the machinegunning of the shrimp boat.

This sequence is a characteristic Communist pattern. The Reds extend their provocative probes step by step to determine how far they can go before there is a reaction. Its nature and scope determines what they do next.

Contrary to certain press reports, there has been no change in the "don't fire" orders of U.S. pilots.

They are still strictly barred from using their weapons against the Cuban-based Migs unless fired upon. In other words, the Migs can continue to buzz and otherwise harass our planes with impunity.

Defense Secretary McNamara personally revealed this in his secret testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In response to a question on what the Kennedy administration proposed to do in the event of a recurrence of the shrimp boat attack, the Pentagon chief made this reply:

U.S. planes have orders to fire only if fired upon. They are free to fire on any plane or ship attacking an American vessel or plane in international waters, but hot pursuit is prohibited. McNamara stated that both he and the President are emphatically against that for the present.

Three Migs were involved in the February 18 buzzing of a Navy patrol plane—two Mig-17's and one supersonic Mig-21.

The U.S. plane was over international waters approximately 40 miles off the northeast coast of Cuba when the Migs swept in and made their first buzzing pass. They were preparing to make a second when two supersonic U.S. interceptors appeared on the scene.

They had hurriedly scrambled aloft from a Florida base in response to word from the naval plane.

The three provocative Migs broke off abruptly and hightailed for Cuba.

The two U.S. interceptors, closing in at supersonic speed, could have overtaken the Reds and unquestionably blasted the Mig-17's out of the sky. But beyond chasing the "buzzers" off, the American pilots did nothing—under orders.

Their orders flatly forbade them from using their weapons against the Communist planes.

Later, the crew of the patrol plane reported the Migs flew so close they could clearly see the pilots. Also that the pilot of the Mig-21 was apparently the commander of the trio and that, while he spoke Spanish, he had a pronounced guttural accent.

More Teachers Abandoning Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when improved education for all students is on the mind of all our citizens. Yet, at the very time when, for a variety of reasons, we must constantly seek improvement, there is the very real danger of a declination in one of the most important factors of education: the quality of the teaching available to our children. This declination stems not from a lack of preparation of teachers for their jobs, but rather from the accelerated pace at which skilled, well-trained teachers are changing their careers from the academic to the world of business, industry and Government.

Yesterday, the nationally known educator-columnist, Dr. Benjamin Fine, wrote of this current danger to our educational system. His article, which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger, deserves the thoughtful consideration of all here in this body. And, for this reason, I insert it in the RECORD:

MORE TEACHERS ABANDONING FIELD

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

Lured by higher salaries in business, industry and Government, more men than ever before are leaving the teaching profession. Angry, frustrated, and insecure in their teaching posts, they say frankly if other jobs become available, they will leave the classroom.

Men in public school work average $5,500 from their teaching. About half or them work at a second job during the school year, while 60 percent hold another job during the summer months which brings them an average $1,200 a year more.

Eighty percent of the men teaching in public schools are married with an average of two children. More than 40 percent have master's degrees, compared to 15 percent for women teachers.

Despite their greater amount of education, their teaching careers are shorter. As a group, men are 10 years younger than their women colleagues, and have only half as much teaching experience.

These statistics have been compiled by Dr. Sam M. Lambert, National Education Association research director. Reporting in the February NEA Journal, Dr. Lambert notes that a large proportion of men teachers have serious financial problems.

Most want to continue teaching but thousands resign each year because of financial difficulties. Their salaries provide basic necessities but little else. A wife facing major surgery, a son needing braces on his teeth, means trouble.

To make ends meet, the men pick up almost any kind of job available in the community as house painters, filling station attendants, selling life insurance, or cemetery lots. Many tutor in the evenings while others work in department stores, serve as part-time busdrivers or run sanitation trucks.

"I don't know whether I'm a full-time teacher and part-time bulldozer operator, or

a full-time bulldozer operator and part-time teacher," a social studies teacher, with two degrees and 14 years of teaching behind him, told me.

According to Dr. Lambert, many men teachers, angry at society in general and at public officials in particular, are even willing to go out on strike. Some have lost all hope that people will ever understand or appreciate the importance of teaching.

Indicative of the feeling of many is this comment from a New York City teacher. "Let me get down to the miserable facts. I earn $5,575 on paper. This glorious figure boils down to $320 take-home pay per month, or about $75 per week. People want good teachers, but we aren't in the same salary category as plumbers, carpenters, sanitation men, clerks, bookmakers, or bankers."

Deeply concerned about the future of his own children, a Florida teacher writes: "My oldest son will graduate from high school next year. I want very much to send him to a good college, but for the life of me I can't figure a way to do it."

The typical middle-class American worker now enjoys a standard of living unmatched in the history of this country. He may own a $15,000 home, two radios, a television, an all-electric kitchen, an automobile, and spend part of his summer vacation at a beach.

By way of contrast, Dr. Lambert cites this teacher who complains: "In the 11 years I have been a teacher, it has been necessary for me to work nights, weekends, and summers to provide for my family the bare necessities of life. The luxury of a vacation is in the realm of daydreaming."

School Administrators Swallow Federal Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1963, there appeared in the Rochester, Minn., Post-Bulletin an editorial dealing with the subject of Federal aid for elementary and secondary education. Entitled "School Administrators Swallow Federal Line," this editorial clearly stated the reasons why Federal aid is not the cure-all for our educational problems and that it is even not the case that under local and State control, that elementary and secondary education have been starved. For the benefit of our colleagues I wish to insert the editorial at this point:

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS SWALLOW FEDERAL LINE

It was hardly surprising, but nevertheless distressing, that the American Association of School Administrators wound up its recent annual meeting by calling for massive Federal aid to education.

The administrators want direct $200-per-pupil Federal grants to appropriate State agencies for all public school students from grades 1 through 14. That adds the two grades of junior colleges for the first time.

It would mean an annual expenditure of $7.6 billion for the 37.5 million youngsters in grade school and the half million more in junior colleges—and at the very time that President Kennedy says if we don't cut taxes we'll have a recession.

Federal bureaucrats have been preaching the doctrine that education at the local and State level has been a failure and that it is essential to get the Federal Government into the act. Unfortunately, the School Administrators Association, the National Education Association, and others who should know better have swallowed the line.

But the facts of the matter are that this argument is not true. One in every twenty school classrooms in this Nation was built just last year. Half of the existing classrooms were built within the past 10 years. Since World War II, the number of teachers has doubled, and their salaries have tripled. The teacher-pupil ratio has declined every year since the war, and the number of teachers is increasing faster than enrollments. Since 1940 this country has increased by 50 percent the percentage of national income spent for education.

Claims that Americans have stinted on education and that it is necessary for big brother Federal Government to save our youth are distortions or worse, plotting one more step down that path toward Central Government control of everything.

A-Ban Gains Held Greater Than Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the great questions confronting our Nation today is whether to continue negotiating a nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union. Believing that we in this body must consider wisely and well intelligent comment about this problem, I would like at this point to put before my colleagues an article that appeared in the Sunday, March 3, edition of the Newark Star-Ledger:

A-BAN GAINS HELD GREATER THAN RISK

(By William R. Frye)

Every time there is a reasonable prospect of negotiating a nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union, a hard core of opposition to the project invariably crops up in the United States and other countries.

Some of the opposition is based on a genuine belief that the terms being discussed are insufficient to guarantee the security of the West. On this ground, there is a basis for reasonable men to disagree.

Other opponents, however, appear to feel that a test ban would be disadvantageous to the West whatever the terms, regardless of the safeguards in the treaty.

It is much harder to make a case for this view. To argue against a test ban per se is to contend that no detente with the Soviet Union could possibly be desirable from the point of view of the free world.

Dr. Edward Teller, the distinguished nuclear physicist, comes very close to opposing a test ban under any and all circumstances.

He argues that "only great and comprehensive openness"—of the kind the Soviet Union obviously is not going to concede—"could guarantee the observance of a test ban."

The Russians, he contends, would cheat and get away with it while the United States and Britain would observe the treaty, sustaining serious security damage.

Moreover, he argues, there would be intensified strain between the United States and France not counterbalanced by new strain between the Soviet Union and Red China.

Experts at the U.N. believe there are gaping holes in Teller's logic.

The case for a test ban starts from the premise that the United States has a significant lead over the Soviet Union in the number and sophistication of its nuclear weapons, and that this advantage would be prolonged if the race in nuclear technology were henceforth to be conducted wholly in the laboratory.

Obviously if the Russians were completely free to cheat while the West observed a treaty, the premise would collapse. But physicists at least as competent as Teller in the field of seismology doubt that this would be the case. There have been striking improvements of late in the art of detecting and identifying underground tremors.

Some risk would be inevitable. No inspection system would be likely to be 100 percent foolproof, even with "great and comprehensive openness." But the likelihood of catching the Russians if they cheated could be made very good—so good that there would be little temptation for them to try.

The really relevant question, U.N. experts say, is not whether there is a theoretical possibility of successful cheating but whether the danger of it is greater than the danger Nikita Khrushchev would undergo if he signed a test-ban treaty and began to open up his country to foreign inspection.

There would be serious risks for him. The last time East and West began to relax and seek a detente, in 1953–55, there was serious unrest in the satellite empire—and then an explosion in Hungary.

Moreover, Khrushchev has more serious alliance trouble than Teller appears to believe. Teller says "it is unlikely that the ban will restrain the Chinese." This is undoubtedly true. It is equally unlikely that the ban will restrain the French.

But a nuclear test ban would be a severe embarrassment to both Paris and Peiping, and a source of resentment in those capitals against those who negotiated it. Given Charles de Gaulle's pragmatism, this could scarcely be decisive with him; but coming on top of all the other reasons for Sino-Soviet antagonism, it might well be the final straw.

Thus any rational analysis of the test-ban issue starts not from absolutes but from relatives; not from the question, "Is there any risk for the West?" but from the question, "Is the risk for the West, and the possibility of gain, greater than the risk and the possibility of gain for Russia?"

U.N. people think the weight of the argument comes down overwhelmingly on the side of the treaty.

Calendar of Events, March 1963, National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the calendar of events for March 1963 of the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are lo-

cated on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: Jacques Callot: A selection of prints from the collections of Rudolph L. Baumfeld and Lessing J. Rosenwald. Central gallery. Through March 17.

Recent publication: Callot: A selection of prints from the collections of Rudolph L. Baumfeld and Lessing J. Rosenwald. Exhibition catalog, 48 pages 10 by 7½ inches with prefaces by John Walker and Lessing J. Rosenwald; introduction by Elizabeth Mongan; 48 illustrations, $1.50 postpaid.

New reproductions: 11 by 14 inches color reproductions. Canaletto, "The Square of St. Mark's"; Chase, "A Friendly Call"; De Heem, "Vase of Flowers," 25 cents each postpaid.

Twelfth annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts: On March 3 John W. Pope-Hennessy, keeper of the department of architecture and sculpture, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, England, will begin a series of six consecutive Sunday lectures on "The Artist and the Individual: Some Aspects of the Renaissance Portrait."

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m., Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 3

Painting of the week:[1] Bellows, "Both Members of This Club" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 66, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Reynolds and Gainsborough; rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: The Cult of Personality" (12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts). Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Natasha Litvin, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 4, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 10

Painting of the week:[1] Jacques-Louis David; "Napoleon in His Study" (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 56, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Boucher and Fragonard; rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection; rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: Humanism and the Portrait" (12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts). Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conducter, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 11, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 17

Painting of the week:[2] Chardin, "The Attentive Nurse" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 54, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Courbet and Manet, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: The Motions of the Mind," 12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts. Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: The Feldman String Quartet, Gloria Whitehurst Philips, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 18, THROUGH SUNDAY MARCH 24

Painting of the week:[2] El Greco, "Christ Cleansing the Temple" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 30, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Monet and Renoir, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: The Princely Portrait," 12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts. Guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Aline Van Barentzen, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 25 THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 31

Painting of the week: Corot, "Forest of Fontainebleau" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 90, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Cézanne and Braque, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Artist and Individual: Imagine and Emblem" (12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts), guest speaker: John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Joel Krosnick, cellist, David Garvey and Charles Wuorinen, pianists, East Garden Court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, Republic 7-4215, extension 272.

[1] All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

[2] 11- by 14-inch reproduction with text for sale, 15 cents postpaid. (Special price this week only. Regularly 25 cents.)

Footnotes at end of speech.

Congress Admired for Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it is a relief to many of us who respect, nay, even love the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States, to read an article such as the following, written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 4.

Mr. Jones has not glossed over all of our shortcomings and they are many. But he does find that by comparison with other parliamentary bodies we show up pretty well, and have lasted much longer.

In these days when Congress is the favorite whipping boy for the press and the cartoonists delight, it is indeed pleasant to read an article like Mr. Jones' which is factual and helpful.

The article is as follows:

CONGRESS ADMIRED FOR BEHAVIOR

It was one of those awful days in the U.S. Senate when a handful of Senators were just standing around beating their gums to empty desks and the puzzled galleries.

The upper house was in a state of paralysis because the liberals had introduced a move to kill filibusters by a three-fifths vote instead of the traditional two-thirds vote, and with the rules up in the air the Senate couldn't organize and the committees couldn't be appointed and so, a month after the beginning of the session, nothing was going on.

Vice President JOHNSON was up on the high chair. A couple of freshmen, TED KENNEDY, of the well-known family, and HOWARD EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, sat around still, presumably, entranced by the newness of it all. Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, was conducting a filibuster on the filibuster, and every once in awhile he would refer to the Senate's being like Caesar's wife and again to its being in Abraham's bosom.

Occasionally, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, would ask permission to make a brief comment that wasn't brief and once Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, asked to interrupt so that he might call attention to the wonderful Ukrainians who were being ground down beneath the Kremlin's heel, whereupon Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, mindful of his own Ukrainians in Pittsburgh, fell all over himself seconding Senator LAUSCHE's sentiments.

I was killing an hour in the practically empty Press Gallery and I kept my eye on a couple of young men across the way in the visitors' seats. One had a beard and they were enjoying themselves hugely and about to die with suppressed merriment at the grotesque performance on the floor. You could just hear them at their next cocktail party laughing Congress to death.

But here's one uncynical newspaperman. Strangely, I come away from either House—even on a terrible day such as that one—with admiration.

The U.S. Congress is probably the best behaved parliament in the world. The raucous and raffish cries of "murder," "treason," and "shame," that characterize the lively debates in Westminster are almost never heard in the Capitol. There is none of the turbulence of the Chambre des Députés in Paris, or the House of the People in New Delhi, or the Israel Knesset. Not since Preston Brooks, of South Carolina, nearly brained Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, 111 years ago has the Senate floor seen a serious fight.

The Congress shows its sophistication by doing practically all its significant work in committee, or at least away from the floor. The floor is largely window dressing—speeches to the gallery and remarks for the RECORD—and, of course, formal voting. Votes may be changed by quiet persuasion or adroit pressure in the corridors, but rarely by frenetic debate in full assembly.

In the new republics all eyes are on the rough-and-tumble congresses. There is the place of passion and oratory and recrimination and contention. And here are spawned the dictators.

For popular government can't survive disorder and chaos. The confusion of mob government in the Agora in Athens brought forth Pericles. The corruption in the Roman Senate made Caesar inevitable. The irresponsibility of the French deputies finally drove the nation into the arms of General de Gaulle.

A republic is a fragile thing. The price of its survival is a reasonable efficiency. Yet popular government is inherently inefficient.

It is full of lost motion, confusion, and indecision. It moves forward under the weak force of persuasion instead of the strong force of personal power.

The U.S. Congress has been a success. Over 180 years, in spite of a host of mountebanks and incompetents and a few genuine rascals, it has listened more often than not to the voice of reason. It has, surprisingly perhaps, usually recognized real leadership and devoted patriotism. Its members—most of them—work desperately hard.

It may, of course, decay. Perhaps its golden age has already passed. Congress is a reflection of the people, and the greed of the people has this year brought financial irresponsibility to a new high. If we ever have a crashing dollar and a national paralysis we may wel lose the right to elect our representatives.

But, even if that happens, history will remember the U.S. Congress. For its time it reached a high point in the delicate art of deliberation. Repeatedly, it showed generosity in triumph and strength in crisis. It had tradition and pride. It molded a lot of good vessels, some out of pretty ordinary clay.

I never leave the gallery, even after listening to sonorous rhetoric rolling over empty seats, without marveling that the whole thing could have lasted so long and performed so well.

The Unnecessary Elk Slaughter in Yellowstone National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention by many sportsmen from California and other States, that there have been several hundred elk killed each year for the last 3 or 4 years in the Yellowstone Park area by the National Park Service. During the winter of 1961–62 the herd was reduced by a total of 5,229 head. Following is an excerpt from information received from the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, regarding the reduction numbers and categories as reported by Acting Superintendent Luis A. Gastellum:

Direct kill by rangers in park	4,309
Hunter kill outside of park	125
Live trapped and shipped	297
Lost in trapping operations	13
Winter kill	476
Total reduction	5,220

I would also like to quote from a report I received from the Department of the Interior, National Park Service covering the winter season of 1962–63 up to and including February 15, as follows:

Direct control (inside Yellowstone)	404
Live shipped	671
Hunter killed (outside)	530
Biological collection	108
Lost in trap (unsalvable 10, salvable 4)	10
Miscellaneous	10
Total reduction	1,735

Live trapping

Live trapped	1,468
Neckbanded and released	390
Retrapped elk	8
Escaped	397

Many of these sportsmen who are complaining about this annual elk massacre, make annual hunting trips to the States which border Yellowstone Park, and each spend approximately $500 for gasoline, automobile repairs, motels, hotels, restaurants, sporting goods, heavy clothing, ammunition, groceries, snake bite medicine, guides, packers, pack animals, airplanes, and many other things, in addition to $75 to $100 for a nonresident hunting license.

Many of the States out West, including California, where I hail from, have established a protective policy for deer, elk, and antelope, when there is a surplus of these animals in a given area, or on the winter range, where they bunch up in large herds and do damage to the farmers' haystacks, fences, and livestock. Action has been taken along one of two prescribed lines, as has been decided in meetings held by the fish and game departments and the sportsmen in California. When conditions arise on the range, as described above, the department of fish and game either takes hay and grain out into the areas where the game is doing damage and/or starving, and feed them; or if the department feels there is a surplus of a certain kind of game in a given area, the department traps the amount of game they feel is surplus and moves them in padded trucks to other parts of the State where there is a shortage of that particular game. Different game has been moved as far as 500 miles in California, and even to neighboring States. There is always the chance of losing a few animals during this transplanting; however, it has been well below 15 percent of the total group.

These same varieties of animals, largely elk and mule deer, however, bunch up during the heavy winters on land under control of the U.S. Forest Service, and overgraze these lands during the winter months, inflicting heavy and irreparable damage to the surrounding timber and shrubbery. However, it is the overwhelming opinion of the sportsmen that this direct method of control killing is far too drastic, and that the Park Service in cooperation with the adjoining States' fish and game departments should carry on a more extensive program of live trapping and transplanting in the future.

It is my thinking, as well as that of many sportsmen, biologists, and wildlife and conservation authorities, that the problem I refer to is the joint responsibility of the departments of fish and game of the respective States that border Yellowstone National Park and the National Park Service. Since our warehouses in this country are overflowing with surplus farm commodities, such as grain and other forage crops, possibly much of this material could be used to good advantage to prevent the game from starving on their winter range, or doing damage in our national parks.

Also, it is the opinion of many sportsmen that the elk and deer seasons open too early, since the game is still in the high country, and spread over such a large area, the percentage of hunters that go hunting in early October are not as successful as the hunters that go hunting later when the elk and deer are starting to work their way down to their winter feeding grounds. A later season would give the hunters a chance to harvest all surplus elk before they get into the Yellowstone Park area. I know many hunters who have been hunting for years in those States bordering Yellowstone Park, and unless these States open their seasons later, and the National Park Service stops killing elk promiscuously, many of the hunters will switch their annual hunting trips to other States, such as Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona, where the deer and elk hunting is almost on a par with that of Montana and Wyoming.

In some of the States mentioned, I believe, the State legislatures, the departments of fish and game, and the fish and game commissions are influenced too greatly by the packers and guides who insist on the early season so they can pack the hunters into the high country. However, the guides will have to alter their routine to give the hunters the full advantage of the replanted herds. This will mean more trips of shorter duration, which in turn, would mean many more satisfied hunters, returning home with a valued elk. This later season will eventually result in a better season for the hunter, and a more remunerative season for the guide and pack animal owners.

I hope that the National Park Service, the U.S. Congress, the departments of fish and game, the fish and game commissions, and the State legislatures of the States involved will give this problem their immediate attention.

Temper of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Ozarks has a fond affection for my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, ranking minority member of our Committee on Un-American Activities, who incidentally is married to the sister of Dr. George Wood, an outstanding physician in the town of Carthage, Mo. On February 19, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative JOHANSEN, delivered an outstanding, thoughtful, and discerning speech before the Battle Creek, Mich., Lions Club. His remarks were timely, to the point, and reflected the views of many Members of Congress sitting on both sides of the aisle. I commend them to the attention of all Members:

(Address by Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Battle Creek Lions Club, February 19, 1963, Battle Creek, Mich.)

I welcome this opportunity to be with you. This half hour is an interlude between a 12-day stay here at home in my congressional district and my return to Washington for the real start of legislative business in the new 88th Congress.

Let me say a word about this session of Congress and also about the time I have spent here at home.

This is the beginning of my 9th year in Congress. I am certain that the months ahead in Washington will be by far the most controversial, the most difficult, and the most crucial that I have experienced as a Member of Congress. By the same token, they can also be the most constructive and fruitful in many years. The potentials of wise, beneficial contributions to the general welfare are there.

Whether or not we make the gains which are so urgently needed depends upon a three-way partnership—a partnership which includes the President, the Congress, and the American people. And the American people themselves can be the decisive factor. I hope you; as citizens, will meet your responsibility and make your power felt by making known to the Congress and the Executive your judgment and your will with respect to the grave issues facing our country.

While I have made a few speeches during the 12 days I have been home I have also done a great deal of listening. If I rightly understand the sentiments and the temper of the people of this district—and I think they are typical of a great many Americans—they are acutely aware of events and of problems; they are thinking earnestly and with deep concern; and they are voicing their thoughts and their concerns and their frustrations, both to each other and to their representatives in Government.

This situation, it seems to me, offers a great opportunity for sound, broad-gage leadership. It imposes a very heavy responsibility on that leadership. And it poses a grave danger. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick" and persistent frustration can be explosive and immensely damaging.

Today I want to speak to you briefly, bluntly, and from the heart about some of the things which I am convinced gravely concern the American people. And I hope to relate those concerns to a few of the specific issues and problems which confront the Congress in the weeks ahead.

1. Never has the desire of the American people to know the facts or their desire to be able to believe what they are told by their leaders—and by the media of public information—been so urgent, or so desperately insistent.

The American people accept the fact that some information regarding the activities and affairs of Government cannot be generally divulged.

But they want—and have the right—to know that the withholding or the editing of information is not for the purpose of covering up mistakes, protecting blunderers, or serving partisan or personal political advantage.

They are disturbed, and rightly so, by references to news as part of the "weaponry." They are disturbed, and rightly so, by abuses of executive privilege which result in denial of vital information to Congress by the executive branch. They are disturbed, and rightly so, by suggestions that Members of Congress refrain from responsible discussion of grave international problems. They are disturbed, and rightly so, by the knowledge that under the past administration one Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times, not only took the lead in formulating a completely, tragically mistaken estimate of the Castro takeover in Cuba on the part of the American people, but that this same Herbert Matthews was actually designated to guide official U.S. policy in the State Department regarding Cuba.

The American people are disturbed, and rightly so, by the fact that allegations and warnings from responsible Members of Congress—of both parties—have been flatly contradicted and denied; then partially conceded to be accurate; and finally acknowledged to be entirely true.

There is plenty of blame to go around for this situation. And the American people themselves share in this blame. We have become the victims of our own genius for advertising, for so-called public relations.

We have become obsessed with a horrible, detestable, abominable thing called the public image. Everyone talks about the "image" we want to build for our political party, for our State, for our Nation, for a segment of our society, for a candidate or other individual.

I am fed up with this word. I think the American people are becoming fed up with it. I think they are becoming desperately concerned, not about the image, but about the reality, the substance, the hard facts, the unvarnished truth.

And all the more so when we learn by bitter experience and disillusionment that the "image" is, in fact, a false facade. We are beginning to learn that what we appear to be is important only as it faithfuly reflects what we actually are.

The most compassionate man who ever walked the earth had a biting phrase for the image makers of his own day: "Whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones."

The American people cry desperately for the truth. And they hope with equal desperation for a restoration of confidence in the spoken words of their elected leaders. What a supreme irony it would be if, in this golden age of modern communications, we should lose the one priceless thing which makes communication meaningful and worthwhile—confidence in what is said and heard.

The matter is summed up in the ancient adage: The penalty of being a suspected or proven liar is that one is not believed even when he speaks the truth.

There are already underway many congressional investigations of official policies and actions in your Federal Government. There will be more. Do not believe it when you are told that these are merely politically motivated. Do not believe it when you are told that they are solely for the purpose of dredging up past blunders.

They are a part of the necessary process of getting the truth, of profiting by past mistakes, of charting wiser courses of action in the future.

2. The American people are gravely concerned about fiscal policies, about fiscal responsibility, about the factors which undergird our economic security and well-being, our economic opportunity, our chances for better business and more jobs.

It is a tragedy if we equate this concern with greed. It is a tragedy if we assume that this concern is merely one which puts dollars ahead of people.

The Communists are wrong when they declare materialism to be the supreme factor of life. The undisciplined humanitarians, on the other hand, are equally wrong when they make unrestrained human wants the basis of all legislative and spending decisions.

Increased conscientious liberals, like the the late Senator Neuberger, Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, and Congresswoman Griffiths of Michigan, are recognizing this fact, and voicing their alarm.

Increasingly, thoughtful Americans are asking—and they are asking me—how we can continue to raise expenditures, increase deficits, add to the national debt and to the interest charges on that debt, and still decrease revenues. And when they ask me, they expect answers, not doubletalk.

And yet a top economic adviser to the President told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress the other day that those who would deny themselves a tax cut merely in order to avoid further deficits are victims of "a Puritan ethic."

This sort of folly is beginning to greatly alarm the American people. It is a justifiable alarm. It is a healthy alarm. I share the alarm.

3. The American people are awakening to the fact that there are no rights in a free society without matching responsibilities—that these are the two sides of an indivisible coin.

They are beginning to recognize this truth with respect to big labor as well as big business. They believe in the right of collective bargaining. They believe in the need and the right of workers to protect themselves through organization against uncontrolled greed for profit. But they likewise know that profit is the lifeblood of business and industry. They know that ownership and management and, above all, the public interest, also have rights and also have need for protection against unchecked greed for power.

It is quite possible that this truth will be reflected in legislative proposals and action this session in the field of labor law. Let us hope that it will be reflected in corrective and not merely punitive legislation.

The American people are beginning to recognize this truth also with respect to relationships between majorities and minorities in our society—whether those majorities and minorities are racial, or religious, or political, or ideological. Unless there is a mutual recognition of mutual rights and also of mutual duties and responsibilities, we can look forward only to more and more controversy, more and more internal conflict, more Oxford, Mississippis; more dubious no-prayer decisions by the Supreme Court; more shameful lawlessness in the Nation's Capital; more intolerance; more chaos.

The American people basically are dedicated to justice, to equal opportunity, to the preservation of rights. But they are heartsick also in their yearning for domestic tranquility. And only responsibility matching the clamor for rights can bring us that. Only that way can we live together in peace and progress.

4. Finally, the American people are beginning to understand that the ultimate defense against our enemies, and the ultimate hope for victory, rest upon firmness in the right, upon resoluteness of will, and upon boldness of action. And they are beginning to demand policies and actions based upon such resoluteness.

Military might is necessary, but it alone is not enough. Military solutions alone are not enough. Indeed we are caught in the ironical situation in which the very destructiveness of our ultimate weapons is such that that we are tempted totally to renounce force as an instrument of national policy, and in the process we may also renounce courage and resoluteness, and so expose ourselves to defeat by nuclear blackmail. And meanwhile our enemies go ahead with their little wars of national liberation, as in Cuba; with their subversion, infiltration, and internal takeovers.

And we find ourselves confronted with such contradictory statements within the period of 24 hours as Senator FULBRIGHT's assertion Sunday, "I do not regard Cuba, as such, as a threat to the physical security of this country or any other country in the hemisphere," and, on the other hand, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Martin, yesterday, that the Soviet Union,

from its base in Cuba, is expected to step up terrorism, sabotage, and guerilla activities in months ahead.

What a confusing, paralyzing, and vacillating effect these conflicting expressions from supposedly responsible leaders of our Nation is bound to have.

Small wonder my own constituents write me, call me, and confront me face to face to demand: What is happening? Have we no guts? How long before we take again the posture of firmness of last October 22 and this time follow through?

Clarity of purpose * * * resoluteness of will * * * firmness of action. These are the ultimate weapons and the only ultimate hope of victory and survival for ourselves and our way of life.

In General MacArthur's words: "It must be of the spirit, if we are to save the fishes."

Republicans Coming Up With Positive and Constructive Answers—Partial Text of a Speech by Representative Florence Dwyer, of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, Before the Legislative Dinner, Morris County Woman's Republican Club, Inc., Morris County Golf Club, Convent Station, N.J., Saturday, February 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, exciting things are happening within Republican Party circles these days. The GOP is actualy the Go party for 1963 and 1964. When Republican speakers take to the hustings these days they can electrify and inspire their audiences with news of what the Republicans are doing in Congress to offer a positive and constructive program for meeting the challenge of the sixties.

One of our talented spokesmen is Representative FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, who recently presented a factual summary of the new sense of direction which is taking place on Capital Hill. Her February 9 speech before the Morris County (N.J.) Woman's Republican Club, Inc., is a great one which bears further attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Representative DWYER's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

(Partial text of a speech by Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, Republican, Sixth District, before the legislative dinner, Morris County Woman's Republican Club, Inc., Saturday, February 9, 1963, 7 p.m., Morris County Golf Club, Convent Station, N.J.)

I am particularly pleased at the opportunity to talk with you today, for I know, both personally and through our mutual friend Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, of your deep and enlightened interest in the Republican Party. We share many interests, I am sure, but above all we share the determination to make our party a stronger, more effective, and more successful party—a party fully equipped to take over the reins of government in the United States and provide our people with the kind of leadership that will assure the security and well-being of our country.

With this in mind, therefore, I am delighted to report to you that things are happening today in Washington that hold out great hope for the Republican Party in the months and years ahead.

It is not too much to say, I think, that a new vigor, a new sense of purpose, a new direction even, and certainly an added enthusiasm is evident among Republicans on Capitol Hill.

Although the signs I see indicate this is happening at all levels of the Republican Party throughout the country—our new Governors, our increased numbers in State legislatures, our renewed activity and strength in local government—I speak especially of the Congress and more particularly of the House of Representatives where the real decisions of national policy will be made this year.

Basically, what is happening is this. Republicans are reassuring what it means to be the opposition party and coming up with some positive and constructive answers. Congressional Republicans are not going to be satisfied to sit back and play dead to the Democrats. This is not opposition in any sense at all. Republicans are not going to be content to say nothing but "no—no—no." This is opposition only in the very narrowest and least meaningful sense. Republicans are not going to permit a political vacuum to grow in which the opposition would be allowed to appear as the only party which has any ideas, any social conscience, any sense of obligation to the public interest. This would not be opposition; it would be surrender.

The greatest Republican of them all—Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we celebrate on Tuesday—had some words to say on this subject which, though we have heard them many times, seem most appropriate at this point in our party's history.

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present," Lincoln said. "The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Today, Republicans in Congress are thinking anew and acting anew. We are responding affirmatively and responsibly to the far-reaching changes in technology which have made our globe so much smaller and more complex. We are confident that our party has the resources of people and talent and ideas to deal effectively with these changes. Republicans provided 8 straight years of sound and progressive government under President Eisenhower. Our party's 1960 platform is an up-to-date statement of Republican principles and policies, a model of balance between the imperatives of progress and the claims of an older tradition—in brief, a chart to be relied upon to navigate a course through troubled, shoal-filled waters.

What we Republicans are proposing, in effect, is the rather revolutionary idea that we take our platform seriously—seriously enough to use it as a foundation of a program of action in Congress.

We believe our platform was an excellent one to run on in 1960 and much too good today to run away from—which seems so often to be the fate of party platforms.

We believe that if the platform was good enough to be the blueprint for 4 more years of a Republican President—and, certainly, it was not the fault of the platform that we lost the 1960 election—then that platform is good enough to guide us through 4 years of opposition.

We believe that opposition must be more than a negative thing, that it necessarily involves proposing positive programs, where the need for action is real, as well as opposing programs we believe go too far or not far enough.

We believe the people will judge the Republican Party by what we stand for as well as by what we stand against.

We believe the people should be given a choice between a Democratic Party we believe is too often inadequate, opportunistic and misguided in its legislative leadership and a Republican Party that offers a realistic promise of stable, commonsense, progressive government, government that will benefit all our people.

We believe that the place in which to make this choice plain and clear to all who will see is in the Halls of Congress where both parties must write the records which the people will judge for themselves.

How are we doing this job? What do I see that gives me so much confidence that Republicans are on the right track?

Before attempting my answers to these questions, I suggest we recall just what it was that first raised the question of what kind of opposition the Republican Party should be.

Republicans lost the 1960 election when we had almost every reason to expect we would win it. To say the least, defeat came as something of a shock. And the hair-thin margin of our loss only added to the sense of frustration that resulted. For Republicans, this was the first experience in 8 long years in adjusting to the difficult role of opposition party. The fact that Democrats had controlled the Congress during 6 of the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration did not lessen the problem, since even as a minority in Congress our energies were devoted to obtaining approval of the Eisenhower program.

As 1961 arrived and the new Kennedy administration prepared to take office, rumors spread to the effect that Republicans would seek a coalition with conservative southern Democrats for the purpose of blocking the new administration's program even before that program had been prepared and sent to Congress.

In that atmosphere, seven Republican Members of the House, including two of us from New Jersey, urged the House Republican conference to repudiate the idea of a coalition and preserve our freedom as an opposition party to oppose the President when we felt he was wrong or support him when we believed he was acting in the best interests of the country.

Although the conference did not act on our resolution, the issue came before the House soon after in the form of the famous proposal to enlarge the membership of the Rules Committee—a proposal intended to make it possible, at least, for important legislation to reach the floor of the House for consideration. Since it is Congress responsibility to vote one way or the other on bills reported by its committees, this was hardly a very radical proposal.

Fortunately, enough Republicans joined us on this issue and voted in favor of enlarging the Rules Committee that the resolution was approved. This was a major factor, I believe, in shaping the kind of opposition party the Republicans in the House have become. While it did nothing to prevent or weaken Republican opposition to the objectionable parts of the Kennedy program, it made it impossible for the Democrats to succeed in portraying Republicans as the party of negativism and blind obstructionism. Moreover, it has helped encourage Republicans to take the initiative in advancing counterproposals and constructive alternatives when we believed that administration programs were unacceptable.

The first major example of this came last year in connection with the Manpower Training and Development Act. For several months, Republicans in the House conducted

a thorough study of the problems of automation and unemployment and developed a number of recommendations to deal with this difficult situation. When the manpower bill came to the House floor, Republicans were ready and virtually rewrote the Democratic legislation making of it a Republican program. The Republican position was so sound that a majority of Democrats joined us to pass it.

This year, the trend toward an active, positive Republican opposition has continued—and with results that are already gratifying.

In its first action of the 88th Congress, the conference of all Republican Members of the House replaced its chairman with a younger, more energetic leader who is fully committed to the principle that Republicans should not forfeit leadership to the Democrats. We have broadened the membership of the House policy committee making it more responsive to like-minded members of the party.

One of the first projects of the conference, for instance, is an effort to obtain for the Republican minority a larger share of the staff members assigned to the legislative committees. This is particularly important if Republican Members are to play an active role in the decisions of Congress and fulfill our responsibilities effectively.

Republicans in the House have also moved ahead with our own alternative programs, even at this early stage of the session, in two very significant areas of legislation—education and civil rights.

Under the leadership of your own Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor have drafted and introduced legislation designed to help solve the No. 1 problem of American education, the need to provide increased facilities for the millions of young Americans who will want and need a college education.

This Republican proposal is sharply in contrast with the administration's education program—a catchall, multibillion-dollar bill that covers no less than 24 separate items. Rather than indulging in the expensive luxury of a gigantic program which has no chance of approval, Republicans have chosen the realistic and responsible approach, a bill aimed at the top priority problem, a bill that will make a decisive impact on this problem, and a bill that can be passed.

In the field of civil rights, there is a different kind of contrast between Republican and Democratic methods. Here, Democrats are caught in their age-old dilemma between high-sounding promises and the inability to perform. Despite their claims of interest in guaranteeing the equal rights of all our citizens, the administration has retreated to the point where it is recommending only a single civil rights measure, a voting rights bill.

In my judgment, civil rights is the chief moral and practical problem facing the United States here at home. Legislation is badly needed—moderate, even-handed legislation that will strengthen the hands of those now working to improve racial relations and eliminate the burdens of segregation. The need for this legislation should not be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

Once again, Republicans have come forward with a realistic and effective civil rights bill. Under the leadership of Congressman LINDSAY, of New York, 24 House Republicans, including the majority of the New Jersey Republican delegation, have introduced civil rights bills—the most carefully drawn and comprehensive civil rights bill since President Eisenhower's 1957 program. Moreover, this bill has the support of the Republican leadership in the House.

Slowly, perhaps, but surely, this new initiative and energy among congressional Republicans is beginning to attract wide attention. The story has not yet been completed and will not be completed, I hope, until Congress has finished its business. Republicans will take the lead in other fields, as well—the vital matter of putting some sense and order and direction into the tangled affairs of our urban areas, for example, a subject to which I am devoting considerable attention at this time.

This is the kind of activity, however, by which Republicans will write a successful record in the 88th Congress. It will be a record, I am confident, that will document for the entire Nation our claim to be the party of responsibility, of concern for people, the party on which all can depend to give America the good government it deserves.

Father Cuthbert and Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in every community there is an outstanding citizen whose unselfish devotion to his fellowman stands out like a bright star on the horizon. All of us experience a deep sense of satisfaction whenever we see such a person receive recognition from his fellowmen for his unselfish work.

In my home community in North Carolina we have such a man in the person of the Very Reverend Cuthbert E. Allen, O.S.B., the vice chancellor and director of development at Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, N.C.

Father Cuthbert has given 30 years of devoted service to the promotion of the ideals of brotherhood among the citizens of Gaston County. He has found time in his busy schedule as priest and educator to promote a better understanding among his fellowmen.

On February 28, 1963, Father Cuthbert's host of friends in Gaston County bestowed upon him a brotherhood award for his tireless efforts in behalf of the people of his community. The Gastonia Gazette, Gastonia, N.C., carried a very fitting editorial on March 1, 1963, concerning Father Cuthbert's contributions to his neighbors. I include this fine editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER CUTHBERT AND BROTHERHOOD

Father Cuthbert E. Allen is a Catholic interested in all men. Last night, this interest was recognized as he was given the seventh annual Brotherhood Award.

Father Cuthbert, as he is known up and down the east coast and distances west, has given more time to other people's troubles than most college presidents or deans.

His former students remember him as being a man with a receptive ear. His associates know him as a man who gets things done.

The Very Reverend Cuthbert E. Allen, O.S.B., was ordained a Catholic priest in 1933 and served as rector of churches in Shelby and Gastonia.

In 1935 he received his master's degree from Catholic University. In 1950 he received the LL.D. degree from St. Vincent's College.

He was dean of Belmont Abbey College from 1936 to 1945. Later he was promoted to president.

In recent years, he has been vice chancellor and director of development. This is the field in which he made his greatest contribution.

When the idea of establishing a community college in Gaston County arose, it was thought that Belmont Abbey might frown upon it for fear of taking away some potential students.

It was Father Cuthbert who openly supported the community college idea, stressing that such a college would complement the Abbey instead of detracting from it.

Congratulations to Father Cuthbert. May his fine work continue for many years to come.

No Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no question has been asked so seriously, and answered so often and with so much agitation in editorials, public utterances, in scientific, economic, and sociological treatises as Whither are we drifting? But it is a question nonetheless valid. It crops up in my mail more and more these days. Pondering the legislative avalanche of new Federal programs which has descended this year, perhaps it would be more accurate to ask, Whither are we racing at breakneck speed? When we reflect on the astounding growth of our income tax and social security systems as appraised in the Lansing State Journal of March 2, 1963, the answer makes disquieting reading indeed. I submit for the attention of my colleagues the following editorial entitled "No Celebration":

NO CELEBRATION

If an anniversary of the ratification of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed this week with far less attention than its significance would have merited, it may have been because many Americans were busily engaged in making out their income tax returns.

The amendment in question was the 16th—the one that authorized Congress to levy an income tax. It became effective February 25, 1913, following its ratification by three-fourths of the States, which if they had known what the future held, might have withheld approval.

The income tax law passed by Congress 50 years ago provided for a normal tax of 1 percent on incomes up to $20,000, and for a surtax on incomes over that amount.

Noting the virtual certainty that graduated taxes will continue to rise after their inception at modest rates, Lyle C. Wilson, a UPI correspondent in Washington, pointed out in a recent column that in 1930 the personal income tax did not apply to income under $4,000 and that in the same year the rate was 1½ percent on income between $4,000 and $6,000. By 1962 the rate had been boosted to 26 percent.

Like the income tax, the social security tax rate had a modest beginning. In 1937-39, the rate was 1 percent each on employee

and employer on annual earnings up to a maximum of $3,000. In 1962 the rate for employee and employer was 3⅛ percent on earnings of $4,800, and on January 1, 1963, the rate for each was hiked to 3⅝ percent on $4,800. Thus employees and employers who paid $150 last year will pay $174 this year.

Unless further changes are made by Congress, the 1963 rate will continue through 1965 but will rise in 1966 to 4⅛ percent, and in 1968 and thereafter the rate will be 4⅝ percent.

Those are the prospects as matters now stand. But President Kennedy's medicare proposal would call for an immediate additional increase of one-fourth of 1 percent and would hike the maximum of taxable income to $5,200.

And that would be only the beginning. As the costs of medical and related benefits for those 65 years of age and over rose, the additional money would have to come from social security taxes or other tax funds.

In the light of the appalling growth of the Federal income tax since 1913, the Nation's taxpayers had no cause to celebrate this week's anniversary of the 16th amendment.

But they do have good reason to reflect seriously on the implications of the event for the future as Mr. Kennedy continues to bombard Congress with new spending schemes, with or without initial price tags attached.

Whatever the first price tags may be, it is almost as certain as it is that night follows day that the costs of the proposed new programs would continue to grow, confronting the American people with either an ever-increasing tax burden or increasingly inflationary and costly deficit financing.

Birthday Congratulations to Lewis Deschler, House Parliamentarian

SPEECH

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, though mine has been a relatively short stay in Washington, it has witnessed and continues to realize the importance and expertness of Lewis Deschler, our House Parliamentarian. In a very real sense, his service in such capacity, of which this august body has been the fortunate recipient since 1928, has helped to sustain and vindicate the axiom that ours is a government of laws, not men. Serving as the parliamentary alter ego of the Speaker, and for that matter, of the entire membership, Lewis Deschler has cleared the well-known tight congressional procedural path time and time again in a way characterized as impartial, decisive, and quiet. His response to inquiries as to procedural stratagems and as to rights and privileges of Members has been particularly invaluable to my congressional brethren as well as myself. Indeed, this great body has been and continues to be the better for its selection some 35 years ago of the outstanding ability and parliamentary wisdom of Lewis Deschler.

I congratulate Lew on his recent birthday anniversary, and, moreover, on the occasion of his 36th year of service as House Parliamentarian. His has been a long and productive service; may the House of Representatives continue to enjoy his wise and nonpartisan counsel for many years to come. May Heaven bless Lew Deschler, and may he continue to privilege this great Chamber with his presence.

Statement Opposing a Change in Tax Treatment of Lump-Sum Distributions From Profit-Sharing Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the members of the House Ways and Means Committee were privileged to hear the testimony of a witness who had traveled 5,000 miles for the specific purpose of testifying before that committee. Mr. Robert R. Midkiff, a community-spirited and versatile young vice president of the Hawaiian Trust Co., Ltd., of Honolulu, presented a most noteworthy statement in opposition to the proposed change in the tax treatment of lump sum distributions from profit-sharing plans. His firm is trustee under 176 profit-sharing plans participated in by more than 10,000 employees in Hawaii. Mr. Midkiff's statement, which has my complete endorsement, reveals the importance of encouraging the profit-sharing movement in our system of economy. I believe his statement worthy of the attention of every Member of this honorable body and under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT R. MIDKIFF, VICE PRESIDENT, HAWAIIAN TRUST CO., LTD., OPPOSING A CHANGE IN TREATMENT OF LUMP-SUM DISTRIBUTIONS FROM PROFIT-SHARING PLANS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 5, 1963

My name is Robert Midkiff and I am vice president of the Hawaiian Trust Co. in Honolulu. I am speaking for the many small companies in Hawaii who have installed deferred profit-sharing plans.

It is a matter of serious import which will cause a resident of the sunny and delightful Hawaiian Islands to fly to Washington to speak up before your hardworking committee. The single point I hope to leave with you, as a result of my brief testimony, is an impression of the sincerity of purpose with which many small employers in Hawaii have gone ahead and agreed to share their net profits with their employees, under nondiscriminatory plans approved by the Internal Revenue Service, and following the ground rules established by the Congress in 1942.

In Hawaii we are very proud to be the 50th American State. We want to measure up to our full responsibilities as American citizens and to contribute our share to the growth of a productive economy. The idea of profit sharing fits in with our traditional Hawaiian respect for the individual worth of every citizen—a warmhearted tolerance for the value of another man's individuality which we call the aloha spirit.

In 1952 I was asked to look into the benefits of, and regulations affecting profit sharing, by one of our clients who had heard about it from a visiting mainland friend. One of the first documents found in my research was the 1939 report of the Vandenberg-Herring subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance entitled "Survey of Experiences in Profit Sharing and the Possibilities of Incentive Taxation." On page 5, of this landmark report, appeared this ringing language, "The committee finds that profit sharing, in one form or another, has been and can be eminently successful, when properly established, in creating employer-employee relations that make for peace, equity, efficiency, and contentment. We believe it to be essential to the ultimate maintenance of the capitalistic system.

Profit sharing is the essence of true cooperation which must embrace not only a wage relationship but also a profit relationship (after labor and capital have both had their fair wages). "It appropriately acknowledges the full contribution which employees make to an employer's success and thus it adds both to the dignity and rewards of those who, without a direct stake in ownership, make ownership worthwhile. It carries the spirit of capitalism to mass citizenship. In many instances it provides old-age security without intervention of government. In all instances it invites an intimate, mutual understanding of the common interest which employer and employee must have in their common enterprise."

GROWTH OF PROFIT SHARING IN HAWAII

I was deeply impressed by this language. At that time there were just three tax-qualified profit-sharing plans for local Hawaiian employers.

That same year, we encouraged three of our good friends to begin to share their profits with their employees in deferred qualified plans.

We have continued to promote the spread of profit sharing. In recent years we have been installing new plans at an average rate of 2 every month for a total of 176 plans by the end of 1962.

We estimate that we are trustee for over 10,000 employees in Hawaii at the present time. These citizens are looking forward to substantial retirement benefits coming from the voluntary sharing of the profits which they helped to create.

There are at least 100 other deferred, qualified profit-sharing plans in Hawaii where we are not trustee. I am sure, however, that all of the Hawaiian companies, most of them with less than 50 employees, who have installed these nondiscriminatory profit-sharing plans share the views I am expressing here today.

In selling the idea of profit sharing to these many small employers, we have always emphasized three fundamental objectives. First is to set up adequate funds to assure a decent retirement for faithful employees. Second, is to install a proven group incentive program. Third, is to enjoy the attractive package of tax benefits, including capital gains treatment of lump-sum distributions, which has been made possible through congressional action.

PROFIT SHARING FOR RETIREMENT

To return to the retirement objective, we have a unique problem in Hawaii. We are 2,000 miles from our major supply ports, which makes us extremely vulnerable to shipping or longshore disturbances. The disastrous effect of our 1949 dock strike on sales and profits is very much in the memory of our businessmen. Therefore, many of them have been reluctant to commit themselves to the relatively fixed annual cost of a pension program. These employers are most aware, however, of the need for supplementing social security with a retirement program, and consequently they are willing

to share profits, in the years when they make them, in a deferred profit-sharing plan.

The magic of compound interest means that a young employee can look forward to substantial retirement distributions. We have estimated the growth of benefits for a bookkeeper who was 30 years old when he started with our company in 1954. After 9 years in our plan, and with an average salary of $450 a month, his account has grown to over $7,500. We estimate, based on our investment experience to date that he will have in his account by 1980 about $75,000. There is, of course, no guarantee of this sum which depends on both future profits and future investment results. Profit sharing is risk sharing and the payout can vary tremendously with the climate of the investment market.

This $75,000 sum is based on average pay of $450 and does not take into consideration any future increases in compensation. This lump sum will be on top of, and additional to, monthly annuity payments from social security and an insured pension plan.

In explaining this lump-sum payment from his profit-sharing retirement plan to our bookkeeper, we point out that he will have a nest egg which he can do with as he sees fit; invest any way he wants to in order to enjoy it during the remainder of his lifetime. He can leave it to his wife and then to his children as a nest egg for their benefit and enjoyment. We point out that he will pay no more than 25 percent of his lump sum as a long-term capital gains tax under the present tax law. Actually a married employee retiring with no outside income would only pay $13,200, or 18 percent, on the above amount.

If he were to receive this sum of $75,000 with outside income equal to his exemptions at age 65 he would pay under the proposed change in the law, about $14,400 in taxes if married, or about $18,750 if his wife should die before his retirement. If he had been able to build up, through thrifty investing, taxable outside income of $4,000 by retirement, he would pay an income tax of about $19,050 if married or $25,190 if single. Such a heavy tax would be very discouraging to a workingman.

We explain these potential benefits and taxes in our employee communication program to achieve the second objective of deferred profit sharing—the creation of group morale and an incentive to improve company gross income and decrease the expenses of carrying on our business. The folklore of our operation is "remember our profit-sharing plan." Employees remind each other of this together with some concrete suggestions such as "Turn off the lights," "Don't waste paper," "Let's bring in another new client," "How about giving better service?"

PROFIT SHARING TO INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY

I am here to assure you that deferred profit sharing as it stands today, really does work to increase productivity. It works wherever the story is told often and well to employees.

I would like to recite to you, briefly, the experience of a small variety store on the island of Maui. Maui, one of our neighbor islands, has seen a decline in population since 1945 because of the mechanization of agriculture and a decline in overall employment in the sugar and pineapple industries. At the hub of the island is a shopping center with a franchised Ben Franklin Store.

About 8 years ago I met Mr. Tadami Kamitaki, a small merchant, owner, and manager of this store. He was much intrigued with the possibility of sharing profits with his employees.

It took about 3 years for profit sharing to catch on at Kahului Ben Franklin and for his message of increased sales and decreased expenses to get through. The store suffered from a relatively high employee turnover and poor sales. Finally, in 1958, the account balances in the profit-sharing fund became appreciable with each clerk finding herself with at least 4 months' pay saved up through her plan. The idea of profit sharing caught fire and sales expanded as the girls started to talk about profit sharing and to ask their friends to come purchase at the store. Every year since 1958, the company net income has increased by 20 percent. All of this in spite of the overall decline in Maui's economy.

As a result of Kahului Ben Franklin's successful experience, four other small companies, also located in the shopping center, have installed profit-sharing plans and are enthusiastically preaching this idea and its benefits to their employees.

Mr. Kamitaki tells us that turnover has ended and that the girls have taken over completely the active management of business. They do the buying, advertising, selling, and act as their own supervisors. By 1961, Mr. Kamitaki found time so heavy on his hands that he decided to leave his Maui store and establish another store, this time on the island of Hawaii.

In 1963, after 1 year of extremely hard work to make sure the new Hawaii store would be successful, he has installed another profit-sharing plan, for his 20 clerks on that island.

In selling the principles of profit sharing to his girls, Kamitaki has distributed to each one a number of books, including a copy of James F. Lincoln's marvelous book on "Incentive Management."

Mr. Kamitaki, as a successful businessman, is quite aware of the personal benefits that he receives from profit sharing, but he is convinced that he is successful because, to use his language, he is "sharing his blessings." His 1963 program to further increase profits at the Maui store and profit sharing for all his employees includes a reduction of prices on all staple items for his customers. This is one of James Lincoln's fundamental principles for successful sharing.

Mr. Kamitaki is entirely typical of the many Hawaiian companies who have accepted, in good faith, the congressional invitation to share profits, as expressed in the 1942 act and broadened in succeeding legislation. I could tell you stories of our work with A-1 Hydro Mechanics, which is a group of young plumbers; Leonard's Purity Foods, who make Portuguese sausages; the Rubber Stamp House; Sam's Supply Co., with 10 employees; all of them typical of the companies who installed profit sharing in 1962 for the 3 basic objectives of retirement, group incentives, and tax savings.

Gentlemen, I humbly suggest that the American free enterprise system will flourish as never before if all of our employees can look forward to retiring with a substantial lump-sum distribution from a company profit-sharing plan that they helped to build. Profit sharing is the most practical way to tie in the wage paid employees, and the clerical, salaried employees with the success of their companies. Without profit sharing, a worker can only see the harsh side of our competitive economy—see layoffs when sales are slow and expenses must be cut. With profit sharing, he automatically benefits from productivity increases and the growth of profitability. Profit sharing successfully ties together the self-interest of stockholders, management, and employees.

The rules of the game, established by Congress in 1942 are working very well at the present time, and are encouraging small and large companies to move ahead with profit sharing. Only last year we saw American Motors agreeing to share profits with its employees. More and more large companies are beginning to catch on to this marvelous idea.

I respectfully request that you do not discourage a most promising program which is so fundamentally important to our American free enterprise system. Please don't tamper with the rules of the game. Sharing profits is a noble idea. Congress should continue to encourage this movement.

Federal Loan for New Papermill Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Stevens Point Daily Journal, Stevens Point, Wis., entitled "Federal Loan for New Papermill Unjustified":

FEDERAL LOAN FOR NEW PAPERMILL UNJUSTIFIED

Washington was treated recently to the unusual sight of a Congressman protesting a Federal outlay in his State. Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Green Bay, came out strongly against plans of the Area Redevelopment Agency to loan $418,000 for the construction of a new tissue paper mill at Tomahawk. He called it a perfect example of Government bungling and waste.

BYRNES pointed out that the Wisconsin papermill industry already has the capacity to meet any demand for tissue products which might conceivably arise. Transferring orders from existing mills to a new one would hardly seem to be the way to create more jobs. Furthermore, as the Congressman emphasized, the industry is alive to every opportunity for expansion and modernization. And existing mills are operating below capacity.

This may be a small matter in the $99 billion the administration proposes to spend in 1964. But it's one of many unwise, unnecessary, and foolish programs that go to make it an alltime record budget.

The budget adds new programs to the old ones, and increases spending in nearly every category. The savings of which some politicians speak do not represent any slowdown of spending, but turn out to be sales of Government property in some cases, and transferring lending functions to private hands in others. The budgets for payroll, overhead and programs rise.

The Government Economy Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers has suggested savings of $2.8 billion in fiscal 1964 spending in a preliminary study of the budget requests, and promises to hunt more fat as time goes on. The National Association of Manufacturers objects to $250 million in new military housing, for example, on the grounds that the housing shortage which led to the program in the first place is long over. It questions $768 million of foreign economic aid to nations which have shown little capacity to use it, and little allegiance to free world purposes.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon defended the budget by citing the rise in population, but he's new in the job and may not have heard that Federal expense has been outrunning population growth for years.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress alike are alarmed at the size of the budget, and the $11 billion deficit forecast—particularly as last year's forecast of a half billion surplus became a realized $8 billion deficit.

The budget can be, should be and must be cut.

Impact of Imports of Footwear on the New Hampshire Shoe Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, the shoe industry is a leading manufacturing industry. A great many of my constituents depend upon a healthy situation in this industry for their livelihood. It is big business in New Hampshire.

There is mounting concern over the impact of imports on this industry, which appears to need certain tariff protection that it is not getting from the present administration.

Shoe production in this country has declined steadily from a peak in 1959 while shoe imports have increased in each year. Shoe exports last year reached the lowest level in decades, amounting to less than one-half of 1 percent of the total U.S. output. At the same time, last year 55 million pairs of shoes of nonrubber types were imported. These imports had a value of $81 million and equaled almost 9 percent of total U.S. shoe production.

This is a serious situation and one in which I believe are required specific protective measures by Executive order. If such an order is not forthcoming in the near future, there will be no alternative but to seek to have Congress require this protection by legislation. Today, as a leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting a fact sheet prepared by the New England Shoe & Leather Association on the impact of imports of footwear other than rubber on the New Hampshire shoe industry:

FACT SHEET

Impact of imports of footwear (other than rubber) on the New Hampshire shoe industry

	1962 estimated	1961 revised
1. Production (New Hampshire is the 6th most important shoe producing State in the Nation):		
Shoe production (pairs)	51,000,000	47,370,000
Shoe shipments (pairs)	51,000,000	47,278,000
Value of shoe shipments (f.o.b. plant)	$177,000,000	$163,107,000
Ratio of New Hampshire production to United States (percent)	8.2	8.0
2. Employment (shoe industry is the largest manufacturing employer in New Hampshire):		
Shoes (except rubber) manufacturing employees	17,935	17,890
Tanning, leather and leather products (except shoes)	2,945	2,880
Total, leather and leather products	20,880	20,770
3. Total wages paid to New Hampshire shoe workers	$58,700,000	$56,700,000
4. Total 1962 U.S. shoe imports estimate as percent of U.S. shoe production	8.9	

U.S. FOREIGN TRADE IN LEATHER-TYPE NONRUBBER SHOES

[In pairs]

Year	Imports	Exports	U.S. shoe production	New Hampshire shoe production
1955	7,809,654	4,642,134	585,369,000	42,413,000
1956	9,998,939	4,531,470	591,757,000	42,094,000
1957	10,988,477	4,397,638	597,648,000	40,742,000
1958	23,596,541	4,224,648	587,115,000	44,576,000
1959	22,276,841	3,504,712	637,364,000	49,470,000
1960	26,638,622	3,244,316	600,041,000	48,480,000
1961	36,783,825	3,034,545	593,310,000	47,370,000
1962 (estimated)	55,000,000	2,900,000	620,000,000	51,539,000
Percent change:				
1962-61	+49.5	−4.4	+4.5	+8.8
1962-55	+604.3	−37.5	+5.9	+21.5

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census; New Hampshire Department of Employment Security.

Hon. Lewis Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am more than delighted that our majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, offered the resolution affording the House of Representatives the opportunity to extend its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Deschler, our Parliamentarian, who is now serving in his 36th year in this important capacity. Others have spoken of Lew Deschler as "the greatest parliamentarian in the world," on Lew Deschler "the man," of his great contributions to all of us as individual Members; and I would like to join with my colleagues in all of these expressions of recognition, appreciation, and high confidence in Lew Deschler, our friend.

More than this, I would also like to record for history the tremendous assistance Lew Deschler through the years has rendered to the professional staffs of the committees of the House of Representatives. As assistant counsel to the Education and Labor Committee in the 82d Congress, I learned that Lew Deschler was always available and often was called upon for opinions on parliamentary questions arising within the committees of the House, as well as to give advice regarding the rules and procedures for presenting committee legislation for floor action.

While I am confident that every Member of the House of Representatives who has ever served with Lew Deschler recognizes his outstanding contributions to the leadership of the House and the Members individually, I know that each staff member who has ever called on the Parliamentarian likewise could testify that his advice and assistance have been invaluable in the work of the Congress in the committees.

It is a great pleasure and privilege to join in saluting Lew Deschler for all of his many contributions. I extend to him my best wishes for many, many years of continued service in this most important position of service to our Nation.

One-Man Rule in the Pentagon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States places upon the Congress responsibility to raise and maintain armies and navies. The degree to which this responsibility has been yielded to the executive branch should cause deep concern to us all.

This becomes more important as the size and impact of our Defense Establishment increases. Hanson W. Baldwin, a prominent writer on military affairs, is the author of a penetrating article in the current issue of Saturday Evening Post. In it, he points to alarming changes brought about in our Defense Department during the past 2 years. Among the changes he notes is the weakening role of Congress.

The entire article deserves the thoughtful consideration of Congress and the entire Nation.

The text follows:

THE MCNAMARA MONARCHY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The unification of the armed services sponsored by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara poses some subtle and insidious dangers—creeping dangers that are political, military, and administrative. And they could present, in their ultimate form, almost as great a threat to a secure and free nation as the attempted military coup, envisaged in the recent novel, "Seven Days in May."

For the kind of unification being practiced and preached today has ominous overtones. It is dangerous to the Nation's political system of checks and balances, dangerous to the continued development of sound military advice and effective military leadership, dangerous to managerial and administrative efficiency.

Mr. McNamara is, first and foremost, trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition.

He has established tremendous Defense Department superagencies, such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, which has taken over most of the intelligence functions formerly performed by the individual services.

This centralization of intelligence has made service dissent on intelligence more difficult, and it has facilitated the molding of intelligence estimates to preconceived policies. In the Cuban situation the primary reason for delay was the insistence of the Kremlinologists that it won't happen here, that Mr. Khrushchev would not take the risk. There's not much doubt that intelligence was influenced by this atmosphere of certainty. In fact, this centralization facilitates top political and policy control of military intelligence. And this is politically dangerous—domestically and internationally.

But this is only one area where Mr. McNamara is attempting to have the Pentagon speak with one voice. The Defense Supply Agency, a huge superagency, is procuring so-called common items for all the services. A Defense Communications Agency is being groomed for further expansion into a National Communications Agency which might well place virtually all of the Government's long-line communications systems under military control. Budgeting, the selection of weapons systems, contracting, personnel standards, uniforms, codes of justice, administrative procedures—all are now tailored to the pattern set by the Secretary of Defense.

Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted and altered statements to Congress by the Chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

PROGRESS MEANS PERIL

Mr. McNamara has not yet succeeded in forcing all the services to speak, officially or unofficially, with one public voice. But he has come much closer to it than anyone before him, and he is still trying. And the progress he has made carries its own political dangers.

For 175 years of our history, separate Army and Navy Departments (and then an Air Force) provided a natural interservice system of checks and balances. The services did not speak with one voice, and politically this was a desirable safeguard. They balanced each other, and their Secretaries provided contrasting viewpoints at Cabinet level. Now only the Secretary of Defense is a Cabinet officer; the service Secretaries as well as the uniformed Chiefs of the services are submerged in an immense Pentagon hierarchy.

The latest reorganization of the State-controlled National Guard, still opposed by some Governors, may ultimately extend Washington's power over the Guard. Such developments represent dangerous weakening of our traditional military checks and balances.

Equally threatening to the Nation's future is the concentration of politico-military power, not merely in Washington but in one department. It places more and more power over the military-industrial complex in the hands of a few men in the executive branch of Government. The dollar volumes of military contracts amount to more than $20 billion annually, with billions more in backlog orders outstanding. The individual services no longer have the final power to contract. The rewarding or cancellation of contracts—which may make or break companies and affect thousands of workers—is now ultimately controlled by a very few men in the top echelons of the Defense Department.

Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

Alternatives, variations, disagreements are the breath of life in any organization; imposed solutions, inflexible strategies, a "party line" from which no deviation is permitted could mean disaster. Mr. McNamara's policies are ostensibly intended to provide alternatives and increase flexibility, but there are many who feel they are having exactly the opposite effect. As Air Force magazine noted in its January 1963 issue, the decision of the Secretary of Defense to phase out the manned bomber will mean that by 1970 the Nation will be almost entirely dependent upon missiles for strategic nuclear delivery.

"We will have substituted rigidity for flexibility," states the magazine. "There will be fewer, rather than more, options for a future President to exercise."

The "one voice" unification trend in the Pentagon presents another potential danger: the development of future generations of officers who will be essentially military yes-men and conformists. They may be wizards of the new techniques of operational analyses and computer calculations, but without the moral courage or leadership qualifications required by the battlefield.

COMPROMISES ON WEAPONS

The single-voice concept is also enforcing—in the name of conformity and standardization—undesirable compromises in weapons systems. Technical competition between the services is being discouraged despite the lessons of the past. The air-cooled and liquid-cooled aircraft engines which ultimately gave us air supremacy in World War II were a direct result of differing Army and Navy technical concepts and interservice competition. In the Cuban crisis of last fall, a Navy camera used in low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuban missile sites proved to be far superior to a camera used by the Air Force low-level flights. The Air Force planes were hastily reequipped with the Navy camera.

Yet, ever since Mr. McNamara took office his slide rule statisticians have been pressuring both industry and the services into designing and producing a single, all-purpose aircraft supposedly capable of doing the varied jobs of all the services. The objective is economy, but the indications are that the attempts to force all into a single mold, may ultimately cost more—in combat effectiveness, if not in dollars. The so-called TFX tactical fighter has been delayed for 2 years while the Defense Department tried to force a design for a fighter that could perform equally well from carrier decks and land airfields. The final result—though officially described as a standard airplane—is actually two variants, both of them probably compromised in effectiveness by enforced conformities. The obvious danger of this approach is the production of a series of hybrid weapons rather than the kind of equipment the men who do the fighting and dying would like to have.

Finally, what about administrative efficiency; what has Mr. McNamara's brand of unification done to the Pentagon? Not only policy formulation, but operations and administration are directed from the office of the Secretary of Defense.

A program called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, dubbed "The Book" in the Pentagon, attempts to chart and elaborate nearly every detail of weapons systems and force structures required by the Armed Forces for the next 5 years. Any significant change in this plan requires an elaborate process of justification, review, and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting, budgeting, progress on weapons systems—even lawn cutting—is programed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary's office.

The reporting and analytical system required has resulted in a tremendous burgeoning of paperwork and great increase in numbers and rank of both civilian and military personnel assigned to echelons above the fighting services in the Department of Defense. But there has been no commensurate reduction, as yet, in administrative personnel and their workloads in the services.

When Mr. McNamara took office, he set out, as the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register put it, "Courageously and confidently to streamline top-echelon Department of Defense management." Instead he has added more to top-overhead—the apex of the Defense pyramid—than any Secretary before him. There were 15 Presidential appointees of Assistant Secretary of Defense rank or higher in January 1961; there are 15 today, though responsibilities and functions have been rearranged. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are 26 today.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is limited by law, a law approved by a Congress wary of the development of a "Greater General Staff," to 400 officers. But the restriction has been evaded by assigning at least 250 other officers to an amorphous division, called the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The total military personnel assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today is about five or six times as large as it was a decade ago. Yet one of the tentative plans discussed in the Pentagon contemplates a further considerable increase in the Joint Staff and the Organization of the Joint Chiefs.

There has been a steady increase in the numbers of topranking, high-salaried personnel, particularly civil service top grades, assigned to the Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, and the Pentagon. As of June 30, 1959, there were 3,009 civilians in the GS-14 to 18 brackets (the top salaried brackets); last June there were 3,950. Moreover, their salaries had gone up from a minimum of $11,355 to a top of $17,500 in 1959 to a minimum of $12,845 and a top of $20,000 in 1962.

This topheavy system has obvious built-in delay factors, and, as the record of the McNamara administration shows, it is far harder to start a new project or weapons system than it is to cancel or curtail an old one. In the first 18 months of the McNamara regime, no major new weapons system was started. Even today the Defense Department can find no military requirement for man in space, and it has curtailed, eliminated or held back such important development projects as a future manned-bomber system (the RS-70), the Skybolt air-to-ground missile and the Nike-Zeus anti-ballistic-missile system.

Though Mr. McNamara has centralized to a far greater degree than any other Secretary, he alone is by no means responsible for the trend toward a monolithic Department of Defense. It has been going on ever since the war.

CONGRESS SHARES BLAME

Concentration of power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense has been hastened by the loosening of congressional control

over the Pentagon. The power to raise and maintain armies and navies, conveyed to the legislative branch by the Constitution, has been watered down as a result of the sheer immensity and size of the Defense Department, the tremendous increase in Executive power, and the weaknesses and mistakes of Congress itself. In the Senate and the House, intercommittee jealousies and the small size of the staffs of these committees—which have not matched, in any way, the growth in size of the armed services—have hampered examinations and control. And Congress, by loose legislation, conferred upon the President and the Secretary of Defense such immense power to reorganize the Pentagon that it has, in the view of some Legislators, virtually abandoned its former power to check, control, and approve every detail of defense policy and organization.

The process of centralization in the Pentagon has gone so far there is very considerable doubt that the service departments can remain separate at all.

Both Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, have publicly opposed a single chief-of-staff system, and have endorsed the separate service "techniques of land warfare, naval warfare, and air warfare." Former Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates has warned against centralization and has said that to "submerge * * * honest differences of [service] opinion and free expression * * * in any monolithic system would be a fatal mistake."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army (retired), spoke in 1960 against reduction of everything to its lowest denominator, one service, one uniform * * * to the dead level of mediocrity, jack of all trades, masters of none, a group of "Yes" men always in unanimous agreement—what an insidiously dangerous philosophy.

If the Pentagon ever does speak with one voice, if the Nation's Armed Forces do come, as the trend now indicates, to represent a monolithic military-political point of view, both freedom and security will be in jeopardy through the slow erosion of democracy into a garrison state and the stagnant conformity that leads to combat ineffectiveness.

Lewis Deschler Resolution

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution tendering the thanks and appreciation of the House of Representatives to Lewis Deschler for his faithful service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for the past 35 years is a very fitting tribute to a great American.

Lewis Deschler is not only the greatest Parliamentarian of our times, but he has endeared himself to all Members of the House. In addition to his many splendid qualifications as Parliamentarian, he has those personal attributes which make people admire and respect him.

It has been a real privilege for me to have been associated with Lewis Deschler throughout my service in the Congress, and I wish him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Timely Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News and two from the Richmond, Ind., Palladium-Item, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, Mar. 3, 1963]

HOW TO GET A TAX CUT

Most Capitol Hill news observers are of the opinion right now that Congress will cut taxes this year—which is the major domestic issue of the current session—but they hasten to inject a number of important reservations with that opinion.

First of all, they agree that President Kennedy won't get the tax program that he has called for. That program has been termed just about everything from "unrealistic to irresponsible"—and among those who have given it these and other names are some members of both political parties in Congress, plus business and labor.

Business groups formerly were cast in the role of proponents of a tax bill, while now they're said to be opponents. From what we have been able to gather, the latter is not true. Most business groups still favor tax cuts, but they also support a corresponding cut in spending by Government.

Labor unions and liberals recently have also been sounding like opponents, too, but they're not. They just want Congress to vote for tax cuts effective at once, instead of in stages as Mr. Kennedy has proposed.

We think, as most other observers have expressed themselves, that there'll be a tax cut before the summer is over. But we believe it will have to be along the lines urged earlier this week in Washington by a committee of businessmen representing 30 State and regional chambers of commerce. Submitted for consideration was a program of feasible reductions totaling $9.8 billion of appropriations in the Federal budget for 1964 with a resultant cut in spending of $5.8 billion.

The economies were advocated as removing "the only real roadblock to tax reduction this year." The roadblock was seen as congressional reluctance to participate in "sheer fiscal irresponsibility" in reducing taxes with the budget already far out of balance.

Once the budget roadblock is removed, the businessmen see the way open to tax reform. They envision this as tax legislation "effectively reducing existing tax barriers to capital formation, individual incentives, and risk-taking, job-creating investments."

The committee identified areas in the 1964 budget where appropriations and expenditures could be cut without disrupting essential Government services. At the outset it called for the rejection of seven new nondefense spending programs proposed for fiscal 1964. The seven new spending measures include the omnibus Federal aid to education program, urban mass transportation, youth employment and training, and four lesser programs. Elimination of these would reduce appropriations $1.5 billion and spending $245 million.

The committee cited a number of Federal loan programs which could be curtailed at a saving to taxpayers of $840 million in appropriations and $659 million in expenditures in 1964. These included REA electrification, area redevelopment fund, Farmers Home Administration direct loans, FNMA special assistance fund, VA direct home loans, and the Small Business Administration revolving fund.

By reducing the outlays for certain Federal grant-in-aid programs the businessmen proposed to save $868 million in appropriations and $762 million in spending. These were in public assistance, grants to schools in federally impacted areas and the school lunch program.

The committee recommended a cutback in civil public works spending in 19 categories of public works including the accelerated public works program enacted last year. If these were held merely to 1962 levels, the committee pointed out, budgeted appropriations and expenditures would be reduced $851 million and $776 million, respectively.

The committee attacked three large-scale civilian research activities as "growing at too fast a pace for efficient utilization of available resources of money and personnel." By slowing down the space program and those for the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation the business group declared $2.5 billion can be saved in appropriations and $1.4 billion in expenditures.

Recommendations for foreign aid were offered as a solution to current problems relating to the balance of international payments, the flight of gold, and budget deficits. These would cut in half the $5.4 billion foreign aid appropriation and limit expenditures to the $2.7 billion appropriation figure—which would be $1.5 billion less than budgeted expenditures.

By reducing the number of Federal employees to 1961 levels, with certain exceptions, largely through attrition by not refilling positions left vacant by resignation, retirement, and death, the committee anticipated savings of $513 million in both appropriations and expenditures.

The business organization supported economy programs in logistical activities that Secretary of Defense McNamara is undertaking. It urged "vigorous prosecution of these and other economy measures with the objective of about 10-percent savings in the annual defense budgets ahead."

There is almost unanimous agreement among economists and politicians, businessmen and labor leaders, and conservatives and liberals that our income tax rates are too high and should be reduced for the good of the economy. The administration has indicated strong concurrence with this view and has proposed a course of tax-cutting action for Congress to undertake. At the same time, however, the administration has set up a roadblock to desirable tax action which is likely to be insurmountable unless it is materially reduced in size. This roadblock is the proposed $98.8 billion 1964 fiscal year expenditure budget with its $11.9 billion deficit.

Remove this roadblock, and we can have our tax cut.

[From the Palladium-Item, Richmond, Ind.]

KENNEDY WON'T LIKE THIS

Thanks to our form of government, those in position of leadership and responsibility are not immune to criticism, either from members of their own political party, from the opposition party, or from the press.

The situation in Cuba, where Communist Russia actually has established a military foothold within 90 miles of our shores, is one in which freedom of expression and the

right of constructive criticism are vitally important.

The administration of President Kennedy has said that it now is high time that its opponents quiet down on the Cuban situation.

Fortunately, the Republican Party has no intention of letting up on its close scrutiny of the Kennedy administration's handling of the Cuban situation. As leaders of the Republicans have pointed out, the Soviets now are rather firmly entrenched in the Western Hemisphere and it may take some doing to get them out.

President Kennedy and his circle of advisers would like to see a bipartisan front regarding our position in Cuba.

By bipartisan, he means no voice of criticism, no opposition, no needling of any kind. But that is not the kind of bipartisanship which will best serve the public.

Republican leaders in the Congress feel that there is deep unrest throughout the country concerning the Cuban situation. They feel, and rightly so, that it is their duty and their responsibility to continue to let the Kennedy administration know that they are watching his progress, or lack of progress, carefully. They will make themselves heard when they feel it is necessary.

This is not the time for shutting our eyes and blindly following Kennedy and his advisers or refraining from any criticism or suggestion whatsoever.

The voice of opposition, of constructive criticism, must continue to be heard, now more than ever before. There is too much at stake for any other course to be followed.

[From the Palladium-Item, Richmond, Ind.]

HOW CAN WE BELIEVE THEM?

How can President Kennedy expect us to have full trust and unshaking confidence in his administration if he, his advisers, and his spokesmen engage in half-truths, evasive answers, sly suppression of facts, or even in outspoken denials.

Take the 1961 invasion attempt on Cuba and Senator DIRKSEN's recent disclosure that four American fliers were killed.

President Kennedy's Defense Department at first declined to comment on the report of the Senate Republican leader.

The Department was unwilling to confirm or deny the statement of Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, who is making a one-man inquiry into the Bay of Pigs disaster in April 1961.

Later, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate Democratic leader, confirmed the report. The four airmen, he said, were employed to train Cuban pilots and navigators. The Americans volunteered to fly combat missions and were killed.

All the details of this ill-fated invasion attempts are in the hands of the Defense Department. If Senator DIRKSEN, alone and singlehanded, succeeded in getting this information, undoubtedly the Defense Department could have published it long since.

The suppression, the alteration, and the withholding of information about public affairs are usurpations of the rights of the people.

The monopoly on information, which a bureaucratic officialdom believes it has on information, destroys the faith, reliability, and confidence which the people should have in their public officials.

Neither is the deft and nimble weapon of social flattery and patronage which the President is employing to control and color news destined to encourage or solidify public trust and reliance in his words and actions.

Arthur Krock of the New York Times, for 50 years a Washington correspondent and a longtime friend of President Kennedy and his family, in a magazine article, says he has seen nothing to match the Kennedy policy of news management, especially in the Cuban situation.

Krock said the weapon of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error in the aftermath of half-won showdowns, such as President Kennedy's with respect of the Soviet rearmament of Cuba.

No wonder Republican leaders and even some Democratic leaders are insisting on a complete disclosure of the Cuban fiasco and are carrying on investigations of their own to get it.

Even Though Heller Jeers We Need More Puritanical Principles in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Rock County Star-Herald of Luverne, Minn., has an editor, Alan C. McIntosh, who does not think much of the theories currently being expounded in Washington, as he demonstrates in an editorial in a recent issue. Thinking my colleagues would be interested, I request that the editorial be published in the RECORD:

EVEN THOUGH HELLER JEERS WE NEED MORE PURITANICAL PRINCIPLES IN WASHINGTON

Dr. Walter Heller, who left the banks of the Mississippi River where he was an instructor at the University of Minnesota, is now the economic adviser to the President.

Sometimes Dr. Heller's theories are so far out in front that you think you are looking at the 1982 model of economic theory.

He slurringly referred to the old belief that living within your income, as an individual or as a government, as being old hat * * * that trying to spend less than you take in is an outmoded puritanical belief.

We think Dr. Heller may be a most brilliant man but we think he needs a reorientation course in America—what made America great—and what made America "tick."

We think he could well apologize to the Puritans—what we need more of in Washington today is principles of the Puritans as to honesty, morals, thrift, and decency and less of what we have.

The curse of too many administrations has been the number of college theorists—and Harvard doesn't hold the monopoly—who have never earned a dollar in their lives by risking a dollar—who haven't even managed a peanut stand but who would remake America, and what made America great, individual enterprise and initiative.

The administration claque jeers at those who do not swallow sight unseen the "reforms" in the tax measure. They say spending is necessary to get "America moving"—that was what they said in the 1960 campaign before they put sand on the rails when they got their hands on the throttle.

Somehow we have the idea that an advance alibi is being prepared for a "Kennedy depression" which will result if policies are not reversed.

What Dr. Heller fails to see, through the miasmic fog of his esthetic economic theories that debt is a virtue, is this:

Private investment which is the only thing that creates jobs has been lagging. It will never pick up unless investors see a hope of profit.

Union demands, which the administration aids and abets as in the settlement of the dockworkers strike, have driven employers to automate at a fantastic pace.

Until profits increase no employer is going to add marginal labor to his payroll.

He just isn't going to risk. It takes an average of $15,000 to $17,000 in machinery and plant investment to create a single job.

Who will risk $450,000 to create 30 jobs when he can make more return just "sitting" on his money.

When bonds bring a higher yield than stocks, as in today's market it is a clear signal of what is wrong.

If Dr. Heller wants to know why America isn't moving forward faster just let him look at the mirror—this man who sees no danger in staggering debt.

Danger of More Cubas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a very fine editorial which appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle-Tribune on February 27, 1963. The editors have pointed out the very important truth that the security of Latin America depends to a large degree on attacking the prevailing social and economic injustice.

DANGER OF MORE CUBAS

President Betancourt uttered the obvious when he told President Kennedy that the United States and Latin America must control air and sea traffic between Cuba and Latin American nations to stamp out Communist subversion.

He uttered the obvious too when he said that economic and social reforms must be accomplished in Latin America or Cuban communism will have numerous national comrades in this hemisphere.

Kennedy did not say yes or no to Betancourt's proposals. He merely pledged full support of Venezuela's resistance of communism. But he could not have failed to see the sense in Betancourt's words, nor could he have failed to discern the enormity of the obligation Betancourt defined.

Obvious, we think, is the fact that the kind of control Betancourt called for would have to be applied almost wholly by the United States. Latin American nations through the Organization of American States never, since the rise of communism in Cuba, have been able to agree on effective action against the Castro regime. The fact that Brazil did not promptly return to Venezuela the hijackers of a Venezuelan ship signifies the unwillingness or inability of Latin America to deal vigorously with the danger of communism.

But effective control of air and sea traffic from Cuba to other Latin American nations would not prevent the establishment of Communist regimes in Central and South America. As long as unrest caused by social and economic injustice prevails, the soil to nourish communism exists, and someone will appear to seed it. Communist Cuba, free to export subversion, makes the seeding process easier.

The President, as he examines this truth, must bitterly rue what his brother Robert calls the mistake he made when Cuban exiles nearly 2 years ago tried to overthrow Castro and failed because the administration refused to shake the dust of neglect from the Monroe Doctrine.

Sikorsky Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today a new company was incorporated under the name of Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corp. Its physical assets were meager, but its hopes were great.

Today that company is Sikorsky Aircraft, of Stratford, Conn., a division of United Aircraft Corp. and a world leader in the design and manufacture of helicopters.

President and guiding light of the 1923 organization was Igor I. Sikorsky then just 33 years old but already a legend in aviation. The first location was a farm on Long Island near Roosevelt Field; the first workers were Russian immigrants and friends of Mr. Sikorsky.

Four years before, this young engineer had arrived in New York City, a refugee from the revolution in his native Russia where he had established himself as a man of vision in the field of aeronautics.

Behind him were early experiments with helicopters in Russia, and success with the Grand, the world's first multiengine—four—airplane and forerunner of World War I's most successful bomber.

The first aircraft built by Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corp. was the S-29-A—the A for America—a twin-engine, all-metal transport which proved a model for future airliners. Despite an early shortage of funds, a number of aircraft followed—including the twin-engine S-38 amphibian with which Pan American Airways pioneered in establishing air routes to Central and South America. With the success of the S-38 came an opportunity for Mr. Sikorsky's company to become a subsidiary of United Aircraft Corp. in 1929.

Under United, Mr. Sikorsky developed a number of flying boats which set outstanding records. In 1935 the S-42 opened air trails to Hawaii and the Orient, and paved the way for regular transatlantic flights. A later, and more advanced flying boat, the S-44, established itself as the first airliner capable of regular transatlantic runs without stopping and without refueling.

Early in 1939, Mr. Sikorsky returned to his first great interest, the helicopter. On September 14, 1939, the VS-300—with Mr. Sikorsky at the controls—lifted itself a few feet from the ground in Stratford, and the Western Hemisphere knew its first practical helicopter. In 1943, quantity manufacture of the R-4 made it the world's first production helicopter and the only rotary-wing aircraft to see action in World War II.

Sikorsky helicopters came into their own during the Korean war. S-51's, and later S-55's, flew rescue and troop-carrying missions that provided a new perspective of helicopters as military vehicles. There followed bigger and faster helicopters as turbine engines took the place of piston engines; helicopters blazed new trails in private industry, and as passenger aircraft. Latest Sikorsky helicopter is the S-64 Skycrane, a heavy lifter that can carry loads of various shapes and sizes up to 10 tons in weight.

Mr. Sikorsky retired as engineering manager of the division in 1957, but he still serves as consultant to a new generation of engineers at Sikorsky Aircraft. He has received numerous honors in a lifetime of leadership in both fixed-wing and rotary-wing aeronautics.

He can look back 40 years to the beginning of a company on a small farm in Long Island and ahead to new aircraft, with new dimensions in design, ability, and use, coming from the present Sikorsky plant in Stratford.

Tax Cut Here—Tax Hike There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, because the significance of local and State government is often overlooked in our economic discussions, I offer for reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the Waukegan News-Sun which is published in Waukegan, Ill., by Mr. F. Ward Just. I heartily commend this message for reading hoping that greater reliance and trust will be placed on the capacity of our American people to govern themselves through local rather than Federal Government:

TAX CUT HERE—TAX HIKE THERE

Running anything as huge as the Federal Government can easily become an all-consuming task. Thus, Congressmen and the Kennedy administration can be excused if sometimes they become so immersed in Washington affairs that they act as if State and local governments hardly exist at all.

This inability to keep the full panorama of government—Federal, State, and local—in mind is well illustrated by much of the debate on the President's tax cut proposals. The bulk of the discussion turns on what consumers and investors might do with their extra dollars. And this certainly is a crucial consideration.

However, the discussion usually ignores a central fact—namely, a very large portion of any tax cut will be almost automatically grabbed by local and State government, one way or another. Indeed, the nationwide rash of proposals to increase State and local taxes in 1963 stands in curious contrast to President Kennedy's call to reduce Federal levies. It seems quite clear that unless an economy wave hits State and municipal leaders, taxpayers would have to use most of any savings in Federal taxes this year to pay heavier taxes to States, counties, and cities.

Certainly the pressure to expand State and local revenues is well documented. The Tax Foundation has reported that from fiscal 1950 through fiscal 1961, combined annual State-local outlays climbed from $27.9 billion to $66.4 billion—a rise of 138 percent.

Significantly, the annual increases in State-local spending during that period averaged $3.5 billion per year—about one-third of the total tax cut recommended by President Kennedy. And the outlook for 1963 is no more promising because fiscal problems were allowed to pile up in statehouses during the 1962 election year. Now they are crying for attention.

Illinois is a fine example of what we mean. Although Governor Kerner seems to be soft-pedaling the need for new taxation until after the April municipal election in Chicago, there is no doubt that Illinois will ultimately have to find about $300 to $400 million in new revenue to finance State programs in the 1963-65 biennium. Our men in Springfield postponed a head-on assault of the revenue problem in the 1961 session by farming the problem out to a study group. Now the study group has come to a dead end and the problem is back in the laps of the Governor and the general assembly.

Meanwhile, local governmental agencies in Illinois are clamoring for more revenue—particularly schools and municipalities. There is, for example, before the general assembly a request for $173 million in additional State aid to schools.

So when President Kennedy talks about invigorating the private sector of our economy with a tax cut, one must not lose sight of the fact that whatever wholesome effect this policy might have, it will be diluted as States and localities kick up their levies.

This does not mean State and local taxation and spending is economic waste. On the contrary, the construction and staffing of a new school or mental hospital consumes a lot in building materials and provides many new jobs.

But this sort of public-sector spending does not help particularly in the critical task of accumulating risk capital in private hands—the kind of risk capital which is sorely needed to finance the research and production of dramatic new products that will spur consumer spending and provide work for idle men and machinery.

Solid, sustained economic growth demands the creative use of capital. We need to free money for investment in new ideas and new techniques—not just more public works projects.

Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am privileged today to extend my sincere congratulations to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

This is a very great achievement and one I am sure that Lew is proud to claim. His devotion to his duties, to our Speaker and to the membership of this House is reflected in his modesty, but we all know he is, without a doubt, the greatest authority on parliamentary law in the United States today.

Above and beyond this acknowledged ability, Lew is a very human and understanding man. He is a humanitarian and is never too busy to lend a helping hand when requested to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are most fortunate to have had Mr. Deschler with us over the past 35 years and I hope the good Lord will watch over him and guide him for many more years to come.

Lew, we will always need your wisdom and your valuable assistance. Again please accept my heartiest congratulations on this very important occasion in your fabulous life on Capitol Hill.

Statement by U.S. Delegate Northcutt Ely to U.N. Conference on Science and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by Northcutt Ely, Esq., a delegate of the United States to the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, held in Geneva, Switzerland, February 4–20, 1963. Mr. Ely's statement, made during the combined session on water development policies, discusses the relationship of water laws to water resource development and makes a point which I believe is of particular significance to our consideration of proposals relating to comprehensive river basin planning.

The address of Mr. Ely follows:

STATEMENT OF NORTHCUTT ELY, OF THE U.S. DELEGATION, FEBRUARY 6, 1963

Much has been said in this meeting about the desirability of flexibility in water laws. I want to enter a caveat.

Of course, every water resource should be developed, where possible, in accordance with a comprehensive plan that brings about the maximum ultimate use of the resource, a balance between the new and the old, a balance among the competitive multiple purposes that the river can serve. But development cannot wait, and the use of water cannot be denied to man, during the long decades that may be necessary to plan, finance, and build the big dams, the long canals, the municipal water aqueducts, the powerplants and transmission lines, and perhaps the fish conservation works, that the completed plan will some day encompass.

That is not the way that the river is put to use and the desert is conquered in a new land. This is usually done by brave pioneers, with few resources, who carve farms and homes out of the wilderness as best they can. As they succeed, an economy of farms and small villages is built up by their use of the water. Later, as the economy matures, it becomes wealthy enough to finance bigger works. Characteristically, these works are dams and canals that serve a community of farmers, organized in a unit of some kind. Still later, the grand design emerges: huge dams and other works able to serve large areas, including a number of irrigation districts and cities.

But when this day comes, the water rights of the predecessor projects that made this growth possible cannot be brushed aside and written off on the plea that flexibility is required for progress, that the assets of the past are the liabilities of the future.

We learned this the hard way in a hundred years of experience in the arid American West. This is still a developing country. Its development is limited by the water supply. West of the 100th meridian, we are an oasis civilization, excepting only a few areas on the Pacific Coast. In this dry area, we found the riparian doctrine that we inherited from the English common law to be wholly impractical. This was for two main reasons: First, under the riparian law, water rights were restricted to lands contiguous to the stream, whereas the greatest opportunities might be upon lands at a distance. Second, under the riparian doctrine shortages of water are prorated, so that the supply for each project, although adequate when it was built, is subject to the hazard that projects built later may demand a share of that supply, so that ultimately all of them must go short. This second element, proration, proved intolerable because projects could not be financed under this sword of Damocles. In short, there are two kinds of drouth, the kind that nature inflicts upon us, and the legal drouth that we inflict upon ourselves by unwise laws. These unwise laws are the ones that permit new projects to crowd in upon a water supply already put to use by other projects.

The wise doctrine, we learned by a century of experience in the dry areas of our country is the law of priority of appropriation: "first in time, first in right." Each project, while it unavoidably remains subject to nature's drouths, is protected from man made drouth. The risk of shortage falls in its entirety on the junior projects, in inverse order of the dates of initiation of the projects. The shortage is not prorated. Each investor knows in advance exactly what water rights are superior to his own. Each has a reasonable time to complete his project with due diligence, whereupon his rights relate back to the date of initiation. Land without water is worthless. Water rights must have at least as great security of tenure as do the titles of the land they serve. If water rights and land titles are taken by the Government, they must be fairly compensated.

Every officeholder is convinced that divine wisdom was not fully revealed until a date which happens to coincide with the date upon which he took office. To him, flexibility is a good word, because to him it means freedom of action. But let its use be tempered by realization that what we do today may be flexibilized by our successors. In the meantime, many plain and humble people will have made irreversible decisions, based on water rights as they then existed. Flexibility is a good thing in the administration of water resources if it is balanced by recognition that water rights of existing projects are not blueprints, to be torn up when better blueprints become available, but are the foundation for existing economies that must be fairly compensated if progress requires them to be displaced.

Hon. Lew Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasantest associations I have enjoyed during my long service in the House has been with our able and distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, who has now entered upon his 36th year of service in this vitally important office. Not only has this been a delightful association, he is one of my closest and dearest friends in this body.

During my terms as Speaker in the 80th and 83d Congresses, he sat at my right hand. As any Speaker, of either party would testify, if any employee of the House is an indispensable man, it is Lew Deschler. His knowledge of the rules, precedents, and procedures of the House is profound and instantaneous. During my terms as Speaker, his services were of inestimable value. It would be impossible to exaggerate the value of his services to the Speaker and to the House.

There is no more dedicated and faithful public servant in our Government than Lew Deschler. He loves this House. He is a stalwart defender of its privileges, its rules and its dignity. He has earned the everlasting admiration, esteem, and respect of the entire membership of this body for his great ability, his knowledge, and his devotion to duty.

I hope he will continue in robust health so that he may serve the House for many years to come.

A Vast Recreational Playground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorial comment made by two Texas papers about the features which could make the Guadalupe Peak area of west Texas the site of one of the United States most magnificent national parks.

My bill, H.R. 3100, now in the hands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, calls for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of the feasibility of establishing a national park in the Guadalupe Peak.

The following comment was made recently by the San Angelo Standard Times:

NO REASON FOR TEXAS TO HIDE ATTRACTIONS

Whether or not the Guadalupe Peak area of west Texas becomes a national park, Representative at Large JOE POOL of Dallas is making a significant contribution to publicizing the scenic beauty of west Texas. It very well could become a vast recreational playground, tying in with other scenic attractions throughout the Davis Mountain area, Fort Davis, and the Big Bend National Park.

Representative POOL's first bill introduced at this session of Congress calls for investigating the possibilities of establishing a national park there.

The grandeur of the Rockies rests in this part of Texas quite as much as it does in Colorado. There are ranges just as scenic and almost parallel in altitude. Guadalupe Peak itself is 8,751 feet and it rates as the highest in Texas. El Capitan on the plain below is 8,078 feet. Because of perspective it appears to be higher than Guadalupe and for years it was thought to be the highest mountain in Texas.

Just west of the Guadalupe range and extending to the Hueco Mountains a short distance east of El Paso is the Diablo Plateau. South of the Guadalupe Mountains are the Davis Mountains, lying principally in Jeff Davis County. Here Mount Livermore rises to an imposing 8,382 feet, rating it the second highest in Texas. There are other mountains ranging above 7,000 feet, providing some spectacular scenery, good hunting, and good climbing if one is disposed to be challenged by heights.

There's no reason for Texas to hide its tourist attractions. The Pool bill will accent these recreational areas and help to pull tourists into the hinterlands of the old frontier.

Nature made of Texas a tremendous empire from the coastal plains to the extremities of the Rockies. Much of it has not been discovered or explored.

The Dell Valley Review, published in Dell City, Tex., responded to the announcement of H.R. 3100 as follows:

A NATIONAL PARK FOR GUADALUPE PEAK

Guadalupe Peak and surrounding area is being considered for the Guadalupe Peak and El Capitan National Park. A bill has been introduced in the House in Washington, D.C., by Representative at large JOE POOL, Democrat, of Texas, according to Sarah McClendon, Washington correspondent from Texas.

The national park would consist of approximately 50 square miles located in the northeast corner of Hudspeth County and northwest corner of Culberson County and would of course include the 8,751 foot high Guadalupe Peak, highest point in Texas and El Capitan Mountain.

Representative POOL, in commenting on the park stated that Guadalupe Peak has long been a favorite of his, the same as it is to thousands of other Texans and out-of-State visitors.

Guadalupe Peak is the last of a chain of mountains that start in the Bering Sea and was used in the early days by overland stage coaches, freight wagons, scouts and the Army, as a guide post against the Texas sky.

Dell City believes along with Representative POOL that a national park at Guadalupe Peak would be a magnificent inducement to bring more people to west Teaxs and we will watch with interest as action is taken on his plans.

A national park would also help open the way for the Dell City area to become an overnite stop for tourists attracted to this area by a national park.

No Political Mileage in ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the House the following editorial from the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of February 27, 1963. It neatly sums up a sharp point concerning the high school ROTC and a certain civilian youth corps.

The editorial follows:

NO POLITICAL MILEAGE IN ROTC

The Kennedy administration is placing great emphasis just now on a variety of youth programs aimed at promoting discipline, good morals, and physical fitness to counter, among other things, juvenile delinquency. The Defense Department also stresses the importance to the common defense of building larger conventional as well as nuclear military forces.

But in the face of all of this we read that the administration proposes to abandon the high school ROTC programs, which for decades have demonstrated their worth in discipline, physical fitness, and basic military training. But, of course, the ROTC program has never proved to be a fertile field for political exploitation, like certain civilian youth corps.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent his civil rights message to the Congress. I note that it was over 2 years in coming. I recognize that the civil rights problem is different in various sections of the country. Nevertheless, I would like to call attention to the action of the Springfield, Mo., School Board when the Supreme Court decision calling for school integration was first decreed. The manner in which the Springfield School Board acted drew nationwide attention in Life magazine and was the subject of an article in the Voice of the People section of the Chicago Tribune. Springfield's school integration was carried out in three steps. First, the students were reassigned. Second, Negro teachers were reassigned, and third, the schools themselves were fit into the integration pattern. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, and as possible guidance to other communities with this same problem, I call your attention to the following statement put out by the Springfield Board of Education, the comments of the Missouri Association for Social Welfare, and the Chicago Tribune's Voice of the People letter.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *January 12, 1955.*

Mr. JAMES A. JEFFRIES,
President, Board of Education, R-XII, Springfield, Mo.

DEAR MR. JEFFRIES: The Missouri Association for Social Welfare, as an organization interested in the health and welfare of all Missourians, wishes to commend the Board of Education of Springfield for the steps which it has taken toward integrating its public school system in accordance with the 1954 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is most gratifying that, although the Court has not yet handed down its decree, you have chosen to begin integration in advance of the mandate. Although there are certain problems which will inevitably arise during the transition, we are confident that you will solve them in the best interest of all children in your district.

Public school education is the solid foundation upon which American democracy rests. The integration of the schools, making it possible for all children to be educated together for future citizenship, can result only in a broader and more enduring democracy. Your action points the way to this goal. The association earnestly hopes that other communities will follow your example.

In the event that we can be of service to you in helping to facilitate integration in your district, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ELSA WADE WILLIAMSON,
President.

There have been numerous inquiries as to when the Springfield Board of Education would act to put into effect the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court relating to race segregation in the public schools.

That decision did two things: First, it announced thae segregation in the public schools because of race was contrary to the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution. Second, it recognized that the sweeping social change decreed could not be accomplished by a mere stroke of the pen, that it involved a complicated shift in the administrative machinery of the public schools throughout the Nation, and to that end it was announced that the case would remain open for further argument as to the means of implementing the principle announced. It is our interpretation and belief that this rather unique procedure was followed in order to give the schools the opportunity to work out their own individual problems.

It should be understood that the plans for a school system are laid out for a year in advance, including the districting of schools according to population served, the assignment of teachers, and other matters. These plans had already been made for the current school year at the time of the Supreme Court decision. This is not to say that in overall planning the decision came as a surprise. On the contrary, it was anticipated, as shown by our shift in plans for an addition to Lincoln School to be financed from the $3-million bond plan. We decided that the sum originally set aside for such improvements should be left unassigned until the larger problem was worked out.

We have continued to give consideration to the changes that will be necessary, but with the consciousness that nothing could be gained by premature announcements before the overall plans for the school year 1955-56 are completely developed. We do think the public should be advised of the main features of the policy upon which we are proceeding:

First, the principle announced by the decision of the Supreme Court will be put into effect in the Springfield public schools as soon as practicable.

Second, that principle will be given effect, not grudgingly, but with our wholehearted support.

Third, to some extent this revolution in school practices will be better accomplished by changes which are as gradual as the circumstances permit. To that end, during the current school year we will welcome the admission of individual students from Lincoln School to the other schools, both elementary and secondary. We believe they will be doing a service to us, to the other students, and to the public at large, by showing that their friendly association in the classroom with the other students is both easy and natural.

Fourth, we will not make plans for a large scale shift of students or for a redistricting of schools for the year already planned, because such would be an administrative impossibility. Contracts with teachers have already been entered into, as of April 15 of this year, in accordance with State law. It is obvious that a radical shift and reassignment of personnel and redistricting of schools cannot be accomplished with efficiency during the current school year and must necessarily await the school year beginning September of next year. Those plans will be worked out with serious care and attention, and will be announced at a time

appropriate to be put into effect for the next school year.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

GLENCOE, June 5.—While many communities are discussing ways and means of circumventing the desegregation decision of the Supreme Court, the little city of Springfield, Mo., a semisouthern community where the segregation schol system has existed for more than a century, has quietly achieved complete integration.

Immediately that the decision was made public last May, the superintendent of the Springfield schools notified students at the all-Negro high and elementary Lincoln School that they could transfer in September to the school in the district in which they lived. That 50 percent of elementary schoolchildren immediately transferred shows the extent to which they were traveling outside school district boundaries. Forty high school students including the entire sophomore class transferred. The first three Negroes graduated from the Central High this week.

Next September will see the completion of the integration program. Lincoln has become a junior high with a change of name to Eastwood. The librarian will be a Negro, the only colored teacher reassigned there. Four Negro teachers will teach at Central Senior High and two Negro teachers have been assigned each to the remaining four junior highs.

The action of the public school system has influenced other institutions. The Southwest Missouri Teachers College has Negro students and when the Assembly of God Church opens its new 4-year college in the fall, it will be on an integrated basis. St. Johns Hospital graduated its first two Negro registered nurses this spring.

A. L. FOSTER.

Washington Sets a Bad Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, that the crime record of the city of Washington is a cause of deep concern to people in all parts of the country is illustrated by an editorial in the Fairmont Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn., which deserves our earnest consideration. I include the editorial written by Claude N. Swanson, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital should set an example for this country and for the rest of the world. It should, in concept, stand as living example as the leading city of the United States. But, it doesn't do that, for which we may all thank God.

Washington, during the last three administrations has become the stamping ground of homosexuals.

Illegitimate births, sex offenses and juvenile crime in our Capital City has reached a point that should shock those responsible for conditions there. But apparently, it doesn't.

Our Nation's Capital has no government of its own. Congress is, ostensibly, its city council. The President of the United States is, in effect, its mayor.

Since its population now is 54.8 percent Negro, the cry for home rule is diminishing and that city may never have a mayor and council of its own.

Washington shows an increase in crime amounting to 41 percent, compared with 14 percent for the Nation as a whole.

In 1961, Washington had 4,251 illegitimate births of record. Of that number, 3,893 were nonwhite; 250, white. That should indicate that at least 4,251 fathers of illegitimate children should be in jail, or contributing to the support of their offspring. No such figures have been cited.

There were five mothers only 12 years old in Washington in 1961. Thirty-five mothers were 13 years old; 112 were 14, and 113 were 15 years old.

Venereal disease is rampant in our Nation's Capital, even among schoolchildren. The venereal rate among the 15 to 19 age bracket was 5,728 per 100,000 population. The national average—which is bad enough—is 416 per 100,000 in this age group.

Washington stands first in the Nation in the number of cases of aggravated assault with the area near and around the Capital being regarded as the most dangerous of all.

Were conditions akin to those found in Washington to become an accepted way of life throughout all of the United States—or even in one or two other cities—Congress would no doubt take notice. But to Congress, conditions in this nuclear age "Gomorrah," are apparently taken for granted.

Perhaps it isn't all the fault of Congress. Perhaps, we as a nation are too concerned with helping the underdeveloped areas of the world. Maybe we are too concerned about getting to the moon, to notice what is going on right on our own doorstep. But there is this to remember: Conditions such as prevail in Washington—and, to a lesser degree in other American cities—contribute to the ultimate decay and downfall of a people who should know better.

A Country Banker Looks at the International Monetary Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the international monetary manipulation is usually beyond the pale of most average individuals. I have a better understanding about what is involved, however, after reading a down-to-earth speech which was recently given by Mr. T. L. Vinyard, executive vice president of First Trust & Savings Bank, Davenport, Iowa.

With the thought that many of my colleagues would profit from reading Mr. Vinyard's objective observations, I include his speech, "A Country Banker Looks at the International Monetary Situation," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A COUNTRY BANKER LOOKS AT THE INTERNATIONAL MONETNARY SITUATION

(By T. L. Vinyard, executive vice president, First Trust & Savings Bank, Davenport, Iowa)

With the utmost respect and humility to men and agencies who are specialists in the field of international monetary matters, I approach this subject in an effort to give my fellow laymen some general concept of what the situation is all about.

I wish to acknowledge my sincere appreciation to everyone called upon for information, whether by letter or in person, and the generous supply of reference material furnished.

As I approached this subject I thought of "Alice in Wonderland"—nothing seemed to make sense. There is unlimited information and mountains of statistics. The emphasis, however, seems to be on the individual problem and the overall situation has not received the same attention.

It might be said that our international monetary situation today is where our domestic national bank system was prior to the establishment of a Federal Reserve System wherein the individual bank could issue its own currency and, in effect, create its own credit. We, in effect, have the same situation with the central bank of each foreign country issuing its own currency and, in effect, creating its own credit. Consequently, the United States has issued more currency and extended more credit now in the hands of foreigners than it can redeem on demand.

Therefore, the strength of the dollar depends upon the balance-of-payments ratio. This unfavorable balance-of-payments ratio is not due to exports and imports. Exports and imports continue to enjoy favorable balance but it is more than offset by foreign aid and capital investments abroad. The situation is further aggravated by continued operating deficits on the part of our Government. The question remains as to how can our country produce more efficiently to make us more competitive abroad?

The failure of our exports to expand sufficiently to finance our imports, oversea investments, and foreign aid is the cause of our present dilemma. Last year the President succeeded in getting Congress to approve the Trade Expansion Act, creating devices intended to create still more favorable export-import balances, thereby reducing the unfavorable balance of payments.

Assuming such legislation is successful the time required may not make possible the protection of the dollar, although the United States thinks it can increase exports 10 percent in 1963 and balance the payments deficit for this year. The surplus dollars that foreign central banks hold is not conductive to us increasing our export trade. Claims against the United States have increased from $3,071 million at the end of 1949 to $10,484 million at the end of 1960. Everyone says we must end the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit but it is like that old saying about the weather: "Everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it."

We are in a bind trying to prevent a business slowdown with easy money and low interest rates which tend to make commodity prices and investment yields to foreigners less attractive. The result is that this merely aggravates the balance-of-payments deficit. The U.S. balance of payments is not going to improve in the first half of 1963. How can it? All you have to do is read the newspaper about Government deficits and foreign aid spending. It is imperative that we take steps to correct this situation without further quibbling.

The United States, as the "world bank" is borrowing short and lending long. Didn't we learn anything from the depression of the thirty's when banks held short-term deposits and long-term loans? There is a theory that our unfavorable balance of payments is only a short-term liability and could be offset by our overall wealth. It has been said, however, "Those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it." We try to be all things to all people but I only know of one power that can do that—Almighty God. And you remember what happened when Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany put himself before God.

Foreign banks do not associate large deficits with economic growth. Continued budgetary deficits contribute to a lack of confidence on the part of foreigners in the

dollars they hold and if we are going to stop a flight of short-term capital from the dollar, it is high time we took some action. It has been suggested that we remove the 25-percent gold reserve on dollars in circulation and put an embargo on the flow of gold out of this country. The next step, logically is to go off of gold completely. It has also been suggested that the dollar be guaranteed but this doesn't correct an unfavorable balance of payments when you have more dollars going out than dollars coming in.

This international monetary situation isn't a question of whether "my daddy is bigger than your daddy" but as one foreign banker put it, "You are like a wealthy man who has spent and spent and now it is time to stop." It is particularly unfortunate when people in high positions begin looking for someone to blame. A recent bulletin (Wayne Hummer & Co., Chicago) stated, "A joint congressional subcommittee blames Western Europe for the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit and absolves this country.

The report of the International Exchange and Payments Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee urges the United States to disregard advice that the payments deficit can be solved by raising interest rates or through fiscal policies. Instead, the report suggests that if our allies fail to support several suggestions—such as unilateral tariff cuts by the Common Market and larger contributions to foreign aid—measures such as exchange controls on capital movements and restrictions on spending by U.S. tourists overseas will be necessary. The subcommittee's attitude is not unprecedented. In certain Latin American countries, notably Brazil, there is overwhelming conviction that the rest of the world, chiefly the United States, is responsible for that country's economic woes. Through that particular mystique that sometimes affects countries that are younger and less realistic than others, most Brazilians are constitutionally unable to associate their own government's policies with their classic financial collapse.

In the January 17, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal was another one of their able editorials entitled "Twin Ailments and Twisted Remedies," wherein Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve System pointed out that it is folly to pursue either domestic growth or international solvency all by itself and it is madness to try it with twisted remedies. As Mr. Martin says, "Both must be achieved together or we risk achieving nothing."

The present system, if any, among countries seems to be for an individual means of settlement. There are several agencies which help finance trade and investments and the May 14, 1962, issue of the Foreign Commerce Weekly listed the following: Export-Import Bank, Agency for International Development (AID), International Monetary Fund (IMF), International Bank (IBRD), International Finance Corporation (IFC), International Development Association (IDA), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and Inter-American Social Progress Trust Fund.

Of these agencies the International Monetary Fund was thought to be quite helpful by establishing quotas to determine the voting power and the subscriptions on each member and the normal quantitative limitations of the members' use of the fund's resources.

The International Monetary Fund accepts U.S. dollars for foreign currency desired so the United States can buy excess dollars of that country to reduce the dollar deficit. When this device is exhausted, then what? And further evidence of the seriousness of this situation is that 10 countries known as the Paris Club have already made informal arrangements to support the International Monetary Fund. Central banks of foreign countries are being led down the road with the idea we are going to balance our budget and everything will be all right. I don't think our dollar can hold out that long.

The ultimate goal of central bank policy in the international sphere is usually stated as the maintenance of international economics and financial equilibrium. Central banks generally set their policies primarily to influence the level of domestic economic activity. Domestic activities, however, cannot always be pursued without regard to a country's economic relations with the rest of the world. The latter consideration is of special significance to countries whose currencies function as "key currency" that are substitutes for gold in the reserves of foreign central banks.

There is not enough gold in the world to guarantee liquidity and a world central bank for the clearing of paper money may be the answer. The supply of gold cannot possibly keep up with the rate in which dollars or credit are being created in the hands of foreigners. Short-term foreign claims (excluding international agencies) on the dollar may now have passed a $20 billion level, although the United States has a defense of about $1 billion against foreign demand for gold (through ownership of foreign currency as the result of swap and loan arrangements and through unused borrowing power under such arrangements) there simply isn't enough gold in the bin when you consider our total gold reserve of about $16 billion, of which about $12 billion is offset to support a 25-percent reserve requirement for currency outstanding. In other words we have between $4 and $5 billion in gold to meet claims of $20 billion (again excluding international agencies).

Therefore, foreign central banks and private individuals abroad are resisting an accumulation of more dollars. There seems to be no reason why we should support foreign claims against the dollar with a gold reserve and there is considerable support that we should withdraw the gold reserve and permit the dollar to seek its own level under a free market, except others argue the dollar would no longer be convertible with other foreign currencies. The ability to redeem dollars in gold is even more ridiculous when you consider domestic dollars in circulation, plus foreign dollars in circulation, plus foreign dollars held as reserves on the part of central banks in foreign countries on which they have issued currency. Foreign central banks have collectively issued the equivalent of $350 billion based on reserves of gold and foreign exchange (primarily dollars) they hold individually, although the total world supply of gold is estimated at 41 billion.

This unfavorable balance of payments can be offset to a degree when foreign countries build up balances in this country as the result of our exports but this is not very realistic considering how critical the situation is. The theory has always been advanced that the repayment of foreign debt will reduce the supply of dollars abroad but, again, such corrective measures do not correct a wrong policy. There is no effective way to stop the outflow of capital except by the markets themselves. Our country, with limited cash dollars, must devise means to carry on increased commerce by use of credit devices, but the question remains as to how the customer (foreign country) will get paid. The challenge of gold and the dollar is really one of building an international monetary system that does for the free world what our domestic system does for the United States.

What we are looking for in the international monetary situation, theferore, is liquidity and the value of the dollar. The agencies that have been set up were designed to assist but when the dollar is no longer liquid and of questionable value, the effect on Main Street, Anytown, U.S.A., will be beyond comprehension today.

The fact remains that most of the effort seems to be toward correcting a technical phase of our international monetary situation, although there have been some plans offered as a solution to the situation and some of the more widely discussed plans are: International payments in a multiple-currency reserve system; alternative forms of support of one central bank by another; short-term capital movement and compensating support action; Keynes plan, reserve creation through loans to central banks; Triffin plan, reserve creation through purchase of securities; stamp plan, reserve creation through aid of development; credit transfer versus credit creation by the fund; reserve creation through revaluation of gold stocks; and gold revaluation, capital gains, and composition of reserves.

The solution as I see it from this limited study is an International Reserve System copied somewhat after our Federal Reserve System. This International Reserve System would be made up of central banks of allied countries and directed by a Board of Governors. The medium of exchange would not be a universal currency because each central bank would continue to operate with the same currency of that country. There would have to be a World Central Bank to act as a clearing agent. Currencies between countries would be converted by the issuance of certificates by the World Central Bank. The issuance of certificates would be determined by checks and balances of the member banks. The need is not to create bigger resources to lend to members in trouble but to create conditions under which the members are less likely to get into trouble and the need to use these resources. Whether or not this could be done without a member foreign country giving up any sovereign power to the International Reserve System is a matter of further study. The seriousness of this situation is growing with such speed that it is hoped the President of this country will appoint a commission to study the overall international monetary situation and recommend a unified system to maintain liquidity and the value of the dollar.

The Return of the Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I ran across an editorial in one of the weekly newspapers of western North Dakota, the Killdeer Herald. The thoughts expressed by the editor provide food for thought for those of us in Congress.

In the sophisticated atmosphere of Washington we often lose touch with the kind of realistic thinking that goes on out at the grassroots among the people. It is always refreshing to me to go home to my State of North Dakota and visit with people who live in the small towns and on the ranches and farms. Many of those people have never been to Washington and most have spent very little time in a large city. They have lived and are living in a world of reality where the majority of people still believe

their destiny is in their own hands. They believe they are responsible for their security and they have not lost faith in their ability to take care of themselves. By and large they have done a good job not only of taking care of themselves, but of looking to their responsibility of providing for the future.

Our State is not blessed with spectacular assets which have brought great wealth to our people such as gold mines or great trade centers. We do have a basic wealth in our soil and in our people who are among the finest that can be found anywhere. By hard work and some privation, we have developed our State and have paid the bills as we went along. I am proud to be able to say to the Members of this House that North Dakota is one of the States which takes great pride in the fact that it has no outstanding indebtedness. Yet North Dakota has more institutions of higher learning, I believe in proportion to its population than almost any other State. We have an excellent State highway system with one of the longest stretches of completed interstate highway in the Nation. We have one of the finest old-age assistance, welfare, and medical care programs to be found anywhere. All paid for.

When I read the editorial in the Killdeer Herald, I realized the thoughts being expressed by this smalltown editor were thoughts shared by most people of my State and I believe by more American people than we sometimes realize.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial with my remarks and commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

THE RETURN OF THE SQUARE

Mr. Charles H. Brower, president of Batten, Barton and Osborn, Inc., in a recent address before the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, said, a great deal about a six-letter word. The word is "square"—S-Q-U-A-R-E.

Back in Mark Twain's day, it was one of the finest words in our language—you gave a man a square deal if you were honest. And you gave him a square meal when he was hungry. You stood foursquare for the right, as you saw it, and square against everything else. When you got out of debt, you were square with the world. And that was when you could look your fellow man square in the eye.

Then a lot of strange characters got hold of this honest wholesome word, bent it all out of shape and gave it back to our children. Convicts gave it the first twist. To them a square was an inmate who would conform to the convict code. From the prisons it was flashed across the country on the marijuana circuit of the bopsters and hipsters. Now everyone knows what a square is: he is the man who never learned to get away with it. A Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to; a guy who gets his kicks from trying to do something better than anyone else can; a boob who gets so lost in his work that he has to be reminded to go home; a fellow who laughs with his belly instead of his upper lip; a slob who still gets all choked up when the band plays "America the Beautiful." A square, and strictly from Squaresville.

His tribe isn't thriving too well in the current climate. He doesn't fit too neatly into the current group of angle players, corner cutters, sharpshooters and goof-offs. He doesn't want to fly now and pay later. He's burdened down with old-fashioned ideas of loyalty, honesty, courage, and thrift.

We have come quite a way since Theodore Roosevelt told us: "Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat."

What has happened to us, is that we have changed from an exporting country to an importing country. By that means that we have been importing instead of exporting ideas. The United States of America was once the greatest exporter of ideas in the world. We created and sold the ideas of individual dignity, responsibility and freedom; we created and sold the idea of government of the people, by the people, and for the people—an idea that is still being brought today. We exported the idea of freedom of worship, the idea of an unfettered press, the idea that those who are taxed should be represented.

It is hard to find a basic idea the American has exported since you and I were young. We have instead brought the idea that an honest man is either a fool or a liar,-the idea of a strong government for weak people, the ideas of "Let Jack do it," "What's in it for me?" and the gesture of the neatly shrugged shoulder.

Always tearing down these days; never building up. Always knocking, belittling, downgrading; a sneer rather than a grin; a mocking laugh rather than belly laugh; poking fun at other people rather than at ourselves.

Laughter today is stored in Hollywood in cans, just as the gold was once stored in Fort Knox. It is taken out as needed and pasted onto TV films. And the laughs track tips us off to when things are funny.

Conformity is sweeping the country. And while more and more people want to get seats in the grandstand, fewer and fewer want to sweat it out down on the field. More and more youngsters who come in looking for jobs are asking "What can you do for me?" rather than "What can I do for you?" They want to discuss the extras they're going to get rather than the extras they're going to give. Their eyes are on the clock rather than on the calendar. The coffee break is more important than the big break. Too many of us are still sitting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and dare to be square. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy. And we can just roll down the path, without bumps, being careful to stay in the middle because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

Too many know the short cuts, and too few know or care where the path leads. Too few of us dare to leave the path, because the path is always the easy way, the way most people go. But there is no path to the future, no path to greatness, no path to progress. No path to outer space or to inner satisfaction.

We should be for participation and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication; for laughter and against sniggering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for the honest way against the short cut, for a well-done job and against the goof-off, for education and against the pretense of learning, for building and against tearing down, for the boys and girls who excel and against the international bedroom athletes.

Mr. Brower ended his talk with the statement that when Benjamin Franklin was told that the War of Independence was over, he said, "Say rather the War of the Revolution is over—the War of Independence has yet to be fought." And today—179 years later—the war for independence has still to be fought.

Let's go along with Mr. Brower and join the SOS—the Society of Squares. It doesn't exist, but it could. Not a leftwing organization. Not a rightwing organization. Just an organization with wings. The organization might even have a secret handshake consisting mainly of grabbing the other guy's hand as though you meant it, looking him square in the eye.

Suppression of Ideas Weakens America

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with those voting "No" on House Resolution 249, and I associate myself with most of their remarks as to the reasons for this action—admittedly an unsatisfactory method of expressing our views.

I do not believe that public exposure before the Committee on Un-American Activities—with the consequent inescapable implication that certain individuals and organizations are un-American—should be used as a punishment for ideas.

I do not believe that ideas of any sort are ever destroyed or weakened by punishment. This can be accomplished only by the power of better ideas.

I believe America is weakened if we place our primary reliance for security upon the suppression of ideas by force or coercion, including the ideas of communism.

In the struggle for a peaceful, free, and democratic world, which is America's primary goal, victory can only be won by the aggressive expression of superior ideas backed to the hilt by programs aimed at carrying out those ideas.

The committee's purposes and methods, in my opinion, have reflected in certain instances a contrary philosophy which is of limited value within this country and which is of positive harm to our goals when applied to the vast developing areas of the world—the major battlefield for freedom and democracy today.

In that battlefield no victories are won by declaiming that a philosophy or a program is un-American, but only by demonstrating that there is an American philosophy or program which is far better.

I fully support the Committee on Un-American Activities insofar as it investigates and recommends legislation for control of subversive activities. At the same time I am acutely sensitive to the constitutional protections of the Bill of Rights involving the free expression of thought and opinion.

My vote is intended to reflect these views.

Managed News Issue Weakens Public Trust in President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of February 24, 1963:

MANAGED NEWS ISSUE WEAKENS PUBLIC TRUST IN PRESIDENT

The White House has invited representatives of all news media to a conference in April to discuss the administration's public information policies.

No one expects this to be a love feast. Associations of news men have criticized the administration's so-called managed-news policies and the administration, in turn, is reported displeased with the manner in which the news is treated.

We have a strong feeling of concern because a conference between government and the news media has been called. Or, rather, that anyone should consider such a thing necessary.

Ideally, the press should go about its business of reporting the news without concern for its management other than obvious restrictions due to requirements of national security. Meanwhile, the President should go about the business of running the Government and letting the news chips fall where they may, except, again, where national security is concerned.

The sad truth, however, is that the Kennedy administration, with its apparent policy of managing the news and its urge for favorable publicity for the President and his official—as well as personal—family, has more than its share of trouble with the news media.

As a result, not only reporters and editors, but the public in general, are beginning to lose confidence in what administration spokesmen, and the President, himself, have to say. This is a very bad thing.

Mr. Kennedy is a clever man and an accomplished politician. He understands the importance of a good image as created by public reports on what he and his administration are doing. But he seems to be trying too hard. He apparently is too much concerned with the image.

At his press conferences he tends to answer serious, searching questions with wisecracks rather than giving serious answers or falling back on the presidential prerogative of "no comment." So long as the assembled reporters laugh, he appears satisfied. But we doubt that the reporters—or the people—really are amused.

This hassle over managed news, of course, stems from the Cuban crisis when the administration not only concealed the truth, but let one of its spokesmen admit that it was doing so. That, of course, was Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, who said that "news generated by actions of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has in the application of military force and related forces to the solution of political problems, or to the application of international political pressure."

The American Society of Newspaper Editors, in a report on news management during the Cuban crisis, pointed out that the Defense Department said, on October 19, that it had no information indicating the presence of offensive weapons in Cuba. Yet Secretary McNamara later said that he had received hard intelligence on this subject October 15.

The question is raised: Have we reached the point where the word of the U.S. Government must be challenged continuously?

The American Society of Newspaper Editors report goes on to point out that Secretary McNamara first said that any ship that ignored the blockade would be shot out of the water.

"What happened?" the report goes on. "Some ships, especially Scandinavian, ignored the blockade. The Defense Department actually ordered only a selective blockade, though the Navy was prepared to maintain a tight one. Interceptions that were made apparently were staged, although the public was led to believe they were real."

The public, which was 100 percent behind the President's stand on Cuba was being misled as to what actually was being done. It is impossible to see what purpose was served. The damage to public confidence in the administration, however, was considerable.

President Kennedy is reported puzzled by his inability to silence his critics of his handling of the Cuban situation and by seemingly adverse public reaction.

He went to the extent of ordering the Secretary of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency to stage an elaborate presentation on Cuba, revealing photographs of the island.

Still the chorus of dissent continues. It does so largely because the news management policy leaves the word of the Government open to question.

And this, we repeat, is a bad thing. Its effect on the political fortunes of Mr. Kennedy is not important even though it may be pleasing to his political enemies.

The point is that the people and the press should have confidence in what the Government says.

We hope this matter can be straightened out in a conference between White House figures and the representatives of news media. We doubt that it can be, however, because the habit of putting on the best possible political face, regardless of the effect on the people's right to know, seems deeply ingrained in the administration. This is not a pleasant thing to contemplate, but we fear that's the way it is.

The Economic Immaturity of Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I received from a concerned constituent:

As an American citizen representing the opinion of a great many people, I am becoming more and more disturbed at the economic immaturity of our Government. The idea that we may be headed for a recession is probably true, but the reason for it is not what our Government is trying to make us believe. In my opinion, we cannot improve the economic health of our country by cutting our revenue (taxes) and at the same time going more and more in debt. The only way that we feel a recession can be avoided is for the Government to change its attitude toward business as a whole which is the creator of our economic health.

If the Government, through its Justice Department and other agencies, would cease to make use of every technicality to bedevil the true leaders of our economy, we believe that there would be almost an immediate improvement in the economic atmosphere of our country. If we could get the individuals in our Government to realize that the Federal Government has no money per se. It takes through taxes a percentage of the earnings of all the people and redistributes these earnings as it feels is proper. There seems to be more and more of a tendency for the Government to believe that it can spend the earnings of the people more wisely than the people who have earned it.

If we can get our Government to realize that our country was built by the energies and freedom of the individuals, and not by an all-powerful centralized government, we may have a chance to save ourselves.

Three Thousand Two Hundred Space-Related Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of accompanying Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Gen. Bernard Schriever to Texas for a look at the aerospace industry in an area where we have always been aware, and proud, of space.

In Grand Prairie, we visited Ling-Temco-Vought, one of the leading aerospace firms producing the weapons carriers, rocket boosters, guidance and detections systems used in the U.S. defense and exploration efforts. We toured the facilities and spoke with men who are tops in the field of space science and its needs. General Schriever spoke for our delegation when he said he was impressed with the tremendous resources, technology, and management, which he saw there.

The place of a firm such as Ling-Temco-Vought in the present and future economy of a space-studious United States is, of course, obvious. But the needs of space age production offer an invitation also to smaller firms in less obvious areas of production.

The following day Vice President JOHNSON spoke at a board of city development dinner in the southwest Texas city of San Angelo. He spoke of the ways in which small business participates in the aerospace industry, in a speech which is cogent for many, many areas of this Nation. I am pleased to offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by the Vice President in San Angelo on February 22.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, BOARD OF CITY DEVELOPMENT DINNER, SAN ANGELO, TEX., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

As long as I can remember, people have been saying they like San Angelo because the air is better here. I agree, the air is mighty good. But what I like about San Angelo—

and what has always made your city one of my favorites—is the people.

I like the spirit of progress, the sense of civic pride, the confidence in the future that has always been so much a part of the people of San Angelo and southwest Texas. It is good to be with you once again—and I am most grateful for all your generous courtesies today.

When I accepted this invitation, I asked one of your distinguished citizens what he thought I should talk about tonight.

He replied, "Why don't you talk about space, we have so much of it."

Space is a good subject—an increasingly important subject for Texans, as for all Americans. We are moving far faster than most of us realize into the age of space, and our lives are being reshaped every day by the flow of invention and discovery coming from space research.

That is what I would like to talk about tonight—about the practical, down-to-earth implications of our great national effort to explore the distant realms of outer space.

You of San Angelo understand the first and foremost implication. You are demonstrating this by the support you are giving to education—at the college level as well as at the public school level. The clear and immediate challenge of space requires that we make available to all of our young people far better education than any of their parents enjoyed.

Ninety percent of the scientists who ever lived are alive today. Ten years from now three-fourths of the people working in the plants and factories of the United States will be working on products not yet invented or discovered. If our sons and daughters are to have an even break in the competition of the 1970's and 1980's, education—at all levels—must have the kind of support throughout the Nation that it has here in San Angelo.

Some are quick to say that there is no place in our system of the small local area college. But as you well know, that is simply not so. Hundreds of thousands of young people are being denied essential college educations because there is no college in their own community. The likelihood of a high school graduate going on to college is 50 percent greater when the student lives within 20 to 25 miles of an institution of higher learning.

Whether close to home or far away we need better education at all levels. We need to be turning out two and one-half times more Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences. At the present rate, the United States will be short 90,000 doctoral degree holders by 1970. We need a wider dispersal of the graduate schools from which such degrees are obtained, because today three-fourths of all Ph. D.'s are being granted by a handful of universities located in only 12 States.

When I say these things to you I am not talking about education for education's sake alone. I know you love freedom. I know how you cherish independence. If we love freedom, if we cherish independence, we will recognize that the battlefield on which these great heritages will be won or lost in this century is the classroom.

The United States leads the world in the aggregate annual number of higher education graduates. But in the Soviet Union institutions of higher learning are today graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as the United States. I am unwilling—as I know you are unwilling—to be content with second place. In education—as in all things—we have the resources, we have the ability, we have the wealth to be first, and we must not settle for less than the best.

When we talk of space and space research there are those who raise the question that our efforts cost too much. Certainly American leadership in space is not cheap. We are now spending 20 cents per week per capita on our national space program. But, at the same time, we are spending each year more than four times our space budget on golf and fishing and movies and other recreation.

Out of this effort that we are making, many Americans ask the question: Is the effort we are putting forth worthwhile? Is it practical? What will it mean to those of us on earth for one or two among us to land on the moon?

I would like to answer that question in terms we can all understand. We are today only in the infancy of the age of space. Our efforts have only just begun. When we look back over the past, we remember that it took us 112 years to develop photography, 56 years to develop the telephone, 35 years to perfect the radio, 15 years to develop radar. Television took 12 years. The atomic bomb took 6 years. Even the transistor took 5 years.

While the space age is not yet 5 years old, we have made remarkable strides in producing usable down-to-earth products. More than 5,000 companies and research organizations have been or are now involved in our space effort. We have produced more than 3,200 different space-related products, many of which are already being put to use.

As one example, at Lawton, Okla., a small hatmaking company experienced difficulty and costly losses because the resin used to stiffen hats often stuck to the heating blocks. That company contacted the Office of Industrial Applications of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA gave them information about nonstick coatings which had been developed in connection with space research on solid rocket fuels. Today, the little hat company in Oklahoma is coating their presses with this substance and its problem has been solved.

I could cite many more examples such as this. But the truth is we have only just begun to realize the benefits of our concentrated space research. These future applications will have meaning for all of us.

Let me give you some other examples. Medical scientists have determined that the kind of space suits worn by our astronauts—such as Colonel Glenn—can be and soon will be used to relieve the discomfort of victims of strokes. In our hospitals and medical centers, the little wire sensors used to signal the earth about the physical conditions of the astronauts will be put to use to keep constant check on the physical conditions of patients in their sickbeds. One product of our research on rocket propellants is already being used to treat tuberculosis.

A great many housewives today are using in the kitchen pots and pans made of ceramics which are the result of space research. Thermoelectric devices, first used to provide power for space satellites, are now being used in heating and refrigeration systems for our homes.

Out here in west Texas we know that the future is being shaped by the application of space technology to such projects as taking salt out of sea water and making the inexhaustible gallons of the gulf available for irrigation in this area. When space technology will permit us to modify the weather, we do not know. We do know that the weather satellites already projected will permit us to make great savings of lives and property in combating storm damage, providing early warning against floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes. Our space scientists even tell me that we will someday soon be using those satellites to guard against invasion of grasshoppers in west Texas and locusts in other parts of the world.

Within a generation it may be possible for us to predict the weather as far in advance as a year, and think what that will mean to both ranchers and farmers in this area.

The day is not too distant when you will be able to pick up your telephone and call distant continents—Europe, Australia, or Asia—as quickly and as cheaply as you can call other Texas cities today. Live television shows will reach your living room from all points of the globe. The scientists in India or Africa or South America will be able to solve problems on computers located at Rice University or the University of Texas. Texas businessmen will be able to check their inventories in warehouses and retail establishments throughout the world in a matter of seconds.

When we recite prospects such as this, I know it is hard for the mind to grasp the full implications. But it is important that we make the effort to see beyond the present and to recognize the full import and impact of the future. Many of us present remember when people were saying that the automobile would never replace the horse and that airplanes would never fly safely and successfully. Twenty or forty years from now our children will be smiling indulgently at our own conservatism and caution today.

You and I—and our 180 million fellow Americans—stand now at the edge of one of the great adventures of mankind. In these years ahead the exploits and adventures of our young pioneers in space will make the headlines. But here on earth without fanfare, without much notice and without us even realizing it, our lives will be changed as never they have been changed in any comparable period of man's experience.

If, in this new age, America is to retain its position as a leader of the cause of freedom it will be necessary for us as a nation to mobilize the full resources of nature and of humankind. We cannot indulge the luxuries of leaving idle the mineral resources and other resources of nature which underlie these rocks and plains of southwest Texas. We cannot afford the expense of undertraining and undereducating our young people. We shall need—and we must have—the full natural and human resources of America mobilized for the great thrust forward which is coming within your lifetime and mine.

When this century began, only 1 out of 10 adult Americans had a high school or college education. Today, such an education is a first requirement for an ever-increasing number of jobs in our economy. Yet, only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school. Only 8 percent have completed college. And nearly 40 percent of our young people are dropping out of high school before they receive their diplomas.

The treasure of America today as always is its young people. We must not permit that treasure to be lost or wasted. Here in San Angelo your community dedication to education has won national attention. You have built one of the finest high schools in America—you are proud of it and you have the respect of your countrymen for the sense of local responsibility which you have shown. In the same sense, you are showing comparable support for higher education through your college.

It is this sense of local responsibility that has made America strong. It is this sense of local responsibility that will help America realize the full rewards and potential of the future. I come here tonight to salute you, to congratulate you, and to commend your example of local responsibility to communities throughout the Nation.

Our strength as a nation—and as the center of the free world alliance—depends upon the sense of local responsibility which freemen in every county, every city, and every State manifest through these times of trial and peril. Governments at all lev-

els—Federal, State, and local—is the creation of the people and the servant of the people. There is no room for contests and conflicts in a struggle for power between the levels of government. There is only room for effort and assertion on the part of all Americans to make our system strong, to make our Nation strong, and to make our cause successful.

We are extending our reach today—we are reaching among the stars to touch the new frontier of man's experience. That longer reach will bring us rewards of which we have never dreamed. We shall live a life of greater freedom, a life of greater reward, a life of greater peace—and this is what we all want to have for our children.

If You Can't Smoke 'Em, Eat 'Em

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an interesting article from the Newark Evening News concerning the latest invention of Dr. Samuel Klein, of Newark, N.J. Dr. Klein is service chief, Medical, Health, and Special Weapons Division of Civil Defense and Disaster Control of the City of Newark and is widely known for his research in marine foods and cancer control:

[From the Newark Evening News, Feb. 6, 1963]

IF YOU CAN'T SMOKE'EM, EAT'EM—NEWARKER DEVELOPS VEGETABLE FILTER CIGARETTE

(By George Kentera)

WASHINGTON.—"Have an unreal cigarette—have a Sentry." This might well be the slogan of Notob Products Co., Inc., of New York, which is dedicated to the proposition that it is truly what's up front that counts—and that what's up front should be, not tobacco, but vegetable fibers.

That's what its new cigarette, Sentry, is made of.

Perhaps because of the New York newspaper strike, perhaps because Washington is a town where a little fire makes lots of smoke, some of Notob's officers were here yesterday afternoon to promote the view that vegetable fiber makes the best smoke.

They listed the inventor of the Sentry process as Samuel Klein, of Newark, chief of New Jersey Civil Defense.

Slight mistake. Klein, who lives at 353 Hawthorne Avenue, is a pharmacist and chemist who is head of the Newark Defense Council's Medical and Health Services Division and who does independent research in marine foods and cancer control.

The Notob officers—Gerald M. Schaflander, president; John Dillon, board chairman; Mark Lane, a former New York assemblyman, legal counsel—weren't ready to say what kind of vegetable fibers were in Sentry. They don't want the tobacco industry to find out yet, they said.

But they emphasized what Sentry did not contain. "* * * no nicotine, coumarine, glycerine, arsenic or other poisons common in all cigarettes," said Dillon.

Lane said the Food and Drug Administration has banned the use of coumarine, an extremely dangerous poison, in food. He added that cigarettes contain more nicotine than the limit allowed in the treatment of cats and dogs.

And he suggested that Congress amend the food and drug laws so that all materials used in smoking would come under FDA jurisdiction so the Government would have authority to halt indicated abuses.

Schaflander, one-time account executive in the tobacco cigarette field, stressed recent statistical evidence indicating a link between the smoking of cigarette tobacco and the rise in heart and cardiovascular disease.

He said Notob believed all smoking was harmful, but that Sentry is less dangerous, less harmful, and that the public should have the right to accept or reject the new product in the marketplace.

Production of Sentry began Friday, he said, in New York; test marketing will begin soon, with national distribution due in March. Sentry will be a few pennies higher than tobacco brands, Schaflander said.

Schaflander was also president of Bantob-Products, producers of the first no-tobacco cigarette, that he says was forced into bankruptcy in 1960. The Notob officials say Sentry is an improved product, that tastes as good as a smoke should to 90 percent of smokers.

Self-Help, Inc.: An Important Answer to Present World Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when I was in Iowa last fall, I had the opportunity to learn more about a type of foreign aid program which should be encouraged because it is based on the American principle of helping people help themselves. I am referring to Self-Help, Inc., a unique, practical plan for making dependable farm and industrial machinery available to emerging areas of the world at prices these people can afford to pay.

Mr. Bert Derry, general manager, French and Hecht Division, Kelsey-Hayes Co., Davenport, Iowa, a member of the board of trustees, briefed me on this nonprofit organization and its plans when I was in Iowa. After I returned to Washington for the new session, I met with Mr. John William Baccarini, executive director, of Self-Help, Inc., and learned more about the implementation of Self-Help's plans.

This week at the Department of Commerce's Trade Fair in Bangkok, Thailand, one of the tractors designed and built by Self-Help, Inc., will be on display along with other agricultural equipment suited for small southeast Asia farms.

It is appropriate, therefore, that I bring to the attention of my colleagues a fuller explanation of what Self-Help, Inc., is; who the people are who guide its destiny; and an outline of its goals. I also wish to include an Associated Press story about the new tractor which has been developed. This appeared in the February 28 issue of the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this material in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SELF-HELP, INC.

Self-Help, Inc., of Waverly, Iowa, is a nonprofit, private organization, designed to make dependable farm and industrial machinery available to emerging areas of the world at prices these people can afford to pay. The organization was initiated in 1950 to provide an avenue for helping farmers to improve their food-producing capacities, but since has expanded to include industrial and shop equipment.

Founded by Vern L. Schield, Iowa farmer and industrialist, Self-Help started by sending a few low-cost, rebuilt tractors, plows, cultivators, etc., to agricultural missionaries throughout the world, who were in a position to demonstrate what the equipment could do. The results were remarkable—so remarkable that an increasing number of implements were shipped abroad. In the last year, nearly a quarter million dollars worth of equipment was shipped to some 23 nations at approximately one-fifth to one-third its actual value.

Where corn yields were 9 to 12 bushels per acre, they are now 60 bushels to the acre. A small grinder does in 20 minutes what it formerly took a native woman 2 weeks to accomplish. Where a number of native women farmed small, garden-sized plots, a cooperative farm field of several acres is now operated by native men—with Self-Help machinery. A farm in South America is now grossing $40,000 annually—thanks to Self-Help equipment. Reports such as these are coming in from all over the world.

"The underdeveloped areas need all kinds of power equipment—tractors, combines, plows, feed grinders, ensilage cutters, planters, etc.," according to Schield. In the United States today, there exists not only a surplus of grain, but also a surplus of agricultural implements, not being used, rusting on the dealer lots and in the farm fields. Self-Help collects, rebuilds, and adapts the equipment for service overseas. After Self-Help has completely rebuilt the equipment (it is in good-as-new condition before sending out), it is shipped to institutions, individuals, and farmers' cooperatives in many countries. Those receiving the equipment are asked to pay a token price only and whenever necessary, a pay-as-you-work plan is provided so that time is given to get production started. (Self-Help feels this method to be better than handouts which tend to have a pauperizing effect.)

Self-Help operates in only those areas where people are too poor to buy new American-made machinery. The program does not compete with manufacturers and dealers who sell equipment abroad. In fact, most of them like and agree with the idea. They are the first to admit that our American-made machinery is too expensive and too advanced for use in these nations at the present time. Self-Help, by selling the machinery at prices these people can afford to pay, is giving them a start toward developing an economy, becoming more self-sufficient, and eventually they will be in a position to buy the new American-made products.

One of the chief assets of the program is its timeliness (What better way can we teach democracy in emerging nations than to help these people to help themselves? What better way can we fight communism than to make these people capitalists?) Also, it is beautifully practical (with hunger being the biggest problem facing large portions of the earth's people, the use of this machinery increases food production). We can send shipload after shipload of surplus food and it will solve their current problem—that of filling their bellies—but until we help them to help themselves, we haven't made any real progress.

Self-Help is completely outside of government sponsorship or influence. Its big job is to help emerging nations to become self-sufficient. It is a program that draws on American resources of know-how and finances. It is providing an avenue for U.S. industrialists, businessmen, farmers, civic groups, and church lay organizations to carry American type democracy and free enterprise to the people who seem most apt to slip into Communist idealogy.

Founder, Vern L. Schield.

Executive director, John Wm. Baccarini.

Secretary, Mrs. Donis Lashbrook.

Board of trustees:

Roger Burgess, associate general secretary of the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, Washington, D.C.

Father Paul Bussard, publisher, the Catholic Digest, 44 East 53d Street, New York, N.Y.

Howard A. Cowden, management consultant, Nationwide Insurance Cos., 1204 Commerce Trust Building, Kansas City, Mo.; member board of directors, Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

Bert Derry, general manager, French and Hecht Division, Kelsey-Hayes Co., Davenport, Iowa.

Murlin Hansel, pastor, Congregational Church, Edgewood, Iowa. (Works closely with agricultural missions in Ecuador, South America.)

J. L. Jewell, comptroller, Schield Bantam Co., Waverly, Iowa.

W. J. Kortesmaki, State department of education, vocational education section; State executive secretary, Future Farmers of America, St. Paul.

Eugene Reynolds, office manager, State of Illinois School Building Commission, 906 Alann Drive, Joliet, Ill.

W. L. Schield, vice chairman of the board in charge of expansion of business into foreign countries and product diversification, Schield Bantam Co., Waverly, Iowa.

Vern L. Schield, chairman of the board, Schield Bantam Co.

NEW TRACTOR IS MADE FOR FOREIGN AID

WAVERLY.—A tiny, low-cost agricultural tractor, which could become the backbone of a unique Iowa private enterprise foreign aid program, will be unveiled in Bangkok, Thailand, March 5.

Self-Help, Inc., of Waverly, a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to upgrading agriculture in underdeveloped countries, has shipped a complete tractor and equipment to the U.S. Department of Commerce Trade Fair in Bangkok.

The fair, which will run from March 5 through April 12, will include displays of a wide variety of agricultural equipment suited for small southeast Asia farms.

THE 12-YEAR-OLD PROGRAM

Display of the new G-9 tractor and equipment at the Asian trade fair is one of many moves which have been made in recent months to spread the word about the Waverly based program for foreign development.

The program, started 12 years ago by Industrialist Vern Schield, of Waverly, is developing on a number of fronts to meet the growing demand for reconditioned farm machinery in foreign countries.

Schield, chairman of the board and founder of the Schield Bantam Co. here, started Self-Help as a private program. He collected obsolete but still useful farm machinery from Waverly area farmers, reconditioned it and sold it at cost to mission stations overseas to help mechanize their agriculture.

FFA CHAPTERS HELP

As the idea of a foreign aid program spread, Schield took steps to strengthen the program.

Efforts to strengthen the source of supply for the used machinery as well as broadening the reconditioning facilities of the program have been made.

Key to this part of the program has been the enlisting of help from Future Farmers of America groups in Iowa and Minnesota.

Self-Help machinery is offered to the farmers overseas at cost. Thus, if a farmer or a group of farmers wants a tractor, Self-Help will find one, recondition it, pack it, ship it, and then charge only what the tractor is worth.

The cost of shipping, conditioning, and also administrative charges are paid out of other Self-Help funds.

SIMPLE TRACTOR

The new nine-horsepower G-9 tractor with equipment was especially designed by Schield. He developed the tractor with the idea of making it simple and small, yet powerful enough to bring truly meachanized agriculture to the backward small farms.

Self-Help officials are offering the tractor, a one-bottom plow, a feed grinder, cultivator, and heavy-duty harrow for the low cost of $675, delivered to the port of destination.

While emphasis is on collecting, reconditioning, and shipping machinery, the Self-Help officials are looking for financial support to defray administrative and shipping costs and keep the price charged to farmers in foreign countries as low as possible.

Taxes and Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of general concern over some of the Kennedy tax proposals, some have met with more opposition than others. Specifically, the 5 percent floor on itemized deductions has justifiably generated fear for the future of the country's far-flung charitable, religious, and educational programs. Organizations which engage in these activities feel that this proposal in the President's tax message will discourage private contributions and encourage the Federal Government to expand further in these areas.

The following editorial from the Findlay, Ohio, Republican Courier expresses briefly and clearly the sentiment of an important section of rural America:

TAXES AND CHARITY

The new Federal tax proposals deal a harsh blow at charity. They substantially reduce the amount of tax deductions that can be taken for contributions to educational, religious, health, and charity causes.

The United Community Funds and Councils of America, the day after the tax plan went to the Congress, sent out an analysis of this aspect of the program. It said in part:

"Any proposal to change the contribution deductibility feature in the present law is dangerous in that it could invite further changes which might do great damage to the country's voluntary system of health, welfare, education, religious, and cultural organizations. This could result in an impairment or diminishing of the significance of contribution deductibility in the American scheme of things or lessen the incentives to giving.

"Therefore, it must be approached with the greatest of care. It should be remembered that contribution deductibility is one of the few practical means by which the Federal Government can express its approval of the voluntary activity of citizens in behalf of health, education, community welfare, etc.; that voluntary effort relieves the burdens of government at all levels; and that many services dependent on contributions are of such a character that they could neither be operated by Government nor subsidized by the State in any other manner than through contribution deductibility because of the doctrine of separation of church and state."

The new tax proposals lump charity contributions with all other deductibles, such as interest, the United Community Funds and Councils of America, discussing this phase of the suggested program, says it is cause for much concern because it has many dangers. Recognition of the unique qualities of contribution deductibility will be lost by being packaged with all other types of deductible items.

"The expression 'closing tax loopholes,'" says the organization "has come into general use in connection with tax reform efforts. Packaging contribution deductibility with other deductibles having differing qualities, carries the implication that it, too, is a loophole."

The real scheme back of the whole thing could well be the forerunner of a power-drunk desire to put everything in the Nation on a compulsory basis, run from and by Washington. We want no part of such an idea and the sooner Congress discards the matter the better.

It is no wonder that the whole tax program as presented to Congress is in deep trouble, as even its strongest proponents now admit.

The 1963 Legislative Program of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Affiliated Young Democrats are a progressive and vital force in the political life of New York State and I am pleased to insert in the RECORD their 1963 legislative program:

THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 1963 OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK

The statewide Legislative Committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York unanimously endorsed the following legislation which they will recommend to the State legislature:

"Outlaw boxing in New York State; continue court reform upstate as to the city, town, and village courts; train and find employment for workers displaced by automation; establish State narcotics agency; new State space and science college; presidential preference primaries; Federal Government take over jurisdiction of New York State Civil Defense Administration and of all States; change Condon-Wadlen Act; more middle-income housing; adequately paid teachers with program to attract people to teaching profession; protection for migrant labor workers.

"Tax incentive to attract new industries to the State; change election law by doing away with names on petitions, and allow candidates to run in their party primary by paying a filing fee and bond for character, to increase participation in party primaries; expand rehabilitation program for young people in correctional institutions; primary election for all State offices; State legislative reapportionment based upon citizen population; permanent primary day in June; increase State aid for education as to fair share of the taxes by the residues; free tuition at city colleges; right to vote at 18 years.

"State build upstate rehabilitation camps for dope victims; fair sabbath law in New York City; off-track betting by a referendum; research study to curtail the pollution of air and water; raise drinking age to 21 years; more stringent penalties to dispensers of narcotics; State bonus of Korean veterans; racial discriminations be extended to all multiple dwellings and one- or two-family houses throughout State.

"More State aid for public health centers; repeal law creating East Hudson Parkway; examinations be given every 10 years for all motor vehicle operators; change election law to live in county 30 days and not 4 months; establish State commission of recreation; mandatory sentence of 20 years for nonaddict pushers in illegal sale of narcotics for profit; mandatory 5-year sentence for carrying knife for improper purposes; mandatory 10-year sentence using knife in any crime of violence; better nursing home care for aged, with more help given to the handicapped and retarded in State; more State scholarships with more assistance to the gifted students.

"Domestic Peace Corps; toughening first and second degree rape laws; recodification of the criminal statutes to curb juvenile delinquency; study laws to unify the Federal and State laws with less entanglement; install device in automobiles to control auto exhaust gas; amend State election law to provide for part-time off for voting; urge State legislature to ratify the 15th amendment, and advocate a printed record be published and made available to the public of full proceedings of State legislature."

The above legislation will be introduced in the State Legislature in January 1963 by our 14 members in the State senate and 29 in State assembly, with Aileen B. Ryan, of the Bronx, chairman in the assembly, and Samuel L. Greenberg, of Brooklyn, chairman in the senate.

Harold R. Moskovit, State President of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York presided.

Behind the Hikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Charles W. Bailey, Washington staff correspondent for the Minneapolis Tribune, in a recent article drew an interesting appraisal of the 50-mile hikes encouraged by the present administration. Mr. Bailey, it will be remembered, is coauthor of the book "Seven Days in May," which has found popularity in this country. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the Bailey article which appeared in the February 18 issue of the Tribune, and ask that it be reprinted in today's RECORD:

ALL THIS HIKING IS THE RESULT OF FIVE CAPITAL BLUNDERS

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Serious students of history probably will overlook it, but the brief crisis over the 50-mile hike tells a lot about the Kennedy administration.

It flashed across the wintry landscape of Washington like a comet last week, dazzling but short lived, leaving blistered feet, bruised egos, and a shower of bad jokes in its wake.

In many respects, the hiking crisis parallels the Canadian crisis. Both began with administration statements being issued without full checking and clearance. Both produced results beyond the wildest nightmares of those who made the statements. Both wound up embarrassing the officials involved.

It is true that one of these crises brought about the fall of a government, while the other brought down nothing more than a few arches. But the basic elements—ill-considered statements, misunderstandings, hastily designed policy expedients, chain reaction repercussions—were markedly similar.

Perhaps the most serious failure of governmental machinery came at the very start. The commandant of the Marine Corps, cleaning out his old files, came across a half-century-old order from President Theodore Roosevelt directing Marine officers to become proficient in long-distance walking.

His mistake was in sending it on to President Kennedy as a curiosity. Everyone in town ought to know by now that it is dangerous to send historical curiosities to Mr. Kennedy.

Mistake No. 2 was made by the Chief Executive, who obviously read the old order hastily and acted without proper background briefing or policy staffing.

He fired it right back to the commandant, saying it was a fine thing and wondering if Marines could do as well today. It is always a mistake to suggest to a Marine that he may not be one of the old breed, especially when the Marine you tell it to can order out the whole corps to prove you wrong.

Mr. Kennedy's second mistake was in bringing Pierre Salinger, his press secretary, into the inner circle of policymakers who had knowledge of the matter.

The President, obviously failing to realize that Salinger is almost as eager to get himself into the public eye as he is to publicize his boss, told his press secretary the whole story.

Salinger proceeded to commit a fourth error. He not only leaked the whole thing to the papers, but went on impetuously in an obviously ill-considered statement to say he'd try walking, too.

Salinger's error, in fact, was a double one. Not only did he let himself in for an inevitable loss of face—those who know him best never allowed themselves to think he would actually walk anywhere—but he also got Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy into the act.

Bobby, who is congenitally incapable of admitting that he cannot do anything that anyone else can do and then some, leaped into his high shoes, called in his own flacks and took off.

In so doing, Bobby made another mistake—and one that is typical of this administration. When a Kennedy does something, he really does it. It mattered not to him that the original order was aimed at producing marines who could carry heavy loads and live off the country while covering ground at a reasonable pace for several days.

All that Bobby saw was the part about walking 50 miles. To a Kennedy, that means do it now, at high speed, and all at once, and never mind the fine print. That's the way he did it, leaving his reluctant comrades scattered along the way to Camp David, Md.

This series of blunders produced utter chaos. Men, women, and children, heedless of their physical conditions, jumped out of their TV lounges and took to the hills. It will be months, perhaps years, before the full extent of the damage to the Nation's health and welfare can be accurately measured.

The end result, of course, was public humiliation for Salinger. He had to be sacrificed, much as Nikita Khrushchev had to sacrifice the prestige of Fidel Castro last October.

Backing down when he stood toe-to-toe with challenge would have been bad enough, but events conspired to make Pierre look even worse. Seven congressional secretaries, all female, had announced they would match him stride for stride—and they went walking anyway.

One of them even went so far as to cut her foot at the start of the hike, and then stick it out to the end, 32 miles away, regardless of pain, suffering, and band-aids.

It is surely to be hoped that out of the debacle some hard lessons may be learned by the administration. Certainly its prestige is not enhanced by this sort of thing. Furthermore, Nelson Rockefeller looks like a pretty good long-haul hiker himself.

How To Deal With Soviet Cuba Short of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting an editorial from the March 8, 1963, Life magazine which discusses the problem of Cuba and places special emphasis on the dangers of communism spreading from Cuba to South America.

The editorial states that President Kennedy's negotiations could seem more serious if "he took steps to put more pressure on the already chaotic Cuban economy, make its support more expensive to the Russians, and ultimately make that support impossible."

In this connection I refer the Members of the House to my remarks on Monday, March 4 when I introduced House Resolution 277, urging a study, by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of the advisability of denying the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels trading with Cuba.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

HOW TO DEAL WITH SOVIET CUBA SHORT OF WAR

The recent freak attack by Cuban Migs on a flagless American shrimp boat elicited a prompt order from President Kennedy; next time our jet fighters will shoot back. But this is no answer to the question that Senators KEATING, COOPER, STENNIS, RUSSELL, and other critics and doubters of the administration's Cuban policy keep asking: Why should there be any Migs in Cuba at all, not to mention some 17,000 Russian troops, more than 500 antiaircraft missiles, and huge quantities of other Soviet armaments? They want to know why the administration continues to downgrade the importance of these Soviet arms and whether

it really has an adequate plan to get rid of them.

More and more of our Latin allies are asking the same question and, in marked contrast to their ambivalence toward Castro a year ago, they are now actually ahead of Washington in wanting action on Cuba. Before the Organization of American States, the Guatemalan Foreign Minister last week demanded a stronger application of the Monroe Doctrine. President Betancourt of Venezuela, in his recent visit said the OAS "should tighten the ring around Cuba, isolating her completely," and also "stimulate democratic resistance within Cuba." OAS Council Chairman Facio of Costa Rica echoes him. An OAS committee has just issued a blunt report on Castro's methods of exporting communism, urging members to take much stronger defensive measures. The Peruvian Ambassador predicts OAS unanimity behind any U.S.-led action against Cuba—specifically a blockade.

In his private exchanges with Khrushchev, Kennedy may be assumed to be prodding for removal of the Russian troops, and he has Ambassador Dobrynin's promise that "several thousand" will withdraw by March 15. But Kennedy still postpones action. He continues to insist on an unreal distinction between offensive and defensive Soviet weapons and he asks his critics not to rock the boat or, as Ambassador Stevenson put it, "make it too embarrassing for him [Khrushchev] to back down again." Why should we be so tender about Khrushchev's face? Sometimes critics are asked how they would handle Cuba; but when Senator KEATING came up with a long list of steps, none of them military, the President asked him not to make these public.

Meanwhile the Russians, for all we know in the absence of on-site inspection, may be (as Senators COOPER and STENNIS suspect) increasing instead of reducing their military strength in Cuba. They are certainly adding to Castro's strength. One does not have to be a warmonger to demand more action. Kennedy's negotiations do not exhaust our peaceful remedies for the outrageous Russian presence in Cuba. Indeed the negotiations would seem much more serious on Kennedy's part, not only to his critics but to Khrushchev, if he took steps to put more pressure on the already chaotic Cuban economy, make its support (already at least $1 million a day) more expensive to the Russians, and ultimately make that support impossible.

For example: U.S. vessels have long been forbidden to carry strategic goods to Cuba, and U.S. Government-financed cargoes are now refused to foreign ships that continue trading with Cuba. That is not enough. The United States could strengthen its partial quarantine by forbidding our ports entirely to these foreign vessels. A further step would be to revive and extend the October quarantine against Soviet vessels bearing arms to Cuba. This might involve us in boarding and inspection. A later step would be to expand the quarantine to any and all tankers, including Soviet tankers. Without Soviet oil, the Castro economy would grind to a halt in a few weeks.

Other measures may have to be taken against Castro. But the first task is to get the Russians and their massive armaments out of Cuba. In a speech in Houston last week Secretary Rusk said: "Fortunately, there is unanimity in the hemisphere on the must crucial matters * * * a Soviet military presence on that island cannot be accepted." It is time for deeds as well as negotiations to prove that we mean that.

Practical Physical Protection of Electrical Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from the day the nuclear age was ushered in nearly 18 years ago there have been many plans and panaceas, little hope, and much defeatism, and much too little cool, calm, and realistic judgment about how man must adapt himself to the nuclear environment of the 20th century. An occasional breath of fresh air clears the atmosphere. This was the case on January 30 of this year when Mr. Robert L. Corsbie, A.I.A., addressed the winter general meeting of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers in New York. His topic was "Practical Physical Protection of Electrical Systems"—used for industrial and commercial power—a subject of great interest to me and of the utmost importance to all of us, as the remarks have application far beyond the field of electrical power. Mr. Corsbie, one of the world's foremost experts in the field of the effects of nuclear explosion on man and structures, is a member of the New York firm of Rose, Beaton, & Corsbie and a consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission. He was formerly Director of Civil Effects Tests and Operations and Chief of the Civil Effects Branch of the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission where he was author or participant in the preparation of more than 200 weapons effects reports during the firing of more than 100 nuclear devices.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his address, as follows:

PRACTICAL PHYSICAL PROTECTION OF ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS

(By Robert L. Corsbie)

I am pleased to participate in this discussion of industrial and commercial power systems during and following a national or regional disaster, and to exchange thoughts on protection against the effects of nuclear reactions, with particular reference to the hazards accompanying and following the explosion of nuclear weapons.

The atomic bursts in 1945 over the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki greatly complicated the professional lives of those who influence and control man's physical environment. The instantaneous destruction of these cities, with populations of 200,000 and more, by airburst bombs of about 20-kiloton energy release, brought into sharp focus the interrelationship of the physical parts of cities, their buildings, and bridges, electrical generating and distributing systems, communications, water supply, sanitation, and transportation.

The unbelievable and unpredicted damage from the nuclear blast, thermal, and ionizing radiation, placed new demands upon architects and engineers. Since that day, they have the responsibility for designing structures and supporting systems of balanced strength consistent in resistance to survive an assumed level of nuclear effects, as well as the effects of winds, floods, earthquakes, and other natural disasters.

Seventeen years ago this month I was in Fort Belvoir, 18 miles from Washington, D.C., preparing and editing the physical damage report of these 1945 atomic detonations over Japan. The damage caused to utility powerlines, communications centers, telephone and telegraph lines above and below the surface, power stations, transformers, etc., was evaluated, extrapolated to our own cities, and published, principally in the "1950 Effects of Atomic Bombs."

Eight years ago this month I was at the Atomic Energy Commission's Nevada test site working feverishly in preparation for the 1955 weapons tests series called Operation Teapot. My position was that of director, civil effects test group, one of the four major organizations engaged in field experiments and evaluations at that time. Within the civil effects program were those projects oriented predominantly toward civil requirements for effects information, which we distinguish from military effects and weapons development needs.

Of especial interest to electrical and electronics engineers—and to many others—were two projects: One, sponsored by the Edison Electric Institute and associated companies, and under Project Officer Ralph V. H. Wood, of the Philadelphia Electric Co., sought information on the relative vulnerability of electric transmission substations and distribution systems compared to that of the homes and factories they serve. The other, sponsored by the Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers' Association and member companies, and under the direction of Project Officer Raymond H. Williamson, of General Electric, sought information on the effects of a nuclear explosion on typical communications equipment. Both projects participated in a detonation which occurred on May 5, 1955, and both projects obtained valuable and useful data which have been reported in the unclassified literature. It is safe to say that our confidence in electrical systems and in communications equipment rose when we surveyed the results of the shot.

If you will think back to 1955 for a moment, you may reach the conclusion that the only thing in the world that hasn't changed is the Volkswagen. They are others, of course; we all realize, however, that the last 8 years have been dynamic years.

During the 1955 tests in Nevada we were concerned with the response of various items, in addition to electrical and communications systems, to the effects of a device having an energy release comparable to 29 kilotons; i.e., 29,000 tons of TNT. Today, the advances in weaponry require that we consider defensive measures against explosions in the megaton range; ie., comparable to millions of tons of TNT.

Changes in the delivery systems have required that we shift our focus from delivery by the manned bomber to delivery by manned bombers and high-velocity missiles. While the yields have been going up, the delivery times—and thus the warning times—have been contracting.

Fortunately, the picture is not entirely one of foreboding, because the active defenses of the United States have been enhanced. Nevertheless, in the summation, the threat we face today is far more serious than the threat we faced 8 years ago.

The prospects of facing this threat are less terrifying if one understands that:

All the effects of a nuclear explosion do not occur at the same time;

The relative hazards vary with the yields of the weapons;

No single condition of burst can maximize all the effects; and

The casualties will be fewer than estimated.

Since the effects of a nuclear explosion vary with the condition of burst, it is unrealistic not to talk about all the effects and all the protective measures. There have been times, such as now, when there appears to be an unwise preoccupation with the hazards of fallout. The only nuclear bombs used in war were airburst, and produced combined blast, burn, and radiation injuries. There were no fallout casualties in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Ground burst nuclear weapons sacrifice 40 percent of burst energy to the ground and maximize only fallout. At optimum height of burst, the ranges of blast and thermal effects of nuclear explosions are significantly increased. If our people were all assured of fallout shelter, I doubt that the enemy would hesitate to select a condition of burst to maximize the immediate effects of blast and thermal.

What can we say about physical damage versus environmental blast and thermal effects? Inside the range at which 30 pounds per square inch would occur, say about a mile from a megaton explosion, we should expect to find complete destruction of buildings, except those which are specially constructed. Out to the 5 pounds per square inch line and perhaps somewhat beyond, in the event of megaton bursts, we should expect to find wooden and brick buildings destroyed. Aboveground structures and commercial electrical and communication facilities will be severely damaged in the 5 and 10 pounds per square inch ranges.

Underground conduit pipelines for gas, water, and other gases and fluids are quite well protected; however, the service connections are usually inflexible and breaks can be expected to occur in profusion at the points where service lines enter buildings. Severe blast damage to mobile equipment can occur in the 5 to 7 pounds per square inch range, and they may be overturned at lower pressures.

Superimposed upon the blast damage, or compounding it, may be damage from fires. Under certain conditions, small fires may become mass fires which consume all combustible material. However, conflagrations and fire storms are improbable under most conditions of weather and built upness. Assuming that we are optimistic about our chances, there is a wide range of actions which we can take. They range from doing nothing, or almost nothing, thus putting ourselves in the hands of "Lady Luck," to the type of protective construction (actually they are protective systems), which goes into hardened missile sites and other military defense installations. If you could put your plant inside a nuclear submarine, you would have it made, barring unbelievably hard luck.

But, the fact of the matter is, you cannot put an electric utility or a steam-generating plant or a telephone company central office in a submarine prepared to submerge and take evasive action at the first hint of trouble.

So, you ask, what will work for the electrical systems? The answer to the question gets us into the first stage of the difficult part of the problem. As a starter, you must have some definition of the threat, and this is not always easy to achieve, because no one can forecast with certainty exactly how it will happen if it happens.

The American Society of Civil Engineers manual, "Design of Structures To Resist Nuclear Weapons Effects," recommends a straight population density approach. Blast peak overpressure resistance levels of 100 pounds per square inch for the heart of population centers of over 200,000 people, 30 pounds per square inch protection within 20 miles of such centers, and fallout shelter only elsewhere. A Sandia Corp. report concludes that blast protection should be provided if one is located within about 20 miles plus the circular probable error (CEP) from a probable target area assuming a 10 megaton yield, or 45 miles plus CEP assuming a 100 megaton yield.

With this sort of guidance, it is possible to make assumptions in which we can have confidence, even though there is always the probability that we may underdesign or overdesign. In any case, the assumptions will very likely be as good as, or better than, many of the impromptu and informal assumptions we use to guide our lives and businesses.

There is another very important consideration which goes into the making of a decision as to the degree of hardening or protection. It is money, and, if there is a moment of truth in the conference, it comes when someone asks: "How much can we afford to put into protective measures?" Indeed, this difficult question has plagued the civil system of defense since the beginning. Unless an organization or individual is determined, very determined, to have protection, the question is hard to answer.

One approach is to think of these problems in terms of the everyday risks which one understands well enough to face daily, and, for the most part, to survive. I don't know what risk you took in coming here today. You took some. You walked across streets, or drove a car, or you came by taxicab or by bus, or by plane, or by boat. So one takes risks every day to live on the ground, under the ground, and in the air. There is a risk in hurricanes, tornados, floods, and other natural disasters. In my assessment of the risks associated with enemy applications of nuclear energy, I conclude, for example, that 1 pound per square inch is no greater risk than driving an automobile. One should not drive an automobile unless he demonstrates some knowledge of driving. A small amount of preparation goes a long way to assure, but not guarantee, survival of 1 pound per square inch.

I suggest that you accept the 1 pound per square inch risk concept and equate it with a 2-4 cal/cm2 thermal effect, which gives a red sunburn. This happens to most of us several times a year—uncomfortable but not disabling. Then equate 2-4 cal/cm2 with a radiation dose, say 100 rem bomb radiation, and 200 rem fallout radiation. The first would be an acute dose and the second a fallout dose, taken over a longer period of time.

In the light of a war situation, I think that these are acceptable risks and manageable hazards because they are comparable to everyday risks. So I would take all these effects and equate them with the hazard of going swimming, or fishing in a small boat, or going to a party on Saturday night, or doing nothing. With such a rationale, there is established a direction in which to go—for an individual, a corporation, a State, a nation. Whatever is done improves one's chances.

But if we have decided on the protection we need at a given location, and we have the funds, are we at last out of the woods? Not quite. We must get someone to design the system. Architectural-engineering firms in the United States can handle conventional powerplants, telephone centers, office buildings, churches, bridges, hospitals, restaurants, supermarkets, and so on, without too much difficulty. But when it comes to a structure and the supporting utilities and services which can survive and protect people in a hostile, nuclear environment, we are not very well off.

First of all, there hasn't been much protective construction, so the professionals haven't had much experience. Second, the people in the drafting room are not equipped with the reference materials they need to do the job quickly and accurately. We don't have the handbooks, and thus every job is a special job, requiring more study, more calculations, and more time.

The engineering and other professions must remedy this. The nation can benefit enormously by our attention to design and details while the plans are still on paper on the drafting board. The nuclear age has brought the need for materials and designs functionally equal to traditional applications, and competitive in cost but of great advantage if we face a nuclear war.

In addition to doing something about keeping the people alive, we must think about keeping the plant alive. This is particularly true if there will be a demand for the products of the plant before, during, and after an attack. Some plants will have to be shut down because they cannot run unattended; others cannot be stopped without ruining the plant.

If we are to be a protected people, we shall first require an informed people. Through your professions and your corporate interests, industrial, commercial, investment organizations, civic groups, and fraternal associates, as well as through publications, you can help.

This country's total defense is incomplete and meaningless without a reliable and responsible organization of professional leaders to guide and direct our civil system of defense. A capability for reprisal alone cannot guarantee survival. Of equal importance is our ability to recover over the days, months, and years following nuclear war. This is too important to play by ear. We must marshal our professions and combine our talents to assist in this gigantic task.

Ten Years of Effective Community Service by the St. Johnsville Enterprise & News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day one of the outstanding rural newspapers in upstate New York, the Enterprise & News of St. Johnsville, N.Y., marked 10 years of service to the community under the present ownership.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to salute the St. Johnsville Enterprise & News and its outstanding editor and publisher, Mr. Roger H. Scofield, for their outstanding record and wish them many, many more years of continued service and growth in influence and effectiveness.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point an article from the February 28 issue of this great newspaper, written by Mr. Scofield, summarizing some of the impressions and achievements of this eventual 10-year period.

The article follows:

[From the St. Johnsville (N.Y.) Enterprise & News, Feb. 28, 1963]

ENTERPRISE & NEWS OBSERVES 10 YEARS UNDER PRESENT OWNERSHIP

(By Roger H. Scofield)

The "discipline of detail" seems to be the theme of our last 10 years of bucking the

economic seas of New York State, specifically in the village of St. Johnsville, in the publishing business.

It could be called a peculiar choice, for someone trained and educated in a field where there is security, where one had earned tenure as a member of the teaching profession.

In retrospect, a fellow wonders what, after all was the nature of the call. Was it a starry eyed crusading spirit? Was it an effort to make a little more money? Was it a desire to be one's own boss? Was it a desire to be heard, after a determination that one had something to say?

The answer we suppose is "yes," in part, to all these questions, a combination, if you will. But we don't mind admitting they all got blurred in the grinding routine and the overpowering necessity to eat.

The plush financial backing we have seen in other enterprises just wasn't there. Decisions had to be made early, whether to go it big, or go it small, with not much choice at that. We chose the latter, naturally, and dove in (two former teachers), to become habitually smeared with ink up to the elbows, and quite often in places more noticeable.

There were temptations right from the start, to go it a little bigger, build a little bigger operation, hire more help. There was even the occasional giving in to this temptation, and the getting of one's ears pinned back, but good. It was like walking a tight wire, wishing you had the knowhow to expand enough to shake loose from the mechanics of the thing and promote it. It was a frustrating, yet not at all hopeless battle to match the facts of life with earlier dreams. There was always hope, even though at times it came through quarter inch pipelines.

We had to change our habits, it seemed, by the dozens. One of the worst was—we no longer had time to talk to people, and we knew this is not the way to serve people. This was heartbreaking, especially since it was a shocking break with the past. By choosing the "shoestring," low overhead approach, impossible accomplishment quotas were set, and quite often, met. A little more knowhow, both mechanically and otherwise, would have saved plenty of ulcer building sessions.

Job printing, at first, was given the cold shoulder, based on the theory of "why burn over a territory with an inferior product before you know what you're doing, when with a little breathing time, you can come up with a good product which will build business, instead of drive it away?"

After 5 years of this sort of "breathing," the Enterprise & News owners figured they were ready to supply the area with a good brand of job work. Local industry cooperated and a Heidelberg automatic press, the best letter press on the market was purchased. Still later, in order to produce complicated forms at a low price, the Enterprise & News owners added a Davidson automatic photo-offset press.

In 5 years, job printing at the Enterprise & News has jumped from nothing to nearly one-third of the total gross of the business. In 10 years, the total annual gross business for the whole operation has more than doubled.

This has been accomplished in part by purchase of a larger, newer newspaper press, making possible the printing of an eight-column paper. Another big factor was moving to a new location in the Devendorf Building at 53 West Main Street, where machinery and equipment were arranged for much greater efficiency.

In the decade preceding the last 10 years, pictures in the Enterprise & News were rare, although quite good, because previous owners had good engraving equipment.

The present publishers felt the greatest impact could be made by ample use of pictures. Sometimes the ample tried to take the place of wise, or good, but the overall effect on the reading public was plus, as was borne out by a big leap forward in the sale of local advertising lineage. This trend has never been reversed, as more and more local businesses come to see that the Enterprise & News lays heavy emphasis on the local scene, whether it be news coverage, pictures, or sale of advertising space.

A little over a year ago, the Enterprise & News acquired a photolathe, an instrument that combines what an electric eye "sees" with the capabilities of a precision lathe.

The local Enterprise & News pictures and many of the pictures you see in advertisements come off this photolathe, in engraving form.

For approximately the last 5 years the Enterprise & News has offered a photo service to the public. This service has expanded steadily.

In the field of public service the Enterprise & News has tried to back things which could benefit the community. This has included everything from housing projects, to municipal marina development, restoration of transient camp building, beautification of the village, fluoridation of water, reopening of the local theater—even the possible coming of Indians to Klock Park, until the latter situation became too ludicrous for further serious comment.

The Enterprise & News has at times been dead wrong in some of its thinking and some of its judgments, but it has tried to stir people into thinking. It has paid the price for its mistakes and filed them for future reference. In spite of them it has tried for a good batting average, and has tried to help.

The Agency That Isn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have seen a lot of things in Washington in my time, but never one to equal the contents of this editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, which is reprinted as the guest editorial in the Decatur Herald, of Monday, March 4, 1963.

Here is a Government agency which says that it is the Domestic Peace Corps and ready to take your application and the Domestic Peace Corps does not exist. There may be such a bill on the Hill some place; but so far as I know I have not heard of it, nor its number, nor have I heard that it is set for hearings. Perhaps we will hear of it one of these days, but I trust in the meantime we will not have wasted a lot of money on legislation which has not as yet been enacted.

The editorial follows:

THE AGENCY THAT ISN'T

If you should be in Washington with an overpowering urge to make a telephone call and you should happen to call Dunkirk 2-3961 (or you can call from here, the area code is 202; it will please Illinois Bell Telephone) you will be answered by a nice feminine voice advising you that you are connected with the Domestic Peace Corps. Should you ask for employment the pleasant voice will tell you to fill out Government standard form 57, found at any post office, and mail it in with a covering letter. The man in charge of the Domestic Peace Corps is Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who has two brothers somewhere in Government.

The strange thing about this telephone call is that you are talking to a Government agency that will accept your application for employment—but the agency does not exist. Congress has passed no legislation creating a Domestic Peace Corps.

But there it is. As large as life. Staffed with 25 people, all of whom are being paid. Equipped with telephones, desks, typewriters, paper, carbon paper, paperclips, waste baskets, in and out baskets and all the other necessities of a functioning office. Yet they do not exist. Someone is paying for all this. Someone is paying the rent on the third floor offices of the Domestic Peace Corps at 736 Jackson Place in Washington, D.C. They may may not exist but payrolls are being met, fringe benefits honored and vacations being earned. And we'll warrant there are expense accounts being honored. But the Domestic Peace Corps does not exist, as a Government agency.

The Domestic Peace Corps is not an agency of the Government; no enabling legislation has been offered. But in preparation for the day when it is offered there is an office, there are people, there is an organization chart, there are lobbyist—there is even a public relations program in force.

For an agency of the Government that doesn't even exist the Domestic Peace Corps shows remarkable signs of life. By the time the New Frontier gets around to offering legislation to make it legal it may be too strong to thwart, too strong to deny. Certainly it is a sterling example of New Frontier bureaucracy.

The U.S.S. "Alamo"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, 127 years ago today the Alamo fell in the bid of Texans for their independence.

One of the participants in that battle was Davy Crockett, who was a Member of this body from 1827 to 1831 and from 1833 to 1835, representing the district that I now have the honor of representing.

I have the honor also of representing the town of Alamo, Tenn., which is the county seat of Crockett County, named after Davy Crockett. Also the Navy has an LSD-33 named the U.S.S. *Alamo*.

There appeared in the Crockett Times, a fine newspaper, edited by Leslie Sims, an outstanding editor of the State of Tennessee, on Thursday, February 21, an article on the U.S.S. *Alamo*. This article is so outstanding and so well written that I feel that it should be brought to the attention of this body.

This article follows:

U.S.S. "ALAMO" HAS HISTORIC TRADITION

The U.S.S. *Alamo* (LSD 33), a dock landing ship, is named after the famed Alamo Mission in Texas. The same mission is the namesake of Alamo, Tenn.

Now revered as the shrine of Texas independence, the Alamo Mission in San Antonio

was built in 1756. It ceased to function as a church in 1793.

After the Texans declared their independence from Mexico in April 1836, the ruins of the Alamo became a Texas fortress. James Bowie and James W. Fannin, with but 90 men, put up a heroic fight in October 1836 to defeat 400 Mexican soldiers who attempted to take the Alamo.

A volunteer of the Texas Army, William Barret Travis, with some 200 men was then dispatched to hold the mission. An army of 5,000 Mexican troops of Gen. Lopez de Santa Anna was marching on the fort.

Famous Indian fighter and former U.S. Representative from Tennessee, David Crockett, was one of the defenders.

The siege of the Alamo started February 28, 1837. It failed to dislodge the Texans until March 6. On that day massive assaults were mounted by the Mexican Army. The first two waves were turned back. The third, an assault force 3,000 strong, swarmed over the adobe walls. Travis, Crockett and their men stood their ground in furious hand-to-hand combat. They were slain to the last man.

Over 600 Mexicans died taking the Alamo.

"Remember the Alamo," became the battlecry of Gen. Sam Houston's Texas Republican Army.

The Texas Army defeated Santa Anna in the decisive battle for Texas independence at San Jacinto April 21, 1837.

U.S.S. *Alamo* was built in Pascagoula, Miss. Her keel was laid October 11, 1954. She was placed in commission in August 1956.

She sailed to Norfolk for ammunition and then departed for the Pacific on her shakedown cruise. In San Diego in October she became a unit of Amphibious Group 1 of the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

The *Alamo* carried cargo-laden amphibious craft between the coast and Eniwetok, Bikini, Kwajalein, the Marshall Islands, and Pearl Harbor.

In mid-1958, she sailed for her first Far East mission at the time of the Formosa crisis. She conducted amphibious training for Nationalist Chinese naval units in Kao Hsuing Harbor, Formosa.

Since that time she has alternated between the 1st Fleet on the west coast and the 7th Fleet in the Pacific.

The *Alamo* is a 6,880-ton, 510-foot-long ship with a beam of 84 feet. She can make speeds of more than 16 knots.

With her complement of Marine helicopters and supplies, she is a valuable part of the amphibious forces in the Pacific. Her helicopters can take part in the Marines newly developed "vertical envelopment" warfare, in which troops and supplies are airlifted behind enemy lines while other troops are making a frontal assault on a beach.

The *Alamo's* commanding officer is Capt. Thomas A. Turner of Piggott, Ark.

Poker, Chess, and Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we all realize these are grave times in which we live, but there are occasions, I think, when we might fruitfully divert our gaze to subjects other than thermonuclear warfare, economic crises, and other melancholy vistas. So it is that I commend to you and my colleagues a recent address entitled "Poker, Chess, and Strategy," delivered before the Armed Forces chess awards dinner by Dr. Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., the distinguished Deputy Secretary of Defense for Education and Manpower Resources. Dr. Katzenbach's thesis is that the national interest might be better served if we devoted ourselves to chess, rather than poker, as an indoor pastime thus the better to hone our minds to combat the machinations of the Soviet Union. Now, I fully realize this thesis is open to debate, particularly among those husbands who, from time to time, value a night out in exclusively male company. Nevertheless, I feel Dr. Katzenbach's remarks might serve to remind us that the exercise of the intellect afforded by the chessboard can be every bit as exciting and rewarding as, say, drawing to an inside straight. Dr. Katzenbach's words are as follows:

POKER, CHESS, AND STRATEGY

(Address by Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education and Manpower Resources, before the Armed Forces chess tournament awards dinner, October 20, 1962)

Every nation has a skeleton in its closet. Most nations have a characteristic or two which those in other nations dislike. Some have faults which they themselves fail to recognize.

The bar sinister on our national escutcheon—I realize that I am talking to men who understand and appreciate the symbolism of heraldry—is that we are and have been a nation of poker players.

Now, no doubt poker has its place. (As a politician I must say this.) But its place has always escaped me. Of course, the cynical might argue that I speak only as a continuous and resentful loser. But as everyone knows all doctors of philosophy are pledged to the sober truth, and as a doctor of philosophy I say that my criticism of poker is not on a petty personal plane. Nor do I take issue with gambling. Rather I believe first, that the game has played deuces wild with our history; and, second, that the game as a whole may have as potentially a disastrous effect on the last half of the 20th century as strip poker has on a college weekend.

Consider for one moment the damage that poker playing has had on the character of the Nation. Note on your television sets that at the moment of our greatest national glory, when the good guys are shooting up the bad guys in the West, that the saloons in which the bad guys play poker have false fronts—ones which make buildings look as though they were two stories high when in fact they are only one. Besides, this Nation originated the "false front" in men's shirtwear, and admitted the front man into the ranks of respectable wage earners. Why was the false front respectable throughout our history? Why is front itself so important? The answer, of course, is poker. For the essence of the game is front and bluff, with some odds thrown in. For those of us for whom candor is high in our system of values, and mathematics is low on the list of our abilities, the game is little better than banditry.

Besides, it is very dangerous in strategic terms.

Let me cite you three reasons. In the first place, poker tends to make one think in terms of odds. But when one thinks in strategic terms, odds are hardly appropriate. For example, how would one respond to policy considerations which were couched in terms of its 3 to 1 A and B will have a falling out, or 4 to 1 that the C will have the atomic bomb in 3 years, or 50 to 1 against the Canadians attacking the Mexicans or vice versa. In the real world, what does one do with odds? The odds are, one rejects them.

Second, poker is not a game in which one can exercise flexibility. Indeed, it was the crass poker player who invented that phrase which we hear everywhere and all the time—to wit, "put up or shut up." It does not seem to me in a world in which the spectrum of threat is as wide as it is, that one can expect any Chief Executive to say blatantly, "I'll call you on that one." This does not mean that I am not fully aware that there is a time to put up or shut up and to say candidly, "I call your bluff." But it does strike me that a game in which one raises the antes or surrenders ones hand is hardly applicable to the complexities to the world in which we live.

Third, and finally, poker leads curiously to circuitous thinking. And I say with regret that this has permeated even the ivory towers of my former academic colleagues. You know, of course, what I mean by poker thinking. It starts with an "if," ends with a "then," and between them alternates pronouns before the verb "think." It goes like this: "If he thinks that I think that he thinks that I think that he thinks, then * * *." Now, if I may say so, without appearing unduly rude, this type of thinking is not forward looking in international politics. Indeed, it reminds me of the dodo bird, which, you will remember, thought flying in ever smaller concentric circles was fun, until he mysteriously disappeared.

Now, chess is a rather different matter. A jack of hearts has no personality but a bishop does. A king of spades is no more a king than I am, but a king on a chess board is a personage—one who moves slowly and deliberately in one direction or another, seldom making mistakes but with, to be sure, no great vigor. His queen, however, obviously is a prime minister. Her relationship to him is one frequently encountered among both allied nations and Communist ones too, for that matter, in which the chief of state is a figurehead and the prime minister, or whatever he may be called, does whatever is done. I must admit privately that I have always thought that somewhere in the earliest history of chess, the word for queen and the word for prime minister must have been alike or else the originators of the great game were not students of the female character. Had the queen been a "she" they would have empowered her to move not only backward and forward but also to move, as women and horses so frequently do, in two directions at once, like the frisky knight.

Now, certainly I do not claim to be in a class with any of you gentlemen, but it requires very little perception indeed to see the relevance of chess to the strategic problems of our time; to raising standards of living, to guerrilla actions, and to the resolution of the cold war. Notice that not only each of the pieces has characteristics of its own, but each gains or loses in strength depending upon the confidence of the player in the piece and the positions of allied pieces. Frankly can you think of anything more meaningful than this to a world in which the great power groupings have so much to gain by winning the confidence and building the prospects of the nations? And finally, the chess player understands, as we all must understand, that there may be tactical advantages to retreats in seeking victory. He understands the most important factor of all—that a pawn is not something to be taken lightly, for the least of the powers cannot only get in the way but can actually bring about the downfall of figures more powerful. I have often wondered who the fool was who spoke of a pawn in a demeaning way as the tool of power.

Given then, Mr. Chairman, that the playing of chess is a habit to be cultivated so that men's minds can understand the problems of their day; and given the further fact that the playing of poker instills habits of thought which are positively dangerous for the national well-being, I hereby move that in the interest of national welfare the latter be banned and the former instituted as part of the instruction in each first grade in the Nation.

Rich Indonesia in Deep Trouble Economically

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Indonesia, despite being one of the richest countries in the world in natural resources, is in deep economic trouble.

In a thoughtful article, which appeared in the Washington Post on March 3, Chalmers Roberts has discussed this trouble and its considerable implications, not only for Indonesia, but for southeast Asia as a whole.

After my inspection tour of the Far East this last year—an inspection which included Indonesia—it became my feeling, considering her vital geographic location, her immense wealth in natural resources, and her population which is fifth largest in the world, that Indonesia might very well become the balance wheel in this troubled and explosive part of our world.

Considering its importance, and as a followup to the article on Indonesia which I placed in the RECORD on February 21, I urge our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to review this timely and probing analysis of Indonesia by Mr. Roberts:

RICH INDONESIA IN DEEP TROUBLE ECONOMICALLY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

DJAKARTA.—Indonesia is in economic trouble so deep that something probably is going to happen, and happen sooner rather than later.

This reporter has spent 10 days in Indonesia, chiefly in Java, where 65 million of the nation's estimated 100 million people live. Few lands are more lush or richer in natural resources. But Indonesia is more frustrating than most nations when it comes to trying to estimate where it is headed.

In talks with Indonesians, high and low, and with foreign observers of several nationalities, it is evident that economic conditions have greatly deteriorated in the past 6 months. Rice, the basic staple, is in short supply and prices have been rising erratically.

Copra, the coconut product, lies rotting or is burned because of price problems and disorganized transportation. Communists are alleged to be behind the burning of some sugarcane in the fields. People lack sugar and oils, and margarine has about disappeared. Indonesia is the world's No. 1 importer of rice, yet it is the world's fourth largest producer.

AN ELASTIC CURRENCY

The exchange rate of the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, reflects these economic troubles. The official rate is 45 to $1, the figure at which the United States must spend the rupiahs it receives in exchange for the food it sends here under Public Law 480. At the Hotel Indonesia here in Djakarta, the nation's one first-rate hostelry, there is a 500 to $1 rate for food but room bills for foreigners must be paid in dollars or other hard currencies. The black market rupiah rate both here and in Singapore, however, has advanced in the past 6 months from 600 to $1 to about 1,300 to $1.

The result is too much money in circulation, too few goods for the rank and file to buy, inflated prices of rice in the free market (which is used to supplement the absolutely vital rice allowances supplied to government and many other employes) and a vast amount of smuggling. It has been learned, for example, that half the Indonesian imports into nearby British Singapore are smuggled there from Sumatra or the islands off its coast.

Indonesia is still 80 percent agricultural and rural, only 20 percent industrialized, and few of the industries employ even 1,000 people. Yet industry as a whole is estimated to be running at only around 20 percent of capacity. This means less goods badly needed at home and less for exports to earn dollars to pay for badly needed imports. Smuggling, too, cuts deeply into foreign exchange earnings.

AID HAS BEEN MASSIVE

American aid to Indonesia since independence in 1949 has totaled around $665 million, of which about 45 percent has been in farm surplus items. Aid from all free world nations (of which Japanese reparations, credits, and grants together slightly top the American total) has amounted to more than $1.5 billion, compared to an estimated $665 million in economic aid from the Communist bloc. This excludes the massive Soviet military aid.

The U.S.-built cement plant, Indonesia's biggest, is one of the few places now running at 100 percent capacity, and the United States is building a urea fertilizer plant. Each was financed by an Export-Import Bank loan and each will provide about one-third of the national need for its output. The World Bank won't do business here, so poor is Indonesia's credit rating and so shaky its economic structure.

With such a dismal picture so evident, one would expect an explosion of some sort. But Indonesians seem to have a low boiling point, the farmer somehow manages to eat and the city worker frequently resorts to graft and stealing.

A WEST IRIAN SEQUEL

The optimists here, both Indonesian and foreign, argue that these serious economic conditions are about to be faced. They say that the military rebellion against the government has now been liquidated and the issue of West Irian (West New Guinea) will be finally solved May 1 when that territory comes under Indonesian rule by way of the United Nations from the Dutch. Hence, now is the time to tackle the economic problems.

Indonesian life, of course, is dominated by President Sukarno, as it has been since independence. He recently said that the time had come to concentrate on the economic problem and the cabinet is reported to have formulated a basic strategic economic principle for surmounting present economic difficulties.

Critics contend that Indonesia's economic problems are self-made, though they concede that recent floods have added to the woe. Last summer's massive buildup (for a country such as this) for the projected attack on West Irian resulted in commandeering much of the transportation equipment, including the shipping, so vital in a nation of some 3,000 islands stretched across an area the width of the continental United States.

Incidentally, senior military officials have told me that some 30,000 men were within 2 or 3 days of D-Day when the Dutch-Indonesia agreement was signed.

Now that some shipping, at least, is coming back to its normal commercial uses, there is an obvious need for a revaluation of the rupiah and a currency stabilization scheme on an international basis. The hopeful think this will happen; the pessimists do not think that Sukarno, whom they rate as an economic illiterate however high they regard his political prowess, will buckle down to the job and enforce the tough decisions, if, indeed, he makes them.

POSSIBLE RED MAJORITY

Such an economic situation, of course, is ready-made for the Communists. The PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and its related labor organization, known as SOBSI, are very powerful. The party now claims 3.5 million members, up from an earlier 2 million claim.

No one knows how strong they really are, but one measure is the fact that a high official remarked to me that if elections were held today, the Communist Party of Indonesia would win an absolute majority. Some outside observers tend to think he could be right and not merely justifying the lack of elections. At any rate, Indonesia is still under martial law, though it is supposed to be lifted May 1.

Ten political parties are legal, but they operate in something of a vacuum since no election is in sight. Sukarno has talked vaguely of an election in 1963; other officials say perhaps in 1964, but the franker ones concede that date is illusory, too.

As long as Sukarno is alive—he is now 61—he probably will continue to be the boss. Officials here tend to throw up their hands when you ask what will happen if he disappears, but the general view is that the military would take over with a civilian figurehead.

Sukarno has built his "guided democracy" on what we might call the principle of consensus; that is, of getting all rival forces to agree. Since he can enforce a high degree of cooperation, Sukarno has made the Communists keep within bounds.

Of late, Sukarno has been talking a good deal about something he calls NASAKOM, an alphabet soup word meaning nationalism, religion, and communism. The third element used to be socialism; the change seems to reflect the growing power of the Communist Party of Indonesia. Sukarno's proclaimed aim is to run Indonesia on this three-legged stool principle.

The Communists' aim is to increase the strength of their leg and in due course to upset the stool in their direction. Currently, they are pressing for posts in Sukarno's inner cabinet, from which so far they have been excluded though they hold posts in the so-called outer cabinet.

The Communist Party of Indonesia is said to want the finance and information ministries, and the reason is obvious enough; to make more economic troubles and to control the already left-tinted public utterances of the government and the press.

The Communist Party of Indonesia, incidentally, is officially oriented toward Peking in its ideological dispute with Moscow, but there appears to be no evidence of a split below the Politburo level. The rank and file party members are concentrating on exploiting the economic misery. Nor is there any sign that Peking is attempting to steer the Communist Party of Indonesia into military opposition to the Sukarno regime, a move which, now at least, probably would be as disastrous for the party as was the Stalin-ordered revolution here in the early post-World War II years.

The press in Indonesia is a disgrace by any democratic standard. News of the outside world is at a minimum and often is quite slanted. Newsprint is imported and pub-

lishers are under the government's heel. In this capital of Djakarta, with a population estimated at 3 million, the 15 papers have a combined circulation of 360,000, of which the five Communist or far left papers have about half the total.

The radio is state-owned. Television, which Indonesia can ill afford but which is a status symbol, has begun in Djakarta, where there are an estimated 10,000 imported TV sets.

This is not a land for dissent by any democratic standard. Dissent runs afoul of the Sukarno philosophy of government, which is based on the ancient village system of consensus and which therefore has wide public appeal.

Marxist terminology abounds. When Sukarno received an honorary degree February 2 at the University of Indonesia here, he was praised for having denounced "individualism, liberalism, capitalism, imperialism, feudalism, fascism as sources of exploitation of man by man." Communism was missing from the list. Any enemy of Indonesia will quickly be branded as an imperialist or neocolonialist or capitalist.

Some of this is explicable for reasons other than the power of the Nation's Communist Party. As able American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, a man with 7 years' experience here, recently put it in a speech: "To the majority of Indonesians—in fact to most of the newly emerging peoples of the African and Asian world—the word 'capitalism' brings forth an immediate and vivid picture of foreign control of their economy and, not infrequently, of foreign exploitation and oppression."

The Dutch, who exploited the wealth of the Indies during 300 years of rule, are still unpopular although some Indonesians want enough of them to come back to help revitalize the largely Dutch-built farm and factory equipment. The Japanese, who occupied the country from 1942 to 1945, are looked upon as liberators from the Dutch.

Those who worry publicly about communism in Indonesia are accused of having a "Communist phobia." The more democratic leaders will tell you, as foreign observers also do, that the PKI's power is balanced by the military, which is rated as highly anti-Communist.

Large numbers of army, navy, and air force officers have been to the United States and the resulting friendship, from the sample I have had, is impressive. The same can be said for the several thousand students and technicians who have been sent to the United States.

Indonesians talk a lot about their poorness despite their great wealth of little-tapped resources, which include the biggest oil source in Asia, much rubber, copra, tin, and other items. In moments of frankness, they will say they have their hands out to both East and West—and that they expect to have their wants met.

The people, of course, are the greatest resource. They are not as aggressive as the Japanese or as hard working as the many Chinese among them, on whom they look with suspicion and often with envy despite the official Indonesian friendship with Red China. Yet Indonesians are industrious; they must be to survive, especially in Java, the most crowded major area in the world after Belgium.

They are not naturally very adept mechanically but they are trying, or at least the upper echelon is trying, to propel the nation into the 20th century industrial revolution. Sukarno has in motion, at least, a massive education program with three shifts in the schools. But the lacks are everywhere—trained teachers, buildings, books, paper. And it costs the university student far more to board than to study.

Indonesia's problem today quite obviously is to get its economic house in order. Perhaps the optimists are right and the necessary moves will now be made. But the pessimists are correct in demanding to see the evidence.

One would be more of an optimist, despite the nation's obvious shortcomings and the massive power of the Communists, if it were not for the lurking suspicion that Sukarno would prefer another foreign policy adventure. The row with Malaya over the British colonial possessions along the northern fringe of Borneo is the subject for another article.

Then, too, the Portuguese hold half of the island of Timor, an anachronism which Indonesians hint they will get around to in due course. To many, Sukarno is a permanent revolutionary who needs such foreign issues to keep his momentum.

In short, this is an attractive yet often baffling nation where many are seeking real progress but where the machinery of government "socialism" is clearly inadequate to the need. Indonesia's future is questionable, yet it is full of vital people who are trying to shed the colonial past with all it inhibitions in order to come to grips with the future.

Proposed Merger of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. With the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution (H. Res. 1367) of the Rhode Island General Assembly:

H. RES. 1367

Resolution earnestly requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to favorably consider the proposed merger of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. with the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads

Whereas the continued operation of the New Haven Railroad is essential to the economy of the eastern seaboard; and

Whereas a merger between the said New Haven Railroad and the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroad would provide a long-range permanent solution to the railroad problems of New England; and

Whereas a merger would permit profitable operation of the New Haven Railroad without a curtailment of service; and

Whereas the said New Haven Railroad and the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads are engaged as partners in terminal operations and have common terminal interests; and

Whereas the said railroads jointly manage the New York Connecting Railroad, which they created to link southern New England with points to the south; and

Whereas the public interest can best be served by a merger of the said railroads: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island earnestly requests the Interstate Commerce Commission to favorably consider this proposed merger of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. with the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby respectfully requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to each Senator and Representative from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, in order that each recognize our genuine interest in this merger.

Army Orders Reports on Congressional Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues today an article from the Syracuse, N.Y., Herald-Journal of March 2, 1963, pertaining to congressional visits to Army installations.

The article, by an outstanding journalist, Jules Witcover, notes that field commanders must submit résumés to the Pentagon of interviews held at their installations with Congressmen or their staffs.

This is an important development, Mr. Witcover writes, because it subjects Members of Congress to the same treatment now accorded newsmen who seek information under the Defense Department memorandum of October 27, 1962.

The article follows:

PENTAGON ORDERS DAILY REPORT ON WATCHDOG VISITS TO BASES

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON.—The Army has ordered its field commanders to submit to the Pentagon daily résumés of any interviews held at their installations with visiting members of congressional committees or their staffs.

The orders are contained in a new regulation that also stipulates that requests for copies of such résumés by the congressional committees concerned must be brought to the attention of the Pentagon "and will be acted upon only by Headquarters, Department of the Army."

The order in effect subjects Members of Congress to a sample of the treatment Pentagon newsmen have been getting ever since last October 27, when a memorandum from Assistant Secretary Arthur Sylvester required reports from all Pentagon employees of all conversations with newsmen, unless monitored by a public information specialist.

Commanders are required to submit a "narrative report of the visit, including identification of persons interviewed and summaries of the interviews of interest to Headquarters, Department of the Army."

The regulation, signed February 7 by Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff, says the reports "will serve to inform all higher echelons within the Department of committee interest in the particular facet of Army activity being surveyed."

This is essentially the same reason Sylvester has given for his requirement that news sources submit a report of conversations with newsmen or have a monitor sit in on interviews. Concerning the newsmen, however, Sylvester has said the procedure keeps his own public information men informed.

Reports on visits by individual Members of Congress not involving committee busi-

ness are left to the discretion of the commander concerned, as is the reporting of any particular interview that "would not interest" the Pentagon.

The requirement for résumés of congressional interviews has been included in an updating of a 1958 Army regulation on reporting congressional visits. Up to now, there had been no order to submit such résumés, nor any provision barring submission of copies to the committees without direct Pentagon clearance.

The regulation also stipulates that "immediately upon receiving information indicating a proposed visit by congressional personnel, an initial priority report will be transmitted direct by electrical means to Headquarters of the Army for the chief of legislative liaison, containing such information pertaining to the visit as is then available."

Commanders are ordered not to delay this first report while waiting for additional information on the visit. Supplementary reports are to be submitted to the Pentagon by airmail unless the commander decides "the subject matter of the report is of sufficient importance to warrant electrical transmission."

Each day thereafter while the Congressmen or their staffs are at the installation, the commander is to send his daily report by airmail to the chief of legislative liaison, with the interview résumés included.

In the case of visits by members of the House or Senate Appropriations Committees or their staffs, a special procedure is required to cut redtape and get the first warning and subsequent reports direct to the budget-making arm of the Army.

When Appropriations Committee personnel are involved, the initial priority report by wire goes directly to the Comptroller of the Army, and all subsequent reports also are channeled directly to him.

The existing Air Force regulation on the same general subject, dated last September 27, lays down procedures for giving the Pentagon immediate notification of an impending visit, but does not require daily reports or résumés of interviews with Congressmen or their aids.

Air Force commanders instead are obliged at the end of a base investigation, hearing, or visit to submit "without delay" complete report "including the place and duration of the visit, names of members and staff representatives, any deficiencies disclosed, any corrective action taken or recommended, etc."

The Navy has no written regulations governing the reporting of congressional visits to naval commands, ships, or installations. When Navy headquarters wants such reports, the Navy says, it asks for them on a case-by-case basis.

Campaign To Destroy American Faith in United Nations—Warning by Francis W. Carpenter in Interview With Journalist William J. Burke of the Springfield, Mass., Daily News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Francis W. Carpenter, director of news service for the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, has rendered a valuable service by warning that a well-organized campaign is being conducted to destroy American faith in the United Nations.

In an interview with William J. Burke of the Springfield, Mass., Daily News, a well-known and widely respected journalist in western Massachusetts, Director Carpenter pointed out that the two major points of concentration of the centrally directed campaign to discredit the United Nations are the West Coast and a Cincinnati publishing firm. After the interview with Mr. Burke, Mr. Carpenter addressed the Springfield Rotary Club and was guest of the Greater Springfield Chapter of the American Association of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Burke's excellent article from the Daily News of March 1, containing Mr. Carpenter's warning in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARGES CAMPAIGN AIMED AT DESTROYING FAITH IN U.N.

(By William J. Burke)

The director of news service for the U.S. mission to the United Nations at a press conference here today charged a centrally directed campaign is underway to destroy American faith in the U.N.—a body which he characterized as "the best hope for law and order in the world today."

Director Francis W. Carpenter, a guest of the local chapter of the American Association for the United Nations and who spoke at the Rotary Club luncheon at the Sheraton-Kimball Hotel, asserted that study showed a well-directed attack on the U.N. from one or two major points of concentration—one on the west coast, which he did not further identify, the other from a publishing house located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

NOTES CONTRIBUTIONS

The soft-spoken veteran of 28 years' newspaper experience quickly ticked off contributions to the United States by the U.N., including support of the American position on every major issue ever to be voted upon.

The U.N., commented Mr. Carpenter, is more than a debating society, for its gives the world a place to blow off steam.

"Where else could we have so dramatically and convincingly placed before the world our position on Russian missiles and nuclear warheads in Cuba?" he asked, recalling the intensity of the situation of October 1962, when the world seemed on the brink of nuclear war.

He recalled the dramatic moment on the floor of the Security Council meeting when U.N. Ambassador Stevenson confronted Russian delegate Zorin with proof of long-range missile installations in Cuba. The favorable reaction and impression gained among the neutrals at that time by the United States is still being felt, Mr. Carpenter said.

The Russians would be only too overjoyed to detroy the U.N, he said. "They have had to use the veto power in the Security Council a hundred times. We have yet to use it." This, he said, would hardly indicate that the U.N. is inimical to American interests in the world.

The official said that only yesterday the new Russian delegate had held up the conference on outer space cooperation at the U.N. by contending the committee should act on his claim that the U.N. Russian Embassy at Glen Cove, Long Island, had its entrance door tampered with.

MAN TO MAKE MARK

Mr. Carpenter saw this accusation as a means for the new man to make his mark with the Kremlin and a means of holding up any action on outerspace cooperation with the flimsiest of excuses.

The U.N. news head said that the Americans at the U.N. were amazed by the congressional fight over the bond issue to support the international body and saw the affirmative vote on it as the greatest endorsement by the government of the U.N. since the signing of the Charter.

Concerning the anxiety of many that Red China might finally win admission to the U.N., the spokesman gave assurances that the American delegation would never reverse its stand against this.

"It would be just turning over the whole of southeast Asia to them," he contended, adding that to give the Red Chinese recognition would open the way for their delegates to go throughout the nations of the world and to ignore the fact that they are not peace-loving or sincere in their relations with the rest of the world.

Certainly, the occupation of Tibet and the attack on India, he said, will not be forgotten by us or the neutrals who are voting with us every time Red China recognition is sought by the Russians.

OUR TROOPS UNNEEDED

On the score of contribution to America, he observed that because U.N. troops are now in the Congo trying to settle the situation there, American troops do not have to be sent and there is no confrontation with the Reds.

He saw the U.N. as an influence in our lives in the Korean war, keeping Greece free, and always as a forum to present our views on crisis situations at anytime. "The Security Council can be called within 24 hours," he commented.

Mr. Carpenter held that despite some vocal opposition to the U.N. any poll would show majority support by Americans of the international body.

Otherwise, he did not see the position of Ambassador Stevenson weakened by stories from Washington, D.C., sources that he sought a softer approach on the Cuban situation than the one taken by the Kennedy administration.

At noon the veteran newsman asserted at the Rotary Club luncheon that the U.N. deserved the Nation's full support and discussed the personalities who make up the U.N. staffing.

WANTS STRONG ROLE

The new Secretary General U Thant is not as diplomatic as the late Dag Hammarskold, certainly, but his position indicates his intention to play an even stronger role in world affairs, said Mr. Carpenter.

He decried the fact that the U.N. Charter could not be amended, holding that there were only about 50 nation-members when the charter was adopted. Now, he said, there are 110 and the Security Council membership, for example, cannot be enlarged.

The Russians are happy about this, but, Mr. Carpenter said, not about the decisions made on every major issue by the majority of the nations in the international body.

He was met at the hotel by Howard R. Clark, New England representative of the American Association for the United Nations, who maintains an office on the American International College campus.

That body brought the U.N. representative to Springfield, and arranged for the press conference and the Rotary address.

Lithuania's Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed with the address

delivered by the consul general of Lithuania, the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis, at Maria High School auditorium in Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, February 17, 1963, on the occasion of the observance of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Under unanimous consent, I include this address into the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL GENERAL OF LITHUANIA, AT OBSERVANCE OF 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, MARIA HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 17, 1963

February 16th is the fourth of July—the independence day—of Lithuania.

The concept of independence is concisely described in the U.S. Declaration of Independence, which reads:

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;"

The declaration of Lithuania's independence was drafted and executed in a similar spirit and philosophy:

"The Council of Lithuania in its meeting on February 16, 1918, voted unanimously to address the Governments of Russia, Germany, and other states with the following declaration:

" 'The Council of Lithuania, sole representative of the Lithuanian people, in conformity with the recognized right to national self-determination, and in accordance with the resolution of the Lithuanian Conference held in Vilnius from September 18 to 23, 1917, hereby proclaims the restitution of the independent State of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, with Vilnius as its capital, and declares the rupture of all ties which formerly bound this state to other nations.

" 'The Council of Lithuania also declares that the foundation of the Lithuanian State and relations with other countries will be finally normalized by a Seimas (parliament), elected in a democratic way by the people of Lithuania.' "

Lithuania's constituent assembly ratified this declaration (on May 15, 1920) and proclaimed the fact that the independence of Lithuania is restored and the state is to be a democratic Republic.

Shortly thereafter (on July 12, 1920) a treaty of peace was concluded between Lithuania and Soviet Russia, article I of which provided:

"Pursuant to the declaration made by the Federated States of the Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia to the effect that all peoples have the right to self-determination until they become completely separated from the state of which they are a part, Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences resulting from such recognition and for all time renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia, which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

"The fact that Lithuania ever was under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and the nation or territory under any obligations to Russia."

Soviet Russia flagrantly violated all of these solemn pledges and the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian nation by forcibly seizing, occupying and annexing Lithuania to the Soviet Union—converting it into a colony of the Russian empire—during World War II.

The Soviet aggression against Lithuania, carried out in conspiracy with Hitler, and the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are the most shameful and perfidious acts ever perpetrated by any nation in the mid-20th century.

This fact is evidenced by the free world's nonrecognition of the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The Soviets themselves do not dare to come forth openly before a world tribunal and request recognition of the fruits of their aggression. They continue to use subterfuge and devious processes to try to gain some sort of recognition or at least a trace of justification of their seizure of the Baltic States. One such subterfuge recently appeared in the UNESCO publication, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," prepared by the Soviet delegation. Among the statements in this publication is this one:

"In 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia) which voluntarily joined the Union."

The Spectator magazine, published in London, branded the statement as, "This is simply a lie," and substantiated it by incontestable facts.

The Earl of Dundee, replying in the name of the Government to the question put by Lord Conésford in the House of Lords, said: "This particular booklet falls far short of the standard of objectivity and meticulous regard for the truth. * * * This is a Russian publication."

The U.S. Department of State qualified the cited quotation as, "The completely false statement * * *. It is too bad that an international body such as UNESCO lends its imprint to this kind of thing."

These facts give additional proof to the importance and significance of the case of the Baltic States. From the legal point of view the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have every right to be free and independent countries. The Soviet Union holds them under duress by force of arms, against the will of their people, and in violation of international law and solemn Soviet pledges and declarations. The Soviet Union attempts, through divers and often devious means, to legalize her illegal acts, involving and compromising even the United Nations and its members, as in the UNESCO publication mentioned before.

The free world refuses to justify the crime and injustice perpetrated by the Soviets, but refrains from asking any clearer and firmer denunciation, and a stronger demand for redress of the wrongs—the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to the people of the Baltic States, of which they were forcibly deprived by the Soviet Union.

This incongruous situation of the Baltic States demands the crystallization of their case and its placement in the true light of facts and of law, so that there would be no doubt as to who is right and who is wrong—a peaceful positive action is imperative. It would be beneficial to the victims of Soviet rapacity and to their defenders. It would place the Soviet aggressor on the defensive and properly deprive him of the assumed role of defender of the oppressed colonial peoples.

Occasionally I contemplate, what would the Russians do or say if one of the major Western countries were to seize and hold some smaller neighboring countries in the same manner as Russia holds the Baltic States? Invariably I come to the conclusion that the Russians would work the case up to such magnitude, and raise such a hue and cry, that the Western Power, holder of the smaller states, would be put to shame before the entire world.

Bearing this in mind, we appeal to the free nations of the world and entreat them to bring up the case of the Baltic States before the tribunal of world opinion. The salient points of the case should bring out the forceable seizure of the Baltic States by Stalin in collusion with Hitler, the subjugation of these nations in contravention of the United Nations Declarations and Charter, and even Khrushchev's proposals that all subjugated nations be freed and made independent states. It should demand that the Soviet troops, administrative personnel and colonists be withdrawn from these states, and their people be allowed to choose their own governments and govern themselves according to their own determination.

May the might of freedom speak out and liberate Lithuania and the other Soviet-subjugated nations.

Why Aren't We Told?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people are more and more concerned with the manipulation, censorship, or complete suppression of the news which are becoming daily occurrences. This administration is determined to feed the American public what it wants them to believe, think, and accept. A typical example of this news suppression was the Kennedy administration's attempt to withhold the information that four Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

I feel the public should know, officially, and from official sources what is going on in Cuba. An excellent editorial on this subject appeared recently in the Troy Record newspaper, Troy, N.Y., entitled "Why Weren't We Told?" and I wish to include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHY WEREN'T WE TOLD?

The irritation resulting from the Kennedy administration attempts at withholding information has increased with the disclosure that four American pilots were among those who died in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, April 17, 1961.

Why could the American people not have been told of this at the time it occurred? The deaths would have been accepted as part of the risk in an attempt to overthrow the regime of Fidel Castro and the four men would have assumed heroic stature.

Instead, it has taken nearly 2 years to learn the truth. The facts came out through Republican sources in Washington which have been sniping at the administration for failing to give proper public information on the invasion. Hiding facts made partisan exploitation possible. Confidence in official statements has been damaged.

The American people have received bad news before, far worse than anything that happened in Cuba and they have accepted it without panic. There is always bound to be bad news with the good. It seems that

the official Washington attitude is that the American people must not be given bad news. They cannot be trusted with it. This is a strange sort of reasoning.

When an election campaign is in progress, those seeking office emphasize they are appealing to the intelligence of the electorate. Once the elected officials have won office their assessment of the public changes. This once intelligent public cannot be trusted with the truth. The people must be kept in ignorance.

The belated admission that four Americans died in the invasion doesn't change anything relative to dealings with Cuba. Castro remains in power and he is a Communist. Soviet Russia is turning the country into an armed camp. The four who gave their lives pursued an ideal which sought to remove a tyrant and a Communist threat. They were not the only ones who died in Cuba. Other Americans also shed their blood and when Castro announced executions there was no withholding of news.

When an American reconnaissance pilot was shot down over Cuba during the Soviet crisis he was given posthumous honors. The pilots who died in the invasion have been overlooked.

Possibly the administration was striving to tone down American involvement. If that was the objective it was wasted effort. Everyone knew that Americans as well as Cubans were involved.

The administration in Washington is running far behind the times. It will not trust the thinking of the American people and it gets itself into hot water constantly because of its shortsightedness. The people in the administration should remember they are the agents of the American people, not their lords and masters.

Lewis Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our distinguished Speaker and the majority and minority leaders in extending my congratulations and best wishes to our well beloved and dedicated Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. At the same time I want to wish him a very happy birthday.

I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the counsel and advice which I have received from him over the years. I can recall numberless occasions when his assistance proved invaluable.

It is a great privilege for all of us who come to the House of Representatives to meet and know Lew Deschler. He has proven to be a great champion of this legislative body and a symbol of reverence for its traditions.

Moreover, I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made here about Lew. These tributes are sincerely meant and keenly deserved.

We wish you, Lew, many more years of fine service in behalf of the House of Representatives, and our Nation.

Poland Is Part of Vast Communist Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a brief address I delivered last Sunday afternoon, March 3, 1963, at the annual convention of the Connecticut District of the Polish American Congress, held in Hartford, Conn. I was very pleased to meet with my Polish friends and to express my support for their cause.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, MARCH 3, 1963, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here with you today and to have the opportunity to address your annual convention. As you know, I came specially from Putnam to be here with you and to meet many of my friends.

Just as many of your leaders and members are well known to me, so the objectives and activities of the Polish American Congress are not unfamiliar to me. Your work in behalf of the people of Poland in the past, and your deep anxiety about your kinsmen abroad who are suffering now under the yoke of communism, is a chapter in itself which is well known to many Americans. We are with you in this struggle and in your efforts to help them.

We in Connecticut are very proud of our citizens of Polish ancestry. They are a good, sturdy, hard-working, industrious, and patriotic element. The men, women and children of Polish origin who have immigrated into this country in substantial numbers over these many decades brought with them the rich heritage of their culture, civilization, religion, as well as their passionate love for freedom. They have made great contributions to America in every sphere of activity. They have helped to enrich the American way of life and American democracy.

Americans of Polish descent have not forgotten their motherland, Poland, nor have they forgotten the millions of freedom-loving Poles who live there today under a ruthless regime. Your anxiety about them is understandable. They are your blood and flesh. Poland is your ancestral homeland. You have cultural and religous ties with the country and its people.

About 2 weeks ago I introduced a resolution in Congress requesting that the United States do all in its power through the United Nations to obtain the liberation of the Baltic States, which have been incorporated into the Soviet Union lock, stock and barrel. In the case of Poland, however, there exists the myth of an independent country, but you and I know well that the people of Poland no more enjoy freedom and independence than do the people of the Baltic States. They are just as enslaved to Communism, just as subservient to the leaders of the Kremlin.

The people of Poland today are a silenced, grim, and unhappy people. They are not free to speak their mind. They cannot practice their religion freely. They cannot observe their historic events and holidays. Poland is not a happy land, a free "People's Democracy," as the Communist leaders would have us believe. The truth of the matter is that Poland is a part of that vast prison of captive European nations which make up the Communist empire.

Neither Poland nor any of the other countries subjugated to Moscow are today independent and sovereign states. They have no freedom. They have no right of self-determination. They are not the masters of their own destiny. Those masters sit in the Kremlin.

The masters in the Kremlin are dedicated to their goal of world domination. That goal does not change, it remains constant. Today it is directed against your kinsmen in Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe. Tomorrow it will be directed against free nations in other parts of the world. Eventually, it will be directed against us in the United States. They are conducting the cold war in deadly earnest—make no mistake about it!

But let me say to you, my friends, that it would be a hopeless and depressing picture if we were to look at it from one side only. We know that the Poles and the other peoples have a profound attachment to Western culture, civilization, and ideas. Their desire for freedom cannot be crushed. Their hopes for self-determination are burning bright in their hearts. We must nurture those hopes. We must give them all the courage we can.

I am convinced that we, in our lifetime, will yet see the liberation of the enslaved nations of Europe. I am convinced that communism is not the wave of the future, but the nightmare of the past. Let us all work together to bring this nightmare to an early end.

The Economics of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1963, Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy made an excellent speech before the annual meeting of the Colorado River Basin Power Consumers at Las Vegas relating to development in the Colorado River Basin. Mr. Dominy gave the status of development in the basin and discussed future needs and the challenge they present. I believe many Members will be interested in Mr. Dominy's speech, and I am therefore including it in the RECORD with these remarks.

The speech follows:

It is always good to see old friends of the Colorado River Basin, and especially your executive director, Harvey McPhail. As Reclamation's Power Chief and Assistant Commissioner until his retirement, Harvey had a reputation as a hard-nosed, tough-minded but fair negotiator on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Government. Now that he is on the other side of the table, he is doing the same good job for you. Of course, I lose a little skin now and then but as long as we are seeking the same end objectives, as I believe we are, I do not mind that too much.

My topic tonight is the economics of reclamation and I want to use my time to put into proper perspective the various facets of multipurpose development in the States of the Colorado River Basin. To borrow an old phrase, we sometimes have a tendency to get so close to one tree of benefits we cannot see the whole forest of multiple purposes and benefits. It is only when we accomplish this total purpose that the Colorado River Basin is assured of maximum benefits. This, I am sure, is your desire as well as ours.

I want to emphasize first that the historic mission of the Bureau of Reclamation was and is to conserve and put water to a useful purpose. Our job is the saving and salvage of water—the storing, controlling and regulating of water supplies for beneficial consumptive uses by the people in the cities and towns and on the farms of the West.

In accomplishing that objective, we have the responsibility to give full consideration to all water resource development functions. We must build our projects to fulfill as many purposes as possible in order that the maximum number of people can realize the maximum benefits from this most valuable of our publicly owned natural resources.

This multipurpose concept has become increasingly important. More and more attention is being given to purposes such as recreation, fish and wildlife, water-quality control, area redevelopment and others that were fully considered in the early days of reclamation. Hydroelectric power, however, was one of the first multiple uses incorporated into the reclamation program and continues today to be one of the most important.

Hydroelectric power plays a crucial and a most significant role in the Federal reclamation program. Important in itself for the energy it provides for farms, homes, and industries in the area, it is doubly so because power revenues are a critical part of the economics of reclamation as we presently know them. The keystone of these policies is reimbursability. The ever-present, hard fact of life in Federal reclamation may be stated simply—a project is feasible if reimbursable costs can be repaid over a specified period of time. The principle was written into the original Reclamation Act of 1902 and is as good and effective today as it was then.

I personally would have it no other way and I do not believe you would either. I believe in paying my own way and I believe Government projects should, too, to the maximum of their ability. I am more than a little proud of the fact that the total Federal investment for reclamation is more than 92 percent reimbursable and that we are more than 99 percent current in these repayment obligations. I say "we" not solely in the sense of a Bureau of Reclamation employee, but we in the sense of the beneficiaries of reclamation, primarily the water and power users.

Now then, how does Federal reclamation power fit into this picture? I say Federal reclamation power because it clearly defines a particular specie of power in the large family from which our various types of energy come. Federal reclamation power is power with a particular purpose which comes from a multipurpose development plan. It is power which is the paying partner making such reclamation dams and reservoirs feasible.

It is public power not only by generation at a publicly owned facility, but because Congress has prescribed that it be marketed with preference to public and cooperative agencies. Thus, Federal reclamation power is so distinct and unique that its place in the total energy catalog should be clearcut.

So tonight, as we discuss kilowatts on the Colorado and their relationship to the economics of reclamation, we are talking about Federal reclamation power—hydroelectric power that provides the financial assistance that assures repayment ability—hydroelectric power that is the prime mover in the entire scheme of water resources development in the Colorado River Basin. Without it, it is safe to say, the Colorado would still be a wild and unruly river, its resources largely wasted. Either that or there would be a tremendous Federal subsidy poured into the efforts to control the river and put it to useful purposes.

I will not attempt to go into the past development on the Colorado and its tributaries. Let it suffice to say that there are presently reclamation facilities for serving 2,212,000 acres of land in the basin and adjacent service areas, and that last year crops harvested from the lands grossed $345.6 million. There are an estimated 9 million people receiving municipal and industrial water in the Colorado River Basin service area. Last year there were nearly 5.5 billion kilowatt-hours of energy generated by Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric plants having a total capacity of nearly 2 million kilowatts.

Take these contributions from Federal reclamation development out of the economy of the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Southwestern States and you would have a great void. Reclamation has made an invaluable contribution to building up the economy of this fastest growing area of the United States during the last half century. Yet, almost every penny of the Federal reclamation expenditure is being repaid. Surely there is no better investment. And hydropower has been a key to this development by providing a means of reimbursement to the Federal Government of the hard dollars put into it over the years.

Specifically now to the upper Colorado River project. Here the law requires that the power costs be repaid within 50 years from date of completion of separable features. Irrigation costs in the major reservoirs must be repaid in 50 years from completion of the dams. Power revenues must repay those irrigation costs on participating units which the irrigators cannot repay in 50 years.

The power payout period and the reservoir irrigation cost payout period, for all practical purposes, are simultaneous. Because power cost is interest-bearing and irrigation cost is not, the minimum annual cost, and hence the minimum power rate, results when power costs are paid in less than 50 years and the irrigation cost in the remaining period. Thus repayment is accomplished at a minimum power rate consistent with legal requirements of the project.

In the Colorado River storage project, estimated to cost over a billion dollars, power pays about 84 percent of the total, while all other uses pay about 8 percent. Another 8 percent is nonreimbursable. These figures well illustrate the role power plays in reclamation.

At the present time, we and the upper basin are moving ahead together on the Colorado River storage project. Navajo Dam is virtually complete. Flaming Gorge Dam has been topped out and the storage of water begun. Less than a million cubic yards is needed to top out Glen Canyon Dam, and the first steps have been taken to enable storage of water in Lake Powell when the spring runoff comes in April or May of this year. Ground was broken at Blue Mesa damsite on the Gunnison River last July, the first of three dams which will make up this fourth major storage unit, the Curecanti.

The first Colorado River storage project power is scheduled for production next September at Flaming Gorge Dam and by mid-1964, at Glen Canyon Dam. Construction of transmission lines was started in 1961 and has been speeded up since completion of negotiations for the interchange and wheeling of Colorado River storage project power by your own and other non-Federal utilities. The animated map on display here shows the wide distribution of this new power supply to preference customers.

Work on the participating projects, which are the end result of the total project authorization, was initiated in 1959. This year will mark the beginning of the harvest of the vast benefits which will accrue. Not only will the first hydropower be produced this year, but irrigation water will also be available to supply more than 7,500 acres of new lands and more than 37,000 acres of supplemental lands on the completed participating projects. With lakes forming behind Navajo, Flaming Gorge, and Glen Canyon Dams, the first benefits from recreational use will also be realized.

Thus, there is little doubt about the place of Federal reclamation power in the economics of development of the Colorado River Basin. Without the financial assistance from these power revenues, we could not achieve the great multipurpose benefits which mean so much to the future of the areas which you serve.

Keep in mind, too, that as economic growth continues in the basin—growth fostered in large measure by expanding our available water resources through the Federal reclamation program—the demand for power skyrockets.

It is clearly evident in the basin, as elsewhere, that we must combine all of our efforts to meet the power needs with maximum output from total investment and facilities. To do otherwise would be wasteful and could possibly increase the cost of energy.

That is why we have sought a middle-of-the-road course to bring all utilities into the picture in working out the best arrangements from the project standpoint. In the challenge of meeting our power needs. I believe there is a place for all of us, public and private utilities, and the Federal Government. That is why I insisted on negotiating agreements with the private utilities for the interchange and transmission of Colorado River storage project power. It is why we reached an agreement with the Colorado-Ute Electric Association and the Salt River project for interconnection and exchange of power at proposed thermal generating plants near Craig, Colo., and Shiprock, N. Mex. This agreement, like those with the private utilities, would be mutually advantageous to all parties.

The decision of the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, announced last week on February 21, enables Colorado-Ute to proceed at one with construction of the first unit of the Hayden steamplant. This will assure savings of construction costs for the storage project and bring to closer realization the benefits that will accrue to the Upper Colorado River Basin through coordinated operation of this plant with the hydroelectric plants of the storage project.

The Colorado Public Utilities Commission is to be congratulated in reaching a decision which will assure Colorado of development of a thermal plant ultimately to be a market for about 1½ million tons annually of its huge coal reserves in western Colorado.

It is worthy to note, in bringing the Upper Colorado River development up to date, that the last Congress authorized three major projects which will make further use of the waters of the Colorado.

One is the Fryingpan-Arkansas which the people of the Arkansas River valley have sought for so long to relieve a critical situation there. It was pleasing indeed to see the people of Colorado united in support of this project. In such unity there is strength. I think we can all borrow a leaf from Colorado's book in burying our differences and

working together in support of reclamation for the common good throughout the West.

The other two projects in the Colorado River Basin area authorized by the last Congress were the San Juan-Chama, which will accomplish for the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico what the Fryingpan-Arkansas project will accomplish for the Arkansas Valley people in Colorado, and the Navajo Indian irrigation project. Both are participating projects of the Colorado River storage project and are major steps forward in the plans by New Mexico to use its allocated share of Colorado River Basin water.

Now what of the future? The upper basin is well on its way to putting its allocated share of water to work. The lower basin set the early pace in development with construction of Hoover, Davis, Parker, and Imperial Dams, the All-American and Coachella Canals, and of course the much earlier construction of the Salt River project, and others in Arizona. But the lower basin has been marking time in recent years pending a Supreme Court decision in the contest between Arizona and California over rights to the water in the lower river.

That decision is anticipated momentarily. Regardless of which way it goes, it should clear the way for necessary further development of the lower Colorado.

Secretary of the Interior Udall set the pattern for this new development when he announced, only a month ago, in response to a request from Chairman ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, a new study of the water needs of the Pacific Southwest which is without parallel in scope. Secretary Udall said, and I quote his announcement: "A critical period is at hand, a more critical period lies ahead for millions of people who are flocking to the Pacific Southwest to establish permanent homes. This burgeoning population will require vast quantities of additional water for industrial and municipal use; greater quantities of electricity and other basic services; and more irrigated land. Piecemeal development cannot do the job. Only regional planing and action will enable us to meet the growth needs of this area."

This is the challenge of the future in the lower Colorado River Basin. It is a challenge which cannot be ignored. It is a challenge which is vital to the continued prosperity of this fast-growing section of our United States.

But it is a challenge which also involves the economics of reclamation about which I have been talking here this evening. It involves Federal reclamation power and it involves complete maximum use and returns from that power to aid in the financing of further development work in the basin.

If the Supreme Court decision goes to Arizona, as the Court's master has recommended, the Bureau of Reclamation will be prepared, as a part of the first phase of the revitalized program for lower basin development, to initiate work on the central Arizona unit as a partial answer to Arizona's long-term needs. It will be expensive and it will require a considerable quantity of pumping power as well. Added power and power revenues from the Colorado will clearly be needed. If the decision goes to California, it will not mean any additional water for that State, but merely a postponing of the day when the metropolitan areas of southern California must go farther afield in their search for water. The need to provide more water for the lower basin, including central Arizona, will remain. In any event, as Secretary Udall has pointed out, there is work to be done and benefits to be realized from further coordinated development in California.

At the same time, there is potential future development in the offing by which Nevada can further utilize its share of Colorado River Basin water. Even Utah, while primarily an upper basin State, has a lower basin project which gives considerable promise but which will require some financial assistance from power revenues of the lower basin in its payback. This is the Dixie project.

Thus, the lower basin now finds itself in the position the upper basin occupied 15 years back when it got down to solid planning to put its allocated share of Colorado River Basin Water to maximum use. A major problem in both instances is finance.

The answer of the upper Colorado River States was total Federal development and utilization of a basin fund for financing more than a billion dollars worth of work. There was no thought of fragmentizing the total basin concept by single-purpose projects to be built and operated by other agencies with their administrative headaches, not to speak of the much greater threat of resulting losses to the all-important basin fund.

Such a basin fund is now contemplated as a part of the proposed future lower basin development. The lower basin will have a running start with three major power facilities, Hoover, Davis, and Parker, already constructed and in operation and their payout is well along.

But there is potentially great storage and hydropower development on the river upstream from Hoover Dam, particularly at the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon sites. Both have been a part of comprehensive development plans for the lower basin for many years. Action on their authorization has awaited settlement of the California versus Arizona dispute and, in the case of Marble Canyon, the control which has been placed on the upper river by Glen Canyon Dam making this project possible.

Now, as Glen Canyon Dam nears completion and is ready to provide this control, and as the Supreme Court nears a decision, there is a new threat to comprehensive development. A non-Federal agency is proposing construction of a single purpose hydro dam at Marble Canyon. The application of the Arizona Power Authority for development of this site is now before the Federal Power Commission.

It has been opposed by Secretary of the Interior Udall and has even been the subject of a bill introduced in Congress by that great leader in Western development, Arizonas own Senator CARL HAYDEN. The bill, introduced by Senator HAYDEN, with the accompanying sponsorship of Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, Senators BIBLE and CANNON, of Nevada, Senator MOSS, of Utah, and Senator ENGLE, of California, would prohibit the Federal Power Commission from issuing license for a power development in the reach of the river between Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Mead during the period ending December 31, 1968. This would give Congress time to consider the overall comprehensive development plan.

We and other Interior agencies are moving rapidly to implement Secretary Udall's study. We obviously cannot complete any report until the Supreme Court renders its decision.

In the meantime, the threat of fragmentization of the lower basin development creates the most serious threat to a carefully considered and orderly plan which the lower basin has yet faced. It could knock the economics of reclamation which I have discussed here tonight into a cocked hat as far as the lower Colorado Basin is concerned.

For unless there is some major change in national policy which is not now apparent, reclamation must continue to pay its own way. This we are doing and can continue to do within the pattern provided by congressional action and developed over more than 60 years of operations. But fragmentization will hinder, if not make completely impossible, the overall total development which is so necessary to our future.

Marquis Childs Asks for White Paper on Bay of Pigs Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is good to welcome the distinguished journalist Marquis Childs aboard. He joined in the call for the full Bay of Pigs story today in an excellent article in the Washington Post. This arguments parallel those I have expressed on the floor this year when I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 82, to create a special joint committee to investigate and report on this ill-fated venture. It is the only way we will ever eliminate political bickering which is hampering development of a genuine bipartisan foreign policy against the common enemy of Republicans and Democrats alike—communism.

Mr. Childs' article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

FOR A WHITE PAPER ON BAY OF PIGS

(By Marqius Childs)

Only a white paper giving a complete account of every aspect of the long Cuban misadventure, with the administration putting it squarely on the line, not glossing over the failures or exaggerating the successes, could at this late date be expected to damp down the political quarrel over American policy.

That is the view of observers more and more concerned lest Cuba become a major issue in the presidential campaign of 1964 with unforeseen and perhaps disastrous consequences. It could spell the end of any bipartisanship in foreign policy at a time when there are likely to be greater strains on the management of that policy than at any point since the war's end.

With a rising emotionalism generated by political charges the administration could be goaded into unwise and dangerous adventures. The temptation would be to prove the critics wrong and throw restraint to the winds.

Yet the objection within the administration to a white paper—a sober, thorough, careful let-the-chips-fall-where-they-may summing up—is that there would be too many red faces. These would not necessarily—nor even probably—be political faces. They would be the experts, the specialists, the weapons counters, on whose secret knowledge in the last analysis the decisions, beginning in mid-1959, were taken. Such a paper might prove to be the best analysis the public has been privileged to have of what is right—and wrong—with the far-reaching American intelligence apparatus.

Short of this the game of pinning the blame on the nearest political target will go on with the technique of leak and counter-leak. That technique is calculated to cause the greatest confusion in the public mind.

Short of a frank disclosure the strain on certain individuals is too great. As one of his stoutest journalistic admirers noted recently, John McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, is on the hottest of hot seats. He is a Republican who worked for the election of Richard Nixon in 1960. When President Kennedy asked him to succeed Allen Dulles as head of the CIA he felt that in accepting he was taking on a disinterested public service.

But now he finds his party in Congress making a major issue of the wrongness of the Kennedy decisions on Cuba and that wrongness goes back in part to the expert opinions on which they were based. McCone is a man of strong convictions. As Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission under President Eisenhower he did not hesitate to oppose the Eisenhower policy of trying to get a nuclear test treaty with the Soviet Union.

McCone believes he was right on the danger of offensive weapons capability being installed in Cuba before anyone else. By implication others were slow to appreciate this threat. Inevitably members of his party, who want to get all the mileage possible out of Cuba, would like to see him become the hero of the occasion. This explains the hotness of the hot seat and the significance for 1964.

In this atmosphere minor differences are exaggerated. On October 3 Under Secretary of State George Ball read a statement to a congressional committee in open hearing, saying there was no evidence of any offensive buildup in Cuba. He based his statement on the latest intelligence reports.

Had McCone approved it? At first he said "No." Roger Hilsman Jr., head of intelligence for the State Department, said he had read it to McCone and the CIA director then recalled that it had been informally cleared with him.

Members of congressional committees have been concerned at McCone's statement in executive session that the President's definitions of offensive and defensive weapons were not of his making. Yet, he has himself said on several occasions that until the actual photographic evidence was obtained from the U-2 flights of October 14 it was impossible to confront Moscow with the challenge the missiles offered to America's security. Going further he has said that not until the far more complete photographic evidence of October 16 and 17 could the proof be put before Latin American and European states in such a way as to gain their undivided unity in support of the United States.

This last is the important aspect of the matter in the view of those arguing for frankness. Since the final evidence was complete and convincing the outcome was never in doubt. That is the answer to accusations that have seemed in some instances reckless and even hysterical. And it is conceivable that a full and frank account might buttress this matter.

Plentiful, Pure Water a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Winnsboro, S.C., News and Herald of February 28, 1963:

PLENTIFUL, PURE WATER A MUST

As of the morning of February 28, 1963, the water situation in Winnsboro—and for that matter, in most of Fairfield—would probably be described by most intelligent laymen as "A-OK." What the situation will be 6 months from now, in mid-August, a year ahead, or 5 years in the future is anybody's guess but it is hardly too early to be taking thought of tomorrow.

There is no water problem here as of this moment for a number of obvious reasons. Rainfall has been heavy, existing industry has made no exhorbitant demands, and no new industry that would be a big water user has been secured nor is one on the immediate horizon. Our storage reservoir has a good supply. But then, of course, no industry that demands a tremendous supply of water could logically consider Winnsboro under present conditions, nor would our area go all out to get such a plant.

For many years now, town authorities have been battling the baffling problem of whether it would be wise to spend a lot of money to guarantee the area an abundant and ever-available surplus of the precious fluid; and if the decision for additional water were made, what route should we take? More storage basins? Go to Little River? Or go to one of the big rivers, to the east or to the west? As a matter of fact, the town council, a few years ago, had decided to have a referendum on the matter, even published comprehensive information on the subject, only to let the issue rest for the time being.

A protracted summer drought, the influx of new industry, a sizable increase in population, or a combination of these things could, no doubt, put us into a critical situation within a relatively short period of time. But, for the moment, water is no problem.

Chester, our near neighbor to the north, thinks it has a serious water problem and a move is currently being considered to lay pipe 20 miles to the river to assure a steady and unlimited supply. But Chester is larger than Fairfield, is apparently doing much better in securing new industry, and is preparing for a future that its citizens look forward to with considerable optimism. Its water program, if carried to completion, is an ambitious and expensive one.

We were forcibly reminded of this omnipresent, nationwide problem, which has reached the acute stage in so many areas, by the excellent NBC program Sunday evening, emceed by Chet Huntley and appropriately titled "The Trouble With Water Is People." (Parenthetically, it might be observed that the trouble with everything is people—or to say it another way, U.S. citizens, by not taking thought together and in time, have squandered an untold amount of their rich natural resources: First the forests, next the land, and now the water. In large part, we have corrected our excesses in destroying our trees and our good earth, but billions of dollars went down the drain before we came to grips with reality. Now, late again in many places, we are waking up as to our water shortages.)

To the problem, here and elsewhere, there are no easy answers, no one solution. Many factors enter in, among the most important of which are pollution by untreated human and industrial wastes, chemicals, and detergents—which put a head of foam on our once pure streams that is distressing to see. The NBC report showed graphically that California, where millions live, Arizona, growing industrially, and other adjacent Western States are in a tragic and deplorable condition as to water, despite Hoover Dam and vast reclamation projects, and before matters get better lawsuits will have to be resolved and billions of dollars expended—to furnish people with a commodity that once was cheap and abundant—pure water. So desperate is the situation that converting ocean water—an expensive expedient but one that is becoming more practical—is being seriously considered as an alternative.

In Winnsboro, in Fairfield, in South Carolina we yet have time to consider alternatives. There should be some definitely defined water laws—for, should we go to a river, what assurance has one that its waters will not be preempted later for other uses? As for the present, however, the News and Herald would suggest that the town and county set up a water study commission to see, first, that sewage is properly treated and disposed of everywhere and to be sure that none of our streams is being unnecessarily polluted. Then, let us together decide, scientifically and intelligently, what is the best approach to assuring a steady and pure supply of water to our centers of population.

In one way, Fairfield is fortunate in that it is sparsely populated. Hence, we have time to face up to the problems of water and pollution and to arrive at an areawide sensible solution—probably at reasonable costs. Time is now on our side but time is fleeting. Let's keep Fairfield a county of green pastures, clean waters, and luxuriant forests—meantime planning to supplement our too meager incomes with desirable industries which we will be prepared to service properly.

The sooner we plan our future, the better that future will be.

Small Business and the Surtax Exemption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. David I. Pursley, has a background which renders him exceptionally well qualified to speak on the matter of small business exemptions from the surtax. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am presenting his letter and commend it to the attention of the entire Congress:

PALO ALTO, CALIF.
March 1, 1963.

Subject: Small business and the surtax exemption.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Congress has demonstrated its continuing interest in small business enterprises and their vital contribution to the gross national product by such legislation as the Small Business Administration and Investment Act, changes in the Internal Revenue Code such as subchapter S, and other moves aimed at stimulating the economy through encouraging growth of new business enterprises.

However, Congress has overlooked the one item of legislation which would help small business most—legislation to change the code to enable small businesses to grow through the retention and reinvestment of earnings.

Today's small businesses do not have this opportunity as did our giant corporations during their formative years. Du Pont, American Can, General Motors, and virtually all others among our large corporate enterprises were able to grow to their present stature because they enjoyed corporate tax rates of only 1 to 19 percent (as they were from 1909 to 1939). These reasonable rates enabled the giants to grow through retained earnings, and enabled these companies to attract adequate equity financing from the public during their growth years.

It is impractical to suggest that Congress roll back the corporate income taxes to the 1 percent or even 19 percent levels enjoyed by these present day corporate giants in their formative years. However, Congress can give the small businesses of today an opportunity similar to that of their present big brothers by increasing the surtax exemption from $25,000 to $250,000. This proposed $250,000 surtax exemption is based on one of the SBA's definitions of a small business, "an enterprise with an average annual net income, after taxes, for the preceding 2 years, of not more than $250,000."

At this moment it is being proposed that the ordinary tax rate on the first $25,000 of taxable corporate income be reduced from 25 to 22 percent. This indicates an awareness of the small business problem, and is a step in the right direction. Nevertheless, the surtax exemption of only $25,000, if continued, will mean that profit for retention and business building will continue to be taxed away if the small enterprise is capable of earning over $25,000. Furthermore, we have experienced a substantial inflation so that today's surtax exemption is much less than half of $25,000 in 1909 or even in 1939 dollars.

This relief for small business can be accomplished without loss to the Federal Government of corporate income tax revenue if the Congress, at the time the surtax exemption is increased to $250,000, maintains the surtax rate at 27 or 28 percent instead of reducing it to 25 percent as proposed in the President's current tax proposal. Of course, large corporations would enjoy the $250,000 surtax exemption also; but this higher surtax exemption, combined with a reduction in the ordinary tax rate to 22 percent, would give small corporations nearly the same opportunity to insure their future growth by retaining part of present earnings as their big brothers enjoyed from 1909 to 1939.

Furthermore, an increase in the surtax exemption combined with a revision of the capital gains tax will greatly enhance the ability of small business to attract equity capital from the public.

This recommendation for legislation is based upon my professional experience in the field of small business enterprises. I hold a degree in economics, augmented by 3 years of graduate research in corporate finance and taxation at the Graduate School of Business, Stanford University. I am the son of a successful small business merchant. After college graduation, I managed a furniture and appliance store for 8 years. Since the four World War II years as an officer in the U.S. Navy Supply Corps, I have been continuously associated with small business enterprises as a financial consultant, and as the owner of a substantial equipment leasing corporation, I have acquired more than $50 million for small business enterprises. Several of the Nation's largest banks and institutional investors have indicated that they regard me as an authority in the field of leasing industrial equipment and the tax factors involved.

I regard the increase of the surtax exemption to $250,000 as vital to the growth of American business, to the stimulation that our economy needs in plant and equipment investment, and to the growth in employment opportunities so urgently required for our future prosperity.

I believe all small businesses will appreciate your consideration of this neglected aspect of our tax law, and I would greatly appreciate your comments on this suggested legislation.

Very truly yours,

DAVID I. PURSLEY.

A True Summer Intern Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the recent White House concern with the political upbringing of students working in Washington, D.C., during the summer, has focused attention on efforts to provide educational opportunities to summer students. Foremost among the organizations providing political education is the National Center for Education in Politics.

The students working in Federal, State, and local political offices under this program are not summer employees but rather student interns enhancing their political education. Last year, 54 students were active at the congressional level, 16 worked on campaigns and another 48 with with political party committees, 16 served with State and local executives, and 5 worked with interest groups. A total of 139 undergraduates, 40 more than the year before, benefited by the program.

In cooperation with the American Political Science Association, the National Center for Education in Politics has set up a Internship Coordination office, headed by Prof. Royce Hanson of American University, in space provided by the American Political Science Association here in Washington. The steering committee has stressed the distinction between an educational internship program and summer employment for students and concentrates on political internships rather than administrative positions.

I have observed in the past, when commenting on any patronage approach that might be applied to summer positions in the executive branch, that there is little need, if any, for political appointments for such positions on the grounds that they have some connection with policymaking. This is supported by a comment in the National Center for Education in Politics report on summer interns for 1962. No survey of possibilities in executive offices will be made on the grounds that the likelihood is not great for developing many genuinely political internships in administrative agencies.

Besides the summer intern program, the National Center provides for 15 to 30 fellows in State and local government. Open to graduate students in political science, law, and related social sciences, this program works with State and local government officials, political parties and major interest groups. Two fellows are also selected from university faculties to serve as special consultants to the chairman of the Republican and Democratic National Committees. In addition, 6 to 10 faculty members have an opportunity each year to work on the staffs of Governors, mayors and other State and local executives and with political parties and interest groups.

Summer internshps are financed through matching fund contributions from the National Center for Education in Politics and the participating governmental or political office or official. Such a program deserves the continued support of all of us in positions of governmental responsibility.

It would be inappropriate for the National Center for Education in Politics program to become involved with summer employment programs. At the same time, I have no doubt that an informal sharing of experiences and approaches to the educational interests of the students here in Washington during the summer would contribute greatly to the success of any summer student employees program such as the one I have suggested to the American Political Science Association. To illustrate the difference in approaches between the National Center for Education in Politics program and that of the White House last summer, I am including, under unanimous consent, portions of the National Center for Education in Politics Summer Intern Program Report for 1962.

To illustrate the concern that reports of political patronage in the summer employment program have caused on college campuses, I will also include, following the National Center for Education in Politics report, a news article appearing in the Yale Daily News of February 26, 1963:

EXCERPTS FROM A REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION IN POLITICS

Our comments about matching contributions to political internships lead to a related and more important consideration; namely, the necessity to distinguish the internship from ordinary kinds of temporary employment of students by the Government. This problem is highlighted by the public attention and partisan overtones of the meetings conducted by White House officials in Washington last summer. The seminars (actually lectures to large numbers of students) were described as being conducted for the political interns working for administrative agencies. These so-called interns were in fact temporary employees, mainly holding low-level civil service ratings, with summer jobs in Washington. Very few seem to have been in contact with political decisionmaking, or to have arranged their summer activities with a view to complementing and enriching their study of politics and government. Without these elements, the summer employment of such students may have been of value to the employing agencies, financially helpful to the students, and even educational in some ways—but they can hardly be described as political internships in the sense in which we regard our own internships.

We are obliged, then, to distinguish the internships we sponsor from any kind of mere summer employment of students in governmental jobs. We can do this only by making clear, at every point, and to all concerned, that we regard these internships as learning experiences, integrally related to the interns' wider study and understanding of politics. It is important that our interns themselves understand this distinction. It is equally important that the political officials with whom they serve appreciate the intern-

ship as primarily an educational undertaking. One of several ways in which we can help insure the academic standards of political internships is to supply, in an overall sense, something like half of the funds for interns' stipends. Matching contributions from political officers are fully justified both to give the officers a stake in the arrangement (for free help may be thought of as worth what it costs), and to increase the financial resources and thereby the number of interns. But a balance must be struck, and the balance must be one which leaves the educational aspects of the internships program squarely in the hands of the educators.

It is not suggested here that the mere fixing of some satisfactory ratio of financial support will insure internship experience of quality. Such assurance depends on the understanding and judgment of politically sensitive academicians and educationally sensitive politicians. No formulas can be devised to create understanding and judgment where they do not exist. Fortunately for the success of our internship programs, many able teachers and political leaders have been willing in the past to participate. We have every confidence that they will continue to lend their talents to this endeavor.

PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AND SUPPORT OF POLITICAL INTERNSHIPS

The press treatment of the White House meetings for student employees of the Federal Government also points up the need for some public understanding of political internships. Time magazine's story of August 17, 1962, also clouded more than clarified the distinction between interns and summer employees.

There seem to be at least three identifiable publics for which the internship program may have meaning. One public is, of course, composed of those who are personally associated with the internship: the intern, his academic adviser, and the political leader (plus his regular staff) to whom the intern is assigned. This is the immediate public of the actors in the program, and the one to which, heretofore, our almost exclusive attention has properly been given.

The second public, representing a wider circle, consists of those who have personal or hearsay knowledge of the program, but have not been involved themselves. In this public are relatives, friends, and collegemates of the interns, faculty members not serving as administrators or advisors, and people with whom the interns come in contact on their political jobs. As the number of interns grows, the number of persons in this second public also grows, and at a more than arithmetic rate. The increase in the internship program can be attributed in part to the process of diffusion of knowledge and interest in which the intern describes his experiences to friends and classmates, and politicians tell other politicians about the values of the program. As more students become aware of the internship opportunities, and more political leaders develop an interest, the demand for internships increases, as do the possibilities. To this point we have not given much thought to our communications with this second public for whom the internship program has some tangential, but no important meaning. Yet this public especially should see clearly the distinction between summer job and political internship, and should appreciate the essentially educational nature of the program.

Though we rely mainly on word-of-mouth for the diffusion of knowledge to the second public, with improved attention to selected media, such as college newspapers, political bulletins and newsletters, and professional association journals, we might further the task of educating these persons about the internship program. Professor Wise's publicity efforts in connection with the 1962 summer internships in Pennsylvania seem to have received a great deal of attention on the college campuses because he sent a news release to the paper of each college from which interns were chosen.

The Pennsylvania CEP internship program also received favorable notice in channels reaching the third public which we may be concerned with. This is the public at large, the average voter, the newspaper reader on the street. We are concerned about this public to some extent for its own sake (recognizing full well that our programs are not of great interest to most people), but also because some members of it may be drawn into our participating or knowledgeable publics. We are also concerned with the big public, to be candid, because the interns, the college administrators, and perhaps especially the participating politicians, like to have their activities noted in the mass media. In Pennsylvania a syndicated education column carried a story about the PCEP summer interns; it appeared in well over 50 dailies and weeklies in that and nearby States. One of the wire services also carried a statewide story about the interns, and the political columnist of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin wrote a feature on the program.

In most affiliates we could justifiably increase, to some extent, the publicity given to our internship program. Politics is always a source of interest. In recent years, education, too, has received much attention in the mass media. Political education ought to be specially noteworthy, then, when it operates through a device as personal, and often dramatic, as the internship. We do not propose to have our affiliate directors or campus representatives become public relations men; we suggest only that the internship program ought to be widely, and properly, known for what it is.

[From the Yale Daily News, Feb. 26, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE HUNTS FOR INFORMATION ON STUDENT SUMMER JOB APPLICANTS

Yale students planning on Government jobs in Washington this summer may be in for trouble, according to an article in the Washington Post.

The White House has asked Federal agencies for complete reports on their plans to hire students during the summer vacation.

This interest has led to fears among agency officials that the White House will use the jobs for Democratic patronage purposes and tell agencies whom they can and canot hire, the article said.

STUDENT BACKGROUND

Dorothy Davies, a White House assistant, is seeking information on the educational backgrounds, work experiences, and legal residences of student applicants.

Earlier, the Civil Service Commission and the Budget Bureau directed agencies to inform it by February 15 of their summer job plans. Mrs. Davies asked to be sent copies of their reports.

HARROWER INVESTIGATES

Norman Harrower, Jr., director of the Office of Counseling and Placement at Yale, said he is investigating the situation and has written to LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Democrat of Texas. BECKWORTH is pushing a bill in Congress to apportion summer jobs on the basis of State population. The Kennedy administration opposes the legislation.

Mr. Harrower said that he had made a trip to Washington in January and at that time observed no indication that there would be any interference from the White House.

MANY YALE INTERNS

Nearly 8,000 students held jobs in Washington last summer; most of these jobs were routine and clerical. Yale students were among those able to secure more exciting work, however, as interns.

Mr. Harrower, who directs Yale's summer intern program, helped 29 students to obtain positions with Senators and Congressmen, usually of their own State. Another 27 undergraduates worked in the executive branch of the Government.

Some 20 Yale law students worked in the offices of the Supreme Court Justices or in divisions of the Department of Justice.

KENNEDY STEPS IN

Last summer President Kennedy attempted to excite students into returning to Government work after graduation with a White House seminar.

The seminar, although generally regarded as a success, was disappointing to many Yale students, who felt they were being talked down to. The White House will continue the seminars this year.

Mrs. Davies, who organized them last year, said she plans to coordinate the student-employee programs this summer to make sure the "good kids don't get lost." She said that a representative group will be hired.

In last summer's seminar, the President and a score of other top officials gave talks on the attractions and challenges of the Federal service.

National Space Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the importance of long-range space research to our overall scientific effort was brought home sharply by a recent article by Charles N. Eischen, which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Traveler on February 27. It was reported that a projected space research laboratory set for Massachusetts will perform research crucial to our national space effort. I am confident that the House Science and Astronautics Committee will see fit to approve this vital project.

The article referred to follows:

VENUS-MARS SECRETS DEPEND ON $58 MILLION LABORATORY—HUB SPACE CENTER IS KEY TO PLANETS

(By Charles N. Eischen)

WASHINGTON.—Americans may never know the true story about Venus and Mars if anything happens to the $58 million space research laboratory set for the Boston area.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration center is that important to exploring outer space, a top Government scientist said.

"It will be concerned with U.S. space travel after we land a man on the moon," said Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, Director of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology for NASA.

"All the technology for guidance systems and communications to explore our solar system must be developed there. This is our long-range planning for additional space travel. We must start here to find out more about space."

Bisplinghoff detailed the plans for the electronics' research center in an interview with the Boston Traveler after he had briefed the House Science and Astronautics Committee on research planning.

NASA's proposal to include $5 million in its 1963-64 fiscal year budget for the center

is to be reviewed next week by a subcommittee of the parent House science unit. Representative Joseph Martin, Jr., Republican, of North Attleboro is a member of the parent committee.

Bisplinghoff was one of several NASA scientists to follow Space Administrator James C. Webb before the committee. Webb had urged continued support from Congress on the U.S. plans to explore outer space and said adoption of NASA's proposed $5.7 billion budget for the year was "vital" to meeting the national goal of landing an American on the moon in this decade.

Most of the hardware needed for that landing has already been designed and is under construction at the instrumentation laboratory at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

LONG RANGE RESEARCH

The Boston area research center will play only a minor role in the lunar landing, said Bisplinghoff. Its importance, he added, will be in the long-range efforts to learn about the other planets.

"We plan to do fundamental research in electronic control systems, communications, and navigational procedures for deeper space missions," he said.

"The techniques developed at this laboratory will tell us whether we can send men on the longer space flights."

Bisplinghoff said his office is already supervising research on life support systems for long-time space missions.

"A recent contract will support a ground test of a complete 150 man-day life support system," he told the committee.

"This system, which provides for atmospheric control, waste disposal, thermal control, and water supply management, will undergo experimentation with five men being supported by it for 30 days. Data on system and component performance to be obtained from this experiment will be applied to future flight system design.

"As an extension of this work, we are currently proceeding with studies on a system which would have roughly five times the lifetime of this current system."

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to testify before the House Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the revision of our tax structure.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to comment on the President's proposal to revise our tax structure.

In dealing with legislation as important as this and covering as wide an area, it is unlikely that we will find many people who will agree with every facet of the President's recommendations. I assure you that I do not envy the tremendous burden which you must assume in performing the task of bringing out a bill that will be acceptable to a majority of Members of the House. I do trust that my comments will prove helpful and not further confuse an already complicated problem.

In the interests of time I will not discuss the general principles underlying these tax recommendations but will address myself to specific parts thereof. I would like, however, to make this one general statement, to wit, the enactment of the bulk of the President's recommendations should redound to the benefit of the entire economy of our country and more particularly to the benefit of the small businessman and to the lower income groups.

I address myself first to the matter of treatment of itemized deductions from personal income.

The proposed new treatment of these deductions by limiting them to that in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income is in my opinion the wrong way to tackle this problem. This would hit hardest at the lower income groups whose deductions while small dollarwise are most meaningful to them. There certainly will be no incentive to anyone to meet their civic and charitable obligations by saying to them that they can get no tax deduction or credit until after they have paid 5 percent of their income. It works an even greater hardship to say to them that the first 3, 4, or 5 percent of their gross income which they actually expend for medical expenses is not deductible. I could never understand the theory by which only the excess over these percentages was deductible.

The recommendation as to minor casualty losses so as to exclude all deductions up to 4 percent of the taxpayer's income would merely create another incentive to cheat. This is analogous to insurance policies which provide that the first $25 or $50 of loss is not payable by the insurance company. Insurance carriers will tell you that this results in most people getting bills for double the amount of the loss in order to cover the excludable portion thereof. The same thing will undoubtedly occur if this provision should be enacted. The Internal Revenue Service couldn't find a force large enough to investigate and check upon those items. It would undoubtedly cost the Government many times more to unsuccessfully attempt to collect the taxes for these deductions than the deductions themselves would aggregate.

Any attempt to remove the exemption from interest on mortgages and the real estate taxes on homeowners' properties would be nothing less than a breach of faith by our Government. Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The small landowners are the most precious part of a State." For years our Government has been urging our citizens to become homeowners. The latest statistics show that almost 60 percent of our families own their own homes today. One of the greatest incentives to the acquisition of homes was the fact repeatedly stressed that interest on mortgages and real estate taxes were deductions from gross income for tax purposes. I urge that we do not change that exclusion.

Another recommendation that I oppose is the repeal of the $50 and 4 percent deduction on dividend income. This exemption was to have been a first step toward the elimination of the unfair and inequitable double taxation on earnings.

In considering what should be done with this recommendation I urge that this committee do not consider how much tax can be received by our Government but rather, do we have a right to tax earnings twice? Once the earnings of a corporation have been taxed, the net amount belongs to the stockholders and, while there might be some logic in taxing a corporation for failure to pay those earnings as dividends to the stockholders, we cannot justify taxing those identical earnings a second time when they are distributed to the owners thereof.

With reference to capital gains, I urge that you will decrease the net revenue payable to the Government on capital gains by extending the period from 6 months to 1 year in order to qualify for a long-term capital gain. It is my opinion that the capital gains taxes payable to the Government would increase two or three times if instead of increasing the period we decreased it to 3 or 4 months. By decreasing the period to 3 or 4 months these capital assets would turn over that much more frequently and each time they were sold there would be a capital gains tax paid.

I heartily endorse the recommendation to tax as earnings and not as capital gains the moneys realized on stock options. But I suggest that that tax be payable not on earnings in connection with stock options granted after enactment of the law but on all earnings received after the enactment of the law, regardless of when the stock option was granted. The proposed changes of the rate of taxation will apply to all earnings thereafter received and any change in the tax structure should equally be made to apply to all earnings thereafter received regardless of when and where contracted for.

The President has recommended an additional tax credit of $300 for all people age 65 or over regardless of the source of their income. This credit is to replace both the extra exemption allowed to older people and the retirement income credit. Our senior citizens are greatly in need of tax relief since the annuities which they receive are usually not enough to live on. I believe that the Committee should consider the exemption from Federal income tax of annuities received by individuals age 65 and over. As a partial step in this direction I have introduced H.R. 4182, which would exempt amounts up to $2,400 in annuities, pensions, or requirement benefits paid by local, State, or Federal governments.

I strongly urge that as recommended in H.R. 4182 all annuities paid by State, local, and Federal governments be exempt from Federal income tax.

I recommend that the provisions of my bill, H.R. 525, to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction from Federal income tax for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, should be included in any new tax bill enacted.

I also urge the inclusion of the provisions of my bill, H.R. 530, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business by permitting individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small businesses to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation; to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1963, and to increase the surtax exemption; to provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings; to liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans; to provide an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate and to provide family sized farmers an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care and marketing of farm products and to provide family sized farms the same exemption.

I believe that these last two items will greatly stimulate small business.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Religion Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered last Sunday, March 3, 1963, at a communion breakfast of the Knights of Columbus in New Britain, Conn. Our distinguished colleague, the Honorabe EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, was scheduled to address this gathering, but he was designated as U.S. member of the Subcommittee on Space Law meeting in Geneva and had to leave just a few days before the meeting in New Britain. I was glad to substitute for him as speaker.

The address is as follows:

RELIGION VERSUS COMMUNISM

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, communion breakfast, Daly Council No. 12, Knights of Columbus, New Britain, March 3, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, friends, I am very pleased to be here with you this morning. It is a delight for me to break bread with you and to have the opportunity to exchange a few thoughts with you.

As you know, Congressman DADDARIO was supposed to have been your speaker here today. He is presently on an important mission in Geneva for the U.S. Government as a member of the Interparliamentary Union Subcommittee on Space Law. As you know, the United States and the Soviet Union are in sharp conflict over proposals for the solution of legal space problems.

The late Pope Pius XII, in his annual Christmas message to the world in 1956, spoke of the divine grandeur and its meaning for mankind in our day. His holiness made this observation:

"In truth modern man, precisely because in possession of all that the mind and labor of man have produced, ought to recognize even more the infinite distance between what he can do and what proceeds from the limitless power of God."

I think this is very sage and sound advice. Unless we recognize the infinite distance between what man can do and that which proceeds from the unlimited powers of God, we are in danger of being carried far away from the belief in God and turn to the belief in a single all-powerful man—a belief which is based more on fear than on conviction.

We need not look too far afield for this possibility. The present regimes in Soviet Russia, Communist China, and the other countries of the Communist bloc, which are all based on a godless philosophy and a way of life from which religion has been completely excluded, are perfect examples of man living in fear instead of freedom, of man living with brutal power instead of God's words of truth and love.

I often wonder how much better life could be for the entire human race, if we would live by God's words. I wonder how much more pleasant it could be if mankind would really practice truth and love, and charity and helpfulness, toward one another. Instead we have a world that is confused, a mankind that is tormented, a way of life which for half of humanity means living in constant fear and enjoying no freedom and no dignity as human beings.

In our lifetime we have experienced the destruction brought on by three great wars. We have witnessed the extermination of millions of people. We have seen whole nations and hundreds of millions of peoples in Eastern Europe and Asia become enslaved and tyrannized by a ruthless and godless ideology. And let us not overlook the fact that we have developed the most awesome weapons, which constitute the greatest danger to human survival in the future. Surely, the genius of man is not destined to reach its zenith in the destruction of all human life on earth? In the last 2,000 years the world has gained much knowledge, but when we observe the direction in which mankind is headed, I am afraid that we have gained very little wisdom.

To my mind, the Roman Catholic faith is beyond all doubt the most formidable spiritual weapon against this antireligious conspiracy known as communism. Spiritual coexistence between religion and communism is impossible. The church and communism must remain forever mutually antagonistic. Communism is the embodiment of the total state which represents a definite danger to civilization itself. It goes to the very roots of life. It is political, economic, it is personal, it affects every phase of day-to-day living.

For us the great danger represented by communism is spiritual. In our form of government there is no conflict between God and loyalty to country. Our system of governmnt accepts the supremacy of God—the Communist state does not. There is the underlying difference.

You can share economically. You can endure politically. You can even suffer personally. But no system has yet been devised for cutting the human soul in two and making it serve two masters. Our soul belongs only to God, and not to the state. The Communist state cannot share its monolithic authority with any other institution. Its basic credo forbids it to accept democratic rule by the people or the principle of obedience to God. With diabolical cunning it seeks to subvert religion and God to a position of subordination to the state.

This is the most wicked element of all in the total fraud that is the total state. Against an enemy of this kind there is nothing left for us to do but to wage a total struggle, a spiritual war, under leadership of the church. By giving voice to your faith, you will help bring about the doom of the enemies of God. We who have faith know that, regardless of its temporary gains, communism will eventually be destroyed because of its godless philosophy.

As we struggle to preserve the peace and fredom of our people, we are also fighting to preserve the peace and freedom of all mankind. With the help of God and in the American spirit that every man is entitled to walk upright in human dignity before God and men, we shall succeed in winning this struggle.

We know that truth and knowledge and charity to our fellow men will, in themselves, not win wars, but we also know that they constitute basic ingredients of freedom and justice, and they can serve as solid foundations upon which to build permanent peace. It is important that we gather these ingredients, strengthen them, and build on them with patience and loving care. We must do so not only with nations as a whole, but also with individuals. We must help them become better human beings, more wholesome citizens, persons with good character and with a positive approach to life. We must not only lend a helping hand to those who need our help, but we must also strengthen the hands of those who are laboring in the vineyards of truth and knowledge and charity.

I should like to conclude with a little story. Shortly after the end of World War II, a devastated city in England began the heartbreaking task of restoring and rebuilding its life. In the old city square had stood, before the destruction, a large statue of Christ, with hands outstretched in an attitude of invitation to the people. On the pedestal were carved the words: "Come unto Me."

During the bombings of the city the statue was struck and shattered. When the restoration began, master artists and sculptors were brought to the city to help restore the statue. The figure was eventually reassembled, except for the hands, of which no fragments could be found anywhere in the rubble. At first it was suggested that new hands be fashioned, but later many people said: "No, leave Him without hands."

And so, today there stands in the public square of that city the restored statue of Christ without hands, and on its base are carved the words: "Christ has no hands but ours."

And so, I say to you: Let us strengthen the hands of those who labor for God and man, those who seek to help their fellow men, and all those who strive for genuine peace in the world.

President Kennedy's Civil Rights Message to Congress Receives Editorial Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials in support of President Kennedy's civil rights message to Congress, taken from the Boston Globe of March 1 and the Boston Herald of March 2:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 1, 1963]

THE CIVIL RIGHTS MESSAGE

Civil rights is too often like the weather, a subject for much talk but little action. There was talk again Thursday, in President Kennedy's message to Congress. But it was good talk, and it is now up to Congress to take the action. There should be no foot-dragging, hairsplitting, or misalliance. Yet there probably will be.

The President's message represents a landmark in the long struggle to protect the rights of Negroes in voting, education, and other walks of life. For the first time, he outlined a specific program directed at both the ballot and the schoolhouse, and he asked that it should not provide the occasion for sectional bitterness.

The President also sought a 4-year extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, which was set up in 1957 and will end in November unless Congress acts. He wants it expanded so that any agency can get information, advice, and help from it.

Until now, it has taken Negroes, even when successful in court after overcoming many obstacles, 2 or 3 years before they could register and vote. The President's proposal would speed these cases with priority treatment and the use of court referees. It would also, in Federal elections, ban different tests for different people, and presume anyone with a sixth grade education to be literate.

All this would strike at the heart of southern discrimination, and the South, its right to filibuster intact, will resist fiercely. Meanwhile the rest of the country has no reason for smugness; it, too, needs to make more progress in civil rights.

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 2, 1963]

THE PRECIOUS RIGHT

In this year's civil rights message President Kennedy has put his chief emphasis on voting, and properly so.

The right to vote, said the President, is not only powerful and precious for itself, it is also the key to achieving other rights. If the Negro is to take his proper place in the affairs of the Nation, he must first of all have equality at the ballot box.

The 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts made a start by authorizing the Department of Justice to intervene in voting cases. But the procedures have proved too cumbersome and time consuming.

To establish a pattern of discrimination against the registration of Negro voters and get a court to appoint a Federal registrar may still take months and even years of litigation.

The President's new program calls for appointment of interim registrars while such cases are pending (in any 200 counties claimed by the Federal Government to be prime discriminators) and for priority handling of voting cases in Federal courts.

It would also prohibit the application of different tests, standards, practices or procedures to Negroes and whites, and would create a presumption of literacy for voting purposes where the applicant has passed the sixth grade.

Doubtless if Congress closes these loopholes others will develop. Establishing the right to vote or any other right against opposition is not easy. But we are making progress. According to the Commission on Civil Rights, considerably fewer than 100,000 Negroes were allowed to vote in the 12 Southern States in 1932. Fifteen years later the number had risen to 645,000, and by 1960 it was 1,362,000.

The Government is now concentrating its efforts on 200 counties, where serious discrimination continues to exist. We can win there, too.

The President's message called for a lot of other things—for ratification of the poll tax amendment, for continuation of the Civil Rights Commission, for financial assistance to communities with desegregation problems, for administrative action against discrimination in labor unions. All are important. But the big thing is voting.

The voting bills must be pushed through this session even if it means sitting out a filibuster and tying up the Congress for a month. The precious right must not be denied any longer.

The Disintegration of American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, my confidence in the future of these United States is constantly being renewed by the clear-sighted visions of my constituents, as revealed in my daily mail. The forces at work within our country which are detrimental to private initiative and individual freedom do not go unnoticed by thoughtful citizens.

Only last week I had the pleasure of receiving such a letter from one of the residents in the Seventh District of New Jersey. Written by Mrs. Robert E. Lexa, of Glen Gardner, N.J., the letter is a succinct analysis of the weaknesses of American character and the governmental actions which have contributed to this state. I know Americans everywhere will gain a new perspective, and recapture old ideals, by reading Mrs. Lexa's letter which follows:

The Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. WIDNALL: For several months I have been wanting to write you, expressing my thoughts about many things for which you represent our family and me in Washington. Somehow—in a negative sort of way—Valentine's Day seems appropriate.

As you can see from the address, we live in the rural area. Fourteen years ago we tried valiantly to become farmers. Perhaps by your viewpoint we erred in not working with the Government's farm policy. By our viewpoint, it is spiritual—and material—waste to be paid for not planting something. It seems to us that it is spiritually unethical, and it does not seem right that parts of the world still have famines while farmers in America are paid not to plant something, and then that a quantity of that particular item lies in a storage place.

Perhaps I should add that we are not fundamentalists nor do we belong to any peculiar religious sect. We have believed these principles for a long time, and still think they are right, that what we are doing, legislatively, in our country is not right.

To cap the climax, a few years ago I took a great books course at a local high—and we reread the Declaration of Independence. This is quite an eye opener.

What a tremendous set of ideals formed the foundations of this Nation.

What built-in incentives.

But, we seem to be letting them slip, blithely giving them up, selling them for the "mess of pottage" called security. We are expecting Uncle Sam to be Father Sam. My thought now is that perhaps the greatest thing Father Sam could do would be to be a good father.

What is a good father?

A good father employs wisdom as well as love in helping his children achieve adulthood.

A good father does not buy his children, but rather encourages them to achieve their own potentials—not by bribery but rather with built-in incentives, knowing the joy of real fulfillment and real achievement; knowing that what one has in the way of achievements or experience he has forever, and this in turn becomes a foundation for further growth and development.

It seems to me that our Government is no longer employing the wisdom aspect of this fatherhood. Through our social security, our unemployment, our farm policy, etc., we are encouraging people to be less than they can be. Perhaps it is mismanagement of a great ideal. From my personal "look-see" we are encouraging people to goldbrick or to do as little as they can for whatever handouts. And we decry the railroad's featherbedding. This is the same principle dressed in different clothes.

I realize that you can do nothing unless you are returned to Congress, that you have to reflect the echoes from home. But why do not some of you stump the countrysides and try to educate the people to want the things they should have?

I hope some of this current activity is merely a swing of the pendulum, like we swung from too strict child rearing to the too undisciplined. But I wonder if we shall ever swing back sufficiently to find the middle-of-the-road policy? Or—will there be individual strengths of character to maintain the guts to do it?

My final plum is one question: How long can a country continue to grow through deficit financing? Yet, surely the tax structure requires revamping. Do you know anyone who can feed a teenager on $600 annually? Or do you know anyone with a decent standard of living who can eat and dress on that sum?

Won't you personally please reexamine the trends in our Government? We have such a tremendous country, such fabulous possibilities, such topnotch dreams to yet fulfill—why are we weakening it from within?

Sincerely,

E. L. LEXA
Mrs. Robert E. Lexa.

Andrew Jackson Snuffbox Comes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have inserted in the RECORD articles about the great and beloved President Andrew Jackson. Andrew Jackson was born in my district in South Carolina, and I feel singularly honored to have this great Democrat as one of my predecessors of the Fifth Judicial District.

We have a fine and growing State park in Lancaster County, S.C., along the North Carolina line. It is known as the Andrew Jackson Historical State Park. The land composites the birthplace of Andrew Jackson.

Recently at the museum at the park we were privileged to have on display President Jackson's snuffbox. It is a gift from the Wyeth family, whose name is intertwined with the history of South Carolina as well as other States. As part of my remarks, I include an article from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of February 21, 1963. I believe this article to be of historical significance, and I commend it to the Nation for history and information. I cannot tell you the great pride I have in bringing these matters to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation in this manner.

The article referred to follows:

ANDREW JACKSON SNUFFBOX COMES HOME

(By Viola C. Floyd)

The chief attraction to be on display at the Andrew Jackson Historical State Park museum on March 15, 1963, when the annual celebration of Jackson's birth is observed will be the silver snuffbox President Jackson sent to a friend of his youth, Mary Crawford Dunlap (Mrs. Samuel C.), of Lancaster, S.C. It is being returned to South Carolina for keeps through the generosity of its latest owners, the Marion Sims Wyeth family of Palm Beach, Fla. The box is not only a reminder of a pleasant youthful romance but is also a reminder of the great bitterness generated by the nullification struggle in South Carolina.

The snuffbox is made from a polished tortoise shell lined with silver. It is oval in shape, 3 inches long and 2¼ inches across. Over the engraving of an American Eagle on the lid is inscribed "Jan. 8, 1815" commemorating Jackson's victory at New Orleans. Above that is the inscription, "U.S.F. *Brandywine*, 1828," designating the ship on which the original donor was stationed and the year box was made. Inside the lid is "To A. Jackson from D. M. Stokes."

Through research done for Mr. Wyeth it has been determined that D. M. Stokes was David Montford Stokes, midshipman on the U.S. flagship *Brandywine*, from November 20, 1827, to May 12, 1829. A resident of Wilkesborough, N.C., when he joined the Navy, he was the son of Montford Stokes who was U.S. Senator from North Carolina 1816–23 and Governor of North Carolina 1830–32. In his youth Andrew Jackson studied law in Salisbury, N.C., under John Stokes and there he met D. M. Stokes who was 5 years his senior. John Stokes and Governor Montford Stokes were the sons of David Stokes from Lunenburg, Va. Stokes County, N.C., was named for Jackson's law teacher, John Stokes.

The U.S. flagship *Brandywine* was the ship on which Lafayette returned to France in 1826 after his visit to America. At the end of the voyage Lafayette presented a portrait of himself to the captain of the vessel, Charles Morris, a veteran of the War of 1812. The portrait is now the property of the Corcoran Art Gallery in Washington, D.C.

BYGONE DAYS

On October 13, 1831, President Jackson wrote a letter to Mrs. Samuel C. Dunlap, the former Polly Crawford to whom he had paid court in the Waxhaws during the days of his youth. He sent the letter, a pamphlet, a newspaper and the silver snuffbox to the widowed Mrs. Dunlap by her brother-in-law, Col. Thomas Williams. A conversation with Colonel Williams concerning the old Waxhaws had awakened memories of bygone days. He referred to her in the letter as "Polly Crawford," expressed regret at having learned that her brothers had passed away during the years since he had known them, asked her to accept the gift, and also stated that he was sending a pamphlet and a newspaper for her son. He expressed the desire that the son might learn from the pamphlet and paper the true nature of the political situation of that day.

NULLIFICATION ISSUE

At the time the letter was written the nullification question was a hot issue in South Carolina. The Nullifiers and the Unionists, the two parties in the State, hotly debated their beliefs. The following year on November 27, 1832, South Carolina passed the ordinance of nullification. The Dunlaps were Nullificationists and did not appreciate the literature sent by Jackson. In all probability it was destroyed by the recipient.

Despite the family's disapproval of Jackson's stand in threatening to send the militia to his native State Mrs. Dunlap penned a courteous reply to the President's letter. She was gracious to the last degree but yielded not one inch to the flattery of a gift from such a source. As she had rejected his suit in her youth she courteously rejected his bid for her support in the conflict. She disdained to mention the pamphlet or newspaper, disregarding thus a controversial subject.

Col. Thomas Williams, referred to in both letters only as "Col. Williams" is identified by Mrs. Dunlap who called him her friend and relative. Col. Thomas Williams, born in Williamsburgh District in 1789, married Martha White Crawford, sister of Mrs. Dunlap, the former Mary Crawford. He was admitted to the South Carolina bar in 1811 and set up practice in Lancaster. Not finding the political atmosphere there to his liking he moved to York district. He served in the South Carolina Legislature for 14 years. In 1835 he migrated to Alabama.

FAMILIES

Mary Crawford Dunlap, to whom Jackson sent the letter, snuffbox, and papers, was the daughter of the Revolutionary officer, Maj. Robert Crawford, and his wife the former Jean White. The Robert Crawford land lay adjoining the James Crawford land whereon Jackson said he was born. In fact Andrew Jackson was only 3 months older than Mary (Polly) who was born June 26, 1767.

Mary Crawford married Dr. Samuel C. Dunlap who lies buried in the old Waxhaw Presbyterian Church cemetery in Lancaster County. To them were born five children, three of whom married. George Washington Dunlap, married first to Elizabeth Harris and second to Mrs. Della Harris, migrated to Texas. The second son, Samuel F. Dunlap, married Sara C. Witherspoon, daughter of Col. James Hervey Witherspoon and his wife the former Jane Donnom. Eliza Jane Dunlap was the only daughter of Dr. Samuel C. and Mary Crawford Dunlap to leave descendants. Eliza Jane was born November 6, 1791, in Lancaster District. She was married in 1810 to Dr. Bartlett Jones, prominent physician of Lancaster who lies buried in the Lancaster Presbyterian Church cemetery. Mrs. Jones died October 6, 1858, while at Warm Springs, Ga.

Dr. Bartlett and Eliza Jane D. Jones had six children: Mary Elizabeth Jones, born April 10, 1811, died December 30, 1856, married James Hervey Witherspoon, Jr. Descendants still live in Lancaster. The second child of Dr. Bartlett and Eliza Jane Dunlap Jones was Benjamin Rush Jones born November 22, 1833, died June 26, 1887, Montgomery,. Ala. He married Frances Amelia Taliaferro of Alabama and had six children. The third child of Dr. Bartlett and Eliza Jones was Eliza Theresa Jones, born April 4, 1816, died May 11, 1890 in New York City. She was married December 21, 1936, to Dr. J. Marion Sims, born in Lancaster District January 25, 1813, died in New York City on November 13, 1883. Their descendants will be listed later. Amelia Virginia Jones, daughter of Dr. Bartlett and Eliza Jones married Dr. Benjamin F. Masey. Bartlett Constantine Jones, son of Dr. Bartlett Jones married Eliza Forney. Samuel Dunlap Jones died unmarried.

Dr. James Marion Sims and his wife, Eliza Theresa Jones Sims had nine children of whom Florence Nightingale Sims, born August 22, 1855, in New York City, was the youngest. She was married on April 10, 1886, to Dr. John Allan Wyeth who was born in Marshall County, Ala., on May 26, 1845, died in New York City May 28, 1922. Florence N. Sims Wyeth died September 24, 1915. They lie buried in the Greenwood Cemetery in New York. To this union there were born three children, namely, Florence Sims Wyeth, Marion Sims Wyeth, and John Allan Wyeth, Jr.

DIRECT LINE

Thus it was that Marion Sims Wyeth inherited the snuffbox in direct line from his great-great-grandmother, Mary Crawford Dunlap. Marion Sims Wyeth, the donor of the snuffbox to the Jackson Park Museum, was born in New York City on February 18, 1889. He graduated from Princeton University in 1910; he was a student at Beaux Arts, Paris, 1910–14; an architect by profession, he has now retired and is living in Palm Beach, Fla. On November 25, 1915, he was married to Eleanor Orr, daughter of Arthur and Eleanor Noyes Orr. Their children are: Florence Nightingale Wyeth (Mrs. Peter W. R. Johnson), Alice Eleanor Wyeth (Mrs. Henry Noyes Barkhausen), Joan Allan Wyeth (Mrs. Theodore W. Griggs II), and Marion Sims Wyeth, Jr., who married Nancy Coffin. Marion Sims Wyeth, Sr., and his wife Eleanor, have 16 grandchildren.

South Carolina citizens are indebted to and deeply grateful to the Wyeth family for the snuffbox gift to the Andrew Jackson Historical State Park located in Lancaster County.

The Clarion Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure and an honor for me to call attention to my colleagues in the Congress, the publication of a new Catholic weekly newspaper, the Clarion Herald, which will serve the people of the 10 civil parishes in the archdiocese of New Orleans, La., and will add enrichment to their lives.

The first issue of this splendid new paper was published last Thursday, February 28, and was distributed to the 131,555 homes of Catholic families in the archdiocese. The Clarion Herald will be published every Thursday, and I am confident that in the future this newspaper not only will serve the Catholic families of the archdiocese, but also will be read by scores of citizens in my congressional district and throughout south Louisiana.

The Clarion Herald is the successor to the well-known weekly, Catholic Action of the South, which fostered the moral welfare of the people of the New Orleans archdiocese for many, many years under the editorship of Millard Everett, now editor of the Clarion Herald, and under the benevolent, wise guidance and counsel of His Excellency, Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummell.

With the sharp format of the Clarion Herald, the wealth and variety of news feature stories and columns which it has, the fine array of photographs, not to mention the highly qualified talent brought to the newspaper for its publication, I know that the paper will not stand on the laurels attained by its predecessor, Catholic Action, but rather will build on them to provide the people of the New Orleans archdiocese with the finest newspaper of its kind in the United States.

One of the most impressive statements coinciding with publication of the first issue of the Clarion Herald was that by His Excellency, Archbishop John P. Cody, aspostolic administrator of the archdiocese, when he declared that the newspaper is not in competition with the daily and weekly newspapers in the archdiocese, but rather "it will be in competition with only two things: religious ignorance and moral wrongdoing." There is no doubt that this newspaper is, and will be in the years ahead, a moral force for good and for the spiritual well-being and growth of the people of the New Orleans archdiocese, whether they be Catholics, Protestants, or Jews. This is the kind of force—a voice for truth and justice—which we cannot have too much, Mr. Speaker, in the United States and the world today. The strength of the American people's faith throughout our history, and the great force for good of our churches in this land of freedom, are among the principal factors which have made the United States the strongest nation on earth, and at the same time, have nurtured in our people the most generous and humanitarian spirit in the history of the world.

I am proud to point out that Archbishop Cody is the pioneer behind the establishment of the Clarion Herald; prior to his coming to New Orleans, His Excellency established diocesan newspapers in St. Louis and Kansas City-St. Joseph, Mo. I know that Archbishop Cody hopes, as I do, that this newspaper will reach new heights of excellence among Catholic papers in America.

I also would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the excellent

group of editors who are directing the publication of the Clarion Herald: Rev. Elmo Romagosa, executive editor and communications director for the archdiocese of New Orleans; Millard Everett, editor, who brings to his new task a wealth of knowledge of the history, dogma, and rites of the Catholic church through his 35 years of editing and writing for diocesan newspapers in Denver and New Orleans, and Emile Comar, associate editor, who for several years was the leading political reporter for the New Orleans (La.) States-Item and one of the finest reporters in my State of Louisiana. Mr. Comar, who served the States-Item for more than 16 years, thus provides a storehouse of knowledge on the temporal affairs of Louisiana, particularly the political and governmental affairs of the State, and combines with it a keen and practical insight and skill into the general operations of a newspaper.

I am proud to salute the editors of the Clarion Herald and to extend my congratulations and best wishes to them in this magnificient endeavor. It is just such an endeavor as this which makes me proud to represent the people of the Second Congressional District of Louisiana.

On behalf of the archdiocese of New Orleans and the editors of the Clarion Herald, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, His Excellency, Archbishop Cody's official statement on the publication of the Clarion Herald which appeared in its first issue February 28. The copy follows:

Catholic journalism in the Archdiocese of New Orleans enters a new era with this first issue of the Clarion Herald. Few dioceses in our country can point to a newspaper heritage of virtually a century of service to the church and to the community.

Our area has enjoyed an enviable level of journalistic excellence in the general as well as in the religious press. The daily and weekly papers which serve our people are established channels of news and opinion.

The archdiocesan weekly paper has traditionally enjoyed the best of relationships with the editors of these papers and has always been given kind consideration when dealing with them. The Clarion Herald is not in competition with these media. Rather it visualizes its role as working in harmony with the general press to provide for its readers a more complete view of life—the religious focus. It will be in competition with only two things: religious ignorance and moral wrongdoing.

In this framework, our new paper proudly assumes its role of service to the community in the best traditions of Catholic journalism.

One of our first actions in setting up the Clarion Herald was to establish a separate corporation, the New Orleans Publishing Co., as publisher of the paper. Although the paper is published by a separate corporation, this does not mean that the Clarion Herald is set free from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, a status which would be neither possible nor desirable. The ordinary of a diocese must hold himself responsible for a Catholic publication issued under his jurisdiction and addressed to the members of his flock for whose guidance and instruction he must answer to the Lord.

On the other hand, the Clarion Herald should not be regarded as the archbishop's personal instrument. Readers should not be given the false impression that the entire contents of the paper are determined by the archbishop's personal wishes, or that the opinions expressed by staff members or contributors are necessarily those of the archbishop.

More importantly, readers should be made acutely aware that a Catholic paper must not only teach Catholic dogma, but must also guard Catholic freedom. It must not constrict the area of that freedom; rather, within the limits set by defined dogma, it should encourage and promote responsible discussion. Clearly, this will not be the case if readers believe all opinions expressed by the paper carry episcopal authority.

Therefore, only those portions of this newspaper which appear under the heading "Official" are to be understood as expressing the formal teaching and directives of the ordinary of this archdiocese.

In discussing religious matters on which the authority of the church permits differing opinions, it will be the policy of this paper to promote free discussion and to refrain from identifying any single viewpoint at the only orthodox belief.

When this paper comments on purely temporal affairs—matters not involving Catholic doctrine or the rights of the church—readers should understand that the views published are those of the editors or of individual contributors. Such views are not to be regarded as the authoritative teaching of the church or as necessarily reflecting the personal opinions of the ordinary.

This paper is not meant to be a "house organ." Rather its aim is to be a Clarion Herald for Christ throughout the Archdiocese of New Orleans. Its very name means that it will point with pride to the accomplishments of our community and its citizens, just as it will not hesitate to speak out clearly as often as truth, honesty, and justice have been violated.

Upon the staff I ask God's blessing in this new step forward.

JOHN P. CODY,
Apostolic Administrator,
Archdiocese of New Orleans.

Remarks of Rev. Edmund P. Joyce, C.S.C., Executive Vice President of the University of Notre Dame, on Occasion of Presentation of 1963 Patriotism Award by the Notre Dame Senior Class to Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, February 18, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the distinguished executive vice president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Edmund P. Joyce, C.S.C., which Father Joyce delivered at the ceremonies marking the presentation by the senior class of the University of Notre Dame of the annual Patriotism Award to the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

I believe that Father Joyce's words about the nature of enlightened patriotism as well as his tribute to Ambassador Stevenson will be of interest to every Member of Congress.

The remarks follow:

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME ON FEBRUARY 18, 1963, BY REV. EDMUND P. JOYCE, C.S.C., EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

It is my privilege, representing the administration and faculty of the university, to accept this American flag from Mr. Maxwell and the senior class of 1963. The ceremony in which we are participating tonight is, as you know, a replica of a ceremony which has taken place year after year, from the early days of Notre Dame's history. . One might fear that it has been repeated so often that it has become an empty custom, a habit, something done almost as a reflex action, without prior thought or conscious effort. This, I trust, is far from being the case. The ceremony tonight is just as solemn, its symbolism equally meaningful, and the occasion quite as relevant as it was when Father Sorin inaugurated the tradition three-quarters of a century ago. Some of the incidentals have been changed, to be sure: Washington Hall is no longer sufficiently large to accommodate the entire senior class; the ceremony has been shifted from morning until evening; it is not always held precisely on Washington's Birthday; the seniors do not now come forth wearing caps and gowns, the patriotism award has been an innovation of this decade and over the years the flag itself has carried additional stars from time to time. But while the trappings may vary, the substance and purpose of the Washington Day exercise remain constant.

ENLIGHTENED PATRIOTISM

It is first and foremost an opportunity for the seniors soon to be graduated to express, as a group, the allegiance of educated men toward the country of their birth. Patriotism is a virtue which in turn encompasses and is nourished by many other virtues. It is, above all, the recognition that our Nation has a constant and an impelling need for our affectionate loyalty, our lively concern, and our intelligent involvement in matters, large and small, which help shape our destiny as a people. It also goes beyond this. In a world of independent nations, shrunken to the status of next door neighbors by the astounding progress in communication and transportation, there is no room for a pseudo-patriotism which reduces itself to a narrow nationalism. "No man is an island unto himself," says the poet. Nor, in this complex and interrelated world, is any nation an island unto itself. The welfare of one is inextricably bound up with the well-being of others. Thus, the enlightened patriot of the mid-20th century is the one who is working assiduously for peace among nations, regardless of their divergent views, for understanding among races, even where prejudice abounds, and for economic opportunities for the world's downtrodden, wherever they might be.

THE EXAMPLE OF ADLAI STEVENSON

One could develop this concept of patriotism at greater length. It would be superfluous for me to do so here tonight. Fortunately, we have here with us the recipient of the 1963 Patriotism Award who, for millions of our fellow countrymen, embodies the enlightened patriotism whereof we speak. Mr. Adlai Stevenson, in the course of his distinguished career, has been among the most articulate and thoughtful spokesmen of a troubled generation. Undeterred by political disappointments, unwilling to rest on the laurels of multiple honors and distinctions, he continues to make his enormous influence felt in the arena of world thought and action. Therefore, in accepting this flag tonight as a pledge of the senior class, I congratulate you on the choice you have

made in your award. May the example of Ambassador Stevenson be for you tonight, and in the years to come, a source of inspiration and strength. May your patriotism be of the same genus, unflagging in constancy, comprehensive in scope, thoroughly Christian in its concern for all men. Go forth in this spirit and you will unquestionably be an effective ambassador for "God, country, and Notre Dame."

Are Test Ban Negotiations a Public Relations Game?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Bill Sumner has written the following penetrating inquiry relative to the test ban negotiations being carried on by the administration:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram, Mar. 4, 1963]

TEST BAN A HOLY GRAIL OR JUST PUBLIC RELATIONS GAME?

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—The present state of negotiations in Geneva over a nuclear test ban treaty has reached the stage where even the most dedicated proponents of such an agreement must be slightly puzzled as to our true intent.

Two propositions have emerged from the confusion. The administration and its negotiating team may possibly view a test ban as a holy grail that should be snatched at even at the risk of national security. This being an extremely doubtful proposition, the thought then occurs that what is going on at Geneva is merely an exercise in international public relations, an attempt to show the world and our own pacifist groups that we are men of good will.

Assuming this last theory to be so—and the odds are tremendous against the necessary Senate approval of any of our more recent proposals to the Russians—it seems to be an expensive and dubious way to win friends. In 1961, when the disarmament commission was created, some $1.8 billion was budgeted. And as such things go, $6.5 billion was appropriated for the current fiscal year and $15 billion is sought now for the next.

All of this is for travel and various associated expenses and for research which no one of either party on the House-Senate Committee on Atomic Energy seems to find believable.

No one seems to know the exact cost of the picture books we have set loose upon the world to tell, in line drawing and simple caption, of the life and good works of our President, but surely this is a cheaper and more astute public relations gambit than our posturings at Geneva.

Be that as it may, the only country of the 17 at Geneva which seems to be approaching the task with any singleness of purpose is Russia. Its negotiators, by standing fast, have driven our own to steadily bargain away most of our original positions. Two years ago we argued for 20 on-site inspections. We are down to seven. The word is out now that we may settle for five. From internationally manned detection stations we have now offered unmanned "black boxes" under national control.

Should this be accepted, and the Russians have given no indication that they want any kind of treaty at all, the real shooting will begin in the Senate. It would take two-thirds of those present to ratify any such treaty, and the case against it will be formidable.

First, there is the long history of broken contracts, dishonesty, duplicity, and the dedication to bury our form of government that should make anyone over the age of 5 somewhat leery about such a life and death matter.

Then there are the arguments used in favor of a ban which will, at this point, no doubt titillate the gentlemen debaters of the Senate.

Would, for example, a ban really slow down the proliferation of nuclear weapons as is argued by Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster? It is argued that a treaty would give the signing parties an opportunity to exert pressure on their own allies. But there is Charles de Gaulle on the one hand and Red China on the other, neither of which seems to be responding to pressure these days.

And would a treaty open up Soviet society and thus create a valuable precedent, a basis for confidence in other agreements? Let us hear what the President had to say along these lines last December 16.

"A totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection which really is desirable," he said. "They are not going to open it (for inspection) because a totalitarian system must exist only in secrecy."

Words to live by, no doubt, and also words to come back and haunt a fellow.

Well-Merited Tribute to Textile Union Leader John W. Edelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a gentleman who is well known to many Members of the Congress received a well-merited tribute at an important meeting here in Washington. John W. Edelman, who has for many years represented the Textile Workers Union of American, AFL-CIO, as its Washington representative, and who has worked on legislative matters representing labor in Washington for more than 30 years, was cited by the National Housing Conference at its 32d annual convention held at the Hotel Statler on February 25.

I have long held a deep interest in the field of housing and am a sponsor of the National Housing Conference. Before election to Congress, I served for a period of 8 years as chairman of the Putnam (Conn.), Housing Authority, and later as director and vice president of the Connecticut Urban Renewal Association.

Although Mr. Edelman has appeared quite regularly at hearings held by the Committees on Banking and Currency on housing and allied matters, it is not generally known in the Congress that he was one of the earliest pioneers in promoting and furthering legislation creating the public housing program in the United States. A detailed and carefully documented account of the movement which led to the adoption in 1937 of the Wagner-Steagall bill—the first public housing bill enacted by the Congress of the United States—is contained in a volume entitled "The Wagner Housing Act" by the Reverend Timothy L. McDonnell, S.J., published by the Loyola University Press in 1957. This study describes in detail the role played by Mr. Edelman in the efforts to have this important legislation brought to the attention of the Congress and the work he and his colleagues did to create the climate which made passage possible.

Mr. Edelman's interest in housing began in the early thirties when he was employed by the American Federation of Hosiery Workers in Philadelphia, a union which sponsored the first housing project in the United States that was built with Government assistance. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America was the first union to concern itself with housing. But the Amalgamated's project—a cooperative apartment house in the Bronx in New York City—was launched with funds obtained from philanthropic sources. In other respects these two pioneer ventures were very similar in motivation and method. Both projects have been enormously successful both from a strict business viewpoint—all obligations have been met, and so forth—and from the viewpoint that the tenants have benefited from and enjoyed the facilities afforded them.

The apartment project which the American Federation of Hosiery Workers undertook in Philadelphia was known as the Carl Mackley Houses. It was named after a much loved worker who was killed in a strike in that city. Very great public interest was created throughout the United States when it was announced that this union and the Public Works Administration—then headed by Harold L. Ickes—would jointly engage in this experiment in the housing field. As a result, the leaders of the hosiery union and the technicians who planned the building, set up what was known as the Labor Housing Conference. Mr. Edelman became the first secretary of that body and engaged in much of the missionary work that was so badly needed in that period. At first this was a regional affair with the officers of the local and State A.F. of L. bodies in Pennsylvania and New Jersey sharing in the early educational activities of the group. However, within a couple of years the American Federation of Labor proper, by formal convention action, endorsed the work of the Labor Housing Conference and adopted a resolution—drafted by the conference—favoring the principle of public housing. The Labor Housing Conference then became the National Labor Housing Conference, moved its headquarters to Washington and undertook the campaign in cooperation, of course, with other publicly minded bodies—which resulted in the enactment of the Wagner-Steagall Housing Act in 1937.

Mr. Edelman's interest in housing matters has not been confined to urban housing. For a time he served as a part-

time consultant to the Resettlement Administration during the period that the four historic "greenbelt" communities were being built. President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Mr. Edelman a member of an advisory committee which was created shortly after the Federal Housing Administration began its long and successful career. I am informed that a search of the early minutes of that advisory committee to the FHA would show that Mr. Edelman was able in those early years to initiate a Government policy which has pretty much persisted till the present day which forbids Government financing of so-called company towns or housing to be built by employers and rented or occupied only by employees. In the past such housing has enabled oppressive employers to take advantage of the workers.

In more recent years Mr. Edelman has been active in building public interest in cooperative housing and serves as an officer of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing. Mr. Edelman is listed as one of the early sponsors of the very attractive cooperative projects known as river houses here in Washington in the Southwest redevelopment area. This handsome group of houses, just recently completed, was undertaken by a cooperative association in conjunction with the Reynolds Aluminum Co.

Within the past month Mr. Edelman was a speaker at a workshop on Housing in Latin America which was arranged jointly by the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development and the National Association of Home Builders. This was a most interesting undertaking in that here we found a group of private enterprisers in the housing field working hand in hand with a citizen organization which is concerned primarily with foreign policy questions and particularly with the development of nonprofit housing schemes for low income groups in Latin America and elsewhere.

Finally, it should be noted in regard to this summary of Mr. Edelman's activities in the field of housing, that all this work was done in addition to his regular duties as a technician employed by a labor organization. While employed by the American Federation of Hosiery Workers and during the years that the Mackley houses were being promoted and realized, and during the period that the Labor Housing Conference was doing its pioneering work, Edelman edited the weekly paper published by the union and carried on research and educational activities as well. Since coming to Washington and taking over the legislative job for the Textile Workers Union of America, Edelman has primarily concerned himself with the basic program, first of the CIO, and then later of the merged AFL–CIO. But in addition to his work on housing legislation, he has played a particular role in the campaign to enact improved minimum wage legislation and many other matters not related to housing. He had plenty of reason to relinquish his efforts in the housing field but because of his great interest in this area, he has continued to give this problem much of his time and energy. The above notes on Mr. Edelman have been supplied to me by Wesley W. Cook, a vice president of the Textile Workers Union of America, who has worked very closely with Edelman both in Philadelphia and Washington for nearly 35 years.

The citation by the National Housing Conference to Mr. Edelman—as read to the convention banquet by its president, Mr. Nathaniel S. Keith—is as follows:

IN TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. EDELMAN

For more than three decades, a modest, two-fisted representative of organized labor has effectively championed every honest cause to help achieve human dignity and a full life for all people.

John W. Edelman, Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, has spent his lifetime fighting poverty, slums, prejudice, sweatshops, second-class education, hopelessness of the aging, exploitation of workers, inferior medical care—every enemy of the development of the human mind, body, and spirit. All have felt the rapier thrust of his dedicated, tireless efforts to make democracy work.

We who take for granted the years of progness in housing, urban renewal, and countless other social and economic gains, would not be meeting tonight to perfect existing tools, had they not been forged by John Edelman and his associates in the critical years of the great depression.

John rallied the few, to serve the many. He has never retreated from a basic goal. When victories were achieved, he stepped aside for others to receive the honors from a grateful nation.

The National Housing Conference, assembled in Washington, D.C., on February 25, 1963, at this our 32d annual meeting, belatedly but with the accumulated respect and affection from passing years, honors itself by honoring John W. Edelman, effective friend of all mankind and ambassador for the underprivileged peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, below I reproduce Mr. Edelman's response to the citation:

It was probably very fortunate for us housers and planners and those other types of operators among us who may be classed as idealists that very, very few of us had a clear idea of what we were getting into when we rather miraculously—as I now look back on it all—got what we loosely call the housing movement going, back in the early thirties. I doubt that many of us would have had the gumption to go ahead had we foreseen, on the one hand, the virulence and implacability of the opposition we stirred up—and, on the other hand, we might have bowed out right there had we realized that the force of events would cause us to become so much more than "housers" in the literal sense of the term.

I have long accepted—and I mean this sincerely and completely—the fact that the elimination of slums and the curbing of jerry building will not either cure poverty in the country nor by these actions alone restore stability to its economy. I have even grown old enough to understand that the provision of decent, safe and sanitary housing will not automatically even make people orderly or remove their liking for liquor. But having made my bow to my hardheaded colleagues and to common sense in general, let me go on to declare and affirm that whether we wanted it or not, we have become involved in an important movement to improve one of the largest segments of American society. Even though we now have more and different problems to tackle than we thought we were taking on—and perhaps more than we really know how to cope with—we are inevitably part of an important social crusade. Maybe we are a bit more hardheaded than most of the people we loosely call reformers; but that's what we are no matter how we squirm at the designation. As a conversation piece some years ago when I mixed in so-called polite society in the suburbs of Philadelphia I liked to introduce myself as a labor agitator. I still regard myself very happily as an agitator, even though people like me have substituted a jargon out of governmentese for the old slogans of social protest.

My plea tonight is that even if we have to handle many more millions of dollars than we ever knew could exist and have become skilled in elaborate transactions with bankers and governments, we do not avoid our true role as a group which is militantly trying to achieve a measure of social justice for those who cannot do it for themselves.

Twenty-five years ago who among us could have foreseen that we would be obliged, almost as a matter of course, to take on the fight for what we now call open spaces—actually for a rational program of land use. Somehow or other we have just picked up our share of the mass transit struggle without even stopping to think that this is not what we bargained for in the beginning. Indeed, we do not blanch at accepting a major share of responsibility for readjusting thousands of human beings who malfunction as a result of deprivation or neglect or discrimination.

So my little preachment to my housing colleagues tonight—a mean trick to moralize when you have so warmly honored me—is to accept the role that we have made inevitable for ourselves. If we have needed all our brain power, and lots of hardihood and faith in these past 25 years, we must understand that we will need more of all of these in the years ahead. But I avow to all of you here tonight that even if we haven't built the promised land with all our successive legislative and administrative battles, we have at least done much for ourselves as citizens of this time and of this society. We have had our thrills. We have had more satisfaction than we have had setbacks. And, seriously, we have made a positive and useful and important beginning on the task of creating a humane society. Let us not falter now. Our commitment to ourselves as well as to our fellows must be deepened and become more demanding. We must discover and develop more resources with ourselves. We must believe more deeply than ever before in what we want to do. We can and must make greater contributions in the 20 years now coming up.

Expense Account Fiasco: Its Effects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration's Revenue Act of 1962 which drastically revised expense account spending is perpetuating a continual economic crisis in many cities across the country. Because of my concern, I would like to commend to my colleagues the following article, entitled, "Expense Account Fiasco: Its Effects," which appeared in the March 11, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article as an extension of my remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 11, 1963]

EXPENSE ACCOUNT FIASCO: ITS EFFECTS

Mounting complaints from businessmen are causing key Members of Congress to take

a closer look at the tightened tax rules on expense account spending.

Hotels, restaurants, clubs, stores and places of entertainment where such spending is a way of life report a significant drop in business in the first 2 months of 1963.

Businessmen are said to be confused and worried, fearful of running afoul of the new rules while entertaining for business purposes.

"Everybody is running around in circles, trying to find out what they can and cannot do," says one executive.

The Senate Finance Committee, on February 28, called in Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for a discussion of the complaints now reaching Congress. The meeting was a closed session of the Committee.

To find out more about this problem, members of the staff of U.S. News & World Report interviewed owners and managers of restaurants, hotels, clubs, catering firms, and other businesses across the country. In those dependent to some degree on expense-account spending, business is down and, in some cases, unemployment is up.

THEY'RE NOT SPENDING

The new tax regulations, says the manager of a luxury hotel in Miami Beach, "are very bad, putting fear into people. They're not spending any more. We're planning to close our night club next year because it's losing money."

Although Florida is enjoying one of its best winter seasons in history, this hotel manager estimates his revenues are down 10 percent. Convention entertaining, which is way off, accounts for most of the drop. He has had to lay off some employees.

This executive puts his finger on the rule limiting spending to reasonable entertainment as the cause of trouble.

"If you're going to entertain, you've got to do it lavishly," he says. "You're better off not doing anything if you're just going to buy a customer a meal. You want him to say, 'Gee, you're a great fellow.' If you want a big order, you've got to entertain big."

In Chicago, the manager of a hotel reports that people "are not bringing wives to conventions as much as they used to. In that we are hurt bad." Also, some companies are sending fewer representatives to conventions.

"There has been a definite slacking off, particularly in convention registrations," says the manager of the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles. "For 1 convention we had 240 reservations, but only 170 showed up.

"Our nightclub business is off, too. Certain performers have a known pulling power. But we're down considerably from expectations." He adds:

"I think it's more uncertainty than anything else at this point. People just don't know. They ask for receipts, but they don't understand that they don't need receipts except in particular circumstances."

RESTAURATEUR'S VIEW

"These expense-account rules have hurt us terribly," says Alex Stuart, owner of La Salle du Bois restaurant, in Washington, D.C.

"In the past, when a group of businessmen ate together, one just picked up the tab and charged it. Now they want separate checks. Our headwaiter and captain are having a lot of trouble with this. One night last week we had 12 businessmen eating together and, after the meal, each wanted a separate check.

"I can't see that people are eating less expensive meals. It's just that we don't have the total of customers that we used to have. One thing we have done recently is to shade our prices a bit. We did this because we anticipated trouble with the expense-account problem. * * * But people are eating as much of the expensive steak cuts as ever."

In New Orleans, Antoine's restaurant is "suffering, like the rest of the big restaurants," says manager Ange Alciatore. "We are still crowded * * * but we are not getting the big spenders. People don't stay as long. They don't sit and enjoy their wines. Now they are mostly small parties. They order fish and chicken. Fewer of them order steaks. I have curtailed my beef orders."

EFFECTS IN NEW YORK

Business in the top New York restaurants was down 18 to 30 percent in January, compared with a year ago, industry sources report. Room occupancy in the city's hotels dropped from 72.4 percent in January 1962, to 69.8 percent in January of this year.

Were these declines attributable to the crackdown on expense-account spending? Businessmen tell this story:

"One of New York's largest and newest hotels had a 30-percent occupancy rate over a recent weekend," reports a public relations counsel for the hotel industry. "They turned on all the lights in empty rooms—an old hotelman's trick." Another new hotel, he adds, "is in bad shape. There's been a lot of overbuilding, but that doesn't explain the drop in business. The confusion over tax-deductible travel expense is largely to blame."

"Things have slowed up," admits the auditor of a university club. "My opinion is that we won't be affected as much as the big hotels and restaurants. I'm afraid that, instead of being a tax saver, these new rules will reduce tax revenue. The Government is going to take in less from waiters and from hotels and restaurants."

Walter Hoving, president of Tiffany & Co., agrees. "The Government will actually lose revenue because of the $25 ceiling on gift deductions," he says. "The liquor industry already is making plans to promote sale of Christmas gift packages selling for $24.95.

"People in the liquor business tell me that last year they made up 1 million cases of gift merchandise at Christmas. From the sale of this liquor, the Government got $30 million in taxes."

When the tax rules were being tightened last year, U.S. Treasury and congressional sources estimated that stricter accounting for expense-account spending would produce additional revenue of $65 to $100 million a year.

WHAT A SURVEY SHOWS

A survey by the National Restaurant Association of 387 restaurants in 40 cities around the country indicates that business declined 16.4 percent in January and February, compared with last year. The survey was limited to so-called expense-account restaurants. It found:

Employment in these restaurants fell by 11 percent early this year, which means the loss of 22,000 jobs based on a 1962 payroll of 200,000.

The volume of dinner business has decreased by one-third, or approximately twice the average decline in sales for all types of business.

Waiters report that their tips are substantially lower than a year ago. The average restaurant check is lower. There are more "single" diners; not as many businessmen are taking their wives along for dinner.

One major corporation is reported to have issued an order limiting the cost of an expense-account meal to $2.25.

Musicians are said to have been exceptionally hard hit by the crackdown. Some restaurants which formerly offered entertainment six or seven nights a week now offer it on weekends only. On weekday nights, some businessmen are said to be fearful of reporting business meals at a restaurant where there is dancing on the ground that it might be construed as elaborate entertaining.

A CATERER'S WOES

The owner of a catering firm in Washington complains: "We have definitely felt the impact of the new rules. One customer, for example, always had a lavish party costing from $650 to $900. This year, his bill was $210. The reason, he told us, was that this year he had to pay the bill himself.

"The trend is toward less-expensive foods. Instead of shrimp lobster newburgh, or prime ribs, they serve sandwiches and canapes. Less-expensive brands of liquor are used. The guest list is smaller. Several long-time customers have warned us that they are not going to have parties they have held for many years, because of the change in the expense-account rules."

Says the manager of a businessmen's luncheon club in Cleveland: "Our January business was off roughly about 9 percent. February looks to be about the same. This is abnormal because those usually are our best months.

"The average meal check remains about the same size; there is no cutback there. But there has been a drop in party business—both in size and the amount spent. Instead of spending $5 a person, we get orders for $4 or $4.50 meals. The size of some parties has dropped from 250 to 150 or 175."

At the Port St. Lucie Country Club, in Fort Pierce, Fla., "There is a definite trend toward more careful spending," says manager Robert Yoxall. "Some members are greatly concerned over what they can write off on their expense accounts. The reaction to the new rules has been quite strong."

At the University Club, in Chicago, "a lot of people have cut out luncheon meetings for business groups," reports the assistant manager. "In the last month we have been running about 800 fewer covers [meals] than a year ago. That's a drop of about 10 percent. I've heard that some other clubs are complaining that their business is off more than that."

Max Guggiari, manager of the Imperial House restaurant in Chicago, confirms this trend. His business is off 20 percent.

"The biggest change has been in our banquet business," he says. "People don't have the business banquets they used to have. We have two rooms for such banquets, and now they are seldom used. Customers used to invite crowds to these banquets and charge it to business.

"People don't spend as much. They don't order as many courses. There is less drinking. They don't order chateau-briand steaks as often as before."

FEWER TRIPS FOR WIVES

In Washington, which often overflows with company officials having business with the Government, the manager of a large hotel blames a decline in restaurant revenue and room occupancy on the tax rule changes.

"Double occupancy of rooms has decreased, because fewer wives are being brought along on business trips," he says. So far, however, there has been no cutback in the number or size of cocktail parties.

"Disastrous" is the word used by Mrs. Jean Moran, owner of L'Espionage, an expensive restaurant in Washington, in discussing the expense account rules.

"We have had a terrific drop in business this year. Volume is off about 30 percent," she reports. "We have fewer customers, and the size of the average check is smaller. People quit after two drinks before dinner. Instead of a chateau-briand, they order something less expensive. They drink less wine.

"My other restaurant, the Rue Royale, has not been hurt at all. Prices there are a little lower. People are looking for less expensive restaurants. They feel it will be safer for tax purposes."

THE LUCKY ONES

Some hotels, restaurants, clubs, and places of entertainment report little or no effect on business from the expense account crackdown. Mostly, like Mrs. Moran's Rue Royale, they offer moderate prices.

"Business has been very good," says William Harrington, manager of the Locke-Ober Restaurant in Boston. "January and February were a wee bit better than last year. * * * We have noticed a tremendous demand for our credit cards. Maybe that is because people want to keep a record."

In Dallas, John Outland, manager of the Dallas Country Club, says: "Our club is fortunate in being within the confines of the city, and we get a lot of 'drop ins' for lunch and dinner. There hasn't been any noticeable impact attributable to the tax laws. I've heard that some other city clubs have been hurt through withdrawal of members who hold memberships in a number of clubs."

"We've had no ill effects," says Everett Woxberg, manager of the Evanston Country Club, Evanston, Ill. "If anything, there's actually been in increase in business * * * Some members have said, 'As long as I have this membership I might as well use it to the fullest extent.'

"That's to comply with the ruling that says a member must use his club over 50 percent of the time for business purposes in order to get a tax advantage."

In Cincinnati, Howard Conners, owner of Howard's Catering Service, reports: "Business is picking up. We handle a lot of sales-promotion meetings. I've heard very little talk about the new rules."

Another caterer, William Degenhardt, in Philadelphia, has noticed no direct effects so far. "We have a different clientele than in a place like New York," he says. "People are conservative, have never gone in for lavish menus."

HOW WORKERS ARE AFFECTED

In certain areas, however, effects of the crackdown are described as serious.

Spokesmen for the restaurant and club businesses in Los Angeles say that unemployment has risen to 15 percent of the work force in those fields. Business receipts have declined as much as 20 percent. Both developments are attributed to confusion over the tax rules.

Norman Leavitt, president of the AFL-CIO Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union joint board in Los Angeles, says: "January was the worst month in the history of our industry. * * * It is mostly the class A restaurants that cater to businessmen where the pressure really hurts. Restaurants at the racetracks, or where the customers come from business circles, are in trouble."

Gene Norman, president of Associated Nightclubs of America, says: "In my opinion, the original talk a few months ago about a crackdown scared everybody to death. But the shock is wearing off, and we hope that by spring or summer the situation will return to normal. It was the psychology of fear which hurt us."

BLOW TO BEEF PRICES?

Reports from the Middle West have blamed tightened tax rules for the sagging price of beef cattle. There is said to be less demand for the choicer cuts of beef.

Dr. Dewey Bond, of the American Meat Institute, in Washington, comments: "The main problem with the cattle market is the supply situation. There is a record number of cattle on feed. This hangs over the market."

However, a wholesale meat dealer who supplies the New York hotel, restaurant and passenger-ship trade says of his customers: "They're definitely of the opinion that the expense-account rules have hurt their business."

This dealer believes that a lot of the weakness in the price of beef stems from the fact that prices got so high late in 1962 that housewives began substituting. "When beef gets too high," he explains, "they turn around and buy fish or cook up a batch of spaghetti."

Man's Future in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, delivered an outstanding speech to the Executives Club of Chicago.

Several businessmen in Chicago have written me about the tremendous impression General LeMay made on this very distinguished group of Chicago businessmen. Frankly, this did not surprise me, for I recall General LeMay as my commanding officer during World War II when he took over command of the 20th Air Force in the Pacific and directed the superfort bombings of Japan.

We Americans can be proud of the fact that we have men like General LeMay guiding our Air Force today. Having personally observed and participated in the aerial attack on Japan in World War II, I am convinced that General LeMay's foresight, determination, and tactical perception saved tens of thousands of American lives by helping bring about an early end to World War II in the Pacific.

This Nation owes General LeMay a deep debt of gratitude, and I am very proud today to be able to call my colleagues' attention to General LeMay's Chicago speech. Here again we see a great American and a great soldier helping his Nation better understand the great problem which lies ahead.

Mr. Speaker, General LeMay's speech follows:

MAN'S FUTURE IN SPACE

(Address by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay)

I am happy to be here today. I especially welcome this opportunity to return to Chicago and talk to fellow midwesterners.

Today I plan to discuss the subject of space. Personally, I can think of no single subject that will loom so large in our future. Why I think this, what the implications are, and what we must do about them will be my topics.

Less than a year ago a distinguished American made this statement to the Cadet Corps at West Point:

"You now face a new world, a world of change. The thrust into outer space of the satellite, spheres, and missiles marks a beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind. In the five or more billions of years the scientists tell us it has taken to form the earth, in the three or more billion years of development of the human race, there has never been a more abrupt or staggering evolution."

That man was Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a soldier with an acute awareness of history.

The President has characterized the exploration of space as "one of the greatest adventures of our time." He has said he regards his decision to expedite the national space program as among the most important decisions he will make during his incumbency. There have been statements by other officials to the effect that man's future lies in space and that successful pioneering of space holds the key to man's well-being.

Our space efforts pose unprecedented problems in astrophysics, mathematics, communications, chemistry, biology, medicine, materials, engineering, and mechanics.

Research and development are commanding the attention of our finest management talent.

Stimulated and nourished by Government space programs, our laboratories, industrial plants, and universities are concentrating our best scientific and engineering brains in the largest scale attack on new knowledge in man's memory.

As a result of this national effort, new ideas, new products, and new technology are literally gushing out of our satellite programs, our missile programs, and our manned space flight programs. Back in June, The Denver Research Institute had isolated 145 separate examples where industry was already making products or using processes originating in space science.

It doesn't take much imagination to see how this new space science will benefit the American economy.

The field of materials is rapidly changing. Miniaturization is affecting such diverse applications as weather forecasting, improved packaging techniques, self-contained power supply units and communications.

Medicine and education are undergoing significant changes.

Lessons learned in our space program will improve the physical and intellectual well-being of all peoples.

The new space science has the potential to create an order of magnitude of economic, cultural and scientific wealth that could significantly change the whole fabric of our society in a few short years. It could affect our world more than all the scientific breakthroughs of history—the work of men such as Copernicus, Newton, and Darwin that changed the world of their day and forms the scientific basis for our present thrust into space.

Space is also a new dimension of man's dangers. It is an infinite region that begins only a few miles above Chicago. It is a medium through which—and from which—vastly lethal machines such as ICBM's can move even now. There is no basis for doubt that future space developments could threaten us with even greater dangers. We could be threatened, not merely with new space-born weapons, but with a whole new region of additional possibilities for aggression.

If there is any doubt about this last statement, I direct your attention to Soviet Defense Minister Malinovsky's congratulatory telegram to the Vostock cosmonauts which stated in part:

"Let our foes know what technology and what militance are in the possession of Soviet power."

Are we to shrink from these implications? Of course not and we aren't.

The national space program, on which the United States is embarked, consists of two parts. One part—that of scientific explorations into space—is the function of NASA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The other part—that of providing necessary military capabilities in space—is the function of the Department of Defense. The two parts of the national space program work in coordination; indeed, all of the space shots so far attempted, have been lifted by rockets developed in the military program—and all of the astronauts have been military personnel. NASA's space operations, however, are not intended to de-

velop military space capabilities. This is due to the fact that NASA does not bear military responsibilities, and has all it can do within its capabilities to execute its nonmilitary space program.

The military capabilities I'm thinking of are: interception and inspection of unidentified or noncooperating space objects—operation of weaponry, observation, and a multitude of others.

On the other hand, the basic space science revealed by NASA activities is and will continue to be, useful in respect to military applications. Just recently the Air Force began participating with NASA in the Gemini man-in-space program.

What does this cooperation mean?

As you can readily understand, certain items of military equipment that may ultimately be destined for application to unmanned space vehicles, are much easier to test in their earlier phases with an intelligent and technically trained man present to facilitate the tests. This wouldn't necessarily be true if we had to develop a manned vehicle for the purpose of conducting these particular tests. But given a manner vehicle, such as Gemini, which is going to fly for other reasons anyhow, we can do collateral testing.

The Air Force will use, to the benefit of military space capabilities, all scientific advances and acquisition of knowledge achieved by NASA. We don't plan to wait for a program of fallout—if we can hasten advancement or increase its utilization through collateral efforts. This we are doing, in national interest, toward advancing our considerable space testing and development of approved space programs.

The military space program is necessary because military capabilities address themselves to military threats and are capable of reacting quickly to enemy aggression.

For example, at this time a significant military threat to the United States is posed by intercontinental ballistic missiles. These missiles pass through space en route to their targets. In the overall flight of a ballistic missile, much the greater part of its trajectory is through space. It may be found that the threat of offensive missiles can be dealt with only by utilizing defensive systems involving space orbiting or rendezvous operations. That raises the question of the inflight survivability of our own missiles. By this I mean we must know whether space can provide to an aggressor means of intercepting our counterattacking U.S. missile force. Thus a prime requirement is to become familiar with military operational factors in space. To seek such defensive opportunities as may be afforded us in space it is only logical that we must learn to operate militarily in that medium.

Space also affords unparalleled opportunities for observation and communications. These are critical factors from a military viewpoint. No nation can afford to allow an enemy one-sided exploitation of space or any other medium for communications and observation in wartime. If one of two opponents possesses military capabilities relative to space, and the other does not, there can well be one-sided military exploitation of space in wartime.

Yet the threats from space are perhaps most profound and most deadly in those aspects which cannot yet be described. Space is a new medium about which military knowledge is sketchy. The medium of air, in which military operations have been conducted for less than 50 years, provides a warning. When the aircraft was first seen in flight, no man visualized a great bomber delivering a nuclear bomb on Hiroshima. The military implications of space may prove to be even more dangerous and even more revolutionary than those that have evolved with the aircraft. For our own safety, we must take the lead and remain in the forefront of whatever developments may come. Otherwise, some dark day could witness the space equivalent of a nuclear bomber, except that the target could be in our own country. We must remember that any medium—be it land, sea, air, or space—where man can function and operate military systems—for either offensive or defensive purposes—can be a region of danger to peace and security. In this new medium of space I believe that the military defenses of the Western World must be objective, applicable, and evident.

I want to emphasize the factor of time by which space threats and counter threats are governed. If an unforeseen threat emerges in the new medium of space, months or years will be required to devise, develop, and render operational the necessary defense against that new threat. A military capability for defense is the product not only of technology, but also of training and operational experience.

To attain this capability now, the Air Force space program is directed toward both the development of hardware and the training of the man.

In regard to the latter, we believe that preserving the peace in space cannot be completely relegated to a black box. The trained man, whether in a manned space vehicle or in a ground surveillance control point, will be one of our most valuable assets in our national space efforts—and for our survival.

Keeping space free for peaceful purposes is a fundamental responsibility of the American people.

Other generations of Americans have borne burdens that were heavy and difficult. Abraham Lincoln, speaking of his period of American growth a century ago, said this:

"We cannot escape history. The fiery trials through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. We, even we here, bear the burden and share the responsibility."

Lincoln's words were applicable to the problem of his American generation: to preserve the Union. Lincoln's generation met its responsibility. We cannot afford to do less.

A unique generation of Americans now governs the life of this country. I am speaking, of course, not merely of Government officials, but of all the millions of Americans who take part in steering the great industrial, agricultural, social, and humanitarian triumph that is the United States. This vast complex that we call America is, by far, the most advanced achievement of man. And this present generation of Americans has helped to achieve it, has defended it in painful wars, and now executes for America the task of assuring its continued growth and security. This should be enough to ask of one generation. It has been, and is a heavy burden, sometimes a desperately difficult task. Yet, it is this same generation of Americans that now face the greatest task to confront man since the beginning of time—opening the door to infinite space. We will pass through that door and confront the challenges, the dangers, the uncertainties, and the failures that are sure to come. We will be required to make decisions that will profoundly affect the future of mankind. We will go into boundless space and deal with its unpredictable events, garner its benefits, surmount its threats. We will go where, in billions of years, earthly man has never been. Space is the newest and the greatest task of this unique generation. Future generations will only refine what you and I have the opportunity to pioneer.

And Americans are professional pioneers.

In summary:

I have stated my beliefs on the importance of space—its importance to the future well-being of our country—its importance to the future progress and, possibly, survival of the world.

I have noted some of the implications affecting this new medium—the peaceful ones of scientific research—the threatening ones of aggression.

I have also indicated paths that will open unmeasured horizons to man—paths where our Nation's security may lie—paths that lead straight up, where Americans will pioneer in a new challenge—perhaps the greatest challenge of all—space.

Connecticut Pioneers Job Retraining Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Connecticut Leads Nation in Job Retraining." The article was published in the January 1963 issue of the Connecticut State Journal, an independent monthly journal devoted to government affairs, of which J. Jeremiah Hallas is the publisher and Herbert C. Hallas is editor.

The article is written by the State labor commissioner, Renato Ricciuti. Our very able Governor, the Honorable John N. Dempsey, deserves much credit for initiating the retraining program in Connecticut. We are proud that "Connecticut is the pioneer retraining State in the Nation," in the words of Commissioner Ricciuti, and "the first to take advantage of the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act" voted by Congress last year. Under this act $1,050,000 has been approved for the retraining programs in Connecticut. What has been accomplished? Here are just a few figures, taken from Commissioner Ricciuti's excellent article written near the end of 1962:

> For the State as a whole, the program developed to include trainees in every area. One hundred and eleven courses have been successfully completed. Eleven are now in progress. Two thousand four hundred and twenty six participated in the completed courses, while 359 are attending those presently underway. In the completed courses, 1,823 trainees were graduated.

In recent months new courses have been added and many more hundreds of young people and unemployed workers are gaining new skills and greater hopes for the future. If the youth employment opportunities program, recently proposed by President Kennedy, is enacted by this session of Congress, it will unquestionably benefit many young people in Connecticut in the coming months and help decrease our unemployment rolls.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend Commissioner Ricciuti's article to my colleagues and to all who are interested in the problem of job retraining.

The article follows:

CONNECTICUT LEADS NATION IN JOB RETRAINING

(By Commissioner Renato E. Ricciuti)

There is little doubt that Connecticut is the pioneer retraining State in the Nation; first in time, first in success. This is true not only in terms of being the first to initiate a major program of its own, but it is also true because of the large number of successful trainees who have graduated into employment.

In addition, Connecticut's experience with its own program put the State in a position to be the first to take advantage of the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act and to achieve, under this program, the first and most extensive success. But, beyond the sheer force of statistical accomplishment are the successful and equally significant experiments in terms of philosophy and procedures.

In his inaugural address to the 1961 General Assembly, Governor Dempsey declared his intention to make Connecticut workers more employable. He observed, "The skilled workman is one of Connecticut's most valued assets. . . . When new skills are required, we intend to be sure that our workers are trained in them; also, in this period of research, we are determined to make those that are out of work more employable."

Soon afterward, the Governor met with Education Commissioner William J. Sanders and me and directed us to undertake a pilot retraining effort in Bridgeport. It was clear, at that time, that the disturbing paradox of high employment and labor shortages in certain skilled areas would continue even when the economy moved upward from the cyclical downturn. Through the pilot program, it was hoped to determine (1) which workers could be effectively adapted to new skills and demands, (2) how much retraining would be required, and (3) how best to utilize available public and private training facilities.

The basic philosophy of the Connecticut retraining effort was formulated in the initial Bridgeport retraining course. As in Bridgeport, no program has ever been undertaken before a labor market survey determined the job needs of industry in the area. As a prerequisite to any program, the community, particularly local industry and business as well as organized labor, was expected to participate actively with conviction in the value of retraining. In other words, the basic philosophy of Connecticut retraining has been to make it meaningful in terms of the economic facts of life of each participating community. What was to be avoided was the training of workers for nonexistent jobs. What was to be reasonably assured was the placement of successful trainees upon graduation.

We recognized that proper selection of trainees would also be an important factor in the success of the program. This assignment was given to the Connecticut State Employment Service which, through its interviewing, testing, and counseling services, chose candidates who not only needed new skills but also had the ability to benefit from retraining.

The first group of 15 unemployed workers completed a 6 weeks retraining course as machine shop operators in June 1961. The success of the Bridgeport program attracted immediate national attention and requests from many Connecticut communities for similar programs.

Expansion of the program into other Connecticut labor market areas was undertaken with the same careful procedures. It was not assumed that conditions in other areas would follow the Bridgeport pattern. Each community received the same careful study and determination of needs. Extension of the program came first in those areas eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act. Others were brought in rapidly until, to date, all major communities have taken part in the Connecticut retraining program under the Governor's community action retraining program which was expanded by Federal assistance under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

One program deserving special mention started soon after the initial Bridgeport effort. The Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp. had indicated the need for thousands of new skilled workers. There was little hope for the recruitment of skilled workers or trainees to meet their needs from the immediate New London area which had one of the lowest unemployment rates in the State. Within easy commuting distance was the Danielson area which, in contrast, had a labor surplus problem with one of the State's highest rates of unemployment.

An intensive retraining effort was undertaken to provide welders, pipefitters, shipfitters, electricians, machinists, and sheetmetal workers needed so urgently to build our nuclear submarine force. Forty-five courses have been completed in these trades and 613 of the 677 graduate trainees, from the Danielson and Norwich-New London areas, are now employed at the Electric Boat Co. Fifty-five participants are taking part in present programs with an additional 100 scheduled to be trained as pipefitters in the near future.

For the State as a whole, the program developed to include trainees in every area. One hundred and eleven courses have been successfully completed. Eleven are now in progress. Two thousand, four hundred and twenty-six participated in the completed courses while 359 are attending those presently under way. In the completed courses, 1823 trainees were graduated. There were an insignificant number of failures since most of the dropouts left for earlier employment, discovering that employers would hire them even without the full course. A few were recalled to former jobs. Included in the above total were 577 graduates in 29 completed programs with 10 more now in progress under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Those in progress include 345 trainees.

While most courses have been of an industrial nature such as machine shop operator, power sewing machine operator, sheetmetal worker, buffer and those mentioned above for the Electric Boat Co., there have been a few in the commercial and service trade areas such as typing, and several courses are now under way to train cooks and formal waiters.

It is important to emphasize that many of the courses were of an orientation nature. Although trainees attended on a full-time basis for anywhere between 3 to 8 weeks, many of the areas of skill require a great deal more time before a person can be considered fully accomplished in these crafts. As expected, most employers have continued the training on-the-job and in a large number of cases, workers are now in full apprenticeship programs.

Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, $1,050,000 has been approved by the Federal Government for Connecticut programs. This includes funds available to the State Department of Education through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for instructional costs and money allocated to the Connecticut Labor Department for training allowances. Additional funds have been provided to cover costs connected with the administration of these programs within both departments.

In addition to its major objective of putting unemployed workers into jobs with new skills that are not likely to become obsolete, the Connecticut retraining program has had other important results. It assists in supplying skilled craftsmen to an industrial complex that has always depended on its high percentage of skilled workers (highest ratio of skilled workers to total workers of any State in the Nation). This has not only been done directly through retraining classes but also as a result of the large number of apprentice candidates discovered through their participation in our training courses.

The program has also had a catalytic effect upon training in private industry by arousing the interest of many companies in apprentice training programs and other on-the-job training. Connecticut is now a training-conscious State and this consciousness cannot help spilling over into all areas of job preparation. There is good reason to believe that the growing interest on the part of school administrators in work-study programs has been accelerated by the example of adult retraining at the State level.

We are likely to find less and less idle training facilities in the State of Connecticut. Our vocational and technical schools, which have provided the facilities for retraining, will soon be in constant use throughout the year as we expand our job preparation and retraining programs. This will be particularly true if the Federal Youth Employment Opportunities Act is passed so that we can extend our efforts to include a larger proportion of young people.

Connecticut has reason to be proud of its leadership in the retraining field. Our success, however, has not distorted our sense of proportion. Retraining is an important new and proven weapon in our fight against wasteful unemployment. Since the depression of the 1930's and during more recent recessions, we have learned to examine the problem of unemployment more critically with an eye to its quality as well as its quantity. While never welcome, economic distortions are likely to continue to accompany industrial change. We need not be unnecessarily fearful if we are willing to apply the same courage, energy, and cooperation to future problems as we have to the necessity for retraining.

Liberty and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Jackman, president of Investors League, Inc., America's oldest union of investors, has brought to my attention an article by the eminent business economist, Bradford B. Smith, appearing in the March issue of the Freeman magazine, entitled "Liberty and Taxes." The topics dealt with are of such serious and widespread current importance that, under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY AND TAXES

(By Bradford B. Smith)

The American society is founded on the idea of individual liberty. It is an abnormal society, for most of the social organizations of history are of the authoritarian form in which a ruling class exploits the governed.

Individual liberty is definable only as the absence of coercion between men. It means not only that no man must initiate physical injury or confinement of another, or take his

property or good name, without his consent; but also and most especially it means that not even government must do these things except to punish those who do them to others, provided private property may be taken for public use if just compensation is given in return. Individual liberty is thus obtainable only when government's superior power to coerce is employed only to cancel out fraud, predation, coercion, and monopoly abuse between men.

If this definition is observed, one may note the following:

1. Freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from man-imposed fear or want are automatic because there is no way that one may restrict such freedom to another.

2. Markets are automatically voluntary and free, for if no man may take another's property without his consent, then each man is free to enjoy the fruits of his own efforts and dispose of them as he sees fit in voluntary exchange for the fruits of others' efforts.

3. Production and marketing are automatically competitive for no one has power (unless backed by government) to prevent another from engaging in pursuits similar to his own; as a corollary monopoly is automatically ruled out unless the government's power to coerce is invoked in its behalf as in franchises, cartels, and labor unions.

4. The sanctity of contract is automatically implied because one who takes property and does not fulfill his contract takes it without the consent of him with whom he contracted.

5. The right to work for and quit working for one's neighbor (within whatever contractual terms are established) is also automatic; as is also the coequal but often unrecognized right to hire and to stop hiring one's neighbor (within the contractual terms).

These matters may seem remote from rather than relevant to Federal taxation in America; yet they are fundamental, for taxation is the systematic taking, without specifically definable quid pro quo, of the individual's substance for the support of government. Taxation, because it is necessary and because it is taking under constraint, is a principal danger to the maintenance of individual liberty in America.

WITH CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED

The key to Federal taxation that is in conformity with individual liberty is epitomized in the phrases "with the consent of the governed" or "taxation by representation." Taxation that is truly with the consent of the taxpayers, as distinguished from being imposed by some on others, is fully within the definition of individual liberty. "No taxation without representation" was one of the slogans of the Revolutionary War out of which came our society. It could only have meant representation of the taxpayers, for the tax tyranny of a foreign king does not differ essentially from the tax tyranny of a domestic group. The determination of the principles of taxation in consonance with liberty thus becomes one of ascertaining just how true "consent" is steadfastly to be secured.

Taxes cannot be determined by everybody in a mass meeting. They are determined by elected representatives. Specifically, taxes are originated in the House of Representatives where the representation is according to population. The task then is to see to it that this body is truly representative of the taxpayers.

THIS TYRANNY FORESEEN

This adjustment was provided in the Constitution (before the adoption of the 16th amendment in 1913) by providing that all direct taxes (of which income taxes are the most direct) should be apportioned among the States in exactly the same way that representation is given in the House—that is, according to population. That way it was impossible for a majority to get together and support a direct tax that fell more heavily upon a minority than by the same act it bore upon the majority. The principle of the voluntary was preserved. The majority had to assume a tax burden voluntarily before it could impose one (but not a greater one) on a minority. Those in the minority were constrained to pay, it is true, but only as much as those of the majority imposed on themselves. Each voter had one vote in electing representatives to decide the tax and each was therefore to pay the same tax his representatives levied.

No better protection for identifying Federal taxation with liberty could have been devised; there is no surer way to reidentify them than to repeal the 16th amendment which granted unlimited power to majorities to impose direct taxes on minorities not paid by themselves, and which has made possible an orgy of demagogic tax exploitation under the slogan, "Soak the rich." There is, of course, no freedom but only tax tyranny when the mass of the electorate supports heavy taxation of a small minority, while itself escaping the burden.

Contrary minded people say those of greater means "can afford to pay more" or have "greater ability to pay." To some extent this is undoubtedly true and to it consideration will shortly be given. But it still remains true that tampering with the identity between voting and paying is tampering with individual liberty in America. It is far better that the majority surely and voluntarily vote taxes on itself while a minority escapes, for that is freedom, than that a majority impose taxes on a minority which the majority escapes, for that is tyranny. The majority has power to protect itself, the minority does not, as pointed out by Madison in the 10th Federalist paper.

PROPORTIONAL TAXATION

If everyone paid the same tax, then it is conceivable that the tax would equal the whole of some small incomes, and be but a fraction of some large incomes. It would deprive some of the whole fruit of their exertions and others of diminishing fractions of the fruits of theirs. It is apparent that equality in taxation does not necessarily mean equality in relative burden or sacrifice. If we distributed taxes so as to make the tax burden, rather than the tax amount, equal to voters, would we then still have taxpaying and tax voting equated? Would the identity be even closer? There are certain reasons and precedents for supposing this would be the case. But what is an "equal burden"? Perhaps the closest to the fundamental that we can get is to recognize that when man is born into the world he has only his limited lifespan at his disposal. It is the element of man's time involved that gives value to things. Air is necessary but has no value because it is abundant. Conditioned air has value because it involves the time of men to provide and operate the mechanisms to produce it. Gold and diamonds take time to discover and mine. An equal burden to men of unequal capacity can then be deemed a burden that conscripts an approximately equal amount of each person's time. The earning power of men may differ but an equal proportion of each person's income tends to represent an equal conscription of time or enjoyment and hence an equal burden.

This recognizes that a spoonful of food to the well-fed would yield more human satisfaction if fed to the hungry—the law of diminishing utility; but it holds that a 10 percent of each person's income tends to be equally prized.

THE MORAL PRECEDENT

If direct taxes are apportioned in proportion to income instead of in proportion to population, while the voice in determining the tax is in proportion to population, we then have established, in the light of the preceding, a reasonable identity between tax determination and human disinclination to pay it. This recognizes equality between men in terms of their each having one life to live, without denying the obvious inequality in their capacities; it protects freedom to live by providing that taxes shall substantially infringe equally upon each person's lifetime.

In support of proportional, direct taxation there is much moral and legal precedent. Tithing started with Moses and has had religious sanction ever since. There are no exemptions. Sales taxes, excises, and customs are collected in proportion to the means expended in purchasing; property taxes are percentages of valuations. These would be the principal sources of revenue were the 16th amendment repealed, and so its repeal would automatically give us approximate proportional taxation. Military conscription takes the same time from each subject to it. Business assessments and distributions are apportioned according to value participation. Proportional taxation of income is the only taxation that leaves the relative distribution of income unchanged. That distribution as determined in a society by the voluntary decisions of its members is the one which represents the maximum attainable human satisfaction in terms of sacrifice to secure it. Thus no one receives a money income in a free society except that he or his property render the community a service voluntarily paid for by the community at its own price. He who secures greater income renders greater service. The community purchases his products or services in greater measure than those of others (thus giving him greater income) only because it wants to—because the shoes he makes, for example, give the greater satisfaction. To redistribute the income under coercion is to cross the community's voluntary decision and thus necessarily to diminish the sum of human satisfaction.

Straight proportional taxation is the only practical and definite, arithmetic principle of direct taxation that there is between the principles of (a) everybody paying the same amount of tax and (b) income equalization, that is, taxation, coupled with subsidy, which results in everyone having the same income after the tax and subsidy.

If anything, proportional taxation takes too much rather than too little of larger incomes, if we consider taxes as payment for the cost of benefit conferred by government. It costs no more to light, clean, and maintain order in the streets for the benefit of those of larger income than for those of lesser; or to maintain courts or count votes; or to provide schools. Many government costs are per capita costs and justify per capita taxes. It is, of course, erroneous to hold that one's income—whatever it is—is a benefit conferred by the community on the individual, for it is as much a measure of the service rendered the community by the individual; they are quits. It is only from the viewpoint of equal sacrifice, of equal disinclination to pay a levied tax, of equal infringement on one's living, of equal burden, that proportional, as distinguished from equal, direct taxation may be justified under the principle of taxation by representation.

PROGRESSIVE TAXATION

Progressive taxation of income by the Federal Government, which is currently practiced in the extreme, provides, first, that many voters of small income are either exempted entirely from paying, or pay very little, and, secondly, that successive increments of larger incomes are taxed at progressively increased rates that become confiscatory.

There is no justification in morals or in the principles of individual liberty for progressive taxation. It is the simple looting through law of the more productive by the

more numerous but less productive. Its appeal is demagogic, and its result is communism, which in turn is but a transitory stage in the evolution away from liberty into dictatorship. The endorsement of progressive taxation is, knowingly or unknowingly, the endorsement of communism, and sincere endorsement of progressive taxation, motivated often by generosity, is unwittingly one of the worst forces undermining individual liberty in America.

Those defending progressive taxation have no principles to rely upon short of taxation which equates all incomes after taxation. That is why they unwittingly support communism. The progressive taxation argument boils down to vague assertions that the poor cannot pay much and the rich ought to pay higher rates. When asked how much higher, there is no answer save that it is a matter of judgment—which in practice comes down to the venal philosophy of plucking the goose just short of killing it. Acceptance of the idea of progressive taxation thus transforms the legislative process of tax levying into pressure group demand to make the other fellow pay the tax in exchange for the group's political favor, instead of united and uniform decision of proper burden to be placed equally on all constituents.

PUNITIVE MEASURES

Some hold that large incomes have got to represent exploitation of others or luck, simply because they are large, and that tax confiscation is a just punishment. This overlooks:

1. No one gets a money income in our society unless it is voluntarily paid him by the community at its own appraisal of the service he or his property renders in exchange. The community is quits with the individual at that point. The argument is weird which holds that he whose industry provides the community with 100 pairs of shoes, for example, should be punished as compared with him who provides but 10 pairs.

2. No one constrains competitors through monopoly except with the support of government. Monopoly income should be corrected by withdrawing the support rather than by taxation to include also non monopolistic income.

3. The thought that it is just to deprive people by taxation of unjust income is a travesty on justice. Were income unjustly secured, justice would require its return to those from whom it was received. To loot the looter through taxation is to engage in highjacking, not justice.

CARE OF THE POOR

Those favoring progressive taxation claim that those of small income should pay little or no tax (be exempted). They can't afford to pay, it is claimed. But if so, then they can't afford to pay for anything else either. There is no reason why, in proportion to their means, they should not pay for government as for other things; there is vital reason why they should if they vote. Thus the argument is essentially an appeal to charity; but the practice is something with an uglier name unless it also provides that the man who pays insignificant or no tax shall have no vote in selecting representatives in the tax-determining body. For otherwise the body degenerates into levying taxes not on those it represents but on others. This is tax tyranny, not taxation by consent, not liberty.

The care and the relief of the unfortunate in a voluntary society must be voluntarily undertaken by those who care for them, if the voluntary society is to be preserved. If that care is constrained (as through taxation) then we no longer have a voluntary society. When a man voluntarily gives something to another, we have a voluntary society, but when one man votes benefit to himself at compulsory cost to others, then even though there is the same transfer of value, the morals of the robber have been substituted for those of charity. Charity and coercion, that is, government, cannot be mixed and freedom remain unimpaired.

TAX PRINCIPLES

From the foregoing there emerges one central principle that transcends all others: If we are to have individual liberty in America, then taxation by representation of the taxpayers must ever be jealously preserved. With taxation initiated in a body where representation is per capita this means that direct tax burdens must be equally distributed among the people. An equal burden is deemed one which consumes an equal proportion of each person's life, which in practice means an equal proportion of income. The one thing always to dread is the laying of a tax burden on minorities by majorities which the majority itself escapes. That is tax despoliation. From this central principle more detailed principles derive:

NO EXEMPTIONS

1. If individual income is to be taxed, all of it, from whatever source derived, by whomever received, in whatever amount, should be taxed at the same rate. This neither soaks the rich nor burdens the poor; it is the only evenhanded principle that is practical.

NO COMPLICATIONS

2. Taxation should be simple in principle and in application in order that there shall constantly be general understanding of it, for otherwise there can never be surety that the consent of the taxpayers is truly rather than misguidedly secured. By the same token Federal taxes should never be hidden, and it is preferable that their payment be painful rather than painless. The levying of hidden taxes is a practice more fitting to an authoritarian State where a ruling class endeavors to keep the governed contented like cows regularly to be milked. In America the preservation of taxation by representation requires that those whose consent is requisite under that principle should at all times be distinctly aware of the tax.

NO PUNISHMENT

3. Federal taxation should be uniform geographically and with respect to the tax base. This means that if there is to be a sales tax on consumption, all things should be taxed, and at the same rate. If so-called luxuries are taxed and so-called necessities are not, this is but an evasion of the principle of equalized burden. It is obviously an effort by a majority to make a minority endure a greater tax burden than the majority is willing to assume. If the buying of tobacco, liquor, and fur coats is sinful, then taxing them rather than forbidding them, is not the practice of virtue but the commercialization of sin for revenue.

NO HANDOUTS

4. The Federal Government should make no expenditures of any kind for which in return the Government does not receive an equivalent quid pro quo. The dispensing of gifts by the Government lightens the net cost of Government to the recipients. By giving back part (or more) than was taken in taxes the result is the same as if the burden of taxation had been lightened for the selected group. Moreover, the power to make gifts of other people's money is the power to command political obeisance and a most dangerous instrument in the hands of power-hungry politicians. This means, for example, that "social security" costs should be voluntarily assumed and financed exclusively by the benefited group—never at the expense of the general taxpayer.

NO GIFT OR ESTATE TAXES

5. Taxation of estates or gifts by the Federal Government is incompatible with the principles of liberty here enunciated. To tax estates or gifts is to deny to the individual the right to possess, dispose of, or exchange the fruits of his efforts as he sees fit.

NO DOUBLE TAXATION

6. There is no place in the framework of liberty for the direct Federal taxation of corporate income. Since corporate income is taxed again when paid to stockholders, the corporation income tax represents an attempt doubly to tax a minority group. This does not mean that corporations or any other form of business enterprise should not be employed in the collection of taxes. They may represent the points at which taxes may be collected most conveniently, economically, and promptly.

NO DEFICIT FINANCING

7. The voters of one period should not tax those of a later period. Those of the later period are not represented in the instant taxing body, and hence today's taxation of the citizens of tomorrow distinctly violates the principle of taxation by representation of those who pay the taxes. This means that to increase its expenditures government should not incur debt, because the burden of its redemption is thereby imposed on future taxpayers.

PROSPECTS

Few individuals perceive the danger to individual liberty in America in progressive direct taxation, or who, perceiving, have the courage to denounce the principle and its practice. This is thoroughly understandable for a number of reasons: It is a long time since we fought a war to get taxation by representation, and the realization of the meaning of the phrase, its vital importance to liberty, its relation to "the power of the purse" have grown dim. The appeal of progressive taxation is double edged—it appeals to the mass voter's greed that the rich should pay the taxes, and simultaneously the greed is glossed over by invoking the spirit of generosity and Christian charitableness of the more productive, for which Americans are notable.

The disappearance of liberty in America through tax despoliation is so natural an evolution that it has been feared and predicted by statesmen and historians down through our history: Madison recognized the danger in the tenth Federalist paper, but pointed out it would be unlikely to happen under the Constitution then proposed for adoption—nor could it until the 16th amendment, a century and a quarter later. Lord Macaulay in 1857 predicted it would happen in the course of the next century, when in hard times, the mass of the voters would listen to the demagogues who promised if elected, to despoil the more productive for the benefit of the less productive.

The real hope for the recovery of individual liberty in America lies with millions of individual citizens and in the prospect that they may rediscover the nature of government. It lies in their rediscovery that government wields the monopoly in coercion; that it has in the past and will in the future be ever subject to awful temptation to employ or delegate its coercive power for seemingly benevolent purposes beyond the limits compatible with the maintenance of individual liberty; that the limits once broken, its power tends to feed upon itself; that government tends always toward becoming master and always away from remaining as servant; and that persistently these tendencies must be jealously and rigidly checked if individual liberty is to be preserved.

Dean Rusk Versus U.S. Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the organizations in the forefront of the battle against communism is the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations, representing a substantial number of captive nations of Eastern Europe. In its bulletin of July 1962, there appeared an article by Prince Niko Nakashidze entitled "Dean Rusk Versus U.S. Congress."

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD at this point excerpts from this article.

DEAN RUSK VERSUS U.S. CONGRESS

In 1959 the U.S. Congress adopted a resolution on Captive Nations Week which became Public Law 86-90 after a proclamation by President Eisenhower.

This resolution by the U.S. Congress was of world historical importance and was entirely in keeping with the humanist and democratic principles on which the new world order is to be set up.

In this era of huge political and social upheavals and of the demands of the nations to live as free individuals and nations, one cannot and must not resort to palliative means, since this method is sure to result in defeat.

The Russian Communist power is advancing and deceptively makes use of the propaganda watchwords which tally with the national, political, and social demands of individuals and people.

There must be no hesitancy in this conflict with the Russian Communist world, a conflict in which the existence of the free civilized world is at stake; one must act in keeping with the demands of the times and must meet the national, political, and social wishes of the peoples. In this mighty global struggle between two worlds—the free Western and the Eastern peoples on one side, and the Russian Communist colonial empire and its vassal states on the other side, the United States plays a leading part. And the free peoples as well as the peoples subjugated by Russia set their hopes on the United States.

Hence the resolution of the U.S. Congress on Captive Nations Week was a manifesto to the effect that the American people are conscious of their historical world mission and, true to their traditions, are prepared to support individuals and peoples and to assist them in their fight for their human rights and for national freedom and independence.

This resolution of the U.S. Congress was thus a declaration of the practical application of the human rights that are recognized in the civilized world and of the principles of modern international law. We were convinced that U.S. policy would now enter into a new and correct stage with regard to the subjugated peoples and that new tactics and a new strategy would now be introduced in the fight against the dire threat posed by the Russian Communist colonial empire, the so-called Soviet Union.

BUT WHAT HAS ACTUALLY HAPPENED IN THE MEANTIME?

This resolution of the U.S. Congress infuriated all the Russians at home and abroad. Khrushchev raged like a madman, the Soviet press resorted to insults and threats, and the Russian emigrants and their press hysterically shouted for help. All of them affirmed that the disintegration of the Russian Empire would mean the end of the world, and they alleged that the subjugated peoples in this Empire were thriving and were leading a happy and secure life. The Russians were, in other words, utterly shocked; they were obviously so dull of intellect and so obsessed by imperialist paranoia that they do not even realize that, with or without the help of the United States, the Russian colonial imperium is doomed to decay and disintegration. Like the other Empires, the Russian Empire, too, will not escape this fate. For this is the inevitable course of the historical process of a new era.

Moscow on the one hand, and the Russian emigrants on the other hand, now did their utmost to make this resolution invalid, that is to say, to shelve it and relegate it to the archives.

The influential coexistentialists, the pro-Russian and pro-Soviet circles that have good contacts with official departments, now got to work. On the pretext that this resolution was an obstacle to relations with Moscow, they managed to persuade the State Department to shelve this resolution, so that it is not used as a guiding principle of the latter's policy and is not regarded by the said Department as expedient. Thus the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union have not been accepted as independent nations, that have a right to an independent state, by the State Department under the leadership of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, and they have simply been written off.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND ITS ATTITUDE

The friends of the subjugated peoples were anxious that the Congress resolution on Captive Nations Week should be expressed in concrete forms. Thus they suggested that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations should be formed in the House of Representatives. Congressman D. J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is the actual initiator of this resolution. About 40 similar proposals were put forward, and the Republican congressional policy committee on principle also advocates such a committee.

This special House committee would have the task of studying and examining the problems of the subjugated nations and, if needs be, of bringing in the necessary proposals in parliament in order to instruct the Government as to the necessary measures to take.

HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, requested State Secretary Dean Rusk to express his opinion on this question. Mr. Dean Rusk's attitude with regard to the formation of such a special committee is absolutely negative. As can be seen from his reply to Chairman H. W. SMITH, he does not, on principle, share the views expressed in the Captive Nations Week resolution regarding the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union.

The reason he gives for his attitude is allegedly the international political interests of the United States and he tries to deny the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union their right to their own independent states inasmuch as he puts forward false and illogical arguments in favor of Russia with regard to historical and constitutional matters.

We realize that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is not acquainted with the history of our peoples and that he is not an expert on the subject of international and constitutional law and we do not take this fact amiss. But we know who his advisers, so-called East experts, are, and we also know for whom these international nihilists and mafias are working.

Mr. Dean Rusk has adopted their advice and thus he, and not an anonymous adviser, is responsible for the opinion of the State Department. For this reason, this reply is addressed to him.

We deeply regret that we are obliged to argue with an American statesman in office. But it is a question of the fundamental and rudimentary rights which all individuals and nations in the free world enjoy and which Mr. Dean Rusk is denying our individuals and peoples. Hence we cannot in this case show any consideration for official titles.

In their native countries our peoples are forcibly silenced and not allowed to express any opinion of their own by the Russian tyrants to whom Mr. Dean Rusk is willing to concede this rule.

As the authorized spokesmen of the subjugated peoples in the free world it is our duty to represent their rights and their interests. And we shall always work for their cause wholeheartedly and shall worthily represent them.

Our ancient, historical, civilized peoples do not deserve to be denied the right to live as free individuals and peoples, and it is equally false to represent the rule of the Russians over them as a historical fact.

It is unworthy of a civilized and Christian country to deny individuals their human rights for reasons of political expediency.

THE CONCEPTION: THE SOVIET UNION—A HISTORICAL STATE

In the said letter Mr. Dean Rusk writes as follows: "any reference to these areas (he is referring to the countries Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia, which are member states of the Soviet Union and not areas, as he maintains) places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of an historical state."

The Soviet Union, which Mr. Rusk designates as an "historical state," has originated as a result of the military conquest of foreign countries. These countries seceded from the Russian tsarist empire after its collapse and restored their independent states. They were then violated by the superior military strength of Bolshevist Russia under Lenin and were subjected to Russian rule. This Russian state was in those days not called the Soviet Union but the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (R.S.F.S.R.). Thus the Red armies of this Russian Republic occupied these foreign countries. Those who represent the power and violence in this Republic, later renamed the Soviet Union, into which the non-Russian countries were incorporated by force, are the Russians.

These non-Russian countries and peoples neither were nor are historical or ethnographical parts of Russia and the Russian nation. For hundreds of years they were free nations with independent states of their own.

Hence it is not only nonsense but also a falsification of historical facts and an impermissible distortion of legal facts to designate the Soviet Union as an "historical state." Whether this is done in ignorance or intentionally, is immaterial, for neither the one nor the other is permissible in the case of a statesman.

Various empires existed in the 19th and 20th centuries, and thus, according to Mr. Rusk's point of view, they were likewise "historical states"—for instance, the Turkish Empire, as well as the Austro-Hungarian, British, Belgian, Dutch, French, and German Empires. But they no longer exist; some of them were disintegrated as a result of wars, whilst others voluntarily renounced their foreign dominions. Since the two World Wars many peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa have gained their national freedom. They have restored their independent states, or else the latter were founded by the former colonial peoples.

The Russian imperium alone continues to exist. If one considers the expansion of its sphere of influence during the period in which the other empires ceased to exist and so many peoples became free, then it is obvious to what extent this Soviet Russian empire, which Mr. Rusk designates as an "historical state," is a legal state.

The Soviet Union is a Russian colonial empire, the most ruthless colonial empire in the world, which rules foreign countries and peoples and in which people are deprived of the most fundamental human rights. But this peoples' prison is in Mr. Rusk's opinion an "historical state" which must not be dismembered.

To recognize the Russians' right of possession over the foreign peoples of the Soviet Union as legally valid and to regard their problem as an internal state affair of Russia, would be equivalent to abnegating all the generally acknowledged moral and legal principles. A right enforced by violence cannot be acknowledged as a legally valid state of affairs. And no right can be based on wrong.

Those who refuse to recognize the right of the peoples subjugated by the Russians in the Soviet Union to their own independent states and who advocate the preservation of this despotic empire, cannot be regarded as humanists and democrats.

THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION AND THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE AS VALID PRINCIPLES

In the opinion of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the Soviet Union is thus a "historical state" whose state rights cannot be contested, and hence the rule of the Russians (for this "historical state," the Soviet Union, is nothing but a Russian colonial empire) over the foreign peoples that have been forcibly and brutally incorporated into this Soviet Union is legitimate.

Thus Mr. Rusk refuses to concede to the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union the right to freedom and to self-determination which is the acknowledged right of all individuals and peoples. And hence he regards these ancient historical and civilized peoples as inferior peoples, who do not deserve to lead an independent state existence. And this in an era in which so many African and Asian free states have been founded, whose peoples have never existed as independent nations and whose masses are on the lowest level of civilization.

We should now like to show Mr. Rusk how legally untenable and how ethically confused his views and arguments are.

The human rights furthered by Christianity, attained by political and social progress and recognized by the civilized world, resulted in these principles being conceded to those nations which constitute a natural community of individuals. For there can be no freedom of the individual if the nation itself is not free. Thus the principle of the right of self-determination of the peoples was established.

The principles of the right of the individual to freedom and to the free development of his personality, to protection of his human dignity, and of the right of self-determination of the peoples constitute the fundamental principles of the present human and international law.

It is stated in the statutes for human rights: "All peoples and all nations shall have the right of self-determination, namely the right freely to determine their political, economic, social, and cultural status."

But according to Mr. Rusk, these principles do not hold good for the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union.

According to the statutes of the U.N.O., article I, relations between the nations are to be based on the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of the peoples. Article III of these statutes stresses that, in their international relations, all members shall refrain from any threats or application of violence directed against the territorial inviolability or the political independence of any one state.

Mr. Rusk denies our peoples the right to these terms; he regards their demands and claims as being barred by the statute of limitations. At the same time, he completely disregards the fact that the claim of individuals and peoples to restitution for a wrong that has been done them, that is a right that has been violated, and to restoration of the said right and to rehabilitation of their human dignity can never be barred by the statute of limitations.

As long as a people has not reconciled itself to the state of affairs which has been created by arbitrariness and force, and as long as it refuses to accept the wrong that has been done to it and does not cease to raise its legal claims, such claims are valid.

Our peoples have never reconciled themselves to the foreign despotic rule of the Russians; they have constantly raised their legal claims, have refused to accept the wrong that has been done to them, and have fought for their freedom and made countless sacrifices.

Youth Employment and the Walsh-Healey Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, in these times when this House and its committees are giving close attention and concern to the problem of our unemployed youth, it is pertinent, I think, to consider actions or failure to act on the part of the Secretary of Labor that is contributing to this difficult problem. I refer to the refusal of the Secretary to make a determination of rates for beginners and trainees in the conveyor industry in Ohio, and to the resulting effect of his determination of the $1.70 per hour as the minimum wage for the industry. In this connection I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this House the following letter and material of Mr. Andrew Kornylak, president of the M-H Standard Corp., of Hamilton, Ohio, and certain material accompanying that letter:

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your recent Walsh-Healey Act increase of the minimum wage in the conveyer industry to $1.70 will do harm to our people and our economy.

I have previously enumerated a number of objections but at this time, discuss only one of them—the harmful effects on the welfare of marginal workers and particularly on our youth. These youngsters, faced with earning their way through college or learning a trade through on-the-job training will have difficulty finding an employer willing to start them at $1.70 per hour.

I am sure you must have, in your early years, been fortunate enough to work as a beginner, learning a trade or profession on the job. I'm sure your employer had a personal interest in you, even if he did not pay the equivalent of $1.70 per hour. He did not consider you as a statistic but as a youth, willing to learn and deserving of all the advice and training he could give you.

Youth today is entitled to the same opportunity. Your recent decision will not permit them to have it.

It will stop the training program we have at our plant. The enclosed tabulation demonstrates what we have been able to do in our plant. This program would be terminated by your decree.

We request that you withdraw your recent determination and as the Nation's leader in the employment and welfare field, that you spearhead a movement to repeal the Walsh-Healey Act, since this act is unnecessary, oppressive, and in other ways, detrimental to the country.

In the absence of the above action, we appeal that you at least incorporate a provision in your final determination to permit:

1. Beginners to work for 1 year subject only to the Congress-approved $1.15 minimum.

2. Unskilled and elderly workers to work for unlimited time, subject only to the Congress-approved $1.15 minimum.

Your favorable consideration of either proposal will be a service to the entire country.

Very truly yours,

ANDREW KORNYLAK,
President, M-H Standard Corp.

HAMILTON, OHIO.

GOVERNMENT NEWS RELEASE DOES NOT CONVEY TRUE STORY

On February 19, 1963, our Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, issued an innocent-sounding release in which he "finds that a minimum wage of $1.70 per hour prevails in the conveyor industry" and states "the employment of apprentices and handicapped workers at special rates less than the proposed minimum would be governed by general regulations under the act."

A number of people when asked for the meanings of the above two statements unanimously thought statement No. 1 meant workers in the conveyor industry were now enjoying a minimum wage of $1.70. They thought statement No. 2 meant that although $1.70 was now being legally established as the new minimum wage for the conveyor industry, trainees and handicapped workers could be employed at lower rates.

Actually, neither of these two interpretations is true. Therefore, if you were an editor and printed the statement as released, you would be misleading your readers.

The facts behind the first quote are that by its own statistics, the Labor Department has determined that one-half the industry paid $1.70 or more to all its employees. The Labor Department then considers this to be the prevailing minimum which must now be met by the other half of the industry.

The second quote is clarified by simply going to the Secretary's full statement as printed in the Federal Register:

"No such provision will be made in this determination because there is no evidence indicating the prevalence of special beginner rates."

If this actual meaning jars you, let's now investigate what the Secretary means by "no evidence." I now quote Jack Karlin, Labor Department economist, replying to James Miller, Labor Department solicitor:

Question. "Does the questionnaire (used to collect the data which comprises the evidence provide anywhere for information as to a beginner's rate?"

Answer. "No it does not."

Do we and the Labor Department speak the same language?

Is it in the national interest to lull the public into believing something which is not true?

AMERICAN YOUTH WILL BE ROBBED OF OPPORTUNITY

The establishment of the new minimum sets up a $1.70 barrier to beginners trying to make a start in industry. If we allow this decision to stick, we will be robbing our own sons and daughters of the opportunity to learn, to feel useful, to be useful, to shape their own futures. We have already trained and legislated our boys and girls into a use-

less existence during the period in their lives when they have the most energy and eagerness to learn. Then baffled by the things they do, or don't do, we throw ourselves and millions of dollars into community and Federal youth programs.

To demonstrate what is possible when an ambitious youngster is given a chance, we tabulate the progress of several recent trainees at our plant. The growth in ability, character, and usefulness to society is reflected by the rise in hourly rate of pay.

Earnings of trainees (1st entry indicates starting date and rate per hour)

Person	Age	October 1961	November 1961	December 1961	January 1962	April 1962	July 1962	September 1962	November 1962	January 1963	February 1963	Location
C. Tabler	21	1.30	1.40	1.50	1.55	1.75	1.85	1.90	1.95		2.05	Shop.
C. Anderson	20	1.30		1.35		1.45	1.55		1.60		1.65	Do.
(?)		1.30	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	Do.
R. Reece	22									1.50	1.62	Engineer.
E. Huey	21									1.25	1.30	Shop.
R. Hale	18										1.25	Do.
C. Wilson	17										1.25	Office.

[1] Let go.

The above youngsters had no prior industrial plant experience. Only two of them have finished high school. We are sorry that one boy, whose name is omitted purposely, did not show enough improvement to continue. We were so encouraged by the first two that we planned, and have already started a training program in cooperation with the Hamilton school system as evidenced by the last four youngsters.

Co-op student. A senior in high school. The Hamilton school system contacts local industry to find employment of educational and training nature for students as part of their education. The student, in addition to the normal school curriculum, spends five afternoons a week on the job. The job is first discussed with the student and his school counselor and his parents submit written approval. The student submits a daily written report of his previous day's activity to his counselor. In addition, the school is in regular contact with the employer. Strict discipline regarding attendance and behavior is mandatory. The pay rate is a fixed amount (for co-op students only) while attending school, but after graduation, there is no restriction on either employment or wages.

The advantages of this program are obvious and the extra effort and sacrifice by our teachers and school administrators should be encouraged. Please do not allow misguided legislation to hamper them. They are quietly doing, with no cost to the taxpayer, what millions will be spent on in the Peace Corps and other programs.

This is the sort of thing our labor economists in Washington should be promoting, not hindering.

They know what they are doing because it was explained to them in great detail at the Washington hearing and in subsequent letters. We have to stop them with a cry of indignation.

MORE JOBS WILL BE LOST

Recently a magazine editor's statement "I have never heard of it" shocked me into realizing how few people are aware of the Walsh-Healey Act. Under this outmoded law, the Secretary of Labor can make determinations of minimum wage which may be 50 percent higher than the minimum which Congress establishes. And, he does so entirely within his own department. The Labor Department chooses the industry, collects the data, runs the hearings, evaluates the evidence, makes its own determination, sets all timetables and procedures, and administers its own decisions, with penalties for noncompliance.

A recent decision raises the minimum in the conveyor industry from Congress' $1.15 to $1.70 and applies to all Government contracts exceeding $10,000.

It will mean loss of jobs to a few of our unskilled employees and may be a hardship to one employee in his sixties who may not be able to find another job and although still able, will have to seek welfare to support his dependents.

This decision shows disregard for the welfare of unskilled or declining workers.

It also challenges the sincerity of the Labor Department's professed concern about automation. In these days when the displaced worker is the unskilled worker, the Walsh-Healey Act is helping to produce more displaced workers.

HOW THE LABOR DEPARTMENT INCREASES GOVERNMENT COSTS

In defense: We are all keenly aware of the need for a defense system superior to that of the Communists. We all dig deep to pay for it. Its gluttonous consumption of our funds starves other more humanely desirable programs such as conquest of disease, education, etc.

We should certainly continue with large defense expenditures but it is vital to be sure that every dollar spent should return a full dollar of defense.

The recent increase from the Federal minimum wage of $1.15 to the $1.70 minimum to be imposed on the conveyor industry means that from now on, many thousands of dollars more will be spent by the Government without any additional return in value.

This increase does not reflect or encourage increased productivity.

In employment: Many marginal workers—the handicapped, the trainees, the unskilled, the elderly, are going to lose jobs or will be prevented from getting jobs because of this Walsh-Healey Act directive.

Through inflation: Increasing wages and costs without matching increase in production causes inflation.

In welfare: Marginal workers now proudly able to earn their own way will be forced to seek welfare for themselves and their dependents.

In education and training: Apprenticeship programs will be discouraged. Beginners will have to obtain their training before the job, either paying for it themselves or looking to the Government to foot the bill.

College students earning their way will be handicapped finding a summer or part-time job.

In social services: Youths having difficulty finding a job will increase the need of more Government spending for programs to keep them occupied and out of trouble.

In citizenship: Probably the greatest cost of all is the loss of character, morale, and initiative resulting from frustration, disillusionment, and lack of opportunity when youths, unskilled, and elderly cannot find jobs.

In administration: The planning, investigation, tabulation, hearings, and administration of this disgraceful law occupy the time of scores of lawyers, economists, clerks, statisticians, investigators, and at least one very clever public relations man. If only we could devote all this money to curing the common cold.

It would be brash to state that all of these things are going to happen suddenly as a result of raising the wage in the conveyor industry. Today we may be talking in terms of less than a million dollars and the loss of less than a thousand jobs. But tomorrow, when the Labor Department program branches out to cover every industry in the country, the damage will be irreparable.

Every useless Government expense should be prevented, no matter how small it may seem to our ever-expanding economists.

Fishermen Salute District of Columbia Aquarium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a ringing salute to the congressional action of last year authorizing the establishment of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium has been voiced by Fishermen's News, a Seattle publication published as "the voice of Pacific Coast fishermen."

In its issue of November 1962, brought to my attention for the first time today, Fishermen's News has hailed this legislation as an important boost for the commercial fishing industry. The article relates:

> The Fisheries Center and Aquarium will in effect tell the story of the importance of the fisheries, both sport and commercial, in the health and well-being of the Nation.

A well-deserved tribute for our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, is carried as a sideline story to the article outlining the benefits in both public education and scientific progress which are predicted for the Center.

Because of the failure in some quarters to understand the basic purposes of the legislation authorizing the Center and because of the comprehensive and effective explanation of the measure which it provides, the article from Fishermen's News is being made a part of the RECORD at this point:

REPRESENTATIVE KIRWAN VICTORY—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AQUARIUM HAILED AS BOON FOR FISHING INDUSTRY

An important, if indirect, boost was given the commercial fishing industry on October 9 when President John F. Kennedy signed legislation authorizing the establishment of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium. The facility will be located in Washington, D.C. It will be operated by the Department of the Interior. Admission fees are to be charged to liquidate the cost of the $10 million structure in 30 years.

The Fisheries Center and Aquarium will in effect tell the story of the importance of the fisheries, both sport and commercial, in the health and well-being of the Nation. The audience will be counted by the millions each year, an audience which will learn more about the fisheries, the fishery environment, the fishery problems, the value of science to fisheries, and the value of fisheries to science, as well as the value of fish to human health. Thus, while the Aquarium as such might not render any direct benefit to any segment of the fishing industry its educational impact upon the general public will be enormous and its direct aid to scientific achievement be of highest importance.

Sponsors of the legislation point out that the Aquarium will have a far greater impact upon scientific achievement than most people dream. It will offer opportunities to scientists from many fields—those interested in the national health, those interested in the national defense, those interested in the potential of the fisheries in alleviating protein starvation before the undernourished peoples lose faith and hope in the fellowship of man. It will offer an educational opportunity for those who want to learn a little or a lot about fish and fisheries and it will be a recreative attraction to those who simply want relaxation from their regular work.

The drive which carried the legislation through a Congress which was at first skeptical and to a great extent derisive, was given by Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Youngstown, Ohio. Representative KIRWAN, affectionately known as MIKE to thousands in Government and out, is well versed in the affairs of the Department of the Interior and other branches of the Government since he is chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. MIKE has proved himself to be a tough bargainer, a willing fighter, for or against an appropriation, depending whether or not he thinks the expenditure is necessary.

When he took the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium as more or less a personal project, MIKE did as expected and proceeded to give it all he had. It was sufficient to make a great many Congressmen see the value in the project which he saw and the net result was the authorization which passed through a session of a selective Congress and wound up on the desk of a conservation-minded President.

Federal officials have pointed out some of the facets of the Aquarium which at present are little known. One is the value of the facility to those studying the cause and cure of human diseases. Those studying cancer, for example, find in the Aquarium a source of test animals, cheap, plentiful in number, in which the various components of human food, the additives and so on, can be studied to determine what effect, if any, these materials have upon cancer in fishes. Electric eels are used in neurological research and porpoises are used in certain phases of naval research.

There are many other facets of human welfare which may be studied and explained such as the river pollution and the various bacteria which share in water pollution. There will be facilities for research; exhibits of fishes of sport and commercial value; exhibits of other aquatic life representative of major geographical regions, displays of food products, medicines and other products extracted from fish and from the sea.

In advocating the establishment of the Aquarium, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said:

"Despite the popularity of fishing for sport and the economic and food-producing importance of our commercial fisheries, the average American has little knowledge about the fish that are the living, renewable resources of our streams, rivers, lakes and coastal waters. The younger generation, especially, needs an opportunity to learn of the tremendous potential of these resources and to understand their value if properly managed and wisely used.

"With hunger and malnutrition among the world's most pressing and constantly growing problems, it is to the relatively untapped resources of the sea and other waters of the world to which we must look in the future for essential additional supplies of animal protein. And since food fish certainly will play an increasingly important role in the world picture, it is our responsibility to foster a knowledge of them and their potential uses. World production of fish now is about 40 million tons annually, with the potential production vastly higher. In the United States, with our annual production of 2½ million tons, fishery products are valued at nearly $1 billion at the consumer level. A fish protein concentrate, cheaply made from now underutilized species and easily transported and stored, may well be one of the answers to the world's hunger problems. A National Fisheries Center would focus attention on problems of this type, would enlighten those who have an interest in our resources and our humanitarian responsibilities, and would stimulate action through better understanding.

"Sport fishing provides vast recreational benefits and a significant source of food as well. A survey conducted by our Department showed that, in 1960, over 25 million Americans participated in sport fishing in a substantial way, spending nearly $3 billion for this sport. Some 6¼ million salt water anglers alone caught 630 million fish during that year. The number of sport fishermen in the United States is expected to double by 1980.

"In its recent report, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended that Federal agencies expand their interpretive and educational services. It mentioned that our Fish and Wildlife Service now conducts tours for visitors at the national fish hatcheries. The Commission pointed out that the benefit of educational activities is clear, especially for a population that is becoming almost wholly urban in fact and in outlook These services promote understanding of the Nation's heritage and the wise use of natural resources."

AID Program for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note that our Agency for International Development missions have been requested to stress, wherever appropriate, the role that investment, both private and public, can play in the development of foreign nations where this program is operating.

Congress laid down policy directing this Agency to make arrangements to find and draw the attention of appropriate enterprise to opportunities for investment and development in less-developed countries in friendly areas, and wherever appropriate to carry out programs of assistance through private channels, including loans under section 201, to any individual, corporation, or other body of persons.

As the program is now being operated there are several AID programs being administered which are designed to foster and promote private investment.

Dollars are available to private borrowers for projects which are well conceived.

Investment guaranties are now available in more countries than before and there is increased interest on the part of U.S. business.

Guaranties are now being issued for Colombia, and will be available in Argentina and Venezuela.

The investment survey program under which the Government shares the cost with potential investors who wish to explore investment opportunities has already resulted in getting American industry to take a look at potential investments which they would not otherwise explore in Turkey, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Colombia. Many more survey grants are being made.

In some key countries the 104(e) Cooley loan program is expected to provide a useful source of local currency financing for sound private undertakings.

Local enterprises, as well as government, are being encouraged to make full use of the development banks, many of which this Government has financed.

All these AID programs are being given increased emphasis, and the Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise, headed by Mr. Seymour M. Peyser, Assistant Administrator, provides a much needed contact point for AID with the U.S. business community. In Secretary Rusk's letter to all ambassadors he stressed their role and that of all senior officers to give maximum impetus to the national export drive.

Thus it appears under AID and related programs that this Nation is moving along a broad front to spark development of underdeveloped nations, not only by direct grants, but by utilizing American private business units supported by Government assistance and loans to make investments in these countries.

Vigorous efforts have also been made to spur the export drive so-called.

I think there are some areas where this type of aid can be helpful, if properly directed, and others where it might well be wasted, regardless of the pains taken to put it on some sound basis. That must remain, however, for administrative decision, since Congress cannot directly administer the law.

On the other hand, it would be very helpful at this time when the dollar gap is still giving us such concern, and when there are several areas in our own country that are economically depressed, and where many people in this country are

living under substandard living conditions, where the Government might inaugurate programs for many resident American people, beset by unemployment and depressed industrial conditions, similar to those which are underway in so many foreign lands to help some foreign nationals.

Some time ago, Congress established the SBA to try to help the small businessman in this country.

I think this is an excellent program, and on the whole it is being well handled. But I think there is room for broadening the base of operations of this agency and making funds more readily available for American businessmen who need adequate financing for meritorious business projects to get more substantial assistance in the form of loans.

I think that the SBA could well be expanded to operate somewhat like AID does in making surveys of our depressed areas, to ascertain the needs and then move to try to assist in the economic rehabilitation and revival of many areas in the Nation where there is distress, unemployment, and hardship; where the economy needs a decided lift.

Notwithstanding our high gross national product, and the general prosperity which the Nation is experiencing, the position and condition of small business in many areas is not especially favorable. To the contrary, it is very unfavorable.

Small business' share of the gross national product is steadily and sharply diminishing.

Its dominant position of a few years ago in employment and business volume has been reversed in favor of big business. It is showing steady decline in vitality, strength and relative importance.

While it is the cornerstone of our free enterprise institutions, the most fruitful climate for the exercise of initiative, imagination, creative managerial skills, business acumen, and opportunity for those eager to advance their station in life in accordance with American traditions, small business has been steadily losing its place in the performance of these functions.

If the present rate of its decline should continue over the period of the next 10 or 15 years there will be to all intents and purposes little remaining of the great structure of small business in this country that in the past has given so much impetus to our free enterprise system and free way of life.

I have no desire at this time to resent the mass of available figures and statistics, charts, and economic indicators that would completely support the statements I have made concerning the alarming decline of small business in our times.

The thesis that I have advanced is readily discernible in almost every community as well as in the statistics, and I think that this Congress must take note of the serious plight of the small businessman today and do something to try to help small business recover its important key place in the American economic system.

The Congress has repeatedly taken note of the need for assisting small business, not only in the legislative field, but by the creation of our Select Committee on Small Business, which has been so ably led in the past by the esteemed gentleman from Texas, my good and able friend and colleague, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, who together with his committee has made some great contributions in bringing the distressing conditions of small business to the attention of Congress and the country and seeking redress and consideration.

But I think we must move along a much broader front, starting now, and going into future years, by expanding the operations of SBA and cooperating agencies of the Government to strengthen and revitalize the entire small business structure.

It seems to me that if we can afford to spend billions to develop business in underdeveloped countries, that we should have no hesitancy about providing such sums as are needed, as promptly as we can, to rescue and resuscitate, revive, and firmly reestablish the small business system of the Nation's economy, so that we may give new life and new opportunity to small business people and all those fellow citizens of ours who may be prompted to select their careers in this field, but who are now dissuaded, discouraged, and disheartened by the continuing retrogression and decline of the small business unit in this country.

Various measures have been taken in the past to help small business, but these must be reinvigorated and more substantially supported, I must repeat.

Small business needs special tax relief to enable it to plow back its profits into business in the form of such measures as I have proposed heretofore and which have not been on the whole favorably considered. It needs a large share of government procurement. Apart from that which is provided for industries in labor surplus areas there should be definite set-asides of government procurement for small business, and as is the case in our foreign investment practices there should be better measures for small business men to secure adequate financing when their business is being efficiently conducted, their projects are sound and meritorius, and there is a reasonable expectation that regular loans will be repaid.

Small business has never looked for charity and is not looking for charity now. It does not need charity to succeed.

It can succeed if it is given a fair opportunity to do so. It needs to be free of discriminations and it needs to be put in a position where it can compete fairly and equally with big business, and not be ground underfoot by huge corporate aggregations that are so strong, that they can secure many advantages in the production, distribution and marketing of goods that are not given to smaller producers or smaller business people.

America needs every legitimate business, big and small, operated under our free system, and not by the Government.

If Congress continues to remain inert and inactive in the face of this great threat to small business and allows it to be dissolved and liquidated by the pressure of big business, big combines, corporate trusts, and great monopolies, the time will come when there will be no small business in this country.

When that time comes, the day of socialism will be at hand, because when that time comes, the people will make such insistent, economic demands upon remaining big business units that they cannot possibly meet them and still remain solvent.

At that time the day of Government ownership will arrive, and first socialism, and then probably communism, will take over the American economic system, and eliminate both the profit motive and private ownership.

None of us want to see that happen, though there are those who are surreptiously working for it.

The American people want to retain our free enterprise institutions, but if we would retain them we must do our part to protect and preserve them against the obviously injurious conditions and effects from which they are now suffering.

In a word, the Congress and the American people must awaken to the dangers of socialism and communism and move speedily to avert them, if it is our real purpose to retain our free enterprise system which has been responsible for our great progress as a nation and the high standards of living, of prosperity, and general happiness that this Nation has achieved.

As we view these dangers of socialism and communism and spur ourselves to greater efforts to preserve our great, free system, it might be relevant for us to recall the way a New York teacher once illustrated communism to his class. "I want to show you the way communism works," he said. "John, you secured an average mark of 95 percent; Dick, your mark was 55 percent. I will now equalize your marks, taking 20 points from John's and adding 20 points to Dick's. This will give you both 75. It will also mean that John's initiative will be taken away and he will not be encouraged to work, and Dick will realize that he has gotten something for nothing and doesn't have to work anyway. The net result will be that neither boy will work." When that happens in the economic system the economic system will collapse, because it is only work that can sustain any system or any nation.

I think that we all might well keep in mind this illustration as we contemplate the needs and problems of small business and make up our minds to move as fast as we can to assist it, before we are no longer able to do so.

Under Secretary Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, March 6, 1963:

UNDER SECRETARY HARRIMAN

The President's nomination of W. Averell Harriman to the post of Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, the Department's third ranking post, should be speedily and heartily confirmed. As Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, Governor Harriman has won deserved praise for his role in achieving neutral status for Laos and in shaping American support of beleaguered India.

In three decades of high-level public service, the Governor has been accumulating the sophistication of judgment and the talent for easy administration on which his new post will allow him to draw. His performance as wartime Ambassador to the Soviet Union is of particular relevance. Time and again, he anticipated the ultimate harsh form of Soviet policies whose gentler contours were so much more conspicuous at the time.

Since then, with perhaps the lone exception of his own venture into elective politics, he has demonstrated a sharp eye for the realities of power and a sure hand for the possibilities of power. In an administration heavily seasoned with younger graduates of Harvard, this elder Eli commands high respect. The position to accompany it should be promptly forthcoming.

Eulogy at the Funeral of John Brophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the eulogy delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor George G. Higgins at the funeral of John Brophy—a gentleman whose whole life was devoted to the labor movement in America and to the improvement of working and living conditions of all our people.

I had the privilege of working with John Brophy for many years and personally know he was a dedicated man with no desire for personal economic gain nor public recognition. He wanted only to give his all to the cause for which he fought.

During his lifetime he saw many accomplishments result from his efforts—but, as he never relaxed his efforts to secure greater gains for those who worked for a living, he continually inspired those around him to carry on too.

Because of our great respect and admiration for this energetic and idealistic man, we—who John Brophy left—will strive to do more in memory of him.

The eulogy follows:

EULOGY AT THE FUNERAL OF JOHN BROPHY

(By Rt. Rev. Msgr. George C. Higgins)

"I know, my God, that Thou provest hearts and lovest simplicity, wherefore I also, in the simplicity of my heart, have joyfully offered all these things; and I have seen with great joy Thy people which are here present offer Thee their offerings, I Paralipomena, 29."

The scriptural text which I have chosen as an introduction to this farewell eulogy of our departed friend, John Brophy, calls for at least a brief word of explanation. The text is taken—admittedly with a certain amount of literary license—from the concluding chapter of the first book of Pararilipomena, sometimes referred to as the Book of Chronicles. This and the second Book of Chronicles are a kind of supplement of the things that were passed over in the Books of Kings. They are, if you will, a history of the line of King David.

The first of these two books—the one from which I have selected my opening text—concludes, in chapter 28, with an eloquent address by King David to an assembly of all the chief men of Israel, the princes of the tribes. David announced to this impressive assembly that he had planned to build a temple in honor of the Lord and had actually prepared all things for the building but, before he could carry out his plans, had been told by the Lord that he was not to build a house in His name because he was a man of war and had shed the blood of human beings. Therefore, David informed the assembly, the temple would be built by Solomon, his son and successor. David then exhorted Solomon to take courage and to build the temple on his own initiative and proceeded to describe the building in detail as he had first envisioned it.

Subsequently, in chapter 20—the last chapter of the first Book of Chronicles—David invited the assembled princes to cooperate with Solomon in the building of the temple. "Now if any man is willing," he told them, "to offer (gifts for the building of the temple) let him * * * offer what he pleaseth to the Lord." And thereupon, "the princes of the tribes of Israel, and the captains of thousands and of hundreds, and the overseers of the king's possessions" promised gifts of silver and brass and precious stone "and the people rejoiced when they promised their offerings willingly, because they offered them to the Lord with all their heart, and David the King rejoiced also with a great joy * * *."

"I know, my God," David exclaimed in the text which I have already quoted, "that Thou provest hearts and lovest simplicity, wherefore I also, in the simplicity of my heart, have joyfully offered all these things; and I have seen with great joy Thy people which are here present offer Thee their offerings."

From the superficial point of view our friend John Brophy, who was born into a working class family in England almost 80 years ago, had so little in common with the great King David whom the Lord had chosen to be king over all of Israel that you may be wondering—and understandably so, of course—whether there is really any justification, other than sheer poetic license, for selecting this particular passage from David's moving address to the princes of the tribes of Israel as our introductory text this morning. I have chosen this text for a very simple reason. To my way of thinking, these words of King David admirably reflect the essential qualities of Mr. Brophy's noble character—absolute simplicity and innocence of heart on the one hand and on the other a contagious spirit of happiness and joy in the service of his God and the service of his fellowmen. In the simplicity of his heart—in which there wasn't the slightest trace of cynicism or double dealing or deceit—Mr. Brophy, during a long lifetime of completely unselfish devotion to the cause of social justice at home and abroad, joyfully offered to the Lord his extraordinary talents and his tireless energy—gifts which, in the eyes of God are of far greater value than gold and silver and precious stones. And again like King David it was with great happiness and joy that he saw other people in the labor movement offering similar gifts of service in the interest of the great cause to which he devoted his every waking moment.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the latter point. Mr. Brophy was not a jealous man. There was nothing small about him—nothing petty. He wasn't concernd about his own reputation or his personal fame, nor was he concerned in the slightest degree about his personal economic welfare. His one and only ambition was to serve his Lord and Master by devotedly serving the cause of social justice, and if others of greater or less ability happened at times to be more influential than he was in achieving this goal, he was the first to offer his sincere congratulations and his selfless cooperation and support. Given the normal tendency of human being to look for the limelight, this, it seems to me, was ample evidence of his almost childlike simplicity and his remarkable greatness of soul.

But if John Brophy was a simple man—in the best sense of the word—a man without guile, an innocent man of single minded purpose, he was also a very joyful and a very happy man. I wonder if any of you ever saw him in the doldrums. I wonder if you ever heard him complain even during the difficult days of his last illness. I must say that I never did, and I was privileged to know him very well. I knew him as a man who, like David, joyfully and enthusiastically offered his gift of service even when the going was very rough and when he might have been tempted to feel sorry for himself or to look for a plausible excuse to slacken his tireless pace.

I could go on from here and talk in considerable detail about Mr. Brophy's lasting contribution to the cause of organized labor in the United States, but that would be superfluous. The story of his career as a labor leader is known to all of you and, in any event, will be amply recorded in the labor press and, let us hope, will also be recorded more permanently in the autobiography which he drafted several years ago and which, I understand, is now in the process of being edited for publication.

Instead of going into detail, then, about Mr. Brophy's public life, I would prefer to say a few words about the long-range meaning of his distinguished career in the labor movement and, more specifically, about the deep religious convictions which animated and sustained him in his struggle for social justice.

Those of you in the congregation who are not members of the Catholic Church will forgive me, I am sure, for speaking frankly about Mr. Brophy's religion and about the influence of religion in his public career as well as in his personal life. My only purpose in doing so is to portray as faithfully as I can the John Brophy whom I was privileged to know for a period of approximately 25 years. I knew him as a deeply religious man who made a conscious effort to apply the social teaching of religion to the complicated economic, industrial and racial problems of the 20th century America. It was his basic loyalty to his God which impelled him to devote all of his time and energy and all of his wonderful talents to the cause of social justice.

It can be said of Mr. Brophy that he was literally born into the labor movement. Devotion to the cause of organized labor and to the cause of the poor and the underprivileged came to him almost as naturally and instinctively as devotion to his family and the country to which his family immigrated when he was still a young boy. He inherited a sound labor tradition from his father before him. And those of us who knew him as a friend can testify to the fact that few men in the history of the American labor movement ever served that tradition more faithfully or more unselfishly. John

Brophy was a dedicated man. He had a vocation in life—a calling to which he gave himself enthusiastically and with boundless generosity. It would not be an exaggeration to say—and may it be a source of consolation and comfort to his family and his friends to hear it said—that he literally wore himself out in the service of his fellowman.

We will gladly honor any man who has dedicated his life to the labor movement. But the labor movement is not a religion—or at least it shouldn't be. It was not a religion for Mr. Brophy. The labor movement is a means—a noble and indeed an indispensable means—through which the workingman expresses and puts into practice the spirit of justice and charity which derives, in the final analysis, from his religious tradition and his religious beliefs. This is what the labor movement meant to Mr. Brophy. I repeat that he was a deeply religious man and one, I might add, who never became too old or too tired to try to learn more about the meaning of his faith and to understand it better from the intellectual point of view. He loved his country and his fellowman. He loved them because they are children of God, the one God and Father of the entire human race. All his life, as I have already indicated, he tried to the best of his ability to demonstrate his love for God by putting his talents and his energy at the service of the workingmen and women of this great country. He did this through the labor movement. In doing so, he was reflecting the spirit which has always animated the labor movement, at least as we have come to know it in the United States.

The labor movement has concentrated on the material welfare of its members and on the material welfare of the Nation as a whole. For this it was founded and for this it has had a struggle against persistent odds. But through it all the labor movement has been conscious of the dignity of man and his spiritual destiny. As far back as 1923 the American labor movement, speaking at that time through the American Federation of Labor, in which John Brophy was so active before the establishment of the CIO, announced to its friends and enemies alike that is was founded on a belief in God and a belief in the spiritual values of man and that, in struggling for the material needs of its members, it was aiming always to raise them to that higher level of living demanded by the basic teachings of religion. Surely it it fitting and appropriate on this occasion to recall this noble declaration of policy—to which the American labor movement still subscribes—and to ponder over its meaning in the life of John Brophy.

The labor movement of our country, recognizing the fact that all freedom and all higher developments of life rest upon first providing assurance of the essentials of existence, has first demanded economic justice as a basis for all other things. But the labor movement has always taught that the material is essential to something higher and that the inspiration of our movement derives from something above and beyond the material. The labor movement strives for economic improvement with unrelenting zeal and fidelity because economic improvement is the first fundamental requisite, but it holds out to all mankind a flaming torch lighting the way to a greater fullness of life, to complete realization of the finer and nobler aspirations of the mind and soul. The labor movement fixes as its goal nothing less than the complete richness of life, without limitation of any kind, the attainment of the complete human ideal, in all of its economic, ethical, and spiritual implications.

This is the objective of the American labor movement. And this was the noble objective of John Brophy—the motive power which made it easy for him to sacrifice his time and energy in the cause of labor. We honor him this afternoon for what he did to perpetuate this great tradition and to give it flesh and blood.

And now that Mr. Brophy has gone to his reward, what would he want me to say, in conclusion, to you his beloved relatives and his loyal friends? I think he would want me to tell you, in the words which will be said by the priest who officiates at his burial, not to languish in fruitless and unavailing grief and not to sorrow as those who have no hope but through your tears to look meekly up to the God of all hope and all consolation. Mr. Brophy was an intensely active man who loved the good things of this world as much, if not more, than the ordinary run of human beings. But he was first and foremost a man of simple supernatural faith. His attitude toward life—and his attitude toward death—was the same as that of David who, after offering his gifts for the building of the temple and after gratefully receiving the gifts of the princes of Israel for the same purpose, addressed to the Lord these beautiful words:

"All things belong to Thee; all that Thou hast from us is Thy own gift; as Thou sayest Thyself, we are exiles and wanderers no less than our fathers were; our days on earth pass like a shadow, and there is no abiding here. Our Lord our God, all this stock we have in readiness, for the building of a shrine to Thy name, comes from Thy hands; all things are Thine."

Finally I think Mr. Brophy would want me to urge all of you and particularly those who were associated with him in the labor movement to continue to offer to the Lord your own talents and your own gifts of selfless service in the interest of the great cause of social justice. Let me put this challenge to you in his own words—words which I have taken the liberty of borrowing from his autobiography to which reference has already been made:

"The past 30 years have been glorious ones in the annals of the labor movement, but we cannot live in the past. We have met the challenge of other years, and forged ahead. Every generation must face the new problems which arise in a changing society. They must battle as we did, but with the advantage of starting from a higher level. The assignment to today's men and women of labor is to demand strong leadership of a united movement and go forth to challenge the assumption of the business and financial group that they have a vested interest and a privileged position in the operation and management of industry which they call free enterprise; to extend our democracy to the economic field and to enhance the lives of the common people not only in America but throughout the world."

Dean of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we were all pleased to see the following, superb article in Roll Call about our distinguished and beloved dean:

INVINCIBLE VINSON

(By Oscar Johnson)

After nearly half a century in the House of Representatives, durable Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, has a tip for his colleagues who hope to take it easy some day: the work just keeps piling up.

"The longer I stay, the more work I have," was VINSON's wry comment when asked how it feels to serve for so long.

No one would blame the 79-year-old lawmaker if he wanted to slow down a bit in his record 50th term. After all, only one man—the late Speaker Sam Rayburn—has served longer in the House, and VINSON will pass his mark in July.

VINSON, however, has no thought of slowing down. The Nation's security is still threatened—and as long as that situation remains he will stay at his demanding job.

The responsibility VINSON bears as chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services is greater than many Members would care to shoulder. Not counting the onus of decisionmaking, just the sheer labor of overseeing the country's sprawling, $50-billion-a-year Defense Establishment would be enough to overwhelm a far younger Congressman.

During his long tenure as chairman, VINSON has developed tactics for handling the burden. He studies and analyzes proposed military legislation, gathers detailed testimony from service chiefs, then draws on his own vast knowledge to arrive at the final decisions.

The resulting legislation in large measure shapes U.S. defense strategy and posture—at least until the whole subject is reexamined the following year.

VINSON has been doing this sort of thing since 1917, when he was appointed to the old House Naval Affairs Committee. That was before the current President of the United States was born. (In all, VINSON has served with eight Presidents.)

Working his way up the seniority ladder, VINSON became Naval Affairs chairman in 1932. He gained his present position in 1946 when House committees were reorganized and Armed Services was created. Except for a brief period when the GOP-controlled Congress, VINSON has been a committee chairman for 31 years.

During VINSON's reign two World Wars and numerous police actions have been fought. An endless parade of service secretaries, generals and admirals has passed through his businesslike committee hearing room on Capitol Hill—and each has learned that the shrewd Georgian is no man to be dealt with lightly.

Despite his awesome seniority, VINSON is still a sharp-minded and fearsome inquisitor. Pentagon officials, secure in their isolated bastion, knew they'd better be well prepared when they cross the Potomac River to face his thorough and sometimes scorching questioning.

Some oldtimers still recall the day in 1947, when Republicans controlled Congress and VINSON was ranking minority Member, the salty Democrat made an admiral admit he had first studied a bill on which he was testifying on his way over from the Pentagon. VINSON asked the committee to table and kill the bill, which would provide for the disposal of some surplus Navy ships—and without a murmur the committee did so.

Although he usually walks swinging a cane nowadays, the sprightly VINSON still stands ramrod straight, paces himself as well as he can. He dresses comfortably in subdued-tone suits with matching vest, sometimes wears tweeds with loud ties.

Puffing on a leaf-wrapped cigar, VINSON can be a congenial talker when relaxing in his pictured-lined inner office with a friend or constituent. He sometimes spends Saturday morning going over district business on Capitol Hill, then returns to his modest residence on Primrose Street in suburban Chevy Chase, Md. He frequently does his own shopping at nearby markets.

The retiring VINSON goes out on few occasions. During a long period while his wife was an invalid he set a pattern of staying with her as much as possible. When she

died in 1950 he remained aloof of social gatherings.

VINSON's appearance has not changed much either over the years. He looks younger than his age, with strands of downy gray hair crossing his bald head, and his well-colored face looks capable of either fury or philosophy.

When it comes to the business of national security, the trim and vigorous VINSON is a man of action. He rules his committee with an iron hand, and a stern gaze over the top of his tortoise-shell glasses—which ride well down on an eagle-beak nose—can be enough to wither the gold leaf on any brass hat.

VINSON speaks with a strong command voice, and in debate has the shrewd tactical instincts of the "swamp fox" for which he is nicknamed.

As Congress convened last month in an atmosphere of growing world crisis, VINSON marshaled his key unit the way a good officer would launch a military operation. He swiftly called an organizational meeting, briefed his lieutenants on what he wanted them to do, and then parceled out the work assignment with an appraising eye for individual talents.

The fast-talking VINSON even told members of his committee what bills he wants them to sponsor this year.

So pressing is VINSON's militarylike campaign to dispose of the legislative agenda that he will sometimes not allow new Members to take time questioning witnesses. (He has a similar habit in his infrequent press conferences, during which he first tells the reporters what the questions are, then answers them.)

Unlike other committees which were still mired in the session's opening throes last month, VINSON's group was speedily operating at full work pace. Not surprisingly, it reported out the first bill of the year—a minor measure enabling Boy Scouts to use tents and other military equipment.

VINSON's imposing schedule for the first 4 months of 1963 has started with the annual military posture briefings, during which the Secretary of Defense, the three service Secretaries, and all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testify. (The leaders, who also go before at least three other congressional groups, don't find the time entirely wasted. Some admit the sessions stimulate their thinking, force them to learn their subjects more thoroughly.)

The briefings present background information which VINSON rates as "very important" to the bill authorizing appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. That $15 billion bill, the first major one considered by his committee, was reported this week. It is one of the most important single pieces of legislation coming before Congress each year.

Most of the work on these must bills will be carried out behind closed doors, for security reasons. The subject matter of VINSON's world—weapons systems, strategy, finances, administration—is exceedingly complex and interrelated. Discussion of one aspect usually brings in the others.

New Armed Services members know they will do little more than listen during their first several years on the committee. Too much is at stake to rely on an inexperienced view. (VINSON may also bang the gavel on a windy witness.)

As the committee soberly considers the Nation's military status in executive session, VINSON tries to develop a consensus on the best course of action. With a sixth sense for majority sentiment, he molds all members to one view.

VINSON does not rely on sheer power to achieve unity; he coaxes deals, demands, and slowly whittles away opposition by slight concessions. On occasion there may be a flash of scorn or temper, but more often a kind of team spirit carries the day. A kind autocrat, VINSON is more of a man in a hurry than an old style, dictatorial chairman trying to throw his weight around.

The committee knows it is wise to go before the House with a unanimous report. With national defense in the balance, members do not want to open the way for a floor fight which might end with nobody satisfied.

Generally an administration supporter, VINSON usually wins the President's approval on his group's bills. They are almost never defeated on the floor.

What little conflict VINSON has had with President Kennedy's astute Defense Secretary, Robert S. McNamara, has been over an "all our eggs in one basket" approach to defense. McNamara, 46, brought a coldly calculating computer mind to his E-ring Pentagon job. But in deciding to ground the RS-70 bomber in favor of missiles development, he ran head-on into the experience-founded long view of oldster VINSON.

Despite his acknowledged respect for McNamara, VINSON raised a good ruckus over abandonment of the manned bomber before missiles are perfected. He got his committee to pass a bill directing the Secretary of the Air Force to spend a prescribed number of dollars on the RS-70 program. On the day before the vote, however, the President invited VINSON down to the White House for a chat and a stroll through his rose garden. Extracting a letter agreeing to review the program, VINSON struck out the offending word.

Keeping America's defense arsenal bristling with a variety of weapons is still a VINSON goal. But his compromise proved he works with the administration, rather than against it. (This year's weapons bill authorizes completion of the three RS-70s already started, and production of two more.)

With VINSON's cooperation, Secretary McNamara has become the strong man of the President's Cabinet, vastly altering the defense policies of "Old Soldier" Eisenhower. U.S. nonnuclear might has been built by giving the Army 16 combat divisions rather than 11 while the Air Force now has 21 tactical wings instead of 16. The Marine Corps has been bolstered, and an Army special guerrilla action force tripled to 5,600 men.

The United States has also put nuclear-armed missiles in hardened concrete sites and nuclear submarines, where they can hit back after an attack.

Administrative changes have been made to consolidate the service intelligence arms into one, and to creat a moneysaving central Defense Supply Agency. The National Guard and Army Reserve are being streamlined, while nearly 100 military installations are being shut down across the country and overseas.

VINSON fears that too much power and decision are being transferred from the separate services to the Defense Department. "I know of no surer threat to the security of our Nation than to adopt the ill-considered proposal that * * * the three military departments be fused into one conglomerate department, or that all military thinking be directed toward one strategic concept," he has said.

(Some New Frontiersmen say VINSON cannot criticize McNamara's unification schemes when, on the congressional level, U.S. defense is largely controlled by one State. They point out that VINSON's Georgia colleague, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, runs the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Additionally, RUSSELL this year is taking over chairmanship of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services, to become a virtual one-man overlord of defense in his Chamber.)

While VINSON's group is examining and debating McNamara's beliefs and the views of other defense figures, the cold war terror has continued. And VINSON has been inevitably drawn in.

During the current Cuban controversy, fueled mainly by Republican criticism of the administration, VINSON has given the President some of his firmest congressional support. Asked by reporters for his view on the situation, VINSON said simply:

"I am confident that the administration is taking all necessary steps to bring about the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba."

Coming from a man who has had inside reports on all developments, the words were reassuring. It was not unusual, however, for VINSON to prove that not all Southern Democrats are die-hard conservatives bent on destroying the national party's program. (Of course, with their Rules Committee blockade—and, more recently, Kennedy's reticence—House Southerners are somewhat freed from opposition to civil rights legislation.)

VINSON, one of the few Congressmen who can "swing" a sizable bloc of votes when needed, greatly aided former Speaker Rayburn in his 1961 Rules Committee expansion fight—and performed the same favor for Speaker John McCormack this year. In 1961 his compromise helped pass the administration's much-wanted minimum wage bill.

VINSON puts it this way:

"Reasonable people don't go bumping into each other and having difficulties that can be avoided. There is always room for a little give and take. That is what makes our kind of Government work."

Although liberal by Georgia standards, VINSON rarely has any political opposition at home. When there is an opponent he still wins by a large margin. The district just can't see any advantage in turning down a man who heads the House Armed Services Committee.

As committee chairman, VINSON does not lobby extensively for defense installation "plums" in the annual building program. He doesn't need to, since the Defense Department frequently happens to find that a Georgia site fits its needs when it launches a new program.

The presence of large numbers of southerners on the House and Senate Armed Services Committees does not seem to have hindered Dixie in getting a good share of military installations. Bases are so liberally sprinkled throughout the South, in fact, that Yankees quip some States may sink underground with the weight.

One spot not claimed by the military is VINSON's 600-acre Georgia farm. There he retreats between sessions while other committee members go on globe-girdling inspection trips. ("I require them to submit written reports," VINSON says. "We find them very helpful.") Control over who gets the much-desired trips gives VINSON another bit of leverage over his men.

For all his knowledge of the military, VINSON has never served in the Armed Forces. Born near Milledgeville, Ga., on November 18, 1883, he attended Georgia Military College before gaining a law degree from Mercer University in Macon in 1904.

Setting up practice in Milledgeville, VINSON was soon named solicitor of Baldwin County. He was in the Georgia Legislature for two terms, 1909–12, serving as speaker pro tempore during 1911–12. Then he switched to become judge of the Baldwin County Court for 2 years. In the midst of this term the congressional seat in his district became vacant.

In a special election on November 3, 1914, VINSON was elected to the House at the age of 30. He was sworn in on December 7, 1914. VINSON now has 48 years, 2 months, and 20 days of consecutive service.

Only Speaker Rayburn, who was first sworn into the same 63d Congress on April 7, 1913, has served longer in the House than VINSON. When he died on November 16, 1961, Rayburn

had compiled 48 years 7 months 9 days of service.

The only person ever to have served in 25 consecutive House terms, VINSON is still junior in overall service to Arizona's venerable Senator CARL HAYDEN, 85. HAYDEN quietly passed the 51-year mark this month, though his service was split between the two Chambers.

VINSON is senior by more than 8 years to his nearest House competitors—Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, 83, and Judiciary Committee Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, 74.

Senior Representative, unofficial "Father of the House," a country lawyer who became a builder of American might, quietly-confident CARL VINSON rates his greatest achievement as "handling and sponsoring legislation for an adequate national defense.

"That," he says, "is what I've been doing since 1917."

Seymour Simon, President of the Cook County Board, Offers Some Frank Thoughts on the State of Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Seymour Simon, president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, which takes in the whole city of Chicago along with the rest of Cook County, delivered a most timely speech on the subject of the state of public welfare.

Mr. Simon's speech was presented to the annual meeting of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago.

It is my privilege to call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Simon's very forthright analysis of the problems which confront my community. It will be wise to reflect on the indisputable fact that whatever problems confront Cook County similar problems also confront thousands of communities throughout America.

President Simon is carving an enviable record as head of the Cook County board in Chicago. His bold views and analysis of this very difficult subject can properly serve as an inspiration to people dealing with this problem throughout America.

Mr. Simon today heads a county board which supervises the affairs of the largest county in the world. There are more than 5½ million people living in Cook County today, and within the next decade, the population of Cook County and the area immediately surrounding it in what is commonly known as Metropolitan Chicago will reach well over 10 million.

It is indeed a stroke of destiny that in these critical times, when this large urban area is undergoing great changes and the inherent problems which by the very nature of things are associated with change, the people of this community can have as their leader a man of Mr. Simon's deep understanding and bold views.

Mr. Simon analyzed the problems of Cook County, but the philosophy woven through the fabric of his thoughts could apply to any large community in the world; and for this reason, it gives me great pleasure to include his speech in the RECORD today.

Mr. Speaker, President Simon's speech follows:

ADDRESS OF SEYMOUR SIMON, JEWISH FEDERATION OF METROPOLITAN CHICAGO ANNUAL MEETING

Tonight marks the first time a county board president has addressed this federation. The appearance is probably long overdue, since both the federation and the county board are vitally and actively concerned with the welfare of human beings.

To restore the ill to health, offer mercy and haven to the aged, are important responsibilities of the board, and a primary concern of the federation.

Without the assistance of organized charities, such as the federation, the welfare needs of this community would demand a paralyzing increase in Government spending and an overburdening upsurge in local taxes. Conversely, the private charities of this community would need to raise almost twice as much as they do now in order to absorb the welfare functions of the county government, and not giving any attention whatsoever to the breathtaking $220 million in State and Federal funds which are distributed locally to welfare recipients, by our county department of public aid.

This is an assignment which would make even the most ardent fundraisers in this federation cringe. Neither of us could provide for the needy of this community alone, and we are even having great trouble doing it together.

The subject on which I have chosen to talk has been announced as "The State of Welfare." I would have labeled it "The Welfare State," except that the term has acquired over the years such an offensive connotation. Those who oppose the idea that it is the responsibility of Government to assist the needy use the term "welfare state" as a synonym for evil. They have given it a meaning which evokes an image more totalitarian than democratic, more European than American.

Even those who believe, as most of you in the federation do and as Sam Goldsmith stated so eloquently tonight, that government must aid the indigent and needy, shrink from using the term "welfare state" these days in advocating what they believe. This is confusing because whatever the name label used, a large segment of American government, from the county courthouse all the way to the White House, is engaged in helping people with personal problems.

This is not a new philosophy in America. It did not originate, as some think, with the New Deal or the Fair Deal or the New Frontier. In Illinois, legislation placing the responsibility on counties to give relief to paupers and medical aid to those who fell sick and were without funds, was first enacted in 1845.

This is the approach of humanity, decency, and good religion. It is part of our American tradition. In America, government at all levels, implemented by private charity, tries to make sure that no one is too poor to go on living.

The 1963 Cook County budget, which we passed last week is, in my view, largely a welfare budget. More than 50 percent of the total appropriation will be spent to assist individual people in trouble, ranging from a horribly burned baby in the excellent burn unit in the children's department at county hospital, to an elderly bedridden patient at Oak Forest, to a boy at Audy Home in trouble with the world and with himself—from the physically damaged to the emotionally wounded. This means, in terms of dollars and cents, that $41 million is earmarked for county hospital, Oak Forest for the Aged, the county department of public aid, the Audy Home and family court. Who can say, in the face of an appropriation of this size, that Cook County is any different than a welfare county?

This budget of which I speak also reflects a difficulty which faces the contributors to the federation—as well as members of the county board—as well as contributors to all charities in communities throughout the land—and as well as those interested in the community fund, which I predict will have a great era under the spirited and exciting leadership that a man with the energy that Jim Downs will give to it. The constant increase in the cost of welfare services in an inflating economy where needs continue to expand and medical care becomes more elaborate and expensive each year. The taxpayers of Cook County, the Jewish Federation of Chicago—all other charities—are caught in an upward spiral of costs in operating hospitals and caring for the aged.

Just as the federation is perplexed by rising costs at Drexel Home, Park View Home, and the Orthodox Jewish Home for the Aged, the county board faces the same problem at Oak Forest Hospital. Just as you spend more money each year for medical services at Michael Reese and Mount Sinai, so does the county board at county hospital. I said that more than 50 percent of our total appropriation was devoted to welfare needs. This is a greater proportion of our total budget than ever before in history was allocated for welfare activities. As you probably have read in the newspapers recently, our county budget was trimmed this year for the first time in 8 years. But, while we were successful in cutting the total budget almost 5 percent, we still increased spending for medical costs.

The appropriation for county hospital was increased by almost $1,300,000 and for Oak Forest by nearly a quarter-million dollars. More dramatic, are these figures: In the past 6 years, the appropriations for Cook County Hospital have risen from $18,400,000 in 1958 to the current $25,400,000—an average increase of more than $1 million a year.

Tomorrow morning in your newspapers you will read some complaints about county hospital. Some of those complaints will state that the size of the nursing staff at county hospital is inadequate. But translating our appropriation into that aspect of medical care and hospital operation, this means that in 1963 we have provided for 82 additional nurses at a cost of $300,000, which follows an increase in the size of the nursing staff by more than 100 in the year 1962.

The demands are great now. In my opinion, the future will bring to the people of this county and to every other large urban county in the Nation even greater demands and higher costs. A variety of circumstances contribute to this trend:

First, our ever-improving standard of living, which coupled with advances in medical science, increases the life span. A few days ago, the Census Bureau announced that 1 out of every 11 Americans today is over 65, compared to 1 out of 35, 90 years ago.

Second, the migration, the in-movement, from rural areas into the large cities. This migration has not stopped. It will continue. As all of America once was the melting pot of Europe, so now our large cities are the melting pots of America.

Seventy percent of our population is clustered in 22 large cities. No one can build a wall around Chicago or any other major metropolis to bar newcomers and keep life in the city like it used to be. No matter how

comforting this thought might be to the wall builders, it is inconsistent with the Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag, which glories in the doctrine of "one nation, indivisible."

Third, too many of our citizens have not had the educational opportunities required to equip them for employment, particularly in our rapidly automating society. The ones who suffered most from this handicap are those who come here from the South or from other rural areas where the school system available to them was inadequate, and the social system under which they were required to live did not encourage their education.

Finally, we live in a paradoxical economy of prosperity and abundance greater than any society has ever known, able each year to reach new heights of productivity but without the ability to absorb fully the labor supply that is available. These are some of the factors making welfare needs an ever-growing giant—a giant which the people of the large urban counties are having increasing difficulty satisfying, as we have been trying to do in the past, on a local do-it-yourself basis. The question is not whether government will continue to assist people in need. No matter how loudly some proclaim that the poor and helpless are responsible for their own plight and should be left to suffer in their own miseries, the long-established tradition that government in the United States will not permit people to starve to death or die for lack of care will not be abandoned. The real decision is the extent to which these needs will be regarded as national rather than local responsibilities, and the extent to which provision for them will be made on a national basis. The alternative is to expect the taxpayers of the large metropolitan areas to continue to struggle to pay these costs through their local taxing structures, a struggle which will become more burdensome to you as local taxpayers with each year that passes.

If the idea of increasing Federal interjection to meet the welfare needs of our urban areas seems repugnant or foreign to you, consider for a moment the existing scope of Federal participation in community betterment. In Chicago, slums have been cleared and expressways built with the aid of the Federal Government. Without such assistance, the slums would still fester and the expressways would still be a dream. It has been my experience during the 8 years I have been in public office that in every instance, even though a large portion of the money came from Washington, the decisions as to which slum areas were to be cleared, when, and what was to replace them, where the expressways should go, and how they should be constructed, have been made at the local level by your local public officials.

Mount Sinai, Michael Reese, and scores of other hospitals in this county have not only accepted but welcomed Federal grants for research. No one has come along to urge that we return to Uncle Sam approximately $100 million the Federal Government will contribute this year to support our local old-age assistance, ADC, disability and blind assistance programs, and instead, ask local taxpayers to replace this money. Incidentally a portion of these Federal funds make up part of the fees of over $1 million which the federation collects for the care of the aged at its three homes. I assure you that the county board feels no resentment over the investigation the Federal Government is about to conduct into the manner in which relief has been distributed in Cook County. We welcome that investigation, for if relief recipients have been treated too generously, or if fraud has been practiced on our welfare department, we want to know about it and Ray Hilliard, our Cook County Director of Public Aid, who is here this evening wants to know about it, and the public is entitled to know about it. I do not suggest that we shift some of our welfare problems to the national scene just to duck responsibility. Neither am I suggesting that we call for Federal aid merely to dip our fingers into the big "pork barrel." What I do suggest is that many of these problems are of national concern, they require the financial participation of the Federal Government. They will be solved adequately only with that assistance. What are some of the needs?

Critics charge that County Hospital is overcrowded and point to patients bedded down in corridors as evidence of community shortcoming. If you visit County Hospital after you leave here tonight, you will find many patients in the corridors. They are there because one of the principles on which the institution operates is never to refuse admittance to persons requiring hospitalization. A public hospital must be operated on that policy. It is unlike private hospitals, whose administrators can hang out the "no vacancy" sign when all the rooms and wards are filled, and stop admissions. And at this time of the year, with respiratory ailments and fractures from falls on ice and other winter accidents, the load is far beyond the ward capacities at County Hospital. But, if you were to visit the hospital in August, you would find many wards where there were a large number of vacant beds. To provide additional ward accommodations for the peak-load in January and February not needed during the rest of the year imposes a burden of expense on society which we cannot expect it to discharge.

There are areas at county hospital where shortage of space is more serious. The obstetrical department, built to accommodate approximately 6,000 prospective mothers, cares for 20,000 annually. Although the department has been enlarged it is still far from adequate. A new building to accommodate this and other departments is needed. But, as the members of the federation know from their experience in building, the cost comes high. Traditionally, funds for expansion and rehabilitation of the hospital have been obtained through bond issues. Whether our votors would put themselves in debt to the tune of the additional millions a proper obstetrical building would cost is a bet on which the odds are long. How much time we have to wait is also doubtful.

The joint commission on accreditation of hospitals, which approves standards of all hospitals, recently placed county hospital on a conditional accreditation primarily because of overcrowding in the obstetrics area. We are in danger a year from now of losing our accreditation completely at county hospital. This loss would be a catastrophy. It would seriously interfere with the ability of the hospital to obtain interns and residents, and would certainly endanger tremendously the ability of the hospital to care for the medical needs of the indigent in this county. It would have serious effect on Michael Reese and Mount Sinai Hospitals because they would have to provide for the services and needs of an even greater number of the sick and indigent of this county than they do at the present time. Why, then, should the Federal Government not be called upon to participate in the cost of the additional facilities needed, just as Federal funds have helped finance construction of many private hospitals through the Hill-Burton Act?

Adequate medical facilities for the indigent of this country are as much a matter of national concern and contribute as much to the national health and strength as the building of a dam in the West or the establishment of a new national park. Should our Nation as a whole not contribute a share to the public hospital requirements of a county that has more people living in it than a combination of 10 States of the Union and which will serve originally from every corner of the land? It is in this direction we must move if we hope to be able to make county hospital what it must be. Cook County should, of course, participate in the cost, but is it wrong to expect the rest of the Nation to match our effort?

Our Cook County Public Aid Department recently made an examination of the literacy level of its recipients. It revealed that the ability of many of them to comprehend is below the sixth-grade level. They lack the basic skills and knowledge necessary to follow simple directions, carry out simple tasks, or even fill out a job application. Is it any wonder that they are on relief instead of being able to develop for themselves a fruitful and productive role in our economy? Last March, the public aid department, with the Chicago Board of Education, embarked upon a program of education for welfare recipients. Its goal is not to give them Ph. D.'s, bachelor degrees, or even high school diplomas; it is simply to raise their educational levels to the point where they have comprehension sufficient to qualify them for training for employment.

More than 7,000 persons have taken advantage of this program. Its expense has been borne almost entirely by the taxpayers of Cook County through the board of education budget. Most of these people were not educated in Cook County, but ignorance produced elsewhere in the Nation has become a drain on the local taxpayers. Is it not a national obligation to fill in the education which our adults should have received elsewhere but never did. The often beaten-up Federal aid to education program which President Kennedy has again proposed to Congress if effective, should guarantee all children, no matter where they attend school, a good enough education so that as adults, they will not require in future years the education we are now trying to provide. A child is an underfinanced and poorly staffed school outside of Cook County is a potential source of trouble to every taxpayer in Cook County if he finds his way here when he grows up. It is as much the concern of the people of this county that the schools throughout the land are adequate as that the standards of our own local school system are acceptable.

I invite your attention to the failure of our community for many years to do something about proper shelter for neglected children. Neglected children who are innocent of wrongdoing are accommodated at our Audy Home under conditions I regard as insensitive and which may very well be developing in them extreme hostility to a society which places them there.

At the Audy Home we find two types of children. Those who have gotten into trouble and require confinement and close supervision, and also those who have done nothing wrong but are merely innocent victims of parental neglect or abuse. The latter look to society only for shelter, food, and clothing. Yet, we place them in detention at the Audy Home where delinquents are also detained, simply because this community has never gotten around to providing another place of shelter for neglected children.

Insofar as possible they are separated from delinquents, but they are still housed in a detention institution which has the atmosphere of a place where delinquents are confined, rather than in the type of reception center they deserve, with a normal homelike atmosphere. The Federal Government has expressed concern about the juvenile delinquency that plagues our large cities. It is embarking on a program to alleviate the circumstances which give rise to delinquency.

Would it not be wise to consider a plan to assist large urban areas in the construction of suitable shelter facilities for neglec-

ted children a necessary and integral part of any program on a national basis having to do with juvenile delinquency?

Sam Goldsmith, the executive director of this federation, is now serving as a very useful and hard-working member of a citizen's committee on the family court which is supervsing a study of the court and Audy Home which will soon be released. I am happy that Mr. Goldsmith is on this committee because he brings to it a wealth of talent and understanding in the solution of social problems as I believe no one in this entire State can surpass. I believe this study will point to the need for adequate shelter facilities in this county for neglected children. I hope that it, unlike some studies which have gone before, will not be placed in a filing cabinet until its existence is forgotten.

We may not yet live in one world, but it is certain we live in one land. No metropolitan area in America is an island. The problems of each are those of the Nation. To solve them we must free ourselves from the dogma that there is either sanctity or American tradition in undiluted local activity. Belief that activity by local government is a safer guarantee of liberty than participation by our Federal Government is a delusion. Our National Government and its courts have done as much to uphold freedom and civil rights in our land as State and local government entities, and more than many of them.

Our welfare needs will be fully and adequately satisfied only by strengthening the national program now in existence and by adopting bold and new programs designed to secure and strengthen all the citizens of our land.

Does the United States Have Nuclear Weapons Superiority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 argument for a nuclear test ban treaty given by U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster, and others on behalf of the administration, is this: The United States has nuclear superiority and unless further nuclear testing is prohibited the United States will gradually lose that superiority.

This squarely brings into issue the following question: Does the United States have nuclear weapons superiority?

Careful examination of statements by the President, Mr. Foster, his deputy, Adrian S. Fisher, and others reveals the following:

SUPERIORITY

Claims for superiority: First, regarding nuclear weapons yield to weight ratios—that is, more bang per pound of warhead—and, second, greater variety and numbers of tactical nuclear weapons in stockpile.

PARITY

In general, parity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. seems to be admitted respecting first, lack of complete knowledge of weapons effects—that is, effects of radiation on radar detection, communications, command and control systems, "hardened" installations, and so forth—second, unavailability of really effective antimissile warheads, and third, nondevelopment of pure fusion weapons—that is, the neutron bomb.

INFERIORITY

No claims are made respecting very high yield U.S. weapons superiority. The Soviets are known to have tested a 58-megaton weapon and claim the ability to scale it up without further testing to 100 megatons.

The foregoing may be assumed to be a relatively accurate assessment of the relative capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R. if it also is assumed those making the claims have relatively accurate information regarding: first, the Soviet stockpile; second, all Soviet tests, including small, undetectable yield underground experiments with tactical and pure fusion weapons.

In evaluating whether or not the assessment of relative capabilities actually supports the advantage claimed for a test ban treaty—that is, that the United States, will retain its lead longer under conditions of nontesting than conditions of testing—the following should be in mind:

First. Small yield-to-weight ratios are important to the American military which does not possess very large thrust rocket engines and thus must rely on lighter warheads for its missiles. This ratio is less critical to the Soviet military which does possess very large thrust rocket engines.

Second. Tactical weapons will be most useful to the American military in defending the homelands of its allies against invasion by an aggressor. Severe limitations on the actual use of tactical nuclear weapons on free world soil in defense of free world soil will be imposed by the necessity to protect friendly populations from the effects of fallout. Additionally, defenders must have in stockpile many such tactical defensive weapons at a variety of locations which the aggressor might choose for its thrust.

Since the Soviet military can expect its role to be that of the aggressive invader of foreign soil at locations of its own choice, it has little need in its arsenal either for variety in or large numbers of tactical nuclear weapons. On the contrary, relatively crude and dirty weapons might conceivably appear advantageous to Soviet tacticians.

Third. In relation to facts set forth in the previous paragraph, it is obvious that pure fusion tactical weapons capability would be of markedly greater advantage to the American military than the Soviet military.

Fourth. In the role of defender rather than aggressor, it would seem that knowledge of weapons effects and truly effective antimissile warheads would be of much greater relative advantage to the American military than to the Soviet military. On a recent occasion Premier Khrushchev claimed Soviet scientists had "solved" the antimissile problem.

Fifth. In light of Defense Secretary McNamara's recent testimony that considerable hardening of Soviet missile bases is taking place, the advisability of including very high yield warheads in the U.S. stockpile deserves knowledgeable consideration.

Sixth. Inasmuch as this argument for a nuclear test ban treaty does not contend the United States will succeed in keeping its "nuclear superiority"—only that it might do so for a longer time under conditions of nontesting—it implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Inevitably then Soviet capability would catch up with us. Then surpass us. What happens then?

It is desired to emphasize that U.S. nuclear capabilities as set forth above are only those collected from various statements by administration officials while speaking on test ban questions. Therefore they do not necessarily represent my own opinions or the actual situation.

Hungarian Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a memorandum from the Committee for Hungarian Liberation which I feel speaks for itself and under leave granted, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I wish to call to the attention of the Members the continued colonial control which Moscow exercises over the Hungarians, other satellite countries of Eastern Europe, and millions of people within the boundaries of the various Soviet Socialist Republics, who have been deprived of their rights of self-determination.

The memorandum follows:

COMMITTEE FOR HUNGARIAN LIBERATION, INC.,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 31, 1962.

MEMORANDUM

It is with understandable disappointment that the Hungarian living in the free world received knowledge of the fact that the United States of America made the recommendation to revoke the authority vested in Sir Leslie Munro in the matter of the question of Hungary. It becomes even more difficult to understand this recommendation when it is considered that Moscow and the Moscow-run Government of Budapest have done nothing to satisfy the resolutions passed by the United Nations in 1956 and later. It is absolutely certain that it is the Russian Red army which kept the Kadar puppet government in power in Hungary. As a result, human rights and national independence do not exist as far as the Hungarian people are concerned. The only change which has taken place in Hungary is the improvement of the Communist propaganda techniques aimed at the free West and elsewhere.

The Hungarian people the world over clearly see the consequence of the revocation of the authority of Sir Leslie Munro. There will be no more discussions in the United Nations concerning the brutal and colonialistic suppression of the Hungarian people. It appears to many as the final burial of the international significance of the Hungar-

ian question. The Hungarian freedom fight is no longer a moral and political weapon in the hands of the free nations. It will appear to eastern and central Europe and the Balkans and the suppressed nationalities of the Soviet Union and proof that individual rights and national independence from 1962 forward, will be measured in terms of double standards. It further appears as a silent acceptance of the status quo.

In view of the above, hope for the liberation of the enslaved nations will diminish. At the same time the power of the Soviet Union and its puppet governments will be increased. In the eyes of the enslaved nations there has been decline in the moral reputation of the Western peoples. Furthermore, this recommendation will in no way improve the spirit of resistance to Communist slavery among the enslaved peoples.

It is understandable that the enslaved nations are deeply disturbed because the champion of freedom, the United States of America made the recommendation, and the protector of small nations, the United Nations, accepted it. The explanation made by U.S. Representative Rowan has not alleviated the unfortunate impression. The transfer of the Hungarian question to the personal authority of the U.N. Secretary General is not comforting, since specific instructions were not provided.

Small nations under these circumstances again are experiencing two great powers taking steps toward agreements without raising the Iron Curtain. The struggles toward liberation and freedom of the small nations which have fallen into an unfortunate sphere of influence became nothing more than sacrificial offerings. Yet, these peoples have been required to sacrifice immeasurably as a result of arrangements made at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. Not only did they lose human rights and national liberties, unnumbered millions have lived through the anguish of elimination of free speech, fear, want and death by torture.

The enslaved nations and the Hungarian people would like to believe that this step was taken as a tactical necessity. They would like to believe that the free West has not abandoned those principles which form the foundation of individual and national existance in the free world. For these reasons we respectfully ask you:

1. That the free nations do not support any action to minimize the significance of the U.N. resolution concerning Hungary, or that these resolutions be stricken from the record with their silent consent.

2. That the free nations refuse to recognize the representative of the Russian puppet government of Hungary, Kadar's government.

3. That the United States of America not give recognition to the Russian colonial rulers in Budapest as being the legitimate government of Hungary by establishing diplomatic relations with it.

4. That the free nations exercise in the United Nations the same energy and sincerity for demanding the disintegration and abolition of the Eastern slave-empire as the United States of America have exercised in demanding the freedom of the Asian and African colonies.

The people living under international or national communism still consider communism as an institution which does not recognize moral codes or political boundaries and an international menace just as under Stalin. They draw these conclusions from personal experience. Today as well as under Stalin, they are living under a complete dictatorship. Behind this dictatorship stands the powerful Red Army. The happy and free nations living at a safe distance are in no position to clearly understand the true nature of that slave-system.

The enslaved peoples cannot share the optimistic views which was implied in a talk given by Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant on December 2, 1962 or by Mr. Ball, Undersecretary of State in New York on December 13, 1962. In the service of a principle, it does not make much of a difference who the individual is and who holds the flag. There is no difference in the purpose of office whether it is filled by Stalin or Khrushchev.

The experienced people of the enslaved nations watched the Cuban developments with critical awareness. The result of the Cuban situation was not one of victory of the principles of the Free West over that of communism, because this never developed into an issue. It was primarily a victory of the United States of America over the Soviet Union in the area of power-politics. The Communist ideology and the way of life it represents never was threatened during the critical period.

There is considerable apprehension among the enslaved nations that the extremely serious reverses which occurred under the effects of Stalin's personality during and after World War II will be repeated now under Khrushchev's personality. Because of an error in the interpretations of Stalin's intentions, very grievous errors were made with reference to the small nations and consequently to the entire world. Not only over 200 million people were tossed into slavery, but the present cold war is a direct consequence.

Authorized by the member and cooperating organizations, societies, groups and branches in the United States of America, Canada, South America and Europe.

JULIUS KOVACS,
Executive Vice President.

Should Cuba Policy Criticism Cease?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N.Y.) Evening Press of February 14, 1963:

END CUBAN POLICY CRITICISM?

Republican attacks on the administration's Cuban policy and on foreign policy in general is causing not a little discomfort in Democratic circles. And some Democrats are criticizing the critics, the idea being to quiet them.

Under Secretary of State George Ball and other administration supporters call for an end to "irresponsible congressional attacks" on the President's Cuban policy. Mr. Ball condemns voluntary intelligence gatherers. Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD sees some Republicans as playing dangerously with the fires of public emotion about Cuba.

New York's Representative STRATTON has charged disgraceful irresponsibility to Senator KEATING who has claimed a continuing Soviet military buildup in Cuba. Politics is imputed to both critics and anticritic critics, and the charge is tenable. Just about anything done or said in government is political. And it can't be, nor is it desirable that it be, otherwise.

Bipartisanship, except in times of crisis, doesn't go with our form of government, and for the most part is more myth than reality. Bipartisanship has existed in foreign aid, making possible huge waste, futility, and even corruption without accountability to the people.

Whatever concerns the well-being of the people and the security of the Nation is a political issue. Cuba is a political issue. And it is good that it has been treated so.

Criticism of the President's Cuban policy has educed valuable and reliable information, perhaps going beyond even that possessed by the administration. Senator KEATING's record of calling the turn on Cuban developments has been amazing.

Senator KEATING was reporting a Soviet missile buildup in Cuba last summer many weeks before the President made public report of it in October. And more recently Mr. KEATING, charging a continuing military buildup, pressured the administration and the Defense Department into making new disclosures on what is going on.

It would be unfortunate for this country if an administration in power could cover up questions as vital to security as those of Cuba. More, not fewer, critics are needed. Congress should have more Keatings. A voluntary intelligence gatherer, he has acquired new stature as a New York Senator, and in the Nation. For his courage and purposefulness, a debt is owed Senator KEATING.

Not without due regard for the responsibility for grave decisions the President must carry, many Americans question Cuban policy. Why wasn't more pinned down in regard to Cuba when the President went to the brink with Khrushchev in October? Why was the blockade removed before Russian troops and large quantities of weapons were out of Cuba?

Why was Khrushchev yielded a strategic victory in being permitted to keep a military base in Cuba? Knowing the duplicity practiced by the Russians, why did the President settle for a promise of removal of Soviet troops in due course?

It is, of course, easier to criticize past Cuban policy than to say what should be done now to reverse the Cuban situation. But that isn't to suggest that there be an abatement of criticism. Cuba is very much a political issue, and so it will remain and should remain.

Congress Should Pass Legislation To Eliminate National Origin Quota System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, introduced H.R. 3926 to eliminate our national origin quota system. I am heartily in favor of this proposed legislation and have introduced today an identical bill, to indicate my strong support.

Since 1924, our immigration system has been based upon the unfair and discriminatory principles of national origin. Under present laws, controlling factors as to whether an immigrant may be admitted to the United States, his admission delayed, or refused, are area of the world in which he was born, his race, and nationality. My bill would eliminate this

repugnant principle. It provides that the person he is, and his fitness to become a citizen of the United States would determine his right to come here—not his place of birth, his race, or his nationality.

The bill provides for a total annual immigration quota of 250,000 to be distributed among four specifically defined classes: first, family unification class; second, occupational class; third, refugee asylum class; and fourth, resettlement class. There would be an annual distribution of the overall immigration quota under the following procedure. Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the four classes and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it takes effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

The flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota will permit us to decide what category of immigrants would at any particular time best serve our country's needs and suit world conditions.

I would point out that an important provision of the bill provides a guarantee that no unfair distribution of immigrant visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country can take place. Within each of the four classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country.

My assistance has been asked in hundreds of immigration cases, and I know the suffering and heartache endured by countless persons who are prevented from coming to our country because of our antiquated and unfair quota system based on national origin and race. Many must be registered with a U.S. consul for half a lifetime before they can be reached under the quota; many do not live long enough to be reached. It is high time that we let intending immigrants know that we shall be happy to admit them as soon as possible and practicable, if they meet reasonable qualifications—that is, that they will be considered as persons, individuals—not solely on the basis of geography or color of skin. Brotherhood—love for our fellow man—should be our guiding motives, not cruel discrimination and implied downgrading of human beings because of their race, color, or place of birth.

The bill also contains additional proposed amendments to remove restrictive features such as the needless distinctions between natural born and naturalized citizens; it also provides for a statute of limitations on deportations. It seeks improvement of administrative structure as well as of administrative and judicial review.

Our Committee on the Judiciary last year undertook an extensive study of population and immigration problems. This study is being continued, and it is hoped that helpful results will be obtained. I feel certain that the study will prove conclusively the need for the new legislation covered by this bill. I trust that the Congress will realistically approach the problem and take favorable action so that these greatly needed improvements in our immigration and nationality laws will become a reality.

Humanities Free Men From Fear and Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the best expressions of the meaning and strength of liberal arts education which I have seen appeared in a recent report by Msgr. James Shannon, president of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., published in the Minneapolis, Minn., Star, March 1, 1963. Father Shannon also clearly explains the role which liberal arts plays in American higher education. I know that all our colleagues will find the report both interesting and enlightening:

HUMANITIES FREE MEN FROM FEAR AND IGNORANCE

(By Msgr. James Shannon in a report as president of St. Thomas College)

The liberal arts are habits whereby men recognize and use effectively the elements of language, number, and form. Properly employed, these arts free the mind of man from fear, fantasy, and ignorance while they lead it to correct reasoning.

Such fundamental disciplines are not acquired easily or quickly. As habits, they can never be taught. They can only be acquired by novices and exemplified in action by accomplished practitioners.

The liberal arts can be exemplified by educated persons in any place: On a log, in a field, in a classroom, in a small college, or in a large university. But they can be exemplified most effectively among groups (of interested persons) large enough to offer members the benefit of disagreement, agreement of qualification by other members, and small enough to permit participation by every member of the group.

Such groups should not only be of manageable size, they should also be composed of persons who share a common desire to spend the time and to acquire the discipline which are demanded of a liberal artist. Such persons seldom move and never function well in large flocks.

Furthermore, in order to be meaningful or purposeful, the liberal arts must be directed toward some intelligible philosophical system and moral order. They are not ends in themselves. The clever dialectician who quotes all the sources, but who lacks personal conviction, is an intellectual monstrosity.

With the present-day necessity for maintaining and extending our highly specialized technology and our expanding economy, our universities must constantly foster the basic and applied research on which our economy is based. External forces, such as the threat of communistic domination of the world, also increase this pressure toward specialization and professional education.

To answer this crucial but transient challenge by sacrificing our education in the liberal arts would be a tragic blow to the Western civilization we wish to save. Hence we are committed to an increasingly serious effort to expand and improve the caliber of our liberal arts teaching at the same time that we expand our technology and our specialized research. Both tasks are necessary.

In the best definition of an educated man written in our day, Jose Ortega y Gasset has said that an educated man is one who understands and appreciates the cultural tradition which produced him and who is willing to spend his time, his talent, and his training in order that that precious heritage might be preserved, protected, and perfected for the generations which will come after him.

There is in modern or ancient literature no better definiton of an educated man. It says everything. It looks to the past. It faces the future.

It relates human rights to human duties and it demands that every man use all of his potential, that he recognize his debt to his forbearers, and that he accept moral responsibility for the heritage he bequeaths to posterity.

Long ago, Henry Adams worried about the degradation of the democratic dogma in American society. He would be shattered to witness in our day the approaching triumph of the mass man, the second-class man who makes no demands upon himself, who can neither create, nor appreciate, nor conserve the culture whose fruits he enjoys.

In contrast, the nobleman, the man of excellence, is a man who realizes that his stature is measured by his contribution to society, not by his demands on it. It is vain to hope that men will ever approach this lofty standard without the benefit of some orderly moral code which goes beyond the natural ethics of Aristotle.

The current crucial problem in Oxford, Miss., the history of economic injustice in Cuba which invited the Marxism of Castro, the betrayal of public confidence in the police department in Denver, the central thesis of the "Ugly American," and the all but insoluble dilemma of controlling nuclear power with justice for the common good—all underline our deep conviction that the fundamental problems of our educational system are moral.

Item No. 1: Where To Cut the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democratic leadership invited members of the Republican Party interested in cutting the recordbreaking budget of this administration to stop generalizing and instead name specific areas where cuts could be implemented without jeopardizing the security of the United States.

I regard this as an appropriate request and from this point on intend to suggest specific items in line with the Democratic leadership's suggestion. Here is the first one I would like to draw to your attention. It involves the TFX contract

award presently under Senate investigation. Here is a case where the administration, overriding the recommendations of five military boards, selected a second-class design costing $500 million more than the design of the Boeing Airplane Co. During the current hearings it has been demonstrated that the Boeing design could have been produced at the much lesser cost and with a much greater flight range of military capability.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I offer this in evidence as item No. 1 for reduction of the administration's budgetary requests.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address Delivered by Senator Hartke at Conference of National Association of Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, last week the conference of presidents of the State broadcasters' association assembled in Washington under the auspices of the National Association of Broadcasters.

At their luncheon session at the Shoreham Hotel on Tuesday, February 26, the conference had the good fortune to have as its luncheon speaker, our colleague Senator HARTKE, of Indiana.

As a member of our Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Senator HARTKE is most knowledgeable in the area of broadcasting. His address on that occasion was instructive and provocative, couched in apt phrasing, and I feel it should be a part of the record of this Senate where we do give a great deal of thought and attention to the responsibilities of broadcasters and our own legislative responsibility in the mass media of communication.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARTKE's address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARTKE ADDRESSES STATE BROADCASTERS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS CONFERENCE

If the broadcaster feels puzzled or lost today, if he feels caught in the crossfire of laws, regulations, orders, community needs, and the necessity of making money, he is not alone. Many people feel lost today in a world they do not understand.

Perhaps we all stand a little too close to the proverbial forest and, thereby, have difficulty with the trees. Maybe we ought to back off and have a look at the whole from a new perspective.

Your industry is unique in our system. On the one hand, the American way insures free speech, the right to criticize, and the other constitutional guarantees we hold so dear. On the other hand, for reasons which you know well, the licensing of broadcasting is necessary and proper since the spectrum is limited and since the ether belongs to all of us. The basic consideration in granting a license is, of course, public service. And one man's public service is another man's poison—especially under our system.

I would, however, like to share some views with you on the service that I think should be performed by the broadcasting industry and the role which I think you and your colleagues and their stations should fill in today's world.

The inherent regulation of the business and the early growing pains have had a lasting effect. But I think there has been no trauma. Rather, I think, the patient need only to examine his past to understand his present so that he can face the future.

As I see the broadcast industry, a radio or television station is not a newspaper of the air, except to the extent that both media ought to be dedicated to public service—the newspaper because of the obligation implicit in the constitutional guarantees and the radio or television outlet because the law says so.

There are today, as you know, many communities in which there is no daily newspaper while there is a local radio station. In these cases, the need to serve the public interest—to fill the gap, if you will—transcends that required by law. There is a moral requisite which equals, if not exceeds, the legal requirement.

If you do not accept this, look at it this way: The holder of a license to broadcast holds a valuable commodity given to him by the Government of the people. The mere issuance of the license turns a paper corporation into a business which can be sold, traded, used, misused, milked, and bikled. Or it can be put to the highest service.

I do not want you to think that I believe that radio and television must broadcast nothing but public service programs. I certainly know that we who own the 55 or 60 million television sets of the country and the 200-odd million radio sets, neither want nor expect continuous doses of news, panels, public affairs, and public service. I like these; they are concerned with my business which is government. I also like steak, pork chops, fried chicken and hamburger. But, as I prefer my steak, pork chops and hamburger to be varied with occasional fish, salads, cheese, roast beef and other dishes, so I prefer my news and public affairs to be varied with entertainment of various kinds. I love music of all types. I enjoy westerns. I respect the rights of my teenage children to indulge in the twist and rock and roll.

It is easy to understand why, in a market like Washington or any other big city, the broadcast media tend to specialize. It is, I suppose, like the big city physician or dentist. But I think we are tending to overspecialization in all of these. I don't think a dentist should specialize exclusively in the care, cleaning and repair of back teeth only. I don't think a physician should turn away a neighbor with a stomach ache because he specializes only in treatment of broken arms. And I certainly don't think that it is necessary for a station to cater exclusively to devotees of rock-and-roll, long-hair music or anything else. Specialization in certain markets—maybe. Specialization to the exclusion of any variety—no.

I do not think any hard and fast rules can be or should be laid down. I think it's a matter for the industry to suggest in keeping with your own policing activities through the broadcasting code.

I do not think you serve the public interest by confining your public service programing to weekends, to class C time, and other offpeak listening and viewing periods. There is nothing to hide or be ashamed of in these programs. If there is, it's the station's fault for airing that kind of program. Government, religion, news and public affairs need not be dull. If a station is to serve the public interest and the needs of the community and the Nation, it has a duty not just to log some air time for this kind of program, but to put a little effort into making it palatable to the listener and viewer. The networks have—ever since the "vast wasteland" speech if not before—shown increasing awareness of these needs. And, in the fine public affairs programs now being aired, they have found new commercial commodities. A good, comprehensive news or public affairs program need neither be dull nor sustaining to be interesting.

In meeting this public service need, a station should be aware of the viewers and listeners beyond the shadow of its antenna. I think this is particularly true now that we have the controversy over the size of a listening area and the issue of interference in the context of the sign-on and sign-off times of daytime radio stations. If a station is going to claim some kind of squatters rights over a vast territory, it ought to be prepared to serve that vast territory, and not just with entertainment or even news of national interest. I think the public service obligation grows with the area being served. After all, the commercial possibilities and the rates grow with the size of the area.

When the broadcast industry recognizes these needs and meets them, it most effectively blocks the critics who feel that radio and television are not grown up. These critics are the ones who fear the lifting of Section 315 permanently, for instance. These critics think that radio and television must remain spoon-fed forever. I do not.

I like to think that a grownup, affluent and responsible free-enterprise broadcast industry has had long enough to learn its obligations in the straightjacket of regulation and ought now be turned as loose as possible. But such action would have to be tempered by the industry's own demonstration of increased responsibility and by government's insistence that the day of reckoning—the day of permit renewal—will be something more than a pro forma thing.

The broadcast industry ought to dare to experiment, dare to be different, dare to educate, enlighten, entertain, explain and criticize. I think stations, which now number 2½ times the number of newspapers in the United States, ought to dare to be more colorful, more complete and more objective than newspapers. Too many newspapers today have fallen or thrown themselves into the chasm of carping criticism. Too many seek to promote selfish ends by blinding themselves to the other side or other viewpoint. I know one newspaper that, during a recent political campaign dig at the opposition, printed on page 1, "read both sides in the ————." Responsible journalism has reached low ebb when this is necessary. I challenge my friends in the electronics journalism field to move into this vacuum and to provide the ingenious and objective coverage of news and public affairs that some people cannot get otherwise. Fortunately, this is not a common need. But it happens too often.

You will recall that I was one of the leaders in the drive to free the industry from the shackles of restriction imposed by section 315. My bill in 1959 would have repealed this section. It was the forerunner of hearings to suspend the section in part or in whole temporarily. It led to the sus-

pension that allowed the famous Kennedy-Nixon debates of 1960.

The President has now proposed that the section be set aside for the 1964 campaign. I, personally, see no reason why section 315 should shackle coverage of any campaign or any news for that matter. The final decisions on news value and coverage should be left to the experts in the newsrooms of radio and television stations and networks. If stations are competent to make other decisions and judgments, surely they can make these.

A section that has been bypassed once and partially shelved and which the President feels should again be partly set aside, is not serving the public needs. I think it's obvious that a law which needs to be lifted in whole or part from time to time is not a good law.

I think if the suspension can be afforded in the contest for the highest office in the land, it can be for all contests for all offices.

I shall propose the repeal of section 315 together with the requirement that there be continuous study of the way in which the industry treats its new freedom.

I appreciate having the equal time accorded to me to tell you broadcasters my views of your business as some of you have told me your views of my business. And I don't mind that as long as it is a fair comment based upon factual information or sincere thought.

I do not want people to be unconcerned with what we say or do here. I would prefer that people agree with me, but if they can't, then I prefer that they disagree with me. For it is important that people be concerned about politics and government. If people neither agree nor disagree with what I do or say, they are, in effect, failing to be concerned about our country and its future. I do not ask people to love me, but only to share with me and my colleagues the responsibility of a great government and a great system.

Different Views on Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an editorial from the Chicago Heights Star of March 3, 1963, which discusses critically the administration's highly publicized and, in large part, mislabeled tax reform proposals.

The editorial follows:

DIFFERENT VIEWS ON TAX REFORM

Due to an apparent slip of the tongue, the administration in Washington will very likely abandon ship with respect to efforts to incorporate so-called reform on its income tax reduction plans.

Until last week, Mr. Kennedy was insisting that part of the income lost through reduction of rates should be recovered by revising schedules of exemptions. Thus the credit allowed on mortgage interest, charitable contributions and other drains on the family wallet would be slashed.

Many persons who assumed home ownership in the belief that income tax advantages would help make this possible would simply be out of luck. So would many churches and charitable organizations. And a liberalized standard deduction plan would be used by many taxpayers, giving them credit for contributions whether they had shared the fruits of their labor or not.

When the President dropped a remark to the effect that he would accept tax deductions without the reforms, however, it became almost certain that this is the opportunity which will be given him. With the reform tie-in, the administration's tax reduction program was a hodgepodge of dubious net value which had encountered stern opposition.

Dropping the most objectionable features of the program is all to the good.

It seems more politically expedient than forthright to employ the term "reform" only in connection with tightening the few avenues of escape from an oppressive income tax system, rather than eliminating gross inequities in the field of taxation.

Repeated efforts by such legislators as fourth district Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI to eliminate obsolete and unfair tax measures have run into a stone wall. The poorest wage earner who is obliged to make an emergency long-distance telephone call must, for example, pay a 10-percent tax on the toll. If one branch of the Government sends his son to a distant Army camp, another branch taxes him for the privilege of inquiring about his health.

But pesky taxes such as these are milked out in small amounts, and frequently the victim doesn't even know he is paying the tab. Their elimination lacks political glamour, else we should see them disposed of before it is decided how much of an income tax deduction we can afford as a shot in the economic arm.

Yet this would indeed be tax reform.

West Virginia State Legislature Adopts Resolution Making Sir Winston Churchill an Honorary Citizen of the State of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on January 14, 1963, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 3, which would confer honorary citizenship of this country on Sir Winston Churchill of Great Britain.

In the 87th Congress it was my privilege to present a similar measure, as did my capable colleague, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, and others. Members who cosponsored this legislation (S.J. Res. 218) which I introduced were Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

My colleagues who cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 3 are Senators ROBERT C. BYRD, ERNEST GRUENING, THRUSTON B. MORTON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HUGH SCOTT, and JOHN G. TOWER.

I am happy to have the opportunity of announcing in the Senate of the United States that the West Virginia State legislature, February 22, 1963, adopted a resolution making Sir Winston an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia, and memorializing the Congress to award him honorary citizenship as an American.

It is gratifying to know that the citizens of West Virginia share our esteem of Sir Winston and recognize his personal and official contribution to the cause of freedom and justice, not only to his country but throughout the world, including America.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 was introduced in the House of Delegates of the West Virginia State Legislature on February 7, 1963, by the Honorable J. F. Bedell, Jr., a delegate from Kanawha County. It was adopted by the house on that date; amended—in a minor way—and approved by the State senate on February 21. The house agreed to the senate amendments and adopted the resolution on February 22, 1963.

I commend the members of the West Virginia State Legislature for their expeditious and conclusive consideration of the resolution and for their judiciousness in adopting it on one of the most significant dates in the history of our Nation—February 22—the birthdate of George Washington, the first President of the United States.

The resolution reads as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24 MAKING SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a citizen of Great Britain by birth, has close ties with the United States of America; and

Whereas said Sir Winston Churchill has demonstrated during the strife and turmoil of two World Wars that he is a friend and ally of the United States; and

Whereas he also has demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the aims, purposes, and aspirations of this Nation at peace conferences, world trade meetings, the United Nations, and elsewhere; and

Whereas there is now a proposal before the Congress that he be made an honorary citizen of the United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate that this great soldier, world statesman, and noted historian and writer be made a citizen of our State prior to being made an honorary citizen of the United States; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That said Sir Winston Churchill be made an honorary citizen of West Virginia and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to award him honorary citizenship as an American.

President Kennedy favors making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. At a news conference on January 24, 1963, he stated that honorary citizenship would not be essential to show the high regard that Americans have for him.

But I would be delighted if the Congress passed a resolution, whether it is (for) honorary citizenship or an expression of esteem.

Some way or other it would be appropriate, perhaps to remind Sir Winston Churchill of our high regard for him. It is written very large in any case, but this would be a gracious act at this time.

Although there has been no action in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on my resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 3—or on other pending similar legislation, the House Committee on the Judiciary approved a measure for this purpose on March 5 and early approval by the House of Representatives is expected.

I am hopeful that the Senate will act expeditiously on this proposal and provide a symbolic memorial to a great statesman and leader whose bond with the United States of America is further enhanced because his mother, Jennie Jerome, was an American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix:

Editorials from the Washington Post, "Honoring Sir Winston" on March 4, 1963, and "Citizen Churchill," March 6, 1963, and, excerpts from an article in the Washington Post by Edward T. Folliard, "Urgency Noted on Citizenship for Churchill," January 13, 1963.

My exchange of correspondence with Sir Winston Churchill.

There being no objection, the material was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

HONORING SIR WINSTON

Now that Sir Winston Churchill has indicated that he would be delighted to accept honorary U.S. citizenship, Congress should act with all speed to bestow the honor. Since Sir Winston had said in 1958 that he might be disposed to decline such a "remarkable compliment," there had been some understandable hesitation on Capitol Hill. With the great British statesman now declaring that he would be "deeply moved by such an honor," it would be ungracious of Congress not to grant what almost every American citizen would like to bestow.

It is not, of course, a matter of trying to claim for the United States this great leader who did so much to save the free world. To be sure, the American people do lay some claim to him because his mother was an American, and there is a feeling in many countries that Churchill, like Lincoln, "belongs to the ages." But there is no thought here of rivaling Britain in Sir Winston's allegiance or affections. Rather, the movement to confer honorary citizenship upon him reflects a general desire to pay tribute to a great Briton who as rendered immeasureable service to mankind.

Nor are the obligations of American citizenship involved. What would be conferred upon the revered former Prime Minister of Britain would be all the honors of American citizenship and none of its responsibilities. Whether or not he would ever come to these shores to accept the honor would naturally be left to his own discretion and would have to be governed in any event by the state of his health. The only question that should concern Congress is the prompt completion of a gracious gesture that will convey to Sir Winston the warmth of the American feeling toward him. Nothing short of unanimous approval in both the House and Senate will do justice to the occasion.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

CITIZEN CHURCHILL

The House Judiciary Committee has moved with gratifying speed to complete its action on the resolution conferring honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill. It is to be hoped that Congress will speed the measure toward final enactment.

The esteem and affection in which "a certain naval person" is held by the people of the United States has not been kept a secret. It is already so well known that no formal act is required to advertise it. It has been demonstrated on one occasion after another. His every visit to this country has elicted from citizens in every walk of life, from officials and from Congress evidences of affection and regard that citizens and officials usually reserve for the most honored and loved of our own countrymen.

Such manifestations of sentiment, however impressive and universal, do not diminish the need for or the wisdom of a formal act of Congress that will place upon the public records of this country an imperishable acknowledgement of a free country's devotion to one who in the gravest of trials spoke, not only for his own compatriots, but for free men in this and every other land.

It has been said that republics are notoriously ungrateful, but it is not true of this Republic. It is equally false to say that the gratitude of democracies is an impulse aroused by the expectation of future favor. These cynical assumptions of ignoble impulse are belied by a thousand evidences that the people of this country have a sure and instinctive response to greatness and a swift and generous reaction to sacrifice in the public good.

The Congress that passes this resolution will speak for a people who are united in their sentiments toward this great man, unanimous in their respect for his genius and wisdom and universally in favor of national tribute as unique as the man it honors.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1963]

URGENCY NOTED ON CITIZENSHIP FOR CHURCHILL

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The campaign to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States is being waged again in Congress, this time with more urgency.

The need for urgency is obvious. Sir Winston is now 88, and as time goes on seems more and more prone to afflictions—his latest being a broken hip, complicated by a bronchial infection. The great Englishman, whose mother was an American, Jennie Jerome, has seemed to be indestructible; but he is well aware of the aphorism, "We all owe God a death."

There can be little doubt that President Kennedy hopes Congress will approve a joint resolution declaring Sir Winston an honorary American citizen. He backed such a move on April 15, 1959, as a Senator from Massachusetts.

Said Mr. Kennedy on that occasion:

"I believe, now that Sir Winston has left active political office, that a grant of honorary U.S. citizenship to him would be a worthy and fully deserved gesture." * * *

Action by Congress authorizing President Kennedy to proclaim Sir Winston an honorary American citizen, is of course, essential. * * *

Mrs. BOLTON reintroduced her joint resolution in the House on the day the 88th Congress convened. Senator YOUNG intends to reintroduce his this week, but he will not be alone. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, also will offer such a resolution, as he did last year.

In the last session, Senators FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, joined in sponsoring the resolution.

Senator RANDOLPH, commenting on a January 9 editorial in The Washington Post headed "Citizen Churchill," which endorsed the idea of honorary American citizenship for the old British lion, said in a letter to this newspaper yesterday that the editorial was "an eloquent and moving tribute to one whose imprint on the pages of history will inspire and challenge uncounted future generations."

The West Virginian recalled Sir Winston's role in World War II and said:

"And yet, his heroism in war is only a small part of the bountiful legacy of Winston Churchill. We think of him today as an astitute political leader, an international statesman, philosopher, artist and learned man of letters. He is revered as a man of peace."

Senator RANDOLPH said that the praise given Churchill in the Post editorial would be "echoed in the minds and hearts of all our countrymen." He said he would reintroduce his resolution and press for its adoption.

"May we soon bring to pass this meaningful recognition which tangibly expresses the heartfelt gratitude and affection, which the American people hold for Sir Winston Churchill," he concluded.

To judge from the Gallup poll, Senator RANDOLPH is not exaggerating when he writes of American admiration for Sir Winston. Over the years, Gallup's agents have asked a cross section of Americans to list the 10 men in the world they most admire.

Year after year, beginning in 1957, the former British Prime Minister was second, topped only by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In a poll taken in December 1962, he was the third "most admired." President Kennedy was first and General Eisenhower second.

There must be many things Americans like about Sir Winston—his courage and stirring oratory in the war years, his brilliance as a writer, his eloquently expressed affection for United States—but his wit certainly should not be overlooked.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., September 5, 1962.

The Right Honorable Sir WINSTON CHURCHILL,
London, England.

DEAR SIR WINSTON: On August 16, 1962, it was my privilege to introduce in the Senate of the United States, legislation which would confer on you the ultimate recognition of esteem and gratitude which the American people may officially offer—that of honorary U.S. citizenship.

Believing that your life and works have ever been devoted to the cause of peace, as well as to brotherhood and cooperation between this Nation and the United Kingdom, this proposed honor would have added significance as a further pledge of cooperative effort by both countries. Especially today, when the need for harmony and unity of action are of paramount importance, would such a pledge be meaningful.

Having genuinely admired your contributions in a variety of fields and unfailing courage in times of stress, I felt that you would not deem it inappropriate to include a copy of my remarks when introducing Senate Joint Resolution 218.

With hope for the continued improvement of your health, I am

Truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

LONDON, *September 7, 1962.*

My Dear SENATOR: I am indeed obliged to you for your letter of September 5, and for the gracious and complimentary terms in which you refer to me. Pray accept my very good wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

Civil Rights Legislation Likely in 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 Roscoe Drummond wrote an excellent piece on civil rights and the prospects of civil rights legislation in this Congress.

With the permission of the House, I am placing it in the RECORD. In so doing I should like to reiterate my request, made by letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, for early hearings on civil rights legislation.

The article follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION LIKELY IN 1963

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is a fair-to-good prospect that strengthened civil rights legislation will be forthcoming at this session of Congress.

A number of measures are before the House and Senate. They are nearly all aimed at two central goals—to protect the right of all citizens to vote and to put a little more speed into the deliberateness of public school integration.

The reason the prospect is fairly good is that both Republican and Democratic leaders are bidding for the initiative. Each side aims to be identified with some positive results.

Since there is no danger that extremist legislation will be passed, this kind of party competition is all to the good.

But Republican supporters of a 1963 civil rights bill cannot afford to alienate like-minded Democrats—and vice versa. Each side of the aisle will need all the backing from the other it can get or there will be no improvement in the protection of civil rights this year. If there are any political dividends to be made on this issue, they will come not from advocacy but from action—that is, from the evidence of which party gave more of its total votes in Congress to practical civil rights legislation.

This is the best test of the relative dedication and the relative capacity of each party to further these two objectives—the right to vote freely and to be free from public discrimination.

At this stage the Republicans in the House, led by the minority members of the Judiciary Committee, are taking the lead in advancing a comprehensive bill that aims to achieve the ends set out in President Kennedy's message last week. At some points it goes further. This bill has already won the recorded support of 37 Republicans in the House.

Democratic Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, and Republican Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky, are giving bipartisan sponsorship to a bill providing Federal protection to all persons seeking to vote in any Federal election.

Their bill, unlike the administration bill defeated last year and introduced again this year, respects the constitutional right of the States to establish voter qualifications. It provides strong measures to insure against discrimination in applying these qualifications. Including Senators COOPER and DODD it has already won the cosponsorship of 17 Democrats and 11 Republicans.

In addition, together with Republican Senators CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, HIRAM FONG, of Hawaii, GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, KENNETH KEATING, and JACOB JAVITS of New York, and with an invitation to Democratic colleagues to join him, Senator COOPER is proposing to put congressional authority behind better progress in public school integration. He proposes that the Attorney General be given the same authority to initiate school desegration suits as he already possesses in voting rights cases under the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Hearings on these and other proposals begin soon. Support for effective protection of civil rights is growing in Congress and will almost certainly bear fruit this year.

President Kennedy, whose personal commitment to the cause of civil rights is amply proved, gave a strong push to action in his eloquent and balanced message.

After listing all the pragmatic reasons why race discrimination is harmful to the Nation—increasing, as it does, the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency and disorder—Mr. Kennedy bespoke the moral conviction of most Americans when he said simply: "Above all, it is wrong."

Those who seek to prevent the Federal Government from protecting the right to vote and from doing its part in erasing this "wrong" never argue that there should be discrimination against the right to vote. They just don't want anything adequate done about it because the right to vote is the most powerful means of securing all other rights.

Distribution of Food Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is well known that Chairman Khrushchev has stated that the Communists would be present for the burial of our system. The statement is falling of its own weight as the Soviets and their Chinese counterparts fret and fume over the failure of Communist agriculture to produce enough to feed their own people while the independent, free enterprise farmers have enough for our country and many of the starving peoples of the world.

While we are sharing with the less fortunate peoples, there remain millions who are starving or suffering from malnutrition. The day is at hand when we can share our abundance. The day may not be far off when it will be essential. This is why many Americans have joined so wholeheartedly in the freedom-from-hunger campaign. I am proud that Mrs. Hartke is taking a lead in the preparation of the freedom-from-hunger world meeting in Washington in a few months. The dinner climaxing the planning session will be on March 21.

Recently, the Catholic Rural Life magazine published an editorial bearing on these problems. It is interesting to note in the article, in addition to the vexing problem of worldwide hunger and malnutrition that there is also a food explosion. It is not confined to our country, but it is confined to the free world. This abundance is not a curse, but a blessing. The abundance amid the Red failures shows again that pride of ownership by the small, independent farmer produces food.

I commend the comments of the Reverend Edward W. O'Rourke, editor of the Catholic Rural Life, to my colleagues as food for thought as well as thoughts for food. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOOD EXPLOSION

We read and hear much these days about the population explosion. We are led to believe that the growth of the world's population is so great that it must be checked by any and all means we can devise. The issue is presented in language full of alarming phrases. The human race is described as a cancer, growing in an uncontrolled manner. Sometimes we are compared to locusts rapidly destroying the world's food supply.

Let us take a careful look at the facts of the case. World food production is increasing more rapidly than world population. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reports that during the past decade, world agricultural production increased at an average annual rate of about 2.9 percent, while the average rate of population increase over this period has been about 1.8 percent per year.

There is no reason to believe that this trend will be reversed. Increase in population in the near future will be more than offset by expanded food production. Several methods for removing salt from sea water are being developed. They will soon be economical enough to permit desalinated water to be used for irrigation purposes. This will greatly increase food production in the Near East, northern Africa, and other areas where food deficits are now serious.

The College of Agriculture at the University of Nebraska has solved the last problem standing in the way of hybridization of wheat. Hybrid wheat will probably yield 25 percent more than open-pollinated varieties.

An acre of ocean produces more food than an acre of fertile land. More than 70 percent of the earth's surface is covered by water, yet we derive only 10 percent of the animal protein supply and probably not more than 1 percent of the total food supply from the sea.

In several nations where food production is now inadequate for the population, vast areas of fertile lands are not being tilled or are being poorly utilized. Striking examples of this are found in India and Brazil. At present, only one-tenth of the land surface of the earth is cultivated. Using only existing methods of farming, this amount could be doubled. Only 12 of the 300 known crop plants provide 90 percent of the world's food supply. Scientific research is needed to develop further uses of other plants.

There is truly a food explosion in the world. The better developed nations already feel its impact. Food surpluses are cumulating in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, France, Denmark, and Ireland. This has resulted in lower income for farmers and large governmental expenditures for price support and production control programs.

This food explosion is a great blessing. However, like all other explosions, it must be handled properly to avoid harmful effects. More developed nations should share their abundance and the causes of their abundance with the less developed nations. As these latter nations increase both agricultural and industrial production, new trade opportunities will open up. Obstacles to the flow of goods among nations must be removed.

Let us, then, have less worry about the population explosion and better use of the blessings of the food explosion. Hunger and poverty stem, not from overpopulation, but from a failure to fully utilize the resources God has given us.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Chamber of Commerce Dinner, Waco, Tex., Thursday, February 21, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vice President JOHNSON at Waco, Tex., Thursday, February 21, 1963:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER, WACO, TEX., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1963

Several weeks ago one of your Waco leaders called me long distance to invite me to have dinner with him at this annual chamber of commerce banquet. Now I like the chamber of commerce. But I am very happy with Lady Bird's food, and I began to tell him that my calendar was rather crowded. But he said, "LYNDON, we have a special honor in mind for you if you can come."

Needless to say, that put things in a different light.

I perked up when I heard that.

He began explaining, "We know that Texas has moved to the forefront of the space age, and we feel it would be appropriate this year for us to give credit where credit is due."

I was really listening by then.

My caller went on—"We think it's time to recognize the Texan who has been out in front in space from the beginning—a man who has risen from a humble Texas background to one of the most commanding positions in the Nation."

I was all smiles by then—and thinking how good the food would taste in Waco. "Why didn't you tell me what you had in mind from the beginning," I said. "Naturally, I'll be there."

Then he said, "Why, thank you LYNDON. I'll tell the board tomorrow that you have accepted and will be on hand for the honor of introducing that distinguished Texan, General Schriever."

Now, you realize, of course, that is just who I thought he had in mind all along.

So, I am here—and let me make it clear, I did not hike the last 50 miles. I told the President in 1960 I would go all the way with J.F.K.—but, if it were all the same to him, I would prefer to ride.

I am sure that you will agree that two of the finest things that ever happened to this part of our State have been BOB POAGE—and that great American, Tom Connally. But, historically, two of the greatest things to happen to this region of Texas have been these: First, the influx into the fertile valleys of central Texas of the great migrations of hardy settlers of all nationalities who populated the region in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The second most important thing is just beginning to happen—that is the space age.

Your guest of honor tonight personifies both chapters of this history. As a very young boy, Bernie Schriever was brought to this country and this State by his parents. Like so many others of the same origins, he has returned much to his adopted country—and Texas and America are richer for it. I would think that even the Baylorites and the ex-Longhorns could forgive him his Aggie days.

Before General Schriever speaks, let me say a few words to you.

Many here remember the days when cotton was king, and these black lands were cotton's empire. In recent years, some have been quick to say that this region is on the decline—that its future is behind it. Like the reports of Mark Twain's death, such gloomy views of central Texas are highly premature.

Where once the future of this region lay at the edge of a plow, today, the future lies in the explorations out among the stars. Waco stands at the center of a vast new complex of space activities. As the triangle—Houston to San Antonio, and Fort Worth and Dallas—grows, Waco is destined to grow and prosper and fill an increasingly important role in the life and leadership of Texas and the Nation.

The industrious people of Waco—led by the kind of community leaders and builders present tonight—are the kind of people America counts on to build a better future for themselves and their children.

Our generations living today are greatly challenged. We live in a time of trial and a time of peril. But the revolution which began on these shores 200 years ago is the revolution of independence and freedom which still is the greatest force in the world.

Fifteen years ago all of Europe, all of the Middle East, all of Asia lay prostrate at the feet of the Red armies. There seemed to be nothing which could stand in the way of consolidation of the Communist empire from the Bering Straits to the Rock of Gibraltar and from the North Pole to the Cape of Good Hope. At that moment, the American people stood behind their President—President Harry S. Truman—when he drew the line at Greece and Turkey and Iran.

We drew the line at the edge of the Communist empire. We said to the aggressor, "This far and no farther." Fifteen years have passed. That line has never been crossed. That frontier of freedom has never been breached. Today within the empire of communism, a great division and dissension has begun between the Russian Communists and the Chinese Communists. While we stand firm, we can responsibly believe that the first stages of disintegration and deterioration of the Communist bloc have begun.

Men of little faith—men of little courage—men blinded by partisan ambition may cry out their prophecies of gloom and doom. But when we see the strength of Western Europe, when we see the commitment to freedom of the new nations of Africa, when we see the valiant stand of the freedom-loving people of Asia, when we see the courage of our friends south of the border, we cannot responsibly conclude other than that the tide of this century is running with us. Communism will not bury us and cannot bury freedom.

The cause for which we stand—the cause to which we are committed—is opening the grave and rolling away the headstones where man's highest aspirations have too long been buried. Our side is the winning side and the knowledge of this should both make us all feel more secure in our homes tonight and give us new incentives to support our country and its cause in the years ahead.

This generation of Americans—like all generations before us—is dedicated to peace. We want a world of peace in which justice and freedom will be part of the lives of all mankind. That fact that the world is now at peace, the fact that freedom is now strong is due in no small measure to the vision, dedication, and determination of men like your guest tonight, who have done and are doing so much to keep the peace and make possible the building of a stronger, safer, and saner world.

It is my privilege to introduce to you Gen. Bernard Schriever.

Tribute to Dr. Philip Hauge Abelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a distinguished gentleman, born and reared in the State of Washington, has been named editor of Science, the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences.

He is Dr. Philip Hauge Abelson, a native of Tacoma, Wash., and a graduate of Washington State University. Dr. Abelson's contributions to our scientific awakening are many. He is codiscoverer of the element neptunium and a coinventor of the uranium isotope separation process that made the atom bomb possible.

Dr. Abelson is a member of the Atomic Energy Commission's advisory committee on peaceful uses of the atom, a member of the major working committee of the AEC, a consultant of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and a member of the Government operations committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

As noted in an editorial published in the Tacoma News Tribune, Dr. Abelson has made substantial contributions to our national security that have not received sufficient attention of these legislative bodies.

I ask that this editorial "Recognition for a Forgotten Man" be printed in the RECORD so that my colleagues can share in the pride of us of the State of Washington for a favorite son.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNITION FOR A FORGOTTEN MAN

An illuminating article about one of the Nation's, if not the world's, outstanding scientists appears in the magazine section of today's News Tribune. He is Tacoma-born Dr. Philip Abelson, the new editor of Science, official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the world's largest general scientific society.

Dr. Abelson was born here April 27, 1913. He was the son of Olai Abelson, an engineer for Tacoma City Light who helped design and build the powerplants for the city of Tacoma's two Cuchman dams. Philip attended Roosevelt school, where he completed eight grades in 6½ years. He moved on to Franklin B. Gault school where he was a member of its first ninth grade, and then was a member of Gault's first class to enter Lincoln High School. At the time he was not quite 14 years of age, but already he was showing indications of the remarkable scientific career for which he was destined.

Despite that predilection he found time for many of the pursuits which are attractive to a normal boyhood. He played trombone

in the Lincoln orchestra, was active in the school's Glider Club and during summer months worked for the city of Tacoma as a substitute surveyor. Later he received his first two science degrees at Washington State College and last year, after that institution had achieved university status, he returned there to receive its first Distinguished Alumnus Award.

In the years which have lapsed since Philip Abelson departed Tacoma to embark upon his conspicuous career in the field of science, many additional honors have come his way. They are too numerous to enumerate here, but many of them are noted in his extensive listing in the 1962–63 edition of Who's Who in America.

Lamentable however by its absence is the fact that this does not include an adequate recognition by the Congress of the United States for what well may be the most remarkable of his scientific achievements. This is a report prepared by Dr. Abelson in March of 1946. He then was head of the Naval Research Laboratory's Special Research Section. This report made possible developments which were an important contribution to the early success of the atomic bomb and subsequently provided the germ of the idea for today's American atomic submarines.

Unofficially Dr. Abelson's contribution has been noted to the extent that he has been described as the neglected man of our nuclear Navy. That, alas, is too little for a man who has done so much. It is high time Congress take appropriate action to rectify the situation.

Congressional Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this year the issue of minority staffing has received more attention and discussion than ever before. Republican members are becoming increasingly aware of the injustice of the present circumstances. On February 23 the Washington Post published an editorial critical of Republican efforts. Congressman William B. Widnall has done much to clarify some of the distortions of the Post editorial. Under unanimous consent I include this letter in the RECORD:

CONGRESSIONAL STAFFS

On February 23 you published an editorial chastising the Republican Party for asking for additional minority employees on congressional committee staffs. It appears to me this editorial overlooks two important points.

First, there is an assumption implicit within the editorial that all staff positions can be equated somehow with nonpartisan appointment. There is no more reason to introduce this assumption into the area of committee staffing than there is to appoint all Cabinet and sub-Cabinet posts through civil service. The executive department, as well as the Legislative Reference Service set up by Congress, provide the great majority of factual material for congressional use, outside of committee investigations. The Legislative Counsel is available for aid in bill drafting.

What is needed, particularly if you concede the Congress its proper role as the originator of laws and policy, is staff members with the knowledge and experience to interpret the facts into legislative proposals according to the policy position of the political party in control. At the same time, if there is to be a responsible opposition, it must have access to staff personnel attuned to its political philosophy as well.

No doubt there are exceptions. Clerical and secretarial staff people, for instance, although even here the designation of such personnel as minority or majority staff, however chosen, creates an invaluable priority system in terms of their time and availability. An additional exception would be staffs of a subcommittee such as the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. In certain instances special outside counsel brought in for investigatory purposes would be appropriate.

The second point overlooked is the simple matter of the present situation. Even assuming a totally nonpartisan staff operation was appropriate, what precisely is the minority party to do while waiting for a benevolent majority not only to increase the capacity of the opposition but decrease their own partisan advantage as well? Some balance must be obtained if only as a temporary expedient.

It is rather puzzling to me that the Washington Post concerns itself with partisan appointments on the Hill which have some justification, and yet ignores the revelation of last week that henceforth patronage considerations will intrude into the summer job picture for high school and college students in the face of an existing nonpartisan personnel system—the civil service.

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Representative, Seventh District, New Jersey.

The Future of Manned Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Future of Manned Aircraft," written by J. S. Butz, Jr., technical editor, Air Force/Space Digest, and published in the March 1963, issue of Air Force magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF MANNED AIRCRAFT

(By J. S. Butz, Jr.)

For military tasks of all types, the United States is rapidly shifting its major reliance to missiles and away from high-performance aircraft. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's fiscal year 1964 budget presentation offers no hope to brighten the clouded future of the strategic bomber, and it raises strong questions about the future acceptability of tactical aviation as presently conceived by the USAF.

In the strategic field the situation is clear. The administration's justification of the budget is slanted to prepare the United States to accept a philosophy on nuclear stalemate.

In Mr. McNamara's words, "We are approaching an era when it will be increasingly improbable that either side could destroy a sufficiently large portion of the other's strategic nuclear force, either by surprise or otherwise, to preclude a devastating retaliatory blow. * * * Therefore [there is] * * * a great mutual interest in seeing to it that they are never used."

To attain this stalemate posture, the Secretary says, "* * * we must concentrate our efforts on the kind of strategic offensive forces which will be able to ride out an all-out attack by nuclear-armed ICBM's or submarine-launched missiles in sufficient strength to strike back decisively."

THE CASE AGAINST MANNED BOMBERS

Clearly, manned bomber forces, even if dispersed and partially on airborne alert, do not fit into this new strategy. Mr. McNamara downgrades the bomber on two main counts. First, he says, "Manned bombers on the ground are quite vulnerable to surprise ballistic missile attack." Second, the Secretary says that, "* * * the B–52 must be committed to its targets, if at all, early in the war because it would be vulnerable on the ground to missile attack. Common sense requires that we must not let ourselves be inflexibly locked in on such a matter."

Essentially the Congress is being asked to believe that by eliminating one of the three means of strategic attack presently available (bombers, ICBM's, and Polaris missiles) the United States is increasing its flexibility and strengthening its deterrence. No mention is made of the position that manned strategic aircraft greatly enhance operational flexibility by allowing: recall of an attack; unmistakable displays of resolve, through stepped-up airborne alerts and large-scale maneuvers, such as were used in the Cuban crisis; wartime assessment of target damage; location and destruction of mobile targets; a close matching of the weapon to the target; and, when the occasion calls for it, the use of very-high-yield warheads.

A strange timetable for reshaping the strategic forces has been presented by Mr. McNamara to the Congress. The entire B–52 force, all 14 wings, will be needed in service for at least 5 more years, through fiscal year 1968, he says. This is at least 3 years after 800 out of the planned 950 Minuteman ICBM's are scheduled to be operational, 4 years after the 108 scheduled Titans are in place, and around 2 years after the bulk of the Polaris submarines are commissioned.

It is hard to believe that the big bombers will survive that long. Even if a large-scale retirement is not ordered, the aircraft are wearing out ahead of their time through heavy use in airborne alerts and the hard buffeting of low-level flights for which they were not initially designed.

However, the most significant sign for the future of the strategic aircraft is the fact that no B–52 replacement is under development—or is even being considered for development.

Mr. McNamara has tried to head off critics of his policy by explaining his position in great detail to the Congress and to carefully selected reporters. Still the matter may develop into a major public debate.

On the technical side, Mr. McNamara's conclusions as to missiles can be challenged on several accounts. On the crucial question of just how vulnerable are ICBM's in silo emplacements the Secretary says, "Fully hard ICBM sites can be destroyed but only at great cost in terms of the number of weapons required to dig them out." Apparently he believes that this will be true for some years after the phasing out of the manned strategic bomber and certainly beyond the next 5 years, to which the current DOD planning is addressed.

Destroying hard emplacements primarily is a matter of increasing either warhead yield or guidance accuracy, or both, in the attacking weapon. On either score the future doesn't look too promising for an all-hard-site ICBM force. According to administration announcements the Soviets significantly increased the yield-to-weight ratio of their nuclear weapons during their most

recent series of tests. And there is no reason to believe that further progress is not possible.

On the other score, there is widespread belief that missile accuracy can be increased dramatically in the next few years. In a state of the art versus time review of missile and space systems by H. H. Koelle, Director, Future Projects at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center (Astronautics, November 1962), Koelle reported that, "For many years guidance accuracy was the limiting performance factor, which led to requirements for high-yield warheads. But, through the extension of presently available technology of sensors and terminal control, we can now see the achievement of a true hard target capability before 1970."

If Mr. McNamara is wrong on this crucial point, then the case for an invulnerable, second-strike, stalemate posture begins to fall apart.

Apart from budgeting and politics, the case against the manned aircraft rests on the accuracy and the power of the latest defensive weapons. If nuclear-armed antiaircraft systems can destroy virtually all of any bomber force, regardless of its size and regardless of its speed of attack, the bomber becomes a highly unattractive offensive system.

However, in testing the validity of the premise of complete defensive superiority, it is well to start with Mr. McNamara's own starting point. He cautions that global nuclear war is "a vast unknown." But as this nuclear enigma is debated, it seems that manned aircraft are getting much the worst of the suppositions.

For instance, the first step in any airtight air defense is to use very large warheads in the defense. Weapons in the size range of the last Soviet tests when detonated at high altitude can damage aircraft and fatally irradiate crews at distances up to several hundred miles and over tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of square miles. The Soviets, with relatively few rockets equipped with these weapons, could make the Arctic a very dangerous place for SAC. Such area coverage would be a potent first phase in the defense. Closer in, interceptors would maneuver against the bombers, firing small atomic weapons. The third and final phase would be ground-launched missiles, which are being steadily improved.

Potent as this arrangement sounds, SAC commanders believe that tactical maneuver and ingenuity, coupled with electronic countermeasures, decoy missiles, and penetration aids of several types, can be combined to outwit this defense in a determined attack. This opinion is strengthened considerably when one remembers that the vital nerves of the defense are a radar net not unlike our civil air traffic control system. Such a system is extremely vulnerable to attack.

The point here, however, is that no modern offensive system, manned or unmanned, is immune to extremely potent counteraction. There is grave doubt about the "relative invulnerability" of the ICBM in its silo. Also technical authorities believe that an ICBM interception system will become practical.

And when the use of very large area weapons is discussed, the Polaris system can be examined in the proper light. The same basic, very high yield weapons that threaten the manned bomber over the Arctic also threaten the Polaris submarine. Multimegaton depth charges, if you will, lobbed over relatively short ranges from the Russian mainland can clear immense areas of the ocean. This enemy capability forces on the Polaris the same requirements for timely action and tactical ingenuity that SAC must satisfy. There just aren't any cheap or easy answers.

Keep the Flame of Freedom Burning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], who has taken a vigorous role in the study of the plight of captive nations under Communist domination, was a speaker at a dinner February 14, 1963, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. The dinner was sponsored by the American-Bulgarian League honoring the Free Europe Committee and Radio Free Europe. With permission to extend my remarks at this point, I include the text of Mr. MONAGAN's speech:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT OF CONNECTICUT, AT WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, AT DINNER SPONSORED BY AMERICAN-BULGARIAN LEAGUE HONORING THE FREE EUROPE COMMITTEE AND RADIO FREE EUROPE

I am honored to have this opportunity to talk with a group of people who by birth, nationality, background, or human sympathy are interested in the fate and future of the hapless and historic people of the great country of Bulgaria.

I am also pleased to join in this ceremonial which does honor to Radio Free Europe and the Free Europe Committee. I have just returned from a trip behind the Iron Curtain and I know the importance and the potential of the work done by this committee and this service.

Unfortunately, in this world of feeble human beings, power often bulks larger than principle and fate too often seems to be on the side of the big battalions. It is also regrettably true that even the most worthy cries of the oppressed and the downtrodden with the passage of time frequently seem to lose urgency to the average citizen and even to the average nation in spite of honest sympathy and good will.

That is why it is so important for interested citizens to meet regularly in order to refresh the recollection of the people of our country and of the world with a repetition of the facts of the Communist takeover of central Europe and to recall to their sympathies the present tragic and persistent condition of the friendly and downtrodden men and women of the captive nations.

It is frequently said that time heals all things and with the passage of the months and years there is a danger that the world will become complacent about the fate of these brothers behind the Communist border and that the rough edge of their tragedy will become smooth in our memories through forgetfulness.

This, my friends, must never be. Self-determination and freedom are not mere catchwords to be bandied about without thought or consideration. They are living principles upon which our Nation and associations of freemen everywhere are based. They are as valid today as they were when enunciated in our Declaration of Independence and their appeal to the victims of tyranny is stronger today than ever because these unfortunate human beings have greater cause than ever to understand their soundness and the need for their realization if the common aspirations of these imprisoned populations are to be realized.

And let there be no question about the fact that these peoples are imprisoned and that these nations are rightly termed captive nations.

I have seen the obscene wall in Berlin. I have seen the barbed wire, the watchtowers, the guards, the automatic rifles, and the dogs at the boundary between free Austria and captive Czechoslovakia.

We know that these barriers have been erected to prevent the wholesale desertions that would occur and have occurred through the departure of eager fugitives from the blessings of the Communist system.

These regimes were not fully chosen by the people. They were imposed by force and have been maintained in the same fashion. In Hungary and even recently in Russia, itself, the Communist overlords have demonstrated that they will not shrink from using the ultimate force in order to maintain their control.

This reality of the willingness to use force is the ultimate and basic fact of life in the guardhouse state.

Bulgaria has been the tragic victim of this imposition of forced control. Through mistaken reliance upon Russian assurances of free elections, the Communists were permitted to take control, and this control—in the now well-known pattern of Communist conduct—has never been relinquished.

I am sorry to say that American credulity and innocence were substantial factors in this takeover.

Partly for this reason, but particularly because we are the most powerful guardians of the liberties of the world, do I feel that the United States has an obligation to work for the restoration of freedom and self-determination to Bulgaria and other similar nations.

It is true that we cannot take up arms for this purpose, but there are many measures, short of war, which we can legitimately take to achieve this end.

During the recent hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Captive Nations which I was privileged to conduct, some of these measures were emphasized and recommended to the executive branch.

First of all, we must keep this question of the seized countries alive. We must take every opportunity in the United Nations and in other forums to emphasize that this problem remains unsettled, but that it should be settled in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

We must seize this and other opportunities to put pressure on the Russians. They do the same to us at every opportunity. Why should we be so punctilious?

We should not be dissuaded by the lack of enthusiasm of some of our allies. The fact remains that the fate of human brothers is at stake and we must never admit that we can become bored or restless at the repetition of claims for freedom and self-expression.

We must also do everything to keep the hopes of the captive peoples alive.

They have fought the good fight. They have remained steadfast. They have resisted both force and blandishments. Our expression of support will encourage them to hold out further toward the day of the inevitable victory.

As our committee recommended, our Government should step up the use of our informational media—to proclaim our support to the world.

This recommendation has a particular application to the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. It is not only the volume of broadcasts which should be increased, but

also the force and the scope of these broadcasts—both in electric power and in political content. After all, this is a war that we are fighting.

Either we mean what we say and we do support the people of Bulgaria and we turn our support into definite actions or we bow to tyranny, change our policy, and permit these good and loyal friends to sink beyond redemption into the Communist quagmire.

I believe that we do mean what we say; that we do support the people of the captive nations and that we are gradually realizing more clearly the folly of attempting to deal on principle with a Communist regime.

I believe that our support will increase and grow and I am convinced that this support and the natural instinct of the captive peoples for freedom and self-improvement will sap the strength of the sterile Leninist creed and will bring a new birth of freedom to the people of central Europe.

The Birth of the Farm Program: Events 30 Years Ago Recalled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this March 8 is a significant date for American agriculture and, indeed, for the Nation. It is the 30th anniversary of the day that President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent out the call for farm leaders to meet in Washington for the purpose of developing a farm program aimed at saving and rescuing our farm people from bankruptcy, suffering, and despair.

The great depression fell upon and ravished agriculture earlier and with greater brutality than any other major segment of our economy.

President Roosevelt acted swiftly in the first 100 days of his New Deal administration to rectify the situation. The Farm Act of 1933 was drafted, debated, and enacted with a determination and swiftness seldom matched in the democratic way of government. The Brookings study, "Three Years of the AAA," reports that in the emergency legislative program of the New Deal, it stood second only to measures to stem the flood of disaster which had swept over our banking institutions.

As we all are aware, this act of 1933 founded the Nation's farm program and was the forerunner of a golden era for agriculture.

Indeed, it was the beginning of agriculture's rise from the great depression to a place of parity and equal economic stature with labor, industry, and business.

The story of agriculture's golden years is an account of the 20-year triumph of the parity principle, 1933 through 1952.

Farm income multiplied sixfold, sevenfold, or eightfold in those two decades. For the 11 consecutive years prior to 1953, the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. Rural people became able to buy the conveniences and comforts hitherto available only to our citizens in the cities. The blessings of electricity were taken to the rural areals. Farmers become financially able to mechanize their farms and to apply new sciences, to bring the blessings of food abundance at low cost to the consumers of the Nation. With the means to do it, farmers devoted their energies to the restoration and conservation of the Nation's most precious resource, the soil. Prosperity on the farms created greater markets for industries in the cities, made jobs, and kept factory wheels turning.

The output per farmworker has more than doubled, so that today it takes fewer than one-half the man-hours of work to produce the Nation's food needs than it did in 1940. This new efficiency in agriculture has made available to American families more and better food, for an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than in any other place in the world.

This all has happened since 1933 when the farm program was first enacted.

But, Mr. Speaker, for the last decade, this farm program has been under severe attack. I cannot understand it. Many of our city friends have been misinformed and prejudiced against farmers. Farmers are divided against themselves. Their program has been weakened.

Today the farm program is in danger of collapse. I am wondering how long we may have the strength in Congress to maintain a farm program at all. Should this farm program collapse, the consequences would be devastating to the whole economy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that we review some of the events attending the birth of this program, 30 years ago. It was then that the Nation first assumed a real responsibility for a parity position of agriculture with other great segments of our economy.

There follows a summary of such events:

March 4, 1933: President Roosevelt was inaugurated.

March 5: He called a special session of Congress, for March 9, to act on the banking emergency. Action on the banking emergency was immediate, with legislation passed on the first day of the session.

March 8: Secretary Wallace and Assistant Rex Tugwell, urged President Roosevelt to ask Congress to take action on agricultural legislation. The President agreed, and directed Secretary Wallace to call a farm leaders' conference.

March 10: Farm leaders (50) met in Washington to formulate their recommendations to meet the national emergency in agriculture. Attending were Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; Charles F. Hearst, vice president of American Farm Bureau Federation and chairman of the legislative committee, and president of Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; M. S. Winder, executive secretary and Chester H. Gray, legislative director; Earl C. Smith, president, Illinois Agricultural Association; C. R. White, president, New York State Farm Bureau Federation; W. H. Settle, president, Indiana Farm Bureau Federation; R. W. Blackburn, president, California Farm Bureau Federation; L. J. Taber, master, National Grange; Fred Brenckman, Washington representative; C. E. Huff, president, Farmers' National Grain Corp.; and M. W. Thatcher, Washington representative; U. B. Blaylock, president, American Cotton Cooperative Association; Congressman W. P. Lambertson, Kansas, representing National Farmers' Union; Charles E. Ewing, president, National Livestock Marketing Association; Ralph Snyder, chairman, Committee of National Farm Organizations, and others.

As a result of their deliberations, they agreed on the first day to recommendations which asked that broad powers be conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture to cope with the emergency.

March 11: A committee from the group of 50 called on the President with the proposal that broad emergency powers be recommended to Congress. The recommendations were signed by the special committee consisting of W. R. Ronald, chairman, editor, Evening Republican, Mitchell, S. Dak.; Charles Ewing; U. B. Blaylock; Clifford Gregory, editor, Prairie Farmer, Chicago; C. W. Holman, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, Washington, D.C.; L. J. Taber; C. E. Huff; E. A. O'Neal; Ralph Snyder; Congressman W. P. Lambertson. (M. S. Winder, secretary; Fred Lee, legal adviser; M. Exekiel, economic adviser, also signed the report.) President Roosevelt directed USDA to prepare the text of such legislation.

March 16: Draft sent to Congress. Message asked for quick action on a farm relief bill. (In the main, the bill followed the recommendations submitted by organized agriculture.) It said: "I tell you frankly that it is a new and untrod path, but I tell you with equal frankness that an unprecedented condition calls for the trial of new means to rescue agriculture. If a fair administrative trial of it is made and it does not produce the hoped-for results, I shall be the first to acknowledge it and advise you." Farm legislation was the sixth major piece of legislation passed in the first hundred days, of the emergency session, but not passed without debate and testimony.

May 12: President signed the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1933.

During the period while farm legislation was being debated, the farm depression deepened. Attention was focused on sporadic outbreaks of violence which resulted in the declaration of martial law in a number of farm areas and on the threat of a nationwide farm strike. Congress was confronted with the facts that realized net income of farm operators in 1932 was less than one-third of what it had been in 1929 and that farm prices had fallen more than 50 percent while the prices of things farmers had to buy had declined only 32 percent. Thus farmers were caught in a serious squeeze between the prices they received and the prices they had to pay and they were burdened with inflexible mortgage payments on lands purchased at inflated prices. Farms for which they had spent life savings were being sold for debts and taxes. In Iowa, for example, one out of every nine farms had been sold one or more times by sheriff in the period 1921–32 and over 52 percent of all foreclosures between 1920 and 1932 had resulted in deficiency judgments.

The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, called into special session at Chicago, sent the President a telegram on March 8 urging that he recommend immediate action to Congress on the restoration of price parity, monetary reform, guarantee of new deposits of all banks, and relief for distressed mortgage indebtedness.

The National Farmers Union and the National Farm Holiday had been urging a mortgage moratorium and guaranteed cost of production. The National Grange had endorsed an export debenture form of farm relief. All three had backed a domestic allotment bill which had failed to pass the Senate during the preceding session of the "lame duck" Congress.

Representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, and the National Grange were among the 50 farm spokesmen who arrived in Washington on March 10, 1933, for the farm leaders' conference. An agreement was reached on the need for broad emergency powers which would include authority for using most of the methods previously proposed. On March 11, a committee from the group of 50 called on the President with the proposal that such broad emergency powers be recommended to Congress.

(Above taken from ERS centennial study.)

The economic situation leading up to passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act had resulted in severe disparity between prices of farm products and other products. By February 1933, the exchange value of farm products for industrial goods had fallen to 50 percent of the prewar average. The exchange value for taxes and credit was even less.

The disparity was present in the price of every farm product. It was most severe in the export commodities, such as cotton, wheat, tobacco, and rice, where the disappearance of severe contraction of export demand had built up great excess stocks of the commodities. It was also marked in hogs and hog products, the reduced export outlets for which had forced increased qualities into domestic consumption. The immediate cause of this disparity was the pressure of surpluses of farm products on the markets.

(From first Agricultural Adjustment Administration report.)

To restore farm purchasing power of agricultural commodities to the prewar 1909–14 level, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to secure voluntary reduction of the acreage in basic crops through agreements with producers and by using direct payments for participation in acreage control programs; to regulate marketing through voluntary agreements among processors and distributors; to license processors, association of producers, and others handling agricultural commodities to eliminate unfair practices or charges; to determine the necessity for and the rate of processing taxes; and to use the proceeds of taxes and appropriated funds for the cost of adjustment operations, for the expansion of markets, and for the removal of agricultural surpluses. Wheat, cotton, field corn, hogs, rice, tobacco, and milk and its products were designated as basic commodities. (This was later expanded.)

The broad and flexible powers granted by the Agricultural Adjustment Act emphasized production adjustment but also provided authority for carrying out two-price programs similar to the McNary-Haugen and export debenture plans. Authority to guarantee cost of production, sponsored by the National Farmers Union, had been added as an amendment to the bill in the Senate but had been eliminated before its enactment.

George N. Peek, who had been an originator of the McNary-Haugen plan and had led the fight for its adoption, was designated as the first Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. He remained in this position from May 13, 1933, until December 15, 1933, when he accepted the position of Special Adviser to the President on Foreign trade.

M. L. Wilson, head of Wheat Section in the Division of Production, had supported the McNary-Haugen plan but had turned from it to play a major role in the development of the domestic allotment plan from which the production control program evolved.

Chester Davis headed up the Division of Production under Peek, and succeeded him as Administrator, effective December 16, 1933.

(Above is taken from ch. 8, "The First Agricultural Adjustment Administration," centennial study, of ERS historical research secretary, Agricultural History Branch.)

Peek was reluctant to use production control, but it was chosen by Secretary Wallace and President Roosevelt as the major method to be used in the drive to raise farm purchasing power. Peek had made it clear that he considered marketing agreements, with the diversion of surpluses into export or other channels, as the most important, if not the only sound method to be used in raising farm prices. Davis agreed with Wallace that production control should receive major emphasis. Others who had fought for the McNary-Haughen plan were now convinced that production control was necessary.

The increasing pressure of the agricultural crisis and the fact that the act was passed after the crop-planting season had begun impelled the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to proceed with the greatest possible speed. Emphasis was placed on production control for the basic commodities, but Government purchases, commodity loans, and marketing agreements were also used to provide more immediate relief and to supplement production restriction for some basic commodities. Marketing agreements, supplemented at times by Government purchases, were used for dairy products and for nonbasic commodities. Funds and authority provided by legislation for general emergency relief and recovery were used in addition to those authorized by the Agricultural Adjustment Act in the drive to raise farm purchasing power.

Farmers enjoyed a striking increase in farm income during the period the Agricultural Adjustment Act was in effect. Farm income in 1935 had increased by more than 50 percent over farm income during 1932. Rental and benefit payments contributed about 25 percent of the amount by which the average cash farm income in the period 1933–35 exceeded the average cash farm income in 1932. The payments not only increased farm income but helped to even it out among regions and commodities serving as a kind of insurance for farmers in drought areas.

Since the chief function of the payments was to serve as "a mainspring to the adjustment of production," an evaluation of the agricultural adjustment program's success would need to consider its effect on production and prices. Farm prices of major commodities advanced markedly but it is impossible to separate the effect of the program from the effects of the drought and to measure other complex factors such as the effect of processing taxes on prices received by farmers. It is also impossible to measure the effect of the adjustment program on business recovery. Economists have attempted to make estimates but there was and is no agreement on the contributions of the program to increase farm prices and income or on the effect of the program on consumer prices.

Irrespective of disagreement on contributions of the program, there has been general agreement on the need for Government action to assist farmers during the unprecedented economic crisis of the early 1930's. Modifications have been made in later programs of crop adjustment and in the committee system of administration but the basic ideas of agricultural adjustment which were enacted into law in 1933 have survived periods of drought, of inflation, of war, of reconversion from war, and of changes in political party leadership in both the Congress and executive branch of the Government.

(From ERS centennial study.)

Proposed Expansion of Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in his farm message, President Kennedy has proposed shifting the major emphasis of assistance to the needy from so-called direct distribution of the food items themselves to expansion of the food stamp program, thereby bringing a greater proportion of this assistance within regular commercial channels.

As pointed out in a recent editorial in the Southeast Missourian, a daily newspaper published at Cape Girardeau, Mo., there are a good many potential benefits in such arrangements.

I believe the editorial would be of interest to our colleagues of both Houses, and ask therefore, unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southeast Missourian, Feb. 16, 1963]

BIGGER ROLE FOR FOOD STAMPS

Persistent unemployment in excess of 5 percent of the work force affects this country in many ways. It should occasion no surprise that grants of food to persons on public assistance rolls reached an alltime high last year.

Some 7.4 million persons got food under so-called direct distribution programs. If food for charitable institutions and school lunch programs be included, more than 2 million pounds of it were handed out in 1962.

With some prospect that further enlargements of food assistance may be called for, the Kennedy administration appears concerned at the amount of food distribution now taking place outside regular commercial channels.

Consequently, in President Kennedy's 1963 farm message, he proposes to shift a substantial part of this distribution to the food stamp program.

Up to now this has been a limited experiment effort—begun in 1961—under which needy persons are issued stamps which they can use for food purchases at local stores.

Administration spokesmen pronounced this plan a success in such places as West Virginia where it has been tried. The new proposal would not wholly replace the direct distribution of food by Government agencies, but would do so in all areas where it is considered feasible.

Expansion of the food stamp plan would seem to have an automatic appeal for all those who think it a mistake for the Federal Government to be in the food distribution business on a large and growing scale. Food retailers evidently would feel benefit if this program is approved.

Present direct distribution involves food valued at around $365 million in a year's time. The President says the costs of switching to the food stamp plan in many

sectors will be largely offset by saving in direct distribution. Chances are, however, that the offset will not be complete.

Even if it is not, however, many in the food field may conclude that some additional cost would not be too high a price to pay for reducing sharply the Government's own food operations.

A shift to greater reliance on food stamps may get new impetus also from some recent reports that certain private food handlers are reaping excessive profits from handling the Government food packages which are too bulky for needy persons to carry home.

All in all, the proposal to turn far more Federal food assistance into private channels through use of food stamps seems a desirable change—assuming always that the inevitable redtape costs can be held to a tight minimum.

Peaceful Enrollment of Harvey Gantt at Clemson College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial taken from the Publishers' Auxiliary, under date of February 23, 1963.

The editorial commends the newspapers of South Carolina for paving the way for peaceful handling of the enrollment of a Negro, Harvey Gantt, at Clemson College. The editorial points out specifically the roll of the Anderson Independent and Daily Mail, whose publisher is Wilton E. Hall. Anderson is located just 17 miles from Clemson College and Mr. Hall's newspapers service that area. The people of South Carolina are proud of the position taken by their Governor, other elected officials of our State, Dr. Robert Edwards, president of Clemson College, and other heads of our educational institutions, and our newspapers, in this most delicate situation.

The editorial follows:

SEVENTEEN MILES FROM CLEMSON, A PAPER ACCEPTS A LEADERSHIP

A local crisis invariably demands participation from a newspaper and success or failure of an area in dealing with the crisis often reflects the attitude of its papers. "No attitude at all" generally rates as the worst sort of participation.

In paving the way for peaceful handling of the enrollment of a Negro, Harvey Gantt, at Clemson College. South Carolina's newspapers have been generally credited with avoiding what might have been a crisis with a violent and tragic ending.

To Publisher Wilton E. Hall of the Anderson Independent and the Daily Mail—closest papers to Clemson—fell the task of deciding the attitude that would be most generally regarded as the prevailing one in the area. Without hesitation the Anderson papers—with a combined circulation of 60,430—took a leadership in urging that peace and dignity be preserved at Clemson.

The editorials that appeared in the papers were so widely accepted as contributing to the outcome of peaceful integration that they were repeated internationally by the U.S. Information Service.

Yet despite their leadership in helping preserve peace and dignity at Clemson, the Anderson papers are not champions of the cause of integration, have not in fact softened their longtime editorial stand for "equal but separate" facilities.

"A majority of papers in South Carolina are undoubtedly in favor of segregation," Publisher Hall told the Publishers' Auxiliary this week. "Nevertheless, the prevailing attitude of this State's newspapers—both weeklies and dailies—was that peace and dignity be maintained during the crisis at Clemson."

From the first, the Independent predicted that peace would be maintained at the college.

"The vast majority of Clemson's students are determined that the college's good name and that of the Palmetto State shall not be smeared across the Nation in connection with the kind of outbreaks that occurred at the University of Mississippi," the Independent said in an editorial. "They are keeping their eyes on the ball—which is that they are at Clemson to further their education."

In addition to an almost solid front for comonsense maintained by the State's press, Mr. Hall feels that good leadership by State officials, particularly Gov. Donald S. Russell, was instrumental in avoiding violence.

When the Governor announced that the State would meet the issue without violence or disorder, the Independent hailed the statement as one of "genuine statesmanship reflecting the overwhelming sentiment of the people of South Carolina."

Apparently the paper's summation of the people's sentiment has been proven by the response to its editorial stand on Harvey Gantt's admission to the college.

To date not one letter of criticism has been received by the paper and Publisher Hall boasts with a gleam in his eye that so far no one has even threatened to punch him in the jaw. No one has canceled a subscription, smashed a window, or stopped advertising.

Nor, to the publisher's knowledge, has there been any disorder at Clemson College, whose campus is 17 miles from the Independent's office. "We withdrew all reporters and photographers following Gantt's enrollment," Mr. Hall told the auxiliary. "Our paper's attitude has been that Mr. Gantt is just another student at the college and we've given him no further publicity.

"We'd like to see the southern viewpoint maintained. In the past we've always supported segregation and urged equal but separate facilities," the publisher reflects, a bit wistfully. "My grandfathers on both sides of the family were Confederate captains, but the Civil War has been over a long time and this had to come."

South Carolina's newspapers, large and small, urged their readers to cooperate in preserving law and peace, Mr. Hall says, and as a result what could have been a tragedy was averted.

West Virginia Continues as a Significant Oil-Producing State—Rich Potential Attracts Interest of Large Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the petroleum industry in West Virginia is an old and established one, and for many years has brought livelihood and convenience to the inhabitants of the Mountain State. As early as 1810 oil was collected from the sands at the mouth of the Hughes and Little Kanawha Rivers, and sold for use in medicines. In 1860 the first oilfield was developed and the first well drilled, at Burning Springs, in Wirt County.

After a brief lull following the Civil War the industry gained impetus from the advance of scientific research in the uses of oil, until, by 1889, West Virginia wells reached an annual output of 16 million barrels.

And, not only is West Virginia a vast repository of the sought for "black gold" but the quality of its product is unusually high. Petroleum from wells in the Appalachian Range consistently brings higher market prices than that produced in many other areas.

West Virginians are proud of their history as leaders in the search for this vitally needed natural commodity—proud that natives of our State have been among the pioneers in bringing forth the world's untapped potentials, in other States than our own and in other countries of the earth.

The late Michael L. Benedum, to name but one, was among the most successful of all wildcat drillers, and a man whose intense dedication and keen insight brought unparalleled success in the search for oil. Often, his perseverance and tenacity would impel him to carry on after others had quit. It was this unwillingness to accept defeat that raised "the great wildcatter" to a position of prominence. Whether prospecting in the jungles of the Philippines, or opening the huge Rumanian oil fields of Ploseti, Mike Benedum was a credit to his native West Virginia, and to the United States. Today he leaves behind the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, a philanthropic organization which is active in the field of granting student scholarships and loans, and in fostering worthwhile projects of educational and community value. His nephew, Paul Benedum, an oil and gas executive and also a native of West Virginia, is president of the foundation.

And, Mr. President, it is heartening to note that West Virginia continues as a significant source of petroleum and natural gas. A recent report by the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce indicates that 1962 production of oil reached 3,453,000 barrels, and that natural gas produced was 204 billion cubic feet—both figures showing substantial increases over similar totals for the previous year.

Large petroleum companies are aware of the potential which still lies in the recesses of the earth beneath West Virginia soil. The Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail reported on February 10, 1963, that—

All of the big oil companies are said to be exploring or actively drilling in the State. Among them are the huge Humble, Tidewater, Shell, Phillips, Mobil, Sun, and Kerr-McGee (with which the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma, was associated) companies. These are in addition to the South Penn Oil Co. and other firms long established in the State.

The search for oil and other natural resources of the earth is an unending process, and West Virginians are happy that their beautiful and beloved State has been blessed by the Creator with such a wealth of these precious raw materials.

I request that the unique news release of February 25, 1963, issued by the Phillips Petroleum Co., be printed in the appendix to the RECORD; also the article "We t Virginia Oil Lures Horde of Producers," appearing in the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail of February 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am Phillips Petroleum Co's. rig No. 45—the largest drilling rig that ever operated east of the Mississippi River—and here is my final report on the No. 1 Finch "A" well I drilled in Marion County, W. Va.

I tried as hard as I could. But I knew, from all the miles of wildcat wells I've drilled around the country, that the odds were about 10 to 1 that I wouldn't find anything and 45 to 1 that I'd not find enough gas and oil to pay my way.

Well, the geologists and engineers and people who operate me tell me we failed here, too. Although I had some shows of gas, my well has been abandoned as a "dry hole" after I drilled it down to 17,111 feet looking for natural gas, and after Phillips had tested all the likely formations for possible production. We even drilled 2,111 feet more than we had expected to, making the No. 1 Finch the largest well ever drilled in the Appalachian Basin.

Now that I'm gone the Phillips people will clean the place spic and span, filling in the holes, and leveling everything off so that before long you'll hardly be able to tell I was there. This is the type of thing my company and other drillers try to do every place to restore the land as nearly as possible to its native conditions and preserve our scenic area.

I want to say that I certainly enjoyed the neighborly West Virginia treatment I received while I was drilling the Finch No. 1. Everyone surely was kind to me and my crew and seemed to really share concern in what I was trying to do. In fact, I just plain relished the unusual crowds of folks who came to keep me company. Down in Texas, people sort of took me for granted.

All told, Phillips spent nearly $1,100,000 on this West Virginia dry hole. My try here is just another example of the kind of difficulties my owners face in searching for new oil and gas production in our country. One thing that keeps them looking is the 27½ percentage depletion, which Congress put in our tax laws over 35 years ago. Some people are suggesting that oil and gas explorers, like my company, be deprived of much of the depletion, but from experience I know it should be otherwise.

This 27½ percentage depletion is one of the reasons I'm now located about 1 mile east of Gladesville in an attempt to find some deep gas production on Phillips 217,000 acres of leases in the Appalachian area. About half my crew on the No. 1 Finch were local West Virginia boys and several of them are at the new location with me. Keep your fingers crossed—even though the odds are way against us maybe we'll find something up there.

I hope you'll drop by and see me if you're ever up my way.

[From the Sunday Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Feb. 10, 1963]

WEST VIRGINIA OIL LURES HORDE OF PRODUCERS

(By John G. Morgan)

A big oil rush is on in West Virginia. From Texas, Oklahoma, California, and other States, the promoters and producers have come in search of the black liquid and the green dollar.

One authoritative news source estimates that about 60 percent of West Virginia is under oil and gas lease. That's close to 9 million acres.

About 1 million of the 9 million acres are classified as land on which oil or gas is being produced, the informant says.

A report by the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce shows further that 3,453,000 barrels of crude oil were produced in the State last year—an increase of 750,000 barrels over the total for the previous year and about 1 million more than the amount reported 10 years ago.

It's also stated in the report that production of natural gas totaled 204 billion cubic feet last year, compared to 193 billion the previous year and 168 billion 10 years ago. A lot of increase in gas production is attributable to the quest for oil. Very often the two fuels are found in the same hole.

All of the big oil companies are said to be exploring or actively drilling in the State. Among them are the huge Humble, Tidewater, Shell, Phillips, Mobile, Sun, and Kerr-McGee (with which the late Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma was associated) companies. These are in addition to the South Penn Oil Co. and other firms long established in the State.

There are some wildcatters drillers in areas not known to be productive. And some companies are looking for new horizons an oil field term for lower strata of earth. Reportedly, experimental depts of 15,000 feet, compared to normal runs of 2,000 feet, have been reached or sought in a few areas.

Why the big rush? There are at least two good answers:

A relatively new system of drilling, known as "sand fracturing," breaks up underground formations and gets the oil out of the ground faster with the help of certain liquids and hydraulic pressure.

There are no controls on oil production in West Virginia. Many of the producers and promoters have come from States that set limits on production.

Another contributing reason is that West Virginia produces what is generally regarded as the world's finest oil—the Pennsylvania grade crude oil, with a paraffin base.

The heavy flow of oil, from thousands of wells, through pipelines to refineries and on to marketing points, has resulted in a problem of tremendous proportions.

The problem is over-production of oil, a nightmare for many of the producers, especially those who are bringing in the new, gushing wells that yield high and quick returns on investments.

A crisis in an attempt to solve the problem was reached January 25, when the Public Service Commission held a hearing on the application of Eureka Pipe Line Co. of Parkersburg.

The company asked the commission for authority to limit the flow of oil from individual wells through its pipes to 20 barrels per month. However, the company said it would accept additional oil on a proportional basis and in accordance with market conditions.

Many producers vigorously protested the company's application. Approval of the request, they said, would result in extensive unemployment and heavy profit losses.

Some producers suspected the motives of the company. There were insinuations that big oil powers were trying to take advantage of independent producers. Questions were asked as to who owned Eureka.

At the hearing, company President R. E. Robinson stated that South Penn Oil Co. owns 26 percent of Eureka, Elk Refining Co. owns 25 percent, and Quaker State Oil Refinery Co. owns 16 percent. It was further stated that South Penn owns 50 percent of Elk Refining Co.

No action was taken at the hearing, continued until April 1. Meanwhile, independent producers, drilling contractors, pipeline officials, and others connected with the problem are attempting to work out a voluntary solution generally acceptable to everyone.

Any agreement, if it can be reached, will almost certainly provide for voluntary controls on production. If this can be done, the application filed with the Public Service Commission apparently will be withdrawn.

Good progress was reported as a result of a meeting of interested groups February 2 in Parkersburg. At that time, E. C. Hartman, Jr., president of the Independent Oil & Gas Association of West Virginia said a nine-member committee was appointed to study the question.

A committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, and a second general session is to be held March 16 in Parkersburg.

Last week key officials connected with the problem were optimistic about the outcome of the negotiations.

Robinson said he felt excellent progress was being made, and added that some earlier misunderstandings were being removed.

Fred Barnett, counsel for South Penn at Parkersburg, said there was very definite progress.

Still there was discontent among the producers. One of their unofficial spokesmen didn't deny that the problem existed, and added that something must be done. But some of his ideas as to what caused the problem and how it could be solved were different from those expressed by officials representing the pipeline company and South Penn.

Francis E. Cain, a producer and promoter from Big Bend, in the heart of "Big Injun sand" country in Calhoun County, said the essence of the problem is that "refineries haven't kept up with production."

"Everyone in the field," he said in a reference to fellow producers, "feels that the refineries haven't been aggressive enough. We need a larger market, larger refineries."

He deplored what he termed the widespread unemployment that would result from production controls in Calhoun, Ritchie, Doddridge, Lewis, Roane and other major oil-producing counties.

As one approach toward eventual solution of the problem, Cain urged that more West Virginians buy the products of Pennsylvania-grade crude oil.

He said the problem is further complicated by the fact Eureka is the only common carrier of oil by pipeline in West Virginia. Until late last year, there was another transportation company, originally known as Valvoline. But it was purchased by the Ashland Oil Co., and then, effective January 1, 1963, Eureka bought Ashland.

Eureka, incorporated in West Virginia in 1890, owns and operates a system of more than 3,000 miles of trunk and gathering lines in the State.

The main system extends from a southern terminus at Cabin Creek and follows a generally easterly and northerly direction across parts of Kanawha, Jackson, Roane, Wirt, Ritchie, Tyler, Marion, and Monongalia Counties. Gathering lines reach out to get locally produced oil in wide areas.

In the early 1900's, the quantity of oil gathered by Eureka in West Virginia reached a peak of about 16 million barrels in one year. A low point of about 1.8 million barrels was hit in 1955. The total has increased every year since then.

Robinson indicated that in his opinion today's situation isn't as alarming as the producers may believe.

If the 20-barrel-per-month limitation should be allowed, and the apportionment formula over that amount effected, then any fresh well could be allocated as much as 350 barrels per month under present conditions, he said.

That ceiling would be sufficiently high for new wells, except under unusual circumstances, the company president said. He

pointed out that low-producing "stripper" wells and the secondary recovery wells would be unaffected by the proposal filed with the public service commission.

Robinson said there is no overproduction as far as the Eureka system is concerned. He said the system could carry as much as two and a half times more than its present average load.

The whole problem, he stessed, is simply that the market is limited for Pennsylvania grade crude oil.

The pipeline official said there is no basis for rumors that his company or other big companies in the oil business are trying to control production for their own interests.

As a matter of fact, he said, the purchases of stock by South Penn, Elk Refining, and Quaker State brought Eureka from the edge of financial ruin about 15 years ago. Without those purchases, he implied, there simply would be no oil transportation system by pipeline today.

Robinson confirmed that Eureka purchased the system formerly owned by Valvoline. But he said Valvoline never was a common carrier under PSC regulation. The lines of the former owner now make up about 7 percent of the Eureka system, he added.

The president said his company is interested in transporting as much oil as it can in the interest of making a profit. He declared it doesn't want to limit production in any way, but added:

"We can't take more than we can get rid of."

Robinson said he felt the necessity for controlling production may be a problem to face for the next several years.

Barnett quickly disputed the report that refineries are one source of today's problem.

He said this is the heart of the matter:

"Runs to stills are scheduled on a basis of market demand."

The larger demand just isn't there, so the "runs to the stills," meaning the oil going into the refineries, must be limited to the existing demand, he explained.

He declared that the sales forces of the refineries are making maximum efforts, but they are severely handicapped by:

Increased sales of cheap oil, with additives, which come close to doing an adequate job for the average buyer.

Less demand per automotive unit today because of engineering advances.

There are two oil refineries in West Virginia—the Quaker Oil Refinery Co. at St. Marys and the Elk Refining Co. at Falling Rock. Some oil is moved out of the State to refineries in the Oil City, Pa., area.

The complex of refineries—the two in West Virginia and the Oil City group—have a maximum mechanical capacity of about 40,000 gallons per day, Barnett said.

Normal shutdowns reduce that figure to about 36,000, he noted, and the refineries are actually handling between 32,000 and 33,000.

Barnett said he could see a substantial solution to the overproduction problem in 12 to 14 months. Within that time, with the proper controls, an aboveground inventory of about 800,000 barrels could be disposed of, he said.

South Penn, which has been operating in West Virginia for 74 years, is engaged in the oil business in four major directions—production, buying, refining, and transporting.

As of December 1961, the company had 3,225 oil wells in the State—or the equivalent of about 1 out of 4 of the 11,341 connected with the Eureka system. The company owns or leases 592,254 acres in the State.

Barnett completely discounted any report that South Penn may be attempting to dominate the oil industry through a method of transportation control that would limit the production of other companies, especially the small, independent outfits.

"We are in the business to make money," he said, and added that his firm is interested in the expansion of the oil business in all directions.

"There is absolutely nothing in any policy of South Penn designed to limit the market, or control the price, or affect adversely the market conditions in any way," he declared.

He said his company is willing to assume a giant share of the real relief to the problem.

Advertising: Instrument of Abundance or Enemy of Society?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, all of us, on occasion, are called upon to make judgments or express opinions respecting the role of advertising in our society. As we know, advertising is a vital force for growth in American business.

In this connection, a most stimulating and statesmanlike discussion of the role of advertising was offered by Mr. Sidney R. Bernstein, editorial director of Advertising Age, in a speech before the Advertising Club of Washington on January 15 of this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the abridged text of this address be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ADVERTISING: INSTRUMENT OF ABUNDANCE OR ENEMY OF SOCIETY?

I am delighted to have the opportunity to discuss advertising before so distinguished a group. The business I represent has been the target of a great deal of criticism lately, including a not inconsiderable amount from Washington officialdom, and I welcome the opportunity to talk back a little.

Is advertising a dastardly thing that should be eliminated from modern life, or is it a useful instrument? And if it is a useful instrument, is it so badly abused that it needs seriously to be curbed, or is its function and its purpose badly misunderstood? And does advertising actually induce us to waste our substance on things of no consequence, instead of devoting ourselves to much more important aspects of life?

These are the kinds of questions that have been written about and argued about in recent years; these are the kinds of questions that have been discussed in books, in legislative halls, in classrooms, and in the business and private conversations of advertising people.

While I cannot pretend to be unbiased or unprejudiced in this great debate, I do hope this afternoon to look at advertising calmly and with reasonable objectivity, to see, first, if and how it fits into the American economy and social pattern, and second, how well we are using it, or abusing it, and how our performance can be improved.

I think we could do worse than to start by talking about what advertising is, and what it is supposed to do.

Stripped to its simplest terms, advertising is definable in two very simple words: It is a substitute, and it is a multiplier. All in the world that advertising does is to substitute for personal salesmanship; and because it is cheaper than personal salesmanship and because it uses mass media of communication, it multiplies—sometimes a thousandfold or even a millionfold, the number of sales calls a company can make on its prospects.

Advertising is simply a substitute—a cheaper but considerably less efficient substitute—for the human saleman, talking personally across a counter or a desk or an opened door, to an individual prospect or customer.

I am using the word "salesman" here in its broadest possible sense, as one who has something to sell—not necessarily a product, but maybe a concept, or a corporate image, or a political movement. Because advertising can be used, and is often used, for functions which are not often thought of as strictly salesmen's functions, but instead may be management functions, or public relations functions.

As a substitute for the human salesman advertising has the same functions, abilities and attributes as the human salesman, in considerably watered down form.

The salesman has only one function—to persuade. He has no power and no authority; he cannot order anyone to do his bidding, or force anyone to bend to his will. He must succeed or fail on the strength of his ability to persuade and to convince, just as the politician, the educator, the clergyman, and all of us in a free society, must measure our success or failure in terms of our ability to persuade our fellow citizens to accept our point of view, to believe as we believe, to act as we urge them to act.

As a substitute and an extension of personal selling, advertising also has the same characteristics as the personal salesman. It can be hard working and efficient, or lazy and wasteful. It can be upright and honest, or slick and shady. It can tell its story calmly and quietly and without hyperbole, or it can shout and gesture and shriek menacingly in your ear. It can address you as though you were a rational, thoughtful human being, or it can assume that you are a first-class boob and incapable of intelligent thought. It can be all these things, and do all these things, but no more. Because in the end its success or its failure, and its value to the advertiser, must rest on its ability to persuade a sufficient number of prospects to do what it says or buy what it sells, without the use of any kind of force or coercion.

Most of the serious students of advertising whom I know are astounded at the image of advertising which seems to exist so widely in nonadvertising minds. When they hear authors and legislators and educators and economists discoursing on the awesome, all-embracing power of advertising to hypnotize America's millions, to mesmerize the dollars out of their pockets and to turn them from the road of economic virtue and sobriety into the primrose paths of overspending for useless, unneeded and unwanted products, they can only shake their heads in wonderment. If only it were true, they say to each other, wistfully and more than a little sadly; if only advertising had such power.

Fortunately, it does not. Advertising has no power but the power of persuasion; and the power of persuasion embraces, by its very definition, complete freedom to make a choice, and complete freedom to believe or disbelieve. Advertising can cajole, it can entice, it can urge, it can argue, but it cannot force.

Remember too, that since those we attempt to persuade have complete freedom of choice, there is a ceaseless competition for the favor of the all-important consumer. Pick up your newspaper, or look at your television receiver. One hopeful advertiser urges you to dress better; another suggests that your money can best be spent on a new washing machine; a third suggests that you repaint your house. And on the very next page in

your newspaper, or the very next second on your television screen, a bank or a savings and loan association vigorously urges you to ignore all these ardent suitors for your money, and instead not to spend it at all, but rather to save it.

Advertising that is worth its salt has one more attribute of the good salesman—an attribute that is sometimes thoughtlessly criticized. That attribute is enthusiasm.

Despite millions of specific examples of its fallacy, most of us are still inclined to believe that if someone builds a better mousetrap, the world will make a beaten path to his door. Yet the simple fact is that, almost literally, nothing has ever been bought in this way.

Making a better mousetrap is not enough; someone must explain that it is a better mousetrap, and why it is better. Someone must be enthusiastic about its merits and its advantages—enthusiastic and zealous enough to sell others on its merits, and to overcome human inertia and unwillingness to change.

It is the salesman, and advertising, that perform this function of the special pleader, bringing us not a stolid, impartial cataloging of good points and bad, but a rose-colored vision of loveliness; not an impassive uncovering of the wares, but an insistence that we cannot get along without them.

Too often, it seems to me, the critics of advertising forget that this is the assigned role of advertising—that like a good salesman or a good lawyer, it is a special pleader, not an unbiased reporter.

There, I believe, is a fairly simple exposition of what advertising is, and what it is supposed to do. Most people are willing to accept it. But a good many people who accept this explanation of what advertising is and how it functions are not willing to admit that it serves any useful place in our economic structure or our society. One of the few who is, is David Potter, famous Yale historian, who is now teaching at Stanford. In a book called "People of Plenty—Economic Abundance and the American Character," he says:

"Abundance must be reckoned a major force in our history. If we seek an institution that was brought into being any abundance, without previous existence in any form, and, moreover, an institution which is peculiarly identified with American abundance rather than with abundance throughout western civilization, we will find it, I believe, in modern American advertising."

And Professor Potter continues: "Advertising is not badly needed in an economy of scarcity, because total demand is usually equal to or in excess of total supply, and every producer can normally sell as much as he can produce. It is when potential supply outstrips demand—that is, when abundance prevails—that advertising begins to fulfill a really essential economic function."

These ideas seem simple enough. Yet in a very real sense, they are deeply revolutionary, and the human mind, and more importantly, the human heart, resists them. They fly in the face of all the copybook maxims of all the ages; they seem to negate the lessons we learned at our mothers' knee; they stir us to unease; and they explain why Mr. Vance Packard makes such a good thing out of books which warn us sententiously of the horrible consequences of our thoughtless behavior.

For good or for bad, man's inventive and scientific genius has conquered most of the problems of production, and we are capable of spewing out enormous quantities of goods and services. If we do not use this capacity, we create economic chaos. So our problem as marketing men is to create wants for these products and services.

We admit—quite cheerfully—that we are not really dealing with needs. In the conventional sense, we are not talking about necessities at all, but about luxuries of one kind or another which we could get along without quite easily. We are, in short, talking about that host of goods and services above the level of economic necessity which constitute a high standard of living.

We are living well, and by "we" I mean millions upon millions upon millions of us. We are living far better than most of us ever thought it possible for so many millions to live; we are living far better, far more easily, than our fathers or our grandfathers ever dared to dream, and we are ridden with the fear that our good fortune cannot be true, that we are somehow wasting our substance, enjoying life too much, rushing headlong down the primrose path. And maybe we are. But I doubt it.

So, I believe it can be clearly demonstrated that advertising and aggressive selling perform essential functions in our society. But I think the public is suspicious of them because it is suspicious, in a very deep and fundamental sense, of the whole notion of an economy of abundance. It likes the idea, but it mistrusts it, too. And it fastens on advertising—as a visible symbol of the economy of abundance—as the prime whipping boy.

There has been a great deal of talk lately to the effect that businessmen, and advertisers and advertising men in particular, are diverting the energies of the American people from the important things of life and causing them to fritter away their substance on things they do not need and can't afford. There have ben assertions that the consumer overindulges in materialistic comforts and conveniences, that this is largely the doing of advertising, and that an all-wise Central Government must step in to change the flow of much of our national income into more noble and more important channels.

We were told that we are lagging behind in our defense efforts, that we are not moving rapidly enough on the scientific front, that we need more and better schools, more and better housing, more and better medical care. And that, in order to make sure that we get them, considerable portions of the national income must be diverted from the purchase of nonessential and unimportant consumer goods.

No one argues about the need for adequate defense. No one decries the desire for more and better schools, nor for more adequate medical care, nor for more adequate housing. But we fail to understand how, within the framework of an economy which dares to call itself free, shackles upon the promotion and sale of consumer goods will help achieve any worthy social purpose. Our problem, as so many economists, and so many candidates for political office in both parties, have pointed out, is not production, but consumption; not lessened business activity, but greater. We need this activity in the private sector of the economy for the growth that provides the taxes that enable us to make unprecedented expenditures in the public sector—for defense, for schools, for medical care, for public housing. And how is this increase in economic production to be achieved, if advertising and selling and the development of higher standards of living are to be harassed and shackled?

And yet presumably intelligent people keep on misjudging the role and the function of advertising, and misstating the purpose and basis of our economy, and the true element of contention between us and the countries behind the Iron Curtain, in almost childishly distressing ways.

A couple of years ago, a distinguished teacher, Alvin H. Hansen, professor emeritus of political economy at Harvard, wrote a book called "Economic Issues of the 1960's." Says Professor Hansen, without even a smidgeon of a snicker:

"The more pressure advertising is successful, the more will we reach a point at which private spending plus necessary outlays for defense will absorb so large a part of our gross national product that little room is left for public investment in scientific research, in schools, hospitals, housing, urban redevelopment, resource development, etc. Indeed, we have already reached this point."

Where—I ask you—has this man been? Every person in this room knows, from personal observation and experience—if not from his job or his tax bill—that we are right now putting into scientific research, schools, hospitals, housing, urban redevelopment, resource development, etc., amounts fantastically greater than we have ever previously dreamed of. And in spite of this—as you people in Government know all too well—we are still not using our productive plant at anywhere near its full capacity, and 4, or 5, or maybe 6 million people who are willing and able to work are not presently employed, because there are no jobs for them. Little room left for public investment, indeed. If we can get business moving a little faster, and improve the tax take a little more, we'll find plenty of room for public and private investment.

Now, Professor Hansen and Vance Packard and numerous others also worry endlessly and tearfully about how wasteful we are, and they tell us how much more effective the Soviet boys are because they have their eye right on the economic ball, and are putting their substance into scientific research and guns and satellites and things like that, that are really important.

But just exactly how much sense does this really make?

Old-fashioned people like me used to talk about a guns-and-butter economy. Nobody uses the term any more, but it has just as much pertinence in the fight against communism as it ever had.

To put it bluntly, it is the "butter" in our economy that our enemies and our potential enemies want to take away from us. It is the lack of material well-being, and the desire for the things we already have, which makes Communists in the first place. If we give up these things before circumstances force us to, then what is the point of the global struggle?

To be sure, we can't just go on luxuriating, at the expense of more essential things; we must be sure that we are not following an expedient and a relatively pleasant course at the expense of either prudence or survival. But it is still true that if we give up everything we have in terms of material advantage and high standards of living, there is little point to defending what is left.

Now, I don't expect everybody to love advertising, any more than I expect everybody to love all salesmen. Advertising is obtrusive, it is insistent, it is frankly and openly trying to get us to do something; and therefore it creates resistance. This is natural and normal.

I do not mean that advertising has a right to lie, or to mislead, or to offend against public taste or decency. But I do mean it has a right, and indeed a duty to be enthusiastic and even lyrical in singing the praises of whatever it is selling. If it is not, it can scarcely persuade us of the virtue of acting as it wishes us to act; and if it does not persuade us to act, it is inefficient and useless as advertising.

I have spent 30 years watching the advertising business and recording its day-to-day activities.

I have not always been pleased with everything I have seen or heard; I am not now pleased with everything that I see or hear in the advertising business. But my faith in the essential importance and the basic rightness of the advertising mechanism as a useful tool of American society remains firm and clear.

I make no apologies for advertising; I believe none are required. But neither do I excuse or condone the excesses, the slippery evasions of the truth, the offenses against good taste which mark some of the promotional activities of the day.

I believe it is important to the American economy and to our social system to make advertising more effective and more efficient. I believe that it cannot be truly effective and efficient unless it is honest and decent and believable; and I shall do everything in my power, both in my job as an individual, to make it so.

But I also believe that we must avoid the tragic consequences of letting advertising be mangled by those who insist that our whole society is pointed in the wrong direction; that we are following the false gods of materialism; and that it is all advertising's fault.

Let me give you the testimony of Eric Hoffer, writing some years ago in Harper's Magazine, on this point:

"If it is true," said Mr. Hoffer, "that the vigor of a society is proportionate to its capacity for enthusiasm, then the habit of insatiable desire can be as much a factor in maintaining social vigor as the dedication to ideals and holy causes.

"A nation is tired when it ceases to want things fervently. It makes no difference whether this blunting of desire is due to satiety, reasonableness, or disillusion. To a tired nation the future seems barren, offering nothing which would surpass that which is and has been. The main effect of a real revolution is perhaps that it sweeps away those who do not know how to wish, and brings to the front men with insatiable appetites for action, power, and all that the world has to offer."

Ladies and gentlemen, advertising is useful and important to our economic well-being. Advertising is the instrument of abundance. Advertising, more completely and more effectively than any other instrumentality, provides that continuous forward drive which Eric Hoffer defines as the essence of progress.

We can be proud of advertising and its works. Our real problem as advertising people is to make certain that advertising can always be proud of us—that we do nothing to impair its value and its usefulness; that we work incessantly to make it more honest, more useful, in better taste, more believable and more effective.

Carpet Tariff Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Monday, March 4, 1963:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

CARPET TARIFF BOOMERANG

Domestic manufacturers who seek protection from foreign competition through the imposition of higher tariffs are seldom concerned with the possibility that other American industries will suffer injury as a result of retaliations. That is precisely what has happened in the case of wilton or woven carpeting. Last March the President acting upon a recommendation of the Tariff Commission made under the provisions of section 7 of the now superseded Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, ordered that the duty on wilton carpet be raised from 21 to 40 percent ad valorem. Since Belgian manufacturers were principally affected by the move, the European Economic Community instantly retaliated by a comparable increase in its tariff on polyethylene resins used in the production of plastic products.

Although these tariff increases did not become effective until August, the predictable damage caused by raising the barriers to international trade is already discernible in the preliminary figures. Belgian carpet imports, which in 1960 were valued at $15.5 million, have probably declined by more than 50 percent while American exports of polyethylene resins to the six Common Market countries fell by approximately $2.5 million in the 3-month period ending in November 1962.

The irony is that the difficulties confronting the wilton segment of the American carpet industry, which prompted the President's action, are principally caused by changing tastes rather than foreign competition. Tufted carpeting has captured the bulk of the domestic market, causing many of the older producers of wiltons to switch to the production of this new product which can utilize the newer synthetic fibers.

Brazil Seething With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we know that President Kennedy refuses to do anything to embarrass Khrushchev and international communism. Our Alliance for Progress is mired down and we have no information on what is being done by us to prevent subversion in the rest of South America.

Henry J. Taylor, in yesterday's Washington News, warns us of the Communist takeover in Brazil. Will we be asleep again?

BRAZIL IS THE FOCUS POINT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

We read our Cuban news in terms of America. Khrushchev reads his in terms of Brazil. And this writer suggests that, a year from today, for every column about Cuba we'll be reading 10 about the Red star over Rio.

In America's October 22 Munich, Cuba is the Czechoslovakia. Brazil is the Kremlin's residual reward. And Khrushchev's Cuba win comes into focus only by looking at Rio, not Havana; at Brazilian President Joao Goulart, not Castro; at the continent, not the Caribbean.

North and South America are shaped like an hourglass, and at the bottom Brazil dominates nearly the whole of it. Rio-based Russians are advising President Goulart today like Macbeth heeding the song of the lying witches. And courageous parts of the Brazilian press are commenting on the fact that 78 Communists are now in the highest key posts.

These are the tested henchmen of this Moscow-oriented spellbinder whose upturned nose and jutting chin are heading for our cartoons to join Castro's beard and giant cigar.

All are not only Moscow applauded but, as if this were not enough, they were approved also by Red China on President Goulart's August 1961 pilgrimage to Peiping, from where he returned to take over the Presidency of Brazil.

High among these henchmen is Marxist Foreign Minister Hermes Lima. And our cartoonist had better be ready for Hermes Lima, too; a fat burglar with an eye as cold as Labrador's ice and his English gone somewhere with his teeth. Lions bluff, tigers don't. Neither does Hermes Lima.

"Premier Castro's government is derived from the self-determination of the Cuban people," said he to Rio Communist Party workers, in a typically gay anti-American crack headlined in the Journal do Brasil last October 24 at the very height of our Cuban crisis. Whereupon President Goulart and Hermes Lima dismissed Vice Adm. Helio Garnier Sampaio, commander in chief of Brazil's fleet, after Sr. Sampaio proposed sending two destroyers to operate with us in the naval blockade.

This began a decisive step against the United States. Any effective Communist resistance must come from the military and when President Goulart climbed to nearly dictatorial powers on January 7 he fixed that.

New commanders took over the 8th military region, the 4th naval district, and the 1st air force—snap-snap, tick-tack, all at once. Each rides the Moscow horse with the look of a jockey on a winner. And day by day the Kremlin borers deepen their hole in the military ranks.

Protests? President Goulart has merely tossed any high-ranking Brazilian into jail. In fact, the Correio da Manha, an important Brazilian daily, is in trouble for castigating President Goulart's arrest of Adm. Silvo Heck when he heroically denounced Communist control of the armed forces.

Infiltrated Brazil stands where Cuba stood 2 years ago. And behind the Havana excitement Khrushchev is building his Moscow masterpiece.

The Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, although Czechoslovakia today is under Communist rule and has been for 15 years, there are men in that country's past who we can hold up as ideals for those of us today to attempt to model ourselves after.

Just 113 years ago—March 7, 1850—Thomas G. Masaryk was born in Moravia, marking a point of utmost importance for the people of Czechoslovakia. For it was Thomas Masaryk who 68 years later was elected first President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia after a long struggle displaying the intelligence and extreme bravery of the man.

Thomas Masaryk, a philosopher and highly perceptive viewer of society, was elected to the Austrian Parliament in 1891, only to courageously resign his position 2 years later in a protest over treatment of Czechoslovak nationalists.

There followed years of writing on history and philosophy, aiming penetrating

criticism at Karl Marx and his ideas. With the coming of World War I, Masaryk fled to Paris and, with Dr. Eduard Benes, formed the Czechoslovakian National Council, which became the recognized government of Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia was recognized as a republic in 1918 and formally proclaimed in October of that year. Masaryk became President and was reelected three times before finally resigning his leadership in 1935 at the age of 85 and with a lifetime of devotion to a cause he saw as all-important—the freedom of his country.

We must constantly be alert to dangers to the element of freedom, now so abundant but always in danger of being lost by those who do not jealously guard it. This is why today, the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, should be important to us all.

Help Not Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of our colleagues to an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 6, 1963. It notes the progress being made in the United States by junior colleges operating with local backing and without Federal financing. In the Seventh District of Missouri which I proudly represent here there is a long-established and highly successful junior college at Joplin, and farsighted citizens of Newton and McDonald Counties are planning establishment of yet another "community college." I suggest to the House that massive Federal aid to education is not necessary in this field. Local school districts are meeting the needs of students with determination and with boldness.

HELP NOT WANTED

In recent years, localities on their own have fast been expanding post-high-school opportunities for education in the form of 2-year "community colleges."

There are now hundreds of these institutions coast to coast, some of them displaying considerable ingenuity in solving their inevitable economic problems. The Norwalk, Conn., community college, for instance, operates a successful 2-year program without even owning a campus or buildings. Its classes meet in a local high school during afternoons and evenings, when most public school properties are little more than idle pieces of real estate. Many community colleges have built their own buildings, but where this is so it has been achieved by community or regional effort.

So there's little evidence of either public clamor or need for the Federal Government to launch a wholesale program of grants to the States for construction of community junior colleges. Yet that's what the administration has recommended to Congress on education. And now New Jersey's Senator CASE has introduced a bill modeled on these recommendations, calling for a 5-year program of Federal aid to build an unspecified number of 2-year community colleges. These institutions, the Senator says, have proved themselves "unique" and truly community-centered, able to economically meet today's needs for advanced education.

Here, then, is a fairly typical case of the Government mind at work. Something useful is started spontaneously and locally, and as soon as it gets going well the Federal takeover itch shows up.

It is perfectly plain, except to officialdom, that making a Federal case out of the community college movement will leave those schools neither unique nor community-centered. They will be just one more testament to the Government's ability to squelch individual and local initiative.

An Open Letter to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an open letter to President John F. Kennedy which appeared in the International Friendship Guide of January 1963. The Guide is the publication of Friendship International, an organization dedicated to greater contact among the world's people. The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

We, the American citizens who have joined the Friendship International Organization, respectfully request you to include a genuine mutual international friendship program as an integral part of U.S. policy.

Some may say that the United States already operates a friendship program, for, after all, billions are being spent on foreign aid and on cultural and other exchanges. Yet while we spend billions of dollars on such projects they have failed thus far to generate a reciprocal spirit of friendship among the beneficiaries of our bounty. This is so because our approach in most cases is defective and our motives are not always sufficiently clear. Therefore, we should try a new approach.

The United States is potentially best equipped to launch the worldwide friendship movement, for our population is composed of peoples of almost every national and ethnic origin.

Thus far we have not been using this potential in the best way possible.

While there are some organizations whose avowed objective is to improve relations with this or that nation, there exists at present no overall organization or plan for this sorely neglected area of human endeavor.

Therefore, may we suggest the following measures:

(1) A White House conference in which all persons interested in the promotion of international friendship could participate.

(2) Establishment of a Friendship Foundation to coordinate the financial aspects of a worldwide friendship movement.

(3) Establishment of an International Federation of Friendship Societies to serve as a clearinghouse and coordinating body for the friendship movement.

(4) Formation of nationality and/or ethnic friendship societies, such as American-Soviet, American-Asian, American-African, etc., with global outreach.

Representatives of each nationality and/or ethnic group should serve on the board of directors of the Friendship Foundation and International Federation of Friendship Societies.

In actual operation the whole friendship movement should be based on reciprocity. In most cases this reciprocity would be comparatively easy to attain but in the case of the Soviet bloc it may at first be rather difficult to work on a full reciprocal basis. This should not keep us from initiating and promoting on the largest scale possible a friendship program with the Soviet bloc peoples for, after all, it is there that the need for mutual friendship is the greatest.

We believe that most if not all of our international problems can be solved through friendship.

Accordingly, we urge you, Mr. President, to carefully consider our suggestions and act on same as soon as possible.

Southern Agriculture, the Tariff, and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, last year the Trade Expansion Act was passed with a special assist from the cotton textile industry as a result of a special deal made by the administration involving a seven-point program. This program included an international agreement negotiated by the State Department under which other countries agreed to limit their exports to this country. It included also accelerated depreciation of textile machinery and a promise to establish equality of the domestic textile mills with their foreign competitors with respect to the price paid for our raw cotton.

This latter plan was pitched to the Tariff Commission in November 1961 but after prolonged consideration the Commission in September of last year rejected the import equalization fee, which was to amount to 8½ cents per pound on the cotton content of imported textiles. This fee was equal to the export subsidy under which we export raw cotton to the world markets at 8½ cents per pound less than our domestic price.

Mr. Speaker, now a bill is before Congress to accomplish what the Tariff Commission refused to do and more. I certainly wish the cotton textile industry well; but I do not understand what special merit attaches to that industry that does not apply equally to the other industries that also suffer severely from import competition. In my district are glass and pottery plants that are under constant bombardment by low-cost imports.

I know of no administration efforts being made to accommodate these industries. Shall we say that this is because they are not as large as the cotton textile industry and therefore do not have as many votes in Congress? Yet, Mr. Speaker, they are American industries, employing workers and paying

taxes the same as the cotton textile industry.

To single out one or two industries for special accommodation in return for support of legislation that was previously strongly opposed by such industries represents favoritism, unequal application of the law and a tactic of legislative pressure that is unworthy of a national administration.

The current cotton legislation in considerable part represents an installment of the same deal. Deals of this order create bitterness and resentment in other industries that have been sold out, and the atmosphere of mutual respect is poisoned.

Beyond that, industries that lend themselves to such tactics bypass the Congress and its constitutional mandate to regulate our foreign commerce. In place of this they throw themselves into the arms of the Executive power and thus lose their independence. They can be disciplined by the Executive and will have little recourse. What the Executive has given them it can also take away from them.

Therefore it seems unwise for any industry unless it believes in more and sharper Executive control of the economy to desert those who seek their rights as a matter of law rather than throwing away these rights for a mess of dubious Executive pottage.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks, an address delivered by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Southern Farm Forum in New Orleans a month ago.

Mr. Strackbein, in speaking on "Southern Agriculture, the Tariff and Foreign Aid," covered such crops as cotton, tobacco, peanuts, cane sugar, rice, poultry, cattle, and shrimp, all of which are products of the Southern States, but gave special attention to cotton because of its top position along with cotton manufacturing in the southern economy.

His statement is both interesting and illuminating and I hope that all who are interested in the current cotton legislation will read it and take it to heart.

The address follows:

SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE, THE TARIFF AND FOREIGN AID

(Address of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Southern Farm Forum, New Orleans, Jan. 17, 1963)

For generations the South was the stronghold of free trade. This was because its economic eggs were kept principally in two baskets, namely, cotton and tobacco. On the other hand, when the growers of these crops and those whose living depended on them, bought manufactured products such as implements, shoes, clothing, etc., coming from the North or from abroad, duty paid, the prices were discouragingly high.

The difference between prices received and prices paid was attributed to the tariff and the tariff was identified with the South's economic ills. The South not unnaturally adopted a policy calling for dismantlement of the tariff and politically alined itself solidly with the Democratic Party which in the second half of the 19th century adopted a campaign cry of "a tariff for revenue only." The Republicans, on the other hand, became identified with protectionism.

Two Democratic Presidents—namely, Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson—while in office suported legislation that lowered the tariff rather drastically. When the Republicans regained power after the two Democratic administrations they soon again raised the tariff. Thus it went until the Franklin Roosevelt administration when the trade agreements program was adopted. This was in 1934. This legislation substituted State Department-conducted tariff negotiations for congressional action. Under this program a long succession of international trade agreements has brought the tariff down about 80 percent. Recently the President was authorized by Congress with strong southern support, to cut the remaining tariff another 50 percent and in some cases 100 percent.

During this near 30-year period since 1934 Congress has virtually given away or lost both its constitutional power to make the tariff and to regulate our foreign commerce.

In recent years the tariff issue has become bipartisan, what with southern Democrats turning toward protection and considerable Republican defection from it. The reason for the shift from the southern free-trade position is not hard to find. The rapid industrialization of the South, especially in cotton textile manufacturing, changed the outlook. Since early in the 1950's the textile manufacturing States of the South, from Virginia down, have become greatly concerned over imports of cotton textiles and in 1955 when the Trade Agreements Act was up for renewal a heavy block of votes from these States for the first time sided with the protectionist forces in the Congress and the trade bill was amended to strengthen its protectionist features. This support was repeated in 1958 but in 1962 as the result of international agreement limiting the imports of cotton textiles, many of the House Members who had voted in 1955 and 1958 for a stronger regulation of imports and for congressional regulation of foreign trade rather than Executive control in this field, swung away and supported the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

This is not to be interpreted as a swing-back to free trade. Rather, the turnabout was a simple case of a deal whereby the cotton textile industry received protection in return for voting free trade.

With this brief background sketch we can move on to the subject of this panel. The question of the discussion this afternoon is whether U.S. trade and aid programs are helping or hurting southern agriculture.

Southern agriculture is, of course, not limited to cotton and tobacco, although these crops are still important. Other important crops are peanuts, poultry, cattle, sugar, corn, rice, fruits and vegetables, tung nuts, hay, etc. Nonagricultural developments include synthetic fibers and textiles; furniture, chemical, rug, garment, and paper manufacturing; cigarette and cigarmaking, shrimp, and other fisheries; oil drilling and refining, etc.

The effects of our trade and our aid programs will therefore vary. The benefits and injuries may be quite mixed. For example, cotton growing was helped by the expenditure of $42.5 million directly for raw cotton in 1961, under the mutual security program. If we include Public Law 480, barter and donations, we exported $227 million of cotton in 1961 under governmental assistance, mostly in the form of sales for foreign currencies.

Yet, under the point 4 program we have helped expand cotton production in other countries, such as India, Pakistan, Egypt, Mexico and Brazil. During the years 1948-52 the United States produced an average of 40 percent of the world's cotton. By 1960 this had declined to 28.5 percent. The principal cotton-growing States of the South are Texas, Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia and Louisiana.

Was the build-up of foreign cotton production while helping the domestic growers beneficial or hurtful to the South? It looks very much like giving with one hand and taking away with the other.

While our total cotton crop, which for the past 3 years has stood at a little over 14 million bales, has not declined in absolute terms, the per capita production, taking increase in population into account, has shrunk over 20 percent in the past 20 years. Of course, the development of synthetics accounted for a good share of this decline; but increases in foreign cotton production have reduced our exports, except as stimulated by heavy subsidies, amounting presently to $42.50 per bale. In 1960 the cost to the Treasury of the 7 million bales exported under the subsidy was only a little short of $300 million and added that much to the budgetary deficit.

It would be quite a strain to find that the foreign aid program, including point 4, has helped cotton growers of the South economically.

Then what of the reciprocal trade program? Did it help King Cotton?

In the first place, we placed strict limitation on the importation of raw cotton under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This restriction at least kept the expanding cotton production that we stimulated in other countries from swamping our domestic market. Had we stuck by the principles of free trade we would not have put the strict quota limitations on imports. In that event, however, our cotton growers would have faced dire consequences from rising raw cotton imports. Thus by protecting the growers was their support obtained for the dismantlement of our tariff on all kinds of products other than raw cotton. Even cotton textile tariffs were cut.

The theory was that if we slashed the tariff on imports in general, exclusive of raw cotton, of course, we would buy more goods of all kinds from other countries and they in turn would buy more from us, including raw cotton. The cottongrower would be distinctly better off than he was because he would sell more cotton abroad but would not be subject to import competition because of the quota limitations.

How much more cotton did we then export?

From 1931 to 1935 we exported an average of 7.2 million bales per year. That was before our tariff-cutting program under the reciprocal trade program got underway. Thereafter a considerable decline set in. The war cut exports very sharply; but even after the war, i.e., from 1951 to 1955 our average annual exports were just below 4 million bales, or 3 million bales below the pretrade agreement level. Then, i.e., in 1956, we started the export subsidy program and began to take markets away from the countries in which we had built up cotton production through foreign aid. By 1957 we had climbed back to an export level of 7.5 million bales. This was followed by another sharp decline for 2 years, after which we worked back up to 7.1 million bales in 1960. Then another but more moderate decline set in.

Evidently the drastic tariff reductions to which we subjected a wide range of industrial and other farm products did not shower manna from heaven on the cotton farmers.

One of the prime results of the cotton program has been to increase the cost of raw cotton to the domestic cotton textile manufacturers some 25 percent above the cost to the Japanese and other foreign textile producers. In other words, the principal consumer of our raw cotton, the domestic manufacturer, has been penalized by this system and exposed to serious import competition. In recent years cotton textile imports have grown by leaps and bounds. To meet this

menace the State Department made an arrangement with the Japanese late in 1956, behind the scenes and outside the trade agreements program, whereby Japan limited her exports to us. That this arrangement was doomed to failure should have been visible at the time and was visible to many, but the State Department by now had gained almost complete control of our trade regulation and Congress seemed to be helpless. In time imports came in torrents from Hong Kong and elsewhere as if a dam had broken. The fat again was in the fire.

The textile industry was now thoroughly alarmed after having been blocked at every turn by the executive branch (read State Department) in its search for an administrative remedy. The State Department's opposition was much after the manner of a small snake swallowing a big frog. Having caught the frog by the toe as in the Japanese textile arrangement, it soon enlarged its hold. The need for control of imports became more and more pressing and all other other remedies other than that offered by the State Department were closed. The Department came into a position now to work its design, which is swallowing complete control of our foreign trade, as if Congress did not exist.

The big chance came with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The textile industry would have been dead set against it as in 1955 and 1958 if it had run true to form. Herein lay the State and Commerce Department's big opportunity. The textile industry held the vote balance in Congress. The bait was an international agreement by which some 19 foreign countries would agree to limit their cotton textile shipments to this country. This would, if carired out, give the textile industry at least some of the protection it sought. The price was something that the textile industry could pay without cost to itself—merely at the expense of principle and leaving in the lurch all other industries that had been pulling together with it in the same boat, and thus dealing a heavy blow to the protectionist cause.

How big a price this was is not yet known.

No one had been more articulate in the Congress than the Representatives from the textile areas (and a few have stood firm) in blunt opposition to congressional abdication of constitutional responsibility. Concentration of too much power in the State Department was deeply abhorred in oratorical outpourings time and again. A great principle was evidently at stake; or, listening, one would have thought so.

When the trade bill reached the floor of the House these voices were stilled. A strange unnaturalness hovered over the debate. Where were those stout voices so often heard in the past? They had vanished. Without them the debate all but collapsed. Then came the payoff with the rollcall. The yeas and nays told the story. Heavy defections from the textile areas, engineered by the executive branch which offered the cotton textile industry protection for support of a bill that was against protection, gained the day for freer trade. The deal was consummated.

Will it help the South? The question is whether one section of the country can be helped at the expense of the economy as a whole. A little more on this later.

There is another reflection. The textile industry has for now effectively endorsed the transfer of power over foreign commerce from the Congress to the State Department, in spite of the many firm words previously spoken in opposition. The industry is now beholden to the executive branch and owes its allegiance to that branch. What the executive has seen fit to give it can take away. The industry is now subject to discipline because it has signed away its independence, however reluctantly.

While cotton growing and cotton textile manufacturing represent dominant features of the South, other crops are also important, as already said, such as tobacco and its manufacture, peanuts, cattle, poultry, etc.

Tobacco production has almost certainly been helped by our foreign aid program. In 1961 the mutual security program, alias foreign aid, took $16.5 million of tobacco. This was no great sum but such a quantity resting on a market might depress prices. The figure expands to $72.8 million if we include exports under Public Law 480, sales for foreign currencies, donations, barter, etc.

If foreign aid has helped tobacco farmers, what of the trade program? Our exports of leaf tobacco have increased from an average of 456 million pounds from 1931 to 1935 to 567 million pounds in 1960, an increase of about 25 percent. On the other hand we reduced the duty on tobacco leaf and our imports grew from 61 million pounds to 164 million pounds during the same period, an increase of about 170 percent. The leading southern tobacco-growing States are North Carolina, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee. Kentucky, also a large grower, is a border State.

As in the case of cotton, the theory was that reduction of our tariffs in general would increase our imports in general and this would provide other countries with more dollars for use in buying American tobacco. Well, we are selling 111 million more pounds and importing 103 million more pounds after nearly 30 years.

Our leaf tobacco production increased by 60 percent during this period. We are now exporting 29 percent of our crop compared with 36 percent from 1931 to 1935.

It could be said that on balance tobacco has lost substantial ground under the trade program. Our exports of leaf tobacco are not subsidized as are cotton and wheat exports.

Rice production has been heavily assisted by the various export assistance programs. In fact in 1961 of the total rice exports of $132 million $79 million consisted of governmentally assisted exports or 60 percent. Since a half of our total rice production was exported in 1961 as much as 30 percent of the total production was exported under governmentally assisted programs.

Unquestionably rice production in the South has been helped by these programs. Our per capita consumption of rice has, however, remained very steady ranging between 5 and 6 pounds per year, with annual variations, but no visible trend since 1930. Imports are and have been relatively insignificant.

Because of the massive assistance to exports of rice it would be difficult to find any particular help attributable to the trade agreements program. The principal rice-producing Southern States are Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas.

Poultry production has come to a position of growing importance in several Southern States. The leading States in commercial broiler production are Georgia, Arkansas, Alabama, and North Carolina. In recent years a flourishing export market has been developed for poultry reaching as high as $53 million in 1961. The principal export markets have been West Germany, Holland, and Switzerland. However, there has been very little participation by the poultry industry in foreign aid or Public Law 480 exports.

Recently the Common Market has raised its duty on poultry and unless this increase is rescinded our poultry exports may be expected to dwindle. The Common Market motive is to become less dependent on the outside for its agricultural products. To that end they have adopted a common agricultural policy and our poultry exports appear to be one of the early victims.

Peanuts, principally grown in Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, and Alabama, have enjoyed an import quota restriction limiting imports to about one-tenth of 1 percent of the domestic production. The purpose is to protect the governmentally supported price of peanuts.

Exports of peanuts have been on a moderate scale, fluctuating usually between $4 and $6 million per year in the last 5 years. These nuts are not separately shown in any foreign aid shipments or under Public Law 480 even though all other products of substantial shipments are shown. Obviously the trade program has been of little benefit to peanut exports. The principal benefit to the industry has been derived from the import restriction, established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This limitation like those on cotton, wheat, and dairy products, is protectionist and in contravention of the principles of free trade.

Cane sugar, which is an important crop of Louisiana and Florida, is divorced from the trade program and imports are under strict allocation under the Sugar Act. We export virtually no sugar because of our generally high price compared with the rest of the world. Neither foreign aid nor the foreign trade program can be said to be either helpful or harmful to sugarcane production in the South except insofar as these programs helped or harmed the economy of this country in general.

Cattle production in the Southern States has increased steadily in the past 10 years. There has been very little participation in foreign aid exports or those arising from Public Law 480; nor is cattle under a price support program. The industry in the South is centered in Texas and to a lesser extent in most of the Southern States.

Under the trade program the duty on live animals and beef and veal were reduced. As a result in recent years imports of live animals and meats have risen to record levels; and the cattle industry has not been helped by foreign aid but has been hurt by imports, especially through the occasional depression of prices.

Beef is one food product that has enjoyed a handsome increase per capita consumption in this country, rising from 55 pounds in 1940 to 63 pounds in 1950 and on to 86 pounds in 1961. Veal consumption by contrast has not increased.

Was this increase in consumption of beef attributable to foreign aid or to our foreign trade program? The answer is there has been no visible connection. The increase resulted from a generally higher consumer income and this reflected relatively prosperous economic conditions. To the extent that these two programs contributed to our general prosperity, they also helped the cattle industry indirectly. This will be discussed later.

The shrimp industry, which harvests its crop from the sea, has grown about 30 percent since 1940, ranging from Texas to Florida in the gulf and north to Georgia and the Carolinas on the east coast. Shrimp imports come in free of duty and imports have risen about half of domestic production. There has been little or no participation in foreign aid exports or exports otherwise assisted by the Government. There is therefore no direct connection between this industry and either the trade or aid programs.

CONCLUSION

As previously indicated, it would be difficult to make a reliable assessment of the value or harm of the trade and aid programs to southern agriculture. In the long run the only benefits that could be regarded as solid and substantial would be those derived indirectly from any general benefit of these programs to the country as a whole. The same would be true of such harm as these programs might inflict. In some instances such

harm might be direct as undoubtedly it would have been with respect to raw cotton, peanuts, and tung oil, had these crops not been protected from imports by import quotas in violation of the very principle of free trade.

Having said this we can hardly avoid assessing the two programs (trade and aid) in terms of their contribution to or hindrance of the economy in general. Foreign aid unquestionably helped the European countries to regain their feet and this was desirable. It has also helped other countries and is not likely to be discontinued.

However, judging from reliable reports, the administration of the funds is sometimes very wasteful. Therefore the cost would be reduced sharply without sacrificing the benefits. Our balance-of-payments difficulties are of course aggravated by foreign aid; and we have through this program generated considerable competition for our own industries. Our budget deficits and growing national debt, with the heavy burden of interest payments resting upon us, have also been aggravated by our foreign aid outlay. The reduction of taxes would be much easier to justify if we did not suffer this heavy aid outgo year after year.

However, in my opinion the trade program, helpful as it may have been in reviving and expanding trade, poses much the greater problem. In fact, I do not believe that our economy will be able to survive the exposure to import competition that the further authorized tariff cuts would promote if the authority is carried out.

Already the economic growth of this country is lagging behind other industrial nations. This of itself would be immaterial but for the failure to provide employment in this country in step with our population increase. Therein lies our failure and it is this failure that generates the calls for public help of all kinds including tax reduction even as our deficits mount and grow.

Our leading manufacturing industries are turning out more goods today than 10 years ago with a million fewer workers. Our agriculture has done even worse, or better, depending on the point of view. The yield per acre in most of our crops has increased so greatly that in 10 years' time from 1950 our farms disgorged 3 million farmworkers, no longer needed. At the same time these farms have produced more than we can eat, drink, or wear, and we are plagued with surpluses.

A good part of this prosperity has been based on high defense expenditures and other public outlays. It has not been a prosperity generated by a self-propelling industrial system such as characterized our system in the past.

Our industries have invested 6 percent less in new plants and equipment in this country in 1961 than in 1957, but they have expanded handsomely abroad. Also, the sales generated by our investments in other countries have grown 60 percent to $25½ billion since 1957 while our exports increased only 10 percent.

The trades, services, and professions, i.e., nonmanufacturing enterprises and activities including State and local government, have in the aggregate grown more rapidly than our population in the past 10 years; but employment at production as a generator of jobs is more important. For every job in our factories, mines, fisheries, and on the farm, two other jobs are found in all the other economic and professional activities. This is a recent development. In 1940 the ratio was 1 to 1; in 1950 it was 1 to 1.5, and in 1960 it reached 1 to 2.

Therefore, if we are interested in employment, and we must be interested in it, we must be especially interested in the economic health of our industries. Each job in them, to repeat, creates two other jobs.

When we import finished goods we do not enjoy this ratio, and our imports are running more and more to manufactured goods. The mix is moving rapidly in that direction. On the other hand, in our exports the trend is in the opposite direction. The share of finished manufactures in our exports is declining.

Also, when we export agricultural products in the unmanufactured form we are doing very little for employment. In recent years a rising proportion of our total exports has consisted of agricultural products. They have now reached the $5 billion level, thanks to the heavy subsidization of exports of the leading items, wheat and cotton.

We are moving in the wrong direction. While we have burdened our production with heavy costs through many legislative enactments on top of war and cold war costs, thus reducing our competitive capacity because of rising rigid costs, we have systematically dismantled our tariff.

This has confronted scores of our industries with very difficult low-cost import competition. This fact in turn has eroded business confidence in the future; and that explains why our new investments in plant and equipment has faltered while we are pouring new capital into other countries, especially Europe. Evidently the outlook is better there than at home.

Instead of improving the outlook for exports in the long run this trend distinctly does the opposite; for we will more and more sell to these growing markets from within. Moreover, our capital will participate overseas while our farmers stay behind and while labor sees the sinews of industry, i.e., investment in new plants and equipment, flow overseas to generate production jobs there rather than here. In many instances the oversea plants will sell to third markets rather than exporting to them from this country.

Obviously no trade program that is based on such contradictory economics can help our economy as a whole even if in the past decade it seemed to do so by swelling our trade. Unfortunately our much vaunted export surplus is so much sponge since it is not self-generated but accounted for by our export subsidies, foreign aid sales, sales for foreign currencies, etc.

We cannot expect our economic system, long the most productive and the only one of its kind in the world, to perform in previously self-propelling fashion, if we shove it around, kick it in the teeth, overload it with burdens and generally curse it up and down. The American mass production system was the world's pioneer in mass-production and modern technology. It developed under quite special conditions, which included antimonopoly conditions and a fair competition to assure the tapping of vast consumer market with the implement of low prices derived from low costs of production. Along with this we assured a mass market by maintaining high purchasing power through good wages and good profits. We were solicitous of the business incentive and kept in mind the function of profits. We did the same for wages, establishing fairness of competition in that field through minimum wage legislation and outlawing of child labor. This raised costs to our producers as did some other legislation.

The combination worked productive miracles. However, now we insist on pitching this high-cost system against a type of competition that is of a different species. Abroad wages are low while productivity is rising rapidly. This sharpens the competitive edge and we will feel it more and more. Our manufacturers, who in the past could be quite sure that they would be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor if they came out with new products or radical improvements in old ones, all of which required expensive development and machinery, today may be quite certain that the home market will be hotly contested by imports that enjoy special competitive advantages and against which there is virtually no remedy under the escape clause of the Trade Act. From the dismal record in this field our industries know that they have no real defense against a ruinous import competition that is growing yearly more intense.

Little wonder that they do not venture as freely as in the past. They cannot be sure that they will be able to dispose of the increased output at a profit. So long as this condition persists we will not get moving in any real sense, even if taxes are reduced.

Southern agriculture has as much of a stake in this as any other segment of the economy, for agriculture that looks to all parts of the country for its market, prospers or withers with the rest of the economy.

Taxes Not Only Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the House an editorial brought to my attention by Mr. Harold H. White, a consulting engineer of Joplin, Mo. The editorial, entitled "Taxes Not Only Threat," appeared in the Joplin Globe Saturday, March 2, 1963. It is a sharp reminder that there are matters besides taxes with which the Congress must concern itself:

TAXES NOT ONLY THREAT

In all of the talk about the tax burden and its adverse impact on the economy, there is much talking around or ignoring of what many economists view as an equally heavy drag on economic growth. It is the continuing and unrestrained pressures for even higher labor costs without equalizing increases in productivity.

President Kennedy has largely skipped over the productivity cost issue in naming taxation as the culprit. No question that it is a culprit, but by no means the only one. Others include excessive Federal deficit spending, which is not productive, and what some economists call economic dictatorship by politically powerful labor unions.

All of these elements should be kept in perspective as Congress considers a realistic tax reduction, with or without tax reforms. For the continuing demands by the administration for larger social welfare spending, plus the threats of more disruptive strikes this year over wage and make-work demands surely will have much to do with whether or not a new recession comes. It will be recalled that the steel strike triggered the 1959–60 recession.

Mr. Kennedy first proposed tax cutting and reforms as the way to get the country moving. Since then there have been wide differences of opinion on where and how tax corrections should be made. The President and his advisers were disappointed or piqued over the general reaction. Hence the recent shift in strategy to put the emphasis on tax cutting.

On the other hand, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon warns that if some of the reforms are not accepted then some of the proposed rate reductions must be made less attractive. And Economic Adviser Heller bemoans the Puritan ethic that causes taxpayers to question the wisdom of tax cuts without spending cuts and the need for public education

on these matters. Thank goodness the people are better educated than he thinks.

There is no predicting at present the outcome of the legislative battle over these matters. Likely it will go on for months, with emphasis on tax cutting and tax reform, and whether they should be separated. But the Congress will do well to take a hard look at all factors troubling the Nation's economic health, for together they will have much bearing on any threat of recession.

The New York Newspaper Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper strike in New York City is threatening to become a national tragedy. The country should know that we in Congress are not unconcerned at this prolonged interruption of the flow of public information in a major American city.

President Kennedy said on February 21 that the situation had "long since passed the point of public toleration" and with that most of us will agree. But he said on the same day that the strike is not "a national issue." I believe the strike is a national issue and I believe the significance of it deserves most careful attention throughout the entire country.

An informed people is essential to the safety of a democratic society. In all too many cases representative government has broken down when the citizenry, for one reason or another, is denied access to information related to public affairs and to their government.

On February 24 the Washington Post lead editorial said the New York strike and the Cleveland newspaper strike are not isolated phenomena arising from the idiosyncracies of individual labor leaders. "They represent an all too common condition in the communications field," said the Post.

The same editorial said this about the two strikes:

They disclose that nearly every newspaper in the United States can be forced into temporary or permament suspension on the option of the leadership of unions—even those representing a tiny fraction of the employees. A society in which such enormous power is vested in persons having no responsibility except that which they owe to their immediate membership does not enjoy the assurances of access to information which it is entitled to expect under a democratic system. No free society would tolerate the exercise of such power by government itself; its exercise by persons neither chosen by nor responsible to a larger suffrage is even more intolerable. Newspapers in this country operate from day to day on the sufferance of their smallest unions, a majority of the membership of which can close the newspaper at will. The power of each union has multiplied beyond all reason or restraint by an all too common tendency of larger and more responsible unions to mortgage their own judgment, intelligence and responsibility in advance by tacit agreements to support strikes in the calling of which they have had no voice. Publication, under these circumstances, is at the mercy of every union, including the smallest and least responsibile labor aggregates. Plants often are compelled to close and stay closed in disregard of and in defiance of the will and wish of vast majorities of the workers in the enterprises involved. The New York and Cleveland strikes, unreasonable as they are, are not even the worst examples of the dangerous vulnerability of the press. It is only just to admit that the situation would be worse but for the sobriety and restraint of the leadership of some of the major unions.

The divisive and tragic nature of the New York strike is matched by the extent of the impasse facing the negotiating parties. To help shed light on this aspect of the deadlock, I call my colleagues' attention to the contents of a letter sent to employees of the New York News February 15 by the president and publisher, Mr. F. M. Flynn.

The complete text of the letter follows:

THE NEWS,
New York, N.Y., February 15, 1963.

To all News employees:

Again, as in earlier letters, I am taking the liberty of writing to you about the status of the negotiations between Local No. 6, ITU, and the New York Publishers' Association.

Many letters, telephone calls, and personal discussions with people vitally concerned with the strike indicate that sufficient detail of what has transpired and what is transpiring is not available to all. For this reason, I will continue to write to you when circumstances warrant, even though some may object to my doing so.

It was necessary for me to point out in the previous letters that we were facing a deadly serious, grim set of conditions. Today, I must report that they are even more serious, if that is possible.

Negotiations are deadlocked. There is no recognizable sign that progress will be made toward resolving the issues in the immediate future.

As you know, an imposing array of individuals and recognized authorities in the field of labor negotiation, mediation, and conciliation have worked hard to bring about a fair settlement between the printers and the publishers.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and the top men in the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service have worked tirelessly to resolve the differences. They continue to follow the dispute with concern.

The Board of Public Accountability, appointed jointly by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, and Secretary of Labor Wirtz, attempted without success to bring into focus the grave nature of the newspaper blackout which has seriously affected so many individuals and interests.

Further efforts to settle the strike were made by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, aided by his labor adviser, Theodore W. Kheel, when they brought both parties together at city hall for a 17-day period starting January 26.

Representing the ITU in these meetings, some of which ran continuously for as long as 20 hours, were Bertram Powers, local president, and John Pilch, international first vice president, who were on hand throughout, and Elmer Brown, international president, who participated during the last few days. Representing the newspapers were their publishers, chief executives, and labor relations men.

Also on hand were key officials of each of the newspaper unions; Harry Van Arsdale, president of the New York City Central Labor Council; Michael Mann, AFL–CIO regional director and personal representative of the labor organization's president, George Meany; John O'Rourke, president of the Teamsters Joint Council, and numerous other union officials.

The formalities of these 17-day meetings included sessions involving the full committees of each side and separate meetings of a special subcommittee. The latter included Walter Thayer, president of the Herald Tribune, Amory Bradford, vice president of the Times, and myself, as president of The News, for the publishers, and Messrs. Brown, Pilch, and Powers for the ITU.

It is disappointing and discouraging to report that not one single important issue was resolved in any of these meetings.

From my experience as a participant in these meetings and from individual, off-the-record talks I have had with principals on both sides of the controversy, I must reluctantly conclude that nothing will be accomplished so long as the present atmosphere persists.

My experience in labor negotiations covers a period of more than 30 years. Never have I encountered a problem so complex; never before have I been unable to see an opening leading to the settlement of a contract dispute.

Every known avenue which might lead to settlement has been explored. All issues have been reviewed innumerable times. Every conceivable approach to an agreement on wages, hours, fringe benefits and the contract term has been considered most carefully.

It now appears that a negotiated settlement will be extremely difficult, if not impossible to achieve. Big 6 is amply financed for paying strike benefits, apparently is backed by all other newspaper unions as well as the Central Trades Council and some determined to achieve its goals regardless of the consequences.

Even though we know a prolonged test of economic strength will leave a deep scars and inevitably will cause irreparable damage, we must accept the conclusion that such a test of economic strength is well underway. No alternate has been found.

It is my considered judgment that the publishers are justified in resisting the known proposals of Local No. 6.

The ITU, of course, is entitled to seek contract improvements. Thus far, however, its representatives have not justified, in my mind, their insistence on moving ahead so far and so quickly with so many extremely costly proposals. We are not dealing with a wage scale in the lower brackets. Wages which would average in excess of $150 a week are not substandard.

The settlement which was acceptable to the Newspaper Guild in November and in which other unions indicated interest in accepting seems to have been overshadowed by recent developments. It continues to surprise me that this large number of employees should be forced to remain away from work with loss of income to support demands for an increase greater than that which they accepted or indicated a willingness to consider favorably.

This situation becomes even more difficult to understand when we view the unbending attitude of the ITU toward any suggestion that the differences be resolved through mediation, fact finding or any form of arbitration.

From this time on the danger of irreparable damage to the future soundness of the News will increase at an accelerated pace.

Failure to resolve this dispute through collective bargaining will bring pressure for other action which may take the form of distasteful governmental intervention.

We fully recognize the right of any union group to seek the resolution of a dispute by withdrawal of its services, but we believe any

excessive use of this right will eventually bring condemnation by the public.

My deep convictions cause me to repeat: This dispute will be resolved best if the parties reach agreement in good faith as a result of the commonly accepted processes of collective bargaining. We shall continue to work for such a settlement.

Sincerely yours,

F. M. FLYNN.

Bulgarian League Pays Tribute to Radio Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the American-Bulgarian League recently sponsored a dinner in New York to honor Radio Free Europe and the Free Europe Committee for their services in the continuing fight against communism on the continent of Europe.

This dinner meeting was capably reported by Lawrence Lafer in a column in the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, 1963.

For the information of those who share an interest in the fate of the captive nations and who applaud the unselfish devotion of Mr. John Richardson, Jr., president of the Free Europe Committee, I include Mr. Lafer's column herewith:

BULGARIAN LEAGUE PAYS TRIBUTE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE

(By Lawrence Lafer)

NEW YORK.—Only 6 years after its most uncertain hour—following the ill-starred uprising of Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956—Radio Free Europe not only was on the air but was the guest of honor at a black-tie dinner of the American-Bulgarian League in New York.

The American-Bulgarian League is an organization of American and Canadian citizens of Bulgarian descent.

A scroll, "For its effective broadcasts to Bulgaria for a period of over 12 years in the interest of bringing truth and hope to her captive peoples," was presented to a network representative at the affair.

REMINDER GIVEN

Almost forgotten were the days of criticism until one of the speakers reminded the guests of the clamor raised by those who blamed Radio Free Europe for inciting the Hungarian revolt when it had no chance of success.

His voice rising, Leo Cherne of the International Rescue Committee said that anyone who believed that a radio station alone could arouse people as the Hungarians were stirred didn't understand the magnitude of the Communist abuses that fired the revolt.

Mr. Cherne was one of seven speakers who thought RFE was doing a commendable job.

DUPLICITY EXPOSED

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, said: "With its many hours of daily broadcasts Radio Free Europe has proved one of our most effective weapons in exposing the duplicity of Communist propaganda and bringing the truth to the peoples of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania."

The Congressman said it was a solemn obligation for those enjoying political freedom in the West to support the work of RFE as a way of keeping alive hope for freedom from Communist tyranny.

REASON SEEN

Representative JOHN MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, agreed. Radio Free Europe is one of the many measures short of war that the United States can take to fulfill an obligation to work for the restoration of freedom and self-determination to Bulgaria and other similar nations.

Mr. Monagan said this country is especially obliged to do this because American credulity and innocence were substantial factors in the Communist takeover of Bulgaria. There was a mistaken reliance on Soviet promises of free elections, Mr. MONAGAN said.

To turn the tide, the Congressman reported that his House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the captive nations recommended to the President:

We must keep the question of the seized countries alive by taking every opportunity in the United Nations and other forums to emphasize that this problem remains unsettled. It should be settled according to the principles of the United Nations.

We must seize this and other opportunities to put pressure on the Russians. They do the same to us at every opportunity. Why should we be punctilious?

We should not be dissuaded by lack of enthusiasm of our allies. The fact remains that the fate of human brothers is at stake, and we must never admit that we can become bored or restless at the repetition of claims for freedom and self-expression.

We must do everything to keep the hopes of the captive peoples alive. Our Government should step up the use of our international media to proclaim our support to the world.

"This recommendation has a particular application to the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe," Mr. MONAGAN noted. "It is not only the volume of broadcasts which should be increased but also the force and scope of these broadcasts—both in electric power and in political content."

BUDGET UNDISCLOSED

(A Radio Free Europe spokesman said the privately financed network's budget has never been published on the theory it would tell the Russians too much. Radio Free Europe is currently trying to raise $11 million. Using 28 transmitters in West Germany and Portugal and operating out of a Munich, Germany, headquarters, Radio Free Europe beams 18 hours of diversified programing daily to Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary. Bulgaria and Romania get 5 hours a day. An estimated 80 million people live in those five lands.)

"After all, this is a war that we are fighting," Mr. MONAGAN said. "I believe we are gradually realizing more clearly the folly of attempting to deal on principle with a Communist regime."

OPTIMISM EXPRESSED

Concluding optimistically, he carried the room. "I believe that our support will increase and grow," the Congressman said. "I am convinced that this support and the natural instinct of the captive peoples for freedom and self-improvement will sap the strength of the sterile Leninist creed and will bring a new birth of freedom to the people of Central Europe."

It is a crime for Iron Curtain country citizens to listen to Voice and Radio Free Europe broadcasts. Are they being heard? The former U.S. Minister to Bulgaria, Edward Page, Jr., told of an experience he and his wife had with Bulgarian peasant children to prove that they are. As the children skipped away after bringing the American couple flowers they sang a song about "a bambina" they could have learned nowhere but from outside the country, the former diplomat concluded.

VISITORS INTERVIEWED

(More formal statistical checks based on interviews with visitors from behind the Iron Curtain, and refugees, show that millions are tuned in, a Radio Free Europe spokesman said.)

A second scroll was presented by the Bulgarian league to John Richardson, Jr., president of the Free Europe Committee, the parent group of Radio Free Europe.

Accepting the award for his group, Mr. Richardson spoke quietly, "Two things I want to say: Courage is not a thing of the past. Sooner rather than later," he said.

"The period we are in, in terms of history, is a short one. The eye of the hurricane, in a very short period of time the world will have made its choice," Mr. Richardson said. "It will be free, slave, or destroyed.

"In this generation it has been a privilege to be allied with an organization in this cause of freedom," he said.

The Cotton Mess Could Get Messier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the problems of the cotton textile situation. I read with interest the following editorial in the Charlotte (N.C.) News, of December 7, 1962, which is quite candid in observations and suggestions as to possible solutions to the problems before us:

THE COTTON MESS COULD GET MESSIER

The Federal Government ought not to get bogged any deeper in the sands of cotton subsidies if it can possibly be avoided—and we believe it can.

Unquestionably the American textile industry needs relief from the unfair competitive advantage which Government policy now gives foreign industry. This policy permits American cotton to be sold on the world market at 8½ cents a pound less than it can be bought on the domestic market. Combined with lower labor costs abroad, this places American industry in a bind both at home and overseas; foreign-made goods are cheaper.

Last summer, the Department of Agriculture recommended the establishment of an "import equalization fee" to offset this advantage for foreign firms. Under this proposal, a fee of 8½ cents a pound would be charged on the cotton content of foreign goods shipped into the United States.

This recommendation was rejected by the U.S. Tariff Commission, which said the Agricultural Adjustment Act authorizes import curbs only if there is a cause-and-effect relation between imports and cotton-support programs.

The latest proposal calls for a subsidy for U.S. industry in order to close the 8½-cent gap. This would complete the circle—subsidies to keep the domestic price high for cotton growers, subsidies to drop the price of American cotton to the world market level for foreign consumers, and subsidies to erase the disadvantage accruing to American industry.

Adjustments in the cotton-support program, in acreage allotments and support prices, could help. But Washington isn't

going to do anything to hurt the farmers. Nor can Washington, in good conscience, longer ignore the plight of American industry.

But rather than place a further drain on the U.S. Treasury, why not try something revolutionary, like requiring foreign industry to compete fairly by paying the import equalization fee which was turned down just a few months ago by the Tariff Commission? If Congress can adopt legislation implementing a subsidy program, surely it can just as easily amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to permit establishment of the equalization fee.

All sorts of objections can be raised to this approach, principally along those lines which hold that the United States must participate competitively in world trade. But participation should not be used as an excuse to subsidize world trade as well.

Congress ought to look closely at the alternatives to industrial subsidies while it looks closely at the total cotton picture. It's a mess—and another subsidy will only make it messier.

How Not To Run a City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial from the Flint Journal of March 2, 1963. The article contains some disturbing information from a report on the relief program in the District of Columbia which we might do well to note with a view to measuring up to our responsibility. The editorial follows:

EXAMPLE OF HOW NOT TO RUN CITY

Much has been written about the upswing in crime in Washington, D.C. Now, by way of the National Association of Manufacturers, comes a report of another ugly situation.

It seems that a General Accounting Office spot survey of the relief program for the totally disabled has shown that more than half those enjoying the taxpayers' charity were ineligible. One recipient, as a matter of fact, had been dead for quite a little while. Granted, you can't be more totally disabled than that, but he hadn't even been eligible while he was alive.

Some had jobs, some were drawing social security, some were being supported by their families. Tax money was being paid to them, and the public servants in charge of your money didn't find out in years of working on the cases the vital information that the GAO was able to turn up in a few days.

Before this investigation, another determined that 75 percent on the general relief rolls were drawing money illegally, some because they happened to be in jail, and that 58 percent of the relief payments for dependent children were illegal.

On top of the alarming increase in crime in Washington, such reports make it appear that our Nation's Capital is taking on the appearance of a disaster area, not through natural calamity but through mismanagement so massive that only the Federal Government's vast resources could have accomplished it.

That's right. Sometimes when Americans get wrapped up in their own local problems they forget that the city is not run by those whose permanent residence is in Washington. It is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government.

Things have become so bad that those who live there claim that the only way to straighten them out would be to let the people run their own affairs, as is done in other cities.

The Federal Government, then, would be freer to extend its expert knowledge of how to run cities, run schools, and fight crime in our communities everywhere else in the Nation, as it proposes to do. Somehow, it's a cheerless prospect.

New Frontier Can't Take It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently the New Frontier can dish it out but canot take it. Who says this? The chairman of the Republican National Committee? No. A New Frontiersman, himself, Mort Sahl, says it.

A story by Vernon Scott in yesterday's Washington Daily News quotes Mr. Sahl fully. I did not know the New Frontier had lost its sense of humor.

LIFE ON THE GRIM NEW FRONTIER: MORT SAHL WANTS HIS LICENSE RENEWED

(By Vernon Scott)

HOLLYWOOD.—Satirist Mort Sahl, a political liberal, is bewildered by the cool reception of his jibes at the Kennedy administration.

From Mr. Sahl's point of view the New Frontier hasn't got a sense of humor.

"I had 8 years with Ike and Nixon," the comedian said. "I got rich on the Republican administration. The Democrats laughed at my jokes about the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, and the Republicans enjoyed a laugh on themselves.

"But things are different now. The Republicans are still laughing but the Democrats aren't."

Last week Mr. Sahl, a friend of United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, attended a Democratic fundraising dinner as principal speaker in place of Mr. Stevenson who couldn't make it.

Mr. Sahl deftly slipped the needle into Democratic leadership with the observation, "I know it's peculiar that I should be replacing Mr. Stevenson at this dinner, but the Democratic Party has a history of accepting less than Stevenson."

"Some of the people ask me, 'What's happened?' You used to be on JFK's team," Mr. Sahl reported.

"When I was in opposition to Ike I was also in opposition to the Republicans. But when I oppose the administration it does not mean necessarily that I am in opposition to the Democrats.

"It is said the President is willing to laugh at himself," Mr. Sahl said impishly. "That is fine. But when is he going to extend that privilege to us?"

Victim of some of Mr. Sahl's most merciless cannonading was former Vice President Nixon with whom the comedian recently chatted.

"We met in a restaurant and had a long talk," Mr. Sahl recalled. "Mr. Nixon said he held no grudges at all and encouraged me to continue to light fires under both parties.

"I guess I'm an irritant to the Democrats because I remind them of their predicament, that the New Frontier isn't making it. Presidential jokes still get laughs built on my license to kid Presidents—but the license hasn't been renewed lately."

Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River Operations Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate a news article from my hometown of Aiken, S.C., regarding the outstanding safety record which has been compiled by Government officials and private management and employees at the Savannah River plant in Aiken County. I am proud of this record, which reflects great credit not only on the Atomic Energy Commission and the contractors and subcontractors at the plant, but also on the more than 8,300 individual workers who are involved in the mammoth operations at the Savannah River plant. I ask unanimous consent that this article as printed in The State on March 2, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AEC SAVANNAH OPERATIONS LEAD NATION IN SAFETY

AIKEN.—The Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River Operations Office, including contractors and subcontractors under its jurisdiction, completed the year 1962 with the best safety record of any Commission installation in the Nation.

The record represents the combined efforts of Government and contractor employees, principally at the Savannah River plant, according to R. C. Blair, Manager, Savannah River Operations Office, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

More than 8,300 individual workers are involved, including all persons at the Savannah River plant employed by Du Pont Operations, Du Pont Construction, the Harding-Williams Dixie Corp., Miller-Dunn Electric Co., Pittsburgh Testing Laboratory, Inc., B. F. Shaw Co., Johns-Manville Sales Corp., the U.S. Forest Service, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

In addition, employees of the Sylcor division of Sylvania Electric Products at Hicksville, Long Island, and employees of AMF Atomics at Greenwich, Conn., are included because of their contractual association with the Savannah River plant.

The Savannah River Operations Office is in competition with 13 other groups which together comprise the nationwide AEC program. This is the second consecutive year that the Savannah River Operations Office has held first place in the AEC safety competition. In both years, the disabling injury rate for the Savannah River group has been less than one-half of the rate experienced by the nearest AEC competitor; it is 19 times better than the national average for industry. In the overall AEC program, 126,000 workers are involved, Mr. Blair said.

In a letter to participants, Mr. Blair said:

"It is accomplishments like this upon which the Commission relies to maintain leadership in the curtailment of human suffering and reduction of property loss due to accidents."

Plaques and certificates will be awarded to the individual companies or employee groups, following the plan which AEC has had in effect for many years for recognition of outstanding achievement in organized programs for prevention of accidents.

Problems of Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the many fine and public spirited newspapers in the First District of Iowa, the Iowa City Press-Citizen, devoted a special issue on January 29, 1963, to the problems of soil and water conservation. The title of this special issue, "We're Losing Our Soil," simply and dramatically calls attention to one of the most serious and long-range problems facing our country. This issue deals with this problem in both its local and national ramifications, with what has been done and what needs to be accomplished in the future. The Iowa City Press-Citizen and the local conservation leaders have contributed greatly to their community by bringing this issue so clearly before the public. Under unanimous consent I include two of the articles of this special issue in the RECORD:

A MILLION-DOLLAR LOSS IN COUNTY EVERY YEAR

(By Gene Ingle)

The economy of Johnson County, regarded by most people as healthy these days, is losing a hidden $1 to $1½ million every year down the Iowa river.

The loss—more than $20 a year for each man, woman, and child in the county—is that of 1½ million tons of topsoil, the main natural resource on which the county's economy is based.

Already, soil experts estimate that half of the topsoil which originally covered the county's 335,000 acres of cropland has eroded away. And the problem is expected to get worse before it gets better.

As the late J. N. (Ding) Darling, famous cartoonist and leading conservationist, once put it, that topsoil represents beefsteak and potatoes, roast duck, ham, and eggs, and bread and butter with jam on it—food down the river.

The alarming loss of topsoil in the county—a loss which can never be replaced—already is threatening Johnson County's position as one of the Nation's leading areas of hog production.

A decline in hog production would have a severe—possibly disastrous—impact on the county's economy, a major portion of which is now dependent on hog production—unless, of course, the nature of the county's economy changes.

Put another way: soil grows corn, hogs eat corn, farmers sell hogs, farmers spend money. No soil, no corn; no corn, no hogs; no hogs, no money. In its simplest economic form, that's the problem.

This topsoil loss also is a major factor in an increase in size and number of the county's floods. Witness last July's Ralston Creek flood. This problem, too, is expected to get worse before it gets better.

Why are we losing our soil?

One hundred fifty years ago, before Johnson County was settled, prairie grass and forests kept the lush soil from the eroding forces of rain and wind. Nature was its own soil conservation agent.

Then man moved in to till the land, to plow under the prairie grass, to expose the soil to the eroding forces of rain and wind—to disrupt the balance of nature.

He has been slow to realize that there eventually will be a day of reckoning.

It was not until the 1930's that this problem was recognized widely enough to permit establishment of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service—a Federal agency to help farmers stop their soil and water losses.

And it was not until 1946 that the SCS came to Johnson County.

Today, about one-third of the county's 2,100 farmers cooperate under contract with the Johnson County soil conservation district in helping to conserve their land for their descendants.

But, admits Ross Barnett, SCS conservationist here, "we've only scratched the surface." He estimates that only 25 percent of the conservation measures the county needs have been undertaken so far.

In 16 years, 25 percent sounds like a big improvement. And it is. But each succeeding 25 percent will be progressively more difficult, Barnett says.

The big problem now (and unless the picture changes, in the future) is that most farmers don't realize what's happening. Or if they do realize it, they aren't willing to do much about it.

"For example," says Barnett, "some farmers say that they'll quit farming before they start contouring. Maybe it would be a good thing if they would."

Terracing of cropland is regarded as one of the more effective soil conservation measures a farmer can take. Yet in 1962, terraces were built on only five Johnson County farms under a Federal Government cost-sharing program.

Neither do most city people realize what's happening. They don't realize that a speck of dirt washed off a Johnson County hillside by a drop of rain means the loss of a penny or two in their pockets.

A lot of specks of dirt grow crops. Lots of pennies make dollars.

What is needed, conservation leaders in the county feel, is a massive education program.

A program—how massive remains to be seen—is now in the embryo stage. Just when and how it will be undertaken hasn't been decided yet by the county's soil district commissioners.

But whatever it is and whenever it is, it will take the cooperation of nearly everyone in the county.

Soil loss means food gone from the marketing bag, less for the table, higher cost for what remains. It means less materials for the industries using farm products, less business for merchants, less employment and less prosperity for us all.

Imagine this country without soil to grow food and industrial materials. Imagine every stream too muddy for boys to swim, or fish to live.

The country has been going in that direction.

Soil and water are the most important soil resources we have. Conserving them is not the worry of the farmer alone; he would be the last to starve.

It's important to all of us—factory worker and salesman, truck driver and banker, lawyer and doctor, "butcher and baker and candlestick maker."

Soil erosion is caused by rain and wind; in Johnson County, mainly rain. Unless nature or conservation measures are protecting the soil, the rain washes it away—into lakes and down rivers.

"Sheet" erosion—where topsoil is washed from productive cropland speck by speck—is the worst type of erosion in Johnson County. Worst, says Barnett, "because the soil disappears and you can't see it disappear."

Cause: Poor land management; soil not spongy enough to absorb water.

Cures: Terraces, contour farming and strip-cropping, grass, fertilizer.

"Rill" erosion is different. You can see it—see tiny rivulets on hillsides where bigger pieces of soil have washed away.

Cause: Farmer plowed through a grassy area where water usually runs down the hillside.

Cure: Grass waterways and other conservation practices.

Rill erosion in its more severe stages leads to gully erosion. Here, you can see huge chunks of dirt being washed away.

Cause: Farmers' lack of concern. "Few farmers care about a gully eating away at a pasture," says Barnett. "But wait till it starts eating at cropland. Then they realize it's getting late and something must be done."

Cures: Education, erosion control structures, straightening of creeks and gullies.

Sheet, rill, and gully erosion—all are problems in Johnson County. More of a problem north of the Iowa River and in the west and southwest parts of the county than in the east, southeast, and north-central portions.

Although Barnett and the soil district commissioners agree that appropriations for the SCS and laws affecting soil conservation could be improved, Johnson County does have the framework for a massive effort to curtail the $1½ million loss to its economy.

But, says Barnett, "we are not going out and force this upon the people. They've got to come to us and request our assistance to get the job done."

[From the Iowa City Press-Citizen, Jan. 29, 1963]

A DROP OF WATER STARTS THE DAMAGE

Before our land was put to plow, the average depth of topsoil was about 9 inches. Now it averages only about 5 inches—nearly half gone because not all of us have learned how to manage our land.

Nature protects the land by covering it with vegetation, such as grasses and trees, so that when the rain falls it is held back and soaks into the soil. Vegetation also cushions and breaks the impact of raindrops.

But man has cut down forests, plowed up the land, exposed the land to the full forces of water and wind. By farming the land, we have destroyed nature's protective covering.

After every rain, the water rushes off the sloping land of Johnson County, carrying with it precious topsoil and plant food. In one rain alone last spring, it was estimated that one-third to one-half an inch of topsoil over 75 percent of the county washed away.

It was money down the river for Johnson County farmers. And the longer it continues, the worse it will become.

This is erosion—in its most striking, damaging form.

Erosion * * * when does it happen, how does it happen?

Erosion, of course, is wearing away of the land. There are many kinds going on about us all the time, among them rain and wind erosion. But we're mainly concerned about the rain, because it is the kind that does the most damage in this area.

It's the force of running water that does the eroding. Deep, fast-running water has more force than shallow, slow-moving water.

If you take a pail full of water and throw it out fast—dash it out—along the top of the ground, it will wash. But if you pour out the same amount of water slowly, it

won't wash away the loose pieces of soil and other things on top of the ground.

That's why water that flows fast will wash or erode land more than water that flows slowly. If the water runs fast, it will carry more soil with it.

The amount of soil that will be washed away in a given time will depend also on how easily the soil will erode.

For example, water may be flowing over two different kinds of soil at the same rate, at the same depth and for the same length of time. Yet one soil will wash away much faster than the other. This is because the two soils differ in their ability to resist erosion.

Twenty-two percent of Johnson County's 390,400 acres are considered by soil experts to be susceptible to excessive erosion, 26 percent susceptible to severe erosion and 52 percent to moderate erosion.

The result of a drop of water falling on bare soil somewhat resembles the action of an exploding bomb. Each raindrop digs a small hole in the ground surface. The loosened soil can then be easily washed away if the water is not held where it falls.

Basically, the process of soil erosion by water consists of three principal steps: (1) loosening soil particles by the impact of raindrops or by the scouring action of runoff, (2) moving the detached particles by flowing water, and (3) depositing the particles at new locations. In a watershed, these steps occur in sequence from ridge to river or stream.

Whenever the rain falls faster than it can soak in, a sheet of water collects on the surface and moves downhill.

The rain continues to dislodge soil and keep it suspended in the moving sheet or feed it into the little streams of water flowing off the field along crop rows or hills. Mineral nutrients and organic matter are churned into the runoff and carried away, leaving the coarser, less fertile particles behind.

The combined actions of beating rain and flowing water remove continuous layers of soil from fields. This is sheet erosion.

On rolling land, soil is removed more rapidly from the hilltops and steep slopes than from the gentle ones lower down, often exposing lighter colored subsoil as erosion progresses. But sheet erosion takes place wherever muddy water moves off a field during a rain without ponding.

If the water in the little streams moves fast enough, it, too, dislodges soil and carries it along with that splashed up by the raindrops. This scouring action carves out channels that join farther down the slope. This is rill erosion.

The little streams or rills carry more soil as they pick up speed or grow in size. The abrasive particles they carry help scour the sides and bottoms of the channels. Sheet and rill erosion in combination remove enormous amounts of soil from unprotected fields.

Further cultivation smooths the rills and mixes subsoil with the surface layer. The result in most soils is a surface layer harder to work and less productive than the original one.

As the rills join to make larger channels, the runoff becomes more and more concentrated as it moves downslope and its scouring action increases.

A sudden drop, or overfall, in the channel multiplies the cutting power of the stream and enlarges the channel as the overfall advances upstream.

The result: gullies. They are channels so deep they cannot be smoothed out by ordinary cultivation. Soil conservation officials say gullies in Johnson County are feeding large amounts of sediment into the county's streams, the Iowa River and the Coralville Reservoir.

Gullies often are a sign that sheet and rill erosion have been going on a long time. Sometimes they divide fields into small areas impractical to cultivate, even where erosion is not serious between the gullies.

The banks of some large gullies slump and cave. This is especially likely to happen if the soil is underlain by a deep crumbly material. As the plunging stream of water undercuts the head and sides of the gully, great masses of soil break loose and are swept downstream.

In this way gullies advance rapidly across some fields and often make otherwise productive land impossible to farm.

When erosion is active on the uplands of a watershed, the stream that drains the watershed may be cutting away its banks, also. This usually is the result of more floodwaters than normal from the unprotected watershed and the scouring action of the sediment load in the stream.

The final step in the erosion process is the depositing of the soil particles that have been moved. This sediment deposit may occur in upland fields or on bottom lands where it damages crops.

Or the sediment may fill streams, ponds, and resorvoirs. In any event, deposition of the soil where it is not wanted may be as damaging as its removal from its original position on the watershed.

The Administration's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 5, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I know that you and the members of your Committee on Finance will be interested in the fact that the federation recently concluded a poll of its more than 190,000 individual members in the smaller independent business and independent professional pursuits on the subject of the tax reduction phase of the administration's program.

In thousands of signed ballots sent to their Congressmen in the House of Representatives a majority of these members voted in favor of the three-stage reduction in personal and corporation income taxes, also in favor of the administration's proposal to reduce personal income taxes by various percentages, also to reduce corporation tax rates to 22 percent on the first $25,000 of taxable income and 47 percent on all above that figure. Additionally a slightly larger majority voted in favor of the corporation rate revision proposal by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, ranking minority member of the Senate Small Business Committee to reduce corporation tax rate to 22 percent of the first $50,000 taxable income leaving the rate at 52 percent above that figure.

It is most significant to note that while a majority of federation members voted across the board in favor of the administration's tax revision proposals an even greater majority stated they favored Congress matching tax cuts with Federal spending cuts on a dollar-for-dollar basis. In other words, Senator BYRD, there is a definite consensus among our members for reductions in Government spending to accompany tax cuts.

For your further information I set forth below the questions asked our members, with the percentage response received:

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. President's proposal for 3-stage tax cut	66	29	5
2. President's proposal to reduce personal income taxes	70	26	4
3. President's proposal to reduce corporate income taxes	53	40	7
4. Senate Small Business Committee plan to cut corporate taxes	59	34	7
5. Congress match tax cuts by spending cuts	83	14	3

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Administration Not Blazing New Trail With Tax Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, editorial interest in tax reform is currently running high, stimulated by the President's recommendations to the Congress. It was inevitable, though, that attention would be directed to alternatives to the proposals now before us, or to modifications aimed at more workable methods of stimulating the economy—the President's announced aim. I submit for the consideration of my colleagues, as an indication of such editorial reaction in the Sixth District of Michigan, an editorial from the Flint Journal of February 26, 1963, which makes some interesting points in favor of the principle we have had before us these many years in the Herlong-Baker bill.

The article follows:

ADMINISTRATION NOT BLAZING NEW TRAIL WITH TAX THEORY

Backers of President Kennedy's tax recommendations to Congress sometimes get carried away. They imply that the theory on which the revisions are based is a novel idea stemming from the New Frontier. This is not true.

The theory, of course, is that a lower rate of taxes eventually will produce more money from a greatly expanded national economy.

In subscribing to such a theory Mr. Kennedy is neither propounding something new nor blazing a new trail in the implementation of an old doctrine.

The principle is as old as taxation itself. It is what is known as the law of diminish-

ing returns which decrees that after a tax passes the maximum level of toleration any further increase in the rate produces less rather than more revenue because it damages the source.

In reverse application, a lower rate of taxation—down to a given point—eventually produces more revenue because it makes possible the creation of more substance to tax.

This is more than a theory. It has been demonstrated in actual application of the Federal income tax.

The Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer recently pointed out that Andrew W. Mellon, secretary of the Treasury under three Presidents—Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover—sold the idea of a rate reduction to a skeptical Congress. He argued that a rate reduction actually would yield more revenue in time than the rates in force because the incentives would create so much more income to tax.

Congress went along with Mellon and experience proved him right. But the theory hasn't been applied in a substantial way since Mellon's day.

This doesn't bean that the idea was swept under the bed and forgotten until now. But those who have been advancing the same arguments Mellon used haven't been listened to in recent years. Now the Kennedy administration is trying to take credit for coming up with a startling new idea.

One group which has been pushing for such tax action for at least 5 years is the handful of Congressmen supporting the Herlong-Baker bill, aimed at lessening the tax obstacles to economic growth. That's how long attempts have been made to get the proposed legislation to the action stage.

In making his tax recommendation, the President accepted the principle on which the Herlong-Baker bill is based. However, he stopped short of the full implementation called for in the bill sponsored by Representative A. S. HERLONG, Democrat, of Florida, and Representative HOWARD W. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee.

For one thing, the administration plan would apply more tax reduction more abruptly—3 years as against 5 years, a $6 billion first-year reduction as against one of just under $4 billion. For another, the Kennedy goal is shorter—an eventual reduction of $10 billion as against one of slightly more than $19 billion.

For another, the President's program puts less emphasis on economic stimulation through the encouragement of investment by keeping both the corporate and individual top brackets much higher.

Also, although Mr. Kennedy has promised to curtail nondefense spending, it seems inevitable that enactment of his plan as submitted would result in an even larger budget deficit, at least in the beginning. The Herlong-Baker bill contains a suspension provision to guard against deficit increases.

Because of the political implications, it is unlikely that either the administration or Congress will endorse in its entirety a bill which has the backing of the business world—which Herlong-Baker has. But the President's latest proposal agrees in principle with the bill (as compared with his recommendation to Congress last year). And it seems not too much to hope that sufficient modifications can be worked out and a program formulated that will overcome the weaknesses of the administration plan and be acceptable to those who believe in fiscal regularity.

As the sponsors of the Herlong-Baker bill pointed out after Mr. Kennedy's recommendation was made, it is not important whose name is on the bill finally adopted or whether it is a combination of several bills.

The goal of more growth and jobs through spaced-out rate reform, while strengthening the Federal budgetary situation, is our overriding concern.

We Handle Khrushchev With Kid Gloves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the amazing story of our refusal to make U-2 flights, last fall, could have been disastrous. We were quite lucky, as it turned out.

President Kennedy, in his program of being blunt with our friends and soft on our enemies, was the one responsible for the failure to use our full intelligence facilities during the period, last fall.

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star, Jules Witcover tells us about the photo-gap:

CUBAN PHOTO GAP TIED TO FEAR OF U-2 RUCKUS

(By Jules Witcover)

Fear of another international U-2 incident appears to have been the major impediment to earlier discovery of the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration was deeply concerned that heavier aerial reconnaissance of the island might erupt into a replay of the U-2 propaganda brawl that scuttled the summit conference in May 1960.

Every evidence, both public and private, tends to support the conclusion that for 5 weeks, high-altitude flights were avoided over areas where the Russians were preparing to build offensive sites, for fear that loss of a U-2 would ignite another diplomatic uproar.

The fear apparently was based not so much on the possibility of a diplomatic setback in the court of world opinion. Rather, it grew out of concern that the bold Soviet gambit might be obscured in a sea of semantics and shifted to the United Nations before conclusive proof could be obtained.

MISSILE THREAT TO U-2'S

Discovery of Soviet surface-to-air missiles by a U-2 on August 29 posed an immediate threat to overflying U-2's, and the shooting down of a Nationalist China U-2 over Red China on September 9 confirmed the surface-to-air missiles' capability.

It is believed now that the U.S. policymakers were sufficiently concerned by the downing of the Chinese U-2 that they stopped all U-2 overflights of Cuba for nearly a week while that incident could be appraised in the light of the Cuban situation.

Finally, it apparently was decided that flights should be resumed, but not over areas protected by the surface-to-air missile sites. Thus, Defense Secretary McNamara was able to report only last week that flights were made four times during the 5-week period of the so-called photo gap and that pictures were taken, but that they didn't relate to the Soviet offensive buildup.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

What appears to have happened then was this:

1. A U-2 flight was made for the first time in 12 days on September 17, but cloud cover prevented effective phototaking.

2. Other U-2 flights were made on September 26, 29, October 5 and 7, but they flew patterns that avoided the surface-to-air missile sites and hence yielded pictures of Cuba that were unrelated to buildup, since the protective surface-to-air missile sites were constructed in the buildup areas.

3. In response to a number of developments—more provocative refugee intelligence, the pressures of leading members of the intelligence community, an increasing clamor from Capitol Hill—the President around October 9 and 10 ordered U-2's to photograph the surface-to-air missile-protected areas.

4. It was here that the discussion took place that led to transfer of overflight responsibility from the Central Intelligence Agency to the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force. In itself this discussion did not cost time, because bad weather would have prevented flights for these few days anyway.

5. SAC was given flight responsibility on October 12 or 13, ostensibly because it had more planes but probably also because of the military implications of potential attacks from the surface-to-air missiles.

6. The President authorized a SAC U-2 overflight for October 14 on a specially preplanned flight pattern taking it directly over the San Cristobal area protected by surface-to-air missiles. The flight yielded the telltale photo of the Soviet offensive buildup well underway. From then on, overflights were stepped up regardless of the surface-to-air missile threat.

STATEMENTS BACK OUTLINE

This chronology of the 5-week "photo gap" period is reinforced by several public statements by high administration officials and a number of private sources in and out of the administration.

John Hughes, the Defense Intelligence Agency expert who brief the Nation in the February 6 televised report on Cuba, set August 29 as the date on which high-altitude photos provided the first evidence of Soviet surface-to-air deployment in Cuba.

It was this information, magnified by the downing of a Chinese U-2, that is believed to have accentuated deep concern within the administration about the possibilities of a diplomatic or propaganda short circuit of the intelligence effort.

A high administration official, discussing the mood of the decision-makers sometime later, emphasized the extreme caution with which the administration approached the matter of sending U-2's over Cuba.

He recounted the propaganda mess that accrued from the downing of Francis Gary Powers' plane over the Soviet Union on May 1, 1960, and emphasized that the memory of this affair was in the minds of key administration advisers throughout this time.

Accordingly, he said the administration proceeded with great care against the chance that a plane might be shot down, causing the loss of U.S. psychological initiative as well as loss of the plane.

The Administration's Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State and the Columbia Record of March 3, 1963, contains an excellent editorial which presents some good food for thought to those supporting the so-called civil rights proposal which would substitute a sixth grade education for vote of qualification tests in the States. This editorial points up the fact that such legislation would water down rather than improve the quality of the ballot in the United States. I commend these edi-

torial comments to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARTY'S PROGRAM

The quality of the American voter needs to be upgraded, not weakened. But when it is proposed that only proof of a sixth-grade education be needed for a person to register and vote, it is a move to further water down the quality of the ballot in the United States.

This provision is included, as was to be expected, in the Democratic civil rights program announced by the President on Thursday. Although primarily aimed at qualifying more Negroes for the ballot, the plan is one which would place many white persons on the rolls who previously had not qualified, or even bothered to qualify. Once such a provision is made law, the vote-getting nets of aggressive machine politics would make much heavier hauls of the innocent and the distinterested and the irresponsible.

One must meet certain standards for government jobs under civil service, and there are prescribed and unquestioned qualifications for many other functions in this country. This is accepted recognition of the virtue of having qualifications. Yet for what should be the almost sacred responsibility of voting, the Democrats now propose a severe weakening of the qualifying standards.

We say "Democrats," since it is clearly apparent that Mr. Kennedy's program is one designed to strengthen the position of that party for the 1964 presidential election. Especially, the Democrats have their eyes on the big city vote over the country. The program emphasizes low Negro registration in some counties in the South, and we may be certain that that will retain the attention of the national party, but it probably is minor in its thinking compared to the weight and importance of the vote in the great urban centers outside of the South.

It cannot validly be maintained by other Democrats who may disagree with lowering the voter standards that this is simply a Kenedy plan. It is the plan of the national Democratic Party and will become more and more a major party objective as the open campaigning of 1964 approaches.

And perhaps by then the Republicans will be going along with the same thing. One cannot reasonably expect anything but a modern Republican ticket and platform in 1964, although the Democrats are likely to outdo them in political modernism.

It is a pity that both parties do not have in force programs designed to raise the quality of the American electorate rather than moving to lower it.

Brotherhood of Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have often stood here before my colleagues in this House to tell them of the gallant efforts of the captive people behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe who fight, in silence and anonymity, to remain the captains of their souls. In the forefront of this battle are the undergrounds, the resistance movements in each country that still exist despite everything the Communist state can do. Year in, year out, the secret war between the Red rulers and the anti-Communist undergrounds go on.

Now a book has been published that tells far more eloquently than I of the courage and drama of the resistance. It is called "Brotherhood of Silence" and it is the thrilling story of the anti-Communist underground in Slovakia. It was written by a leader of the Slovak underground who now lives in the West, Stefan Ilok, with an American journalist, Lester Tanzer. Stefan Ilok is not the author's real name, but it is one by which he is known to many members of the Slovak underground. Through his trips to Europe, through the flight of Slovaks to the United States, through an elaborate network of couriers, Mr. Ilok has amassed firsthand reports of men and women who have risked their lives to harass, sabotage, and thwart the oppressive rulers of their native land. Their names have been changed to protect the identities of those who now carry on the dangerous fight for freedom, but the stories that appear in this book are documented in the files of the underground leaders.

In the days right after World War II, the underground organized itself as a secret state. It had its own general staff and army—the guerrillas; its own communication system, built around the couriers; its own labor unions, intelligence network, and division of psychological warfare. But sabotage and large-scale guerrilla warfare seemed to advance the Slovaks' cause little if any. Conventional sabotage was but a thorn in the Communists' side: bothersome but not particularly dangerous. Such tactics had succeeded in preserving the ideal of freedom in Slovakia but they had not toppled the Red rulers.

So the underground struggle had to enter a new phase. Now, the resistance must throw its resources into the broader struggle between East and West. More particularly, into the new war for supremacy in science and technology, a bloodless war with vast significance to the future of the world. Now the underground seeks to tap the scientific strength of the Communist empire for the benefit of the West. Now it engages in scientific and military espionage, probing for information to help keep the West abreast of Communist accomplishments—and weaknesses. I think it is no secret that such information from the Slovak underground has already found its way into committees of this House.

How the underground has evolved in Slovakia is graphically told in Brotherhood of Silence. But underlying the more violent activities of the underground is the Church of Silence, to my mind the most fascinating and most meaningful section of Brotherhood of Silence. Men of all faiths will be uplifted by the account of the brave Catholic priests who, driven underground by the Communist rulers, clandestinely minister to the devout Catholics of Slovakia, performing the sacraments, conducting masses in caves, basements, and mountain hideouts. So long as a man believes in a power greater than his own, so long as he believes in God, his mind and soul has not succumbed to communism. It is the members of the Church of Silence, the secret church, who keep religion alive in the shadow of the godless police state, and by so doing nourish the people's hope of eventual freedom.

The Washington Star has called "Brotherhood of Silence" "a story of vast courage and heroism." Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, has called it "an inspiring piece of literature." Doctor Daniel Poling has said of "Brotherhood" that—

> In its field as of now, this is the one and just about the only book. * * * In these flaming pages, the cause of freedom, both physical and spiritual, takes on proportions of grandeur.

I would like to add one final word. Though "Brotherhood of Silence" deals primarily with Slovakia, it is more than just a book about the Slovak people. The struggle of Slovakia is not a unique story, but a universal one. Over the years we have seen the people of Hungary, Poland and East Germany rise against their rulers. In recent weeks and months, the activities of anti-Communist undergrounds in Cuba and Communist China have made the headlines. There have even been food riots and demonstrations against suppression of religion within the Soviet Union itself. Nowhere, not even at the heart of the Communist Empire, can the spirit of man forever remain shackled.

This is the moral, the lesson of "Brotherhood of Silence." In Mr. Ilok's closing words—

> I have told the story of the Slovak underground not to glorify my native land, but to exalt man's indomitable resistance to tyranny everywhere, his unquenchable yearning to be free.

Hon. Lew Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a brief word of congratulations to Lew Deschler in marking the 35th anniversary of his service as House Parliamentarian.

Without question, the ability of the House to act responsibly and progressively on legislation and in fulfilling its obligations to the many diverse and geographically disparate constituencies from which its members come depend upon the rules which it adopts and follows as a legislative body. The preservation of order, decency and regularity is of the greatest importance to our democracy.

No better statement of the purpose of the rules can be found than that set forth in Jefferson's manual, which is in the hands of all House members in an edition which is prepared and revised regularly under the careful supervision of Lew Deschler. As Lew has noted, the rules under which the House operates today are perhaps the most finely adjusted, scientifically balanced and highly technical rules of any parliamentary body in the world.

We often hear criticism and complaint about rules when they seem to be invoked to prevent haste. Yet rules are established and maintained primarily to protect the rights of minorities, while permitting the majority to work its will.

In the course of daily events, the House and its Speaker and its members must rely constantly on the word and judgment of a man who is fully familiar with this body of rules, and it is in his knowledge and experience that the solution is found for steady and regular progress, without constant wrangling and captious argument.

This is an important and sensitive role, and it is one that Lew Deschler has discharged faithfully and well over many years, earning the praise and warm regard of the House.

Right to Preference Is Not Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in our zeal to protect the minorities we are sometimes prone to outlaw the right of individual preference. Many cases of so-called discrimnation turn out to be a matter of preference or the inability of an individual to perform the requirements of a particular job. A very fine statement on this subject was recently presented at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Equal Employment of the Distract of Columbia Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights by Mr. Ted Wilson of Wilson Personnel, Inc. I would like to include Mr. Wilson's statement at this point:

REMARKS OF TED WILSON AT THE MEETING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Gentlemen, I was invited to come here to present my views on existing discrimination in Washington. While I am an officer in the local association of Washington Personnel Agencies, let me make clear from the outset that I speak only for myself and from more than 16 years' experience in Washington's personnel field. Gentlemen, I want to speak in defense of discrimination not from racial, nor religious, nor color or national origin, but the simple human right of exhibiting a preference.

For instance, we had a book, a play, a musical and a movie on the theme "Gentlemen Prefer Blonds" and some do. This is outrageous discrimination against brunettes and since I married one, I object to this sort of general statement—I prefer brunettes. But every day in my office, my counselor cater to the wishes of an employer who prefers a woman attractive to him over another type. Now, I want to make clear this implies no immoral undertones. He just likes to be in the presence of, what is to him, a pleasant person who is an asset to his office. Frankly, I hope we never see the day that any pressure or any legal action is ever taken to make that man or those men change their views. I think that in a free society we are entitled to our preferences—Negro, oriental, and white.

Are we entitled to discriminate solely because of race, religion, color, or national origin? Ought we? Perhaps not.

But there are other discriminations. Age, for instance, and sex. Women won't work for other women. A woman executive prefers a man in a certain job because she feels her sex doesn't have the ability for certain jobs, privately feeling that she is the exception. Should this discrimination exist? It does We should also consider it.

Should we prevent a man of 59 from getting a job solely because of age? We do. Ought we? We should consider this.

I have a point and the point is this: Discriminations or human prejudices exist, for and against. The two words "civil rights" have come to mean only one thing these days; that is, the conflicts and problems between African and other races. But civil rights are much broader. Equal opportunities are much broader than this.

But much the same solutions apply to every one of the problems. We cannot legislate human preference. But be can educate it. Let me repeat—educate it.

My problems, in an office where we interview for employment several hundred people a week, deal with human prefrences. We pattern them out. And we can reasonably say that employer A prefers certain types where employer B prefers others.

Every employer has preferences. I like that word much better than I do discrimination. And let me say this: Rarely does any employer ever satisfy all his preferences. The one overriding quality that will get an individual hired, over any preferences, is skill. Regardless of sex, race, age, or religion, the question, "Can this person do the job and can this person do it so much better than any other applicant" governs the situation. It governs every hiring process.

This conference has been called to find that discrimination exists. I tell you it does. But skills, high skills, can end it. And education will create these skills; and nothing but education can do it.

I cannot take an eighth-grade student and get him a job as a mathematician in a computer-oriented corporation—white, Negro, oriental, or Baptist. But give me a top mathematician, with education and skills, and I don't care whether he has three eyes and one leg, I'll get him a job. I can't get a girl employment as a secretary if she types 30 or 40 words per minute. But give me a girl with 70 or 80 words per minute typing and 150 words per minute shorthand and the line of employers who will be waiting to hire her stretch from this committee room to the White House.

I can't get an elderly man of 70 a job as a freight handler, but I could get him something in which he is highly skilled, if these skills are in demand in this white-collar city.

I would like, at this point, to refer to testimony given this committee yesterday by Mr. Hetzel, of the USES, as reported in the Washington Post newspaper, wherein he took this forum to again criticize private industry. Mr. Hetzel is the man who has announced that his tax supported and expensive employment agency is not in business to help the unemployed or the needy except only incidentally. However, I say this, let the Bureau of Employment Security or USES look to their own house. South of here, such Federal tax-supported agencies are so discriminatory as to have separate entrances. No Washington private employment agency has this and most I know of handle anyone with high skills in their particular area of specialty. Many agencies handle more Negro than white, particularly in the hotel, restaurant, and semiskilled areas.

The point in question here seems to be, Will an employer hire a Negro? The point is not whether he or she is referred through USES or private enterprise. I seriously question whether regulation or either Mr. Hetzel's subsidized job agency or my taxpaying private agency will change an employer's preference, if such exists, and gets the person hired. And that's what we're here for, isn't it?

I have a problem to lay before this committee, at this time. Committees like this, with wide publicity, create more problems than they solve. If this committee shall declare, at the end of their meditations, that Washington, D.C., be a free city where all Negro persons can get a job, then we will have untold numbers of Negroes here tomorrow from other areas where such situations don't exist. We don't have jobs for them. This is a white-collar city. What can we do with people, white or Negro, old and young, who can't fit into a clerical situation? The nature of this Federal city precludes heavy manufacturing industry. We will never have jobs for all the people that publicity of this sort will bring.

This brings me to another problem. I spoke of an elderly man who applies for a job as a freight handler. He doesn't get it. He complains that he was discriminated against because he was too old. Gentlemen, the reason he couldn't get the job was because he couldn't handle freight.

A Negro girl applies in my office for a typist job. She declares she types 30 words per minute; a test shows she types 22. We will not refer her for a typist job. She complains she is being discriminated against. This is not true. Fifty words per minute might well have gotten her the job. But she will become a statistic in your files.

Now there is no question that the problems of racial conflict are knotty. I have never presumed that you invited me to solve them. They exist. But I will tell you this, if you educate any race to high skills, the preferences employers have in Washington will be overridden by the manifest skills displayed by these applicants.

Opposition, Yes; but Obstructionism, No

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that the only type of criticism which leads to the solution of problems is constructive criticism.

In the short time I have spent as a Member of the House of Representatives I have become even more solid in my belief, particularly in the matters that come before this Congress.

Criticism that is not constructive, can often be destructive, and this is a force we certainly do not need.

It is with this in mind that I suggest the following editorial, written by James

Hudson, publisher of the White Mountain Roundup at Springerville, Ariz.

OPPOSITION, YES; BUT OBSTRUCTIONISM, NO

Some call it obstructionism; some call it wild potshooting; and some call it opposition. Whatever you call it, it has been a favorite sport of a large group of Republican Congressmen and a largely Republican press the past 2 years.

We were always taught that constructive criticism is good, but that criticism for just criticism's sake is a waste of time and effort. Now two national publications have come out with news stories that a younger element in the Republican ranks, led by GERALD FORD, the newly elected head of the House Republican Conference, has decided that obstructionism has been hurting the party more than it has been doing good.

It has appeared to us that Senators KEATING, DIRKSON, GOLDWATER, and SCOTT and House Minority Leader HALLECK have been having a lot to say without saying anything. And Representative FORD'S group of young GOP Members has come to that same conclusion and decided that that will have to stop before they do the party irreparable damage.

The National Observer, the new family weekly published by Dow, Jones & Co., and Newsweek, the weekly news magazine, both stated that FORD and his cohorts feel that opposition is good if they have an alternative to offer. They feel that the administration's medicare and education bills leave something to be desired. So they are offering alternative bills.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, when he was Senate majority and minority leader under President Eisenhower, and Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House at that time, offered this type of opposition, and it was constructive opposition. It is good that a segment of the Republican Party can offer to do the same.

Seven Steps Toward Getting a Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a valuable and helpful article summarizes the techniques recommended by Ray A. Ziegler of the Oregon Bureau of Labor, who has assisted thousands in obtaining employment. The article, "Seven Steps Toward Getting a Job," is written by James Nathan Miller and appears in the March 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest, condensed from Future, the magazine of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Ziegler conducts a course in creative job search techniques at Portland Community College. A jobseeker should analyze his experience and skills ruthlessly and objectively, prepare a résumé and devote full time to an organized effort to obtain a job. Mr. Ziegler has found that many people have underestimated their potential.

I commend the article to my colleagues, and I am sure that it will prove valuable to all those who, at one time or another, may be seeking employment.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD "Seven Steps Toward Getting a Job" by James Nathan Miller.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN STEPS TOWARD GETTING A JOB

(By James Nathan Miller)

Most people at one time or another are faced with the need of finding a job. Today, with the commercial and industrial scene changing rapidly, people are changing jobs often, and there are many opportunities available. But, however ample his ability, the average jobseeker usually has little knowledge of how to sell that ability on the labor market.

There are techniques which can be learned readily, and the jobs go to those who master them. Watch an expert job counselor in action.

Ray A. Ziegler is director of the senior worker division of the Oregon Bureau of Labor. He conducts a two-session night course in creative job research techniques at Portland Community College. Of 1,500 who took the course in its first year, 1,200 are now working, and 9 out of 10 of them say they owe their jobs to what they learned there.

Ziegler meets jobseekers in what was once a high school classroom. Behind the desks in a typical first session are about 20 students, the youngest a boy of 18 in a blue zippered jacket, the oldest a housewife in her 60's. There are high school dropouts, college graduates, skilled and unskilled workers—most of them currently unemployed. Ziegler gets right down to business.

"How many of you filed 10 or more applications for jobs last week?" One hand goes up. "When we're done here," Ziegler says, "you'll understand why you've got to do better than that, and you'll know how." Then he analyzes the problem of finding a job, making the process seem as logical as the working of a mathematical formula. Here are the major factors.

First, remember that jobs are always available at every salary level, because of the constant "churning" of the labor market. U.S. Department of Labor figures for last August showed a turnover rate of 8.9 percent of the labor force. Roughly half of this was created by "accessions," or newly created jobs; a quarter by "quits"; the remaining quarter by layoffs, firings, retirements and deaths. On the blackboard Ziegler shows what this means. "There are 350,000 jobs in driving distance of us right now, in the greater Portland area. Use a rock-bottom estimate of the turnover rate, say 4 percent. That means 14,000 openings in the next month alone—as available to you as to anyone else."

Second, zeroing in on one of these jobs should be an organized, full-time job in itself. To treat jobseeking as a kind of unwelcome semiholiday is not only inefficient but demoralizing. Says Ziegler, "For an employer you work a 40-hour week. Why goof off when you're working for yourself?"

Set a goal of a certain number of applications a week—always making the applications in person, not just by letter or telephone. For nonexecutive jobs, an attainable goal is one application an hour, 40 a week; for jobs at the executive level, which require longer interviews and more complicated scheduling, 10 to 12 a week. Don't think that when you've applied once you have that company permanently "covered"; keep going back. Some employers, as a matter of policy, hire a man only after his second or third visit.

Third, analyze your experience and ability. Do it ruthlessly and objectively. This is perhaps the hardest part. At the end of the first session Ziegler hands the class six mimeographed questions to be taken home and answered at length. Then at the second session, in a kind of group-therapy technique, the answers are discussed in class. The questions:

What things have I done with any degree of success?

What things have I done that others have commended me for doing exceptionally well?

What jobs have I held? (Describe them in detail.)

What equipment can I operate?

What are the things that I really like to do? That I don't like to do?

"It's amazing what a complete inventory these questions provide of your job potential if you give them real thought and answer them fully," says Ziegler.

Surprisingly, most people find they have underestimated their potential. Recent high school and college graduates, and housewives particularly, tend to feel that they have nothing special to offer. One 18-year-old girl, unemployed for 9 months, listed on her self-analysis sheet that she enjoyed designing and making her own clothes, that she had often been complimented on her taste, and that she had studied art, design, fashion and advertising art in high school. Her feeling was that plenty of other girls could list the same things. Ten days after taking the course she had a job as an assistant window decorator in a Portland department store.

In the classroom discussion there is no coddling, since the purpose is an objective inventory of each individual's assets and debits. A former counterman is forced to agree, once it's pointed out, that four employers in a row couldn't all have been prejudiced when they claimed he was antagonizing customers. A man unsuccessful as a salesman is asked why, when he heads his list of dislikes with "meeting strangers," he is in the field at all.

Fourth. Once you know your potential, decide whether you are now qualified to get full benefit out of it. If not, it may be wise to take night school or correspondence courses after getting a job, or even go back to school or into the armed services for further training. Ziegler puts it this way: "The average 25-year-old has 80,000 working hours ahead of him; the average 45-year-old, 40,000 hours. Multiply your expected number of working hours by your present hourly wage—and then by the hourly wage you could earn if you increased your skills. For young people especially, a year or two or three invested now in self-improvement can pay enormous dividends."

After looking at it this way, many do choose further training. A middle-aged bookkeeper is now aiming for a master's degree in psychology, intending to become a teacher. A 20-year-old stock clerk upped his lifetime earning potential from $140,000 to $325,000 by taking a 3-year course in electronics.

Fifth, write a résumé. This is the most important single tool in any job search. (Of those who got jobs after taking the course, 91 percent attributed their success largely to the résumé.) It is simply a one- or two-page typewritten list of your jobs and skills, prepared in such a way as to advertise everything salable. It is drawn up in reverse chronological order, the most recent experience listed first. In class, the résumés are subjected to rigorous group discussion out of which emerge tight, hard-selling documents with the irrelevancies eliminated.

"Their most common fault is too much generality," says Ziegler. "An employer wants to know more than that you were 'a salesman'; were you just an order taker in an easy line, or did you have to go out and sell hard? Whatever you were successful at should be spelled out."

The résumé provides leverage to the jobseeker. First, it makes possible a high rate of applications, since less time is wasted filling out application forms. More important, it allows you to set the tone and direction of

the interview. Many jobseekers emerge from interviews with the miserable realization that their strongest points were never discussed. A good résumé prevents this.

Sixth, study the labor market and its economics. Too many think what they're doing is "asking for a job"; actually they're trying to sell their services—a given quantity of usable energy, of a certain quality, on which the employer can make a profit. You buy a package at the store not as a favor to the clerk but because you want what's in it. An employer hires you for the same reason.

To learn which employers are shopping for what skills, consult such publications as the U.S. Labor Department's "Occupational Outlook Handbook," and "The American Worker's Fact Book," as well as the manufacturers' directories of all companies in a given area—available at the library or local employment-service headquarters.

Seventh, know the specific avenues that lead into the labor market. In a recent survey, 1,000 employed and unemployed male workers were asked where they looked for jobs. Most gave only one or two sources—the help-wanted ads, the State employment service, private employment agencies.

"This is only scratching the surface," Ziegler points out. "And those three aren't necessarily the best sources." Some of the others discussed in the course are:

A canvass of plants. "Talk to the workers at quitting time; they'll tell you a lot about a company's hiring practices."

Friends and neighbors: "Employers put personal referrals from employees high on their list of supply sources."

New construction: "Every new office building or factory that goes up needs to be staffed, from air conditioning maintenance men to building manager. And many of the tenants will be new or expanding businesses, or will have to replace employees who didn't make the move."

Civil service: Government is one of the biggest employers in the country, if not the biggest, employing millions. Therefore merely by the mathematics of the turnover rate it should have several hundred thousand available jobs at any given time.

High school or college job counselor: "But don't depend on him alone."

For any field, you can make up your own list: the yellow pages, trade papers, a union agent, trade associations—all can give invaluable leads. But the seeker has to work at it. And that, of course, is the heart of the matter. "I tell the students I'll give them half of what's needed: the knowledge," Ziegler says. "But they have to add the other half: the determination and raw energy."

The results of his remarkable course—the people who have gone out and found jobs—are a source of deep satisfaction to Ziegler. "If you get a job for a man you are only answering his immediate problem," he says. "But if you teach him how to get his own job, you've helped him in a fundamental way. You've given him the pride and security that come from self-reliance."

How Hard Is President Kennedy's Budget?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's press conference, President Kennedy remarked that he did not know where the Republicans could cut the budget and stated it was a hard budget. In due course, the Members of this House will have an opportunity to show whether they vote for tax cuts and increased appropriations or whether they vote responsibly to prevent bankruptcy of this Nation.

Today's Wall Street Journal has an excellent editorial on how the people of the United States really feel with respect to putting our fiscal house in order:

THE POLITICS OF SPENDING

The Republicans in Congress believe they have a good political issue in the administration's extreme spending plans. They may well be right, but whether they are or not, someone ought to keep hammering on the issue, for it is far more than a matter of partisan profit.

There are plenty of clues as to how the electorate feels about Federal spending. One is the lack of general enthusiasm for the Government's costly domestic proposals. These are largely retreads of last year's, which in turn were largely retreads of the notions of the depression thirties, and the public seems even less excited about them than before.

But voters, so far as anyone can tell, are indeed concerned about spending that has plainly gone out of control. A spending budget of nearly $100 billion, causing a deficit of nearly $12 billion—that is a bit too much for many an American to accept uncritically.

The concern partly explains the lukewarm public response, surprising to the Government's political experts, to the tax program. Almost everyone is persuaded that tax rates should be substantially reduced, but a lot of people are also convinced it should be done only in a framework of fiscal restraint.

Such reactions are reflected in congressional tax tepidity in both parties. They are also reflected in the plan to seriously challenge the administration's demands for new increases in the ceiling on the public debt. And they are reflected in the current Republican talk of trying to cut appropriations by $10 billion to $15 billion, which could reduce actual spending in fiscal 1964 by $4 billion to $6 billion.

In sum, the old theory that one of the best ways for a government to win friends is by throwing more money around doesn't look as impressive as perhaps it did in the thirties. A concerted attack on spending might therefore pay political dividends for the party or group that undertakes it.

That result is all the more possible because the economic case against the Government's fiscal policy is so strong. Boiled down, the policy calls for deficit spending regardless of economic conditions. But since sensible men can hardly espouse deficits for their own sake, it should be repeatedly asked what is the purpose of such a policy.

One ostensible purpose is economic stimulation, a matter of by no means minor political importance. The idea is that huge, continuing deficits, achieved by greater spending or tax cuts or both, must increase the people's purchasing power and hence whet their demand for all kinds of additional goods and services.

Unfortunately for the theory but happily for the Nation, the evidence shows an abundance of purchasing power. While consumers are spending at a record rate, savings are also sharply rising; savings-type assets have jumped 20 percent just since 1960.

In these circumstances deficit spending cannot be counted on to spur demand. All it can be counted on to do is weaken the dollar by piling up inflationary potential, whether the potential begins to materialize next year or 5 years from now.

Given such a feeble economic case, some suspect that the deficit policy is also aimed at expanding the Government's size and capacity to control the economy. A new inflation, for one example, could be an excuse for direct price and wage controls. We hope this is not the conscious reasoning, but a deficit policy would be well designed to attain such ends.

Whatever the reasons for the Government's economic approach, the enormity of its plans makes spending the single most significant domestic issue. If there is anything the political opposition should oppose, it is this—not merely in hope of partisan gain but for the good of the Nation.

Crippled Children Dominant Interest of the Late Andrew J. Sordoni

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of March 3, 1963, carried an extremely interesting feature article on the late Andrew J. Sordoni written by Mr. Thomas F. Barry, a staff writer and West Side editor for that newspaper.

The article follows:

CRIPPLED CHILDREN DOMINANT INTEREST OF ANDREW J. SORDONI

(By Thomas F. Barry)

Newspaper accounts throughout the State of the death of Andrew J. Sordoni last week emphasized his rise from a low station to a stature of national prominence. His friends and associates over the years remember his most important attribute—his human qualities.

Senator Sordoni's first interest, when success began to mark his career, was in the direction of rehabilitation of crippled children. This began shortly after his election to Forty Fort Borough Council.

Many incidents demonstrated his sincerity:

A FRIEND IN NEED

Once while driving through Plymouth on his way to Harrisburg, he suddenly applied the brakes to his car when he noticed a crippled child bravely trying to play catch with a sturdy young friend. A passenger in the car, I was instructed to get the name of the child, the name of his parents and the name of the family doctor. A noted surgeon was called in and was able to help the youngster become a useful member of society.

A Swoyerville man, deformed since birth, attended Forty Fort schools with the senator. He was amazed when called into the office of the Sordoni Construction Co. and told an effort would be made to correct his condition. After extensive consultations with specialists, his condition was found to be beyond medical help, but not until everything possible had been tried.

MADE A PHOTOGRAPHER

Another case concerns an Exeter young man, now deceased, who was a patient at the Nesbitt Memorial Hospital, suffering from a broken back, the result of a mine accident. During his stay, he took up photography, but his camera became useless.

Senator Sordoni's attention was called to this with the result that the young man received a new camera and enough film to last for years. Later he became a familiar figure on Exeter streets, taking pictures. The ex-

pensive camera attracted no little attention.

Senator Sordoni's tremendous zeal for the rehabilitation of those afflicted from childhood was matched by his drive for perfection among the personnel in the management end of his various business organizations.

THAT SIDEWALK IN SWOYERVILLE

That he put his heart and soul in his work is best attested by frequent visits to Swoyerville covering a period of about 30 years. In his early days of contracting, he constructed a culvert and built sidewalks. Year after year he inspected the work and would comment to a friend:

"That was a good job."

These visits were made during the time when contracts worth millions of dollars were bein manhandled by the Sordoni Construction Co.

Since his death the question has been asked what were "the factors" that contributed to his success. The answer is simple. He used a strong and a vigorous body and a fine mind to overcome obstacles and to carry out well-developed plans. His ability to select able and loyal executives was another factor. But above all, he had the ability to sell his service.

Andrew Carnegie, the steel magnate, was asked once why he paid Charles Schwab a million a year. The answer was salesmanship. Sordoni was at home in a small mining town or speaking before a group of the Nation's industrialists. His salesmanship brought millions of dollars in contracts. While public relations men prepared speeches for him, none of these was ever delivered. He spoke extemporaneously.

GAVE OWN EXAMPLE

A sample of his salesmanship was noted in a drive to help the little State of Israel. He used the knowledge that he acquired on a trip to that ancient land to obtain large pledges at a public meeting in Miami. He did not ask only for money, but also equipment. He got both.

Senator Sordoni's taste for relaxing entertainment was simple. He liked cowboy pictures, the hotter the action, the better the picture. The late Tom Mix, who once was his sergeant in the Army, was his favorite.

Next came playing checkers. He once played checkers with me from early evening until 4 in the morning—when he finally won the game.

His checker playing brought some humorous incidents. Joseph Gunning, a vice president of the Sordoni Construction Co., while driving Sordoni to Harrisburg, hit a hole in the road. The result was that Sordoni's game of checkers with this reporter came to an abrupt end with Gunning ordered to pick up the checkers that had been knocked to the floor.

The senator had a sense of humor, too.

At the conclusion of his third term as a member of the State senate, he decided that he would not seek reelection.

While driving through the back country he came upon a farmer who had a fine field of potatoes. He stopped to compliment the man, but found that instead the farmer said:

"Senator, does it cost much money to run for the senate?"

HE FOUND OUT WHY

"It cost me plenty," replied the senator. Then adding, "Why do you want to be a State senator?"

The farmer looked at him for a moment, then said in all sincerity. "I don't want three terms. I just want to serve long enough to get myself a glass barn, like you have on your farm."

"I wish you luck," answered Sordoni.

The glass barn on the Sterling Farms happens to be one of the most modern in the Nation.

Before the sneak attack of Japan, officials of that government attempted to buy a large collection of carvings, representing generations and generations of Japanese, collected by Sordoni. The attack, however, brought out the sign:

"Not for sale."

But we'll have to stop.

The recollections of this reporter would fill volumes.

Five to Ten Billion Dollars Lost Annually by Wastages and Mismanagement in U.S. Executive Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be my duty to direct the attention of the citizens of this Nation, the President, the members of the Cabinet, all administrative officials of our Government, and the Members of this Congress to the reports of the General Accounting Office—GAO.

The General Accounting Office is an independent, nonpolitical, and reliable source of information on the fiscal and management operations of Federal agencies. Its reports contain findings on inefficient and uneconomic functioning in the administration of the executive department.

The GAO is directed by the Comptroller of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell. The Comptroller General and his staff are performing a most valuable public service in finding and disclosing the inefficiencies, the maladministration, and the mismanagement that exists throughout the huge Federal bureaucracy.

The GAO reports are based upon investigations, examinations, and audits of Federal agencies. It issues hundreds of reports annually to the Congress, the President, and various executive agencies. These reports reveal a uniform pattern of gross maladministration and mismanagement that permeates our Federal operations. There are literally thousands of areas of Federal activity where shocking and massive wastages repeatedly take place.

Mr. Speaker, the following are five briefs extracted from the Comptroller General reports issued between February 26 and February 28, 1963.

U.S. MILITARY IN JAPAN FAIL TO PROPERLY UTILIZE CIVILIAN MANPOWER

In 1961, U.S. military installations in Japan were staffed by about 1,800 Japanese nationals in excess of accepted manning guides at an annual wasted cost of $2.7 million.

Despite this overstaffing, many facilities had not been adequately maintained and large backlogs of work had accumulated. Part of this backlog, which should have been performed by station forces, was performed under contract in fiscal year 1961 at an additional cost of about $465,000.

The Comptroller General's Office reported that the Army, Navy, and Air Force had failed to develop complete and valid manning guides as to the number of personnel required to maintain facilities and operate utilities in Japan.

The GAO cited inadequate management controls, inefficient use of personnel, lack of adequate work standards, and failure of management personnel to properly perform their duties, as contributing factors to this deplorable situation.

U.S. ARMY FAILURE TO PROTECT RUBBER TRACKS FOR TANKS AND COMBAT VEHICLES

In 1960, the U.S. Army incurred an unnecessary cost of $5 million to rebuild rubber tracks for tanks that were allowed to deteriorate.

The deteriorations were caused by the failure of the U.S. Army to (a) issue and use the oldest tracks first; (b) furnish unused tracks to manufacturers of new tanks; (c) protect the tracks by inside storage.

The General Accounting Office report states: "The management weaknesses disclosed in this report on rubber tracks are the type that could pertain to all of the Army's replacement parts which are subject to deterioration."

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS DISPOSAL OF STEAM SHOVELS

From April 1960 to April 1962, 103 10-ton crane shovels purchased by the U.S. Army Engineers were released for disposition. These shovels had an acquisition cost of more than $2 million.

Twenty-five crane shovels were sold for $207,850, which cost the U.S. Army Engineers $541,200.

Eight crane shovels sold for $56,000, although their cost to the U.S. Government was $173,000.

A large portion of the shovels were completely new, unused shovels.

During the same period, the U.S. Army Engineers sold $350,000 worth of repair parts for its crane shovels.

While these new and serviceable shovels and parts were being given away or sold for bargain prices, the U.S. Army Engineers had full knowledge of their future need for these shovels.

A study by the U.S. Army Engineers dated April 18, 1962, recommended the purchase of several hundred similar shovels for the period 1965 to 1967, at a cost of $12 million. There have been no technological improvements in these crane shovels and none were expected in the near future.

The Comptroller's report describes these transactions in the following language:

"Improvident disposals," "undoubtedly result in substantial waste," "inconsistency indicates a lack of coordination and control within the Corps of Engineers."

U.S. ENGINEERS UNNECESSARILY EXPEND $575,000, AND PLAN TO SPEND ANOTHER $321,000 FOR OUTBOARD MOTORS

In 1959, the U.S. Army Engineers had 1,400 25-horsepower outboard motors on hand. These were completely new and unused motors.

At the same time in 1959, the U.S. Army Engineers unnecessarily purchased

925 25-horsepower motors at a cost of $575,000. They also planned to purchase 553 new 25-horsepower motors to replace new or slightly used motors.

There was no indication of technical obsolescence of the 1,400 new motors on hand.

The Comptroller's report refers to these transactions as: "Unnecessarily bought." "We recommend no further disposal of 25-horsepower motors for which there is a foreseeable need."

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS PURCHASE AND SALE OF GENERATORS

From July 1959 to September 1960, the U.S. Army Engineers sold 316 30-kilowatt generators in excellent or in good condition at an average price of $150 per generator.

At the same time, it purchased a larger number of 45-kilowatt generators at a replacement cost of $4,879 each. The 30-kilowatt generators were, at the same period, classified by the U.S. Army Engineers as acceptable substitutes for the 45-kilowatt generators. The cost of the new 45-kilowatt generators for which the U.S. Army Engineers had acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators was $1.5 million.

In 1960, the Navy was disposing of 10-kilowatt generators as excess. At the same time, the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing new generators at a cost of about $1,500 each. The Comptroller General's office found that the capacity and specifications of the Navy generators being sold were the same as those that the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing.

Although appropriation and taxing power is vested in Congress by our Constitution, the executive department is charged with the responsibility for the efficient administration and management of public funds.

The critically dangerous fiscal insolvency of this Nation, both at home and internationally, is the result of the failure of both Congress and the executive department to faithfully discharge their respective constitutional responsibilities.

I would like to emphasize that the irresponsible dissipation of tax funds has existed and grown over many past administrations. But, today's rampant administrative fiscal abuses and mismanagements are the prime responsibility of today's executive department and its administrative officials.

Based upon the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, I am convinced that the wastages and the squandering of public funds in the executive department exceeds $5 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, the 1964 budget appropriations of $107.9 billion recommended by President Kennedy could be reached by upward of $5 billion if the President and the executive branch of our Government were to dedicate themselves to the exercise of reasonably good business practices.

This enormous saving could be realized for the taxpayers of this Nation without in any way reducing our military power, or sacrificing any present public service.

This sorely needed fiscal relief for our economy and our taxpayers cannot be gained without a clear, immediate public demand and the coordinated efforts of the Congress and the executive department.

Reviews of Autobiography of Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the former able and progressive Senator from Montana, Burton K. Wheeler, has written a very interesting autobiography in collaboration with Mr. Paul F. Healy. On February 28, I put in the RECORD two reviews of this fine book. I now ask unanimous consent that two additional reviews, from the Chicago Tribune and the Denver Post, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

RELIVING A QUARTER CENTURY AS A COMBATANT IN THE SENATE

In 1905 a young easterner fresh from the University of Michigan Law School was bilked out of his nestegg of $215 while waiting for a westbound train to take him away from Butte, Mont.

It was a piece of bad luck that Massachusetts-born Burton K. Wheeler turned to his, and the Nation's, advantage. Forced by an empty wallet to take another look at the lusty, roaring copper mining town, he wound up making it his home. He hung out his lawyer's shingle and became Butte's most famous resident.

Wheeler won his political spurs in the rough give and take of the copper country, and in 1923 Montana elected the fighting liberal Democrat to the U.S. Senate.

During his 24 years in the Senate, Wheeler never stopped fighting. Able and diligent, he was trusted and respected by both friend and foe. His autobiography is a lively, fascinating account of his long career and of American politics for nearly half of the 20th century.

Readers will learn more about the lawmaking process and the workings of the Senate from Wheeler's reminiscences than from textbooks on government or from political novels. This is an exciting unvarnished first-person story, spiced with anecdotes and observations on Presidents, legislators, and Supreme Court Justices.

As a brash freshman, Senator Wheeler was instrumental in exposing some of the Harding scandals. As a New Dealer in Roosevelt's first term, he was tapped by F.D.R. to steer passage through the Senate of the far-reaching act for stringent regulation of public utility holding companies.

Two years later, in 1937, Wheeler led another spic Senate floor fight, against F.D.R.'s bill to pack the Supreme Court. It was Roosevelt's worst legislative defeat, but to Wheeler it was less a personal victory than a victory for the American system of government.

When World War II began, Wheeler fought all out against F.D.R.'s interventionist policies. He turned down Roosevelt's overtures to be his runningmate, and likely successor, because Wheeler would not tailor his convictions for political reward. In 1946 political foes in his own party finally succeeded in bringing about Wheeler's defeat for Senate renomination.

Now a vigorous 80, Wheeler is a prosperous attorney in Washington. He harbors no grudges from his many battles, for he fought not against men but for his beliefs. To some, the wild-eyed radical has aged into a diehard reactionary. As Wheeler sees himself, however, his basic outlook did not change with the years; rather, others shifted their ground and their viewpoint of him.

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 3, 1962]

AN ERA OF GIANTS IN U.S. SENATE

(Reviewed by former Senator Ed Johnson)

Burton Kendall Wheeler, with candor and zest, tells all in "Yankee From the West." The exciting epoch in which he served as an eager and aggressive Senator, and the part this "son of the wild jackass" played in America's transition from the comfortable stability of "Silent Cal" Coolidge to the new responsibilities of world leadership, is well told in this historic volume.

The 1920's, 1930's, and 1940's were made to order for this revolutionary. The tumultuous political, economic, and social upheaval occurring in those decades of vibrant American history required ambitious men of venture, fearlessness, self-reliance, and solid integrity.

Wheeler makes no effort to conceal his own bold vanity and his super self-satisfaction or the strength, weakness, and motives of his colleagues, contemporaries, and political rivals. In that respect the book borders on the brutal. But it is in accord with Wheeler's fixed concept of integrity. He accepts nothing less than absolute honesty.

The book starts with the bitter campaign aimed at keeping the United States out of World War II. The motivation of the America First movement, in which Senator Wheeler assumed the leading role, is spelled out in detail.

However, when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Wheeler folded his tent and issued this laconic statement, "Let's lick hell out of them."

Wheeler also spells out what every newly elected Senator or Representative must learn when he sets foot in dreamy old Washington—that Congress is a snaillike moving body where great patience is a prime necessity.

He puts it this way—"Itching to try out my toga, I departed for Washington on March 1, 1923, with high hopes for legislative action. I discovered this was the last thing the Senate wanted. The lawmakers had little to do during the Harding era of complacency. Following the formalities of opening the session, including the swearing in of the elected Members, the first action was to take a long recess. Many Senators were planning trips to Europe, and when I learned that fares on Government-owned shipping lines were cheap, I decided to go, too."

The Senator and Mrs. Wheeler visited Paris, Rome, and Venice, then went to Russia. Moscow was throbbing with activity and the arts were getting a big play, but Russia was suffering from a severe famine, also. In the industrial areas, inexperienced workmen were trying to handle obsolete machinery with outmoded methods. The United States had imposed a ban against trade with Russia, but England was carrying on a brisk business, using American goods.

Upon his return to the United States, Wheeler proposed that we recognize Russia and open trade with her. In the face of our own surpluses of wheat and cotton, he

held the blockade of famine-stricken Russia to be stupid and inhumane. He was assailed viciously by the National Civic Federation and by much of the press. His colleagues in the Senate were shocked.

Senator Wheeler's first legislative session started in December 1923. He got into trouble immediately. He entered the Senate Chamber puffing a big, black cigar. He was called to order. That error was inadvertent, but soon the Senator was in the doghouse again on a deliberate breach of senatorial ethics.

This is how Wheeler describes it—"The U.S. Senate welcomes newcomers but doesn't care to hear a peep out of them for a long time afterward. On December 10, 1923, Senator Lodge suggested the names of all the committee chairmen and routinely asked they be named by unanimous consent. I objected. I startled myself as well as everyone else by my call. With two words I had shattered a tradition."

On February 20, 1924, with only a few weeks of Senate under his belt, Wheeler rose nervously in the Senate to deliver what he deemed the most important speech of his career. He introduced a resolution to create a select committee to investigate Harry M. Daugherty, the Attorney General of the United States, and a crony of the late President Harding. The New York Times called it the most sensational speech of the present Congress. Eventually President Coolidge asked for Daugherty's resignation and got it.

Shortly thereafter the Democrats nominated John W. Davis for President and Charles W. Bryan for Vice President. Promptly Wheeler announced that he could not support the Democrat ticket. The Progressives nominated La Follette and accorded him authority to name his running mate. His choice was Wheeler. The Republicans nominated Coolidge and Dawes.

The Republicans based their campaign on "The business of America is business" and "Coolidge or chaos." "Silent Cal" lived up to tradition by remaining cool, collected and hard at work in the White House. No amount of heckling and jabbing by Wheeler evoked the slightest response from the dignified President.

During the campaign, Wheeler would place an empty chair on the platform, pretend that Coolidge was seated in it and address it with stinging questions which of course went unanswered. The Denver Post described this stunt as "an excellent bit of comedy" and reported that "it knocked the audience out of their seats."

Wheeler declares that this was the era of giants in the Senate. He says the Senators were immaculate dressers. Many wore frock coats, and in summer months the southerners would blossom out in white suits. Old-fashioned oratory, fullblown and gaudy, distinguished this "deliberative body." Wheeler, with his careless dress and more careless oratory, must have been an oddball.

A surprise feature of the Wheeler story is the frequent references to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. One chapter is titled "Life With F.D.R." Reading between the lines, one gets the feeling that way down deep, Wheeler regards President Roosevelt as the No. 1 personality of the 20th century. These two proud warriors clashed frequently.

The Wheeler story also is replete with observations concerning Members such as Huey Long, the self-styled Robin Hood of the bayous; Claude Swanson, the master of the epigram; Thaddeus Caraway, master of sarcastic wit; and Jim Reed, the razor-sharp debater.

Wheeler's last chapter, "Defeat and Renaissance" pulls deeply at the heartstrings. What human quirk causes voters to strike down a faithful public servant and dependable friend? It is one of the mysteries of American politics.

The people of Montana never had a more loyal and distinguished friend than Senator Wheeler. And yet he was defeated in a Democrat primary by a man with limited experience. Anyone contemplating a political career should read Chapter 19. It will not discourage him. It will charge him with the spirit of Go! Go! Go!

Wheeler is a hard-boiled realist, skeptical by nature and tight as tree bark in money matters. Nothing irks him quite so much as to be placed in the role of sucker.

What an effective Secretary of State Burton K. Wheeler would have made. His diplomacy at times might have been a bit harsh, but it would have been understood.

Every dollar of foreign aid would have hit the mark intended by Congress. When struggling humanity merited help, it would have had help. Peace based on rigid integrity and good faith—but on no other terms—would have been promoted. Read "Yankee From The West" and see if you do not agree.

ED C. JOHNSON.

Economic Growth and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Some Thoughts on American Business," from the Review and Outlook column of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME THOUGHTS ON AMERICAN BUSINESS

Unlike some of our friends in Washington these days, we are old enough to recall the great depression not as a studied lesson in a history book but as a remembered personal experience. No one needs to tell us that it was a time of troubles.

Yet curiously we find it hard to convince our younger friends that in those days not everyone was sunk in despair or believed the gloomy myth of the day that America was a "mature economy," with all its growth and greatness behind it.

Most of all, our young friends find it hard to believe that such depressed times could also have been times of economic growth. The myth today is that growth and prosperity are one and the same thing, so lack of growth and repression must also be equated. And because the United States does not seem to be growing as rapidly as it has at some other times, the fashion is once again to be gloomy about the future of the mature American economy.

Well, it wasn't quite like that; and we doubt if it's going to be. There's no reason to believe that the pessimists about this country's economic future will be less wrong than they have been in the past. In any event, count us not among them.

This doesn't mean that we are cheerful about all that's being done to the American economy right now, or that we think it can be abused without a price. Rather, its just that we are convinced by the record that the American economy can take an awful lot of abuse and that we are skeptical about the durability of high fashion in economic ideas. The delusions of one era pass as surely as those of another.

Take the fashionable ideas about growth. The thirties were, right enough, depression years. They were also years of growth by the yardsticks it's now the fashion to use. Between 1933 and 1940 the gross national product practically doubled and the national income more than doubled.

This coinciding of growth and depression hardly suggests growth is a bad thing—between 1950 and 1960 there was the same doubling of the figures, and by anybody's standards the fifties were years of prosperity. It's simply a reminder that growth and prosperity are not synonymous. You can have one without the other, and in our history we frequently have.

Indeed, the history of the United States is strewn with passing economic troubles, recessions, depressions, and downright panics, but over the whole span of that history the bright years far outnumber the dark ones and the total record of economic growth and rising material well-being for its citizens is unsurpassed by any country in the world.

One moral from this is to beware of anybody who takes the statistics of a few brief years, gloomily projects them into the future and then says the country is going to hell in a hack if it doesn't forthwith adopt some particular nostrum. There's another moral, too, when you look back at what brought on the times of troubles.

Almost without exception they were preceded by plain foolishness, the belief by people or politicians (or both) that the elementary principles of economic health no longer applied or could be ignored. Land speculation, currency tinkering, wild credit expansion, overinvestment, unchecked Government deficits, mounting State debts, attempts to prop prices and a cavalier attitude toward "foreign" balance of payments—all these things have played their roles in the recessions of the past. Each was brought on by the excesses that went before.

The trouble, of course, was that the excesses did not seem like excesses, nor the nostrums like quackery, until it was too late. It would take a bold man, looking at the nostrums now being offered, to say we have outgrown that human frailty.

Yet the real moral is that American business does not succumb easily to abuses. Even in the long and deep depression of 1873–78, as in the depression after 1929, there were many segments of the economy that retained much vigor, and some that even expanded. More to the point, the Nation's recuperative powers have been immense.

In the collapse of 1893—brought on by uncertainty over the dollar and a flight of capital to Europe—nearly 500 banks failed and business bankruptcies were numbered in the thousands. Once confidence was restored in the dollar and the gold drain halted, recovery was rapid. Finally, none of the foolishness, or the troubles it caused, stopped the upward march of the American economy.

The reason, we think, lies in the enormous resiliency of private capitalism and a free enterprise society. Repeatedly, as in the 1930's, direct Government efforts failed to recapture prosperity; just as repeatedly, once given a chance the country got itself moving again. Right after World War II, for example, it made liars out of some supposedly learned economists who again wailed that our growth was at an end, as well as our prosperity.

This resiliency is not easy to define in a textbook. For essentially it involves the accumulating effects of thousands of minor decisions of individual businessmen, of their wit or their luck in finding ways under, around or over whatever is the immediate economic problem.

If the problem is depressed business, some people will find a way to sell things even so.

If the problem is high taxes, somebody will find a way to accumulate capital and put it to use in spite of the tax collector. If the problem is foreign competition, some businessmen will find a way to meet that competition in spite of high costs. If the problem is inflation brought on by Government tinkering with the money, a great many people will somehow find a way to protect their savings and capital to a marked degree.

Beyond that, the country has always come to recognize bad policies at last and halt them before the damage was irreparable. Nobody argues any more for 16-to-1 silver, any more than they do for prohibition. We still have the farm program, perennial deficit spending, lopsided labor laws, punitive taxes, and those who preach inflation as salvation. Yet already all of these things are in doubt if not yet disrepute. Even some politicians are beginning to wonder if you can fool the people forever.

Of course even if you could plot these favorable factors on a piece of graph paper they still would not tell you whether business will be up or down in the next few months. But what this economic discussion is all about, or ought to be, is the reach of America's economic horizon in the years ahead, not just how business will be nursed along between now and the next election.

If that be true, the real pessimists are those who tell us all will be lost if we don't swallow a huge dose of the latest patent medicine brewed by fearful men in Washington. These desperate economic remedies are prescribed only by those who no longer believe in the free economic system.

We still do. Nothing can guarantee this country against some painful consequences from bad economic policies. Yet when you take the enormous resources of this country, add to them the ingenuity and industry of its people, measure these things against its record for recuperation from punishment, and finally project it all against the horizon of opportunity that lies before it—then you cannot really be a pessimist about America's economic future.

Midwinter Conference of Reserve Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening the 1st of March many of the Members of the Congress and the leaders of our military services joined the Reserve Officers Association of the United States at the Reserve Officers Association's annual midwinter banquet. This banquet climaxes a 3-day midwinter conference of the leaders of this association who come here from throughout the United States and oversea theaters to discuss matters of vital importance to them and to our national defense.

This was a particularly significant meeting for many reasons. First, this association gathered to do honor to one of the Members of the Congress who had given great and outstanding service to the cause of national defense before his death only this last fall. The Reserve Officers Association gave to the widow of the late Dennis Chavez, one-time Member of this House, its annual Minute Man Award as the citizen who has contributed most to national defense. Many of us recall the outstanding service of the late Mr. Chavez in the House and later in the other body and it was our privilege to join in honoring his memory and paying our respects to his lovely widow.

The occasion also marked the award by Reserve Officers Association of its Chaplain of the Year citation to Lt. Col. Maurice Kleinberg, who flew to Washington from his post of duty in Korea, to receive this award and to receive the recognition of all those hundreds who were present and who also were happy and privileged to do him honor.

Also, in the group was a representative party from the Confederation of Inter-Allied Officers representing the countries who joined with the United States under the Atlantic Pact in a mutual treaty of defense. This group was lead by His Royal Highness, Prince Peter of Greece, who appeared in the United States as a lieutenant colonel in the Greek Army Reserve.

Prince Peter's brief remarks to the banquet stirred us all and made us all aware of the deep commitment of the NATO Allies including especially our friends from the European countries who have fought by our side in the past to the cause which our great Nation is committed.

Prior to the banquet the national officers of the Reserve Officers Association together with Prince Peter and the other 12 officers from the European countries were received at the White House where President Kennedy, Maj. Gen. John H. Foster, the president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States and Prince Peter, as president of the Confederation of Inter-Allied Reserve Officers—NATO, exchanged their views of their mutual commitment to this program of allied effort for the peace and security of the Western World.

Mr. Speaker, because these events do and will have a lasting effect on our security and because of the fact that all of these events have some significance in our current history, I am presenting for publication in the RECORD, the remarks of the various individuals involved in these happenings.

I should like to point out that the principal speaker at the banquet on last Friday evening was the great majority leader of this House, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma. Mr. ALBERT's remarks were a simple and outstanding tribute to the cause for which the Reserve Officers Association works and to which all of us as Members of the Congress are committed. I am asking these various remarks to be presented in the order in which they were given.

REMARKS OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE PETER OF GREECE AND DENMARK, LIEUTENANT COLONEL OF THE GREEK ARMY RESERVE, AND PRESIDENT OF THE CONFEDERATION OF INTER-ALLIED RESERVE OFFICERS, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MIDWINTER BANQUET OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 1, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Secretary of State for the Army, Mr. Secretary of State for Navy, admirals, generals, fellow officers, ladies and gentlemen: The cold war is a tragic event, but it has had this advantage, that it has brought us together. It has brought us together, us from the old countries Europe and you the extension of Europe into this continent and we are proud that you should be an extension from our continent, because fancy what it would be if the Chinese had got here first. And because you are an extension from us, you have, after the last war with the tragic events of the Second World War and with the enormous development of armaments, been drawn into the inevitable vortex of world affairs to which we in Europe have been used to for many centuries. Especially us who live in the southeast part of Europe, in Greece, where for 2,500 years already, we have been in the frontline of the East-West conflicts. Unfortunately situated at a crossroad between three continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia, we have first already in the fifth century, B.C., repulsed the advance of central Asian hordes, and as you know the Persian wars against Greece were halted at Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea. Then with Alexander the Great we pushed back Asia as far as India and thus allowed Rome to develop in the Mediterranean, which eventually took over from us.

I should say that our relations with yours are very much those of the ancient city-states of Greece, or the Hellenistic states and of the Roman Empire. They bear a parallel I think which exists today. After the fall of the Roman Empire, Byzantium carried on the struggle guarding Europe against the East and it was only with the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century that we were eventually overrun, but this advance of the central Asians caused the expansion of Europe overseas and in this way was this continent peopled.

With the last war we have again come back to the same situation. Our civilization of the West versus that of central Asia today, represented by the Soviet Union, and the struggle thus goes on with weapons, which we never had before, which oblige us on both sides of the Atlantic to try to avoid an open conflict with our hereditary enemies because of the terrible effect that this would have, and in his cold war I think the role of Reserve officers has changed from what it was before because the reserves must be ready much quicker and be on their toes continually.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who received me yesterday and I was honored to be received by him, mentioned to me how much he thought it was important that Reserves were ready immediately and available at any moment's notice. And thus again in the tradition of the citizen-soldier of the city-states of Greece, where Demonthenes, Xenophon, where Epaminodas fought in the front ranks of the city-states army, we the reserves must be ready at any moment to help, especially in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and that is why we are so pleased and privileged to have been been invited over here to see how your organization works.

The last 2 days have been very important, very interesting for us. We go back with a feeling, when we go to Europe, that we should like to work in closer with you; and that our organization, the CIOR, of which I am privileged to be the president for 2 years, is entirely at your disposal to tighten the bond between us for this common defense.

REMARKS OF GEN. JAMES E. FRANK, U.S. ARMY RESERVE, NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN PRESENTING THE CHAPLAIN OF THE YEAR AWARD TO CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) MAURICE S. KLEINBERG

The chaplain to whom I am honored to make this presentation has flown here, especially to receive this award, from Korea where he is now serving his second tour. He is a man of considerable intellectual attainment

and has served in several pulpits throughout this country. He is currently assigned to Headquarters 8th Army in Korea and has served the Army well in the Office of the Chief of Army Chaplains and also in the Military District of Washington. I would like to now read the award from the Reserve Officers Association of the United States:

"AN ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION, WITH RESPECT TO THE SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) MAURICE S. KLEINBERG

"Whereas, Maurice S. Kleinberg, an officer and leader in the Chaplain Corps in the Military Force of the United States has at personal sacrifice and with exemplary devotion to duty given unselfishly of himself, his talents, and his energies, to provide meaningful spiritual development in the Armed Forces, and has contributed substantially to the welfare of personnel both in precept and example: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this association awards to Chaplain Kleinberg, in meaningful recognition and sincere gratitude to him as representative of the corps this citation as Chaplain of the Year.

"For the association, the national council, March 1, 1963,

"JOHN H. FOSTER,
"Major General, Air Force Reserve, National President,

"JOHN T. CARLTON,
"Colonel, U.S. Army Reserve, Executive Director."

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Chaplain Kleinberg, to present this award to you in the name of the Reserve Officers Association of the United State and particularly as representative of the Army section of this great association.

ADDRESS OF CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) MAURICE S. KLEINBERG IN RESPONSE TO CHAPLAIN-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD BY THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ANNUAL MINUTEMAN BANQUET, MARCH 1, 1963

Honored guests, I don't know when it will come to my lot again to address such an august gathering as this and I have completely forgotten the protocol. There are altogether so many dignitaries, so many great people, members of the Armed Forces, beginning with the Secretary of the Army and other Secretaries of services, we have the Congress with us, we have the Senate with us, we have almost every dignitary you can about imagine.

I am like the old prophet who looked out upon a great audience once and he said, "I am astounded and confounded, dazed and amazed."

I couldn't anticipate what would be in my lot tonight and I am really surprised despite the fact that I've known of this award for some time.

I am sure I can't read the manuscript in front of me because the light shining in my unphotographic countenance, and so I am going to extemporize to you tonight and bring you a message that I feel keenly ought to be said to such a tremendous and influential group as this.

Some of you men who have been in the service long before I have, remember the time when the chaplain had difficulty establishing his position. In fact, nobody knew quite what to do with the chaplains in the service. There was a time, I was told, when the chaplain had to be the special service officer on the side. He had to be in charge of some athletic functions. Yes, sometimes even to be in charge of monitoring the post exchange activity.

I am happy to tell you tonight that that has long been changed.

The chaplain's work and the chaplain's service has been recognized as it is tonight by the generous award of the Reserve Officers Association in giving annually a chaplain's citation.

I think this is tremendously important because it represents a tremendous amount of progress in appreciation of the value of religious forces in our great and glorious country.

The chaplain has found his place. He is welcome and there isn't a commanding officer today worth his salt who doesn't appreciate the position of the chaplain and his value on the training team of young men who serve in the Armed Forces of our country and who serve under circumstances where their character is being challenged, their emotions are being in a state of upheaval and all the rest of their background is being disturbed.

The chaplain functions as a builder of character, as a guardian of the basics of this great and glorious country.

Now, I want to say that it is because we have had high standards in the chaplains' branch beginning with the Chiefs of Chaplains, who have set up the standard that they would not compromise with, and they have set up and they have programed for the finest interfaith activity that we enjoy in this country.

They have established an esprit de corps where rabbis, priests, ministers, march shoulder to shoulder under the motto of cooperation without compromise.

It is the greatest opportunity for a young clergyman to find life unfolding in the full; rich and poor live side by side, the races, the colors, and the creeds are mingled, as we find the finest and the best in each individual.

This is the job of the chaplain; this is the job of religious forces in our great and glorious services; and this is the privilege that it has been mine to be a part of throughout these many years.

I want here publicly to give expression of thanksgiving to those Chiefs of Chaplains beginning with Chaplain Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Msgr. Patrick J. Ryan, Rev. Dr. Frank A. Toby, and our present Chief of Chaplains, who happens to be with us, Chaplain (Maj. Gen.) Charles E. Brown, Jr.

Those men have offered me in my career as a chaplain an opportunity to test my strength and to test my faith, and I am grateful to them for the opportunities for service which they have given me over these many years.

I want to say here and now that it is a great privilege to bear this honor tonight and I trust that I shall deserve it as my career goes on. I hope that all of us together may go from strength to strength so that we may be a part of expanding the free world where men can grow from being brother's brother to becoming our brother's brother's brother.

HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER CARL ALBERT, OF OKLAHOMA, BEFORE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION BANQUET

Mr. President, Mrs. Chavez, Mr. Secretary Vance, Mr. Secretary Korth, Senator Russell, Chairman Vinson, General Lemay, General Wheeler, Prince Peter and fellow reservists of the Confederation of Inter-allied Reserve Officers, ladies, fellow Members of Congress and fellow members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

We gather here tonight in the name of the Nation's Minute Man—the symbol of every citizen's commitment to serve his country in war and in peace—to do honor to a tradition, and to pay tribute to those who have helped to build this tradition.

We of the Reserve Officers Association, now in its 41st year, take pride in our contribution toward the building of "a military policy which will provide adequate national security."

Our organization strives to implement this goal in both the national and international areas, through the use of conventional methods and again through such innovations as its grassroots exchange program with the European allies of the United States.

It is an honor to have with us tonight Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark, who is also a lieutenant colonel in the Greek Army Reserve, and the president of the Confederation of Inter-allied Reserve Officers.

He has been accompanied to the United States by 11 CIOR leaders from European nations. It has been a unique and valuable experience to have had these outstanding allied officers with us for the ROA conference and banquet. We have gained much from their visit which will contribute to the establishment of greater understanding and harmony among reserve leaders and ultimately toward the strengthening of the free world alliance.

Many of us in this room have served in uniform, some of us have served in the Congress, and some of us have served and are serving in both the legislative and the military branches of the Government.

Many years ago we were reminded by a great citizen-soldier—George Washington—that "when we assume the soldier, we do not put aside the citizen."

Those who are here as civilians, those who are here as professional military men and women, and those who are here as Reserve officers, can say they fully share in an understanding of that dual responsibility in their lives.

The implementation of this responsibility is the primary goal of this association.

The Reserve Officers Association since its inception has consistently sought to focus both public and governmental attention upon our national requirements for modern, well-trained and well-equipped, Ready Reserves. This has never been an easy assignment. In the post World War I period, the public tendency was to look away from the need for military preparedness, toward a more pacific way of life, even toward disarmament. Again, after World War II, there still remained, although to a lesser degree, some apathy toward sustained reservist readiness.

The experience of Korea prompted the Reserve Officers Association to ask for the development of high priority, instantly ready for action, fit and trained Reserves—available for call within the hour. The state of world affairs since that time has accentuated the need for this kind of readiness. There is not, within the foreseeable future, a time when we will have no requirement for a competent Reserve force.

One of the former national presidents of ROA, present tonight, as long as 8 years ago urged that a limited force be selected, organized, trained, and equipped.

The administration's new programs, about which we have heard so much lately and about which there has been some misunderstanding, had their inception in our association's programs.

The Reserves have changed and are changing—the military equation overall has changed—and we must respond accordingly.

In the words of General MacArthur, the Reserves became "truly professional in World War II."

Military capabilities and requirements being what they are today, nothing short of a truly professional standard of training would enable the Reserves to function in a crisis. For that reason it is desirable that the patterns of the regular services and the Reserves be almost identical—since in crisis their missions will be identical.

More than a decade after World War II, the active forces of the military still included within their temporary structure reservists who constituted a majority of the officer corps on duty. It was in this period that the career reservist came into being.

The changed makeup of our overall military strength, both regular and reserve, and

the importance of both to our national defense, make it incumbent upon the Congress in writing legislation to provide for their equal treatment under the law.

The Reserve Officers Association had a share in the development of the one-Army concept—which, of course, applies to the other services as well, and in the same manner and spirit. The Reserve Officers Association read the signs of the times and acted accordingly. An articulate spokesman for the modern Army was Gen. Bruce Clarke, who is with us tonight. General Clarke was among the first to advocate the one-Army concept.

The broad base of our citizen-reservist forces must be maintained. I know that President Kennedy is going to see that it is maintained. I know that the military leaders and the leaders of the Congress who are here tonight—and those who are not here—are going to see that it is maintained.

We have heard some suggestions about the ROTC programs. The ROTC units are the wellsprings for the development of competent military personnel. They also must keep pace with modern-day concepts.

Far from abandoning our high school and college ROTC programs, we should foster and encourage their role in preparing our young men to participate in the defense of our country.

The role of the Reserve, its importance within our overall defense effort, and our entire concept of preparedness, all of which mean so much to the security of the free world today, have had many great champions in the Congress of the United States. Among these, few have played such a significant part over so long a period of time, as the great national leader to whose memory we pay tribute tonight.

The career of Senator Dennis Chavez in the Congress had many distinctions but none more noteworthy than his commitment to the cause of strength as the path to peace and security.

His legacy to unborn generations cannot be measured.

His image will remain as real to us as that of the minuteman whose symbolic cloak it is our privilege to drape about him.

Before I read the resolution which our association has addressed to honor the memory of this great man, I would like to ask his beloved companion and helpmate, Mrs. Chavez, to stand beside me.

"Whereas, throughout his lifetime, (a) his devotion to the purest concept of duty to country; (b) the nobility of his purpose in leadership for adequate national security; (c) the steadfastness of his dedication to the citizen-reservist tradition; (d) the clarity of his judgment to insure strength, effectiveness, and high morale in the Nations military force, have given confidence to his generation, inspiration to posterity, and safety to this Nation's institutions and ideals: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That in the name of the minuteman, whose genius in patriotism gave our citizens the will to exist as a free people, in recognition of his great service to the United States, the Reserve Officers Association dedicates to the memory of Dennis Chavez its annual minuteman award as the citizen whose career contributed most to the national security of these times."

In the name of our association, it is with a deep sense of privilege—and it is my sincere personal pleasure—to present to you, Mrs. Chavez, this award.

REMARKS OF SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL BEFORE THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ANNUAL MINUTEMAN BANQUET, MARCH 1, 1963

General Foster, Mrs. Chavez and Dennis Chavez' family, Chaplain Dummet, Colonel Kleinberg, Secretaries of the Services, my colleagues in the House and the Senate of Congress, officers of our armed services, Reserve officers and their ladies, and the Reserve and members of the confederation of Reserve officers from abroad, it is a great honor for me to be asked to respond on behalf of the lovely widow of Dennis Chavez to the honor that has just been presented in his memory, a citizen who has contributed most to national security.

Truly, Dennis Chavez has contributed most all of his life to the national security.

Because while he was born in humble circumstances in New Mexico, he worked hard to get an education and he succeeded in getting sufficient education to come to Washington and take over a small position in the U.S. Senate while he worked to get his degree as a lawyer from Georgetown University.

Eleven years later he came to Congress, in 1931, and there he has been practically all the rest of his life.

What appealed to me most about Dennis Chavez was his patriotism and his insistence on building our national security.

We served together as members of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Defense.

He was chairman of that committee and I was a senior minority member for a number of years, I think 6 years. During that time we became fast friends.

Now his concern also was for the welfare of the military man—his housing, the hospital facilities, the opportunities to carry out the good family life and especially to see that he was adequately paid for his services.

Dennis Chavez concern was more for the personalities that were concerned with the military, perhaps even more than the procurement and other parts of providing for our services.

And then too, what appealed to me was his concern for the small men, the private and the corporal in the military services and the small industry, the small leader in industry throughout the country.

I know I remember of one instance where a small manufacturer with plants in New Jersey and Massachusetts, far from New Mexico, was being put out of business because of the product that came from Japan.

So Dennis Chavez did much to put into the act the provision of "buy America," and incidentally, in the case of that industrial leader, he found that after he had this "buy America" in, the product of that man was better than the product that they were getting from Japan.

During our service together we had many friendly discussions. We grew to have respect for each other's opinions. At times we disagreed, but not often, and when we disagreed we always worked in a calm quiet manner to settle and compromise on our differences of opinion.

And so, when Dennis was no longer with us this year, I felt that I had lost a real friend.

And I have got to continue in the days to come my discussion with Mrs. Chavez to reach a conclusion on a question that Dennis and I were never able to decide.

We discussed many times whether the Spanish from whom he was decended came up through Mexico into New Mexico before the Anglo Saxons from whom I've decended came into Plymouth and Salem in Massachusetts.

So, Mrs. Chavez, you and I have something to discuss in the future and it is a great honor and privilege for me to respond in behalf of Mrs. Chavez to this very distinguished award which was given to your late husband, a gentleman whom we will always remember in the U.S. Senate as a patriot and a lover of his country and a fine, fine public servant in the best sense of that word.

Frauds Against the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the recent hearings by the Special Senate Committee on Aging, investigating fraud and quackery, have attracted considerable national attention.

To my mind, this attention signifies deep concern over the problem and a desire to help protect our citizens, young and old, against such practices.

The March issues of both Consumer Report and the Progressive carried articles on our hearings.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Consumers Report]

FRAUDS AGAINST THE AGED

The 88th Congress opened with a dramatic curtain raiser of special interest to the consumer. It dealt with the very old story of villains robbing the weak and defenseless of their lifesavings. Produced by the Senate Special Committee on Aging, under the chairmanship of Senator PAT MCNAMARA, the drama took the form of hearings into frauds, quackery, and other practices leading to the exploitation of old people. In their increasing number, the aged have more than ever become an easy mark for gyp artists, according to witnesses representing the American Medical Association, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, American Association of Retired Persons, National Better Business Bureau, Government agencies, and others.

In his testimony, Kenneth B. Willson, president of the Better Business Bureau, covered many of the classic gyps: lifetime dancing lessons at fabulous fees paid by lonely widows; paradisiacal retirement homesites on the side of a Hawaiian volcano, the floor of an Arizona desert, or the edge of a Florida swamp; overpriced sewing machines sold along with worthless promises of steady income earned at home; phony devices for curing the incurable (and perhaps the otherwise curable); furnaces and home repairs sold by "official inspectors" who disappear with substantial downpayments in pocket.

A recurring theme was medical quackery, and the exploiters were by no means limited to the itinerant peddler and small-time sharper. Dr. Robert E. Shank, chairman of the American Medical Association's council on foods and nutrition, included in his strongly worded indictment "nearly every distributor of vitamins and vitamin-mineral supplements." "The vast majority," he said, "contain elements not needed in human nutrition or not shown to be lacking in conventional diets." Oliver Field, director of the American Medical Association's department of investigation, testified about the giant advertising campaigns for major-brand aspirins, reminding the Senators that aspirin tablets "are all the same" and people might as well buy the cheaper brands. These and numerous similar useless drains on the consumer's dollar have often been called to the attention of CU's readers during the years of publication of the reports.

But the public simply does not get enough accurate information, though it does get far

too much misleading information, about medical frauds that may be lurking around any corner, behind any knock on the door, and at the other end of the line whenever the telephone rings. The American Medical Association's Mr. Field expressed concern over the lack of regulation of people who advertise medical services. Dr. Ronald W. Lamont-Havers, medical director of the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, urged more widespread publicity whenever a regulatory agency cracks down on a fraud.

Nor is quackery abetted merely by silence or inattention on the part of the press. Dr. Gerald D. Dorman, of the American Medical Association board of trustees, noted how stories in newspapers and magazines have helped promote Krebiozen as a cancer cure and Liefcort as an arthritis remedy. And if the press is at fault, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, a committee member, pointed out, so are some members of the medical profession. He told the American Medical Association officials that their organization should have a self-policing policy to prevent doctors from writing books or articles containing harmful misinformation.

Whether the consumer will gain new protection as well as new enlightenment from the McNamara committee hearings is problematical. It must be remembered that the equally pertinent hearings conducted by Senator PHILIP A. HART on deceptive packaging did not move the 87th Congress to legislation, though that battle is not yet lost.

At least two areas of new legislation were broached to the committee. Commisisoner George P. Larrick, of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, cited the need for tighter controls over cosmetics, medical devices, and barbiturates, as well as increased factory inspection. Chairman Paul Rand Dixon, of the Federal Trade Commission, said his Agency needs authority to issue temporary restraining orders against allegedly fraudulent or misleading advertising, and a Post Office Department spokesman said similar authority is needed in policing direct-mail frauds. As matters stand, Mr. Dixon argued, a cease-and-desist order can be delayed as long as 4 years through the legal process, even though the complaint involves the cheating practices of an outright swindler.

The Senate at any rate now has before it another strong case for better regulation through new laws and larger appropriations for the regulatory agencies.

[From the Progressive]

THE GULLIBLE AMERICAN

(By Laurence M. Stern)

A year ago this month President Kennedy laid before Congress one of the most far-ranging and precise definitions of Federal responsibility to the Nation's consumers ever issued by a Chief Executive.

"The Federal Government," the President stated, "by nature the highest spokesman for all the people, has a special obligation to be alerted to the consumer needs and to advance the consumers' interests." In his message the President enunciated a catchy manifesto for the unorganized consumer majority—the right to safety from dangerous foods and medicines; the right to be informed of fraudulent advertising claims and labeling; the right to choose in a competitive market, and the right to a voice in the formulation of Government consumer policy.

Because of the well known aversion of many Members of Congress to tamper with the conventions of the marketplace, most of the President's appeals for legislative reform were left on the dusty reject shelf. Nonetheless some lawmakers recognize that the issue of consumer protection is invested not only with moral equity but with political capital as well.

Hardly had the new 88th Congress organized itself before the first full-blown investigation was under way, exploring a major no man's land of abuse—the widespread exploitation of the elderly by merchants of goods and services ranging from instant arthritic cures to sand-locked or waterlogged retirement lots.

The hearings, conducted by Michigan's Demorcatic senior Senator PAT MCNAMARA, were masterfully staged and shrewdly timed to come during a period of general calm in the Capitol. A virtually captive gallery of reporters and television camermen provided excellent public exposure. The sensation unfolded by MCNAMARA's witnesses, if somewhat shopworn, did delineate the wide dimensions of the problem with which Congress and the administration must come to grips.

What emerged during the 3 days of preliminary testimony before MCNAMARA'S Special Committee on Aging was a portrait of a gullible American society, willing to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into a bottomless sinkhole of quackery. Businesses and fortunes thrive on the aches, pains, and mass credulity of the public. To conjure away irregularity, arthritic agony, bulging waistlines, hangovers—even loneliness—consumers will resort to primitive, superstitious solutions, such as special herbs and copper bracelets with "curative circuits." As many as 11 million arthritics are being fleeced out of a quarter of a billion dollars each year, the McNamara Committee was told, by promoters of such cruel and worthless gadgets as well as "special" foods, seawater at $3 a pint, or high-priced analgesics no more effective than an aspirin tablet.

And in pursuit of that summum bonum of physical well being—regularity—Americans during 1961 spent some $160 million. One American Medical Association spokesman commented despairingly, "We are becoming a nation of bowel neurotics."

Our propensity for pill gulping has expanded the vitamin business within recent years into an industry of vast proportions—fed by the medical ignorance of the public and high-pressure salesmanship of pharmaceutical interests. Dr. Robert E. Schank, chairman of American Medical Association's council on foods and nutrition, complained: "Perhaps the most lucrative deception is perpetrated by nearly every distributor of vitamins and vitamin mineral supplements. The immediate question is not whether vitamins or vitamin supplements are necessary—but that the vast majority contain elements not needed in human nutrition or not shown to be lacking in conventional diets."

There is also the richly-imaginative world of the special food hucksters and faddists, who dispense thin nonsense for bulging profits in books, radio lectures, and syndicated columns. The audience for such bilge numbers in the millions. One example cited to the Committee on Aging was a widely selling book that offered this counsel to readers: "Best known for its directly beneficial effect on the sex organs is vitamin E. Serious lack of this vitamin may cause sterility." To obtain this "so-essential-for-virility" ingredient, the author recommended consumption of wheat germ oil, sesame seeds, and egg yolk. The prescriptions multiply from other so-called authorities, and include rose hips, safflower capsules, and vinegar and honey (honegar) pills. One dietary supplement firm reported a growth in earnings during 1961 from $2 to $8 million.

The range of consumer frauds spotlighted by the McNamara inquiry, although directed primarily at the aged, are really as broad as the marketplace. The boom in sight unseen, 10-dollar-down, 10-dollar-a-month retirement lots has become a major source of swindles. Last year at a National Conference on Interstate Land Sales, California Attorney General Stanley Mosk revealed that the mulcting of lot buyers had reached a national rate of half a billion dollars annually. Currently, according to the Better Business Bureau, postal inspectors are investigating 150 land promoters and the Federal Trade Commission is looking into dubious real estate offerings in six States. Only two States, Arizona and California, have countered with laws to require public disclosure of the true facts about any land offering before contracts can be signed. Indeed, perhaps one of the most significant developments of these first hearings came when Arizona's ultraconservative Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the adamant champion of States rights, agree with his Democratic colleagues on the Committee that some type of Federal action is needed to crack down on real estate frauds.

Other frauds and deceptive promotions detailed by Kenneth B. Wilson, president of the National Better Business Bureau, included:

Certain savings and loan associations (in States with inadequate regulation) which solicit mail accounts, using glowing promises of high dividend rates and expensive gifts. Financially unsound, and without insurance on deposits, these fraudulent associations have lured thousands of elderly people to deposit their life savings and then left them destitute.

An ingenious fake health insurance swindle successfully worked in Idaho. An "agent" would sell a health and accident policy covering the elderly, collecting $100 to $200. Before the policy was delivered, an accomplice of the agent would call on the victim, say he was investigating the agent, and ask for the receipt for the money, to be used in the "investigation." This left the victim with no policy and no proof of payment.

Still another burgeoning source of fraud is the proliferation of dance studios that prey on lonely, elderly women by offering "lifetime" dance instruction contracts—a form of old age insurance against loneliness. The Bureau cited case after case of women in their sixties and seventies who had been swindled out of thousands of dollars and left penniless by means of the lifetime contract gimmick. Invariably the only recourse has been the courts, which is nowhere near as effective as sound preventive law.

Paul Rand Dixon, Federal Trade Commission chairman, testified that he would renew efforts to obtain legislation to permit swifter action to protect the public. Under existing law, Dixon said, a swindler can employ lawyers who "engage in every legal shenanigan" to delay for as long as four years the issuance of binding Federal orders against cheating practices. Dixon said the Commission needs authority to issue temporary restraining orders pending a final court decision.

The McNamara committee also heard testimony on the role of mass media in the engineering of consumer consent. An example was the case of Liefcort, an arthritis nostrum developed in the basement workshop of a young Canadian-American doctor who also manufactured hair-growing preparations, skin ointments, and vitamins.

Look magazine, on May 22, 1962, published a story on Liefcort and its inventor, Dr. Robert E. Liefman, who had been expelled from one hospital and was no longer licensed to practice medicine. Interspersed through the article were photographs of Liefman and patients treated with the drug, a combination of powerful hormones. There were accompanying captions, such as "Dr. Liefman chats with a 73-year-old patient, who says his medicine helps her," and "5-year-old Lise was unable to bend her left knee until she began taking Liefcort. Now she climbs steps and runs."

As a result of the Look article, demand for the drug soared, the Journal of the American Medical Association reported last fall. Dr. Ronald W. Lamont Haver, national medical director of the Arthritis and Rheumatism

Foundation, told the McNamara Committee that two deaths in a Montreal hospital were directly attributable to Liefcort treatments. In another case, he said, a 6-year-old girl treated with the drug developed abnormal hair growth on her face and "tremendous" breasts.

The drug is now banned from the United States through efforts of the Food and Drug Administration although this does not prevent large numbers of Americans from going to Liefman for the treatments, according to Lamont Haver. The FDA has also warned that Liefcort is known to cause serious reactions, including severe uterine bleeding. Liefman is also wanted by U.S. marshals for selling a baldness "cure," the American Medical Association Journal reported.

The Liefcort case, Haver concluded, is a prime example of "how successfuly articles in lay magazines and the press can skyrocket an insignificant, ineffectual remedy to national importance, causing hundreds of thousands to be duped and endangered." The publishers, he said, "must share the guilt of this deception with its promoters."

The special vulnerability of older persons to publicity about miraculous cures and invigorating foods, was described for the McNamara committee by George P. Larrick FDA Commissioner.

"These oldsters need little more than a vagrant suggestion to lead them to believe in the restorative powers of various nostrums. They are longing to read or hear about some wonder cure for the particular ailment that afflicts them, and with pathetic eagerness they embrace and employ it. It has been estimated that consumers waste $500 million a year on medical quackery and another $500 million annually on misrepresented vitamins, so-called health foods and nutritional supplements."

The press was criticized at the hearings for its complicity in running fraudulent real estate advertising. When Wilson was asked if the Better Business Bureau warned newspapers about racket advertising, the Better Business Bureau president replied that the organization compiles lists of suspect firms, but that many newspapers are not interested. At least three Senators, Democrats HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and Republican BARRY GOLDWATER, voiced astonishment and accused the press of irresponsibility.

On a far larger scale, the files of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's drug investigating committee show how major pharmaceutical companies in the United States use syndicated columnists, feature writers, and prominent television idols to force-feed the public with new, sometimes questionable drugs. Curiously, the medical spokesmen at McNAMARA's January hearings were silent on the promotional campaigns of these big, commercially respectable firms. Perhaps no one knows better than the American Medical Association where to set the boundaries on a crusade.

The question of drug prices did not arise once during the hearings of the Committee on Aging. It did however—often and prominently—in the deliberations of the Kefauver committee and in floor debate on the drug reform bill last year.

Take the case of prednisone, a drug used in relief of arthritic pain. KEFAUVER's investigators discovered that one firm, McKesson & Robbins, marketed prednisone to retail druggists at $20.95 a 1,000 tablets on a generic, or nontrade name basis. On the other hand, another company, Schering, sold it to retailers under the trade name Meticorten at a price of $170 per 1,000, KEFAUVER told the Senate during last year's debate. His staff, KEFAUVER stated, computed the cost of producing prednisone at $13.61 per 1,000; on this basis, the wholesale price for the Schering product was twelve and a half times the factory cost.

The primary market for prednisone is among elderly arthritis victims living on limited incomes. To obtain the trade name form of the drug, they had to pay about 28 cents a pill or nearly $30 a month for the boon of pain relief. Once McKesson & Robbins went into production of prednisone on a generic basis, it computed the costs at about 1 cent per pill.

Vivid testimony on the cost difference to consumers between trade name and generic drug products was given last August to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by Ernest Giddings, of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons:

"In our drug service * * * here in Washington," he said, "we fill approximately 6,000 prescriptions weekly. If these could all be filled with generic drugs, rather than with the same drugs carrying trade names, the savings to our members would be tremendous. As an illustration, we have many members using a trademarked drug prescribed for heart condition. In a 4-month period we dispense some 335,000 tablets of this drug. Sold under the trade name, this would amount to $13,187. If they were dispensed under the generic name, they would cost only $7,662, or a saving of $5,525.

"To use another illustration, a popular prescription for high blood pressure sells in the amount of 190,000 tablets per month, for a total of $10,250. The generic version could be purchased for $3,945, or a savings of $6,305.

"A well-known tranquilizer sells up to 120,000 per month, with a cash value of $6,840. Purchased under the generic name, they would cost $3,000, or a saving of $3,840."

The drug reform bill that Congress enacted last year did nothing directly to curtail the high price of drugs or to modify the patent restraints which enable some major drug producers to control the price structure. However, the toughened set of controls with which Congress equipped FDA could have an indirect pocketbook benefit to the consumer. They should relieve much of the concern that physicians have had about prescribing generic drugs, now that all manufacturers will be subject to the highest standards of quality control. There is still much room for improvement, however, in the generic labeling of drugs, liberalization of patent monopolies, and, most important of all, an administrative overhaul of the Food and Drug Administration, which suffers from pedestrian leadership.

Last year's drug story on Capitol Hill was an example of how Congress, which shows such alacrity at legislating for special interests, must be shocked into action for consumers. The White House cannot gracefully claim credit for pushing the bill through. It was the thalidomide scandal, with its revelation of deformed births, that provided the political thrust for enactment. In fact, the whole development of our food and drug laws have been the result of reform by political shock waves.

Still on the agenda of the President's March 1962 consumer program are such major steps as the truth-in-financing bill sponsored by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, the deceptive packaging bill reintroduced this year by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Michigan Democrat, and further progress in food and drug supervision.

One promise the President did fulfill. He appointed a Consumer Advisory Council to lobby for the forgotten majority. However, the group has not been heard from since, and perhaps it is just as well. President Kennedy might be aroused to fight for his own consumer program. The consumer could hardly find a better lobbyist.

The Danger We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 4, the Lawrence (Mass.) Eagle-Tribune published an article which does much to clarify the real issues involved in the current debate over tax policy. The choice, as the Eagle-Tribune rightly pointed out, is not between a tax cut or tax reforms, but between a destructive or sound fiscal policy.

THE DANGER WE FACE

Tax cut or recession is the choice confronting the country as President Kennedy portrayed it before an audience of bankers.

The President of course does not definitely forecast a recession, but he sees danger of one unless business gets a stimulant. He sees lower taxes as the necessary stimulant—a stimulant so powerful that it will expand business to proportions so profitable surpluses will replace deficits in government financing in a year or two.

Taxes are too high. The heavy burden they place on business is especially bad for the country because it handicaps business activity and retards business advance. The Kennedy administration earns credit for one thing, that should have been recognized by politicians years ago, that taxes on business can be dangerously heavy.

But the administration does not earn credit for its action in light of this recognition.

Tax cut or recession is not the country's only choice.

Cutting taxes without cutting expenditures proportionately almost certainly would make a bad matter worse.

A few days after the President addressed the bankers, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon appeared before a congressional committee to ask for a higher ceiling on the national debt. The bills are coming in, he said, and they must be paid. The only way to pay them is to borrow more money. Not much more money can be borrowed under the present ceiling on the debt.

Raising the ceiling probably is unavoidable. As Dillon said, the bills must be paid. But a rate of expenditures consistently faster than the rate of revenue is not unavoidable. Expenditures can be cut. They must be cut. If the Kennedy administration does not face this fact, another must. The inflationary business of rising costs and rising debt is destined to destroy the economy unless it is stopped.

The President, however, displays no awareness of this fact. He sees the need to stimulate business as a means of enabling the Government to continue and to expand its vast spending programs.

Business needs stimulation, but it can be stimulated without a tax cut now that would make a bad matter worse. The inflationary expansion that the President calls for would increase prices to local consumers and weaken the American position in foreign trade by pricing more American goods out of world markets. It would place in greater peril the already hazardous position of the American supply of gold.

This supply is already more than fully mortgaged to foreigners with claims on it. If they should demand the payment in gold that legally they can demand, the entire American gold supply would be wiped out and they would be short more than $4 billion

of collecting what is due them. High taxes are not worse for business than more inflation and exposure of the dollar to devastating devaluation.

These risks are unnecessary. The great national need now is a sound fiscal policy by Washington. This means a policy of balanced budgets, of debt reduction, of diminished foreign aid as a means of bringing international payments toward a state of balance, the fostering of higher interest rates to make investment attractive to foreigners as well as to Americans, and of course—vital to balanced budgets—reduction of all but imperative expenditures.

The choice for the country is not the only one the President defined. The country has a far more important choice, between destructive and sound fiscal policy. Distressing fact is that the administration is blind to it.

Pay Now, Refund Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the chief concern in the domestic field as exhibited by citizens this session is the tax proposals pending before the Ways and Means Committee.

Substantial interest has been created by the discussion of reforms in our tax structure.

One of the simplest, or perhaps most fascinating and equitable reforms is the proposal relating to the methods of tax collection at the Federal Government level, more specifically, the withholding of taxes from citizens in advance of the period at which they are legally due. This matter was the subject of a profound editorial in the Citizen newspapers, a chain published throughout the southwestern suburban area of Cook County. I place this editorial, which appeared in the February 28 issue, into the RECORD at this point:

PAY NOW, REFUND LATER

Every year it comes up, and every year—mercifully—it dies down.

It is the perennial question of whether the State should levy an income tax in addition to or instead of the property taxes.

To our way of thinking, the correct answer to the question is that, for raising funds that must be raised, an income tax is the lesser of the evils. At least it catches every self-supporting citizen at the same point in the rat race (i.e., before he spends or invests), and whether graduated or not, it purports to rob the rich and the poor according to their ability to pay. The proceeds, of course, are distributed to the indolent more on the basis of cunning than anything else.

But more intriguing to us than the basic question is the side issue of the manner in which taxes ought to be collected.

The method which has caught our fancy was most recently mentioned by former President Eisenhower: to prohibit the Government from withholding taxes from citizens' paychecks, thus requiring tax payments to be made by individuals from their cash holdings (that is, if they have held on to it).

In the first place the Government has no right whatsoever to collects its taxes in advance, if only because this procedure robs the citizen of the use—profitable use—of his money between the time he earns it and the time he is obligated to send a share of it off to the Government.

A further inequity occurs among persons fortunate enough to be entitled to tax refunds: they can scrape through the year, minus their tax overpayments, and then delight themselves by receiving (after proving their innocence), many months into the new year, only what was their money all along. And does Uncle pay interest on the money he borrowed for 15 months? You know the answer; you also know that you pay interest on whatever you owe him, however.

But of course the best argument for abolishing withholding tax is that each citizen, by having to pay directly from his own pocket, can realize exactly what his share in the cost of the Government is. He also realizes that his employer is paying him considerably more than his "take-home" pay, and that if it's hard for a man to get along on what he makes, it is more likely the fault of a greedy Government than a stingy boss.

It is foolish even to think about this, because Americans have seldom wanted the truth. It is so much more pleasant to delude ourselves into thinking that we can get something for nothing by going to Washington, and letting tax money instead of our own money pay for the things that are nice to have, but hardly necessary.

The Gold Brick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as public interest and knowledge of the President's tax cuts grow, we find the volume of complaints mounting when the vast implications of the proposals are clearly perceived by the public.

An excellent commentary on the tax proposals appeared in the February 27 issue of the Hammond Times, an independent publication in Hammond, Ind. In view of the detailed and clear examples contained in this editorial, I insert it into the RECORD without further comment, feeling it speaks for itself in an effective fashion:

THE GOLD BRICK

More and more people have been taking a look at President Kennedy's proposed tax cut, and have made the disillusioning discovery that it is coupled with reform provisions that would turn the tax cut into a tax boost.

This discovery that the tax cut would, in effect, put money into one pocket of the average taxpayer while taking a bigger load out of the other pocket, coupled with the fact that the President proposes no cut in Federal spending to make up for any revenue loss from the tax cut, explains the lack of enthusiasm for the proposal in Congress.

One certified public accountant in Baldwin, N.Y., was so alarmed at the deceptive manner in which the tax cut—really a tax increase for many—has been presented that he wrote Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, to explain in detail just how phony the tax cut would be.

It has been estimated that some 60 percent of the breadwinners in this country are buying their own homes and nearly all are purchasing them by means of mortgage financing. Interest and property taxes were made deductible from income tax by Congress to encourage home ownership.

Other items now deductible from Federal income taxes are interest on installment purchases and personal loans, other State and local taxes, contributions to churches and charities, casualty losses due to fire, storms, and so forth, and medical expenses.

President Kennedy's so-called tax-cut plan calls for an amount equal to 5 percent of a taxpayer's gross income to be slashed off these deductions—which means that the taxpayer would be paying taxes on an additional 5 percent of his income.

The Baldwin, N.Y., accountant, Harold R. Hafner, figured out how these tax proposals would result in tax increases for 12 clients for whom he prepares income tax returns.

The one with the lowest income is a widow, receiving income entirely from interest and dividends. Her income for 1962 amounted to $3,932. Her net taxable income, after present allowable deductions was $756, on which she paid no tax. President Kennedy's plan, which would disallow 5 percent of her allowable deductions, would force her to pay a tax of $39 next year, a 100 percent boost.

Another taxpayer, with income of $4,835 in 1962, has, after deductions, a net taxable income of $643 on which he pays $128 income tax this year. Under President Kennedy's tax cut plan, a total of $241, or 5 percent, of his deductions would be disallowed. Thus, this small taxpayer would find himself, in 1963, paying $163 income tax, an increase of 27 percent.

Another $4,343 salary taxpayer, who this year would pay $243 income tax, would, under President Kennedy's proposal pay $268 next year, an increase of nearly 9 percent.

But a taxpayer with an income of nearly $9,300, paying $1,271 in taxes this year, would be boosted by only 2 percent, to $1,297, or by $26. Taxes for the heaviest taxpayer in the accountant's 12 examples, a man with $47,102 income, now paying $9,433 in income tax, would go up only 8½ percent, or $803.

Ah, say the backers of this so-called tax cut plan, but taxes will be reduced in 1964 and 1965 as the rates are slashed deeper. But this, too, is a fallacy, Mr. Hafner demonstrates, because even for the $5,000-a-year (less than $100 a week) man with 4 dependents, the net taxes will go up. This is because he is due to pay $72 a year more in social security by the end of 1965.

And whether you regard social security as a tax or not, it comes out of your pocket and goes into the Federal Treasury.

This $5,000 taxpayer has $1,100 in deductions. This leaves him a net of $3,900 and, after deductions for himself and three dependents ($600 exemption each) he now pays $300 income tax, or 20 percent of $1,500 net taxable income.

Under President Kennedy's tax plan, he would lose $250 of his $1,100 deductions, so that his net taxable income would be $1,750. On this, for 1963, he would be taxed at a rate of only 18½ percent, paying $323.75. For 1964, he would be taxed at 15½ percent, or $271.25, and for 1965 at 14 percent, or $245.

Thus his net saving would be $60 for 3 years. But don't forget that $72 increase in his social security tax. The net effect would be to raise his tax bill by $12 over the next 3 years.

For the $10,000-a-year man in the same situation, with $1,800 of deductions, the result would be better. He would save $254 in taxes over the next 3 years which, even with the $72 boost in social security, would give

him a 5-percent saving on his taxes, or a net saving of $182.

The $15,000-a-year man would fare even better. He would save $343, or 5.1 percent, even after allowing for the $72 social security increase.

This is tax reform to help the little guy?

These figures scrape some of the lead off the gold brick the administration apparently is trying to sell the American people.

Facts From Fables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the editorial from the February 27 Austinite, which is published weekly in the Chicago area.

In the face of an inevitable budget deficit due to increased spending and a proposed cut in tax revenues, the editorial is indeed apropos. Congress will be asked to again increase the astronomical debt ceiling within a few short weeks notwithstanding the present public indebtedness of more than $300 billion. There is a great deal to be learned from the moral of many of Aesop's parables, and the following might be worth serious thought in the interest of regaining the proper perspective in dealing with the Nation's current fiscal problems.

The editorial follows:

It is often said there is nothing new under the sun. This appears to be true, especially in the realm of advice. So instead of trying to pontificate on today's subject of tax cuts without cost cuts, let's take a look at a few parables Aesop came up with some 2,000 years ago and see if the points are still valid today.

THE ANTS AND THE GRASSHOPPER

"The ants were employing a fine winter's day in drying grain collected in the summer time. A grasshopper, perisiting with famine, passed by and earnestly begged for a little food. The ants inquired of him, 'Why did you not treasure up food during the summer?' He replied, 'I had not leisure enough. I passed the days in singing.'

"They then said in derision: 'If you were foolish enough to sing all the summer, you must dance supperless to bed in the winter.' "

THE THIRSTY PIGEON

"A pigeon, oppressed by excessive thirst, saw a goblet of water painted on a signboard. Not supposing it to be only a picture, she flew towards it with a loud whirr and unwittingly dashed against the signboard and jarred herself terribly. Having broken her wings by the blow, she fell to the ground and was caught by one of the bystanders.

"Zeal should not outrun discretion."

THE MAN AND HIS TWO SWEETHEARTS

"A middle aged man, whose hair had begun to turn grey, courted two women at the same time. One of them was young; and the other, well advanced in years. The elder woman, ashamed to be courted by a man younger than herself, made a point, whenever her admirer visited her, to pull out some portion of his black hairs. The younger, on the contrary, not wishing to become the wife of an old man, was equally zealous in removing every grey hair she could find. Thus it came to pass, that between them both he very soon found that he had not a hair left on his head.

"Those who seek to please everybody please nobody."

In summing up our thoughts on the money management of our national household, a much younger man than Aesop put it more succinctly. Benjamin Franklin said, "He that goes a borrowing goes a sorrowing."

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, whatever the issue, BILL PROXMIRE, the senior Senator from my State of Wisconsin, can be counted on to use his own independent judgment, faithful to his own intelligent perception of issues and events. The Portage (Wis.) Register, a fairminded Republican newspaper published in my congressional district, in a recent editorial, illustrates this point with respect to Senator PROXMIRE's analysis of and objections to the President's tax reduction and reform proposal.

Apart from the merits of his position on the tax proposal, the significance of this editorial lies in the simple fact that the Portage Daily Register, which rarely has praise for a Democratic legislator, has recognized the qualities of independence, forthrightness, and integrity which have marked BILL PROXMIRE's distinguished career.

The editorial, published on March 4, follows:

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE has been following an independent course for sometime, but some of his latest statements are surprising to his former opponents and probably amazing to many of his Democratic colleagues.

We heard him on a radio interview a few days ago present some real objections to the President's tax reduction and reform bill. He expressed doubts over the proclaimed efficacy of this measure in restoring economic activity, and questioned at the same time the impact of some of the so-called reform proposals.

These inject a new element of uncertainty in the business community, which may make it hesitate to take the course needed to stimulate employment and business activity, he maintained.

Most impressive, however, was his recent assertion that a program of tax reduction accompanied by huge deficit spending can bring untold hardships to senior citizens, who are now forced to live on social security and small pensions or limited savings.

Deficit spending, he emphasized, will inevitably lead to inflation. Thus the funds which senior citizens now have will become even more inadequate in the years ahead.

We believe that many citizens of both parties will gladly join Senator PROXMIRE in his fight for greater economy in government and a reduction of deficit spending. We feel that nothing can hamper sound economic growth in America more than instability and uncertainty over the future.

We also feel that no greater injustice can be imposed upon senior citizens than to impair the value of their savings, their pensions, their life insurance, and their social security.

Inflation which impairs the value of these many savings, accumulated for retirement years, can be the direct and inevitable result of financial irresponsibility to many items in the Federal budget which can be cut, and urges that tax reduction be accompanied by some measure of Government economy.

While we have not followed Senator PROXMIRE along his political course, we are glad to back him up in his present crusade for tax reduction through economy in government.

President Kennedy's Tax Proposals Will Hurt Private Charities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a number of witneses before the Ways and Means Committee have expressed concern that charitable institutions as well as educational and cultural facilities would be hurt by the 5-percent floor on deductions called for by the administration. The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune sums up some of the more pertinent arguments:

THE TAX REFORMS

We've already discussed Mr. Kennedy's plan to limit deductions from taxable income, but the persistent notion that this limit won't hurt contributions to schools and charity calls for further rebuttal.

The argument put forward in support of this notion is clever but misleading. "Look," advocates of the tax program tell us, "the plan to allow deductions only to the extent that their total exceeds 5 percent of a taxpayer's income isn't aimed at contributions. It shouldn't even hurt them. If a taxpayer's deductions already exceed 5 percent of his income, as is generally true in upper income groups, then anything he gives to charity will still be deductible."

This slippery argument fails to persuade those who should know most about the matter. A storm of opposition to the plan has arisen from schools, churches, and charitable organizations.

They have good reason to worry on several counts. Contributions are the only type of deductible expense over which a taxpayer has much control. He can't do anything to trim casualty losses or taxes. There's little he can do about doctors' bills. He can't escape interest payments once he has given a mortgage on his house or borrowed money for some other purpose. He can trim legitimate business expenses only at the risk of hurting his business or impairing the effectiveness of his work. Therefore it's academic to argue that the new limit would be aimed at all deductions alike. If a taxpayer wants to trim expenses, he obviously will pick on contributions first.

Why would he want to trim expenses, especially if taxes are being cut? Well, for one of two reasons. One of the many conflicting purposes of Mr. Kennedy's reforms, it will be remembered, is to persuade more taxpayers to take the standard deduction. Let's say that a man has a taxable income

of $10,000 and has had deductions ranging from $1,000 to $1,500 a year.

Under the proposed change, he would have to subtract from his deductions 5 percent of his income, or $500. This would reduce his deductions below the standard deduction of $1,000 which a married man in these circumstances is entitled to take regardless of what deductions he has. For practical purposes, then, anything he gives to charity would come out of his own pocket in full; his deductions won't be affected. According to Mr. Kennedy, 6½ million taxpayers would shift to the standard deduction and thus lose the tax incentive to give to charity.

Higher income groups, who furnish most of the money given to charity, would want to economize for a different reason. They probably would still itemize their deduction; but when they get through figuring out their new tax—what with the proposed change in deductions and in the treatment of dividend income—they would very likely find that instead of being lower, their taxes are higher.

Thus the chief argument of the tax cutters and tax reformers is undermined when it comes to those who are most likely to give to charity. With higher taxes, and with added restrictions on charitable deductions in the highest income groups, they, too would be tempted to trim their generosity. The effect on donations, as the prospective recipients realize all too well, might be calamitous.

The way to head off this mischief is for every taxpayer to make himself heard in Congress.

A Proper Congressional Concern

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, those who express concern about the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House often seem to be insisting that it is undemocratic and unconscionable for a democracy to post guards against its subversion. The great responsibility of service on the committee carries with it a willingness to endure a succession of unwarranted attacks on joint and individual integrity—and a determination to persist in the assigned task in spite of these perverse sallies.

It is to the eternal credit of the committee members that they have borne the onslaughts with firm resolve, and the Nation is in their debt. Where better than among the representatives of the people, duly elected, should there be an active concern for the persistent threat of subversion, and an instrumentality to assist in its exposure?

As we prepare to vote our conviction as to the continuing need for the committee, Mr. Speaker, we might recall the significant service it has rendered in spotlighting laxity in the enforcement of personnel security procedures within highly sensitive agencies of Government concerned with the national defense. I should like to recall to the notice of the House the committee's investigation of disgraceful and dangerous security looseness in the secret National Security Agency and read into the RECORD the following editorial which appeared on August 15, 1962, in the Richmond (Va.) News Leader:

INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Those who persistently maintain that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is misdirected sound and fury should gage their outrage by the report issued Monday. This document cites 22 distinct corrective actions taken by the National Security Administration following the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation into the defection to Russia of the homosexual security risks Bernon F. Mitchell and William Martin. NSA has since cooperated fully in tightening its lax security procedures; but if the House Committee on Un-American Activities had not existed, or had been abolished before it began its 13-month investigation, the Nation's most critical and most secret agency of defense would still be wide open to Communist penetration.

The Mitchell-Martin story was an ugly one. Both men worked as mathematicians in the cryptology section of NSA. Both were hired and given access to top secret information before security checks had been completed. Both were eventually given clearance despite Mitchell's admission of sexual aberrations and Martin's association with Communist party members, even after becoming an NSA employee. On August 5, 1960, the two disappeared, apparently with top-secret information about NSA activities; on September 6 they turned up at a Moscow press conference.

The National Security Agency is so sensitively secret and so vital to the country's defense that no outsiders can describe its activities. Not even the Civil Service Commission, which regularly audits all Government jobs, is allowed to know what NSA employees do. Yet the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation discovered that the Agency had made a regular practice of hiring employees before security checks were completed—ever since the Korean war had given the pretext of an emergency. One of the major revisions of NSA policy was the correction of this incredible practice.

Under another strange policy, the NSA placed almost complete reliance on checking security clearances through lie detector tests, without coordinating information received from the FBI and other agencies. The lie detector or polygraph, useful as it is, charts only chemical and psychological reactions. An innocent but nervous subject comes off badly; a guilty, calm subject may get through without suspicion. J. Edgar Hoover has warned many times that the polygraph can give no more than hints, even to an operator experienced at reading the graphs. Yet the NSA allowed security clearances to be given on the strength of a junior officer's interpretation of the polygraph.

The irregularities in hiring extended to the NSA's director of personnel himself. House Committee on Un-American Activities investigators, working with the FBI, turned up falsifications in the personnel director's background file; the director, who of course had complete access to his own file, then attempted to thwart the committee by forging a form with the correct information and substituting it for incorrect statements. This man has been fired for his forgery.

Since the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation, NSA security has been tightened in all fields. Greater emphasis is put on pyschological and medical investigations of prospective employees. Guards and watchmen have been increased. The clearances of all employees have been reviewed, and 26 known homosexuals have been dropped from the rolls.

Both the Secretary of Defense and the Director of NSA have been active in the housecleaning, but it was the House Committee on Un-American Activities that devoted more than 2,000 hours to the investigation. This effort has resulted not only in the practical cleanup of the present mess, but in a bill now about halfway through Congress which will forestall a loosening of security practices. The men who are hired to guard a special trust for the country must submit to greater tests of loyalty. Were it not for the House Committee on Un-American Activities we would have no way of knowing whether these tests were being applied or not.

How Arabs Have Progressed in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit Jewish News of March 1, 1963, regarding the remarkable progress Arabs have enjoyed in the State of Israel.

The article is as follows:

HOW ARABS HAVE PROGRESSED IN ISRAEL

Israel is so sharply divided on the question of the existing military rule imposed as a restriction upon the 260,000 Arabs who form a formidable minority in that country that the motion to abolish the military government was defeated by the close vote of 57 to 56. There prevails the fear that by freeing the Arabs from the military control there will be the danger of strengthening fifth columnists.

In due time, the restrictions imposed by military rule undoubtedly will be removed, and the last barrier between the Jewish and Arab citizens of Israel will thereby be abolished.

In the meantime, in view of the regrettable spread of anti-Israel propaganda, on the score of Arab relations, it becomes necessary to emphasize time and again the great benefits which have come to Israel's Arabs as a result of the reestablishment of the Jewish State.

Arab propaganda often has transgressed the elementary principles of truth—to an extent of its brazen attempt to introduce anti-Semitic notes in discussions of the relationship between the two peoples. By making the existing conditions known factually the vicious propaganda may, let it be hoped, be eradicated.

An interesting fact about the benefits accrued to the Arabs from Israeli rule is that, since 1948, when Israel's independence was proclaimed and was established by resisting the onslaught upon the small Jewish State of five neighboring enemy countries, Arab land irrigation increased 15-fold. The Arabs had used 800-year-old methods of irrigating their lands by means of hand-driven apparatus of using sticks or iron bars, attached to carts driven by mules. In 1948 Arabs in Palestine irrigated 500 acres of land. Now, as a result of the opportunities afforded them by a friendly Israeli government, they are irrigating 7,500 acres of land in Israel by modern methods.

Contrary to previous sights, Arab women now are seldom seen carrying pails of water on their heads. There are 103 Arab villages

in Israel, and more than half of them have had water piped into all their homes by the Israel government. Previously, all the Arab villages secured their drinking water from wells located many miles from their homes.

Many revolutionary changes already have taken place in Israel, where there now function 28 local Arab councils.

Illiteracy is disappearing entirely among the Israeli Arabs, and only seldom does one come across an Arab child who does not benefit from the country's compulsory education law. There isn't an Arab village in the entire country that does not have one or more kindergartens and the necessary provisions for an elementary education.

Compare this with the facts acknowledged in a recent statement in Cairo that the Egyptian Government had allocated the sum of $36 million to eradicate illiteracy by 1970—admitting that 73 percent of Egypt's population of 26 million can neither read nor write, Cairo alone accounting for 825,000 illiterates.

So that all the facts relating to Israel's treatment of the Arabs may be known in all their details, we present here a portion of a statement by Haim Mass released from Jerusalem:

"The medieval rule of clans headed by a Mukhtar has been replaced by a democratically elected local government. Sometimes the obvious inferiority of services in the Arab sector as compared with those in the Jewish parts of the country is balanced by lavish subsidies by the Israel Government, out of proportion to Arab local councils share in the state's development budget.

"The development program is not confined to villages. The Arab town of Nazareth, where during the British mandate the water portion to Arab local councils' share in the shortage was so acute that large prices were paid for drinking water carried by women from wells in the neighborhood, has had a modern water network installed, for the most part at government expense.

"In the formerly all-Arab town of Jaffa an Arab teachers' seminary has been opened, to provide tutorial staff for the 10 existing Arab secondary and 152 Arab elementary schools. Considering that at the time of the emergence of the state there were only 2 secondary schools and 60 elementary schools at the disposal of the Arab minority and, having regard to the fact that there has been only a moderate population increase in the Arab sector, efforts to improve educational standards of the Arab minority has been most pronounced.

"Shimon Landman, Director of the Minorities Division in the Israeli Ministry of the Interior, recalls how 10 to 15 years ago Arab women gave birth to their children almost exclusively at home, with the assistance of a midwife or female relative, or at harvest time out in the fields where they happened to be working. Today, every Arab woman, irrespective of her social status, enjoys the facilities of a maternity ward in a public hospital or in one of the two Arab health centers at Tirah and Baka el Gabrieh. In addition, Arab women are entitled to the same maternity grants as paid to Jewish mothers by the National Insurance Institute for the acquisition of basic requisites for the newborn. Arab women also receive medical attention and advice on child care in mother and child welfare stations found in all towns and villages. The Ministry of Health, the Hadassah Medical Organization and the General Workers' Sick Fund see to it that not a single Arab village is left without regular medical services and that not a single Arab child is excluded from the countrywide vaccination and antiinfantile paralysis drives.

"Mother and child welfare plays only a small role in the task of bringing emancipation to the Arab woman. The fact that by Moslem tradition wives are purchased for money and valuables appears to be detrimental to endeavours in this direction. Thus, life in the Arab village is characterized by a duality of purpose. On the one hand, Arab women are taught in the village clubs how to read, write, cook, sew and take care of their babies; on the other, they have to work from sunrise to sunset in the fields, and at harvest time little girls are prevented by their fathers from attending school, in open violation of the law whose representatives must temporarily surrender to 'tradition.'

In the north, where most of the 250,000 Arabs of Isreal live, progress has been so rapid that 15 years of Israeli rule have had a greater civilizing influence than the 431 years of Ottoman and British administration. Illiteracy is disappearing, disease has been stamped out. The Arab village is becoming prosperous, more enlightened, more self-conscious and more public-minded. The deplorable necessity of retaining military government, indispensable for security considerations, cannot do away with the fact that in no Arab country anywhere in the Middle East have such strides been made in so short a time to raise an Arab generation free from the fetters of feudalism and backwardness."

Israeli's Arabs have been called the most fortunate of the Arab peoples. They share Israeli's prosperity but they also play a role in the security that must be provided for that little and still struggling state. When the Arabs of Israel will have completely abandoned their enmities and will consider themselves, as they should, full citizens, military government rule surely will be abandoned and amity will rule the land. Then perhaps the Arabs in Israel will share in the great opportunity of establishing peace for the entire area so that the standards of the Arabs' kinsmen in other lands may be elevated and a new era of social justice will rule in the Middle East.

Virginia Maple Sirup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is maple sirup time in Virginia. Yes, with all proper deference to the reputations of sister States which produce this delicacy, Virginia claims preeminence in quality and flavor for its maple sirup.

For many years, we kept this treasure to ourselves, savoring it in secret, and left the ballyhoo of commerce to maple-tree tappers elsewhere. More recently, however, we have found it possible to spare some of this superb product of the Virginia highlands for visitors to the Commonwealth. It is a pleasure, therefore, to extend an invitation from Highland County, Virginia, to attend the fifth annual Highland Maple Festival, to be held the weekends of March 16–17 and 23–24.

Highland County, which styles itself pridefully and with ample scenic reason as "The Switzerland of Virginia", is a center of maple sirup production. The Festival, concentrating on informal hospitality, is sponsored by the Highland County Chamber of Commerce. Dr. T. E. Billingsley, chairman this year, has announced that four sugar camps will be open to the public.

To see maple-sugaring operations at their best, and to taste maple sirup at its finest, therefore, the public is invited to head for Monterey, the county seat of Highland County, on one of the Festival weekends, and watch for the welcoming buckets which the Festival Committee will have in place on maple trees along the main highway leading to Monterey.

I am confident that all who accept this invitation will return home bearing a new realization that, on the basis of taste appeal, Virginia maple sirup takes first rank.

The Bishop's Pastoral Letter for Lent on Race and Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 3, 1963, the Right Reverend Austin Pardue, Episcopalian bishop of Pittsburgh, isued a pastoral letter on race and religion which was read in all parishes and missions in his diocese. I think that this letter contains thoughts on prejudice which can be helpful to persons of all faiths. The letter follows:

THE BISHOP'S PASTORAL LETTER FOR LENT ON RACE AND RELIGION

This is the season of Lent. We are called to 40 days of concentration upon the meaning of the crucifixion. A cross stands on or over every altar in our diocese.

The Lenten seasonal color is purple. It symbolizes the theme; namely, repentance. This comes from the Greek word "metanoia." It literally means to seek a change of mind; a new outlook from selfishness to unselfishness and from intolerance to understanding.

In this, the 20th year of my Consecration as your bishop, I call upon us all to repent for our sins of prejudice, intolerance, and discrimination against any race or religion. I am not speaking in anger or impatience, but in love and charity. If we harbor these sins of discrimination against race and religion, we will destroy our own souls, threaten our own bodies and contaminate our own children. If these sins are not corrected, they may well bring destruction upon our own Nation.

Scholars, the world over, tell us that the next world war will probably be a racial conflict. I have recently been on a preaching mission to south Africa and I can readily see and believe what they say as prophets of the future. We, as Christians, cannot stand by and cling to our past prejudices. As our Lord cried from His cross 2,000 years ago, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do," so now He repeats the cry as we continue in our blindness. Therefore, I ask you to make individual examinations during this season of Lent; to seek God's forgiveness for past mistakes, so that our Easter communions may be a joy to the resurrected Christ.

Will you as an individual, ask yourself the following questions?

1. Am I aware that our Lord lives in the heart of every human being on earth; that to discriminate against race or religion is hurtful to Him; that wherever a human

being is suffering, there is Christ likewise suffering?

2. Am I antagonistic when a person of another color joins my parish, sits in my pew, attends my church society, or kneels next to me at the altar rail? According to his or her reliability and devotion, am I glad to have a person of a different race on my vestry or hold a parish office?

3. In my daily work, am I willing to labor side by side in union jobs, in office posts in any kind of honest employment with decent people regardless of race or religion? Am I willing to be helpful to such persons, cooperative and understanding and to conduct myself in the spirit of Christ and the Constitution of the United States? If I am an employer, am I willing to hire those of different races when they are qualified for positions and are willing to give of their best abilities? Am I doing my best to end economic discrimination so that our free enterprise system will remain free for every willing worker? Do I want full employment for all sorts and conditions of men as long as they are honest, reliable, and industrious?

4. Am I too hard of heart to have a sense of shame when I drive through blighted areas, overcrowded slums, filthy, and deteriorated living quarters? Does my heart go out to the needs of the children and the delinquency that follows from such living conditions? Am I moved to help improve these conditions or do I simply "pass by on the other side" without care or action?

5. When people of other races move into my neighborhood, am I courteous to them or do I seek ways of preventing their presence?

6. Do I seek special privilege, regardless of my race or religion, when I lack dependability, courteous manners, and sincere willingness to work and search for truth and sound learning?

7. Am I provincial, unwilling to study the world conflicts now being fought along lines of racial and religious hatred? Have I tried to understand the consequences of spiritual blindness in racial antagonisms?

My friends, few of us will find ourselves without guilt on one or many of these questions. May we approach them with calm understanding, spiritual insight, persistent prayer, and openness of mind. May those of us who feel strongly on one side or the other of these questions, ask God to rid us of the self-righteousness that breeds a haughty air of intolerance. May we approach this issue of the hour with intellectual integrity, emotional discipline, Christ-like humility, and patriotic devotion. May we not judge some other part of the world or nation without first examining our own consciences in the community in which we now live.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

AUSTIN PARDUE,
Bishop of Pittsburgh.

No Propaganda Ministry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Rushville (Ind.) Daily Republican, issue of March 4:

NO PROPAGANDA MINISTRY

Management of the news is a growing practice in the United States. It shows up on all levels. But nowhere has it reached the proportions now being disclosed in Washington.

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, actually boasted of the way the administration had carefully timed releases to news media to produce the proper effect in the Cuban crisis. For a top administration official to declare that news is a weapon must give the free world the shudders.

Then came a directive by Sylvester to all of the Defense Department's military and civilian personnel to report to him the substance of every interview or telephone conversation with a newsman. A similar order has been put into effect by the State Department. In plain words, officials are being told not to talk to reporters.

Most disturbing is the attitude on the part of top U.S. officials that these developments reveal. They are saying that the only news American citizens should receive is that in governmental handouts. It would be easy to extend this to matters not involving U.S. security. The next step is telling selected untruths to influence public opinion.

This is a situation about which all Americans should be concerned, regardless of their political or ideological beliefs.

Employment-of-the-Handicapped Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of the two prize-winning essays in the employment-of-the-handicapped contest conducted in the great 23d Congressional District of California on the subject of "How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of the Handicapped Worker."

The first-place winner was Ralph A. Sorensen, of Lynwood, Calif., a student at Lynwood High School, who won a $50 bond, and the second-place winner was Cheree Noyon, of Compton, Calif., a student at Dominguez High School, who won a $25 bond. I am sure you join with me in complimenting these young Americans and the contest committee under the leadership of Mrs. Lillian Karnes, a distinguished veteran, now of Lakewood, Calif., but who for many years lived in the congressional district which I have the honor of representing.

The essays follow:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF THE HANDICAPPED WORKER

(By Ralph A. Sorensen)

How does my community benefit from the abilities of handicapped workers? I am proud to be a citizen of a community that has realized that the physically disabled are valuable assets, not pitiful liabilities.

"Valuable asset?" one queries. "How can can an individual, deformed or demented by war, disease, or accident, be of any practical use to anyone?" Let us look at the record. Two of the greatest military generals of history, Julius Caesar and Napoleon Bonaparte, were both epileptics. Halleyrand, Darwin, Franklin Roosevelt, Steinmetz, and Toulouse-Lautrec were all crippled, yet the philosophies, inventions and works of art of these handicapped men have changed the course of history. Ludwig von Beethoven was so deaf he could not hear a note of his symphonies, yet his music has thrilled generations. Incredible? Yes. But these are just a few of the world's celebrities who, in spite or maybe because of their disabilities, became great. The list goes on and on, each example a blow to the myth that handicapped means useless.

In our community, the situation is one of give and take—the community gives the handicapped the tools and training, and in turn reaps the harvest of an able and productive working force.

A prime example of the work being done in our community can be found in the nearby Community Rehabilitation Industries, a private foundation designed to rehabilitate the handicapped person so that he may face the world again with as much to offer as the next man. Inside the walls of this center can be found men, some crippled, some blind or deaf, yet all performing tasks that benefit themselves and their communities. For these men are re-learning to perform simple tasks that they once performed without a second thought until fate struck them down. When they graduate from the center, as have over 200 persons, they will move into industry as very capable employees. Community Rehabilitation Industries is but one of several such organizations in our area, both State and private, all with the purpose of tapping this oft neglected resource.

Our community today is a better place in which to live because of the abilities of handicapped workers. When it becomes common knowledge that the handicapped worker is an able, diligent, and productive member of society; when man realizes that the physically disabled person is an asset to his community, rather than a millstone around the community's economy; then the entire world will be a better place in which to live.

NOT CHARITY—BUT A CHANCE

(By Cheree Noyon)

The handicapped are not first blind or deaf or crippled; they are first human beings. This means they should not be designated as a faceless mass, but rather judged as individuals. Many times we have a tendency to forget that the deaf or blind are not all alike, that they all have personalities and skills of their own.

These people do not like to be lumped together, pitied and predjudiced against. They want to prove their worth as individuals, and they are determined to have an equal chance. Being handicapped seems to endow them with a will. They work harder and better at their jobs. They are more careful in industrial work knowing well what kind of consequences an accident may have. They are also very conscientious, because there are few second chances for the handicapped in employment. Their roles in society are useful and varied. They range from housewives, draftsmen and industrial workers to authors, artists, lecturers, and teachers. They fulfill their roles as well or better than anyone.

It is a mistake to single out the handicapped as objects of pity. For they do not want pity or charity—only an equal chance. The odds against them are high, therefore their triumphs are double victories. They must have spirit and they do. Beethoven did much of his greatest work after he had lost his hearing. When he realized he would be deaf, he bravely challenged, "I shall take fate by the throat." And that he did. He wrote the most beautiful, powerful music the world has heard. He wrote it without ears—from his heart. He is a wonderful example of a great man with perseverance, strength and soul. He should serve as a lesson to us that even though the handi-

capped have physical deficiencies, their souls and minds are sound and true. They are courageous, faithful people and there are no finer virtues than these. Helen Keller, Frances Butler, Helen Morgan, and many others surmounted seemingly impossible odds to become useful contributors to our culture. These people are certainly not to be pitied but honored and respected. Why then should be pity others so afflicted?

The handicapped often have to cope with pitying stares and comments. It is to their credit they receive these calmly and even with humor. There is a story of a disabled Korean veteran who had lost one of his legs.[1] At the hospital where he was convalescing, a woman looked at him with too obvious pity and exclaimed, "Why you poor boy. You've lost your leg." This would have been a very embarrassing moment for the GI, but he was equal to the situation and responded with a tone of surprise while glancing at his leg, "Why I'll be doggoned if I haven't."

The handicapped's biggest problem is society's general condescending opinion toward them. In order to eliminate this feeling, it is necessary to promote understanding. This can only be done by interaction between them and general society. The Paul Binner classes of today's public schools are a start. Here deaf children attend the same schools as the other students. Through association students learn to regard the deaf and dumb not with aversion or pity; they learn to accept them as individuals just like themselves. We need more education of the public in these matters.

Where there is understanding there is no fear. And it is true we often fear the handicapped. We do not know how to treat them. We feel somehow they ought to be treated differently from other people. This is not so. Try to imagine yourself as a handicapped person. Would you be any less a person? Would you feel less, care less, understand less?

They don't either.

[1] Reader's Digest, December 1955.

Cook County Group Backs Antidetergent Pollution Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the widespread support for legislation to prevent continued detergent pollution in America is a reflection of the seriousness with which the people of this country view this growing problem.

Groups that have focused their attention on the Nation's water resources have been in the forefront of those endorsing the efforts to force a switch to decomposable detergents.

Such a group is the Cook County Clean Streams Committee. Because the feelings of this group are typical of those of organizations in other metropolitan centers, I particularly call the Cook County committee's stand to the attention of Members representing urban areas.

Excerpts from their statement follow:

Our Cook County Clean Streams Committee is delighted to learn that you have introduced into Congress H.R. 2105, which, if passed, would make it unlawful to import into the United States or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce, any detergent after June 30, 1965, unless such detergent conforms with standards of decomposability prescribed pursuant to section 3 of this act.

The rapidly growing use of detergents in the United States is making our rivers and streams not only unsightly but also is threatening the purity of our water supplies. We feel that H.R. 2105 is a sorely needed measure that should receive the full support of the Izaak Walton League, sportsmen's clubs, and all organizations interested maintaining pure water supplies. We shall do all that we can to support this measure.

I would note that the approach embodied in H.R. 2105 together with amendments to add to the effectiveness of the legislation have been included in a new antidetergent pollution bill, H.R. 4571.

People Have No Intention of Keeping Quiet When They Feel Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days when there is so much controversy over Cuba it is of considerable interest to read the views of responsible people in Florida who are so close to the situation. One of the best statements I have read in recent weeks is expressed in the editorial of Jack Gore in the Fort Lauderdale News of February 12.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that others may benefit from its message:

PEOPLE HAVE NO INTENTION OF KEEPING QUIET WHEN THEY FEEL THREATENED

The appeal voiced by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball this past Sunday night for Americans to stop talking so much about the Cuban situation and sit back and let it develop, emphasizes once again the important role that public opinion plays in the determination of national policies

Under Secretary Ball strongly believes that now that all the facts about the Cuban deal have been given to Congress and the public everybody should unite in a common shell, keep their traps shut and throw their unlimited support behind our Government's efforts to resolve the situation.

In ordinary circumstances Ball's advice would be very sound counsel well worth heeding. But this advice presupposes something that just does not exist in the Cuban situation. It presumes that our Government is taking direct and forceful action to protect the interests of the citizens it represents and that a great majority of these citizens are well satisfied with the results that have accrued from this action.

We wish this were true but the commotion that is currently being raised over Cuba signifies just the opposite, and a large part of this commotion is being engendered by people who don't have any political axes to grind but who are definitely interested in preserving basic policies this Nation has followed for a good many years.

There are, we think, just as many Democrats as Republicans interested in trying to find out what has happened to the Monroe Doctrine these past few months. We wouldn't call abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine a partisan political issue. Yet, to hear some people talk today, anybody who brings up such a basic question is trying to make political fodder out of the Cuban situation.

We have always felt that partisan politics should stop where the real security of this Nation begins. Thus, anything that affects the security of this country, in our book, should be argued not on a political basis but on an America first basis.

People can disagree with national policies that affect our security without being considered disloyal. In fact, we think they not only have a right but a responsibility to do just this as we haven't yet reached the point in this Nation where a political administration's word is the law and everybody has to bow and scrape before it.

It is argued that all the current furor over Cuba is apt to create the impression abroad that we are a disunited people not capable of throwing our shoulders behind a common wheel. But, in this respect, we are like two brothers fighting among themselves but who can and do instantly unite when they are threatened by an outside force.

Fortunately, in our political system, the force of public opinion cannot be ignored too long. When it is mustered behind any given objective it can literally move anything before it including a stubborn Congress, a muddle-headed State Department or a recalcitrant administration.

It was public opinion, as evidenced by a rising furor in the Congress, that eventually forced administration officials to suddenly change their tune last fall and recognize the seriousness of the growing Russian missile threat in Cuba before it was too late. Now, it is public opinion again which has once more forced administration officials to come out in the open and admit facts which, if they had their way, would be better left covered up.

All this goes far beyond partisan politics. It is not just Republicans or Democrats who are threatened by the growing Soviet menace in Cuba and the rest of the Caribbean. It is America and Americans and anytime anybody starts playing politics with their security it is time to call a halt to such a dangerous game.

Personally, we don't give a whit whether the Cuban problem started primarily with the Eisenhower or the Kennedy administration. This is water under the dam and bickering over this serves no useful purpose beyond a certain point. But we do care about what is or isn't being done about the Cuban problem right now, and so should every other American who is the least bit interested in winning the fight against communism.

If this administration has committed itself to scrapping the Monroe Doctrine and living with a Communist bastion 90 miles from our shores then it ought to have the guts to say as much instead of beating around the bush. If it hasn't scrapped the Monroe Doctrine as the basic policy of our country then it is time not only to say this forthrightly but to take firm action to give its words weight.

People get confused and petulant primarily when they don't know or can't find out in just which direction their leaders are taking them and their country. That is why Americans are confused and petulant right now. They see an admitted menace to their security in their backyard but they see little being done about it. They want something done, and until they have some clear evidence that it is being done, we doubt they will take Undersecretary George W. Ball's advice to stop asking embarrassing questions of the administration.

JACK W. GORE.

Agricultural Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, Editor Dick Hanson, in the January 1963 issue of Successful Farming, has come up with some very interesting observations on agricultural price fixing.

A well-informed and highly regarded farmer, one of the many in my district, says every Congressman and farmer in the country should read it. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Hanson's column follows:

Many people believe that agricultural price fixing is a relatively new idea. The facts of the case are that price fixing in agriculture is as old as agriculture itself. And, almost without exception, government price fixing attempts in the agricultural economy have eventually ended in failure.

I recently received a copy of a report issued by the USDA's Bureau of Agricultural Economics in 1922. The report is entitled "Food Control During 46 Centuries," and I thought you would be interested, as I was, in reading part of the summary of this report.

"The history of government limitation of price seems to teach one clear lesson: That in attempting to ease the burdens of the people in a time of high prices by artificially setting a limit to them, the people are not relieved but only exchange one set of ills for another which is greater. Among these ills are (1) the withholding of goods from the market, because consumers being in the majority, price fixing is usually in their interest; (2) the dividing of the community into two hostile camps, one only of which considers that the government acts in its interest; (3) the practical difficulties of enforcing such limitation in prices which in the very nature of the case requires the cooperation of both producer and consumer to make it effective.

"Egypt took entire control of the grain trade and saved the people from starvation, but took over the land in return.

"Athens regulated the grain trade and set prices by legal enactment but found herself unable to enforce them.

"Rome made a colossal experiment in controlling prices by legal enactment, but it utterly failed.

"Great Britain had on her statute books laws fixing the price of bread continuously for more than 500 years. The price of wheat, fish, and wine was also regulated, but all such laws were abrogated in 1815, because of their failure to accomplish the purpose for which they were designed.

"Antwerp was overthrown in 1585, and at least one historian of note declares that price-fixing legislation was largely responsible for its downfall.

"India has learned in the hard school of experience that even in times of famine, price fixing is a very dangerous expedient because it removes one of the most powerful checks on consumption; namely, high prices.

"The colonial United States tried the same experiment at various places and times but failed utterly to secure satisfactory results.

"Revolutionary France tried the same measures, but the protagonists of the movement perished on the guillotine."

One of my college history teachers always started his first lecture of the year by telling the class, "History is the study of man's successes and failures, but pay closest attention to man's failures, you'll learn more from them."

It appears today that too many agriculturally influential people in and out of government have failed completely to study their history lessons.

Republic of Guatemala Calls for Consolidation and Full Implementation of the Monroe Doctrine Before the Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to see that the Republic of Guatemala called for the consolidation of the Monroe Doctrine in the Organization of American States recently and I believe the remarks are worthy of consideration by all the Members of the House.

I am therefore requesting that the remarks be reprinted in the RECORD, particularly in view of my introduction of the Monroe Doctrine resolution, House Joint Resolution 227, calling for its implementation.

It is my hope that the leadership of Guatemala, in calling for adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, will provide the Kennedy administration with clear evidence that Latin American countries do not want this document thrown in the ash can, nor do they want the Khrushchev coexistence doctrine substituted for it, particularly as it relates to Cuba and Communist subversion in this hemisphere.

The text of "The consolidation of the Monroe Doctrine as proposed to the peoples of the Americas by the Republic of Guatemala in Central America through the offices of the Organization of American States" follows:

GUATEMALA, CENTRAL AMERICA,
January 1, 1963.

To the Honorable President of the Council of the Organization of American States, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

EXCELLENCY: As President of the Republic of Guatemala, I wish to convey through Your Excellency my admiration and cordial greetings to the Council of the Organization of American States, conclave of hemisphere personalities that so wisely interprets the will of our peoples.

THE EFFICIENCY OF THE OAS

Proof of the wisdom of the Organization of American States is the result of the Punta del Este Conference held in January last year, which reinforced the democratic and freedom-loving system enjoyed by our peoples.

That notable example moves me to address myself to this sanctuary of Pan Americanism, to reiterate before you the opinion held by Guatemala about the necessity of making the Americas into truly free lands, rid of colonial pressures of any kind.

COLONIAL ERA IN THE AMERICAS

We must remember that the countries that make up our hemisphere are one in origin, one in experience, one in tradition; and that they were all formed at about the same period. We all were subdued through the conquest of our lands by Europeans who, ever since the time of Columbus discovery, came here seeking wealth and power. The greed and bloodthirstiness of those colonizers may perhaps be at the root of the growth throughout the Americas of a unanimous will to liberty, to full and total liberty.

The precarious title Spain held as a consequence of the discovery of America moved the other European powers to grab as large a portion of the new continent as they could. The decisive hierarchy of the Pope divided the New World between Spain and Portugal by the line of a meridian, a decision that was respected by those two governments. But the wave of conquest unleashed by other rival nations carried them even to vile piracy in their immoderate lust for wealth and aggrandizement.

Their scorn for the aborigines of America, who were classified and exploited as beasts of burden, followed later by their discrimination against the Creoles, were catalytic agents in the formation of our hemispheric sense of nationality and our determination that all slaves should be set free in America and that this land should become the paradise of free men.

At the end of the 18th century, and beginning of the 19th century, we began to cast off the chains that bound us to our European despoilers. It was not an easy independence. The blood of our people, the long sacrifices, the painful process of adaptation to a new way of life, paid for it. Our great leaders, Bolivar and Washington, San Martin and O'Higgins, Hidalgo and Morelos, and the fathers of Central American independence, cast the mold for our American nationality; sturdy, heroic, courageous, determined, and above all, free.

The independence of America was not easily accepted by the old usurpers of our land, who made several attempts to recapture the domains which were then breaking away from them drawn by the overpowering urge for freedom.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Interpreting the thinking of statesmen of the stature of John Quincy Adams, Jefferson, and Madison, President James Monroe of the United States of America proclaimed in his famous address to Congress, in 1823, that the American Continent, because of the free and independent status it had assumed and maintained, could not thenceforth be considered as subject to future colonization by any European power, and added that any attempt to extend the colonial system to any portion of this hemisphere would be considered as dangerous to the peace and safety of his nation.

That message fulfilled its purpose by setting the foreign policy guidelines of the great nation of the North, as regards European colonialism.

Later on, that unilateral declaration gradually took on more and more important meaning, until it came to be known as the "Monroe Doctrine" and constituted a basic tenet of international American law, with full hemispheric scope.

Europe only partially understood the warning implicit in the Monroe Doctrine, and for British diplomacy it was not until 80 years later, in 1903, that the Duke of Devonshire declared that His British Majesty's Government "accepted the Monroe Doctrine without reserves," possibly because its appetite for colonizing in the New World had already been satiated.

THE DOCTRINE CRACKED

There are other great and flagrant breaches of the Monroe Doctrine, such as that of an empire in Brazil supported by Portuguese bayonets, and the formation of an empire in Mexico imposed by the troops of Emperor Napoleon III of France (1861–67). Thank

heaven, both vanished and were entirely wiped off the political map of America.

THE DEGRADING TREATIES

There were, nevertheless, lamentable exceptions such as that of the unsavory Dallas-Clarendon treaty, about which I shall make some comments.

As a specific complement to the Monroe Doctrine, the United States of America in 1850 signed the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty with Great Britain to put a stop to British colonial expansion in Central America. British greed, however, did not relent and was able cunningly to inveigle Washington into signing another instrument, the Dallas-Clarendon treaty, in 1856, executed behind Guatemala's back, by which both powers arbitrarily fixed the boundaries of the settlement of Belice (over which Great Britain had, and presently has, no valid title), and extended such boundaries to the Sarstoon River, a zone theretofore not occupied by Great Britain.

The arbitrary establishment of such boundaries without the consent of the affected country—Guatemala—encouraged Great Britain to expand its abusive occupation, and left by country standing alone, weak and defenseless against the ever-increasing onslaught of British pressures.

Notwithstanding its legal invalidity, that treaty expressed the policy of the signatory nations, silenced U.S.' opposition to the expansion of colonialism in America and was the efficient forerunner of the Anglo-Guatemalan Convention of 1859, at which my country was coerced into accepting the terms imposed by that injurious instrument.

LET US STRENGTHEN THE DOCTRINE

If for over a century and a half the Monroe Doctrine has been unable to extirpate the gangrene of colonialism from America, it becomes imperative, as well as undeferable for the good of our hemisphere's destiny, to consolidate it with measures of inter-American scope that can give it a new direction and new dynamics, make it effective and put it in harmony with the anticolonial resolutions adopted at inter-American conferences over the past 20 years.

The conquering countries were not, in fact, schools of democracy. Instead of trying to stimulate the new political trends locally in order to raise the Indian populations' cultural and ideological level out of its stagnation, they have kept them in a state of forced inertia by punishing whoever struggled for freedom. This is the reason for the deplorable backwardness and ignorance in which many of the peoples of America who were subjugated by extracontinental powers still live today, in spite of the much used trick of disguising the colonial regime with empty names devoid of real significance and minted only to flatter the Creoles candid pride.

Therefore, it is not redundant to say, since it is true, that the historical process of emancipation of the Americas cannot be complete as long as there remain areas subject to colonialism in this hemisphere. Colonialism holds peoples in a state of spiritual and economic subordination that curbs their intellectual progress and becomes the breeding ground of open dissatisfaction. These constitute "cracks" in the inter-American system, through which Communist-inspired ideologies and combat methods, both foreign to our continent's vital interests, can and do infiltrate. For that reason it will be very difficult, while colonies subsist in America, to give strength to the democratic front which fights the bloody, anti-Christian totalitarianism.

We must, as a consequence, repair those cracks in the inter-American system by putting an end to colonialism, whose survival is incompatible with the ideals of America. It contravenes the principles proclaimed at numerous inter-American conferences and undermines continental unity, which is a basic condition for guaranteeing our security and the benefits of peace, progress, and liberty. Colonialism and American collective welfare are opposite terms.

GUATEMALA PROPOSES

Guatemala considers it a signal honor to be a country that has insistently demanded the abolition of colonialism. We regret to acknowledge that up to now, very little has been achieved through the agreements and pronouncements on the matter that have derived from the inter-American meetings and, specially, through the inspired 33d resolution of the 9th American International Conference of 1948, which proclaims that "it is a just aspiration of the American Republics that colonialism and the occupation of American territories by extracontinental countries should be brought to an end."

WOUNDS SUFFERED BY THE DOCTRINE

The freedom-loving conscience of the American nations is wounded by several facts that point up the futility of that important statement. Suffice it to recall the creation of the entity originally known as "Anglo-American Committee for the Caribbean," organized on March 9, 1942, to facilitate the development of the American and British dependencies in the Caribbean area, which committee was later enlarged through an international agreement of October 30, 1946, made effective August 8, 1948, to include the colonies of France and the Netherlands. This fact caused the Committee's name to be changed to conceal its ends of supporting the British, French, and Netherlands colonies in that zone of the Caribbean, embedded in the very heart of America. This is why it has since 1946 been called the "Caribbean Commission." That commission is a body blow to the "just aspirations of the American Republics," firmly determined as they are to put an end to the colonialism that is still represented by several multiform blotches on the map of our continent.

THE DOCTRINE, A MYTH

Within the clear geographical, sociological, and ethnical boundaries of America, where our devotion to liberty makes us stand out, and differentiates us from other races; here, in the very land of freedom, there are yet many thousands of human beings who live under the European colonial boot. When their dreams of freedom become manifest, they are immediately handcuffed with the "sound reasoning" of European bayonets which are rushed to the theater of events to suffocate those demonstrations; and all attempts to throw off the colonial yoke are either placated with ever unfulfilled promises, or wrapped up in a silk-lined cage called Commonwealth.

In those cases where American countries hold a just title over a portion of land unlawfully held by a European country, all claims are ignored, all attempts toward a solution shatter against the colonial policy of the Old World where every clamor for liberty falls on deaf ears.

Over the southern end of the continent, in the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, a European flag waves. Over part of the territory and islands of Venezuela the same colors fly. Over Belize, unredeemed land of Guatemala, that same emblem offends the American sky.

And in the meantime, nothing is being done to return those lands to their rightful owners, the peoples of this Hemisphere.

Are we not aware of the fatc that the Bermuda Islands, close to the coast of the United States of America, and the Bahamas a little farther down, are indivisible geographical parts of North America? In them, military bases were established for the defense of this Hemisphere. But this should not occur in lands leased for 99 years, but rather in lands over which should wave the same flag carried by those glorious soldiers of 1776 in New Providence.

Or, can we be overlooking the fact that those, too, are lands of America, of these countries we so proudly call lands of freedom?

This remnant, incompatible with our way of living, has been the object of much preoccupation and work at the Organization of American States. It has been discussed at Inter-American conferences and at consultative meetings; it has promoted the creation of the American Commission of Non-Self-Governing Territories, and it has brought about the issuance of several inspired resolutions.

THE DOCTRINE, AN ABUSE OF LYRICISM

Since the first consultative meeting in 1939, and on through the act of Havana in which the matter was treated as incidental in relation to the war, and more especially at the 9th Conference held in Bogotá in 1948, and in Caracas in the 10th Conference of 1954, this subject was discussed at length. Guatemala's position in this respect is well known and clear, and we are proud of the fact that our position is unyielding.

But what is the use in solemnly declaring in Resolution XCVI of the 10th Conference that "it is the will of the peoples of America that colonialism maintained against the desire of peoples and the occupation of territories, be definitely ended" or what is the practical purpose in declaring "the necessity that the extracontinental countries having colonies in the territory of America not delay in carrying to completion the measures contained in the provisions of the United Nations Charter in order to make it possible for the respective peoples to exercise fully their right of self-determination, so that colonialism in America shall be definitely eliminated," as that brilliant but ineffectual Resolution XCVII of the same Conference reads?

The resolutions issued by our Organization of American States must not remain only as a florid phrases contained in the final act of a conference, to be perhaps repeated in the next conference. This is incompatible with the dynamics which should govern the American States; and it is not possible that "will of the peoples" remain only written in a document while, year after year, thousands of men in America continue to be subjects of European powers.

Guatemala believes that the juridical principles which serve as basis for the undeferable necessity of bringing to an end all colonial systems in this continent are irrefutable, and that it is already imperative to insist upon them. We all know that colonies and foreign territories must disappear from the map of this hemisphere. And since we know it, since we are fully convinced that is so and we have so declared repeatedly, why do we not execute the will of the peoples, as it is our duty to do?

THE NEW MONROE DOCTRINE

During the 20th century, no more European aggressors arrived to invade American lands. However, many colonial-minded Europeans who invaded our mainland and islands since the discovery of America have remained embedded in its soil, and some apparently free American peoples, are still trapped within the webs of a "commonwealth," and other territories have been incorporated into European nations through ephemeral political constitutions. The Monroe Doctrine should no longer aim only at preventing the arrival of more European colonialists, but at making all European colonialists now holding American territory unlawfully, abandon the hemisphere once and for all, thereby leaving its sons, its peoples, and its territories truly and completely free of their material and political influence. This is the consolidation of the Monroe Doctrine and must also include the present case of Cuba.

The former aborigines did not summon the Spaniards, the Portuguese, or the British; it was the latter who subdued and took exclu-

sive possession of these territories by force of arms, which were the product of a more advanced civilization. But the case of Cuba is entirely different. Cubans who seized power by force of arms and who have not been supported by the vote of the people have summoned a European and Asiatic nation, Russia, not merely to defend them with enormous war armaments and political ammunition, but also to establish a bridgehead for the political and military subjugation of the Americas.

ITS CONSOLIDATION

In order to be consolidated, therefore, the Monroe Doctrine must also embrace the solution for this new, serious and perilous aspect.

The Monroe Doctrine must be consolidated. The already consecrated motto "America for the Americans" must be complemented with the command: European colonialists, get out of America.

To accomplish this noble purpose, the colonial territories under dispute should be incorporated into the American nations to which they correspond, pursuant to applicable regulations.

To the same end, Guatemala maintains that the other colonies not claimed by American nations, which are as yet incapable of self-government, must be placed under a transitional regime which guarantees the future independence of their peoples, and remain temporarily under the trusteeship of the Organization of American States.

Such a regime would permit those countries within whose corresponding geographical areas those colonies belong to cooperate in the overall progress of the later. For this purpose, it will be indispensable that the colonial authorities withdraw after delegating their powers to ad hoc committees appointed with the help of the Organization of American States, in order insure the neutrality of the new provisional administration, with absolute exclusion of high officials of any extracontinental power.

Only in this manner can the aspirations of the American countries be attained, and the progress and well-being of the peoples still under the sterile tutelage of European countries be stimulated. Only in this manner will the injustice of colonialism be definitively eradicated from this land of freedom which is America.

And with respect to the frightful case of Cuba, if we still have any self-respect and sense of honor to comply with our international commitments to which we have affixed our signatures, the Americas have no other alternative than to enforce the treaties of Rio de Janeiro, and one and all, if need be, with bayonets fixed, clean out the Europeans and Asiatics from the swamps and legendary cities of the unfortunate island of Cuba.

Only in this manner will it be possible to obliterate foreign serfdom and bring to a successful conclusion the historical process of the emancipation of America.

Accept, Excellency, the expressions of my most distinguished consideration.

For a consolidated Monroe Doctrine: America for the Americans. European colonialists get out of America.

In the name of the Republic of Guatemala in Central America,

MIGUEL YDIGORAS FUENTES,
President of Guatemala.

Law and Order in the House

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I venture to add a new Member's word of appreciation to the eloquent and fully merited tributes which have been paid here today to the distinguished Parliamentarian of the House, Mr. Lewis Deschler.

Many a new member has learned early in his service here that at least a modest working knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House is essential to his comprehension of the lawmaking process and his appropriate role in it. He is heartened to find that he is not without willing assistance in this effort at self-education.

Mr. Deschler is affable, patient and, above all, rich in knowledge of form and precedent. One realizes quickly that 35 years of service have not dulled his enthusiasm for his work, or his pride in the responsibilities assigned him.

Every Member of the House, I am sure, is secure in the recognition that Mr. Deschler's counsel is available to all, and is given conscientiously, impartially and wisely.

An Amendment To Lower the Draft Age to 22

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week when H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the Universal Training and Service Act for another 4 years, comes up for action before the House, it is my intention to introduce an amendment which would reduce the draft age to 22.

Under existing law, all young men, ages 18½ to 26, must register under the selective service program.

Testimony before the Armed Services Committee during 2 days of hearings on this very important bill discloses that while there are more than 10 million American youths now registered under the draft and while an additional 1,500,000 more young men who reach the registration age of 18½ annually are added to the list of those eligible for the draft, only 76,000 American youths are expected to be drafted during the current fiscal year. Assistant Defense Secretary Norman Paul, the Pentagon manpower chief, estimated that about 90,000 young men would be drafted during each of the next 4 years if current Army strength is maintained.

It appears to me somewhat cruel and illogical to subject more than 10 million American young men to the shadow of the draft for a period of 7½ years when we only take an infinitesimal fraction of these young men into the Army every year.

It might be well to point out that of the 76,000 young men who will be drafted this fiscal year, nearly half of those drafted will have volunteered for induction so that actually, Mr. Speaker, we are drafting into military service in this country at this time 38,000 young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure we are all very much impressed with the depth of concern and understanding President Kennedy has shown for the young people of America. The President has proposed various programs to Congress to try to alleviate the problems of unemployment among young people in this Nation.

It is significant to note that out of 4 million people unemployed in this country, 800,000 of these are young men of draft age. These young men constitute the largest single group of unemployed in this country, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Selective Service Act in its present form has seriously contributed toward this large rate of unemployment among our young people.

As a member of the House Committee on Labor, I have had an opportunity to study this entire subject of unemployment among our young people; and several witnesses, men high in this Government, have agreed that employers are reluctant to hire young men of draft age for two basic reasons:

First. An employer is reluctant to invest in the training of a young worker whom he will lose to the military service within a relatively short time.

Second. Employers do not like to commit themselves to keeping a job open for 2 years, as required under the law, when a young man is drafted into the service.

This second point is extremely important to remember. I have talked to employers who have stated they could reconcile themselves to the idea that when they hire a man of draft age they may lose him to the military but their great objection is that when this young worker does go into the service, the employer must freeze this job for 2 years so that it will be available to the young man when he returns from military service. If an employer hires another worker to fill the gap, he is confronted with a difficult decision of either carrying both these workers when the selectee returns or dismissing the second worker, even though his work may be acceptable.

I have talked to many young men in my district of 1-A status who have told me the first question they are asked when they apply for a job is their draft status. These young men have stated that when they tell a potential employer they are 1-A, they are politely told that there is no work available for them.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with human beings, not chattels, in this legislation. These are young Americans who I am sure are perfectly willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary, just as have their forebears, in the defense of freedom and survival of America. I don't know of a single young man who has tried to intentionally or willfully shirk his responsibility to his country. On the contrary, many of these young men have come to me and stated they want to volunteer for military service so they can get their 2 years over with as quickly as possible; but in many instances throughout the country, even those who want to volunteer for the 2-year enlistment under the draft have to wait for a very long time before sufficient quota numbers are available for 2-year voluntary enlistment.

It appears to me that the amendment which I intend to offer would in no way

disturb the present defense establishment. My amendment provides that:

After July 1, 1963, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this Act except as provided in section 4(1) and section 6(h) of this title, after he has attained the age of 22 years. This paragraph shall not apply during any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.

It is clear from this amendment that the stimulus which the Defense Department claims it needs to encourage young Americans to volunteer for military service would remain. Certainly those Americans between the ages of 18½ and 22 who do not want to take their chance on being drafted would continue to volunteer for any of the defense services as they do at the present time.

Under my amendment, anytime the President felt we needed more young men than are being drafted, he could restore this Act to its original status with all of its present provisions simply by declaring the need for a return to the original legislation.

My amendment in no way disturbs the present system of deferments, and those young men who want to go on to college to continue their education would continue getting the same deferments as they do under existing law.

The only change that would occur under my amendment is that an estimated 2,500,000 Americans who now must wait before they are called up for duty would be exempt after they reach the age of 22.

The practical effect of this amendment would be that those young Americans who are not called up for military duty before they reach their 22d birthday could then proceed to plan their lives in an orderly manner and could also have new job opportunities made available to them. They would remain registered under the draft, however, for any possible national emergency when, of course, all Americans would respond.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the argument presented by the Defense Department that any changes in the present Selective Service System would reduce the voluntary enlistments which constitute the overwhelming majority of our military personnel.

Secretary Paul told the Armed Services Committee that it is the local obligation for military service that has enabled the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps to maintain their strength for years without using the draft, and for the Army to maintain a force of five volunteers to each draftee in recent years. Mr. Paul believes that without the spur of the draft, the armed services would be unable to fill the National Guard and Reserve ranks, the ROTC route to officer status, or get enough doctors and dentists to care for the men in uniform.

It would appear to me that my amendment would in no way disturb this conclusion. But my amendment would help the military get the type of soldier it needs more efficiently.

It should be a source of great concern to us that out of 1,110,000 Americans who became 26 years old last year, 300,000 or 27 percent were ruled physically or mentally unfit under our present service requirements; 11 percent or 130,000 were permanently deferred because they were fathers; and 40,000 or 4 percent held student or other deferments.

While it is true that 640,000 or 58 percent of this group of 1,110,000 who became 26 had had or were undergoing military service, this particular group represents less than 60 percent of the total. From these figures we gather that as these men become older, their potential use to the Armed Forces diminishes in direct proportion.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our present policy of drafting men up to the age of 26 is wasteful and creates indescribable sociological problems in this country.

It is wasteful because I am sure we can all agree that a man in his middle 20's does not have the stamina to stand up to basic military training as the young man in his teens. Under present law we are faced with this dilemma of providing the military with selectees whose average age gets higher every year, when in the modern Armed Forces of America the great need is for younger men with greater stamina. It is unfortunate that the Pentagon has not been able, or willing, to face up to this reality.

If we are to talk about inequities under the present act, I should like to cite a figure which appeared in the Washington Post on March 6, which revealed a total of 123,000 men above the age of 26 who now hold no deferment of any kind but are not being called because the Army wants younger men. These men who are put near the potential of the induction priority system escaped induction at the normal 23-year-old induction age because they then held deferments and did not lose them until they were past 26.

Mr. Speaker, the present act imposes an unfair burden on draft boards throughout America. These draft boards realize the tremendous backlog of potential selectees that is building up in their respective communities. It is entirely conceivable that these draft boards would want to draft younger men to meet the modern needs of the services. However, under the present law the draft board has no choice but to take the selectees off the top, and as a result, older men are being called up.

Recently my attention was called to a dire ctive sent out by the State selective service director in Illinois, in which he urged local draft boards to be as lenient as possible in granting deferments because of the tremendous backlog of potential selectees that is being built up in this one State alone. His directive stated that as of last September, there were 60,000 young men registered under the draft in the State of Illinois between the ages of 18½ and 26 classified as 1-A. The State's draft quota has been averaging around 260 selectees for the entire State of Illinois, and half of this monthly quota was being filled by volunteers. We are receiving several thousand new registrants every month, and so the State director called this problem to the attention of local draft boards. He pointed out in his directive that the State of Illinois was compelled to select men at the age of 23, 24, and 25 to fill the meager State quota when in fact the military is asking for younger men.

I am sure the same problem exists in every State in the Union.

Under the amendment which I intend to propose, it is true that younger men would be selected. But it is also true that those who are not called by the time they reach their 22d birthday would in fact be able to plan their future in a more orderly manner unless some major catastrophe beset this country.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will not in any way interfere with the present impetus to get volunteers. However, I would not be fair with myself and my constituents if I did not take this opportunity to register a strong protest against the manner in which the Defense Department has been conducting its recruitment program.

In this period of labor surplus in America, I feel sure thousands more of our young men would give serious consideration to voluntary enlistments in the military service if the recruiting program was being carried out in a more effective manner. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that some of the recruiting practices now border on sheer fraud, and the word has gotten around to the young men in this country that those fancy posters which the military uses to induce enlistments too often cannot be believed.

Just the other day I had one of my constituents fly to Washington from Germany at his own expense. I believe he told me it cost him $390 of his own money for air passage to fly to Washington during his furlough to try to unscramble his mixed up military career. This young man volunteered a year and a half ago under the 3-year voluntary enlistment program, which has as its slogan, "Choice—not chance." This young man was attracted to voluntary service because he had been told if he volunteers for 3 years, he can select his assignment and the school he wants to attend. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that I must report to this House that during the past year and a half, while stationed in Germany, this young man's glamorous assignment was to serve as an orderly in a recreation barracks. It should come as no surprise that under these circumstances, a soldier can become very bitter and pose serious discipline problems to the military.

I have any number of letters, and I am sure other Members have similar letters, from young men who have been attracted to the military service by these fine slogans and multicolored signs on how one can get a career in the military service—only to find when they signed on the dotted line, that they were misled.

If the military wants to increase voluntary enlistments, let the Defense Department take a hard look at its recruiting practices and let it assure young Americans that the least they can do is have faith and confidence in the integrity of the military service for which they volunteer.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm hope that the House will face up to the problem we have in America today. The Armed Services Committee itself admits that

surely by 1967, basic changes will have to be made in this entire approach of selective service. Their own statistics show that by that time the post World War II bumper baby crop will have reached military age, and there will be far more men available than the Armed Forces of the present size could use, allowing for father, student, and other deferment policies.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we need not wait 4 years. The House ought to face up to the problem today because we already have more than 10 million men whose lives are being seriously disrupted. I do not know of a single one of these young men who would want to avoid his responsibility to his country, and I am sure these young men are not seeking any avoidance of their military responsibility. But the point is crystal clear that it is a mathematical impossibility for these young men to be called up during their early years because of a system that is erroneous in its basic premise. Millions of these young men cannot make adequate plans for the future.

I served in World War II. I volunteered long before Pearl Harbor and so, Mr. Speaker, I never was a part of the draft. Should this Nation go to war again, I certainly would not hesitate to again offer my services. I mention this merely to emphasize that I am fully aware of the great sacrifice men who serve our country make, and I have the highest respect for these men. But keeping the draft age in its present form from 18½ to 26 in my judgment does not serve the best interest of the country and creates not only unemployment problems, but to a certain extent, Mr. Speaker, accelerates our rate of juvenile delinquency. It would not surprise me one bit to find a direct correlation between this inability to get jobs among young men, on the one hand, and their decision through restlessness to follow a path to young delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will accept the amendment, particularly since the President can negate this action at any time he feels that a reduction in draft age is either impeding voluntary enlistments of there exists a need for larger numbers for military personnel. We are the only nation in the world that drafts men into the Army at the ripe age of 26, all other nations draft their soldiers at much lower ages, is not it time we ended this foolishness and folly. I hope we do by adopting my amendment.

Kennedy's Proposed Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the concern over the proposed budget and its involvements is brought out quite vividly by the following editorial from Farm and Ranch magazine:

KENNEDY'S PROPOSED BUDGET

(By Thomas J. Anderson)

The Eskimos are very experienced in dealing with wolf packs. They plant—handle-down—razor-sharp knives in the ice, and rub the blades generously with seal blood. The wolves small the blood, lick the knives and cut their tongues. This brings on a seemingly inexhaustible supply of good, warm blood—free. And the wolves stand there licking, until they drop in their tracks from loss of blood and freeze to death in the snow.

The Eskimos on the Potomac have had their knives out for us for years and we are licking away something even more precious than blood—our freedom. Federal aid is Federal control. Federal aid is our own blood, a continuous transfusion in which the bureaucrats keep one-third for their own use.

In America today, one-fourth of the people are living off the other three-fourths, completely or partially. In Socialist America 48 million people get regular Government checks. That's roughly—and it is rough on those of us who pay the bills and don't get any—one out of every two households in America.

Kennedy's proposed budget and demand for more spending and less taxes is immoral, since it requires public theft, not only from us but from unborn generations.

If taxes are cut as the President desires, the deficit will doubtless run to $15 billion. This means increasing the debt limit again. But so what? As the Socialists say, "We owe it to ourselves." Lord Keynes, the British Socialist, sold this philosophy to the late Eleanor Roosevelt's late cousin-husband, and the destruction of American freedom was underway.

The Socialists in control of our country have no intention of balancing the budget. Deficit spending has become a way of life—and, unless we have a grassroots rebellion, will become a way of death for the free enterprise system, more commonly called the American way of life. Debts and deficits are unimportant, say the Socialists. The important thing is to keep the country moving with "vigah." And it is. Toward dictatorship.

"Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect, the people are too damn dumb to understand," said Roosevelt's Schlesinger, Harry Hopkins. Maybe it's time for another Boston Tea Party. If "the people are too damn dumb to understand," perhaps they ought also to be too dumb to continue paying for their own enslavement.

Federal spending mostly for defense? Don't believe that lie. Some of our leaders don't even believe in our defense. Billions in defense spending goes for foreign aid to the United Nations and other enemies. Other defense billions go to such things as the National Defense Educational Act, providing Federal funds to students to study such subjects as anthropology and sociology.

The increase in nondefense spending in the past 8 years has been twice the increase in so-called defense spending. Total Federal spending for benefit programs doubled from $11.4 billion in 1947 to an estimated $25.8 billion in 1963. Most of this is vote-buying Federal aid and welfare projects. Kennedy's proposed $98.8 billion bankruptcy budget is $500 million more than the budget at the height of World War II.

Continuous deficits are intended and inevitable, unless the people rebel. Mere interest on the Federal debt costs us $19,000 per minute, around the clock. Interest takes 10 cents out of every budget dollar. Interest eats up more money than the entire size of the debt in the great depression.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution * * * are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." The Constitution gives the Federal Government no power or control over agriculture, health, welfare, labor, dams and public power projects, education, unemployment, or housing.

Socialism is planned tyranny by the few. It means Government ownership or management of banks, railroads, power, newspapers, television, radio, schools, steel, automobiles—and you.

Most of us are against socialism, if it is called that. Some of us are against socialism if it invades our particular business. Doctors are preponderantly against socialized medicine, which gores their own ox. Sadly, few doctors are on record against socialized agriculture, or power or housing. Their usual excuse is that they can't afford to be controversial. Freedom is one ball of wax. If we have a socialized agriculture, we'll have a socialized America and vice versa.

Middle-of-the-roader Norman Thomas, six times a candidate for President of the United States on the Socialist Party ticket, has stated: "The American people will never knowingly adopt socialism, but under the name of liberalism, they will adopt every fragment of the socialist program until America will one day be a socialist nation without knowing how it happened."

Congress can greatly reduce spending, and taxing, and debt whenever it wants to. It'll want to only when the people demand it.

Many years ago a drove of wild hogs lived in a big bend of the Ocmulgee River in Georgia. They had survived floods, fires, freezes, hunters, and droughts. Hunters bragged when their dogs fought the hogs and returned alive. Finally, a one-gallused man came by the country store on the river road and asked how he could find the wild hogs. All he had with him was a one-horse wagon, an ax, a lantern, some quilts, some corn, and a single-barrel shotgun.

Several months later the hog-hunting stranger came back to the same store and asked for help to bring out the wild hogs. He said he had them all over in a pen in the swamp. People came from miles around to see the captive hogs which all the natives knew couldn't be captured.

"It's all very simple," droned the one-gallused stranger. "First, I put out some corn. For 3 weeks they wouldn't eat it. Then some of the young 'uns grabbed an ear here and there and scampered to the underbrush. Soon they were all eating it. (If one didn't, he knew the others would.) So then I began building a pen around the corn, a little higher each day. 'Fore long I noticed they were all waiting for me to bring the corn and had stopped grubbing for acorns and roots. I build the trapdoor. Naturally, they raised cain when they seen I had 'em, but I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can first get him to depend on me for a free handout."

Fellow hogs, we been fenced. We been had, by one-gallused Socialists. Let's dig out.

Society for the Propagation of the Faith Raises $5,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Columbian Squires, which is the Junior Order of the Knights of Columbus, of which you and the gentleman of New York addressing you are members

conducted a service-type activity for the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Squires throughout the United States participated in various kinds of fund-raising projects with all proceeds going to the society. When the final tabulation was made, over $5,000 had been raised. A check for the amount raised was presented to His Excellency the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, national director of the society, by the New York State Chief Squire, Robert W. J. Wysocki, a resident of the 14th Congressional District of New York, in behalf of the Squires throughout the Nation.

One-World Advocates Pose Additional Threat to U.S. Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how any patriotic American can read the following article by Walter Trohan in the Chicago Tribune without becoming seriously concerned with what the United Nations is doing to us, I just do not know. Imagine the audacity of any group which is going to demand that American judges renounce their citizenship to swear allegiance to an organization which is controlled and directed by Communist and other anti-U.S. powers. The publication of this plan alone should be enough to make the people of this country seriously consider the wisdom of giving any more of our money, prestige, or moral support to the United Nations:

ONE-WORLDERS SEEK TO DRAG THE UNITED STATES INTO INTERNATIONALISM

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—Internationalists are campaigning quietly to strengthen the International Court of Justice as a step toward bringing the United States into world government.

The big stumbling block is the Connally reservation, introduced as an amendment to U.S. participation by former Senator Thomas T. Connally, Democrat, of Texas, which preserves sovereignty. Under the reservation, the United States does not surrender sovereignty to the International Court but reserves the right to decide whether any matters, which the Court might be called upon to consider, are matters for national consideration or whether jurisdiction will be waived to the Court.

Since no sovereignty of any importance has been waived, the International Court is an impotent body. Internationalists are pulling to strengthen it in such a way as to drag the United States in. Internationalists are working to get a favorable resolution in the American Bar Association's meeting in Athens this year.

JUDGES WOULD RENOUNCE U.S. CITIZENSHIP

The plan is to revise the statutes of the International Court to:

1. Make each of the judges of the Court and the members of his immediate family renounce their national citizenship and become United Nation citizens.

2. Have judges serve for life.

3. Authorize the Court to determine jurisdiction after at least 10 of its 15 judges agree the tribunal should have jurisdiction.

4. Uphold the veto right of permanent members of the U.N. Security Council with respect to enforcement of Court decisions.

5. Provide that no declarations of adherence to Court jurisdiction will be required. The revisions in the Court statutes would come into effect unconditionally after adoption by two-thirds of the members of the U.N. Assembly.

The suggestion that a judge and his family renounce their homeland and become U.N. citizens is a ridiculous bit of moonbeam chasing. No one can expect judges of Communist countries to be freed from the dictation of their bosses by such a clumsy device. After the Congo, there might be judges who would be less than eager to take allegiance to atrocity forces.

While life tenure for judges seems a good idea, it might serve to freeze that body when periodic alterations might be the wiser course.

TENURE SUBJECT TO GOOD BEHAVIOR

Life tenure would be subject to good behavior, but who would judge behavior? No doubt the ultimate power would rest in the U.N. General Assembly, where new nations hold the balance of power.

Permitting judges to determine jurisdiction, even by unanimous decision, would circumvent the Connally reservation. It would be possible, under the revisions, for alien judges from backward nations to play havoc with the rights of American citizens.

The retention of the veto power of the U.N. Security Council is advanced by one-worlders as insurance for the protection of American rights. The veto power is held by only 5 of the 110 U.N. members, so the internationalists are actually urging that 105 U.N. members, without veto power, shall have no course but to bow to the World Court.

The provision to subject every U.N. member to the jurisdiction of a world court by a two-thirds vote of the U.N. General Assembly is strong meat for an American citizen who wants to retain any measure of American sovereignty.

It is clear the internationalists are not aiming simply at wearing away opposition to surrender of American sovereignty piecemeal, but want surrender tied up in one big package labeled "international justice."

Bipartisanship Works Both Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, has written an excellent editorial in the March 3 issue of his newspapers.

His remarks are most timely since President Kennedy is complaining because the American people are quite concerned about Cuba.

If the President wants to unify the country, he could do so by revealing fully all the facts on Cuba and disavowing Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester's statement that the deliberate deception of the American people is justified.

Under unanimous consent I include the following editorial:

WHERE IS BIPARTISANSHIP?

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Our Ruth Montgomery, certainly in the top echelon of Washington observers, wrote a perceptive and provocative piece last Friday. It concerned the lack of real bipartisan foreign policy in the Kennedy administration in contrast to a truly bipartisan policy in the administration of another Democratic President, Harry Truman.

As might be expected, she built up her thesis with documented care. She recalled the Senate's "great debate" on foreign policy in the early years of the Truman administration, in the course of which the late and great Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, issued this proclamation: "I will not participate (in foreign policy) only at time of crashlanding, but insist on being in at the takeoff."

Well, President Truman let Republican leaders in at the takeoff, and out of that, Ruth recalled, came the United Nations, the postwar treaties, and the tremendous Marshall plan which rescued Western Europe. In fact, Mr. Truman permitted Senator Vandenberg to choose the man to head the Marshall plan—Paul Hoffman.

Now let's hear from Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, the current ranking Republican on foreign relations.

"So far as I know," he said recently, "there is no bipartisan foreign policy."

He went on to explain that he and his GOP colleagues have yet to be consulted by President Kennedy or the State Department in advance of foreign policy decisions. When the fateful decision was made to quarantine Cuba, Senator HICKENLOOPER and other leaders of his party were informed only after Foreign Ambassadors had been summoned and told what was in the works.

In other words, the Republicans wound up in the crash landing, having been denied a seat at the takeoff.

Now get this:

"Today there is a prevailing view in Washington that to criticize the administration on any foreign policy count exposes at worst a moral flaw, at best political irresponsibility. The Secretary of State and the President both have fobbed off responsible critics of specific phases of our policy as being captions or ignorant.

"Bipartisanship cannot be permitted to be an excuse for burying dissent. Especially at a time as fluid as the present it must not become a restraining wall against the flow of fresh ideas and the expression of honest doubt."

The above is a quote from the then Senator John F. Kennedy, in 1957.

All of which pertains to the present confusion, doubts and controversy over Cuba.

The President finds himself in a double bind; on the one hand bipartisanship was confined to the crash-landing formula, and on the other Mr. Kennedy and his administration associates are nettled by the continuing questioning and criticism of their policy. I don't think the questioning and criticism are going to end very soon, nor do I think they should.

And this is not said captiously, but by one who earnestly hopes the administration will continue to be as firm and right as it was in the confrontation with Khrushchev last fall.

The Cuban situation just won't roll over and go to sleep.

One example why it won't are current and seemingly authentic reports from Washington that Khrushchev intends to keep about 10,000 Soviet troops in Cuba indefinitely * * * and thus perpetuate an intolerable presence of foreign military power in this hemisphere.

Khrushchev promised to pull out some of the estimated 17,000 military personnel by March 15—and indeed a handful, not more than a few hundred, have left in the last few days. Four other ships are known to be on the way. Careful reconnaissance and intelligence estimate that they can take approximately 7,000.

Thus it becomes a matter of simple subtraction. Deducting 7,000 from 17,000 leaves 10,000, and there has been absolutely no indication—at least as far as the administration has put out—that Khrushchev has any intention of removing any more. In fact the indications are the other way around; that he is determined not to remove any more.

Informed guesses are (A) that he will use the Soviet military presence in Cuba for all its propaganda worth throughout Latin America, (B) that he does not trust the Cubans to handle Soviet "defensive" weapons on the island, and (C) to protect Castro. All are probably correct.

It is fantastic to fear that the Soviet troops would be used to invade the United States or any other part of the hemisphere. Our response would be immediate and overwhelming.

But it is not fantastic at all to conclude they are being used to train Castro troops in infiltration and subversion; that their continued presence would be a festering sore in our prestige; or finally that to acquiesce in their remaining in Cuba would be to agree with Khrushchev that the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

The administration cannot acquiesce. Because the Soviet troops do not pose a direct military peril, it cannot condone their presence as a minor irritant.

I repeat a suggestion first made here February 10. It has since been reinforced by similar stands by former President Truman, Senator John Sherman Cooper, and many others.

If after X date it becomes clear that Khrushchev has no intention of removing the remaining troops, I suggest President Kennedy should give him Y days to do so.

If he does not do so in Y days, the United States and all other members of the hemispheric family would throw a complete quarantine ring around Cuba and allow nothing—repeat nothing—into the island, by sea or air.

As the Common Market of the new Europe begins to sound uncommonly like the old Europe, still another old controversy is being heard from again.

It is the relationship of Spain, its aging dictator Generalissimo Francisco Franco and the strategy of the West's historic conflict with world communism.

Now whenever this is raised numerous people go into tizzies, from left to right; few issues in recent history aroused such violent emotionalism as the Spanish civil war of the late 1930's.

This barbaric affair, often called the rehearsal for World War II, was won by Franco by dint of massive aid in men and material from Hitler and Mussolini. Franco's name is, accordingly, still undeniably a dirty word in many parts, here and abroad.

But Franco later denied Hitler land access to Gibraltar, thus preventing him from bottling up the Mediterranean. He told me he did this because he felt the 1939 pact between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia absolved him from any obligation to Hitler.

Whatever his reasons were—he may have had a sneaking suspicion Hitler wouldn't win anyway—the fact is that he did it. In my opinion, and strictly from the viewpoint of military history, he has never received adequate recognition for this.

Looking at the Spanish question today, in the equally cold light of current military problems, it seems strange that so strategic an area has not been as fully integrated into the defense system of Western Europe.

Recent reports have hinted Spain is seeking NATO membership as the price for Polaris use of its big Rota naval base at Cadiz. Well, I fail to see why this should even be an issue.

There seems to be little logic in continued exclusion of Spain from NATO.

If the dictatorial nature of the Spanish regime is offered as the reason, how can one rationalize the membership of Prime Minister Salazar's Portugal, hardly a parliamentary democracy If his association with Germany and Italy is offered as a reason—then how come they are in NATO?

The Pyrenees Mountains, separating the Iberian Peninsula from the rest of Europe, constitute the only really effective natural land barrier in NATO's sphere of interest. A huge U.S. investment, in the form of great air and naval bases, has been poured onto Spanish soil. And one merely need look back again to World War II and the crucial necessity of the Straits of Gibraltar to recognize the immensely strategic nature of this corner of Europe.

In addition, the political complexion of the south shore of the Mediterranean has undergone radical changes since the Franco question first raised its head. Morocco and Algeria, once French, are now independent nations, both with dubious attitudes to the East-West face-off.

In short, Franco Spain—regardless of its domestic politics or even lack of them—should be a solid link in the NATO chain. Britain, Norway, Denmark, and Belgium oppose this, apparently seeing Franco only as a former pal of Hitler and Mussolini. And any one of these can veto Spanish NATO membership. These countries should reorientate, at least re-examine, their views purely in the harsh light of national survival.

When Hitler attacked Russia on June 22, 1941, Winston Churchill addressed the world. He said he had been a lifelong foe of communism and would remain so. But he added he would march with the Devil himself to defeat Hitler.

Spain is more important to NATO than Franco's old alliances are a threat to Europe's safety.

Motivation Worries Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a newspaper article clipping from the Springfield Daily News, Springfield, Mo., which was sent forward by Hon. Morgan Moulder, a former member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for several years. This statement was made by Mr. Moulder's cousin, Thomas Moulder, a member of the Springfield Board of Education.

The article follows:

BEHIND SHOWING OF TWO MOVIES TO TEACHERS—MOTIVATION WORRIES MOULDER

A Springfield School Board member who said he is worried about the motivation behind the showing of two movies at a teachers' meeting Monday night demanded to know last night whether contents of the film might be used in classroom work.

Board member E. Thomas Moulder, who cited an article in Tuesday's Springfield Daily News as the basis of his worries, referred to the show of "Operation Abolition" and "Operation Correction."

Calling for the teaching of "pure, unadulterated, jingoistic Americanism" in the city's scools, Moulder said he is not seeking to abridge the right of freedom of speech, but that this freedom does not include the right of a teacher to teach anything he or she may want to teach.

The "Abolition" movie was based on 1960 riots in San Francisco, which the House Un-American Activities Committee says were Communist-led. The second film purported to be a correction of the first situation shown.

Former Congressman O. K. Armstrong and Dr. William McClure conducted a commentary on the two films.

Moulder's statement:

"Gentlemen, I wish to read into the minutes of this meeting this article taken from page 15 of the Tuesday, February 12, 1963, issue of the Springfield (Mo.) Daily News. The article is headlined '2 "Operation" Movies Bring Lively Claims.' "

"Now, gentlemen, I do not mean to imply by this statement that any individual, group, or organization is communistic or Communist dominated. I do, however, want to make my views quite clear concerning this matter both to the board of education, to the teachers of the Springfield Public Schools, and to the general public of Springfield.

"I am concerned that a movie would be shown at a teachers meeting that, in the words of the newspaper, and again I quote, 'purports to correct the abolition movie and attacks the congressional committee.' I am worried about the possible motivation behind the organization of a teachers meeting to hear a program on riots that took place in 1960 and have not been a matter of public interest since that time.

"Of course, a program of this type could possibly be of interest to a teacher of political science or an allied field. Were all of the teachers present at this meeting in this category? And whether they were or were not political science teachers, I am interested in knowing what use will be made of this material in the classrooms of the Springfield school system. The question also arises in my mind if this was an attempt at indoctrination in a liberal political philosophy, or if it was simply an innocuous showing of two movies with a commentary following for the employment of a group of teachers.

"I do not want to abridge the right of freedom of speech. This is not my purpose, as abridged freedom of speech is one of the noteworthy disgraces of the Communist dictatorship. However, I submit to you that the American principle of freedom of speech does not include a right for a teacher to teach anything he or she may want to teach in his or her classroom. I do not deny that any individual or group of individuals may, if they wish, view this movie or any other movie; but when it takes place at a teachers' meeting on school premises, I believe that the board and the public have a right to inquire and to know the purpose of such a viewing.

"Now, I address myself to the following portion of my statement not only as a member of the board of education but also as a parent, a taxpayer, a patron of the Springfield Public Schools, and above all as a citizen of the finest country on the face of the earth, the United States of America. I do not want my son taught disrespect for the U.S. Congress, or for any of its committees, or for any other duly constituted authority. I don't want him to be taught that there is any compromise with communism, that there is even a hint of a possibility that communism might be right, or that commu-

nism might be anything but a threat to his freedom and well-being.

"I realize, of course, that we cannot teach the values of freedom and democracy in a vacuum; that it is well and wise that a contrast be shown. This can certainly be done through the medium of a well developed curriculum and properly oriented instructors who will see to it that their students are taught Americanism and not communism.

"In that connection I wish to read an excerpt from an article in tonight's issue (Wednesday, February 13, 1963) of the Springfield Leader and Press, on the front page of that paper, entitled, 'Communism Study in State.'

"I am an American and I'm proud of it. My son is an American, and I want him to be taught Americanism; pure, unadulterated, jingoistic Americanism. I am dogmatic on this subject, and I admit to no other way than this in teaching about our Government. I believe, too, that I have the wholehearted support of the large majority of Springfieldians and Americans on this matter."

About 30 persons attended the Monday night showing, which was under sponsorship of the Association of Classroom Teachers of Springfield. George Buckley, Parkview teacher who acted as master of ceremonies, declared:

"All comments I have heard were very favorable that meetings of this type were of a very high professional caliber."

Confusion of News Stories on Cuba and Failure of Administration To Tell the Truth Makes Us Wonder What Is Going on in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, confusion continues to surround the question of Cuba. We read many accounts in the newspapers, that there are thousands of Russian troops in Cuba, that many have been pulled out, that a few have been pulled out, that the missiles have all been removed, that the missiles have not been removed, that many weapons potentially dangerous to the United States are hidden in thousands of caves in Cuba. The President does little to clear up the situation and seems to be as much in the dark as to the actual facts pertaining to the Russian military buildup in Cuba as the most ill-informed citizen. We surely cannot believe the President is completely uninformed, therefore we must come to the conclusion that he is deliberately keeping the truth from the American people and only giving out, through his management of the news, such items as he believes will keep the American people in the dark.

Well, here is something to think about in the two following newspaper articles. One from the Chicago Tribune giving an eye-witness account of the great number of Russians in Cuba, the other from the Copley News Service pointing to the development of Cuba as a Soviet nuclear sub base. Could it be that the technicians in Cuba are actually submarine personnel and maintenance crews? How long is President Kennedy going to allow this buildup to continue—until Khrushchev is strong enough to make further demands upon us, or until just before the next election when it could well be too late?

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

REPORTS MANY RUSSIANS AND GUNS IN CUBA

(By Knowlton Nash)

(NOTE.—Reporters and cameramen from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have returned from Cuba, where they filmed a report for the Canadian network. Here are the impressions of one of the group, the network's Washington correspondent.)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Two of the most striking impressions you get in Cuba are that there are so many guns and so many Russians.

Almost half of the people carry machine-guns, rifles, or pistols. To a Canadian, it seems a little unusual to be greeted by a hotel doorman carrying a Czechoslovak burp gun or by a pistol-packing room clerk. Militia boys and girls, some as young as 15, carry guns. One young militia girl I saw was carrying a rifle almost bigger than she was.

I went to a Russian motion picture and noticed that many boys and girls on dates lugged along their guns—a somewhat incongruous sight as they held hands with one hand and carried their guns with the other.

MEASURE OF ALARM

While initially, at least, there is a measure of alarm at the sight of so many guns, you get a feeling of some frustration at the sight of so many Russians.

Cubans constantly mistook us for Russians, apparently believing any fair-haired person is a Soviet citizen.

While I saw literally hundreds of Russians dressed in civilian clothes wandering about Havana or jammed in the back of trucks rushing to factories, I saw few Chinese. The Chinese that I did see were the most properly dressed of anybody in Cuba, even wearing ties, something the Russians and Cubans generally do not do.

Food is very short in Cuba, although nobody is starving, and it is expensive in restaurants. Stringy pork and elderly chicken are the main dishes, along with rice. Outside Havana, the food is rather less appetizing.

RATIONS ARE TIGHT

The Cubans themselves are on tight rations, including one chicken a month, one-eighth of a pound of butter a month, and five eggs a month, if you can get them.

We were in Cuba at the height of the sugarcane cutting season and the Government had launched a nationwide campaign for volunteer cutters. The No. 2 man in Cuba and its economic czar, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, spent 2 weeks cutting cane himself in Camaguey Province.

It was in the canefields that I interviewed him. The interview was conducted in a semicircle of his guards, all carrying machine-guns, rifles, pistols, and machetes. I found it a bit inhibiting at first, but you get used to it after a while.

GLAD TO TALK

Guevara was only too glad to answer any question and this seemed to be the attitude of the Cuban people. Those who support the Castro government are proud of their guns, their communism, and the houses and hospitals they have built. Those who oppose Castro are equally anxious to talk, but only when you are out of earshot of any intelligence operatives or microphones.

When I came out of Cuba the first things I did were to sink my teeth into a juicy steak and luxuriate in being able to say anything I wanted without looking over my shoulder.

[From the Copley News Service]

U.S. EXPERTS LOOK TO CUBA AS SOVIET NUCLEAR SUB BASE

President Kennedy's decision to replace land-based intermediate-range missiles in Britain, Turkey, and Italy with Polaris submarines underscores a dangerous aspect of the Cuban situation.

The possibility of Russian missile submarines operating out of Cuban ports worries U.S. Navy and Pentagon intelligence officers. Such a move quickly would restore the Soviet firepower lost when Premier Khrushchev withdrew 42 missiles and more than 30 jet bombers from the island.

Navy experts report that they have no evidence of Russian submarine operations in Cuban waters. They admit, however, that several excellent submarine bases are available. Cuban exiles have insisted for several months that many of the Soviet "technicians" on the island are building submarine facilities. They also have reported sighting Soviet subs, although no missile submarines have been claimed.

The U.S. Navy is particularly concerned about announced Soviet plans to build "fishing bases" in Cuba. Such a base, Navy men say, easily could handle submarines.

No one in the Navy minimizes the Soviet undersea potential. Top priority has been given U.S. antisubmarine developments in the face of a Red fleet of between 400 and 500 submersibles. It is the largest submarine force in the world and at least 250 are modern, snorkel craft built after World War II.

An undisclosed number are capable of firing nuclear missiles. Most of these missile subs must surface before firing, but Russia now claims it has craft similar to the American Polaris fleet ballistic missile subs that can fire while submerged.

Forty to fifty Russians subs belong to the largest Z class. The others are Q or W types. The first announcement of nuclear-powered Red subs came last July 21. A few weeks ago Moscow claimed that one of its nuclear subs sailed under the Arctic icepack and surfaced at the North Pole.

U.S. intelligence reports this distribution of the Russian submarine force:

Northern (Arctic)—no medium range, 110 long range.

Baltic Sea—50 medium range, 40 long-range.

Black Sea—5 medium range, 70 longrange.

Pacific and Far East—50 medium-range, 60 longrange.

This adds up to 385 operational submarines. Their distribution indicates strategic deployment in long-range operations.

Aside from being able to attack Western sea communications, Russian subs also could, as the U.S. Navy has said, operate directly off U.S. coasts from their bases in the U.S.S.R.

Russian bases in Cuba, of course, would constitute an even greater menace.

Soviet seapower's strategic threat to the United States is dramatized in the Navy's huge antisubmarine warfare plotting room at Norfolk, Va. On a giant wall-to-wall map, black diamond-shaped markers indicate goblins. That's the U.S. Navy's nickname for Russian subs presumed to be roaming the seas.

In one recent 6-month plotting period, the map showed 186 separate reports of what may have been Soviet submarines. Apparently some of them, from their positions, were probing American submarine defenses, testing the Navy's detection and tracking proficiency.

Close contacts between United States and Russian submarines are rare. Soviet subs, however, frequently are tracked by American undersea craft as part of realistic training exercises.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have received an interesting communication on the subject of excise taxes. As it reflects the feeling of many citizens back home, it occurs to me that the message should be of value to the Members of this body. For that reason, and under unanimous consent, I am herewith placing it in the RECORD:

EXCISE TAXES

The scene is your bedroom tomorrow morning and you are still in bed.

"Something is different," you think as you stretch and look around your room. Pardon us, we neglected to explain, that during the night all the luxury items were removed from your room leaving you with only the necessities. According to Webster, "luxury" is defined as "anything conducive to sumptuous living," rather than a necessity. Webster defines a "necessity" as "something necessary, indispensable, or an imperative need."

We, however, categoried your luxury and necessity items according to Government standards. "What time is it?" Don't know—watches and clocks are gone—luxury items. Turn on the radio? That's gone, too, the manufacturer told us that is in the luxury classification. Ready to get up now? Yes, your beautiful robe and leather slippers are still here, they are not in the luxury class.

Hadn't you better awaken your wife since she will have no way of knowing what time it is either, her watch is gone—luxury item, too. By the way, she is your wife, isn't she? Just wondered about that, neither of you is wearing a wedding ring—luxury items, you know. Yes, you can shave, we left your electric razor and shaving soap. Sorry, no shaving lotion—luxury item.

Ready to dress now? Here are your underwear, socks, shirt, trousers, leather belt, tie, handkerchief, and coat, all necessities. Cuff links for your shirt? Sorry, they're gone—luxury items. Tie clasp? Gone, too, another luxury item.

Just a minute, you forgot your leather shoes. What happened to your money and your billfold? Your mony, your cards and anything else you had in your billfold is all on the top of your chest of drawers but your billfold—well, that is gone, luxury item. Your car keys? They are with your money; your keycase is a luxury item, too. Sorry, you can't put those things in your brief case—luxury item, you know, so we put all your books and papers on your desk.

No, we can not offer any suggestion to help you transport these things—your money, cards, keys, papers and books were all in luxury items and those items are gone.

Maybe your wife could offer a suggestion. Guess she did not hear you because she is so busy picking up the things she had in her purse. Her purse is gone, too, plastic or leather, it is also a luxury item. It is a good thing she does not have to worry about any cosmetics, they're gone, too, luxury items.

Hadn't you better be on your way? You have a busy day ahead of you and you have only the sun for a time guide. Wouldn't you know it? It's a cloudy day, so now how are you going to gage time? (We forgot to tell you that we left your stainless steel watch band, that is not on the luxury list—we just took your watch, which is on the luxury list.) Frustrating, isn't it?

Tax reform, the topic up for discussion today? Wasn't the luxury or excise tax imposed on certain items during World War II to conserve precious metals and retard the purchases of these items? Watches, clocks, wedding rings, billfolds, purses, briefcases, keycases, radios, cuff links, tie clasps, and cosmetics are all on that luxury list. What do you think about this classification, now, after the hectic morning you have just been through—are these items really and truly luxury items or are they necessities?

New Frontiers. Tax reforms. Stimulate business. How? By contining a bill whose main purpose was to retard business. Is World War II still being fought? It must be, since the tax it fostered is still in effect. How about giving the jeweler a break? Are the watches, clocks, wedding rings and other items he sell luxuries? Are tailored made suits—exquisite gowns—specially designed furniture—custom made shoes and custom designed appliances—necessities? It the excise or luxury tax a fair tax or is it a discriminatory tax?

May every tick of your watch or clock remind you that all the jewelers in Wisconsin are depending on you and your ability to differentiate between a luxury and a necessity. Give them the break they deserve—repeal the discriminatory, unfair, and business retarding excise tax.

We are all depending on you and your fine sense of justice.

Sincerely,

VOELTZ JEWELERS,
ERNEST AND MARIE VOELTZ.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Eulogy to Paul L. Hillsamer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened recently by the death of Mr. Paul Hillsamer of Marion, Ind.

He was not only a dear friend; he was also a very unusual and wonderful person—a man who was loved and respected by his community and by all who knew him.

At his funeral, the Reverend Robert J. Center of the Gethsemane Episcopal Church of Marion delivered a eulogy to Paul Hillsamer that, like the man it honored, will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that eulogy printed in the Appendix of the RECORD since it so beautifully and effectively expresses the feelings so many of us shared at the passing of our good friend.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is not customary for the Episcopal Church to use eulogies of the dead in her burial rites except when the person deceased was a well-known citizen of the community or state. There is no doubt that Paul L. Hillsamer, our brother departed, was such a well-known and public-spirited citizen of Marion, and of Grant County, and of Indiana, and of the United States, and of the world. In addition, he was a devout Christian layman, a former vestryman and church schoolteacher in this parish.

He was a loyal Episcopalian, Anglo-Catholic through and through, and yet he was broadminded in the best sense of that word. He kept his heart and his purse open to other religious traditions ranging in the ecclesiastical spectrum from the Salvation Army to the Roman Catholic Church.

Here lies the remains of a man who was of the earth earthy, a man of the sod of Hoosierland, a giant hulk of a man who was obviously made of clay. Oh, but that clay housed a mighty spirit, a spirit that could rage and did, and a spirit that could be loving, tender, and compassionate beyond words.

The good works that he did can be counted only by heaven, but I personally know of many of them, and I am sure that you do, too. He looked upon men—as the saints regard them—as children of God, all of them, the unwashed, the ignorant, the unlovable, the characters, the brightly sophisticated, the white man and the brown, yes—and this sometimes requires a lot of a man—even those on the opposite side of the political fence.

This was not the kind of a man to take Christian piety and hide it in a precious box to be taken out and caressed occasionally. One of his strongest convictions was that the holy faith must be made operative in the marketplace, in the political arena, in the press, in personal relationships. He knew that Christians have to move from clean and sweet-smelling places where we would all prefer to be, into the stink and the dirt of life as it is lived by most people to bring the love of Christ into society.

The things that touched him deeply could bring him quickly to a boiling point. But he knew how to repent in dust and ashes; he knew how to forgive a real or imagined insult; he had the humility to admit honest mistakes.

He was a man of the people, a self-made man if there ever was one, one who made more than the best of his original circumstances and environment. He did not receive an extensive formal education, with university training, but he read widely and deeply, he thought a great deal, and he had one of the most impressive memories I have ever known. He was a lover of children and the family. He was keenly aware of the insecurities and injustices some children have to face, and he burned with a holy passion to overturn these things.

This raw Hoosier, this noble man, this tremendous frame with the tender heart, we commend to the love of God and the prayers of the saints as we proceed to the celebration of the requiem mass. We loved him, and we shall miss him.

In Memoriam: Mrs. Edes Schlacht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News, which, although entitled "In Memoriam: Mrs. Edes Schlacht," is in essence a tribute to all mothers everywhere:

IN MEMORIAM: MRS. EDES SCHLACHT (DIED MARCH 9, 1940)

Mrs. Edes Schlacht was a noted East Side New York, charitable and welfare worker, wife of the late Jacob Schlacht, beloved mother of the (late sons and daughters—Israel, Leonard, Harry, Joseph, Minnie, Rose) East Side News Publisher and Editor Abraham Schlacht.

Harry H. Schlacht (famed East Sider, city official, noted newspaperman, and writer) before his death wrote:

"Mother o' mine, we bow our heads at your shrine; we kneel at the altar of sacred memories; we venerate your holy name; there is no tribute too great, no honor too glorious, to pay our mother; we are transplanted upon the wings of blessed memory back to our childhood; we recall your tender caresses, your loving embrace, and your sweet lullaby at twilight; we hear again your soft voice which once made our infant hearts rejoice. You were the keystone of the home. Your love was the greatest approach to divine love that God grants to man. Now you touch us only in our dreams."

East Side New Yorkers salute the memory of one of many East Side mothers (of all nationalities) who had contributed to the historical greatness of our beloved East Side, New York, America.

ABE E. EISENSTEIN.

Young Texan Among Capable Peace Corps Workers Serving as Teachers in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the San Antonio Light recently published an article describing the important work of a young Texan, Miss Graciela Ramirez, 22, and her fellow members of the Peace Corps in eastern Venezuela.

Miss Ramirez, of Brownsville, Tex., and her fellow workers are outstanding examples of the intelligence, diligence, and high level of capability which have made the Peace Corps one of our Nation's greatest diplomatic achievements.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the San Antonio Light of Sunday, March 3, captioned "Texas Girl Teaches English" be printed in the appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS GIRL TEACHES ENGLISH

CUMANA, VENEZUELA.—Graciela Ramirez, 22, of Brownsville, is 1 of 12 Peace Corps volunteers teaching English in the high schools of eastern Venezuela.

The Venezuelan Government has, within the past 3 years, launched a vigorous campaign to wipe out illiteracy as well as to raise the level of instruction in the country's rapidly expanding school system. (The population of Venezuela is growing faster than any other on the continent.)

English has been made a compulsory subject for high school students. The demand for skilled teachers in the language has far outstripped the supply. With the coming of the volunteers the shortage has been somewhat lessened and some schools have been able to send their own staff members away for advanced study.

Gracie, who graduated from San Antonio's Our Lady of the Lake College in 1962, lives with two other volunteers in this coastal city of 80,000 people, the oldest Spanish settlement in South America. The other teachers in the project are scattered in six nearby towns.

Gracie and her two roommates, Ruth Huseman of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Gretchen Ott of Logan, Utah, share a scantily furnished house in the center of town with a stray

dog which they have befriended. They began their teaching assignments last September. Gracie is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert W. Ramirez of Brownsville.

Shall We Write Off Rural America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the March issue of the Progressive Farmer there appears a very thoughtful editorial by Mr. Alexander Nunn dealing with the serious effects to the American way of life caused by the transition of this country from a rural to an urban civilization. Mr. Nunn points up very forcefully the dangers inherent in this change. He makes reference to the fact that—

Over and over nations that are now but a memory started down the road to ruin when they forgot or "wrote off" their rural people.

Oliver Goldsmith in his poem "The Deserted Village" mourns the demographic consequences of the industrial revolution in 18th century England:

Princes and Lords may flourish, or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

I call Mr. Nunn's editorial to the studied attention of the Members of the House:

SHALL WE WRITE OFF RURAL AMERICA?

(By Alexander Nunn)

As America becomes more and more an urban nation, there are some things we simply cannot afford to forget. Over and over nations that are now but a memory started down the road to ruin when they forgot or "wrote off" their rural people. While there is still time, we had better take stock of basic values a rural America has brought us.

1. If America chooses to write off its rural areas, it is likely to be writing off much that we consider essential to democracy. Our country was built on a rural society. The men who wrote the Declaration of Independence and drafted the Constitution were largely men with rural backgrounds and rural convictions. They established a system of checks and balances which it seems to me today many of our urban dwellers are willing to see wiped out.

Throughout history, there has been among all rural peoples a respect for law and order and for basic human dignity. The rural dweller knows that you cannot put the cart before the horse. There's only one way to grow: "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."

2. If America writes off its rural areas, it will be tending to write off basic moral values. Of course, rural areas have very real problems in morals, in activities of teenagers, and in other basic social issues. Nothing is clearer from history, however, than that as society becomes more urban and more crowded into smaller areas, family ties become looser, moral values decay, and corruption in high and low places become more pronounced.

As much as I fear communism, I don't fear communism from without nearly as much as I do the decay within us that will permit communism to take hold in this country. As George Meredith said in "Modern Love":

"In tragic life, God wot,
No villain need be! Passions spin the plot:
We are betrayed by what is false within."

If we wipe out our rural areas, we are going to destroy the last great bulwark in the country against communism.

3. Rural people and the dwellers in our villages, towns, and small cities have a much stronger pride in and a fiercer love for land and home and country than people packed together into large metropolitan areas. Throughout history the great fighting armies have come from the landed citizens. It was true in the days of the Roman Republic, and earlier of Greece. It was true of England in her centuries of climbing to world leadership. It was true of the men who fought the Civil War, on both sides. As we go from an imaginative and creative society, which usually is rural or nomadic, to an acquisitive and money-minded society, with heavily concentrated populations, fewer are willing to either live for or die for principles.

4. To destroy rural America as we have known it would destroy for the American people the best source of nutritious and varied foods of the greatest abundance and at the lowest cost ever known in terms of hours of work. I don't believe that any factory-ized or industrialized farming system would long produce food at the low-cost level that the American people now get it. It still amazes me that when America, the most powerful nation history has ever known, has been built on this strongest and soundest agriculture any civilization has ever known, there are those who continue to damn and abuse farm people.

5. For a number of years one of my young associates and I have been studying rather carefully the primary sources of top national leadership. Over and over we find that the people who have stood out have come either from the open country, the villages and towns, or our rural-minded cities.

America must find an alternative source for the type of leadership we are talking about if it is to survive. With our proportion of rural people becoming smaller and smaller, we cannot expect them to supply the high percentage of total leadership they have been doing.

6. What, then, of the future? There are some rather interesting straws in the wind. At Lake Wales, Fla., at the famous Bok Tower, there is a plaque on which these words of John Burroughs appear: "I come here to find myself. It's so easy to get lost in the world."

The New York Times magazine of May 20, 1962, featured a story about America's pioneer era (1608–1890) entitled "They Lived the American Dream." The author paid special tribute to pioneer qualities and virtues that built America and then concluded: "We still haven't found anything to take their place."

Nothing will help us more to meet these basic issues of survival than that we are awakening to our weaknesses and dangers. I believe America still has the brains and the will to protect and improve its future. Out of our suburban developments may come some of the answers to our problems of morals and leadership. More factories in the open country and in our smaller communities is certainly one key answer. We must stop this movement of farm and rural people into our crowded cities. As a nation we have been gradually, if much too slowly, awakening to the basic contributions of our farmers. Most of all, we are recognizing that we need a moral and a religious awakening.

Finally, let me quote D. W. Brogan, British historian and political scientist, who has never in my observation shown any strong favortism for America. He said not too long ago, after summarizing all our good and bad traits:

"In material, moral, and intellectual resources, the United States is richer than any other society has ever been. It still is 'the last, best hope of earth.'"

Nation's Oldest Newspaper Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last Wednesday, Mr. E. L. Turner, publisher of the Valdosta, Ga., Daily Times, celebrated his 100th birthday. Mr. Turner is the oldest daily newspaper publisher in the United States, and all Georgia is proud of him on this occasion. He is a great newspaperman and a good citizen.

There is a lesson for all of us in the philosophy of Mr. Turner. He has never retired, believing that those who stop working get old faster than those who remain active. The Atlanta Journal joined the rest of Georgia in paying tribute, in a news article and editorial, to the venerable Mr. Turner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no obligation, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIN'T NO ACCOUNT LATELY, PUBLISHER GRUMBLES AT 100

(By Remer Tyson)

VALDOSTA, GA., March 6.—"I ain't been no account for 2 months," grumbled E. L. Turner, the oldest daily newspaper publisher in the country, who Wednesday marks his 100th birthday.

Turner, publisher of the Valdosta Daily Times, was lamenting a recent 2-week stay in the hospital. He is recuperating at home from an internal disorder.

The hospital encountered a major problem and eventually relatives had to station an attendant in Turner's room to solve it.

The nearly 100 year old but still peppery patient kept hopping out of the hospital bed every time backs were turned.

This wasn't his fist trip to the hospital. His tonsils were removed at age 87.

How does he expect to spend the next 100 years?

"I'll let them take care of themselves," Turner sparred.

Until his recent illness, the publisher went almost daily to his newspaper office—except when he was vacationing in Miami.

He intends to return to his office when he builds up more strength and the weather improves.

Beside his long life, involved from birth in the newspaper business, Turner's trademark is his dry humor.

Since he began nearing the century mark, he is always asked how it feels to be 98, 99 or, as Wednesday, 100.

Turner has a stock reply: "Damn good. If I weren't, I'd be dead."

A favorite story about the elderly publisher concerns a frustrated linotype operator who was being switched from one job to

another when manpower was scarce during World War II.

The operator declared he intended to quit his job as the publisher walked by.

"Sit down, son," Turner remarked. "If things don't get better in 2 weeks I'll go with you."

Born the son of a weekly newspaper owner in Nashville, Ga., Turner worked as a printer in Hawkinsville and Thomasville before taking a $40-a-month job in 1889 with the South Georgia Times, published twice weekly in Valdosta.

He had became general manager of the paper by October 1905, at the time of one of south Georgia's most sensational murder trials.

Because of intense interest in the trial, Turner and Editor C. C. Brantley turned the newspaper into a daily. It has been a daily since even though the board of directors was never consulted about the venture. Turner says he and the editor were never reprimanded for their unauthorized action.

J. G. Rawlings and a Negro, Alf Moore, were convicted of murdering two small children near Valdosta during the trial that spawned the daily newspaper.

Turner has ben heard to relate he went by the jail to talk with Rawlings on the day of the hanging and received a personal invitation to the event that afternoon.

"But I couldn't go," Turner commented. "I went out and got a slug of liquor and went home."

The venerable publisher is slight of build, about 5-6 in height, and his mustache and hair have turned shining white.

He complains about not being able to see well, but usually reads several newspapers each day with the aid of silver-rimmed spectacles. He sometimes wears a makeshift eyeshade—a green-colored baseball cap with top cut out.

Turner takes pleasure in rocking, chewing tobacco, and reminiscing about the past.

A surprise birthday party will be held in the 100-year-old publisher's honor Wednesday at the Valdosta Country Club. About 150 friends and relatives from throughout the South have accepted invitations.

MR. TURNER'S CENTENNIAL

A lot of birthdays will be celebrated this week. And one of the most interesting will be here in Georgia.

Wednesday is the 100th anniversary of the birth of E. L. Turner, publisher of the Valdosta Times.

Mr. Turner was born during the Civil War and grew up in his father's newspaper shop in Alapaha. After more apprenticeship in Hawkinsville and Thomasville he came to Valdosta.

In 1905 he decided both the Times and the town had a future and went daily. He was right and has been granted many years to enjoy and profit by that decision.

Five years ago, on his 95th birthday, he made what he said was his first speech. He reported that he believed retirement aged a man and that those who quit at 65 were making a mistake. Time proved him right again, at least in this case.

Ten years ago, Turner Rockwell, the editor of the Valdosta Times, reported that at 90 Mr. Turner was the oldest active publisher in the country.

Five years ago Mr. Rockwell said the title could no longer be disputed as nobody had caught up with him since.

This year we congratulate Mr. Turner on further outdistancing any competitors and extend the best wishes and congratulations of the Journal on this notable occasion.

Objections to Federal Income Tax Reduction and Reform Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Belle (Mo.) Banner, in a recent editorial, makes some thought-provoking comments regarding certain of the broad objections that are being heard about the Federal income tax reduction and reform questions that have already become central issues in the 88th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, "The Money Has To Go Somewhere," be printed in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my opinion that the appraisal the editor makes of the fundamental issues that are involved is well worth the consideration of all our colleagues in the Senate and the House of Representatives, for each of us must answer the question, "Is the Government profiting by penalizing initiative?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONEY HAS TO GO SOMEWHERE

Some curious arguments are being used to block the prospect of a reduction of the Federal income tax this year.

One reaction to the Treasurys' proposals is that the amounts of tax savings to any one person or family will be so small that no one will be impelled to make any marked change in his buying habits.

That may be just as well. For what the United States wants is not a spending spree, by individuals any more than by the Government, but rather a measured increase in purchasing power made up of driblets of small savings to millions of taxpayers.

If many of these savings are used to pay off old debts or are salted away in savings accounts, does that mean the tax cut has had no effect? On the contrary, it would mean the reduction at low-income levels was serving some of the purpose sought by high-bracket reduction. The finance companies would lend to new borrowers or the savings banks would buy school or highway bonds and new capital would be provided.

But at the other end of the tax scale a great deal of grumbling is heard because some of the saving expected from reduction of extremely high rates may be offset by reforms—which Congress on the other hand may not approve.

A balk on this score might limit the extent of the percentage cuts. But it does not follow that investigators who have been waiting for an incentive should reject the half-loaf in favor of no bread. The Nation seems just a little in danger of penalizing itself by the attitude of a small boy who for a moment would like to call off Christmas when he learns he is getting a winter jacket instead of a bicycle.

The basic question is whether the money that is being collected by wartime, high-rate income taxes is going to continue to go into the Government coffers or whether some of it is going to be left where it will be spent in what economists call the private rather than the public sector.

Of course, the Government needs money to pay off the public debt. But is it going to get more by punitive rates or by rates that encourage business activity? A merchant may want to pay off his mortgage faster. But will he do so by keeping his prices at levels that drive people away from his store? Is the Government profiting by penalizing initiative?

Oil Dumping Harms U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Oil Dumping Harms U.S. Economy," written by Henry J. Taylor, and published in the Baltimore News-Post of March 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL DUMPING HARMS U.S. ECONOMY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Victory in the West Virginia primary started John F. Kennedy on his speed run for the Presidency. He swung hard at miners' unemployment in prescribing for the Nation's unemployment as a whole. This swept the day.

But today John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers, and associated interests, bristle with outraged voices that echo and clang into coal-conscious Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Colorado, Alabama, Arkansas and Kentucky.

The National Coal Policy Conference, representing not only the union but all major coal producers throughout the country, more than 30 coal-carrying railroads, many electric utilities, mine machinery makers, etc., have notified Mr. Kennedy that the New Frontier residual oil policy is a complete reversal of everything said and promised. Will Congress supply the correction?

Residual oil is a leftover product from refining. A domestic supply arises. But it is also dumped here in enormous quantities from Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, etc., at whatever price any market anywhere will bear. And this freezes out other fuels and fuel-making jobs like a degouging glacier's creeping ice that hardens as it spreads.

The National Coal Policy Conference calls the damage under New Frontier policies much more severe than ever in the past. For the administration in 2 years has ordered three increases in import quotas for this foreign-produced waste oil.

The allowable was upped from 154 million barrels when Mr. Kennedy took office to 191.8 million today, including a 6.5-million barrel increase in February, which touched off the current fireworks.

Every increased million barrels dumped here displaces about 250,000 tons of coal. And every million tons of coal thus displaced costs the jobs of about 400 miners. The

191.8 million barrels now involved defines the dimensions of that effect.

The mine price of coal has been reduced by about 45 cents a ton since 1948—an achievement probably unique in our nation's cost history of the past 15 years of inflation and price increases.

But Venezuela, as only one example, now dumps residual oil into New York-New England terminals at $2 per barrel, or less. Shippers are required to pay only 5 cents a barrel duty. Anything they get for this waste is "found money"—thereby aggravating our balance-of-payments and gold problems.

The National Coal Policy Conference insists that it should be obvious to the White House that coal miners simply cannot compete with such predatory competition.

Spokesmen cite Mr. Kennedy's West Virginia promise: "Economic progress at home is still the first requirement for economic strength abroad. We will not turn our backs upon workers and their families undergoing the hardships of unemployment."

Now, economic—and all other—problems are always easier controlled in campaign speeches and professors' textbooks than in real life. This often makes the ultimate performance as unsuitable as a tuna fish in a trumpet. In this case the White House now explains its residual import increase policy as "in the interest of free trade."

I asked miners' hero John L. Lewis, a man who certainly knows the score, for his views. He answered me with the look of a giant Indian peeling with war paint.

"Industrial coal can compete well with oil," Lewis said, "but since when is 'dumping' called free trade? It's plain crazy to increase and encourage it. This isn't free trade. It's stupidity; and it's economic murder."

Coal miners and railroad workers throughout our country, and the thousands of other businessmen and taxpaying citizens whose livelihood depends on King Coal, one of America's greatest commodities, aren't very good at just waiting, waiting.

The administration's 37 million barrel increase in foreign waste oil allowable is equivalent to about 9½ million tons of coal. It represents jobs to thousands of miners (alone) in 1961 and 1962 and even a greater displacement this year.

Where in this policy is the throb and sob of our Nation's unemployed? Are our unemployed merely to sit still like a patient asked to say "Ahhhh?" Not if the vast, diversified assembly in the National Coal Policy Conference can help it.

My Friend—Lew Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it is truly gratifying to praise the accomplishments of a selfless man. It doubles that satisfaction when the man who deserves and gets that praise is my friend. I add my voice to that of many others when I give just recognition to the more than 35 years of understanding service rendered to the House of Representatives by Lew Deschler.

Before I speak for anyone else, I first speak for myself. When I was new here, Lew personally helped me to avoid legislative mistakes. He increases my efficiency as the Representative of the people who send me here.

What Lew Deschler does for me, he does for evey Member of the House who seeks his counsel.

This same patience and sagacity lubricate the parliamentary wheels of the full legislative body. As the years accumulate, as the influence of legislation enacted here increases around the world, as emerging nations struggle to form parliamentary systems of their own and emulate one already functioning, who but the probing historians of future years can fathom the impact this one quiet, knowledgeable man may have had on the history of his fellow men?

To paraphrase a verse from a New Testament parable, "Well done, thou good and faithful public servant."

Tribute Paid to the "New City of Boston"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on February 24 the Boston Globe paid tribute to the "new city of Boston" in a special 32-page supplement. Progress in urban renewal, commercial development, educational expansion, and architectural experiment is graphically and dramatically portrayed in these pages. As the Globe points out, Boston is a self-made city. I would particularly like to call attention to the fine statements contained in this supplement by the mayor of the city of Boston, John F. Collins, the chairman of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Right Reverend Francis J. Lally, and the publisher of the Boston Globe, Mr. Davis Taylor.

Under unanimous consent, I include these letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR JOHN F. COLLINS

This is a decade of change and growth for Boston. Even more, it is a decade of decision and dedication. We are striving to create a truly "new Boston," one which will be worthy of our proud traditions.

The task we have set for ourselves is not an easy one. Boston has felt the full impact these past years of the spread of blight. I am confident, however, that with hard work and perserverence, we will succeed as succeed we must.

What will Boston be like in 1975? That is the question, this admirable report seeks to answer. I suggest there are four broad goals which we should seek to attain in the years ahead.

A renewed and vigorous downtown: Downtown Boston is the very heart of the city, indeed of the entire metropolitan area. Yet its decline and obsolescence are visible to all. With the government center project, now ready to start construction, together with our efforts to renew the waterfront and the central business district, Downtown Boston shall regain its once-proud position in our economic and cultural life. The Prudential Center, too, is a dramatic symbol of our increasingly healthy economic climate and prosperity.

Better neighborhoods: Our goal is to stop the spread of slums and make our older neighborhoods attractive, safe, and pleasant places to live and raise a family. In this planning process—planning with people in the fullest sense of the word—the emphasis will be on conservation and rehabilitation rather than demolition.

Improved educational opportunities: Our schools can be the best guarantee for future strength in the neighborhoods of Boston. Too many of our schools today are old and obsolete. We must rebuild our school plant as one part of a vast effort to improve educational opportunities.

Cultural and institutional strength: Boston is in fact a "City of Ideas." We are the home of nearly countless educational, medical, and cultural institutions. They are a familiar and well loved part of Boston. Our goal is to encourage the arts of learning and healing to be worthy in all respects of Boston's tradition for excellence and for beauty.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. COLLINS,
Mayor.

REBUILDING WITH IMAGINATION

Can Boston really rebuild itself with imagination and beauty?

Will the older neighborhoods of Boston—South End, Washington Park, Charlestown, and others—come back into their own as attractive and desirable neighborhoods in which to live and raise a family?

Can we renew our waterfront, Boston's window of the world, as a vital part of the city? And will downtown Boston regain its leading role in the metropolitan economy?

Is there a solution to the transportation mess which threatens to strangle the city?

Can Boston, in short, find the ways and means as well as the self-confidence to renew itself?

These are some of the questions being asked today. Their answer will govern Boston's future.

The Boston development program is dedicated to finding a comprehensive solution to these vital problems. We cannot and should not make little plans—we need to be bold as well as prudent.

I believe our program for the "New Boston" meets these tests, but there is much that needs to be done.

Our program is guided by four key principles:

Leadership from city hall. No city can renew itself without bold and effective leadership from city hall. There is too much at stake for timidity and buck passing. Boston is fortunate in having in Mayor Collins a mayor with both vision and courage.

Active citizen participation: We believe that the residents of Boston's neighborhoods should have an important voice in their own future. This the the essence of planning with people and it is a cornerstone of our program.

Coordinated administration: Urban renewal regrettably is complex. It requires careful meshing of local plans with Federal and State assistance and long-term capital programing. We cannot afford to rebuild Boston without substantial and continuing Federal aid and indeed this is only just since cities are such a large source of Federal tax revenue. Boston is burdened with a bewildering government structure that encourages divided responsibility. Our program is built on coordinated administration under the mayor's leadership.

A concern for beauty: Boston has a deserved reputation for beauty. It is entirely possible to rebuild our city in an unattractive and unimaginative way. It is also possible to provide for the best in design quality

not only in new construction, but also in the restoration of existing neighborhoods. The latter is ur goal, and I believe in the Government center complex we will achieve an outstanding architectural complex worthy of the best in Boston.

I believe that with continued citizen support Boston can indeed rebuild itself. This report shows the what and the where of our efforts.

EDWARD J. LOGUE.

THE CRUCIAL YEARS

(By the Right Reverend Francis J. Lally)

The Boston Redevelopment Authority looks to the future of Boston with hope and optimism. We believe that the next few years can well be crucial in Boston's efforts to renew itself.

We are confident of the future because it is, after all, to be determined by the efforts, imagination, and enthusiasm of the citizens of our city. Without your support we could not have begun this task; without your continued determination and your willingness to participate actively, we cannot hope to reach our goals.

The work of the Boston Redevelopment Authority divides itself into several phases.

First, we must try to create a plan for each neighborhood and section of the city. Such plans must try to preserve the best that now exists and make room for attractive new housing and other improvements. In each residential neighborhood we seek to plan in active cooperation with the residents of the neighborhood itself.

Second, we must obtain the necessary citizen and legislative support to adopt and carry out the plan. In this respect, we look not only to the Federal Government but also to the Boston City Council and other Government agencies.

Third, we must carefully provide for the necessary acquisition of buildings and the rehousing of families. We are making every effort to be just and humane—our goal is not only to minimize relocation, but even there to help insure families find better housing at reasonable prices.

Fourth, it is our task to provide the sites for new construction largely by private enterprise. In the coming year, we look for the construction of several hundred moderate cost, private housing units as well as construction of the Government Center complex and other buildings.

A city, above all else, exists for the people who live, work, and visit there. Boston has been famous throughout the world as a city which people loved and cherished. Our goal is to keep Boston that way.

A CITY RENEWS ITS YOUTH

Where people of courage and vision came in small, sturdy sailing ships, over wide seas, 337 years ago, to start the America we know today, where now a 52-story building, beyond their wildest dreams, grows in a city that sheltered the settlers in tiny frame houses, fashioned in the sawpits, where young and old, from all parts of our far land, make the most moving of all historic pilgrimages to see where America got its go, where the builders of modern America now come—

To get ideas from the fertile brains of men in our laboratories, at our drawing boards, behind desks in our counting rooms, behind machines that require men of skills;

To get money from men of sound foresight who, over the generations, have furnished the capital for the expansion of the greatest industrial nation in the world;

To see men of science and medicine whose wise and prudent research has made the city the medical and scientific capital of the country;

To read newspapers, more of them than in any large city in the country, of many complexions and all of good character;

To find colleges and schools for the oncoming generation, interpreting a civilization coming of age.

And now they see—

A city not content to live on its proud past;

A city that is like a family which remakes its old home—to keep its character and warmth—and to add all the comfort and convenience available to Americans of today,

A city that has full new branches on its old roots;

A city that has the courage to rebuild its business, its highways, its neighborhoods—a new city to work and live in;

A city now in the midst of a remaking that will be the wonder of generations to come—a new hub in the wheel of modern plants and beautiful communities all but encircling the city;

A city that is shaping its own destiny—making its dreams of greatness come true,

A city with men and women equal to the challenge of such brave venture—with the fortitude to see the thing through,

A new-old city in which the Globe is proud to play its part and happy to contribute this brief biography of the Boston of tomorrow.

Other public and private building projects than those touched on are underway throughout the city.

They include the 32-acre New York streets project in the South End. Clearance work will soon get underway in Castle Square where new housing and commercial developments are expected.

There's a proposal for 400 housing units for Mattapan, and a 10-story apartment building off North Harvard Street, Allston.

DAVIS TAYLOR.

The Administration's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently in the Washington Post there was a column by Rosco Drummond entitled "On Cutting Taxes: The Consensus is Favorable."

I bring this article to the attention of Senators because I feel that in it Mr. Drummond succeeded in interestingly and succinctly evaluating the tax proposal and the controversy surrounding it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Drummond's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON CUTTING TAXES: THE CONSENSUS IS FAVORABLE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The way the President's tax program has been battered and buffeted, you'd think everybody was against it and that its prospects for passing were diminishing.

The opposite is nearer the truth. The controversy, which the bill has evoked, appears larger than it really is, and the consensus for tax reduction now is far greater than it appears.

Some people do not like particular parts of the tax program. That is understandable; its provisions are subject to considerable change by Congress. But these differences over exactly how the tax cut should be carried out should not be allowed to blur the fact that there is today a nationwide coalition of opinion, embracing the business community, labor leaders, and professional economists, that tax reduction has been delayed far too long, that it will help the economy and that now is the time to act.

President Kennedy has improved the prospects of his proposed tax cut by what he said to the American Bankers Association symposium on economic growth in Washington this week. He not only made an unusually effective plea for his bill, but more important he stated that he will not clutter and becloud the urgent issue of tax reduction with tax reform, which is far more controversial and will take more time to work out.

I am convinced that the administration's tax objective is prudent and basically conservative. It rests on sound economics and proposed a sound solution.

The central fact is that for more than a decade the growth of the American economy has been held back by the drag of excessively high tax rates. This repressive tax burden has been carried over from World War II and the early postwar years when the tax level was raised still higher to fight inflation.

Inflation is in check; unforutnately, so is the economy. Now we need to liberate the economy for faster growth.

Business Week magazine, no spokesman for the New Frontier, submits that the President's "analysis of the Nation's chief economic problem and the proposed solution make excellent sense."

It makes sense because the proposed tax cut draws on the experience of industrial nations that have the best postwar record of economic growth, preeminently West Germany and Japan. The lessons their experience teaches are these:

The higher rate of economic growth in Germany and Japan has in very large part resulted from higher rate of investment in new plants, modern equipment, and new products.

This higher rate of investment was made possible because the German and Japanese tax systems encouraged the accumulation of risk capital.

The purpose of the tax cut the President has put before Congress is to help free the economy from two inadequacies—insufficient investment by business and insufficient demand by consumers.

It seems to me the President has made a sound decision in giving tax reduction the highest priority and in not confusing the issue by insisting on tax reform simultaneously.

It is true that the immediate effect of the tax cut will increase the Federal deficit. But the consequence of the Eisenhower tax cut was to increase revenue and cut the deficit. The overriding consideration is the need to free the economy from the drag of intolerable tax rates. It should be done despite an immediate deficit.

A major tax cut is no panacea for everything that ails us, but it is a right beginning.

Lew Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join in this well-deserved tribute to our distinguished Parliamen-

tarian, Lewis Deschler. His vast knowledge, unbelievable memory and alert mind have won him top recognition in his chosen field and every Member of the House will attest to the fair and impartial manner in which this outstanding capability is exercised. His ready smile is sincere and warm. His huge frame commands attention upon first meeting, but association soon demonstrates he possesses a heart and spirit of equal size.

Lew Deschler has seen history made during some of the most stirring periods of our Nation. His role, though great, has been little known, largely due to his quiet and assuming manner, but those who have glimpsed him in action know how effective are his rapid fire responses as he counsels and advises. The tribute of the Speaker gives special validity to this attribute. It is my hope that Lew Deschler will continue to discharge his important service to our Nation for years to come. We congratulate him on his birthday and extend every good wish.

Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an extreme pleasure for me to call to the attention of the Members of Congress an address delivered by the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, before the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies on February 26, 1963.

The city of New York is proud of the record of its fine commissioner of welfare, the Honorable James R. Dumpson, who so ably presides over the city's department of welfare.

The mayor forcefully reminds us that we have, in effect, completed the circle insofar as philanthropy and welfare are concerned. Private philanthropy gradually gave way to public welfare and now financial stress has caused the municipalities to again look to the community for assistance in meeting the needs and services of the community.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

I am glad to be at this gathering sponsored by the Federation of Protestant Social Welfare Agencies. I consider this organization to be one of the finest in the field. It is an outstanding illustration of what might be called—in sociological terminology—positive volunteerism; or to put it in plain English, it is a major social force doing many good works, supported by the concerted good will of a great number of private individuals acting through their voluntary organizations. This federation has consistently supported and encouraged the Government in the discharge of its responsibilities, without seeking to evade or unload any part of its own.

I salute the fine attitude of this organization. I have long known it, respected it, and appreciated the good works it has performed and the leadership it has provided in the social work field. And not so incidentally, the praises of the federation are persistently sung to me by our eminent commissioner of welfare, Jim Dumpson.

It has been widely noted by foreign observers, beginning with the Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, 125 years ago, that one of the peculiar things about Americans is—and always has been—their penchant for forming and joining voluntary organizations, clubs, lodges, and associations of every kind to achieve their personal, social, or political purposes. No question about it, we Americans are joiners by habit and inclination.

We Americans look to our voluntary organizations to do what needs to be done even before we look to government. And when we think of government, our first inclination is to depend on—and complain to—local government. This, too, is an American characteristic. It reflects our history.

It reflects our belief in democracy and, above all, our unlimited faith in our own powers.

In 1932, at practically the peak of the depression, with 16 million unemployed, all State and local governments in the entire Nation spent a combined total of $444 million on public welfare. Even that figure was three times the amount spent in 1927. But in 1960, State and local governments spent $4,250 million on public welfare—an increase of 1,000 percent over 1932.

Once upon a time, of course, private expenditures for public welfare—it was called philanthropy in those days—were much greater than public expenditures. Today, the balance has completely shifted. Thirty years ago, public welfare was conceived largely in terms of caring for the hungry, meeting the emergency needs of the jobless and the destitute, and providing a modicum of care for needy children, needy aged, and the needy sick. In rough outline, that was about the size of it.

By today there has been an explosive expansion of services, along with an explosive change in our public welfare concepts. By now, public welfare has been institutionalized. The idea of it and the necessity of it have been generally agreed to. Indeed, the foundations and premises of public welfare are only rarely attacked. This is to the good—except for one thing. Some of these premises are not being as closely inspected by analytical and sympathetic minds as perhaps they should be.

In fact, the city's social and human problems are growing beneath our eyes and under our hands. Today, we are discovering that we have in our midst a group of people who might be called the "permanently" poor. It is an unpleasant fact, but it is a fact that we have third generation welfare families in New York City. Many of them are so psychologically disadvantaged, bruised and frustrated by their attempts to climb the walls of the well, that they have resigned themselves to life at its bottom, as did their parents—and in some cases, their grandparents.

All 1-day-old babies in New York City theoretically have the same potential for fulfillment and happiness. Yet it is a sad fact that something immediately divides many of these children into pigeonholes marked "probable success" and "probable failure" before they finish grammar school. In the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, for example, we have found that some children are already two grades behind by the time they get to the fifth grade. And in seven of the city high schools with predominantly nonwhite student bodies, we have found that the percentage of dropouts by graduation time runs from 33 to 66 percent. That simply means that as many as three out of five entering students drop out before they get their high school diplomas.

As James B. Conant has pointed out, this is social dynamite. But it is also economic disaster for New York City; here in this city, by the end of this decade, we foresee a 20-percent increase in professional and technical manpower needs, along with a 19-percent decrease in manual and unskilled jobs. We will need more skilled workers. More and more of the unskilled will fall into the pool of the jobless, the aimless, the hopeless.

We must do whatever we can, whatever is necessary, to end this perpetuation of poverty. And this is just one problem out of many that have become apparent in the light of 1963.

Of course, I could cite our welfare department statistics on intake and caseload to show how many individuals are being handled, how many children, how many adults, how many aged. I could cite all the varied and comprehensive services we perform—from vocational retraining of the jobless to tenant training in public housing. I could also cite figures showing how many social workers, caseworkers, supervisors, homemakers, and inspectors we now have on the job.

Within the framework of present practices, procedures, methods, and concepts, we can and should congratulate ourselves and point with pride to the level of the services we provide for the needy, the disadvantaged, the young, the aged, the weak, the helpless and homeless, the maladjusted, and the unskilled.

But we also need to ask ourselves from time to time: where are we going? What basic headway have we made against our problems? How much can social welfare contribute to a solution of these problems? What beneficial effects have our welfare programs had upon the social fabric of our community? While we are surely helping some individuals, what is happening to those who are not being helped? Are we strengthening the indigenous forces in the community? Are we raising or improving the level? Has our public welfare machinery retained the flexibility it needs? Is there not a tendency to become so involved with the internal problems of public welfare that our communications with the actual people involved have become somewhat strained?

I am aware that a Moreland commission, a special high-level review commission established under the terms of the Moreland Act, has just completed a study of the administration of welfare in New York State. I am proud to say that New York City's administration of welfare has come off very well in this report. Our procedures for detecting and discouraging chiselers and cheaters were noted and commended. I am pleased and satisfied that this is so. There goes another exploded myth in the welfare field.

But neither this Moreland Commission Report nor any other I have seen really asked the deep, fundamental and searching questions I am suggesting.

I have suggested questions, but I have not given the answers. I do not pretend to know the answers. That is the trouble. I don't think any of us really know the answers.

We do know that to resolve our present problems, we need many, many more social services than we now provide. We need a substantial number of new and major measures by the Federal and State governments—on the economic, educational, and social welfare fronts. Most of the needed measures are well known. All of them are controversial, too, to put it mildly. Yet somehow we must secure the consensus that is necessary to obtain their enactment.

As far as the capacity of our own city government to do much more than it is already doing, I must tell you frankly that we have reached a point where I must ask you, and we must all ask ourselves: where is the city government going to get the

money to pay for the additional services that we need?

Today, it looks as though, for the next fiscal year, we will face a gap of more than $200 million between the revenues we can expect to receive and the expenditures we will be called upon to make. And this is a most conservative estimate. I don't yet have the final figures. We shall have to bridge this gap, because we are forbidden by our State constitution from operating at a deficit. The decision must be made whether to curtail our essential services or raise new revenues by local taxation. There is no other answer. Moreover, I must emphasize that our need for services will continue to expand in the years immediately ahead, while our present sources of revenue carry no such promise.

I do not say that our first object must be to reduce the money we spend on welfare, but we do need to determine whether the amount we now spend is being spent as effectively as possible, and whether we might not save some here and spend more there, and in so doing, make real headway against real problems.

For this reason, as well as many others, we must examine and reexamine our approaches and commitments in the field of public welfare. In this process of examination and reexamination, I look to the private and voluntary agencies for help, counsel and wisdom. I look to them to help supply the leadership. May the day never come when the leadership in social welfare is considered to be solely or even primarily in the hands of government.

Frequent reference is made to the partnership between public and voluntary agencies. I know that Commissioner Dumpson made a major address last year in support of such a relationship. I subscribe to that relationship with all my heart. I go one step further. I say that whereas at one time there was a necessary shift of emphasis from voluntary agencies to public welfare agencies, today great and increasing emphasis must now be given to the role of the voluntary agencies. I hasten to add that I do not look to the voluntary agencies for significant financial expenditures but rather to the greatly increased use of their human resources, of their experience.

I have said it before, and I say it again today, that we will need to draw more and more from the indigenous resources of the community and of the neighborhood, from its internal resources. The word is "mobilization," and more and more there must be a recognition that the community must supply part of the manpower to meet the totality of community needs and services. There is not enough money in anybody's treasury to pay for all that we need.

We must learn how to mobilize both the active and latent forces within the various neighborhoods and communities. Public welfare must cease to be solely or even principally the concern of professional social workers. It must become everybody's business.

Our entire city must be brought to feel the sense of immediate relationship with and concern for the new elements recently added to our city. All who need help must be helped. And this includes those whose chief need is to be needed. Above all, we must reverse the process whereby, in recent years, urban living—which is supposed to be the height of civilized living—has been stripped, in many respects, of both its urbanity and humanity.

The spirit of the jungle, rather than of civilized society, has entered into the central core of the ctiy. Different population groups regard each other often suspiciously, sometimes even fearfully across the wasteland of noncommunication and misunderstanding of each other's problems and capacities.

All this must be remedied. All this can be remedied. All this shall be remedied, if all of us will work together with good will, with dedication, and with a total absence of prejudice and preconception.

We have the will to succeed. We must succeed.

Growth of Air Taxi Industry Means Speed and Convenience for Traveling Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, those of us who have over the years maintained close contact with the problems and interests of the aviation industry are heartened to note the steady growth and expansion of so-called third-level air carriers. These efficient operators provide realistic and workable small aircraft service linking off-airline points with regular route terminals without making demands on the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Congress. Air taxi service can—and does every day—give on-request transportation between airports of any size and other facilities of similar or different size, particularly in rush or emergency situations or where scheduled airlines are not convenient as to flight requirement.

The February issue of Air Travel carries an informative article, "Bigger Boom Ahead for Air Taxi," which discusses problems and advances in the air taxi system in the United States. The author, Keith Saunders, executive editor of the magazine, points out that the potential for widespread and efficient air taxi service is real. The National Air Taxi Conference represents these branch line carriers, with a membership of 165 operators in 186 locations.

Executive Secretary Mrs. Ethel Whitaker reports that National Air Taxi Conference was founded February 6, 1950, for the purpose of raising the standards of air taxi operators and to obtain the approval, confidence, and acceptance of the scheduled airlines and the traveling public. How well National Air Taxi Conference has accomplished these aims is forcefully illustrated by the figures for the 12 months ending September 30, 1962. During that span of time its members flew 59,411 revenue trips, of which 56,298 were for passengers, 2,432 for cargo, and 328 in ambulance service. Revenue in plane-miles flown, and the number of passengers served have also reached a level which reflects public acceptance.

Along with Mrs. Whitaker, National Air Taxi Conference President James Loeb participates in the formulation of plans and programs designed to advance the interests of third level operators. And, it is gratifying to note that a fellow mountaineer, my good friend Oscar Tate, of Greenbrier Airlines, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., serves as second vice president and a member of the board of directors of National Air Taxi Conference. I am confident that under the leadership of these experienced and dedicated experts, the National Air Taxi Conference and its members will convince more and more Americans that it is desirable to fly all the way.

Mr. President, I request that the article "Bigger Boom Ahead for Air Taxi," in the February 1963 issue of Air Travel be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIGGER BOOM AHEAD FOR AIR TAXI

It may be a long time before the Civil Aeronautics Board ever gets around to approving a certificated, subsidized third-level (something below present trunk line and local) air service, but the potential for such a service—without subsidy—already exists.

The National Air Taxi Conference, which represents 165 operators in 186 locations in nearly all sections of the country, believes that air taxi can provide a realistic and workable third-level service linking off airline points with airline route points without published schedules but without making any demands upon CAB and Congress to foot the bill.

Air taxi can—as it does every day—provide demand service between airports of any size and other airports of similar or different size, particularly in rush or emergency situations or where scheduled airline frequencies are sparse and something less than convenient.

ROLE IS IMPORTANT

Using such slogans as "Fly All the Way" or "All the Way by Air," the air taxi business in recent years has made unspectacular but steady advances in establishing itself as a well-equipped safe and self-supporting air service and is now approaching the point where, in the words of CAB Chairman Alan S. Boyd, it "can and should fill an important role as an integral and complementary segment of one air transport network."

Just now, this bustling but still relatively small segment of the air travel industry has several things going for it. For example:

While there are approximately 6,000 airports in this country, fewer than 600 have scheduled airline service. For the passenger whose point of origination or destination is one of the more than 5,000 off-airline airport cities, air taxi means he can go all the way by air.

The regional airport concept being pushed by the Federal Aviation Agency and CAB will further reduce the number of airline-served airports in the years ahead, leaving many more communities without an air service of their own.

CAB's use-it-or-lose-it program will wreak a steady attrition of smaller towns that will lose their air service for lack of adequate support. Also, the local service airlines, pressed by CAB and Congress to reduce their subsidy needs, will voluntarily seek to give up certain marginal traffic points or at least to overfly them on all but a minimum number of daily flights. All of this will create new opportunities and new demands for air taxi service.

The speed of today's turboprop and jet aircraft is such that businessmen are becoming increasingly reluctant to spend almost as much time in surface travel at the end of a 1,000- or 2,000-mile airline trip as they spend in the air.

Corporate salaries in the administrative, sales, and engineering categories are so high today that time becomes of prime importance when such individuals have to travel—and time is the major stock-in-trade of the air taxi business.

With all these things operating in their favor, the air taxi people feel that the only way their business can go is up. In fact,

that's the way it has been going since fiscal year 1955, the first full year for which National Air Taxi Conference has operating figures supplied by its membership. Here are some figures:

In the October 1954-September 1955 period, National Air Taxi Conference members made 27,135 revenue trips, broken down as follows: 21,810 passenger trips, 5,134 cargo trips, and 227 air ambulance trips. In the 12 months ended last September 30, the figures were: 59,411 revenue trips, of which 56,298 were for passengers, 2,432 for cargo, and 328 in ambulance service.

Revenue plane-miles flown rose in the 8-year period from 5,622,401 to 15,092,984; revenue passenger-miles went up from 6,388,603 to 58,093,372; cargo-miles went from 285,568 to 413,664; and ambulance miles rose from 160,856 to 208,338.

Passengers carried in the 1955 operating year totaled 79,535, including 5,655 connecting with the airline, 6,251 from the airlines, and 67,684 others. For the year ended last September 30, the National Air Taxi Conference members flew 131,716 passengers, including 31,627 fed to the airlines and 24,672 feeding from the airlines, plus 75,633 others.

FLOW NOT BALANCED

These last figures point to one of the current flaws in the air taxi picture: traffic which the air taxi operators turn over to the scheduled airlines exceeds by nearly 30 percent that which they receive in turn. And that is one of National Air Taxi Conference's major concerns at present—how to correct this imbalance. One way, of course, would be a coordinated nationwide program of advertising and promotion that would bring the air taxi industry great identity and recognition. But this is something the industry simply does not feel it can afford in its present stage of development. But there are other things perhaps just as important which, in National Air Taxi Conference's view, might be reasonably attainable. These include—

1. An air taxi service directory showing air taxi destination cities, exact fares, airline connections etc.

2. A through-ticketing arrangement enabling the airlines to write tickets for air taxi service and for air taxi operators to accept such tickets.

Twenty-two scheduled airlines are now parties to the new air taxi service agreement, which enables them to make air taxi arrangements for passengers who request them and who pay a $10 deposit, and enables them to give air taxi operators confirmed reservations for their passengers upon request. A through-ticketing arrangement would be a real boon to the air taxi people, especially if there also existed an agreement whereby the universal air travel plan credit card could be accepted for travel by air taxi.

Discussions relative to the through-ticketing agreement have been held with the air traffic conference, and a presentation on air travel card use for air taxi service is tentatively planned at air traffic conference's next board meeting in March. One or both of these arrangements may come into being within another year.

Also in the advanced planning stage is what CAB Chairman Boyd described as the air taxi industry's "single most practical need of the moment"—an air taxi service guide or directory.

To be an effective sales tool, such a guide must have a simple format and yet must contain the required information: (1) Is air taxi service available from point A to point B? (2) What does it cost (exact fare in dollars and cents)?

It is generally agreed that fares quoted should be for the entire aircraft—one fare for single-engine with a numeral (S-3) indicating the number of passenger seats available; and one fare for twin-engine with a numeral (S-4) indicating the number of passenger seats available. Flight time is also considered important and should be indicated.

Once a format has been agreed upon—and this is nearer than you might think—the big question will be how to get this effective sales tool into the hands of the people who can use it to best advantage, airline sales and reservations personnel? It could be distributed as a special section of the official airline guide—North American edition—replacing the present air taxi section. It could be distributed as an integral part of the quarterly OAG Travel Planner (successor to the Air Traveler's Guide). Or it could be printed as a separate guide or directory. All of these questions, together with cost figures, will be discussed at considerable length in the next few months, and such a directory or guide may well come into being this year.

Then just watch airline-air taxi cooperation thrive and grow. For air taxi service has an inherent flexibility which no scheduled carrier can match. As Chairman Boyd put it in a speech before National Air Taxi Conference members:

"You need be there only when you have a passenger. But you can be there when he wants you to be, to take him directly where he wants to go. This can make for a very attractive service—attractive to you as the producer, attractive to the traveler as the consumer. Certainly this type of service—properly priced—is far more useful to the traveler than a minimum scheduled service of two or three flights daily. As business grows it will become possible to synchronize your services, to promote joint use of one trip, and the price to each passenger should approach that of scheduled service."

GOALS ARE VARIED

That's one of the goals toward which National Air Taxi Conference's membership is working. And if they can get some of the other things they are seeking—an air taxi service guide, a through-ticketing agreement, an upping of the present gross weight limitation of 12,500 pounds so as to permit acquisition and utilization of lightweight turbine-powered aircraft, and possibly some protection from CAB in the form of route protection (a far different thing from subsidy) to those operators who have developed an air taxi service of their own volition and at their own expense in response to a public need.

Air taxi could well become one of the most dynamic segments of the air travel industry in the years just ahead.

Stirring Story of Texas Family of Gen. Bernard Schriever To Thrill Every American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Abilene Reporter-News of Thursday, February 28, published a page 1 story about a remarkable Texas woman and her sons, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever and Col. Gerhard Schriever. It is brilliantly written by Mr. Felix McKnight, of Dallas. It should thrill every American.

Because it is a story that could happen only in this country, I ask unanimous consent that this stirring article by Felix R. McKnight, executive editor of the Dallas Times Herald, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LADY: THE REWARD OF FAITH

(By Felix R. McKnight)

Quietly, as she lived her magnificent life, a lady has died. Too few paused upon the passing of Mrs. Elizabeth Schriever Betzlmann at Lackland Air Force Base Hospital, San Antonio.

But the world must know this story. It is an imperative in the uncertain moments when fibers of faith seem to get lost, or misplaced.

The young, the old can pick up threads of courage of being, of purpose from her life.

I shall tell it from memories. Some that reach back to a childhood of more than 40 years ago are faded by time.

It starts with a day at a San Antonio elementary school when I met a lean, shy boy. Strong, Teutonic features etched in a handsome face. He spoke with an accent.

It was just at the end of World War I. Bennie was a German-born boy not long in the United States and his classmates, cruel as the young can be, chided and harassed him. They shouted "Kaiser Wilhelm," and in the safety of groups chased him from the school grounds.

But Bennie was back every day. He could take it and he resolutely went his way. The classmates wearied of their mockery; the iron character of the boy repelled them. He was strong and unafraid and the respect for his new country, the United States of America, was obvious to those who cared to look.

None of the American children knew that Bennie's father was an engineer on a North German Lloyd steamship impounded in New York Harbor at the beginning of the war of 1914.

In 1917, even as the war blew wilder, seaman Schriever's ceaseless efforts finally brought rich reward—his wife and two sons were removed from Germany and brought to this country.

Father Schriever took his frightened family to New Braunfels, Tex., to live with relatives. The safety and the freedom of the United States were found in the village.

The war ended and he found employment as an expert machinist in a San Antonio foundry. The family was moved and an American epic started within this obscure little group.

It was born of tragedy. Father Schriever was killed in an industrial accident and suddenly Elizabeth Schriever found herself in a strange land the sole support of two young sons. She struggled to learn the language and she went to work.

The Schrievers lived in a small frame house hard by the 12th fairway of the Brackenridge Park municipal golf course. Fifty feet from the 12th green Mrs. Schriever erected a 10- by 10-foot wooden shack. She stocked it with a tangy homemade lemonade and cold drinks. And each morning she made dozens of homemade sandwiches and cookies. The drinks were a nickel, the sandwiches 15 cents. And they were the best in town.

Tourists flocked there by the hundreds—and they waited until they reached Mrs. Schriever's stand to slake a thirst or satisfy an appetite.

Gracious and charming, a beautiful lady with an accent quickly became one of the best known personages of San Antonio. She worked from dawn to dusk 7 days each week. The young boys helped with the chores and soon started adding to her nickels and dimes by caddying and doing odd jobs.

The years went by and Bennie entered high school—a tall and muscular young man. Little brother Gerhard was in elementary school and Mrs. Schriever's sandwich stand flourished. Never did a foursome pass her by. The good lemonade, the hot bread sandwich, and the warmth of the woman made it a "must" stop.

Bennie's life in the shadow of a golf course paid high dividends. In the few hours he had for recreation he practiced diligently. He became the best golfer in San Antonio, one of the best in Texas and the Southwest. He had little time for tournament golf or he could have become one of the great amateurs of his time.

But Bennie patterned his life to a minimum of play. The nickels and the dimes were hard to come by and the toil of his mother was not forgotten. He graduated from high school with honors * * * and a few years back Gerhard was treading the same trail.

The coins were transformed into hard-earned dollars and Bennie went away to Texas A. & M. College. Stripped of details that would make another chapter, Bennie made the wonderful woman back at the sandwich stand the happiest of all Americans.

With honors, high honors, he was graduated from Texas A. & M. in 1931. Bennie was now a Reserve officer of the U.S. Army and no prouder lady ever lived than Elizabeth Schriever. One immigrant son graduated cum laude; the other on his way.

Bennie immediately joined the U.S. Air Force and started pilot training. Mother Schriever had a few more years of her sandwich stand as son Gerhard finished his education.

The story quickens and episodes in the life of the Schrievers unfolded almost with each new day. Briefly, too briefly to do justice: Bennie became a South Pacific air hero; was recalled from active duty by the Air Force and assigned to Stanford University to work on a master's degree in aeronautical engineering.

Brother Gerhard was graduated from college, entered the Air Force and put another star in Mother Schriever's crown.

Now it was Colonel Bennie and the rangy Texan was submerged in the first fascinating phases of missiles and rockets and space—the kid from the sandwich stand with the superb golf game, the agile mind, the fierce love of country.

He became a one-star general—then major general in command of 75,000 persons laboring in the infant stages of intercontinental ballistic missile programs. Brother Gerhard—a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force

Mother Schriever had done her work well. She laid down her chores, married a man of the same mold, kindly Hans Betzimann, and started enjoying the children of her sons.

Cruel was her reward. Some 4 years ago she was rendered helpless by a stroke. Paralyzed, virtually speechless but still with light in her eyes, she could understand when her Bennie was confirmed a four-star general. The highest rank in the land.

The other day this queenly lady who fled enemy soil to become one of the great Americans died in peace.

She left:

Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief, Air Force Systems Command, No. 1 missile man. A German immigrant boy who, more than any other person, holds the destiny of this Nation in his firm hand.

And Col. Gerhard Schriever, side by side with his brother in the sensitive area of space science, the Air Force Systems Command.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Roger Latham, who writes a fishing column for Fishing Tackle Trade News, points out that in many parts of the country "gravel is more valuable for the production of fish than it is for building roads."

His column includes further evidence of the need for legislation which I have proposed, S. 468, to require the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of Federal-aid highway plans which affect fish, wildlife, and recreation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Latham's article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELLING FISHING

(By Roger Latham)

If you look around at some of the new road construction in almost any State, you quickly get the impression that highway engineers and highway planners are seldom fishermen.

They learned in college that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line, and that's the way they build the road, even if it means eliminating the best darned trout pool in the whole region.

It wouldn't be too bad, I suppose, if the damage stopped a few yards above and below where the road crosses the stream, but a stream has curves, and they don't seem to like anything with curves (well, anything inanimate, that is). So to make sure there will be no damming effect from these right-angle bends, which produce the best fishing holes, they put a bulldozer or shovel in the streambed and straighten it for a quarter of a mile in each direction. This leaves a stretch of stream that's now about 3 inches deep and 50 feet wide, where before it was up to 4 feet deep and maybe only 6 to 10 feet wide.

But this still isn't all. In lots of places, the most convenient source of aggregate for fill and for concrete is often these same streambeds. They go right to work digging out the gravel and eliminating much of the natural food supply. Even worse, they destroy the spawning grounds.

The U.S. Department of Commerce estimated 5 years ago that almost 10 billion tons of aggregate will be used for Federal-aid highway building through 1970. This, of course, does not include the great quantity which will go into other highway construction. Unless sportsmen and conservationists can prevent it somehow, a good part of this incredible tonnage will come from stream bottoms.

In many parts of the country, this gravel is more valuable for the production of fish than it is for building roads, even if we eliminate the esthetic or sentimental values. Out in California, a study revealed that each spawning salmon in the Sacramento Valley is worth about $17.50 to the commercial and sports fishing interests. It was estimated that about 50 salmon spawn on each acre of gravel. Thus, the value of the salmon produced annually per acre exceeds $800 and sometimes amounts to as much as $1,600.

Even the smaller trout streams of the East will annually attract hundreds of anglers to the area and cause thousands of dollars to be spent in tackle stores, local restaurants, hotels, gas stations, and other business establishments. Even streamside dwellers may benefit by furnishing room and board and guide service.

Then finally, there's that old bugaboo—silt. Great earthfills, deep cuts and miles of bare highway shoulders permit tons of soil to enter the otherwise sparkling clear stream. Fisheries biologists know what this silt load does to a stream bottom, to the supply of aquatic fish food and to spawning success. One new highway, if not immediately and carefully cared for, may permanently cripple a fine trout stream. Several may go a long way toward ruining a good-sized river.

With prompt and proper care, however, much of this drainage can be prevented. Burlap strips and seeding with the right grass or other plant cover will quickly stop erosion. This, in the long run, is an economically sound procedure, too, since going back to refill and regrade eroded slopes and berms costs plenty of money.

A lot can be accomplished toward preventing the ill effects of highway construction on fishing and fishing waters. Public sentiment is probably the best means of getting highway engineers and highway department officials to see the light. Bertram D. Tallamy, former Federal Highway Administrator, indicated his concern for the esthetic values several years ago by stating that it costs no more to have a highway divide around a clump of trees of a trout stream than it does to ignore these values and destroy them.

The best approach is for the sportsmen, working in conjunction with the game and fish department, to send their protests and suggestions to the highway department in the form of resolutions. Copies of any such resolutions should go to the Governor's office and to the State senators and representatives.

Newspaper editorials, and columns by the outdoor editor, can go a long way toward enlisting public support. This can become an important crusade for some newspapers, with pictures and plenty of facts and figures.

Because any lessening of interest in fishing or the reduction of fishing opportunity will hit the tackle retailer in the place where it hurts most—his pocketbook—he should feel obligated to do a little prodding and a little leading in this fight against careless construction methods. Sometimes just a word or two in the right ears will start a chain reaction. As a result, State officials will soon know that there are people who care and who insist on saving the blessings they have left.

Areas of Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the presentation in the following editorial from a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor is comprehensive and worthy of national attention. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

AREAS OF CONCERN

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Inside the United States, the political battles of the next 6 or 8 months are likely to include these: first, the long, complex struggle over a tax bill; second, the efforts of the administration to defend its Cuban policies; and, third, its efforts to defend its position in the world both regarding the European alliance, and in its aid policies toward the lesser developed nations.

In all these great areas of concern, the administration is in serious trouble. Of course, events may take place somewhere in the world—in Berlin, in Vietnam, in Taipei, in India—which could shock and challenge the United States and thrust the list of three issues into the shade. But at the moment, taxes, Cuba, and the Western alliance—with all they stand for—are dominant issues on which the administration's prospects rise or fall.

President Kennedy's own personal position basically rests on such issues, although it is intensified both pro and con by other more emotional questions. Never has any American President conducted a more extensive publicity campaign in his own behalf; never have results been more basically uncertain despite plainly favorable psychological factors. The three great issues are not going to be settled soon. Let us take them one by one:

AWKWARD POSITION

The tax cut proposals were not of the right proportions to suit either side, and some of the tax reform ideas displeased almost everybody. Only a few weeks ago, Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon testified that if Congress passed tax cuts without tax reforms he would advise the President to veto the bill. Last week, the President admitted—although there has been argument over whether he misstated himself—that he would take tax cuts without tax reforms if he had to. This left Secretary Dillon in an awkward position but nobody seemed to worry much about that.

In his most recent statements, the President has sought to shift to Congress the responsibility for a business recession or depression if they do not cut taxes. Such a blunt warning before an election year is stiff political medicine. Congress does not like it. Furthermore, it would be a confident

economist who would be sure of the effects of any tax bill, least of all the kind of compromise and watered-down measure likely to issue from this Congress.

So the business situation next year is uncertain at least. The country could very easily be in one of its recurrent cyclical recessions. Unemployment could be higher than at present—higher than it was when President Kennedy took office. So on the issue of taxes the President faces a problematical future. Things could turn out politically encouraging for him, but even more probably they could turn out very disappointingly.

CUBAN OUTLOOK DUBIOUS

On the second issue, Cuba, the outlook is equally dubious. The administration has deliberately chosen a long-range course. It is being pushed by some Republicans and some Democrats to take more drastic steps: a tight blockade of the Communist-held island, or even an invasion. Perhaps the President does not mind being pushed into such a situation. But few of his advisers have reflected this view. Rather, they—like the President—have said Castroism must be sealed off and isolated in Cuba, and that to intervene overtly would do more harm than good.

Only when medium-range Soviet missiles presented a clear and present danger to the United States did the President take a stronger line. It worked on the short run, but there is much evidence the Soviets are doing just what they like in Cuba: retaining the island as an outpost, and preparing actively to prevent any anti-Castro revolution while preparing to aid any pro-Communist revolutions on the mainland. They have time and they can wait, but they are not inactive meanwhile. Unless the Communists themselves take more overt steps, the Cuban situation by election time, 1964, is likely to be just as unsatisfactory as it is today, and probably more so. Thus the Cuban issue is constantly working against the administration, for the American people remain deeply disturbed at an active Communist base in their front yard.

On the third issue—the disintegration of President Kennedy's grand design for an Atlantic community, and the comparable dwindling of hopes for the underdeveloped, newer nations, President de Gaulle still stands squarely athwart the road to a more effective Atlantic alliance. There is no sign of anything that will move him. Should the United States try to bring pressure, President de Gaulle can bring far more effective pressure against the dollar and the U.S. unfavorable balance of payments. By calling in French dollar holdings he could virtually ruin the dollar and put a cruel drain on gold. That is one reason why the United States has not been talking tougher with President de Gaulle.

POLICIES IN CONFLICT

Indeed, the continued unfavorable balance of payments might grow into an issue of graver import than the other three. President Kennedy was worried about it when he took office; he is worried about it today. It remains a major unsolved problem. Monetary efforts to combat business slackness in the United States, such as reduced interest rates, are harmful to the balance of payments by making it less attractive for capital to remain in or come to the United States.

Thus there is a conflict between domestic and foreign economic policies. Thus President de Gaulle is unlikely to be moved out of the road of Atlantic integration. He is sternly opposed to the leadership of the United States and he regards Britain as merely the tool of the Americans. American diplomats, like Ambassador Livingston Merchant, diligently trying to sell American nuclear defense proposals to Western Europeans, are finding it hard going. The Western Alliance is in disarray. There is no hint when it will come back together again.

American policy toward the underdeveloped nations is similarly uncertain. Never has the foreign aid program been under heavier attack, both from without and within. Democratic Senators who have toured southeast Asia, the Clay review committee appointed by the President himself, and various others, are in agreement that heavy cutbacks, greater selectivity, and stronger enlistment of private capital are all needed. It would not be unlikely if Congress cut the pending foreign aid appropriations more severely than ever before.

It is becoming apparent that a good deal of foreign aid is not productive, and it fosters graft and artificiality, and that slow, steady building at the grassroots with the support of local capital is far more useful in the long run. The future in the long list of new and undeveloped countries is very uncertain.

THREAT TO STABILITY

In Africa, communism's efforts to penetrate have not been successful. In the Middle East, nationalism remains ahead of communism. But in Latin America the Cuban center of action is a constant threat against stability in many nations on the continent. So the third issue—the alliance and the aid program—shows a slipping back rather than a moving ahead in the last 2 years. Unless the situation turns around, the administration will face stern difficulties with the electorate next year. But you cannot beat somebody with nobody. The Republican opposition could not expect to defeat President Kenendy's reelection campaign by simply saying that most of his 1960 campaign attacks and promises had been unfilled.

Going beyond politics, however, it is clear that the United States as a nation needs strengthening of its policies. Its economy needs strengthening, whether by tax cutting or by budget cutting or by other measures. The dollar needs to be rescued. The threat presented by communism in the Caribbean is indeed serious. The breaking apart of the Western alliance needs to be checked, the instability and poverty of much of Africa, Asia, and Latin America need to be remedied.

These are serious problems. At a time when the Communist world is deeply divided, the non-Communist nations should not permit themselves the luxury of factionalism. The challenge is to statesmanship, not to partisanship. And the difficulties which the Kennedy administration faces are difficulties which the United States faces as a nation, and the free world faces. We are all involved in their solution.

Washington Post Article Recalls Adaptation of Kipling's "On the Road to Mandalay" by Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 8, there was an article "United States and Burma Reach Accord on Working Road to Mandalay." Apparently this project, about which there was considerable discussion several years ago, is being reactivated.

During a hearing in May 1960, on Alaska highways before the Subcommittee on Highways of the Senate Committee on Public Works, a witness from Alaska was telling of the difficulty in getting Federal cooperation in a highway program for Alaska. The consultant the Alaskans wished to employ was being sent to Asia to cooperate in the building by the International Cooperation Administration of a road from Rangoon to Mandalay, a matter of 450 miles.

At that point Senator GRUENING said:

I have been so touched by this foreign aid project for a road to Mandalay paid for by American dollars which recalls "On the Road to Mandalay" by Rudyard Kipling, which has been famed in verse and song, that I was tempted to bring it up to date, and if it would not be undue levity, I would like to read it at this point.

It asked Senator GRUENING "Have you composed a parody?" to which he replied "I have an adaptation." Senator COOPER of Kentucky said he would be glad to listen. Senator LONG of Hawaii suggested that the adaptation should be sung and not merely recited. But as an accompanist was not present the Senator from Alaska read the poem, which, I feel, deserves to be immortalized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Possibly the poem should be brought up to date. Since the Administration for International Development has replaced the International Cooperation Administration, perhaps Senator GRUENING's second verse, written 2 years ago, should read "Where the AID'ers play" rather than "Where the ICA'ers play." In any event, American dollars are now being used to build this highway. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post of March 8, 1963, be inserted in the RECORD, followed by Senator GRUENING's adaptation of Kipling's verses.

There being no objection, the article and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1963]

UNITED STATES AND BURMA REACH ACCORD ON WORKING ROAD TO MANDALAY

The United States and Burma yesterday announced agreement on rebuilding a part of the road to Mandalay.

Engineering studies are to begin immediately on a 42-mile stretch from north to Pegu, it is hoped that construction will start with the Burma dry season which begins in December.

Funds for the road, once the cost is determined, will come from some $28 million the United States set aside to assist the road to Mandalay as long ago as the spring of 1959.

For the past year, agreement on a go-ahead has been held up by General Ne Win's government because of differing views on which route the road should take north of Pegu and on to Pyu.

Ne Win has wanted to follow the foothills along the Sittang River valley to avoid flood dangers. The United States suspects this route would be far more costly than a route along the valley floor and bypass all the population centers along the old Road to Mandalay.

Under the agreement reached yesterday, Burma and the United States decided to confine their attention to the Rangoon-Pegu

stretch and face up to their Pegu-Pyu differences at a later date. Agency for International Development officials want the Pegu-Pyu stretch to follow whichever route is found to be most economical and technically feasible.

MANDALAY—1960 (WITH APOLOGIES TO RUDYARD KIPLING)

By the old Mulmein Pagoda, lookin' eastward to the sea,
There's a Burma project settin', and I doubt it works for me.
But the White House says we've got to, and the foreign echoes say
Come you back, you Yankee dollar, come you back to Mandalay.

On the road to Mandalay,
Where the ICA'ers play,
Can't you hear their 'dozers chunkin' from Rangoon to Mandalay?
On the road to Mandalay
Just another giveaway
And the dough comes up like thunder from the good old U.S.A.

Bargaining on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 6, 1963.

BARGAINING ON TRIAL

Labor Secretary Wirtz has let it be known that, in his view, collective bargaining is on trial. Labor and management face their "last clear chance" to prove that they can work things out by themselves. If they don't, he strongly implies that the Government stands ready to take over.

Looking around the Nation, it's not hard to find evidence that collective bargaining is indeed in trouble. As Mr Grimes commented on this page the other day, traditional bargaining procedures lately have proved of little help in the airline, railroad, aerospace, newspaper, and longshore industries.

How did bargaining get in such a bad way? Why is there increasing talk that "something must be done" by Government?

Ironically a large part of the answer is simply that Government has done so much already. Washington proclaims proper wage as well as price behavior. In purported defense of the public interest, Government officials roam the country intervening in labor disputes. Their intervention comes ever earlier, sometimes even before real bargaining has had a chance to begin. And its circle of interest grows ever wider, sweeping in even the Metropolitan Opera.

The more the concept of public interest has been twisted and expanded, the more labor disputes become a matter of public shouting rather than private bargaining. Increasingly, both sides see little reason for flexibility in their dealings with each other. Why should they try to work things out at the bargaining table? The chances are the Government will settle it anyway.

It's true that both sides can still resist Government pressure up to a point. Thus the railway clerks on the Southern Pacific, in their eagerness to preserve featherbedding, feel free to ignore the findings of a Presidential board. And the head of the New York printers' union, denounced by the President, blandly replies that Mr. Kennedy was misinformed.

After all, they have before them the interesting precedent of the longshoremen. When the dockworkers resisted Federal pressure, the Government turned on the employers and in effect forced them to accept a settlement. A settlement, in fact, that went beyond the Government's own wage guidelines.

So it is hardly surprising that the Government, as well as the would-be bargainers, feels a growing sense of frustration. It has stepped in too far and yet the only answer it sees is to get in even deeper. Unless, of course, those directly concerned with collective bargaining should somehow overcome all the Government-imposed obstacles, pull themselves together and regain mastery of their own affairs.

The chances for any such development, in the current circumstances, are dim. For collective bargaining, even before the Government stepped up its intervention, was being called on to accomplish too much. A labor official quoted by Mr. Grimes put it this way: "Collective bargaining was intended to handle specific problems between a specific company and a specific union." Where those conditions still prevail, labor relations are often excellent.

But even a cursory glance at today's America will show how far bargaining generally has departed from the original concept. With their explicit exemption from antimonopoly laws, labor unions over the years have steadily expanded the area of bargaining to a point where negotiators are called upon to set wages and working conditions for employees in a wide variety of plants in a variety of geographical areas, often located throughout the country.

Is this request entirely reasonable? The head of the Steelworkers Union admits to being out of touch with the real wishes of the rank and file, and other national union leaders cannot be much better informed. Yet, on their distant reading of the needs of their members, national unions now can and do close down not just a few plants but whole industries.

In this situation, it is no solution to take the process of wage determination still another long step away from the workers—to entrust the problem to government. That way lies the road to complete economic regimentation, a regimentation that could hardly be expected to stop with wages. Surely it would make more sense to head in the opposite direction, to try to bring about local bargaining in local plants over local issues.

If collective bargaining is indeed on trial, it is government that has largely put it there. And government also must stand in the dock.

Aid to Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, President Kennedy recently submitted to Congress his recommendation that a basic program of hospital insurance for the aged be provided for Americans 65 and over primarily through the social security system. Thirty-five Senators joined me in introducing the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963. Action on this matter is long overdue. That is the central point of a statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council published on February 26, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL MESSAGE ON AIDING SENIOR CITIZENS, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

For the first time in our history the President of the United States has sent to the Congress a special message on the problems of the aged and aging. The President's program recognizes with fresh perspective and clear vision that old age need not be characterized by anguish, fear and insecurity, that the phrase "the golden years" can indeed become a reality for millions of more Americans, and that the Federal Government has an important role in helping States, local communities, and individual families in bringing this about.

Of course, the first and foremost priority is hospital insurance. As the President so eloquently stated: "A proud and resourceful Nation can no longer ask its older people to live in constant fear of a serious illness for which adequate funds are not available. We owe them the right of dignity in sickness as well as in health. We can achieve this by adding health insurance—primarily hospitalization insurance—to our successful social security system."

The AFL-CIO has called for the enactment of health insurance for the aged through social security and railroad retirement for some years past. Since our early support of such legislation we have witnessed an increasing recognition of the need for action, we have seen legislative proposals revised and modified and we have watched the support of thoughtful citizens and responsible organizations strengthen and grow: In the development of the last several years, these facts stand out:

(1) The aged need health insurance: Health insurance has become the accepted way of paying hospital and other large health bills for the majority of Americans. The increased medical needs that come with old age make payment of major health costs at the time of illness utterly impractical for those living on a retirement income. Health insurance for the aged is imperative.

(2) The type of insurance the aged need most is hospital insurance: The greatest health expenses during old age are associated with hospitalization. A program of benefits emphasizing hospitalization and nursing home care is the most appropriate program for meeting the most urgent needs of the vast majority of the aged.

(3) The only practical way to finance hospital insurance for the aged is based on the social security principle, with benefits: For those people who are not now covered by social security or railroad retirement financed out of general revenues. Our social security system is today serving many millions of Americans in protecting them against loss of income through retirement, disability, or death. Beneficiaries have earned this protection through contributions made during their working lives. Social Security must be extended to protect people against the fourth major threat, the high cost of hospital and related care. Social insurance, enabling people to contribute while they are working toward benefits which they receive as a matter of right at the time of retirement is far superior to a welfare pro-

gram. Social insurance prevents poverty and preserves dignity.

(4) Public welfare medical assistance is only acceptable as a second line of defense: While public assistance medical care cannot substitute for social insurance, it can function as a supplement to the basic hospitalization program of social security, just as old-age assistance has supplemented the OASDI system for a quarter of a century. The President answered well those who would rely solely on welfare medical programs instead of social security financed insurance when he so aptly pointed to the weakness of welfare medical assistance as helping people to get health care "only if they first accept poverty and then accept charity."

(5) Private insurance can make a major contribution by supplementing the basic hospitalization plan. We can expect private insurance greatly to expand as it supplements basic hospitalization coverage through social security just as other private insurance grew after the passage of the original Social Security Act.

(6) The time for action is now. We call upon the Congress of the United States to enact a program of hospital insurance for the aged through social security and railroad retirement at this session. Although irresponsible opposition has done all it can to confuse the American people about the issues at stake, the vast majority of Americans young and old, can see through the sloganeering and scare tactics, and will support with enthusiasm the prompt enactment of the administration's sound, practical proposal of hospital insurance for the aged.

While the problem of providing hospital insurance for the aged supersedes all other matters that would improve the lot of the older members of our families, we cannot overlook the special needs of the aged in the areas of housing, income, employment taxes and special facilities and services. We congratulate the administration on the scope of its program for our older citizens and urge the Congress to implement it with prompt action.

Cuban Caves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now there have been conflicting claims about a Soviet military buildup in Cuba.

In an effort to shed light on this subject, my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] made a statement on the House floor February 28. This statement largely consisted of material obtained from the Legislative Reference Service concerning the numbers and sizes of Cuban caves. The information obtained was fragmentary and incomplete.

On March 8, 1963, the Chicago Tribune carried the following story on page 3:

SCANT DATA AVAILABLE IN UNITED STATES ON CUBAN CAVES

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Little public information is available about the thousands of underground caverns in Cuba, some of them of vast size, where Russian troops are reported to be storing large amounts of military equipment and supplies.

It is known, however, that some are a half-mile long, with arching roofs as high as a skyscraper, the ground dry, and the temperature even, capable of storing the biggest missiles and jet bombers, as well as tanks and artillery of lesser size.

Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, has placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on the Cuban caves which he solicited from the Library of Congress. The report cited some published references to the caves it found in library files but it conceded that information was scarce.

NO SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE

The U.S. Geological Survey, for example, told the library researchers that it had no specific knowledge of the number and sizes of the caves.

This same lack of information apparently extends to the highest intelligence officers. When Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, told Senate investigators yesterday of Russian activity indicating underground storage of weapons, his prepared statement first asserted: "There are several hundred caves in Cuba." "Hundreds" was later scratched out and "thousands" substituted.

NOT ALL REMOVED

Fitch noted persistent reports from refugees that not all long-range missiles had been removed from Cuba after the Russian agreement of last October 27. However, he indorsed the official administration position which expressed the "belief" that the Russians have removed all strategic missiles.

The refugee reports contend that 88 medium-range (1,500 miles) missiles were sent to Cuba and that only 42 were withdrawn last fall. The remaining 46 are underground, they assert.

Such missiles easily could be hidden in Cuba's caves, Representative CLEVELAND noted. The Library of Congress reported some studies of the caves in Spanish publications, most of them, however, describing explorations and pictographs found on the walls. One of these was a century-old "guide to the cave of Bellamar," on the San Juan River near Mantanzas Bay.

CLEVELAND said this lack of accurate information concerning the number and location of Cuba's caves was distressing.

"It seems obvious," he said, "that we should have collected this information. For more than 50 years prior to the Castro takeover we had freedom to acquire this information. Our information-gathering programs have lacked selectivity and impetus."

The gentleman from New Hampshire has diligently pursued his research on Cuban caves. On March 9, the Manchester Union-Leader published the following article on page 1:

CLEVELAND ASKS DATA ON CUBAN CAVE NETWORK

WASHINGTON.—A Congressman suggested Friday that if anyone has information on Cuban caves and their weapon-storage capabilities he should forward it to the Library of Congress.

Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, said such data might help the Defense Department and congressional committees. He noted that the Army's chief intelligence officer told the Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday that Cuban caves may hide Soviet weapons.

More than a week ago CLEVELAND told the House there apparently is little accurate information on the size, number or location of Cuba's caves.

"For more than 50 years prior to the Castro takeover," CLEVELAND said, "we had freedom to acquire this information. All of this suggests our information-gathering programs in the past have lacked selectivity and impetus."

I am pleased to report that information is already being received by the Library of Congress.

I wish to applaud the nonpartisan efforts of the gentleman from New Hampshire. He has taken the time and trouble to help Congress obtain sorely needed background information on a matter of importance to all Americans.

Old-Age Care and the Public Purse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on February 25 I arose to praise an action of Wyoming's State Legislature in implementing the Kerr-Mills medical care bill. I now ask unanimous consent to enter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article on that same subject by the distinguished columnist, Holmes Alexander.

Mr. Alexander has noted Wyoming's action in becoming the 28th State to provide medical care for its aged under the joint Federal-State aegis of the Kerr-Mills act.

His comments pay tribute both to Wyoming's State government and the laudability of the Kerr-Mills program.

I ask that they be printed in today's RECORD as further evidence of joint cooperation in meeting the needs of senior citizens through voluntary, economically sound programs managed by State governments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD-AGE CARE AND THE PUBLIC PURSE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—By the act of its current legislature, Wyoming becomes the 28th State to provide medical care for its aged under the Kerr-Mills Act by which the Federal Government matches State funds.

Although the bill passed the Wyoming House, 39 to 16, and passed the Senate, 27 to 0, the lawmakers are not happy about it. Neither is the Wyoming press. Everybody concerned seems to feel that the problem is bigger than the solution, that the new act is helpful and necessary, but insufficient and imperfect.

All Americans of conscience, I surmise, wish that more could be done for the needy aged. It is a compassion that does the Nation credit, but it should not load us with a guilt complex that can be exploited by the bureau builders and denigraters of this greathearted land.

Old age is a natural law, an act of God, which cannot be repealed by human legislatures. The best that mortals in a self-governing society can do is insure that old persons in need are given medical aid which they, their communities, and their families are not willing or able to provide.

It is equally necessary for State and Federal Governments to keep their guards up against chicanery and freeloading. Welfare racketeering has become a scandal. There are brigands who raid the public treasury behind masks of demagoguery. There are

deadbeats who fatten on the relief rolls. There are children who will not help their needy parents if they can find a way to duck this duty. There are taxeaters galore who plant both feet in the trough and shoulder off weaker persons who need and deserve the fare.

For these reasons, I take it, the Wyoming Legislature deserves commendation for writing the bill it did. A copy on my desk shows that care was taken to discharge the double responsibility of aiding the needy and protecting the public purse. To obtain medical aid a Wyoming resident of 65 must show a doctor's certificate of illness, must pay the first $100 of cost, must not be already on relief, must have an income of not more than $1,200 a year, property resources not exceeding $2,500 annually, and a home with an assessed value of no more than $4,000.

The result of this selectivity is to provide aid for 6,996 Wyoming residents out of a total of 30,000 who are over 65. Presumably only those who need the aid will get it. By paying the first $100, the elderly patient gains the dignity of being a contributor—and the State saves $400,000. By covering only those in provable need, the State spends $570,000 for the next 2-year period instead of nearly $10 million to cover everybody, needy or not. This bill is voluntary. Were it compulsory and universal, as the President's medicare bill would be, the total tax cost would be 10 times the amount just appropriated in Wyoming.

The bill contains escape clauses for hardship cases. A person whose medical bills reduce his means below the $1,200 income figure automatically becomes eligible. Health insurance payments up to $150 a year can be subtracted from the income figure. The public also gets an escape clause. If a medically aided person dies and leaves property, the State must be paid back before the heirs inherit the estate.

This is not a bill to be ashamed of. This State and all States with similar acts have legislated wisely and well.

Feed Grains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a resolution adopted by unanimous vote at the 18th annual convention of the Virginia State Feed Association in Roanoke, Va., on February 19, 1963:

FEED GRAINS

Whereas the Federal Government is again preparing legislation designed to reduce feed grain acreage and to further increase the cost of feed grains at taxpayers' expense, and

Whereas Virginia is a deficit grain-producing State and is in great need of expanding its grain production to supply the present needs of its poultry and livestock industries; and

Whereas a larger supply of grain at competitive prices is absolutely essential to the well-being and to the future growth of these much-needed agricultural industries in Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Virginia State Feed Association urge the State's congressional delegation to oppose with all their vigor the continuance of the present feed grain programs or the adoption of other legislation which will have the effect of further reducing the feed grain acreage in Virginia; and be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Government be prohibited by law from continuing indefinitely to compete with private industry in the distribution of grains and other agricultural products in domestic and world markets, which results in a double loss to the American public; that is, the selling of these products at a loss to the taxpayer and the loss of huge sums in tax dollars that would be paid by private industry on the income from the sales now denied to it by Government competition.

Detection and Inspection or Deception and Destruction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this is what the Eisenhower test ban position was in 1958 when the Geneva test ban negotiations began, any treaty would include only a ban on the kinds of testing which would be subject to detection, identification, location, and verification.

It was recognized that underground testing which produced seismic shock signals of less intensity than 4.75 on the Richter seismic scale could not be detected reliably, let alone identified as possible cheating, located and then verified by on-site inspection.

Therefore, only events of greater magnitude were to be prohibited by the treaty.

This was in accordance with President Eisenhower's declaration:

> We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party unless that treaty contains within itself self-enforcing mechanisms.

Notwithstanding the above, this is what the Kennedy test ban position was on August 27, 1962, when at the Geneva Conference table, the administration proposed signing a treaty that would ban all underground tests, whether or not cheating could be detected and policed in the low-yield ranges.

This is what the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 7, 1963, could be developed by cheat testing in the low-yield ranges below which neither individual tests nor a whole series of them could even be detected by any seismic detection system, let alone identified or located:

First. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

Second. Higher yield tactical weapons up to a much larger yield—by extrapolation—"almost any tactical weapon one has in mind"—with such confidence that proof testing of the weapon would not be required.

Third. Much higher yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from events as small as 1 kiloton with such confidence as not to require proof testing before safely placing the new weapons in stockpile.

Fourth. At least one-half of all tactical weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military, also with such confidence as not to require proof testing before stockpiling.

Fifth. A substantial fraction of all large-yield strategic weapons of interest, by the simple expedient of testing in underground cavities which muffle explosions down to siesmic effects below the 3 kiloton threshhold of detectability by "decoupling" their shock from the surrounding earth.

Although not discussed by Betts at the hearings, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Dean at the Geneva talks has affirmed that development of the pure-fusion, neutron bomb can be carried out below the threshold of detectability. The military significance of this new weapon has been described as "equal to or greater than" development of the H-bomb. Naturally, the remaining one-half of all tactical weapons of interest which could not be tested without decoupling could be tested using the technique.

What the Kennedy administration proposes to do, even in the new draft treaty presently under preparation by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for offer to the U.S.S.R. within a few weeks, is wholly to forego U.S. testing and advances in all such weapons categories and simply to trust the Soviets to keep their word not to test them and develop them clandestinely underground.

This is what President Kennedy said about such unpolicied test ban situations on March 2, 1962, just a few days more than a year ago:

> A nation which is refraining from tests obviously cannot match the gains of a nation conducting tests.
>
> The basic lesson of some 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret.
>
> If all testing can be halted—then the nuclear arms race would be slowed down at last. But this must be a fully effective treaty. We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium.

This is what President Kennedy said on March 6, 1963, last Wednesday:

> We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every insurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate.

So, what is the administration's position today?

Notwithstanding what Mr. Kennedy says his administration's position is, notwithstanding Mr. Kennedy's denunciation of uninspected moratoriums, that is exactly what the administration's position is today. It is not proposing a fully

effective treaty. It is proposing one full of obvious cheating holes.

This inconsistency between actual position and described position is great cause for concern. It should be quickly resolved.

Americans have a right to an answer to the test ban question:

Detection of Soviet cheating and inspection of Soviet soil or deception by Soviet duplicity and destruction by Soviet nuclear superiority?

Mexican National Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in "The Ventura County Rancher With Al Tiffany" column in the February 1963 issue of the Broadcaster, monthly publication of the Ventura County Farm Bureau. The editorial follows:

Has it ever occurred to you that one of the big differences between agriculture and industry is that no big segments of agriculture has ever been shut down because of labor trouble? Whereas, workers in huge sections of other economic divisions—coal miners, factory personnel, transportation workers, to name a few—become dissatisfied with their lot and strike. This has never happened in agriculture. The labor difficulties which have occurred have been isolated enough so that entire areas or segments of the economy have not been affected.

It seems fantastic that efforts are still being made to bring the farmers into line with labor demands and place them under the control of outside influences which could cripple the production of our farms and ranches. Those who feel that agriculture can be regimented according to a set of rules, or that legislation will automatically solve the ills of growing food and fiber seem to have a mental block. They do not realize that nature is the pervading influence in farming, not boards of directors, union officials or legislators at any level of government.

Factories, stores, and even Government offices may bend to the power of organized labor, but when you try to pressure Mother Nature you come off second best. She continues to hold complete sway over the production of the products of the soil as she has for millions of years and to date no private or governmental agency has found a way to change her very much.

The role of Government in the management of labor in agriculture is puzzling to say the least. There are, in some governmental areas, those who are determined to get rid of the bracero program. They are aided and abetted by do-gooders, various misinformed groups and individuals who insist on making a social problem out of an economic fact. The campaign has taken some odd and surprising turns.

In one instance the Government actually encouraged the development of cotton picking and sugarbeet harvesting machines. This would seem, at first glance, an odd thing to do if the Department of Labor wanted to create more jobs for domestic workers.

This was apparently the theory behind the move: to free the domestic workers who had formerly worked in cotton and sugar beets. This, in turn, would create a labor force which would take the place of the braceros. And this program, finally would be discontinued.

But the planners did not figure on the vagaries of human nature. They forgot—or never knew, though this seems impossible—that the braceros go where they are needed and when they are no longer needed they are sent home. But the domestics, who were freed by the cotton and beet harvesting machines, are American citizens and they can go where they please.

So, they did not dutifully go where the planners thought they would—to the vegetable and fruit areas of California and the West. No, they went to the Southeast—because that's where they wanted to go and no one could force them to go anywhere else. Consequently we now have the harvesting machines, we have the domestic workers, and we still need the braceros.

What was it that Robert Burns said about "the best laid plans of mice and men?"

Release of Archbishop Slipy of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I submit remarks given by Mr. Albert C. Walsh, Omaha attorney, to Ukrainian-Americans of Assumption Church of the Byzantine Rite of Omaha and friends. The gathering on February 17 was to celebrate the release of the Most Reverend Joseph Slipy, Archbishop of Lviv and Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, from a Communist concentration camp.

Mr. Walsh's remarks follow:

TE DEUM LAUDAMUS: ARCHBISHOP SLIPY'S RELEASE

We praise You, O God, and confess that You are the Lord. In His great Goodness God has freed from a Communist prison His servant, the Archbishop of Lviv, Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, the Most Reverend Joseph Slipy.

We Latin Catholics have forgotten the time after the collapse of the Roman Empire in the West when our bishops upheld society almost by themselves. They were not only the spiritual leaders of the Western World but by necessity became its civil and temporal leaders as well.

In this age, despite your love of country and your sacrifices, the Ukraine has lost its independence. In your homeland you do not have a government which can rally the patriotism of your people. Your Ukrainian Catholic Church has been completely suppressed. So, it is not surprising that your Metropolitan, Archbishop Slipy, symbolizes your beloved Ukraine country. He is the uncrowned leader of the Ukrainian people. At his release from prison we Latin Catholics rejoice with you Byzantine Catholics and thank God, who is the Giver of this and of all good gifts.

What manner of man is Archbishop Slipy? He was born in 1892, the son of a Ukrainian farmer. He studied at Innsbruck, Austria where he received the degree of doctor of sacred theology. Ordained in 1917, he later studied at the Gregorian University of Rome. He returned to the Polish Ukraine in 1922. A brilliant professor of theology, writer and editor, he became the rector of the Theological Seminary at Lviv in 1929; it was there that your good pastor and our good friend, Father Walter Wozniak, met him when he applied for admission to the Seminary. In 1944 he became Archbishop of Lviv and Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. On April 11, 1945 along with most of the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops, he was arrested by the Communists. Imprisoned for a year and then tried by a Soviet military court he was condemned to 8 years at hard labor in a Russian concentration camp. Released in 1953, he refused to apostacize, and so was rearrested, tried, and condemned to another 5 years' imprisonment at hard labor. Released again in 1959, he was soon rearrested and condemned to 7 years at hard labor. He was recently released and permitted to go to Rome.

Think of it—almost 18 years spent at slave labor in Communist concentration camps. What greater proof of his courage and fidelity to Christ could he have given? He has lived a martyr's life. How much easier it would have been to die a martyr's death.

Why was Archbishop Slipy released? Have the Communists finally given up their persecution of religion? It would be foolish to think so. Russian Governments, both Czarist and Communist, have violently and systematically persecuted the Ukrainian Catholic Church since 1441 when the Russian Prince Vasili dethroned the Metropolitan of Kiev, Isidore, the first Ukrainian Cardinal.

We should not deceive ourselves that the Communists have had a change of heart. They keep hundreds of priests prisoner in their concentration camps. Their wall still stands in Berlin, guarded by their security police who shoot anyone trying to escape from them. Their security police guard the rest of their borders in their watchtowers with their hundreds of miles of barbed-wire entanglements, land mines and watchdogs, all to keep their people imprisoned. Not many months ago a Soviet astronaut flaunted his atheism in the press of the free world. Khrushchev still maintains thousands of Russian troops in Cuba, and the Communists continue the war in Vietnam.

So, we should not draw any hasty conclusions from the fact that the Communists have released Archbishop Slipy from prison. The Communists will try to make his release pay for itself. No doubt they hope to create good will for themselves with the gullible, and to generate some propaganda pressure to get something they want.

What does the archbishop's release mean for us in the Western World? Is there a message here for us Catholics of the Latin rite? I think there is a message—a message and a warning. His release raises the question, What are we Latin Catholic doing for our persecuted brothers? What are we doing to lessen the sufferings of those members of the mystical body of Christ whom the Communists persecute?

We know what you Ukrainian-Americans are doing. You are praying. You do directly what you can. But you realize that much more could be done if we—your fellow Catholics of the Latin rite—would rouse ourselves, shake off our indifference and work with you to relieve those who are persecuted. And so, you do your best to call our attention to the persecution which the Communists inflict on your relatives, your friends, and on the Ukrainian Catholic Church. You try to get us to help those who suffer persecution.

How have we responded to your appeals? Let me answer the question this way. The Chinese Communists persecuted and imprisoned Bishop Cuthbert O'Gara. When they finally expelled him from China, he hoped to arouse American Catholics to the sufferings of their brother Catholics in China. How did we answer his appeal? By and large we ignored him. Bishop O'Gara said it was easier to bear Communist persecution than the indifference of American Catholics. We have done very little to help our brother Catholics who suffer Communist persecution. We forget that it is Christ himself whom they persecute. What will we Latin Catholics say to Jesus Christ our Judge when He asks us at the judgment, "I was persecuted, and what did you do to help Me?"

We cannot rely on the U.S. Government to do this job for us. The U.S. Government plainly showed its attitude toward those suffering Communist persecution when the U.S. Embassy in Moscow shut its door in the face of those Russian Baptists who asked for asylum in the name of Jesus Christ. Further, the U.S. Government has completely abandoned any idea of supporting a liberation movement against the Communists. Not only that, but the United States has abandoned the Monroe Doctrine and has consented to the maintenance of a Communist slave state in Cuba, 90 miles off our shores. Furthermore, the United States has adopted a policy of peaceful coexistence with the Communist empire. And now the U.S. Government is disarming in the face of the Communist enemy; witness the abandonment of planning and production of advanced nuclear bombers, the RS-70 program; witness the abandonment of the Skybolt nuclear bomber missile; the abandonment of nuclear missile bases around Russia; and the recall of our nuclear bombers from bases around Russia. Our Government is not only willing to settle for things the way they are now, but is disarming to prevent even any threat to the Communists. We cannot count on the U.S. Government to help those suffering Communist persecution. The U.S. Government does not want to embarrass the Communists.

But what can we do? We can do a great deal. We can pray. Does that sound like a truism? About 1 year ago the Ukrainian Catholic bishops here in the United States called a press conference to spotlight the sufferings of Archbishop Slipy in his Communist prison. Here in Omaha, our beloved archbishop, the Most Reverend Gerald T. Bergan, called upon us to pray for those suffering Communist persecution. I am sure many American bishops did likewise. Today on this, his 71st birthday, Archbishop Slipy is a free man. If it is a holy and wholesome thing to pray for the dead, how much more holy and wholesome it must be to pray for those suffering persecution for Christ. Those who suffer persecution have first call on the charity of our prayers.

Secondly, we can and should constantly remind our fellow Americans and our Government of the persecution which our brothers are suffering from the Communists. There is hardly an issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which does not carry articles about the persecution of the Jews in Russia. The Communists do not generally kill Jews—they pressure them. They close some of their synagogues; they restrict the publication of Jewish religious books; they obstruct the training of rabbis; they give the Jews adverse publicity; they make it difficult for Jews to get a professional education. My friends, you and I know that the Communists have treated the Jews mildly in comparison to their treatment of Ukrainian Catholics. The Communists have made a determined effort to suppress catholicism completely among Ukrainians.

Our Jewish friends are telling their story. We Latin Catholics are not telling the story of our persecuted brothers. You would think the silent church is on this side of the Atlantic. We can and should make the sufferings of our fellow Catholics known. We Latin Catholics must cooperate with you Byzantine Catholics to tell the world of Communist persecution. Then maybe our Government will exert itself to alleviate the sufferings of our brothers in Christ.

Archbishop Slipy symbolizes the fidelity of the Ukrainian people to Christ in the face of Communist persecution. That is the reason we honor him. We can honor him best by loving Our Lord Jesus Christ as Archbishop Slipy has loved him. We can love Our Lord by working and praying for our brother Catholics who are suffering Communist persecution. That is the message of the archbishop's release. The warning is that if we fail to love Our Lord as we should we may soon suffer persecutions ourselves.

Just as God has released Archbishop Slipy from a Communist concentration camp, so one day God will free the Ukrainian people and all other people from Communist slavery. Let us praise and thank God for His goodness, and pray and work together for that glorious day.

Thank you.

Housing Utopia Is Fine, but Where's the Cash?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared on March 6 in the Daily Intelligencer, a newspaper published in Doylestown, Bucks County, Pa. The said editorial goes right to the heart of one of the problems which is presently confronting us:

HOUSING UTOPIA IS FINE, BUT WHERE'S THE CASH?

We need the stout advocates of principle at both ends of the political spectrum. They sharpen public debate on the great issues and serve as a useful check on too precipitate Government action.

But it does not follow from this that those who stand for principle are of necessity braver and more useful than those who occupy the compromising political center.

The National Housing Conference, a 32-year-old organization devoted to eliminating slums and blight, perhaps illustrated in its newest Washington meeting how easy it is to talk on the side of the angels.

The NHC notes some largely unassailable facts:

Our total annual output of new housing is insufficient to meet the needs of a growing population, especially those in lower- and middle-income groups. We are not getting enough urban renewal and we are getting too much urban and suburban sprawl.

To get more and better housing, to arrest deterioration, wipe out slums and check sprawl, the NHC proposes that the Federal Government quickly approve vast new sums.

Toting up the rough amounts involved in its proposals for expanded urban renewal, low-rent housing, housing for the elderly, improved rural and farm housing, we attain a figure upward of $4 billion. A portion would be in loans.

A nonspecialist in housing problems is hardly equipped to question the wisdom of NHC's figures as an ideal proposition.

What the outsider can question, however, is how NHC President Nathaniel Keith and NHC's resolutions committee can discuss these proposals for 21 pages as if not one single other claim on the Federal budget existed.

It is recognized that better housing is just part of a broad attack on poverty. But nowhere are housing's demands on the budget put in a scale of priorities with such other needs as job retraining, improved general education, health, welfare, highways.

Nothing is said of the fact that we must spend some $55 billion for defense and other sums to aid our friends abroad.

Indeed, NHC says plainly that its proposed bigger housing effort has a "first claim on the resources of our economy." Many Americans had thought that defense requirements enjoy that preeminence.

NHC's goals are fine. But in stating them flat out in a kind of political and economic vacuum, the group has done just the easiest part of the job.

Left to the political engineers who must deal in realities is the task of scaling such propositions to make them fit somewhere in today's baffling array of competing demands.

Truth, Toughness Needed in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an excellent editorial which appeared in the Ashland Times-Gazette, Ashland, Ohio, written by Robert Beer, publisher of this independent daily newspaper. It focuses attention on the growing grassroots sentiment regarding bungling policy in the Cuban situation.

I commend this fine editorial to all of the Members of the House:

TRUTH, TOUGHNESS NEEDED IN CUBA

When the arms buildup began in the Florida Keys several months ago this writer pledged to silence his criticism of President Kennedy and to support him in his apparent determination to avert another blunder such as our chickenlivered failure to back up the Bay of Pigs attack. The chance of hot war then became a calculated risk and, at last, our country was to assert its responsibility to its own people and to the other free nations of the hemisphere.

So it seemed.

Fear of the possible consequences of such a firm stand was smothered by a renewed pride and confidence in ourselves and our President. The showdown was at hand—the brave and noble move had been made—someone would be obliged to either fight or lose face before a world audience. Unity among the Americas was at an historic peak—more fierce and abiding than ever. Now there would be a beginning of an end, an end of 20 years on a powder keg while one Republican and three Democratic Presidents watched communism creep its way like molten lava from the Kremlin to the very shores of the United States. The end was in sight.

So it seemed.

It was Khrushchev who backed away. He promised to withdraw his service personnel and arms from Cuba. Yes, there would be inspection permitted to assure compliance with this agreement. Yes, the process would start as soon as we relinquished our blockade of the island. What a victory this was for all free countries and the true friends of Uncle Sam. How plain it now was, that the Red plan was based on bluff and arrogance, how wonderful it was that the United States of America had regained its global prestige and was emerging as the savior of democracy and as the acknowledged winner of a bloodless showndown. The insults and threats would be no more.

So it seemed.

Disillusionment by reason of inaction and timidity at the highest Government level is with us again. Alas, more than ever before the feeling of shame and futility is with us. There is apprehension and lost confidence.

Is the next stupid deal with the Soviet to be the abandonment of our Guantanamo Naval Base in return for an exodus of the Russian guests? We anticipate with horror the headline "Castro Stays—Gitmo Goes."

For months the Cuban situation has rapidly worsened. It was first denied that 17,000 Russians occupied the island. Administration word declared that the Red missiles were gone, the launching sites destroyed, the evacuation an accomplished fact, the pact with Russia honorably consummated, and the situation again under our control.

This, we now know was utterly false and deliberately misleading.

When the compassionate and levelheaded Jim Bishop, John Knight, and other reputable and distinguished observers have their craws full of managed news releases from the White House it is time to take heed.

The Cuban refugees who were unlawfully ransomed by way of typical Kennedy family manipulation swear that only a few of the really potent attack missiles left Cuba. They maintain that more Russian troops and service personnel are arriving every week—that the huge assault weapons have been transferred to island caves—that Castro is now a confirmed and powerless puppet. Refugees are excitable; these reports may not be true.

Our cursory inspection of the departing ships of U.S.S.R. convinced the brains of Washington that there was full compliance with the arms withdrawal deal that Kennedy made with Khrushchev. Indeed, were not the tarps lifted on one or two of the suggestive missile silhouettes that were observed on the decks of the Russian vessels? Indeed were not the portions of the cargo thus exposed quite similar to the pictures we have seen of Russian rocketry on parade in the streets of Moscow?

Did we board the ships and verify these assumptions? Did we lift the tarpaulin sheaths from the other packages to see if they covered real jet missiles or merely the severed trunks of royal palm trees? Did we inspect the caves, count the Russian guests on the island? Did we insist that Nikita make good his bargain?

We did not.

Furthermore we are still relying on fuzzy pictures made from hedgehopping U.S. planes. We are told by way of the hoodwinked press that such is adequate proof that our doubts are unfounded. Incoming shipments show no rocket contours on the decks * * * again reconnaissance photos, we are told, indicate that a blockade or contact inspection is unwarranted.

Why further provoke or irritate the touchy and honorable Nikita? Why risk another incident?

This editor is not buying such custom-tailored trash and neither is the Washington press corps, the publishers of our Nation's responsible newspapers, nor a growing number of Members of Senate and House on both sides of the aisles.

While Huntley and Brinkley chuckle about the walking antics of the personable Pierre Salinger—a man who this writer admires and knows in a casual way—an accomplished journalist with an impressive background for faithful dedication to the best interests of the fourth estate—we wonder.

We wonder if it doesn't get awfully oppressive to be on the inside these days. We wonder if even a stout fellow like the able and redoubtable press secretary doesn't often yearn to take a brisk hike into the fresh, open air.

In our opinion he has the most demanding job in Washington.

Praise Given to Bureau of Land Management Administration in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, people generally, and Members of Congress in particular, usually hear only the complaints and criticism that are made about Government agencies. The Bureau of Land Management has been no exception to this general rule.

As a welcome change, there has come to my attention a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Consolidated Wool Growers of Western Colorado, which was held at Hotchkiss, Colo. on February 13, 1963, expressing appreciation to the Bureau of Land Management for its "very good work in administration of the sheep ranges in this district."

In bringing this matter to the attention of the House I would be remiss if I did not mention in passing the cooperative spirit that has been displayed by Mr. Lowell M. Puckett, State Director of the Bureau of Land Management. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the cooperation that Mr. Puckett has given to me and to the people of Colorado.

I compliment the Consolidated Wool Growers for their constructive action in taking note of meritorious service and I include the text of the resolution with my remarks for the information of all Members:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

At the annual meeting of the Consolidated Wool Growers of Western Colorado the following resolution was passed.

This association wishes to express our appreciation to the Bureau of Land Management for their very good work in administration of the sheep ranges in this district. Their work in range improvement is notable. The development of stock water, in cleaning of useless brush, in reseeding, in fencing along borders of allotments, and for access roads add to practical management which show results in improvement of the range.

Sheep growers know and feel that it is time the public should know the land management is doing all possible within the means they have to develope the potential of public ranges. We feel that in the last few years, the cooperative agreements have resulted in improved conditions.

Water development, in construction of water ponds has eliminated wasted trailing. The construction of dams has prevented erosion.

The fencing program of the last few years has increased better management and has eliminated damaging duplication of use.

We feel that intelligent training and practical application, and cooperation of users are bringing good results.

Therefore this association wishes to thank the land management and its officers and pledge further cooperation.

D. W. MCINTIRE,
President.

Will Clayton Speaks Out Against Cotton Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Will L. Clayton is well known throughout the Nation for his distinguished service to this country as former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and Assistant Secretary of Commerce. He is known throughout the world for his knowledge of the cotton business, as head of he great international firm of Anderson & Clayton.

I think it would be well for those who are endeavoring to manipulate the U.S. cotton industry to heed the recommendations contained in Mr. Clayton's brief remarks before the National Cotton Council in El Paso last January 28.

So that others interested in U.S. cotton gaining its rightful place in the world market may have an opportunity to read this distinguished statesman's recommendations, I have the privilege of inserting his remarks:

REMARKS OF W. L. CLAYTON AT THE 25TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL, EL PASO, TEX., JANUARY 28, 1963

We are all indebted to Dr. Horne and to Mr. McCord for their lucid exposition of the critical danger the United States faces of losing its raw cotton trade.

I have studied the council pamphlet of September 1962, and I am in complete agreement with Dr. Horne's conclusions, except I go farther than he in fixing the responsibility for this situation and in the steps that must be taken to correct it.

To develop the points I wish to make, I must take you back to an historic meeting I attended in Washington in June 1933, almost 30 years ago.

This meeting was called by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There were about 100 men present, all interested in some aspects of the cotton business.

As I remember it, the telegram calling this meeting was rather vague as to its purpose, but soon after the meeting opened, it was apparent that its purpose was to get the cotton trade to approve a decision already made for the Government to pay farmers to plow up every third row of the growing cotton crop.

I spoke out against this with all the vigor that I could command. I said if the Gov-

ernment felt it owed the cotton farmer something, that they should pay it to him and not try to make the market pay it, because the market would not do it for long, and in the end, if we followed that road, the United States would lose its cotton supremacy. One other man supported me. His name was Thompson, and he was an official of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association.

But our voices were like one crying in the wilderness.

At that time, the Civil War psychology still persisted that cotton was king in America. The United States produced more cotton than all the rest of the world put together. We produced then 14½ million bales for consumption. We are producing the same amount today, but a sizable quantity goes in the Government loan.

In these 30 years, foreign free world production has increased from 8½ million bales to 21 million bales. If we included Russia and China, the increase is even greater.

As Dr. Horne has shown, synthetics have increased greatly.

Obviously, some of this accelerated growth in foreign cotton and in synthetics would have taken place in any case. To me, however, the most frightening aspect of our present situation in cotton is the fact that we are losing markets at home and abroad, while foreign cotton and synthetics are both going down in price and up in use.

For the 10 years prior to the meeting in Washington in June 1933, the average of our cotton exports was 7,880,000 bales. The average for the past 10 years is 4,732,000 bales. In these 30 years, we have lost over 3 million bales per year in exports of cotton.

What can be done now to save our raw cotton industry?

I don't pretent to know all the answers, but I believe I know some of them.

Obviously, U.S. cotton's principal competitors are foreign cottons and synthetics, both of which operate in a free market. The greatest service of the free market is the automatic selection of the most efficient means of production.

World commodities, like coffee, cotton, sugar, wheat, et cetera, produced for export, cannot be sheltered from world competition. Even for domestic consumption, every commodity has its competitors.

If our cotton is to regain its rightful position in the domestic and world markets, then the U.S. Government must restore cotton to a free market. Reducing the price is not enough. Does any man in this room imagine that any bureau in Washington knows what the price of any world commodity, such as cotton, should be? The answer to this question is to be found in the record of Government price fixing for these past 30 years Just look at the record of the two-price system on cotton. The United States, a number of years ago, officially branded such system as "dumping," and now at a time when the rest of the industrialized free world is moving in the opposite direction, we engage in this system, not only for cotton but for other commodities. Among other faults, this two-price system on cotton lays a wholly unfair and indefensible burden on our cotton textile mills in allowing their foreign competitors in the domestic goods market to acquire their raw material, even U.S.-grown cotton, at 8½ cents per pound less than the U.S. mill must pay.

In my opinion, nothing but a return to the free market will save our U.S. raw cotton trade. Nevertheless, under Government control these past 30 years, we have gone so far in the destruction of this trade that there certainly will be a period during a shift back to farmer control when cotton farmers will need help. It is believed that this period will not last more than 5 years and will cost our taxpayers much less than the present dollar cost of Government control of cotton, to say nothing of the loss of our cotton business due to such control.

As Dr. Horne has indicated, U.S. cotton is fighting a desperate battle for survival. I want to add that it is fighting this battle with both hands tied behind its back so long as the Government continues control of cotton production and of the cotton market.

Flood Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Sevier County News-Record on Thursday, March 7, 1963, regarding the devastating flood which swept into Sevierville and Sevier County last Tuesday night and Wednesday morning, March 5 and 6.

Many homes in the Love Addition and on Riverside Drive of Sevier County had to be evacuated, and merchants of downtown Sevierville worked throughout the night setting up barricades in efforts to keep water out of their stores. Court Avenue in Sevierville was a thoroughfare for boats Wednesday morning as floodwaters from the Pigeon River covered the heart of the town entering many of the business establishments and causing widespread damage.

Mr. Bo Roberts, editor, and Mr. William C. Postlewaite, publisher, of the Sevier County News-Record, are to be congratulated on the fine coverage of this flood and for presenting a word and picture story of the flood, pinpointing the desperate need for flood relief. I thought it was so good that I would like to make it available to the other Members of Congress.

The article follows:

FLOOD AGAIN

(By Bo Roberts)

High waters swept into Sevierville early Wednesday morning causing a flood in the downtown and some residential sections at least greater than the one in December of 1961 and possibly as large as the one in 1957.

There has been a lot of talk, but very little action taken since the 1961 flood, and it seems many area citizens are wanting to get something done. Thousands of dollars of damages have again been caused, even though many persons had 6 or 7 hours to prepare for the flood. The next flood could be years away * * * of it could be next week * * * it is high time action is taken on the part of local, State, and Federal officials to see that something is done to stop this costly and dangerous flooding.

There have been no reported casualties, but many homes in the Love Addition and on Riverside Drive have had to be evacuated. Merchants in downtown Sevierville worked throughout the night setting up barricades in efforts to keep water out of their stores. Water is reported to have gotten into several businesses in spite of their efforts.

Veteran observers of floods here were divided on whether Wednesday's flood was larger than the 1957 flood or not, but in any event it was another costly bit of high water.

Some 3.5 inches of rain fell Tuesday, coupled with melting snow from the mountains; this sent both prongs of the Little Pigeon River rising rapidly. The first signs of overflowing came at about midnight, and then at about 1 a.m. the water started rising rapidly. It reached its crest about 6 or 6:30 a.m. Wednesday and started to fall shortly thereafter. Some Knoxville-Sevierville traffic was open shortly after 9 a.m.

Homeowners and businessmen now face the task of cleaning up, another costly operation.

The Sevier County Volunteer Rescue Squad was on the scene all night Tuesday, aiding in the evacuation of homes and serving in many helpful capacities. Also on extra duty were the Sevierville police and the Sevierville Volunteer Fire Department.

No details were available at press time as to the total amount of damage.

Now is the time to get something done about this situation; we shouldn't wait until an even larger flood comes and takes several lives.

Improving Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point, an editorial from the Baltimore News-Post of March 4, 1963, titled "Improving Medical Aid," which points up so well certain drawbacks in the administration of the Kerr-Mills program for providing medical care for senior citizens in my State of Maryland.

It is for this reason that I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives, H.R. 4388, to correct this situation and permit the individual States to select the agency to be responsible for medical assistance to the aged, rather than having this program supervised by the State departments of welfare. The editorial is appended at this point and I commend it to the attention of the Congress:

IMPROVING MEDICAL AID

As now administered in Maryland, the Kerr-Mills program for providing medical care for senior citizens is supervised by the State department of welfare and is carried out by local welfare agencies, in Baltimore by the city department of public welfare.

Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS of Maryland's Sixth District has noted that this system has certain drawbacks, principally because applicants for aid must file their applications with the welfare agencies.

"Many people," Congressman MATHIAS points out, "feel that there is a certain stigma to making applications for welfare aid. This objection has some basis in fact because those who receive medical aid through the welfare department may not otherwise be needful of welfare assistance."

To correct this situation, Congressman MATHIAS has introduced in Congress a bill which would change the Kerr-Mills provision by permitting individual States to select the agency which would be responsible for medical assistance to the aged.

Advocates of the Kerr-Mills program agree that it can be improved. Congressman MATHIAS' proposed legislation is one way to achieve improvement. His bill should receive full congressional support.

Soviet Bombers—How?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a most disturbing revelation has been made by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in yesterday's Long Island Press. It concerns Soviet bombers flying over several of our aircraft carriers.

I wonder if President Kennedy will also consider these bombers as defensive?

The article follows:

SOVIET BOMBERS KNEW JUST WHERE U.S. CARRIERS WERE

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary McNamara's delayed disclosure of those Russian reconnaissance-bomber flights over four U.S. carriers is only part of this jolting story.

What the at-times-circuitous Pentagon boss didn't reveal is even more significant than what he finally did make known.

For security reasons most of these chilling untold facts cannot be divulged as yet. They are still tightly classified—although, of course, no secret to the Russians; only to Americans.

But it is possible to publish the following extremely important information that McNamara withheld:

In each of these ominous carrier overflights the Soviet reconnaissance-bombers flew direct to their midocean "targets" by the shortest circular routes from bases in Russia. The giant Red planes (known in the West as Bears) did not search for the carriers. They set courses straight for them and flew over them.

Such extraordinary bull's-eye flying, as it is being termed by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is possible only in two ways, as follows:

Possession by the Russians of a secret space (satellite) or other high level reconnaissance system that enables the detection and tracking of ships.

Advance Soviet knowledge of the exact location and courses of the four carriers—the *Enterprise, Forrestal, Kitty Hawk,* and *Princeton.*

Military authorities are convinced the former is the case.

These highly revealing incidents confirm for them a growing belief they have had for some time that the Russians have in orbit one or more reconnaissance satellites with the same capabilities as our very secret Samos and Ferret.

These U.S. satellites take photographs and monitor communications. The Air Force has at least six Samoses in orbit from 150 to 300 miles above the earth. These satellites snap pictures of Russian areas and installations and transmit them to ground receiving stations. The Ferret, in addition to being equipped with a camera similar to those in the Samos, has a complex electronic system for monitoring communications.

Both the Samos and Ferret can take photos at heights of several hundred miles from which individuals on the ground can be identified.

Strikingly indicative of the high degree of effectiveness of the Reds' detection and tracking system are the following grim details about which Secretary McNamara was characteristically vague:

The Navy reported that the Bear reconnaissance-bomber that flew over the 75,000-ton *Forrestal* southeast of the Azores on February 22 was tracked some 2,100 miles from a base in northeastern Russia. From the very start the Soviet plane made a beeline for the carrier and flew directly to it by the shortest circular route.

Throughout, the intruding Bear was under surveillance either by radar, radio, or by plane. Two Ferret satellites were tuned in on the Russians. What was learned is classified.

For two brief periods radar lost its "loc" on the Soviet plane. This was done to the Reds' using a new type of metal chaff that temporarily blotted out radar contact. But surveillance was maintained through other methods, and interceptors of the *Forrestal* were in the air long before the Bear hove into sight.

However, intelligence experts point out that is not as important as it may appear to be.

They cite the fact that the Bear has the capability of being armed with a known Soviet air-to-ground missile that can be launched some 650 miles from a carrier—definitely out of the range of U.S. carrier-based interceptors.

One Navy report on the incidents—also not mentioned by McNamara—stated that a Bear that overflew a carrier was equipped with racks that could have carried nuclear bombs of more than 20 megatons. Photos were taken of this Communist plane showing these bomb racks.

An intelligence report stressed the point that, in direct contrast to these bullseye overflights, it took the Navy 4 days to locate that hijacked Venezuelan freighter.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, had much to do with forcing disclosure of these sinister overflights. He questioned McNamara about the *Kitty Hawk* incident during the latter's closed-door appearance before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Obviously startled and disconcerted, McNamara admitted the accuracy of Goldwater's information.

Later, after conferring with the President, the defense chief hurriedly summoned a press conference and announced the overflights.

An Example of Individual Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, throughout our great country silent benefactors play vital roles in countless small communities such as my hometown of Russell, Kans.

Russell, and in fact all of Russell County, Kans., lost a true friend in the death of W. H. "Bill" Sellens on February 10, 1963. Blessed with a degree of material wealth Mr. Sellens firmly believed in community betterment and practiced this belief in individual responsibility for many, many years.

There are countless examples bearing the stamp of his generosity in our community but perhaps his greatest pride was in doing his bit to insure first class medical treatment for the patients and first class facilities for the staff of Russell City Hospital. I share with you a letter written by Dr. M. E. Schulz, Mr. Sellens' physician for many years, to the Russell Daily News:

YOUR HOSPITAL AND BILL SELLENS

In January 1963, your hospital was 20 years old. For the past 12 years, Mr. Bill Sellens has been the greatest benefactor of this community institution for healing the sick. Through his generosity, your hospital has been made a better place in which to care for the sick, and has been kept modern in every respect.

Each and every one of us should be particularly grateful for this man. He was truly a pioneer of Russell County and expressed many times that the good Lord was kind to him, and he wished to return this kindness to his home community. This is something that many of us should think about, for it is our home community which is important, for it is where we live and where we die. Mr. Sellens was a God-fearing man, who in the early days quarried our famous stone posts, at the price of 10 cents apiece. He was a very humble man and truly left his community in a better condition than when he found it. He had many friends. He was a towering man, well above 6 feet in height, and distinguished in his actions. He gave to the youth in many ways, as he was always interested in our children. This kind of citizen is a citizen worth writing about. He believed in self-determination and individual responsibilities. He not only spoke of individual initiative, but he practiced it.

Here are some of the things that your hospital would not be blessed with had it not been for gifts over the past 12 years from Bill Sellens: the professional staff library, many room furnishings, solarium furnishings, laboratory equipment, two different sets of new X-ray equipment, air conditioning, the doctors' call system, and many other things.

It has been said that there is always a woman behind every man's actions. The above comments could not have been said were it not for the very able Mrs. Amelia Sellens, wife of Mr. Bill Sellens, and it is trite to say that these things could have been done only with her full cooperation.

Activities of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, at another point in the RECORD today, Congressman DON L. SHORT is including in his remarks, House Joint Resolution Q-1, passed by both houses of the North Dakota State Legislature without a dissenting vote.

The resolution requests Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the Department of State. In other words it calls for an investigation of the activities of the State Department as it relates to our foreign policies

as they in turn affect our internal welfare.

This opinion is shared by many people in and out of the Congress, and it is hoped, therefore, that for the good of this Nation and the good of the State Department the problems can be reviewed and aired in order that there may be a complete understanding among the State Department, the Members of Congress, and the citizens of this country.

ABCD Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1963, Postmaster General J. Edward Day inaugurated a new major postal service innovation—ABCD, standing for accelerated business collections and delivery—in the Washington metropolitan area.

This new service will provide 4-hour delivery of local first-class mail in the downtown business area from Monday through Friday. By the end of this calendar year 273 cities in this country will have the advantages of accelerated business collections and delivery service, a step forward in mail service comparable in importance to the start of free city delivery a century ago.

In launching the accelerated business collections and delivery service here in Washington, Postmaster General Day paid richly deserved credit to the architect of this innovation in mail service, Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen, by presenting him with the Post Office Department's first annual Benjamin Franklin Award.

As head of the vitally important Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department for the past 2 years, Mr. Belen is publicly credited with an impressive record of accomplishments that have resulted in numerous major improvements of national significance in the Post Office Department. His imaginative and dynamic approach to problems that have long beset the Postal Establishment has brought about improved efficiency, lower cost, and, most important, better service. He has played a major role in developing a number of progressive programs, similar to accelerated business collections and delivery designed to maintain our postal service as the most modern and efficient in the world.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the tribute paid to Mr. Belen by Postmaster General Day, which follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL

Introduction of the accelerated business collections and delivery program here in the Washington area provides an ideal occasion for special recognition of the architect of this very successful program of 4-hour business mail service.

It is my genuine pleasure to honor Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen as the first Post Office Department official to receive the Department's esteemed Benjamin Franklin Award.

The Benjamin Franklin Award is a new top honor award of the Department reserved for officials in noncareer positions whose outstanding leadership and accomplishments have resulted in major improvements of national significance in the work of the postal service.

I am rather unusual among Postmasters General, because I have never been national chairman of my party or even particularly active in politics at all. In fact, when President Kennedy announced my appointment—as the first Cabinet member ever from Southern California—he emphasized that it was not because of my very incidental past political activity but because of my management experience, in State government and in business.

I was associated for a number of years with one of the largest and finest law firms in the country. After that I was a senior officer for 8 years of a giant insurance company which is the third largest private corporation in the world.

And yet I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I am right now that I am serving in the Federal Government. Every day I work with Federal executives who demonstrate superb imagination, energy, good judgment and practical idealism. With few exceptions I have found that the Federal executive sees himself in context with the great complicated world we live in, he has a lively interest in new ideas and in wider horizons—and he does not take himself too seriously.

Fred Belen has all these qualities. He has been Assistant Postmaster General heading the Department's key Bureau of Operations since the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and for the past 8 months he has additionally carried, with distinction, many of the responsibilities of the Office of Deputy Postmaster General.

Before assuming his present post in January 1961, Mr. Belen had been Counsel and Chief Counsel of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 14 years and was already widely acknowledged as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on postal administration.

In developing and spearheading major programs of service improvement and economy, Mr. Belen has brought imaginative new approaches to the solution of longstanding problems of the postal service. Accelerated business collections and deliveries is but one example.

He has shown outstanding leadership in enlisting the cooperation of the Nation's large volume business mailers, and has demonstrated that such cooperation benefits both the mailer and the Department.

He has provided expert and energetic direction to the Post Office programs of cost reduction and management improvement, giving concrete expression to the President's goals of economy and manpower utilization. He has been a major contributor at the executive level to the Department's accomplishments in holding to a minimum manpower increases in the postal service, in the reduction of Christmas temporary employees from 295,000 in 1960 to approximately one-half that number in 1962, in the return of $37 million of our Department appropriation to the Treasury in fiscal 1962, and in the Department's capacity to absorb this year $40 million of the recent postal employee pay increase.

Mr. Belen first inaugurated the accelerated business collection and delivery program on a pilot basis last August 14 in his home city of Lansing, Mich.

In designating Frederick C. Belen as the first official to be honored with the Benjamin Franklin Award, I am proud to recognize Mr. Belen's exceptional contributions to the operation of the postal service. I now present to him this beautiful plaque of unusual three-dimensional design featuring an inset bust of the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, and a genuine specimen of the very first postage stamp issued by the U.S. Government—in 1847.

The stamp carries Benjamin Franklin's portrait—and it is interesting to note that it is a 5-cent stamp.

Inquiries: Democrats Handcuff GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the battle to bring about a better balance between minority and majority staff members on congressional committees is beginning to get backing at the grassroots level. As a case in point I offer an editorial from the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times, of February 23, entitled "Inquiries: Democrats Handcuff GOP." Under leave to extend my remarks, I request that this editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

INQUIRIES: DEMOCRATS HANDCUFF GOP

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL and those associated with him in the demand for the Republican right to appoint 40 percent of staffs of House committees are so right that its denial is nothing less than a ruthless power play by Democrats.

Actually, the proposal is so fair that it lost by only 1 vote, 10 to 9, in the House Administration Committee.

Democrats in the House are leery of investigations, a major reason for holding the overwhelming number of investigators under their thumbs.

The inquiries which are apt to engage attention of committees extend into the labyrinth of Federal-State appropriations, particularly into the use of funds for Federal highway construction.

In Massachusetts, for instance, that type of scandal has wider ramifications touching figures whose reputations are of concern to party colleagues.

In other States, inquiries have suddenly been dropped at times, Republicans say as pay dirt appeared on the horizon.

The liberal Washington Post, supporter generally of the Kennedy administration, says editorially:

"Representative SCHWENGEL has estimated that fewer than 50 of about 500 committee employees are Republicans.

"It does not follow, however, that the other 450 are Democrats.

"In many cases where appointments have been made on merit, the political affiliations of the employees are not known and are of no significance, and this is as it should be.

"The professional employees ought to be available to serve the minority as well as the majority, with the object of advancing the

work of the committee and not of merely making political hay."

The Washington newspaper must expect its readers to be naive to swallow the defense it presents for the failure to give Republicans enough staff members to bring about some semblance of adequate personnel for their committee work.

The Republicans ask 40 percent of the 500 staff members which is certainly a reasonable proportion based upon Republican representation in Congress.

And the idea that professional staff members do not know the Democrats are their bosses and do not carry out their bosses' will is too foolish for argument.

The Washington Post's statement that "it does not follow that the other 450 are Democrats" would bring questioning from Democratic Members of the House if they did not feel that this large group is Democratic enough to hold its place on the Federal payroll.

We Cannot Abandon Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from the White House "command post" a concerted barrage of propaganda is being aimed at anyone—Republican or Democrat—who deigns to criticize the Kennedy record of inaction with regard to Cuba.

As one who has been subjected to such criticism, I find consolation in noting the criticism of the administration's myopic attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine by none other than former President Harry S. Truman. As a historian and rugged individualist, Mr. Truman recognizes the peril of the present situation. I commend him for his strong call for action.

I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks the article entitled "We Cannot Abandon Cuba," which appeared in the New York Standard on Sunday, February 24, 1963.

The article follows:

[From the New York Standard, Feb. 24, 1963]

WE CANNOT ABANDON CUBA

(By Harry S. Truman)

Along with everyone else, I have been concerned about the situation in Cuba. The Cuban people have been beset with internal problems almost from the time Cuba was discovered by Columbus. One set of tyrants seems to be succeeded by another in guise of liberators.

There is now much talk about Cuba. There are those who read and talk about it—and there are those who tell those in charge what to do and how to do it. That is all right, as far as it goes, but it does no good and could do much harm, if we get into a political hassle about it. Foreign policy should never be an issue between the great political parties.

Is there no hope for Cuba? Is Cuba now doomed to become the Balkan satellite of the American continent? These and many other questions are being raised.

The one thing that history teaches us over and over again is that no system of government that defies the will of its people can long endure and, while modern weapons in the hands of a new crop of quislings make the task of liberation more formidable, it is as true today as it ever was that the will of a people to be free is irresistible. Any government that imposes its will from the top will be overthrown in time. When the people reach that certain point of loss of patience and the congealment of their will to resist they strike back with the savage fury of bloody revolution, resulting in more cruelties in the name of the revolution.

We have always been sympathetic toward the Cuban people but for one reason or another, things never seemed to work out so that the affairs of Cuba could be administered by honest and devoted patriots, rather than the greedy, selfish, grafting dictators that kept succeeding one another.

The present situation in Cuba defies all reasoning. Castro as a revolutionary leader fighting to unseat Dictator Batista attracted sympathetic support from many quarters in this hemisphere, and from the United States in particular. There was some reason to hope that here at long last there may have arisen a true patriot and able leader, who would devote his energies to the establishment of representative government, and put through necessary reforms for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

But, again, our hopes were doomed to disappointment. The man, Castro, became inflated and power mad—and incapable of the kind of leadership Cuba needed in her period of reconstruction.

Instead of applying his energies to the solution of the needs of Cuba, Castro betrayed his revolution by delivering the Cuban people to the political imprisonment of a Russian-made Communist dictatorship. He thus committed Cuba to a life of crisis, of aggression, oppression, and intrigue.

We admit that our policies toward Cuba, and I would include my own administration as well, have left something to be desired. For some reason we have put off for too long our responsibility to put pressure on the Cuban leaders to institute badly needed reforms.

There is one thing we cannot do and must not do and that is to abandon Cuba to her self-imposed tyrants and new conquerors. For as long as these people enforce their will by the use of modern weapons, the Cuban people will be compelled to undergo prolonged suffering, before they can hope to restore themselves by the process of spontaneous popular uprising.

The Cuban situation is in a different category and should not be confused with the other satellite victims within the Russian-Chinese orbit. Cuba was delivered to Communist control and domination by a betrayal of a modern-day Quisling, Castro. He perpetrated this act of treason against the Cuban people and even those of his revolutionary followers, in the name of liberation from colonialism.

I think that it is well that we take a look at the record of our past relations with Cuba. From early 1899 to mid 1902, while Cuba was under temporary U.S. military rule, following her liberation from Spain, most of the offices were placed under Cuban nationals. During that period much was done to build public works; strict measures of sanitation were put into effect; the civil service was reformed; and public education significantly improved. Yellow fever, which had been plaguing Cuba for centuries, was eradicated.

At the same time a constitutional convention was called to establish a system for self-government. The first Cuban Continental Congress met on May 5, 1902, and we turned over control of the Government to the people of Cuba.

In restoring Cuba to self-government the so-called Platt amendment was accepted by Cuba on June 12, 1901, as a part of its Constitution.

Among the several provisions of the Platt amendment were these:

"The sanitation measures set up by the military, were to be maintained;

"Naval stations authorized to be leased to the United States; and

"The United States reserved the right to interfere in the affairs of the island if it became necessary."

It seems to me, that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand, and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, that we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development.

These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba, as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

The situation is clear, the problem is obvious, the solution not so apparent. But, like the bubonic plague or cholera, quarantining is one remedy that every public health authority knows must be imposed until a virulent epidemic abates.

A former President, much as he might try, cannot detach himself from events, even long after he is out of office. On one of my walks, a speculative thought kept going through my mind on how I might have dealt with Castro if it had been mine to do. This is how I saw it: Immediately after the conclusion of the revolution in Cuba, I would have invited Castro to the White House. This is the way I might have put it to him:

"Mr. Castro, your revolution is over and now you have the responsibility and the big job of reconstruction. You have made a great many promises to your people in enlisting their support. How are you going to make good in those promises? You don't have the resources of your own in Cuba, and there are no means in sight to enable you to perform the things you promised the Cuban people.

"Now, there are only two places where you might get the necessary economic support to put over your program of reforms. We are close to Cuba and we have historic ties with your country. All we would expect in return for our support would be that you keep the Cuban institutions free, and the Cuban people free, and that you get rid of corruption. This is all we would ask, this is all we would expect, and Cuba would enjoy complete sovereignty and independence as a nation. But if you should elect to go the other way—the Communist way—you will become a puppet and that can only lead you to more trouble and bloodshed."

I would have hoped that after some such exchange we should have come to an understanding and I think we might have reached a friendly agreement. All this, of course, needed to have been quietly negotiated within the privacy of the White House. With that out of the way I might have closed our meeting with a friendly suggestion, perhaps something like this:

"Now that we understand each other, Fidel, let us get to work and do all we can for the cause of your people."

The Cuban crisis has served one useful purpose—it again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their "hit and run" type of international piracy. And it provided the United States with an opportunity to make it clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

What Does It Take To Make a Situation Critical Enough To Get Something Done?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Tri-County News on Friday, March 8, 1963, regarding the devastating flood which swept into Sevierville and Sevier County last Tuesday night and Wednesday morning, March 5 and 6.

Another flood has swept through Sevierville and Sevier County leaving in its wake terrible damage. It affected local people. Merchants suffered water damage. Workers couldn't get to their jobs. Sevier County schools faced the prospect of another day of missed school. It meant extra work for patrolmen, road crews, and so forth, and also no State traffic could pass through Sevierville for several hours. Traffic on U.S. Highways 441 and 411 was blocked and interstate transportation ground to a halt.

Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Hamilton are to be congratulated for their editorial on the critical flood situation, which appeared on the front page of their newspaper, and I thought it was so good that I would like to make it available to the other Members of Congress.

The article follows:

WHAT DOES IT TAKE TO MAKE A SITUATION CRITICAL ENOUGH TO GET SOMETHING DONE?

Well, Sevierville and Sevier County has just been subjected to another flood. It happens so often any more it is difficult for a newspaper even to get a different picture of water damage to put in the paper.

We have had letters to TVA, letters to Senators, letters to Congressmen, letters to Nashville—but we still have flood conditions two or three times a year.

The Tuesday night flood was a serious one. It affected local people. Merchants suffered water damage. Workers couldn't get to their jobs. Sevier County schools faced the prospect of still another day of missed school on top of 12 days already to be made up. It affected the State of Tennessee. It meant extra work for patrolmen, road crews, etc., and also meant no State traffic could pass through Sevierville for several hours. It affected the United States. Traffic on U.S. Highways 441 and 411 was blocked and interstate transportation ground to a halt—all because we didn't do anything about the water situation when the sun was shining.

Is the situation critical? Yes. Just suppose you lived in the upper end of the county and needed to get to a Knoxville hospital in a hurry. Just suppose you were scheduled to be at the airport, or train station to leave for an important business engagement. Imagine that you were scheduled for a vital job interview, etc. The situation has gotten to the place where we can almost be sure there are going to be several times a year when activity in the county is going to be disturbed by high water. Conditions are not getting better—but worse.

Whose fault is it? Well, trying to be honest about the matter, it seems to us to rest on all of us as well as the people at Washington (TVA and Army Corps of Engineers). It is our fault because we have failed to do as much as we can to make sure people do not lessen the water passageway in construction of homes and business buildings.

It is also the fault of the Federal Government agencies whose job it is to help us remedy the flood situation. There have been enough surveys, committees named, setting aside funds, including in the budget, etc. There certainly has not been enough action.

Really, though, the purpose of this editorial is not to point back and try to place the blame somewhere. What we feel should be done now is for all of us to work with our city officials, county court members, Congressman QUILLEN, Senators GORE and KEFAUVER, and make sure the talking stops and the work begins!

Now, while the latest flood is still fresh in our minds, is the time to gouge someone into action. Too many times already we have been upset about the flood and then when the sun came out and the water went down we quit pushing for action.

Administration Whimpering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people know for certain that they have not been given all the facts on the Bay of Pigs. There has actually been deliberate deception by President Kennedy, on the subject. Administration officials, instead of acting like crybabies ought to be men enough to come clean on this disaster so that steps may be taken to see it doesn't happen again.

An excellent editorial in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star should be read by every American and every member of this administration who had responsibility for the Bay of Pigs:

FACTS WANTED

Senator MANSFIELD, in our opinion, is a man of great integrity and competence. Nevertheless, we think he missed the real point in his impassioned appeal to the Senate to refrain from politicking on the Cuban question.

The majority leader has suggested that recent Republican attacks were based on a news story that was published on May 5, 1961. He also has expressed the belief that these attacks are injurious to the national interest—that to toy with such things as the details of who bungled the Bay of Pigs operation is to toy with the life of the Nation.

This is an argument which overlooks a basic point. The American people have been encouraged to believe that no U.S. forces were involved in the Cuban invasion, and that President Kennedy would not permit them to be involved under any condition. In the strictest sense, this is true. But it also strikes us as the finest kind of hairsplitting—if news reports in addition to those mentioned by Senator MANSFIELD are correct.

These additional reports, coming from presumably responsible and informed individuals, indicate that the May 5, 1961, news account told only a small part of the story. These reports suggest that 16—not 4—Americans were involved as pilots or in training capacities in the Cuban invasion. Some of them certainly were National Guard officers, evidently recruited by the Central Intelligence Agency on some kind of informal or civilian basis. If this is so, the statement by Attorney General Kennedy that "no U.S. Forces" took part in the invasion needs very careful scrutiny.

Our feeling about this matter is not that it was wrong to use Americans to train the Cubans, or even to fly combat missions. It is a great pity, we think, that the effort at the Bay of Pigs failed because too few Americans were used, and because their equipment, including planes, was inadequate to the task.

What disturbs us is that this continuing leakage of information which, if true, casts doubt on the accuracy of former official statements, can hardly fail to make most Americans wonder whether their Government is telling the truth or is trying to brainwash them. Certainly it is necessary to protect our intelligence structure. At the very least, this means that the public cannot be told all. But when a mishmash of conflicting information gets into the public domain, it is desirable that all of the facts—consistent with protecting national security—be put on the record. We do not believe that this has been done in the Cuban affairs. On the contrary, we think that facts, undoubtedly known to Castro, are being covered up or distorted to protect individuals in this country from their responsibility for the monumental blunder at the Bay of Pigs. This is unwise and—and within the limits of legitimate security considerations—unnecessary.

Shift in Tax Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it is often beneficial to view a complex problem from a distance in order to reach a thoughtful, realistic conclusion. Such an impartial, nonpartisan appraisal was achieved in a recent editorial from the Rome, Italy, Daily American concerning the tax proposals recommended by the administration. The editorial comment is excellent, and merits serious consideration with its sound thoughts from abroad.

SHIFT IN TAX TACTICS

President Kennedy has wheeled the heavy guns out of his arsenal of arguments for passage of his tax reduction bill—and revealed a shift in his tactics.

In his economic report to the Nation, the President said, "The outlook for continued moderate expansion in 1963 is now favorable." Later on, in the same message, he declared, "I do not expect a fifth postwar recession to interrupt our progress in 1963."

Now, however, he has warned that unless his tax program is accepted the United States may face a recession in the near future.

This shift in approach doubtless has been caused by the almost universal opposition which has sprung up to the Presidential plan.

Labor has been critical because there are not larger reduction for the low-income tax brackets, although on the basis of percent-

ages they get more relief than any other group.

Corporate managers have been critical because such reductions as are given their organizations are extremely small and long delayed.

Investment specialists do not like the new capital gains rules. Realtors, charities and educational institutions know that they will be hurt by the 5-percent floor under itemized deductions.

It is a matter of conjecture whether the President's warning of a recession will change any of these points of view.

Kennedy admits that his plan may not be perfect, and suggests that those who are opposed to it put forward a solution of their own.

This already has been done, in advance of the President's admonition.

The Baker-Herlong bill, which would achieve tax reduction and release tax drags on capital formation and incentives, has been kicking around the Capitol for several years.

Most of the objectors to the administration program are in favor of the Baker-Herlong bill.

Economist Ralph Robey points out that the administration proposal would add "well below 1 percent" to personal income in the Nation in 1963 "not enough to make even a measurable difference in the business trend, even if it were all spent."

How about another congressional look at the Baker-Herlong bill?

Haven't Seen It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently a very significant and meaningful editorial appeared in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune. Because it points up a great lack of interest on our own history and heritage I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so this pertinent observation and valuable information might be made known to more people.

The editorial follows:

HAVEN'T SEEN IT?

Several days ago we flipped on the TV set and watched three Chevy Chase students and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER being interviewed down at the Capitol.

The Senator gave a brief and quite interesting sketch about the room in which they were seated (it was the room where the Presidents used to come at the tag-end of a congressional session so they could sign or veto bills.)

Anyway, the interviewer also asked a few questions of the students and two out of the three revealed that this was their very first trip inside the Capitol.

Such a tour was "a fascinating experience" all three youngsters agreed.

We agreed too. In fact, we'll unashamedly admit that we get sort of a lump in our throat each time we even drive by this lovely building, one which is sort of a world capitol for folks who enjoy freedom as we know it.

But the "two out of three" did lead us to wonder about all the crowds that are lining up down at National Gallery to see the Mona Lisa.

We wonder how many of these folks have taken the time to make a tour of the Capitol Building, something thousands of people who don't live right here have driven many, many miles to see.

What a shame that more residents of this area don't take the time and trouble to go inside and look around or, if they have already, take their children to do so.

Don't get the idea we're anti-Mona Lisa, either. We think it's pretty fine that many folks who'll never get to the Louvre now have the chance to see this world-famous painting. And if you're taking the family down, remember that gallery officials have suggested that the dinner hour might be the easiest to avoid a lot of "waiting in line."

Urban Transit and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Monday, March 11, 1963:

URBAN TRANSIT AND PROSPERITY

Two weekend developments have underscored again the absolute necessity of good transit facilities in an urban area such as Philadelphia and its surrounding counties.

One of them, reported exclusively in the Sunday Inquirer by Joseph C. Goulden, was the abrupt about-face of Delaware County authorities toward regional cooperation and a possible transit authority. Obvious political overtones aside, Delaware County last week found itself losing two important industries with a total payroll of more than 1,100 persons and—in our opinion—accurately diagnosed part of the trouble as stemming from transit difficulties.

So Delarawe County, the lone holdout from the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Compact which has brought various benefits to Philadelphia, Bucks and Montgomery Counties, now is prepared to join in talks which involve even more than Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Compact—the possibility of a genuine authority to deal with all transit matters in the area.

The other development was the stand taken Saturday by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia in favor of the $500 million urban transportation bill now in Congress. In taking this position, the local chamber is bucking the national chamber, which has held that all transit problems are local.

We believe, with the Philadelphia group, that such problems are national in scope because, in our increasingly urban Nation, what happens to the cities in their economic function is pretty much what is going to happen to the entire country.

It is becoming more evident every year that, like liberty, prosperity in this country is indivisible.

We are pleased that Delaware County now is joining in the regional efforts to cope with our common transit problems and we hope Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Democrat of New Jersey, chief sponsor of the urban transportation bill, is correct in his prediction that it may be the first major legislation enacted this year.

The need is now.

Timber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I joined with many of my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle in sponsoring a resolution calling upon the President to impose a temporary emergency quota of 6 percent on all imports of softwood lumber. The softwood lumber market in our Nation at this time is in serious condition, and the market prediction for this year is even more gloomy.

The Department of Commerce, Business and Defense Services Administration, Forest Products Division, released a report late last week which is entitled, "Lumber Industry, Outlook for 1963 and Review of 1962." This report estimates that lumber production is expected to total about 34.3 billion board feet this year, an increase of 4 percent over 1962. But, along with this optimistic note, the report also predicts a further decline in softwood lumber prices.

The severe windstorm which hit the west coast last October blew down an estimated 11.2 billion board feet of timber. To prevent an epidemic of insect infestation in this downed timber and to alleviate a serious forest fire danger, this timber must be harvested and marketed quickly. The addition of this harvested windfall timber to the already depressed softwood lumber market will result in further economic chaos.

The report shows that lumber imports this year will total approximately 5.3 billion board feet, a rise of 8.5 over 1962. Of this amount, 94 percent of the imported lumber will be softwood lumber. It is estimated that 5.1 billion board feet of softwood lumber will be imported into our country this year, and will comprise 15.5 percent of the total softwood consumption of our Nation this year. Last year we imported 4.5 billion board feet, and this amount made up 15 percent of our total domestic consumption.

Thus the increasing amount of foreign lumber imports, and the harvesting of the downed timber, will result in a further decline in the market price of our domestic lumber industry. This fact makes it more urgent than ever that the President take immediate action to impose an emergency quota.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the Lumber Industry Report prepared by the Department of Commerce, along with a resolution dealing with the Canadian import situation which was forwarded to me by the Ferry County Timbermen's Association.

The report and resolution follow:

LUMBER INDUSTRY OUTLOOK FOR 1963 AND REVIEW OF 1962

SUMMARY

Lumber production is expected to total about 34.3 billion board feet in 1963—4 percent more than in 1962—based on estimated demand, the Business and Defense Services

Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, reported today. However, at least an additional billion board feet is expected to be produced through salvage of windthrown timber resulting from the severe west coast storm in October 1962. This excess production would be added to inventory and would tend to depress softwood lumber prices. Lumber imports will probably total about 5.3 billion board feet in 1963, a rise of 8.5 percent.

Statistical summary

Statistics for 1961 and 1962 and estimates for 1963 are as follows:

	1961	1962	1963 [1]	Percent change	
				1961–62	1962–63
Production (million board feet)	31,843	32,885	[2] 34,330	+3.3	+4.4
Value of shipments (thousand dollars)[3]	2,591,000	[1] 2,700,000	2,800,000	+4.2	+3.7
Quantity of imports (million board feet)	4,248	4,884	5,300	+15.0	+8.5
Value of imports (thousand dollars)	312,616	368,902	400,000	+18.0	+8.4
Quantity of exports (million board feet)	755	792	830	+4.9	+4.8
Value of exports (thousand dollars)	87,153	91,898	96,000	+5.1	+4.8

[1] Estimated.
[2] An additional billion board feet may result from salvage of windthrown timber.
[3] Sawmill and planing mill products (not related to production figures).

Source: Bureau of the Census.

OUTLOOK FOR 1963

The lumber industry (standard industrial classification code 2421) comprises approximately 32,000 establishments employing about 240,000 people.

Lumber consumption is expected to total 38.8 billion board feet in 1963, about 5 percent more than in 1962. Prospects for the principal lumber-consuming industries are generally favorable. In the construction industry, total construction lumber requirements in 1963 are expected to equal or exceed those in 1962.

Expenditures for private and public construction are expected to be 3.3 percent greater than in 1962. Construction of new housing, largest single user of new lumber, is expected to increase slightly in 1963. Construction of multifamily housing (two or more units), which has increased sharply in recent years, is expected to level off at slightly more than the 32 percent of total housing construction reached in 1962. Total consumption of lumber in residential construction has been held down in recent years because these multifamily units require less lumber than single-family structures. Expenditures for residential alterations and repairs and for nonresidential construction (industrial, commercial, religious, educational, etc.) are also expected to rise slightly in 1963.

The pallet industry, one of the fastest growing lumber-consuming industries, used an estimated 1.7 billion board feet of lumber in 1962, which was 5 percent of total domestic production. Pallet production totaled 68 million units in 1962, compared with 64 million in 1961. Production has increased steadily in the last 4 years—the 1962 increase amounting to the largest on record. Production in 1963 is expected to gain modestly.

Shipments of nailed and wirebound boxes and crates will probably increase about 5 percent in 1963. Shipments of nailed wooden boxes and crates were about 7 percent higher in 1962 than in 1961, and those of wirebound boxes and crates were 3 to 4 percent higher.

Total shipments of household furniture may be about 4 percent greater in 1963 than the record high attained in 1962. Value of shipments of unupholstered wood furniture (case goods) totaled $1.6 billion in 1962, compared with $1.4 billion in 1961. Value of shipments of upholstered furniture was $906 million in 1962, a record annual increase over the $802 million reported for 1961. Value of shipments of wood office furniture may increase about 2 percent over the total in 1962 of $89 million.

About 33 percent more railroad freight cars are expected to be constructed in 1963. The railroads also expect to upgrade a larger number of older cars, thus tending to increase the consumption of lumber. In 1962, 36,555 new freight cars of all kinds were built, 12.5 percent more than the 31,720 cars built in 1961. The construction of cars using wood, accounting for about one-third of the total, increased at approximately the same rate. Procurement of railroad ties is expected to increase 5 percent over the quantity purchased in 1962, when the increase was 20 to 25 percent over purchases in 1961.

In addition to demand from wood-using industries, lumber production in 1963 will also be strongly affected by the level of imports (especially of softwood lumber) and the salvage of west coast timber blown down by the severe storm in October 1962.

Total imports have risen from 1.3 billion board feet in 1947 (3.7 percent of apparent domestic consumption) to 4.9 billion board feet in 1962 (13.2 percent of consumption). Imports of softwood, accounting for 94 percent of total imports in 1962, have increased rapidly in recent years, as follows:

Year	Million board feet	Percent of total softwood consumption
1947	1,096	4.1
1960	3,636	12.5
1961	4,004	13.7
1962	4,573	15.0
1963 (estimate)	5,100	15.5

Source: Bureau of the Census; estimate for 1963, Forest Products Division, BDSA.

On the basis of recent trends, total lumber imports in 1963 should be about 5.3 billion board feet.

A severe storm on the west coast in October 1962 blew down 11.2 billion board feet of timber. To prevent an epidemic infestation of bark beetles and consequent additional loss of green timber, this timber must be removed rapidly. The salvaged timber is expected to boost production of logs (including sawlogs, plupwood logs, veneer logs, etc.) from 1 to 2 billion board feet above the level which might otherwise be expected.

Growing demand for lumber in industrialized countries and export promotion programs of both Government and industry may increase exports to 830 million board feet in 1963, a 5-percent gain over 1962.

At the estimated levels of consumption, imports, and exports, lumber production of about 34.3 billion board feet will be required to meet domestic demand in 1963. Salvage of windthrown timber would raise total production by at least 1 billion board feet, which would be added to inventory.

The average wholesale price index for all lumber was 96.5 in 1962 (1957–59=100), compared with 94.7 in 1961 and 99.8 in 1960. The index for softwood in these years was 95.9, 93.5, and 98.6, respectively. Excess production resulting from salvage of blowndown timber would tend to depress softwood prices in 1963. It is estimated that each 300 million board feet produced in excess of demand would reduce the price $1 per thousand board feet.

RESOLUTION

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled: We, the members of the Ferry County Timbermen's Association, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasingly yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

Whereas a serious blowdown of timber occurred in Washington, Oregon, and California in October of 1962 and salvage of said blowdown timber will place a further burden on the orderly marketing of lumber from other domestic areas; and

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as: (1) depreciated currency; (2) low stumpage rates; (3) noncompetitive bidding; (4) less costly and restrictive forest practices; (5) lower wage rates; (6) high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada; (7) low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; (8) a cooperative Government; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress and President of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

Passed the 17th day of January 1963, at regular meeting of Ferry County Timbermen's Association.

Attest:

FRED C. LEJAUR,
President.

IRA MERRITT,
Secretary.

The Difference Between Republican and Democratic Policies on Cuba and Planned Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, very often in speaking with Republican groups around this country I have stated that if every party organization in the United States worked as diligently and as effectively as the Washington Republicans under the leadership of Carl Shipley, we would never lose elections. This is particularly significant when one realizes that in Washington neither a Democrat nor a Republican can vote but, nevertheless, these people feel an obligation to the two-party system which has made them a most effective organization.

Their leader, Mr. Carl Shipley, one of Washington's outstanding citizens, recently addressed the adult seminar of the Church of the Brethren at the Dodge Hotel in Washington, and his remarks are so pertinent and important to our time, that I ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOP CHAIRMAN CARL SHIPLEY TO ADULT SEMINAR OF CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN

Discussion of alternatives is the vital ingredient of the democratic process. Representative Government based on our two-party system would wither and die without the stimulus of conflicting proposals by the Republican and Democratic Parties. The differences between the national goals of the Kennedy administration and Republicans, with respect to Cuba and planned deficits, are wide and deep.

The Republican Party has consistently urged programs looking toward victory in the cold war. The Kennedy administration has apparently abandoned victory as a national goal. It is committed to settling for half-a-loaf compromises, coalitions, and concessions. Peace at any price is the Kennedy program. This policy has led us to the brink of disaster in Cuba. The Kennedy administration's smoke screen of explanation that the hundreds of torpedo boats and ground-to-air missile fighters are defensive, that the Russian submarine base in Cuba is no threat, and that the 17,000 Russian soldiers are simply housekeepers, leads the Nation away on a false scent. We must move forward in the spirit of Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders. We must remove the Russian military threat from Cuba at whatever the cost. First we need a total blockade by ground, air, sea, and communications media. Then recognition of a Cuban Government in exile. Next, support of anti-Castro Cubans financially and militarily to retake Cuba. If that fails, we must invade with our own forces. Americans can never accept a contemptuous disregard of the Monroe Doctrine by Communist Russia or the presence of a Russian satellite government in Cuba on a permanent basis. And we cannot wait for Cuba to fall from within—as we have with Hungary, Poland, and all the others. Coexistence is completely out of the question, and the Kennedy administration is dead wrong in pursuing that goal. Some Americans living today recall the storming of San Juan Hill, when our country under Republican leaders removed a foreign military presence from Cuba. The reasons for eliminating Russian influence from Cuba today are much greater than the reasons which moved our country in the days of Gen. Leonard Wood, Col. Teddy Roosevelt, and Admiral Dewey. Let us not be hoodwinkled by the Kennedy administration's soft sell on the danger which confronts us just 90 miles away.

The second great difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties focuses around the Kennedy administration's planned deficits and planned inflation. This is their complicated proposal to cut taxes by $10 billion, increase the budget to nearly $100 billion, and shift the tax burden away from the lower and higher economic groups on to the middle class. Family, church, business, and community life in the United States is based on sound pay-as-you-go theories of a balance between income and outgo, and a distribution of the tax burden, so that every citizen from the lowest economic group to the highest bears a fair and proportionate share of the ever-increasing cost of government.

For the first time in the history of our country, the Kennedy administration has put forward a proposal to abandon this basis premise and commit the country to a program of planned deficits and constant expenditures greater than income. Just a few examples of the Kennedy tax proposal illustrate the situation. First, Mr. Kennedy would take a million taxpayers completely off the tax rolls at the lower end and reduce the tax on highest incomes from 91 to 65 percent. Next, Mr. Kennedy would virtually steal from the churches, schools, and charities by depriving millions of taxpayers of a portion of their charitable deductions, by putting a 5-percent floor under church and school contributions. He would take away over $3.2 billion in deductions from this group. Mr. Kennedy has proposed to take away the sick pay and retirement pay exemptions, and to take away the $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividends. This all strikes hard at retired persons, sick persons, and those on pensions or other fixed incomes. Mr. Kennedy would deprive homeowners of their mortgage interest deduction and deprive real estate and estate transfers of capital gains treatment. He would extend the holding period on capital gains. These are all devious tax increases, to offset the promised tax cut. Excessive taxes must be cut, but only when nonessential expenses are cut. The Kennedy proposal is fiscal folly.

Robert Frost—Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written in honor of Robert Frost by Miss Marty Hale, the Old Spinner, of Steubenville, Ohio:

ROBERT FROST—IN MEMORIAM

(By Marty Hale, Steubenville, Ohio)

Unmindful of the sun's bright glare,
Or wind that ruffed his whitened hair—
He was majestic, standing there
To add his bit of sentiment—
The words with serious intent—
To honor our new President.

The sun was bright—he could not see
Those words—and yet how gallantly
He praised our country's history.

Many loved poets we recall,
Some have achieved that magic call,
But he was greatest of them all.

He struggled, and he reached his goal,
Sometimes it takes a heavy toll—
A poet writer his heart and soul.

These words of his we keep apart,
Perhaps a vagrant tear may start—
They'll live forever in our heart:

"Your woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

An emptiness—a world that wept—
Those promises have all been kept,
Because today the poet slept.

That Uncuttable Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "That Uncuttable Budget" from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of March 1, 1963:

THAT UNCUTTABLE BUDGET

Washington was treated the other day to the unusual sight of a Congressman protesting Federal spending in his State. Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, opposed plans of the Area Redevelopment Agency to build a $418,000 paper mill in Wisconsin. It would produce paper products just like other mills in the State turn out, and the existing mills are running far under capacity. Transferring orders from old mills to the new ones will transfer jobs as well, and no new jobs will be created.

This is a small matter in the $99 billion the administration proposes to spend in 1964. But it's one of many unwise, unnecessary, and foolish programs that go to make it an alltime record budget.

The budget adds new programs to the old ones, and increases spending in nearly every category. The "savings" of which the politicians speak do not represent only slowdown of spending, but turn out to be sales of Government property in some cases, and transferring lending functions to private hands in others. The budgets for payroll, overhead, and programs rise.

The Government Economy Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers has suggested savings of $2.8 billion in fiscal 1964 spending in a preliminary study of the budget requests, and promises to hurt more fat as time goes on. The NAM objects to $250 million in new military housing, for example, on the grounds that the housing shortage which led to the program in the first place is long over. It questions $763 million of foreign aid to nations which have shown little capacity to use it, and little allegiance to free world purposes.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon defended the budget by citing the rise in population, but he's new in the job and may not have

heard that Federal expense has been outrunning population growth for years now.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress alike are alarmed at the size of the budget, and the $11 billion deficit forecast—particularly as last year's forecast of a half billion surplus became a realized $8 billion deficit.

The budget can be, should be, and must be cut.

Congress Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is often criticized and regrettably is rarely commended. Congress, as an institution, is often made the national whipping boy and all too infrequently commended.

It is refreshing, therefore, to read a recent article by Columnist Jenkins Lloyd Jones, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star commending Congress. I believe this article is worthy of wider reading, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

CONGRESS ADMIRED FOR BEHAVIOR—ABSENCE OF TURBULENCE ON FLOOR CREDITED WITH HELPING SUCCESS

It was one of those awful days in the U.S. Senate when a handful of Senators were just standing around beating their gums to empty desks and the puzzled galleries.

The upper House was in a state of paralysis because the liberals had introduced a move to kill filibusters by a three-fifths vote instead of the traditional two-thirds vote, and with the rules up in the air the Senate couldn't organize and the committees couldn't be appointed and so, a month after the beginning of the session, nothing was going on.

Vice President JOHNSON was up on the high chair. A couple of freshmen, TED KENNEDY of the well-known family and HOWARD EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, sat around still, presumably, entranced by the newness of it all. Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia was conducting a filibuster on the filibuster, and every once in a while he would refer to the Senate's being like Caesar's wife and again to its being in Abraham's bosom.

Occasionally, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, would ask permission to make a brief comment that wasn't brief and once Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio asked to interrupt so that he might call attention to the wonderful Ukranians who were being ground down beneath the Kremlin's heel, whereupon Senator SCOTT of Pennsylvania, mindful of his own Ukranians in Pittsburgh, fell all over himself seconding Senator LAUSCHE's sentiments.

I was killing an hour in the practically empty Press Gallery and I kept my eye on a couple of young men across the way in the visitors' seats. One had a beard and they were enjoying themselves hugely and about to die with suppressed merriment at the grotesque performance on the floor. You could just hear them at their next cocktail party laughing Congress to death.

But here's one uncynical newspaperman. Strangely, I come away from either House—even on a terrible day such as that one—with admiration.

The U.S. Congress is probably the best behaved parliament in the world. The raucous and raffish cries of "murder," Treason and shame, that characterize that lively debates in Westminster are almost never heard in the Capitol. There is none of the turbulence of the Chambre de Deputes in Paris, or the House of the People in New Delhi or the Israel Knesset. Not since Preston Brooks of South Carolina nearly brained Charles Sumner of Massachusetts 111 years ago has the Senate floor seen a serious fight.

The Congress shows its sophistication by doing practically all its significant work in committee, or at least away from the floor. The floor is largely window dressing—speeches to the Gallery and remarks for the record—and, of course, formal voting. Votes may be changed by quiet persuasion or adroit pressure in the corridors, but rarely by frenetic debate in full assembly.

In the new republics all eyes are on the rough-and-tumble Congresses. There is the place of passion and oratory and recrimination and contention. And here are spawned the dictators.

For popular government can't survive disorder and chaos. The confusion of mob government in the Agora in Athens brought forth Pericles. The corruption in the Roman Senate made Caesar inevitable. The irresponsibility of the French deputies finally drove the nation into the arms of General de Gaulle.

A republic is a fragile thing. The price of its survival is a reasonable efficiency. Yet popular government is inherently inefficient. It is full of lost motion, confusion and indecision. It moves forward under the weak force of persuasion instead of the strong force of personal power.

The U.S. Congress has been a success. Over 180 years, in spite of a host of mountebanks and incompetents and a few genuine rascals, it has listened more often than not to the voice of reason. It has, surprisingly perhaps, usually recognized real leadership and devoted patriotism. Its Members—most of them—work desperately hard.

It may, of course, decay. Perhaps its golden age has already passed. Congress is a reflection of the people and the greed of the people has this year brought financial irresponsibility to a new high. If we ever have a crashing dollar and a national paralysis we may well lose the right to elect our representatives.

But, even if, that happens, history will remember the U.S. Congress. For it's time it reached a high point in the delicate art of deliberation. Reportedly, it showed generosity in triumph and strength in crisis. It had tradition and pride. It molded a lot of good vessels, some out of pretty ordinary clay.

I never leave the Gallery, even after listening to sonorous rhetoric rolling over empty seats, without marveling that the whole thing could have lasted so long and performed so well.

Hon. Lew Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in all the words they have uttered in praise of our able Parliamentarian Lew Deschler. Lew was on the job when I came to Congress almost a quarter of a century ago, and I learned quickly to seek his counsel and advice, all of which proved to be good. Lew Deschler possesses that sixth sense, to see the right, and to live right during every minute of the day.

I could go on for hours, Mr. Speaker, expounding my high esteem of this great and good man, but it is simply not possible to gild the rose, neither is it possible to say anything that would add to the love and high esteem that all have who know well, my friend, Lew Deschler.

I only wish for you, Lew, many more years of service to the Members of Congress and to our beloved Nation, which you have served so well for over one-third of a century.

Blockade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report issue of March 18, 1963, entitled "Blockade," points out the truth that many American citizens know even if the President and his military and State Department advisers do not know.

Cuba is a threat militarily, politically, and in every other way to us and the nations of this hemisphere. The longer we postpone taking the necessary action, first to neutralize the danger and then to remove the danger and the threat, the more difficult will the task become. There is no point further in quibbling over kinds of blockades although the pacific blockade mentioned by Mr. Lawrence is pertinent. The main thing is to prevent further military buildup while we determine militarily what action is necessary to reimpose the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere, which means freeing Cuba of communism of any form, Castro, or Khrushchev.

The editorial follows:

BLOCKADE

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy told his news conference on March 6 that the primary source of the shipments into Cuba today are bloc ships. This, of course, means that, under orders from Moscow, the Communist-bloc countries of Eastern Europe are sending to Castro not only military equipment but oil and other goods essential to Cuba's economic survival.

The American people, on the other hand, are furnishing what is popularly known as foreign aid to the governments of several countries whose ships are carrying oil and other supplies to Cuba.

How long will it be before the United States puts into effect and enforces a blockade against this traffic?

President Kennedy admits that an embargo on oil to Cuba could be effective. He says:

"There isn't any doubt that over a long period of time that denial of oil would make a difference. To deny the oil would require,

of course, a blockade, and a blockade is an act of war, and you should be prepared to go for it.

"I think we indicated last October that in periods where we considered the United States was endangered, we were prepared to go as far as was needed to remove that danger, and we would, of course, be willing always to do so again, if we felt there was a situation which carried with it that kind of danger to the United States."

When the President says that a blockade is an "act of war," does this apply to all forms of blockade? History doesn't support such a broad assertion. In the handbook of law known as Corpus Juris Secundum, widely used in America's judicial system, there is a particular reference to what is called a pacific blockade. It is defined as follows:

"The so-called pacific blockade is a means of coercion, ordinarily treated as falling short of war, consisting in the interruption of commercial intercourse with certain ports or coasts of a state to secure redress for an international wrong.

"The accepted position is that pacific blockades should not bear on third states except as they are affected by the constraint directly applied to the port or ports blockaded."

Whether a pacific blockade might eventually develop into an acknowledged state of war is hardly relevant, since, realistically speaking, there has been and still continues to be a state of war between Cuba and the United States. The Soviet Union has been proved conclusively to be a military partner of the Cuban Government. The whole world knows that offensive armament intended for a potential attack on the United States was set up in Cuba by the Soviets and that at least 17,000 troops and technicians were brought there from Eastern Europe to man the apparatus.

On the same day—March 6—that the President at his news conference was promising to take action if the Cuban situation became dangerous again, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, head of U.S. Army Intelligence, was testifying before a Senate subcommittee, as follows:

"From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations throughout the island.

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items."

General Fitch described the various kinds of tanks, artillery mortars, rocket launchers, and ground-to-ground missiles in Cuba today, and then declared:

"With the introduction of this equipment into Cuba, the potential firepower and mobility of ground forces has been increased considerably. No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba although it is possible that they could be used by some of the weapons systems present there."

Why then do we quibble over the technicalities of international law as we observe an obvious enemy building a military machine 90 miles away from our shores with the unquestioned purpose of endangering the people of the United States?

Why should Congress continue to vote money to the government of any country whose ships carry oil and other goods to strengthen Castro's position?

Why should the United States hesitate to impose a pacific blockade which will not interfere in any trade operations of the Soviet Union or its satellites with other parts of the world, but will effectively place a boycott on all commerce with Cuba?

We imposed a quarantine last autumn and intercepted Soviet as well as other ships in the Atlantic as they approached Cuba. If we had a right to do this then, we have the right today to put into effect a pacific blockade so as to protect and defend the people of the United States and other peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

Chemists' Magazine Reports New Detergent That Cleans as Well Without Polluting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4571, to end detergent pollution of the Nation's streams and water table would require manufacturers to stop using the chemical that is now the key ingredient in most synthetic detergents.

The choice of a substitute will be up to private industry within the bounds set by standards of decomposability to be established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The availability of a substitute that is reportedly comparable to the products now in use in its cleaning ability but unlike them in that it is full decomposable has been reported in a recent article in Chemical and Engineering News. American research may be able to develop an even better substitute for the present perpetually foaming product. The imposition of a reasonable deadline will spur such efforts.

The report on the new biodegradable detergent follows:

GERMAN FIRM DEVELOPS NEW SYNDETS

West Germany's detergent sweepstakes, sparked by a law forbidding sale after October 1, 1964, of products that aren't at least 80-percent biodegradable, has another entry. A new group of nonionic detergents claimed to be 100-percent biodegradable has been unveiled by H. J. Zimmer Verfahrenstechnik, a chemical research and development firm located in Frankfurt, West Germany (Chemical and Engineering News, Feb. 18, p. 49).

The products are sugar esters of hydroxy fatty acids. The group currently numbers four and includes the sugar esters of ricinoleic acid, and mono-, di-, and trihydroxystearic acids.

In addition to being biodegradable, the new detergents are low-foaming, nontoxic, and stand on a relatively cheap and available raw material base—sugar and natural oils. And their detergent activity compares well with that of tetrapropylene benzene sulfonate (Tpbs). Tpbs is Germany's biggest selling detergent, has about 85 percent of the market. But it's only about 25-percent degradable, hence will be barred by the Federal Republic's detergent law.

Producers scrambling: Detergent producers and process developers are currently scrambling for substitute products that will meet the 80-percent degradability requirement (Chemical and Engineering News, Feb. 18, p. 65). At stake is a detergent market in West Germany that's estimated currently at about 100,000 metric tons a year, or about $25 million.

The key to the washing ability of the new products is the hydroxyl group, according to Dr. Herbert Simonis, technical manager of Zimmer's purification process methods affiliate and coinventor of the detergents with Dr. Mohammed Ismail, also of Zimmer. The sugar ester of stearic acid, for example, has practically no washing activity, he points out. However, at least one hydroxyl group on the fatty acid chain raises washing ability to competitive levels. Optimum washing properties seem to lie between monohydroxy- and dihydroxystearic acids.

The four sugar esters have similar properties. Special raw material or market conditions would determine which would be produced, Dr. Simonis says. The sugar ester of ricinoleic acid is cheapest to make. But superiorities of other members of the group in certain specific properties might make them more suitable for higher value washing products.

In cost, the new products don't score quite so high. Zimmer figures production cost at about 23 cents per pound of sugar ester. This is about twice that of Tpbs. But the amount of detergent in commercial consumer washing products is only about 2 percent according to Dr. Simonis. The balance is filler and various additives. In industrial detergent products, the detergent fraction might rise to 10 to 20 percent, he says. So, on a final product basis, Dr. Simonis estimates that Zimmer's sugar esters will only be 10 to 15 percent higher in cost than Tpbs.

Will license: Zimmer, which is not a chemical producer, is aiming at licensing the process that it has developed for making the detergents. It is currently negotiating with several companies, including one U.S. firm.

The firm isn't ready to talk process details publicly yet. However, it has roughed out the general scheme, which involves a two-step reesterification of sugar and fatty acids from natural oils. First, fatty acids from raw castor oil or other natural oils are reacted with a low-boiling alcohol such as methanol or ethanol. Then the resulting ester is reacted with sugar to give the sugar ester. Actually, a mixture of about 75-percent monoester and 25-percent diester results, but it can be used as such and needn't be purified. The process is rather simple, Dr. Simonis says, doesn't require special equipment, and in many cases can probably be run in existing plant equipment. Further unpurified raw materials can be used.

Zimmer has tested a number of natural sugars, finds that cheap cane sugar (sucrose) is best. Others can be used, but they cost more and have no special advantage, Dr. Simonis says. Various natural oils that give fatty acids having at least one hydroxyl group, or that can be hydroxylated by hydrogen peroxide or peracetic acid, can be used.

After finding that the sugar ester of ricinoleic acid (from castor oil) is degradable and has good detergent qualities, the firm's research group prepared the sugar esters of mono-, di-, and tri-hydroxystearic acid for comparison. These turned out to be comparable to the ricinoleic acid sugar ester, but need more processing, are more costly.

Tests made: So far, Zimmer hasn't tested its detergents in large-scale sewage treatment plants. However, it has had tests made by two independent university authorities. Dr. H. Schlegel, director of the Institute for Microbiology of the University of Goettingen, has tested them for microbiological properties, found them nontoxic and degradable by bacteria normally found in sewage.

Dr. Herbert Koelbel, rector of the Technical University of Berlin, checked out detergent characteristics. He found that all four esters foam less than Tpbs. At the same time, they lower surface tension by at least

50 percent, outstripping Tpbs in this respect. In wetting ability, the mono- and di-hydroxystearic acid sugar esters are about the same as Tpbs, while the sugar esters of trihydroxystearic and ricinoleic acids are somewhat lower. In washing ability (at 80° C. in hard water), the dihydroxystearic acid sugar ester showed up best, the sugar esters of monohyd oxystearic acid and ricinoleic acid were about equal to Tpbs, and the sugar ester of trihydroxystearic acid was a little lower.

Higher Education Not in Dire Distress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, from a rich background of educational leadership which includes the position of president of the University of Illinois and comptroller of that institution, Lloyd Morey effectively challenges the assertion that higher education in the United States is in dire distress. He does so in an open letter to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS. Because this bears directly on problems before the Congress I present the text of his letter.

The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO U.S. SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

JANUARY 2, 1963.

In College and University Business for December 1962, you have asserted that "it is a disgrace that no aid to higher education was adopted by the 87th Congress."

I contend that both your assumptions and your conclusions are without adequate foundation. I believe evidence is lacking that the colleges and universities of the country are not being able to meet the demands upon them with reasonable satisfaction or secure the financial support needed by them without resort to Federal assistance.

For the year 1962–63, State-supported institutions received an average increase of 21 percent in State appropriations for operating expenses. Large capital appropriations also were made in most instances, and a number of States passed bond issues for higher education facilities. Private gifts, both individual and corporate, also showed substantial increase in both private and public institutions.

The National Education Association not long ago asserted that sufficient facilities exist or are in prospect to take care of every student seeking to attend college. The Ford Foundation in a survey found that many institutions could handle half again as much enrollment by using facilities more efficiently. Changing Times reported recently that at least 57,000 vacant places are open in accredited colleges.

As to student aid, institutional and private sources of help are abundant and are increasing. It has yet to be established that any young person who desires to go to college and can profit by it cannot find help if he needs it. Federal funds for undergraduate assistance decrease the spirit of self-reliance on the part of both the student and his family, as well as tending to decrease interest of other sources in supplying such aid.

I realize that the Federal Government for over a century has played a helpful part in the development of higher education. But financially, the part has been relatively small. The States and private sources have assumed the far highest proportion of the cost, both operating and capital. Much of the money coming from the Federal Government is for special purposes, many of which are unrelated to instruction. Assistance in loans for facilities has been helpful, but the ultimate cost of these comes from other than Federal revenue.

Contracts and grants from Federal agencies to higher educational institutions have grown vastly in amount in recent years. They have yielded considerable value but are not an unmixed blessing. They are drawing the institutions concerned into a net of restrictions and procedures which is growing tighter and tighter and interfering more and more with the main purpose of higher education: the teaching of students.

Furthermore, largely because of congressional limitations, rarely does an institution receive full compensation for what it does for the Government.

The first thing Congress should do on behalf of higher education is to lift these limitations and give its agencies a free hand to reimburse institutions for all costs incurred in connection with grants and contracts. The next most important thing would be to give its own Office of Education the funds to make the latter a competent and useful factfinding and advisory body, enabling it to give capable leadership to educational advancement.

There is probably no instant in which the State authorities of public institutions or the alumni of private schools have asked for increased Federal support. These are the people who supply most of the funds for higher education. The main pressure comes from organizations of public institutions for most of whom the States are already making abundant provision and are amply able to continue and expand such support. The sincerity and motives of these organizations are not questioned, but both they and you seem to overlook the fact that the Federal Government does not now have the money for such additional appropriations, and sooner or later, must get it from the taxpayers and donors who are now paying for higher education. It is far better that the institutions go to them in the first place.

No, Mr. Senator, higher education shows no evidence of being in the dire distress you picture it, and neither it nor those it serves are likely to be so, even without further Federal assistance. The disgrace of the 87th Congress was not in failing to appropriate more money, but in appropriating much more than it has or is in prospect under present revenue resources, and in failing to provide means of meeting what it has appropriated or for the payment of any part of the debts to which it has obligated itself and the country. When, and only when, it does these things, should it consider increasing its obligations.

LLOYD MOREY,
President Emeritus and former Comptroller, University of Illinois.

The Money Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and quite proud to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two poems written by a good friend and a constituent, John H. McMahon, of Crestview, Fla. Incidentally, writing is not his career. He is a forester and a very good one, but he has chosen a wonderful media for expressing himself and he does so with talent:

MAPLE LEAVES

Sighing north winds prophesy
The time is come for leaves to die.
As if to warm the stubborn cold,
They turn yellow, red and gold.
Then down they go, like banners bright,
Making death a cheerful sight.

Could I choose a way of dying,
And had no creed nor fond belief,
I'd do it like a maple leaf,
With colors flying.

THE MONEY TREE

I think that I shall never see
A bank pay interest like a tree.
A tree whose lovely limbs are dressed
In green, as if with money blest,
A slave who asks no paid vacation,
No benefits or workman's compensation,
Whose value changes hills and "hollers"
Into a sea of greenback dollars.
Growing on through wind and rain,
Making quiet, capital gain.

Pension and Profit-Sharing Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, more than 1,500,000 people presently employed in the United States are sharing in the profits of the firms which under profit-sharing plans are directly affected by the administration tax proposals. From 1938 until the present the number of profit-sharing plans in this country have increased from 500 to 33,000 and are increasing at the rate of 5,000 per year.

It is for this reason that I submit for the Members of the House the following statement of Mr. Kenneth M. Piper, representing the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, made before the House Committee on Ways and Means recently:

My name is Kenneth M. Piper. I am vice president of human relations at Motorola Inc., Franklin Park, Ill. Today I speak for the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, a nonprofit association of approximately 900 companies with profit-sharing plans covering some 1,500,000 employees in all types of enterprises throughout the United States. I am vice chairman of the council and a member of its board of directors. The headquarters of our organization is at 400 West Madison Street, Chicago 6, Ill.

I am accompanied this morning by the President of the Council, Mr. Stanley D. Noble, and by our legal adviser, Mr. Herman C. Biegel of the Washington firm of Lee, Toomey, and Kent.

The council strongly favors continuing the present tax treatment of lump-sum distributions from qualified profit-sharing plans. The council disagrees with the administration's recommendation in this area. While the council is here to voice its disagreement with this proposal, I want to add

that in principle the council endorses the general objectives which the administration seeks to achieve through its tax program. For instance:

(1) Excessive taxes are a drag on "private purchasing power, initiative, and incentive";

(2) There is great need to encourage more private investment in order to open up more job opportunities, not only for today's unemployed, but for today's youth, who will soon be entering the labor market;

(3) There is an urgent need for us to become more competitive—to improve productivity—in an increasingly competitive world; and

(4) There is need to provide an effective incentive for our citizens to achieve all of these goals.

We believe that profit sharing is one of the most versatile and effective employee-relations tools, and that it should be encouraged because it helps achieve the President's stated objectives. These are in fact the goals for which the council was formed. These goals are set forth in our constitution in these words:

"(1) The council believes it to be highly important to develop an economy in which there is freedom of opportunity for each to achieve his maximum personal development. The council holds that profit sharing offers a most significant means of bringing into being such an economy.

"(2) The council considers well-planned profit sharing to be an effective means of developing group cooperation and efficiency.

"(3) The council holds that widespread profit sharing will tend to stabilize the economy.

"(4) The council holds that the true spirit of partnership which sound profit sharing engenders is of paramount importance."

In order to understand why the council opposes the administration's recommendation to eliminate capital gains treatment of lump-sum distributions from qualified profit-sharing plans, I believe it will be helpful if I review briefly what profit sharing is, how it got started, what its aims are, and how it has worked.

WHAT IS PROFIT SHARING

The council defines profit sharing as any procedure under which an employer pays or makes available to regular employees, subject to reasonable eligibility rules, in addition to prevailing rates of pay, special current or deferred sums, based upon the profits of the business. The Treasury Department's regulations define a profit-sharing plan as "* * * a plan established and maintained by an employer to provide for the participation in his profits by his employees or their beneficiaries." Thus, profit sharing is something in addition to regular wages and salaries currently paid for services. One of the fundamental profit-sharing principles is that profit sharing is not a substitute for wage or salary compensation. It is a formalized program for sharing in the profits generated by the application of energy, ingenuity, and creativity to capital invested in the employer's business. In order to obtain Treasury approval a plan cannot discriminate in favor of highly paid employees.

The basic aim of profit-sharing plans is to develop a sense of partnership between the employer and his employees, so that they will have a common interest in working to make the business profitable. Its aims are:

(1) To create a sense of partnership;

(2) To increase group incentive;

(3) To encourage employee thrift;

(4) To attract desirable employees and reduce turnover; and

(5) To provide employee security, particularly for retirement.

It is very clear that profit sharing is a unifying force, drawing labor and management closely together in a common goal of making more profits and providing employees with a real incentive to contribute to productive efficiency.

HOW DID IT GET STARTED?

The sharing of the fruits of capital and labor is as old as mankind. It is clear that profit sharing was not established to take advantage of any Federal income tax statute since the movement antedates the income tax system. For instance, in the United States the oldest profit-sharing plan now in existence was established by Procter & Gamble Co. in 1887. Many other well-known existing plans were established decades ago. However, as our tax system grew and as Congress became more fully aware of the important contribution profit sharing could make, our tax policy was shaped to encourage the growth and development of profit sharing.

In 1938, at the time of the well-known study of profit sharing conducted by Senators Herring and Vandenberg, there were only about 500 plans in existence. However, Congress recognized that even though there were then relatively few profit-sharing plans, profit sharing might well make an important contribution to the growth and stability of our economy if encouraged by appropriate Government policies. Accordingly, the Senate instructed the Herring-Vandenberg committee to consider "what advisable contribution, if any, may be made to the encouragement of profit sharing by the Federal Government, including the granting of compensatory tax exemptions and tax rewards when profit sharing is voluntarily established." After an exhaustive study, the Herring-Vandenberg committee issued a report in which it set forth the following conclusions:

"The committee finds that profit sharing, in one form or another, has been and can be eminently successful, when properly established, in creating employer-employee relations that make for peace, equity, efficiency, and contentment. We believe it to be essential to the ultimate maintenance of the capitalistic system. We have found veritable industrial islands of 'peace, equity, efficency, and contentment,' and likewise prosperity, dotting an otherwise relatively turbulent industrial map, all the way across the continent. This fact is too significant of profit sharing's possibilities to be ignored or depreciated in our national quest for greater stability and greater democracy in industry."

Congress agreed with these findings of the Herring-Vandenberg committee. Moreover, Congress decided that the best way to help profit sharing realize its full potential was to adopt tax provisions which would foster the growth of profit-sharing plans. Accordingly, in 1942, Congress adopted the principle of capital gains treatment of profit-sharing plan lump-sum distributions which the Treasury Department now criticizes. This principle was reexamined by Congress and following such reexamination was further liberalized and extended in 1951, 1952, and 1954. Proposals to change this fundamental principle of taxation of lump-sum distributions from qualified plans were made to the Senate in 1960 and as recently as September of 1962. Both times that Congress was asked to change this fundamental principle it rejected the requests.

HOW PROFIT SHARING HAS WORKED

The council and its affiliated organization, the Profit Sharing Research Foundation, have accumulated an important body of statistics on how profit-sharing has worked The Profit Sharing Research Foundation of Evanston, Ill., was organized to meet the need for objective factfinding and research in profit sharing. In 1960 the foundation published two studies, entitled "The Stockholder and Employees Profit Sharing." The first study compared the 14 largest department store chains in the United States, 7 of which had profit-sharing plans and 7 of which did not. This study covered the period from 1952 to 1958. The second study covered the 16 largest food store chains in the country, 11 of which had profit-sharing plans and 5 of which did not. The second study covered the period 1952 through 1959. Here are the results:

The profit-sharing companies in both types of chainstores showed consistently superior profit performance in each of the years included in the studies. For instance, in each of the 7 years the profit-sharing department store chains earned rates of return on invested capital ranging from 25 to 50 percent greater than the rate on invested capital of the nonprofit sharers. Looking at the foodstore chains, in each of the 8 years the profit-sharing chains earned rates of return on invested capital ranging from 13 to 27 percent greater than the rates of invested capital of the nonprofit sharers. Now here is what this superior profit performance meant:

(1) Increased revenues for the Government from the profit-sharing companies;

(2) Increased productivity of the employees of the profit-sharing companies;

(3) An increase in jobs provided by the profit-sharing companies; and

(4) An increase in the security enjoyed by the people who work for the profit-sharing companies.

Profit sharing has been significant not only from a financial standpoint for employers, employees, and stockholders, but it has also made an important contribution in the sensitive field of labor-management relations. In companies which have profit-sharing plans, there are fewer labor disputes, strikes, and other work-stopping incidents which hold back the growth of our national product. Absence of this waste contributes greatly to the stabilization of our economy.

When results such as I have described are coupled with a long-established governmental policy of encouraging the growth of profit-sharing plans, is it any wonder that the number of qualified profit-sharing plans has increased from approximately 500 plans at the time of the Hering-Vanderberg committee study in 1938 to more than 33,000 by the end of 1962, or that such plans are currently being established at the rate of about 5,000 per year. It should be stressed that while some large companies have established profit-sharing plans, most of the plans now in existence are found in the medium- and small-sized companies. Many small companies are subject to wide fluctuations in profits and profit sharing is the most desirable way for these companies to provide retirement security for their employees.

HOW TREASURY PROPOSAL WORKS

The Treasury Department proposes to tax at ordinary income rates the gain on a profit-sharing distribution. However, to prevent bunching of income in any one year, the tax is to be computed by the use of an averaging device, which generally treats the distribution as if it had been received in the first 5 retirement years after distribution. Under the Treasury proposal one-fifth of the distribution would be added to the employee's other income (excluding any wage or salary income from the employer) received in the year of distribution, and the resulting tax on the one-fifth would be multiplied by five to determine the total taxes on the distribution.

TREASURY PROPOSAL WILL DISCOURAGE PROFIT SHARING

The sums in profit-sharing plans very often represent accumulations over many

years of service, sometimes as many as 40 years or more. Why should accumulations over so great a number of years be taxed as if received over a 5-year period, or any other arbitrary period of time? If the 5-year period is adopted, it will discourage the continuance of existing profit-sharing plans and the establishment of new ones. Investment of profit-sharing funds in stock of the employer company will be discouraged with an adverse effect on the incentive impact to employees. The council is seriously concerned about the effect the Treasury Department proposals will have on profit sharing, particularly profit sharing in small companies.

The administration proposal would result in an increase in the taxes which most employees covered by deferred profit-sharing plans would pay on lump-sum distributions. An inevitable byproduct of its adoption would be a trend among employees to take their distributions over longer periods of time. This would conflict with what employees themselves prefer. A recent study by the council shows that where alternative forms of distributions were available 70 percent elected to take their benefits in a lump sum rather than in installments. The study also showed that 97 percent of the plans reporting provide for lump-sum distributions. It is also significant to note that in most cases profit-sharing plans are supplemental to fixed pension payments, such as social security, or those provided under private pension plans. The purpose of profit-sharing plans in these instances is to provide the employee with a capital sum, in addition to the guaranteed retirement income which he will receive over his retirement years, which he can use for various personal needs such as entering a business of his own, educating his children, buying a home, meeting extraordinary medical expenses, et cetera.

A further byproduct of distributions made over longer periods of time would be that the governmental revenues would be decreased over what they would be when lump-sum distributions are made. In fact many distributions which are now taxed would not be taxed at all if spread over a long enough period of years.

It has been said that the present method of taxation of lump-sum distributions from deferred profit-sharing plans is a device which principally benefits highly compensated employees. A recent survey by the council indicates that out of over 4,000 lump-sum distributions to retired employees of 223 companies during the period covered, 92 percent were made to persons whose annual compensation range was $10,000 or less.

TREASURY PROPOSAL IS COMPLEX

The Treasury Department proposal will inject additional complexity into the tax law. Each employee receiving a lump-sum distribution must go through the following separate computations:

First, he must compute the tax on one-fifth of his lump-sum distribution plus his income other than salary received from his employer;

Second, he must compute the tax on his income other than salary income received from his employer;

Third, he must subtract the tax determined under the second step from the tax determined under the first step;

Fourth, he must multiply the resulting figure by five to obtain his partial tax attributable to his lump-sum distribution;

Fifth, he must then compute his income tax on all of his income including his salary income from his employer but excluding his lump-sum distribution; and

Sixth, he must determine his final tax by adding the partial tax on the lump sum determined under the fourth step to the tax determined under the fifth step.

The Treasury proposes to substitute this complex system in place of the present comparatively simple, well-understood capital gains method.

In addition to the 5-year averaging device, the Treasury Department proposes to continue to tax as capital gains distributions attributable to accumulations now existing under profit-sharing plans. The 5-year averaging device for part of the distribution and capital gains treatment for the remainder of the distribution inject complexities into the tax law which will make it (a) difficult for the Internal Revenue Service to administer; (b) difficult for trustees to administer; and (c) most important of all, difficult for taxpaying employees to understand.

Secretary Dillon indicated that this change in the income tax law is not designed to produce additional revenues when he stated in the technical explanation that: "For the average employee, the tax on his lump-sum distribution will be roughly the same as he would pay under the present capital gains rates." Moreover, the Treasury Department estimates that the lump-sum amendment together with other capital gains definitional changes will bring in only $8 million additional revenue. The President has stated that tax reform should be directed to encouraging growth and employment, and that it would be unwise "to launch into a full-scale battle on general reform for academic reasons." It is respectfully submitted that in an age of $100 billion Federal budgets, with a Federal debt in excess of $300 billion, a proposal which involves less than $8 million of revenue and which is so complex, must be characterized as "academic.'

UNREALIZED APPRECIATION ON EMPLOYER STOCK

Now, a word about lump-sum distributions which include stock of the employer corporation. Frequently such stock appreciates in value between the time when it was acquired by the profit-sharing trust and the time when it is distributed to the employee. Under present law the employee does not have to pay tax on this unrealized appreciation of the employer company stock until the employee sells or otherwise disposes of this stock. If the employee had invested his money directly in such securities, the gain would not be taxed to him until he actually disposed of the securities, and at that time the appreciation would be taxed as capital gain. Under the Treasury Department's proposal, the appreciation on stock purchased with both employer and employee contributions would be taxed as ordinary income. Moreover, the gain would be taxed before the time that the employee actually receives his gain by selling the stock. The result is that employees will not contribute to profit-sharing plans which distribute securities of the employer, and the incentive element of such plans will be killed. In addition, the proposal will curb the desirable trend toward wider diffusion of ownership of American industry, which has been encouraged by plans which distribute securities of the employer. For these reasons the council strongly opposes any change in the present law on the taxation of lump-sum distributions which include stock of the employer corporation.

THE DEATH BENEFIT EXCLUSION UNDER SECTION 101(b)

The Secretary of the Treasury has also recommended that the present $5,000 exclusion available to the beneficiary of a deceased profit-sharing participant, under section 101(b) of the Code, be eliminated to the extent that the deceased employee was covered by group life insurance carried by his employer. Most certainly this proposal will be detrimental to the widows and orphaned children of deceased employees who were covered under profit-sharing plans.

The council is opposed to any such proposal which will run contrary to the welfare of these beneficiaries. The present exclusion under the existing law is limited to $5,000 and certainly cannot be considered a provision to benefit highly paid employees. The council strongly urges the committee to reject this proposal because it will further diminish the value of profit sharing as an economic incentive which is so important today.

CONCLUSION

The Council of Profit Sharing Industries appreciates very much the opportunity of presenting our views to you this morning. Profit sharing is an effective means of developing cooperation and efficiency; it helps create harmonious labor-management relations; it helps create a sense of partnership between employer and employee; and it benefits employers, employees, stockholders and the Government. The number of qualified profit-sharing plans has increased since 1930 from a few plans to more than 33,000 plans today. This growth in profit-sharing plans has been materially aided by the wise tax policies adopted by Congress. We fear that the complex and inequitable proposals of the Treasury Department will have an adverse effect on the entire profit-sharing movement. We therefore urge that this committee recommend against any change in the present rules for taxing lump-sum distributions from deferred profit-sharing plans.

Ernest S. Griffith Says American Ombudsman Could Serve a Most Useful Function

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as former Chief of the Legislative Reference Service, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith has a familiarity with the problems and operations of Congress that is well known to Members of this House. Dr. Griffith, now dean of the School of International Service at the American University, has made a valuable contribution to the consideration of the possible adaptation of the Scandinavian office of Ombudsman to the American political system. I therefore call particular attention to his views on the subject. I would refer also to my remarks on the Ombudsman in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084.

Dr. Griffith's views follow:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Just a note by way of response to your letter of February 27, concerning the office of Ombudsman.

If such an officer were at the disposal of Congress, and confined his activities to serving such Congressmen who cared to use him, I believe that he might fulfill a most useful function. While I was in the Legislative Reference Service I was impressed by the way in which we of the Legislative Reference were able to assist in providing information requested by constituents. However, even so, often we were aware that there were functions in connection with specific inquiries concerning decisions in the executive branch which it was unsuitable for us to handle. Someone with more power and with the specific function of watchdog would be

required. As matters stand, this function, in many instances, is performed by the individual Members, but with very considerable unevenness—the variables being the Member's time, importunity, his specific function within the Congress itself, etc.

As a specialist dealing with this type of inquiry, in all probability it would be welcomed by the agencies themselves, and they would learn to respect his sincerity and understanding, as well as the power of inquiry which would lay back of it. I believe to extend his role beyond this would create unnecessary complications for the executive agencies which have problems enough, in any event.

Sincerely,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Dean, School of International Service.

Where Reds May Take Over Next in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, so long as the Monroe Doctrine is not reimposed in this hemisphere; so long as communism, Castro and Khrushchev control Cuba; so long is the danger of subversion to the other Latin and South American countries of this hemisphere. The danger is no less real to the United States but is not so immediate as it is to the others of Latin and South America.

Where next will the Communists strike and through subversion as well as overt terror and violence cause Government to fall, to be replaced by a Communist regime?

The attached article from the March 18, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Where Reds May Take Over Next in Latin America" indicates that Guatemala may be next. Others have predicted Haiti. No one knows, of course, for sure which will be next. One thing, however, we know for sure that until and unless the Monroe Doctrine is reimposed someone will be next, to be followed by others.

When will our national leaders realize the terrible danger that communism poses in this hemisphere, in Cuba, not only as a military base but as a center for fomentation, unrest and revolution, in other countries of this hemisphere. Let us hope they wake up in time.

WHERE REDS MAY TAKE OVER NEXT IN LATIN AMERICA

Worry over the Communists in Cuba is likely to preoccupy the Central American Presidents and U.S. President Kennedy at their March meeting in Costa Rica.

But a king-sized headache for the United States is building up here in the largest and most populous country of Central America. It is this:

The way things are going, Guatemala could become "the next Cuba," giving the Communists a base on the mainland of the Americas.

Or, to prevent that happening, there may be a military takeover.

A PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

A political campaign is now underway to pick a successor to President Miguel Ydígoras Fuentes in a national election next November. The front runner by far, at this stage, is a former President—Juan José Arévalo—who once opened the door to communism in Guatemala and went into exile when the Communists were later overthrown.

With elections little more than half a year away, the Communists and their followers are recognized as the best organized political force in Guatemala. The active anti-Communists are disorganized and divided. And the rest of the voting population seems pretty much disinterested in what happens.

Arévalo, whether he disavows it or not, has the quiet but determined support of Communists and fellow travelers. The Guatemalan Communist Party, which has had experience in running this country once, is rated as seasoned, tough and thoroughly disciplined.

WHERE REDS ARE STRONG

Hard-core membership in the party is estimated at 1,500. But party influence actually is far greater than that number indicates, since the Communists are particularly strong among students, young professional people, teachers, and in several key unions.

There is also evidence that the social security system and the lower courts have been heavily infiltrated by Reds.

A lull in Communist activities has been noticeable lately. The common belief is that the Reds are staying in the background, planning to make their move only after the elections.

With non-Communist factions divided or apathetic, political experts say the only element that remains capable of stopping the Arévalo bandwagon is the nation's armed forces. Defense Minister Enrique Peralta recently announced that Arévalo will not be permitted to take office again. The clear implication is that the military will intervene and take over the country, if necessary.

IF ARMY SHOULD ACT

But Guatemalans are beginning to doubt that the army, whose participation would be vital, has the capacity to move. After an air force uprising was put down last November, the armed forces united in a pledge of military respect for constitutional government. Now a move to block the election would be interpreted by some officers as a violation of constitutionality. The result might bring a split, with the danger of a military civil war.

It is former President Arévalo's history and background that give the major concern to those who fear a Communist takeover here.

Most Guatemalans do not consider Arévalo a Communist. He is regarded as an ambitious opportunist, with an irrational hatred of the United States. It was Arévalo, at the close of his earlier term, who arranged for Jacobo Arbenz to get the Presidency in 1951—a move that turned the country over to rule by Communists.

EXILE—FOR HEALTH

When the pro-Communist Arbenz government was overthrown by a revolt in 1954, Arévalo was out of the country, serving abroad as an ambassador. He decided it would be healthier to go into exile. He opened his present campaign while living in refuge in Mexico.

In recent months, the former President has been hard at work trying to spread the idea that his anti-Americanism is past history and that his present candidacy has the backing of the U.S. Government. His supporters have made that claim so often and so insistently, in fact, that the U.S. Embassy has been kept busy denying it.

Despite his current protestations of U.S. friendship, many Guatemalans feel that Arévalo, once elected, would have no choice but to open the way for the Communists once again. They reason it this way: Businessmen, the church, and a good part of the armed forces, will never support Arévalo. To govern, therefore, he will have to court the continued support of the Communists who are now disguising themselves as "reformers."

Also, Arévalo's opponents point out, Fidel Castro took power in Cuba disclaiming Communist sympathies—then promptly turned the place over to them.

Complicating the political outlook here is the experience, so far, with the Alliance for Progress program.

Guatemalan officials, from President Ydigoras Fuentes on down, consider that the Alliance for Progress is too slow and too demanding in its emphasis on reforms to be of much help to the local economy. They have adopted a land-reform law and the first income tax in the country's history in the hope of starting Alliance money flowing. But they insist that both changes are going to hurt Guatemala's economy in the long run.

WHY LOANS LAG

Since March of 1961—the date the Alliance for Progress is considered to have gone into effect—Guatemala has received less than $10 million in new loans. This, combined with $26 million which was still in the pipeline of past aid programs when the Alliance for Progress started, gives the country a total of $36 million in loans that have not yet been drawn down.

According to U.S. officials, the reason Guatemala doesn't get loans faster is that it doesn't take the action necessary to set the loans in motion. They tell stories of loans that were not drawn against for months because officials didn't get around to openings bids. In other instances, the Government has failed to prepare projects that would justify loans for technical assistance.

Alliance loans for water and sewerage projects and for low-income housing remained unused, say U.S. officials, because Guatemala was supposed to put up one-third of the amount, and claimed she didn't have the money to do so.

A WESTERN SIZEUP

One Western official stationed here says that the whole trouble is that the Government "doesn't have the slightest idea of what the Alliance is all about." His explanation:

"What is wrong is that you are dealing with a society here that has a concept of mankind opposed to that of Western civilization. In Guatemala, the educated, the people of means and their children, are interested only in amassing as much as they can for themselves and their families. They have no sense of obligation to the rest of society."

Says another official: "You would think that after Cuba, in self-interest, these people would change to relieve some of the economic pressure on the rest of population. However, they are as uncompromising as ever."

There are plenty of problems here, regardless of who is to blame.

Operating expenses of the Government go up and up. Until last June, the United States donated $10 million a year to support Guatemala's budget. This has since been cut off, and the Government—with a budget of $105 million—now has running debts with its suppiers of between $15 and $18 million.

Next to Venezuela, Guatemala has the highest cost of living in Latin America. Critics say this is because the Government imposed high protective tariffs to raise income and stimulate local production. As a

result, everything from food to manufactured goods is expensive.

An imported automobile tire that cost $25 before present import taxes were imposed now sells for $50. A man's shirt that used to sell for $3.25 now costs $7. A chicken costs $3.50, in a country where the per capita income is estimated at about $175 a year.

The escape valve for Guatemalans is the fact that most of them live close to the land, out of the money economy. Conditions, nevertheless, are bad. There is widespread unemployment, and an even larger problem of underemployment.

After student riots last year, a flight of capital developed. There is a lack of new investment. U.S. private investment is estimated at $125 million. But neither foreigners nor Guatemalan investors seem willing to put new money into the economy. This has been accentuated by uncertainty over the election.

HEADING FOR TROUBLE?

Outwardly, there is an impression of relative calm in Guatamala City. Yet, when you listen more closely, you hear worried people everywhere saying that their country needs peace, but it is heading toward chaos and conflict.

For the rest of Central America, and for the United States, the worry is that out of conflict and chaos will emerge one of two things: another military dictatorship, or another Cuba.

Katyn Forest Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stefan Pomierski, a constituent of mine who truly understands the nature of the Communist beast has written me of the Katyn Forest massacre of thousands of Polish officers, by the Russian Communists, 23 years ago, and I feel his letter should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read:

Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR STEVE: As we are approaching another Spring, in many communities wherever Americans of Polish extraction will be gathering, they will pause in a few moments of silence to pray for the souls of some ten thousand Polish officers massacred in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia in the gruesome days of the Spring of 1940.

Material gathered by the Polish Government-in-exile (at present in London) and by a congressional committee investigating the facts, evidence and circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre, without doubt establish the identity of the perpetrators of the cruel mass murder as the evil and godless forces of the Red Kremlin.

It is said that this material is sufficiently convincing to present all the facts to the General Assembly of the United Nations requesting an indictment of the guilty parties.

On this 23d anniversary of the Katyn Massacre, the voices of the souls of these murdered Polish officers go out to this great country of ours, which has always stood in the defense of justice and honor, in the hope that neither fear nor timidity will induce the leaders of the free world to be silent, when fortitude and firmness and courage in a just cause be tested, be it the rape and betrayal of the Polish nation at Yalta, the Katyn massacre, the Budapest slaughter and the ever increasing menace at our own doorstep.

In this grave hour, we must be more than mindful that godless Communism, which is boldy encircling us, operates by means of deceit and tyranny, by treachery and murder.

As a citizen of this great country of ours, and as your constituent I would be remiss in my duty if I would not bring my viewpoints, which I am sure are shared with many constituents of yours, to your good attention.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

K. STEFAN POMIERSKI.

Florida Port Calls for Closing All Trade With Countries Aiding Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, support continues to grow for strong action by the United States against those countries which permit their ships to supply Communist Cuba.

Recently the governing body of Port Everglades, one of the largest and busiest ports in the Southeast, went on record supporting the closing of all U.S. ports to the ships engaged in Cuban trade.

I ask that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and want to personally thank the Broward County Port Authority for their support, which is an indication of the personal sacrifices that our public officials and citizens are willing to make to eliminate this Cuban threat to the security of all the Americas.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 12-1963

Resolution of the Port Commission of the Broward County Port Authority expressing its endorsement and urging the adoption of a policy by the United States of America closing all American ports to vessels engaged in commerce or trade with the Republic of Cuba.

Whereas in view of the current Cuban crisis there is a growing sentiment among the citizens and residents of the United States of America that all American ports should be closed to commerce and trade dealing with the Republic of Cuba; and

Whereas this sentiment has been exemplified as representative of the citizens and residents of the State of Florida by expressions of the Honorable PAUL G. ROGERS, Representative from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Florida, on the floor of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas the Port Commission of the Broward County Port Authority is charged with the responsibility of the operation of Port Everglades in Broward County, Fla., which said port is a deepwater harbor which accommodates vessels which have dealt in commerce and trade with the Republic of Cuba, and is therefore cognizant of and vitally interested in the significance of such continued commerce and trade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Port Commission of the Broward County Port Authority, That it goes on record as being in favor of the United States of America adopting a policy which will close all American ports to vessels directly or indirectly engaged in commerce with the Republic of Cuba; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith forwarded to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, the Honorable Spessard L. Holland and the Honorable George A Smathers, Senators, and the Honorable Paul G. Rogers, Representative, and to such other persons in positions of public confidence and trust as shall be appropriate.

Adopted at Port Everglades, Fla., this 19th day of February, A.D. 1963.

KERMIT E. WHITSON,
Chairman, Broward County Port Authority.

Attest:

OLIVIA M. WOODS,
Deputy Port Secretary.

Communist Racism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about what purports to be a new look in the Soviet Union. Chairman Khrushchev has with great ceremony turned his back on what he describes as the errors of the Stalinist era and has broadcast to the world much about the new freedoms he alleges individuals now enjoy in the U.S.S.R.

However, while the Soviets have undeniably made some progress in material things since the collapse of czardom in 1918, there is serious question as to whether comparable strides have been made in human freedoms. As a recent editorial in the Jersey Journal points out:

Having done so well in material things, the next great stride forward must be in the matter of human freedom. Today's Russians have rejected some of the unnatural restrictions on normal human thinking which were attempted in the early days of their revolution. To complete freeing the individual, they must now cease their relentless campaign against religion.

This is a challenge which the Soviets cannot answer with another propaganda bombast; the reply must be found in true freedom of conscience and enjoyment of human rights within the borders of the U.S.S.R. Present-day Soviet anti-Semitism is a stern warning to the believer of all faiths as to what they might expect from Communist dictatorship. Soviet actions permit no other interpretations. The world—and especially the new nations of Asia and Africa—will pass stern judgment on Soviet racism as the sordid facts are brought to light.

The December 7 editorial of the Jersey Journal follows:

CABLE TO KHRUSHCHEV

Life within the Soviet Union and relationships between that country and its neighbors in the world would be far better if Nikita Khrushchev would take the advice

given in a cablegram which is reproduced today on page 11.

It is signed by a large group of Protestant, Jewish and Catholic leaders, among them some of our best known clergymen.

They are protesting specifically the Soviet Union's treatment of Jews, but on a broader scale they are protesting the Communist lack of appreciation of all religion.

Just how bad it is was reported thoroughly only a few months ago when Lee Hills, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, led a group of American editors through a long tour of Russia. On his return he wrote a complete report about the Soviet effort to stamp out religion and went on to say:

"Some say it is harder to be a Jew today in the U.S.S.R. than in the Russia of the Czars, which invented the word 'pogrom'."

This persecution is all part of a general and stupid policy whereby the people of the Soviet Union are denied religious expression. Yet probably no one act could make Russia a better neighbor to all people than for Khrushchev to conclude a concordat with all religions. Understanding and appreciation of religion would mean the end of the absurd restrictions which require people to be walled into their homeland, to hear only what the jamming apparatus will allow radio and television to bring, to say only what the local commissar will clear through censorship.

The Soviet Union in the 45 years since its revolution has made phenomenal material strides. It has built huge industries, it has developed housing and welfare programs, it has sent satellites and men into space. It has recovered from the terrible wound of a great war. Slowly Russia is breaking with the economic contradictions bundled under the label "Marxism-Leninism."

Having done so well in material things, the next great stride forward must be in the matter of human freedom.

Today's Russians have rejected some of the unnatural restrictions on normal human thinking which were attempted in the early days of their revolution.

To complete freeing the individual, they must now cease their relentless campaign against religion.

American Public Power Association Advocates Authorization of Devils Jumps Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, authorization of the Devils Jumps Dam on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River is now under consideration by the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee.

The American Public Power Association has joined with members of the Tennessee and Kentucky delegations and numerous other individuals and associations in supporting and urging the authorization of this project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the American Public Power Association in support of the Devils Jumps Dam be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION TO HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL-RIVERS AND HARBORS RE AUTHORIZATION OF DEVILS JUMPS PROJECT, FEBRUARY 27, 1963

American Public Power Association is a national trade organization representing more than 1,100 local publicly owned electric utilities, mainly municipal systems, in 44 States and Puerto Rico with offices at 919 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

APPA supports technically and economically feasible Federal multiple-purpose water projects with hydroelectric potential because: (a) some 375 public power systems purchase part or all of their power supply from Federal power marketing agencies; (b) comprehensive river development dictates that maximum use be made of water resources for all purposes, including creation of electricity; (c) power is a paying partner which returns its full cost plus interest to the Treasury and frequently provides financing for other beneficial programs, such as irrigation; (d) the Federal power program aids the entire economy by supplying needed new sources of electrical energy; and (e) Federal generation and congressionally established sales policies encourage availability of inexpensive electricity through formation of a competitive yardstick.

For these reasons, APPA asks favorable consideration of the multipurpose dam and reservoir on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River at Devils Jumps.

Devils Jumps would provide 480,000 kilowatts of installed capacity. Project evaluation in accordance with standards established by the President last year show a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1 for a 50-year period, 2.4 to 1 for a 100-year period.

An appreciable diversity in the flows and consequent minimum pool levels at Wolf Creek and Devils Jumps will give Devils Jumps a dependable capacity of 510,000 kilowatts when system dependable capacity is lowest. With 255,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage transferred to Devils Jumps, Lake Cumberland could be operated with a higher head. The result would be an increase in dependable capacity of 86,000 kilowatts and 40 million kilowatt-hours of average annual energy at Wolf Creek and 18 million kilowatt-hours annually at Old Hickory, Cheatham, and Barkely projects. Increase in regulated flows would also benefit the Cordell Hull and Celine projects.

The Devils Jumps project power could be marketed to local public agencies. Power from this project could be available to Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio, States in which there are more than 200 municipal electric systems, numerous rural electric cooperatives, and Federal agencies. Many of these municipalities have no supply of low-cost power. Power from Devils Jumps, with adequate transmission, may help maintain the integrity of these municipal systems and assure continuation of their yardstick rate.

APPA recommends authorization of the Devils Jumps project, and urges early action on the part of Congress to provide funds for the project.

Fair Housing for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, the city of Berkeley, in the Seventh California District which I have the privilege to represent, is facing a significant test of whether "all men are created equal," or whether "they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

These are, of course, promises of our Declaration of Independence; they are promises which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. But Berkeley, like too many cities throughout our country, is confronted with the fact that our practices do not always match our precepts, that our deeds are not always as good as our words.

On April 2, the residents of Berkeley will vote on an ordinance recommended by a distinguished and representative 18-member citizens committee, and adopted by the city council, to establish a fair housing ordinance—to establish an ordinance prohibiting discrimination in the sale, rental, or lease of housing because of race, color, religion, national, origin, or ancestry.

This ordinance is sound because it is designed to correct a demonstrated inequity. As the citizens committee stated in its report:

> Accumulated evidence shows that discrimination in housing within the city is widespread and general, in both rental and sale of housing.

This ordinance is sound because it stresses the moderate approach of education, conferences, conciliation, and persuasion, with only final resort to public hearings and court action.

This ordinance is sound because it does not mean that an individual must sell or rent to a minority group member because he is a member of that group. It means rather, that housing cannot be withheld only because the applicant is a member of a minority group.

Finally, this ordinance is workable on the actual experience of 10 States and 3 cities which have similar laws.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is economically wasteful. It is dangerous to our position in the world community. It is contrary to the standards upon which this country has risen to greatness. Above all, it is morally wrong.

As President Kennedy stated it so clearly in his civil rights message last month:

> Let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Berkeley have an opportunity with this fair housing ordinance to make a major attack on the dread disease of discrimination. They have an opportunity to further insure the basic civil rights promised and guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. They have an opportunity to practice one of the fundamental precepts of America—the equal worth of every human being regardless of his race or color.

As an advocate of home rule, as a resident of Berkeley—one of our pioneering American cities in the field of good government—and as an American citizen, I am supporting this fair hous-

ing ordinance as an important step toward true equality of opportunity.

I urge my fellow Berkeleyans to continue their great tradition of leadership in the field of social justice and approve overwhelmingly the fair housing ordinance.

Editorial—Ideal Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps has been a success—almost everyone agrees.

President Kennedy has now proposed a National Service Corps—or a Domestic Peace Corps to work in this country and to help in many areas where volunteer workers could bring great benefits through their assistance to the community.

Mr. Malcolm S. Forbes, editor in chief and publisher of the highly regarded Forbes magazine, in a recent issue, has endorsed the Domestic Peace Corps idea.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

IDEAL IDEA

The administration's plan to set up in this country a domestic equivalent to the Peace Corps is first rate. The Peace Corps is proving eminently successful. Today 4,384 Corpsmen are at work at modest but essential instructional tasks in 44 countries. In those countries where the Peace Corps has units, many governments are asking for more as a result of what the volunteers are doing and achieving.

Within our own boundaries we have many areas where the need is great and fulfillment by normal processes difficult and too often financially impossible. When serving in the Senate of New Jersey several years ago, I headed the Committee on Institutions and Agencies. A prepetual problem was getting enough personnel with sufficient education and motivation at the existing wage levels in those positions directly responsible for rehabilitation, education, and understanding. The need was only partially met by part-time volunteers who donated their efforts in neighboring institutions for the aged, the mentally disturbed, the chronically ill, the inmates of reform institutions, and so forth.

For a variety of reasons many, both young and old, may not be able to undertake overseas service in the Peace Corps. We have at home, however, a wide and crying need for those idealistically motivated and with proper background to tackle the sorted specific tasks at hand. Those to whom money is not the primary motivation, but who seek to help where they can, can be priceless assets, not only in the job they do themselves but in the example they set and the know-how they spread. Many with equal enthusiasm cannot afford such tasks as lifetime careers. It is in just this area that a Domestic Peace Corps can be so meaningful.

I remember as a freshman in college how a number of classmates would devote Sunday to working voluntarily with youngsters in a neighboring juvenile delinquent institution. What they may have lacked in professional experience, they more than made up for with the enthusiasm and the interest that motivated them.

At very low cost such idealism can be intelligently harnessed and directed for maximum effect. Present plans call for a modest beginning and aim at having no more than a very few thousand at work by 1965–66.

I predict the Domestic Peace Corps won't lack volunteers.

I know it won't lack useful undertaking.

I hope it won't lack enthusiastic public and congressional support.

Affiliated Young Democrats of New York Legislative Program for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert at this point the New York State legislative program for 1963 of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York.

This program was adopted by the Statewide Legislative Committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York at a meeting held on December 6, 1962, in New York City.

The program follows:

THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 1963 OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK ADOPTED THURSDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 6, 1962, AT THE HOTEL PICCADILLY, 227 WEST 45TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

The Statewide Legislative Committee of the Affiliated Young Democarts of New York held their meeting last evening, at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York City, and unanimously endorsed the following legislation which they will recommend to the State legislature when they convene in January 1963:

"Outlaw boxing in New York State; continue court reform upstate as to city, town, and village courts; train and find employment for workers displaced by automation; establish State narcotics agency; new State space and science college; presidential preference primaries; Federal Government take over jurisdiction of New York State Civil Defense Administration and of all States; change Condon-Walden Act; more middle income housing; adequately paid teachers with program to attract people to teaching profession; protection for migrant labor workers; tax incentive to attract new industries to the State; change election law by doing away with names on petitions, and allow candidates to run in their party primary by paying a filing fee and bond for character, to increase participation in party primaries; expand rehabilitation program for young people in correctional institutions; primary election for all State offices; State legislative apportionment based upon citizen population; permanent primary day in June; increase State aid for education as to fair share of the taxes by the residues; free tuition at city colleges; right to vote at 18 years; State buildup-State rehabilitation camps for dope victims; fair Sabbath law in New York City; off-track betting by a referendum; research study to curtail the pollution of air and water.

Raise drinking age to 21 years; more stringent penalties to dispensers of narcotics; State bonus for Korean veterans; elimination of racial discriminations be extended to all multiple dwellings and one- or two-family houses throughout State; more State aid for public health centers; repeal law creating East Hudson Parkway; examinations be given every 10 years for all motor vehicle operators; change election law to live in county 30 days and not 4 months; establish State commission of recreation; manatory sentence of 20 years for nonaddict pushers in illegal sale of narcotics for profit; mandatory 5-year sentence for carrying knife for improper purposes; mandatory 10-year sentence using knife in any crime of violence; better nursing home care for aged, with more help given to the handicapped and retarded in State; more State scholarships with more assistance to the gifted students; Domestic Peace Corps; toughening first and second degree rape laws; recodification of the criminal statutes to curb juvenile delinquency; study laws to unify the Federal and State laws with less entanglement; install device in automobiles to control auto exhaust gas; amend State election law to provide for part-time off for voting; urge State legislature to ratify the 15th amendment; and advocate a printed record be published and made available to the public of full proceedings of State legislature."

The above legislation will be introduced in the State legislature in January 1963 by our 14 members in the State senate and 29 in State assembly, with Aileen B. Ryan of the Bronx, chairman in the assembly, and Samuel L. Greenberg of Brooklyn, chairman in the senate.

Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York presided at this meeting.

Mr. Harriman's New Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as a follow New Yorker I have always been proud of the distinguished public service and record of the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, the former Governor of the Empire State of New York. On Saturday, March 9, 1963, I was very much pleased to read the following editorial published in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., of that date:

MR. HARRIMAN'S NEW JOB

W. Averell Harriman is clearly one of the more remarkable public personalities of our time. Few Americans have served their country as long as he. He has been on the job for so many years in such a wide variety of posts (including his tour of duty as Ambassador to the Soviet Union and his stint as Secretary of Commerce) that people are inclined to take him for granted as a Johnny-on-the-spot kind of man who usually shows a touch of excellence in whatever he does, at home or abroad.

It is not surprising, therefore, that President Kennedy has chosen Mr. Harriman to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. This means that the former New York Governor (to mention just another of the offices he has held) will give up his work in the Far Eastern field and become third in command at the State Department, preced-

ed only by Dean Rusk and George Ball. At 71, Mr. Harriman continues to be a man of impressive energy and administrative ability. He can be counted upon to do a sound job in discharging his new responsibilities.

Tax Program Defined as Stimulus to the Growth of Nation's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, a major subject now being discussed in the Congress and by the public is the President's program of tax reduction and reform. The Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, is continuing its hearings on this legislative proposal.

Last week, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury, spoke at the annual convention of the Associated General Contractors of America. His comments are a very clear summary of the many reasons the President has proposed both a tax reduction and reform program.

Under Secretary Fowler makes a key point in behalf of the program, namely that it is needed as a stimulus to our Nation's economic growth. He further outlines the importance of the proposed reforms to the overall success of the program.

Because these remarks deserve the attention of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The text of Under Secretary Fowler's speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA

I welcome this opportunity to speak to you—the leaders of one of America's largest and most vital industries—about a subject which concerns all of you as deeply as it concerns all America—the President's tax program as a stimulus to the growth of the economy in general and of the construction industry in particular.

The bald statistics alone describe eloquently and cogently not only how large a share of America's economic strength resides in the construction industry, but how inseparably linked as well is the growth of the construction industry with the overall growth of the economy. Last year, for example, total construction accounted for more than $61 billion, or more than 10 percent, of our gross national product. More than $43 billion of this amount was in private construction and nearly $18 billion in public construction. Equally striking is the fact that contract construction last year involved roughly 5 percent of the total employment in all nonfarm establishments—which was two-thirds greater employment, for example, than in the automobile and other transportation equipment industries.

But even these figures—remarkable as they are—are no adequate measure of how much you have done to help meet so many of our most crucial economic and human needs. You build the roads we travel on, our apartment buildings, our hospitals, the schools our children learn in, the plants that house our manufacturing might, the broad range of public works that are essential to a modern society. These you build—and upon them all America builds.

No one can deny that in the past 5 years of retarded economic growth you have done much and that, in comparison with most other segments of our economy, you have done will. But as much, as you have done, we need much more; and as well as you have done, you have not done as well as you might have had our rate of economic growth been greater and had we been spared the recessions that have visited us with increasing frequency in recent years.

Our growth rate of 2.7 percent from early 1955 to the present compares unfavorably with regular rates in Western European countries of 4, 5, and 6 percent, or our own earlier 4 percent trend, even though our rate from 1960 to 1962 has been somewhat higher than the trend since 1955.

These differences in percentages sound insignificant, but their cumulative consequences are tremendous. A sustained rate of growth at 4 percent instead of 3 percent would mean that the economy would produce over the next 10 years as a whole, in today's prices, almost $400 billion more of goods and services, with all that this would mean to family incomes, wages, profits, and governmental revenues.

Our stunted growth over the past 5 years has affected the construction industry directly and substantially—depriving it of many potential opportunities, and reducing many of its actual sources, of growth—even though the construction industry has resisted recessions better than some other industries.

Some of your choice markets, both actual and potential have suffered from the general slowdown in economic growth. Take business and construction as one example. When you note that total business fixed investment declined from an average of 10.3 percent of our total output in the late Fifties to only 8.6 percent in 1962; and that private non-residential construction declined from 4.2 percent of total output in the late Fifties to 3.8 percent in 1962—when you note these and similar figures, it becomes unmistakably clear that the construction industry has in fact suffered a loss of potential growth in one of its prime markets. In the area of manufacture—to pinpoint one specific construction market—the average growth per year in our stock of business structure declined from 1.7 percent in the 1947–57 period to 0.4 percent in the 1957–62 period. As a major goods-producing segment of the economy, manufacture is of course highly sensitive to changes in consumer demand. And the constrained growth in consumer demand which we have witnessed in very recent years has caused, not only lagging investment in plants for goods and processes already in the market, but an even greater lag in plant investment for new products and processes.

These are some areas in which our slow economic growth rate has meant either diminished opportunities for the construction industry or opportunities that have failed to materialize. But had our economy over the past 5 or 6 years been operating at closer to capacity levels—had it not been handicapped by wartime tax rates that were expressly designed to hold back consumer demand, initiative, and investment—had it been able, instead, to enjoy greater incentives for growth, had consumer disposable income and investment funds been greater, had economic decisions depended less on tax consequences and more on market factors—then would more factories have been built, and more hospitals and more schools, and more roads, and more dams.

We cannot recover lost opportunities. But we can—and we must—seize every present opportunity to remove the obstacles to economic growth that have hindered us in the past, and, if we do nothing, will hinder us with even greater consequence in the future. The President's proposed tax program offers us such an opportunity to remove what every major segment of our economy will agree has been one of our most formidable obstacles to growth—a repressive tax structure which restricts much too tightly the rewards for investment and weighs heavily on every income level and in every area of our economy.

Let us not lose or diminish the very real opportunity which the President's program presents by creating obstacles of our own—by focusing on one or two details which offend us and losing sight of the soundness and substantial promise of the program as a whole, or by forgetting that, in its major dimensions and in the stimulus it offers to the economy, the President's tax program will greatly benefit all of us. In the economic as well as in the human sense, no man is an island—and there is obviously not one of us personally and not one of our industries that will not prosper from an expanding economy.

Let me touch here briefly upon just three salient facts about the President's tax program that have too often been either obscured or ignored in the many and rather massive misunderstandings of various details in the program.

First, even more important than the actual tax, savings for a given individual is a given year from the President's tax proposals is the substantial overall effect of the lowering of tax rates. More than simply reducing tax liabilities, the substantially lower rate scale offered by the tax program has the larger effect of greatly increasing the rewards for effort. The sizable reduction of 20–30 percent in the top rates in every income bracket would increase effort and risktaking—would make the market, rather than tax consequences, the prime determinant of economic decisions—and would open more widely the door to substantial increases in net disposable income after taxes. As the President has well said in his tax message:

"This will restore an idea that has helped make our country great—that a person who devotes his efforts to increasing his income thereby adding to the Nation's income and wealth, should be able to retain a reasonable share of the results."

The President's program will also, of course, reduce actual taxes paid. If the program were enacted exactly as it is today—with both the proposed rate reduction and the reforms—wall over 99 percent of all taxpayers would enjoy a reduction, most of them a substantial reduction, in taxes.

Second, the President's tax program offers, as a result, to virtually every American, and to every segment of our economy, heightened incentives and new opportunities—the promise of expanding markets and the reality of higher profits—the prospect of additional rewards for hard work and for intelligent risktaking—all the benefits, in short, of an economy that is free to move and thrive on its own inherent power.

Third, the more than $8 billion reduction in the individual tax burden and the $2.3 billion reduction in the corporate tax burden would immediately boost both purchasing power in consumer markets and the savings and incentives for investment. These increases, in turn, have readily discernable implications. For as output and employment rise to meet new private demand they generate new incomes which, in turn, can be consumed or saved and invested. Thus the stimulus of a tax cut to both consumer and investment demand can multiply throughout the economy, setting in motion forces of expansion that would otherwise remain inert. In this process the incentives for pro-

ductive investment would be heightened through enlarged demand and through reduced corporate tax rates which will increase aftertax profits. And the production of new machines and the building of new factories, offices, stores, and apartments would further increase consumer incomes in the same way as would the expanded production of consumer goods.

No industry as large as the construction industry, as vital and as closely linked to the country's economic well-being, can afford to ignore these very real implications of the President's tax program. In the four quarters ending in the last quarter of 1962, our rate of economic growth was only 2.7 percent—compared with our entire postwar average of 3.4 percent. If in 1964 we were merely to return to this postwar average—and we fully expect to do better than that—then by the end of that year we could expect business construction expenditures, should they do no more than retain their present percentage of total output, to rise by roughly around $2 to $3 billion over the present $21.2 billion. But should a new and more brisk investment atmosphere restore to business construction the proportion of total output it held in the late fifties, then we might expect expenditures to rise by more than twice that amount.

Certainly in a period of accelerated economic growth, which the tax program is designed to foster, industry will not find it sufficient to concentrate its investment in new equipment alone. For increased demand for present products, and the increased profitability of expanding present capital investment for existing goods and processes, would create a highly favorable atmosphere for new products and processes and the new plants needed to produce them.

Industry is, of course, not the only or even the largest market for the construction industry. But I think it is quite clear that in your other markets as well a similar process would occur. In 1962, for example, State and local governments financed $11.3 billion, or almost one-fifth, of all construction activity. Yet many State and local government units have found it increasingly difficult to finance, not only many new and needed projects, but needed expansions of present projects. New schools, new urban renewal developments, greater matching funds for highways, new roads, and many other programs suffer because State and local governments simply cannot find the revenues necessary to support them.

The economic expansion we anticipate as a result of the President's tax program offers a genuine opportunity for a health increase in State and local revenues to finance needed public construction without raising State and local tax rates. This must be of more than passing importance to you in view of the increasing resistance to rises in State and local tax rates and bond issues for construction purposes.

Within a few years, the proposed tax program will lift our gross national product substantially over what it would otherwise be. Assuming that this additional growth would amount to $50 billion per annum, then this would mean an increase of 8 percent, or $3.5 billion, in tax revenues collected by States and local units at present effective rates. The State of Michigan, for instance, would realize $2.5 billion as its proportionate share of the gross national product increase. Or should the induced increase in gross national product reach only a range of $30 billion, then this would mean an increase of over 5 percent, or $2 billion, in State and local tax revenue. Michigan's proportionate share would be $1.5 billion. And throughout the country the reduction in Federal taxes, along with greater prosperity and lower unemployment, would lessen the pressure on local and State budgets from welfare and relief costs, leaving more money available for other needs.

The point, I think, is abundantly clear: In the expanded economy which the President's tax program is fully capable of generating, the construction industry cannot help but thrive. But let me make it equally clear that the proposed tax program that can provide this stimulus is a program of tax reform as well as rate reduction. Nor should anyone deceive himself into believing that, without any of the proposed reforms, the tax program would be as effective as I have described it. The President himself has emphasized that of all the reforms the largest and the most important is rate reduction itself. This, however, should not be interpreted to suggest that the reforms are merely something added to the program as an afterthought with no importance in and of themselves. The reforms, I can assure you, are an essential part of the overall program.

Everyone agrees that the tax program must include, as its most important element, substantial tax reduction and rate reduction. But not everyone realizes that the proposed reforms are vital—not only in terms of equity, hardship relief, and economic growth—but to the very achievement of larger rate reductions than would be fiscally responsible without them. With the reforms it is possible to obtain rate cuts of $13.6 billion, together with additional help for the poor and aged which bring this figure well over $14 billion, at an overall cost of only $8.8 billion. The reforms—including the gradual transition to a more current tax payment basis for corporations—will, in other words, offset more than $5 billion—well over a third—of the budgetary impact of the most important part of the program, the rate reductions and hardship relief. The only way, therefore, to achieve the largest possible rate cuts within the limits of fiscal responsibility is to combine them with base-broadening tax reforms.

I do not mean to suggest that the Congress must accept the reforms in exactly the size and shape proposed by President Kennedy. As the President himself has noted, this is a matter for the Congress to decide. What I do mean is that every measure which whittles away at those reforms must be compensated for in some fashion. If one takes part of that $5 billion offset away, one must run the risk of a greater budgetary impact with the consequent fears of inflation that this may well raise in some quarters. Or one has another alternative—one can whittle away at the rates themselves, thus blunting the overall thrust of the program by weakening its most essential part.

My point is, in short, that the reforms are an essential and integrated part of the entire program. Any effort to remove them—in part or entirely—is bound to have a price of its own. Those who oppose the reforms, whether they do so on grounds of principle or because those reforms would interfere with the benefits they would otherwise receive from the rate reductions, should reflect upon the alternatives before they commit themselves irreparably. They would look beyond what the program means in terms of dollars and cents tax cuts. They should look beyond what the program would put in their pocketbook this year, next year, or 1965. If there is one thought I would like to leave with you today it is that you and, indeed, anyone seriously concerned with the economic welfare of this Nation should look very carefully at the tax program in the light of that welfare.

This program was not devised as a quick shot in the arm for a lagging economy. It was not devised as mere adrenalin to help us cope more readily with any difficulties in the immediate road ahead. It was designed for one purpose and one purpose alone— to lift our economy onto another plane—a plane on which it can move forward more consistently and more rapidly in the future than it has been able to in the past. This is the only kind of economy that would give us more jobs, more sales, more income—and more construction—not only for next year or for the next 2 years, but for many years and perhaps for even decades to come.

For richer or poorer, the performance of the construction industry—as of all our industry and all our people—is indissolubly wedded to the performance of our economy. And how well our economy performs in the years ahead depends on how far we today can look beyond our parochial and conflicting self-interests to the larger self-interest common to us all that the President's tax program is well designed to serve.

Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from U.S. News & World Report of March 18, 1963, "The Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting," is but another story of the emerging truth of U.S. backdown.

The most disconcerting part, of course, is to learn so long after the fact what part the United States played and to learn it almost by happenstance rather than to be forthrightly told by our own national leaders.

This further story of the Bay of Pigs disaster adds to our knowledge of what took place although we have not yet been told the full story by the President and those responsible.

Under leave to extend my remarks. I include the article in the RECORD.

BAY OF PIGS: THE CURTAIN IS LIFTING

That clamp of secrecy on what happened at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, just will not stay put. Information keeps leaking out.

Now it shows: Americans were in far deeper than officials admit. And U.S. air power was ready to go on a moment's notice.

More and more details are breaking through the curtain of secrecy to show how deeply Americans were involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight deck, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

American frogmen scouted the beaches in advance of the attack, American combat veterans flew B-26 bombers into the battle zone and piloted planes carrying Cuban paratroopers who were dropped in advance of infantrymen.

None of these men were members of the regular U.S. Armed Forces, although several

were Air National Guardsmen. All were volunteers. But after word got out that four American pilots died in combat at the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy said this at his news conference on March 6:

"Let me just say about these four men: They were serving their country."

HOW U.S. HELPED

These details can now be told.

In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught, by chance, in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a planehold of Cuban paratroops from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over an American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and copilot, were in a C-54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B-26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene, not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B-26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

U.S. B-26 PILOTS HIRED

On March 7, 1963, the Chicago Sun-Times reported that Air National Guard pilots from Alabama, Arkansas and Virginia, "were offered $2,500 a month by the Central Intelligence Agency to take part in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961." The newspaper said pilots from the three States were "sought out because the Guard units of those States were the last to fly the B-26 bombers used in the invasion. The World War II bomber was retired from the State units in 1959."

The Chicago American identified Brig. Gen. George Reid Doster of the Alabama Air National Guard as tactical commander of the anti-Castro force. General Doster refused to confirm or deny the report, but indicated he would like to tell his story to a congressional committee. He said: "I wish they would call me and let me put my feet on a desk and talk for about 8 hours."

It had been reported earlier by U.S. News & World Report that at least 18 American airmen went to Guatemala to train Cuban pilots of the B-26 bomber fleet that the invaders had assembled. These men were recruited for combat duty. Later their orders were changed, limiting them to the role of instructors. But when things started to go wrong at the Bay of Pigs, those who wanted to were permitted to go on combat missions. At least 10, maybe more, did so.

There still is no public report by the Administration on how many Americans were involved in the invasion, or what they did. But gradually, after 2 years of silence, some of those Americans are beginning to tell their experiences. And as their accounts are pieced together, the curtain of secrecy is lifting from the Bay of Pigs.

Secretary Dillon Emphasizes Small Business Provisions of President's Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I am deeply interested in the effect of the President's tax proposals on the small business segment of our economy. Tax reductions and revisions which are of benefit to small business are long overdue.

The Treasury Department has submitted to me as chairman of the House Small Business Committee a memorandum which summarizes the principle points in the President's tax program, which affect small business. It appears that the benefits to small business under the proposed program will be extensive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Dillon's letter and the Treasury Department's memorandum be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter and memorandum follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 11, 1963.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing pursuant to your request a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program which affect small business. Since small business plays a part in virtually every segment of the economy, all the proposals in the President's program may have some direct or indirect effect, but I believe the memorandum covers the major provisions and provides a good starting point for those interested in the impact of the program on small business.

I understand that John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration, will shortly submit a more detailed analysis of the proposal as it affects small business to the Committee on Ways and Means. This statement, when it is released, may also be of use to you and the committee.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

The 4½ million small business enterprises in the United States are very important to the economy. They account for about 95 percent of all business organizations, employ about 30 million people, and are responsible for about 40 percent of total business volume.

President Kennedy's proposed tax program would benefit small business directly in a number of ways. The most important one is lower taxes. Under the program small business enterprises, whether they are corporations, partnerships or sole proprietorships, will enjoy substantial rate reduction.

Corporate income tax rates for companies with a net income of $25,000 or less will be reduced this year from 30 to 22 percent. In 1963, corporations with taxable incomes of $25,000 or less will get reductions of about 27 percent, compared with reductions of about 10 percent at $50,000 and 4 percent at $100,000.

The overall reduction in corporation tax rates will be proportionately larger for small companies. Reductions in the surtax paid by large corporations will go into effect in 1964 and 1965. But even when all three steps of the corporate tax cut are in effect, the tax reduction for small companies would be greatest. The reduction for companies with profits of $25,000 or less would amount to about 27 percent; for those earning $100,000 to $1 million, it would amount to about 11 percent; and for those earning more than $1 million annually, it would be about 10 percent. For the 467,500 corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less, the annual tax saving would total about $233 million.

Small business will also benefit directly from the individual income tax rate cuts, which will average considerably more than 20 percent. The reductions will be made over a 3-year period and will scale down the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent. These rate cuts will help particularly the millions of individual proprietors and partners whose main, and sometimes only, source of income is from a business.

The tax program will also benefit small business indirectly in a number of ways. The reductions in individual tax rates will release a large volume of additional consumer purchasing power. More than 90 percent of the tax reduction will quickly find its way into consumer buying, boosting retail sales and, then, in turn, wholesalers' and manufacturers' sales. The resulting improvement in the business climate and confidence should be an important factor in sustaining an expanding economy.

The corporate and individual tax cuts would result in higher after-tax profits and retained earnings. The tax program will thus help remove one of the most persistent deterrents to the growth of small business—a lack of adequate capital. Because of their inability to obtain conventional long-term financing for expansion and modernization, small businesses are forced to rely on closely short-term credit, which they must continually refinance, to supplement their limited internally generated funds. Tax reduction would increase the volume of earnings which can be plowed back into small businesses to sustain their healthy growth. Tax cuts would also attract new investment to small businesses, since the profitability of such enterprises would increase. At the same time, increased profit prospects would improve their borrowing power.

Inequities which now discriminate against small business will be removed by the tax program. For example, a small business may be competing with a wholly-owned subsidiary of a large corporation; the subsidiary is a legal entity, hence able to take advantage of the benefits of the $25,000 surtax exemption. A company with a number of such wholly-owned subsidiaries can reduce substantially its effective tax rate compared with enterprises that have equal income but are organized as a single corporate entity. Chains of multicorporate units are in effect paying small business tax rates, yet benefiting from economies inherent in large businesses. The new law would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus improve the competitive position of small enterprises.

OTHER TAX PROPOSALS THAT INFLUENCE SMALL BUSINESS INCLUDE

Income averaging: If a taxpayer's individual income in a given year should rise materially compared with previous years, he may find himself in a higher tax bracket. Under the administration's proposal, a taxpayer in this situation could average his current income with that of the past 4 years and if the current income amounts to more than 133 percent of the average, he would be allowed in effect to treat the excess over 133 percent as though it were earned over a 5-year period. Thus he would be taxed at a considerably reduced rate. Incomes of small unincorporated businesses, farmers, ranchers, writers, and artists vary widely

from year to year; they would benefit especially from the averaging provision.

Cost of research and development machinery and equipment to be treated as current expense deduction: Present law requires capitalization of such assets, although other business expenses for R. & D. may now be deducted as incurred. The proposed law would allow a company to treat as a current expense deduction all expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research and development.

Special provisions are included in the proposal to meet the needs of some small businesses with moderate R. & D. budgets that would not otherwise qualify for the current expense treatment. For larger enterprises claiming the R. & D. deduction, equipment used only part-time for research and development purposes, or used in the performance of a Federal contract, would not qualify. Under the special provisions for small business, any expenditures for equipment used directly for research and development could be expensed in an amount up to 4 percent of $500,000 of total expenditures for research and development. For purposes of the special small business provision, equipment used only part-time but at least 50 percent of the time for research and development would qualify to the extent of 50 percent of its cost. Moreover, research and development equipment not used exclusively in the performance of a Federal contract would qualify. The maximum deduction under this small business provision would be limited to $20,000 annually.

The proposed changes in the tax treatment of capital gains will also directly and indirectly aid small firms. The capital gains changes include:

Rate reduction: Under the program, 30 percent of long-term capital gains of individuals, instead of the present 50 percent, is includible in taxable income. Combined with the individual tax reductions this means that capital gains would be taxed at an effective rate of 4.2 pe cent, instead of the present 10 percent, in the lowest bracket and progress to a maximum of 19.5 percent, instead of the present 25 percent. In addition, the corporate rate on capital gains would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

These reductions should increase investment in small companies as investments which are now retained solely for tax reasons become "unlocked" and as the overall tax program increases the prospects for profitable investment in small business.

Extension of the holding period: The holding period for long-term capital gains would be increased from the present 6 months to 1 year. Small business investments typically require several years to mature. This change would limit long-term capital gains to bona fide investors, rather than short-term speculators and would encourage investors to devote more funds to investment in small firms.

Taxation of capital gains at time of death or gift: Under the p ogram, net gains on capital assets would be taxed at the time of transfer at death or by gift. This change would increase the mobility of capital by reducing the tax inducement to hold assets until death.

Since the principal estate asset of a small businessman is often his business, special provisions have been included to insure that estates will not be forced to liquidate a small business to pay a capital gains tax. The first $15,000 of gain would be excluded from tax as would the gain on any property transferred to a surviving spouse, up to a maximum of one-half the gain in the estate. These exclusions are expected completely to eliminate payment of capital gains tax upon death for all but 3 percent of those who die each year. For those who would become subject to some tax, a 5-year averaging provision would reduce the effective rate of tax on the gain and the tax could be paid in instalments over a period of 10 years. Redemption of stock in the company to pay the capital gains tax would be allowed without additional tax.

Unlimited capital loss carryover: The present 5-year limitation on carryover of capital losses against capital gains and up to $1,000 of ordinary income would be eliminated. The change would especially help the small investor who may not have the portfolio diversity that would make it feasible to match capital gains and losses in only 5 years. The extension of time would mean greater opportunities to offset losses, with a tax saving, for those who make substantial investments in small business, and thus increase the supply of risk capital for such enterprises. Moreover, the unlimited capital loss carryover should encourage risk investment generally, which would benefit small business.

Just as small business stands to gain in a special way from tax reforms which encourage economic growth, it stands to lose more heavily from inaction on the tax front, which would increase the chances of an early recession or continued slack in the economy. Small business lacks the resources available to larger companies to withstand an economic downturn. Therefore, the mortality rate among small firms in a recession would be heavy. The President's 1963 tax program will make a major contribution toward providing an environment that will foster the vigorous growth of the small business sector as part of a strong and expanding economy.

Classroom Teachers Medals Awarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has singularly honored Hyde Park High School, Boston, Mass., in awarding classroom teachers medals to two of the school's staff. Miss Marie E. A'Hearn was presented with the medal for her work during the school year 1961–62, and Dr. William J. Reid, head of the history department, received his award for 1960–61.

Miss A'Hearn teaches the principles of democracy course at Hyde Park High School. She conducts her classes on the theory that participation is the key to both knowledge and citizenship. Her classes learn about democracy in practice as well as in theory. When issues of a national scope are considered, the class invites its Congressman, Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, to speak to them. On State issues the representatives to the general court are asked to come and talk. On local issues, a member of the city council discusses city matters with them.

These sessions are not the usual high school assembly talks. These are working sessions. The class invites the speaker and suggests the topics to be discussed. The guest presents his talk and then is subjected to a barrage of questions. The result is some increase in knowledge, some enlightenment on the issues and, most important, increased respect by the students for our public office holders.

Arrangements for these visits are made by the students. They choose the moderator, secretary, photographer, class hostess, and all who have anything to do with the program. The students develop questions and topics and decide who should be invited.

No student passes a principles of democracy course unless he has actually worked in a political campaign. Some students who are most reluctant to participate in practical politics become some candidate's most enthusiastic workers. Concerned about the failure of more women to participate in politics, the class contacted various persons in public life, including all the ladies in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate, to find out why this was so. The class secretaries summarized and mimeographed the results. The pupils then discussed the issue on a Boston radio program. Under the strong guidance of Miss A'Hearn, Hyde Park students are learning that democratic government depends on effective participation.

Dr. Reid's contribution lies in a somewhat different area. The Boston public schools began teaching about the menace of communism, as well as fascism and nazism, in 1939. In 1941, the Boston schools published one of the first documents about the isms used in any school system. After the war the program was expanded.

Concerned about the fact that too many youngsters leave high school before graduation and may become easy prey to the glib teachings of others, the Boston schools, in 1954, began development of a program to increase patriotism and knowledge of our democratic republican government in grade nine. This program was instituted on an experimental basis. A committee under Dr. Reid's leadership, developed material that would help pupils to understand our government on the local, State, and national levels. It also produced a curriculum guide for the ninth grade, that would make our American boys and girls aware of the menace of communism. As the preliminary projects proved successful, the program was extended to include every ninth grade student in the Boston school system. In his position as coordinator of civic education for the Boston public schools, Dr. Reid is responsible for the effectiveness and growth of the program.

At special assemblies of the student body and the faculty, Mr. Charles J. Keelon, headmaster of Hyde Park High School, congratulated the recipients on the honor they had brought to the school by their contributions to furthering our American ideals. Assistant Superintendent of Schools Frank J. Herlihy, on behalf of the Freedoms Foundation, presented the Classroom Teachers Medal to Dr. Reid on Flag Day, 1961, and Deputy Superintendent William H. Ohrenberger awarded Miss A'Hearn her medal on October 10, 1962.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 9, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger)

NEW FRONTIER PROGRAMS IGNORE TECHNOLOGY

President Kennedy completely ignores technology in the social and welfare programs he is trying to impose on the country and therefore fails to understand they cannot work. In a major speech on the floor of the House this week I pointed out that in the programs he has submitted to Congress, the President seems to be acting on impulse rather than on any sound technical basis. I focused attention on the welfare part of the New Frontier program, which, in spite of suggestions to the contrary, is being expanded at a faster rate than most other segments of the budget, including national defense. The justification for this expansion is political rather than logical or reasonable. The New Frontier is trying to capitalize on a formula developed by the New Deal—a formula that reads (1) Many persons are in need, (2) The Nation has resources with which to meet the need, (3) The Federal Government should use the resources to meet the need.

It is my contention that points 1 and 2 do not justify the conclusion implied by point 3. Technologically, no standards or criteria can be developed by which to administer Federal social welfare programs to produce the results which the administration promises when it proposes Federal financial involvement. The only reasonable way to measure the effectiveness of public services is to measure them only in terms of results achieved. In my speech I outlined where desired or promised results have fallen far short in such programs as urban renewal, area redevelopment, advancing civilian technology, and in studies in connection with Federal aid to education. In order to get some idea of the complexity of trying to impose Federal participation in the social and welfare fields, try to write a formula for Federal aid which will work and which will come within the framework of the Constitution.

EXPERT WITNESSES QUESTION PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS

Some of the best tax minds in the Nation appeared before the Ways and Means Committee this week. The development of their testimony clearly indicates the fallacies of President Kennedy's tax proposals. The first such witness was Roswell Magill who, 25 years ago, was Under Secretary of the Treasury in Franklin Roosevelt's Cabinet. Mr. Magill's statement substantiated my own challenge to the President's tax program. He said: "President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control."

CONSTRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Magill listed a constructive program, sensible as I see it. (1) Lower individual income tax to 50 percent for highest bracket and 16 percent in the lowest bracket; (2) Let Korean taxes expire—corporate tax drop from 52 percent to 47 percent; (3) Study structural reforms separately; (4) Lower Federal spending, balance the budget.

G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, under my cross examination developed these constructive recommendations: (1) Eliminate double taxation; (2) Eliminate capital gains tax, and redefine capital gains; (3) Relate Federal spending to income—balance the budget. These recommendations are much more likely to prevent recession, of which the President warns, than the President's recommendations.

ECONOMICS PROFESSOR HITS PROGRAM

William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University, was more blunt: He said: "In this statement I seek to make but three points: First, to demonstrate the nonscientific and anti-economic growth deficiencies of rate progression in general. Second, to show how the President's tax proposals reflect these deficiencies and are hence self-defeating of their stated goal of economic growth. And thirdly, to give support to maximum correction at this time of the deficiencies of graduation." Professor Peterson pointed out again that the President's program is self-defeating. The steepness in individual income tax rate progression, especially when linked to the proposed 5 percent rule on itemized deductions affords virtually no tax relief to the middle and little to the upper brackets. The professor said he regards the middle and upper brackets as prime sources of America's capital formation and hence of economic growth. An amazing figure in this testimony showed that tax rate progression beyond 50 percent of taxable income yields the Treasury only about $1 billion (out of a $98 billion budget) or about enough to run the Government for 4 days. So the excessive rate is not designed to raise revenue, but to penalize and, in effect, stifles initiative or, in Professor Peterson's words, "Incentive is the thing. It accounts for enterprise and ingenuity. It is the secret of American prosperity."

REDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME HURTS OUR SYSTEM

The theory of the social planners around President Kennedy upon whose judgement his tax proposals are based, would have us believe our free economy can best be developed by a redistributon of income (the theory of equalization). But redistribution assumes a standard of distributive justice different from the standards of our market economy. "It assumes," Peterson said, "that the market knows least and Government knows best." He then reminds us, "This democratic market system, this incentive system, is precisely the means by which we have become the richest and freest people in all the world."

The only way we can insure the health of the economy is to insure the rate of capital formation—that is, in the rate of investment. This is the theory of the Alger-Baker-Herlong bill. A number of witnesses, including Professor Peterson, believe this bill is the only fiscally feasible and responsible alternative to our present income tax structure. It stresses investment, whereas the Administration stresses current consumption. In sharp contrast to the Administration's program, it would reform the present steep schedule of rate graduation while, over a longer period of time, provide substantially as much tax relief as the Administration at the lower income tax levels. Capital formation is clearly the road to growth. There is no other way. Without capital, there will be no goods for consumers to purchase.

OVERCAPACITY RESULT OF INEFFICIENCY

The administration planners stress the overcapacity of American industry. Professor Peterson points out the administration's stress on overcapacity misses the point. The real point is not simply overcapacity, but the nature and causes of excess capacity. A careful study of all the factors shows that basically, overcapacity is a matter of inefficiency. The principal criticism of the President's proposals, brought out by many witnesses in their direct testimony and in my discussion with them under cross-examination, is the lack of confidence and knowledge of our system displayed by the President, his continued efforts to downgrade the United States. Unfortunately, the results are the President's statements of problems and legislative solutions that downgrade the system and successes of the United States.

A fine representation of Dallas and Texas was made to the site subcommittee of the Republican National Committee in an effort to get the 1964 Republican Convention in our city. The Chamber of Commerce would have been proud of the quality of the presentation. John Leedom, Peter O'Donnell, Mrs. Ike Kampmann, Harry Bass, Al Fay, Senator Tower, and Ed Foreman created a remarkable impression on the committee. All Dallas is proud of this effort to bring a meeting to our community which will result in $5 to $6 million in revenue. This presentation was in the true spirit of Dallas that our people can accomplish any job, no matter how tough or how big. It is this spirit that built our city.

Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba, January 2 to January 14, 1963—Part 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, my last remarks on "Cuba in 1933" appeared in the February 21 RECORD and served as a sequel to the previous chronologies parts 1 through 10. The "Cuba in 1933" speech was to serve as part 11, preceding today's part 12. Part 11 was a kind of flashback in history and I hope a pointed reminder that our problem with the Communists in Cuba did not originate—as many seemed to feel—with the overthrow by Fidel Castro of the Batista regime in Cuba. Instead, it could be traced back to the time when the Communists failed in their efforts to subvert Germany and cast around for a more profitable base of operations from which to spread their deadly doctrine of dialectical materialism, or as some term it materialism opposed to idealism or state opposed to God. Never has there been a more materialistic doctrine preached than that of communism and never a more idealistic doctrine preached—if admittedly not always practiced to the letter by individual believers—than the Sermon on the Mount. In comparing that inspired writing with the hate motif of the Communist materialism, it is clear that something far deeper than

a mere political philosophy or type of ideology is involved in the struggle between Communist and free nations of the world for the minds of men.

The beginning of the year 1963 brought disheartening reports to the American people. Instead of victory, we found containment. Instead of a relaxing of tension we found increased tension, following publication of reports that on the island of Cuba there remained, in addition to the thousands of Soviet troops described in part 10, 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles, 144 missile launchers, 24 bases at different spots on the island, 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles, over 100 Mig jet fighters, some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns, 350 medium and heavy tanks, 34 subchasers, and missile and motor torpedo boats, as well as 70 helicopters.

We were threatened once again by the Soviet Union with war if we made any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba. Castro displayed ground-to-air missiles during his fourth anniversary celebration in Cuba. Our President was called a vulgar pirate chief by the acknowledged pirate of all pirates. The ransom paid by American citizens and businessmen for the Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners was thrown back into our faces—not literally, but verbally—by Castro. And again the Communists—this time the Chinese Communists—proved themselves past masters at twisting facts by virtuously announcing that they strongly opposed—the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. They accused the Soviets of 100-percent appeasement, a Munich pure and simple in withdrawing missiles from Cuba.

By this time the American people were not at all sure that our triumph was anything of the sort. Instead it began to appear what Khrushchev himself termed it, a triumph of the Soviets, in that while some 40 missiles may have been removed, the island of Cuba had been successfully turned into a bristling arsenal, and any Cubans remaining who might wish to throw off the yoke of Castro's communism would find themselves in the same predicament as the Hungarians who tried to throw off communism in Hungary.

Although on January 6 both the United States and the Soviet Union requested the United Nations to close the book on the Cuban controversy. It did not seem possible to do this. Some of the Cuban exiles even accused President Kennedy of being politically motivated in his Orange Bowl appearance on December 29 of last year. And the Cuban Government set aside 10 percent—213.7 million pesos—of its record 2 billion peso budget for 1963 for national defense and public order. While Cuba was planning to defend the Castro regime against its own unhappy citizens, our American citizens were once again digging down into their jeans to raise from $10,000 to $15,000 to pay the ransom still being demanded by Castro for uninterrupted return of Cuban invasion prisoners. And an unknown donor was rumored to have been urged successfully by Attorney General Kennedy to donate $1 million for this cause.

We then found ourselves in the peculiar position of being maneuvered at the same time into helping build a $30 million agricultural experiment station in Cuba, through the United Nations voluntary Special Fund, 40 percent which was provided by the United States. This project, approved in 1961, would allocate something over $1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations for a 5-year project in Cuba. Cuba was to put up $1.8 million, and the uneasy suspicion began to spread that not only were we to provide 40 percent of the aforesaid fund, but our ransom money would provide the other $1.8 million as well. The collective blood pressure of thousands of Americans began to rise, along with the number of protesting letters to congressional offices about the Cuban agricultural deal.

As in most Soviet-bloc countries, it became apparent that for some reason communism and agricultural abundance had nothing in common. Adlai Stevenson admitted that although the United States opposed this agricultural aid to Cuba, there was apparently nothing we could do about it and of the $1.2 million, the U.S. taxpayers probably would find themselves paying $480,000. However, the United Nations later postponed, although temporarily—the controversial agricultural survey project for Cuba, much to the relief of the congressional Members who had been hearing some pretty strenuous objection from the American people.

Senator KEATING, known now as the man who was right last fall about Cuba, contended that Castro was now 10 times better equipped militarily than he was last spring and stated that 20,000 troops were in Cuba, along with 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and some 500 antiaircraft missiles.

President Kennedy stated that while a danger continued, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba. He praised the United Nations for its value in serving the cause of peace for its use as a forum in the Cuban crisis and for its task of unification in the Congo—none of which seemed to convince a goodly segment of the American people.

A chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA [1]

(Jan. 2, 1963 to Jan. 31, 1963)

January 2, 1963:

An article by David Kraslow in the Miami Herald stated that "Cuba has 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles and 144 missile launchers at 24 bases ringing the island.

"The list is current and is based on what the U.S. Government believes to be solid intelligence.

"Other items include over 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles; over 100 Mig jet fighters; some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns; 350 medium and heavy tanks; 34 subchasers and missile and motor torpedo boats, and 70 helicopters."

January 2, 1963:

The Soviet Union's leading theorist, Mikhail Suslov, pledged today that his country would "actively resist any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba," Tass news agency reported.

Communist Party Secretary Suslov told a Moscow audience that "the forces of peace and socialism must vigilantly watch over the scrupulous observance by the United States of its commitment not to attack Cuba and to restrain its allies from doing so."

January 2, 1963:

The ground-to-air missile, not generally known to have been in Castro's possession, came into view at the tail end of an hour-long display of military hardware, part of the celebration of the bearded Prime Minister's fourth anniversary of power.

In a 90-minute anniversary speech, Castro referred briefly to the missiles, saying that "today, the first ground-to-air rocket artillery crews in training have paraded past here."

He said the rockets would be used to keep Cuban airspace free of intruders.

Castro assailed President Kennedy as a "vulgar pirate chief," and claimed he forced Washington to pay indemnity for the release of Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners who were liberated for $53 million worth of food and drugs sorely needed by the Cuban regime.

"They call it ransom, but the fact is that they had to accept the payment of indemnifications. For the first time in its history, imperialism paid an indemnification of war."

Castro repeated his demand that the United States get out of its Guantanamo Bay Naval Base at the eastern tip of Cuba, but he did not intimate that any other than legal means would be employed to oust the United States.

The Prime Minister also repeated that Cuba would never accept inspection on its soil to verify the removal of land-based offensive Soviet missiles, as the United States has demanded. He made no criticism of Moscow for the withdrawal of the missiles and jet bombers, but stressed Cuba's sovereignty.

January 2, 1963:

An editorial in the Peking People's Daily stated that "Those who accuse China of opposing peaceful coexistence also attack the Chinese people for supporting the just stand of the Cuban people in their struggle against U.S. imperialism. When the heroic Cuban people and their revolutionary leader Premier Fidel Castro resolutely rejected international inspection as an infringement on Cuba's sovereignty and advanced their five just demands, the Chinese people held gigantic mass demonstrations and parades throughout the country in accordance with their consistent stand for proletarian internationalism, and firmly support the Cuban people's struggle in defense of their independence, sovereignty, and dignity.

"How can one possibly interpret the resolute support which the Chinese people gave to the Cuban people in their struggle against international inspection and in defense of their sovereignty as meaning that China was opposed to peaceful coexistence or wanted to plunge others into a thermonuclear war? On more than one occasion we have made it clear that we neither called for the establishment of missile bases in Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of the so-called offensive weapons from Cuba. We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermonuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a 'Munich.' What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose, and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of this sort can only be regarded as 100 percent appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple. A compromise of this

[1] Unless otherwise stated excerpted from the Washington Post and the Washington Star; reproduced with the permission of the Washington Post and Washington Star.

sort has nothing in common with the policy of peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries."

January 4, 1963:

A split within the Cuban invasion brigade broke into the open today with charges by one of its members that the liberated prisoners were being used as political fodder.

The charges revealed for the first time that 100 prisoners boycotted President Kennedy's Orange Bowl appearance on December 29.

Enrique Llaca, Jr., one of the invaders recently released from Castro's prisons, singled out Manuel Artime, civilian commander of Brigade 2506, and Joe Miro Cardona, head of the exile Cuban Revolutionary Council, for criticism.

"They are using the brigade for their personal benefit," declared Llaca, 27-year-old former Cuban attorney. Both Artime and Miro Cardona denied it.

Llaca attacked President Kennedy's Orange Bowl visit to meet the brigade members as politically motivated.

January 6, 1963: Time magazine today listed the U.S. companies that contributed to the $53 million ransom paid to Premier Fidel Castro for the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners.

The list, including pledges, accounts for most of the $53 million ransom although in some cases only the value of goods already shipped rather than the company's full commitment, is known.

The United States and the Soviet Union asked the United Nations today to close the book on the Cuban controversy.

The two powers made their request in a terse, joint letter sent to U.N. Secretary General U Thant and signed by U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson and Vassily V. Kuznetsov, the Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister.

Today's message made no effort to conceal the deadlock in American-Soviet negotiations. But it hailed the fact that war had been avoided and expressed hope other tensions might be eased.

Stevenson and Kuznetsov suggested that the Cuban item be wiped off the Security Council agenda "in view of the degree of understanding reached" and "the extent of progress in the implementation of this understanding."

The statement ended on a note of hope:

"The Governments of the United States and of the Soviet Union express the hope that the actions taken to avert the threat of war in connection with this crisis will lead toward the adjustment of other differences between them and the general easing of tensions that could cause a further threat of war."

Carlos M. Lechuga, Cuban Ambassador to the U.N., delivered Cuba's objections in another letter 2 hours earlier.

The Cuban objections were summarized in one paragraph:

"As you know, Mr. Secretary General, the negotiations carried on with your generous intervention have not led to an effective agreement capable of guaranteeing, in a permanent way, the peace of the Caribbean and in liquidating the existing tensions."

Lechuga repeated the Cuban attacks on American "aggressive and interventionist policy."

January 7, 1963: The Cuban Government today announced a record 2 billion peso budget for 1963. About 10 percent of it—213.7 million pesos—was earmarked for "national defense and public order."

American business made a substantial contribution to Fidel Castro's last minute demand for $2.9 million in cash to assure uninterrupted return of the Cuban invasion prisoners.

A check of 25 of the Nation's largest companies indicated today that individual contributions to the special cash fund raised by Gen. Lucius D. Clay ranged from $10,000 to $150,000 and more.

Castro claimed the $2.9 million was owed him for the release of 60 prisoners in April. Of the total, $1 million was pledged by an unknown donor solicited by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

The cash fund was separate from the $53 million in drugs and food pledged to Castro.

The Kennedy administration set up special machinery yesterday to handle future policy toward Cuba.

Sterling J. Cottrell, a veteran Foreign Service officer who formerly headed a task force on the Vietnam question, was named coordinator of Government activities dealing with Cuba. He was given the title of Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

As part of its economic squeeze on Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, the United States will demand that the United Nations cancel a project to help build a $3 million agricultural experimental station in Cuba.

U.S. sources said today that Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson has been instructed to fight right down the line to halt previously approved plans under which the U.N. Special Fund would grant more than $1 million for the project. The United States, which contributes 40 percent of the money spent by the Special Fund, voted against the grant on the grounds that the project could not be carried out because of the large number of Cuban agricultural technicians fleeing the country. U.S. sources said this situation was even more complicated now because of Soviet technicians in Cuba.

Under the plan approved in 1961, the Special Fund would allocate something over $1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) to finance the U.N. part of the project over a 5-year period. Cuba would put up $1.8 million.

The United States argues that Castro is neglecting the economic and social development of the country to concentrate on political problems and has, therefore, forfeited any right to U.N. aid.

January 8, 1963: Cuba was pictured as a land plagued by growing food shortages "where tightening of the vest is now a normal way of life."

This view of the Cuban food situation was contained in a U.S. Foreign Agriculture Service report that said the Premier Fidel Castro regime has just about wrecked the island's agriculture in 4 years.

The report described the food situation there as the poorest in years and added that it may get worse this year. Farm production, it reported, has fallen off 20 percent since Castro took over.

January 8, 1963:

United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson said today the United States has opposed from the beginning a plan to send Cuba $1.2 million in U.N. funds for an agricultural project.

But if the U.N. governing board approves the plan there isn't much that can be done about it, Stevenson said.

Of the $1.2 million, $480,000 probably would come from U.S. taxpayers.

January 9, 1963: President Kennedy talked for an hour yesterday with Vasily Vasilevich Kuznetsov, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. They discussed the settlement of the Cuba crisis and took a look at disarmament and Berlin as problems that remain to be solved. The conversations, it was said, were held in a very cordial atmosphere.

January 10, 1963:

After a 2-day delay, 100 American citizens will leave for the United States Sunday on the return flight of an airliner carrying ransom supplies to Havana, a Swiss diplomat reported today.

The diplomat had no word on whether a score of Americans held in Cuban jails would follow. Thousands of Cuban relatives of the freed Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners also are anxious to leave.

Between 500 and 700 Soviet troops left Cuba during the last day or so aboard the Russian passenger ship *Baltika*, it was reported here yesterday.

Several thousand other Soviet forces are reported to have left Cuba since the end of the October missile crisis. But U.S. officials believe some 16,000 to 17,000 remain in Cuba. About 6,000 of these are known to be organized in combat units.

The reports were made as official sources said the United States is expected soon to ask the Organization of American States to consider almost total isolation of Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Cuba trade perils aid, U.S. warns.

The United States has served notice on countries whose ships go to Cuba that they risk losing American aid.

State Department press officer Joseph W. Reap disclosed yesterday that the warnings have been conveyed in line with the new forign aid law. Congress last October attached a proviso that aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk advised the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that even the possibility of a U.S. no-invasion pledge on Cuba no longer exists.

The administration has made clear repeatedly that President Kennedy's offer of such a pledge was conditioned on on-site inspection to verify removal of Soviet missiles and bombers from the Communist-ruled island. It has been apparent for weeks that there would be no such inspection even though negotiations to that end were not concluded until this week.

Rusk appeared before the committee yesterday, and after the closed session Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, told reporters the Secretary covered the point like this:

"Any commitment was contingent on the exchange of letters (between Mr. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev) which required on-site inspection as well as the removal of missiles and other offensive weapons.

"In view of the failure to get the inspection, the commitment no longer exists."

FULBRIGHT said Rusk assured the committee that U.S. intelligence is convinced all offensive weapons of nuclear capability have been removed from Cuba.

Cuba and East Germany will establish diplomatic relations at the ambassadorial level, the Government press reported today.

The Government newspaper El Mundo said the decision to elevate the present East German-Cuban trade mission to embassies "was due to the close and friendly present relations between our two nations and will contribute to formalize and consolidate even more the bonds of friendship between our peoples."

A newspaper editor charged today that the Kennedy administration, by "manipulating" news as a cold war weapon, is imperiling the American people's right to full and accurate information on how public affairs are being handled.

The charge was made by John H. Colburn, managing editor of the Richmond Times Dispatch, in a speech before the Arizona Newspapers Association.

The editor said the American press must shoulder much of the blame for controlled news from Government because it has too often "been complacent about its responsibility to zealously seek out the truth."

"The press today could do much more to inform the public about the open and insidious efforts to keep the truth from the public," he said.

"As the result of the furor over news manipulation during the Cuban crisis last

October, thoughtful people are more concerned about truth in news. Their right to truthful news is in jeopardy because the news manipulators have grown more confident as the result of their recent successes."

The Communist daily Hoy says Cuba's 1963 sugar harvest is off to a poor start. The mills are not getting enough cane to grind, a Hoy reporter complained.

The report, covering the central Province of Camaguey, said crop work at the Patria o Muerte (fatherland or death) mill Thursday, the start of the season, was below last year's level. It said the mill would have to close Monday or Tuesday unless it got more cane.

January 12, 1963: 89 Cuban-Americans, including elderly people and children clutching toys, arrived here today on a freedom flight from Havana (Miami Herald).

January 13, 1963: A controversial agricultural survey proposed for Cuba has been temporarily postponed by the United Nations Special Fund. * * *

The decision not to act now on the Cuban project avoided a fight threatened by the United States, which puts up 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, contended yesterday that Fidel Castro is "10 times better equipped" militarily now than he was last spring.

He said Castro "has 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and 500 antiaircraft missiles, some of them the most modern in existence, and 20,000 troops."

KEATING made the comments on a program taped for New York television stations.

January 14, 1963: In his state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy said that while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba.

While we shall never weary in the defense of freedom, neither shall we ever abandon the pursuit of peace.

In this quest, the United Nations requires our full and continued support. Its value in serving the cause of peace has been shown anew in its role in the West New Guinea settlement, in its use as a forum for the Cuban crisis, and in its task of unification in the Congo.

A Case Against Certain Reforms in the Proposed Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I received recently a fascinating letter and individual income tax breakdown from a distinguished retired teacher in Holyoke, Mass.

This fine lady, who is 76 years old, has an income from various sources in the neighborhood of $5,000. As her letter indicates, she maintains a house, claims two exemptions and has heavy medical expenses.

She makes an excellent case against certain of the reforms in the proposed tax laws. She demonstrates the hardships that would follow.

I think that her breakdown, an exact copy of her 1962 return, should open a few eyes in this House. Here is a lady who would be seriously harmed by some of the tax reform provisions.

Reform, as it has been applied through history, implies progress. If a person over 65 cannot claim two exemptions, cannot itemize deductions, does not have a retirement income credit and so on, we are not progressing, Mr. Speaker, but advancing backward.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, this individual case indicates that we are going to have to examine every facet of the tax programs before coming to any final decisions.

With your permission, I would like to include a copy of the letter and breakdown in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

A CASE AGAINST CERTAIN REFORMS IN THE PROPOSED TAX LAWS

HOLYOKE, MASS.,
February 19, 1963.

Representative SYLVIO CONTE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CONTE: Possibly you may be interested in seeing what the proposed tax reform would do to me.

My income, which varies but a very few dollars from year to year, was in 1962 $5,060.97. I am 76 years old, have to keep up a house, claim two exemptions(being over 65) and itemize my deductions and have a retirement income credit. My medical expenses are heavy and I carry much insurance because of my small savings.

If under the new tax reform a person over 65 cannot claim two exemptions, cannot itemize deductions, does not have a retirement income credit but is allowed to take only $300 from the income tax, my tax would impose a real hardship.

It seems to me that the new tax reform imposes hardships on the group of older retired persons.

I talked with a man at the Internal Revenue bureau here in Holyoke. He said they could make no suggestions to Washington but that I could write to Senator SALTONSTALL and to you.

I am enclosing a copy of my 1962 tax.

Thank you for sending me your reports or perhaps I should say your letters.

People in Holyoke seem much pleased with you.

Sincerely yours,

ISABEL M. KAGWIN.

COPY OF PERTINENT INFORMATION OF U.S. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURN FOR 1962

Following is the pertinent information from form 1040—U.S. individual income tax return, 1962, for Isabel M. Kagwin, 483 Beech St., Holyoke, Mass., social security No. 033346175, retired teacher:

INCOME

Wages, salaries, tips, etc	--------
Federal income tax withheld	--------
5b. Interest (schedule B or other list)	$250.68
5c. Rents, royalties, pensions, etc. (schedule B)	4,855.29
9. Total (add lines 4 through 8)	5,060.97

TAX RATE SCHEDULE

11a. Itemized deductions, total from page 2	1,697.31
11b. Subtract line 11a from line 9	3,363.66
11c. Total exemptions from page 2 here (2), multiply by $600	1,200.00
11d. Subtract line 11c from line 11b	2,163.66
12. Tax, $400 plus $36.0052	436.00
13. Self-employment tax	--------
14. Total (add lines 12 and 13)	436.00

PAYMENTS AND CREDITS

15b. Payments and credits on 1962 declaration of estimated tax	$240.00
15d. Retirement income credit	304.80
15g. Total	544.80

TAX DUE OR REFUND

17. Overpayment	108.80

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

Contributions:	
March of Dimes	1.00
Bay State Society for Crippled Children	1.00
Mount Holyoke College	5.00
Church	20.00
Salvation Army	5.00
UNICEF	1.00
Total paid	33.00
Interest expense:	
Peoples Savings Bank:	
Apr. 16, 1962	50.00
June 20, 1962	50.00
Sept. 21, 1962	50.00
Dec. 26, 1962	50.00
Total interest	200.00
Taxes:	
Real estate taxes	455.70
State income taxes	14.75
State and local sales taxes	53.10
Gas tax	17.76
Registry of motor vehicles	6.00
Excise tax	16.50
Cigarette tax	12.84
Total taxes	523.55
Medical and dental expense:	
Drugs:	
Chester's Drug Store (Jan. 3, $25.95; Feb. 3, $18.73; Mar. 2, $19.29; Apr. 3, $28.08; May 2, $25.14; June 2, $42.23; July 5, $31.18; Aug. 4, $21.69; Sept. 4, $27.92; Oct. 2, $32.67; Nov. 2, $26.75; Dec. 3, $41.64)	341.27
NRTA and AARP Drug Buying Service Washington (Jan. 5, $12.03; Feb. 1, $24.14; Mar. 4, $19.30; Apr. 5, $10.96; May 2, $26.12; May 14, $9.14; May 26, $12.36; June 21, $16.33; July 20, $14.03; Aug. 11, $23.05; Sept. 7, $6.58; Sept. 15, $25.19; Oct. 8, $5.78; Oct. 26, $11.27; Nov. 26, $23.30; Dec. 8, $11.58; Dec. 26, $11.07)	262.23
Total drugs	603.50
Enter 1 percent of gross income	50.60
Total drug deduction	552.90
Doctors and dentist:	
Louis A. Rigali, D.D.S. (Mar. 19, $4.00; Apr. 20, $8.00; July 30, $10.00; Sept. 14, $3.00; Oct. 16, $8.00; Oct. 20, $5.00; Nov. 8, $8.00)	46.00
Herbert R. Toombs, M.D., Apr. 12, 1962	15.00
Bernard J. Niemoio, M.D. (Apr. 17, $10.00; Apr. 24, $10.00)	20.00
Philip H. Clarke, M.D. (June 2, $10.00; Oct. 5, $5.00; Nov. 5, $5.00; Dec. 6, $11.00)	31.00
Holyoke Hospital, Apr. 13	16.50
Total	128.50

Medical and dental expenses—Con.	
Insurance:	
Mass 65	$27.00
Washington National	26.00
Old American	7.50
Conn. General	84.50
NRTA Insurance	96.00
Blue Cross and Blue Shield	66.36
Total insurance	257.36
Total medical, dental and insurance premiums	385.86
Enter 3 percent (age 76)	--------
Total allowable medical	938.76
Other deductions:	
NRTA dues	1.00
Hampden County Retired Teachers Association dues	1.00
Total	2.00
Total deductions	1,697.31

Did you file a return last year?
Answer. Yes.

I declare under penalties of perjury that I have examined this return (including accompanying shedules and statements) and to the best of my knowledge and belief it is true, correct, and complete. If prepared by a person other than taxpayer, his declaration is based on all information of which he has any knowledge.

(Signed) ISABEL M. KAGWIN,
Taxpayer.

SCHEDULE B—SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE OF INCOME AND CREDITS

Interest income

1. Name of payer:	
Peoples Savings Bank $14.86, $38.68, $81.94	$135.48
Holyoke Savings Bank $.42, $37.06, $32.72	70.20
2. Total, enter here and on line 5b, page 1	205.68

Pension and annuity income

1. Investment in contract	3,400.20
2. Expected return	10,200.00
3. Percentage of income to be excluded (line 1 divided by line 2) 33.3 percent.	
4. Amount received this year	600.00
5. Amount excludable	199.80
6. Taxable portion	400.20
1. Investment in contract	1,608.00
2. Expected return	3,393.00
3. Percentage of income excluded, 47.4 percent.	
(Figure by New York Mutual)	
4. Amount received this year	199.56
5. Amount excludable	$94.59
6. Taxable portion	104.97
1. Cost of annuity	6,925.09
2. Cost received tax-free in past years	6,925.09
4. Amount received this year	4,350.12
5. Taxable portion	4,350.12
Total income	4,855.29
Total income	5,060.97

Retirement income credit

Question. Did you receive earned income in excess of $600 in each of any 10 calendar years before the taxable year 1962? Answer. Yes.

1. Retirement income for taxable year	$5,060.97
2. Maximum amount of retirement income for credit computation	1,524.00
5. Balance (line 2 minus line 4)	1,524.00
6. Line 5 or line 1, whichever is smaller	1,524.00
7. Tentative credit (20% of line 6)	304.80
8. Total tentative credit	304.80
Limitation on Retirement Income Credit	
9. Amount of tax shown on line 12, page 1	436.00
11. Subtract line 10 from line 9	436.00
12. Credit. Enter here and on line 15(d), form 1040, the amount on line 8 or line 11, whichever is smaller	304.80

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the Scranton Times edition of Thursday, March 7, 1963, an extremely interesting and informative article on the several nationalities who observe St. Patrick's Day, other than the Irish, of course, appeared in the "Personal and Pertinent" column, written by Mr. Neil L. Whitney, associate editor for that newspaper. The information contained therein was supplied Mr. Whitney by Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian from Pittston, a city in my congressional district. As St. Patrick's Day will be observed this weekend with appropriate ceremonies in countless cities and towns throughout the Nation, it gives me great pleasure to include the text of the aforementioned article:

It is not only those who were born in the Ould Sod—and their descendants—who celebrate on March 17, the day dedicated to honoring the memory of St. Patrick, Ireland's patron saint. So I am reminded by my old friend, Charles A. McCarthy, past president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Greater Pittston. In rummaging through some old papers in his desk recently, Mr. McCarthy ran across a clipping from the Italian-American Herald, a newspaper published in Philadelphia. A feature story in the newspaper, written 2 years ago by Dr. Edgardo Del Vallino, Italian consul general for Philadelphia, pointed out that it was on March 17, 1861, that the Kingdom of Italy was officially established. In the nation's fight for liberty a little more than a century ago, it had the support of a large segment of the American people. Dr. Del Vallino made reference to a meeting in Cooper Institute, in New York City on December 18, 1860, attended by more than 3,000 persons who gathered to give expression to the sympathy felt by the American Nation on behalf of the cause of liberty for which the Italian people, under the leadership of the heroic Garibaldi, have so nobly and successfully struggled. It was pointed out that Garibaldi, one of a number of Italian patriots brought to this country as political exiles, spent some time in Staten Island lining up support for the cause of liberation of his native land. Then there was Dr. Valentine Mott, an American who took an active part in the Palermo revolution in 1848. Dr. Mott, who was a surgeon, was wounded in action as he fought at the side of Italian patriots.

Thus it is, Mr. McCarthy reminded me, that March 17 is a historic date for the people of Italy and their descendants. "It may also be of interest to know," he wrote me, "that San Cataldo, one of the most outstanding of Italy's patron saints, was actually an Irishman. San Cataldo was an Irish monk. While making a tour of the Holy Land, he visited Rome and the Pope, recognizing his special talents, persuaded him to settle in Italy. Later he was made a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church. The town of San Cataldo in Sicily was named in his honor. When residents of San Cataldo and its environs emigrated to the United States they kept the name alive by organizing local social groups known as the San Cataldo Societies, one of which still flourishes in Pittson," Mr. McCarthy explained. "And as you know," he continued, "many other nationalities honor St. Patrick. For example, the Welsh have always conducted their most important eisteddfod of the year on St. Patrick's Day. This year the Dr. Edwards eisteddfod in Edwardsville will be held on Saturday, March 16 (since St. Patrick's Day falls on Sunday). Over 100 years ago, the early Scots in this region, who usually banded themselves into societies known as the Caledonian Clubs, always had big curling matches on St. Patrick's Day. I feel that this information," wrote Mr. McCarthy, "may be beneficial to many of the younger generation who do not quite understand the nigh position of respect the Irish have held in the estimation of all peace-loving nations—and how is it that when a segment of the population gets together to organize for some cause an Irishman inevitably winds up as head of the movement?"

Our Opinion: Extra Effort Pays Off for Bristolians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Bristol Herald Courier on Friday, March 8, 1963, showing that extra effort pays off for Bristolians. Mr. T. Eugene Worrell, publisher; Mr. Herman Giles, associate publisher; and Mr. Barry Sussman, managing editor, pay a very high tribute to members of their staff.

My heartiest congratulations to Maggie Forbush, society editor; Gene Thompson, sports editor; and Howard Taylor, staff writer, for the wonderful job they are doing and in the words of Daniel Webster, "A sense of duty pursues us ever. It is omnipresent, like the Deity."

The Bristol Herald Courier is one of the Nation's finest newspapers, and my congratulations are also extended to the publisher and associate publisher and members of their staff for publishing such an outstanding newspaper. My best wishes to the three who are honored in the editorial and the entire staff and all employees of the publishing corporation.

The editorial follows:

[From the Bristol (Tenn.) Herald Courier, Mar. 8, 1963]

EXTRA EFFORT PAYS OFF FOR BRISTOLIANS

"A sense of duty pursues us ever. It is omnipresent, like the Deity."—Daniel Webster.

An announcement appearing in today's edition of this newspaper tells of two honors that have been bestowed upon Society Editor Maggie Forbush by the Virginia Press Women's Association. The awards, first-place in news pictures and first-place in promotions and publicity, came on the heels of similar honors presented to Gene Thompson, our sports editor, and Howard Taylor, staff writer of the Virginia-Tennessean. All three won distinction in competition with Virginia's metropolitan papers.

The significant thing about these awards is not that they were given to Bristol newspapers staffers, but rather the manner in which they became possible. Mrs. Forbush, whose primary duties deal with the society activities of Bristolians and area residents, took first-place in photography with two published pictures taken during a November 6 fire that killed three persons. Since November 6 was election day, most regular newsmen were tied up in political affairs, but Mrs. Forbush, in the true spirit of journalism, was ready to fill the gap. She won a highly coveted honor for her efforts.

In much the same manner, Howard Taylor received an honorable mention in editorial writing in competition with Virginia's largest newspapers, including those published in such metropolises as Richmond, Roanoke, Norfolk, and Newport News. Editorial writing is not in the general line of Taylor's duties, but in this case he was so moved by the death of a favorite author, William Faulkner, that he produced an editorial essay that appeared in the combined Sunday edition of the Herald Courier and Virginia-Tennessean. He also received a coveted award, particularly treasured because many competitors for the laurel had far more experience than he and failed to place in the Virginia Press Association awards.

Gene Thompson, dean of the sports writers in this area, actually won two awards, a second-place honor among Virginia metropolitan sports scribes for writing and an honorable mention for his column, "Looking at Sports." The first award, which came in competition with the State's top sportswriters, was a result of his account of the University of Tennessee-Alabama football contest. This is the award he especially cherishes and the story that won it was draped in inspiration; it was a thing of beauty that one would not expect to find in the sports columns of any newspaper.

All three of these staffers won honors for actions above and beyond the call of duty; the recognition they received is well-deserved.

Source Selection Evaluation for the TFX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we in the House have many responsibilities in common with our colleagues in the Senate. It goes without saying, of course, that both bodies believe in approaching all questions with fairness and openmindedness.

A Senate investigating subcommittee is now busily looking into the Defense Department's selection of the General Dynamics Corp. in association with the Grumman Corp. to build the new TFX fighter. As any newspaper reader must surely have concluded by this time, the committee has turned up and released to the press many fragmentary scraps of information which would tend to indicate that Boeing, rather than General Dynamics, should have been chosen to build this revolutionary new aircraft. To date, that subcommittee has given no opportunity to the responsible officials in our Defense Department to give the affirmative reasons for their decision.

Feeling an obligation to contribute all possible help to this committee in its relentless and objective pursuit of the truth, I herewith submit for the RECORD a few facts that may contribute to public understanding of this matter.

Specifically, I offer the text of a memorandum for the RECORD regarding the source selection evaluation of the TFX. It is dated November 21, 1962, and signed by Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth and Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, and approved by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. Here is the text, with two deletions, as noted, for reasons of military security:

NEWS RELEASE

We have reviewed the source selection evaluation for the TFX (F-111) most carefully.

This evaluation is by far the most comprehensive source selection evaluation in our experience, and we have great confidence in the details as well as the general conclusions. The magnitude of completed work provides a reliable indication of the quality of both the proposals and the evaluation. Requirements of the work statement have been met in practically all areas by both contractors; where any deficiencies exist, adequate provision has been made to comply with the work statement. All the necessary information is available for selecting a contractor.

The evaluation has produced an advanced aircraft operationally acceptable to both the Navy and Air Force users. It will be a true biservice aircraft, providing for both the Air Force tactical fighter mission and the Navy carrier-based fighter mission.

As both Services agree, the TFX design represents a significant advance in the state-of-the-art and results in a weapon system superior to those now in the inventory or in production for either Service. The TFX can provide target coverage at a higher mach number than present aircraft and approximately five times the range in performing a typical mission profile. The following is a comparison of the TFX and the F4C, using the General Dynamics version of the TFX as an example. (Deleted here for security reasons is this comparison of the TFX and the F4C. The comparison, as indicated, was made to illustrate the superiority of the TFX concept. The TFX figures used in this comparison are neither those of the General Dynamics version, as stated, nor the Boeing version, but are figures indicating the general area of the design concept for the TFX).

In its design the TFX has unusual flexibility and growth potential. Improvements in powerplants, weapons and special equipment can be anticipated, followed by new techniques and new missions. Growth potential is an important consideration, because the life of the aircraft should be long to justify the high cost.

It is apparent from the evaluation that the Boeing and General Dynamics proposals, although possessing strong dissimilarities, are rated equally. In the raw score comparison, General Dynamics received 175.6 points and Boeing 172.1, a difference of less than 2 percent.

The Air Force gives a significant edge to the operational characeristics of the Boeing aircraft, because of its longer ferrying range, greater firepower, and the provision of thrust reversers for increased maneuverability. The Navy also favors Boeing's operational features but to a lesser degree, attributable in part to the lower number of Boeing aircraft which could be accommodated aboard a carrier (specific numbers classified). In the Navy version the Boeing proposal has a speed restriction which would require additional weight to be added. The General Dynamics aircraft is slightly inferior in weapon selectivity and carrying capability; however, its superior supersonic performance and lack of a speed limitation are considered to be basic advantages which can overcome the deficiencies.

Inasmuch as either of the proposed aircraft can perform the mission required by both services, and the evaluation of the proposals provides no overriding margin between the competitors, it is necessary to consider other factors in evaluating these aircraft.

The first of these is the degree of commonness. A high degree of commonness will initially provide a larger number of identical parts and their required tooling, and a future higher rate of common maintenance and operating spares. General Dynamics has a distinct edge in this area, and more closely adheres to the Secretary of Defense guidelines to "reduce weapons system costs by maximizing similarities of Air Force and Navy versions and by maximum use of common equipment and structures."

On a reasonably comparable basis, 85 percent of the parts in the General Dynamics version are identical, contrasted with 60 percent in the Boeing proposal. This factor, we believe, will become increasingly important as the development program of the aircraft evolves. Furthermore, it is doubtful that, in the normal course of development, Boeing can maintain their degree of commonness. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that Boeing contemplates separate static test programs for their two versions. As stated in the evaluation, Boeing is, in effect, proposing two different airplanes from the structural point of view.

It is significant that General Dynamics' integrated program for the two versions of the aircraft showed a reduction of $623 million, in comparison with their cost of developing the two versions separately. The saving in the Boeing proposal was only $397 million, emphasizing the degree to which Boeing's versions are less similar than General Dynamics.

Another factor concerns the reservations expressed by the Navy regarding the structural aspects of the Boeing proposal.

It is believed by Boeing that components used in the Air Force aircraft can be manufactured by the same tooling and reduced for the Navy aircraft by machining. It seems reasonable that if the Navy reservations as to the adequacy of the Boeing design turn out to be sound, necessary modifications of the structural design will further reduce the degree to which the Boeing versions will be common. In addition, if the Navy's reservations as to the structural integrity, the fatigue problem, and the introduction of titanium in structural members are well-founded, further manufacturing problems may be introduced which are not envisioned by Boeing at this time.

Another factor to which we gave consideration was the cost proposal of the two manufacturers. It is hard to understand the optimism of the Boeing estimates for engineering, tooling and manufacturing. With respect to tooling costs, it appears from the estimates and the rationale used by Boeing that they are approaching the development of this aircraft on a very simple basis. Boeing has reduced its man-hour estimates for manufacturing by as much as 30 percent below the industry average and has based much of its estimating on experience with B-52, KC-135, B-47 and BOMARC costs. It is not believed that this experience is directly applicable to a high-density, complex fighter aircraft. Boeing provided for acquisition of duplicate tooling in the production program, which reduces the RDT & E cost estimate. Sustaining tooling manhours have been reduced to a most unrealistic level and sustaining engineering has again, through bookkeeping, been costed in the production program rather than in the RDT & E program. This implies that there would be no manufacturing difficulties due to engineering change proposals during the research and development program.

We conclude that the Boeing formula for estimating the cost of the aircraft resulted from an overoptimistic impression of the complexity of the TFX in relation to Boeing-produced bombers. Boeing's estimates for the total research and development program are so low that, in our opinion, they have seriously misjudged the difficulties to be expected in this aircraft of new concept.

There are additional examples of excessive optimism in the Boeing proposal—the apparent belief that thrust reversers can be developed without major problems and engineering changes; the view that the variable sweep wing can be quite easily applied to the TFX concept, the use of titanium in structural members; and the unique design for the propulsion installation. These examples suggest, if our experience is any guide, that much redesign and testing would be necessary, contrary to the reduced engineering estimates and cost indicated in the Boeing proposal.

Conversely, it is noted that the General Dynamics proposal applies extensive engineering and test effort to the development program and could be considered as being conservative. It is felt that this approach is more likely to meet the development milestones and cost goals than the Boeing proposal.

In analyzing the summary of ratings in the evaluation, it is pertinent to note that the General Dynamics evaluation exceeds Boeing's in the technical areas of air vehicle, propulsion, flight control, secondary power and environment control, mission and traffic control, aerospace ground equipment, crew provisions, and personnal subsystems. These favorable areas, in our opinion, outweigh the deficiencies in offensive systems, reconnaissance, and penetration aids.

Further, the favorable rating in production program planning and cost realism provides much credibility to General Dynamics

in areas with which we are particularly concerned.

The final consideration stemmed from the fact that the General Dynamics/Grumman team has extensive experience in the development and production of high performance, tactical, and carrier-based aircraft. It is thoroughly familiar with all the problems of stability augmentation and supersonic operation. This experience is not obtained in developing and producing bombers and subsonic jet transports, which have been the major portion of Boeing's experience in recent years.

It is our opinion, therefore, in view of the fact that both aircraft proposed are acceptable and offer a capability far beyond present-day aircraft, we should accept the General Dynamics proposal on the basis that it proposes the greater degree of commonness, contemplates the use of conventional materials, provides the higher confidence in structural design, and offers the better possibility of obtaining the aircraft desired on schedule and within the dollars programed.

Value of Free Press Demonstrated by Brainerd, Minn., Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States too often take for granted our freedom of the press. Because this freedom is so much a part of our accepted way of life we don't always appreciate its need nor its value. In the following editorial Mr. Floyd Emerson, editor of the Brainerd Daily Dispatch, demonstrates both the necessity and the value of maintaining a free press in the United States:

ARMY ARREST SHOWS IMPORTANCE OF FREE PRESS AND OPEN COURTS

Publicity given by the press to the arrest of a Merrifield man by the U.S. Army and subsequent announcement that the man probably won't be officially charged with a specific offense for 30 or 60 days demonstrates once again the importance of freedom by the press to follow law enforcement and court activities.

Often when newspapers insist on using stories on court activities, defendants in court cases feel that the newspapers are being nosey and have no right to report their names in the news.

Pressure is often brought to bear on newspaper editors and reporters to leave names out of the paper.

Most reputable newspapers, however, reject these requests because they realize that full coverage of the courts is an important protection to the rights of the American people.

In countries which do not have a free press and open courts, citizens can vanish without a trace and be held for months or years without being charged with any crime.

In America, this can't happen so long as the press is alert and the people back the right of the newspapers to cover all Government functions, including the courts.

There are many persons in Brainerd who believe that when the Army arrested an ex-soldier and whisked him out of town without notifying his employer and without giving full information to his family, he was being denied some rights which belong to an American citizen.

However circumstances of this man's arrest would never have been known by the public had not the press told his story.

His chances for justice at the hands of the Army are greater, no one will deny, when his case is being given full publicity.

This was proved not long ago out in Idaho when the Air Force insisted on holding for murder a man who had been cleared by civil authorities.

Shortly after a national magazine printed his story, the man was released.

It is well for the American people to reflect now and then on the importance of a free press and open courts. Constitutional rights might not be much good without them.

Foreign Policy by Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans do not believe it, but here it is—the use of the computer by the New Frontiersmen, to make policy. Constantine Brown, in last Thursday's Washington Evening Star, tells how we are straddling the fence on foreign policy so that our friends do not respect our statements of determination and our enemies know we do not mean it:

POLICY FLUIDITY VERSUS WEAKNESS—SHIFTS IN METHODS ARE BELIEVED PUTTING U.S. STRENGTH OF PURPOSE IN QUESTION

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The average European is little aware of the Kennedy administration's goal for a peaceful one world through disarmament and world law. Perhaps this is because American policymakers have not prepared their roadmaps carefully and the goal has become obscure in the general confusion of policies.

From the Bay of Pigs to Skybolt, De Gaulle to Canada, and offensive weapons to NATO, the road has been rocky and confusing, not only to the average European but especially to European statesmen.

The one thing the young theorists who came to Washington with President Kennedy were sure of was that the rigid Dulles policy was unproductive and that the base for their policies would be flexibility. And it is just this flexibility that is confusing, especially when those policies are so flexible they change from day to day and are not properly spelled out. For this reason, we read in the daily dispatches such words as "appears to be," "is apparently," or "seems to be."

U.S. policy on Cuba is a good example of the confusion. Perhaps it was a mistake at the outset for President Kennedy to make such rigid statements as "Let all our neighbors know that we shall join them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas." It no longer fitted into the policy picture when a year or so later the President told the Soviet Union that if Fidel Castro would agree to an on-site inspection on the removal of Soviet offensive weapons, he would pledge that the United States would not invade Cuba.

One hears more and more about Washington computer machines. Alternative policies and figures are tossed in and the answer comes tumbling out pat and precise. There were many, including this reporter, who thought this was a New Frontier joke. After all, smart as the machine is, it can only compute questions, selected by the policymakers. With what bias, or wishful thinking, are the questions asked? A woman asking her friend, "Do you like my hat?" expects the answer to be "Yes."

Do American policymakers ask, "Is a flexible policy better than a rigid policy?" or do they ask, "Which is better, a rigid or flexible policy?" If they asked the computer if an integrated NATO nuclear force would be the best defense of Europe, the machine could not have told them President de Gaulle would not agree to it.

Some months ago the administration believed Mr. Castro was in the Kremlin dog house and therefore this was beneficial to us—that this made Cuba less of a danger to us. Now there are hints from Washington that this has been discarded. Since the firing by MIGs on the shrimp boat off Florida keys, there is belief that Mr. Castro was pleased that our complaint was directed to him through the Swiss Embassy in Havana rather than to Moscow.

The Castro regime, it is said, has been sensitive because since the crisis in October Washington has bypassed Havana and dealt directly with Moscow. The new thought is that since we are addressing ourselves to Mr. Castro his prestige has been enhanced and he may be more amenable to reason. This, according to Washington dispatches published in the Italian press, may help to reestablish communications between Cuba and the United States.

Yet, only 3 months ago Washington was saying that its position on Cuba would be fluid in the hope that Mr. Castro's status at home would deteriorate. And last November the policy was that the United States was going to put a steady economic and political squeeze on Mr. Castro aimed at making him too expensive for the Russians.

European statesmen and their staffs give careful attention to American policies on Cuba, believing they reflect what may be expected in other areas such as Berlin and the disarmament conference. Recently a headline read, "United States Bending," and the ensuing dispatch reported that the "United States is bending over backward to keep its bargaining position fluid while still insisting that a meaningful disarmament treaty must result."

"You can't have it both ways," remarked a diplomat in Rome. "Plans for strengthening NATO which Washington changes often and overnight is an example of being too fluid. Washington does not give the impression of having strength of purpose. If you are looking to reestablish communications with Cuba, that certainly is not opposing aggression in the American hemisphere. If you are giving in to Soviet demands on a disarmament treaty, neither is that strength of purpose."

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. We in Congress join freemen everywhere in observing this anniversary. We have a moral

obligation to do so, for we speak not only for ourselves but for those men and women of Lithuania who must observe this anniversary in silence.

Lithuania is not a make-believe nation. It has a long and honorable history, dating back to A.D. 1009, nearly 500 years before the discovery of America. It was not only the first nation in Eastern Europe to embrace Christianity but it also was the first nation which helped stem the Tartar invasion from the East. Admittedly, the heavy Russian suppression of this small nation and the Russian reliance on deportation, execution, and colonization methods dim hopes of Lithuanian survival as a nation and as a people. Nevertheless, we should recall that Lithuania has emerged from seemingly hopeless situations in the past. During the 120-year Russian occupation, from 1795 to 1915, there were five insurrections. And when the chaos of World War I allowed Lithuania to break its chains, its people formed a free and independent government out of the ruins and amidst the opposition of its hostile neighbors. A free Lithuania affirmed its cultural traditions, and maintained a democratic form of government for 22 years until it was, once again, invaded by Russia in violation of four treaties of friendship and nonaggression.

The captive peoples of Lithuania and other Eastern European satellites stand as constant reminders to the world that it is the Soviet Union wihch maintains the largest colonial empire on earth today. If permitted a choice between naional independence and membership in the Soviet Union, there is no doubt in my mind as to what the people of Lithuania would prefer. Let us continue to call for free elections and freedom for the captive peoples. There must be no moratorium in this struggle. I join my colleagues in expressing sympathy for the misfortune which has so often befallen the Lithuanian people, and in expressing our hope that one day they will again be free.

Proposed Reorganization Plan for the Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the people of South Dakota, as in other areas of the Nation, are extremely concerned about the proposed reorganization plan for the Internal Revenue Service which was announced last week and is now under review.

South Dakotans are inclined to believe that the change as it has been explained so far will result in little, if any, savings to the taxpayer—only a loss of service. They are perplexed by this additional example of Government efforts to centralize government in large urban areas in the face of numerous recommendations that the Government be brought closer to the people and that there be more decentralization of Government offices.

In recent years the Congress has been asked time and again to pass programs such as rural areas redevelopment, distressed areas assistance and accelerated public works. At the same time, a department of urban affairs is recommended to assist with the problems of overcrowded urban centers.

It makes little sense to us at a time when millions of dollars of tax funds are being spent for programs aimed at helping rural areas to have sweeping Government reorganizations in smaller offices of this and other agencies.

At the same time, recent tax revision entails more complicated regulations which would seem to require greater effort in individual taxpayer assistance. To meet the demands of more detailed regulations and growing population, the Internal Revenue Service is asking for a larger budget and thousands of additional employees. Apparently these employees would be needed to answer the letters of taxpayers like those in South Dakota who will be deprived of the personalized service they now receive from our district office at Aberdeen.

As a further example of the viewpoint of South Dakotans, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials appearing recently in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader and the Aberdeen, S. Dak., American News:

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Mar. 9, 1963]

IS TAX OFFICE CHANGE NECESSARY?

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon boldly announced a reorganization plan for the Internal Revenue Service this week. He said it would save about $5 million a year in overhead costs.

The plan involved trimming operations in 12 of 62 district offices, merging 4 other offices and reducing its regional offices from 9 to 7. The idea is to make better use of supervisory personnel—give fewer chiefs more Indians.

Strangely enough, the plan called for consolidating the New York and Boston regions in Boston—which is the home of a new young Senator whose last name is Kennedy. This same young man told his constituents during last fall's election campaign he could do more for Massachusetts.

A few days later, Secretary Dillon announced that he would reconsider his plan, which was to take effect next January 1. His recommendation stemmed from an uproar in Congress. Republican Senators charged that the 1964 presidential campaign is already under way. Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, called it a part of a pattern of concentrating power in a few urban centers.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, said that while the reorganization plans are aimed at saving $5 million annually, the Treasury's budget calls for an increase of $430 million and 4,100 more employees.

The plan as it affects South Dakota calls for transfer of some 10 to 15 staff positions from the Aberdeen district office to St. Paul. The positions eliminated will be top supervisory or overhead positions and their staffs. The district revenue office in Aberdeen now has about 100 permanent employees.

The Aberdeen district office through the years has done a good job. W. C. Welsh, the district director, and his staff have administered a difficult job with fairness and good service to the taxpayers of South Dakota.

If the system is working now, why make 15 Government workers in Aberdeen pull stakes for St. Paul? Why take a regional office out of Omaha and consolidate it in Chicago? Or move a regional office from New York to Boston, another big city?

We fail to see the advantages of concentrating more Government employees in bigger offices, unless the increased efficiency and the savings are so great as to warrant it. That does not appear to be the case in Secretary Dillon's plan, considering his request for additional employees and a bigger budget.

There is already too much concentration of Government, defense industry and defense installations in a few large centers in this big country. Our big, bureaucratic Government would do well to consider further decentralization instead of going in the other direction.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American News, Mar. 9, 1963]

IRS CHANGE NEED SHOULD BE PROVED

Voters and taxpayers of South Dakota are disturbed by the announced plan of the Treasury Department to remove from this State some of the functions of the Internal Revenue Service.

The plan, described earlier this week, would move some of the key personnel in the South Dakota district office in Aberdeen to St. Paul, Minn. The duties now being accomplished in South Dakota would be performed in a neighboring State office rather than the South Dakota office.

In our form of Government, where the people have a strong voice in directing elected officials, South Dakotans have the opportunity to demand a detailed explanation of the proposed centralization of functions of IRS district offices.

Fortunately, for the satisfaction of all concerned, South Dakotans, members of the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce among them, are seeking detailed information about what benefits the taxpayers might expect from the suggested reduction of the duties of the district offices.

If the IRS planners can not prove better service to the taxpayers and a substantial savings in operational costs as a result of the proposed change the change will be protested vigorously.

The South Dakota district office of IRS has functioned smoothly and satisfactorily under the present setup. It should not be changed just for the sake of change.

Fiscal Cat Is Out of the Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the March edition of my newsletter in the RECORD, so that it may have as wide a circulation as possible:

FISCAL CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

Well, the fiscal cat is out of the bag. President Kennedy now has said that he wants a $10 billion tax cut this year, whether we get tax reforms or not, even though this means a $12 billion deficit.

This appears to me to be the old, old theory of borrowing money to spend our way into prosperity. Now, I can understand a business man going to the bank and borrowing some money to finance the purchase of new equipment which would produce a profit for his company. But, a business man

would have to show that the new equipment would make a profit or he'd be turned down flat because, as many of you know who have borrowed from a bank, it wants assurance that it's going to be repaid. But not the Federal Government, oh no. The Secretary of the Treasury not only says it won't be paid back, but very frankly states that the Federal Government will continue at least through 1967 to have deficits.

The fact that the value of our dollars and our gold supply have reached a critical stage doesn't seem to worry the administration either. Only this week the Treasury announced it borrowed another $100 million in marks from Germany last month. This loan is in addition to the $100 million in marks Germany lent us in January and the $380 million in lire, francs and marks we borrowed from several European nations last year. Also, recently our gold supply was depleted by $100 million.

This is a sad situation for the United States, which once was the place other countries came for credit. Now we have to go out and beg for loans. How many times can we go to the well? As the saying goes, what happens when the chickens come home to roost?

Now, if I can judge by the replies I've received from my February newsletter, 99 percent of you believe this sort of fiscal policy is strictly for the birds. I agree. Almost all of you said that we must cut spending before we cut taxes. Again I agree. Well, some of us here in Congress are getting at it and when we've come up with a specific program of cutting expenditures, some people in some areas probably won't like it—and, I'll get some complaints. But, that old saying that you can't have your cake and eat it too really applies here.

Let me add, at this time, my thanks for your letters in reply to my last newsletter.

TFX HASSLE

Maybe, you've read about the TFX hassle. Briefly, Boeing and General Dynamics were competitors for a $6 or $7 billion contract for an aircraft. Despite the fact that all the military people recommended the Boeing plane, Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, and other civilians awarded the contract to General Dynamics. Politics?

General Dynamics has its plant in Texas. Boeing, of course, is in Wichita and Seattle. Senator McCLELLAN is presently conducting an investigation into this matter, and after talking with some members of the committee, I have a hunch that the deal is going to smell to high heaven.

Certainly, if Boeing had the best proposal they should get the business even if they're not located in Texas. Y'know what some people are calling the TFX now? The LBJ. And, it costs somewhere between $80 to $400 million more.

Sincerely yours,

JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Way back in 1945 I was a member of the American Red Cross Clubmobile unit serving in Europe during World War II. Much time was spent at ports through which almost every U.S. military unit in this theater passed at one time or another. When they did, they gave me one of their shoulder patches, telling me how their unit really won the war. I finally had all these colorful patches sewed on a jacket.

Someone mentioned to me that 20 years from then this "patch jacket" would be an historical item. Recently at a dinner, I had the privilege of sitting next to Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Director of the Smithsonian Institution, where historical items are kept. I told him about my patch jacket and he asked if I would give it to the Smithsonian. I told him I'd leave it to the Smithsonian in my will. Someday you may see it listed as "Westland's Patch Jacket," worn by the wife of the Second District Congressman of Washington State in World War II. It hardly seems possible that all of that is history today.

VISITORS

Bow: Mr. and Mrs. George Hammer.

Edmonds: Mr. L. K. Pennington, Mr. William G. Hathaway.

Marysville: Mr. Ralph A. Augustavo.

Mount Vernon: Lynn A. Dale.

Port Angeles: Mr. and Mrs. Ken Peterson, Mr. R. M. Hurt, Mr. Glenn Simkins.

A Stronger ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass. It expresses the sentiment of a great many people—including myself—on the question of whether to abolish or, instead, modernize and strengthen the high school ROTC program.

Last week I was privileged to testify before Congressman HÉBERT's subcommittee on this subject. I agreed at that time with the distinguished chairman that the Defense Department's desire to eliminate this time-honored program was apparently motivated by what he aptly termed "a misguided sense of economy."

Surely this is the case. To save $5 million at the expense of a program that offers a chance to teach American youth qualities of leadership, responsibility and patriotism, in a sound and effective manner, while at the same time providing the Nation with a corps of potential officers and career servicemen, would be no saving at all. It would be a great and irrevocable national loss.

Chairman HÉBERT and Congressman BRAY have proposed, as an alternative to the abrupt elimination of junior division ROTC, a bill (H.R. 4444 and H.R. 4427) that would greatly increase its effectiveness and extend participation to the Air Force and Navy as well.

They are to be commended for taking this positive approach to the problem and deserve the wholehearted support of all those Members of Congress who agree with the following editorial, that this program long ago has demonstrated "effectiveness in building fine young men imbued with patriotism, respect for discipline and the military, and (is) of inestimable worth to the Nation in war and peace":

A STRONGER ROTC

The high school ROTC crisis evidently is over, and with a happy ending, since the Pentagon announced it has dropped the plan to eliminate the program.

Obviously, the Defense Department was reluctant to tangle with a Congress that showed more and more signs of defending the ROTC. The turning of the tide probably came when two influential members of the House Armed Services Committee, Representative HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Chairman VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, rallied to the support of the high school program.

The Pentagon then had serious doubt whether most of this program is worth the cost.

Happily, VINSON and HÉBERT have taken an opposite tack, one shared by most communities—including New Bedford—which have had firsthand experience with ROTC and its fine results. They believe that if the program is lacking anything, it's because it has been starved for lack of Government funds and encouragement.

Accordingly, HÉBERT plans to seek a sevenfold increase in the $6 million a year program and to make it available to 2,000 public and private secondary schools, rather than merely to 225 institutions, as at present.

This sounds more like it and Mr. HÉBERT ought to find ample support for strengthening the ROTC. Long ago it demonstrated effectiveness in building fine young men imbued with patriotism, respect for discipline and the military, and of inestimable worth to the Nation in war or peace.

As a sidelight, New Bedford organizations and individuals presumably played a major role in bringing about this Pentagon reversal. From the moment the Standard-Times first made public nationwide the proposal to eliminate this program, literally scores from this community voiced their objection to Congress. It was this expression of public opinion which produced the strong congressional opposition.

Public's Right to News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Public's Right to News" from the February 28, 1963 issue of the Pomona (Calif.) Progress-Bulletin.

The editorial contains pertinent and timely comment on the news management issue which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress:

PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO NEWS

The continuing flurry of charges that the Kennedy administration seeks to manage the news needs to be put in some balance.

The President himself has taken a hand, trying to minimize the issue by treating it wittily—as he often does when under some fire.

Yet there are probably few responsible newsmen in Washington and elsewhere who doubt that management of the news is taking place.

What has to be understood is that this is not something unique to President Kennedy. The Eisenhower administration practiced news control, as did the Roosevelt and Truman regimes before. In fact, this is a technique as old as memory.

Nor is it limited to the national Government. Sleuthing reporters have been complaining about "invisible government" at the State level for decades.

The fact it is both commonplace and old does not justify it as a policy. Within the limits dictated by security, the proper needs of diplomacy, and the effective operation of government, the public is entitled to know what its elected and appointed officials are doing and saying.

But the record of history, right up to the most current events, indicates that government officials have a strong self-protective instinct. They are not about to hand out gracefully and ungrudgingly information which in any way will damage them personally or politically.

They do not need, at the national level, to tell themselves they are deliberately withholding information for these reasons. The great emphasis on defense and security gives them an easy way of rationalizing news control. On top of this, there is a natural tendency for men in office to believe they know better than anyone what is wise and proper and safe to disclose.

As a matter of fact, men in government are not the only ones who set themselves up as judges of what the public should know.

Giant business corporations, affected with a public interest to the extent that government concerns itself with their disputes, their pricing policies, and the like, are extremely guarded in what they tell the public.

Their excuse, also often a rationalization, is that to disclose too much may be to give valuable information to their competitors.

Few individuals or agencies deeply entwined in public affairs believe they have a duty to "tell all." In one degree or another, they all "manage the news" they take part in.

Where the Kennedy regime went astray was in openly avowing, even for 1 day, that news management was official policy. The retractions and denials, however humorously stated, probably will never catch up with that one.

The McNamara Monarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saturday Evening Post:

THE MCNAMARA MONARCHY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The unification of the armed services sponsored by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara poses some subtle and insidious dangers—creeping dangers that are political, military, and administrative. And they could present, in their ultimate form, almost as great a threat to a secure and free nation as the attempted military coup, envisaged in the recent novel "Seven Days in May."

For the kind of unification being practiced and preached today has ominous overtones. It is dangerous to the Nation's political system of checks and balances, dangerous to the continued development of sound military advice and effective military leadership, dangerous to managerial and administrative efficiency.

Mr. McNamara is, first and foremost, trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition.

He has established tremendous Defense Department superagencies, such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, which has taken over most of the intelligence functions formerly performed by the individual services.

This centralization of intelligence has made service dissent on intelligence more difficult, and it has facilitated the molding of intelligence estimates to preconceived policies. In the Cuban situation the primary reason for delay was the insistence of the Kremlinologists that it won't happen here, that Mr. Khrushchev would not take the risk. There's not much doubt that intelligence was influenced by this atmosphere of certainty. In fact, this centralization facilitates the top political and policy control of military intelligence. And this is politically dangerous—domestically and internationally.

But this is only one area where Mr. McNamara is attempting to have the Pentagon speak with one voice. The Defense Supply Agency, a huge superagency, is procuring so-called common items for all the services. A Defense Communications Agency is being groomed for further expansion into a National Communications Agency which might well place virtually all of the Government's long-line communications systems under military control. Budgeting, the selection of weapons systems, contracting, personnel standards, uniforms, codes of justice, administrative procedures—all are now tailored to the pattern set by the Secretary of Defense.

Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the Administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

PROGRESS MEANS PERIL

Mr. McNamara has not yet succeeded in forcing all the services to speak, officially or unofficially, with one public voice. But he has come much closer to it than anyone before him, and he is still trying. And the progress he has made carries its own political dangers.

For 175 years of our history, separate Army and Navy Departments (and then an Air Force) provided a natural interservice system of checks and balances. The services did not speak with one voice, and politically this was a desirable safeguard. They balanced each other, and their secretaries provided contrasting viewpoints at Cabinet level. Now only the Secretary of Defense is a Cabinet officer; the service secretaries as well as the uniformed chiefs of the services are submerged in an immense Pentagon hierarchy.

The latest reorganization of the state-controlled National Guard, still opposed by some Governors, may ultimately extend Washington's power over the Guard. Such developments represent dangerous weakening of our traditional military checks and balances.

Equally threatening to the Nation's future is the concentration of politicomilitary power, not merely in Washington but in one department. It places more and more power over the military-industrial complex in the hands of a few men in the executive branch of Government. The dollar volumes of military contracts amount to more than $20 billion annually, with billions more in backlog orders outstanding. The individual services no longer have the final power to contract. The rewarding or cancellation of contracts—which may make or break companies and affect thousands of workers—is now ultimately controlled by a very few men in the top echelons of the Defense Department.

Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

Alternatives, variations, disagreements are the breath of life in any organization; imposed solutions, inflexible strategies, a "party line" from which no deviation is permitted could mean disaster. Mr. McNamara's policies are ostensibly intended to provide alternatives and increase flexibility, but there are many who feel they are having exactly the opposite effect. As Air Force magazine noted in its January, 1963, issue, the decision of the Secretary of Defense to phase out the manned bomber will mean that by 1970 the Nation will be almost entirely dependent upon missiles for stategic nuclear delivery.

"We will have substituted rigidity for flexibility," states the magazine. "There will be fewer, rather than more, options for a future President to exercise."

The "one voice" unification trend in the Pentagon presents another potential danger: the development of future generations of officers who will be essentially military yes-men and conformists. They may be wizards of the new techniques of operational analyses computer calculations, but without the moral courage or leadership qualifications required by the battlefield.

COMPROMISES ON WEAPONS

The single-voice concept is also enforcing—in the name of conformity and standardization—undesirable compromises in weapons systems. Technical competition between the services is being discouraged despite the lessons of the past. The air-cooled and liquid-cooled aircraft engines which ultimately gave us air supremacy in World War II were a direct result of differing Army and Navy technical concepts and interservice competition. In the Cuban crisis of last fall, a Navy camera used in lowel-level reconnaissance flights over Cuban missile sites proved to be far superior to a camera used by the Air Force low-level flights. The Air Force planes were hastily reequipped with the Navy camera.

Yet, ever since Mr. McNamara took office his slide rule statisticians have been pressuring both industry and the services into designing and producing a single, all-purpose aircraft supposedly capable of doing the varied jobs of all the services. The objective is economy, but the indications are that the attempts to force all into a single mold, may ultimately cost more—in combat effectiveness, if not in dollars. The so-called TFX tactical fighter has been delayed for 2 years while the Defense Department tried to force a design for a fighter that could perform equally well from carrier decks and land airfields. The final result—though officially described as a standard airplane—is actually two variants, both of them probably compromised in effectiveness by enforced conformities. The obvious danger of this approach is the production of a series of hybrid weapons rather than the kind of equipment the men who do the fighting and dying would like to have.

Finally, what about administrative efficiency; what has Mr. McNamara's brand of unification done to the Pentagon? Not only policy formulation, but operations and administration are directed from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

A program called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, dubbed "the book" in the Pentagon, attempts to chart and elaborate nearly every

detail of weapons systems and force structures required by the Armed Forces for the next 5 years. Any significant change in this plan requires an elaborate process of justification, review, and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting, budgeting, progress on weapons systems—even lawn cutting—is programed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary's office.

The reporting and analytical system required has resulted in a tremendous burgeoning of paperwork and great increase in numbers and rank of both civilian and military personnel assigned to echelons above the fighting services in the Department of Defense. But there has been no commensurate reduction, as yet, in administrative personnel and their workloads in the services.

When Mr. McNamara took office, he set out, as the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register put it, "Courageously and confidently to streamline top echelon Department of Defense management." Instead he has added more to top overhead—the apex of the Defense pyramid—than any Secretary before him. There were 15 Presidential appointees of Assistant Secretary of Defense rank or higher in January 1961; there are 15 today, though responsibilities and functions have been rearanged. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are 26 today.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is limited by law—a law approved by a Congress wary of the development of a "Greater General Staff"—to 400 officers. But the restriction has been evaded by assigning at least 250 other officers to an amorphous division, called the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The total military personnel assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today is about five to six times as large as it was a decade ago. Yet one of the tentative plans discussed in the Pentagon contemplates a further considerable increase in the Joint Staff and the organization of the Joint Chiefs.

There has been a steady increase in the numbers of top-ranking, high-salaried personnel—particularly Civil Service top grades—assigned to the Office of the Secretary, the Department of Defense and the Pentagon. As of June 30, 1959, there were 3,009 civilians in the GS-14 to GS-18 brackets (the top-salaried brackets); last June there were 3,950. Moreover, their salaries had gone up from a minimum of $11,355 to a top of $17,500 in 1959 to a minimum of $12,845 and a top of $20,000 in 1962.

This topheavy system has obvious built-in delay factors, and, as the record of the McNamara administration shows, it is far harder to start a new project or weapons system than it is to cancel or curtail an old one. In the first 18 months of the McNamara regime, no major new weapons system was started. Even today the Defense Department can find no "military requirement" for man in space, and it has curtailed, eliminated or held back such important development projects as a future manned-bomber system (the RS-70), the Skybolt air-to-ground missile and the Nike-Zeus antiballistic-missile system.

Though Mr. McNamara has centralized to a far greater degree than any other Secretary, he alone is by no means responsible for the trend toward a monolithic Department of Defense. It has been going on ever since the war.

CONGRESS SHARES BLAME

Concentration of power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense has been hastened by the loosening of congressional control over the Pentagon. The power to raise and maintain armies and navies, conveyed to the legislative branch by the Constitution, has been watered down as a result of the sheer immensity and size of the Defense Department, the tremendous increase in executive power, and the weaknesses and mistakes of Congress itself. In the Senate and the House, intercommittee jealousies and the small size of the staffs of these committees—which have not matched, in any way, the growth in size of the armed services—have hampered examinations and control. And Congress, by loose legislation, conferred upon the President and the Secretary of Defense such immense power to reorganize the Pentagon that it has, in the view of some legislators, virtually abandoned its former power to check, control, and approve every detail of defense policy and organization.

The process of centralization in the Pentagon has gone so far there is very considerable doubt that the service departments can remain separate at all.

Both Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, have publicly opposed a single Chief of Staff system, and have endorsed the separate service "techniques of land warfare, naval warfare and air warfare." Former Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates has warned against centralization and has said that to "submerge * * * honest differences of [service] opinion and free expression * * * in any monolithic system would be a fatal mistake."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army (Ret.), spoke in 1960 against reduction of "everything to its lowest denominator, one service, one uniform * * * to the dead level of mediocrity, Jacks of all trades, masters of none, a group of "Yes" men always in unanimous agreement—what an insidiously dangerous philosophy."

If the Pentagon ever does speak with one voice, if the Nation's Armed Forces do come, as the trend now indicates, to represent a monolithic military-political point of view, both freedom and security will be in jeopardy through the slow erosion of democracy into a garrison state and the stagnant conformity that leads to combat ineffectiveness.

Report of Committee on Inland Navigation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress 49th National Convention May 17, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to comply with the request of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to insert into the RECORD the report of the Committee on Inland Navigation at the congress 49th national convention, May 17, 1962. Chairman of the group is Hon. Gleason N. Stambaugh, Sr., Florida Inland Navigation District, West Palm Beach, Fla.

The report follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INLAND NAVIGATION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

The committee on inland navigation met in the Potomac Room of the Mayflower Hotel at 10 a.m. at the call of the chairman.

Present members of the committee attending were—

John B. Quinn, executive vice chairman, National Resources Development Association, Lincoln, Nebr.

Edward C. Hudowalski, assistant superintendent, New York State Department of Public Works, Albany, N.Y.

W. Armin Willig, vice president, American Commercial Barge Line Co., Jeffersonville, Ind.

Thomas B. Casey, chief waterway engineer, Springfield, Ill.

Marshall N. Dana, assistant to the president, U.S. National Bank, Portland, Oreg.

Col. George T. Derby, Engineers, U.S. Army (retired) Princeton, N.J.

O. R. Douglas, the Mead Corp., Anderson, S.C.

Philip W. Fitzpatrick, consultant, port authority, St. Paul, Minn.

Col. Hubert S. Miller, Engineers, U.S. Army (retired) vice president and general manager, Trinity Improvement Association, Fort Worth, Tex.

Present as interested parties were—

W. G. Lyden, Jr., Box 1294, Youngstown, Ohio.

Chas. G. Crom, (Ohio delegation) Toledo Lucas County Port Authority, Toledo, Ohio.

Homer Reed, city manager, Pensacola, Fla.

Charles H. Overman, Jr., mayor, Pensacola, Fla.

R. L. De Chant, Greater Cleveland Growth Board, Cleveland, Ohio.

F. H. Hendry, Post Office Box 13228, Tampa, Fla.

George King, Port Canavaral, Fla.

John W. Sears, Calument Harbor, Homewood, Ill.

Edgar Leo Johnson, Gainsville, Fla.

W. Palmer Van Arsdale, Port Everglades, Fla.

Bill Tompos Wierton, State senator, West Virginia.

K. M. Loyd, secretary, Interconnecting Waterway, Inc., Youngstown, Ohio.

Justice H. Fugate, City Hall, Wichita, Kans.

The chairman announced a quorum and appointed Hubert S. Miller as temporary secretary. All present read the governing rules for this committee and proceeded to the selection of chairman for subcommittees with the following results:

SUBCOMMITTEE AND CHAIRMEN

Hazards and aids to navigation, Philip W. Fitzpatrick.

Channel dimensions and maintenance, Philip W. Fitzpatrick.

(The above two committees combined.)

Rates and competition, Col. George T. Derby.

Operating costs, Col. George T. Derby.

Methods of evaluating projects, Col. George T. Derby.

(The above three committees combined.)

Defense value of individual channels, Col. Hubert S. Miller.

Design and equipment of floating craft, E. H. Hendry.

Fuels and propulsion, E. H. Hendry.

Cargo-handling equipment, E. H. Hendry.

(The above three committees combined.)

Freight vehicle interchange, W. Armin Willig.

There was discussion as to the recreational aspects of navigation with decision that this be considered by Mr. Fitzpatrick's committee.

It was moved, seconded, and carried that the above combining of committees be approved.

The Florida representatives presented for information a resolution adopted by the city of Pensacola in support of certain important improvements on the rivers and harbors of Pensacola.

General instructions were given for carrying out the subcommittee work during the coming year in compliance with the governing rules provided by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

It was understood that the subcommittee chairman above named would recommend to Chairman Stambaugh and to Mr. William Webb, executive vice president, the names of additional members to serve an these subcommittees and that they would be appointed by national headquarters.

It was announced that any members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress who desired to serve on any of the above subcommittees let the fact be known to Mr. Stambaugh or Mr. Webb.

The meeting was adjourned.

HUBERT S. MILLER,
Secretary.

How Poles Heard Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in its editions of March 3, carried a very interesting story by its California correspondent, Seymour Korman, which brings to light one more significant piece of evidence regarding the infamous Katyn Forest Massacre perpetrated by the Soviet Union against Allied soldiers in the early days of World War II.

I had the honor of serving as chief investigator of the select committee of Congress which investigated this massacre in 1952. The evidence that we compiled at that time proved conclusively that the Soviet Union had murdered 15,000 Polish Army officers who had been captured by Communist troops during the invasion of Poland and then taken to the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia, to meet their death.

I should like to commend the Chicago Tribune and its correspondent for bringing to light one more piece of significant evidence which adds to the strong record against the Soviet Union for this horrible crime. During our very exhaustive investigation in 1952, we were not aware of the Polish newspapers and the very significant stories which they carried as disclosed by Mr. Korman in his article which appears below.

Mr. Korman has made a significant contribution toward completing the record, and I am sure that historians of Soviet treachery will be grateful to him.

So far as I know, this is the first time that public attention has been called to the very important publications which are now a part of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University.

Mr. Korman's informative article follows:

HOW POLES HEARD KATYN MASSACRE—15,000 ARE SLAIN BY RUSSIANS IN FOREST

(By Seymour Korman)

PALO ALTO, CALIF., March 2.—Growing suspicions by the Polish people that the flower of their army officer corps and intelligentsia was massacred by the Russians in the Katyn Forest in May 1940, are disclosed in a remarkable collection of wartime newspapers in the archives of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace on the Stanford University campus.

In April 1943, in the midst of World War II, the Germans, then occupying Poland and part of western Russia, accused Josef Stalin's Communist government of slaughtering 15,000 Poles, taken from 3 prison camps in Russia.

BODIES DUG UP

Of those 4,258 bodies were unearthed from crude mass graves in the Katyn Forest, 10 miles west of Smolensk. Bodies of more than 10,000 others have never been found.

The Russians denied committing the murders and charged the Germans were the guilty ones. But most investigations since then, including one by a U.S. congressional committee, have fixed the blame on the Russians for one of the most atrocious crimes against helpless prisoners of war in the history of the world.

The pertinent newspapers in the institution, founded by former President Herbert Hoover in 1941, were published by the Polish underground in the period of the German occupation from 1941 to 1945.

DONE AT GREAT PERIL

The publication of those papers was done at great peril—the Germans would torture, and often execute, those whom they found with them. The papers varied from 6 to 16 pages, and were of pocket size so they could be hidden easily. They were circulated several times a month.

Dr. Witold S. Sworakowski, assistant director of the Hoover institution, himself a Pole, said the most important file in the collection contains 51 issues of the newspaper Przez Walke Do Zwyciestwa, which he translated as "Through Struggle to Victory."

"We have the editions from August 1942, through June 20, 1944," Dr. Sworakowski said. "In several of the 1942 issues there are complaints from Polish families that they haven't heard from husbands and sons since the spring of 1940.

LETTERS CEASE COMING

"These men had been captured by the Russians in late 1939, and there had been letters from them the first few months of their imprisonment—nothing since. There were queries in the newspapers as to why no mail was getting through from the prisoners.

"Then, in the issue of May 10, 1943, the newspaper told of the German claim that the Russians had perpetrated the Katyn massacre."

The translation of the rest of this article, as given by Dr. Sworakowski, was: "On December 3, 1941, Gen. Vladislav Sikorski, Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-exile, in conversation with Stalin, asked that all Polish war prisoners in Soviet hands be freed.

"The Polish Government did not receive an answer from the Soviet Government concerning the whereabouts of missing officers and none of those missing officers reported to the Polish Government.

MOST HIDEOUS CRIME

"While there must be an investigation, the Polish Government demands that the German Government not use these bodies in the forest as a subject of propaganda. Up to now this is German propaganda—we have to be careful. There is no question but we are facing one of the most hideous crimes in the history of mankind.

"Of our own experience, it could happen with the Bolsheviks; we know the Germans also did such things. The Soviet-German pact of 1939 did not surprise us—we knew of the duplicity which the Russians used previously in relation to Poland."

By the next issue of the newspaper—June 20, 1943—the underground was increasing its belief in the Russian guilt.

ASKS SOME QUESTIONS

"Why this Soviet attitude on Katyn?" Dr. Sworakowski translated from the publication. "Why did Russia refuse to let the international Red Cross make an investigation of Katyn? Why was this refusal also a pretext by Russia for severance of its relations with the Polish Government-in-exile?"

The "Through Struggle To Victory" and five other small, bound volumes of the Polish underground press were among the Hoover institution materials used by J. K. Zawodny for his book on Katyn. This was entitled "Death in the Forest" and was published last year by the University of Notre Dame press.

Zawodny concluded: "The Katyn massacre was perpetrated by the Soviet security police (NKVD) and under auspices of the Soviet Government."

UNITED STATES CALLED ACCOMPLICE

This also was the finding of a congressional committee in 1952—that the Russians, with Stalin's order or knowledge, committed the crime to exterminate any possible postwar Polish leadership.

Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Republican, of Wisconsin, charged on November 30, 1952, that the United States, and particularly the Roosevelt administration, was "an accomplice in the massacre because it possessed the facts and refused to tell the people."

The six volumes of underground publications were presented to Hoover in Warsaw in 1946 by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, who had been head of the Polish peasant party opposed to the Communists. Most of the underground editors were members of Mikolajczyk's party.

FORCED TO FLEE

Mikolajczyk handed the volumes to Hoover under the eyes of the angry Communst puppet leaders—the latter couldn't object because Hoover was an honored guest. But soon after, Mikolajczyk had to flee the country for his life—he now lives in New York.

Sworakowski said that among the real heroes of the Polish underground press were the newsboys.

"They carried on their arms the German controlled newspapers," he said, "but under their coats they had the underground publications.

"So noble and brave were the Polish newsboys during the underground days that a statue has been erected in Warsaw to them."

Arthur Krock: A True Journalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as a voice crying in the journalistic wilderness, Arthur Krock is one of the great journalists of our time—independent, courageous, unmanaged. Despite his personal friendship for President Kennedy, he has properly criticized the Kennedy propaganda machine, at which Hitler would have marveled.

I have written the editor of the New York Times, expressing my appreciation of a man like Arthur Krock:

MARCH 7, 1963.

Mr. JOHN B. OAKES,
Editor, New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. OAKES: Congratulations to the New York Times' columnist, Arthur Krock for his fine article on New Frontier management of news.

No more callous disregard for the intelligence and trust of the American public has

ever been shown by any administration in the history of our country. I am more than a little amazed that President Kennedy, with his affinity for the memory of that predecessor, seems to have forgotten FDR's words: "The truth is found when men are free to pursue it." Does the current truth hurt so much that he would prevent us from finding it out?

As Mr. Krock points out, even more devious is the determined pursuit of "managing the purveyors of the news." It is to the great credit of many news people that some of these attempts have met with failure; but to the extent some have been successful, a gross injustice has been perpetrated on the Nation.

It is not a happy thing to witness an administration so desperately committed to self-perpetuation that it would stifle dissent by smothering "unfavorable" facts, not only from its political opponents, but its supporters as well.

The Times can be especially proud of its distinguished columnist Arthur Krock for his timely caveat of March 1963.

Sincerely yours,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

The Case of Belize: A Problem of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the controversy between Guatemala and Great Britain over Belize, or British Honduras, is one that has existed for a long, long time. In the interest of harmony in the hemisphere, this problem should be disposed of through prompt and peaceable negotiation. I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Diario Las Americas, March 7, 1963, on this subject:

THE CASE OF BELIZE: A PROBLEM OF AMERICA

The American Republics have the obligation to fully back Guatemala's just claims against England for the latter's occupation of what is known as Belize, or British Honduras.

As it is known, England arbitrarily exercises jurisdiction over that piece of Guatemalan soil, a territory of approximately 23,000 square kilometers and a population of 90,000. In the course of over a century, different Guatemalan administrations have made demands to England in this connection, without the erstwhile all powerful Great Britain, once the owner of a vast empire, yielding to the call of justice to return Belize to the Guatemalan people. It is good to recall that the generosity of those Guatemalans was made evident when, during the Second World War, while England struggled together with other nations against push of Nazi-Fascist totalitarianism, they temporarily stopped their replevin action, in a gesture the London statesmen failed to appraise in all its noble meaning.

In this dispute Guatemala has with England, in defense of her national sovereignty, all of Central America has supported the opinion that Belize is Guatemalan soil, and all America expressed its concern and hope that England would solve this matter of justice upon the approval of the 19th resolution of the second meeting of consultation of American Foreign Ministers, held in Havana in 1940, which expresses the earnest hope and the good wishes of the countries of America in favor of a just, peaceful, and prompt solution of the problem of Belize between Guatemala and Great Britain.

There is no doubt possible, therefore, that America officially recognized the existence of a dispute which England arbitrarily insists on denying, to say the least. And America, in solidarity with Guatemala, in fulfillment of its historic destiny, should support in the proper manner the small Central American Republic object of a sustained injustice by England, an injustice that implies the military and civil occupation of a piece of Guatemalan territory.

In the same manner in which other administrations have done it, the present Government of Guatemala has insisted on the claim, and it is necessary that America as a whole stand behind that replevin action, the triumph of which would be the triumph of justice and of a well understood international coexistence.

Effect of Increase in the Importation of Woolen Textile Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the woolen textile industry of the United States has distinguished itself over the past several months by an extraordinary degree of patience. In spite of solemn assurances of meaningful assistance which would stem the ever-increasing tide of woolen textile imports, the year 1962 saw a 78-percent increase in importation of wool products over the 1961 level. The share of the U.S. market taken over by foreign producers has increased drastically.

A statement adopted last week by the Board of Directors of the Northern Textile Association puts the entire matter in focus, and in order that all of my colleagues in the Congress may become familiar with the situation, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TEXT OF THE STATEMENT UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION

We have been encouraged by the President's obvious grasp of the nature of the textile import problem, and are conscious of the efforts made by the administration to deal with a problem which adversely affects not only New England and the South, but wool- and cotton-growing areas of the West and urban apparel centers.

During the first month of the present administration, a direct and forthright approach was adopted in establishing a Cabinet committee, followed by the announcement in May of 1961 of a program that encompassed all fiber branches of the industry.

The first international cotton arrangement was completed in July of 1961, and a second early last year. Both provide means for preventing market disruption by the limitation of imports.

Although it was agreed that these arrangements would be followed promptly by action to restrain imports of textiles made of wool and other fibers, nothing has been accomplished, no international conference to restrain imports has been called, and no steps for control by the United States have been developed.

Meanwhile, imports of wool products in 1962 rose 78 percent over the level of 1961, and manmade textile imports rose 39 percent. An additional 18 wool mills closed in 1962, and the share of the U.S. market taken by foreign goods has increased by over 40 percent.

Direct appeal to the administration by Members of Congress and the industry to carry out the textile program have been to no avail. The program has continued to drift, jobs have continued to disappear, and conflict between agencies of Government grow. The program announced by the President appears to be more dependent for its implementation upon the whims and changing policies of foreign governments than upon domestic direction. Our own Government delays as a major American industry is eroded.

This situation is known to textile producers and textile workers, to apparel manufacturers and apparel workers, and to wool growers throughout the country.

With a deep sense of responsibility to the employees and people in the communities where textile and apparel plants are located, to those who produce the fibers we use, and to those in the Congress who have worked for a solution of this problem, the Board of Directors of the Northern Textile Association calls this ominous situation to the attention of the public and to those members of Government who are unaware of the situation or whose opposition to the clear intention of the President has contributed to this crisis.

New Way of Celebrating the Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I heed the suggestion of Mr. George E. McQuaid, of Los Angeles, and insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent article appearing in the This Week magazine.

This extremely interesting article suggests a unique new way of celebrating our national holiday on July 4 and further commemorating the signing of the Declaration of Independence on that memorable date in 1776.

I believe every American should read this inspiring article—and perhaps the idea suggested in it may prove to be the symbol of national strength and unity we need so badly in these difficult times.

The article follows:

This is the story of two This Week readers and an idea which we believe can sweep the country, stir a new wave of patriotic feeling and turn this Fourth of July into the most inspiring celebration in our Nation's history. We are sure all This Week readers will be interested in it. Here is the idea:

On July 4, 1963, and each year thereafter, all church bells, all bells in Government buildings, and all carillon bells in colleges and universities will ring for 4 minutes in every part of the country. Every radio station will broadcast the sound of bells for 2

minutes, followed by a reading from the Declaration of Independence.

The idea's proponents are a pair of Connecticut Yankees with a lifelong interest in the American heritage—Eric Hatch, a distinguished writer, many of whose stories have appeared in This Week, and Eric Sloane, a meteorologist, artist and writer who is an expert on early American barns, covered bridges, and tools.

HEARTBEAT OF THE NATION

Since it is fitting that the Nation's birthday be celebrated where it began, Hatch and Sloane suggest that a special ceremony be televised from Philadelphia, in front of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, and that across the Nation the bells ring out at this same moment.

As the great chorus of bells swells across the land, it will be heard by families at home, on the lakeshore, in the mountains, wherever Americans gather on the Fourth. The sound will come as a thrilling reminder of what the Fourth of July stands for, challenging each of us to remember the heroic resolve formed by the men who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor 187 years ago.

July of 1776 saw the Declaration of Independence, democracy's greatest manifesto, approved by the Continental Congress. Delegate John Adams went to his Philadelphia boarding house and penned a letter to his wife Abigail, in Massachusetts:

"I am apt to believe," he wrote of the great event in which he had taken part, "that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires and illuminations from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore."

Perhaps a little of the noble grandeur that John Adams felt has been dulled in our hearts by the passage of time. The Fourth of July has evolved into more of a summer holiday than a patriotic festival and "games" and "sports" have taken over perhaps a little too much of the stage. The "illuminations"—or fireworks, were a dominant Fourth of July sound for decades, but have largely disappeared. The bells, which John Adams also mentions, Sloane and Hatch now propose reviving as a uniting feature of the whole day—much like the national observance of 2 minutes of silence at 11 a.m. on Veterans Day.

SPIRIT OF THE FIRST FOURTH

Adams wrote of an Independence celebration "from one end of this continent to the other," at a time when the newborn Republic scarcely penetrated beyond the Appalachian Mountains, when the whole West was a wilderness whose title was in the hands of Britain and Spain. Alaska belonged to Russia, and Hawaii had not even been discovered. Today, the grandeur of the Independence Day he envisioned should certainly be remembered.

What can you do to help bring about a truly reverent and patriotic Fourth?

Writers Sloane and Hatch appointed themselves a committee. They obtained the endorsement of Gov. John N. Dempsey and Senator Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut. Here's how you can get the project started in your community:

First, organize your local committee. Get support from interested groups such as historical societies, veterans' organizations, civic, labor, church, and educational groups. Then find the bells. A good one to start with is your own church bell. Speak to your pastor. Make a survey of other bells in your community. Get local newspapers and TV and radio stations enthusiastic about the program.

A good time for the celebration might be 2 p.m., eastern daylight time, in Philadelphia and progressively earlier westward across the country. Get started now so that freedom's bells will ring out loud and clear in 1963.

What's Wrong With Our Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the professional educators and those exponents of control of education are always telling our citizens that what is needed is more money and a curriculum directly from Washington. In yesterday's Washington Evening Star a very refreshing viewpoint was expressed by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, whose article is well worth reading:

GET NEW TEXTBOOKS, AMERICA—RETURN TO STANDARDS OF OLD IS URGED; PATRIOTISM, HEROISM, MORAL TEACHING

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

If we can ever cure the asininities of the look-say method of teaching reading, which has condemned many hundreds of thousands of young Americans to word guessing, it will be time to start in on the content of grade school textbooks.

These beautifully printed and illustrated books include texts so remarkable for their dullness that it is little wonder Young America can hardly wait to get back to the TV. Most of them have been steamcleaned of every vestige of excitement, of inspiration and romance.

There is no reference to God or religion. This is regarded as controversial. There is no story of war. If we don't think about it, maybe it will go away. There is nothing that would give rise to patriotism. How old fashioned.

I have before me a fifth grade reader, "Days and Deeds" published last year by Scott, Foresman & Co. and standard in many hundreds of American school systems.

With a puerile vocabulary it discusses such things as Uncle Lem's new outboard motor, John's lawn-mowing business, and how Wally, the bloodhound, helped Jerry, the police dog, find his missing bone.

I have also before me a reprint of "McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader" published in 1879. Let's skip through the list of contents:

"The Relief of Lucknow," London Times. "Battle of Blenheim" by Southey. "Sands of Dee" by Charles Kingsley. "An Old-Fashioned Girl" by Louisa May Alcott. An account of a riot in the Massachusetts State Prison. Supposed speech of John Adams by Daniel Webster. Excerpts from "The Virginian" by Thackeray" and from "Hamlet." "Disseration on Roast Pig" by Charles Lamb. "A Frigate Chase in the English Channel" by James Fenimore Cooper. "The Boston Massacre" by Bancroft. "No Excellence Without Labor" by William Wirt. "Religion, the Only Basis of Society" by William Channing.

Blood and thunder? Plenty of it. Heroism? Of course. Moral homilies? In profusion. Religious preachments? Unashamed. Patriotism? With pride. And in addition tough words and involved sentences that would flabbergast the fifth-grader who has been brought up on the thin consomme of today's "Days and Deeds" series.

On June 20, 1961, Dr. Max Rafferty, school superintendent of La Canada, Calif., made a speech that caused a sensation and resulted in his election last fall as California Superintendent of Public Instruction over the dead bodies of the progressive educators. He asked: "What happened to patriotism?" and I quote:

"We have been so busy educating for 'life adjustment' that we forgot to educate for survival. Words that America had treasured as a rich legacy, that had sounded like trumpet calls above the clash of arms and the fury of debate, we allowed to fade from the classrooms.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable * * *."

"We have met the enemy and they are ours * * *."

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Search for these towering phrases in vain today in too many of our schools. The golden words are gone. Patriotism feeds on hero-worship and we decided to abolish heroes.

The quest for the Golden Fleece has been crowded out by the visit of Tom and Susan to the zoo. The deeds of the heroes before Troy are now passé, and the peregrinations of the local milkman as he wends his way among the stodgy streets of Blah City have taken over. Bobby and Betty pursue this insipid goal of a ride in the district garbage truck while the deathless ride of Paul Revere goes unsung.

For Roland at Roncesvalles we have substituted Muk-Muk, the Eskimo boy. It is, I think, significant, that education during the past three decades has deliberately debunked the hero to make room for the jerk.

No wonder these heroless American kids often broke down before the Red brainwashers in the Korean prison camps. They had no points of reference. They had no understanding of the traditions of liberty. In many cases, the Communists were delighted that there was so little to erase. It was a cinch to unteach those who had never been taught.

In commenting on a modern sixth reader, "Bright Peaks," put out by Houghton Mifflin, Dr. Russell Kirk says: "With the exception of a poem by Sara Teasdale, another short poem by Robert Frost, and an autobiographical piece by John Muir, every selection is by a fourth- or fifth- grade writer."

Why? Could it be that the fifth and sixth graders can't read the classics as they did in the days of McGuffey? Could it be that the bankruptcy of the look-say method and the stubborn refusal of many school administrations to admit the error have required them to pretend that there is special virtue in extending kindergarten-style reading to the upper grades?

It's time America got a new set of textbooks. It's time we quit boring bright students to death with the banalities of John and Jane visiting the henhouse. It's time we put romance and courage and excitement and some frank moral indoctrination before our children in their most impressionable years.

We don't have to go back to McGuffey.

There's plenty of good writing. But let's give our children some literary taste, some ethical calories and patriotic vitamins.

To hell with these sawdust sandwiches.

Right Kind of Legislation Will Make Agriculture Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, William J. Kuhfuss, president of the Illinois Agriculture Association, recently said:

The direction of national farm programs should be toward maintaining a market price economy in agriculture and not toward ever-increasing Government regulation.

His speech was the subject of a timely and well-presented editorial in the Quincy Herald-Whig.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, Mar. 6, 1963]

AGRICULTURE'S ROLE

The role of agriculture in the Nation's economy was put into sharper focus late last week by William J. Kuhfuss, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, when he spoke at a convention of the Illinois Vocational Association in Chicago.

He emphasized that management decisions must be made by individual farmers and not by the Federal Government if the future of American agriculture is to remain bright.

There are those who disagree with the stands that have been taken by the Farm Bureau for greater freedom for farmers, freer competition under which agriculture would be left more on its own to respond to the market price system. But Kuhfuss, citing the importance of agriculture and the preeminence of American agriculture in the world, built a good case for fewer controls.

"Our agriculture," he said, "is the envy of the Communist world. As a matter of fact the farm systems of the Communist world are good examples of how futile it is to depend upon Government directives instead of individual initiative.

"The direction of national farm programs should be toward maintaining a market price economy in agriculture and not toward ever-increasing Government regulation. That is why the farm bureau has opposed and will continue to oppose the present supply management concept of the present Secretary of Agriculture."

Backing his point, Kuhfuss reminded that a century ago 85 percent of the population was engaged in farming while now the farm population is less than 8 percent of the total, and that less than 4 percent of the Nation's population actually produces some 87 percent of the Nation's food and fiber.

Despite the small agricultural population, however, Kuhfuss said it is highly important for the jobs it creates, as well as for the food it produces. About 40 percent of employed people, he declared, now work either in agriculture or in businesses and industries related to agriculture.

He cited as examples the fact that farm people buy 13 percent of the Nation's petroleum products, which is more than any other single industry; some 8 percent of rubber; twice as much steel as the railroads, and use more electricity than Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit and Houston—all combined.

One might suggest that it is the smaller farmer who fears the free marketplace concept. Farmers of this type fear that under an agriculture freed of restraints and supports, the 4 percent of the population Kuhfuss says now produces some 87 percent of all food and fiber would produce about 100 percent of it.

But one cannot deny that free American agriculture became the world's best, nor deny Mr. Kuhfuss' declaration that the right kind of farm legislation would encourage freedom to adjust to ever-changing needs, resulting in an aggressive and progressive agriculture such as has helped so much in making America strong and prosperous.

The Mind Reels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a $99 billion budget, over 50 percent of which is allocated to defense, we do have items of substantial interest that add to the taxpayers' burden without any practical justification.

In a consistent fashion, the General Accounting Office attempts to control the inefficiency inherent in a huge Government operation.

The Chicago Sun-Times in its editorial of today, March 12, discusses the struggle of this agency to protect the taxpayer's dollar. This informative editorial deserves attention, and I place it into the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Mar. 12, 1963]

THE MIND REELS

The way of a Government agency with a dollar is a wondrous thing to behold—if you happen not to be a taxpayer.

The watchdog of the taxpayer's pocket, the General Accounting Office under Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, is the authority for the following brief notations of waste and general inefficiency in the stewardship of the taxpayer's money by the military.

Item: The project to build a nuclear-powered aircraft languished for 15 years at a total cost of $1 billion. No aircraft had been built when the program terminated.

The GAO did find that $17,147,000 had been spent to construct facilities that were used but little. Another $2,953,000 was spent for design and related work and never used. There were grave deficiencies in administration and a distinct lag in the making of vital decisions during the life of the program.

Item: In order to satisfy the Department of the Air Force the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercially owned facilities.

Cost to the taxpayer: $10,300,000 more than if similar Government facilities had been used. There was no evidence that the Air Force had made any cost comparisons before granting the contracts.

Item: The Government incurred unnecessary costs of $5 million to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other vehicles because the Army had allowed these tracks to deteriorate in storage.

Item: The Corps of Engineers (Army) had spent $575,000 to purchase 925 25-horsepower outboard motors and had plans to buy another 553 25-horsepower outboard motors for $321,000. The Army had in depot stock at least 1,400 such motors that had never been used. The new purchases were intended to replace these unused motors.

President Kennedy has challenged those who criticize his budget to show where cuts can be made. It seems odd that he must ask. The GAO sends the President a copy of every one of its reports.

How To Reduce the World's Largest Budget—United States Loses $250 Million Annually on Electronic Computer Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, a minimum of $250 million could be saved annually in the totally irresponsible, uncoordinated leasing of electronic computer systems by the various Federal agencies.

At least five authoritative Federal official studies and reports have proven that massive savings could be realized by the outright purchase of electronic computer systems in place of the prevalent leasing arrangements.

As of June 30, 1963, a total of 1006 electronic data processing machines will have been installed. Despite the proven recommendations and experience that enormous savings are realized under outright purchases, 867 or 86 percent of Federal computer systems were, or will be, leased instead of purchased.

Based upon a detailed study of 523 of the 1,006 computer systems, $148 million could be saved over a 5-year period by the purchase instead of the present leasing contracts. In addition to these savings averaging $29.6 million per year, $105 million could be saved annually after the 5-year period by outright purchase of these 523 systems.

Another $100 million per year could be saved by purchase procurement instead of leasing contracts on the remaining 483 computer systems, and upon excessive overcharges for maintenance contracts on the 1,006 electronic computer systems.

Another $50 million per year could be saved by the purchase instead of the rental of electronic equipment used in classified military, intelligence, surveillance operations; by advertised competitive low bidding; by coordinated Federal volume discount purchases.

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1963, the General Accounting Office (GAO), under the direction of the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, issued an investigative and audit report entitled "Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government."

This report is a shocking indictment of our system of Federal procurement of electronic equipment. It reflects a complete breakdown of managerial and ad-

ministration accountability for public funds.

Although the Budget Bureau requirement states that Federal agencies should purchase electronic equipment if rental charges exceed purchase and maintenance costs over a 6-year period, our Federal officials continue to lease nearly all needed equipment. Under the Budget Bureau regulations, each agency is permitted to avoid purchasing where, in its discretion, there may be anticipated changes in data processing requirements.

The intent of the Budget Bureau purchase regulations is continually being violated by our Federal procurement officials.

Mr. Speaker, For specific examples of gross incompetence, maladministration and mismanagement of public trust, I quote from the Comptroller General's report of March 6, 1963:

According to the inventory of the Bureau of the Budget, by June 1963, there will be 42 IBM 7090 and IBM 7094 systems in Federal usage. Of these, 6 are to be purchased and 36 are to be leased.

Total estimated savings of $57,449,000 could be achieved over an initial 5-year period of use through purchasing rather than leasing these 36 systems. It shows also that estimated savings for each year of continued use past this period would be $34,378,000.

Thus if these systems were purchased, rather than rented, and used for 7 years, the Government would realize savings of approximately $126,200,000.

* * * * *

According to the Budget Bureau, there will be 16 IBM 7080 systems in use by June 30, 1963. Of these, 1 is to be purchased and 15 are to be leased.

Estimated savings of $24,413,000 could be realized over an initial 5-year period through purchasing and there would be additional savings of $11,778,000 for each year past this period.

If used for a total of 7 years, the purchase of the 15 systems would produce estimated savings of $47,696,000.

* * * * *

We believe the Government could save hundreds of millions of dollars in the next several years as a result of the financial benefits of purchasing.

The Air Force was leasing 36 IBM 650 systems. The rentals range from $4,200 to $23,000 per month. Eight of the nine components could have been purchased for approximately the cost of 1 year's rental; purchasing would have saved $146,000 over the intended period of use.

Mr. Speaker, the audit report of the Comptroller General states that both rental prices and purchase price of electronic computer systems are set by the manufacturers and are not negotiated by our Federal agencies.

Similarly, the maintenance contracts are accepted by our agencies without negotiation.

The Federal Government is at the mercy of electronic computer manufacturers. The uncoordinated separate procurement of electronic computer equipment by each Federal agency loses for the Government huge annual savings that would accrue from volume purchase discounts.

Mr. Speaker, the whole fabric of our electronic computer systems procurement is tainted with irregularity, illegality, incompetence and mismanagement.

The Need for Development of Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current interest and discussion of the mining industry and the need for greater development of our natural resources, I submit for the RECORD an article on the subject written by Mr. R. J. Bruning, columnist for several Idaho newspapers, containing remarks of Mr. Roger V. Pierce of Salt Lake City, who is the president of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers. It is an informative and interesting article, and I recommend it for reading by all who are concerned with the Nation's mineral policies. The column follows:

STREAM OF THOUGHT

(By R. J. Bruning)

When Roger V. Pierce, of Salt Lake City, took over as president of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers this week, he made some observations about government and world mineral policies that apply not only to minerals but in part to the lumber industry as well.

Because these two industries are so important in north Idaho's economy, they are worth heeding.

Especially are they worth heeding in light of the fact that a year ago this month a representative of the State Department told an audience in Coeur d'Alene that north Idaho should, in effect, write off mining and lumbering as the backbone of its economy.

At the time the State Department official spoke, the administration was working for passage of its trade program, which permitted this Government to slash tariffs in an effort to aline itself with the Common Market.

As we see now, the Common Market is not the all-embracing program the administration then thought it would be—at least not for the time being. With England excluded from the Common Market, the United States has had to revise its foreign trade goals.

Nevertheless, the administration's emphasis has been on foreign trade—even to the point of permitting imports to hurt domestic production. The lumber industry learned this month, for example, it can expect no tariff protection from the administration. The lead-zinc industry learned that some years ago, under a different administration.

"Many nations," Pierce observed, "utilize what mineral resources they possess as instruments of foreign policy, while the U.S.A., with its substantial mineral wealth, generally does not. We are, therefore, deeply concerned with the continued advancement of the American mineral technology in view of these world events.

"Where world conflict, instability and chaos should raise its fearsome head, the West must have the engineers and the technological know-how to mobilize the minerals resource base so that our civilization can go forward, unscarred. The cry is regularly heard, the warning flags are up. Too few engineers are in the colleges today, to meet the requirements of any such future mobilization or the civil needs of a decade or two hence."

By neglecting our mining industry today, we double and triple the effects any crisis has on our ability to supply this country with vital metals and minerals.

Mines are not developed overnight, ore reserves cannot be summoned up on a moment's notice. It takes years of exploration and development work is neglected if the mining industry lacks the price incentive to go ahead with such costly programs.

Pierce also makes another observation worthy of study. Pointing out the AIME is greatly concerned with the conservation of minerals and metals resources, he says:

"True conservation, of course, is concerned with both efficient extraction and production as well as intelligent end use. It does not embody 'non-use' or locking up of mineral wealth in any shape or form from use by man * * * How wasteful it would be for man not to bend every technological effort to achieve the most efficient and effective development of the great natural resources of the world."

The mining industry is concerned, not only with foreign imports of lead and zinc and attempts to lockup natural resources in wilderness areas, but also by administration policy regarding stockpile metals.

Efforts are being made in some quarters to have the Government release these stockpiles. The result would be ruinous to an already badly crippled mining industry.

The stockpiles represent one isolated instance of the Government using its mineral wealth as an instrument of foreign policy. These metals were purchased and stockpiled for two reasons—to provide the Government with a reserve in the event of an emergency, and to bolster the price of the metals in an effort to keep mines operating, also in the event of an emergency.

Pierce has developed a good argument for the natural resources industries of the Nation.

His words should be studied by the administration, by the Congress, and especially by the residents of north Idaho, who are so deeply concerned.

A Plus for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the record-breaking flight of the Air Force transport plane from the Philippines to McGuire Air Force Base was, as the Newark Star Ledger points out in the following editorial, "a vivid demonstration of how far aviation has advanced in this air age." The editorial of February 25, 1963, reads as follows:

A PLUS FOR US

The outer edges of the world shrink ever closer as modern aviation demonstrates a striking ability to move planes faster and stay in the air for longer periods.

In a tranquil world, this could be a blessing.

In a world beset by hot and cold wars, it could be a curse.

A vivid demonstration of how far aviation has advanced in this air age was the flight of a military jet transport plane that came down at McGuire Air Force Base, capping a direct route from the Philippines, a distance of 9,868 miles, in 15 hours and 22 minutes.

The big plane averaged 642 miles an hour and was able to pass up a normal refueling in California because of favorable tail winds.

This Nation's capacity to move troops and materials swiftly for long distances, if viewed from another angle, could be a blessing. It has obvious value as a deterrent, a word that is enjoying wide currency these days in military jargon. A deterrent, wisely deployed, is an effective psychological weapon in this age of thermonuclear firepower. It's a big plus for our side.

Professor Robert Rienow Comments on the Need for an American Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently suggested that Congressmen and academicians seriously consider the possibility of adapting the Scandinavian device of Ombudsman to the American political system. My remarks are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084. Distinguished political scientists are responding with considered opinions which I commend to the attention of the House.

Robert Rienow, professor of political science at the State University of New York at Albany, recently wrote me as follows:

NEED FOR AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I was, of course, pleased to hear from you; we had much in common when we were working on the conservation of waterfowl.

I think your motion about the Ombudsman moves in a highly commendable direction. I would have some reservations, however, to the emphasis you give in this proposal to the relief of Congressmen from some of their chores. Do you not probably run the risk of making a "fixer" out of the Ombudsman whose scorecard of favors secured is his highest recommendation? I recognize you are using this activity as a selling point but I had always understood that the Ombudsman was an independent agent who policed the bureaucracy against injustices perpetrated on citizens. Some of this traditional flavor persists in your proposal, but I believe we had better ponder carefully what type of intervention had best be entrusted to this official. It is, of course, just conceivable that those activities not appropriate for the Ombudsman ought not to be undertaken by anyone.

I share with you a strong concern that the citizen may be engulfed by the very bureaucratic machinery he has set up for his own welfare. There are two objectives here and I think they are of a different order: the first is the frequent need for expediting favorable action, and the second is the more critical demand for a reversal of judgment and the correction of injustice. The distinction here is not always clear cut, but I should not like to see an Ombudsman leading a chamber of commerce delegation to the Department of Defense in the hope of snatching a contract.

Perhaps all my doubts could be met by a carefully phrased congressional charter creating the office. Anyway, I shall continue thinking about it. The project deserves all the attention it can be given.

ROBERT RIENOW,
Professor of Political Science.

Applaud New Academic Atmosphere at Northwestern University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues today an excellent article which appeared in the March 3 edition of the Chicago Tribune applauding the high academic atmosphere at Northwestern University.

I am particularly happy to call this article to the attention of my colleagues because it demonstrates the high academic standards which are being developed at universities in the Chicago area. It is these high standards which I am confident are going to help make Chicago the great intellectual center of America.

The Chicago Tribune is to be congratulated for giving the universities in the Chicago area the proper national recognition which they so richly deserve.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 3, 1963]

APPLAUD NEW ACADEMIC ATMOSPHERE AT N.U.—SERIOUSNESS OF STUDENTS IS PRAISED

(By Clay Gowran)

The picture of Northwestern University gained from some of its officers and faculty members is that of a fine school which is getting even better.

President J. Roscoe Miller within the last few days has told Northwestern alumni during a swing along the west coast of "a new kind of academic atmosphere, a new sense of scholarly purpose" at his institution on Evanston's lakefront.

ELIMINATE NARROW COURSES

Payson S. Wild, vice president and dean of faculties, described in an interview the reemphasis on liberal arts courses for all Northwestern undergraduates, regardless of their specialties, and the elimination of many narrow technical courses.

Jeremy R. Wilson, assistant director of admissions and financial aid secretary of the university, spoke of the improvement in caliber of undergraduate students coming to Northwestern, as indicated by a consistent upward trend in test scores.

Dr. Edmund Perry, associate professor and chairman of the department of history and literature of religions, talked of the new type of students he and his colleagues have noticed on the campus—"An intellectual vanguard which is a challenge to us, and the most encouraging thing I've seen in my whole teaching career."

MOST FROM TOP QUARTER

The warmest statements about Northwestern's intellectual growth were those of Miller—in the talk prepared for the west coast alumni—and Wild.

In his prepared talk, Dr. Miller states that students who compose Northwestern's present freshman class come almost without exception from the top quarter of their high school classes.

"These are serious students, and this is a challenge to us, for we must provide them with the continued intellectual stimulation they deserve," he says.

STUDENTS MORE DEDICATED

Among the signs of intellectual growth Miller sees are "long lines of students waiting to use library facilities * * * dedication of attention to serious discussion outside the classroom * * * a decreasing emphasis on social activities * * * a new type of social activity which is identified with social service problems in various areas."

Dean Wild, who was a professor of government and dean of the graduate school of arts and sicences at Harvard University before he came to Northwestern in 1949, used the words of another professor in giving his estimation of Northwestern's academic standing.

"R. Barry Farrell, associate professor of political science here now, came to us from the faculty of Yale University some years ago," said Wild. "He has said that the top two-thirds of our students here at Northwestern are as good as Yale students, with the bottom third a bit lower.

"RATES THEM WITH HARVARD

"I'd say what Farrell has said. I see young people come to Northwestern each year, and I'd rate the thoughtful ones we get with those I had at Harvard."

Dean Wild told of the reemphasis of liberal arts courses for all students, a change conceived in 1952 and introduced in 1954.

"Northwestern has seven undergraduate schools—liberal arts, business, education, journalism, music, speech, and our technological institute," he said. "Nevertheless, although there are these seven doors leading to a bachelor degree, all involve liberal arts studies, and heavily.

"For instance, 82 percent of the work in journalism consists of liberal arts courses, and two-thirds of the work in the school of education. We've done away with a lot of the narrow technical courses in the various fields of specialization, and brought back liberal arts work. It is the core of all Northwestern undergraduate education, and I think it has brought about quite an upturn in the quality of that education."

GET TOP PROFESSORS

Dean Wild also mentioned, and with obvious pride, that Northwestern undergraduates—even the greenest freshmen—are exposed in classes to the university's topflight professors, and not just instructors and graduate assistants, as in some schools.

"We expect all of our professors to teach at both the undergraduate and graduate level, so our undergraduates have the opportunity to come into contact with our best and most senior professors," said Wild. "We don't believe in first-class and second-class faculties."

Wilson gave a picture of the upturn in Northwestern undergraduates, as evidenced by verbal and mathematical scores in the college board scholastic aptitude test which has been required of all candidates for admission since 1957.

GIVES SOME STATISTICS

That year, he said, Northwestern's entering freshmen class in liberal arts had an average of 519 (out of a possible 800) in the verbal S.A.T. and 514 (out of a possible 800) in the mathematical S.A.T. The present freshman class in liberal arts, he said, had a verbal average of 587, and a mathematical average of 615. He said averages for the six other schools varied up and down from that of liberal arts which, with about 850 freshmen, has about half of the 1,709 freshmen in the class of 1966.

"The average liberal arts freshman this year was at the 13 percent mark in his high school, as far as academic standing," Wilson said. "Only 2.9 percent of liberal arts freshmen came from the lower half of their high school classes, and most of these were from

private schools which were extremely selective in their choice of students."

Wilson emphasized, however, that Northwestern has no "cutoff point," below which it will not consider a student. He asserted that test scores are only one measure of a student's ability to benefit from, and contribute to, a Northwestern education. He called attention to the fact that the test averages he disclosed were for liberal arts only, and said: "Nothwestern has seven undergraduate schools, which appeal to students with a variety of abilities and talents."

Dr. Perry, 39, took his doctoral degree at Northwestern, and then taught at Duke University in Durham, N.C., for 4 years before joining the NU faculty. In his classes, he said, he deals with undergraduates from all schools and from all yearly levels, and he said his courses are considered rigorous ones.

DEGREE WAS PASSPORT

"Ten years ago, many students at Northwestern were like terrapins," he asserted. "If you tried to get close to a student then, to his mind and his thought, he withdrew, as a terrapin draws into its shell if you get close to it. The student then was quite content to come to lectures and listen, then feed back the information given him. But he was not interested in seeking out professors as persons, in getting to know them, in finding out what had interested them in their subjects, and why they had chosen their fields for their lives.

"Ten years ago, the student was not nearly so much concerned with real information, and with originality. Education was a passport, a degree was a union card.

"But today, with the good student, it's entirely different. He is analytical of everything. He is not satisfied to be given a cyclopedic knowledge of several subjects; he wants to know, 'How do I fit all this together, and how does all this enable me to relate better to other human beings?'

"He is not primarily concerned with an education as a means to professional success, but more with what it can contribute to him as a person who must relate to others with different backgrounds and cultures. And these good students have the kind of analytical facilities to spot phoniness a mile off. They are not going to, for instance, be taken in by communism, any more than by the John Birchers. I'd be willing to turn this group loose in Russia, and I'd bet they would make more of a dent in the Communist mentality than it would make on theirs.

"I've noticed this intellectual vanguard over the last 5 years, and it is growing. I see about 400 students in my classes, and the vanguard is strong, and below it is another and growing group of better-than-average students genuinely interested and striving enthusiastically."

Political Salesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lansing State Journal of March 5 contained the following brief editorial comment, which in a very few words says an awful lot:

POLITICAL SALESMANSHIP

In his steady bombardment of Congress with proposals for ever-increasing Federal spending the President resembles the salesgirl in the candy store who always has customers lined up waiting for her while the other girls are idle.

Her secret? Simple, she explains. "The others scoop up more than a pound, then take away from it. I scoop up less than a pound, then add to it."

The President obviously is proposing much more than Congress will be disposed to grant. He knows this, but he may hope that in 1964 he'll get credit for scooping up lots of Federal goodies while Congress will get most of the blame for taking away those goodies.

Less Aid, Better Used

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid can be a strategic weapon in our battle against communism and for the extension and preservation of freedom. It can be a primary means to help underdeveloped nations help themselves to economic stability and prosperity. Or, as many of us are aware, it can be simply a drain on our own economy causing unbalanced budgets, soaring deficits, and unfavorable balance of payments. The choice belongs largely to the Congress. We have a chance this year to reevaluate the aims, effectiveness, and efficiency of our whole foreign aid program. In this connection, I would like to call my colleague attention to the following thoughtful editorial of the Christian Science Monitor:

LESS AID, BETTER USED

One of the great tides of postwar history is slowly beginning to reverse itself. The sending of massive U.S. aid into southeast Asia on an emergency basis, throwing up dikes against the outward pressure of communism, is soon to taper downward.

Reduction is to be orderly—a term given special emphasis by Senator MANSFIELD in the report of his Senate subcommittee making this recommendation. "Extreme caution," Mr. MANSFIELD says, will have to be exercised by the President, lest Congress be tempted to make a meat-ax cut and cause panic or instability in the area.

It is expected that the Clay Committee, now reviewing foreign aid, will make a similar recommendation and that David Bell, the new Administrator of AID, will be in accord.

This is a good move and it should not alarm the loyal supporters of the foreign aid principle who are veterans of many a congressional battle against the meat-ax. There are several motives for the change of direction:

It is time that well-to-do Western allies of the United States carried their share of a common load.

It is possible to reduce military supplies, now that friendly and neutral countries of southeast Asia are reasonably well armed, and to switch more to economic aid.

The postwar emergency period is now long past when the indiscriminate sluicing of aid seemed necessary. A more economical and efficiently used aid can now accomplish just as good, and probably a better, result.

Aid has been one-sided which is not a solid basis for mutual respect in the long run. More projects whose benefits spread both ways are needed.

There is reason enough in these and various other lesser motives for starting to use less aid more intelligently. But behind them all is one overriding concern which no one mentions, and which ought to be on everyone's mind.

Americans have always said they wanted to help other peoples to help themselves. This is part of the American dream, that individuals and nations should be self-reliant. No person and no nation should have its vital tasks of growth and even of defense indefinitely and preponderantly done for it. There is something debilitating about too much aid, or automatic aid, or blind giving which does not exact responsibility in return.

To say this is not to provide an excuse for coldly turning away from less fortunate peoples who are still greatly in need of many kinds of assistance. Charity is a greater duty than any selfish form of economy. But extremes of economy are not now the danger. A cautious, careful curtailment, to repeat Senator MANSFIELD's phrases, plus every effort to involve the Western allies and to turn one-sided aid into mutual exchange, will be the best way of continuing to support foreign aid.

Installation of Rector of St. John's Episcopal Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, 1963, President John F. Kennedy continued a tradition exercised by each President since Woodrow Wilson in signing a prayerbook in St. John's Episcopal Church located opposite the White House on Lafayette Square. Many past Presidents have attended St. John's and every President since President Madison has had the occasion to visit there at some time or another. Consequently St. John's has been traditionally called the Church of the Presidents.

Significantly, in conjunction with this historic visit, was the installation of a new rector of the storied church by Rt. Rev. William F. Creighton, bishop of Washington. The new rector is the Reverend John C. Harper, who, I am very honored to tell the House, was an immediate past resident of Westchester County, New York.

Reverend Harper, a native of Massachusetts, trained for the ministry at Harvard College and the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge. After service in Massachusetts parishes he was called in 1957 to be rector of St. Matthew's Church located in Bedford which is in Westchester County. Mr. Harper served his parishioners faithfully for 5½ years until called by the Vestry of the church to become rector of St. John's.

We in Westchester are sorry to lose this fine gentleman and servant of God whose presence enriched our county. However if we must lose him, we are happy that it is the Nation's Capital which shall reap the harvest of his guidance and wisdom. On behalf of my col-

leagues, whom I am sure join me, I extend a warm welcome to Reverend Harper, to his wife, the former Barbara Quarles, and to their three children. We hope theirs will be a pleasant and bountiful life enriched by service to God and their fellow man.

From Westchester a fond farewell—to the Nation's Capital—hail and a fruitful tenure.

Winston Churchill—Flowers for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that the Congress of the United States honor Sir Winston Churchill, a statesman and historian whom we admire as a citizen of the United Kingdom and as a citizen of the world.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act on this resolution while Sir Winston is still able to appreciate the receipt of American citizenship. I wish to call to the attenion of my colleagues a poem entitled "Winston Churchill—Flowers for the Living," written by Howard R. Hodson of Wakefield, Mass., which is befitting of the high esteem with which the American public places this distinguished statesman.

The poem follows:

WINSTON CHURCHILL—FLOWERS FOR THE LIVING

As the sun goes down and the curtain falls
On those tremendous days,
And the words won't come to mind or tongue
To form the fitting phrase
For the one whose voice left the world no choice
In the time of blood and tears,
For his leadership and statesmanship
In England's desperate years.
And no one is forgetting
In the eulogistic setting
Of lines devoted to the one,
The many thousand others
And those no record covers
Many a worthy father
And many a splendid son.
Here, in the Great Republic
Are those of English strain
Who respond with admiration
And then, enthuse again.
And may this modest tribute
To one who needs it not
Be added to the many
From far and wide, unsought.
The Armada, Blenheim, Waterloo
Eclipsed, it may be thought
By the fateful Battle of Britain
Where the ominous trial was wrought.
And the Captain and Commander
In fact, if not in name
Was the Gentleman from Downing Street
Who would not quit the game.
The frightened world watched anxiously
Despair yields to surprise,
And on the Day of Victory
It was the Reich's demise.
The great old man is with us
Declining, to be sure,
But his presence still reminds us
What his country could endure.
Those days of dire adversity
Of achievement and acclaim;
The man who named "Their Finest Hour,"
Will leave its greatest name.
They will lay him in the Abbey
Where else does he belong?
They will surpass encomiums
They will exhaust all song.
All honor and all tribute
That the grateful Nation knows
Will be bestowed upon him
In poetry and prose.
But if they want a tribute
The final and the best,
Take it from the vanquished foe
Who put him to the test,
For if someone would ask him
Hitler, in Hell, will say
That 'twas only Winston Churchill
Who made it end that way.
What satisfaction there must be
To envision at life's end
The Pageantry, prepared for few,
With all it does portend.
The impressive pomp and circumstance
Of funereal panoply,
The muffled drum—the cadence slow
The throngs in sympathy.
And all of those who knew him then,
In that former time
When he was not as other men,
And saw the unseen sign.
The Roll is long, and graven there
In honor and in pride
Are England's great, who in their time
Each crisis took in stride,
And measured by the task he faced
The odds to overcome,
Who, in all that Galaxy
Has higher honor won?
The mightiest military power
The world had even known
In vain against him hurled its force,
Withstood by him alone.
Let well his name remembered be
Forever by the free,
And make his best citation this
For Time and History,
"He was the Nazi's Nemesis
And his V was Victory."

—H. R. H.

Aloha From the Hawaii State Legislature to Congress and the Department of Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege in behalf of the Hawaii delegation to insert into the record a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Hawaii on February 26, 1963, sending its aloha to the Congress of the United States and to the Department of the Interior for their part in providing an appropriation of $175,000 for the restoration of the city of Refuge in recognition of the unique history of Hawaii.

The City of Refuge is located near Kealakekua on the Island of Hawaii. It is a site of great significance in the history of ancient Hawaii. The City of Refuge was a heiau or ancient Hawaiian temple which through law and custom served as a place of refuge for anyone who feared for his life or safety. It was used by the women and children, the aged and infirm during periods of war between rival aliis or chieftains as well as by persons who feared for their lives or safety at any time, whatever the cause.

The city of Refuge was an institution of ancient Hawaii; it stands as a reminder that some system of refuge and freedom from fear should exist in the modern world today, when rival chieftains of nations clash. In a way it is symbolic of this great Nation which has served as a place of refuge for the oppressed peoples of the world. The resolution follows:

THE SECOND LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

Senate Resolution 30—extending sincere appreciation and aloha to the Congress of the United States and the Department of Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the State of Hawaii possesses a history and development unlike that of other States in the United States; and

Whereas the United States of America through its Congress and its Department of Interior has seen fit to recognize this unique history; and

Whereas Congress has implemented this recognition by the appropriation of $175,000 for the restoration of the City of Refuge; and

Whereas pursuant to said appropriation, the Department of Interior through its National Park Service has begun the restoration of the historic trails and general area abounding the City of Refuge; and

Whereas this project will preserve in living form a part of the history of these isles, for the enlightenment and education of our own people as well as our visitors; and

Whereas this project is also providing employment for a great number of citizens; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963, That sincere appreciation and aloha be extended to the Congress of the United States and the Department of Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; and be it further

Resolved That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and to each of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was this day adopted by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963.

NELSON K. DOI,
President of the Senate.
SEICHI HIRAI,
Clerk of the Senate.

Representative Joe Evins Has Qualified as Workhorse Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues an article in the Nashville Ten-

nessean, written by Mr. Lois Laycock, Washington correspondent. Mr. Laycock's thoughful remarks are about an outstanding Member of Congress, the Honorable JOE EVINS, who devotes his tireless energy to his committee obligations, and to the interests of his constituents. My close personal friend and colleague is unquestionably one of the most capable and influential men in Congress.

The article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE JOE EVINS HAS QUALIFIED AS WORKHORSE CONGRESSMAN

(By Lois Laycock)

WASHINGTON.—Members of Congress usually fall into one of two categories—they're either workhorses or showhorses.

A workhorse Congressman spends most of his time attending long and grueling committee meetings, where the real work of Congress is done, and in looking after the needs of his constituents. The showhorse is more interested in making speeches and in keeping his name in the headlines.

From the standpoint of hard work and solid accomplishment, Representative JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee's Fourth District Congressman, can claim membership in the workhorse fraternity.

EVINS is not a colorful Congressman. He seldom makes a speech or a headline. Though cooperative with newspapermen, he is not an avid publicity seeker.

TENDS TO HIS WORK

But EVINS tends to his committee work. A man of restless energy, the 52-year-old Congressman puts in long hours with the House Appropriations and the Small Business Committees. He recently became chairman of the latter.

Already he has made it clear that the Small Business Committee will not engage in sensational investigations under his leadership. Instead of stressing probes of trade regulation and law enforcment against big business, EVINS intends to emphasize "positive and affirmative" steps of assisting small business.

He wants to find ways and means of helping the smalltown merchant survive.

"More and more," he said recently, "we see large chainstores moving into suburban areas and smaller communities. This expansion is a result of natural development following community development, and also because they have ready access to equity and long-term financing not available to local competitors. The Small Business Administration already is attempting to make more equity capital available to small business and we want to see what other help can be provided.

The question is how can we help small business meet this competition by providing greater amounts of equity capital and management assistance, rather than taking up specific practices in a piecemeal fashion. This is the negative approach. We must find ways to help small business meet the competition and survive.

Despite his elevation to the chairmanship of the Small Business group, EVINS expects to continue spending most of his time with the Appropriations Committee where he is an influential member of subcommittee dealing with 20 independent Government agencies and with public works money bills.

From his strategic position on the public works subcommittee, he has been able to obtain funds for numerous projects in Tennessee as well as for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"The greatest satisfaction in serving in Congress is being able to accomplish some things for Tennessee," he says. "My initial service on the Veterans' Affairs Committee was very satisfying in that we were able to do some things for the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

FOUGHT FOR TVA

"But the fight to preserve and perpetuate the TVA has been most rewarding. Though the attacks against this great agency are constant and recurring, TVA is now on a sound financial footing."

EVINS played an influential role in getting initial construction appropriations for the J. Percy Priest and Cordell Hull dams in the last Congress and expects to get considerably more money for these projects this year.

He initiated and got approved a $1 million appropriation to construct a Federal fish hatchery on Dale Hollow Lake in his district after first talking the Interior Department into recommending the site.

He recently pushed through legislation authorizing a new Federal courthouse at Winchester. He has secured appropriations for the construction of 20 new post offices in his district.

EVINS concedes that his growing seniority on the Appropriations Committee has been helpful.

"Long service in Congress affords you the opportunity to serve your people," he asserts.

EVINS has served in the House since January 1947, when he took the oath of office in what former President Truman later characterized the the 80th "Do Nothing" Congress. It may have been a do nothing Congress, but it produced some top political leaders of later years.

TOOK THE OATH

Of the freshmen Congressmen who took the oath with Evins were John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Richard M. Nixon of California, and Carl Albert of Oklahoma, now majority leader of the House.

EVINS was born into middle Tennessee politics. His maternal grandfather, the late Andrew Jackson Goodson, was postmaster of Smithville and first superintendent of education in De Kalb County.

His late father, James E. Evins, a well-to-do small businessman, was mayor of Smithville for 20 years. He served in the Tennessee Legislature and on the State Democratic Executive Committee.

The Congressman's entry into active politics, however, followed a law career and 4 years of service in World War II. While serving in the Army in Europe, he received the Democratic nomination for the State Senate but turned it down.

RAN FOR CONGRESS

Following the war he promptly ran for Congress in 1946 and won. He has been reelected with only token opposition for nine consecutive terms. Against Republican opposition last November, he received 88 percent of the vote despite the fact that 5 of the 23 counties in the Fourth District are almost solidly Republican.

EVINS is a graduate of Vanderbilt University and received his law degree from Cumberland. He did postgraduate work at George Washington University here.

From 1935 to 1941, EVINS was a member of the legal staff of the Federal Trade Commission, which he left to enter the Army.

He is married to the former Ann Smartt, daughter of Judge R. W. Smartt of McMinnville and the late Mrs. Smartt. They have three daughters, Mary, a seventh grade student, Janet, recent graduate of the University of Tennessee who is now a copy girl for the Washington Post, and Joanne, who is doing graduate work at Columbia University.

EVINS once had gubernatorial ambitions. However, he says that is all over now.

"My boyhood ambition was to be Governor of Tennessee but your ambitions change," he says. "I'm content where I am."

Mexican Housing Needs, Constitutional Rights and International Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the best ways we can help the Latin American peoples is in the field of housing. A good example is Mexico where there is an urgent need for housing. An article on this subject was published recently in the Mexico City Daily Bulletin by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, who is a prominent international lawyer and expert on U.S.-Mexican affairs. He lived in Mexico for many years and is a member of the Mexican Academy of International Law, as well as of the American Society of International Law, Inter-American Bar Association, International and Comparative Law Section of the American Bar Association, and other legal groups.

I am pleased to insert into the RECORD his article on Mexican housing needs, as well as two articles dealing with constitutional rights and international policy of Mexico. They are as follows:

MEXICO NEEDS HOUSING

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In "A Latin American Program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 5, 1962), I touched upon the need for housing in Latin America and made brief reference to the needs of Mexico. In "Latin America Needs Housing" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 17, 1962), I covered the subject of the housing needs of Latin America in greater detail, but limited space only permitted brief mention of Mexico.

The extremely rapid population growth in Mexico during recent years has contributed toward the creation of a very critical housing problem. From 1951 to 1960 the population of Mexico City itself rose 58 percent to approximately 5 million inhabitants. As significant as this population increase might be, it was even far less than in 54 other urban areas in Mexico where the population during the same period of time increased approximately 78 percent.

Present urban population of Mexico is almost triple that existing in 1930, whereas, rural population has increased by only 66 percent. In other words, urban population has grown from 33 to 44 percent of the total for the nation.

The tremendous population explosion in cities can be attributed mainly to the relatively great progress made in social and economic development including the substantial expansion of employment opportunities in urban areas.

It has been estimated by the Bank of Mexico that in 1960, approximately 84 percent of families in Mexico lived in only one or two rooms each. According to the 1950 census less than 20 percent of the housing units in Mexico had walls of adequate materials, while over 80 percent of the housing units were of below standard construction. To bring the seriousness of this critical housing situation into sharper focus, it should be pointed out that almost half of the houses covered by the above-indicated census had walls of adobe or mud.

Very conservative estimates would indicate the need of well over 1 million new housing units and a thorough reconditioning or reconstruction of at least another million units. Just to keep up with the requirements of population growth, Mexico must construct at least 200,000 housing units per year, with approximately 140,000 of same in urban areas. Insofar as public and private construction has been at the rate of 30,000 to 50,000 units a year, the urban housing gap alone is growing by approximately 100,000 housing units annually.

This annual deficit will result in a continuous increase in the existing deficit, resulting from the more than 2 million homes which have to be built or rebuilt to meet present needs.

It should be of some interest to note what has been done or is being done to alleviate the urgent need for more homes in Mexico. In line with this need, over 30 years ago the Mexican Government, in a move to attempt to assist in financing private housing, especially in urban areas, authorized the establishment of mortgage banks, which gather savings and channel them toward the financing of construction.

In 1946, through modification of the existing law, the creation of private banks specializing in housing was encouraged. More recently, a law was enacted authorizing individual apartment ownership in apartment buildings. To date the private housing industry has shown a preference for construction of commercial buildings and luxury apartments rather than low cost houses.

Accordingly, luxury apartments have tended to saturate the market in cities as Mexico City, while the overall housing problem resulting from the acute shortage of low cost dwellings tends to grow more critical with the passage of time.

With reference to public housing, the Government has attempted to meet the housing needs of the lowest income groups and provide housing for families of limited resources through various official organizations in which there is state participation.

These include the Instituto de Seguridad y Servicios Sociales de los Trabajadores del Estado, which is responsible for the pension funds for Government workers, and has invested a substantial amount in housing especially for civil servants.

The Mexican Social Security Institute, which is in charge of the social security program, has channeled some of its funds into housing for workers.

The National Housing Institute (Instituto Nacional de la Vivienda) was created in 1954 to coordinate the efforts of public agencies, municipalities and private institutions in the construction of low and middle income housing.

It obtains funds from the Federal Government budget and the National Urban Mortgage and Public Works Bank (Banco Nacional Hipotecairo Urbano y de Obras Públicas) as well as from bonds which certain financial institutions are required to purchase in specific amounts.

This bank financed the construction of almost 12,000 houses from 1933 to 1958, and as indicated, it has also participated actively with the other official institutions in financing their housing programs.

The Government of Mexico fully recognizes the urgent priority of the housing problem and plans to increase its financial contribution. In the past 3 years, only approximately 3 percent of total Federal expenditures were directed toward housing. The Government reports that it is necessary to intensify the programs now in existence and that official construction programs are expected to include about 12,000 units per year by 1964 which will be a vast increase over past official construction programs.

CONCLUSION

Private mortgage institutions were recently required to give preference to construction of medium and low-cost housing, with the purpose of benefiting families of modest resources. In addition, limits have been placed on the use of resources by these mortgage institutions to finance commercial buildings and luxury residences.

The Mexican Government petroleum agency (Petróleos Mexicanos) has developed a plan by which its employees will be able to obtain home construction loans, and over 30,000 plantworkers employed by the petroleum industry throughout Mexico will be eligible for participation in this program. In addition, the Secretary of Defense spent close to $3½ million in the last 3 years for construction of housing for military personnel and the National Urban Mortgage Bank has established a credit of $8 million to construct approximately 1,000 homes for army personnel.

The Mexican Social Security Institute has also greatly expanded its activities in the housing field. In 1959 and 1960, it constructed the independence project with 2,500 housing units, a nursery, 2 kindergartens, 2 primary schools, and other services at a cost of approximately $12 million.

One of the most important construction projects recently undertaken in Mexico City is the Nonoalco-Tlaltelolco urban complex which has been constructed in cooperation with the State Worker Institute and private business and which will provide 15,000 apartment dwellings. The National Housing Institute also is prepared to expand its urban housing into a broader field of activity in rural regions, for which it has adopted, directed mutual-aid in which farmworkers will supply the labor.

The Mexican Congress, the later part of 1962, passed important legislation covering reforms of the general law of credit institutions and auxiliary organizations which among other things, made provisions which should be beneficial to the field of low cost house construction.

Savings institutions, savings banks, and those granting loans for housing, and investment banks with savings and loan departments, were authorized to grant mortgage loans for low cost housing for up to 80 percent of the value of the security or more if there is additional security.

These institutions are also authorized to receive deposits in special savings accounts by persons wishing to obtain a mortgage loan, and to secure the support of other organizations in order to increase their resources for operations of this type.

All these measures are designed to channel a greater amount of savings for the construction and acquisition of housing by those sectors of the population which lack adequate credits for such operations.

It has often been stated that the stanchest defender of private property and the man who can always be depended upon to oppose communism, is the man who owns his own home. He who is most susctptible to Communist propoganda is the man who cannot provide proper shelter for his family. The urgent need for low cost housing must be given No. 1 priority to remove both a source of fermentation for the Communists as well as a gross affront to human decency.

LET'S KNOW MORE ABOUT MEXICO

PART I—CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In Mexico the guarantee of the rights of the individual as provided for in the constitution of the nation consists of limitations on the power of the state by specific directives which insure due respect by the state for individual liberties. Every inhabitant of Mexico whether native or foreign is entitled to the following guarantees:

1. Personal liberty. Slavery is prohibited in Mexico.

2. Freedom of speech, except when it attacks morals or rights of third persons, leads to a crime, or disturbs the peace. Freedom to write and publish material on any subject is inviolable.

3. The right of petition, which must be respected by all state agencies. As far as political matters are concerned, this right is reserved to Mexican citizens. Every appeal is entitled to a decision by the authority to whom it was directed, and the authority is fully obligated to notify the petitioner of such decision promptly.

4. Freedom of association and assembly. Any peaceful association or assembly which is being conducted for a lawful purpose cannot be arbitrarily restrained, and any respectful gathering or assembly which formulates petitions or protests against acts by a given authority are considered as being legal.

5. Freedom to possess arms for self-defense, with the exception of those prohibited by law, or typically military weapons.

6. Free transit in the Republic or residence therein. This right extends to foreigners as well as Mexicans. Mexico does not require a security card, passport, safe conduct, or other similar requirement, with the exception of instances involving criminal, civil or administrative responsibility.

7. Personal safety, consisting in the prohibition of trial by private laws or specially formed courts to decide on individual cases, as well as complete lack of any prejudicial retroactive laws. Nobody may be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

In principle, the only penalties that can be imposed in criminal proceedings are those specifically provided for through corresponding legislation. Excessive fines may not be imposed nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

Only when a warrant is issued by appropriate authorities may a search be conducted, or control exercised over, an individual's home or property.

8. Religious liberty.

9. Inviolability of the home and the mails.

10. The freedom to own property is guaranteed, and no one may be deprived of the proceeds of his labor except by judicial decision. The penalty of confiscation is prohibited.

11. Freedom to work consists in the fact that no one may be obliged to render personal services without just compensation and under his full consent. Public services are obligatory only when so provided by law. Agreements that arbitrarily regulate human liberties are inadmissable.

General working conditions for the laboring class are basically established in Article 123: maximum 8-hour day, the particular situation of women and minors, wages, days of rest, etc.

12. Freedom for commerce and industry. The exercise of this liberty can be limited only by court order or administrative resolution.

The foregoing individual public rights are guaranteed by the amparo, a legal injunction which provides extensive protection from the state for human rights as life, liberty, etc., with provision for due reparation of whatever right may have been violated.

A traditional Mexican institution having original characteristics, the amparo is more extensive in scope than a writ of habeas corpus and other similar legal courses of action. Amparo is applied by the Federal courts of Mexico and considered to be such an excellent form of legal action that it

was incorporated in Article 8 of the United Nations Organization.

PART II—INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Although Mexico attained its independence from Spain over 150 years ago, it is actually during the last 50 years that the nation has developed an international doctrine which truly reflects the deep aspirations of the Mexican people.

Among the principles which Mexico has stood for over a period of many years, are the following:

1. Recognition of the free self-determination of peoples and inviolable respect for their sovereignty and political independence.
2. Repudiation of any form of external hegemony.
3. Preeminence of the country's political Constitution over any other internal or international statutes.
4. Acknowledgment of non-intervention and the principle of judicial equality of states as the basis for international harmony.
5. Respect for the humanitarian right of asylum.
6. Adherence to the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence among peoples.
7. Strict compliance with the U.N. Charter and with the principles of continental solidarity and cooperation as accepted within the Inter-American system.
8. Use of arbitration in settling international conflicts.
9. Recognition of the usefulness of international economic and technical cooperation on a worldwide or regional scale, as long as the foregoing principles are observed.
10. Equity in economic and commercial relations.
11. The need to expend individual and joint effort in reducing the profound inequalities existing between standards of living in underdeveloped countries and nations that are more advanced economically.

Since the end of 1958 foreign policy of Mexico has been set forth in pronouncements by President Lopez Mateos as follows:

"Mexico upholds and will continue to uphold its own doctrine with respect to international relations. We are striving to insure concord, cooperation, a just peace, nonintervention and reciprocal respect among nations.

"Mexico will assume a fair share of responsibility in the task of building a world in which peace, based on the highest moral values, will permit international cooperation to bring forth better fruit.

"Our international behavior will conform * * * to two fundamental rules: to accept nothing that will endanger our sovereignty, and to cooperate unfailingly in any effort that might serve effectively to increase harmony among the nations of the world or improve man's living conditions.

"We Mexicans do not advocate, nor have we ever done so, the application to other countries, wherever they may be, of standards we have established in our own.

"The existence of a strong and united Latin America capable of eliminating all undue causes of internal friction by undertaking remedial social action, and above all, willing to combine resources and efforts in raising the standards of living of its peoples; the existence of such a Latin America, freed from poverty, health hazards and ignorance, has become a need whose satisfaction is demanded by the entire continent.

"One of the cardinal points of my government's international policy is the strengthening of the ties that bind us to the other peoples of Latin America. We have certain affinities with them which derive from history as well as geography, plus an awareness of the common problems inherent in our economic and spiritual development.

"Economic cooperation is the sign of our times. Faced with the example of other continents which are in the process of forming vast economic units, our peoples cannot remain in a state of isolation from each other. In a few short years the majority of our countries, despite their geographic extension, may turn out to be excessively small economic units incapable of full development or providing their inhabitants with the standards of living to which they aspire.

"Our way of life, and the political institutions which are an expression of it, represent a philosophy founded on the supreme value of the human being. Americanism in humanism. We do not conceive of man as an abstraction or just another piece in the machinery of history. To us, man is a concrete reality, a being of flesh and blood who has a right to happiness on earth, to work, to eat, and to enjoy the dignity of human liberty. To strengthen our democracies, create abundance where poverty now holds sway; to improve social justice where inequality, oppression, ignorance and misery now prevail, will not only mean building a better America: the struggle will also be on behalf of the greatness of man."

Closeup of the Peace Corps 1 Year Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, every American can justly be proud of the productive, unselfish service being provided to the peoples of some 45 countries around the world by our U.S. Peace Corps volunteers. These 4,000 American volunteers—young and old alike—now serving abroad in every continent except Europe are establishing an unprecedented, exemplary record of service to their fellowmen in the underdeveloped and less-developed nations of the world. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what these Americans are doing for the peoples of other countries is unprecedented in the history of the world, and they deserve God's speed and a hearty salute from all of us.

It was just 2 years ago when President Kennedy started the Peace Corps as a pilot project, and it was a short year and a half ago, when the President signed into law the legislation establishing the Corps. Many of us were skeptical about the effectiveness and success of such a challenging enterprise, but these volunteers have proved themselves and the worthiness of their endeavor not only to our own citizens but also to the peoples of the countries with whom they are working.

Today there are more than 4,000 Americans overseas in this service, and more than 1,000 volunteers in training for assignment abroad; by the end of this year, the Peace Corps hopes to have a total of about 9,000 volunteers in training and in service abroad. At this time, Mr. Speaker, there are more than 1,500 Americans serving in Africa; over 1,700 in Latin America; more than 1,200 in the Far East, and close to 600 in the Near East and southeast Asia. Their ages range from the youngest at 18, to the eldest at 76—the latter being a civil engineer in Pakistan. And these numbers do not reveal the great response from Americans to serve in the Peace Corps—the much larger number who have applied, but for one reason or another have not been able to join.

Furthermore, the early reluctance of some nations to accept Peace Corps volunteers, to allow them to come into their lands and work with their people, has been reversed to a tremendous degree; now there are more requests from more countries for corpsmen to initiate programs for the benefit of their peoples than can be filled at this time. This fact should be most heartening to all Americans, and is certainly a tribute to the foresight and vision of President Kennedy, and to the dedication and hard work of Sargent Shriver, the members of his staff here in Washington and to all the Peace Corps volunteers at home and abroad.

What programs are those dedicated volunteers providing for some 45 nations around the world? What projects are they engaged in with the support and help of the peoples themselves? The primary program is education, in which teachers are offering instruction in a great variety of subjects, including everything from teaching English and other humanities, to instructing in modern agricultural techniques and the use of modern farm equipment. Other programs of great importance are public works projects of all kinds; agriculture and agricultural extension work; public health and sanitation, and general community development, both urban and rural.

One of the finest aspects of this service, Mr. Speaker, is that it operates on the basis of a joint enterprise—that is, the people themselves are encouraged and stimulated to self-help, to work with the Peace Corps volunteers on various projects for the betterment of their own lives and communities. This very important self-help aspect is repaying many times over the American taxpayers whose dollars are supporting the program throughout the world. In fact, the Peace Corps is a form of foreign aid which most assuredly is paying dividends in excess of the outlay, and every American can be proud of his part in this most worthy endeavor.

For the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress, I would like to call their attention to a very fine article by David B. Richardson of the staff of U.S. News & World Report, which was published last December 10, 1962, in that noted magazine, and which outlines the success of two Peace Corps volunteers after 1 year's work on various projects in the rural, distressed village of Zipacon, high in the Andes in Colombia, South America.

The achievements of Dennis Grubb of Westport, Conn., and his teammate, Carl Stephens of Lexington, Ky., against very tough obstacles is living proof of the dedication of these volunteers, of the success of their efforts, and of the vitality of the Peace Corps.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I commend the article to every Member of the House and to every Senator as a prime example of the faith we all should have in the future of America and of our democratic way of life against the onslaught of communism or any other tyrannical form of government. These two corpsmen are splendid examples of the determination and the strength of young Americans to preserve democracy in these United States and to spread its light around the world. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article from the U.S. News & World Report into the RECORD.

The article follows:

CLOSEUP OF THE CORPS—1 YEAR LATER

ZIPACON, Colombia.—Drive along the dusty, mountain road to this village of 3,500 people and you get an idea of what the Peace Corps has meant to one community bypassed by progress for many years.

Since late in 1961, two young Americans have been working here as part of the first contingent of Peace Corps volunteers sent to underdeveloped countries.

Zipacon, nestled in a green valley 8,700 feet high in the Andes, is only an hour's drive from Colombia's modern capital of Bogotá. But in terms of living conditions, it is ages distant.

The people of Zipacon have no running water or sewage facilities. Only a few houses have electricity. Death from dysentery, tuberculosis or malnutrition is a constant threat.

Shortly after the Peace Corps men moved in, one of them, Dennis Grubb, 21, of Westport, Conn., told a visiting staff member of U.S. News & World Report:

"I don't know how all this is going to turn out, but we sure are going to give it a big try. Frankly, I think we've got something good going here."

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

That "something" Mr. Grubb spoke of is now clearly visible to the returning visitor.

Entering Zipacon, you see a cooperative food store, opened just recently. Farther down the road is the site of a low-cost housing development. On the other side of town is a new, one-room schoolhouse of brick.

Freshly cut roads wind out in three directions to outlying parts of the village. Along one of these, the foundation is being laid for a small electric power plant. And, in the center of town, an old building is being converted into a community recreation center.

These projects—and a dozen others in the works—probably constitute the biggest burst of civic improvement that Zipacón has experienced in its 400 years of recorded history.

HELPING ONESELF

This is no crash porgram of U.S. aid. None of the projects has been financed by the Alliance for Progress, the program of economic assistance to Latin American countries. The changes in Zipacón spring from what is essentially a self-help operation.

Several organizations, public and private, are playing parts. So are dozens of villagers, working in their spare time without pay. But the spark and drive for these changes stem, in large part, from Mr. Grubb and his teammate, presently Carl Stephens, of Lexington, Ky. Theirs hasn't always been an easy task.

Most of the adults of Zipacón are farmworkers who earn about 50 cents a day laboring in nearby fields. Until recently, they were accustomed to expect all benefits to flow from the top down—from the central government, the big landowners or the church.

Like their forefathers, they waited for improvements to come from these traditional sources rather than organizing to get things done themselves. Down through the years, as a result, improvements came slowly in Zipacón—when at all.

At the start, many villagers saw the Peace Corps as a sort of philanthropic agency from which new benefits—including lots of cash—would flow. Some still think that way, despite contrary evidence. Others have answered calls for volunteers on various projects, have worked or watched a while, then drifted away. Still others have refused to cooperate.

MOMENT OF CRISIS

At one point, last December, it even looked as if the Peace Corps might have to pull out of Zipacón by public demand.

Trouble broke out when a newspaper in Bogotá printed an overly vivid account of the difficulties facing the two Americans in the rural community. A few irate citzens, claiming that the article pictured their village in a bad light, organized a strong protest that singled out the Peace Corps for blame.

Dennis Grubb and his partner left town for a 2-week Christmas vacation, not knowing whether they would be able to resume work here. But several of their new friends got busy and rallied the villagers to their support. The Peace Corps men were welcomed back with a community celebration in their honor.

One measure of how far the civic do-it-yourself movement has gone since then is the number of villagers who show up each weekday morning for voluntary work details. In recent months, the turnout has numbered almost 80 percent of the farmworkers in the district, working on their off days.

STORY OF A SCHOOL

The story of the building of the Santa Ana school shows how the Peace Corps works hand-in-hand with the local residents to push through improvements.

People in the Rincón Santo district had been trying to get a school for some time before the Peace Corps moved in. They had an acre of land available, but no money to pay for construction. That left 40 children in the district without classroom or teacher.

The Peace Corps men found the villagers willing to build the school themselves if they could get the materials. It was decided to put up a temporary structure that would qualify the district to get a teacher assigned by the state government.

The Peace Corps brought in a simple, hand-operated machine for making building blocks. The machine was provided by CARE, the international welfare agency. Soon, the villagers were turning out blocks made of local materials. Volunteer workers got donations of other necessary building materials. The school was finished in 1 month, and a teacher arrived a few weeks later to start the first classes.

NEEDED: A ROAD

Next, Corpsman Grubb and a village leader approached a business firm in Bogotá that had established a plan to devote part of its profits to the construction of permanent rural schools. To be eligible for such aid the village had to provide a road to the school site.

The Americans checked around and got the loan of a bulldozer from a Colombian Government agency. The community agreed to pay for fuel for the bulldozer and to put in culverts and fencing along the new road. Money for this was raised by holding a bazaar.

Both men and women chipped in to help build the road. Mr. Grubb and his partner did the surveying and helped operate the bulldozer. They pitched in and shoveled dirt when necessary.

When the road was finished, the company in Bogotá donated $2,500 for the new school. In 9 weeks, with almost every able-bodied citizen of the district taking part, the red brick building was completed.

Out of that project, the Peace Corps got more than a school built. It got the first civic-action committee in the area that is now entirely on its own. The Peace Corps is no longer needed to spur action or round up work details. And that was one of its major goals.

"It's the future we are concerned about," says Mr. Grubb. "That one school is nothing to what these people can do for themselves in years to come with confidence and community spirit."

THE NEXT TARGET

For the immediate future, the Peace Corps has various projects in the works in Zipacón. One is the expansion of a tiny health center, which now has few drugs and limited medical equipment. Another is the building of a second school. Also active are plans for more roads to link the village with nearby communities and make it a market center.

In the meantime, the two Americans keep busy on a variety of other chores. Recently, they plastered the town with announcements of a free chest X-ray and vaccination program, provided by a Government medical team. The two also showed a movie that emphasized the importance of protection against smallpox. There was a record turnout when the doctors arrived in Zipacón.

The people of Zipacón long since have accepted the Peace Corps men as fellow members of the community. Children hail them in the streets. They are star players on the basketball team of the local athletic club. When the governor of the department of Cundinamarca appeared at a festival in Zipacon recently, village leaders asked Mr. Grubb to make the welcoming speech.

FOR REDS: A QUESTION

Even the Communists in Bogotá have been taking notice of the Peace Corps work in Zipacón and other vilages. Not long ago, two Communists appeared at a village function and tried to stir up a protest against the United States.

"Let's talk about you Communists," said Mr. Grubb. "Just what have you done to help the people of Zipacón?" The Reds had no answer.

For the U.S. taxpayer, the cost of helping Zipacón to develop itself has been small. The two Americans each get Colombian money equivalent to about $122 a month. Another $75 a month is credited to their accounts back in the United States toward the day when they leave the Peace Corps. In their first year they received about $150 more for housing, furniture, and work clothing.

In addition, CARE provided supplies worth $1,400—a mimeograph machine for public notices, medical and sports kits for schools, surveying equipment, books, and a horse. The Peace Corps team in Zipacón has no motor vehicle.

In looking back on his first 12 months in Zipacón, Mr. Grubb is cautious about making any claims. He feels a sense of accomplishment at having been able to adjust to different customs, different living conditions, and a different language. But he feels, too, that the job he started in Zipacón—helping other people to help themselves—has barely begun.

"There's a lot more work to be done here," he says. "You can't hope to succeed in this type of work in 1 year—maybe not even in 5 years. But I believe we have made a start in the right direction."

Trim "Needs" to Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, public interest in the size of the proposed deficit continues to mount. It becomes very readily apparent that the answer to the debate is a conscientious effort on the part of the Congress to trim the budget.

This point is well emphasized in an editorial of the Tuesday, March 5 issue of the Chicago Tribune, which I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point.

TRIM "NEEDS" TO MEANS

If you don't have shoes you obviously need a pair. If you have one pair you need another, because two pairs worn alternately wear longer than two consecutive pairs. If you have two pairs, you need another, for different purposes, still better wear, and the feeling of well-being that will promote your fortune. This goes for any number up to 20 pairs.

A process like this accounts for the size of the budget of the United States. Ambitious politicians find "need" to fill, and votes to reap. If a "need" has widespread appeal, such as handouts to distressed areas, it gets corresponding support. If it pleases only a small group, such as a research grant to improve the breed of silkworms, logrolling is required; legislators pass each other's vote bait.

The Washington staff of the Knight newspapers made a comparative page-by-page study of the budget—the size of a mail-order catalog—for the third time in 7 years. Their report left no doubt of the empire-building motives behind the mushrooming of bureaus and projects.

As Edwin A. Lahey expressed it, "a hundred thousand rolls into a million, a million rolls into a billion, and a billion into $99 billion." Somebody gets the idea that it would be good to promote civilian interest in marksmanship, and a cash subsidy is voted to buy ammunition. In 1964 this item will be $1,600,000. This, of course, is one of the smallest items, but it illustrates the psychological basis for many of the projects: "As long as we are wasting billions elsewhere, we can surely spare a few millions for this worthy program."

The budget abounds with startling contradictions. Subsidies to support the price of farm crops produced in excess of demand will cost $4.4 billion, while other large sums will be spent to find ways to raise farm output.

It may be granted that some benefit flows from every one of these projects. Somebody gets the money. But here we go back to the "need" for more shoes. There would surely be some advantage in having them. But lacking the price, only a nitwit would conclude that the advantages of 2 dozen shoes were greater than the disadvantages of debt incurred to buy them.

There is a strange and often-disproved theory that, by spending for all these purposes $12 billion more than the $87 billion the Government will take in, some magic takes place that transforms debt into prosperity. What actually happens is that the deficit is paid by cheapening the money.

This process is familiar to any man who, 20 years ago, bought insurance designed to give his widow $200 or so a month. He paid hard dollars, but the dollars his widow gets won't go very far.

If everyone able to see the connection between profligate spending and the rising cost of living were to complain to his Congressman, the budget would be cut substantially. Necessary expenditures for defense and other purposes are great enough, without stripping the taxpayers to spend for spending's sake.

The politicians, of course, think the most votes are to be had by the course followed in the present budget. It has yet to be proved that they are wrong.

Rev. Peter S. Rush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Peter S. Rush, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Jersey City, N.J., who entered upon a brilliant military career when he accepted appointment as a chaplain in the New Jersey National Guard in 1940, was recently appointed a brigadier general, New Jersey Army National Guard. On that occasion he was honored by a military review which was attended by a large group of his friends.

Following service in World War II, Chaplain Rush remained on active duty and saw further service with combat forces in Korea.

The report of the review tendered Chaplain Rush as it appeared in the Jersey Journal follows:

HUDSON "LITTLE CHAPLAIN" NOW BRIGADIER GENERAL

A man who had been "just a little chaplain in the Army" during World War II, yesterday became the first brigadier general in the Chaplain Corps of the New Jersey Army National Guard.

The Reverend Peter S. Rush, pastor of St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, received his commission as a general following a review of troops held in his honor at the Jersey City Armory, headquarters of the 2d Brigade, 50th Armored Division, New Jersey Army National Guard.

Participating in the review at 3 p.m. were the men of the 1st Battalion, 113th Infantry, the 2d Battalion, 112th Infantry, and the 50th Armored Division Band.

Some 1,500 spectators watched the colorful ceremonies and applauded the smart-looking and well-drilled troops. Among the guests of honor were Bishop Martin Stanton, the Sisters of Joseph's Convent, many State and city officials and Irish Constable Patrick J. Kenny.

Top brass in the reviewing party included Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey Department of Defense, who presented the commission in behalf of Gov. Richard J. Hughes; Lt. Col. Philipp W. Kunz, local commander, and Lt. Col. Alfred A. De Matteo.

Also among the spectators was St. Joseph's Girl Scout Troops 29 and 36, led by Dorothy and Mary Holt of 71 Warner Avenue.

Father Rush, wearer of the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Army Commendation Medal with oak leaf clusters, served with distinction in the 44th Division, 71st Division and on the staffs of Gen. Mark Clark and Gen. Lucius Clay in World War II. He also served in Korea, taking part in eight major campaigns.

Part 13: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Castro and Cuba—January 14, 1963 to January 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today's continuation of my chronology on Castro and Cuba involves a rehash of Fidel Castro's five point program—which he had announced on October 23, 1962, as being the only basis on which the Cuban and U.S. crisis could be solved.

These five points were:

First. End of economic blockade and all measures of commercial and economic pressure exercised against Cuba by the United States.

Second. End of all subversive activities, dropping and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, organization of mercenary invasions, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, "all of which actions are organized in the territory of the United States and certain accomplice countries."

Third. End of pirate attacks carried out from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico.

Fourth. End of all violations of air and naval space by U.S. planes and ships.

Fifth. U.S. withdrawal from the naval base of Guantanamo and return of this territory to Cuba.

That these five points had suddenly assumed importance to not only Castro but also to the U.S.S.R. and Red China was proved by their quick expression of support for the statements—which they ignored at the time the crisis was at fever pitch.

Castro, emboldened now by Kremlin support for his five points—publicly called for all Latin American revolutionaries to rise up against imperialism while denouncing the United States as "the most aggressive nation in the world."

His words stating that "a war was avoided, but the peace was not won," were strikingly similar to many uttered by American citizens, including those in the political field—proving that at least there was agreement between Castro and the United States on one issue.

The only ones who appeared completely happy and satisfied with the arrangements were the Soviets—because as Khrushchev so obligingly had pointed out—the Communist regime was firmly fixed on the island of Cuba—and in exchange for only 40 or so missiles, a few planes, a few Soviet troops.

Castro designated our Alliance for Progress foreign aid program for Latin America as reactionary and antiquated—declaring it would not "prosper because it is a policy of exploitation." This was a clear indication of the Communist line to be preached in South America regarding our efforts to aid them—but many North Americans—while agreeing on the term "exploitation"—felt they were the

ones being exploited—not the Latin Americans.

Diplomatic immunity had its day in court—when one of our Federal judges withdrew same from a Cuban United Nations attaché—ordering him to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents. Since our U.S. Communist Party had also been ordered some time back to register—this seemed only just to many Americans—although Communists of all nations felt it was rank discrimination and entirely unjustified.

Once again Khrushchev effectively stopped any tendency on the part of U.S. citizens toward complacency, by pointing out his principle of coexistence—which had been violently criticized by Red Chinese—had in the past given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories. He again termed ours an "ultimate defeat" because Cuba still remained a Communist nation. About this time all the Communist nations of the Western World jumped on Khrushchev's bandwagon—calling for unity and a ceasing of "washing their dirty linen" in public. The Red Chinese also declared the Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of peoples of labor in America and the world"—had won the victory of Cuba's independence, her sovereignty, and fruits of her revolution. This of course did not leave our American laboring people with a good taste in their mouth.

Khruschev indulged in his favorite pastime of "rocket rattling," declaring that as many as 120 Russian missiles were now ready to be launched at the United States in case of war, and claiming that while 40 rockets had been withdrawn from Cuba, 80 or probably even 120 had been set up in other "better places than Cuba," although he failed to name the places.

So while the Communists castigated their party members for lack of unity and irresponsible attacks on their policy, our own political parties in this country were suffering the same throes because of disagreement not only as to the proper policy but the degree of information to which the American public was entitled on the Cuban issue. This of course was not an issue in the Communists' quarrels because their citizens are not guaranteed the privilege of freedom of the press or information.

Senator FULBRIGHT renounced the constitutional right of the Congress to assist in foreign policy decisions by his statement that they—the Congress—interfered with the effectiveness of the President's leadership thus becoming at one and the same time a most unpopular man with many of his colleagues and a goodly segment of the American public. He pointed out that during the October Cuban crisis the leaders of Congress were informed, but not consulted, and deemed this to be quite proper. However, many felt that he failed by not adding that the President did receive counsel and advice—although not by congressional leaders—but instead by a group called the EX COMM—made up of some National Security Council members with a few personal additions of his own.

At long last some of the questions previously raised about Adali Stevenson's part in deliberations of the Security Council during the Cuban crisis were again brought up, and by one of the same writers who originally had brought this to the attention of the public—Stewart Alsop. However, in this instance he had the guarantee of an approved summary by Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson's official spokesman at the United Nations.

Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General and President's brother, committed what some termed his worst faux pas of a series, by allowing himself to be interviewed by the Miami Herald—as well as the U.S. News & World Report—and bringing up the subject once more of the fateful Bay of Pigs invasion. Reiterating that President Kennedy had taken full responsibility for failure of the invasion plans, he stated that the President not only had approved the plan, but it had been fully cleared by the CIA and Joint Chiefs of Staff and air cover had never been promised. Whereupon Senator GOLDWATER contradicted the Attorney General, stating he had been given a definite impression by the President, during a personal interview, that air cover had been a part of the original invasion plans, and charged Bobby Kennedy with not only "rewriting of history" but attempting "news management."

This resulted in a rash of public statements by various political leaders calling for complete investigations—and as full disclosure of the facts as possible consistent with our national security—to the American public.

Senator FULBRIGHT once again accused the Republicans of "partisanship"—but for his trouble was reminded by several newspaper columnists that he had not been heard calling for a "nonpartisan" approach during either the 1960 presidential campaign—or during President Eisenhower's administration.

Senator RUSSELL promised an investigation into the military and defense issues but not into the political issues. Senator MORSE recommended a reading of the still-secret transcript of his subcommittee hearings on Latin American affairs before partisan speeches were made but the transcripts were described by Senator GOLDWATER as being "the most inconclusive testimony I have ever read."

And once again former President Eisenhower was called upon to state whether or not his administration had conceived the ill-fated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs—stated unequivocally that it had not—but rather had contemplated a "guerrilla type of action." And this seemed to close the chapter as far as the Eisenhower administration's part in the fiasco was concerned.

But the curiosity of the American public still mounted—and it seemed inevitable to all that something had to be done to clear up the controversy.

On one hand, many public-spirited and sincere citizens indicated they felt perhaps this curiosity was being overdone. A quotation I recently found perhaps describes their emotions to a certain degree:

> Curiosity is a kernel of the forbidden fruit, which still sticketh in the throat of a natural man, sometimes to the danger of his choking.—Fuller.

However, on the other hand, equally public-spirited citizens and equally sincere took the position which might be described by this quotation:

> The gratification of curiosity rather frees us from uneasiness, than confers pleasure. We are more pained by ignorance, than delighted by instruction. Curiosity is the thirst of the soul.—Johnson.

But the American public—not bothering with semantics—seemed rather to feel that asking for official reports giving the whole truth—as long as it did not involve giving away valuable national security information to Communist countries—was only a rightful part of their constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press and freedom of speech under a Republican form of Government.

Part 13 of my chronology on Castro and Cuba follows:

PART 13. SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO AND CUBA

January 14, 1963: Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vassily V. Kuznetsov came to Havana last night and gave Fidel Castro fresh assurances that the Kremlin backs the five points raised by the Cuban Prime Minister at the height of the Caribbean crisis.

The points include demands that the United States give up its Guantanamo Naval base, lift trade restrictions imposed against Cuba, and give a no-invasion pledge.

January 15, 1963: Prime Minister Fidel Castro called today for the Communist world to heal its rifts and for revolutionaries of the Western Hemisphere to rise up in violent upheaval against imperialism.

In a fiery televised speech that began last night and lasted several hours, Castro sounded his most aggressive demand yet for revolution in Latin America.

Castro's speech contained the customary denunciations of President Kennedy and the United States, which he described as "the most aggressive Nation in the world.

"For us, the Caribbean crisis has not been resolved," he said. "A war was avoided but the peace was not won.

"We don't believe in Kennedy's words," he said. "But Kennedy has given no pledge (against invasion) and if he did give it he has already withdrawn it.

"The imperialists are shipping arms, saboteurs and agents into Cuba, organizing bands of pirates and retaining a piece of our territory (the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo) that points at the heart of our nation."

Castro also attacked the U.S. sponsored Alliance for Progress as reactionary and antiquated.

"It will not prosper because it is a policy of exploitation," he said.

January 15, 1963: A Federal judge today denied diplomatic immunity to a Cuban United Nations attaché accused of sabotage conspiracy and threw doubt on immunity for staff members of any foreign U.N. missions and even for ambassadors to the U.N.

In a lengthy and perhaps precedent-setting decision, Judge Edward Weinfeld refused to grant Roberto Santiesteban a habeas corpus writ on the basis of diplomatic immunity. He ordered the Cuban to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents.

January 15, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev called for a truce today in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

His call for a halt in the increasingly bitter and vocal dispute between Moscow and Peiping over the Soviet Union's peaceful coexistence policy caught the free world and porbably also the Communist world off balance.

In defending his principle of coexistence, Khrushchev said that in the past it had given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories.

This, he claimed, was the basis of his Cuban tactics. While admitting that some critics had called removal of the rockets from Cuba "defeat," he claimed he had only been "flexible," and that President Kennedy suffered ultimate defeat because Cuba remained a Communist nation.

January 16, 1963: With Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka setting the stage, Communist Parties of the Western world started jumping aboard Nikita S. Khrushchev's Sino-Soviet truce bandwagon today.

In a 25-minute speech to the East German Communist Party's Sixth Congress, Gomulka said that dirty linen should not be washed in public but should be cleansed patiently and quietly in "internal discussions."

"The public polemics which are damaging the cause of international unity of the Communist movement and the irresponsible attacks on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the leaders of some Communist Parties increased during the crisis in the Caribbean (Cuba).

"The leadership of these parties did not want to understand that the crisis was solved favorably for Cuba and the cause of world socialism, through the policy pursued by the Soviet Union."

January 16, 1963: Cuban delegate Armando Hart-Davalos made an impassioned plea at the East German Party Congress for Communist unity.

"We Cubans regard it as a vital obligation to defend Communist solidarity. With the help of serious critical analysis we should be able to prevent the present differences of opinion from reaching a crisis."

January 17, 1963: "Miami, Fla., January 16.—Ninety persons, 38 of them U.S. citizens who had been living in Cuba, arrived today aboard a Pan American airliner which had flown to Havana with a load of ransom for liberated invasion prisoners.

U.S. Immigration Service officials said the other 52 passengers were relatives of the Americans.

January 18, 1963: In a speech to the East German Communist Party Congress, chief Chinese Communist delegate Wu Hsiu-Chuan stated that all the heroic Cuban people mobilized themselves, united around their revolutionary leader, comrade Fidel Castro, persevered in the five just demands for the protection of Cuba's independence and sovereignty and waged an uncompromising struggle against U.S. imperialism, thus it was the heroic Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of the peoples of labor in America and the world, who won the great victory in defense of Cuba's independence, sovereignty and the fruits of her revolution and made a great contribution to the cause of world peace.

U.S. imperialism bullies the fainthearted but fears the stouthearted, what it fears most is the strength of a united revolutionary people.

January 18, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev said today as many as 120 Russian missiles are ready to be launched at the United States in case of war.

"The American imperialists know that we withdrew 40 rockets from Cuba," he told East German steelworkers at Eisenhuettenstadt. "But we have set up 80, probably even 120 rockets in other places.

"Cuba is not the most convenient place to base rockets," the Communist leader said in his most anti-Western speech since he arrived for the East German Communist Party Congress last Monday. "We have better places than Cuba.

"The United States wanted to use 300,000 men against Cuba," he said. "They bared their teeth like wolves, but still did not bite. Has American imperialism lost its appetite? No, but we are a powerful club."

January 20, 1963: The Swiss announced tonight that the way had been cleared to allow between 900 and 1,000 more relatives of Cuban invasion prisoners to leave Cuba aboard the American ship *Shirley Lykes*.

An Embassy spokesman said, "The Cuban authorities have said they will make available exit permits for between 900 and 1,000 Cuban citizens directly related to the former Playa Giron (Bay of Pigs) invasion prisoners."

January 20, 1963: Citing the Cuban crisis, Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urged today that the powers of the President to handle foreign policy be strengthened.

FULBRIGHT said foreign policy powers in Congress interfere with the effectiveness of the President's leadership.

This was demonstrated clearly in the October Cuban crisis when there was no alternative to Presidential decision and action, FULBRIGHT said.

The circumstances were such that it was quite impossible to seek the counsel of the leaders of Congress, who, in fact, and quite properly, were informed but not consulted," the Senator continued.

January 20, 1963: Stewart Alsop said today that Adlai E. Stevenson advised the National Security Council to consider giving up the Guantanamo Naval Base, if necessary, in exchange for the dismantling of Russian rocket bases in Cuba.

Alsop said he and the coauthor of the report, Charles Bartlett, obtained their information during three lengthy talks with Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson's official spokesman at the United Nations.

He said Fritchey approved this summary of Stevenson's position: "Stevenson was only willing to discuss Guantanamo and the European bases with the Communists after a neutralization of the Cuban missiles."

Alsop quotes from notes made by Bartlett in an interview with Fritchey: "Stevenson's general approach was to avoid military action until the peacekeeping machinery of the U.N. had a chance to function. He therefore opposed the air attack and favored the blockade. As the consensus hardened on the quarantine approach, he turned his thoughts toward the possibility of a settlement, both short term and long term."

January 21, 1963: In an interview with David Kraslow of the Miami Herald Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stated that no U.S. air cover was ever planned or promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in April, 1961.

"There never was any plan to have U.S. air cover," Kennedy said. "There never was any promise. Not even under Mr. Eisenhower was American air cover in the picture.

"From the begining the President said no American forces would take part in the operation. It was made absolutely clear that under no condition whatsoever, would Americans be used in the invasion.

"And it simply cannot be said that the invasion failed because of any single factor. There were several major mistakes. It was just a bad plan. Victory was never close."

Kennedy confirmed that the invading force appealed to the U.S. warships for help when they were pinned down on the beach. He declined to say whether the appeals were relayed to the President.

"The decision was made that there would be no change in the ground rules," Kennedy said. "There had been a firm understanding always, accepted by everyone, that there would be no U.S. forces in the invasion under any condition. We stayed with that."

Kennedy said no invasion plan had been completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. "There was just a general concept," he said. "The logistics and the details were worked out after the President took office.

"The President has taken responsibility for the failure and that's as it should be. He approved the plan. But it's not true that he sat down with two or three civilians and worked out this plan at the White House.

"The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was war gamed at the Pentagon in whatever manner they do these things."

January 21, 1963: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, charged that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy appeared to be trying to rewrite history in the "latest example of news management by the New Frontier."

GOLDWATER said he talked with President Kennedy at the latter's request shortly after the invasion fiasco and "I certainly got the impression then that an air cover had been part of the original invasion plans."

Also, he told the Senate, "I am sure the entire American public has understood that the air cover was definitely in the invasion plans until the President was persuaded—by some still unidentified advisers—to cancel it."

GOLDWATER also took issue with a speech last Saturday in which Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said the "rattlesnake in Cuba" has been defanged.

"I suggest it is a highly optimistic view and one which the United States cannot afford to adopt as a matter of policy," GOLDWATER said. "Castro's Cuba is still a menace to freedom in the Western Hemisphere."

January 21, 1963: Argentine Foreign Minister Carlos Muniz agreed with Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday that the Organization of American States (OAS) should follow up its unified stand in the Cuban crisis with new coordinated moves against Communist Cuba.

Muniz, in a talk with Rusk, is believed to have stressed that Argentina will back solidly any action the United States may take to weaken the Cuban Government and prevent Castroite subversion in Latin America.

January 22, 1963: Senate Republicans moved to conduct their own investigation of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. They said they wanted to get the entire story historically accurate.

Senate GOP Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said he proposed making such a preliminary inquiry on his own and heard no dissent when it was discussed at a GOP policy meeting, yesterday. He said his proposal was not prompted by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona.

DIRKSEN said he plans to make an exploration of his own, take it up with the GOP policy committee staff, and then decide whether the matter should be put up to a Senate legislative committee for more formal investigation.

Senate Democratic Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, suggested that if DIRKSEN wants the entire story he should have his investigation include the circumstances that led to the coming to power in Cuba of Castro and communism.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the DIRKSEN proposal has a very strong partisan aura, and any conclusion would be considered quite partisan.

January 23, 1963: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, proposed a full Senate Armed Services Committee investigation of the disastrous 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, the committee chairman, said if military and defense issues and not politics are involved the committee would look into them.

"It's not our function to settle political matters," he said.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, whose Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs has already investigated the invasion, told the Senate its members should read the still-secret transcript of those hearings before making partisan speeches.

GOLDWATER fired back that he had and "it's the most inconclusive testimony I've ever read."

GOLDWATER proposed that the Armed Services Committee have $100,000 to finance its inquiry and report no later than March 31. GOLDWATER is a committee member.

The Senator said the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, and Allen Dulles, then Central Intelligence Agency chief, should be called to testify.

January 23, 1963: Former President Eisenhower said the ilifated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs was not conceived during his administration, but that, instead, a guerrilla type of action was contemplated.

General Eisenhower discussed the Cuban situation and numerous other domestic and international topics during a taped interview with newsman Walter Cronkite on CBS (WTOP-TV in Washington).

When Cronkite asked the former Chief Executive whether the Cuban invasion plan had been made under his administration, General Eisenhower replied: "No, No, No."

He added: "There was no way. We didn't even know at that time whether we could do anything more, or whether these refugees would be sufficiently numerous and strong to do more than go into the * * * eastern part of the island, in the mountains, and start in the return a counterrevolution."

He said the planning was to find a leader for the Cuban people to help them to rise up and overthrow Cuban Premier Fidel Castro but "how are you going to find a man that was not a Batista man, and not a Castro man, and still be a leader?"

South Bend Tribune and Washington Daily News Approve U.S. Position on Financing of Peacekeeping Operations of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD two excellent editorials endorsing the recent decision of the U.S. Government with respect to U.S. contributions to the financing of the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

The first editorial, "Holding Feet to the Fire," was published in the March 10, 1963, issue of the South Bend (Ind.), Tribune:

HOLDING FEET TO THE FIRE

In an article on this page today, William R. Frye poses the question: Can the United Nations take on another peacekeeping operation like the Congo?

He reports the answer of the people at the U.N. to be: "Yes, providing the money problem can be solved. Nothing will be possible unless the U.N. can learn to pay its bills."

There is increasing evidence that the U.N. will have to solve its money problem without extraordinary help from the United States. And it should. The United States too long has been expected to take up the slack every time the world organization runs into financial difficulties.

The latest evidence that the United States is tiring of the "sugar daddy" role came last week in a singularly stern message to the U.N. Finance Committee.

In the future, the committee was informed, the United States will pay no more than its regular 32-percent assessment for U.N. operations, including those in the peacekeeping category.

There would be an exception, the committee was told, if delinquent members pay up approximately $130 million in arrearages.

The statement said: "The U.S. position on any possible future contributions above our regular scale assessment for peacekeeping operations will be decisively influenced in the months ahead by the financial support which other members of the United Nations actually provide."

The pressure which the United States is exerting on the U.N. to put its financial house in order is appropriate.

It reflects, we think, the sentiments of a growing number of Americans who respect the United Nations and all it stands for, but are convinced that for its own good and effectiveness it must learn to stand on its own feet.

U.S. public opinion and congressional support of the U.N. will be weakened dangerously if the responsible leadership at the United Nations ignores the warning to cease looking to Washington for more than a fair share of financial support from this country.

Mr. Speaker, the second, entitled "Good News," is from the March 12, 1963, issue of the Washington Daily News:

GOOD NEWS

The United States properly, and at long last, is snapping shut its pocketbook at the United Nations. Or so our Government says.

From here on, U.S. Ambassador Francis T. Plimpton has told the U.N.'s 21-nation Finance Committee, the United States will pay no more than its regular share for underwriting the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations. (We have paid 49 percent of the U.N. Congo costs, for example, although our official assessment is only 32.02 percent of the U.N. budget.)

Only exception would be if other nations now in arrears paid up their debts and then on some future need agreed to contribute more than their regular assessments.

Touche and bravo. Let's make this one foreign policy we stick to.

Under unanimous consent I also insert the article by William R. Frye published in the South Bend Tribune to which the editorial in that newspaper makes reference:

U.N.'s "TEETH" ARE GROWING FAST—SO IS WILLINGNESS TO USE THEM

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—United Nations experience in the Congo—and the possibility of new crises in Borneo or Yemen—have raised a question: Can the U.N. take on another major peacekeeping operation like the Congo?

The answer U.N. people give is: "Yes, provided the money problem can be solved." Nothing will be possible unless the U.N. can learn to pay its bills.

Other hurdles, however, have been overcome in a way which no one would have dreamed possible 2 years ago. The U.N. has been growing "teeth" at a fantastic rate.

Some of the problems solved, or well on the way to solution, are these:

1. A command structure: 2 years ago, the U.N. scarcely realized it might need a commander in chief and a chain of command. Its biggest operation up to that point had been little more than an armed observer corps.

In the Congo, the U.N. had to fight.

There is at U.N. headquarters what amounts to a military chief of staff under Secretary General U Thant. He is Brig. I. J. Rikhye, an Indian general officer. He has three lieutenant colonels and a Canadian air force squadron leader under him.

They ran the military side of the Congo war. Their desks are practically side by side on the 38th floor of the U.N. Building with those of Dr. Ralph J. Bunche and his three deputies, who controlled the political side of the operation.

The two offices—political and military—worked together.

2. Equipment and firepower: The United Nations idea of how to equip an army in the field has been transformed in the past 2 years.

Former Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, for example, never dreamed that the Congo force would need fighter aircraft.

The U.N. did not expect to have to fight. Self-defense, the governing principle of the force, was taken to mean passive defense—shooting back if one were shot at. Actively wiping out an enemy's strong points in order to prevent an attack was not remotely considered.

The fighting with Katanga in September 1961 changed all that. Suddenly, in order to protect its personnel, the U.N. had to have insignificant fire power, air cover, and combat logistics. With American help, it got it.

3. Training: U.N. people say it takes a good 6 months to break in a colonel or a general who is assigned to work for the United Nations. During that period, he is often the U.N.'s toughest problem.

U.N. civilians, too, have a lot to learn about working with an army. Executives from headquarters with little or no military background sometimes found themselves sent to the Congo on 48 hours' notice and put in what amounted to tactical command of an army of several thousand men.

Both civilians and military men need training in U.N.-type military operations. Rikhye has worked out a plan for a 3-month training course at a kind of command and general staff college to be set up in Geneva. But it has been shelved for budget reasons. It would cost $50,000 to $60,000 for each course.

4. Legal and constitutional inhibitions: Hammarskjold always interpreted the U.N. charter to mean the U.N. could not properly impose peaceful settlements. He painstakingly negotiated Egypt's consent, for example, before sending the U.N.'s Mideast peace force into Gaza in 1957.

Later, this force was authorized to shoot at illegal border-crossers only under extreme circumstances. It had to be called self-defense. Still later, in 1958, the U.N. observer team in Lebanon telephoned infiltrators and made appointments to come and inspect their illegal activities.

In the Congo, the U.N. had to impose peace. There was no practical alternative. It tried persuasion, and got nowhere. It cracked down.

This was a much more important psychological and political watershed than many realize. In the future, the U.N. is much less

likely to tiptoe gently into a troubled situation, using patience and forebearance. It is, on the contrary, likely to get tough at a fairly early stage.

The U.N. is, moreover, building standby power to be tough.

Master files are being built up to show the kinds of skills and specialties available. If the U.N. were to need an airport management crew, for example, one could probably be found, and delivered on a few days' notice.

The prospect of a U.N. with "teeth"—with power to impose the will of the world community on trouble-makers—is better now than at any time since 1946 and 1947, when the charter dream of a world peace army originally faded.

Cost of Government Purchases To Go Down in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, though Raleigh, N.C., is not a part of my district, my study into Government procurement has led to my interest in an industry there. Due to a decision by the Comptroller General on a case I submitted last November, that industry is about to get a Government contract and save $10,000 for the taxpayers.

Due to this firm's efficiency and the Comptroller General's decision to uphold its position, a radio transceiver is going to be built for the Federal Aviation Agency at a lower cost than would have been the case. If there are more decisions with this conclusion, we can expect the cost of Government purchasing to go down in the future.

Many of my colleagues are aware that for months and months I have made a detailed study of electronics purchases by the Government. In many cases the taxpayer has been the loser. In some I have been able to report successes in changed regulations and in savings to the taxpayers. The latter is true today—a happy ending for manufacturer, taxpayer, Government, and, yes, this Congressman.

Last November this firm outlined for me a problem it had with the FAA. Quoting for manufacture of a small radio transceiver, it inadvertently neglected to include a detailed description of the equipment with its proposal, as prescribed by FAA regulations. Because of this, it was ruled out of the procurement. At this very same time, this same firm was making the identical equipment for FAA under another contract, and for this reason was able to be low bidder. In other words, because of a technicality, this firm's competence was scribed by FAA regulations. Because of ment was to rise by $10,000.

After studying the case closely, I contacted the Comptroller General and said:

While the difference between this company's bid and that of the next low bidder does not exceed $10,000, it appears to me that any award other than to this firm would be a waste of tax dollars.

After a thorough study, the Comptroller General agreed with me and advised me by letter, March 7, 1963, that he had made a determination in favor of the Raleigh firm and it should get the contract. Despite the clerical error, the Comptroller General acted in behalf of saving the taxpayer's money. It is too bad we do not have more such people.

This is another case in a long list I am going to present in this session. I will also suggest legislative corrections, such as my H.R. 4409. As these cases are compiled, I hope the Rules Committee will take heed and report H.R. 4409 to the floor for action by the House. Its enactment into law, plus enactment of other legislation I shall soon propose, would curtail many abuses now being carried out in the name of national defense and would result in tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

Foreign Aid: Lack of Popular Support Is a Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the very perceptive columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond of the New York Herald Tribune news service, effectively set straight the record on public support of our foreign aid program. Noting that 58 percent of the American people approve foreign aid, Mr. Drummond suggests that the Congress would be well advised if it were to be guided in this crucial matter by the judgment expressed by the great majority of our citizens.

That foreign aid does not enjoy the support of the majority of the American people is, as Mr. Drummond points out, a myth. The time has come to explode that myth and consider foreign aid on the basis of what it has accomplished and will continue to accomplish in the fight to improve conditions in impoverished areas, to strengthen economies of depressed nations and to bolster democratic governments throughout the world.

Mr. Drummond's column on this important subject which appeared in the March 12 issue of the Washington Post follows:

FOREIGN AID—LACK OF POPULAR SUPPORT IS A MYTH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentionally made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden (one-twentieth of the budget) and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence.

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South, 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about $4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive backup statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955.

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid, Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

Educational Television Produces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on other occasions I have indicated my personal and professional happiness at the success of the educational television effort in South Carolina. I have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on other occasions, information about this effort because I knew from firsthand acquaintance that other areas of America are going into this kind of program in the educational concept and I feel that the experience of pioneering in South Caroline has been significant. We have been proud of what we have done, and I salute the general manager of the South Carolina educational television center, Mr. R. Lynn Kalmbach who lives and has his office in Columbia, S.C. Recently he wrote a very fine letter to the Columbia (S.C.) State, and the letter was published on March 6, 1963. I commend this letter to those who are interested in the future of this new and useful and productive and exciting role television is playing in the accelerated education of our youth. The letter is as follows:

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION SEEN AS AN ANSWER

To the EDITOR OF THE STATE:

The following is a copy of a statement I have today addressed to the members of the South Carolina Legislature:

Newspaper headlines in the last several days have emblazoned the National Education Association's findings that South Carolina ranks at the bottom of the 50 States in many vital areas of educational credit and achievement. Coincidently, State medical authorities have disclosed that we are 50th in the education of trained nurses.

After 5 years of year-round effort, working long days and often into the nights, those of us engaged in the development of statewide educational television at all grade levels, are more firmly convinced than ever—by results—that the answers to many of the acknowledged inadequacies of South Carolina education are within reach. Even a reasonable rate of educational television progress, geared to the readiness of schools and pupils to absorb what is offered, will further prove what is known and accepted by recognized authorities over the Nation—that superior teachers on television working as a team with cooperative classroom teachers, at all times, can do an increasingly excellent job of educating children, young people, and adults. We can by educational television move swiftly up the rankings of the States.

The striking advantage of educational television, as set forth in the beginning in South Carolina, persists today: television is simply a powerful and effective communications instrument by which superior teaching on practically every subject can be transmitted, with high-quality visual aid support, to all children at every grade level in each of the State's 1,250 elementary and high schools as well as to all technical training centers, junior colleges, colleges, and hospitals.

Also, from the outset in this State, the teamwork use of educational television, with a classroom teacher in every class at all times, has proved to be the best method.

The television teacher presents the subject matter during approximately half of the class period, and the classroom teacher—often gaining in experience and quality as she works with the television teacher—attends to the pupil relationships, as has always been the case, by answering questions, counseling with pupils, testing, and in general controlling the work of the class.

Among those children participating in the limited amount of educational television so far authorized and utilized, we know that more children are learning better than ever before. Standardized testing on such a difficult subject as algebra has proved that South Carolina children taught with the aid of educational television score better than the national average in significant numbers. The same is true in geometry. We are satisfied that the learning gains are the same on other subjects for which there is no national testing with which to compare.

Also, since there is little data on standardized testing among children taught the conventional way in South Carolina, there can be no matching of results through no fault of educational television, but the National Education Association reports that this State is at the bottom in most results of evaluation.

South Carolina has been acclaimed as the Nation's leader in educational television by such authorities as Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, director of the Ford Foundation; former U.S. Education Commissioner Sterling J. McMurrin; Dr. James Tintera, director of Michigan's educational television program, and others. Educational television authorities have come to Columbia from most of the States of the Nation, and from Japan, Hawaii, Italy, England, France, and other foreign countries to study our system.

Dr. Eurich, whose foundation has sponsored more than $35 million worth of educational television projects throughout the Nation, has declared that "South Carolina, in our opinion, has the basis and blueprint for what education television needs to bring about a healthy revolution in the American education system."

Within just the past few weeks, official State educational television committees from North Carolina and Mississippi have deeply explored the South Carolina concept. The Province of Quebec, Canada, the metropolitan school district of Cleveland and Columbus, Ohio, the States of Kentucky, Michigan, California and others are pursuing the concepts learned here. Oklahoma has been stirred by the South Carolina way after a newspaper writer spent a week in Columbia producing a series of articles for the State's largest newspaper, the Oklahoma City Times.

South Carolina educational television has been featured in Time Magazine, National Review, the New York Times and member newspapers of the Associated Press and United Press-International over the Nation.

Authorities within South Carolina have spoken strongly and positively in support of educational television, including the Board of Directors of the South Carolina Association of School Boards; Dr. Robert C. Edwards, president of Clemson College; Dr. Thomas F. Jones, Jr., president of the University of South Carolina; Dr. Robert L. Sumwalt, former president of the university; A. L. M. Wiggins, chairman of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Higher Education; State Superintendent of Education Jesse T. Anderson and others.

Turning for a moment to the economics of education, let us examine what it would cost the State to raise its average annual per pupil expenditure of about $200 for all education to the national average of $400. For 606,000 pupils that is a cumulative increase of $12 million per year for 10 years, or eventually a staggering total of $121 million per year above what is now being spent on education, provided all other States stood still during the 10 years.

The economics of an educational television system, on the other hand, become more and more feasible. Three years ago a cost projection for a complete multichannel system to every school, college, and technical training center in the State—with six simultaneous channels providing all the subjects believed to be necessary in the foreseeable future—would cost, for everything involved, an average of $8,000 a year per school. This would cover all educational television costs, including receiving sets in schools, reproducing and up-dating all video-taped courses on an average of every 5 years, and guaranteeing systematic maintenance and replacement of all equipment.

At present, however, with substantial recent reductions in transmission rates, video tape costs and other expense items as educational television gains in mass usage over the rest of the Nation, the cost projections for a complete system have declined from the $8,000 figure 3 years ago to $6,000 a year per school at present costs.

Under this system every high school in the State would receive 36 daily half-hour subjects taught by the finest teachers available. Elementary schools, with shorter educational television periods, would receive two full channels of service (12 hours a day divided into 10- to 20-minute periods) and there would be one full channel available for the colleges.

Then when schools finished their regular day in the early afternoon, the whole six-channel system would be fully available (at no more transmission or equipment costs) for other purposes during the afternoon, evenings, Saturdays, Sundays, and the 3 months of summer. A vast program of adult education in highway safety, medicine, nursing, technical training, economics, automobile driving training, and many other subjects could be provided.

Much has been said publicly in recent months, for example, about teaching driver and automobile safety courses, economics and Americanism in the public schools. If called upon, the educational television system could within a matter of months, with the present network reaching into every county, start sending out expertly prepared courses. There already is much video-taped and filmed instruction, done by excellent instructors, which could be adapted in whole or part to courses as approved by South Carolina authorities.

The network already is connected with most of the State colleges and all branches of the university. Twelve hospitals of the State already are tied in for medical and nursing instruction. The hospitals pay their own way.

The Southern Regional Education Board recently reported that educational television is advancing so rapidly over the South that it is difficult to issue monthly progress reports which are not out of date by the time they are mailed out. The rate of progress over the Nation as a whole is booming. Though South Carolina now holds a leading position, this may not be true much longer as other States move up due to the demands for better education.

Educational television has been in use in South Carolina for 5 years. Most of the contentions of its potential as reviewed in this statement were set forth from the beginning. The original South Carolina concepts as introduced 5 years ago have not been basically altered in any way, except that some have been confidently and objectively expanded.

Though constantly and closely scrutinized by authorities from within and outside the State during the 5 years, no basic weakness has been brought forth by any authorities as to the soundness of the South Carolina system.

We recognize that anything as strong and farreaching as educational television would upset some of the conveniences of existing practices, but it already has been satisfactorily proven in many schools, where cooperation is wholehearted, that educational television can quickly be woven into the conventional system without undue difficulties.

Initial objections to scheduling problems have faded as schools found ways to adapt and as the prospect of multichannel transmission made clear the chance for repeated showings of the same lesson. The college preparatory level of the material thus far produced has caused some discomfort in schools which have heretofore not been able to maintain this level, but greater selectivity and increased competence of both teachers and students viewing the lessons is lessening this problem. Given enough channel time educational television can enrich instruction for the noncollege bound as well as for those preparing for college, offering greater educational opportunity for all.

The South Carolina Educational Television Commission has requested an increase in appropriations of $405,000 for educational television. With this modest request, services to the schools now in the system can be doubled, and additional educational opportunity can be provided by open circuit to 398 elementary schools, 140 high schools and to the general public.

We have won recognition as the national leader in educational television with an expenditure for educational television that represents less than 1 percent of the total State budget. It is the belief of the commission that in no other way can so much be offered so many for so little.

R. LYNN KALMBACH.

"Woman's Role in the Community"—Talk by Congresswoman Sullivan Before Downtown St. Louis, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed rare for me to be away from Washington when the House is in session—I have an ironclad rule against doing so. But yesterday I broke it for what I considered good and sufficient reason: The launching in St. Louis of an annual weeklong series of events sponsored by Downtown St. Louis, Inc., an organization of our downtown business leaders, in the form of a "Salute to the Woman Who Works." As honorary chairman this year of "Downtown St. Louis Salutes the Woman Who Works," it was a pleasure for me to attend the opening luncheon and discuss "Woman's Role in the Community."

Nearly all women work—and work hard—although two-thirds of them are not gainfully employed. The one-third who are in the labor force perform work vital to the national economy. But whether employed or not, all women have many civic responsibilities outside the home, and after working hours, and these were among the points I tried to cover in my talk.

In view of the widespread interest in the subject matter of my talk, a subject which I know is under comprehensive study by the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my speech, as follows:

"WOMAN'S ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY"—ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, HONORARY CHAIRMAN OF "DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS SALUTES THE WOMAN WHO WORKS," MONDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 11, 1963, AT SHERATON-JEFFERSON HOTEL, LAUNCHING WEEK-LONG SERIES OF EVENTS SPONSORED BY DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS, INC.

On one of those bitterly cold days last month, when every householder could almost see the wings on his dollar bills—in the form of fuel going up the chimney—and there was snow and ice to chop away from the front walk, and the car wouldn't start and probably needed a new battery, and people's bones ached from the cold, and life was truly grim, one man who lives in the Third Congressional District probably felt he had taken as much of the grind as he could stand without finding a safety valve for letting off some steam. So he wrote to me. It was one of the most indignant letters I ever received as a Member of Congress. How dare we, he asked, let so many days go by without accomplishing anything? What were we being paid for? Why didn't we work at the jobs to which we were elected? What was the idea taking money under false pretense? Who did we think we were? How did we get that way? What right have Members of Congress to think they are above and beyond the moral responsibility to give a full day's work for a full day's pay? Why don't we pay back the salary we receive for not working? And so on and so on—for several pages.

Apparently, he had read a newspaper article commenting on the fact that with 6 weeks gone by, Congress had not passed a single major piece of legislation, and had acted on very few minor ones. Furthermore, out of deference to the annual desire of the Republicans in Congress to use Lincoln's Birthday week as a time for blasting the Democrats in speeches at fund-raising dinners all around the country, Congress was in semirecess for that week; and would have a similar week of informal recesses around the time of Jefferson's birthday so that the Democrats in Congress could return the compliment by going around the country attacking Republicans.

ORGANIZING A NEW CONGRESS IS COMPLEX

Actually, of course, it always takes at least a month, and often 2 months, in each new Congress—every 2 years—for a variety of organizational arrangements, including the adoption of new rules, agreement on committee ratios for the majority and minority parties, and assignments to committees, before the committees can even begin to get down to work. As everyone should know, the committees are the bill-perfecting workshops of Congress. By the time legislation comes to us on the House floor, for instance, it has pretty well been shaped by an appropriate committee into the form in which it will pass, and while amendments can be offered from the floor they are seldom accepted. So nothing is really even begun until the committees are organized. For nearly a month now, however, the committees on our side of the Capitol have been working very hard—and I can attest to that personally, since I am one of the Members on the House side with assignments on two House committees. And it seems they both usually schedule meetings at the same hours of the same days—but that's another story.

In any event, the terrible-tempered man who wrote me the indignant letter about Congress not earning its keep, picked just the wrong time to vent his spleen upon me for not working. After 10 years in the Congress, I am used to receiving abusive letters occasionally about the faults and inadequacies and shortcomings of Congress, or of individual Members of Congress, but usually these do not come from residents of my district, I am happy to say, since most of my constituents seem to know that I work pretty hard to at the job.

But this fellow just picked the wrong day to write. His letter arrived on a day when my desk was piled high with letters which I had dictated and had to read carefully before signing. It had been a week of very heavy correspondence on every conceivable type of problem which is called to my attention by constituents in trouble, or in need of help, in connection with Federal Government activities, which are vast and diversified. The food stamp plan, which I had been responsible for having installed on a pilot basis in St. Louis, was running into all kinds of misunderstandings and, apparently, some bureaucratic rigidity—and so there was a lot of telephoning I had to do between Washington and St. Louis—to the mayor and other officials—and then to the Department of Agriculture. I finally set up a conference in my office to try to work out the details so that the plan could operate more effectively, and with less bureaucratic inflexibility, and less misunderstanding on the part of those eligible for its benefits.

ON A SUNDAY AFTERNOON

Further, I was engaged in a behind-the-scenes struggle with the Pentagon and the State Department and even with some of the people in the White House over the policies we should follow in connection with our rights in the Canal Zone—this comes under my responsibility as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Earlier, I had been asked to make a quick trip with my subcommittee down to Panama—where the heat was about as oppressive as the cold was up here at the same time—for an on-the-spot investigation of the very complex, and I would say extremely important, problems in our relationships with the Republic of Panama, and our plans for either building a second canal or expanding the present one to meet the constantly increasing volume of shipping waiting in line at Cristobal or Balboa to cross from one ocean to the other.

And in the midst of all of this work—in came that letter berating me—well, there must be a stronger word than that—denouncing me, on the grounds that Members of Congress were not earning their salaries and should be ashamed of themselves because the House was not in continuous session.

What made the charge so ironic at the time was that I opened that letter and read it in my office—on a Sunday afternoon, and it is not unusual at all for me to be in the office on Sundays—or for 10, and often 12 hours on most other days, either.

I mention that incident today not in order to have all of you immediately get out your handkerchiefs and shed a few tears over Congresswoman SULLIVAN'S arduous life of toil—I happen to love every minute of my job for a great many reasons, and have made a practice every 2 years of asking the voters in my district to keep me working just as hard as ever at the job. I have cited the incident of the abusive letter berating Congress for not working hard at a time when I was working very hard indeed, because it illustrates a point I think is valid about most women in this country.

SALUTE TO WOMAN WHO WORKS MUST INCLUDE MOST WOMEN

Today's luncheon, and this week-long series of events sponsored by Downtown St. Louis, Inc., salute the woman who works. While I know that the salute is aimed primarily at women who work in the downtown area, I think the accolade could well apply to most women in St. Louis—and in the Nation. Most women work. About one-third of them work for pay—are gainfully employed—but most of the other two-thirds also work, and work hard, and do very essential work. They work hard at rearing children, and at making an attractive home and good home-life for their families; they work hard at innumerable volunteer tasks in the community and in the schools. Also, among the two-thirds of our women not gainfully employed, are a sizable number who are themselves in schools and colleges training for professional assignments in the future, or acquiring a firm and solid educational background which will fit them for whatever the future brings, and enable them, too, to be better mothers of tomorrow's citizens.

Work? Yes, most of the women we know work—and work hard. So a salute to the woman who works must include the homemaker, the woman rearing a family of fine children, the many women who are assisting their husbands in all manner of endeavor without any pay, the millions who make the great nonprofit voluntary organizations operate as effectively as they do in community and in other activities—the Red Cross, formed 82 years ago by a great American woman worker, the Community Chest, the Heart Fund, the March of Dimes, church activities, and so on and so on and so on—they are all manned by workingwomen who work very, very hard, whether they receive remuneration for their efforts or not.

So when anyone says only one-third of our women in this country over the age of 14 are working, implying that the rest are not working, it is as untrue and oversimplified as the letter I received denouncing me for not earning my salary because the House of Representatives was not in daily session for the week of Lincoln's Birthday. Much of the work women do in the home is taken too much for granted by those who have never had to wear themselves out doing it.

I have been a woman who works all my life—as I know many of you also have been. I have always worked at full tilt—giving any job I ever had all of my best efforts—so I can honestly say, I believe, that I have always worked hard. But whenever I begin to feel the hours might be long, or the effort exhausting, I think back to what my mother put forth in the way of effort and energy and time—and she never worked for pay in her whole long life. But she reared nine children—and she was a strict disciplinarian, as well as a loving parent. She really worked. Today's mothers of young children have many laborsaving devices my mother did not have when she was rearing her family; but I know that being a good homemaker is still hard and never-ending and exhausting work. So no one can ever downgrade in my presence the work done by the woman who stays at home.

ADVANTAGES OF DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS

However, the one-third of our women who are gainfully employed outside the home—working for pay—are doing important work, too; they make up a very important one-third of our total labor force, I believe most of us here are in the category of employed women. We also share the pleasure of working in downtown St. Louis—although I have the chance to enjoy that pleasure now only when Congress is not in session, and that is only a few months out of the year. But I share your enthusiasm for the joys and advantages of working in the downtown area—the nearness to the stores and theaters and hotels, and the wonderful convenience of the downtown area. Years ago, I fought hard to keep the Comptometer School, where I was employed, from leaving downtown. And now every time a new apartment building or a new office building, or a new anything goes into place here in the downtown, and particularly in the redevelopment areas, I take a double personal pride in it—for in addition to my long allegiance to downtown, I can see in stone and concrete and steel and glass—and in light and airy and pleasant surroundings—some of the dramatic results of the long hours of hearings and legislative effort I have had to invest in the redevelopment program over the years as a Member of Congress serving on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. While the downtown area has always been a wonderful place to work, it is also becoming once again now a wonderful place to live * * * and the rejuvenation which has taken place here in St. Louis of what were once depressing, dirty, airless, factory and warehouse and residential slums—into the beautiful environment now taking shape—is one of the greatest achievements of urban renewal in the entire Nation.

To the men and women of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., who have given so much time and effort and imagination, and who have invested so much money, too, toward the redevelopment of our center city, I want to address a personal salute of my own—right now. I am grateful to you.

Now, with the commercial taken care of—a bow to our sponsors—let's consider the substance of this program today: woman's role in the community, with particular reference to the woman who is employed.

WOMEN WORKING OUTSIDE THE HOME

Who are the workingwomen—we who make up about a third of all women over the age of 14 and a third of the entire labor force? There are more than half a million of us in Missouri alone and, contrary to what a lot of people seem to think, most of those women are working because they have to work—many as the sole support of families. Interestingly enough, however, there has been a very significant increase nationally in the past decade in the number of working wives, from less than 8 million 10 years ago to about 13 million now. In Missouri, for instance, although only one-third of all workers are women, and although only 1 out of every 3 married women are workers, it is interesting to note that well over half of all of those workingwomen—56 percent—are married women. The surveys indicate—with one important exception—that the higher the family income, the less likely the wife is to go out of the home to work. So it is safe to assume that a very large proportion of working wives are finding it necessary to work in order to supplement the family income for a variety of important reasons: to help a young husband with his education, perhaps, or to help him get a start on his way up the economic ladder; or to help put the youngsters through college; or to pay off debts resulting from illness or business reverses; or to make up the difference between a marginal existence and a decent standard of living. There is not too much value in trying to analyze why each and every workingwomen works, because the reasons vary among individuals. I said, however, that there was one important exception to the rule that the higher the family income, the less likely the wife is to take employment. It is this: The higher the educational level reached by the wife, the more likely she is to be found in professional or other paid employment.

Since the better educated women command higher salaries, on the average, the thesis does not hold true that all workingwomen are working entirely because of family economic necessity.

I suppose it's safe to say, however, that even where economic necessity is not a factor, families with working wives find it comparatively easy to spend at least up to the combined family income. What family doesn't?

CHANGING PATTERNS OF EMPLOYMENT

However, the facts as they have developed in recent years in relation to the workingwoman—the woman who is employed—reflect a pattern which is of great importance to the overall American economy. The idea that most women workers are casual employees—young things fresh out of school, putting in a few years before marriage, or in the early years of marriage, and will then retire from the labor force—is out of date. While it is true that the highest percentage of women workers in any age group are those between the ages of 18 and 24—45 percent of all women in that age group are employed—it is a further fact that almost as high a percentage—43 percent—of those between 33 and 44 are also employed. And 42 percent—or almost as many proportionately—of those between the ages of 45 and 64 are also employed.

So what we see here is a significant pattern: in the early years of womanhood, after schooling, before marriage, and perhaps in the first year or two of marriage, nearly half of all young women are in the labor force, working, acquiring skills, earning money for future wants, if not always for immediate needs. After age 24, however, there is a sharp drop. Only a third of our women in the age group between 25 and 34 are in the labor force. These are the years of acquiring a family, and running oneself ragged in keeping up with those human dynamos which brighten the home and exhaust the mother.

But then, gradually, more and more of these women go back into the labor force, back to work, either into new types of jobs or into the ones they worked at before marriage. There is a constant demand for trained workers; it is only the untrained woman for whom jobs seem to be elusive. But a good secretary, a nurse, a good saleswoman or manager, a business machine operator, a trained woman in many such fields, while having to meet and beat down a certain amount of age bias on the part of employers, can usually find a satisfactory position, if she has maintained her old skills or has developed new ones which are in demand in the job market. Millions of women are going in and out of the labor force each year, as family circumstances permit or require, so that from age 35 to 65, at least two out of every five women are gainfully employed. And, believe it or not, about 10 percent of all women over 65 are still working.

DECISION MUST BE A PERSONAL ONE

Many observers deplore the fact that so many women are working outside the home. Where there are young children at home, needing a mother's full time, care and attention, most of us have always felt that mother's place is at home. But sometimes the facts in individual cases may dictate otherwise. Throughout the long history of Aid to Dependent Children, from the depression days of 1935 when the program was enacted, we emphasized the importance and the desirability of enabling the mother to stay home to care for her children, with at least a bare minimum living standard assured through the assistance program. But in recent years, we have found that this policy is not always such a good one in all cases. And so, last year, in a rather historic change of direction, Congress passed a new Welfare program which is intended to encourage the ADC mothers, and other people on assistance, to acquire skills which can be used in gainful employment to become self-supporting. We need day-care centers; we need assured standards in the care of the

children—particularly young children—while the mother is in training, or working, and we need more part-time job opportunities for mothers who must work but who want to be home when the children get home from school. But the point of departure from the old program was the feeling that rather than have a family of youngsters grow up living always just on the thin edge of poverty—for that's the best we really provide now through the various State welfare programs—it is better to have the family enjoy a decent standard of living, even if it take the mother out of the home for part or most of the working day.

We can argue this point for hours, on moral and other grounds. In the final analysis, however, I think we have to agree that this is a problem each family should decide by itself, and for itself.

UNEQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

But when a woman goes off to work, part-time or full-time, married or single, either from economic necessity or from personal preference . . . perhaps because she has skills which are valuable to the economy and which she enjoys putting to economic use—the further fact emerges that she is probably going to experience some incompresensible discrimination when it comes to her paycheck. This is not just an impression we all have—all of us who have ever been in the business world—it is a proven fact: in job after job, there is a dual pay schedule . . . one for men, another for women, doing exactly the same work. The Post-dispatch recently carried a Sunday article on this discrimination, and later, an editorial denouncing the practice, which I hope many of you noticed. I thought so highly of it I placed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as support for the principle embodied in my bill to require Equal Pay for Equal Work done in interstate commerce. We passed such a bill last year in both Houses of Congress, but unfortunately, the circumstances of its passage by the Senate in the final days of the Session were such—as a rider on a foreign embassy construction bill—that the House and Senate Committees concerned could never find the magic formula for getting together in Conference to resolve the differences in the two bills. So the measure died with the end of the 87th Congress. But I am hopeful we can pass similar, or even better, legislation on equal pay this year, or at least in this Congress.

Believe me, no matter how high you stand on the occupational pyramid, you would personally benefit from the existence of such a law on the books. For there is pay discrimination, and we all know it; there is discrimination in promotions, and we all know it. One of the things all of us can do as working women is to make sure the employers all know that we know of this discriminatory policy.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY NOT DISCRIMINATE

As one righteously—and properly—indignant St. Louis working woman wrote me a few weeks ago on this issue:

"There are thousands of widows, divorcees, and even single women with as much (and sometimes more) financial responsibility to meet than some of their male coworkers, yet these women must accept a lower wage scale because they are women, and regardless of their abilities. Female teachers, office and credit managers, accountants, bank tellers, professionals in various fields, are paid substantially less than their male counterparts. Yet when these same women pay for groceries, buy an automobile, pay medical and dental expenses, and meet other such obligations, no distinction is made because they are women. There is no double standard in costs."

Naturally, I might add, her letter was written to me in support of the equal pay bill.

The Federal Government, as far as its own employees are concerned, is under a legal prohibition against the practice of wage discrimination against women, and this has been the law for many, many years. The job carries its own salary in the Federal service, regardless of who fills that job. That is the law. But, here again, practice has not always conformed to promise: because for years there have been effective barriers to the promotion of qualified women into top career civil service positions. This is just recently being broken down, thanks to the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and particularly to Margaret Hickey's committee of that Commission—the Committee on Federal Employment Policies and Practices—which uncovered a moth-eaten old ruling from a former Attorney General which permitted Government officials to specify, in filling job vacancies, whether the job should go to a man or a woman. In most instances, there was no valid reason in the world why either sex should be specified. This has all been changed, just within the past year; under the Executive order which Margaret Hickey's committee proposed, and which the Commission on the Status of Women, and the Attorney General, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, all agreed the President should issue—and which he did issue—practically all jobs in the Federal service, and promotion opportunities, too, are to be open to competition from all qualified individuals, without regard to sex. This is a tremendous breakthrough toward fairer employment opportunities for women in the Federal service, and the results already have been rather spectacular; nearly all job openings—except for a very few which logically require men only or women only—are being offered on an even basis to all who can qualify, and, as a result, women are climbing up the civil service scale to positions, of increasing importance commensurate with their training and ability. This kind of open policy on employment opportunity would not hurt any employer, in my opinion, unless, of course, a particular job is simply not suited to women—or there are compelling reasons to limit crews to members of one sex.

IMPACT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Nevertheless, some people raise the objection that such a policy takes away job opportunities for men—for men who need work in order to support their families. By and large, this objection is not valid. Of course, there are exceptions, but on the whole, the jobs which women tend to train for, and qualify for, and to prefer, are those which few men seem to want to do, or are willing to train for. This may change, as the new Manpower Development and Training Act gets into effective action, because the shortage occupations are, in many instances, in fields in which women seem to predominate. So we shall just have to wait and see how many unemployed or underemployed men are interested now in training for jobs as stenographers, office machine operators, computer programers, school teaching, nursing, the service trades, beauty operator, and so on. Frankly, I think it would be a very good thing for wage rates in those predominantly female occupations and professions if more men did go into them.

Generally speaking, it isn't a case of our having too few openings in this country for skilled people and that men and women must compete with each other for them. The situation is really quite different. We have a shortage of trained men and women in all of the professions and in the sciences and in nearly every field in which long years of preparation are necessary. Of course, this is not true in railroading and in coal mining and a few other industries. But generally speaking, we have unemployment primarily because we have so many untrained people for whom unskilled jobs are rapidly disappearing. Firing trained women will not open jobs for untrained men. So let's keep our perspective on this issue.

COMMISSION ON STATUS OF WOMEN

I mentioned very briefly the President's Commission on the Status of Women, on which St. Louisan Margaret Hickey serves with great distinction. This is the Commission which President Kennedy established a little more than a year ago with Eleanor Roosevelt as Chairman. She said at the time that it would be her last assignment in public service, and prophetically, her words were true. But she was spared long enough to develop a very comprehensive approach to all of the problems of women as citizens, as workers, as volunteers in civic activities—the problems of equal educational opportunities, equal pay, discriminatory legislation, and so on—and all of us, as women, can look forward with great anticipation to the report this Commission is assigned to make to President Kennedy by next October—a study of where we are and what the problems are, with recommendations on how best to solve them. Much of the work of the Commission, of course, is directed at the problems of working women, but not entirely so.

For as we all know, the concern of the women of St. Louis and of our country, whether employed or not, must be about far more than the availability of a job, or the conditions of employment on the jobs which are available, important as those things are. All of us, whether employed or not, have deep obligations as women to our community and to our country. Woman's role in the community is an all-encompassing one. She must be a force—politically and socially—for improvement and reform in all of our public responsibilities: schools; social welfare standards; the opportunities for youth to find a place in society—to acquire skills as well as education; the improvement of recreational programs; the proffering of understanding help for the mentally ill and hope for the handicapped; and care for the elderly—all of these, I insist, are primarily women's concern.

BE PART OF COMMUNITY'S SOCIAL CONSCIENCE

Women may not, in all cases, be in positions which enable them to solve these problems—the solutions may require political as well as community action, and women are in a small minority in positions of political power. But these problems will never be solved without constant agitation by women, insisting that solutions must be reached. When you have those circumstances, believe me, miracles can be achieved.

So every woman's first responsibility outside of her family is to be part of the community's conscience—and a conscience which acts like the one we all carry within us—a conscience which refuses to be quiet when wrong is being done—a conscience which cries out against apathy, and ignorance, and crime, and indecency, and poverty, and illness, and neglect.

"But," you might ask, "what can I do about these things? I'm just one person."

True enough. But one and one make two, and two and two make a committee or a delegation, or a task force. Enough women, indignant enough about a social ill, can organize, and stimulate the civic conscience into doing something about it. In our city, and in every city, crime is an acute and frightening reality; poverty is widespread; ignorance and illiteracy are far too common; municipal services are unable to cope with expanding needs; the voluntary organizations are swamped with demands for help; both public and philanthropic funds are always insufficient for the needs. There is so much which needs doing to make

our cities better able to meet the problems of public health and safety.

ONE INDIVIDUAL CAN DO MUCH

These are the mayor's problems, of course, and the board of aldermen's problems. But they are yours, too. Whether you live in the city or merely work here, this city is the nerve center of your life and well-being. Solutions for urban problems are possible—but only if there is a will to solve them, and a willingness to contribute personally to the admittedly high costs of these solutions. Unless we solve these problems, it will require no H-bombs to wipe out our cities; they will just shrivel up and die from hardening of the municipal arteries. And this we cannot permit.

What can an individual do? Every American citizen—thank God—can do a lot: you can take more than just a voting interest in public affairs, you can take an active political role—whichever party you believe in. Work for it. Contribute to it.

Participate in the selection of candidates, not only in primaries, but in the ward and precinct organizations. Write letters to those of us in public life who may be in a position to influence public policy directly. Never underestimate what your lone letter might accomplish.

For instance—and I've told this story often—a single letter to me 7 years ago from the mother of a retarded child, pleading with me to try to help her child receive the educational opportunities that child could use advantageously—stressing that most retarded children could be helped—started me working on a legislative objective which I consider among my most important activities in the Congress—legislation to train more teachers for exceptional children of all categories—up to then a relatively untouched field. Now we have such Federal-aid teacher-training programs for mentally retarded children and for children with speech and hearing defects. My original bill for such teacher-training programs for all exceptional children, including gifted children, was introduced in 1957. Since then interest has gradually mounted until now the President of the United States has formally endorsed and recommended just such legislation.

MANY AVENUES FOR SERVICE

That one letter to me was not by itself responsible, of course, but it stimulated my own thinking to the point where I obtained expert help in drafting comprehensive legislation which later became the guideline for all of the omnibus bills subsequently introduced—and now I think we will finally pass such comprehensive legislation.

Individual letters to me from housewives who found glaring examples of deceptive packaging and misleading labeling in the stores—and every woman shops—were of tremendous help to me in drafting the first bill ever introduced in Congress to attack this serious economic problem. Other housewives wrote to other Members of Congress, and now there is widespread interest in the subject. Again, I think we will curb this abuse effectively.

A woman—a lone woman—doing her job conscientiously in the Federal Food and Drug Administration is now a national heroine—Dr. Francis O. Kelsey. What she did in the thalidomide incident paved the way for a dramatic illustration of how fast Congress can work when the problem is clear and the danger is real. I had introduced my comprehensive food, drug and cosmetic reform bill on January 3, 1961, and for months it was the only bill in Congress to meet head on some of the serious problems growing out of loopholes in our 23-year-old drug control legislation. I tried for a year and a half to stimulate interest in this great problem. So did Senator KEFAUVER. Our efforts were apparently bearing little fruit—indeed the issue seemed dead for the 87th Congress—until the public disclosures of the thalidomide case provided the public stimulus to action—and then Congress acted so quickly, and so effectively, that the results were spectacular * * * a milestone in consumer protection equal to the original drug law of 1938, which, in turn, in its time, was the tightest and most effective law of its kind in the world. It took approximately 100 deaths from a faulty drug—elixer sulfanilomide—in 1938—to spur the Congress to action that time.

CONGRESS REFLECTS PUBLIC

Just remember that Congress reflects the public—and it takes a great deal to arouse the public enough to stimulate Congress to action. You are part of the public—and you see much about you which you condemn and want to see changed and improved. Do you bother to speak up, to complain, to protest, to agitate, to insist on correction of conditions and situations which you believe are bad in our society?

If you don't act—and don't try to get action—you are not heartening to your womanly instincts; you are ignoring your social conscience; you are an accessory to the crime of public apathy. And that's one of the worst crimes of all in a democracy.

I want you to help me—and all of your other public officials—to represent you more effectively in trying to cure the ills of our society and our economy. On the job, or in handling household supplies, or in shopping in the stores, or in leisure time activities, any woman can spot a lot of things which need correcting and which can be corrected through the political processes of our national, State and local governments. Perhaps those of us close to the problems cannot always see them objectively—like the housewife who can instantly spot the dust on a neighbor's coffee table but is unaware that the pictures on her own living room walls are crooked. In public life, we sometimes see only what we want to see and we can easily find reasonable excuses for not acting, particularly if no one is nagging at us to act. Public officials, after all, are human too.

However, in every level of government, a successful official is usually one who can recognize a problem in time to join in its correction before everyone has spotted it. But always—in almost every instance—someone spotted it first—before the official did—and told him about it. So all of us in public life need reliable "spotters"—people who will take the trouble to call our attention to problems as they emerge, rather than wait until they become insuperable. Will you, then, volunteer for this civic responsibility?

If you will, then my salute to you today—heartfelt and sincere in any event—will be a great big hurrah for the women of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., the women of Downtown Activities, Unlimited. For my gratitude to you will also be just that, unlimited. Thank you.

Appropriation for U.S. Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I submitted on March 7, 1963, to the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee on Appropriations in support of the 1964 appropriation for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., which is in my congressional district. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to present to you a brief statement in connection with the annual appropriation which you are now considering for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, located at New London, Conn., which is in my congressional district.

The Coast Guard Academy provides professional instruction to cadets who, upon the completion of a 4-year course of studies, become eligible to receive commissions as ensigns in the Coast Guard "in the service of their country and humanity." There are some 600 cadets enrolled at the Academy, coming from all parts of the country. They are fine, upright, and dedicated young men.

We in the eastern part of Connecticut are extremely proud of the Coast Guard Academy, its record of fine achievements over the years, and its role in training young men in seamanship, in the sciences, and in the service of their Nation. This is true in wartime, as well as in peacetime.

As a result of a comprehensive survey conducted by an architectural and engineering firm in 1961, an 8-year long-range program was undertaken for the expansion and modernization of the Academy. The improvement program scheduled for the fiscal year 1964 will cost a total of $1,750,000. The biggest part of the project calls for modernization of athletic facilities. The present indoor athletic facilities of the Academy are contained in a gymnasium building known as Billiard Hall and a small fieldhouse of temporary construction during World War II. These facilities are crowded and inadequate for the Academy's physical education program.

It is proposed to build a new wing to Billiard Hall which will provide more indoor athletic space, as well as the construction of adjacent outdoor athletic fields. In addition, there will be replacement of the heating and plumbing systems, rehabilitation of the electrical system, construction of the first phase of a field house, alterations of space in Billiard Hall, and the building of roadways and exterior utilities.

All of this is part of a forward planning program which will considerably help to improve the Coast Guard Academy and make it a modern institution for training our youth in this very important service to the Nation.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy was established in 1876. In the year 1910 it was set up at Fort Trumbull in New London, and in 1932 it was relocated to its present plant. Thus, the Academy has been in New London for the past 53 years. It has become a very important factor in the community and the surrounding area, economically and in other ways.

I have been honored recently when our distinguished Speaker, The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, appointed me as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy. I am now looking forward to the official visits as a member of the Board to inspect the physical facilities of the institution, the morale of the cadets, and the progress of the modernization and improvement program at the Academy. In due time, we shall report back to Congress our findings and recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, in the interests of national security and the continued need for this specialized training, I strongly urge you and the members of this subcommittee to approve the full budget requested for the Coast Guard Academy for the coming fiscal year. Any reduction of the sum requested will only delay the realization of this program of improvement in the time specified and will hinder the work of the Academy in meeting the Nation's goals prescribed for it.

Private Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the issues which we discuss in Washington affecting, as they do directly or indirectly, every citizen in the country, are naturally observed with considerable interest by community newspapers which very effectively express grassroots opinion.

The controversial medicare or socialized medicine proposal of the administration is receiving considerable scrutiny and thorough evaluation. Typical is an editorial which appeared in the Blue Island Sun-Standard of March 2, discussing interesting aspects of the problem of medical care for our senior citizens, and I ask leave to insert it into the RECORD at this point.

PRIVATE MEDICAL CARE PLANS INSURE 136 MILLION

By 1962 more than 136 million people, the highest in history and 75 percent of the U.S. civilian population, had some form of voluntary protection in the form of health insurance. This information published by the Wall Street Journal.

The Journal article includes other interesting information about illness statistics, cost of medical care and forms of protecting these costs.

Americans spent in 1961 slightly over $21 billion on medical care, the Journal informs, quoting statistics from the Health Insurance Institute. However Americans spent nearly the same sum on recreation and spent even more on personal business expenses such as bank service charges and legal service.

"Americans as a whole can afford the medical care they are getting. That plainly does not deny the fact of financial distress in many individual cases," the Journal reported.

Not all of the health insurance programs pay all medical costs, though the coverage, as well as the scope and variety is growing. It is also true that medical care for the aged is a special problem in a society whose tremendous medical strides mean people are living longer though voluntary programs for those over 65 are now proliferating.

It is also true that we have people too poor to pay for any insurance, though the problem of poverty is far less severe than it used to be, the article in the Wall Street Journal comments.

Against these considerations must be set the actual provisions of the proposals for Federal medical care for the aged. Since it is far from comprehensive, it is not going to solve anybody's financial problems; in fact, compared with some of the voluntary programs, its benefits look fairly meager.

"Moreover, it would exclude some 3 million people who are not eligible for existing social security payments, and many of these are people in real need.

"It would appear that the medical care of the indigent and the chronic unemployables in our midst will still have to be provided by private and community assistance," the Journal points out.

"The Government plan would however increase the social security tax of all who are on the rolls, regardless of need. The cost of medicare is unknown, but it is generally conceded that it could and probably would be staggering.

"The compulsory feature not only narrows the choice for the individual but deprives him of income with which he might otherwise prepare for the health and other problems of old age.

"The question before the Congress is not, and never has been, a choice between the social security approach or no medical care for the aged or anybody else. The advocates of compulsion are fond of saying the United States lacking a Federal care program, is behind the times.

"What is conveniently ignored is precisely the fantastic growth of private health insurance in this country. In the light of the evidence, those who insist that only Washington can do it may be the ones really living in the past," the Journal says concluding its comments.

Boy Scout Honors for Third District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Third Massachusetts District, which I have the great honor and privilege to resepresent in the Congress, was signaled out for special recognition last month by the Boy Scouts of America during National Boy Scout Week.

Peter W. Kotilainen of Millbury was chosen as 1 of 12 Scouts from throughout the United States to deliver in Washington the highlights of scouting activities in region 1 as part of the annual Boy Scout Report to the Nation. His alternate was Jon David Naparstek of Ayer, also from the Third District, another outstanding young Boy Scout leader and Eagle Scout, who has been active in the affairs of Mohegan Council of Central Massachusetts.

Peter, who is the junior assistant scoutmaster of Troop 9, sponsored by the Millbury Federated Congregational Methodist Church, was designated to represent the entire New England region during the official weeklong ceremonies in Washington, New Jersey, and New York. In addition, he was awarded a $300 college scholarship by the Reader's Digest.

During his 3-day visit to Washington, Peter attended the 53d anniversary breakfast in the Presidential Room of the Statler-Hilton and met many leaders in national affairs who were honored as helpful friends of Scouting.

Among other Scout honors earned by Peter during his active association in the Boy Scout movement are the Eagle Scout Bronze Palm Medal and the God and Country Award. In addition, he holds 30 merit badges for achievement in various phases of Scouting.

In 1961, Peter was named Boy Scout of the Year by Troop 109. More recently, the troop Beaver Patrol, under Peter's leadership, was designated the best camping patrol by Mohegan Council. In 1960, he was a patrol leader at the National Boy Scout Jamboree at Colorado Springs.

A junior at Millbury High School, Peter is active in the debating and science clubs and a member of the track team. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Toivo Kotilainen of 15 Alpine Way.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to extend my congratulations to Peter Kotilainen and Jon Naparstek and their families who may well be proud of the honors granted these young leaders by the Boy Scouts in recognition of their leadership and work in Scouting. To Peter and Jon, I also extend my very best wishes for their continued advancement in Scouting and community achievement. I predict brilliant futures for both these young men.

Speech of Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, is doing an excellent job for the Department of Interior and for the whole country. Recently he made a very fine address which I think is of great interest to the Congress, for the Commissioner spells out just what irrigation has meant in economic terms.

Mr. Dominy spoke on March 9 at Dothan, Ala., before the National Association of Produce Market Managers.

Following is the text of his address which I submit for the benefit of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY FLOYD E. DOMINY, COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCE MANAGERS, DOTHAN, ALA., MARCH 9, 1963

It is my pleasure and privilege to be with you today. It is an outgrowth of a recent trip during which your good president, Phil Cronkite, discovered our community of interests. Today I want to highlight for you the many services and activities which are at the heart of the reclamation story.

We are an agency of the Department of the Interior and have been in business more than 60 years now. Our principal aims and accomplishments throughout these years have been the development and conservation of water and water-based resources.

The area in which we operate measures over 60 percent of the total area of the continental United States, or roughly 1.8 million square miles. It comprises the 17 States lying west of a line drawn from Brownsville, Tex., to Winnipeg, Canada in the north—more commonly known as the reclamation States.

When President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Reclamation Act of 1902, establishing the Reclamation Service, now known as the Bureau of Reclamation, it was a major expression of the Nation's interest in the economic development and settlement of the arid and semiarid lands of the western half of our country. And the measure has paid rich dividends.

You see, water is a commodity in extremely short supply in the West—particularly at those times of the year when it is needed most. Little or no rainfall occurs beyond the storms of late fall, winter, and early spring. Large areas are actual desert lands—allowing only cactus to grow under the scorching blaze of a sun which is rarely clouded over.

Yet, this scorching sun turns into a blessing when we put water on the land. Instead of crumbling into dust, the earth offers up a rich harvest, that may include many specialty crops and fruits and vegetables that go through some of your markets.

Irrigation has been the key to the settling of the Western frontier, and the development of Western water resources has been the prime factor in converting a once-barren wasteland into a great national asset.

Irrigation agriculture made the first Spanish missions possible and later on opened the door to such permanent Anglo-Saxon settlements as Riverside and Anaheim in California, at Salt Lake City in Utah, at the Greeley Colony in Colorado, and elsewhere. Except for the seaport cities, virtually every major population center west of the 100th meridian has its origin at the site of an irrigation farming venture.

Progress, of course, seldom comes over night. Early efforts to irrigate the land by private capital and private individuals and cooperatives were handicapped for a variety of reasons—lack of experience, lack of knowledge regarding soil and plant characteristics in their response to the artificial application of water, lack of data regarding weather and streamflow. Above all, there was insufficient knowledge of the technology required to build storage and conveyance works to a scale which would insure optimum continuing utilization of the available water resource. And even if the technical know-how had been available, individual citizens would have been hard pressed to obtain the capital necessary for so large an undertaking.

Development of the West accelerated rapidly when the resources of the Federal Government were thrown behind the effort. Unlike most development programs, Reclamation was founded on a basis of reimbursability. More than 92 percent of the cost of all authorized reclamation projects is repayable and we are more than 99 percent current in the scheduled return of this obligation.

To be sure, governmental efforts could succeed only with the wholehearted cooperation and participation of the citizens. Accomplishments in the 60-year history of the reclamation program are clear evidence of the people's concern and interest in putting our water and land resources to work.

Let me tell you a little about the things we have been able to do in these arid States where precipitation runs as low as an inch or two a year in some areas.

Bureau irrigation projects today are capable of irrigating well over 8 million acres of highly productive western farm land. In 1961, about one-fifth of all cropland irrigated in the United States received either a full or a supplemental supply of irrigation water from reclamation-constructed works. Over 150 different crops are grown each year on reclamation project lands, valued in excess of a billion dollars. The cumulative value of reclamation harvests from 1906 to 1961 approaches $18 billion.

Fruits and vegetables alone grossed over $375 million in 1961, with all fruits averaging $544 and all vegetables averaging $366 per irrigated acre. Peaches ran $437 an acre and fresh market tomatoes $1,688 per acre. Many crops and fields of individual crops are higher. For example, celery averaged $1,416, and cucumbers $1,197 per acre.

A vast army of packagers, distributors and marketers speed these products to the areas of demand and on to the final consumers.

As executives in the produce industry, you are completely familiar with the marketing process and can appreciate the many phases through which a product must pass before it reaches its final destination. And I am sure you appreciate, more than anyone, the value of a timely shipment of high-quality produce under favorable market conditions.

It is in this area that we make a strong case for irrigation: timeliness, high quality, high production per acre, and high returns. Good irrigation practice makes one, or more, of all of these things possible. And, in doing so, it contributes positively to our level and standard of living.

You may ask yourselves the inevitable question: "But why increase our production when we already have a huge crop surplus?" And I would say to you: "A surplus of what?"

In our experience the introduction of irrigation on productive lands frees the farmer from the inflexible pattern which has forced him to dryfarm the few crops constituting our present surplus problem.

With the help of irrigation, the farmer may plant for the market; subject to the length of growing seasons and his own ability to combine water, land, and fertilizer, he may grow such nonsurplus vegetable, fruit, and field crops as will yield him the highest net returns. No longer is he at the mercy of a raincloud which may or may not yield its moisture; no longer is he at the mercy of an unrelenting sun and dry sky.

The farmer so becomes once more his own free agent, subject only to the pressures and rigor of a competitive marketplace. And it is for these reasons that we hold the reclamation program to make a positive contribution in our national efforts to regain a balanced agriculture.

In our so-called humid States, too, the practice of irrigation is gaining increased acceptance. Growers here in the Southeast and Eastern States have come to recognize it both as an effective insurance against crop failure and simply as a good farming practice, offering generally higher yields and a wider choice of cropping patterns.

But it is not the farmer alone who benefits from irrigation. When water becomes a controlled factor of production, a greater variety of profitable crops may be grown and industries will be keen to grasp the opportunities offered in the processing and marketing of these crops.

Let me illustrate:

An average of more than 60 cents of the consumer's food dollar goes to cover processing and marketing expenditures.

In response to the growing consumer demand for more convenient foods and for new and different products, the U.S. food industry is spending nearly $100 million a year for product research. About one-third of the food store volume today comes from items that were not even available on the market a dozen years ago. And this trend continues.

Only two decades ago, scarcely 3 percent of the fresh fruits and vegetables marketed were consumer packaged. In the 1960's we may expect half or more of our fresh produce to be offered in prepackaged form.

Fifty-five railroads today haul loaded truck trailers in piggy-back fashion—44 of these haul fresh produce in refrigerated trailers.

Thirty-five years ago strawberries packed in barrels were the only fruit produced commercially frozen. Today, the shopper is hypnotized by the vast array of concentrated and frozen products—ranging from fruit juices to complete meals.

Many new industries spring up, providing employment and opportunity for livelihood in the processing of these farm products.

The humble but important potato is now available in the retail market in as many as 30 different processed forms.

In turn, of course, farm processing industries create jobs and opportunity in other industrial fields. Let me quote you California as an example. Industry sources have estimated that:

The steel industry each year sells 300,000 tons of tinplate to California canneries for use in the production of metal containers.

Glass manufacturers annually sell 1.1 billion jars to that State's food processors.

Paper products manufacturers supply 125 million fiber box containers annually to California food handlers.

Printers provide one million miles of printed labels each year to canners and packagers.

For every 100 employed in agriculture, another 263 are employed in such closely associated industries as canning, preserving, transporting, storing, packaging, and selling.

We cannot even guess what all this means in dollars and cents to an area or region. We do know, however, that none of this would have been possible, that prosperity and growth in the West would have been seriously impeded without the development and utilization of its most limited resource—water.

Let me tell you a little about the physical aspects of our reclamation projects which store and conserve this resource. A typical project normally consists of a storage dam and reservoir, a diversion structure, one or more main canals to transport the water to the general areas of use, and a distribution system made up of networks of laterals and ditches to take the water to the point of use. Where soil and topography require drainage, a system of drains is also constructed as a part of the distribution system.

Generally, the laterals take off at various points of the main canal and bring water to what we call the farmer's headgate, usually located at the highest level on the farm. From here gravity will allow it to run into the farmer's own system to the ultimate point of application.

Of course, I have greatly oversimplified the actual picture. When we go into an entire river basin, the structures and facilities required for efficient operation can become enormously complex in their interaction and interdependence. Also, topography, or the lay of the land, are not always on our side. At times it is necessary to pump the water over and through mountains. Certain lands may be difficult to drain, or they may be suitable only for sprinkler irrigation.

Seen even in this light of adversity, the Bureau of Reclamation enjoys a unique position among organizations in the heavy construction field. No job is too large, or too small, or too complex when it adds to the prudent conservation of our limited resources and to the well-being of our economy. And the wealth of data and experience amassed by our staff during more than half a century's success in water development remains unmatched.

The facilities in operation on reclamation projects today number some 216 storage dams and reservoirs, 131 diversion dams, more than 7,200 miles of canals and pipelines, and over 30,000 miles of laterals and drains. The active capacity in our reservoirs is sufficient to cover with water one foot deep an area equal to the entire States of Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and South Carolina, and still have enough left for each of us to have a good swimming pool of our own.

While our early projects served almost exclusively the purpose of irrigating fertile farmlands, today this is no longer sufficient in itself. Because of the complexities of modern life, and the many pressures and demands put upon our limited water supply, our modern projects now serve a multitude of purposes.

We would be sadly remiss in our duty, for example, if we ignored an opportunity to prevent future flood damages, or if we overlooked possibilities to improve fish and wild-

life habitat, to take advantage of the hydroelectric power potential, to supply needed water for cities and industry, or to expand our recreational resources.

These many services are important and vital to all of us, and in planning and building our projects we are not willing to settle for less. It is the people's investment, now and in the future, and we intend to guard and protect it as best we can.

Let me briefly illustrate for you the evolution in our national philosophy and view on water development, as it is reflected in policy statements and in the laws under which we operate. The original Reclamation Act of 1902 authorized the use of funds received from the sale of public lands for the examination, survey, construction, and maintenance of irrigation works. The act also provided for repayment of construction charges by the beneficiaries of a project.

In 1928 came the Boulder Canyon Project Act—the first truly multipurpose project to be authorized by Congress. This act provided for the disposal of project-produced hydroelectric power to repay the cost of project facilities allocated to the power purpose and thereafter to repay the millions of dollars which were spent for flood control purposes.

In 1939, reclamation law was further adjusted to recognize the importance of power and municipal water supplies in determining whether or not project construction was feasible and economically justifiable. A provision was also included to the effect that those portions of the project cost which were allocated to the purposes of navigation and flood control were in the national interest and need not be repaid.

Further legislation has provided for the conservation of fish and wildlife resources at reclamation projects and has recognized such costs as nonreimbursable. Recent congressional authorizations of individual projects have recognized the importance of including recreational facilities as part of the project and provided for the nonreimbursability of project costs associated with the recreation purpose.

Congress now has before it a proposal for a land and water conservation fund—a bill widely acclaimed by many individuals and groups and strongly supported by the Department of the Interior—which will go a long way toward further development of recreational facilities at Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs and elsewhere.

More than 90 percent of all Americans now engage in some form of outdoor recreation activity. The President has proposed a fund from various sources, including a user fee car sticker, which would provide grants-in-aid to the States on a matching basis and also permit the acquiring of additional Federal lands and waters to enlarge the national park system, the national forest system, or for the preservation of wildlife—all for the benefit of the public. The user-fee system and other income, including proceeds of the existing 4-cent tax on marine gasoline and special motor fuels used in pleasure boats, would put the planning, acquiring, and developing of needed outdoor recreation resources on a pay-as-you-go basis. In effect, it makes the recreation user pay his way, which is as it should be.

Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs have always been centers of recreational activity, but it is unfair to expect the water users—the irrigation farmers, for example—to be burdened with recreational costs. The land and water conservation fund bill will, if enacted, assist materially in greater public use of reclamation facilities for recreation purposes on the fairest possible basis.

A continuous thread through the history of water development points the way to ever-greater utilization of our water resources on behalf of our rapidly increasing population. This very day, our mass media exhort you to guard against the pollution of our streams and lakes. Even this very minute many people and Federal, State, and local agencies are coping with the problems posed by the explosive increase in our number and the intensive urbanization and industrialization which accompany it.

National policy with regard to these problems is perhaps best expressed in the President's first special message on national resources:

"Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home, and industry. If all areas of the country are to enjoy a balanced growth, our Federal reclamation and other water resource programs will have to give increased attention to municipal and industrial water and power supplies as well as irrigation and land redemption."

The Bureau of Reclamation has accepted this challenge of our modern age. We are undertaking such water development projects in the Western States as the Congress may authorize at a construction rate of nearly $400 million annually. We are constantly receiving inquiries and offering information about our work from other areas of the United States. Indeed, there is a bill before the Congress which would extend our services on a nationwide basis.

Our engineering and hydraulic research laboratories at Denver, Colo., are the mecca of engineers and technical people from all over the world. We have been participants in the national effort to help other countries by teaching them to help themselves in the development and use of their water resources.

This is the gospel of reclamation. If I seem a little evangelical it is because I am convinced of the vital importance of this work in furthering our own national economy and prosperity and in alleviating want and hunger in the world.

Again let me express my appreciation to Phil Cronkite for this opportunity to meet with you. I hope I have been able to contribute something of value to your sessions.

Mary Dempsey, Connecticut's First Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the Connecticut State Journal for February published a fine profile study of Connecticut's very charming first lady, Mrs. Mary F. Dempsey, wife of our distinguished Governor, John N. Dempsey. The Dempseys come from my town of Putnam, Conn., were neighbors and are close friends of my wife and myself, and he was my predecessor as mayor of Putnam for many years.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to insert into the RECORD the article about Connecticut's first lady, Mary Dempsey. It reads as follows:

MEET CONNECTICUT'S FIRST LADY

Three months have passed since Mrs. Mary Frey Dempsey and her husband received assurance from 549,027 voters that they were welcome to remain living in the executive residence at 990 Prospect Avenue in Hartford.

The solid vote of confidence from the people of Connecticut changed the Dempseys' temporary residence in the 19-room mansion to a more or less permanent one.

In the 2 years of temporary residence in the house that has been the official home of seven former Governors (Baldwin, Snow, McConaughy, Shannon, Bowles, Lodge, and Ribicoff) since it was purchased by the State in 1943, Mrs. Mary Dempsey has learned to successfully lead three lives, as wife, mother, and Connecticut's first lady.

MARY FREY

The story begins 44 years ago when Mary Frey was born to Carl and Margaret Frey in Pawtucket, R.I. She was one of four children. Her father worked in the textile business and the family moved from town to town in Rhode Island, eastern Connecticut, and eastern Massachusetts.

Mary's father was soon transferred to Putnam and in 1934 Mary entered Putnam High School as a freshman. Here she met an attractive upperclassman, a senior no less, with an engaging smile. Six years later, after a "whirlwind courtship," Mary Frey and John Noel Dempsey were married.

The following years were happy years. Four Dempsey children came and the whole family ate, drank, and lived politics. Does Mrs. Dempsey like politics? "Well, I really don't know. I've never known anything except politics." John Dempsey at 21, as soon as he could vote, had been elected alderman in Putnam. In the ensuing years the Governor-to-be served Putnam as councilman, as mayor for 13 years, and as State representative for three terms. In 1954 he became executive assistant to Governor Ribicoff and in 1958 he was elected Lieutenant Governor only to become Governor in 1961 when Governor Ribicoff stepped aside to serve in the Kennedy Cabinet.

HAPPIEST TIME

"Our happiest time has been just recently when John won the November election and was sworn in on his own this January." Mrs. Dempsey's pride in her husband's accomplishments, and this latest one in particular, is boundless. She admits moments of anxiety before the outcome of the election was known. "I thought John would win, but I thought the election would be a lot closer than it was and I was worried. But the children and John's mother were very optimistic and had no doubt about the outcome. As a matter of fact, they thought I was silly even to worry about it."

MOST IMPORTANT ROLE

Mary Dempsey loves her new role as Connecticut's first lady. One of the reasons for this love and for her rapid adjustment to her new life is that it is not totally new. The role she considers most important and the one she has chosen to play has not changed in the last 2 years, nor in the last 20. In her own words she tells what she considers to be the role of a wife of a man in public office: "I feel that a wife of a politician should have two main concerns. First, she should do what she can to make her husband happy, making sure he gets a reasonable amount of sleep, eats enough, etc. And she should be a helpmate to him, someone with whom he can discuss things; someone whom he can really count on. Secondly, she should be very concerned with raising their children."

THE DEMPSEY CHILDREN

The children have taken their new surroundings in stride and are thoroughly enjoying themselves. Edward, the oldest boy, is at a seminary in Rochester but enjoys coming home and entertaining his friends in the big brick house. John, Jr., 17, Margaret, 16, and Kevin, 14, entertain their friends there too; but there is a certain "class consciousness" because of the "vast" difference in ages. "The 17-year-olds don't wish to associate with the 16-year-olds and the 16-year-olds naturally have nothing to do with

the 14-year-olds," says Mrs. Dempsey. "Instead of one party, we end up having to have three."

The children's main occupation when the family first moved to Hartford, according to Mrs. Dempsey, was to call each other on the intercom and numerous telephone extensions, pretending they were other people.

Now the focus is on driving. John Jr. takes the car the Governor gave Mrs. Dempsey for Christmas and offers to drive her anywhere she wishes to go. "I've only driven my own car once, to the beauty parlor. I think they think I don't know how to drive." Kevin, who knew how to drive when he was 11 but who is still not old enough to get a license, drives an old 1953 Ford around the residence grounds.

"The children lead a fairly normal life at home and in school where they certainly do not get any concessions from their teachers." Mrs. Dempsey adds that the only thing the children do not like about their new station is having to get dressed up to have their picture taken.

Both Governor and Mrs. Dempsey feel family life of the utmost importance. In line with this they plan as much time around the children as possible. "Things we do as a family we always enjoy. Our favorite trip is to Camp Drum to review the National Guard."

PEOPLE AND FRIENDS

Mrs. Dempsey shares her husband's enthusiasm and concern for people. This is another reason why she finds her role as Connecticut's first lady so much to her liking. An affable person herself, she loves meeting people and feels that as the Governor's wife she has a chance to meet people and be exposed to more ideas than she would otherwise. She remembers faces but not always names. One of her pet peeves is people who come up to her and say, "You remember me * * * who am I?" and then become indignant when she does not remember.

Mary Dempsey's favorite "duty" by far is to visit various institutions in the State to see what is being done for people. The children at such places as the Newington Home and the Connecticut Valley Hospital are a joy to her and she finds herself returning often to see how the same children are progressing.

"We have met lots of people and have made some wonderful friends, but the friends dearest to John and myself are our old friends." Mrs. Dempsey refers to ten or so people from around Putnam whom they have known since John Dempsey's alderman days. "You have very few close, lasting friends in your life. John and I think there is nothing more wonderful than friends who are always friends no matter what happens—we have had some lean years, you know. We try to see our old and dear friends as much as possible."

A TYPICAL DAY

Life is never dull for Mary Dempsey. A typical day includes breakfast with the Governor and a visit with the children before they go to school. Next the day's meals are planned with the cook. "I think the hardest thing to get used to when we first came here was not doing everything myself. I used to be a jack-of-all-trades. But no more." The executive residence maintains a staff of seven jacks.

Appointments, official luncheons and teas follow with perhaps an unofficial moment to shop for the children. The Dempseys make an attempt to be together for dinner.

Time left over, what there is of it, is well spent by Mrs. Dempsey. She is an insatiable reader. She reads while traveling by car or train until dizziness sets in. One of the things she used to love to do and misses a great deal is to cook. Italian dishes, spaghetti, lasagna, eggplant parmigiana are her favorites. "I never liked to do the dishes though. And I always dreamed of a little girl who would come and do them for me. And she always did—me."

Connecticut's first lady is not in the limelight as often as some other first ladies have been in the past. She does not like limelight as such. Her family is her life. Her concern for the people of Connecticut is real. This is the woman who plans to live at the executive residence for 4 more years—at least.

St. Peter's Unit First at Rifle Drill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in view of recent Department of Defense proposals to drastically curtail ROTC programs, I found a report of the sixth annual Pershing Rifles Invitational Drill of special interest. The development of military discipline in our young men, even in this age of sophisticated weaponry, is important and I feel that spirited competition such as evidenced in this intercollegiate drill competition is worthy of attention. Twenty-two colleges entered thirty-eight teams in this contest.

I am especially proud that the team representing St. Peter's College in Jersey City in my district captured first place in the competition.

A report of the Pershing Rifles drill competition as it appeared in the Jersey Journal follows:

ST. PETER'S UNIT FIRST AT RIFLE DRILL

Although Company N-8, Pershing Rifles of St. Peter's College, Jersey City, did not compete for trophies at the sixth annual Pershing Rifles Invitational Drill in Jersey City Armory, the unit captured first place in overall point standings.

The company was host for the event and had declared itself ineligible for trophies.

The drill, which started at 8 a.m. and ran for most of Saturday, was attended by upwards of 3,000. Twenty-two colleges and universities with a total of 38 teams were represented.

The audience saw the program through to the final review and presentation of awards, so interested was the crowd in the proceedings.

One of the highlights of the trick drill competition was the first-place performance of "The Raiders" from North Carolina A. & T. College in Greensboro, N.C. This unit wowed the crowd with its unusual shuffle type cadence and twirling guidon.

As part of its sequence the entire unit waved goodby to the audience as it was preparing to leave the floor. This unit placed second in the country among the drill teams competing at last year's Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, D.C.

Northeastern University from Boston took first place, followed by New York State Maritime College from the Bronx and Providence College, Providence, R.I.

First place trophy in Infantry Drill Regulation was awarded to City College of New York. Second place was won by Providence College and third place was captured by New York Maritime College.

Second position in trick drill went to the Scarlet Rifles of Rutgers and the third spot was taken by Northeastern.

Judges for the competition were Lt. Col. Alexander S. Mikhalevsky, professor of military science at Bordentown Military Institute, chief judge; Capt. Ernest A. Kochy, Capt. Donald P. Keeney, and Capt. Alfred F. Tittel from II Army Corps at Camp Kilmer and Capt. Robert W. Smith from the Marine Corps.

Trophies were presented by Rev. Leo McLaughlin, acting president of St. Peter's and Lt. Col. Joseph P. Jaugstetter, professor of military science at St. Peter's.

Company N-8 is commanded by Pershing Rifles Capt. Peter F. Egan. Moderator of the unit is Capt. James M. Moore, U.S. Army.

Current Developments in Space Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper prepared for presentation at the 1963 southeastern regional meeting of the American Society of International Law, held February 1 and 2, 1963, at the University of North Carolina Law School:

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SPACE LAW

(By Dr. John Cobb Cooper, member of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton University, legal adviser to the International Air Transport Association, and former vice president of Pan American Airways)

The development of space law has reached a stage where it is now directly subject to national and international political pressures. In December 1961, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the now celebrated resolution 1721A (XVI), as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Recognizing the common interest of mankind in furthering the peaceful uses of outer space and the urgent need to strengthen international cooperation in this important field;

"Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be only for the betterment of mankind and to the benefit of states irrespective of the stage of their economic or scientific development.

"1. Commends to states for their guidance in the exploration and use of outer space the following principles:

"(a) International law, including the United Nations Charter, applies to outer space and celestial bodies;

"(b) Outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states in conformity with international law, and are not subject to national appropriation;

"2. Invites the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to study and report on the legal problems which may arise from the exploration and use of outer space."

Discussing this resolution a few weeks later in an article on "Self-Defense in Outer Space and the United Nations," published in Air Force and Space Digest for February 1962, I said:

"It must be noted that the resolution does not define the term 'outer space' or the term 'peaceful uses.' However, the resolution clearly commits the U.N. to the basic principles that international law and the charter are there applicable, also that this area and celestial bodies are free for explora-

tion and use by all states 'in conformity with international law,' and 'are not subject to national appropriation.' This can only mean that neither outer space nor celestial bodies are now subject to territorial claims of any single state nor can they be hereafter. The U.N. has thus determined that outer space has an international status analogous to that of the high seas where, as Mr. Justice Storey of the U.S. Supreme Court said in the case of the Mariana Flora in 1826: 'It is the common highway of all, appropriated to the use of all, and no one can vindicate to himself a superior prerogative there'."

One year later it is obvious that I was too optimistic in feeling that the legal status of outer space had been settled, and that it could be considered as an area with the same wide freedom of use as international law applies to the high seas. It is now apparent that grave disputes exist between members of the United Nations as to possible limitations on the use of outer space. There is no understanding as to what constitutes authorized activities in outer space "in conformity with international law."

Following the adoption of the 1961 resolution by the Assembly of the U.N., the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space met early in 1962 and created a legal subcommittee. This subcommittee met in Geneva in May and June, followed later by a further meeting of the full committee and finally the First (Political) Committee of the 1962 Assembly. No agreement was reached on any of the proposals which had been submitted.

On December 19, 1962, the Assembly of the U.N. on recommendation of its first committee, adopted Resolution 1802 (XVII). That resolution (1) noted with regret that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had not yet made recommendations on legal questions; (2) called upon all member states to cooperate in the further development of law for outer space; (3) requested the committee to continue urgently its work on the further elaboration "of basic legal principles governing the activities of states in the exploration or use of outer space," on liability for space vehicle accidents, and on assistance to and return of astronauts and space vehicles, as well as on other legal problems; (4) referred to the Committe, as a basis for its work, all proposals thus far brought forward, including the draft proposals as to basic principles submitted by the U.S.S.R., the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom, and the United States (copies of which are attached as appendices to this paper), also the United States proposal as to liability, and the U.S.S.R. and United States proposals as to assistance to and return of astronauts and space vehicles.

The primary problem as to the "basic legal principles governing States in the exploration and use of outer space" has thus been returned to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, together with the subsidiary questions of assistance and liability. The proposals as to basic principles, read in the light of the debates in the several committees, illustrate the gravity and depth of apparent areas of present disagreement. These proposals are ostensibly designed to amplify the principles contained in the original 1961 Resolution 1721A (XVI). No one can predict today what the outcome may be when the Legal Subcommittee resumes its work later this year. Certain questions must be settled if concrete action is to follow. The questions most pressing seem to be (1) whether or not free enterprise may be used to explore and operate in outer space; (2) whether the operation of space vehicles or satellites in outer space to gain intelligence as to surface conditions in foreign territory constitutes illegal international espionage; (3) to what extent prior international consultation is needed before a new space project is launched; (4) what is meant by the term "peaceful uses" and its relation to problems of disarmament.

FREE ENTERPRISE IN OUTER SPACE

This paper is presented as part of a discussion on "Legal Aspects of Doing Business in Space." It would therefore appear useful to consider first the serious disagreement on the extent to which free enterprise may be engaged in the exploration and use of outer space. An examination of the Soviet proposal as to basic principles discloses that paragraph 3 asserts that all states have equal rights to explore and use outer space. However, paragraph 7 limits this by declaring that "all activities of any kind pertaining to the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out solely and exclusively by states." This was not carelessly included. The phrase means just what it says; namely that no activity is to be permitted except that of the state; and no corporate or other private activity may exist. The Soviet representative at the meeting of the Legal Subcommittee said, during the seventh meeting of that group:

"In capitalist countries radio corporations intended to explore outer space on their own account. If they could do as they wished, private capitalistic competition would displace international cooperation." His delegation therefore considered that all exploration and use of outer space should be carried out solely and exclusively by states. Six months later the Soviet spokesman in the United Nations First Committee supported the same proposal on somewhat different grounds, saying, after discussing high altitude atomic explosions: "We stress again that all operations of that kind which could hinder the peaceful uses of outer space should not occur. In order to insure the true responsibility of states for the results of their activities in outer space, in order to prevent the possibility of harm being caused to mankind as a result of activities in space, we propose that all activities pertaining to the exploration and use of outer space should be carried out solely and exclusively by states."

In contrast it should be noted that the United Kingdom draft declaration of basic principles provides in paragraph 4 that "all states shall, for themselves and their nationals, have equal rights in the exploration and use of outer space."

The United States clearly did not accept the proposed Soviet limitation. The U.S. representative in the First Committee stated on December 10, 1962, that the phrase "activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space," appearing in a proposed committee resolution then under consideration, "does not contain any suggestion that only states may carry on activities." After indicating that such activities might also be conducted by international organizations, he said: "In addition there may be corporations, private or semiprivate in character which, in the future, will conduct space activities. The activities conducted by such organizations must also conform to the rule of law."

The ideological position taken by the Soviet bloc seeking to exclude private enterprise from outer space operations might result in serious difficulties. Certainly the disagreement must be settled in any final statement of basic principles.

OBSERVATION SATELLITES

Paragraph 8 of the U.S.S.R. draft declaration of basic principles contains the following paragraph:

"The use of artificial satellites for the collection of intelligence information in the territory of foreign states is incompatible with the objectives of mankind in its conquest of outer space."

This proposal was vigorously, and even violently, supported by speakers for the Soviet bloc during the various discussions. A clear conflict of views as to the international law applicable developed. The representative of the United States in the Legal Subcommittee stated, in summary, on June 7, 1962:

"International law imposed no prohibition on the observation of the earth from outer space, which was peaceful and did not interfere with other activities on earth or in space. It might be performed by astronauts as explorers and scientists, by Tiros satellites for humanitarian public services relating to weather prediction, and by other means for such purposes as resource surveys, engineering and development projects, and the mapping of remote areas. For example, his delegation considered that the observations made by Major Titov from the Vostok II, and indeed any other observation which the U.S.S.R. might be conducting in outer space, were peaceful and that Major Titov's military status and the intent of his observations were irrelevant."

The U.S.S.R. introduced in the Legal Subcommittee a proposed agreement for assistance to astronauts and spacecraft landing in foreign territory and providing for their return. Article 7 of that draft stated:

"Foreign spaceships, satellites and capsules found by a contracting state on its territory or salvaged on the high seas shall be returned without delay to the launching state if they have identification marks showing their national origin and if the launching state has officially announced the launching of the devices found.

"Space vehicles aboard which devices have been discovered for the collection of intelligence information, in the territory of another state shall not be returned."

The U.S. proposal covering return of spacecraft did not contain the exception insisted on by the U.S.S.R. as to space vehicles used for the collection of intelligence. The final distinct conflict is best illustrated by official statements during the meeting of the First Committee of the U.N. on December 3, 1962.

The U.S. representative said:

"A navigation satellite in outer space can guide a submarine as well as a merchant ship. The instruments which guide a space vehicle on a scientific mission can also guide a space vehicle on a military mission. One of the consequences of these facts is that any nation may use space satellites for such purposes as observation and information-gathering. Observation from space is consistent with international law, just as is observation from the high seas. Moreover, it serves many useful purposes. Observation satellites can measure solar and stellar radiation and observe the atmosphere and surfaces of other planets. They can observe cloud formations and weather conditions. They can observe the earth and add to the science of geodesy. Observation satellites obviously have a military as well as scientific and commercial applications. But this can provide no basis for objection to observation satellites."

Replying the same day the Soviet representative in the First Committee said:

"We cannot agree with the claim that all observation from space, including observation for the purpose of collecting intelligence data, is inconformity with international law—a conclusion which could be drawn from the statement made this morning by the representative from the United States. Such observation is just as wrong as when intelligence data are obtained by other means, such as by photographs made from the air. The object to which such illegal surveillance is directed constitutes a secret guarded by a sovereign state, and regardless of the means by which such an operation is carried out, it is in all cases an intrusion into something guarded by a sovereign state in conformity with its sovereign prerogative. Thus such observations are in violation of the sovereignty of states, and no analogy exists here with principles applying to the

open seas. If it were merely a case of observing what happens on the high seas, one could of course accept this analogy; but when it is a case of observation on the high seas for purposes of collecting intelligence information, then we are dealing with an intrusion into the sovereign rights of states, an attempt to penetrate into that which a state tries to protect on its territory. And I should add to this the further fact that, for technical reasons, one cannot find out by observation on the high seas what one can find out from outer space. Thus this analogy used by the representative of the United States can be considered neither from the factual nor from the legal angle as valid and applying to the situation we are at present discussing. For these reasons we consider that the activities involved are incompatible with the provision of the U.N. Charter. Such gathering of intelligence data through the use of space vehicles is in violation of the sovereign rights of states, and if outer space is to be used in peaceful cooperation, such operations cannot be regarded as legal or in conformity with international law, and hence there could be no question of the possibility of defending such a position on the basis of international law and generally recognized principles."

Other speakers from the Soviet group charged specifically that the gathering of information through the use of satellites in outer space constituted espionage.

The gravity of this dispute cannot be questioned. It involves primary questions of international law as well as of international politics. It is difficult to see how any basic principles can be agreed upon to govern the use of outer space unless these questions as to observation satellites are clearly settled.

PRIOR CONSULTATION AS TO NEW SPACE PROJECTS

Paragraph 6 of the U.S.S.R. declaration of basic principles is as follows:

"Cooperation and mutual assistance in the conquest of outer space shall be a duty incumbent upon all states; the implementation of any measures that might in any way hinder the exploration or use of outer space for peaceful purposes by other countries shall be permitted only after prior discussion of and agreement upon such measures between the countries concerned."

The latter part of this paragraph was construed by those opposed to it as giving a veto power to any member state of the United Nations if it took the position that a new project of another state would hinder the exploration or use of outer space for peaceful purposes of the objecting state. It will be noted that the basic principles suggested by the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom, and the United States do not contain any specific requirement for prior consultation and determinative objection by a state other than the launching state. The United Kingdom declaration requires that exploration and use of outer space and celestial bodies shall be exercised by all states with due regard to the interests of other states in the exploration and use of outer space and to the need for consultation and cooperation between states in relation to such exploration and use. The U.S. declaration, in its preamble, refers to the importance of international cooperation and in paragraph 1 asserts that outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states, on the basis of equal rights, in conformity with international law.

It is obvious that any final statement of basic principles must clarify the position as to whether a state, about to embark on a new use of outer space, must consult in advance with every other state which might deem itself interested, and an answer must be given to the problem as to the effect of any objection made either before the new project is launched, or thereafter.

Some of the discussions appear to imply that the Soviet proposal might have the effect of requiring prior consultation before any nuclear explosion was planned for outer space, on the ground that such explosion might interfere with peaceful uses of outer space by other states. If this is the effect of the prosposal, it has far-reaching political and military importance. It would be in fact an indirect disarmanment agreement so far as outer space nuclear explosions are concerned.

PEACEFUL USES AND DISARMAMENT

None of the proposals defined "peaceful uses." As noted earlier in this paper, this was true of the original 1961 resolution. The debates in the various committees in 1962 have not clarified the situation. The old question still persists as to whether a peaceful use means nothing except a nonmilitary use or whether a peaceful use can include a military use which is not aggressive. The Soviet proposal went so far in paragraph 5 as to provide that the use of outer space for propagating war, national or racial hatred or enmity between nations should be prohibited. The situation was complicated by the fact that the problem of disarmament became involved in the discussion and questions were raised as to whether the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had any jurisdiction to consider any problem which politically required a decision as to the extent of future disarmament. Further difficulty appeared from the fact that another United Nations committee was simultaneously discussing problems of disarmament as affecting outer space.

It is to be hoped that in any final statement of basic principles as to the exploration and use of outer space some clear indication will be given of what constitutes authorized peaceful uses of outer space.

CONCLUSION

The United Nations is not, in my judgment, a legislative body. Its resolutions are not original sources of international law. They may indicate the existence of a principle already accepted as binding law by the international community. However positive acts by the United Nations, such as the 1961 outer space Resolution 1721A (XVI), if not subsequently protested, are strong evidence of acceptable principles. It would therefore appear that the international community has gone very far toward accepting the basic proposal that outer space and celestial bodies are not part of the territory of any state and are not subject to national claims hereafter. However the disputes that have arisen, as indicted above, make it clear that the manner in which this undefined area called "outer space" may be explored and used has not yet been determined. International peace certainly requires that this position be clarified.

It must also be noted that the United Nations has not yet sought to determine the line of demarcation between the "airspace" and "outer space." In none of the discussions was there any challenge to the view that the airspace above a foreign state is part of its territory. In such airspace the subjacent state has the sole and unilateral right to control all movement. It can forbid the passage of foreign spacecraft when ascending toward or descending from outer space. It has long been my view that grave international complications will soon arise unless this situation is rectified. As a jurist I feel that outer space law must determine and state the rights of states to use the area which we call "outer space," and must, at the same time, fix the area in which such international rights exist.

JOHN COBB COOPER.

PRINCETON, N.J., *January 31, 1963.*

The People Versus the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had mailed to me an editorial which was published vocally over radio station WTYC at Rock Hill, S.C. This editorial indicated the public's opposition to the surrender of Perez Jimenez to Romulo Betancourt. I gather from this editorial that they think Jimenez should be given asylum to the United States such as we have offered to other political targets. I do not know of my own knowledge, the facts set forth in the editorial, but I do know of the integrity of this radio station and its personnel, and I am putting this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Nation may be alerted to the facts and think expressed. If this represents the true facts, and I have every confidence that it does, I would hope that this would inspire the State Department of this Nation to reverse what seems to be its intentions on this subject.

THE PEOPLE VERSUS THE STATE DEPARTMENT

We are going to ask you at the end of this message to strike a blow for freedom, and, for the life of an individual. We hold no claim for the worthiness of this man to live. He may be the rankest scoundrel. If so, there are those better informed than are you or we, who say that he is no greater scoundrel than the man to whom the U.S. State Department would deliver him to be liquidated. Our claim to this man's right to live is your right to survive. He may be needed. He is Perez Jimenez (pair-as yay-men-as). Perez Jimenez is the former President of Venezuela who preceded Romula Betancourt. Betancourt wants Perez delivered to him in Venezuela. The U.S. State Department took Perez out of his home in Miami and has put him in a Miami jail and is going through a legal hocus-pocus to send Perez to Betancourt. Betancourt wants Perez because Perez represents the man most able to take over the Venezuelan Government should there be an opportunity. Perez is ardently anti-Communist. Betancourt is—we'll let you judge for yourself.

Betancourt as a young man worked openly as an agent of the Communists in Venezuela. Because of his Communist activity he was exiled from his homeland, Venezuela, in 1928. In exile in Costa Rica, Betancourt with Manuel Mora founded the Communist Party of Costa Rica and for 5 years was head of the party from 1930 to 1935. As head of the Communist Party in Costa Rica, Betancourt learned that he could not sell communism to the people openly. He devised this deception. He "renounced" his membership and was welcomed back to his homeland, Venezuela, to work as an anti-Communist. There he gathered about him all of his old Communist workers and began to undermine the Government. He made the mistake of putting in writing to other Communists his scheme. These letters came into Government possession; he went underground and for 9 years worked for hidden bases. In 1945 he was successful. Betancourt, by military revolt, took charge for an earlier term as President of Venezuela. He

lasted 3 years. His rule was so corrupt and tyrannical that the military that put him in power threw him out. That revolt was led by Perez Jimenez. Betancourt was exiled again. He spent 9 years in New York where he was the hero of the intellectuals that are running the U.S. Government today. His Communist activities in New York were so flagrant that he was arrested by New York officers on information provided by J. Edgar Hoover's FBI and was expelled by the United States. Three years later, leftists in Venezuela, threw out Perez Jimenez and Betancourt won an election with undercover support from the U.S. State Department. These facts are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The U.S. State Department that brought Castro to power supports Betancourt. They have jailed Perez Jimenez in Miami and intend to deliver him to Betancourt. Perez Jimenez, like Batista, like any exile—like Betancourt—is entitled to safe conduct in this free country of ours. If the citizens of the United States can stop the Communist encirclement of this Nation in America, the day will come when the United States will need Perez Jimenez. Only your letters, telegrams, and phone calls to your Congressmen and Senators can stop the State Department from delivering Perez Jimenez to Betancourt. You will have to act fast. The next legal move is March 12. This is another case of the people versus the State Department.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Remarks of U.S. Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., to the Maryland Council of Farmer Cooperatives at Ellicott City, Md., on February 27, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland, at Ellicott City, Md., February 27, 1963:

REMARKS OF U.S. CONGRESSMAN CHARLES McC. MATHIAS TO THE MARYLAND COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, ELLICOTT CITY, MD., FEBRUARY 27, 1963

In my remarks here today I shall not stress my longstanding interest in, and support of, agricultural cooperatives. And, I will not try to give you any advice on how to operate your cooperatives so that they will be of even greater service to your members, for I know you are more expert in this field than I am. Nonetheless, I do appreciate your inviting me to share with you some thoughts I have on the future of agriculture.

There is an erroneous idea that there is an inevitable conflict bteween the interests of farmers and those of consumers. This idea is expressed most frequently by those who think that the prices of farm products should be pushed by Government action of one kind or another. I would agree that there is a conflict between excessive Government intervention in agriculture and the longrun interests of consumers.

But if we take a close look at the real interests of consumers and farmers there is no conflict. The idea that there is a conflict is obsolete.

Consumers have an interest in maintaining the kind of an efficient, freewheeling, vigorous, and productive agriculture that has emerged in the United States and which Maryland agriculture so well exemplifies.

That this kind of agriculture serves the interests of consumers is evidence by the steady decline in the cost of buying an adequate diet.

In 1940 the average U.S. family spent 40 percent of its income for food. In 1961 the average U.S. family spent 19.7 percent of its income for food. In fact, if it bought the same kinds and quantities of food in 1961 that it bought in 1935–39, it would only spend 14 percent of its income for food.

Consumers have upgraded their diets. They are buying more meat, poultry, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables than they did 20 to 25 years ago. They are buying more convenience foods, foods already to cook and eat.

U.S. consumers have more incomes left for education, medical care, housing and recreation because of the efficiency of American farmers.

It may not always appear that the benefits of this efficiency of production are shared in equitably by farmers themselves. But despite the growing pains of the agricultural revolution, the American farmer is a proud, independent, and stable part of the American scene. Agriculture is not sick, it's not prostrate, although it is changing. The net worth of farmers on an overall basis and on an average per capita basis continues to grow annually.

American farmers today are able to provide their children with education, with medical care, with an opportunity in life as never before.

Of all industries, agriculture has been clearly demonstrated to be that industry which does poorest, from the standpoint of both farmers and consumers, when central, political management is substituted for the incentives of a free economy.

The idea that Government must get involved commodity by commodity in planning production, in controlling production, marketing, and pricing of farm products, is an antiquated, inefficient, and dangerous approach to the future of farmers, and to the interests of consumers as well.

I like to be able to quote the President of the United States—he is everyone's President. He told a recent press conference that:

"The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decision maker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed."

I could only applaud the sentiment. If he could only persuade some of those Harvard faculty members in the White House that teachers should listen and learn like the rest of us. In particular, I could wish that he would tell Secretary of Agriculture Freeman of his rediscovery of the key economic principle that has made the American economy go.

I don't need to tell you about the impact of the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. But I do think I should take a minute to relate this to Government policy in the area of taxes and spending.

Farm costs, both production costs and the cost of marketing your products, continue to rise.

There is no mystery as to why this is so. Farm costs go up because of a variety of Government programs and policies.

Government spending is a major cost in all businesses and particularly in agriculture.

All Government expenditures must be paid for, either in taxes or in that most insidious of taxes, inflation.

Taxes go into the making of prices. Virtually every tax is eventually paid by the consumer of goods and services.

In a hundred hidden ways, taxes turn out to be costs and prices.

Every new or bigger spending program enacted by Congress means more costs, in taxes and in prices, to farmers and to other citizens.

Since farmers are the biggest consumers of goods and services on a per capita basis, they have a particularly heavy stake in Federal tax and spending programs. So anyone who tells you how much he loves farmers and how he wants to vote for things to help farmers, who then votes or works for a whole raft of new and bigger spending programs, is not really working for the interests of farmers. His concern for farmers' welfare is delusion and illusion, a lot of double-talk.

I am sure that you have a major interest in the European Common Market and how it is going to affect you as farmers and as marketeers of farm products. This is a major subject in itself so let me make just one brief comment.

The European Common Market is a fact of life. It may turn out to be one of the crucially important developments of history. When we look at the ECM we can only wish it well and hope that it will mature as a strong economic force and military ally against Communist imperialism. But we must also be concerned with respect to the impact of the trading practices of this economic unit on U.S. farmers and other exporters. The recent import fees established on poultry illustrates the seriousness of the problem.

Section 252 of the trade bill enacted by the Congress was specifically designed to deal with this problem. It provides that whenever a foreign country maintains non-tariff trade restrictions or variable import fees which prevent the expansion of trade on a mutually advantageous basis, "the President shall * * * suspend, withdraw or prevent the application of benefits of trade agreements concessions to products of such country."

This is a tough policy. It was so intended by the Congress. It was intended as a means of giving our negotiators a means to prevent such harmful actions to U.S. farmers and other exporters as illustrated by the fence ECM has built around their poultry industry.

But this policy of the trade act is meaningless unless it is implemented. The Nation must look to the President and the State Department to implement the policy.

As yet, I have seen little indication that the policy will be forcefully and effectively implemented.

We must recognize that our Government has one major handicap in endeavoring to obtain acceptance of this policy by the ECM. This is our own Government farm policy.

The administration is busily engaged in preventing free market prices from functioning here in the United States. Consequently, when we insist that other countries should discard their protective policies we are negotiating from a position of weakness.

It is not exactly a strong bargaining position for us to tell others do as we tell you, not as we do.

It seems to me that Maryland agriculture has a great future. We have the advantages of an efficient agriculture and a nearness to the major markets of the United States.

It seems to me that this future will be best protected by building on the assets we have. These assets can be dissipated by centralized management of agricultural production and marketing which would curtail our efficiency and share our markets with areas less favored geographically.

In devising national policy relating to farm program we should copy success. With all its problems, those segments of U.S. agriculture which rely on the market as the major determinant of income and the major guide to investment, production and marketing, have a much more favorable outlook than those which have had the benefit of central planning and control.

Brazil Is the Focus Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent column which appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 6. Columnist Henry J. Taylor points up the focal point of Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere as being Brazil and predicts that a major attempt to expand Soviet domination will be made there within a year.

Text of the column is as follows:

BRAZIL IS THE FOCUS POINT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

We read our Cuban news in terms of America. Khrushchev reads his in terms of Brazil. And this writer suggests that, a year from today, for every column about Cuba we'll be reading 10 about the Red star over Rio.

In America's October 22 Munich, Cuba is the Czechoslovakia. Brazil is the Kremlin's residual reward. And Khrushchev's Cuba win comes into focus only by looking at Rio, not Havana; at Brazilian President Joao Goulart, not Castro; at the continent, not the Caribbean.

North and South America are shaped like an hourglass, and at the bottom Brazil dominates nearly the whole of it. Rio-based Russians are advising President Goulart today like Macbeth heeding the song of the lying witches. And courageous parts of the Brazilian press are commenting on the fact that 78 Communists are now in the highest key posts.

These are the tested henchmen of this Moscow-oriented spellbinder whose upturned nose and jutting chin are heading for our cartoons to join Castro's beard and giant cigar.

All are not only Moscow applauded but, as if this were not enough, they were approved also by Red China on President Goulart's August 1961, pilgrimage to Peiping, from where he returned to take over the Presidency of Brazil.

High among these henchmen is Marxist Foreign Minister Hermes Lima. And our cartoonists had better be ready for Hermes Lima, too; a fat burglar with an eye as cold as Labrador's ice and his English gone somewhere with his teeth. Lions bluff, tigers don't. Neither does Hermes Lima.

"Premier Castro's government is derived from the self-determination of the Cuban people," said he to Rio Communist Party workers, in a typically gay anti-American crack headlined in the Journal do Brasil last October 24 at the very height of our Cuban crisis. Whereupon President Goulart and Hermes Lima dismissed Vice Adm. Helio Garnier Sampaio, commander in chief of Brazil's fleet, after Senor Sampaio proposed sending two destroyers to operate with us in the naval blockade.

This began a decisive step against the United States. Any effective Communist resistance must come from the military and when President Goulart climbed to nearly dictatorial powers on January 7 he fixed that.

New commanders took over the Eighth Military Region, the Fourth Naval District and the First Air Force—snap-snap, ticktack, all at once. Each rides the Moscow horse with the look of a jockey on a winner. And day by day the Kremlin borers deepen their hole in the military ranks.

Protests? President Goulart has merely tossed any high-ranking Brazilian into jail. In fact, the Correio da Manha, an important Brazilian daily, is in trouble for castigating President Goulart's arrest of Adm. Silvo Heck when he heroically denounced Communist control of the armed forces.

Infiltrated Brazil stands where Cuba stood 2 years ago. And behind the Havana excitement Khrushchev is building his Moscow masterpiece.

When Congressman Travels Abroad Who Pays His Tab?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about counterpart funds, especially during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that very few of our citizens know what these funds are and what they can be used for. I even venture to say that there are some Members of Congress who are in the same predicament.

The following article appeared in the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., on March 11, 1963. This article states clearly, and therefore simply, what these counterpart funds are, how and when they can be used, and which countries have them and in what quantities.

Indeed, the Evening News has done a real service in making these facts readily available to its readers.

The article follows:

[From the Newburgh (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 11, 1963]

WHEN CONGRESSMAN TRAVELS ABROAD WHO PAYS HIS TAB?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Although the U.S. owns more than $3.8 billion worth of foreign currencies, it often has to dip into its own gold supply to meet expenditures abroad.)

(By Stanley Meisler)

WASHINGTON.—Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, squired two good-looking female assistants to the Lido nightclub in Paris last summer and paid his way with U.S.-owned francs. The night on the town provoked outcries back home.

POWELL had a quick defense. He quoted Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon as saying if POWELL and other Congressmen didn't use these francs, the U.S. Government would have to burn them.

"This is money going right down the drain," POWELL said.

Dillon said he had no recollection of making the remarks and added that he felt these funds "require the same prudent management and careful handling as any other moneys of the Government."

In fact, other administration officials say that most times that a Congressman uses funds like these, he forces the United States to buy more foreign currencies with American dollars.

POWELL'S night on the town, the outcry, his defense, and the denial by Dillon reflect one of the most complex and massive problems in American international finance.

Throughout the world, the United States owns more than $3.8 million worth of rupees, pounds, dinars, zlotys, kyats, and other foreign money. But the United States can't or won't use most of it now.

In Poland, for example, U.S.-owned Polish zlotys total more than $100 million. But every year the United States dips into its own gold to pay $1.4 million in U.S. social security and other benefits to residents of Poland.

In most cases, legal limitations, diplomacy, and economics prevent the United States from using all this foreign money that accumulates as a result of U.S. foreign aid.

Under U.S. laws, in fact, more than half the money, while American owned, must be used for the benefit of other countries. And, according to U.S. officials, the United States would rock and perhaps wreck the economies of other countries if it ever spent the rest of the money in one swoop.

"We would cause inflation," said Bartlett Harvey, Chief of the Economic Progress Division of the Agency for International Development. "We would hurt the very countries we are trying to help. We would end up spending more American dollars to help them fight the inflation."

The problem of U.S.-owned foreign currencies is so complex that it seems to attract attention only when Congressmen take these funds to finance junkets around the world.

U.S.-owned foreign funds come from three main sources:

1. The sale of surplus wheat and other crops. Under the law, friendly countries may pay for this with their own currency instead of U.S. dollars.

2. Grants of economic aid. Under this program, an American manufacturer ships his commodities to a foreign land. The United States pays him in dollars. The foreign land sets up an account with an equivalent or counterpart amount in foreign currency. Ninety percent of this account reverts to the foreign land for its use. The remaining 10 percent becomes U.S.-owned funds.

3. Repayment of loans. The law provides that some foreign nations may repay their loans in foreign currencies.

President Kennedy, in his budget message to Congress, estimated that during the present fiscal year ending July 1 the United States owned $3,875 million worth of this foreign currency.

Of this total the law set aside $2,542 million worth for use by foreign countries that the United States wants to help.

That left $1,332 million for the United States in use, maintaining embassies, paying foreign employees, printing books, building military housing, conducting research in the foreign lands.

The bulk of this money is in eight countries: Burma, India, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Egypt. There the supply of the foreign currency overwhelms the needs and desires of the U.S. embassies.

In India, for example, the United States will have a supply of $362 million worth of rupees in 1964. Officials estimate the Embassy in New Delhi will use about $24 million worth that year. That will leave a supply of $338 million worth, enough for 14 more years. As foreign aid increases, the supply will grow bigger.

Here is where the paradox about Congressmen comes in.

With their U.S. Government-financed junkets, they spend $500,000 worth of counterpart funds of other U.S.-owned currencies a year. But they seldom visit the countries that have a huge supply of these currencies. Harvey said that Congressmen have used only $22,000 worth of Indian rupees in 5½ years.

But in France the U.S. Embassy needs more foreign currencies than it owns. In 1964, the embassy in Paris will have a supply of $12 million worth of counterpart and other funds, but it will need $168 million

worth of francs for all its activities. As a result, whenever a Congressman uses these funds in France, the United States will have to buy francs with dollars to make up the loss.

The use of counterpart and other foreign funds by Congressmen does not come under the scrutiny of the General Accounting Office which has the power to look into every financial corner of government except in Congress.

In a recent report submitted to Congress by Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, the GAO cited three ways in which it felt the United States could make better use of counterpart funds and other U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

First, the GAO said the United States should use more of the foreign currencies when they are in heavy supply and it cited a case like Poland to show this is not being done. The GAO said the United States could pay social security benefits in zlotys rather than dollars to Polish citizens who once worked in the United States.

Second, the United States, according to the GAO, sometimes buys foreign currencies when it owns counterpart funds that have been set aside for future projects.

Finally, the GAO said that the United States loses money by depositing much of its foreign currencies in banks that pay little or no interest.

At the end of 1959, the GAO said, the United States owned $46.6 million worth of lira, most of it deposited in the low-interest paying Bank of Italy. The GAO said the United States could have earned $475,000 a year if the funds had been deposited in a commercial bank.

Proclaiming Sir Winston Churchill an Honorary Citizen of the United States of America

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the hope that H.R. 4374 will be passed by this House today without a dissenting voice. I am very happy that the Committee on the Judiciary has brought the bill before us today. I realize, of course, that they have rules and regulations of long standing which make it impossible for them to use the whereas clauses which I had hoped might be attached to this bill. I had no pride of authorship in these clauses which I sent to the committee, but I hoped that they might carry to Sir Winston something of the warmth and affection of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the words we all speak here today will go to Sir Winston Churchill with the assurance that we wish him everything that is good, that we recognize him as one of the great men of our era. He has earned for himself a position of prominence among the leaders of the English-speaking world as a writer, historian, and orator; and being the son of an American mother and an English father, more than any other, truly epitomizes the closeness of spirit between the two great English-speaking peoples.

The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, hereby expresses itself in high appreciation for his outstanding contribution to peace and to freedom and to the courage it takes to wage war. He has served as a challenge and an inspiration to our Nation as well as to his own.

The gift of honorary citizenship in the United States of America is one honor, one token of rare esteem and love which is within this country's power to bestow here through the House of Representatives. That it was never done before makes it all the more cherished in the hearts of all of us who had hoped that this might be brought to pass. Certainly, it is worthy of Winston Churchill's place in history. This is something no man can buy or acquire in any way except through the grateful generosity of the American people. It is the most appropriate gift we can convey to symbolize the warmth and the affection that an appreciative and an admiring people feel toward him.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the resolution will be passed without a dissenting vote.

Earl Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, because this article deserves the attention of my colleagues, I would like to herewith insert in the RECORD an article recently apearing in my hometown paper, the Times-Herald:

VALLEJO RESENTS THIS SLUR

Every straight-thinking resident of Vallejo and Solano County should resent the two billboards located adjacent to this city which bear the American flag and, in big letters the sign: "Impeach Earl Warren" three times elected Governor of California, and summoned by ex-President Eisenhower to fill the position of Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, have every right to resent this slur against a man who so richly deserves the honors and respect bestowed upon him.

Every man is entitled to his opinion regarding the qualifications and official acts of Chief Justice Warren. Some of the decisions rendered by the Court have not been received with acclaim, but they evidently represent contemporary interpretation of the law and come within the Constitution. They are honestly arrived at and concurred in by a majority of the Court, otherwise, they would not have been rendered.

This Nation enjoys the right of honest criticism of legal procedures, of acts by Congress and of our foreign policy for the well being or security of the Nation. However, when viciousness and hate replace criticism and honest differences of opinion, then perhaps soon law and order can be supplanted with lawlessness and contempt. Earl Warren is too big a man to take notice of this scurrilous attack, but his friends should not only resent the ugly charge, but rush to his support.

This monstrous offense to one of the Nation's top officials has been attributed to representatives of the John Birch Society, and if the attribution is true, it is small wonder thinking Republicans are so concerned about the Birch Society's attempt to take control of the party.

Thus far, the only evidence in regard to Earl Warren is that he has performed his duties in the highest tradition of honesty and justice.

Fiscal Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has been consistent over the years in regard to fiscal solvency of the United States Treasury. Today's editorial makes such good sense that I include it herewith, with the recommendation that it be read by every Member:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE COUNTRY?

You look over the list of domestic economic troubles as noted by President Kennedy at his press conferences. There isn't one that a healthy tax cut wouldn't cure or at least help substantially.

And the only way to get a meaningful tax reduction is to legislate a healthy cut in Federal spending.

The basic problem is as simple as that, though the solution is difficult in the present political atmosphere.

Relief from the extortionate load of Government spending would generate energy from top to bottom. It would give people something to work for.

To hear the talk as to lack of opportunity for youth you would think there were just so many jobs until the Government passed a law to create some more. You wonder how youngsters ever got a job in the past. This same frightened scramble to divide up poverty held back recovery from the great depression and now dominates discussion of automation.

Jobs generate jobs. Wages and profits create the demand for goods, which puts more and more people to work—unless the chain is broken by bungling Government intervention or expropriation of the fruits of industry.

Talk about our crop of war babies growing up and needing jobs. They are relatively few in numbers compared to the millions of refugees from communism who streamed into demoralized West Germany after the war. Work was found for all of them and West Germany actually has a labor shortage. Automation did it—along with sane, old-fashioned fiscal policies which balanced budgets, made the mark one of the soundest currencies in history and produced the feeling of confidence in the future which comes with a rising living standard.

On the other extreme are such countries as Argentina. There is a land potentially as rich as ours—demoralized by massive governmental bungling and an inflated currency.

Argentina's trouble is our trouble, though we are not nearly so far gone and had more fat in the form of capital to eat up.

The complacent tendency in Washington to cut taxes while letting the spending run simply is a plan to eat up some more of the capital which makes jobs. By inciting

more inflation it will nullify any tax cut. By breeding fear of an unsound currency it will discourage enterprise and we will have more unemployment, not less.

The prosperity of Western Europe dates from the time when it scorned the advice of our frightened liberals, hardened its currencies and started paying their bills with cash. We now owe them money in form of balance of payments. Our Government now is buying these currencies in great quantities to protect the once almighty dollar.

More vocal politicians and economists in the United States are in the grip of an economic obsession that we can borrow ourselves rich. This brand of mass insanity has run its course in Europe but still afflicts a great deal of the world including the underdeveloped countries, all of which somehow managed to eat for centuries without our help, or maybe in spite of it.

None of these new nations has a chance until it discovers that only work creates wealth and that capital accumulation must be protected if their people are to have the tools which make work productive.

Under present policies, they are frightening away capital faster than it can be poured down the ratholes thus created, through foreign aid from the U.S. Treasury.

We see two main sources of hope. One is the amazing resiliency of the U.S. economy which has survived and even progressed during a generation which has expropriated half its profits and sterilized them in wasteful Government schemes. The other is mounting impatience with the whole red ink business, out through the country.

When the people finally sense what has been happening to them and vote their indignation, the politicians will sober up and find a way. If the country—and particularly the unemployed—are to be spared deepening troubles, that had better be soon.

National Child Evangelism Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, February 19 was the "National Day of Prayer for the Spiritual Needs of the Children of our Nation." In observance of this occasion, numerous churches in my district of Indianapolis, Ind., presented programs explaining the work of the International Child Evangelism Fellowship.

The week of February 17 to 24 marked the 26th anniversary of child evangelism work. Its activities under the direction of International Director Rev. Jacob DeBruin encompass all phases of Bible teaching for children. In Indianapolis, under the leadership of Mr. Joseph Hosman, chairman of the local child evangelism committee, the group offers activities such as open-air classes, summer camp, rallies, and 26 weekly good news clubs. The fellowship also offers a teacher's training program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the very survival of our Nation as a free and prosperous land depends in large measure upon the moral and spiritual training of our youth. No nation has long maintained such a high standard of living as we have in the United States without an equally high standard of moral conduct.

The importance of programs such as that offered by the International Child Evangelism Fellowship is manifest in any study of juvenile delinquency statistics. It is clear to me that the only way to prevent development of delinquents and the only way to insure the maintenance of high moral standards in our youth is through spiritual guidance and training. This is an area where our powerful, paternalistic Government can be of no help. This work must be done by dedicated individuals, imbued with the love of humanity and the desire to serve God. That they have been doing an excellent job I am sure, I am also sure that much more needs to be done, and the work of the International Child Evangelism Fellowship and other such dedicated groups deserves our wholehearted support.

Gainful Employment—Key to the Tax Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most penetrating of the many editorials and columns I have so far seen dealing with the tax issue is the following from a new magazine, Challenge, the February 1963 issue of which recently came acros my desk. I commend it to my colleagues.

THE TAX ISSUE

The easy-to-take part of the President's tax cut proposition is that taxes are draining too many resources out of the private economy, and therefore the economy is not being sufficiently nurtured for continued growth at a rate deemed proper and necessary. Almost everyone agrees with the President on this.

The trouble comes with the corollary to the President's proposition, namely that the Federal budget must be allowed to operate in the red until such time as the economy's growth can more than easily provide the needed revenue to redress the balance between income and outgo. There is considerable disagreement on this aspect of the proposed tax changes. And since aspect No. 1 can hardly be carried through without first settling the fate of aspect No. 2, one can expect that before this session of Congress is done, more words will flow than the $13,500 billion that the U.S. Treasury may or may not have to do without.

My concern today is not to add to the pros and cons of aspect No. 2, which is sure to get its share of attention and always does every year whether a tax cut is an issue or not. Rather, it is aspect No. 1—the one that almost everyone agrees with—that intrigues me. What I wonder about is whether a tax cut—essentially a lowering of tax rates for all income categories—is really going to do what so many people say it will do. Will more money left in private hands really help bring about the economic growth we all agree we need, in the way we need it?

These are peculiar times, and I believe that the lessons of history are not particularly useful guides to the problems we seek to solve. In a world in which space travel is no longer a figment of wild imagination; in which the United States of America can elect a Catholic to the presidency; in whch Buddhist monks visit the Pope; in which colonialism is dead, and world leaders fear to make war upon one another—in this kind of world where in 1 year we can experience more "firsts" than any previous generation could in decades and even centuries—in this kind of world it is too dangerous to think that that which once worked in a certain way will work that way again.

The objects we have shot into orbit, as well as the price index, have proved that what goes up does not have to come down. It is in this posture of skepticism that I wonder whether, just because during the past 30 years we have learned about fiscal and monetary policy, more money in the hands of the private domestic economy will really lead to the kind of growth we need and want. The theory is correct. But for which times? yesterday?, today?, tomorrow?

What is the private domestic economy going to do with the money that the Federal Government may or may not have to forego? The approximately $100 that the average taxpayer will save must, in turn, be consumed or reinvested in a most remarkable manner in order to have the salubrious effects projected for the tax cut. If the money goes into traditional channels of consumption. I doubt that this will contribute much to the development of new ideas, new products and services—the new ways to serve one another that are necessary to bring about realistic future growth.

Similarly, if the producers of our basic goods and commodities put their new-found revenues into traditional programs of expansion, once again I doubt that this will lead to the kind of growth we shall need for future prosperity. If this is the way "rescued" tax revenues are employed, we shall certainly sell more durable goods for a while, until the market is glutted and we settle into another recession. If we expand the capacity in areas where we already have overcapacity, then we shall find ourselves in a permanent state of idle capital resources.

AND WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

The key to future prosperity is gainful employment. Our need, in the President's words, is "to provide opportunities for the 4 million new Americans who are born every year." To turn that trick will take more than doing more of the same old things. From all that I can hear and see in the current discussion of what the tax reduction is supposed to achieve, I find very little emphasis on the need to invest in new ideas and new techniques, not only in the area of business and industry, but in the social area of new ways to live, new ways to use one's time and new ways to make a contribution to fellow men.

If we are not creative in the uses we find for the extra money to be left in private hands, we shall neither solve the problem of cyclical ups and downs nor of long-term unemployment. It just so happens that in a free society private business and private individuals are singularly well suited to solving the big economic problem of our times—major structural change—provided that the nature of this problem is clearly understood and private responsibility is reaffirmed.

Finally, I find small comfort in this quote from President Kennedy's state of the Union message: "In today's setting, private consumers, employers, and investors should be given a full opportunity first." What if the opportunity is not grasped? Should we assume that the Government must step in? This could very well be the outcome of a failure to use a tax cut for imaginative investment in the future. The wisdom of the private sector is on trial.

Score One for the Minority and Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "Score One for the Minority and Facts" as a portion of my remarks:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Mar. 10, 1963]

SCORE ONE FOR THE MINORITY AND FACTS

(By Herbert G. Klein)

In the House cloakroom, behind closed committee doors, and in private meetings, a Republican minority has been quietly but forcefully fighting the battle for a better balance in majority-minority representation on the staffs of committees.

Now joined by some Democrats, this is a battle in which the minority is winning, or at least gaining.

The struggle doesn't make big news of itself. But its results will produce headlines. It's the advance work by staff members which usually turns up the background facts needed by both minority and majority members.

This is the heart of the problem, a problem which is nonpartisan in its broad sense. After all, either party can be either majority or minority, depending on the Nation's political mood. A Congressman must have strong staff help if he is to study intelligently the many bills and proposals brought before his committees. Without backup help from a staff he is compelled to lean more on instinct than on facts—and facts should be uppermost.

What happens when only the chairman has control of the staff of a committee? Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, is an example. While minority members struggled for information, POWELL took his own staff on a trip touring European night clubs. Under a program adopted by Congress this week, however, the staff of POWELL'S Education Committee should lean less toward partisanship and more toward professionalism because the subcommittee chairmen have been given added power.

Another example is in public works, where the chairman, Representative CHARLES BUCKLEY, Democrat, of New York, has kept two of his committee's staff on his personal political work in his home district.

Normally it is no problem for Congressmen in the majority to get the staff help they want. The Democrats currently not only can control the size of committee staff, but they also are assisted by staff people from various administrative departments, but who then is to look at the administration's departments—unless it is the minority?

This lack of staff has been one key reason why Republicans have failed to develop adequate programs to build their image. This also has meant inadequate investigation of potential schandals such as those regarding highways as well as those surrounding associates of Billie Sol Estes.

The current minority battle for staffing has been intelligently planned and already has gained 30 more staff assistants for the minority.

Basically, however, the effort is not to add numbers but to covert at least part of the committees' staff from a highly partisan point of view, to a professional one where employees are directed to give fair help to both the minority and the majority. The effort is not to eliminate partisanship but to gain at least a 60-40 split.

The Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 emphasized the concept of professional staffs. This is now recognized by both Democrats and Republicans on the current House Administration Committee. Part of the fault in the past has rested with the Republicans who have lacked the fighting spirit of the new group now taking over and have chosen to play ball with strong Democratic chairmen.

There have been cases where committee chairmen have successfully ordered employees to conceal records even from other committee members. This happened during the investigation of highway scandals last year, where it is generally accepted, a more thorough investigation might have provided a major shakeup. In the Billie Sol Estes case at least one staff member became so frustrated with the suppression of information that he slipped a major investigation document to a newspaper reporter.

The minority staff battle has been the major accomplishment of the new Republican House Conference Committee led by Representative GERALD FORD, Republican, of Michigan. The success is reflected well on FORD'S subcommittee headed by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, and including Representatives THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri; JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York; JOHN J. RHODES, Republican, of Arizona; PAUL F. SCHENCK, Republican, of Ohio; ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, and CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York.

For the two-party system to succeed, it needs an articulate minority as well as a strong majority. Professional staffing should be established as a permanent principle which will serve both parties—regardless of which is in the majority at the time.

The Administration's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Cogress the following thoughtful analysis of the administration's tax program given by the to call to the attention of Congress the Honorable Henry H. Fowler before the 13th annual midyear conference, Tax Executives Institute, Inc. This is a precise, well-defined, overall picture of the makeup of the President's proposed reduction and reform program. I am confident my colleageus will find this information extremely interesting.

The analysis follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE 13TH ANNUAL MIDYEAR CONFERENCE, TAX EXECUTIVES INSTITUTE, INC., MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SUNDAY, MARCH 3, 1963

The President has proposed a comprehensive program of rate reduction and reform to improve the tax system and make it an integral part of a sound and consistent fiscal program that recognizes both our internal and external needs.

As tax executives, you know our present tax structure is full of discouragements, distortions, complexities, and inequities. It is not doing the job required of it.

The American economy since 1957 has been sluggish because total demand has been sluggish and capital investment inadequate. We are not producing each year at least 30 billions of dollars of wealth that we have the labor and resources to produce.

The President's program is designed to deal positively with this problem. It is concerned with creating a tax system that is responsive to our current national requirements, that utilizes all existing resources, that leads to full employment and increased growth, that provides revenues for balanced budgets and surpluses, and an equilibrium in our balance of international payments in an atmosphere of greater incentive, equity between taxpayers, with market allocation being the governor rather than tax considerations.

The role of this tax proposal is to unleash the expansionary forces that render the economy fully capable of discharging its responsibilities at home and throughout the free world.

This is the principle on which the President's tax program was formulated. It is a balanced program, designed as the President himself has said, "to expand demand among both investors and consumers, to boost the economy, in both the short run and the long run, and to achieve in time both a balanced full-employment economy and a balanced Federal budget."

The program is balanced in at least four major respects:

First, it is balanced in its timing: It is not a "quickie" or one-shot tax cut and it does not delay until the indefinite future necessary repairs of the tax system.

Second, it has fiscal balance: This administration has proposed adding $2.7 billion for the tax cut—within the bounds of safe budgeting—to a budget in which Government spending on all but defense, space, and interest on the debt is curtailed.

Third, it is balanced between across-the-board rate reduction for individuals and corporations on the one hand, and necessary structural reform on the other.

Fourth, it balances incentives to investment with stimulus to demand.

Timing is essential. To delay, to do nothing, would lead at best to continued slow growth, to continued high unemployment, to a continued underemployment of both men and machines, to inadequate demand and investment and to continued substantial budgetary deficits or unmet national needs. At worst, to delay or do nothing might increase the risk of recession.

This administration is not saying a recession is imminent, but we cannot overlook the fact that we are in a period of cyclical danger.

Secretary Dillon declared last week he did not see a recession in 1963 or any time in the future. But the Secretary added, "chances would be greater" for future recession, and effects of such a recession would be far more severe if no tax program is enacted this year.

We do not want a hasty, unbalanced tax cut because what is required is to make a real beginning on a permament restructuring of our tax system to lighten the repressive weight of Federal taxation and high tax rates on our economy. A quickie tax cut would not give us this permament restructuring.

The President in his State of the Union message gave a full first priority to tax reduction and reform this year. In his tax message he recommended not a quickie tax cut but a program for a full-scale and permanent restructuring of our income tax system, featuring rate reduction through net tax reduction and base broadening reforms. The President said then, "this program is

designed to achieve broad acceptance and prompt enactment."

In answering a question last Monday, he reaffirmed his judgment that "what we need is the bill this year" and that "the best bill that can be gotten is the one we recommended."

As for fiscal balance, the President has made it perfectly clear that the prospect of expanding economic activity and rising Federal revenues in the future does not mean that Federal outlays should rise in proportion to such revenue increases. He said in his budget message:

"As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit. Although it will be necessary to increase certain expenditures, we shall continue, and indeed intensify our effort to include in our fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs."

This administration had hoped to seek a tax reduction in the atmosphere of a balanced budget. But it was necessary, because of national security, to augment sharply our nuclear and armed forces, step up our efforts in space, and meet the costs of servicing a national debt that has grown larger as a result of those imperatives. This budgetary big three accounts for $70 billion of the $98.8 billion budget and their increased needs have accounted for nearly 73 percent of the total expenditure increases occurring in this administration.

Expenditures for programs other than defense, space and interest have been held slightly below last year by taking what was most urgent and reducing or eliminating what was not—the fourth time this has occurred to 15 years—against a background in which the average increase in this sector of the budget has been 7.5 percent per annum for the last 9 years.

Although proposed defense outlays in fiscal 1964 are some $2.4 billion above outlays for 1963, many billions of dollars in proposed programs were eliminated because the President and the Secretary of Defense were convinced that their benefits in terms of a stronger defense did not warrant their costs.

National security in the modern world cannot be bought cheaply, and it is too precious to risk by a bargain basement approach or by an arbitrary budget ceiling. Nevertheless, military spending has no immunity to searching examination as to needs, costs and alternatives. Improvements in the Defense Department supply and logistics program, alone, will result in savings of $3½ billion in 1965, an amount that will pay the entire cost of the President's legislative program in Congress. Inventory reforms, improvements in maintenance procedures, elimination of unneeded activities and the closing of unnecessary installations yielded a 1964 budget saving of about three-quarters of a billion dollars, so that the rise in defense effectiveness is much greater than the increase in expenditures.

A consideration of the outlook for future expenditures shows the President's policy of holding the rise in total expenditures to a rate substantially below the rate of increase in revenues to be a practical objective consistent with the national interest.

There are important reasons to expect there will be a slowdown in the rise of defense expenditures. We are reaching a new plateau of readiness in both our strategic and limited war capability. While expenditures will continue to rise in some areas, such as research, these increases will be balanced by reduction in other areas and by other savings. The result will be a sharply increased defense effectiveness per dollar of outlay.

While another sharp increase in space expenditures will occur in 1965, this increase will be less than 1964. Interest payments can also be expected to rise somewhat as a result of the transitory deficits on our way to a balanced budget. Foreign economic assistance expenditures are under intensive study. While it would be premature to speculate on the likely trend of these expenditures, several countries already have passed the critical stage in their progression of self-sustaining growth and should soon be able to move ahead without further aid.

Expenditures in other areas—broadly the "domestic" sector—will be affected by a large number of pluses and minuses. It will be a clear responsibility to find enough minuses to offset the pluses resulting from the need to carry out, at an effective level, programs essential to the Nation's progress and well-being. The funds needed to finance these programs should be found in large part through four major types of savings:

(1) The substitution of private for public credit.

(2) Reduction in expenditure in existing programs whose relative urgency has diminished with changing times and pertinence.

(3) The extension of the principle of user charges.

(4) Intensive emphasis on efficiency and cost reductions throughout the Government.

With the close cooperation of the President and the Congress in holding down expenditures, barring an unexpected worsening in the cold war, the tax program and the related program of expenditure control are feasible and consistent with the national interest.

To effect additional fiscal balance, apart from expenditure control, the tax program itself is designed to minimize the budgetary impact of revenue losses. A 3-year approach was mapped out to avoid an overly sharp drop in budgetary receipts for fiscal 1964–65 and to keep the temporary increase in the deficit at a level which is manageable and compatible with stability.

This choice of a phased rate reduction program along with recommending reforms designed to offset about a quarter of the cost of rate reductions, should serve clearly to rebut any assumption that the tax reduction program was aimed to enlarging the budget or prolonging deficit financing.

The fiscal advantage of including the so-called structural reforms is at least as important as their other merits in terms of equity and tax policy.

Given the accompanying policy of expenditure control described, and the features of fiscal balance incorporated in the tax program itself, the enactment of the tax program this year would seem to be the most fiscally balanced course to follow. For, once the tax brake is released, the base of taxable income, wages and profits should grow at an even faster rate than before—and revenues should soon substantially surpass their pre-tax cut level, or eventually the level they would have reached on a slow growth pattern, or even sooner, the level they would reach in event of an intervening recession.

If, for example, we should slide into another recession, pulling annual GNP down by as little as 3 percent, the deficit would increase twice as much In other words, the deficit, without a tax cut would then be far higher than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut. We accept the additional slice of deficits that are a consequence of the tax program very reluctantly—in the conviction that this program is the course best designed to promote a continued, steady and increased rate of economic advance and the surest route to balanced budgets and surpluses consistent with national security and leadership in space.

Third in the list of balancing features is tax reduction and reform. There is general agreement among those who study our tax system that the level of rates is too high, up and down the scale from top to bottom, individual, and corporate. It is because of the onerous 91 percent individual top and the 52 percent corporate maximum that loopholes, tax preferences, and special privileges were written into law or preexisting provisions increasingly utilized to evade the tax base.

The President's program attacks this problem using two approaches. We recommend lowering the rates, and because that will eliminate or minimize the need for the special tax preferences, we seek to remove some of them. The ultimate goal of a sound tax policy in the economic environment of the sixities should be to reach the lowest scale of rates feasible and to divest the tax system of provisions that misallocate resources, result in unnecessary hardship, give unfair advantage to a particular group or groups and unnecessarily complicate an already complicated situation.

A number of changes—minimum standard deduction, child care, aged provisions—are designed specifically to rectify hardship. They will result in revenue losses totaling $790 million. Other reforms will eliminate or reduce special priviliges, thereby broadening the base of taxable income and increasing revenue. The net result of all these changes will be an increase in revenues of approximately $3.3 billion. These increased revenues will offset a portion of the $13.6 billion cost of the rate reforms, and it is our conviction that the $10.3 billion balance is the maximum revenue cost that can safely be accepted. Therefore, failure to raise revenue through structural reform will necessarily require an upward revision of the recommended rate structure.

Such high rates would be unfortunate since there seems to be a broad measure of agreement that the individual rate structure that we have proposed is what is required to spur economic growth. Higher marginal rates decrease incentives for effort and risktaking, and thus would not be as effective in solving the overall problem.

To limit the tax program to the scale of rate reduction achievable through net tax reduction—approximately $9 billion—and forgo the opportunity to achieve an additional $4.6 billion in deeper rate reductions is to accept a second best result in the most important tax reform, a lower rate structure.

To forgo the opportunity provided by rate reduction to achieve other structural reforms to promote equity, eliminate special preference no longer compatiable with rate reduction, and make the market rather than the tax system the allocator of resources and effort is to lose the most practicable opportunity of a decade for achieving the other reforms. These are some of the reasons why a balanced tax revision program of reduction and reform is worth the extra effort involved.

Finally, and of signal importance is the balance in the tax program between demand and investment at all levels of effort and output. The tax program offers additional direct incentives to investors and makes it possible for consumers to buy more of the goods and services produced by American businessmen.

It ignores neither buyer nor investor, and that is as it should be.

But before going into further discussion of the investor-demand factor, I would like to summarize some of the main features in the program applying to business:

(1) The program reduces corporate income tax rates from the present 52 percent to 47 percent, a $2.4 billion cut which amounts to an increase in after-tax earnings of corporations of just over 10 percent.

(2) The program contains a provision providing immediate and substantial benefit to the 450,000 small corporations in the United States with earnings of less than $25,000 per year. For 1963, the present normal tax of 30 percent, applicable to the first

$25,000 of taxable corporate income, would drop to 22 percent. Thus, an immediate tax reduction of almost 27 percent would be provided small corporations, those corporations that generally have least ready access to capital markets and are consequently most dependent on internally generated funds for the financing of their investment projects.

(3) There is a proposal to eliminate the present 2 percent tax on consolidated net income of affiliated corporate groups filing consolidated returns plus a plan to repeal the present tax on intercorporate dividends, of dividends which do not go outside particular families of corporations.

(4) A significant provision would allow corporations to treat expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly and specifically for research and development as current expenses. Such a change from present treatment should provide a measure of greatly needed encouragement to civilian research and development which is badly needed in many sectors of the economy and should result in greater efficiency, an increased flow of new and improved products and an improvement in our balance-of-payments position.

So that some of the revenue losses implicit in the provisions I have outlined can be offset, while the proposed level of tax liability is unaffected, the President also has proposed a speeding up of corporate tax payments. There is provision, though, for a gradual transition from present arrangements to an arrangement under which corporations will be on a fully current tax basis, just as individual taxpayers are right now. This speeding up of corporate tax payments will impose only a small tax burden on corporations, although it will mean a great deal to the fiscal feasibility of the corporate program.

It is estimated that the speedup when fully effective, will cost corporations about $10 to $15 million annually. Many companies now set aside funds to pay their taxes as they earn the income on which the taxes are due; and typically corporations then invest these funds in interest-bearing securities or in bank accounts that pay interest. What these corporations will lose by the speedup in tax payments is just the interest on the funds they now set aside for tax payments.

If all the tax proposals are adopted there obviously will be less need for individuals to seek capital gains treatment of ordinary income, primarily because of the accross-the-board reduction in individual rates to a 14 to 65 percent range, a reduction of 29 percent in the highest bracket, accompanied by appropriate reductions in the middle and low income ranges.

The cut in the individual tax load amounts to about $8.7 billion, with $5.5 billion going to the taxpayers earning under $10,000 a year. These are the bulk of the consumers, and almost all of their tax cut can be expected to directly enter the spending stream with its multiplier and accelerator effects. American consumers traditionally spend a large percentage (92 to 94 percent) of their after-tax or disposable income.

Corporations will benefit from rate reduction by $2.4 billion at current levels of profit. Add this to the $2.1 billion reduction in tax liabilities that corporations received last year as a result of depreciation reform and the investment tax credit, and you get a total tax relief for corporations of nearly $4.5 billion. This would amount to a reduction in corporate tax liabilities of nearly 18 percent. In addition there are business benefits in the lower individual rate scales affecting upwards of 4 million self-employed and unincorporated businesses.

George Terborgh pointed out in his study "New Investment Incentives," published by MAPI, that last year's depreciation reform and investment credit together provided the equivalent of a tax rate reduction on income from new investment of 10 percentage points. Adding the 5 percentage point reduction in the corporate tax rate contained in the President's tax program brings the total reduction with respect to income from new investment in machinery and equipment to approximately 15 percentage points.

(It is approximately 15 percent because with the lower tax rate the more liberal depreciation provides a somewhat smaller tax saving than true under a 52-percent rate.) This reduction of 15 points is a reduction of about 30 percent relative to the present tax rate of 52 percent.

Another way to look at the effect of the 1962 program coupled with this year's proposals is to note that the improvement in profitability of new investment resulting from the 1962 program is estimated at 20 percent. The 5-point reduction proposed by the President adds an additional 10 percent subject to the reservation expressed above, to bring the total improvement in after-tax profitability to close to 30 percent.

The resulting increase in return on business investment after taxes from the 1962 action and the proposed programs should bring many hitherto marginal investment opportunities into an attractive range, particularly as increasing demand moves up volume and opportunity. Also, the pressure to assure maximum profits or increasing volume by modernization of high cost plant or increasing new capacity will be felt.

The effect of a lower scale of corporate and individual tax rates plus lower rates on capital gains will be increasing incentive and initiative to earn the marginal dollar by increasing investment and risktaking. The market rather than tax consequences will tend to become more of a prime determining factor of economic decision.

The administration realized that if the United States is to grow more rapidly in the future as it surely must, investment will have to proceed at a faster pace. And the administration also recognizes that if investment is to grow, the tax environment in which investors live will have to be more favorable. That is what we are striving for.

But to encourage investment, strengthening of consumer demand also is required. The purchasing power of the consumer must be increased to utilize present productive capacity fully so that additions to productive capacity will be worth while.

Of course, if the economic situation were different, if all of our economy's resources were fully employed, strengthening of consumer demand would not be important to investment.

But we do not have a full employment economy, and those who argue on the assumption that we have are mistaken. There is room for a twofold attack on the problem of getting higher levels of investment. Corporate and individual income tax laws can and should be changed to make investment more profitable. And individual income tax laws should be changed in such a way that consumer demand is strengthened, thereby making utilization of existing capacity more profitable and additional capacity for old projects or new capacity for new products more inviting. For a tax cut which only adds to saving will not produce the early intensification of investment that is so vitally needed if an economy is to grow.

There are some who argue we are in a full employment situation and have been since roughly the beginning of 1962. This argument is based on a contention that there is no unemployment of capital, no excess capacity in manufacturing and other industries.

What is being argued is that the economic recovery of 1961–62 slowed down so dramatically in 1962 because the economy exhausted its industrial capacity, ran out of capital, and so could increase output only slowly.

The diagnosis is incorrect. There is excess capacity today. How much no one really knows for who can say down to the last machine how much there might be in the entire economy?

But the estimates of excess capacity obtained from interviews with businessmen or from a careful analysis of historical developments are not without meaning. We have evidence that excess capacity is widespread throughout the manufacturing sector of the economy, so that this sector was operating at only 83 percent of capacity in September 1962. When compared with the average preferred operating rate for all manufacturing industries—which is variously said to be 90 and 94 percent—this 83 percent operating rate indicates a considerable amount of excess capacity, enough so that errors of measurement cannot be made to disappear.

The fact that we have this excess capacity—last September only 3 of 15 manufacturing industries were within 5 points of their preferred rates—is evidence that stimulating of consumer demand will not result in inflation and is evidence that stimulating consumer demand is entirely in order.

CONCLUSION

During the past 5 years it has become increasingly clear that our present tax structure, characterized by high levels of rates of income, repressive at every level and type of income, fastened on the economy to restrain war and postwar inflation, designed to hold back consumer demand, initiative, and investment, now checks growth, invites recurrent recessions, depresses our Federal revenues, and contributes to chronic budget deficits.

At the year's beginning there was a clear consensus which had crystallized during the preceding 7 months following the slackening of expansion in early 1962, that the Nation required major tax revision in 1963, a conclusion implicit in the studies of the House Ways and Means Committee incorporated in the Tax Revision Compendium of 1959, and adopted in the President's first tax message in April 1961. Those most knowledgeable about our tax system and its role in our economy in the Congress, in business management and finance, in labor leadership, in the law and accounting, and in the academic world have urged the enactment of a program which, in the words of the President's tax message of April 1961, would be: "Aimed at providing a broader and more uniform tax base, together with an appropriate rate structure" which would put us "toward the goal of a higher rate of economic growth, a more equitable tax structure, and a simpler tax law."

Now the moment of truth is here and proposals generally responsive to these objectives have been submitted by the President to the Congress.

As is always the case with tax legislation, the season of hearings before the committee charged by the lower House which is the body with constitutional authority to originate revenue legislation, is hearing the anticipated differences of those in the private sector with the President's proposals. I submit these differences are and will be largely differences in degree and emphasis.

Those who wish a quickie or one-shot tax cut enacted immediately with permanent restructuring put off will contend with those who feel that an attempt should be made to solve all tax problems at once by the substitution of new systems of taxation or even more sweeping structural changes than those proposed. The President's program falls between these two extremes, being designed to achieve the best bill of tax reduction and reform that can be enacted this year.

Those who wish a substantially increased scale of Federal domestic expenditures in the 1964 fiscal year will contend with those who would abandon any tax program until the budget is balanced. The President's program falls between these two extremes to move forward on the priority job of tax revision, within the bounds of fiscal discipline, against the background of a budget in which Government spending on all but defense, space, and interest in the fiscal year 1964 is reduced and a policy of allocating a substantial part of revenue increases toward eliminating budgetary deficits.

Those who would confine tax revision to rate reduction made possible by base broadening will contend with those who would limit rate reduction to the amount that can be bought by net revenue losses. The President's program would seek the maximum rate reduction available through a combination of net tax reduction and base broadening reforms.

Those who believe that only incentives to investment are needed and that increased consumer demand to utilize idle capacity and manpower is unimportant will contend with those to whom a single sharp stimulus of consumer demand through tax reduction for the lower brackets is all that is necessary to solve our problem of slow growth. The President's program falls between these two extremes being designed to combine both incentives to investment with the stimulus to consumer demand.

In conclusion, may I suggest that the President's program is a balanced program on all of these issues where there are differences of degree and emphasis: It is balanced in its timing; it has fiscal balance, it has balance between rate reduction through net tax reduction and accompanying structural base broadening reforms; it balances incentives to investment with stimulus to demand.

Whatever the variants in degree and emphasis, I would hope that all those with responsibilities in this area, public or private, would never lose sight of the common objective, a modification in the calendar year 1963 of our tax laws along the general lines proposed.

Wasting the Taxpayers' Money—A Senator's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article entitled "Wasting the Taxpayers' Money—A Senator's Report" as a portion of my remarks.

WASTING THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY—A SENATOR'S REPORT

WASHINGTON.—Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, said today the Government wasted the taxpayers' money by sending him to Geneva as a delegate to a United Nations conference. After 4 days at the conference on science and technology for underdeveloped countries this winter, Mr. YOUNG told the Senate, he and another U.S. delegate "became disgusted and left—that's all we could stand."

He had no complaint about being sent common class in an airplane for the trip, Mr. YOUNG said, but when he got to Geneva he found out delegates from countries like Nigeria came first class with Uncle Sam picking up 40 percent of the tab.

Senator YOUNG said the conference was composed of hundreds of delegates all sitting around pretending they understood what was being said. Then there was a round of receptions in which drinks "containing almost 100 percent alcohol" were served.

"In the United States we are used to diluting it with a little tap water," Senator YOUNG said.

Representatives of the U.S. aid program were swarming all over the place showing no competence at all, Senator YOUNG said.

The final blow came when the State Department put out a press release quoting him as saying the United States should send roving technicians around the world helping underprivileged countries. Senator YOUNG said he had made no such proposal.

"This probably was written by a reporter who got fired from a newspaper" for incompetence and went to work for the Government, Senator YOUNG added.

"I am fed up," Senator YOUNG concluded, "with the taxpayers having to spend billions of dollars" in foreign aid. He said the foreign-aid budget can be cut 20 percent this year "without harming it one bit."

"Then some of these people can come home and make a gainful living," he said.

Some of the Challenges Which Confront Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was made by our former colleague, Hon. John Davis Lodge, at the annual dinner of the Federation of Women's Republican Clubs of New York State last January 25.

The speech is excellent, and as we all know, former Ambassador Lodge has always had a particularly deep knowledge and interest in foreign affairs and has served his country with signal distinction in this field.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN DAVIS LODGE AT THE ANNUAL DINNER MEETING OF THE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUBS OF NEW YORK STATE

SOME OF THE CHALLENGES WHICH CONFRONT US

Madam President, members of the Federation of Women's Republican Clubs of New York State, guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinguished honor for me to be asked to address the annual dinner of your splendid organization. I know, from personal experience, how helpful, indeed how decisive, your participation in politics can be. The women in our party are most effective; in addition they perform all manner of necessary and, in many cases, unglamorous chores and, most important of all, they bring into politics the much-needed ingredient of idealism. Without idealism, we flounder and fail.

Politics is, after all, the science of government, and the two-party system is the heart of representative government as we enjoy it in the United States. The independent voter depends for his independence on the survival of the two-party system. In nations which have more than two effective parties, the independent voter has little influence. Such nations tend toward minority rule. The proliferation of political parties is apt to produce weakness and chaos. George Washington, whose birthday we shall celebrate next month, said: "Government is not mere advice; it is authority with the power to enforce its laws." A country which has less than two parties, or, in other words, a one-party system, is a country on the road to dictatorship. Accordingly, it is vital that an ever-increasing number of our citizens join one of our two major parties. Politics is the art of inclusion and this is true both on the domestic and on the international scene. The survival of our system of government depends on the sense of responsibility of our citizens. Freedoms and responsibilities are inseparable. More than 24 centuries ago, Pericles said: "We do not say that a man who takes no interest in politics minds his own business. We say he has no business here at all." Obviously, today Pericles would have applied this exhortation also to women.

Nationally, the Republican Party contains elements well fitted to lead America and the non-Communist world at this time of difficulty and danger. We can produce the leadership which we must have in order to cope successfully with the Communist onslaught abroad, while maintaining a strong economy and a sound currency at home. For it is getting late, and our very survival is at stake.

We meet 2½ months after a nationwide election, an election which, though in many respects disappointing witnessed a resounding Republican victory in the Empire State. It would be well for us Republicans in Connecticut, and for Republicans in many other parts of our country, to take a long, hard look at New York and at the vigorous and imaginative leadership of your dynamic Governor, Nelson Rockefeller and of your distinguished Senators, JACK JAVITS and KEN KEATING. I was privileged to serve with your Senators in the House of Representatives. I congratulate the voters of New York for their good sense and sound judgment in keeping Nelson Rockefeller in Albany and JACK JAVITS in Washington. I am confident that my old friend, KEN KEATING, who has consistently shown vision and courage with respect to the Cuban threat, will be returned to Washington in 1964. I am delighted that the outstanding ability of my old friend, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, continues to be recognized at the polls.

There are many reasons why the Republican Party has been so successful in New York: good candidates, superior organization, adequate financing. There is, I think, another reason: We Republicans have become intensely preoccupied with our public image. Let us, instead, think about the public. I am convinced that this has been a great factor in Republican successes in New York.

The public—the American people—have recently been told by the President, in his state of the Union message, that the state of the Union is good. We are asked to believe that the threat from outside our borders is receding, that Communist imperialist aggression is on the wane and that, at home, our economy is so resilient that we can substantially reduce taxes and, at the same time, increase expenditures, thereby getting the best of both worlds. A deficit of almost $12 billion is anticipated.

What are the facts?

The cost of government and the cost of living marched steadily upward in 1962 and are still rising.

Federal spending and deficits continue to undermine confidence in the American dollar, both at home and abroad. Our gold reserves are still melting away. Our domestic economic growth will be stimulated when our external payments problem is resolved. The best way to stimulate the economy and to encourage business is to maintain the value of the dollar. This we are not doing.

In 1962, the administration badgered business in many ways—through tax rulings,

manipulating of defense spending and antitrust charges; and, in general, by playing politics with the business community.

Unemployment is still nearly 6 percent of the labor force.

The news has been, to a great degree, managed so as to attempt to create a slant favorable to the administration.

Strikes are inhibiting the economy and impeding defense efforts. The newspaper strikes in New York and Cleveland are harming many thousands of people and are depriving many millions of valuable information with respect to what our Government is doing and what is happening to the world. The longshoremen's strike is having a damaging effect on our entire economy. The transit strike in Philadelphia is causing great personal inconvenience and important business dislocations. In addition, there is a disturbing rumor that big steel is increasing its inventory in order to prepare for another steel strike sometime next spring.

We Republicans, indeed we Americans, would do well, less than 3 weeks before the birthday of the founder of the Republican Party, to ponder on the serene wisdom of Abraham Lincoln who said: "Property is the fruit of labor, property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself. Thus, by example, assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

He understood that there is no natural conflict between labor and management; between those who own the businesses and those who work in them. He proclaimed that all these elements in our society are interdependent and that we must think first of the total American community, on the survival of which we all depend.

The fact is that, in spite of the campaign oratory of 1960, our rate of economic growth during the past 2 years has been considerably less than the leading industrial nations of Western Europe. In spite of campaign criticism of the Eisenhower administration, the United States has, during the past 2 years, failed to modernize itself. Public services, particularly in the areas of health, education, and transportation, are not keeping up with the headlong urbanization of our population.

In spite of a managed and well-heeled domestic public relations effort, the picture abroad is hardly comforting.

The State Department and indeed the United Nations are obviously striving, at the expense of old friendships, to be popular with new nations. The United States is friendlier toward India than toward her victim, Portugal, and this in spite of the fact that India ignored the right of the people of Goa to self-determination and that Portugal is a very small nation compared with India. Our doctrinaire, somewhat sanctimonious, anticolonial attitude certainly has not made us popular with the Dutch, the Belgians, the French, the Portuguese or the British, particularly since we do not often talk about the Russian colonies. We did not fight the American Revolution to liberate the American Indian. But we joined Russia in demanding at the United Nations an investigation of Portugese Angola.

Last summer, while on active naval duty with the 7th Fleet in the Far East, I had the opportunity to talk to some of Mr. Kennedy's New Frontier representatives. Their optimism is hardly justified by the course of events. Economic progress in Western Europe is pointed to as though it were an accomplishment of the New Frontier and as though it were a major victory against the Communist threat. Certainly it is an encouraging manifestation of the essential health of our Western allies. Certainly it gives the lie to the Communist prophets of the doom of our free private property system. Yet, just as certainly, it is hardly reason enough to ignore the dark clouds which are charging down upon us in South America, in southeast Asia and elsewhere. The Communist threat lies not only in the field of economics; it is all inclusive.

The President's action with respect to the quarantine of Cuba last October has been overplayed and misunderstood. The Soviet buildup in Cuba was becoming extremely dangerous and threatened to pin down America in such a way that a checkmate would soon follow. Reports to the U.S. Government were such that no President could have allowed the situation to drift. I am reluctant to believe that the President's action in Cuba was an election gimmick. Yet it is true, as Senator KEATING pointed out, that the weapons and the men had been in Cuba for many weeks. It is distressing that 2 weeks after the election, the President suddenly found out that the crisis and the threat no longer existed, that the watered-down naval quarantine was no longer necessary. We know that most of the weapons and all of the men are still there; we know that the President's terms have not been met; we know that on-the-ground inspection has not taken place; we know that Castro continues defiant and threatening. Given the circumstances, we could not have done less. The obvious, immediate danger was eliminated, at least for a time. But it is distressing to note that in doing this we apparently made concessions which will help the spread of Communist military force and subversion in this hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine has been tossed overboard and the Communist poisons, sabotage and subversion, are seeping elsewhere into Latin America from Cuba.

In other words, while Khrushchev has temporarily lost face, he has effectively accomplished his objective which was, not to destroy the United States with nuclear weapons, but to protect his conquest of Cuba and help him in conquering other nations in our hemisphere.

A basic defect, so it seems to me, in the thinking of many Americans, is that we think of the Communist threat largely in terms of nuclear warfare and ideological conflict. The fact is that the many millions of people who, since the end of World War II, have been subjugated by the Communist tyranny, have been defeated, not by nuclear attack or by the contagion of the Communist doctrine. They have been conquered by infiltration and subversion, by blackmail, coercion and bribery; by external pressures and internal force. We must learn to operate successfully in this twilight zone of action. We must also, as Gen. Lauris Norstad recently pointed up, concentrate more on conventional forces in order not to be confronted with an all or nothing choice.

Nor is the picture much more comforting in other parts of the world. In Berlin, there exists a precarious sort of standoff which could be turned against us by a reckless and timid miscalculation such as occurred in the Bay of Pigs in 1961. The ransom spent to liberate 1,113 Cuban heroes certainly appeals to our sense of humanity and brotherhood. Yet it cannot be denied that there freedom was purchased, also, at the cost of helping our enemy not only in a material way, but psychologically. It also involved, if I may say so, a wound to our national honor and pride. Certainly we had an obligation in all conscience, to rescue these brave men from Castro's brutal prisons. The honorable way to rescue them is by helping them to carry out their original noble objective—rescue them, not buy them.

In Laos, the troika coalition government, endorsed at Geneva and organized by the United States is, of course, doing nothing to prevent Communist infiltration and indeed is bringing the leftists to a controlling position. The Communist Vietcong terrorist organization in South Vietnam has warned that there can be no peace in Laos while war is being waged in neighboring South Vietnam. In South Vietnam, the war has become difficult and expensive. In point of simple fact we are heading, some 10 years later, for an American version of Dien Bien Phu. We should make an all-out effort to win, or we should withdraw.

Thailand, Cambodia, and Burma are all beset by troubles. We gave leftist Cambodia economic aid in spite of objections from pro-Western Thailand. Indeed our pattern of flexibility regarding the Communist threat has produced discouragement among our friends and allies in spite of our temporary firmness last October with respect to the Cuban quarantine.

In Katanga, the United States-backed United Nations, instead of keeping peace, is waging a cruel war with mercenaries to force a people into a form of unity which they do not find acceptable and which did not exist prior to the Belgian occupation. This is certainly a denial of self-determination. But it is more than that; it places the United Nations and the United States in an untenable position. It sets a very disturbing precedent. For there are many trouble spots in the world. Is the United Nations to intervene everywhere it finds a situation it doesn't happen to like, and is the United States going to give the United Nations the power to intervene? It would be well to heed the warning of Albert Schweitzer, who has spent almost 50 years in tropical Africa and who said that the war against Katanga, which is without juridical foundation, involves the risk that the United Nations will lose the respect which it enjoys in the world. Victory won at the expense of principle can hardly bring lasting good. Moreover, in the East-West conflict, it constitutes a blow against the very pro-Western elements who are in the best position to combat Communist infiltration.

And so we find ourselves in the position where we give Communist Castro $63 million worth of medicine and food, and to the anti-Communist Katangans we send death and destruction.

The Angola revolutionary camp is located on Congolese territory, with the blessing of the United Nations.

Last summer, the Kennedy administration indignantly broke off relations with Peru and halted all aid programs when certain military leaders, in order to avoid chaos, took control of the Government. There was no question of thwarting the will of the people, for the people had not expressed their will. This ill-advised move, engineered by the callow mystics of the ADA, embarrassed the country. This, mind you, is the same administration which sends food, arms, machines, and various forms of hardware to the Communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia and gives aid to Communist Poland and to the pro-Eastern dictatorship in Ghana. This is the administration which aids quasi-dictator Nasser in Egypt and which ceremoniously receives Marxist Cheddi Jagan, Prime Minister of British Guiana and pro-Castro Ben Bella, the leader of the Government in Algeria. Apparently, the real enemy is never on the left.

And so, as we look about us, both at home and abroad, there is plenty to give us pause. Is the state of the Union really so good?

We shall not come to grips with our sea of troubles through the doctrine of peaceful coexistence which is simply surrender on the installment plan.

We shall not achieve a breakthrough for our side by the slogan, "Peace without victory." As General MacArthur pointed out, "In war, there is no substitute for victory." Hot or cold, we are in a war in which no

quarter should be asked, because none will be given. We cannot prevail by a partial, rather mild and temporary quarantine of Cuba, useful though that tardy gesture was. We cannot win through by some sudden deed of excellence. You cannot, in human experience, rush into the light.

Neither can we come to grips with our troubles at home—inflation, rising costs and prices, strikes and unemployment—by quick, impatient remedies, such as lower taxes and larger deficits, although tax reforms and tax reductions are certainly overdue.

We Republicans must present to the people of this land, in convincing and contagious terms, constructive alternatives to the negative, unimaginative, defeatist attitudes now rampant in Washington. We must stop snatching defeat from the jaws of victory by bickering and arguing among ourselves about conservative Republicans, liberal Republicans, and real Republicans. We must, instead, unite under one banner as Lincoln Republicans.

The principles and ideals which have inspired the Republican Party in its moments of greatness, provide an umbrella broad enough to cover all Republicans and indeed many independents and Democrats.

The times are urgent. Our system of Government is on trial. We Americans are being tested. We must prove that we can go through thought barriers as well as sound barriers. Even the atomic missile will move to the measure of man's thoughts. We must prove that we are more capable of sacrifice than those for whom austerity may be both a necessity and a creed. We have more to give up and therefore more to defend. No struggle, no victory; no victory, no crown; no wilderness, no Moses; no cross, no Christ.

This is the challenge which confronts the Republican Party. This is the challenge which confronts America. This is an interesting and exciting time to be alive. Let us, then, as Lincoln Republicans, go forward to victory, remembering the luminous exhortation of the founder of our party:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history; we will be remembered in spite of ourselves; no personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us; the fiery trial through which we pass will light us in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

Hellerious Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Newsweek magazine of March 11, 1963. The editorial points out that the spend-more, tax-less Alice in Wonderland theories of the Kennedy administration are heading our Nation toward chaos. Text of the editorial, written by veteran financial writer Henry Hazlitt, is as follows:

HELLERIOUS ECONOMICS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

What is the rationale behind Mr. Kennedy's extraordinary proposal that, in the face of a huge deficit of nearly $9 billion in the current fiscal year, we should increase spending, drastically cut taxes, and bring about still another deficit of nearly $12 billion in fiscal 1964, plus an indefinite number of deficits thereafter? On its face, this program seems the height of fiscal irresponsibility. How can it be defended?

The most elaborate defense of it is to be found in the President's annual Economic Report published on January 21. The report consists of a 20-page message to Congress signed by the President and a 268-page report of the Council of Economic Advisers (164 pages of text, 104 pages of tables) signed by Walter W. Heller as Chairman. It is impossible to say how much Mr. Kennedy's policies are based on Chairman Heller's economic theories, or how much the theories are an attempt to rationalize the policies that Mr. Kennedy has decided to adopt. In either case the outlook is ominous.

For the theories set forth in the full report, and summarized in the President's message, are utterly fallacious. And if policies based on them are persisted in, they must imperil the dollar and ultimately lead to a disastrous inflation.

WAGE DISTORTIONS

Mr. Kennedy, laudably, wants to cure unemployment. But he never mentions, and the whole Economic Report never mentions, the main cause of unemployment, which is the excessive wage rates successfully insisted on by some unions in key lines. Practically all unemployment is attributed by the President to "insufficient demand." And insufficient demand is always interpreted to mean insufficient money supply. So unemployment is always to be cured by more Government spending and more money, while wage-rate distortions are systematically ignored.

The way to cure unemployment and give zip to the economy, on this theory, is to have huge and continuous deficits, to increase spending, and to cut taxes. "The main block to full employment," says the President, "is an unrealistically heavy burden of taxation. The time has come to remove it." The President speaks as if the burden of taxation had nothing to do with the amount of Government spending. This spending, in fact, is to be increased. The question may well arise in the reader's mind: Why not abolish taxes altogether? Then there would be no block to full employment whatever.

DEFICITS FOR STRENGTH

Indeed, Mr. Kennedy is not daunted by paradox. He tells us that if we fail to cut taxes, we will slide into recession, and then "the cash deficit for next year would be larger without the tax reduction than the estimated deficit with tax reduction." We have entered the world of Alice in Wonderland, where the prudent and responsible thing is planned deficits, and where "if we were to try to force budget balance by drastic cuts in expenditures * * * we would not only endanger the security of the country, we would so depress demand, production, and employment that tax revenues would fall and leave the Government budget still in deficit."

But what if the Heller theory fails? What if heavy unemployment persists as in the thirties even with constant huge deficits? What if the vague hope is not realized that some miraculous prosperity will balance the budget in spite of reduced taxes? Mr. Kennedy himself concedes that "if we were currently straining the limits of our productive capacity * * * tax reduction would be an open invitation to inflation, to a renewed price-wage spiral." What if this inflation occurs—as is altogether probable—even under present conditions of more than 94 percent employment?

It would be flattering to call this Heller-Kennedy budget theory Keynesism. It carries the logic of deficits to lengths that would have appalled Keynes himself. For Keynes—as Per Jacobsson has just reminded us—at least recognized that excessive real wage rates make full employment impossible.

The Heller-Kennedy spend-more-and-tax-less theory can lead only toward fiscal and monetary chaos.

The Numbers at the End of the Rainbow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article that appears in the April issue of Pageant magazine just released.

This article which I submit for the Members' consideration explains our only Government-run lottery in Puerto Rico:

THE NUMBERS AT THE END OF THE RAINBOW

Gambling in the United States is a $50-billion-a-year business, most of which is illegal and little of whose profits goes into Government coffers. Yet in 51 nations of the world the treasury and economy are boosted by the benefits of a national lottery. Many voices have been raised over the years asking why the United States does not also take advantage of this potential source of tax reduction. Former President Harry Truman spoke last year before the American Legion Convention on the need for a lottery. There is a National Committee for a Government Lottery in Washington. And Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican of New York, who has advocated a national lottery for 10 years, argues that there already is a profitable lottery on U.S. soil in Puerto Rico.

Pageant recently went to that pretty island, talked to officials and men on the street of all classes to learn the effect and to study the machinery of a Government lottery. Does it lure the poor to gamble in hopes of escaping the drudgery of their lives? What opposition exists? Could a lottery eliminate gambling in the States?

Again this year a proposal for a national lottery is before Congress. Is a lottery simply immoral gambling or a way to tap man's gambling nature for social benefits?

No one can say how many individuals in the Puerto Rican population of 2.5 million buy tickets. But each of the 48 weeks a year the lottery is held, 60,000 tickets are printed and each can be divided up to 60 times. For a 25-cent "fraction" one can hope for a $1,250 prize. For a whole ticket, costing $15, top prize is usually $75,000, second prize $21,000. But in special drawings, held in July and December, dreams come as high as $360,000, but tickets cost more, too.

Who buys? All classes can be seen coming up to the wandering salesmen. One buyer, typically, explains he would gamble anyway—illegally if necessary. Another claimed, "It is the only way to become rich here." A third purchaser, when asked to comment on the huge odds against him said, "You just have to be lucky." He turned out to be an accountant. Although a housewife said she had bought a ticket monthly since the lottery's reestablishment in 1934 (it had been abolished for a time), she had never won. "But I try for a house, a trip, a business of my own."

Although to capitalize on the dreams of people may seem callous, Congressman Fino argues that there is a "natural gambling

spirit in the American people. More than $3 billion annually is wagered at U.S. tracks." And the McClellan Subcommittee on Investigations estimates that of the $50 billion gambled illegally each year, much is eventually used to finance other kinds of criminal activity.

The Chicago-made, $100,000 equipment for the drawings is literally open for all to see during the Monday selections. Behind a glass case in the auditorium of the Lottery Department's building in San Juan two large wire cages revolve. Out of one drops the winning ticket number, on a small ball. From the second cage another ball drops out. On it is marked the amount the first ball has won. Numbers are matched with prizes over and over. Every number and prize on every ball is checked before and after the drawing. Every winning ticket is checked to prevent renumbering or forgery of tickets.

According to Armando Arroyo Gerena, chief of drawing procedure, the 3,000 ticket agents and their 9,000 salesmen, plus all the civil servants of the department, are hired according to need as well as competence. In a recent typical week $584,985 in prizes were paid, $48,000 went to municipalities. The Government took the remaining $148,000. Formerly all Government lottery revenue was earmarked for medical projects. Now it is simply used for general purposes. For a richer, larger country like the United States, it has been estimated that the lottery could add $10 billion to Government coffers. It could be used for tax abatement, it is said, or for specific purposes like hospitals, as is done with the receipts of the Irish Sweepstakes.

There are exactly 9,536 varied ways to win the Puerto Rica Lottery. The actual number of winners depends on how much the $15 tickets are fractioned into 25-cent shares. Many thousands could win each week.

While the local Catholic authorities do not oppose the lottery, some church groups see all gambling as weakening the individual's moral fiber. Congressman FINO claims there is no stopping illegal gambling, and, like prohibition, gambling only profits racketeers until legalized. Against the threat that a legal lottery will create gamblers, there is the lesson of Jose Hernandez, Puerto Rico lottery director, who says simply, "I don't gamble."

Lew Deschler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a legislative body like the House of Representatives with 435 Representatives of such widely different areas and interests, the daily functioning of the House in a smooth and orderly way is a continuing tribute to its Parliamentarian.

However, on the occasion of Lew Deschler's 35th anniversary in that post, it is fitting to pay special and explicit tribute to the service he has rendered to the House and, with exemplary impartiality, to all its Members. The rules of the House are both numerous and technical. There are more than 11,000 rulings that constitute precedents for the conduct of House business. In these circumstances, the sureness with which Lew Deschler makes his judgments, represents ample evidence of his immense accumulation of knowledge and of his dedication to his work.

I should like to join many of my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished Parliamentarian on his anniversary and his birthday. I hope his highly valued service will continue so that I shall have many occasions in the future on which to renew these congratulations.

An Awesome Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, late in May, on a day yet to be designated by Secretary Freeman, the American farmer will be asked to make a decision on future wheat programs. In a very real sense, wheat is at the crossroads this year. The commodity has been subjected to moderate doses of supply management in recent years. The question to be decided in May is whether the wheat farmer is to be fed a poisonous dose, the same portion which now has the cotton farmer flat on his back.

The president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, William J. Kuhfuss, in the current issue of the IAA record, discusses the referendum. He points out very ably the awesome responsibility faced by the farmer in the May referendum. I commend this editorial to the attention of all Members:

A HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY

The American wheat farmer carries a heavy responsibility to all of agriculture when he casts his ballot in the coming wheat referendum. The significance of the outcome is more important than the acres of wheat to harvest in 1964 or the price it will bring. Direction for future agricultural legislation is being given. The basic issue is whether the farms of America are to be managed by farmers or by Government. The future for Illinois producers of feed grains, livestock, soft red winter wheat, of which there is no surplus, and all other important commodities is being decided by a few wheat growers. The place to stop cow quotas is in the wheat field.

The farmer will be bombarded with speeches, economic analyses, news releases, and personal contacts by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Department should not jeopardize its reputation of integrity by implying that personal opinion is fact. Also, there seems to be no recognition that it is the responsibility of the executive branch of Government to administer programs, not devise, legislate, and impose them on the farmer.

Congress emphatically refused to buy the Secretary of Agriculture's proposal 2 years ago that he be given the authority to originate and inaugurate agricultural control programs with only a veto power retained by Congress. But let's look for a moment at these "facts."

The Secretary always says it is not his responsibility to tell the farmers how to vote, but before he finishes he makes it plain that they had better vote "yes" for their own good. He claims that the referendum offers producers a choice between $1 and $2 per bushel for their wheat and that defeat of his control plan would lead to trade wars and chaos in the international market. This just isn't true. The reference to $2 versus $1 per bushel for wheat is hardly realistic, as the blended price the farmer would receive under the certificate plan for all his wheat would be less than $2, and even the world price is well above the $1 so emphatically mentioned.

Defeat of the wheat certificate control plan would not end all Government wheat programs. The basic agricultural laws of 1938 and 1949 are still in effect. Also, Congress will still be in session after the referendum and it is not about to abdicate its responsibilities. It may even further limit, and I think it should, the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to dump CCC stocks to demoralize prices.

An elaborate brochure, entitled "Wheat—The Program for 1964—An Economic Analysis," has been widely distributed by the Department as it throws its full resources into this campaign.

In an attempt to convince farmers the propaganda brochure was accurate, six noted economists from land-grant colleges were asked to review the material prepared by the USDA. A letter, signed by these six economists appears in the front of the brochure. Two qualifying statements contained in the letter read as follows: (1) "The conclusions are cast in terms of short-run costs and returns in the wheat and feed grain sectors. The study does not examine long-run implications, nor does it enter into philosophical and other non-economic issues"; and (2) "While we offered suggestions and criticisms of the text, the final wording is that of the authors."

It becomes obvious that the six economists who reviewed the figures did not see fit to endorse the USDA propaganda approach. As educators, they disclaimed responsibility for the narrow, short-range approach.

As we face this referendum, we should ask ourselves:

Can you put a dollar value on the freedom of the farmer to make decisions unmolested by a dictatorial government?

If the boy who wants to farm tomorrow were given a ballot, how would he vote?

Should farmers be led to ignore the virtual certainty that Congress will enact a sensible wheat program if the certificate plan is not aproved?

If fear is to be injected into this campaign should it not be directed at the long-run cost of going down the supply management road to licensed and regimented agriculture?

Proclaiming Sir Winston Churchill an Honorary Citizen of the United States of America

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this esteemed body, it was a great privilege to join with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in recommending that Sir Winston Churchill be granted honorary citizenship in the United States of America.

To be able to recognize one of the world's outstanding leaders who has

worked and fought for the very ideals we Americans hold so dear—love of God, love of country and love of fellow men—is an honor I shall long treasure.

By our action today, the people of America have again shown the peoples of the world that democracy is a living, vibrant force which always stands ready to embrace those who believe in freedom.

The Politics of Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 7, 1963. The editorial points out that the electorate is not buying the big spending schemes of the New Frontier, and urges continued warnings of the danger these ill-conceived plans pose to the future of America.

The text of the editorial follows:

THE POLITICS OF SPENDING

The Republicans in Congress believe they have a good political issue in the administration's extreme spending plans. They may well be right, but whether they are or not, someone ought to keep hammering on the issue, for it is far more than a matter of partisan profit.

There are plenty of clues as to how the electorate feels about Federal spending. One is the lack of general enthusiasm for the Government's costly domestic proposals. These are largely retreads of last year's, which in turn were largely retreads of the notions of the depression thirties, and the public seems even less excited about them than before.

But voters, so far as anyone can tell, are indeed concerned about spending that has plainly gone out of control. A spending budget of nearly $100 billion causing a deficit of nearly $12 billion—that is a bit too much for many an American to accept uncritically.

The concern partly explains the lukewarm public response, surprising to the Government's political experts, to the tax program. Almost everyone is persuaded that tax rates should be substantially reduced, but a lot of people are also convinced it should be done only in a framework of fiscal restraint.

Such reactions are reflected in congressional tax tepidity in both parties. They are also reflected in the plan to seriously challenge the administration's demands for new increases in the ceiling on the public debt. And they are reflected in the current Republican talk of trying to cut appropriations by $10 billion to $15 billion, which could reduce actual spending in fiscal 1964 by $4 billion to $6 billion.

In sum, the old theory that one of the best ways for a government to win friends is by throwing more money around doesn't look as impressive as perhaps it did in the thirties. A concerted attack on spending might therefore pay political dividends for the party or group that undertakes it.

That result is all the more possible because the economic case against the Government's fiscal policy is so strong. Boiled down, the policy calls for deficit spending regardless of economic conditions. But since sensible men can hardly espouse deficits for their own sake, it should be repeatedly asked what is the purpose of such a policy.

One ostensible purpose is economic stimulation, a matter of by no means minor political importance. The idea is that huge, continuing deficits, achieved by greater spending or tax cuts or both, must increase the people's purchasing power and hence whet their demand for all kinds of additional goods and services.

Unfortunately for the theory but happily for the Nation, the evidence shows an abundance of purchasing power. While consumers are spending at a record rate, savings are also sharply rising; savings-type assets have jumped 20 percent just since 1960.

In these circumstances deficit spending cannot be counted on to spur demand. All it can be counted on to do is weaken the dollar by piling up inflationary potential, whether the potential begins to materialize next year or 5 years from now.

Given such a feeble economic case, some suspect that the deficit policy is also aimed at expanding the Government's size and capacity to control the economy. A new inflation, for one example, could be an excuse for direct price and wage controls. We hope this is not the conscious reasoning, but a deficit policy would be well designed to attain such ends.

Whatever the reasons for the Government's economic approach, the enormity of its plans makes spending the single most significant domestic issue. If there is anything the political opposition should oppose, it is this—not merely in hope of partisan gain but for the good of the Nation.

Standards for U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested by various officials of this administration and by some Members of Congress, that the conduct of foreign policy is a matter for the President alone, and that all his decisions deserve bipartisan support in the field of foreign policy.

Yet we have a Foreign Affairs Committee in the House and a Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate. Surely, Congresses in the past have not completely abdicated their responsibility in the field of foreign policy.

Therefore, I feel it is entirely appropriate, and even obligatory, for Members of Congress to express their opposition to individual policies when they find themselves in disagreement. My contention for the past several years has been that we have no clear-cut foreign policy, that this hit-and-miss attitude has resulted in not a few blunders by several administrations, including the present one.

In recent weeks, it has become increasingly clear that much of our policy is founded upon a complete confidence in, and support for, the policies, actions, and resolutions of the United Nations, that is, U.S. support of the U.N. action in the Congo; the granting of a U.N. agricultural project for Communist Cuba through a special U.N. fund financed in part by the United States; and the publication of Communist propaganda by UNESCO, namely, "The Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," authored by a Communist. It is true that the U.S. delegation has voiced objection in the latter two cases, but feeble words are poor substitutes for decisive action.

These isolated incidents might be considered inconsequential if they did not reflect a more serious flaw in our relationship with the United Nations. That flaw is expertly analyzed by Mrs. Alice Widener, editor of U.S.A., in a recent article appearing in the February 22–March 8 issue of U.S.A.

The tendency to regard U.N. resolutions as law, and the insistence on complete subservience to U.N. policies even at the expense of legitimate national interests is the basic issue at stake in most debates on the effectiveness of the United Nations. Those of us who express disapproval and opposition to certain policies of the United Nations are not attacking all facets of the international organization, but we are objecting to the extent of U.S. involvement.

I think that U.S. foreign policy, in light of its dependence upon decisions made by the United Nations, needs complete reevaluation. We must retain the right to defend our security against the world Communist movement, and we must oppose policies of the United Nations whenever they are inimical to the interests of freedom in the United States and throughout the world.

Mrs. Widener's article follows:

REPORT ON THE U.N.

(By Alice Widener)

Are the American people willing to hand over determination of their foreign policy to the United Nations?

This is the question lying at the heart of our membership in the U.N. It is a matter which Americans refused to consider while enthusiastically supporting the United Nations since 1945, hoping and longing for a better world and permanent peace.

In world affairs, it generally takes the passage of time and a sudden incident to highlight a prolonged bad situation. Such an incident occurred in the recent decision by the United Nations Special Fund to conduct an agricultural aid project in Soviet Cuba. Actually, the Cuban aid project is in itself a minor affair costing the relatively small sum of $1.16 million. But this boy-sticking-out-his-tongue defiance of American public opinion has at long last jolted Congress and the people of our country into belated realization of what really lies behind the U.N. disregard of American sentiment, principle, and vital national interest.

Shutting their eyes and minds to the realities of their entangling alliance in the United Nations, most Americans assumed that the international organization never could or would act in a manner contrary to the wishes of the United States or in conflict with it. This assumption was unfounded.

On February 15, 1963, the distinguished columnist David Lawrence wrote, "The United Nations has reached a turning point in its history. Sentiment in the United States for withdrawal from the international organization has just been given strong new impetus. * * * Democrats as well as Republicans have denounced the U.N.'s (Special Fund in Cuba) action on the floor of Congress. * * * When the U.N. flagrantly ignores the policy of the United States, it

brings up the broad question of whether financial aid by American taxpayers shall be extended blindly and without any opportunity to keep the funds from being used to defeat the foreign policy of this country."

Mr. Lawrence certainly highlighted the problem we face in the United Nations, but in this writer's opinion it is a mistake to stress the matter of U.S. taxpayers' financial aid to the United Nations as a main point of consideration about our membership in it, notwithstanding U.S. taxpayers' rightful concern.

The main point at issue concerning U.S. popular front membership with Communists in the United Nations is that of national sovereignty. Next to it, money matters are insignificant.

Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, recognized this in an official interview (his first since the Cuban crisis of October 1962) published Sunday, February 24, 1963. As reported by the Associated Press in the Philadelphia Inquirer, the text of the interview shows clearly that Ambassador Stevenson is entirely willing for a supergovernment to be imposed on the world, and he has not the slightest objection to surrender of U.S. national sovereignty to that supergovernment. Here are the two pertinent questions and answers which followed his assertion, "The world has grown smaller; it's shrunk with the evolution of science. Now we are a large family in a small world."

"Question. Does that mean the U.N. can act on its own as sort of a supergovernment or would it act only under the charter by invitation?

"Mr. Stevenson. Well, it will be under the charter as long as the charter exists in its present form and will be subject to all the frailties of the present charter.

"I don't know whether we're at the point yet—and perhaps we won't be in the foreseeable future—where we'll be able to impose a supergovernment on the world. Maybe that is going to be the ultimate evolution for preserving peace.

"But as of now, power still is the major influence in the world and the power of the great states still is beyond the control of the United Nations.

"It's interesting, however, in talking about power, that in a world which now is so fragmented by so many states, instead of the relatively few states of only a generation ago, that the little states find their security in banding together.

"Separately and alone, they're helpless against the great states. Banding together in the United Nations, and each having a vote, they can exercise a degree of self-preservation—just as the collective influence of the state in the local community has greater power than any individual member of the state.

"Question. Do you think then, Governor, this will be way of the future, that individual nations will have to give up more and more of their sovereignty for the sake of a strong international organization?

"Mr. STEVENSON. Well, we've been yielding sovereignty bit by bit. I suppose that process will go on, that more and more states will feel they have to respond to the majority view, to the organized opinion of the world. Whether they do that voluntarily or under coercion is one of the problems we have to confront.

"But the relinquishment itself (of sovereignty), which causes many people such anxiety, is a process that has been going on for some time and I think will go on more and more in the interest of the security of nations as a whole."

Mr. Stevenson's two replies deal with the entire question in a nutshell. But these replies entail discussion, or should do so, which ought to be held now before the United States is confronted with response to the majority view at the United Nations by coercion, or in an imposed supergovernment by coercion.

It is exceedingly interesting to follow Mr. Stevenson's mental processes. Lately they were revealed in his correspondence with the National Foreign Trade Council on the subject of the United Nations Resolution on Permanent Sovereignty Over National Resources. The history of this resolution is the best possible example of what actually takes place at the U.N. and what our U.S. attitude is.

Initially, the Soviets proposed a resolution on permanent sovereignty and the United States found it entirely unnecessary. The Soviets persisted; the resolution was framed by the U.N. Economic and Social Council. The Soviets proposed in 1962 an outrageous confiscatory amendment entitling any nation to seize foreign investments—"steal" is a more fitting word.

In the U.N. Economic Committee (which is virtually controlled by the Soviets), the vote on this resolution was 60 to 5 against us. In the General Assembly, the Soviet amendment was defeated by the narrow margin of 41 to 38. The resolution as a whole was adopted and will have lasting injurious effects on foreign trade and private foreign investment. The National Foreign Trade Council is fully aware of this and made its views known to the U.S. Mission to the U.N.

On February 12, 1963, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson sent to the Chairman of the National Foreign Trade Council a letter which exposed the dreadful weakness of our position at the U.N.

"There is one thing that obviously could not be done," wrote Mr. Stevenson, "that is to make the issue [of permanent sovereignty over natural resources] disappear altogether. On every occasion during the past 10 years the United States has both officially and unofficially made it plain that it did not consider it useful to have a General Assembly discussion or resolution on this subject. We opposed the adoption of the resolution setting up the Commission on Sovereignty Over Natural Wealth and Resources."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—But it was set up.)

"In this last session of the General Assembly, Ambassador Klutznick strongly urged the desirability of avoiding a resolution on this subject."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—But it was presented.)

The complicated blackmail technique prevalent at the United Nations, and the disastrous weakness of a United States afraid, or for some reason unwilling, to say a loud "No" to something it doesn't want, is nowhere better shown than in the following paragraph of the Stevenson letter of February 12 to the National Foreign Trade Council:

"You might also be interested in a report on a conversation involving one of our delegation members during the period between action by the Second Committee (Economic Committee) and action in the Plenary (of the General Assembly). During a conversation with officials of four leading international oil companies, our delegation member observed that there was a possibility that paragraph 5 (confiscation amendment) inserted as a result of Soviet amendment might remain in the text in Plenary. In that case, the U.S. delegation would again vote against the resolution as a whole. The company representatives were asked whether this might be a preferable situation to one in which the offensive paragraph would be removed and the U.S. delegation would vote for the resolution. The lawyers among them were emphatic in their view that it would be far preferable for the paragraph to be removed and, following such removal, for the United States to support the resolution. Their view was based on the consideration that if the United States voted against the resolution as a whole, our interpretation of such matters as 'appropriate compensation' and other important issues in the resolution would have less weight. From the standpoint of legislative history, they felt that a U.S. vote in favor of a suitably amended resolution would be a desirable result. As you know, this result was obtained."

What a deal.

In the first place, our American interpretation of "appropriate" compensation is only that—our own interpretation. The U.N. refused to spell out "appropriate" as "prompt, adequate, and effective." We asserted this was our definition of "appropriate"; but the matter remains entirely speculative.

After Potsdam, former President Harry Truman ruefully remarked, "the Soviets don't mean the same thing we do by the word 'democracy'."

What do Senegal, Uruguay, Brazil, Indonesia, Poland, Ghana, and other nations that voted for the U.N. Special Fund project in Soviet Cuba mean by the word "appropriate"?

It is frightening to see the words "legislative history" in Ambassador Stevenson's letter. Constantly, he and other advocates of imposed supergovernment deny that resolutions enacted by the United Nations are "laws," and they repeatedly assert that the U.N. is "not a government." It isn't, but it acts like one. And several of its resolutions have been cited as law or its equivalent in courts of law.

When all is said and repeated, again and again, there remains the big issue of sovereignty before the American people. Are we willing to hand over determination of our foreign policy and economic policies to the United Nations? We should make up our minds about this while there still is time to do so. Otherwise, we'll wake up some morning to find ourselves subjects, not citizens, of an imposed supergovernment empowered to coerce us into submission to majority will at the United Nations, where we are in a popular front with the Communists who are ready, as Khrushchev recently said, to shovel the last spadeful of earth on a dead capitalism.

Congress Hoodwinked: The Billion-Dollar Boondoggle—U.S. Air Force and Atomic Energy Commission Waste $1.04 Billion on Studies Before Junking Impractical Nuclear Airplane Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in a period of 10 years from March 1951, to March 1961, the U.S. Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission were jointly engaged in feasibility and research studies aimed to produce a nuclear-powered airplane.

These Federal agencies wasted $1,040 million up to the time of the cancellation of the project in March 1961. During this time, and in spite of the lavish expenditures, no usable airplane frame, engine, nuclear powerplant, or military weapons system was developed under the program.

The $1,040 million expenditure is a total loss to the taxpayers of this country, except incidental theoretical knowledge with a minimal practical value. More tragic than this wastage of tax funds, is the fact that these funds represent a useless wastage of research, engineering, and technical talent and manpower. Research and engineering manpower to this extent had been diverted from projects that could have strengthened instead of weakened the relative military power of the United States to that of the Soviet.

During these 10 years, the emphasis, direction, and end purpose of this program had shifted and changed eight different times. The emphasis shifted from flight demonstration to applied research, to military weapons systems, to experimental no-flight program, to experimental flight program, to development for all-purpose military aircraft, to nuclear reactor shielding program, to research on nuclear reactor experiments.

During this whole period, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense had represented this project to the Congress as an urgent military weapons system. The Congress was misled and hoodwinked for 10 years concerning the actual purposes, the urgency, and the progress of this project.

After years of study, the Department of Defense, in another change of heart and mind, announced the specifications for this nebulous airplane to be: Speed, 400 to 600 miles per hour; altitude, 30,000 feet. At the same time, the United States already had the B–52 and the B–58 military bombers with the following capabilities: The B–52 with a speed of 600 miles per hour and an altitude of 35,000 feet; the B–58 with a speed of 1,300 miles per hour and an altitude of 50,000 feet.

For military purposes, this airplane was obsolete from the beginning to the end of the 10-year research project.

No military weapons system was ever seriously projected for this airplane by the Air Force, even if it could have been successfully developed and feasibly manufactured.

The General Accounting Office investigated, audited, and reported its findings on this fantastic nuclear airplane project. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell's recent report cited numerous deficiencies in purpose, direction, and management on the part of the military and atomic energy agencies which contributed to the astronomical costs and disappointing results.

The Comptroller General cited the following governmental management errors:

First. Various major facilities were constructed but never used for their intended purpose.

Second. Construction designs and plans were completed and paid for without ever being used.

Third. The Department of Defense failed to furnish timely direction and supervision of the contractors.

Fourth. The Department of Defense delayed for over 2 years in giving the Atomic Energy Commission a decision on a vital military aspect of the program.

Fifth. The Atomic Energy Commission extended a contract for producing yttrium oxide, 7 months beyond its need.

Sixth. A large negotiated contract was almost entirely subcontracted which pyramided overhead and profit costs for both prime contractor and subcontractor costs.

The prime contractors for the nuclear propulsion system were the General Electric Co. and Pratt & Whitney Division of the United Aircraft Corp.

General Electric was paid $527,384,000 under its contracts. Pratt & Whitney received $164,480,000.

The Comptroller General disclosed the following deficiencies and inefficiencies of the General Electric Co. under its contracts:

First. Ineffective equipment accountability;

Second. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Third. Accumulation of stock outside storerooms;

Fourth. Uneconomical purchases;

Fifth. Deficiencies in accountability for certain inventories;

Sixth. Divided internal audit responsibility, thus precluding effective and comprehensive coverage of General Electric's nuclear airplane activities.

Seventh. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings;

Eighth. Accounting records did not segregate allowable and unallowable costs;

Ninth. Government audit services not utilized;

Tenth. Delay in suspending project;

Eleventh. Improper method for computing fixed fee.

The Comptroller General's review of operations of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft disclosed innumerable weaknesses in the financial and quantity controls over materials and supplies inventories, and a lack of formal accounting records to support the financial reports prepared by Pratt & Whitney.

GAO cited the following deficiencies in Pratt & Whitney's operations:

First. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Second. Inadequate accountability for inventories;

Third. Stock records accessible to warehouse employees;

Fourth. Improper handling of requisitions;

Fifth. Absence of written procedures for inventories;

Sixth. Accumulation of excessive and obsolete inventories;

Seventh. Inadequate accounting records; and

Eighth. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General's revelation of this billion dollar boondoggle is a shocking example of the wastages that occur in our Federal system of administration. There are thousands of areas where sheer, clear wastages are going on.

There is no question in my mind that the 1964 budget could be reduced by from $5 to $10 billion by reasonable businesslike management in our executive and administrative agencies. This responsibility rests with the Chief Executive.

Congress cannot undertake to displace or to exercise detail supervision over the management and administrative responsibilities of the executive department.

Not the CCC Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of March 11, 1963. The editorial points out that the old CCC was a failure, and warns of repeating the same errors in this decade. Text of the editorial is as follows:

NOT THE CCC AGAIN

Thirty years ago this country, engulfed in a cataclysmic depression, turned to such innovations as the Civilian Conservation Corps for a way out. In that period of massive unemployment, the CCC was a desperation move, one of the emergency strokes dreamed up by the New Deal to stem the receding tide of prosperity.

If there were few who questioned the logic of a "make work" program in those dark days, there are many who wonder whether a CCC-type Youth Conservation Corps (a high-priority administration goal) should be considered even as a stopgap for today's comparatively low-scale unemployment. And this holds true, we think, despite President Kennedy's most recent appeal for enactment of his youth employment opportunities bill. Among those who have their fingers crossed on this proposal is Dr. Austin S. Murphy, director of the National Association of Manufacturers' Education Department.

Testifying before a Senate Labor Subcommittee, Dr. Murphy raised many questions, among them: (1) Would there be enough volunteers between 16 and 22 to make the Corps worthwhile (2) With no Army officers such as directed the CCC, would there be adequate and competent camp supervisory personnel? (3) Would a corps encourage more school dropouts? (4) Would the sociopsychological effect cause the enrollee to become "a potential member of the hard-core unemployed rather than a productive and useful member of society?"

Whatever its value, the CCC won no prizes for character building. That was indicated by the fact, Dr. Murphy noted, that nearly 500,000 youths, or one-fifth of the Corps, washed out "through desertion or for disciplinary reasons." In short, Dr. Murphy found the whole idea of "make-work by Government fiat" reprehensible and destructive of "individual initiative and self-reliance in seeking employment." He added:

"Finding employment is generally considered a responsibility of the individual while the function of the Government is limited to providing a climate conducive to industrial growth and expansion and to individual development. The philosophy underlying this proposal, however, appears to be that the Government should assume responsibility both for creating jobs and for tailoring them to the needs and qualifications of specific groups of individuals. The solution suggested here of increasing public pay-

rolls to reduce unemployment will, in my opinion, inevitably worsen our problem rather than serving to provide a meaningful solution."

The real solution, Dr. Murphy suggested, can be found in the Herlong-Baker tax rate reform bills. Unlike the administration proposal, the NAM-supported plan stresses sharp reductions in corporation as well as upper and middle personal income tax brackets during the first stages of a 5-year program. This approach, NAM believes, would stimulate economic growth and create new jobs. Of course, it does not necessarily follow that the NAM is right or that its recommendations, if adopted, would produce the needed jobs. But its approach seems more promising than a revival on a small scale of the old CCC.

Prof. Paul Van Riper Says American Ombudsman Should Follow Swedish Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of the possibility of using the successful Scandinavian office of ombudsman in the United States is producing various opinions among leading authorities in law and government about about how the office might be developed in this country. Paul P. Van Riper, professor of administration at Cornell University's Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, urges that the office adhere closely to the pattern developed in Sweden.

To add to the Congress information on this important subject, I am presenting his thoughtful views to the House. I refer you also to my views on the subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084.

Prof. Van Riper's views follow:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: It is with interest that I have received your letter of inquiry concerning my views on the utility and feasibility of the ombudsman concept in the American Federal Government. I am by no means a legal specialist and I have had no firsthand contact with any of the various Scandinavian versions (or the German) of the ombudsman. Nevertheless, in connection with my interest in the civil service, I have come to know something of this device, for which I have considerable respect.

I would consider that it would be feasible to employ the ombudsman device in the United States. The version that I would most strongly support would be the oldest and perhaps best tested—the Swedish, where there are both civil and military versions. It would seem quite possible to utilize both here in the United States.

In your own views of this matter, as expressed both in your letter and in your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would not entirely concur. As you have expressed your thoughts, two matters concern me. The first, and least important, has to do with the impression that the ombudsman might undertake any number of the "services" now undertaken by Members of Congress, and your wording suggests that such "services" might include information, introductions, explanations of procedures, etc. Certainly this latter kind of "services" are under no circumstances functions of any version of the ombudsman. An ombudsman is essentially a prosecuting, investigative agency with respect to alleged administrative irresponsibility. Perhaps I have done your remarks an injustice, but in the form you have presented them to me, they are by no means clear on just what an ombudsman would do. As for relations with the Comptroller General, I see no problem of excluding financial matters now under the Comptroller's jurisdiction. But the Comptroller's jurisdiction is considerably broader than financial matters; and a full examination of this jurisdiction might suggest the need for drawing a more precise boundary line between the two than might otherwise exist. The penalty for not doing this is considerable confusion in everybody's mind, and particularly that of the public.

But any of the above do not strike me as especially difficult matters to handle if there is any desire to do so. I am much more concerned at the thought that a citizen could not get access to the ombudsman except through a Member of Congress. It is a general principle of American justice that the judicial system should be equally open to all. And this is the central principle of the ombudsman concept. I will be quite frank here; I would rather see no ombudsman concept at all than one to which access could be, and almost certainly would be, capriciously controlled along the lines you suggest.

In your suggestion that a Member of Congress, despite, say, a citizen's wish, might refuse access to the Ombudsman, even with the best of motives, seems to me an impossible and inequitable refusal of equality before the law. And such would, I think, be especially true—and especially strongly felt to be true—of constituents who do not happen to be members of the same political party as that of the Member of Congress. Your concept immediately injects partisan politics into a concept, the essence of which is judicial and investigative, irrespective of partisanship.

Finally, I do not find at all persuasive the suggestion that a Member of Congress could in fact, if he chose, accomplish the same task as the Ombudsman, given the latter's powers as developed in, say, Sweden. A Member of Congress neither has such full powers—as a single Member of Congress—nor do I think it would be possible to write legislation giving him equal powers. This simply means that the alternative you propose, of a Member of Congress handling a problem rather than sending it to the Ombudsman, is for many problems simply not an alternative with equal meaning for the citizen who seeks redress.

I would, however, expect any Ombudsman to turn up considerable material for the legislative mill. Nor do I see any Ombudsman "interfering" much with the functions of Members of Congress. Rather, if the Ombudsman concept is taken in its full form and procedure as in Sweden, I see the possibility of considerable additional assistance to both the citizen and the legislative branch. Actually, there is more than enough business for all, as I am sure you have long since realized and as your concern over the growing staff of the legislative branch indicates.

In other words, I would support the Swedish Ombudsman concept, in both its civil and military formulations. I would actively oppose any endeavor to limit the jurisdiction of any Ombudsman solely to complaints which are referred to him by Members of Congress and to limit access of any citizen directly to the Ombudsman.

I hope these remarks are of some use to you. I appreciate your interest in the problem of administrative responsibility and especially in the solution available in the form of the Ombudsman concept. It deserves to be more widely understood and I wish you success in your endeavors to explore and publicize its utility.

PAUL P. VAN RIPER,
Professor of Administration.

To a Nation's Budget—Billions for Dog Whelpers and Moon Shots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, since the President and members of his party challenged the Republican economy forces to be specific about budget cuts, our mail has been filled with helpful suggestions from citizens all over the country.

It has been said often enough that there is someone who will object to almost any item we seek to cut in the budget. It could be said just as truthfully that there is someone who can find a good reason for reducing almost every item.

Some days before the Republican task force announced its program, Edwin A. Lahey, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Detroit Free Press, went to work on the budget himself. Mr. Lahey's specific recommendations for cutting the budget—and I wish to emphasize that they are Mr. Lahey's recommendations, not ours—were printed in the March 3 edition of the Free Press. He has some good ideas.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Lahey's immensely sensible budget-cutting article:

TO A NATION'S BUDGET—BILLIONS FOR DOG WHELPERS AND MOON SHOTS

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—The budget of the United States is a 1,195-page catalog style book showing how other people plan to spend $99 billion of your money beginning July 1.

This spending will include $12 billion on the cuff. In political science, when you go on the cuff it is called a managed deficit.

It may be unfashionable and and even unpatriotic to read the budget like a gimlet-eyed auditor going over a drunken reporter's expense account. But there's no law against it.

In a way, it's a little like getting into a pancake eating contest. Your sense of reality gets numb treading through the figures.

A hundred thousand rolls into a million, a million into a billion, and a billion into 99 billion.

Your head spins trying to keep in focus such diverse items as $5,000 to enlarge the toilets at the Botanic Garden in Washington, $80,000 for a dog-whelping facility at the agricultural lab in Beltsville, Md., $8 million for underground parking facilities for Congressmen, and $15 million as a confidential fund for the Secretary of Defense.

But through the haze emerges the picture of a steadily growing Federal establishment. Little agencies that the average taxpayer never heard of show up each year with pleas

for more people on the payroll, more services to perform.

The taxpayer reading the budget would be inclined to agree with Representative GERRY FORD of Michigan, a veteran Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee, who says he's never seen a budget that could not be cut.

Going over the notes from an item-by-item reading of the budget, some topical classifications fall into place.

SUBSIDIES

All through the budget there are direct and indirect subsidies.

The Federal Government helps build local airports—there are $75 million in the 1964 budget for this purpose.

Biggest subsidy of all is for farm price support. Seventy-five percent of the Department of Agriculture budget next year goes for this purpose. Total of subsidy—$4,367 million.

Subsidies for ship construction are going up—from $64,200,000 in the current year to $112,500,000 in fiscal 1964.

The maritime subsidies are in the Department of Commerce budget. But in the Department of the Interior there's another subsidy, for $750,000, for the construction of fishing vessels.

Small airlines are still subsidized by taxpayers. In the Civil Aeronautics Board budget there is provision for $67,307,000 for 13 local service operations, $5,775,000 for three helicopter operations, $9,211,000 for eight airlines in Alaska, and $900,000 for two local airlines in Hawaii.

We give $3 million to the States next year (up from 2 million this year) as incentive payments to control outdoor advertising on the highways.

The Bureau of Educational Research and Development of the Office of Education wants to increase its 1963 budget of $5,250,000 to $7,567,000 in 1964 to discharge responsibilities which include "encouraging and assisting in the establishment of science clubs."

The subsidy of subsidies is tucked away in the overwhelming Department of Defense budget, which with related items like atomic energy work and foreign military assistance is taking a neat $56 billion of the budget in fiscal 1964.

One item in the defense budget asks for $528,000 to promote civilian interest in small arms marksmanship. The funds are used to pay travel expenses for civilians going to the shooting matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, and to the State of Ohio as rent for the shooting range.

The budget notes modestly that the rifle practice program is augmented by the free issue of ammunition purchased under other appropriations. The value of the ammunition to be given to civilians in 1964 is estimated at $1,600,000.

Seven years ago, when members of the Washington Bureau of the Knight Newspapers first began exploring the crags of the budget book, this rifle practice subsidy was down for a modest appropriation of $300,000.

Having exposed this Government expenditure with such vigor, to the point where the appropriation now has been almost doubled, the members of this bureau feel entitled at least to a salute from the 22 permanent employees of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, whose average Government salary is $5,604.

COMPLIANCE

If you're thinking of a tax revolt like those Poujadist characters in France, forget it.

Your hired hands in Washington are spending plenty just to refine the technique of running you down and shaking you loose from the last nickel due the Government.

The Social Security Administration is spending $4,064,000 to see that Internal Revenue gets everybody's social security number, for cross-checking purposes.

And the Internal Revenue Service, whose budget has moved up from $451 million in 1962 to $578 million in 1964, has a program called the taxpayer compliance measurement system. This will identify the size and causes of various kinds of noncompliance, so that the Service can better devise effective ways to improve conditions.

In pursuit of this and other objectives, Internal Revenue is boosting the number of its employees from 55,775 in the current year to 60,504 in fiscal 1964.

An independent agency called the Advisory Commission in Intergovernmental Relations is asking $285,000 for studies which include programs to reduce taxpayer compliance costs. This agency had 39 employees and a budget of $192,000 in 1962. It will have the same number of workers in 1964, with a 48-percent increase in its budget request.

ENCRUSTATION

You find, as you browse through the Federal Budget, a form of encrustation which reminds you of the inexorable way in which nature builds a coral reef. A few examples will suffice:

One of the budget readers in our expedition was pleased to observe that a Federal spending program had terminated. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which had 49 jobs and $550,000 to spend in 1962, seems in the 1964 budget to have come to a quiet end. But hold. The Interior Department picks up from there. It has a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. This new Bureau started modestly with $28,000 in 1962, when the Commission mentioned above was breathing its last. But in 1963 the new Recreation Bureau had $1,137,000 and is asking for $2,462,000 in 1964. In the coming year this Bureau will have 223 permanent positions.

In the Mutual Security Act of 1963, Congress set aside $73 million for payment of war damage claims in the Philippines. This began a process of encrustation in an agency known as the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

This Commission is exploding from a payroll of 105 and an appropriation of $684,000 in the current year to a payroll of 193 and an appropriation of $2,320,000 in 1964, in part because at least 15,000 of some 100,000 Philippine war damage claims must be investigated.

The cost of rent, communications, and utilities for this small agency is jumping from $11,000 in 1963 to $206,000 in 1964.

CONTRADICTIONS

The taxpayer perusing the Federal budget is frequently bemused by the apparent contradictions in the activities of his public servants in Washington.

The staggering sum we pay each year to support farm income is predicated on the thought that farmers will produce less.

But there are agencies occupied with the task of increasing farm productivity. The Agricultural Research Service wants $75 million in the coming year to study how to do this.

Also, the United States manages 178 million acres of public lands which are being restored to productivity.

As heretofore mentioned, we have $56 billion set aside next year for Defense, an establishment that has been growing with each new burst in the arms race.

But oddly enough, one of the fastest growing groups in the Federal establishment is the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This peace-loving office had a modest appropriation of $1,831,000 in 1962. It has grown faster than the prospect of peace has receded. In 1964 the Disarmament Office will be armed with a $15 million appropriation and 223 jobs, 97 of which are in the $10,000 to $20,000 per year range.

EXPERTS

Federal bureaucrats have some elbowroom in the administration of two types of funds granted to them by Congress. These are the per diem appropriations and the representation or entertainment allowances.

Many Federal agencies have authority to hire specialists on a per diem basis for a short-term assignment. The current per diem rate of pay ranges between $75 and $100 per day.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, which pays its mediators $100 per day, has a breakdown in its budget presentation to indicate the growth rate of this form of Federal employment.

In 1962 the Service had $13,000 in its per diem fund. In 1963 this was increased to $76,000. The budget request for 1964 is $175,000.

The representation or entertainment allowance for Federal agencies is generally associated with the Department of State. For some years Representative ROONEY, Democrat of New York, chairman of a House Appropriations Subcommittee, has called this the diplomats' booze allowance.

The furor about ROONEY's booze allowance has apparently died down. The Department of State in 1964 is asking for entertainment allowances of $996,000, an increase of $46,000 over its 1963 request.

The educational exchange branch of State has a request for $20,000 for entertainment abroad and $5,000 for entertainment in the United States.

The U.S. Information Agency, for some years in the doghouse with Congress, is asking for $140,000 for entertainment abroad and $3,000 in the United States.

UP, UP, UP

The overwhelming impression you get from a reading of the Federal Budget is that of never relaxing growth.

The answer to this usually is that a growing nation needs a growing government. This answer dodges the grim fact that Government jobs at the Federal, State, and local levels are opening up at an annual rate nearly three times that of jobs created by private industry, whence tax revenue is derived.

The rise in housekeeping costs for the United States, as reflected in the budget presentation of the General Services Administration, is a fair sign of the growth of the Federal establishment.

The GSA operating budget, to run Federal buildings, has risen from $298 million in 1962 to $336 million in 1963 to $375 million in 1964.

Even the Bureau of the Budget, now in charge of a managed deficit, finds it necessary to expand. In the coming year its costs will increase from $5,850,000 to $6,700,000.

This budget is a many-splendored thing, made up of little items the average taxpayer has never heard about. But these little items add up to a staggering load.

Uncle Sam has undertaken, for example, to promote the political, economic, and educational advancement of some 80,000 natives on 2,141 islands which comprise the Trust Territory of the Pacific.

In the current year we are doing this mission for $7,700,000. In the year ahead the Department of the Interior wants $15 million to do the job. Just the judicial system for these natives is increasing in cost from $87,000 in 1963 to $107,000 in 1964.

The Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea, home of 600 natives, cost $2 million for administrative purposes in fiscal 1963. The Department of the Interior wants $2,500,000 next year.

This survey has not pretended to be complete. The really big agencies of the Government have hardly been mentioned. The Department of Defense and its financial operation is simply too vast for the human

mind to comprehend, and this generalization can probably be stretched to include those running the show.

One thought does stay with you while you browse through the rising tides of Federal expenditures. It is contained in a statement sometimes anonymous, sometimes attributed to Calvin Coolidge: "Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody."

"News Management Traced Back to Father of the Country"—An Article by Carleton Kent of the Chicago Sun-Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent article by Carleton Kent, the able Washington correspondent of the Chicago Sun-Times. The article, entitled "News Management Traced Back to Father of the Country," was published in the March 10, 1963, issue.

The article follows:

NEWS MANAGEMENT TRACED BACK TO FATHER OF THE COUNTRY

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—At least until November 1964, the Nation is going to hear a wealth of charges that the Kennedy administration is engaged in the management of news.

In the opinion of this court, the defendant is guilty as charged. And about all he has going for him, while the sentence is taken under advisement, is the following preliminary probation report:

So were a great many, if not all, of his predecessors in office, beginning with George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and running through time to Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The woods hereabouts are still full of fairly lively reporters who used to grin wrily in the knowledge that at least they knew when they were being taken for a management ride by a number of fairly recent predecessors of President Kennedy.

Some of them insist that the national record for management of this elusive tangible known as news was achieved during the Eisenhower regime by James C. Hagerty, Presidential press secretary.

They hail his feat of convincing the country that one of the oldest American Presidents, despite a heart attack and an ileitis operation, was in great shape to run for a second 4-year term.

DONE WITH COMPLETE CANDOR

They tend to forget, however, that Hagerty did this with utter candor—by calling in the news media and with the help of charts and photos and a team of distinguished medical men, absolutely swamping the public with details on how things were going in the President's vascular and intestinal networks.

Perhaps the Madison Avenue award to Hagerty should have gone for the way he managed to have a steady stream of White House announcements on hand during Mr. Eisenhower's frequent golfing vacations, as a way of indicating there was at least as much work as play about them.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was never above managing the news. One of his ways was to suggest that the mass of the metropolitan press was against him—the editors and publishers, that is. For he always made a point of indicating that the reporters really were on his side.

And now and then, when a reporter indicated he really was not, Roosevelt would publicly invite him to put on a dunce cap and stand in a corner at his press conference.

Harry S. Truman often got irritated by the opposing press. But he "managed" the reporters covering him by often saying: "You're right, it's those editors who do things to your stories."

One of the most outstanding jobs of news management was achieved by Herbert Brownell, first Attorney General under Mr. Eisenhower, who one weekend called into conference the heads of five Washington newspaper bureaus. And to them he leaked the news that Earl Warren was to be made Chief Justice of the United States.

Still practicing their trade are representatives of another newspaper generation who remember the device Calvin Coolidge used for managing the news without getting hurt by a possible bad bounce.

At his press conferences he used to select from a stack of written questions those he cared to answer. The answers always were attributed to a "White House spokesman."

Some of these news pioneers are able to summon up a smile over current charges that Mr. Kennedy and his family, both official and personal, use dinner parties, the swimming pool, and a variety of exclusive interviews, leaks, and charm to obtain a pleasant image for the New Frontier.

For they recall that Theodore Roosevelt, a couple of ages ago, was just as assiduous in getting himself on a friendly basis with a limited number of Washington reporters.

And historians reveal that the revered forefathers had their moments, too, of managing the news—although there is no record that any member of their government made the bald public admission that the release, withholding, or alteration of news is a part of the country's cold war, "weaponry."

A WEAPON IN LINCOLN'S ARSENAL

News was, however, "weaponry" to Abraham Lincoln a hundred years ago.

He informed his Cabinet on July 22, 1962, that he intended to issue a proclamation of emancipation, freeing southern slaves, this for military reasons as much as for morality's sake.

Members of his Cabinet argued that such a move would cost the Republicans that fall's elections, particularly since Robert E. Lee's series of triumphs over the Union Armies had disgruntled the North.

So Lincoln managed to suppress that bit of news for 2 months, until after the boys in blue could claim at least a partial victory against Lee's invasion of Maryland at Antietam. Then, on September 17, Lincoln announced that the slaves, at least in Dixie areas controlled by the Union Army, were free.

Thomas Jefferson was a news manager, too. He took into his Government an editor to put out a pro-Jefferson paper as a counter to attacks from the Federalist press.

At the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, the Founding Fathers were afraid the Constitution might never be ratified if news leaked out to the public about their deliberations.

And when one of the delegates let drop on the floor an important document, the Father of his Country gave the Convention a scalding blast on the danger of carelessly making it possible for the newspapers to get hold of such matters.

Security, or perhaps news management, was so well handled in those days that not until some 40 years later did the voters learn specifically, from publication of James Madison's notes, what really went on at the Philadelphia Convention.

Bushy Run Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me personal pleasure and I deem it a great privilege to bring to this Congress today a brief review of the history of what is described by a well-known historian as the "most decisive victory in all history gained by the white man over the American Indians."

The above quote comes from the title page of C. M. Bomberger's "The Battle of Bushy Run." This year of our Lord 1963, marks the 200th anniversary of the momentous period in our early history.

The community in which I live, in the 21st Pennsylvania Congressional District, is marking the 200th Bushy Run Bicentennial with an 8-day celebration. I have introduced a resolution calling for a commemorative stamp to honor this occasion. I hope the committee will allow the House a vote in the near future. Consider this an appeal for your vote and support of this resolution.

I can assure the membership of the House that any and all of you will be made welcome, if in your travels you can stop to visit us during this celebration.

You will be privileged to walk upon the ground where heroes of yesteryear gave their all, that this Nation might be born to give the world a new concept of human freedom and human dignity.

With your kind indulgence I present a brief history of the Battle of Bushy Run:

THE BATTLE OF BUSHY RUN

Permission has been granted to the publicity committee of the Bushy Run Bicentennial by J. Graf Bomberger, editor of the Jeannette News Dispatch, to print excerpts of his father's book, "The Battle of Bushy Run," in various newspapers and publications of the area. The monograph was copyrighted and published in 1928 by C. M. Bomberger, of the Jeannette Publishing Co., Jeannette, Pa.

Copies of excerpts are being forwarded to Washington, D.C., to Congressman JOHN H. DENT who has stated that he will read the history of the Battle of Bushy Run into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in his efforts in obtaining Federal recognition for the battlefield at Bushy Run and aid in celebrating the 200th anniversary of the battle.

Local citizens are laying extensive plans for an 8-day celebration to commemorate this historical event on August 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, 1963.

The title page of the book contains these words: "The Battle of Bushy Run, the most decisive victory in all history gained by the white man over the American Indian."

THE BATTLE OF BUSHY RUN

The Royal American Regiment, the 60th, after the Revolutionary War changed its

name. It still is in existence and now is known as the King's Royal Rifle Corps. The King of England is colonel in chief. It served in the World War with Gen. Sir. Edward H. Hutton as chief officer. Its rifle depot is at Winchester, England. It colonels commandant (1928) were Lt. Gen. Hon. Sir A. Richard Montagu-Stuart-Wortley, K.C.B., G.C.M.G., D.S.O., 1st Battalion, and Lt. Gen. Sir William P. Campbell, K.C.B., 2d Battalion.

From a British historical viewpoint, an excerpt from the Annals of the King's Royal Rifle Corps, vol. 1, by Lewis Butler, London, is not amiss.

It will be noted that the compiler of the annals says "And in truth the Battle of Bushy Run forms a landmark in the history of our empire."

Chapter 7, page 156:

"Sir Jeffery Amherst * * *. But in the middle of June the latter (Amherst) reinforcing Bouquet at Philadelphia with a company of the 42d and one of the then 77th Highlanders, formulated his plan of campaign, under which Major Wilkins, of the 60th, was to proceed to the relief of Detroit by way of the Great Lakes; while Colonel Bouquet was to march in person by way of Fort Pitt to Presque Isle. Bouquet pointed out the need of abandoning the small outlying posts and concentrating their garrisons at Fort Pitt, but Amherst refused his consent. However, on June 23, news of a massacre of a party of Englishmen roused the general to fury, and he took steps to reinforce Bouquet with the remainder of the 42d and 77th Regiments; but the former comprised but 241, and the latter but 133 officers and men.

"At the end of June, Colonel Bouquet had crossed the Susquehanna and reached Carlisle, and at Carlisle he was detained for 18 days in the collection of transport and provisions. But for his tact, energy, and knowledge of the country the effort would probably have been in vain. At length he was able to move. But no wonder that to the terrorstricken countrymen his task appeared to be an impossible one. His force included about 550 men—less than those actually killed with Braddock—and was largely composed of the two Highland regiments already mentioned, brave as lions, but some too sickly to march on foot, and none trained in the mysteries of Indian warfare.

"Slowly the little army, impeded by its large convoy, crept along the Cumberland Valley. Bouquet, too well versed in war to forget as more modern generals have done, the absolute necessity of a commander marching with the advanced guard, walked ahead of his column, rifle in hand, at times actually taking the part of a scout.

"The route selected was that on which General Forbes, at Bouquet's instance, had advanced to the capture of Fort Duquesne. Shippensburg, 22 miles west of Carlisle, was found to be full of a starving crowd. The steep slopes of the Alleghenies were painfully and wearily climbed; Forts Loudon and Littleton in turn reached. The latter was empty, for the government of Pennsylvania, with incredible perversity—to use the expression of the American historian, Parkman—had refused to garrison it, and Bouquet was obliged to hand some of his precious ammunition and provisions to a few countrymen, in order to enable them to prevent its being burned. Juniata was also found to be empty.

"Ourry had wisely withdrawn the one or two men who guarded it, as a reinforcement to his own slender garrison. On the 25th, Bedford, the frontier town of comparative civilization, was reached. Ninety-five miles, since the start from Carlisle, had been marched in 7 days—under the circumstances a remarkable performance.

"Warmly must the force have been welcomed by Louis Ourry and his refugees, no less than eighteen of whose neighbors had been scalped by the Indians.

"Bouquet halted for 3 days at Bedford; then, protected by an advance guard of riflemen, his little army, with infinite toil, scaled the main ridge of the Alleghenies, and on August 2, arrived without opposition at Fort Ligonier, and relieved Archibald Plane and his garrison. At Bouquet's approach, the Indians had vanished, and news of their whereabouts was not to be obtained. It was necessary to advance with redoubled caution; and, with a view to greater mobility, the Colonel determined to leave behind his ox wagons, reducing his transport, which even then amounted to 350 packhorses and a few oxen. On the 3d, he resumed his march, and next morning started for the stream of Bushy Run, which he had fixed as the halting place for the day; intending, after dark to break up his bivouac and, in hope of avoiding an ambuscade, to traverse by night the perilous defile of Turtle Creek, where for some miles ran the track, flanked on one side by a wall of rock, on the other by a precipice with a river flowing below.

"The heat of summer was intense; mosquitoes abounded; the water-springs were dry. Yet 17 miles had been marched and Bushy Run was but half a mile ahead, when, on a sudden, a volley from an unseen foe struck down the leading files of the vanguard. The column at once closed up; a sergeant and two men still unwounded held their ground, and the advanced guard being reinforced had no great difficulty in beating off the assailants, and in following them up. But hardly had the pursuit ceased when the Indians returned to the attack; and the firing was simultaneously taken up by other parties of savages concealed on the high ground overlooking the flank of the column. To gain these heights became imperative; and was effected by a charge of the whole line. But it was merely cutting through water. As soon as the savages had been dispersed on one side they appeared on another in greater numbers. Constantly reinforced the Indians succeeded at length in surrounding the column and in turning attention to the convoy in the rear. For the protection of the convoy the fighting line had no alternative but to fall back; and, every moment as it retired, the enemy's fire became hotter and more harassing. But, in these trying conditions, the steadiness of the British troops was conspicuous; and the convoy, cleverly posted, was regained. Attack after attack was repelled.

"After 7 hours, night put an end to the conflict. But the prospect was the reverse of cheerful. Upward of 60 men of his whole force, which in its entirety probably fell short of 500, had been struck. Bouquet's position on high ground, from the tactical point of view fairly good, was waterless, and his men—particularly the wounded—and the horses were suffering agonies of thirst. After dark, Bouquet retired a little to the hill where his baggage had been posted, and formed a ring around the convoy. For defensive purposes, he was now better off, but there was still no water. Colonel Bouquet thoroughly realized the peril of his situation. In a dispatch written that night to Sir Jeffery Amherst, after describing the action, he continues:

" 'We expect to begin at daybreak. Whatever our fate may be, I thought it necessary to give your Excellency this early information, that you may at all events take such measures as you think proper with the provinces for their own safety and the effectual relief of Fort Pitt; as, in case of another engagement, I fear insurmountable difficulties in protecting and transporting our provisions, being already so much weakened by the losses this day in men and horses; besides the additional necessity of carrying the wounded whose situation is truly deplorable. I cannot sufficiently express my admiration for the cool and steady behavior of the troops who did not fire a shot without orders, and drove the enemy from their posts with fixed bayonets. The conduct of the officers is above my praise.'

"It needs but little reading between the lines to realize how critical Bouquet felt his position to be.

"The night was passed in cold and darkness, for no fires could be permitted; but in the twilight of the following morning at 5 a.m., yells and cries from the surrounding bush at a distance of about 500 yards heralded another attack on the part of the Indians. Approaching under cover of the trees, the savages opened fire simultaneously on every side. Nearer and nearer they came with the perfection of skirmishers, and making a beautiful example of a mode of attack a century and a half in advance of its age. Then, when close at hand, they would make a rush, only to be repelled by the steady fire and leveled bayonets of the extended line of defenders.

"Again and again the same thing happened. Again and again the Royal Americans and Highlanders advanced to make counterattack, only to find their savage foes vanished into space. But each attack left the British force a little weaker, a little diminished in numbers; and, worse still, positively maddened by thirst. There could be no doubt that the action was going in favor of the Indians. For hours, the soldiers could, and unquestionably would, hold their ground, but their ultimate fate was not longer doubtful. The redoubled yells of the Indians, still concealed, but so close that Bouquet and his men could hear their derisive taunts, showed that the savages were well aware that their victory was at hand. It was impossible for the troops to quit either the wounded or the convoy; many of the horses had stampeded and their drivers had disappeared; and the immutable law that an immobile force must eventually be destroyed held good at that time not less than at the present day.

"But with the coolness of a man born to command, Colonel Bouquet was gaging the situation. There was still one chance. If the enemy could be allured into the open, the regular troops would make short work of the Indian foe. But how was it to be done? Bouquet determined to solve the problem by the usually futile expedient of a feigned retreat The moment was favorable, for the savages were becoming every moment more audacious. Bouquet ordered two companies of the Royal Americans to retire, and the gap thus made in the circle was filled by the extended files of the companies on either side The orderly way in which these maneuvers were executed shows that the force was well in hand.

"The Indians at once fell into the trap, dashed forward, and assailed the weakened line with great violence. Suddenly they found themselves attacked by the two companies above named, which, having quitted the circle, and being concealed by a depression in the ground, now hurled themselves against the enemy's right flank. Taken as were the savages, by surprise, they met the unexpected assailants with great gallantry, but a bayonet charge following up the volley quickly decided the matter, and the Indians fled in confusion. In their flight they crossed the line of fire of two companies—one of the 42d, the other of the Royal Americans, the whole commanded by Captain Barret of the latter—detailed as a support, and the rout was complete. The four British companies followed in hot pursuit, and the left of the Indians, although not attacked, seeing the fate of their colleagues followed their example, and fled in confusion. One prisoner was immediately despatched.

"The Indians left 60 dead upon the field, a large number of whom probably fell during the final charge. If, however, as seems pretty certain, this figure is exclusive of the number killed on the previous day, it speaks well

for the skill of the British marksmen against an almost concealed and constantly moving foe. The opposing forces seem to have been numerically about equal. Bouquet's losses are stated at about 5, and 20 percent of his whole force, comprising 3 officers and 47 men, missing.

"Bouquet lost no time in following up his victory. The same afternoon, as soon as litters could be provided for the wounded, he pushed on to Bushy Run. Hardly had he formed his camp when, to the astonishment of all, they were fired upon by the Indians. The bold assailants were, however, at once driven off by the Royal Americans, and no further incident occurred that day. But the force was unfortunately weakened by the fact that a quantity of loose horses had galloped off during the action, and it had, in consequence, become necessary to destroy such part of the provisions as could no longer be carried. Fort Pitt was now about 25 miles distant. Colonel Bouquet resumed his march on the 7th, but was so much harassed by his pertinacious foe that it was not until the 10th that he was able to reach his destination and relieve Ecuyer and the garrison. The losses of both men and material, which he had incurred en route, made it impossible for the force to cross the Ohio for its ulterior object of relieving Detroit. Bouquet's march of 324 miles from Lancaster was therefore at an end, and he perforce contented himself with provisioning Fort Pitt and the other stations on the line of communication, and making preparation for winter quarters.

"His operations had, it is true, not put an end to the rebellion but they had filled the Indians with consternation; and the women, by the signs of grief and mourning prevalent among barbarians, showed how thoroughly they appreciated their husbands' defeat.

"Sir Jeffery Amherst was most complimentary to the visitor. The news was received in the provinces with transports of job and admiration; those acquainted with the difficulties of Red Indian warfare being the loudest in their praise. The Assembly of Pennsylvania, to its credit, passed a vote of thanks to Colonel Bouquet. And, in truth, the battle of Bushy Run forms a landmark in the history of the Empire. It was not merely that so sternly contested an action had never previously been fought between Briton and redskin, but the Braddock's dying prophesy had been carried out in its entirety; we had learned to do it better next time. Yet it may be doubtful whether Bouquet was not the one and only man in America who could have won that victory; and it will be noticed that the force which conquered at the crisis was one not of provincial levies, but of the Royal Army.

"Since August 5 and 6, 1763, the 42d and the 60th have stood side by side on many a hard-fought field. Splendid as is the record of the Highlanders, it is possible that there may be no action in which their steadfast gallantry has been put to a higher test, or on which they may look back with greater satisfaction than the fight at Bushy Run, led by their heroic major, Allen Campbell, and under the command of a Swiss colonel whom his adopted country has long ago forgotten.

"The Black Watch was formed early in the 18th century with specially picked men by the King for maintaining order and later (1739) made a line regiment (the 42d Foot), now a territorial regiment (district 42) officially known as the Royal Highlanders, of which the old 42d Foot forms the first battalion. * * * They were so named from the color of their uniforms. * * * This regiment is still in existence. * * * Bushy Run is one of the most important battles on the roster of notable victories in its records. * * * Its Colonel Commandant was (1928) Gen. Rt. Hon. Sir John G. Maxwell, G.C.B., C.V.O. * * * Its regimental depot is at Perth, Scotland.

"General Maxwell furnished interesting and thrilling first-hand data taken from the historical records of the Black Watch 1729–1881, which corroborates (except in a few minor details) information from other sources on this subject.

"The Royal Highlanders were stationed in Albany till the summer of 1763, when they were sent to the relief of Fort Pitt, then besieged by the Indians. The management of this enterprise was intrusted to Colonel Bouquet, of the 60th regiment, who, in addition to the 42d, had under his command a detachment of his own regiment and another of Montgomery's Highlander, amounting in all to 956 men.

"The body reached Bushy Run about the end of July, where, about to enter a narrow pass beyond the run, the advanced guards were suddenly attacked by the Indians, who had planned an ambushcade. The light infantry of the 42d regiment moved forward to the support of the advanced guard and driving the Indians from the ambushcade, pursued them a considerable distance. The Indians returned and took possession of some neighboring heights. They were again compelled to retire, but they soon reappeared on another position, and continuing to increase in numbers, they succeeded in surrounding the detachment, which they attacked on every side.

"Night put an end to the combat, but it was renewed next morning with increased vigor by the Indians, who kept up an incessant fire. They, however, avoided coming to close action, and the troops could not venture to pursue them far, as they were encumbered with a convoy of provisions, and were afraid to leave their wounded lest they might fall into the hands of the enemy.

"Recourse was, therefore, had to stratagem, to bring the Indians to closer action.

"Feigning a retreat, Colonel Bouquet ordered two companies which were in advance, to retire, and fall within a square which had been formed, which, as if preparing to cover a retreat, opened its files. The stratagem succeeded. Assuring themselves of victory, the Indians rushed forward with great impetuosity, and whilst they were vigorously charged in front, two companies, moving suddenly 'round a hill which concealed their approach, attacked them in flank. The assailants, in great consternation, turned their backs and fled, and Colonel Bouquet was allowed to proceed to Fort Pitt without further molestation. In this affair, the loss sustained by the Royal Highlanders was as follows: Lt. Johy Graham and James Mackintosh; 1 sergeant and 26 rank and file killed; and Capt. John Graham of Duchray, Lt. Duncan Campbell, 2 sergeants, 2 drummers and 30 rank and files wounded.

"After passing the winter in Fort Pitt, eight companies of the Royal Highlanders were sent on a new enterprise, in the summer of 1764 under Colonel Bouquet, now promoted to the rank of brigadier general. The object of this expedition was to repress the Indians on the back settlers. After a harassing warfare among the woods, the Indians sued for peace, which was granted and the detachment under Brigadier General Bouquet returned to Fort Pitt in the month of January after an absence of 6 months.

"Notwithstanding the labors of a march of many hundred miles among dense forests, during which they experienced the extremes of heat and cold, the Highlanders did not lose a single man from fatigue or exhaustion. The regiment passed the following year in Pennsylvania. Being ordered home, permission was given to such of the men as were desirous of remaining in America to volunteer into other regiments, and the result was that a considerable number availed themselves of the offer. The regiment reduced almost to a skeleton, embarked at Philadelphia for Ireland in the month of July 1767. The following extract from the Virginia Gazette of the 30th of that month shows the estimation in which the Highlanders were held by the Americans:

"'Last Sunday evening the Royal Highland Regiment embarked for Ireland, which regiment since its arrival in America, has been distinguished for having undergone most amazing fatigues, made long and frequent marches through an inhospitable country, bearing excessive heat and severe cold with alacrity and cheerfulness, frequently encamping in deep snow such as only those who inhabit the northern parts of Europe can have any idea of, continually exposed in camp, and on their marches to the alarms of a savage enemy who in all their attempts were forced to fly.

"'In a particular manner, the freemen of this and neighboring provinces have most sincerely to thank them for that resolution and bravery with which they, under Colonel Bouquet, and a small number of Royal Americans, defeated the enemy, and insured to us peace and security from a savage foe; and, along with our blessings for these benefits they have our thanks for that decorum in behavior which they maintained during their stay in this city giving an example that the most amiable behavior in civil life is in no way inconsistent with the character of the good soldier; and for their loyalty, fidelity, and orderly behavior they have every wish of the people for health, honor, and a pleasant voyage.'"

The loss sustained by the regiment during the 7 years it was employed in North America and the West Indies was as follows: officers killed, 13; sergeants killed, 12; rank and file killed, 382; total, 407.

Officers wounded, 33; sergeants wounded, 22; rank and file wounded, 508; total, 563.

Inflation Termed Robbery of People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a portion of my remarks the following article entitled "Inflation Termed Robbery of People":

INFLATION TERMED ROBBERY OF PEOPLE

EDITOR, THE UNION: Scarcely a week passes that someone is not convicted and sentenced in local courts for the commission of armed robbery, theft, or comparable felonies. Should anyone go about claiming that such persons had committed no crime and should be set free, most people would believe the claimant to be mentally unbalanced.

Article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution empowers Congress "to coin money, regulate the value thereof," among other things. For a number of years now a majority of our representatives in Congress have supported a policy of deficit spending and inflation of currency to cover these deficits. This policy has resulted in millions of people being defrauded of billions of dollars of their savings. Everyone who owns or owned bonds (including Government bonds), insurance, annuities, building and loan shares, money in banking accounts or anything of a fixed dollar value has been robbed by this fraudulent tactic.

Along with the power given Congress to regulate our money go responsibilities both fiscal and moral. These responsibilities cannot be separated one from the other. It was on the basis of an assumed moral responsi-

bility that the people gave certain powers to Congress under the Constitution. Is not the individual Congressman bound to observe the commandment "Thou shalt not steal"? It seems that the Congressman who subscribes to ethical standards set forth in the Bible would not support a continual policy of deficit spending and inflation.

Is there an ethical difference between being robbed by the vote of a Congressman or a gun held by a highwayman?

JOHN FOSTER.

Downey Republican Women, Federated, Downey, Calif., and United Steelworkers of America, Local Union 2058, Bell, Calif., Support House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted me I wish to call your attention and that of my distinguished colleagues to the text of two very pertinent resolutions adopted by groups in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif., supporting the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which I am a member.

The following resolution was adopted by the Downey Republican Women, Federated, Downey, Calif., on February 25, 1963:

RESOLUTION OF THE DOWNEY REPUBLICAN WOMEN, FEDERATED

Whereas the Communist Party of the United States of America, under orders from Moscow, has intensified their efforts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas there are many agents from Communist countries (including Red China and Soviet Russia) registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act who are continuously spreading Communist doctrine and anti-American propaganda in this country; and

Whereas the loyalty oath of the Communist Party of the United States of America states in part: "I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and a firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Downey Republican Women, Federated, urge Congress to support and maintain the Committee on Un-American Activities as a duly constituted standing committee of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That the House Committee on Un-American Activities continue its unremitting efforts and intensify the search for facts leading toward proper legislation or revision, thereof, to protect and preserve the Constitution of the United States of America against all subversion.

DOWNEY REPUBLICAN WOMEN, FEDERATED,
DOROTHY W. SYKES, *President.*
LEILA W. MOORE, *Secretary.*

This resolution was voted on at the February 25, 1963, meeting of the membership of the Downey Republican Women, Federated. Copies will be sent to the members of the House Rules Committee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I call your attention to the following communication from the United Steelworkers of America, Local Union No. 2058, 4224 East Florence Avenue, Bell, Calif., in support of the committee:

MARCH 4, 1963.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Local Union 2058, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, voted to give its full support to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We therefore ask that you give full support, by all means possible, to continue this important and urgently needed committee.

Sincerely,

S. H. DOUGLAS, *President.*

Address by Daniel J. Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech delivered by Daniel J. Carr, president, to the members and guests of the George Washington Chapter of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Arlington, Va., on February 21, 1963.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY DANIEL J. CARR

No fair man ever begrudged an Irishman's words of praise for the glories of Irish history; the beauty of Irish women; the holiness of Irish saints; the erudition of Irish scholars, or the dear imprisoned sunlight of Irish whisky. What might rightly be construed as boasting if said by an Italian, a German, or an Icelander, must be regarded as a simple declaration of fact if proclaimed by a son of Erin. Indeed, his praise of things Irish would of necessity always remain understatement.

One might single out, for example, the astonishing capacity of the Irish to emerge victorious over the whips and scorns of time; the ignorance or malice of those not so fortunate as to be of Irish ancestry. Within living memory, it was a commonplace to see signs in the city of Boston announcing "Help wanted," with the qualification: "Irish need not apply," appended. Yankee employers, the Lord be good to 'em, were not really discriminating against Hibernians. It was just that their Yankee shrewdness perceived that their own puny efforts to leave a mark on American history would be swallowed up in the driving energy; rare abilities; disarming charm and fey good luck of Celtic employees.

It is by no means astonishing that this same Boston has given our country the first statesman to promise his electorate the moon—and mean it.

There's more than a bit of cork in the Irish. They cannot be submerged for long—it was of this breed that the axiom was first coined: "You can't keep a good man down." Let me direct your attention to just one historic proof of that curious destiny by which the Irish, though often repressed are never depressed; though often regarded with jaundiced eye by the bewildered non-Irish—yet possess a marvelous gift of turning adversity into achievement by employing outrage as a ladder to the stars.

Turn with me for a moment to the year 1848 when the young Irish disorders are rocking the Emerald Isle. Nine lads stand before the bar of English justice (I use the term justice here loosely). For their part in the ancient struggle to cast off the yoke of tyranny and free the human spirit from thralldom to the invader, these young men have been tried for treason against Her Majesty, the Queen; found guilty, and are about to be sentenced. Attend while the herald of history trumpets out their names: John Mitchell, Thomas McGee, Richard O'Gorman, Morris Lyene, Charles Duffy, Terrance McManus, Patrick Donahue, Thomas Meagher, and Michael Ireland.

The stern-faced judge, the legal representative of the occupying power, fixes a baleful stare upon the nine brave defendants standing erect before him. "What have you to say in your own defense," he intones, "before I pronounce sentence upon you?" Meagher, on behalf of all, speaks out in ringing tones:

"My lord, this is our first offense but not our last; if you will be easy with us this once, we promise, on our word as gentlemen to try and do better next time! And next time—sure, we won't be fools enough to get caught."

Thereupon, the indignant judge sentenced them all to be hanged by the neck until dead, and drawn and quartered in the approved fashion. Protests from all over the world at this barbarous sentence forced the hand of Queen Victoria—she commuted the penalty to deportation for life to far-off, still-primitive Australia. Well might these nine patriots sing out the poet's words:

"O, Ireland, must we leave you
Driven by a tyrant's hand,
Must we seek a mother's blessing
In a strange and distant land?"

In 1874, word reached the astounded Queen Victoria that the celebrated Sir Charles Duffy, who had just been elected Prime Minister of Australia, was the same Charles Duffy who had been deported some 25 years before. At the Queen's order, the records of the rest of the defendants convicted for treason against the Crown at this same trial were searched out. Here is what was uncovered:

Thomas Meagher, Governor of Montana; Terrance McManus, brigadier general, U.S. Army; Patrick Donahue, brigadier general, U.S. Army; Richard O'Gorman, Governor General of Newfoundland; Morris Lyene, attorney general of Australia, in which office Michael Ireland succeeded him; Thomas D'Arcy McGee, member of Parliament, Montreal, Minister of Agriculture and president of Council, Dominion of Canada; and John Mitchell, distinguished New York political leader and father of New York Mayor John Purroy Mitchell, who was a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of New York.

I should like, briefly, to sketch the history of our society, and for this I am indebted in great measure to Alan Kemp Dolliver of Baltimore for the research hereinafter reflected.

It is sometimes thought that the original Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was founded in New York City, but the fact is that Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love, was (appropriately enough) the site of its birth—the date: March 17, 1771. Although some of us neither look it nor feel it, we are therefore older than our beloved American Republic. Two of our honorary members present at that first meeting were also signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Filial organizations appeared in subsequent years in Ohio, Minnesota, Washington, Virginia, and other areas. It has always remained a nonsectarian group, not because its members do not accept the need for loyalty to their own religious convictions, but because they are keenly aware of the frailties and limitations of the human spirit, along with its noblest aspirations. We are not in any sense a church society, but a God-fearing man-made society, and we have accepted perforce the sentiments of Thomas Moore, that lyric singer of Irish ballads:

"Shall I ask the brave soldier who fights by my side,
In the cause of mankind if our creeds agree?
Shall I give up the friend I have valued and tried,
If he kneel not before the same altar as me?"

Our great seal was adopted in 1772, and it symbolizes, in rare artistic form, the dedication of our strength to the best traditions of Irish-American principles of glorious liberty. Expectedly, for on Irish lover takes no second place to the more flamboyant French and Italians so far as the gentler sex is concerned, a lovely woman adorns the medal; she is supported by a harp—that is, the musical instrument, not the man. St. Patrick, vested in the full regalia of his spiritual office is depicted driving out the snakes.

We've never been content merely to wave the shamrock; brandish the shillelagh and practice the brogue. We are conscious of our duties as friendly but we shall pass over, in typical Celtic humility, our long, unbroken, and generous record of philanthropic labors to needly fellow men, regardless of creed, race, or color. We have even, on occasion, shown largess toward the natives of Perfidious Albion.

Of Gen. George Washington it is rightly said that he was first in war and first in peace. He was also one of our first honorary members. The rolls of this society include many celebrated warriors, and the clank of arms raised in just battle have rung sweetly in the ears of those who went before us. I shall refrain from telling of General Moylan, fierce in combat with his "Moylan's Dragoons" in the U.S. War of Independence. Nor shall I pause to narrate how the Light Horse Troop of Philadelphia, also renowned for its part in the revolutionary cause, was largely composed of friendly sons, who perhaps saw the war as affording also an opportunity to strike a blow for a freedom their fathers knew not when Brittania ruled the Irish Sea.

Capt. John Barry, the father of the U.S. Nayy, was ours. The Secretary of the Continental Congress, Charles Thomson, counted it a privilege to be similarly numbered. He it was who first prepared the Declaration of Independence for publication from the manuscript of Thomas Jefferson. But the list of eminent soldiers, statesmen, patriotic leaders, grows too long, and I must not weary your patience even in the blessed task of enumerating the matchless achievements of our predecessors.

One is not at liberty to omit, however, mention of the cultural contributions the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick have made to American life, for example: Victor Herbert, the great composer, was a member. He founded the glee club of the New York branch, and its songs reflected that magic blend of joy and gentle melancholy so inseparably woven into the Irish spirit.

In the crucible of privation at Valley Forge; in the surging years of our glorious Republic's infanthood; in the dynamic economic, industrial, social, and cultural expansion of later decades; amid the awesome national and international responsibility that maturity has brought this fair land—our society has left an indelible stamp upon the history and high purposes of these United States. Invisibly but really, our escutcheon blends into the stars and bars of Old Glory. I say to you, gentlemen, that we are proud of our society's unblemished past and its imperishable role in the drama of American history. We cherish the lofty heritage that is ours and aspire to guard it safely against all tarnish.

Unto you, my brother members, and unto all those sons of men not so privileged as we to be friendly sons—and their great loss and sorrow it is indeed—in parting I leave all with this Irish wish:

May the road rise to meet you
May the wind be ever at your back
May the good Lord ever keep you in the hollow of His hand
May your heart be as warm as your hearthstone
And when you come to die may the wail of the poor be the only sorrow you'll leave behind.
May God bless you always.

Reducing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, though I am pleased with the many favorable editorials that have greeted our efforts to reduce the budget, I am especially gratified by the response in my hometown newspaper, the Canton Repository. I include with my remarks a series of three excellent editorials pointing out the reasons why the budget must be reduced and some of the roadblocks in our path.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Canton (Ohio) Repository, Mar. 5, 1963]

AMERICANS ARE CONCERNED

Cuba and taxes are causing the greatest concern—internationally and domestically, respectively—among Cantonians, it was disclosed Sunday in a Repository survey of 100 men and women.

Judging from reports from other parts of the country, the sentiments seem to be pretty much the same all over.

Americans have been worrying about the Russian buildup in Cuba ever since it was revealed last fall, and currently, since the Russians have not yet left the Caribbean island as "invited" to do by President Kennedy more than 4 months ago.

The debate over the Federal income tax is boiling toward a climax now that Congress is going to work on the President's request for an income tax reduction and a list of so-called reforms.

In Canton, the Repository survey showed about one-third of the people consider taxes to be the most important domestic issue facing Congress. The majority of those with opinions about taxes believe there should be no reduction unless it is accompanied by an offsetting cut in Government spending.

That's the way the Congressmen's mail has been going, too, from all parts of the country.

Most taxpayers usually are ready to welcome any reduction in the amount they have to pay Uncle Sam. Some do now, regardless. But well above a majority who have made their opinions known to their Congressmen are opposed to further deficit spending.

Typical, according to an Associated Press survey, is this taxpayer's comment to his Senator: "My household—family of five—would collapse in short order if run by the financial precepts of the Federal Government."

President Kennedy's theory is that a tax cut would encourage further business and personal spending which, in turn, would increase business and therefore yield a greater ultimate tax return to the Government.

This may be fine theory, but it seems quite unlikely to succeed at the above-income rate of expenditures the administration is requesting.

Republicans in the House are trying to do something about it. Maybe they can succeed. At least they have let the country know they will try.

A special task force headed by Canton's Representative Bow announced Monday that it plans to make every effort to bring about a reduction of $10 billion to $15 billion in Federal spending next year.

The group, Mr. Bow said, plans to make specific recommendations in these fields: Limiting additions to the Federal payroll, reducing manpower in various offices to make up for pay increases due next January 1, postponement of nonemergency construction, a moratorium on starting new programs not essential for the national welfare or security and reappraisal of existing programs and services with a view toward reducing them.

"Americans," Representative Bow said, "are shocked by the assertion that we can spend more with less revenue and somehow bring about prosperity. They can't do it in their homes or businesses, and they don't believe the Government can do it either."

Somewhere along the line, in some American generation, the American people are going to have to reduce their national debt. This year could be a good time to call a halt to the too-long-endured policy of spending more money and taking in less.

[From the Canton (Ohio) Repository, Mar. 6, 1963]

CAN TREASURY RAIDS BE STOPPED?

Is the Republican Party's all-out fight on Federal spending worth the effort?

Will the task force set up by Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee under Canton's Representative FRANK Bow accomplish anything?

Anyone tempted to answer no is tempted to give up on the United States.

He is tempted to agree that skeptics among the Founding Fathers who said a representative democracy would destroy itself by raiding it own treasury were right and everybody who believes in popular government is wrong.

This is not an academic question.

It is whether the United States can manage its money affairs responsibily.

Representative Bow and like-minded legislators in both parties are trying to prove that popular sovereignty is workable.

This is deadly serious for them. It is deadly serious for America.

Local government must live within its income. It has no choice. It can borrow money only until its creditors lost faith in its ability to pay.

School districts and counties must live within their income. They, too, can borrow only until their creditors get cold feet. Then they must cut their coat to fit the cloth.

State governments must make ends meet. They are limited in the kind and amount of revenue they can collect.

Voters have the final say-so on how much revenue will be turned over to the State spenders.

All other government, all private enterprise and all citizens of the United States must measure up to their money responsibilities. They have no choice.

Only the Federal Government, of all kinds of government—only the Federal spenders, of all Americans who spend money—can shrug off money responsibilities.

Washington spends, goes into debt, spends and goes into debt. It can't stop.

Ever since the beginning of this deficit delirium a third of a century ago, the Federal Government has been going into debt in deep plunges and coming to the surface for quick gasps of air before sinking again. It has been drowning in red ink.

For the last few years it has been floundering in a debt $300 billion deep. It is confronted now with a startling proposition for going into debt still further while at the same time easing up on taxes—a fiscal tranquilizer to keep the country from worrying. But the country is worrying any—worrying about bankruptcy.

The Republican task force will try to prove the United States is not doomed to destroy itself with its ineptitude in handling money. This is not a partisan project. The Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations are equally guilty of deficit financing.

Is it worth the effort?

Will the task force do anything?

If the answer is no, it is no to the larger question: Can the United States withstand Treasury-raiding by its own people as represented by legislators in the House of Representatives and the Senate?

Ultimately, there must come a time when the credit of an over-extended Federal Government wouldn't be any good either.

[From the Canton (Ohio) Repository, Mar. 10, 1963]

EVERYBODY'S WHITE ELEPHANT

Government spenders have an old trick of challenging their critics to tell where they would cut expenses.

If the critics fail to pop up with a detailed list, the spenders chortle, "What did we tell you? We're already on rock bottom. We should be spending more, not less."

Nonsense like this has pushed this Nation to the brink of financial irresponsibility—the nonsense that spenders cannot be challenged successfully.

They are not making ends meet.

If they're on rock bottom and need more money, they either must ask for more taxes or be guilty of breaking faith with the people.

But, instead they're asking for less tax income—more spending but less revenue.

They don't know what rock bottom is. The generation of billionitis that began with the New Deal and has carried the national debt far past $300 billion, besides crippling the Nation's economy with confiscatory taxes, has been presided over at the top executive level by two sons of wealthy men who never earned a living, an unsuccessful small businessman who spent most of his life on public payrolls and a military careerist paid according to his rank. What would they know about rock bottom?

Here are a few facts about rock bottom that might keep Washington from sounding daffy when it says it has saved every penny that can be saved:

It's when you subtract the cheese from the macaroni and cheese;

When the four jobs that were consolidated into two jobs are consolidated into one job and the one job is cut down to part time;

When the coat that was cut down for the second kid in the family is cut down again for the third kid, then given to a relative's kid for the wear still left in it;

When the improvement everybody had been talking about for years, provided it could be afforded, finally isn't mentioned because a dozen things have become more important, and 11 of them are concerned with saving money;

When the wolf that has been scratching at the door it permitted to come into the house, so it can be pounced on, dressed out, and converted into wolfburgers;

When the white elephant considered sacred because of its color is painted gray and given to a traveling circus.

Free-spending government is everybody's white elephant.

The fact is, it's not sacred.

The fact is, it can be sent on its way.

The fact is, government can live within its income like its citizens and like the wealth-producing enterprises that pay for government.

The Federal frying-out process being undertaken by Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee under Ohio Representative FRANK T. BOW, will be blocked by the Kennedy administration's claim that it's on rockbottom.

Nonsense.

Most of those fellows wouldn't recognize a rockbottom if they were worm fishing, let alone running a government.

Mr. Speaker, the Journal Herald, of Dayton, Ohio, in another of the newspapers that supports our effort to reduce the 1964 budget to somewhat more manageable size. I ask leave to include the Journal Herald editorial with my remarks:

WE'RE WITH YOU, MR. BOW

We like the budget-cutting challenge laid down by Ohio Congressman FRANK BOW and his fellow Republicans.

Whether or not they succeed in substantially reducing the administration's monetary requests remains to be seen. The important thing is to subject the whole massive budget to careful scrutiny.

Clearly, if Mr. Bow and others in the minority party do not undertake the chore, no one else in Washington will. The Democratic leadership is already rising to the defense of budget and in yesterday's press conference the President made it plain that he is content.

We believe it to be the proper function of an opposition party to probe and question, to make those in the majority prove the worth of their policies. The resulting exchange of views can do much to clarify important national issues, to inform the general public on what the National Government is doing.

Thus we expect the forthcoming dialogue between Mr. Bow and the Democratic command on the 1965 budget to accomplish a great deal. Before it is finished the public's understanding of major domestic and foreign issues should be broadened, administration policy lines should be more carefully defined. And in the process perhaps some money will be saved. Keep going, Mr. Bow.

Young Speaker Hails Junior Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure this morning, along with my colleagues in the Oklahoma congressional delegation, to meet and visit with several young Oklahomans who have won trips to Washington as a result of gaining distinction in various activities in the area of agriculture.

Miss Judy Radke, of Chelsea, Okla., was one of four speech contest winners who reside in the Second Congressional District, and a welcome guest of the Oklahoma Members of Congress attending the reception.

Judy is a champion of the Junior Farmers Union. Her speech convincingly argues that the most important scientific development of this century is the progress made in American agriculture. Because of the interesting points she raises, I wish to insert into the RECORD the complete text of her speech, "The Junior Farmers Union and How It Promotes Good Community Living."

THE JUNIOR FARMERS UNION AND HOW IT PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

What is the greatest scientific development of this century? No, it's not the airplane, nor television. Not the atom bomb, either. No, neither is it rockets, space ships, nor Telstar. It is American agriculture.

Recently in the Cuban crisis the term "agricultural surplus" was changed to "agricultural reserves" and these reserves were probably the deciding factor which caused the Communists to back down from their Cuban challenge.

Today through the courtesy of the Farmers Union, stanch supporters and builders of American agriculture, I am here to tell you how my organization, the Junior Farmers Union, contributes to good community living.

Over 20 years ago the Farmers Union, realizing the young people were their greatest resource in their fight to preserve the family-type farm and promote good communities, organized our Junior Farmers Union to provide the training we would need to become alert, active leaders and citizens for tomorrow—to teach us to solve today's problems and meet tomorrow's challenges in American agriculture.

We have as our goals good citizenship, which goes hand in hand with a good education, that is, getting a basic instruction in the operation of our great democratic government, our obligation to be well versed in the economic and social problems of the world today so that we may be intelligent voters tomorrow, supporting the legislative goals sponsored by the Farmers Union.

Second, a scientific approach to farming—that is, learning by doing under the able leadership provided by our elders, to utilize the technical know-how and the machinery made available to us through our soil conservation district to conserve our soils, and to modernize our farms by employing "Willie Wiredhand" and the REA to improve our farm income.

Third, better livestock for the farms is encouraged through our livestock projects for competition in fairs.

And finally, cooperation as a means of reducing farm consumption costs, realizing that if we farm people join together in cooperative buying and selling, we can increase our net income by the money we can save.

Yes, our study clubs have made the problems which we will face as future owners of the family-type farm real and meaningful to us. Our local leaders and the educational material provided by the Farmers Union have taught us pride in farming as an occupation. We realize that American agriculture is the wonder, and possibly the salvation, of the world.

Too, the Farmers Union provided a camp program—such as Camp Redlands, where four subjects important to farmers—co-op, United Nations, civil defense, and Know Your Farmers Union—are studied, optional classes are offered in handicraft, recreational leadership which we may utilize in our home community and public information.

In the troubled times which we face today, there is a greater need to preserve the family-type farm and build better communities.

As Junior Farmers Union members, let us urge our neighbors to join the Farmers Union to promote good community living and preserve the family-type farm—the heart of the American way of life.

Freedom Foundation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently a distinguished citizen of southwest Missouri, Mr. Fred DeArmond of Springfield, Mo., was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award of the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge for an article he wrote entitled "The Freedom to Choose."

The article appeared in December 1961 issue of the Freeman. In the swirl of confusion today over conflicting political ideologies, Mr. DeArmond's reflections are like a breath of fresh air. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues, and indeed to all Americans.

The Freedom Foundation award reads as follows:

The directors and officers of Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge announce with pleasure the selection of Fred DeArmond by the Distinguished National and School Awards Jury to receive the George Washington Honor Medal Award for the magazine article "The Freedom To Choose." An outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life.

The article follows:

THE FREEDOM TO CHOOSE

(By Fred DeArmond)

As a young man and a dreamer, I went through the rebellious stage when socialism appeared to me as the hope of an erring world. I read "the Nation" and the little Blue Books, published by E. Haldeman-Julius and authored by that remarkable stable of writers that he enlisted. Among them were some literary geniuses and more who represented the long-haired avant garde of contemporary reform—the skirmish line for our present heavy thunder of socialism's legions.

The claim for the new order that appealed most strongly to me at that time was the efficiency that it was to usher into economic life. Think of all the waste in a competitive system: three men delivering milk or laundry in the same block when one could do it and end all the duplication of driving and equipment and begging for business; farmers and manufacturers providing too much of some things and not enough of others; abortive business failures, dog-eat-dog competition. If all this activity were organized and planned intelligently, then Thoreau's dream of living comfortably and working at a dull repetitive job only 6 weeks a year could be made a reality. Then, too, Oscar Wilde's aim, so alluringly voiced in his "Soul of Man Under Socialism," to "reconstruct society on such a basis that poverty will be impossible," might be realized.

But I was fortunate in having an older and wiser friend with whom to discuss my aspirations for a better world. "Yes, it does look inviting at first glance," he said to me. "But here's what is principally wrong with the whole scheme of the Socialists. It would deprive men of the right to choose. That is one of the basic freedoms that I cherish, and I believe you do, too."

My friend went ahead patiently to explain that when a man examines his own motives, he doesn't want the good life prescribed for him by anyone on earth. He wants to choose the road he will travel, decide for himself, make his own mistakes.

Later, I came to see how true this was. Then I realized that the nearest thing to paradise a man can hope to attain in this world is to get up in the morning when he chooses, eat what he chooses for breakfast, choose what he will do for the day, where he will go, where he will live, and with whom he will associate. This, of course, is a utopia not often completely realized. But we approach contentment in just about the degree that we are free to choose for ourselves.

That wise old seer, Ludwing von Mises, has pictured the horizon of choice in his "Human Action." Choosing determines all decisions, he says. More, "all human values are offered for option. Man never chooses between two modes of action which we call, from an adopted point of view, virtuous or vicious." The various courses are arranged in a row before him. He picks out one and sets aside the others.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SAVING

An important area of choice in the economic zone is that between present gratification of immediate desires and the expectation of future pleasures. Every time one chooses the former, he spends, and when he chooses the latter, he saves. Saving was once considered good, by the old-fashioned standards of Ben Franklin. Then John Maynard Keynes sold America as well as his native Britain the modern philosophy that spending is a good word and saving a bad word. But if past generations had not chosen to save, how could we have all these great industries to produce goods and provide jobs?

Collectivism in all its forms is basically a denial of free choice for the individual. The regimenters say people are incapable of choosing what is best for them. When that doctrine is refuted, they retire to an inner fortress of polemics and maintain that such choice is not for the good of society as a whole. "The greatest good for the greatest number" is their final dogma. No tyranny in history has been so monstrous but that it could be defended on this pragmatic ground. What are a few million lives of Russians or Chinese in the scales against some fanatic's notion of well-being for generations yet unborn?

The area left for human choice has been and is being pushed back in this country by a continually moving fense of Government controls. Fifty years ago individual liberty was just passing its peak in America. Since then it has been trending steadily downhill along the slope of central authority and prescriptive rule of colonial days under the English Georges, which the pioneers had shed their blood to change. It is the most remarkable and fearsome cyclical reversion of our times. Fearsome because on below the present downward slope is a swampy lowland where liberty may be so restrained that Americans will look back to 1961 as a golden age by comparison.

DWINDLING AREA OF CHOICE

In 1911 an American could choose where to spend or invest practically all his earnings. Then we had no income taxes, but held to the wise provision in the first article of the Constitution, which reads that "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States * * * according to their respective numbers." Today an American has, on the average, control over less than two-thirds of his income. In the above-average brackets he may have as little as 9 percent to dispose of as he chooses. Taxes are confiscating wealth faster than as a nation we can produce it, says Wyatt F. De Loache, an official of Du Pont's Extension Division.

The stopping point in Government control of our money is not in sight. In fact, the outlook in 1961 is darker than ever before. The economic advisers of the new administration agree with one of their number, Harvard Prof. John K. Galbraith, that the people are far too affluent. Much more of their income must be taken by government for "socially desirable" ends. The people's morals and culture will be improved if they have less to spend on elegant autos, exotic foods, erotic clothing, and all the other things that Americans choose to buy with their own money.

We do not have the choice of whether or not to invest in government bonds. Our savings in banks, investment companies, and insurance are in considerable part in these securities without the investor having any choice about it.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

The American of 1911 could contract to work for almost any employer of his choice. Today, in a large segment of industry, he can take a job only if he has a union card or agrees to get one within 60 days. Then, except for a few tightly organized areas, he could join a union or not. Now he is denied that choice in most trades.

It is no answer to say that the majority of union men seem to prefer it that way. In some dictator-led unions we have been shown by the congressional investigations that there is no such thing as free expression of views. And well over half the Nation's workers are still unaffiliated with the unions and entitled to choose how they shall bargain with employers.

In the Taft administration no one questioned the inalienable right of an employer to choose for a job the best available applicant, or the one he thought he could get along with best. Now, in some States, he may have to answer to a board which says in effect, "You have discriminated against this race, or that religion, because it had more applicants than the one represented by the person you hired. We can't permit that." A militant minority in the Congress clamors for a Fair Employment Practices Act which would make this restriction national.

WHEN TO SOW, WHEN TO REAP

Had anyone told an American farmer in 1911 that he would live to see the day when he would have to obtain permission from a Federal official before choosing to plant his south 40 in wheat, the farmer would have laughed at such a fancy. But it has come to pass; farmers have actually been taken to court for harvesting a wheat crop for the market.

No longer can men and women choose when they will retire or how much they can earn by part-time work after retirement. That is prescribed for them in most instances.

The businessman's traditional right to set the prices for his goods or services has been hedged in to the point that he can't be sure whether he has violated one law by pricing too high or another law by making his prices too low. He is rightly prohibited from price collusion—by a Federal law enacted in 1889 and recently shown to be still adequate for its purpose.

To speculate on what will be next is to open up an unpromising prospect. In view of the Federal Government's assumption of a substantial part of the responsibility for education, how much longer will your school board be free to choose textbooks your children and grandchildren will study? Is the freedom to choose your doctor and hos-

pital to last much longer? Are we heading for some sort of resurrected caste system under which the careers that youth embark upon will be chosen for them? Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World" and George Orwell's "1984" have become much more than novelists' fancies. Today they are apparitions of what may happen here.

ESSENTIAL TO SURVIVAL

At this point I pause to give the Planners their chance for rebuttal. I know what they will say first. "But limitations on freedom of individual choice are essential to survival. You would not permit people to choose all sorts of unsocial conduct. That would be a reversion to barbarism."

This much, of course, must be granted. There are some choices that we cannot leave to individual discretion without inviting anarchy. No one in possession of normal faculties would leave a wife in possession of the liberty to choose another husband more to her fancy without going through certain processes of law. In business, practices of deception and fraud have long been proscribed alike by public opinion and common and statute law. But in our time no businessman knows for sure what he can and cannot do, because he is subject to a myriad of regulatory orders by quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial boards and commissions in Washington, all having the force of law. Congress has abdicated much of its authority to the bureaucrats. The area of executive decision—freedom to choose the wisest course—is being narrowed hourly.

Von Mises says, "We do not assert that man is (entirely) free in choosing and acting. He is subject to inherited characteristics—his biological patrimony. Man is free in the sense that he must daily choose anew between policies that lead to success and those that lead to disaster, social disintegration, and barbarism."

Both Von Mises and F. A. Hayek "Individualism and Economic Order" stress the dependence of sound choice on the chooser's sense of values. The expression of values we call judgment, and it comes from character and experience even more than education.

We cannot permit freedom of choice to a patient in a hospital without endangering the success of his treatment. Nor can a prison inmate be given much choice while he is under discipline for his misdoings.

But the necessity of protecting freedom of choice, as the basis of all freedoms, from merely bureaucratic curtailment is not to be refuted by attacking these absurd exceptions that only prove its essential worth. The application of all rules must be varied for fools and criminals. However, we may well preserve even the right of a citizen to make fool choices, as long as in doing so he doesn't trample on the rights of others.

WE NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD

The advocates of statism will raise another objection on strictly empirical grounds. "These 50 years when you say that freedom has been eroded in so many particulars have been years of fabulous advances in material well-being. We never had it so good before. Do you want to go back to the way people lived in 1911?"

This argument is specious but false. It begs the whole question by posing two fallacious assumptions.

Assumption No. 1 is that standard of living is the only or the chief yardstick of human happiness. It leaves unanswered the question: Are people on the whole happier than they were in 1911, when their freedom to choose was so much greater? Have their spiritual resources been undermined? Could they endure with fortitude another terrible ordeal such as they met successfully in 1861–65?

Assumption No. 2 is that there is some relation of cause and effect between the rise of statism and the advance of 20th century technology that has brought so many new inventions and the ability to produce and distribute more goods to more people. There is no valid evidence of any correlation between the two phenomena. On the contrary, the dead hand of bureaucracy and the restraints of collectivist reform have acted to bar material progress in many ways. To mention only one area, this influence has kept agriculture from realizing the shining promise of natural development in keeping with the scientific spirit of the age. Statism has created large new problem areas that under individual enterprise would not have confronted us: in foreign trade and labor relations as examples. Henry Wallace's effort in the 1930's to rig higher prices for the cotton farmer caused the United States to lose its position in the world cotton market and heavily restricted our exports by building up competition from other countries. The Wagner Act and its National Labor Relations Board displaced genuine collective bargaining between management and labor with a new form of collective bludgeoning which still prevails.

We must remember, too, that the American economy didn't stand still before the coming of the collectivist revolution. It could be shown that material progress from the end of the Civil War to 1911 was relatively even greater than it has been since that time. We have reason to believe that unfettered individualism would have accomplished more, rather than less, in the past 50 years, than we have witnessed, and at the same time have preserved these lost freedoms. Nor is it too late to deflect the present trend.

If we are to continue as free-born Americans, we should not, in Emerson's words, "abdicate choice." Actually we have already abdicated shockingly large areas of choice. With every session of Congress and of the 50 legislatures, to say nothing of the city councils and the daily grist of orders and regulations from hundreds of boards and commissions, commanding the citizen he must do this and he must not do that, free choice is being suppressed at an alarming rate. These ominiscient planners are deciding for us. Every day the difference between being in prison and out of prison becomes less. And that man with the brief case, from the IRS, may be ringing your doorbell today to spell it out for you.

One General Combined Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the people in my district are very much concerned about the high income taxes they are paying, and, particularly, the new tax proposals.

Mr. John K. Dockman, Baltimore, Md., has presented me with his outline for one general combined tax, which I am glad to bring to the attention of the House today.

The outline follows:

ONE GENERAL COMBINED TAX

Under this plan all taxes (National, State, county, and city) would be paid with one general combined tax. At present we are paying taxes at all levels of government, and in some instances paying a tax on a tax.

The benefits of this type of tax would affect everyone:

It would help employment. Housewives would be more inclined to employ full-time or part-time household help because they would not be required to keep records and make out reports for the Government. (Wages would not be taxed; taxes would be paid as money is spent.)

Small business and storekeepers could employ additional part-time help because they would not have to keep records and withholding tax.

Business, large and small, could depreciate equipment as competition demanded. More upgrading—more spending—more taxpaying.

In brief, we could simplify the keeping of records, and we would pay taxes as we spend money.

Because salaries and wages would not be taxed, incentive would be encouraged. Some persons, under our present tax system, will not work after they have earned a certain amount of money in a year; they feel from then on they are only working for the Government. This plan would encourage them to work the full year, the additional income would be spent on luxuries.

Financial relief in distressed areas would be expedited. In event of an economic crisis and a section of the country were declared a distress area the President and Governor of that particular State could declare the stamps, certificates and checks negotiable at their face value (not at their redemption value).

It would encourage savings in U.S. savings bonds and State bonds.

Real estate taxes would be eliminated. (A property owner who maintains his property would not be penalized.)

Money spent for doctors, dentists, hospital care, food and drugs would not be taxed.

The elimination of income tax forms, together with its apprehensions now filled out by Americans, would give them a new sense of freedom, which is needed to encourage investment, progress and a feeling of security for coming generations of Americans.

For purposes of explaining the plan we'll say the Federal Government's percentage would be 6 percent. The average State would be 4 percent making a total of 10-percent tax on purchases and transfer. The State would purchase from the National Government stamps and certificates which would have an overprint identifying the State.

Where cash is used at time of purchase, the purchaser would receive stamps or certificates equal to the amount of tax.

Business and industry or persons using checks would pay by check at time bill is paid. The check would have two sections, an upper and lower. The upper which would be a separate check would be made payable to the seller or supplier. As an example, if the amount of bill was $1,000, the check would be made to the seller or supplier in the amount of $1,000 and the lower check would be made payable to the State treasurer of the State from which the goods were purchased and would be in the amount of $100, which represents 10 percent of the purchase. Sixty dollars of this would go to the Federal Government and $40 to the State government. The State treasurer would pass on to the various subdivisions of the State their share of tax.

The one combined general tax would be paid at the time payment is made.

The tax would apply on all taxable merchandise when sold by manufacturers, distributors, and retailers.

Within the year, purchasers of taxable merchandise will have accumulated stamps, certificates and canceled tax checks totaling 10 percent of his purchases. By acting as collector, and to keep the system honest, these stamps, certificates, and canceled tax checks could be redeemed for a percentage of their face value.

All transactions, whether government, business or individuals would pay this tax—the State would benefit by National Government purchases and the National Government by State purchases.

4-H Clubs Saluted by Speech Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, several outstanding young Oklahomans are presently visiting Washington as guests of the Oklahoma Farmers Union. These young people have excelled in many areas of agriculture and conservation work.

One of these, Miss Linda Mullican of Vinita, Okla., is in Washington as a result of winning first place in the State 4-H Clubs speech contest.

Linda's speech, entitled, "How My Organization Promotes Good Community Living," is a fine example of enthusiastic loyalty to the 4-H Clubs in Oklahoma.

It gives me pleasure at this time to insert Linda's winning address on the importance of 4-H Clubs in community affairs into the RECORD.

The address follows:

4-H CLUBS SALUTED BY SPEECH CHAMPION

I would like to tell you how my organization, the 4-H Club promotes good community living.

The 4-H Club is a great organization, not only for our rural youth, but for the urban boy and girl as well. Any youth between the ages of 9 and 21 may join a 4-H club, and other than crops and livestock, the urban youth may have the same projects as the rural youth; 4-H work has been established upon the principles of democracy. It is an organization whose programs and activities are determined by and for the members of the local club. Its membership is not determined on income, creed, color, or affiliations of any other youth organization, and club members are not required to pay dues. Our Government considers it a worthwhile organization, for it is sponsored by the USDA. Our 4-H clubs have almost 100 percent cooperation from parents, businessmen, many school officials and the Farmers Union. Our 4-H leaders, like those of the Farmers Union Junior Organization, and older 4-H Club boys and girls serve as junior leaders in helping train younger members, therefore, 4-H is not a heavy burden on taxpayers.

Since its beginning, the 4-H Club has worked hand in hand with the Farmers Union, which also has one of the finest youth programs in Oklahoma, in a combined effort to promote good community living, and to encourage boys and girls to compete for honors in fairs, livestock shows and other contests, such as the speech contest sponsored by the Farmers Union.

Our National 4-H Club emblem is the four-leaf clover with the letter H on each leaflet running parallel with the midrib of the leaflet. When a child joins a 4-H club, the first thing he learns is the meaning of this club emblem or what the 4-H's represent. They represent the equal training of the head, heart, hands, and health of every member, and in our all-star emblem, the fifth H represents the home. Every 4-H Club member lives by our motto, which is "To Make the Best Better."

Our 4-H Clubs inspire higher ideals, such as clearer thinking, greater loyalty, better living, and the building of good character of our youth. In fact, our 4-H Clubs develop citizenship. The informal education provided by the extension service of our land grant colleges and universities through 4-H is unique. It supplements the training received in the home, church, and school.

In our 4-H Club work we learn parliamentary procedure, the kinds of committees, and the jobs of committee members. We learn the steps and precautions necessary in solving problems. We get experience in leadership and learn how to help and get along with others in our club and our community. We get training in recreation, personality improvement, and many other things which build character and make good citizens.

I have stated the purpose of our 4-H Clubs, defined the National 4-H Club emblem, have shown you how my organization, the 4-H Club promotes good community living, and how 4-H Club members, with the help of the Farmers Union, are learning to become the future citizens in our democracy.

Oklahoma City Newspaper Published With Type Set Entirely by Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, a technical achievement of great importance was accomplished recently by the Oklahoma Publishing Co. in Oklahoma City, Okla. On March 5, 1963, the Oklahoma City Times published its regular edition with type set entirely by an IBM computer. The ramifications of this milestone in publishing history are, of course, incalculable, but will result primarily in the newspaper reading public receiving later breaking news in home editions.

It is, Mr. Speaker, altogether fitting that this technical breakthrough should come on the 60th anniversary of the Oklahoma Publishing Co. and on the 90th birthday of its president, editor and publisher, E. K. Gaylord. The growth of Oklahoma and her capital city are due in large measure to the personal efforts of Mr. Gaylord and the paper he publishes, and this latest technical accomplishment is indicative of his pace-setting achievements. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD three news items which will illustrate the significance of this latest achievement and the part that Mr. Gaylord has played in the history of Oklahoma.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

OKLAHOMA CITY NEWSPAPER PUBLISHED WITH TYPE SET ENTIRELY BY COMPUTER

OKLAHOMA CITY, March 5.—The Oklahoma City Times today published its regular editions with type set entirely by a computer.

The feat marked the culmination of several years of independent research by the Oklahoma Publishing Co., working with officials of the International Business Machines Corp.

An unjustified perforated tape is fed into the computer, which then cuts a perforated and justified tape. That tape is run through a linotype, which sets the type automatically. The computer in its tape justifies lines of type to the proper column width and automatically hyphens words.

"This important improvement in the efficiency of newspaper production methods has implications for every community in America," said Robert H. Spahn, production manager of the Times and Daily Oklahoman. "It could make the difference economically in the survival of many newspapers."

"This system, if used widely by other newspapers around the country, could result in 100 million Americans' receiving later breaking news in their local newspapers," said Charles L. Bennett, managing editor.

The system centers around the computer, which can punch teletype tape at the rate of 85 column-width lines a minute—fast enough to keep eight linotype machines busy continuously.

Today's achievement was set as a 90th "birthday greeting" for Publisher E. K. Gaylord, who has continuously operated the two Oklahoma City newspapers since 1903, when circulation—now more than 310,000—was only 3,500.

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Mar. 5, 1963]

YOU'RE READING NEWSPAPER HISTORY

The newspaper you are now reading is a first in newspaper history.

Every line of news type in today's Times was justified—that is, spaced and hyphenated by a computer.

This latest technical achievement in newspaper production was inaugurated Tuesday as a staff gift to E. K. Gaylord, president and publisher, in celebration of his 90th birthday.

Gaylord was pleased, because the accomplishment marks another step in the progress of the publications that have been his life's work for 60 years. But the accomplishment was hardly a surprise to a man who habitually thinks in the future and who continually seeks out the latest information on scientific developments in all fields for his spare-time reading.

The Oklahoma Publishing Co., which Gaylord founded in 1903, also will complete during his 90th birthday year—which also is the 60th anniversary year for his company—its new $3 million plant. Typically, under his direction, the new building was planned "for at least 40 years ahead," including space for computers.

Several years of independent company research, close liaison with computer experts from the International Business Machines Co., and 18 months of trial and error were needed to establish the automated system of setting type which already has attracted nationwide attention of publishers.

As now in operation, the high-speed IBM 1620 computer receives a coded tape produced by a typist who has copied a reporter's story, after editing.

The computer then produces a second tape which will operate a linecasting machine. The computer puts into the new tape correct spacing, hyphenates words when necessary, and measures each line so that it will fit exactly between column rules.

One machine, which occupies little more space than an ordinary desk, produces a punched tape that will set type at the rate of 85 column-width lines of type a minute—enough to keep 8 Linotype machines running continuously at their maximum speed.

From the readers' standpoint, the computer produces a newspaper more free from errors, and spacing and word hyphenation are more uniform.

LATER NEWS

It also brings the possibility of delivering much later news to newspaper subscribers, according to Charles L. Bennett, managing editor.

From an industry standpoint, two immediate major benefits are seen. The publishing industry, newspaper, magazine, and book, has long been concerned with rising costs of production. This new system "could make the difference economically in the survival of many newspapers," said Robert H.

Spahn, production manager of the Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times.

RULES REMEMBERED

The computer doesn't really have to learn the English language to hyphenate words. But it can store basic rules of English in memory banks, and can work on the "probability" of hyphens occuring between any two letters in some 3-million words that were studied to give it a memory.

The first machine was delivered to the Oklahoma Publishing Co. in mid-1962 and the first "computerized" news story actually appeared in the papers in September. A second machine arrived early this year and is now in use.

Use of computers to set type is typical of the forward-looking, dynamic, exploring nature of a man 90 years old Tuesday who as a young business manager of the St. Joseph, Mo., Gazette heard of the opportunities possible in Oklahoma at the turn of the century.

He came to Oklahoma City and in 1903, together with two associates, formed the Oklahoma Publishing Co., which purchased the 8-year-old struggling Daily Oklahoman

The Weekly Oklahoman, also launched in 1903, later became the Farmer-Stockman. The Oklahoma City Times was acquired in 1916.

CIRCULATION GROWS

Circulation of the Daily Oklahoman was 3,500 in 1903. Circulation of the Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times—of which Gaylord still is president, publisher, editor, and general manager—now exceeds 300,000 daily and the Sunday Oklahoman is just approaching that figure. They are the largest-circulation newspapers in the Southwest.

Other Oklahoma Publishing Co. properties include Oklahoma's first radio station, WKY; Oklahoma's first television station, WKY-TV; the State's largest express trucking service, Mistletoe Express, and two other television stations, KTVT in Fort Worth-Dallas and WTVT, in Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.

PROGRESS STRESSED

The emphasis at Oklahoma Publishing Co. is on progress. But progress often looks so routine that unless we told our story of computer typesetting today, few Oklahomans would realize that something big, new, and revolutionary had happened in Oklahoma City with the publishing of today's newspaper.

But that's the story of news—and the reason for newspapers.

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Mar. 4, 1963]

PUBLISHER'S BIRTHDAY MARKS MILESTONE IN PAPER HISTORY

This is a year of milestones for the State's largest newspapers—the Daily Oklahoman and the Oklahoma City Times—and their publisher. For it is the 60th anniversary of The Oklahoma Publishing Co., and Edward K. Gaylord will be 90 Tuesday.

Characteristically, for Gaylord himself there will be no elaborate ceremonies marking his 90th birthday and 60th year at the helm of the Oklahoman.

YEAR TO REMEMBER

But for the Oklahoman and Times, this will be a year to remember. Opubco's new $3 million office and editorial building is nearing completion, and this year will mark major expansion for the firm. At the same time new production techniques are being introduced to keep the papers ahead of their time.

Most men would have long since retired, but at 90 Gaylord is in excellent health. He takes a daily hand in the direction of the far-flung communications interests of Opubco, which includes radio and television stations in Oklahoma City, Fort Worth-Dallas, and Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla., as well as the Farmer-Stockman magazine and Mistletoe Express Service.

Edward King Gaylord was born March 5, 1873, on a farm near Muscotah, Kans. Drought and grasshoppers forced the Gaylord family to move to Colorado.

FIRST NEWSPAPER

Gaylord's entry in the newspaper business came when he and his brother Lewis bought into the old Colorado Springs Telegraph. He also studied law. Finally Gaylord sold out and moved to Oklahoma territory.

When Gaylord bought into the Daily Oklahoman in 1903, it was not the leading newspaper in the Territory. In fact, it could boast of only about 3,500 circulation while the Guthrie Capitol claimed 20,000. Guthrie was then the territorial capital.

The Oklahoman built a new building, led a successful fight to move the State capital from Guthrie to Oklahoma City, suffered a disastrous fire and built another new building, this time at Fourth and Broadway.

The Oklahoman is still at Fourth and Broadway, but has long since outgrown the original five-story building. A mechanical annex was added in 1929 and the new editorial and office building, set to open this summer, will complete the complex.

MAGAZINE LAUNCHED

In 1911, the Farmer-Stockman was launched. The afternoon Times was bought at public auction on January 1, 1916. And in 1918 Gaylord became president of Opubco when partner Roy Stafford sold out.

The "roaring twenties" brought further circulation gains, entry into the new field of radio through purchase of WKY, and another big civic campaign, this time to relocate the Rock Island railroad tracks from the center of town.

ONE JUMP AHEAD

Gaylord, who always seemed to be one jump ahead of the newspaper industry in general, diversified into the burgeoning medium of television soon after the war.

In recent months Opubco has led the way in adapting that modern marvel—the computer—to all types of newspaper tasks.

Gaylord's aggressive editorial campaigns have helped Oklahoma City and the State grow, and stirred political hornets nests as well. But the veteran publisher has never shied away from controversy.

Though he will be 90 Tuesday, Gaylord shows no signs of slowing his pace.

Pace setting has been Gaylord's labor of love, and friends say he's still going strong.

Young Oklahoman Speaks for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Oklahoma congressional delegation had the privilege of meeting with a group of outstanding young Oklahomans who are visiting Washington as a result of winning various honors in the field of agriculture and conservation.

Four of these young people are from the Second Congressional District and all four are winners of speech contests concerning the importance of agriculture to our daily lives.

Jimmy Russell, of Morris, Okla., was one of the State champions in the Future Farmers of America speech competition. His address, entitled "How Soil Conservation Promotes Good Community Living," is an example of the depth with which these youngsters approach their subjects.

Although Jimmy is just a sophomore in high school this year, his research in the field of soil conservation and his enthusiasm clearly indicate that he will be one of Oklahoma's leaders of tomorrow.

At this time, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of Jimmy Russell's speech.

The speech follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

(By Jimmy Russell)

Honorable judges, fellow Future Farmers and friends. I am Jimmy Russell from the Morris FAA Chapter. It is with the greatest pleasure that I speak to you on the subject, "How Soil Conservation Promotes Good Community Living."

In 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt made the statement: "When the soil is gone, man must go, and the process does not take very long."

To a good many people soil merely means the ground on which we move about and make homes, or the dirt from which plant growth and crop products, somehow emerge.

Most of us fail to fully appreciate how much we depend on the soil and how essential it is to the very survival of the human race.

Our topsoil is priceless, it cannot be measured in dollars and cents, it must be measured in terms of life or death.

Nations go to war to get more topsoil to feed, clothe, and shelter their people. Civilizations have perished for want of it. You can see the ruins of once glorious nations, buried deep in the sand washed from eroding farmland. Yes, topsoil is certainly worth more than all the money in every bank in the world, and we don't have any too much of it.

One of the earliest of civilizations, that of the Assyrians and Babylonians was created in rich farming territory between the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers. When their land, which could produce such wheat that it could be cut two times in a growing season and then pastured, was destroyed, so was their empire.

The Phoenician city of Carthage, for a time the greatest city in the world, was able in the year 800 B.C. to send out ships to Britain and into the Atlantic. The Carthaginians allowed their soil to waste away, and today, the site of their once proud city forms a vast part of the Sahara Desert.

Just how does the Oklahoma Farmers Union tie into the soil conservation picture? As most of you know, the Farmers Union is an organization promoting the worthwhile work of the family farmer throughout the United States of America. They are always crusading to keep the family-size farm in existence.

Therefore, the Oklahoma Farmers Union is promoting our soil conservation activities, realizing that the soil is the basis for all agriculture existence.

By taking an active part in promoting youth leadership events such as this speech contest, the Oklahoma Farmers Union is leading the way to success in soil conservation.

We have become the strongest nation in the world, yet if we allow our soil and soil fertility to be lost we will become a weak nation. The nation that is without food can easily be conquered.

Civilization became a reality because of agriculture.

The words of the eloquent and gifted soil conservationist, Mr. C. W. Fowler, lend themselves very appropriately to the theme of this address. He recently said, and I quote:

"Let's conserve our soil and our moisture,
That was made by the hand of God.
Let's keep the row crops off the hills;
Let's keep them covered with sod.

"Now when we depart from this old earth
For realms below or above;
Let's leave a better, prettier farm
For those we dearly love.

"Let them not say as we said before
After our years of sweat and toil,
Thanks a lot for the farm, old man;
But, where in the heck is the soil?"

Thank you.

Warped Thinking by the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in their zeal to maintain their status as the official brass tongue of the extremists, the Washington Post unleashed on Thursday, February 28, a distorted attack on a measure recently introduced here in the House by a Member for whom we all have the highest regard, Representative BASIL WHITENER.

In an editorial entitled "Beating Children," the Post, with their usual, intemperate disregard for logic and commonsense when attacking a man or his ideas, attempted to show that my colleague's bill to permit teachers to use "reasonable force" to maintain order in their classrooms, would surely lead to sadistic and savage attacks upon defenseless children.

A picture of broken and bleeding children's bodies was conjured up, in which this violence would beget violence, and in which children would turn on their teachers like animals.

The Post justified this warped thinking by stating that:

Where jungle law prevails, supremacy belongs to the most savage.

This, then, is to state at the same time that Washington schools are peopled by savages and it would be foolhardy to tamper with the law of the jungle in an effort to restore order and decency.

Equating "beating" and "sadism" with the "reasonable force" cited in Representative WHITENER's bill is an easy matter for the Post's editorial writer. He has only to resort to the simple expedient of twisting the facts to fit his concept.

It means nothing to the Post that Representative WHITENER is not advocating savage beatings of children. It serves their purpose too well to infer that is what he has in mind.

I recall only too well, and I imagine every Member in the House recalls it too, the "physical discipline" to which my colleague refers and to which we were all exposed when we went to school.

I cannot however, try as I might, remember any of my classmates coming back from a cloakroom session with a teacher, bleeding and with broken bones. I do not recall a single incident in which a child, taken firmly by the hand and led to the principal's office, returned later with his spirit permanently broken; a shattered neurotic because his bottom had been warmed by a good spanking.

Yet, the Post maintains that "where authority relies upon force, kindness is a weakness and love is looked upon as mere sentimentality." This is a sophistry of the first magnitude.

By cleverly substituting the words "beating" for "spanking"; by insinuating that a paddling would "undermine the moral discipline on which, in the main, education necessarily depends," the Post mires itself in a theory so blundering in its logic, so extravagantly juvenile in its understanding of what a school is supposed to be that its intended slur on Representative WHITENER misses its mark.

The editorial, in all its splendid fatuousness, is reprinted below for the amusement of all the Members.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 28, 1963]

BEATING CHILDREN

Representative BASIL L. WHITENER has introduced a bill which would take away from the District Board of Education control over physical discipline in the schools here and which would permit teachers to use "reasonable force" to maintain order. What is meant by "reasonable force?"

Teachers already have—and have always had in the District of Columbia—authority to use such physical force as may be necessary to restrain or control a violent child. They are simply forbidden, under current rules, to use physical force as a means of punishing a child. Like a policeman making an arrest, in other words, they may use as much force as is necessary but they may not go beyond this and use force for punitive purposes.

Although Dr. Hansen himself is, of course, wholly opposed to such conduct, other people who talk about "corporal punishment" must have in mind some form of spanking, whipping, beating, striking, or otherwise physically castigating children as a disciplinary measure. We think there are some dangers in authorizing teachers to punish in this way.

First, there is a danger that children may be injured. Even in the best of school systems there may be a sadistic teacher who may punish for the pleasure of punishing. "Juvenile delinquency," a distinguished social scientist has pointed out, "serves many purposes, including that of providing sadistic adults with fantasies suited to their special tastes." In addition, even a decent, well-intentioned teacher may lose control of himself when he resorts to violence and inflict serious injury on a child. At least one child beaten by its parents is brought into each hospital in the Washington area each month.

(2) There is a danger that violence will beget violence. It may be safe enough to strike or beat little children in grade schools—at least until they grow old enough to take their revenge on teachers—but to strike a husky, loutish teenager, who has been accustomed to beatings, and to beating others, all his life, is to invite him to strike back. Where jungle law prevails, supremacy belongs to the most savage.

Even the beating of little children may be dangerous, when one comes to think about it. For parents who prefer to do their own beating of their own children may come to school and beat the teacher who has beaten their child.

(3) There is a danger that resort to physical discipline will undermine the moral discipline on which, in the main, education necessarily depends. For where authority relies upon force, kindness is a weakness, and love is looked upon as mere sentimentality.

The theory upon which physical punishment of children in school is commonly justified by those who advocate it is that teachers are in loco parentis. But this justification loses sight of the fact that there are real and deeply felt differences of opinion among parents respecting the validity of corporal punishment. If teachers are to serve in the place of parents, they ought to emulate them. At the very least, they ought to spare the rod in the case of those children whose parents believe in sparing it. Quite possibly they will find, anyway, that these are the very children who need it the least.

Hullabaloo Notwithstanding, the TFX Choice Was Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Houston Chronicle on Sunday, March 10. The editorial concludes that the choice exercised by the Secretaries of Defense, Air Force, and Navy, as a source selection for the TFX, was a wise choice.

It is my firm conviction that this conclusion represents the sentiment of most thoughtful Americans who have had an opportunity to examine both sides.

The editorial follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 10, 1963]

HULLABALOO NOTWITHSTANDING, THE TFX CHOICE WAS WISE

Even if testimony about the TFX fighter plane being released by Senator MCCLELLAND's subcommittee wasn't censored, we'd have a difficult time picking our way through it to the essential issues. How can an airplane be so complicated?

Secretary of Defense McNamara decided the Air Force and the Navy should have an all-purpose fighter both could use. While carrier and land versions will differ, they will have a high degree of "commonality" that means money saved—in development, production, and operation.

The TFX—tactical fighter-experimental—will cost about $6.5 billion. It will pack just about every weapon a tactical plane could use, and be adaptable to practically any combat situation.

Although any aircraft manufacturer would delight to chew on such a plum, bidding for it narrowed to two giants: Boeing and General Dynamics-Grumman who pooled their bid.

Air Force-Navy leaders liked Boeing's versions best. The Secretary of Defense overruled them; picked General Dynamics-Grumman.

The Defense Department spelled out its reasons in a memorandum released last week, which concludes:

"It is our opinion, therefore, in view of the fact that both aircraft proposed are acceptable and offer a capability far beyond present-day aircraft, we should accept the General Dynamics' proposal on the basis that it proposes the greater degree of commonness, contemplates the use of conventional materials, provides the higher confidence in structural design, and offers the better possibility of obtaining the aircraft desired on schedule and within the dollars programed."

Are those reasons enough? Is the matter done, and can development and production begin in earnest? Of course not. We all know Washington better than that.

Concede that there was little to choose from between the Convair and Boeing proposals, that both were pretty good. Still, a choice had to be made, and it is the Secretary of Defense's job to make it.

Concede that there was plenty of political pressure exerted to influence the choice. General Dynamics will handle much of the production at its gigantic Convair plant in Fort Worth. Texans in Washington, from the Vice President down, don't want the plum to ripen on somebody else's tree. Boeing can bring considerable pressure to bear, too. Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, doesn't intend to let one of the biggest industries in his State lose the contract without a fight.

Hazarding a rough judgment at this point, we'd say political pressures about canceled one another, however, and that the contract decision was made honestly by the Defense Department on the grounds it has stated.

We believe that if Congress were quietly polled, it would say "Amen" to Mr. McNamara's decision. Nobody wants to shortchange our defense, but these blank-check years—the services get just about anything they want—are becoming tiresome. If money can be saved without sacrificing sinew, we should save it.

A footnote: The TFX likely will be the last combat airplane. On December 3, 1903, not quite 60 years ago, the Wright brothers nursed their sputtering little kite into the air. Not quite 6 years later—on August 2, 1909—the U.S. Army got its first plane.

The Navy flew combat missions at Vera Cruz, Mexico, in 1914. A young flying officer, Pat Bellinger, later an admiral, hurled a bar of laundry soap at a sniper who had put a hole in his plane's wing, the first aerial bombardment.

Now, an era is beginning to end. The bomber generals, like the battleship admirals, are fading restlessly but surely away. The TFX will be a magnificent weapon, first of its kind, but last of a species.

In Commemoration of the 245th Nike Missile Battalion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1963, the 245th Nike Missile Battalion, which is located in Huntington Station, Long Island, N.Y., will be disbanded and the personnel will be either discharged or attached to other National Guard units.

The 245th and its forebears has had a long and glorious history. I desire to pay tribute to this proud unit. That history reflects the annals of this Nation. The 245th traces its lineage to 1654 when a company of "Minutemen" was organized by the Dutch burghers in Breuckelen (Brooklyn) to suppress lawlessness and smuggling in their village and nearby communities on Long Island Sound. Since then, the unit has seen service in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the War Between the States, Spanish-American War, two World Wars of this century and the Korean conflict. In its passage from "Minutemen" to Nike Missile Battalion, the 245th, in its own words, "has ever been ready to serve its country's call."

I desire at this time to place in the RECORD a brief summary of the history of the regiment.

HISTORY OF THE 13TH REGIMENT 59TH AEF AND 245TH COAST ARTILLERY

Following its organization as a company of "Minutemen" by the Dutch burghers of what is now Brooklyn, the unit saw service in the Revolutionary War. In 1776, the Brooklyn "Minutemen" became a part of the Continental Army as the right flank company of the 64th Regiment of Foot. In this capacity, it fought throughout the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.

Later, this right flank company came to form a part of the Brooklyn City Guard. This guard in turn played a major role in the formation of the 13th Regiment of Infantry embodied into the service of New York in 1847.

This 13th Regiment was called for active Federal duty in the War Between the States. According to its annals, it was the first New York militia regiment to volunteer to a man for service in this war.

The regiment served during the Spanish-American War as part of the 22d New York Volunteers. Thereafter, it remained as an infantry regiment until 1900 when it was reorganized as an artillery unit and ultimately became the 13th Coast Defense Command.

During World War I, officers and men in the regiment were attached to a number of units which served with great distinction and efficiency in combat action, particularly in France, in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives and the defensive sector of the 1st Army, the Lorraine sector.

Following the war, the regiment again resumed its status as the 13th Coast Defense Command until 1924, when it became the 245th Coast Artillery.

Under the Presidential proclamation of national emergency in 1940, the 245th Coast Artillery was once again called to Federal service and sent to garrison the artillery fortifications at Fort Hancock, Sandy Hook, N.J. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, most of the senior noncommissioned officers and officers of the regiment were sent to various training camps over the country as cadres to train the rapidly expanding Army that was to eventually carry the United States to victory over the Axis Powers. The remainder of the regiment was brought to full combat strength and served throughout World War II. Members of the 245th saw action in all parts of the globe during the monstrous conflict and in all theaters of the war, from Bataan to Okinawa.

When the "call to arms" was sounded in 1951 in Korea and a United Nations force was dispatched to that war-torn land, the 245th was again called to the service of the Nation until the cessation of hostilities in 1955.

At the present time, the 245th Nike Missile Battalion is serving the Nation at missile bases on Long Island, proud of the fact that from the early company of Dutch "Minute Men" to the present battalion of "Missile Men," this stanch and venerable organization of American fighting men has ever been ready to serve its country's call.

Prize-Winning Speeches by Members of the Oklahoma Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three prize-winning speeches given by members of the Oklahoma Farmers Union who reside in my congressional district in Oklahoma. These are the speeches of Mark C. Kelly, Fletcher, Okla.; Linda Payne, Hollis, Okla.; and Steven L. Moore, Loveland, Okla.:

HOW MY ORGANIZATION PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

(By Mark C. Kelly, Fletcher, Okla.)

Emergency—Dr. Jones, please report to the operating room immediately. This call came booming from the loudspeaker of a major hospital. Dr. Jones rushed to the operating room and found a man suffering from severe cuts on his legs. Dr. Jones' orders came quickly, "Put clamps on the cut veins and arteries to stop the bleeding, then prepare to put the severed tissues back together." His orders were carried out and within a few weeks the patient was on his feet almost as good as new.

Now, let us look at this relatively simple case in a different way. Let us suppose that when Dr. Jones had given his orders, the interns and nurses had turned and said, "We don't want to. We haven't the time. It is 5 o'clock and we are off duty." The man would have probably died from the loss of blood. This would be a poor way to run a hospital.

Now, compare our patient with the United States, which at this very time is in danger from the loss of her lifeblood, the soil. Let us compare Dr. Jones with the Soil Conservation Service, vocational agriculture, our extension division, and the Farmers Union "The doctors of the soil."

The doctor has given his orders, "Put clamps on the bloodlines," which would be simple to stop erosion and depletion now. However, just as we saw in the second cast the interns and nurses refuse to help. The nurses and interns being we, the people, not only Mr. Farmer, and Mr. Rancher, but also Mr. Banker, Mr. Grocer, and Mr. Businessman. "We haven't time nor money," comes from many. Others say, "the soil will last as long as I do so why should I worry?" Meanwhile the lifeblood of our Nation is being lost at the rate of 500,000 acres per year or 1,300 acres a day. If this loss continues, our Nation could become one of the dead nations—"for a nation that cannot feed itself is a weak nation."

Yes, the blood of our patient is leaving. The soil from our farms leaves with each rain and windstorm.

How are we to stop erosion and depletion? Dr. Conservationist has already proved that planting grasses and legumes is one of the

best ways to put clamps on the bloodlines of the soil, as Dr. Conservationist has ordered. Through the leadership of our local Farmers Union organization, our FFA chapter's motto of holding every raindrop where it falls is catching on. Grass as a vegetative cover, if you please, serves as a protective blanket over our patient. While protecting our patient from the enemy erosion, the grass blanket "brakes up" the raindrops as they fall, tends to hold back the water, and let the water soak into the soil to form the mightiest reservoir of all times, the earth.

Grass is increasing our blood bank of organic matter. The small roots of grass move about in the soil making way and furnishing pathways for food for soil organisims of the red corpuscles of our lifeblood.

Soil without organic matter, like a ship without its sail, is virtually rendered useless.

Worn out, unproductive land eventually results in widespread famine. Hunger may knock on our own door of the United States if conservation practices are not judiciously followed.

Our supply of really good land now stands at about 400 million acres, or 2½ acres per person. Emergency, with a population explosion booming to 225 million Americans to feed by 1975, our acres per person will shrink to less than 2 acres each. By the turn of the century, we will have two times the number of mouths to feed. This will leave only 1 acre for each person. Where will your acre be? Will it be on a washed away, eroded hillside—leaving you and your family hungry? This hunger will only lead to strife, uprising and war.

To sum this up, we must produce more food from less land and thinner topsoil. A mighty army of doctors, who are conservationists, interns who are farmers and ranchers, and nurses, who are the businessmen, must be mustered and armed with the tools to increase the lifeblood of our Nation. We must set up a blood bank of organic matter and mend the broken arteries to insure a healthy population.

We, the future farmers of America, are looking for leadership from our senior citizens in the Farmers Union organization to lead us in conserving our lifeblood—the soil.

Mr. and Mrs. America, God has granted us a fruitful and bountiful Nation—Are you going to let it wash away?

(By Steven L. Moore, Loveland, Okla.)

Honorable judges, fellow future farmers, and guests, I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

These words are part of the creed of the Future Farmers of America of which I am proudly a member. This organization, founded in 1928, has down through the years strived to fill the ranks of American citizenship with a new type of man. A man with an overwhelming loyalty to his country and his God.

Dying, Horace Greeley, great American newspaperman, exclaimed: "Fame is a vapor, popularity an accident, riches take wings, those who cheer today will curse tomorrow, only one thing endures—character." These weighty words bid all remember that life's one task is the making of manhood. Our world is a college, events are teachers, happiness is the graduating point, character is the diploma God gives man.

The task of building young men and women is a huge one so therefore we shall never cease to develop character, train for useful citizenship, and foster patriotism in American youth. We try to develop a boy in three specific ways. They are, (1) physically, by building his body through hard work; (2) mentally, by developing and bringing out the qualities of leadership, sportsmanship, and fairplay, and (3), and which I feel most important of all, spiritually by teaching him to understand and appreciate the world given to him by his Maker.

But as it says in the Bible, "The harvest is great but the laborers are few." The task of awakening American youth to the huge responsibility placed upon their shoulders, that of preserving American freedom, is a huge one. It cannot be done by one alone. Therefore several other organizations have flung themselves into this never-ending battle. One of the most outstanding of these new champions of democracy is the Oklahoma Farmers Union. Their program of summer camps along with a system of scholarships given to deserving young men and women has done much to further the common cause. I must commend the action already taken but at the same moment urge that the forward pace must not be stopped at this point. We the FFA and the farmers' union must join as allies in an all-out-war against the alien forces working within our Nation. The spirit which, in the early years of our Nation's life ran rampant, the spirit which was expressed by one of our greatest patriot's speeches, part of which was, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death," must again take precedence in the minds of all America. The words "juvenile delinquency" must be completely and utterly obliterated from the American vocabulary.

Ladies and gentlemen, this will be a huge and monstrous task, but it can be done, it must be done, and with the help of Almighty God, it will be done.

FARMERS UNION JUNIORS

(By Linda Payne, Hollis, Okla.)

President Stone, madame chairman, fellow contestants and friends of the Farmers Union, I believe Farmers Union Juniors does more to promote good community living than any other functioning organization. The hope of our United States lies in educating its youth. That education is the basic purpose of Farmers Union Juniors. An educated populace will advance a nation, especially a democracy such as ours. Today, when mighty nationalistic forces, agitated and supported by communism, are trying to destroy our way of life, it is important—vitally important—that youth be informed about democratic principles. One of the most compelling forces for democracy is Farmers Union Juniors. Let's see how Farmers Union Juniors promote good community living while they educate for democratic living.

Education is like raising a shade to let in light. Last harvest season that light really shined for me. In 1961 my father hauled his wheat to Eldorado where he waited many hours in line instead of going across the street to another elevator which had very few customers. I could not understand why. Our first lesson in Farmers Union Juniors was on cooperatives. That shade flew up. The name on that elevator sign gleamed brightly—Farmers Union Co-op. My father was a partner in the business, he shared the profits. With his dividend he purchased the much desired piano so I could take those longed for music lessons. Multiply our experience by the number of others selling wheat at that elevator and you see that it means a better living standard for the entire community.

The most classic example of a farmers union service cooperative is the Elk City Community Hospital, which has been protecting the area's health for over 30 years. My organization offers other services; such as health insurance, automobile and property insurance, hail, crop, and fire insurance. How much better to buy from a cooperative which shares profits than from a private business which swallows them. Protection, whether of health or property—is in my estimation, the best community living. Let us consider the activities of my organization on the State level. Farmers Union believes the family farmer needs help; therefore, it keeps its ear to the ground and lobbies in the State legislature for the legislation beneficial to the farmers. It has been currently working on the reapportionment question to the farmer's advantage. Farmers Union Juniors are learning by their methods to make their communities a good place to live, and will carry on the traditions of the parent organization.

We live in an ever-changing society. As the circumference of our world becomes smaller, it is all important that we understand the people who live, not just in the next county but in the next country. Through the course, "Tools for Peace", offered we Farmers Union Juniors, we have learned the needs and attitudes of the people who inhabit far-off Africa and Asia; we have learned about various organizations, supported by Farmers Union, which help these needy people, we have learned that what happened in India, Yemen, Russia, China, Cuba, the Congo, and Argentina has as much impact on our lives today as our own cooperative efforts to get better schools, roads, and hospitals. My organization helps us—you and me—to promote good community living in those far-off places. Just this year the Burlington Co-op in Alfalfa County gave 1,666 bushels of wheat to CROP, and designated it for Algeria, that needy new nation in Africa. Now, I ask you, is that not promoting good community living on an international scale?

The Peace Corps might have been a new idea with the New Frontier, but the idea itself was ages old with the Farmers Union. For years it has been sending agricultural and home economics experts to guide people of foreign lands to better community living. My organization believes in being of service to mankind. It contributes to UNICEF, which provides milk for many a child who would otherwise never taste it. He who loves mankind seeks to improve its living standards, Farmers Union Juniors tries to do this.

Therefore, my organization promotes good community living through education, legislative assistance, and worldwide cooperative efforts. We are an offspring of Farmers Union, and in its efforts to serve humanity it uses the democratic principles which we apply. These democratic principles were the same yesterday, they are the same today, and they will be the same forever. It is these principles which will preserve our Nation inviolate for the future. Through educating youth in these humanitarian democratic principles my organization is doing more to promote good community living than any other.

McNamara Called Out of Bounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has demonstrated more interest in the superficial impressions created by what it says rather than in the basic meaning of what it does. As a result we as a people and our friends abroad are coming to question official Washington's concern for truth. Government statements no longer carry the weight of reliability. We face a crisis of credibility. The rea-

sons for this crisis are ably developed in the following column from the Minneapolis Tribune of March 6, 1963, written by nationally renowned columnist, Richard Wilson.

McNAMARA CALLED OUT OF BOUNDS

(By Richard Wilson)

It is perhaps inevitable that the Secretary of Defense would range into problems in foreign affairs, but this makes these excursions no less objectionable.

The scope of the Office of Secretary of Defense is already broad enough without his acting as foreign affairs spokesman. When the Office is held by a dominant personality, as in the present case, difficult problems arise, and particularly so when the Secretary of Defense is wrong on some major points.

The Defense Department, if not the Secretary of Defense, was wrong in its official announcement that there were no missiles known to be in Cuba 72 hours before the President said the weapons were there.

A more recent error was Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's statement to a national TV audience:

"I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries."

If McNamara did not have such evidence he was not in a sound position to discuss the international aspects of the Cuban problem as they affect the foreign affairs of Latin American countries. McNamara's statement was made on February 6.

On February 19, John A. McCone, Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that 1,000 to 1,500 Latin Americans went to Cuba in 1962 for training in sabotage and guerrilla tactics and more have gone this year. These "students" entered Cuba from all but one Latin American country. McCone's secret testimony was recently published by the House committee.

McCone said the Latin American revolutionaries are organized into national units "in effect forming a packaged cadre which can be returned to the homeland at the appropriate time to lead a 'liberation army.'"

This evidence gathered by the Central Intelligence Agency stands in direct contradiction to McNamara's public assurances. Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries, and on a scale never before known in this hemisphere. Thousands of men are being trained in Cuba to take over the governments of every Latin American country execpt Uruguay.

The announcement that misleading or untrue statements about the American military posture are a part of our weaponry against wily enemies emanated from the Department of Defense. This put everyone on notice that what comes out of the Department of Defense is not necessarily always the whole truth.

But it is astonishing that a Secretary of Defense would make a television report to the American public which contained such quickly exposed bunkum.

The Central Intelligence Agency is not a creature of the Department of Defense. Its responsibility is to the President. It utilizes the information of various intelligence agencies in the Defense, State, and other Government departments.

The Secretary of Defense is a member of the National Security Council, an agency established by law but superseded, in effect, in the Kennedy administration by an executive committee of the Council not authorized by law. McNamara has no authority in law or in precedent to act as a spokesman in foreign affairs except as his opinion might be made known in the National Security Council. McNamara holds office at the discretion of the President.

Recently he held a press conference to go into matters which more properly could have been left to the Secretary of State. McNamara disclosed that long-range Russian jet bombers flying as reconnaissance planes located and overflew American aircraft carriers. These incidents were in international waters.

The American reaction to such overflights is not within the independent authority of the Secretary of Defense. But it is a matter of primary importance to the Secretary of State, who by law and custom acts on behalf of the President in foreign affairs. One would be hard put to imagine any other major nation permitting its secretary of defense to hold a press conference to discuss such problems. Occasionally the Soviet Minister of Defense, Marshal Malinovsky, makes a speech when Premier Khrushchev is present.

On taking office, President Kennedy was insistent that the United States must speak to the world with one voice. A number of voices have been speaking lately, but some of them have not been telling the whole story.

It is, therefore, little wonder that so many Americans say they no longer believe what they hear from Washington about Cuba.

Fantastic Brainwashing Statement by Our Disarmament Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out what I believe to be one of the most fantastic brainwashing statements ever made to insult the intelligence of the American people. Mr. William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, is quoted in yesterday's Washington Star as saying that the Soviet Union would not cheat on a nuclear test ban once it accepted a treaty. This statement deserves the repudiation of every American who has any semblance of a memory. It is absolutely beyond comprehension that any high official of this administration could be so blind to the deceitful ways of the world Communist overlords.

I believe the administration should repudiate any official who presents such a naive position. To allow such a person to remain in this sensitive position which is vital to our defense and our future is offensive to all of us. I opposed this Disarmament Agency when when it was before the Congress in the last session and one of the reasons was my fear that such people would be placed in positions where they might implement some appeasing agreement with the Communists. It would seem that my fears were well placed. The record indicates that one concession after another has been made by Mr. Foster. He should resign.

The incredible story, taken from the March 12 Washington Star, appears below:

FOSTER EXPECTS NO CHEATING IF REDS ACCEPT TEST BAN

(By Earl H. Voss)

The Soviet Union would not cheat on a nuclear test ban once it accepted a treaty, in the opinion of William C. Foster, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Until there is some movement away from the present Soviet position, however, the United States will not reduce further the seven on-site inspections per year it demands on Soviet soil, he said.

In testimony before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of Congress yesterday afternoon, Mr. Foster gave the first comprehensive picture of the new draft treaty the United States is preparing to submit at the Geneva negotiations.

He listed five main considerations:

(1) The United States and the United Kingdom themselves would designate 14 key members of on-site inspection teams sent to the Soviet Union. The full team might consist of 20 members. The other six would be from the international staff of the international organization but could not be Soviet nationals. The leader of the inspection team would be American or British. In the previous draft treaty, the United States did not explicitly require inclusion of United States or United Kingdom nationals.

(2) Detection stations for catching suspected violations of a treaty would not be internationally supervised but would be completely manned by American and British nationals. The stations would be outside the Soviet Union.

(3) Neither numbers nor locations of control posts would be fixed, as in the old 180-station Geneva system.

(4) The annual quota of on-site inspections is set at seven and will apply to all seismic magnitudes, both above and below the threshold of detection. This will provide "at least as great a deterrent" against tests above the then-detection threshold as the larger quotas proposed under the old Geneva system, Mr. Foster said.

(5) Before suspected earth tremors can be investigated by on-site inspection teams they must be located with some degree of precision. Whether it should be 200 square kilometers or 500 square kilometers has been a problem of dispute between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. Foster told the joint committee these proposals have two basic advantages over earlier ones:

Control of the detection network and the inspections on Soviet territory "is more completely vested in the United States and the United Kingdom." And greater use could be made "of a broad range of intelligence factors in addition to seismic information in determining whether the Soviet Union was honoring its treaty obligations."

Intelligence alone could not be used to obtain an on-site inspection, Mr. Foster acknowledged, because the suspected earth tremor would have to be located by seismic means alone.

If the Soviet Union refused to accept U.S. seismic evidence or a request for on-site inspection without seismic evidence, the United States could abrogate the treaty if its intelligence information convinced the Government a violation had occurred.

Both Mr. Foster and Secretary of State Rusk, who appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, emphasized the President still believes a nuclear test ban would be in the U.S. interest because it would preserve American nuclear superiority longer.

Republican Representative HOSMER, of California, challenged Mr. Foster's claim that "there is no precise detection threshold below which an evader could be sure of getting away with clandestine testing."

Secretary Rusk had told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the morning that the administration believes its detection capabilities are "better than can be fully disclosed."

Future Homebuilders Win Warm Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Miss Ethel Doennig of Chelsea, Okla., is one of the outstanding young Oklahomans who are in Washington at the present time on a trip sponsored by the Oklahoma Farmers Union.

This morning, the Oklahoma congressional delegation visited with Ethel and the other young Oklahomans who have won State recognition for their activities in the field of agriculture. My colleagues and I had the privilege of hearing Ethel deliver her State championship speech on the importance and the objectives of the Future Homemakers of America.

In an eloquent and impressive manner, Ethel related how organizations such as the Future Homemakers of America are building the leadership of tomorrow among our young people of today. At this time, it is a pleasure to insert into the RECORD the text of Ethel's prizewinning address.

The address follows:

HOW THE FHA PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

Twenty years or more ago the Farmers Union realized that the greatest resource for the survival of the family type farm was its young people. Always progressive and enterprising, in fostering better conditions and better communities for farm people, the Farmers Union, began to sponsor activities for youth groups such as the Future Homemakers of America, the FFA, the 4-H Clubs, and the Junior Farmers Union to promote good community living.

I proudly wear the beautiful emblem of the Future Homemakers of America, which symbolizes all that is good and fair in American home life such as truth, love, security, and faith and seeks to promote better community living for each individual member and her family.

Yes, we have learned well the example set by such great organizations as the Farmers Union and have accepted four objectives with five national projects for the period 1962-65.

Our first objective is to discover ourselves and our worth to others. We believe that we can make the greatest contribution in helping to improve personal, family, and community living by finding ways in which we can live life at its best. To do this, we are taught the value of integrity, the courage to stand firm in the face of adversity.

Of the divine traits, the ability to forgive is one of the best ways to improve personal and family living and to create rewarding experiences outside the home. The willingness to forgive and then turn at once to another's needs is spiritual life at its best.

In our personal development, our relationships with family members and our responsibilities to others in the community, loyalty to one's self and doing the best one knows are vitally important.

Our second objective is to contribute to the joys and satisfactions of family living. This includes the responsibilities of family members toward each other. It also includes the thought that marriage calls for preparation involving the advantages and disadvantages of early marriages.

Our third objective is to strengthen our education for future roles. The project for this objective is staying in school. Our education is a vital part of our existence. Learning goes on for one's whole lifetime, but the pattern of our personality is set early under the guidance of the home, the school and the church.

Our homes are vitally important in helping us to prepare for successful living outside the family. As part of our fourth objective, launching good citizenship through homemaking, we should stress concern for people outside our communities. As President Kennedy said, "Human brotherhood is not just a goal. It is a condition on which our way of life depends." If we are to accomplish our goals in life we must have the determination to work at them as long and as hard as necessary and the faith which will take us through times that seem hopeless.

The Future Homemakers of America, following the examples set by the Farmers Union gives us our foundation for future living. The purpose of life is not what you get out of it, but what you can give toward making your community a better place in which to live. Therefore, let us join the Farmers Union, in continuing to promote the family type farm and prepare our selves today for responsible community leadership tomorrow.

A Doctor's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from my longtime friend, Dr. Robert J. Moorhead of Yazoo City, Miss., relative to the undesirability of legislation which would finance medical care through the social security system. Because Dr. Moorhead presents many thoughtful ideas on this subject I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD. It follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1963.

Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS: Please pardon this few minutes intrusion on your valuable and limited time.

I am, indeed, proud to sincerely thank each Congressman who has steadfastly supported the continuance of the American system of free-enterprise medicine by opposing King-Anderson type legislation. I wish to present here sufficient fundamental and factual reasons in opposition to such legislation to win the support of those Congressmen who either are undecided or who are now supporting those bills and measures which as designed will intentionally or unintentionally alter and eventually destroy the free-enterprise system of the practice of medicine.

None of the American physicians who consistently oppose King-Anderson type legislation have been given the fairness of fact in any of the condemnatory press publicity gymnastics, since none has announced refusal to treat patients 65 and older. Instead, they have explicitly pledged themselves to continue to provide medical care for those who cannot pay for it, regardless of age. Those physicians have pledged not to participate in what they consider to be "self-destruction"—the King-Anderson type plans—where one individual would be forced, through the social security compulsory tax program, to help pay for his neighbor's medical care whether or not the neighbor could pay for it or, in fact, needed it. The proposal to pay medical expenses for the aged with Federal funds has only one meaning—it is a proposal to enslave the doctors. The action of the doctors was that which freemen have always taken to protect an advancing dictatorship: refusal to sanction, help, or participate in the growth of slavery.

The payment of medical expenses for the aged by the Federal Government does not justify the socialization of medicine. It is an historical fact that in all instances where financing of any segment of medical care has been placed under the Government's social security compulsory tax program, total socialization of all medical care for all people has inevitably followed. Here, the physician, the fee, the medication, the service, the hospital and the patient are all federally controlled by bureaucrats and other nonmedically trained personnel. This, of course, is medical slavery—for when the Government sets the terms, they are enforced by the police power of the State. The standard of the Government become the laws of the country and no others are legally permitted.

In considering King-Anderson-type bills or proposals to finance hospital and nursing home care for the aged out of the tax money collected through the Federal social security system, we have but to realize that once a King-Anderson-type bill is passed, the driving urge or "need for" more votes will start a political drive to eliminate the age limit. Then, the medical care cost for all—or nearly all—Americans will become the responsibility of the Federal Government. Now, then, could we escape that which has been inevitable with national compulsory health insurance programs in other countries; deteriorating caliber of medical standards; higher over-all expense; run-down facilities; overcrowding; a bureaucratic dehumanization of doctor-patient relationship; migration of our physicians to areas of freedom—if any should exist then—and, a decrease of high calibered students studying medicine?

There is no conflict between the interests of patient and the interest of doctors. The enslavement of the medical profession does not benefit the patients; it merely deprives them of doctors: the most dedicated, able and independent quit the profession or never enter it.

We Americans—and unquestionably American physicians—are well aware of the problem of need for medical care for a relatively small segment of our elderly population. There are excellent examples of honest, conscionable attempts to solve this need through implementation of the Kerr-Mills law; continuing alterations and new advances in voluntary health insurance plans to cover these older, less fortunate people; encouragement of activity in the first few echelons of responsibility (the family, the local community, the State); and, the expressed and exemplified interest of the physicians, without charge, to care for those who cannot pay. There is no need, nor excuse, for any American, young or old, under our present system, to go without medical care, if he only makes known such need.

A vote for King-Anderson type legislation, in my opinion, is a vote for medical regression, and a vote against such legislation is a vote for the continuance of American medicine as we know it, and the best and most progressive the world has ever known.

We, in competitive, American, free-enterprise medicine realize full well that our opponents can afford to lose time and time again in their effort to socialize American medicine and we can lose only once.

God grant that all U.S. Congressmen will give serious consideration to the facts of the case; the demonstrated, historical inevitability of such a socialistic program; and, will realize the anxious concern of American physicians—their physicians—over the possible deterioration of this absolutely essential profession, and will vote against the King-Anderson type bills and all similar measures seeking the same results.

Most sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. MOORHEAD, M.D.

Maynard, Mass., Post Office Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 the new modern post office at Maynard, Mass., was dedicated with an impressive and well-conducted program arranged by Postmaster Frank C. Sheridan.

Following is the text of the dedicatory address I delivered on this memorable occasion:

MAYNARD, MASS., POST OFFICE DEDICATION

It is a very happy privilege and honor for me to be here with you today for the dedication of this beautiful, new, modern post office for the town of Maynard, and it is a special pleasure indeed, to be introduced so graciously by my old and very dear friend, Postmaster Frank Sheridan who, since the year 1935, has so conspicuously, ably, and outstandingly served this great town as its postmaster.

The Maynard Post Office goes way back in the history of our country and was first established May 30, 1850, as the Assabet Post Office. The name was changed to Maynard Post Office May 8, 1871.

Frank Sheridan has some very illustrious predecessors, Amory Maynard, one of the founding fathers, Asahel Balcom, Lorenzo Maynard, John Harriman, Abel Haynes, Benjamin and Ernest Johnson, George Flood, William R. Hall, Arthur Walker, and then the very distinguished Arthur J. Coughlan who came along in 1915, later to be succeeded by Timothy Moynihan and William Stockwell, all most worthy predecessors.

I think Frank would be interested in knowing that the salary wasn't very attractive when the office was first started. The first year, for example, the annual salary was fixed at $61.78, out of total net proceeds of $82.89, and it was 1897 before the salary went up to $1,300.

But salary or no salary, these gentlemen all gave a good account of themselves for the Federal Government and for the town, and we are proud today to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to them, and to say to our good friend, Frank, that he has left an indelible imprint upon the history of Maynard for his fine, outstanding service and spirit of dedication.

The early postmasters, obviously, had to have some other income. Amory Maynard, one of Maynard's founders, owned the big mill right across from the Town House served as a boarding house for mill employees and was subsequently taken over by the town as a municipal building. That building was torn down and our beautiful new post office has been erected on its site.

Postmaster Balcom was a successful and prosperous farmer. John Harriman ran a laundry. Abel Haynes, the general store; Ernest Johnson, a drugstore; George Flood, a livery stable; Arthur Coughlan, a man of surpassing handsomeness and personality, as well as ability, was also a selectman, and a most popular figure in the town.

The Federal Government recognizes that Maynard is a great historic community tracing back to the proudest origins of our country; its loyal devoted people stand unsurpassed in the Nation, because through the years they have given practical demonstration, not only in war but in peace, of their peerless Americanism and high patriotic motives, their reliable, industrious, enterprising habits, and their willingness to exert their very best efforts for the common good and the national well-being.

It is particularly appropriate, therefore, that today in these exercises, the Federal Government should provide this splendid new edifice under the post office lease construction program with its modern appointments and facilities, manned by a talented, devoted postmaster and a rare staff of faithful, capable postal workers, than which no finer can be found in the entire land.

The architects, engineers, and builders have done their job with great skill, capacity, and effect.

These facilities are admirably located, are charming and well constructed, are practical and functional, and are set up in every way most efficiently to serve the people and the town of Maynard.

High ranking members of our great Post Office Department are here today and I am happy indeed to congratulate them, and all others who have had any part in making these striking new facilities a reality.

I realize that today one of Frank Sheridan's fondest dreams has come to pass, because he persisted in reaching this objective when only a few of us irresponsible enthusiasts were beating the bushes for this new post office.

Fortunately, in the end, by our joint efforts, we were able to impress the Post Office Department with the need and desirability for it, and the project was finally approved. So, my friends, here we are to hail the event and to express our gratitude and appreciation to all those who helped us so generously. Surely we are making history here on this spot.

There is one more duty that we must perform today and that is to render our humble thanks to the good Lord for having guided and sustained our loyal people and our great Nation in the ways of order, security, freedom and personal liberty.

The clamors and threats of communism and materialistic philosophies may be heard through the world, and at times, they may even be heard not far from our friendly shores and reverberating through our smiling skies.

But we can be secure and confident with one thought: that if we follow the example of the gallant patriotic men and women who preceded us and stand with the same steadfastness, the same high purpose and the same firm determination which they always showed, against the disturbances, unsettlements and dangers that press upon us from time to time, that we will find the ready and successful answer to the problems of present and future, grave though they may be; that by the common efforts and the great strength that only free men and women devoted to lofty, spiritual ideals may know, we are destined to preserve and enrich the freedoms we cherish and aid the whole world in finding the blessings of universal peace.

May this beautiful, new, post office facility stand here for many years to come to serve the people of Maynard and as eloquent testimony to our great, undying faith in our beloved country.

Public Housing Breeds Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the public housing advocates have been telling us for years that the answer to all the social problems of individuals and the way to eliminate crime is to foster more public housing at the taxpayers' expense. Unfortunately, the facts do not bear out this argument. The crime records in New York City prove that there is a greater incidence of major crime in public housing developments than in the city as a whole, including the slum areas.

The solution to the problem of crime does not lie in giving people something they have not earned and cannot appreciate. I believe that every citizen of this great Nation is entitled to the best food, clothing, and housing which he can earn for himself. I do not think it is a proper function of government to feed, clothe, and house the people. In adopting the principle that this is a proper function of government we have robbed too many of our people of decency and self-respect with the result that instead of improving the lives of our people we have seen an increase in immorality and crime, a breakdown of family life, and the setting in of a moral decay in our society which may well spell the end of free America.

The following article from Human Events sets forth some of the facts regarding crime in public housing developments in New York City. I recommend it for your serious consideration.

CRIME IN NEW YORK'S PUBLIC HOUSING

(By Stephen H. Marcus)

Thirty years ago, the liberals assigned to public housing the top priority position on their "most urgent" list and subjected the American public to an interminable propaganda campaign in its favor.

First—the New Dealers contended—slums were caused by certain glaring inefficiencies in the free enterprise system. Capitalism could not provide the laboring masses with housing of a decent standard and at a price comfortably within their means. Next, once the slum dweller was removed from the dismal squalor of ghetto life, and nestled in public housing, he would evince a natural positive response to his new environment.

With his family and himself shielded by the sturdy walls of public housing from the morals-decaying influences of the slums they could now lead richer, more productive lives—or so the New Dealers claimed.

Countless times the public was told, as the liberal New Republic editorially insisted in 1931, that "the * * * problem is to get rid of the dreary expanse of substandard housing * * * and to build new communities, so financed that even the lowest income groups will be able to afford them. * * * The objective cannot be achieved by building only four walls and a roof; it is a matter of obtaining at the same time fresh air, sunlight, playgrounds, and gardens. * * *"

There is public housing, the New Republic curtly promised, or a revolution.

The tenets of the public housing gospel received judicial support. Said a New York court decision in the mid-thirties: "The public evils, social and economic, of such slum conditions are unquestioned and unquestionable. Slum areas are the breeding places of disease which take toll not only from denizens, but by spread, from the inhabitants of the entire city and State. Juvenile delinquency, crime, and immorality are there born, find protection and flourish."

Submitting to the voluminous liberal propaganda of the day, New York City, in 1935, embarked on the Nation's first public housing program.

The lush promises of the liberals clamoring for public housing during the New Deal have not, however, materialized—even after 27 years of public housing experiments in New York City. As a crime preventive, socialistic housing has shown itself to be an unmitigated failure. Rather than reducing crime, public housing has become its monumental festering place.

Today, public housing is the anticipated, and almost daily, stage for murders, rapes, muggings, and thievery. Indeed, in the houses the number of "crimes against persons," for instance, soars away above the city's crime rate. Homicide in the housing projects occurs 50 percent more frequently per 100,000 residents than in the city as a whole. It is evident that the public housing crime rate also boosts the city's figures, so that crime frequency in the city, excluding the housing projects, would be lower than statistics reveal and thus the housing crime rate would be relatively higher.

That public housing is a hopeless disappointment as a crime deterrent cannot be denied. Yet New Yorkers are so deeply imbued with liberal dogma that possible objectors to housing proposals are exhaustingly reluctant to offer their opinions for fear of public censure.

A few months ago the New York Journal-American published an exposure of the ubiquitous crime and delinquency in the city's public housing projects. The paper's crusade included an exposé of housing conditions—in itself a worthwhile endeavor—but failed to remind its audience of the assurances fed them by starry-eyed reformers during the New Deal, and instead confined itself to making a lame plea for added police protection in the houses.

Between July 15 and August 14 of last year, disclosed the Journal-American, 131 assaults were made upon tenants and passers-by in the projects. One housing project, the paper said, reported 12 rapes in the first half of 1962. Murders occur in the projects on the average of two a month, and the average for all arrests is more than 200 a month. Residents of the General Grant Houses, the Journal divulged, were registering 10 complaints a day.

Interestingly enough, the paper explained that the available figures, gruesome as they are, are actually grossly understated because victims living in the houses are silenced by fear of reprisals; most crimes go unreported. After the recent rape and slaying of a young girl in the city's Manhattanville project, for example, the police announced that 30 rapes had gone unreported by the projects frightened tenants.

Another reason for inadvertent distortion is the lack of a sizable housing police force. In 1960, for instance, 29 arrests were made at the Baruch Houses, also in Manhattan. Yet the next year this figure skyrocketed nearly 500 percent to 139 arrests because of the increase of police officers guarding the project in mid-1961.

The Journal-American blamed the housing authority—the city agency which administers to the needs of the houses—for concealing the true crime figures and continually suppressing adverse publicity. An anonymous housing authority police officer, one of the men employed to guard the public housing developments, complained to the Journal: "The authority is doing everything possible to minimize the real situation. Its basic policy is to ignore or cover up the crime as bad publicity.

"When we make an arrest we get bawled out for hurting the project. We are discouraged from even reporting anything but the most serious complaints. We are forbidden to make any investigation.

"The morale of the housing police is in a terrible condition. The only time a man gets congratulated is when he stops vandalism. Otherwise, we're supposed to sweep everything under the rug."

After commendable reporting of housing conditions, the Journal-American finally asserted that the supposedly inadequate size of the housing authority police force was the root cause of the appalling crime rate of the projects. The paper argued that the entire housing authority police force consists of 605 men or 134 police officers for every 100,000 project tenants. Considering that each man works only an 8-hour day, there are only 200 policemen or 1 for every 2,500 persons living in public housing.

But the facts show that the New York City Police force totals barely 23,000 men, who must guard the lives and property of close to 9 million—including those who live in public housing projects. The special police assigned to the projects are additionally employed because of the extra danger there. There are, therefore, 133 policemen for every 100,000 New Yorkers.

In short, proportionately a slightly larger force guards the public housing developments than the city as a whole, but the projects register a 50 percent greater homicide rate.

The series aroused so much public feeling that New York Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Jr.—ironically, the son of one of the earliest and most vocal proponents of public housing—ordered an additional 100 men to fill the ranks of the housing authority police force at a yearly cost of $530,000. And finally after the recent brutal rape and murder of a 12-year-old girl in her parents' project apartment in West Harlem in Manhattan, the mayor authorized an added 200 men—hired from a private protective agency—to serve as an auxiliary housing police force.

What New York's politician mayor and the Journal-American conveniently failed to tell the public were some distasteful but salient facts about life in the city's housing projects—facts demonstrating conclusively that public housing is nothing but an abject failure.

Not once, for instance, did the Journal ever identify precisely those persons arrested for perpetrating crime in the projects. Their identities were left unrevealed in the hope that the public would assign the crimes to transient vagrants and hoodlums. But according to a confidential report issued by Irving Wise, the director of management of the houses, most of the persons apprehended for criminal behavior on project grounds are project tenants. These are the same people awarded the lavish privilege of residing in a $15,000 apartment with extras: tree-lined malls and playgrounds, all provided by taxpayers' money.

The report states that project residents are responsible for all murders, more than 80 percent of all sex offenses and 70 percent of all thefts.

Project corridors and elevators reek with urine deposited by tenants.

Despite all these facts, public housing has a seemingly long and untroubled future in New York. One hundred and five projects stand today, built at a cost of $1.5 billion. Now in planning or construction are 50 more, raising New Yorkers' investment in public housing by another one-half billion.

Two billion dollars of their money has been taken. They have been taken.

Federal Aid Will Not Keep Teachers From Quitting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, American education faces problems, but is education doing everything it can to correct its problems? A teacher's life is often made unattractive and miserable by thoughtless and petty citizens.

Many teachers of the highest caliber will be needed in the years ahead. But for 125,000 teachers, or 1 in every 12, this year will be their last, according to an article in Life, "How We Drive Teachers To Quit."

Federal aid to education will not provide a cure from selfish or doting parents, from those who hold teaching and learning in low regard, and from an incompetent educational bureaucracy.

Federal aid dollars would likely spawn more of the bureaucracy of mediocrity in education, and cause more local neglect of schools where local constructive contribution is needed.

"They cannot take the system and you cannot blame them" states this excellent article, excerpts from which are given here:

HOW WE DRIVE TEACHERS TO QUIT

(By Richard Meryman)

For approximately 125,000 teachers, 1 in every 12 now working in our public schools, this will be their last year in the profession. Probably a third of them will be the best teachers, the best minds, the ones best able to ignite and fan the enthusiasm of their students.

Many will be retiring or leaving for marriage and a family. But too many will quit permanently because they are fed up. Their ambition and self-respect will take them into business or other professions. They will, of course, leave behind a hard core of excellent, dedicated teachers who remain the heart of U.S. education. But they also leave behind an increasing proportion of tired timeservers.

To replace the 125,000 who left last year, only 106,000 college graduates entered the teaching profession. This year 30,000 additional teachers were needed to relieve teaching loads in overcrowded classrooms.

While the well-publicized low pay in public schools helps drive out top teachers, there is another less known but deeply important factor. Teachers leave the profession because their satisfaction and enthusiasm have been finally suffocated by what can be called the system.

Interviews with ex-teachers across the country, who freely discussed why they quit, brought a startling chorus of blame addressed to the system. By the teachers' definition, the system consists of: (1) know-nothing school boards; (2) insecure, inadequate principals; (3) doting parents; (4) rebellious or apathetic children, and (5) poorly trained teachers drawn from the bottom of the college-educated group. The system produces not explosive, dramatic incidents but a succession of frustrations, of petty worries, an accumulation of angers that go far beyond normal griping. The idealistic young teacher who hopes to be stimulated by his working environment finds instead that his intelligence is repeatedly

insulted. The repetition of incidents similar to the following is the cause of the querulous attitude of many teachers and ex-teachers:

An assistant principal in Cleveland, Ohio said to an elementary teacher who was planning to introduce a little French, "They don't need a language. Everyone speaks English all over the world. I just spent 2 weeks in Haiti without any French."

"The kind of people you most want to hang on to are often the ones you lose," says Sterling McMurrin, the U.S. Commissioner of Education who recently resigned to return to his position on the University of Utah faculty. "Many first-rate individuals go into teaching, but they aren't treated as people with enormous talent, great skill, training and education."

Virtually all teachers basically enjoy teaching and want to excel at their jobs. Many who teach the Nation's thousands of well-run, well-staffed schools really do enjoy it (and excel at it) for years. But the simple truth is that the profession's appeal does not endure long enough for enough teachers.

The average continuous teaching career in U.S. public schools lasts only 5 years. A survey of a class from the University of Illinois College of Education showed that 30 percent quit after teaching 2 years, and that 40 percent did not go into teaching at all, despite their certification. In Utah 2 years ago, 1,044 (12 percent of the total) teachers left their jobs. A survey to determine who quit and why showed that one-third of these teachers were rated "very good" and 14 percent excellent. The reasons most frequently cited for leaving by excellent teachers were working conditions.

Teachers who are openly critical of the system maintain that the local school board does best by its teachers when it has the least to do with them. However, instead of sticking to broad policy and pushing for better education, school boards too often yield to temptation and constantly look over the shoulders of the professional educators.

The problem, many teachers feel, frequently stems from the type of individual who seeks a position on the school board. Most school board members are elected—and campaigns cost money. The financial support sometimes comes from a special interest group; when the position's prestige can be a valuable asset, the candidate himself may foot the bill. The board often ends up with a strong and determined representation of successful businessmen—"the butcher, baker, and candlestick maker," as an ex-teacher described them.

They regard as troublemakers educators and laymen who are movers and shakers, who fight a running battle for higher standards in the schools and the money to pay for them.

Such school boards tend to hire the second element in the system: principals and their assistants whom teachers find more concerned with pleasing the school boards and individual parents than with helping and supporting their staffs.

No one has more control over the school climate than the principal. Yet the principal who lowers teacher morale by relying on petty discipline is not uncommon in the land.

A Long Island, N.Y., principal frequently got on the public address system, piped into every classroom where the children could hear it, and ranted at his teachers for not obeying his rules. A group of teachers there bitterly called themselves "The Incapable Fools Club."

In a Los Angeles elementary school a supervisor from the department of education appeared with a little black book, measured the placing of the bulletin board and announced to the incensed teacher that it was 2 inches too high off the floor.

Through lack of imagination or simply lack of administrative help—the principal passes on to the teacher a series of petty chores that cut deeply into classtime. Teachers find themselves serving as penny-ante bankers who collect milk money, cracker money, cafeteria money, savings bank money, contributions to various charities, student organization dues. They are asked to sell tickets for athletic events, yearbooks, school emblems, class pins, even accident insurance. Then of course there are the teachers' traditional "extra" duties: supervising after-school activities of the pupils, attending faculty meetings and PTA meetings. In all, according to a research report from the National Association of Secondary School Principals, nearly one-fifth of a teacher's day—and his energy and ingenuity—is spent at jobs which could be performed by non-professionals or by automated devices.

But the most demeaning duty which administrators ask of teachers is the role of policeman. A young lady who quit a New York City high school to become a magazine reporter gave this description of the humiliation involved: "Things begin to wear on you, and you take a hard look at where you are and then have to decide whether you want to go through the various garbage disposal assignments for 30 years to make a career out of teaching. Garbage disposal assignments are the hall jobs and cafeteria jobs and watchdog jobs a teacher has to take.

"Hall patrol duties are usually bad because you have to keep outsiders out of the school and the kids inside. Neither is easy. And you get involved in going into student restrooms and throwing out the smokers. None of this has much to do with teaching, nor does it leave you the kind of dignity or capacity for friendship with the kids a teacher needs."

Some principals measure classroom success in ways that encourage overextended teachers to shortchange their pupils. The quiet classroom—a principal's delight—can mean that children are doing undemanding makework at their desks, or it may mean they are ritualistically covering prescribed ground for a weekly test. "Low test grades reflect on the teachers, not the class," said a current Los Angeles teacher. "The (system's) big emphasis, therefore, is on the tests, not on what the teacher could explore beyond the textbooks. Many times the kids ask, 'Are we responsible for this on the test?' I see red every time that happens."

An English teacher in San Francisco who quit to go into textbook publishing said, "The ones who just sit in the jobs rise to positions of eminence. But those teachers most dedicated to the students, the ones with lofty ideals, often wind up in hot water. They're accused of giving too much homework, expecting too much of their students."

Parents who add to the teacher's burden by meddling, complaining and making special requests are a powerful part of the system. Much of the parental interference in the classroom is done with the best intentions but it nevertheless reduces the teacher's chances of personal fulfillment—and sometimes upsets the course of education.

In one Texas school which pursued a program of "homogeneous grouping," children of roughly equal performance were put together in the same class. Though the practice is frequently controversial, the teachers there found that it improved their effectiveness. A minority of the parents, including several with influence whose children were assigned to slow classes, raised a furor. This year the system was abandoned. "You can't blame a guy for not chopping his own head off," said the principal in defense of his surrender. "Besides, any program the parents are not really for just isn't going to work. You'd surprised. When the parents are dissatisfied, the dissatisfaction goes into the children, who hear the gripes of the parents at home."

Teachers get nasty notes asking that their child's grades be reconsidered. Some parents even appeal to the board of education, claiming that the grades reflect the teaching, not the child.

"Schools are an emotional outlet for parents' anxieties, a natural scapegoat," said a Los Angeles assistant principal. "Parents are supposed to be interested, so everybody thinks he has a legitimate right to criticize.

"The unhappy parents keep at you, needling day after day. The administrators have to cater to the public. Their very security depends on a happy community. As a result, schools are being ruined because they're run 90 percent by public relations."

Almost all teachers work under the shadow of censorship. A teacher in Arizona who later quit to join a college faculty, explained to her class that Communists, however misguided, act from the premise that what they do is right, not evil. One of her pupils went home and gave a garbled report of her statement. The boy's uncle, who was president of the board of education, heard about it.

"It was discussed at the board meeting," the teacher said. "The interpretation was that I was teaching my pupils that communism is good—me a Roman Catholic educated by Jesuits and a registered Republican. My case was scheduled to come up formally before the board of education. While all this was happening, nobody spoke to me. An old friend finally stepped in and settled the situation, but it could have been messy. There was no respect for my integrity. I was sucecssfully challenged in my own classroom by a child who misquoted me."

Today the community provides the teacher with very little prestige and sometimes actually goes out of its way to make him feel hapless. Townspeople telephoned one Connecticut man—who finally quit teaching—and offered him baby sitting jobs. "When I refused," he said, "and maybe my voice showed something, some of the callers actually told me, 'Oh, I thought all teachers did it.' "

In one Detroit school humiliated teachers reported they must go down to the basement boilerroom to smoke. They are not permitted to smoke within sight of the pupils, and the boilerroom is the only place available to them.

In most U.S. communities today the most popular measure of prestige is income. Only 2 percent of all teachers make $7,000 and over, and the average income which communities pay beginning teachers is $4,100.

A Harvard University report described one inevitable result of the relatively poor pay levels in the teaching profession with these words: "they (teachers) live on the fringes of the middle class. But they cannot afford to indulge in the tastes of their peers. * * * They—and their wives and children—make admirable sacrifices. But in doing so, they confirm society's impression of a lowly group, not quite first class and deserving of no better than the hand-me-downs of our civilization."

However, despite the widespread lack of palpable prestige and their feelings of harassment by school boards, by administrators, and by parents, teachers still reach for the unique professional satisfaction that comes behind the closed classroom door. There, with whatever talent and energy they possess, they harvest the real rewards of teaching.

A former high school teacher, who moved up to a college where she could teach "without restraints on myself as a human being," said: "The most joyous moment is when sparks start flying and something comes clear, a meaning the students hadn't thought of in terms of their own lives. This is the most exciting thing that can happen in education—to have a child ask a probing or new question about tough material or surprise

you with a thoughtful answer. You hear from them years later and learn they have continued their interest, and then you know you led them into something they had to have to live."

But the pupils, who supply the teacher with his greatest rewards, are also the fourth factor in the system—one that is inevitably linked to the factor of parents. Many classrooms are being turned into virtual outpatient clinics, where all adolescent problems are supposed to be handled.

A Chicago suburban elementary schoolteacher said of her charges: "They're just like babies. The parents indulge them, let them talk back, then come to school and say, 'We can't handle them.' But the parents expect us to."

Many children return home after school to an empty house. The mother is gone—holding a job to help boost family income. A high school teacher in Chicago reported that some boys in his classes work as much as 6 hours a day after school, often to earn the down payment and installment money for an automobile of their own. Sometimes, when they cannot keep up on the payments, they drop out of school to take a full-time job rather than lose their investment. So the teacher is frequently confronted by children who largely look after themselves.

"Such a child," said this teacher, "may be malnourished, tired emotionally upset from lack of care—and has small patience for any sustained mental or physical activity—or for even staying in one place."

While established teachers are frequently rewarded with advanced classes, new potentially top teachers, fresh from college theory courses are often thrust in front of dull, bored, even belligerent students.

One young woman, bitter and disillusioned, quit teaching after 1 year in a Long Island, N.Y., school. She had five classes of students with median I.Q.'s in the eighties. "Some boys would come into the room yelling," she said, "and then the other kids would yell and get up out of the seats and form into groups. I went home sick every night for months. I lost all sympathy for those kids and I really didn't care a thing about them. I wanted them quiet and I got them quiet."

Under such circumstances it is easy for the emphasis on discipline to overwhelm that on instruction. "You're not supposed to teach kids to think, but to be robots," said another ex-teacher. "Teachers become obsessed with details like keeping a line of children straight at all costs. No talking. No running. Nothing positive, all negative. At their desks the children at my school were supposed to sit with their hands folded and their eyes trained on you.

"The answer? Get teachers who are flexible. But where are they, and why would they want to enter such a life?"

Finally, the system itself circles viciously and tends to lower the overall quality of instruction as the best teachers leave. Faced with the mediocrity of their colleagues, the more scholarly, idealistic teachers feel unhappily isolated.

Dr. Salomon Rettig, a psychologist who conducted a series of interviews with teachers in Ohio, said, "I was very glad to get away." The teachers, he found, were choked, had no freedom of expression. They were not being stimulated nor were they stimulating others. "They are a highly selected kind of person," Dr. Rettig said, "compared to other professional people: a highly intelligent person on one hand, and on the other hand one who doesn't mind being told by rules, parents, supervisors what he or she can and can't do.

"And the teacher thinks he is disliked, that nobody cares about him really. You would expect their sense of restriction to be transmitted to the children. I'll bet 100 to 1 there is no genuine freedom of expression in their classrooms."

At the University of Chicago three sociologists tested a group of women teachers with an average of 10 years' experience. The group showed no drives at all to accomplish demanding tasks, to do things better than other people, to analyze themselves and others, or to show sympathy toward any person in trouble.

These sociologists arrived at two conclusions in explaining why the traditional public image of the old-maidish male or female schoolteacher often fits. First, individuals are gradually pressed into the typical teacher mold by the sheer weight of the system. But secondly, and crucially important, colleges of education throughout the United States attract a kind of person psychologically precast to fit the mold—undemanding and noncompetitive. Unfortunately, colleges of education tend to become havens for students who are well down in the academic barrel.

Also the education of elementary schoolteachers can be so humiliating, especially for a man, that the highly intelligent, strongly motivated candidate may not submit. An ex-elementary teacher in Los Angeles, who finally broke away from the classroom to become a lawyer, was trained on the theory that to learn to teach little children one must do as little children do. He and his classmates in one education course played children's games and did second-grade dances singing, "Little Dutch Nina Goes Dancing Away."

Low-level students who attend low-standard colleges usually end up as inferior teachers. By way of illustration, take the subject of English. A recent study showed that half the individuals teaching high school and junior high English in the United States today did not major in English at college.

In one Northern State, less than half of the 315 teachers who gave courses in world history had studied modern European history, and less than 10 percent of them had studied Far Eastern history. (Twenty percent of the social science teachers majored in physical education.)

There are, of course, teachers who overcome the handicaps of inadequate training and develop into first-rate educators.

One such teacher was recalled by a former pupil: "I remember," he said, "I once handed her a poem I had written and she said, 'This is beautiful.' It was dirty and smudged and misspelled, too, but to her it was beautiful. I melted. She invited me and two other boys in class to her room to read T. S. Eliot to us.

"I went back to see her a few years ago, to see what her magic was, and there was no magic. She seemed pedestrian and dull, or maybe just old. But she had been magic to us. And on her shelves she has volumes written by her old students."

What can be done to beat the system and keep good teachers at their jobs? "All of us have to get together to find the way," said a Californian. "We have to risk self-examination, risk close scrutiny, risk reprisals against those doing their best to correct the mess. Maybe if we get stronger people, they may be able to defend themselves, be able to speak out, become part of the system and change it."

Why Johnny Can't Get a Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker we are all aware of the unemployment problems of our Nation. We are told on good authority that as of this date there are a million youth out of school and out of work. The January 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest carries an interesting story on the subject "Why Johnny Can't Get a Job." The article was written by Lester Velie.

The article points up the great need for expanding vocational and technical education programs in the public schools of our Nation. In 1958 I introduced as a part of the National Defense Education Act a measure to greatly strengthen vocational and technical education in our Nation. This program has been of great value to the people and to our Nation. I think we would all agree that the program authorized under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act was too small to meet our Nation's needs.

Though I am in general agreement with the statements contained in the Reader's Digest article, it does make statements regarding existing laws with which I do not agree. It mentions one of the present acts which was enacted 45 years ago and states that it is "geared to the needs of Woodrow Wilson's day." In talking to my many vocational friends I am told that there is nothing wrong with this law except that it does not provide enough money to do the job that must be done. We are not teaching too much about home economics in our schools nor about agriculture. In fact the program is inadequate. What we need is to greatly expand all programs in keeping with employment needs of today.

The Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education appointed at the request of President Kennedy in its report that has just been released clearly shows that there is nothing wrong with our present program of vocational education but that it greatly needs expansion.

The Reader's Digest article follows:

WHY JOHNNY CAN'T GET A JOB

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—One out of every five boys between the ages of 16 and 19 who looks for work fails to find it. Yet thousands of highly paid jobs are going begging. There is an answer to the problem.)

(By Lester Velie)

As a world capital, New York City needs an army of butchers and bakers and cheeseblintze makers to keep its hotels, restaurants and ocean liners going. And so, when the agitated ship-line man broached the case of the vanishing garde-manger, I reached for my notebook.

"He's the cook who prepares hors d'oeuvres and buffet tables. We pay him $10,000 a year—plus all he can eat. But try and hire one. And try and hire a $7,500-a-year saucier, or any other skilled kitchen or dining room help."

Curious as to what other high-priced jobs might be going begging in New York City, I checked further. A meat wholesaler produced a payroll swollen with overtime due to labor scarcity. One of his butchers was earning $11,000 a year, others $10,000. One 21-year-old youth, just 3 years out of high school, was already earning $8,400 yearly.

Nor is the dearth of skilled men limited to the food trades. Furniture manufacturers, short of cabinet makers, are importing them from Europe. New York State Employment Service executives report that jobs go unfilled in 61 skilled trades—from glass

blowers to printers, from cheesemakers and boilermakers to TV repairmen.

In Chicago, an auto-mechanics union official said to me, "An auto body man can earn up to $10,000 a year—but my local can't supply the need." Detroit badly needs tailors and machinists. Philadelphia needs sheet-metal workers, electricians and sewing-machine operators. Many cities lack shoe repairmen, sales clerks, typists, turret lathe operators—not to mention such specialists as dietitians, pharmacists, medical-laboratory technicians.

Here is a curious national problem. So acute are shortages of skilled workers today that businesses are threatened. (For lack of that gardemanger and other kitchen mechanics, U.S. ocean-passenger business may well be lost to foreign lines.) At the same time, unemployment—particularly among the young—keeps rising implacably.

Why? Consider some of the new forces at work.

Last year, approximately a million teenagers ended their schooling and looked for work. Not long ago, these youths could be absorbed in industry or on the farm. But galloping automation has wiped out 2 million blue-collar jobs in the last 5 years. (In farming alone, 800,000 jobs have vanished since 1957.) True, automation has created 3,500,000 new jobs in service industries—in stores, garages, banks, real-estate offices. But these jobs require training. And so many of our young people lack the needed training that 1 boy out of every 5 between 16 and 19 fails to land a job. Automation, then, like a huge searchlight, makes painfully visible a giant flaw in our educational system: our schools are flunking the job of preparing our young for the workaday world.

The reporter who looks for the reason promptly bumps into an Alice-in-Wonderland situation.

Only 5 of every 100 children who start school go on to win a college diploma. Yet virtually all teaching aims at the academic needs of this minority. The job needs of the majority who will drop out or won't go beyond high school are largely neglected. Only 4 percent of all public-school funds are spent on vocational training—less than 1 percent in some cities, such as Philadelphia and Kansas City, Mo. So gloomy are the findings of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education that its staff director, Dr. Chester Swanson, describes the need for reform as "the biggest problem facing American education today."

Look at the way New York City meets its urgent need for butchers and bakers. "You must go see our Food Trades High School to believe it," a meat wholesaler urged.

I found this institution housed in a 90-year-old abandoned elementary school in mid-Manhattan. Inside, some 100 pupils were learning to bake bread and pastry, to slice up a side of beef and to cook a short-order meal. A bakery instructor described teaching conditions: "We have some 40 boys to a baking class, but only four knives for shaping dough."

Were the knives expensive?

"No, they cost only $5 apiece, but there isn't any money in the appropriation," the teacher said.

There were other problems in the ancient school. The ovens, long obsolete, had no precise temperature control. Students had to bake bread without the steam needed to keep it moist, since the school lacked steam boilers. So the future bakers would not know how to bake under industry conditions until they went into the trade. For lack of space, ovens were crowded in corners and against walls, where it was both inconvenient and dangerous to use them. The cafeteria, where the boys learned food handling, had no steam tables. Since there was no space for academic classes, students trekked daily to another building some 2 miles away.

Naturally, the school had trouble attracting bright students—and about 40 percent of those who entered dropped out before graduation. Only 72 apprentice bakers, butchers and cooks were graduated last June.

The Food Trades School is not an exceptional case. Most of New York City's vocational schools are so dilapidated that it would take, I was told, 10 or 15 years of construction to replace them. Other big cities provide similar examples of vocational education's low estate. Of Chicago's eight vocational schools, only one was built for the purpose. The others are converted old elementary schools. The city's Commercial High School is jammed into a 96-year-old structure. In Kansas City, Mo., the lone, 1890-vintage vocational school is located in the town's worst slum, and so repels students that enrollment has dropped 60 percent in recent years.

Vocational education also has trouble attracting qualified teachers. For years, local teachers' associations refused to accept vocational instructors as members. Teaching a boy to repair a car or to work with sheet metal did not fit the academic concept of the calling.

And there is the pay. An educator who has headed three school systems points out, "If you want to hire a bricklaying teacher, you have to compete with a contractor." This educator has never been able to hire a bricklaying teacher.

Chicago could use several hundred more vocational instructors. A full-time recruiter scours industry for them—but he might as well be recruiting for Casey Stengel's Mets.

Attracting capable and motivated students is just as difficult. Status-minded parents steer many students elsewhere. Too often the vocational school is regarded as a kind of educational purgatory where school-system failures and problem children are sent to do penance.

Even when vocational-high school principals win the right to screen applicants for admission, the choice among candidates is so narrow that performance is frequently unimpressive. At New York's new Aviation High School, for example, 44 percent of the students leave before graduation, and of the remainder so few master the aviation mechanic's trade that only 1 of every 7 is recommended for the Federal Civil Aeronautics Board licensing examination.

It is time to ask ourselves: What is public education for? Dr. James Conant, the educator-statesman, urges this answer: The educational experience of youth must be tailored to fit his need for his life's work. "There should be a smooth transition from full-time schooling to a full-time job, whether that transition be after grade 10, or after graduation from high school or college," says Dr. Conant.

Significantly, those relatively few communities which have faced up to the educational needs of the majority who will not go beyond high school have followed the line of Dr. Conant's answer. In Milwaukee, under a State law passed a half century ago, vocational education has been raised to first-class citizenship by being taken out of the hands of regular school administrators and given to independent vocational-education boards with tax powers to raise their own funds. Milwaukee's independent board consists of two industrialists and two labor leaders. The city's school superintendent sits in as an ex-officio member, and has a vote. The results can be seen in Milwaukee's central vocational school—the biggest institution of its kind in the country and a world showpiece as well. Last year, some 180 teams of observers, 70 from abroad, came to study the school.

In contrast with Philadelphia, say, which spends but $280,000 on vocational training yearly, Milwaukee—with one third the population of Philadelphia—spends 17 times as much: $4,800,000. With this kind of financial support, Milwaukee's Central Vocational School gave job training last year to 18,000 high-school students, apprentices and adults. A close working arrangement with industry keeps the school abreast of the city's job needs and of changes in technology.

Thanks to the skilled workers supplied by its vocational system, Milwaukee has become the "Machine Shop of America." And there is an additional dividend; when a non-academic-minded student gets job training that he can relate to his earning needs later, he remains in school. In contrast with the country's high-school dropout rate of 40 percent, Milwaukee's dropout rate is only 5.5 percent, the lowest of any big city.

Allentown, Pa., another bellwether town in vocational education, goes a step further than Milwaukee. It ties schoolwork to on-the-job training in industry.

To begin with, Allentown's school administrators find out if a high-school student intends to go on to college. If not, a guidance counselor discusses a vocation with the boy and his parents. On choosing one of 13 trades that range from cabinet-making and auto-engine work to TV repair and plumbing, the boy submits to aptitude tests. If the results are encouraging, he takes 2 years of shopwork in his trade plus regular academic work. In his senior year, high-school counselors—cooperating closely with industry—place the boy in a part-time job in a garage or factory or with a building contractor. He then divides his time between class and job: 3 weeks in one, 3 in the other.

Allentown's work-study program solves key vocational-education problems. The student learns to work with modern tools and equipment that his school might not be able to afford. He learns how to get along with adults. He works for pay with a skilled supervisor. Most important, he has something to work for: the job that will await him on graduation.

Allentown's work-study concept is gaining acceptance elsewhere, particularly in the South. But it will need help from educators, industry and unions to take hold. For one thing, many school administrators frown on programs that take students outside the school. For another, most big corporate employers arbitrarily bar jobs to those under 21. In Allentown, school officials have had to place their work-study students mostly with small manufacturers, with garages and with nonunion building contractors. (Most building-trade unions feel that work-study programs undermine their control and restriction of apprentice training.)

If our communities are to meet the job-training challenge, an overhaul of Federal Government practice is needed, too. The Federal Government is providing (in fiscal 1963) $56,650,000 in allotments to States for use in public school vocational education. As a rule, the States more or less match the Federal contribution. Since the Federal law is 45 years old, the way the aid is apportioned is geared to the needs of Woodrow Wilson's day.

Under the law, Federal money is doled out in seven categories in specified proportions. For example, more money is spent to teach girls to cook and sew than to teach boys how to work in industry. Also, about one third of all available vocational education funds (Federal, State, and local) go to training farmers, although farmers now constitute but 6 percent of the labor force. Meanwhile, less than 5 percent goes to training young people for sales work—where many job opportunities exist.

Significantly, those communities that lead the way in vocational education disregard the Federal pattern and rely on their own resources. The most important task the President's Panel on Vocational Education could achieve would be to convince Congress to cut the restrictive strings on its vocational aid to States and let all communities spend the money as job needs dictate.

The Presidential Panel could also urge Congress to broaden Federal assistance to the new area vocational-technical school which cuts across school-district boundaries and so permits funds to go further. National Defense Education funds for such schools have already spurred Georgia, for example, to build 6 new area vocational-technical schools and to schedule another 20 for early construction. Connecticut has built 14 new area vocational-technical schools, and other States are making similar plans.

The lopsided picture of jobs begging for men while men beg for jobs suggests that something must be done to bring the two together. That something must be a new kind of schooling for today's needs.

Prof. Samuel Williston, Teacher and Lawgiver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the entire legal and academic world was deeply saddened by recent news of the passing at the age of 101, of Prof. Emeritus Samuel Williston of Harvard University.

Professor Williston was one of the greatest law teachers and writers of our time. The list of his authorship of legal books, tracts, and law review articles is truly prodigious and constitutes a striking and enduring contribution in his special field of contracts and sales that has never been equaled in history.

I would venture to suggest that the law does not know such painstaking research, brilliant scholarship, and penetrating analysis such as typified his great work in several volumes on the subject of contracts. This work is probably the greatest of its kind that has ever been written.

Any effort I might make to describe and evaluate Professor Williston's life work and great contribution would be feeble indeed. Truly, he was a giant in his field, standing out as the unchallenged leader of the authorities on contracts and sales of his time.

His influence in clarifying, shaping, codifying, and simplifying the law in several vital fields was, in truth, a phenomenal achievement that has left an indelible imprint upon legal and judicial institutions in this country and the world.

Great, impressive, gifted, effective teacher that he was, as several generations of Harvard Law School men will testify, his epochal work was by no means confined to the classroom, the library, or the law school lecture room. Every law office, every judge's chamber, State legislatures, and the Congress were invaluably aided by his authoritative writings on the law.

His influence was felt particularly and in a monumental way, so to speak, in the restatement of the law on contracts and sales and related subjects, and in State legislatures which he invaluably served in preparing original drafts on several uniform laws on sales, warehouse receipts, liens, freight handlers and others. The range and variety of his scholarly works can be readily seen from the following partial listing of his books:

"Cases on Engineering Contracts"; selection of cases from "Cases on the Law of Contracts," edited by Samuel Williston, arranged by Bruce Wyman. Brown and Co., 1904.

"Commercial and Banking Law," prepared for the American Institute of Banking.

"Commercial Law," prepared for the American Institute of Banking.

Draft of an act relating to the sale of goods.

"The Law Governing Sales of Goods at Common Law and Under the Uniform Sales Act."

"The Law of Contracts."

Lectures on business law and the negotiable instruments law.

"Life and Law"; an autobiography.

"Negotiable Instruments."

"Selected Cases and Statutes on the Law of Bankruptcy."

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," by Samuel Williston, prepared for use as a textbook in Harvard Law School.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," edited and annotated.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," revised and annotated.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Sales," by Samuel Williston and William E. McCurdy.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Sales of Personal Property."

"Some Modern Tendencies in the Law."

"A Treatise on the Law of Contracts."

"The Uniform Partnership Act," with some remarks on other Uniform Commercial Laws.

"The Law Governing Sales of Goods at Common Law and under the Uniform Sales Act."

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts."

Many of these words have gone into several revised editions. This brief listing by no means covers all of Professor Williston's writings. His law review articles alone would cover a period of some 60 years and many pages of bibliography.

It would be impossible for anyone to measure precisely or adequately his memorable service to the great university where he taught for so many years, to his many students who were always the sincere, compelling object of his concern and most solicitous attention, the courts of justice, the great legal profession and innumerable public causes of magnitude and importance to which he gave so willingly and unselfishly of his superb talents and untiring efforts.

We may well say of his passing that a giant oak has fallen in the forests of humanity and its reverberations are heard in many places in the world where the rule of law is treasured.

Teacher, savant, author and public servant, Professor Williston's example of dedicated devotion to his great tasks will long shine out in the world of pure scholarship, law, and jurisprudence, beaming his learning, wisdom and high ideals for the enlightenment and advancement of man across the dark barriers of skepticism and doubt.

Of his personal qualities, his modesty, humility, generosity of impulse, and concern for his colleagues and friends, much could be said; for the greatness and fame of his achievements never swerved him from his personal loyalties or the many warm human attachments he enjoyed during his long, useful life. In the best sense, he was an illustrious American and a great human being.

It may also be appropriately said that his loss is truly irreparable, not alone for the dear ones who survive him, but for his great university, for the world of juridicial letters, and for the many fine causes he so devotedly served.

I tender my most heartfelt sympathy to his family, his close friends, his academic colleagues, and his school. The memory of Samuel Williston will long remain green with those who knew and esteemed him.

Down the long, unbroken channels of law and jurisprudence, wherever freemen seek the light of justice for all, his honored name will be gratefully remembered and imperishably enshrined.

May he find rest and peace in his heavenly home.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

th
pl
Th
ch
al
ac
wl
la
we
in

ai
ar
Ca
Ap
co
so
a
Bo
Xi
tr
pa
wl
a
fo
of

ra
la
lif
m
lic
na
ar
by
co
bi
ti
w
ti
ze
pr
st
de
ar
te
ar
pl
ar

w
of
ag
or
er
m
w

Appendix

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is some historical doubt about the place and date of St. Patrick's birth. There is no doubt whatever about the charm and force of his saintly personality, the magnificence of his lifetime achievement, or the enthusiasm with which his feast day is celebrated in Ireland, and by those of Irish descent, as well as countless of others, everywhere in the world.

People frequently announce, with an air of surprise, that St. Patrick was not an Irishman. Irish people know, and Catholics know, that St. Patrick was the Apostle of Ireland; and the apostle of a country, in common understanding, is someone who has come from outside into a country, bringing the faith, as St. Boniface to Germany, or St. Francis Xavier to the Indies. In many countries, a native-born saint is adopted as patron, and many other saints, elsewhere. Ireland, however, has so great a debt to St. Patrick, and so great a love for him, that his place as patron saint of Ireland is assured forever.

Young Patrick, taken captive by pirates, and sold into slavery in pagan Ireland, escaped and devoted the rest of his life to the task of redeeming his pagan masters from the slavery of heathen beliefs and of sin. He received his seminary training in the schools of Tours and Lerins, in France, was commissioned by Pope Celestine I to undertake the conversion of Ireland, and consecrated bishop in 442. Even within his own lifetime, he saw that pagan land on fire with the love of God, the love of Christian learning, and a flaming missionary zeal. Out of St. Patrick's example, his preaching, and the efforts of devoted students and holy bishops and priests under his direction, Ireland has acquired and maintained the character of a center of Christian intellectual development and Christian charity, and a prime supplier of Catholic teachers, missionaries, and priests to the rest of the world.

In accordance with Catholic custom, we celebrate on March 17 the occasion of St. Patrick's death, just 1,470 years ago, in the year 493. This was the day on which, according to our belief, he entered into the joys of Heaven, richly merited by his joyful acceptance of God's will for him, his brave and vigorous work for the cause of Christ, and his unfailing love for all of Christ's children.

It is more than the grass under the rain that keeps Ireland green today in the hearts of those that love her—it is the memory, forever green, of that devoted servant of God and lover of humanity, St. Patrick, the man of humility and force, of kindness and courage. Wherever you see, today, the glint of green of a shamrock, or of whatever plant or fabric may do temporary duty as a shamrock, you see a visible sign of the greenness of that memory—the glow of love for the great St. Patrick, and for the land he made a land of glory and beauty and holiness.

The influence of Christian Ireland has been strong in America from early days. Long before the Revolution, in 1737, the Charitable Irish Society was organized and brought into being on St. Patrick's Day, in Boston, to enable the Irish citizens of the town to aid "their poor and indigent countrymen." We have records of the celebration of St. Patrick's Day by the Irish troops maintained in the American Colonies before the Revolution. And St. Patrick's Day obtained a special local, as well as national, significance in 1776, when the British evacuated Boston, and the American troops under George Washington marched in to take possession. Thus our local patriotism, as residents of Boston, our State loyalty, and our national patriotism, are united, in the celebration of Evacuation Day, with honor to St. Patrick, symbol of the Irish ancestry and Catholic faith in which so many of us take pride.

In the early colonial days, we find in history men and women of Irish blood emigrating to the various Colonies of America as early as 1636. Through the decades and generations of colonial and constitutional government, sons and daughters of Ireland have come to America. Their descendants today in our country constitute countless of millions of our citizens.

I think it can be said that those of Irish blood, in peace or in war, have been contributors to our progress, and more, have always responded to the service of our country.

As St. Patrick was the crusader for God and mankind in his day, so can we, during this trying period of the world's history, emulate the spirit of St. Patrick in our own lives.

By doing this we will be able to make our greatest contribution to God, country, and mankind.

And it is well that we pause on St. Patrick's Birthday to honor this saint of action, and in our own minds, reflect on the lessons we can learn from his spiritual and dynamic life—making us better persons—making us better Americans.

Assaults Against the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was my honor and pleasure to address the National Security Commission of the American Legion this morning at the Statler Hotel. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MARCH 14, 1963, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Washington in his Farewell Address warned that our form of government could be attacked and destroyed through means other than a direct assault. I believe his words of warning could be appropriately directed to many of the activities which we find our society engaged in today. I am thinking of things like the direct and indirect assaults being made against the free enterprise system, like the downgrading of our military system and its leaders, like the great unrealistic push for disarmament at any cost.

Today I should like to direct my remarks to what is taking place in the field of military development and disarmament. This is an area of great concern and importance to the America people because it directly affects the present and continued security of our Nation in a time of mortal conflict with an enemy which has sworn to destroy us. It also is an area which is growing so complex so fast that it must be studied constantly by all Americans interested in the defense and extension of freedom throughout the world.

And let me state at the very outset my fear that the course we are presently embarked upon is in the direction of unilateral disarmament.

On April 18, 1962, President Kennedy at a press conference said "the United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of every basic provision of a treaty of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world." This document should receive far more consideration and study than it has been given by the people of this country. Here is a sweeping, all-inclusive proposal for disarmament that had not been discussed with the interested Members of Congress, but which has the possibilities of reducing the U.S. ability to wage war at all levels to an impossibly weak position. At the time, no one took this document too seriously, and for a variety of reasons. To begin with, it was regarded more in the line of a propaganda gesture designed to show the world that we were more desirous of disarmament

and lasting peace than were the Russians. It also was felt to be a document that the Soviets would never agree to, and, therefore completely meaningless. Another factor was the assurance from administration spokesmen that any agreement reached at Geneva would have to be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

It never occurred to any of us, I am afraid, that the mere offering of this proposal at Geneva, containing as it did specific steps looking to the eventual disbandment of national armies and their replacement by a United Nations peace force, was in itself a moral commitment of a sort. And I don't believe anyone in his wildest dreams ever considered the possibility that the three-stage disarmment plan tabled at Geneva might provide the framework for unilateral moves by the United States to try and reverse the trend toward greater weapons systems.

Now I won't burden you with the entire wording of this document here today. But I must mention what to me is the salient point in the first stage of the American disarmament proposal, because it is in this area that we find the United States seemingly helibent on accomplishment without benefit of Russian reciprocity. The point I have reference to calls for a reduction in the inventory of vehicles capable of delivering nuclear weapons. Either by accident or design, we seem to be proceeding with this objective through administrative orders from the Pentagon. Consider, for a minute, the decisions that have been announced since this program for disarmament was presented at Geneva. The RS–70 has been abandoned, Skybolt has been dropped, manned bombers are being phased out, Nike-Zeus is being delayed, the Dyna-Soar program is being reexamined for possible junking.

I believe it is very important at this stage in our development if all of us would rework our thinking on the subject of disarmament. What does the word really mean? To most people, I suspect, it means the actual doing away with arms, and to those of us who have lived through periods of actual disarmament the association is with the sinking of vessels, the destruction of guns and tanks and other weapons, etc. But I believe now we must understand that disarmament can be accomplished under present conditions by the simple expedient of not providing new military equipment, particularly in the fields of vehicles capable of carrying nuclear weapons; by slowing down research and development; by not pushing nuclear tests as fast as does the enemy.

This position of mine might seem incongruous to you because it can accurately be argued that we are spending more for defense this year than ever before; we are building up our long-neglected conventional forces and we are adding heavily to tactical aviation. So I believe it is necessary, to explain why, I believe, we present the picture of a nation trying to perform the hazardous and difficult task of going in two directions at the same time.

There are those in Government who realize that strength and the willingness to use it are the only deterrents to war, but there are others who believe that we must push disarmament no matter what concessions we must make to get the job done. I suspect that these opposing forces are contesting for supremacy in the development of policy and implementing action.

Let me point out that up to a few days ago it was abundantly clear that the civilians in the Pentagon were against the manned bomber and consistently fought any plans for extending its life beyond 1970 when the B–52's are due to be completely phased out. But just this week we learn that the Secretary of Defense, under congressional prodding, is showing some interest in the development of a long-range reconnaissance strike vehicle and has suggested to the Air Force that recommendations be made.

This is good news because it indicates that the Secretary may finally have come to realize that we must be superior in all areas of military capability or risk failure in our efforts to preserve peace and extend freedom. The reluctance of the Pentagon to push for development and production of the RS–70 program—even though all study groups in the Pentagon have recommended it and Congress has voted the necessary funds—has been a contributing factor in my conclusion that we are engaged in unilateral disarmament. And I am therefore happy to recognize what may be a change in attitude on the part of the Secretary of Defense and hope that he will not perform on this as he did in the case of Skybolt, and completely reverse his field in the space of 1 year.

Now speaking of Skybolt, the air-to-ground missile that the British had been counting on, let me quote you what the President of the United States had to say about it on March 28, 1961, in a message to Congress. He said, "Another type of missile less likely to be completely eliminated by enemy attack is the air-to-ground missile carried by a plane that can be off the ground before an attack commences * * * its successful development and production may extend the useful life of our bombers in the missile age."

As you all know, this important concept, emphasized by the President in March of 1961, was abandoned at Nassau without any consultation, so far as I can determine, with the Air Force or with our NATO allies other than Great Britain.

This audience might well ask, "Is it important?" Well, I can tell you that the majority of the military people, and I believe that includes a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, think it is just as important today as it was in March of 1961. And, we might heed what the Russians are saying. An article distributed by the Soviet news agency Tass on February 21 of this year claimed the Russians have "supersonic rocket-carrying aircraft capable of striking enemy [United States] targets without entering their zone of antiaircraft defense."

It is important for us here to understand that the Skybolt would have done two important things: It would have insured man's place in the air and it would have given our Air Force and the Royal Air Force of Great Britain a weapon with which the enemy could be attacked from 360 degrees instead of the very few known degrees that ICBM's must travel, thus compounding his defense problem. This, like the RS–70, constituted a vehicle which could carry nuclear weapons. And it was abandoned on the basis of some mysterious computations arrived at by the civilian Pentagon.

We now get into the important area of space and I believe that from now on in speaking of what we formerly called air power, we must substitute the phrase aerospace power. The argument we hear most often these days from those in official position who see space development only along peaceful lines is that there is no call for man in space even though they will admit that there can be military uses of space.

Until recently our one official concession to the military possibilities of space was the Dyna-Soar program for manned spacecraft projects. This program called for the development of a piloted spacecraft which could be lifted into orbit by a Titan III rocket and glide back to earth on wings. To my way of thinking, it would add an important new dimension to the defense system and one that we can rest assured the Russians are at this very moment attempting to master. But the latest reports gleaned from the Defense Secretary's testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, indicate that this important program may become the price of a new missile-armed bomber to follow the B–52. In other words, according to the press reports, if the Pentagon authorizes a new manned bomber it may cancel the Dyna-Soar.

This, of course, is no answer at all to the heavy criticism the Defense Department has been running into on Capitol Hill. The demand being raised in Congress for adequate defense is not subject to barter, or the trading of one weapons system for another. It is rather a demand for more defense options, for an overall defense program that will provide us with a maximum of flexibility. This demand is for manned bombers as well as spacecraft. It does not downgrade the Pentagon's preoccupation with conventional Armed Forces, but sees these as an integral and important part of the whole.

Dyna-Soar is one of the oldest concepts for orbiting man. It could and should have been accomplished by the United States years ago. But now that it is on the verge of development, it must not be abandoned in favor of any other project. I must say from reading the papers I am completely puzzled by the Defense Secretary's reasoning. He seems to be telling us that Dyna-Soar can be canceled if we proceed to modify the Gemini for military purposes. Now this might sound reasonable enough to the layman, but it makes no sense to the military man. Dyna-Soar is a military project, planned that way from the very first. Gemini, which is a two-man spacecraft like the present one-man Mercury, is a nonmilitary project being developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The problems and the time involved in suddenly adapting a patently civilian space project into a military program would be enormous. And the question arises of whether we have the time. The question also arises as to whether the adaptation of Gemini into a military spacecraft is practical enough to cause us to drop the Dyna-Soar.

Now if Pentagon cancels Dyna-Soar, as it did Skybolt, and then later changes signals on the development of new manned bombers again, the Air Force will have had it once and for all. Then aerospace superiority will pass unquestionably into the hands of the Russians.

If there is one thing we can say for sure about the Pentagon these days it is that U.S. military thinkers—with their slide rules, their electronic computers and their blinking lights—can change their minds faster about more important matters than any other group of planners in the world. They certainly change too fast for our allies to keep up, and I believe that we can find that the reason for much of the disarray in the Atlantic Community today is traceable directly to the Pentagon's inability to make up its mind on what weapons systems are best for the defense of the free world. We began with Skybolt, then switched to Polaris submarines, then switched to Polaris-carrying surface ships. We began with the RS–70, formerly known as the B–70, then switched to an all-missile concept, and now we appear to be getting back to the manned bomber idea. And as I have just pointed out, we began with Dyna-Soar and are now talking about junking that for a souped-up Gemini. What comes next, I can't tell you. I don't think even the Pentagon's latest model of UNIVAC has the answers as of this minute.

But I can tell you this, one of the simplest ways for this Nation to disarm itself is to keep changing our minds every year about military concepts and weapons systems while the Russians push ahead with a single-minded purpose of becoming supreme in all military spheres and dimensions.

While I have reported some encouraging signs that perhaps the Pentagon is getting back to the idea of a new manned bomber to carry on after the B–52 this is by no means certain. And I don't know how you

can tell for sure in the light of all the contradictory information emanating from the Pentagon these days. But I suggest that if the Pentagon thinkers are still holding to the idea of placing our strategic reliance on missiles when today's nuclear strike power finds the men and bombers of SAC responsible for about 90 percent of our ability, then I suggest we are traveling down a very dangerous road. Someone once said, "If you can't command it, you can't control it; if you can't control it, it is useless in modern warfare." This being the case, I can think of no weapon with less commandability and controllability than a missile already launched. On the other hand, the manned aircraft is completely commandable and controllable and presents the enemy with the gigantic problem of defending himself from all sectors—not just one.

Included in our inventory of missiles are Polaris submarines and yet today after abandoning Skybolt, to the utter dismay of the British, we are suggesting that surface ships carry Polaris and that our NATO allies provide themselves with these weapons. The question that comes to mind here is why the United States doesn't cut back its own submarine program in favor of a mix of submarines and the less-expensive surface ships if it considers these latter good enough for NATO. If the surface ship is not good enough for the United States, why is it being sold to NATO?

Of course, no one can quarrel with the mixed concept in weapons and weapon carriers, but one can quarrel rather violently with the idea of placing all of our offensive and defensive eggs in the nose cone.

Who or what, for example, is going to tell our Commander in Chief what targets were hit and what targets were missed on enemy soil unless it be the eyes and voice of a man in an aircraft. Certainly, the enemy is not going to cable us that we missed such-and-such a target and hit others. Extend this argument out into space. If the enemy has, as they claim they have, a missile-carrying satellite, how can we expect to disarm it by seeing space only as an area to be pursued for peaceful purposes. Man has a place in space and I hope it does not require a Russian man in a weapons-carrying spacecraft to prove it to us in sputnik fashion.

Now on the nuclear test ban negotiations we have heard a great deal of talk about the Russian offer to accept three on-site inspections a year. President Kennedy hailed this as encouraging. Other administration spokesmen have interpreted it as a breakthrough insisting that it meant the Soviets had finally accepted the principle of on-site inspections. However, a man in position to know the truth of this—Arthur H. Dean, former chief U.S. disarmament negotiator—recently told a luncheon of the American Association for the United Nations that the Soviet limit would make any test ban agreement "absolutely unworkable." He went on to say that three inspections is like having three wheels on a car and that the Soviet offer does not represent a concession of any kind.

Another argument we hear frequently from disarmament enthusiasts is that our failing to detect Soviet underground tests would run no risk because nothing important could be gained through such low-yield experiments. However, Mr. Dean had something to say about that, too. He said that it is possible to carry out underground anti-missile-missile tests as well as neutron bomb tests if the neutron bomb is ever developed. This is precisely the argument used by Senator DODD in his thorough-going and thought-provoking discourse on the dangers of the concessions we have been making at Geneva.

It is my firm conviction that when we begin concentrating on only what we in the United States can do to lessen the threat of nuclear escalation, we begin to think and act in terms of unilateral disarmament. Our primary concern in the military field should always be with enemy capabilities and enemy intentions. It does us absolutely no good at all to think in terms of disarmament unless our yearning and our desire is reciprocated by the forces which have sworn to destroy us. And we have no reason to believe that the Soviets are engaging in anything but a propaganda marathon at Geneva.

They haven't made one single move that would justify our belief that they want disarmament at this time under any terms. And even if they did sign an agreement with us, what assurance would we have that the terms of such an agreement would be honored? It could, and undoubtedly would, be broken at the first moment when a Soviet advantage could be gained. If we have learned anything at all from our experience in dealing with the Russians it is that they cannot be trusted in any sphere of East-West activity and certainly not in the military sphere.

So I believe we should stop thinking in terms of disarmament and start concentrating on what the Soviets are doing in the military field. There is no doubt at all that while the talking goes on at Geneva and we offer one set of concessions after another the Russians are proceeding at top speed and with great determination in all armament areas. They are probing the military possibilities of space. They are concentrating on new and wider military options. They are improving their military capabilities in all spheres and placing their main dependence on the manned bomber. They aren't stinting on the development of missiles. They are going ahead with all types. But they are keeping their manned bombers too because this increases their flexibility and adds an important option to their military capabilities.

Overall, the Russians are continuing to apply science and technology to military purposes with huge research and development programs. And from these flow a rapid progression of military systems from invention to operational inventory. Let me emphasize, there is absolutely no evidence of any kind that the Soviets are cutting down the number of their existing weapons systems, as we are, or that they are withholding the development of new systems.

Let me remind you that for all the decisions and counterdecisions coming out of the Defense Department these days; for all the talk we hear about the efficiency and competence of the Secretary of Defense; for all the money we are expending for military purposes, not one new weapons system has been proposed under the present administration. All the activity we see and hear about today is directed toward the shifting of concepts and weapons systems proposed and started under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations.

This is not only stagnation but it is also disarmament. Inertia in defense matters, compounded by indecision and constantly changing concepts, is the same as spotting our enemy an advantage, a running start, if you please, for the final confrontation.

In closing, let me say that man has come through thousands of years of development in warfare, from bare fists to nuclear weapons. Each offensive has been met with a defense as I am certain the nuclear threat will be. Man, who became master of the rivers became the master of Asia; man, who dominated the land masses and the means of controlling it, then dominated the early world. Then came man's domination of the seas, first in the Mediterranean, then on the oceans. Then came man's control of the air as we know it today and as every expert whom I have ever heard speak on the subject has said in one way or another, "He who controls space will control the world."

Those who feel that the risk of nuclear war is more real than the risk of not being strong can only see another engagement where triggers are pulled resulting immediately in all-out nuclear war. They obviously don't agree with the President who has said that he wants something between embarrassment and holocaust. These people fail to recognize that we have been witnessing a world engaged in many shooting wars ever since World War II and there has been no escalation. This has been true because, first, I am convinced that neither side ever wants to escalate to the ICBM or MRBM stage, and, second, our vast superiority in methods of delivery have driven the hard facts of war home to the enemy. We must keep them and develop new vehicles to replace them.

Free Enterprise Awards Association Award to Walter J. Tuohy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that Mr. Walter J. Tuohy, president, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, a widely known industrialist, of Cleveland, Ohio, is the recipient of the American Success Story Award presented by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., of New York. I join with his many friends and associates in congratulating him upon this occasion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short biography of Mr. Tuohy, including mention of his accomplishments.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Tuohy was born on March 12, 1901, on Chicago's South Side. His father was a Chicago police sergeant; his mother had come from Ireland as a girl. He left high school at age 16, but 2 years later entered DePaul University. For 9 years he worked days, attended classes at night, earning various degrees, including law. While pursuing the goal of better education and business advancement, he worked as stockyard messenger, railroad clerk, and coal salesman. By 1939, he was president of Globe Coal Co.; 4 years later he became vice president in charge of coal traffic and development of Chesapeake & Ohio. In 5 years, he made president of the C. & O.

One of the most respected of railroad leaders, Mr. Tuohy has combined supersalesmanship, operating know-how, and a genius for finance to remake the C. & O. into one of the most modern and progressive railroads in the country, with assets of $1,074,483,390. It is also one of the Nation's leading moneymakers, with 71 successive years of profitable operations and 46 successive years of dividends declared.

Since Mr. Tuohy has been president, the C. & O. has become a new railroad, with more than $866 million of capital improvements, more than half of which was financed out of earnings. Physical plant rates second to no other railroad in the country. The C. & O. has 90,850 freight cars, 1,072 diesel locomotives, a fleet of 7 giant Great Lakes train ferries, was the first railroad to use electronic computers in daily operations, is

among the leaders in applying such space age tools as radar to sort out freight cars, and electronics to route trains by remote control and keep track of all cars on lines.

Long known as a coal railroad, under Mr. Tuohy's direction the C. & O. undertook to diversify traffic by building up merchandise revenues and at the same time retaining leadership in coal. Today, its traffic is healthily diversified—half coal, half merchandise. Serving nine States and Ontario, Canada, the road can best be described as a 5,100-mile transportation assembly line, linking the Nation's producers, processors, and consumers. Passenger operations and revenues are small, but standards of service, courtesy, and comfort are maintained.

Mr. Tuohy credits the C. & O.'s growth to dedication of its 25,000 employees and to teamwork by his management people. Through a well-planned communications program, employees better service conferences, and other employee associations, Mr. Tuohy's influence goes right down the line to every C. & O. railroader. He believes employees should be part owners of the company and encourages them, through a special employee program, to buy stock on small monthly payments. In 1961, the average C. & O. wage was $7,020, the highest in the company's history.

The C. & O. possesses excellent records of cooperative dealings with labor organizations, takes pride in systems for speedy handling of employees' grievances. As a result, there have been no major work stoppages on the C. & O. for many years. Walter Tuohy enjoys personal friendship with many railroad labor leaders, an attitude reflected throughout his management team.

Mr. Tuohy's main current interest is directing progress toward affiliation and ultimate merger of the C. & O. and the Baltimore & Ohio. Considered one of the most important consolidations in railroad history, it will create an 11,000-mile system. The plan has the endorsement of Governors, communities, and shippers, all agreeing that the C. & O.–B. & O. will strengthen transportation in the East, the national defense, and benefit the public greatly.

Cited for his contributions to the railroad industry, for fostering the C. & O. employee shareowner plan (making railroaders members of the corporate family), for excellent labor relations, and for his determination to make the C. & O. a model of service to the Nation's industrial progress and its defense effort, Mr. Tuohy is very deserving of the American Success Story Award.

A Fiscal Letter From Great, Great Grandpa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Blackduck American, a weekly newspaper in the Seventh District of Minnesota, recently reprinted an open letter, which I would like to share with my colleagues. There is not only humor in this open letter, but much serious thought as to the future of our Nation. The article is as follows:

A FISCAL LETTER FROM A GREAT, GREAT GRANDPA

We have just read an open letter which was recently written by the editor of the Lusk (Wyo.) Herald which we think was very decent of him. He wrote a letter to his great, great grandchildren in which he attempts to explain—Oh, well, we'll give you the whole letter:

"Inasmuch as we shall never meet, I want to leave you this note of appreciation. You see, it was during my lifetime that the leaders of the United States decided to spend some of the tax money that your great grandparents, grandparents, parents, and you, and most likely your descendants, would have to pay. Thank you for your generosity. Our practice of deficit financing was started during a financial depression and was necessary. It was necessary to continue the practice through a great war, called World War II. Following World War II the United States had a period of long prosperity, but we had grown accustomed to spending more tax money than we liked to pay, rather than paying off what we had borrowed, we decided to let you do it. I hope you won't hate the memory of my generation. Mostly, they were darn fine people. They would have liked to leave you the same rich, debt-free heritage that they received, but in the name of progress we had to get money from someone. We took it from you. Thanks.

"With appreciation,

GREAT, GREAT GRANDPA JIM."

Incidentally, we've made a carbon copy to leave to our own kin.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the American Legion will celebrate the 44th anniversary of its birth. Founded in Paris, France, at the historic caucus of delegates from the First American Expeditionary Force on March 15, 1919, the American Legion has grown from its 463 founding officers and men to an outstanding organization of more than 2½ million legionnaires. These legionnaires represent veterans from three wars: World War I; World War II, and the Korean war.

The largest veterans organization in all history, the American Legion has enjoyed a consistent record of dedication to, and pursuit of, the American ideal. Its continuing goal has been to keep America always American. It is therefore fitting to take this opportunity to congratulate the American Legion on its impressive record of achievement, dedication, and integrity.

So that all may know of the high ideals set forth for the Legion by its founders in March 1919, I would like to recite a portion of the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion:

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

Mr. Speaker, no greater compliment can be paid, I think, than to state that the American Legion has lived up to the high standards it set for itself 44 years ago. I join with the Legion's many friends all over the world in offering my deepest congratulations on the anniversary of its founding and on the outstanding record it has established. I am proud to be a member of this great veterans' organization.

Personnel for Psychiatry—Medical Education—Resolutions of American Academy of Child Psychiatry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two resolutions of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, Dr. James L. Cunningham, of Dayton, Ohio, president, and Dr. Joseph Weinreb, of Washington, D.C., secretary, and Dr. Abram Blair, of New York, treasurer. The first resolution deals with the subject "Personnel for Psychiatry," and the second with the subject "Medical Education."

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONNEL FOR PSYCHIATRY

Resolved, That the American Academy of Child Psychiatry gives highest priority to the manpower problem in child psychiatry; that we will participate with other appropriate professional groups to establish mechanisms for the study, promotion, and strengthening of recruitment and training efforts in the field.

In consideration of implementing this resolution, we (1) declare the manpower problem a matter of first priority; (2) encourage the establishment and staffing of a National Commission of Psychiatric Manpower; (3) identify and assign responsibility to appropriate committees to give priority to manpower problems over the next several years; (4) express our willingness to work in collaboration with the Council on Mental Health of the American Medical Association looking to the establishment of a counterpart commission on mental health manpower by the American Medical Association; (5) express our interest in participation in organizing a coordinating council at the national level for planning purposes in the mental health manpower field; (6) urge regional groups of the academy to organize similar coordinating councils on a regional basis, and encourage the regional groups to work actively in behalf of training and recruitment at the county and community level with particular reference to capitalizing on the county medical society as a resource; and

(7) participate in organizational mechanisms which will bring into play the thinking and efforts of professors of psychiatry, chiefs of professional training, and other leaders in institutional and university training centers and render their mutual assistance more effective.

MEDICAL EDUCATION

Resolved, That the American Academy of Child Psychiatry recognizes that shortages of physicians, psychiatrists, and particularly child psychiatrists, and new needs for broadening the scope of medical practice and its specialties, calls for major attention to the pools of college-trained persons from which medical schools draw their applicants, and the schools in which medical students and medical graduates are trained with respect to their number, location, and the quality of their product. To this end the American Academy of Child Psychiatry calls the attention of its members to the efforts of the American Association of Medical Colleges in support of Federal aid to medical education and encourages support of the American Association of Medical Colleges in these efforts.

Specifically, this includes support of the concept of (a) matching funds by the Federal Government for modernization and expansion of existing schools, and construction of new schools; (b) financial aid to students of medical schools in nonrefundable scholarships; (c) general support of medical education including various levels of graduate training; and (d) coordination of all Federal grants relating to the field of medicine and continuation of use of non-Federal consultants; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Academy of Child Psychiatry would be interested in participating in the study of new methods of financing medical education; and be it further

Resolved, That methods be developed to encourage selected college and high school students to prepare for careers in the mental health professions; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Academy of Child Psychiatry bring to the attention of the governments of the various States the importance of increasing facilities for undergraduate and postgraduate medical educational facilities.

Are We Americans Fast Losing Our Perspective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the economic theories of the administration have placed our Nation at crossroads. To pursue their managed-deficit, spend-yourself-rich theory may well inflate and spend our economy to the point of no return to fiscal responsibility.

I am pleased to submit for the RECORD a brief but effective compilation by William R. Donaldson, a man skilled in sound dollar theory.

The article follows:

ARE WE AMERICANS FAST LOSING OUR PERSPECTIVE?

Our 1963 Federal debt is $303½ billion, about $1,686 for each man, woman, and child in the United States; in 1910 that debt was just over $1 billion, or $12.41 per person. New York State debt including all subdivisions and school districts is now almost $8 billion, $459 per person. All this represents spending by government over and beyond taxes collected. In 1910 all tax collections took about 5 percent of national income; today it is about 33 percent. How long can this go on in face of Europe's and Japan's fast mounting economies, their gross national incomes rising sharply and in ratio well in excess of our own Nation? And now the Common Market, with tariff walls to be reduced to invite a flood of foreign goods produced at much lower wage rates. All our Nation's gold reserve and even more is now owed to foreigners who can claim it virtually on demand. Our 1963 dollar holds only 46 percent the purchasing power of the 1940 dollar.

Some quotations: "A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess out of the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that democracy always collapses over a loose fiscal policy, always to be followed by a dictatorship and then a monarchy." Two centuries ago this was written, when our 13 colonies were possessions of Great Britain, and by the leading economic historian of the day, Prof. Alexander Fraser Tytler. He was commenting on the decline and fall of the Athenian Republic more than 2,000 years before that. And the philosopher Santayana has said: "Those who will not learn from history are bound to repeat it."

Wrote President Thomas Jefferson: "I am for government that is rigorously frugal and simple, and not for one that multiplies offices to make partisans, that is to get votes, and by every device increases the public debt under the guise of being a public benefit."

Said Woodrow Wilson, our President 50 years ago: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitations of government power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

And add Calvin Coolidge, a later President: "Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody. But the results are ruinous."

Writes Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce (Saturday Evening Post, Mar. 10, 1962): "If ignorance paid dividends, most Americans could make a fortune out of what they don't know about economics. Hardly 1 person in 20 has the sketchiest idea of how our economy functions. America may be the greatest industrial power on earth, but for all that most of us know, our greatness might depend on growing breadfruit trees."

Herbert Hoover, another former President, stated in an address, titled "The Uncommon Man": "A nation is strong or weak, it thrives or perishes upon what it believes to be true. If our youth is rightly instructed in the faith of our fathers; in the traditions of our country; in the dignity of each individual man, then our power will be stronger than any weapon of destruction that man can devise. * * * And now as to this whole gamut of socialistic infections, I say to you * * * God has blessed us with another wonderful word, 'heritage.' The great documents of that heritage are not from Karl Marx. They are the Bible, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. Within them alone can the safeguards of freedom survive. Safeguard the true spirit of these guarantees for your children, that they may not become the prisoners of a hydra-headed socialism. * * * If anyone arises to say all this is reactionary, you may class him as either fuzzy minded or an ignorant enemy of freemen."

Said Karl Marx (later echoed by Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev): "We will force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

Have not we Americans already lost our perspective?

Quality Control: Key to Survival of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the subject of "quality control as a key to industrial survival" raises a subject vital to our economy and to the national security.

Recently, my colleague, Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, addressed the Western Quality Control Conference on methods and techniques which could be employed to secure economies and greater proficiency in both industrial and defense production. His remarks have been well received by industry and should be of interest to the Nation as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent to have Senator CANNON's speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY CONTROL: KEY TO SURVIVAL OF THE UNITED STATES

(Speech of Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, of Nevada, before the Western Regional Quality Control Conference, Las Vegas, February 22, 1963)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be with you today and to address this conference which has under consideration the subject, "Quality Control as a Key to Industrial Survival."

As the process of technological change moves inevitably forward, quality control has become a vital key to the future. Quality control, or, in the words of Dr. Robert Seamans, associate director of the National Aeronautics Space Agency, the "assurance that men and equipment will do what they are supposed to do at the right time and for the right period of time, in every phase of long and complicated operations," is vital both to civilian industrial processes and to the defense of our country.

In a sense, therefore, survival of the United States in this turbulent world, depends upon proper quality control, or reliability.

Our technological society has already embarked upon the industrial revolution characterized by the word "automation. Automation is, as you know, the process of controlling operations through mechanical or electronic devices, with little or no human assistance. These operations may control industrial production, manipulate, and solve and retrieve information.

Consequently quality control is of the utmost importance to the operation of automated processes, and in turn, facilitates the development and refinement of further automated operations. As automation gains momentum, quality control will grow in significance.

In my remarks today I would like to pose the question of whether we have true and reliable quality control and just how much of what we hear about is for show and how much of this important effort is actually producing results. I am informed that America spends up to $10 billion a year for military maintenance and repair. Certainly much of this vast expenditure of taxpayers' money is justified, but it is the shrinking of this multibillion-dollar figure that is the end result of quality control. And it is my interest as a Senator and a member of the Armed Services Committee to do everything I can to assure that quality control not be given a lot of lipservice and very little attention. Such gatherings as this can go a long way toward getting the objectives of our common purpose.

Let me cite just one example of automation and reliability testing. A completely automated 110-foot production line, designed and operated by one of the largest electrical products companies in the United States, produces film strip resistors. The production line is a highly coordinated system in which a digital computer calls all the signals. Automated equipment deposits a carbon coating on a ceramic core, sputters on gold terminations, attaches caps and leads, spirals the carbon to value, encapsulates the resistor in a protective shell, tests at three different points for quality, marks appropriate values on the resistor, and finally packs the components for shipping.

At no point in this entire process is a human operator involved. Human error, poor judgment, inattention, and fatigue have been eliminated as possible causes of defective components.

Furthermore, an automatic performance or "quality control" test checks each resistor for leakage of its protective shell. The units are immersed in a hot bath and any leakage, indicated by air bubbles, is detected by a photoelectric cell. Should the resistor fail this leakage test, the component is automatically discarded by the machine.

Although the electronics industry is still in its infancy in the development of automated production lines, because of the increasing emphasis upon reliability, other automated lines will doubtless be designed to produce the hundreds of components which make up every piece of electronic equipment.

The process of automation is revolutionizing many other industries, as well.

No mention of automation can fail to ask the question, "Is this new technological development a blessing or a curse?"

If handled through intelligent business and Federal programs, I am confident that automation will prove a boon to mankind. Greater production of goods and services, both military and civilian, increased productivity and lower costs, shorter hours, widened opportunities for education, and upgrading of skills. These and many other benefits can accrue to our society from proper use of automation. In short, a higher standard of living for all, as evidenced by an ever-expanding real gross national product, could result from automation.

Without a strong and growing economy, geared to maximization of production and consumption, this country cannot meet its vital international and domestic commitments and emerge victorious in its role of defender of the free world.

To repeat, as our economy evolves into a sophisticated automated society, greater and greater emphasis will be placed on the central theme of this conference—quality control.

Turning now to the interrelated spheres of defense operations and space exploration, here again the keystone is "quality control" or "reliability." The efficient functioning of conventional armaments, and missiles and space vehicles as well, depends upon "quality control." In fact, with the current emphasis upon missile and spacecraft programs, "quality control" looms larger and larger in significance, for the cost of today's complex space vehicles and weaponry has reached an alltime high. Recently someone aptly quipped, "When you have a malfunction in space, you can't pull into Joe's garage."

We in Congress have often thought that it would be better not to have the equipment at all, than to have it and not be able to use it when we need it. We should be able not only to detect errors, but to prevent them before they are made. I am looking to this society to develop methods and techniques to improve quality and to keep up with technological advances.

The challenge of "quality control" or reliability is succinctly stated by a recent editorial in the magazine Aviation Week, as follows:

"The problem of achieving 100 percent reliability in space exploration vehicles is difficult enough, but the problem becomes even more acute when the space age moves as it will shortly—into operational satellite systems for weather reporting, navigation, reconnaissance, and communications. For in these systems, a single minor component failure in a single satellite could disrupt the functioning of the entire system for the interval it would take to fire a replacement vehicle into proper orbit. This would prove to be an extremely expensive process if the failure rate reached as high as the statistical rate now generally acceptable in high 'quality control' industries."

Ladies and gentlemen, perhaps a word or two concerning the dimensions of our defense and space exploration programs will further emphasize the need for the highest possible standards of "quality control." Estimates place defense spending during fiscal year 1963 at $48.3 billion; it will certainly be higher in fiscal year 1964. Potentially the most expensive single aspect of the defense program, its expenditures on space systems, only, are currently costing about $2 billion a year.

In addition, nonmilitary space programs are costing approximately $3.6 billion during fiscal year 1963 and will doubtless rise in the next fiscal year.

Unfortunately, these huge expenditures to make America invincible are a necessity in a world constantly threatened by war.

As President Kennedy declared in his current state of the Union message to Congress, "Until the world can develop a reliable system of international security, the free peoples have no choice but to keep their arms nearby.

"This country, therefore, continues to require the best defense in the world. This means, unfortunately, a rising defense budget. It means the expenditure of more than $15 billion this year on nuclear weapons systems alone. * * *

"But it also means improved air and missile defenses."

Models of missiles and space vehicles of the future stagger the imagination. Although our space program has already produced modern wonders, who knows what the future will bring? Battles in outer space are by no means beyond the realm of possibility. Let there be no mistake about it. That nation which controls outer space, controls our planet, earth.

Although the United States and the Soviet Union recently concluded an agreement on peaceful uses of space and are negotiating for further agreements, nevertheless we must be vigilant. Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric warned last June, "We are very conscious of the need, however, for taking out * * * certain technological insurance, be it cost support or a share of the national objective of peaceful use of outer space. We have had some sad experiences, obviously reaching agreements with the Soviets on nuclear test bans and other such objectives for the benefit of mankind. And we want to be prepared, and we don't want to be caught by surprise if any hostile use of space should occur."

Therefore, with the steady advance of the space age with all of its military implications, our lives quite literally depend upon the concept under discussion at this conference—"quality control."

Perhaps we can one day soon find the answer to the question posed for all of us, and that is, that—we never have time enough to build things right the first time, but we always find time to build things again when they are not right.

What happens when "quality control" is a success? What happens when quality control fails? Let me illustrate by a few examples.

One major element of U.S. nuclear power is the Minuteman ICBM. Why? Because it has proved to be sure-fire missile. Extreme accuracy, high reliability, and relatively low cost are the chief design characteristics of the Air Force's Minuteman ICBM. To achieve the high reliability requirements of this missile, special reliability programs were instituted at each of the component manufacturers.

Similarly, the Mariner II Venus probe established a new landmark in the scientific exploration of the solar system. Preliminary results from one of the Mariner instruments, a magnetometer, indicate that substantial and useful information was obtained as the spacecraft triumphantly raced past Venus on December 14, 1962.

Without "quality control," these delicate instruments on Mariner II could never successfully transmit data to recording instruments manned by anxious scientists here on earth.

Failures due to lack of proper "quality control" are costly. For instance, the premature end of the useful life of the orbiting solar observatory early in June 1962, was a good example of why the highest possible standards of reliability or quality assurance must be demanded of industrial contractors. OSO was intended to provide a wide variety of solar data during an orbital life of 6 months, as an early step in our "man on the moon" project. Instead, a relatively minor mechanical malfunction deprived the entire complex satellite of all of its useful functions at the end of 11 weeks.

In spite of the failure of this first OSO, the lunar project, or Project Apollo, is continuing full speed ahead in an attempt to beat the Russians to the Moon.

Furthermore, one of our foremost submarine experts recently charged that industry has fallen dangerously short of meeting the exacting technological standards of the nuclear age.

He said, "Not just the complicated gear but also the conventional components of nuclear plants are frequently flawed by faulty welding and casting due to ineffective quality control and failure to follow specifications. Delivery and performance of these conventional items have been less reliable than of the nuclear reactors themselves." For example, "In the case of steel castings, we often have to order two to three times as many as we need because we have so much trouble obtaining satisfactory ones."

Officials of the Defense Department believe that the performance of defense contractors would improve greatly if there were stiffer penalties for slipshod work and higher rewards for jobs well done.

Realizing that reliability or quality control is now a matter of major national concern, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency instituted last year a new program de-

signed to assure the desired quality of space systems. I am sure that you are all far more conversant with the technical aspects of this program than I am. However, the basic program may be summarized as follows:

(1) It shall be NASA policy to utilize every practical means of assuring high quality of space systems. In order to accomplish this objective, quality assurance requirements shall be placed contractually on space system contractors and subcontractors by NASA installations.

(2) Assuring satisfactory contractor performance in developing and maintaining the quality of space systems and their parts is the responsibility of the cognizant installation, assisted by Government inspection agencies to the extent determined advantageous by the NASA installation.

As the significance of "quality control" deepens, the need for scientists and engineers who specialize in the techniques of such control likewise increases.

However, shortages of talented, highly trained scientists and engineers threaten the achievement of vital national goals. The President's Science Advisory Committee warns that "unless remedial action is taken promptly, future needs for superior mathematicians and physical scientists will seriously outstrip supply." The report commented on the challenge of military security and space explorations as follows:

"Extensive and sophisticated research and development serve as critical elements of a modern national defense effort which increasingly depends upon highly complex systems and diversified military capabilities."

Achievement of national goals in space creates an extraordinary new demand for scientific and technological manpower. The highly complex nature of space projects, compressed time scales, and need for high reliability require especially perceptive and able technical management, the best in engineering, and for the future, new advances in science.

To meet burgeoning needs for engineers, mathematicians, and specialists in the physical sciences, now often abbreviated EMP, the President's committee recommends a vastly expanded program of Federal, State, and private financial aid to graduate students in these fields. Furthermore, existing centers of excellence in "EMP" and encouragement of the establishment of new centers specializing in these areas should be included in such a broad educational program.

I heartily concur that this program of aid to EMP, which is embodied in a legislative program recently submitted by the President to the Congress, should be enacted during this session. I would like to see much more done in the field of science and engineering education.

As the committee report states, "The relationship of science and engineering to our vital national commitments is such that we cannot postpone the start of a vigorous, and ambitious national program to accelerate EMP graduate training. The Federal Government must immediately take the initiative, the leadership, and the central responsibility for supporting this effort."

To sum up, quality control is literally the key to survival of the United States. The complex and accelerated technological advances produced by automation demand an unprecedented level of reliability of performance in civilian industry. "Quality control," or reliability, in turn, paves the way for further development of automated processes.

If properly utilized, automation can produce enough goods and services to enable this Nation to meet easily its international commitments, while achieving at the same time, its domestic goals of a decent standard of living for all.

In the area of defense operations and space exploration, "quality control" is assuming ever greater importance.

We are dealing with a problem which does not only involve the "quality control" experts at your plants, it also includes designers, purchasing agents, and production planners. All of these people have to be motivated to do it right the first time through the application of what some of you in the trade call "meticulous attention to grubby detail." But the goal is well worth the effort when we consider that there would be few if any failures at Cape Canaveral with really ironclad "quality control." And when we realize that we are not pushing the state of the art too fast but too often we assume that "quality control" exists where, in truth, it does not.

Although conventional weapons are by no means relegated to the past, the new space age with all the military implications of missiles and spacecraft, likewise places a premium on "quality control."

To insure higher standards of "quality control," the Defense Department suggests greater rewards for excellent performance by contractors and NASA has instituted a "quality control" program as an integral part of its contract procedures.

Finally, we are threatened by shortages of scientific manpower so necessary to the carrying out of "quality control" programs. To remedy this dire situation, further governmental and private programs are needed to strengthen higher education in EMP.

Let me close with the following quotation, again from Dr. Seamans, "We are engaged in a tremendous scientific and technological effort to carry out our accelerated national program. After the brains, the skills, and the industrial resources have been marshaled, the key to success still lies in the reliability * * *" or, in the words of today's program, "quality control."

Oil Issue Reportedly Resolved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] made an excellent statement concerning residual oil on the floor yesterday. I would like to commend my colleague from Massachusetts for the detailed research and effort he has put into this problem.

I hope the administration will take careful note of the arguments advanced by my colleague. With great pride I wish to associate myself with his remarks to the fullest extent possible.

I think the gentleman from Massachusetts performed a great service in relating the residual oil problem to the support of our ally, Venezuela. It is vitally important to the United States that Venezuela's economy should continue to be prosperous. There is no doubt that Venezuela is high on the list of targets for subversion by Moscow and Peiping.

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 14, 1963, there appeared an article entitled "Oil Issue Reportedly Resolved." I fear that the resolution discussed in this article will be bad news to Americans in New England and in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District.

The article states that the Kennedy administration has decided to limit imports of residual oil. While it is true that the residual imports were increased about 12 percent last year, the rate of increase is not sufficient to provide New England consumers with fairplay and reasonable prices.

The Washington Post article said:

OIL ISSUE REPORTEDLY RESOLVED

(By Julius Duscha)

The hottest international oil issue facing the White House reportedly has been resolved largely in favor of domestic economic and political considerations.

The issue involves controls over the imports of residual oil, a thick, low-cost fuel used by electric utilities and other industries on the east coast. Nearly all of the oil comes from Venezuela.

Last month Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, recommended to President Kennedy that the administration undertake "a careful and meaningful relaxation" of the controls.

Despite this recommendation, the White House was reported yesterday to have decided to permit a smaller increase in imports than it allowed in the last year.

The decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers.

The coal industry argues that residual oil displaces coal in east coast industrial markets. The domestic oil industry opposes all oil imports although little residual oil is produced in the United States and it is therefore not competitive with U.S. products.

The strongest opposition to the import restrictions has come from the New England States and from Venezuela.

The controls were an important subject of the recent talks in Washington between Mr. Kennedy and President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

The controls have been justified in the name of national security. Their supporters maintain that imports must be restricted to help keep the domestic oil industry strong so that it could easily fulfill all of the country's needs in time of war.

Officials charged with administering the residual oil import program have privately acknowledged that the restrictions can be justified only on domestic, political and economic grounds.

Two big international oil companies—Standard Oil of New Jersey and Texaco—account for 45 percent of the residual imports, which are determined by a rigid Government formula.

Last year the residual oil quotas were increased about 12 percent—from 461,000 to 517,000 barrels a day, or by 56,000 barrels.

The increase planned for this year reportedly would be 50,000 barrels a day, lifting the daily quota from 517,000 to 567,000 barrels.

This amounts to an increase of less than 10 percent compared with 12 percent during the last year.

But, 15,000 barrels, or almost a third, of the projected increase would be used to replenish residual oil stocks in the United States.

The stocks are at dangerously low levels partly because of the cold winter but largely because the imports allowed during the last year were not large enough.

When the 15,000 barrels reserved for inventories are deducted from the projected 50,000-barrel increase in imports, the actual

increase is brought down to 35,000 barrels a day compared with the 56,000-barrel increase of the last year.

I would like to thank Mr. Julius Duscha for the excellent reporting he has done on residual oil and the problems of New England woolen industries. Mr. Duscha has provided a voice in the Nation's Capital for two issues of vital concern to my constituents and their New England neighbors. I salute Mr. Duscha.

Closure of the Glen Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, closure of the left diversion tunnel of the Glen Canyon Dam restricting the flow of the Colorado River, which initiated the storage of water in Lake Powell, was accomplished yesterday. Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy has issued instructions to commence storage immediately in order to take advantage of fortuitous circumstances which will permit earlier storage than was originally anticipated.

Commissioner Dominy has said:

Storage in Lake Mead is near an alltime peak—not only from a cyclical standpoint but additionally for this time of year to meet lower basin water needs. We have been able to expedite work on the outlet gate at Glen Canyon Dam to effect immediate control. This combination of circumstances makes this the most favorable time we could possibly select to commence storage.

"We are indeed fortunate to be able to close the gates 30 days earlier than anticipated," Commissioner Dominy added. "In this year of likely reduced runoff, every day's storage will make a difference in the total operational program. It is fully expected that even with approximately 75 percent of normal runoff, as currently forecast from March 1 snow surveys, dead storage can be obtained within 10–12 months. This will insure meeting the power production schedule at Glen Canyon Dam next year."

The dam proper is now more than 90 percent completed with the highest block in the 710-foot dam now within 10 feet of crest elevation. About 300,000 cubic yards of concrete is needed to bring all of the blocks in the dam to crest height. Glen Canyon Dam will be topped out with placement of the last bucket of concrete sometime this summer.

L. F. Wylie, project construction engineer for Glen Canyon Dam, manipulated the hydraulic controls of the left tunnel high-pressure gates. The controls are located in the gate chamber deep within the bedrock of the left abutment of the dam and directly above the gates in the left diversion tunnel. Access to the gate chamber is by way of galleries and shafts through the concrete of the dam and the rocks of the dam's abutment.

The filling of Lake Powell also heralds the beginning of boating and other recreation on this great manmade lake. By midsummer it is estimated that Lake Powell will be more than 150 miles long and reach a point above Hite, Utah. The new lake will exceed 65 square miles in area.

Temporary boat ramps and other facilities have been built by the National Park Service at the Wahweap Recreation Area located about 5 miles from Glen Canyon Dam. The rising waters of Lake Powell will reach these temporary ramps by June. Until that time, boats can be launched at Kane Creek, 20 miles from Wahweap Recreation Area. James Eden, Superintendent for Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, has pointed out that, as the water level gradually rises this summer, Lake Powell will offer unparalleled scenery to boaters who can explore the many side canyons which enter the Glen Canyon of the Colorado.

Millions of game fish will be planted in Lake Powell this spring, under a program planned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State Fish and Game Departments of Arizona and Utah. Opening of Lake Powell to fishing is planned for 1964.

Development of recreational facilities and the fish and wildlife program on Lake Powell is being accomplished under the provisions of section 8, Public Law 485, which authorized the Colorado River storage project with Glen Canyon Dam as the key feature.

New Frontier Planners Continue To Beat Drums, for Domestic Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, youthful New Frontier planners continue to beat the drums for a Domestic Peace Corps, and still without any clear congressional approval for their activities.

Recently I was advised by a retired Missouri schoolteacher that she had received, with her monthly retirement check from the Kansas City School District, a "Survey on National Service Program" questionnaire. The questionnaire was to be returned to Study Group, 736 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D.C. This is the address of the Domestic Peace Corps planning group, staffed with personnel on loan from other Government agencies.

The retired schoolteacher properly asks:

Who is sending out such blanks and where is the money coming from?

I sought an answer from the man apparently in charge of Domestic Peace Corps planning, David L. Hackett, Special Assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy. I received a reply to my letter, but no answer to the question:

Where is the money coming from?

Surely this is a legitimate question which should be answered by some responsible official of Government, but no one seems willing or able to do so. And what about the other activities of the Domestic Peace Corps planners?

An editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 8, 1963, tells of a visit to that city by a Richard W. Boone, who is described as "director of the program development section of the soon-to-be proposed national service program (the Domestic Peace Corps)."

What funds were used to finance Mr. Boone's trip to Chicago and no doubt other cities? Have other Domestic Peace Corps planners fanned out over the country in an effort to build up public support for this latest New Frontier boondoggle? When, if ever, will Congress step in and put a stop to the unauthorized expenditure of public funds by this planning group?

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the Chicago Sun-Times editorial to which I referred:

BUREAUCRATIC ENERGY

The director of the program development section of the soon-to-be proposed national service program (the Domestic Peace Corps), Richard W. Boone, was in Chicago on Wednesday. He had some interesting things to say about this giant boondoggle that will call for the expenditure of from $5 million to $10 million the first year of its existence—if the Congress legislates it into life.

"One of the basic tasks of the national service program is to assist in basic education of youth and adults from depressed areas to raise basic educational levels and reduce illiteracy," Boone said.

Obviously Boone is not acquainted with, or doesn't care about, programs now in operation in several areas in this country to do this very job. Chicago has a program underway that has enjoyed great success and is now being expanded with the use of educational television. The taxpayers of the other 49 States are not being dunned to underwrite the Chicago program. Nor were Illinois taxpayers dunned to pay for a successful program to reduce illiteracy in Philadelphia when that city brought its resources to bear on this very problem.

Like most Washington projects almost half of the total cost (40 percent) of the operation of the Domestic Peace Corps will vanish into the great maw of "administrative cost" in Washington. Boone hopes that in the later stages the administrative costs would drop to 30 percent.

This is a futile hope. If past experience is a teacher and a guide this hoped-for cut in administrative costs will never come about; the costs will rise and rise and rise.

The frightening thing about these bland and bright young bureaucrats is their complete acceptance of the tenet that the people of this country have lost their pride and will blindly accept the intervention of the Federal Government into local affairs. The best thing that can be said for these bureaucrats is that they have boundless energy.

Thomas Jefferson, who knew a thing or two about government noted: "I am not a friend to a very energetic government. It is always oppressive."

Addresses by Cardinal Spellman and Mr. Charles H. Silver at Dedication of the Anna Silver Public School in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, an event of the kind that too often escapes general notice took place in Manhattan's Lower East Side on Valentine's Day of this year. It was the dedication of new Public School 20.

What lifted this event out of the commonplace was that Public School 20 has been named the Anna Silver School in memory of the mother of Charles H. Silver, an alumnus of Public School 20, former president of the New York City Board of Education and currently executive assistant to Mayor Wagner for educational and industrial development.

The name of the late Mrs. Silver was chosen as symbolic of East Side mothers who inspired their children to distinguished careers. These distinguished alumni include the senior Senator from New York Mr. Javits, Harry Golden, Edward G. Robinson, and Paul Muni, George and Ira Gershwin, and many, many others who have made life richer for so many.

The principal address at the dedication was given by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks and those of Mr. Charles H. Silver appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HIS EMINENCE, FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN, AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONIES FOR THE ANNA SILVER PUBLIC SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY

It is a great joy for me to be here this evening and a valued honor to participate personally in this beautiful and touching tribute to a valiant and noble woman. Anna Silver must have been a remarkable and wonderful mother; for knowing my old and dear friend, Mr. Silver, as well I do, it was she who is responsible for what he is today and for all he has done through these many years of dedication and service to God and to his fellowman.

It is particularly fitting that a school, this beautiful new building, is now dedicated to her memory. For a school strikingly symbolizes a mother's desire to ennoble, and to enrich the lives of children, and her loving concern for their temporal and spiritual welfare. I can think of no better or finer memorial that Mr. Silver would rather have for his dear mother than this school, which he and so many other prominent citizens attended and that reflects so well his own dedication and commitment to education not only here in this neighborhood but on the city, State and National levels as well.

This teeming and crowded East Side where Anna Silver lived, worked, and reared her family, was the melting pot from which came forth the strong and hearty mixture that forms an important segment of our American heritage. Life, for those who came as immigrants and settled in this neighborhood, was not easy. It entailed adaptation and innumerable adjustments to new conditions and needs and to a way of life so different from that to which they had been accustomed. With their world almost restricted to this small section of the city they worked hard and performed their daily, busy, hectic and humdrum chores of earning a living and raising their children in the spirit, in the faith, and in the traditions they inherited from their fathers before them.

There is a life that is worth living now as it was worth living then, when Anna Silver and thousands of mothers like her dwelt in this neighborhood. It is the dedicated, selfless, useful life, cleansed, and elevated to that great ideal of love of God and love of one's neighbor. How true the old saying that all work is empty save when there is love. For when one works with love he binds himself to others and to God. If Anna Silver and those symbolized by this beautiful memorial were asked the question: "What is it to work with love?" I am sure her answer, if it were possible for her to reply, would be in substance much the same as one given many years ago. What is it to work with love you ask. It is to weave the cloth with threads drawn from your own heart, even as if your beloved were to wear the cloth. It is to build a house with affection, even as if your own beloved were to dwell in that house. It is to sow the seeds with tenderness and reap the harvest with joy, even as if your beloved were to eat the fruit. It is, in short, to charge all things you fashion with a breath of your own spirit.

But, this life that is worth living also involves a battle that is worth fighting now as it was when Anna Silver dwelt in this neighborhood. This is the continuing battle to advance the cause of social justice, equality, human dignity, and religious values. It is the never-ending battle to safeguard and protect our children from all that would weaken and undermine the integrity of the home and the duties and responsibilities of parenthood. Anna Silver and so many like her heroically engaged in this battle, never failing to teach her children by precept and example the honor of serving such a country as America. Like so many other immigrant parents she was, as it were, destined to do that work and was proud to do it, realizing as she did, its meaning and necessity.

Tonight, we rejoice and are glad and grateful that her labor was not in vain nor the fruit of her sacrifice forgotten. For this beautiful memorial in her honor will ever serve as a tribute to her unfailing faith in God and in her neighbor and to her unselfish courage and loyalty to this great ideal.

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE MAYOR FOR EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, AT DEDICATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL 20, MANHATTAN—THE ANNA SILVER SCHOOL

What a little boy learns, he never forgets. I have never forgotten the East Side.

I have never forgotten my first teacher. I did not understand in those careless days, long ago, how very much I owed her. I did not even realize how much she taught me.

Yet, here I am tonight, after almost a lifetime devoted to education. I have returned to my own Public School 20 * * * back to the East Side.

Yes, I have returned—and, again, my mother is with me—as she was more than half a century ago when I stood for the first time within the walls of this blessed school. I stood with a lump in my throat and my heart full—as it is today—with the ache of tender memories, recalling the days of my childhood, the cherished hours with my family and with friends long since gone.

And yet, by some miracle of the imagination, here in a reborn Public School 20, many of those loved ones seem to be standing beside me.

I can feel the cool hands of my mother. I can smell the sweet freshness of her dress as I clung to her—unwilling to begin the fearful adventure of meeting the teachers who were going to take her place in guiding me through the early experiences of life.

Where have they gone—all those golden years—all those busy days tumbling crazily after each other? What I would give to recapture even one of them—to spend it again with my mother—my father—my brothers—my sisters—my teachers and schoolmates.

I did not know. I did not realize how much I had—how much it means just to be a boy in a school like this.

And yet—although many dear faces have vanished forever—although much has changed—the vibrant spirit of Public School 20 continues to live and to grow—and none of us has really lost it.

The streets outside are very much the same—and somewhere among those shouting, racing youngsters—playing under the watchful eye of their mothers—somewhere among them is still the son of Anna Silver.

Or else I am among the tiny old desks of old Public School 20—near the center aisle where you could slide the doors back to join all the classrooms into a single assembly hall that once seemed so very large.

Or I am singing the familiar songs with my school companions and rising to pledge allegiance to the flag—yes—and certainly, in those days, bowing our heads to pray.

Or, I am sitting on the hard benches listening wide eyed to the story of the beginning of this land of opportunity, joining the chorus of young voices that chanted "My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty * * *" as I learned the meaning of that marvelous word, "liberty."

What a little boy learns, he never forgets, and I have never forgotten that the East Side, as I grew up in it, was a living definition of democracy.

To it had come the immigrants and descendants of immigrants, the poor, tired, huddled masses yearning to breathe free, and learning how good and how pleasing it is when brethren dwell together in unity.

To it had come the East Side mother—a symbol of all mothers everywhere—rearing a worthy generation—rocking the cradles of freedom—sending their sons to Public School 20 to learn the ancient motto: "Ad astra per aspera"—"To the stars—despite all obstacles."

And how truly has the issue of this school fulfilled its destiny. Our list of graduates reads like a university honor roll: George and Ira Gershwin, Senator Jacob Javits, song writer Irving Caesar, drama stars Paul Muni and Edward G. Robinson, authors Harry Golden and Aben Kandel, Judge Simon Silver and Judge Samuel J. Silverman, realtor Irving Maidman, neurologist Benjamin Apfelberg, poet Elias Lieberman.

There are other great names yet to come. Men who will rise in our places—from among the very students who will attend assembly in this room. I am thinking of generations yet unborn who will fall heir to this great tradition. I am thinking of restless, eager, and talented young men and women who will study and work and strive—true to the ideals of the East Side boy who is never quite content and always determined to make it a better world.

But, most of all, I am thinking of mother—of my mother—of the East Side mother who lived her life for her children.

Our school is named for Anna Silver—not because she was my mother—although you can appreciate how proud I am that this dramatic new building bears her dear name. No—it is called the Anna Silver School because my mother was typical of your mother and all mothers—and the sacred love they gave us—the love that we seek later, but never find again as long as we live.

My mother was a simple, humble, warm, and intensely human person. If she could be with us here, today, she would call me to her side and say:

"Charlie, what's all this fuss about Anna Silver? Why so especially, son, for me? Why not for Mary Murphy, or Carmen Fernandez, of Rosie Cermak, or any of the thousands of other wonderful mothers of every creed and color all over our neighborhood?"

And I would answer: "Mother, I am glad that the school I attended bears your name. You were my first teacher."

I know that my mother would understand. Mothers always understand, even though we cannot always honor them with their name on a school. Yet, they see beyond the outward silence—and even neglect—to read the tribute in our hearts.

Let me give you the pleasure of hearing such a tribute—the work of my dear and

gifted friend, Theodore Reade Nathan. He calls his moving poem "The East Side Mother":

I'd gladly give up gold or fame
To seek again that poorer place
Where when the hour of bedtime came,
I gazed up at my mother's face.

The hours have gone, the days have fled
The years have washed away like sand,
I stand upon the shore of dread
And cannot find my mother's hand.

What wisdom—oh, what wealth is there
To change that rumpled little fool
Who pushed her fingers from his hair
Before he hurried off to school.

She watched him on his way to class
Admonishing from up above:
"Be sure to let the horse-cars pass"
And so we heard the voice of love.

The East Side mother long ago
Gave us her strength, her faith, her youth—
Gave us the will to learn and grow
And so we knew the voice of truth.

Look down once more from where you are
To watch the children of our day,
And be again their guiding star—
Mother, help us find our way.

I think that constitutes one of the most beautiful and moving Valentines any mother could receive today.

It is part of my way of thanking the boys and girls attending Public School 20, the fine teachers, Principal Benjamin Falon and the Assistant Superintendent Mrs. Florence Becker, the parents, members of the local school board and the community.

I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to the gifted artist, Lumen Martin Winter, who created the eloquent and dramatic mural you have all seen in the lobby.

I am also thankful for the constant assistance of Public School 20's unofficial historian and inspired organizer, Aaron Fishman.

Let me express, before I close, my deep and heartfelt appreciation to you, in particular, Your Eminence, for blessing our ceremony with your good wishes. Even though this is no ordinary school, I know how very extraordinary a thing it is to be so honored.

I am sure that my mother would have been deeply moved, as I am, because you have made a day that means so much to me—mean so much more.

This school has been distinguished on the day of its dedication by the presence of New York's own beloved Archbishop, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman.

I want to acknowledge the presence of another cherished friend, the man who joined me 3 years ago in a public pledge—while I was president of the board of education—that Public School 20 would rise again. He is with us tonight to see that promise gloriously fulfilled.

We can be all the more grateful to him because today—St. Valentine's Day—is his wedding anniversary.

It is wonderful that you could be with us, Bob. We all join in heartfelt congratulations to Susan and to you.

Happy anniversary to our mayor, Robert F. Wagner and his lovely first lady .

To all of you and to our honored guests, I say thank you—for myself—for our city—for the untold thousands of children who will be prepared for life within these walls, and for the distinguished alumni of Public School No. 20.

Thank you for giving us this great, new school.

And thank you for being so good to your mothers—and to mine.

Mr. Fred—Mr. Republican of the Eastern Shore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Salisbury, Md., Times, under the date of March 9, 1963.

Mr. Frederick Paul Adkins, known to his Eastern Shore friends as Mr. Fred and Mr. Republican, was unique in his perception of his fellowmen. He was the one who "always saw a need and did his best to fill it."

Few men in their lifetime have given so much to the well-being of others as Mr. Fred.

The editorial follows:

[From the Salisbury (Md.) Times, Mar. 9, 1963]

MR. FRED

Frederick Paul Adkins was Mr. Fred, the man who always saw a need and did his best to fill it.

And in doing so he made the Eastern Shore a better place in which to live. His business was the firm started by his father E. S. Adkins & Co., which he and his brothers built and expanded throughout the Eastern Shore.

His avocation was the promotion of those things which he thought would be in the best interests of his beloved Eastern Shore. He was known as Mr. Republican, a leader at State and national levels and saw his daughter rise to the highest post ever held by a woman in his party's ranks and in the Federal administration. He was also Mr. Eastern Shore, organizer of the old Delmarva Eastern Shore Association as well as of the Salisbury Chamber of Commerce, and their first presidents.

He was the founder of the Wicomico Hotel and its first president, the founder of the Salisbury Times. In World War I and World War II he was given civilian tasks of responsibility and also devoted his time to bond and community campaigns. A prominent lay Methodist, he was the driving force that brought about the building of the Bethesda Methodist Church, was a Methodist conference lay delegate, participated in the conference that brought the union of Methodism, was on the board of his church and for many years was superintendent of its Sunday school. He was a trustee of Western Maryland College.

His recognition from the State included offices of State tax commissioner and State industrial accident commissioner.

A Mason and a Shriner, he was awarded the honorary 33d degree, given only for outstanding dedication and service.

He was a fund raiser of outstanding success, and one of his secrets in that success was being one of the first and major contributors, ranging from the early days of Peninsula General Hospital to the present War Memorial Youth and Civic Center, the latest major community undertaking.

Mr. Fred needs no memorial. His memorial is living, our community as he has touched its facets through his life and improved it for our betterment.

A New and Interesting Development in America's Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to place before my colleagues in the House of Representatives certain information as to a new and interesting development in America's space program. The Science and Astronautics Committee is presently holding hearings on this development. Although this matter has been discussed at considerable length in the New England press, I am not sure that all are fully informed on it.

Members of the House will recall that when President Kennedy, 2 years ago, recommended expansion and acceleration of the national space program he described it as part of "the battle that is going on around the world between freedom and tryanny—the battle for men's minds." He made it clear to the Congress that a difficult, expensive, and comprehensive program, in space sciences and technology, would be necessary. In this connection he stated:

> This decision demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, material and facilities, and the possibility of their diversion from other important activities where they are already thinly spread.

This continues to be the problem of the space program. It is absolutely essential that the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be utilized to develop and support a wide range of programs of scientific investigation and development.

There are, of course, many facets to the scientific, research, and development work of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, each part of which must be permitted to proceed and accelerate to the extent possible in harmony, one with the others. In some cases, NASA has been able to build on known technology or to accelerate programs of research and development that had already been instituted. For example, it was able to expand on the talents available from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It was able to integrate into its program certain of the work of the Army Ballistics Missile Agency, under Dr. Wernher von Braun, at Huntsville, Ala., the Vanguard team from the Naval Research Laboratory, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory which had been under Army contract. NASA has been able to integrate the work of these separate teams and on them to build sound and forward looking space programs in the aeronautical and propulsion fields.

However, a less satisfactory foundation has existed with respect to electronics and its related physics disciplines and

capabilities. It became obvious that some extraordinary steps were necessary to keep that phase of the space sciences in pace with the rest of the program. The major importance of electronics components, technology, and instrumentation, in all space endeavors, made it doubly necessary to broaden NASA's space electronics research base as rapidly as possible.

An extensive study of the best way to approach this problem was inaugurated; various approaches were explored, such as the possibility of establishing electronic research systems and development groups at one or more of NASA's existing centers, the establishment of a fairly large electronics research subcenter at an existing NASA installation, the use of the talents of other governmental electronics laboratories, the establishment of a private laboratory as an affiliate of a major university or foundation, and the desirability of establishing a new NASA center as an entity with the necessary facilities.

After most careful analysis, it was decided that the most effective solution, consistent with all other problems, was to establish a new research center, specifically devoted to research in electronics and related physics disciplines. This would permit a concentration of research talent in one place; it would avoid conflicts between development missions and research efforts in other fields, and by providing a variety of research facilities available under a singleness of direction it was felt that there would be a rapid development of a critical mass of electronics research data. I wish to point out this center is for research and not for development of hardware or for production of electronic components or subsystems. The results of its research will be available to all. It should be a factor in the growth of electronic and related industries. There are estimates that about three-fourths of the cost of spacecraft goes for electronics, yet at present members of the industrial community undertaking spacecraft contracts spend no more than 5 percent of their resources for electronic research.

This decision having been made, further studies were made as to the proper location of such a facility. This included consideration of a host of criteria, including the availability of adequate utilities and services, including power, water, communications, and sanitary facilities, the proximity of institutions of higher scientific and engineering education, not only as a basis for the interchange of ideas but at which facilities could be provided for additional study by members of the research center's staff. Other considerations involved the need for the new center to be located in an industrial community in which interests with similar technical work were available. It was essential, because of the proposed size of the center, to be sure that the new installation would have available to it satisfactory community facilities such as housing, recreation, schools, and colleges, and a variety of transportation services would be available for both long and short distances.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after most careful consideration, has decided that the best place to locate the electronics research center is in the Greater Boston area It has recommended that such action be taken and it is my understanding that the President's budget includes initial funds for the acquisition of land, site development, and planning for such a facility.

A total of $8.5 million has been recommended for this purpose in the fiscal year 1964. Five million dollars is budgeted for the acquisition of land, site development, and planning of the research center, and $3.5 million for personnel costs and for the operation of the installation. As now conceived, the center will involve a capital investment of approximately $50 million in buildings and facilities and a gradual growth of personnel assigned thereto to the level of 2,000 people.

As I understand it, an interim step in the planning of this great institution is being taken prior to the actual congressional decision through the establishment of an electronics research task group, temporarily attached to the Office of Advanced Research and Technology and composed of personnel located both at headquarters in Washington and at the northeastern office in Cambridge.

On behalf of myself and the entire Massachusetts delegation, I should like to commend the foresight, vision, and decision of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this matter, and to commend to my colleagues on the Committee on Science and Astronautics and on the Appropriations Committee the early consideration of the authorization and appropriation actions necessary to initiate this very important phase of America's space effort.

Numerous U.S. Citizens as Well as Latin Americans Travel to Cuba for Subversive Activities—Contrary to the Law and Without Prosecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and shocked to learn—and even more so to receive verification from responsible sources in and out of government—that U.S. citizens as well as Latin Americans are going to Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico even though this is in direct violation of the law.

I have had submitted to me by a reliable source and have checked it through every governmental source available to confirm its authenticity, a list of 73 U.S. citizens who have used this devious, undercover, Communist open-door route to Cuba in a period of only 4 short months in 1962.

The House Un-American Activities Committee records, when checked briefly against this list, indicates that two of the U.S. citizens on the list of 1962 travelers to Cuba are identified as having Communist backgrounds.

What is equally significant is that the Justice Department has not prosecuted these known American Communists who are flagrantly violating the law in this manner, nor has the State Department made any attempt to close this open door to Cuba and communism that has met with any success.

Existing law, as publicly announced by a State Department press release issued June 29, 1961, prior to the travel by these 73, prohibits U.S. citizens from traveling to Cuba without obtaining passports specifically endorsed for such travel by the U.S. State Department. Willful violation of this law is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both.

Mr. Speaker, the Cuban Embassy in Mexico is the established open door through which Communist subversives from throughout the Americas gain entrance to Cuba and then return to their respective homelands, including the United States, for purposes of subversion and sabotage.

Passage from Mexico to Cuba is made possible through the amazing Communist gimmick of not requiring visas issued by the Cuban Embassy in Mexico to become a part of the visitor's passports or to be evidenced thereon, but rather is a separate document easily discarded.

This devious, undercover device is in direct violation of international law and custom. It makes it possible for people from the United States, if they meet the standards of acceptability laid down by Castro's embassy in Mexico, to receive visas for travel to Cuba. While in Cuba, they can receive their Communist indoctrination course in sabotage and subversion, return to Mexico and then to the United States without their passports ever showing they have been to Cuba—all in violation of U.S. law as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have turned the names of the 73 Americans over to the House Un-American Activities Committee for a thorough investigation.

I think it worthy to note the backgrounds of 2 of the 73 U.S. citizens who have made this journey, both women who have known Communist backgrounds.

One woman traveler was indentified as a member of the Communist Party in testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1955 by an undercover agent for the FBI who posed as a Communist. She was also identified as a Communist by a former managing editor of the Communist Daily Worker who broke with the party and testified against her. In hearings as recently as November 14, 1962, she was active in the Los Angeles branch of the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee which has been identified as a Communist front organization.

The other woman admitted in 1957, when coming before the California State Bar, that she had been a Communist.

Although she has ostensibly resigned her official membership in the party, she has since been active in Communist front organizations. She recently wrote President Kennedy protesting the trial of the Communist Party for failing to register and also participated in the organization of the Los Angeles chapter of the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee.

In addition to the people on this list, a number of other identified Communists have been advertising in Communist publications including Peoples World and the Worker and through brochures, that they have just recently returned from Cuba and are giving lectures concerning the latest information on Castro's island—slanted of course toward Castro and communism.

Mr. Speaker, failure to close this open door and to prosecute these people some of whom are open and notorious in their admission that they are going to Cuba through Mexico is inexcusable and alarming.

Mexico is one of only five Latin American nations still recognizing the Castro regime, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Uruguay being the others, and one of the few that permit travel to Cuba.

I am at this point inserting a copy of the State Department press release prohibiting travel to Cuba as well as the title of the United States Code pertaining to the subject.

The article follows:

COPY OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE PRESS RELEASE PROHIBITING TRAVEL TO CUBA

JUNE 29, 1961.

On January 16, 1961, the Department of State publicly announced that all U.S. citizens desiring to travel to Cuba must obtain passports specifically endorsed for such travel by the Department.

The Department has recently received information that some U.S. citizens are being encouraged to visit Cuba via Central and South America, without complying with the passport requirements.

Travel to Cuba by a U.S. citizen without a passport specifically validated by the Department of State for that purpose, constitutes a violation of the Travel Control Law and Regulations (title 8, United States Code, sec. 1185; title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, sec. 53.3).

The Department warns all concerned that a willful violation of the law is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

THE KOREAN WAR NATIONAL EMERGENCY PROCLAMATION IS STILL IN EFFECT—EXCERPTS FROM THE APPLICABLE STATUTE

SECTION 1185. TRAVEL CONTROL OF CITIZENS AND ALIENS DURING WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY

(a) Restrictions and prohibitions on aliens

When the United States is at war or during the existence of any national emergency proclaimed by the President, or, as to aliens, whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more states, and the President shall find that the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this section be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, it shall, until otherwise ordered by the President of the Congress, be unlawful:

(1) for any alien to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States except under such reasonable rules, regulations, and orders, and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President may prescribe;

(2) for any person to transport or attempt to transport from or into the United States another person with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that the departure or entry of such other person is forbidden by this section;

(3) for any person knowingly to make any false statement in an application for permission to depart from or enter the United States with intent to induce or secure the granting of such permission either for himself or for another;

(4) for any person knowingly to furnish or attempt to furnish or assist in furnishing to another a permit or evidence of permission to depart or enter not issued and designed for such other person's use;

(5) for any person knowingly to use or attempt to use any permit or evidence of permission to depart or enter not issued and designed for his use;

(6) for any person to forge, counterfeit, mutilate, or alter, or cause or procure to be forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered, any permit or evidence of permission to depart from or enter the United States;

(7) for any person knowingly to use or attempt to use or furnish to another for use any false, forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered permit, or evidence of permission, or any permit or evidence of permission which, though originally valid, has become or been made void or invalid.

(b) Citizens

After such proclamation as is provided for in subsection (a) of this section has been made and published and while such proclamation is in force, it shall, except as otherwise provided by the President, and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President may authorize and prescribe, be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States unless he bears a valid passport.

(c) Penalties

Any person who shall willfully violate any of the provisions of this section, or of any order or proclamation of the President promulgated, or of any permit, rule, or regulation issued thereunder, shall upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by like fine or imprisonment, or both; and any vehicle, vessel, or aircraft together with its appurtenances, equipment, tackle, apparel, and furniture, concerned in any such violation, shall be forfeited to the United States.

(d) Definitions

The term "United States" as used in this section includes the Canal Zone, and all territory and waters, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The term "person" as used in this section shall be deemed to mean any individual, partnership, association, company, or other incorporated body of individuals, or corporation, or body politic.

(e) Nonadmission of certain aliens

Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an alien to whom a permit to enter the United States has been issued to enter the United States, if, upon arrival in the United States, he is found to be inadmissible under any of the provisions of this chapter, or any other law, relative to the entry of aliens into the United States.

(f) Revocation of proclamation as affecting penalties

The revocation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued in pursuance of this section shall not prevent prosecution for any offense committeed, or the imposition of any penalties or forfeitures, liability for which was incurred under this section prior to the revocation of such proclamation, rule, regulation, or order.

(g) Permits to enter

Passports, visas, reentry permits, and other documents required for entry under this chapter may be considered as permits to enter for the purposes of this section. (June 27, 1952, ch. 477, title II, ch. 2, section 215, 66 Stat. 190.)

Proposed Legislation To Alleviate the Shortage of Physicians and Dentists in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have, during this session, introduced three bills to help alleviate the critical shortage of physicians and dentists in the United States by providing Federal funds for medical and dental school construction, operating expenses, and scholarships.

Today I am introducing further legislation with the same objective of increasing our Nation's supply of doctors and dentists. Specifically, I propose to amend title II of the 1958 National Defense Education Act to provide for forgiveness of loans for students who subsequently practice medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in geographical areas determined by State health authorities to have a shortage of individuals in such practice.

The National Defense Education Act already provides that up to 50 percent of loans plus interest may be forgiven if the borrower becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school. The loans may be canceled at a rate of 10 percent for each year of teaching service.

This provision was prompted by a critical shortage of trained teachers. Surely our Nation faces a no less critical shortage of health personnel, for we will need 15,000 additional doctors and a similar number of dentists by 1975.

What have we, as legislators, done about the dearth of doctors and dentists? Thus far we have placed very few marks on the legislative scoresheet. We have not yet acted favorably upon proposals that my colleagues and I have made to provide Federal assistance for the construction of badly needed medical, dental, and public health educational facilities. Nor has any Federal helping hand been extended to medical and dental schools in meeting their ever-mounting operating expenses. Nor has Congress acted favorably upon legislation which I have repeatedly introduced to provide for scholarships for medical and dental students.

Meanwhile, the shortage of these scarce personnel resources has become

all the more serious with the decline—for the fifth consecutive year—in the number of medical school applicants.

The financial problems faced by these students—and I will use students of medicine as an example—have become increasingly insurmountable. Studies by the Association of American Medical Colleges and the National Opinion Research Center in 1959 reveal that the medical student is indeed the "poor man" of the student world.

The proof is striking. A medical student's education—excluding living expenses—costs more than twice that of a graduate student in arts and science. The average direct cost to the medical student is about $1,000 a year or $4,000 in 4 years. In contrast, the educational expenses of the arts and science graduate student average only $450 a year or $1,800 for a 4-year program of Ph. D. training. Adding living expenses, the average 4-year expense to a medical student exceeds $11,000.

The difference in stipend income of these two groups is equally appalling. The average medical student receives $500 a year or $2,000 in stipends in 4 years; the average graduate student in arts and science receives $2,000 per year or $8,000 over a 4-year period.

Moreover, 47 percent of the medical students in 1959 had obtained loans, whereas only 9 percent of the graduate students had to borrow money to meet their educational or living expenses. The average dollar value of the loans to medical students was $3,900, while the average loan to the graduate student was $2,500. Thus more than five times as many medical students as graduate students had plunged themselves into debt.

The study further reveals that almost four times as many medical students received help from their families as did arts and science graduate students. Yet there was no evidence that the parents of medical students were in a higher income group. The answer given by the graduate students was simply that they did not receive support from their parents because they did not need any support from them.

The financial problems of medical students with wives and families—62 percent of the 1959 graduating class were married and 54 percent of them had one or more children—are even more acute.

Meanwhile, the tuitions charged by medical schools have risen at a phenomenal rate. Between 1934 and 1963, private medical school tuitions increased 202 percent, public school nonresident tuitions rose 161 percent, and resident tuitions rose 145 percent.

While the costs of a medical education progressively rise, the resources available to the medical student in meeting expenses progressively decline.

Faced with this serious situation, I propose that the national defense student loan program be modified so that 25 percent of the unpaid loan plus interest be forgiven for each complete year that an individual practices medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in areas determined by State health authorities to have a shortage of such practitioners.

This amendment would have three important effects. First, it would remove the sharp edge from medical and dental student indebtedness which in 1959 averaged $4,258 per student for medical students alone. Of the 6,799 medical students who graduated in 1959, over half the class was in debt, and one-third had loan liabilities directly related to their medical education. Yet, unlike graduate students, these students faced a year of internship, and many faced 1 or more years of residency training before they could begin actual medical practice.

I have often pointed out that a number of Federal agencies such as the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, and Atomic Energy Commission provide not only loan but also scholarship and fellowship assistance to Ph. D. candidates in the basic sciences and engineering. Small wonder that these fields are becoming increasingly attractive to young people trying to decide upon a career.

The second effect of my amendment would be to help alleviate physician and dentist shortages in areas where shortages are most serious; in particular, the rural areas of the United States.

For the past 20 years, the New England, North Atlantic and Pacific regions of the United States have retained high ratios of physicians to population, while the South Central, North Central and Mountain States have continued to have the lowest ratios.

In 1957 a total of 33 States were below the U.S. average in the ratio of non-Federal physicians to population. In view of the fact that our population has continued to increase while the number of graduating physicians has not, there is good reason to believe that the situation existing in 1957 is even more serious today.

The original intent of the National Defense Education Act which authorized the national defense student loan program, was "to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation" and "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

Thus the third—and perhaps most important—effect of the amendment I propose would be to bring the national defense student loan program into closer conformity to these stated objectives which reflect not only the intent of the National Defense Education Act, but also the best interests of our Nation.

Mr. William Wesche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our governmental system is measured by the ability, loyalty and industry of our public servants. The dedication and zeal of our local town and village officials is too often known only in such town or village. My attention has been drawn to the retirement of the village clerk of Farmingdale, N.Y., William Wesche, whose 32-year record of service deserves recognition beyond the confines of his community, and it is with pleasure that I commend him by quoting the statement of Mayor Joseph Brune on the occasion of Mr. Wesche's retirement:

WILLIAM WESCHE

The village of Farmingdale, Long Island, for years has had the reputation of having a village clerk's office that was constantly responsive to the daily needs of its citizens. This was primarily due to the complete dedication of Bill Wesche to his duties. During the past 32 years, it has been his diligence, foresight, and integrity that has assured good government in Farmingdale.

The art of local government administration has been truly enhanced by this outstanding public official. We certainly wish him the best in retirement.

Controversy Over the TFX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post which points out that the burden of proof regarding the controversial decision on the TFX fighter-bomber rests upon the Secretary of Defense. It is in the national interest that this controversy be resolved to the benefit of the taxpayer who foots the bill for the defense of our Nation.

The editorial follows:

CONTROVERSY OVER THE TFX

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN'S investigating subcommittee is a long way from having settled the controversy over the TFX superfighter aircraft. Indeed, up to this point the subcommittee's censored hearings have served chiefly to stir up controversy. Well-grounded conclusions appear to be still some distance away, if such conclusion can ever be drawn. Nevertheless, the airing of this questionable contract award has already served a useful purpose and whetted the public appetite for full information.

From the testimony released to date Defense Secretary McNamara and his top civilian aides who awarded this $6.5 billion aircraft program to General Dynamics Corp. are clearly on the defensive. They have not given the subcommittee convincing reasons why they chose General Dynamics for this largest fighter contract since World War II in disregard of the conclusions of four military evaluation boards that the TFX design submitted by Boeing Aircraft would be better and cheaper.

Air Force Secretary Zuckert and Navy Secretary Korth had said in defense of the challenged decision that a comparison of the "raw scores" of the two planes showed General Dynamics with 175.6 points and Boeing with 172.1. But Air Force Col. Charles A.

Gayle, program director for the project, has told the subcommittee that "it is not the normal practice to add the raw scores" because some features of the competitive planes are entitled to more weight than others. The subcommittee has found it necessary also to correct some of the figures that had been used in computing the costs of the rival craft.

This probe into the reasons for overruling the experts takes place against a background of intensive competition for lucrative defense contracts and widespread use of political influence in this sphere. Even the President intimated in his campaign speeches last fall that the election of Democrats would be beneficial in channeling a large share of defense contracts into a State. Most Congressmen are also up to their necks in the struggle for defense contracts for their own areas. It follows that extraordinary vigilance is necessary to make sure that contracts are not being awarded arbitrarily or for partisan reasons.

In these circumstances the burden of proof that the TFX contract award to General Dynamics best serves the national interest clearly falls upon Secretary McNamara and his aides. Perhaps they can make a convincing case for overruling the evaluation boards four times, but they do not appear to have done so to date, and this controversy will continue to wax hot until they meet that obligation.

Community Junior Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a 5-year program of Federal assistance to the States for construction and expansion of public community junior colleges.

My bill is similar to a bill I introduced in the last session of the Congress and with H.R. 1575, which Mr. ULLMAN, of Oregon, introduced last January 19.

The modest program of Federal assistance for public community colleges provided in my bill will help combat the twin problems of the increasing need for technically trained manpower and the rising costs of college education. The high costs of college education prevents millions of bright youngsters from attending college. This problem and the absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate loss of brainpower which could be saved by establishing easily accessible and inexpensive public community colleges.

My bill provides for $200 million annually over a 5-year period for grants to the States for construction and expansion of public community colleges. Half of the yearly appropriation would be divided equally among the States. The remaining one-half would be apportioned among the States on the basis of their relative school enrollment compared to total school enrollment of all States.

The program will be administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in cooperation with the various State boards or commissioners of education. Federal assistance will be contingent upon acceptable State plans for constructing and expanding public junior colleges in communities needing and desiring such institutions.

Construction of public junior colleges will make higher education available at low cost to the student and at moderate cost to society. There is a great need for these colleges, particularly in areas such as I represent.

Just as importantly, an expanded nationwide system of public community colleges can serve a diversity of purposes crucial for our increasingly technical economy. They provide 2-year programs of technical; scientific, and managerial training for those not desiring to attend a full 4-year college course. They also permit students desiring to complete 4-year courses to begin their education more inexpensively near home.

The investment required by this program is truly insignificant compared to the returns it will provide our society.

Lincoln Day in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a tradition of observing the birthday of President Abraham Lincoln has been started at Bar Ilan University in Israel. The observance places emphasis upon the cultural ties which link the United States with Israel's history and is climaxed by an address delivered by an American who had made a significant contribution to both countries. Last year the Lincoln Day address was delivered by Commissioner Bernard Katzen of the New York State Commission on Human Rights. This year the Lincoln Day address was delivered by Dr. Israel Goldstein, rabbi emeritus of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, one of the oldest in New York City. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD excerpts from the address by Dr. Goldstein at the Lincoln Day observance, Bar Ilan University, Israel, on February 12, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSONS FOR ISRAEL FROM ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S LIFE

On August 7, 1955, I had the privilege of participating in the dedication of the Bar Ilan University, as a Zionist colleague and admirer of the great Jewish leader whose name was bestowed upon this institution, as a friend of its first president, Dr. Churgin and as an American Jew, paying tribute to an educational enterprise of higher learning in Israel aiming to be a special link with American Jewry and with the American academic community.

At the dedication exercises I said that "it will not be enough that an institution of higher learning will be religious. Its primary justification will have to be its academic quality."

Today, more than 7 years later, it is a pleasure to note the physical, numerical and educational progress of Bar Ilan University. In looking over your literature I was interested to see, for example, that the most popular majors are, in the order named, psychology, Hebrew literature, chemistry, Bible, English, indicating a good balance between the Jewish and the general fields of interest.

Today, I come to you in a different status from that of 7 years ago, that of a resident of Israel who is living and working on this side of the bridge uniting American Jewry and Israel, a bridge in which Bar Ilan University plays an increasingly important part in the intellectual segment of the traffic on that bridge. In founding Brandeis University in the United States 17 years ago, I had hopes that it too might play a role in this intercultural traffic.

For all these reasons I have special pleasure in participating in your Lincoln Day exercises. These exercises held annually, constitute an additional link with the spiritual heritage of America. The Lincoln building on your campus is a tangible token of this special link.

The birthday of Abraham Lincoln is an occasion when it would seem appropriate to say a word about Lincoln's Jewish contacts. The Jewish population in the United States of his day numbered less than 150,000, and was particularly meager in the section of the country in which he grew up and developed. The first man to suggest Lincoln for the Presidency was a Jew, Abraham Jonas of Quincy, Ill. When he was elected to that high office, Abraham Kohn, of Chicago, presented him with an American flag bearing Hebrew characters in its fold, the words from the Book of Joshua, chapter 1, verse 9: "Have I not commanded thee? Be strong and of good courage—be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed, for the Lord thy God is with thee wheresoever thou goest."

Lincoln was the first President to offer a Jew a position of diplomatic representation to a foreign power; the post of Minister to Italy offered but not accepted, to Sigesmund Kaufman of New York. To another Jew, Joseph Seligman of New York, he offered the post of Secretary of the Treasury. It was not accepted. He was the first President to appoint a Jewish Army chaplain, having seen to it that the existing law which spoke only of Christian chaplains was duly amended. His strongest intervention on behalf of Jews was when he countermanded General Grant's order expelling Jewish traders from military posts.

An interesting sidelight on Lincoln was his expressed approval of the idea of the restoration of Jews to Palestine. The idea was broached to him by a Christian Zionist. Lincoln agreed that the project was worthy of serious thought but said that the United States was too busy with the war to take any major role in an international problem like Palestine.

When Lincoln's life came to its tragic sudden end on an early Saturday morning the rabbis were the first to eulogize the martyred President. Among them was Morris J. Raphall in the pulpit of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, which it has been my privilege to serve. Rabbi Isaac M. Wise, in his eulogy, said, "Lincoln believed himself to be a descendant of Hebrew parentage. He said so in my presence."

Whatever may have been his genealogical descent, Lincoln's spiritual ancestry was the Bible. It was one of the few books on which he had been reared and it saturated his speech, his thought, and his feeling. A man of mystic moods, he had premonitions of his untimely death, that he like Moses would be denied the entry into the Promised Land.

The question of Lincoln's religion has often been debated. Hence these words of his de-

serve to be recalled, "I can see how it might be possible for a man to look down upon the earth and be an atheist, but I cannot conceive how he could look up into the heavens and say there is no God." Indeed, in the most trying hours for himself and for the Nation, when crucial action was called for, Lincoln drew upon the deep fountains of his faith in God. In the crucial days of the Civil War, he wrote down the words intended only for himself, "The will of God prevails." Solomon Schechter, who since his youth in Rumania had been an admirer and student of Lincoln, put it well in a remarkable Lincoln Centennial address delivered in 1909, "No religious hero ever entered upon his mission to conquer the world for an idea or creed with more reverence and a deeper feeling of the need of divine assistance than did Lincoln."

The lives of the great are beacon lights not only to their own generation and not only to their own nation. Hence our observance of Lincoln Day here in Israel might well consider what lessons Lincoln's life holds for Israel's present and future.

There were two main issues in Lincoln's life, one, moral, the abolition of Negro slavery, the other, political, the unity of the Nation. At given points, the moral and the political issues were intervened. Thus too it is with us in Israel.

Israel has enlarged and extended Lincoln's banner by carrying it into a continent which used to be known as the Dark Continent. The peoples of Africa, after centuries of underprivilege and oppression at the hands of colonial powers, have felt the stir of freedom and are now rapidly emerging into national freedom and independence. Israel is extending to them a fraternal hand, making available to them the results of its own experience in transforming political freedom into economic freedom through land reclamation, industrial development and cooperative living. Israel, a young nation itself, no sooner learns than it offers to teach. Its hand of friendship has been warmly grasped. The world cannot remain half slave and half free. Israel's part in helping to bring closer the new day when the submerged peoples of yesterday will emerge into the full freedom of tomorrow is one of its most honorable credentials in the international community.

May Lincoln's birthday, observed in Israel from year to year, serve as a recurrent occasion to review its own progress in consolidating and strengthening its internal unity and in enlarging its already impressive moral credit in its foreign policy as a helpful friend to nations small and large who are ready to grasp the hand it offers.

Thus a new light will shine on Zion whose rays will benefit all.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CONTE. On Sunday, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate again the great feast day of St. Patrick. Wherever men gather on this day, there will be good will. Although St. Patrick belongs to the sons of Erin, his feast has assumed the spirit of universality.

It has been almost 1,500 years since St. Patrick first set foot on Irish soil. The faith he planted there prospered and grew during the Middle Ages, and Ireland was a source of culture and missionary activity throughout Europe.

According to the calendar, it is not yet spring on St. Patrick's Day, and therein lies fair warning. But there is a kind of spring in St. Patrick's Day—for the green which stands for Ireland, which is indeed a fair land, can also stand for the spring of joy and gladness which fills every Irish heart on this day.

It is my hope that the faith in God and the joy in life which our Irish brothers have always possessed in such abundance continue to light the world and bring hope and gladness in the most troubled times.

Religion and the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is unthinkable to me that the reading of the Bible and the humble utterance of the Lord's Prayer would be held unconstitutional and would be banned from our public schools.

Yet, these questions are now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest court in the land, which, upon convening, hears this supplication: "God save the United States."

In my opinion, Mr. President, a decision by the Supreme Court to outlaw Bible reading and the saying of the Lord's Prayer in our classrooms would be more far-reaching, and infinitely more devastating, than last year's infamous New York school prayer edict. I submit that the decision greatly distorted the intent of the first amendment, and dealt a severe blow to the fundamental faith in Almighty God upon which this Nation was founded.

Life magazine has editorially pointed out that the two cases now pending before the Supreme Court, involving the Bible and the Lord's Prayer, present an excellent opportunity for the Court to reexamine "the premises on which it has been deciding cases of this kind up to now." I sincerely hope the justices will not let pass the opportunity to right a wrong.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIBLE: BETTER IN SCHOOL THAN IN COURT

It is America's custom to hand its toughest issues to the Supreme Court, this insuring the Court's recurrent unpopularity. Such an issue was the subject of oral argument before the justices last fortnight. They were asked, by a Pennsylvania Unitarian and a Maryland atheist, to outlaw the reading of the Bible and the saying of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools of those two States. When the decision comes down it could have even more seismic political effects than last year's famous New York school prayer decision (Life, July 13). As one or two justices have indicated, it is a good time for the Court to reexamine the premises on which it has been deciding cases of this kind up to now.

In the New York case the Court outlawed a prayer written by the board of regents, Justice Black saying for the majority that "it is no part of the business of Government to compose official prayers." The regents' prayer had little to recommend it but its innocuous nonsectarianism, though millions of Americans were shocked to learn that any prayer could be unconstitutional. The Bible and the Lord's Prayer have quite a different place in the national conscience. Yet the constitutional issue is much the same.

The constitutional issue is the alleged conflict between religious devotions under public auspices and the first amendment, which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The authors of that amendment would have seen no such conflict in these cases. Congress has made no law establishing a religion, certainly not in the sense in which the Congregational Church was the legally established church of Massachusetts, for example, as late as 1834. The exercise of religion in all States, including Pennsylvania and Maryland, is freer by any test today than it was when the Bill of Rights was passed. Until the 1830's our publicly supported schools were almost exclusively run by clergymen, with a heavy dose of religion. As the public school system matured, Horace Mann prescribed Bible readings for them as necessary to a rounded education. (The Catholics, with their different view of the Bible, appealed to the courts against this practice in vain.) Since then the public schools have become more and more secular, their purpose having shifted from the salvation of souls to the literacy of the electorate. In addition, the 14th amendment (1868) made the religious prohibitions of the Bill of Rights applicable to States as well as to the Federal Government. That is why the role of religion in the public schools has become a modern political issue and can claim to be a constitutional one as well.

Since 1930 the Court has so treated it in a series of decisions: Cochran, Barnette, Everson, McCollum, Doremus, Zorach, Engel. Yet instead of clarifying the issue, these decisions have muddied it, leaving school boards and citizens in mounting perplexity. Free textbooks and bus rides for parochial school students are OK; religious instruction for public school students is OK, but not on school property, and not if compulsory, or maybe not if the lack of compulsion embarrasses the student. The father of the Unitarian students in the Pennsylvania case refused them their option to leave class during the Bible reading because he didn't want them to be considered "oddballs." (Had the early Unitarians been that conformist, could they have captured Harvard?) The precedents are by now so confining that the Pennsylvania School Board lawyer felt obliged to argue as though the Bible were not a religious book, just a source of morality. He thus "denigrated" the Bible (said Justice Goldberg) without explaining how morality, even if it is proper State business, can have other than a religious source.

Such is the morass into which the Court has led us. One could scarcely be surprised if it should now make a break for the opposite shore—that of complete secularization, a literal wall of separation between public property and piety of any kind. Justice Douglas, in the New York prayer case, made it clear that he even regards the

marshal's words in his own court—"God save the United States"—as unconstitutional. This logic could lead to the outlawing of "In God We Trust" on our coins and a similar phrase in "The Star-Spangled Banner."

What would be the result of this radical break with the American past? It might have one salutary result: to force some parents to take more care for their children's religious education at home and church. Complacent Protestant parents could no longer feel that the public schools (in one lawyer's words) are a "kind of Protestant institution to which others are cordially invited." Yet this description scarcely fits the vague, brief and vestigial echoes of their Protestant origins which some students hear in our public schools today.

The Court is not obliged to decree complete secularization in our schools. In a ringing address in Utah last fortnight, Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School denounced the New York decision as a species of legal "absolutism" which "is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light." He and others have found at least three grounds on which the Court could have reached a different decision—and still can. First, school devotions may be none of the Court's business, since there is no real compulsion on the nonreligious minority, who by making a Federal case of it are seeking rather to limit the majority's religious freedom than to protect their own. Second, some matters are best left to States and communities anyway; education is certainly one of these; and to divorce education from religion altogether is to stultify both. But third, the U.S. system of religious freedom has never meant that the Government must be hostile or even indifferent to religion.

"Religion in America," said Tocqueville, "takes no direct part in the government of society, but it must be regarded as the first of their political institutions. * * * Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot." Washington, Jefferson, Adams and most of the Founding Fathers, whether Christian or deist, said much the same. So has the Supreme Court. But, says Justice Douglas, "If a religious leaven is to be worked into the affairs of our people, it is to be done by individuals and groups, not by the Government." To which the State of Pennsylvania replies: if you outlaw the Bible from our schools, the Government is working a religious leaven out of our affairs where the people have put it and want it. The Government would thus declare itself not neutral but hostile to religion.

Said the Maryland Court of Appeals: "Neither the first nor the 14th amendment was intended to stifle all rapport between religion and government." If absolutist logic stifles that rapport, millions of Americans are going to find themselves in a different America from the one they have believed in. Unless the Court, in its next decisions in this area, can throw a blinding new philosophical light on this problem, satisfactory to parents, educators and civil libertarians alike, it had best let the school boards work it out themselves, as they have been conscientiously trying to do.

Like the school desegregation decisions of 1954, this is basically a political decision that must take account of custom and belief as well as justice and legal precedent. But the 1954 decisions, unpopular though they were in many quarters, have been generally suported by the moral sense of the Nation. The complete secularization of public schools would be not merely unpopular—the Court always has to risk that—but it would offend the Nation's natural piety and sense of its own past.

Their Blood Upon Our Heads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. K. W. (BILL) STINSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a great many things have been written concerning the handling of the Katanga crisis by the United Nations forces. An exceptionally well-written editorial appeared in the Catholic Northwest Progress newspaper, Seattle, Wash., on Friday, February 1, 1963, and I feel that it is worthy of being quoted in its entirety in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THEIR BLOOD UPON OUR HEADS

Sacrilegious profanities against the Eucharist, mutilation of missionary priests and the violation of nuns, this is the occupation of professional murderers who terrorize the Congo.

These crimes cry out for vengeance. But to date there has been no nation with courage enough to so avenge them.

We stare in horror at photographs of mangled Christians beaten to death with bicycle chains, we read with disgust documentaries on Congo atrocities such as "The War in Kantanga," report of a mission by Ernest Van Dan Haag or the address of Senator THOMAS J. DODD entitled "The Crisis in the Congo." We study with growing resentment reports of Congolese religious who miraculously escape death at the hands of terrorists such as the interview with Pere Darmond by Philippa Schuyler entitled "The Martyrs of Kongolo" appearing in the January issue of the Priest magazine. And from all of these sources evidence of guilt points in but one direction. Crime after crime is attributed to savage mercenaries under the command of the United Nations.

Just last week, Archbishop Joseph Cornelius, O.S.B., of Elizabethville, capital of the Congo's secessionists Province of Katanga, removed all doubt about the crimes committed by U.N. soldiers in the Congo.

The Congolese prelate confirmed reports that U.N. Ethiopian troops looted and damaged a number of Catholic churches in his see. In an interview in Brussels, Archishop Cornelius said:

"According to reports I personally received, the Ethiopians completely looted St. Benedict's Church and broke into the tabernacle of another church in the Kasapa suburb of Elisabethville."

"The reports also confirm the cruelty of the killing of Katangese civilians. A girl was violated and bayoneted in the stomach. Two others were violated and killed.

"Seventy corpses were brought to Prince Leopold Hospital. All this was done by the Ethiopians."

In Elisabethville, Rev. Edouard Killesheye, vicar general of the Elisabethville archdiocese, protested against the flagrant breach by U.N. troops of international conventions sacred to all civilized nations.

What right, might we ask, did the U.N. soldiers have for attacking Elisabethville in the first place? The Chicago Tribune has charged, "U Thant's men invaded Elisabethville without the slightest legal or moral justification." Columnist William S. White summed up: "The ugly truth is that deceit and evasiveness and incredible arrogance have marked the United Nation's course in the Congo from first to last."

Now let us read from the opening paragraphs of the United Nations Charter.

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained. * * *.

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state * * *."

But before we heap all our guilt and righteous indignation upon the United Nations, perhaps we had better take a better look at ourselves. For, after all, the people of the United States supported the United Nations in this ugly and disgraceful war. The bombing, desecration, rape, and pillage which so offends our highly civilized sensitivities was made possible only because the U.S. Government is willing to foot most of the bill with our own hard-earned tax money. Don't forget that 47 percent of the cost of the U.N. Congo operations is underwritten by our own Government.

This week, Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai E. Stevenson has promised to press for a full investigation concerning reports of alleged excesses by U.N. troops in Katanga. These reports which we have outlined and to which Mr. Stevenson refers have been flooding his desk as far back as December of 1961. It's about time something was done.

And while Mr. Stevenson is at it we might ask him to reread the opening pages of the U.N. Charter and then take another look at Moise Tshombe. There are those who still believe, despite current propaganda to the contrary, that his only crime was that of being anti-Communist and pro-Western, that his only desire for Katanga is "territorial integrity" and "political independence."

We cannot escape responsibility for what has happened in the Congo. And the American people had better see to it that all the facts are known lest the innocent blood of 20th century Christian martyrs be sprinkled upon our own heads and upon the heads of our children.

Scientific Manpower Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, as Senators know, I have spoken on various occasions in the past few years on the very great concern which I have for our Nation's utilization of technical and scientific manpower. The problem of securing the trained men and women needed to accomplish our ambitious programs in space, defense, and industry generally is one which should command the highest national priority.

I have received a letter from William A. Douglass, president of Careers, Inc., enclosing an article which he has authored on this subject. I feel it presents some highly useful information and a challenging new approach worthy of serious study. Mr. Douglass and his organization have been performing highly useful services in improving communications designed to bring the right man and the right job together, and his studies include an active file of 20,000 engineers and scientists whose services are utilized by some 67 national employers including private industry and Government agencies.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Douglass' letter and article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD so that his findings on manpower utilization may be known to all who are concerned with this important challenge.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 18, 1963.*

Senator HOWARD W. CANNON,
259 Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CANNON: Knowing your continued interest in every program which will alleviate our Nation's shortage of technical professionals, I am forwarding an article shortly to be published by me under the title, "The Need for Retraining of Engineers and Scientists."

In a time when so many people of stature are calling for more young people to solve our shortages, I believe you will share my concern for their fathers—men who achieved engineering and scientific degrees 20 years ago, who depend on this learning for their livelihood, and who today are not being utilized.

Our survey indicates, for instance, that a startling 54 percent of all applicants were not requested for a single interview. This is 54 percent of a group which I believe too many presume to be 100 percent utilized to their own and the Nation's interest.

Consider the fact that my company has registered some 20,000 engineers and scientists on a basis comparable to this survey sample in the past year. Presuming a continuation of more than 50 percent noninterviews you see in the frustrations of 10,000 men the serious—and as yet unfaced—problems of technical obsolescence.

I will welcome your comment.

Yours sincerely,

CAREERS, INC.,
WILLIAM A. DOUGLASS,
President.

THE NEED FOR RETRAINING OF ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS

(By William A. Douglass)

There has been a great deal of talk about the so-called engineer shortage. We have all been alerted to this shortage by figures published by the Scientific and Engineering Manpower Commission and by the recent study by Dr. Nichols DeWitt for the National Science Foundation, which compared the number of engineering graduates in the United States with those in the Soviet Union.

None of these studies has been encouraging. In terms of absolute numbers, our output of engineers is actually declining. In terms of our ever-mounting needs, that decline, in projection, becomes a matter of increasingly grave concern. Moreover, the Russian reservoir of engineering and scientific manpower is reaching three times that of the United States.

Yet, despite these figures, a nagging doubt remains that the shortage is more apparent than real; that the solution to the problem lies primarily in better utilization of the manpower we have, rather than in simply mass-producing greater numbers of people.

Some time ago, Senator HOWARD CANNON, of Nevada, a member of both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Space Committee, suggested that the Government conduct an inventory or survey, in order to determine just where our existing scientists and engineers are working, and whether they are actually in jobs that are using their capabilities to the fullest extent.

Whether such a survey will ultimately be undertaken, I do not know. However, our research department at Careers, Inc., has accumulated and analyzed some statistics which give an interesting preview of some of the things which a broader survey might reveal.

By way of explanation of the statistics and evaluation which follow, let me state that Careers, Inc., operates about 50 career centers a year in various cities across the United States. These centers are actually cooperative recruiting ventures to which some 15 to 30 major employers of scientific and engineering personnel each send a company personnel officer to conduct interviews. Almost without exception, the employers are major defense contractors or Government agencies.

Scientists and engineers register at the center either by phone or in person. Their registration forms are then reviewed by each of the company interviewers present at the center, and each indicates whether or not he would like to interview the registrant. Registrants, of course, are free to accept or reject the interview bids. This process provides us with a cross-section running into the thousands, from which we are able to draw statistical data and conclusions.

We have analyzed in considerable detail the results of this process in four of our major centers—Dallas, Los Angeles, Boston, and Chicago—involving a total registration of 1,267, and the results have been most interesting.

In the first place, we found that 17 percent of those with degrees who registered at our centers were unemployed. This figure in itself is surprising, inasmuch as it has generally been assumed that virtually all engineers and scientists are employed, and that those who are job hunting are interested in changing jobs, not in simply finding jobs (table I).

I will not pretend to examine in detail the entire significance of this figure, but I would like to suggest that it certainly seems to lend support to the belief that the United States is underutilizing the skills of its supply of technical manpower.

It also lends support to the importance of establishing some kind of restraining program for professional people. The Government this year recognized the necessity of undertaking the retraining of workers who are out of work through no fault of their own, but are unemployed simply because of rapid changes in industrial technology. It seems to me that the inescapable corollary of this condition points to the fact that many of our engineers and scientists also need to be retrained so as to best fit their skills into the new disciplines and to bring their academic knowledge up to date.

Further light can be shed on this need for retraining if we go back to our research department's figure of 17 percent unemployed and break it down by engineering and scientific specialty, in order to see what fields had the most and what fields had the least unemployed. As might be imagined, aeronautical and aerospace sciences and the data processing professions had the smallest unemployed percentage—3 percent for the former and 9 percent for the latter. The professions with the greatest number of unemployed were the electrical, chemical, and civil engineers, with 17 percent, 18 percent and 22 percent, respectively. Those people who classified themselves under the more general heading of industrial engineer had a 20-percent unemployment ratio (table I).

In interpreting these figures, we should bear in mind that they do not represent the percentage of unemployed in the field as a whole, but they do represent the percentage among the part of the profession which has an interest in obtaining a new position.

In order to doublecheck these figures, we examined the registrations at the career centers from the opposite point of view. In other words, turning from supply, we looked at the demand for the registrants according to their fields of specialization. The career center figures give a good picture of this, as we know how many requests for interviews each registrant receives. In order to present this picture clearly, we broke down our registrants according to field of specialization and according to the number of interview requests received (table II).

We found, for example, that 27 percent of the data processing people received five interview bids or more, while not a single civil engineer received as many as five interview bids. Within these extremes we found that 18 percent of those in the field of physics received five or more interview bids, as did 23 percent of those in electrical and electronic sciences. Only 1 percent of the chemists or chemical engineers got into the five-bid class.

If you look at the fields whose members were least in demand, the same picture is revealed. A staggering 91 percent of the civil engineers registering at the centers got no interview bids at all. Sixty-four percent of the chemical engineers and 51 percent of the mechanical engineers similarly received no bids for interviews. All told, 54 percent of the degree-holding applicants failed to receive a single request for interview. Please bear in mind that the employers represented at the centers are major defense contractors.

This demand picture appears to reinforce the belief stated earlier that retraining is just as much a necessity for our professional people as for our blue-collar workers. After all, in both instances, the very same broad technological changes have caused the dislocation; and it does not seem fair to assume that the professional is not just as much in need of assistance in making the necessary adjustment as is the nonprofessional. In fact, the professional, with a large investment of his time and money in a particular discipline, actually can use more guidance and more assistance in changing his field than the blue-collar worker.

Certainly a high IQ in itself is no guarantee against individual technical obsolescence. As our figures seem to suggest, the civil engineer, no matter how competent, can be just as up against it in the employment field, due to lack of demand for his skills, as is his bypassed blue-collar counterpart—both need to be retrained in a more needed field if they are to make their proper and rightful contribution to present day industry.

Using the figures we have accumulated as a guide, therefore, it would seem that there may be considerable substance to the theory that our so-called technical manpower shortage is really just as much a question of proper utilization of our engineers and scientists as it is a question of a purely numerical shortage.

Moreover, with the prospect of turning out greater numbers of graduates dim at best, at least for both the near and intermediate future, it would seem that the most promising area of attack on the shortage would be in the realm of utilization.

The retraining of professional people is still a somewhat unfamiliar and novel concept, but it is one worth a great deal more

study and investigation by the Federal Government, the technical societies, industry, the universities, and all of us who are interested in seeing that American technology and American technical manpower deliver the best of which they are capable.

TABLE I.—*Total registrants by field (Dallas, Los Angeles, Boston, and Chicago)*

	Unemployed	Percent	Employed	Percent	Total	Percent
Aeronautical and aerospace	1	3	29	97	30	100
Electrical and electronic	25	17	122	83	147	100
Chemical	24	18	110	82	134	100
Mechanical	23	12	165	88	188	100
Civil	14	22	50	78	64	100
Industrial	17	20	70	80	87	100
Physics	14	16	76	84	90	100
Mathematics and statistics	11	19	46	81	57	100
Data processing	3	9	30	91	33	100
Business administration	28	24	90	76	188	100
General and unclassified with degrees	24	18	112	82	136	100
Total	184	17	900	83	1,084	100
Nondegrees	52	28	131	72	183	100
Grand total	236	19	1,031	81	1,267	100

TABLE II.—*Total requests by field (Dallas, Los Angeles, Boston, and Chicago)*

	No bids	Percent	1 to 4 bids	Percent	5 and over bids	Percent	Total	Percent
Aeronautical and aerospace	5	16	23	77	2	7	30	100
Electrical and electronic	46	31	67	46	34	23	147	100
Chemical	85	64	47	35	2	1	134	100
Mechanical	95	51	83	44	10	5	188	100
Civil	58	91	6	9			64	100
Industrial	55	63	31	36	1	1	87	100
Physics	30	33	44	49	16	18	90	100
Mathematics and statistics	11	19	40	70	6	11	57	100
Data processing	9	27	15	46	9	27	33	100
Business administration	90	76	28	24			118	100
General and unclassified with degrees	101	74	35	26			136	100
Total	585	54	419	39	80	7	1,084	100
Nondegrees	143	78	40	22			183	100
Grand total	728	58	459	36	80	6	1,267	100

Hawaii Ratifies Constitutional Amendment Outlawing Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform the Members of this Chamber that the Legislature of the State of Hawaii has ratified the proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution outlawing the poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections.

The Legislature of the State of Hawaii has been in session just 3 weeks and their rapid action gives Hawaii the privilege of being among the first 20 States to approve this amendment. Hawaii was the first State to ratify the 23d amendment which permits residents of the District of Columbia to vote in presidential elections. Hawaii, as might be expected, stands in the forefront of States fully endorsing equality not only in voting rights, but equality of opportunity in every aspect of community life. Hawaii has long demonstrated that people with a wide variety of racial backgrounds can live and work side by side in harmony and fairness.

Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution adopted by the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RATIFYING A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATION OF ELECTORS

Whereas the United States is proud to be considered one of the world's leading democracies, and Hawaii is equally proud to share in that great tradition; and

Whereas the preservation of the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers requires that constant vigilance of an enlightened population; and

Whereas there have been injustices in our country which demand the attention of our people and require action by those who have been entrusted with the authority to govern by the people; and

Whereas one of the most flagrant injustices has been the artificial barrier to participation in the electoral process provided by the imposition of the poll tax in some of these United States; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has taken steps to remove one of these injustices by initiating an amendment to the Constitution of the United States through U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 29, which reads as follows:

"JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATION OF ELECTORS

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'.": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Second State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963, the House of Representatives concurring, That the article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as set forth in U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 29, dated August 27, 1962, be and it is hereby ratified; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Administrator, General Services Administration, and that copies of this concurrent resolution also be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

NELSON K. DOI,
President of the Senate.
SEICHI HIRAI,
Clerk of the Senate.
ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
_____,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, blighted areas of our American cities, once a matter of shame, are being transformed into civic showcases through one of the Federal Government's most successful programs.

I am referring to urban renewal, which was the subject of a fine editorial on March 4, 1963, in the Kansas City Star.

The Star editorial comments that urban renewal stimulates $5 of private and other investment for every $1 put up by the Federal Government. Other benefits are new civic pride and wholesome, useful areas which will improve life in our cities.

I believe that the editorial will be of interest to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Mar. 4, 1963]

URBAN RENEWAL PRIMES THE NATIONAL PUMP

Kansas Citians long ago became familiar with the impressive results of urban renewal. The headliner project here has been in the civic center area where literally blocks of downtown real estate have been cleared to make way for new office buildings, apartments and other structures. The preliminary price tag is more than $60 million.

Other local ventures include the Gateway Center, with its commanding position at the west end of the intercity viaduct in Kansas City, Kans., and a number of extensive housing developments.

Multiply this work by the projects now underway in 600 other American cities and you see the scope of urban renewal. Only a start has been made. A study, quoted in U.S. News & World Report, estimates that it would require $1.1 trillion in the next 12 years to reshape American cities. Such an expenditure would dwarf even the current level of defense spending. U.S. News poses the query:

"Time and again, this question is asked: If defense spending—now on a vast scale—ever does decline sharply, what can take its place?"

Urban renewal is one candidate. For a relatively small part of the total cost, the Federal Government has primed the pump across the land. Currently, some 1,200 projects are underway, and the U.S. contribution to purchasing and clearing the land amounts to about $3 billion.

It is a lot of money, but consider a second statistic. Nationally, for every dollar that the United States contributes, private investors and others put up $5. In Kansas City, the Federal and State office buildings have become important developments for the civic center area cleared through urban renewal. But such buildings are the exception rather than the rule.

Applying the national average, the $3 billion Federal investment has attracted about $15 billion in private capital. Based on its national survey, U.S. News predicts that the present level of development is "only a drop in the bucket compared with what could happen."

In our era, urban renewal is reshaping the face of virtually every American city. Once-blighted areas—that had been all but written off—are being converted into showcases that promise a better urban life for the entire Nation.

A Young Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey points with pride to a young woman of Clifton, N.J., who is in a very real sense a true ambassador for the United States of America. An article appearing in the Passaic-Clifton Herald News of March 7, 1963, tells why.

The article follows:

ETHEL SILVERMAN, OTHER FORUM DELEGATES, MEET THE PRESIDENT

(By Edward J. Reardon)

WASHINGTON.—Ethel Silverman, 17-year-old Clifton High School senior, was among the 39 World Youth Forum delegates who were received at the White House this morning by President Kennedy.

It was the highlight to date of their week-long visit to Washington, first stop in their 3-week tour of the eastern seaboard which will end on March 21 with a session in New York City's new Lincoln Center.

Ethel has the distinction of representing the United States in the group of delegates from 39 countries throughout the world, including Argentina, Spain, France, Belgium, New Zealand, and Nigeria. Only Iron Curtain country at the forum is Yugoslavia.

Ethel said all the delegates speak English. "All of us are extremely close," she explained, "due principally to the orientation period we spent together at Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, N.Y., during the Christmas vacation."

The delegates from foreign countries have been in the United States since, living with American host families. They have been meeting weekly for discussions on world issues and problems.

Ethel arrived in Washington Sunday and says she has been having the time of her life since. She and the other delegates haven't wasted a minute since their arrival. On Sunday they toured Washington, saw the Washington Monument, the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials and other places of historic interest.

On Monday there was a visit to the U.S. Supreme Court where the delegates were addressed by Associate Justice Arthur Goldberg. Then they were taken for a tour of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. When Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy learned they were in the Justice Department Building, he invited them to visit his office.

"When we arrived," said Ethel, "we found him moving chairs around to accommodate us. He was friendly and very pleasant and made a fine impression on all of us."

Yesterday most of the group went to the Voice of America studios where records were made for playing in their home countries. But Ethel was one of four special guest panelists on a prerecording of the "Youth Wants to Know" program. They were interviewed by Howard K. Smith. The show will be televised Sunday on the ABC network.

After the White House visit with President Kennedy, the remainder of today is being spent on Capitol Hill. The delegates had lunch in the Senate dining room with Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and his wife as their hosts. Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON of Ethel's home district, was among the other House and Senate Members invited to the luncheon.

Today is the delegates' last in Washington. Tomorrow they go to Richmond, Va., and will visit Philadelphia, New Haven, Boston, and Brattleboro before ending the 3-week tour in New York City.

Ethel is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Irving Silverman, 164 Randolph Avenue, Clifton. An older sister, Mrs. Jules Bresslour, is a social worker in the Clifton school system. Two brothers are physicians, Dr. Joseph Silverman, a New York pediatrician and Dr. Michael Silverman, a radiologist stationed at the Army Redstone Arsenal in Alabama.

What's Wrong With the Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning's lead editorial in the Washington Daily News is so basic, sound, penetrating, and fundamental that I believe it should be included in the RECORD for all to review and perceive. I would call particular attention to the ultimate paragraph and urge our colleagues to exercise their judgement. The editorial is entitled "What's Wrong With the Country?" and follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE COUNTRY?

You look over the list of domestic economic troubles as noted by President Kennedy at his press conferences. There isn't one that a healthy tax cut wouldn't cure or at least help substantially.

And the only way to get a meaningful tax reduction is to legislate a healthy cut in Federal spending.

The basic problem is as simple as that, although the solution is difficult in the present political atmosphere.

Relief from the extortionate load of Government spending would generate energy from top to bottom. It would give people something to work for.

To hear the talk as to lack of opportunity for youth you would think there were just so many jobs until the Government passed a law to create some more. You wonder how youngsters ever got a job in the past. This same frightened scramble to divide up poverty held back recovery from the great depression and now dominates discussion of automation.

Jobs generate jobs. Wages and profits create the demand for goods, which puts more and more people to work—unless the chain is broken by bungling Government intervention or expropriation of the fruits of industry.

Talk about our crop of "war babies" growing up and needing jobs. They are relatively few in numbers compared to the millions of refugees from communism who streamed into demoralized West Germany after the war. Work was found for all of them and West Germany actually has a labor shortage. Automation did it—along with sane, old-fashioned fiscal policies which balanced budgets, made the mark one of the soundest currencies in history and produced the feeling of confidence in the future which comes with a rising living standard.

On the other extreme are such countries as Argentina. There is a land potentially as rich as ours—demoralized by massive governmental bungling and an inflated currency.

Argentina's trouble is our trouble, although we are not nearly so far gone and had more fat in the form of capital to eat up.

The complacent tendency in Washington to cut taxes while letting the spending run, simply is a plan to eat up some more of the capital which makes jobs. By inciting more inflation it will nullify any tax cut. By breeding fear of an unsound currency it will discourage enterprise and we will have more unemployment, not less.

The prosperity of Western Europe dates from the time when it scorned the advice of our frightened liberals, hardened its currencies and started paying the bills with cash. We now owe them money in form of balance of payments. Our Government now is buying these currencies in great quantities to protect the once almighty dollar.

More vocal politicians and economists in the United States are in the grip of an economic obsession that we can borrow ourselves rich. This brand of mass insanity has run its course in Europe but still afflicts a great deal of the world including the underdeveloped countries, all of which somehow managed to eat for centuries without our help, or maybe in spite of it.

None of these new nations has a chance until it discovers that only work creates wealth and that capital accumulation must be protected if their people are to have the tools which make work productive.

Under present policies, they are frightening away capital faster than it can be poured down the ratholes thus created, through foreign aid from the U.S. Treasury.

We see two main sources of hope. One is the amazing resiliency of the U.S. economy which has survived and even progressed during a generation which has expropriated half its profits and sterilized them in wasteful Government schemes. The other is mounting impatience with the whole red-ink business, out through the country.

When the people finally sense what has been happening to them and vote their indignation, the politicians will sober up and find a way. If the country—and particularly the unemployed—are to be spared deepening troubles, that had better be soon.

Spiritual Strangulation of Soviet Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as has been pointed out previously by a number of our colleagues, the last year and a half has witnessed accelerated harassment of Russian Jews. The tragic history of the Soviet Union in the past is being repeated again through the singling out of Jews for discriminatory treatment.

Khrushchev's cynical denials while official Soviet machinery pushes inexorably toward the extinction of Jewish cultural life have had little effect on the reprehensible actions of Russian officials and publications. The closing of synagogues and the incidence of so-called economic crimes, punishable by death, are the most obvious facets of the sinister pattern of Soviet anti-Semitism.

I invite the attention of Senators to "The Commander Reports" from the February edition of "The Jewish Veteran" written by an esteemed constituent, National commander of the Jewish War Veterans, Morton L. London, of Teaneck, N.J. Commander London's charge to the Nation's oldest active veterans organization is a challenge to Americans of all faiths. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMANDER REPORTS

(By Morton L. London, National Commander)

Of growing concern is the spiritual strangulation of Soviet Jewry under a policy of overt and covert anti-Jewish measures which are government-inspired and directed. While the present state of affairs is not as ominous as that during Stalin's "black years," the last 5 years of his dictatorial reign when masses of Jews were exiled to barren Siberia or wantonly executed, all signs point to a slower death to the Jewish community in Soviet Russia through denial to Jews of the ethnic and cultural rights accorded to other Soviet nationalities.

A thriving Jewish cultural life has been extinguished through the closing of such institutions as Yiddish theaters, literary and cultural research institutions, the banning of the publication of Yiddish books, professional journals, and newspapers. Jews are not permitted to maintain schools to teach Yiddish or Hebrew to their children nor instruct them on Jewish history and culture. The study of Hebrew has been outlawed, even for religious purposes. No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917. Only four rabbinical students are currently in training throughout Soviet Russia today. The production of religious objects, such as prayer shawls (tallisim) and phylacteries (tefillim), are prohibited. The public baking and the sale of matzah are forbidden.

In the last 18 months, the Government has stepped up its program of harassment and denouncement of Jews. Synagogue leaders have been forced to resign from their jobs. Some who have been secretly tried and convicted of alleged espionage ended up with lengthy prison terms. In the press, the Jews have been vilified as money worshippers. Jewish rites such as circumcision have been mocked as barbarous. The synagogue has been painted as the scene for drunkenness and brawling. Adult children of elderly pious Jews are held up to public scorn. Advancement of Jews in political and economic life of the country has been retarded. Of 70 individuals sentenced to death since May 1961 for "economic crimes against the state," at least 42 are known to be Jews. In Vilna, the people were invited to the "Jewish show trial."

It is quite evident that the Jews in Soviet Russia cannot protest. If given the free choice, many would obviously leave the country for Israel or other havens. But Soviet policy, unlike that of some satellite nations in the Communist orbit in Eastern Europe which permits some emigration, severely restricts the free movement of its citizens.

There exists a body of opinion in the American Jewish community which alleges that any protests organized in this country will only do further harm to Soviet Jewry. They assert that the best approach is to mobilize public opinion of outstanding liberal leaders throughout the world whose record of friendship for the Soviet Union is acknowledged by the Russian leaders. Frankly, I remain unconvinced by their approach. If I read the events in Nazi Germany correctly, our friends never accomplished anything significant in the rescue of the German Jewish community. This is our fight to be fought in the arena of world public opinion.

The world must be informed of the atrocities committed against the Jews of Soviet Russia. The neutralist nations who are flirting with the Russian bear must be educated regarding the denial of human rights to Jews in Russia. We must demand from our Government that they vigorously protest in the United Nations this wanton attack against our fellow Jews. We are alerting our fellow veterans to join in this fight, and we are writing to Jewish veteran associations whom we met in Israel last September to make similar protests through their respective governments. Obviously, we are consulting with the other major Jewish organizations on this subject as well.

St. Patrick's Day Has Special Memory for All in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered to the Shamrock Society of North Providence, R.I., at Bouffard Council Hall, on March 10, 1963:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY HAS SPECIAL MEMORY FOR ALL IN RHODE ISLAND

(Remarks of U.S. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY at annual celebration of Shamrock Society of North Providence at Bouffard Council Hall, North Providence, R.I., March 10, 1963)

I am happy to be with the Shamrock Society of North Providence tonight and to join in honoring the memory of Ireland's great St. Patrick on the even of his approaching feast day.

For most of us the history of Ireland and the Irish race does not begin until the coming of St. Patrick to the Emerald Isle. It is difficult for any of us to even think of Ireland, or to speak about its past, its present, or its future, without at the same time thinking and speaking of its patron saint. It is quite appropriate and necessary that we of Irish birth or ancestry never cease to commemorate his feast day with gatherings such as this of the Shamrock Society of North Providence. It is the one and only time in all the year that we pause to recall the values of our Irish heritage, a noble heritage which has contributed so much to the mainstream of our own American way of life.

In a true sense we share the memory of St. Patrick and the celebration of his feast day with many others of differing races and nationalities for the simple reason that his character and his contributions to Christian civilization are such as to command a universal respect and admiration. This probably accounts for the fact that the patron saint of Ireland is not only honored in many other lands but also he is claimed as a native son by a number of nations extending from the Baltic Sea to the Mediterranean. As you know, the exact place of his birth has never been precisely determined. Some say that Patrick came to Ireland from the sunny shores of Italy or Spain; others say that he was born in the rocky uplands of Scotland or a lonely village on the French Normandy coast; some other authorities claim that he was really brought to Ireland from the Scandinavian area as a young galley slave on one of the Viking ships which frequently raided communities along the shoreline of Ireland. Perhaps it is not too important for us to know the exact origin of St. Patrick. The important thing is that we know that he brought the doctrine of the Christian gospel to pagan Ireland and achieved a victory there which has never been lost despite the erosion of the centuries on the spirit of man since those ancient days. His impact on the Irish mind and spirit has never been destroyed. Moreover, the peaceful force of Christian idealism which he implanted in the hearts and minds of the men and women of Ireland has produced a harvest of tremendous good in all quarters of the globe right up until the present time.

The tide of saints and scholars who have ventured forth from the green hills and dales of Ireland to other lands has resulted in innumerable achievements for the cause of Christian civilization both yesterday and today. No other country of comparable size in the history of the world has done so much for the cause of Christianity, and it all began with the planting of the seeds of faith by St. Patrick himself.

The religious nature of St. Patrick's Day requires that the first and most important of our recollections is that of the spiritual heritage which we derive from our Irish ancestry. However, as a direct result of adherence to the true concepts of Christianity, the Irish came to love and cherish freedom and liberty and to despise oppression and bigotry with such vehemence as to be willing to sacrifice their lives and fortunes in a persistent struggle to achieve and maintain

these virtues for themselves and for others. Indeed, it can be said that the persecution and oppression of Ireland in the years gone by has been a most significance factor in the development of liberty and free government in various parts of the world.

For example, the earliest record we have of Irishmen in the United States coming together to pay homage to St. Patrick practically coincides with the movement for freedom and independence in the American Colonies. In 1771, at the city of Philadelphia, an organization which numbered both Protestants and Catholics of Irish birth or descent was founded and dedicated "to the memory of Ireland's patron saint." Many of them were later identified with the Revolutionary Army of Gen. George Washington—one of them, Stephen Moylan, became the trusted aide-de-camp to Washington himself. Other Irishmen were signers of the Declaration of Independence and were early participants in the Continental Congress. The contribution of the Irish to the foundation and the advance of this country is too well known to require any long recitation.

Their persecution in their homeland was due, as we know, chiefly to the reason of their loyal adherence to the faith of their fathers. The denial of this basic human freedom in Ireland resulted in a tremendous migration of Irishmen either through their free choice or by virtue of compulsion to many other lands on the European, North and South American continents, and even as far as the continent of Australia. Wherever they went the men and women of Ireland brought to their new homes love of their religion, love of ideals of freedom and liberty, and a hatred of oppression and tyranny. This is why Chile honors a Bernardo O'Higgins as its great liberator, France, a Marshal McMahon, America, a John Barry, Australia, a Sir Charles Duffy, and Newfoundland, a Michael O'Gorman—all sons of Ireland who were dedicated to the cause of freedom in their adopted countries.

We can all take pride in the fact that the names of countless Irishmen are found in the records of the early struggles of this country for its independence as well as its successive wars to maintain it. Of course, we are equally proud of the contribution in the arts and sciences which men of Irish birth or ancestry have made to the development and progress of the United States. I believe, however, that there is a special affinity between the characteristic Irish quality of stubborn insistence upon freedom and liberty, upon the right of freedom of worship, and the great historic tradition of our own State of Rhode Island of which we are all so proud and yet, at times, we may tend to forget. This State was founded on principles of liberty for which Irishmen were struggling and dying in Erin's Isle at the very time that Roger Williams, fleeing from puritanical oppression in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, erected his banner of freedom at what he called the Providence Plantations. He was banished for having dared to express the very thoughts of religious freedom and liberty in his sermons and writings which, if adopted in the British Isles, would have spared the people of Ireland from the fire and sword of the invading armies of Cromwell which were occurring at that very time. It is interesting to note that Roger Williams spoke out with equal vigor against the persecution of the Irish in Ireland as he did against the persecution of the Huguenots in France and the Indians in America.

In short, he spoke a language which the Irish could understand and support; he expressed a doctrine which would have meant salvation instead of ruination for the tiny nation of Ireland in his own day. While we know that he found no Irishmen awaiting him here on his long, hazardous flight from Massachusetts, who can say that a leprechaun or banshee did not help to guide him safely through the wilderness?

In keeping with the Christian concepts of charity, however, it is interesting to note that in 1676 when a great deal of suffering resulted from the Indian wars in New England, a public subscription was undertaken in and around Dublin, Ireland, to send a ship loaded with oatmeal, wheat, malt, butter, and cheese to relieve the critical needs of the early New England settlers. Most of this relief went to the Plymouth Colony. This is known as the "Irish donation of 1676" and is referred to in the "New England Historical General Register" as well as in the "Reports of the Rhode Island Historical Society." This is a remarkable demonstration of the application of the true Irish spirit of forgiveness.

It is well, also, to remember that the famous battle of Rhode Island which was fought near Newport in 1778 was successfully accomplished by forces of the Revolutionary Army under the command of the great New England Irishman, John Sullivan. There are many other interesting contributions to the early foundations of this State in which the names of men of Ireland are prominent. I would like to think that the Irish were particularly at home in this area because of the principles upon which the State was founded and Saint Patrick's Day should be the brighter and the happier for that very reason in the land of Roger Williams.

Recently, I came across an interesting connection between Ireland and the early State of Rhode Island which I would like to share with you. It is found in an early history of Brown University published in Providence in 1837 by a librarian of the university, Mr. Guild. In recounting the history of the foundation of this famous institution, originally called the College of Rhode Island, and setting forth the difficulties encountered in adopting its remarkably liberal charter which guarantees educational opportunities to persons of all religious faiths, the author told the story of the Reverend Morgan Edwards who in 1767, was commissioned to solicit funds for the foundation and endowment of the college.

He was authorized to seek them in England and Ireland to which he sailed that year. In order to allay any doubt as to his honesty, Dr. Edwards gave a meticulous account of all his receipts together with the names and residences of his benefactors. It is a remarkable fact that a large part of the contributions for the founding of this Baptist institution came from the cities of Cork and Dublin. As a matter of fact, the contributions from Dublin were greater than from any other area in the British Isles, except from the city of London. It is apparent that the concepts of freedom and liberty contemplated by the founders of the university struck a responsive chord in the hearts of many Irishmen.

High on the list of these early benefactors of Brown University are Mary Murphy, Frances McCarty, William Harrington, Mrs. Luke Kelly, John Reilly, Mary McMaster, John Armstrong, Joseph Dunn, and William Mitchell. Others on the Reverend Edwards list were Mathew O'Dwyer, Francis Allin, William Lawton, Humphrey Crowley, James Ellis, James Aikin, John Lyons, Abe Lane, Richard White, Robert Moore, Rachel Connors, William McGowan, James Martin, Thomas Read, Thomas King, Rebecka Gibbons, William Hunt, Nathaniel Mackey, Dr. Samuel McCormick, William Mitchell, James Moody, and James Brennan.

These contributions from Ireland together with those from England were placed in a special fund by the officers of the university with the requirement that the "interest thereof should forever go to pay the salary of the President."

So, from College Hill to Newport back to the Massachusetts border, St. Patrick's Day should be a day of special memory for all of us in Rhode Island. Let us never forget our heritage and let us not forget to give our thanks for the blessings of freedom and liberty which every son of Ireland has found awaiting him here in this great State of Rhode Island.

Forty Minutes With President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Baptist Standard of February 27, 1963.

The editorial was written by Dr. E. S. James, the distinguished editor of that journal. Dr. James relates his own reactions and reflections following a personal conference with President Kennedy.

While I am not a member of the denomination whose members Dr. James serves so conscientiously, I believe there is much of interest to all of us in this editorial. As a Presbyterian, I take pleasure in submitting for printing in the RECORD this editorial from the Baptist Standard:

FORTY MINUTES WITH PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(By E. S. James)

What does a country preacher say and do when he goes to the White House and sits alone for 40 minutes with the President of the United States? Does he spend the time bragging on the administration or tell the national leader how many mistakes he has made and how the country ought to be run? Does he try to tell the President about how many persons dislike or love him, or does he make it an opportunity to seek something for himself or his people? Just what does he do, and what should he do?

These and other questions had to be answered in the mind of the Baptist Standard editor when the invitation came to visit President Kennedy on February 10. The invitation was not sought, nor was it arranged by others in his behalf. It was no doubt suggested to the President by Brooks Hays, Bill Moyers, and other Baptists; but the invitation was initiated by the man who lives in the White House, and it was gladly accepted.

Readers of the Standard know and the President knew that this editor opposed his election in 1960. We made it plain then that our opposition was not political but that it was based purely on our sincere belief that no member of the Roman Catholic Church would be free to think and act independently. Just how does one visit with the man in the White House when he has tried to keep him out of that house? What attitude may he expect to find on the part of the host? How does he feel when he walks alone past the guards and administrative assistants into the presence of the man who holds the highest elective office on earth?

Since it is generally known that the invitation was extended and accepted this editor has decided to review it in detail for those who have manifested an interest. Others would do well to stop reading at this point.

It is not protocol to quote the President without specific permission from him. Such permission was not sought, but it is appropriate to give a personal appraisal of the man we met and relate the subject of our conversation.

At no time have we met a more charming and gracious personality. He knows how to make strangers feel at ease in a moment, and when one sits down near him to engage in informal conversation, any misgivings he may have had immediately flee. It was easy to say what we had planned to say, and the President left the impression that he was definitely interested in knowing more about the Baptist people. After all, that is about all we know much about; and we did want him to know them as we know them.

It was a pleasure to tell the President that he has disillusioned many of us who feared that a Roman Catholic could not make a good President and that in our personal opinion he has proved that there is at least one who can act without religious bias. It was a joy to compliment him on his fairness in making appointments because it seems evident that he has shown no religious prejudice in them. It was easy to thank him for listening to us little people and for his rigid adherence to his preelection statement that he would defend the principle of separation of church and state. We gave it as our opinion that he has sometimes stood very tall when the country was bowed low and that perhaps he stood tallest when he quarantined Cuba and defied the Communist world. After listening with intense interest to his appraisal of some international problems, we asked permission to tell him about the people called Baptists, but we made it very plain that no person is a spokesman for them and that our observations were our very own.

It was a privilege to remind the President that Baptists do not think themselves to be better, wiser, more competent, nor more patriotic than others, but they do believe they measure up to the average in each realm and that while they know they are regarded as narrow in doctrinal interpretation, they do not believe they are ever bigoted or more narrow than the Bible justifies. We acknowledged that as we have seen Baptists, they have sometimes been wrong on the race question, acceptance of Government subsidies, prejudgment of personalities, and conformity to customs. We affirmed, however, that they are, in general, good people who work hard, worship often, pray much, participate in politics and government, give of their sons when the Nation needs them, pay their taxes, vote, and support their elected officials to every extent that is reasonable.

It was our purpose to point out to him that democracy is necessary to Baptist progress. They are a democratic people and have never fared well under a totalitarian government. He seemed to understand that the purest democracy on earth is a small Baptist Church where every member has a voice in everything that is done. We tried to make it plain that Baptists follow one book, the Bible, and that they try to obey it at any cost. We sought to explain why Baptists have such an affinity for religious freedom by pointing out their part in securing it in America. He remembered that the Baptist preacher, John Leland, had joined Statesman James Madison in securing the first amendment to the Constitution; and he seemed to understand that it is just a part of the Baptist nature to contend for the principle of separation of church and state. He pointed out the fact that his own bishop, Cardinal Cushing, is likewise opposed to Federal aid to parochial education, a fact known by most informed persons.

We asked for permission to point out some areas where this separation principle seems most often endangered, and it was granted. Five areas were suggested by us: The disposition of surplus Government property, distribution through church agencies of food for peace in foreign countries, use of Peace Corps personnel as teachers in sectarian schools in other lands, use of foreign aid for building public schools in countries where the system is under domination of a religious group, and subsidies to church-related institutions on any level. We expressed the opinion that while some Baptists do not hold with us on what constitutes subsidies, we believe Baptists at the grassroots level are solidly against Government aid to them or any other church groups.

Each of these areas was discussed in detail, and the President knows the difficulties involved. We got the impression that he is vitally concerned about safeguarding the separation principle in each of them. We noted with much satisfaction that he is definitely concerned about vast numbers in other lands who know nothing of the Christian faith. As we interpreted his thinking it is that he is much more concerned about their knowing God than he is about what church tells them about Him.

Three times we had suggested that perhaps we should leave, but each time he insisted that we remain. After 40 short minutes the time came to close the conversation, and the President called for a picture to be made.

Back in the hotel room we sought to evaluate the man we had just met for the first time. We knew he had made some mistakes and that, being human, he will make some more. We were convinced in our mind, however, that our President is a man of faith who is characterized by great intelligence, much ability, strong convictions, and profound courage. We had told him that we do not agree with all his plans and programs, and he understood that it was not just an effort to be critical. We are convinced, however, that he will not knowingly err when the welfare of the Nation is at stake. This editor was remarkably impressed with his apparent sincerity, his gracious and understanding spirit, and his eagerness to be President of all the American people. We have prayed for him many times, but we will do it more often now that we realize more fully the weight of the load a President carries.

It would be good if every American, regardless of his religion or his politics, could have the experience that was ours. It would no doubt give him a new appreciation of his Nation and of this and every other President on whose shoulders such responsibility has been placed by a free people in a free land.

State and National Policies on Highways and Recreation and Parks—Resolution Adopted by the Recreation Association of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Recreation Association of Michigan, during its annual meeting at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Mich., last December, adopted a resolution placing the association on record as strongly opposed to the apparent inconsistency of State and National policy on highways and its policy on recreation and park areas.

The resolution protests the practice of selecting expressway routes which do not insure adequate protection to local park areas, resulting in serious encroachment of irreplaceable park lands to the detriment of the public.

S. 468, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and myself, would help to protect such recreation areas, as well as fish and wildlife resources, from damage due to Federal-aid highway construction. Our bill would require approval by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with appropriate State officials, of plans and specifications for proposed construction of Federal-aid highways.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the Recreation Association of Michigan be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY RECREATION ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING AT KELLOGG CENTER, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH., DECEMBER 13, 1962

Whereas it is the policy of the Federal Government, as indicated by the adopted report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and various legislation encouraging and providing for acquisition of park lands and open spaces by municipalities to meet local recreation needs; and,

Whereas the current recreation policy of the State of Michigan adopted in August 1961 favors encouragement of local government efforts to provide adequate recreation and park areas to meet local needs; and

Whereas the Michigan Highway Department's practice of selecting expressway routes does not insure adequate protection to local park areas, resulting in serious encroachment of irreplaceable park lands to the detriment of the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Recreation Association of Michigan, in its annual meeting at the Kellogg Center, East Lansing, Mich., go on record as strongly opposed to the apparent inconsistency of State and national policy on highways and its policy on recreation and park areas; be it further

Resolved, That the Recreation Association of Michigan express its concern to the present and incoming administrations for the State of Michigan, urging support for appropriate legislative and executive action to provide more adequate protection of local parks threatened by State or interstate highways; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be directed to Gov. John B. Swainson, Governor-elect George Romney, Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton, U.S. Senator METCALF and other appropriate State and national legislators, as well as to President Kennedy, urging appropriate legislative and executive action to provide adequate protection of park lands against highway encroachment.

DON MARTIN,
Secretary.

The Advantages of Living in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it happens all too seldom that community

leaders are paid the honors due them while they are living. It was therefore a thrilling experience for me to attend on February 10 of this year the dedication of the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School in north Hennepin County, Minn., and to hear H. O. Sonnesyn himself deliver the dedication address.

Mr. Sonnesyn has made unique contributions to the large area comprising Robbinsdale, Crystal, Brooklyn Center, Brooklyn Park, Golden Valley, New Hope, and north Minneapolis. His remarkable sense of public service has been demonstrated time and time again through the newspapers of which he is editor. His ready humor, his humanitarianism, and his high standards of fairplay have made him everybody's friend.

His community service has been solid, substantial, sincere, and long lasting, but even more important, it is continuing. His dedication address reflects the wisdom of a Greek, the wit of an Irishman, the romanticism of a Latin, the industry of a Norwegian, and the solid faith in spiritual and human values of the good American which Mr. Sonnesyn very much is.

This is his address:

THE ADVANTAGES OF LIVING IN AMERICA

(By H. O. Sonnesyn)

I am humble today as I stand in the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School. Humble because the school board of district 281 saw fit to name such a fine building in my honor. And, yet, being only human, I am also extremely proud that the school board and its able administrator, E. J. Cooper, superintendent, paid me this honor while I am among the living.

Today this beautiful building is fully manned with competent teachers, consultants, and an efficient principal, Henry Scaia. It is a thrill to me every time I have to call the school and the sweet voice of the girl at the switchboard says, "H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School." There was one occasion when I felt particularly important. I called the school and asked for Mr. Scaia. The girl immediately answered, "H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School." Mr. Scaia was out. The girl inquired, "Whom shall I say is calling?" I cleared my throat and very importantly answered, "H. O. Sonnesyn." She did not seem to be too impressed. I do want her to remember, however, that on March 17, the proper answer to telephone calls might be "The H. O. Sonnesyn Eelementary School." The Irish deserve some credit. The Norwegians should not get all of it.

Because the school has been named for me does not mean I own it. There may, in fact, be many people who wonder why this school was named the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School. So do I. I can think of so many people who would have been far more deserving of the honor.

You people own this school in spite of the name. The students in this school are your children and I have been honored by having them call on me in a group at my office and also in speaking before their classes. I admit there are few of them I would like to steal. I have no flesh and blood sons or daughters to carry on my name. In reality this school is my child, my only one. It will carry the Sonnesyn name down through the years after the Supreme Architect has decided His plans for me have been completed and I am no longer needed on this earth. What greater reward could a man receive during his life than to have a school named in his honor?

Several years ago I sat in the auditorium of the Carl Sandburg School in Golden Valley and heard one of the greatest American poets of today deliver his dedication talk when a school that had been named for him was dedicated. I never dreamed or expected an occasion would come when I would assume the same role he was performing that day. I naturally do not expect the same audience response he received that day. While he spoke it seemed as if no one breathed or even moved. It was that quiet. I am not a Carl Sandburg.

I can at least borrow some of the thoughts Carl Sandburg expressed on that memorable day, parts of which I find inscribed on a bronze plaque that hangs in the hallway of the school. I believe the thoughts expressed by Carl Sandburg are just as applicable at the H.O. Sonnesyn Elementary School.

The words quoted on the plaque are: "Old and tarnished hearings have it, 'Time is a great teacher and Time will tell.'

"This building as a tool and instrument, as a breathing structure newly come to life might speak for itself today and say, 'I am a child of time. I celebrate the dignity, importance and pathos of time. Loving hands and thoughtful hearts have seen my foundation rise to serve as best they may a generation living in a time of world storm. Here to my rooms will come generations, one after another, gazing in on themselves in reverie, some asking the ancient questions: While we live what is worth looking at, what is worth listening to, and what might be worth dying for?

"Here they may study the guarded meaning of Lincoln opening his 'house divided' speech: If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it.

"Always the path of American destiny has been into the unknown. With each new test and crisis it always cost and there were those ready to pay the cost, as an affirming character in 'Remembrance Rock' says, 'Man is a changer. God made him a changer.' You may become the witnesses of the finest and brightest era known to mankind. The nations over the globe shall have music instead of murder. It is possible. That is my hope and prayer—for you and the nations."

Fortunately none of us know what may happen in the future. God chose it to be that way when He created this world. Only God knows what the future holds in store for each of us.

Some of the future's greatest scientists in the world may be attending classes in this building today.

There is much left to explore in the field of medicine today and diseases which have baffled the medical profession may in the future be solved by some student just learning to scribble his or her name in this very building today. He or she could be your son or daughter. The future outstanding engineers, educational and business leaders may be included in the present student population of the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School. One of the future superintendents of district 281 may be in the kindergarten of this school today or he may even become the principal of this school in future years. It is nearly safe to predict future council and school board members may be studying his lessons in this school today.

Some boy who is today just learning his prayers may become a future world renowned religious leader comparable to Billy Graham or Bishop Sheehan. He will have received his original teachings that made him study the progress of the world and civilization in this very same building.

Some of the athletes who may make future athletic history on the baseball diamond, the football gridiron, the basketball court or in some other competitive field may even be playing on the playgrounds of this school today.

Today's enrollment at the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School may include the names of future great actors, actresses, TV and radio personalities, or world-known artists. Or perhaps it may be some girl or boy mastering grammar today in this very building who will put beautiful words on paper that will either win the Nobel or Pulitzer prize.

Every day we read about the problems of segregation in some portions in the South. As we read these stories the thought never comes to us that a comparable situation could some day develop at the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School. With today's exploding population and the emigration of people from the cities to the suburbs, let us never close our eyes and say, "It can't happen here." I hope that when it does happen, and it eventually will, that we can settle it the American way instead of the manner it is being handled in some places in the South today. I borrow a little thought from the Minnesota Journal of Education:

"Little children don't need lessons in brotherhood. A small Negro girl in Duluth wrote in her Thanksgiving letter, 'I'm thankful we have such friendly neighbors.' A first grader of Swedish descent summed up the whole lesson when she put her white hand on a little Mexican girl's brown one and said, 'Brown and white go nice together.'"

A kindergartner reported one of the greatest lessons of her life. Her eyes shining with happiness, she leaned over to her father at dinner and whispered: "Today I learned a friend."

I earnestly pray the day will never come when some little boy or girl is barred from attending the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School because he or she may have a different colored skin or may worship differently than we do.

I sometimes hear people say we are building too elaborate schools. Do you realize that because of the long-range planning the men and women at the head of our school system in district 281 have done that today is the future we dreamed about yesterday? Probably the man who had more dreams than anyone else was E. J. Cooper. The difference, however, between Mr. Cooper and other dreams was he made them come true. What a campaign manager he could have made for some politician if he had not been in the educational field. And I'll tell you his secret weapon. When he begins talking, try and get a word in edgewise. Let him try that today. I personally know there is not a school system in Minnesota that excels district 281, which has another unique distinction. No bond issue backed by the school board has ever been turned down by the voters. We today have 22 schools in district 281 and 2 more are to be erected—the new high school and an elementary school. Because of my confidence in our school leaders I have verbally and editorially supported every bond issue that has been proposed by the board. I would certainly be a Judas if I fought the future progress of district 281 after such a fine building as we are dedicating today has been named for me.

Teaching is just as dedicated a profession as the ministry, medicine, journalism, engineering or any other field you may name. Because teachers have the ability to impart knowledge we are given outstanding leaders in every field where our Nation needs them, something we are too often prone to forget just as we fail to remember this training for future leadership is first obtained in an elementary school comparable to the one we are in today.

There are no persons in the world today to whom we should pay greater homage than our teachers.

The essential ingredient in a democracy is people. Democracy is defined as a government in which the supreme power is re-

tained and exercised by the people, therefore, the greatest natural resource of the United States is the individual person. Since this is true, the first national goal to be pursued at any level—Federal, State, local, and private—should be the development of each individual to his fullest ability so his vote, his judgment, and his contributions will be for the betterment of democracy. The entire American school system is based on that philosophy and teachers in the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School and the other schools of district 281 constantly strive to have their pupils reach that goal.

Ideas come from individuals, and progress comes from democratic ideas. These ideas are the combination of imagination, intelligence, and courage.

The fullest development of each individual is essential to prevent a dictatorship and to preserve a democracy. Facism, nazism, and now communism, are the result of one-man leadership in many areas. Many people must play important roles to keep our democracy safe. That is the role the teachers of the H.O. Sonnesyn elementary school are teaching your youngsters to assume.

Let's look at the role of Mr. Average IQ Citizen in our democracy. He knows we have a President and that he can vote for the man he wants in government or even run for office himself. He fundamentally understands the Constitution and enjoys his rights such as freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and his inalienable rights. He also satisfactorily performs most of his duties; (1) He thinks himself reasonably, if not intelligently, informed about the fundamental principles, the structure of the government; (2) he for the most part and most of the time appreciates the advantages of living in the United States; (3) he usually performs all the functions of a good citizen, such as voting at all elections, paying taxes, respecting the laws, and participating in civic affairs such as the PTA, chamber of commerce, and other groups; (4) he is loyal to our country and is ready to defend it when attacked by enemies either within or without.

Mr. IQ Citizen also enjoys the most important role of all—the right of being an individual. Yet in so doing he sometimes fails to maintain a democracy, inasmuch as he fails to understand that these are every citizen's rights, too.

Whenever any citizen, no matter what the reason, is deprived of his development of his right to participate in government, it is a denial of one of his inalienable rights. This is a threat to everyone in a democracy, since an incompetent citizen is a threat to the freedom of all. Ignorance in a citizen is the worst threat of a democracy. These are the people who are susceptible to the propaganda from communistic sources.

We must remember our central goal in a democracy is a faith in the value of the possibilities of individual development. Anything that bars this development should be removed. Nothing whatsoever should curb the individual's right to live as long, full, and rich a life as possible. Herein is the challenge of us to do our best to gain and preserve the individual rights of all.

Our freedoms are indivisible. If we lose one, if there is a rent in the seamless fabric that holds them, they will all escape, as sand drains from a bag that sustains even a single rent. The freedom to worship is bound up in the freedom to learn and the freedom to teach.

There is danger in our struggle against dictatorship that we will be tempted to use some of its weapons. Of what avail would it be to us if we escaped one set of chains only to find ourselves bound with others? In the preservation of liberties, instinct alone is not a sufficient safeguard. Although our Nation was born from the compulsion of our forefathers to be free and independent, it will take understanding and determination to keep intact the liberty they bought for us at a high cost.

Milton, writing in an era of fear and tension, gave his own statement of faith, which we would do well to preserve as our ideal today. He said, "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience above all liberties." The cornerstone of our liberty is to know and to speak freely. On this rests our religious and civil freedom.

The year of 1963 marks not only a new year, but also a new decade. This gives the new year a greater significance. Thirteen years ago we marked the middle of the 20th century. We could review the first half and plan for the next half. Now the planning period is over. What the sixty's produce is likely to characterize the whole century. Fortunately the fifty's saw no world War, though the fear of one hung over every year of it and does even today. In our land we saw increasing prosperity. Even the churches saw accelerating growth and temporal power. The faith of our people and even the faith you display as individuals is what drives all of us to become better citizens.

In their own words as in their lives, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, whose birthdays we are celebrating this month, expressed those ideals which we Americans should even prize highly to this day. One of their most cherished images that has come down to us illumed by time pictures them as men of faith and servants of God.

President Washington, whose undaunted spirit set the tone for the Nation in all decades since, summed up his religious feelings in these words: "We have abundant reason to rejoice in this land that the light of truth and reason has triumphed over the power of bigotry and superstition, and that every person may worship God according to the dictates of his own heart."

That was no empty piety but a statement of fact. In America we do have the freedom to worship God "according to the dictates of one's own heart." It is a basic freedom—one for which we should be grateful. But like all freedoms, it must be practiced to be kept whether it is in the business world, the educational field, your private life or the political arena.

Perhaps Abraham Lincoln had this in mind when speaking of the Civil War then raging across the land, he said: "The struggle today is not altogether for today. It is for the future, also. With a reliance upon providence all the more firm and earnest, let us proceed with the great task events have evolved upon us."

Great tasks are still upon us. The srtuggle is yet for the future. In such times as these, the words of these two Presidents may well be our guide.

Before I close, I would like to have Mr. Scala step over. In behalf of Mrs. Sonnesyn and myself we are presenting the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School with this set of Junior Britannica Encyclopedias. We hope you may find use for them.

May the H. O. Sonnesyn Elementary School continue to be the fine educational institution, which it is today.

I thank you for the fine attention you have paid me and the greatest honor that has ever been paid me in my life—the naming of this school. God bless all of you for this honor. I hope my future life will merit the confidence you placed in me. In behalf of myself and my wife, I say: "Thank you."

Address by Senator Hartke Before the District of Columbia Dental Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the remarks of Senator VANCE HARTKE made before the District of Columbia Dental Society on March 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is probably true that you at one time or another have had a personal experience which brought out your instinct of self-preservation. For example, a serious personal sickness, combat in war, serious financial difficulties, or personal challenges. My purpose today is to think in terms of your self-preservation and how it is tied to our Nation.

First, we will review Khrushchev as a dictator; second, we will consider Stalin and Khrushchev; third, we will see that Khrushchev is a dictator and must be treated as one; fourth, we will recognize that dictators and thereby Khrushchev are real failures to humanity; fifth, we will try to bring out your self-preservation by recognizing that although dictators are dangerous, that our self-preservation is dependent on something more than merely defeating dictators.

In these days, it is frequent that there are wild exaggerations, at least in statements of some individuals, concerning the role of Khrushchev.

Frequently, many individuals seem to think that there is something remarkably different about this man. Let's look at him for a moment.

He is a dictator. He is pursuing a goal with a relentlessness, and sometimes pettiness. Khrushchev is, certainly, a man to be concerned with in this world today, mainly because of where he is in a position of importance. Therefore, we would have to admit that he is an important man.

But the fact that he is important does not make him immune to the emotions and weaknesses of less important men. He is subject to jealousy, to wounded pride, certainly to the desire for publicity. He is ambitious to the extent that he is interested in always attempting to disprove any inferiority he might have. He is revengeful. He has a tendency to close the door on those with whom is disagrees, and he certainly disagrees with enough people as is evident by those who have been banished from high place in his government.

Indeed, the passion and the temperament, and the drive, which raised this man to the heights which he has today, tend to intensify and to magnify his own personal failings. But in all of this, let us not be unmindful that these emotions are going to affect our future and mold history. In Russia, there is nothing new to see a man such as Khrushchev in a position of dictatorship. The Russian people have really never known any government except dictatorial leadership.

Stalin, for example, is probably going to be recognized as one of the most powerful dictators that the world has ever known. Stalin was, in many ways, what Khrushchev would like to be, today. Stalin certainly had deter-

mination. He had fire and glamor. He was a master at deception. He was capable of zig-zagging in major policy. He was always accessible to the persons that he wanted to be accessible to. He was always able to outmaneuver those who worked around him.

Stalin always supervised the little things. This left the impression that he was very personal in his approach.

Stalin wanted to be associated in the eyes of his people with Lenin because Lenin led the spirit of the revolution. Early, in the revolutionary days of course, it was always Lenin and Trotsky. Stalin wanted it to be Lenin and Stalin. So, Stalin managed to eliminate Trotsky and thus it was Stalin and Lenin. Then on Stalin's death Khrushchev wanted to replace Stalin with himself. Khrushchev wanted it to be Lenin and Khrushchev. Then the pattern is practically the same. Stalin, in his day, insisted that every mention of Trotsky's name, in a favorable light, had to be stamped out. Today, Khrushchev insists that every mention of Stalin's name in a favorable light must be stamped out. Stalin had all of Trotsky's pictures destroyed. Now Khrushchev has had all of Stalin's pictures destroyed. Stalin had the Soviet history and books revised and republished in order to completely take Trotsky out of the books, or to otherwise blacken his role. Now Khrushchev has had the histories and books revised in order to take Stalin out of them or to blacken his role. Under Stalin, the authors wrote the histories of the Red army without praising Trotsky's name once, even though Trotsky was the organizer of the Red army and the first Bolshevik War Commissar. Now Khrushchev is having the histories rewritten to show that he was the real military leader of the army in World War II.

Stalin left the impression that it was he who always stood by the side of Lenin, not Trotsky. Now Khrushchev indicates that it is his ideas which are similar to Lenin, and not Stalin. Stalin, in his day, had to be hailed as the source of all good, the originator of all good ideas, the father of every successful enterprise. Now it is Khrushchev who must be hailed as the source of all good in Russia. Khrushchev now insists he is the originator of all the ideas and he is the father of every successful enterprise.

What this all adds up to is—Stalin was a dictator; Khrushchev is a dictator. We must treat them in every way as any democracy must treat a dictator. To be misled into believing that Khrushchev is not really a dictator would be self-deception.

However, it is also evident that even dictators sometimes have good goals. Just as in Stalin's time, there was a definite desire to create generally better economic conditions. He was interested in building more factories and harnessing the power of the Soviet Union. So today, Khrushchev, too, is interested in doing those things which make the country stronger because only in this way is a dictator able to continue his own personal dictatorship. What probably is more important to them as dictators is that it builds their own personal glorification.

Thus, no matter what Khrushchev ultimately was, when his power as a dictator is threatened, you can expect him to act basically as Stalin acted, using fear, lies, and murder. Every dictator usually ends up using these same weapons.

I need not remind you of the possibility of war. Usually, the cause of the war is long in the making, but really short in breaking. To make matters worse we have found out that dictators are always very dangerous for individuals, dangerous for their countries, and dangerous for world peace.

One thing, above all, that we should by this time know, is that dictators have taught us to treasure freedom above everything else.

The experience of all dictatorships has been that without freedom there can be no full stomachs. There can be no economic security without civil rights. For what good is a job when the secret police can take you out of it, or when you can be arrested without a charge and sentenced to jail or death without a trial. Remember, that citizens of a dictatorship want most of all to be free. Furthermore, nobody except the dictator ever likes a dictatorship.

The dictatorships of the past make us love democracy more and more. But then, the question arises—how much do we really love democracy?

You could answer: We fought World War I, then World War II, for democracy—two major wars in a generation.

In spite of this we now must face the question, Will there be world war III? Do people really learn from past experience? Have we learned from the mistakes we have made in the past? Those mistakes which have cost millions of people their homes and their lives. Has this really opened up our eyes? Just how did we get into those two terrible wars? How can we avoid another of the same kind.

These, really, are the questions which we should be answering—or at least, we should be asking them.

These questions and their answers are more important than whether or not some individual remains in office. It is more important than talking about our rights to certain territory. It is more important than even local markets or the world markets. Certainly it is more important than money.

There are some obvious facts. First, some of the basic causes of friction between nations continue without much abatement; second, there is general economic maladjustment in many parts of the world; third, there certainly is racial animosity; fourth, there are social injustices existing in almost all areas of the world.

These poisons were not caused by communism. These were the poisons which produced World War I. These were the poisons which produced World War II. Furthermore, these are the poisons which could easily produce world war.

Even though dictators may start wars, their chances for success depend on the existance of these poisons. In my opinion, Hitler could not have succeeded to have overrun Europe if it had been a healthy Europe. Nor could Mussolini have taken Ethiopia if it had been a healthy Ethiopia.

The real difficulty was with the basic foundations of these countries when the dictators started their wars. Now, what is it that Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung have to offer that Hitler didn't offer, or Mussolini didn't offer, other than murder, slavery, fear, and hunger. They offer no solutions. They will not eliminate the international poison.

The Chinese are starving. There is a shortage of coal in Prague, in Czechoslovakia today. In every Communist country the farmers have failed in their efforts to produce enough to feed their people.

Certainly Khrushchev is not in the position to offer anything of a positive nature. He has not been able to give his people real freedom so let's mark him down as scoring a zero. He's flunked the course.

In other words, Khrushchev has demonstrated that he cannot give any proof that communism can build anything for human needs.

Yet, dictators have won victories. Since this is true, this is proof enough that there is something more needed in this world than what we have so far offered. Dictators have not cured any of the human problems of the world; but equally true they are not the sole cause of the world's troubles.

If governments are going to be indifferent to the cruel suffering of millions of their own flesh and blood, then we certainly can expect that the poisons for more wars are already with us.

We seem to be capable of spending billions of dollars in order to prepare for war, to prepare for destruction. But we scream and fail in any way, to take positive action to wipe out our slums here at home; to meet the real challenge in the field of education; to meet the problems of continued long-term unemployment; to treat humans as equals.

First of all, we are going to have to be capable of convincing our own people that we believe in real freedom in the field of civil rights, economic rights, and human rights.

We are going to have to convince our own country and the world that we are determined to fight the battle against hunger; to take action against poverty; to provide the opportunity for every individual in our land and the rest of the world to secure food, housing, and an opportunity to live in decency and real freedom.

No one will be able to guarantee these rights for any length of time. It will take continuous action.

The world wants something new and something better. Now is the time for us, as a free society, to provide that type of intelligent, intellectual leadership which can give the world something new and something better. We can make their dreams come true; we can help to make this world a place where peoples homes are places of hope, where prayers for freedom and peace can mean something real.

For, after all, it is not alone the dream of every American, but it is humanity's dream—the dream of all people—that there be freedom, peace, and plenty. The world's people want rather simple things—personal items such as decency, honesty, loyalty to friends, goodness, and the respect for human life. These are the things which are scorned in dictatorship.

They were scorned by Stalin. They were scorned by Hitler. They were scorned by Mussolini, and they are scorned by Khrushchev.

Even though we in this country may have, at times, dulled the spirit of revolt and searching; let us remember that under dictatorships such as Khrushchev, they have crushed the spirit of revolt and searching, more important they also crush the right to protest and the right to think. In a real free society, the spirit of revolt, the spirit of searching and the right to protest and the right to think must be guaranteed.

We have seen that communism has failed the society of the world. Some say we must make a choice between freedom of a full stomach.

We know that no dictatorship has ever given freedom or a full stomach.

But in the free society, we can have ideas. We can make ideas live. We can make ideas work. We can also have full stomachs.

This is the spirit of democracy. This is the spirit which can destroy war, destroy depression, can destroy racial feuds, can end slums and can end unemployment.

Some men have this vision. Some men want to carry out the action to make the vision a reality. To some this may seem like sacrifice, but to me this seems like the greatest opportunity that man will ever have—namely, to serve his fellow man for the glory of God.

The Mallory Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor recently

reprinted an editorial which was published in the Boston Herald concerning the liberties of the American people. The main thrust of the editorial was to meet certain statements of Police Chief Robert W. Murray, made in an interview with U.S. News & World Report. Police Chief Murray's statements reflect the zeal of a dedicated police officer. Of course, this is not news to the people of the Washington area who are familiar with his record as a law enforcement officer. However, the criticism expressed in the editorial is sound. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights require our constant attention. Otherwise, practices which are more akin to tyranny than liberty appear and prosper.

Undoubtedly, the Senate will be faced later this year with legislation to destroy the so-called Mallory rule which more accurately should be described as the McNabb rule. This rule provides that a confession is inadmissible in Federal court if obtained during a period of unlawful detention. Rule 5(a) of our Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure directs that an arrested person shall be taken before a committing magistrate without unnecessary delay. If the police fail to take an arrested person before a committing officer as required by the rule, they are violating the law. Thus, any confession obtained by the police after they have held the arrested person for an unnecessary time without taking him before a magistrate is the fruit of unlawful police action. Since 1914 in the Weeks case, the Federal courts have refused to admit evidence illegally obtained. If we destroy the Mallory rule, we will be turning back the clock of justice 50 years. We will be saying to the police: You have our permission to violate the law in your efforts to extract confessions and if you are successful you may make use of such confessions in the courts. In effect, we also will be ordering the courts to be accomplices to unlawful actions of the police. There are many more fundamental arguments for preserving the Mallory rule. They will be presented in detail at the appropriate time. However, at this time, I hope this editorial from the Boston Herald will be read and considered carefully as it relates to the Mallory rule.

I ask unanimous consent that the Boston Herald editorial printed in the Christian Science Monitor be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CRIMINAL" AND "ORDINARY CITIZEN"

"Our criminal convictions are constantly being reversed on technicalities—not on the evidence. The police are frustrated.

"The criminal is being afforded more legal protection than the ordinary citizen. I often wonder who, besides the police, is concerned about the rights of citizens to be free from attack by criminals."—Police Chief Robert W. Murray of the District of Columbia, in an interview with U.S. News & World Report.

Here is a statement that will be widely endorsed among policemen. But it suffers a fatal defect of logic. It expresses concern for the ordinary citizen yet ignores the fact that the ordinary citizen—the person innocent of any crime—is the very one whose security the technicalities are designed to insure.

Society safeguards innocent citizens from abuses of the police power through these "technicalities." It excludes illegally obtained evidence from a criminal trial not to favor the accused but to discourage the police from obtaining evidence by means which injure innocent persons.

It is the ordinary citizen who is victimized when the police make an unwarranted arrest, as in the recent case of Folksinger Jackie Washington here in Boston.

It is the ordinary citizen whose privacy is invaded when police engage in a fruitless search of his home or automobile with neither court sanction nor probable cause.

It is the "ordinary citizen" who suffers when induced by coercive police interrogation into giving a false confession.

Chief Murray implies that the police are capable of distinguishing between a criminal and an ordinary citizen.

But they are not; nor is it their function to try. The determination of guilt is the function of judges and juries.

The function of the police is to enforce the law without breaking the law. If this proves frustrating, then that is the price of a free society.

Address by the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, Before Buffalo Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, our great city of Buffalo, N.Y., was highly honored by the presence of the distinguished Senator from Maine, the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

Senator MUSKIE was invited to Buffalo to address a joint dinner meeting sponsored by the Professional & Businessmen's Association, Inc., the Advocates Club of Buffalo, and the Medical Arts Society, and chaired by Mr. Eugene V. Buczkowski.

In the afternoon I was privileged to join a large delegation to meet Senator MUSKIE at the Buffalo International Airport. Immediately thereafter a reception was held in his honor at a local hotel.

In the evening, Senator MUSKIE was the principal speaker at the dinner, and his speech was very well received. He was introduced by Mr. John Aszkler, the former mayor of Lackawanna, N.Y., and the keys to Buffalo and Lackawanna were presented to him by Mayors Chester Kowal and John C. Ogarek respectively.

I am pleased to insert Senator MUSKIE's speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His speech follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE, OF MAINE, BEFORE BUFFALO GROUP

Never before in history has mankind had before it as great a promise for its fulfillment as we have today.

We are on the threshold of unbelievable development of our human and natural resources, and we can see on the horizon the control of disease, the eradication of poverty and misery, and a general uplifting of the standard of living throughout the world.

At the same time, however, mankind faces the gravest threat to its survival in history. We live in an age of crisis, and the threat of a nuclear holocaust is constantly with us.

This paradox derives primarily from the political situation which now exists in the world. Driven by the highest form of stimulation—a threat to national survival—the United States and the Soviet Union have, since World War II, made fantastic advances in science and technology and we are continually discovering—as a byproduct to the race for survival—ways and means to alleviate human misery.

This priority is, of course, due to necessity, not to choice. We all hope for the day when real peace will prevail, and national disputes are determined under the rule of law. Until that day arrives, however, we must maintain our defenses.

In assessing the worldwide struggle in which we are now engaged, many in the free world are, it seems to me, unduly pessimistic. Lately, we have been hearing and reading about the Communist threat to Cuba almost to the exclusion of other areas of conflict and crisis. While I would not for a moment attempt to minimize the gravity of the situation in Cuba, I would like, for a few moments, to try to assess the conflict to date in a broader historical perspective.

Let us set the stage.

The world is divided roughly into three groups: The Western democracies, centered around the United States and the NATO nations; the Communist bloc, centered around the Soviet Union and Red China; and the large group of so-called uncommitted nations.

The tensions which now grip the world derive from two principal sources.

First is the conflict which has arisen as a result of the policy of world domination openly advocated by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc. Standing out against the Communist drive for world domination is the free world, led by the United States. Our objective is a peaceful world of independent nations free to choose their own system of government.

The second major source of world tension is the explosion of nationalism and the accompanying drive for improved living standards in the new and undeveloped countries.

The two forces are, of course, interwoven. For example, a major part of the Communist blueprint for domination includes taking advantage of the instability of uncommitted and undeveloped nations.

These, then, are the broad outlines of the world today.

Let me now make it clear that what I have to say about the future of communism is speculation, not fact; possibility not certainty. I claim no special crystal ball in world affairs. But I do think that sufficient evidence is available to suggest that communism has reached the high tide of its expansion and is starting to recede.

What is that evidence?

First, I believe, that, as a theory, communism has proven to be wrong. Marxist theory holds that communism must succeed because capitalism is doomed to destroy itself. Marx believed that capitalism must fail because it could only widen the gap between the rich and the poor, and that the oppressed would inevitably rise and overthrow the wealthy few.

The economists of the 19th century formed the basis for Marx's theory. They held that the ultimate and the only goal of a capitalist society was the accumulation of wealth in a competitive economy. It follows logically that a society geared to maximum profit in a competitive economy is forced to reduce wages as far as possible in order to increase

profits. Marx simply carried this one step further and said that eventually wages for the masses would get so low and profits for the few would get so high, that an explosion would inevitably occur.

But Marx was wrong because he never considered the possibility that capitalism might be able to adapt itself to changing conditions. Essentially this has been brought about because the Western democracies possessed the framework—a free and openly elected government—within which to make peaceful changes, and because far-sighted businessmen, trade union leaders, and economists have seen that a more equitable distribution of wealth was to the advantage of all concerned.

This was dramatically illustrated in January 1914, when Henry Ford first announced the $5 day. Prior to that, American wages rarely exceeded $2.80 for a 9-hour day. Ford—a most practical man—revolutionized economic theory by voluntarily raising employees' wages to $5 for an 8-hour day. This was, of course, directly contrary to accepted economic theory of the 19th century. It destroyed the foundation of Marxism.

Ford saw that by raising his wages above the mere subsistence level, he was making his workers customers also. This simple but revolutionary thought has made the American workingman the world's greatest consumer, and has raised American living standards to a degree unprecedented in history.

Thus, we see, that by its willingness to adapt, voluntarily, to changing economic circumstances, while retaining the basic concepts of private property and the profit motive, American capitalism has clearly demonstrated the fallacy of communism as a theory.

To be sure, labor and capital are in conflict in this country. To be sure, there has been violence. But it is largely a controlled conflict with a common objective, and few, if any, would dream of major class warfare here. In fact, it is here, in the heart of capitalism, that the classless society has been most nearly achieved. And we have, at the same time, retained intact our political freedoms, for we know that economic freedom and political freedom are bound together in such fashion that the loss of one generally leads to the loss of the other.

Not only has communism failed in theory; it has failed in practice.

Marx foresaw communism as the final stage in the development of nations, coming after the violent destruction of capitalism. In fact, as we have seen, communism developed originally in those countries which had never experienced a capitalistic society. They have used communism primarily as a method to achieve rapid industrialization. That is, in fact, communism's major appeal today to the undeveloped countries.

And though the Communists dictatorship has succeeded in transforming the Soviet Union into an industrialized society, it has done so at such a high cost in all other fields that it must be considered as a failure.

Consider Soviet agriculture. Abolition of private property, removal of the profit incentive, and forced collectivization have resulted in catastrophy after catastrophy in agriculture. Millions of farmers have been murdered in the process of enforcing collectivization. In the United States, farmworkers comprise 10 percent of our national labor force, and they have produced food in such abundance that disposal of our surplus has become one of our major domestic problems. By contrast, farmworkers comprise almost half of the Russian labor force, and theirs is a constant struggle to meet the national needs. We are all familiar with the results of the imposition of Communist theories upon Chinese agriculture, where each year has brought that country closer to the horrible prospect of widespread famine. And the problem persists in other Communist countries as well, such as East Germany and Yugoslavia. Nowhere in the Communist world is the agriculture problem one of surplus.

And, of course, the most important field where the failure of communism is evidence is in the field of political liberty and individual freedoms. The application of Marxist theories has required, in every Communist state, a completely closed society, fearful of new ideas and open interchange with other nations, afraid to permit its people to know what is going on. Each Communist country has been supervised by that 20th century testimonial to man's humanity—the secret police and the systematic use of terror.

All that Soviet Russia has demonstrated is that a large modern nation, rich in resources, can rapidly develop its industrial potential by giving to that development absolute priority over all competing claims. This can be done only by repressing political and economic freedom for the individual, and that is what the Soviets have done.

These first two pieces of evidence of the decline of communism—its theory and in fact—lead to a third: that communism has spent itself as an inspirational ideology which gripped men's hearts and minds completely. We are all familiar with the portrait of a dedicated Communist—subjugating his entire life to what he considered to be an ideal. That portrait is less common today than it was 30 or even 10 years ago.

In 1917, communism was a theory. In the 1930's it was an experiment. Today, it is a fact. And it is much more difficult to inspire with facts—unpleasant facts at that—than it is to do so with theories and experiments.

Inside the Communist bloc there have been increasing signs of tension and dissatisfaction with the monolithic state. The Polish and Yugoslav Communist Governments are under constant pressure from their people for more freedom. Khrushchev's destalinization program is not just a rejection of the rule of his predecessor, it is an indictment of the system itself.

In the underdeveloped countries, originally attracted by Communist promises of rapid economic development, we see increasing disillusionment and the rejection of Communist domination. This has happened, for example, in the African countries of Guinea and Algeria.

The really remarkable thing about the Communist effort in the uncommitted portion of the world has been its failure. On the surface communism offers quick and simple solutions which have great appeal for the illiterate and poverty stricken. Democracy, on the other hand, is an exacting form of government because it requires an active, educated people. The concepts of individual liberty are not easy to impart to people who have never had them. Nevertheless, slow as it is, we are making some progress, while communism's failure is more evident.

A fourth reason for its decline is the growing split within the Communist bloc itself.

For many years, the Communists and we in the West harbored an illusion of Communist countries as a single, monolithic group whose interests were identical. That illusion has now been shattered. The Communist bloc has emerged as a group of nations bound by force to a common ideology, but with divergent national interests. The most dramatic example, of course, is the growing split between Russia and China.

This split traces back many years. In the 1920's and 1930's, when the Chinese Communists were fighting for their very survival against the then superior forces of Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin repeatedly based his decisions upon what was good for Russia, not upon what was good for the Chinese Communists. Thus, when Stalin's principal foreign policy aim in the Far East was to create a strong China to act as a buffer between Russia and her traditional enemy, Japan, Stalin did not hesitate to sacrifice the Chinese Communists. Mao-Tse-tung was one of the first to learn this painful lesson. Whatever their personal beliefs about communism, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have been united in subjugating purely Communist interest to Russian interests when the two conflicted. Perhaps the best example of this was the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

We must, however, retain our sense of perspective about this split. As serious as their differences are, Red China and the Soviet Union have much more in common. Aside from their mutual distrust, their principal difference at this time is one of methods, not goals. Both believe in the eventual destruction of the capitalist countries, but the Chinese Communists believe unswervingly in achieving this goal by forcible means, even if it involves total nuclear war. In fact, one of the most disturbing signs arising out of the arguments between the two is the apparent ignorance of the Chinese Communists leaders concerning the possible effects of total war. The Soviets believe no less in the ultimate goal of world domination, but they think the way to do it is by subversion and victory in the economic sphere. To the Chinese, the Russians advocate a soft line.

But let us not delude ourselves that they differ as to their goals. A complete split may come, but there is insufficient evidence to support such a proposition at this time.

My final reason for believing that communism is on the decline is the determination of the Western democracies to resist Communist aggression.

The Cuban crisis of last fall comes quickly to mind. It is more dramatic than previous confrontations because weapons continue to get bigger and more dangerous, but it is in reality one of a series of encounters in which resolve and determination have forced a Communist withdrawal.

Shortly after World War II, Stalin attempted to press the advantage he had gained by virtue of America's rapid demobilization and the continued presence of the Red Army throughout eastern Europe. He attempted to penetrate Iran, Turkey, and Greece. In each case the attempt was met with resolve, particularly in Greece where the fighting was brief but bloody. In each case, the Soviets failed, thanks to the Truman Point Four Plan. Soviet efforts to subvert the European countries were thwarted by the Marshall Plan and the formation of NATO.

In 1948, Stalin attempted to blockade Berlin, and again Western resolve turned a possible Soviet victory into a stunning defeat for communism.

The attempted Communist thrust into South Korea was contained because President Truman had the courage and foresight to commit American forces to the effort.

And even today, we are continuing the costly, difficult, yet necessary task of repulsing Communist aggression throughout Asia.

In addition to these defensive measures designed to contain Communist expansion, we are continuing our positive program of assistance to the undeveloped countries.

Our mutual security program, which helps us by helping others, directs foreign aid into productive channels.

In the past 8 years we have given $17 billion in surplus foods to the hungry and needy throughout the world, in a gesture of generosity unmatched in history.

The Peace Corps is another example of affirmative and imaginative action which demstrates the kind of idealistic commitment which is possible in a free society.

These then are some of the reasons why I think that we may be seeing the beginning of the decline of communism. It is really

an inefficient and inhumane system for operating a government.

But we must remain ever vigilant. It is a tragic fact of history that mankind has experienced only 220 years of peace in almost 3,500 years of recorded civilization. And the Second World War demonstrated anew that war will come to those who seek to avoid it at any cost. Only by maintaining our strength and our sense of justice will we persevere.

We must rely upon our own strengths and our own deeds in insuring liberty for our children. The Cuban crisis of 1962 provided us with a dramatic illustration of our strength properly utilized to achieve a desirable goal.

Foreseeing the possible decline of communism is no reason for a reduction of effort on our part. Real progress is never made by sitting back and hoping that your opponent will stumble. Indeed, one major reason for the decline of communism is our own strength and fortitude. A major relaxation of these by the United States would inevitably result in success by the Communists in their quest for world domination.

Destiny has placed into American hands the burden of carrying for all humanity the torch of liberty in these perilous times. I am confident that those hands are sufficient to meet the task.

Communist Efforts To Undercut the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern over the attitude of our State Department and our representatives in the United Nations over our tendency to be lenient toward the Communist bloc and toward the economic efforts of that bloc to undercut the American economy.

Recently I received a letter from Mr. Charles D. Kindall of the Harding-Kindall Glass Co., of Springfield, Mo., with respect to the increased imports of window glass from Iron Curtain countries.

I think the exchange of correspondence involving our Department of State reflects the one-world philosophy of that executive branch of Government, even though part of that one world is predicated to bury us.

The correspondence follows:

COMMUNIST EFFORTS TO UNDERCUT THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

NOVEMBER 20, 1962.

Dr. DURWARD G. HALL,
Wilhoit Building, Springfield, Mo.

DEAR DR. HALL: The flat glass jobbers of America are faced with an extremely serious problem from imports of Czechoslovakian jalousie glass and Russian window glass. These are entering the U.S. market in increasing quantities. Congress has refused to grant most-favored nation or trade agreements concessions and lower tariffs to these countries. Thus, goods enter under the 1932 full tariff rates, but their state-owned industries, nevertheless, can ship glass into the United States which sells at prices quoted in this competitive domestic industry.

The only possible answer for this problem is an embargo or a strong quota on Iron Curtain glass. Otherwise, American jobbers will be closing down; and their investments and the jobs of their workers will be lost.

Currently, the Russians and Czechs are bringing the glass into certain selected markets—stressing New England, Florida, and the Gulf States. For example, one company reports from the South that it had to close down one plant and that the sales volume in its other plant dropped from $600,000 a year to $120,000 a year, after the Czech glass began flooding the market.

At the present time, my nearest competitors who handle foreign class are Memphis, Tenn.; Tulsa, Okla., and St. Louis, Mo. As far as I know, there has been a small quantity of this glass shipped into Springfield to only one company; therefore, effect on our market has not become apparent at this date. Your consideration of this matter would be greatly appreciated or anything you might be able to do in preventing the glass produced by these countries from entering the United States at the 50 percent advantage now extended to them.

Sincerely,

CHARLES D. KINDALL.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 11, 1963.

The Honorable DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Thank you for your letter of January 7, regarding the letter you have received from Mr. Charles Kindall, vice president of Harding-Kindall Glass, Inc., of Springfield, regarding imports of glass from Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R.

Our domestic legislation contains safeguards against imports, irrespective of origin, under conditions which result in unfair competition and injury to American producers. Among these is the Antidumping Act of 1921, as amended. This law authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to levy additional duties on imports where the injury or threat of injury has been caused by imports sold at dumping prices. The U.S. Tariff Commission has recently completed an investigation under the Antidumping Act with respect to imports of sheet glass in jalousie louver sizes from Czechoslovakia. It found that such imports were not causing injury to the domestic industry.

Although U.S. trade in sheet glass with bloc countries has been expanding, it continues to be relatively small. Total value of sheet glass imports from the bloc was $579,000 in 1959, $697,000 in 1960, and $905,000 in 1961. Of imports in 1961, $402,000 originated in Czechoslovakia, $432,000 in the U.S.S.R., and $70,000 from other bloc countries. Imports from the bloc were equivalent to 3.3 percent of imports from all countries, valued at approximately $27 million in 1961.

The United States favors the contacts between East and West which flow from trade in peaceful goods. This policy is based on the belief that the United States can most effectively exert an influence on developments in Eastern Europe and take advantage of any favorable and liberalizing trends in this area if the scope of relations with countries of that region is broadened. This includes maintaining and developing normal and active trade relations with the Eastern European governments of the Soviet bloc.

We hope the foregoing information will be helpful to you in replying to Mr. Kindall.

Sincerely yours,

For the Secretary of State:

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

FEBRUARY 18, 1963.

The Honorable DURWARD G. HALL,
Congressman, Seventh District, Missouri, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HALL: I have procured a letter which I believe better explains and defines the conditions in which our flat glass industry finds itself. I think that the following will be an accurate résumé and I would of course welcome the support which you indicated for this undertaking and for those problems in your letter of January 15, 1963.

We are, of course, distributors and jobbers for a complete line of flat glass products. Our company and the industry as a whole are faced with an extremely serious problem resulting from the imports of both Czechoslovakian jalousie size window glass and other window glass products that come from countries which are located behind the Iron Curtain. We believe that the volumes are such as to constitute a very real threat to our industry and to our markets, notably on the peripheral areas of this Nation.

The mere fact, however, that these materials have not as yet penetrated to Springfield, Mo., does not officiate the need for remedial action at this time. It appears to this writer that the impact of these materials on the total national market scene exert very real pressure in our areas despite the fact that the actual commodities do not reach this locality.

As you may know, in June of 1961, the President increased the tariff duties charged on sheet glass products manufactured in those countries which had received concessions under the general agreement on tariffs and trade and this increase placed those duties at a level which were in effect maximum under the said law. The Russian and other Communist produced glass products had prior to that already been paying the said maximum rate inasmuch as they were not eligible for such tariff concessions. The effect and end result of this action by the President was, of course, to give relief to the domestic manufacturers of glass from the very heavy competition that was being inflicted upon them by Western European and Japanese manufacturers of those products.

The important point here is, however, that the Russians did not suffer in the slightest from the action of the President and the same of course can be said of other Communist nations. In fact, there has been a rather dramatic increase percentagewise in their shipments into the domestic market since that increase occurred.

Now, I certainly do not wish to have you believe that this is a letter which is forsay critical in any way of the increase in duties that were levied by the President. It is my personal belief that the only realistic and reliable remedy for this situation is one which is based upon an absolute country quota rather than the utilization of tariff barriers. I do not suggest that the domestic industry was not entitled, and in fact, greatly in need of the relief remedies which the President found necessary to impose. However, I do say that with the domestic industry now being furnished with the tariff relief noted above and with the companion increase of the Russian and Communist shipments of window glass increasing at the rate now being experienced, it seems reasonable that we should carry the remedies even further and very drastically increase the rates of duties charged on such Communist products.

This is in essence the basis of my contention and my concern. I do not believe that it is possible for this industry or any other industry to long withstand in any portion thereof the impact of slave-labor-produced commodity products being dumped into this market on an at will basis. We simply do not believe that it is possible for the conditions to continue as they now exist.

In line of my previous correspondence with you, I solicit and request your assistance and support for any program which will serve to eliminate and restrain the impact of these materials on this industry of ours.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES D. KINDALL,
Vice President, Harding-Kindall, Inc.

Address by the Honorable William L. Springer, of Illinois, Before District of Columbia Federation of Citizens' Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday evening, March 9, Congressman WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Republican, of Illinois, made a speech before the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, at their annual dinner at the Mayflower Hotel.

I was present on this occasion. Many of the remarks Congressman SPRINGER made on that occasion are pertinent to the welfare of the District of Columbia and I feel sure that my colleagues, as well as the general public, would be happy to know what he said.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith append Congressman SPRINGER'S speech in full.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. SPRINGER OF ILLINOIS BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, it is not without a certain degree of reluctance that I speak to you this evening. Not that I am reluctant to be here this evening—it is a pleasure to be here, and an honor to have been asked to speak to you.

I am reminded of the story of little Tommy, seated on his father's lap, thumbing through the pages of an illustrated Bible—and suddenly coming upon a picture of Daniel about to enter the lion's den. Tommy was truly perplexed for the picture portrayed Daniel wreathed in smiles. "Dad," Tommy said, "I don't quite understand this picture. Here is Daniel about to enter the lion's den—and he seems quite happy about it." "Well, son," came the reply, "That's probably because he realizes that when the feasting's over he won't be called upon to say anything."

I knew when I came here this evening that I would be called upon to say something—and that degree of reluctance to which I referred has no reference to the Daniel in the story.

Again I'm reminded of the same little Tommy, this time in school, and being asked to add two and two. "Four," Tommy promptly replied. "That's pretty good," said the teacher. Said Tommy—"pretty good, heck; that's perfect."

Tommy had the problem and the answer. I have the problem. I should say problems. But not the answers, and from that stems the reluctance.

Since I first started my service on the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the problems of the District have been increasingly impressed upon me. And the problems are many, from home rule and judicial reform to education and housing. From public safety and protection to transportation and welfare.

The District Commissioners' legislative program for the 1963 legislative year, submitted to the Congress last month, runs the entire gamut. Some of their proposals undoubtedly will pass the Congress. Others will fail. Still others probably will not even be considered in committee.

It would obviously be impossible, to discuss in one evening, all of the problems which confront the District and the District Committee. It will be impossible to discuss any one of them in the depth necessary to do it justice.

But this evening I would like to discuss briefly—hit the highlights—of three of those problems: housing, education, and transportation.

Dr. Carl F. Hansen, superintendent of schools, in a report issued just last month to the board of education, said that the aim—of education—is to furnish the education currently needed to produce citizens capable of coping effectively with the problems of modern living. "District school authorities have not been able to achieve this goal in the past; they are not even close to attaining this aim at the present time; and the accomplishment of such an end cannot possibly become a reality in the foreseeable future without much improvement in fiscal support by the District Board of Commissioners and the Congress of the United States."

Dr. Hansen told the board of education that even though the situation in the school system were static, achieving the goals of modern education in the District would be formidable, but that the problems are compounded by a school population that has increased on the average, some 3,000 children annually, and which will increase, during the next decade, an average of 4,000 children annually.

"Building needs have plagued the school system as far back as anyone now connected with the administration can remember. No matter what standard of measurement one uses, the conclusion is the same, the District of Columbia Public School System does not have a sufficient space of good quality or bad, at the present time. No plans heretofore in contemplation will remedy this situation by the end of the present decade."

Obsolescense of buildings is a serious factor at the elementary school level. Of the 133 elementary school buildings that were occupied by pupils for instructional purposes on October 18, 1962, 53 will be 60 or more years old if still in use during the 1968–69 school year, the final year of the currently planned District public works program. It must not be taken as a flat declaration of policy that any school building 60 or more years old must be replaced, but rather that each building should be considered individually. Some might be of continued use without imposing educational handicaps on the children who used them, but, with few exceptions, these buildings will be inadequate for a complete educational program and should be replaced by 1968–69.

Pointing up the need for new school buildings, let me say that the District school population will increase from a projected 137,400 for the 1963–64 school year to a projected 163,000 for the school year 1968–69, an increase of approximately 18 percent.

To meet the demands of this growing school population, the Board of Education has proposed a 6-year building program which will have a considerable ameliorative effect at the four school levels. It must be remembered that this latest version of the Board's building program has not yet been approved by the commissioners: in fact, a public hearing was not held by the commissioners until November 1962. A substantial part of the proposed construction has been disapproved by the commissioners. Furthermore, the details of such a program are always tentative. From year to year, the Board's proposals represent the best estimate of the needs and the most effective solution of the problems of space shortages deemed possible at the time the revised program is offered for approval. Changes in circumstances that were not reasonably foreseeable at the time the plan was drafted require periodic review and amendment. Since the drafting of this section of this study began, the budget office of the District of Columbia has presented to the commissioners its recommendations for action on the 1964 items in the Board's suggested program. The budget office not only recommended deletion fo some very important items, but it postponed final approval of all remaining projects—except equipment money for five projects now in some stage of construction—until a revenue measure is passed by Congress to provide funds for capital outlay.

So there is the problem, money from the Congress. But even with the money the solution is not so easy.

Let me turn now to the National Capital Housing Authority.

According to the Office of Urban Renewal, public works construction during the next 5 years will force nearly 11,000 families to move from their homes. Some 30,000 to 40,000 individuals will be affected in this displacement.

NCHA requested approval by the Board of Commissioners for five sites for some urgently needed housing for low-income families. Mr. Walter E. Washington, NCHA executive director, told the Commissioners: "I realize that the proposed extension of the public housing supply will only provide for about 5,000 to 6,000 of the 30,000 to 40,000 persons to be displaced. To some this is not enough; to some it is too much. Nevertheless, we appear here today to tell the city that these sites are all we have been able to locate after years of conscientious searching."

The sites were approved by the Commissioners, and the matter is now before the Public Housing Administration for its approval. If approval is received here, 5,000 to 6,000 persons in the low-income group will receive adequate housing.

However, the report generally paints a bleak and dismal picture of the immediate future for housing low-income groups. As of September 30, 1962, a total of 7,543 families were on the NCHA waiting list, requiring housing of from one to six bedrooms. And to this figure must be added the balance of the 11,000 families to be displaced during the next 5 years. However, the experience with displaced families in the southwest urban renewal area indicates that approximately one-third of these families went into public housing which could reduce the figure of 11,000 to a figure of between 3,000 and 4,000. But this would still give us a figure of some 10,000 to 11,000 families in need of adequate housing.

And adding to the frustrations of many of those seeking the housing is the fact that, particularly in the multiple-bedroom area, that some families have had to wait 8 to 10 years before they were placed.

NCHA gives us this picture of its ability to place families in public housing due to monthly turnover: 12 one-bedroom units per month; 41 two-bedroom units per month; 18 three-bedroom units per month; 5 four-bedroom units per month; 2 five-bedroom units per month; and just 1 six-bedroom unit each 6 months.

As of the end of last September the authority had exactly 24 vacant units of all sizes. This means that of the 7,543 families on the waiting list as of that date, 24 had some immediate prospect of receiving a home. As of January 31, 1963, that figure stood at 7,323 families.

Compounding NCHA's problems is the fact that it is limited by law to activities within the District, some 70 square miles. Of this land, 65 percent is earmarked for purposes other than residential. A 1956 rezoning

study of the District of Columbia showed that 56.6 percent of the District's land area was at that time held in public and quasi-public ownership. Only 23.2 percent of the total land area was utilized for residential purposes, and only 3 percent was vacant.

The NCHA has examined over 42 sites comprising hundreds of acres in various sections of the city, and this search produced just the five usable sites for which it requested approval.

The inescapable facts are these: (1) development within the District of Columbia has virtually eliminated the vacant tracts which in earlier days would have been available for the authority's use; and (2), because of increased land and building values, the costs of acquiring and clearing slums have risen so as to severely limit the construction of the low-density housing which the authority so urgently needs.

The Authority states it must continue to explore every new method and technique of extending the housing supply; acquisition and use of existing properties, spot clearance and construction, and utilization of public lands not urgently needed for other high-priority uses, and an accelerated use of scattered site development.

However, this latter approach—scattered site development—has come under considerable fire. Property owners say it downgrades their property. NCHA says it does not; that, in fact, it increases property values. I am not going to presume to say whether it does, or does not. I am giving this to you as an example of the controversy we face, in addition to the problem of money.

Again, there is the problem, but not the solution.

Finally, let us take a look at transportation in the district. And here, again, we have controversy—controversy between the District Highway Department and the National Capital Transportaton Agency which was established by Congress in 1960 to prepare a transportation program for the Metropolitan Washington area and, subject to congressional approval, to construct and provide for the operation of mass transit facilities.

The region's transportation problem springs from the fact that the population is rapidly expanding and that most people working downtown have no satisfactory alternative to using their automobiles. The result is serious congestion of streets and highways, a condition which will become steadily worse unless decided improvements are made in transportation facilities. In 1960, Metropolitan Washington had a population of 2.2 million. It is expected to have a population of 3.6 million in 1980, an increase of 66 percent, and it will continue to grow after that.

Virtually all of this growth is taking place outside of the District itself. However, the primary trouble spot today is the Washington downtown area, which is, and will continue to be by far the region's largest employment center. While the number of persons traveling to or through the downtown area in the peak hours will be a declining proportion of all trips made in the region as the region grows outward, the total number of trips to and through downtown will grow sharply. In 1955 some 176,000 persons wanted to travel to or through the downtown area during the peak hour; by 1980 this number is expected to be as high as 254,000, an increase of 44 percent. This growth will occur in part because of an increase in downtown employment, which by 1980 is expected to be 17 percent greater than in 1955. The substantial increase in downtown trips is also attributable to the fact that there will be a steady increase in movements from one side of the downtown area to another. This increase in crosstown travel has been a pattern in every major urban area.

A number of plans have been advanced to meet Washington's future transportation needs. One would call for an all-highway system with improved bus service. Another calls for a minimum highway program—only those highways already built, under construction, or heavily committed—plus a regional rapid transit system. A third, the Highway Department's 1959 plan, calls for a very large highway network and a small rapid transit system. NCTA's plan calls for a sizable highway network, though not as large as that proposed in the 1959 plan, improved bus service, and a rail rapid transit system reaching from downtown Washington into the suburbs.

Any and all of these transportation plans would affect the agencies about which I have already spoken, the Board of Education and the National Capital Housing Authority. Any extension of Washington's highways would increase the number of displaced families, throwing a further load on NCHA. And NCHA would almost be forced to locate these displaced families in other areas of the city, adding to the planning woes of the Board of Education.

Also a cause for concern is the fact that, while the population of the Washington metropolitan area has been increasing rapidly, the population of Washington itself has declined. Middle- and upper-income families are moving out of the city into the suburbs, leaving a preponderance of low-income families in the District. Thus, while the needs of the District's population are increasing, the tax base is decreasing.

I could hardly speak on the problems confronting the District of Columbia without at least mentioning the National Capital Planning Commission, the Central Planning Agency for the Federal and District Governments, within the National Capital region. It is, according to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, charged with the duty "to plan the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features thereof."

It is going to have a busy time. It affects, and is affected by, nearly every other agency that has to do with the District of Columbia and the Metropolitan Washington area. For instance, it will have to hammer out differences in the National Capital Transit Association transportation plan and that of the highway department's 1959 plan, although the final decision must be made by the Congress.

To finalize, let me recapitulate. The magic number of the District of Columbia is three, more and better schools, improved highways and transportation, and adequate housing and neighborhood rehabilitation. Even with these three stones in the arch there can be no solid support for the future without a keystone. The keystone in this arch is planning. Without planning none of these three vital areas can succeed.

In modern urban planning, yearly cash and long-term credit are the two ingredients for success. Unless the District of Columbia can look forward to reasonable annual outlays and adequate long-term credit, nothing can be accomplished.

The President's plan for a Federal payment equal to taxes is a start in the right direction. With this anticipated increase in the budget of the District long term credit is in order.

The Congress this year ought to vote a payment equal to what industry would pay back home in taxes in every Congressman's congressional district. We on Capitol Hill should not be asking local taxpayers to pay the Federal Government's share of what it ought to be paying for the space we take from the tax rolls.

A payment equal to taxes is a fair Federal contribution. It is what every other municipality would be demanding if the Federal Government were located in that community. Most States now are making such a payment. In my home community of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., the State of Illinois is making a payment in lieu of taxes for community services for the space and buildings of the University of Illinois in the Champaign-Urbana community.

The District of Columbia is growing at a rapid rate, far beyond anything anticipated 18 years ago at the end of World War II. It will take a crash program to keep us on an even keel, with 3,000 more spaces needed next year in the school system, a complete complex of highways and bridges and a further rehabilitation of worn-out neighborhoods and increased modern housing, all pressing for attention.

The hour is late but it is not too late. We can do the job in the next 5 to 10 years if the Congress acts this year. The climate is right and we ought to get on with the job.

Groups such as yours, with groups within groups, each attacking certain problems, common, related, or entirely unrelated, working to seek ultimate solutions to those problems, are of immeasurable help. Your studies of our problems, the counseling and advice contained in your petitions to the various governmental agencies of the District—and to the Congress—are of great help and importance to those of us who must make the final decisions. Through your efforts we are able to gain clearer pictures of the problems; and are thereby better enabled to come up with the right answers.

Little Tommy came up with a pretty good, I mean perfect, answer to his problem.

I hope that we in the Congress may be able to do the same.

Navy Award to Mrs. Virginia W. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Navy recently presented to Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly its Meritorious Public Service Citation, in a ceremony in the Pentagon, presided over by the Honorable Fred Korth, Secretary of the Navy. This honor is one well deserved, indeed, by Mrs. Kelly, and it is also significant recognition by the Navy of the outstanding public service of Mrs. Kelly and other American women to the Navy and to the Nation.

In order that this citation may be brought to the attention of all Members of the Congress and the American people, and also may be recorded for history, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Navy citation, Mrs. Kelly's remarks in response, and news items about the award be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation, statement, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR VIRGINIA WELDON KELLY

For outstanding contributions to the Department of the Navy in the field of morale and welfare. As a member of the congressional press corps, Mrs. Kelly has consistently fought for the welfare of the personnel of the military services and for projects vitally important to the naval service. Her vigorous campaign in support of construction of a naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif.,

was a key factor in the events leading up to its being included in a bill for military construction. She has carried on an unremitting crusade for a new naval home in Philadelphia. She has, in addition, spent many hours as a volunteer worker at Walter Reed Hospital. Her life of unselfish service is an inspiration to thousands of servicemen, and her sincere and devoted work is greatly appreciated by the Department of the Navy.

In recognition of her valuable services this citation is approved this 30th day of October 1962.

(Signed) FRED KORTH.

REMARKS BY MRS. VIRGINIA WELDON KELLY ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION BY NAVY SECRETARY FRED KORTH OF THE NAVY MERITORIOUS PUBLIC SERVICE CITATION, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1962

Mr. Secretary, thank you for your gracious words. As an American citizen, as a Navy wife and as a member of the press, I am deeply appreciative of this honor and shall try to be worthy of it. Officers and men of the U.S. Navy, both active and retired, their dependents, and their widows and orphans have always been dear to my heart. This is as it should be because no man has ever loved the U.S. Navy more nor served it more loyally than my husband, Tom Kelly. Tom came early into my life when I was only 15 years old. I knew from that moment on that he and the U.S. Navy would together be entwined in my heart as long as I lived. I am thankful that my parents taught me to love my country. I am happy that my mother can be present today. She was born in Hungary but is a dedicated American citizen who has told me throughout my life that Americans are greatly blessed beyond their common knowledge. I am sorry that my sister, Mrs. Walker, of Beverley Hills, Calif., cannot be with us today for she, too, loves her country.

My father has graduated into the larger life but he was a brave man in war and peace who loved his country. As long as he lived, he bore upon his body the scars of hand-to-hand combat in warfare. His ancestors came to this country in the middle of the 17th century. I am the 10th generation of this family in this country.

I have always been proud to be a Navy wife. In my observation, Navy wives are a remarkable group of courageous and compassionate women who stand together as sisters in every aspect of life. Together they look upon birth; illness, tragedy, life, and death.

I am also proud to be a member of the press. In my opinion the men and women of the press are most loyal citizens who serve their country ably in a demanding and difficult profession.

Mr. Secretary, as an American citizen, I wish to thank you for all you have done and are doing for our beloved country. Thank you for your dedication to the U.S. Navy and to their families. I am most respectfully appreciative of President Kennedy's compassionate interest in the U.S. Navy and their families, and his interest in all the citizens of this country. I appreciate all that is done for us by those in authority.

I am deeply appreciative of the loving kindness, continuing interest, and tireless unselfishness of the U.S. Congress who are ever alert to the human needs of servicemen and their families. Year in and year in the statesmen work without thought of themselves for the good of their country. Far too seldom, do they receive the thanks of the citizenry. The names of these legislators are eternally engraved upon my heart. With your permission I would like to mention the name of one other person. I was blessed by having two mothers. My other mother was my husband's dear mother who has also graduated into the larger consciousness. She was proud of her sons and grandsons, all of whom served with the military. She flinched on only one occasion: During World War II when one grandson was killed in action. The next day, however, she dried her tears for the moment and said to me, "Darling, the tree of liberty must be watered with our tears as well as our blood."

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram, Nov. 27, 1962]

VIRGINIA KELLY GIVEN CITATION BY U.S. NAVY

WASHINGTON.—Virginia Kelly, Washington correspondent and columnist for the Independent, Press-Telegram, Monday received the Navy citation for meritorious public service for her work in connection with the establishment of a naval hospital in Long Beach.

"It could well be named the 'Virginia Weldon Kelly Hospital' for all the effort she made," Navy Secretary Fred Korth said in presenting the citation, one of the highest honors the Navy can grant to a civilian.

Mrs. Kelly, wife of Rear Adm. Thomas J. Kelly, Jr., USN, retired, was commended on the Senate floor prior to adjournment for this and other work in behalf of the Navy by Senators JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, and CLAIRE ENGLE, Democrat, of California.

The award ceremony Monday was held in the office of Secretary Korth and attended by dozens of Washington luminaries. Included among the guests were:

Adm. and Mrs. Arleigh Burke, Representative and Mrs. Craig Hosmer, Mrs. Clair Engle, Vice Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Claude V. Ricketts and Mrs. Ricketts, Rear Adm. Edward C. Kenney, Chief of the Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, former Assistant Defense Secretary Perkins Maguire, former Under Secretary of State and Mrs. Loy Henderson, Mrs. Morris Cafritz, and others, including Mrs. Kelly's special guest, her mother, Mrs. John D. Weldon.

In addition, telegrams were received from Senator STENNIS, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida. Senators ENGLE and A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrats, of Virginia, were unable to attend because of hearings in progress at the Capitol.

And in presenting the Navy citation Monday, Korth said it was being made on behalf of a grateful Navy and called hers a life of unusual service an inspiration to thousands of servicemen.

It was believed that Mrs. Kelly is the first woman to have received this award.

The 500-bed hospital got final approval during the past session of Congress after being bottled up almost 12 years in the Senate Armed Services Committee. And in that connection Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the committee, had this to say:

"At the time that I had almost fully decided that a certain hospital on the west coast was not at all necessary, unless it were to be used by retired personnel, Mrs. Kelly finally convinced me that it was absolutely essential that the hospital be constructed.

Mrs. Kelly has been a member of the Washington press corps for 15 years, having begun on a free-lance basis with the Press-Telegram when she and her husband moved from Long Beach to Washington.

She always has gone to bat for the Navy as a reporter, beginning with a campaign to reopen the Long Beach Naval Shipyard before the Korean war. And she has spent hours of volunteer time working for servicemen at Walter Reed Hospital here.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent, Nov. 26, 1962]

VIRGINIA KELLY HONORED

The multitude of people here and in Washington who know Virginia Kelly and her good works will applaud an event in the Capital City today.

It is the presentation to Mrs. Kelly of the Navy's Meritorious Public Service Citation—the highest award that can be given to a civilian by the Navy.

Mrs. Kelly, who has represented this newspaper in Washington for well over a decade, is a devoted friend of the Navy. She has worked indefatigably over the years for such projects as the Long Beach Navy Hospital, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard and fair treatment of active and retired naval personnel as to housing, medical care and other benefits,

In her writings she has interpreted Navy objectives and Navy life. She has a wide readership, here and elsewhere. We are proud and pleased at the honor bestowed upon her by Navy Secretary Korth.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Nov. 26, 1962]

NAVY HONORS VIRGINIA KELLY FOR SERVICES

WASHINGTON.—Virginia Kelly, a contributor to the Commercial Appeal, was honored by the Navy Monday for outstanding contributions in the field of morale and welfare.

Navy Secretary Fred Korth presented her with the Navy's Meritorious Public Service Citation at a ceremony in his office attended by Navy officers, Members of Congress, newsmen, wives, her husband, Rear Adm. Thomas J. Kelly, U.S. Navy retired.

She was cited for having "consistently fought for the welfare of the personnel in the military services and for projects vitally important to the naval service."

The citation listed her support for a new naval hospital in Long Beach, Calif., a new naval home in Philadelphia, and her service as a volunteer worker in military hospitals and institutions.

Mrs. Kelly, the former Miss Virginia Weldon, was born in Paris Landing, Tenn., daughter of the late Dr. John D. Weldon and Mrs. Weldon, who now makes her home here with Mrs. Kelly.

She and Admiral Kelly have been living in Washington since 1946, after tours of duty at a number of Navy bases here and abroad.

Secretary Korth told her she was the first woman ever to receive the Navy's Meritorious Public Service Citation. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, wired congratulations and Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, telephoned her.

Adm. Kelly is assistant to the chairman of the board of Socony-Mobile Oil Co., with offices in Washington and New York.

New Day for the Navajos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, "New Day for the Navajos," by Karl K. Krueger which appeared in the Rotarian of January 1963:

NEW DAY FOR THE NAVAJOS

Up in the ancient pines high on the sunny mesa where few men have ever walked and none has swung an ax, young lumberjacks in tin hats are now cutting 150,000 board-feet a day.

With their own personal might vastly extended by powersaws, power skidders, power-loaders, power everything, these tough timbermen "fell and limb" a 10-story tree in 5 minutes, buck it into 16-foot lengths in another 3 or 4, load it on a log truck and pup in less time than this telling takes, and send it snaking down the canyon road to the log yard.

There a giant iron lumberjack with 20-foot arms playfully picks up the whole load, and, so to speak, stuffs it in the top end of the sawmill. Now, as more young men in tin hats throw switches, the bandmill whines, the planer groans, the kiln fires thunder, and out at the bottom flows a yellow river of new pine boards—straight, clean, pungent, the finest Ponderosa anywhere—150,000 board-feet a day.

Is this a Weyerhaeused operation, this model of lumbering this ultimate in sawmills, or is it perhaps the pride of Georgia-Pacific or of Long-Bell or of some other tall name in the world of timber?

No, sir, not at all, none of these. "The People" own this thing—lock, stock, and barrel; forest, road, and mill. "The people," in this case, are the Navajos of the United States Southwest, the handsome, virile, growing tribe of American Indians which has dwelt meagerly amid the sands and sage and monumental geology of this region for 5, 7, maybe 10 centuries and which now with 90,000 men, women, and children, is the largest of U.S. Indian tribes. Navajo, if you don't know, means "people."

Yes, on their tribal lands high on mountain and mesa where the rains come often enough, the Navajos have a great treasure of timber—one of the largest stands of Ponderosa pine in the world.

And now as their own boys go up into their own forests and bring their own logs down to their own mill and there convert them with their own machines into No. 1 clear Ponderosa proudly branded "Navajo Pine" and send it to the open world market in the firm expectation of making a business profit—well, when this happens a new day has dawned in Navajoland. And it has.

The Navajo, for whom so many have tried to do so much for so many different reasons for so long a time, is doing this thing—this big thing—for himself.

Standing with the Navajo as he greets this new day and sharing his happiness are his many good "Anglo" friends in government, in industry, in education, in the press, and in other segments of society who have helped and advised him and who applauded his decision to take the plunge and put $7½ million on the line for a business enterprise his tribe would both own and operate. The new sawmill. "The Navajo are leanring faster than any other minority group in the United States of America," says one of those friends, Reino Sarlin by name. Mr. Sarlin is forest supervisor for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in Navajoland, and it was he, actually, who sparked the whole idea. About him more later.

"This is point four at home in the land of its origin," says another of those friends, Charles L. Wheeler. Charlie, whose name you may recognize, is a San Francisco executive and past president of Rotary International. Now largely retired, he has brought to the Navajos some of the top brains in the lumber business including his own. And he has brought them cheaply, in some cases at no cost at all. In this kind of thing he sees a great opportunity for Rotarians. But more of this and Charlie also later.

Did I by chance start this story too fast? Have I lost you, reader? If so, or even if not, let's start back nearer the beginning—and with some geographic orientation.

Spread the map of the United States of America before you and find the four Western States of Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. Note that the four have a common corner. (This is the only place in the United States of America where this occurs and just last September the Governors of the four States met there to dedicate a great flat monument built to surround the existing benchmark and bearing the inscription: "Four States Meet Here in Freedom Under God." Three of the four chiefs, it so happens, are Rotarians.

Well, this four corners country is roughly the center of Navajoland, which stretches east and west about 250 miles and north and south 150. It's dry land mainly desert. It's sand, sage, cactus, scrubby cedar, and piñon. It's creosote bush and the tumbling tumbleweed. It's a leathery old Navajo saying "pray for rain" in greeting and farewell; it is a farmer in Arizona bulldozing huge old cottonwood trees to earth because a single huge old cottonwood tree evaporates up to 90 gallons of water a day. It is drought and dust; and when it rains, the people—many of them—stand out in it and turn their smiling faces up—and the gray sagebrush greens up and fills the whole world with its bracing pungence.

yellow sands soar buttes and mesas and "shiprocks" looking indeed like great hulls breasting the waves, and coming in sandstones of pink, red, gray, and green. This is the land of Monument Valley with its weird columns on a ghostly plain memorializing 200 million years of erosion. This is wilderness which when viewed from the air shows faint wagon tracks meandering here and there and surprisingly often ending in nothing.

Sand dunes and canyons, mountains and lakes—this is the land of the Navajo. He has always been here, say his legends. "The people" originated below the earth and came up to the surface through a reed in a lake to the North. Scientists agree that, reed or not, the Navajos did, indeed, come from the North. Their tongue is identified with that of the Athabascan Indians of northwestern Canada and Alaska.

In his 500 or 1,000 years on these dry slopes the Navajo turned from hunting to herding, borrowed ideas from the nearby "city" Indians, developed a "total life way" made up of the flint way, the beauty way, and many other Ways, got horses and sheep and firearms and silver from the Spanish, resented and raided the military posts planted by the United States after it acquired the region from Mexico, spent some time in prison as punishment, yes, in 1864 Col. Kit Carson was ordered by the U.S. Government to round up the whole tribe and march it to Fort Sumner, N. Mex., which he did and where 8,000 Navajos spent 4 years in what old ones still speak of as the saddest page in their history, then returned in 1868 to their shrunken tribal lands which Uncle Sam now set aside for them as their own reservation forever and to which he added bordering lands for a present total of 14½ million acres. That's about 25,000 square miles and that's about the size of West Virginia or of Ireland.

So on their beloved land once more the Navajos resumed their herding and weaving and began to try to figure out the many outlanders now crowding around them—the cattlemen, the sheepmen, the railroad men, the men from the Bureau of Indian Affairs who came with ideas of schools and new type medicine men who knew nothing about "sings" or sand painting, and others who brought a great variety of goods and welcome barrels of used clothing.

Today, to leap to the present, you find the Navajo living still on the land, typically. He likes freedom, independence, elbowroom, so you may find his hogan or small cabin up a little valley, huddled beneath a protecting rock, miles from nowhere, clustered with five or six other hogans. This is a clan, these five or six families, a strong and basic social unit. One is forever loyal to his clan but never marries within it. The 90,000 people now on the reservation are in some 600 clans with 17,500 hogans. The clans collect in 74 precincts, each of which gets to send a representative to the tribal council in Window Rock, Ariz., which is the seat of tribal government and the seat of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Individually the Navajo on the reservation may be poor. The floor and roof of his mud-chinked hogan may be of earth and he may have to carry his water for 10 miles, but the chances are pretty good that he carries it in a shiny 1½-ton pickup truck. Dealers in pickup trucks in cities around Navajoland do a brisk business—the man with the GMC agency in Gallup reportedly doing more than any other GMC dealer in the world. The pickup truck is the family car and most prized possession. It hauls everybody and everything everywhere. Furthermore, the Navajo gets so many things free—education, health services, agricultural advice, loans, marketing help, etc.—that the headman of the tribe, brisk and businesslike Paul Jones, recently said: "Welfare, like black water (which is our word for firewater), is a bad thing we got from the white man."

Tribally the Navajo is indeed well off. He has $70 million in the bank. On the reservation and on other lands allotted the tribe there are enormous recently discovered reserves of coal, gas, and oil, and uranium, too. On lease and royalty basis large commercial mining interests are working these fields. From oil and gas alone the tribe has collected $135 million—and has spent it carefully on such things as a huge new civic center, a tribal fairgrounds, and an arts and crafts center all at Window Rock, and on scholarships for some 450 outstanding young Navajos.

Now, it is fine to have that money coming in * * * but some questions do arise: When do we Navajos begin to learn to run things ourselves? What work is there for our keen Navajo boys and girls coming back from college? Shall they come back to the hogan and the little flock of sheep? Can we hold them? Employment—where can we get more of it for our men barred from off-reservation jobs by the language barrier?

Among Navajos asking these questions were the more than 3,000 men who served their Uncle Sam with distinction in World War II, many in the Signal Corps, where they used their own Navajo tongue as a code.

Rejno Sarlin, the forester, thought he saw an answer in the trees. Perhaps better than any other man he knew the 740,000 acres of the Navajo forest. And he knew how desperately this virgin forest needed thinning.

"A decadent forest," he called it, "good only if harvested." Photometric surveys had shown that you could take 34 million board feet out of it every year forever—and that you ought to take 50 million feet out each year for 5 or 10 years just to catch up." Thinking on these things, and on the many young Navajos he knew who needed challenging, good paying work, Forester Sarlin got the idea of a big lumbering operation and put it in the ears of tribal leaders.

"What? Go into our sacred forests and cut down the trees?"

Old Navajos demurred, but most everyone else was enthusiastic, and wanted to know more. To learn more the tribe brought in consultants, forest economists, specialists, and practical, long-experienced lumbermen. All their findings added up to: go ahead.

And so in 1958 with the blessing of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington, D.C., the tribe set up a wholly owned

corporation called Navajo Forest Products Industries, Inc., put $7½ million into it for construction and initial operating expenses, appointed a management board and then started out to recruit the best men for it. Four would be Navajos, five would be non-Navajos who would bring industrial know-how to the corporation.

That's what took a delegation of five tribal leaders to San Francisco one day soon after. The word was that a Mr. Charles L. Wheeler, longtime executive chief of the Pope and Talbot lumber and shipping combine, was nearing retirement, and was interested in this kind of thing. Was he?

No man on earth could have been more so than this fast-but-soft-talking dreamer with the quiet executive force who could see at once the myriad possibilities in the proposal—and for Rotarian Charlie Wheeler not the least of these was the opportunity for service it offered Rotarians.

"After all," says Charlie, "I had felt and said for years that Rotary's greatest dormant resource is its capacity to furnish senior members who have the experience needed to render technical assistance and that the best use we could make of that resource would be to get these senior citizens to share their experience in underdeveloped lands.

From my experience on the original point 4 program and on visits to 2 dozen or more underdeveloped areas of the world. I concluded that there is a far greater need for technical help than for money grants." Then, too, Charlie well knew that his old Rotary friend Kenneth H. Smith, of Scotia, Calif., one-time head of the Pacific Lumber Co., had been advising the tribe almost from the start of the dream, and was full of excitement about it.

So "I would be honored" was Charlie's answer to the tribe, and soon he was installed as first chairman of the management board, to which came other retired executives like him—the retired president of Shell Chemical Corp., the retired vice president of Crown Zellerbach Co., the retired chiefs of two big lumber outfits and a still very active executive of a forestry-consulting company—four of these five being Rotarians. The four Navajos named to the board are all young tribal leaders, college educated, handsome, sharp as tacks, and enthusiastic, and one of them recently paid Chairman Charlie the nicest compliment he ever expects to get. "Our board is supposed to have five whites and four Navajos on it," he said. "Actually with Charlie Wheeler on the board we have four whites and five Navajos."

And so the Navajo Forest Industries Board came together, selected a general manager, Rotarian Leslie I. Holmes, of Cloverdale, Calif., who was formerly an executive with U.S. Plywood, Weyerhaeuser, and other lumber companies, finalized its plans for the new sawmill, and began construction in September 1960.

Eight hundred Navajos working for an even 2 years with big contractors from Phoenix, Albuquerque, Seattle, and other places poured concrete, riveted corrugated sheet steel, ran the piping, installed the mighty conveyors and cranes and kilns, and by last September 1 had put together not the largest sawmil in the U.S. Southwest but certainly the finest there or, in fact, in the whole United States. Electricity powers the mill—electricity from generators turned by turbines turned by steam generated in boilers fired by "hog fuel"—sawdust and slabs from the mill itself.

At the same time the Navajo builders had built a new town to go with the mill. They named it Navajo, laid out broad winding streets, put in the utilities, ran up 40 houses, provided a place and plan for everything, even down to a dock for pleasure boats in the town's own natural Red Lake. Perhaps significantly the first civic institution to open its doors in Navajo was the public school. The builders had brought their children. Their education must go on. Just begun, Navajo may one day have 4,000 people. That is the plan.

And on September 6 the tribe and its friends from all over the United States gathered to dedicate the new mill and the new town. Pouring in from all the little towns and clans on the reservation, from all the cities off the reservation where some 13,000 Navajos work and live, the men dressed in their jaunty sombreros and tight jeans, the ladies in their velveteen blouses, squaw skirts, and silver and turquoise jewelry, the babies on their baby boards, in rolled the people to see for themselves the big things the tribe was achieving—to inspect the mill and town, to eat a barbecue feast for 8,000 persons provided by the businessmen of Gallup and of course to hear some speeches.

Tribal Chairman Paul Jones said he counted the huge sawmill one of the great developments of the tribe—second only to the discovery of oil and gas on the reservation. Handsome J. Maurice McCabe, executive secretary of the tribe, reported that the Navajos were now inspired to find other industries. The Honorable Philleo Nash, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, from Washington, expressed great pride and pleasure in the initiative and courage the Navajos had shown in all this, and the chairman of the management board looked ahead to problems of the future. "We must find a number of efficient, experienced senior citizens, of good intent," he said, "who have the ability and patience to teach the Navajo technical skills and the responsibility necessary to successfully run a good industrial enterprise.

"We must begin the installation of conversion facilities for the production of residue products—one of the fascinating possibilities is a building block compounded of sawdust, chips, and a special bonding cement. But most essential at the moment is an early townsite development—at least a general store, eating and meeting facilities. In fact, what is axiomatic elsewhere can well become the Navajos' most important byproduct—the community services, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker can well employ more men than the major industry itself.

"Here is not only a challenge to the Navajo people but a challenge to every person interested in Indian welfare. We must let it be known to senior citizens and senior craftsmen, in every walk of life but especially in the lumber industry, to service clubs—Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, and others—to religious leaders, educators, and statesmen that here is a service opportunity."

"Daily our attention is brought to what the United States is doing in foreign aid and furnishing technical skills to underdeveloped areas world-wide. May we not, in good taste and in good faith; call attention to some homework which can help make the first Navajo Forest Products Industries more successful?"

And so, dedicated, inspected, and admired, the mill started up and whirs on. As the workers gain experience and confidence—almost none of the five hundred had ever been in a factory of any sort and few spoke English—production increases and will soon be 200,000 board feet daily, and the town of Navajo fills in and grows greener day by day.

The Navajo singer or medicine man serves the Navajo who is ill or distressed with any one of 50 ceremonial chants—the "Evil Way," the "Mountain Top Way," the "Enemy Way" and so on. But he also has some cheerful ceremonials and one of them is the Blessing Way sung to invoke health, wealth, success, and good babies.

A lot of people in a lot of places are asking the Blessing Way on Navajo, N. Mex., and if all goes well there, who knows?—maybe someday the Navajo will sing the "Blessing Way" or the "Business Way."

Resolutions Adopted by Disabled American Veterans, Department of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two resolutions recently passed by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Oklahoma. These resolutions are vitally important to the veteran program of Oklahoma, as well as to programs helping other groups such as the handicapped, older worker, the youth and other persons who have difficulty in obtaining employment.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Disabled American Veterans sponsored the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the GI bill; and

Whereas title IV of the act provided for the U.S. Employment Service, Veterans' Employment Service, and each State agency shall provide effective counseling, testing, job placement and job development in order for all veterans to receive maximum services for job opportunities; and

Whereas the act provided the State agencies shall designate one or more employee preferably a veteran assigned in each full-time functioning office to carry out the duties prescribed by law; and

Whereas, the State agencies continue to receive additional assignments; such as programs for the handicapped, youths, older workers, and the minority groups without increased funds to hire necessary personnel to carry out these duties; and

Whereas these additional duties and responsibilities placed upon the agencies and the local offices have in many instances required so much time of the office staff and in many instances the local veterans employment representative thereby limited the amount of time to assist the veteran in testing, counseling, job placement and especially job development; and

Whereas, the Disabled American Veterans appreciates the outstanding job being done by the National Employment Service and the local offices. However, the act of 1944 as amended definitely set forth the requirements for the Veterans Employment Representative and prescribes his duties in assisting the veteran in obtaining employment. The Disabled American Veterans also appreciates the necessity for the other programs and are in accord with each of them. However, the increased workload placed on the local offices has, in the opinion of the Disabled American Veterans, decreased services to the veteran in obtaining employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Executive Council of the Disabled American Veterans at its meeting in Muskogee, Okla., March 2 and 3, 1963, do hereby go on record petitioning the Congress to provide adequate personnel for the U.S. Employment Service and the State agencies in order for each full-time functioning office to designate a full-time employee, preferably a veteran, to be directly responsible and assigned on a full-time basis to discharge the duties of the local veterans employment representative as prescribed by law; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress make adequate appropriations to provide the necessary staff for the additional programs; such as, handi-

capped coordinator, youth, senior citizen, and minority group; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of the Oklahoma congressional delegation requesting their support to carry out this resolution, and copies be forwarded to the Disabled American Veterans Headquarters for consideration at its State convention, Secretary of Labor, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and Veterans Employment Service.

A. L. HAND,
Department Commander.
J. V. ADAIR,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it is the established policy of the Federal Government as enacted in legislation to assume responsibility for providing employment assistance and job counseling to veterans; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has by two statutes—the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; Public Law 16, 78th Congress and Public Law 894, 81st Congress, provided for a nationwide service for the employment of veterans through the U.S. Employment Service and the Veterans Employment Service: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans at its State executive committee meeting in Muskogee, Okla., on March 2 and 3, 1963, go on record as insisting upon the maintenance of the Veterans Employment Service as a Federal operation adequately staffed to insure to all veterans a maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment and enactment of legislation necessary to insure that objective; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to department headquarters to be considered by the State convention, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of the State of Oklahoma, and to the U.S. Senators and Congressmen for Oklahoma.

A. L. HAND,
Department Commander.
J. V. ADAIR,
Department Adjutant.

Japan Is Stirred by Reuther Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese labor movement no longer is anti-American, according to the western edition of the New York Times in a dispatch appearing March 4, 1963.

Much of the credit for this change goes to Walter Reuther, the president of the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO, who made a spectacular visit to Japan. His trip, as might be expected, drew the noisy protests of the hardline Communists in Japan. But Mr. Reuther managed to get through to the bona fide trade unionists of Japan who have been neglected and ignored by too many persons in the State Department in past administrations.

As the New York Times dispatch by its distinguished correspondent, A. M. Rosenthal, makes clear, "before Mr. Reuther's visit, Mr. Ohta, chairman of the general council of trade unions, said there were anti-American labor leaders in Japan. Now, he said, there are none."

This change in Japanese labor attitudes toward collective bargaining and toward the United States is a great credit to Mr. Reuther and to the traditional practical mindedness of the American labor movement.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix the full text of the two New York Times articles describing Mr. Reuther's visit:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 2, 1962]

JAPAN IS STIRRED BY REUTHER VISIT

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

TOKYO.—Walter P. Reuther has returned to the United States after a trip that, in the view of many involved in Japanese industry, may turn out to be one of the most important visits to this country by an American in a decade.

For 10 days, the vice president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations conferred with Japanese union leaders of the left, right, and center on matters that touch on Japanese unionism, politics, and economics and on relations between Japan and the United States.

The chief hope of the Japanese union leaders is that the Reuther visit will help them in their struggle for a larger share of the fruits of Japan's booming industrial production. They also hope that it will speed the delicate trend toward unity in the Japanese union movement, now split politically and ideologically.

For the Japanese public, the most important result of the visit was to emphasize the point that the U.S. labor movement is giving strong backing to the Japanese unions in the fight for a fair share of the increase in Japanese productivity.

Mr. Reuther said in speeches and at news conferences that the union leaders of the United States and Western Europe agreed that at the moment the Japanese worker was not getting a fair share. He announced that an international union research center would be set up here, with American union support, to help the Japanese unionists collect reliable statistics on Japanese wages compared with wages in other countries and in relation to Japan's own economic standards.

A fundamental controversy exists in this country between employers, who insist that Japanese industry cannot afford to pay higher wages, and Japanese labor, which insists it can and must.

Politics enters heavily into the picture although Mr. Reuther tried to avoid taking political sides. The Japanese Government, run by the conservative-minded and pro-American liberal Democratic Party, generally sides with the employer. Most unions support opposition parties of the left.

TURN FROM THE LEFT

In recent months, the General Council of Trade Unions, the largest union combination, has shown signs of dropping its traditional emphasis on leftist and anti-American political slogans and concentrating more on trade union issues.

The council, according to Japanese specialists, has been forced by the modernization of Japanese industry to concentrate more on union demands than on ideology and leftist slogans and demonstrations.

This 4 million-member group and other union groups concede tactly that they were unprepared for the challenges presented by modernization and automation. They understand the need to retrain workers and open new job opportunities and the need to reform seniority rules under which wages are based less on skill and performance than on length of service.

Mr. Reuther had close contacts with the General Council, one of the four unions that invited him to this country. U.S. circles here do not believe that the Council has suddenly changed its political leanings and has become a great friend of the United States.

But there is a theory, advanced by Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer and endorsed by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy during his trip to Japan last winter, that the United States and its union leaders could not afford to ignore politically the Council's huge membership, the non-Communists among its leaders and the influence wielded by the union.

The belief is that officials and union leaders in the United States should try to get the Council to look at American views and institutions a little more carefully.

TRADE A KEY FACTOR

Mr. Reuther's visit also is important against the background of Japanese-United States trade. Japanese unionists and employers are aware that many union members in the United States oppose increased imports from Japan because of her cheap labor.

Mr. Reuther and the Japanese union leaders hope higher wages in Japan will eliminate some of this coldness toward the "made in Japan" label. Mr. Reuther went out of his way here to say that for their part union members in the United States had to pay more attention to the fact that the jobs of 4 million Americans depended on the export trade of the United States. That trade, he said, could exist only on the basis of a two-way street.

Economists believe there are many, many industries in which the Japanese cannot undercut foreign competition. In these industries, relatively low wages are offset by the need to import raw materials and by higher western assembly-line productivity.

But in industries where the labor cost is the decisive factor, Japanese employers say, it would be national suicide to eliminate the great competitive asset this country possesses.

[From the New York Times (western edition), Mar. 4, 1963]

JAPANESE LABOR PLANS CAMPAIGN

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

TOKYO.—Japan's strongest labor union has organized its 4 million members for an intensive double "spring offensive" that touches directly on this country's economic and political position in the world.

For the next 2 or 3 months the union will devote its leftwing political power, its treasury, and its talent for street demonstrations challenging two of the basic platforms of the conservative-minded government that runs the country.

One campaign will be aimed at destroying the idea that Japan cannot afford to pay wages as high as those in other industrialized nations. The slogan will be "Wages Equal to Western Europe."

The second drive will be to prevent the Government from ending its long feud with South Korea and starting to put Japanese money into the faltering South Korean economy.

The infusion of Japanese economic strength into South Korea has been a top-priority diplomatic goal of the United States in Asia. The union has made opposition its top-priority political goal at home.

MOVING TO THE RIGHT

The man who will lead the spring offensive is Kaoru Ohta, chairman of the General Council of Trade Unions known as Sohyo. Mr. Ohta, a burly man with a taste for open collars and candid conversation, heads an organization that is an ally of the Japan

Socialist Party and is committed to socialization of Japan but now speaks of moving to the right.

As Mr. Ohta explained, "moving to the right" means, among other things, dropping the virulent anti-American slogans of Sohyo's past.

"You notice that we don't talk any more about imperialism," he said.

Mr. Ohta gave part of the credit for the more polite attitude toward the United States to last year's visit of Walter Reuther, vice president of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations. Mr. Reuther went out of his way to talk with Sohyo leaders and promised American labor's support to the Japanese union's demand for higher wages.

Before Mr. Reuther's visit, Mr. Ohta said there were anti-American labor leaders in Japan. Now, he said, there are none.

The United States has concentrated on making contact with Sohyo leaders and inviting them to visit Washington, on the theory that the non-Communist left is too influential to be ignored.

HIGHER WAGES DEMANDED

But in the opinion of Japanese labor experts the "movement to the right" has been brought about not so much by U.S. interest as by economic pressures within Japan. The chief pressure is the growing belief of union members that they are not getting a fair share of Japan's booming increase in production. This has forced Sohyo to concentrate more on "rice bowl" issues than on political demonstrations.

Mr. Ohta said the Japanese steelworker outproduced the German or British worker. But the Japanese steelworker earns only half the German wage and a third the British, he said.

The average wage in Japan is 25,000 yen a month, or $69.45, according to Mr. Ohta. The Government puts the figure at about $83. Sohyo is campaigning for an increase of about $14 a month in basic pay. Mr. Ohta said Japanese labor was prepared to mount strikes throughout the country to achieve the goal.

But leftwing political goals remain very much a part of Sohyo's campaigns despite the "movement to the right." Sohyo collects about $1,671,000 a year from its members in dues and assessments and Mr. Ohta said about a third of that was spent directly on political drives.

The campaign against the talks with South Korea, Mr. Ohta said, are aimed at preventing Japan from being drawn into a new Northeast Asia Treaty Organization. He said that he had no evidence that either the United States or Japan planned such an organization—both countries deny it—but that it might happen.

Japanese labor specialists believe the union is focusing on the Korean situation as the handiest political weapon with which to fight the ruling Liberal Democratic Party. With local elections coming this spring, the union and Socialist Party hope to capitalize on traditional Japanese iciness toward Korea, pick up some votes and maintain the traditional Sohyo commitment to leftist politics despite the new emphasis on economic goals.

A Recent Report on Israel Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, almost invariably people who visit Israel report that although that nation is constantly threatened by hostile neighbors, its people have a tough-minded determination to succeed. The March 1 edition of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette carried a thoughtful story about Israel by Mr. Leland Harard, director-consultant of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL GROWS DESPITE PRECARIOUS STATUS

(By Leland Hazard)

JERUSALEM.—Tel Aviv is a good place to break an air journey from New York to India. We landed just as the blue of the eastern Mediterranean sky was disputing stoutly with the black of the night and we were off at once by car on the hour's drive to Jerusalem. As the road unfolds, one mingles thoughts of ancient Hebrew history with sights of modern times. We passed the Vale of Ajalon, where Joshua commanded the sun to stand still while he pursued the Amorites.

My official guide—thanks to good friends in Pittsburgh—tells me that Tsora is nearby, the place of Samson's birth and burial, the grim reminder that Israel was embattled 3,000 years ago as she is today. The headlights of the car mark the trucks and the tanks resting askew on the roadside where Arab fire left them in the bitter 1948 attempt to cut off Jerusalem from the newly proclaimed State of Israel. They are carefully maintained as memorials to the defense of Jerusalem.

Jerusalem sits in the midst of the nations and countries that are around her, exactly as the Prophet Ezekiel said. A city which was already there when Abraham came, a city now watched daily by the Jordanian soldiers, posted in ancient, sometimes sacred, structures along the border, which runs crazily through the city, sometimes dividing buildings, even houses—Israel's Jerusalem is the most exposed, most tenuously held capital in the world. Sacred to Jews, Christians and Moslems, who believe that Mohammed ascended to heaven from here, Jerusalem is rent by the 1949 Jewish-Arab armistice line, which generally left each side with what it then held. Israeli Jerusalem holds King David's tomb, where Jews, especially women, come to be blessed. But the Arabs hold the remains of the second temple—the Wailing Wall. And a Christian in Jerusalem can only look at the Arab-held Mount of Olives, so near at hand, and must only peer through the bright haze at nearby Bethlehem.

Jerusalem maintains a memorial to the 6 million Jews killed by Hitler's Eichmann. The present population of Israel is one-third of the number of Jews brutally murdered in the World War II holocaust. There are 12 million Jews in the world. Two million of them live in weirdly shaped Israel, with a width which varies from 10 to 70 miles, a length of 260 miles, and frontiers of 750 miles to defend against Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Egypt, and, if Nasser's United Arab Republic ever materializes, against over 80 million Arabs. What is the outcome for such a nation?

I sat in the pleasant living room of an Israel cabinet minister. A big portrait of a lovely girl hung on the wall among other interesting works of an Israel artist. She was killed in the War of Liberation, the mother told me quite simply, dry eyed. Abdullah Saliel, pursuing his adventures with Nasser in the Yemen, boasts that they will meet in Tel Aviv. Phrases such as "Push Israel into the sea" are current in the Arab world.

Americans can have no concept of what it means to live so precariously. I am assured by informed members of the Israel Government that the Israel Army could fend off any aggression today. But in the long run? That is another question.

Israel could make peace with the keyly positioned Jordan. It is Nasser who blocks settlement. If the American Government had not been so precipitously squeamish at the time of Suez in 1956, a lasting compromise might have been negotiated. This is the way some highly placed Israelis feel about the episode. Ironically our action at the time of the Suez crisis gained America no good will in Egypt and did nothing to extinguish the slow burning Arabian fuse in the Near East.

Against such odds, in the face of such uncertainties, the evidences of Israel's faith are impressive. Within reach of low-powered Arab rifles a new Hebrew university campus, to replace one impounded by Jordan only 3 miles away, has arisen. Constructed of native stone, the modern buildings are handsomely designed, both exteriors and interiors. They give an air of permanence more convincing to the eye than some of the metal clad structures we build in Pittsburgh. Within the same area, a great semicircular rim of land, commanding a pleasant valley, the capitol buildings are going up according to a carefully prepared long-range plan. A great circular hospital is in being, with an adjoining medical school on the way.

The economy is both tightly and loosely controlled. Private enterprise is encouraged. But there is government sponsored enterprise; also there are cooperatives and in some cases labor unions embarked upon industrial enterprise, the left hand sometimes striking against the right. Foreign exchange is closely guarded. A Volkswagen costs $4,000, because of the high tariff; a martini costs only a high American price, 90 cents—an index, perhaps, to the relative importance of martinis and Volkswagens in any economy.

At a luncheon I asked a highly placed official known all over the Jewish world for his brilliant verve, "How many people can the present Israel support?" He said that the population could rise to 4 or 5 million within the existing area of Israel, and within the present technology. Israel seeks no additional land.

I have more questions to ask and I have yet to see the agriculture, but at the end of the first 3 days I know that modern Israel is an act of faith.

Safety Standards for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, the latest year for which figures are available, over 100,000 Federal employees suffered work-related injuries. Compensation for these injuries represented a new liability to the Federal Government in excess of $35 million. When we add the untold cost in human suffering to the fact that the liability incurred each year represents only a portion of the actual expenditures by the Federal Government as compensation for these injuries, we realize that this is a situation which deserves our most urgent attention.

As Congressman-at-Large from Maryland, a State in which more than 86,000 employees of the Federal Government

work, in addition to the thousands of Marylanders that work in the District of Columbia for the Federal Government, I have interest in improving the existing safety practices.

There are presently no existing minimum safety standards which apply to all Federal agencies. With approximately 54 different Federal agencies responsible, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, for the safety of the Federal employee at the workplace, there are over 50 different types of safety programs.

With over 50 agencies responsible for individual safety programs, there presently exists much duplication of effort in the way of publications, training, inspections, and requests for financial support for safety personnel. There is no agency or coordinating body which has the authority to see that overall objectives are set, that minimum Government-wide safety standards are developed and put into effect. Although the Department of Labor promotes cooperation and coordination of the Federal safety effort, through the Federal Safety Council, it does not have authority to really develop and coordinate an effective Federal safety program.

My bill amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act would accomplish the following things:

First. It would require the head of each Federal agency to establish a safety program in conformity with the standards, programs, and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

Second. It would give the Secretary of Labor authority to develop, promulgate and promote minimum safety standards for Federal employees.

Third. It would provide for surveys and investigations of injury cases which would provide useful data for individual agencies to use in controlling injuries to their employees.

Fourth. It would provide a means for coordinating and collecting the information and data developed by each Federal agency and making it available for all to use thus preventing duplication of effort.

Fifth. It would provide an advisory staff of technicians for those agencies wishing to initiate or improve their safety efforts.

Sixth. It would provide a Federal safety advisory committee which would include representatives from both labor and management and thus insure a more closely knitted joint labor and management effort toward improving the safety record.

Seventh. It would provide resources for training and education of Federal advisory personnel in order to upgrade the safety know-how of those responsible for the safety of employees.

It is imperative that something be done to better coordinate the Federal efforts in accident prevention. It is imperative that minimum Federal safety standards be developed and that every Federal agency be required to meet them. Amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act would establish the coordination and direction needed. It would reduce the danger experienced by Federal employees exposed to various hazards and save tax dollars.

Ikard Elected President of American Petroleum Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, two excellent articles about the election of my predecessor in Congress as president of the American Petroleum Institute have appeared in the widely read trade publications of the oil and gas industry in recent days.

The selection of my good friend Frank Ikard for this highly responsible post in the petroleum industry is an indication of the outstanding reputation he has gained throughout the Nation and the world.

One of the articles appeared in the March 11, 1963, issue of the Oil and Gas Journal, titled "Where Is American Petroleum Institute Headed?"

The other, titled "Ikard Elected American Petroleum Institute President," appeared in the February 1963 issue of Independent Petroleum Monthly. I commend both these articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Oil and Gas Journal, Mar. 11, 1963]

WHERE IS AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE HEADED?

(By Clyde La Mottee, Washington editor)

A question of current interest and long-range import to the petroleum industry is how well Frank Ikard can fill the role as president of American Petroleum Institute.

If it is assumed that he has the potential—and the American Petroleum Institute executive committee obviously felt so or it would not have elevated him to that position after the death of Frank Porter—then the question hinges primarily on how fast and how far he will move. And in what direction.

It was with this in mind that a Journal reporter called on Ikard at his Washington office.

Ikard discussed an assortment of topics: The strength and weaknesses of American Petroleum Institute, the complex and ever-changing government-industry relationship, oil's involvement in the battle over taxes, and the constant need for new techniques and emphasis both in and out of American Petroleum Institute if the industry is to stay vigorous and progressive.

1. TRANSITION

The unexpected loss of Frank Porter last November 30 cut short the gradual transition in American Petroleum Institute leadership that had been planned.

When Ikard resigned from Congress late in 1961 to become executive vice president of American Petroleum Institute it was generally understood that the big Texan would become Porter's successor eventually.

The informal plan at the time was for Ikard to serve as executive vice president for a couple of years and then move up after Porter's retirement, with Porter serving in an advisory role for another year or so to assist him.

This plan, it was felt, would give Ikard time to become better acquainted with the organization and its functions. Too, it would enable him to get to know the oil industry better, and vice versa.

But Ikard had been with the American Petroleum Institute only a year when death struck down Frank Porter without warning.

A short time later, in January, the executive committee formally chose Ikard for the presidency.

The period of transition had ended abruptly.

2. EVALUATION

A change in leadership creates a natural opportunity for a fresh appraisal of an organization.

Such a situation now exists at the American Petroleum Institute and Ikard is well aware that both he and the Institute will be under close scrutiny for some time to come.

Gradual changes and shifts in emphasis appear inevitable, and each move will be used by people in and out of the industry to gage how well Ikard is doing.

"We can't stand pat," Ikard says, "because new problems are constantly cropping up and new aspects to old problems develop. Therefore, we have to grow and change and adjust with the times."

It is obvious that Ikard already has given much thought to what American Petroleum Institute is and what it should try to be in the years ahead.

"It's a big organization, representing all segments of the industry," Ikard says reflectively, "so it has to take all these viewpoints into consideration.

"This means that sometimes it cannot take a stand on a given issue because industry opinion may be sharply divided.

"However, it seems to me that this handicap is more than offset by the fact that in many instances the industry can and should speak with one voice. In these cases, an organization such as ours provides the means of doing so."

What are some examples?

"There are many programs from which all the industry benefits," Ikard explains. "For instance, research and development, standardization, a travel-development program, and compilation of necessary statistics, data, and information.

"Also, there are many day-to-day tasks that the American Petroleum Institute performs. Many of these don't make headlines; in fact, often they pass virtually unnoticed by many segments of the industry. But they are things that need to be tended to or else the industry suffers."

Ikard mentioned the work American Petroleum Institute does, in conjunction with others, in advising the Government Accounting Office on industry questionnaires, record forms, and reports. He mentioned, too, air-and-water-pollution problems and the fact that governmental agencies need industry advice and cooperation in order to work out feasible programs.

Frequently one of American Petroleum Institute's chores is the prosaic job of developing and presenting information to assist a governmental or industry group.

"I don't say we are performing all these functions perfectly, or even doing them well in every instance," Ikard points out. "But these are the things that American Petroleum Institute can and should do.

"It seems to me, therefore, that our main concern should be with how we can perform these jobs rather than trying to go off on some new tangent."

Clearly, Ikard does not anticipate any rapid, major overhaul of the American Petroleum Institute organization, its targets, or its techniques.

Instead, it can be anticipated that changes will evolve gradually, with little fanfare, and that they will be in the form of shifts in emphasis rather than abrupt new directions.

Such a pattern would be in keeping with Ikard's method of operating in the past. In Congress, for example, he was seldom in the spotlight and yet he gradually emerged as

one of the most influential and effective Members of the House.

3. COMMUNICATION

The new president of American Petroleum Institute apparently feels strongly that constant effort and attention must be given to improving communications in the industry, between industries, with the Government, and with the public.

Intraindustry: As the petroleum industry grows and becomes more complex, the need for communication within the industry becomes more and more important.

"Unless this happens, misunderstandings develop and people wind up working at cross purposes," Ikard observes. "This doesn't necessarily solve a given problem, but I discovered when I was in Congress that my first task was to get others to understand what I was trying to accomplish if I expected to get their help."

As a step toward better intraindustry understanding, Ikard has made a point of discussing industry problems frequently with other oil associations and company representatives so that each would be aware of what the other is doing, and why.

Interindustry: The petroleum industry has been accused by other industries at times of playing a lone-wolf role.

Ikard hopes to encourage better understanding and closer cooperation.

"The oil industry is directly involved with virtually every other industry, either as a supplier of its fuel, as a supplier of raw material for its products, or as a major consumer of that industry's goods.

"It stands to reason, then, that if we can call to their attention the fact that we have a common meeting ground, we can be helpful in meeting common problems."

Government: An ever-increasing problem the industry faces is that of governmental action affecting it.

Recognizing this, the American Petroleum Institute has gradually stepped up its Washington operations in recent years. And there is little doubt that a major factor in the American Petroleum Institute's move to hire Ikard was his knowledge of the Washington scene and of oil-related problems there.

Ikard tries to spend 2 days a week in Washington and is likely to devote even more time at that office as Congress gets more deeply involved in taxes and other oil-related problems.

From his congressional background, Ikard is acutely aware of the need for an industry to tell its story well in Washington. This is not only the case with Congress but with the myriad of governmental agencies involved in one aspect or another of oil-related functions.

"As I see it," Ikard says, "our job is not to try to influence but to inform. That applies not only in our dealings with Congress but with governmental agencies and the general public.

"We need to let our viewpoints be known, explaining our position without trying to twist anyone's arm, giving information that is useful in a particular situation."

Ikard points out that Congressmen and many Government officials have to deal with a wide range of problems and therefore cannot be expected to be as conversant with oil problems as someone in the industry.

Therefore, he explains, the big necessity is to provide those people with the right information at the right time.

He thinks the American Petroleum Institute will be performing a service not only to the industry but to the public if it can further establish itself as a reliable source of information on oil-related matters.

Although there has been no sharp increase in American Petroleum Institute's Washington activities since Ikard joined the organization—and perhaps no big increase is likely—it is already evident that Ikard's presence has had an effect.

Ikard can go to the White House and get in to see the President. On Capitol Hill, he is on a first-name basis with many influential Congressmen. And throughout Government he has many contacts and acquaintances.

This does not necessarily mean that Ikard can get what he wants. But it at least provides a setting for getting the industry's story told—and listened to.

4. PARTICIPATION

Recently Assistant Secretary of Interior John M. Kelly urged the oil industry to send more men to Washington to fill oil-related positions in Government.

Ikard endorses this proposal enthusiastically. As a matter of fact, the Institute has asked Kelly to attend a meeting of the American Petroleum Institute board to spell out his ideas on this subject in more detail.

"The business community as a whole has been lax in not participating more in Government," Ikard says. "There is a real need for a practical, hard-boiled approach to this Nation's problems.

"The oil industry has talent that could be put to good use in Washington, and more men from industry ought to be made available."

As a result of the interest of Kelly, Ikard, and others, a plan may be evolved whereby oil companies and associations will help supply an increasing number of qualified industry officials for oil-related Government positions.

"It seems to me that both the industry and Government would benefit from such an approach," Ikard reasons.

5. TAXATION

The industry is now involved in the toughest tax fight it has faced in decades.

With so much at stake, the industry's efforts and strategy are of prime importance.

"We need to take an affirmative approach and seek to avoid the defensive or apologetic," Ikard suggests. "And we need to gain as boad a public support as possible."

He thinks it is important to stress the overall impact the $280 million oil-tax hike would have on the industry's exploration and production and on its financial ability to make investments in plants and equipment.

"It's obvious that the added tax burden would not be conducive to stimulating the growth of a vital segment of our national economy."

The American Petroleum Institute president expressed these beliefs:

Other industries need to be reminded of the fact that they are likely to be directly affected by any crippling blow against oil.

The public should be made to realize that such a change as that recommended by the President will be reflected in the price the consumer pays for oil and oil-related products. Even administration spokesmen admit there would be an effect on prices.

Congress and the administration should be made aware of the ramifications affecting national security and welfare and the Nation's economy generally.

"People who agitate for a change in long-established oil practices and principles are playing with the heartbeat of our entire economy," Ikard says.

However, Ikard is a man with basic faith in the commonsense of Americans and in our form of government. Therefore, he is confident that if the industry states its case clearly and fairly—and makes sure enough people hear the facts—the eventual verdict will be favorable to the industry.

6. IKARD AT WORK

Ikard has been going at a terrific pace since joining the American Petroleum Institute and particularly since the loss of Porter.

He shuttles between Washington and the American Petroleum Institute office in New York. He makes frequent trips to Texas and other regions to discuss problems with oil people or to make a speech at some organization's meeting.

All this, plus his tax-battle involvement, learning the ropes at American Petroleum Institute, adjusting from the role of Congressman to that of leader and administrator of a large association, add up to quite a schedule.

Even so, Ikard invariably appears relaxed and unhurried. An associate says Ikard never loses his temper, never pounds his desk nor raises his voice.

"You go to him with some problem and he hears you out," the associate says. "It may be days or weeks before he mentions it again and you figure he's probably forgotten all about it.

"Then one day he calls you in and tells you his decision, and why. It's obvious he has thought it through carefully, perhaps even more so than you had done.

"He doesn't like to move until he has given something careful thought. Then, when his mind is made up, he's ready to go."

Ikard quite apparently is a team-type man who prefers working with others to taking over the spotlight himself.

That, then, is the man at the helm of the American Petroleum Institute.

[From the Independent Petroleum Monthly, February 1963]

IKARD ELECTED PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

Frank N. Ikard was named president of the American Petroleum Institute last month, after serving for the past 13 months as executive vice president of the American Petroleum Institute. He succeeds the late Frank M. Porter.

Ikard served four terms—1952 to 1960—as Representative to the U.S. Congress for the 13th District in Texas, winning a reputation for his work on the House Ways and Means Committee.

In the House, as a relative newcomer, he won the confidence of then Speaker Sam Rayburn. Ikard was a leader in the fight for workable controls on imports of foreign crude oil and petroleum products into the United States.

Ikard did not seek reelection in 1960, at which time he joined the American Petroleum Institute.

Ikard comes from old Texas stock. His grandfather, W. W. Ikard, settled in the north Texas open-range country, making his headquarters in Clay County. The family has been prominent in north Texas ever since.

Ikard was born at Henrietta, Tex., in 1914, received his law degree from the University of Texas in 1937, and was admitted to the Texas bar the same year. He practiced law at Wichita Falls from 1937 to 1948, with his practice interrupted by service in World War II.

As a rifleman in Europe, he fought in Normandy, northern France, Aachen, the Siegfried Line, and the Hurtgen Forest. He was wounded twice. In November 1944 his company was encircled and captured by the Germans. While a prisoner of war, his 6-foot, 4-inch, 225-pound frame was reduced to 135 pounds by malnutrition.

He returned to the practice of law at Wichita Falls. In 1948 he became judge of the 30th Judicial District Court of Texas, serving until 1951 when he was first elected to the Congress.

In 1940 he married the former Jean Hunter of Wichita Falls. The Ikards have two sons, Frank, Jr., and Bill.

On the Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter entitled "On the Washington Scene":

ON THE WASHINGTON SCENE

MAGNA CARTA FOR THE AGED

While the Nation's news media properly highlighted the announcement of President Kennedy's proposal for hospital insurance for retired persons they pretty much ignored the rest of his far-ranging plan to bring our growing ranks of old people back into the mainstream of our community life. To me the idea of putting to use the talents and the experience of our senior citizens is at least as significant a proposal as providing for their physical well-being.

The administration's hospital insurance for the aged proposal, introduced as H.R. 3920 by Congressman CECIL KING and as S. 880 by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, represents an improvement over previous bills as might be expected when legislation has been under long consideration.

As President Kennedy pointed out in his special message, the financing of health care costs for the aged is becoming an increasingly serious problem not only for individuals but also for local communities and States which are reluctantly being saddled with those costs after individuals exhaust their savings and sell their assets to pay hospital and doctor bills. At present there are 17½ million people over 65 years and the number increases by 1,000 a day until by 1980 there will be 25 million. Medical costs for retired people are skyrocketing well beyond their current ability to pay. Only 10 to 15 percent of such costs are covered by private insurance. Three-fourths of all retired people over 65 have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, much of which comes out of public benefit programs because in fact 12.5 million receive social security benefits and another 2¼ million are on public assistance.

The administration sees its plan to provide social insurance financing for hospital and nursing care as a sound conservative way to keep the mounting costs of serious illness for retirees from being shifted to local real estate and/or personal property taxes. State and local governments are already suffering from insufficient revenues and pressures to provide facilities and services for a growing population.

The new King-Anderson bill would provide:

Eligibility: Insurance to defray for practically all persons past 65 the cost of inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, skilled nursing home, and home health care. Cost for those receiving social security will be paid from a new fund in the system while that for other persons will be paid from the Federal Treasury.

Scope and duration: Inpatient hospital services paid for either, (a) up to 45 days with no deductible; (b) up to 90 days with a deductible of $10 a day for the first 9 days—with a minimum of $20—or (c) up to 180 days with a deductible equal to 2½ days' average hospital care;

Skilled nursing home services: Up to 180 days furnished in nursing facilities affiliated with hospitals.

Outpatient hospital diagnostic services: As required subject to $20 deductible, when furnished during 30-day period.

Home health services: Up to 240 visits during calendar year by therapists or health aids for recovering patients.

No Government interference: Patients would be free to choose their own physician and accredited hospital.

Private groups: Blue Cross or other organizations chosen by hospitals to represent them can have delegated to them certain responsibilities in administering the act.

Private health insurance: The act would provide that private health insurance will be encouraged to develop supplementary insurance protection for the aged.

Financing: All costs paid for social security beneficiaries would be financed through increases in contribution rates of one-fourth of 1 percent for employers and employees and four-tenths of 1 percent for the self-employed. Maximum annual earnings subject to tax would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200 beginning with 1965. Cost of benefits for other beneficiaries will be paid from the general fund in a transition period until practically everyone can qualify for social security coverage.

Tax benefits: Proposed tax reductions in 1963 are especially planned to ease burdens for people over 65. A $300 tax credit would be substituted for the extra exemption and retirement income credit to reduce the present unfairness in taxation of income from different sources. It is estimated by 1965 about 3.4 million persons 65 years and over will pay $470 million less in Federal income taxes.

Improved economic security: Raising the maximum taxable wage base for computing benefits from $4,800 to $5,200 will make it possible to raise maximum monthly benefits for a worker from $127 to $134 and for a family from $254 to $268.

Increased employment opportunities: In his message President Kennedy pointed out, "Denial of employment opportunity to older persons is a personal tragedy. It is also a national extravagance, wasteful of human resources. No economy can reach its maximum productivity while failing to use the skills, talents, and experience of willing workers."

It disturbs me that in recent years our economy has lost its vigor and failed to provide jobs for millions of young workers and forced the early retirement of older workers. I am gratified over this emphasis given to finding ways to stimulate our economy.

Looking to the day when all willing workers can have jobs, the President recommends that the Federal civilian agencies review current policies and practises regarding the employment of older workers, looking toward the better use of their skills and experience. Private employers are invited to do the same.

The President further recommends that the Federal-State Employment Service strengthen its counselling and placement services and give special attention to the employment of older workers.

In addition the President recommends that the manpower development and training and the area redevelopment programs give special attention to the training of older workers in their communities. New ways will also be sought to find out what jobs elderly men and women may want to do part-time in their own neighborhoods. Some suggested activities would be school lunch hour relief, child care in centers for working mothers, home care for invalids, assistance in schools, vocational training and programs to prevent juvenile delinquency.

Also, a proposed National Service Corps contemplates the enlistment of elderly people with special abilities in volunteer service programs in their communities.

The broad scope of the President's program for elderly citizens illustrates the practical idealism of the administration. In setting it forth to Congress President Kennedy was mindful of historian Toynbee's observation that a society's quality and durability can best be measured "by the respect and care given its elderly citizens."

I am confident that history will record that our society was not found wanting because our country, true to its tradition of humane consideration, did in our day adopt a health, economic and social program which adequately meets the physical and spiritual needs of our citizens in the golden years of their lives.

FORT SNELLING INSURANCE CENTER

In the past weeks the Veterans' Administration in Washington has been putting the final touches on plans to transfer the VA insurance activities of the Denver Office to Fort Snelling. By June 30 it is expected that the augmented facilities at Fort Snelling will handle 2 million GI life insurance policies representing $13.5 billion worth of protection to veterans and their families in 28 States of the West, Midwest, and the South.

The consolidation of activities at Fort Snelling was due largely to the economic and efficient performance of the staff there which is under the direction of Manager John Murphy. I was pleased to participate at various stages in the decisionmaking process on the transfer.

MODERNIZATION OF THE ST. PAUL POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMHOUSE

During the month, I announced that the General Services Administration was initiating plans to modernize the St. Paul Post Office and Customhouse Building on Kellogg Boulevard.

The existing building will be upgraded to bring it into conformity with the new addition. Construction on the annex at the rear of the building for the Post Office Department is proceeding but not without some problems.

I was notified recently that GSA has substantiated my charge that substandard ventilation ductwork was being installed. The faulty sheetmetal work is being replaced with the materials which the specifications require. Certainly the Government is entitled to receive full value for money spent on such projects.

JUNIOR ROTC

In swift reaction to the Defense Department's proposal to abolish Junior ROTC in the Nation's secondary schools, Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of the House Armed Services Committee, introduced H.R. 4444 to extend the program permanently. During hearings on March 6 and 7 a DOD assistant secretary announced that it was planned to continue Junior ROTC for at least another year.

I have been advised that Mr. HÉBERT plans to push for the enactment of his bill to put Junior ROTC on a permanent basis so DOD cannot alter it at whim.

This matter is of great interest to the many parents of Cretin High School boys who have written to me asking that the program be continued.

Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have recently received a copy of a letter of concern for the success of nuclear test ban negotiations which was addressed to the President of the United States by

some of the business, professional, and educational leaders of the city of Baltimore.

I believe it important that my colleagues in the Senate have the benefit of the views of these distinguished leaders of public opinion in Maryland, and for this reason, I ask unanimous consent that their letter to the President be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President of the United States and Others in Authority:

We are concerned that recent widely publicized statements of those opposing a nuclear test ban treaty, e.g., Dr. Edward Teller, may drown out the counsel of the scientists, citizens and Government representatives who believe a nuclear test treaty is in the best interests of the United States.

We believe that such a treaty will improve our country's security by slowing down the arms race, stopping the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, preventing further radioactive contamination, and setting the stage for eventual worldwide disarmament under international inspection.

With the differences narrowed to a few inspections a year, we are closer to an agreement now to end nuclear weapons tests under international inspection and control, than we have been in the 5 years of the negotiations which began under President Eisenhower's administration.

We affirm our support of our Government's efforts to resolve the few remaining differences and to negotiate a treaty to end nuclear weapons tests by all nations, for all time.

Dr. Allan C. Barnes; Henry H. Callard, Gilman School; Alexander S. Cochran; Hans Froelecher; Frank T. Gray; Sidnedy Hollander, Jr.; Arthur U. Hooper; Albert Keidel, Jr.; William L. Marbury; Theodore R. McKeldin; Dr. Eugene Meyer, Department of Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University; J. Jefferson Miller; Dr. William R. Neumann, Department of History, Goucher College, Towson; John B. Ramsay, Jr.; Rev. Alfred B. Starratt.

FEBRUARY 16, 1963.

Feed Grain Program Costs Illinois Livestock Producers $70 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 90 days of the Kennedy-Freeman feed grain program has cost Illinois livestock producers at least $70 million.

Secretary Freeman's policy of driving down corn prices through Government sales in order to get a good signup under the program-encouraged overproduction of livestock, and is responsible for the recent drop in prices.

Hog prices today are at the lowest point in 3 years, and cattle the lowest in 18 months.

A 9.8-percent drop has occurred in Illinois hog prices and 10.5 in beef cattle since November. Average hogs dropped from $16.40 per hundredweight in November to $14.80 in February, while cattle declined from $23.70 to $21.20.

This price drop cost Illinois hog raisers $21.9 million and cattle raisers $47.3 million.

I base my calculation on a January 1 livestock inventory of 7,894,000 hogs worth $223,400,000 and 3,470,000 cattle worth $450,620,000.

The loss estimate is on the conservative side because part of the decline had already occurred by January 1, and dairy cows, also adversely affected, were excluded in the figures.

Even before the feed grain program was first enacted in 1961, livestock people were informed that it would be Government policy to keep market price of corn from rising. This was practically an insurance policy against feed prices going up, and consequently livestock numbers were increased.

The price received by American farmers for corn has declined slightly each of the last 3 years, and last year averaged $0.998—just under a dollar a bushel, as indicated by this table:

Corn—Monthly price received by farmers

[Per bushel]

	Calendar years				
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
January	$1.02	$0.979	$0.963	$0.951	$1.03
February	1.04	.995	1.00	.956	1.06
March	1.06	.999	1.01	.968	------
April	1.13	1.05	.945	.988	------
May	1.15	1.07	1.02	1.03	------
June	1.16	1.08	1.03	1.03	------
July	1.13	1.09	1.05	1.04	------
August	1.13	1.07	1.04	1.02	------
September	1.09	1.06	1.04	1.04	------
October	.990	.991	1.02	1.02	------
November	.982	.866	.938	.938	------
December	.959	.911	.947	1.00	------
Simple average	1.07	1.01	1.00	.998	------

Source: USDA.

Secretary's Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, my affable colleague from Oklahoma, the Honorable TOM STEED, has demonstrated his understanding of the problems of Members of Congress in many ways throughout his illustrious career. He has now demonstrated his understanding, not only of the problems of the Members of Congress, but also of the staffs of each Congressman's office. This recognition of the staff member's problems was Representative STEED's proposal that a secretary should be permitted to select a chair for his or her comfort instead of one of prescribed standard dimensions. It is not anticipated by our colleague that this small consideration would increase the cost of equipping a Member's office.

This proposal was noted by a newspaper serving Kansas, the Topeka Daily Capital, and some comment was made in the editorial column of that paper on Wednesday, March 6. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

SECRETARY'S FRIEND

U.S. Representative TOM STEED of Oklahoma appears to be going down in history as the secretary's friend in Congress.

STEED has brought into the open what lawmakers less brave have hestitated to mention. He says flatly that secretaries come in different sizes and that this fact has been roundly ignored. Obviously, STEED says, the matronly secretary needs a larger chair than the lithe young stenographer. Accordingly, STEED believes each secretary should be permitted to chose from a variety of chairs the one that is best suited to her, well, to her personality.

We presume the chairs will be sort of like the sizes in men's sports shirts. Small, medium-large, and large.

Representative STEED is able to befriend the congressional secretaries because he is chairman of the legislative appropriations subcommittee, which makes him a sort of housekeeper for Congress. His subcommittee must approve whatever Congress spends on itself—for curtains, watercoolers, garages, office help, furniture and what-have-you.

As a housekeeper, STEED has a luxurious house to keep. Currently under construction is a huge new House Office Building, the cost of which is variously estimated at $71 million to more than $100 million, depending on what you include. The cost per office suite for each Representative in this plush facility has been estimated at $483,000.

We can attest that TOM STEED has labored in far less expensive offices because he is a former colleague of ours being a newspaperman—and a good one—before he got into politics. It is typical of STEED that he's looking out for the comfort of congressional secretaries. He ought to get the vote of every secretary in his district on the basis of his considerate policy in Washington. If we could, we'd cast one medium-large vote for STEED ourself.

My only comment, Mr. Speaker, is that I am wondering if there is a single secretary on Capitol Hill who would request the large size.

Sympathetic Understanding of Portugal's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years our relations with Portugal have deteriorated because of our unwillingness or inability to understand the difficult internal problems of readjustment which are faced by this country.

Portugal has been a friendly and understanding ally of the United States. She has acted with us in NATO and has provided us with one of our vital bases in the Azores.

Fortunately, in recent days, the sympathetic understanding of Portugal's problems has been increasing as well as the recognition of the many good points

of Portugese development, both internally and overseas.

As evidence of this understanding, I include in the RECORD herewith a column by Robert H. Estabrook which appeared in the Washington Post of March 14, 1963.

The article follows:

EVOLVING PORTUGAL DEFENDS HER ROLE

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LISBON.—Prime Minister Antonio de Oliveira Salazar is among the world's most durable rulers presiding over one of the world's most conservative countries. To some he is a savior, to others a benevolent autocrat and to still others a dictator. After more than 3½ decades in power, Dr. Salazar at 73 retains an amused twinkle in his eye. In his unassuming, scholarly way he personfies the stability which his countrymen sought fruitlessly before him.

By many indices he has been remarkably successful. Lisbon is an extraordinarily clean and lovely city. Portugal's per capita income is still statistically the smallest in Western Europe, $260, but low prices mitigate some of the effect. Poverty remains, but Portugal has been industrializing as she attracts people from agriculture and expands basic education. Last year she showed a quite satisfactory 7 percent economic growth.

Stability has been accomplished by suppression of some political liberties. No organized opposition exists, though there have been occasional outbreaks of dissatisfaction. The captive press reflects the debilitation of censorship. A political police is enough in evidence to keep dissenters fearful and protests discreet.

But the regime is scarcely bloodthirsty; even political prisoners are permitted university studies.

For 2 years Portugal has felt the strain of a war against terrorism in the African province of Angola. Militarily the situation seems under control, but Portugal is apprehensive about Algerian arms through the Congo. Meanwhile she is a pariah in the United Nations, denounced regularly for not granting immediate independence to Angola and Mozambique.

Such demands affront the sense of historic mission which Salazar insists is to bring economic development and education apace in a multiracial pattern. There is little talk here about self-determination in a Portuguese commonwealth, but significantly new universities are being inaugurated this fall in Angola and Mozambique.

When the enterprising Governor General of Angola, Gen. Venancio Deslandes, was dismissed in a disagreement over university administration it appeared as if liberalization had been halted. Then the Oversea Minister, Dr. Adriano Moreira, himself was ousted. Some say that this was merely a conflict of personalities, but others feel that Salazar mistrusted Moreira's ideas. Concessionaires protested when Moreira ended compulsory cotton planting in Mozambique and raised wages.

But, if retrogression seemed likely, the opposite could be the case with a new law which the national assembly will debate next week. Legislative councils in oversea provinces henceforth are to be wholly elective with complete control over budgets. Simultaneously an internal common market is to eliminate economic discriminations. If these reforms are implemented as promised, the decentralization they portend could become a form of self-government.

At the same time Portgual has begun to welcome foreign capital. Export-Import and World Bank loans are helping finance Europe's longest bridge across the Tagus River being built by the United States Steel Export Co. Portugal now wants additional investment at home and overseas, perhaps partly to interest others in her African problems. She also is preparing for what she hopes will be eventual membership in the European Common Market.

Self-pity over Goa and anger at the United States and Britain have receded. American forces continue to use the Azores base as talks proceed spasmodically. Portugal views the negotiations as primarily a political lever. Officials do not expect American policy on self-determination to change but would like expressions to be more sympathetic. They were irritated by Assistant Secretary of State Williams' recent remarks in Leopoldville.

Few things have an urgent stamp in a country where aspirations and practice sometimes contrast markedly. This is a time of reassessment. How long Portugal can realistically hope to persist in her multiracial objections overseas against nationalist pressures remains the big question. She declines to recognize any necessity for a gesture to conciliate world opinion.

Instead, officials take satisfaction in what they say has been more foreign understanding and even respect from some African countries for the Portuguese approach. They are confident that ultimately they will be proved right. Nevertheless, although change sometimes seemingly requires as much painstaking effort as one of Lisbon's mosaic sidewalks, Portuguese policy is in fact evolving.

Invocation by Very Rev. Joseph Baran, V.F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives was honored today to have the Very Reverend Joseph Baran, V.F., pastor of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church in Lansford, Pa., deliver the daily invocation. I am particularly pleased because Father Baran resided in Sheppton, Pa., in my congressional district, for over 20 years before assuming his present position at St. Michael's.

I am sure we all join in Father Baran's prayer for our respected colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, whose death today has saddened the Congress.

Father Baran also called our attention to the fact that today, March 14, 1963, marks the 24th anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence which was made on March 14, 1939.

I join Father Baran in commemorating this important anniversary. All Americans are justly concerned over the fate of more than 4 million Slovaks who are presently living under Communist dictatorship in their homeland. The more than 2 million Americans of Slovak origin who have made such a great contribution to our cultural, social and economic life have a special interest in this day of commemoration. They can be assured that the Congress of the United States and all Americans join them in working for the day when freedom and justice and peace will reign throughout the world.

It's Time We Plug Foreign Aid Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Franklin and Oil City, Pa., News-Herald:

[From the Franklin and Oil City (Pa.) News-Herald, Mar. 8, 1963]

IT'S TIME WE PLUG FOREIGN AID HOLE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Author Frederic Wakeman writes of two Burmese who had a big rock in a wheelbarrow, which would not have been so unusual except that one of them was carrying the wheelbarrow on his head. They simply preferred to carry the wheelbarrow that way.

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and his bipartisan group of foreign aid investigators, calling for a halt on further taxpayers' funds to southeast Asia, gives needed recognition to this type of problem.

We strike the right note when we approve our expenditures in humanitarian terms. No nation in all history has done so much for the people of the world and asked so little. This is another reason we can be proud we are Americans. But there are a hundred places to start and no place to stop. Actually, we are in 98 of them.

The courageous Senate group points out that more than $5 billion of the American people's earnings have been poured into southeast Asia alone, and they question whether much—if anything—has been accomplished by the spending, in fact, they imply it has been counter-productive, a tragic reward for our taxpayers' sacrifices.

The U.S. Department of Labor says our average factory worker earns $92 per week. Assuming he claims three exemptions, the worker pays out of his earnings an annual Federal tax of $509.60. He works full time more than 5 weeks each year just to pay this tax. More than a million workers worked 5 million weeks only to send their money to southeast Asia. At least they might hope they were helping, not hurting.

Two billion of these taxes have gone into Vietnam: a full 40 percent. Yet listen to Majority Leader MANSFIELD in a classic departure from others' frequent pap: "I visited Vietnam 7 years ago. Vietnam now appears to be, as it was then, only at the beginning in coping with its grave inner problems. All current difficulties existed in 1955. But now it is 7 years later and 2 billion U.S. dollars later. Yet, substantially the same difficulties remain—if, indeed they have not been compounded."

Senator MANSFIELD's bipartisan Senatorial group makes similar reference to Burma, Malaya, Singapore, Brunei, Sarawak and North Borneo—among other places where surely the American people have not the faintest idea that their taxes are going.

Our aid of all kinds now flows to 98 countries. Recently this column printed the complete list. Certainly very few of us could even name (and certainly not pronounce) half of the places.

You need not be a Toynbee to see that there is no common lever for the lifting of humanity. The Government spenders speak eloquently of the influence of poverty abroad. They do not tell us very often such homilies as the fact that many African

tribes refuse to raise anything but cattle, a status symbol.

The spenders speak of democracy, freedom, justice, and so forth, in Western terms that much of humanity simply does not understand. If you have ever been in equatorial Africa could you say that the natives are really interested in Marx or Jefferson? It doesn't seem possible.

From my viewpoint the truly great service is that we at least try to relieve the most feral fratricide and human pains. All the rest omits the hard realities Senator MANSFIELD touches on.

In some instances our foreign aid has been a fine success. Even in some places where results are hard to measure the intangible gains have been important. But with each added year our ability to sustain the ballooning and relentless cost changes and lessens. We must be careful where and how we cut it; but cut it we must.

The pyramid is the problem now.

The 15-year bill exceeds $100 billion. Eventually, we must gear our giving to our powers and not just to our desires. Looking at our taxes, the dangerous balance-of-foreign-payments problem and our gold outflow, that time is long, long overdue. If the Senate and House fail us in this cut, and a very large cut among the 98 countries, it will be an act of irresponsibility.

America's Best Known Smalltown Banker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Mr. Frank P. Powers of Mora, Minn., is often described as "America's best known smalltown banker." He has earned this reputation through his leadership in adapting and expanding bank services to meet communitywide needs. He is known to many Members of Congress through his participation in the activities of professional groups in which he is respected as a spokesman for smalltown bankers. Mr. Powers has announced the sale of the Kanabec State Bank, but he will remain in Mora as president of the bank.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report of Mr. Powers' many activities from the Kanabec County Times.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kanabec County (Minn.) Times, Feb. 14, 1963]

FRANK POWERS SELLS INTEREST IN KANABEC BANK

Irving C. Rasmussen, former State commissioner of banks, was named senior vice president of the Kanabec State Bank by the board of directors Saturday. Frank P. Powers, president of the Kanabec State Bank, announced last week that Mr. Rasmussen had purchased the local bank.

Frank P. Powers remains president of the bank and all other official positions in the bank remain unchanged.

The new move brings together the talents of F. P. Powers, America's best known smalltown banker, and Mr. Rasmussen, who has also gained both State and national eminence in the banking field.

Rasmussen should fit the role well. His 30 years of banking evperience has equipped him admirably for the Mora job. Following high school, Rasmussen attended 2 years of law school, filling in with eight study courses under the auspices of the A.I.B., plus a complete accounting course with the International Accounting Society.

Like so many successful bankers, Rasmussen began his career as a messenger. His first start was with the Fourth Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis. While there, he worked throughout the bank, in proof, clearings, and as a savings and commercial teller.

In 1946, he joined the Marquette National Bank, and in succession was the manager of the bank's installment loan department, worked within the bank's correspondence division from which he advanced to other positions of management. In 1955, he was appointed State commissioner of banking, a position he maintained until 1961.

Mr. Rasmussen gained the respect of all bankers and banking groups while serving in this public, and often very challenging, role. While commissioner, he was signally honored by his election to the position of president of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks. In adition, he served as chairman of the executive committee of this same group.

Other positions Rasmussen held while Commissioner of Banking include the position of district representative and chairman for the third district of the National Association of State Bank Commissioners, and chairman of the tax committee of the State Group of Banking Commissioners working on tax equality. Mr. Rasmussen worked on committees under former Governor Freeman, studying installment loan financing, installment sales, working on small loan legislation and industrial loan legislation, and insurance legislation for installment loan purchasers.

In 1961, he was made vice president of the Marquette National Bank in Minneapolis.

Mr. Rasmussen is a member of the Scottish Rite Zurah Shrine, the Arch Lodge of Masons in Minneapolis, the Elks club, and has a membership in the Minnesota Good Roads Association. He is president of the Minnesota Valley Bond club.

He is also a member of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and of the American Institute of Banking. He is a trustee of the Lutheran Church.

Mr. Rasmussen is married and has two children, a son in his second year at the University of Minnesota and a daughter who resides in California.

Mr. Rasmussen has already begun to take over management and control of the bank. Powers voiced pleasure over the prospects shared by both Rasmussen and himself. "I am happy," he commented, "to have found so able a man to take over a job for which I have felt such responsibility. The Kanabec State Bank has been my life. I owe the people of Mora and the surrounding countryside a great debt of gratitude. I know that the banking needs of the community will continue to be served as well as, or even better than in the past."

Mr. Powers began his banking career as cashier of the Quamba State Bank in 1919. At that time the bank had deposits of $13,000. Powers became president of the bank in 1922, and the bank's growth continued. In 1932 the bank moved to Mora and its name was changed to the Kanabec State Bank. Located on North Union Street, the bank continued its steady growth until it outgrew its quarters and a modern bank was built on Maple Avenue. Today it has deposits of $8 million.

In 1945, Mr. Powers also organized the State Bank of Ogilvie, Ogilvie, Minn. He has retained the title of vice president and director of this bank.

The list of credits due Mr. Powers is staggering. He served as president of the Kanabec County Bankers Association in 1929, president of the 10th district group of Minnesota Bankers Association in 1930, president of the 6th County Clearing House Association in 1934, president of the Minnesota Bankers Association in 1938 and 1939. For 4 years he was a member of the executive council of the Minnesota Bankers Association.

He has taken a prominent part in the activities of the American Bankers Association, was elected vice president for Minnesota in 1935, and served as a member of the organization committee in 1936 and 1937. In 1939, he was elected a member of the executive committee of the State bank division, becoming vice president in 1941, and served as president in 1942 and 1943. He was a member of the ABA executive council during 1943 and 1944, and served as a member of the nominating committee from Minnesota several times. He has served as a member of the committee on service to war veterans, committee on consumer credit, and several other committees of the American Bankers Association. He was elected treasurer of the ABA in 1947 and re-elected in 1948. He is currently a member of the Federal legislative committee.

Mr. Powers was a member of the 1947 graduating class of the Graduate School of Banking at Rutgers University, and has participated in several courses conducted by the American Institute of Banking Study Group. He is director of the Farmers Home Mutual Insurance Co. and the Spring Vale Mutual Fire Insurance Co. He is treasurer of the State Association of Farmers Mutual Insurance companies, and served as president of this association in 1948. He has served as a member of the Minnesota Economic Development Council, appointed by Governor Luther W. Youngdahl for the years of 1948 and 1949.

Mr. Powers has been active in civic and community affairs. During World War II, he was chairman of the Kanabec County War Bond Committee, member of the executive committee of the Minnesota War Bond Committee, chairman of the Kanabec County Red Cross Committee, president of the Mora Businessmen's Association and was treasurer of the Mora country club for 12 years. He has taken a keen interest in the veterans welfare, has been very active in the American Legion, and served two terms as commander of the Lee Goldsmith Post 201 at Mora.

Inaugural Address of Lt. Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Lt. Gov. Raymond P. Shafer in the Senate Chamber of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pa., January 15, 1963:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF LT. GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER, DELIVERED IN THE SENATE CHAMBER OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE STATE CAPITOL, HARRISBURG, PA., JANUARY 15, 1963

This moment, in this beautiful chamber and in the presence of my friends and colleagues of the Pennsylvania Senate, is one of the proudest of my life, and I wish to take

this opportunity to thank my fellow Pennsylvanians for the honor bestowed upon me today. I deeply regret that my father's illness has prevented his attendance but I am very happy that the rest of my family and so many of my friends, not only from my home Crawford County, but also from all over Pennsylvania are here to share these pleasant events together.

I am signally honored with the presence of so many distinguished guests; and I sincerely appreciate the participation of our next Governor, the Honorable William W. Scranton; the Chief Justice of the Pensylvania Supreme Court, the Honorable John C. Bell, Jr.; the Chairman of the Inaugural Committee, Gen. Milton G. Baker and my former law preceptor and present President Judge of the Crawford County courts, the Honorable Herbert A. Mook; together with my predecessor the Honorable John Morgan Davis.

All of this evidences one of the most meaningful tributes any man could have and I am deeply grateful.

But even more, all of this tends to bring into sharp focus the reason for this day of celebration. In less than 2 hours, the oath of office will have been administered to our next Governor, William W. Scranton, and this will mark another milestone in the moving history that is Pennsylvania. Under his dynamic and forthright leadership, and with the cooperation of all concerned citizens, Pennsylvania and the new administration will turn to the solution of the difficult and complex problems which face all of us.

Many of these problems are chronic which cannot be solved in a few weeks or even a few months; but with our tremendous resources, both human and natural, with our strategic geographical location, and with a magnificent determination, we have the basic ingredients with which we may work, together, toward their ultimate solution.

This date, too, in a larger sense, marks another milestone in representative government itself, for again the reins are being transferred from one administration to another in an atmosphere and spirit of harmony and good-will, as it should be in our free society.

But, our responsibility as elected representatives of the people goes far beyond the narrow minimum duties prescribed for each particular office, far beyond the alleged definitions of our individual party label, it goes to the very heart of the rich heritage of our way of life. If this heritage has any meaning beyond the pleasure of historical entertainment, it should be to assist us in making our decisions today.

This heritage says we should face the intellectual and moral decisions which constantly confront us with firmness and resolution. This same heritage says that in difficult and challenging times, like the present, all of us must rise above narrowness of viewpoint, selfish obstructionism, and excessive partisanship, which, like the man who clothes his desire in the dress of distorted fact, merely impedes progress.

It is this same heritage which says that those of us in governmental service should strive for the enactment of only those statutes which permit all citizens to get along together just a little better, and to insure that these rules of conduct are administered fairly and equally.

This same heritage demands that in a free society one of the basic duties of elected representatives is to guard zealously against the encroachment of the government complex itself on the rights of citizens; and in these days of the ardent advocacy of extended government, this may be one of our most grave responsibilities.

In short, we are charged to proclaim and reproclaim that when our Founding Fathers said all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, they meant it, and we mean it, for then, forever.

We in Pennsylvania have as our symbol the keystone, which in itself has deep significance. And each of us has almost daily opportunity to serve as a symbolic keystone in working for the common good. But let us not forget that even keystones are useless without connection to the other stones in the construction, since together they perform the task, together they carry the load, together they uphold the arch.

Our Government is not something apart from the people, it is a creation of their will and a reflection of their desires and opinions. And the solutions of the problems facing all of us will be met only by service together.

For myself and the role I shall play as president of the senate, I pledge that this great body shall be conducted with absolute impartiality, dignity, and decorum. And as a member of the new administration I pledge to assist Gov. William W. Scranton in every way within my power to the end that this administration will be one of which all Pennsylvanians, yes, all Americans, will be proud.

All of us, by working together, by assuming our individual responsibilities can and must make, not just the Senate of Pennsylvania, not just the general assembly, but the total administration of government in this great Commonwealth a striking example of what government with the consent of the governed should and can be.

Jimmy Durante: An American Legend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Jimmy Durante recently celebrated his 70th birthday. Somehow it seems appropriate in the spring of the year to take a few moments to talk about this ageless entertainer whose impish magic has the fresh quality of the season of renewal. Chronologically he may be 70 years old, but his antic spirit denies the passage of years. It is joyous, human, ever-green.

Jimmy Durante has been a permanent fixture of American radio, movies, Broadway, and television for so many years that it is impossible to conceive of any of these vast fields of art and wit without him.

I am sure many aspiring performers would like to know the formula that has given Jimmy his enduring success. Possibly he has been studied to determine his secret; certainly from time to time there have been emulators. If they watched for tricks of expression or clever kinds of "business," they were on the wrong track. It isn't gimmicks that make him endure. It is the force of personality—a warmth of demeanor that stems from his having known all shades and circumstances of life—having known them, absorbed them, appreciated them, and conquered them.

The creation of a legend more often than not requires a passage of time during which a historical perspective gives luster to memories. Jimmy Durante is still with us, and God willing, many years remain to him to touch the quick of American humor. But because he has been a practitioner of the special art of American humor for more than 40 years, already human memory, which polishes and embellishes with loving care anything that represents a continuing and ageless part of itself, has made him into an American legend.

The entertainment world may claim him as their own. Their pride is understandable, but he belongs to all of us.

Absurdity of Farm Program Mounts as Congress Keeps Shelling Out Tax Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News which, to my mind, exemplifies the laudatory and highly effective work being done by our hardworking and distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY.

The editorial follows:

ABSURDITY OF FARM PROGRAM MOUNTS AS CONGRESS KEEPS SHELLING OUT TAX DOLLARS

Last week a bit of byplay took place on the floor of the House of Representatives which better than anything in recent days clearly portrays the utter idiocy that lies behind this Nation's fantastically expensive farm program.

The byplay took place over a request by the Secretary of Agriculture for an immediate $508 million appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corp.

The gentleman who had the responsibility of asking his colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the appropriation request was Representative JAMES L. WHITTEN, a Mississippi Democrat. Obviously not pleased with his chore, he told the assembled House Members that despite the fact Congress had served notice on the CCC last year to reduce its spending by cutting its appropriation by $800 million, the agency had not only failed to reduce its spending but had increased it.

Thus, the CCC was now critically short of funds which was the reason Agriculture Secretary Freeman was requesting the immediate appropriation of another $508 million.

"The Secretary told us," Representative WHITTEN said, "that should this money not be appropriated, he would have to send out notices that it would be impossible to carry out further price supports and make further loans on agricultural commodities. This, the Secretary said, would result in chaos."

Obviously, if what Secretary Freeman had reported was true, a cutoff on price supports and commodity loans would have spread a certain amount of consternation among the ranks of farmers who are now so tied up in Government regulation and redtape they hardly know what a free market is any more. But, even so, a number of Congressmen were not content to permit Secretary Freeman's statement to go unchallenged.

Republican PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois, was one who got on his feet to aim some acid comment Freeman's way. He charged that

the Agriculture Secretary had fixed dairy price supports at such an unrealistic level that $300 million worth of butter, cheese, and dried milk have now piled up in Government warehouses with over $117 million of this having been added in the past year. Cotton support at 32.5 cents a pound will result in the Government being forced to increase its cotton hoard to an unprecedented 10 million bales by August and a $2 support price on wheat has resulted in "half a billion more tied up in wheat inventory than when he (Freeman) took office," FINDLEY charged.

More than that, FINDLEY declared, even tobacco, once the model crop that was supposed to prove the soundness of the price support theory, is now in heavy surplus supply and soybeans, "the wonder crop of the farm belt, a commodity that was healthy and selling well at home and abroad when Mr. Freeman took office," now shows an inventory of $50 million in Government bins.

No Congressman rose to refute these charges. They stand as mute evidence of the abject failure of our whole idiotic farm program, yet the House, by a vote of 254–154, eventually voted to grant the appropriation of $508 million on the grounds there was nothing else it could do.

Maybe so, but the Congressmen can't escape their own responsibility for this mess by trying to foist all the blame on Secretary Freeman. It is the Congress that controls our farm program and so long as Congress refuses to face up to the reality of the fraud it is perpetrating on the taxpayers of this Nation by blindly continuing a program that has no chance of success, it can't very well tell the Secretary of Agriculture to accomplish a miracle.

It is now costing the taxpayers some $8 billion a year to support such a crazy quilt farm program that all semblance of commonsense disappeared from it years ago. Under this program we have one agency in the Agriculture Department spending millions per year to bring new acreage into production while another agency in the same Department is spending more millions paying farmers to take their land out of production. It is a program that sees our tax money being used to raise the price all of us must pay for our food while billions of dollars of this same food lies rotting away in Government warehouses.

It is an insane, utterly senseless program that should have been stopped years ago but hasn't been stopped for the simple reason the Congress lacks the moral fortitude and the political guts to stop it. It is not a question of there being no alternative. There is the alternative of returning the farms and the marketplace to the farmers where they belong and let the natural laws of supply and demand take the place of these useless and costly Government price supports.

But that's too sensible a course for Congress to follow. It likes to buy votes with our money and so long at it can continue to do so without any more protests from the taxpayers than have been forthcoming, so long will we be stuck with shelling out our money in an endless stream on a program that long ago fully demonstrated its uselessness.

Authorizing Appropriations for Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my disappointment in the House action taken yesterday on H.R. 2440, a $15.8 billion Armed Forces authorization bill for procurement, research, development, and other purposes.

This was an important bill, both in amount and nature. The total Federal budget request for fiscal year 1964 is $98.9 billion, and the total request for new obligational authority for the Department of Defense is $52.1 billion. This $15.8 billion authorization bill involves over 15 percent of the 1964 fiscal year budget requests for all planned expenditures for the Nation and over 30 percent of all defense budget requests for fiscal 1964.

No one, and certainly not this Member, would permit this Nation to cut corners on our national security. However, because we in the House of Representatives failed to meet our responsibilities, it was necessary for me, in good conscience and in the exercise of my independent judgment, to vote against this bill in the hope it would be returned to committee, trimmed of waste, and returned to the floor for passage. It is now my hope that the Appropriations Committee will give careful study and thought to ways in which the amounts might be reduced without endangering our defense posture.

While I have high respect for the Secretary of Defense and for the members of the Armed Services Committee, it is difficult to understand how, in a $15.8 billion bill, the Congress could accept each item as presented by the administration without a single cut and then add an additional $497 million.

I appreciate that the funds added were for the potentially valuable RS–70, which I believe in and opposed only because the administration has repeatedly said it would not use the funds even if authorized by Congress, and the vitally necessary two additional killer subs, which I supported. However, I am convinced that there is sufficient fat in the bill to accommodate these additions if necessary and still make substantial savings.

To be specific, the most obvious way to save on defense spending is to cut waste and improve procurement procurement procedures. This was a poor bill because it failed to cut the waste in defense procurement; it failed to force an improvement in procedures which led to the corruption and waste in the recent Signal Corps scandal, to cite but one example; it failed to include recommendations to encourage competitive bids with a corresponding reduction in sole-source, negotiated, and cost-plus contracts.

We talk of economy. Yet yesterday by a vote of 374 to 33 the House rubber-stamped 15 percent of the Federal budget, and possibly the largest administration bill which will be before the Congress this year, without a single cut. Undoubtedly it was because defense spending is considered sacrosanct. National defense is sacrosanct, but waste in defense spending is not; and waste and inefficiency are always present in a $50-billion-plus operation. Instances of waste in defense spending are continuously being revealed by the General Accounting Office. A few examples are illustrated by the recent Sun-Times editorial of March 12, 1963, which I request permission to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the fiscal situation in this country and the planned budget deficit of $11.9 billion. I believe our economy needs a tax cut to bring the now confiscatory tax structure in line with the needs of 1963. Furthermore, I would desire a tax cut without the administration's misnamed reforms which would do much to discourage the homeowner, to harm educational institutions, hospitals, and other charitable institutions.

However, unless the Congress carefully but firmly cuts at least the more obvious waste out of the proposed Federal budget, whether in agriculture, defense, NASA, and even the congressional budget, and with our gold-plated third office building and certain abuses by some individuals of counterpart funds we are not free from criticism, we will not have a tax cut.

The House must not fail to meet its responsibilities. Waste is a luxury we cannot afford. We must give up some of our sacred cows. The question before the 88th Congress is, "Will we meet this responsibility or will we talk one way and vote another?"

The editorial follows:

THE MIND REELS

The way of a Government agency with a dollar is a wondrous thing to behold—if you happen not to be a taxpayer.

The watchdog of the taxpayer's pocket, the General Accounting Office under Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, is the authority for the following brief notations of waste and general inefficiency in the stewardship of the taxpayer's money by the military.

Item: The project to build a nuclear-powered aircraft languished for 15 years at a total cost of $1 billion. No aircraft had been built when the program terminated.

The GAO did find that $17,147,000 had been spent to construct facilities that were used but little. Another $2,953,000 was spent for design and related work and never used. There were grave deficiencies in administration and a distinct lag in the making of vital decisions during the life of the program.

Item: In order to satisfy the Department of the Air Force the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercially-owned facilities.

Cost to the taxpayer: $10,300,000 more than if similar Government facilities had been used. There was no evidence that the Air Force had made any cost comparisons before granting the contracts.

Item: The Government incurred unnecessary costs of $5 million to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other vehicles because the Army had allowed these tracks to deteriorate in storage.

Item: The Corps of Engineers (Army) had spent $575,000 to purchase 925 25-horsepower outboard motors and had plans to buy another 553 25-horsepower outboard motors for $321,000. The Army had in depot stock at least 1,400 such motors that had

never been used. The new purchases were intended to replace these unused motors.

President Kennedy has challenged those who criticize his budget to show where cuts can be made. It seems odd that he must ask. The GAO sends the President a copy of every one of its reports.

"When Peace Corps Teachers Return"—An Article by R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an article from the March 1963 edition of the NEA Journal, a publication of the National Education Association, by R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, entitled "When Peace Corps Teachers Return."

Surely the Nation should put to good use the abilities and experience of the Peace Corps volunteers on their return to the United States. Their talents are diverse and exceptional and there are few careers in which they can make a greater contribution to our country than as teachers.

I have been glad to see that many universities, such as the University of Notre Dame in my own home district in Indiana, have established special fellowships for returning Peace Corps volunteers. Many of these fellowships are directed toward enabling the returning volunteers to complete their graduate studies with a view toward pursuing a career in teaching.

Mr. Shriver's article follows:

WHEN PEACE CORPS TEACHERS RETURN

(By Sargent Shriver)

This summer, almost 500 Americans who have been teaching overseas with the Peace Corps for 2 years will return to the United States. Will many of these Peace Corps volunteers pursue teaching careers here at home? How will their experience affect their attitude toward teachers and the teaching profession? What influence will these returned Peace Corps volunteers and those that will follow them exert on American education?

These are questions I'm frequently asked by American educators. They want to know the results of sending experienced teachers and college graduates (many without professional preparation) to teach in developing nations. The answers are beginning to emerge.

Education dominates Peace Corps work. Almost two-thirds of the more than 5,000 volunteers now serving are working in this field. Since the Peace Corps acts in response to requests from developing nations, we feel this indicates the significance these countries attach to advancing their education programs.

Some volunteers, we find, arrive at important insights about teaching and learning. Carol Byrnes, age 25, a Peace Corps teacher's aid in the Philippines from Duquesne, Pa., says:

"Our rewards in a project like this come from the satisfaction in seeing a child's face light up when he has learned to pronounce a new word properly. We have had to learn, and must continue to learn, how to be sustained by this kind of gratification.

"Only time and the future will tell if our efforts in the Philippines have been successful. Many of us have had to grow up and mature to the point of doing a job where we sometimes can see no material results of our efforts."

TEACHER FOR THE PEACE CORPS

Another of our volunteers who is serving in the Philippines is David Szanton, 24, a native New Yorker. Here is how he describes his life as a teacher for the Peace Corps:

"Another fellow and I have a house of our own in the town of Numancia in the province of Aklan.

"It is constructed mostly of bamboo and nipa palm, and has a living room, kitchen, pantry, and bath. The floors are split bamboo, and the house in general is quite airy, light, and comfortable. As far as I'm concerned, all this talk about the great discomforts the volunteers are putting up with is just so much hogwash.

"Most of our waking hours are spent one way or another working in or through the schools. The bureau of public schools requested that we work largely in the fields of second language (English) teaching and science.

"Like most of the other volunteers, I've spent most of my time working with the teachers. I help them develop their lesson plans, teach them the general science they are to teach their classes, show them how to do science demonstrations, and pass along second-language teaching techniques we learned at Penn State and the training center here.

"When the new school year begins in June, I am going to stop spending so much time with the teachers and put in several hours a week working on remedial English with a small group of the slower students and on advanced science programs with about a dozen of the brighter kids who are more likely to go on to high school.

"Here you are given a position of leadership and great respect within a community. Quite clearly, there are already indications that these 2 years in the Philippines will be one of the most valuable and educational experiences of my life."

AN EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

We feel, as does Szanton, that the time spent in the Peace Corps is an educational experience. For instance, Newell Flather, a volunteer teacher in Winneba, Ghana, got a chance to change the curriculum—an opportunity that would rarely come to a teacher in the United States. As Flather tells it:

"I consider my supreme achievement of the term to be the reorientation of the school's history program from British to West African. This job was left entirely up to me, and it involved a good deal of reading and study in order to find the right books for the students and the right syllabus for the teacher."

Flather, like other volunteers, assumes many additional responsibilities. He teaches English to the upper forms, is a form master, an entertainment master, and a debating union master.

Flather's latest project has been to help enlarge the school library, which had only 30 books when he arrived. Flather wrote his brother, his church, his high school, and various social groups in Massachusetts. The first 1,000 books arrived recently, and more are on their way.

Roger Hamilton, of Arlington, Va., who taught in Halfassini, Ghana, feels that many of the returning volunteers who have been teaching will want to teach in the United States but that those whose only teaching experience has been in the Peace Corps may be discouraged by the problems of certification.

The returning volunteers are going to be eager to get into their careers as fast as possible. Some, but not all, may have the patience or motivation to complete certification requirements for teaching. Responsibility falls on all of us to encourage these young people to stay in teaching.

According to Hamilton, "The volunteers are interested in getting into meaningful teaching situations quickly because they have been doing this overseas."

I am happy to say that some leading educators agree with Hamilton about the value of the teaching experience gained overseas by Peace Corps volunteers with bachelor's degrees.

Dean John Monro, of Harvard College says, "Two years in the Peace Corps today can be as significant as a Rhodes scholarship."

George Makechnie, dean of Boston University's Sargent College, says: "I encourage my students to think of Peace Corps service. The Peace Corps will have a general salutary effect on education in this country."

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT

Recognizing the value of the Peace Corps experience overseas and the possibility that many of the returning volunteers may want to teach in the United States, some State boards of education are studying ways in which volunteers may receive recognition for their overseas teaching experience and how to help them meet certification requirements on their return.

One specific example is California, where Carl Larson, head of teacher certification for the California State Board of Education, feels that with their special preparation and experience the Peace Corps teachers normally can come back and directly start teaching in California.

"If the volunteers have been teaching satisfactorily in organized schools, and we can verify the fact, we will count the oversea teaching in lieu of the required student teaching," he says.

Dr. Larson adds that appropriate credit given by universities for the volunteers' training program would be accepted by the State as credit toward the number of education hours required for a teaching certificate.

COOPERATION FROM SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

We are very appreciative at the Peace Corps for the invaluable cooperation given us by schools and colleges throughout the country and by the American Association of School Administrators. For instance, school systems around the Nation are granting two-year leaves of absence to teachers who join the Peace Corps. New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and Denver are a few of the major cities that have granted leaves, and scores of smaller school systems have taken similar action.

Georgetown University has set up graduate and undergraduate scholarships and Michigan State University has set up graduate assistantships for returning volunteers. Ohio University will award educational credits for teaching done overseas in teaching projects in the west Cameroons, sponsored by the Peace Corps and administered by the university, for those who are working toward teacher certification in Ohio. It will also give some credit for correspondence courses completed by the volunteers during their Peace Corps assignment.

Plans are under way at the University of Pittsburgh; New Mexico State University; and the State University College of Education at New Paltz, N.Y., to give similar credit. Like plans are under consideration at Syracuse University.

Even the volunteers who will not go into teaching on their return will, I feel, bring back with them greater understanding of the worth of a good system of education. For

example, Jack Magri, who is teaching in Mogadiscio, Somalia, says:

"One thing is certain about my experience here. I'll return to the United States with a greater appreciation for our teachers and the teaching profession.

"While we are students, teachers are taken for granted. After we finish school, they are often forgotten. You can be sure I won't forget them now—I realize what an important contribution they are making."

Opportunities for teachers are now available in several projects, training for which is slated to begin in the spring or summer. The new projects are in Malaya, North Borneo/Sarawak, Thailand, Barbados, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Philippines, Ghana, Nigeria, Nyasaland, Colombia, and Indonesia.

Extension of Draft Law

SPEECH

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], which would limit the extension of the draft to a period of 2 years, rather than the 4 years proposed in the bill before us.

I most certainly agree that during these most perilous times, it is absolutely necessary that we continue the draft. In this age of manpower versus mechanization, in this nuclear pushbutton age, I agree that we must maintain our military strength, not only for the protection of these United States, but to honor our military commitments in other far-flung areas of the world. If it is necessary that we enlarge our Armed Forces, and increase our military strength to prevent further Communist aggression, I would gladly support such a program.

However, with world conditions as unsettled as they are today, with some of our allies willing to assume additional responsibilities insofar as the defense of their own country is concerned, with so many new nations emerging which are willing and anxious to take their own places in the union of free countries, we cannot be sure of what our manpower or military requirements might be in the future. Certainly an extension of 2 years at the present time would give us the necessary time and an opportunity to thoroughly review and reconsider our military needs in the light of current and future developments. And, if as a result of the investigation and study it is determined that the draft must be continued, then it would be a fairly easy task to ask the Congress in session at that time to extend the appropriate legislation.

If this amendment is defeated, I shall, of course, vote for the committee bill, to extend the draft for a period of 4 years.

Tribute to Joseph Bonapart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to call to the attention of my colleagues the 50 years of devoted service which Mr. Joseph Bonapart has rendered to the needy children of California. In these times, when the problems of children and youth press upon us with increasing urgency, the work of this man should serve to remind us of the great contribution which one dedicated man can make.

Following is the text of a report on the celebration of Mr. Bonapart's 50 years of service which I submit for the benefit of my colleagues:

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH BONAPART

"No one in the State of California has contributed more to the welfare of young people than Joe Bonapart. Countless men and women in our State today are useful, constructive members of society because of the inspiration and guidance given to them in their youthful days by this wonderful, dedicated human being," writes California Attorney General Stanley Mosk to the Vista Del Mar Alumni Association, sponsors of a December 16 Ambassador Hotel dinner honoring Joseph Bonapart for 50 years of child-care service.

Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, telegraphs from Washington, D.C., "I offer my congratulations on this occasion in recognition of your vigorous and progressive leadership in the field of child welfare.

"The Vista Del Mar Child-Care Service has been consistently responsive to changing conditions and needs of families. It has been a key influence in stimulating other institutions and agencies elsewhere in the country to develop a variety of services for children and their families.

"Your 50 years of child-care service have been indeed golden ones."

Writes U.S. Senator THOMAS KUCHEL: "Over your lifetime, you have been an inspiration in this direction and your constructive, unselfish activities in devising, launching, and carrying out programs for boys and girls needing help have been a contribution of inestimable worth."

Lester A. McMillan, California assemblyman sends: "Your efforts, leadership, and judicious counseling I am sure have not only benefited many individuals with whom you have worked, but have inspired a more enlightened approach to solving such problems in the whole field of social service."

Judge Irving Hill, president of the Jewish Federation-Council, writes: "During his 50 years of dedicated service, Joseph Bonapart has contributed many forward-looking concepts in the field of care to needy children. He has been an innovator and a pioneer; he has not been satisfied to merely accept the status quo, but has strived successfully to improve it.

"As a result of this, Vista Del Mar has the reputation of being among the finest institutions of its kind in the country. Because of Joseph Bonapart's devotion, Vista Del Mar is much more than just an institution: it is a home to the children who live on the grounds as well as to those who, under its jurisdiction live in foster homes, in treatment cottages, as well as those who are recipients of the many other services he has helped to bring to fruition."

As do so many others, Joseph Reid, executive director of the Child Welfare League of America, Inc., dwells on Mr. Bonapart's national prestige. "The impact of your career is being felt, not only in Los Angeles or the State of California, but nationwide. Although too little note was made of the developments in which you pioneered on the west coast, I think it can safely be said that today that is no longer the case.

"I know of no one in the field, who, to the same extent as you, was not only an innovator and pacesetter in his early professional years, but who has also seen to it that the services he leads have been consistently in the forefront in utilizing new scientific knowledge and insights from experience as they became available."

County Probation Officer Karl Holton, declares: "I know of no man who is more highly regarded than you are for your outstanding leadership, for your devotion, for your dedication, and for your interest in every area of family and child welfare in this country."

"Under your supervision Vista Del Mar has become one of the Nation's foremost child service agencies," lauds Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson, and continues, "some children who would otherwise not have had opportunities, will grow into men and women that we can be proud of because of your very inspiring devotion to children."

Sherrill C. Corwin pointing to "a career spent in bringing happiness to youngsters and parents alike, of devoting a whole life to improving the lot of others—selflessness at its best," sums up with "no one is more deserving."

Councilwoman Rosalind Wiener Wyman alludes to "Mr. Bonapart's espousal of intelligent new practices in behalf of children, which has enabled Vista Del Mar to provide a pattern for the Nation" and declares "thousands of good citizens today—many of them parents and grandparents—owe their present happiness and well-being to formative years spent in Vista Del Mar under Joseph Bonapart's distinguished leadership, dedication and devotion."

The Governor, mayor, and other public officials daily add their congratulations to the distinguished Vista Del Mar Child-Care Service director.

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at Luncheon of Annual Civil Rights Conference of the New York City Central Labor Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am enclosing herewith a copy of an address made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor

of the city of New York, at the Annual Civil Rights Conference of the New York City Central Labor Council, held at the Americana Hotel in New York City on March 9, 1963.

The mayor points up our obligations and responsibilities in the field of civil rights, and I commend the speech to the attention of my colleagues.

The mayor's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT LUNCHEON OF THE ANNUAL CIVIL RIGHTS CONFERENCE OF THE NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL

This is an important meeting, and I consider myself privileged to participate in it. It is important, not just because the people here on the dais and in the audience are important and influential individuals, but because our purpose is important. I can think of no purpose on the domestic front which is more important, and few of even equal importance.

We meet here not to pass judgment on the civil rights struggle, not to discuss whether civil rights are a good thing or whether to join in the struggle. All these phases are in the past. This meeting here today, and all our efforts on this front these days, for all of us who hold positions of responsibility in such fields as labor and government, is on how to implement and supplement and translate into terms of program and action the victory already won by the struggles and sacrifices of those directly involved, of those against whom the sharp, cutting edge of injustice and discrimination has been turned for all these generations.

It is my privilege to be here in my capacity as head of a city which has been in the vanguard of the civil rights struggle. Generally speaking, we have led the way. This is a city of freedom. Its goal is to be a completely open city.

I do not think I need review all the legislation and all the action programs we have promulgated in the past. Many of you in this very room have stood with us and helped provide the push to put these programs over, and to win the victories that have been won, the establishment of a commission on human rights, the passage of the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs law, the formation of the committee on exploitation, the creation of the committee on job adavncement, and the enactment of a local minimum wage law.

Organized labor, its leadership and membership, are as responsible as any other force for the development of these programs. I am happy to pay my tribute for their support and influence in this cause and for these programs.

Today it is on the forces of labor that we must depend for most of the muscle that must be mobilized to push our minimum wage bill through the State legislature if we are to succeed in doing it. And let me say at this point that we must succeed. New York City must be permitted to establish a wage floor of $1.25 and then $1.50, and thus safeguard the health, safety and living standards of its citizens.

Most of the major agencies of our city government are heavily engaged, in one way or another, in the endless and many-fronted battle against discrimination and in support of our goal of an open city with equal opportunity for all.

With our board of education and our board of higher education, the equalization of opportunity for all is an object of primary concentration. Likewise committed is the department of welfare, the housing agencies with their farflung programs, the health and hospitals departments, the department of labor, the department of parks, and the youth board. There is one agency exclusively devoted to this purpose; that is the commission on human rights. There are also the highly successful committees already referred to, which work within the labor department—the committee on exploitation and the committee on job advancement.

This vast range of efforts and activities has had its effect. How could it be otherwise There is hardly an area of life or living in this city which does not bear the impact of these undertakings. Hundreds of thousands of individuals in this city have benefited directly from these activities. But the chief beneficiary has been the city itself, since these activities have made possible the accommodation of the city's dynamic growth and development with the vast immigration which has taken place over the past two decades.

In various specific fields of civil rights, we have broken through one barrier after another. The city government has, I believe, kept pace—and I claim no more than that—with the advances and changes in the goals and objectives of the groups engaged in this struggle, including the forces of organized labor.

We in the city government ask no special praise for what we have done. We still have not done enough. We still must do more—much more.

Today's problems in the civil rights field are tougher, if anything, than the problems we confronted 10 years ago. The old ones were more massive and, hence, simpler to attack. The new ones are more complex and harder to get hold of. The further we get into these new problems, the tougher they get. But that only means that we are getting closer to the core.

I am thinking about the problem of joblessness, which is so closely related to the manifestation of delinquency. Of course, job discrimination is a major factor in minority group joblessness. We are doing what we can about that, and we should and will do more. Another factor is the denial of advancement and promotion—on which we are also working, and on which there is also much to do. But while we are working at these factors, we are also coming to grips with the growing problem of the lack of skills among these unemployed. I don't think I need tell this audience how vital skills are for getting jobs.

Lack of skills, of course, is due to lack of vocational training. And the road to the attainment of vocational skills is all too frequently blocked by the lack of even the simplest reading comprehension. And behind this, there is often found the lack of motivation—the lack of enough motivation to seek and acquire even the simplest reading comprehension.

In this city there are 77,000 young people between the ages of 14 and 24 who have job problems. This includes 30,000 who are out of school and out of work, 14,000 who are working only part time, and 33,000 who are not looking for jobs at all. These latter are among those who lack motivation.

We know that in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn, which is today one of our most tragically blighted areas, with a predominantly nonwhite population, the percentage of high school dropouts by graduation times runs from 33 to 60 percent. This means that as many as three out of every five students drop out before they get their high school diplomas.

It is a further fact that among these so-called dropouts, the compelling factor in a great many cases is not—as we formerly assumed—simple economic necessity. Many of these dropouts left school not because their parents wanted them to go to work, but rather because these pupils simply have not had the will or the motive to go on in school, they didn't like school, and nobody at home has supplied the will or the motive.

It is very clear to me that in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, as in a number of analagous areas in this city, the corroding, corrupting, and degrading force is discrimination and denial of hope for equality, for advancement, and for equal opportunity.

Social as well as housing blight comes to such areas because the lives of so many of the people who live in the area have been blighted. We have now learned that people blight housing just as housing blights people.

In fact, the lack of modern plumbing facilities does not degrade people as much as discrimination does. That is what really makes them sick—sick into the second and third generations. And I say this in full awareness of the fact that there is an equal and opposite sickness in those who impose the discrimination and who foster the prejudice.

What ought to be the tender years for many of our city's Negro youth often turn out to be the brutal years—years in which the fresh young buds of hope are crushed, never to revive. We must change this circumstance, completely. Every member of the new and present generation of young Americans must all know how to hope and how to aspire to better things—for if they lack or lose the ability, or even more, the desire to better their condition, to advance in the race of life, then they are relegated and we are relegating them to a life of catch as catch can and to a life which may turn to crime as often as not; but in any event, they are subject—far above the average—to every social weakness which preys upon the population as a whole.

I see this problem not in a theoretical or abstract sense. I see it in its concrete manifestations.

I have walked and ridden down Fulton Street and Nostrand Avenue in Brooklyn, and through the side streets; and along 100th, 101st, and 102d Streets in East Harlem; and along 110th, 111th, and 112th Streets in Harlem; and along 87th, 94th, and 95th Streets between Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West in Manhattan. Nobody needs to tell me very much about the effects and manifestations of discrimination. I know it by sight. I know it by its impact upon the city in terms of crime, of disease, and of hard dollars of financial cost.

There are national statistics, too—very impressive ones. President Kennedy used some of them in his message to the Congress just a few days ago—that a Negro baby born in America has about half the chance of a white child born in the same place to complete high school. That Negro child has one-third the chance to finish college, and one-seventh the chance to earn $10,000 a year. But he has twice the chance of being unemployed, and he has a life expectancy 7 years shorter.

There are other arresting—and depressing—facts and figures.

In 1950 the average Negro's income, nationwide, was 61 percent of that of the average white person. Thirteen years later, this figure—despite all the civil rights progress—has dropped to 60 percent.

In New York City 44 percent of our Negro families, which are nearly one member larger than the average white family, had annual incomes of less than $4,000. Less than 20 percent of the white families had incomes less than $4,000.

I could cite more of these economic and social statistics. But what is the use?

The question we must ask and the question we must answer is: What are we going to do about this situation?

In the first place, I think we must recognize that we must contend not with just one factor but with a great many of them. Second, we must recognize that we are dealing not just with abstract conditions or situations but with specific people—millions of individuals who have an impact upon each other and each of us—individuals who must also be considered as a group and as a com-

munity. Thus our efforts must be directed toward the group and community as well as to the individual.

We must fight not only for civil rights for each individual but for civil rights for the group—for social rights for the group, if I may try out a concept.

In my view, it is through the group—and principally through the group, and of course the family—that motivational forces can be unleashed.

We must have a vastly expanded program of education in reading comprehension and of vocational education and training in those skills which can lead to employment in categories in which there are shortages.

This we must do. This we must find a way and the means to do.

I say to you, in general, and in conclusion, that the chief theater in the struggle for human rights is rapidly shifting from the South to the North, and especially to the cities of the North. The struggle is going on here right now in New York City. We face the accompanying problems in sharp and concrete form. We must resolve these problems and tread their manifestations. We surely cannot avoid them or close our eyes to them.

In summary, this is our challenge; it is the challenge of the hour.

Need for Congressional Emphasis on Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend the feed grain program under terms which will give assurance of fair prices to farmers. Testimony has been presented to the Livestock and Feed Grain Subcommittee, of which I am a member, pointing out the success of the voluntary feed grain programs enacted by Congress for the years 1961 and 1962.

Present indications are that farmers will again sign up in larger than anticipated numbers for the feed grain program enacted for 1963. There is no dispute that our burdensome surplus feed grain stocks have been greatly reduced under these programs. In fact, testimony has been presented which would indicate that by the end of the 1963 marketing year, our feed grain stocks will be down to the point of providing only a safe carryover.

I make these remarks to point out the success of the programs passed by Congress to reduce the surplus. These programs, as we all know, were voluntary and to have been successful they required the cooperation of farmers. Farmers did cooperate and their income was substantially increased. Now, however, when stocks are reaching the point where they are not out of proportion to being adequate, I believe that Congress should be reminded that farmers are still receiving far less than their fair share of our national income.

It seems to be very evident that whenever our Nation has felt that need to call for increased production or decreased production, the farmer has always cooperated with congressional direction.

I believe very strongly that Congress should not now turn its back on the continued need of economic justice for our agricultural economy and I am in receipt of documented proof every day that much must yet be done to further improve farm income. The small businessmen in my district fully realize that the mere elimination of farmers is no solution to the less-frequent ring of the cash register. He is well aware that it is the total agricultural income of his trade area that counts, not how many farmers bring that income to town.

Mr. Speaker, I as well as the farmers I represent are well aware of the serious problems confronting our Nation. We believe that in order for the agricultural community to best be able to help solve these problems agriculture must be prosperous.

Congressional Republicans and Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson, is another great newspaper that supports our efforts to reduce the 1964 budget. Under permission granted, I include its excellent editorial with my remarks.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS AND DEFICITS

Announcement by House Republicans in Washington that they plan to organize a drive to cut the Federal budget by $10 billion to $15 billion, is one of the most encouraging reports to come from Washington.

That this comes at a time when President Kennedy is asking for a tax cut, and a new spending authority of $107 billion, is significantly welcome. It represents an organized effort in Congress itself to try to compel the Kennedy administration to follow a policy of financial integrity, in contrast to prevailing thoughts that financial deficits are a blessing.

The big thing for the Republicans to do at this time is to get a specific plan under way, which will propose exactly where the cuts can and should be made. They must expect strenuous opposition from organized armament makers and also from the organized farmers. They might go over some of President Kennedy's numerous recommendations for new spending, that involve $100 million here, and some other hundreds of millions elsewhere. Many of these are "foot in the door" proposals, which would become permanent fixed charges in future years, but which, desirable as some might be, are not necessary.

If the Republicans will keep the public informed of what they want to do, they will find that the country is in a mood to support them. Most of the people realize that a tax reduction would provide a good business stimulant, provided Federal spending is reduced by an equal amount. They shrink with profound distrust at the idea that waste and extravagance, and spending just to be spending will improve our country's economy and reduce unemployment.

The Republicans also can have confidence in the fact that they have a duty to exercise a loyal opposition as a part of a successful democratic government. No issue could be more timely than that of maintaining the financial integrity of the country.

It gives a desperately needed answer, in part, to that problem of the balance of international payments which a year from now, if not before, will confront the Washington administration.

East Orange Centennial—An Address by George E. Stringfellow, General Chairman, East Orange Centennial, Before the Annual Meeting of the East Orange Historical Society, March 10, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1963, the city of East Orange, in the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey, celebrated its 100th birthday. It has grown into one of the loveliest cities in the United States since it became a township on March 4, 1863.

The East Orange Centennial Committee has been formed and in a short time will inaugurate a series of commemorative programs which will last through the remainder of the year. A steering committee of outstanding citizens unanimously recommended to the able mayor of East Orange, the Honorable James W. Kelly, Jr., that Mr. George E. Stringfellow be appointed as general chairman of the centennial committee. At the mayor's invitation, Mr. Stringfellow accepted this appointment, thereby assuring the success of the celebration in the mind of the whole community. As the mayor stated:

I could think of no one more qualified, more capable, or more industrious to accept the leadership of this committee for the proper observance of the 100th anniversary of East Orange than Mr. Stringfellow.

Mr. Stringfellow is widely known and respected throughout the whole country for his numerous civic, fraternal, and philanthropic activities. In 1959 he retired as senior vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Industries, West Orange. Mr. Stringfellow had been employed with the Edison Industries since 1918 when he left a very lucrative job selling motor cars to statesmen, ambassadors, and wealthy dignitaries of the Nation's Capitol to take over the Washington, D.C., office of the Edison Storage Battery Co.

The consistently high selling records and profitable administration of that office prompted his boss, Mr. Thomas A. Edison, to give Mr. Stringfellow the position of general sales managership of this company. That was in 1923. The following year, Mr. Stringfellow was

made vice president and general manager.

Mr. Stringfellow has been a resident of East Orange since 1923. His present address is 75 Prospect Street, East Orange.

Mr. Stringfellow has plunged into plans for the centennial with characteristic energy and enthusiasm. On Sunday afternoon, March 10, 1963, he delivered a most interesting address before the East Orange Historical Society concerning the centennial program. It is a pleasure to insert his address in the RECORD:

EAST ORANGE CENTENNIAL—AN ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, GENERAL CHAIRMAN, EAST ORANGE CENTENNIAL BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE EAST ORANGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY, MARCH 10, 1963

Madam President, officers, members, and guests of the East Orange Historical Society; thank you for your gracious introduction and thank you for the warmth of your reception.

I am highly honored by your invitation to appear on your annual meeting program. I especially appreciate your cooperation in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of East Orange.

Although I am a native Virginian, the friendly city of East Orange has been my home almost continuously for the past 4 years.

This centennial finds our city one of the healthiest and best governed in the Nation.

The mellow gentleness of the gas lamps lighting our tree-lined streets, reminds one of our Nation's heritage. A heritage which has given us the world's highest living standard and a degree of liberty unequaled in recorded history.

As cities go, ours is a youngster—yet strong and able, well prepared to grow.

We have fine churches to feed our souls. Our fame as a cultural center is spreading as it should.

We have good stores and good community services.

If we wish to enjoy the theater, the opera, or other offerings of the world's greatest metropolis, we are practically at its threshold.

Our city is one of the cleanest in the Nation and our fire and police departments rate among the country's finest.

We have excellent schools and an outstanding public library. We have splendid parks, playgrounds ,and recreational facilities for young and old.

Miss Jessie W. Boutillier, capable president of your highly respected society, is chairman of our historical committee. We know that she is going to do her best to present a true picture of the history of East Orange.

I believe it was Carlisle who said, "Histories are as perfect as the historian is wise, and is gifted with an eye and a soul."

That Miss Boutillier is wise and that she is gifted with an eye and a soul no one will doubt. It is a privilege therefore to work with her and through her with your society.

It is important that we tell the true story of our good city, for a glorious future can best be predicated upon the foundation of an illustrious past and East Orange does indeed have an illustrious past and I can think of no one more capable or willing to help us present it than your president.

Miss Boutillier has asked me to tell you something about the plans for our 100th anniversary.

Our executive committee was appointed by Mayor James W. Kelly, Jr. about 6 weeks ago. It had its first meeting on February 4—about a month ago and subsequently appointed chairmen of the action committees of which Miss Boutillier is one. These chairmen presented their tentative plans last week which are now being evaluated.

There will be an observance of the first town meeting on April 16 and special programs for Memorial Day and the Fourth of July.

There will be the centennial dinner on May 8, many special programs in the fall and a business and industrial exhibit, perhaps in October.

A full schedule of major centennial events is nearing completion and will be given wide publicity in the press, radio, and television at an early date.

Most of the merchants, automobile dealers and others, will participate in the special centennial activities.

Merchants have indicated their willingness to install special historical displays and we are looking to your society for historical items to be placed in these exhibits. If we obtain the kind of cooperation from the chairmen of other committees we are receiving from Miss Boutillier's committee, success of our centennial will be assured.

[From the East Orange (N.J.) Record]

THE FIRST 100 YEARS

The Civil War was at its height. The Emancipation Proclamation had been issued. The city of East Orange was born.

All this took place 100 years ago, in 1863. Now, East Orange, facing a period of unprecedented growth, is making plans for a giant celebration to mark this centennial with civic pride.

As the opening gun in this celebration, Mayor James W. Kelly, Jr., has named George E. Stringfellow as the citywide chairman. This is one of the most felicitous choices that could have been made.

George Stringfellow's business successes are a matter of record in the electrical industry.

On the personal plea of Thomas Alva Edison, Stringfellow took over the management of one of the largest units in the Edison Industries. From there he rose to the senior vice presidency of Thomas A. Edison Industries.

What is less well known to the general public, however, is the extraordinary success this man has had in the civic enterprises which have been such a big part of his life. The period when he was president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood was one of such success that they have yet to be matched in subsequent years. His 2-year term as president of the New York Kiwanis Club carried that organization to heights that are still spoken of with awe. His work with the American Cancer Society's New Jersey Division, of which he was one of the founders, is nowhere better illustrated than in the annual George E. Stringfellow Awards to newspapers for their work in advancing the cause of the battle against this dread disease.

We could go on at great length. The end result would be that the centennial celebration looks like a success right now. No man, however, can be expected to carry the burden of such an undertaking by himself. It will require the wholehearted cooperation of every organization, every civic group, every citizen, every businessman in the city. Given Stringfellow's leadership and such cooperation, East Orange will see a yearlong fete which will go down in history as a year of wonders.

Urban Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have today sponsored the urban mass transportation bill so that I can be counted as one who is strongly supporting the administration bill, which provides $500 million in matching grants over a 3-year period to help State and local governments improve mass transit facilities.

A conference on transportation was held in the northeast section of Philadelphia, which is in my district. Local transportation problems were considered at the meeting, which was attended by civic leaders and city officials. Panel members who participated are connected with the Passenger Service Improvement Corp., Penjerdel, and Penn Jersey Transportation Study.

On March 4 the Honorable James H. J. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia, appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency as an official representative of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Mayor Tate said he supported the mass transit bill "because I believe it offers an opportunity of providing adequate public transportation through regional agreements with private operations."

While some witnesses before the committee called the proposed legislation "very conservative," requiring substantial local initiative and participation, it is an important step in the right direction. The enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963 will materially aid the development of the city of Philadelphia and other great urban centers in our country.

Republicans "Sharpen the Distinction" on the House District Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the very able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] early in this Congress volunteered his services as a minority member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. He was named to that committee along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], who has had extensive experience in the problems of modern metropolitan government. On February 2, in its editorial columns, the Washington Post greeted these two new Republican members of the District Committee as follows:

SHARPENING THE DISTINCTION

Representative SCHWENGEL, a Republican from Iowa, asked for a seat on the House District Committee and his party assigned him there. Four Democratic Congressmen who, like Mr. SCHWENGEL, believe in home rule for the District, also volunteered to serve on the committee. Their party chose only one of them to sit there. The proportion is an accurate reflection of the state of the Democratic leadership's enthusiasm for the cause of self-government in Washington.

The Republicans then filled a second seat on the committee with Representative HORTON, of New York, who was a city councilman in Rochester for 6 years and who knows something about planning and mass transit. The only real qualification for the District Committee is a record of interest in the busi-

ness that now lies before the city. While the two Republicans meet it, three of the four Democratic recruits do not.

A third Republican seat is still vacant. If the party fills it as well with a man who understands the requirements of metropolitan government, then it will have perceptibly changed the character of this committee. More important, it will have sharpened the distinction between the two parties' attitudes toward the District's welfare. Since the city now votes in presidential elections, we may expect to hear more about this interesting subject in next year's campaign.

During the recent discussion of the appropriation for the District Committee, I noted my reservations about the way in which minority staffing on this committee was being short changed by the majority. Along with his interest in District affairs, the gentleman from Iowa is also deeply concerned over the problem of inequitable division of committee staff members between the majority and minority sides of many of our committees. The Post asks that Republicans continue to sharpen the distinction between the parties in their treatment of the District of Columbia. To be effective in doing this, the minority must have a fair share of the committee's staff responsible to it to help with the spadework which is essential in bringing forward constructive alternative proposals to those offered by the majority. The gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from New York make an impressive contribution to the quality of the House District Committee A further impressive contribution to helping them, and their Republican colleagues on this committee, to frame sound legislation for the District of Columbia, to "sharpen the distinction" as the Washington Post asks, would be to reform the staff structure of this committee.

President Fails To Acknowledge Basic Problems Affecting the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy continues to try to intimidate Congress into adopting his whole tax program by the use of scare tactics, threatening a deep recession among other dire prospects. The President, in his usual blithe way of ignoring the facts of economic life, makes no mention of many of the other problems affecting our economy—the unbridled power of labor leaders to halt production and to force unrealistic wage rates on industry, robbing us of the investment capital needed to create more jobs. If the President is sincerely concerned with the economy, let him stand up to labor with the same firmness he attacks business so that millions of dollars will not be lost to business and to the Government in lost taxes through strikes such as we have witnessed in New York and Cleveland in the long struggle in the newspaper industry.

David Lawrence, in the following article from the Washington Evening Star, points out a few sound economic facts. I wish the President and his fuzzy-thinking advisers would take the time to understand our American economy and our people.

AN ECONOMIC SURGICAL OPERATION

(By David Lawrence)

Unemployment is rising, yet business is not supposed to be in a recession. President Kennedy is asking for a tax cut that he believes will stimulate the economy and goes so far as to say that a recession will come if the tax bill is not soon passed.

But this confusing picture beclouds the real issue—the actual causes of the "chronic sluggishness" to which the administration's economists frequently refer.

For the grim truth is that a tax cut by itself will not remedy the basic ills of the economy. There are today many things wrong with the economic situation as a whole, but they are being ignored for political reasons.

Statistics in generalized categories alone do not tell the whole story.

First of all, the total volume of sales is growing, but not as rapidly as it should if more jobs are to be created.

Second, total profits may show up well compared to previous records, but this can often mean merely that large businesses are making more profits on a bigger volume of sales while many of the marginal companies are suffering.

Third, the rate of profit in business is lagging due to higher and higher costs.

Fourth, while many corporations and individual businesses throw in the sponge each year, the number has increased in the last few years. The sales of the companies that go out of business are absorbed by the larger companies, and unemployment grows.

Fifth, big companies are face to face with rising labor costs and are trying every way, especially through automation and new technology, to lower their labor costs.

Sixth, population is increasing, but the number of jobs being created isn't keeping pace with the growing number of persons of working age in the country.

What's basically wrong with the national economy? It isn't difficult to find out, but the administration as well as most of the politicians of the opposite party will not even discuss the subject in their public speeches, let alone come forth with a solution.

The best way to explain the problem is to analyze any major strike that has cost a community hundreds of millions of dollars. For instance, the New York newspaper strike cost the people directly or indirectly involved nearly $400 million, and must have cost Uncle Sam a large amount in lost taxes from individuals and businesses. It shouldn't have taken 3 months for both sides to recognize the facts of life—the point beyond which fatal injury would be imposed on some of the employees, with a consequent reduction of available jobs in the industry—but it did. Many employers can't wait that long and hence capitulate.

It isn't the effect of the strike alone but the underlying causes that merit careful analysis. How, for instance, can a company with a narrow margin of profit or actual losses pay increased labor costs which are based on the capacity to pay enjoyed by the more successful companies? In industry after industry, rates are fairly uniform and labor's demands are figured on what the most prosperous businesses can pay. Differentials in wage rates have sometimes been applied. But they are not usual. Some of the larger companies sit at the bargaining table in an industry-wide negotiation knowing that the settlement they themselves can afford will drive competitors out of business.

The uneconomic factors which the organized power of labor unions has introduced are numerous, and these will not be corrected by a simple tax cut. Such a cut is expected to stimulate the economy through a rise in individual incomes. But personal income is pretty high already. Not everybody spends money that would be better saved for future needs, such as higher education for children.

It may be doubted whether the economy will be materially stimulated by private spending generated by a tax cut. Increases in Government spending will not do it, either. For, as one set of Government projects is completed, there have to be replacements, and the drain become continuous.

Nor can the problems of the economy be solved by gloating over statistics that show a rise in total profits. It's the number of businesses that survive and the rate of profit each can enjoy, as well as the sums available for investment, which in the end can mean an increase in jobs. All the other devices are temporary remedies designed to alleviate pain but not to cure a chronic illness. What the economy requires more than anything else today is a major surgical operation. Congress will sooner or later have to take power away from the short-sighted leaders of labor. Timid men in public life will have to be replaced by men of real courage.

New markets and expansion of existing markets are vital. These need large sums of venture capital. Oversea markets for American goods can be increased. But a favorable climate at home and abroad for venture capital requires confidence and a long-range program, rather than the temporary remedies now being proposed. The latter, when added up, merely postpone but do not avoid deep recessions and possibly depressions.

Critics of the Administration's Cuban Policies

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I sense in recent days and I hope that I am perceptive, at least in this incidence, a tendency on the part of some but unfortunately not all critics of this adminstration's Cuban policies to be influenced more by fact, logic, and honesty than by fantasy. It was so blatantly obvious that the criticism of even some of the more responsible leaders of the opposition which we have heard lately was based on rumor passed to them by prejudiced and unreliable sources and natured by political opportunism.

It is encouraging to note that perhaps some have seen the error of their ways and have cause to realize that the kind of reckless criticism that has been so prevalent in the past is damaging to the security of the United States and hampers actions that might lead in a reasonable time to a peaceful solution of the Cuba problem.

But a great amount of damage has already been done by those who insist on making Cuba a political bogeyman in the hope that they might scare a few more votes into their camp.

The language and cliche of the reckless critic is so often more appealing to

those who may have feelings on an issue but are largely uninformed. The flamboyant lexicon and emotional appeal are the weapons employed to overcome reason and truth.

The politically motivated critic has succeeded in influencing the thinking of many citizens and has, therefore, to a degree undermined confidence in the Presidency. How well these critics have succeeded was impressed upon me yesterday when I saw that the delicate problem of Cuba, which can be solved by no political party but only by a nation united, was the subject of an automobile bumper sticker bearing the flippant remark: "Don't worry they're still 90 miles away."

I am alleged to have a fair sense of humor, but I failed to see anything funny in this remark. To me it was merely further evidence that irresponsible political leaders have succeeded in making a matter of grave national security a partisan issue. They seek not a solution to this difficult problem, they hope for prolonging the controversy until 1964.

We do not by any means seek to shut off sound and reasoned criticism of the administration's actions with respect to Cuba. My concern is that the wild and reckless accusations of some members of the opposition wash over the more thoughtful and tempered criticism that contributes to rather than impedes actions aimed at achieving a peaceful solution of the crisis in the Caribbean.

President Kennedy leaves shortly to travel to Costa Rica to meet with the heads of Latin American countries for a full discussion of the crisis in the Caribbean and South America and it is important that he leave for that crucial meeting with full bipartisan support.

The influence of the United States can be brought to bear at this meeting only if the President speaks with the united backing of the people of this country.

Those who for mere political gain seek to thwart this goal work against the best interests of the United States and a peaceful solution to the Cuba crisis.

News Management Traced Back to Father of the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times of March 10 carried an excellent article regarding management of news. I sincerely hope that those of our Republican colleagues who have been engaging in these anguished outcries against the Kennedy administration with charges that it has managed the news will quietly and dispassionately read this fine article.

This article was prepared by Mr. Carleton Kent, chief of the Sun-Times Washington bureau, who is without any question one of the Nation's outstanding journalists and political observers. It has been my privilege to know Mr. Kent for some 25 years, and I can state with no equivocation that he is today one of the Nation's most respected members of the press.

I believe Mr. Kent has performed a great public service in calling attention to the fact that this whole problem of making news available to the press dates back to the very roots of our Nation.

Mr. Kent's article follows:

NEWS MANAGEMENT TRACED BACK TO FATHER OF THE COUNTRY

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—At least until November 1964 the Nation is going to hear a wealth of charges that the Kennedy administration is engaged in the management of news.

In the opinion of this court, the defendant is guilty as charged. And about all he has going for him, while the sentence is taken under advisement, is the following preliminary probation report:

So were a great many, if not all, of his predecessors in office, beginning with George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and running through time to Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The woods hereabouts are still full of fairly lively reporters who used to grin wryly in the knowledge that at least they knew when they were being taken for a management ride by a number of fairly recent predecessors of President Kennedy.

Some of them insist that the national record for management of this elusive tangible known as news was achieved during the Eisenhower regime by James C. Hagerty, presidential press secretary.

They hail his feat of convincing the country that one of the oldest American Presidents, despite a heart attack and an ileitis operation, was in great shape to run for a second 4-year term.

DONE WITH COMPLETE CANDOR

They tend to forget, however, that Hagerty did this with utter candor—by calling in the news media and with the help of charts and photos and a team of distinguished medical men, absolutely swamping the public with details on how things were going in the President's vascular and intestinal networks.

Perhaps the Madison Avenue award to Hagerty should have gone for the way he managed to have a steady stream of White House announcements on hand during Mr. Eisenhower's frequent golfing vacations, as a way of indicating there was at least as much work as play about them.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was never above managing the news. One of his ways was to suggest that the mass of the metropolitan press was against him—the editors and publishers, that is. For he always made a point of indicating that the reporters really were on his side.

And now and then, when a reporter indicated he really wasn't, Roosevelt would publicly invite him to put on a dunce cap and stand in a corner at his press conference.

Harry S. Truman often got irritated by the opposing press. But he managed the reporters covering him by often saying: "You're all right, it's those editors who do things to your stories."

One of the most outstanding jobs of news management was achieved by Herbert Brownell, first Attorney General under Mr. Eisenhower, who one weekend called into conference the heads of five Washington newspaper bureaus. And to them he leaked the news that Earl Warren was to be made Chief Justice of the United States.

Still practicing their trade are representatives of another newspaper generation who remember the device Calvin Coolidge used for managing the news without getting hurt by a possible bad bounce.

At his press conferences he used to select from a stack of written questions those he cared to answer. The answers always were attributed to a "White House spokesman."

Some of these news pioneers are able to summon up a smile over current charges that Mr. Kennedy and his family, both official and personal, use dinner parties, the swimming pool, and a variety of exclusive interviews, leaks, and charm to obtain a pleasant image for the New Frontier.

For they recall that Theodore Roosevelt, a couple of ages ago, was just as assiduous in getting himself on a friendly basis with a limited number of Washington reporters.

And historians reveal that the revered forefathers had their moments, too, of managing the news—although there is no record that any member of their government made the bald public admission that the release, withholding, or alteration of news is a part of the country's cold war weaponry.

A WEAPON IN LINCOLN'S ARSENAL

News was, however, weaponry to Abraham Lincoln a hundred years ago.

He informed his Cabinet on July 22, 1862, that he intended to issue a proclamation of emanicipation, freeing southern slaves, this for military reasons as much as for morality's sake.

Members of his Cabinet argued that such a move would cost the Republicans that fall's elections, particularly since Robert E. Lee's series of triumphs over the Union Armies had disgruntled the North.

So Lincoln managed to suppress that bit of news for 2 months, until after the boys in blue could claim at least a partial victory against Lee's invasion of Maryland at Antietam. Then, on September 17, Lincoln announced that the slaves, at least in Dixie areas controlled by the Union Army, were free.

Thomas Jefferson was a news manager, too. He took into his government an editor to put out a pro-Jefferson paper as a counter to attacks from the Federalist press.

At the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, the Founding Fathers were afraid the Constitution might never be ratified if news leaked out to the public about their deliberations.

And when one of the delegates let drop on the floor an important document, the Father of his Country gave the Convention a scalding blast on the danger of carelessly making it possible for the newspapers to get hold of such matters.

Security, or perhaps news management, was so well handled in those days that not until some 40 years later did the voters learn specifically, from publication of James Madison's notes, what really went on at the Philadelphia Convention.

Feast of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, coming from New York City which shelters so many sons of Erin, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words in commemoration of the feast of St. Patrick, which is being observed this coming Sunday, March 17.

It has been said that true statesmanship is the art of changing a nation from what it is into what it ought to be. With this definition in mind I would like to present the brief history of a man seldom referred to as a statesman, yet, within that definition, must be considered one of the greatest statesmen of all times. Without bloodshed and without revolution this gentle, God-fearing soul did change a nation from a conglomeration of violent, pagan clans into a God-loving people whose culture was a beacon to the world throughout the Dark Ages; whose unfaltering faith we have all admired; whose sparkling, perspective humor we have all enjoyed.

I refer, of course, to the people of Ireland and to their holy, venerable Apostle, St. Patrick, whose feast day, March 17, is celebrated throughout the world.

St. Patrick's birthdate and birthplace are unknown. It is possible that he was born in France but more probable that he was born in Scotland, near the banks of the River Clyde. His father was Calpurnius and his mother was Conchessa, a near relative of St. Martin of Tours.

Raiders from the Irish coast captured Patrick at the age of 16 and carried him away in slavery to Northern Ireland where he served King Milcho for 6 years. In nakedness, hardship and hunger he tended sheep and swine on the bleak, cold mountains of Antrim. Even in hardship Patrick learned to love the soft Irish countryside with its crags and brooks, its misty moors and rolling greenhills. He dearly loved the Irish people and readily adopted their gentle ways while rejecting their pagan customs.

St. Patrick returned to his homeland at the age of 22 after escaping from Irish slavery. For the next 20 years he lived a life of penance, prayer and study in preperation for the return to his beloved Ireland.

The mission of preaching to Ireland was given Patrick by Pope Celestine, following the Saint's consecration, in 432, to be Bishop of Armagh. On Holy Saturday of the following year Patrick gathered his followers on the Hill of Slane to celebrate the great Feast of Easter. Great bonfires were built, the Paschal torch was lit and Patrick preached on the Mystery of the Resurrection, as is Catholic custom.

On the nearby Hill of Tara was King Leaghairie (Leary) a warrior king blessed with a fiery red beard and cursed with a roaring black temper. He was celebrating a pagan feast, also with bonfires, as was the Irish custom. King Leaghairie had given orders that no bonfires were to be enkindled until after those on the Hill of Tara were lit. When the fires of St. Patrick were reported to him his anger was a madness itself. The king set out in a royal rage, intending to put Patrick and his followers to the mighty sword of Gaelic wrath.

The encounter between the gentle saint and the mad king is a high point in Irish history and, as such, has been improved upon in almost all accounts. It is true that there were several trials between the saint and the druids of the king; in every instance the druids were defeated.

The winning of Ireland began with the defeat of King Leaghairie, for, in defeat he had to admit to the divine nature of St. Patrick's mission and was forced to permit the saint to preach the Gospel throughout the land. This was not a simple matter for, in his own words, Patrick ran a continual risk of "ambushes and plots, daily expecting a violent death, or to be robbed, or reduced to slavery." Fear of death or bodily harm did nothing to stop St. Patrick in his work.

We know little of Patrick's last illness except that he died at the monastery of Saul in eastern Ulster after almost a century on this earth. For 12 days his sacred remains were reverently visited by a grateful nation, and then St. Patrick was lovingly laid to rest in Downpatrick.

In observance of this feast day I take great pride and pleasure in sincerely inviting all Americans, of all descents and religious persuasions, to join in thanking God for the gifts of faith and love, brought to us by the great St. Patrick.

The Disaster on Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues a resolution adopted by the Guam Legislature with reference to my visit to that island last year.

I humbly accept this commendation, not so much on my own behalf as on behalf of the congressional committees which I represented on that visit, as well as the Small Business Administration which once again in time of emergency performed outstandingly.

The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION 464(2-S)

Resolution relative to commending the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Member, House of Representatives, from the State of New York, for his trip to Guam in the aftermath of typhoon Karen, for his appearance before the legislature, and for his interest in the problems of the people of Guam

Whereas the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Member, U.S. House of Representatives, from the State of New York, a ranking member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and subcommittee chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, has been on Guam for the last several days, and during his stay has not only appeared on radio and TV to tell the public the interest of the Congress in Guam's plight, but has also informally met with members of the legislature and thereafter addressed them while in special session; and

Whereas throughout his stay in the territory, he has demonstrated not only warmth and sympathy with and interest in the problems of the people of Guam but has taken affirmative action to assist the territory by way of checking into the activities of the disaster program for Guam of the Small Business Administration, with which program he is as familiar as any man in Washington, having held for a number of years committee assignments dealing directly with the small business program; and

Whereas the Small Business Administration disaster relief program is of vital importance to the rehabilitation of Guam from the effects of typhoon Karen and thus the people of this territory are extremely fortunate in having had as a visitor to the stricken territory Representative MULTER, a recognized congressional leader in this field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express to the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Member, House of Representatives, the warm commendation and appreciation for his trip to Guam following Typhoon Karen for his appearance before the legislature and for the warm interest and sympathy he demonstrated in the problems of Guam, particularly in the field of the disaster relief program of the Small Business Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, to the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Member, House of Representatives, and to the Governor of Guam.

A. B. WON PAT,
Speaker.

V. B. BAMBA,
Legislative Secretary.

(Duly adopted on the 9th day of December 1962.)

Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, we pause today, and each St. Patrick's Day, to celebrate the land which has spread around the world the ideals to which he devoted his life. We pay tribute, too, to those of Irish birth or blood in our own America, both those who toiled in the past, to bring America to the prosperity and strength that are hers today, and to those who stand today bravely facing the future with Irish stubbornness and Irish resilience.

There are many speeches being made today, and each St. Parick's Day, to celebrate the qualities of the Irish people, and their contribution to the building of our America. But I make no apology for adding one more to the number. I owe it to myself, as well as to the glory of St. Patrick and the credit of the Irish in America, to stand forth and let it be known that I am grateful to St. Patrick for his heroic example and devotion to the gospel, to the land of Ireland for her myth and magic, her laughter and valor, her human friendliness and her agelong endurance. I owe it to myself, too, to make it clear that I appreciate the great part men and women of Irish blood have played in the history of America, and in every phase of our life.

Through many long years, the Irish in America, coming as penniless refugees from poverty and starvation, from political oppression and religious restrictions, were largely confined to laboring jobs. It was they who built many of the railroads of America, the roads and canals, the ditches and sewers. But while they were laboring at these tasks, with long hours and low pay, they built more than the physical roadways and railways and waterways of our land. A greater contribution than their work in steel and asphalt and stone and brick was the warmth and sparkle they brought to American life, the ability to bounce back at adversity with a witty comment and a new effort, and the affection of family relationships, friendships, and love of man and woman. The power of Irish eloquence, and the sweetness of Irish song, especially as rendered by our magnificent Irish tenors and sopranos, has almost persuaded us that there is something distinctively Irish about a man's love for his mother, or a young man's fondness for a girl. From the caustic wit and jovial humor of Finley Peter Dunne, and the lyric love and patriotic enthusiasm of George M. Cohan, the nature of Americanism has become tinted with a most becoming hue of green. Therefore, on St. Patrick's Day, Americans of every race and national origin join with the Irish in paying joyful tribute to the great saint, and to the land to which he brought the great gift of faith.

Educator Sees Threat to Private Philanthropy in Our Colleges in President's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Members of Congress up to date on the facts being presented to the Ways and Means Committee in our study of President Kennedy's tax proposals, I would like to include as a part of my remarks the following statement made today before the committee by Dr. Miller Upton, president of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. Dr. Upton points out so clearly the danger to private philanthropy which has meant so much in creating our fine and free educational system in America:

STATEMENT OF MILLER UPTON BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WITH REFERENCE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TAX PROPOSAL

Congressman MILLS and members of the Ways and Means Committee, I am appreciative of this opportunity to appear before you with reference to the President's proposal for tax reduction and reform.

INTRODUCTION

By way of general background information in support of my qualification to appear before you on this subject, my name is Miller Upton and I am president of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. I have been a college teacher of finance and economics. Prior to becoming president of Beloit College I was dean of the School of Business and Public Administration of Washington University in St. Louis. In 1959 and 1960 I served as chairman of the Continuing Revenue Survey Commission for the State of Wisconsin responsible for studying the total tax structure of that State for the purpose of recommending broad revisions and structural improvements. I am a member of the American Economic Association and the American Statistical Association and a member and past president of the American Finance Association. I am also a past president of the Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities and the immediate past president of the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges.

My interest in making a statement before you is twofold: First, as a private citizen with special training, experience, and interest in the subject before you I am constrained to make certain observations which I feel might offer something to your important deliberations. Second, and more importantly, as president of a private, nonprofit institution of higher learning, of which there are many in this country, I am anxious to present a point of view which I am confident needs to be represented with urgency in the interest of protecting our Nation by preserving an element of it which is essential to its continued strength and vitality as a society committed to individual freedom.

THE ESSENTIAL NEED FOR PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY IN A FREE SOCIETY

My point can be introduced most quickly by reference to a phrase which we employ at Beloit College to establish the essential rationale for our existence. It is, "public enrichment through private endowment." This is not merely a catchy phrase or an idle slogan; it is an expression in capsule form of the essential philosophical foundation of our society.

The existence of a free society is dependent upon the quality of the voluntary choices made by its citizens. It is commonplace that if we are not capable individually to accept our social responsibilities voluntarily we are not capable of being free. And the more government intrudes itself into the sector of private decisionmaking and substitutes centralized direction for voluntary individual action, the more the basic foundations of our free society are eroded.

The nature of our fiscal policies and our tax structures is critical in this regard. If the Government resorts to fiscal policies which are inflationary, the endowments of private social service agencies across the country, particularly colleges and universities, are made subject to evaporation of value. And if the Government fails to encourage private philanthropy actively by allowing an individual in effect to tax himself voluntarily for approved social service activities, then compulsory taxation becomes the only alternative and our society loses that much more ground in its presumed effort to advance individual freedom. Because freedom and responsibility are interlocked, to discourage private philanthropy in support of social service activities is to weaken the most essential strand in the fabric of a free society.

THE WEAKNESSES OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROPOSAL—ITS ADVERSE EFFECT ON PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY

It is on both counts that I oppose the tax program that has been proposed by the President: It moves in the direction of discouraging private philanthropy and it is bound to contribute to further inflation. The structural changes with regard to charitable deductions while not overly great are a definite move in the wrong direction and are bound to affect adversely private philanthropy just that much. If there is to be any change in the relationship of taxes to private philanthropy it ought to be in the direction of encouraging more not less. The proposals to allow only those charitable contributions in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income and to tax at capital gains rates all net gains on capital assets at the time of transfer by gift represent the start of a vicious circulatory process of destroying privately supported social service agencies and expanding the scope and influence of centralized government.

As it becomes less easy for individuals to make contributions to private agencies it becomes less possible for these agencies to serve adequately the growing needs of our society in education and elsewhere. And as these growing needs cannot be served by voluntary philanthropy, government at all levels—local, State, and National—is encouraged and even forced to take over. The costs of government thereupon rise greatly, and tax revenue has to be increased accordingly. As tax pressures mount, there is both less available in the private sector to be given voluntarily and there is added inducement to reduce again the amount of allowable deductions, include charitable contributions. And so it goes, until eventually all social services are financed almost wholly by the compulsory tax route, and the specter of the monolithic state assumes clearer dimensions.

THE WEAKNESSES OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROPOSAL—ITS INEVITABLE STIMULUS TO INFLATION

Of equal importance, however, is my concern with the inflationary implications of the whole proposal. Our private institutions have been harmed seriously from the ravages of our endowments by the war and postwar inflation. Further inflation is bound to compound our financial difficulties and make us easy prey for the lure of governmental handouts.

I am not aware of the fact that it is claimed that the President's tax proposal would not contribute to inflation. The argument runs that the increased purchasing power resulting from the tax cuts would increase general economic activity, thus increasing output and income sufficiently over time that the lower rates would produce enough tax revenue to balance the budget. Frankly, I am appalled by such reasoning in high places. For one thing, no account is taken, apparently, of the differences in short-run and long-run effects. Tax reductions result in an immediate increase in purchasing power, and since production cannot adjust simultaneously, there is bound to be an immediate upward pressure on prices.

However, my concern primarily rests on even more fundamental, long-range considerations. The notion that we can eliminate current unemployment and stimulate the general economic development of the country by reducing taxes and not reducing expenditures is a proposition that is supposed neither by established economic theory nor historical fact. It is a theory, to be sure, but not one that is accepted by professional theorists at large. For the present it is at best a bit of wishful thinking, and I submit that it would be reckless exercise of legislative responsibility to make a judgment on such wishful thinking when the possible consequences to our society are so dire.

We must be wary not to rationalize ourselves into doing something simply because of the great temptation that exists. There is no one among us who does not want his taxes reduced. A general state of mind exists, therefore, which leads toward our trying to justify something which to us individually has great appeal. However, if you are to be faithful to your great responsibility for the financial stability of our country and the financial welfare of its citizens and institutions, you must be careful not to be-

come hypnotized by the siren song of lower taxes.

I read with surprise the other day that the President in one of his press conferences warned that if his proposal was not adopted the economy would drift toward general deflation. His economic advisers must have winced. For in his "Special Message on Tax Reduction and Reform," dated January 24, 1963, he states:

"My recommendation for early revision of our tax structure is not motivated by any threat of imminent recession—nor should it be rejected by any fear of inflation or weakening the dollar as a world currency. The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, underinvestment, unused capacity, and persistent unemployment."

If the President has reason to believe that deflation or depression is imminent, then his proposal for deficit financing through tax reduction may have some shortrun validity as a form of economic stimulant. But if the deficit is spent for this short-run gain it cannot also be counted on to produce long-range economic recovery. If the adrenalin of reduced taxes is injected to stem the forces of acute deflation, it cannot at the same time attack the problem of chronic unemployment of labor and capital. Such unemployment is a special disease which must be attacked in a selective fashion through careful identification of the contributing cause and not dealt with in an indiscriminate fashion through general monetary and fiscal policies. In not attacking the true cause of unemployment, the increased purchasing power can only have the effect of pushing prices higher.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since I do not look with favor upon an approach which merely criticizes and fails to offer constructive suggestions, I would like to be able to offer my own ideas with regard to resolving the three great issues at stake. These issues are (1) how to cope with our present state of chronic labor unemployment, (2) how to increase our rate of economic growth, and (3) how to deal with the need for tax reform. Because I am limited in my formal presentation to 10 minutes, I am attaching to this statement an addendum which covers very briefly my principal thoughts along these lines. I hope they may be of some value to your deliberations.

Again I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for granting me this special opportunity.

ADDENDUM TO STATEMENT OF MILLER UPTON BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WITH REFERENCE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TAX PROPOSAL, MARCH 14, 1963

Some thoughts on alternative ways to cope with the current problems of chronic labor unemployment, long-range economic development and tax reform:

Chronic labor unemployment: The situation which prevails in the labor market is not one of general weakness. Those individuals who are currently out of work have, for the most part, been left stranded in the economic stream by technological change, shifts in the consumption pattern of our society, and increased domestic purchase of certain foreign goods. These islands of unemployment must therefore be removed by selective programs of retraining and relocation through counseling. I grant that these are tedious and difficult methods but under the circumstances they are the only ones that offer any realistic prospect for helping this situation in an enduring way. Dumping more liquid purchasing power into the economic stream may cause it to flow faster, but it will still flow around and past the islands of unemployment.

Economic development: So far as long-range economic development is concerned, the only way we are going to stimulate our economy to reach an enduring stage of greater vitality is by removing the shackles which inhibit such vitality. There is no evidence that we are chronically lacking in economic fuel. Personal disposable income keeps rising, consumer credit keeps rising, retail sales keep rising, and even consumer prices keep rising. Rather, all evidence suggests that the economic machine is not firing properly.

In his special message the President states: "But it has become increasingly clear—particularly in the last 5 years—that the largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources and to a higher rate of economic growth is the unrealistically heavy drag of Federal income taxes on private purchasing power, initiative and incentive. Our economy is checkreined today by a war-born tax system at a time when it is far more in need of the spur than the bit."

We have in this statement the essence of a half-truth. The largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources is our debilitating lack of confidence in freedom in the marketplace. The checkrein, if you will, is not the tax structure per se but the attitude which has produced all manner of restrictive business legislation, including a tax structure which is nearly confiscatory at certain levels and which places political and administrative convenience ahead of economic reason. For example, I know of no one who can justify a corporation income tax on economic grounds.

It is a biological and economic truism that we can't experience stability and growth at the same time. The conditions that make for the one do not make for the other. If what we want is economic vitality and growth we have to be prepared to accept change, and with economic change comes economic disruption, including unemployment. If the economy is vibrant and growing, however, such unemployment will be of a temporary rather than chronic sort. If, on the other hand, we want economic stability primarily, we must impose centralized direction and controls over individual initiative, in which case we dispense with the creative—and disruptive—attribute of free individual expression. Stability through controls and vitality through freedom are mutually exclusive conditions. We have to choose one or the other; we can't have both.

If we are sincere in our desire to regenerate the economic vitality of our country, then we must have confidence in freedom in the marketplace as surely as we have it at the polls. There is sufficient evidence in our history and the recent history of Japan and West Germany to support the contention that economic vitality, like all human vitality, is dependent upon free expression of the individual members of society. Although our country established the precedent for this and reaped remarkable benefits in economic development because of our leadership in the application of the principle, we have become disenchanted with such economic freedom and our whole attitude toward it as a society has become contaminated.

We have damned the system for individual abuses of the system, and as a result we have put the collective brakes on our economic progress and development. We ought to punish severely individuals who abuse the social trust that is implicit in this economic freedom and not penalize society as a whole. It is irrational to poison all the livestock in the barn in order to get rid of the rats.

We who operate in the academic community are great champions of the importance of the free competition of ideas. But the validity of the principle is not limited to the academic community; it applies equally to the economic and business community. When an individual teacher abuses his great trust we do not consider delimiting academic freedom in general. By the same token we ought not restrict and shackle economic freedom generally in a misguided effort to protect society against individual abuse of the freedom.

TAX REFORM

As for our tax situation, we have reached the place where we must dispense with the use of patent medicines in the form of rate reductions and isolated amendments and resort to surgery in the form of a complete overhaul. Anything less than this will merely be temporizing and no worthwhile effect will be had on long-range economic development. Everyone who has given any serious consideration to the matter has had to admit that the present tax structure is a monstrous concoction without any governing rationale—a burdensome and ugly mass of unrelated accretions that have accumulated over time as an outgrowth of different political and emergency pressures. It can readily be shown to be inequitable, overly cumbersome, overly expensive to administer, and a severe deterrent to economic vitality and growth and development.

Although taxation is as old as human society, general reliance on the income tax is relatively new. Certainly it is new in this country. We have learned much from our experience over the past 50 years which we should draw upon in developing an entirely new tax structure. The present tax law should not be considered sacrosanct simply because it is the prevailing law. We should not allow ourselves to become enslaved by a monstrous creature which has been fashioned by the combining of separate and disparate acts designed to deal with immediate needs which vary with the passage of time.

In the final analysis, tax reform is fundamentally simple if it originates from a real desire to deal with fiscal and economic realities and does not confuse the issue with political pressure. If the Government would proceed in such reform on the known fact that all taxes, however called or however collected, must be paid out of individual income, a new structure could readily be developed which would be simple, direct, equitable, and efficient.

Such fundamental reform should also reckon with the fact that in any society there should be only one taxing authority. The situation that prevails now with local communities, States, and the Federal Government vying with one another for the citizen's tax dollar is one of utter confusion and leaves the individual taxpayer a pawn that is pushed around rather callously by the separate governmental authorities, each passing the buck to the other. Either the Federal Government should raise its revenue by an assessment on the individual States on the basis of each State's contribution to the national income, or it should become the central taxing authority and take care of the separate needs of the States. In keeping with the Federal character of our national governmental structure the assessment approach would be by all odds the better, but we seem to be drifting rather indifferently and dangerously toward the other.

Certainly there would result from such a major overhaul a substantial amount of temporary disruption within the economy. Some businesses and business practices have come to be tied directly to the ramifications of the existing tax law. But to preserve a bad law to protect its economic spawn would be the height of irrationality. The economic disruption resulting from a complete tax overhaul would not last long, and the great benefits that would result to our society at large would be worth far more than the price of temporary inconvenience that would have to be paid.

The Harris Committee Is Promoting an Outstanding Public Service to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call my colleagues' attention to the investigation currently being conducted by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce into the methods and procedures used by the various companies of America engaged in the business of rating public reaction to television programs.

The chairman of this subcommittee is the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, who is also chairman of the full committee.

It is becoming patently clear from the hearings being conducted by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] so far that all is not well in the public pulse-reading industry of America.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and his subcommittee are performing one of the most important public services ever presented to the American people. This might sound like an exaggerated statement, but it is my firm conviction that this Nation has not as yet grasped the magnitude of the contribution Mr. HARRIS is making toward improvement and development of American culture.

I have always suspected that fine television productions have been knocked off the air because they allegedly received poor ratings under the present system of determining public reaction. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we have a wasteland in American radio and television—and I agree with the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission that there is a wasteland—then this deplorable situation has been, in my judgment, motivated to a great extent by the rating system.

There is no question that advertisers must resort to some form of motivation research to determine how they are going to spend their advertising dollar. My criticism of the rating system is not to be construed as an effort to do away with polls on public opinion. On the contrary, I firmly believe that motivation research is extremely important in a free economy. However, I am equally convinced that the Harris committee hearings will lead to a much more reliable method of determining public reaction to the various television presentations. It would be my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the television industry will welcome an exposure of the shortcomings in the present system of rating their efforts. I am sure many television stations would prefer to use their own judgment in selecting program content but these station operators too often have been victims of the rating system so blindly followed by advertisers. If we have had a wasteland in television, I am certain it was not the fault of the television station operators but of the rating system.

I believe Congressman HARRIS and his committee deserve the highest commendation not only of Congress but also of the American people for this important investigation. It is my firm belief that when this committee has concluded its work, the entire cultural level of America will be considerably improved. The work of this committee will elevate our cultural standards in television for many generations to come.

Following is an article which recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal which shows the results the Harris committee has already stimulated:

THREE TV RATING CONCERNS SIGN FTC CONSENT ORDER

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Trade Commission accused three companies measuring television and radio audiences of misrepresenting their accuracy and using techniques leading to bias or error. It said each had agreed not to engage in such practices.

The Commission said A. C. Nielsen Co., Chicago; C-E-I-R, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Pulsa, New York, had agreed on the consent orders with FTC attorneys.

"The agreements are for settlement purposes only and do not constitute admissions by the respondents that they have violated the law," the Commission said.

Each company was charged with claiming its rating were accurate and achieved by techniques barring error, when, actually, the FTC charged, such ratings are estimates.

Among other things, the Commission said, Nielsen and C-E-I-R failed to announce the number or percentage is an audience sampling that refuses or is unwilling to cooperate. Nielsen and C-E-I-R also use information from diaries, kept by listeners, the FTC said, some of which contain hearsay reports.

Nielsen, the commission contended, bases the total audience for a station partly on measurement and partly on a projection calculated from obsolete ballot surveys.

Among other alleged shortcomings, Pulse was said to use reports containing the general preference of a person interviewed, not what he heard or saw.

Father Matthew Martin Admonishes Irish-Americans Who Have Been Accepted in America To Be Tolerant of Negroes and Puerto Ricans and Other Minority Groups Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Father Matthew Martin, director of students at Holy Cross Seminary in Dunkirk, N.Y., admonished Americans of Irish descent to reflect on their own heritage and fight for acceptance in the United States, and to be tolerant today of other minority groups such as the Negroes and Puerto Ricans. I join in these sentiments of this priest.

Father Martin was speaking to the Hampden County membership of the Ancient Order of Hibernians during their annual St. Patrick's banquet in Springfield, Mass., Sunday night, March 10. I include the newspaper account of Father Martin's address, taken from the Springfield Union of March 11, in the Appendix, as follows:

COUNTY HIBERNIANS URGED TO HELP FIGHT INTOLERANCE

All Irish eyes were smiling Sunday night as some 500 persons gathered in the Sheraton-Kimball Hotel for the 13th annual St. Patrick's banquet of the Hampden County members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

HELP OTHERS ACHIEVE

Principal speaker was Rev. Matthew Martin, a native of Westfield and presently director of students at Holy Cross Seminary, Dunkirk, N.Y., who exhorted the audience to "look back on your heritage and help others to achieve theirs."

Father Martin outlined the fight of the Irish emigrants to achieve acceptance in this country since the end of the last century. He noted that a similar battle is being fought now by other minority groups such as the Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

He reported that some descendants of the early Irish, Germans, Italians and Jews today "reserve the same intolerance for the Negro and Puerto Rican that was showered on their forefathers. Christ died on a cross to save all men. Now the cross has become a fiery symbol of bigotry."

"I appeal, to Christian parents," he said. "Do not pass prejudice on to the children. Do not rear them on slogans. Do not introduce them to poisonous name calling. Leave them in their innocence where they accept a friend regardless of color or nationality."

MARK OF PRIDE

"In my mind we do not have to go to other cities for a fine example of tolerance—the scholarship fund for Negroes set up here in Springfield has always been a mark of pride with me," Father Martin continued.

"I would like to see Springfield become a center for the study of tolerance. I would like to see the Ancient Order of Hibernians offer its corporate membership here to insure success," he added.

Other guests included: Rt. Rev. Msgr. James J. FitzGibbon of Holyoke, who represented Bishop Christopher J. Weldon; Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Jr.; Rev. Owen McGrath of the Columban fathers; and State and county Ancient Order of Hibernians officials.

Toastmaster was Attorney Leonard Gibbons of Holyoke. Joseph A. McDonald, accompanied by Miss Ruth Wright, presented a musical program. Miss Denise Leary gave recitations. Mrs. Bernard N. Gilchriest and Mrs. James P. Leary were cochairmen.

Address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

The address, which was delivered on March 9, follows:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE, NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO, MARCH 9, 1963

I suppose it is inevitable that most of us are nearsighted about national problems. We are able to focus on them only as they apply close to home and we find it difficult to see how they affect people in other fields and other States. One of the curious things I have found since becoming Attorney General, however, is that when it comes to civil rights, we very quickly become farsighted. We are quite ready to point accusing fingers at the South and are easily outraged by a Little Rock, by the beating of freedom riders, or by a Meredith case. Yet we respond to discrimination right around us with blank and uncomprehending stares. The attitude is "the other fellow is wrong" and the more wrong he is, the more that automatically puts us on the side of the angels.

There is no question that segregation in the South is socially, politically, and morally wrong. But there is deep-seated segregation in the North, also, and it is just as wrong. Racial discrimination is a national, not a regional problem, and it cannot be solved simply by individual instances of Federal action on behalf of freedom riders or a single college student. The solution requires the hearts, the voices, the minds, and the muscle of individuals and organizations all over the country, public and private. The President said last week, in his civil rights message:

"The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad."

I am particularly pleased to be with you here today because labor, and especially groups like yours, historically have been committed to social justice and social action. For years, unions have been in the forefront of efforts toward equal opportunity for all workers and all citizens.

Last year, Mr. Van Arsdale's local 3 provided an example of such leadership by including 200 Negroes and Puerto Ricans among its 1,000 new apprentices. The New York Council of Painters also has opened its apprenticeship program to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

In the past few months, 122 international unions, representing more than 10 million workers have joined with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and pledged themselves to union programs for fair practices. The dual seniority problem is the subject of wide and serious attention by labor. Segregated locals are fast disappearing. Indeed, probably at no time in the long history of the American labor movement have so many union leaders given such deep and effective attention to the problem of providing equal opportunity for all, regardless of race.

DISCRIMINATION IN LABOR MOVEMENT

Yet we would be dishonest with ourselves if we did not admit that some discrimination continues to exist within the labor movement—and by no means only in the South. I am thinking, for example, of a particularly ironic situation that exists right now in Washington. Howard University, a distinguished Negro institution, is building a new gymnasium. At least four of the building trades locals involved, however, have no Negroes working on the project. For that matter, these locals have only a handful of Negro members or apprentices.

The fundamental responsibility for solving problems like this is that of labor itself. Your group and others like it do a great deal to help. The Government also has a responsibility in this field: the work of the Vice President and the Equal Employment Committee is well known to you and the President has directed me to seek legal techniques, rules, and procedures to deal with such discrimination.

But there is a more fundamental responsibility for both you in the labor movement and for us in Government. We are as firmly opposed to discrimination in voting, education and other fields as we are to discrimination in unions. It is in order to help the Nation act more effectively against discrimination that the President last week sent Congress a special message on civil rights. The administration's program includes three legislative proposals, concerning voting, education, and assistance to areas and organizations undertaking desegregation.

The first and most important bill deals with voting. The people's vote is the people's voice and when some people cannot vote they cannot effectively speak against injustice and deprivation of other rights.

It's like the story told at the time the 19th amendment was being voted on by the States. A decided antifeminist complained to his Congressman: "Can't you do something to stop them scarecrow suffragettes from voting?" The Congressman replied, "You mean my charming constituents of the fairer sex?"

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

We have worked very hard under existing law seeking to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens. The Department of Justice has filed 35 voting suits, 25 of them in this administration, challenging discrimination or threats in southern counties against Negro registration applicants. But this is a painfully slow way of providing what is, after all, the fundamental right of citizenship. There remain more than 20 counties in the South where less than 15 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered.

Even where we have brought suit, the cases require extremely detailed preparation. In our suit in Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voter applications and to subpena 185 witnesses for the trial. Such suits each require the total attention of 4 to 6 of the 40 lawyers in our Civil Rights Division for several months.

It often takes many more months before Negroes finally can register and vote. In Ouachita Parish, La., for example, the Department filed suit in July 1961. Although 24,000 out of the 40,000 eligible whites were registered to vote, only 725 of the 16,000 eligible Negroes were registered. Another 5,000 Negroes had, in fact, been purged from the voting rolls.

In the 33 months since we brought the suit, a special election for Congress has passed. A general election has passed. And still not even the date for trial has been set. It may well be 1964 before we finally secure a decision and Negroes can register and vote freely.

This is neither an extreme nor an isolated case. There is a real and immediate need for speeding up the process.

PREFERENCE TO VOTING SUITS

We are asking Congress, therefore, to authorize that voting suits be given preference on court dockets and tried in an expedited manner. This parallels the laws of many States which give priority to election suits in an effort to resolve them before the election is over and the chance to vote wiped out.

Even if cases can be expedited, there still will be a timelag between the filing of a suit and the issuance of orders against further discrimination. Therefore, we have asked Congress to provide for the appointment of temporary Federal referees to determine the qualifications of registration applicants during the time voting suits are pending in court.

In addition to the need for speed in guaranteeing the right to vote, there also is a great need for insuring fairness in determining who is qualified to vote.

Some Southern States use the literacy test to make this determination. As a result, barely literate whites, coached by the registrar, often are registered. Meanwhile, Negroes—like a National Science Foundation graduate student from Cornell, or teachers with advanced degrees—arbitrarily are declared illiterate and thus ineligible to vote.

Other States have used the constitutional interpretation test. Applicants must copy and explain sections of the Federal or State constitutions. Negroes often are required to copy and interpret long, archaic sections of a State constitution, or are required to explain what "due process" means, to a registrar who knows no law.

Whites, meanwhile, copy such provisions as, "There shall be no imprisonment for debt." One white gentleman, who was registered, interpreted that section in these words:

"I think that a Neogroe Should Have 8 years in college Be for voting Be couse He dont under Stand."

DOUBLE BURDEN OF INJUSTICE

We should reflect on such examples more in sadness than in irony, because they demonstrate the double burden of injustice inflicted on the Negro. Not only is he prevented from registering and voting, but the method of doing so is a grotesquely unfair test.

There's an acid joke about the Negro who attempted to register in a southern county. The registrar asked him to copy and interpret the 14th amendment. He did so, brilliantly. "All right, if you're so smart," the registrar said, "recite the Gettysburg Address from memory." The Negro did. "OK, give us the second inaugural speech." Again the Negro came through beautifully. Finally, the registrar pulled a Chinese newspaper out of his desk and asked, "Can you read this?"

"That's easy," said the Negro. "It says, 'No Negroes are going to vote in this State this year'."

We are asking Congress in our proposed voting measure to prohibit specifically the use of different tests or standards for different registration applicants. And we have asked that completion of the sixth grade should be regarded as evidence that an applicant is literate.

We also are asking Congress for two other pieces of legislation, both stemming from a need for assistance as well as enforcement. Our experience has demonstrated that people want to obey the law. In the field of education, for example, the violence last fall at the University of Mississippi should not overshadow the fact that 60 southern school districts were desegregated last year—peacefully and without fanfare. In many cases the Department of Justice assisted through informal consultations.

ASSISTANCE IN SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Communities in the South not only want to obey the law, but they want and need assistance in doing so. One of the laws we seek would establish in the Office of Education a program of technical and financial assistance to communities in the process of integrating their schools.

Such a program would help such school districts profit from the lessons of others—such as Atlanta, where public and private bodies combined with great success in 1961 to desegregate schools without incident. Many communities lack the background and resources required to minimize tensions both outside and inside the schools and to assure the maintenance and improvement of educational standards.

We have applied the same principle of providing information in our third legislative proposal, for the extension and expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights. Not only community governments, but many organi-

zations, both public and private, both in the North and the South, can benefit substantially from expert guidance and information about how others have handled integration problems.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Civil Rights Commission has the background and ability to satisfy this need and the President consequently has recommended that it be authorized to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse—providing information, and technical guidance to any requesting agency.

Combined with continued effort under existing laws and policies, this, then is the administration's civil rights program. There are those who say this program does not go far enough. It is true that there is other civil rights legislation which might be introduced, such as a bill seeking authority for the Government to initiate school desegregation suits. But I would say to these critics that it is perfectly simple to introduce and support bills that have no chance of passage. But to do so would endanger measures that do have a chance. These critics have no responsibility for action. It is the aim of this administration to seek action and progress, not merely talk and headlines.

Further, let it be clear that this civil rights program is only that—a program. To sit back and wait for progress to come just because somebody in Washington has asked for new laws is as starry-eyed as waiting for the day labor minstrels once described when "the mills are made of marble and the machines are made of gold."

It took courage and effort for the labor movement to achieve the economic standards it enjoys today. It will take the same kind of effort to achieve the social ideals we profess in the field of civil rights.

We stand not only for labor or the Negro or minority groups, but for the ideal of freedom and dignity which underlies our society.

I come here today to call on you for your efforts on behalf of the administration's program. I come to ask you to speak out and act as a body. I ask you to go back to your internationals, your locals, and your communities to seek their support, both for this program and for its aim.

"Race discrimination," the President said in his civil rights message, "hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong."

He Followed a Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, this week the raging waters of the Guyandotte River and other West Virginia streams devastated wide areas of southwestern West Virginia. The mud and misery left behind defy human description.

At the height of the crisis, a cool and determined legislator made a firm decision. U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, after taking all necessary steps to mobilize public and private efforts to combat the emergency, on March 13 flew by plane and helicopter to the flood-stricken areas of Logan, Williamson and other spots where the disaster had engulfed the people.

This was no mere grandstand gesture. Senator BYRD quickly rounded up high officials in the Office of Emergency Planning, the Public Health Service, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Small Business Administration, and key congressional officials—men who could inspect, report and help make decisions on the spot—and sped with them to the points where help was most needed.

The lights burned late in room 342 of the Old Senate Office Building as Senator BYRD made careful preparations for the important trip. That night, far into the night, he made more than 20 telephone calls to key West Virginians in the hard-hit and seriously flooding areas. Long after midnight he went to bed, but when I saw him at 6:30 a.m. Wednesday he was refreshed, clear eyed and determined as we set out for Andrews Air Force Base in the early morning fog.

Lesser men would have taken one look at the pea-soup fog and turned back. Senator BYRD insisted, like Columbus, that the only course was to "Sail on." For several hours he waited, with the large group of Federal officials at the airport, waiting for the fog to lift, while he put in countless calls to the areas of trouble in West Virginia. The weather was almost impossible, but Senator BYRD knew from the information he was receiving that the plight of the people was deperate, and he knew it was his duty to press on to make the flight.

Finally, at 10 a.m., the big plane lumbered down the runway and headed east for Charleston, W. Va., and Huntington, W. Va. Three helicopters picked up the group and set them down in Logan on the muddy Logan High School field. All afternoon and into the dusk and early evening, Senator BYRD and his group worked steadily, interviewing local officials, mobilizing rescue efforts, coordinating State, local, and Federal agencies, checking on fresh water supply, inspecting health hazards, encouraging local relief workers, calling an additional assistance where needed.

While Senator BYRD's party were airborne, President Kennedy declared these critical areas disaster areas, making them eligible for Federal assistance to restore and repair public facilities. The sun came out. The temperature rose to the sixties. The flood waters started to recede, but millions of dollars of damage had been done and the long process of scraping the mud away had only begun. Stores and markets had their stocks destroyed. Thousands of people lost all of their personal possessions.

But when Senator BYRD and his dog-tired group returned to Washington Wednesday night they had accomplished their objective of bringing the maximum amount of help to people in dire distress.

In a sense, Wednesday's trip is the story of Senator BYRD's life—the story of a long and determined fight against seemingly insuperable obstacles, the story of a man who will follow a dream, the story of a man who has known and experienced human misery and therefore works to the limits of his endurance to ease human misery.

West Virginia is proud of U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD.

As a further illustration of why West Virginia is proud of Senator BYRD, I include the following article which appeared in the Raleigh Register of Beckley, W. Va., March 7, 1963:

BOB BYRD HAD A DREAM AND MADE IT COME TRUE

(By Roy Lee Harmon)

It was no doubt a cocky individual who said:

"The difficult things we do right away, the impossible take a little time."

But experience has taught me that a man who will follow a dream through hell and high water and considerable underbrush and also work hard can do most anything he wants to do.

U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD is a prime example of this logic.

Back in 1946 BOB BYRD was a butcher boy in a grocery store in this area. Among his "assets" was the ability to play the fiddle for 10 or 15 minutes. He doted on "Old Joe Clark"—and I heard him play it so often during his first political campaign in 1946 that I felt I knew old Joe personally.

BOB and I were both political beginners that year—and both candidates for the House of Delegates.

BOB outran me in both the primary and general election. That fiddle, I am sure, gave him an advantage, maybe an unfair advantage. You see, I play the piano—but I couldn't put the darn thing under my chin or carry it around from one rally to another. So I had to just be there on display at the rallies and perhaps mutter a few sentences. But we were both elected—even if BOB and his fiddle did almost do me in. Bill File was the other member of the Raleigh delegation. (We had three from Raleigh County then.)

When we got to Charleston, BOB rented a small room on the corner of Duffy and Washington Streets where, during the session, he stayed up most of the night reading the bills, numbering them and marking down his "yes" or "no" decisions in a composition book.

I roomed a block away, occupying the "parlor" in the home of a woman who turned out to be secretary or something of the dry forces in the State and who lobbied me on the evils of strong drink every time I came in the house. For this I paid $10 a week out of a meager salary of $500 a year—and I didn't eat too well during the 60-day session either.

But this is about BOB BYRD, his ambition and how he attained a mighty goal after pursuing a dream over hill and dale and playing "Old Joe Clark" countless times.

Just before or during the first days of the 1947 session BOB stood on the street corner opposite the house where he roomed, and looked up at the capitol dome. It was after dark and the dome was flooded with electric light.

After a little meditation BYRD told a friend of mine:

"Right over there is where my political destiny will be determined in the next 60 days."

Since I wasn't politically ambitious and was more concerned with learning my way around in the House and voting sensibly, I marvelled at BOB's dream. Even then he was looking to greener pastures, to higher

places in government. To me it seemed a little fantastic. But now I know it wasn't.

BOB BYRD realized he had an education handicap. This is not to say he wasn't a smart boy—because he was. But this coal miner's son wanted a college degree. He was already married and had a family. But soon after the session ended he set about getting more education. In due course I believe he attended Morris Harvey, Marshall and Concord colleges. He was getting ready to make his big dream come true.

After another term in the house he went to the State senate.

From there he went to Congress—and from Congress he went to the U.S. Senate. Always he combined his political climb with more and more education. In Washington he attended law school and I understand he is now a full fledged lawyer.

And the moral of this little story, if any, is: never underrate a dream.

Industrial Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the last Congress, a proposal which I had offered to facilitate the provision of health care benefits to retirees under qualified corporate pensions plans was enacted as part of the bill which finally became Public Law 87-863. Although it was not designed to act as a final solution of the problem of financing retirement health care for all of our citizens, it was another step forward in the excellent progress which we have been making—and continue to make—in this field.

The operations and potential of these programs was mentioned by Mr. John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., in a speech before the American Hospital Association convention last fall. Mr. Connor's speech was reported in the February 1963 issue of Massachusetts Physician under the heading "Industrial Medicare." I am placing this report of Mr. Connor's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an indication of where this new law can be of help to our elderly in meeting their medical expenses:

INDUSTRIAL MEDICARE

A different solution has been suggested by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., speaking before the American Hospital Association convention in Chicago, September 18, 1962. Mr. Connor called upon all major U.S. companies to provide industrial medicare programs for retired employees. Citing the example of his own company, he said Merck has provided retired employees and their dependents with a hospital and surgical insurance program for the past 4 years. The cost is borne entirely by the company, which is now giving thought to broadening the program to make available to all retired employees a major medical insurance program comparable in scope to that available to all active employees on a voluntary, contributory basis, at a reasonable cost.

Such programs, declared Mr. Connor, offer exciting possibilities of solution of the overall problem of helping elderly persons meet medical costs, even though they are not a complete solution to the question. However, if they were adopted by all major corporations and businesses across the country, "the nature of the national problem which we face together might be totally changed."

Equally important, every unit of government which does not now provide them should also "devise adequate plans for taking care of the health needs of its own retired employees," Mr. Connor proposed. "It is a national scandal that those most in need of financial help during sickness in their declining years are often women and men who have served faithfully and well for many years on inadequate salaries as teachers, policemen, firemen, and civil servants of all kinds."

Mr. Connor noted that many Members of Congress would like to encourage industry to do more to meet the medical care needs of retired employees. He reminded his audience that the House of Representatives recently passed a bill to give business a major incentive to add medical insurance to pension plans. The proposed legislation would change the present law to allow current tax deductions for funds paid into qualified pension plans to provide postretirement medical benefits for present employess.

BURDEN DIMINISHED

"Voluntary and contributory health insurance for retired employees of most corporations and most local, State and Federal employees would not be a complete answer to the overall problem of meeting the medical costs of the elderly, but it certainly would represent such an appreciable improvement that the remainder of the problem would be more manageable," concluded Mr. Connor.

Investigative Arrests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of a letter which I have today sent off to Commissioner Walter N. Torbriner, president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

Hon. WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please accept, for yourself and your fellow commissioners, my very sincere appreciation for the courage and tact with which you handled a very delicate situation in connection with standing firmly behind your order that investigative arrests in the District of Columbia must cease.

You and your fellow Commissioners have taken the same oath as Members of the Congress to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. This you are doing in accordance with the dictates of your conscience based on the legal advice upon which you are entitled to rely.

You have acted in the best traditions of our country. Our Constitution very properly requires that the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government be independent of each other. That means that no group of Congressmen, whether acting as a committee or part of a committee, have any right to direct the members of the executive department of Government in the fulfillment of their duties. The constitutional process provides for such directives only by act of Congress, which means the due and proper enactment of a law. The fact that the Congress has been too slow in correcting defects in the criminal law as it applies in the District of Columbia is neither reason nor excuse for countenancing further violation of the constitutional rights of American citizens.

This is not a shedding of tears for criminals. This is insisting on protection of the rights of the innocent.

It is indeed strange that in enforcing the Federal criminal law outside of the District of Columbia and in enforcing the criminal law in each of the 50 States, the enforcement and prosecuting authorities are not hampered because they are prohibited from making so-called investigative arrests in the manner and to the extent that has heretofore prevailed in the District of Columbia.

Once again, my hearty congratulations go forward to you.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Member of Congress.

Runaway Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article which appeared in the March edition of Cosmopolitan magazine entitled "Runaway Americans."

The material for this article has been supplied by the first lady of the American screen, Miss Joan Crawford. Miss Crawford has performed a great public service to thousands upon thousands of American workers who have relied on the American movie industry for their livelihood and who today are being denied this opportunity because of the flight of American movie producers to other parts of the world.

It is my sincere hope that this article by Miss Crawford will stimulate some meaningful action to restore the United States to its position as movie capital of the world.

I should like to suggest, as a beginning, that American movie producers be permitted to apply the 7 percent tax credit investment incentive plan on each new movie or television production and filmed television production which they produce within the continental limits of the United States.

Congress approved this 7 percent tax credit investment incentive plan on corporate earnings last year to stimulate plant expansion and investment in American industry.

Because of the peculiar nature of the film producing industry, it would appear to me that the film producers should be permitted to treat each motion picture

as a new and separate enterprise subject to the full benefit of the 7 percent tax credit.

In Washington this week is a special delegation of labor and management representatives from Hollywood, New York and Chicago, which collectively is trying to find some way to reverse the tragic flight of American movie producers to Europe and the Far East.

It would be my hope that as a result of this fine article by Miss Joan Crawford, this delegation would be able to return to Hollywood, New York and Chicago and advise their respective colleagues that the Federal Government is aware of the severity of this problem and is indeed moving with some assistance.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Crawford's excellent article follows:

RUNAWAY AMERICANS

(By Joan Crawford)

The French have the word for it, one of the most terrible words in any language—déraciné. It means, in effect, uprooted, lost inside an alien atmosphere, caught in a lotus land of deceptive ease which withers initiative, ambition, and native pride.

I am thinking specifically of American runaways, particularly American movie producers who have found it cheaper to make films abroad, and actors who have sought an answer to taxation by moving to Switzerland.

That they have harmed themselves can be seen by the mediocrity of so many of the films they have made and the box office popularity listings. That is their own business. But they have also hurt Hollywood and that is my business. They have hurt the United States financially, and that is the business of all of us. The millions of taxable dollars that disappeared into Switzerland before the U.S. Treasury stopped the drain last year were not written off with a shrug by our tax people. The debt was spread around among those of us who remained here.

As an actress I am naturally most interested in what has happened to the careers of the runaway actors. I was looking recently at the list of the top 10 moneymaking stars in the United States and Canada. They are, in order:

Doris Day, Rock Hudson, Cary Grant, John Wayne, Elvis Presley, Elizabeth Taylor, Jerry Lewis, Frank Sinatra, Sandra Dee, and Burt Lancaster.

This is enormously revealing. Of all Hollywood's top 10 stars who have settled in Europe, only one, Elizabeth Taylor, has retained her moneymaking value, and Liz is so unique both as a star and as a phenomenon, that I doubt whether she can be categorized in any list at all. The other nine actors whom Americans like best are people whose roots are firmly here in the United States.

The most significant omission is William Holden. Bill, one of my favorite actors and favorite people, was the pacesetter of the runaways, and benefited most from the loophole in the tax laws. He led the box office list for years. Last year he was number eight. This year he is not in it at all.

WHY ARE THEY BORED?

Now movie fans are not sociologists. They will not stop liking their favorite star just because he has moved from Beverly Hills to Lausanne. Clearly it is not the fan but the star who changes. The actor loses something of himself when he moves abroad. He no longer makes the same contact with his public. The record proves it.

So does one's subjective experience. I travel constantly, both for Pepsi-Cola and for my own pleasure, and one thing I have noticed about actors and producers who live in Europe, and especially Switzerland, is that they are bored. Bored to distraction. This is not the fault of Switzerland—a most enchanting country. They are bored because there is no real reason why they should be there.

Van Johnson summed it up to a friend of mine not long ago. He lived for a time in a beautiful chalet in Switzerland. "From my window I looked onto the most gorgeous snowcapped mountain. After I had been living there a while, I noticed a strange thing. The mountain was getting closer. I looked each morning, and each morning I noticed that it was closing in on me. One morning I woke to find it in my garden. I screamed 'Aaaaargh' and fled the country."

Van's fantasy is not so farfetched as it sounds. One of the great rewards of an artist's existence is to talk to others who share his interests. But films are not made in Switzerland. Story conferences are not held in Switzerland. Most of the runaways' friends are in Hollywood or New York. Even their tailors seem to be in London or Rome. I suppose they can invite their bankers to dinner once in a while and discuss the state of the Geneva Bourse. Occasionally their local doctors. Their mayors. And then what?

A friend of mine stayed with Jack Palance in his Swiss home some time ago, and wrote, "Jack moons around the place and doesn't know what to do with himself. He is always writing stories that never get finished, or poetry, the last line of which never seems to scan."

The paradoxical result is that they are almost never there. They are in London, Paris, Rome, on the Riviera or at Torremolinos. The runaways are also runaways from their own Swiss responsibilities.

And they never seem to learn the language. "We are not expatriates," they insist. "So why should we learn the language? We are here for business reasons." They pine for contact with home. I was amused to notice how many runaways cultivate their own corn patches to satisfy a recurring native hunger for corn on the cob. In Europe such corn as is grown is inferior and is fed to pigs. The Americans import their corn seeds from the United States, but the frustrating thing is it never seems to thrive.

In Lausanne I sat in on a most morose conversation which went on for an hour, and can be summarized as follows:

"I planted Country Gentleman seed. What did you plant?"

"Golden Bantam. Five hundred square meters of it."

"How much did you get?"

"Three ears. Three lousy ears."

"How were they?"

"Inedible."

One of my favorite quotations is from Goethe. "A career must develop in public, one's talent in solitude." Switzerland is a wonderful place to develop the latter, but it works both ways.

The comparison between the progress of Hollywood stars and the stagnation of runaway stars is too profound to be dismissed as coincidence. Take the magnificent careers of Tony Curtis and Burt Lancaster, two actors who have realized from the start that Hollywood was not only their home but the mainspring of their inspiration, in good times and bad. Neither started out with any kind of reputation as an actor. Today they are considered two of the best in the world; they are getting better, and are striving to be better still. It is Hollywood that provided the challenge, that gave them momentum and ambition. Hollywood alone provided a yardstick of measurement. It is impressive to observe Curtis and Lancaster at work. They give not a damn about salaries or taxes. All they are concerned about is their own professional and artistic fulfillment.

It is inconceivable that either Tony Curtis or Burt Lancaster would have come so far if they had run away to Switzerland or Rome. Today they would be brooding in an Alpine chalet, or sipping aperitivi in a sidewalk cafe on the Via Veneto, and instead of thinking career, career, career, they would be thinking taxes, taxes, taxes.

Let me say at once I do not blame Bill Holden for providing maximum security for his family. Film business is precarious even for stars, as I know to my cost. I once spent 3 years doing no work at all when I was labeled "box office poison" by Variety, after which I made three hits in a row, including "Mildred Pierce" which won me the Academy Award. I grossed more than half a million dollars in 1 year, and taxes plus expenses left me with just over 4 percent of it.

So much for the stars. It is not the stars, however, who are hit by the runaway productions, but the people who make the pictures, the electricians, sound men, cutters, head gaffers, number one boys and number two boys, grips who push the camera, dolly workers, best boys (top property men) and boom men. Hollywood has had 40 years to acquire a huge pool of technical talent. Many of them make $30,000 in a good year, but the apparent decline of Hollywood has put them in a desperate position.

MANY HITS, MORE HORRORS

This is not to suggest that all American pictures should be made in Hollywood. I think it is important and educational for producers to work abroad when the subject demands authentic settings, and an actor has to go where work is.

Van Heflin summarized the actor's position when he returned from Europe recently and wrote, "It is pure happenstance that the films I have starred in during the past few years have all been on foreign soil. I wasn't particularly anxious to leave my home near Hollywood, and in making films abroad I sought no tax advantage. Now I'm back in Hollywood and I'm hopeful there will be more suitable scripts to keep me here."

I talked to Hugh O'Brian when he returned home from Vienna, Paris, and London after making "Come Fly With Me." The story is about stewards and stewardesses on international commercial airlines, and, as Hugh says, the wide screen demands visual authenticity. "Three Coins in the Fountain" could not have been made elsewhere than in Rome," he said, "and 'Hawaii' could hardly be made in Catalina." This is true, and I agree that such films as "Ben-Hur," "El Cid," and "The Longest Day" could only have been made in Europe.

This is not my point. The sincere producer who seeks to make a picture in the authentic locale with authentic backgrounds is not a runaway. The runaway is the man who says not "Where can I make this best?" but "Where can I make it cheapest, and how, in doing so, can I arrange my affairs so that I don't have to pay taxes to Uncle Sam?" He abandons Hollywood with its expertise, its professional movie population who depend on him for works, its unique place in American life, and elects to adopt the inferior, the shoddy, the gimcrack.

Dozens of American producers and directors and scores of American actors are working in Rome today. What has been their contribution to the industry? For every "El Cid" there are a dozen so-called "spectaculars," made by runaway producers and runaway stars, with papier-mache sets, Technicolor as raw as a bloodshot eye, dubbing that doesn't synchronize, 50 horses photographed to look like 5,000. I ask myself, would it not have been better to stay home? Did Jack Palance really run away to Rome just to make "The Mongols?" Stewart Granger to make "Swordsman of Siend?"

Goffredo Lombardo, head of the giant Titanus Film Co., of Rome, has some terrifying things to say about the condition of the Italian movie industry today. What he says,

in summary, is that the honeymoon for American runaways in Rome is over. It is no longer cheap to make films in Italy, and the supreme irony is that the costs have been driven up not by any reasons of quality, but by the very shoddiness of organization that our runaways went to Rome to exploit.

Let me explain. It is a habit in Rome for a speculative producer to approach a big star and promise him much more than he usually gets for a film. With the star's verbal promise, the producer next approaches a star director and says, "I've got Marcello" (or Vittorio, or Rossano) and again promises the director an astronomical sum. With two verbal promises—both so ephemeral that the slightest puff of wind would blow them away—the speculator approaches a distributor and says, "I've got Marcello and Federico," and asks for a minimum guarantee of distribution, meaning an advance on the picture's future earnings, if any.

And so on, the producer raising cash as he goes along—the end result is hideously expensive and usually a financial disaster. In order to stave off the bailiffs, the producer is obliged to start the process all over again, in the same hit-or-miss way, a vicious spiral that is exhausting and debilitating the Italian film industry. According to Lombardo, these fly-by-night producers have forced up the cost of moviemaking by 30 percent to 50 percent in the past 2 years.

CHAOS—THE ORDER OF THE DAY

My purpose is not to criticize the Italian motion picture industry. Far from it, I think it is marvelous—for Italians. Italians are making better pictures in Rome today than we are making in Hollywood. In Hollywood we wish we had the talent and flair of Italian producers and directors, and I, myself, hope to make a film for Carlo Ponti soon. The Italian talent is the result of long and arduous training in a chaotic milieu. It is a chaos they understand. They were born to it. Chaos is their school. Men like Fellini, Ponti, De Sica, Antonioni, Visconti, can take one look at the crazy jumble of jigsaw pieces laid out in front of them and see the final picture. That picture is usually a masterpiece.

The Americans cannot. Their training is from smooth-running Hollywood, just as the Italian training is chaotic Rome. The Americans cannot learn the Italian system in one picture, or two, or even three. They lose themselves in the chaos. Take the example of the man who rented autos to take stars of "Cleopatra" to the studio. He started with two limousines, owning one, paying for the other. But Cleopatra being Cleopatra, he soon made so much money that he now has 200 limousines and is one of the wealthiest transportation men in Rome.

His Roman resource was endless. He pulled a trick which would never have fooled an Italian producer, but succeeded in gulling the Americans. He set up a subsidiary company, then passed a rumor that he was a crook. The production man fired him, and cast around for another transportation company. But the only other company big enough was the subsidiary company. There was no alternative but to hire it, for even more money. In Hollywood, I should add, most stars drive to the studio in their own cars.

If the American cannot learn the Italian secret of creating order out of chaos, he can learn gimmicks, ways to raise not quite enough lire, the garbage of semihonest financing. He can speculate with speculators, fly as high by night as the highflying Italian. Once he has learned the gimmicks he is finished for Hollywood. He returns to Hollywood a lesser man, with diminished prestige and ambiguous memories, rarely pines to go back to Italy, except for a holiday.

It would be agreeable to report that the runaway producers are learning their lesson, but, at the time of writing, the opposite is true. Now that Italy has become expensive, and Spain is becoming more expensive, they are turning to Yugoslavia. What, in heaven's name, possesses them? Let us look at it in this way; in Hollywood there are 15 cameramen recognized for their ability to photograph women. In Rome there are two. In Hollywood there are 25 directors who know how to direct women. In Rome there are two, Fellini and De Sica. In Yugoslavia there is nothing. Of anything.

Now Hollywood may not be making such good films as the Italians are, but it is doing a lot better than its critics give it credit for. Fine pictures are still being made by Alfred Hitchcock, Billy Wilder, Elia Kazan, and Robert Aldrich.

There is a comforting professionalism about Hollywood which exists nowhere else. As Tony Curtis said to me recently, "Only Hollywood gives the star the pleasure of having the best people all around one. It is so beautifully organized." The only film I ever made abroad was "The Story of Esther Costello." (English producers) with Rossano Brazzi. That picture could have been shot in Hollywood in 2 months. In England it took 6 months, mostly due, it is true, to strikes (Hollywood has those, too). But many of the technicians in England had to get up at three in the morning to be at the studio at 5:30 or 6 a.m. Hollywood, on the other hand, has everything on the front doorstep. At Warners, most of the technicians live some two blocks away, at MGM perhaps six blocks away.

"What Ever Happened to Baby Jane?" was made in 31 days. It contained very complicated sound work. Intense silences were broken by sudden, piercing screams. Our sound man and boom man were brilliant. They were so geared to every split-second nuance that they never once had to retake. This professionalism does not exist anywhere else.

WHERE ARE THEIR ROOTS

Throughout this article I have emphasized the importance of roots. I have concentrated on film people because it is with them that I am most familiar. But the principle extends to other walks of life, and other nations, too. I find American expatriate society in London, Paris, and Rome charming but aimless, without drive, and with rather low morale. Billy Wilder's "One, Two, Three" indicated the basic unhappiness of the American business executive who has leaped at a chance to live abroad, save on taxes, and acquire cheap domestic labor, and in doing so has lost his national identity. This is even more true of runaway film people.

I have read that the great migration of American writers to Paris in the 1920's was followed by the equally great migration back. It must have been fun sitting all night in the Rotonde and the Dôme, with only a few sous in their pockets, talking art and literature, or founding highbrow magazines all in lowercase type. But ultimately there comes the question, what price are we paying for this freedom which involves no responsibility?

A character in Henry Miller's "Tropic of Cancer," living in Bohemian squalor in a Paris garret, says, "In America you wouldn't dream of living in a joint like this. Here it seems natural—it's like the books you read. If I ever go back I'll forget all about this life, just like you forget a bad dream."

This is not solely an American problem. It is a universal moral dilemma. Take the fortunes of Sophia Loren and Gina Lollobrigida in Italy. Gina was a star before Sophia had ever been heard of. Today Sophia is a bigger star than Gina. What happened in the meantime? Sophia is a woman so tied to her native Italy that she even risked going to prison because of her delicate marriage to Carlo Ponti. She could have escaped to Hollywood or Paris or Switzerland, and spared herself the endless embarrassment of appearing in court and being insulted by paparazzi, human piranhas who call themselves photographers and whose sole purpose in life seems to be to humiliate celebrities. But Sophia stays stubbornly put in Rome. Gina Lollobrigida quit Rome for Canada. Insofar as I could follow the case, it seemed to be little more than a fit of pique against the Italian Government. I consider it no coincidence that Sophia's career has recently prospered more than has Gina's.

Take the Hollywood English. It is significant that the Britishers who made the greatest success in Hollywood were either those who kept the Union Jack flying and their roots solidly in England, like C. Aubrey Smith and Ronald Colman, or else became 100-percent Americans, like Cary Grant and Ray Milland, who is Welsh. I have often wondered whether fine actors like Stewart Granger, James Mason, and Michael Wilding would not have been bigger successes if they had made themselves more clearly identifiable as either Americans or Englishmen. Too often they seemed to be neither. Actors like Richard Burton, James Mason, Stewart Granger did not seem to care very much for their native countries. But they did not seem to like Hollywood any better. It was all very perplexing to those who had found no occasion to question their own roots.

PARASITIC RELATIONSHIPS

The moral of the runaway story is this: one can guard one's roots or one can transplant, but one cannot live without roots at all, which is what the runaways are trying to do. They dare not tie themselves anywhere because they never know when they might have to fly even further; today Italy, tomorrow Yugoslavia, next week? They are seeking to live off a foreign country while having no part of it. They will accept the country's currency, but they won't learn its language. They plan big deals which do not enrich the country of their adoption, and actively help to impoverish the industry at home.

They read only the Paris edition of the New York Times or Herald Tribune, never the Journal de Genève or the Corriere della Sera. They can quote the New York stock market and they know the standing of the Los Angeles Dodgers, but they would be at a loss to name the Prime Minister of Italy. This same bleak philosophy they pass on to their children, whom they send to the American schools which dot Europe. Some of these schools are good, but many are dreadful, and some really scandalous. Almost any deadbeat American, with or without degree, after scraping the bottom of the European barrel, can get a job as teacher in one or another of them. Thus the child learns nothing about the country in which he is living, nor its language, and gains only a remote, debased impression of his own America served up to him by a runaway teacher on the skids.

A GAME OF TV DOLLARS

They always come home sooner or later, because, being rootless, they have withered. No sap from the land of their adoption has penetrated into them.

It is, however, an ill wind. I hope Hollywood is not taking advantage of this article to pat itself too enthusiastically on the back. I discussed the subject recently with Tony Curtis and we agreed—heatedly, if one can agree heatedly—that Hollywood had been in need of a sharp lesson. The Hollywood of 10 years ago was just too complacent for words. Technicians were cutting off their noses in their astronomical wage demands.

The producers got fat. Everybody got fat. Airily they sold good films to TV, doing themselves an almost unimaginable disservice. Inefficiency has ruined many American industries. It was not inefficiency that ruined Hollywood. It was something much more macabre, something without precedent. It was a game of Russian roulette in which the prize was television dollars. The trouble was that Hollywood was playing the game with itself. It was committing coldblooded, deliberate suicide.

The major studios, then controlling everything, saw suddenly what they had done and fled to Europe, Asia, Africa, anywhere to escape from the timebomb which they had so imprudently tied to their own shoelaces.

I believe the turning point has been reached. The recent tax legislation that has stopped the appeal of Switzerland for runaway stars will also affect the producers sooner or later. It will be good for everybody when they come back—just so long as Hollywood does not draw the wrong conclusion, that it was right all along, and resume its bad old ways. Somehow I don't think it will. The shock has been too severe.

Nothing Wrong With the Country if the President Will Leave It Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, to listen to President Kennedy and his confused economic advisers, one would think America has had it. Since the day of his inauguration the President has found it difficult to find one good word to say about his country. This America, of which most of the 188 million citizens are proud, this great land of ours which has a higher standard of living than any country in the world, with greater opportunities for men of all races and creeds, this United States of America which has given its young men, its resources, and billions of its dollars to the cause of humanity and freedom, this Nation, your land and mine, seems to be a source of constant irritation to the President and his official as well as his immediate family. Every speech coming out of the White House downgrades the United States. The President, his brother, and all the administration spokesmen constantly talk of millions of hungry Americans, millions of people going without an education, a whole race driven to crime and immorality because they are oppressed. Certainly, we have problems in the United States. There is unemployment, there are those who are unfortunate and need help, some individuals in minority groups are suffering discrimination and we, as a people, are aware of these problems and, thank God, we are doing something about them.

Just once I would like to have our President say something good about America. I would like to have him point with pride to some of the progress we have made under a system of free society in creating better opportunities for more people than any other nation on earth, that people are not starving in America, that members of minority groups in this country have made tremendous progress. If he has ever made a complimentary remark about our system and our progress, you may be sure he has followed it with a contradictory request for more Federal power or the substitution of Federal control for free enterprise. What an inspiration it would be for all our people if the President would indicate that he shares some of the pride of all our citizens in the greatness of this Nation.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with America that we cannot cure, if our freedoms are not curtailed and if our private enterprise system is not shackled with foreign ideologies which have never worked. If the President and his social planners will leave the country alone and return the role of the Federal Government to the bounds set for it by the Constitution, we can solve the problem of unemployment, there will be greater opportunities for all our people, our economy will move ahead.

As a part of these remarks I would like to include the editorial "What's Wrong With the Country," from the March 13, 1963, edition of the Washington Daily News:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE COUNTRY?

You look over the list of domestic economic troubles as noted by President Kennedy at his press conferences. There isn't one that a healthy tax cut wouldn't cure or at least help substantially.

And the only way to get a meaningful tax reduction is to legislate a healthy cut in Federal spending.

The basic problem is as simple as that, though the solution is difficult in the present political atmosphere.

Relief from the extortionate load of Government spending would generate energy from top to bottom. It would give people something to work for.

To hear the talk as to lack of opportunity for youth you would think there were just so many jobs until the Government passed a law to create some more. You wonder how youngsters ever got a job in the past. This same frightened scramble to divide up poverty held back recovery from the great depression and now dominates discussion of automation.

Jobs generate jobs. Wages and profits create the demand for goods, which puts more and more people to work—unless the chain is broken by bungling Government intervention or expropriation of the fruits of industry.

Talk about our crop of war babies growing up and needing jobs. They are relatively few in numbers compared to the millions of refugees from communism who streamed into demoralized West Gernmany after the war. Work was found for all of them and West Germany actually has a labor shortage. Automation did it—along with sane, old-fashioned fiscal policies which balanced budgets, made the mark one of the soundest currencies in history and produced the feeling of confidence in the future which comes with a rising living standard.

On the other extreme are such countries as Argentina. There is a land potentially as rich as ours—demoralized by massive governmental bungling and an inflated currency.

Argentina's trouble is our trouble, though we are not nearly so far gone and had more fat in the form of capital to eat up.

The complacent tendency in Washington to cut taxes while letting the spending run simply is a plan to eat up some more of the capital which makes jobs. By inciting more inflation it will nullify any tax cut. By breeding fear of an unsound currency it will discourage enterprise and we will have more unemployment, not less.

The prosperity of Western Europe dates from the time when it scorned the advice of our frightened liberals, hardened its currencies and started paying the bills with cash. We now owe them money in form of balance of payments. Our Government now is buying these currencies in great quantities to protect the once almighty dollar.

More vocal politicians and economists in the United States are in the grip of an economic obsession that we can borrow ourselves rich. This brand of mass insanity has run its course in Europe but still afflicts a great deal of the world including the underdeveloped countries, all of which somehow managed to eat for centuries without our help, or maybe in spite of it.

None of these new nations has a chance until it discovers that only work creates wealth and that capital accumulation must be protected if their people are to have the tools which make work productive.

Under present policies, they are frightening away capital faster than it can be poured down the ratholes thus created, through foreign aid from the U.S. Treasury.

We see two main sources of hope. One is the amazing resiliency of the U.S. economy which has survived and even progressed during a generation which has expropriated half its profits and sterilized them in wasteful Government schemes. The other is mounting impatience with the whole red-ink business, out through the country.

When the people finally sense what has been happening to them and vote their indignation, the politicians will sober up and find a way. If the country—and particularly the unemployed—are to be spared deepening troubles, that had better be soon.

Jefferson County Citizenship Tour Represents Best in American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, if from time to time we become a little stale in our attitudes and perspectives, we have only to look at the situations which face us through the eyes of the young. I have just had such an opportunity due to the visit of a splendid group of young citizens from my home county, Jefferson County, Ala., who were here at the Capitol today—March 14, 1963. This group, comprising one outstanding junior from each high school in our county, is the Jefferson County Citizenship Tour, and this marks the 17th annual visit of the tour to our Nation's Capital and to other historical points on the eastern seaboard.

The Jefferson County Citizenship Tour has over the years been organized and directed by Mrs. Alyce Walker, the very efficient and competent associate editor of the Birmingham News.

These young men and women, selected on the basis of their scholastic achievements, their interest in current affairs, and their consistent good character, trace, on their tour, the early history of our great nation. One of their first stops

is at Williamsburg, Va., a famous seat of colonial government in America, and vital source of the spirit of independence which was subsequently proclaimed for our people. The group then went to Philadelphia to view the spot where our Declaration of Independence was adopted and where the Liberty Bell rang out, its clarion call reaching into the souls of men all over the world to kindle everywhere the urge for freedom and representative government. Next, the citizenship tour proceeded to New York, where George Washington took the oath of office as first President of the United States 174 years ago next month. While there, the group visited the United Nations, first lasting organization to be established for the promotion and maintenance of world peace.

This week, the group came to Washington to spend most of their time and it is well and good that they should do so. It is here that representative government was nurtured and made meaningful so that, today, Washington, D.C., capital of the United States, is also the capital of the free world.

These young men and women from Jefferson County, Ala., are truly going to be leaders of the next generation. The respect in which they hold our American heritage and the enthusiasm they show for our representative system of democracy has demonstrated to me that the next generation is well preparing itself to take over the reins of the chariot of freedom and democracy which is making its way across the world and the ages.

I am pleased to report that one of the big thrills for each of these boys and girls was an opportunity to preside momentarily over the House of Representatives, though the House was not in session, by sitting in the Speaker's chair. As is customary, they each made a wish at this point and I know that their wishes, one and all, related to their keen desire to see the American brand of democracy and freedom expand and flourish. Another great treat for the group was to have lunch with the Alabama Congressional Delegation and to meet and hear those who are their Representatives here in Congress.

I wanted to record the visit of this outstanding group by giving the House an account of their short stay with us. I insert herewith the names of these splendid young citizens, of whom I am so proud, as well as the names of their parents, and the schools they represent:

Mr. Tommy Brock, son of Mr. and Mrs. John E. Brock, 118 Meadow Lane, Trussville, Ala., Hewitt-Trussville High School.

Mr. Herbert Kyle Hedrick, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. H. K. Hedrick, 1804 Dartmouth Avenue, Bessemer, Ala., Bessemer High School.

Mr. Frank Y. Johnson, son of Mrs. A. Reddus Johnson, 452 Tupelo Way, Birmingham, Ala., John Carroll High School.

Mr. Dwight Lee, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lee, Route 1, Box 130, Gardendale, Ala., Mortimer Jordan High School.

Mr. Coleman Lollar, son of Mr. and Mrs. Brownie Lollar, Route 2, Quinton, Ala., West Jefferson High School.

Mr. Charles Michael Stanberry, son of Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Stanberry, 113 Stratford Road, Birmingham, Ala., Shades Valley High School.

Mr. Joe Wright, son of Mr. Joe Wright, Route 1, Adger, Ala., Oak Grove High School.

Mr. Wade Lehmon Roberts, son of Mrs. H. H. Roberts, 49 Graymont Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Glenn High School.

Mr. Charles Henry, son of Mr. William E. Henry, 1105 Linthicum Street, Tarrant, Ala., Tarrant High School.

Mr. Dennis Oran Freeman, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Hershall Freeman, 3014 Pearson Avenue SW., Birmingham, Ala., West End High School.

Mr. Wayne McIntyre, son of Mrs. C. P. Sticher, Grove Hill, Ala., McNeel School.

Mr. Leland Douglas Maddox, son of Mr. J. D. Maddox, Route 3, Box 59, Bessemer, Ala., McAdory High School.

Miss Anna Lu Nichols, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Chris Nichols, 8104 First Avenue, South, Birmingham, Ala., Banks High School.

Miss Joyce Moseley, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. W. Moseley, 3304 Avenue S, Ensley, Ala., Ensley High School.

Miss Tiajuana Virginia Lazenby, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Lazenby, 2800 Wesley Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Jones Valley High School.

Miss Lynn Oaks, daughter of Mrs. Walter H. Oaks, 1001 Heflin Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Phillips High School.

Miss Jenny Larkin, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. N. C. Larkin, 1209 Concord Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Ramsay High School.

Miss Patricia Alford, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. A. W. Alford, 8205 10th Avenue, South, Birmingham, Ala., Woodlawn High School.

Miss Karen Monroe, daughter of Mrs. Angie Monroe, 1300 35th Street, West, Birmingham, Ala., Fairfield High School.

Miss Linda Pettey, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Pettey, Jr., Lakewood Estates, Bessemer, Ala., Brooke Hill School.

Miss Cheryl McCord, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. L. B. McCord, 1005 Southridge Drive, Birmingham, Ala., Misses Howard School.

Miss Ann McCarn, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. D. W. McCarn, Warrior, Ala., Warrior High School.

Miss Pam Sparks, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Sparks, Warrior, Ala., Warrior High School.

Miss Carol Griffis, daughter of Mr. George Griffis, Route 15, Box 216, Birmingham, Ala., Minor High School.

Miss Sylvia Ann Lindsay, daughter of Mr. John W. Lindsay, Route 1, Box 71, Graysville, Ala., Corner High School.

Miss Cherry Louise Skinner, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph W. Skinner, 142 Kenilworth Road, Bessemer, Ala., Hueytown High School.

Miss Diane McKinnon, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. R. McKinnon, 433 North 29th Street, Leeds, Ala., Leeds High School.

Thoughts on Tax Revision and Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the House Ways and Means Committee has received two brief and forceful statements from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. on two important parts of the current tax revision and reform proposal. Both of these were statements by Alexander Stott, vice president and comptroller of A.T. & T. and they deal with the subjects of the proposed repeal of the $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit for dividends and the repeal of the tax advantages now accorded restricted stock options. I believe these statements deserve the attention of all who are interested in the subject of tax reform and for this reason I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They follow:

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER L. STOTT, VICE PRESIDENT AND COMPTROLLER OF AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This statement is made on behalf of the Bell System companies to give our views on the proposal for repeal of the $50 dividend income exclusion and the 4 percent dividend tax credit.

The proposed repeal of the dividend exclusion and credit would probably fall with greater impact on the Bell System than on any other large corporate enterprise. This is because of our continuing need for large amounts of new capital to finance the construction of communications facilities throughout the country, and because we must rely upon purchases of stock by large numbers of small investors to raise this needed capital.

What has already happened since World War II will illustrate the magnitude of our problem. During this period the Bell System has had to raise about $16.5 billion in new capital from investors. Of this amount more than $9.5 billion has been equity capital, obtained through the issuance of some 183 million additional shares of A.T. & T. stock. In this period the Bell System raised over 20 percent of all the new equity capital obtained by all corporations in the United States from the sale of securities to investors. We have no doubt that the dividend exclusion and dividend credit provisions in the law have been important factors in making it possible for us to accomplish this result. We are certain that elimination from the law of these benefits to stockholders would impair our ability to raise needed capital in the future.

The President's proposal to repeal the $50 dividend exclusion and the 4 percent dividend credit is based on the following arguments:

First, the dividend credit and exclusion have failed to encourage equity investment;

Second, the credit and exclusion have not provided a satisfactory partial offset to double taxation of dividend income;

Third, the dividend credit and exclusion are discriminatory and inequitable and provide more relief to high income recipients of dividends than to individuals with low incomes; and

Fourth, the proposed 5-point corporate tax rate reduction will provide equitable relief from double taxation of dividend income.

I will take up these arguments in order:

The argument that equity investment has not been encouraged is at variance with our experience.

As to the argument that the dividend credit and exclusion have failed to encourage equity investment, our experience and study would strongly indicate otherwise.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the parent company of the Bell System, is now owned by more than 2.2 million share owners, who have an investment in our business at current market prices of some $30 billion. Of these owners almost 1.2 million, or over 54 percent, have become owners in the 9 years since the passage of the dividend provisions in 1954. Thus we added more owners during this 9-year period than in the prior 66 years of our corporate existence.

The increased interest of investors in our stock since 1954 is not due solely to the dividend exclusion and dividend credit provisions. However, we are confident that these provisions have contributed substantially toward making it possible for us to raise the capital we have needed. Consider the importance of the $50 exclusion in this regard. At the present time 43 percent of the A.T. & T. share owners' accounts receive less than $100 in dividends per year. Moreover, we know from our studies that perhaps 30 percent of the holders of our shares own no stock in other companies, and among the small holders the proportion must be much larger. Further, about one-third of our individual accounts are in joint tenacy (and thus entitled to an exclusion of $100). For a large portion of our holders, therefore, the $50 exclusion (or the $100 exclusion in the case of joint tenants) eliminates, or largely eliminates, any tax with respect to their dividends. This cannot fail to be a tremendous inducement for the persons of moderate means to acquire shares of our stock.

There is much to indicate that the experience of our company has not been unique. Since 1954, the amount of capital, both debt and equity, provided by investors to corporate enterprises generally has increased substantially. Government data in exhibit A compare the average annual amount of external equity and debt financing by all corporations in the past 9 years with similar averages in the 8 years prior to 1954. It is significant that equity financing after the enactment of the dividend provisions increased 68 percent over the earlier period, whereas debt financing increased only 46 percent. These amounts represent new investment capital actually supplied by investors to business for the expansion of plant and equipment. They do not include market purchases by investors of previously issued securities.

This growth in investment capital has been accompanied by a large increase in the number of share owners. In 1954 only 7 million individuals owned shares in American corporations; today around 17 million own shares, or an increase of some 150 percent in only 9 years. The chart attached as exhibit B shows the stock ownership growth of our company and also of the three companies with the next largest share owner lists. An upward surge is evident in all four instances.

There is reason to believe that this growth of stockholders in American corporations generally has in large part been due to purchases of stock by persons in the middle and lower income brackets. A 1960 survey of stock ownership among American families made by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center shows that 58 percent of the value of all publicly traded stocks in individual hands is owned by families with less than $15,000 annual income; 36 percent is owned by families with less than $10,000 annual income; and 10 percent is owned by families with less than $5,000 annual income. A survey made by the New York Stock Exchange in 1962 showed the median income of share owners to be $8,600.

A study made by the A.T. & T. share owners' list as of September 30, 1961, handled by the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, shows that 55 percent of our share owners have family incomes of under $10,000, and that the median family income is $9,000.

Our conclusion from the foregoing summary is that the dividend credit and exclusion have in fact encouraged equity investment.

The argument that the dividend credit and exclusion have not provided a satisfactory partial offset to double taxation of dividend income.

As to the argument that the dividend credit and exclusion provisions fail to provide a satisfactory partial offset to the double taxation of dividend income, it was recognized in 1954 that the legislation was only a partial step toward the elimination of double taxation of dividend income, and that other steps would have to be taken to provide a full remedy. As a matter of fact many other nations, including England and Canada, go much further than we do in allowing credit, for taxes paid at the corporate level, against individual income tax on dividend income. The fact that only partial relief has thus far been afforded in this country does not seem to us an argument for eliminating any relief at all.

The argument that the dividend credit and exclusion are discriminatory and inequitable.

The third basic argument advanced in support of the President's proposal is that the dividend credit and exclusion are discriminatory and inequitable and provide more relief to high income dividend recipients than to individuals with low income.

These provisions of the law were drafted to give a greater percentage relief from double taxation to those in the lower tax brackets than to those in higher tax brackets.

With reference to these provisions, Marion B. Folson, Under Secretary of the Treasury, in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in 1954, made this statement: "The percentage reduction of tax under the combined dividend exclusion and credit is greatest in the lowest tax rate and declines progressively as the income level rises."

The facts appear to us clearly to confirm this. It is easy to see this with respect to the $50 dividend exclusion. As I have observed, the tax with respect to the dividends received by a large portion of our smaller holders is entirely eliminated.

The 4 percent dividend credit favors the low income individual by removing a larger proportion of the income tax he must pay on dividends. The income tax on $100 of dividends for a person in the 20 percent tax bracket would be $20, and for a person in the 91 percent bracket it would be $91. But for both of these individuals the dividend credit would be the same $4. The relief for the lowest bracket man is thus 20 percent ($4 divided by $20) while it is only 4.4 percent for the man in the highest tax bracket ($4 divided by $91). Exhibit C shows that the percent relief from the additional individual income tax on dividends resulting from the dividend credit declines steadily from the lowest to the highest income tax bracket.

As to the argument that the proposed 5 point corporate rate reduction will provide equitable relief.

As to the argument that the 5 point reduction in the corporate tax rate will provide equitable relief from the double taxation of dividend income, it is true that any reduction in the corporate rate will help the situation. However, as exhibit D shows, the combined tax burden on corporate income would remain heavy even with the proposed tax rates, and the 4 percent dividend credit and $50 dividend exclusion would still be a desirable way of providing relief from double taxation of dividend income particularly, as has been shown, to those in the lower tax brackets.

More, not less, should be done to encourage investment of capital in industry.

As we in the Bell System look ahead we see the need to raise very large amounts of new equity capital over the coming years. To do our job will require tremendous expansion of facilities, costing many billions of dollars.

The same is true of industry generally. There is general agreement that more should be done to encourage corporate business to increase its spending for plant and equipment. More investment capital is needed and we have come to realize that investment capital in the United States is not an unlimited reservoir that can be tapped at will. Moreover, the supply of investment capital made available to industry is dependent in no small part on what investors think of the outlook. If investors have confidence that they will receive fair treatment, they will have an incentive to commit their capital—otherwise they will not.

If the Nation is to achieve the economic growth expected of it, and at a rate that is needed, business generally must expand much more rapidly than at present. This means that a large share of available savings must flow into our business enterprises in the future years. Under these circumstances it is imperative that existing incentives for equity investment not be eliminated. Indeed, it would seem to be in the national interest to offer greater incentives for investors to place their savings in free enterprise if our national goals are to be achieved.

Obviously, it is extremely important to avoid any step that would inhibit the creation of the new capital required for the expansion of our economy. A return to full double taxation of corporate dividends should be rejected.

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER L. STOTT, VICE PRESIDENT AND COMPTROLLER OF AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This statement is made on behalf of the Bell System companies to give our views on that part of President Kennedy's current tax program which would repeal the provisions of section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code. These provisions accord special tax treatment to so-called restricted stock options.

My purpose in appearing before you is to urge that, if the tax laws are to be revised in this area, recognition should be given to the difference between executive incentive stock options and the capital raising type of employee stock purchase plan such as is used by the Bell System and many other companies.

Although the Bell System has not been unique in using the capital raising type of employee stock plan, I should like to give you our experience as the background or frame of reference for our suggestions. Unlike the executive compensation type of options referred to by the President, the purpose served by our type of plan is to raise equity capital for the expansion of the business.

IMPORTANCE OF A.T. & T. STOCK PURCHASE PLAN

The Bell System started using the capital raising type of employee stock purchase plan in the period of expansion following World War I. In the 1920's sales of stock to employees raised more than 13 percent of the Bell System's equity capital.

Since World War II the Bell System has had to undertake tremendous construction programs to meet the unprecedented demand for telephone service. Telephones in service have increased from 22 million at the end

of World War II to 66 million at the present time, requiring expenditures of about $30 billion for the construction of new telephone facilities. During this period the Bell System has experienced an average annual growth rate of 7½ percent, as contrasted to an average annual growth rate of 3 percent for the economy as a whole. To do this job the Bell System companies have had to raise from investors about $16.5 billion of new capital of which more than $9.5 billion was equity capital raised through the sale of 183 million shares of new A.T. & T. stock. Over $2 billion of this new equity capital has been raised through the sales of stock to employees in the postwar years under employee stock plans.

PRINCIPAL TERMS OF A.T. & T. PLAN

Under our present employees' stock plan the formula for determining the purchase price has been approved by stockholders along with other terms. The price per share is 85 percent of the market price on the last business day of the purchase period, but not more than 85 percent of market at the time of offering (or less than the par value of the shares). This formula involves an underpricing below market sufficient to make the offerings successful, and the underpricing is also reasonably related to that used in offers to stockholders.

The reasonableness of this pricing formula is amply demonstrated by the table, attached as exhibit A, which shows the underpricing used in major electric utility stock offerings to the public.

Offerings are made to all regular employees of the company and its subsidiaries, and about 725,000 employees are presently eligible to participate. The number of shares which an employee can purchase is proportionate to his rate of pay, with a maximum of 300 shares under any one offer. Shares are paid for in regular installments over a 2-year period, with no right of prepayment. However, an employee may cancel his election to purchase and receive the cash accumulated or apply this cash toward the purchase of shares.

BROAD EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN PLAN

About 349,000 employees, or about half of the total employee body, are now purchasing 6,740,000 shares, or an average of 19 shares per employee. Participation extends to all employees regardless of pay or their level in the organization. Currently about $350 million a year of new money is being obtained by this means. We have estimated that sales under the plan in the years directly ahead could produce in the neighborhood of one-third of the new money requirements from external sources.

PLAN DOES NOT PROVIDE COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES

Our plan and similar capital-raising plans have, we believe, had inequitable tax treatment in the postwar years. Tax difficulties have centered on the question of whether the differential between the purchase price of the stock and the market value at time of purchase is compensation to the employee. We are clear it is not compensation. Rather, we see it as a necessary underpricing to induce sufficient participation in the plan and completion of installment payments.

Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, our certified public accountants, agree that our plan involves no element of compensation. Also, the Federal Communications Commission has ruled there is no compensation to be recorded in the accounts of the companies.

Prior to World War II the Internal Revenue Service had viewed the price differential in a plan like ours much as we do. In 1945, however, the U.S. Supreme Court held in the Smith case, which involved a stock option granted to an executive admittedly as compensation, that the differential between the amount paid for the stock and its market value at the time the stock was acquired was additional compensation subject to tax. Subsequently, using this decision as a basis, the Treasury Department ruled in effect that in all cases where the price paid by an employee for stock issued to him by his employer was less than fair market value at the time of purchase, the full differential was to be considered income taxable as compensation. Since compensation was held to be involved under this rule, the employing company was entitled to claim the amount of the differential as a deduction for income tax purposes.

We were concerned about the impact of the Smith case rule on our plan and in 1949, after several years of discussions, we offered to enter into a closing agreement with the Service. Under this agreement we would have given up our right to a corporate tax deduction in the amount of the differential between market price and purchase price, if such differential were not taxed as compensation to the employees. The Service did not accept the offer and later in 1949 it ruled that the entire differential under our plan was taxable to employees at the time of purchase.

EFFECT OF 1950 LEGISLATION ON OUR PLAN

In 1950 Congress enacted the predecessor to the present stock option provisions of the tax law, and authorized restricted stock options. This legislation was designed to exempt from the Treasury Department ruling the incentive type of executive compensation stock option which met certain conditions.

The requirement as to price in the restricted stock option legislation enacted in 1950 were such that the purchase price formula of our plan qualified it for restricted stock option treatment. The option aspect is not of great importance in our plan because shares must be paid for in installments over a relatively short period. The essential benefit under the present law is that the tax on the differential is not payable until the shares are disposed of. However, upon the disposition of shares the differential is taxed as compensation just as if our plan were an executive compensation option rather than an installment sale on reasonable terms. If disposition does not occur within 6 months of the time the shares are issued, the company is not entitled to corporate tax deductions with respect to the differential.

EFFECT ON OUR PLAN OF PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

President Kennedy's tax recommendation would restore in all situations the rule in effect directly after the Smith case, which rule is now applied to offerings not qualifying as restricted stock options. A tax would be imposed at ordinary income tax rates upon the amount of the price differential at the time the shares are issued to the employee whether the shares were sold or not. The companies would be entitled to deduct the total of such price differentials and thus reduce taxes at the higher corporate rate. As the chart attached as exhibit B shows, more than 80 percent of the shares are purchased by employees in the 20 percent to 22 percent tax brackets. The result in the case of a plan like ours would be twofold: first, it would impose a hardship on employees by creating a tax liability at the time the shares are issued, based on a theoretical, unrealized element of compensation; and, second, it would result in a large revenue loss to the Government. On the latter point, we estimate that if our plan had been treated on this basis since 1950, and if we had been able to sell the same number of shares, our Federal income tax liability would have been reduced by around $400 million; whereas the amounts of tax paid or ultimately payable by employees would not have been substantially affected.

LAW SHOULD RECOGNIZE DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER OF CAPITAL-RAISING PLANS

In the event that new legislation should be considered, we urge that such legislation recognize the distinctive character and important function of capital-raising plans such as that of A.T. & T. Such legislation should recognize that a sale of stock on an installment basis to employees generally, on nondiscriminatory terms, for the purpose of raising needed capital, does not involve compensation as long as there is only a modest underpricing to assure the success of the offer. Such a provision would permit, without tax penalties, the reasonable underpricing required to induce sufficient participation to assure a successful offer. Since no compensation would be involved, the employing company would not be permitted a tax reduction for the amount of the underpricing.

It is of importance that numerous other large companies have capital-raising plans. I do not have the figures for all industry. However, we recently made a survey covering the period 1957–61 which showed that some 33 other major companies had used or were then using this type of plan, with the shares offered having a market value of close to $500 million. A summary of these other plans is attached as exhibit C.

The importance of employee stock purchase plans to the Nation's economy cannot be minimized. We will, if you so desire, suggest language that might be incorporated in the law to recognize the distinctive character of the capital-raising type of plan and to accord it equitable tax treatment. What we suggest would not reduce Government revenues derived from these plans, but should increase them over what they would be if the President's recommendation were adopted.

House of Morgan Spreading Tentacles Into Western Germany Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a most alarming report has come to my attention. According to the American Banker, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. is completing negotiations to acquire an almost 50-percent interest in a major West German mail-order department store chain—Neckermann Versand KG, reportedly the German Republic's largest mail-order concern.

This is only one of three deals of this type carrying Morgan Guaranty into nonbanking fields in West Germany. It is reported that about a month ago Morgan acquired an interest in Quellen-Lehnig, West Germany's largest distributor of mineral water and other beverages.

Also, about a year earlier Morgan Guaranty is reported to have purchased a share interest in Henschel-Werke Kassel, West German machinery manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, we have long established the basic principle in this country that banking and trade and commerce should be held separate. Banks have enormous

powers—most important of which is the power to create money. They should not be permitted to have direct or indirect interests in trade and commerce lest they indulge in favoritism and reciprocity in their lending operations.

It is bad for banking to spread into trade and commerce in this country—it is even worse to see it doing the same thing in foreign lands.

I insert the article on the negotiations by Morgan Guaranty which appeared in the American Banker of February 19, 1963:

GERMAN FIRM SOUGHT BY MORGAN GUARANTY

(By Michael Benson)

NEW YORK.—Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. is near completion of negotiations to acquire a substantial interest in a major West German mail-order and department store chain, it has been learned.

The negotiations involve almost 50 percent of the shares of Neckermann Versand KG, reportedly the Germany Republic's largest mail-order concern.

Participating with Morgan in the negotiations are said to be two investment firms: Jesup & Lamont and Burnham International, the foreign arm of Burnham & Co.

The New York bank's negotiations are being conducted through Morgan & Cie, S.A., the Paris investment company in which Morgan Guaranty holds a 70-percent interest. The New York bank recently reopened the Paris investment banking firm. Its interest is held through an Edge Act corporation, Morgan Guaranty International Finance Corp.

The two investment firms yesterday declined to comment on the negotiations. However, a spokesman for Morgan Guaranty confirmed that negotiations were in progress between Morgan & Cie and the German firm.

Reliable sources say that the group is seeking to purchase total shares valued at 41 million deutsche marks. The cost is estimated at $23 million. The total capital of the German mail-order house, after an increase in shares, will amount to 85 million deutsche marks.

If the negotiations are successfully completed—and all indications point to the fact they will be—Morgan and the two investment companies are expected to place the issue privately among investors abroad. Some shares, though, may be held for their own accounts.

Neckermann Versand is little more than a dozen years old. Its sales have mounted steadily and now total better than $200 million annually. It is a limited partnership, headed by Josef Neckermann. Other principals in the company include Annemarie Neckermann and Alwin Burkel.

Figuring importantly in the negotiations are Investiha, a Frankfurt investment company connected with Berliner Handels-Gesellschaft and Friederick Flick, a prominent German financier. Both have sizable holdings in the mail-order company.

The Morgan-Neckermann deal not only represents the first large transaction that Morgan & Cie has taken since its reactivation, but the continued investment interest of Morgan Guaranty in the German market.

About a month ago, for instance, Morgan Guaranty acquired an interest in Quellen-Lehnig, West Germany's largest distributor of mineral water and other beverages. It was made mainly for the bank's trust customers. The bank was joined in the acquisition—which amounted to a 75-percent interest costing some $4 million—by American Express Co. and Joseph R. Nash, a financier.

About a year earlier, Morgan Guaranty purchased a share interest in Henschel-Werke Kassel, West German machinery manufacturer. Mr. Nash was also connected with this deal.

Tribute to Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, March 17 is the day when Irishmen all over the world gather to celebrate and pay tribute to Erin.

As an American of Irish ancestry, I join in the tribute. I want first to admit a lack of talent in giving true and worthy expression to a people to whom the world owes so much; to a people who ask for so little; and to a people who receive so little.

Maybe I should iterate the path of Irish history and call to mind the Kings of Tara's Hill, or Brian Boru and the Battle of Clontarf. Maybe I should talk of the Book of the Kells, the Cells of the Monks, and the learning of the scholars of old. A prayerful tribute could be paid to the memory of Patrick, Bridget, Malachy, and many more. All this I could do. Maybe I should dwell upon the sweetness of the land of Ireland, the brilliance of her emerald cloak, the stark beauty of the isles, the sad splendor of the gloaming upon her evening hills, the lilt of her gay little rivers and the peaceful stillness of her lakes, the rugged coasts, and the ever-sounding seas about her. Or listen to her poets, her philosophers, her scholars, her men and women of wit and charm, her bards and her minstrels. Or tell anew the myths and the fancies, the tales and the Come-All-Ye's, the annals of olden times, and rhapsodies of the blind walkers of the roads. Or glory in the tenacity which preserved the faith of our fathers, the holiness of martyred priest and nun, or saint, and humble laborer. And might we not join in spirit with the pilgrims wending their way to Mellray and Knock and Croagh Patrick?

I could dwell upon the priceless substantial contributions that the Irish have brought to these shores of our beloved America and the part they have played in every field of endeavor which has been for the development and permanence of this great Nation. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land—and from every bit of hallowed ground, far flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead.

No, in this space age—when nations are looked to for what they will do to preserve our way of life and our civilization—let us not forget what we already owe to the people of Ireland.

I do not want to dwell on the riches of memory alone, but I want to recall that the Treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of Western civilization. It must never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, besides the Beacon of the Holy Faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single, strong flame which was nourished and kept alive on that little green isle set in the vastness of the ocean waters. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the Western World that is good, and true, and beautiful, and it casts its challenging brilliance even upon the farflung steppes and tundras of Russia. And it will burn forever, because it is fed with the oil of truth and kindled with the breath of belief in God, His justice, His wisdom, His mercy, and His love. Ireland, I am sure, can again be called upon to preserve Western civilization even if she must go it alone.

Illinois Gets $18.4 Million To Aid Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently released its yearend review showing the disbursement of Federal aid to education throughout the Nation.

Those who are constantly complaining that Federal aid to education means Federal controls might be wise to ponder the fact that we are now spending more than $600 million a year in various programs of Federal aid to education. I have yet to hear a single local school administrator complain that any of these programs have brought Federal controls.

The State of Illinois last year received $18.4 million in Federal aid to education.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, showing a breakdown of this Federal aid to the State of Illinois. The article follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Tribune, Jan. 3, 1963]

ILLINOIS GETS $18.4 MILLION TO AID EDUCATION

The Federal Government spent an estimated $18,450,000 for education in Illinois in 1962, according to a yearend review by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Throughout the Nation, the Government spent about $600 million for education.

Melville H. Hosch, regional director of the Department, said that in Illinois the Federal Government:

Shared in financing the enrollment of an estimated 116;000 high school students in vocational classes, 1,400 in area schools for skilled technicians, and in establishing 6 training projects for unemployed workers. Federal cost: An estimated $2,600,000.

ABSORBS FEDERAL BURDENS

Granted $5,358,000 to school districts in which enrollment increased because of Federal activity.

Loaned $3,162,000 to 7,500 students; awarded $938,000 more in fellowships for graduate study in the State, primarily for teacher training; and granted 56 additional fellowships at a cost of $233,000 to students majoring in modern foreign languages.

Strengthened guidance, counseling, and testing programs at a cost of $750,000.

HELPS BUY NEW EQUIPMENT

Enabled elementary and high schools to buy up-to-date mathematics, science, and modern foreign language equipment and materials. A sum of $2,350,000 was matched dollar-for-dollar by State funds.

Sent 278 Illinois foreign-language teachers back to school to learn improved teaching methods including use of language laboratories at a cost of $382,000.

Provided, under the Library Services Act, $232,000 to extend library services to people in rural areas.

AIDS RETARDED CHILDREN

Granted $35,000 to held educate mentally retarded children and $70,000 to help train teachers of the deaf.

Granted $545,000 for educational research.

Hosch said that, throughout the country, one of the most outstanding developments in education has been the increasing interest in vocational education and technical training for young people and adults.

E Pluribus Unum et Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of their 1963 commemoration of the Feast of St. Patrick I was privileged to address the National Democratic Club in New York on the matter of current legislation. As a testament to the patient and silent suffering of the members of the Nation's oldest political club I ask to extend my address as follows:

E PLURIBUS UNUM ET ERIN

I am profoundly honored to be called to address you in the 130th year of the oldest political club in America. And I commend you for your audacious courage in selecting for your St. Patrick's night speaker an Irish-Catholic-Brooklyn-Democrat. Within the last century, for one of my ilk to speak his mind at the corner of 38th Street and Madison Avenue would invite a fallout of vegetables, masonery, and lumber on the heads of the audience. Therefore on the premise that some APA's or plug-uglies from the five points may be still lurking in the neighborhood and recognizing the fact that you have been 90 days without newspapers I shall deal with the news from our great Capitol and the relatively inocuous topic of citizenship and statehood.

On Tuesday, March 12, by a vote of 377 to 21 the House of Representatives voted to extend honorary citizenship to an Englishman, Sir Winston Churchill. Without abnegation I admit that this descendant of the Galway herring chokers took the Queen's shilling and voted in favor of Sir Winston's cause. However, since the record will not show it, let history recount that my eminent and most distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN J. ROONEY and I were the last two into the well of the House to cast our votes. We delayed in order to hold common counsel as members of the AOH on the merits of the prospective citizen. I am proud to state that we resolved the question on the affirmative side by giving due consideration to the fact as documented by our boro historian, Jamie Kelley, that Sir Winston's mother, Jenny Jerome, once resided in a south Brooklyn brownstone. Reasoning with that clarity of perception and appreciation of the true and fair which is characteristic of Mr. ROONEY (and myself to a lesser degree) we concluded that such residence was in a sense a purification and a credential sufficient to validate the admission of her offspring.

However, since the conference of dual citizenship on her most illustrious soldier-statesman will be an immeasurable boon to Britain's pride and posture I suggest that it is timely and proper for the Congress to address itself to a related and compensatory matter affecting the Republic of Eire.

Noting the imminence of the feast of St. Patrick and sensitive to any possible slight to the land of my forbears, by the admission of America's newest prospective citizen I have drafted legislation to extend honorary and voluntary status to Ireland as our 51st State.

I am hopeful that my resolution will receive early and favorable consideration since I expect that it will be referred to the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of which I am a member. More significantly the chairman of that committee is the great statemaker, the distinguished Representative LEO O'BRIEN, of Albany. And I am now privileged to reveal that Chairman O'BRIEN and the rest of the membership have unanimously voted to admit me to the august and exclusive "Society To Admit Ireland as the 51st State" in recognition of my advocacy in behalf of this legislation. In order that no unkind critic may accuse us of perfidy as a secret society I am at liberty to disclose that in addition to Chairman O'BRIEN and myself the membership of our illustrious society includes that Honolulu Harp, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE. Let no one doubt that the great Senator is an authentic and legitimate descendent of Kathleen Ni Hoolihan. So Irish is he that his ancestors took care to move the "O" to the middle of his name where it could never be disturbed by the anglicization of either the prefix of the suffix.

In a solemn conclave of our trinitarian society it was agreed that consideration of Erin as our 51st State is long past due. In fact it was suggested that it perhaps should have been either 49th or 50th since it is only 3,825 miles from Washington or New York to Dublin and 5,164 miles to Honolulu and 3,059 miles to Juneau, Alaksa. However it was concluded that no ground has been lost since Alaska has had the good judgment to elect as its first Governor an icy Gael, William A. Egan while Hawaii has similarly displayed good sense in its choice of two fine chief executives in succession named: William Francis Quinn and John A. Burns.

The society duly noted that O'BRIEN, the great statemaker, had exhibited characteristic enlightenment in bringing such an intelligent electorate into the Union.

With his gifted mangement in the House and the brilliant sponsorship of the good Senator in the upper body there is good reason to expect that the land of the orchid and pineapple and the isle of the potato and the shamrock will be linked in confederation.

I urge that the implications of this union are most appetizing. A postprandial draught of potcheen, the distillate of the potato, to create a mellow Irish mist would be followed on the morn by pineapple squeezins to lift the fog and Dublin dew.

I hasten to add at this point, to avoid diplomatic involvement that this proposed legislation has not been cleared with the White House although little trouble is expected from that quarter if one can rely on grassroots reports from Wexford.

By the same token I assure the great Republic of Eire that I have no intent to demean its status as equal to any nation on the face of the earth in its dignity and sovereignty by an offer of voluntary statehood. My desire to effect greater union between two of the world's great democracies is animated by recognition that the Irish contribution to the size and quality of our population and the glowing pages of our history is so vast that it deserves most singular treatment.

Beginning with the discovery of America there may be some dispute as to when and by whom it was first explored but there can be no doubt that the Irish had a hand in it. Some say the first immigrant was St. Brendan of Clonfert who is said to have found Greater Ireland as this continent was then known in the sixth century A.D.—eight centuries before Columbus. But most Irishmen are reluctant to contest this point. Not only are we mindful of the Italian vote and the present composition of the New York City Board of Estimate but we are unwilling to admit that we had possession of the land for over a thousand years before electing an Irish President. It is the better part of conciliation to agree that the Genoese explorer discovered this great land but he was guided by the expert seamanship of Rice De Galvey, of Galway, his navigator who would have landed in New York instead of San Salvador if he had his own way but he was outvoted.

As the Irish are not disposed to make much of their role in discovery, so too our innate modesty leads us to deprecate our role in the settlement of this great Nation. As Randolph Cabot Rooney replied to Lowell Wendell Maguire when he was asked about the order of his arrival in America—"We came over on the second boat. We sent the servants ahead on the *Mayflower*."

As there can be no question of discovery, so can there be none as to the Irish motivation of our fight for independence.

Now, not only did the Irish indulge in the great sport of firing on the Redcoats in the War of Independence, but they had a hand in the inciting to rebellion.

Four of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were born in Ireland: Col. James Smith, George Taylor, Edward Rutledge, and Matthew Thornton.

Five others had Irish parents or grandparents, and the most famous signer of all, John Hancock, owed his corollographic signature to the penmanship taught by an Irish schoolmaster.

In all the wars this Nation has fought for liberty, union, and democracy it may be said that we won because God and right were on our side; but it didn't hurt to have the Irish with us.

The Father of this country well knew this, for on the 17th of March 1776 General Washington paid tribute to his Irish troops by making the watchword "St. Patrick."

In 1779 a committee of the British House of Commons went on a junket to find out the cause of the revolution. They asked Joseph Galloway, a loyalist, "What were the troops in the Service of the Congress composed of? Were they native, or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch, or Irish?"

Said Galloway: "I can answer that question with precision. They were scarcely one-fourth native, one-half Irish, the other fourth English or Scotch."

And when the surrender of Lord Cornwallis was announced to Parliament, Lord Mountjoy said, "England has lost America through the exertion of Irish immigrants."

Just as hard as the Irish fought in the Revolution to divide Britain from the Colo-

nies, they fought in the Civil War both to preserve the Union and to defend the South.

It may be truly said that the side with the most Irish won the war. And on the side of Union it was the Irish brigade, largely from New York, which led the fray.

Perhaps the greatest tribute to the Irish brigade at Fredericksburg came from an unexpected source—the correspondent of the by no means pro-Irish Times of London. He wrote:

"To the Irish division was principally committed the desperate task of bursting out of the town of Fredericksburg and forming under the withering fire of the Confederate batteries to attack Marye's Heights towering immediately in front.

"Never at Fontenoy, Albuera, or at Waterloo was more undaunted courage displayed by the sons of Erin than in those six frantic dashes which they delivered against the almost impregnable position of their foe.

"* * * After witnessing the gallantry and devotion exhibited by his (Meagher's) troops and viewing the hillsides, for acres strewn with their corpses as thick as autumnal leaves, the spectator can remember nothing but the desperate courage and regret that it was not exhibited in a holier cause. That any mortal men could have carried the position before which they were wantonly sacrificed, defended as it was, it seems to me idle for a moment to believe. But the bodies which lie in dense masses 40 yards off the muzzles of Colonel Walton's (Confederate) guns are the best evidence of what manner of men they were who pressed on to death with the dauntlessness of a race which has gained glory on a thousand battlefields and never more richly deserved it than at the foot of Marye's Heights on the 13th day of December 1862."

Quite often, Irish troops faced one another on the battlefield. A number of Irish companies were among the Confederates who turned back the Irish brigade before Marye's Heights. Later at Petersburg Irish soldiers on both sides called an unofficial truce.

Someone asked if there were any Limerick men present. "Enough to take care of the whole of County Cork," came the reply.

The Gael fought so well during the Civil War because he possessed the "Irish edge." In addition to his piece (and he was as good with the stock as the sight).

He bore into battle his great sense of humor. Stories circulated by the hundreds during the Civil War.

There was the story of the Irish soldier who asked his commanding officer for a furlough. He explained that his wife was sick and there was no one to look out for the children. "Pat," said the officer, "that's very strange, for the chaplain has a letter from your wife asking us not to send you home. She says every time you go home on leave you get drunk and frighten the children." "Faith," said Pat, "there's two of the most splendid liars in the army in this room. I was never married in me life."

Likewise the story of the Irishman carrying a comrade suffering with a leg wound to a first-aid station. Unknown to him a cannon ball took the man's head off while he was carrying him. When the Irishman reached the station and dumped the corpse down on a cot someone pointed out to him that it lacked a head. "Why, the deceivin' creature" he said. "He told me it was his leg that was botherin' him."

We best sum up the saga of the Irish in the fight for America's freedom, union, and democracy when we refer to the list of those who have won the Nation's highest decoration—the Congressional Medal of Honor. The greatest name is Murphy—21 in all, with the Kelly's on their heels—18 heroes strong. And nestled there among them, sleeping with the brave, the list records a Carey. Hugh himself—sergeant of Company "E", 82d New York Infantry—Civil War—born in Ireland. Enough to swell a man's chest to bursting when you note that among the foreign born who hold the medal, Ireland with her handful of 4 million souls has won more than twice as many as any other nation who sent men here to help.

But lest we speak too much of fighting which is more a hobby than an aim, look to the feats of Irishmen who forged this land so strong.

Despite the claims of Russia as to who invested what, there's no question that the Irish have done as much as most.

Undoubtedly the first guided missile was the haverstraw hand grenade first found at the end of a Gaelic arm.

And you'd have no hat on your head but for Cavanagh of Danbury, nor heels on your shoes save for Humphrey O'Sullivan.

Robert Fulton dreamed of steamboats at an Irish father's knee, and Mr. Holland and his submarine is a credit to the race. Louis Sullivan sketched the skyscraper, Crimmins built it, and McDonald dug the subways and canals. Marcus Daly found our copper. John MacKay the Comstock silver and William Shoney O'Brien had a hand in gold.

But it is in song and story that the Irish best excel. Victor Herbert and Eugene O'Neill and a regiment behind them much too long to tell.

So with our last word on labor we'll rest the Irish case—from Meany to Maguire—the father of Labor Day—the work of Gaelic leaders gave the union man his say.

Especially do I urge the support of voluntary and honorary statehood for Ireland by the members of this great New York audience and National Democratic Club. Only in this way can we heal a painful wound on the corpus of New York politics as invented by the boys of the spartan band, of the five points, and the sixth ward.

In 1853 New York elected to the Congress "the one and only Mike Walsh" an inveterate foe of privilege. He served the cause of the common man and also several terms for libel. He spoke in the Congress for the minimum wage, and fought the waste of public funds and the extension of slavery. Defeated for reelection by "Honest John" Kelly he foresaw the danger of the bolshevik revolution and tried to induce the czar to buy ships for the Russian navy from one of his friends in Constantinople. Coming back to New York he visited the watering places on Broadway to take the pulse of the electorate and nothing else. He expired one night stretched prone on the streets of his city beloved. There are those unkind wags who would have you believe that he fell there in stupor when the truth is that his love of New York and the United States was so strong he tried to hug the earth to his bosom in his dying embrace.

Now he is laid to rest in the Greenwood cemetery which lies in the 15th district of Brooklyn which I am privileged to represent.

The grievous wound of which I speak is that Congressman, patriot, defender of the rights of man though he was—Mike Walsh never became a citizen. How thus can he rest easy in his grave—and that in Brooklyn.

This legislation I suggest in its retroactive effect would not only put Mike to rest—but in truth by our action if Tuesday, Walsh would walk with Sir Winston—for the good of them both.

Finally, I will recognize that there are as many Sons of Zion in the audience tonight as there are Sons of Erin. I therefore suggest that this other great and free country which lies along the Jordan should one day receive similar treatment. To that end I would urge that it note the precedent of Ireland in demonstrating that brotherhood which is the highest order of democracy. Since the Dubliners have shown the way by electing that great Hebrew Hibernian Lord Mayor Briscoe as their city executive it would be a stroke of sheer enlightenment to herald an Irishman as mayor of Tel Aviv.

Then truly we could say from Honolulu to Dublin to Haifa—aloha, sogarth aroon and sholem Alecchem—E pluribus unum et erin.

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in eastern central Missouri is a remarkable man, the editor of a remarkable newspaper. James L. Miller, editor of the Washington Missourian, has just returned from the last of a series of trips abroad which have from time to time covered a large part of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

He is widely read and widely traveled and his newspaper, the Washington Missourian, has been awarded year after year by the State Editorial Association first place in order of excellence among the newspapers of its class throughout the State. Its editorial page was accorded one of the two top places in the Nation by the National Editorial Association in session at Hershey, Pa., in 1962.

His recent editorial just published on his return from Africa is of such international significance that I am including it verbatim in my remarks as follows:

THEY HAVE REASON TO BE AFRAID

The American Committee on Africa apparently was afraid to have a group of American newspapermen visit Angola in Africa for fear they might find out something that the committee didn't want them to find out.

This committee has been carrying on a bitter fight to force Portugual out of Africa. What business that is of this committee has never been explained, but it seems right in line with our meddling in other people's affairs.

When the National Editorial Association announced last fall that it planned to make a study mission into Africa, including Angola, the American committee printed a stinging article in its publication about the proposed tour under the heading of "Tripping Through Africa."

The article stated that there were some 411 foreign agents in the United States and that about 25 more were about to be added. Who were these 25 potential new agents? the article asked, and answered its own question.

"None other than 25 unsuspecting members of the National Editorial Association," the article explained, and added:

"The plan is simple enough. Twenty-five handpicked editors and publishers will pay their own way on a 4-week tour of Africa. * * * It seems not unlikely that some of the journalists will produce copy sympathetic to Portuguese ears. * * * While we trust that the natural common sense and intelligence of U.S. newspaper editors and publishers will take them through most normal situations, we are not so sure that this time they will not have met their match.

"At stake is the continuation of the last remaining colonial empire. Let us try to trace the links between this and the role of the visiting newsmen."

The publisher of the Missourian and the Citizen was one of the visiting newsmen. When the newsmen returned to the States from their mission earlier this month, somebody who failed to identify himself, stuffed a reprint of the article into the mailboxes of correspondents at the United Nations. That happened on the same day the editors returned to New York.

This whole mess proves only this one thing—the American Committee on Africa is deathly afraid of what the visiting newsmen found in Angola and reported to their readers. If this committee had not been afraid of being exposed by a group of impartial and disinterested newspapermen, there would have been no need for the desperate warning the committee put out, and its attempt to frighten off the publishers by branding them as potential foreign agents if they wrote something favorable about Portugal and Angola.

Foreign agents for what, or for whom? The committee didn't say, because it couldn't.

Now let's take a closer look at this whole situation. To start with, the visiting newspapermen were not handpicked—if they had been the NEA certainly would not have picked the publisher of a weekly newspaper in Missouri. It would have picked much bigger fry.

Any member of the National Editorial Association was given an equal opportunity to make the African Study Mission. The only qualification and requirement was the newsman's ability to pay for the trip, and have the time to get away from his office for several weeks.

If there was any attempt to brainwash the newsmen, it was made by the American Committee on Africa itself, and by no one else—a committee that probably is financed by the American taxpayers.

No attempt whatever was made by the Portuguese Government to brainwash the visitors.

They were absolutely free to ask questions, and they were free to accept the answers in whatever light they wished.

The visitors were free to go and come in both Portugal and in Angola as they pleased.

They could drive out into the country as far as they wished, and stay as long as they wished, and to talk to whomever they met.

There were absolutely no restrictions of any kind put in the way of the visiting newsmen—if there had been, it would have been a clear indication that the Portuguese had something to hide, and the suspicious minds of any newspaperman would immediately have been aroused.

The very fact that the American Committee on Africa expressed the kind of fear it did is in itself the best possible proof that it was afraid the visiting newsmen might find out how our Government is meddling in other people's affairs and the enormous amounts of the taxpayers' money we are wasting.

We all know how foolish it would be to hand a class of first grade pupils in Washington $100,000, for instance, and tell them to run the school system for the coming year.

Yet that is what we are doing in some African countries, only on a much grander scale.

We are pouring millions and millions into the Congo yet it is doubtful whether the leaders and politicians of that miserable nation could operate a peanut roaster successfully, let alone a government.

And we are not finished paying in the Congo. The American taxpayers will have that burden on their shoulders for a long time to come. Now we are trying to create and even worse and possibly more costly condition in Angola by forcing Portugal out of there.

Even the black leaders in most of the other African countries will tell you that if Portugal is forced out of Angola within the next few years, and the country is turned over to the natives, the result will be far worse than the Congo ever was. There will be anarchy, rape, murder, and a general disregard for all law. The cost to make the repairs in the end and to slowly bring back order over a several year period will have to be borne as usual by the American taxpayers.

Is that part of our foreign policy? It appears to be. It appears our policy is to meddle in other nation's business, and then call on the American taxpayers to pay for whatever damage we have done.

In Addis Ababa we are spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for a new airport for the Ethiopian Airlines, which is owned lock, stock, and barrel by the country's emperor, Haile Selassie, who calls himself the King of Kings, the Elect of God—and, he might add, the elect of United States, for the money he is able to get out of us.

Every dime we are spending on this airport will go to enrich this Monarch, who already has more wealth and property than he knows what to do with. This man, in fact, is the world's greatest dictator. He doesn't only own his country and everything in it, but the Coptic church as well. When you are in Ethiopia you either do as the king says, or be locked up. Mr. K. could learn a few tricks from this Ethiopian.

In Liberia, where we are constructing one of the world's greatest radio stations, the President of the country is building himself a palace that was supposed to cost $2 million, but is already up to around $4 million. Only God knows what the final cost will be, yet there are few schools in the country to teach the people to read and write. And the majority of these are financed and operated by foreign missions.

Our policy in South Africa is with the jungle Bantu, and against the white man, who was there before the native African. It was the white man who settled the country, developed it, and made it what it is today—in fact, he did more than that—he saved one tribe after another from being wiped out by stronger tribes, who were chasing the weaker ones southward, where these weaker tribes finally ran into the white man, who was pushing up from the south.

For us to tell the white man in South Africa what to do would be the same as France or England telling us in America to either wipe out the Indian reservations or get out and hand the country back to the Indians. That seems to be our policy in South Africa.

In the vicinity of the Holy Land they have a network of highways that compares to the best we have in this country.

They will point to these roads in Jordan and tell you—America built them for us.

Yet we right here in Franklin County had to wait 20 years to get a road from Washington to Union, and then only after several people were killed.

They are driving on well constructed roads through the rugged mountains north of Jerusalem, but we in Franklin County can't get a sorely needed new road from here to the Diamonds. We've been trying to get this road for the past 10 years, and now we are informed that we might have to wait another 5 because there is no money available.

But there seems to be plenty of money available for the "Amos and Andy" governments in Africa and parts of Asia.

In Jerusalem you see more new American cars on the streets than you do right here in Washington. The reason for that is simple enough. The American taxpayers either pays for his own car, or does without, while in some of the foreign countries they seem to have no problem getting new American cars.

Besides building his highways, and paying to run his government, is the American taxpayer also called on to buy the foreigners' cars, and keep him in food and clothes?

There are painted signs in some countries that say "Yankee, go home."

That is the best advice any country could give us—go home, stay home, and put our own house in order. We have plenty to do right here at home without meddling in everybody else's business—at the taxpayers' expense.

Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today as the Members entered the chamber they received a green carnation in observance of the great patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick. The boutonniere for each Member was presented, as in past years, under the auspices of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America. The Ancient Order of Hibernians, founded in 1836, is a fraternal and social organization with some 700 local groups whose members are descendents of Hibernia, and dedicated to preserving ancient Irish lore and traditions. May I take this opportunity to pay tribute to members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America and express my appreciation for their contribution today.

Mr. Speaker, on St. Patrick's Day we delight to do honor to the memory of the great St. Patrick, apostle, bishop, and patron saint of Ireland. In the celebrations and speeches that mark the day, we are accustomed to praise the land and people of Ireland, to mark those qualities in the Irish character that seem most worthy of emulation and esteem. We speak, too, of the Irish who have given their lives or shed their blood in the defense of our country, and of the Irish who, in civilian pursuits, have contributed to the well-being, the entertainment, and the intellectual and artistic development of our people. Often, on this occasion, we call attention to the moral vigor and stamina which St. Patrick exhibited in his life, and instilled in his disciples, and we point out the need for these stalwart virtues in the perilous and inspiring circumstances that surround us today.

But I think it is well, sometimes, to go right to the heart of the matter, and speak simply of the life and character of St. Patrick, the brave, good man, and the devoted servant of God. Draw all good lessons you will from his life—they will be the more effective when accompanied by an appreciation of the man himself: his humility and simplicity, his audacity, his unwavering faith and shining virtue, hs untiring service to Christ and His Church, and his kind and friendly approach to his fellow man.

We know Patrick in his own writings, from which both the events of his life and the character of the man appear in

clarity and completeness. Let scholars dispute as they will about the place and time of his birth, and the date of his coming to Ireland. These are factual historical points of some importance, I admit, but they pale into insignificance before the importance of the man's life and character, and the magnificence of his achievement.

I urge all who have not done so, to read for themselves St. Patrick's account of his life, called his Confession, and his letter to the savage chieftain, Coroticus. You know, of course, the outlines of his story—how he was captured in his youth by what we should now call pirates, and sold into slavery in the pagan land of Ireland; how he escaped from his slavery through guidance vouchsafed him in a vision, and wandered long in the unsettled territories of what is now northern France; how a voice urged him to return to Ireland, to spread the Christian faith among the pagans who had been his masters; and how, by daring and persistence, ingenuity, and devotion, he succeeded at last in making Ireland the Christian nation she has ever since remained. The charm of Irish wit and humor, the play of Irish fancy and the sublimity of Irish poetic imagination, the charm of Irish song and the dash of Irish courage, and the ingratiating quality of Irish blarney—all these qualities may well have existed among the Irish people before ever St. Patrick set foot upon their strand, whether as captive or as missionary and bishop. But each of these qualities found high and spectacular expression in the character of St. Patrick, as it appears from his own writings, and each of these qualities, as it appears in the Irish and those of Irish descent today, is warmed and colored by the Christian fervor that imbued the whole life and nature of the Saint, and constituted his gift to Ireland and his claim to our grateful remembrance.

A Tribute to St. Patrick and the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the few occasions each year we can depend on unanimity of opinion from both sides of the aisle is that happy time we put aside our legislative calendars and pay proper tribute to the land of St. Patrick and her distinguished sons.

We are familiar with the inspiring role the patron saint of Ireland played in the history of the Western World. We are equally aware of the great role played by the people of Ireland in America's early history, and the continuing contributions made to our Nation by their descendants.

It has been said that "Ireland gives England her soldiers, her generals, too." In America, we can say that. But we can say much more, for in every profession, business or industry, in every scholastic, artistic or athletic endeavor there are names of sons of Erin at the top. So, too, in the three branches of our Federal Government—in the Court to the east of this Chamber, in the house a few blocks to the west and here in our Speaker's chair, distinguished sons of Erin sit.

In honoring the patron saint and the nation of Ireland, we express our affection and gratitude toward the people of Ireland for giving so much to the character and strength of our beloved Nation. Americans of all ethnic derivations shall never forget the contributions Irish-Americans have made to the general welfare of America.

Political Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the recent statement of the Honorable LeRoy Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters before the Subcommittee on Communications of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am sure that my colleagues in the House will find the suggestions of Governor Collins interesting, provocative and extremely timely.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF LEROY COLLINS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, my name is LeRoy Collins, and I am president of the National Association of Broadcasters. I appreciate the invitation to appear before you and testify regarding proposed legislation (H. J. Res. 247) which would exempt from the equal-time requirements of section 315 the candidates for President and Vice President in the 1964 campaign.

It was a similar suspension in 1960 that made it possible for broadcasters to bring to the American people a new look and a whole new dimension in American politics. The confrontations of candidates Kennedy and Nixon were events of monumental significance, and it is with a deep sense of pride that I point to the performance of broadcasters in that campaign. It was a service that won an overwhelming consensus of praise for its fairness and responsibility—greatly stimulated interest in the election—and contributed importantly to the public's knowledge and understanding of the candidates and issues.

Last year, there were elected over the land 35 Governors, 38 Senators and 435 Representatives. Also, the whole election process involved thousands of local and State offices. In many key contests, more than two candidates were involved. Unquestionably, section 315 provided a limiting factor on public information and prevented the people from receiving the advantages of full broadcast coverage.

Now it is true that the 1959 amendments which exempted bona fide newscasts, interviews, documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news from the equal opportunities provision of section 315 proved to be of great help and substantial improvement.

But, we at NAB feel strongly that the legal straitjacket of 315 requires more than piecemeal removal. It is our position that the shackles should come off all the way.

Most American broadcasters feel that section 315 not only fails to serve a useful purpose, but further, actually handicaps them in serving the public interest. Therefore, we contend that the operation of section 315 results in a disservice to the American people.

I know the concept of equal opportunities sounds at first blush like the epitome of fairness. The very words seem to have a strong ring of freedom. Yet, as logical as the proposition seems at first, in truth the aim goes far wide of the mark.

When enacted—actually, its basic provisions were contained in the old Radio Act of 1927—the section was accepted as a relatively simple provision of law. But with changing times and the greatly accelerated importance of broadcasting in political campaigns, there has resulted a highly complex group of rules and regulations, interpretations, and policy statements that make the handling of political broadcasts now a nightmare.

For example, on October 3, 1962, the Commission published a 28-page document, in question-and-answer form, of its interpretive rulings under section 315. This was before the 1962 elections and was for the guidance of the broadcaster in the campaign then underway.

Shortly after the elections, and notwithstanding all the clarification, one Commissioner publicly lamented, "We have just completed one of the most trying political campaigns that the broadcasting industry has ever experienced. Many and difficult questions arose * * *."

This was understandable because, as the campaigns progressed, the Commission was harrassed and belabored to decide whether various types of talks on variety shows were bona fide interviews; whether debates by candidates before nonpolitical groups were on-the-spot coverage of news; whether under section 315 a broadcast at an outright political-group meeting involving an exchange between candidates entitled a group to an opportunity to reply to what it regarded as an injury to it; whether the use of film clips of a candidate's picture and voice in simulated debate was material broadcast over which there is no censorship; and so on, and on, and on.

Many of these issues have required such hair-splitting interpretations as would defy the wisdom of Solomon, and as would be expected, the views of those making the decisions were of many varied shades and hues.

In this welter of inquiries and decisions, one fact stands out: As important as the 1960 exemption was to broadcasting and the American people; as important as were the 1959 exemptions in aiding wider coverage of the 1962 campaign, their prime result was to underscore the basic failure of section 315.

Section 315 fails because it makes of the broadcaster an automaton and denies to him proper responsibility and accountability.

Section 315 fails because it denies to the broadcaster a range of journalistic judgment equivalent to that accorded other arms of the press.

Section 315 fails because in creating a fear of doing wrong, it destroys the initiative and resourcefulness and the will to do right.

And when section 315 fails it is not the broadcaster who loses most, but the public.

In the face of a truly outstanding record in the coverage of political and public affairs, it is very difficult for the broadcaster to understand the unwillingness of the Congress thus far to trust him in the political broadcast field. In all other forms of programing, his good-faith judgment is permitted to control.

More than a law, more than the power of the Federal Communications Commission, the intimate relationship of the good-faith broadcaster to his community's life and progress will make certain fair and honest coverage of all matters of public importance—including political broadcasting.

If the repeal of section 315 is achieved, I am convinced that electronic journalism will offer far more extensive and more meaningful coverage of political matters.

Many Members of the Congress have expressed reservations concerning the outright repeal of section 315 at this time. If this should prove to be the consensus, then we would certainly support House Joint Resolution 247. But we shall continue to urge repeal of section 315 because we believe that the public interest demands it and that the Congress will ultimately adopt this position.

There is, however, another alternative that we would like to suggest. The freedom the broadcasters exercised so responsibly in the 1960 presidential campaign can and should also serve the country well in the contests for all political offices in 1964.

I urge that you consider, if just for the 1964 campaign, suspension of section 315 for all candidates—National, State, and local. This would afford the broadcasters the opportunity to prove in the crucible of experience that they are qualified to, and in fact will, exercise sound discretion in political broadcasting; and, furthermore, that the American people—and this is even of greater importance—will benefit from a freer and more open discussion of political matters. Then, if broadcasters prove unequal to the trust, if the experiment fails, no further action would be necessary to reestablish the statutory obligations.

From the point of view of the Congress as well as the industry, this suspension of the equal-time provision of the act for all elections in 1964 would afford an even greater opportunity than 1960 to obtain a reliable body of evidence of how the industry could operate with good faith and good judgment entirely free from the shackles of section 315.

I would, therefore, respectfully urge that the Congress so extend the 1960 experiment during the 1964 elections.

Mr. Chairman, essential to our democratic society is human friction. Argument, dissent, disagreement, minority versus majority, liberal versus conservative—all of these are the stuff of progress. We believe section 315, although intended to provide a catalyst to this process, has been an impediment.

Only through free communications can this powerful force be kept working. With section 315, broadcasting is crippled and unable to do its full part in helping the Nation meet its responsibilities.

Certainly there must be good faith and responsibility by the broadcaster. This we seek to encourage at every turn. And this the Congress has adopted as its policy through the Communications Act.

Give us, I urge, the whole range of responsibility for our broadcast programing. You will find, I am confident, that your trust is not only deserved, but that our national life will be significantly enriched.

Farmers Home Administration Should Have $800,000 Increase From Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration is, in my opinion, one of the great workhorse agencies of the Federal Government, and by this characterization I mean nothing derogatory. The image springs to mind because FHA carries a tremendous burden; it was maltreated under the Republican administration, but its spirit has never faltered regardless of callous beatings and skimpy fare. Senator HUMPHREY, in a speech on the floor of the Senate recently, set forth the unpleasant statistics of neglect during the Benson years, underlined with the Senator's customary vivid prose. There is little I can add to these facts, but it has been my experience that knowledge can be acquired in two very general ways; by actively gathering information and by introspection. During my schooldays in east Texas I learned something about the origin of our country; what kind of people we Americans are, and the history of other great civilizations. Meditating about the Farmers Home Administration in this context, I am aware of a great truth—our country was won and was held by the small farmer and the small rancher both serviced by the small merchant and the smalltown banker; the family farm was indeed the wellspring of historical America. We hear about the hard-core Communist, the dedicated, imbued, fanatic Communist; is there a hard-core American? Yes, I believe so, and he is typically found on the family farm just as much a fanatic, if you will, and just as dedicated to his American way of life—imbued with Americanism. I know that the smalltown banker has now diminished in numbers, that in many cases his function is diffused and lost in our economic maze. I know that the small farmer is now being serviced for his banking needs by the Farmers Home Administration; or, not being serviced he joins the urban unemployed, and thus begins our decay.

I know that the Farmers Home Administration is not just a workhorse agency plodding a bureaucratic path, as the Benson administration saw it—occasionally lunging ahead by fits and starts overburdened with budget-starved programs, but a vital movement, kept alive by the men and women of FHA who daily work beyond their strength because they are also fighting for a cause. It is time to give proper sinews to this agency; to give proper recognition to FHA's function, which is a basis of our economy; and proper recognition to FHS's guardianship of the family farm, which is a basis of our culture. I recommend to the Appropriations Committee that at least $800,000 be provided to the Farmers Home Administration for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Inter-Media Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital links in the chain of representative government in this country is that of our mass media. Gone are the days when a Member of Congress could hope, by going from stump to stump, to reach his constitutents with reports of what had occurred in Washington and on what his views were of major issues. To some extent congressional newsletters have taken a part of this burden, but still the major share of it rests on our mass media to report back to the people what is happening and what positions their representatives have taken on important issues.

I have been very critical of the media in their failure to discharge this duty as they should. I believe this vital link in representative government is a weak one. I am encouraged, however, by the interest which I have found among many of the professionals in the media who are worried about this failure as well, for they realize that the principal discipline must be exercised in the media themselves.

An interesting inter-media discipline has been developed by Steve Fentress of television station KMOX in St. Louis. Mr. Fentress has a biweekly program, "KMOX-TV Views the Press," in which he reviews the newspapers and news magazines of recent date to help point up the issues and their treatment. With this program he helps the people of the St. Louis viewing area become more aware of the points of controversy in the news and how the printed media succeed or fail in giving the people a true picture of the news.

This discipline is an excellent technique and Mr. Fentress deserves credit for his part in initiating and developing it. I believe it is a constructive effort in promoting sound and strong representative government.

Connecticut Bill Proposes Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the interest that I and many others have expressed in the possibility of adapting

the Scandinavian ombudsman to the American political scene is paralleled by proposals to use the institution on the State level.

Ralph Nader, of Winsted, Conn., who has had a long interest in the use of the ombudsman in this country, has called to my attention a bill to establish an ombudsman that has been introduced in the Connecticut General Assembly.

Although the office, as I envision it, would be quite different on the Federal level—the ombudsman would be an agent of Congress ready to handle professionally constituents' problems referred to him by Members of Congress—I believe the key provisions of the State bill may be of interest to many legislators.

The bill provides that the main function of the ombudsman shall be to investigate any decision or act done or omitted by any of the State departments or agencies. He may investigate on a complaint or on his own initiative. If he decides that the act was unreasonable, unjust discriminatory or just wrong, he can make a public report of his opinion and send recommendations to the errant department. If no remedial action is taken, he can refer the matter to the Governor and the general assembly.

Observations on Atomic Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the National Observer of March 11, 1963, there is a very interesting comment in the "Observations" column concerning an atomic test ban. It addresses itself to the widespread argument that the current discussions at Geneva—if they result in a test ban agreement—would prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons among nations that do not now possess them. For the information of my colleagues, I include the article:

An atomic test ban is needed, its enthusiasts have been arguing in recent days, to prevent a "proliferation" of nuclear weapons among nations that do not now possess them—Red China, for instance, or someday perhaps countries like Egypt or Israel.

The logic is sound; the more weapons there are around, the greater the chance of even a minor conflict escalating into atomic warfare. The job of controlling atomic weaponry would be simpler if these weapons could somehow be limited to nations that already have them—the United States, Britain, Russia, and France.

But to contend that the test ban under discussion in Geneva would prevent proliferation of atomic weapons is misleading and mischievous. It's a little like saying a law against jaywalking will prevent motorists from speeding. The point of the test ban talks, which have been dragging on for nearly 5 years, is to reach an agreement among just three nations to halt testing of atomic devices—no more, no less.

The United States, Russia, and Britain would be the only nations obliged to abide by it; France, which has not yet perfected its devices, wants nothing to do with it. Neither would the pact have any effect on nuclear weapons already stockpiled or the production of new weapons already designed.

So when advocates say a test ban would prevent "proliferation," they are merely peddling a pig in a poke.

Honesty and Frankness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the following words of the Very Reverend Harold Frank Lemoine, D.D., the dean of the Cathedral of the Incarnation, Garden City, N.Y., appeared on March 10, 1963, in the Cathedral Message. They are so appropriate that I spread them upon the RECORD for all to see, and, I hope, to heed.

HONESTY AND FRANKNESS

(By Harold Frank Lemoine, D.D.)

It is a sad commentary on our American life and on our Christianity, too, that we see so much deception and begging of truth practiced all over our land, from high positions of leadership downwards.

In the past few weeks we have seen denials made about what happened in Cuba and then without any shame or apology, statements have been made which set the record straight, and the original declaration was correct.

Why do politicians try to mislead the people? Many of them go to church and pray and make their communion. This is what makes a mockery out of our religion. It is not only elected politicians who act this way, but also a tremendous portion of our population, from whose ranks the elected leaders come.

I would think more highly of a political leader if he would be honest and admit an error or would say, "I have miscalculated."

"Honest Abe" Lincoln was a rail splitter. Trouble is today we have too many "hair splitters" in government.

The sad thing for us in Garden City is that there are Nassau County officials who want to be "village splitters" by decimating and desecrating our lovely village, criss-crossing it with superhighways. We have every right to expect our elected politicans to be our servants and not our masters. (That was a favorite phrase of Winston Churchill, and I like it, too.)

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Vice President's "Challenge to Americans"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 13, 1963, the Vice President of the United States, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, spoke before the National Advertising Council at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C.

His remarks were titled "Challenge to Americans."

His remarks are so brilliantly eloquent that they deserve the attention, not only of those members of the National Advertising Council who heard the Vice President personlly, but of the Members of the Senate, and Americans everywhere.

In his prepared text, Vice President JOHNSON said:

As a nation, we are challenged. As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

Since I have been a member of this Senate I have had the honor of serving with the Vice President, not only since he has been Vice President, but when he was the majority leader of the Senate. When he was summoned, I know personally he has searched for the answers which would keep "America free and the home of the brave." But whatever position of service to America he has held, the Vice President, has been, to paraphrase his words, in this order, a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat. He has never been partisan at a time when the need called for a patriot.

Because he is a patriot and a statesman, and because he is a Democrat, last and always, he is able to bring to the country leadership for Americans in his speech to the National Advertising Council which is so worthy of us all. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS

(Address by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, National Advertising Council dinner, Presidential Room, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963)

On this occasion, others of the administration have spoken of the programs and policies by which our Government seeks to meet the challenges to our system. For my part, I want to speak of our system itself, and of the challenge it presents to us for maintaining the effective and responsible functioning of our Government.

Whatever our programs, whatever our policies, if our country is to succeed, if our cause is to prevail, if the challenge to Americans is to be met, our political system, the system by which we govern ourselves, must function effectively and responsibly.

I wish that I might objectively say that such is now the case, beyond all doubt. But no honest observer, no matter what his persuasian, could be entirely content with the performance of our political system at this period of our history.

In the arena of national public affairs, we are debating more and resolving less. On issue after issue, our energies are exerted more to frustrate answers than to find them. Inaction is exalted by many as a greater virtue than decision. If we are not defaulting our basic national responsibilities, the question does arise whether we may not be forfeiting or compromising valuable national opportunities.

I do not believe that any discussion of our national programs, policies, and purposes would be complete without a full and frank acknowledgment of this problem, its causes, and its extensive implications.

Let me say that my interest in this is the product of my own experience, service, and convictions. The office I now hold is the one constitutional office which exists solely to assure the orderly and effective functioning of our system. Before becoming Vice President of the United States, I was, as leader of the majority party in the Senate, confronted with unique responsibilities for helping to maintain the functioning of our system during the longest period of divided party responsibility in our Nation's history.

This is a subject with which I have lived closely, and about which I feel strongly. While I intend to speak candidly in these remarks, I mean only to speak constructively, remembering that I am a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat, in that order, only and always.

Your council is now engaged in an effective and intelligent campaign to bring home the "challenge to Americans." I congratulate you on the quality and contribution of that effort.

As a Nation, we are challenged.

As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

But I believe both our understanding and our response begin with a clear understanding of our Nation's position in the world. Challenged as we are, we still do not live in an America besieged, an America beset, an America grimly imperiled.

The vital truth of this last half of the 20th century is that while we are challenged, we are also the challengers, challenging all the oppressors and oppressions of humankind.

Since time began, the weak have been at the mercy of the strong; the peaceful have been the prey of the aggressor; the vanquished have been victimized by the victors; the poverty of the world's masses has been of concern only to the poor themselves. Disease has been the concern only of the sick. Human despair and deprivation have mattered only to the despairing and deprived.

We of America has been the first to challenge this age-old order of human affairs and we have challenged it successfully. We have demonstrated that men can be strong without being selfish, can become powerful without becoming unprincipled, can be victors without being vandals, can be saviors without being spoilsmen.

The fruits of this are many.

Of the 50 nations which have gained their independence in the postwar years, not one has chosen to ally with the Communist tyranny.

Nations which have warred against one another for centuries have in these times joined together in mutual alliances and binding friendships.

The example of the political and economic unity of our 50 States is reshaping the future of virtually every continent where men are free.

We can with good cause believe that a new age is coming in the affairs of man, and we can with sure knowledge know that it is an age which had its beginnings and takes its inspiration from these shores.

It is against this standard that we must today, and always, test and measure the performance of our system. It is not enough for our system merely to guard the present, although that it must surely do. It is imperative that our system continue to challenge the future.

This imperative is more than any other the special burden of this period of our national affairs and public policy. We have over the past 20 years committed our national resources and our national efforts to programs which have succeeded. Because of that success, not because of failure, as some would have it, we must now respond to new conditions and new challenges with new programs.

Because containment of Communist aggression did succeed in Europe and the Middle East and Southeast Asia, we are now faced with the Communist effort to escape that containment by penetrating into the Western Hemisphere.

Because economic assistance did succeed in the Atlantic community, we must now deal with upright allies instead of prostrate friends.

Because independence fashioned after our own example did succeed in Asia and Africa, we must at the United Nations hear many more voices, the voices of men speaking for themselves, as we do, instead of being spoken for by others.

By every measure, the tide runs with us. But if "the winds and waves are always on the side of the ablest navigators," we must at this period adjust our sails to hold true to our course. That is the clear and compelling necessity of our public policy at home as abroad.

But we can question, in fact we must question, whether our system is now functioning effectively and responsibly to accomplish this.

In the sum of our national experience, success is the predominant reality, success domestically, success internationally. Mistakes have been made. But we stand virtually alone as a nation which has never experienced a mistake fatal to its national existence, integrity or independence. Yet, despite this record, the predominant theme of our public discussions of national policy is talk of failure rather than success. Our system is disgorging much afterthought about what we should not have done and offering little forethought about what can be done.

In this context, the example of Cuba is obvious. But it is a fitting commentary on the problem that most of the discussion on Cuba has obscured two essential points:

First, that our system cannot function effectively if it is paralyzed by irresponsible conflicts which tear down confidence in our system; and

Second, that our system cannot function responsibly if we disregard the purpose and importance of the constitutional concept of the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government.

On these matters, I speak from intimate personal experience. During the period to which I have referred, when I served as majority leader of the Senate, the majority position in Congress was held by one party, the executive position was held by another party. Such a division could not have accurred or have been tolerated in any other government, representative or totalitarian.

What was impressed indelibly upon me during that period was that either party or both parties had the power then to bring the functioning of our system to a halt, and, in so doing, to collapse the strength as well as the hope of the cause of freedom. Furthermore, in that same situation, those same consequences could have come had the congressional majority sought to transgress and usurp the powers of the Executive.

I do not recall these circumstances to give or claim any partisan credit. It required the patriotism of two parties, not one, for divided government to work at all. My purpose is to make these points:

1. In the design of our system irresponsible partisanship, and irresponsible partisanship alone, holds the power of paralyzing and immobilizing our Government.

2. Our Constitution did not base itself upon the concept of an opposition party with the sole duty to oppose. On the contrary, our system is based on a concept of the duty to decide by full and thoughtful debate, and our system will not function if that duty is defaulted.

3. In parliamentary systems, issues make the election calendar. In our system, election calendars make the issues the partisans. Thus, we must seek to avoid the hazard that the issues we debate will be false or obsolete or worse.

4. When we allow the constitutional separation of powers between legislative and executive to fall into disarray, we invite the serious danger of the subversion of our system. There must be no back door to the American Government in its dealings with foreign governments or nationals or we will not long be masters of our own house. Under our Constitution, the Executive and only the Executive speaks for and acts for this Nation in relations abroad—and no partisan cause can justify disregard of this standard.

5. Finally, I would make the point that if our system is to function successfully, the central focus of partisan attack cannot continue to be the people's confidence in the institution of the Presidency of the United States.

No head of state in the world bears more responsibility than the President of this Nation, yet none has less free exercise of authority. As an individual, he is subject to law. His vetoes can be overridden. His appointments can be rejected. He is Commander in Chief but he cannot raise armies and fleets on his own authority. These provisions are in the Constitution and we would not have it otherwise. They are legitimate and based upon the studied consideration of men of wisdom.

But beyond the Constitution, there has grown up in our times an inordinate preoccupation with frustrating the Chief Executive, thwarting his recommendations, controlling his course by weakening or destroying the public confidence in him. Beyond the parties themselves, this is an activity indulged by many effective segments of our society, business and labor, races and religions, regions and States. And it has made little difference whether the President has been Republican or Democrat, Dwight Eisenhower or John F. Kennedy.

I am a partisan. I have practiced my partisanship with enthusiasm in proper partisan seasons. But I have never, and will never, seek to destroy before the Nation or the world the confidence of free men in the institution upon whom the success of freedom's cause must depend.

I speak as I do tonight because, as I have said, it is imperative that our system challenge the future.

If we are to succeed in the future as we have in the past, we must in many realms of public policy cease to do what there is no longer need for us to be doing and begin to do what we should already have done.

We must not permit partisanship to paralyze us.

We must not permit conservatism defined 40 years ago or liberalism defined 30 years ago to prevent us from defining for ourselves the progressiveness, prudence and patriotism required for these times today.

We must not permit the search for failures to lead us away from the exploitation of our successes.

We must not permit the valid purpose of preventing a single office from becoming too powerful to be perverted so that we cause the whole Nation to become too powerless.

We must not allow the separation of powers within our system to be subverted and thus invite the subversion of our freedoms as well.

The tides of these times run with us. That revolution of freedom which began on these shores still challenges and changes the world. The challenge to Americans is to understand how great and how successful is their cause, and that they serve that cause by being patriots before they are partisans.

In partisanship, as in patriotism, there must be standards by which responsible men abide. If patriotism knows no season, partisanship must never forget its season. America will not be served by a perpetual and unending campaign for power between its partisans who contest with each other for the seizure of power rather than the resolution of issues.

In our policies, foreign and domestic, this is a time for reform.

It is no less a time for reform in our politics, and in those free institutions through which our system functions. This is important work and vital work for us all, and none is more important now. For if a house divided against itself cannot stand, a system contending against itself for the sake of contention alone cannot succeed.

The thoughts I have expressed here tonight are not new with me. They are thoughts that I have expressed when I was the Democratic leader under a Republican President. The same thoughts, I believe, are valid now that we have a Democratic President and must always be valid.

There is a legitimate role for partisanship in our society. We must and should have partisanship because issues must be debated, must be discussed from all points of view, if they are to be resolved.

The danger—and this I say to my colleagues of both parties is that we will debate issues not to solve the problems of our country but solely to solve the problems of the next election. The danger is compounded when we debate just to find areas of disagreement and to ignore the areas of agreement.

I have always sought the areas of agreement. Without such an effort, our society cannot long endure because we live under government by consent and unless we know what we consent to, effective government is impossible.

As patriotic Americans, let us seek out the areas of agreement upon which we can preserve our freedoms. Let us debate those issues upon which we disagree with dignity, with candor, and with the objective of finding a solution.

On that bedrock, our freedoms will endure. The united voice of free men will solve not only the problems of the next election but the problems of the next generation and the words "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable" will remain a living reality for all time.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is easy to get excited over Federal expenditures, the national debt, and this country's unbalanced budget.

It is very difficult, however, to explain these problems so that they can be understood by most of the people. I believe there was delivered recently a speech which did a great deal toward explaining these problems and toward attempting to eliminate much of the emotionalism tied up with them.

This was the very interesting speech delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] on March 11, before a dinner group at the Brookings Institution. As a good explanation of some of the basic facts which have to do with this Government's fiscal policies, I recommend the address by Senator HARTKE and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARTKE DISCUSSES BUDGET IN BROOKINGS INSTITUTION APPEARANCE

Let's do away with the budget. After all, it is the subject of plenty of adverse comment. After all, as some claim, it is out of control, out of date, and out of balance.

Then let's do away with the Federal debt. After all, as some claim, the Federal debt is too high, dangerous, a burden on us, a millstone around our children's necks.

To you experts, this may sound like a lot of tomfoolery. Yet to most Americans, this is what they hear and some believe about Federal fiscal affairs. I am sure each of you recognizes these slogans for what they are worth. But of all the affairs of Government the matter of fiscal affairs is least susceptible to slogans. It is a matter of simple bookkeeping and difficult economics. It is difficult to explain in simple terms.

We are a big country with awesome responsibilities and tremendous obligations. The budget is an estimate of what these responsibilities and obligations are costing.

In estimating the budget we attempt to judge the future economic conditions using past conditions as guidelines. What are some of these basic past facts and conditions? We have now had about 2 years since the last recession trough. During this time the gross national product rose $61 billion;

personal income increased by $43 billion, and corporate profits increased by $11 billion. These figures are quite remarkable for a period of about 24 months and in general language would be called times of prosperity. Output of steel mills is on the rise at its highest level since April of 1962. The auto industry is on the verge of near record sales, and auto sales last year were generally exceptionally great. The first 20 days of February ran far ahead of a year ago and are not far under the level of February 1955, the year of recordmaking sales. Retail sales are very brisk, following a record year. Although unemployment is a nagging problem, the truth is that employment is at an alltime high.

Yet, the President has complained about a lagging economy and business is complaining about a profit squeeze, what they want is more "pep" in the prosperous times we are having.

The cynics might easily look at the condition of our business and economy and say: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

The truth is that the rate of growth in the United States has been good but it should have been better. More than that, the growth in 1962 was slower than in 1961 and there is no reason to expect it to accelerate in 1963. Therefore it is deemed desirable to stimulate the economy.

One method of stimulation is a tax cut. In considering enactment of a tax cut, it is necessary to give an estimate of some future economic conditions. Let's look at the future. The prosperity of the past 2 years is probably going to continue. The gross national product reached an all-time high of $554 billion in the calendar year of 1962, more important, the fourth quarter of 1962 brought the gross national product to an annual rate of $562 billion. It will probably go close to $580 billion in 1963. Here again, if we follow the reasoning of the cautious cynics, the question would again be proper: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

In the field of corporate profits it is expected that we will reach still more record breaking heights by increasing another $2 billion. Personal income is expected to increase by about $20 billion. These almost staggering prosperous figures are enough to warm the breasts of all even the gloom and doom prophets.

The truth, as I see it, is in a very simple proposition: "Times are good."

Now that times are good, why should we have a budget with a deficit. Well, in fact the choice this year is really not a deficit with a tax cut or a deficit without a tax cut. The fact is there will be a deficit either way. Now for the sake of the partisans, those of the Eisenhower years must first meet two basic facts:

1. The Eisenhower years produced a deficit of over $22 billion for 8 years, and no peacetime deficit has ever exceeded the one Eisenhower had in 1959 in the amount of approximately $13 billion.

2. Congress cut the budgets of President Eisenhower by $20 billion. If this had not been done we would have had a total deficit of over $42 billion for the 8 Eisenhower years.

Now to calm the waters in regard to all expenditures, it is normal that Congress usually cuts the budget submitted by the President. This statement is true, although the wisdom of such action is frequently challenged.

The fact that times are good and that we are going to have a deficit point up a truism, the Nation which leads the world is going to have excellent times in order to continue our role as world leader. The proposed budget, submitted by President Kennedy, recognizes this international responsibility. In this budget the following costs of Government are increased:

1. Defense expenditures are proposed to be increased by $2.4 billion.

2. Space expenditures are proposed to be increased by $1.8 billion.

3. Interest costs will be up $900 million. All other costs combined are proposed to be less than last year.

With this background I would like to briefly approach some of the more common questions concerning our fiscal policy for next year.

IS GOVERNMENT SPENDING GOING OUT OF CONTROL?

All levels of Government have been subject to sharp pressures for increased expenditures during the postwar period as our population has grown, as wages and prices have risen, and as demands for improved governmental services have expanded. Since 1948, State and local government expenditures have more than trebled and Federal expenditures for nondefense purposes, including a rapidly expanding level of grants-in-aid to State and local governments, have only doubled. The Federal Government has also borne a sharply increased burden in the areas of national defense, international affairs, and space.

However, the economy has been growing at a slightly faster percentage rate than Government spending. As a result, Federal budget expenditures today bear about the same relationship to gross national product (total value of all goods and services produced in this country in 1 year) as they did in the latter 1950's:

Ratio of Federal budget expenditures to GNP

Fiscal year:	*Percent*
1955	17.1
1956	16.2
1957	15.9
1958	16.2
1959	17.2
1963 (estimate)	16.7

Apart from defense, space, and interest, budget expenditures between 1961 and 1964 will increase less than they did between 1958 and 1961.

WHAT ABOUT INCREASING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT?

Since the war, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government has grown less rapidly than the population and much less rapidly than State and local government employment:

[In millions]

Calendar year	U.S. population	State and local government employment	Federal civilian employment in executive branch
1948	146.6	3.8	2.0
1962	186.6	6.8	2.5
Percent increase	27	79	25

One force making for increased employment is simply the steady increase in our population, which puts an added burden on many programs. At the end of 1964, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government will be 189,000 higher than it was a decade earlier; yet the percentage increase in Government employment over this period will be less than the percentage increase in population.

Federal civilian employment under the 1964 budget provides for the same number of people to serve every 100 persons in our populations as was true when the present administration took office, a smaller ratio than prevailed 10 years ago.

Federal civilian employment is actually lower today than it was in 1952, while State and local government employment over the same period has increased 67 percent.

CAN WE EVER HOPE TO ACHIEVE A BALANCED BUDGET UNDER PRESENT POLICIES?

Yes, there is always hope. Realistically, the experience of the past generation shows that as long as we are operating under a restrictive tax program there is little hope to achieve a balanced budget. The present tax policy is based on war taxes.

It is restrictive. We should remove the wartime tax shackles. Then the law of supply and demand could again operate more closely to normal. This would increase purchasing power, increase production, reduce unemployment and increase profits. The net result would be an expanded economy, a greater prosperity, increased tax revenue, and a balanced budget.

SHOULDN'T ANY TAX REDUCTION BE OFFSET BY A CUT IN EXPENDITURES?

In the first place, Congress will more than likely cut the amount proposed in the President's budget. But to merely cut expenditures without considering the consequences would be plain stupid. Cutting expenditures is a desirable aim of all government. But you cannot increase our Army and cut the cost; you can't go half way to the moon; you can't default on our Government debts; you can't cut generalities, you have to be specific. Little attention need be given to the individual who speaks of general reduction in expenditures unless they are specific.

WON'T THE DEFICIT OF NEARLY $12 BILLION ANTICIPATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964 TEND TO CAUSE INFLATION?

Under present economic conditions there need be little fear that the President's tax program and the deficit for fiscal year 1964 will tend to cause inflation. The law of supply and demand are such that inflation comes only when there is full employment and full production. Today, there is still unemployment and unused production facilities.

IS IT A GOOD POLICY TO PROPOSE A REDUCTION IN TAXES WHEN THE BUDGET IS ALREADY IN DEFICIT?

As I have previously said, our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget. Rather our choice is between chronic deficits resulting from chronic slack in the economy, on the one hand, and transitional deficits temporarily enlarged by tax revision designed to promote full employment, thus increasing revenues and making possible an ultimately balanced budget.

CAN WE AFFORD A FURTHER INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT?

Whether measured by the total size of the debt or by annual interest payments, the Federal debt is becoming a progressively lighter burden on the economy:

Calendar year	Federal debt end of year (billions)	Percent of GNP	Annual interest payments (billions)	Percent of GNP
1947	$256.9	109.6	$5.0	2.1
1952	267.4	77.1	6.1	1.8
1957	274.9	62.1	7.6	1.7
1962	303.5	54.8	9.6	1.7

The public debt as a proportion of our gross national product will fall to 53 percent of the gross national product in fiscal 1964, compared to 57 percent when this administration took office. Last year the total increase in the Federal debt was only 2 percent, compared to an 8 percent increase in the gross debt of State and local governments. Taking a longer view, the Federal debt today is only 13 percent higher than it was in 1946, while State and local debt in-

creased over 360 percent and private debt by 300 percent.

MY CONCLUSION

We are a leader in the world. We are a growing nation. We have an unfilled destiny. By bold action, clear thinking, and high hopes we will be able to lead in a manner which makes us all proud.

Critical Problems of Migratory Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an excellent editorial in Ave Maria urges the passage of legislation to help solve the critical problems of our migratory farmworkers. The editorial emphasizes that "this country as a whole cannot afford to permit the rural exploitation of our citizens. We cannot afford the continued waste of generation after generation of young people whose only occupational equipment is a bent back for picking cabbages." This editoral underlines the active concern that many of our citizens and church people feel about the situation of the migrant, and I am sure that my colleagues will find it interesting. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP THE MIGRANT—NOW

In these days, when talk of union power monopolies is heard even in prounion circles, it might be well to take a look at a segment of the working population that has no union protection: the migrant laborer.

His plight was well phrased in a speech by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio: "He stands before his employer defenseless and alone. He needs food and the necessities of life. He has little or no bargaining power. He must work to eat. His children need food. Until this year the employer could hire this man for 50 cents an hour and make him work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week picking cotton. When payday came the grower could reduce the wage to 30 cents an hour, and if the worker didn't like it that was too bad for him. Prudence dictated that he be docile, silent, and robbed."

The archbishop pointed out that farm labor has been excluded from most social welfare legislation, and that farmers have encouraged the continuation of child labor: The migrant with a family frequently must put his wife and youngsters to work in the field to live, and lack of education forces these children into the same form of slavery.

It is slavery, of course, an economic slavery, because those oppressed by the yoke of need have no opportunity to seek a better life, to escape from the chains that bind them to nomadic toil on the land.

And, because they are nomads, municipal and State laws in their favor have had very little impact. They travel from State to State, following the planting and harvesting of crops, hoping that work can be found.

Owing to this wide-ranging, interstate aspect of this major disgrace on the face of America, Congress has been concerned about the plight of the migrant laborer and the harmful effect on the national community of hundreds of thousands of unskilled, often illiterate, laborers eking out the barest of existences.

Powerful lobbyists have kept the help from Congress down to a thin trickle of legislation that has not alleviated the problem to any measurable extent. Now, however, a group of bills are pending in the Senate, introduced by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey.

Essentially, what these bills provide are the following: improved educational opportunity for the migrant and his family, daycare services for migrant children, improved child labor protection for migratory children, crew leader registration, a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, improved employment service for migrants, minimum wage, national labor relations coverage, and adequate sanitation facilities.

Opposition will come. The cry will be, "We can't afford to pay higher wages." In some cases, this may well be true. Perhaps other methods will have to be improvised to assist those farmers who are earnestly concerned with paying a decent wage but do not have the economic capability.

But we insist that this country as a whole cannot afford to permit the rural exploitation of our citizens. We cannot afford the continued waste of generation after generation of young people whose only occupational equipment is a bent back for picking cabbages.

It's time the American people—and this includes the massive, well-established labor unions—became indignant over the agonizing conditions of the migrant worker. And it's time they acted.

Conference on Equal Employment Opportunity—Progress and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 28, Mr. Carl Shipley, chairman of the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, appeared before the Conference on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Citing the lack of equal job opportunities in the District of Columbia, Mr. Shipley urged implementation of the recommendations contained in the Republican platform of 1960. I am proud that an outstanding member of my party has spoken out forthrightly on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shipley's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

(By Carl Shipley)

We appreciate your invitation to participate in this Conference. The Republican Party is absolutely committed to equal employment opportunity. Our position is clearly set forth in the Republican platform of 1960 entitled "Building a Better America." In our platform we pledge—

Continued support for legislation to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity to make permanent and to expand with legislative backing the excellent work being performed by the President's Committee on Government Contracts.

Appropriate legislation to end the discriminatory membership practices of some labor union locals, unless such practices are eradicated promptly by the labor unions themselves.

Use of the full-scale review of existing State laws, and of prior proposals for Federal legislation, to eliminate discrimination in employment now being conducted by the Civil Rights Commission, for guidance in our objective of developing a Federal-State program in the employment area.

Special consideration of training programs aimed at developing the skills of those now working in marginal agricultural employment so that they can obtain employment in industry, notably in the new industries moving into the South.

We are concerned with the fact that neither President Kennedy nor the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have seriously sought congressional action on these matters. Census Bureau information shows a substantial difference in levels of employment as between our Negro citizens and white citizens of similar abilities. For example, only 2.5 percent of the male white labor force of 175,000 was unemployed in 1960, while 5.7 percent of the Negro male labor force of 181,000 was unemployed; 134,000 of the white men and women among the employed persons in the District in 1960 were occupied in professional, clerical, skilled, and managerial categories while only 61,000 Negroes enjoyed the opportunity of this upper bracket employment.

Conversely, 109,000 Negro men and women found employment only as operatives, household workers, laborers and service workers, while only 37,000 white men and women were left in this group. The census figures might be subdivided in various ways to show a similar disparity of job opportunity between whites and Negroes in various industrial and commercial categories. For example, there were nearly 10 times as many Negroes employed in households as whites, and twice as many employed in construction and eating and drinking places. There were one-fifth as many Negroes employed in communications, half as many in retail trade, half as many in finance, insurance and real estate as whites.

Of course, allowance must be made for the fact that many persons in the Negro community simply do not have the qualifications for professional, technical and managerial positions. This is in part due to lack of equal opportunity in education, training and apprenticesihp programs, especially among the labor unions. Equal job opportunities cannot become a reality for all citizens until all applicants are equally qualified to fill these jobs. For example, there are many professional and technical positions with large companies open today across the country, where race would be no bar, if there were qualified applicants for the positions. On the other hand, racial prejudice in employment is frequently camouflaged by a claim of lack of qualifications.

The Republican platform suggests a remedy for this situation in the form of a Commission for Equal Job Opportunities. Job opportunities must be made available for all citizens, regardless of race or religion at the apprenticeship and training level. Every American should be entitled to a chance to get on the opportunity ladder, regardless of race or religion, and work himself upward toward positions of higher responsibility and greater pay, to the fullest limit of his ability and training. Equal employment opportunity will only result when there is a continuation of equal education opportunity, equal housing opportunity, and equal apprenticeship and training opportunity.

The Nation's Capital has a high income level according to the census. Income distribution of families in the District of Columbia shows a median family income of $5,993. However, what is not so quickly seen is the mathematical disparity between whites and Negroes. The median income of white families is $7,692 while the median income of Negro families is only $4,800. Of the 38,000 families with incomes of $10,000 and over, 34 percent are whites while only 10.5 percent are nonwhite. While the $3,000 per capital income of District residents is higher than the national average of $2,242, and higher than in all but Delaware of the 50 States, the opportunity to obtain this income is not distributed equally as between whites and Negroes.

While progress is certainly being made in both the private and public sectors, problems of discrimination in employment opportunity will probably continue until governmental action of the kind recommended in the Republican platform is authorized by the Congress of the United States. Hobart Taylor, Jr., Executive Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, recently said: "We have not really done anything for a man or a woman if we tell them that they have the right to compete for a $15,000-a-year job when they are precluded from receiving the training that qualifies them for that job." He is one Democrat who is beginning to sound like a Republican in his sincere concern with the problem of equal training opportunity—a proposition presently absent from the Democratic platform.

Tribute to Enrico Fermi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Calumet Chapter of the American Italian Societies passed a resolution commending the University of Chicago for its plan to dedicate in 1964 a statute of Enrico Fermi.

The University of Chicago has announced its intention of completing by 1967 a senior research center which would be a living monument to Enrico Fermi, the man, who was in large part responsible for the first successful self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction. The dedication will be on the date of the 25th anniversary of this very important historic event which took place on the campus of the university.

Premiere Fanfani of Italy, as a gesture of cooperation has recommended to the Italian Parliament that it participate with the University of Chicago in the establishment of this center. The Italian Government in turn, has commissioned a leading Italian artist to chisel a sculpture in honor of Fermi which will be placed at Stagg Field.

In recognition of the above, the Calumet Chapter of the Italian American Societies passed a resolution commending the University of Chicago, Premiere Fanfani and the Republic of Italy for their actions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE CALUMET CHAPTER, AMERICAN ITALIAN SOCIETIES

Whereas Stagg Field at the University of Chicago is the site where scientists on December 2, 1942, initiated a continuous liberation of atomic energy—latterly described as "self sustaining nuclear chain reaction"—thus ushering mankind into a new age of stupendous scientific development, and

Whereas the university now has deemed it fitting to erect there a senior scientific research center as a living monument marking the spot of so great an historic achievement, such research center to be ready for dedication in 1967 on the date of the twenty-fifth anniversary of this first successful atomic experiment, and honoring the name of Enrico Fermi who directed it; and

Whereas Premier Amintore Fanfani of Italy has proposed to his country's parliament that it participate with the University of Chicago in the establishment of this center, to which scholars from all over the free world will be welcome; and

Whereas all this is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Fermi experiment; and

Whereas the Italian Government already is commissioning a leading Italian artist to chisel a major work of sculpture honoring Fermi, to be placed at the Stagg Field birthplace of the Atomic Age and dedicated in 1964: therefore be it

Resolved, That the Calumet chapter of American Italian Societies commend the University of Chicago for its design to have dedicated in 1964 a statue of Enrico Fermi at the exact spot on its campus where the Atomic Age was born, and that this organization express its approbation of the University's purpose to honor the memory of a great man of science with a research center; and be it further

Resolved, That the Calumet chapter, American Italian Societies, also commend Premier Fanfani for the active part he is taking in the establishment of the research center, and the Republic of Italy as well for its full endorsement; all of which coupled with the good will visit here of Premier Fanfani should serve to increase in some measure the feeling of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Italy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the dean of the University of Chicago, and that four copies be sent to the Italian consular agent for Indiana, Edward Fiori, with the request that he forward copies to the Italian consul in Detroit, the Italian Ambassador in Washington, and to the appropriate office of the Republic of Italy in Rome.

Submitted by:

SAM BUSHEMI,
Member of the Board of Directors.

Attested by:

LOUIS FERRINI,
President, Calumet Chapter, American Italian Societies.

Proclaiming Sir Winston Churchill an Honorary Citizen of the United States of America

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the legislation honoring Sir Winston Churchill as an honorary citizen. In addition to the great service which Mr. Churchill has rendered to Great Britain and to the entire British Empire, he has contributed substantially to greater understanding between our Nation and the other English-speaking peoples around the world. This understanding and mutual respect which Mr. Churchill advocated is one of the most hopeful developments in the human quest for a peaceful world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to associate myself with this—though it be symbolic legislation—and to salute Sir Winston Churchill, a British subject, and an honorary American citizen.

Air Pollution: A Nationwide Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the current issue of New Medical Materia devotes considerable attention to the subject of air pollution, a menace to this Nation's health which grows more serious every day.

The magazine's editorial, entitled "Air Pollution: A Nationwide Menace," comments that the filth in the air has reached critical proportions and that more than 90 percent of the Nation's population live in communities which suffer from air pollution.

The lack of adequate effort to control air pollution across the country has prompted this magazine and the American Medical Association to urge a Federal air pollution program that has teeth in it—a law that will provide an enforcement program to cope with the problem.

I hope the Members of the Senate will have a chance to read the articles on air pollution in this publication and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR POLLUTION—A NATIONWIDE MENACE

Almost too late, we are awakening to the alarming facts of air pollution. From an occasional disaster—such as London's 1952 killer smog which resulted in 4,000 excess deaths, and our own Donora, Pa., incident in which 5,900 people out of a population of 13,900 were sickened—we have arrived at a situation of nationwide menace.

The chart on page 17 of this issue [not printed in RECORD] reveals that over 150 million tons of pollutants spew forth into our air each year in the form of dangerous gases, dusts, and fumes. The 15,000 quarts of air that each citizen breathes daily bring into the delicate tissues of bronchial pathways and lungs a portion of these contaminants, their deadly effect masked in every type of respiratory ailment from asthma and bronchitis to possible lung cancer.

Only if air pollution illnesses were made a reportable disease could we get an idea of the extent to which the Nation's health has been damaged. Even so, we do know that, as of right now, every community with 2,500 or more people—covering 90 percent of the

Nation's metropolitan population—suffers from air pollution.

CRITICAL LEVEL

With over 6,000 communities now located in problem areas, we read with frightening frequency of locations where filth in the air suddenly reaches a critical level and endangers all residents until a prayed-for wind blows it away.

Dr. Roger S. Mitchell of the Webb Institute for Medical Research, Denver, told the recent Air Pollution Conference in Washington that we already know enough—right now—to reduce pollution to bearable proportions.

Then why have we not done so?

Many fingers point at many culprits. For instance, an enormous portion of the air's filth admittedly comes from the smokestacks of industry and from the exhaust pipes of 70 million cars and trucks on the roads.

The automobile industry and some of the public utilities have spent large sums toward solving the problem. Many other industries, according to Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, have selfishly resisted such expense. Indeed, Senator WILLIAMS reports in his commentary on page 16 [not printed in RECORD] that some industries have even threatened to move to locations where public officials are "more reasonable."

GOVERNMENT ALSO GUILTY

But government, too, is guilty of polluting the air. Municipalities over the Nation, declares Arthur Benline, commissioner of air pollution in New York City, foul the atmosphere with contaminants from incinerators, huge public housing projects, and from asphalt, sewage disposal and powerplants.

Most to be condemned, perhaps, are those public officials whose duty it is to pass legislation to cope with air pollution, but who, according to Senator WILLIAMS, have not had the statesmanship or courage to do so.

It has become so apparent that only a strong enforcement program run by the Federal Government can effectively control air pollution that the American Medical Association has come out strongly in favor of such action.

What is needed, in the view of authorities, are established definitions of air pollution, the creation of an enforcement mechanism of laws and penalties, and financial appropriations adequate enough to put teeth into enforcement activity.

Short Lesson in Elementary Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the article by J. A. Livingston, which appear's in today's Washington Post, makes one wonder whether or not we are still in the mercantilist age. What is the nature of wealth? Is wealth treasure? Or is wealth the production of goods and services?

Such speculation about economic doctrine reminds us again of what Adam Smith attempted to teach us. If there is a science of economics it truly must be political economics, for it is only by adopting sound policies, based upon true values, that we create an environment for the production, distribution, and exchange of real wealth.

For a short lesson in elementary economics, particularly as it relates to the "Wealth of Nations," I commend Mr. Livingston's article to our colleagues' attention:

HOW DIFFERENTLY KEYNES IS READ

(By J. A. Livingston)

"As I read your column about Graeme Lorimer and gold mining," writes James L. Malone, of Swarthmore, Pa., "it seemed to me that his advocacy of gold mining was similar to that of another prominent man whose name seems automatically to raise tempers and blood pressures among prominent citizens of Mr. Lorimer's background.

"I am curious to know wherther Mr. Lorimer is happy that John Maynard Keynes had almost the same recommendations for gold mining. In chapter 10 of 'The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money,' Keynes says the following:

" 'At periods when gold is available at suitable depths, experience shows that the real wealth of the world increases rapidly; and when but little of it is so available, our wealth suffers stagnation or decline. Thus gold mines are of the greatest value and importance to civilization.

" 'Just as wars have been the only form of a large-scale loan expenditure which statesmen have thought justifiable, so gold mining is the only pretext for digging holes in the ground which has recommended itself to bankers as sound finance; and each of these activities has played its part in progress—failing something better.

" 'To mention a detail, the tendency in slumps for the price of gold to rise in terms of labor and materials aids eventually recovery, because it increases the depth at which golddigging pays and lowers the minimum grade of ore which is payable.' A few sentences further on," continues Mr. Malone, "we find in Keynes:

" 'Ancient Egypt was doubly fortunate, and doubtless owed to this its fabled wealth, in that it possessed two activities; namely, pyramid building as well as the search for the precious metals, the fruits of which, since they could not serve the needs of man by being consumed, did not stale with abundance.'

"Don't you think," concludes Mr. Malone, "that Mr. Lorimer is advocating Keynesian economics and that if bankers can agree that gold mining would be a good thing for improving the national economy, that we should all be able to support Mr. Lorimer's idea?"

To Mr. Malone's first question, the answer is: In regard to gold mining, yes, Mr. Lorimer would go along with Keynes. When I read him Mr. Malone's letter, he said: "I'm an amateur economist, a pragmatic economist, and Keynes sounds all right to me."

As to question No. 2, I, for one, am not able to support Mr. Lorimer's idea. And even Keynes, if I understand him correctly, would only commend gold mining as the lesser of two goods, as a last-resort boondoggle. We countenanced leaf raking in Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency, because men had to (a) have occupational therapy for self-respect, and (b) draw an income. Subsidizing gold mining is a close relative.

As Keynes notes, in the so-called good old days, gold mining had a contracyclical virtue. When business declined, mines could pucrhase machinery, dynamite, chemicals, and other supplies cheaply. Often wages fell. So costs dropped.

And, because the price of gold was fixed—first at $20.67 an ounce and then at $35 an ounce—profit margins widened. It became profitable to expand operations, which added to employment.

But, said Keynes, a similar result could be achieved by cramming bottles with banknotes, burying them in disused coal mines, filling in the excavations, and then soliciting from private companies "on well-tried principles of laissez faire" bids for franchises to mine the "note-bearing territory."

To be sure, argued Keynes, "it would be more sensible to build houses and the like, but if there are political and practical difficulties in the way of doing this, the above would be better than nothing."

He thus was saying that it is better to add to useful wealth by public works—roads, schools, hospitals, etc.—than to subsidize gold production. Consequently, I conclude that Mr. Keynes is on my side.

But Keynes was such a many-sided fellow—so nimble-minded and so sardonic—that any man, if he seeks long enough, can draw on him for help in an argument.

I'm merely citing the same chapter—but a different verse from Mr. Malone.

Urban Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, shortly after Congress adjourned last year, the publication Business Week carried a very detailed and extensive article on urban transportation—commenting on the upsurge in interest in revitalizing bus and rail transit as a way of coping with the growing traffic congestion problems of our urban areas.

The article analyzes many of the questions, and pros and cons involved in this complex subject, and concludes:

In the long run, mass transportation will be revived and revitalized. It has to be.

An editorial in the same October 20 issue makes some observations worth quoting:

"Obviously, the automobile has a place in urban transportation. But it can't be allowed to destroy the city. The only real solution to traffic and parking troubles would seem to be some sort of compromise, with efficient freeways and streets for people who have good reason to drive within the central city, and equally efficient public transit for the rest. The specific mix will vary from community to community."

Mr. President, this is not the time to comment on all the points covered in this extensive article.

Let me just say, with respect to the balance between highways and transit, that in any growing metropolitan area we need both. We need them coordinated with each other, and more importantly we need them both coordinated with land use plans for the urban area in which they are located.

The President's proposed urban mass transportation legislation is essential to the achievement of these goals, and I earnestly hope my colleagues will take the opportunity to read this informative article and editorial, which I ask unani-

mous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEP LIVELY, PLEASE

For all the bitterness that goes into complaints about the traffic problem, it seldom seems to improve very much. A new expressway quickly becomes so popular that it's as snarled as the route it replaced. Meantime, public transit by commuter train, subway, and bus withers away.

Lately, though, there have been signs of returning sanity in dealing with urban traffic. The congestion has become so bad that a number of U.S. cities are taking the first steps toward reviving mass public transit—by building wholly new systems or strengthening old ones. Los Angeles may have to recreate a transit network destroyed only a few years ago by competition from the auto.

The reason for these moves is easy to find. Continuing to rely mainly on the automobile will almost certainly undermine the city's role as center of culture and business. Streets and parking areas already gobble two-thirds of downtown Los Angeles. Atlanta figures that without public transit it would need 120 expressway lanes by 1970, plus 28 downtown connectors, and an 18-lane freeway would be essential for Washington by 1980.

Obviously, the automobile has a place in urban transportation. But it can't be allowed to destroy the city. The only real solution to traffic and parking troubles would seem to be some sort of compromise, with efficient freeways and streets for people who have good reason to drive within the central city, and equally efficient public transit for the rest.

The specific mix will vary from community to community. But public transit is plainly the best way to move great numbers of people into and out of a concentrated area like midtown Manhattan, Chicago's Loop, or San Francisco.

It is equally plain, however, that just any old rattletrap transit system won't do the job. The service must be fast, cheap, attractive, and efficient. Otherwise, motorists will never be lured out of their cars to use it.

That sort of service is expensive to provide. But it is considerably cheaper than trying to create that contradiction in terms, the modern city that is all streets and no city.

TIDE TURNS FOR TRANSIT

For the millions of Americans who commute to work by car, battling the daily traffic is an ordeal—nerve-fraying, time-wasting, accident-breeding, and pocketbook-flattening.

The hardening of traffic arteries discourages downtown shopping, promotes blight, causes an enormous waste of productive time, sharply increases police requirements, and slows the movement of goods as well as people.

Today a great debate is raging over how best to unclog city streets and increase the efficiency of urban transportation. Basically, the argument is over how much emphasis to put on freeways and private automobile transportation, how much on mass, public transportation.

Time for a change? In recent years, most urban travel has been given over to the private passenger car. Confronted with the ever-mounting tide of automobiles that welled up with postwar affluence, cities have relied mainly on construction of broad, limited access freeways. A heavy outpouring of Federal highway aid encouraged this.

Now, however, there is a growing belief among city managers and planners that the time has come to right the urban transportation balance and to begin reducing some of the emphasis on freeways catering to automobile traffic in central business districts.

Rising trend: Early next month residents in the San Francisco Bay area will vote on a $792 million bond issue for a regional rail rapid transit system to serve more than 30 cities. On November 1, a special agency created by Congress to draw up a mass transportation plan for Washington, D.C., and its nearby suburbs will lay its proposal on President Kennedy's desk. The plan will call for railroad commuting and, eventually, a subway.

Cities that already have extensive rail commuter and rail rapid transit systems—New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland—are pumping new life into them through rehabilitation and expansion.

Los Angeles and Atlanta—both of which have relied principally on buses or street cars for public transportation—are considering building rapid transit systems.

Other big urban centers—among them Miami, New Orleans, Buffalo, and Milwaukee—either have underway or are about to begin comprehensive regional studies that are expected to lead to increased emphasis on public transportation by bus. And in Pittsburgh and St. Louis, public agencies are contemplating buying up bus and trolley lines within those cities and their surrounding areas, and pulling them together to form integrated, areawide systems—a step already taken successfully by a number of other cities.

New capital: This renewed interest in mass transit is expected to lead to a substantial capital investment over the next decade. In a study made for the Federal Government, the Institute of Public Administration, a nonprofit research organization, conservatively estimates the anticipated outlay at $9.8 billion.

But will these plans ever get beyond the point of meriting a big layout in the Sunday newspaper?

In highway and automobile circles, there is a crack that when it comes to rapid transit systems, cities do a lot of talking but don't build them; that even with bus systems, planners envision a lot of improvements that seldom materialize.

Even if the mass transit systems do materialize—along with more freeways that must inevitably be built—can the public be induced to use what is obviously the more efficient means of transportation?

I. CONVENIENCE FIRST

"American travel habits haven't a damn thing to do with efficiency," declares Robert Livingston, Colorado State Highway Department planning and research director. "All I know is the facts: The number of people per unit of automobile keeps going down and down and down."

Sad record: If proof were needed that most people prefer convenience to efficiency, there is no better evidence than what has happened to mass transportation over the past 2 decades—the years when motorists were demanding ever bigger, broader, longer freeways.

Since 1940, the bus and rapid transit industries have lost 28 percent of their passengers, have decreased vehicle-miles operated by 17 percent, and trimmed employment by 41 percent. A 92-percent increase in revenue, through a seemingly endless series of fare hikes that drive still more people to their autos, has been outstripped by a 116-percent jump in operating expenses.

Last year these two industries earned a profit of only 1.9 percent on gross revenues of $1.4 billion. Not since 1950 has their profit been as much as 4 percent.

This picture is considerably bleaker when the commuter rail situation is painted in. Service reductions and abandonments have been regular since World War II; use of equipment a half century old is not unusual. The New Haven Railroad, a major commuter line serving both New York and Boston, is in bankruptcy.

Even so, there are many indications that the present groundswell of interest in mass transit means a real comeback. There will be setbacks: Taxpayers will balk at bond issues, and other financing problems will arise. Roadbuilding and auto interests will throw up strong opposition, particularly to rail transit. But in the long run, mass transportation will be revived and revitalized. It has to be.

A look at population and automobile growth trends provides the basic reason: People and cars will proliferate and concentrate in urban areas at such dizzying rates that mass transit must be expanded to ease the crush of automobiles and space-consuming freeways.

Today, roughly two out of every three Americans live in and around cities; by 1980, with the population an expected 250 million, three out of every four will. This vast conglomeration of people will be concentrated in only about 2 percent of the Nation's land area—with most of the concentration in 40 great urban complexes.

Along with the increase and concentration of people in urban areas, there will be a parallel—but more rapid—rate of growth in automobile use. Auto registrations, now 65.6 million, will hit 120 million by 1980—roughly one car for every two persons. Most of these cars will be driven in urban areas. Already 50 percent of total auto travel occurs on city routes; by 1980, 60 percent will.

II. TALE OF FOUR CITIES

As they contemplate the future, those concerned with urban affairs face this question: Can we continue to allow mass transportation facilities to wither away and still afford the price—in both dollars and space—that will be exacted by freeways and parking facilities to accommodate the rising wave of automobiles?

Atlanta's Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., answers this way:

"If we abandon mass transportation and require all those using it to rely solely on the private automobile for moving around, or if we fail to provide for future mass transportation facilities where none now exist, the congestion on our streets and highways and the lack of storage space for our private cars will become so unmanageable that the private automobile will cease to be a convenient and flexible mode of transportation. Instead, it will be an instrument of private torture."

Atlanta's dilemma: Allen says that without public transit by 1970, Atlanta would need a total of 120 expressway lanes radiating out of the city, and 28 downtown connectors—"a physical impossibility if the city is to remain a city.

As an alternative, Atlanta is contemplating a $215 million rapid transit system utilizing present rail facilities that fan out from its center. Automated trains of single or multiple cars, traveling at an average 45 m.p.h., would operate over 60 miles of track serviced by 32 stations. Passengers would be discharged in a downtown transit center.

The plan is subject to modification, and completion of the system is probably 10 or more years away. But political and business leaders—including Robert L. Sommerville, president of the Atlanta Transit System, which operates the city's existing bus and trackless trolley system—agree overwhelmingly on the need.

Out of the question: In Washington, a 1959 transportation study, looking ahead to the metropolitan area's 1980 traffic, specifically considered the possibility of an auto-dominant system in which the presence of the existing bus network was recognized, but a continuing decline in bus service was accepted.

Under these conditions and allowing for automobile traffic growth by 1980, the study found that 10-, 12-, and 14-lane freeways in portions of the District of Columbia, as well as one 18-lane section near the central business district, would be required—again a virtually impossible use of urban space. Hence the mass transit plan soon to be sent to the President.

San Francisco's aim: San Francisco is trying to bring to reality a rapid transit system aimed at taking 25 percent of the automobiles out of its peak rush hour traffic and reducing the need for additional freeways. Currently 48 lanes of highways serve the area's needs. By 1980, however, an additional 72 lanes would be needed in San Francisco, Oakland, and Berkeley, plus an additional 36,000 parking spaces.

To build 1 mile of freeway requires 30 to 40 acres of space. In San Francisco the density of population is 16,500 people per square mile, so that 1 mile of freeway can displace 800 to 1,000 people—and many businesses. It takes taxable property off the tax rolls, too, though highway advocates insist that increases in surrounding land values more than offset this.

Though the bay area tore down an earlier transit system a few years ago, its new rapid transit plan calls eventually for a 75-mile, $1.3 billion network of aerial, subway, and surface lines over which space age electric trains would travel at 70 miles per hour. It would include a 4-mile tube sunk beneath the bay from Oakland to San Francisco, and feature 37 passenger stations with parking lots for 30,000 cars.

Los Angeles, too: Even Los Angeles, which also tore down an earlier transit system, and which more than any other city has committed itself to freeway transportation, is turning to mass transit as a supplement. Two-thirds of downtown Los Angeles already is consumed by streets and parking areas; yet without some alternative, more space to accommodate more automobiles will have to be provided. The metropolitan area's 7.3 million population will jump to 11.3 million by 1980.

Already, more than $1.2 billion has been spent on 346 miles of freeway in Greater Los Angeles. By 1980, it's estimated that 1,342 miles of freeway will have been completed at a cost of $4.3 billion.

To conserve what is left of central city space, Los Angeles is contemplating a 22.7 mile, $210 million rapid transit system.

III. COSTS OF CONGESTION

In considering the future, then, city officials see a pressing need to keep automobiles and freeways from taking a disproportionate share of space in the central business district—and mass transportation offers the best insurance against this.

Expensive freeways: The high cost of urban freeways is also a big factor. Those that are part of the federally aided Interstate Highway System, for example, will consume 45 percent of the program's total $41 billion cost, though they account for only 13 percent of the total mileage.

The proposed 13-mile inner loop freeway system in Washington carries a price tag of $300 million, roughly $23 million a mile. A 12-mile turnpike in downtown Baltimore cost $180 million, $15 million a mile. And a three-mile stretch of beltway in Cleveland cost $75 million, or $25 million a mile.

Highway builders argue that it is unrealistic to cite such per mile costs without considering the traffic handled. They point out that the urban section of freeways that are part of the Interstate System will handle close to half the system's total traffic.

Highway groups also point out that highway users pay for the roadway through user charges—tolls and taxes on gasoline, tires, parts, and accessories and excise levies on new equipment.

But freeways also generate other costs: improvements in local street systems feeding into them; additional parking (more and more cities are going into the municipal garage business); expansion of traffic control systems. The expressways feeding New York's newly double-decked George Washington Bridge, for instance, have become so complicated that nearly $1 million worth of signs is required to steer motorists into the correct lanes. Moreover, a network of "escape lanes" has had to be set up for motorists who lose their way.

Urban sprawl: Mass transit gets an additional boost from the growing concern of businessmen and local officials over the fate of central cities. With the trek to the suburbs and the flight of industry and business to peripheral areas, central business districts find it increasingly difficult to maintain themselves as vital cores of urban areas.

This massive decentralization also accounts to a great extent for the plight of public transportation. City populations have moved outward faster than routes could be extended under old regulatory restrictions and meager transportation company earnings. The shift has drastically reduced population densities, so that many routes prove unprofitable even when extended.

Revival of mass transportation could help slow this trend, city planners believe, preserving and enhancing the social and cultural values of both central city and suburban living.

The year-2000 plan for the Washington metropolitan area, for example, seeks to curb haphazard sprawl with a corridor plan of future development. A half-dozen corridors, which new mass transportation lines would help develop, would radiate from the present fringe of the city, separated by wedges of open space.

Economic drag: The principal way mass transportation can help in protecting the central city is by removing the economic drag of congestion. Measuring the dollar cost of congestion to a city is extremely difficult, but some efforts have been made.

San Francisco analysts estimate that during the rush hour in three bay area counties alone, 150,000 man-hours are now lost to highway congestion on the average workday. In Pittsburgh, it's estimated that a 10-minute delay in traffic means a productive time-loss of $222,000 at basic steel wages. The National Retail Dry Goods Association calculates very roughly that the annual cost of congestion in New York City is $1 billion.

IV. GOVERNMENT'S HAND

Two other trends are working in favor of a mass transit revival:

A growing acceptance of the reality that mass transit, if it is viewed as a public necessity and if it is to operate at fares low enough to attract substantial patronage, must in many cases be subsidized.

The Federal Government's increasing interest in helping cities—both with money and advice—is solving urban transit problems.

The trend toward subsidy stems from the realization that, though fare box revenues often cover operating costs for transit companies, they seldom are sufficient to support a large-scale investment program. And unless equipment is kept up to date, patronage will continue to decline. The reason the fare box is usually insufficient is that mass transportation is mainly a peak-hour operation.

Philadelphia story: Philadelphia is an outstanding example of a city that concluded that maintaining and improving rail commuter service was vital even if the service had to be subsidized.

Through a government agency known as the Passenger Service Improvement Corp., Philadelphia buys commuter service from the Pennsylvania and Reading rail lines. This service is tied in with a city-owned subway, and a rapid transit line from Philadelphia to Camden.

Passenger Service Improvement Corp., makes up railroad deficits stemming from reduced fares, additional service, and modernization. The reduced-fare operations, started in 1958, have increased use of commuter lines by an average of 43 percent in the past 3 years.

Kennedy plan: On the national level, President Kennedy is pressing Congress to approve Federal subsidies for expanding mass transportation. The rationale is that the Government pays 90 percent of the cost of city freeways that are part of the Interstate Highway System, and 50 percent of the cost of urban highways that are part of the primary and secondary highway systems. Therefore, there is a corresponding need to support urban mass transit.

Another argument is that fragmented local governments cannot raise the needed funds. An Atlanta regional planning official says bluntly: "We simply will not have a rapid transit system unless we get some Federal aid."

Under the Kennedy plan, Federal assistance would be primarily in the form of grants for capital improvements, amounting to two-thirds of the net project cost.

The President has recommended a 3-year $500 million Federal outlay as the first installment. Whether or not Congress enacts this, the odds are that it will expand Federal aid for mass transportation in some form.

The Federal Government already has a limited aid program, and the President has taken steps to coordinate it, and any new program, with Federal highway activities. For instance, he has instructed the Bureau of Public Roads to consider favorably the reservation of special lanes for buses on federally aided urban highways during peak hours.

Place for buses: This is a recognition of the importance of buses in urban transportation. In medium-sized and smaller cities the only feasible form of mass transportation for many years will be buses. Even in the bigger cities express buses will play a vital role.

The bus offers greater flexibility of routing and scheduling than does rail transit. It can readily adjust to changing needs, and provision for its use can be made from highway-user revenues, thus avoiding high fixed-capital investment.

The great problem is that buses have to operate in the same environment of congestion as the automobile unless they are allotted special lanes. Congestion skyrockets their cost of operation.

Freeways, particularly those with special lanes, are ideal for express buses; but local service is often out of the question because of an absence of pull-out areas.

What can be done with effective bus transportation has been demonstrated in Houston, where transit operator Bernard Calkins bought a declining company with outmoded equipment for $2.4 million in June 1961, and revitalized it. Calkins is carrying out a $15 million modernization program leading to a full air-conditioned fleet. He has improved routing, added 30 miles to the system and substituted zone fares for a one-rate system to raise money for new equipment. The trend of declining ridership in Houston has been reversed.

Aid in planning: Aside from promoting use of reserved lanes on Federal-aid highways, the Kennedy administration has also pushed through Congress a requirement that urban highway development be coordinated with mass transit planning. Under the new law, the Secretary of Commerce will not approve Federal-aid road projects in metropolitan areas after July 1965 unless they are

based on continuing, comprehensive transportation planning by State and local governments cooperatively.

Federal funds aid mass transportation through other programs:

One provides $50 million in loans for acquiring, constructing, reconstructing, and improving mass transportation facilities, and $25 million in demonstration grants covering two-thirds of the cost of mass transit experiments. Under the grants, the University of Washington is studying the performance and impact of the monorail from downtown Seattle to the World's Fair. Detroit ran an experiment to find out if bus service improvements would induce people now driving to switch.

Federal funds to aid planning helped finance a $3.5 million study of Chicago's needs, which recently recommended extension of the city's elevated-subway system, 230 more miles of expressways, and moving sidewalks in the Loop. In Massachusetts, under the same program, work has started on a mammoth, $10.2 million study covering 144 communities and towns.

V. WILL THEY SWITCH?

But the question remains: If you build new transit systems or improve old ones, will people ride them?

Dr. Leon N. Moses, director of research of the Transportation Center of Northwestern University, studied the question as part of a research program under a grant from the Automobile Manufacturers Association.

He found that in the Chicago area only 13 to 32 percent of auto commuters who listed other forms of transit as their second choice would actually shift to these other methods even if they were free (assuming prices were the only variable factors).

To get a 50-percent diversion to other forms of mass transit, Moses found auto commuters would have to be paid 35 cents a trip on bus-streetcar, 45 cents a trip on elevated-subway, and 15 cents on suburban railroads.

These figures are based on what people think the cost of various forms of transportation is. It can be argued that commuters do not actually count in the full cost of automobile operation (table, below).

It can also be argued—and often is—that even if they did, a substantial number of people would go right on driving. Lewis Mumford, author and commentator on urban problems, puts it thus: "Since the motor car is treated like a private mistress and not included in the family budget no matter how extravagant her demands, it is hard to dispose of such a sentimental attachment on purely practical grounds."

Dim view: Highway and auto interests take a dim view of the revived interest in mass transit. They particularly abhor the occasional suggestion that highway funds should be used to finance rail rapid transit, or that needed freeway development should be held up while transit plans are being studied.

They make the point that in no major city, including Los Angeles, has an entire freeway system been completed. The freeway pattern for most big cities aims at having through traffic and traffic from one suburb to another avoid downtown areas, by using outer belts. Surveys in large cities, according to the Bureau of Public Roads, show that over 80 percent of traffic on downtown streets in peak hours is merely passing through to other destinations. Completing bypasses for this traffic will greatly alleviate congestion.

Perennial lag: While this is a convincing argument, mass transit boosters question whether freeway construction will ever catch up with growth in auto travel. And even if it does, they ask, What will threading metropolitan areas with more and wider ribbons of concrete do to the structure of cities?

"This," says Mumford, an avowed mass transit man, "is pyramid building with a vengeance: a tomb of concrete roads and ramps covering the dead corpse of a city."

What's the cheapest way to commute?

[Average cost for 1 person to travel 1 mile (in cents)]

Commuter rail coach	2.6
Subway or elevated	3.2
Bus	3.2

Auto	Out-of-pocket cost	Full cost [1]
1 rider	3.5–4.0	10–11
2 riders	1.8–2.0	5–5.5
3 riders	1.2–1.3	3.3–3.7

[1] Includes depreciation, insurance, etc., but not downtown parking.

Data: Senate Committee on Commerce.

Tribute to the Late Honorable Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, California, the Congress, and our Nation have lost a dedicated public servant in the untimely passing of our colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, of California. His patience, courageous loyalty to his convictions, and his ever willingness to help others, were attributes we always admired. Even those who sometimes disagreed with some of his views respected his devotion to those principles in which he believed and by which he lived.

I shall remember him as the two of us, the day before his passing, walked down to the well of the House to vote—he to vote one way, I the opposite. We chatted as friends, and he, as the elder statesman he was, gave to me advice on many things concerning the welfare of our community. This was typical of the man: never to hate, never to be bitter, never to appear superior in wisdom, though he was a wise man.

CLYDE DOYLE was a friend to all of us, and he will be truly missed.

My deepest sympathy goes to the members of his family.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuban Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about Cuba and our foreign policy regarding it. Recently, many angry and partisan attacks upon the President and the administration have tended to obscure the fact that President Kennedy and the United States scored a major victory in the cold war in demanding that Russian missile systems be removed from Cuba and in having this fact accomplished in short order.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post, in a recent news story pointed out many of the true facts regarding the United States-Cuban policy.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham goes on to report that the responsibility for the final downfall of Castro rests with the people of Cuba themselves and that young leaders are now attempting to organize forces which will provide the downfall of a Communist government in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Graham be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedly gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's preemptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weakkneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be rescued from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already a-building takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Vietcong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest United States aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S.

support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of war of liberation that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement insde Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a smash and grab raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A general smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT—TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

Missile Sites in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, these remarks upon the subject of missile sites in Alaska will supplement my remarks to this House last spring on the same subject appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1962, at page A3593. At that time a rumor was afloat that the Pentagon was about to announce that a network of Minuteman missile sites would be established in Alaska. To date no such announcement has been made although:

First. Alaska is strategically located as the corridor between Asia and North America.

Second. A missile weapons system in Alaska would be much nearer to our Nation's potential enemy targets, for example, over a thousand miles closer to Russia and Red China than any location in the other States, a factor which would improve accuracy and the effectiveness of the weapons.

Third. Land is available in Alaska in the general area of all suitable locations without cost, which would allow construction upon the bedrock of American soil, so to speak, as distinguished from the political quicksand of bases and sites on foreign soil.

Fourth. Locations in Alaska are far dispersed from the great industrial centers of the United States.

Fifth. Funds spent upon the construction and maintenance of such sites in Alaska would be money spent in our own country consistent with the effort to improve our balance of payments.

Sixth. So long as the great deterrent is the power to strike back and destroy an aggressor, the military importance of Alaska must not be overlooked, a point which the Russians apparently apprehend judged from the flight last week of two of their planes over Alaska.

Seventh. Alaskans, with very few exceptions, have let it be known that, in the interest of our country as a whole, they are willing to undergo the increased risk to them which would be incident to the establishment of missile sites in the 49th State.

Consistent with the chain of events and related factors which I have just mentioned is recent action by our veterans in Alaska, as follows: A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Alaska, at Juneau, and a like resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Juneau. The body of both of these resolutions reads as follows:

MISSILE SITES IN ALASKA

RESOLUTION

Whereas it has been disclosed that a new survey of Alaska has been completed; that the feasibility of deploying missiles in this State is now under study at the Pentagon, and the Commander in Chief of the Alaskan Command has urged through official channels the emplacement of offensive missiles in Alaska; and

Whereas the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars in Alaska have long sought a reevaluation of the military posture of this State and have urged that Alaska's strategic importance be recognized and acknowledged by the planners in the Pentagon; and

Whereas the advantages of Alaska as a missile base have repeatedly been pointed out by various news media and Members of the Congress, and are obvious to many of the military leaders in Washington and elsewhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, In regular meeting assembled at Juneau, Alaska, that:

1. This council call on all citizens of Alaska and on all Americans everywhere to assist our elected officials in obtaining a reevaluation of the military posture in Alaska;

2. This council believes this Nation cannot afford further delay in recognizing the strategic importance of Alaska and the obvious advantages of this State as a base for offensive missile capability; and

3. The military leaders in the Pentagon be urged to approve the construction of missile-launching facilities in Alaska without further delay.

Hon. Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Grim Reaper stands at our elbow as a constant reminded that this life is uncertain and fleeting and that we are never sure when the call may come to each one of us. Last Wednesday we joined with our departed colleague in the important work of this House and we saw him leave at the close of day in apparent health and strength. And then on the morrow we learned with grief and consternation of his untimely demise.

Passing this way but once it behooves all of us to have a bit more concern for the amenities as we meet, even casually, those who are our associates on this life's journey. In that particular, CLYDE DOYLE was truly one of this earth's noblemen and his qualities of greatness stem from an innate kindness and the traits of a gentleman. Our colleague and brother was a kind man, a gentle man, and withal a representative of the people who walked in the fear and admonition of the Lord.

As the vice president of our Christian fellowship group he led our meditations on occasion and demonstrated by his humble but nonetheless forceful witnessing that he had made his peace with his Maker and that his life would continue to be one of dedication in the service of the Nation and his fellow men. We who have passed through the dark valley know something of the heartbreak and anguish that now assail his loved ones and our sympathy goes out to his bereaved helpmate and the other members of his family with whom we are joined in mourning the passing of a great public servant, who was also a fine Christian gentleman.

City Editor and Rural Publisher Present Views on Managing the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of Tennessee newspaper editors and publishers were guests of President Kennedy for lunch at the White House.

Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, editor and publisher of the Putnam County Herald and Citizen, in the district I have the honor to represent in his report of the meeting, commented on managing the news.

Also syndicated columnist Drew Pearson has recently commented on changes of so-called managing the news.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Harwell's comments and Mr. Pearson's column be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These excerpts follow:

MANAGING THE NEWS

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

Of course, recent charges that the administration has tried to manage news had a place in the Presidential-publisher discussion. In fact, the writer asked Mr. Kennedy if he would comment on the article written by his friend, Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, who said the administration has tried to obtain a favorable press by distorting events and trying to charm publishers and editors.

The President made it rather clear that he did not agree with Mr. Krock. In fact, it is not breaching the confidence of the discussion to state that he expressed with "vigah" views along the line of his recent press conference statement when he said if the administration has tried to manage the news, it hasn't always done a very good job of it.

It has also been pointed out by others than the President that Mr. Krock never complained about his intimate contacts with former Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, from who he obtained many exclusive stories.

In connection with "managing the news," it was interesting to note that among those attending the luncheon were the publishers of the Knoxville Journal and the Chattanooga News-Free Press, who have not yet been accused of utterances favorable to the Kennedy administration. We are not planning to hold our breath until they do. There were several others in the group known to have favored Mr. Kennedy's opponent in 1960, with no apparent changes in their leaning since.

NEWS MANAGEMENT: THERE'S NOTHING NEW ABOUT THIS TECHNIQUE

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—There's some interesting irony behind the fact that Arthur Krock, pundit emeritus of the New York Times, has written in Fortune magazine a scathing criticism of the Kennedy administration's managed news.

The irony results from the fact that Arthur put the Kennedy family in the newspaper business. He got Jacqueline Kennedy her job with the Washington Times Herald as "the inquiring reporter." He got the late Kathleen Kennedy, sister of the President, a job as secretary to Frank Waldrop, editor of the Times Herald. And he encouraged the President, when a Senator, to write his book, "Profiles in Courage." In the preface of the book, John F. Kennedy pays tribute to Krock for his help.

As a result of this intimacy, J.F.K., a week or two after he became President, dropped quietly around to Krock's house for dinner. The guest list was carefully selected and guests were instructed not to breathe a word that the President was present.

NOT EVEN FRIENDS

But the President isn't dining at the Krocks' any more. The two aren't even friends. For you can't keep on panning any President and expect him to slip round to a family dinner.

This is a penalty which every newspaperman has to risk. If you're going to keep your independence, you can't afford to get too chummy with the White House.

However, failure to dine with the President, or even having the President sore at you, does not mean that news is managed. Almost every President I have known, with the exception of Harry Truman, has tried to influence the news; and Kennedy is no different from the others. He is less managerial than Eisenhower and Hoover, more so than Roosevelt and Truman.

HOW TO MANAGE NEWS

Looking back on a long period of covering Washington, I can recall that Calvin Coolidge resorted to very little news management. He didn't have to. Times were good, problems nonexistent, the Coolidge bull market was roaring, and any newsman who tried to report that Coolidge wasn't the greatest President since Washington was likely to have trouble with his publisher.

Herbert Hoover did attempt news management, and with a heavy hand.

When Herbert Hoover didn't like what the Chicago Daily News carried from the London Naval Conference, he called in Col. Frank Knox, the publisher, and insinuated that Paul Scott Mowrer, foreign editor of the News, and Constantine Brown, its London correspondent, should be fired.

John C. Martin, publisher of the Philadelphia Public Ledger and the New York Post, also was summoned to the White House, received presidential complaints against Frank Simons, syndicated columnist. Toward the end of the Hoover administration, Patrick J. Hurley, then Secretary of War, demanded of the Baltimore Sun that I be fired. I was.

In diagnosing so-called management of the news, you have to remember that around 80 percent of the press is Republican; so that, normally, Democratic Presidents are subject to more relentless scrutiny than when a Republican is in the White House.

FDR'S TACTICS

Knowing this, Roosevelt solicited the advice of several newsmen on how to get along with the press. He even invited me all the way to Warm Springs, Ga., before he was inaugurated, to ask my ideas. They were very rudimentary—namely, that the publishers would be against him anyway, so concentrate on the working press. The newsmen covering the White House I compare to machinegunners in the frontline trenches, firing a thousand words on the front pages every day, while the publishers fired one big gun buried on the editorial page.

I am sure Roosevelt would have pursued this course any way, regardless of advice. But he used to enjoy twitting the editors and publishers, and for the most part got along with the working press. He even started the custom of inviting the working press to an annual White House reception.

Truman was the most nonchalant President with his press relations I have known. Criticism definitely did not get under his skin, but he slugged it out rather than trying to manage anyone.

IKE'S MANAGEMENT

President Eisenhower probably did more news managing than other recent Presidents or, rather, had Jim Hagerty do it for him. Ike didn't get too irked with the press, for the simple reason that he never read the papers. They were boiled down and put before him in capsule form, with the stingers pulled.

But, whenever an unfavorable story was about to break, the skillful Jim Hagerty managed the headlines by breaking another big story, this one favorable, in order to hog the headlines. For instance, when Charlie Bartlett broke the story of Air Force Secretary Harold Talbott's conflict of interest, Hagerty rushed out an announcement that Eisenhower planned to launch a new satellite into outer space.

Somehow or other, such unpleasant incidents as when Ike got mad down in Georgia and threw his golf club at the side of his golfmobile, never managed to get published. Some said it was because newsmen and photographers covering Ike had their baggage lost or their hotel reservations ignored, if they were too critical.

At any rate, Ike's news management was sometimes very subtle; but it was definitely there.

KENNEDY'S MANAGEMENT

Under Kennedy, news management is not so subtle and probably not so efficient. This is partly because the majority of publishers are against Kennedy and harder to manage. Also because the President tried to do much of the managing himself.

For instance, he telephoned Henry Luce of Time and Life, and the publisher who recently put out Krock's piece on managed news, to ask him how Luce would run the country if he were in the White House. Kennedy even accepted some of Luce's ideas. But, this did not change the critical tenor of Time's news coverage.

Kennedy also phoned James Reston of the New York Times, to complain about the publication of a photo of himself, dripping wet on a California beach, being admired by adoring, scantily clad females.

And, on one occasion, the President inquired with alarm how many issues of the New York Times containing Krock's critical column on Katanga were being circulated in Washington. As a result of the strike, there were only about 30.

In brief, Kennedy is very "PR conscious." He watches his public relations more than any other recent President. But when he calls in the press, as he did in Florida before Christmas, and gives them a background statement on his hopes, aims, and policies to be printed as coming from high authoritative sources, he is doing exactly what Calvin Coolidge, Republican, did four decades ago.

The only difference is that Kennedy does it once a year, whereas Coolidge used the White House spokesman technique twice a week.

The Late Honorable Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, Representative CLYDE DOYLE was a close personal friend of mine. I shall miss Mr. DOYLE not only because he was one of the kindest and most thoughtful of persons, but because he was a man dedicated to helping his fellow man.

Many of his family continue to live in my congressional district. I know most of them personally. To Mrs. Doyle and his daughter and to the other members of his family I extend my heartfelt sympathies.

The Opinion Poll Results, 22d Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks I have received over 16,000 replies to my 1963 opinion poll. This questionnaire is mailed annually to each family of registered voters in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio shortly after the convening of each session of the Congress.

May I express my continuing gratitude to each person who replied to this poll for his interest in his Government and in the many important issues that face the present session of the Congress. It is only through the expression of the views of our constituents that the Congress can get the feel of the grassroots sentiment of the American public. The results of this poll should be of particular interest to the Congress because of the nearly equal number of registered Republicans and Democrats who reside in this district, with the balance of the residents maintaining an independent political status.

There appears to be strong sentiment in favor of a reduction in Federal income taxes with 74 percent of the replies to a question on this subject approving a tax cut, 21 percent opposing a tax cut, and 6 percent having no opinion. There is an even greater sentiment favoring a corresponding, or substantial reduction in Federal spending, with people basing their opinion undoubtedly on the fact that if there is to be a tax cut it will have to be one earned by the taxpayers through a cutback in Federal expenditures. Favoring such reduction in Federal spending were 75 percent of the replies, while 10 percent were opposed, and 15 percent had no opinion. A strong reaction was received in letters from many homeowners who strenuously object to any tax revision program that will not allow them to take full credit on their income tax return for real estate taxes, interest payments on their home mortgages, and contributions to charitable causes.

The steadily declining interest in a Federal health care plan tied in with the social security system was further emphasized by a 50-percent vote opposing the social security health care approach, 37 percent favoring it, and 13 percent having no opinion. The trend of thinking on this subject as reflected in these polls over the past 4 years is as follows:

[In percent]

Year	Yes	No	No opinion
1960	60.3	32.0	7.7
1961	58.0	35.0	7.0
1962	55.3	40.1	4.6
1963	37.0	50.0	13.0

This trend away from a program of health care under the social security system, does not, however, indicate a rejection on the part of a majority of people of the need for some assistance on the part of the Federal Government to help our aged in meeting the constantly increasing costs of hospital and medical care. There appears to be a realization that there are other and better ways this can be accomplished as suggested by the 41 percent favorable response to the question setting forth a program of voluntary health insurance with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year for each taxpayer over 65 years of age to cover the cost of the premium for such health insurance. It is hoped that the administration and the Congress will give serious study to this type of approach to alleviate the costly burden of health care borne by our senior citizens.

It was especially interesting to see the strong support for legislation I have introduced to permit a taxpayer to deduct from his income tax the cost of college tuition and educational expense, or that of his dependents. This legislation, if enacted, would be of substantial benefit to higher education, to families who are trying to provide a college education for their children, and would not be in conflict with the constitutional provision establishing the separation of church and state.

Those who are familiar with and have supported the efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities will be heartened to know of the strong support the work of this committee is receiving from the general public. The continuation of this committee was approved by 73 percent of the replies, opposed by only 14 percent, with 13 percent of the people expressing no opinion. The residents of the 22d District will be interested in learning that the Congress has recently approved the budget for the continued work of this committee by a vote of 385 to 20.

The growing sentiment that Congress must take some positive action in the field of labor-management relations is clearly reflected in the opinions of residents of my district who support compulsory arbitration in nationwide strikes by a favorable vote of 74 percent, with 18 percent opposed, and 8 percent having no opinion. An equally strong vote in favor of including labor unions under the type of antitrust laws now governing industry is shown with 75 percent of the replies approving of such legislation, 10 percent opposing, and 15 percent having no opinion.

Although most Members of Congress receive a great amount of mail opposing military and economic aid to foreign countries it is enlightening to know that the greater weight of opinion favors continuation of this program as one of our main forces in combating the spread of communism. In favor of this program were 53 percent of the replies, 33 percent opposed it, and 14 percent had no opinion. It is apparent also that many of those favoring foreign aid expect the Congress to review carefully every part of this program in the hope of reducing aid wherever possible, and phasing it out, or completely stopping aid, if it is determined the national interests of the United States are not being furthered.

The people of our metropolitan areas, such as Cleveland, are awakening to the need for some action on the part of the Federal Government to assist our youth, from the ages of 16 to 21 years, who either voluntarily or by force of economic necessity, drop out of school. With the high rate of unemployment—at present over 6 percent of our working force—it is difficult for these young, unskilled people to obtain work, and consequently we are plagued with increasing problems of delinquency and crime. The creation of a Youth Conservation Corps to give employment to many of these young people was approved by 66 percent of the replies, while 24 percent opposed it, and 10 percent had no opinion.

The complete results of this poll follow:

[In percent]

Do you favor or oppose—	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1. Taxes:			
(a) The proposed income tax reduction of approximately $13,500,000,000 over the next 3 years	73	21	6
(b) A corresponding reduction in Federal spending	75	10	15
2. Medical care:			
(a) A compulsory health-care plan financed through the social security system	37	50	13
(b) A voluntary private health insurance program with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year toward the cost of the premium for each taxpayer	41	32	27
(c) No further Federal participation in the health-care field	32	30	38
(d) Participation by the State of Ohio in the existing Federal Kerr-Mills health care program covering persons in low income brackets	36	27	37
3. Education:			
(a) An income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition and educational expenses of a taxpayer or his dependents	73	18	9
(b) Federal assistance to needy States for public school construction	46	39	15
(c) Federal aid to colleges and universities for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and research facilities	46	39	15
4. Communism: Continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities	73	14	13

[In percent]

Do you favor or oppose—	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
5. Labor:			
(a) A Federal compulsory arbitration law to resolve labor-management differences when it is determined that the national interest is affected by a nationwide strike	74	18	8
(b) Including labor unions under antitrust laws	75	10	15
6. Social security: Amending the social security law to permit continuation of benefits to children between the ages of 18 and 21 while they remain in school	68	23	9
7. Veterans: Legislation to grant GI educational benefits to peacetime servicemen	45	43	12
8. Foreign affairs: Continuation of our military and economic aid program to friendly nations	53	33	14
9. Mass transit: A Federal program to assist cities in establishing and maintaining mass transit systems	27	59	14
10. Domestic Peace Corps: The establishment of a domestic Peace Corps	37	45	18
11. Youth Corps: The creation of a Youth Corps to give employment to unskilled youth between the ages of 16 to 21 years	66	24	10
12. National debt limit: An increase in the present national debt limit of $308,000,000,000 to permit financing of a tax cut and any new domestic programs	28	58	14

Setting a Price on Use of the Great Outdoors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the insatiable appetite of Government departments to extend bureaucratic control over forest reserves and other public lands is a matter of grave concern in Idaho, a State with the greater portion of its area contained in Federal lands. There is a proposal before the Congress to charge fees for recreational use of these facilities, a proposition that I view with distaste and which will alarm the people of Idaho. The matter is sagely discussed in an editorial in the March 13 edition of the Idaho Daily Statesman, published at Boise, Idaho, which I submit herewith and recommend for reading by my colleagues and all people who are interested in preserving their freedom to use the great outdoors of our mountains and forests and streams without imposition of a fee for recreation:

A TWO-PRONGED APPROACH

One way that Federal authority might finance a $1 billion outdoor recreation program for "improvement" of lands under its control would be to assess and collect a fee of $2 or $3 from persons entering on those areas.

That's the proposal set forth in a bill, S. 859, on which the Senate Interior Committee has lately conducted hearings. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman testified for the proposal, but about a dozen Senators raised questions.

One of them, Idaho's Senator FRANK CHURCH, said westerners are accustomed to free use of parks and forests and charging them fees might cause as big an uproar as when barbed wire fences were put on the range. He suggested, too, that westerners might become so incensed that it might be necessary to employ more rangers and arm them with guns.

That, of course, is carrying an expression of opposition to an extreme. But it is indicative of popular resistance that the proposal would surely encounter if it were put into operation.

Nobody's objecting to the fee that's charged for admission to the national parks where the need for accommodations, roads, and supervision that are provided is quite obvious. Idaho's national monument, the Craters of the Moon, has been improved, and imposition of the fee there seems to be pretty generally accepted. It would seem to be quite likely, too, that picnickers and campers might quite readily go along with a policy under which they would pay a reasonable fee for use of facilities provided for their convenience.

What does give rise to vigorous opposition to this expended fees proposal is the broad range of its scope. It would apply not only to the national parks, but also to areas under the control of half a dozen other Federal agencies—the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary between the United States and Mexico.

Under its provisions, conceivably, a fee could be charged for going onto Bureau of Land Management sagebrush lands around Boise. And the Caldwell News-Tribune poses a not impertinent question: "How would you like to have to buy a Federal permit to go to Kuna Cave, or up Jump Creek or Succor Creek, or on a rock hunting trip, or to take friends up to Silver City?"

Resistance to this proposal is bound to be pretty resolute until and unless the sales pitch can be revised to give assurance that this fees system would be administered with reason and restraint, and that the fees payer would be getting value for his money.

It's to be observed, though, that Federal authority has another string to its bow. Sponsors of this fees system are saying that they would be quite happy to take, instead, appropriations of $60 million annually for 8 years to accomplish their purpose.

So it could be that the proposal of this fees system is a diversionary tactic. What we have to deal with may be an approach on two fronts. While we're resisting one of them, we may be well advised to be vigilantly on guard against the other, too.

Tribute to Clyde Doyle, Deceased

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, being only a freshman Member of this honorable body, I have not had the privilege of knowing CLYDE DOYLE as those who have already expressed their sentiments. Ours was only a casual acquaintanceship. But I do know that he was a supporter of statehood for Hawaii when we were knocking at the congressional doors for admission into the Union.

As a representative of Hawaii's grateful people, I join in grieving over the loss of CLYDE DOYLE, of whom it can aptly be said that he, too, like his son, gave up his life for love of his country and his fellow men.

While I fully realize that human words, no matter how sweet, cannot beguile Mrs. Doyle and her family from the great sorrow that must be theirs, I wish to add my expressions of sympathy and condolences to those already expressed. I do hope and pray that they will derive some comfort from the fact that there are many friends and beneficiaries of his handiwork who share in their immeasurable loss.

New Regulations Regarding Small Business Investment Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested in a recent press release from the Small Business Administration concerning the use of funds committed to small business investment companies.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, was enacted to help provide for an additional source of long-term funds and equity capital for small business—and any diversion of funds by these licensed and chartered institutions will serve to defeat the purpose and intent of Congress in enacting this legislation.

The new regulations announced by the Small Business Administration directs that small business investment company funds may not be used for purposes contrary to the intent as enacted by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the press release in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Funds raised by small business investment companies for the sole purpose of assisting small business concerns cannot be diverted to other types of financing under amended regulations announced today by the Small Business Administration.

In explaining the amended regulations, SBA Administrator John E. Horne pointed out that it was the clear intent of Congress, in adopting the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, that SBIC's be chartered for corporate existence under State law solely and expressly for the purposes of operating under the act, and be licensed by SBA under Federal law for the same purpose.

The new regulations also provide that the paid-in capital and paid-in surplus of a licensee cannot be reduced more than 10 percent in any one fiscal year of the licensee.

In a few cases, Mr. Horne added, licensees have applied to SBA for permission to sur-

render their licenses, but with the intent to continue their corporate existence and to use their funds—raised to help small business concerns—for purposes alien to the act. The agency has found that to permit any such diversion of corporate purpose and funds would frustrate and impair the administration of the act. Thus, effective immediately, SBA will not permit the surrender of a license unless accompanied by a satisfactory plan for the liquidation of the licensee's assets, distribution to its shareholders, and dissolution.

In other cases, licensees have proposed to reduce their paid-in capital and paid-in surplus to such an extent that their previously approved plans of operation and investment policies would be materially affected. A substantial reduction of capital is in effect a partial dissolution. To allow it would be to allow a diversion of capital from the purpose intended by Congress—namely assisting small business concerns.

Accordingly, the paid-in capital and paid-in surplus of a licensee cannot be reduced more than 10 percent in any one fiscal year.

Licensees under no circumstances will be allowed to reduce their paid-in capital and paid-in surplus below the statutory minimum of $300,000, and if they are borrowers from SBA, they must obtain prior approval from SBA for the permitted 10-percent reduction.

Administrator Horne also pointed out that the regulation requiring SBA approval of new officers, directors, and 10-percent-or-more stockholders of licensees remains in full force and effect.

Costa Rica Meeting and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is scheduled to attend the forthcoming meeting of the Presidents of the Central American States and Panama at San Jose, Costa Rica. It is assumed that matters of vital concern to those countries and our own Nation will be discussed. It is likely that one of these subjects will be the Panama Canal.

Over a period of many years our Government has made concession and concession to Panama, and all without any realistic compensatory or reciprocal benefits to our country. Moreover, the rights, power, and authority of the United States concerning the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal have been steadily impaired.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that whatever weakens the authority of the United States in these regards hurts Panama and the five Central American countries as well. It is to be hoped that the President will meet any proposals which may further our treaty rights concerning the canal with a rocklike stand for our own interests.

The time is certainly overripe for a forthright and openly proclaimed reaffirmation of our treaty rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, accompanied by the declaration by our Government that what serves the best interests of the canal also serves the best interests of the countries of the Isthmian region and for the entire free world as well. The approaching meeting should supply an appropriate occasion for such declaration.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, are now viewing the Costa Rica meeting with deep concern.

Uncle's Oil Policy Aids Castro Plot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Uncle's Oil Policy Aids Castro Plot," which appeared in the March 11, 1963, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

UNCLE'S OIL POLICY AIDS CASTRO PLOT

The National Coal Policy Conference, a group made up of mines, miners, railroads, and others interested in coal's future, depicts in a cartoon—and only as a cartoon can—what would happen to industries and the public on our east coast if Fidel Castro, Communist dictator of Cuba, decided to shut off the flow of cheap waste oil from Venezuela.

It is this matter of waste oil dumped on our shores at any old price which is the chief concern of the Coal Policy Conference these days, and for good reason.

Not only is there a national security angle to the menace of waste oil, but there is the vital matter of jobs for coal miners, thousands of whose means of livelihood have been taken away by the flood of waste oil which our Government permits to be dumped into some of coal's natural markets.

The Coal Policy Conference cartoon depicts the bearded Castro, with hand upon a valve in the Venezuela pipeline to our east coast, turning the valve to the "off" position. The little man with the big beard, standing on his Red island athwart the oil route from Venezuela, could easily, with the help of his Russian and Red Chinese allies, stop the flow of oil.

The cartoon is not exaggerated, the menace of the possibility being that those plants on the east coast which have converted from coal to waste oil, under the promise of a saving in fuel costs, might find themselves some fine day without any fuel at all. The damaging effect would not be confined to these plants, of course, but would affect to that extent our ability to wage war; hence the proposition has a defense angle which Washington should be quick to see.

Coal Policy Conference makes the following points in the matter of Castro and what he has in his power to do:

The threat posed by Castro to Venezuela, the source of most east coast waste oil, is clear and present.

If Venezuela falls to Castro, the alternatives faced by the United States would be either an interrupted supply of fuel for highly essential east coast plants or the buying of oil from a Communist regime.

By stabilizing oil imports, the dependence upon foreign oil could be checked and reversed, thus avoiding the real danger of giving to Castro a trump card in the months ahead.

The alternative is a continuation of present oil import policies which are creating a situation ready made for exploitation by our enemy, Castro.

The Coal Policy Conference, a large bloc of Representatives and Senators from coal States, and a number of citizen groups and individual citizens, insist, with sound sense, that our National Government's oil import policies which have created such bleak alternatives for the Nation must be reexamined and revised.

By what strange logic or reason, it is proper to ask, did our Government arrive at waste oil import policies which could make so vital a sector of our economy as the east coast a possible hostage to the ambitions of Fidel Castro, and encourage the well-advanced Communist plot to take over Venezuela?

In the forefront of people entitled to ask this question, of course, are coal miners idled by the waste oil imports, coal properties with reduced running time, railroads and railroad employees, and all others whose economic well-being is dependent upon good old coal, the basic fuel in our country's wartime and peacetime needs.

Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, many of us who supported H.R. 10 over the years before its enactment, have been concerned over the lack of speed displayed by the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service in promulgating regulations to implement the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962.

Although this delay may be justified, in view of the many complexities of the statute, nevertheless the lack of guidelines has held back many interested private funding media from putting plans on the market.

However, there have been indications that a breakthrough has come even in advance of the Treasury regulations. Last week I attended a press conference at which the Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co. of Washington, D.C., announced that its plan is going on the market immediately. VALIC President John D. Marsh explained that he feels this plan will comply with the Treasury regulations, whatever they may be.

This first insured H.R. 10 retirement plan combines the features of a variable annuity and a fixed dollar annuity, with complete flexibility designed to fit the needs of every individual. Under this unique equity-funded retirement plan, the purchaser may select any range of benefits from a 100-percent variable annuity to a 100-percent fixed-dollar annuity.

It has these plus factors:

First. Simplicity—the buyer need not be concerned with the complexities generally associated with pension and retirement plans.

Second. Additional benefits—the buyer has the option of including such benefits as life and disability coverage in the annuity contracts at special premium rates. The participating employees of the self-employed individual also will be able to purchase these additional coverages if they wish.

Third. Group coverage—VALIC will write this plan on a group basis as well as on an individual basis and therefore it can be geared to fit the needs of associations of self-employed individuals—at lower group premium rates.

Skidding on Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend we received the unhappy news that the administration has chosen, after all, to ignore recommendations of its own Office of Emergency Planning regarding the control program on residual oil.

This action had been rumored, of course. Mr. Boyle of the United Mine Workers actually told reporters in advance of the Interior Department's announcements that he had the President's "assurances" that the OEP would be disregarded in this matter.

On February 13, 1963, in response to a petition I had the pleasure of initiating, the Office of Emergency Planning issued to the President a thoughtful report based on literally years of study of the residual oil import qeustion. The conclusions were, essentially, that imports of this low-grade fuel oil do not jeopardize national security, nor do they contribute to any significant degree to unemployment in the soft coal industry. In view of these findings, the Office of Emergency Planning then recommended, very conservatively I would say, a "meaningful relaxation" of the restrictions.

Despite this carefully considered study and Director McDermott's recommendations, the administration has announced quota levels that permit for a smaller increase in imports than were allowed last year.

As the Washington Post very aptly puts it, this represents a "significant victory" for the coal and domestic oil industry. The victory was bought, however, at the cost of a continuing burden to the users of this fuel—an unwarranted discrimination that serves no national purpose and can only be interpreted as a political concession.

In this regard I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues two editorials on this subject: one, from the Washington Post, following the decision; the other published in the Boston Herald before the decision. They merit the consideration of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1963]

SKIDDING ON OIL

Caught between the devil of domestic politics and the deep blue Caribbean Sea, the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy. It is seeking to please everybody. During the Eisenhower administration, this country unwisely began placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States. And what has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry.

A month ago, a top-level White House memorandum called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports. The outcry from coal producers and from the refining branch of the oil industry was prompt and predictable—and apparently the outcry was heard. As this newspaper forecast, the administration yesterday announced the smallest possible increase in residual quotas—50,000 barrels a day which would make the daily quota 567,000 barrels.

The figures are slippery, and by artful presentation it may be possible to argue that something is being done for the embattled democracy of Venezuela. But can it be seriously argued that the wafer-thin increase is in any sense "meaningful"? That was the phrase used by the White House memorandum—a phrase, be it noted, that was approved by every department involved except the Labor Department. Last year, without benefit of a White House report, residual quotas were increased by 56,000 barrels a day.

Let it be acknowledged that the dilemma is real. But this administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism. It surely might entail some difficulties with coal State Senators if a genuinely "meaningful" relaxation of residual oil imports were put into effect April 1. But then it would entail infinitely more difficulties if the regime of President Betancourt should be overwhelmed by the totalitarian enemies who find comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela.

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, Mar. 10, 1963]

BLACKMAIL OR OIL

A brutal fight is going on in Washington to force higher fuel costs on New England by further restricting our residual oil imports. According to Platt's Oilgram News Service, Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD of West Virginia, have warned the Kennedy administration to cut down the import quota on this heavy oil or suffer reprisals in Congress on the Kennedy trade expansion program.

This is a kind of blackmail aimed at coercing the President to scrap the careful findings of his own Director of Emergency Planning. These findings destroyed the only legal foundation for import curbs—national security. The Nation's defense is not disturbed by residual oil imports; in fact Under Secretary of State Ball advises that doubts about the residual import program cause problems in our relations with friendly nations. Venezuela is the chief source of residual.

The Emergency Planning Director has only one reservation—that the Government proceed carefully to assure the continued primacy of Western Hemisphere oil sources.

The soft coal lobby and the soft coal States still fight us. They contend, against decisive data to the contrary in the emergency planning report, that the use of residual oil in New England is throwing miners out of work.

What are the facts?

The consumption of residual in district I (the east coast) has not materially increased in the last 10 years. The increase in imports has simply replaced a decline in domestic production of this almost waste product.

Unemployment in the mining industry is not the consequence of residual oil competition, but results from the dieselization of railroads, a shift by households and small concerns from coal to fuels other than residual, a more efficient use of coal particularly by utilities and above all by mechanization of mining.

The coal industry's only major gain since the war has been in the utility market where the most direct competition between coal and residual takes place. Coal has more than held its own there.

Residual oil is an important fuel in a very limited part of the country—chiefly in New England and Florida and in these regions only in areas adjacent to water transportation.

Yet for such illusory gain for the coal industry, New England is subjected to these ills:

An increase in the cost of oil from 23 cents to 47 cents a barrel as measured by the difference in price between bonded and unbonded oil drawn from the same spigot.

An increase in the price of other energy fuels.

A disorganization of distribution so that competitive pricing is impossible and buyers are tied to one dealer.

The President's Director of Emergency Planning declares there is no salvation for the coal industry in residual restrictions, only grief for New England. Defiantly the coal States still demand higher restrictions on the threat of legislative reprisals.

Which wins, blackmail or oil for New England?

Hon. Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, today our country, our State, and our Nation lost a real champion of democracy, with the sudden passing of our colleague, CLYDE DOYLE. Little did we realize that when he answered the rollcall on the floor yesterday that we were witnessing the final vote to be cast by this sincere, dedicated legislator. His 16 years were spent in devotion to what he felt was the right answer to the many legislative decisions that he faced. This record of accomplishment has left its mark of sincerity upon his contemporaries for time immemorial.

It has only been my privilege to serve with him for a short time on the Hill. Even though this is my first term my colleague CLYDE DOYLE has found the time to drop by my office and ask if there was any way in which he could be of assistance to me or my staff in helping us to get started with our future endeavors in representing the district.

This was the fabric of the man; he always had time for his fellow man.

Mrs. Burkhalter joins with me in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and daughter and her family in the loss of a devoted husband and father.

Lack of Executive Control Results in Alarming Squandering of Public Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it becomes more evident every day that the conduct of the affairs of this Nation is grossly inefficient and archaic.

Our Federal system of executive and administrative management is wholly inadequate. It lacks control and accountability for Federal expenditures. There is a lack of incentive for efficient management and an equal lack of penalization for mismanagement, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in office. Almost daily, the Comptroller General of the United States reports to the Congress on situations where the Government is shown to have wantonly dissipated millions of dollars of public funds.

Mr. Speaker, the following briefs are extracted from two reports recently issued by the Comptroller General:

NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS BY GOVERNMENT FOR PETROLEUM COMMERCIAL STORAGE WASTES $10.3 MILLION

From September 1958, to December 1962, the Defense Petroleum Supply Center of the Department of Defense negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in commercially owned and operated facilities.

The total cost to the Government of these contracts was $33.6 million.

The Comptroller General estimated that the Government could have constructed its own facilities at a cost of only $23.3 million.

Not only would $10.3 million have been saved for the taxpayers, but the Government would then also own and operate those facilities.

In order to obtain title to the commercial storage facilities under these circumstances, the Government would have to pay an additional $9 million.

The Comptroller General's report stated: "Had Department officials appropriately evaluated the relative costs of Government facilities with the prices proposed by contractors for storage in commercial facilities, they should have recognized that the proposed prices would result in relatively large and disproportionately higher costs to the Government."

GROSSLY INEFFECTIVE SAFEGUARDS BY GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR RESULT IN EXCESSIVE COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT

The Atomic Energy Commission contracted with Sandia Corp., of Albuquerque, N. Mex., for the design and development of weapons around the explosive systems conceived by AEC's nuclear research.

The Comptroller General's review of this contract indicated that purchase order prices negotiated by Sandia with six of its suppliers "had been accepted without adequate evaluation of the cost estimates, either by Sandia or by the Atomic Energy Commission, thereby resulting in increased costs to the Government." All overstated costs agreed to by Sandia would, of course, be passed on to the Government.

Time and time again, the Comptroller General found that Sandia failed to obtain sufficient evidence of the reasonableness of the quoted prices, and then neglected to perform an adequate review.

As a result of these failures, Sandia would negotiate greatly overstated "fixed-price purchase orders" with the companies concerned. The suppliers, after fulfilling their contracts at costs to them a great deal below the "fixed-price purchase order," would justify their "windfall profits" on the basis of "increased efficiency of operation."

The following are specific instances wherein the GAO cited the suppliers as having realized grossly excessive profits:

(1) Catalyst Research Corp. charged the Government $610,000 in excessive labor costs and fixed fees;

(2) On purchase orders totaling $663,064, the American Instrument Co. realized a profit of $184,044;

(3) Sandia erroneously paid Curtiss-Wright Corp. $189,600, due to an overstatement of prices by Curtiss-Wright. This price overstatement resulted from the use of projected material cost data, apparent duplicate charges for certain modifications, and even charges for equipment which the Government itself had furnished to Curtiss-Wright;

(4) The AEC approved purchase orders negotiated by Sandia with Waste King Corp., relying on Sandia to obtain sufficient evidence of the reasonableness of the quoted prices. This, however, was not done, and the Government incurred excess costs of more than $132,000.

Specific deficiencies noted by GAO:

(1) Purchase orders did not provide adequate safeguards to protect the Government as to reasonableness of costs.

(2) Fixed-price purchase orders did not give Sandia the right to audit supplier's costs. For example, Waste King proposed a price increase of about $554, or 28 percent, for each of 724 tail cone assemblies, which was subsequently approved by Sandia. Because an audit clause was not included in the fixed-price purchase orders, Sandia was precluded from using an audit of Waste King's costs as a means of determining the reasonableness of the price increase.

(3) Development purchase order did not give AEC protection as to the reasonableness of prices under subsequent production orders.

(4) Sandia did not include a purchase order provision reserving the right for Sandia to approve its suppliers' subcontracts awarded to a wholly-owned subsidiary.

Mr. Speaker, the fantastic chronology of waste and mismanagement in the Federal Government repeatedly uncovered by the Comptroller General makes it self-evident that expenditures could be reduced by a minimum of $5 to $10 billion annually. These reductions could be effected without impairing our military power or curtailing any necessary public service.

The elimination of wasteful expenditures would result in a substantial reduction of our Federal budget and in a consequent substantial reduction in taxes for the Federal taxpayer.

The Power To Not Tax Like the Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, like many Members of Congress I have become deeply concerned about a recent proposal which is contrary to the basic policy of our Government, and which will materially increase Federal expenditures and decrease Federal taxes.

With an anticipated budget deficit of almost $12 billion for fiscal year 1964 and with substantial budget deficits anticipated in future years, it becomes vitally important that our Government encourage in every way possible new investment by taxpaying business.

The electric utility industry in fiscal year 1962 paid $2,680 million in local, State, and Federal taxes. That industry's annual investment in new plant and equipment of about $3½ billion is approximately 10 percent of the total annual investment in new plant and equipment by all American business.

The present administration says that its policy is to encourage taxpaying American business to invest more money in new property and thereby create new taxes. The administration's policy in connection with the taxpaying utility industry appears to me to be exactly the opposite and to be one of destruction instead of one of creation.

The most serious deterrents that I have seen to new investment by any business are the recently proposed regulations of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture regarding rights-of-way for electric power transmission lines.

These regulations, among other things, provide:

First. That the Secretary can refuse to issue a transmission line right-of-way permit if he believes that the proposed line is not in accordance with the Federal power marketing policy. This, in short, means that he could deny a permit to build an investor-owned taxpaying line in order to make it necessary that a Federal tax-free line be built.

Second. If a permit is issued it is to contain a provision giving the Interior Department the right to utilize the excess capacity of the line, to transmit power to any Federal customer. This would place the Interior Department in a position to take away present customers and future customers of taxpaying utilities, thereby reducing the future investment of those taxpaying utilities in generation, transmission, and distribution facilities.

In my judgment these regulations are not only wrong in principle but they make the Interior and Agriculture Departments a dictator in connection with

the use of the transmission facilities of the investor-owned utilities when those utilities are directly in competition with the Interior Department electric power sales program.

Unless the Interior and Agriculture Departments decide against the issuance of these transmission lines right-of-way regulations, I strongly believe that Congress should take some very direct and affirmative action in this connection to reduce Federal expenses in connection with the Federal power program and to encourage the creation of new taxpaying facilities.

Tennessee Space Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Arnold Engineering Development Center near Tullahoma, Tenn., in the district I have the honor to represent, for a number of years has been one of the Nation's outstanding aerodynamic and space research centers. They have engaged in a training program for scientists through a small cadre of outstanding scientists and engineers.

Recently Arnold Center officials, the Department of the Air Force, the University of Tennessee, and others have worked for the establishment of the Tennessee Space Institute at the Center. The Air Force has made the necessary land available for this Center and the State legislature has recently authorized the expenditure of $2 million for the establishment of this Center.

Although Tennessee has already been in the space field, this new space Center places our State in the fore in the space race. The Center has already received encouragement from the National Science Foundation and from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Under the guidance of the trustees of the University of Tennessee, Tennessee Space Institute should be in line for substantial grant and research assistance from the Federal Government to assist in its training and research programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial has commented on the importance of this center. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

TENNESSEE STAKES ITS OWN CLAIM ON SPACE

It is an accepted fact of our times that we have passed through the threshold of the space age. Men have circled this planet at fabulous speeds and any number of scientific gadgets have been lofted into the thin, thin air.

Talk these days in the aerospace ready-rooms is of manned shots at the moon and other Buck Rogeresque feats which sorely test the average earthman's imagination. Still, one after another, undreamed of conquests are being made as well as planned.

What do we as a nation gain by all this tremendously expensive experimentation? First, and foremost, it could mean our very survival, for if the bandit nation lays first claim to space it has a better than even chance of dominating this planet. Secondly, of course, the interest of science is served. By learning more about that which now lies beyond our ken, we learn more about ourselves and our world.

It is in keeping with the times that the State's general assembly has authorized the expenditure of $2 million to establish a space institute at the Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma to be operated under the auspices of the University of Tennessee.

It will be the mission of this new educational arm to offer graduate level courses in aerospace science and engineering while carrying on research in these fields for both Government and industry.

The measure was offered for consideration by the Clement administration and drew wide support throughout the State, as well as endorsement by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the group charged with directing the country's space experiments.

The location at AEDC is ideal. Too, the Government's massive missile center at Huntsville, Ala., is but a short distance away. Those who have pioneered the field will be readily available for consultation and seminars.

The space institute as it expands will play an important role in this new and exciting field. By taking affirmative action, the legislature has developed new educational opportunities for young Tennessee scientist-engineers, creating a pool of trained technicians for prospective industry and above all has furthered the Nation's efforts in aerospace.

Wrong Way To Make Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Island, Ill., Argus of March 12, 1963:

WRONG WAY TO MAKE JOBS

President Kennedy is right in assessing unemployment as the No. 1 U.S. problem. It increases relief costs and aggravates the crime problem. Worst of all, it denies an opportunity for the jobless to make something of themselves and raise their families in decent circumstances. Mr. Kennedy presented some of the hard facts to Congress yesterday.

But his proposed solution continues to defy tradition. He makes a new plea for tax reduction without corresponding economies, and urges a series of domestic programs calculated to spur the national economy, or put more zip in it, in the words of his chief economic adviser.

He has overlooked a vital factor in prosperity. It is investment confidence. Because some of our major industries show an excess of plant capacity over present demand, he apparently assumes that investment capital and business expansion are a secondary factor, that the main task is to scatter more dollars around so that the greater purchasing power will put all the plant capacity to work, and thus create more jobs.

But many companies would like to improve their production efficiency and do a better job of competing with foreign producers. Enterprisers would go ahead with new ideas if they could find the capital that had confidence in the future. They hold back because this all-important confidence is lacking.

Mr. Kennedy's own figures ought to convince him that he is on the wrong track. His deficit for the current year is running at a rate of around $8 billion, up from last year. Yet while income has risen, unemployment also has jumped and is now above 6 percent.

Obviously, dollar spreading is not the right remedy. Mr. Kennedy would do better to spread a little confidence in the business world by putting the Government's financial house in order.

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker—

The American public is becoming increasingly alarmed as the spending programs of Government reach astronomical proportions.

That is the opening sentence of a letter I received from John H. Hafemeister, vice president of the Ideals Publishing Co., in Milwaukee. And it correctly sums up the views being expressed more and more in mail from home.

Mr. Hafemeister's comments are particularly cogent. In the hope of convincing Members who need convincing that this growing opposition to wasteful and deficit spending is reaching convincing proportions, I am, under unanimous consent, placing Mr. Hafemeister's letter in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

IDEALS PUBLISHING CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 20, 1963.

Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GOOD MORNING, CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: The American public is becoming increasingly alarmed as the spending programs of Government reach astronomical proportions.

Those funds, provided by the productive segment of the American economy, no longer match anticipated spending, nor can it unless higher and more confiscatory taxes be levied.

For over the past 30 years, with pitifully few exceptions, our Government has tried to spend its way into prosperity.

And for over 30 years the philosophy of deficit financing has become more ingrained in Government.

There is, to the American public, little or no evidence that this policy is either wise or sound.

Rather, it has been proven unwise, unsound, and devastating to the country as inflation runs rampant through our economy.

This will stop only when legislators follow the mandate of the productive Americans and cease this destruction of the American system.

To blatantly talk of new budget of wild expenditures and still provide something for everybody in tax cuts is not only cruel but patently dishonest, and in complete violation of even a modest amount of commonsense.

To carry this concept to the absolute ridiculous, doubling the tax cut should have an even more salutary effect on the economy.

We need legislators who will emulate the conduct of the vast majority of constituents who believe in the principles that made America the strong, virile, self-supporting country that was built by men of vision and a populace who believe in the basic principles and the dignity of hard work.

By what right has the wealth of the Nation, produced by Americans, been poured into the treasuries of nations whose political paths threaten the world. These moneys and products do not even trickle to the people of these countries, as the American public had been led to believe, but serve only to perpetuate the dictatorial governments we abhor.

Our Government continues to spread our tax dollars like a mantle over the world, and serve to pay off foreign government leaders for their weakly demonstrated support, and the native populations feel not the largess of a generous Uncle Sam, and move further away from a freedom that we hoped they would achieve.

This irresponsible spending in our own country becomes a political expediency, so as not to alienate any segment of our population from the grab bag of the treasury.

We breed a new generation, segments of which no longer are dedicated to their own improvement and uplift, but are penalized if constructively employed as free dollars are so readily available only for the asking, and a reasonable amount of proof of idleness, even indolence.

Dollars that can be provided only from the earnings of those who work and produce for a constructive contribution to themselves and the Nation.

We breed a new generation who now look only to Federal Government for funds that formerly were allocated and collected on a local basis to best serve local needs. The appeal to larger governmental agencies produces no greater efficiencies or improvements, rather more costly projects and a new competition for funds dependent on the strength of political pressures.

The vast control, the ability to marshal governmental forces against business, industry, the professions, education, yes, all segments of the population, lead, as demonstrated in recent years, to controls and pressures that we have always disdained to see in foreign governments, and we seem so reluctant to recognize and fight against in our own Government.

We ask you to represent your American citizens who will not continue down any path other than the fundamental path that made America a great country.

The calculated risks of inflation and bankruptcy as demonstrated for 30 years of deficits must stop, and this problem begins with all of us, and our elected representatives.

There is an untold vast amount of support by a concerned population to those elected officials who firmly believe, who firmly act, who firmly legislate in accordance with the wishes of citizenry whose sense of fiscal responsibility is being violated in all levels of government.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. HAFEMEISTER,
Vice President, Production.

Our Money's Worth From U.N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial appearing in the Brooklyn Tablet.

As I have said on numerous occasions in the past, the Brooklyn Tablet is one of the foremost and finest newspapers in the United States of America.

This editorial entitled "Our Money's Worth From the U.N.?" clearly points out how the taxpayers' money is being used for purposes objectionable to the people of the United States and I believe it also clearly points out what must be corrected if the United Nations is ever to succeed in its designed purpose.

The editorial follows:

OUR MONEY'S WORTH FROM U.N.?

Those who have stated the Communist peril is 3,000 or more miles away received a striking answer last week on two fronts. In the first it was revealed at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York City that the sum of $3 million had been appropriated to provide an agricultural program for Communist Cuba. In the second instance, it was announced that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—had published and circulated a booklet by two Soviet citizens extolling Russia and denouncing the United States.

It is unnecessary to state that the people of the United States pay close to 40 percent of U.N. (including UNESCO) costs, and they are thereby paying their money to assist international enemies.

The Congress of the United States, and in fact the State Department, has denounced the stooges for communism guilty of these insulting and insidious actions in reference to Cuba and UNESCO. As a matter of fact, even those Congressmen, as well as newspapers, who have continually denounced critics of the U.N. and UNESCO as isolationists, reactionaries, and foes of the world peace, have now taken the lead in condemning the action of the international brigades favoring Castroism and communism over our own beloved country. Considering the desperate time the United States is having with Cuba, which now is an arsenal and base for those who would destroy us and seek to capture Latin America, this was an inopportune time for the U.N. to betray us.

As for the lying booklet put out by UNESCO, it denounces "colonialist oppression" by Western nations and describes the Soviet Union as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples," according to United Press International. "The unequal treatment of nationalities, colonialist oppression and discrimination on grounds of race or nationality, which still characterize a number of capitalist countries today, are to be explained by the political and social system prevailing in those countries." In contrast, the U.S.S.R. has achieved "full equality" between races and nationalities.

For example, the study states that in 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, "which voluntarily joined the union." As Edmund Rehak, Czech-born Secretary of the Assembly of Captive Nations of Europe, comments, "It is notoriously well known, except apparently to UNESCO, that the Baltic States were invaded by the Red army and were simply annexed by the Soviet Union."

Isn't that some education UNESCO is handing out? And at your expense. It was too much for even such an internationalist stalwart as Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to swallow. The Minnesotan declared, "It is bad enough to hear this arrant nonsense from the official organs of Soviet propaganda. It is intolerable to hear it from an international organization established to disseminate truth and knowledge, and to encourage a respect for objective scientific and social fact. (The report) is pure, patent nonsense. An organization dedicated to truth and scientific knowledge should not be engaged in such utter misrepresentation and distortion of the facts of history."

If there are any Americans who have not been alerted hitherto, they should now see the handwriting on the wall, for here is strikingly shown the hostile philosophies which threaten the United States from within. In the days of Theodore Roosevelt our Government would have spoken out clearly and loudly against these insults against our country and people, and the offenders would not only have had more respect for us but would take care not to bait us again. We are happy Congress has started to grumble and is beginning to realize we are paying the bill for advancing communism. It will, however, not begin to act effectively until it stops the flow of appropriations which enable the U.N., in matters like those revealed last week, to act as agents for the Red world offensive.

Hon. Clyde Doyle

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that all of us who knew and served with our late colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, learned of his death.

He was a man of the most unswerving dedication to the concepts of Christianity and patriotism. I have served with him on the Armed Services Committee and have observed his unfailing devotion to duty, there and on the floor of the House of Representatives. Along with people the world over who are joined in the mutual goal of fighting communism I am acquainted with the outstanding work he did as acting chairman and longtime member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In this work he never forgot that the dignity of man is priceless even to the most unfortunate among us.

May God comfort Mr. DOYLE's family with the memory that he was a Christian, a gentleman and a patriot, and one with whom we in the House of Repre-

sentatives were privileged in the highest sense to serve, a man whose special attributes will be deeply missed by us, and be freedom-loving people everywhere.

An Appeal to Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate to give space in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a column by Max Freedman in the Washington Post on Saturday, March 16. The column, which is captioned "FULBRIGHT's Example," draws attention to an appeal to reason and temperance in a world in which action and courage are basic.

I am of a different political party than Senator FULBRIGHT, and my views may often be different than his. Nevertheless, I approve his appeal to reason in the building of the type of courage and faith necessary to preserve individual freedom on the earth.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

FULBRIGHT'S EXAMPLE

(By Max Freedman)

One of the penalties for an absence from Washington is that so many events have vanished beyond recall even though one would have liked to discuss them. Fortunately, some events last beyond their hour and help to mold the slow changes of national policy. In this category, beyond doubt, belongs the book containing a selection from the public papers of Senator FULBRIGHT. Our thanks must go to Mr. Karl E. Meyer, the editor, and to Mr. Walter Lippmann for his foreword.

Even friends and admirers of Senator FULBRIGHT must read this book with a sense of astonishment. He is so much wiser and more generous than we had allowed ourselves to believe. There are, of course, some blots on his record. His conduct in the Little Rock controversy requires no eulogy, and his brief to the Supreme Court on segregation is no heroic document. But those who seek perfection should look neither at men nor at statesmen. It is enough that in an age of shabby values Senator FULBRIGHT has raised the public debate to give a fair hearing to new ideas.

With Thoreau, he believes that it is never too late to give up our prejudices. Men with this faith in the power of reason are never common in public life and are never more needed than they are now.

Since the war the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has had four important chairmen. In a formative period of American policy Senator Vandenberg provided an essential link between the past and the future. Under the guidance of Senator Connally the committee became the forum for every major debate on foreign affairs. Without Senator George, it would have been impossible for Mr. Dulles to keep Congress under his spell. Now, with Senator FULBRIGHT, we are watching a new tradition in the making.

Senator FULBRIGHT has no ambition to be the agent of the White House or the State Department. Nor does he try to impose his own authority on the committee. He remains a free spirit despite the power of his office and his loyalty to the Democratic Party. It is this freedom which explains his influence in Congress and the country.

Speaking rarely, but always with dignity, Senator FULBRIGHT has usually, on the big issues, been ahead of public opinion. He was thinking of the problems of peace when others were still caught in the toils of war. He foresaw the need of bringing Congress and the President into a sensible partnership on the broad themes of foreign policy. He organized support for the United Nations when isolationism was still a smoldering force. He wanted the Marshall plan to lead to the economic union of Western Europe. He advocated some form of political union if the members of NATO were to share an abiding purpose. It is a proud record, and it speaks for a man not adrift on the turbid stream of events but having a clear goal and making constantly for it.

As a final laurel wreath, it should be added that he has not always been most wrong when his advice has been neglected. His unavailing wisdom when he stood against the Cuban invasion is a title of glory in itself.

If one were to give a single passage as an expression of the central theme of Senator FULBRIGHT's philosophy, perhaps one would be forgiven for choosing this declaration from an address in 1961:

Our proper objective as a nation must be, as it was to Woodrow Wilson, to make a society instead of a set of barbarians out of the governments of the world. Advancement toward this objective will require persistent effort in the face of inevitable frustrations. More fundamentally, it will require the cultivation of qualities that are associated with maturity rather than youth: qualities of wisdom, as well as resourcefulness; persevering determination, as well as righteous dedication; and, perhaps most of all, moral courage in place of adolescent bravado.

It often is held as a reproach against Congress that it has dwarfed its leaders into servants of a party instead of letting them become the guides of the Nation. This charge is too violent and sweeping to be either accurate or convincing. Senator FULBRIGHT can be taken as a model of the better Members of Congress who trust the public, when it has the facts, far more than they do the unexamined decisions of even the wisest official. But he also believes that the public must suspend judgment until it knows the facts, must never sharpen personal feuds, and must always resist the folly of giving simple answers to complex questions. Armed with this faith, he is unable to have more respect for the self-righteousness of public opinion than he has for the clamorous simplicities of the fanatic. Perhaps this independence of spirit explains why he has kept so many of the pieties of scholarships amid the rancors and vanities of politics. It is an example worth following.

H.R. 2440: Defense Procurement Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on my vote on H.R. 2440—the bill authorizing $15,856,390,000 for defense procurement and research projects.

I voted for continuation of the RS-70 manned-bomber program since I feel most strongly that this is vital to our strategic defense.

I very definitely believe that we must remain militarily strong; and although I have advocated—and shall continue to advocate—economy in government, I do not feel that we should economize to the point where we weaken our defenses in any way. In regard to H.R. 2440, however, I believe that it might be possible to cut the amount requested—which was in excess of the amount asked for by the administration—and still maintain our military strength at a level second to none. I, therefore, voted for recommittal of the bill for further study by the Committee on Armed Forces.

When this recommittal motion failed—and because of my respect for the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services—I accepted that committee's recommendation and voted for passage of H.R. 2440.

However, I want it understood that when I have the opportunity to vote on specific appropriations in the future, I intend to vote to cut expenditures where I feel that such cuts are sound and will not result in impairment to our national security and well-being.

Disaster Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD a telegram I recently received from the Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia, which offered to replace all uninsured Smith, Kline & French medicinal supplies that were damaged or destroyed as a result of the recent disaster in Alabama caused by the floods.

This is an instance of cooperation that can only be accomplished in a democracy where each one is interested in the health and welfare of his neighbor:

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Smith Kline & French Laboratories expresses deep sympathy for the citizens of Alabama whose lives have been tragically disrupted by the disaster of the recent floods. My company stands ready to help as best it can the process of recovery to normal conditions. We have arranged through the Alabama Pharmaceutical Association to replace at no cost uninsured SK&F medicinal products which have been damaged or destroyed by the floods. We hope our aid will be of economic benefit to the pharmacies af-

fected and of genuine service to all citizens of your State who require our products for their good health.

WALTER A. MUNNS,
President, Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

I would also like to place at this point in the RECORD my reply to Mr. Munns, expressing my thanks for the assistance rendered by his laboratories:

Thank you so much for the wonderful display of cooperation and interest your laboratories have shown in rendering assistance to those affected by the disaster caused by the recent floods and tornados. I know I speak for all Alabamians affected and this is indeed a noble gesture on your part. I want to commend you and your company as well as the Alabama Pharmaceutical Association for your efforts in replacing these uninsured drugs at no cost.

KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
Member of Congress.

What Is It To Be Irish?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity today, to insert the following, written by Mr. Hal Boyle of the Associated Press Newsfeatures in New York City. I felt this would be appropriate at this time:

WHAT IS IT TO BE IRISH?

How can you put the wonder of it into words? If a psychiatrist stretched himself out on his warm couch after his last customer had gone home, and he dreamed of the man he himself would most like to be, well, he might be perfect, but he'd still be only half an Irishman on St. Patrick's Day.

What is it to be Irish? It is to have an angel in your mouth, turning your prose to poetry. It is to have the gift of tongues, to know the language of all living things. Does an Irishman pause and turn an ear to a tree? It is because on this day he wants to hear what one sleepy bud says to another as it opens its pale green bands to the warm sun of spring.

What it is to be Irish? Oh, on this day it is music. Not just the cornet in the parading high school band, but the deep, deep music of living the low, sad rhythms of eternity. The Irishman hears the high song of the turning spheres, the dim lullaby of the worm in its cocoon. All the world is in tune, and he is in step with the tune, the tune that only he can hear.

What is it to be Irish? It is to live the whole history of his race between a dawn and a dawn, the long wrongs, the bird-swift joys, the endless hurt of his ancestors since the morning of time in a forgotten forest, the knock-at-his-heart that is part of his religion.

What is it to be Irish? It isn't only the realization that he is descended from kings. It is the realization that he is a king himself, an empire on two feet striding in power, a strolling continent of awe.

What is it to be Irish? Why on St. Patrick's Day, to be Irish is to know more glory, adventure, magic, victory, exultation, gratitude, and gladness than any other man can experience in a lifetime.

What is it to be Irish? It is to walk in complete mystic understanding with God for 24 wonder hours.

Statement of Hon. Everett G. Burkhalter, Member of Congress, Before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 18, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement delivered by me before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 18, 1963:

STATEMENT OF HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER BEFORE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 18, 1963

The No. 1 problem in America today, I feel, is air pollution. Some sections of the country refer to it as smog, but regardless of what it is called it is a daily detriment, a serious daily detriment, to the health and welfare of each and every community in the land.

Certain of the scientists and air pollution experts and some health authorities try to say that this problem is confined to parts of California and a few of the other large metropolitan areas. However, I have also discussed the problem of air pollution with many other individuals who feel that they are as well qualified to speak about the problems as any other authorities; and this latter group is of the opinion that air pollution is fast becoming the No. 1 problem in the Nation.

Physicians and health authorities have long held that air pollution is certainly a contributing factor, and perhaps one of the major causes, of lung cancer, heart ailments, asthma, tuberculocis, and other respiratory ailments.

The general public is still skeptical about what is really causing smog, or air pollution. Most experts still insist that the automobile, rather the motor vehicles, contribute in excess of 60 percent of all the pollutants and irritants which are discharged into the atmosphere. The other factors which constitute the remaining 40 percent are spread out in smaller percentages. The following are some of these sources of air pollution: Petroleum refineries, steel mills, chemical plants, rubber processing and finishing establishments, foundries, electroplating plants, open dumps and even the municipally-owned incinerators and a host of unlisted and unnamed industrial processing plants. Air pollution is also contributed to by each little community restaurant, each open burning of trash and leaves; in Los Angeles all backyard incinerators were outlawed because of the solid pollutants carried into the air each day.

The first conclusion a person was apt to jump to was if you didn't see smoke or dust, no air pollution was occurring. However, because of the intensive research and public educational programs presented today concerning the many reasons for the pollution of air the public has become well aware that it is for the most part, the unseen vapors and chemicals which react one with the other to cause one's eyes to water and burn and to cause terrific pains and discomfort in breathing to some individuals.

It has been pointed out that local, city, county, and even State laws are not the answer. Why? Because today there are thousands of individuals who commute to and from their daily occupations or businesses who may travel well over 50 miles a day, and these people may cross and recross many local, county, and even State boundaries during the day. It is easy to see that these local ordinances which attempt to control air pollution are meaningless, because the moving, fleeting pollutants are carried out and beyond the local boundaries of their origin by the changing wind and weather patterns. The same rule naturally applies to the tourist, as well as to the commuter.

In the face of ordinary facts such as these it is imperative for any control which is to be really effective to originate at the Federal level.

Today there are four or five different devices which have been tested and proven effective for the control of motor vehicle exhaust by the State of California Air Pollution Control Board. These have also been tested by the automobile manufacturers. These devices may be installed on automobiles at the factory as standard equipment, and should be, if we really intend to combat this vital problem in America today.

Unfortunately these devices will cost the consumer money; but the comfort and contribution to the well-being, of not only the consumer and his family, but to every citizen in the Nation, far overrides the expenditure. These devices, I refer to, would cost approximately $7 or more, or up to as much as $150, the more costly device being a permanent type which would not have to be periodically replaced or recored, as in the case of some of the less expensive ones.

In regard to the other 40 percent of air contamination, the control of the pollutants from the small and large industrial establishments is a factor which can be a financial drain on companies which are still paying interest and prinicpal on original loans, and will be for the next 10 to 20 years. A large portion of these new industrial plants have been started and established in the last 15 to 18 years, and a high percentage of the owners are veterans who received their initial loan from the Small Business Administration.

In talking to many of these individual owners, I have found, that although they are encumbered with present financial obligations they would be more than willing to seek further loans which would make it possible for them to install air pollution control devices on any and all processes they employ which are presently contaminating the atmosphere, if such loans would be made available from the Government agencies at a low-interest rate.

It is not the desire of any of us advocating the enforcement of controls of air pollution to harass or close down any of our industrial, commercial, or any firms which are contributing to the economic well-being of our country. However, this is a two-way street and the public health is of the first importance. Due to this dual involvement, and to the ready cooperation of many of the firms to install devices to control the emission of pollutants from their establishments, I believe that those of us in the legislative branches of the Federal Government are obligated to make low-interest loans available to this group because of the very important contributions to the welfare and health of the Nation this control of air pollution would be.

I therefore urge all members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to weigh the responsibilities involved in the interest of public health and urge that Mr. Roberts' bill, H.R. 4415, be supported and passed by this committee.

Thank you so much for the time allocated to me for the presentation of my remarks dealing with this subject.

William L. Higgs, Esq., Awarded the Seventh Annual Florina Lasker Civil Liberties Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, the New York Civil Liberties Union held its annual dinner and awarded the seventh Florina Lasker Civil Liberties Award to William L. Higgs, Esq., of Mississippi, in recognition of his courageous, imaginative, energetic and articulate leadership, and legal advocacy in advancing the civil liberties of Negroes in the State of Mississippi.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered upon this occasion by Dr. Charles Frankel, professor of philosophy at Columbia University, and the acceptance speech of Mr. Higgs:

THE EMANCIPATED AND THE FREE

(Address by Charles Frankel, professor of philosophy at Columbia University and member of the NYCLU Board of Directors, at the annual dinner of the New York Civil Liberties Union, Tuesday, February 12, 1963, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City)

We meet tonight on the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, one of the great symbolic acts in our history, and in human history. The Emancipation Proclamation enacted a central principle of the democratic revolution, a principle that is not yet realized, but which has kept the world increasingly uneasy for some centuries now, and will keep it uneasy for some centuries to come. It is the principle that no man belongs to another man except as his brother and his peer, that no group of people shall be the instrument of others but that we are all instruments of one another.

Yet there is another reason, I think, why the Emancipation Proclamation is a symbol for us. We remember it as an act of courage. The courage in it was the courage to face what had become a necessity and to accept it. The greatness of Lincoln, the reason he speaks to us so intimately, is precisely that he was and remains everyman's President—that he so clearly, in his own experience, lived through all the hesitations and evasions, all the fears and ambiguities of conscience, that beset the rest of us when we are wrestling with a matter of principle; and that, despite all these doubts, indeed with the doubts still clinging to him, he struggled into clarity and commitment.

We think of Lincoln as a self-made man, but he was, more significantly, a self-emancipated man, and that self-emancipation was the prelude to the Emancipation Proclamation. He tried to find an easier way out; he tried to avoid the recognition scene in which he would have to discover his destiny and his country's. And in the end he did only what had to be done, what could no longer possibly not be done, and he did it as an act of war, as a tactic in a war. But he knew what he was doing; he was aware not only of the people he was liberating but of the pains he was causing, the questions he could not answer, the principle he was finally making so unequivocally his own that he would never be able to go back on it. And this is why his act, although it was a triumph of principle and a triumph of Lincoln over himself, is also for us an act that has the poignancy and catharsis of tragedy. Lincoln acted in full knowledge and recognition of necessity, and his act fills us not only with admiration for his nobility but with pity for him too, and with fear for ourselves.

Which brings me to the figure whom we have chosen to honor tonight. Lincoln would not have had his troubles, and we would not be having ours, were it not for troublemakers like Mr. Higgs. And the trouble with troublemakers like Mr. Higgs is that they put themselves to so much trouble they could easily avoid. If only they were a little less stiff necked, if only they saw principles less clearly, if only they were a little more realistic—which means if only they could be blind to plain facts and turn their backs on plain necessities—the rest of us could sleep. We would not sleep peacefully because the injustices that trouble Mr. Higgs—that make trouble for him—trouble the rest of us, too. Despite what some of the fellow citizens of his State probably think, he has not invented these injustices, and it is these injustices that are causing the trouble, and not Mr. Higgs, who is merely pointing out that unpleasant fact. Nevertheless, things are bad enough and complicated enough already without someone's upsetting everybody by setting out to do what is right. Without Mr. Higgs we would still not sleep the sleep of the righteous, but it would be easier to sleep the sleep of the ordinary homme moyen sensuel. But there he is, and he has the courage and stubbornness, and who does he think he is? This leads some of us to get very angry with Mr. Higgs. But it leads others of us to ask the same question about ourselves. Who do we think we are? Are we mice or men, Bigots or Higgots? And so we end up trying to join Mr. Higgs because we can't lick him. This is a democracy and no man has a right to set himself apart. Accordingly, if Mr. Higgs is not going to conform to the rest of us, we are going to have to conform to him. But first we are going to try to make life over there where he lives a little easier by dining at the Waldorf and giving him a prize. I hope that now he is satisfied—but I doubt that he is.

The title of my talk tonight, "The Emancipated and the Free," no doubt seems redundant, and I confess that I made it up, not quite at the point of a gun, but at the point of a telephone. Mr. Rundquist, when he asked me to give this address, was comfortingly and villainously vague. He said that we could worry about details—title, press releases, all that sort of thing—in the future. I take a serene and farsighted view of the future: I see all eternity before me. Mr. Rundquist, however, is a man of action. Ten minutes later, the telephone rang again, and Mr. Haskell wanted a title and asked me if I had the text ready. Nevertheless, the title is not just the typical stammer of a professor who, unable to find the right word, uses two wrong words to make his meaning clear. I mean to use these two words to stand for different things. And in the difference between the meaning of these words, in the tension, past and present, between the emancipated and the free, a large part of the story of democracy, I venture to suggest, can be told. For the liberties that characterize democracy, the liberties to whose defense this Civil Liberties Union is dedicated, were in their origin and for most of their history, the special privileges of a tiny minority of well placed people. They were the liberties of those who were born free and unequal, and had never had to be emancipated.

The British speak of a young man born with "natural advantages." This succinct and luminous phrase, needless to say, designates a young man born into wealth and social position. Any young man so born will, of course, know that it is natural—indeed, divine—for him to have these advantages. Now the civil liberties, the right to speak and publish, to go where one pleases, to worship or not to worship as one chooses, to be tried before one's peers, to make claims against the police and the authorities, to be let alone—such liberties have traditionally been the prerogatives of freemen. And freemen have been a special class, those born with natural advantages. Their liberties were symbols of their position. Greek freedoms were enjoyed by a small class of citizens existing on the labor of a large number of slaves. The birthrights of Englishmen were not in practical, daily fact, the birthrights of all Englishmen until the present century. And in no part of the world today, not in Great Britain or the United States, let alone in the countries where men are striving for what they call freedom, is the individual's enjoyment of civil liberties unaffected by his natural advantages. His wealth or lack of it, the accent with which he speaks, the clothes he wears, the social position he occupies, all affect the treatment he can expect from officials, and the respect for his rights which he will receive from the community. It should not surprise us, therefore, that the civil liberties are in trouble. They are in origin and overtone, and to a large extent they remain in fact, gentlemen's privileges, and those who have felt how ungentle the gentleman's world can be to people who do not belong to it are not likely to spend their time celebrating the civil liberties or seeking them above all things. They are likely to think of the civil liberties as status symbols, like Cadillacs and honorary degrees.

During the last few years I have been making some studies of the theories of democracy that are entertained in various parts of the world, and of the strategies and institutional devices that are employed, particularly in countries which are poor and where liberties are not well rooted, to give concrete shape to such ideas of democracy as are entertained. In the course of these studies, I have done an agreeable amount of traveling, and a year or so ago I found myself in Mexico talking with a group of selected graduate students from Mexico and other Latin American countries. Our conversation digressed to the Alliance for Progress. All were interested and hopeful, but all but one were skeptical. And when I chose to let this digression continue, and asked them for the reasons for their skepticism, they answered me in refreshingly straightforward terms. Ideally, they said, they wanted both liberty and economic well-being. And they had no doubt at all about the country in the world which they should most wish their own countries to resemble. It was not China, and certainly not Russia, and of course not Cuba. It was the United States. But they were not sure that our country was the proper model for them, and in making this judgment they were only taking their cue from us—from what we had been saying to them at least implicitly for more than a century. "You North Americans believe in liberty and democracy," they told me, but you believe in them only for North Americans, and not even for all of them, but only for the white North Americans and the polite ones. You do not think your advantages are for export, so do not be surprised that we should agree with you, and regard your privileges as privileges we cannot afford."

In this feeling, the free, the possessors of liberties, have often agreed with them. The free have not usually been convinced that the liberties they enjoy can be safely turned loose for others to enjoy. The history of modern democracy is in large part the history of the struggle of groups, hitherto excluded from the full rights of citizenship in the community, for membership in that community. Religious minorities, the industrial classes, the workers and poor farmers, have

all had to knock hard at the doors guarding the meeting-places of the free before they have been allowed inside. And at every stage of the expansion of the community of the free, the already free have expressed anxiety at what would happen to their freedoms if everybody had them. The aristocratic Tocqueville came to the United States, and admired what he saw—even more remarkable, he understood what he saw—but he left with the conviction that this new thing, democracy, could lead to the most insidious despotism of all, a willing, self-imposed despotism accepted in the name of the sovereignty of the people, which would extinguish liberty because it would extinguish the desire for liberty, putting in its place the equivocal doctrine of the equality of man. John Stuart Mill, who was a democrat as well as a liberal, thought that the rising danger to liberty in his century would come from the tyranny of the majority. There is something in this fear that liberty will be thinner the farther it is spread.

One can say that the civil liberties have been traditionally the privileges of a gentleman's club, and that gentlemen have a certain natural distaste for making admission to the club too broad, and this is true. But it does not show that the gentlemen are necessarily wrong. The great effort of modern democracy, the trial to which it is putting human capacities, is to enlarge the political community, to emancipate great numbers from their ancient position as outsiders in their own societies and in international society, and still to preserve the old gentlemanly codes of freemen. If anything can be said to be "the meaning" of our time, this, I think, is what it is. And the fears that it cannot be done are not entirely groundless fears. For the effective protection and successful practice of civil liberty rests on much more than written guarantees and established laws. Civil liberty can exist even where there are no written guarantees—though no one should take this as a reason for neglecting written guarantees. And civil liberty may not exist even where there are written guarantees. At bottom, the presence or absence of liberties, and the ability to use them so effectively that their worth and their joy is made manifest, depends on the existence of an elaborate and sophisticated etiquette. And that etiquette, for better or worse, is a gentleman's etiquette.

It asks people to be sure enough of themselves to be willing to take a stand, and still humorous enough, urbane enough, to allow others to go on being wrong, and worse, to go on being wrong by disagreeing with them. It asks people to recognize that there is authority but to distrust authority; to be implacable and stern when one man denies another man his rights but to grant even this culprit his rights; to treat the competition of interests and faiths and ideas as a game which must be played in accordance with rules, a game in which it is not dishonorable to lose, and yet to recognize that this competition is not, after all, a game, that men's interests and faiths and ideas can be matters of life and death. Perhaps most difficult of all, the etiquette of civil liberty requires men to seek consensus and to live by the decisions reached by the majority fairly, and yet to be solicitous of dissenters and to treasure minorities because it is they who bring texture and color to a society's life, and energy, and the chance to change. This is all extraordinarily difficult; if anything goes more against the grain of human passions than this etiquette, it is difficult to imagine what it is. The civil liberties are aristocratic, and there is reason to be fearful about their destiny when the untrained, the hungry, the angry, and the impatient are admitted to the political community and given power.

Indeed, when the etiquette of civil liberty is described, when the qualities of character, of combined restraint and courage which it demands, are spelled out, it would be natural to conclude that something quite impossible has been described. This etiquette seems too much to expect of an animal who has come out of the evolutionary mud. And yet, of course, it is not all impossible. The etiquette exists. And it exists and works in the United States, a country where the word "gentleman" is commonly used to describe heavyweight prizefighters who behave themselves. That there are flaws, and serious ones, in the picture is evident. But I cannot easily foresee a time when the civil liberties will be finally safe, when it will not be necessary to work, fight, and sacrifice for them. To me it is surprising, and it is a matter which leads me to take considerable pride in my species, that they exist at all. No greater proof of the capacities of men to make themselves over exists than the fact that civil liberties have been developed, defended, and extended, and that in great nations which have had to absorb hordes of newcomers in generation after generation, these liberties not merely exist but thrive. And the condition of these liberties, to my mind, is one principal measure of the degree of civilization that a society has achieved.

But we have been talking of the liberties of the free, and it is time to speak, not of the free, but of the emancipated, of those who have been born without "natural advantages", but have somehow escaped or been released from their inherited condition of servitude. The slavery from which Lincoln freed Negroes is one dramatic form of servitude. It is close to, but not identical with, the kind of servitude from which millions today are being emancipated, or are seeking emancipation. This is the servitude that is fixed on a man because he is a member of a specific social class or religious or racial group or national community. It is the servitude that he must carry with him as a badge, knowing that he is unlikely to receive the equal treatment of the law, that he will live his life governed by people who are not his own kind, that he will be the odd man out when the goods of this world are distributed, and that, simplest and worst, he will spend his days being humiliated or patronized, feared or studied, policed or helped from on high—but always treated as a second-rate sort of human being whose right of admission to the world of those who count does not quite exist.

This kind of servitude has never been easily understood or imagined by those who are born free. For almost two decades since the war, freemen in the Western democracies have been caught off guard repeatedly, unprepared for the revolutions, and not believing that so much distrust and hate should come their way. We have been puzzled at the behavior of men who have been prepared to risk economic disaster, who have cavalierly imperiled the legal framework of liberties that the West has tried to provide for them, who have put themselves, with every apparent sign of willingness, under authoritarian or one-party governments—and who have called this new condition freedom. They have not meant what we mean by the term; they have meant something quite different—the elevation of the group to which they belong to an equal position with other groups; the chance to say that they are Egyptians or Algerians or Indonesians and to know that others will defer to them because they are. By "freedom" they mean recognition, status; they mean, indeed, that when recognition and status are distributed to people, they will be among those who do the recognizing and grant the status.

There is, I think, a special difficulty here in the United States in understanding the strength or even the character of this demand for emancipation. That difficulty is reflected in the loaded term we use to describe our most aching social problem. We describe it as the Negro problem when it is overwhelmingly plain that the major obstacle in the way of making reasonable progress with it is that there is a white-man problem. Even in naming the disease we reflect the system of power and prestige which determines who will give the disease its official name. And our fumbling efforts to comprehend the nature and force of this explosive aspiration of the majority of our species today for recognition, for emancipation, has also hurt us repeatedly in our foreign policy. We speak of the rule of law, elections, liberties—all good and necessary things; we offer economic advancement—and we had better; but we have trouble grasping the point that these things, invaluable as they are, are not entirely to the point. With our heritage of civil liberties, we can understand why people should fight for the right to vote, or should want to change the political forms under which they live. With our successful conquest of a continent behind us, we can understand why people should want the promise of better economic conditions, or why they should complain when their individual opportunities to improve themselves are limited. But we do not understand—or, at any rate, we need to be regularly reminded—that while they may want such political and economic changes, they also have another kind of change in mind as well. They want a change in the relative positions of different groups, in the proportion of the society's resources allocated to these groups, and in the measure of deference and respect the members of these groups receive because they are members of these groups. They want freedom from bondage as a group, an identity as members of a chosen people among other chosen people.

Failing to understand this, we fail to understand the crucial aspect of the revolutions of emancipation. This is that these revolutions are social revolutions. In a social revolution, those who have been on the outside looking in, those who have been treated as second class and second rate, are struggling to get some of their own back. They do not want simply a change in the form of government, or a better standard of living. They want a change in the position of the group to which they belong. They want to move in the places where they could not move before, to walk along the fashionable streets, to stay out of the fashionable clubs because they want to stay out and not because they have been told to stay out. And if they are lectured about the benefits of the liberties which the law guarantees them as individuals, they are likely to say that this is not true, or, if it is true, it is also a grim mockery; and if the lectures go on too long, these people seeking emancipation may end not simply by demanding equal recognition, but by putting their own people in and throwing the other people out. They may want to take over the fashionable streets and break the fashionable windows. This is what Castro represents in Cuba, and what the Black Muslins reflect here at home.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood. It seems to me wholly wrong to say that the civil liberties are purely gentlemen's pleasures. I have no doubt that most people would enjoy the chance to speak as they please, to move where they wish, to take and leave their jobs on their own terms, to demand and to get their rights from the police and the government. These are not recondite joys, and not at all, I think, the special values of a particular class or culture. And where they do not exist, fundamental personal security does not exist, and fear and indignity generally do. But the awareness of these values and the desire for them is likely to be less imperious than the desire, when a man is among the unemancipated, for land to work or relief from

the moneylender. And the demand for recognition, for emancipation, is also more imperious.

For there is a difference between having liberties and being emancipated. To have a liberty is to be unrestrained by any other man with respect to doing some particular thing; to have a civil liberty, as we commonly use the term, is to possess a guarantee that the law and the police power can be invoked to restrain others from restraining you. And a man can have such liberties, abstractly speaking, even though he is not emancipated. He may be free to speak as he pleases, for example, but only unable to find anybody with power who will listen seriously to what he says; no law may prevent him from going to a university, but hostility may make his going there a torture. And conversely, a man may be emancipated, but have few or no liberties. He can be a member of a group that receives as much respect and shares as amply in the commonwealth as other groups, but be unfree, like everyone else, to live or travel where he pleases, or to criticize his rulers, or to follow his conscience. But while there is a difference between being free and being emancipated, and while it is dangerous to confuse the two, they are nevertheless tightly linked in practice. The unemancipated are generally also less free; the free are generally also emancipated, or have been born free. And that is why the destiny of liberty is tied to the destiny of the struggle for emancipation. Those who are struggling for emancipation will be indifferent or hostile to the liberties of freemen if freemen are hostile to, or slow in recognizing, the urgency of the demands for emancipation. For those who are seeking emancipation are not likely to think that liberty is their business unless those who have liberty think that emancipation is theirs.

But this brings me back to the Emancipation Proclamation, and to Mr. Higgs, and to our present involvement with both of them. I have been dwelling on the dangers to freedom that come from the struggles for emancipations. These dangers would be great enough if they were the products only of the hostilities between nations, and between social classes; they are immeasurably worse because these difficulties are almost everywhere dipped in the acid of racial animosities. Yet in this country the people whom Lincoln began to emancipate are demonstrating that, despite what has been done to them, they still wish liberty as well as emancipation—they wish to be members of the nation and not unwilling enemies within it. And those among them who have led the way in their struggles against their condition of servitude have also demonstrated that they know very well the etiquette of liberty, and can use it on their side, and can only be defeated, if they are going to be defeated, by people who would prefer to destroy that etiquette rather than to let them win their battle. American Negroes have fought with admirable, almost incredible, restraint, and self-control. They are still fighting for social emancipation, but they have demonstrated the qualities of self-emancipation, of spiritual emancipation, for which we remember and revere Lincoln. If they fail here in this country, having shown these qualities and having fought in this way, if they do not soon begin to win more quickly and more surely, it is unlikely that the people elsewhere who are also seeking emancipation will ever be tempted to follow their lead or to believe that the etiquette—the ethic—of liberty is anything but a rich man's, and a white man's, imposture.

The final practical question, in short, is whether we who possess liberties can also be self-emancipated. I do not mean simply emancipation from prejudice; it is easy to say that one has no prejudices, and not quite so easy, but still not so hard, really to believe, and even to act, as though one did not. But while that is something, that is barely the beginning of the problem. Servitude puts creases in men's minds. It puts them in the minds of those in servitude and in the minds of those who are not. And these creases turn understanding and self-understanding into bypaths. Our problem, beneath the problem of "prejudice," is that even the best intentions are poisoned because we do not know how to be candid, because we have lost the faculty, where the problem of the Negro and of the white is concerned, of using words honestly and stating facts squarely. Only occasionally can a Negro and a white break through the curtain of angry or mollifying words, and speak to each other simply, without saying less or more than they mean. Only occasionally can Negroes speak to Negroes or whites to speak to whites about the problem without similar difficulty. This is what living with this daily assault on elementary decency has done to all of us. And the emancipation from this servitude will not come easily. But it will come, I think. In remembering Lincoln, and in celebrating the existence of Mr. Higgs, we are trying to say to ourselves that this self-emancipation is possible and that it must come.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM L. HIGGS, ACCEPTING THE FLORINA LASKER CIVIL LIBERTIES AWARD

Mr. Gettner, Mr. Rundquist, members, and friends of the New York Civil Liberties Union, this award is received as a trust for all those who are participating in the struggle for human rights and human dignity in my State of Mississippi. Many of my associates there have given of their time, energy and physical safety far more than I. And there are many more who will make the sacrifice in the days and the months immediately ahead. My receiving this award is simply a recognition of the work that they have done and have yet to do. I pledge to you and to all others that we in Mississippi shall not rest until freedom exists there and indeed, throughout the South. For, I should add, neither the white nor the colored man is free now. Neither can act, nor speak, nor even think as he wishes. However, there are many whites who do not for themselves desire this freedom of expression; for it is a price that they are so very willing to pay for their near absolute control of the Negro, who is even today in my State largely a slave.

I trust that there are none of you so naive as to believe that the Negro in Mississippi is necessarily better off as a U.S. citizen than he would be as a Soviet citizen. I do not believe that Russian statements on this point can be correctly challenged.

Now, let me give you some basic facts: The per family income in Mississippi is for whites at least three times that for Negroes, and Negroes generally have much larger families. This not only means that the Mississippi white has an income approaching the national average, while the State as a whole has the lowest in the Nation, but it also means that the Mississippi white can control the labor and life of the Negro at dirt-cheap wages. Compensation of a dollar a day or less for Negro labor is not at all uncommon. About $20 a week is tops for a colored maid's wages, and a high percentage of Mississippi white homes enjoy such services. Most Negro families in Mississippi have no bathroom facilities at all—no running water of any type, which means that they have only a yard hand pump and toilet facilities consisting of an outhouse and a hole in the ground. An excessive percentage of Negro babies never survive their first few days of life.

And the State of Mississippi (i.e., the white State) cares little to correct these things. It denies decent jobs to Negroes. It deprives them of free surplus food from the U.S. Government. It denies them federally financed housing because this would deprive private, white landlords of income and would bring about improvement of the lot of the Negro. And it uses all organs of the State to suppress their freedom. A high percentage of State officers, including the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, are members of the violently racist White Citizens Council, which differs from the KKK only in that it has greater respect for law and order and has not had to contend—at least until recently—with the threat or the actuality of occupying Federal troops. If necessary, they use violence, and they have done so. This is their official policy as announced last month from their national headquarters in Jackson, Miss.

For the Negro who aspires to freedom and human dignity, and for those who would assist him, Mississippi is indeed a police State. I often think that if Mississippi were not in the Federal Union, Mr. William Shirer could have written a book about Mississippi that would have told of a degree of human suffering equal to that described in his present work. In sum, the existence of the U.S. Government forces the State of Mississippi to constantly cast one eye over its shoulder to see that "big brother" is not getting angry.

A few more facts: many of you may believe that my State is giving the Negro a separate but yet equal education. To believe this propaganda is tragic. Today, local funds, which make up about half of the Mississippi public school budget, are spent in the ratio of $4 for each white child to $1 for each Negro child. State level funds are also spent discriminatorily. Some local funds in some counties are spent in ratios of more than 100 to 1, white to Negro, per pupil.

Negroes make up 43 percent of Mississippi's population, yet they probably do not constitute even 3 percent of the electorate. (And bear in mind also that one must be able to vote in order to serve on a jury.) In my opinion, and contrary to the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, there is not a single Mississippi county where there is not administrative discrimination against Negroes who try to become voters—and there are 82 counties in Mississippi. This is in addition to the whole raft of discriminatory voting laws that the State has periodically enacted to keep the Negro from voting. The mose recent one is the statute requiring the printing of all prospective voters' names and addresses in the county newspaper for 2 weeks before they may register. I trust you can grasp the significance of this law.

The State of Mississippi prevents Negroes from voting by the enactment of laws requiring progressively higher degrees of education and learning while at the same time purposely denying them this requisite education and learning. This program is a clear, vicious cycle. And you in the North are in many ways the recipient of its evil effects which are, among others:

1. As the Negro emigrates north, it forces illiterate, morally untrained, and physically weakened people upon you.

2. It means that a large segment of the Nation's population cannot vote who would otherwise be a strong voice at the polls for human dignity and freedom and for economic welfare for our Nation and the world.

3. It gives the Communist bloc a propaganda weapon of great power and truth.

4. And, most of all: the plight of the southern Negro beckons the nonsoutherner and solemnly asks him how it is that he does not advert his mind and actions to correct an inhuman situation whose solution is within his power.

At this point I should like to relate briefly a few of my recent experiences:

Many of you have heard and read in considerable detail of the Meredith case. I suppose that I was the first attorney to whom

James Meredith came (around the end of 1960 and the beginning of 1961) to confide that he had applied to the University of Mississippi and that he knew he would need legal assistance to enter. I trust that some day soon the full, remarkable, and dangerous story of this case will be told. Even as late as a week or two before his scheduled entrance last September, Meredith, while having supper at my house with some visiting students and me, stanchly maintained that he could and would go to Ole Miss safely and without guards. I only wish that I had the time to tell of the lengths the State of Mississippi went to keep this brave man out—such as convening the entire legislature 1 minute after midnight on the Thursday morning of his first scheduled entrance, lights blazing on Capitol Hill in an otherwise dark Jackson, as mute witness to the worship of white supremacy; and then again, such a measure as convicting him the next morning in absentia, without even his attorney present, of falsely filling out a voting registration form—so as to immediately procure his arrest and thus prevent his entering Ole Miss.

At present, together with the ACLU, I am representing a convicted, alleged Negro rapist, William Smith, whose case is now before the U.S. Supreme Court. This man was beaten so badly immediately after his arrest that the picture in the next day's paper gave small indication that his face was that of a human being. I hardly need add that he allegedly signed a confession. He was secretly held incommunicado for a month. He was then arraigned, had a local lawyer appointed for him on a Friday and the case was set for a hearing the next Monday, at which time he was summarily tried, convicted, and sentenced to execution. I could go on at great length about this case, but I believe you get the picture.

This summer, in June, I was showing a group of college students from the Midwest around the northern part of my State. There was a Negro coed in the group of five. We were trailed and closely watched by both State and local law-enforcement officers throughout the major part of our trip. We arrived in Clarksdale, Miss., about noon on a Sunday for a scheduled congressional campaign windup meeting of the unsuccessful try at the Democratic nomination of Rev. Merrill Lindsay, the first Negro to run from that district in the 20th century. Both city and county police constantly and ominously patrolled the church where we held our 4-hour long meeting, until the meeting adjourned at about 7:15 in the evening. We then left with the police closely trailing us in three cars. We were arrested at the city limits, taken to the county jail, and put in cells. We requested, but were not allowed to use the phone; nor to know with what we were charged, other than suspicion. We were taken before no magistrate; our car was secretly searched, though locked. I was threatened with death through the easy manner of being placed in a cell with a prisoner who had instructions to dispose of me. I was interrogated that night on almost exclusively race matters and was repeatedly accused of being a traitor to my race and State. After the friendly part of the press became appraised of what was happening, early the next morning, the radio and TV were full of our arrest. The local officials became obviously fearful and released us at about 3:30 the next afternoon. No charges were ever filed. We had been secretly seized, searched, threatened, interrogated and held without charges for over 20 hours. We were released only through fear of publicity and of Federal and other outside intervention. I was told by the sheriff never to return to that county.

The situation has gotten so bad recently that seven other young fellow workers in Mississippi (all Negro) and I, with the invaluable assistance of New York Attorney William Kunstler, filed a suit in Federal District Court in the District of Columbia on January 2, 1963, to compel the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the FBI to enforce Federal law in the State of Mississippi and to use Federal marshals to protect Negro citizens. I regret that the day has arrived when it is necessary to sue the Attorney General of the United States to force him to do his duty.

And as a sad footnote to these experiences, let me add the case of Clyde Kennard, a very bright and trusting young Negro veteran. Kennard tried a few years ago to peacefully enter Mississippi Southern College. He was indicted immediately subsequent to this attempt and convicted of the "grand larceny" of a few sacks of chicken feed. The existence of virtually no evidence, save that of the testimony of an alleged accomplice in the hands of the police, who was then released, made no difference to the jury. Kennard received 7 years in the Mississippi State penitentiary. Although obviously ill of cancer, for many months he was denied medical treatment and kept at hard manual labor. All this in spite of repeated letters and entreaties from the University of Mississippi Hospital written to the prison authorities and the parole board.

Finally, mounting litigation and national publicity (for which, I am happy to say, I have been somewhat responsible) forced Governor Barnett to feign innocence of what was happening and suspend Kennard's sentence. Tragically, a grateful Kennard has nothing but praise for his Governor's exercise of grace.

Now I should like to comment briefly on the Kennedy administration's record in civil rights:

1. The Attorney General, Mr. Robert Kennedy, in his recent civil rights report to the President, has claimed much in the way of achievement in this field. But as one from Mississippi, I would like to ask him just how much he has done to secure rights for Negroes to vote in my State. The increase in Negro registration in Mississippi since this administration has taken office is almost nil. Negroes are constantly being harassed, intimidated, attacked, and shot at because of their efforts to try to vote. Almost all the effectiveness of the Civil Rights Acts in the voting field has been nullified as a result of the appointment by President Kennedy of Judge William Harold Cox, a close friend of Senator Eastland, as Chief U.S. District judge for the Southern District of Mississippi.

In short, I would say to the Attorney General: you are right when you say that the most significant civil rights problem is voting, but that you are dead wrong when you think you are truly justified in congratulating yourself on any achievement that you might have made in this area. You are looking not at the enormous amount of work that needs to be done but are merely making a political comparison with the prior Republican administration. In the latter sense, it may be that you can be congratulated; in the former sense, which I believe to be the true one, your efforts are, I think, sadly lacking.

It seems to require a freedom ride which results in violence to force you to move to desegregate public transportation facilities; a deadly riot at the University of Mississippi to make this administration finally enforce Federal law; a direct order from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to force you to prosecute the Governor of Mississippi for flagrant contempt; and even constant violence against prospective Negro voters has not yet moved you to protect their rights and their persons by Federal forces at your ready command. Today in Mississippi, when a Federal marshal is notified that Negroes who are going to try to register will probably be beaten and perhaps even shot at, this marshal does not make any move to prevent it. And he is under the direct control of the Attorney General of the United States.

2. It is my feeling that the Justice Department has been moving like a snail escaping from a tidal wave. At first it requests local white political power structures to uphold the civil rights of their Negro citizens—which request is, on occasion, slightly complied with after considerable delay. Secondly, the Government normally files an extremely complicated but extremely limited piece of litigation which after many months produces little or no result. It seems to me that it is about time that broad, imaginative suits were filed and vigorously prosecuted to bring down immediately this vicious structure of segregation, exploitation, and oppression of the southern Negroes.

3. Another point that I would like to make is that, at the specific request of the Attorney General, the Civil Rights Commission has been effectively prevented for many months from holding an extensive public hearing in the State of Mississippi so as to provide the public of that State and of the Nation with facts that are so badly needed in order to correctly judge recent events. The Commission, I am informed, does not even have a voting section at present; yet its prime statutory duty is to report on voting. The Attorney General says that the Commission should not hold a hearing in Mississippi because it might prejudice any trial of Governor Barnett. Yet if Mr. Robert Kennedy's past actions in attempting to punish the Governor for his flagrant and utter contempt of the orders of the Federal courts are any indication of when he will finally effectively move against Mr. Barnett, I fear such hearings will never be held.

4. I formerly made the statement that anyone who believed in civil rights would be out of his mind to vote Republican. However, the appointment of Federal district judges, and to a degree, circuit judges in the South by this administration, has given me serious doubts on this score. The continued appointment of additional racist judges to the Federal bench in the South, particularly to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, could have a devastating effect. This must not be allowed to happen.

Finally, I have a few suggestions and proposals which I believe will help achieve civil rights and civil liberties in the South:

1. Where litigation concerning the right to vote is concerned, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has for too long spoken alone for the Negro. It is about time that the legal representatives of the southern Negro were heard and were parties to this voting litigation. In general, Negro groups in the South are not having their interests adequately represented in the courts by the Department of Justice. I suggest, therefore, that a lawyers' committee be formed to represent the interests of the southern Negro groups in all Government-filed litigation, and to initiate broad and creative suits that the Federal Government fails or refuses to file.

2. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans covers six southern States: Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Georgia, and Florida. If a rule is adopted by the judicial council of the circuit, composed of all of the circuit judges, to the effect that the Chief Justice of the United States under the plenary powers of designation and assignment of Federal judges, be requested by the chief judge of the fifth circuit to assign a nonsouthern judge, retired or active, to each of these six southern States to hear all and only civil-rights cases, then Federal justice will finally be available to the Negro citizen. Negroes will quickly vote in large numbers, and the civil-rights problem in the South will be largely solved. The judicial council has ample statutory powers to adopt such a

rule—both sections 332 and 137 of title 28 of the United States Code provide for this. There is also ample precedent, and in situations not nearly so extreme.

3. As I mentioned earlier, the protective use of Federal marshals directed by the Attorney General to prevent local law officers from molesting prospective Negro voters as they try to register, and to provide protection to Negro protest movements exercising freedom of expression, will go a long way toward the final solution of this problem.

4. I would also suggest to this administration that it is about time that in appointing Federal officials in the South, their position on civil rights be taken into consideration. I do not know of a single Federal official in the entire State of Mississippi who is a Negro. A favorable Federal power position in each Southern State would be of great value in achieving civil rights for Negroes in the South.

5. And, finally, the second section of the 14th amendment, providing for the reduction in representation of a State's delegation in th House of Representatives and the electoral college in the proportion that a State denies any of its citizens the right to vote for any reason other than age or residence within the State, is indeed a powerful weapon that has lain dormant. Its great power lies in the fact that it can be enforced in many ways; in that it is crystal clear and mandatory; in that it is in no sense dependent upon discrimination against race, creed or color, but deals only with results different from near-universal suffrage, and in that it exacts a great price from a State for its limitation upon free and general voting. The House of Representatives can, under its ample constitutional powers, enforce this provision. It did so in 1872. The House is not hampered with the filibuster and can move rapidly, even tomorrow. I urge the creation of a movement to have the second section of the 14th amendment enforced by Congress.

I close with a word of thanks again to the New York Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union for the work they are doing in the southern civil rights struggle and for the opportunity to present these thoughts here this evening to this distinguished audience.

U.S. Military Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit a thought-provoking memorandum by Mr. Seymour Melman, associate professor of industrial and management engineering, Columbia University, New York.

Professor Melman deals with the subject of U.S. military power as it presently exists, the question of how much military power is necessary, the 1964 military budget, the impact of our military budget upon a declining domestic economy and the flight of gold, and many other problems related to military spending.

While I do not agree with some of Mr. Melman's arguments and recommendations, I do find his treatment of this subject most intriguing, especially the subject of "military overkill."

The memorandum follows:

HOW MUCH MILITARY POWER IS ENOUGH?

(By Seymour Melman, associate professor of industrial and management engineering, Columbia University)

Soon after President Kennedy presented a 1964 military budget request totaling $56.7 billion, Secretary of Defense McNamara told us that "we calculate that our forces today could still destroy the Soviet Union without any help from the deployed tactical air units, or carrier task forces, or Thor or Jupiter intermediate range ballistic missiles."

The military fact behind this judgment is an American military overkill capability that is in excess of almost anyone's conception. The idea of overkill is a thermonuclear invention. Never before could one think of military power sufficient to kill people more than once. But now the abundance of military power is so great that ordinary prudence dictates a reduction in the military budget request. Without reducing the massive forces already in being, we could cut the military budget enough to handle many pressing national problems and open up new opportunities for American policy.

NOW 125 TIMES OVERKILL

In 1963 about 3,390 strategic weapons, major aircraft, and missiles, are available to the U.S. Air Force and Navy. These major vehicles can deliver warheads whose total power is equivalent to 21.97 billion tons of TNT. (The bomb dropped on Hiroshima, which killed 100,000 people, was the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT.) All of this does not include the fighter planes, intermediate- and short-ranged missiles, torpedoes, mines, cannon, and tactical rocket launchers like the Davy Crockett. And the stockpile of warheads is probably as much as twice the total that is deliverable by the major aircraft and missiles now in hand.

What is the possible military significance of this much nuclear power?

Let us call this relationship a "Hiroshima equivalent" and let us use this in some military calculations that are at once nightmarish and realistic.

On the entire surface of the earth there are now about 2,000 cities of over 100,000 population, containing about 600 million people. If every one of these cities were a target for nuclear destruction and if there were an allowance of 30 percent of failure to deliver to target, then the U.S. strategic vehicles alone could deliver the equivalent of 2½ million tons of TNT for each 100,000 people. Since it took only 20,000 tons to kill 100,000 people at Hiroshima, the United States now possesses an overkill capability on this global scale of 125 times.

Strategic weapon systems operational in calendar year 1963

Type	Weapon system	Number of delivery vehicles	Yield per delivery vehicle (megatons)	Total yield (megatons)
U.S. Air Force:				
Aircraft	B-47's	600	10	6,000
	B-52's	600	20	12,000
	B-58's	100	20	2,000
Total		1,300		20,000
Missiles	Atlas	120	(1)	120
	Titan I	50	(1)	50
	Titan II	30	(1)	30
	Minuteman	500	(1)	500
Total		700		700
U.S. Navy:				
Aircraft	Skyhawk A-4D	1,000	(1)	1,000
	Skywarrior A-eD	150	(1)	150
	(Vigilante A-3J)	(?)		
Total		1,500		1,150
Missiles	15 Polaris submarines with 16 missiles each	240	0.5	120
Total		3,990		[1] 21,970

[1] 21,970,000,000 tons of TNT equivalent.

NOTE.—Above table does not include smaller planes, intermediate- and short-range missiles, torpedoes, mines, cannon, tactical rocket launchers (Bazooka, Davy Crockett) etc. Also, warhead stockpile is possibly two times and more, than delivery vehicles.

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 16, 1963, pp. 393–416.

In the Sino-Soviet bloc there are about 370 cities whose people amount to approximately 1,400 "Hiroshima equivalents." Again, with allowance for 30 percent attrition, the U.S. overkill capability in relation to the entire Sino-Soviet area is now 500 times.

Finally, the Soviet Union alone contains about 140 cities with 100,000 population or more, altogether approximately 500 "Hiroshima equivalents." Allowing in this case for 50 percent failure to deliver warheads, the United States alone could deliver about 25 megatons per "Hiroshima equivalent." This amounts to a U.S. overkill capability of 1,250 times.

MAINTENANCE OF PRESENT FORCES MILITARY BUDGET

I think there are very few Americans who would suggest that such an overkill capability is insufficient. Many Americans might rest assured knowing that we can kill all the people of the Communist bloc just once.

Accordingly, I have made a preliminary analysis of the proposed military budget in order to estimate the cost of maintaining present forces. The results are shown in the accompanying table. Military personnel and pay increases are held intact, and so is the entire operational and maintenance budget—for this provides for the continuance of the presently existing military power. The procurement item, however, can be reduced at least $6 to $10 billion. Similar reasoning suggests sharp curtailment of the military development and construction items. Provisions for family housing are retained.

A U.S. military budget to maintain forces at present level

[In millions of dollars]

Major military functions	Recommended new spending in administration budget for 1964	Possible reduction
Department of Defense—Military functions:		
Military personnel:		
Present programs	$13,235	
Proposed legislation to increase military compensation	900	
Operational and maintenance	11,792	
Procurement	16,725	$6,000-$10,000
Research, development, tests, and evaluation	7,262	7,000
Military construction	1,232	1,232
Family housing	734	
Civil defense	300	300
Military assistance	1,480	1,480
Atomic energy	2,893	2,000
Defense-related activities:		
Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials	28	28
Selective Service System	38	
Emergency preparedness activities:		
Present programs	52	52
Proposed legislation	30	30
Total	56,702	18,646- 22,646
Possible reduced budget		34,056- 38,056

Source: Analysis of Federal activities by function, from "The Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1964," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963. P. 61.

The civil defense item is eliminated since this whole activity is technically unsound and politically dangerous.

The military assistance item is cut on the grounds that further addition to existing military capability serves no plausible function.

The administration's recommendation on atomic energy deserves to be cut by about two-thirds since further production of warheads makes no kind of sense at all. The present stockpile of warheads is far in excess of delivery capability. The same applies to the industrial stockpiling activity, which is already an economic and a physical embarrassment.

All told, this preliminary estimate points to the possibility of reducing the military budget proposal by $18 to $22 billion while retaining in full state of operational readiness military forces that already have incredibly large overkill capability.

The implied freeing of $18 to $22 billion in the Federal budget for other purposes should make possible a fresh approach to a set of grave national problems that have been caused by our sustained heavy military spending.

FIVE NATIONAL PROBLEMS

While spending about 10 percent of our gross national product each year for fresh military forces, we have been drawing away capital from other uses and allocating the Nation's prime productive asset—our scientific and engineering talent—into military work. Having done this, and having spent about $450 billion for these purposes during the last 10 years, we have generated our side of a thermonuclear stalemate with the U.S.S.R. and a set of grave national problems.

(1) The civilian economy of the United States, deprived of fresh capital investment and technological manpower, has entered a period of deepening stagnation. Many of the industries that lie at the base of a modern industrial system, like those producing machinery of many sorts, now show the symptoms of technological and economic decline. These industries are the center of our unused industrial capacity and of industrial unemployment. Ten percent of America's gross national product is used for military purposes. That 10 percent contains well over half the Nation's scientists and engineers, whose services are used for military purposes.

These conditions are undermining the world competitive position of American industry. In 1960, for example, while we spent about 10 percent of our goods and services for military purposes, the countries in the Common Market spent 4 percent. During the same year we spent 5 percent for machinery and equipment for our industries, while the countries of the Common Market spent 10 percent for theirs. The result has been plain for all to see: full employment and rapid economic development in the countries of the Common Market, and economic stagnation in many regions of the United States.

(2) The flight of gold from the Federal Treasury has reached the point where it jeopardizes the international value of the dollar. Twelve years ago the U.S. Government held $24 billion in gold bullion. Today the gold stock has been reduced to about $15 billion. This compares to $12 billion that is legally required as the basis for our currency. At the same time about $19 billion in claims against U.S. gold is held by the central bankers of foreign countries and by various private individuals. While causes for the adverse balance of payments over these years are composed of many elements, one element dominates the scene and converts a favorable balance of trade into an unfavorable balance of payments: heavy dollar spending abroad for military purposes.

(3) We have developed a new condition in American life, a bureaucracy that rules a military-industrial complex in the United States. Highly concentrated in particular States and regions (23.3 percent of manufacturing employees in California work in military industries; 30 percent of those in Kansas are so employed, but 1.1 percent of those in South Carolina) the military manufacturing industry takes orders directly from the Department of Defense and delivers its goods to that customer only. We have yet to see any serious steps by these military industrialists toward blueprinting the conversion of their firms from military to civilian economy.

(4) Thirty to forty million Americans live in the deepest poverty: they are poorly housed, poorly fed, poorly clothed. A capital fund and, even more important, the technical talent that might be used to raise the productivity of these people is being used elsewhere. One result is that one out of six Americans is virtually removed from the market, for these men, women, and children can scarcely afford the bare minimum of sustenance.

(5) While concentrating on military development at home and abroad, we have left more than half the population of the earth in a sustained condition of bleak poverty, and thus vulnerable to Soviet penetration. Our foreign assistance program has been overwhelmingly military. We have not yet learned that as long as economic development is left to be carried out by a process of extracting taxes from an impoverished peasantry, a police state becomes the reasonable, necessary form of government. This will continue to be the case in Asia, Africa, and Latin America until we organize our enormous productive resources to make possible industrialization in the rest of the world under conditions that improve the level of living from the very start. The Asian, African, and Latin American countries will then have the option of economic development together with a measure of personal and political freedom.

All these problems require for their solution a shift of resources from military to productive uses. For, unlike most industrial production, military production is a dead end. Missiles are built, but they can only be tested, not used. The production of weapons leads to no further production, only to stockpiling. It does nothing to rectify the economic problems of the United States or the world.

NEW POLICY OPPORTUNITIES

The large savings that are possible in our military expenditures, even while maintaining enormous power, allows us to raise fresh questions about our whole world strategy. The world policy of the United States has been based on the assumption that military power is the indispensable instrument for resolving national conflicts. What are the possible alternatives to this view? Could the productive capability of the United States be used as an instrument of power? One calculation is that if we use our productive might to generate economic development at home and abroad, then we could confront Soviet leaders with an altogether new situation: An industrial thrust from the United States of such power and political consequences that in order to meet it the Soviets, for their part, would have to take disarmament seriously. For the U.S.S.R. has no unused industrial capacity. Its smaller industrial base could provide major additions to industrial output only by the conversion of its military complex. Could such a strategy, a peace race, break the negotiating deadlock which now plagues all disarmament efforts?

Lastly, don't these calculations of military overkill put the whole problem of the risks of a test ban in a fresh light? Against the background of the massive military might already in hand, the risks of entering into a test-ban agreement with the U.S.S.R., under reasonable inspection, look like an opportunity for a call of halt to the spread of nuclear weaponry. For the spread of overkill does not produce security.

A prudent national budget can maintain the present military capacity while liberating large funds. These resources are the proper size for ameliorating grave national problems, and for mounting an alternative system of power politics based upon our industrial, productive might.

Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I think it would behoove each of us who

would be a self-appointed chairman of the "Subcommittee on Cuba" to read the statesmanlike speech by the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8. In that speech, entitled "Cuban Disclosures and Foreign Policy," the distinguished leader poses three questions any critic should ask himself. First, am I talking for a partisan purpose? Second, am I talking with the full realization that my words may help to drive the people and the President's course toward war, limited or unlimited? Third, am I talking with the belief that my words will help the President in his primary task of safeguarding the security of the United States and its national reputation for honesty, integrity, and decency while he attempts to exert a constructive influence for freedom and peace, not only with respect to Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere and the world?

A conscientious answer to these questions might serve to direct such criticisms to dispassionate and constructive ends. Surely rational men can argue reasonable alternatives without producing sensationalism and squandering the fruits of past triumphs. I think history will show that a definite shift in the power balance of the world occurred on Sunday morning last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. What remains to be done is another question altogether and certainly deserves the best answers from all of us. Let us proceed in that way. Mr. Speaker, in this vein, I submit an article by Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down, and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's preemptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cocophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be rescued from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already abuilding takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Viet-Cong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from the U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And, they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of war of liberation that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is

composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. These negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counter revolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

Report on Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I was pleased to note an article which appeared in the February 1963 issue of Independent Petroleum Monthly respecting House Report No. 2567, issued by Subcommittee No. 4, of which my colleague, the Honorable TOM STEED, is chairman.

This is an important subject, and in order to give it wide attention, I have requested permission that the article be reprinted in the RECORD. The article follows:

STEED SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON EFFECTS OF FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS ON U.S. BUSINESS

Representative TOM STEED's subcommittee, which has kept the spotlight on business problems created by petroleum imports, has called for further study during the 88th Congress of the manifold problems connected with the excessive importation of petroleum and petroleum products from foreign sources.

In a report to the chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, STEED's subcommittee said that President Kennedy's revision of the import program on November 20 will not solve the problem. The report said, however, that "the subcommittee is happy to see adopted for the first time the principle of import quotas based on domestic production.

"Properly implemented, this approach can bring to the domestic oil industry for the first time in the last 6 years a share of the expanding market and thus stimulate the exploration so essential to our national security," it was added.

The subcommittee, which held extensive hearings on the imports problem during the 87th Congress, said a second improvement in the import control program, along the lines of the subcommittee's recommendation, is the inclusion of presently exempt overland imports within the overall relationship to domestic production. "Overland imports thus would not be able to increase further at the expense of U.S. production," the report said.

The subcommittee quoted Harold Decker, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America: "Improvements in the program * * * will contribute to the Nation's security position as to oil supplies, although this perhaps will be more a long-range than immediate benefit * * *. Further action to improve the oil import program will be necessary to assure adequate supplies for the consuming public and the national security."

The Steed report said "the impact of the present high levels of imports of crude oil and petroleum products into this country had grown to such proportions as to constitute serious and immediate danger to the national security."

It added: "The international situation is today much more ominous than it has been since the end of the Korean conflict. It cannot be questioned that, in wartime, dependence cannot be placed on foreign fuels. A healthy, domestic oil and coal industry, capable of supplying both the civilian population and the military forces in time of emergency, is essential to national security."

In addition to continued study of the problems resulting from excessive imports of foreign crude oil and products, STEED's subcommittee listed other recommendations to Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. These included:

1. There is urgent need for a better liaison between all the various branches of the Federal Government—in order to establish a unified and coordinated overall policy respecting petroleum.

2. Import quotas on crude oil, unfinished oils and finished petroleum products (excluding residual fuel oil to be used solely for fuel) be reduced immediately to 1 million barrels per day, or to an amount not to exceed 10 percent of domestic production for the preceding year, whichever is the lesser.

This would provide renewed incentive for exploration and development to domestic producers of oil, the report said.

3. As an alternative to a reduction in the quotas of imported oil and petroleum products, a tariff of at least $1.25 on each barrel of foreign crude oil, unfinished oils, and finished petroleum products should be seriously considered.

4. An appropriate legislative committee should give consideration to amendment of the internal revenue laws to provide for a direct credit for income tax purposes for all oil sold by American producers in competition with Soviet bloc oil in the foreign world market.

This credit would be for the amount representing the difference between the price at which such oil would have to be sold to meet the Soviet competition and the quoted price of the prospective crude oil in foreign world market.

"This would be a particularly useful tool to employ as a counteroffensive measure to the Russian use of petroleum as an economic weapon," the Steed group said.

5. Import quotas on residual fuel oil, to be used solely as fuel, should be fixed at a level no higher than the total of such imports in 1961, so as to reduce the threat to national security which residual oil imports now create.

5. A suitable Government agency should immediately undertake a survey of essential plants and installations along the east coast, where more than 50 percent of all defense contracts are held and where virtually all imported residual oil is used.

This agency should determine the true extent to which those plants have become dependent on this insecure foreign source of fuel through abandonment of other types of burning and fuel handling.

The Steed subcommittee held hearings during the 87th Congress. Witnesses included oil industry leaders, officials of Federal and State Governments, and representatives from various trade associations, including the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

As a result of these hearings, the Steed subcommittee reported these findings:

1. The mandatory oil imports control program has not achieved its objectives since the domestic oil- and gas-producing industries are not in an economically healthy condition. State allowables are the lowest in history, exploration and drilling for oil and gas continue to decline, unemployment is increasing in the industry, crude oil production is static.

2. Decline in the domestic oil and gas industries has occurred even though the voluntary oil imports program, which failed, was followed by a mandatory program. The executive branch of the Government, with power to correct and adjust the import program, has not acted "to the degree necessary to achieve the objective."

3. The subcommittee noted the statement sometimes made that importation of petroleum would be good for the United States since it would tend to promote international trade and commerce and create a favorable international atmosphere.

The Steed group said: "It must be recognized that oil and its products belong to a different category from other commodities that flow in the channels of international trade. This is because petroleum is needed to propel the engines of defense and keep America's industry in production to supply those needs, not only for the Nation at peace, but also for those potential needs in case of an emergency or war.

"Should the United States become more and more dependent upon foreign sources of supply, while neglecting the development of its own producing and refining capacity, it would thereby greatly endanger its national existence," it was added.

The committee said it "is sympathetic to the need to assist the economy of such friendly Western Hemisphere nations, and was gratified to find that Venezuela's economy has not suffered as a result of this Nation's oil import control program."

In fact, the hearings brought out that sales by Venezuela to the United States of all goods, but mostly petroleum, increased from $892.3 million in 1958, the year before controls were imposed, to $948.3 million in 1963.

4. The hearings brought out this anomaly: One the one hand, the Department of Interior tried to restrict the flow of foreign petroleum through the imposition of mandatory quotas. On the other hand, other departments of the Government (Department of Commerce's Bureau of International Trade) do the diametrically opposite and encourage the importation of petroleum into the United States.

5. The subcommittee has reason to believe that Canada is importing cheap oil, and, at the same time, exporting its high-price oil to the United States. Recognizing the importance of hemispheric solidarity and good relations with neighboring nations, the subcommittee added:

"It would be remiss in its obligation to the Congress not to report its findings that such practices are not conducive to the U.S. national interest and that ways and means must be found to correct such undesirable tendencies."

6. Excessive oil imports, particularly residuals, are destroying the capacity of the coal industry to produce and contribute its share to the Nation's economy and security. The coal industry cannot maintain its production in the face of continued loss of markets to excessive foreign fuels.

The Steed report added: "Some of the witnesses testified that in the event of war—tankers which bring oil from foreign lands to America would be extremely vulnerable to submarine attack.

"Should the United States become more and more dependent on foreign sources of supply, while neglecting the development of its own producing and refining capability, it would thereby greatly endanger its national existence.

"Not only would small and independent business be completely wiped out, but this could present an Achilles heel for the future. The subcommittee deems it of utmost importance that this does not happen."

Tribute to Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1963, Lewis Deschler had served the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States 35 years as its Parliamentarian. On March 4, 1963, this House duly celebrated the event here in this Chamber, with the passage of a resolution—unanimously—that did Parliamentarian Deschler a high, appropriate and immensely deserved honor. This resolution—House Resolution 274—expressed the thanks and appreciation of the House for what the resolution called Parliamentarian Deschler's "wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and Members" and for his "exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules."

This pertinent and official language in the resolution has very considerable implications and we in the House, especially those of us who have served here a long time, know precisely what the correct and meaningful phrases of the resolution mean. The words "wise" and "impartial" could hardly be improved upon and I can vouch for their precision because I, too, happen to have toiled in this Chamber since 1928, and I am fully aware that parliamentary impartiality and wisdom can be the lubricating medium that explains efficient and correct parliamentary practices. All this, as I have witnessed Mr. Deschler's service at close hand, attests to a judicial temperament, a punctilious dedication to the essential subtleties of orderly procedure, that again and again has won him, certainly from me, the highest order of respect and confidence.

What I would like to point out today is that Lew Deschler's service over these three and one-half decades has been a remarkable contribution as much to the country as to the several Speakers and the House Members who have served here, and who so constantly and exhaustively availed themselves of his talents and his knowledge. It is not enough to say that he enjoys an extraordinary mastery, as the tips of his fingers, of the infinite minutiae of parliamentary law. This happens to be his basic and—for this House—his indispensable tool, for the guidance that governs our tasks here. But over and above this knowledge and the immediacy of his judgment we recognize the quality of the man. This is an essentially inherited factor and all his own. It could not have been grafted onto his intellect from any of the good and distinguished schools he attended in Ohio or here in Washington.

In this quality of the man I emphasize especially the element of character, without which I doubt he could have maneuvered his way successfully among the strong and sometimes overwhelming personalities that again and again occupied this Chamber. He has a force of personality which is persuasive and decisive and restrained without being at all obtrusive, and which is never lacking in respect for the dignity of those who depend upon him for consultation, advice, judgment, and knowledge. He has again and again, almost constantly in the work-a-day affairs of this House, demonstrated a genius for understanding the political and personal problems of his distinguished clients, helping always, without abdicating by one jot or tittle the sacred precincts of his impartiality. He has been the diplomat extraordinary who, more than most diplomats, has always been clear and informative, and so diligently devoted to what is right and just, irrespective of rank or position, that the highest and the most powerful, as well as the humblest, have honored him for his integrity.

President Kennedy wrote to Parliamentarian Deschler emphasizing his "unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives." Vice-President LYNDON B. JOHNSON has been quoted in this Chamber for his high opinion of Mr. Deschler, and, of course, the late Sam Rayburn, as we have been told, spoke of him as "a big brain man." To the encomiums of these very great leaders of our time, and to the excellent expressions of appreciation that have already been uttered in this Chamber, I add my own brief tribute to one of our mostly unsung heroes of the parliamentary system. For, Mr. Deschler and his performance is to the efficient operation of this House what grammar is to the correct employment of language—an indispensable discipline.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen I extend to Lewis Deschler my compliments, my respect and my gratitude.

Churches and Other Charitable Institutions Not Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune on March 11, 1963, entitled "Churches, Other Charitable Institutions Not Tax Loopholes."

The editorial follows:

CHURCHES, OTHER CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS NOT TAX LOOPHOLES

Is your church in Wisconsin Rapids, Nekoosa or Port Edwards a tax loophole?

Arrows of criticism aimed at President Kennedy's so-called tax reforms are zinging around the National Capital. Many of the pointed comments are hitting their targets.

The idea behind Kennedy's hoped-for $13.6 billion in tax cuts spread over 3 years is to cause all of us to spend more money.

At the same time, he wants to plug up loopholes (favored treatment) supposedly existing in some taxes. This would bring about $3.5 billion into the U.S. Treasury, actually leaving about $10 billion in our pockets with which to buy more goods and services and create more jobs.

Well, loophole plugging sounds fine but many of the routes by which money escapes the Federal tax collector are not loopholes at all; they are proper avenues for the support of the best part of American life.

Just why churches, hospitals, YMCA's YMCA's, seminaries, private schools and private colleges, and charitable institutions of other kinds are treated as loopholes by the President and his advisers is hard to explain.

Deductions for interest paid (as on home loans), for State and local taxes, for accident losses and medical expenses are big loopholes, too, according to the tax reformers.

So, administration tax experts in Washington want to fix the law so only the amount of charitable contributions and above deductions in excess of 5 percent of income can be deducted for tax purposes.

This would mean, for example, that the taxpayer with taxable income of $4,500 would get no deduction for the first $225 he paid for the above so-called loopholes. That's wrong because if he wants to give $50 or $100 of that to his church he should

get a tax deduction. A church is no loophole.

As incomes go up, charitable contributions usually increase in dollar amount. People with higher incomes weigh-in heavily with financial support of churches and other charitable institutions.

Small and large contributions from incomes have provided millions of dollars for the building and spiritual programs of churches in South Wood County in the last 15 years. More such contributions must be counted on here in the future.

A drive for Riverview Hospital may be made in the next year or two and again small and large contributions from income will be sought for that construction. And they should be tax deductible.

This move by Kennedy's tax boys to disallow deductions under 5 percent of income is partly to force people to list their deductions and figure out what if any part comes to over 5 percent.

The reformers think that if it seems like too much trouble people won't bother to itemize. And that would make it a lot less work for the Internal Revenue Service to audit tax returns.

But disallowing perhaps hundreds of dollars of a family's contributions is a poor way to stimulate the economy. Money spent on churches and other charitable institutions buys goods and services and creates jobs in the best kind of way.

Members of Congress will be happy to hear your views before they vote on whether to reform tax laws.

National Rice Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from one of the major rice-producing States, I am pleased to call attention to the observance of National Rice Week now under way.

Rice is produced in greater abundance than any other food and it has been the principal—frequently the sole—sustenance for half the people of the world for thousands of years. It is produced on every continent, in every hemisphere and in practically every country. The U.S. rice industry customarily participates in 15 to 20 percent of world trade in rice.

Rice was brought to the United States in 1694 by a ship, enroute from Madagascar to England, which was blown off its course during a storm and forced to land at Charleston, S.C., for repairs. When the ship had been made ready to continue on its voyage the captain gave the Governor of the colony a small parcel of rough rice, from which enough rice was soon grown to supply South Carolina and neighboring colonies. From South Carolina production moved to Louisiana, then to other States. Today rice is produced in 13 States, with the major production in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and California.

Rice, the energy food, is relatively low in price but high in nutriment. It is a favorite with housewives because it is easy to prepare, economical, tasty, and versatile—it goes well with any meal, almost any dish.

In celebration of National Rice Week, March 17 to 23, an extensive advertising campaign is being conducted in news media. Newspaper and magazine food editors all over the United States are being provided with rice recipe material and photographs to be used in giving the public detailed information concerning the importance and value of this vital food. The advertising is being done by private brand distributors and by the Rice Council, a national organization of the rice industry for promoting domestic consumption, supported by voluntary contributions from all rice growers and millers.

Also active in the interest of the rice industry is the Rice Millers' Association, a nonstock, nonprofit, incorporated trade association of the rice milling industry. Organized in 1899, it is composed of a majority of the commercial rice mills of the United States, and is headed by Mr. J. P. Gaines as executive vice president, with headquarters in Washington. For a great many years, until his retirement, Mr. William M. Reid, who has done so much for the welfare and development of the rice industry, served as president.

The Rice Millers' Association has announced that in observance of National Rice Week, the rice industry will sponsor a free serving of a rice dish to all persons who dine at the restaurants and cafeterias at the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday, March 20. There will be table notices announcing that the rice is being provided with the compliments of rice growers, millers and Members of Congress from the rice growing States, each of which will be named. I am happy to join with my colleagues from these States in extending a hearty invitation to all Capitol diners to share in this treat.

Soviet-Czechoslovakian-Cuban Politico-Military Power Drive in Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the vital interests of this Nation are at stake in the current struggle for political power in Haiti.

A combined force of Soviet-Czechoslovakian-Cuban Communists have penetrated and infiltrated the Haitian Government. They are now in the process of consolidating their political power within the Haitian Government.

The Soviet is establishing, step-by-step, the political power foundation in Haiti for another massive Communist military offensive force to be directed against the United States.

Our lack of effective counter political action again exposes the rigidity, futility, and sterility of the policies, strategies, and tactics of our Government in dealing with the nonmilitary phases of the Soviet world political power war.

I present a copy of a letter written to the Department of State, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency on this impending crisis.

The letter follows:

SOVIET-CZECHOSLOVAKIA-CUBAN POLITICO MILITARY POWER DRIVE IN HAITI

MARCH 15, 1963.

THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK: I am certain that you are aware of the powerful Communist influences that exist in the Haiti Government.

It is a matter of public knowledge that the Minister of Finance, married to a French Communist, was expelled from Paris for Communist activities. The closest adviser of the President was the leader of the Haitian Communist Party in 1946. The Minister of Information and Coordination, the only minister to survive eight successive Cabinet shakeups, along with his brother, the Director of Economic Control, make no secret of their open admiration, enthusiasm, and sympathies for Castro and his regime.

Haiti today is seething with unrest and insurrection possibilities. Under the Haitian constitution, a presidential election will be held in May of this year. It is quite possible that a revolutionary crisis will take place in Haiti during, or shortly after, this presidential election.

In the event of the overthrow of the Duvalier government, it is certain that Duvalier's Communist Cabinet officers will assume power and convert Haiti into a Castro-type Communist dictatorship.

I am authoritatively advised that neither the National Security Council, the State Department, nor the Central Intelligence Agency have formulated any practical policies or strategies to prevent a Castro-type Communist takeover in Haiti in the event of an insurrection during or after the May presidential election.

Our diplomatic and Central Intelligence representatives in Haiti have been unable to slow down or stop the progressive deterioration of United States-Haiti relations. The sharp curtailment of U.S. aid to Haiti is forcing Duvalier to solicit economic assistance from the Soviet.

Newspapers have recently reported the arrival of Czechoslovak experts who are the advance agents for a Soviet absorption of the Haiti Government.

This Soviet penetration of Haiti will necessarily and progressively extend into a political, economic and military domination of the nation.

I am aware that your Department has announced that the United States will, on request, give military assistance to any Latin American nation threatened with Communist takeover. Mr. Secretary, it is abundantly clear that such a request will never come from Dr. Duvalier, nor from his Soviet-Cuban backed potential successors.

In October 1962, the Congress passed a joint resolution which empowered the President to "prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere."

This policy is meaningless if the executive department does not choose to implement the authority granted by the Congress.

It appears that no specific alternative plans have been formulated, or are ready for activation, to anticipate and forestall the step-by-step Soviet takeover of Haiti.

Mr. Secretary, I respectfully ask that the State Department, in conjunction with the

National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency, formulate adequate policies and prepare such plans of action as may be necessary to prevent the Soviet from establishing in Haiti another Cuban-type military threat to the safety of this Nation.

Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, Frank J. Johnson, editor of the American Security Council's Washington Report delivered a most meaningful address to the National Security Commission of the American Legion on the subject of psychological warfare.

Mr. Johnson's penetrating remarks were as follows:

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Remarks by Frank J. Johnson, editor, Washington Report, American Security Council, before the National Security Commission meeting, March 12, 1963)

My topic today is psychological warfare. It is an appropriate topic. Appropriate because the cold war may ultimately be won or lost by the proper employment, or lack of it, of psychology. And this begins with the psychological problem here at home. It has to do with the root philosophy of our cold war strategy. Unless this Government, and unless our people understand why there is no end in sight to the cold war, and why it is we have steadily less rather than more security, and why we encounter nothing but frustration in our desire to achieve a peaceful world, we will be talking about psychological warfare in a vacuum—simply an exercise in debate or rhetoric—mere words tossed to the winds of time, which blow not with us but against us.

I want to illustrate these remarks by dealing first with a specific of foreign policy, Cuba, and then attempt to show how this specific is conditioned by the underlying fallacy of our cold war strategy.

I'll begin on Cuba by quoting a statement from Churchill. Said he, "There is no worse mistake in public leadership than to hold out false hopes soon to be swept away. The people can face peril or misfortune with buoyancy, but they bitterly resent being deceived, or finding that those responsible for their affairs are themselves dwelling in a fool's paradise."

The events of the past 4 months fit Churchill's remark extraordinary well. A massive psychological warfare campaign is now being waged on the American people to convince them that all is well. It comes in every speech from a State Department official; it comes in TV spectaculars and White House news conferences. It was exemplified by a speech of Vice President JOHNSON last month in which he asserted that 1962 saw the great turn against world communism; and he based that in large part on events in the Caribbean and Latin America. And the Gallup poll seems to show that the people on balance believe it. The majority is still satisfied with our conduct on foreign affairs. Are they being deliberately deceived? No, I don't think so. Our leaders are probably not as optimistic as they appear in public, but they do, to a degree, live themselves in a fool's paradise. They are genuinely convinced that they are following the course of maximum security at minimum risk. I challenge this belief from top to bottom.

We won an important victory last fall; let's make no mistake on that. But we won it by doing what Walter Lippmann has warned that we must never do: We spoke to the Soviet in the language of ultimatum. Russia understood that unless we got satisfaction on the missile removal in a very short period of time there would be U.S. military action against Cuba. The forces were poised; public opinion was prepared; the United States was formally committed. Khrushchev knew that he was in great danger of losing his Cuban position entirely and that he would be able to do nothing about it. He chose, of course, to salvage what he could, accepting defeat in preference to a disastrous war or the ultimate humiliation of standing aside while U.S. Marines threw communism out of Cuba.

Though beaten from the start, the Soviets sought desperately to soften their defeat by extracting some concession in return. First came the proposal to swap for the missiles in Turkey: Refused (though now carried out); then the offer to withdraw their missiles and permit onsite inspection in return for a no-invasion guarantee. Was the Soviet contempt for our intelligence so enormous that they seriously expected us to accept this proposal? We cannot know. It must have at least seemed worth a try. We can only speculate that when it paid off there was a whistle of relief and perhaps incredulity in the Kremlin.

Certainly as an act of psychological warfare the offer even to consider a no-invasion pledge on Cuba at the very moment when we were on the verge of winning a tremendous and possibly decisive cold war victory, must rank as a first-class historical blunder. Its defenders argue that it was no more than a reaffirmation of the pledge given 6 weeks earlier that we would take no action against Cuba unless it became an offensive base. This was bad enough. But after October 22 the situation had changed. It changed the moment the first Soviet ship turned back before our blockade, thus demonstrating, for those who had doubts, that Russia would not fight a war over Cuba. At that point the enemy showed his fear, and every principle of strategy demanded that not the missiles but communism in Cuba should be the target.

But what did we do? With the enemy on the ropes and ready for the knockout we graciously stepped back and offered him the opportunity to get a second wind. The conditional offer of no-invasion guarantee struck an enormous psychological blow at the morale of the anti-Castro Cubans and put new heart in his shaken defenders. And if there is a hard-line faction in Moscow it must have given them a potent new argument.

It is not too much to say that on the weekend of October 27–28 the scales of human destiny hung precariously in the balance. Sometimes this happens in history. There is a moment of time in which a single decision by a few men will profoundly affect the whole future of humanity. On October 22, 1962, we left the "age of innocence." On October 27, when we offered to give the no-invasion pledge, we reentered it, and perhaps fatally this time. The cold war, which may then have been tipping strongly in our favor, may at that moment of time have tipped suddenly the other way, and our own final decline and defeat may have begun.

This is a grim statement and I hope that I am wrong. I qualify it with the word "may" because it was not the decision itself which was so disastrous—this can still be reversed—but the state of mind, the cold war psychology which produced it and was revealed by it. And this state of mind can change also. There is still time, but not much time.

Consider what has happened in the past 4 months. The psychology which ran so strongly for us in the days after October 22 now runs almost as strongly against us. Our psychological victory over Russia—and that is what it was primarily—has turned to ashes. We never formally gave that no-invasion guarantee, but this is semantic quibbling. Everyone understands that the Government now intends no forcible action to remove communism from Cuba. There has been a resulting sharp reversal of the atmosphere. Castro has emerged from the crisis almost unscathed and Soviet prestige has been largely restored. Vastly encouraged by these facts, Latin American revolutionaries have redoubled their efforts. The whole hemisphere has become a tinder box. The situation is highly dangerous in half a dozen countries.

Cuba is important to Khrushchev and to communism generally. It is enormously important. It has become the fulcrum of the cold war and now overshadows all else, because it is the key to the accelerating Communist offensive in Latin America. Its continued existence as a Communist state, in the face of repeated U.S. pledges and one abortive effort at the Bay of Pigs to liberate it, serves to demonstrate the impotence of the United States and gives great psychological impetus, purely apart from its physical use as a base, to the Communist offensive, which is primarily psychopolitical. The missiles are gone, yes, but the threat from Cuba is greater now than ever before.

Let us recall this to mind: We have long been pledged to go to thermonuclear war if necessary to keep the Soviets out of West Berlin. Why? Because its fall would increase the military threat to Europe or ourselves. Of course not. It is because the psychological effect of a U.S. retreat from a firm commitment would be devastating.

And so it is now with Cuba. Cuba is the West Berlin of the Western Hemisphere. Only here the absolutely vital imperative of U.S. policy is not just to keep it out of Communist hands, it is too late for that; it is to regain Cuba for the free world. We are committed to this. We have ample power to do it. Continued failure to do it will be just as disastrous in its effect, much more so in fact than a decision to retreat from Berlin the next time the Soviets put on the pressure.

I think our policymakers generally recognize the imperative of freeing Cuba. What they do not realize is that there is no safe or painless way to do it. Diplomatic and economic pressure alone will not work. It is going to require some element of force or the clear and unequivocal threat of force. This is because the U.S. imperative to remove communism is matched by an equal imperative of Soviet policy to maintain it there if this can be done without war with the United States. Khrushchev will never voluntarily give it up. He will invest whatever is necessary to keep it going. Soviet troops and equipment are in Cuba to make sure that communism will not be overthrown by anything short of direct U.S. military intervention. These are the grim facts but Washington either will not accept their truth or will not face up to their consequences.

Current Soviet policy is to deter the employment of U.S. force against Cuba. There are two ways to do this—by threats and by conciliation. Thus, on the one hand, Khrushchev and Defense Minister Malinovsky go further than ever before in warning that an attack on Cuba will mean world war III. They stop short of any formal commitment along these lines, such as taking Cuba into the Warsaw Pact, but they know the threats add fuel to those who argue that we must not employ force for this reason.

On the other hand, there is the continuing exchange of secret letters between Khru-

shchev and the President. The revelation that Khrushchev has offered to withdraw "several thousand" troops by March 15 is a clue to their general drift. In the face of our presumed continued prodding on troop withdrawal, Khrushchev demonstrates his "good will" by a conciliatory gesture. There is always just enough "give" to his position to keep us heading down the primrose path in the belief that a diplomatic solution is just around the corner, thereby cutting the ground from under the "hawks" who press for immediate action.

In this manner, troop withdrawal could be strung out for years. But this is not the real issue any more than the missiles. The real issue is elimination of communism from Cuba, and quickly, very quickly. Troop withdrawal should be regarded only as a means to this end, to be quickly followed by other steps. But our policymakers turn a deaf ear to this argument. There is not a single statement which suggests any sense of urgency. Why not? It is because current policy is imprisoned by the fundamental, stultifying fallacy which has dominated the whole conduct of the cold war; that we can do business with a Soviet Union still determined to destroy us. The corollary of this is that the chief danger to the world is the bomb and not communism, and that every issue is negotiable if there is only enough patience.

There is no other explanation for the failure to convert the Soviet defeat of last October into a rout. The strong action announced on October 22 was a temporary aberration from the usual mold of American policy. It was dictated by the bold enemy stroke which threatened at once to upset the military balance and which permitted no time for protracted negotiation. But the moment the Soviets yielded on this point to our own power play, the United States lacked the courage, the foresight and the wisdom to grasp the full implications of what this policy aberration had achieved. We gave a sigh of relief that the immediate crisis had passed and returned our policy into its accustomed groove. As a policymaker in the Kremlin might have put it, "We were eyeball to eyeball and the other fellow just blinked."

The most amazing and revealing thing about us was the orgy of self-delusion in which we wallowed in the month immediately following. It was freely predicted that the Cuban crisis marked the end of an era in Soviet foreign policy. This great Soviet defeat was the final bankruptcy of Khrushchev's policy, his last-gasp haymaker from the floor of the ring. Nothing further was required from us; the Soviet would conclude that the cold war was now too dangerous and might genuinely change their outlook on world affairs; the discredited Castro's days were numbered and he would soon fade away. Flushed with false confidence, the United States embarked on yet another effort to find a new "spirit of Camp David."

Today we find ourselves in the ruins of these hopes but they will not die; there are words of peace and coexistence from Moscow, to be sure, and there is opposition to the rash adventurism of the Chinese. But they are mixed with the chilly blasts of Soviet nuclear diplomacy and the savage, unremitting hostility to all that we stand for. There are no settlements and the enemy offensive through the center of our line gathers momentum.

Yet the search for a settlement goes on, and we must not rock the boat on Cuba, we must not press Khrushchev too hard lest we back him into a corner, or lest we upset the delicate balance of diplomatic negotiation. That promises a nuclear test ban, removal of the Soviets from Cuba, and maybe that will-o'-the-whisp, disarmament. Unflinching in its belief that these negotiations can succeed, the Government pleads for patience and argues that all is well.

Here, I submit, is the deadly state of mind that in the end will bring us communism or nuclear destruction, or both. And the two are not mutually exclusive. It is a fallacy to think that world communism will bring world peace. The subsequent struggle between Communists fighting for ultimate world power would be too frightful to imagine. There is no peace in surrender.

But no one is now talking of surrender. The really deep gulf between the two serious schools of thought on foreign policy in this country is between those who think that serious negotiations and permanent settlements and accommodations are possible with the Soviets and those who believe that this is by definition impossible until the hostile Soviet purpose is first changed. And the corollary of this view is that the Soviet purpose can never be changed by containment alone.

The first school of thought has always been dominant in this country. There has been no permanent success for their policies but the hard line alternative is always judged to be worse. And so we go on and on with the burden of proof more than ever on the conciliators. Few would deny that under the containment strategy the drift of events has increased rather than decreased the ultimate prospect of war.

Here is the great philosophical issue: Can any really genuine agreement be reached on any vital issue without at least a minimum of mutual good will? Can the nuclear genie be put back in the bottle while the cold war goes on? My answer is a flat "No." There has been no disarmament, nor can there be, except on Soviet terms which are clearly intended to improve their military capabilities relative to our own. And this certainly applies to a nuclear test ban.

In short, can any of the really great problems of the world be solved until the cold war has ended? And is there any way to end it without winning it? And does not winning it imply, at the absolute minimum, the abandonment by the Soviet Union of its basically hostile, aggressive policy toward the West?

Here is another thesis of containment which I challenge, namely that we can both fight the cold war and satisfy the "revolution of rising expectations" of the underdeveloped nations. This is a real problem, and unless we at least partially bridge the economic gap, the world will be in turmoil, communism or no communism.

Under the "evolution" concept of cold war victory, one of the prerequisites is an economic and social transformation of the underdeveloped world to end the attraction of communism. I submit that this is impossible and a reversal of priorities. We can win the cold war in the sense I have defined it without first transforming the underdeveloped world. We cannot bring about this transformation without first winning the cold war. The "haves" cannot successfully aid the "have nots" until they first settle the civil war between themselves.

The reasons for this are fairly obvious. So long as we have to go on spending $50 billion plus on defense, we cannot extend foreign aid on anywhere near the scale that it must be extended if we are to significantly raise the living standards of the poor nations. Furthermore, the cold war prevents us from making effective use of the aid which we do give. "Political considerations" involved in the cold war prevent us from exercising the necessary degree of internal interference in the economies of the recipient countries to make sure the aid is wisely and efficiently utilized. About the best we can hope to do is keep up with the exploding populations, if even that.

On the other hand, if we first win the cold war, which is the only way we can end the arms race, we and the Russians might then be able to join hands in a concerted foreign aid program which would quite openly interfere in the receiving countries to whatever degree was necessary to get the job done.

But we are not winning the cold war and we may be losing it. It shows no signs of ending: On that everyone must agree. Precisely because there continues to be "good fishing" in the underdeveloped world, precisely because the containment policy imposes no real risks to the Soviet Union, and precisely because it offers the Soviets reason to believe that their ultimate objectives can yet be achieved, containment puts no real pressure or inducement on the Soviets to change their hostile policy toward us. As such I believe it is the path of greater rather than lesser risk to the United States. This risk includes not only the possibility of ultimate political defeat but of nuclear war as well. The Chinese are insisting that the United States does not have the will to fight. Too many efforts on our part to be conciliatory may cause the Soviets to delude themselves into believing the Chinese are right, which could lead some day to a fatal miscalculation of the risks on their part. Our failure to carry through on Cuba when all the military advantages lie with us will hardly convince the Kremlin "hardliners" that their policy is bankrupt.

On the other hand, U.S. military intervention in Cuba, abandonment of the fiction that disarmament is possible in the absence of a termination of the cold war, full-scale economic and political warfare against the Soviet Union, encouragement rather than discouragement to nationalist guerrilla operations against the Chinese Communists, and a full and frank explanation to the American people as to why all these things, and more, are necessary might add up to the psychological warfare necessary to finally "persuade" the Soviet Union that its interests really do lie in making a permanent settlement with the West. We keep telling them that this is so but we never do anything to convince them of it. I do not maintain that there is no risk in such a policy. There is no way to avoid risk in the thermonuclear age. Every alternative has its own dangers. But I suggest that in the long run the strategy which I propose runs less risk of a final nuclear holocaust than the one we are presently following. And I suggest that it is the only way in which we can hope to bring an end to the cold war.

Panama Canal: Congress Must Act To Prevent Threatened Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 18–20, which will be attended by the Presidents of the Central American Republics and the President of the United States, has again focused attention on the Caribbean situation in which the Panama Canal is the key element. It was, therefore, with much gratification that I noted the introduction by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of House Concurrent Resolution 105, which aims to clarify the present confused understanding of the U.S. sovereign rights,

power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

In this connection, it will be recalled by those Members who were present in the House on February 2, 1960, that this body adopted by the vote of 381 to 12 House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, which, in effect, was aimed at preventing the display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone.

Within a matter of days, after the adjournment of that session, and as predicted by me in an address to this body, this specific evidence of the will of the Congress as regards the Panama Canal was ignored by the President in Executive order on September 17, 1960, directing the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory at one spot. Instead of meeting the situation, this surrender merely led to more demands as shown by the subsequent authorization by the executive of the wide display of the Panama flag in the territory, which even includes one at the Canal Zone administration building.

Such formal displays of the Panama flags in the Canal Zone are not harmless gestures but symbols of weakness on the part of the officials responsible for what amounts to deliberate collaboration with those who would subvert the sovereign rights, power, and authority over the canal enterprise. Such treaty obligations and responsibilities, for some time, have been verging toward liquidation through the process of piecemeal surrenders.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize what I have often said that where there is responsibility there must be authority; otherwise there will be chaos. The process of liquidation has now gone so far that if the Panama Canal is to be saved, it must be rescued by the Congress of the United States.

To this end, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 113, which is identical with House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The indicated resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 113

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange or ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world; and for which rights, the United States has paid the Republic of Panama the full indemnity and annuities agreed upon by the two nations; and

Whereas, on February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives in the Eighty-sixth Congress, by an overwhelming vote, approved H. Con. Res. 459, favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty."

Whereas, because of continuing claims of sovereignty over the Canal Zone by Panama which, if granted, would liquidate United States control of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, a further declaration by the Eighty-eighth Congress is deemed necessary and timely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and will lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

(4) That the provisions of H. Con. Res. 459, Eighty-sixth Congress, are reiterated and reemphasized.

AFL-CIO Executive Council Urges Extension of Minimum Wage Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO Executive Council recently adopted a resolution with respect to minimum wage. The executive council urges that the Fair Labor Standards Act be extended to cover workers engaged in commerce who are presently excepted from this drastically restricted act.

The President of the United States, in his economic report, recognized the deficiencies in the present law and expressed a need for extension of coverage.

Many millions of workers are excluded from FLSA. These laborers are among the most exploited in the Nation. Pay of less than $1.25 per hour is barely a subsistence rate. The 87th Congress raised and extended the minimum wage, but coverage is still unduly restricted. Because I believe the Congress is interested in correcting this injustice, I am submitting the AFL-CIO resolution for consideration by my colleagues.

The resolution follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON MINIMUM WAGE, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBURARY 21, 1963

To its great credit the 87th Congress increased the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extended the protection of the law to some 3½ million workers who were previously excluded from it.

In a report to Congress this month, Secretary of Labor Wirtz said a study by his Department made it clear that the higher minimums had no inflationary effect, and that employment had risen in the industries affected by the increases. More than 2½ million low-paid workers benefited to the extent of $500 a year, he noted.

The benefits will spread even further in this and subsequent years as the step-by-step improvements provided in the law reach more of those workers newly covered by it. They will be better off and so will the Nation.

But it must also be recognized that the coverage of this fundamental statute is still drastically restricted. More than 15 million American wage earners have no protection whatever under the Federal law; and they include workers who are among the most blatantly exploited in our Nation's history.

Their needs are immediate; their problems are current; their plight has been described and documented in congressional hearings in previous years.

As Secretary Wirtz' report pointed out, these underpaid workers need legislative help. With few exceptions, he said, they did not benefit, directly or indirectly, from the wage increases provided for other low-paid workers by the 1961 improvements in the Federal law. Thus further extensions of coverage are clearly necessary, he said.

The labor movement has repeatedly made this same point. We were keenly disappointed, for example, by the denial of coverage under the 1961 act to such notoriously underpaid toilers as the laundry workers and the hotel and restaurant workers; and by the retention of the special exemption for sawmill operators, which permits them to hire labor at wages that would have been shockingly substandard 30 years ago.

No amount of special pleading by commerical interests can overcome that fact that a wage of $1.25 an hour provides bare subsistence at best, and any lesser sum cannot adequately meet even the basic items of food, shelter and clothing. It is intolerable for any American to toil for wages too low to live on.

Therefore, apart and in addition to the fundamental changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act which we elsewhere advocate, the executive council of the AFL-CIO calls upon Congress to extend the coverage of the FLSA to all workers engaged in commerce and directs the AFL-CIO legislative department to conduct a major campaign to this goal and calls upon all AFL-CIO affiliates to support this effort to the fullest.

Unveiling of Portrait of Hon. Emanuel Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 12, in the committee room of the Committee on the Judiciary, a portrait of our chairman, EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, was unveiled. Present were your distinguished self, the distinguished minority leader, members of the Committee on the Judiciary, about 50 Members of the House together with the family of Mr. CELLER and his dear friends. This was the culmination of months of preparation. In September of last year, a Celler Portrait Committee was organized, of which Representatives FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio, and RICHARD H. POFF, Republican, of Virginia, and myself undertook gladly the task of securing contributions for the painting of the portrait and appropriate ceremonies.

We believed that under the chairmanship of EMANUEL CELLER this committee had made a valuable contribution to the course of free government and felt that his 40 years of experience in the House and over a decade as chairman, added to the qualities of scholarship, warmth, and understanding, called for this tribbefore his family and friends. Mr. Mcbefore his family and firends. Mr. MCCULLOCH and myself, reflecting the bipartisanship spirit of this committee, were honored by having this opportunity to express our admiration and esteem for MANNIE CELLER. His reply to our remarks, I believe, are such that they reflect the character and quality of this man and will underline and explain why the members of this committee feel as they do about him, and so I wish, at this point, to insert MANNIE CELLER'S statement at the ceremony of the presentation of his portrait to the Committee on the Judiciary:

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, AT THE UNVEILING OF A PORTRAIT IN HIS HONOR

I thank you for this moment. A lifetime gathers only a few moments of this kind. Here, with my family, my dear wife, daughters and son-in-law, my friends, my colleagues, I feel that all the strands of my life have been woven together, and I am moved and humble and proud and grateful, and do not know where one emotion begins and the other ends. I would be less than candid if I did not say the words uttered of me warm the cockles of my heart.

In the first sitting for this portrait, after Mr. Margulies had made but a few strokes on the canvas, I began to see, much to my amazement, the resemblance emerge. It was like being recreated. At first, I was as restive as a colt in a saddle but after awhile I ceased flouncing. I believe it was Cromwell who said to his artist, "Paint everything including the warts." Mr. Margulies has painted, in a way, a biography. He has reflected the qualities of character, the shades of personality, in short, a painted biography. "How can you do this," I asked, "with only a few strokes?" He replied, "In those strokes lie 40 years of work." And so I feel as if 40 years of my work in Congress symbolized in this moment.

If any man has reason for gratitude, I am that man. I have been privileged to sit as chairman of this committee for more than a decade, and I say without reservation that a finer group of men exists nowhere. We have debated, and argued, and questioned in the best tradition of a free society. Never has any member discarded the basic courtesies nor the willingness to listen. The work we have done together has created for each man his own passport to immortality. It is my prayer that my portrait and that of Judge Sumners, and portraits of other chairmen who will come after me, will look down upon a like group of men who, in honor and in graciousness, have followed their concessions and disciplined their minds so that they can bequeath to their people a just enduring and a free government.

Thank you everybody.

Professor Blaisdell Appraises Proposal for American Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Donald C. Blaisdell, professor of political science at the City College of New York, has appraised the possible adaptation of the Scandinavian office of Ombudsman to the American political system, setting forth the advantages and disadvantages as he sees them. In doing so he has followed the concept of the American Ombudsman that I outlined in remarks to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084.

I present Professor Blaisdell's views in order to acquaint the Members with an additional useful evaluation of the desirability of creating an American Ombudsman.

The letter follows:

MARCH 11, 1963.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The question raised in your letter of February 27 interests me. I have read it carefully, also the accompanying materials.

As I see it, adaptation of the Scandinavian office of ombudsman might be beneficial for the following reasons:

(1) It would meet the individual Congressman's need for relief.

(2) As a consequence of (1) adoption of the idea would benefit Congress as a whole as well;

(3) In the four fields mentioned, this is, social security, military service, veterans' affairs, and immigration, adoption might well result in better service to individual petitioners;

(4) Tone of administration might be improved, for proper and not for political reasons.

On the other hand:

(1) There is no precedent in American Government that I know of; it would be an innovation, hence suspect; the Office of the Comptroller General does not appear as a precedent, as the function of this office is different;

(3) In the four fields mentioned, that is, ance of success here, for following reasons: magnitude of the problem much smaller; different traditions growing out of monarchical and constitutional forms of government; different functions of parties,

(3) In size, the office would probably rival that of the Comptroller General; is this desirable?

(4) Question whether it meets the need, which, as I see it, is to separate the legitimate from the questionable requests. Its workability, then, goes back to the Members of Congress as individuals rather than as Members collectively. In other words, the Member of Congress should upgrade himself more as representative than as delegate.

On balance, I should say it is worth trying for a trial period.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD C. BLAISDELL.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 16, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 16, 1963)

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

The first of several key bills voted on in the House this week was House Resolution 2438 to extend the draft law for an additional 4 years. It passed by a vote of 387 to 3. Although I voted for the extension I raised several pertinent questions. The bill had five purposes: (1) to extend the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years; (2) to extend the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces for 4 years; (3) to extend the Dependents Assistance Act, the law under which E-1's, E-2's, E-3's, and E-4's with 4 years of service or less are entitled to increased allowances, because of dependents, for 4 years; (4) to extend the so-called doctor's draft law for 4 years; (5) to extend for 4 years the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before July 1967. Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act there are six categories in class 1-A, men available for induction in order: (1) delinquents; (2) volunteers; (3) men between 19 and 26 who are nonfathers; (4) men between 19 and 26 who are fathers; (5) men over 26 years of age; (6) men between 18½ and 19 years of age.

In raising questions during debate on the bill I said: "We are disrupting our youth and their education. * * * We are affecting many civilian programs and certainly the educational institutions in our country. We are taking 90 percent men who will be noncombatant and do not need to have A-1 physical condition. Take these men who are driving staff cars. They are to be drafted to do what? Drive cars? Be PX salesmen, clerks, warehousemen, cooks, and countless other services? We need to get the best men we

can and use their civilian skills. These jobs can be done as civilians. Why take a man out of civilian life and make him do something he would do as a civilian. Has the committee gone into why the Seabee technique was disbanded? In World War II the Seabees did an outstanding job. They wrote a proud chapter in the history of our Nation and we could do worse than to give qualified civilians now the same great opportunity to serve their country. In this way many noncombatant jobs could be done by civilians instead of drafting men to do these operations."

U.S. CITIZENSHIP FOR WINSTON CHURCHILL

A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States (H.R. 4374), passed 377 to 21 with ALGER against. In voting against this bill I give quarter to none in my admiration and respect for the greatness of Winston Churchill and his place in history. I do not believe that citizenship can be given as an award. I do not believe in degrees of citizenship, but rather in all citizens enjoying the same advantages and responsibilities, including taking part in their government and sharing as a taxpayer in the cost of such government. I, too, would quickly bestow any appropriate honor on Winston Churchill in appreciation for his courage, wisdom, and leadership of the free world.

MILITARY HARDWARE

The bill known as the "military hardware" measure (H.R. 2440) is to authorize appropriations during fiscal 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. The measure authorized $1.7 billion for the Army; $6.6 billion for the Navy and Marine Corps; $7.4 billion for the Air Force. It would buy 3,000 planes; 6,000 missiles; 43 new ships; and $3.4 billion for research. This was the first major opportunity in this session to make a sizable cut in President Kennedy's recordbreaking budget. Instead the House increased the President's request by $363,700. Voting on this measure was in three phases: (1) To increase the amount requested for the development of the RS-70 bomber and to increase from six to eight the authority for additional "killer" submarines (2) a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to trim 5 percent from the overall procurement budget (with the exception of the amount for the "killer" subs) and 12.5 percent from the research and development budget (with the exception of the RS-70 bomber item) (3) final passage of the bill.

I voted for the increase in the RS-70 program because, as I stated in debate, "the RS-70 should be developed beyond transportation level to weapons carrier and missile-launching platform and whatever other military purposes it can fulfill. There must be no gap between our present manned bomber system and a future fully capable missile program. Even at worst, we must leave no stone unturned in new weapons and also protect our present investment in RS-70." I support the increase in killer subs for the obvious reason that we must maintain defensive and offensive superiority. On the motion to recommit to make overall cuts, I voted "Yes." When this motion failed, I voted against the entire bill, stating on the floor: "Failing to take the responsible action outlined in the recommittal, I could not consistently agree to final passage. * * * Under no circumstances does this mean I am opposed to military preparedness and these weapons. But I shall at the same time expect the greatest value received for every defense dollar spent."

Very important observations were made by Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, a member of the Armed Services Committee, who said in part: "The Secretary of Defense in testimony before the committee stated he feels by better management in the procurement area alone over $2½ billion could be saved." Congressman LAIRD pointed out the improper procedures resulted in increased costs wherein cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts were placed rather than contracts awarded through competitive bids. Several examples from GAO reports included the AN/SPS 10 radar $3.9 million overpayment, AN/APS 88 airborne radar $561,000, AN/PDR 43 radiac set $600,000, AN/WRT 1 and 2 radio sets $15 million. I believe the time to stop such reckless spending procedures is in the authorization bill. When Congress passes an authorization with the excuse that we can trim later in the appropriation bill, we are kidding the people because when the appropriation bill comes down we will be told we have to pass it because we have already authorized it.

THE M'NAMARA MONARCHY

Important in the debate on the military bill was the recognition by several Congressmen, including Democrats, of the autocratic rule of the Department of Defense by Secretary of Defense McNamara. A devastating article by Hanson W. Baldwin in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, states: "Mr. McNamara is the first and foremost trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition. * * * Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the Chiefs of the services and their Secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed, or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff." In the debate on the military bill Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, a Democrat, asked: "If Congress itself will meet its responsibilities in the discharge of its duty under the Constitution to raise and maintain an Army and Navy or whether the Congress is prepared to continue its abdication of authority and failure to discharge its responsibilities." Congressman HÉBERT, in a resounding speech said: "In my 23 years here and 21 years association with the Armed Forces of this country, I have never seen the morale of the Pentagon at such a low ebb." It is time Congress and the American people demand a return to constitutional government with its separation of powers.

Quote of the week on Cuba (from the hearings on H.R. 2440):

"Mr. WILSON. Let me ask you bluntly: Do you think the Monroe Doctrine has been violated?

"Secretary MCNAMARA. I don't personally believe it has, but this is a question for the State Department to answer and for the lawyers to answer, and not for me."

The Honorable Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, love of family, love of country, complete dedication to its welfare, compassion for his fellow man; kindly, gentle, and always fair in his dealings with others. These were the distinguishing characteristics of a warm and humble human being whose presence will be sorely missed by all the Members of this body. Serving with CLYDE DOYLE was an experience of personal enrichment to all who shared the privilege. Much has been said here today attesting to the high regard in which he was held by the Members of the House of Representatives. Death at anytime shocks those close to the person whose life ceases. But, Mr. Speaker, I know the members of Congressman DOYLE's family can read our own personal expressions of sorrow and, from them, gain great pride that the one they loved so dearly was so universally esteemed. I join in expressing my sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and all the other members of our late colleague's family.

Tribute to Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, nothing can quite compensate or fully console the Members of this House or the people of the country, for a loss so severe as the sudden and unexpected death on March 14 of our colleague CLYDE DOYLE, of California. Yet there was an aspect of CLYDE DOYLE's successful, fruitful, and effective life, that provides us all with some modicum of comfort in our bereavement. For CLYDE DOYLE had recognition and respect from the people he served for 17 years in this House as the Representative from the 23d District of California. Moreover, while his services were constant and distinctive and both the quality and the quantity of his effort for his district, for California, and for his country, were massive and rich in results, he had the satisfaction, through the years, of public appreciation.

Not only was he appreciated and admired by his constituents who nine times elected him to this House, but he knew the admiration and affection of his colleagues here; and the leadership held him in high esteem. So that as he moved among us to the very last, CLYDE DOYLE was rich in honors, in the respect of his colleagues, and in commendations from those who were close to him, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn for example, who on occasion evaluated as exemplary his sound and steady and unflagging workmanship as an American legislator.

For 17 years, as I know of my personal knowledge, he kept a daily diary of the doings of the Congress. This, it seems to me, could be an invaluable personal record, rich in observations, commentary, anecdotes. For CLYDE DOYLE had a feel for history and events and a sensitive appreciation of the characteristics of those around him and their reactions. I hope someday that his diary may become a public record, for inevitably it will throw the light of a fine imagination on the chronicle of our times in the House. Those of us who knew CLYDE DOYLE well,

know also that the diary will have about it a kindliness and a sympathy for his fellow man that will cause hurt to no one should it ever achieve publication.

It may perhaps be said that those of us who were nearest to him knew him for qualities and accomplishments that cannot be found in reports and statements appearing as matters of routine in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I, for one, especially regarded him highly for his services on legislative matters, affecting savings and loan problems and banking. He was an indefatiguable worker and had what some of our staff people like to call a knowledge in depth of the matters that came before him. When he discussed a problem of legislation that touched on the armed services, for example—he was a member of the committee—he was persuasive, articulate, informed, and sound.

Similarly, in his 12 years as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he demonstrated an understanding of this profoundly controversial problem that revealed not only the importance of the committee and the need for it, but gave confidence to us all that its management, its reports, and its decisions, would meet high standards of justice. For CLYDE DOYLE was not only a first-class lawyer, he was also a person for whom justice and fairplay had absolute meanings. And many of us have already commented on his gentleness, his sensitive human feelings, and his broad tolerance. These qualities in our colleague made him an outstanding friend of a whole spectrum of public causes in which he was constantly and often brilliantly active: from the YMCA in his district to the California Philharmonic Orchestra Association, and from the Boy Scouts to the Kiwanis Club. The list of his affiliations make a column or more of fine print, and I think it can be said, that all of them felt the beneficent influence of his help, his counsel, and his leadership. No wonder that at one time the inter-allied Council of Service Clubs, of Long Beach, accorded him the Meritorious Citizenship Award as the most valuable and useful citizen.

That accolade, "most valuable and useful citizen," best sums up the superb career of CLYDE DOYLE. It is good to know that he knew he had the praise and approbation of his fellow man and that everywhere he was regarded with honor and affection.

The Honorable Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked and deeply grieved upon learning of the death of my colleague from California, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him always respected his devotion to duty, the sincerity of his conviction, and his unceasing effort, as he explained it, "to find true goals for lasting values."

In his day-to-day relationships with people, CLYDE DOYLE always showed the understanding, patience, and humility that endeared him to so many of us. Moreover, though at times we disagreed on certain issues that arose in this distinguished House, I never found him to be disagreeable. His untimely passing is a great loss to California and the Nation. Perhaps we can find solace in the fact that the memory of our colleague and his accomplishments shall long remain, untouched by the forgetfulness of time.

Mrs. Roosevelt joins me in expressing sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family.

Federal Aid Sought in Curbing Runaway Film Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, last week, 10 Hollywood motion picture craft unions petitioned Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz for cooperation in curbing runaway film production and outlined plans for Federal support.

The unions, all members of the Committee To Promote American-Made Motion Pictures, represented all areas of the motion picture industry. The petition was supported by unions representing studio grips, electricians, makeup artists, sound technicians, office workers, studio plasterers, and screen cartoonists.

Following is the text of the petition as it appeared in the columns of the Hollywood Citizen-News, one of the newspapers that serves part of the 27th district, which I serve:

THE AMERICAN IMAGE

Americans have long been proud of the fact that their country has been known as the world's film production center. For decades, the United States has held a position of world leadership in the field of mass communications of all kinds—a powerful tool in the presentation of the expressions and images of a free society. The American film has undoubtedly been one of the most important disseminators of ideas and one of the truly universal and potent educators of our time.

The chance to present a more favorable American image on the movie screens of non-Communist countries in reply to attacks by our Soviet adversaries is virtually fading away. The industry-coined word, "runaway" film production, is the culprit which has not only undermined the American image, but has diminished an important part of the American economy.

Since World War II the number of American interest films made abroad has been phenomenal and frightening. Five hundred and nine feature pictures that were made overseas in approximately the last 10 years represent an investment of over $750 million. This has had a serious effect on the economies of the States of California, New York, Illinois, Colorado, Florida, Arizona, and, in a lesser degree, in any number of the States where domestic location sites would have been used. Between 1946 and 1960 the number of foreign-produced pictures shown annually in American theaters skyrocketed, a rise from 19 percent to 60 percent of the total screen fare of America.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS TREND

The cold hard fact is that imported films have overrun American production to the extent that, if the trend is not halted, the American theatrical film industry faces oblivion. It is true that American industry in general is becoming more and more international. Surveys show that where other American industries export less than 6 percent of their production, Hollywood sends more than 65 percent of its pictures abroad. Certainly these pictures should be American-made to present an American portrait.

Apropos of this, Hazel Flynn, columnist for the Citizen-News in Hollywood, wrote last October that "not only the foreign product now being imported, but the films being made abroad via runaway production, should be investigated by Congress as many of them are corrupting our youth and some are Communist dominated in a deliberate attempt to break down American ideals and the American way of life. Communist financing is being used in some of these runaways, and Communist union labor is being used in making the films."

Miss Flynn ends her column with: "This column, as you may have gathered, is * * * dedicated to trying to bring production of American films back to where it belongs and where it can be controlled so as to win friends and influence people for the benefit of this country."

We find that every nation in the world, that has a significant motion picture industry, with the exception of the United States, offers a financial subsidy to producers who film within their borders, under specified conditions. The most sophisticated subsidy system is the British Film Fund Agency established in 1957 and popularly known as the Eady Pool. It is understandable why 31 percent of American interest films made abroad were filmed in the United Kingdom or British Commonwealth. It has been estimated that the average U.S. producer who qualifies under the pool receives a subsidy of about one-third of the United Kingdom box office of his film and it may even go as high as 40 percent.

In Italy a film gets a subsidy if it is produced in Italian or has an Italian version and is made in Italy with a majority of Italian personnel, so that some features receive in subsidy 16 percent of the gross of the film in Italy before taxes for 5 years.

Features that have "unusual merit," according to the Italians, can be awarded as much as $400,000. One Italian movie mogul is especially ingenious in collecting subsidies from two or three nations for a single film. He uses a French company as a front, qualifying for a French subsidy of 22 percent of the earnings of his picture outside France plus the 16 percent of the Italian box office. And, to top the whole thing off, he is said to refuse to make an important film without an American star—thus gaining entry into the U.S. market as well.

In France, government subsidies are available to producers if the film is made in French, with French technicians, with leading French players, and if it is developed and edited in French labs and studios. Most of the capital must be French and the majority of the board of the producing company must be French.

Spain will encourage coproductions with at least 50 percent financial participation and with at least 50 percent billing for Spanish artists. The Spanish producer gets a loan of 40 percent of his outlay, and a subsidy ranging from 25 to 40 percent. Income tax is reduced from 4.95 to 1.98 percent, and there is no payment of import or dubbing fees if it is distributed in Spain.

The Mexican Government film bank gives advances to producers of 40 to 80 percent for distribution rights to CIMEX, the Government distribution agency.

Other nations offer assistance in various forms—Yugoslavia, Israel, Denmark, Argentina, Pakistan, Austria, Belgium, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Holland, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Greece.

A report of the subcommittee of Congress on the impact of imports and exports on American employment states: "Since subsidies are the strongest inducement to foreign production, the most effective weapon against excessive foreign production is to curb the subsidy or alternatively make subsidies available for American production."

Representative JOHN DENT, chairman of the committee, says that "there is no doubt that if our Government demanded an end to subsidies the so-called American motion picture runaway production problem would become miniscule."

EMPTY SOUND STAGES

The jarring blow of these runaway productions is apparent in a quick glance at unemployment figures in Hollywood. In 1946 an employment figure was set at 24,000. By December 1957 the figure had dwindled to 13,000.

A noted economist, Dr. Irving Bernstein, found in a 1957 survey that Hollywood labor had already paid dearly for the decline in the motion picture industry since World War II, in terms of shrinkage of employment; a static labor force with virtually no infusion of new blood; and a sharp narrowing of differentials in wage rates and earnings in comparision with workers in other industries.

That simply means that while wages were shooting up for workers in other industries because of the rising economy—in the movie industry, the opposite had occurred. Now the unemployment situation is so severe that craftsmen who have worked continuously for the same major studio in Hollywood for as long as 25 or 30 years have been laid off. During the first 6 months of 1962 approximately 19,000 motion picture people were without employment in Hollywood.

The "runaway" film problem has affected all of the employees working in the American motion picture industry. The laboratory film technicians are no exception. At present, technicians are in the throes of an industrywide layoff; particularly at the Technicolor Corp. which processes the major domestic color release work in Hollywood.

In the past 10 years, footage and employment has consistently declined in inverse proportion to the increase of American producers running abroad to produce their pictures.

For example:

Technicolor Corp.

Year	Annual footage	Employees on payroll
1953	581,000,000	2,300
1954	529,000,000	2,134
1955	524,000,000	1,872
1956	436,000,000	1,858
1957	309,000,000	1,477
1958	304,000,000	1,467
1959	308,000,000	1,362
1960	315,000,000	1,366
1961	338,000,000	1,395
1962	309,000,000	1,327

Feature motion picture production at Consolidated Film Industries is now 10 percent of what it was in 1951. For example, 10 years ago Consolidated averaged 10 features per day; whereas, in 1962, they processed 1 feature per day, and this is usually a low budget independent production.

In recent years, the following Hollywood film laboratories have closed their doors, with the resulting unemployment of laboratory technicians, projectionists, machinists, cameramen, laborers, janitors, etc.:

Paramount Laboratory, 1950; Cinecolor Laboratory, 1954; Warner Brothers Laboratory, 1958; Columbia Laboratory, 1959; National Screen Laboratory, 1961.

The above unemployment has forced the remaining laboratories and technicians to diversify operations in the processing of television, educational, amateur, industrial and governmental films. These films are very competitive and are low-budget productions.

If, and when, the Common Market becomes a reality, it is imperative to hold the present requirements regarding import of positive film; whereby the import tax on positive film is 0.01 cent per foot. If this restriction is lifted, it would be impossible to compete with processing done in Mexico, Japan, Spain, Italy, etc.

Why this loss of employment? Because 87 pictures which should have been produced here, were made outside the country in 1962. In 1 month alone, August, 25 feature pictures were being filmed and only 3 of these were being made in the United States.

Obviously, oversea movies have a severe impact on National and State economy. In the last 10 years, in excess of $500 million in wages, salaries, and purchasing power has been diverted from the State of California alone—particularly in the southern California area. The economies of other States have been affected as well.

AUTHENTICITY ON LOCATION

One cannot damn all producers for wanting authentic backgrounds for their pictures and shorts. A film such as "Sayonara" is undoubtedly improved by the flavor of authenticity. But it is difficult to understand why a full-scale reproduction of historic Independence Hall should be built at great expense in Madrid, for the picture "John Paul Jones." The great American patriot might stir in his grave knowing that his American historical acts were depicted in Spain.

Once Hollywood was heralded worldwide for magnificent screen settings—today Rome seems to be the film capital of the world. In the National Observer, February 11, 1963, appears a report on the filming of "55 Days at Peking." A movie set of Peking as it appeared in 1900 has been built there that is captioned "the most authentic set in movie history." Producers have invested some $8,500,000 in it.

THE MANY-FACETED TRUTH

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, in his address to the 87th Congress, tied up a great many facts in a few words:

"The effects of this trend [runaway] are multiple. Aside from Federal revenue losses due to loopholes in our national tax system, our Nation suffers the chain reaction of reduced purchase of raw materials, curtailed spending for power and water and transportation, declining local receipts from real estate property levies as studios and laboratories close, disappearing employment opportunities for supporting players, extras, laboratory personnel, film editors, and literally dozens of specialist groups.

"There is another alarming symptom, one which all who are disturbed about juvenile delinquency, lawlessness, subversion, and Communist aggression should bear in mind in appraising the consequences of the withering away of American film production and superiority. Ethical and moral standards enforced in the writing and filming of motion pictures at home are flouted and ignored in oversea production. There has been evidence of insidious, subtle Communist propaganda cleverly inserted in films shot abroad."

These statements may sound strong, but both the American Legion and the American Federation of Women's Clubs stand soundly behind Senator KUCHEL's assertions.

American motion pictures are recognized by the U.S. Government as an important national asset in the field of worldwide mass communications which perform the vital role of relaying the dramatic message of America's high standard of living, democratic ideals, social accomplishments, and technological achievements to millions of people on theater screens and TV sets all around the globe.

Today this national mass communication is being wrested from the United States—and something must be done to retrieve it.

THE SIX-POINT PROGRAM

While we may bitterly condemn the individuals and corporations from American film industry who have fled from Hollywood for tax-dodging purposes, our interest should be concentarted on bring about a solution.

There have been many proposals made to the Secretary of Labor with which we agree, but we feel that these should be supplemented by certain explicit proposals which we shall now present.

The joint labor management committee of the motion picture industry submitted the following six-point program:

1. Petition the Small Business Administration to change the current SBA policy against making loans to communication industries.

2. Support proposed legislation which would limit tax exemptions for Americans living abroad to $20,000 annually for first 3 years, $35,000 per year thereafter.

3. Support Federal legislation which would permit the spread of income over a period of years for persons engaged in activities (such as acting) in which maximum earning power is relatively brief and often spasmodic; it is hoped such legislation would cause popular stars to make a larger number of films.

4. Support measures aimed at reducing extravagant, tax-free expense allowances given to creative personnel living abroad.

5. Make efforts through appropriate agencies such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to remove unfair trade barriers and cooperative disadvantages which handicap American production.

6. Make cooperative efforts to ascertain cost differentials between Hollywood and foreign film centers.

1. With respect to the first, relating to petitioning Small Business Administration to change the current SBA policy against making loans to communications industries, the undersigned motion picture unions suggest that small business loans be made to the motion picture industry with the proviso that all pictures granted loans must be made in the United States.

2. In regard to the proposed legislation that would limit tax exemptions for Americans living abroad, we believe that the Tax Revenue Act should be further amended so that limitations also be applicable to corporations and foreign subsidiaries thereof.

3. With respect to Federal legislation which would permit the spreading of income over a period of years for persons engaged in activities (such as acting) in which maximum earning power is relatively brief and often spasmodic, we respectfully urge that the averaging necessary for tax purposes apply only where the income is earned in the United States.

4. We feel that foreign film subsidies offered by foreign governments has resulted in this grave situation confronting the motion picture industry in our country and that the only answer is a subsidy by our own Government in order to compete with film subsidies abroad.

Of the foreign film subsidies, Britain's Eady Pool has proved to be most efficient for British film production. The present 10-percent admission tax now in effect in the United States would be a foundation for a plan similar to the Eady plan of Great Britain. Many labor groups are emphatically of the opinion that a subsidy of some kind is absolutely necessary.

LABELING

As of now, all foreign films, recordings, and similar articles imported for public exhibition or broadcasting are deceptive as to their origin. The Customs Bureau has construed the term "ultimate purchaser" to be the theater operators and TV stations, so that markings relating to their origin appear only on the film can or container.

There is no doubt that if the American public can readily see that it is being asked to patronize "runaway" films or television programs at the expense of American workers, our problems will begin to fade. We believe it imperative that the country of origin appear on all advertising material as well as on the film itself.

CORPORATION TAX

Recent revenue act amendments in part require payment of U.S. income taxes on foreign subsidiary profits where the American company owns in excess of 50 percent of the foreign subsidiary.

This is now being evaded by American movie producers abroad by transferring part of the holdings in such foreign subsidiaries so they control only 49 percent. It is apparent that further study of the problem should be made. If the American companies having foreign subsidiary companies do not pay U.S. income tax on profits from their subsidiaries until such profits are repatriated, as is now the fact, then the result is only further foreign investments with such funds rather than investing them in the production of films by quota in the United States.

QUOTAS

Since certain foreign countries limit distribution of movie films by quota arrangement, we urge reciprocal treatment and limitation of foreign films by quota in the United States.

FIRM SUPPORT

The undersigned labor organizations support and augment the six-point labor-management program. These salient points which we have presented are offered in the hope that our joint effort will bring the motion picture industry back to the United States.

AMERICA'S MESSAGE

Throughout the past years as the cold war dragged on and on, we have been able to carry a message to people all over the world through both televised series and films. This message included America's political ideals, technological achievements, economic and social opportunities, and the warm and comfortable way of our life here.

But now the sound stages stand empty.

The American film industry stands in this desperate position today—at a time when we vitally need every effort to maintain a strong American image in the world. We must face the fact that we are engaged in a war of ideas and ideals.

The films imported from Europe deviate toward the immoral and dissolute and have a detrimental effect on the minds of our children. This denotes a definite lack of moral control in the writing and production of foreign films, which is entirely opposite from the rigid American maintenance of moral standards. This one fact alone should bring us to our feet, ready to fight for the youth of America, if not for our own economic reasons.

THE VOICE GROWS WEAK

The most successful era in the production of American motion pictures took place when the bulk of the industry's output emanated from Hollywood. Southern California was hailed as the film capital of the world and the world paid attention to what it had to say, both culturally and economically. But today, that voice has grown weak, and we must not allow it to grow weaker.

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The problem of runaway production cannot be ignored. We must constantly keep the American image strong to millions of people in our troubled globe, and one sure way to get through to these people is to show them our strong, ever-growing, idealistic and democratic way of life. Mass communication is our only hope. We must bring the prodigal back from foreign shores, and the only way to do it is to make Hollywood and other American film centers alluring once more. Let us all take up the weapons today in this very vital fight for the American way of life.

Impact of U.S. Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recent comments made by Director S. K. Wick of Minnesota's fine vocational education program were referred to in an editorial which appeared in the Mankato Free Press of Friday, March 15, 1963.

Vocational training has taken on new significance during the past few years in our Nation's economy. Any new emphasis on the training of our youth and the retraining of our unemployed can have a great impact on the sound progress which has been made by our historic approach to vocational school aids. With this thought in mind, I include the Mankato Free Press editorial in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

IMPACT OF U.S. AID

Vocational education is one of the areas where Federal financial assistance has made its greatest impact. Within the past couple of years two acts have been passed wherein the Federal Government pays all of the cost without State or local matching funds. The State agrees to provide only the training.

After a year of observing the effect of this program, S. K. Wick, Minnesota director of vocational education, set down his observations in the February issue of the MVA Viewpoints, the official publication of the Minnesota Vocational Association.

"The Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost without State or local matching funds," wrote Wick. "While on the surface this may seem like a good program for the schools and the State, we have observed much more Federal control in this program than in the regular vocational acts that require matching money. A comparison on the operation of the programs under those two acts with the regular programs has made us conclude that Federal participation in any vocational act, which does not require matching money will inevitably have a much greater degree of Federal control. Our opinion is that it would be much better to have Federal, State, and local participation with a minimum of Federal control as we have had in the past. Any new bill, such as the one we expect will be proposed by the administration in Washington based on the panels' recommendations, should be watched very closely to see that Federal controls are not increased beyond that which we have had in the past."

Director Wick thus makes a point that has been made by this newspaper on frequent occasions. Any time Federal money is accepted for local projects, it necessarily follows that there will be varying degrees of Federal control.

The Mankato area vocational school, which has not accepted the offer of 100-percent Federal aid, is one of the most successful institutions of its kind in the State. It is operated with the goal of fitting the needs of the territory it serves. The direction is local and is not influenced by the availability of funds from Washington. If the Mankato school had agreed to take part in the 100-percent assistance plan it would have been obliged to offer classes in selected subjects that may not fit the needs of this particular area. In many cases persons taking vocational training are perfectly willing to pay their own way without help from the Federal Government. They enroll in the classes that are available because they have a specific vocation in mind. They know the employment opportunities which will result from that kind of training. Federal aid in vocational education is not unlike that proposed for other types of schools. The more the Federal Government takes part in the program the less control local authorities have over it. What Director Wick says is applicable to all types of Federal aid.

La Salle College Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, has proclaimed the week of March 17 to March 24 as La Salle College Week. This outstanding college was in my congressional district in the 86th and 87th Congresses and now the college is in the district represented by my distinguished colleague, Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

I have included in my remarks the story of La Salle College which appeared in the Sunday supplement of March 17, 1963.

The article follows:

A VIBRANT CENTURY: FOUNDATION OF THE FUTURE

"There's a certain excitement about these thriving young colleges, isn't there?" the visitor asked, gazing at the students hurrying along tree-lined walks.

"Well, I'd agree there's excitement, all right," smiled the professor, "but La Salle's a hundred years old, you know."'

"Hard to believe. I've looked over a few colleges in my time and this one looks young to me. Look at those buildings. Not one of them is a hundred years old."

The visitor was right—yet wrong.

For La Salle College at the beginning of its second century represents the paradox of youth in age. Though founded in March 1863, the college did not occupy its present campus at 20th Street and Olney Avenue until 1929.

There are old buildings in La Salle's history, however. When chartered as a college by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, La Salle Academy was merely a tiny annex to St. Michael's Parochial School at 1419 North Second Street. After the War Between the States, the college and high school occupied the site at Juniper and Filbert Streets, now familiar to Philadelphians as the old Bulletin Building.

Center city expansion and increasing enrollments, however forced La Salle to look still farther north on Broad Street, and in 1882 the college moved to Broad and Stiles Streets into the Bouvier Mansion, a house built by one of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's ancestors. Affectionately remembered by many alumni as "1240" (the street address), the mansion served the college well for almost half a century.

But by 1925, it was obvious that more room was necessary. A growing La Salle needed a campus, with trees and open fields that would one day be dotted with buildings. Yet La Salle realized that it was a city college at heart, and it had no wish to move to the suburbs. The problem was solved in 1928 with the acquisition of a part of "Wister Farms" at the present campus location, 20th Street and Olney Avenue.

In those halcyon days of the late twenties, Americans glowed with optimism at the promise of the big bull market and enthusiastically shared President Hoover's hope that "poverty will be banished from this Nation." It was a time of hope. Look at the many institutions whose cornerstones read "1928." One of these is La Salle's college hall. But on October 24, 1929, the hopes of many Americans lay shattered on the stones of Wall Street. In the words of Frederick Lewis Allen, "An era had ended."

An economic catastrophe for the Nation is no less a cataclysm for its private colleges. Like many schools, La Salle entered the great depression sunk in debt and low in hope. Not many young men were clamoring to go to college, and some wondered if we needed as many colleges as we had.

Enrollment dropped even more drastically during World War II, when service enlistments reduced the student body to fewer than 100 students by 1943.

After the war, La Salle exchanged its old crisis for a new one: suddenly the half-empty corridors were thronged with GI's eager to make up for the 4 years they had lost. The age of the GI bill had arrived, and American higher education has not been the same since.

One remembers the rather frantic air La Salle had in those days—the heavy sprinkling of "Ike" jackets and khaki shirts; the students with gray hair; the wedding rings preceding class rings; the seriousness of even the extracurricular activities; and La Salle's growing awareness of its new and greater responsibilities.

From this impetus came far-reaching plans for physical and academic growth destined to guarantee La Salle's commitment to the expanding needs of a booming Greater Philadelphia.

In the postwar years, La Salle has become virtually a new institution. From a prewar enrollment of 400, the college has mushroomed to more than 5,000 day and evening students—a thirteenfold increase. In 1960, La Salle College and high school were physically separated for the first time in their histories. The college gained the use of an entire building after the high school occupied its $3 million campus in Springfield Township, Montgomery County. Twelve new buildings changed the face of the campus, and a young, vigorous faculty and administration added to the overall regeneration.

A CHRISTIAN BROTHERS' COLLEGE

La Salle College is conducted by a Roman Catholic religious order known as the Brothers of the Christian Schools or, more familiarly, "the Christian Brothers."

"Are they priests when they finish their training?" is the question frequently asked by those encountering the brothers for the first time. They are not. The brotherhood is a separate vocation, distinct from that of the priesthood, since the brothers are actually laymen who elect to live together in a religious community under vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Their special work in life is the Christian education of youth, and they teach boys of all ages from grade school to the university level.

La Salle's name is derived from St. John Baptiste de La Salle, a French priest who founded the brothers 284 years ago. Concerned that the lower classes in 17th century France received little or no education, St. La Salle established a free school on April 16, 1679, to "teach the sons of artisans" and staffed it with five teachers who lived in common as brothers.

From its modest beginning, the order has become international in scope, with more than 18,000 brothers teaching more than 600,000 students in 72 nations. In the United States alone, 3,000 brothers conduct 141 institutions, including 7 colleges. Many Philadelphians know and respect the work of the brothers, since in addition to La Salle College, they also conduct La Salle and West Catholic High Schools, St. Francis Industrial School in Eddington, and St. Gabriel's Hall in Phoenixville.

Individually, the brothers receive no salaries, but contribute their services, whether as teachers or administrators, or both. This living endowment is La Salle's primary source of support other than tuition, since the college receives no direct support from either government or church.

La Salle College is the alma mater of many of the brothers teaching in the Baltimore district, in high schools from Miami to Pittsburgh. About 120 young brothers live in the scholasticate in Elkins Park and take their bachelor's degrees from La Salle.

Before embarking on a life dedicated to teaching, each brother earns a bachelor's degree, fulfills State requirements for teacher certification, and completes work toward a master's degree in theology; many take advanced degrees in specialized fields of study.

LA SALLE AFTER DARK

The increased emphasis on education that followed World War II found many young Americans facing a dilemma. Married and burdened with family responsibilities, they were unable to leave their jobs and seek a college education; yet without that education they saw themselves as limited and handicapped in their future ambitions. To meet this demand, La Salle established an evening division in 1946.

From an initial enrollment of 127 students, the evening division has soared to its current student body of 2,500, nearly equaling the day division in size. Nearly all of these men work in the Philadelphia area. In their quest of a degree, most attend classes 3 hours each night, 3 nights a week, for 6 years.

Unlike a night school that offers only highly specialized courses designed merely to meet the needs of a particular job, La Salle's evening college attempts to give a student an education in the liberal tradition. He studies literature, philosophy, history, and languages, in addition to courses in his major field.

A PLACE TO LEARN HOW TO THINK

A college is "a place to learn how to think." Robert Maynard Hutchins once said. New buildings, distinguished alumni, and so on, are only signs of a college's vitality—perhaps not even important ones. At the heart of any college are its faculty, its students, and its curriculum.

La Salle recognizes the fact that its remarkable physical growth would be meaningless if not matched by a similar academic development. The faculty is currently engaged in a self-study aimed at developing long range plans for the future. Many effects of this study are already evident. New courses in psychology and the fine arts have been added; offerings in science have been broadened to include courses in geology and astronomy.

An important part of La Salle's academic development is the continuing effort being made to improve faculty salaries and benefits, to assure that good men will be attracted to the faculty. Without such men a college would be little more than a collection of books and buildings; with them, it is indeed a place where students can learn how to think.

The students themselves are drawn largely from this area, although the residence halls house students from 27 States and 10 foreign countries. Most come from modest circumstances and many avail themselves of La Salle's annual $200,000 program of financial aid.

In addition to financial aid, La Salle offers a thorough counseling program. Trained psychologists in the counseling center conduct tests and interview all freshmen; other faculty advisers are assigned to meet individually with students seeking academic guidance. The center also advises and assists seniors applying for graduate school awards. This program has undoubtedly contributed to an increase in the number of award winning graduates during the past 5 years.

Improvement continues in other areas. Since La Salle draws so many students from high schools in the Philadelphia area, the college tries to be of service to local guidance counselors and teachers. More can be done to ease the transition from high school to college, and greater cooperation between faculties would seem to be a desirable first step.

In so many of the challenges facing La Salle during the century to come, that first step will be all important. As President John F. Kennedy said in assessing the even greater difficulties facing our Nation:

"All this will not be finished in the first hundred days. Nor will it be finished in the first thousand days * * * nor even, perhaps, in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

The Noblest Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial in tribute to those noble sons of Ireland who immigrated to this great country and helped to make it what it is today.

The editorial was written by a very charming friend of our family who until a short while ago lived in the Washington area:

THE NOBLEST SONS OF ST. PATRICK

(By Anita M. Manchester)

"I have left you behind
In the path of the past,
With the white breath of flowers,
With the best of God's hours,
I have left you at last."
—*From "Ireland," by Dora Sigerson.*

In the second decade of the 19th century, the Irish immigrants began swarming to the great land of promise, America. The coastal cities, particularly New York and Boston, were the brunt of the first wave. A writer in the Boston Pilot of that day wrote this, "Out of these narrow lanes, blind courts, dirty streets, damp cellars and suffocating garrets will come forth some of the noblest sons of our country, whom she will delight to own and honor."

Why did these people burst forth from an island of such great natural beauty which they had extolled exquisitely in song and verse and which they loved so much? As a more recent historian has put it, "Rebellion after rebellion had failed to shake off England's control. The land was owned by foreign landlords who planted tenants as their most profitable crop."

The Irish first arrived in America at the dawn of the canal and railroad era. The lowly Irishman, happy with $6 a month and keep, supplied the crying need for unskilled labor. In 1818, 3,000 Irishmen were working on the Erie Canal. Twenty-two years later, New York State had nearly 1,000 miles of its canals built by Irishmen. And the only monument for many an Irish laborer was a railroad crosstie.

To DeWitt Clinton, the political and economic leader of the immigrant Irish who built his canal, the Irish-American owes his emancipation. Clinton pushed through legislation allowing a naturalized citizen the right to vote even though he did not own property. Prior to Clinton's amendment, possession of property was requisite for voting privilege in New York State and almost all States.

With the vote, the Irish-American found his voice and ultimately a new profession for which he seemed to have a natural affinity—that of politician. But the pull up from the jungle slums of America's coastal cities was a long one—and mostly by the bootstraps.

Between the years 1845–47, a blight destroyed the potato crops in Ireland. As the potato was the stable crop of the Irish farmer, the country suffered severe famine. Over a million famine emigrants arrived in America during those years, and their emigration was financed almost entirely by Irish-Americans. On wages that averaged about 50 cents a day, they managed to send back home over $800,000 to rescue their relatives and friends from starvation.

Love of homeland, a burning patriotism, is built in the Irish nature. For all the hardships the Irish immigrant underwent in the dreary years of assimilation in the American culture, he did not blame his adopted land; he praised it; he loved it. He celebrated the Fourth of July with the same Irish enthusiasm with which he celebrated the Feast of St. Patrick.

The prophecy of the writer in the Boston Pilot has proven true. The mark the Irish have made in America is a mark in which Americans today take pride.

Best of all, we're still celebrating.

Happy St. Patrick's Day.

Report on Connecticut 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a pioneer plan to help the elderly in meeting their health care costs by making available to them special low-premium health insurance, the Connecticut 65 program, has completed its first 15 months of operation and is labeled a success despite a first-year deficit. Some 27,000 enrolled in the Connecticut program, which, under special legislative authority, permits cooperation among the State's insurance companies to spread the insurance risks for this age group. Both the Wall Street Journal and the New York Journal of Commerce noted the Connecticut 65 report. I am placing these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help keep the Congress abreast of this promising development in the health insurance field.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 7, 1963]

CONNECTICUT'S OVER-65 HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN IS TERMED A SUCCESS; REPORT FAVORABLE DESPITE LOSS OF $555,398 IN FIRST 15 MONTHS; POLICYHOLDERS NUMBER 27,000

Connecticut's plan for providing low-cost health insurance to State residents over 65 years old was termed a success despite a $555,398 operating loss in the first 15 months of the pioneer program.

William N. Seery, chairman of an intercompany executive committee that represents 32 insurance concerns participating in the nonprofit plan, said 27,000 elderly persons have become policyholders.

A similar plan in New York, launched a year later, had 107,404 members at the close of its initial enrollment period, November 15. This plan has 49 participating insurance companies.

A cooperative program of the same type was started recently in Massachusetts and at least a dozen other States are considering such plans.

Insurance companies have acted to provide nonprofit hospital and medical-expense coverage for the elderly since pressure developed for Government-financed insurance as a part of the social security system.

Mr. Seery, who also is a vice president of Travelers Insurance Co., gave these figures for the first 15 months of the Connecticut program: Earned premiums, $3,656,520; benefits paid, $2,198,554; set aside for pending claims, $1,150,000; operating expense, $863,364. He said operating expense included $240,000 of initial organization costs and $117,380 of first-year commissions to agents, which won't be duplicated. Agents receive commissions only on initial enrollments, not on renewals.

Benefits paid went to 5,500 persons, of whom more than 170 received amounts of $2,000 to $5,000 under major medical policies, Mr. Seery said.

Claims ran about 10 percent higher than expectations, Mr. Seery said, noting that there was no firm basis of experience for a forecast. Another factor was that the average age of those enrolled was 74 years, somewhat higher than had been expected, he said.

"We expect the program to be self-sustaining," Mr. Seery said. "Changes will be made as they appear necessary or desirable." He added that the claim experience and operating methods are being studied "to assure the most efficient and economical operation."

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Mar. 5, 1963]

CONNECTICUT 65 CALLED SUCCESS DESPITE 15-MONTH DEFICIT

Connecticut 65, the State's pioneer plan for providing broad, low-cost health insurance for the aged, was termed a success by its sponsors.

William N. Seery, chairman of the executive committee representing the 32 participating insurance companies, said the program currently is providing protection to 27,000 of the State's senior citizens, and that one of every five of them has already received benefits.

In a report to State Insurance Commissioner Alfred N. Premo, on Connecticut 65's first 15 months of operation, Mr. Seery said the first accounting period ended with a $550,000 deficit, but expressed confidence in the program's continued growth and future success.

"As with other forms of insurance, we know that the financial results can be meaningful only over a much longer period of time," he said, adding that the unknown factors inherent in any new plan, coupled with the high costs of initial development were largely responsible for the deficit.

FIRST IN NATION

Mr. Seery, who is also vice president, Travelers Insurance Companies, pointed out that Connecticut 65 was the first program in the Nation in which insurance companies pooled their resources to protect the elderly against the high costs of serious illness.

New York and Massachusetts now have such programs in operation and a number of other States are actively considering them.

Commenting in detail on the financial statement filed with Mr. Premo, Mr. Seery said Connecticut 65 received $3,656,520 in earned premiums during the 15 months ending December 31.

BENEFITS TOP $2 MILLION

Benefits amounting to $2,198,554 were paid to 5,500 individuals, more than 170 of whom received amounts ranging from $2,000 to $5,000 under the program's major medical plan. In addition, an estimated $1,150,000 in claims were incurred during the period but weren't reported in time to be listed in the statement as paid.

Expenses totaled $863,364. Of this amount, $240,000 was used to set up the plan and to present the concept to the elderly citizens of the State. This expense will not have to be repeated to any such degree in the future, Mr. Seery said. Operating expenses were $406,540 and taxes paid to the State amounted to $99,444.

COMMISSIONS PAID

"We also paid $117,380 in first-year commissions to the agents whose services were so valuable in getting the program started. These accident and health insurance agents—some 3,000 of whom have assisted people to enroll in the program—willingly accepted minimum one-time commissions,

actually little more than a handling charge," Mr. Seery said. The commission total would be less in future years since commissions are paid only for enrollment and not when the coverage is renewed, he added.

Claims and expenses combined exceeded income by $555,398. In addition, member companies did not receive an anticipated allowance of $54,848 for their own expenses and risk.

Commenting further on the results, Mr. Seery said claims ran about 10 percent higher than estimated since there was no firm basis from which to forecast the claim experience. There also was a backlog of need to be filled during the first year, and the average age of those enrolled—a factor affecting claim levels—was 74 years, higher than expected.

How Reds Use Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, students of Panama Canal history long ago observed that its traffic volume is extremely sensitive to wars and depressions and to appreciable political, economic, and other upheavals in any part of the world, such as crop failures, strikes, destruction by tropical storms, developments of foreign industries, and closure of the Suez Canal.

In 1962, this sensitivity of the canal, as an index of geopolitical significance, was shown by the impressive increases in the volumes of cargo in the Sino-Soviet-Cuban traffic. As such, it serves to emphasize that U.S. control over the canal enterprise should be strengthened rather than weakened, as some theorists have so persistently advocated.

In these connections, attention is invited to 1962 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company, which gives an illuminating discussion of canal traffic.

An article by Milburn P. Akers in the March 1, 1963, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, dealing with certain aspects of the canal question follows:

HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Red China and Soviet Russia are making very good use of the Panama Canal in efforts to bulwark Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba.

The 1962 report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company contains, on page 6, the following statement:

"Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year (1962) was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba."

Undoubtedly, Nikita Khrushchev, Mao Tze-tung and Castro fully appreciate the use of this American-built and American-operated facility which helps them to carry out their Caribbean designs without the necessity for the long and expensive sea voyage around South America. The fact that the Panama Canal Company, which operates the canal for its owners, the taxpayers of the United States, spent $16,100,000 to improve the canal in 1962 probably causes them to rejoice also.

Ships which transit the canal are required to pay for its use. Such payments are, no doubt, a bit of a load on the Cuban economy. But now that the traffic has been called to Washington's attention efforts will no doubt be made to remit the tolls on these shipments. Such action would be in line with the solicitous manner in which U.S. policy in respect to Castro's Cuba is currently conducted.

Why the United States should permit use of its facilities to undermine its position in the Caribbean is difficult to comprehend. The statement that we are obligated by treaty and international law to permit transit of the canal by the ships of all nations is not a sufficient answer.

The United States doesn't recognize Red China. Treaties and international laws and practices which may be binding upon the United States insofar as other nations are concerned are not applicable to Red China. The United States has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. There may be a technical distinction between nonrecognition and the current status of United States-Cuban relations. That point is moot. If, however, the United States has the right to deny use of American ports to foreign ships engaged in the Cuban traffic, a right it has asserted, it can find ample legal grounds on which to deny use of the Panama Canal and its facilities, including the harbors, to the ships engaged in this particular traffic.

The ships engaged in the Sino-Soviet-Cuban traffic fly many flags. Those three Communist countries have relatively small merchant marines. Much of the traffic is carried in Greek, British, Norwegian, Lebanese, Japanese, Polish, and Yugoslav bottoms. These also should be forbidden use of the canal's facilities for this particular traffic.

If the American Government doesn't intend to employ every economic tool it has to bring about Castro's downfall it shouldn't announce such policies; halfway measures, such as it now engages in, are worse than none at all.

Since the ending of World War II, Panama Canal traffic has increased 212 percent. In 1962 canal shipments between Red China and Cuba increased 600 percent over 1961. This huge increase gives some measure of the use to which this American-built, American-operated facility is being employed to thwart American policy in respect to Castro's Cuba.

The United States stopped buying Cuban sugar for the sole purpose of wrecking that island's economy and, in so doing, bringing about Castro's downfall. To prevent that downfall, Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals. As noted in the 1962 report of the Panama Canal Company, sugar shipments from Cuba to Red China and Soviet Russia "accounted for the vast majority of this (increase) combined tonnage."

This is but another example of the fact that the United States, as a consequence of inept policies and implementation, does more to defeat itself than all the Communist nations combined.

Manpower and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the perplexing and melancholy difficulties in the employment situation continue to haunt us. And the unemployment statistics do not take into consideration the matter of underemployment.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a Walter Lippmann column appearing March 14, 1963, in the Washington Post and an editorial appearing in the same paper on March 18, 1963:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1963]

MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT

President Kennedy's first manpower report, submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, is a sobering document which should convince even the most casual reader that unemployment, the Nation's most pressing economic problem, is not susceptible of quick and easy solutions.

Since 1947 some 10 million new jobs have been created, bringing the volume of employment to an all-time record of 67.8 million in 1962. Nevertheless, employment opportunities have failed to keep pace with the rapidly growing labor force, and since 1958 the average rate of unemployment has been well in excess of 5.5 percent. There are now 4.9 million jobless persons who comprise 6.1 percent of the labor force, and unless the present trend is sharply reversed, the problem will become more acute. According to the President's calculations:

The net growth of the labor force in the sixties is expected to be about 13 million, more than 50 percent greater than in the fifties.

Unless the growth of new job opportunities is also accelerated, unemployment totals will rise. If in the next 5 years we provide new employment at the pace of the last 5, by 1967 unemployment will come to over 5½ million, or more than 7 percent of the 1967 labor force.

Although our knowledge of the causes underlying the rising trend of unemployment is as yet imperfect, some of the more salient factors are readily discernible. Labor has been displaced by advances in technology and the striking gains in man-hour productivity. Since 1947, output per man-hour in private industry has increased at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, and these gains, rather than increases in man-hours of work, account for more than 80 percent of the growth of total output since 1947. Employment in the manufacturing sector has been declining since 1956, and the introduction of labor-saving technology has doubtless affected employment even in those sectors of the economy which have been growing most rapidly.

The technological innovations of the past 15 years have also created employment opportunities, but the jobs which they have produced demand skills and a degree of sophistication that cannot be supplied by the traditional blue-collar worker with a limited education. Yet 7.5 million out of the 26 million young people entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970—or some 29 per-

cent—will lack high school diplomas. Unless the gap between the requirements demanded by the new technology and the educational attainment of those entering the labor force can be narrowed, widespread unemployment among young people is likely to persist.

The difficulties created by rapid technological change can be substantially mitigated by fiscal and monetary policies designed to accelerate the overall rate of economic growth. But their elimination will require a massive program for the retraining of displaced workers and a nationwide effort to lower the high school dropout rate. While a promising start was made with the passage of the Manpower Development Act which will provide for the training of some 400,000 people over a 3-year period, it is only the beginning of what will prove to be a very long campaign.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

(By Walter Lippmann)

The first report on manpower, which the President has just transmitted to Congress, raises a question about unemployment to which there is no obvious answer. Why is it that for 5 consecutive years since 1957—both under Mr. Eisenhower and under Mr. Kennedy—the average rate of unemployment, 5½ percent, has been so much higher than it was in the years immediately after the war, when the average rate was less than 4 percent?

Moreover, in the past 10 years there have been three business recessions and after each recovery the rate of unemployment has been higher than after the preceding recovery. These facts indicate, as the Labor Department study accompanying the President's report puts it, that in recent years the American economy has been moving away from full employment rather than toward it.

It was by studying this gloomy situation that the administration came to the conclusion that corporate and individual income taxes are so high that they are depressing consumer demand and spending for capital investment. Though I believe wholly that this is a sound conclusion, I am moved to ask whether the administration remedy for academic stagnation is adequate. What moves me to ask this question is a reading of two lectures by the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, Mr. Per Jacobsson, one delivered at New York University and the other at the American Bankers Association meeting in Washington.

In reading these lectures, we must begin by remembering that Mr. Jacobsson is a very distinguished Swedish economist whose ideas descend from the same original source as those of John Maynard Keynes. Mr. Jacobsson, therefore, is in favor of the prescription, which comes from Keynes, that in order to overcome the sluggishness of an economy it is necessary to expand the demand for goods and services.

Where Mr. Jacobsson differs from the administration program is not about the tax and the budgetary deficit. He differs about wage policy. In substance, he says that while expanding demand can stimulate growth, it will not cure unemployment unless it is accompanied by a freezing of production costs and particularly wage rates. If I read him correctly, he says that it is quite possible to stimulate the growth of the economy without making much of an impression on unemployment. It is very interesting and quite significant that Mr. Jacobsson cites as his authority none other than John Maynard Keynes himself.

Keynes, he says, thought that while it is necessary that "demand should be increased," he was no less insistent that "in time of marked unemployment money wages should be kept stable for unemployment to be reduced." As a matter of fact, Lord Keynes went further than that. In his celebrated book "The General Theory of Employment," Keynes declared that in a given organization, equipment and technology, real wages and output are uniquely correlated so that, "in general, an increase in employment can only occur to the accompaniment of a decline in the rate of real wages." This decline in real wages would happen if money wages are frozen (while business is slack) while prices rise during the period of recovery from the recession.

Mr. Jacobsson's view, and even more that of Lord Keynes, differs from that of the administration in this respect. The administration has been trying, and with considerable success, to keep wage increases from exceeding the rise in the productivity of labor. Mr. Jacobsson's view is that this policy will not lead to the same reduction in unemployment as would be achieved if during the expansion of demand, money wage rates were kept constant or rising more slowly than productivity.

Mr. Jacobsson argues that this unpopular remedy for unemployment is necessary because in the past few years we have been in a "new situation." The postwar inflation has worked itself off; since 1959 wholesale prices have been practically stable and the cost of living has not risen much.

During the inflationary years, individual firms could grant wage increases because they could raise prices without a decline in their sales. But with inflation ended, most firms cannot raise prices without losing sales and therefore reducing their profit margins. In this kind of situation, Mr. Jacobsson believes, it is not possible to cure unemployment merely by cutting taxes and expanding demand. It is necessary also to stabilize labor costs.

Needless to say, this is an unpopular remedy. As evidence of it there is Governor Rockefeller's recent statement about economic growth. He too wants to expand demand by cutting taxes. But he is discreetly silent about wage policy.

An analysis of the figures shows why the country is more likely to put up with the existing unemployment than to brace itself to the disagreeable remedy which Keynes and Jacobsson recommend. Who are the unemployed? In the main they are the politically feeble. They are young people, many of them without votes. They are the older workers. They are Negroes. They are workers in declining and unstable industries and in the depressed areas. They are in general unskilled workers. There are some 4 million of them, not counting another 2½ million who are partially employed.

All of them together are not a politically formidable group, and as long as they are taken care of neither party is likely to take on the kind of opposition which the Jacobsson-Keynes formula would arouse.

While the evidence of past recoveries does not at first glance seem to confirm Mr. Jacobsson's theory, could it be that he has a point? I should like to see a qualified spokesman of the administration argue the issue which, without in the least pretending any expertness of my own, I have ventured to raise. Is it possible to reduce unemployment substantially by the tax bill alone?

Chauncey Brewster Tinker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a great university must necessarily include great teachers who can fire the imagination of students. Such a teacher was Chauncey Brewster Tinker, sometime sterling professor of English literature at Yale University. He has just died in New Haven.

As one of his students, who will always be in his debt, I would like to call attention to the career of Professor Tinker. It is one which deserves emulation by those who seek to enchance the quality of education in America. A short discussion of Professor Tinker's life which appeared this morning in the Baltimore Sun is appended.

The article follows:

C. B. TINKER, SCHOLAR, DIES; FORMER PROFESSOR AT YALE FOUND BOSWELL PAPERS

NEW HAVEN, March 17.—Chauncey Brewster Tinker, a Yale University scholar who discovered the long-missing Boswell papers in 1925, died last night at a Hartford nursing home.

The former sterling professor of English literature at Yale was 86. He had been ill for many years.

As a teacher, Tinker inspired many students who later became prominent in education and the arts and still call themselves "Tinkerians."

After writing and lecturing for years on the age of Dr. Samuel Johnson, 18th-century English writer and scholar, Professor Tinker began to suspect that many papers of Boswell, Johnson's biographer, were still in existence and began to look for them.

He advertised in Irish newspapers in 1925 for stray scripts written by the 18th-century English author. He received two unsigned answers, saying, "Try Malahide Castle near Dublin."

CONTACT SUGGESTED

The notes advised him to get in touch with Lord Talbot, the castle's occupant and a direct descendant of Boswell.

Tinker wangled an invitation to tea from Talbot, who afterward led him to an ebony cabinet where he found hundreds of Boswell papers.

The dramatic discovery led to revisions of views on Boswell's period among scholars.

The papers are now being edited for publication at the Yale library.

Despite his influence as a scholar, Tinker found his greatest pride in teaching. "I shall be remembered for my students," he once said. "They are my jewels."

He was the last of a group of scholars, renowned in their field, who taught in Yale's English department in the 1920's and 1930's. The others were William Lyon Phelps, Wilbur L. Cross, and John M. Berdan.

He received his Ph. D. from Yale in 1902 and later was awarded honorary degrees by Yale, Princeton, Wooster, and Hobart Colleges, and the University of Rochester.

In 50 years of teaching, writing, and lecturing, Professor Tinker ranged in his interests from Beowulf to A. E. Housman; only late in his life did he focus on Johnson and Boswell.

He taught a course on "The Age of Johnson" for many years, and students began to cal it "The Age of Tinker."

Consumer Credit: Cold War Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, an article by Gen. George Olmstead in the

February issue of News Front seemed to express some good thoughts on the subject of consumer credit as a cold war weapon and as a way to help build up a broad middle-income class in the underdeveloped countries. Of course, consumer credit is dependent on other components of initial economic growth, but I think that once this period is reached, such a force can be quite dynamic to generate greater economic growth.

The article follows:

CONSUMER CREDIT: NEW COLD WAR WEAPON

It is time to recognize that the great challenge of the future is to develop the economic strength of the individual citizen, by creating a growing middle-income group throughout the world—individual citizens with better living standards, something to fight for, and greater reason to resist communism.

Communism has gained ground in so many countries in recent years because most of these nations have only two economic classes—a very small, very rich class at the top, the poverty stricken masses below, and nothing in between.

The best way to win the long-range economic cold war against communism in the coming years is to help build up a broad middle-income class in each of the free countries. Our foreign aid program can help to bring this about but it must go into channels that so far have been largely overlooked.

One of the most potent forces for building a large economic middle-income class, as we have demonstrated in the United States, is the availability of low-cost consumer installment credit. I believe it can be a new weapon in the cold war.

It does little good for us to talk about political freedom when the majority of the world's people remain in economic bondage. While we pour billions into countries in the hope that they will grow and prosper, we do little or nothing to help provide the purchasing power to enable their people to buy and consume the goods that make possible higher living standards.

The development of mass credit, introduced in 1910, helped to make possible the mass demand that, in turn, nourished mass production and mass employment in the United States. It aided in building up our American middle-income society that enjoys the world's highest living standard.

It put into the hands of our people the credit to enable them to purchase automobiles, furniture, electric washing machines, vacuum cleaners, sewing machines. Later it made it possible for millions to buy radios, mechanical refrigerators, automatic furnaces, and other heavy-expense household conveniences considered "durable goods."

Buying cars on installment payments has made it possible for the automobile industry to become one of the industrial giants in the United States, employing some 10.5 million people directly, and more millions in related industries. It helps explain why 77 percent of U.S. families own cars and why 65 percent of the world's passenger cars are owned by Americans.

Other countries are roughly about where the United States was a generation or more ago in making credit available to the many who could qualify. Banks in Europe have not yet seen fit in most cases to do much in what they call "hire purchase."

There are trading firms and "money merchants" especially in less-developed areas but most of these charge such exorbitant interest rates that they constitute the greatest economic obstacle to the healthy growth of private enterprise and of an economic middle-income class.

Hardly a nation in the world can be found where there is not a sizable nucleus of people who would qualify by our standards for credit: personal reputation, and steady employment and income. Yet, for countless millions of them there is no low-cost way for them to get credit to buy the many conveniences they want.

The great stumbling block in even the most advanced countries is that the commercial banks have been reluctant to get into installment credit. The same thing happened in the United States at the start.

Today, the U.S. commercial banks are the largest suppliers of installment credit in this country. They account for about 40 percent of the nearly $45 billion of installment credit now outstanding.

The banks of the free nations must be encouraged to bring credit to those who can qualify—so more of their people will be able to afford to buy the automobiles, home appliances, and other modern conveniences their industries can produce. This will open the way for more employment and an acceleration of economic growth—just as it happened here.

It will enable people to buy the products of their own growing mills and factories. Also, it will help make them better customers for our exports, an assist for our troubled balance of payments which we badly need.

The dynamic force of installment credit can be made to generate greater economic growth and development and more human happiness and well-being abroad, just as it has done in the United States.

Consumer credit can be a mighty new weapon to help the free world win the cold war. For those people of the world who doubt and wait to see whether communism or capitalism will prevail, for those who believe and sacrifice and hope for better things tomorrow, for those who will support the free way of life but lack the means to be effective—to all of them we Americans have an answer.

Put buying power in the hands of the worthy individual, his lot in life improves, and the economy of his country grows stronger through his purchases. His economic freedom brings on a new understanding of political freedom for which he strives. And should the time come when he must defend this freedom, he, personally, as an individual, has something worth fighting for.

Damaging Decisions Made by Underlings in State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, until we have a complete and thorough investigation of the Department of State, its policies and personnel, we are going to continue to have decisions made which are damaging to American prestige and policy and against our self-interest.

The following column by Dr. Robert Morris cites just one instance of how dangerous some of these decisions are and who makes them:

OUR ERODING RAMPARTS

(By Robert Morris)

When the U.S. Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 decision in 1958 caused the then State Department passport security regulations to fall, President Eisenhower recommended that passport security legislation was urgently needed. He said, "Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger."

Five years have passed. The need for this legislation has obviously increased and there is still no such legislation. Hundreds of Soviet operatives certainly, and more likely thousands, are using the credentials of U.S. passports, implementing the grand design of Soviet conquest around the world. Despite the grave concern openly expressed by top people in our Government, a handful of lower echelon persons have thwarted efforts to plug this security hole.

Frances Knight, the experienced Director of the Passport Office of the U.S. State Department, a gracious lady of the tradition of Ruth Shipley who held that office before her for decades, has repeatedly tried to prevent Communist agents from using American passports to carry on their appointed tasks abroad.

Last year she testified that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has pointed out that "Communist espionage in this country is much more active now than it ever has been" and that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F.B.I. has said on March 19, 1962, "The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic."

Yet her Passport Office by direction had to issue passports to 547 persons she knew to be Communists. These Communists not only carry out courier and intelligence assignments and collect blackmail information about Government officials, but blacken the reputation of the United States abroad by acts and utterances. During the Korean war, for instance, some respectable appearing American citizens set up a press conference abroad and stated that the United States was using bacteriological warfare in Korea. It was devastating propaganda for the Communists all over Asia.

Miss Knight, in testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has pointed out how he is now forced, by State Department regulations, to blot out of her mind, when deciding who is a Communist, all F.B.I. or security information which she says constitutes 99 percent of her evidence.

She said:

"I, as the issuing officer, am supposed to tailor my 'reason to believe that the applicant is a member of a Communist organization' to data which can be made public regardless of how much classified information is produced by the FBI or other agencies of Government to the effect that the individual is a dangerous Communist. If the proof cannot be used in open hearings, with the right to cross-examine witnesses, I have been instructed to disregard it. In other words, I am expected to read the file, dismiss the classified information and base my decision on what can be best described as generalized public information. I maintain that no one can do this in good conscience and this places me in a difficult position between the law and the Government's expert 'legal advisers' who interpret the law. It is a fact that under the present regulations, the more treacherous and vicious and destructive the individual may be, the less likely it is that he will be denied a passport."

Then she said:

"The public has been led to believe that, at long last, there are regulations in effect which will prevent the use of the U.S. passport for the benefit or promotion of world communism. There appears to be no reali-

zation that the few functionaries who may get caught in this very ineffective net are relatively unimportant."

Congress would certainly grant legislation but it has been told that the administration does not need it; that the existing regulations are adequate. The evidence is mountainous that the opposite is true.

When the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee looked into this matter it discovered that the decision that enables Communists to move at will with our credentials, was made, not by the President, J. Edgar Hoover, Miss Knight, the security administrator, or any of the responsible leaders of Government but by a handful of lower echelon bureaucrats. The underlying letter that set the crippling policy was drafted by a second-tier lawyer who had worked in the State Department only 1 year. He acknowledged he had come into State after working under Walt W. Rostow when that important policy planner headed up a covert CIA operation at the Center for International Studies at the Massachuseets Institute of Technology.

The testimony of the subcommittee shows clearly that a handful of lower officials for State and Justice got together in November 1961 and made the damaging decision and did not even see fit to consult the heads of their departments before promulgating the resulting policy.

Reading the record will reveal that Senator THOMAS J. DODD has pointed out that the State Department in allowing passports to Communists is adopting standards in passport security that are "substantially those advanced by Mr. John Abt in behalf of the Communist Party, although in some respects they seem to go even farther in the party's favor than even Mr. Abt has gone."

Fantastic you say. Not, however, if Mr. Rostow's underlying theme that "communism is mellowing" is the basis of our policy in all departments. And it should be obvious when you observe the missiles in Cuba, the offensive of the Vietcong and the Pathet Lao and scores of other manifestations of implacable Soviet aggression that, rather than mellowing, it is becoming more voracious as it moves in for the kill. It is our inner ramparts that are mellowing and eroding.

Tragedy and Testimonial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the accidental deaths of Peace Corps volunteers serving in the Philippines prompted a moving letter to Director Shriver of the Peace Corps which is at once a heartfelt expression of condolence and a testimonial to this program in the Philippines. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include this letter from the affable and dynamic Ambassador of the Philippines, His Excellency Amelito R. Mutuc, whom I have come to know well through mutual association in the Jaycee movement.

The letter follows:

EMBASSY OF THE PHILIPPINES,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.

Mr. SARGENT T. SHRIVER,
Director, Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: My heart is heavy as I write to you to convey my deepest sympathy and condolence on behalf of the Filipino people and Government on the sudden and tragic death of the youthful American Peace Corps volunteers, Nancy Ann Boyd, of Martinez, Calif., and Philip Walter Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo.

On this sad occasion, there are no words to express the grief that we Filipinos share with our American friends. Nancy Ann Boyd and Philip Walter Maggard were young Americans who, imbued with the idealism and energy of youth, left the comfort of home and the warm affection of their loved ones, to extend help in the Philippines and to seek new friends for themselves and their country.

They endeared themselves to those Filipinos who were the beneficiaries of their help and counsel and friendship. They found a responsive chord in the hearts of their young Filipino counterparts, because the help and counsel and friendship that they extended were filled with the alacrity and honesty of youth.

It is painful to contemplate that in the short span of existence of the Peace Corps in my country, three young Americans lost their lives—David Mulholland, Nancy Ann Boyd, and Philip Walter Maggard. But perhaps you and I and their loved ones, who must carry the heaviest burden of sorrow, can find deep consolation in the fact that they died with bosom friends, in service not only to your country but to mine as well.

If the work of these young Americans has any significance in any assessment of the future, it is that they gave up their lives to give meaning and purpose to the noble and worthy cause of the Peace Corps which you so ably head—that our two countries share the enduring values of human dignity and of selfless service to God, country, and fellow men; that in peace, as in war, we are joined in mutual endeavor, as we must, in the noble cause of service to humanity for whihc David Mulholland, Nancy Ann Boyd, and Philip Walter Maggard lived and died; that even, as we have honest differences, we are joined in cooperative effort toward one common purpose and one common ideal, the ideal of peace with justice and larger freedom.

These young Americans have honored us by coming to the Philippines and working with us. Today, as tomorrow, Filipinos honor them as true representatives of a great country.

Sincerely yours,

AMELITO R. MUTUC.

Jaycees in Action as Poultry Export Crisis Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the discriminatory policies of the European Economic Community which virtually have denied access to the poultry of Virginia and other States continue, despite hints that some relief might be in prospect.

The seriousness of this problem has been recognized in the active interest manifested by many Members of this House, and of the other body. It has the concern of the executive branch at highest levels, as it should.

Particularly helpful in the support of our negotiators with the European Economic Community, I believe, have been the efforts of the poultry industry in Virginia and elsewhere to enlist the support of other segments of the economy, in the recognition that what hurts the poultryman in any major poultry-producing State hurts all who do business with him.

In Virginia, the junior chambers of commerce—the Jaycees—demonstrated once again the methodical mustering of energy which characterizes any project which commands the attention of the Jaycee movement.

Initially, a resolution was adopted by the Broadway-Timberville Jaycees, of which Richard Harpine is president, in the heart of Virginia's poultry region, as follows:

PROPOSED RESOLUTION BY REGION V, VIRGINIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CONSISTING OF BROADWAY-TIMBERVILLE, CHARLOTTESVILLE, CULPEPER, ELKTON, HARRISONBURG-ROCKINGHAM, LOUISA, LURAY, MADISON, ORANGE, STAUNTON, STUARTS DRAFT, WAYNESBORO, WOODSTOCK

Whereas the European Common Market is putting into operation a system of highly protectionist measures which are designed to restrict export opportunities for U.S. poultry and other agricultural products; and

Whereas these measures are inconsistent with and repugnant to basic fair trading principles which have been established under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce condemn the use of such devices as gate prices, variable levies and similar discriminatory measures which have, as their principal purpose, the effect of strangulation of trade instead of promoting free trade between countries; and be it further

Resolved, That the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce urge that the President of the United States utilize all of the powers available to him under the Trade Expansion Act to bring about a removal of such unfair barriers against our poultry and other agricultural products and that, if necessary, similar measures be used against the goods of the offending countries to the end that such trade barriers may be eliminated so that mutually beneficial trade may be conducted between the countries of the free world.

This resolution was adopted on a regional and State level by the Jaycees of gional, giving it endorsement by more than 100 chapters, and sent forward to the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, the national body of the Jaycee's movement.

My good friend, Herb Bateman, president of the Virginia Jaycees, has informed me that his organization has taken steps to bring this resolution to the consideration of Jaycees across the United States, and I am confident the poultry industry nationally can expect substantial additional evidence of support from these young men, many of whom have had no direct involvement in the poultry industry but who, with characteristic alertness and perception, have recognized that the restrictions imposed by the European Economic Community have caused substantial economic damage to a major agricultural industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that we have had most success in West Germany

in the development of an European market for our poultry, success which has been erased by the complex of variable levies, gate prices, and so forth, now impressed on our poultry trade by the European Economic Community. As of interest to Members of the House from poultry producing States, I include an article by a major German importer which appeared in the March 1933 issue of the publication, Broiler Industry.

The article follows:

A GERMAN IMPORTER'S ADVICE: STAND UP—THE U.S. POULTRY INDUSTRY "DOUBTLESSLY HAS BEEN DISCRIMINATED AGAINST," SAYS ONE OF GERMANY'S LARGEST FOOD DISTRIBUTORS; HE SUGGESTS WE KEEP UP BARGAINING PRESSURE

(By Waldemar Krogh)

While this report was being written, negotiations for Great Britain's entry into the Common Market had failed, for the time being. Consequently, the European Common Market is still limited to the six original countries, and the bigger economic integration which was hoped for did not materialize.

In view of this situation, it has become considerably more difficult to predict the future of poultry transactions in EEC countries.

On account of the EEC market regulations since July 30, 1962, a lot has changed in the European poultry market. The main burden and damage are borne not only by importers and exporters, but by consumers. There is no doubt that Western Germany, by far the biggest poultry importer within the EEC, is affected most.

In view of the gate prices fixed by the EEC market regulations, and in view of the very high levies, we had to considerably limit our purchases from third countries, mainly the United States, since July 30, 1962. It was not possible for the importers to jump the hurdle of dues.

To this very day, the entire import and wholesale trade of Western Germany is partly living on imports effected before July 30, 1962.

If asked, "Which sales prospects still exist for the U.S. poultry in Europe?" there could be only one answer: for the time being, the prospects are limited.

The importer's risk is not quite as big when dealing with European third countries, since the time factor in transporting U.S. shipments must be considered. (Duty fees could increase while a shipment is on the high seas.)

A lot, if not everything, will depend on the outcome of negotiations pending between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the EEC Commission in Brussels.

Nobody should be under an illusion, however, that the German importers' purchases of poultry will remain as before. This applies, first of all, to fowl. According to information received, internal production of hens in the EEC member countries (also in Western Germany) will be increased considerably. The very high gate prices, as well as levies applicable on imports from third countries, will give the EEC poultry industry quite a remarkable advance.

American producers and exporters, in any case, will have to offer many more advantages in the future if they want to remain in the European Common Market. Quality, presentation and calibration as well as uniform packing with metrical weights, will be important.

During the last few years, however, the United States, in particular, has made every endeavor to comply with demands of the European markets. Nonetheless, shipment of poultry must be improved greatly. In Western Germany, every effort is being made to perfect a refrigeration system which will maintain "zero" temperature (minus 18° C.) from processing plant to consumer, including carriers, such as ships and delivery trucks. Too often, this is still not possible.

U.S. shipowners, as a result, had to be instructed to handle the poultry more carefully when loading and discharging. Stevedores in many cases did not apply sufficient care. One of the requirements is better and stronger packaging, a matter for which the packers are responsible.

In order to eliminate such difficulties which arise when goods, are shipped from American ports, we propose establishment of control organizations guaranteeing a really impeccable shipment of goods.

If these requirements of the European importers are fulfilled by the American exporters, then the American goods should be comparable to Danish goods. This would certainly improve the sales prospects for the United States.

If efforts of the United States in this respect are continued, I suppose that the Common Market will not become fully self-sufficient in poultry production. It is estimated that approximately 70,000 tons of U.S. poultry were imported to Western Germany in 1962. Such a quantity cannot be replaced by one's own production overnight.

It is my personal opinion that the U.S. poultry producers and exporters doubtlessly have been discriminated against. If the United States exercises a certain pressure on European authorities responsible for the restriction of U.S. poultry imports, by measures concerning the import of European export goods to the United States, then a question is bound to arise in this connection; that is, how to treat other third countries?

PRE-EEC VOLUME A GOAL

In any case, I think that the threat to take measures against the importation to the United States of America of Western German export goods perhaps might result in positive changes for the import of U.S. poultry to Western Germany.

The export of industrial goods doubtlessly is most important for Western Germany. An endeavor should be made to get a guarantee for sales in the same amount as before.

Western Germany cannot renounce the export of her goods since it would be impossible to sell this quantity in her own market. It must be remembered, too, that such internal pressure of goods would result in a considerable reduction of prices.

As mentioned before, it is impossible to predict which situation will arise during the current year in view of the still pending negotiations between Washington and Brussels. Should the present situation remain unchanged until the end of this year, one has to reckon upon a further decrease in U.S. sales to the Western German market. It is impossible to give a longer forecast, either, as too many factors play a decisive part; for example, stagnation of per capita consumption of poultry as a result of very high prices following introduction of the EEC market regulations.

Sales of poultry during the past 4 years increased by approximately 4 kilograms (8.8 pounds) per capita. This has been due only to attractive prices. The consumer in Western Germany is remembering this fact with pleasure.

If poultry will not be sold at reasonable prices in the future, then one has to anticipate that poultry will become a rare item on the family menu. Unlike earlier days, Germans have learned to use chicken during the week—many fryers, fowls, ducks—above all, backs and necks.

Concluding, I should like to express the hope that the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture will be successful, together with the EEC Commission in Brussels, in finding a solution which will be satisfactory for all parties.

Before America takes measures which will bring great losses to our industry, the Government of the Federal Republic should emphasize these difficulties in Brussels and should not take protection of German agriculture as the only standard to justify its actions. This might seriously endanger the German export industry.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Seattle Times and the letter of enclosure to me by Mr. R. J. Schuur, describing the desperate situation this Nation faces in the matter of water pollution and describing the disgust, irritation, and frustration of one of our citizens with this filthy and sordid defilement of one of our most priceless natural assets.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
March 7, 1963.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR SIR: Your recent statement at the National Wildlife Federation in Detroit regarding the pollution and contamination of the Nation's water supply was noted in a Detroit paper. You deserve my personal congratulations.

The writer has many times brought this to the attention of our local, State, and National administration to no avail. This Nation is the world's worst in this respect when it comes to air and water pollution plus the denuding of our forests. Many like yourself have brought this matter up but it seems nothing has been or is being done to correct these disastrous conditions. Our State and National leadership is dragging their feet in an effort to correct the situation. Our so-called townships are one of the worst offenders. Their dry well, sometimes called cesspools, pollute our underground water supply. Everything from detergents to bathroom waste goes down these drains. This condition could be corrected if we had a national law making it mandatory that all townships be required to connect on to city sewers. This in itself would immediately prevent further pollution of our underground water supply.

Then we have our city sewers which dump the wastage into our rivers, streams, and finally finds its way into the Great Lakes which are then polluted. Our inland lakes are already showing up dead fish due to the oil slicks from the outboard motors. The Kalamazoo River is a good example of pollution. I invite you to come and investigate the local river. It is not a river but a stinking polluted mudhole due to the local dumping of industrial waste plus the city sewers. Our State water resources department has been trying for some time to correct the situation with so-called sewage treatments, installed by the firms that dump their waste, but without success.

There is one way and only one way these conditions can be corrected, by forcing through law, that the industries involved be forced to haul away their waste to some specified area to dry out and then burned. Some solution can and must be found.

It begins to look like our National and State leadership are afraid of stepping on someones' toes, the industrial toes. If this attitude continues to be taken we will never

get anywhere. Aggressively action must be taken regardless of who is involved.

Another national disgrace is the pesticides, poisonous sprays used to combat insects. This condition is so severe it not only poisons our soils but is also killing our fish, our wildlife but also our trees and forests. These poisons find their way into our rivers and streams and eventually our lakes and finally into the Great Lakes. Yet we hear nothing from our State and national leadership to combat this nuisance, leadership who appear to be under the heels of the pesticide industry. It begins to look like these industries are bigger than our Government. If this is the case then we are lost and hopeless. Nature itself can control insects. Ladybugs are one example.

As an individual I realize this letter will bear no weight. However as a citizen of this once beautiful Nation I feel I have at least done my part in trying to correct an evil situation before it is too late.

Very sincerely yours,

R. J. SCHURY.

WATER POLLUTION: A DEADLY THREAT

"Water, water everywhere,
And all the boards did shrink;
Water, water everywhere
Nor any drop to drink."
—S. T. COLERIDGE.

Such was the curse of the ancient mariner. Posted over every bridge and dam, on every river and stream, it one day could serve as an epitaph for a civilization.

Unless we stop poisoning our waters with chemical bug killers and quick-sudsing detergents, with radioactive wastes and virus-bearing slaughterhouse remains, with untreated municipal and industrial sewage, with oil-well brine and pulp mill acids and tons of silt from road and building projects; unless we reduce these and other hazardous contaminants, the curse could fall on our land in our lifetime.

And the boards that will shrink may well be the props holding up the entire free world.

Here indeed is a case where more truth than poetry is involved.

For want of a glass of clear water, the continent that heard Niagara's restless roar and sang of the mighty Mississippi and the wide Missouri and drew its life blood from the Great Lakes, that incredible reservoir holding more than one-third of the world's fresh water supply, that continent, that civilization could die of thirst in the midst of plenty.

And the Nation that Khrushchev once threatened to bury well might bury itself—ingloriously, ironically, insanely—in its own garbage.

The evidence already is there: appalling, irrefutable, increasing every day.

President Kennedy has called the situation "a national disgrace."

"Pollution of our country's rivers and streams," he told Congress in his message on natural resources, "has reached alarming proportions."

A housewife in Babylon, Long Island, draws a glass of water with a 2-inch head of froth. It looks more like a glass of beer, but it has an oily, fishy taste.

Towns along the Animas River in Colorado and New Mexico, where a uranium mill dumps its wastes, learn their drinking water contains 40 to 160 percent more than maximum safety levels of radioactivity.

Epidemologists trace an outbreak of hepatitis along the eastern seaboard to oysters raked from the Gulf of Mexico and to clams dug in New Jersey's Raritan Bay and along the Connecticut coast.

Rensselaer, N.Y., orders its residents to boil all drinking water as the bacteria count soars in its water mains from pollution in the Hudson River.

Faced with drought conditions in the Neosho River, Chanute, Kans., attempts to recycle water from its sewage-treatment plant directly into its purification plant. The water meets acceptable health standards, but foam rises to the top of every glass, piles up in 15-foot high billows at the water works and blows across town like snow.

Freighters passing through Chicago's ship and sanitary canal churn up so much suds that sprays are employed to break up the billows. On Mondays, when Chicago housewives discharge tons of detergents with the water from the weekly wash, the frothing is noticeably worse.

Gas bubbles rise from the sludge at the bottom of the Missouri River below Sioux City, where a packinghouse unloads tons of animal entrails. Farther downstream, Omaha awaits the river's arrival for drinking water.

Along a 40-mile stretch of Wisconsin's Fox River, where 34 paper and pulp mills hug the banks the water flows with the color and consistency of lentil soup. And the great salmon runs are diminished in Puget Sound, another pulp-mill area.

A chemical plant near Austin, Tex., discharges its wastes in the Colorado River. For 140 miles downstream, all fish die.

Paterson, Nutley, and Passiac, N.J., switch to emergency water reserves when the Passaic River floats up a cargo of dead fish. The verdict is poison by pollution.

A similar verdict is returned for thousands of dead fish found floating in tributaries of the Tennessee River, where valley farmers used DDT to rid their cotton of boll weevils.

Youngstown, Ohio, steel mills using the Mohoning River for cooling processes raise the temperature of the river so high in summer that not only is all fish life eliminated but the water is made unfit for anything—even for cooling purposes.

Typhoid fever breaks out in Keene, N.H. Hepatitis cases set a new record. Leptospirosis, better known as sewer workers' fever, suddenly crops up in the Missouri River valley. Health departments in a number of cities note an upsurge in diarrhea, intestinal disorders, and stomach sicknesses. In each case, water is the virus carrier.

These are not Orwellian nightmares of some distant day.

All of these incidents of pollution actually happened in recent years. Some already have been corrected. Some are up for action in Federal enforcement cases. Some continue unabated.

The point is that pollution problems like these can and do happen to America's rivers and streams every day. New and worse ones are in store in the future as our population booms and industry flourishes.

CLEAN WATER VITAL

Clean water is absolutely essential to America's continued existence as a nation and a civilization. We drink it, bathe in it, wash with it, cook with it, fish and swim in it. It irrigates our crops, powers our plants, refines our products, produces our electricity.

Despite a favorable annual rainfall, our available water has not increased appreciably since Columbus landed. Its use and abuse have—drastically. For more than a half century, we have been using our great rivers—the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Colorado, the Columbia, the Hudson—as little more than open sewers. In that time, our population has doubled and the pollution load in our waters tripled.

The greatest gains in population and industry are yet to come. We now use about half the water we can trap. By 1980, when according to the Senate select committee's figures our population will jump to 244 million, we will be using it all. By the year 2000, with a population of 329 million, demand will triple. Water re-use will be a necessary way of life.

Today about 40 percent of our population drinks re-used water: Water that has been through the sewers of some other city before purification. For instance, Pittsburgh's sewage plants empty into the Ohio River, Cincinnati takes the water out for drinking purposes and in turn dumps its sewage back in the river, Louisville repeats the process and so on down the river. Some Ohio River towns use water that has been flushed down the sewers of 10 other communities.

Water is our only major re-usable resource. It can't be duplicated. It has no substitute, no synthetic equivalent. But it can be used over and over again. The problem of keeping our rivers clean enough for this sort of constant re-use has been complicated vastly by the wonders of modern living.

Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I recently wrote to the Honorable Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in which I called to his attention the reasons why, in my opinion, Farmers Home Administration must be provided with additional funds for administering its increased workload:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. GORDON: It has very recently come to my atention that the gradual attrition of private credit sources available to farmers in northeast Texas has now reached a point where something has got to be done. the responsible Federal agency in this field is the Farmers Home Administration. The purpose of this letter is to tell you that in my opinion FHA must increase their lending capability and augment their staff, otherwise they cannot assume the added burden. The reluctance or inability of private credit institutions to provide farm credit has been obvious for many years, not only in loans made to farmers by State and National banks but also in loans made by various production credit association over the State of Texas.

Farmers' Home has extended the effectiveness of their available funds by using their loan authorizations to pay interest and depreciation to prior lien holders of essential livestock and farm equipment, in an attempt to encourage private institutions to continue their line of credit rather than require refinancing by FHA. Even this has not offset the trend. Bank officials in northeast Texas will tell you:

1. The percent of agricultural loans made compared to other purpose loans has declined in the past 10 years from 50 percent to 20 percent. Even though there has been a decline in the number of farmers in this area, it has not been as rapid as the decline in agricultural credit.

2. Less than 10 percent of agricultural loans are made to young farmers, in spite of the fact that the average age of bank customers who farm is between 55 and 65. Because of this trend it is extremely difficult

for young farmers to obtain credit sufficient to enable them to become successfully established.

3. Farmers who have repaid their indebtedness to Farmers Home experience great difficulty in returning to private sources of credit. Even though their assets have been increased considerably and they are free of debt, these farmers cannot obtain a relatively small loan for annual operating expenses.

4. Statutory loan limits and other legal limitations are not contributing factors toward the policies of credit institutions in making fewer agricultural loans.

5. Individual comments:

"The number of our agricultural loans, including part-time operators who are fully employed and own only a few head of cattle, is around 400 to 450. This compares with around 1,000 loans some 10 years ago. The average age of the families financed by our bank is around 60 to 65 years. Only a very few young farmers are being financed by the bank, and most of these farmers have other income."

"We have approximately 150 agricultural loans, and about 90 percent of these are combination crop and livestock operations. The average age of the farm families being financed is around 50 years. There is little need of a farming operation of such size as to require a line of credit in excess of $6,000 or $7,000. We are financing no young farm families who conduct a full-time farming operation. The young farm families that we do finance are fully employed and have considerable nonfarm income. These operators usually have only a few head of cattle."

"Our bank is financing some 500 farm families, with an average loan of around $2,000. The average age of these families is a little over 65 years. The bank's experience in farm credit is very disappointing. In fact, agricultural losses have almost offset all the profits made by other departments of the bank. The number of farm loans made has declined some 40 to 50 perment in the last 10 years. The trend is toward larger and fewer operators and farmers who have other sources of income."

"This bank is financing some 189 farm loans; about five are young farm families. The percent of loans made to farmers in 1951 was 53 percent while the percentage of loans made to farmers in 1962 was 21 percent. We have had no loss on farm loans during the last 3 years but we are not interested in financing farmers and ranchers."

"Agricultural loans made by this bank decreased 40 to 50 percent during the last 10 years. The types of farming operations have changed and most of those being financed have nonfarm employment. Practically no loans at all are being made to assist young farmers to become established in the farming business. Only a very few large crop farmers are being financed. We are reluctant to finance cotton."

"It appears that most of this bank's customers are livestock and combination farmers. Our bank is not making agricultural loans for cropping operations, and we have made only a few loans to new young farmers. These young families are mostly going into livestock operations with nonfarm income."

"Ten years ago 75 percent of the loans made by this bank were agricultural loans and about 80 percent of those were to crop farmers. Today about 60 percent of the loans are farm loans, and practically none of the operators are straight crop farmers. Nearly all are livestock operators. The average age of the farm families being financed by this bank is from 55 to 65 years. We only make small farm loans, and very few loans are being made to young farm families."

"Ten years ago 85 percent of the loans made by our bank were agricultural loans. Of these approximately 60 percent were crop farmers. Today only about 25 percent are agricultural loans, and only 10 percent are crop loans. Agricultural loans in this area are getting larger as the need for operating credit increases each year. Farm families are getting fewer in number."

"This bank finances mostly cattle operations. It finances very few young farmers, and all of these have nonfarm income. We are reluctant to finance cropping operations, and we do not like to make farm loans unless the farm operator has nonfarm income of at least $2,400 or more annually. Even then, the average loan is from $400 to $1,500. Most of the families receiving this credit are from 55 to 60 years of age."

"We make few farm loans and those farm loans being financed are very small operators with outside income. We do not believe cropping operations are sound and consequently we make practically no crop loans."

"I have referred some of my customers to FHA due to the bank's inability to continue providing credit to them, then, after their operations have been reestablished on a sound basis, they have returned to this bank for their credit needs. Most of our farm loans are to older people, and the operators are getting larger in size and fewer in number. Most of our loans are for dairy and livestock enterprises, and we have practically no crop loans."

"The banks in this area are making fewer and fewer agricultural loans each year. Very few crop farmers are being financed by the banks. Many farmers, mostly tenants, are quitting because of lack of adequate financing. Larger amounts of credit are needed each year to conduct a sound farming program because of the need to carry out improved farming practices such as increased use of fertilizers, insect control, etc. Consequently, an increasing number of farms are becoming idle because of the lack of operators. These farm lands are being purchased by larger operators and are being made into much larger farming units. These larger units are producing less agricultural income because of the change from cropping programs to livestock programs. The decrease of this income and the lack of people formerly engaged in crop farming operations are having an adverse economic influence on the local communities. Many of the farm families that have left could have stayed and conducted sound farming programs had they been able to receive adequate credit with FHA supervisory assistance that would enable them to carry out the necessary changes in farm management due to the advance in agricultural technology now needed to carry out a profitable farm operation."

"The present 'cost-price squeeze' being experienced by farmers will require longer repayment periods than are presently being extended by most private credit institutions. The banks are handicapped in providing the additional needed credit due to a lack of trained personnel necessary in servicing farm loans. The amount of annual credit needed by the average farmer has almost doubled in the last 10 years. This is due to the necessity for farmers to producer higher yields of crops in order to maintain an adequate volume of income which includes increased costs for fertilizer, insecticides, labor, machinery, repair."

"FHA may be the only source of future agricultural credit. Many good crop farmers are rejected for bank loans. I do not believe the banks are making loans that they could or should make. The trend is toward fewer agricultural loans in most banks. I know of many family-type farm operators that could not get adequate credit from private sources at the present time."

"There has been a change away from row to crop production due to the reluctance of the banks to provide this type of credit. A change from row crop production to livestock is not the answer now, nor is it the answer in the future to the adverse direction the rural economy is now taking; production credit is only assuming risks that any bank would take in making agricultural loans and, therefore, do not provide any additional credit to offset this trend toward fewer agricultural loans."

"A great number of our farmers are of the age where they cannot get a job, and not old enough to draw social security, they are at the crossroads of life. Unless they can get help from some source to farm, I do not know what some of them will do. Most of the farmers would quit if they could get anything to do. I have noticed that as soon as a farmer can draw his social security, he is out of the farming business. But, something is going to have to be provided for that man until he can retire. We do not have any young men that are starting their career farming. Something must be wrong with the setup when no young men want to farm."

I am especially concerned regarding this trend in private credit since it is requiring a tremendous increase in the responsibility of the Farmers Home Administration to supplement private credit without adequate personnel to staff their local and State offices, personnel that are needed effectively to meet the increased credit demands of eligible farmers and ranchers. Since the present appropriation for administering the FHA program is insufficient, it was recently necessary for the agency to terminate the employment of 27 county office personnel; this is in spite of the fact that at the present time FHA has loaned in Texas $11 million more than for the same period a year ago. Another indication of approaching crisis is the increasing number of applications received by FHA for credit assistance which has caused a rapidly increasing loan volume.

During the 1961 fiscal year, FHA in Texas loaned $48 million for all types of loans, both initial and subsequent. In the 1962 fiscal year, they loaned $60 million in Texas. In fiscal 1962 over 9,000 applications for initial assistance were received. If adequate funds are available there will be a tremendous increase in both the number of applications and the funds needed to meet the farm operating costs of sound family farming operations. Of the over 9,000 applications for new or initial assistance that were received, 4,500 new or initial loans of all types were made. This ratio discloses that FHA has made diligent efforts to provide credit assistance only to those families who have a reasonable chance of success and who can be profitably reestablished in farming operations.

As previously stated, FHA found it necessary to restrict the use of loan funds for refinancing purposes only to cases of absolute necessity to enable the farmer to continue an otherwise sound operation. Despite FHA's careful efforts to reduce loan funds for this purpose, it was necessary this year to use $2.3 million in contrast to the $1.9 million used in the 1961 fiscal year.

It is clear to me that the need for the services provided by the Farmers' Home Administration is expanding at a tremendous rate. It is also apparent that unless there is an immediate increase in available funds for administering this increased workload, individual farm families will be seriously and adversely affected, as will the entire rural economy.

I will very much appreciate your comments on this situation as I have described it in this letter.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincererly yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Steuben Society Views the New Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Steuben News, publication of the Steuben Society of America, in its February 1963 editorial, addressed itself to the new economics now being preached by the President and his advisers. The Steuben News urges the Congress to maintain its position under the Constitution to guard the Nation's purse strings. I am placing the editorial from the February issue of the Steuben News in the Appendix of the RECORD to share the views of the paper and the society on this important subject:

THE PRESIDENT PROPOSES, THE PRESIDENT DISPOSES

A program of tax reduction and reform, without reducing spending, is now before the peoples' representatives. Congress must now perform its constitutional duty of controlling the purse strings of the Nation.

To be sure, every American would welcome a long overdue reduction in taxes and fiscal reform. It would give the harassed taxpayer a much needed breathing spell; and a tax cut is possible.

A detailed account on "the national household" and fiscal responsibility has been presented in recent issues, as well as in this issue of Steuben News. A reasonable conclusion is that conservatives and liberals are in agreement, that the high tax rates are an intolerable deterrent to business, job creation, and economic growth, and until this deterrent is removed our economy cannot move forward. However, all responsible fiscal experts, who have not listened to the Fabian Socialists' siren song of deficit financing also agree, that a spending cut must precede a tax cut.

Boiled down to its essence the President's program, "to cut taxes without curtailing spending" is highly speculative, and means: To borrow money to reduce taxes, creating a deficit for years to come, so heavy that it could endanger the stability of our currency. Should this occur, it could bankrupt our Government as well as every citizen of the United States of America. The resulting chaos could even lead to dictatorship. No one would be happier about that than Mr. Khrushchev.

The first witness before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress will be none other than Dr. Walter W. Heller, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who is presumed to be the chief architect of the deficit-spending proposal. He is also the same Dr. Heller, who under President Truman went to Germany after World War II to help the Adenauer government to set up its economy. The German experts however rejected the professor's theories and did it their own. The fantastic economic recovery of West Germany under a system opposed to the theories of Dr. Heller speaks for itself.

Congress must be aware of the book-learned economist's history, when it considers his testimony. We are not aware of any success of his previous speculative proposals and question this one. His testimony calls for searching analysis.

The peoples representatives had better sharpen the pruning shears and begin with the reckless spending under the foreign aid program, via the House Foreign Affairs Committee. There are only a few facets of Federal spending which are not in line for some heavy pruning without jeopardizing efficiency.

Finally: the President may propose expenditures, but it is the Congress which must dispose, in this instance appropriate.

It is its constitutional prerogative and duty to the taxpayer, to all Americans and to the generations to come, to return our Government to fiscal sanity.

During its last session the Congress surrendered one of its most important prerogatives, that of levying import duties. Is it too much to ask now that it dedicate itself to the preservation of the remainder of its prerogatives and exercise them to the fullest extent in controlling the purse strings of our "national households?"

Is it too much to ask that it put aside partisan considerations and crack down hard on reckless spending?

It is the sacred obligation of our elected representatives to remove the adventurous speculative, yea "revolutionary" provisions from the proposed program and return to basic, sane and sound fiscal principles, to make the much needed tax cut possible.

President's Tax Proposal Perils Private Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, probably no provision of the President's tax proposal, now before the Committee on Ways and Means, will have greater impact than that will permit taxpayers to deduct interest on gifts to charity only in amounts which exceed 5 percent of total income. Should this provision be included in the final version of the bill and become law, we may well see the end of private charity in this country. Perhaps that is what the social planners desire so that we will be forced to accept Federal welfare programs in lieu of the many fine private and church programs now in existence.

In order to keep Members of Congress informed on the voluminous testimony being presented to the Ways and Means Committee on the whole tax program as well as to the feeling of the people in all parts of this country, I am including as a part of these remarks several statements and articles concerning the charity deductions. First, a letter addressed to me as well as one addressed to the honorable chairman of our committee from the Dallas County United Fund, Inc. Second, an editorial from the San Diego Union, issue of March 11, 1963. Finally, a statement presented to the committee by John S. Hayes, president, United Community Funds and Councils of America:

DALLAS COUNTY UNITED FUND, INC.,
Dallas, Tex., March 7, 1963.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRUCE: After long and thorough study of the President's tax proposals, the executive committee of the Dallas County United Fund voted unanimously to express our opposition to those points having to do with charitable deductions by individuals, and in particular to that section setting up a 5 percent floor under itemized deductions.

We strongly believe this proposed floor would definitely make it more difficult for groups such as ours to secure contribution support and result in real confusion for the charitable giver. Traditionally, the complete deductibility of the average contributor's gift has been a great incentive to his support of voluntary organizations. These contributions are the only free-choice expenditures among those items allowed as deductible, and it is doubtful that the average individual taxpayer would feel that the more he gives, the less there is to tax, so long as a portion of those items would not be fully deductible.

We are proud, as we know you are, of the outstanding services rendered at minimum cost by privately supported health, welfare and character-building agencies in Dallas County. We are also aware that unless they are adequately supported through voluntary giving some other means of financing them would be necessary—a means that could be greatly more expensive to each of us.

As information, I am enclosing a letter sent to Congressman MILLS today, expressing our views on this subject. We sincerely hope and believe you will do everything possible as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a Member of Congress to prevent the dilution of incentives for voluntary charitable giving. Thank you for your interest.

Very sincerely,

JAMES F. CHAMBERS, Jr.,
President.

DALLAS COUNTY UNITED FUND, INC.,
Dallas, Tex., March 7, 1963.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
U.S. House of Representatives, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: The executive committee of the Dallas County United Fund has studied closely the President's tax proposals submitted to Congress in January. We have, of course, given most of our attention to those points which are of special interest to charitable organizations, and in particular to that section having to do with a 5-percent floor under itemized deductions of individuals.

Although we understand that the entire program is designed to leave the individual taxpayer—and charitable giver—with a greater sum of expendable income, in our considered opinion this proposed floor on itemized deductions would definitely make it more difficult for groups such as ours to secure contribution support.

We believe this proposal will create a great psychological block among charitable givers who itemize their deductions. This belief stems from the fact that contributions to charity are the only free choice expenditures among those items allowed as deductible. In our opinion, it is doubtful that the average individual taxpayer would feel that "the more he gives, the less there is to tax," and that the end result would be one of confusion to the taxpayer as to what is and what is not deductible.

As citizens and taxpayers we are proud of the outstanding services rendered at minimum cost by privately supported health, welfare and character-building agencies in Dallas County. We sincerely hope and believe your committee will recognize the importance of full deduction privileges for taxpayers to this country's privately supported charitable organizations and the resultant benefits to all our citizens.

Thank you very much for the privilege of presenting to you the results of our careful and thorough deliberations. We know your

committee will give this entire matter the most careful consideration.

Very sincerely,

JAMES F. CHAMBERS, Jr.,
President.

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 11, 1963]

TAXES TO CUT GIFTS

The administration's new tax bill provides that taxpayers may deduct interest on gifts to charity and mortgages "only in amounts which exceed 5 percent of total income."

Taxpayers who normally would give away 20 percent of their incomes would get no tax deductions on the first 5 percent, under President Kennedy's plan.

Who would suffer? All privately endowed universities, cultural projects, churches and charities would be the victims. Contributors in the middle and upper tax brackets most certainly would review their previous gifts to education and charity and curtail them.

It is logical to assume that large contributors, after realizing they will get no deductions on the first 5 percent and that they also face a new capital gains tax on appreciated securities at the time of gift or death, will become more conservative in their giving.

There are those who argue that these provisos would affect only the wealthy. That is true to a large extent. But large contributions have been the bulwark of most fundraising campaigns. Harvard obtained about $82.5 million in its "Program for Harvard College." There were 27,000 contributions but of that number 712 produced close to $70 million.

Institutions and charities dependent upon contributions from private sources should properly raise an outcry against the administration's tax proposals. Their fiscal stability hinges on defeat of the measure.

PRESIDENT'S 1963 TAX MESSAGE

(Testimony of John S. Hayes, president, United Community Funds & Councils of America, March 7, 1963, before Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.)

My name is John S. Hayes. I am volunteer president of United Community Funds & Councils of America, the national association of local united funds, community chests, and community welfare councils. Annually these organization's secure about $520 million from 31 million contributors for 35,000 health, welfare, recreation and youth services, including the Red Cross, Boy Scouts, Salvation Army, YMCA, hospitals, day care centers, homes for the aged, Catholic charities, services for the retarded, health research organizations and many others. The total expenditures of these organizations are on the order of $1,600 million a year.

Our movement has had 50 years of experience with large and small givers. In communities served by united funds and community chests almost every family is represented by one or more contributors. Our organization believes, therefore, that it is qualified to express an informed opinion about the tax proposals under consideration as they relate to charitable contributions.

United Community Funds & Councils of America would like to associate itself with the testimony of the National Social Welfare Assembly which you have heard. At the same time it believes that, because of its position as the primary source of contribution support for voluntary health, welfare and recreation services in this country, it should record its own views on the proposal to change the method of treating contribution deductions for income tax purposes.

There is much in the President's message relating to charitable contributions which we applaud; the proposal to apply uniformly a ceiling of 30 percent on charitable deductions to all types of eligible organizations, for example. We cannot, however, approve the suggestions that contributions be lumped with other types of deductible expenses and along with them be subject to a floor equal to 5 percent of adjusted gross income.

It is impossible for anyone to say with certitude what the net financial impact of all the administration's tax proposals on charitable organizations will be. Our organization has tried conscientiously to analyze and evaluate the various claims, estimates, and statistical projections which have been offered but the factors which influence giving are highly complex. Tax deductibility is much more significant for some contributors than for others and under some circumstances than under others. Our leaders believe that the psychological impact of the 5 percent floor on many givers of strategic importance to charitable organizations will, at best, be to offset any beneficial effects of lower tax rates and, at worst, to discourage charitable giving and generosity. It is our considered judgment that it will make the financing of charitable organizations more difficult. This would result in less service to children and old folks, less character building activity for youth, less health care and research.

But financial considerations are of even less moment than our concern over the fact that for the first time in the history of the income tax, a backward step in the matter of contribution deductibility has been proposed. When contribution deductibility was first enacted in 1917, it applied to individuals only and carried a ceiling of 15 percent. In 1935 contribution deductibility was extended to corporations. Later the ceiling on individual deductions was raised to 20 percent and more recently to 30 percent for certain types of organizations. Throughout this entire period the expressed objective was to encourage and assist voluntary citizen activity in the fields of religion, education, charity, health, and culture; and the movement has been toward more rather than less encouragement. Never before has a floor been considered which would result in the first portion of a charitable gift being nondeductible.

There are two basic reasons for our concern:

1. Financial considerations appear to have been permitted to obscure the social purpose for which the charitable deduction exists. Among all deductibles it has unique characteristics. It is the only one which is a discretionary expenditure. No one needs to make a charitable contribution. It is essentially an unselfish act. To one degree or another all the other deductible expenditures are mandatory or personal interest expenses. The unique characteristics of charitable contributions and the community benefits they produce entitle them to different tax treatment from any other kind of expenditure.

2. The failure to realize fully that contribution deductibility is an ingenious device by which the Federal Government encourages the American pluralistic approach to meeting social needs within the limits imposed by the Constitution of the United States. Many services dependent on contributions are of such character that they could neither be operated by Government nor subsidized by the State in any other manner than through contribution deductibility because of constitutional limitations.

Exemption from local real estate and local and State sales taxes are of great importance to charitable organizations. But, except for the contribution deductibility which it confers, Federal tax exemption is almost meaningless because charitable organizations do not have taxable income. Contribution deductibility, then, is one of the few practical means by which the Federal Government can encourage voluntary citizen activity for community betterment.

We believe it is vital to the future of voluntary charitable activity that contribution deductibility be disassociated from any other type of deductible item and that nothing be done to it that would impair its effectiveness as a stimulus to giving and generosity.

We appreciate your kind attention to our views. Thank you.

Job Trends Demand Respect for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, changing times indicate that individual members in our society must emphasize education if they and their communities are going to adjust to future labor needs. The following editorial is from the Quincy Herald Whig:

OCCUPATIONAL CHANGES

Studies based on the 1960 U.S. census revealed that for the first time white-collar workers outnumbered blue-collar workers in the United States. A new study by the Bureau of the Census further spells out shifts in U.S. employment, and provides further warning that education will be more important than ever in the years ahead.

Perhaps no decade previously had shown such a drastic shift in the Nation's employment as the 1950–60 period, which was one of unusual economic growth and scientific and technological development.

The 1960 census was the first which showed the white-collar workers was No. 1 in employment, although the trend had become obvious before verification by the census. But the study of employment trends revealed by the 1960 census has shown other changes, too.

Changes in the principal occupational classifications of the experienced labor force showed the white collar group as a whole finally dominant because it gained an overall 28 percent, while blue collar employment increased only 8 percent, with the entire national work force gaining only 15 percent. But in the white collar group the biggest gains for the decade were in professional ranks. The professional group gained a whopping 47 percent, boosted especially by growth in the ranks of teachers, engineers, and technicians in the science field.

Next to professional ranks, the clerical group gained most, 35 percent. Sales occupations gained 19 percent, and managers 8 percent. Service employment gained 26 percent, lower only than professional and clerical ranks in the white collar group. Craftsmen increased by only 13 percent, and operatives by 9 percent. Laborers decreased by 6 percent. Farming showed the big decrease, a loss of 40 percent, reflecting mechanization of farming.

Another development noted was the continued acceleration of women joining the

working population. This has been going on for a generation, but accelerated in the 1950-60 decade. The civilian labor force during that period increased by some 8¾ million, and two-thirds of that number were women. Primarily white collar and service workers, women now comprise fully a third of the total working force of the Nation.

How drastic was the overall change can be seen by the fact that when the 1960 census was taken white collar workers numbered 27¼ million, which was more than 1½ million more than the number of blue collar workers, whereas 10 years earlier blue collar workers outnumbered white collar workers by 2½ million. The gap undoubtedly has widened more in the last 2 years. Even more startling is the fact that 1960 showed only 4 million in farm occupations, compared with 7 million in 1950.

Some of the greatest growths in specialized occupations noted were in quite specialized fields. Thus there were 19,300 economists tabulated in 1960, against 8,900 in 1950. There were 14,000 physicists against only 7,500 in 1950, and 12,100 psychologists against 4,900 in 1950.

There would seem to be reason to believe that the present decade may show occupational changes almost as startling when returns are in for the 1970 census. Education is obviously the answer for the young person who is to meet such a challenge.

Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was my great pleasure to accompany Van Johnson, of St. James, Minn., to the Boy Scout report to the Nation breakfast here in Washington. Van, an outstanding young man who lives in my district, was one of only 12 Boy Scouts chosen from a total Scouting membership of 3,909,485 to give a national report, and his is worth the attention of my colleagues. I include it in today's RECORD under unanimous consent:

Scouting has done a lot to help me and millions of other boys to keep physically fit. All sorts of opportunities are provided in Cub Scouting, Boy Scouting, and Exploring to achieve physical health and strength through participation in outdoor sports, hiking, cycling, camping, swimming, woodchopping, swim a mile, climb a rope, scale a wall, and many other activities that are a part of Scouting.

One of my most rugged experiences in Scouting was the trip I took with members of my troop when we achieved the 50 Miles Award. This award is given to each individual of a Scout troop or Explorer unit who successfully covers a wilderness foot trail, or canoe trip, or boat route of not less than 50 consecutive miles, over a minimum of 5 days without the aid of motors.

Our trip was an exciting canoe trip through the rugged wilderness of Superior National Forest and Quetico Provincial of Canada. The 12 members of our crew, with a guide and an adviser, set out from the Charles L. Sommers Region 10 Wilderness Canoe Base, carrying all necessary food and equipment for 10 days on the trail. Independent of all outside help, we set out to meet in this truly rugged high adventure the challenge set by our predecessors, the colorful French voyageurs.

I wish every boy in America could have the opportunity I am enjoying in Scouting "to keep myself physically strong as well as mentally awake and morally straight."

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a "great day for the Irish." The annual celebration of St. Patrick's Day once again found the "wearin' of the green" an appropriate costume in all parts of this great land of ours.

Observing national days is a proud part of our heritage as a free and independent people. It calls attention to the source of much of our strength as a Nation—that we have combined the rich traditions of our foreign ancestries into a unified and dynamic society.

St. Patrick's Day and other observances also serve to remind us of some unfinished business. We still have a job to do in assuring equal protection under the law to all our citizens, irrespective of their race, creed, color, or national origin.

The task that lies ahead is a challenge to all of us, both in public and private life. I found this challenge eloquently stated in an editorial published by two of the weekly newspapers that are circulated in my congressional district, the South-East Weekly Journal and the Henrietta Weekly Journal. I commend this editorial by a distinguished journalist, Mrs. Marian T. Deuel, to the reading of my colleagues:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

St. Patrick's Day calls for much fun and celebration nowadays, but in earlier days, much blood was let in certain sections of our country as well as abroad. For generations the orange men and those who wore green, fought both secretly and in public—and even when we were in school, woe betide anyone who wore a bit of orange ribbon, even.

Our country has seen mass protests against different groups in each succeeding generation and so it is nothing new for another minority group (as they like to be designated for publicity reasons), to demand the attention of everyone who will listen. And why we allow ourselves to take it all so seriously and to disrupt our lives so, is really a question.

As we have said, this has been going on for years—during the past 50 or 60 years especially, and if one will only read back a bit, it can be seen that we have had those who fought the English, the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, the refugees from lower countries of Europe, the women, the Jews, and now, the Negroes feel they are personally and as a group being persecuted.

After a certain amount of strife, each group which has proven its worth, has peacefully settled into the tapestry which comprises the pattern of America, and people no longer set any of these groups aside as being any different than another. And, given a chance to show their true worth, this will be true of the Negro if he earns it.

To say that because a person was born into a certain strata of society and so is doomed for life is not and should not be so. But it may well mean that he has to work a little harder and be a bit more patient, to win his point.

Our own city is populated by men and women who have done this and they are what we term "good citizens" for they live beyond the man-made barriers of birth, race, creed, hatred, jealousy, greed, and the hundreds of cancer-like barriers to their progress.

Thus in our fair city, we must be cool-headed and we must learn that, while on one side, a man must have fair treatment, yet he also must earn the right to that fair treatment. He must so conduct his ways, be he white, yellow, black, that he earns the respect, admiration and love of his fellow man. No one can command these; they must be earned. And actually most of us really feel far more comfortable when we can respect all men and women with whom we come in contact.

So, amidst the jovial St. Patrick's festivities, let us learn a lesson from the strifes and strains of history.

This present-day trouble will also pass if we will be patient and understanding. If those who now strain and try to push their way too fast will only understand that others too, have their rights. They must also understand that laws were made for their protection as well as others, and must be respected for the welfare of all.

These Are the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest editorial voices in eastern Oregon is that of J. W. Forrester, Jr., editor of the Eastern Oregonian. Mr. Forrester's paper is well known for its fair and objective reporting; Mr. Forrester himself is noted for his keen understanding of western problems.

On March 7 the Eastern Oregonian carried an editorial dealing with the pending wheat referendum, which I recommend to Members as an excellent explanation of issues involved in the referendum:

THESE ARE THE FACTS

Eastern Oregon wheatgrowers have been promoting a two-price plan for the production and marketing of wheat for many years. At last it is within their grasp. In a referendum this year the Nation's wheatgrowers will have the opportunity to vote in the two-price plan.

The two-price, or certificate program as it also is known, has been endorsed by all nationally recognized general farm organizations, with the exception of one. The American Farm Bureau Federation opposes it.

As readers of this newspaper know, it has been a supporter of the two-price plan for many years. The Oregon Wheat Growers League was a pioneer supporter of the plan. Some of the most able exponents of the plan have been Umatilla and Morrow County wheatgrowers.

If wheatgrowers understand clearly what they are voting on at the referendum of this

year—what they will get if they approve or reject the two-price plan—we are confident that they will approve it. The program will go into operation only if two-thirds of the growers who participate in the referendum vote for it. This means that those farm organizations that support the plan must make an all-out effort to get the facts to their wheatgrower members.

This newspaper hopes to adequately perform the function of getting all available information to wheatgrowers of this area. It is more important, we think, that the newspaper do that than endorsing or rejecting the program. We trust that after the referendum no wheatgrower who reads this newspaper will say that he didn't know what he was voting on.

We shall begin this process of disseminating information by setting down a summary of facts compiled by the National Grange. Here it is:

With a favorable vote each grower will receive certificates covering about 80 percent of the normal production of his alloted acres. Wheat covered by certificates will be supported at $2 per bushel (national average) noncertificated wheat from alloted acres will be supported at $1.30 per bushel.

With an unfavorable vote acreage allotments will still be in effect and all wheat grown on allotted acres would be supported at 50 percent of parity or about $1.22 per bushel. There would be no price supports for growers exceeding their allotment.

With a favorable vote each grower's 1954 allotment will be 10-percent reduction. This payment will be determined by multiplying normal yield by 30 percent of the support level. (Example: assuming a 1963 allotment of 100 acres with a normal yield of 26 bushels, the payment would be 30 percent times $2 times 26 bushels times 10 acres or $150.)

With an unfavorable vote there would be no diversion payment. With a favorable vote a grower may divert up to an additional 20 percent of his allotment. (In addition to the 10 percent already mentioned) payment on these additionally diverted acres will be determined by multiplying the number of acres so diverted by 50 percent of the support level. (Example: with a 25-bushel normal yield and an additional 18 acres diverted, this payment would be 50 percent times $2 times 25 bushels times 18 acres—or $450.)

With an unfavorable vote there would be no diversion payments.

With a favorable vote Government-owned stocks of wheat will be reduced by about 150 million bushels per year. It is estimated that within 4 years the surplus would be down to 600 million bushels—the amount recognized as desirable as a "safe or strategic" reserve. Once this level is reached the number of certificates issued will be increased.

With an unfavorable vote wheat production would increase; Government-owned stocks, acquired at taxpayer expense, would continue to mount. Grange studies clearly indicate that (a) wheat acreage would increase to at least 65 million acres, (b) production would rise to about 1,800 million bushels, (c) the market price of wheat will drop to $1 per bushel and, (d) the surplus will continue to grow by about 600 million bushels annually.

A favorable vote will greatly strengthen the U.S. position in international trade; negotiations can be continued without uncertainties created by unstable U.S. wheat prices.

An unfavorable vote will create serious international problems. U.S. wheat prices would, for the first time drop below the world market price—lower than the minimum called for by the International Wheat Agreement. Repercussions would be felt throughout the world. Fulfillment of trade commitments already made by United States would become increasingly difficult; it would point toward an expansion of the role of Government in the international wheat market.

With a favorable vote the certificate program will provide a total producer income of about $2,300 million.

With an unfavorable vote producer income would drop to around $1,600 million—a loss of $700 million despite an estimated harvest of 60 million acres. Bringing this to an individual farm level, it means that a farm which could produce an income of $2,300 under the certificate program would gross about $1,600 under the only other program offered in the referendum—a loss of $700 for the individual grower involved and to the economy of his community.

High Time for a Hard Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, America is known for a proud tradition of liberty, justice, opportunity, and idealism, but Americans can neglect ideals and traditions. Indifference is the disease of a decaying civilization. The following outstanding editorial is from the Jacksonville Journal Courier, Jacksonville, Ill.:

HIGH TIME FOR HARD LOOK AT OURSELVES

Some observers of American life say we spend too much time in stock talking and are too self-critical.

Certainly we all talk a lot. But mixed in with the criticism is plenty of shouting about the greatness of America. If the balance seems wrong, it could be that our pro-Americanism dwells less on our virtues than on the dangers and weaknesses of our enemies.

Even with all our self-scrutiny, it is not clear that we do a very good job of taking stock.

We know we have some bad flaws. Crime and corruption are rampant; we turn out too much careless, shoddy work; we have let our big cities fall, generally, into a curious crumbling chaos; we bury some of our knottiest problems—like education, health, and unemployment—in a great avalanche of words.

Yet, while we acknowledge these as shortcomings, we do not consistently exhibit the kind of concern that leads to effective action. We have made the lack of caring almost a way of life. We have made the excusing of failure nearly a science.

In the matter of crime, for example, we can't get sufficiently aroused to halt the flow of deadly weapons into the hands of brutalized or emotionally disturbed persons—especially juveniles.

Often we call car stealing "borrowing" instead of what it is. In slums and fashionable suburbs alike, we concoct a staggering array of excuses to justify not punishing transgressors. But a criminal law without penalties might as well invite its own violation.

Some suggest that American life today is increasingly like a great glacier, whose sheer size and weight forces a human conformity that deadens initiative, robs us of heroes and the example of high performance they can give us all.

Too many Americans in their public aspect lack dignity and a sense of responsibility of the sort befitting a proud people.

They park their cars badly, depriving others of space. They do not even accommodate graciously to the presence of other persons, but instead block stairs and doorways, monopolize a sidewalk, noisily dominate a room shared by many.

Clerks at magazine stands, in book and record stores shudder at the daily descent of some members of the public, for they leave behind them a clutter of rumpled magazines, crinkled book pages, and scuffed records. They use but do not buy.

One could fill a book with the horror tales of work badly done, whether it be original, repair or maintenance effort.

The "excusers" say it was always like this, that things only seem worse now because the absolute numbers involved are greater.

Some parts of history tend to support this notion. But history also shows that nations and civilizations do slip badly and sometimes fatally.

Are our shortcomings normal or are they marks of decline? There's a problem the critical stocktakers have hardly touched.

The Puritan Ethic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial of the February 18 St. Louis Globe-Democrat deals with the subject of "Economics and the Puritan Ethic." The traditional concepts of economics, which the President and his advisers have rejected, are not disproven by the Kennedy-Heller thesis; rather this position gives one more challenge to the private enterprise system to show that it means the best life and greatest progress for our country. I am placing the editorial of the Globe-Democrat in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to further express support for the puritan ethic for economy:

ECONOMICS AND THE PURITAN ETHIC

The President said at his latest press conference he fears another business recession more than the $11,900 million deficit forecast in his new budget. Can Mr. Kennedy have capitulated to the Keynes corollary that the best way to scale out of any economic problem is on a Federal debt pyramid?

Apparently the President is not bothered over the Puritan ethic blamed by his top economic adviser, Dr. Walter W. Heller, for the dour public reception given the administration's big-spend, big-deficit program.

The administration expects the tax-cut program sent to Congress would in a year or two resuscitate the economy so effectively, deficits would be wiped out. F.D.R. made similar predictions for his deficit operations; they fell flat.

The tax relief schedule recommended by the New Frontier is such that most economists outside Government believe it would do little or nothing for the economy.

No one looks on the possibility of another recession with equanimity. The President is sincere certainly in wishing to avoid one. He campaigned to get the Nation's industry and business on the move. An economic setback next year would be awkward so shortly before the national election campaign.

But the tools offered by Mr. Kennedy to "rev" up the wheels of American industry are not likely to give the country's economy ma-

terial impetus. The President does not seem to understand what makes the Nation's economy tick, what it needs to lever it out of a comfortable lethargy.

The tax reduction he has urged in Congress would ease burdens somewhat on the lower income brackets. That will be widely welcome. But it is far more a vote lure than an economic stimulant.

The middle and upper income taxpayers would get meager relief indeed. Business itself would have to pay more taxes next year than now, to get mild relief later.

Yet it is business, industry where jobs are created. It is in the middle and upper brackets that funds are raised for capital investment.

Further stifling the whole program is the administration's determination to ladle out more billions—deficit billions—for schemes such as aid to education, medicare, large urban programs, more agriculture subsidies.

Tax cuts, accompanied by increased, lavish Federal spending, make little sense when we already are paying some $10 billion annually just for interest on the national debt.

The "Puritan ethic" Dr. Heller so casually derided is a simple economic fact of life. The American people have to pay their way or go bankrupt. There is no realistic purpose in believing Government is any different. The New Frontier may have abandoned this ethic. The Nation dare not.

The President has already intimated what he may do if Congress fails to adopt his red-ink blueprint and controversial tax plan. He has declared:

"I do not say that a measure for tax reduction and reform is the only way to achieve these (economic) goals. No doubt a massive increase in Federal spending could also create jobs and growth, but in today's setting, private consumers, employers, and investors should be given a full opportunity first."

These words are suggestively frightening, as if the administration threatens a takeover of the economy.

The Wall Street Journal refers to the present Government as looking at enterprise economy as though it were on trial for its life.

Massive spending by Government is false economy. Most of what Government does is nonproductive. It adds little or nothing to the economy. This is a dangerous pitch to woo prosperity, which has always come in our history from private industry, confident investment—a free economy.

Indianapolis Cleans Up Its Slums on Its Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, slum clearance can be accomplished and urban renewal brought about without Federal aid as shown by Indianapolis, Ind., where 42 acres of slums have been replaced through local and private capital. Indianapolis, like my own city of Dallas, Tex., is leading the way in showing other American cities what can be done through local initiative and without the dictation of Federal bureaucrats. If other American communities will follow this lead we can begin to make real headway in cutting Federal spending, balancing the budget, paying off the debt, and lowering taxes so that all our people will have more of their own money to spend in their own community for whatever purposes they, as free men, decide is best for them.

The following article from the March 22, 1963 issue of the World, tells the Indianapolis story:

INDIANAPOLIS: URBAN RENEWAL ON ITS OWN—42 ACRES OF SLUMS REPLACED BY LOCAL AND PRIVATE CAPITAL

On May 1 Indianapolis will open America's model of private urban renewal: A downtown housing project built without a single Federal dollar.

Its construction in 1 year has prompted the architect to claim the project as "the fastest moving urban renewal project in the country. We broke ground the day the contract signed," he says.

A spokesman for the architect, Pick & Will, cites two basic reasons for the speed and efficiency of the construction: Lack of Federal redtape; financial involvement of the architect.

Not only is there no National Government redtape to entwine the developers, but the local authority—the Redevelopment Commission of Indianapolis—steps out of the picture once the contract has been signed.

Pick & Will owns a financial interest in the Riley Center Corp., which is developing the project, and the Chicago architects have a vested interest in the development.

NO FEDERAL MEDDLING

The absence of Federal subsidies, and therefore lack of structural demands, enabled Indianapolis to select what it considered the best plan for the job.

Thus, the Hoosier capital chose the Pick & Will design despite the fact that the firm was the middle bidder. The city bypassed the highest bidder so it could pick the plan it thought would "do the most for the community."

Pick & Will not only claims that it has built the housing project (called the James Whitcomb Riley Center, in honor of the famed Hoosier poet), faster than any Federal project, but the Chicago firm also contends that its buildings are better looking.

The project is being built for middle- and high-income residents. Rents will range between $100 and $300 a month. Some of the persons evicted when the area was cleared will return to the new apartment buildings, according to Pick & Will.

The 3 buildings that will open on May 1 will have 504 apartments. A second phase will add another 1,000 apartments and a third stage will bring the total to more than 2,000.

THIRTY-STORY BUILDING

The first phase includes 2 "crown tower" buildings 30 stories high and 1 "twin tower" structure 17 stories tall. Unlike the blocklike blobs thrown up in many Federal urban renewal programs, the Riley Center's buildings will rise majestically above the Indianapolis skyline.

"We won't be replacing slums with slums," says the Pick & Will spokesman, referring to structures built by the Federal Government to replace blighted areas and slums.

The Riley Center is replacing 42 acres of slum structures, chiefly roominghouses and old commercial buildings, in downtown Indianapolis with a housing area that will include a restaurant, shops and service facilities, underground parking, and a recreation section that will feature a reflecting pool, which will be frozen during winter and used as a skating pond.

The city bought the 42 acres and sold the property to the Riley Center Corp.

The Riley Center is the eighth self-help project undertaken by Indianapolis under the sole financing of the local government and private capital.

The city's first project was in the Flanner House area. Under this program, Negro homeowners traded 20 hours of work on the project for equity in a home. More than 180 single-family residences have been built since 1958 and the project is still growing.

SELF-HELP PLAN

How did Indianapolis put its self-help plan into motion?

The city asked for and received from the State special legislation which permits the Redevelopment Commission of Indianapolis (made up of five nonpaid civic and business leaders) to borrow money to finance both the clearance of slums and the preparation of land for redevelopment.

For purposes of repayment, the entire city was made a special taxing district and the local government was authorized to levy on that district enough taxes to retire the amount of indebtedness maturing each year.

Initially, the Indianapolis procedure involved more outgo than income. Only one project was completed at a profit. However, increased tax revenues from completed projects have now brought total urban renewal expenditures close to the break-even point.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the world at large and the ranks of the clergymen in particular, suffered a grievous loss last week in the death of Bishop G. Bromley Oxman, retired bishop of the Washington area of the Methodist Church. Under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles from the Washington Post of March 15, 1963, one an editorial and the other an obituary by Kenneth Dole, the newspaper's religion editor. Both pieces speak clearly for the applied Christianity of Bishop Oxnam.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

G. BROMLEY OXNAM

The extraordinary drive, energy, leadership and capacity for organization with which G. Bromley Oxnam was endowed would surely have made him eminent in any field of activity. In college, he was at once an outstanding athlete and a Phi Beta Kappa scholar. He chose the church as a commitment when he was very young, was ordained a Methodist minister at 25, served as a professor of theology and later as president of DePauw University and became at 44 the youngest bishop in Methodism's history. He was bishop successively in the Omaha, Boston, New York and Washington areas.

Throughout his career, Bishop Oxnam was known as a liberal clergyman. This is to say, he believed in religious toleration, freedom of expression and social reform. Ardently interested in the theater and in pictorial art, he was opposed to censorship and committed to the concept of individual liberty; he was critical of all attempts to compel conformity and of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in particular.

For these heresies, the HUAC compiled a dossier on him, and one of its members, Rep-

resentative Donald Jackson, denounced him on the floor of the House of Representatives, declaring, with characteristic taste and discretion, "Bishop Oxnam has been to the Communist front what Man O' War was to thoroughbred racing."

The bishop demanded a hearing by the committee and in a long, dramatic session which lasted all day and far into the night, made a point-by-point refutation of every item in the file and gave the committee a lesson in elementary Americanism. That hearing took place just 10 years ago and constituted, in a sense, the culmination of Bishop Oxnam's career. He served, on that occasion, as an eloquent witness to the Christian ideals of which his whole life was an exemplar.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

BISHOP OXNAM DEAD—CHAMPION OF LIBERALISM

(By Kenneth Dole)

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam retired Bishop of the Washington area of the Methodist Church and one of the Nation's outstanding religious leaders, died late Tuesday at the Burke Rehabilitation Foundation in White Plains, N.Y.

He had gone there to recover from an operation for Parkinson's disease. He was 71.

Bishop Oxnam, for many years a prominent figure in the religious world, having served as president of the Federal (now National) Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, became a household name after his appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1953.

He had been asked to answer charges, not only against him but against the body of liberal clergymen, of Communist sympathy suggested by membership in Communist-front organizations.

TESTIFIED 10 HOURS

For 10 hours on a sweltering July day, the bishop answered the committee's questions and made it plain that he and the other liberals had no truck with communism. "I am fundamentally opposed to the whole Communist movement," he declared.

On another day, he would say that the hope of the world is "love operating in freedom." Christianity, he said, "holds that love is the force that unites men." As a religion of love, Christianity needs freedom, he said. "It's under the condition of freedom that Christianity and the church have their greatest opportunity."

Under the committee's questioning, that covered periods going as far back as into the 1920's the bishop conceded that he had been associated at times with organizations later cited as being Communist controlled or inspired. But he made it clear that whenever he detected an indication of Communist influence, he got out.

CLEARED BY PROBERS

The hearing ended, after midnight, in a triumph; for the Committee unanimously voted "that the records of this Commitee show that this Committee has no record of any Communist Party membership or affiliation of Bishop Oxnam."

During his Washington bishopric, from 1952 to 1960, Bishop and Mrs. Oxnam called upon all the 1,700 ministers in the Washington area; he served a period as president of the Methodist Council of Bishops, and he led in the development of Methodist institutions here.

Through his encouragement, support and prompting, American University made a great advance toward his vision of it as "a great Protestant institution in the Nation's Capital." The American University established its School of International Service, and Sibley Hospital moved into a new building near the university to provide a nucleus for a medical center.

MOVED SEMINARY HERE

Dear to his heart was Westminster, Md., Theological Seminary, which he influenced, as chairman of the board of trustees, to move to Washington and create its present handsome campus at the northeast corner of American University. Its chapel, well known to Washingtonians for the figure of Christ on the Massachusetts avenue wall, was named after him.

The Bishop was one of the founders and a vice president of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

The son of a mining engineer, he was born at Sonora, Calif., and studied at the University of Southern California, Boston University, and Harvard. In college he played tennis in addition to football and won a Phi Beta Kappa key. He was ordained in 1916.

After a notable 10-year pastorate at the Church of All Nations, Los Angeles, he became professor of practical theology at Boston University, then president of DePaw University, Greencastle, Ind. In 1936 he was elected bishop of the Omaha area; in 1939, of the Boston area; in 1944, of the New York area; and in 1952, the Washington area.

LAUDED BY COLLEAGUE

He was succeeded here, in 1960, by Bishop John Wesley Lord, who said yesterday that "the whole religious community, both national and worldwide, has suffered an irreparable loss." Bishop Lord added that "it would be hard to name a great social movement within the Methodist Church during the years of his effective ministry that did not bear the imprint of his dynamic personality."

"Bishop Oxnam," said Bishop Lord, "was recognized by friends and foe alike as one of the 'summit souls' with whom God on occasion blesses mankind."

Besides his wife, the former Ruth Fisher, Bishop Oxnam leaves two sons, Robert F. Oxnam, president of Drew University, Madison, N.J., and Philip H. Oxnam, of Kenwood, N.Y.; a daughter, Mrs. Robert McCormack, of Scarsdale, where the Bishop and Mrs. Oxnam had lived the last 3 years, and eight grandchildren.

There will be a service for his immediate family today, and a memorial service later. Following cremation, his ashes will be buried at Mount Auburn Cemetery, Cambridge, Mass.

Meaningful Suggestions for Action Against Cuba Short of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reject the idea advanced by high administration officials that the only choice is to do nothing in regard to Cuba or to go to war. I believe there are a number of effective and positive alternatives. I believe further that the vast majority of Americans support these alternatives, because they know that regardless of whether there are "defensive" or "offensive" jet fighters and missiles in Cuba, it is a base for exporting of communism into the other American countries.

We cannot simply let the situation drift; all reports from our own Government and other American governments clearly show that Cuba is being used as a vast training ground for Communist agents. We need only to read the report by the Organization of American States, entitled "Subversion in the Western Hemisphere" to learn what is taking place. This report says hundreds of Latin American youths have attended Cuban training centers where they have received instructions not only in Marxist-Leninist theory, "but also in propaganda techniques, the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and so on."

There is danger from Cuba right now to the Governments and peoples of Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Guatemala, and other nations. The leaders of the other American countries are far ahead of our own in seeking action against Castro. We simply cannot afford to wait until Castro's henchmen and their Kremlin-oriented brothers in arms have established themselves in Central or South America before we act.

I suggest that the following steps be given serious consideration. They are not especially original with me or with my party; they come from the Nation's responsible press, from the people, and from our friends in South and Central America who are looking and waiting for action.

Many of the following suggestions are related to the serious economic situation in Cuba and would frankly be intended to increase unrest by the people there due to the continued shortages of basic goods.

First. Close the Panama Canal to any ship trading with Cuba.

Second. Close all U.S. ports to any ship trading with Cuba.

Third. Use the pressure of cutting off foreign aid to countries whose ships trade with Cuba.

Fourth. Encourage concerted action through the Organization of American States to cut off all trade with Cuba in this hemisphere.

Fifth. Encourage OAS nations to act against Communist propaganda as recommended in the OAS report.

Sixth. Demand onsite inspection of missile sites and storage areas, the sixth of President Kennedy's requirements in his October 22, 1962, speech.

Seventh. Demand fair compensation for American property seized by Castro.

Eighth. Seize all Cuban assets in this country.

Ninth. Notify Castro that we will not permit any expansion of his form of dictatorship in this hemisphere.

Tenth. Furnish arms and training to Cubans in this country and other countries so they can aid other hemisphere governments in rejecting armed force used by Castro-trained guerrillas.

Eleventh. Recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile.

Twelfth. Demand that Russian troops leave Cuba.

Thirteenth. Reinstate the blockade or quarantine of Cuba.

The last two points are strongly supported by the American people, accord-

ing to pollster Samuel Lubell, writing in the Washington Star earlier this month. Points seven, eight, and nine were suggested by the President himself during the 1960 campaign.

Other suggestions could no doubt be added to this list, for there are many ways available to put pressure on a nation when it is desired to do so. But, to repeat, it is time to do something.

President Kennedy has pledged to act when the Communist revolution is exported from Cuba to the rest of the hemisphere. Is not the time for action now?

Two Federal Employees, James F. Deane and Jerome V. Bugnacki, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, too often the valuable service rendered to our citizens by Federal employees goes unnoticed and unappreciated.

Last week, at the 11th annual awards luncheon sponsored by the Federal Business Association of Detroit, two men who have made outstanding contributions to their agencies and the general public were honored.

Named Outstanding Federal Administrator was Mr. James F. Deane. Federal Employee of the Year was Mr. Jerome V. Bugnacki.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the valuable service rendered by these two gentlemen and to thank them for their energy, enthusiasm, and imagination in serving the public.

OUTSTANDING FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE YEAR 1962: JAMES F. DEANE

Mr. James F. Deane, assistant district director, Detroit District of the Internal Revenue Service, started his Government service in 1934 as an office deputy with the Internal Revenue Service, which clerical position carried a CAF-4 grade. Within a few years he received a number of promotions and served in many administrative positions. With the reorganization of the Service in 1952, and the creation of the present Internal Revenue Service districts, James F. Deane was appointed to the position of assistant district director, as second in command of the Detroit district which covers the entire State of Michigan, with 1,800 employees in 35 offices collecting approximately $7 billion of taxes each year.

During 1940, when the Federal Government was making preparations for war, the revisions in the tax laws made many people subject to tax who were previously exempt. The Internal Revenue Service underwent considerable change in its procedures; the number of employees increased rapidly. This trend has remained unchanged, with a major reorganization occurring in 1952. During this time James F. Deane was always under extreme pressure and was faced with seemingly insurmountable obstacles, coupled with an acute shortage of trained assistance. Although he consistently received "excellent" efficiency ratings, more remarkable, however, is the fact that these ratings were received during a priod when drastic changes were being made in the Internal Revenue Service. That he made the record which he did is ample proof of his flexibility, adaptability, ingenuity and overall ability.

A member of the Board of Directors of The Federal Business Association of Detroit for several years, being president of the Association during 1957; James F. Deane participated in the executive development program at Wayne University, and in May 1961 was named coordinator for the savings bond program for all-Federal agencies in the State of Michigan.

James F. Deane is active in church and civic affairs, is a member of Delta Sigma Pi Fraternity and graduated from the University of Detroit where he majored in accounting. Mr. Deane resides at 6361 Thorncrest Drive, Bloomfield Township, with his wife, Eleanore; their son, John Peter, is in the Jesuit Order.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 1962: JEROME V. BUGNACKI

Mr. Jerome V. Bugnacki, customs inspector, was born in July 1918 and lived in Milwaukee, Wis., until he was 17, when he joined the (CCC) Civilian Conservation Corps. Four years later he enlisted in the Regular Army and while stationed at Fort Wayne married a Detroit girl, Lorraine DuBois.

Rapid advances in grade soon promoted Mr. Bugnacki to the rank of 1st sergeant. As an instructor in the Fifth Ranger Battalion, he participated in the Normandy invasion and the Battle of the Bulge and was severely wounded when a hand grenade exploding nearby, cost him the sight of his left eye. His courage had earned him the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, a Presidential citation, and several medals and ribbons. Receiving an honorable discharge in March 1945, he returned to his home in Milwaukee for a short period prior to embarking on his new career in the Customs Service in May 1945.

While assigned as a customs inspector to the Detroit and Windsor Tunnel during 1959, Jerome Bugnacki uncovered the ring leaders of an organization that furnished undesirable aliens with documents to aid them in entering the United States. For his part in this case, Inspector Bugnacki received a Certificate of Commendation and a cash award from the Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, "for his extraordinary detection of aliens inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws." Again, while at the Ambassador Bridge, Inspector Bugnacki was successful in detecting a group of aliens who were working in the United States in violation of the immigration laws.

For the past year, Inspector Bugnacki has been assigned to the Ambassador Bridge Station where his capacity for producing quality work, for seeking work that must be done, and for the absorbing of details, has been observed by his supervisors. His personal efforts have contributed materially in establishing harmonious relations with those people who come into contact with customs and with his coworkers.

Although Inspector Bugnacki is very devoted to his work, and his performance is over and above that which is expected of him, he has been able to remain a real companion to his children, which relationship has evolved into a mutual admiration within his family. Jerome V. Bugnacki has six children, two sons and four daughters, all living at home, 2220 Calvin Street, Lincoln Park, Mich.

The Story of 10 Little Free Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Gulf States Utilities Co., an investor-owned electric utility company, has reprinted the following paraphrase of a well-known jingle. I am including it as a part of my remarks because it illustrates so clearly what can happen to the American people if we continue to allow the encroachment of the Federal Government into our lives, thus eroding our liberties.

These are the workers: Reddy Kilowatt, doctor, railroader, oil worker, steelworker, farmer, lawyer, grocer, salesclerk, reporter.

The article follows:

THE STORY OF 10 LITTLE FREE WORKERS

Ten little free workers in this country fine and fair.
But if you cherish your freedom—worker have a care.
Ten little free workers—Reddy was doing fine
Until the Socialist got him—then there were nine.

Nine little free workers laughed at Reddy's fate
Along came Federal medicine—then there were eight.

Eight little free workers thought this country heaven
But the government took over the railroads, then there were seven.

Seven little free workers—till the oil workers got in a fix
Uncle said oil's essential and took over, leaving six.

Six little free workers till the day did arrive
The steel mills too were federalized—then there were five.

Five little free workers—but the farmers are free no more
The farms have been collectivized—that leaves only four.

Four little free workers till the Government did decree
All must have free legal advice—then there were three.

Three little free workers—the number is getting few,
But with Government groceries selling food—then there were two.

Two little free workers—our story's almost done,
With clerks at work in Federal stores—that leaves only one.

One little free worker—the reporter son-of-a-gun
Mustn't criticize Government—so now there are none.

Ten little free workers—but they are no longer free
They work when and where ordered, and at a fixed rate you see,
And it all could have been prevented if they'd only seen fit to agree
And work together instead of saying "it never can happen to me."

How One City Solved Its Downtown Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Pomona Mall, which is located at Pomona, Calif., in the congressional district I am honored to represent, has generated widespread national interest.

Many publications across the country have carried stories about the mall. A recent article on it is in the U.S. News & World Report which carried the Pomona story in its March 11, 1963, issue.

The Pomona Mall is a unique shopping area created and carried through by private initiative and resources. It has done wonders in rejuvenating Pomona's downtown shopping area.

I believe the Members of the House will be interested in reading the U.S. News & World Report account on Pomona. Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

HOW ONE CITY SOLVED ITS DOWNTOWN PROBLEMS

POMONA, CALIF.—Rebirth of a downtown shopping area here in southern California is getting the close attention of community leaders across the country.

Just a few years ago, the central business district of Pomona was a picture of neglect, apparently on the verge of extinction.

Businesses and banks were moving to suburban shopping centers. Those that remained had a dilapidated look. Shoppers were few, and sales kept falling. Many stores were abandoned, empty.

"It was," says one merchant, "like teeth missing from a smile."

Today, the downtown heart of this city of 75,000 people is beating regularly. Business is good and getting better. A new feeling of prosperity is evident.

Businesses that moved away are coming back. New stores and offices are opening up. Buildings that had been run down have been spruced up.

New private and public buildings are under construction or planned, including a $2.5 million headquarters of a savings and loan association, a civic auditorium and museum, and buildings of State and Federal courts.

KEY: A PEDESTRIAN MALL

At the center of all this activity is a pedestrian mall that stretches for nine blocks through the central business district.

Automobile traffic is not permitted along the mall. It is planted with shrubs and flowers. There are shaded benches and fountains where shoppers can pause.

Ample parking for thousands of cars is available a few hundred feet from the mall. Most of the parking spaces are free. In others, a small charge is redeemable with a purchase or use of a service.

Once again, as in years past before the impact of the automobile age, shopping downtown is a social event. Children romp on the mall while their parents visit the stores. Older residents of the Pomona area pause to chat and renew acquaintances.

In nearly 5 months that the mall has been open, downtown merchants have reported sales increases of up to 30 percent. Property values are up.

"The mall acts as a vacuum cleaner," says Pomona's Mayor James Baker. "It pulls the people in."

A leading department store that estimated sales losses of $4 million to out-of-town competitors in the year before the mall was opened now finds its customers coming back.

"Last year I did a lot of my shopping in Pasadena," said one woman. "This year I'm doing all of it in Pomona."

Is the mall just a novelty—the downtown business boom only a temporary upturn? Most community leaders believe not. A few skeptics say that it will take a year or more to decide.

THE POMONA STORY

The decline of Pomona's business district is a familiar story to many cities—large and small. It set in after World War II, with the gradual strangulation of downtown by a huge increase in auto and truck traffic.

Growth of the suburbs in the wake of a population boom in southern California speeded up the process. One-stop shopping centers—modern and shining, with plenty of free parking space—began to spring up on the city's outskirts.

"We spent five times as much to accommodate outlying shopping centers in the last 10 years as on downtown in the last 25 years," said Mayor Baker.

Also, as elsewhere, inertia, procrastination, lack of planning, and absentee ownership of property contributed to the neglect of downtown, he added.

Rebirth for Pomona began as far back as 1950, when a street improvement plan was put into effect. This provided for three underpasses beneath a railroad that parallels Second Street—the street now closed by the mall.

PARKING: NO PROBLEM NOW

Next, an attack was made on the parking problem. In recent years, 18 lots with about 2,000 parking spaces have been developed by private interests.

At the same time, many stores began building attractive rear entrances that opened directly on the parking lots.

"This puts the automobile where it belongs," says Mayor Baker, "in the municipal back door, not in the parlor."

The pedestrian mall recently completed is the final step in getting autos "out of the parlor." Along its nine-block length there are three crossings, controlled by traffic lights. This permits access by emergency vehicles.

Cost of building the mall was assumed by the property owners who benefited from it, under a special act of the State legislature. Only one property owner opposed the project. The entire cost, including relocation of sewers, lights, and utilities, was $621,000.

Groundbreaking for the mall was the occasion for a civic celebration. The construction period was used by downtown merchants as a sales-promotion attraction. Residents of the area were encouraged to visit downtown to watch the mall's development.

When the mall was dedicated in October, an evening square dance was attended by 75,000 people.

INSTANT ACCEPTANCE

The impact of the mall was immediate and not limited alone to merchandising. A large savings and loan association made its first investment in the valley area in more than 5 years. One property owner, who had been trying to find a buyer for 3 years, got his asking price. An automobile-supply chain which had abandoned its downtown store moved back.

Even merchants in outlying shopping centers approve of the mall. None has complained of being hurt, although some have stepped up their advertising. Said one: "Anything that helps to improve the area helps us."

"The mall," says a banker, "has helped to spark cooperation and enthusiasm. Without those, you just can't get anywhere in downtown redevelopment."

NOT A CURE-ALL

Although the pedestrian mall appears to be accomplishing its purpose of bringing the people back to the city, Pomona's community leaders are not content to stop there.

A new construction program that will change the entire face of the city is underway. Completion is set for 1970.

"It was never expected that the mall would be a cure-all for our city's problems," says Mayor Baker. "But it goes a long way toward restoring character to our city."

Were Our Turkish Missile Bases Bargained Away During the Cuban Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has sent me a portion of the transcript of a broadcast on October 27, 1962, over station KPFA in Berkeley, Calif., by Reporter John Cooper. I submit that portion herewith:

This is a copy of a message sent to Acting Secretary U Thant by Chairman Khrushchev of the Soviet Union:

"You were concerned about the fact that we helped Cuba with weapons with the aim of strengthening its defense capacity, but Turkey is located next to us and sentinels walk and look at each other. You have located in Turkey destructive rockets literally next to us, at our side. We agree to remove these weapons from Cuba which you regard as offensive weapons. We agree to do this and to state in the United Nations this commitment. Your representative will make a statement to the effect that the United States, on its part, bearing in mind the anxieties and concern of the Soviet States, will evacuate its analogous weapons from Turkey. Let us reach an understanding what time you and we need to put this into effect."

Khrushchev said he thought it would not be difficult to get Cuba and Turkey to agree to permit United Nations inspection teams on their territory to police the dismantling of rocket bases.

Mr. Speaker, this was just 5 days after President Kennedy announced his quarantine against the shipment of offensive weapons to Cuba. It was undoubtedly at the time of intensive and delicate negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In light of the subsequent decision by the Kennedy administration to remove missile bases from Turkey, the message to U Thant from Khrushchev, if it was in fact sent, raises very serious and basic questions. It definitely points to the distinct possibility that the Kennedy administration did agree to withdrawing our Turkish bases in exchange for the Russian agreement to remove its missiles from Cuba.

This is a question that the administration should forthrightly answer. No American would object to removing our

bases for military reasons but we would certainly object to being bluffed into such action by the boss of the Communist world.

Were our Turkish bases bargained away during the Cuban crisis?

Cheating and Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, particularly, there has appeared on the horizon of a world living in the melancholy shadow of nuclear war a chance that a feasible, practical nuclear test treaty may be attainable. There has been much heat, but little light on this vital matter from some quarters and, therefore, I include a column by Walter Lippmann, appearing March 14, 1963, in the Washington Post, in the Appendix of the RECORD because of his observations on aspects of this problem.

The article follows:

CHEATING AND ESPIONAGE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator DODD has said that "there is one supreme question which the Senate must ask about any test-ban treaty: Does it provide reasonable protection against cheating by the Soviets?" This is an important question, and the hearings now being held before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee are focused on it. But it is not the supreme question.

The supreme question is whether the United States and the U.S.S.R. can agree not to do any more testing in the hope of changing the existing balance of power in nuclear weapons. This would mean, it is agreed on both sides, an acceptance of the fact that while both sides are now capable of inflicting devastating damage, the American arsenal is bigger and more versatile than the Soviet's. The purpose of the treaty would be to slow the refinement of the nuclear art, refraining from further testing in the hope of achieving an absolute superiority.

The hope of achieving an absolute superiority exists among some scientists and some military men in both countries. It does not exist by any means among all scientists or all military men. If either country could, for example, achieve a perfectly effective antimissile missile, it would thereby wipe out the menace of the other side's whole nuclear armament. Or if either side could make a bomb so powerful that it could destroy the whole power of the other to retaliate, it would have absolute superiority.

Such hopes of absolute superiority, which neither side will avow publicly, explain why the public surface argument against the proposed treaty is what it is—the Americans talking about cheating and the Russians talking about espionage.

The truth is that the Russians do not really mean that two or three onsite inspections are all right while seven or eight would be espionage which would undermine the security of the Soviet Union. What the Russians mean is that if they offer fewer inspections than Mr. Kennedy thinks he can accept and still get the treaty ratified, they will have proved that they want to stop testing and they will still be able to test. Beside the ingrained Russian reluctance to open their country, there is the much more matter-of-fact feeling that if they test, they may achieve absolute superiority. On our side, the truth is that Senator DODD and his mentor, Dr. Teller, are not primarily concerned with cheating. Dr. Teller at least, if I have read his public statements correctly, is primarily concerned with avoiding any treaty which will slow down the development of nuclear weapons. The most vocal critics at the moment in this country may say they want a foolproof treaty. What they really want is not to stop testing.

For myself, I do not take the view that they are necessarily wrong. If they would quit talking as if they had some kind of superior patriotism, the perfectly arguable issue which is not yet fully resolved could be discussed. I think that the real issue should be brought up to the surface and that we should have a full debate on whether, for the sake of peace and of our own national interests, it is better to slow down nuclear development by banning tests or to stimulate development by continuing the tests.

This is the real question both in this country and in the Soviet Union. Our fear of cheating and their fear of espionage are cover arguments used by men who in their hearts believe that they must find a way to continue to test without outraging world opinion. Four more on-site inspections than the Soviet Union has already offered will not reveal much of anything which this country does not already know about the Soviet military establishment. But those few extra inspections might enable the President to get a treaty ratified, and that is precisely what those who want to go on testing in the Soviet Union do not want to see. Nor is there any serious dispute that with our present improved methods of detection including a few on-site inspections, the chances of perfectly safe and undetectable cheating on a profitable scale are close to zero.

The strongest argument for continuing to test is that our nuclear scientists will languish and disperse if they cannot put their theories to the test of experiment. For it is still not possible to make the conclusive tests in laboratories. It is true therefore that the proposed treaty is the first formal attempt in modern times to inhibit the growth of scientific knowledge.

The argument in favor of such a treaty is that, as regards world peace, an agreement on so vital a matter would be a breakthrough which could open the way to other agreements. And, as regards the American national interest and the interest of the Western Alliance, our security will be enhanced if the Soviet Union will accept the existing balance of nuclear forces.

McNamara and the TFX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times is especially pertinent to the recent talk of influence being used to gain defense contracts:

MCNAMARA AND THE TFX

In the current controversy between Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and Congress over the TFX fighter plane contract, it may be a good idea to recall the chief reason Congress unified the Armed Forces back in 1947 and set up a single Secretary of Defense.

To wipe out obvious costly duplication among the services and thus save the taxpayer billions of dollars.

Ever since passage of unification, Congress has been reinforcing the idea by giving the Defense Secretary more power.

Now the country has in McNamara a Defense Secretary with both the statutory backing and the personal ability to enforce unification as never before.

So when both the Army and Navy demonstrated a need for a supersonic fighter plane, McNamara demanded a single craft which would meet the differing requirements of both services. He estimated that if such a plane could be designed, it would save the taxpayers $1 billion.

With as much as $6 billion involved in developing and producing this plane, the race for the contract naturally was hot. In time, the field was narrowed to two—Boeing and General Dynamics-Grumman.

Boeing went into the judging finals with a design most pleasing to the services themselves—a design which varied enough for Air Force and Navy functions for McNamara to hold that the company, in effect, was proposing two different airplanes from a structural point of view.

General Dynamics followed the boss' orders more explicitly, producing a design of much greater "commonality" for both services and which would have greater interchange of parts.

McNamara, supported by the Air Force and Navy Secretaries, calmly overruled the military and awarded what will be the first of a series of huge contracts to General Dynamics—despite Boeing's somewhat lower bid.

McNamara's argument for a single plane is persuasive. As for Boeing's lower bid, he points out with much justification that original bids on such huge weapons systems have meant little in the past because the actual costs have commonly increased from 300 to 500 percent over estimated costs.

But the question is on whether political influence affected this award. And if so, how much? The TFX contract is big business. The winning areas are Fort Worth, Tex., and Long Island, N.Y.—both in States which voted for President Kennedy—versus Republican Wichita, Kans., where Boeing would have assembled.

McNamara denies there was any politics at all in his decision.

But with so many members of the Kennedy administration, and particularly the President's brother, TED, campaigning on what they can do for their State there is enough of this type of smoke to justify a congressional look-see. Senator MCCLELLAN'S investigation to date thought, it should be noted, has produced no evidence of political influence.

It's too late to affect this case, but Secretary McNamara would help his cause in the future if he could get his boss, the President, to stop this line of campaign promising.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Increase in Residual Oil Import Levels Not Viewed as Victory for Coal, Nor Is This Action a Loss for Venezuela Or East Coast Area of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on March 16, 1963, the Washington Post reported in its news columns an action by the Secretary of the Interior on March 15 wherein he issued an order in which maximum import levels for residual fuel oil to be used as fuel were announced at a new level of 575,000 barrels daily for the east coast—PAD District I—for the allocation period April 1, 1963 through March 31, 1964.

The Post's staff reporter, Julius Duscha, set the stage in his interpretative news article for an editorial in the same issue. The headline of the Duscha story was "Residual Oil Imports Get 9.6 Percent Increase." That staff reporter described the action in the first two paragraphs as follows:

> Domestic coal and oil producers won a significant victory yesterday when Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall authorized only a small increase in residual oil imports.
>
> The losers in the decision were Venezuela, which produces nearly all of the residual oil burned in the United States, and the users of the thick industrial fuel, most of whom are in New England.

Mr. Duscha then wrote in the next paragraph that—

> The White House and the Interior Department have been subject to intense political pressures both from the supporters and from the opponents of the controversial import control program.

In an editorial, the title of which was "Skidding on Oil," the Post expanded the Duscha line and attacked the residual oil import control program in general and the March 15 policy and quota pronouncement in particular.

It is my view that both Mr. Duscha and the writer of the opinion article, "Skidding on Oil," wrote prejudged accounts of the action. I have responded in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post.

It is my judgment that the news dispatch under the headline, "Eastern Import Quotas for Residual Fuel Oil Are Boosted by Agency," in the March 18, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal comes closer to being an accurate account, and I quote parts of that news story as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—The Interior Department, as expected, set maximum import levels for residual fuel oil on the east coast at about 575,000 barrels a day, beginning April 1. This is about 50,200 barrels a day more than currently authorized.

I inquire, Mr. President, where is the victory for domestic coal and oil producers claimed by Mr. Duscha in the Washington Post article? A daily increase of 50,200 barrels of residual oil imports is hardly a victory for coal and it certainly does not represent the loss for Venezuela that Mr. Duscha and the Post editorial imply.

Now, Mr. President, I call attention to the following additional paragraph from the Wall Street Journal dispatch:

> There is pressure on one side from coal mining interests to tighten Government curbs on residual fuel oil imports, and pressure on the other side from industrial consumers to scrap the curbs. The Kennedy administration, in announcing the new allocations, in effect, ignored both sides and continued the present policy of setting the aggregate quota equal to the difference between estimated demand and domestic output.

That interpretation appears to me to be much more realistic than the news article and the editorial published in the March 16 issue of the Washington Post.

I have stated in a letter to the editor of the Post the personal view and official opinion that "the President, as our Chief of State, as our Commander in Chief, and as the Chief Executive—and he does wear all of these hats in this instance—has been attempting to perform the art of the possible through democratic compromise, and has not been trying to do the impossible—please everybody—as charged in the Post editorial."

And I stated further that because the policy seems not to be especially pleasing to anyone, "this is not necessarily an indictment of the administration; perhaps it has, on balance, done the best that it is possible to do in arriving at its solution to a problem on which there is such wide disagreement."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the March 16, 1963, Washington Post editorial, "Skidding on Oil," and my letter of March 18 to the editor of that paper in which I comment in considerable detail on the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1963]

SKIDDING ON OIL

Caught between the devil of domestic politics and the deep blue Caribbean Sea, the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy. It is seeking to please everybody. During the Eisenhower administration, this country unwisely began placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States. And what has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry.

A month ago, a top-level White House memorandum called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports. The outcry from coal producers and from the refining branch of the oil industry was prompt and predictable—and apparently the outcry was heard. As this newspaper forecast, the administration yesterday announced the smallest possible increase in residual quotas—50,000 barrels a day which would make the daily quota 567,000 barrels.

The figures are slippery, and by artful presentation it may be possible to argue that something is being done for the embattled democracy of Venezuela. But can it be seriously argued that the wafer-thin increase is in any sense meaningful? That was the phrase used by the White House memorandum—a phrase, be it noted, that was approved by every department involved except the Labor Department. Last year, without benefit of a White House report, residual quotas were increased by 56,000 barrels a day.

Let it be acknowledged that the dilemma is real. But this administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism. It surely might entail some difficulties with coal State Senators if a genuinely meaningful relaxation of residual oil imports were put into effect April 1. But then it would entail infinitely more difficulties if the regime of President Betancourt should be overwhelmed by the totalitarian enemies who find comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela.

WASHINGTON, *March 18, 1963.*

EDITOR,
The Washington Post.

SIR: Your editorial, "Skidding on Oil," in the Saturday, March 16, 1963, issue is representative of the type of advocacy of uncontrolled entry of foreign products into this country that tends to increase the ranks of both protectionist and isolationist blocs in the United States—especially in the interior States. And I write this as one who supported the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and most foreign aid and international policy legislation during my 19 years in the Congress. But I write also in the role of one who is becoming alarmed in seeing the ranks of employed American labor thinned by the impact of imports on certain domestic industries and markets.

In this connection, I suggest that the rush of the coal industry into manpower-displacing mechanization of mining came principally at the time of and as a consequence of the advent of uncontrolled imports of predatorially priced foreign residual oil. It was and continues to be a condition forced by growing foreign competition—a competition the Post apparently would have expanded and accelerated notwithstanding the economic consequences of driving domestic fuels industries out of more and more of the domestic markets.

Your editorial observes that the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy, namely, is seeking to please everybody. Without implying complete approval of the administration's residual oil policy, I cannot agree with this observation.

In representing a coal, oil, and gas producing State, I have been endeavoring to work for the appropriate and necessary interests of these important domestic industries, the health of which means so much to our local, State, and national econmies and to our people. Accordingly, I have been a consistent and persistent participant in discussions, negotiations, and deliberations with a bearing on the development of international trade legislation and on the formulation of residual oil policies especially.

It is clear that there are differing views within the administration concerning the question of what should be this Government's policy on residual oil as a commodity and on importation of foreign residual oil in particular. But it is my personal and official opinion that the President, as our Chief of State, as our Commander in Chief, and as the Chief Executive—and he does wear all of these hats in this instance—has been attempting to perform the art of the possible through democratic compromise, and has not been trying to do the impossible, as charged in the Post editorial.

I feel that the President knows it is impossible to please or satisfy within the framework of a single policy the editors of the Post, the Venezuelan Government, the international oil companies involved in the refining and marketing of Venezuelan and Dutch Antilles petroleum products (including residuals), the east coast importers-marketers, and the domestic coal, oil, and gas economy interests—including the so-called coal State Senators to whom you refer.

The fact is, of course, that the residual oil import control program announced last Friday in the Post as a "coal victory" was not that at all. It is obvious that it was not pleasing in any degree to the Post's editors. Apparently it was not received with applause by either the Venezuelan Government or some of the international oil companies or by importers-marketers. But neither was it totally satisfactory to me or to colleagues allied in the effort to keep residual oil imports at tolerable and reasonable levels. Segments of the coal industry, in fact, have severely criticized the latest installment of the administration's residual oil import control plan.

It seems, therefore, that the editorial allegation that "the administration is seeking to please everybody" is one which does not square with the facts because no one especially seems to be pleased with the policy. This condition is not necessarily an indictment of the administration; perhaps it has, on balance, done the best that it is possible to do in arriving at its solution to a problem on which there is such wide disagreement on all facets.

I am disappointed that the announced residual oil control program lacks elements which are necessary to help bring about more stability for domestic fuels industries. But this does not alter my view that the President arbitrated the widely differing opinions on the controversial subject in what he doubtless construed to be the best interests of the combined and inseparable national security, national economy, and so-called hemisphere solidarity considerations which it is his duty to evaluate and protect.

Although I do differ with the administration on some details, I do not concur with the Post's editorial inference that there is nothing "meaningful" about "placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States."

It is amazing your newspaper should imply that the Government of the United States has little if any obligation to the interior States but seemingly does have a superior obligation to Venezuela and the industries of the eastern seaboard States.

After terming the restrictions on residual oil imports to be unwise, your editorial declared that the control program "has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers (and) has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry."

I challenge this assertion. The following is in rebuttal:

Residual oil sales in the Eastern United States alone are and have been for some time supporting approximately one-fourth of the total cost of the Venezuelan Government. This certainly is a real and very substantial yield for a country's waste product. And it is a considerable contribution for this one Venezuelan commodity to elicit from U.S. dollar-paying customers. Does this help our balance-of-payments deficit situation?

Furthermore, this foreign residual oil, derived and delivered cheaper on our east coast than most domestic residuals, is fast driving the domestic residuals out of not only the eastern fuel markets but, in fact, out of domestic production. Consequently, at the higher levels of imports authorized, foreign residual oil in increasing quantities has been and will be admitted to replace and displace domestic residuals. Certainly it cannot be said that this has been bad for Venezuela. The opposite is true. Venezuela has been helped while the domestic refineries have been forced to cut production or to extend the refinery processes to eliminate or vastly reduce residual yield.

As for the assertion that the residual oil import control program has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry, the mistake is in the increasing of the levels of residual oil import quotas so that more and more of this foreign waste product can be brought into our country at predatorily administered prices to compete with and to displace domestic fuels, especially coal. Without controls, foreign residual oil would virtually flood domestic coal out of eastern electric utility and heavy industry markets before such innovations as coal by unit trains at lower delivered prices and extra-high voltage, long-line transmission electricity can be delivered competitively from coalfield powerplants to the east coast, including New England.

Furthermore, the Government of the United States, for national security reasons, has no right to permit the strategically and economically important east coast to become almost totally dependent on an offshore product to supply its heat and energy requirements.

If the domestic coal industry of the interior United States is to be eliminated or domestic petroleum refinery production to be endangered, at least let these conditions be the result of domestic competition—not foreign. Energy from American coal helped build the vast utility and heavy industry complex of the east coast; the coal and domestic petroleum interests should not therefore be condemned for seeking to maintain a fair share of the fuels markets of the region.

If the east coast is going to turn more substantially outward and offshore for supply there doubtless will be an appropriate "interior America" response. This condition should be avoided in the interest of a strong and healthy United States of America. A condition of strength in the Nation's perimeter regions only and economic strangulation and sociological decline inland is unthinkable.

I am not suggesting that the east coast should reorient its supply lines totally inward or that it should be required to do so by Government decree. But I urge that there be closer cooperation between our coastal areas and the interior. Parenthetically, it is important to note that such overwhelming proportions of our country's vast defense spending have gravitated to the coastal States that this, too, is becoming a cause for real concern in interior U.S.A.

It is my belief that our President is so cognizant of these conditions that the administration's continuation of the residual oil import control program—rather than a scuttling of it by relaxation of controls as recommended by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning—is one of the necessary resulting actions.

Finally, I am in disagreement with your concluding statement which seeks to include the oil import quota program under the blanket indictment of "every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela." Admiration for the administration of President Betancourt—an admiration which I share with the editors of the Post—should not blind us from acknowledging the very generous trade policy maintained by the United States toward Venezuela.

Contrary to the implications of your statement, U.S. imports from Venezuela are more than double our exports to that country, and our purchases account for approximately 50 percent of all Venezuelan crude production and about 75 percent of that country's residual oil production. Nor does this tell the entire story; for Venezuela receives further benefit from U.S. trade in the rate of exchange of pegging the oil export rate at 3.05 bolivares per U.S. dollar in contrast to the rate for Venezuelan imports of 3.35 bolivares per dollar. The rapid progress toward economic recovery in Venezuela during the past year is perhaps the best evidence of the working of the so-called trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela. I rather doubt that there are many nations that would balk at this kind of discrimination—at this type of treatment.

For these reasons and those mentioned earlier, and notwithstanding my disagreement with some details of the residual oil policy and quota announcement, I believe the Post's editorial, "Skidding on Oil," does injustice both to the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. In establishing the oil import quota program, the previous administration rightfully acknowledged the relation between national security and the health of our domestic economy. In continuing the quota program the Kennedy administration has rightfully reaffirmed the importance of this relationship.

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate.

Closure of the Glen Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, closure of the left diversion tunnel of the Glen Canyon Dam restricting the flow of the Colorado River, which initiated the storage of water in Lake Powell, was accomplished March 13. Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy has issued instructions to commence storage immediately in order to take advantage of fortuitous circumstances which will permit earlier storage than was originally anticipated.

Commissioner Dominy has said:

Storage in Lake Mead is near an alltime peak—not only from a cyclical standpoint but additionally for this time of year to meet

lower basin water needs. We have been able to expedite work on the outlet gate at Glen Canyon Dam to effect immediate control. This combination of circumstances makes this the most favorable time we could possibly select to commence storage.

Commissioner Dominy added:

We are indeed fortunate to be able to close the gates 30 days earlier than anticipated. In this year of likely reduced runoff, every day's storage will make a difference in the total operational program. It is fully expected that even with approximately 75 percent of normal runoff, as currently forecast from March 1 snow surveys, dead storage can be obtained within 10 to 12 months. This will insure meeting the power production scheduled at Glen Canyon Dam next year.

The dam proper is now more than 90 percent completed with the highest block in the 710-foot dam now within 10 feet of crest elevation. About 300,000 cubic yards of concrete is needed to bring all of the blocks in the dam to crest height. Glen Canyon Dam will be "topped out" with placement of the last bucket of concrete sometime this summer.

L. F. Wylie, project construction engineer for Glen Canyon Dam, manipulated the hydraulic controls of the left tunnel high pressure gates. The controls are located in the gate chamber deep within the bedrock of the left abutment of the dam and directly above the gates in the left diversion tunnel. Access to the gate chamber is by way of galleries and shafts through the concrete of the dam and the rocks of the dam's abutment.

The filling of Lake Powell also heralds the beginning of boating and other recreation on this great manmade lake. By midsummer it is estimated that Lake Powell will be more than 150 miles long and reach a point above Hite, Utah. The new lake will exceed 65 square miles in area.

Temporary boat ramps and other facilities have been built by the National Park Service at the Wahweap Recreation Area located about 5 miles from Glen Canyon Dam. The rising waters of Lake Powell will reach these temporary ramps by June. Until that time, boats can be launched at Kane Creek, 20 miles from Wahweap Recreation Area. James Eden, superintendent for Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, has pointed out that, as the water level gradually rises this summer, Lake Powell will offer unparalleled scenery to boaters who can explore the many side canyons which enter the Glen Canyon of the Colorado.

Millions of game fish will be planted in Lake Powell this spring, under a program planned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State Fish and Game Departments of Arizona and Utah. Opening of Lake Powell to fishing is planned for 1964.

Development of recreational facilities and the fish and wildlife program on Lake Powell is being accomplished under the provisions of section 8, Public Law 485, which authorized the Colorado River storage project with Glen Canyon Dam as the key feature.

Blackmail or Oil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Governor Smith of New York used to say, "Let's look at the facts," and it is still the only solution. One can interpret coercion, or collusion in any manner possible, but the facts, and the record remain immutable. In regard to the residual oil problem, we know that unemployment in the mining industry is not related to residual oil competition, but results from a number of other factors. We also know that the U.S. production of residual oil for a period ending November 1962, was down 18 million barrels, or 7 percent under production for a similar period in 1961, while domestic demands remained the same. And many of the factors that have been cited are put in proper perspective in this excellent editorial from the Boston, Mass., Herald, Sunday, March 10, 1963, which I insert in the RECORD at this point.

BLACKMAIL OR OIL

A brutal fight is going on in Washington to force higher fuel costs on New England by further restricting our residual oil imports. According to Platt's Oilgram News Service, Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD of West Virginia have warned the Kennedy administration to cut down the import quota on this heavy oil or suffer reprisals in Congress on the Kennedy trade expansion program.

This is a kind of blackmail aimed at coercing the President to scrap the careful findings of his own Director of Emergency Planning. These findings destroyed the only legal foundation for import curbs, national security. The Nation's defense is not disturbed by residual oil imports; in fact Under Secretary of State Ball advises that doubts about the residual import program cause problems in our relations with friendly nations. Venezuela is the chief source of residual.

The emergency planning director has only one reservation, that the Government proceed carefully to assure the continued primacy of Western Hemisphere oil sources.

The soft coal lobby and the soft coal States still fight us. They contend, against decisive data to the contrary in the emergency planning report, that the use of residual oil in New England is throwing miners out of work.

What are the facts?

The consumption of residual in district I (the east coast) has not materially increased in the last 10 years. The increase in imports has simply replaced a decline in domestic production of this almost waste product;

Unemployment in the mining industry is not the consequence of residual oil competition, but results from the dieselization of railroads, a shift by households and small concerns from coal to fuels other than residual, a more efficient use of coal particularly by utilities and above all by mechanization of mining;

The coal industry's only major gain since the war has been in the utility market where the most direct competition between coal and residual takes place. Coal has more than held its own there.

Residual oil is an important fuel in a very limited part of the country, chiefly in New England and Florida and in these regions only in areas adjacent to water transportation.

Yet for such illusory gain for the coal industry, New England is subjected to these ills:

An increase in the cost of oil from 23 to 47 cents a barrel as measured by the difference in price between bonded and unbonded oil drawn from the same spigot;

An increase in the price of other energy fuels;

A disorganization of distribution so that competitive pricing is impossible and buyers are tied to one dealer.

The President's Director of Emergency Planning declares there is no salvation for the coal industry in residual restrictions, only grief for New England. Defiantly the coal States still demand higher restrictions on the threat of legislative reprisals.

Which wins, blackmail or oil for New England?

Governor Paiewonsky Addresses Peace Corps Men in Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Virgin Islands, too, are making a contribution to the success of the Peace Corps. On March 8, 1963, Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky addressed members of the Peace Corps Gabon training project at Charlotte Amalie before leaving for Gabon in west-central Africa. During the course of our training, the corpsmen were given not only careful and comprehensive formal training but they learned by doing as well. Since much of their work will be along educational lines in Gabon, the corpsmen's training included actual construction of two elementary school buildings which have already been put into usage.

Governor Paiewonsky expressed the hope that the training the volunteers had received in the Virgin Islands would equip them for rigorous experiences they may expect in their new environment in tropical Africa. Governor Paiewonsky's remarks to the graduating corpsmen follow:

REMARKS OF GOV. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY AT FINAL CEREMONIES OF PEACE CORPS GABON TRAINING PROJECT, MARCH 8, 1963

Being here at your commencement ceremony today is gratifying to me in many ways. This group of Peace Corps volunteers, soon to embark for Gabon in west central Africa, is the first of what we in the Virgin Islands hope will be many training projects in the future that will utilize our facilities here. Also, under the strong and diligent guidance of your administrators and instructors from the experiment in international living and the Peace Corps, your contingent might, in a sense, be thought of as the first

graduating class of the college of the Virgin Islands—which, in actuality, will open its doors to its first students on these very premises less than 4 months from today. For those of us who remain in the islands to carry on our own progressive history, you men will always have a special place in our hearts, not only because you trained here and built two schools for our people, but equally because you are now carrying to the African continent, in President Kennedy's words, part of the "responsibilities in the great common cause of world development."

I think it is significant that your project will be getting underway in Gabon just 2 years after President Kennedy announced the very first Peace Corps project during his press conference of April 21, 1961. This was a group that went to Tanganyika in east Central Africa to map and construct roads. Your efforts in constructing 40 school buildings and teacher housing in west central Africa will not only compliment the first Peace Corps project, but carry to yet another area of the world the good will, genuine concern and respect we Americans feel for the emerging nations of the world. When I was a boy growing up and acquiring my early education here in the Virgin Islands, Africa was a relatively unknown and poorly understood continent, far removed from the exigencies of our own daily life. Today, she is one of the most important and exciting areas of the world, and hardly a day passes without the mention of her in the press or over the radio and television. As you no doubt have discovered in your area studies, Africa is not only emerging, individually and collectively, but she is doing so at an amazingly accelerated rate.

During your tour of duty in Africa, you will need immense reserves of fortitude and endurance. But, if you will only recall, during the times of hardship and strain of patience while at work in your tropical environment, all the colorful episodes of history that have gone before you, all the sufferings and struggles that man has necessarily endured during his thousands of years as a human being, perhaps it will enable you better to persevere in your task.

While you men are working on your building project those many thousands of miles away, we in the Virgin Islands will also be moving ahead in our endless task of making a better life for our people. We are changing from an agrarian economy to one more dependent upon tourism and small industry. We, too, are emerging, so to speak, and we need the same fortitude and endurance required of you men, for at times there are misunderstandings, losses of temper and failures of patience. But we progress, more rapidly with every step. I think what we all need, good men everywhere, is a sensibility and reasonableness which certainly is characteristic of civilized men the world over.

As you fine young men leave us now to assist in this great African emergence, remember that you go representing a traditional American ideal, which is helping people to help themselves. In addition, you will also be helping yourselves and your country. When you return, 2 or 3 years hence, you will have participated in an unparalleled experience and will bring back to America a better knowledge and understanding of this particular area of the African Continent. You will be in a position to help others who are studying Africa and who may then one day go there better prepared for the experience.

As you take leave of the Virgin Islands, we are somewhat saddened, for all partings of good friends have their melancholy aspects. Even though your workload here has been rigorous, I know that you have found time to explore our islands and make many friends. We hope these friendships will be lasting and that you will one day return and renew them.

On behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands, I thank you for having built the school buildings at Nisky and Madison, I thank you for your excellent conduct and the friendship you extended and found while here, and we send you off with all our good wishes. When you arrive in Gabon, you might well recall Thomas Jefferson's optimistic thoughts in his 67th year: "I steer my bark with hope in the head, leaving fear astern."

Good luck and Godspeed.

Brotherhood of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, public awareness and determined action is essential in our fight against the continued denial of civil rights of many of our citizens. This is an issue which affects every aspect of our lives as individuals and as a nation.

Religion and morality are offended by prejudice and discrimination, and we may not disregard except at our peril the national and international significance of the fight for equality of opportunity in education, housing, jobs, and every other area of living. I have repeatedly emphasized the fact that law is essential to prevent the constitutional denial of equality of opportunity and to help create a moral climate in which social discrimination will be regarded as equally reprehensible.

The National Conference on Religion and Race, which was held in Chicago in January 1963, brought together prominent clergymen and laymen of all faiths in an effort to speed up the struggle against the denial of civil rights. They emphasized the role of religion in the fight against discrimination, and the impact of their discussions will bear a significant influence in the effort to arouse public opinion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, New York City, and president of the Synagogue Council of America, at the National Conference on Religion and Race, January 14, 1963.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

(Statement of Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, New York City, and president of the Synagogue Council of America at the National Conference on Religion and Race. January 14, 1963, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill.)

It is both a pleasure and privilege for me, as president of the Synagogue Council of America, the coordinating body of the six leading Jewish religious bodies of our country, orthodox, conservative, and reform, rabbinical and lay, to have joined His Eminence, Cardinal Meyer, archbishop of Chicago and Mr. J. Irwin Miller, president of the National Council of Churches, in convening this historic conference.

The great religious communions of our country, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, have affirmed on many occasions their conviction that all men are created in the image of God and are equally regarded as His children by our Heavenly Father. They have expressed their abhorrence of every form of prejudice and bigotry on the grounds of differences in racial background. They have vigorously condemned as evil and unjust discrimination in employment, housing, schooling, transportation and the use of public facilities which have been established to serve the entire community.

What endows this conference with particular significance is that the three great religious bodies of our country, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, have come together to speak out with one voice, in the name of the one God whom we all worship, in an effort to impress not only our own congregants but the entire American people with the urgent necessity of translating into daily practice the noble concepts of human equality which we have many times individually proclaimed.

The equality of all men is a basic principle of the American way of life. The Declaration of Independence proclaims that "all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The Emancipation Proclamation, issued by the immortal Abraham Lincoln a century ago on the first of this month, outlaws human slavery and the famed Supreme Court decision of 1954 declares unconstitutional the practice of segregation of the races in schools maintained by the people.

Laws enacted by legislative assemblies are, to be sure, important. Their mere passage, however, is not enough. The widespread resistance to these manmade laws in the North as well as the South—we must not forget that our problem is not sectional, but national—is a challenge to all of us who believe in God's fatherhood and man's brotherhood to stress and proclaim anew the higher, God-made laws proclaiming the precious worth of every human being and at the same time to humbly confess our failure to implement them in our own lives.

It appears to me that if we are to make a meaningful and concrete contribution to the resolution of the shameful and humiliating condition known by the evil word "racism," we must first have a clearer concept of the relation of religion to the social, political, educational, and economic problems of life. Is religion a way of looking at certain things or is it a certain way of looking at all things? To some, religion either by definition or by the way they react to life's problems, is a way of looking at certain things. To them religion's sole or principal function is to be concerned with such matters as God, church attendance, retreats, ceremonials, observance of holy days and festivals, immortality, sin, repentance, and so forth. They maintain that areas such as business, industry, race relations, slums, poverty, child labor, social security, social justice, civil rights, segregation are all outside the purview of religion. To them religion has no relevance to everyday living. They would agree with the 19th century statesman who remarked: "Things have come to a pretty pass if religion is going to interfere with private life." They lustily sing "God Is in His Holy Temple" and then make sure that He remains within the confines of the sanctuary instead of taking Him with them into the highways and byways of everyday living.

There are others, however, who insist that while prayer, ritual, and ceremony play an important role in religious living, these by no means constitute the totality of religion.

To them, religion in its truest and finest sense is a certain way, based upon man's awareness of God and God's requirements of His children, of looking at all things. For them religion is only partly concerned with enabling souls to enter heaven. Its principal purpose is to help create a little more heaven on earth for all the children of God as taught by the prophets of the Bible. That is why the prophets preached against corrupt politics, land monopoly, social injustice, racial bigotry, national arrogance. Micah summed up his concept of religion in the famed utterance wherein he declared that walking humbly with God constitutes just one-third of our Heavenly Father's requirements of man. The other two-thirds consist of doing justly and loving mercy.

It is, of course, one thing to proclaim lofty teachings which envisage a society wherein all human beings live together as brothers. It is quite something else to implement these principles of simple justice. When a priest, minister, or rabbi exercises his right, as a teacher of religion, to denounce not alone evil but evil doers and speaks out forthrightly in defense of those who are denied the elementary rights which belong to all human beings, he is likely to share the experience of Amos, who was told in so many words by Amaziah, the priest of Beth-El: "Go peddle your radicalism somewhere else, where the overhead isn't so high."

In the minds of many laymen, and some ministers of religion, there appears to be a dichotomy between religion and life. They insist that preachers confine themselves to purely religious matters, which have little or nothing to do with the practical affairs of life. Several years ago a young rabbi expressed both amusement and sadness when he learned that an important member of his congregation vigorously objected to a passage in one of his sermons wherein he expressed sympathy for a young Negro who had been brutally murdered by a mob. His congregant objected on the grounds that his rabbi "had no business mentioning politics" in his sermon. The pulpit of this rabbi, by the way, is not in Mississippi or in some other southern community, but in enlightened California. Basically, race prejudice is not a political or an economic problem but a moral and religious problem.

If this Conference on Religion and Race is to succeed in achieving its objectives, we must make it crystal clear that while we are all uncompromisingly loyal to our respective religious convictions, practices, and ceremonials, we are united as sons and daughters of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism in our equally uncompromising affirmation that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26) and that all human beings are descended from one common ancestor, proving thereby that no man is racially superior or inferior to his fellow man. Created in the image of the Divine, all men enjoy equal spiritual dignity. They are entitled to the same rights and upon all alike devolve the same responsibilities.

It is well known that proponents of racism and segregation have quoted the Bible to prove the existence of superior and inferior races as a manifestation of God's will. Thus, shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War a distinguished rabbi of New York City, Morris J. Raphall, delivered a scholarly address which brought comfort to believers in human slavery. Rabbi Raphall was only one of numerous ministers of religion throughout the centuries and even to our day who pointed to many Biblical ordinances and laws as evidence that the Bible condones slavery. That the Bible also condones polygamy seemed to have escaped their notice. The fact is that a great many customs and practices to be found in the Bible merely reflect the mores of ancient society. Rabbi Raphall's far more scholarly contemporary, Rabbi David Einhorn, then of Baltimore—he was forced to flee from this city when a mob threatened to lynch him—called slavery "the greatest possible crime against God."

The fact is that the Bible, while recognizing slavery, constantly tries to humanize the institution. Thus, while as late as 1854 the Congress of the United States passed a law making it mandatory to restore fugitive slaves to their master, the Book of Deuteronomy (23: 16–17) commands:

"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master a slave that is escaped from his master. He shall dwell with thee * * * in the place which he shall choose within one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not wrong him."

Even more significant is the experience of Miriam, sister of Moses, as recounted in the Book of Numbers (12: 1–9), when she and Aaron "spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married." She is punished by being stricken with leprosy. Aaron pleads with Moses that she be forgiven. Moses prays to God on her behalf and after 7 days she is healed.

Like all peoples, ancient and modern alike, the Hebrews of Bible times regarded themselves as the chosen of God. As proof of their superiority, they would point to their miraculous deliverance from Egypt by God's mighty hand and outstretched arm. The prophet Amos reminds his people that all races and peoples are equally loved by God when he cries: "Are ye not as the Ethiopians unto Me, O children of Israel? saith the Lord" (9: 7). Yes, God brought Israel out of Egypt, but He also brought the Philistines out of Caphtor and the Syrians out of Kir.

The glorious and undying message of the Book of Jonah is oft obscured in the minds of many by reason of the unimportant and inconsequential incident of the whale or, as the story has it, the "great fish" which God had especially prepared. Jonah is commanded by God to journey to Nineveh, "that great city," and plead with the people to mend their ways lest they be destroyed by the corruption and wickedness into which they had fallen. The prophet flatly refuses to obey God's command, boards a ship and begins his journey westward toward Tarshish rather than eastward in the direction of Nineveh. Why? Because he feels himself superior to the people of Nineveh, has no pity for them and is quite content for them to be destroyed. Whereupon God again orders him to go to Nineveh and this time he obeys. He preaches to the people and mirable dictu, they hearken to him, repent and are saved from destruction.

Now one might think that the prophet would have rejoiced over his successful preaching mission. But not Jonah. He is exceedingly displeased and downright angry over the outcome, even to the point of wishing that he were dead. Then he is again filled with anger when a gourd which God had caused to grow out of the earth to shield him from the sun withers the next morning. The sublime lesson of God's concern for all His children, whatever be their race or creed or nationality, is driven home in the last two sentences of the book of Jonah:

"And the Lord said: 'Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow, which came up in a night and perished in a night; shouldst thou not have pity on Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, and also much cattle?' "

In view of its significant and enduring challenge to humankind throughout the ages and even to our own times, it is not surprising that the ancient rabbis ordained that the Book of Jonah should be read in all synagogues on the Day of Atonement, the most sacred holy day in the Jewish religious calendar, a practice which is observed to this very day.

Racial discrimination has been defined as "the unjust separation of people from things and circumstances" and segregation as "the immoral separation of people from people" (Kyle Haselden). Many organizations are dedicated to breaking down the cruel walls and barriers which divide people from people. They demand that the right to vote, to equal educational opportunities, to equal employment opportunities and to adequate housing shall be denied to no man on account of difference in race. In this battle to build a society and a world in which the dignity of every human being is jealously guarded and the equality of all men taken for granted, the forces of religion, if they are true to their purpose, must, both by precept and example, be in the forefront, leading and not following, courageously fulfilling their prophetic mission of being the conscience of humankind.

Watch Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Gov. James Rhodes and his Republican administration in Ohio have entered into a sound fiscal program which has attracted nationwide attention. I think it is refreshing to most people to see a government even though it be on the State level which believes in economy and balanced budgets. The following editorial from the Washington Daily News is an example of favorable reaction and I am asking that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that it might inspire our National Government to follow the same course.

The editorial follows:

WATCH OHIO

One of the most interesting developments in government in the Nation today is occurring in Ohio.

There the new Republican Governor, James A. Rhodes, is doing something most of his fellow Governors, and President Kennedy, claim is impossible.

In office only 8 weeks, he has ordered 7,000 State employees cut from the payroll, imposed a 9.1-percent cut in funds of all State departments, dropped $120 million of State-financed projects and even sliced welfare and relief funds. The point in reducing State relief contributions is not to cut payments to recipients but to force relief administrators to tighten the relief rolls.

Governor Rhodes is trying to make Ohio the testing ground of an economic program in sharp contrast to that of the New Frontier. He thinks by rigid government economy and no increased State taxes for 4 years, his program will encourage industry to expand and locate in Ohio, thus relieving the State's economic and fiscal problems.

Only time will tell whether his slashes in State services will arouse the wrath of a majority of his constituents—most of whom, as judged by Washington politicians, want only more and more from Government.

Whatever the outcome, Governor Rhodes at least has the guts to try to restore old-fashioned frugality. If successful, he will

have provided an invaluable lesson for other political leaders who just might be persuaded to emulate him, with resulting benefits to all taxpayers. And, of course, a successful ending to his experiment would make him a national political figure of prime importance.

Col. Albert S. Callan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, during my early years as a young prosecuting attorney of my home county, I heard and was greatly impressed by an address delivered by Colonel Callan. Many years passed before I had the opportunity to compliment him, but he recalled the occasion vividly, in his own words, as speaking from a high place and looking down into a multitude of faces. It was characteristic of the colonel to speak on a high plane and his forensic ability was attested by the fact of his reputed appearances in each and every county in his native State of New York.

On Friday, we of the 28th Congressional District, sadly gathered at the little church around the corner from his home in Chatham, N.Y., for the last rites of this great American, a man of strong character and even stronger faith in this Republic and its institutions. Now he rests among the scenes that he loved so well, among the hills and hollows, the fields and streams of upstate New York.

While engaged in public service, including an outstanding military career, Colonel Callan for more than half a century was the owner and publisher of the Chatham Courier and one of his finest tributes appears in the columns of a friendly business competitor, the Hudson New York Register-Star. Under unanimous consent, I include herewith their editorial under date of March 13, 1963:

COL. A. S. CALLAN

The ranks of stalwart Columbians lessened in the death on Tuesday of Col. Albert S. Callan, Sr., of Chatham. He was a vigorous and active man throughout his lifetime in many lines of endeavor and his passing came as a severe shock to countless admirers and friends, even though they had known for some time he was in failing health.

There were so many facets associated with his life and career that a writer has the problem of dealing sufficiently with them and their order of importance. Included were over 50 years as publisher of the Chatham Courier, historian, political leader and adviser, legislator, soldier. He might be called the father of the American Legion in Columbia County as it was he who fostered practically all the posts numbered here. He was the first commander of the county Legion and he was one of the earliest of the State commanders.

Colonel Callan was a rugged exponent of the philosophy of the Republican Party principles, both with pen and voice. His belief in that party was so stanch that he never wavered in his support of that organization no matter how strong his personal regard, admiration or even affection of members of the rival major party, was. Over the period of a great many years, it was his judgment, advice and counsel that enabled the GOP to maintain its weight and preponderance in Columbia County. His counsel was also sought by State leaders and he always responded to appeals to stimulate campaigns in other areas. He truly was one of the vanishing school of old-time and effective orators. He did not become a disciple of the modern school which produces readers chanting or parroting the works of ghost writers. He was invited to speak in every county of New York State in political campaigns over the years and the power and appeal of his voice was widely recognized.

He thrilled to the combat of political war but he was a generous victor in thought and action. He was always a friendly business competitor and frequently visited this office to chat and exchange greetings with old friends and acquaintances and it can be said his visitations were relished and enjoyed by us. A vigorous and enthusiastic man, he possessed a most appealing personality and it was a pleasure to meet and visit with him on many and all occasions.

There are many who will remember Col. Albert S. Callan for a long time and there are many who will always cherish memories of his kind and generous acts. We are included among the friends who mourn the passing of a fine citizen and an intense and outstanding son of Columbia.

Why Should Any Remain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Washington Star of March 11 contains an interesting editorial that I would like to call to the attention of the Senate. In discussing the rumored removal of Soviet troops from Cuba, the editorial says:

After all, since there are at present about 17,000 Soviet soldiers and technicians in Cuba, the withdrawal of, say, 5,000 would still leave the Kremlin with a relatively formidable force on the small captive island. And why should such a force be maintained there?

Why, indeed? I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET ALL OF THEM OUT

As far as it goes, it is welcome news that Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin has publicly reaffirmed Premier Khrushchev's promise to withdraw "several thousand" Russian troops from Cuba by the end of the week. But what is meant by "several"? four? five? six? The Kremlin remains altogether vague on the subject, and the Americas therefore have reason to feel a continuing sense of deep concern.

After all, since there are at present about 17,000 Soviet soldiers and technicians in Cuba, the withdrawal of, say, 5,000 would still leave the Kremlin with a relatively formidable force on the small captive island. And why should such a force be maintained there? One plausible explanation is that it could be used effectively in a long-term program designed to train traitorous Latins to carry out sabotage, subversion, and guerrilla warfare against their native countries—a program with the ultimate objective of communizing the hemisphere. And another explanation is that the force could be put into swift action to smash any possible popular uprising against Fidel Castro's tyranny.

It is because of these and kindred considerations that Defense Secretary McNamara has warned Moscow that the United States will never tolerate Russian combat operations in the Americas. And for the same reasons Secretary Rusk has declared that so long as there is a Soviet "military presence" in Cuba, and so long as a Marxist-Leninist situation exists there, there will be "unfinished business" in the Western Hemisphere. Certainly, even if there is a pullout this week of 5,000 or so of the Kremlin's troops, the basic menace will still remain—a menace grave enough to call for the closest possible inter-American cooperation to contain and counter it, politically, economically, and otherwise.

This prospect will change for the better only when, as, and if the men of the Kremlin decide to remove from Cuba all their troops and arms. Clearly, unless and until that decision is made, there will be precious little chance of easing international tension and promoting a trustworthy peace.

Deputy Federal Highway Administrator, the Honorable D. Grant Mickle, Calls for Expansion of Research and Development Effort in Speech Before Regional Highway Research and Development Conference, Columbus, Ohio; West Virginians Attend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on March 12, 1963, the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce, State highway departments, and various educational and research institutions sponsored a regional conference on highway research and development at Lincoln Lodge, Columbus, Ohio. Gathered at this meaningful conclave were representatives from 11 States and the District of Columbia, and officials of the Federal Government who met together to consider how best to solve the problems of national growth which today beset the highway industry.

Participating in this significant conference were the following leaders from West Virginia: C. A. Arents, dean of the College of Engineering, West Virginia University; George F. Fenton, division engineer, Bureau of Public Roads; Burl A. Sawyers, commissioner, State highway department; Dr. J. A. Shaub, chairman of the Department of Civil Engineering, West Virginia University; Harry C. Schwender, director of the planning and traffic division, State highway department; Irving I. Varon, planning engineer, Bureau of Public Roads; and, Col.

George E. White, Jr., chief engineer for planning, State highway department.

Mr. President, one of the memorable highlights of the meeting was an address by the Honorable D. Grant Mickle, Deputy Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, who spoke of the need and opportunity for an expanded highway research and development program. Deputy Administrator Mickle pointed out that those concerned with research and development as it pertains to our road system must be prepared to pursue three basic objectives:

First, to single out those areas of research which are most essential and urgently needed; second, to devise the best ways to accomplish these needed studies and the thought processes that develop with and from them; and, third, to develop means for actual application of the results of such research.

I request that Deputy Administrator Mickle's speech be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED AND OPPORTUNITY FOR AN EXPANDED HIGHWAY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(Remarks by D. Grant Mickle, Deputy Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, at the Regional Highway Research and Development Conference, Lincoln Lodge, Columbus, Ohio, March 12, 1963)

It seems almost unnecessary for me to tell you who are assembled here about both the need and the opportunity for an expanded highway research and development program. You are as familiar as I am with the subject in general terms. Certainly in many technical aspects you are the experts, not I.

But rarely do any of us seem to find the time or make the occasion to sit down and consider the subject as a whole to discuss and delineate what are the needs and priorities of a comprehensive highway research and development program. In the simplest of words, we are faced with two questions: What needs to be done? And what needs to be done first?

This conference seeks to put us on the road toward the answers to those questions. I could liken that road to the interstate system; and this conference to a roadside rest stop. In our pause here for reflection, it is hoped that we will sharpen and freshen all of our faculties.

We can then continue on the road of research and development, for a safer and more efficient trip, and with greater assurance of reaching our appointed goals. One of them, surely, is a maximum return for our research dollars.

Let me turn now more specifically to some of the needs and opportunities for highway research and development.

In the past 15 years or so, the emphasis on highway transportation problems has shifted considerably. Certainly much still needs to be learned about highway design and construction. But a dominant research issue today seems to me to be a more fundamental question: What is the current role of highways in the everyday life of our society? What is it going to be in the future?

Both transportation demands and urbanization are increasing in seemingly geometric progression. Highway officials are confronted with increasingly complex problems of both technology and administration. It is evident that improved and new technologies, and methods for assimilating them into the highway transportation system, must be researched and developed.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 has provided a great impetus and opportunity for an expanded highway research program. Beginning with fiscal year 1964, the 1½-percent Federal-aid funds may be spent only for research and planning projects. The act also authorized use of an additional one-half percent of the ABC primary, secondary, and urban Federal-aid funds for research and planning, if the individual States desire to do so.

What can we do with these funds, to produce maximum benefit from our investment? Some kind of inventory, of stocktaking, would seem in order. Fortunately, we need not work in a vacuum. A comprehensive study of highway research needs was made in 1959, and published as Special Report No. 55 by the Highway Research Board.

That study demonstrated two significant points. First, highway research has not been of sufficient scope and volume, and has been far from a balanced effort. Second, there is a need for some overall coordination device on a nationwide basis. This would avoid unnecessary duplication of effort in some fields while others, equally essential, are entirely overlooked.

It seemed obvious that the highway research effort could be very profitably enlarged; and that with its aims and goals coordinated it could do a far more effective job.

As one part of this coordination objective, the American Association of State Highway Officials last year launched its national cooperative highway research program. The program in this fiscal year involves about $2 million for research projects in six broad problem areas.

But that program is not intended to replace the State's own research efforts. Rather, it will focus on high priority research areas which are of widespread interest and are beyond the capacity of any single State to undertake.

It seems to us that one of the most effective roles the Bureau of Public Roads can play in research is to aid in delineating broadly the needs for research, regardless of what agency may ultimately undertake the work. Indeed, that is the principal purpose of this conference. We think also that Public Roads can serve well to provide a needed coordination among the many participants in research.

I would like next to mention a few specific areas of research and development that seem important to me.

The tremendous drain on aggregate supplies in the United States for construction on our highway systems will consume some 9 billion tons of aggregates in the next decade, enough to build a wall 100 feet high and nearly 100 feet wide across the country. Further research and development is needed in the production of artificial aggregates from clay, shale, and other low-grade materials; in the stabilizing treatment of moderately plastic or granular and sandy soils by chemical or other means; and in the development of mechanical means for eliminating poor materials from marginal gravels.

A necessary preliminary or adjunct to those studies are materials inventories. All but a few States are now working in this field. It provides means of classifying the available materials as to quality and suitability for the various requirements of highway construction; and of determining the quantities available at the various quality levels. Thus it invites management of these supplies to avoid wasteful use and to assure conservation of the least abundant and most vitally needed clean and high-quality aggregates for highway surfaces and for structures.

Inventory procedures already involving applications of research include advances in airphoto interpretation, improved methods of classifying soils, use of earth resistivity methods in preliminary subsurface exploration, and comparative evaluation of aggregates for sub-bases, bases, and surfaces involving concrete and bituminous mixtures. Further research in this whole area seems needed.

A second vital research area is concerned with social and economic changes brought about through highway transportation. The need to study carefully the overall consequences of highway improvements is basic to the planning of transportation systems, both rural and urban.

These studies naturally lead into studies of human needs and desires and the human reaction to transportation improvements. In addition to the physical manifestations of changes in land use, industry, and commerce, we need to study the reasons and decision-making processes of individuals and corporations which bring about the particular physical manifestations observed.

We are all aware of the critical situation of our urban transportation facilities. It is essential that highway improvements be coordinated fully with all other modes of urban transportation, so that the completed system will be a balanced, optimum one. Research in this area will help us to make major decisions, involving billions of dollars, shaping our cities, and affecting the living habits of their residents for years to come.

There is need for comprehensive studies of the financing of transportation and of methods of raising the money required to build and operate whatever systems are chosen. Through such studies, as well as general economic studies, perhaps greatly improved public policies can be formulated as guides for the continuing development of our transportation systems.

The physical, dollar-volume size of our highway transportation system, including the roads, the vehicles, and their operation, is tremendous. It is an important part of our economic life. Transportation today accounts for 20 percent of our gross national product; and highway transportation accounts for three-fourths of that, or 15 percent of the total GNP. It is evident that decisions in economic fields must reckon with the impact they might have on highway transportation. The reverse is equally true. Surely this is a fertile field for research.

An area of eminent practicality for research and development is highway maintenance. The job is steadily growing bigger; the increasing mileage of freeways has introduced problems of novel and difficult nature. Research in improved maintenance may produce large monetary savings, perhaps equivalent to a substantial increase in fuel tax revenue.

We also must substantially step up our applied research and development efforts to meet other current problems. It isn't enough merely to gain new knowledge and understanding about our transportation system. Such knowledge must be put to work and used. For example, we know a good deal about improving traffic operations along existing streets, but frequently such knowledge is not used and congestion that need not be is the result. Our study of Wisconsin Avenue in Washington, D.C., demonstrated that use of a wide variety of already known traffic engineering techniques could substantially increase capacity and at the same time reduce peak-hour traveltime.

Similarly, the use of all of our already available knowledge regarding hydraulics and hydrology could provide more efficient and economical culvert and bridge designs, and we would have greater confidence in the results of our design effort.

One final area of research I would like to touch on is management. The highway profession is no longer solely the arena of the civil engineer. We are just as much interested, for example, in economics, soci-

ology, geography, and psychology. We must be equally interested in management, for good administration of our varied programs is one of our most vital responsibilities. Surely it is worth careful study.

I hope I have provided some initial stimulation to this conference today. I have mentioned some of the areas of research and development that I think are important.

It is up to you, here and hereafter, to develop and pursue three basic objectives:

First, to single out those research areas that are most essential and most urgently needed;

Second, to devise the best ways to accomplish these needed studies and the thought processes that develop with and from them; and

Third, to develop means for actual application of the results of such research.

I want to assure you of the wholehearted cooperation of the Bureau of Public Roads. We have recently made some changes in our operating procedures with respect to the 1½-percent funds used for research. But this by no means indicates any diminishing respect for the traditional close working relationship that has existed for so long between our regional and division offices and the State highway departments. We value that relationship highly; we believe it is useful and productive, for research, as it is for planning, location, design, construction, and all of our other joint responsibilities.

Returning to my earlier analogy, I sincerely hope that this conference—this rest stop on the road of research—will prove to be of real benefit to all of us, and through us to the public whom we serve.

National Wildlife Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my colleagues are aware that this is National Wildlife Week, and that it is a time being used to point out the dangers of chemical poisons to wildlife. For many years, Mr. Speaker, I have been warning about the potential and real dangers of insecticides, particularly to the beautiful areas of western Massachusetts and the Berkshires, as well as the rest of the United States. I hope that this week and every week of the year will be used to study the serious problems we face. We are making a positive step in this direction, and I hope we continue the battle to preserve our wildlife. From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of Friday, March 15, 1963, I would like to include an article entitled "Constructive Commentary" by Richard Thompson:

CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENTARY

(By Richard Thompson)

Sunday marks the opening of National Wildlife Week.

It's getting so every Sunday marks the opening of national something week. There are very few weeks in the 52 that are still open. If you have a worthy cause you better pick your week quick before they are all used up, if they aren't already.

This year the National Wildlife Federation, the Massachusetts Audubon Society and the Holyoke Bird Club, are using the week to point out the dangers of chemical poisons to wildlife and man.

Rachel Carson did a pretty good job of it in "Silent Spring," published last year. The Massachusetts Legislature took a leaf out of her book and acted on the problem in the State by setting up controls for mass spraying operations.

Anyway, the Holyoke Bird Club along with the national organizations, is quite upset about the free use of insecticides in the area.

One of the promoters of National Wildlife Week tells a story of a local man out to save a maple tree from blight, who sprayed it liberally with an insecticide and before he could walk away a robin fell dead at his feet.

That is pretty dramatic when one stops to think about it.

It seems that man in his fight to control the insect world is controlling everything else along with it, from robins to many kinds of fish and animals.

The local committee points out that there is more than one way to kill a pest. Perhaps chemical insecticides aren't the answer for proper control.

It may be that the early bird catches the worm, but if the worm has had an overdose of DDT it's the early worm that gets the bird.

DDT apparently won't hurt a worm, but it will kill a bird that eats the worm.

This problem of insecticide contamination is a serious one. The purpose of the local committee and the wildlife federation is a good one.

As spring approaches and New England's little pests take to the air again, it might be a good idea for the conservation minded homeowner to look into other methods of control.

Large amounts of insecticides are dangerous to animals, birds, and sometimes man himself.

Oceans of Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the February 16 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Dr. Milner B. Schaefer, one of the Nation's outstanding marine scientists, speaks out on the importance of oceanographic research to the economy and security of our country.

Titled "Oceans of Ignorance," Dr. Schaefer's article also carries the warning subtitle, "The United States May Lose the Wet War Unless It Steps Up Marine Research."

Dr. Schaefer points out the tremendous efforts the U.S.S.R. is making to dominate this scientific field and thus gain domination of the oceans, and he also cites the huge, modern research and fishing fleets Russia has constructed and is constructing to exploit this anticipated worldwide ocean domination.

The comparison which Dr. Schaefer makes of these Soviet fleets with our own small scattering of antique fishing craft and oceanographic research ships, most of them reconverted auxiliary craft of wartime vintage, is not encouraging.

In fact, it is only in the past 2 years that the Government has embarked on a program designed to gradually make up for our obvious deficiencies in this vital scientific field.

Dr. Schaefer is highly qualified to speak on these matters through the columns of the Saturday Evening Post. In 1935 he received his bachelor of science degree at the University of Washington, later achieving his doctorate at that university, and for the following 4 years was biologist for the Washington State Department of Fisheries.

From 1938 until 1942, when he resigned to serve in the U.S. Navy, Dr. Schaefer was engaged as scientist with the International Pacific Fisheries Commission. From 1946 until 1950 he held the position of aquatic biologist with the Fish and Wildlife Service at Stanford, Calif., and Honolulu, Hawaii, following which he joined the faculty of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, Calif.

An original appointee to the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Schaefer testified before the Committee on Commerce in the 87th Congress on the marine science bill then pending, and he has also testified before the committee at hearings on fisheries problems. In addition to his other duties, he is Director of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

Mr. President, I commend Dr. Schaefer's article: "Oceans of Ignorance" to the attention of the Congress and to all readers of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCEANS OF IGNORANCE

(By Dr. Milner B. Schaefer)

THE UNITED STATES MAY LOSE THE WET WAR UNLESS IT STEPS UP MARINE RESEARCH

We live in a new age in which many of our dreams and much of our money go into the booming space program. But as we reach toward the stars we are ignoring a major part of the planet on which we live, and this indifference could cost us dearly. The oceans contain more currently needed information than any land mass beyond this planet. Nevertheless the administration will spend some $4 billion in 1963 for space research and exploration, while a paltry $150 million will go into oceanic investigation.

We are steadily dumping radioactive waste into the oceans with little or no idea of the long-term effects.

Every day we are more and more vulnerable to attack from missile-carrying submarines, yet we have failed to develop a foolproof underwater detection system capable of giving adequate warning against intruders.

The oceans cover 71 percent of the earth's surface, furnish our rain and determine our climate, yet we are making no effort to learn how to use the ocean to control the weather.

The oceans provide 90 billion pounds of the world's food each year, yet our share of this vast haul shrinks with each passing day.

This is a shocking situation. Officials remain almost as oblivious to the desperate need for oceanographic exploration as in 1769, when Benjamin Franklin had to reach into his own pocket in order to pay for charting the Gulf Stream. Astronomers know more about the moon's near surface than we do about the region where life began. This is "inner space" which contains 90 percent of the earth's animals. It is the great heat-and-cold regulator of the

globe. Topographically, we stand in knowledge where the dryland sciences stood in 1750.

Ocean-bottom structures and fossils can reveal how life began, why the continents separated; they can show us how to get at petroleum pools richer than man has ever known. But less than 2 percent of the sea floor has been mapped, let alone drilled into and examined.

Tests indicate that the sea can supply valuable antibiotics, yet these have not been isolated.

We believe that, through research and by building anchored transocean buoys, hurricane and tidal-wave damage can be cut by two thirds (through computed data flashed to shore).

We suspect that man has so choked the atmosphere with furnace, factory and car fumes that he has overloaded it with carbon dioxide, which, acting like the glass in a greenhouse, may be overheating the world's climate. But we cannot prove it because there has been little money for research to discover how fast the sea removes CO_2 from the air. Why does this matter? Because only a few degrees of sustained increase in temperature could melt the ice caps, raising the sea level and flooding coastal cities.

PERIL OF ATOMIC WASTE

Then there is the problem of radioactive contamination. A 1962 study of contamination of the Pacific by atomic waste reported that, while there is no present danger, we are woefully short of facts needed for a correct evaluation of just how much radioactivity introduced into the sea will return to us through its food supplies—which is the great hazard. If we do not understand this process, future generations whose survival will depend upon seafood may curse us.

Basic as this is, it has been painfully hard to secure backing for broad, coordinated studies. If government moves slowly, can our university and private labs, alone, take up the slack? No, because we are too few, understaffed, underequipped, and almost hopelessly logjammed with other equally pressing projects aimed at uncovering the sea's secrets.

Russia understands the broad sweep of this wet war far better than any other power. She is out to dominate the sea—both economically and militarily. "If the U.S.S.R. gets what she's after," said Senator WARREN MAGNUSON last year, "she will hold sway over 90 percent of the earth and imperil the remaining 10 percent with ballistic missiles fired from submarines hovering along the continental shelves."

Popping up now and then in northern waters has been a curious-looking craft, a Russian submersible named the *Severyanka*. It is not a nuclear submarine, but it is a remarkable underwater research vessel. A submarine with windows in it, the *Severyanka* has sampling devices that enable it to cruise leisurely at 100 fathoms and do research on everything from sound detection to fish populations. In effect, it is a unique, laterally moving, bathyscaphe.

We have nothing comparable. The United States owns one bathyscaphe, the *Trieste*, a fixed, cumbersome, deep-sea "blimp" that is booked solid for research projects for the next few years. Otherwise, this country has just 18 ships manned by scientists and designed for basic ocean study. The Russians have at least 75. If our people had a *Severyanka*, or a *Lomonosov*, we'd be overjoyed.

The Russian *Lomonosov* is a modern 5,900 tonner capable of carrying 70 scientists on extended voyages anywhere in the world. The Reds are far along on a crash program in oceanography equal to their early sputnik drive. Our own ships, 18 to 30 years of age, can carry only small parties, because only one of them is of more than 700 tons.

The Soviet oceanographic fleet is larger than those of all the Western nations combined. Although Moscow never sent out sea probers before World War II, it now maintains some 1,000 senior oceanographers compared to about half that number on our side.

Storm warnings raised before congressional committees have brought little relief. Some modest money increases and a few new ships have been voted. But Senator MAGNUSON's bill to double oceanographic research fell by the wayside. Another bill by Representative JOHN DINGELL to establish a national statement of ocean policy and coordinate all programs, passed by both Houses of Congress, drew President Kennedy's pocket veto. This despite the fact that the existing system is more tangled than a topsail-halyard knot, involving some 20 bureaus in nine departments and independent offices.

The President had earlier told Congress, "We are just at the threshold of knowledge of the oceans. * * * Our very survival may hinge on it."

"Threshold" is correct, but there seems no sign that we will be taking any immediate steps to cross that threshold. Take a few specifics:

By 1980, the United States alone will need an added annual 3 billion pounds of seafood; the needs of other, land-poor countries are staggeringly higher. In the race for cheap protein to supplement meat, maintaining our rights to use fishing grounds is vital. But our fisheries remain stagnant while those of rivals have nearly doubled in a decade.

Once the proud whalers of New England outsailed all comers; today, with antique ships and techniques, our New England fishermen are put to shame on Georges Bank, almost within sight of Cape Cod, by the Russians. Our tuna fleets still dominate the East Pacific, but are outdone worldwide by the Japanese.

Foreign fisheries benefit from extensive research—which we lack. Their huge diesel trawlers steam forth with scientists aboard, armed with sonar, temperature gauges, plankton samplers and underwater lights to draw fish. To Russians and Asians it is a deadly competitive struggle to expand territory, to stake prior claims for their swelling peoples.

At a recent sea conference in Geneva, Americans were asked by Soviet oceanographers, "What are you doing about automation?"

Thinking of our nets, lines, and trawls that date back to Captain Ahab, we mumbled evasive replies. The Russians grinned, and one said, "At our Giprorybflot Institute, Leningrad, we are designing fully automated boats of 5,000 tons. Few fishermen are needed. Everything is done by pushbutton. It is all taken care of by undersea eyes and the ship's digital computer. Automation navigates, searches out fish, hauls in and processes the catch in a continuous, fast operation."

While we ignore many modern advances, we also have been lax in conservation programs. Our policy has been to cut funds of many scientific commissions charged with conservation of commercial species. Right now, for instance, the yellowfin tuna situation is critical. Unless research can establish catch limits acceptable to North, South, and Central American nations, yellowfin tuna may become entirely fished out. In 1962 a House subcommittee knocked $250,000 out of the Commission's budgets. As Director of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission I was forced to cut back on yellowfin studies that might have saved this valuable crop.

Then there is the brains shortage. Ask young men why they avoid oceanography and they shrug, "Who teaches it?" Only 17 of our universities offer advanced degrees in marine science. Only five own their own high-seas ships. Last year the Smithsonian Institution was jammed with barrels of yet-unclassified sea specimens. Needing a dozen curators now, and more later, the Smithsonian is hard put to find any. It is estimated that fewer than two-tenths of 1 percent of the 300,000 senior scientists in this country work on marine matters.

Antisubmarine warfare is another urgent problem. Dr. Harrison Brown of California Institute of Technology has told the Senate, "Nobody knows how to go about monitoring nuclear subs. ASW is, I believe, the gravest, most difficult problem we face in the military field."

If land missiles stalemate one another, the action may shift offshore, where counterweapons to our Polaris nuclear subs would be of first concern. Attack subs are detected by two acoustical means: a listening sonar system which picks up their sounds, and an active system of steady "pinging" signals which echo back when they strike a submarine. But against vessels able to run deep and stay submerged for weeks, neither system has enough refinement or reliable range. The sea's physics and biology and ever-changing environment must be thoroughly known before more sensitive instruments can be devised.

The picture is not entirely gloomy. We are slowly learning to make the sea transparent—to see through it acoustically. Recently signals from the ship *Vema* off Australia were picked up off Bermuda, although they had to travel around Africa. Physicists knew they could exchange signals within an ocean, but did not realize they could communicate underwater from ocean to ocean. Next we need a vast spider web of submarine sound receivers as capable of finding and identifying intruders as the radar net which guards our air spaces.

Based on what we know now, the possibilities for mankind through marine research are immense. As lighthouses now guide surface craft, a criss-cross of submarine "roadmap" sound beacons will guide future ships. Huge submarines will be used as ships of commerce, traveling at twice today's speeds at much reduced cost.

KEY TO WEATHER CONTROL

Almost all rainfall comes from evaporation of sea water. Once we learn to adjust the sun-sea-atmosphere "heat engine" we will control rainfall and eventually perhaps all weather.

Biologists find sea life strangely uninfected by cancerous growths. If we could find out why, it could mean the medical breakthrough of the century. Aquaculture is in prospect: a process by which we could cultivate seafood domestically, much as we breed farm animals.

Sooner than we realize, land-mineral assets will dwindle, and then the sea can rescue us. Some 400 billion barrels of oil lie under the continental shelves. Billions of tons of manganese nodules—containing tremendous weights of copper, nickel, cobalt, vanadium, molybdenum and zinc—recently have been located on the deep Pacific bottom.

It seems inconceivable to me that we should put so much of our wealth into efforts to build engines to soar away from earth and devote pennies to the seven-tenths of this planet on which we actually live. The first men to reach the moon will be only as strong as the base they left behind. This will be an ever-diminishing base for free society and an expanding source of bounty for the opposition unless our waterproof friends in Washington get moving.

National Correct Posture Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, physical fitness is being stressed as a national goal. Fifty-mile walks are a challenge, but one can contribute to physical fitness merely by standing still—if he maintains correct posture. Indeed, correct posture is primary to the acquisition of a sound, healthy body.

Correct posture is taught universally by physicians of every school and by physical education teachers in every school. One national organization, the National Chiropractic Association, pinpoints this annually in its effort to have the week May 1–7 set aside as National Correct Posture Week. Every movement of this kind should be encouraged.

Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D.C., in behalf of his association, has assembled some thoughts and techniques on promoting good posture in a brief statement having the title, "Good Health, Good Posture", and I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Murphy's statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. EMMETT J. MURPHY

Contributing to national health and welfare by improving individual posture is the sole aim of the National Chiropractic Association when it annually sponsors—from May 1 through May 7—National Correct Posture Week.

This is the time when chiropractors use every means of publicity to draw public attention to this primary aim of chiropractics. They believe, preach, and practice that good posture and good health go together.

In that belief we are in complete agreement with every branch of the healing arts, and we are sincere in our constant efforts to cooperate with all Americans in improving the standards of our national health.

It has been most encouraging to note that many agencies of our Federal Government have been in the vanguard of those advocating correct posture as a definite aid toward sound health and long life.

All recruits are familiar with the basic teachings of our Armed Forces which stress correct posture—not only on the parade ground, but elsewhere. These teachings stress correct posture as a means of physical, mental, and emotional well-being.

It is important to remember that good posture means much more than simply standing straight. Good posture is that position of the body in any activity in which all of its parts are working effectively and with proper balance, ease, and comfort.

On this one point all spokesmen of all branches of human endeavor have agreed for hundreds of years that correct posture is one of the most important paths to good general health.

This viewpoint is shared by medical and chiropractic authorities, public health workers, nurses, psychiatrists, the armed services, pediatricians, and specialists in industrial relations.

Good posture is a result of holding your body in a balanced position. The easiest way to attain it is to think of an imaginary line running from the tip of the skull through your neck, shoulders, hips, knees, and insteps. When the head is bent forward, the abdomen thrust out, or the back bent, the line of gravity is shifted, and a strain placed on muscles to keep the body from falling.

To test: Stand with back to wall with head, heels, shoulders, and calves of legs touching it, hands by sides. Flatten hollow of back by pressing buttocks down against the wall. Space at back of waist should not be greater than the thickness of your hand.

Stand facing close to wall, palms of hands touching front of thighs. If chest touches wall first, your posture is probably excellent, or at least good; if head touches first, it is only fair; if abdomen touches first, your posture is really bad.

When you stand straight your head should be balanced and erect. Your shoulders are relaxed and low; your chest is held high. Your lower back should curve to just a slight degree. Your abdomen should be flat. Have your knees straight but not stiff, and feel your weight in the outer borders of your feet.

You should sit with your feet flat on the floor. Do not slump in a chair, but keep your back straight and your abdomen flat. As in standing, your head should be erect and well balanced. When you lean forward, lean from the hips, not from the waist.

Movement should start at the hips. Your head and upper part of your body should remain at right angles to the ground. Swing your arms freely. Look ahead, never down. Point your toes straight ahead. Knees should be relaxed and free.

Without the wholehearted cooperation of the American people, National Correct Posture Week would be a meaningless phrase.

It is the wonderful assistance of schoolteachers and school authorities, of State legislatures, of Governors and mayors, of Members of the U.S. Congress, and of the people themselves that has made National Correct Posture Week an increasingly important observance in the United States.

Every year more and more officials at the city and State level proclaim its observance officially.

The active members of the National Chiropractic Association lead in observance of National Correct Posture Week, because the science of chiropractic is dedicated to the elimination of postural faults which rob human beings of the health they should have.

Taxpayers Are People Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press of March 8 carried an editorial that discusses thoughtfully the recommendations of many Republicans that there is a need to reduce spending. The editorial points especially to new obligational authority which starts with modest proposals and then involves very high expenditures in succeeding years. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP BUDGET SNIPPERS

If they maintain the attitude they have indicated in recent days, Republican Members of Congress just might save President Kennedy's tax-cut proposal and at the same time get the administration's spending program back somewhere within bounds. (The latter being the only right way to get the former.)

GOP members of the House Appropriations Committee say they will offer an item-by-item trimming job which might get as much as $4 to $6 billion in actual spending out of the 1964 budget. More important, they are shooting at the so-called new obligational authority gimmick—a bookkeeping device which forewarns of even bigger spending to come after 1964.

Government spending has gone up to Mr. Kennedy's estimated $99 billion for 1964—biggest budget in history—largely because of built-in programs permitted by Congress in past years. These programs always carry a delusion of modesty at the outset—then bulge out in later years, when it is harder to stop them.

It is the new obligational authority which gets these programs started, without the ultimate price tag on them. If the Republicans, with Democratic help, can head off this type of entrapment, they can go a long way toward bringing to a halt the rapid climb in Government spending, which has become something like perpetual motion.

The spenders in Washington are now, and will go on, trying to spread the idea that any budget paring is dangerous or will impair national security, or will stunt the country's growth. If the Republicans, as one spender put it, "want to come out against people, that is their privilege."

But taxpayers are people, too, and reducing spending so the taxpayers may keep a little more of their own money hardly strikes us as antipeople.

Fourth Anniversary of Hawaiian Statehood

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been moved by the eloquence and the sincere sentiment in the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA. The fame as an orator of the first order of the gentleman from Hawaii had preceded his swearing in as a Member of this historic body, and, Mr. Speaker, in his maiden speech in this Chamber, and on a most historic occasion, he has lived up to his reputation.

We are happy and proud to have him as our colleague and the House indeed is enriched by the presence of both Mr. MATSUNAGA and Mr. GILL. I congratulate the people of Hawaii on their rare good judgment in the selection of statesmen of such ability and such dedication. They are worthy successors of the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE who endeared himself to all his colleagues in the House

and is now serving his State and the Nation in the other body. I would be remiss if I did not mention the Honorable John Burns who during his service with us as a delegate from Hawaii was a vital factor in the attainment of Hawaiian statehood. It is a source of pleasure to us all that former Delegate Burns is now the Governor of the great and proud State of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, many of the States of our Union, powerful and mighty States, in my boyhood were still serving their apprenticeships as territories. With the attainment of statehood all expanded and grew and became strong and indispensable parts of our imperishable Union. I count among the priceless opportunities given me by my congressional service that I had been permitted to work, to speak, and to vote in several Congresses for statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska. This is a heritage that I am proud to hand down to my children, to their children and to those of my blood in all the generations to come.

I am thrilled today with a sentiment of patriotism, of pride in my country and faith in its future, on this fourth anniversary of the statehood of Hawaii and the remarks of my colleagues in observance thereof, my warmest congratulations to the people of Hawaii on the magnificent manner in which they have responded to the challenge of statehood.

The Feeble-Minded One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginia anecdotes are often gems of pungent, tongue-in-cheek humor, characteristic of the stalwart, windblown, hard-working people of the Mountain State. Many of these anecdotes are of a self-effacing kind, for hill-country folk believe in poking fun at themselves, rather than giving offense to the other fellow.

Perhaps the most noted chronicler of mountain-people anecdotes is the West Virginia Hillbilly, a weekly newspaper which I commend to all Americans who enjoy dry humor and narratives that sparkle with simple, descriptive portraits of hill-country folk.

In the March 9, 1963, edition of the West Virginia Hillbilly, which is published in Richwood, W. Va., there is related on page 16 an anecdote which I feel is typically and characteristically of Mountain State flavor. I ask unanimous consent to have this anecdote printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that Americans everywhere can appreciate the story-telling artistry of West Virginians.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the West Virginia Hillbilly of Mar. 9, 1963]

THE FEEBLE-MINDED ONE

Harry Pauley tells this story and says it is true and I suppose it is actually as true as any of Harry's stories. Some Internal Revenue agents came down to Harry's town of Iaeger to investigate the income tax returns of one of the town's more prosperous businessmen. The man was paying so much tax that the minions of that department of Government decided there must be something hidden away. The report looked just too open and above board. The fellows had no success. They looked at his ledger and they checked his invoices and all his canceled checks and, stay as long as they could, there was no indication of tax evasion.

Well, they decided then that while they were there maybe they had better have a look at his employment record and see if they could find some violation of wage and hour requirements. Here, too, there was no evidence of fraud. The least paid to anybody was within the legal limits and all overtime and double time and coffeetime and such was paid for right to the penny and right on the line.

But certainly, there was some infraction. So they went to him and asked him now if there wasn't somebody else who was drawing money from the business that wasn't reported. And he said, yes there was, a fellow who didn't amount to very much and he was only getting a couple of dollars, or maybe $3 a week.

The men perked up. Aha. Tell them more. Well, the man said, there isn't much to tell. I guess you would say he isn't too smart, you know, kind of feebleminded. Wasn't on the ball like other people. All he knew was work. He'd come in early before anybody else and start the day off. Had his own key. And then sometimes he'd get so concerned with the job that he would forget to go eat. And then he always was the last man out. Even worked late. Or came in at night.

Yet, he only paid him a couple or three bucks a week. The men shook their heads and sharpened their pencils. Taking advantage of a man who evidently didn't have all his marbles. But was a valuable, hard-working fellow.

"We'd like to talk with this fellow," they said.

"You are," the fellow told them.

Post 6 Decides Wisely To Build Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the March 9, 1963, issue of The Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky., entitled "Post 6 Decides Wisely To Build Home," contains a reference to a gentleman who had a great deal to do with the naming of the American Legion. This gentleman is not only one of Kentucky's outstanding citizens and attorneys, but is a great American.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial which is as follows:

POST 6 DECIDES WISELY TO BUILD HOME

News that Hopkins County Post No. 6, American Legion, plans to rebuild on the site of its handsome post home, destroyed by fire February 22, will be greeted with satisfaction by Hopkins County servicemen who regretted the loss of the Princeton Road structure.

At a meeting of members of the Legion post's realty corporation and post officials, decision was reached to decide upon the type of building to be erected on the post homesite, and then employ an architect to draw up building plans.

This is the normal procedure for post 6 to take, and the one to be expected under the circumstances. It would be out of character for the servicemen who comprise the post membership to proceed otherwise, and out of the challenge posed by the February 22 fire, it is expected, there will emerge a new post home which will be a modern and revised version of the old.

It happened that the fire which destroyed the post 6 building came as the birthday of the great veterans' organization approached. As we mentioned in our editorial about the month of March and the events and anniversaries associated therewith, it was 44 years ago, come March 15, when a handful of war-weary but victorious American soldiers met in Paris, France, and associated themselves together "for God and country" in what came to be the largest and most influential organization of war veterans in history.

As we mentioned before, Madisonville's well-known Maj. M. K. Gordon, dean of Hopkins County attorneys, supplied the name "American Legion" when the Paris session came to the matter of selecting a proper name for the veterans' group they were building. It is a part of local history, too, that Earlington veterans organized the first Legion post in Kentucky and were entitled to the No. 1 designation. They were chiseled out of it, however, by Jefferson County post, and Earlington vets had to be satisfied with No. 2.

Hopkins County post, as everybody knows, is No. 6. It, like the Earlington post, was not born full-grown in the days of peace which followed the First World War. The average serviceman was weary of warfare, didn't want to be reminded of it, and in many cases was wary of joining an organization which many thought was a sort of Reserve force which would automatically make them eligible for recall in a time of need. The American Legion idea had to be sold to the veterans, in other words, and the selling took time, talent, and a firm conviction that the ex-serviceman needed a strong organization to represent him and fend for him in Washington or otherwheres.

Now the American Legion is about to celebrate its birthday with a 1963 enrollment which is running well ahead of 1962 in spite of the fact that death now claims about 55,000 Legionnaires each year, this number largely from among the World War I founders. It is apparent from the figures that veterans of World War II and the Korean war which is sometimes called World War 2½ continue to join at a rate that more than compensates for the toll taken by the man with the scythe.

The central theme March 15 in the birthday observances in the thousands of Legion posts in the 50 States, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, on American bases and in various cities around the world will be an American Legion showcase of the four programs to which the founders dedicated themselves so long ago.

There are Americanism, child welfare, rehabilitation and national security, goals that may never be completely attained but which must forever be kept in mind and fought for and advanced by the Legion in time of war and time of peace, so long as the Legion exists.

National Commander James E. Powers of the Legion has suggested that there are men and women in every community eligible for membership in the Legion, and needed by the Legion, who should be invited to join and contribute of their time and talents to the real work of the organization.

Certainly there are many veterans in Madisonville and Hopkins County who are not affiliated with the veterans' organization, and thus are missing an opportunity to join in the work of these distinguished, public-spirited ranks. In addition to building a new post home, here is another chore cut out for Post 6 Commander Tom Brown, Post Adjutant W. G. Davis and their associates in the Hopkins County Legion group.

Frederick R. Kappel Receives Silver Quill Award of Nation's Specialized Business Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the recent 14th annual state of the Nation dinner of the Specialized Business Press of America, sponsored by National Business Publications, Inc., at the Sheraton-Park, February 7, 1963, in Washington, at which the chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Frederick R. Kappel, was presented the Silver Quill Award for 1962 by the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, for "distinguished service to the business community."

Many Members of the Congress joined industry and business leaders, Government officials and policymakers in our national life, at this notable event.

The excerpts follow:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES MILTON B. KIHLSTRUM, PRESIDENT, MILLER PUBLISHING CO., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

We come to the climax of our evening—the presentation of the Silver Quill Award of the Specialized Business Press. As always, there were many candidates considered—all outstanding; all deserving. However, none sparkled with such brilliance as that guiding genius behind Telstar who is here to receive our highest tribute.

We are also favored by the presence of another great man of universal respect—the Vice President of the United States—who was himself, last year, recipient of this award. The Specialized Business Press of America will always be honored, Mr. JOHNSON, by its association with your momentous endeavor. We are delighted to have you now present the Silver Quill Award for 1962.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON IN PRESENTING THE 1962 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS TO FREDERICK R. KAPPEL

Mr. Kihlstrum, Mr. Schoenbrun, Mr. Kappel, distinguished guests at the head table, ladies and gentlemen—the dynamics of living are at an alltime peak. Time and distance are shrinking, as the marvels of the space age burst forth at an ever-increasing rate. We're in a race—a race for survival, a race for solutions to social problems, a race to the moon and beyond. This competition involves our way of life—involves our way of doing business, involves our way of maintaining leadership—maintaining it through freedom rather than maintaining it through force.

I suggest that there is more to the space race than those whose rockets are more reliable and those whose spacecrafts first attain their objectives. Those are important, of course, but, as I say, there is much more involved.

There is a contest between a democracy with private enterprise and a dictatorship without private enterprise. As the leaders of the former, we must continue to prove to ourselves and to the world that partnership between private business and free government is the superior way of getting things done.

The Silver Quill Award is peculiarly devoted to the field of business. It is granted by the Nation's business publishers to those whom they have selected as having performed outstanding service to business. But, we're living in a world where all of us—business and labor and agriculture or professionals—must operate in such a manner that what we do in our own field also serves the best interests of our country.

I have not come here this evening to lavish compliments on Frederick Kappel—the people in this audience have recounted his accomplishments so many times that words from an amateur are entirely superfluous. It is the tradition of the Silver Quill that the recipient of the previous year's award make the presentation and I am pleased that this tradition has selected me to pass it on to a most deserving, most distinguished, most competent and a greatly dedicated all-American, Fred Kappel.

REMARKS OF FREDERICK R. KAPPEL

This is an honor I deeply appreciate for several reasons. The first is that this occasion has come through the years to be such a meaningful event. What makes it so, of course, is all people who have gathered around. And, certainly, this gathering is a great tribute to the business publications of the country. We have only to look around this room to realize the importance attached to the business publishing function.

I can't help thinking, too, of the men who have been honored in previous years. It makes me very proud and also very humble to be associated with such a group. One of its most distinguished members, your guest of honor last year, just sat down a minute ago after saying more about me than I could recognize. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for being so generous in overstating my case.

Another thing that pleases me especially is that this year's award really honors many people and not just me. I have been in the Bell System nearly 39 years. It doesn't take that long to realize that whatever credit we earn is the work of able and devoted men and women all through the business. And it doesn't lessen my personal appreciation, it only increases it, to be able to say—on their behalf as well as for myself—thank you for this recognition.

The story of Telstar is a perfect example of what I have just said. Hundreds and hundreds of people have done their absolute best to make this wonderful thing work. This best involves disciplined scientific imagination, great technical proficiency and the most demanding insistence on quality. But something more is needed, too. What is it that invigorates such effort? What fires people up and then pours on the coal?

I think it is the realization that there are great ends to be served and that every job well done contributes importantly to serving them. By great ends, I mean the mastery of space as a new medium for worldwide communications; the creation of a system which, along with ocean cables, will meet fast-growing human needs; the demonstration of continuing American leadership in extending and improving services that, hopefully, will help bring together the peoples of all nations.

As matters now stand, Telstar has provided basic assurance that satellite communications are indeed feasible and practical and that design and construction of commercial satellites, and ground stations to work with them, can now be approached pretty much as a straight engineering project. There is no scientific obstacle to designing a commercial system immediately and bringing it into being as soon as the satellites could be manufactured and put into orbit, say in 2 or 3 years.

I also mentioned ocean cables. Regarding them, I might say, too, that in a few years' time, their capabilities for handling all kinds of communications will surely equal those of satellites. It would be a great mistake to think that all the paths of progress are out in space.

The important thing of course is to make the best use of all the opportunities. The incorporators appointed by the President are working hard, as you know, to get the Space Communications Corp. started. Speaking for the Bell System, I will just say again that our wish and hope are to take an active, constructive part in this, and as soon as possible. We want to help build a strong, healthy enterprise that will be a great success.

Now the theme of this meeting tonight has been "The Challenge of Universal Communication." And it seems to me this takes us inevitably to the problems of communication in the broad sense—not just the kind I have been talking about, but the whole matter of communicating ideas and purposes of spreading and getting understanding. It is in this effort that the specialized business publications play their important part, not merely as reporters but as lively interpreters of the goals, the achievements, the significant thinking of American industry.

But how can we in business communicate better? And what do we want to communicate anyway?

Several thoughts occur to me. First, I think business simply must communicate more successfully than it has; that the economic growth we are all striving for depends first and foremost on the vitality and drive that is generated in the private sector of the economy—on stimulating and rousing the energies of private enterprise—on encouraging acceptance of risk and the enthusiastic, eager exercise of management skills.

I honestly don't believe the country can get where it wants to go in any other way. Without question these factors have been central to our progress so far. Yet we seem unable to communicate the very philosophy that the country has prospered by. We have watched millions of young people grow up with little or no understanding of the practical economics of business enterprise. We have let profit come to be a dirty word—or a mere technical term in professional eco-

nomic lingo—while the absolute need for profitability has been clouded over and obscured.

Second, we have big problems in this country and we will not solve them if our aims are small. I said earlier that I thought the driving force behind Telstar was the realization of important ends to be served. If we in busines want to instill confidence in others, if we want to inspire people to strive, then we must communicate a feeling of purpose, a feeling that what we are doing is deeply and truly important—important to the country and important to the future.

But we can never communicate this kind of feeling just by using words. I don't say words can be dispensed with. Basically, however, business—and Government, too, for that matter—communicates by how it works. This is age-old doctrine, I realize, but I still can't find a better one. The determination to produce quality, the utmost in value, whatever the product or service may be—this makes work important. This gives dignity to employees, character to the business, lasting substance to investment and satisfaction to consumers, with attendant public respect. Performance and only performance will largely communicate itself—with the help of words to be sure—but the business that puts on great performance will never need the dictionary to explain it.

As a third point, I think more businesses are learning that by the very act of stating their purposes, they greatly encourage their own effort to achieve them. This involves what I call giving hostages to performance. When you commit yourself to the public plainly, for all to read or hear—well, you are committed. You are out on a limb. You have to stand or fall, and that is a wonderful discipline.

Unhappily, most instances of climbing out on a limb now occur in disputes of various kinds and involve demands made on others. What I am speaking for here is that we make more demands on ourselves, and make them in public. The words we use to do this might even be the most important in all business communication.

Finally, just a word about communication and agreement. Some people I talk with seem to think these are two sides of the same coin. I don't think so at all. I agree that communicating means to listen as well as to talk, but the name of the game is not "Me, too." After all, one of the main purposes of communication is to make clear when you disagree, and why.

I make this rather obvious point because I hope the theme of this meeting will not carry any of us off into dreamland. We surely need, in this country, broad unity of purpose. But we shall never arrive at it by pretending to agree when we do not. We shall get there only by continuously testing and prodding each other—by a continuous dialog, as the intellectuals call it. And what I am saying here tonight comes down essentially to this:

First, business needs to do all it can to improve its part in the dialog; and second, the foundations for success in this effort must be, as they have always been, good purposes, good will, good faith, and good works.

To the national business publications I say again, for myself and equally for my associates in the Bell System—we are deeply grateful for this award. We shall try our best, with your valued and important help, to contribute usefully toward solving problems of communication, in every sense of the word.

Thank you very much.

Two Books on Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate two new books on Indonesia, a country which the free world should watch because of the growing threat of communism in that young but very populous land.

I ask unanimous consent that two book reviews relating to the subject, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the book reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOLSHEVIKS IN BALI

(By Burton Raffel)

("Indonesian Communism: A History," by Arnold C. Brackman (Praeger, 336 pp., $6.50), warns that Western assistance to the current regime would not only dishearten democratic foes of Sukarno but drive the country's Communist Party into an effective underground opposition. Burton Raffel, a member of the Indonesian Council of the Asia Society, lived from 1953–55 in Indonesia.)

This is first-rate political history, a pioneering book that has none of the deficiencies forgivable, but usually predictable, in path-breaking investigations. Arnold Brackman is clear, accurate, and concise; he is detailed, though never pedantic or dull. His fairness is admirable, as is the calmly honest, calmly outspoken tone he displays throughout "Indonesian Communism: A History." The fine chapter on the abortive Communist putsch (Madiun, 1948), e.g., reads like the best of current military history, and the concluding chapters have the ring of analytical prophecy:

"[President] Sukarno secured Irian [West New Guinea], as he pledged he would—albeit at the cost of wrecking the economy, snuffing out representative government, trampling on civil liberties, mortgaging Indonesia's future to Soviet arms shipments, andl providing the Communist Party with a rare opportunity to develop a base of mass power. * * *"

Indonesia's Communist Party, the oldest in Asia (its Dutch progenitor, one Sneevliet, was also instrumental in founding the Chinese Communist Party), only emerged from gray, conspiratorial obscurity after the war and the August 17, 1945, proclamation of independence. Mr. Brackman shows us the party's careful organizational planning, sponsored and directed from Moscow: Indonesian Communist students returning home, disguised as Socialists, Social Democrats, and what-have-you; ancient "Bolsheviks" sent back from 20 or more years of exile; the local party faithful, maneuvering this way and that with the dogged devotion familiar the world over. An excellent example of the last, cited by Mr. Brackman, is that of a former party chairman, Sardjono, who was asked in 1942 to join the Allied cause:

"I harbored no personal animosity toward the Dutch despite 17 years of confinement," Sardjono explained later. "My attitude was conditioned by my impersonal ideology. I was glad to have the opportunity to fight Fascism." Here was the dedicated, disciplined Communist.

However, even independence, with the turmoil introduced by the Japanese invasion and continued by the Dutch reinvasions of 1947 and 1949, was not a fertile enough field to enable the Communists to take power. There were several attempts, Madiun being only the most prominent, but none of them were successful—except in eliminating most of the old-line party leadership, killed in their putsch attempts or shot by the Indonesian military after arrest and in the face of Dutch armies. In 1949 Indonesian communism was fragmented, ineffective, and largely discredited.

Its renaissance was due, as Mr. Brackman brilliantly shows, to two men, President Sukarno and, secondarily, the young party chairman, D. N. Aidit. This is a fascinating tale, masterfully unfolded on any number of levels simultaneously, and far too involved as well as too important, to be briefly summarized here. (The index is excellent.) Mr. Brackman gives us, neatly and expertly, the world Communist scene at each stage, and patiently weaves the Indonesian Communist scene into that basic pattern. Indonesian politics are, in a word, messy; Mr. Brackman works his way through them with the ease and clarity of a wise, experienced hand, unraveling motivations, confessing to speculation where solid evidence is lacking, analyzing, and—praine be—criticizing as he goes.

"The Dutch (reinvasion) dealt the West a hard blow throughout the Afro-Asian world and made a mockery of the Western contention that colonialism was in its death throes. * * * The West's folly, of course, would be perpetuated in Indo-China and later repeated in Algeria and Angola. * * *

"Nowhere in non-Communist Asia did the Communists masquerade so successfully in nationalist guise—and accordingly enjoy so free a hand—as in Indonesia.

It may also be added that nowhere in non-Communist Asia was the national leadership as irresponsible or unaware as in Indonesia. * * *

The success of the Marshall plan in western Europe, which was technically capable of absorbing massive assistance, prompted Washington to embark (in 1951) on a similar program for Asia. The United States indiscriminately made a similar assumption about the new states, despite their diverse political, economic, cultural, and religious backgrounds and temperaments. The United States failed to appreciate the starkly different psychological climate. * * *

"Indonesian communism" is full of important political lessons, many of them quietly underlined by Mr. Brackman's frequent paralleling of Indonesia and Chiang Kai-shek's China. He does not overestimate Communist strength: "the Communists have attracted a mass movement not because the masses have endorsed the Communist program, but because the Communists have promised * * * [prosperity and land], and the peasantry is unaware that the Communists know that they cannot fill this cornucopia." On the other hand, Mr. Brackman writes, "If the party could gain direct control of the armed forces, or failing in that, neutralize the army's effectiveness by encouraging 'war lordism' or by subverting ill-paid troops, the party would be on the threshold of power." The author's summation of President Sukarno's position, and of any possible westward tack that skillful opportunist may take, applies far more widely than the borders of even the sixth largest nation in the world:

It would be folly for the West to reward such opportunism. A program of Western

assistance would not only dishearten the democratic opponents of Sukarno's regime, many of whom are now in jail, others under surveillance, but would also drive the PKI [Communist Party of Indonesia] into an underground opposition from where they could fan the smoldering fires of popular discontent. In such a situation, the West would find itself backing the wrong horse. Western errors of omission and commission have been manifest in Indonesia for more than a decade; they would be compounded by shoring up the incumbent regime and, therefore, the status quo."

THE HECTIC ARCHIPELAGO

(By Bernard Kalb)

"Indonesia: Troubled Paradise," by Reba Lewis (McKay. 192 pp. $5.95), tells of the teenaged nation's particularly hectic years. (Bernard Kalb is southeast Asia correspondent for CBS News.)

The fifth most populous country in the world, Indonesia, an archipelago of magnificence, frustration, and 100 million people, is one of the most underdeveloped, underknown, and under-understood new nations around a land badly in need of being explained. This is quite a challenge, telling the story of a turbulent, headstrong, independent teenager like Indonesia, and Reba Lewis, who lived on Java during the particularly hectic years of 1957 to 1960, is the latest of a comparatively few Americans who have had the courage to try.

Indonesia has a way of dividing the foreigners who take up temporary residence there into -philes, -phobes, and -phobe-philes, with the accent on -phile. Though critical at times, Mrs. Lewis is an unabashed -phile. The wife of a world health organization professor who helped set up a department of pharmacology at the Fakultas Kedokteran affiliated with Airlangga University, in Surabaja, she got around, learned how to speak bahasa Indonesia, and browsed through the works of foreigners (Captain Cook and others) who preceded her to the archipelago. The result is a highly personalized, generally sympathetic account of the history, politics, and people of Indonesia. It is illuminating (when she writes about what she herself saw, heard, and discovered), guidebooky (when she writes about Bali, Borobudur, etc.), and exasperating (mostly because of what she writes—and leaves out—about politics). It is, curiously, without any special passion, even though it is a book, one has the feeling, Mrs. Lewis couldn't resist writing.

At times probing, at times superficial, her narrative tells of the years 1957–60: the revolt of the outer islands that began in 1958, the campagin for Irian Barat (West New Guinea), the crackdown on the Dutch community, the sudden devaluation of currency in 1959, the attempt on President Sukarno's life in 1957, the great strides made in education, the discrimination against the Chinese. Many of the facts and some of the emotions are here; thank to Mrs. Lewis' personalized chronicling, a newcomer to the story of Indonesia does get a bit of the feel of what took place in those years when Indonesia was pushed across the threshold to "guided democracy."

All right. But it is in the field of political reporting that the author is at her weakest. For example—and this is only one example—she says that the 1948 Communist uprising at Maduin, in mid-Java, was a result of the policy followed by the anti-Communist Moslem Masjumi Party "against the progressive forces as well as the Communists." "Tidak," as they say in Indonesia. It means "not at all." Communist strategy at that time, when the young republic was in the midst of a revolution against the Netherlands, was laid down by a hardened Communist by the name of Muso, who had just had himself smuggled into Indonesia after a long exile in the Soviet Union. Though certain historians have debated whether the Communists staged their revolt on their own initiative or were provoked into it by anti-Communist military elements, the critical fact is that it was not a reaction to the policies of the Masjumi. It was part of Communist insurrectionist strategy in southeast Asia at the time. The book also lacks an analysis of Sukarno's political tactics, the current strategy of the Communist Party, and Indonesia's belief in—and merchandising of—her policy of "nonalinement" in a cold war world.

But, as one -phile to another, I can't resist congratulating Mrs. Lewis for adding her account to the small but growing shelf of books, in English, about a troubled giant eager for love.

Energy Development Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology recently held in Geneva, Switzerland, many papers were presented to the delegates from the 87 attending nations. The purpose of this Conference was to make available to the less-developed nations information in the fields of science and technology could be applied and utilized effectively by these nations.

As part of my remarks I include the statement presented to the Conference by Mr. Northcutt Ely in the session on energy development policies. Mr. Ely is a member of the law firm of Ely, Duncan, and Bennett of Washington, D.C. His statement follows:

ENERGY DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

I have read that a hundred thousand men labored to build the Great Pyramid. Their manpower, working to exhaustion 12 hours a day, could be equaled now by the energy produced by a 3,000-kilowatt generator, working around the clock. To take a modern comparison, if a nation has a labor force of 5 million men, each working an 8-hour shift, the energy they can generate with their muscles can be duplicated by a 100,000-kilowatt generator, working 24 hours a day. The drudgery of the men who dragged the stones to build the pyramids can be replaced by the energy produced by a machine that can be contained within your garage. The energy produced by the muscles of the entire labor force of a medium-sized nation can be duplicated by the energy produced by a machine that can be housed easily within the space of this auditorium.

Low-cost energy is the key to the future of man's progress. We are doubling our use of electric energy every decade in many parts of the world. In this respect, at least, the energy explosion is outpacing the troublesome population explosion, which threatens to double the population every three or four decades.

Some elements of energy costs are controlled by economics, some by politics. Speaking as a lawyer, let me comment on two elements in the political category. I am speaking now of policies that ought to control development of energy for consumption within the producing country. I am not speaking of policies that ought to control the pricing of resources for export.

First, as to taxes. When we arbitrarily tax energy sources we arbitrarily hobble and disable the giant that we have created, just as though the Pharaoh had chained stones on the backs of his pyramid builders. Taxes on coal, crude oil, fuel oil, gasoline, electric power, all increase the cost of energy that enters into every level of industrial activity. The weight thus added at the first stage thus operates with the increasing effect of multiple levers upon each succeeding stage. It is good policy to make energy available abundantly and cheaply. It is bad policy to make energy scarce and costly by high taxation, thereby diminishing the effectiveness of labor and the abundance of their product capable of yielding tax revenues.

Second, as to interest rates. The energy-producing industries (by this term I mean the several stages from production of coal, oil, gas, fissionable materials, etc., or the construction of dams, on through the construction of plants to generate energy through thermal processes, hydroelectric generators, atomic reactors, etc., and finally the transmission and distribution network) all require large amounts of capital per dollar of gross revenue produced. For example, in some Government-owned hydroelectric systems on which industry depends for low-priced energy, the ratio is almost $20 of capital invested in plant for each dollar of annual revenue received. Most of this $20 of capital has to be borrowed from someone. The interest rate, the cost of hiring money, is therefore much more important here than in those businesses in which the ratio of invested capital to gross annual revenue is very low, because of rapid turnover of the inventory of goods in which the investment is made. In the energy industries, if the interest rate on the $20 borrowed is increased by 1 percent, this increase equals 20 cents per year. To recover this added 20 cents requires an increase in the price of the product from the hypothetical price of $1 to $1.20. This is an increase of 20 percent in the price of the product. A 20-percent price increase may so burden the cost of energy to the consumer as to make unfeasible the construction of needed industries that require large quantities of power. Such industries will remain unbuilt, or will be built in another country where the cost of money is lower. Capital in the large amounts required cannot be obtained in the form of nonreimbursable foreign aid. It must be borrowed, and hire for the money must therefore be paid to the lender in the form of interest.

But interest rates reflect the risk that is assumed by the investor. This is true whether the money is borrowed from private investors or borrowed from a foreign government. Even a Socialist country, when it lends money to someone outside its borders, and charges interest upon that loan, becomes a capitalist with respect to the money that it expects to get back from the foreign borrower. A nation, like an individual, with a good reputation for respecting foreign investments, can attract foreign capital at lower interest rates than a nation or an individual with a bad reputation for repudiation of debts. In the long run, no nation that needs help from the harvested resources of another nation in order to develop its own latent resources can afford the luxury of expropriating the foreign savings that it has thus enlisted. This is acutely true with respect to the energy industries which must recruit capital in massive and increasing amounts that are related to the explosive curve of growth of demand for energy, but which can only pay back that capital slowly and over a long period of time. As someone discovered a long time ago, it is not profitable to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

The Republicans Unmasked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the airwaves and the press have been filled for weeks now with propaganda from the other side of the aisle about the great economy record which the Republican Party has in store for this session. By attempting to label the Kennedy administration as "big spenders," they thought they smelled blood in anticipation of next year's election. The distinguished minority leader talked of cutting an arbitrary $3 billion out of the defense budget. Others had grander ideas—they were going to cut up to $10 billion, or $15 billion out of some unidentified "fat" in the budget.

But as so often has happened the past 30 years, the Republicans do not put there votes where their mouths are. In their first big test last week on the defense budget, the Republican economizers turned out a majority of their party to vote for increasing the President's request by hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this difference between talk and performance—which the Republicans have made into a fine art—reminds me of the woeful cries of "socialism, socialism," with which they filled the air all through the Roosevelt and Truman administrations as the Democratic Party tried to meet the needs of the Nation with social security, minimum wages, resources conservation, rural electrification, and other measures. Oh, these things to help the average American were socialism or worse, our friends lamented.

But when they came back into power in 1953, did they repeal any of these terrible socialistic measures? Of course not. Did they even try? No, indeed. As our great Speaker Sam Rayburn used to remind them, "If it was socialistic to put these laws on the books, then it's socialistic to leave them there."

Mr. Speaker, this Republican talk about fat budgets, wasteful spending, and so on is just political poppycock generated for next year's election. Our great Secretary of Defense, himself a Republican, cut more than $15 billion out of the defense budget, as requested by the armed services, before it was sent to Congress. And then a majority of Republicans in this House voted to add hundreds of millions of dollars to the President's recommendations. No wonder the American people have entrusted them with the control of Congress for only 4 years out of the last 34.

Our Republican friends must be very pained to read the column of a most distinguished editorialist, himself regarded often as one of the most persuasive Republicans, which appeared in the Washington Post for Tuesday, March 19.

Entitled "The Budget-Cutters: An Upside-Down Approach," this column by Roscoe Drummond of the New York Herald Tribune syndicate, unmasks this Republican gap between profession and performance in a most unsparing way. So that many thoughtful Americans across the land who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the benefits of Mr. Drummond's incisive analysis, I am including his article in full:

THE BUDGET CUTTERS—AN UPSIDE-DOWN APPROACH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Republicans are making a very odd beginning in their avowed crusade to cut the Federal budget. It is an upside-down approach—this cutting the budget by increasing it. It is not much of a way to go about it.

The first test vote in the House dealing with fiscal 1964 provided the Republicans with the opportunity to begin to do what they have proclaimed and pledged they would do.

The test found the majority of Republicans voting to add still more to the already record-high defense budget.

It helped to produce a military appropriation bill which, together with a committee action increasing the administration's military pay bill, exceeded the Kennedy request by $1.1 billion.

It elicited a barrage of Republican criticism at the best ally the economizers could possibly have at the Pentagon, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

That's the picture and unless you are wearing upside-down glasses, it looks like this:

In their first big opportunity to show that they meant it when they set a goal of $10 to $15 billion in budget cutting, the Republicans not only took no action, they took reverse action—upped the spending.

The Republicans by their own votes are now further from their objective than when they started—and are moving in the opposite direction.

Instead of having to trim $3 billion from the defense budget, as the Republicans have been talking about doing, they now face the task—in part as a result of their own votes—of having to cut about $4 billion if they are to achieve their goal.

No wonder Representative KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, who votes economy as well as talks economy and who cast one firm ballot against the whole military authorization bill in protest over its size, had this to say after her fellow Republicans had increased it:

"How can we go out to our people, harassed taxpayers, and tell them that things have got to be cut, and then vote more than was requested?"

I suspect that this is a rhetorical, if tearful, question and that no answer is really needed. The only answer I could give is that the Republicans flunked their first economy test badly. If they hadn't cut the defense budget by a single penny, they would have only flunked by 100 percent. They did worse than that. They voted to add money to the budget; they voted to authorize more than was requested; they came up to the starting line of their economy race and took a big step backward. Unless the Republicans do have a secret formula by which appropriating more money will mean spending less, they simply talked out of one side of their mouths and voted out the other in their first economy test. Not a pretty sight.

Are the Republicans helping their cause by harassing Secretary McNamara? I doubt it.

The central criticism they bring against McNamara is that he is substituting civilian judgment for military judgment in making the final decisions of the budget and selection of weapons systems.

I do not say that the Secretary of Defense cannot err, but where does this argument take you? McNamara had to substitute civilian for military judgment in cutting $10 billion from the total military requests of the three services down to $52.5 billion. If he hadn't the Republicans would have to cut $20 billion instead of $4 billion to reach their goal.

If the Republicans in Congress are going to succeed in cutting $4 billion from the defense appropriations, they will also be substituting civilian for military judgment.

There is, however, one military command they could well ponder: "About face."

Dr. Abelson Advances Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science noted with their January 11, 1963, issue of Science magazine that Dr. Philip Abelson was their new editor.

The change also was noted in Washington State. N. H. Wynne began to assemble material on Dr. Abelson for an article to be carried in the Sunday supplement of the Tacoma News Tribune. Frank M. Lockerby, executive editor, thought an editorial would be in order recognizing the contribution which Dr. Abelson has made to the community of science. Both Frank Lockerby's editorial and Mr. Wynne's article appeared in the Sunday, March 3, edition of the Tacoma News Tribune.

I would ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to have both printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tacoma News Tribune and Sunday Ledger; Mar. 3, 1963]

RECOGNITION FOR A FORGOTTEN MAN

An illuminating article about one of the Nation's, if not the world's, outstanding scientists appears in the magazine section of today's News Tribune. He is Tacoma-born Dr. Philip Abelson, the new editor of Science, official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the world's largest general scientific society.

Dr. Abelson was born here April 27, 1913. He was the son of Olai Abelson, an engineer for Tacoma City Light who helped design and build the powerplants for the city of Tacoma's two Cushman Dams. Philip attended Roosevelt school, where he completed eight grades in 6½ years. He moved on to Franklin B. Gault school where he was a member of its first ninth grade, and then was a member of Gault's first class to enter Lincoln High School. At the time he was not quite 14 years of age, but already he was showing indicationa of the remarkable scientific career for which he was destined.

Despite that predilection he found time for many of the pursuits which are attractive to a normal boyhood. He played trombone in the Lincoln Orchestra, was active in the school's Glider Club, and during summer

months worked for the city of Tacoma as a substitute surveyor. Later he received his first two science degrees at Washington State College and last year, after that institution had achieved university status, he returned there to receive its first distinguished alumnus award.

In the years which have elapsed since Philip Abelson departed Tacoma to embark upon his conspicuous career in the field of science, many additional honors have come his way. They are too numerous to enumerate here, but many of them are noted in his extensive listing in the 1962–63 edition of Who's Who in America.

Lamentable however by its absence is the fact that this does not include an adequate recognition by the Congress of the United States for what well may be the most remarkable of his scientific achievements. This is a report prepared by Dr. Abelson in March of 1946. He then was head of the Naval Research Laboratory's special research section. This report made possible developments which were an important contribution to the early success of the atomic bomb and subsequently provided the germ of the idea for today's American atomic submarines.

Unofficially, Dr. Abelson's contribution has been noted to the extent that he has been described as "the neglected man of our nuclear Navy." That, alas, is too little for a man who has done so much. It is high time Congress take appropriate action to rectify the situation.

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News-Tribune, Mar. 3, 1963]

OUTSTANDING SCIENTIST BORN, REARED HERE—EX-TACOMAN ACTIVE IN NUMEROUS FIELDS

(By N. H. Wynne)

"A gifted individual has nothing if he is without drive and a sense of direction," Philip Abelson, the new editor of Science, wrote for the January 11 issue. "A man of moderate endowment may show flashes of genius if he struggles hard enough."

His editorial, "Manpower or Mind Power," went to 80,000 subscribers, most of them members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This is the largest general scientific society in the world, and was founded in Philadelphia 115 years ago. For its members, and for many others concerned with the expansion of knowledge, the 52 issues of Science each year are "regular reading, the voice of the American scientific community."

Dr. Abelson has been called "The Reluctant Thunderer," too busy in his new position to editorialize. "He has opinions, some strong, many unorthodox, but he feels that he can best foster science by employing his energies on technical content."

On January 11 he asked why mere numbers should be "the standard yardstick in studies of scientific personnel." Can good Ph. D. scientists and mathematicians be recruited and developed only by increasing subsidies? "This carries the implication that scientists, like nuts and bolts, are interchangeable and can be mass produced. All of us can understand numbers and money. But who can measure or inspire creative genius?"

Science is mailed each Wednesday to more than a thousand subscribers in the State of Washington. Most of them have heard much about the brilliant scientist who has become its editor—but do they know that this modern Benjamin Franklin had most of his formal education in our own State?

ATTENDED SCHOOL HERE

Philip Hauge Abelson was born in Tacoma, and began his education in Roosevelt School, Gault Intermediate, and Lincoln High. He received his first two science degrees at the State college in Pullman; and on April 5, 1962, he returned to the campus of Washington State University, to receive its first distinguished alumnus award.

His parents had come from Norway to South Dakota. Ellen Hauge had come alone at 18, determined to raise a family in America. When she married Olai Andrew Abelson they built their first home in Pullman, near where Todd Hall stands today. These new Americans were eager for a good education, and began classes almost next door at the young State College of Washington. Andrew remained in classes to earn a degree in civil engineering, but Ellen was kept from graduation when their son, Harold, was born.

Olai Abelson became an engineer for Tacoma City Light, and he helped design and build the powerplants for its two Cushman dams. The young mother kept house at 2205 East 35th Street, where Philip was born in 1913.

Franklin B. Gault, last of the "intermediates," was partly completed in January 1926 and was opened to its first ninth grade class. Philip Abelson came from Roosevelt School, where he had completed eight grades in 6½ years. He was among the 60 or more 9–B's who had Gault all to themselves and a few teachers until the two other grades were admitted in March.

IN HIGH SCHOOL AT 14

The first class went to Lincoln High in January 1927. Philip was among them, not quite 14 and rather small. He played a trombone in the Lincoln Orchestra and was active in the Glider Club. This quiet boy would be called in his school annual "a bashful man," but he was confident enough in some fields. Among his classmates were John Gookins, now a police officer; and Roy Johnson, who owns a machine shop. They recall Philip as a "brain," far ahead of most of them in mathematics.

In his senior year he chose two classes that were most important to his life work, as he reviewed it many years later. "Perhaps the best was a chemistry class with Miss Florence Kelly, which strengthened my interest in research." He also joined the Lincoln News staff, "wrote heads, a few trifling stories, and an editorial or two. Time spent on the News was one of the best investments I made at high school."

In June he was a Lincoln High graduate, with a scholarship rank third among the boys. Several magazine articles have mentioned his work during that summer of 1930, before he left for college. He used some good instruction in surveying, given by an expert—Olai Andrew Abelson. During the summer months Philip worked as a substitute surveyor for the city of Tacoma.

WON HONORS

Two Abelsons left for the State college in September—Philip and his older brother Harold, who had been working in Tacoma for several years. Harold became a civil engineer like his father; while Philip earned a chemistry degree in 3 years, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and two science honoraries. Then came 2 years of graduate study and experience as a laboratory assistant.

In 1935 Philip Abelson had a M.S. degree in physics, and he was now ready, at 22 years of age, to enter 4 more years of graduate study. He was attracted to the famous Radiation Laboratory of E. O. Lawrence at the University of California.

He also "found a special attraction in Miss Neva Martin, a brunet of considerable quiet charm," who came from Pullman to marry him at Berkeley. Years of study were ahead for her too, until she became a physician and professor of medicine.

In his Science editorial Dr. Abelson recalled that "the Great Depression was a valuable experience for some scientists who were in that formative years at the time. Turning away from the negative aspects of lack of money, they emphasized the search for truth, the love of knowledge, the joy of discovery, the esteem of colleagues."

Was he recalling experiences among his own group at Pullman or Berkeley? Four years ago Theodore Irwin wrote in the American Weekly that "young Abelson was assigned to study the neutron in 1935. He bombarded some uranium with the aid of the cyclotron, laboring throughout the night when the cyclotron was not in use by others. The young scientist spent $20 of his own money (he was earning $60 a month) to buy 10 pounds of cured uranium oxide."

Philip had his first national recognition in 1937, when one of his reports was published by the National Academy of Science; then in 1939 he became Philip H. Abelson, Ph. D., with a degree in nuclear physics. His dissertation described fission products from uranium, and identified radioactive antimony, tellurium, and iodine.

Philip and Neva Abelson then moved to Washington, D.C., where he became a physicist with the Carnegie Institution, a great semipublic research organization that has made many important discoveries during its 60 years. In his first 2 years there he helped design and construct its first cyclotron, and worked with Prof. Edwin O. McMillan in the discovery of neptunium.

Next came a call to the Philadelphia branch of the Naval Research Laboratory, from 1941 to 1946. There Abelson developed a method for enriching uranium 235, and then designed and supervised construction of an atomic plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Two months before the end of his Navy service he filed the famous Abelson report, with detailed plans for a feasible nuclear-powered underwater craft. Theodore Irwin has hailed him as the "forgotten father of the atomic submarine," and many experts feel that he should receive more official recognition. Dr. Abelson has given no indication that he agrees with them.

In 1946 he returned to the Carnegie Institution, where since 1953 he has been director of the Geophysics Laboratory, one of its seven research centers. Only a professional writer of science articles could do justice to his many important activities during the past 17 years.

AWARDED MEDAL

When the Washington Academy of Science awarded Dr. Abelson a distinguished service medal in 1950, it compared him to Benjamin Franklin and listed some of his outstanding contributions in chemistry, biochemistry, engineering, geology, physics, geophysics, and meteorology. His friend Frank Campbell calls him a paleobiochemist, for his exploration of organic matter in sedimentary rocks and fossils.

Congressman THOR TOLLEFSON announced in the Tacoma News-Tribune of April 30, 1959, that Dr. Abelson had been elected to the National Academy of Science. There was mention of his sister-in-law, Mrs. Ruth Abelson, who is employed by the Clover Park schools; and of a cousin, Eric Abelson, now with the Tacoma Fire Department. Two other cousins began their education in local schools: Leigh Huseby, a mathematician; and Norman Abelson, music instructor in the University of Minnesota.

In that same year, 1959, Dr. Abelson edited a book, "Researchers in Geochemistry." Scientists from Groningen in the Netherlands, and Wurzburg in Germany, to La Jolla, Calif., contributed 23 chapters. One of them was by Abelson himself, "Geochemistry of Organic Substances," which indicates the direction of what he calls his hobby in research.

INTERESTED IN SPACE

At that time he become a coeditor of the Journal of Geophysical Research, for which he seeks and selects manuscripts about the

space effort. This periodical is a world leader in its field, its monthly issues averaging 360 pages. Each issue may contain 30 or more articles, such as "Possible Presence of Ice on the Moon," "Fluctuation of the Coleman Glacier, Mt. Baker," and "Whistler-Mode Echoes Received at Seattle."

The October 6, Saturday Review contains an article, "Dr. Philip Hauge Abelson, a Stormy Critic, Becomes Editor of Science, Sheaths His Lightning." In it Lillian Levy reviews some activities that he is determined to continue in addition to his new work.

Among them are his post at the Geophysical Laboratory, his coediting of the Journal of Geophysical Research, active committee work with the National Academy of Science and with the Atomic Energy Commission, responsibility as counselor to the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, active participation in a dozen or more other organizations, and commitments to lecture at universities and research centers.

Have friends in Washington State been forgotten by the busy man in Washington, D.C.? The Alvin Vincents, of McKinley Road, can say no. Vincent had been Phil Abelson's Sunday School teacher at the Roosevelt Heights Christian Church. When this East Side couple was celebrating their golden wedding anniversary 2 years ago, into their party telephone congratulations came across the continent.

HONORED BY WSU

An opportunity to meet many Northwest friends came in April 1962 when Philip Abelson returned to Washington State University for a day. Its regents, including Attorney William Goodwin, of Tacoma, had voted the first Distinguished Alumni Awards to Dr. Abelson, '33 and '35; Edward R. Murrow, '30; and Henry T. Heald, '23.

When Abelson returned to the campus on April 5, he met many old friends among the faculty members, and inspected the nuclear reactor. That evening when he received the first award in Bryan Hall he gave a major address, "Fossil Biochemicals—A Bridge Between Then and Now."

One of his many conferences on campus was with a sophomore, LeRoy Abelson, son of his older brother Harold, who had become a civil engineer. At the time of Harold Abelson's death in 1955 he was resident engineer for Tacoma City Light at Mayfield. His older son, John, was now doing graduate work in biophysics, and LeRoy would soon become the third civil engineer in the family.

The next day, April 6, was the occasion for what the Spokesman-Review called "Tacoma Class, Then and Now; Old Haybarn Gang Holds Reunion." Five friends who had gone through Roosevelt School, Gault and Lincoln High, met in the home of Dr. Milton Durham, Spokane surgeon and member of the WSU board of regents. From Seattle came Robert Durham, Northwest director of the American Institute of Architects; from Long Beach, Calif., came Ernest Kartinen, engineering manager for Signal Oil; and from Tacoma, Richard Smith, manager of the Foremost Dairy plant and former mayor of Pullman. They had come to congratulate the first distinguished alumnus.

DURHAM CREDITED

The Haybarn Gang toasted W. W. Durham, father of Milton and Robert. "He introduced all of us to science," Phil Abelson recalled that evening. The Gang was meeting as 35 or more years ago they had met in a certain barn on the East Side of Tacoma. One of their research projects in those days was collecting birds' nests. They had accumulated 120 at one time.

The Spokane paper showed two photographs. One was R. Durham, M. Durham, Abelson and Kartinen 40 years ago. The other was a staff photograph of the same four with an addition, Smith, who took picture above, taking it again.

Editor Abelson may now find little spare time for visiting his friends out west. In becoming editor of Science, he recently wrote, "I am in the position of one who has been made custodian of a uniquely valuable property." He plans to extend reporting to more sciences, to scent discoveries before they are published, and to cut in half the time formerly given to editing manuscripts.

HOME IN PHILADELPHIA

Most of Philip Abelson's scientific work lies in Washington, D.C. If his activities are not too pressing, he goes off to his Philadelphia home for weekends with his wife and with Ellen, their 15-year-old daughter. Mrs. Neva Abelson is an associate professor of medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, and has a Philadelphia practice. She is an authority on the diagnosis and treatment of problems connected with Rh blood factor.

In his science editorial of January 11, Dr. Abelson asked why "Some graduates are on the job only 40 hours a week. A desirable standard is more like 70 to 90 hours."

That is without doubt more like the work-week of Philip Hauge Abelson.

The Cavemen of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of Friday, March 8, asks several questions about the contents of caves in Cuba. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAVEMEN OF CUBA

It is an irony that the brilliant species called man felt secure enough to get out of the caves several hundreds of generations ago and now is digging back into them—for hard defense against nuclear war and for screening against the prying eyes of planes.

There are, in fact, offensive and defensive caves. The question at the moment is, Which kind are the caves of Cuba?

That arms—Russian arms—are stockpiled in the numerous caverns of the island 90 miles from the United States is rated highly probable" by U.S. Army Intelligence. But the kind of arms is not known. An Army spokesman told a congressional committee this week that it is our belief that Russia did remove all strategic weapons systems, and that no nuclear warheads are now on the island. Belief and proof, though, are quite different; and Americans cannot be much reassured by the evidence that Soviet troops are doing the cave stuffing, with even Cubans barred.

It is obviously a dangerous setup in which America's present surveillance and espionage seem to falter. The cavemen of Cuba are one more Russian gambit somehow to be checked, and one more argument on the side of those who favor drastic settlement of the Cuban provocation.

Gov. Manuel F. Leon Guerrero Inaugurated at Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1963, the Honorable Manuel Flores Leon Guerrero, a native son and experienced government employee, was engaged as the sixth civilian Governor of Guam. Governor Guerrero's appointment will assure the Guamanians of a sound administration and is a step forward in our policy of delegating additional authority to our territories as they mature and prove themselves capable of assuming more responsibilities.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of our colleagues the inaugural address delivered by Governor Guerrero:

Mr. Secretary, reverend clergy, members of the legislature, distinguished guests, and friends, I stand before you today a humble man, grateful for the high honor which is being bestowed upon me, and fully mindful of the tremendous responsibility which faces me.

In the beginning, let me express the appreciation of myself and my family for the many acts of graciousness and thoughtfulness you are showing us today.

And let me express to my thousands of friends on my home island heartfelt appreciation for the support, loyalty, and fellowship which you have so generously shared with me throughout all the years of my life.

I also would ask Secretary Carver to return to Washington bearing expressions of gratitude from the people of Guam to all of our fellow Americans for our membership in their society.

Recently, while in our Nation's Capital, I had the pleasure of appearing before three of our congressional committees. To each of them I tried to describe the fearful feeling of loneliness which we knew the first few hours last November 12, after Typhoon Karen had mercilessly battered our island to its knees.

I told them, as I have said to many of you, that it is wonderful to be an American and have the unlimited support of 180 million fellow countrymen when you face adversity.

But in moving forward in the difficult months ahead we must keep faith with the American people and with American traditions.

It is certain that in the days to come we will be put to an acid test. The tremendous task of rebuilding our ravaged island and furthering the long-neglected development of our general welfare in all fields will demand from us what William James called a lonely kind of courage in combating forces which may lie buried within ourselves and which could well defeat our purpose and cost us the valued respect of our fellow countrymen.

William James observed that the deadliest enemies of nations are not their foreign foes, but those that dwell inside their borders. I would assume that he meant such things as a lack of integrity and dedication within the Government, and lack of interest and participation in governmental affairs by all citizens.

At any rate, here is how he wrote it in much more telling words than I could muster:

"And from these internal enemies civilization is always in need of being saved. The nation blessed above all nations is she in whom the civic genius of the people does the saving day by day, by acts without picturesqueness; by speaking, writing, voting reasonably; by smiting corruption swiftly; by good temper between parties; by people knowing true men when they see them and preferring them as leaders."

To those of you in our government, I issue a special charge to display that lonely kind of courage. I know from many years at all levels of government service that it is needed constantly—whether you are a laborer or a Governor—and if you did not demonstrate it on a day-to-day basis, your service is limited, and the time may come when you cannot face your fellow man with a spotless conscience.

President Kennedy expressed my feelings in his state of the Union message to Congress in 1961 when he said:

"Let every man and woman who works in any area of our National Government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and with honor in future years, 'I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need.' "

To those of you outside the Government, I would say that the United States and Guam are your heritage and are part and parcel of you and will be of your children and their children.

Generations ago a village parson in England preached what has become a very famous sermon based on the theme, "The Bell Toll for Thee." John Donne expressed in simple language the interdependence of mankind, and pointed out that an injustice to one is an injustice to all others. He said that if a clod of dirt washed from the shores of Britain, that island was changed, and with the changing came changes in its people. The same is true of Guam—what affects one affects all, and I say to you with firm conviction that the time has come when we all must adopt and practice that truly Christian concept.

We hear much, and rightfully so, of Guam's position in international affairs and of the things which we must contribute to the cause of peace on earth. Human history records no greater challenge than that which the free world faces today in a continuing struggle against tyranny.

And no greater weapon is available to us than our ability to enlist day-to-day individual participation in government on all levels, and the acknowledged root of every successful government is government on the local level. Which means to me, in short, that the government of Guam belongs to all of us, and it behooves us to know it, to participate in it, and to protect it from all destructive forces, both from without and within.

And, in addition, we must meet the great challenge which faces us to develop within ourselves a greater capacity for leadership. We must nurture in our young people not only that capacity but the desire to be leaders, both in and out of our government. We must strive for maturity, based upon a desire to render service in an atmosphere of unity, which we must also create.

During the past trying weeks, when every effort was being made to approach our recovery programs on a sane, sensible basis, I took every possible action to keep all elements of our community informed on problems and progress. I sincerely believe that is the way a government should operate, and I intend to pursue that course so long as I sit in the Governor's chair.

I hope to mold together, in a common cause, all departments of the government, our civilian community, and, most certainly, our friends of the military and civilian Federal agencies who indeed are an integral part of Guam.

I might say here that this policy already has borne fruit, because our people are informed partners in what we are trying to do, and I believe we have among us a unity which will produce major dividends as we move along the rough path of rehabilitation and development of an outstanding American community.

I would be remiss if I did not speak frankly to you now.

As I have said before, we face long, hard months, and even years, in creating the type of island which we owe our children. There lie before us long periods of frustration, because we cannot properly accomplish our purpose overnight.

I call on you for patience and understanding as well as the same cooperation you have shown so dutifully since November 12.

And I can tell you honestly that the national administration and the Congress are sympathetic and willing to help us by responding to programs which are sensibly formulated and presented reasonably and without rancor.

President Kennedy and Secretary Udall, despite the overburdening pressures of international crises and domestic affairs, are taking a personal interest in Guam, just as they have done since this national administration took office. Rest assured that we will receive all the guidance and assistance which we honestly merit by the furtherance of good government and development of sound and progressive programs.

The only thing which can deter us—the only thing which can defeat us in our combined effort—is the lack of a combined effort.

I pledge my part in creating one. And I call upon you for a similar pledge, reminding you again that the welfare of generations to come depends upon what we do now.

I humbly ask God to grant us strength as we move forward together as Americans, fully determined to produce a community in which our children will flower and prosper under the wonderful traditions of the greatest system of government on earth.

Let us adopt as our guide the message expressed in that passage of the Scripture which charges us "to make a stand upon the ancient way, and then look about us, and discover what is the straight and right way, and so to walk in it."

Thank you.

Farm Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in December 1962 I arranged for distribution of about 4,000 questionnaires to the farming counties of the Second Congressional District of Arizona. I believe that the results, now tabulated, may be of interest to our colleagues.

In the first instance I mailed this questionnaire to approximately 2,000 persons on my mailing list in Cochise, Pinal, and Yuma Counties—areas whose economy is heavily based on agriculture. In addition, I had the splendid cooperation of the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation and its fine director, Bill Davis. With the consent of the Federation boards in each of my five counties, the questionnaire was mailed to every Farm Bureau family. Additionally, the Yuma Daily Sun kindly consented to publish the questionnaire in its columns, urging readers to clip the questionnaire and send the answers directly to me.

Mr. Speaker, with this wide distribution I had hoped for a large cross-section of farmer opinion. The results, in number, were disappointing; there were only 195 returns. At first I was inclined to believe that this response indicated apathy among farmers. On closer examination—and after talking to numerous farmers who received the mailing—I am satisfied that this is not the case. I believe that Arizona farmers are vitally concerned about present farm legislation. They are, however, confused by their long experience with different and changing programs. They recognize that there are big deficiencies in our present programs, and they recognize that city dwellers, who far outnumber farmers, are unhappy about the cost. Yet they fear any sudden or drastic changes. Farmers, as a group, do not have any simple, clear-cut solutions to this massive crop of problems and inequities. I am inclined to believe that these feelings, rather than apathy, account for the small number of returns.

This conclusion is suggested by a Marana farmer who wrote a long, sincere, and constructive letter reporting on a meeting of his friends called specifically to discuss my questionnaire:

> I am sure you will not be surprised to learn that this group of only eight or so persons could not arrive at 100-percent agreement as to the program we would like to see enacted.

I have said that the returns were small in number, but I can report that they were very large in quality. The great majority of those who replied wrote separate additional letters, or extensive marginal comments, giving their detailed thoughts and suggestions. I have read each one of these, and I was impressed by the seriousness and good sense with which these Arizonians discussed problems of vital importance to their livelihood. The depth of these replies and the wide discussion touched off by the questionnaire have fully justified my efforts in this undertaking.

In tabulating the returns I had them divided into three categories:

First. Price support farmers—110 replies: This group included all those who indicated that they were participating this year in one or more price support programs. Many of the replies tabulated in this group were from farmers who also grow crops for free-market sale.

Second. Free-market farmers—60 replies: Counted here were active farmers cultivating citrus, alfalfa or other crops not subject to price support programs.

Third. Nonfarmers—25 replies: These were individuals not presently engaged in farming. Many of these are people who formerly engaged in agriculture, who work in farm-related businesses, or who had some special interest in farm legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the tabulations themselves are worth careful examination, but I have noted the following highlights:

First. Present programs are not popular: Both farmers and nonfarmers in my

district agree that the present programs are wrong and should be revised in some way. A Pinal County nonfarmer echoes the sentiment expressed by many who wrote comments on the questionnaire:

> Things are in such a mess that patchwork or piecemeal mending of the present programs can never work any real or lasting benefits. A completely new approach is needed.

Second. Free-market conditions are preferred: Almost 90 percent of the non-price-support farmers and 66 percent of the price-support farmers prefer that the Federal Government establish free-market conditions—either now or eventually. A small Cochise cotton farmer expressed a common feeling when he wrote:

> I have seen farmers become well-to-do while others could not make a living—all because of farm subsidy and restrictions. Free enterprise would help us no end.

Third. A transition to free enterprise farming is favored: While there is general agreement that free-market conditions should be established, a large majority do not want the Government to "quit agriculture" immediately. One price-support farmer wrote:

> In my own personal situation, if the cotton and feed grain programs were discontinued, I would be out of this type of farming fast. I would go broke.

The price-support farmers are especially opposed to any sudden change. What all the groups prefer is that free-market conditions be established by way of a transition period of 3 to 5 years during which there would be declining price supports, or some kind of transition payment. According to one farmer:

> By using a transition period and working toward free enterprise we might be able to adjust financial policies so that few, if any, farmers would be wiped out.

Fourth. Cotton policy disliked: With regard to Federal cotton policy—cotton is the chief agricultural product in my district—none of the nonfarm replies and only 4 percent of the free enterprise farmers favored the present programs. While 29 percent of the price-support farmers favored the present policy, more than 50 percent preferred that free-market conditions be established sooner or later. A high percentage—over 80 percent—of the nonfarmers and free-market farmers preferred a return to the free enterprise way of farming cotton. Only a small percentage of the respondents favored voluntary land retirement payments.

Fifth. Food-for-peace program is liked: Arizonians are very much in favor of the food-for-peace program. Over 86 percent of the returns gave favorable responses.

Sixth. Price-support farmers and free-market farmers differ: Price-support farmers are less anxious for the Federal Government to revise present agricultural policies than free-market farmers, yet each want free-enterprise conditions established eventually.

The price-support farmers—58 percent—favor the present cotton export subsidy, and the free-market farmers—89 percent—oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I recently published the results of a survey I made of constituent opinion on a wide range of legislative matters. Included in this questionnaire, which prompted more than 2,500 replies from all parts of my district, was the same question on farm legislation asked of farmers in this questionnaire. The results were as follows:

Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe Federal farm legislation should take?	Percent in favor
Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by two-thirds of farmers voting in referendum	21
Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate	13
Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free-market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc	66

While my poll of farmers is not a scientific cross section, it does give me a general idea of what Arizona farm people are thinking. The general attitude is that the present makeshift and piecemeal programs are inadequate and that something should be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, a small Cochise cotton farmer, who is also a cattle rancher, summed up the option of some southern Arizona farmers when he wrote me:

> I think that we should move to free enterprise farming as quickly as possible. I am one of those who is privileged to enjoy the freedom of a cow ranch. I can raise as much beef to sell as feed conditions and my own ability will allow. I can look my banker and the rest of the world in the face (as a rancher). As a farmer I lie, connive, and perjure myself to the local PMA board. I beg them for more cotton acreage and would steal some if it were possible. I bow to the most high in Washington and hang my head in shame. My farm is for sale.

This blunt opinion, of course, would be sharply disrupted by many who feel that bankruptcy for farmers and farm communities would quickly result from any drastic change.

It is hard to draw any positive conclusions from this interesting project, but I believe it was worthwhile. I want to thank especially all those who responded. I shall keep their opinions in mind in the months ahead.

The complete results of this poll follow:

Responses to the farm questionnaire

	Nonfarmer		Free-market farmer		Price-support farmer		All responses	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe the Federal Government should take?								
A. Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by ⅔ of farmers voting in referendum	0	100	2	98	36	64	20	80
B. Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate	27	73	27	73	35	65	31	69
C. Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free-market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc	92	8	90	10	66	34	78	22
2. If Congress should decide to abolish acreage allotments and price supports for basic commodities, would you favor—								
A. An immediate change with no transition or phase-out period and no transition payments?	20	80	27	73	15	85	20	80
B. A transition period of 5 to 10 years, during which price supports would be gradually reduced to nothing?	28	72	24	76	45	55	36	64
C. The Udall plan for immediate elimination of acreage allotments and price supports, but with a 3- to 4-year period of declining cash transition payments based on a percentage of the price support payments paid during the last year of the present programs?	81	19	80	20	70	30	75	25
3. If free-market conditions were adopted for basic farm crops, would you favor—								
A. Marketing-order legislation providing that a two-thirds majority of producers could use Agriculture Department machinery to establish quotas so that production could be adjusted to the approximate level of demand?	14	86	31	69	50	50	39	61
B. Laws to permit USDA to make annual estimates of quantities which producers could market at fair prices, so that farmers could through voluntary action restrict production—without controls or price supports—to the approximate level of demand?	74	26	84	16	55	45	68	32

Responses to the farm questionnaire—Continued

	Nonfarmer		Free-market farmer		Price-support farmer		All responses	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
4. Do you favor or oppose the food-for-peace program under which surplus foodstuffs are used in our foreign aid program?	84	16	77	23	92	8	86	14
5. With regard to Federal programs for cotton, what is your thinking on these points:								
A. Should the present export subsidy be continued?	8	92	11	89	58	42	36	64
B. U.S. textile manufacturers often complain about the export subsidy, and are demanding some kind of import fee on cotton textile imports equivalent to the amount of export subsidy. Would you favor such an import fee?	50	50	45	55	61	39	59	41
C. At the present time, cotton farmers generally cannot transfer cotton allotments from one State to another. Which of these would be better?	*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*	
1. No transfers permitted	26		45		51		46	
2. Transfers allowed only in cases of real hardship	53		16		18		22	
3. Allotment transfers permitted without restrictions	21		39		31		32	
D. At the present time cotton allotments cannot be transferred from one county to another within a State. Which of these rules would be better?								
1. No transfers permitted	16		35		38		35	
2. Transfers permitted without restriction	31		35		47		41	
3. Hardship transfers only	53		30		15		24	
E. If we are to continue with price supports and acreage allotments, what should be the per-pound support price?	*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*	
Extra long staple	(1)		43		48		46	
Upland	(1)		25		28		27	
6. What legislation would be best for corn and other feed grains?	*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*	
A. Present temporary programs of price supports, based on voluntary acreage reductions	5		7		19		13	
B. A mandatory type program with price supports and acreage or bushel allotments if approved by two-thirds of the farmers voting	0		3		13		8	
C. Free-market conditions	95		90		68		79	

[1] Nonfarm responses were inconclusive.

	Percent in favor		
	Present programs	Voluntary land retirement payments but no supports or allotments	Free market
7. What kind of farm legislation would you favor for these crops?			
Cotton:			
Nonfarmer	0	19	81
Free-market farmer	4	12	84
Price-support farmer	29	21	50
All respondents	17	18	65
Wheat:			
Nonfarmer	0	23	76
Free-market farmer	2	13	85
Price-support farmer	20	20	60
All respondents	11	18	71
Dairy products:			
Nonfarmer	4	11	85
Free-market farmer	4	6	90
Price-support farmer	18	6	76
All respondents	10	7	83
Produce, vegetables, fruit, citrus:			
Nonfarmer	3	12	85
Free-market farmer	4	8	88
Price-support farmer	10	3	87
All respondents	7	6	87

SIZE OF THE FARMS

	Free-market farmers	Price-support farmers
Size of farms owned or operated by the respondents to this survey:	*Percent*	*Percent*
Small (0 to 300 acres)	66	40
Medium (300 to 700 acres)	16	21
Large (700 acres or more)	18	39

Americas Roused to Need of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during these days when the President of the United States is in Costa Rica, in an effort to increase the ties of friendship between the United States and the Latin American nations, I wish to call attention to an article by Drew Pearson, published in the Washington Post of today, titled "Americas Roused to Need of Unity." The article points out the efforts of the past and outlines the efforts and facts and the necessity of closer ties between the American Republics, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

AMERICAS ROUSED TO NEED OF UNITY

(By Drew Pearson)

Charles de Gaulle of France and Fidel Castro of Cuba don't have much in common, but jointly they may have succeeded in putting a couple of time bombs under the lethargic march of pan-American unity.

Ever since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Simon Bolivar, North and South Americans have been talking about a bona fide alliance of the Americas, but doing nothing more than talk.

Sumner Welles, godfather of the good neighbor policy, came closest to it by writ-

ing the Central American Pact of 1923, by which the five banana Republics worked together to combat military dictatorships. However a U.S. Marine-trained sergeant, the father of the man who is now retiring as President of Nicaragua, kicked this feeble attempt at unity into a cocked hat. Dictatorships, plus disunity, have flourished in Central America ever since.

Today, however, as President Kennedy meets with the Presidents of these same Republics, he has a great chance to reconstruct unity and simultaneously rescue the well conceived, but poorly executed, Alliance for Progress.

In doing so, he has two unwelcome but nevertheless useful allies, De Gaulle and Castro.

Whether we like it or not, De Gaulle has ended pax Americana. He has driven the first nail into NATO, has shown that Europe is going to be on its own; and we might as well recognize that fact.

NATIONALIZATION OUTMODED

Knocking down European national barriers has made the Common Market the second most prosperous trading area in the world, ranking next to a trading area called United States of America, which, 100 years ago, in a bloody civil war, settled the question of so-called States rights and barriers to unity.

And there's no more reason for the five tiny republics of Central America, with the same Spanish culture, the same economy, to support separate expensive armies, separate navies, separate ambassadors abroad, and separate expensive national pride than there is for Nevada, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, et al, to maintain separate armies, navies, ambassadors, etc.

Castro, our second unwelcome, disagreeable, but yet everpresent "ally," has put the second time bomb under us by warning that if we don't act to reform the encrusted oligarchy of Latin America and give a break to the landless peons, his Russian-trained revolutionaries will.

In no other area of the world has the aristocracy, in this case the descendants of the old Spanish conquistadors, so successfully and sometimes brutally rebuffed reform.

Even before the Kennedy administration, President Eisenhower in 1959 initiated a modified Alliance for Progress and advanced $50 million to Peru for land reform. The 80 top families controlling the arable land of Peru merely put the money on the shelf. Land reform was ignored.

For this and other reasons, including lack of drive in both Washington and Latin America, the Alliance has become not an alliance for political power and cooperation, but a bailing-out operation. When a government found its balance of payments dwindling, it rushed its finance minister up to Washington to get a loan from the Alliance. This stopgap operation has changed nothing.

Meanwhile, the inequities of the Latin American caste system remained unreformed, the oligarquia remained as powerful as ever, and Castro's agents continued to make converts among the campesinos and obreros of Latin America's crowded cities and coffee plantations.

OUR COMMON MARKET

The problem confronting President Kennedy is to weld the five Republics of Latin America together into one homogeneous unit and simultaneously promote reform. He has some enlightened leaders to work with, plus the presence of a Central American Common Market which has made substantial progress.

Significantly, this Common Market was started not by the United States but by the United Nations under the guidance of an exile from dictator Perez Jimenez of Venezuela—namely, Enrique Tejera Paris, who is now Venezuelan Ambassador in Washington.

Ten years ago, Tejera Paris plodded through the dusty streets of the Central American capitals persuading them to sign a treaty knocking down tariff barriers, with the result that 95 percent of goods produced in Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua already crosses their borders duty free.

Costa Rica has signed to join this Common Market, and Panama will probably come next.

What this market means is that 12 million people of these tiny Republics can form a market with a buying power of $2.3 billion instead of competing against each other as nations of 2 to 4 million people each.

This has already started. President Kennedy can expand it—eventually to include all of Latin America and the United States and Canada; and to include a parliament of the Americas.

Bertha B. Shore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most colorful and beloved personalities of Kansas journalism is dead. It was with considerable personal regret and sorrow that I learned of the passing of Miss Bertha B. Shore, editor of the Augusta, Kans., Daily Gazette, on March 13, 1963. Although she had been in failing health for the past 3 years, she was a working newspaperwoman until the end.

Bertha Shore loved people and she loved to laugh. She was everlastingly proud of her hometown of Augusta. Her wit and her wisdom won for her the admiration of her fellow Kansans. Her fame was not confined to Augusta and Kansas. She was well known and respected among her colleagues of the journalism profession throughout the Nation.

Her column called Half and Half, written under her signature of Ima Washout, was widely read and quoted not only in our State but by many newspapers across the United States.

Funeral services were held for Miss Shore in Augusta last Saturday. Rolla Clymer, publisher of the El Dorado, Kans., Times and the newspaperman she most admired, read a eulogy to her memory. Mr. Clymer said in part:

When Bertha B. Shore's being went out into the vastness the other night, this world's store of gladness and mirth suffered a damaging loss. For Bertha was a blithe spirit, the handmaiden of laughter and the daughter of gaiety.

Her contributions, mostly in paragraph or brief editorial handling, stood out like beacons on a hilltop. They were wholly original, they sparkled with good humor, they had a whipcracker quality and they appealed strongly to the rank and file.

She was ever vital, enchanting and full of gusty spirit. The sunshine she spread about her during her passage through a weary world will linger on. * * * The brightness of its sheen will enduringly bless the scene where she worked and laughed and which she loved with fervent passion.

As an indication of the respect which the newspapers of Kansas demonstrated for Bertha Shore, I include the following editorials:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle and Beacon]

BERTHA SHORE

Bertha Shore is dead. The fact is hard to accept for a generation or more of Kansas editors who turned enviously each day to her column of barbed humor on the front page of her Augusta Gazette.

The force of her personality and quickness of her wit brought national attention to the Gazette, which is one of the State's smallest dailies, and made quotes from her a commonplace in magazines and syndicated columns across the land.

She was equally welcome in gatherings of Kansas newspaper and political people, at the famous roundtable in New York's Algonquin Hotel, or surrounded by admiring listeners in the artists' colony at Taos, for she talked as intriguingly as she wrote.

Bert was a resolute foe of the pompous and the pretentious, and she knew how to jab them where it hurt, but her jibes were without malice and her column reflected consistent good humor and delight in life's ironies.

She enjoyed the image she had created of herself as raffish and slightly disreputable, and she liked saying things to shock strangers, but friends knew that beneath this studied pose there was a responsible and forceful editor who contributed greatly to the betterment of Augusta and Butler County.

There aren't many like Bertha Shore. Kansas journalism was enlivened by her example.

[From the Augusta (Kans.) Daily Gazette]

THEY CAME ANYWAY

Much has been written since the death of Bertha Shore, longtime Gazette editor. One writer raised the question: Did Bert ever hope to attain the fame of being a writer on the staff of a big metropolitan newspaper?

If she did, she never said so, and if she had wanted to be, she would have probably been one. She had the ability, and she was capable of fitting into any situation. And she would have probably shown some of the girls on the big papers a thing or two in more ways than one, though she would not have tried to show anyone up for the sake of trying to be smart.

But it's most certain that Bert liked it here. What more could she have wanted? She was doing what she liked to do, and reaching the people she wanted to reach, sometimes even farther.

Fame? What more fame could Bert have had?

Someone once said if you build a better mousetrap the world will beat a path to your door.

Bert Shore didn't even have to build a mousetrap.

Let Supply and Demand Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14, my distinguished

colleague from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, graphically pointed out the sharp decline in hog and cattle prices which has occurred in 90 days of the Kennedy-Freeman feed grain program.

To further dramatize the economical bind livestock producers now find themselves in, I should like to include in the RECORD excerpts from a letter which has just reached my desk.

This letter was in the form of a petition and included the signatures of 43 reputable, hardworking farmers who reside in the 19th Illinois District which I represent.

At the outset, this communication pointed out that as beef producers the writers of the petition were not interested in having the Government subsidize the beef industry nor guarantee a specific profit on feed cattle.

It was pointed out that to condone this type of practice would only bring about Government control and would weaken the overall agriculture structure.

In addition to the policy which has driven down corn prices through Government sales in order to get a good signup under this feed-grain program, and is in a large measure responsible for the recent drop in prices, there is another factor which I believe needs proper investigation, and has added to our economic problems. I refer, of course, to the disproportionate drop in dressed beef prices in over-the-counter sales.

As pointed out in the letter received from my constituents, in December 1962, the average price of choice fat steers in Chicago was $30.50. Three months later, on February 25, 1963, the average price of the same type cattle was $24—a drop of 21 percent. During the same period beef sold over-the-counter in the local chainstores dropped 11 percent.

This severe decline in the price of fat cattle without a proportionate drop in dressed beef is a serious threat to the welfare of the economy. Comparable figures with respect to dressed pork would reflect similar discrepancies.

We cannot be both fish and fowl. If this administration is attempting to rig prices of feed grains then I respectfully suggest we go into the area of controlled labor costs and take practicable steps to investigate whether or not chainstores are exercising undue control over the dressed meat market.

I believe if the economics of supply and demand are allowed to work freely, without the threat or influence of monopolistic forces, be they from within or out of Government, then we shall have some hope of overcoming the present threat to our economy.

The ICC Decision in the Southern Railroad Grain Rate Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my very good friend, Mr. Tom Ragland of Nashville, Tenn., has given much study to problems of transportation, particularly water transportation, in Tennessee and the TVA area. He has brought to my attention an excellent editorial in the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, published in New York on Monday, February 4, 1963, commenting on the decision of Division II of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Southern Railroad grain rate case. I think the comments and observations in the editorial deserve the attention of everyone in the Congress who is interested in the transportation problems of our Nation. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Feb. 4, 1963]

NO FLOOR BELOW?

If we read the signs aright, the Interstate Commerce Commission has now come very close to ruling that there is virtually no floor below which a railroad may not depress its rates in order to rid itself of water or truck competition, provided it has the financial strength to do so.

The Commission has not yet said this in explicit terms. But its Division II (which is empowered to act with the force of the whole agency) has implied it strongly in the decision it issued last month upholding the right of the Southern Railroad to make very sharp rate cuts on quantity shipments of grain moving into the Southeast from Midwestern river crossings.

This has been one of the most protracted hard-fought rate cases to reach ICC in recent years. But oddly enough, the real significance of ICC's action on it is not to be found so much in the ruling itself, but in some of the reasons on which it was based.

The background of this case is familiar to our readers. At stake was a large grain movement created largely by low barge rates from the Midwest to Tennessee River ports. As a result of these low rates, poultry growers in Georgia and Alabama were able to achieve vast increases in production.

As it happened, a large number of truckers also got into this movement in time. The Southern Railroad then moved to protect its own position by acquiring a big fleet of very large and highly efficient hopper cars ideally adapted for the movement of bulk grain. That done, it published very sharp rate cuts on quantity shipments; garage and truck operators protested and the whole matter was thrown to ICC.

Outwardly the battle was primarily between the barge and rail operators. From a regulatory point of view, however, it was primarily between the Southern and the truckers—other railroads having shied away somewhat from any strong stand pro or con.

There was some speculation whether ICC would approve the full extent of the cuts the Southern proposed, but there was not much surprise that the Commission found that the Southern's much-improved method of operation, together with the new equipment, justified lower rates. Even among the protestants in the case, this was more or less expected.

The real surprise was in Division II's finding on a subject upon which this particular proceeding apparently did not turn at all. This was to the effect that the bargelines could not argue that they were the true "low cost" carriers in this case because they had not demonstrated the extent to which public investment in waterway maintenance and improvement was a factor in their total operating costs.

The Commissioners admitted that this is a factor that ICC "has never considered" previously in determining the reasonableness of rates. They might also have added that as the transportation laws have been construed up to now they were never directed to consider it, either. What they seemed to have in mind is not something that now is embedded in the law, but something President Kennedy wants embedded in it.

When it is considered that the water carriers have lost all but one of the major protests they have launched with ICC against rail selective rate cutting in recent years (the exception now being in the courts) and that to these losses they have now been burdened with the brandnew equipment cited above, it begins to look as though ICC on its own is determined to carry through two of the Kennedy transportation proposals now before Congress—the ending of minimum rate regulations on bulk commodities and introduction (in modified form) of the principle of waterway and highway tolls.

Leaving aside the individual merits of the Southern Railroad rates, which we do not attempt to pass on at all, there are two factors in this situation we find worrisome.

The first is the indication that the Commission's recent activities add up to something that might be described as regulation by anticipation. The second is that the effect of the public cost stipulation in the Southern grain case is to make it virtually impossible in the future for either truck or barge carriers to demonstrate they have any claim whatever to the rather crucial low-cost status in rate cases.

Even assuming a willingness to do so, how can any one carrier, or group of carriers, be expected to make an allocation of all Federal waterway (or highway) expenditures, divide them neatly between flood control, soil erosion control, river bank stabilization, hydro projects, industrial water supply and the like; then determine to what extent a waterway is used by private industrial and for-hire carriers and finally pro rate the results down to his own operation?

We cannot imagine what ICC's Division II thought it was really doing when it gratuitously added this crushing stipulation to the heavy burden of proof its past actions have thrown on the water carriers.

Is there, someplace in the back of the Commission's mind, the thought that it may be possible to forstall congressional action on minimum rate controls, user charges and the like by wiping out a competitive situation that the President finds distasteful?

Division II's reasoning in the Southern grain rate case (as distinct from its ruling, which is another matter) has done little to quell the suspicion that this may be precisely what ICC does have in mind.

Detroit Hosts 1968 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. I am extremely pleased that Detroit has been designated as the American city to bid for the 1968 Olympic Games. I congratulate the U.S. Olympic Committee for not letting the unsportsmanlike maneuvers of the Los Angeles committee upset the previous decision picking Detroit.

All of us owe a debt of thanks to the Detroit Olymic Committee, Mayor Cavanagh and other elected officials who have worked so hard to promote Detroit's

selection. I also want to commend the gentleman from Michigan, Representative HAROLD RYAN, of Detroit, who was among the first to act after Los Angeles attempted its end run.

The action of the U.S. Olympic Committee reflects the vitality of the city of Detroit and the citizens of Michigan in making it perfectly clear that Detroit is ready and eager and able to do an outstanding job as host for the 1968 Olympics.

Trout, Unlimited: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of a letter from Trout, Unlimited, a national conservation organization, addressed to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York. The letter protested what Trout, Unlimited, called willful and unnecessary destruction of trout streams in New York's Catskill Mountains.

This protest, Mr. President, illustrates again a problem common in all parts of the country. We all recognize the need for good highways; but in building them we must be careful that our precious fish, wildlife, and recreation resources are not destroyed.

Enactment of S. 468, which the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and I introduced in January, would represent a big step toward meeting this problem as it relates to construction of Federal-aid highways. Our bill, known by the initials "SOS"—for Save Our Streams—would amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, to require the approval of the Secretary of Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on Federal-aid highway systems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from Trout Unlimited, to Governor Rockefeller be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TROUT UNLIMITED,
Saginaw, Mich., January 9, 1963.

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Executive Mansion,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER: Trout Unlimited, a national conservation organization dedicated to the preservation and protection of trout and trout waters, has been deeply concerned for some time over the impending construction of the New York State Quickway along the Beaverkill and Willowemoc Rivers in the Catskill Mountains near Roscoe, N.Y.

A recent on-the-spot inspection of the area in question, consultations with local citizens, and personal observation of the construction work now in progress along the lower river have only served to amplify this concern.

It is Trout Unlimited's conviction that, once the "highwaymen" complete their bridging, straightening, filling and rechanneling of this most famous of all American trout streams, it will bear no resemblance whatsoever to the beautiful recreational resource that it is today.

Then, gone forever will be the historical runs, riffles, and pools that have drawn the faithful from every corner of the continent to this hallowed shrine where American flyfishing was born.

And once the silt-laden waters have filled the pools and covered the spawning riffles, gone too will be its greatest asset, wild native trout.

But, as important as anything, with the passing of the esthetics, the trout and the access, gone also will be the goose that lays the golden eggs, its economic value, the very lifeblood of its local residents.

It seems incredible that Government agencies charged with the well-being of its citizens should be so shortsighted as to destroy one of the very things upon which this welfare depends.

Trout Unlimited vigorously protests this willful and unnecessary destruction of a priceless and irreplaceable natural resource and we earnestly urge your personal intervention before it is too late.

In addition, if Trout Unlimited can be of assistance in any way in resolving this problem, through mediation or otherwise, we would consider it an honor to be called upon. We offer our availability, in person and at your convenience, for this purpose.

We thank you for the privilege of bringing this important matter to your attention and we look forward to its early and favorable resolution.

Sincerely yours,

TROUT UNLIMITED,
A. C. NEUMANN,
Executive Secretary.

Sale of Communist Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of an ordinance adopted by the council of the city of Columbus, Ohio, relating to the licensing of those who handle Communist manufactured or processed goods.

The people back home, including local government subdivisions, are tired of waiting for affirmative action by Washington.

The ordinance follows:

SALE OF COMMUNIST GOODS

An ordinance, No. 203-63, to enact Columbus city codes, sections 536.01 through 536.99, inclusive, pertaining to the sale of Communist manufactured or processed goods.

Be it ordained by the Council of the City of Columbus, Ohio:

Section 1. Columbus city codes, sections 536.01 through 536.99, inclusive, are hereby enacted to read as follows:

"536.01 Definitions.

"(a) 'Communist manufactured or processed goods' shall mean all goods, wares, or merchandise manufactured or processed in Communist countries offered for sale at wholesale or retail.

"(b) 'Communist countries' shall include, but not be limited to, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Red China, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, Cuba, Lithuania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, and North Korea.

"(c) 'Person' shall extend to and be applied to associations, clubs, corporations, firms, partnerships, and bodies politic as well as to individuals.

"536.02. License required.

"No person shall knowingly offer for sale Communist manufactured or processed goods without first obtaining a license therefor.

"Every application for license as required above shall be made at the office of the city auditor on a form to be provided, and such pertinent information as the city auditor may deem necessary shall be given under oath by the applicant.

"Each application for license shall be accompanied by a license fee of $100.

"Upon receipt of a license, such licensee shall post or cause to be displayed in a place conspicuous to customers the license stating that the place of business is licensed to sell Communist manufactured or processed goods.

"Each license shall contain in prominent lettering, the words 'License to Sell Communist Manufactured or Processed Goods', and such other language as deemed necessary by the city auditor.

"Each license issued in accordance with this chapter shall expire on the 31st day of March next following the issuance of said license.

"536.03 Labels—signs.

"No person, knowingly offering for sale Communist manufactured or processed goods, shall fail to display, in a place conspicuous to customers, a sign containing in prominent letters no less than 5 inches in height the words, 'Communist Manufactured or Processed Goods, Sold Here' or in lieu of the sign, to tag prominently all Communist manufactured or processed goods, each such tag containing in easily discernible letters of not less than 8-point type the words 'Communist Manufactured or Processed Goods.'

"536.04 Advertising.

"No person shall knowingly offer for sale, advertise, call attention to, or give publicity to the sale of any Communist manufactured or processed goods in any newspaper, magazine, circular, form letter, or any open publication, published, distributed, or circulated in this city, or on any billboard, card, label, or other advertising medium, or by means of any other advertising device, unless there be conspicuously displayed directly in connection with the name and description of such merchandise and each specified article, unit, or part thereof, a direct and unequivocal statement, indicating that such merchandise or each article, unit, or part thereof so advertised was manufactured or processed in a Communist country.

"536.05 'Good faith' exemption.

"Columbus City Code 536.01 through 536.99 shall not apply to any visual or sound radio broadcasting station or to any publisher or printer of a newspaper, magazine, or other form of printed advertising, who broadcasts, publishes, or prints such advertisement in good faith, without knowledge that Communist manufactured or processed goods are being advertised.

"536.06 Separability of provisions.

"Each section and each part of each section of this chapter is hereby declared to be an independent section or part of a section and, notwithstanding any other evidence of legislative intent, it is hereby declared to be the controlling legislative intent that if any such section or part of a section, or any provision thereof, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held to be invalid, the remaining sections or parts of sections and the application of such provi-

sion to any other person or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby, and it is hereby declared to be the legislative intent that these sections or parts of sections would have been adopted independently of such sections or parts of a section so held to be invalid.

"536.99 Penalties.

"Whoever violates this chapter shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than ($500) or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both. Any such violation shall constitute a separate offense on each successive day continued."

Section 2. That this ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed March 4, 1963.

GOLDA MAY EDMONSTON,
President of Council.

Approved: March 12, 1963.

W. RALSTON WESTLAKE,
Mayor.

Attest:

GORDON F. SERROTT,
City Clerk.

Canadian Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Niagara Falls has many claims to fame, not the least of which is the fact that it stands as the symbol of good neighborliness and international cooperation between the United States and Canada. The Niagara River, which divides New York State from Ontario, Canada, has been crossed by bridges of goodwill as well as of steel, and this spirit extends the entire length of the 3,987-mile border between Canada and the United States. Not a single soldier guards that border.

Niagara Falls is far more than a compilation of statistics, important as these are, to provide some concrete idea of the important role it plays in the relations between the United States and Canada. Its glories are celebrated by the National Geographic magazine in an article featuring a series of magnificent color photographs, which I hope all Senators will see.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "Niagara Falls, Servant of Good Neighbors," written by Walter Meayers Edwards, and published in the National Georgraphic magazine for April 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIAGARA FALLS, THE SERVANT OF GOOD NEIGHBORS

Searchlights of more than 4 billion candlepower radiate splendor over Niagara Falls, a breathtaking spectacle on the United States-Canadian border. Rainbow hues flash across the lip of shadowed Luna Falls and bathe 1,000-foot-wide American Falls beyond the guardrail enclosing Luna Island. Observation tower at Prospect Point rises from ice-choked Niagara Gorge.

Peace rules the border. Stars and Stripes and the Canadian ensign fly side by side on Rainbow Bridge; its 960-foot steel span above turbulant Niagara Gorge links New York State with Ontario. Five million annual visitors step across the painted boundary marker. Not one soldier stands guard along the 3,987-mile United States-Canadian frontier.

Slicker-clad sightseers ride the diesel vessel as she pitches and rolls below Horseshoe Falls. The *Maid of the Mist* has carried countless visitors into the caldron. Her name perpetuates the legend that Indians each year sent their fairest maiden over the falls in a canoe to appease the thunder god living below.

An aerocar swings above the whirlpool at a sharp right bend of Niagara Gorge 3 miles below the falls. Here the river, churning down the 300-foot-wide passage at 25 miles an hour, flings its savage current against the Canadian bank and forms a giant swirl. This tramway stretches 1,708 feet between two stations in Canada, dipping to 150 feet above the water.

Also, translucent waters of Luna Falls spray visitors in Hurricane Deck near the former Cave of the Winds. No tourists have been permitted behind the water curtain since 1920, when falling rock killed three persons. The cave no longer exists.

Niagara's power capacity ranks the falls as the Western World's largest hydroelectric complex. Every second some 200,000 cubic feet—the combined flood of Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, and Erie—flow down the Niagara River to the falls. A 1950 hands-across-the-Niagara treaty gives Canada and the United States equal shares of the plunging water for generation of power, some 4 million kilowatts. It prescribes a minimum flow over the falls of 50,000 cubic feet a second except in daylight during the tourist season, when it is increased to 100,000 for esthetic reasons. Twin conduits, each larger than four doubletrack railroad tunnels, channel part of the water to the newly finished Robert Moses plant. Likewise, two mammoth 5½-mile tubes beneath Niagara Falls, Ontario, feed the Sir Adam Beck-Niagara Generating Station No. 2, across the river from the Moses plant. At night when power demand is low, Niagara-powered electric pumps store water in reservoirs. During the day's peak demand, the stored water flows out through the same pumps, which become turbogenerators producing more electricity. The diversion reduces erosion that has gnawed back the falls from the Niagara escarpment about 7 miles since the ice age.

Further, ships plying Canada's Welland Canal bypass Niagara Falls. Eight massive locks overcome the 326-foot drop between Lakes Erie and Ontario. Bushes and earth fill a trenchlike remnant of the last of three previous Welland Canals. The falls lie 10 miles east.

Another industry which is dependent upon Niagara's gigantic electric power is the U.S. electrochemical industry. Cheap, abundant water power and rich deposits of rock salt naturally make this industry a cradle at the falls.

Martial music and cannon salute Fag Day in June at Old Fort Niagara, where the river meets Lake Ontario, 15 miles north of the falls. Frenchmen built the castle, now part of a New York State park, in 1726 to strengthen their hold on the Niagara frontier. Behind the facade of an innocent chateau, massive walls hid cannon emplacements, powder magazine, and a well to insure water during attack.

A floral clock on the Canadian side, inspired by a similar timepiece in Edinburgh's Princes Street Gardens, is three times larger than its Scottish counterpart. Stainless steel hour and minute hands weight 500 pounds each. Some 24,000 plants, different in each season, make up the design. Power transmission towers rise above Canada's Sir Adam Beck-Niagara Generating Station No. 1.

Additionally, there is a Seagram tower which gives sightseers an eagle's-eye view of falls and gorge. Visitors to the eight-level crow's nest atop the 325-foot structure see the bridge-linked cities of Niagara Falls, Ontario, and Niagara Falls, N.Y. Nearby roars the world's most famous waterfall. Niagara has become synonymous with a mighty, overwhelming flood, not by height or volume alone, nearly 100 falls are higher, and at least 2 carry greater flow, but because of the 186-foot leap of a tremendous amount of water.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Carver's Remarks at Guam Governor's Inauguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the inauguration of Gov. M. F. L. Guerrero, at Agana, Guam, on March 9, 1963, Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., advised the people of Guam that the national administration will continue its policy of "increasing reliance on the innate competence of our territories to manage their own local affairs in accordance with the highest American traditions of self-government." However, he emphasized that the privilege tendered "carries with it a balancing duty; authority tempered by responsibility."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to have Mr. Carver's remarks placed at this point in the RECORD:

My designation as the representative of the Department of the Interior on this happy occasion is a matter of great personal pleasure and satisfaction. A little less than 2 years ago I took my turn on this rostrum to honor another Governor. Then 2 months ago, I came to Guam again—but on a mission of a far different sort—to survey and discuss the disaster of last fall and your plans for reconstruction.

But both of those occasions had one common factor which made them memorable and satisfying. That was the presence, the quiet effectiveness, the uniform good will and the pleasant personality of the man we honor today. I should have been greatly disappointed to have missed the special pleasure and privilege of seeing Manuel Guerrero sworn into the office he has so richly earned.

I am here not only to convey the most sincere congratulations and earnest good wishes of the Secretary of the Interior, but also to assure you of the great confidence in Guam's future which is held by all of those on the Department's staff who have come to know and appreciate Governor Guerrero's great talents. To these I add my own expression of immense satisfaction that the President has chosen such a fitting representative of Guam to provide leadership in this critical period of its history.

Two years ago I announced the policy of the present national administration in the

management of territorial affairs. That policy is one of increasing reliance on the innate competence of our territories to manage their own local affairs in accordance with the highest American traditions of self-government. That continues to be the guiding principle of our relationships with the several territories, but especially with Guam and the Virgin Islands whose readiness for such responsibility has been recognized and formalized in organic legislation.

This policy is more than hollow rhetoric. I am confident that Governor Guerrero, former Governor Daniel, and your legislative leaders will testify that they have encountered an absolute minimum of Federal interference or regimentation as to any matters which are purely or primarily local in their scope. We extend at all times the hand of assistance and support and facilities for consultation and advice. But the power to decide remains with you, through the political institutions you are molding to the peculiarities of your geography, your economy and your culture.

Our conviction to this principle has not gone unchallenged. There are those who characterize it as a dereliction of Federal responsibility. It is criticized as the course of least resistance by some who would have us review in detail every local decision and impose the judgment of "big brother" hindsight. These pressures have been resisted; I am confident that such resistance will be continued, unremittingly.

As to the criticism that our policy is one of buckpassing, the easy course, the truth of the matter lies in precisely the opposite direction. There have been occasions, happily infrequent ones, when our judgment counseled a different course from that taken at the territorial level—whether at Agana, St. Thomas, Pago Pago, or Saipan. The human reaction in such cases, particularly if conditioned by the experience of supervising subordinate bureaus in the executive establishment, is to intercede, to reverse, to veto, to order corrective action. This is the easy course for those holding responsibility and having the naked authority to influence action.

But the policy of which I speak is in the nature of a self-denying ordinance, a commitment to restraint. The impulse to dictate solutions, however subtly, is an affront to and a cynical retreat from any sincere commitment to the philosophy of self-government.

It is even more than that. We learn as much from the mistakes as from correct decisions, often more so because the consequences of error leave more lasting impressions. More fundamentally, the right to decide includes the right to be wrong. Actions to limit the latter, however noble in their conception, work an erosion of the basic philosophy. Progress toward total competence in the art of Government must not be impeded by oversolicitous guardianship which isolates the political body from the experience of being mistaken.

There is another side to this subject, however—one that needs emphasis equal to that accorded the basic premise. There is a law of compensation in Government as well as in nature; every right carries with it a balancing duty; authority is tempered by responsibility. Social and political morality depend upon full acceptance of and dedication to these obligations, as well as enjoyment and exercise of the benefits. When rights are insisted upon and authority exercised without equal emphasis on duties and responsibilities, then the fabric of democracy is ruptured. One need not subscribe to the tenets of Marx or Hitler to qualify as an enemy of democracy. A rampant majority trampling on the rights and dignity of its fellow citizens is equally a denial of its ethical basis. Our system can only survive when the people have confidence that its ideals are being observed. Loss of that confidence breeds cynicism and abandonment of determination to support and defend it.

In our territorial structure, this balance of responsibility has two primary aspects: The relationship between Federal and local interest and the balance between Government and citizen.

More than any other community in the American commonwealth, the people of Guam have had unfortunate occasion to demonstrate their allegiance, loyalty, and commitment to its values. This is beyond question now if it were ever open to any other conclusion. The Organic Act of Guam was the partial response of a grateful United States. By its terms, the substantive guarantees of human rights assured by the Federal Constitution were extended to the citizens of Guam who were also formally accorded U.S. citizenship. Our relationship is therefore sealed by a mutual act of faith. The strength of the United States is committed to the protection of this community whose citizens are accorded a wide degree of latitude to regulate their own affairs within the framework of our political philosophy.

But since the source of your Government power is Federal—your Organic Act was an act of Congress, signed by the President—it must never be forgotten that there remains a purely Federal interest which must be respected and preserved. The process of local self-government must be conducted in the context of continuing respect for this interest. The Governor whom we see inaugurated today assumes a comparatively rare position—paralleled precisely by only one other. He is the executive head of a self-governing body politic. He is also a Federal officer charged to uphold its laws and to be sensitive to its interests. He may not act in one capacity in a manner which would be detrimental to the other.

But this responsibility is not confined to the Governor alone. He symbolizes the position of the community and its elected representatives. Local self-interest must be tempered by consideration for the broader national interest, but with particular reference to the special conditions which prevail in Guam. The delicacy of this balance and the need for cooperation and understanding are major factors which make us appreciate and welcome the assumption of office by Governor Guerrero.

Turning now to the internal aspects of responsible self-government, I would impose upon you no more demanding a standard than I would Idaho, or California, or Mississippi. But even the common standard established for all American communities is a demanding one, difficult to achieve under the most ideal conditions.

Its beacon lights are integrity and competence in administration coupled with due process and equal protection of the laws in policy conception. I refer to these basic standards not in narrow legal terms, but in the broadest concept of social motivation. Every person touched by the power of governmental authority has the right to have his legitimate interests carefully and sincerely considered. Citizen or alien, entrepreneur or wage earner, resident or transient, native or newcomer—all are entitled to fair treatment. Distinctions based on class are indefensible. Distinctions based on situation may be tolerated only where required by a heavy preponderance of necessity in the achievement of a significant public policy objective.

Democratic institutions are founded upon the tested principle of majority rule. But a sound philosophy of democratic living must undergird such institutions and it places equal weight upon the sanctity of minority rights—the right to be heard, the right to genuine consideration, the right to appeal or redress, the right to be different without indignity. When we abandon these ideals, the system is no longer democratic but the mob rule that the prophets of freedom and human dignity have counseled against through the centuries.

The term "minority rights" has in some quarters suffered a distortion that limits it to connotations of skin pigmentation, cultural origin, or religious practice. We must not be so limited in our view of so important a principle. Not only does that narrow view work a denial of basic protections to those who merely think differently, but it also cultives an insidious psychology leading to future mischief. When the cultural, racial, or religious minority becomes dominant, there is no tradition which requires it to respect those who have slipped from control.

The hopes and aspirations which we expressed 2 years ago remain undimmed. Guam continues to symbolize the American governmental ideal at the edge of an alien sphere of influence. Tried anew in the crucible of adversity, you have confirmed our faith in the capacity of our common institutions not only to survive but to provide the framework for reconstruction under local leadership and momentum.

There has been no pause in the march toward increased self-government. Every governmental act which demonstrates further competence and experience is a step toward the common goal. But when we accept the power to govern we must be mindful of the obligations and responsibilities which accompany it.

No one individual can bear this burden alone. Its components must be a living force in the community, reflected in its representative body. The moral tone which exists in this community lends assurance that Governor Guerrero will have united support in conducting public affairs on the high ethical plane demanded by our democratic ideals.

Eloise Pleasant—President, Women's Aviation Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of March 12, in a column written by John F. McLeod, carried the following item:

The "most pleasant girl in aviation," Eloise Pleasant of Pan American Airways' public relations staff here, has been elected president of the Women's Aviation Club for 1963–64. Now local in scope, the club has national goals.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. McLeod's appraisal of Miss Pleasant. The fact that she is a constituent of mine only adds to Mr. McLeod's essential premise—that Miss Pleasant is as pleasant as her name implies.

Pan American should be proud of the kudos which have come to Miss Pleasant. If the ultimate objective of the Women's Aviation Club is to become national in scope, Miss Pleasant has the know-how. Her own company started from beginnings as modest as her club and through determination, resourcefulness and hard work achieved the international position it now enjoys.

Mobile Health Teams Serve Central America Under Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Agency for International Development reported on the mobile health teams which are serving in Central America under the Alliance for Progress. We have heard much about the obstacles confronting the Alliance program and the difficulties and disappointments which have inevitably accompanied such a far-reaching program. In order to keep a proper perspective we should emphasize the constructive work which is contributing to the development of these American neighbors.

Following is the statement describing the work of these mobile health teams:

MOBILE HEALTH TEAMS SERVE CENTRAL AMERICA UNDER ALLIANCE

Mobile health teams, traveling by jeep, boat and mule, are introducing modern medicine to remote villages of six Central American countries under a unique Alliance for Progress program announced today.

Drugs and medicine will be distributed to people in 600 villages by teams of Central American doctors, public health nurses and sanitarians. The mobile teams will treat malaria, anemia, worms, general infections, and intestinal diseases with antibiotics, iron pills, antimalaria drugs and other medicine.

Two U.S. Government agencies, the Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps, have joined in the Alliance program, with the six governments of Central America in getting the program underway. American food, through the food-for-peace program, is also being used.

Modern medical services of the mobile teams will be backstopped by some 200 Peace Corps volunteers and other community development specialists who will help village committees carry out preventive health measures and build health centers and other community projects. Modest fees collected for medical treatment will remain in the villages to help finance these projects.

Another phase of the program will reduce malnutrition among preschool children and expectant mothers. The mobile teams will distribute high protein food-for-peace commodities in cooperation with U.S. voluntary relief agencies. Food will include dried milk and other dairy products, wheat, flour, bulgur, rolled wheat, corn and corn meal. Team nurses will teach mothers how to prepare the food and advise them about general nutrition.

Modern medicine has been unknown or unavailable in the villages that will be served. Annual per capita income in the rural areas averages less than $100 and many village people have never worked together outside of their families.

Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance, hailed the project as an "outstanding example of cooperative efforts the Alliance can achieve."

"We are gratified by the response in the participating countries," he said. "Each ministry of health has enthusiastically embraced this region project as the forerunner of a self-help effort to establish modern medicine among people who have never before seen a doctor."

Under Dr. Edgar F. Berman, of Baltimore, Md., former president of MEDICO and an AID consultant, work for the six-nation program began early last fall and two pilot teams began working in El Salvador on December 1. Several now are at work in Costa Rica and Panama and two boats, the *Alianza* and the *Progreso*, were launched recently on the Rio Coco in Nicaragua. Other units soon will be organized in Honduras and Guatemala. Altogether, more than 60 will be operational by next fall.

Most teams will travel in heavy-duty ambulances financed by AID and built by the Willys Motors, Inc., Toledo, Ohio. Fully equipped, a jeep-ambulance costs $2,900. It is designed to transport a patient requiring hospitalization from a rural village to a hospital in a central city. Each vehicle displays a silver cross as a backdrop for the distinctive Alliance for Progress symbol.

"If this is going to be a program the village people can rely upon," Dr. Berman said, "service must be given regularly throughout the year. That means these teams will travel by muleback if necessary to reach the villages at least twice a week."

Berman helped assemble a regional team of AID specialists to help organize and administer the program in all of the participating countries. They are: Dr. William Cope, former AID health adviser in Colombia, chief medical officer; Theodore Tenorio, administrative support officer; Mrs. Emilie Putnam, community development adviser; Louis Gardella, chief sanitarian; Peggy Pentz, health educator; and Bernice Cramer, public health nurse.

Through the ministries of health, Central American governments are retaining local physicians as national directors and eventually will assume full responsibility for the rural health program. At the outset, local contributions usually total at least one-third of the cost. Later, the countries will pay all expenses.

Each village donates furnishings for a health station—tables, sofas, towels, chairs, washstands, sheets, and soap. The village people also provide the equivalent of $100 in local currency for stationery and printed fee receipts.

Several villages in El Salvador and Costa Rica have contributed land and buildings for health stations and others hired permanent nurses or dentists who accompany the mobile team.

In a year's time, it is estimated that a team will dispense more than $10,000 worth of drugs financed by AID to 75,000 patients (many will receive more than one treatment, so the number of individuals will total less than 75,000 per team). Doctors and their helpers in El Salvador and Costa Rica are examining patients at a level of more than 300 per day. At this rate, when all of the teams are at work full time, more than 4 million examinations and treatments will be conducted yearly in the 6 countries.

Mau Maus of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have called attention repeatedly during the past few days to the growing concern finally being awakened to the need for strict and vigilant law enforcement in the Nation's Capital.

I was glad to see on yesterday that Arthur Krock, writing for the New York Times News Service, had devoted a column to the disgraceful conditions that prevail in Washington and had, in addition, commented on two of the many causes of widespread lawlessness here. One is the attitude of some Negro organizations, claiming a position of leadership among members of their race, to the effect that all the police officers of an entire precinct should be dismissed in disgrace because a patrolman shot and killed a Negro hoodlum who was resisting arrest after the forcible assault and robbery of a pregnant white woman on the streets.

The other is the effect of the so-called Mallory rule, promulgated by the U.S. Supreme Court to limit the time of detention of any suspect before his arraignment, now seized upon by the District Commissioners to forbid police arrest and questioning of any suspect without filing formal charges. It is somewhat ironic that the women employees of the Supreme Court building, along with those in our offices and those employed by Members of the House, need the protection of armed police officers to go safely to their cars on nearby parking lots when dusk has fallen.

Indicative of the confused thinking of some of the extremists in behalf of a distorted theory of civil rights is this quotation from a letter I received today from a District resident criticizing the police officer who shot a robber who refused to halt when so commanded, and me for stating that the officer had acted legally and in the proper discharge of his duty. The District resident wrote:

> I expect you as a responsible official to remember that ours is a government of laws, not of men. * * * Nothing will return life to this dead man, but repetitions of this unjust act can be avoided when elected officials, such as you, to speak out against violations of any citizen's rights to life and protection under the law, etc.

In speaking of this incident on the floor of the Senate last Thursday, I specifically explained that under the laws of every State in the Union and also the District of Columbia, police officers have both the legal right and the moral duty to exercise such force as may be necessary to apprehend a man known to have committed a felony. This was a fundamental principle of the English common law which was the law of all the original 13 Colonies unless and until changed by statute. The principle is thus stated by Blackistone, the greatest of all commentators upon the English common law:

> 1. Summary regarding arrests by officers without warrant:
>
> "2. Arrests by officers, without warrant, may be executed * * * 4. The constable * * * has great original and inherent authority with regard to arrests. He may, without warrant, arrest any one for a breach of the peace committed in his view, and carry him before a justice of the peace; and, in case of felony actually committed, or a dangerous wounding, whereby felony is like to ensue, he may upon probable suspicion arrest the felon; and for that purpose is authorized, as upon a justice's warrant, to break open doors, and 'it is said,' even to kill the felon if he cannot otherwise be

taken * * *." (Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. 4, 4th ed., pp. 302–303.)

2. Summary regarding justifiable homicide:

"Homicide is justifiable * * * for the advancement of public justice, which without such indemnification would never be carried on with proper vigor * * *.

"Homicides committed for the advancement of public justice are * * * 2. If an officer, or any private person, attempts to take a man charged with felony, and is resisted; and, in the endeavor to take him, kills him. But * * * there must be an apparent necessity on the officer's side, viz., that the party could not be arrested or apprehended * * * unless such homicide were committed; otherwise, without such absolute necessity, it is not justifiable." (Ibid., pp. 182–183.)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the Arthur Krock column, entitled "Mau Maus of Washington, D.C." as printed in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of March 18, 1963. I commend its perusal to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Mar. 18, 1963]

MAU MAUS OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—This Capital City of the United States, which many American political orators assert to be the capital city of the world, is unsafe for law-abiding citizens engaged in their lawful concerns.

After darkness falls, and often in the daylight, the streets of Washington are perilous to lone pedestrians, women in particular.

Homebreaking and entering, attended by violence that ranges from brutal beatings and robbery to rape and murder, are on a rising scale.

But the restraints on the police of criminal law enforcement have been steadily watered down by judicial and administrative rulings.

This weakening is one consequence of the Supreme Court decision which promulgated the so-called Mallory rule. That strictly limited the time during which the police may question anyone detained under suspicion of crime before formal arraignment.

And last week the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia compounded the problem of criminal enforcement by forbidding the police to arrest and question suspects without filing formal charges.

The Commissioners issued this order on their interpretation that such arrests are unconstitutional, while congressional committees were drafting legislation to modify the effects of the Mallory rule. The order was issued despite requests from committee members that it be withheld in the meantime, and also despite the expressed judgment of Police Chief Murray that the order will impose another handicap of crime prevention and criminal law enforcement in this city.

The Mallory rule takes its name from the Negro rapist, convicted by a jury of this crime and of intent to murder, whom the police had questioned for 7½ hours. Mallory made no charge of police brutality, and he never repudiated his confession. But the Supreme Court set him free, holding that his confession was unconstitutionally used as evidence in the trial because of the 7½-hour span of the prearraignment police questioning.

The rising degree of criminality in Washington since that ruling has made a jungle of the city's streets. It has infected the schools. Superintendent Hansen has felt obliged to ask for the removal of the ban on corporal punishment—he would administer it in mild form—and authority for school officials to expel uncontrollable pupils under 16 years of age.

The problem created by youthful prowlers on school premises, who beat up pupils and disorganize classes, has grown so serious that the police policy of arresting such troublemakers on the premises is being expanded to off-premises arrest warrants for frequent offenders.

But, in addition to the legal plagues which beset the Washington police, they are under the constant bombardment of organizations seeking to establish that their methods are brutal in general and especially so when employed against Negroes. This racial group which—though overwhelmingly composed of orderly, law-abiding citizens—contains the increment that is predominant in the criminal product of the city. An editorial in the March 15 issue of the Washington Daily News deals with a typical instance.

Officer Frank Klimicke shot and killed a Negro, with a constant criminal record since the age of 11, who, after a daylight robbery of a pregnant woman pedestrian and a long police pursuit, refused to obey Klimicke's command to halt.

Soon afterward a telegram was sent to the District of Columbia Commissioners by the Committee on Racial Equality (CORE), in which the shooting was termed "murder."

Among other demands made in the CORE telegram were these:

An entirely new set of commanding officers in the 10th precinct, and "thorough investigation of police brutality charges" by "persons not connected with the Police Department," whereupon the Daily News blasted CORE as follows:

"Racially oriented champions of less rigorous police safeguards * * * overlook the fact that the respectable, law-abiding colored citizens are endangered as much or more than white citizens by a tiny tribe of almost hopelessly uncivilized brutes * * * urban Mau Maus circulate in and out of our courts and jails and cause nearly all the violent crime * * * habitually lawless criminals who can only be controlled by force."

These facts, are usually obscured in the press, and in national politics.

Arthur Hoppe Writes About National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Hoppe, columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, continues in his satirical manner to focus attention on some of our national problems.

I ask unanimous consent for his columns of March 5, 8, 13, and 15 to be in serted in the RECORD with my remarks.

The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 5, 1963]

SAVE THE ECONOMY—THROW AWAY MONEY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning and how is your disposable personal income today? The condition of your disposable personal income is of grave concern to Mr. Kennedy, Congress, and me. Actually, we don't care what you do with it as long as you get rid of it. This is called "stimulating the economy." And it's terribly important in the cold war.

As you know, Mr. Kennedy has proposed a big tax cut so we'll all have more disposable personal income to dispose of. Mostly for things we don't need very much. Like another electric can opener in every kitchen.

But we have to buy more things we don't need so the manufacturers who make things we don't need can hire more people to make things we don't need so we'll all have more things we don't need. Otherwise, as everybody knows, the Russians will catch up with us and they'll have as many things they don't need as we do. Which would be awful.

But even so, Mr. Kennedy's having trouble giving us our money back. It's because many experts have no faith in us buyers. They say we already have plenty of things we don't need. They say we've reached the stage where we don't think we need things we don't need. So, they say, if we get a tax cut, we won't spend it. We'll hoard it. In banks. And thrift, of course, would wreck everything.

Obviously then, what we need to stimulate jaded consumer spending and thereby save the economy is for some incomparable genius to invent a spanking new, unheard of item we don't need. So I've invented it. It's called a Gimmph.

Initially, the Gimmph will be produced in three basic models: the Portable, Standard and Status Gimmph. (The last having chrome handles, brass-plated zippers, and a two-way power outlet.) Later, we will introduce the Outdoor Gimmph for the patio, the Underwater Gimmph for the pool, and the efficient No-Frills Gimmph for the office.

Our opening advertising campaign, aimed at opinion leaders, will stress the theme: "Be the First on Your Block To Own a Gimmph." Once every block has a Gimmph-owning family, we will turn to the keep-up-with-the-Joneses approach. The next step, naturally, is "Two Gimmphs in Every Home." Then three, then four. And so on. Indeed, our market analysts see no reason why every home can't have more Gimmphs than people. Unlike electric toothbrushes.

Across the Nation, Gimmph factories will be a-humming and retail outlets a-buzzing. Salaries will double. Workers will then be able to afford twice as many Gimmphs as before. Which, in turn, will double Gimmph production. Which, in turn, will double salaries. Which, in turn—

For the Gimmph is cleverly designed to break through the last rampart of consumer resistance. Yes, sir; no prospective buyer will ever ask, "But do I really need a Gimmph?" Because that would be a silly question.

So an economic growth rate of 78.2 percent is clearly achievable. Our leaders will be delirious. The Russians will roll over dead. And should anyone ever challenge our greatness as a nation we can simply point with pride to the fact that Americans own 23.2 times more Gimmphs per capita than the world average.

And isn't that sort of what we're all striving for?

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 8, 1963]

THE FREE PRESS CAN BE COSTLY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"News management," said my press agent friend, Mr. Harry V. Plate, dropping two free tickets to the opening ball game on my desk, "is a threat to our democracy."

I said I certainly agreed. But I was surprised to find Mr. Plate on my side. "I mean," said Mr. Plate, handing me a bottle, "if it's managed wrong. And look at Mr. Kennedy's press conferences."

Did he mean they were rigged? "They are fraught with danger," said Mr. Plate, offering me a pair of cuff links. "What if Mr. Kennedy gets a head cold? and stuffed-up

ears? and can't hear the questions? True, we would have the same questions and answers as always. But if he missed a single question, he could get a whole answer behind. Stop and think."

So, with Mr. Plate's guidance, I stopped and thought.

Question. Mr. President, what about the growing rift between Khrushchev and Castro?

Answer. (Mr. Kennedy is banging his ear with the heel of his hand and the question passes unnoticed.)

Question. Sir, are you satisfied with the work of the Vice President?

Answer. I didn't know one existed.

Question. Mr. Kennedy, is it true Caroline really has her own secretary now?

Answer. Very definitely, yes. And furthermore, let me emphasize that this member of our team is destined to play an ever-increasing role in our foreign and domestic policies in the trying months ahead.

Question. Mr. President, what about your proposed tax cut?

Answer. This has been blown up out of all proportion to its significance. It is a small routine detail of concern only to our own family.

Question. About Cuba, sir. Would you comment on the campaign by ultraconservatives urging a preemptive nuclear strike against Russia herself?

Answer. Actually, the most recent studies show quick action in this field to be vital to our economy. And I hope Congress will unite behind this nonpartisan measure so that its blessings can be conferred on all Americans at the earliest possible moment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

(The ace newsmen scramble from the room to flush out this news—news which, of course, triggers Mr. Khrushchev into hitting the button.)

Answer. Such rash statements, gentlemen, harm our common cause. And I would like to warn those who make such statements that while they are free to express what they will, they are a threat.

Well, it's seldom I take issue with Mr. Plate. But such a fiasco is impossible. Because nobody, I said in defense of our President, manages news more smoothly than he.

In fact, I was so angry I summed up the whole position of my profession on this issue: Not only is Mr. Kennedy managing the news adroitly, but he can't do it. Because you can't buy us ace newsmen. The American press, I told Mr. Plate ringingly, is absolutely free.

"If only that were true," sighed Mr. Plate, handing me my tickets to the Las Vegas annual press junket along with a list of clients he wished mentioned, "I'd save $15,000 a year."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 13, 1963]

DREAD DISEASE HITS GI'S IN VHTNNNG

(By Arthur Hoppe)

War is hell in south Vietnam. Our leader out there, Gen. Paul Harkins, has ordered our troops to stop kissing the girls goodby. With both hands.

The General, it seems, was out at Saigon Airport. And saw a group of GI's saying goodby to their Vietnamese girl friends. The way GI's usually do. And I take it none of them saluted when he passed.

Because the General announced he was "distressed." And he issued an order decreeing these "intense public farewells" to be neither "fitting or appropriate." And why can't everybody shake hands or something? Or else.

Oddly enough, a similar order was issued once in the neighboring kingdom of West Vhtnnng. And it almost cost us the war.

It was in the 14th year of President Ngo Mahn Ngo's lightning campaign to wipe out the dread Vietnarians with his trusty little Loyal Royal Army of 6,000 men. And 200,000 U.S. military advisers.

For 14 years, our military advisers had been standing on the parapets, advising each loyal royal troop to get out there and fight. But, as you recall, each uncivilized troop just lay in his foxhole playing his ghee (a kind of 27-note flute) and singing sad songs of love. Love being that backward nation's principal staple.

But we stubbornly went on showing the Vhtnnngians how to die for old Vhtnnng. We even helped them do it. With napalm bombs, and things. But nothing worked. The ignorant heathen went right on loving.

Then a terrible thing happened. Our military advisers got infected. The original carrier was a Maj. L. J. Sprock, who kissed a Vhtnnngian girl in a dark alley under the impression she was a clerk-typist from the U.S. Embassy. To his surprise, she tasted just like a girl.

Two days later Major Sprock bought a ghee. And began singing sad songs of love. Like "When the Butterfly Caresses the Frangipani I Think of You Emptying the Automatic Dishwasher in Shelby, Ohio."

In no time, all our military advisers were kissing native girls when off duty. And when on duty they were climbing down into the foxholes and fraternizing with the troops. In three-part harmony.

Our leader, Gen. Slim Perkins, was shocked. "Love," he said in General Order 167, "is contrary to regulations and is impeding the war effort. So no more kissing girls. And now, men, let's all get out there and die for good old West Whatsitsname."

This, as the General hoped, reinstilled the proper fighting spirit in our 200,000 military advisers. And they attacked. Unfortunately, what they attacked was General Perkins' headquarters. Luckily, however, they stopped to kiss their girls goodby first. And this gave the General a week to think things over and rescind the order.

Which all goes to prove war is hell. Thanks mostly to generals. Because there's nothing more hellish than not being able to kiss the girl you'd die for. Not that the old romantic notion of dying for a kiss isn't pretty silly. But it's only half as silly as dying without it.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 15, 1963]

TOUGH TIMES AHEAD, LOOSEN YOUR BELTS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I don't know what this country's coming to. Mr. Kennedy keeps trying to give us a $13 billion tax cut. And what happens? Nobody wants it.

Not only is Congress skittish, but polls and surveys show that we, the people, are pretty dubious about the whole thing. If not downright skeptical. And it's obvious Mr. Kennedy is face to face with a shocking, unheard of problem in practical politics: How do you make a tax cut look attractive?

True, he's doing his best in his uphill struggle to give us more money to spend. He keeps telling us we'll like it. If we just try it. Because it's really good for us. Even if we don't understand why.

Maybe so. But I've sampled our mood. And, if Mr. Kennedy wants each of us to take a tax cut, he's going to have to throw in some incentive. Like maybe green stamps.

(Scene.—The Internal Revenue Service office Local IRS Chief J. K. Wrack is just finishing totting up the return of a nervous citizen who sits, wringing his hands, in the chair by his desk.)

Mr. WRACK (triumphantly). Just as I thought, Mr. Boynton. You've figured your tax on the basis of the old rates prior to the cut. And you're trying to overpay us, let's see, $23.90. Here's your refund check. And don't think you can cheat the IRS. We've got computers, you know.

Mr. BOYNTON (pale but firm as he hands back the check). I can't accept it. It's a matter of principle.

Mr. WRACK (wheedling). Come now, Mr. Boynton, I'm sure you understand that you must accept the tax cut. So you'll have more money to spend. So you'll buy more. So you'll earn more. So you'll pay more taxes.

Mr. BOYNTON. That's a tax cut?

Mr. WRACK. Mr. Boynton, I appeal to your patriotism. You must accept this check for the good of the country.

Mr. BOYNTON. All I know is we're 300 billion bucks in the hole. I insist you keep my $23.90.

Mr. WRACK. Look, Boynton. Need I remind you of subsection 1532-a-903 (B); "Overpayment of Taxes, penalties proscribed." You can get 20 years in Leavenworth for willful and deliberate violations.

Mr. BOYNTON (rising tremblingly to his feet). I don't care. My only regret is that I have but half my life to give to the national debt.

Mr. WRACK. You're a tough case, Mr. Boynton. All right. If you'll make the sacrifice and swallow this tax cut, distasteful as it may be, we'll make it up to you politically. We'll cancel that new Federal dam, quit work on that new highway past your store and fire your brother from the local postmastership.

Mr. BOYNTON (wide eyed with delight). You will?

Mr. WRACK. It's a promise. Now get out there and spend.

Well, I never did understand high finance. When it gets above $1.98 it never seems like real money. And, oddly enough, I think Mr. Kennedy's tax plan would help the economy. If he can just force it down our throats.

And yet it delights me that we, the people, are opposed to taking a tax cut. Because while we may be wrong, it shows that collectively we have a high sense of responsibility. Of course, this may bode ill for our zany economy. But it sure bodes well for our democracy.

A Tribute to the American Legion, on the Occasion of Its 44th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call attention to the fact that 44 years ago this month the American Legion came into existence at the so-called Paris caucus of March 1919.

That was, in my estimation, a singularly important event, Mr. Speaker, representing as it did the first major attempt of American veterans of World War I to quash the expansion of world communism—a baby tiger in the year 1919, that was to grow into the awesome beast which we confront today.

Had all Americans risen in like spirit, to meet the threat of communism in 1919, there would be no such problem confronting us at this moment as that represented by Russia, Red China, Cuba, and the rest of Communist society. Unfortunately, however, the Legion stood

virtually alone, back in those days, in viewing with alarm the dramatic spread of Communist ideology. While others, in a manner befitting idiot children, spoke in terms of communism as a kind of interesting experiment, the newborn American Legion of 1919 was pouring forth its condemnation of Communist principles from the start.

This was the period, you will recall, when European veterans were returning home en masse to join the Socialist Party of that period, from which revolutionary efforts developed in Russia, Hungary, Germany, and many other countries, including even Canada. Moving in to eliminate the revolutionary spirit among American veterans, the American Legion reminded its followers of that for which they had fought: a set of principles standing forth far and above the feeble promises of socialism. In short time the Legion battle cry had carried the day among the great mass of American doughboys and there was not the slightest chance for socialism's spread within the United States—at least, not with the aid of American veterans, and not without their bitter opposition.

Notwithstanding all later contributions of the American Legion to the American way of life, none, in my opinion, exceeds in importance the very first step, by which the Legion aided and abetted the democratic cause at a dangerous and perilous time, and with remarkable effect.

We have every reason to hail the accomplishments of the American Legion at this time, and to wish its membership good health and a glorious future in the stirring days ahead.

Are We Witnessing the Death of Our Republic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, are the fears of our Founding Fathers coming to pass? Is this Republic to die because everyone wants something from the Government and there are none with courage to attempt to turn the tide There is a very grave danger, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to these questions is "Yes." Because practically everyone is either getting something from the Federal Government, or there are plans in the works to include everyone, Federal spending is going to go up and up and up until the balloon bursts and this free America will have perished. We cannot go on spending nearly $100 billion a year and maintain a strong and free economy with the necessity of maintaining taxes which are almost completely confiscatory and robbing our economy of the seed capital which alone will keep it growing.

To reverse this situation will take courage on the part of the people and on the part of Members of Congress. Our citizens, at some point, must stand up and say we do not want a Federal handout and we demand that all such bribes be stopped. And responsible Members of Congress, someday, will have to decide if the saving of our Republic is important enough to gamble their political future and tell the people the truth, that continued Federal spending spells disaster.

How far down the road to disaster we have come is indicated in the following excerpt from the U.S. News & World Report of March 25, 1963. In this list of who is getting Federal money, is anyone left out?

Maybe you wonder why spending by Government keeps going up and up, why cuts aren't made even when spending rate is near 100 billions a year.

The reason is simple: Too many voters get checks from Washington, or indirect benefits from spending by Washington. They want bigger checks and bigger indirect benfits, not smaller checks or an end to indirect benefits.

Politicians recognize that. Whether Republicans or Democrats, they back away from lining up for specific cuts that would affect specific voters.

So put this down as an axiom: Barring an end to cold war, spending by Government will go on rising. And if cold war should end, there would be a scramble to find new ways to spend in order to help offset defense cuts. Anyone left out?

Just look at a partial list and you see the political problem:

School lunches aid 16 million pupils and their voting parents. Jobs in Federal Government for civilians number 2.5 million; military, 2.7 million; they all can vote. Workers in industries dependent on arms spending total 4 million. Veterans getting benefits for service-connected disabilities: 2 million.

Survivors of veterans getting pensions: 900,000. Living veterans getting non-service-connected pensions: 1.2 million. Veterans getting hospital care: daily average, 139,000. Veterans' visits to clinics or private physicians paid for by the Government: 3.7 million in a year.

Farmers getting price-support loans or conservation payments: 2 to 3 million. Needy persons getting surplus food: 8.8 million. Consumers getting electric power from rural co-ops borrowing capital from Government at 2 percent: 5.2 million. Co-op telephone subscribers on same basis: 1.6 million.

Counties with subsidized crop insurance: 1,096. Depressed areas now getting area-redevelopment help: 900. School districts getting Federal aid because of Government installations: 4,300. Students getting loans: 235,000. People getting vocational rehabilitation: 485,000. Employment service placing people in nonfarm jobs: about 7 million placements in a year.

Old-age relief going to destitute aged: 2.3 million. Medical assistance for indigent old people goes to 500,000. Then there's old-age and survivors' insurance. Parents and dependent children benefited: 3.8 million.

Totally and permanently disabled getting aid: 468,000. Retired people drawing old-age insurance checks: about 13 million. Payroll taxes meet the costs of the insurance, as contrasted with relief parts of social security.

What you can see is that a very great number of people get aid from the Government, and have an interest in seeing this aid increased in size. It's estimated that those getting either regular or occasional checks from Washington number at least half as many as voted in the last election.

Members of Congress, aware of this fact, can't ignore it in voting.

There's another important side of it, too. Government contracts total many millions each year. Local stakes are high in those contracts.

Robert McNamara, Defense Secretary, showed how these contracts can be changed for a purpose when he withdrew contracts abruptly from some companies during the 1962 steel controversy. Edward Kennedy, the President's brother, campaigning for office, stressed his ability to get contracts for his State.

Politicians often are rated, and base appeals for votes, on their ability to get money for their States or districts out of the till in Washington.

It seems that what the Founding Fathers worried about is coming to pass. The early worry: That, if masses of voters were given the right to vote themselves something for nothing, there would be no limit to their demands.

Checks against Federal power and power of voters were set up. But: In the 1930's, the last barriers to runaway demands of voters were broken down when the Supreme Court removed the limits on Federal power over the economy.

If voters want, the sky is the limit in aid programs from now on.

Bureau of Customs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, has been taking vigorous action under the leadership of Commissioner Philip Nichols, Jr., to modernize, simplify, and streamline customs procedures to bring them in line with the Government's policy of encouraging travel to the United States and to help redress our balance of payments. Two articles, one of them published in the Washington Post by its travel editor, Mr. Dick Tenelly, the other in the Philadelphia Inquirer by Jerry Cahill, point up this fine effort by the U.S. Commissioner of Customs. I will insert these articles at this point in the RECORD so that Members of Congress may be cognizant of their contents:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 27, 1963]

U.S. CUSTOMS TRIES TO PLEASE TOURISTS

(By Dick Tenelly)

The U.S. Customs people wish other people would not think so harshly of them. If only Americans coming back from abroad, and foreigners about to visit these shores, would learn the regulations before they leave, and if only they would cooperate a little with customs inspectors at ports of entry. If only* * *

With some such wistful thoughts in mind, the Bureau of Customs—an arm of the Treasury Department as long and as inflexible as an income tax collector's—has prepared a standup counter poster for distribution among travel agents, airlines, rail terminals, and wherever they might possibly be seen, if not heeded, by those who could profit from stern admonition.

First of all, the poster urges travelers to read the Bureau's pamphlet of "Customs Hints" that they may be fully informed

about exemptions, privileges, and restrictions. The pamphlet may be obtained here from the Commissioner of Customs. If you know the rules, you shouldn't expect any trouble on coming back.

Accept only official information or advice. Don't rely on the word of an "experienced" traveler who thinks he once got away with something. And never believe anyone abroad who is trying to sell you merchandise.

All you have to do to stay out of trouble is declare everything you bought while abroad, new or used, at its true purchase price, with an invoice to back it up. The customs boys already know the market price of just about any item you might acquire.

It would help a lot, too, if returning sojourners could pack all purchases in one place, instead of scattering them about among several pieces of luggage.

One last thing. Be sure you know your own State's liquor import limits. The Feds won't let you off the pier with more than your home State will allow.

PREDATES TREASURY

The U.S. customs service is one of the oldest administrative agencies of the Federal Government. It is older by a month than the Treasury Department, of which the service is a part.

The First Congress of the United States, anxious to find sources of revenue for the new Nation, lost little time in providing for the collection of customs. The second law adopted by that Congress, on July 4, 1789, was the Tariff Act. Four weeks later the lawmakers established customs districts, ports of entry, customs officers and collection procedures.

Operations of the service are directed by a Commissioner of Customs headquartered in the Treasury's Bureau of Customs in Washington. Of the service's approximately 8,500 employees, fewer than 300 work in Washington, however. The rest are scattered around the world—at seaports, airports and border stations in the 47 customs districts in this country and the Virgin Islands; and in major cities abroad.

Principal responsibility of the service is enforcement of U.S. tariff regulations. In addition the service administers laws relating to the ownership and documentation of vessels, and assists in the enforcement of other Federal laws.

In its first year of operation, the customs service collected approximately $2.5 million for the Government. By fiscal 1961, its revenues had mushroomed to more than $1.4 billion, and its officers had processed more than 158 million persons and 45 million ships, planes, trains, buses, trucks and cars.

CUSTOMS SERVICE TO UNVEIL NEW LOOK

(First of four articles on the "new look" in the U.S. Customs Service)

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON.—Congress willing, the day may not be too far off when smartly uniformed young hostesses, skilled in foreign languages and schooled in tact, go on duty in the customs clearance areas of the passenger piers of New York.

Travel-seasoned passengers may blink in surprise, but for Government officials the presence of the girls will be just another manifestation of a quiet revolution that has been putting a new face on the Nation's oldest revenue-collecting arm in the last decade.

TOO GRUFF FOR UNITED STATES?

For years travelers have looked upon U.S. customs inspectors as unnecessarily gruff characters. And the inspectors have seen themselves as little more than policemen, bent on catching smugglers and intercepting proscribed articles. In fact, some of our best people are smugglers.

Today, customs personnel must be more than enforcers and collectors. Frequently they constitute a foreign visitor's first exposure to official America. And with the United States anxious to maintain its image abroad and hopeful of luring more tourist dollars to our shores, the Government wants the exposure to be a pleasant one.

That explains the plan to ask Congress to hire the pier hostesses, who would be members of the newly formed U.S. Travel Service and would help passengers through the often mystifying labyrinth of customs and immigration procedures.

DUTY: BE PLEASANT

The girls' primary duty would be to help create a pleasant, cheerful pier environment, by extending a friendly welcome to foreign visitors and homecoming Americans. They also would be available to assist passengers with babies, the aged and the elderly, and to answer questions.

Nineteen hostesses recently hired by the Immigration Service already are on duty at New York's Idlewild Airport. If present thinking is carried out, these girls will become part of the Travel Service hostess team.

The hostess plan is only one aspect of the effort to give U.S. port inspectional services, and particularly customs, a new look. Some others:

1. An intensified indoctrination program to emphasize to customs officers the need for courteous, friendly treatment of travelers, and to encourage them to acquire language skills.

2. A stepped-up effort to persuade owners of waterfront and air terminal facilities to improve customs areas. Early this month, a voluntary campaign to brighten up the New York piers got underway. It was inspired by a request from President Kennedy.

3. Creation of a public relations office to educate the public, travel agencies, airline and steamship personnel to the job that customs must do, not only in enforcing tariff regulations and collecting duties, but in preventing the entry of insect pests, disease carriers and other prohibited items damaging to health, agriculture and industry.

4. Adoption of simplified procedures and experimental techniques designed to speed the process of clearing customs. Chief among the experiments is the use of oral baggage declarations, instead of written declarations. The experiment was undertaken in Miami in September and in Honolulu in November. It is due to be introduced soon at Idlewild.

The effort to put a smile on the face of the customs service presents to the public is of relatively recent origin, according to David B. Strubinger, Assistant Commissioner of Customs.

UNDER PHILADELPHIAN

It began under the administration of Ralph Kelly, a Philadelphian who was Commissioner under former President Eisenhower, has continued under the present Commissioner, Philip Nichols, Jr., and has been given impetus by a citizens' task force that last year completed an intensive study of customs procedures.

Kelly, Nichols, and the task force all recognized that foreign visitors to the United States, including persons in a position to influence policies in their home countries, might form a lasting impression of this country on the basis of their first impression—while going through customs.

Strubinger puts it succinctly. "We feel very strongly that a cheerful welcome to the United States is an essential part of our work."

CONSTANT REMINDERS

Customs inspectors are constantly reminded of that policy by directives from Washington, and personal instructions from their superiors. If an inspector persists in brusque treatment of travelers, he is transferred to another job that does not require contact with the public.

Occasionally, an overeager inspector will forget the new diplomacy line. When it happens, no one is more red-faced than the men who run the customs service. They are aware that friction is bound to arise in a situation that involves dealing with the public under less than favorable circumstances.

But they want the indoctrination program to work, and believe it is working. Strubinger reports that it has been seldom necessary in recent years to transfer an inspector because of incidents with travelers.

On the other hand, customs officials are fond of relating the experience in diplomacy of an inspector in Boston, who encountered a traveler—an American—who flatly refused to submit to the required baggage examination.

REVERSE PSYCHOLOGY

The inspector, faced with the unpleasant prospect of involved legal formalities that would have forced compliance, decided on reverse psychology instead.

"Don't open your baggage—and that's an order," he said.

The bellicose traveler turned purple, and promptly opened his bags.

"Nobody's telling me what to do," he muttered.

How to deal with the public will be one of the principal training programs the Customs Service hopes to sponsor at the Customs Academy for which it will ask a congressional appropriation next year. The school will be situated on Long Island.

LANGUAGE TRAINING

Also to be stressed will be formal training in language skills, a principal recommendation of the task force.

Courses in Spanish already are offered at Miami, and members of the Service's Mexican border force list Spanish as their second language. Informal instruction is underway at other ports, including New York which lists among its customs personnel inspectors who can converse in 11 different languages.

The task force found a principal source of traveler annoyance in the physical condition of customs clearance areas, particularly at New York's Hudson River piers which, for the most part, are unheated in the winter, sweltering in the summer, generally unpainted and devoid of creature comforts.

COMMITTEE FORMED

Subsequently, a special committee of Government, city and steamship-industry representatives was formed under the leadership of the U.S. Treasury Department, of which the customs service is a part.

The committee, headed by Assistant Treasury Secretary James A. Reed, on December 7 came up with 15 recommendations.

Indicative of the extent of the problem, the first two proposals dealt with such elemental matters as the provision of adequate heat and the installation of benches, tables, and chairs for the use of passengers before and during customs processing.

Some piers already have begun putting the recommendations into effect.

The customs service has no funds of its own to improve passenger areas in which inspectors work, and thus must rely on the cooperation of port operators.

SITUATION TO CHANGE

The situation may change soon with respect to air terminals. The Federal Aviation Agency recently authorized customs to pay rent for airport facilities it now gets free. With the rent will come demands for improved work places, customs officials say.

Another source of irritation found by the task force is the policy that every incoming piece of luggage must be opened and inspected, wherever possible, regardless of

whether the passenger has anything subject to duty.

The Agriculture Department, charged with the responsibility of preventing the entry of foreign pests and diseases that could damage American agriculture and livestock, insists on the policy.

CITES STATISTICS

It cites statistics showing that interceptions of contaminated meats and foods are 5 to 7 times greater when 100-percent baggage inspection is enforced, than when baggage is merely spot checked.

Exponents of the "every bag" policy like to point out what happened in 1954, when a baggare spot check was in effect for 60 to 90 days. Part of the Florida citrus crop became infested by the Mediterranean fruitfly, and losses of $2.5 million resulted. Customs was blamed.

On the other hand, listen to the typical reaction of the American tourist returning from a trip abroad. According to the task force report, it goes like this:

"We traveled through 10 countries, were treated courteously, and never had a bag opened. Only to return home, where we are taxpayers, and have them treat us like criminals."

If it is the difficult task of the Custom Service's new public relations office to take the ire out of a prevailing reaction like that, it should be somewhat easier to bring home to the taxpayer the importance of the work of the U.S. Customs Service.

Its contribution to the health and economic stability of the Nation has been enormous. In terms of revenue alone, customs has played a crucial role in keeping the U.S. Government solvent.

From 1789 to 1791, customs produced all but $19,440 of the young Nation's income of $4.4 million. From then until the era of the personal income tax, year in and year out, customs has delivered the bulk of the country's annual revenues.

MANY CUSTOMS CHEATERS ARE AFFLUENT

(Second of four articles on the "new look" in the U.S. Customs Service)

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON.—Popular conceptions of the smuggler as a shifty-eyed, swarthy type with the scruples of a cat and a thirst for a fast buck swiftly disappear on examination of cases handled by the Division of Investigations and Enforcement, U.S. Bureau of Customs, Washington, D.C.

The shifty-eyed, swarthy type is represented in goodly number, to be sure.

But also represented are Philadelphia society matrons, business executives, actors, shipping tycoons, art collectors, airplane pilots, diplomats, and military officers of high rank and low.

Chester A. Emerick, Deputy Customs Commissioner in charge of the Division, who retires New Year's Eve after 45 years in the service, puts it rather wryly:

"Some of our best people are smugglers."

Best, in this sense, is translated, "persons of substance." For reasons best known to themselves, the most affluent tourists are the most likely to cheat the U.S. Customs service.

They are playing a game that is not only risky, but one that is likely to be expensive as well.

Every year, customs assesses fines and penalties of more than a million dollars on persons who attempt to evade duties by failing to declare oversea purchases on their return home.

Such persons face the possibility of criminal action. In addition they may be required to pay a penalty equal to the U.S. appraised value of the article, and to ante up an equal amount if they want to keep the item. Otherwise it becomes U.S. property.

In discussing smuggling by tourists, custom officials make it clear that the vast majority of Americans returning from trips abroad—one source put the figure as high as 99 percent—pay their U.S. duties without squawk or subterfuge.

But of the remaining 1 percent, the bulk are well-heeled characters who could easily afford to settle accounts with Uncle Sam.

Take, for example, the European entrepreneur and his American wife, who favored extended shopping trips abroad but seemed reluctant to tell U.S. customs about their purchases.

In 1958 the couple was assessed penalties of more than $50,000 on acquisitions they either neglected to declare or grossly undervalued. In the latter category were a dozen Dior and Balmain gowns, purchased at $6,500. Their value was listed to customs at $3,000.

Failure to declare purchases, and undervaluing purchases, appear to be the favorite techniques of the tourist smuggler attempting to avoid duty on acquisitions beyond the $100 exemption now generally in effect for residents returning from abroad.

A few months ago a Philadelphia society matron swept into international airport from a shopping trip to Italy. Customs had been tipped that the trip had included visits to a number of high fashion shops in Rome. Its Philadelphia staff was consequently intrigued to discover the woman had failed to declare several purchases, and had undervalued others.

The acquisitions amounted to $1,589. Unless the woman can convince customs there were mitigating circumstances in her failure to tell all, she may have to pay more than twice that amount to keep her purchases.

As a spokesman for the enforcement division puts it, "mitigating circumstances are difficult to find in cases of wealthy tourists who knowingly fail to declare."

The lady might have saved herself trouble if she had known of the experience of another member of Philadelphia society, who arrived at the airport under similar circumstances a month earlier.

This traveler placed a $95 valuation on her principal acquisition, a two-piece wool suit. Customs officials, who make it their business to inform themselves in such matters, thought differently. They placed a price of $315 on the suit.

Would-be tourist smugglers sometimes are ingenious, but even these are frequently tripped up, thanks to the thoroughness of the U.S. customs agents who investigate cases of suspected fraud for the service.

Thus the case of the wealthy woman who arrived at a New York pier last year. She was greeted warmly on the pier by a daughter before clearing customs. Mother slipped daughter a costly emerald ring, employing a frequent play of customs cheaters.

The agents were suspicious, however, and under questioning, the woman not only admitted the fraud, but confessed to failures to declare purchases on a number of previous arrivals. The seizures totaled $18,239.

Sometimes the cheaters are just plain unlucky, like the arrival who secreted a $475 gold brooch in a piece of salami, apparently unaware of the rigid restrictions on bringing processed meats into this country.

The salami was confiscated almost as a matter of course. Its valuable content was quickly exposed.

Similarly ill blessed was the Miami shopkeeper who arrived in New York on October 23, 1958, aboard the SS *Constitution*, unaware that one of her fellow passengers was the then Commissioner of Customs, Ralph Kelly, of Philadelphia.

She may have been unaware of him, but Commissioner Kelly maintained a lively if discreet interest in her, and particularly in the energy she devoted to transferring goods, acquired at fashionable European shops, from their original boxes to her luggage.

The shopkeeper pleaded guilty to attempting to slip the goods through customs duty-free, for resale at her store. She was fined.

The case illustrates a point. Customs sometimes will go easy on the tourist whose failure to declare purchases is based on a plea of ignorance or bad advice—and who had no intention of reselling the articles.

In the absence of established fraud, his penalty might be as small as the duty he would have had to pay anyway.

But in instances where the smuggled items are destined for resale, customs is inclined to throw the book at the cheaters.

It happened to the Miami shopkeeper, and it happened to a group of New York businessmen who had a good thing going until a worker in customs' San Francisco mail division decided to read a Hong Kong newspaper during his lunch hour.

The newspaper, addressed to the New Yorkers, was tightly rolled. When the customs worker unrolled it, he discovered a number of pouches affixed to the inside sheets, and pieces of smuggled jade in the pouches.

The New Yorkers were fined $11,000.

TIPS, SLIPS AID CUSTOMS MEN

(Third of four articles on the "new look" in the U.S. Customs Service)

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON.—In the continuing battle of wits between the men of the U.S. Customs Service and the professional crooks and amateur smugglers who try to violate our import laws, the odds would seem to favor the forces of darkness.

The service has only 250 agents and 525 uniformed port investigators in full-time antismuggling police work.

The lawbreaker, on the other hand, can be anyone—a prim Bronx housewife, a dashing airlines pilot with a brilliant war record, an illiterate Oriental seaman—and he or she can mask the smuggling activity in a big country against an almost unbelievable volume of international travel.

In 1961 there were more than 158 million border crossings and port arrivals in the United States. The multitudes came by car, bus, train, ship, and plane. More than 27 million walked.

Against these odds, the relative handful of customs policemen seized more than $16 million worth of smuggled goods in fiscal 1961 and more than $23 million in the year ended June 30. They arrested more than 2,900 smugglers.

Informers throughout the world played a key role in their success.

Under the law, an informer is entitled to a reward in the amount of 25 percent of the value of the seized merchandise, up to a maximum of $50,000, and most of the tipsters who provide information to customs do so for cold, hard cash.

David C. Ellis, 44-year-old assistant deputy commissioner in charge of enforcement, tells of one smuggler who was so greedy he "informed himself out of business." The man dealt in the illicit importation of parrots. Such imports are rigidly restricted because the bird is a carrier of parrot fever, a pneumonia-like illness that is extremely serious.

The parrot man was prospering, but he couldn't resist the informer's fees. He fed Ellis, then an agent in the field, tips about his customers. As evidence piled up, the customers were arrested one by one. Soon the smuggler was out of business.

Sometimes informers have other motives. There was the case of the housemaid who informed on her wealthy employers, who privately boasted how they had slipped thousands of dollars of dutiable purchases past customs. She talked because she disagreed with their political views.

Often an informer will offer information in exchange for immunity from prosecution.

Such was the case of a young woman Ellis arrested in Houston, Tex., on Christmas Eve, 1955, with 150 pounds of marijuana in her possession. The investigator could have had her prosecuted, but he suspected she played a key role in an international smuggling ring.

In return for a promise of immunity, the girl talked—to an extent beyond Ellis' wildest hopes. It developed she had a photographic memory for numbers and faces. On the basis of telephone numbers, street numbers and highways she remembered, investigators assembled thousands of pieces of evidence and 50 witnesses to document her story. Three hundred additional pounds of marijuana were confiscated, and smugglers in 14 cities went to prison.

The girl today lives in a distant city, a price on her head. Only Ellis knows her address. He isn't talking.

His silence illustrates the absolute trust that exists between customs agents and informers, who literally place their lives in the hands of the Federal investigators.

MATTER OF POLICY

As a matter of policy, the customs men refrain from making arrests if they know their informer's safety might be jeopardized.

This doesn't mean the tipster himself is free to break the law, and informers themselves are the first to accept this hard rule of law enforcement.

The reason is simple, as Ellis explains it: A lawman who would connive to break the law by winking at violations couldn't be trusted, and trust is all-important to the informer.

In bringing smugglers to the bar, customs agents use scientific devices and a lot of legwork to supplement their intelligence network.

HIGH-POWERED X-RAY

They don't like to discuss the detection aids, but one such device already has been widely publicized. It is the inspectoscope, a high-powered X-ray device that enables the investigator to peer into packages without disturbing their wrappings.

Smugglers are a wary breed who will just leave a package unclaimed in the customs office if they think it's been tampered with.

Thanks to the inspectoscope, a Bronx housewife saw nothing amiss when she arrived at a New York airport in 1954 to pick up a crate marked glassware sent to her from Europe. She toted the crate to the car, where her husband waited behind the wheel.

BROKE DIAMOND RING

In hollowed-out sections of the crate, agents found 10 packages of diamonds. The Bronx couple talked, and a ring that had smuggled $243,810 in diamonds in the United States in the course of a year was out of business.

Legwork that carried investigators from Miami to Mexico City to Coatzacoalcos, Mexico, to Nassau, to Panama City, and New York helped customs unmask a dummy corporation set up with the collusion of the Castro regime to evade U.S. export controls to Cuba.

The shipment in question covered 1,902,300 pounds of American fungicides and insecticides worth $435,971. Representatives of the bogus corporation told customs they planned to sell the chemicals to the Mexican Department of Agriculture at a healthy profit.

INVESTIGATORS SKEPTICAL

Customs was skeptical. Its investigators had failed to unearth anyone in Coatzacoalcos, Mexico, purported home city of the corporation, who had ever heard of the firm. The investigation also disclosed that several of those involved in the deal had been linked to smuggling in the past.

Then the insurance agent for Lloyd's of London, who wrote the insurance for the shipment, was located in New York. He verified the suspicions.

The shipment was only to stop briefly at Coatzacoalcos, and then head for Havana. The ultimate consignee was Castro's Banco Para el Comercio Exterior de Cuba.

Customs got an unexpected assist from the bearded dictator. Castro took to the airwaves to complain that the Americans had seized his shipment.

U.S. District Judge Emett C. Choate, of Miami, made it official, declaring the shipment the property of the U.S. Government. It was sold at auction. Proceeds went to the U.S. Treasury.

A LITTLE ADVICE FIRST CAN SAVE TRAVELERS TIME, TROUBLE, MONEY

(Last of four articles)

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON.—Americans planning a trip abroad will find themselves well-served to consult with the U.S. Customs Service beforehand. It could save them time, trouble, and money.

Customs regulations are admittedly complex, and it seems that there are exceptions within exceptions for many rules. Take for example, the duty-free exemption for returning residents, currently pegged at $100.

EXEMPTIONS, EXCEPTIONS

To qualify for the exemption: The articles acquired abroad must be declared to the customs officer, must be for your personal or household use, must not include more than 1 gallon of alcoholic beverages and more than 100 cigars.

Here are some of the exceptions:

You can't qualify if you are outside the United States less than 48 hours, unless you return by way of Mexico. Then there is no time limit, provided the articles for which you seek exemption were purchased in Mexico.

TIME LIMIT SET

And you can't qualify for the exemption more often than once every 31 days.

If you are returning from the Virgin Islands, a U.S. possession, you get not a $100 exemption but one for $200. However, you can include in the exemption not more than $100 in articles acquired elsewhere than in the Virgin Islands.

You don't have to meet a time limit to qualify for the Virgin Islands exemption, unless you include in it items picked up outside the islands. Then the 48-hour rule applies again.

The foregoing gives you an idea why customs advises travelers to pick up printed pamphlets outlining the rules in detail and to ask questions when in doubt.

Here are some other tips:

Save your receipts. You must declare the actual purchases price of your foreign acquisition. If you cannot support it with dependable information, the customs officer may assign a value to the article based on the service's knowledge of foreign markets.

Declare everything. Your customs baggage declaration is all-inclusive, covering everything you acquired abroad, including gifts and articles you are bringing home at the request of a friend, and articles following by mail.

USE NO EXEMPTION

Use is no exemption. Some travelers have the mistaken notion that they need not declare wearing apparel, jewelry and cameras acquired abroad and such items if they were used during the trip. This is not true, although the customs officer is authorized to make allowances for wear and tear, when applicable.

Watch out for restricted items. Owners of certain trademarks registered with the U.S. Treasury can prevent or restrict, by means of the customs, the importation of merchandise so marked, if they choose. Customs issues revised lists of such items every 6 months. Also controlled are the entry of fruits, vegetables, plants, plant products, meals, meat products, animals, firearms, and goods from Communist countries.

REGISTER BEFOREHAND

Register beforehand. If you are taking a previously-acquired foreign made article, a watch, for example, with you on your trip overseas, you could have to pay duty on it when you return, unless you can prove when and where you acquired the article. The best way to obtain such proof is to register the article at the nearest collector of customs office before you leave.

Avoid unofficial advice. Some overseas merchants will offer to provide phony sales slips, listing the price of the article lower than it actually was, as a "favor" to help the tourists avoid U.S. duties. The trick seldom works. Customs maintains up-to-date price lists from foreign markets.

Prepare for port. You can make life easier for the customs officer and yourself if you are ready for him. It's a good idea to prepare a list of your overseas acquisitions before your home-coming, assemble your receipts, and pack your bags in such a way they can be speedily examined, preferably concentrating your vacation purchases in a single bag.

Time To Get New Schoolbooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 11, 1963, and was reprinted in the March 25 edition of the U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Time to Get New Schoolbooks." This article stresses a thought which has been going through my mind for some time that our young students do not learn enough about the glories of American history and the pride of being a citizen of the United States of America.

I hope this article may be read by every Member of Congress and I trust that those responsible for the inculcation in the youth of America of the glory of being an American citizen will adopt the sound suggestion made in Mr. Jones' article.

The article follows:

TIME TO GET NEW SCHOOLBOOKS

If we can ever cure the asininities of the "look say" method of teaching reading, which has condemned many hundreds of thousands of young Americans to word guessing, it will be time to start in on the content of grade-school textbooks.

These beautifully printed and illustrated books include texts so remarkable for their dullness that it is little wonder young America can hardly wait to get back to the TV. Most of them have been steam cleaned of every vestige of excitement, of inspiration, and romance.

There is no reference to God or religion. This is regarded as controversial. There is no story of war. If we don't think about it, maybe it will go away. There is nothing that

would give rise to patriotism. How old fashioned.

I have before me a fifth-grade reader, "Days and Deeds," published last year by Scott, Foresman & Co., and standard in many hundreds of American school systems.

With a puerile vocabulary, it discusses such things as Uncle Lem's new outboard motor, John's lawnmowing business, and how Wally, the bloodhound, helped Jerry, the police dog, find his missing bone.

I have also before me a reprint of McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader, published in 1879. Let's skip through the list of contents: "The Relief of Lucknow," London Times; "Battle of Blenheim," by Southey; "Sands of Dee," by Charles Kingsley; "An Old-Fashioned Girl," by Louisa May Alcott; an account of a riot in the Massachusetts State Prison; supposed speech of John Adams by Daniel Webster; excerpts from "The Virginian," by Thackeray, and from Hamlet; "Dissertation on Roast Pig," by Charles Lamb; "A Frigate Chase in the English Channel," by James Fenimore Cooper; "The Boston Massacre," by Bancroft; "No Excellence Without Labor," by William Wirt; "Religion, the Only Basis of Society," by William Channing.

Blood and thunder? Plenty of it. Heroism? Of course. Moral homilies? In profusion. Religious preachments? Unashamed. Patriotism? With pride. And, in addition, tough words and involved sentences that would flabbergast the fifth grader who has been brought up on the thin consomme of today's "Days and Deeds" series.

On June 20, 1961, Dr. Max Rafferty, school superintendent of La Canada, Calif., made a speech that caused a sensation and resulted in his election last fall as California Superintendent of Public Instruction over the dead bodies of the progressive educators. He asked: "What happened to patriotism?" and I quote:

"We have been so busy educating for 'life adjustment' that we forgot to educate for survival. Words that America had treasured as a rich legacy, that had sounded like trumpet calls above the clash of arms and the fury of debate, we allowed to fade from the classrooms.

" 'Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable.'

" 'We have met the enemy and they are ours.'

" 'Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute.' "

Search for these towering phrases in vain today in too many of our schools. The golden words are gone. Patriotism feeds on hero worship and we decided to abolish heroes.

The quest for the golden fleece has been crowded out by the visit of Tom and Susan to the zoo. The deeds of the heroes before Troy are now passé, and the peregrinations of the local milkman as he wends his way among the stodgy streets of Blah city have taken over. Bobby and Betty pursue this insipid goal of a ride in the district garbage truck while the deathless ride of Paul Revere goes unsung.

For Roland at Roncesvalles we have substituted Muk-Muk the Eskimo boy. It is, I think, significant that education during the past three decades has deliberately debunked the hero to make room for the jerk.

No wonder these heroless American kids often broke down before the Red brainwashers in the Korean prison camps. They had no points of reference. They had no understanding of the traditions of liberty. In many cases, the Communists were delighted that there was so little to erase. It was a cinch to unteach those who had never been taught.

In commenting on a modern sixth reader, "Bright Peaks," put out by Houghton Mifflin, Dr. Russell Kirk says: "With the exception of a poem by Sara Teasdale, another short poem by Robert Frost, and an autobiographical piece by John Muir, every selection is by a fourth- or fifth-grade writer."

Why? Could it be that the fifth- and sixth-graders can't read the classics as they did in the days of McGuffey? Could it be that the bankruptcy of the "look-say" method and the stubborn refusal of many school administrations to admit the error have required them to pretend that there is special virtue in extending kindergarten style reading to the upper grades?

It's time America got a new set of textbooks. It's time we quit boring bright students to death with the banalities of John and Jane visiting the henhouse. It's time we put romance and courage and excitement and some frank moral indoctrination before our children in their most impressionable years.

We don't have to go back to McGuffey.

There's plenty of good writing. But let's give our children some literary taste, some ethical calories and patriotic vitamins.

To hell with these sawdust sandwiches.

Pentagon Boss Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there has been some strong criticism in and out of the Congress of the Secretary of Defense. In my opinion some of this has not been constructive nor justified. I believe the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 15 is an educational and balanced explanation of the stimulus of much of this criticism. I would, therefore, like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

PENTAGON BOSS MAN

When Robert S. McNamara first came to the Pentagon 2 years ago to be briefed on his new job, the outgoing Secretary, Thomas S. Gates, suggested he study a new Air Force report on the legal powers of the Secretary of Defense. The theme of the study was that Congress in 1958 had voted vast but unexplored authority to the Secretary—authority that Mr. Gates was just beginning to understand and to exercise.

Mr. McNamara found in that report one of the solutions to the problem that had plagued previous Secretaries and had deeply disturbed Congress and the public—the problem of forcing four Services to agree on a minimum essential national defense.

Ever since he was sworn in Mr. McNamara has used the full legal powers of his office. He has consolidated functions common to all of the services; he has plunged into the details of Defense Department problems; he has asked the services embarrassing questions about imbalances and inconsistencies in the force structures and has insisted on clear, fast answers to his questions; he has introduced new management techniques to meet military objectives more cheaply, and he has made the tough decisions required by his job.

Some Congressmen are criticizing him today, largely on the score of not leaving the decisions up to military men. They do not say Mr. McNamara has failed to consult the military men, for the record of congressional hearings show he has done this exhaustively. The conclusion is that the Congressmen can only be asking that the military men make more decisions—or, more likely, argue more and procrastinate more.

We like Mr. McNamara's approach. Other approaches have been tried, and they did not work. There was the spectacle, for instance, of former Secretary of Defense McElroy begging Congress to "hold our feet to the fire" and force the Pentagon to choose between the Bomarc and Hercules missiles.

If Congress wants to return to the old days, then Congress must change the law to take power of decision away from the Secretary of Defense. We think that Congress, upon reflection, will not want to do this. For someone must make the decisions, and they are tough to make. We hope that Mr. McNamara will come up with the right answers, and we think, certainly on the whole, that he has been right. The real point is, however, that someone must be willing to do the homework, to take the responsibility and to assume the personal risks of decision making in the Defense Department. This is what Mr. McNamara has been doing, and we do not believe that Congress, the President, or anyone else, is in a position to do it for him. If the Secretary is strong willed and hard boiled, these qualities are essential in his job.

Kennedy Doubletalk on Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the administration continues the old trick of selling medical aid for the aged as "insurance" in spite of the fact that it is not insurance, has been ruled out as insurance by the Supreme Court, and no administration spokesman will ever acknowledge it as insurance when they come before the Committee on Ways and Means to plug for it. If there are valid arguments for Government sponsored medical aid programs, let the administration debate it on the issues, not by attemping to fool the people into accepting a program which is not what it is claimed to be. The following editorial "Camouflaging a Tax" from the AMA News furnishes some pertinent food for thought:

CAMOUFLAGING A TAX

Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, told a network television audience, "We'll sell you an insurance policy." The President in a message to Congress, referred repeatedly to "hospital insurance."

Both were speaking of the King-Anderson bill, a proposal to finance partial health care for the aged through the social security system. But levies upon workers and employers for social security are taxes, not insurance premiums. On page 1 of the King-Anderson bill, the proposal is called a "Hospital Insurance Act." However, readers who continue to page 62 will find that payments are called taxes rather than premiums.

The fact that King-Anderson is not an insurance program is evident in Supreme Court decisions. Social security offers no contract. Taxes collected under the King-Anderson bill would not be set aside for future use of the taxpayers but would be used on present beneficiaries. Today's worker will receive benefits only if future generations of workers can pay ever-increasing taxes.

The administration's emphasis on the word "insurance" to describe a compulsory tax plan is not the result of careless language. The use of the word has been carefully considered. The American public has great respect for insurance, a respect which the backers of King-Anderson would like to see transferred to their bill. Insurance is easier to sell than taxes.

Mr. Celebrezze told TV viewers that the public is better informed about the proposal this year because the administration has overcome a "misconception" about what "we referred to as health insurance." He apparently sees gains in the campaign to mislabel an obligatory tax. Perhaps the Amish farmers of Pennsylvania should be asked to testify on this misconception.

The Amish, who disavow all insurance on religious grounds, once believed the talk about social security being insurance and refused to pay the levy. The Internal Revenue Service said they were wrong, that the levy was a tax, and placed liens on a number of delinquent taxpayer accounts. Three horses belonging to one Amish farmer were seized by IRS and sold to satisfy the tax indebtedness.

The misconception persits. The Government's offer, "We'll sell you an insurance policy," should logically include an offer to return three horses to a Pennsylvania farmer.

War Hawks and War Whoops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, once again Walter Lippmann has set down in his syndicated column of March 5, 1963, an insight into the fulsome criticism directed against President Kennedy's Cuban policy. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that this article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WAR HAWKS AND WAR WHOOPS

(By Walter Lippmann)

After a week in Arizona I not only have a fine sunburn but also I think I have learned something. By reading Mr. Pulliam's newspapers in the morning and the evening, I have learned that we must distinguish between a war party—of which I have seen no traces out here—and a war whoop party, which likes to be warlike but does not want war.

A war party consists of people conspiring and agitating to start a war from which the country will win, they think, profit and glory. It would be hard to find an American who thinks that in any great war today there could be much profit or glory. The war whoop party consists of people who suppose that no matter what we do the Russians will not go to war. Having this kind of confidence, they suppose that in order to get rid of Castro, we are quite free to flirt with smallish acts of war such as blockade or even an invasion and occupation. They see no essential difference between the Cuban war of 1898 and a Cuban war in 1963.

Yet there are in fact not many who want to take such risks. The mass of the war whoop party—a significant minority of the Nation—do not want any war or any shooting. What they do want are the fruits of a successful war without having to fight a war. Every day Mr. Pulliam's editorial writers knock the stuffing out of Khrushchev with a smashing editorial.

I shall be going back to Washington convinced that the country wants Cuba handled without war, big or little, and that it would not only be wrong but quite unnecessary for the President to change his course in order to quiet the war whoopers. The fact in the Cuban problem is that there is now a consensus on the controlling facts.

The responsible opposition, which is best represented by Senator KEATING of New York, are in agreement with the administration that (1) with the removal of the long-range missiles there is no military threat to the United States, and (2) that with constant aerial photography, it would not be possible to do again what was done during the intelligence gap, in September and October—to construct secretly an offensive base. They are agreed furthermore (3) that the Cuban problem is not military but paramilitary. Cuba is a convenient base for training and equipping agents and infiltraters, saboteurs and guerrillas to operate in Central and South America.

This being the character of the Cuban problem today, the American people have to make a fundamental decision. Shall we wipe out the subversive base by conquering it, expelling the Russians, arresting the Castroites, and governing Cuba? The answer is that we shall not do this unless there is deliberate planned aggression from Cuba against American interest and rights. Why won't we do it? Because the invasion of Cuba would require several divisions of troops and would cost very heavy casualties, and would after a successful invasion and conquest leave us with the odious task of policing Cuba and with the obligation to feed and restore Cuba for a period of perhaps 10 years at the least.

Not even the war whoopers in their most carefree and irresponsible movements want an invasion and occupation. What then is left? What is left is what we now have: the policy of containment. Once we adopt the policy of containment we are faced with the controlling reality, which is that the United States alone cannot contain Castro tightly. How tightly he is contained depends not on us alone but most of all on what the other American states are able and willing to do. We can help them with advice and technical devices, but the United States cannot guard all the harbors and airports and control the channels of communication, including embassies from all parts of the world, through which subversion operates. Each American country will have to deal with the small aggressions. The United States, if it has Latin American cooperation, can control the seas and intercept any large scale operation which might be launched from Cuba.

The policy of containment cannot be emotionally satisfying. Only an invasion, and an invasion only in the first days before the casualty lists come in, would satisfy the emotions of the war whoopers. But while the country will not feel happy about containment it will surely feel unhappy about the alternative. For a war would not be clean and surgical and quick. It would be long, dreary, and inconclusive.

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable JACKSON E. BETTS, former speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives, has made the Washington News editorial entitled "Watch Ohio" available to all his colleagues and to those in the executive department of the Federal Government, who read the RECORD.

Gov. Jim Rhodes is doing such an excellent job in Ohio that his record is attracting favorable attention in every State of the Union.

I wish to call attention to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of the issue of March 15, 1963, "It Can Be Done."

Gov. Jim Rhodes has not told me that he is a "Puritan," but his record leads me to believe that he has many of the Puritans' most admirable traits. Incidentally, the record shows that Ohio voters appear to hold such attributes in high esteem.

The editorial follows:

Is a swelling Government an irreversible feature of the American system? The record of the last three decades and the attitude of the present administration might suggest to some that it is. For this reason it's interesting to see what one State is doing about it surfeit of officialdom.

Shortly after taking office, James A. Rhodes, the new Republican Governor of Ohio, dismissed 2,700 of the 4,000 employes the previous administration had blithely hired in its final months of power. He followed this by ordering a 9.1 percent reduction of expenditures in every department.

Now such methods may strike some people as being economy-by-meat-ax and perhaps that's true. But the knotty growth of bureaucracy is rarely reduced with pinking shears. And certainly Ohio's effort demonstrates that bureaucratic growth is still within the power of mortal men to control, wherever men are willing to try.

Comments on the President's 1963 Economic Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Economics and Research of the American Bankers Association has published what in my opinion is a very thought provoking list of comments on the President's 1963 Economic Report.

In view of the fact that our unemployment problem which the President says is our No. 1 concern can only be solved by a favorable economic climate, the comments by the Department become more important.

COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT

PREFACE

In the interest of promoting full and active discussion of current economic problems and policies, the American Bankers Association is pleased to provide this copy of a statement appraising the President's 1963 Economic Report and the accompanying annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers. The statement was submitted on February 15 to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress.

As is noted in the introductory section, no attempt has been made to examine in

depth all of the information and ideas presented in the administration's reports. Instead, emphasis has been concentrated on those broad aspects which, in our judgment, are most deserving of public scrutiny and analysis in the months ahead.

We hope that you will find our statement of interest, and we invite your comments on the ideas expressed.

CHARLES E. WALKER,
Executive Vice President.

INTRODUCTION

The President's Economic Report and the Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers are comprehensive and thoughtful documents, ranging widely over a large number of today's economic problems and policies. Faced with the wealth of detail and analysis contained in them, we have chosen to limit our comments to those broader aspects of policies and problems which, in our judgment, will deserve the greatest attention in the months ahead. Naturally, our discussions tend to be concentrated in areas where our emphasis or views differ, to a greater or lesser extent, from those expressed in the reports on which we have been invited to comment.

We share with the President and the Council the concern expressed over the need for measures designed to improve the long-range growth performance of the Nation's economy. We share, also, their conclusion that major tax reduction offers the most promising approach to strengthening and reinvigorating the domestic economy. Obviously, the use of major tax reduction as a long-range stimulus to the economy carries potential risks as well as potential rewards—the net results being heavily dependent on the manner in which a program of tax reduction is integrated into the overall financial policies of the Government, including spending policies, monetary policy, and debt management. The rewards which can be secured by tax reduction adequately are detailed in the President's Economic Report. In our judgment, the potential risks which are incurred, and the implications of these risks for Federal spending, monetary policy, and debt management, do not receive sufficient attention. Nor, in some cases, do specific recommendations in the report reflect recognition that these risks are present.

The President and his Council find that a program of major tax reduction, coupled with further increases in Federal spending which lead to the largest peacetime deficit ever planned, is compatible with the need for domestic price stability, consistent with the requirement for securing further balance-of-payments improvement, and responsive to the need for a faster growing economy. Moreover, the administration does not anticipate that the incurring of a budget deficit now estimated at almost $12 billion, and at a time of serious imbalance in our international accounts, will present serious conflicts among the objectives to be served by debt-management and monetary policies.

We accept, as desirable goals of public policy, the objectives which are outlined by the President and the Council: expanding output and employment opportunities; price stability; and balance-of-payments equilibrium. We do not believe, however, that the President's program is best designed to contribute to the achievement of these objectives. We find particularly puzzling the light treatment given to possible conflicts, at least in the short run, between the policies which may be required to achieve each of the goals. The balance between domestic growth and full employment, on the one hand, and price stability, on the other hand, has always been extremely difficult to strike. Economic expansion, even within the framework of price stability, is not necessarily compatible with balance-of-payments equilibrium in the long run, and in the short run is likely to aggravate our payments problem. Moreover, the decline in the Nation's international liquidity position makes it extremely doubtful whether monetary policy can serve the short-term interests of both balance-of-payments improvement and domestic economic expansion. These are only a few illustrations of the areas in which we may experience short-term conflicts in the pursuit of multiple economic goals. The administration's economic program, featuring heavy emphasis on economic growth, reflects all too often the judgment that these economic objectives are mutually complementary in the short run as well as in the long run.

The following sections contain a report of our views, in turn, on the fiscal, monetary, and debt-management policies proposed by the administration, and on the policies discussed with respect to our persistent balance-of-payment deficit. A final section reviews the Council's wage-price guidelines for collective bargaining.

FISCAL POLICY

At its 88th annual convention last September, the American Bankers Association cited tax reduction as the major tool available for stimulating long-run economic growth, but it cautioned that reductions in tax rates would not in fact encourage sustained growth unless a number of safeguards were observed. One of the most important of these safeguards was cited as follows:

"Tax reductions must be implemented within the bounds of fiscal prudence. This, means that * * * Federal spending over a protracted period must be strictly limited and effectively controlled * * *."

In our judgment, the requirement for implementing a tax cut "within the bounds of fiscal prudence" would not preclude a temporary swelling of the Federal deficit—if this income resulted from a tax reduction of the magnitude proposed by the President. For practical as well as economic reasons, our endorsement of tax reduction has not been coupled with the demand that the reduction be accomplished without exerting a temporarily adverse impact on the Federal budget. We regard tax reduction as an investment in future economic vigor, and we look upon the accompanying temporary enlargement of the deficit as the price, though not the purpose, of the tax cut. Even a temporary enlargement of the Federal deficit resulting exclusively from tax reduction is not without risk at this time—the risk of generating renewed inflationary pressures and compounding our balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet our confidence in the constructive forces that tax reductions can unleash leads us to believe that the price, in terms of a temporary and manageable swelling of the deficit, can and should be paid.

Despite our confidence in the stimulative powers of tax reduction, we remain concerned about the size of the projected deficit for the coming fiscal year. We note particularly that the increase in the deficit is much more a product of further increases in Government spending than of revenue losses attributable to tax reduction. In our opinion, fiscal planning which results in the projection of a $12 billion deficit for the coming fiscal year borders closely on economic brinksmanship, and our concern over this development is further deepened by the knowledge that in 5 of the past 6 fiscal years the budget deficit originally has been underestimated, on the average, by $8 billion.

Thus, the incorporation into the 1964 budget of a $4.5 billion spending increase represents one of the most disappointing aspects of the administration's fiscal program. If spending for the year ahead had been budgeted at fiscal 1963 levels, the projected deficit would have been held to the approximate level of the manageable deficits incurred in each of the last 2 fiscal years. The exercise of stricter discipline is essential if we are able to afford tax reduction without running the risk of allowing an unmanageable deficit to develop, and it will remain essential in the future if we are to allow the process of economic expansion to produce a progressive strengthening in the Government's fiscal position. By combining tax reduction with a significant increase in Federal spending for fiscal 1964, the administration has not only magnified the risks which attend major tax reduction, but it also has raised the question of whether or not, in the future, we can expect the determined efforts to curtail Federal spending which are imperative if the process of tax adjustment is not to result in a deterioration of the Government's fiscal position. Unless these risks can be reduced, and unless the capacity of the administration to curtail spending more effectively can be demonstrated, the desirability of embarking on a tax-reduction program must be expected to be appraised with considerable skepticism.

Our concern over the size of the deficit being planned for fiscal 1964—and recognizing that the estimate of $12 billion could be significantly short of the mark—reflects our appraisal of the possibilities for financing a deficit of unusually large magnitude without generating renascent inflationary pressures and/or imposing a critical strain on international confidence in the dollar. A failure on either of these counts would constitute a severe setback to our domestic economy and, of greater significance, impair the economic security of the entire free world. Given our limited capacity to finance deficits without running risks the consequence of which could be extremely grave, it is particularly regrettable that the deficit being forecast is so heavily weighted by increasing Federal spending. In our present circumstances, these spending increases are, dollar for dollar, both less effective and less efficient in serving the long-range growth needs of the Nation.

The administration's judgment that unused capacity in the economy safeguards against the renewal of inflationary pressures is questionable. As Paul Samuelson points out in his basic text, Economics, "the real difficulty with full employment lies not in its rough definition but in the fact that wages and prices may begin to soar while there is still considerable unemployment and excess capacity." This is particularly true when a significant amount of the unemployment is structural, and not cyclical, in nature.

Aside from the fiscal implications of the administration's proposal to reduce taxes, there also are questions related to the structure and timing of the proposed tax cut. At our annual convention last year, we recommended the following structural and procedural approaches:

"Both the magnitude and the character of rate reductions must be tailored to provide additional incentives for sustained economic expansion, rather than simply to give a temporary one-shot boost to the economy. This requirement dictates that reductions in tax rates should be both substantial and permanent. Moreover, it means that rate reductions must be designed specifically to provide additional incentives for capital inventment * * * upon which the achievement of rising productivity is so heavily dependent. * * * even with strict limitation upon Federal spending a gradual transition to lower tax rates is almost certain to produce temporary and moderately unfavorable effects on the Government's fiscal position. These effects can be minimized by providing for a gradual reduction of tax rates according to a predetermined schedule, rather than by a single major reduction * * *."

It is clear that the President's tax program meets two of the basic requirements expressed above: that the reduction be substantial and permanent, and not of the one-shot variety; and that there be a gradual transition to the lower rates. With regard to the structure of the tax reduction, however, our position has emphasized the provision of "additional incentives for capital investment * * * upon which the achievement of rising productivity is so heavily dependent." This emphasis suggests the need for concerted action to improve the sluggish performance of business investment by sharpening the profit incentive. The most direct approach to strengthening this incentive is by substantial and immediate relief from the heavy tax burden for those most immediately concerned—corporations and individuals in the middle- and upper-income brackets. In fact, in his 1962 economic report, President Kennedy emphasized such incentives in speaking of his plans for tax reforms:

"Later this year, I shall present to Congress a major program of tax reform. This broad program will reexamine tax rates and the definition of the income base. It will be aimed at the simplification of our tax structure, the equal treatment of equally situated persons, and the strengthening of incentives for individual effort and for productive investment."

The statements in the 1963 economic report, on the other hand, place greater stress on inadequate demand, and the proposed structure of tax reduction is weighted heavily by the desire to spur consumption expenditures. As stated by President Kennedy, "the most important single thing we can do to stimulate investment in today's economy is to raise consumption by major reduction of individual income tax rates." Increasing consumption is regarded as the starting point for acceleration of economic growth. Thus, the actual tax reduction and reform program, as described in the President's January mesage, is skewed in favor of the lower income groups; less emphasis is given to relief for middle- and upper-income individuals and for corporations, more closely identified with the investment process.

While it is recognized that the causes and effects in the consumption-investment process scarcely can be separated but in theory, and that the increases of both are mutually interdependent, it nevertheless seems evident that the structure of the proposed tax reduction fails to strike a proper balance between those features which can be expected to stimulate consumption directly and those which will operate primarily to stimulate growth-producing investment. The crucial investment mechanism in the economic process will fail to function properly, regardless of consumption stimulants, unless profit horizons are extended directly by reducing the taxes applicable to the fruits of investment.

The Council's report recognizes that the shortfall in expansion last year was in "the failure of expenditures other than consumption to rise as far as had been expected." While consumption, wages, and Government expenditures have all moved briskly ahead during the past decade, corporate profits and business investment have behaved sluggishly. Surely this record lends support to the view that tax reduction should concentrate more directly on incentive, the profit motive and investment.

MONETARY POLICY AND DEBT MANAGEMENT

Under the caption "Monetary Policy and the Balance of Payments" the Council's anual report points out that:

"While a balance must be continuously struck between credit and interest rate policies in support of domestic economic expansion and policies to protect or improve the balance of payments, any conflict is more a shortrun than a longrun one. In the long run, the U.S. balance of payments probably has much to gain from a fully operating, rapidly gaining domestic economy."

Unfortunately, Federal Reserve authorities have found themselves in this shortrun position for several years and there seems to be little likelihood that our balance-of-payments difficulties will soon evaporate.

Still, the Council seems to stress the domestic side of the problem:

"What matters most at this time is that financial policy should be designed to facilitate rather than retard the expansionary process which the tax program is designed to launch. When unused productive resources are available, it is not inflationary to permit a parallel expansion in the supplies of money and liquid assets and in the availability of bank credit."

The Council goes on to mention the concern sometimes expressed that too much monetary stimulus "may be an embarrassment" at a future time when the public's excess liquidity could be used to "add fuel to inflationary flames." In the Council's judgment, however, such a danger is lessened, since "the same mechanisms which supply the economy with liquidity can be reversed, and very quickly, to restrict liquidity and credit."

It is to be noted, however, that our experience suggests that prompt withdrawals of liquidity from the economy have been difficult to accomplish successfully. As a practical matter, we are most likely to avoid overt inflationary pressures in periods of economic prosperity if the liquidity added to the economy during the preceding period of slackness is not excessive.

Despite the constraints that balance-of-payments discipline has placed on the monetary authorities, particularly with respect to the level of short-term interest rates, there has been no lack of credit availability in this country. In 1962, the growth in the public's liquid assets, and of bank assets, was unusually large. And measured against gross national product, total liquid assets have been sustained at a relatively high level.

In view of our international payments problems, any additional monetary ease would carry grave risks. Nor is there any indication that additional monetary ease would prove helpful to the domestic economy. Recent remarks of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve are to the point: "My present feeling is that the domestic liquidity of our banks and our economy in general is now so high that still further monetary stimulus would do little if any good—and might do actual harm." This observation was reinforced in January by the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, who expressed his view that "if money had been easier it would not have had any appreciable effect on business activity and might have encouraged undesirable speculative excesses in some directions."

We do not subscribe to the view that our balance-of-payments difficulties stem primarily from excessively easy monetary policies, and we do not look upon monetary restraint as containing the permanent solution to our payments difficulties. Nevertheless, as our international liquidity declines and as the prospects for fundamental improvement in our international accounts remain uncertain, we are forced to the conclusion that greater emphasis may have to be placed on monetary policy as a defensive weapon in the protection of the dollar. The necessity for this approach can be reduced or eliminated only by the vigorous implementation of fundamental corrective actions on other fronts.

With respect to debt management, the association's resolution which sets forth our views concerning the relationship between tax reduction and the management of the public debt contains the following relevant passage:

"The implementation of a program of tax reduction must be accompanied by a willingness to employ maximum flexibility in the use of debt management and monetary policy, including a willingness to rely on market forces for the determination of long-term rates of interest."

Under the circumstances of what might well be a peacetime high in the Federal budget deficit, and given the risks discussed earlier of inflation and/or further deterioration in our international financial position, maximum flexibility in debt management is more urgent than ever before.

The Council report notes that "the 'proper' way of financing a deficit is that which contributes to the goals of increased output, growth, price stability, and payments balance." While one cannot take exception with the Council's conclusion, it is pertinent to note that it offers little evidence of the recognition that in debt management, as well as in monetary policy, serious difficulties can arise in attempting to serve all of our economic objectives simultaneously. Within the context of our present economic problems, it would be reassuring to have the Administration's unequivocal pledge that, if necessary, maximum efforts will be made to finance the deficit by sales of obligations to genuine savers, and that it is prepared to pay whatever rates of interest are required to secure such a noninflationary placement of the debt. Similar commitments to flexibility of this kind have been voiced by Treasury officials. In addition, monetary authorities have cited the dangers of efforts to maintain interest rates at artificially low levels. The failure of the President's report, and of the Council's report, to echo this sentiment is a source of concern. Since the underlying emphasis in each report is on the importance of securing a faster rate of growth, with secondary stress on the need for balance-of-payments improvement and virtually no admission of the possibilities for a renascence of inflationary pressures, there is ample reason for suspecting that the administration might resolve the conflicting objectives of debt management policies in a manner which could be injurious to our economic health.

Moreover, the failure of the administration to recommend the removal of the 4¼-percent interest-rate ceiling on Government bonds underscores the over-all impression that the administration may lack the dedication to flexibility in debt management and monetary policy which the noninflationary financing of an unusually large deficit requires.

Although the Attorney General has ruled that 4¼-percent bonds can be marketed at a discount, thereby permitting a de facto breach of the 4¼-percent ceiling, there is no assurance that his view would be sustained by the courts. In any event, discount selling is a cumbersome and inefficient way of marketing long-term securities. In the judgment of most market observers, the Attorney General's opinion does not provide the final answer to the problem of the interest-rate ceiling, and ultimately the problem must be confronted.

The possibility of higher interest rates should not be dismissed at the outset in thinking ahead about the complex tasks facing debt management and monetary policy. As has been amply demonstrated in fast-growing European nations, rising rates of interest are not an enemy of domestic growth. This is not to say, by any means, that we should tighten monetary policy prematurely. But the emphasis must be on a flexibility free of rigid views or commitments as we feel our way along.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

The most urgent economic problem now confronting the United States is, in our

judgment, the persistent deficit in our international accounts. Upon the resolution of this problem rests not only the economic security of the United States, but also the strength of our free world allies and our role as political and financial leader of the free world alliance. In view of the gravity of our international financial problems, and of our recent failure to show significant balance-of-payments improvement, the absence of additional positive measures for strengthening our payments position is a source of the utmost concern.

Despite general observations that the payments deficit must be eliminated, the reports of the President and the Council of Economic Advisers contain few specific proposals which could be expected to result in permanent or fundamental relief to our payments position. Quite to the contrary, the overall economic policies prescribed for the coming fiscal year reasonably can be expected to produce an adverse impact at least in the short run, on our balance of payments. In view of the reduced volume of our international liquidity, these short-run complications are far too serious to be glossed over with the observation that, in the long run, economic growth and balance-of-payments equilibrium are compatible goals of public policy. In fact, whether or not they are compatible depends not upon the rate of growth, but rather upon the characteristics and structure of growth and upon the trend of domestic cost and prices.

In the absence of measures which would reduce the dollar drain associated with oversea spending by the Federal Government, it can be argued that our balance-of-payments weakness creates the necessity for relatively austere domestic economic policies. In striking contrast, the President's recommendations call for the introduction of strong economic stimulants. These recommendations ignore the increasing short-term aspects of our balance-of-payments problem, and they are based on the assumption that the United States has considerable time and maneuverability with which to redress the imbalance in its international accounts. We do not share these judgments.

We are particularly concerned over the administration's emphasis that balance-of-payments equilibrium must be achieved by increasing the surplus on private accounts, rather than by reducing the deficit on Government accounts. The notion that the private sector of the economy should be held responsible for generating whatever payments surplus is required to support a predetermined level of oversea Government spending is indeed a novel one. To our knowledge it is without precedent. Assertions to the effect that a cutback in oversea spending would necessitate the sacrificing of national objectives should not be allowed to obscure the fact that a failure to cut back such spending can, by undermining our international financial position and the world payments system, lead to incomparably more serious sacrifices of our objectives.

We do not believe that the United States has either the time or the maneuverability which would allow it to seek answers to its balance-of-payments problems in essentially long-range approaches. However attractive such long-range remedies may appear to be, we can afford short-range stimulus only if it is accompanied by measures which produce immediate relief from the large dollar drain resulting from heavy Government spending abroad. A program of domestic economic expansion would be a realistic prospect if accompanied by such direct and forthright action. The failure of the President to propose such action must stand, in our judgment, as a strong inducement for reducing the risks in the expansionist economic policies which the administration has outlined.

WAGE AND PRICE GUIDEPOSTS

The Council's annual report restates the guideposts for "noninflationary wage and price behavior" presented for the first time in the 1962 report. The Council apparently feels that these guides, stated in terms of an industry's rate of productivity increase, continue to be useful as reference points in collective bargaining.

Opinions vary as to the influence the guidelines had in negotiations last year. Some observers contend that their impact was limited to large-scale negotiations in the concentrated industries, while they had little or no impact in the smaller or more fragmented industries. Others contend that they were a source of difficulty for Federal conciliators, who found that unions usually seize upon the general guide—the 3-percent trend rate of overall productivity increase—as a minimum. Most everyone agrees that the guideposts were of litle significance last year because of the generally stable economic environment.

In earlier sections of this commentary, we have expressed our fears that inflation may once again appear on the scene, particularly unless the program to spur economic growth is implemented in a cautious and well-balanced manner. Even if prudent policies are followed, the possibility of rising prices becomes greater as we approach a full employment situation. For these reasons, it is all the more important to analyze and discuss the wage-price guides now, rather than later when they may be a crucial reference point in wage negotiations.

While the economic theory on which these guideposts are based may be sound, the practical implications of their use as instruments of public policy is another matter. The difficulty arises from the fact that productivity gains, both in the economy as a whole and in particular industries, are exceedingly difficult to measure with precision. Such measurement is so difficult that opposing bargaining groups—labor and industry—could easily come up with equally convincing statistics to back their own special interests. This being the case, a referee would have to come into the picture to settle the argument. This referee probably would be the President, or his representative, backstopped by statistics compiled by Government agencies and in all probability interpreted by the Council of Economic Advisers itself.

With the effective mobilization of public opinion, as illustrated by the famous steel price incident, industry and labor could be forced, in effect, to act as suggested by the Council's interpretation of the "guideposts." In our judgment, this method of determining wages and prices would be even more objectionable than wage and price controls openly administered by a Government board—an arrangement acceptable only in wartime. Somewhere along the line, the results could well be de facto determination of wages and prices by the administration without a mandate from the Congress or the people. Such a transfer of decisionmaking from the market to the Government simply could not be tolerated in a free enterprise society.

The answer to the problems of achieving noninflationary pricing and wage decisions does not lie in allowing for public participation in these decisions, either directly through legislation or indirectly through moral suasion, but rather in assuring a market balance between labor and industry. If the economic environment is stable, such a balance should result—on the average, but not invariably—in noninflationary wage and price decisions in response to market forces.

There is no question that our Government is alert to the dangers to a free-market economy which are inherent in monopolistic price fixing by business. Vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws should continue to combat undue business concentration. At the same time, undue labor power must be curbed. There are indications that this vital half of the problem is beginning to be faced, but its solution must be pursued with a great deal more vigor and candor if the principle of equality of bargaining power between labor and industry is to be achieved.

There are various approaches to such equality, including the possibility of applying the antitrust laws to labor as well as to business. However, the important and indeed crucial need is for a recognition and endorsement of this basic principle by the administration; once that occurs, solutions to the problem can no doubt be found.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing comments on the economic reports of the President and the Council can be summarized by the following six points:

1. There is no room for further increases in Government spending at this time. The combination of a large tax cut and additional Government spending would violate standards of fiscal prudence by bloating the Federal deficit to inflationary proportions. The planned spending increases should be eliminated.

2. If Federal spending is held constant, the magnitude and timing of the President's proposed tax reduction would appear to be appropriate; but it should be aimed more directly at stimulating investment. Accordingly, corporations and middle- and upper-income groups should be relieved of their heavy tax burdens to a greater extent than is now planned.

3. In review of the aggressive fiscal policy planned, the Treasury must be prepared to finance increases in the public debt in a noninflationary way, out of savings, to the extent necessary. To assure that this is possible, the archaic 4¼-percent interest-rate ceiling on Government bonds should be removed.

4. Any further monetary ease would be largely ineffective in its stimulus, could lead to a deterioration in the quality of credit, and is unwarranted in view of the contemplated fiscal policy measures. Possibilities for the necessity of higher interest rates as a temporary measure for dealing with our balance-of-payments problem should not be dismissed.

5. Faster economic growth per se may or may not help to solve our balance-of-payments problem. At any rate, the primary burden of a permanent solution should not be shifted from the Government sector, which acounts for the larger part of the deficit, to the private sector. The most obvious approach is to reduce the disproportionate burden now borne by the United States in the common defense of the free world.

6. The council's wage-and-price guideposts are elusive in practice, and reliance on them could lead to de facto determination of wages and prices by the administration. Achievement of noninflationary wage-and-price decisions lies in the principle of equal bargaining power between business and labor, which must include methods to curb concentrations of labor power as well as of business power.

Fourth Anniversary of Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving on the House

Interior Committee when Hawaii was at long last accepted into the Union, after knocking at the door for half a century; and so had the privilege of supporting her Statehood, both in Committee and on the Floor.

Hawaii's loyalty had been demonstrated in Two World Wars and the Korean conflict, during the latter of which the then Territory of Hawaii had a higher casualty per population rate than any State. We are all familiar with the magnificent record of men from Hawaii during the Second World War; every present member of the Hawaiian Democratic congressional delegation to Congress saw action in that war. Mr. GILL fought in the bitter campaigns in the Pacific theater; Mr. MATSUNAGA was a member of the renowned 100th Infantry Battalion in Italy, and the junior Senator from Hawaii, whom we learned to respect so much before his sojourn to the other side of this Hill, is a much decorated veteran of the famed 442d Regiment.

Mr. Speaker, I was therefore greatly honored to be privileged to have some small part in the successful passage of Hawaii Statehood, and am very pleased to be able to join the able Congressmen from Hawaii in tribute on this fourth anniversary of the signing of the statehood bill.

Brazil Admits Loan for Soviet Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, as further proof of my position on the Brazilian loan, I would like to include in today's RECORD an article that appeared March 12, 1963, in the Columbus Evening Dispatch, one of Ohio's foremost newspapers.

This article bears out my contention that Mr. Dantas did not misunderstand the question when he admitted part of the United States loan would be used to finance Soviet trade. The question is very simple and stated very clearly.

The article follows:

BRAZILIAN ADMITS LOAN SOUGHT FOR SOVIET TRADE

(By Carl DeBloom)

WASHINGTON.—The Brazilian Finance Minister, Santiago Dantas, under fire from some congressional sources over his country's trade program admitted to a Dispatch reporter Tuesday that Brazil would use U.S. money to promote trade with all nations including Russia.

Ohio Congressman WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Jr. has requested an explanation from Secretary of State Dean Rusk why United States would negotiate a loan for any sum of money to enhance trade between Brazil and Russia.

Dantas heads a delegation to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and $1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over a 3-year period. Part of the 3-year plan is to ask United States to help finance a $160 million per year trade agreement between Brazil and Russia.

HARSHA stated on the House of Representatives floor last week and again Monday, regardless of the amount of the loan whether $1.5 billion or $450 million, "the American taxpayer does not want his money used to expand Russian trade with any country."

Dantas was questioned by the press in the White House as he was leaving a conference with President Kennedy.

He was asked, "Will any part of the loan you receive from the United States be used to promote trade with Russia?"

The Brazilian finance minister answered, "The money will be used to promote trade with many countries."

The reporter pressed, "Including Russia?"

He replied, "Yes, Russia."

A State Department information officer explained "Brazil is lacking for markets. She does business with the Soviet Union. The Soviet bloc is the one untapped market for Brazil's chief export—coffee."

Before Dantas leaves on March 20, he will have seen several Cabinet officers, officials at the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, Inter-American Bank, and private bankers.

HARSHA further emphasized his point, saying, "Not only is any negotiation that would enhance Red trade foolhardy and detrimental to our national security, but in direct conflict with the stated purposes of our tremendous defense budget and foreign aid outlays."

Paul Flowers' Greenhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 23, there appeared in the Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation which is published in Memphis, Tenn., a fine article about Monda Kay Alexander and the excellent 4-H Club of Greenfield, Tenn.

This column is "Paul Fowers' Greenhouse" and is outstanding in every respect. Mr. Flowers is an excellent writer who is widely read all over the Midsouth. His choice writings have been published in a book and I certainly feel that this fine column should be called to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

[From Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Feb. 23, 1963]

PAUL FLOWERS' GREENHOUSE

Now Monda Kay Alexander is a 4-H Clubber, and senior in Greenfield, Tenn., High School, who believes in something, and I bring her to Greenhouse readers' attention lest we get the idea that there's anything wrong with this upcoming generation. So long as Monda Kay and others like her look upon life with such wholesomeness, and through such perceptive eyes, our future is safe.

Monda Kay plans to attend Freed-Hardeman College when she finishes high school, and then she hopes to teach, which boosts her even higher.

This is what she wrote recently:

"OUR FARM AND I

"Since the 4-H Club is for the benefit of farm boys and girls, I feel that it is appropriate for me to express the meaning of our farm to me.

"I live on a medium-sized farm, that raises about everything. I have come to know, and appreciate, the work that my parents and forefathers gave to provide that land for me.

"On a crisp fall day, I can look around in my own front yard for a great distance without looking at the window of a neighbor, without the rush of traffic, without the smoke from factories. I stand enveloped behind a secure wall of nature, guarded by the sky, the sun, and clouds.

"As I pause this brief moment, I have a deep feeling of security and warmth flowing from the knowledge that my family will have food from the garden, beef and pork from our animals, and money from our crops.

"More warmth comes inside me as I recollect our brief pauses for prayer and Bible reading, our family council meetings to plan work, or just to talk about family life.

"The purchase of our farm was much like that of those who started our country. My parents were poor when they married, and had to work many years to save enough to buy the land. They sacrificed many things to realize their dream of a place of their own. Thus our farm means determination crowned by success.

"Like my parents I must have the determination to succeed, since success comes only from determination.

"The sod that has been turned many times on our farm was bought at the price of sacrifice—sacrifices of the first settler of America to open a free land; sacrifices of the Civil War; sacrifices of many soldiers in two World Wars to keep tyrants out—and sacrifices of my parents.

"Those who made these sacrifices have instilled in me a devotion to freedom, truth, loyalty, happiness, understanding, faith, and good will toward men.

"Our farm is the present, with a major role in the world. It is the future of our country, of our family, of myself. It is the key to my life. It will send me to college. It will be the occupation of one or more of my brothers.

"Our farm is a beginning, a beginning of life for human beings, animals, plants, and flowers, all things of nature.

"I love our farm because here I can go outside and cry as loud as I wish, or I can sit in quiet solitude. I can look up and see carefree birds sweep to and fro, or a billowy cloud drift by toward destinies unknown.

"In the fall I know rest is near by the lazy drift of a leaf falling silently to the ground; in the spring I know that the world is awakening once again, heralded by opening of buds.

"Our farm is a whole world of ideals, activities, and beauties.

"Always I am proud to say:

"This is our farm."

The Honorable Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, out of respect to our departed colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE], I include a prayer in the RECORD.

This prayer which I offer, Mr. Speaker, was delivered in the House of Representatives on May 6, 1913, by the then Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D.D. It was offered on behalf of a deceased Member of Congress of that day and it has seemed to me it expresses in plain

but very sincere words the emotion, sympathy and deep sense of loss which all Members of this body, some 50 years later, have experienced in connection with the death of our dear and honored colleague, CLYDE DOYLE.

The prayer I offer reads:

We come to Thee, O God our heavenly Father, with hearts bowed in sorrow, because death, always mysterious and unbidden, has visited this congressional body and taken from its midst a Member who was peculiarly fitted by natural gifts, education, and experience to serve his people and his country. But Thou art God; Thou knowest the beginning and the end; Thou hast ordered all things, and Thou doest all things well. Comfort us, his people, the stricken wife and children, by the eternal faith revealed to the world in the life, death, and resurrection of the Christ who thus brought to light life and immortality in Thee.

Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away;
Change and decay in all around I see;
O Thou who changest not, abide with me.

Amen.

American Rights a Vital Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Paul Pattyson of Annandale, Va., in my congressional district, has recently called to my attention a need for the teaching of sound principles of democracy in the schools of our several States.

As I share Mrs. Pattyson's concern over this problem, I welcome this opportunity to read into the RECORD Mrs. Pattyson's letter to me of January 29, and the article by Dr. Leslie J. Nason, to which she referred.

The letter and article follow:

2511 CREST DRIVE,
Annandale, Va., January 29, 1963.

Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROYHILL: I am enclosing a copy of an article by Dr. Leslie J. Nason which appeared in the Sunday Star on January 27, 1963. I wish I knew the procedure to get this article before our people formulating the curriculum for our schoolchildren.

Therefore, I am forwarding it to you with the hope, and request, that you will have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. PAUL L. PATTYSON.

[From The Washington Sunday Star, Jan. 27, 1963]

AMERICAN RIGHTS A VITAL STUDY

(By Leslie J. Nason)

In our concern about being fair and allowing students to hear about the Communist system, we are falsely assuming our children are thoroughly grounded in the free enterprise system.

Our students are not prepared to understand a discussion of Communism until they have a background of knowledge of our rights and freedoms.

Recently I talked with a junior home from a State university for the holidays.

He said: "My father did a wonderful thing for me a couple weeks ago. I had sent him a copy of a Communist-front paper, saying we students found little wrong with their theories.

"My father returned the paper to me with marginal comments, statement by statement, paragraph by paragraph, pointing out the inaccuracies, the omissions and distortions.

"For the first time I had a good understanding of the free enterprise system. That annotated paper changed the thinking of a group of students with whom I discussed these things."

OUR BILL OF RIGHTS

As parents we must explain the rights and privileges, as well as the responsibilities that are part of life of a citizen in the United States. These should be illustrated in schools with examples and case studies from preschool grades through college.

Schools should make sure students really understand the individual rights set forth in the Bill of Rights. These are the things, they stand to lose. Students should understand:

Their right to accumulate and save money, and have these savings guaranteed up to a substantial amount.

Their right to devise new mechanisms, and have these guaranteed by patents.

Their right to express themselves in books and protect such efforts and property with copyrights.

Their right to choose and pursue any education they are qualified to master.

Their right to live as respected citizens equal under the law and follow whatever profession, trade or occupation they choose.

Their right to move freely within the boundaries of the United States and with our Government's protection throughout the free world.

FOUNDATION NEEDED

Not until our children are secure in this knowledge should they be subjected to the claims of another system. And surveys indicate an alarming percentage of college students are not aware of them.

Moreover, many adults have not had the opportunity to take courses in school covering the free enterprise system, its workings and advantages.

In our American system we have everything we are willing to go out and get. Communists will promise all the things we think we don't have but, in reality, they give nothing and take everything.

Views of Former President Eisenhower on Honorary Citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by a friend of mine that General Eisenhower has authorized the following statement of his views on the proposal to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen:

Sir Winston Churchill has been my warm personal friend for more than 20 years. I have known him both in wartime and in peace as an inspirational leader and a man dedicated to the promotion of Anglo-American friendship and the solidarity of the English-speaking community. In a long and varied career he has many extraordinary achievements to his credit, of which his reputation as the political leader of Great Britain during World War II, and his brillance as an author are unquestionably the most widely known.

All these facts, to which must be added the circumstance that his mother was of American birth, clearly justify in my opinion the awarding to him of an honor that has previously been given to only one other, General Lafayette. It is my further opinion, that in taking this action, the Congress would not in anyway create a precedent. I believe that the circumstances are such as to make the case so exceptional as to stand as practically unique.

Stop Sending Brazil Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include in my remarks another article appearing in the March 16, 1963, issue of the Columbus Evening Dispatch.

The Dispatch is one of Ohio's outstanding newspapers and this article provides some very thought-provoking reasons why the U.S. loan to Brazil should not be made.

For those of my colleagues who are interested in this issue, I commend the article to them. It points out very vividly some unique aspects to this problem. Following is the article:

DEMANDS GROW IN CONGRESS TO STOP SENDING BRAZIL AID

WASHINGTON.—An official U.S. statement that Communists have bored into Brazil's Government put new steam Saturday into a congressional movement to bar aid to the huge, trouble-racked South American country.

Pouring more millions into Brazil now would be "an exercise in futility," one congressman said. There were demands that assistance be denied until Brazil cleans house of Reds or extreme leftists in any positions of power and shows that American aid will not be used to promote Brazilian trade with Russia.

The U.S. statement about Red infiltration came out in a curious, mixed-up way at a time when Francisco San Tiago Dantas, Brazilian Finance Minister, was here trying for multi-million dollar aid. A powerful man in the Brazilian Government, he is an advocate of a soft policy toward Communist Cuba.

On Thursday, a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee issued a transcript of testimony attributing the following statement to Lincoln Gordon, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil:

"Their number (the Communists in Brazil) is small but their influence is much larger than those numbers would suggest. The principal field of infiltration and influence is in the labor unions. In the Government itself there has been infiltration. The student movement is another major area of penetration, with the national student union now being dominated by Communists."

This statement was reported to have brought a hot, indignant reaction in govern-

ment circles in Brasilia. Evidently, the State Department felt Gordon might meet an embarrassing reception when he returned there.

The Department got out a statement saying the remarks had been submitted to the House subcommittee by the Department itself, not by Gordon. Still later it was explained that the Department and Gordon were really in accord on the remarks.

The fact that the Department took responsibility for the charges raised speculation that it was trying to get the Brazilian Government, headed by President Joao Goulart, to take a harder line on Communist issues, including Cuba.

The Communist Party is outlawed in Brazil and no known Communists hold important posts in the Government. However, the party operates openly and six men backed in last October's election won seats in the Chamber of Deputies. Also, leftwing Nationalists hold several high offices.

Brazil's Foreign Minister, Hermes Lima, expressed regret over the State Department's assertion. "I lament that an occasion such as this publicity should have been given the testimony," in the subcommittee report, he told a reporter.

Goulart declined immediate comment, although he said he might have a statement later. Meanwhile, his leftist brother-in-law Deputy Leonel Brizola, an anti-American firebrand, said of Gordon: "He doesn't have the minimum respect for Brazil's sovereignty."

In Washington, Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Jr., Republican, of Ohio, called attention to a recent acknowledgment by Dantas that U.S. aid money would be used in part to promote trade with all countries, "including Russia."

"At a time when we are using American tax dollars in the Alliance for Progress to try to strengthen Latin America against communism," HARSHA said, "I think it would be an exercise in futility to turn over money to Brazil so it can promote trade with Russia."

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, said he would look with "extreme distaste and indeed abhorrence" on aid to Brazil at this time. He said:

"There is no question that there is substantial subversive activity in the Brazilian Government, including the armed forces. This is a real danger and threat."

Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, said he would reserve comment until he could study the matter further. Many other legislators were unavailable for comment, but there was little doubt that developments had made the road for Brazilian aid more rocky.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, recently Westchester County was deeply saddened and left the poorer by the loss of a most illustrious and distinguished Methodist clergyman, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. Bishop Oxnam before his retirement in 1960 had a varied, long and rich career. Prior to his election as bishop in 1936, he was the president of DePauw University. In addition to being the Methodist bishop of the areas of Omaha, Boston, New York and Washington he was the president of the Federal Council of Churches from 1944 to 1946 and one of six presidents of the World Council of Churches from 1948 to 1954.

Bishop Oxnam was the exemplar of a dynamic combination of physical, intellectual and moral excellence. He was a former football player at the University of Southern California, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, before he went to pursue his theological studies at Boston University.

Upon his passing Bishop John Wesley Lord was quoted as saying:

Bishop Oxnam was recognized by friend and foe alike as one of the "summit souls" with whom God on occasion blesses mankind.

We in Westchester share this sentiment and to his wife, the former Ruth Fisher, his sons and daughter and his eight grandchildren we send our deepest sympathy. Their loss and ours and the Nation's is very great.

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, by granting Sir Winston Churchill honorary American citizenship, the House pays a great man a singular and well-deserved tribute.

His contributions to the preservation of American freedom in a time of supreme crisis, for all of Western civilization, fill the pages of modern history. In the 1930's he courageously defied the appeasement policies of his own country which culminated in the Munich capitulation and the advent of World War II. In the early months of the war, when Hitler's armies had triumphantly subdued the European Continent, leaving England to fight on alone, his eloquent voice and masterful personality provided a rallying point for the hopes of both the free and the enslaved nations. His dogged determination sustained England during her darkest hour and held the Atlantic frontier safe until America entered the war. Thus, he gave his nation one of its finest hours.

For these and other acts born of consummate wisdom and indomitable courage, we owe Sir Winston an immeasurable debt of gratitude which House bill 4374 discharges in part. Our affection for him is deeper, not only because his mother gave him American blood and ancestors who fought side by side with General Washington in our War of Independence, but because he represents one of the finest statesmen produced by the English-speaking peoples. In addressing the Virginia House of Delegates March 8, 1946, Sir Winston gave expression to his hope for union and understanding which we will do well to recall: "Above all, among the English-speaking peoples, there must be the union of hearts based upon conviction and common ideals. That is what I offer. That is what I seek."

In honoring this great man, we also honor ourselves.

J.F.K. Loses the Playoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, while a committee of this House holds hearings on managed news and the New Frontier's own brand of almost total censorship, the so-called country press is anything but fooled. Daily in newspapers arriving in my office, I find editorial expression of the insight and knowledge about today's events possessed by midwestern newspapers.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD, as an example, an editorial from the Madison Courier of March 15, 1963, which shows graphically what the editor of that newspaper, Mr. Lloyd G. Neal, thinks about our Cuban fiasco:

J.F.K. LOSES THE PLAYOFF

Although New Frontiersmen in Washington insist that President Kennedy made no deals with Premier Khrushchev to obtain removal of offensive weapons from Cuba, an exchange of letters from October 26 to October 29, 1962, reveal a number of conditions and demands laid down by the two leaders.

Mr. K. demanded as a condition for removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba that the United States close its Jupiter bases in Turkey and guarantee Cuba against invasion.

Asked for, but not as a condition for removing missiles, was the closing of all other bases surrounding Russia, including other Jupiter bases in Italy, and the airfields from which U.S. bombers carrying nuclear weapons could attack the U.S.S.R.

Several days after the initial exchange of letters, Khrushchev said the Soviet Union would back Cuba's demands that the United States give up its naval base at Guantanamo Bay.

J.F.K.'s requests were less complicated: Removal of offensive weapons systems from the island nation and supervised inspection to guarantee that all missiles and bombers were removed.

Today, just 4 months after the conditions were laid down by both sides, the box-score reads like this:

Missiles: The U.S.S.R. dismantled and removed 42 medium-and intermediate-range missiles from Cuba. The United States ordered shut down 15 Jupiter intermediate-range missiles in Turkey and 30 in Italy. Score: 45 to 42, in favor of Russia.

Bombers: Khrushchev ordered 42 Russian IL-28 jet bombers from Cuba. The Kennedy administration has ordered the eventual closing of all B-47 jet bomber bases around the Russian periphery, approximately 1,000 aircraft. Score: 1,000 to 42 for the U.S.S.R.

Troops: Khrushchev, with great fanfare from the Kennedy administration, announced, and did, recall an estimated 6,000

Russian troops from his garrison in Cuba. The U.S. Department of Defense ordered 40,000 American troops out of Western Europe. Score: 40,000 to 6,000, in favor of the U.S.S.R.

On-site inspection: Somehow, the internationally controlled on-site inspection of Cuba fell by the wayside. As President Kennedy said in a recent speech: "No, the camera, I think, is actually going to be our best inspector." Score: 1 to 0, in favor of the U.S.S.R.

Coupled with the Kennedy pledge that the United States will not invade Cuba, the only match Khrushchev has not won in the island playoff with J.F.K. was his later support for Castro's insistence that the United States surrender its naval base at Guantanamo Bay.

This may well be the next step.

Investment for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, economic development and economic growth of the less developed free-world countries, and particularly of our neighbors in Latin America, are of greatest concern to the United States. Our foreign economic policy is designed to help these areas both through direct Government assistance programs and through encouraging private skills and private investment funds to be channeled into their economies. An article from the March 11 issue of the American Banker by Michael Benson, international banking editor, suggests that one important way to harness both foreign and domestic capital resources would be through the establishment of private, broadly held investment companies. Entitled "One Answer to a Latin American Dilemma," the article follows:

ONE ANSWER TO A LATIN-AMERICAN DILEMMA

(By Michael Benson)

The real financial question in Latin America today is how to mobilize adequate development capital? Highly placed Government officials in this country as well as those south of the border have been trying hard to come up with the answer, but without real success.

One reason why this has become such a thorny question of late is that the bold and massive Alliance for Progress program of U.S. Government aid has been lagging rather badly. Another is that foreign private investors have been quietly pulling out of Latin America, rather than plunging more money into that part of the world.

Last week the question came up again, and with it a suggestion for an answer that well may brighten the spirits of many rather disheartened leaders of Latin America's economic development.

It came from a prominent Puerto Rican financier, Gaspar Roca, Jr., a former high Government official of his land's well-known "Operation Bootstrap." He firmly believes that the answer lies in the establishment of private, broadly held investment companies in each of the Latin American countries.

Mr. Roca, who terms his plan "democratic capitalism," holds that investment companies, at least in theory, are a perfect vehicle for mobilizing massive but stagnant funds currently being held by tens of thousands of business and professional men in Latin America, as well as in other developing areas.

Mr. Roca's idea on the mobilization of local capital—which has probably been the 2-year-old Alliance for Progress' toughest problem—is almost certain to receive a receptive ear in many influential circles.

One reason is that there has been a marked lack of private financial institutions to mobilize local investment capital within Latin America. Perhaps the most notable exception is New York-based International Basic Economy Corp., which operates mutual funds in Brazil, Colombia, Chile, and Argentina.

Even more important, though, is the fact that the need for private investment by Latin Americans has become more widely recognized. This was pointed up recently in a statement by David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, and Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president, First National City Bank.

The two prominent bankers said the "encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance." They urged that U.S. policies be reoriented to place far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private enterprise and investments.

The bankers' views were included in a separate opinion growing out of the 26-man Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP), appointed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to appraise the program.

Mr. Roca has begun in earnest to put his idea into practice. He believes that his 2-year-old San Juan investment company—International Investment Co.—of which he is president and general manager, is a good prototype for ones that can be started by private citizens in Latin American countries. And he is not alone in his belief.

For Mr. Roca has been invited to such countries as Colombia, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic to outline his ideas to government and financial leaders.

Mr. Roca, who is a highly articulate, hard-working executive, feels he has his work cut out for him. "The job is anything but easy, particularly if you consider our experience in Puerto Rico," he said in an interview during a visit to New York.

He noted that, although the island's Investment Companies Act of 1954 offered a group of incentives, principally in the area of taxes, it was not until the 1960's that the first successful enterprises were organized. Resistance to local productive investment in Puerto Rico, he added, was typical of what will be faced in industrializing countries all over the world. He gave these major bottlenecks:

Tradition of family ownership and operation.

Distaste for minority investment position.

Desire for short-term high yield.

Preference for real property over equity investment.

Nonetheless, Mr. Roca pointed out, in the past few years, the idea has "caught hold and has been worth the fight." His own company, for example, which is the largest in the island commonwealth, has now reached a capitalization of $1 million.

However, more important, he maintained, is that the company's 150 stockholders represent a cross section of middle-class positions found in all of the developing countries. As typical, he noted physicians, teachers, lawyers, druggists, insurance agents, and engineers.

"Actually in every so-called underdeveloped land there is a nucleus of hundreds of middle-class citizens, with millions of dollars that could be put to work in modern industrial and commercial development," observes the Wharton Business School-educated financier.

"Government-to-government foreign aid, important as it may be," he said, "does little to motivate emerging nations toward dynamic private enterprise and free market economy. To understand these things deeply, people have to participate personally."

The Budget Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President is very clever at turning away every demand for budget cuts by challenging anyone to show where it can be cut as if suggestions have never been made. In my opinion, from $8 to $10 billion can be cut from the budget without endangering our defense or national security and without cutting out essential government services. Of course, it will take some discipline by the people, by the Congress, and above all, by the administration, but it can be done.

The following reprint from the U.S. News & World Report shows where $3 billion can be saved by not adopting new programs and by cutting back on some old ones. In addition I have some further recommendations to save billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. No public works are justified in a time of deficit spending, so let us cut back on all public works until the budget is balanced and we begin to pay down the debt. Get the Government out of the power business, sell the public power projects and return them to private enterprise; liquidate public housing; cut out urban renewal by the Federal Government; eliminate Federal participation in depressed areas, and allow local and private initiative full rein; cut the farm programs 20 per cent with eventual elimination; cut foreign aid by $3 billion; cut military authorizations 5 percent and research and development 12.5 percent for another $800 million; knock $1 billion off the space program.

When we make these cuts we can bring about a realistic cut in taxes, allow the people to keep more of their own money, increase risk capital to strengthen the economy and create more jobs which alone creates more wealth.

The U.S. News & World Report article follows:

IF YOU WANT TO KNOW HOW THE BUDGET CAN BE CUT

A flurry of new ideas for trimming President Kennedy's budget is developing in Congress.

Mr. Kennedy himself has challenged Members of Congress to show him where spending can be curtailed without hurting the country.

Both Democrats and Republicans, rising to that challenge, are coming up with proposals of their own.

Most of these plans, to date, are in general terms, not pinned down to specific items in the budget.

Most of the plans, also, are in terms of authority to spend, rather than in actual

spending during the fiscal year starting next July 1.

The result, by late March, was widespread confusion over whether, where, and how actual spending could be cut.

"BUILT-IN RISES"

Big-scale cuts in spending, without halting programs already in operation, were proving hard to find.

The reason: Spending increases are "built into" the system. Programs already voted by Congress tend to increase in cost by the year.

In the end, even if Congress does vote some sizable reductions in the Kennedy budget, the Government is almost sure to spend more money in the coming year than it is spending this year.

These and other conclusions are pointed up by a new study of the budget by the economic unit of U.S. News & World Report.

The subject of that study: where and how much the President's budget for the year ahead can be pared down.

All told, as shown by the chart on these pages [not printed in the RECORD], here are the reductions economic unit experts on the budget report can be made without using a "meat-ax approach":

In spending authority, that is, authority requested to commit funds for spending in the year starting July 1 and later years—$5.9 billion.

In actual spending during the year to start July 1—$3.1 billion.

LEVEL: $95.7 BILLION

This would mean reducing actual spending in the year ahead from the proposed $98.8 to $95.7 billion.

The Government still would spend $1.4 billion more next year than it is spending this year.

A cut of $3.1 billion amounts to little more than 3 percent of the Kennedy budget. Still, some groups would be hurt, and stiff resistance would be felt.

Note that this budget reduction would not affect some of the biggest items of spending in the Kennedy budget.

National defense would not be touched. The cuts that could safely be made in this field come down largely to a matter of military judgment.

Major farm programs are not covered by the study. Cuts could be made, but Congress is unlikely to upset these programs at the start of a new crop year.

All items of budget saving set out in the economic unit study are specific. No blanket economies are shown—such as a flat percentage cut in money or personnel for each agency of Government.

All major new programs that have been recommended by Mr. Kennedy, except for those involving national defense, would be omitted.

This would mean no general aid to education, no new program of aid to urban transit, no youth-employment program, and no new system of developing recreational areas. A total of nine new programs would be dropped.

The result would be to cut $1.7 billion out of the requested authorization, but only $340 million out of actual spending in the year to start next July 1.

The reason: In the first year of a new program, spending usually is relatively small. In later years, once the new program gets into full operation, the cost tends to mount.

The bulk of any cuts, thus, must be made by trimming the cost of programs already in operation.

In these existing programs, the economic unit study lists 19 specific reductions in spending below the Kennedy estimates for the coming year.

These economies would reduce total authorization of new funds by $4.2 billion, and actual spending by $2.8 billion.

BIGGEST CUT: SPACE COSTS

For civilian space programs, the spending cut would be $800 million. This would be the biggest single economy of all. Space projects would proceed more slowly than the White House has in mind, but spending still would be $3.4 billion. That is $1 billion more than in the current year.

Foreign economic aid, in terms of spending, would be reduced by $400 million. That would leave $1.9 billion to spend. There are widespread demands in Congress for cuts here.

The special program of public works in depressed areas, authorized by Congress last year, would get no additional funds. Saving, $197 million.

School aid for areas burdened by the children of Federal workers would be reduced by $148 million. This would mean an end to Federal funds to help educate the children of parents who work on Government property but live elsewhere. Federal money still would be used for educating children of those parents who both live and work on Government property.

Relief money—public assistance—would be trimmed by $200 million, which still would leave $2.7 billion to spend. Many believe this program could be tightened up considerably. Reports of cheating on relief have been widespread.

Veterans' programs would be cut back. Direct loans to veterans would be ended, saving $216 million. Medical care for veterans would be reduced in cost by $200 million, or about 18.6 percent, necessitating some tightening up in this program. Veterans' pensions for illnesses not service connected would be trimmed by $200 million, or about 11 percent. This would mean setting up stricter standards of eligibility.

A budget item of $200 million for further pay increases to civilian Federal employees—on top of raises voted last year—would be cut to half.

These and other economies listed in the economic unit study would be strongly resisted in Congress.

Yet many members are demanding cuts far more drastic than those listed in this study. The 1963 battle of the budget is just beginning.

Legislative Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Government often discourages what it attempts to encourage.

"Government Bewildered" is an editorial from the Santa Cruz (Calif.) Sentinel reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor:

GOVERNMENT BEWILDERED

As so often happens when lawmakers decide to make some major changes in legislation, they often start working at cross purposes and wind up with even greater confusion and ill-defined regulations than when they started.

Let us take a look at what is happening in the complex field of labor laws now the focus of considerable legislative attention on several fronts.

In Congress the subject of overtime is due for some hearings. Several Representatives have expressed the idea that instead of time and one-half pay for overtime, it would be better to make it double time. Their theory is that with overtime so expensive, employers would hire more people to eliminate the overtime.

The weakness of the theory that banning overtime would create more jobs is the fact that so much of the extra costs of business are tied to the fringe benefits which are charged per employee, not for the total amount of earnings.

If we continue to invoke such artificial controls, assertedly designed to cerate more employment, we are liable to stifle whatever chances we have to employ a greater portion of the existing labor force.

The way to create more jobs is to ease regulations, make it possible for business and industry to expand with the economy instead of continually increasing costs both in taxes and in the area of fringe benefits per employee.

Centennial Birthday of Rev. Andrew Pavco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during September of this year, Slovaks in the United States, and particularly in Pennsylvania, will pay tribute to the late Rev. Andrew Pavčo, a zealous priest, author, and fraternalist. From the time he arrived in America, Reverend Pavčo lived in the Pennsylvania anthracite coal region. He aided the struggling miners and encouraged them to use for their children our Nation's educational opportunities of which they themselves were deprived in their native country, Slovakia. In joint effort with his friend, the late Rev. Matthew Jankola, he helped the newly organized Congregation of the Slovak Sisters, whose first members were daughters of Slovak miners. He inspired them and others to use the opportunities of our free Nation in order to build a better future. During many strikes and mine tragedies, he was always an adviser to those who needed help and guidance.

The State of Pennsylvania owes much to leaders such as Father Pavčo. In gratitude, I join his many admirers in calling the attention of the Senate to his exemplary work. I ask unanimous consent that an article written by a native Pennsylvanian, Mr. John C. Sciranka, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Sciranka, a well-known American Slovak journalist, composed the article for the March 1963 issue of the Zenska Jednota (Ladies Union), official organ of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union of the United States of America and Canada, the largest Slovak women's organization in the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY OF REV. ANDREW PAVCO

(By John C. Sciranka)

On September 3, 1963, American Slovaks will observe the centennial birthday of Rev. Andrew Pavco, Slovak Catholic priest, who labored in the Scranton diocese since his arrival from Slovakia in 1897.

Father Pavco was a prolific writer and translator of many novels and plays. He supplied all the Slovak Catholic newspapers in America for a period of three decades with articles.

He was born in the village of Habovka, Orava County, Slovakia, on September 3, 1863. His parents, Ján and Zuzana Pavco, were peasants. As a bright lad, he succeeded in obtaining a higher education and was ordained to priesthood in Banska Bystrica, Slovakia. Very little is known about his early years of priesthood in the native country. However, since his arrival in the United States in 1897 he left a noteworthy mark, which speaks highly of his active life as a priest, fraternalist, and writer.

First he served as pastor of Holy Family Slovak parish in Scranton, Pa. From there he was transferred to Pittston's St. John the Baptist Church. This was followed by a pastorate at Freeland. He concluded his earthly life on July 13, 1932, as pastor of Holy Trinity Slovak Catholic Church, Hazleton, Pa.

Prior to that he served as supreme chaplain of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada, succeeding his good friend, Father Matthew Jankola, who died in 1916 in Bridgeport, Conn. He held the office of supreme chaplain of the First Catholic Slovak Union until 1923 when Msgr. John S. Sobota succeeded him. He was elected honorary chaplain for life and kept on writing for the newspapers.

Father Pavco aided the founding of the Congregation of the Slovak Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius which has a Mother house in Danville, Pa.

In fact, when their founder, the late Reverend M. Jankola was discouraged because the first postulants were on the verge of giving up their profession, it was Father Pavcō who suggested that they turn for aid to the Sisters of Immaculate Heart of Mary in Scranton, Pa., where they received their training.

Father Pavcō was for many years also the chief representative in the United States of the Society of St. Vojtech (Adalbert), the largest Slovak Catholic cultural organization, which had over 200,000 members until its property was confiscated by the Communists in Slovakia. It was Father Pavcō who represented this society in America and solicited members and subscribers for its many religious books and magazines for over three decades. The society awarded him with honorary membership and mourned his death.

Now that the Slovak Catholic Federation of America is preparing for its national convention, which will be held on May 13, 14, and 15, 1963, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., where it was founded on February 22, 1911, by the late Reverend Joseph Murgas, noted priest-scientist and inventor, plans are being formulated to honor Father Pavcō on his centennial birthday. He was born in the year of the Millenium of SS. Cyril and Methodius' arrival to Slovakia a century ago. His life added much to the progress of the Slovak Nation in general and the Slovaks of the United States, and especially the Scranton diocese in particular. We pay tribute to him as zealous priest, writer, and ardent fraternalist, who will always be remembered by those, who can evaluate his great work and important mission, which made American Slovaks and Scranton diocese much richer in spiritual and material things. This writer had the privilege and honor to know Father Pavcō and, therefore, feels happy that he can remind his many admirers of his centennial birthday.

Growth of the Chemical Industry in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the January 1963 issue of Connecticut Industry, a monthly publication of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, contains a very interesting article on the chemical industry in our State. The article, entitled "Connecticut's Chemical Industry—A Look Ahead," is written by Walter L. Elwood, Jr., plant manager of the Chas. Pfizer & Co. plant at Groton, Conn., which is in my congressional district.

This article deserves wide attention not only for its description of the chemical industry today, but for the important role it indicates for this industry in the future. Of interest, for example, are these facts: Some 13,000 people are now employed in the chemical industry in Connecticut and this industry is growing in recent years at a rate of 50 percent greater than all manufacturing in the State; in terms of the value of its manufacturing, the chemical industry in Connecticut has increased from $52.3 million in 1947 to $181.6 million in 1960, or three and a half times as great.

One other interesting fact should be noted: More than 50 percent of the products manufactured and sold by the chemical industry today did not even exist a quarter of a century ago. In the same manner, we can only dream about the many new products to come out of this industry in the next 25 years. Speaking of the creativity of the chemical industry's scientists and engineers and the skill of its workers, the author states in his article:

This, perhaps, is also a reason for a note of optimism for future growth of the chemical industry in Connecticut. Our school systems in Connecticut have demonstrated they can convert native Yankee ingenuity into skilled chemical workers, second to none. Our colleges are world-renowned.

Connecticut is a good place to live and we have attracted capable, creative scientists with a competitive spirit who are willing and able to battle with their counterparts all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the article by Mr. Elwood in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

CONNECTICUT'S CHEMICAL INDUSTRY—A LOOK AHEAD

(By Walter L. Elwood)

It has been said with more humor than truth, that Connecticut's chemical industry dates from the manufacture of synthetic nutmegs. Unfortunately, this person gave our fair State a pseudonym, the Nutmeg State, and he may well have been the cause for the reluctance to define, measure or even list the chemical industry in Connecticut in the economic studies published prior to World War II.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDUSTRY

The industrial and marketing activities which economists today define as the chemical industry is a complex one which is tightly woven into the fabric of all other classifications of industry which make up our total national economy. Definition of the chemical industry is forever changing as new technology unfolds.

Some of the problems of defining the industry become apparent when one considers that the making of steel, aluminum, and glass are chemical reactions. In man, vision, nerve impulses, and brain mechanism are thought to depend on complex chemical reactions, with a speed and efficiency which are the envy of every chemical plant manager. A virus has been shown to be composed of two specific chemical compounds which, when joined together, have the ability to reproduce. Sharks form vitamin A in their liver; the Connecticut chemical industry produces it synthetically.

Another characteristic of the chemical industry is its tremendous rate of technological change. More than 50 percent of the products sold by the industry today didn't exist 25 years ago.

The chemical industry in Connecticut has these same characteristics and covers a range of products so wide it would be impossible to list them all. It includes nickel-plating solutions, fuel oil conditioners, medicines, vitamins, limestone, aerosol products and packaging, resins, perfumes, cosmetics, pesticides, synthetic organic chemicals, antibiotics and soap. The products are used by the chemical industry itself, other industries, and the general public. A very important part of the industry includes the firms which distribute the products to the consumer.

NATURE AND RANK IN CONNECTICUT

Like all manufacturing in Connecticut, our chemical industry concentrates on high value precision products and is close to the ultimate consumer. Connecticut's per capita value added by all manufacturing, is highest in the United States. The Connecticut's chemical industry's per capita value added of $13.35 per man-hour tops all manufacturing classifications in Connecticut.

This is at once a tribute to the skill of Connecticut people and an acknowledgment that we do not have the basic raw materials and low-cost energy required by the total chemical industry. By and large, the chemical industry in Connecticut deals with the distribution or further processing of chemicals made elsewhere—resinmaking, cleaning solvents for machinery, pharmaceuticals, and vitamin production for example. Some of the Connecticut chemical industry which is considered basic would be limestone and related products, magnesium and calcium from native dolomite deposits.

Even so, Connecticut has ranked 20th or 21st in the United States (28th in population) for the past 5 years in terms of total value added in manufacturing. In State terms, the chemical industry employs about 13,000 people (3.3 percent of total) and has been growing at a rate of 50 percent greater than all manufacturing in the State for the past several years. Probably because the Connecticut chemical industry is less basic than the chemical industry in general and concentrates its efforts closer to the consumer, and because the chemical industry spends a higher percentage of its sales dollar on research, particularly application or product improvement research, the Connect-

icut chemical industry seems to respond to population growth and a rising standard of living more favorably than the total U.S. chemical industry.

GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION IN THE STATE

Figure 2 (not printed) shows a relationship between population growth and U.S. chemical production. Between 1947 and 1960, the Connecticut chemical industry in terms of value added in manufacturing increased from $52.3 million to $181.6 million, a rate of growth much greater than the national average. Also, Connecticut population growth rate in 5 of the last 6 decades has surpassed the national average.

This close connection with population and a basic requirement of the chemical industry customers for quick reliable service probably has a bearing on the distribution of the State's chemical industry. The Stamford area has the greatest employment in its 27 plants. The Groton, New London, Ledyard triangle ranks second with five plants, one of which is considered to be the largest production unit for antibiotics in the world. New Haven follows with 35 plants. Other chemical centers are: Hartford 19, Bridgeport 19, Danbury 12, Middletown 12, Norwalk 18, Wallingford 4, Waterbury 8, Ansonia 4, Bristol 4, Thompsonville 6, Torrington 2, New Britain 4, and several others with one or more plants.

Connecticut, with almost 98 percent of its total road mileage paved or hard surfaced and with two Class I railroads with 800 miles of trackage, and three excellent harbors at Bridgeport, New Haven, and New London, has as good a transportation system as any in the country. This makes it possible to service efficiently the chemical-based demands of the 44 million people with a buying income in excess of $88 billion who live within a 300-mile radius of Connecticut.

The past 15 years have seen the chemical industry in Connecticut develop into a fast-growing, increasingly important, segment of Connecticut's total manufacturing industry. Like most industries, the Connecticut chemical industry has its share of problems. The continued growth of the industry depends on how well the challenges are resolved. Now for a look at the more important problem areas.

PROBLEM AREAS

Though competition is the life blood of the American economy, it reaches a unique intensity in the chemical industry. Here, chemical products compete against other chemical products as well as against products of other industries, process competes with process, important customers often become important competitors almost overnight. As profit margins shrink in other industries, as oil and milk, they look to surplus capacity or sidestreams or byproducts and try to upgrade them (all too often successfully) into important competitive chemicals. Chemical processing equipment is complicated and expensive—an investment of $30,000 to $40,000 per worker is required. To operate profitably, high volume is needed. Quality service (and all too often price reductions) are the means to higher volume. Competitors must modernize or die. Frequently they modernize and the cycle starts once more.

Since Connecticut's chemical industry concentrates on high value products, it is a particularly important target for, not only the rest of the U.S. chemical industry, but every chemical industry in the world. The chemical industry has long since passed the save the paper clips approach to cost savings, and is increasingly dependent on the brains and creativity of its scientists and engineers and on the ability of the working man to adapt to highly complex automated operations and techniques to meet competitive challenges.

CONNECTICUT'S INDUCEMENTS FOR GROWTH

This, perhaps, is also a reason for a note of optimism for future growth of the chemical industry in Connecticut. Our school systems in Connecticut have demonstrated they can convert native Yankee ingenuity into skilled chemical workers, second to none. Our colleges are world renowned.

Connecticut is a good place to live and we have attracted capable, creative scientists with a competitive spirit who are willing and able to battle with their counterparts all over the world.

Another important factor which has helped Connecticut chemical industry grow has been a favorable political climate. It could always be better, of course, but in many areas, including taxes, we compare favorably with other nearby States. Political or governmental activities and industry activities are becoming more involved and interdependent and this trend promises to continue.

How the State government evaluates the social needs of its people, and how it raises the money to meet those needs and, particularly in relation to how this process is carried out in nearby States, will have an important influence on the future growth of the chemical industry, as well as on the growth of its customers: the other manufacturing industries.

Communications between government and industry within the State have been good with the statewide industrial organizations playing an important role. It is vitally important to future growth to not only maintain, but improve these communications.

THREATS AND HOPES

Perhaps of even greater importance is the area of cooperation and understanding between the chemical industry and the Federal Government. During the past year we have seen examples of complex legislation involving the Connecticut chemical industry unduly influenced by headline hunters with a distorted picture, playing on emotion packed, tragic episodes like the Thalidomide case. Other incidents, such as Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring," dealing with misuse of chemically produced insecticides and periodic cancer scares emotionally connected with the use of chemicals in food preparation, can trigger unwise legislation if understanding and communications are not greatly improved.

Of particular importance to the Connecticut chemical industry will be the implementation of the Federal Trade Expansion Act. One must wait and see how the details of this plan are worked out to evaluate its effect on the Connecticut chemical industry. It may offer opportunities for Connecticut to have access to cheaper basic raw materials. It is more likely that the high value precision type of product market characteristic of the Connecticut chemical industry will be a primary target of our European competitors. One hopes this market would not be bartered away for an increased wheat market, for instance. In any case, it is vitally important for the people negotiating for the chemical industry to understand its complex nature. We, in the industry, must redouble our efforts to improve communications, cooperation, and understanding between the industry and the Federal Government.

In the next 10 years, we think the chemical industry in Connecticut will continue to grow at a rate greater than Connecticut's average population growth which is higher than the national average. We think the growth rate of the chemical industry will continue to exceed that of all manufacturing in the State.

We do not anticipate any change in the basic nature of the chemical industry. We will continue to process or distribute basic chemicals made elsewhere and will be closely linked to the growth of population and an increased standard of living.

Continued improvement in our transportation system will give us ready access to one-third of the total U.S. population, 37 percent of its effective buying income and 35 percent of its retail sales.

Our continued high expenditures for research will add many products we can only dream about today; perhaps the new chemical which is reported to be more like leather than leather itself will give us a boost, or a plastic coating for moving parts of machinery which will eliminate oiling or greasing, or electric circuits powered by bacteria will in turn spark growth in other fields. We cannot say what products will come—we only know they will come.

We should hold our U.S. ranking of 21st or 22d and possibly move up a notch or two in terms of value added in manufacturing.

We would anticipate the rate of capital expenditures ($101 million in the last 7 years) would be much larger in the next 10 years as competition and new products force modernization or expansion. On the other hand the number of employees will probably grow at a slower rate, perhaps even below the rate of population increase, as the industry strives to be more competitive and the area of competition expands to other countries in the world with lower wages rates.

The most important reason for optimism lies in the tenor of the comments I received from other chemical people in the State.

Basically they say: "We don't know what challenges lie ahead or what the future holds, but we'll be in there trying to give our customers better value through better products and better service."

In the final analysis the people in our industry will determine its future. They have demonstrated ability, determination, and the desire to work hard. Our sicentists are as capable as any in the world and much of the competitive battle will be fought in the laboratories.

Certainly we face problems, but if the Connecticult chemical industry could speak with one voice I think it would say, as Admiral Farragut once said: "Damn the torpedoes—full speed ahead."

National Geriatrics Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles H. Silver, executive assistant to the mayor of the city of New York for education and industrial development, and president of Beth Israel Hospital, a well-known and well-considered institution in my city, had occasion to speak in connection with the building of a National Geriatrics Center under the sponsorship of the Home of Old Israel at the Parade of Stars, March 4, 1963, at Madison Square Garden.

His remarks are singularly appropriate at this time in view of the measure pending in the Congress dealing with aid to the aged under social security and under unanimous consent, I include them herewith:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER

I cannot help expressing a hope that you have not called upon me to participate in

these ceremonies as a qualified senior citizen, but as the young representative of our city.

If that point has been thoroughly cleared up, let me add that I am deeply grateful for the honor you have chosen to pay me, and I am happy to be with you and to lend whatever assistance I can on behalf of so valuable a portion of our population.

My work as president of Beth Israel Hospital for more than 16 years has already afforded me intimate appreciation of the needs and problems of our senior citizens. I have met them day after day and talked with them personally in our own very active geriatrics clinic. I can assure you that some of our aging patients are the youngest and most vigorous people I know.

Medical science is constantly increasing the number of the elderly as it lengthens the span of their life expectancy. Many of these wonderful people can be termed "old" only if you read the label of years. Their senses are keen; their strength has not failed; their minds are alert.

I think that the National Jewish Geriatrics Center of the Home of Old Israel will mark a milestone in the history of mankind's efforts to build a more humane civilization. The elderly must not be cast off. They must not be stored away to wait for the merciful release of the Almighty. They have helped to make our world. They remain among us, living and loving life. They must retain a place of respect and honor and the pride of feeling that they continue to be an important, useful part of society.

My favorite credo for tonight is—and I wish I had been the first to say it—"Grow old gracefully? Never. I intend to fight every step of the way."

I think we should all bring cheer and help and material aid to everyone who is fighting to stay young and useful. I think we should be right up alongside of them—in their corner—instead of trying to push them into one.

Government, industry, and the professions are coming to realize that our senior citizens are a precious national resource and not a liability. Life has been made longer. The twilight of our days now stretches deep and far before the darkness.

When I think of Eisenhower, Truman, Herbert Hoover, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, when I think of Bernie Baruch helping to shape the destinies of our day from his sunny park bench, when I think of Winston Churchill pointing an immortal pen against the gathering clouds to write a monumental history of the English people, then I know that we have met here to assure the triumph of a sacred mission.

Society has been successful in finding places for the talents and energies of the disabled. Now we must turn our attention to the able men and women of advanced years. They don't feel that the parade has passed them by. Some of them may still be able to lead it.

The least we can do is to let them march at our side. What we owe the old is reverence, but all they ask for is consideration. Age is not a defeat, but a victory—not a punishment, but a privilege. The test of a people is how it cares for its old.

In the National Jewish Geriatrics Center which we will build, under the sponsorship of the Home of Old Israel, doctor, nurse, and research technician will focus the most advanced techniques on the problems of the aged. Soaring structures of stone and steel—care and compassion—will soon rise from the blueprints and drawing boards on spacious oceanfront land that has already been acquired.

Every provision will be made for occupational therapy, vocational rehabilitation, recreation, and group projects to foster a climate of renewed usefulness—an active and zestful interest in life.

Here, in a haven of hope revived, we will keep elderly hands active, elderly minds busy, elderly hearts lifted with a new-found pleasure in life, an alert participation in the abundant rewards of their remaining years.

All of this depends, ladies and gentlemen, on your assistance, as we pioneer a new era of aid to the aged, offering a better tomorrow for those who treasure whatever comfort and joy we can give them today.

You can join in pressing this unceasing battle against mankind's ancient enemies—disease, ignorance, and death.

You can march shoulder to shoulder with all of us who care. You can play your part, keeping more completely than ever the ageless commandment: "Honor thy father and thy mother, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee, that thine own days may be long upon the earth."

Peninsula Faces Sewage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Palo Alto, Calif., Times on October 9, 1962, chronicling the rather frightening sewage problem that that area faces.

This, along with hundreds of other articles across the country, characterizes the failure of State and local agencies to abate pollution and the terrible failure of the Public Health Service to aggressively enter into and to abate pollution for the protection of the lives of all of our people:

PENINSULA FACES SEWAGE PROBLEM

(By Spencer Michels)

When you plan a family outing of swimming, fishing, boating, and water skiing, do you ever consider the San Mateo County shore of San Francisco Bay?

Probably not.

Two waterfront areas on the bay are closed to swimming and water skiing—at South San Francisco and at Redwood City. If the sewage problem gets much worse, others may be closed, Eugene Howell, county public health engineer, has indicated.

The waste from thousands of homes in San Mateo County is being treated at about a dozen sewage treatment plants on the shores of the bay, and the treated sewage is then dumped into the shallow water.

As the population continues to grow, the demand for both sewage treatment and recreational facilities grow also. And it's obvious—even to those not in the sewer business—that swimming and sewers don't mix—at least not very well.

With this in mind, Howell suggested to the county board of supervisors and to County Manager E. R. Stallings that a study be made of ways to clean up the waste disposal problem in the bay.

At the present the situation is confused. Many towns operate their own sewers and sewage treatment plants, and other areas are served by sanitary districts like the Menlo Park Sanitary District—a separate government entity with its own board of trustees, staff, and sewage treatment facilities.

Representatives from these districts and city sewage departments met last week to discuss mutual problems. Stallings, in calling the officials together, had said that nearly every plant is currently overloaded or under fire, for some other reason, by the Regional Water Pollution Control Board, and yet there are large undeveloped areas of the county which do not have sewage treatment facilities available to them.

As a result of the meeting, Stallings said, he will immediately explore what Federal funds are available for a consulting engineer to make a complete study of the county's problems. He estimates that such an examination will cost $35,000.

One problem some officials feared would develop failed to materialize at the meeting. That was the possibility that trustees and employees of the many sanitary districts would object to any unified action for fear of losing their jobs.

"This didn't seem to be indicated the other day," Stallings said. "They think some kind of action is a necessity. We can't keep dumping sewage in the bay if we hope to develop it for recreation."

Dr. Lawrence Cook, a trustee and engineer of the Menlo Park Sanitary District, agreed. "The county is overdue to have some overall planning," he said.

According to Howell, the public health engineer, at least two solutions, and probably more, are possible. A common outfall or pipeline could connect the various districts, and transport all the sewage into the deep waters of the bay. This would probably make the water near shore relatively safe for recreation.

Another answer, most likely more expensive, would be to pump sewage through a pipeline to the coast, and dump it far out in the Pacific Ocean.

If something isn't done, Howell warned, swimmers in the bay will leave themselves exposed to typhoid, dysentary, and some virus infections.

Clyde Doyle Gave Nation His Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following fitting tribute to our departed colleague Clyde Doyle was part of the editorial page of the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram on March 15:

DOYLE LIVED UP TO MOTTO: "GIVE NATION YOUR BEST"

Clyde Doyle was a conscientious man. The career which ended in his death in Washington yesterday was consistently marked by evidences of a man doing his best. Mr. Doyle did his best as a Long Beach citizen who accepted many civic responsibilities and as a Congressman serving seven and a half terms during some of the Nation's most turbulent and critical years.

Before he went into public life Mr. Doyle had a key role in innumerable civic activities in Long Beach. A plaque on the wall at municipal auditorium testifies to this distinguished effort. It shows that he was awarded the Inter-Service Club Meritorious Citizens Award for outstanding civic service.

His congressional career began in the war year of 1944 soon after his son was killed in action. A Democrat, he was temporarily retired in the Republican sweep of 1946, returned to Congress in 1948 and remained until his death. How well he was regarded and in what affection he was held in Con-

gress was indicated by 2½ hours of eulogies on the floor of the House yesterday.

After his early years in Congress as a Representative of the district including Long Beach, Mr. Doyle changed residence to South Gate and continued as Representative of the northern part of the old district, cut off in redistricting. But he continued his strong interest in the welfare of Long Beach and was a strong ally of Representative CRAIG HOSMER in such vital matters as the shipyard and naval hospital project.

His congressional service was marked by a long and unsuccessful crusade in behalf of servicemen who had received less than an honorable discharge. But his prominence came as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which he was acting chairman at the time of his death. He was devoted to the cause of rooting out and opposing communism, and added strength to the committee's efforts by sponsoring reform of hearing procedures.

As a politician, Representative Doyle inevitably drew some fire in the partisan and ideological wars of his congressional years, but the sincerity of his patriotism and devotion to principle was never questioned. He was a lifetime admirer and student of the career of Abraham Lincoln, whose picture he long kept above his desk.

Mr. Doyle was an emotional man, and outward evidences of that sometimes drew frivolous comment. But there were indications of a deep-seated feeling for principle and of warm compassion.

Among his political eccentricities was the inevitable reference to his district as "the great 18th" or "the great 23d" Congressional District. He never failed to remind listeners of his pride in the area he represented.

For years, his letters and messages carried a line across the bottom: "Our beloved country deserves the best we can give it." Clyde Doyle lived up to that motto.

An American Ombudsman Could Aid Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in asking the Congress and others interested in improvement of American Government to study the possibility of using the Scandinavian Ombudsman in America, I suggested a role for the American Ombudsman as an agent of Congress. My remarks are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084. The Biddle Survey of March 5 has summarized my idea of the American Ombudsman in a brief story that I call to the attention of the House.

The article follows:

AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN COULD AID CONGRESS

As congressional sessions become progressively longer, it would follow that members would have less time for such extracurricular activities as helping their constituents. Under current practice, a Congressman will go out of his way to satisfy the folks at home even though he has a rigid workday schedule. With longer sessions he could not follow this policy unless he cut down on time for committee meetings and hearings, and for studying bills he must vote on. A politician, of course, depends on the people back home—if he is a Representative, they vote for him every 2 years; if he is a Senator, he is secure for 6 years before they have a chance to decide whether they want to send him back to Washington for another term.

How a Congressman could devote practically all his time to his work as lawmaker (at least while Congress is in session) is a problem many a Congressman would like to solve. And it is not characteristic of the United States alone; other nations have the same problem.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin believes he has found the key to a solution. He recently urged Members of Congress to discuss the possibility of adapting the successful Scandinavian office of ombudsman to the American scene. He believed it would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Congress if an ombudsman stood ready to deal with those constituents' problems that are referred to his staff.

The ombudsman (meaning: "commissioner" or "official") would aid constituents in such matters as social security, military service, immigration, defense contracts and the many odd problems the folks back home think ought to be solved by their man in Washington. The ombudsman would not be a single individual; his setup would be similar to that of the Comptroller General, who is responsible for advising Congress on financial matters.

As far as we know, nothing has been said about reducing the office staffs of the various Congressmen when the ombudsman cometh to lighten their burdens. Nor has anthing been said about bringing more measures to a conclusion in Congress during the course of a session. But these, it seems, would be the ultimate goals.

Undetectable Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter to the editor appearing in the Washington Post on March 13 so the vital information it contains may have wider dissemination:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

TESTS BEYOND DETECTION

On the nuclear test ban issue you gave a generous 27 column inches to James Newman's rambling emotional outburst in defense of Deputy Disarmament Administrator Adrian S. Fisher and against Senator DODD and myself.

At this writing you have given not even a fraction of an inch to startling factual testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's Director of Military Applications. Betts revealed the big hole, even in the administration's upcoming new treaty draft, through which the Soviets can drive clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority.

Let Mr. Newman, your editorialists, and reporters quibble if they must over effectiveness of identification, location, and onsite inspection of detectable events which might be nuclear tests.

But why not also let your readers in on the fact there exists a very vital low-yield range of cheat testing—single shots or an entire series—which cannot be detected at all?

These are shots below a 3 kiloton yield equivalent in alluvium regarding which Dr. Frank Press told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, March 7, detection capability is very close to zero.

This is a testing range in which the administration proposes to forgo wholly any and all U.S. developments and, as a practical matter, simply trust the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests to develop secretly nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

These are the significant weapons General Betts authoritatively declared could be clandestinely tested and secretly developed in the undetectable area freely open to surreptitious activity:

Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

Extrapolation from events as small as 1 kiloton up to much higher yield battlefield tactical weapons with such confidence as not to require proof testing.

At least one-half of all tactical weapons of all yields and types of interest of the military, also with such confidence as not to require proof testing.

A substantial fraction of all large-yield strategic weapons of interest, by the simple expedient of testing in underground cavities which muffle explosions down below the 3-kiloton yield equivalent for seismic nondetection purposes.

General Betts added, as an indication of what kind of weapons development is of interest, that about 50 percent of actual U.S. underground testing in Nevada is precisely in the low, undetectable kiloton range.

Only last Wednesday President Kennedy told the Nation "we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every insurance that we could detect a series of tests underground." Yet the upcoming treaty draft being prepared by Adrian Fisher and others proposes to do exactly that. The incontrovertible result is a gap of inconsistency between the administration's words and deeds.

It is little wonder that Americans observing the administration's test ban disarray, including Senator DODD and myself, are deeply concerned with its incredible inability to match oratory with action.

This is particularly true when President Kennedy's words of March 2, 1962, are recalled announcing resumption of U.S. nuclear tests at that time. These included the following:

"A nation which is refraining from tests obviously cannot match the gains of a nation conducting tests."

"We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium."

Those who may, somehow, become aware of General Betts' testimony, may feel as I do about the President's words of a year ago. Namely, they hardly can be erased by the unabrasive conclusions of such practitioners of "nuclear gapsmanship" as Messrs. Fisher, Newman, et al., that cheat testing in the "big hole" for surreptitious nuclear development really doesn't matter at all.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.

WASHINGTON.

Pulliam Versus Lippmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter by Mr. Eugene Pulliam, which is a well-worded rebuttal to comments by syndicated Columnist Walter Lippmann on recent editorials in the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette.

Mr. Lippmann, in a recent column, referred to critics of the administration's Cuba policy as "war whoopers," saying he based his conclusions on reading the above-mentioned newspapers. I feel this was an unwarranted attack not only on Mr. Pulliam and his fine papers, but by inference also upon the many Americans who are voicing wholly justified concern over some of the actions and inactions of the administration in regard to the Cuban menace.

Mr. Pulliam's letter eloquently and adequately states his defense, and he has additionally rendered a service to the whole reading public by sending this letter to each paper that carried Mr. Lippmann's column.

The letter, as it appeared in the March 8, 1963, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE—PULLIAM VERSUS LIPPMANN

Mr. Walter Lippmann accuses our newspapers—the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette of Phoenix, Ariz., of supporting an American "war whoop" party (Post-Dispatch, March 5). According to Mr. Lippmann, the war whoopers want the fruits of a successful war without having to fight a war and they advocate all sorts of carefree and irresponsible adventures against Cuba, including an American invasion and occupation. Mr. Lippmann says he bases his conclusions on reading our papers and especially our editorials for 1 week.

I wonder if Mr. Lippmann has read any of our editorials carefully? He has certainly completely misunderstood our editorial policy.

As publisher of the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette, I would like to explain our true editorial positions:

1. We do not advocate an invasion or an occupation of Cuba. What we do advocate—and have done so for many months—is a forceful American policy aimed at Castro's isolation and eventual overthrow. We think that an American partial blockade or quarantine can be one of the effective instruments of such a policy, especially as it has the support of the Latin American states. We also believe that the anti-Castro resistance movement should receive more active United States backing.

2. We don't believe—as Mr. Lippmann thinks we do—that the Russians will not go to war no matter what we do to them. The Russians will certainly go to war to defend themselves from attack. But we do not believe that the Russians would go to war to defend Castro. We believe that Soviet Premier Khrushchev is a very shrewd politican—the shrewedest the Communists have had in Moscow for a long time. Beset as he is with very serious internal troubles, Mr. Khrushchev would not, in our opinion, do anything reckless in order to challenge an American naval blockade on Cuba. Still less is he likely to risk a nuclear war in order to save Castro from an American supported anti-Castro uprising.

May I say that we are not trying to be wise after the event. The day President Kennedy proclaimed the American quarantine, last October, we wrote that the Russians would accept it and would not initiate any military countermeasures. We maintained that attitude throughout the whole Cuban crisis, while a lot of liberal commentators, including Mr. Lippmann, expected the Russians to challenge the American Navy or to start a nuclear war. For us, the chances of nuclear war last October were minimal. They were, in fact, nonexistent and we said so at the time.

I dare say we proved to be right, which is, perhaps, one of the reasons Mr. Lippmann dosen't like us.

EUGENE C. PULLIAM.

Tax Reform Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, many viewpoints on tax cuts, revisions, and reforms are being pressed forward at this time before the Committee on Ways and Means, and to individual Congressmen.

On February 19, in the Dayton (Ohio) News there appeared an editorial presenting one viewpoint in an extremely refreshing manner. The editorial is generally in favor of the objectives sought by the President of the United States, and I commend it to the notice of other Members:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News, Feb. 19, 1963]

TAX REFORM LOGIC

Most of the campaigns now launched against the President's fiscal policy package have features in common. They're almost uniformly selfish, cynical, and deceptive. From the squawks of some objectors, one might think the program the work of a gaggle of two-bit fortune tellers, rather than the product of some of the country's best financial and economic brains.

Not to be lost sight of in all the piecemeal critical confusion is the fact that administration requests for both tax reform and tax cuts are complementary and reinforcing. So are the targets they aim for. One without the other won't be enough to get a dragging economy on the move.

One target is redistribution of income reached by tightening tax loopholes for those who are well off, giving more tax relief to those with least income to spend. The effect on the economy would be to increase buying power, which in turn stimulates investment, takes up production slack, creates jobs.

The second target, aim of corporation tax cuts, is encouragement to industry to spend more on research and plant modernization, in part to jack up its competitive position in world markets. This, too, would have a magnifying effect on the at-home economy—more spending, more paychecks, more buying power, more jobs.

The third target, attainable only if Congress votes the winning combination of tax reform and tax cuts, is to bolster Federal revenues by spurring an economic growth rate that is now too poke-along to keep up with increases in the labor force. This means accepting a short-term deficit in expectation of getting back three times as much in increased collections from fuller employment a couple of years from now.

Where else will the cash come from to maintain both adequate defenses and an adequate rate of investment in the things that sustain the economy—such necessities as water supply, highways, and schools?

There is nothing unknown in this formula. The Full Employment Act of 1946 is based on just these concepts. Perhaps the most sensible question asked is whether it might touch off a new inflationary spiral. So long as able-bodied millions remain unemployed, and factories puff along at 60 to 80 percent of capacity, that question is less urgent than it sounds.

Hospital Ship "Hope" Scores Victory in Peru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, along with several of my colleagues in the House, I had the privilege of hearing a firsthand report on the tremendous success of Project Hope during its 10-month operations in Peru.

On hand to brief us on Hope's reception and work in Peru were Dr. Fernando Cabieses Molina, the Director of the Peruvian Development Fund, and Dr. William Walsh, the founder and president of the People-to-People Health Foundation, sponsors of the SS *Hope* hospital ship.

The SS *Hope* has become a new and inspiring symbol of America to millions of our foreign neighbors in Indonesia, Vietnam, and most recently in Peru. This private, nonprofit people-to-people assistance program which specializes in bringing America's medical and health knowledge to underdeveloped countries has presented a new face of Uncle Sam, previously unknown to many parts of the world.

Dr. Cabieses gave a vivid and enlightening report on the feeling of his people in Peru about the work of Project Hope. At this time, I wish to insert some of Dr. Cabieses' remarks into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because his views are valuable reading to those who share the opinion that our most effective foreign aid is in the people-to-people programs.

Dr. Cabieses' remarks follow:

Two weeks ago, in the port of Salaverry, Peru, a momentous historical event was taking place. Thirty to forty thousand Peruvian men, women, and children had come to this barren piece of Peruvian coast to give a farewell sendoff to a ship they loved and cherished as a new symbol of American friendship. That ship was the SS *Hope*.

It was a new symbol for a few of us who could understand and had been exposed to other efforts from the north—but for the people gathered at the pier and on miles and miles of shoreline, this was not a new symbol—this was the symbol of American kindness and friendship—the only symbol, one may say, for more than 95 percent of the handkerchief-waving Peruvians.

It was not an easy task to analyze this moment in the emotions of everyone present. This was far from a cheering crowd waving goodbye to a highly admired group of American doctors and nurses. This was a silent, unorganized sobbing human mass, with tears in their eyes, mumbling a farewell to a very dear and loving friend.

One week before, the same overwhelming mass of people had crowded the stadium in Trujillo, Peru, in a spontaneous demonstration of love and admiration for the beloved Gringos. And it was then that many of these American men and women realized for the first time the tremendous importance of the task they had performed, of how much good they had done for others, of how much good they had done for themselves, of how overpowering human love can become when rooted so deeply in the hearts of thousands of friends gathered to say goodby to the *Hope*.

Health programs, within the framework of a long-range development alliance, may be either an expense or an investment. * * * Any program which creates in a group the idea that the health of its people is the responsibility of others or that their well-being is a grant they should expect and demand from somebody else, is suicidal. A program of this sort, whether it is for health, housing, land reform, or any other social aim, becomes not only a dangerous expense—it is a sociological crime.

But when you find that health needs serve as a starting point for free communication between two people; when you see that health programs can be so effectively used as a starter for the development of higher motivations; when one can easily prove that health programs become a tool for linking two different cultures; then, every cent spent within this framework is worth a dollar. And I would call this an investment, and a very good one.

Project Hope has shown the way in Trujillo, Pru, The S.S. *HOPE* has returned to the United States after a 10-month successful mission—and it left behind there, as it did in Indonesia and Vietnam, a true legacy of learning, a real people-to-people communication. Project Hope has served Americans well and the people of Peru will not forget their friends.

A Voice of Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was absolutely fascinated with what I would like to call the "voice of reason" heard recently in the person of Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School in relation to the Supreme Court decision in Engel against Vitale, or better known as the Supreme Court prayer case. In calling his lecture "Absolute Is in the Dark," Dean Griswold demonstrated the reverse proposition, that is, "reason is in the light." Few men in our time have had the courage to speak out frankly and with precise reasoning that Dean Griswold has done in this instance. On a controversial issue such as the Mr. Justice Black opinion cited in the prayer case, there is great need for the intelligent and sophisticated examination of the real underlying issues from both the legal and moral standpoint. This Dean Griswold has done, and in doing so, demonstrated the genuine liberal position of our times, as contrary to the bind of ritualistic liberalism prevalent today.

I include the full text of the lecture as follows:

ABSOLUTE IS IN THE DARK—A DISCUSSION OF THE APPROACH OF THE SUPREME COURT TO CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

(The William H. Leary Lecture, delivered at the School of Law of the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, by Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass., on Wednesday, Feb. 27, 1963)

William Henry Leary was dean of the School of Law of the University of Utah for 34 years, from 1916 to 1950. During this time he strongly influenced the legal education of a large proportion of the lawyers now active at the bar in Utah. It is fitting that this lectureship should be established in his honor. I greatly appreciate the invitation which has been given to me to give this third of the Leary lectures, though I am conscious of the difficulty which I shall have in meeting the standard already set in the lectures given in earlier years by Justice Roger J. Traynor,[1] and by Justice William J. Brennan, Jr.[2]

I

For nearly a century and three-quarters the Supreme Court of the United States has been a subject of fascination to lawyers, professors of law, political scientists, politicians, and to other citizens of this country. That is as it should be. The Court and its function are central to our system of government, a system which is unavoidably complex because of the size and diversity of our country. It is remarkable indeed that we have, for so numerous and diverse a people, a governmental system which works. The key to this success, I am sure, is the role which the Supreme Court was designed to play and has played in resolving the personal and governmental conflicts which inevitably arise. These conflicts are sometimes of extraordinary difficulty, both intellectual, and practical, and it should hardly be surprising that their resolution is not always prompt or clear.

An institution charged with the role which the Supreme Court has successfully filled for so many years is entitled to our respect and understanding. If one criticizes the Court—as people have always done in the past, and should continue to do in the future—it should be essentially for the purpose of trying to contribute to that respect and to that understanding. The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay. Criticism of decisions of the Court or opinions of its members, should be offered as an effort to repay that debt, and with the thought that conscientious criticism may be an aid to the Court in carrying out its difficult and essential tasks. It is in that spirit that my remarks this evening are offered for your consideration.

II

A number of years ago I saw in the Saturday Review a little item under the heading "Atomic Age Fables." It rather appealed to me and I cut it out. When I was preparing this lecture, I thought of it, and it may, in a way, serve as a text for my remarks. It reads as follows:

"In the land of absolute, where everyone and everything is perfect, there is no light at night.

"The annals of the absolutians record that they once discovered the electric light, but as is known, the perfect electric light burns in a perfect vacuum.

"Absolute is in the dark."

As this fable indicates, absolutes are likely to be phantoms, eluding our grasp. Even if we think we have embraced them, they are likely to be misleading. If we start from absolute premises, we may find that we only oversimplify our problems and thus reach unsound results. It may well be that absolutes are the greatest hindrance to sound and useful thought, in law, as in other fields of human knowledge. I would like to suggest, with great respect, and real concern, that the Supreme Court of the United States has, in recent years, been engaged, in certain types of cases, in a species of absolutism in its reasoning, which is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light. Absolutism is an easy and sometimes appealing mode of thought. It provides its own anodyne for the pains of reasoning. It states the result with delusive finality. But it is, I think, a thoroughly unsatisfactory form of judging.

The most extreme form of the absolutist position has been taken by Mr. Justice Black, particularly in certain extrajudicial pronouncements. Thus, in his James Madison lecture at New York University, on February 17, 1960,[3] he said:

"It is my belief that there are 'absolutes' in our Bill of Rights, and that they were put there on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be 'absolutes.' "

And he reiterated this, and extended it in a widely publicized interview at the biennial convention of the American Jewish Congress, on April 14, 1962.[4] In this interview, he dealt specifically with the first amendment, which you will recall, reads in the following terms:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Justice Black lays great stress on the words "no law" in the opening phrase which says: "Congress shall make no law."

In the interview referred to, he said, among other things:

"But when I get down to the really basic reason why I believe that 'no law' means no law, I presume it could come to this, that I took an obligation to support and defend the Constitution as I understand it. And being a rather backward country fellow, I understand it to mean what the words say. It says 'on law,' and that is what I believe it means."[5]

Here we have both absolutism and literalism. Just to make it clear that he would not be misunderstood, he went on to say that laws about libel and slander are invalid. Here are his words:

"I have no doubt myself that the provision, as written and adopted, intended that there should be no libel or defamation law in the United States under the U.S. Government, just absolutely none so far as I am concerned."[6]

And he added:

"I have an idea there are some absolutes. I do not think I am far in that respect from the Holy Scriptures."[7]

Professor Kurland has recently suggested that further discussion of this absolutist point of view may amount "to thrashing a straw man."[8] I hope that this is true. But

[1] "Bandlands in an Appellate Judge's Realm of Reason," Utah L. Rev. 157 (1960).

[2] "Federal Habeas Corpus and State Prisoners: An Exercise in Federalism," 7 Utah L. Rev. 423 (1961).

[3] Black, "The Bill of Rights," 35 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 865, 867 (1960).

[4] Cahn, "Justice Black and First Amendment Absolutes: A Public Interview," 37 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 549 (1962).

[5] Ibid, at 573–574.

[6] Ibid. at 577.

[7] Ibid. at 582.

[8] "Book Review," 30 University of Chicago Law Review 191 (1962), reviewing Hook, "The Paradoxes of Freedom" (1962), which contends against the "absolutist" approach.

the eminence of those who have taken this position, and the influence which these views have already had in several areas of constitutional law lead me to think that consideration here may be appropriate.

III

Within the past year, a case came before the Supreme Court which directly involved the interpretation and application of the first amendment. This was the New York school prayer case decided last June: its name is *Engel* v. *Vitale*.[9] It involved a prayer formulated by the State board of regents in New York, and recommended by them for use in the schools of that State. The prayer, in its entirety, was as follows:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

As you know, the Court, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Black, held that the reciting of this prayer in the public schools of New York violated the Constitution. It was, the Court held, an "establishment of religion," forbidden by the first amendment. Of course, Mr. Justice Black did not do this all alone. Five of his colleagues joined with him. Mr. Justice Stewart dissented from the judgment, and two of the then members of the Court (Justices Frankfurter and White) did not participate. Justice Douglas wrote a concurring opinion, in which he made it largely a matter of finance. Though differing some in his reasoning, he, too, showed the absolutist approach. He recounted all of the ways in which governmental bodies now finance some activity with a religious element or overtone: "chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services"; "compulsory chapel at the service academies, and religious services * * * in Federal hospitals and prisons"; "religious proclamations" by the President; " 'In God We Trust' " on our money; "Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia"; and many other things, including exemption from "the Federal income tax" and "postal privileges" for "Religious organizations."[10] All of this is bad, according to Justice Douglas. After recognizing that "Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with" such things, he said, summarily, and absolutely: "Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes."[11] It's as simple as that. They are all bad. And perhaps they are if the absolutist approach to such matters can be accepted as sound. These are the lengths to which absolutism takes us.

But is it all as clear as this? Do words convey such positive and overpowering meaning? Is there no room whatever for thought or consideration? Perhaps it would be worth while just to look carefully at the words of the Constitution. Just what does the first amendment say? These are the words again, which like all words are not digits in a computer but are "the skin of a living thought"[12]:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

That is the first amendment, in all its majesty. I will not yield to any Justice of the Supreme Court in my respect for those words, or, indeed, in reverence to them and the thought that they express. Nor will I yield in my conception of their importance not merely in our history but in their present function and worth in helping us to preserve a free nation. But what do they say? "Congress shall make no law." Congress had made no law in the Engle case; no law of Congress was in any way involved. Of course we must look to the 14th amendment. At this point, though, the construction ceases to be a literal one, and becomes, indeed, a rather sophisticated one. What does the 14th amendment say? Here are its relevant words: "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Is there anything there about freedom of religion, or about an establishment of religion? Obviously not. But there is a reference to "liberty," and this has been construed to make effective against the States some of the provisions of the Bill of Rights[13]—though clearly not all of those provisions.[14] As Mr. Justice Black has put it: "My belief is that the 1st amendment was made applicable to the States by the 14th."[15] That may be; and within some limits, applied with proper care and restraint and understanding, I rather like the result. But it takes some rather broad construing. It cannot conceivably be regarded as required by the literal language of the 1st and 14th amendments. It is truly a far cry from saying with sweet simplicity that " 'no law' means no law."

But let us go on. What is it that Congress can make no law about? It is "an establishment of religion." What does that term mean? That takes some construing, too. Certainly there was much history behind the phrase. Not only did England (and Scotland) have an established church, but there were established churches in a number of the States at the time the first amendment was adopted.[16] And they were something very different from a Regents' recommended prayer. It takes a measure of construction to bring this prayer within the no-establishment clause. "No law" may well mean no law. But "establishment of religion" might mean establishment of religion; and those who wrote the "establishment of religion" clause might be rather perplexed by the use which has been made of it in 1962. To say that this is an absolute is, I venture to say, to allow oneself to be deceived by the absolutist approach, and to deny oneself the opportunity to appreciate just what one is doing when the meaning one wants to put upon the words is first put into them, and then taken out with all the aura of the absolute approach. "No law" means no law. It is as simple as that—that is, if one ignores the other words which are involved in the task, such as "Congress," "establishment of religion," "the free exercise thereof," and "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Of course, I do not say that these are meaningless words. I do suggest that they are words which require construction, which are by no means absolute in form or content, and that to ignore them under the guise of the absolutist approach is to fail to recognize and perform the most significant and fundamental part of the task of judging.[17]

One need hardly say here that a considerable portion of the history of this State involved a controversy over a question which many persons sincerely believed to be a matter of religion. I refer, of course, to the issue of polygamy. Congress did pass a law forbidding polygamy in the territories, and in *Reynolds* v. *United States*[18] this was held constitutional. Similarly, in the status admitting Utah to statehood, Congress legislated again on this subject,[19] and this has never been challenged. This example, and others that could be given, are enough, I think, to show that the words of the first amendment, in its several clauses, require interpretation, in their application to widely differing situations, and cannot be given sound meaning and effect merely through a mechanically absolutist approach.[20]

Compare *White* v. *United States*, 305 U.S. 281, 292 (1938), where in answer to the contention that taxing statutes must be construed in favor of the taxpayer—an essentially absolutist position—Mr. Justice Stone said: "We are not impressed by the argument that, as the question here decided is doubtful, all doubts should be resolved in favor of the taxpayer. It is the function and duty of courts to resolve doubts."

There are already many discussions of the absolute approach in print. In this situation, one may be bold to enter into the field, but the importance of the subject may warrant an effort to express another point of view.

Other treatments of the general topic include Frantz, "The First Amendment in the Balance," 71 Yale Law Journal 1424 (1962); Meiklejohn, "The First Amendment is an Absolute," 1961 Supreme Court Review 245; Mendelson, "On the Meaning of the First Amendment: Absolutes in the Balance," 50 California Law Review 821 (1962); Levy, "Legacy of Suppression" (1960); C. L. Black, "The People and the Court 96–100" (1960); Reich, "Mr. Justice Black and the Living Constitution," 76 Harvard Law Review 673; Kurland, "Of Church and State in the Supreme Court," 29 University of Chicago Law Review, reprinted in Kurland, "Religion and the Law" (1962); Fried, "Two Concepts of Interests: Some Reflections on the Supreme Court's Balancing Test," 76 Harvard Law Review 755 (1963).

[9] 370 U.S. 421 (1962).

[10] 2370 U.S. at 437, footnote 1.

[11] 370 U.S. at 437.

[12] Holmes, J., in *Towne* v. *Eisner*, 245 U.S. 421, 425 (1918).

[13] See *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940); *Schneider* v. *State*, 308 U.S. 147, 160 (1939); going back to *Gitlow* v. *New York*, 268 U.S. 652 (1925).

[14] *Twining* v. *New Jersey*, 211 U.S. 78 (1908); *Palko* v. *Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319 (1937); *Adamson* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 46 (1947).

[15] Cahn, supra note 4, at 578.

[16] It is said that in a number of New England towns the formal record title of the local Congregational Church has never been changed, and is still vested in the town, as it was in Colonial times, and when the Constitution was adopted.

[17] "For Justice Black, too, his announced code of judicial philosophy has not proved to be a workable rule of judicial action. * * * In many memorable votes and opinions, Justice Black has in fact followed the course indicated as inevitable by Justice Holmes' comment on the necessity for judicial choice." Rostow, "The Sovereign Prerogative, xvii (1962).

[18] 98 U.S. 145 (1878).

[19] Act of July 16, 1894, c. 138, sec. 3 (first), 28 Stat. 107, 108.

[20] Professor Kurland has suggested that cases decided under the religion clauses of the first amendment are not sound test of the absolutist argument, since there are two clauses in the religion portion of the amendment (the "establishment" clause, and the "free exercise" clause) which must obviously be read together, or "balanced." Thus, it is said, the Court could not have decided other than it did in the Reynolds case without having "established" a particular religious group in Utah. The argument is somewhat subtle, and has not been recognized by the absolutists. On the whole, it seems to emphasize that what is required here is a reading of the whole Constitution, in the light of its setting, purpose, and effective operation, in other words, the important, difficult and inescapable process of interpretation.

There has perhaps been some unfortunate use of nomenclature in dealing with this problem. The approach espoused by Justice Black, and followed by him and some of his colleagues, has, understandably enough, been called the "absolutist" approach. The other approach has been called the "balancing" approach, because it is thought to involve the balancing of various competing claims to the judge's attention. Both of these appellations may well be misleading.

The Black approach might better be called the "fundamentalist theological" approach. A hint of this is given in Justice Black's reference, which I have already quoted, to "the Holy Scriptures." If one thinks of the Constitution as a God-given text stating fixed law for all time, and then focuses on a single passage, or, indeed, on two words—"no law"—without recognizing all the other words in the whole document, and its relation to the society outside the document, one can find the answers very simply. "'No law' means no law." No more thought is required. Earlier this month, I was in New Orleans, and saw a large illuminated sign outside a church there, which read: "God said it. We believe it. That's all there is to it." This seems a similar approach.

On the other hand, "balancing" may be a misnomer, too, as a description of the method followed by those who do not accept what I have just called the fundamentalist approach. The "balancing" label makes the approach which Justice Black does not like more vulnerable to verbal attack than it merits, and the Justice has not failed to take advantage of this.[21]

Rather than "balancing," the approach which appears to me to be sound might better be called the "comprehensive" or "integral" approach, since it involves looking to the text of all of the Constitution, and, indeed, in proper cases, to the "unwritten Constitution,"[22] examining and considering fully all relevant texts and conditions of our constitutional system, and integrating all together in reaching the ultimate solution. Instead of focusing on a few words, and ignoring all else, including the effect and meaning of those words, as distinguished from thier apparent impact when isolated from everything else, as the absolutist or "fundamentalist" approach does, the comprehensive or integral approach accepts the task of the judge as one which involves the effect of all the provisions of the Constitution, not merely in a narrow literal sense, but in a living, organic sense, including the elaborate and complex governmental structure which the Constitution, through its words, has erected. Under the fundamentalist approach, the judge puts on blinders. He looks at one phrase only; he blinds himself to everything else. Can this approach really be preferable or sounder than one under which the Court examines all constitutional provisions in a living setting, and reaches its conclusion in the light of all the relevant language and factors? Of course, this comprehensive approach requires strong and able judges. Let us hope that we may continue to have such judges. Without judges of high ability, great character, and stanch courage, our constitutional system will surely suffer under any approach to constitutional questions. As Professor Hamilton has said: "That Marshall was there and Taney and Cardozo—and not others—has shaped the very fabric of the Constitution."[23] And this may surely be said of Justice Black.

IV

Let me now turn to another aspect of the matter. I venture the thought, quite seriously, that it was unfortunate that the question involved in the Engel case was ever thought of as a matter for judicial decision, that it was unfortunate that the Court decided the case, one way or the other, and that this unhappy situation resulted solely from the absolutist position which the Court has taken and intimated in such matters, thus inviting such litigation in its extreme form.

What do I mean by this? I have in mind at least two separate lines of thought. One is the fact that we have a tradition, a spiritual and cultural tradition, of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution itself, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect. The other is that there are some matters which are essentially local in nature, important matters, but nonetheless matters to be worked out by the people themselves in their own communities, when no basic rights of others are impaired. It was said long ago that every question in this country tends to become a legal question.[24] But is that wise? Is it inevitable? Are there not questions of detail, questions of give and take, questions at the fringe, which are better left to nonjudicial determination?

First, as to the long tradition. Is it not clear as a matter of historical fact that this was a Christian nation? Of the immigrants who came to previously British North America by the time of the adoption of the Constitution, virtually all were Christian, in all the degrees and types of persuasion which come within that term. Are the *Mayflower* compact, Ann Hutchison, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian nation, having, for various historical and philosophical reasons, developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought. Nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion.

It is perfectly true, and highly salutary, that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These are great provisions, of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces; chapels in prisons; "In God We Trust" on our money; to mention only a few. God is referred to in our national anthem, and in "America," and many others of what may be called our national songs. Must all of these things be rigorously extirpated in order to satisfy a constitutional absolutism? What about Sunday? What about Christmas? Must we deny our whole heritage, our culture, the things of spirit and soul which have sustained us in the past and helped to bind us together in times of good and bad?

Does our deepseated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the founders that it would. It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history. I do not believe that the contentions now made would occur to any man who could free himself from an absolute approach to the problem.

V

Jefferson is often cited as the author of views leading to the absolutist approach. His "wall of separation" is the shibboleth of those who feel that all traces of religion must be barred from any part of public activity. This phrase comes from Jefferson's reply to the Danbury Baptist Association, dated January 1, 1802.[25] It is clear that he wrote it deliberately, and with planned effect, as, before issuing it, he sent it to the Attorney General for comment with a note saying that he thought answers to such addresses as "the occasion * * * of sowing useful truths and principles among the people which might germinate and become rooted among their political tenets." What Jefferson wrote was a powerful way of summarizing the effect of the first amendment. But it was clearly neither a complete statement nor a substitute for the words of the amendment itself. Moreover, the absolute effect which some have sought to give to these words is belied by Jefferson's own subsequent actions and writings.

This matter has been thoroughly investigated by a number of writers. The most recent, and perhaps the most dispassionate of these, is Robert M. Healey, whose book, entitled "Jefferson on Religion in Public Education," was published in 1962. Professor Healey shows that Jefferson denied "that the government was without religion." On the contrary, he contemplated that "those areas of religion on which all sects agreed were certainly to be included within the framework of public education." And he continues, "Jefferson was indeed against government support of any kind for any one or more churches," but "it is not true that he was against support of religion in general or against any form of religion in public education."[26]

The seeking of motives in such cases is dangerous and fraught with difficulties, especially when the motives are likely not to be clearly appreciated by the authors of statements or opinions, or by commentators. On this, Professor Healey may shed some light. He says: "Jefferson's attempts to relate religion to public education reflected his belief that his own religious persuasion was not only right but neutral, and therefore a constitutionally acceptable basis for developing moral adults and fostering religious freedom." And he adds that Jefferson's actions "reveal an unconscious but powerful drive to put his own religious be-

[21] "The majority's approach makes the first amendment, not the rigid protection of liberty its language imports, but a poor flexible imitation." Black, J., dissenting, in *Braden* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 431, 445 (1961); in dissenting in *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1, 164 (1961), Justice Black said that history shows that "the dangerous constitutional doctrine of 'balancing' has been the excuse of practically every repressive measure the Government has ever seen fit to adopt." See also Frantz, "The First Amendment in the Balance," 71 Yale Law Journal 1424 (1962).

[22] Hamilton, "Preview of a Justice," as Yale Law Journal, 819, 825, n. 1 (1939).

[23] Ibid. at 821.

[24] "It is plainly true that we put upon the Supreme Court the burden of deciding cases which would never come before the judicial branch in any other country." Solicitor General Cox, "Understanding the Supreme Court," 7, being the Louis Caplan lecture in law, at the University of Pittsburgh, delivered Sept. 26, 1962. The Solicitor General did not address himself to the question how far the Court itself is responsible for the scope of the questions which come before it for decision.

[25] The full text appears in "16 Writings of Thomas Jefferson," 201–02 (Lipscomb and Bergh, eds. 1903).

[26] Healey, "Jefferson on Religion in Public Education 208," 256 (1962).

liefs in a position of unusual strength. * * * That his efforts to foster religious freedom in public education might result in the virtual establishment of his own beliefs * * * undoubtedly never occurred to him in any convincing fashion."[27] Might the same words be applicable to our present advocates of absolutism?

Similarly, though Catholic reaction to the *Engel* decision has been varied, it may be that some of it is motivated by the thought that if public education can be completely secularized (so that, as it has been said, "religion" in such quarters becomes "a dirty word"), then there will be an increased public demand for sectarian education which can combine religion with general education. This could then be an argument in favor of parochial schools, and as the public schools decline, the argument for public support of parochial schools can be advanced in one guise or another. Thus, as so often happens, the absolutist approach may be its own worst enemy, and may result in a situation which will in effect destroy public education, and thus go far to defeat the very results the absolutists want to achieve.

VI

Now let me turn to the other point—that there are some matters which should be settled on the local level, in each community, and should not become great Supreme Court cases. This can be presented on an essentially legal level, in terms of "standing to sue," and this has been thoughtfully developed by my colleague, Professor Sutherland.[28] What I have in mind is not really different, but I would like to consider it in less technical terms.

The prayer involved in the Engel case was not compulsory. As the Supreme Court itself recited, no pupil was compelled "to join in the prayer over his or his parents' objection."[29] This, to me, is crucial. If any student was compelled to join against his conviction, this would present a serious and justifiable question, akin to that presented in the flag salute case.[30] The Supreme Court did not give sufficient weight to this fact, in my opinion, and relied heavily on such things as the history of the Book of Common Prayer, which, under various acts of Parliament, was compulsory on all.

Where there is no compulsion, what happens if these matters are left to the determination of each community? In New York, under the action of the regents, this determination was made by the elected authorities of the school district. It was, indeed, a fact that a large number of the school districts in New York did not adopt the so-called regents' prayer. This may have been because they could not agree to do so, or because the situation in particular school districts was such that all or a majority did agree that they did not want to have such a prayer or that it was better to proceed without a prayer. Where such a decision was reached, there can surely be no constitutional objection on the ground that it was a decision locally arrived at, or that it amounts to an "establishment" of "no religion." But, suppose that in a particular school district, as in New Hyde Park, it was determined that the prayer should be used as a part of the opening exercises of the schoolday. Remember that it is not compulsory. No pupil is compelled to participate. Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? This would suggest that no school can have a pledge of allegiance to the flag if any student does not wish to join. I heartily agree with the decision in the Barnette case[31] that no student can be compelled to join in a flag salute against his religious scruples. But it is a far cry from that decision to say that no school district can have a flag salute for those who want to participate if there is any student who does not wish to join.

This is a country of religious toleration. That is a great consequence of our history embodied in the first amendment. But does religious toleration mean religious sterility? I wonder why it should be thought that it does. This, I venture to say again, has been, and is, a Christian country, in origin, history, tradition, and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics, I think it can be said, that it developed its notion of toleration. No one in this country can be required to have any particular form of religious belief; and no one can suffer legal discrimination because he has or does not have any particular religious belief. But does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition? The Moslem who comes here may worship as he pleases, and may hold public office without discrimination. That is as it should be. But why should it follow that he can require others to give up their Christian tradition merely because he is a tolerated and welcomed member of the community?

Though we have a considerable common cultural heritage, there have always been minority groups in our country. This, I am sure, has been healthy and educational for all concerned. We have surely gained from having a less homogenous population. Of course, the rights of all, especially those of minorities, must be protected and preserved. But does that require that the majority, where there is such a majority, must give up its cultural heritage and tradition? Why?

Let us consider the Jewish child, or the Catholic child, or the nonbeliever, or the Congregationalist, or the Quaker. He, either alone, or with a few or many others of his views, attends a public school, whose school district, by local action, has prescribed the regents' prayer. When the prayer is recited, if this child or his parents feel that he cannot participate, he may stand or sit, in respectful attention, while the other children take part in the ceremony. Or he may leave the room. It is said that this is bad, because it sets him apart from other children. It is even said that there is an element of compulsion in this—what the Supreme Court has called an "indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform."[32] But is this the way it should be looked at? The child of a nonconforming or a minority group is, to be sure, different in his beliefs. That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable, and educational, for him to learn and observe this, in the atmosphere of the school—not so much that he is different, as that other children are different from him? And is it not desirable that, at the same time, he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted? No compulsion is put upon him. He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and to respect what they feel is significant to them.

Is this not a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the majority group? They experience the values of their own culture; but they also see that there are others who do not accept those values, and that they are wholly tolerated in their nonacceptance. Learning tolerance for other persons, no matter how different, and respect for their beliefs, may be an important part of American education, and wholly consistent with the first amendment.[33] I hazard the thought that no one would think otherwise were it not for parents who take an absolutist approach to the problem, perhaps encouraged by the absolutist expressions of Justices of the Supreme Court, on and off the bench.

VII

It is appropriate here to say something about the problems of the Sunday law cases.[34] Because of the absolutist approach, these cases were very hard for the Court, when I think they should have been quite easy—as is evidenced, I believe, by the fact that no such question was ever raised for 150 years after the adoption of the first amendment. It is true that many of the State statutes were a hodgepodge, full of inconsistencies and contradictions. It is true that the Massachusetts statute, going way back to early colonial days, was entitled: "An Act for the Observance of the Lord's Day." Why should that be important? By an amendment adopted in 1962, it is now "An Act for the Observance of a Common Day of Rest." Is that really any better? It is perfectly plain that the observance of Sunday has religious roots and origins. This is equally plain as to the observance of Christmas and Thanksgiving. Is that bad? Are these things not all part of our history, our culture, our heritage, our tradition? Must we give them all up because of a newly found absolutist approach to a problem which cannot possibly be resolved wisely in absolutist terms?

The problem may be illustrated by a recent dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas, in another Sunday law case, where he wrote:[35]

"By what authority can government compel one person not to work on Sunday because the majority of the populace deem Sunday to be a holy day? Moslems may some day control a state legislature. Could they make criminal the opening of a shop on Friday? Would not we Christians firmly believe, if that came to pass, that government had no authority to make us bow to the scruples of the Moslem majority"?

The question is a fair one, but I believe that the justice implies a wrong answer. If I live in a state with a Moslem majority, and it passes such a law—not compelling me to do anything, I ask you to note, but only to refrain from work on a certain day—I would think that the law was appropriate and one which I should obey. Not long ago, I was in Tunisia, a country in which the overwhelming majority of the people are Moslem. While there, I expected to comply with their laws and customs. They are a tolerant people, and did not seek to compel me to participate in any of their religious

---

[27] Ibid. at 252, 253.

[28] Sutherland, "Establishment According to Engel," 76 Harv. L. Rev. 25 (1962). See also Jaffe, "Standing To Secure Judicial Review," 74 Harv. L. Rev. 1265 (1961), 75 Harv. L. Rev. 255 (1962).

[29] *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 423 (1962).

[30] *West Virginia Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

[31] *West Virginia Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

[32] *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 431 (1962).

[33] "Acquainting the student with religious pluralism is part of democratic public education's duty to introduce future citizens to pluralism of all types: economic, political, ethnic, racial, and others. Schooling should enable the student to face the actualities of free society. If instead it gives him only silly, sentimental notions concerning the unity of all Americans he will be an incompetent citizen." Healey, "Jefferson on Religion in Public Education" 270 (1962).

[34] *McGowan* v. *Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420 (1961); *Two Guys from Harrison-Allentown Inc.* v. *McGinley*, 366 U.S. 582 (1961); *Brannfeld* v. *Brown*, 366 U.S. 599 (1961); *Gallagher* v. *Crown Kosher Super Market*, 366 U.S. 617 (1961).

[35] *Arlan's Department Store of Louisville, Inc.*, v. *Kentucky*, —— U.S. —— (1962).

observances. But it would have seemed most inappropriate to me to have taken advantage of their tolerance and to have sought to interfere with their customs simply because they were not mine. While they knelt and prayed in the street at the muezzin's call, I stood respectfully by—with a tourist's interest, no doubt, but also taking advantage of the opportunity to do some thinking of my own. It was quite clear to me that I did not feel religiously oppressed merely because my own freedom of action was slightly interfered with in order that they might have theirs.

A day of rest is very deeply seated in all societies. Generally, as in our culture, it has an origin which is at least partially religious. But it has a wider basis than that. It is also one of those things which is rather good in itself—even the Russians have a common day of rest, and after some experimentation, they have settled on 1 day in 7. And it is a thing, good in itself, which loses much of its good unless it is observed by all on the same basis. If a majority of the people want to observe Sunday as a day on which ordinary work is not performed, even though there may be some religious motivation in picking that day, I find it hard to see that there is anything wrong or oppressive in making that law applicable to all members of the community—as long as the persons who do not care to observe Sunday themselves are not compelled to do anything.

Cannot much the same thing be said for Thanksgiving and Christmas, and Christmas carols in the school, and simple, thoughtfully chosen Bible readings, and Christmas decorations in public places, and all the many other things which are a happy part of the culture and tradition of a large proportion of our society? In Boston, where I live, the Christmas display on the Common is far too brash and gaudy for my taste. Some of my friends irreverently call it the Christorama. It is on public ground, and I assume that it is provided at public expense. But I should think it sheer arrogance on my part to object to it, either on grounds of taste or of expense, as long as it is clear that a large part of my fellow citizens get joy and pleasure and satisfaction from it.

In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities, who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant, too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves, and nothing is done which they cannot wait out, or pass respectfully by, without their own personal participation, if they do not want to give it? Is it not a travesty that we have brought ourselves, through an essentially thought-denying absolutist approach, to the point where such things as chaplains in our prisons, or chapels in our military academies, can be seriously and solemnly raised as threats to the religious freedom which is guaranteed by the 1st amendment—as made applicable to the States, in very general terms, by the 14th amendment? In saying this, I am fully mindful of the rights of those who have or profess no religion, and who are surely entitled to the same respect as anyone else—and should themselves give the same respectful regard to the rights of other citizens, accepting reasonable arrangements made in this area by the majority, with no compulsion on them to participate.

VIII

The Court, of course, is not without its supporters on this matter. To me it is disappointing that so fine a legal scholar as Edmond Cahn has accepted and embraced this view in what seem to me to be extravagant terms. In a recent address he calls the views I am trying to express "the ink eradicator' philosophy." The "immediate objective" of this approach, he says, is "to erase the words of the first amendment from the parchment of our Bill of Rights."[36] Of course this is nonsense, and does not, I feel, with great respect, measure up to what we should expect from Professor Cahn. As I have said, I will not yield to anyone in my belief in and reverence for the first amendment. Nevertheless, accepting it in full, it still has to be construed and applied, with intelligence and judgment, to concrete cases. Professor Cahn chooses to ignore this, although it is the essence of government under law. Professor Cahn says: "We protest that the guarantees of the Bill of Rights are still meaningful, still worth the struggles, sacrifices, and martyrdoms our ancestors underwent for them."[37] Of course we all agree. But does that advance consideration of the problem? We still have to determine the meaning of the Bill of Rights, and its application to actual, practical, human cases. This process is not helped by an absolutist or fundamentalist approach which refuses to consider all factors which are relevant in the situation before the Court.

If any further proof were needed, Mr. Justice Black's assertion that the first amendment makes libel laws unconstitutional would seem to be sufficient. As President Robert K. Carr has said:

"Of what value is free speech to a man to whom others have ceased to listen because of a malicious blackening of his name? Is it quite so easy to conclude, as Justice Black does, that one man's freedom of speech must always take precedence over another man's right to protect his reputation?"[38]

IX

When I planned this paper, I had expected to deal with a number of other areas in which it seems to me that an absolutist brand of thinking has led the Court to some conclusions which may yet be found to be erroneous. Having got myself so much involved in the problems of prayers and religion, I can do no more than suggest the other matters that I had in mind. Three illustrations will suffice to show that the problem of the absolute approach is not limited to the area of religion. The first two of these show, I think, the influence of an absolutist approach to the free speech clause of the first amendment, while the third deals with what I would regard as a creeping absolutism as to the provisions of the Constitution relating to jury trial.

(1) The first topic to which I allude is the question of the power of courts to deal with publications as in contempt of court, when the publications have occurred outside the courtroom. It is well known, of course, that the British courts exercise these powers quite widely, and that publications with respect to pending criminal cases are sharply restricted there. Here we have to reconcile the freedom of the press provisions of the first amendment with the right to a fair trial which is implicit in the provisions of the fifth and sixth amendments. The Supreme Court, however, focusing solely on the first amendment, and applying what appears to me to be an absolutist approach, has held that publications outside the courtroom cannot be punished as contempt.[39] This has been carried to bizarre lengths, in my view, and the result has been seriously to impair the right to obtain a fair trial in this country in many cases.[40]

(2) The Court has understandably had its difficulties in the area of obscene publications. The task of determining the line between permissible publication and those beyond the pale can be largely avoided if one focuses only on a dryly literal interpretation of the "free press" clause of the first amendment. This approach has been urged by Justices Black and Douglas in a dissenting opinion in a recent decision.[41] It is hard to believe that such a result was contemplated by the framers of the first amendment. It is very hard indeed to find it in the language used in the amendment, which surely requires elucidation. Again, I do not yield in my regard for any part of the first amendment. It still seems to me that it requires careful, thoughtful, vital, and not merely mechanical interpretation.

(3) The other illustration I would give is in the area of jury trial. Here, too, in recent years, the Court has taken what seems to me to be an absolutist approach. It is true that the Constitution guarantees trial by jury in civil cases. But it is still necessary to interpret what was meant by trial by jury. At common law, and as understood when the sixth amendment was adopted, this clearly meant trial by jury under the guidance and instructions of the judge, and the Supreme Court has reaffirmed this view in modern times.[42] But the present Supreme Court goes to great lengths to uphold jury verdicts, and virtually eliminates the superintending power of the judge. This new approach of the Supreme Court, applied in the employers' liability, Jones Act, and elsewhere,[43] is not, I believe, sound historically, and is not required by a proper construction of the constitutional provision. It is, instead, as I see it, the consequence of an absolutist view which—as it says "no law" means "no law"—says that "trial by jury" means "trial by jury," without giving consideration or weight to the proper construction and application of that term.

Obviously, my treatment of these questions is inadequate. I mean only to suggest that the absolutist approach has made its way through much of our constitutional law. This is, to me, a serious matter. The absolutist approach involves, I submit, a failure to exercise the responsibilities—and indeed the pains—of judging. By ignoring factors relevant to sound decision, it inevitably leads to wrong results.

---

[36] Cahn, "The Parchment Barriers," 32 American Scholar 21, 36, 37 (1962).

[37] Ibid. at 38.

[38] Carr, "Those Wise Restraints which Make Men Free," in Jones (ed.), The Constitution of the United States, 1787–1962 (University of Pittsburgh, 1962), 39, 44; also in 58 Oberlin Alumni magazine 4, 7 (November 1962).

[39] *Nye* v. *United States*, 313 U.S. 33 (1940); *Times-Mirror Co.* v. *California*, 314 U.S. 252 (1941); *Pennekamp* v. *Florida*, 328 U.S. 331 (1946); *Craig* v. *Harney*, 331 U.S. 367 (1947). See Donnelly and Goldfarb, "Contempt by Publication in the United States," 24 Modern L. Rev. 239 (1961); Goldfarb, "The Constitution and Contempt of Court," 61 Mich. L. Rev. 283 (1962).

[40] *Maryland* v. *Baltimore Radio Show*, 338 U.S. 912 (1950).

[41] *Roth* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 476, 508 (1957). "The first amendment, its prohibition in terms absolute, was designed to preclude courts as well as legislatures from weighing the values of speech against silence." Douglas, J., dissenting, ibid. at 514.

[42] *Herron* v. *Southern Pacific Co.*, 283 U.S. 91, 95 (1931), in which Hughes, C. J., cited and relied on *Capital Traction Co.* v. *Hof*, 174 U.S. 1, 13, 14 (1899).

[43] See, for example, the rather sweeping statements of Justices Black and Douglas, dissenting from the recent order of the Court amending the Rules of Civil Procedure, January 21, 1963.

The taking of extreme positions leads too often to what may be in part self-inflicted wounds, which the Court can ill afford to endure when its task is so difficult at its best. The three dangerous constitutional amendments recently proposed by the Council of State Governments may be cited as examples. Though the forces behind these are clearly diverse and mixed, the influence of absolutist doctrines in the Court should not be overlooked in their evaluation.

This is an area in which, as Professor Kurland has said, the questions are "too frequently ignored by the intellect and resolved by emotion."[44] It is, too, an area in which we are in constant need of light. That light can be provided by painstaking professional and judicial work which seeks to identify and appropriately to evaluate all of the relevant factors in the many difficult problems that come before the Court. Beyond that comes the extraordinarily hard task of judging in the light of all these factors. Under the absolute approach, no light is needed. We look to one text only. There it is: "no law" means "no law." Is this not a delusive way to certainty? On this basis, reason is abandoned. We can be fairly sure that, down that road, "Absolute is in the dark."

[44] Kurland, "Book Review," 30 U. of Chi. L. Rev. 191, 197 (1962).

Fortress America or Isolationism for the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the U.S. News & World Report of March 25, 1963, is most disturbing. On the face it looks as if the administration plan for a Fortress America is a return to the isolationism of the forties except we now face a much more determined and dangerous enemy. There are two aspects of the program as brought out in this article which are alarming:

First. If we pull all of our forces out of Europe and Asia to concentrate on building up our defenses and retaliatory forces on this continent, this will leave Russia free to overrun the rest of the world. Such a plan increases distrust among our allies and could result in leaving us completely surrounded by Communist-controlled nations.

Second. Is this a first step toward setting up a United Nations armed forces? After we have withdrawn all our forces from allied nations, would it not be natural for the clamor to arise for an international police force to which we would turn over our defense?

I would feel easier about this situation, Mr. Speaker, if I were sure we could trust the Kennedy administration, but there has been so much doubletalk from the White House, so much "management" of the news, so much of the newly enunciated policy "that it is proper for a government to lie" that I am concerned about any such drastic move as outlined by the U.S. News & World Report.

The article follows:

FORTRESS AMERICA: LATEST IN DEFENSE IDEAS

(The danger of nuclear holocaust is forcing big changes in U.S. military planning. Nagging troubles with NATO allies add to the problem. All of a sudden it looks to many as if the United States is packing up, getting ready to abandon Western Europe.)

For the past 2 years, radical and far-reaching changes have been underway in U.S. defenses as directed by the White House.

Suddenly, it is found that these changes are creating concern and open distrust among allies in Western Europe—and anxiety among many military men in the Pentagon.

The cause of concern, authorities say, is this: The United States all at once gives the impression of a nation slipping in resolve and seeking to isolate itself from necessary risk and danger in today's world.

This question, in fact, is now being raised in world capitals:

Is the United States, because of fear of being drawn into nuclear war by others, starting to withdraw into a fortress America?

The French high command claims that the United States clearly is withdrawing its nuclear guarantee from Western Europe and will pull out its troops in just a matter of time. That fear is described as being behind President de Gaulle's drive for an independent nuclear force of his own.

Leading military authorities, in Europe and in this country, describe U.S. strategy as moving in four distinct steps:

STEP 1

The ring of forward U.S. bases around Russia, built at tremendous cost and by hard bargaining since World War II, is being dismantled. Nuclear bombers, medium missiles, and some forces are being withdrawn from England, Italy, Turkey, Morocco, Spain, France, Alaska, and Guam. U.S. bombers and their oversea bases, in the new scheme of things, are waning in importance and are on the way out.

STEP 2

Continental Europe is to be denuclearized in two ways, if U.S. plans prevail, to lessen the chance of the United States being drawn into a general atomic holocaust with Russia. First, efforts will be intensified to dissuade the Western Allies from building their own nuclear forces. Second, the United States will cut down sharply the numbers of atomic weapons in the hands of U.S. troops in Europe.

STEP 3

In Europe and around the world, U.S. ground forces and tactical air units are to be gradually withdrawn to U.S. soil. This results partly from U.S. initiative and partly from growing pressures exerted by allies. U.S. treaty commitments will preferably be met in the future by "fire brigade" forces based in this country.

STEP 4

Backbone of U.S. defense, shifting rapidly away from bombers, soon will be nuclear missiles—mainly Minuteman and Polaris—based on U.S. soil or in U.S. submarines—where the President can maintain absolute control, free from political or other interference from allies. From this nuclear fortress, the United States, if attacked, will be able to destroy Russia without using oversea bases.

Those four steps add up to a significant change in U.S. military planning. Military men say it is clear that the whole postwar policy of stationing the main thrust of U.S. forces abroad is in the process of being scrapped.

What is behind that change?

Experts cite a number of reasons. Not only De Gaulle of France, but virtually all of Western Europe, wants to break away from heavy dependence on the United States. Some nations want to build a "third force" between Russia and the United States that would leave the United States no place on the Continent.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has bound the United States closely to Europe, is undergoing a profound change. Some countries are not pulling their weight, as Washington sees it. That is a matter of disillusionment to the United States. The whole idea of NATO is now under serious attack.

Pressure on the United States to reverse its balance-of-payments deficit is growing.

One way to halt the steady outflow of gold is to cut back on U.S. military establishments abroad.

The biggest single reason for change in U.S. planning, however, is the sudden emergence of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

THE BIG KILL

In today's world, in a showdown, nuclear missiles are king. Only two nations share ICBM power: United States and Russia. War between the two would mean between 40 and 120 million dead in each country. Neither can destroy the other without being destroyed in return.

Until very recently, a U.S. commitment to come to the aid of Europe involved only limited risk. Today, as authorities see it, for the United States to get involved in a tactical nuclear war in Europe would mean risking its own total destruction.

America's new strategy is designed to minimize chances of being drawn into a war of nuclear proportions. Some experts claim to see an unspoken understanding between the United States and Russia to avoid a direct nuclear clash of any size anywhere in the world.

Taken together, these reasons have already started a chain of events. Experts describe them as follows:

BASE SHUTDOWNS

The United States moved into 80 major military bases in 25 foreign lands after World War II. These bases served as a potential springboard to carry nuclear attack into the Russian heartland. Their purpose was to deter attack by Russia.

From the start, Communist pressures and nationalist sentiments started eroding the base network. The Air Force was thrown out of its big transport base in Saudi Arabia. It cut back its headquarters in Tripoli. This summer the Air Force will abandon three major Moroccan bases, another decision forced on the United States. In the past, the United States resisted giving up bases. They were considered vital to round out the Nation's strategic defenses.

Now, the United States is pulling out, without being forced. First to be relinquished are bases for B-47 bombers. The Strategic Air Command withdrew the first of these from England in February in a preliminary to a general exodus from a half dozen other countries.

This year, 225 B-47 jet bombers will be retired from the U.S. Air Force, and the whole B-47 fleet of 765 remaining planes will be retired by mid-1965. The rest of the SAC force—630 B-52's and 100 B-58's—will be based on U.S. soil.

DENUCLEARIZED EUROPE

Plans already are in the works to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the hands of U.S. troops in Europe. Those troops are armed with a vast variety of nuclear weapons—carried in planes, as battlefield artillery, aboard ships, and as intermediate-range missiles.

Civilian authorities in the Pentagon are reported to be pushing for a cutback. Their reason: The more nuclear weapons there are in Europe, the greater are the chances of accidental war, or of using those weapons to "escalate" little wars into big ones.

A major cutback is indicated in the number of Davy Crockett nuclear missiles to be assigned to Europe. This is a weapon for individual GI's. Most nuclear weapons in the field are entrusted to officers. In the future, as other battlefield missiles are developed, fewer will go overseas as replacements for older models. The idea is to keep a tighter rein on U.S. nuclear arms.

By April 1, the United States will remove all its intermediate-range missiles from the continent of Europe. The plan is to replace 30 Jupiter missiles in Italy and 15 in Turkey with Polaris missiles in U.S. submarines in the Mediterranean Sea. Sixty other intermediate-range missiles, Thors, are being dismantled and are being removed from England.

SKEPTICS

Gen. Pierre Gallois, well-known military adviser to Charles de Gaulle, told U.S. newsmen that removal of American missiles from Turkey and Italy amounts to disengagement of U.S. forces from Europe. Remarked General Gallois: "To pretend that any new arrangement, such as moving the deterrent to sea, is a way of modernizing the deterrent, is a swindle."

Withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons is regarded as one step to the denuclearization of Europe.

A second is to deter U.S. allies from developing their own independent atomic forces.

The United States, as a counteroffensive to President de Gaulle's go-it-alone nuclear policy, has offered to help provide a nuclear force to be commonly owned and operated by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The American aim, as described by France, is to keep ownership and control where the United States can clearly direct it.

As the cheapest and quickest approach, the U.S. plan calls for a "multilateral force with some 200 Polaris missiles mounted on 25 or more surface ships. The crews would be drawn from several NATO nations, and any participating nation—including the United States—would have the right to veto a firing order.

The U.S. plan, as described by one officer who opposes it, is "simply to clear the Continent of missiles and put them well out to sea. It is a plan to tie up NATO, because with multinational crews and so many fingers on the trigger, you can be reasonably sure no one will ever use those missiles—which is precisely what the United States wants."

Europeans are said to be far from sold on the U.S. plan. Many see it as a way to eat up European resources earmarked for independent nuclear forces, while forcing Europe to continue to rely almost entirely on the United States for the big nuclear decisions.

Senior Allied military men oppose the idea on the same ground they opposed a multilateral NATO ground force a decade ago; they are convinced it will not work out.

On March 13, Livingston Merchant, special representative of the President, wound up a round of talks with Allied leaders on the Polaris-for-NATO plan. Only West Germany, it was reported, was plainly enthusiastic about the idea. In Washington, officials said the plan would be pushed despite opposition.

U.S. WITHDRAWAL

Americans are now serving abroad. With those servicemen are most of the Navy's 450 major warships and at least 2,000 Air Force planes. Half of the Army's 16 combat divisions are in foreign lands. With the troops is a smaller army of civilian employees and 600,000 women and children. This tremendous force is to be cut back, authorities predict, for three main reasons:

(1) To stop the gold outflow. It costs 3 billions a year to maintain U.S. forces abroad. In West Germany alone, 700 millions a year is spent to keep troops ready to defend Western Europe. As a start at cutting expenses, 15,000 U.S. troops have just been brought home from Europe, and plans are in the works to recall another 25,000. That is considered just the beginning.

(2) A desire to streamline. More and more, the idea of a "global strike force" based in the United States is reaching full stature. The plan: Combat equipment is stored at vital spots overseas, but troops are kept at home. If trouble erupts, the equipment is ready for troops rushed from the United States by jet airlift. Jets—the C-135, and soon, the C-141—move troops in a hurry. The C-135 has rotated Army battle groups between points in America and Europe, making the long flight nonstop in 9½ hours.

(3) Pressures from allies. Concern is growing in Washington over future U.S. relations with many of its allies and the chance that new problems may hasten a U.S. withdrawal from overseas.

Portugal's displeasure over U.S. policy in Africa is creating trouble over U.S. base rights in the Azores—site of both air and naval outposts.

The U.S. Navy doubts that it will be able to remain in Port Lyautey, Morocco, after the Air Force moves out of its bases this summer.

Spain wants more economic aid and closer Spanish ties with NATO as a price for further cooperation. The United States has four major air bases in Spain, has spent $2 billion there in the past decade.

Italy is balking over the idea of Polaris submarines' using its ports.

In Great Britain, question arises over the possible rise to power of the Labor Party. How would that affect United States-British joint defense plans?

In France, where the United States withdrew its nuclear bombers in 1960 after a spat with De Gaulle, the course for the future is seen as uneven and difficult.

U.S. leaders are being reminded that American troops and bases, whether in Europe or elsewhere, remain an irritating symbol of a foreign power. The days of the troop contingents and the bases, say many experts, are numbered.

NUCLEAR FORTRESS

This is the missile arsenal now taking shape in the United States:

At land bases are one hundred and twenty-nine long-range Atlas missiles and fifty-four Titan I missiles. Another 54 Titans, the Model II, are now being put in place. The first 60 Minuteman missiles are in "hard" bases in Montana. At sea are 144 Polaris missiles aboard nine nuclear submarines, with a tenth sub, the U.S.S. *Thomas Jefferson*, now going through its final missile-firing trials.

The two solid-fueled missiles—Minuteman and Polaris—have been judged the best money buys by Defense Secretary McNamara and are to be mass-produced for the future. In 3 years, the country will have 950 Minutemen at bases in 5 States, and 656 Polaris missiles on 41 submarines. The Titans will be kept in the U.S. inventory; the Atlas missiles will be retired in time.

It is this new kind of missile power, you are told, that contributes heavily to the idea of the United States being turned into a nuclear fortress.

Against that background, the United States is seen moving further away from direct involvement in European military affairs than at any time since World War II.

Some military leaders, in Europe and in this country, are fearful of the possible consequences.

FREE WORLD ADRIFT

They agree that withdrawal of the United States from oversea bases would help ease tensions with Russia, but claim it would spell the end of the U.S. system of alliances that has held the free world together.

Doubts are expressed by these officials about U.S. ability to react in an emergency, if the cutback continues.

Turkish airfields, for example, were used during the Lebanese crisis of 1958. Authorities question whether the United States once withdrawn from Turkey, would ever go back to Lebanon if it had to spring all the way from the United States. Asked one European officer: Once the United States pulls out, what are the chances of coming back to aid an ally in a local issue, particularly if it knew such aid might risk a nuclear attack on the United States?

SOVIET TAKEOVER?

U.S. military men see still other dangers in a cutback of oversea forces, as now being indicated by civilian officials in the Pentagon. They say wholesale withdrawal from Europe would be taken by Russia as an invitation to overrun the Continent.

Over all, U.S. defense strategy is regarded as going through an awkward period of change. An older "containment" strategy is being discarded and in its place is a substitute that many claim has not yet taken any real shape.

This warning, however, is given by military professionals: If the present trend continues, the result will be a Fortress America strategy of military isolation that could prove costly to both the United States and to Western Europe.

The Power of Prayer and Christian Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the appendix of the RECORD my 20th annual St. Patrick's Day address carried on Cleveland radio stations WERE and WDOK:

THE POWER OF PRAYER AND CHRISTIAN ACTION

St. Patrick's endowment to the Irish race and to all humanity is so rich and so vast that scholars and orators down through the centuries have been recording and relating his life and times with enthusiasm and without pause. It makes little difference that disagreement exists as to the time and place of his birth and death, or that documentary evidence is not now available to confirm all the good and great work of his lifetime. Among mortal men St. Patrick holds a unique place, untarnished by centuries of inquiry, undiminished by the doubts which attach to the legends of time, and unshaken by the eras of disbelief which have disturbed the tranquility of Christendom over the past centuries. The spirit of St. Patrick lives on with the steady sureness of the rise and set of the sun, with the power of the rushing tides which move the seas and with the refreshment of life akin to the spring when so much of God's handiwork is again reborn.

The gifts of St. Patrick to all the human family live on with each generation, because they provide food for the human spirit. The nature of man is unchanging. It is the same today as it was in the days of St. Patrick. We in our times have seen that man lives not by bread alone, as we witness the evil outcomes of a belief that holds the animal desires and needs of man are all that matter. Those evil outcomes today pose a threat to the survival of the entire human family. Atheistic communism is but a part

of that threat. Equally dangerous is the pernicious infection of materialism in Western society, with its false goals and symbols, with its cold detachment from responsibility for the common weal, with its disdain for those human concerns which mark Christian life and its preoccupation with personal gain above all else. The signs of this disintegrating process are many. But the spiritual power of Christianity, upon which Western society has been built, remains strong and restive beneath the thin veneer of contemporary life. We who believe must break through that artificial surface which has fallen upon our civilization. A spiritual rebirth of the Western world is sorely overdue.

Turning to the ways and means through which a spiritual rebirth of the Western World may be launched, we find no shortage of suggestions or remedies. There are no doubt many roads leading to that end. None is short and the one that is sure is marked with dangers, sacrifice, and commitment. That is the road Patrick traveled from his early youth, in his years of preparation to convert pagan Ireland to the cause of Christ, in his tireless mission among the Irish people until his happy death among men.

Two lessons from the life of our patron Saint demonstrate the spiritual power of Christianity. The first is the lesson of prayer and the second is the lesson of Christian action.

It will be recalled that Patrick, as a boy of 16 years, was captured and carried off to slavery in Ireland. Baptized a Christian before his capture, he found the real meaning of his faith during 6 years of captivity. While he ate the bitter bread of bondage in a foreign land, a profound spiritual change came over him. "The Lord," said Saint Patrick in his confessions "opened the sense of my unbelief." The love of God so fully consumed his soul that in a single day or night he would offer a hundred prayers—for strength and deliverance and for the conversion of his captors. He often thought about escape and he longed for his family. But the dangers of escape were many. He did not know the countryside or how to get to the sea. If his master recaptured him it might mean loss of his life. Along the way he could be captured by hostile forces and resold into slavery. A voice came to him in his sleep—"Behold thy ship is ready," heartening him to attempt the perils of escape to a port some 180 miles from his master's house. He escaped avoided all dangers enroute and reached the port to find the ship of his dreams waiting and soon to sail. Applying for service on the ship, he was rebuffed. Patrick was not robust of body and the ship's crew was comprised of sea ruffians. Turning to depart he began to pray and before he had finished the ship's master had a change of heart and called out to him to come aboard. At sea, Patrick tried to convert the members of the crew. Before Patrick reached the safety of a monastery in Europe his trials and dangers were many and the power of prayer was many times demonstrated for him.

But Patrick sought much more than his personal safety. He had set as his goal the life of a missionary to spread the light of Christianity. This required intensive preparation, as Patrick was aware of the shortcomings of his early life, particularly his lack of scholarly training. In the course of his preparations under the tutelage of learned men, he dreamed of his experience in far away Ireland in which a man came to him bearing many letters, handing him one he opened it and it began "We pray thee, holy youth, to come and again walk amongst us as before." It was then that Patrick removed any doubts about his goal to convert the Irish people.

Patrick's wish to return to Ireland as a missionary was not quickly granted. After his ordination there appears to have been some doubts as to the wisdom of his wish as well as his adequacy to fulfill it. Palladius was the first bishop sent to Ireland by authority of Rome. His mission was to administer to the spiritual needs of the small Christian communities then existing in Ireland. There were many doubts held about efforts to convert the entire Irish race, some based upon the fierce character of most tribes, some upon insufficient knowledge about the customs of the people, and others upon the magnitude of the undertaking and the lack of missionaries for the task. Bishop Palladius died after 1 year of work in Ireland and the way was then opened for Patrick to fulfill his mission. Consecrated a bishop, he departed for Ireland with a small band of followers in the year 432. From then on until the death of Patrick, the many lessons of Christian action which he left us were performed on Irish soil.

Patrick, in his mission to the Irish people, maintained a happy balance between prayer and the good works of Christianity in action. He learned from his early youth that prayer and good works were inseparable, that one without the other could not work God's will on earth. Accounts of his missionary life are filled with events marking this happy combination.

Patrick prayed for strength, spiritual as well as physical, to carry on his work. He needed both in abundance as he traveled the hostile countryside, filled with the hardships and fraught with dangers from tribal chiefs and lesser kings and their followers.

Patrick prayed for courage to face the dangerous tests of his mission. To convert the Irish he had decided on the bold course of confronting the tribal chiefs and lesser kings with the message of Christianity. Patrick dared to accept the greatest risks as necessary to the success of his mission. His life was in the balance on many occasions, in the test with the Druids, in the exchange with the tribal magicians, and in his challenges to the superstitions and false idols of the pagan way of life.

Patrick prayed for wisdom to understand the strange ways of the many Irish tribes, to understand their customs, their legends, the background of their particular places of ceremonial worship, and their fierce spirit. His understanding of all these things made easier his mission of conversion and on occasion saved his life and the lives of his followers. By the use of reason and the sincerity of his good example, he changed ancient ways without offending those attached to them.

Patrick prayed for the gift of eloquence in bringing the message of Christ to a people set in their ways and not easy to convince. And his eloquence in support of the way, the truth, and the light was so great as to leave this blessing as a dominant trait of the sons and daughters of Ireland in every generation.

Patrick prayed for the virtue of patience and in his mission he was patient with all and everything except evil. Evil was the handiwork of the Devil and Patrick could have no patience with the Devil or any of his works. He did not believe in the peaceful coexistence of good and evil. How well he understood that one or the other must triumph. His victory was the triumph over evil.

Patrick prayed for fortitude to persevere in all trial and suffering, in times of temptation, in situations of seemingly hopeless odds, and in the loneliness that so often attended his role as shepherd of his flock. Fortitude and perseverance were strong in the works of Patrick. He could not be deterred from his mission. Setbacks were regarded as but a test for more important tests to come. Success was accepted as a sign that he must redouble his efforts.

It is accurate to conclude that Patrick prayed for the opportunity to prove himself a strong and unyielding soldier in the army of Christ. How else can we explain his readiness to give his life so that the teachings of Christ might be brought to the people of Ireland, living in what was then regarded as the most distant land of the known world? He never sought the easy way, but always the right way. He never held to the warmth and comfort of the hearth because his home was wherever his holy mission took him, always ready to carry the message of Christianity into the contest with pagan beliefs, customs, and traditions.

Patrick was more than a true and tried soldier in the army of Christ. His place in history as a bold and determined leader of men to a life of eternal happiness is assured. Patrick did not seek this reward. Fifteen centuries of Christendom have conferred it upon him. Patron saint of the Irish, St. Patrick is beloved and honored by all who believe that life does not end in this world and that the life of the spirit is eternal.

We have learned that the power of prayer can move mountains, light the darkest skies, calm the most violent storms, and heal the gravest wounds. But St. Patrick has taught us that prayer, accompanied by Christian action, in a spirit of total commitment, can change the world. And change the world we must, through a vigorous rebirth of Christian life.

Few of us can hope to emulate the life of St. Patrick in our journey through this world. But all of us can aspire to follow in his well marked journey those footsteps which come closest to our individual station in life, to our individual capacities, and to the opportunities which come to each and every one of us in our daily lives. The true Christian can not detach himself from responsibility for the common good. Christian life must be filled with a warm and human concern for the misfortunes and needs of our fellowmen. As we pass along the road of life we must be aware of those who fall by the wayside and whose cries for help are weak or timid. And like Simon of Cyrene we must be ready to share the burdens of others less fortunate. For this is the fulfillment of Christian life in the spirit of good St. Patrick which can change the world of our times.

Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my colleagues in saluting the action taken by the House in unanimously passing H.R. 274 on March 4, 1963. This resolution embodies the high esteem and respect which all Members have for Mr. Lewis Deschler who in his role as Parliamentarian, impartially advises the Speaker and other Members on the innumerable precedents and the intricate operation of this body's rules. For 35 years Mr. Deschler has rendered invaluable and inestimable service to

many Speakers, Members and indeed to the whole Nation. All of us owe a true debt of gratitude to this gentleman, and I am delighted that the House has provided an opportunity for us to express it. The honest confidence we place in this able and learned gentleman is a key factor in contributing to the smooth and orderly function of this great legislative body. Mr. Speaker it is my fond hope that Mr. Deschler will serve us for many more years.

Speech by Richard M. Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by Mr. Richard M. Jackson, president of Seaboard World Airlines, recently presented to the New York Society of Security Analysts:

SPEECH BY RICHARD M. JACKSON

Seaboard World Airlines is the smallest of the three certificated U.S. airlines flying scheduled services between the United States and Europe. The other two are the giant companies, Pan American Airways and Trans-World Airways, which are franchised to carry all types of traffic—passengers, cargo, and mail.

Seaboard World is currently franchised to carry only cargo and mail on scheduled flights and passengers on charter flights. Seaboard's routes extend from New York to 7 countries and 17 cities in northern Europe. Seaboard World has approximately 900 employees, and owns about $40 million worth of airplanes.

The recent financial history of Seaboard World, if not tumultuous, has certainly been more than mildly exciting. The company was close to financial failure in 1960, as a result of which there was a management and financial reorganization late in that year. Further financial adjustments were made in 1961.

In the 5 years from 1957 through 1961, losses before special items totaled $15.5 million on gross revenues of $105 million, or a loss ratio of about 15 percent on sales.

The trend was actually worse during the last 2 of these years with a loss ratio of 23 percent.

The year 1962 was the year of change. On total sales of about $23 million, the company will show a profit of approximately $900,000 or 4 percent on gross.

However, for the last 6 months of 1962 the profit ratio was 12 percent on gross revenues, and net earnings for the period were 46 cents per share on 3.5 million shares outstanding at yearend.

The obvious questions at this point are: 1. What caused this dramatic change? 2. Are the causes likely to have long-term effects?

The causes are highlighted by the fact that in 1962 versus 1961 we grossed $2.1 million more of revenue with $3.5 million less expense.

Let us look at the revenues first. Commercial freight revenues increased by 30 percent, due to progressively effective sales efforts in retailing and wholesaling of our product. This more than offset a decrease of 18 percent in mail revenues. Total scheduled service revenues increased 11 percent to a record total of $14.4 million. Charter and other revenues increased 8 percent to $8.6 million.

The changes in the cost structure are as easy to define. The year 1962 marked the first full year of operation of our new fleet of CL-44 swingtail airplanes. The year started with four of these huge 30-ton payload airplanes on hand, and by July the fleet had grown to seven. The improved economics of this airplane over its predecessor Constellation are best described by saying that the flight cost per mile of the two different airplanes is about the same, but the CL-44 has a payload capacity 66 percent larger. We were able, therefore, to obtain more revenue on fewer flights at less cost. Substantial reductions in the overhead were also made during the year, and our percentage of overhead to direct cost as defined by the CAB, is only 67 percent.

Summing up the $5.6 million improvement in P. & L. in 1962 over 1961, approximately one-half is due to the lower operating cost of the new airplanes and the other one-half is ascribable to management's achievements in building revenues and decreasing controllable costs.

The hackneyed phrase about turning the corner would seem to have applied to us. But, we all have turned corners before and have learned that other corners remain ahead to be turned. What is likely to lie ahead for Seaboard World?

The ratio of our business today is about 50 to 50 military charters versus scheduled service revenues. This compares favorably with ratios of over 75 to 25 for the domestic cargo lines. It is also interesting to note that even PAA, with its far wider commercial franchise, derives some 20 to 25 percent of its gross revenues from Government business, including nontransport type activities.

The objective of Seaboard World is to reduce its reliance on military charter revenues by gradually increasing the percentage of scheduled operation revenues to the whole. This does not mean we are looking for less military business, but rather that we are concentrating on increasing our other business. We also have recommended to the Government that reduction in reliance on military business be recognized as a credit factor in the selection of contract award winners.

We believe that Seaboard World's completely modern fleet of turbine-powered, long-range, heavy-lift airplanes; which are convertible to or from passenger cabin configuration in a few hours, coupled with our high safety and performance record, will continue to give us a high rank in eligibility for MATS awards in future years.

The common carriage half of our business is transported on approximately twice daily scheduled service across the North Atlantic. The profitability of these common carriage operations can be measured in terms of load factor and load mix. Load factor is expressed as a percentage of the total payload weight capacity used. Seaboard World's load factors for the last 6 months of 1962 were 86 percent eastbound and 75 percent westbound. This illustrates the fact that our sales program involves directional selling to yield the highest possible load factor in both directions. We have been quite successful in this respect. The load mix or average payload yield varies widely with the type of revenue carried. For example, highly rated material, such as furs and airmail, yield over $1 per pound on our route. On the other extreme is military impedimenta at 30 cents per pound. Theoretically, then, a full CL-44 load of 60,000 pounds at a 100 percent load factor could yield anything between $18,000 and $60,000 in gross revenues depending on the mix. This graphically explains why load factors alone do not tell the profitability story in air cargo operations.

Earlier in this talk I mentioned the terms "retailing" and "wholesaling" of our product.

By "retailing" I mean the normal sale to a shipper of air transportation for a certain weight of cargo at the appropriate common carriage rate.

By "wholesaling" I mean two things: (1) Development of large-volume transatlantic airfreight through large-volume discounts which will become effective April 1, 1963, and (2) our offer to other transportation companies to act as wholesaler for them by selling to them a fixed amount of capacity, which they treat as their own, and which they in turn retail to the shippers.

In the first type of wholesaling, we have had to convince our fellow airlines in traffic conference meetings to arrange the rate structure so as to attract the large-volume shipper and freight forwarder. This has been a long process, but we are gradually succeeding, as volume rates, on the average, are going down.

This brings me to the second category of wholesaling. Seaboard World Airlines and the German Airline Lufthansa have pioneered a new form of air cargo wholesaling, which we refer to as a blocked space agreement. In this arrangement Lufthansa can retail the advantages of the CL-44 to its shippers because Lufthansa purchased from us as wholesaler 20,000 pounds of capacity on each flight six nights a week in both directions between New York and Frankfurt. The contract with Lufthansa has produced about $2.5 million of revenue for Seaboard World in 1962, and the agreement runs to the end of 1963, with an option for Lufthansa to extend it to the end of 1965.

The blocked-space principle makes a lot of economic sense for both parties concerned. The buyer of the space acquires daily frequency on the fastest all-cargo service in amounts equivalent to small airplane capacity, but at a cost achievable only by the most modern large cargo airplane. The seller of the space obtains guaranteed payment for space which he otherwise might not sell. I often think of this program as the joint sharing of the use and costs of the most efficient new pipeline across the ocean. Few can afford to build their own pipeline for their relatively low volume of traffic, and fewer should do so if one that is already built is available for their use at cost. Our company is negotiating with other airlines for expansion of this blocked space program.

The latest statistics for 1962, through October, of transatlantic airfreight tons carried rank the first six carriers by percentage participation in the market as follows: 1. Seaboard World Airlines 21 percent; 2. Pan American World Airways, 20 percent; 3. KLM Royal Dutch Airlines, 12 percent; 4. Trans World Airlines, 8 percent; 5. Air France, 7 percent; 6. British Oversea Airways Corp., 6 percent. The remaining 26 percent is spread among the 10 other transatlantic scheduled airlines. These figures represent total airfreight carried in both scheduled and chartered flights by both passenger and all-cargo airplanes.

The all-cargo airplanes of the various airlines carried approximately one-half of the total airfreight tonnage, and, of this amount, Seaboard World carried 42 percent.

What is Seaboard World's future with respect to the retailing of commercial airfreight? The answer to this question depends on the size and growth potential of the market and Seaboard World's percentage participation in it.

The size of the North Atlantic cargo market is today still small—in the neighborhood of $75 million a year. Its growth rate has averaged more than 20 percent a year during the last decade, and 30 percent a year during the past 3 years. Quoting Professor Brewer of the University of Washington,

"This dramatic growth has resulted in very little penetration of the traffic that is considered to be air potential for air carriers operating over this route in the future. As a result, the development of the North Atlantic aircargo industry is just beginning." He goes on to say "Aircargo traffic over the North Atlantic will grow at an average annual rate of 25 to 36 percent during the next 3 years, after which the percentage rate of growth will be slightly lower. The industry will move ahead at an average annual rate in excess of 20 percent a year during the next 15 years."

The European Common Market, our own Trade Expansion Act, and the approaching equalization of social and commercial standards between the United States and Europe all are potent factors in the future growth of trade across the Atlantic. Aircargo becomes profitable only when the carrier has a good load in both directions. Routes connecting an industrialized area with an agricultural area are notoriously poor for aircargo, because generally only the industrial products bear a high enough value to fly. In the transatlantic airfreight market, however, the huge, highly industrialized complexes of Europe and the United States anchor down both ends of the best aircargo route in the world. We in Seaboard World intend not only to hold, but to improve, our position in this market.

In the light of recent developments in the competitive future of U.S. airlines on the North Atlantic routes, and, of course, I am referring to the published plans for merger of PAA and TWA, some passing comments from the only potential outside U.S. survivor of this fusion are appropriate.

The principal PAA–TWA argument that the merger should be approved in order to raise the U.S.-flag carriers' participation in the market from 34 percent to the neighborhood of 60 percent, because approximately that percentage of the travelers are Americans, is sheer bunkum. These poor, misguided American travelers are flying on the airline of their choice, which apparently half the time does not mean PAA or TWA. Is it reasonable to argue that the Government must reduce the American travelers' choice of U.S. airlines from two to one in order to increase the number of travelers selecting a U.S. carrier? If this is logic, it escapes me.

Furthermore, commercial history shows that the merger of competing firms generally produces less total sales than the sum of the previous two. The merged companies may become more profitable due to cost reductions, but the revenues are usually lower.

A cogent precedent for this has already occurred in the North Atlantic U.S. airline system, where the merger of PAA and AOA achieved a lower participation in the market than the sum of the individual carriers before the merger.

In the face of this precedent even involving the very carrier whose name is to survive in this case, it seems likely that this proposed merger will actually reduce U.S.-flag participation in the world's most important airline market. Similarly and resulting therefrom, the claim that the merger will significantly reduce the serious drain on the U.S. supply of gold, etc., balance of payments, etc. is also likely to backfire.

The normal way for a commercial enterprise to increase its share of the market is to improve its sales and services, which both of these carriers have had ample opportunity to do. In fact, that is exactly what their foreign competitors have done, to the supposed detriment of the two U.S. carriers. This brings up a pertinent question of whether these two carriers are really competitively sick or whether it is just a case of hypochondria over inflated images of their proper share of the market.

The logic of merging to save the expenses of duplicate services and facilities does not escape me, and if this were the only criterion, the merger should be approved. However, the public interest must be served ahead of private interests, and the PAA/TWA merger, as proposed, is not in the public interest for the following reasons:

1. The classic anti-monopoly arguments apply to this case even though competing service is available on foreign flag carriers because of the oft-quoted fact that the American travelers constitute two-thirds of the market, and the market is huge in terms of dollars—over 500 million a year. The evils of monopoly would certainly be levied on the enormous numbers of U.S. citizens who would have only one choice of a U.S. airline and whose natural inclination would be to choose their own flag carrier. If this argument is not accepted, and U.S. citizens are expected to have no innate preference for a U.S.-flag operator, then the stated purpose of the merger to increase U.S. participation in the market is invalid. Monopoly of a U.S. carrier on a route should be considered only when the size of the market is so small as to jeopardize profitable operations of two carriers. Nothing could be further from the truth with respect to the North Atlantic passenger market.

2. Approval of the merger, as proposed, is not in the public interest because the U.S. Government would lose its ability to measure performance and take corrective action in the areas of subsidy eligibility, mail service, defense needs, and international ratemaking. These are vital factors affecting the public interest which cannot be measured by observing foreign airlines and cannot be entrusted to one U.S. commercial carrier. Let me say this—if it is decided that one airline organization should represent the U.S. Government and its 180 million citizens in foreign air service over the world's major passenger routes (and I hope this decision does not occur) then I for one would advocate nationalization of that company as being in the best interests of the public. There is obviously a point beyond which a privately owned commercial entity can properly represent or be controlled by the Nation it supposedly serves, and a privately owned U.S. chosen-instrument airline on the North Atlantic is well beyond that point. This is not a radical idea, since PAA's and TWA's principal passenger competitors are nationalized foreign-flag airlines, to which they ascribe devastating competitive abilities.

3. Approval of the merger, as proposed, would not be in the public interest because of the potentially severe adverse economic impact on Seaboard World Airlines. The merged carrier with its own domestic feeder and enlarged foreign feeder systems could control traffic which today Seaboard World can compete for at Seaboard World's coastal gateways. The merger carrier would be able to use its passenger monopoly position by means of interline and other arrangements to attempt to bar Seaboard World from a substantial part of its current market.

I think it is quite clear that there is substantial question about the merits of the PAA/TWA merger as it is proposed.

Is it possible to add or subtract something to or from the present plan to make it more acceptable to our national objectives and international airline system?

I think the answer is "Yes" provided that:

a. The American public is not deprived of a choice of at least two U.S.-flag carriers on the world's most valuable route.

b. The U.S. Government is not deprived of a second U.S. passenger carrier to use as a yardstick to measure the large carrier's performance as a national instrument.

c. The surviving U.S. international cargo competitor is strengthened to protect it from the pooled competitive advantages of the large carrier.

Perhaps you have guessed the made to order answer on all three counts. It is the certification of Seaboard World Airlines to carry passengers on the North Atlantic route.

Would this not create another TWA which we have just laboriously eliminated? The answer is "No," because Seaboard World has little desire or chance of growing to the size of TWA in the passenger market. Seaboard World would become a yardstick competitor and not a huge, almost equal, competitive force.

Could Seaboard World effectively compete in the passenger market with the merged carriers in addition to the foreign flags? The answer is "Yes" and is proven by Seaboard World's ability to effectively compete in the cargo market with all of these same carriers.

Does Seaboard World have the experience and qualifications for the job? The answer again is "Yes," since for many years, in addition to its cargo operations, Seaboard World has transported tens of thousands of passengers on full-plane charters between the United States and Europe. Seaboard World has the passenger and North Atlantic route experience, and the experienced personnel, communications, and management to do the job.

Does any other U.S. airline fill the bill of small size, certificated route experience on the North Atlantic, and proven ability to compete with all North Atlantic operators? The answer is clearly "No."

To conclude, I would like to reiterate that I believe Seaboard World Airlines has turned a major corner in its corporate history. The company has a new lease on life, and is in a good position to grow and thrive on the enormous potential of the North Atlantic air cargo industry.

The proposed merger of Seaboard World's two U.S. competitors, as it stands, would be against the public interest and potentially harmful to Seaboard World Airlines. However, we have full confidence that the U.S. Government, in considering the interests of the national transportation system and the health and growth of the air transport industry, will not approve such a merger unless Seaboard World Airlines also is strengthened to allow it to compete and to serve as a competitive spur and a yardstick for American free competitive enterprise.

Connecticut Pioneers in Atomic Power for Peaceful Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1963, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission in Washington announced that it had approved proposals for the construction of large nuclear power plants in Connecticut and California. The Connecticut plant is to be located at Haddam Neck, on the east bank of the Connecticut River in Middlesex County, which is in my congressional district.

This is important news for the whole country, the significance of which should not be overlooked. It constitutes a major step in the direction of atomic

power production for peaceful use and of direct benefit to millions of people. Although there are several atomic-powered electric plants in operation in the country now, most of these are of relatively small production of 40,000 to 60,000 kilowatts and only two that are between 200,000 to 225,000 kilowatt plants.

The Connecticut plant will have a 490-000 kilowatt capacity and will be the largest plant of its kind in the Nation when it is completed in 1967. The estimated cost is around $80 million. It should be noted that 12 New England electric utility companies have combined resources to form the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co., which will construct and supervise the plant.

We in Connecticut are very proud of the fact that our State can participate in such an important pioneering effort for the benefit of our people and those in the neighboring States.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the announcement of the Atomic Energy Commission of March 5, and also an article by John Chamberlain published in the Norwich, Conn., Bulletin of March 18, 1963, entitled "Atomic Power in Connecticut." They are as follows:

TWO NUCLEAR PLANT PROPOSALS ACCEPTED FOR NEGOTIATION OF CONTRACT ARRANGEMENTS

Two proposals submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission for construction of large nuclear power plants have been accepted as the bases for negotiation of contract arrangements.

The proposals, from the city of Los Angeles and the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co., Hartford, were submitted in response to an invitation issued last August by the AEC under the modified third round of its power demonstration reactor program. Both utilities propose to complete construction in 1967 of 490,000 gross electrical kilowatt plants with pressurized water reactors. The Los Angeles plant would be located in Corral Canyon near Malibu Beach and the Connecticut plant at Haddam Neck on the east bank of the Connecticut River.

Connecticut Yankee has requested $7,035,-000 for design assistance and waiver of fuel use charges valued at $7,145,000. The city of Los Angeles has requested $9,948,200 for design assistance and waiver of fuel use charges valued at $8,200,000.

First consideration for negotiation of contract arrangements will be given to the Connecticut Yankee proposal because of the smaller amount of financial assistance requested and the availability of modified third round funds for the proposed project.

Acceptance of the Los Angeles proposal is subject to availability of modified third-round funds in addition to funds for the Connecticut proposal.

The AEC plans to complete negotiation of the bases for contract arrangements by March 29. It will then submit the arrangements to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of the Congress for review before negotiating contracts for the projects.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, Mar. 18, 1963]

ATOMIC POWER IN CONNECTICUT

(by John Chamberlain)

At Haddam Neck, a quiet point on the lower Connecticut River in a backwater region once dismissed by Mark Twain as "Haddam, East Haddam, South Haddam, wish-the-Devil-had-'em," the latest thing in modern industrial science is about to be reared—an $80-million, atom-powered generating station that will produce electricity at a 5 to 6 mill per kilowatt-hour cost that is competitive with the plants that burn coal or oil.

This is big news, a portent which indicates that the long-promised breakthrough in atomic power electrical production has finally occurred. It has come far more quickly than anyone had reason to expect 5 years ago, when the first atom-powered plant in Shippingport, Pa., was clumsily turning out electric current at a 50-mil-per-kilowatt-hour cost.

The great development has caught the Nation unaware because it has had its eyes and ears glued elsewhere. In the early 1950's everybody was talking about the peacetime promises of atomic power, but progress seemed painfully slow. Private investment, frightened by the cost of atomic equipment and dubious about the ability of investor-owned companies to compete with Government plants supported by the Nation's power to tax, shied off from taking the tremendous risks involved in experimental power reactors. And the general public, thinking the whole business a mirage, turned its attention to missiles, to space capsules, and to Polaris-carrying atomic submarines. A landing on the moon actually seemed closer for a while than cheap electric power from atomic fission.

A JOINT VENTURE

The new atom-powered station at Haddam Neck in Connecticut, a joint venture in which 12 New England electric utility companies are interested, won't be in operation before 1967. But its success, according to those who are putting up the cash for it, is a foregone conclusion. The 12 New England companies that have formed the so-called Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co., have the experience of the Yankee Atomic Electric Co., of Rowe, Mass., to go by. The atomic-powered plant at Rowe was, as the Atomic Energy Commission put it, the "nuclear success story of 1961," and the engineering group that built the Massachusetts nuclear reactor has been engaged to supervise the construction of the station at Haddam Neck.

OTHER PLANTS OPERATING

As of this moment, a number of atomic-powered electrical plants are in operation throughout the United States. Besides the original one at Shippingport, Pa., a 60,000-kilowatt plant, there are the 208,000-kilowatt Dresden Nuclear Power plant, owned by Commonwealth Edison of Chicago; the 161,000-kilowatt Yankee plant at Rowe, Mass., Consolidated Edison's 225,000-kilowat plant at Indian Point, N.Y.; and the 47,800-kilowatt Big Rock plant at Charlevoix, Mich. Other plants are scheduled to deliver their first atomic-generated electrical power in 1963. These include the 60,900-kilowatt Enrico Fermi plant at Lagoona Beach, Mich., sponsored by the Detroit Edison Co. and others; the Humboldt Bay Power Co., 48,000-kilowatt plant at Eureka, Calif., and the 58,000 kilowatt Pathfinder plant at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. For 1964 the 40,000-kilowatt Peach Bottom, Pa., plant will be ready.

Though they are impressive enough, most of these are relatively smalltime stuff when compared with the plant that will be coming into operation in the late 1960's. The Haddam Neck station will have a 500,000-kilowatt capacity. The Bodega Bay atomic plant in California, a development of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., will be producing 313,000 kilowatts by 1966. Los Angeles promises a 400,000-kilowatt plant. Southern California Edison is taking the lead in building a 365,000-kilowatt station near San Diego. The new plants are noticeably going up where coal transportation costs are high.

So the brave new world of atomic power production is coming fast upon us. It has all happened while we were literally craning our necks at the skies. It has many ramifications, some of them rather touchy: For example, the problem of writing insurance against an atomic power accident is not easily surmounted. But that is something for another column.

Retardation: A Matter of National Interest Which Deserves Our Maximum Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, one of our major concerns in this session of Congress must be a program to help solve a major problem facing the country today. We all are becoming familiar with the great problems of the mentally retarded. We know that mental retardation continues as a major problem to this Nation, socially and economically. We know that while only 4 percent of the mentally retarded are confined to institutions, their care costs relatives and communities some $300 million annually. Additional amounts are required for the construction of facilities for custodial and educational purposes. These costs amount to an additional $1 billion per year or more. We know, Mr. Speaker, that about 3 percent of the population of this Nation are persons having significant difficulties in adapting adequately to their environment. Based on this figure of 3 percent, approximately 126,000 children born each year will be classified as mentally retarded. Of this group, 110,000 will suffer mild retardation which can, with special training and assistance, be reduced, enabling them to acquire limited job skills and achieve a certain independence in the community. The remaining children in the group classified as mentally retarded will range from severe retardation to moderate retardation, for which additional services are required. As a nation we were slow in recognizing the problem and attempts at a solution. However, since 1950, interest in the problem of mental retardation has grown very rapidly. Foundations, parents groups, professional groups, and members of legislative bodies have stimulated activity in this field when they became convinced of the urgent need for some solution to the problem. I feel it timely, Mr. Speaker, at this time, to emphasize the part taken by the Federal Government in this important work. I would like to review the activities of the administration in studying the problem, discovering its scope, and planning its solution.

I. THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST STATEMENT, OCTOBER 11, 1961

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the President's message of October 11, 1961, calling for a national plan in mental retardation. The President expressed a deep

concern over the Nation's failure to act to solve the problems of the mentally retarded. He defined mental retardation as a "condition resulting from a basic abnormality of the human mind." He recognized mental retardation as a symptom of a disease, rather than a disease itself.

The President reviewed the scope of the problem indicating that "mental retardation is a serious personal matter to at least 1 out of every 12 people." He indicated that by 1970 "we will have at least 1 million more retarded persons than there are at present." After referring to the birth rate of mentally retarded children the President said:

This is a national problem and it requires a national solution.

The President went on to indicate the financial hardships to the families of the mentally retarded and the emotional strain suffered by the retarded child in trying to cope with modern society. He stated that we must act nationally to alleviate the problems of the mentally retarded. We owe it to them as individuals and to ourselves as a Nation.

The President indicated that the effort to help the mentally retarded at that time took six basic forms:

First. Diagnostic and clinical services for the retarded were being expanded.

Second. An increase in beds in residential institutions.

Third. An increase in the number of special education classes.

Fourth. Parent counseling was conducted by professional persons in the field.

Fifth. Child welfare agencies were attempting to meet some of the needs.

Sixth. Vocational centers to prepare the child for a useful life were established.

The President in his first statement went on to say that although the effort was being made along the foregoing lines, "the central problem remains unsolved, for the causes and treatment of mental retardation are largely untouched." He therefore called together a panel of outstanding professional people to prescribe a program of action. The activities of the panel were directed generally to "the adequacy of existing programs and the possibilities for greater utilization of current knowledge." More specifically the President instructed the panel to review and make recommendations with regard to—

First. The personnel required to do the job.

Second. The areas of concern that offer the best hope of success and the means necessary to encourage activity in the area.

Third. Present programs of treatment, education, and rehabilitation.

Fourth. Unity faction between Federal and State Governments and private resources.

II. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PANEL ON MENTAL RETARDATION, OCTOBER 1962

The President's Panel, chaired by Hon. Leonard W. Mayo, made its 194-page report to the President in October 1962. After introductory remarks on the nature and effects of mental retardation, the panel made eight recommendations which it discussed in the report:

1. Research in the causes of retardation and in methods of care, rehabilitation, and learning.

2. Preventative health measures including (a) a greatly strengthened program of maternal and infant care directed first at the centers of population where prematurity and the rate of damaged children are high; (b) protection against such known hazard to pregnancy as radiation and harmful drugs; and (c) extended diagnostic and screening services.

3. Strengthened educational programs generally and extended and enriched programs of special education in public and private schools closely coordinated with vocational guidance, vocational rehabilitation, and specific training and preparation for employment, education for the adult mentally retarded, and workshops geared to their needs.

4. More comprehensive and improved clinical and social services.

5. Improved methods and facilities for care, with emphasis on the home and the development of a wide range of local community facilities.

6. A new legal, as well as social, concept of the retarded, including protection of their rights, life guardianship provisions when needed, an enlightened attitude on the part of the law and the courts, and clarification of the theory of responsibility in criminal acts.

7. Helping overcome the serious problems of manpower as they affect the entire field of science and every type of service through extended programs of recruiting with fellowships, and increased opportunities for graduate students and those preparing for the professions to observe and learn at first hand about the phenomenon of retardation. Because there will never be a fully adequate supply of personnel in this field and for other cogent reasons, the panel has emphasized the need for more volunteers in health, recreation, and welfare activities, and for a Domestic Peace Corps to stimulate voluntary service.

8. Programs of education and information to increase public awareness of the problem of mental retardation.

III. THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

For the first time in our history the President sent a special message to Congress on the problems of mental retardation and mental illness. He suggested a threefold attack on these crucial problems:

First. Discover the cause and eradicate.

Second. Strengthen the skilled manpower and resources of knowledge necessary to sustain the attack.

Third. Strengthen the programs and facilities serving the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

With these objectives in mind the President suggested a new approach, "designed, in large measure, to use Federal resources to stimulate State, local and private action."

To prevent the increase of mental retardation, the President recommended a 5-year program to stimulate State and local activity to "plan, initiate and develop comprehensive maternity and child health care service programs" which would aid families unable to afford needed medical care. To further aid to reduce the effect of mental retardation, the President suggested doubling the existing $25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child health, using a significant portion for the mentally retarded. I suggest that the Congress should promptly and fully support this recommendation. Further, the President emphasized the need for community facilities and services for the mentally retarded. The President suggested grants to be awarded to the States on a selective basis to give every State an opportunity to begin a well organized, comprehensive program to meet the needs of the mentally retarded. The President urged the granting of Federal funds for the construction of facilities for first, inpatient clinical units in which specialists on mental retardation would serve; second, outpatient clinics including facilities for special treatment; and third, "satellite" clinics in outlying cities for treatment of the mentally retarded.

Finally to promote research the President suggested "legislation to authorize the establishment of centers for research on human development including the training of scientific personnel."

The President urged action in his recommendations stating the intention to promote, "to the best of our ability and by all possible and appropriate means—the mental and physical health of all our citizens."

IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed to the Congress a program responsive to the President's special message of February 5, 1963 and the Report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. The program will cost $204,723,000 for fiscal year 1964 an increase of $76,219,000 over the program for fiscal year 1963. Through the enactment of this program, expanded activities would be permitted by the Public Health Service through the National Institutes of Health; through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; through the Bureau of State Services; through the Children's Bureau; through the Office of Education and through the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. The emphasis in all of the foregoing units would be on research development with a view to studying the scope of the problem and possible solutions.

V. THE CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, I know every Member of this distinguished body is concerned with the problem of mental retardation and is desirous of doing everything possible to solve what the President has correctly called a national problem. The maternal and child health and mental retardation planning admendment of 1963, known as H.R. 3386, was introduced by my distinguished colleague, Representative WILBUR MILLS and on the Senate side by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Mr. RIBICOFF (S. 1072). This bill proposes to accomplish the following:

First. Project grants to the States to pay for comprehensive State and community action on mental retardation.

Second. Project grants for comprehensive maternity care—including in-

fant care after childbirth—for women in low-income groups among whom there is a high incidence of births of children who are mentally retarded. This would be a 5-year program of project grants in which the Federal share would be up to 75 percent. The program would be administered by the Children's Bureau, under a proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

Third. An expansion of both the maternal and child health program, and the crippled children's program of the Children's Bureau from the current $25 million annually for each program to an ultimate $50 million annually after 7 years. Under the President's budget for fiscal 1964 at least $1 million would be used specifically for mental retardation activities in these two programs.

Fourth. A new research program of the Children's Bureau authorizing grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Of the recommended first year appropirations of $2.1 million it is expected that about $500,000 will be used for research in the field of mental retardation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I recall at this time that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has introduced in the Senate bills to provide funds for the construction of mental retardation research centers and the construction of facilities for the care, treatment, and training of the mentally retarded—S. 755 and S. 756—and a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which would provide Federal assistance for service to the mentally retarded and others whose vocational rehabilitation potential is difficult to determine (S. 968).

Mr. Speaker, I say the action of the President in addressing himself to this problem early in his first term is commendable. The action taken at that time in appointing the panel of distinguished citizens resulted in a comprehensive study of the problem and recommendations which the President could use as a basis for the special message on this national problem. The bills now before this distinguished body which I have briefly reviewed indicate the beginning of Federal action to alleviate the problem. I look for continued action in this field, constant attention to this grave problem, and a day when this national problem will be measurably alleviated.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to introduce legislation which will further treat with this subject. I have used as a basis the clear way of progress already made in an area once considered hopeless. I am indebted for suggestions to such groups as the Guild for Exceptional Children, from my own district who are doing much fine work in this field. I trust that Members of this House will support pending legislation and the bills I have briefly made reference to. For each Member knows that any delay on our part will result in increased suffering among what I have often called "our greatest asset"—the Nation's young and their dedicated and loving parents.

For those who wish to go into this subject in depth, I suggest the following publications:

"A Proposed Program for National Action To Combat Mental Retardation"—The President's Panel on Mental Retardation, October 1962.

"First National Report on Patients of Mental Health Clinics"—Anita K. Bahn, B.A.; and Vivian B. Norman, B.S.

"A Proposed Program To Combat Mental Retardation"—Rudolf P. Hornuth.

"Preparations of Mentally Retarded Youth for Gainful Employment"—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1959, No. 25.

"Research Relating to Mentally Retarded Children"—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1960.

"The Mentally Retarded Child at Home"—Laura L. Dittmann, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

President Speaks to Advertising Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an Associated Press dispatch containing excerpts of President Kennedy's recent remarks to the Advertising Council in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy—and the next several months may well be dominated by these topics. In the last 100 years, questions of economic policy have become as complex to the layman as questions of space and military technology. Free soil, free silver and free trade, for example, were basically easier to understand than the balance of payments, the tools of debt management and the application of countercyclical forces. Today every problem has several alternative solutions, and every answer raises several questions. I am more than ever convinced of the words once uttered by George Bernard Shaw: "If all economists were laid end to end, they still would not reach a conclusion."

FAMILIAR QUESTIONS

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

1. The limit on the national debt;
2. The size of the Federal budget and
3. The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced the legislative and executive branches before—and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it. Economic history—specifically the history of 1957–60, which produced two recessions from which the economy never wholly recovered—clearly warns us now that the wrong answer to each of these three questions would spell downturn and disaster for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during those crucial years have been previously acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face us now. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past—but we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

HARSH RESULTS

The Federal Government—and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of Government, but the Government as a whole—decided in 1957 to keep the debt limited unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

—In the decade previous to July 1957, unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

—In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output—it has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

—In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957, the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer primarily to budget and balance-of-payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

STRONG ECONOMY

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The six succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all time in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit at all.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after the mid-1957 decisions, with a total deficit of $11.2 billion during the next 3 calendar years and a gold loss of more than $5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem the tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from tax reduction. Let us remember that the $12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been estimated to be a surplus of $466 million.

REALISTIC CEILING

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden—as measured by its proportion of gross national product—steadily declining.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to the trend at all levels of government, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of the previous year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years.

And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut, but for a program which will add only $2.7 billion to the next budget

deficit. Certainly it is clear that, if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut.

So I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be remembered by us all—by those of us in the administration and the Congress, and those in this audience who are leaders of opinion in the business community.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote De Tocqueville in 1835, "consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterward repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years—if we can stick to the facts and cast out falsehoods and, above all, distinguish clearly between facts and falsehoods—then, surely, this great country can achieve the full fruits of greatness which today remain beyond our reach.

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter 1959 was operating at the level of a $17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a $2 billion deficit—and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of $7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who calls this "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short- and long-term credit—long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today output is $30 to $40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

SAME DECISIONS

Now, in 1963, the Government is once again faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures:

"In the second half of 1957 the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

New Bill on Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of introducing today the administration's proposals to extend and improve the Area Redevelopment Act. This legislation was one of the first and most important bills passed under the Kennedy administration. Those of us who fought long and hard over the years to get this on the statute books are tremendously heartened by the progress made over the past 2 years.

The area redevelopment program has brought hope to hundreds of communities and rural areas which have suffered for years from heavy unemployment. Already some 800 areas, accounting for 78 percent of all eligible places, have submitted overall economic development plans analyzing the problems which face them and blueprinting the steps to be taken to restore prosperity and full employment. The Agency has approved 700 individual projects which will create 34,000 jobs and help 18,000 worker-trainees. The benefits of this program, of course, go far beyond those directly involved by helping to stimulate the growth of the entire area and, in fact, helping to raise production and incomes nationally.

The bill I am introducing today is one of high priority. I am sure it will have the support of all of us who are concerned over the plight of the unemployed and the waste of national resources and manpower. I plan to hold hearings on the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency beginning April 1. In these hearings we will take testimony on every aspect of the problem and give careful consideration to every point of view. I am hopeful that we can bring the bill to the floor in the near future.

For the benefit of Members, I am inserting a section-by-section summary of the administration proposals contained in my bill.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

GENERAL

The attached amendments would allow the Area Redevelopment Act more fully to meet the needs for which it was created through increased fund authorizations and flexibility. These amendments are based upon the experience of the Area Redevelopment Administration during the period May 1, 1961, through February 28, 1963, and are more fully described below:

Section 2. Declaration of purpose

* * * * *

Section 3. Amendments to section 6(b)

(A) Authorization To Increase the Total Amount of Industrial and Commercial Loans Outstanding

Section 6(b)(1)(A) of the Area Redevelopment Act now places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of loans and/or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for commercial or industrial projects in areas designated under section 5(a) of the act. Section 6(b)(1)(B) places a similar limitation on the amount of loans or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for such projects in areas designated under section 5(b) of the act. It is the purpose of section 3(a) of the proposed amendments to raise the ceilings on the total amounts of loans outstanding under each of these sections from $100 million to $250 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed the Small Business Administration to execute loan agreements amounting to $20,431,335 in industrial and commercial loans for projects in 5(a) redevelopment areas and $17,711,442 for projects in 5(b) areas. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administration has project applications in the total amount of $86,431,967 pending for projects in 5(a) areas and $118,510,788 pending for projects in 5(b) areas. Evidence indicates that loan activity will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of loan approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have approximately $425 million in loans outstanding under section 6 by June 30, 1965, if there were no statutory limitations. It is clear that the present ceilings imposed by section 6(b)(1) of the Area Redevelopment Act will be reached considerably before the act's termination on June 30, 1965, unless otherwise amended.

(B) Refining the Minimum 10-Percent Requirement

Section 6(b)(9)(B) requires at least 10 percent of the aggregate cost on an industrial or commercial project for which an Area Redevelopment Administration loan is sought, to be supplied by a public or semipublic body in the form of equity capital or as a subordinated loan with delayed repayment. The proposed amendment to this section would authorize the minimum 10-percent money to be repaid during the same time but at no faster rate than the financial assistance extended under section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

American Redevelopment Administration has experienced great difficulty in obtaining the required 10-percent money in order to advance the economies of redevelopment areas. In fact, there is a direct relationship between the severity of the economic problem and the difficulty experienced by communities attempting to raise the required funds. The present proposal would not eliminate the 10-percent requirement but would make it possible for redevelopment areas to attract additional financial sources which are presently unable to participate in projects because of the statutory restrictions on repayment.

Section 4. Authorization to increase the total amount of loans for public facilities outstanding

Section 7(c) of the act places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of public facility loans which can be outstanding at any one time for public facilities under section 7. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the total amount authorized to be outstanding from $100 to $150 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed delegate agencies to execute loan agreements amounting to $24,777,200 in public facility loans for projects located in areas designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. Loan applications were pending in the amount of $13,178,525 for such projects. However, the pending applications figure does not include anticipated loans resulting from the denial of section 8 applications in whole or in part. Evidence again indicates that loan activity resulting from section 7 and 8 applications will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have more than $100 million in loans outstanding under section 7 by June 30, 1965, but for the present $100 million limitation.

Section 5. Authorization to increase the total amount which can be appropriated for grants for public facilities

Section 8(d) of the act authorizes $75 million to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants for public facilities under section 8. This amendment would increase the total amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose for the duration of the act from $75 to $175 million, and would enable it to remain available until expended when so specified in appropriation acts.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $35 million for public facility grants, together with the $40 million previously appropriated for fiscal year 1962, exhausts the authorization under the act for this purpose. As of February 28, 1963, applications for grants totaled $26,875,566. Obligations for 1964 are currently being estimated at $35 million, with a minimum 10-percent increase estimated for 1965. The requested increase in authorization to $175 million takes into account both the $75 million previously appropriated and the approximately $75 million currently projected, with some leeway for anticipated increases. If the statutory authorization is not increased, ARA's public facility grant program will go out of existence at the end of fiscal year 1963.

Section 6. Amendments to section 11

(A) Authorization To Increase the Annual Amounts which Can Be Appropriated for Technical Assistance

Section 11 of the act authorizes appropriations not to exceed $4.5 million annually to provide technical assistance useful in alleviating or preventing excessive unemployment or underemployment. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the annual amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose from $4.5 to $10 million.

Under its present authorization, the Area Redevelopment Administration as of February 28, 1963, had approved contracts in the amount of $1,651,000 for technical assistance. Applications for such assistance had been received in the total amount of $25,799,248. Of this total, approximately $11 million of these applications were received in fiscal year 1963. Currently, applications are arriving at a rate of $1 million per month. Experience has shown that this assistance is of great value, and it is anticipated that the rate of applications will continue to rise.

(B) Amendment To Make Explicit Discretionary Authority to Require Repayment of Technical Assistance

The additional language makes it clear that the Secretary has the authority to require repayment of funds advanced for technical assistance in appropriate cases.

Section 7. Procuring the services of experts and consultants under section 12(10)

This section governs the procurement and payment for services of experts and consultants hired temporarily by contract or appointment to assist the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the act. It limits temporary services to 6 months, omits mention of intermittent services, and limits the per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence to $15. The proposed amendment would modify the provisions of this section in conformity with 5 United States Code 5a by authorizing the procurement of temporary services of experts or consultants up to 1 year instead of 6 months and providing for intermittent services, thereby explicitly assuring to ARA the authority customarily available to executive departments in this regard. It would also automatically conform the authorized per diem allowance to the current applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations, which is now $16.

Section 8. Authorization for appropriated funds to remain available until expended and for depositing certain appropriations in the Area Redevelopment Fund

The proposed amendment to section 23 will provide for appropriations being made on a basis where funds may remain available until expended. In addition, funds appropriated for the purpose of making loans under sections 6 and 7 of the act are directed to be deposited in the Area Redevelopment Fund which is established by section 9(b) of the act. This amendment further provides for payments of interest to the Treasury on use of funds appropriated to the Area Redevelopment Fund.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the Monday decision of the Supreme Court regarding the so-called unit rule in Georgia is, in the words of Maryland's Attorney General Finan, "clearly applicable to Maryland."

I call the attention of those States righters who would mourn the death of the unit rule and attack the action of the Supreme Court, to an excellent and prophetic editorial that appeared a few weeks ago in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune:

STATES RIGHTS

As a result of the inexplicable refusal of the malapportioned State senate to pass legislation overwhelmingly approved by the house of delegates, to repeal the archaic unit rule system of voting in Maryland primary elections, the Maryland Committee for Fair Representation has been forced to institute suit in Federal court to put an end to this unfair practice.

Undoubtedly, some will criticize the committee for seeking intervention by the Federal judiciary as another alleged instance of Federal interference with States rights. Such criticism rests on an unfounded premise. We believe firmly in the principle of States rights; however, we believe just as firmly in the need for States responsibilities. In our opinion, one of the main reasons why citizens of the States, especially those residing in the urban and suburban areas, have turned increasingly to the Federal Government with their problems is because of the indifference, neglect, or inability on the part of the States to assist in the solution of such problems.

One of the obvious reasons for the States failure to perform its proper responsibilities in the field of government is, of course, the gross malapportionment which has so long prevailed in many States, including Maryland. Rural domination of State legislative chambers has not been conducive to the reform or the refashioning of those bodies into effective instruments of government, capable of carrying on the public business in the 20th century.

In addition, many of the States operate under ancient constitutions, once quite adequate but now woefully inadequate. Maryland's constitution is an outstanding example. Approved by the convention of 1867, it has not had major overhauling since that time.

As stated above, we believe in States rights. Further, we believe that smaller units of government, whether they be States, things much more effectively and efficiently, and with far less loss of individual freedom, than the Federal Government. However, if smaller units of government are to perform their functions and serve all of the people, they must be so constituted as to be able to carry out those responsibilities.

We believe the time has come for the General Assembly of Maryland to realize that the redemption of States rights in the Free State, as elsewhere, can only come about through the acceptance and effective execution of present and pressing States' responsibilities.

Elimination of malapportionment, repeal of the unit rule, preparing for, and convening a constitutional convention, granting greater authority for county home rule, and permitting greater intergovernmental cooperation with respect to metropolitan area problems are just a few of the reforms which must be accomplished if the Jeffersonian ideal of States rights is to have either validity or meaning for the people of Maryland.

More Patient Attitude Toward Underdeveloped Nations Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, an excellent editorial appeared in the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette urging a more patient attitude toward the underdeveloped nations. Having had the opportunity, just last November, to observe firsthand the situation in Africa, I realize the importance of this message and wish to share it with my distinguished colleagues.

This editorial emphasizes that time and patience are needed for social and economic progress. In Africa, Asia, and Latin America, improvement is on the way, but it is slow. This is an important issue facing the entire world which demands our attention and consideration. I am sure that my colleagues will find this editorial interesting.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette]

SOCIAL PROGRESS TAKES TIME

Political, economic, and social progress in the more backward parts of the world cannot keep up with the speed of a jet plane.

This fact is irritating to most people.

The want to see the earth made over in a short time so that there will be nothing more to worry about.

They might as well accept the truth that there always will be something to worry about. It is probably a good thing, too.

Strong men and women do not flourish in the presence of purple ease.

Too much materialism and too much poverty are, alike, a hindrance to the development of character and intelligence.

Economic progress is slow in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The people there have not accumulated enough capital to do the things which they would like to do in the way of industrialization, of irrigation, and of improvements in agriculture.

They need colleges and industrial schools and better transportation.

The Alliance for Progress has been slow, because "the powers that be" in Latin America are not willing to permit the reforms which are necessary to the success of the Alliance.

Those who have enjoyed special privileges over a long period do not wish to give them up, if they can help it.

In Asia and Africa, some of the people have so little experience outside their narrow, poverty stricken villages that they do not know how to seek a better life.

They have no real conception of what a better life is. But they are slowly learning.

They, too, may get impatient ultimately and do a lot of hasty and foolish things, which will set back their progress.

But we should realize, when they do, that impatience is as much a part of our makeup as it is theirs.

For we hope to see the world remade according to our taste in a few short years. It is not going to happen. Social and economic progress takes time.

Two Strikes Against U.S. Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Clinton Chronicle, of Clinton, S.C., has printed in its March 14, 1963, issue two excellent editorials which I commend to the attention of the Senate. They are entitled "Two Strikes Against U.S. Textile Industry," and "Hearing Slated on Trotters Shoals Dam." I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO STRIKES AGAINST U.S. TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Textile plants in the United States have one strike against them when they open their doors for business every morning.

And the umpire who imposes this automatic strike against cotton mills in Clinton, Laurens County, S.C., and everywhere else in the United States is the U.S. Government. It forces American mills to pay $42.50 a bale more for cotton than Japanese mills and other foreign plants pay for the same bale.

That fact was dramatically brought to the attention of Clinton people last week when a bale of cotton was displayed in each of the two local banks with signs reading, "This bale of cotton, grown in the United States, cost local textile mills $182.50. Any foreign mill could have bought this same bale for $140—or $42.50 less."

And strike No. 2 is also automatically imposed by the umpire (the U.S. Government) when foreign-made textile products are allowed to flood the American market. These

goods are made by cheap foreign labor paid at the rate of 15 to 20 cents a day.

Agencies of the U.S. Government seemingly have gone out of their way to place stumbling blocks in the path of the American textile industry in recent years. Indeed, some officials have gone so far as to state that the textile industry is expendable. All for the sake of building goodwill for the United States abroad and keeping foreign nations in the Western camp.

It's high time that some concern be exhibited for the cottongrowers of the country, the hundreds of thousands of textile workers, and the millions upon millions of dollars invested in the industry.

The future of this great segment of the U.S. economy "depends on how quickly Congress reacts to the need for positive far-reaching action," local textile executives stated this week.

The Administration Again Injures the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following release by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., of March 15, 1963, is of interest to those who are interested in a healthy coal industry:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 15, 1963.—Announcement by the Department of Interior today that residual oil import quotas will be increased by 50,000 barrels daily during the coming quota year means that domestic coal will lose an additional potential market for about 4 million tons to this cheap imported fuel, Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference declared today.

"This decision," he said, "ruthlessly sacrifices the welfare of the domestic coal industry and the families dependent upon it for a livelihood to the expediency of foreign policy and political pressures."

"The President's decision to continue import controls, rather than to eliminate them as is known to have been recommended by some administration advisers, is welcomed by the domestic fuels industries and by all those seriously concerned with maintaining a secure energy base for America's needs in both peace and war," Mr. Moody said.

"However," he asserted, "the need for an effective control program has been ignored, and this ruthless disregard for the welfare of millions of Americans causes us deep disappointment.

"We had been hopeful, as a result of conversations with administration officials by representatives of our industries, as well as by Members of Congress who are concerned over excessive residual imports, that the new import program would recognize the need for maintaining a reasonable ratio between imported residual oil and competitive fuels on the east coast and that it would be established as a firm program which would continue for the duration of this administration.

"As late as Wednesday of this week Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, for example, had declared in a published statement that 'I sense a larger degree of willingness to recognize that foreign fuel should not henceforth be permitted to usurp unreasonable shares of the domestic market. Foreign residual oil, dumped at predatory prices, gradually has diminished the competitiveness and the availability of domestic residuals and has disrupted the domestic coal market. A limit on the degree of disruption is essential, and I have reason to hope it will be built into the new orders to be released by the Secretary of the Interior * * *.'

"Senator RANDOLPH further stated: 'On the basis of information available I am hopeful that the residual oil import control program to be announced will apply for the duration of this administration, rather than merely on an annual basis. If so, then the coal industry and related industries will be able to plan responsibly for the future without fear of their projections being upset by periodic increases in residual fuel imports.'

"These expectations by Senator RANDOLPH, the coal industry, and others concerned, were completely ignored. We can only conclude that the market greed of the supplying nations, the major international oil companies and a few imported oil marketeers were given more recognition than the crucial economic needs of vast segments of the domestic fuels industries and their employees.

"Perhaps the recent visit to the United States of the President of Venezuela, and the known efforts being made by top officials of the administration to even further open U.S. markets to foreign oil, should have been a warning as to how this question would be resolved.

"However, as we pointed out in a letter to Secretary of State Rusk on March 13, Venezuela and the Netherlands West Indies, which largely refine Venezuelan crude, have increased their shipments of residual to the United States by some 50 million barrels annually since the import control program began. Thus, there was no excuse for increasing residual imports as a move to aid the Venezuelan economy.

"This is the second straight year the administration has increased import quotas for residual oil by some 10 percent or more. Altogether this administration has increased import quotas by some 55 million barrels annually, the equivalent of about 13 million tons of coal annually. In all, imported residual oil permitted under the new quotas will be the equivalent of more than 50 million tons of coal.

"When it is realized that each million tons of coal production lost destroys the job opportunities for 400 American miners, we can assess the extent to which this administration has ignored the best interests of domestic coal and railroads and their employees.

"It is now apparent that, if domestic fuels are to obtain relief from excessive, predatory price competition from insecure foreign residual oil, they will have to look to Congress for legislative action, rather than to the executive branch which they had hoped would at long last establish an effective control program," Mr. Moody concluded.

Cracking the Slum Wall—An Editorial From the Journal, Ave Maria, Endorsing the Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Committee on Education and Labor is considering the youth employment bill, which would provide for a Youth Conservation Corps in which unemployed young men could work in parks and forests and recreational areas.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial in the March 16, 1963, issue of the national Catholic weekly, Ave Maria, which is published in my congressional district, at Notre Dame, Ind., endorsing the Youth Conservation Corps program.

The editorial follows:

CRACKING THE SLUM WALL

(NOTE.—Should Catholics participate in the nonviolent protest movement? Leaders in the Catholic interracial apostolate apparently answer yes—and we hope the response to their plea will be considerable.)

Criticizing the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, a Catholic newspaper noted that "problem boys" should not be sent where greater moral problems may face them.

The editorial concludes that if the Corps "is to be any counteragent to criminal tendencies, it will have to do more than give boys employment; it must provide for their systematic moral training."

We certainly agree that, should the legislation creating the corps be enacted, built-in safeguards insuring cooperation with religious groups should be included.

But we can't quite see the corps as being a greater threat to the youth's spiritual life than thir environment back home.

It is designed to help those from backgrounds that impede opportunities: the victims of our urban slums and overcrowded ghettos, where the schools are the poorest and decent family life is rare.

Just a change in location and a chance to find out that they can do something themselves, with the resulting self-confidence, would help these youngsters, many of whom are school dropouts—not for lack of intelligence but for want of incentive.

Removed from the gang life and led to appreciate the value of usefulness, they can gain a perspective denied them in the alleys and the streets. We think many will see their potential future with a new vision, uncluttered by the debasing environment in which they grew up to their teen years.

If this wider view of their lives is accompanied by the development of skills that will help them stay out of the slums in which they were born, and opportunities to stay close to the faith in which they were reared, the youth who doesn't benefit by this program will be the exception.

According to latest calculations, there are more than 600,000 young Catholic students on secular campuses in the United States. That is more than twice as many as there are on Catholic campuses. By 1970, this total is expected to reach nearly a million, with the proportion in favor of secular campuses becoming greater.

Impressed with such figures, Michael Novak, in a recent issue of Commonweal, says he finds it "difficult to see why the American Church does not give at least as much attention to her students, wherever they are, as to her parishes." He would like to see priests assigned in a more fruitful balance between Catholic and secular campuses.

The point may have been well made. The Newman Apostolate, which is the organization set up for the church's official mission to the secular campus, is making great strides. But the priests and laymen in the work will be the first to admit that they have a long way to go. Newman's coverage is inadequate both in terms of campuses (only 850 out of approximately 2,400 have Catholic clubs, with full-time chaplains for only 12 percent) and in terms of students (only about 1 in 5 joins).

Yet it is this organization which has the greatest potential of making a virtue out of necessity. On the secular campuses of the

Nation we have at least two-thirds of our young Catholic students being forced to integrate with society on a level that is most influential, the intellectual community. We may regret the pressures, the lack of funds and personnel that have forced the situation, but we should not miss the opportunity it presents.

The Newman centers that are adequately set up and staffed are making a unique contribution to the church and society. Within the Catholic group they make provision for the pastoral care and the religious education of the students. Sacraments are administered, courses in philosophy and theology are given, lectures and discussions are held on pertinent subjects tied in with the curriculums. Without the circle, they attempt to influence the campus through the students' activity as Newman Club members, through ecumenical seminars and comment and criticism on the teaching and practices of the university staff.

Looked at from the student's point of view, the help that he receives from the church through the Newman Apostolate is crucial. Today his job is not an easy one. He has not only to attain an excellence in his field, but he has to acquire a direction for his talents that is different from and sometimes opposed to that of many of his fellow students. It is not so much a danger that Catholic students on secular campuses will becomes pious incompetents. The danger is rather that they will become competent for the wrong reasons, for the "respectable" goals of the home in suburbia, the junior-executive job, the country club membership. The church has a real task—whatever campus it is on—to counter "respectability's" exclusive claim on youth.

Along with competence and a thrust toward true goals, today's Catholic student has a deeper task: that of uniting the cultures of the secular and the Catholic where they go their separate ways. This he does not by merely sprinkling holy water on secular learning, but by immersing himself in it, with all his spiritual forces, and becoming the leaven so that the secular learning can come to its fullness. Whether it is in the value subjects, such as psychology, sociology or politics, or in the physical sciences, the Catholic student or scholar will have more to say about man than the secular thinker. But the church has to be there helping him to investigate the total picture, to see the whole man, natural, and supernatural.

The church's influence is needed in one final and most important area, that of directing the student's motivation and dedication toward charity. The student must realize that there is no true Christian activity without charity, and that he must continually direct his knowledge to serve God and man. Unless he gets this orientation, he cannot be said to have been successfully educated. Only the church can give it to him.

Actually the pressures that are today influencing Catholics to the secular campuses may in the future be seen as a blessing in disguise. It has been noted that such giants of the American church as Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland saw even in the last century the importance of Catholics absorbing the culture in which they live in order that the culture itself might "feel the yeast of the Gospels." But unless the multitudes of Catholic young people on secular campuses are reached with the "yeast," the expected yield may not be forthcoming.

It doesn't take a prophet to see that it is the educated in our age who are going to have increasing powers of directing the destiny of numerous lives and of society itself. From the Catholic side, it is unrealistic to see all of our leadership power coming from the graduates of Catholic colleges and universities. A great portion of that leadership must come from our secular institutions. For that reason, the church's challenge to bring itself to the thousands on our secular campuses becomes increasingly more critical.

KENNETH W. PETERS.

Establishment of a National Cemetery in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Legislature.

The people of North Dakota have expressed their views on the establishment of a national cemetery adjacent to and in conjunction with the International Peace Garden located at Dunseith, N. Dak. I support the position taken by the State legislature in adopting this resolution.

North Dakota is one of the few States that does not have a national cemetery. At the present time a veteran or his survivors residing in North Dakota, who wish to be buried in a national cemetery, must arrange for burial at Fort Snelling National Cemetery in St. Paul, Minn., or at Black Hills National Cemetery at Sturgis, S. Dak. Due to the distance and additional costs involved, many of the veterans, whose families and relatives live in North Dakota, are prevented from taking their rightful place with other veterans who served with them in World War I and II and the Korean conflict.

It would be appropriate and fitting to establish a national cemetery at the International Peace Garden. The Peace Garden is dedicated to peace and friendly relations with Canada, and lies on the boundary of North Dakota and Manitoba. The site of this garden, which lies in the Turtle Mountains, was selected for its natural beauty and because it is located midway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. It commemorates the 150 years of peace that has happily existed between the United States and Canada and symbolizes that these two nations can live in peace and harmony along the longest unfortified boundary in the world.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION N-1

(Solberg, Haugland, Wilkie, Hofstrand, Vinje, Berg, Fitch, Backes, Anderson (McHenry), Hoffner).

Concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Congress to establish a national cemetery adjacent to and in conjunction with the International Peace Garden.

Whereas the State of North Dakota proudly claims 72,000 veterans who represent 11.4 perecnt of this State's total population; and

Whereas a deceased veteran who has indicated a desire to be buried in a national cemetery must now be buried in a State other than North Dakota; and

Whereas there now exists in North Dakota an International Peace Garden which is maintained as a memorial to commemorate the long existing relationship of peace and good will between the people and the Governments of the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas a national cemetery is a memorial to those men who were called upon to serve so that that same peace and good will might be spread throughout the world and it is therefore only fitting and proper that a national cemetery be established adjacent to and in conjunction with the International Peace Garden: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the U.S. Congress be urged to establish a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota adjacent to and in conjunction with the now existing International Peace Garden; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD F. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.
FRANK A. WENSTROM,
President of the Senate.
HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Professor Walker Comments on Ombudsman Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, distinguished political scientists throughout the country are contributing their opinions on the possibility of adapting the office of ombudsman to the American political scene. I set out one form that the ombudsman might take in remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084. In order to further acquaint the Members of the House with the possibilities for use of this successful Scandinavian institution in this country, I include the remarks of Harvey Walker, professor of political science at Ohio State University. Professor Walker's remarks follow:

MY DEAR MR. REUSS: I am intrigued by the suggestion in your letter of February 28.

I am, of course, familiar with the institution of the ombudsman in Scandinavia. I have never thought of it as an adjunct to the legislative system, although I think it might very well be applied there. Actually, however, what I think you want is something a little different, namely, an office which can relieve you of petty detail but not an office which would be a true counterpart of the ombudsman, who is more of an executive officer responsible to the chief executive to receive and act upon citizens' complaints against administrative ineptitude or oppression.

There may be some advantage to the use of the Scandinavian institution as a handle to accomplish the purpose you have in mind, but there might be some confusion if the same name were used, as this office has acquired a very distinctive character in the

countries where it exists. It may very well be that we need an ombudsman office in Washington and in each State capitol, perhaps in each large city, also. Many city managers have accomplished this result by employing an assistant charged with receiving citizens' complaints, referring them to the proper agencies for action, and following up to see that proper action is taken, and then reporting to the city manager on the whole effect. Such offices of course do not have the same degree of dignity and the same capacity for independent action as the royally appointed ombudsman in Denmark or Sweden, but such officers still perform a very useful function.

Best wishes to you in the further development of your proposal.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY WALKER.

Indonesia: Problems of Concern to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, since my return from an inspection tour of the Far East this last year, I have several times called our colleagues' attention to the economic problems of Indonesia and its possible dangerous effects on the stability of this sensitive and important area of the world.

As I have stated previously, because of her wealth of natural resources, her population which is fifth largest in the world, and her strategic geographic location, Indonesia's problems and policies must be of concern to us.

Accordingly, I encourage our colleagues to read the following articles—one by Albert Norman, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, and the second by Norman Sklarewitz from the Wall Street Journal of March 19:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 18, 1963]

GESTURE TO AUSTRALIA: INDONESIAN AMITY

(By Albert E. Norman, Australia-New Zealand correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

CANBERRA.—Indonesia has assured Australia that it wishes to develop a good neighbor policy with this country. Australia will share a common frontier with Indonesia this year when the Indonesian takeover of West New Guinea is completed.

This Indonesian assurance, given by Foreign Minister Subandrio, followed a request by the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia Keith C. Shann for an explanation of Indonesia's policy of "confrontation" toward Malaya. This term was first used January 20 in a speech by Dr. Subandrio in Central Java when he asserted Malaya was "pursuing a policy hostile toward Indonesia."

Since Australia had contributed forces to the Commonwealth Strategic Reserve based in Malaya for the protection of that country against Communist aggression, it was of first-class importance for the Australian Government to learn from the highest Indonesian sources just what constituted Indonesian grievances and what a policy of "confrontation" meant in removing them.

COLONIALISM ISSUE

Dr. Subandrio said he had shown Ambassador Shann "all the information and documents available" to support his government's allegations against Malaya. Just what the Australian Government thought of this information, no doubt conveyed to it by the Ambassador, has not been publicly disclosed at this writing.

The Australian Government has had, apart from this information, the benefit of an Indonesian Foreign Ministry public explanation of "confrontation." Broadly, this policy means applying the same tactics of international pressure against Malaya, as were used against the Netherlands in the West New Guinea dispute.

In this latter, Indonesia attacked the Netherlands politically on all possible occasions as a "colonialist" power. It attacked it economically by repudiating an agreement to repay a debt of several million guilders owing to the Netherlands. Militarily, it attacked it by landing Indonesian troops in West New Guinea when an agreement to hand the territory to Indonesia was virtually assured. On this general pattern, it may be safely concluded that "confrontation" aims to isolate a nation from friends and resources.

SOVIET AID EXTENSIVE

Since his "confrontation" speech, Dr. Subandrio has said that Indonesia is concerned about the spate of international comment on his country's military buildup. The Indonesian leader, comparing Indonesia's armed forces with Australia's, said that relatively speaking Australia's were stronger.

This comparison is true when based on relative technological and industrial capacity, the ground chosen by Dr. Subandrio. On the other hand, Indonesia has acquired quantitative superiority in armaments over Australia in the last year or so, with large-scale aid from the Soviet Union.

But in this context, it is worth noting that nothing has been disclosed publicly on the very important question of munition supply to sustain Indonesia's armed forces. A comprehensive supply program is essential, if the armament buildup is to be more than aggressive looking window dressing. Moreover, in the tropics it is difficult to preserve stockpiled munitions from deterioration.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 19, 1963]

THEMES AND VARIATIONS: $5.50 FOR FRIED EGGS

DJAKARTA, INDONESIA.—From over the hotel cashier's counter, the polite Indonesian accepted the confused look on the face of the just-arrived American tourist.

"It is not difficult to understand," the clerk said hopefully. "The official Bank of Indonesia rate of exchange here is 45 rupiahs to 1 U.S. dollar. But, because you are a tourist, my Government gives you a special rate—180 rupiahs to the dollar. This hotel is operated by the Government, however, so we do not accept rupiahs in payment for our rooms. Rates are quoted only in dollars and you must pay in hard currency. Still, for your meals and beverages you may pay in rupiahs at the extra special rate of 500 to the dollar."

The American shook his head and joined millions of Indonesians in the "funny money" game that is sweeping the country in the wake of its worst economic crisis. Having a pocket computer isn't absolutely necessary when visiting Indonesia these days—but it helps.

Actually, guests who stay at the plush, new Government-owned Hotel Indonesia are lucky. By computing meal costs at the 500-to-a-dollar rate, the management shields them from some degree of the wild inflation now in effect. A resident foreign businessman must change his dollars at the official 45-to-1 rate. By contrast, the rupiah on the free rate has now sunk to 1,200 to 1 U.S. dollar. What this does to prices is reminiscent of the monetary madness that hit Germany after World War I.

BREAKFAST CONFUSION

Consider a normal breakfast at the Hotel Indonesia: A small glass of orange juice is 100 rupiahs. If you're a hotel guest, that's 20 cents; if you're a nonguest and changed your dollars at the tourist rate, it's 55 cents. If you're a resident foreigner, it's $2.25. But if you dare to risk jail and change your dollars on the black market, the orange juice is just 8 cents.

Care to try two fried eggs priced at 250 rupiahs? They're either 50 cents, $1.40, $5.50, or 20 cents, depending on which rate you use.

The rupiah has shrunk steadily over the past 6 months and, in direct reaction, local prices have gone up. Shopkeepers in Djakarta scribble prices on scraps of paper since new ones are generally needed weekly. At the legal tourist rate, a small tube of toothpaste is almost $2; a pair of men's nylon stretch socks $2.30; a lady's simple cotton blouse, $5. For the resident foreigner here, those prices would be four times as much.

Some items have increased almost 100 percent since the first of the year, especially imported commodities already in short supply as a result of a drastic cutback in nonessential imports. So far, the only Government move taken in connection with the inflationary spiral is to print more and more rupiahs. One businessman in town cashed a traveler's check and received in return a bundle of "rupes" numbered in sequence—fresh from the printer.

Commodities with prices less easy to adjust, such as public transport fares, postage, and gasoline, which are controlled by the Socialist Government, remain bargains. A tank of gasoline costs around 17 cents even at the legal rate of exchange. A flight on Garuda Airways, the national air carrier of Indonesia, is priced at $17.50 but if you pay the rupiah price of 3,134 at the free rate, it comes to a little under $3. Officially, Garuda can't refuse rupiahs but with their value so low, it manages not to have space for passengers paying in anything but hard currency.

EXPORT STRATEGY

Indonesian exporters have been uninterested in selling their products abroad at the 45-to-1 rate and this has cost the Government valuable dollar earnings. To woo export commodities off the domestic market, special incentives are now being offered. Exporters of dollar-producing materials are given a more favorable conversion rate and are also entitled now to use 15 percent of the dollar sales for their own import purposes. Domestic importers, conversely, face six different conversion rates designed to discourage imports of nonessential commodities.

The current state of the Indonesian economy results, in part, from irresponsible spending policies of the socialistic Government of President Sukarno that have all but wiped out foreign exchange reserves. Foreign credits which could have been used to develop production facilities have instead been dissipated on such extravagances as athletic stadiums, and an expensive military establishment.

Production of dollar-earning commodities—tin, rubber, tea, and others—continue to sink at a time when the domestic economy needs imported raw materials and the basic tools of production.

An emergency $17 million loan by the United States to Indonesia in late February is expected to help start stalled production machinery, but any benefit from this infusion won't materialize for at least 3 or 4 months. In the meantime, the rupiah game is expected to continue.

NORMAN SKLAREWITZ.

Boy Scout Jamboree of 1968

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a joint resolution, approved recently by the Montana State Senate and House of Representatives and signed by the Governor, invites the Boy Scouts of America to hold its 1968 National Boy Scout Jamboree on the eastern edge of Glacier National Park in Montana. I take this opportunity to add the voices of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself to the invitation our State is extending to the Boy Scouts.

As the resolution points out, Mr. President, a number of sites immediately outside the eastern border of Glacier National Park are under consideration for the National Jamboree. It is difficult to describe the majestic, rugged beauty of this area of the Rocky Mountains in northwestern Montana. Suffice to say that it is one of the truly great unspoiled scenic areas in our country. The late Montana journalist-historian, Joseph Kinsey Howard, might well have been thinking of this area when he wrote his classic, "Montana—High, Wide, and Handsome." For Glacier National Park is indeed high; it is wide; and above all, it is handsome.

Mr. President, I believe the resolution adequately points out the attractions of this area. It is with utmost pleasure that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I join in urging the Boy Scouts of America to hold its 1968 jamboree in Montana and share with us the unsurpassed natural beauty and recreational opportunities of the big sky country.

Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution extending the invitation to the Boy Scouts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF MONTANA INVITING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TO HOLD AND CONDUCT ITS NATIONAL BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE IN 1968 ON THE EASTERN BORDER OF GLACIER NATIONAL PARK NEAR EAST GLACIER, MONT.

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America conduct jamborees on a national level in scenic and wholesome surroundings; and

Whereas the people of Montana have a keen interest in the activities of the Boy Scout movement; and

Where the Boy Scout jamboree has never been conducted in Montana; and

Whereas a number of sites immediately outside the eastern border of Glacier National Park are now under consideration as a place where a Scout jamboree may be held; and

Whereas Glacier National Park is a unique park in that it has 60 living glaciers and it is one of the most scenic and interesting parks within the United States; and

Whereas East Glacier, Mont., is near the Blackfoot Indian Reservation at Browning, where, in an authoritative and authentic museum, Indian property, relics, and items having tremendous interest to those interested in anthropology are preserved for the information of all Americans; and

Whereas there is, within a short distance of Glacier National Park, the largest fresh water lake in the United States east of the Mississippi River, Flathead Lake; and

Whereas within a short distance of Glacier National Park is located one of the world's highest and largest concrete dams, Hungry Horse; and

Whereas near Glacier National Park the Boy Scouts of America can see and observe wildlife, including elk, deer, mountain sheep, mountain goats, marmots, bears, and moose; and

Whereas Glacier National Park is near the Bob Marshall wilderness area and other alpine areas, said areas being some of the last genuine and authentic primitive areas in the United States; and

Whereas there are numerous dude ranch facilities in the immediate area of the east border of Glacier National Park; and

Whereas many persons are known to take tremendous interest in the Triple Divide peak of Glacier National Park because of the knowledge that the waters flowing from said peak flow into the Pacific, Atlantic, and Arctic Oceans; and

Whereas the relationship between the United States and Canada is excellent, and the Dominion of Canada has established Waterton National Park which is also a mecca for persons interested in mountain beauty and recreation; and

Whereas the climate of the proposed site is cool at night, warm during summer days, and relatively dry (average rainfall during July being about 1.6 inches); there are no poisonous snakes and the area is free of rats; and

Whereas Yellowstone National Park is in relatively close proximity to the east side of Glacier National Park; and

Whereas adequate transportation, including railroads with numerous sidings, bus and airlines, is available from all points of the United States to Glacier National Park and the proposed sites; and

Whereas the people of Montana would feel privileged and honored to welcome the American Boy Scout Jamboree in 1968 to Montana; and

Whereas it is the consensus of the membership of the senate and house of representatives of the sovereign State of Montana that the holding of the National Jamboree for the Boy Scouts of America in 1968 within the State of Montana would be an event which would prove to have a wholesome and beneficial effect upon the lives of the young men and their sponsors at such jamboree, now, Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Montana, That the State highway commission, in general, and the State advertising director, in particular, be authorized, requested, and directed to invite the Boy Scouts of America, through the national headquarters of said organization, to hold and conduct its National Boy Scout Jamboree in 1968 at one of several sites immediately outside the eastern border of Glacier National Park near East Glacier, Mont., and that said commission and advertising director use all proper means to extend Montana hospitality to said Boy Scouts of America; and be it further

Resolved, That this formal resolution is intended to be an invitation from all of the people of Montana to said Boys Scouts to enjoy the scenic beauty, wonders, and recreational facilities within the State of Montana, the Big Sky Country; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this joint resolution to each member of the State highway commission, the advertising director of the highway commission, the Honorable Tim Babcock, Governor of Montana, the bus, railroad, and transportation agencies, the national headquarters of the Boy Scouts of America, the councils of the Boy Scouts of America within the State of Montana, the Highway No. 2 Association, and to such other persons or agencies which would endeavor to assist the Boy Scouts of America to make the National Jamboree within the State of Montana in 1968 a success from every point of view.

DAVID F. JAMES,
President of the Senate.

Speaker of the House.
TIM BABCOCK,
Governor.

Address By Senator McClellan Before Arkansas Basin Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on March 8 at Tulsa, Okla., the Arkansas Basin Development Association held its annual meeting. We were fortunate in having as our guest speaker the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, U.S. Senator from Arkansas. I cannot recall attending a meeting where the crowd was more enthusiastic or accepted more completely the views of a speaker.

I had the honor of being master of ceremonies at that meeting; and it is a distinct pleasure and honor for me to submit, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the remarks of our distinguished colleague, who made such a profound impression upon those who were present to hear him.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address by the senior Senator from Arkansas printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN, THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, TULSA, OKLA., MARCH 8, 1963

Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure to be your guest on this occasion and to have the privilege of addressing this splendid audience of fellow citizens of the Arkansas River Basin.

Your presence here this evening impressively demonstrates again your support of, your enthusiasm for, and your dedication to, the accomplishment of the comprehensive water resource development program of this valley, to the construction of which our Federal Government is now, I think, irrevocably committed.

The large attendance at this meeting and the ardor and buoyancy of spirit prevailing here, significantly indicate that you are generally satisfied with the progress made and the momentum that we have achieved in carrying this project forward. We have, I

am sure, every right and good reason to be pleased and gratified.

We have long since passed the conception, visionary and planning periods, and the authorization action that necessarily precede all construction programs of magnitude that are sponsored and financed by the Federal Government.

Our Arkansas River Basin program has now reached the stage where it is so thoroughly and finally planned, so firmly and positively directed, and so completely activated and energized that we now not only know where and how it is going, but we also know when it will get there. As presently scheduled, we will reach our goal in 1970.

To that end I can assure you that all members of your congressional delegations will not only be alert to and will oppose any proposal or action that would hinder, delay, or interfere with that happening; but we will also actively support adequate appropriations to expedite further construction and make certain the job is completed by that time.

The distance we have traveled to reach the milestone of the present has, at times, been rugged and difficult. In earlier stages of our journey, we encountered delays and hinderances that were vexing and disappointing. Some of them, of course, were unavoidable.

However, faith, vigilance, perseverance, and hard work on the part of your organization, other auxiliary groups, and your Representatives in Congress have succeeded in moving the project from the early stages of hope and uncertainty to the present state of advancement and progress that assures success and the full attainment of our ultimate goal.

When measured by the dollar yardstick, this basin project is now about one-fourth completed. We are probably further along, however, than the dollar figures would indicate. With the closure of the big upstream dams and of Dardenelle on the main stem, and with the progress that has been made on bank stabilization work, we have already gained substantial control over the river's bad habits—silting, wandering, bank destruction, and irregular flow and flooding.

The size of the total task in which we are engaged in this valley is hard to comprehend. It is immense. Over the period of the next 7 or 8 years, nearly $1 billion will be poured into this basin in the form of contracts, wages, and materials by the Federal Government. Some of the material used, will be bought outside the basin, but much of it and most of the labor are being procured right here in the area.

More than 100 million cubic yards of earth will have to be dredged from the channels. Another 100 million yards will be piled into earth embankments. More than 600 million pounds of steel, 8 million barrels of cement, and 8 million tons of rock and aggregate will have to be put into place.

In addition, some 1,700 miles of highway, railway, and utility lines will have to be moved and relocated.

Within the next 10 years, State, county, and municipal governments, along with private enterprise, are expected to spend at least another billion dollars for the improvements necessary to make adjustments to the changes taking place and in the opportunity investments that this great resource development invites and provides.

Income and employment generated by such large scale construction is bound to provide an economic surge of unprecedented dimensions in this basin—one that is sure to carry forward until the project is completed. After completion, and when the Government's construction income has dwindled off, no doubt there will be a slack period of time—maybe a few years—before the full impact of new industrial development is felt.

State and local governments and business should be aware of this problem and make plans accordingly for that transition period. To the extent, of course, that industrial development can be accelerated, this situation can be met or at least greatly alleviated. We must keep on, and never cease planning for more expansion, more growth, and more building as our valley changes and future needs develop. For it is when we look beyond the construction period, that we foresee in the decades ahead great, almost revolutionary, changes in our lives.

Much has already been written and said about the glowing future of the Arkansas River Basin. I will not attempt to match crystal balls with anyone, but I would suggest that we recall many demonstrated facts as revealed and experienced by other river basins that have had similar programs. I shall only mention one as an illustration.

In 1920 the tonnage carried on the Ohio River was only about 10 million tons. By 1929, when the Corps of Engineers had completed the first canalization program on the Ohio, that tonage had more than doubled. It had increased to almost 50 million tons by 1950, and now it is in excess of 80 million tons.

There can be no doubt that water resource development has tremendously accelerated economic growth and progress in the Ohio River Basin. That development is credited with being an important reason for the investment of about $13 billion in industrial facilities in that valley during the 1950's.

As I have indicated, the Ohio River is not an isolated instance. Comparable statistics could be recited for the Illinois River, the upper Mississippi, and the Tennessee Valley.

Our late lamented and beloved Senator Kerr, to whom we are indebted more than to any other man for progress on the Arkansas Basin program, recently estimated that if the Arkansas Valley matches the achievements of the Tennessee Valley (and there is no real reason why it shouldn't), this development program should bring $20 billion in personal income into this region within the next 20 years. He felt that in view of its superior resources, the Arkansas Basin should far outstrip the achievements of the Tennessee. I share that view.

The more we look at this region, the more we must wonder that so many of its opportunities have remained neglected and untapped for so long.

A disadvantageous freight rate structure, which placed us in a poor position to compete for industrial development; the unreliability of our river with its unstable course and irregular flow; the relative sparseness of population; and the limited markets available to this region—all these have handicapped us in the past.

But these handicaps are being overcome. Navigation on the Arkansas will give us the low-cost transportation we need to open our coal resources and attract industries. And, as people move out of the increasingly congested eastern section of the country to seek open spaces and opportunities farther west, we may expect the population growth of our States to be greatly accelerated.

Then, at long last, we will be able to capitalize on the great blessings that nature has given us. We can utilize to the fullest one of the largest supplies of uncommitted water to be found in the United States—water which modern industry seeks with increasing eagerness to cool its machines, to drive its turbines, and to incorporate into its manufacturing processes.

Thus, industry can make maximum use of our huge wealth in basic energy fuels—gas, oil, and coal. Moreover, our many other mineral resources would also be turned into wealth. The Arkansas-White-Red Basin contains 65 commercial minerals, including 30 of the 38 important minerals that our country is now importing from abroad. Among these 65 minerals are sulphur, coal, salt, glass sands, ceramic clay, building stone, lead, zinc, and petroleum with its vast implications for the development of petrochemical industries.

Along with industry, other forms of enterprise will benefit. Fertilizer and farm machinery, building materials, steel and cement will come to our communities at lower cost; and many of our agricultural and other domestic products can likewise be shipped and marketed more cheaply.

To proclaim the Arkansas River Basin to be the land of opportunity, both as of now and for tomorrow, is no idle boast, no overstatement, nor is it an exaggeration. Instead, that assertion is based on fact and simply declares that which is true.

This claim of opportunity that we can proudly make today for this river valley and for our respective States amounts to only a modest appraisal and a very conservative evaluation of the great worth of the magnificent multipurpose development now in progress and the tremendous wealth and benefits that are destined to flow therefrom.

Reference to our area as a land of opportunity is not a mere attempt to coin or to make use of the phrase for any propaganda value that it may have, but rather to describe adequately and appropriately a pleasant and impressive reality.

This comprehensive development program on the Arkansas River is one of the largest ever undertaken by our Government, as an overall project, under the direction of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army.

In many respects its potentials transcend and surpass those of any other water resource development system in our Nation. It is truly one of the most dramatic and progressive programs for the conservation and development of water resources ever authorized and embarked upon by the Federal Government.

The completion and operation of these vast improvements will open up new vistas of prospects and possibilities for the expansion and growth of agriculture and industry, far beyond anything that was contemplated when the project was first envisioned or when it was finally justified and authorized.

What we have here is not just a local or area development standing alone or apart and isolated from other national interests. It is not a development whose benefits are restricted and confined to the immediate community or to the geographic section in which the improvements are being made. It is, and will be, a vital integral part of the overall structure of America's might and power.

New products and increased production emanating and resulting from this great venture will tremendously strengthen our economy, reinforce our national defense establishment, and further promote and enhance progress and general prosperity throughout the Nation.

Every dollar being expended on this program is an investment in these things—in the future of our country. All the cost incurred in the building of this system of improvements properly comes within the category of national investments rather than in the column of Federal expenditures. In the course of time—and much sooner than we may have estimated—these funds now being appropriated for this purpose will all be recovered into the Federal treasury. It will pay for itself many times over, by reason of the enlargement of the tax resources which this development will generate.

Thus, we are transforming what has heretofore been a significant, but dormant, economic potential into a future dynamic national asset. What we are building here is another powerful pillar of strength of such quality and endurance that the march of time for generations to come cannot efface or weaken. The years of progress that lie

ahead can only augment and accentuate its force and influence upon our national image and stature.

By doing this—by making large investments of public funds—we also enrich the heritage of future generations.

In my judgment, some of the fiscal policies our Government is pursuing are unsound. In some other fields, I believe, it is unwisely making excessive and unnecessary expenditures—expenditures that are improvidently swelling our national indebtedness and further encumbering the estate that we are leaving to those who will follow us.

I definitely oppose that course and policy. But, in the vast development and conservation that we are making in our vital water resources—for every dollar we are prudently spending for this purpose—we are adding substantially to the wealth of their heritage.

We should also keep in mind another and vital area of compelling interest in which enormous expenditures are necessary and currently being made—that is in the field of science and technology. Some $15 billion annually is now being spent by Government and private sources for research and development. Research and development, in fact, has itself become a major industry in this country, one of the largest—one of the fastest growing.

We must therefore anticipate and prepare for the future by looking understandingly at what is happening today—what is emerging from the present. It is clear, and becoming more and more so every day, that the economic pattern of the future is emerging around science and technology. It is emerging through the difficult process of creative thought and innovation. We see this all around us everywhere.

The principal elements of this developing economic change are threefold. They are the scientists and their research facilities; the management and financial resources capable of bringing research to an economic outcome; and the educational, business, and political leadership capable of creating the proper setting for these scientific and technological forces.

Research and development have definitely become one of the few determinative influences in the ebb and flow of industrial location. This is a positive factor that we should not lose sight of. Again, I think, circumstances greatly favor us, and opportunity is knocking at our door.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has built five major installations to the south and east of us. They are Cape Canaveral; the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala.; the Michoud plant in Louisiana (where the Saturn rockets will be assembled); the giant test facility now being built in Mississippi; and the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston, Tex. (the home of the astronauts).

These installations are permanent—they are here to stay. They are fundamental to the creation, the assembly, the manning, and the launching of this Nation's largest rockets. These plants may, in time, be supplanted, but they will not be duplicated. They are a part of our economic landscape for many, many years to come.

It is of significant advantage that our great river basin leads directly into this whole gigantic space complex. It would seem, therefore, that we have done our river work in good time. We should seek to take full advantage of this magnificent opportunity to manufacture here in our area many of the components for missiles and spaceships and to carry on other vital work related to these installations.

It is not enough, however, for us to look down the river and see those things that might be of value to us. We must bring our great potential to life and find ways and means to make it an efficient part and parcel of this vital new space system. We must make this a major effort. Just as we have worked over the years to build the base from which we can now draw out the physical potential of this great river basin, so should we now work to achieve the full fruits and benefits of the opportunities this river development program has opened up to us.

We should pursue with unrelenting vigilance the opportunities that we have to develop those industries and those services that are now coming within our reach. This will be no easy task. It may well be more difficult than our work has been thus far, but it is most challenging, and success in the effort will surely be abundantly rewarded.

In conclusion, may I say, that the wonderful progress we have made in our river basin program is a tremendous tribute to the unity, vigor, and indefatigable persistence with which the people of this basin, and particularly your organizations, have supported the program throughout the years. The unified presentations made to the congressional Appropriations Committees each year by the Tri-State Committee representing Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and speaking for them with one strong voice, have been truly impressive and effective. The unity of your respective organizations and their working together have brought home to the people of this region a broad understanding of the importance of this development program and rallied their support behind it.

I congratulate you, and may I urge that you continue to labor harmoniously together in further seeking to bring into full fruition the magnificent and dynamic possibilities of future progress and prosperity that are now available to us.

Hon. Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of our colleague, CLYDE DOYLE. To know CLYDE DOYLE was to love him. I have never met a more kindly or genuine person in my life.

During my first term in the Congress I was informed that there were no assigned seats in the House of Representatives. While this was true, CLYDE DOYLE had his own seat and everyone was aware of it. When the House was in session, he was nearly always sitting in it.

This kind and intelligent man displayed a devotion to duty that was an example to all of us. He possessed one of the finest attendance records in the House.

The thing that I shall remember most about CLYDE DOYLE is the counsel he gave me when I first came to the Congress 2 years ago on his practice of accumulating the Chaplain's prayers and sending them out to the ministers of the churches in his district. "Chaplain Braskamp says a wonder prayer," CLYDE informed me, "and I feel that the ministers in my district in California will find his prayers spiritual and helpful."

CLYDE DOYLE was a great Christian and a great American and a friend to all of us. I know that his presence in the House brought out the best in all of us just as his final words in letters to his constituents, "our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are," attempted to bring out the best in them.

I extend to his family my profound sympathy in this hour of their great loss and sorrow.

Black Absolutism on the School Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to submit an excellent article by Mr. James E. Clayton, which appeared in the Virginian-Pilot, Tuesday, March 12, 1963. The subject of this article is "Black Absolutism on the School Prayers." I recommend Mr. Clayton's article to those who desire a more penetrating look into the problems now facing the Supreme Court, as it must decide on whether or not to permit prayers to be said in our public schools. I have introduced legislation, along with many of my colleagues, which, if passed, would certainly clarify at least the intent of Congress on this problem that is so meaningful to all of America. The legislation I have introduced is in the form of a House joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in the public schools of the United States. I surely believe that Congress should pass this resolution and give the American people the right to say once and for all what their opinion is about the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in our public schools.

The article by Mr. Clayton follows:

[From the Virginian-Pilot, Mar. 12, 1963]

BLACK ABSOLUTISM ON THE SCHOOL PRAYERS

(By James E. Clayton)

WASHINGTON.—Using the school prayer cases as an illustration, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of the Harvard Law School, has made one of the sharpest attacks in recent years on the philosophy that underlies some of the Supreme Court's decisions.

In a speech at the University of Utah, Dean Griswold expounded his argument that too many justices and too many Americans adopt an approach that is oversimplified and narrow when they consider the meaning of the Constitution.

The approach Dean Griswold criticized—he called it absolutism—is one largely developed by Justice Hugo L. Black.

Thus the Griswold speech is on one side of a dialog that began long ago among intellectuals in the legal world. For years, as Justice Black was developing his philosophy bit by bit in Supreme Court opinions, Justice Felix Frankfurter was attacking it bit by bit. Beginning with a speech by Justice Black in 1960 and encouraged by an interview he gave last spring, the topic has come under serious discussion by many outstanding legal thinkers.

At its simplest, the argument turns on how the words of the bill of rights, particularly those of the first amendment, should be applied in the contemporary world. But in its full ramifications, the argument involves the total approach one takes to the Constitution.

Justice Black has chosen the word "absolute" to indicate his view. A prime purpose of the Constitution and the bill of rights, he has said, "was to withdraw from the Government all power to act in certain areas. * * * If the Constitution withdraws from Government all power over subject matter in an area, such as religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition, there is nothing over which authority may be exerted."

Looking at words of the first amendment—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," Justice Black says, "it says 'no law,' and that is what I believe it means."

Dean Griswold calls the Black approach fundamentalist-theological in its philosophy. "If one thinks of the Constitution as a God-given text stating fixed law for all time, then focuses on a single passage or, indeed, on two words—no law—without recognizing all the other words in the whole document, and its relation to the society outside the document, one can find the answers very simply," Dean Griswold said. "No more thought is required."

The basic trouble, he argues, is that Justice Black's approach causes a judge to put on blinders. He looks at one phrase only; he blinds himself to everything else.

The better approach, Dean Griswold argues, as did Justice Frankfurter, is "a comprehensive or integral approach (that) accepts the task of the judge as one which involves the effect of all the provisions of the Constitution, not merely in a narrow literal sense, but in a living, organic sense, including the elaborate and complex governmental structure which the Constitution, through its words, has created."

This is, essentially, the view that the Supreme Court must "balance" the various rights and powers involved when cases arise under the Bill of Rights. In contempt of Congress cases, for example, the Frankfurter-Griswold view calls for the Court to weigh the claims of an individual to remain silent against the need of Congress for the information he possesses. The Black approach, on the other hand, says the Constitution establishes the right of silence and this must be respected regardless of what power is asserted against it.

"The great danger of the judiciary balancing process is that in times of emergency and stress it gives Government the power to do what it thinks necessary to protect itself, regardless of the rights of individuals," Justice Black has said. "If the need is great, the right of Government can always be said to outweigh the rights of the individual."

Dean Griswold objects to use of the term "balancing" to describe what he is talking about. He argues that it is not a question of weighing rights but of reading the Constitution as a whole rather than in fragmented sections.

In return, those who support Justice Black argue that his view is far more complex than it seems on the surface. Prof. Charles A. Reich, in a recent article in the Harvard Law Review, suggests that Justice Black's view must be read in conjunction with his fear that judicial power will be abused and his belief that the fundamental "balancing" decisions regarding rights and powers were made when the Constitution was adopted.

How does the school prayer issue fit into all this?

The Court already has ruled that public schools cannot begin their days with recitation of an officially composed prayer. It is now studying whether they can use the Lord's Prayer. In both cases the question is whether the use of the prayer establishes a religion in violation of the first amendment. Justice Black wrote the opinion in the first case saying it does.

Dean Griswold thinks the Court approached this problem wrongly. But, beyond that, he thinks this is an issue that was carried to the Court only because too many Americans have adopted the "absolutist" view of the Constitution.

As a result, he says, both the justices and the parents have looked too much at the Constitution's prohibition against establishing religion and too little at the Constitution's and the Nation's tradition of tolerating all religious beliefs and nonbeliefs. He said:

"It is perfectly true, and highly salutary, that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law 'respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' These are great provisions of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all traces of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention.

"Does our deepseated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history. I do not believe that the contentions now made would occur to any man who could free himself from an absolute approach to the problem.

"This is a country of religious toleration, but does religious toleration mean religious sterility? I wonder why it should be thought that it does. This, I venture to say again, has been, and is, a Christian country, in origin, history, tradition, and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics, I think it can be said, that it developed its notion of toleration, does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition?"

Dean Griswold goes on to argue that prayers in the schools help teach tolerance. The child in the minority who refused to participate, learns that he is different but that the difference is accepted, Dean Griswold says, while the child in the majority learns that those who are different are tolerated and accepted.

"Learning tolerance for other persons, no matter how different, and respect for their beliefs, may be an important part of American education, and wholly consistent with the first amendment," Dean Griswold says.

Dean Griswold's comments would be much less important than they are if their impact was confined to school prayer issues. But he thinks that the prayer cases are only an example of a school of thought that engages "in a species of absolutism in its reasoning that is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light." The Supreme Court, he suggests, has engaged in this in such diverse areas as contempt of court and jury trials as well as first amendment problems.

Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a report from Mr. Phillip Lorenc, of Macomb, Ill., a student teacher who has aided Mr. Gene Pavelonis, physical education instructor in a physical fitness program for seventh and eighth grades at Bushnell Junior High School, Bushnell, Ill.

This program was undertaken as a result of President Kennedy's recommendation for improved physical fitness. A program adopted was an 18-item motor efficiency test, without apparatus. Dr. Curiton, originator of this test, demonstrated it at Western Illinois University, in Macomb, to all the school systems in the Macomb area. Each boy was rated on each of the 18 tests and the 2 top-ranking students were Tom Franck and Mike Steelman. Tom passed all 18 and Mike all but 1.

Washington Spendthrift Philosophy Losing Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article by Edson B. Smith in the Boston Herald in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a portion of my remarks.

I know many of my colleagues join me in applauding Mr. Smith on this very timely and illuminating piece of writing.

The article follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Mar. 19, 1963]

THE INVESTOR

(By Edson B. Smith)

WASHINGTON SPENDTHRIFT PHILOSOPHY LOSING FACE

Per Jacobsson, distinguished head of the International Monetary Fund, recently said that the notion there should be permanently unbalanced budgets strikes him as "the emanation of permanently unbalanced minds."

In the Wall Street Journal of a fortnight ago, Prof. Jules Backman of New York University wrote that he preferred the "Puritan ethic" to the "spendthrift ethic." Many similar examples could be offered as evidence of the rising tide of resentment against the fiscal irresponsibility of the present administration.

There can be no argument about Federal taxes being too high, but they are not as obviously too high as is Federal spending. The farm program, Federal investment in the electric light business and other needless socialist undertakings, the never-ending pork barrel, excessive veteran aid, crazy foreign aid, billions spent so we can find out if the man in the moon is really made out of green cheese, probable extravagances in national defense spending—all these, and many more could be pared to the saving of a vast number of billions a year were the will to save really present in official Washington. We could have a major tax cut and a budget surplus at once, if our rulers wanted it that way.

Throughout the country the balanced budget is accepted as standard at the State and municipal levels. Perhaps some psychiatrist can tell us why it is that the atmosphere in Washington causes the men we select to rule us to lose all contact with prudence and commonsense.

The obvious way to stimulate economic growth and reduce unemployment is to put greater emphasis upon the profit motive, make business concerns want to build more plants and hire more people. Calvin Coolidge's remark that the only way a man can get a job is to have somebody hire him still stands.

BEST TRADE SPUR MOVES NOT VOTEGETTERS

The basic difficulty in this whole area of thought is that the moves by Government which will best stimulate business performance are not the moves which will get the most popular votes for their sponsors. Perhaps the way for the average Congressman to get reelected is to vote to concentrate tax reduction in the lowest individual income tax brackets and to continue the present policy of giving labor unions favored treatment. These emphatically are not the roads to business stimulation.

And right here is the handicap under which a democracy must work. Often the popular things are not the good things to do. Lower corporate taxes would be much more helpful to the community as a whole than lower individual taxes. The individuals vote and the corporations do not. So it is at least a rather hopeless cause.

Similarly it would be better for the cause of economic growth were tax relief concentrated in the high rather than in the lower income tax brackets because it is in the upper brackets that the sources of capital are found.

Whatever makes for more capital investment in industry, and more profits for business, is what the country needs. Emphasis along these lines, and unemployment would vanish in a matter of months.

And yet, nearly every politician believes that fostering a program of helping the big fellow and the big corporation and passing the little fellow, would be political suicide.

GERMAN PROSPERITY BASED ON SURPLUS

A German gentleman, Dr. Hermann Abs by name was in the United States recently to address the American Bankers Association convention. Dr. Abs is managing director of the Deutsche Bank of Frankfort, one of Europe's largest and most respected financial institutions.

In his talk to the American bankers he said some interesting and significant things. During the great period of prosperity which followed World War II neither the budget of the West German Government nor the governments of the various German States operated a deficit. On the contrary there were often surpluses instead.

During the years between 1950 and 1960 "the credit policy of the German Central Bank was extremely conservative and restricted." German trade unions exercised restraint in their demands for higher wages unrelated to productivity. The German Government granted special depreciation allowances to basic industries for investment purposes. Corporations were allowed a substantial reduction in corporate taxes on distributed profits.

And right here is the blueprint for prosperity for the United States: a balanced Federal budget, more restrictive credit policies, limiting wage increases to gains in productivity, and tax incentives to economic growth and the payment of dividends.

Our main objection to these leftwing liberal fellows in politics is that their ideas just do not work. The governments of the United States, and of the various States and cities and towns are always thinking up new ways to inject themselves into the lives of us common people. It never occurs to the politicians that the one thing we all want the most is to have them stop spending our money foolishly and reduce our taxes.

Paleozoic Pains in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Personal and Pertinent column of the Scranton Times recently carried a very interesting article on the coal industry of Pennsylvania, its beginning and present condition. As part of my remarks today, I quote this article written by Mr. Neil Whitney, associate editor of the Times.

The article follows:

Those of us born and reared in this section of Pennsylvania for the most part take for granted the presence of coal beneath the surface of our land. As laymen, we give little thought to how this fuel happened to get there or how it was that this particular region has a virtual monopoly on anthracite in all of the United States. In a section of the current issue of Business Review, the publication of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Evan B. Alderfer has an interesting article dealing with the current plight of the coal industry—anthracite and bituminous—in our State. "Paleozoic Pains in Pennsylvania" is the title the author gives his story, in which he gives a thumbnail sketch furnishing us with the basic information as to how these great deposits of coal were brought into being. "Paleozoic" is defined in Webster's as "of, or pertaining to, or designating a grand division of geological history from the beginning of the Cambrian to the end of the Permian. The Paleozoic Era was characterized by the culmination of nearly all classes of invertebrates except the insect. In its later epochs land plants, amphibians and reptiles first appeared." In his article, Mr. Alderfer writes that "approximately 285 million years ago Pennsylvania was in worse shape than it is today. Of course, there were no budgetary problems, no urban congestion, no worries about growth, no excess capacity, no unemployment and no labor-management discord. Yet present-day difficulties of the Commonwealth have roots 285 million years deep. By the geologist's calendar, the Paleozoic Era had just begun to dawn. The climate was damp and the landscape was bleak and dreary. Land contended with water for domination, leviathans infested the seas and primitive reptiles made their appearance on land. Great ferns and forests flourished in our State resembled the great Dismal Swamp.

"Time went on and on," continues Mr. Alderfer. "Through cycles and seasons, plant life grew and decayed. Over inconceivably long periods of time the accumulation of roots, tree trunks, leaves, twigs, shrubs, grasses and mosses that had been covered with water so deep that decomposition had been retarded formed deep layers of black muck and peat. Periodically, the encroaching ocean covered the accumulated muck with sand and silt, so that the swamp lay buried thousands of feet deep by sediment from the receding land surface. At various times during the 80-million-year carboniferous or coal-forming period the land heaved and at other times it sank to form alternate layers of coal beds, interspersed with layers of shale and sandstone. Under great pressure through milleniums and buildup, the original deep peat beds of ancient swamps were compressed into shallower seams of true coal, ranging in thickness from 4 feet or less to 10 feet or more. So it came to pass that Pennsylvania, as part of the Appalachian coal fields, was endowed with a rich understructure of energy which predestined the Commonwealth to become a great industrial empire." Then Mr. Alderfer proceeds to a review of the evils which have befallen the coal industry. Anthracite has dropped from a peak output of 100 million tons in 1918 to less than 20 million tons a year, while soft coal has slipped from a top production, also in 1918, of 179 million tons to 65 million tons. Unemployment is in excess of 6 percent in 8 of the 11 anthracite counties. When the coal business ran into trouble, the article points out, Pennsylvania "ran into a lot of trouble because it was the country's original coal bin. To date, the State has mined 8 billion tons of bituminous and over 5 billion tons of anthracite." Reviewing the original coal in the Commonwealth Mr. Alderfer thus finds that "fundamentally, though not exclusively, the pains in Pennsylvania are Paleozoic."

The Silver Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial on pending silver legislation from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 21.

THE SILVER DOLLAR

We have come a long way since William Jennings Bryan used to orate about the "cross of gold" and demand the acceptance of silver as basic to our monetary system on a ratio of 16-to-1 with gold. Now Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has made a recommendation that, if approved by Congress, will diminish the importance of silver by switching from silver certificates to Federal reserve notes thus freeing 1.3 billion ounces of silver required by law to maintain $1 silver certificates in circulation. The recommendation is eminently sensible. Mr. Dillon points out that the Government's supply of silver for coinage will run out in 1965 unless it can free for use by the Government's mints some of the 1.3 billion ounces now lying useless in vaults. When the Government's supply runs out, it may have to buy silver in foreign markets, for the domestic production of silver is not sufficient to meet all demands.

Some of the silver-producing States have long maintained a sentimental interest in silver dollars, along with a powerful bloc in Congress that prevented any modernization of our silver laws. The silver dollar is about as obsolete as the arguments of the silver bloc, and sentiment is strong for a revision of our laws concerned with silver in its relation to the monetary system. If something is not done, Mr. Dillon suggested even graver threats to silver coinage ahead. If the Government has to diminish its gold reserve still further by purchasing silver abroad, we may be faced with a common European expedient of using other cheaper metals. The silver bloc would hate the thin jingle of aluminum dimes and quarters. To forestall that hazard, let the silver laws be revised.

New York Times Account of GOP Nuclear Test Ban Committee's Third Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the western edition of the New York Times newspaper yesterday carried the following account of the Republican Conference Nuclear Test Ban Committee's third report, issued the day previous:

GOP CHIEFS FEAR "HOLE" IN TEST BAN

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—The House Republican leadership asserted today that the administration's proposals for an atomic test ban would leave a "big hole" for undetectable cheating by the Soviet Union.

Through this "big hole," the Republicans warned, "the Russians clandestinely can prepare a nuclear Pearl Harbor without any fear whatever of being caught."

The statement, issued by the Republican conference committee on nuclear testing and signed by the House Republican leadership, represented one of the party's strongest attacks on the position taken by the administration in the test-ban negotiations in Geneva.

Until now the Republican criticism had centered on the administration's concessions in the negotiations, such as abandoning demands for international control stations within the Soviet Union and reducing demands for onsite inspections to seven a year. In today's statement the Republicans said they came to the critical conclusion that, as a result of these concessions, there would be no reliable system for detecting small underground explosions within the Soviet Union.

The statement, the third issued by the Republican group in the last month, took the form of a summary analysis of technical testimony presented earlier this month to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy on test detection problems.

From this testimony the Republican committee drew the conclusion that the administration's proposal for a network of seismic detection stations outside the Soviet Union would leave a "big hole" in detecting small underground explosions.

The statement pointed out that the proposed seismic detection system would have a detection threshold of 3 kilotons—the equivalent of 3,000 tons of TNT. Clandestine underground explosions smaller than 3 kilotons, it declared, would not be subject to verification at all.

Underground tests of 3 kilotons or less could not be detected, the report said, because by the time their seismic signals reached stations outside the Soviet Union they would be so small as to be drowned out by the normal seismic noise in the earth's surface.

If by chance detection should occur, it said, the impossible job of identifying such suspicious events among hundreds of small earthquake signals of comparable size still will hide the cheater safely inside the "big hole."

Administration officials have acknowledged that the proposed detection system would have decreasing chances of detecting underground explosions of only a few kilotons.

The administration has contended, however, that the risks of violation are far outweighed by the risks of an unabated atomic arms race and that the weapons advances that could be made through small underground tests would not significantly alter the military balance.

In contrast, the Republican statement argued that the small underground tests could be of considerable importance in developing a broad spectrum of nuclear weapons, including the so-called neutron bomb.

In support of this contention, the statement cited the testimony of Maj. Gen. Austin W. Betts, Director of the Division of Military Applications in the Atomic Energy Commission.

On the basis of this testimony, the statement said that in the undetectable, "big hole," it would be possible to develop all tactical nuclear weapons of interest to the military and a substantial fraction of the strategic weapons needed.

The statement recalled that General Betts had said about one-half of all the underground tests in Nevada were in this low-yield range of undetectability.

To enter into a treaty on the terms now proposed by the administration, the statement said, would be tantamount to offering to stop all significant U.S. nuclear weapons developments and, as a practical matter, simply trust the Soviets to keep their promise to do likewise.

The statement called on the President to shake off his fuzzy thinking disarmament advisers and return to the concept of an enforceable test-ban treaty. Specifically, it urged the President to insist that there be manned seismic detection stations within the Soviet Union in sufficient numbers and at all locations required to close the "big hole."

Actions of the U.N. Against Government of Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. R. L. Prince, of Landrum, S.C., has called my attention to a brief article which recently appeared in the State, of Raleigh, N.C., dated March 2, 1963. Mr. Prince thought the contents of this article should be called to the attention of the Members of the Congress as a further reminder of the unwarranted and inhuman actions taken by the U.N. against the anti-Communist government of Katanga. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Mar. 2, 1963]

ANYBODY PROUD OF THE WAY U.N. MAKES WAR?

From an eyewitness account of the first week of the third round of the U.N.'s war in Katanga, published January 7 by the prominent Brussels newspaper, Le Soir. "On December 28 the Ethiopians who had assembled on the Aveune des Usines attacked the African suburbs of Albert—against which they fired 5,000 rounds from 120-caliber mortars—and Kenya. They then proceeded to a cleanup, house by house. Looting of radio sets, watches, and clothes. Every African who got in their way was knocked down. The wounded were finished off—disemboweled with a knife or shot through the head. The women were raped. Those who fled served as living targets for the Blue Helmets. Children were killed by kicking their heads in, and entire families were wiped out.

"At the Ineacat farm, near Kerberg, the Ethiopians made the Europeans get outside the houses and kneel while they looted the buildings. Thirty-five women and children were later brought out in ambulances. The Blue Helmets pillaged the cottages of the African workers.

"Then there was the murder of Madame Dister, a Frenchwoman beaten to death by the Ethiopian soldiers."

Another Appraisal of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I had occasion to comment on the floor of this House with regard to the performance of duty on the part of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. I pointed out then that there were a lot of us in this House who admire the job the Secretary is doing and who are impressed by his ability to make tough decisions and then stick by them when the flak begins to fly.

I was pleased the other day to see that this appraisal of our Secretary of Defense is shared by the Washington Evening Star, as demonstrated in its editorial of March 15, 1963. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial:

PENTAGON BOSS MAN

When Robert S. McNamara first came to the Pentagon 2 years ago to be briefed on his new job, the outgoing Secretary, Thomas S. Gates, suggested he study a new Air Force report on the legal powers of the Secretary of Defense. The theme of the study was that Congress in 1958 had voted vast but unexplored authority to the Secretary—authority that Mr. Gates was just beginning to understand and to exercise.

Mr. McNamara found in that report one of the solutions to the problem that had plagued previous Secretaries and had deeply disturbed Congress and the public—the problem of forcing four services to agree on a minimum essential national defense.

Ever since he was sworn in Mr. McNamara has used the full legal powers of his office. He has consolidated functions common to all of the services; he has plunged into the details of Defense Department problems; he has asked the services embarrassing questions about imbalances and inconsistencies in the force structures and has insisted on clear, fast answers to his questions; he has introduced new management techniques to meet military objectives more cheaply, and he has made the tough decisions required by his job.

Some Congressmen are criticizing him today, largely on the score of not leaving the decisions up to military men. They do not say Mr. McNamara has failed to consult the military men, for the record of congressional hearings show he has done this exhaustively. The conclusion is that the Congressmen can

only be asking that the military men make more decisions—or, more likely, argue more and procrastinate more.

We like Mr. McNamara's approach. Other approaches have been tried, and they did not work. There was the spectacle, for instance, of former Secretary of Defense McElroy begging Congress to "hold our feet to the fire" and force the Pentagon to choose between the Bomarc and Hercules missiles.

If Congress wants to return to the old days, then Congress must change the law to take power of decision away from the Secretary of Defense. We think that Congress, upon reflection, will not want to do this. For someone must make the decisions, and they are tough to make. We hope that Mr. McNamara will come up with the right answers, and we think, certainly on the whole, that he has been right. The real point is, however, that someone must be willing to do the homework, to take the responsibility and to assume the personal risks of decision-making in the Defense Department. This is what Mr. McNamara has been doing, and we do not believe that Congress, the President, or anyone else, is in a position to do it for him. If the Secretary is strong willed and hard boiled, these qualities are essential in his job.

Counterpart Funds and U.S. Foreign Currency Accounts Acquired Without Payment of Dollars: A Survey of Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Counterpart Funds and U.S. Foreign Currency Accounts Acquired Without Payment of Dollars: A Survey of Expenditures":

COUNTERPART FUNDS AND U.S. FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS ACQUIRED WITHOUT PAYMENTS OF DOLLARS: A SURVEY OF EXPENDITURES

INTRODUCTION

The present report places special emphasis on some aspects of the counterpart and U.S. foreign currency accounts acquired without the payment of dollars, and deals with other aspects in a less detailed manner. Due to the fact that a substantial part of the desired information does not appear in published sources, and that the time limitation did not permit an extensive search of unpublished sources, the scope of the report is necessarily limited.

It must be pointed out that due to the form in which basic data used in the preparation of this report appear in their sources, some deficiencies and discrepancies are inescapable; these will be identified in the body of the report and, where possible, explained. A further consideration to be taken into account is the fact that the data presented below have been computed from cumulative or partial figures. These are subject to accounting revisions and foreign exchange rate fluctuations; hence, statistical information presented in the included tables is not absolutely accurate but contains a small margin of error.

Throughout the report sight must not be lost of the fact that, although all data are given in dollars, these data are actually not specifically dollars but only dollar equivalents of foreign currencies involved.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

At the outset, a distinction must be drawn between counterpart funds and U.S. foreign currency accounts acquired without payments of dollars. Although both are generated predominantly by some aspect of the U.S. economic foreign aid effort, the basic difference between the two hinges on the ownership of the funds involved.

(a) Counterpart funds are deposits of foreign currency made by a foreign country recipient of U.S. economic grant aid into a special account. These deposits are to a certain degree commensurate with the dollar value of the assistance furnished, and remain the property of the foreign country, although their use is subject to U.S. control. They may be used for assistance purposes authorized in the pertinent statutes either for the benefit of the country of deposit or in specified instances for the benefit of a third country. A small portion of these funds, usually up to 10 percent, is subject to transfer to the ownership of the United States and may be used for U.S. expenditures abroad as authorized by law.

(b) U.S. foreign currency accounts within the scope of this report are only those foreign currency accounts which have been acquired without the expenditure of dollars. For the most part, they are generated by sales of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities under various programs; they do include, however, currencies derived from some additional minor sources. In distinction from counterpart funds, these accounts are owned in their entirety by the United States and may be used primarily for further economic assistance or for payment of various U.S. obligations and nonaid programs abroad, as authorized by the pertinent legislation.

Foreign currencies derived from some specified sources may not be used without reimbursement in appropriated dollars, while others may be so used. Among the latter are funds used for the purpose of covering congressional foreign travel expenditures.

USE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS

Table I presents a breakdown of deposits to and withdrawals from foreign-owned counterpart funds by fiscal year and major purpose. "Foreign aid" column indicates expenditures of these funds for U.S.-approved development and other assistance projects in the country of deposit or in a third country. "U.S. use" indicates transfers of foreign currencies from counterpart funds to U.S. foreign currency accounts. (See table I.)

TABLE I.—*Transactions in counterpart funds, by major use, fiscal years 1949–62*

[In million dollar equivalents]

Fiscal year	Deposits	Withdrawals			
		Total	Foreign aid	U.S. use	Other
1949 [1]	2,682.5	2,057.0	1,922.9	134.1	
1950	3,181.9	2,261.3	2,153.7	107.6	
1951	2,307.7	2,800.7	2,681.1	119.6	
1952 [2]	1,792.9	1,803.8	1,720.6	83.2	
1953	1,336.2	1,308.7	1,218.8	89.9	
1954	1,010.8	1,232.1	1,154.4	77.7	
1955	854.4	817.3	771.5	45.8	
1956	829.0	855.8	832.5	23.3	
1957	811.3	810.8	769.5	14.3	
1958	814.4	1,084.3	1,069.3	15.0	
1959	621.5	731.3	723.9	13.6	−6.2
1960	650.8	732.2	718.9	24.1	−10.8
1961	675.0	656.7	632.1	24.6	0
1962 [3]	482.4	571.6	556.7	14.3	.6

[1] Cumulative since the inception of the European program on Apr. 3, 1948.
[2] Includes cumulative data of the Far East program since its inception on June 5, 1950.
[3] July 1, 1961, through Mar. 31, 1962.

Source: U.S. Agency for International Development, counterpart funds and AID foreign currency accounts; data as of Mar. 31, 1962; and comparable publications of predecessor agencies as of June 30.

U.S. FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS

As has been noted earlier, the present survey deals only with those U.S. foreign currency accounts which have been acquired without payment of dollars. U.S. expenditures of foreign currencies purchased with appropriated dollars are for all practical purposes expenditures of dollars and are accounted for as such.

Excluded from the presentation are transactions in foreign currency accounts held by the United States in trust for foreign governments.

Table II shows the transactions (except interaccount transfers and exchange rate adjustments) in U.S.-owned foreign currency accounts. Except for a small portion, all foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars regardless of their source are credited first to a U.S. Treasury account from which they are transferred to the account of the agency requiring their use. Because of this accounting procedure and of the fact that the sourec of table II is constructed on the basis of current day-to-day receipts and disbursements, the expenditures entry is not a true portrayal of net foreign currency expenditures by an agency inasmuch as it does not reflect reimbursements of unspent funds to the U.S. Treasury and other adjustments. The expenditures entry reflects rather the gross disbursements by the U.S. disbursement officers from foreign currency accounts.

"Sales for dollars" entry shows the amount of foreign currencies spent for settlement of U.S. obligations payable in foreign currencies from appropriated funds. In the course of its worldwide operations, the United States through its agencies incurs obligations, payable in foreign currencies which do not fall within the legislative authorization for the use of foreign currencies without reimbursement in dollars. Such obligations are settled with foreign currencies purchased by the spending agency with appropriated dollars and are accounted for as dollar expenditures. Within the limits of physical and statutory availability such purchases are made from foreign currency accounts acquired without payments of dollars.

Comprehensive data on foreign currency accounts of the United States have been published by the U.S. Treasury only beginning in 1958; data for earlier years are not available.

TABLE II.—*Transactions in U.S. foreign currency accounts acquired without payment of dollars, 1958–61, by fiscal year and agency*

[In thousand dollar equivalents]

Fiscal year	1958	1959	1960	1961
Receipts	1,185,759	1,269,908	1,210,699	1,303,143
Expenditures	526,986	726,122	559,153	711,197
Funds appropriated to the President	505,418	688,417	506,152	680,024
Export-Import Bank		11,189	20,031	19,572
U.S. Information Agency	221	1,215	1,212	
Department of Agriculture	3,571	4,836	7,970	22
Department of Defense	15,828	14,762	16,554	11,080
Department of State	1,949	5,703	7,234	499
Sales for dollars	270,483	240,573	203,427	215,183

NOTE.—Due to rounding detail may not add to totals.

Source: U.S. Treasury Department, combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government, fiscal years 1958–61.

Foreign currency expenditures from the funds appropriated to the President were for the bulk of the U.S. foreign assistance, extended in foreign currencies through the International Cooperation Administration (now Agency for International Development), Development Loan Fund (now a part of AID), and Department of Defense, and for the administrative expenditures connected therewith.

The transactions of the Export-Import Bank were primarily those connected with the lending activities under the provisions of section 104(e) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). These activities have been transferred during fiscal year 1962 to the Agency for International Development.

The U.S. Information Agency's expenditures of foreign currencies are authorized for American-sponsored schools and centers, and for the audiovisual program (both administered jointly with the Department of State), for translation of foreign language books and periodicals, and for organization and operation of U.S. trade fairs abroad.

Expenditures of foreign currencies effected by the Department of Agriculture were made under the authority of section 104(a) of Public Law 480 for the development of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural commodities.

Foreign currencies used by the Department of Defense were spent primarily on military family housing programs.

The Department of State is authorized by statute to spend foreign currencies for a variety of purposes falling within the provisions of section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and several subsections of section 104 of Public Law 480, such as international educational exchange; American-sponsored schools and centers abroad; scientific, medical, cultural, and educational activities; construction of buildings for U.S. Government use; American educational institutions, and workshops and chairs in American studies abroad; and for financing an audiovisual informational and educational program. A portion of State Department expenditures involves also congressional travel expenditures.

CONGRESSIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

In addition to the authorized uses listed above, section 1754(b), title 22 of the United States Code provides that "local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties—for their local currency expenses."[1] For the purposes of accounting, these currencies are made available to the Congress through a special account of the State Department (19 F.T. 561). This account serves the sole purpose of providing local currencies to members and staff of the committees of the Congress traveling abroad on official business.

Officials of the other two branches of U.S. Government in foreign travel status may not, generally speaking, use foreign currencies without purchasing them with appropriated dollars. The exception to this rule are expenses incurred during travel abroad connected with the administration of programs for which the use of such currencies is authorized. Such expenses cannot be isolated without detailed inspection and analysis of all the transactions in their respective accounts.

During the last 4 fiscal years, the disbursements of foreign currencies through the 19 FT 561 account were as follows (in dollar equivalents):

1958	$535,890
1959	398,199
1960	631,180
1961	309,253

These amounts are included in the total expenditures of foreign currencies from the State Department accounts as listed in table II.

The lack of more detail in the U.S. Treasury's public accounting for foreign currencies spent for congressional travel is due to the statutory requirements on accounting for such funds. While Treasury's data are only a record of disbursement vouchers submitted by the U.S. disbursing officers abroad and charged against the congressional travel account of the Department of State, the statutes place the primary responsibility for detailed accounting upon the Congress. They require that detailed reports on foreign currencies used by the members and staff of congressional committees, broken down by the individual user and major purpose, be submitted to the chairman of the committee on whose business foreign travel was performed. These reports are published annually on a calendar year basis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since the provision for such detailed public accounting has been in effect only since 1960 (sec. 105(a), Public Law 86–628), detailed breakdowns of foreign currency expenditures for congressional travel can be provided only for the period since 1960.

Prior to 1960 only consolidated reports giving totals by type of foreign currency and major purpose were published for each committee, although detailed individual reports were required of each foreign currency user for submission to the respective committee chairman (sec. 401(a), Public Law 85–477, Mutual Security Act of 1958).

Before 1958, the chairmen of congressional committees, authorized to use foreign currencies for travel abroad, were required only to submit to the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as the case may be, "full reports" on total amounts of foreign currencies spent and purposes for which spent (sec. 502(b), Public Law 83–665, Mutual Security Act of 1954). There was no requirement for making these reports public.

In view of the above-mentioned reporting requirements, only certain totals, published by the Congressional Quarterly Almanac which were based on public sources and inquiries to congressional offices, are available for the years 1955-59. They give the following picture of Member travel and foreign currency expenditures (in dollar equivalents) connected therewith:

Year	House		Senate		Total	
	Travelers	Expenditure	Travelers	Expenditure	Travelers	Expenditure
1955	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	[2] 136,000
1956	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	490,236
1957 [3]	178	122,656	46	169,186	224	291,842
1958 [3]	117	356,493	42	131,792	159	488,285
1959 [4]	139	258,023	51	145,831	190	403,859

[1] Not available.
[2] Approximate amount.
[3] On fiscal year basis; data exclude expenditures of joint committee which were not available.
[4] On calendar-year basis; expenditures of joint committees included under Senate.

Source: Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1958–60.

The number of travelers indicated above comprises only Members of Congress and does not include employees of the committee concerned. It is presumed, however, that the expenditures contain also those incurred by the committee employees since the pertinent statutory provision in effect prior to 1958 required that total amounts spent by the committees be reported.

The 1958 change in reporting procedure specifically requires that expenditures of committee employees be included in committee chairman's report; hence expenditure data for 1959 in all likelihood comprise both members and employees of committees.

Data for the calendar years 1960 and 1961 are presented in detail in table III. Since source data include foreign travel expenditures in appropriated dollars as well as foreign currencies, the same information has been retained in the table. For the purpose of a better analysis, distinction has also been made between trips financed from foreign currency and appropriated funds, and those financed solely from dollar appropriations.

Table III has been derived from the detailed reports published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in accordance with statutory requirement. For the sake of uniformity of presentation some adjustments, based on remarks and other information contained in the published reports, had to be made in the process of computation of data appearing in table III.

Congressional trips identifiable as taking place only within the United States have been excluded, while U.S. travel connected with trips abroad has been included.

Insofar as indicated in the source as such, several foreign trips made by the same per-

[1] The use of foreign currencies specifically for congressional travel was first authorized by section 527 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 385).

son were counted as separate trips. Any listed refunds on unused transportation tickets or of unused funds, or reimbursements for nonofficial expenditures have been deducted wherever applicable. On the other hand, cost of transportation furnished by the military, the value of which was listed as unknown, in several instances had to be omitted. To this extent, the dollar cost of congressional travel is understated. It is assumed that this aspect does not affect the foreign currency cost.

TABLE III.—*Official congressional travel abroad, calendar years 1960 and 1961; by number of trips, and expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated dollars; broken down by House and Senate, and Members and staff* [1]

[Values in dollars or dollar equivalents]

Type of currency spent on trip	Members				Staff				Total			
	Trips	Foreign currency	Dollars	Total	Trips	Foreign currency	Dollars	Total	Trips	Foreign currency	Dollars	Total
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1960												
Foreign currencies and dollars	78	87,728	16,410	104,137	33	41,691	7,053	48,744	111	129,419	23,463	152,881
Dollars only	19		26,080	26,080	15		28,334	28,334	34		54,414	54,414
Total	97	87,728	42,490	130,217	48	41,691	35,387	77,078	145	129,419	77,877	207,295
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1961												
Foreign currencies and dollars	138	209,856	21,205	231,061	61	85,427	11,854	97,281	199	295,283	33,060	328,343
Dollars only	62		59,794	59,794	14		21,831	21,831	76		81,625	81,625
Total	200	209,856	80,999	290,855	75	85,427	33,685	119,113	275	295,283	114,685	409,968
SENATE, 1960												
Foreign currencies and dollars	49	38,788	19,814	58,602	45	52,338	13,230	65,568	94	91,125	33,044	124,169
Dollars only												
Total	49	38,788	19,814	58,602	45	52,338	13,230	65,568	94	91,125	33,044	124,169
SENATE, 1961												
Foreign currencies and dollars	65	69,077	16,439	85,515	65	85,039	13,215	98,254	130	154,116	29,654	183,769
Dollars only	31		13,371	13,371	14		3,769	3,769	45		17,140	17,140
Total	96	69,077	29,810	98,887	79	85,039	16,984	102,023	175	154,116	46,794	200,910

[1] For explanation of table III and additional data for 1960 see text. Number of trips may be understated since multiple trips by 1 individual were counted as such only where there was a specific statement to that effect. Due to rounding detail may not add to totals.

Sources: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1961, 1962.

Expenditures of both foreign currencies and dollars listed in the source as group expenditures were prorated among the individuals participating in the trip to which they applied if such individuals were easily identifiable, or among all the persons reported by a committee as having traveled abroad.

Travelers reported by the joint committees (Economic and Atomic Energy) have been included in figures for their respective House of Congress, if Members, and in those for the Senate if employees. To the extent of House employees participating in joint committee travel the data for the Senate are somewhat overstated.

Also not included in the table are foreign currency travel expenditures of the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations, and of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee incurred during the period January 1 through May 13, 1960, which were reported in the source only as expenditure amounting to $26,383 dollar equivalents. The number and breakdown of individuals involved in this travel is not available.

As an individual item of interest it might be mentioned that the reported various refunds and reimbursements of nonofficial expenditures during the 2 years amounted to $5,995, broken down as follows (in rounded figures):

	1960	*1961*
House	$542	$1,722
Senate	1,574	2,158

As mentioned earlier, the original expenditures involved in these refunds have not been included in table III.

Is Profit Without Honor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, in an address on January 30, 1963, in Evansville, Ind., Mr. Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., president of the Aluminum Co. of America, at the annual dinner of the chamber of commerce, posed the following questions:

What about profits? Are they something good or something bad? Are they seeds of growth, or are they just something left over when the accountant's books are balanced? And how much is left over in these days? Do profits divide us—plutocrats on the one hand and slaves on the other—or do they make growth and freedom possible?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Litchfield shows that increased profits help corporation ownership and management grow and expand, increase the number of jobs, increase wages, increase buying power, and also increase the government's tax intake. Under unanimous consent, I include this address entitled "Is Profit Without Honor?" in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

IS PROFIT WITHOUT HONOR?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good evening ladies and gentlemen, it is certainly a pleasure to be here tonight. I enjoy the opportunity to make new friends, and I've learned something about the heartwarming dynamics of Hoosier hospitality.

But, most of all, it makes me feel at home to be in a place where Alcoa and the community are working hard together to build for a future which we all hope will be prosperous. Here is one place in America where people are doing something positive to help keep this country moving ahead.

I am glad that Alcoa is part of this positiveness. You will remember that last October we announced plans to build a multimillion-dollar rolling mill next to our Warrick smelter. When completed, the new plant will have the capacity to produce 120 million pounds of precision-rolled aluminum sheet each year. Our engineers have designed the plant to allow for future expansion to several times this capacity. The risks involved in an investment of this magnitude are great, but if we are able to maintain control over costs—and if the economic outlook brightens—we will try hard to convert this possibility of further expansion into something more tangible. But first we must get this new unit underway. As you know, work at the site has already started.

I am sure Cy Ibach, our works manager, keeps you informed on our hopes and plans for Warrick. But, just in passing, let me point out again that, when completed, the new fabricating operation will provide the

opportunity for approximately 1,000 new jobs. We expect that eventually there will be 300 or 400 more jobs at the smelter. The only way to make these additional jobs possible is to jack up the demand for aluminum to a point where we can add additional potlines. We're working hard at it. And remember—you can help, too, by making sure that every bit of aluminum you buy is made by Alcoa.

As a temporary economic bonus, it is anticipated that the contractor's peak employment during construction of the new fabricating plant will reach 1,500.

In short, Alcoa is staking an important part of its future right here in your area. That's what I mean when I say it makes me feel at home to be in a place where Alcoa and the community are working hard together to build something tangible, something which should help to make the future more prosperous, something that will create more jobs.

Let me repeat for Alcoa that we are proud to be a part of this community. We believe in you. And we sincerely hope that you believe in us too—and that the news of our expansion was good news to everybody.

MANAGEMENT'S TOUGHEST DECISIONS

Let me take a moment to point out another side to this story. The good news of Alcoa's expansion at Warrick had to be bad news for the people of some other community. For no company can decide to build a plant in one location without making the decision not to build the plant somewhere else.

Deciding not to build a plant—deciding to shut down an existing plant—deciding to end operations in one community and start them in another—all of these decisions are among the toughest any businessman has to make. Yet there is no way I know to avoid such decisions.

Late in 1960, for example, changing patterns in the automotive industry and the pressures of competition made it imperative that Alcoa consolidate some of its aluminum castings sections. One was in Detroit; another in Cleveland. We had to decide where to consolidate.

Local and State taxes were important cost factors at both installations. However, when we compared the facts, we found that, in 1960, State and local taxes in Michigan amounted to 4.98 percent of our capital investment. The same taxes in Ohio amounted to only 1.04 percent. Based on these costs alone, Alcoa was paying more than four times as much for the right to do business in Detroit as in Cleveland.

After weighing other costs—which proved to be much alike—we settled for Cleveland.

I think Alcoa management has the right to ask this question: Did Alcoa make the decision to consolidate at Cleveland—or was that decision made for us largely by the citizens and government of the State of Michigan?

I believe the decision in large part was made for us, not by us.

FACTS OF BUSINESS LIFE

And that brings us to a second question: Why has Alcoa decided to cast its lot with this community instead of some other?

In recent months, Alcoa has held serious and frank discussions with its Evansville neighbors. There have been talks about the tax situation. There have been talks about ways to improve labor-management relationships. There have been talks with employees about what we can all do to help reduce costs. We are confident that these discussions have served a useful purpose—that there will be improved Alcoa-community cooperation in the weeks and months that lie ahead.

We at Alcoa believe you understand that business, to be permanent and healthy, must live in an environment where there is long-term tax stability—where labor-management relations are characterized by prudence and good judgment—where the economic needs of one segment of the community are not allowed to overshadow the life and vigor of the community as a whole. We have been completely frank with you in discussing our problems. We hope there has been—and is—mutual understanding.

Let's put it another way. Alcoa believes that the people of this area and the people of Indiana understand that the basic all-important function of a business is to turn a profit—that a business cannot fulfill its community and social obligations without earnings—that without a profit, any business must die—that business is not a social institution or a charity—worthy though these causes may be—but an organization that can survive only through dollars-and-cents profits.

I believe it is fair for you to assume that any large corporation which plans additional capital investment in your State does so because it believes you understand these facts of business life. You may assume, too, that Aluminum Co. of America is no exception.

UNDERSTANDING PROFITS

Though you understand these facts, it is becoming painfully clear that growing numbers of our fellow Americans do not. And that is what I would like to speak briefly about this evening.

I believe there is a tremendous task ahead for all of us who understand the material and moral consequences of doing business in a free enterprise economy. I believe that all of us who do understand have an obligation—which is part patriotism and part just plain common sense—to make the profit motive clear to those who do not understand it.

And that is the role I have chosen for myself tonight. I come to you as a missionary, or salesman if you wish, of the profit motive.

What about profits? Are they something good or something bad? Are they seeds of growth—or are they just something left over when the accountant's books are balanced? And how much is left over in these days? Do profits divide us—plutocrats on the one hand and slaves on the other—or do they make growth and freedom possible?

Certainly there is evidence to an alarming degree that all too many of us look upon profits as something hidden, probably exorbitant and possibly evil.

In a recent national survey of students from seventh grade through college, better than 60 percent believed the following statements to be true:

Business owners get more money than workers from increases in machinery output.

Owners get too much money compared with employees.

In many industries, one or two companies so dominate the field that they act as monopolies.

In some fields, so much power is concentrated in the hands of so few companies that it is bad for the Nation.

More than 63 percent of the seventh graders tested believed the Government should control large company profits; 57 percent of the high school seniors and 47 percent of the college freshmen agreed. In a later survey of adults, a whopping 42 percent agreed.

Among students preparing to be teachers, only half understood that a business cannot function without profit—only 27 percent believed that the most practical way for workers to earn more was to produce more.

There were two statistics which particularly frightened me. The first was this: Of college students majoring in education, only 20 percent got any exposure to economics. The second was: When asked, "Why do people work?" only 6 percent of the young people interviewed answered, "Because they like to work."

These are Americans, mind you—not children brought up as the heirs of socialism.

I suggest you ask your own children what they understand about profits. Ask them if they really understand and endorse these facts of life: that the reason, directly or indirectly, that they can go to school or college, the reason there are schools and colleges with teachers and physical facilities, the reason there are churches, hospitals, YMCA's, Boy Scout camps, and all the other advantages they take for granted, is because someone—a lot of someones in fact—made profits.

Such public attitudes cannot help but inhibit the ability of our free-enterprise economy to continue to give life and vigor to our national environment.

HOW PROFITS HAVE DECLINED

The current profit picture tends to show how this kind of unrealistic thinking is gradually being translated into unrealistic action.

Last year President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers issued a report which showed the decline of corporate profits after taxes as a percentage of gross national product. In the 1947–51 period, net profits equaled 7.2 percent. Profits fell to 5.2 percent in the 1952–56 period, and to 4.6 percent in the 1957–61 period.

What happens when profits fall? Fewer new plants are built—less money is available for research and development—fewer dollars are spent on advertising and sales promotion—less tax money is paid to government—less money is available for schools, churches, and charities.

Fewer new plants mean fewer new jobs. Less money for research and development means less emphasis on new products and new markets, and less growth. Reductions in advertising and sales promotion budgets mean reductions in sales and the number of new customers. All of these things add up to fewer jobs—a smaller tax dollar—and even smaller profits in the future.

I might add here that in 1961 a number of our finest corporations paid their stockholders—their owners—no more than they would have received had they left their money safe and sound in the bank. They got nothing in compensation for risking their capital, a risk always present in business. When a corporation has to do this, it places itself in a poor position to ask the public—or present owners—to provide more funds for growth in the future.

United States Steel's Roger Blough puts the profits problem in another way: "Profits in total dollars have risen only 2 percent since 1950. Wages paid to employees have risen 96 percent—the tax bite 68 percent. If it had been possible for profits to keep pace with the rest of the economy, profits would have reached $40 billion in 1961, instead of $23.3 billion actually realized."

What's wrong with profits of $23.3 billion?

What's wrong is this: It illustrates an alarming trend—a trend due largely to lack of understanding of the function of profits. Profit is a motor which powers growth. The bigger our economy grows, the bigger motor it takes to keep it growing. This formula also works in reverse. Economists have noted that a decline in profits is followed quickly by a decline in employment. America needs between 1.25 and 2 million new jobs each year to keep up with our growing population. If we are to have more jobs, we must have more profits to invest in more productive facilities.

FORMULA FOR ACHIEVEMENT

It seems to me that somewhere along the line we have lost the basic American formula

for achievement. Perhaps we have lost touch with reality. Perhaps it will be useful to turn briefly to the historical origin of our Nation to see where we have strayed from our Founding Fathers' original intent.

If you turn to the pages of the Constitution of the United States—as adopted July 2, 1778—you will be hard put to find the basis for our present-day business-government-labor-management relationships.

Article 1, section 8, of our Constitution provides a basis for Congress to collect taxes and to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. As we have all known since early childhood, the intent of the provision to regulate commerce among the several States was to make sure that free trade would be maintained—that no State would raise a tariff against its neighbor.

Why is the subject of economic participation and manipulation by Government so conspicuous by its absence in the Constitution?

The answer is crystal clear to me, as I hope it is to you. The founders of our Nation understood one basic, profound truth. That truth is that private enterprise, with the profit motive and a minimum of Government regulation, provides the only practical alternative to Government-owned or Government-controlled economy.

Why didn't our Founding Fathers want a Government-owned or a Government-controlled economy?

Because they understood what too few people understand today. That for the Government to control or manipulate the flow of food, clothing and shelter is to provide an environment in which the initiative of the freeman is gradually extinguished, until, indeed, government is absolute. They were properly wary of Central Government control.

The colonists had learned this lesson from firsthand experience. For George III, King of England, had his own version of the Council of Economic Advisers. This council had a big plan for the colonies. The plan was this: The colonies would provide England with an endless flow of raw materials, at prices deemed fair by the council of economic advisers.

After all, the council, in its wisdom, understood the needs of England and the colonies alike. And since it wasn't involved in making a profit, it could render a fair and impartial decision.

English industry, in turn, would convert the raw materials into finished products which would be sold back to the colonists at prices deemed fair by the council.

This kind of old English Government planning taught the colonists the virtues of free trade. It also taught them the kind of economic slavery that comes as the product of government participation and manipulation.

The colonists as individuals and as groups were searching for freedom, not slavery. And it was through free trade—motivated by the delicate instrument of free enterprise and the profit motive—that they hoped to open the doors of their homes to the fresh air of freedom. For without profit, a free enterprise can neither remain free nor even remain an enterprise.

And thus it was that the profit motive became an important weapon in defense of freedom—as much a part of our national heritage as the Bill of Rights or the Constitution.

HAS THIS FORMULA WORKED?

Did this radical philosophical idea prove to be sound and workable in practice?

Though it may not be perfect, the free enterprise, profit-motive philosophy has given birth to a miraculous horn of plenty. From this original and idealistic concept has grown the most vigorous, the most dynamic, the most prosperous nation in the history of the world. And by it and because of it, free men—by their own hands and their own wits—have come to build the great wealth of commerce and industry from which all Americans and a large part of the free world presently draw nourishment.

Today, the United States of America, with about 6 percent of the world's population, is producing more automobiles, more electrical appliances, more TV sets, more telephones than all the rest of the world put together.

Free enterprise is providing the highest standard of living ever known—a standard of living in which Americans spend $26 billion annually for education; $4 billion just for new schools, $87 billion for food, beverages, and tobacco, $34 billion for clothing; $42 billion for housing; $19.4 bilion on recreation—plus billions on churches and charities.

Meanwhile, back in the Soviet Union, that great fatherland of all government planning, things aren't going so well. After 40 years of complete and total control of the farmer, it still takes 50 percent of the Russian work force to produce what we consider a "poor pickings" diet. America produces more food than it knows what to do with on less than 10 percent of the work force.

And from the American free enterprise horn of plenty continues to flow more jobs, more wages, more private property, more wealth than have ever been known in history.

But most important of all—the profit-seeking philosophy has been the principal guardian of the most sacred of all human values—the value for which it was originally created. That value is man's right to free choice. That value is freedom.

If these things are so—and in our hearts we all know they are so—can profit be without honor? Can profit be something bad? Can profit be just something left over after the accountant's books are balanced? Do profits make slaves of us, or do they make our growth in freedom possible?

You and I know the answer. How can there be others who do not?

Perhaps the time has come to check our bearings—to note our course and our future direction. Perhaps the time has come—having listened too long to the virtues of the planned economy—to turn our ears to the voices of Jefferson and Hamilton and Franklin. They spoke more of freedom.

Perhaps the time has come when we should plot a graph—with freedom as one axis and statism as the other—and look carefully to see which direction the black line is leaning.

THE SOLUTION

What can we do about it?

The first thing we must do is to make a firm resolution to provide our children—at home and at school—with a proper free-enterprise education in economics. Our children are the heirs to freedom. Let them learn carefully how their forefathers came by it.

Next, we must put a stop to the consider-me-first attitude which sometimes dominates business-government-labor-management relations. We all want the same things. Corporation ownership and management want to grow and expand—to build for the future—to make improved products at reduced costs. The solution can be found in increased profits.

Labor wants an increase in the number of jobs—increases in wages—increases in buying power—increases in job security. The solution can be found in increased profits.

Government wants an increased tax take—to do the things we must do as a nation. The solution can be found in increased profits.

Since we are all after the same thing, let's work toward it together.

The next thing we must do is to take a greater interest in the affairs of our Government. Before we elect a representative to office, let's make sure he, too, has learned his lessons in free enterprise economics. And once we have placed him in office, let's watch to make sure he practices what he has learned.

A good place to start would be by backing both the tax reform and budget reform measures coming before the Congress this session. We need to put some commonsense back into taxes. Just as important, we need to put some commonsense back into Federal budgets. Write your elected representatives—write them often.

And here are some other things you can do:

When your next door neighbor tells you of the need for a new superhighway, point out that only free enterprise profits can make it possible. And when your visiting Aunt Martha remarks on the fine quality of your church organ, point out that free enterprise profits made it possible. And when sister Sue brings home a new book from the library, point out that free enterprise profits made it possible.

Point out again and again that only profitable companies grow—only profitable companies hire people—only profitable companies raise our standard of living—only profitable companies can make nonprofit activities possible.

These are the things that all of us—the missionaries of the profit motive—must do to keep this country moving ahead. We must do these things at the national level—and we must do them right here in Evansville, too.

Alcoa wants to grow. Alcoa wants Evansville to grow. Alcoa must pay fair and honest wages—but wages that reflect increases in production, not increases in coercion. Alcoa must pay fair and honest taxes—but taxes we can honestly afford to pay—not taxes our well-wishing neighbors wish we could afford.

And Alcoa must have profits—to invest wisely in new plants and equipment—to pay Alcoa's 30,000 shareholders a fair and equitable return on their investment—and to grow.

Profits will continue to be the key to our successful relationship. May we all prosper in future profits.

And, as we do these profit-seeking things together, let us continue to bear in mind the material and moral consequences of what we do. For profits are not without honor. They are the lifegiving seeds of all our freedom.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I have enjoyed being your guest. Thank you.

Lewis Deschler, House Parliamentarian

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of well-deserved tribute paid to one of the best friends the House of Representatives has, Lewis Deschler. For more than 35 years he has displayed his genius as a parliamentarian. His guidance is accompanied always by wit and courtesy, and his warm good nature has endeared him to us all. Without subtracting from Lew Deschler's own outstanding talents, and

with perhaps more truth than modesty, I would like to point out that he exemplifies the sort of character we from Ohio think of as typically Buckeye. In addition to having had the original good sense of being born in our great State, Lew comes from Chillicothe. As a freshman that won my heart immediately, since the Minshalls were politically active in Chillicothe for almost a century. All in all, it is hard to fault Lew Deschler, a man of enormous talent, graciousness and dedication. Ohio is proud of him and the U.S. House of Representatives is deeply in his debt.

A. B. Taylor, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on March 14, 1963, one of South Carolina's most distinguished citizens, Mr. A. B. Taylor, Sr., passed away. Mr. Taylor was a gentleman who had worked hard all of his life even as a young boy in order to make the most of the opportunities which our form of government provides for all of us in this country. He proved that with determination, industry, strong character, and the application of sound judgment it is possible for an individual in this country to attain much success, not only in the business world, but also in winning the respect and admiration of his fellow man.

I think the story of Mr. Taylor's life, as recently portrayed in two articles which appeared in the Spartanburg Herald of March 15, 1963, merit the attention and study of all Americans in view of the fine lesson which it provides for all who are willing to make the most of whatever opportunities they may have.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. B. TAYLOR, SR., DIES OF ILLNESS

A. B. Taylor Sr., 78, the founder of the vast Taylor-Colquitt Co. and Spartanburg civic leader, died at general hospital at 10 p.m. Thursday after a long illness.

Mr. Taylor had been in the hospital since December 23, 1962.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Ruth King Taylor, of the home; one son, A. B. Taylor, Jr., of Spartanburg; one daughter, Mrs. Walter J. Brown, of Spartanburg; two sisters, Mrs. Ernest Folger and Mrs. Lorena King, both of Pickens; and three grandchildren.

The J. F. Floyd Mortuary is in charge.

Born August 9, 1885, at Central, he formally began his career in 1907 as a civil engineer but at the age of 10 he was working in an Atlanta bookstore and at 13 he was depot agent in Pickens where his family lived at the time. Noted for his energy, drive, and modesty throughout his long business and industrial career, at the outset he was a railroad man—from trackworker as a youngster to an owner years later.

The son of the late John T. and Fannie C. (Brandon) Taylor, he was graduated in 1907 with the B.S. degree from Clemson College where as a student he organized and was first manager of the Clemson Tiger, recognized as one of the leading college newspapers in the country.

In 1928, Clemson bestowed upon him the honorary C.E. degree.

He was president of the Spartanburg Advertising Co. from 1941, until its sale in July 1947, and chairman of the board of directors of the Commercial National Bank of Spartanburg until January 1962. He was a member of the South Carolina advisory board of Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., and a former director of Auto Finance Co., Piedmont & Northern Railroad, Union Buffalo Mills & Liberty Life Insurance Co. A former member of South Carolina State Forestry Commission, he served as president of the Spartanburg Chamber of Commerce, 1930 and 1931. In 1932, he was appointed to Spartanburg County Board of Control and served as its chairman from April 1933, until April 1936. He was reappointed to the board and served from May 1937, until October 1948.

He was a member of the Spartanburg Rotary Club and the Piedmont Club and a member of Routh Memorial Presbyterian Church.

A. B. TAYLOR'S CAREER BEGAN IN 1915

(By Glen W. Naves)

The wood preserving career of A. B. Taylor, Sr., long since expanded into Taylor-Colquitt Co., began in 1915 when he started operating under the name of A. B. Taylor Co., incorporated as Taylor-Colquitt in 1923. The company's parent and largest plant is located at nearby Sigsbee (Spartanburg County) with its home offices at 217 East Main Street. It also has owned and operated a large plant at Wilmington, N.C., for several years and also has yards and an office in Richmond, Va., and a yard at Cranford, N.J.

The Spartanburg industrialist, who died here Thursday night, began on a small scale. Starting with a small railroad tie yard at Pickens in 1914, selling a few hundred ties a month, he expanded his operation year by year.

From the beginning he appeared destined to get into some business which involved railroads. He was born of a railroad family. His father was a railroad conductor and a native of Gwinnette County, Ga., where his mother was also born.

After they were married they moved to Central, which was the central point on the Southern Railway between Atlanta and Charlotte and an operating stop. Since the only activity in Central was railroading, Mr. Taylor was literally born on a railroad.

He was only five when his family moved to Atlanta where the elder Taylor, having been promoted to conductor on the Southern, could more conveniently meet his schedule. There, young Taylor attended grade schools while his family continued to live near the railroads in a section close to Georgia Tech.

The son's first regular job was working in a bookstore at the age of 10. Just before the turn of the century his father was given the position of the manager of the Pickens-Easley Railroad and the family moved back to South Carolina.

The elder Taylor was not only manager but also was conductor on the 12-mile railroad. Young Taylor did everything from working on the tracks to collecting fares. At 13 he was the depot agent at Pickens where his family lived. He arose at 4 in the morning to check the train out, attended school and returned to his job at the depot to check the train in on its return from Easley.

In later years, he bought and owned the Pickens Railroad and his father continued to operate it. When his father was ready to retire, Mr. Taylor sold the railroad to the Appalachian Lumber Co.

Mr. Taylor graduated from Pickens High School in 1902. The following fall he enrolled at Furman University but by spring had decided he did not want to be a minister as he had thought at first. In the fall of 1903 he entered Clemson. There he was not only active in school affairs but he launched his first business venture, a small haberdashery shop in a dormitory basement room.

He also was named business manager of the college annual. He conceived the idea of establishing a monthly newspaper and selling advertising to make money for supporting and promoting the annual. Thus, he organized the Tiger.

Cadet Taylor also managed the Clemson track team and dabbled in real estate. Clemson had no drugstore at that time. The enterprising cadet located a store site and interested a doctor in opening a drugstore with assurances that Clemson professors would patronize it. The present Martin drugstore in the heart of Clemson is the outgrowth of this venture.

When Mr. Taylor received his civil engineering sheepskin in 1907, a panic year, he went to work at odd jobs. He helped in laying out a transmission line in Georgia and worked the Georgia Railroad & Power Co. in establishing a dam location near Cartersville.

The Miami (Ohio) River flood took him to Dayton in 1912. In 1913 at the age of 29 he returned to South Carolina. Here, his first job, this time in his profession as a civil engineer, was for the Pickens Railroad. There he saved up $1,000 from a trestle grading and filling job. Concurrently, he came across a man who was "losing his shirt" in a small railroad tie business. He helped him finance and decided to go into the tie business on his own.

Next, he headed for Washington to see W. F. H. Fink, timber agent for the Southern Railway. This was in 1914. He got a buying commitment from Mr. Fink, returned to Pickens and went into the white oak tie business full scale. He later furnished the Southern ties for widening (doubling) its Atlanta-Washington tracks.

Having formed A. B. Taylor Co. in 1915, in 1918 he associated T. D. Colquitt, a Southern tie inspector and the name of the business became Taylor-Colquitt Co. By 1918, Mr. Taylor was buying and selling around 700,000 ties a year, buying from producers along the main line of the Southern, the Gainesville & Northwestern, the Murphy, N.C., line of the Southern and several other Georgia and South Carolina railroads.

In 1916, he moved his business to Easley. In 1918, John Renfro joined the company. He was followed by R. C. Gabriels. Mr. Renfro later became vice president and Mr. Gabriels timber purchasing agent.

Soon after, Taylor-Colquitt branched out into the pole business with Duke Power Co. as the first customer. In 1923, the company was incorporated as Taylor-Colquitt Tie & Pole Co. In 1930, D. S. Burnside, now treasurer, joined the company.

Because of rail facilities, Mr. Taylor established his treating plant in Spartanburg. In 1935, Taylor-Colquitt acquired its Wilmington, N.C., plant.

The firm and its staff of chemists have developed industry-important first vapor drying and other major processes.

A new company, TACO, was formed in 1955 to handle the licensing of plants desiring to use patents purchased by Taylor-Colquitt in its research program.

The Passing of a Great and Beloved Editor and Citizen of Auburn, N.Y., Mrs. Charles D. Osborne, Editor and Publisher of the Auburn Citizen Advertiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day the people of upstate New York were saddened by the untimely passing of a great lady, a great community leader, the beloved editor and publisher of the Auburn Citizen-Advertiser, one of the great community newspapers of upstate New York, Mrs. Charles D. Osborne.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include two articles and one editorial from the March 13 issue of the Auburn Citizen-Advertser on the life and the passing of Mrs. Osborne.

The articles follow:

MRS. CHARLES D. OSBORNE

The passing of Mrs. Charles D. Osborne saddens not only the many who knew and loved her, but also those who realize it is a great loss to the community as well.

Even before she succeeded her late husband as president of the Auburn Publishing Co. nearly 2 years ago, she had exerted a great influence on the cultural and social life of Auburn.

She was a charter member of the Cayuga Museum of History and Art, serving as its first president in 1936, and as a member of the board for many years.

She was an active member of the Seymour Library Association for many years and was elected to its board of trustees in 1955. She served as a member of the library's book committee and became its chairman last year.

Mrs. Osborne also helped to cultivate an interest in literature through her weekly book reviews appearing in the Citizens-Advertiser for many years under the pen name "E. W."

She was a charter member of the Auburn Memorial Hospital Auxiliary in 1954, and had always maintained an interest in its work. Similarly, she was an active member of the former Mercy Hospital Guild and retained her interest when it became the auxiliary.

Mrs. Osborne was active also in the Woman's Union, serving as president of its board of trustees from 1952 until 1957, and had attended a meeting of the board yesterday.

In addition to her many activities in civic affairs, she always maintained an interest in this newspaper and shared with her late husband many of its responsibilities. Thus, upon his passing she was able to step into the position he had filled as publisher and carry on the traditions established by him and his father, the late Thomas Mott Osborne.

It was those traditions which have led to many tributes from fellows in the newspaper profession such as those expressed today following the news of her death.

Kirtland King of the Albany Bureau of United Press International, in expressing his sympathy, declared that "The Citizen-Advertiser, under the Osborne family, has been one of the great newspapers in this country."

Norris Paxton, chief of the Albany Bureau of the Associated Press, expressed similar sentiments when he said: "The untimely death of Mrs. Osborne leaves a sad gap among member newspapers of the Associated Press, as well as in Auburn. She and her late husband have produced a notable newspaper that has been, and we feel sure will continue to be, one of the national mainstays of the AP cooperative system."

And one of her closest associates, William O. Dapping, managing editor emeritus of this newspaper, expressed it equally well when he noted that for nearly half a century Mrs. Osborne "has cherished the same noble sentiments as those of her late husband, Col. Charles Devens Osborne, and his late father, Thomas Mott Osborne, in making the newspaper a monument of independence, honest editorial integrity, and sound guidance for its readers."

These same feelings are shared by all her associates on this newspaper, who appreciated her concern for the highest ideals of their profession. There are no "sacred cows" or personal prejudices influencing the integrity of this newspaper. It always has been free to report the news fairly and objectively, without fear of reprisal by anyone, whether of small or great influence.

MRS. CHARLES D. OSBORNE, 69, DIES—WAS PUBLISHER OF CITIZEN-ADVERTISER—STRICKEN UNEXPECTEDLY, ACTIVE IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Mrs. Charles D. Obsorne, 69, president of the Auburn Publishing Co., died unexpectedly this morning at Auburn Memorial Hospital after suffering a heart attack.

Born Edith Wendell, she was the youngest daughter of the late Prof. and Mrs. Barrett Wendell of Boston, Mass. Mrs. Osborne is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Agnes Osborne Griswold of Wayne, Pa.; a granddaughter, Miss Sara Penelope Griswold of Wayne; two brothers, William G. Wendell of West Hartford, Conn., and Barrett Wendell, Chicago, Ill.; a sister, Mrs. R. G. A. van der Woude of Kent, England, and several nieces and nephews.

Mrs. Osborne had been a communicant of St. Peter's Church, Auburn, since her marriage to the late Colonel Osborne January 18, 1913. She was a member of St. Peter's Altar Guild.

A native of Boston, Mass., Mrs. Osborne has made her home in Auburn since her marriage. She maintained residence at 115 South Street, and also had homes at Buck Point, Owasco Lake, and Portsmouth, N.H.

Mayor Maurice I. Schwartz said of Mrs. Osborne this morning:

"I have known Mrs. Osborne for a great many years and have always considered her one of Auburn's leading citizens.

"Her unexpected death comes as a real shock to me as I am sure it will be to all her friends and the citizens of Auburn to whom she was well known. My sincere sympathy to her family."

Mrs. Osborne was an active member of the community and carried on many of the positions held by her late husband following his death June 1, 1961.

Mr. Osborne's father, Thomas Mott Osborne, internationally known prison reformer founded the Auburn Citizen in 1905. The paper was merged with the Advertiser-Journal in 1931.

Following Colonel Osborne's death, Mrs. Osborne was elected president of the Auburn Publishing Co., publisher of the Citizen-Advertiser on June 24, 1961. She was reelected to the position on April 4, 1962, and served in that capacity until her death.

On September 18, 1961, Mrs. Osborne was elected to the Auburn Advisory Board of the Marine Midland Trust Co. of central New York. She was the first woman to serve on the board of the Auburn banking institution and was elected to fill the vacancy created by the death of her husband.

Mrs. Osborne carried on the traditional annual C-A family picnic and outing at the Buck Point residence. She also took her late husband's place at the annual Newsboy Dinner, the most recent of which was conducted at Auburn Inn February 25. Her words to the boys at that time expressed her theory of life:

"In driving a car, the mirror which reflects what is behind is extremely important. So in going through life is guidance from the power of example."

Mrs. Osborne was a charter member of the Cayuga Museum of History and Art, serving as its first president in 1936. She had been a member of the board of the museum each year since that time and recently was made an honorary member of the museum's board, when health curtailed her activities. She was one of the principal signers of the museum's charter in 1936 and had been active in the events of the museum since its inception.

She was an active member of the Seymour Library Association for many years and was elected to the board of trustees in 1955. She was a member of the book committee of the library, elected chairman of that committee last year.

She had written the book reviews appearing weekly in the C-A under the pen name "E.W." during the many years of her association with the newspaper.

Active for many years in the interests of the Woman's Union Mrs. Osborne served as president of the board of trustees of the union from 1952 until 1957. She had attended a meeting of the board yesterday morning.

She was a charter member of the Auburn Memorial Hospital Auxiliary in 1954, and had always expressed interest in the work of the auxiliary.

She was an active member in the former Mercy Hospital Guild, becoming associated with the guild in 1955, and continuing as an active and interested member when the guild became the auxiliary.

She was a member of the Chilton Club, Boston, Mass.

Services will be at 3 p.m. Saturday at St. Peter's Church with burial in Fort Hill Cemetery. There will be no visiting hours.

Friends wishing may contribute to the Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, Mass., for cancer research, attention of Dean Henry Meadows.

CIVIC, NEWS, RELIGIOUS CHIEFS PAY TRIBUTE TO MRS. OSBORNE

The family of the late Mrs. Charles D. Osborne received the sympathy of friends and associates representing the city, county, State, and Nation today.

Mrs. Osborne died unexpectedly today at Auburn Memorial Hospital after suffering a heart attack.

Mrs. Osborne, widow of the late Col. Charles D. Osborne, who died June 1, 1961, was at the time of her death, president of Auburn Publishing Co., publisher of the Citizen-Advertiser.

Representatives of organizations she was associated with expressed sorrow at the notice of her unexpected death.

Rev. James E. Mahagan, rector of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, said of the death of the late communicant: "Her death is a great loss to the church and to the community."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James D. Cuffney, dean of Cayuga Catholic Deanery, said: "I would like to extend my sympathy to the family of Mrs. Osborne and her associates at the Citizen-Advertiser.

"Her death is a great loss to our community as well as the newspaper she so capably represented after the death of her husband.

She followed in the footsteps of her late husband, a real soldier and an outstanding civic leader.

"May Almighty God have mercy on her soul."

William O. Dapping, managing editor emeritus of the Citizen-Advertiser, said today: "To say that the Citizen-Advertiser staff was terribly shocked at the news of the sudden death of Mrs. Osborne is wholly inadequate to realize its full meaning.

"For nearly half a century, Mrs. Osborne has cherished the same noble sentiments as those of her late husband, Col. Charles Devens Osborne, and of his late father, Thomas Mott Osborne, in making the newspaper a monument of independence, honest editorial integrity, and sound guidance for its readers.

"Since the death of her husband in 1961, she has continued these policies, and more recently as acting president of the Auburn Publishing Co. she has grounded these ideals solidly in the operation of this unique family newspaper.

"We shall miss her greatly as we who survive carry on in producing a good newspaper."

Norris Paxton, chief of the Associated Press bureau, Albany, said "The untimely death of Mrs. Charles D. Osborne leaves a sad gap among member newspapers of the Associated Press, as well as in Auburn. She and her late husband have produced a notable newspaper that has been, and we feel sure will continue to be, one of the national mainstays of the Associated Press cooperative system. We join with the residents of Auburn in mourning the passing of Mrs. Osborne."

Kirtland King, Albany bureau manager of United Press International, said today: "Please accept my sincere sympathies in the untimely passing of Mrs. Osborne. The Citizen-Advertiser, under the Osborne family, has been one of the great newspapers in this country. All who knew and loved her will miss her."

Thomas A. Cloutier, president, New York Associated Dailies, said today: "The sudden and unexpected death of Mrs. Osborne is a shock to her many friends in the newspaper craft.

"We of the New York Associated Dailies recall her graciousness as host at her home at Buck Point last June, extended to members of the New York Associated Dailies when we met there. The deepest sympathy of all members of the New York Associated Dailies is extended to Mrs. Osborne's family and to the staff of the Citizen-Advertiser."

Former Representative John Taber said: "I have always had the highest respect for Mrs. Osborne, I know that her passing will be a very considerable loss to the community because she always had the public interest at heart."

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON said in Washington today: "I am greatly shocked and saddened by the news of Mrs. Osborne's untimely passing.

"While unfortunately I had the privilege of knowing her personally for only a brief time, I was immediately and deeply impressed by her profound sense of personal and public responsibility and by her true interest in everything happening in her community.

"During her service as publisher of the Citizen-Advertiser, Mrs. Osborne most ably carried on and expanded the great tradition of service and farsighted public leadership for which this newspaper has long been known.

"I know that Mrs. Osborne's passing will be mourned by all the people of Auburn and that her place of leadership in the community will not soon be filled."

State Senator George R. Metcalf said in Albany today: "I am deeply grieved by the untimely death of Mrs. Osborne.

"She was a person of great integrity who was forever dedicated to the welfare of Auburn. The community has lost one of its noblest citizens and I have lost a dear friend."

Assemblyman George M. Michaels, from his Albany office, said this morning: "I just heard with shock and sorrow of the death of Mrs. Osborne. It will be a tremendous loss to the community and the kind of loss the community can ill afford.

"I will always remember her with a great deal of fondness and affection. She and her late husband, Colonel Osborne, gave me encouragement when I first came to Auburn almost 30 years ago."

State Democratic Chairman William H. McKeon said in New York City today that he was deeply shocked at the news of the untimely death of Mrs. Osborne.

"Her death is indeed a great loss to the community of an outstanding citizen."

Speaking as a political leader, Mr. McKeon said that the voices of Mrs. Osborne and the late Colonel Osborne were listened to for guidance and sound judgment in the political field.

Former Auburn Mayor Edward T. Boyle, vacationing in Florida, said today: "I am deeply grieved to hear of the death of Mrs. Osborne. I came to know her through her late husband, Col. Charles D. Osborne, who was a good friend of mine. I have met her on many occasions, both politically and socially.

"Mrs. Osborne took an active interest in the civic affairs of Auburn and always fought for what she thought was fair and just. She will be greatly missed by the community."

Former Mayor Herbert T. Anderson said today: "Mrs. Osborne's death was a great shock to me and a great personal loss. Her friendship and that of her late husband, Col. Charles D. Osborne, meant more to me during more than 25 years than I can possibly say. In less than 2 years, this city has suffered the loss of two of its best known, best loved residents whose love of Auburn and its people has been unmatched in our generation."

Former Mayor Robert A. Nelson said today: "I was grieved to hear about the passing of Mrs. Charles D. Osborne. Mrs. Osborne and the late Colonel Osborne certainly played a leading part in the welfare of the community. Her unselfish service in civic affairs will be sorely missed."

Samuel V. Kennedy Jr., president of Seymour Library Association said "In the death of Mrs. Osborne, the library has suffered a grievious loss. Mrs. Osborne served for many years as a trustee, giving freely of her time and energy to the library. As chairman of the book committee, her broad knowledge of literature and current writings was of inestimable value, and her advice and counsel in other matters were always for the best interests of the library.

"Mrs. Osborne will be deeply missed."

Prof. Walter K. Long, director of Cayuga Museum of History and Art, said today that Mrs. Osborne's death "is a great loss to the cultural facilities of the community."

Officials representing auxiliaries of Auburn Memorial Hospital and Mercy Hospital and the Woman's Union, expressed the sorrow of the auxiliaries and the community.

Tribute to W. Averell Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Fort Wayne, (Ind.) Journal-Gazette editorialized most appropriately on the appointment of W. Averell Harriman as the "No. 3 man in the American State Department."

Because this tribute, entitled "Harriman as No. 3 Man," significantly points out that Secretary Harriman is "not a striped-pants boy," and denotes his dedication to public service, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette, Mar. 14, 1963]

HARRIMAN AS NO. 3 MAN

W. Averell Harriman has now become the No. 3 man in the American State Department.

He is the Under Secretary for Political Affairs and as such ranks next to Dean Rusk and George W. Ball.

The promotion of Harriman will add strength to the State Department.

He has had a vast experience in public affairs. He is a practical man and knows the world at firsthand. He inspires confidence in those with whom he talks.

Averell Harriman, as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, was one of the first men of America to realize just what the Soviet Union was bent on trying to do.

He has also served as Ambassador to Great Britain, as Secretary of Commerce, and as Governor of the State of New York.

It might be said in passing that the State Department cannot get too many good men these days. Foreign policy is a matter of survival in the age of atomic weapons.

Mr. Harriman will bring to his new post accurate knowledge of both political and economic affairs.

As he himself said in a recent interview, he is "not a striped-pants boy," meaning a career diplomat.

Unemployment Concerning Editorial Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently there has been much said about the increase in the rate of unemployment in this country. Credit for the increase goes to automation, seasonal layoffs, and the fact that the economy is growing slower than the population.

Some of this may be true; some may not. In Indiana, three newspapers have editorialized on this subject. Each of these editorials is worthy of consideration by the Members of the Senate. I, therefore, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent to have the following three editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD: "Six Out of Every One Hundred," an editorial appearing in the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, March 13, 1963; "Unemployment," an editorial appearing in the Hammond (Ind.) Times, March 17, 1963, and "The Attack on Unemployment," appearing in the March 17, 1963, issue of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, Mar. 3, 1963]

SIX OUT OF EVERY ONE HUNDRED

Six out of every one hundred Americans willing and able to work are out of a job. That is the stark essence of the most recent figures from the Department of Labor.

The total number of employed is not declining. On the contrary, it is on the rise and last month reached a February record of 66,358,000. The answer to this simple sum is plain; the economy of the United States is growing more slowly than the population. New workers are coming onto the labor market faster than new jobs are being created by economic expansion.

The administration, doubtless with an eye to passage of its proposed tax cut and other legislation intended to give the economy a shot in the arm, has not sought to hide or minimize the problem. Secretary of Labor Wirtz has declared that "while there are no signs of a general recession, the growth of jobs has not kept pace with the increase in the labor force. Our economy is simply not expanding fast enough. It must do so if we are to avoid an economic downturn."

Americans tend to be complacent about their economy, just as they were complacent about the supremacy of U.S. science and technology before Sputnik I soared into mocking orbit. The plain fact is that our economic growth has been disturbingly slow in comparison with the expansion of other national economies. Americans need somehow to be jolted out of a smug belief that, as always in the past, the U.S. economy is the most dynamic on the face of the earth.

It can be. No one, looking back at astonishing performance in the past, can well doubt that. But "can be" is not good enough, under present circumstances. Gunnar Myrdal, the famous Swedish economist, recently said that "the most important problem in the world today is how to get America out of relative economic stagnation." That is a judgment to take most seriously, and also a challenge to meet.

[From the Hammond (Ind.) Times, Mar. 17, 1963]

UNEMPLOYMENT

News that the Nation's rate of unemployment, as well as the actual number of jobless workers, reached a new peak in February and were the highest since November 1961, offered statistical proof that one of the major national problems still remains to be solved.

February was the first month since October 1961, that unemployment failed to drop below the same period of a year previous. The rate was 6.1 percent, and the jobless total was 4.9 million—or 385,000 more than in February last year.

The number of those unemployed 15 weeks or longer rose 150,000 and the number without jobs for 6 months or more went up 78,000.

The fact is that the cure for this problem has not been found, let alone the key to the door of economic growth. Somehow, no matter what is done, the inexorable process of foreign competition, automation, and excess capacity continues unabated.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette, Mar. 19, 1963]

THE ATTACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT

All Americans should be concerned about the present unemployment problem in the United States and do what they can to help solve it.

There is no one single solution. It should be attacked from several angles.

Many young people are out of work today because they are not properly trained to hold the jobs which are available.

They dropped out of school before they were trained in anything which would help them to earn a living.

Unable to get money in the usual manner, some of them turn to lives of crime and cost the State in numerous ways.

It would be much cheaper to fit them for some useful work and a normal life.

There are also those who are thrown out of jobs because of automation. They need retraining for some new kind of work and often have to move to a new locality to find employment.

Federal Spending Should Be Cut Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the growing debate of tax cuts in the face of mounting Federal expenditures is certainly the most important issue facing Congress today. Concern over the Nation's fiscal management is being expressed throughout the country. Long-range consequences of the route this Congress chooses for the Nation in meeting this issue will affect not only our own generation, but those to follow us.

Recently, the Concord Tribune of Concord, N.C., commented on this issue and I should like to call the attention of the Congress to the editorial which appeared in the March 4 issue of this newspaper. It contains thoughtful and worthful observations not only about the operation of our executive branch, but also for the Congress itself to ponder.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING SHOULD BE CUT NOW

Not until the voters of the United States stand up and demand a cut in Federal spending commensurate with a cut in taxes will the United States be able to bring its budget into balance.

The free spending of the U.S. Government is breathtaking. There seems to be no limit on appropriations for whatever the bureaucrats request. Foreign aid should be phased out completely in a matter of a few years.

A hard look should be taken at all military and space appropriations, and see if the American taxpayer is getting a fair return for the money he has to pay in Federal income taxes.

The U.S. Government must operate within its income just as every citizen. How long would the average individual last if he engaged in deficit spending? Not long. He would soon be denied credit of every kind.

It is just and right that we be alert on national defense, but the U.S. allies should be required to pay their just part of maintaining the NATO alliance. The Western nations of Europe are showing great progress but have not been willing to support their full share of the costs of NATO military establishment.

When a nation owes as many billions as this country it's time for Congress to eliminate all wasteful spending. We don't know of any Senator or Representative who has been elected or reelected on a campaign of more spending, but somehow when they get to Washington too many of them forget the promises they make to their constituents.

Oratorical Contest Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last February 20, I had the honor of serving as a judge at the 10th annual oratorical contest sponsored by the Benjamin N. Cardozo Lodge of B'nai B'rith. The contestants, selected from the high schools of New York City, spoke on the topic "What Brotherhood Means to Me."

Mr. President, each presentation evidenced the sincerity as well as the idealism of these young people. I was delighted to find their ideas of brotherhood not solely centered around family or friends or even fellow Americans, but, instead, arising from a much broader base—that of brotherly love for human beings throughout the world. In my judgment, their conceptions of brotherhood are impressive, and certainly warrant the attention of all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following my remarks, the essays of John Carey and Howard Harris, the first-place and second-place winners, respectively, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD IS LOVE

(By John Carey)

"Love seeketh not itself to please,
Nor for itself hath any care,
But for another gives its ease,
And builds a heaven in hell's despair."

On April 4, 1962, Tass, the official Soviet newspaper, reported an incident at the Berlin Wall. They said, "A traitor was executed last night while aiding more traitors to escape into West Berlin. His name was Alexis Alexandrovitch."

Alexis never crossed the land barrier to freedom, however, he did cross the barrier in his mind. From that moment when he decided to aid those refugees he demolished the wall of hate which the Communists had built in his mind. He proved to us that charity, love of neighbor, brotherhood is not a facade as is communism.

Brotherhood is an inborn quality which all men possess. When the moment of decision came, Alexis proved that inborn qualities can demolish any barriers which men may build.

These facades exist in the minds of all men. If we are to love our fellow man, if we are to practice brotherhood, then we all must destroy these facades. Alexis was given just one chance, we are given many. Our facades will be broken by small seemingly insignificant actions. Maybe it will be holding a door open for someone, but remember, by opening that door you are allowing brotherhood to sweep in, for that's what brotherhood is, a

thousand small actions, which together make up the greatest force on this earth, love.

Let's perfect ourselves with small actions which will grow and become great deeds. Let's establish love, brotherhood as the key that will open up the door to freedom.

Francis Bourdillon exemplified this key when he wrote:

"The night has a thousand eyes
And the day but one;
Yet the light of the bright world dies
With the dying sun;
The mind has a thousand eyes,
And the heart but one;
"Yet the light of a whole life dies
When love is done."

The human race is in dire need of a voice, a voice of love, a voice of brotherhood. No one man alone could be this voice, but if just one man would start to whisper, and that whisper be reechoed by those who listen and then become a sound, which in turn would become a voice, greater, stronger, louder, until like a chain reaction, a wave of brotherhood would spread throughout our Nation.

Each individual here tonight is capable of starting that whisper, that whisper of brotherhood. Be individuals, be sincere, be noble.

Nobility, the forgotten virtue, is our shield for brotherhood. Alice Cary defined nobility, she said:

"True worth is in being, not seeming
In doing each day that goes by,
Some little good, not in dreaming
Of great things to do by and by;
For whatever men say in their blindness
And in spite of the fancies of youth;
There's nothing so kingly as kindness
And nothing so sacred as love."

WHAT BROTHERHOOD MEANS TO ME

(By Howard F. Harris)

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, and the earth was without shape or form, and God was lonely. So He sat down upon the bed of a river and in His hand He took a lump of clay. From it He molded man. And from man sprang mankind and from mankind sprang brotherhood. Even as mankind came from man, out of a moment of wickedness in the Garden of Eden. So brotherhood has sprung from the evils of man's mortal life. From the wars and famine of ages. From men who cried out in agony under the sword of their enemy.

And you ask me, What does brotherhood mean to me? To me it means hope, to me it means life, it means love. The hope that someday someone will say that I belong, that you are wanted. That we are needed. A life worth living. And love, the kind of love where tears are shed and shared with joy. To me it would mean a release so that my insides no longer will feel the heat of indignation. The shame. I feel the shame of a human being, and I cry out: "I am human, I'm entitled to my heritage of brotherhood as a member of mankind." Yet it always seems that I'm alone, no one cares to listen. I'm desperate, yet none cares to listen.

I am but a youth, and I must honor the wisdom, you my elders have acquired. I try to speak with the respect due you. So do you mind if I question? Where is brotherhood? Where is this intangible, this nebulous concept that could ease so much pain? It isn't easy to teach love I know. Because love is like the dewy fragrance drifting in the air. To be breathed by all that have nostrils, by all men. Never to be gathered and hoarded. Love is something to breath deeply of. I know this too; those who can speak to themselves, with truth, honesty, with sincerity, they should have no need of my talk tonight.

Truth Is Needlessly Undermined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Second District of Washington State, whom I represent, are concerned with what appears to be the administration's management of the news.

This concern is reflected in an editorial published in the Mount Vernon Argus on March 14, 1963. The editorial points out that a couple of Washington State newspaper editors were told during a Presidential briefing 2 days before the Cuban showdown that Cuba was not the main U.S. problem and that Cuban developments were a minor worry.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this editorial should be available to every Member of Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

TRUE: NEEDLESSLY UNDERMINED

Defense Secretary McNamara complained in Washington, D.C., this week that public confidence in top officials in the Federal Defense Department had been needlessly undermined.

The Secretary, of course, was blaming the U.S. Senate Permanent Investigations Committee, which has been inquiring into the award of the TFX fighter-bomber contract to a Texas firm, as against Boeing's Wichita operation. He complained of "the fragmentary releases of portions of the testimony of witnesses who themselves are only familiar with part of the considerations underlying the decision in question * * *."

There is no doubt that confidence in the Defense Department has been shaken, not only by the recent news in connection with the TFX award, but also by the Department's admitted effort to "manage" the news, as far back as the Cuban incident in October. The administration played with the truth in its public and semipublic utterances at that time, and now it is reaping the harvest of mistrust that this kind of official conduct always breeds.

There are a couple of Washington State weekly newspaper editors who are still burning over having accepted an invitation to a Presidential briefing in October. At this briefing, some 2 days before President Kennedy called for the Cuban showdown, the guest newspapermen were told that Cuba was not the main U.S. problem or danger.

On that same day, it was later disclosed, the U.S. Government had determined conclusively that offensive type Russian missiles were then being erected on the Cuban bases. Yet these newsmen, who had responded, at personal time and financial sacrifice, to the Presidential invitation to come and be informed, were being given to understand that Cuban developments were a minor, if any, worry.

There followed the Defense Department spokesman's frank admission that the news—the information given the public—had been distorted (managed, of course, is a nicer word) to suit the Government's idea of what the U.S. public and the world should be told. And, within the past week, this same spokesman first impugned the motives of the Senate's Investigations Committee and then had to go before it and apologize.

Coming to Seattle today for a look at Boeing defense operations, Secretary McNamara, according to advance announcement, is going into hiding, as far as being interviewed is concerned. If he feels he has to go into hiding with his ideas, it would appear that the confidence he says he has lost has been undermined not only by the Senate committee but also by a Machiavellian effort to make the end justify the means in Government and a resort to an "Uncle knows best" viewpoint, which always rankles with the people who pay the bills, the public, and may be depended upon to backfire in the long run.

McNamara isn't the first Defense Secretary, or other public official, to make this discovery.

Economic Developments in Southeastern Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, as one who is vitally interested in all the efforts and programs to improve the standards of living of the people of southeastern Ohio by encouraging and promoting the development and expansion of industry, I wish to include in the RECORD a speech delivered to the Columbus Rotary Club, January 21, 1963, by Dr. Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

The speech follows:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTHEASTERN OHIO

It is a pleasure indeed to be with you today at the Columbus Rotary Club, and it is a privilege to be able to share some of my ideas on the economic development of southeastern Ohio with the business and community leaders of Columbus.

Bill Guthrie referred to my experience at the Harvard Business School and my involvement in some of the economic changes which have taken place in New England during the past dozen or so years. As many of you know, in the pre-World War II period New England was heavily dependent upon certain basic industries such as textiles. When competition from the South moved in and when economic conditions changed, New England quickly became a depresed area. Many people in those days threw up their hands and said that New England was finished economically. Happily enough, a few farsighted individuals recognized that in the great universities of New England, specifically Harvard and M.I.T., we had a resource which could spark the revitalization of New England and push the Greater Boston area into becoming one of the leading electronic and research centers in the Nation. To have worked at a university which led in such developments and to have served on the boards of some of these exotic companies along the well-known Route 128 has been a thrilling experience for me. It is one for which all of us here in this room, I believe, are working toward today in southern and central Ohio.

We see many changes taking place in our State and in the rest of the world. It is a gross understatement to say that we are living in a time of rapidly accelerating change. Just a year ago Novice Fawcett was kind enough to invite me to speak at

the commencement exercises at Ohio State University. I spoke then about such forces as population growth which are revolutionizing our lives today and will hit us with even greater impact in the decades ahead. To illustrate the rate of this increase, let me remind you that within the next 3½ days enough new people will be born into the world to populate a city the size of Columbus. By the time our students who are now freshmen graduate from our universities the population of the United States will have grown to over 200 million. This so-called population explosion has implications for all of us, particularly those of us who are in the field of higher education. We at Ohio University will be enrolling in the next 10 years as many students as we have had in our entire 158-year history.

Other kinds of dramatic changes are affecting our lives with equal force. The forecast that we shall land a man on the moon by 1968 or 1970 is now widely accepted and has become a significant national goal. Some people are predicting that we shall be traveling at supersonic speeds in commercial airplanes within a decade. One cynic, keenly aware of the related problems which must be solved, has said that the advertising slogan of the airlines in 1970 will be "breakfast in London, lunch in New York, cocktails in San Francisco, and baggage in Buenos Aires."

It has been said that 90 percent of the scientists who have ever lived on the face of the earth are alive today. Clearly, this is one reason why we are seeing such dramatic breakthroughs in all technological fields. Other kinds of less heralded but even more dramatic research breakthroughs are taking place. We are on the threshold of discoveries too awesome to comprehend even just a few years ago. Live organisms have already been created in laboratory test tubes. Other studies are inducing mutations in living creatures, heralding the day when humans can adapt themselves to survival in the atmosphere of outer space and the strange climates on other planets. Other experiments are leading to the creation of a thought machine which will permit communication between people without the use of language. It will be possible for people to exchange innermost thoughts and deep-seated emotions now beyond the threshold of articulation. Such a device will be to the brain what eyeglasses are to the eyes and what hearing aids are to ears. I need not remind you of other sociological changes which will dramatically change our lives and our relationships with other peoples of the world within the immediate years ahead.

During this yast year, my first year in the State of Ohio, I have been very much impressed with the vitality and imagination shown by leaders here in business, government, and education. Ohio has always been one of the wealthiest States in the Union and has led in the development of basic industries which have served well our Nation and the entire world. In recent months many thoughtful citizens have observed that our position of leadership is in jeopardy unless we continue to change, to adapt, and to innovate. For years Ohio has been heavily dependent upon such basic industries as steel, automobiles, and tires. We have observed the impact of growing competition from Japan, West Germany, and other nations which are developing strong economies and sophisticated marketing programs. We have also seen the effects of new processes, new products, and new research activity. As we look ahead over the next 5 to 10 years, we can speculate about the implications of new breakthroughs in research and development upon these basic industries. What will happen, for example, if new modes of mass commuter transportation are developed or if cars are moved about on something other than tires? Not too many years ago the automobile ruined the buggy and harness businesses and completely closed down the old blacksmith shops. What will happen to the refrigerator manufacturing business when widespread use is made of nuclear treatment for preservation of food?

I should like to direct your attention to the excellent report which has recently been published and distributed by Ohio's Research & Development Foundation, Inc. No doubt many of you have read this thoughtful study prepared by leading businessmen, educators, and scientists in our State. Ohio is confronted with the problem which is perplexing every one of our wealthy industrial States in America today. We are faced with an increasing shortage of highly educated, highly skilled people. We have far too few outstanding scientists, engineers, teachers, doctors, lawyers, and other people with advanced professional skills. To verify these needs one can turn to the "Help wanted" section of any daily metropolitan newspaper and count the columns and pages of requests for highly skilled, technical people. Ironically, coupled with this desperate need for highly trained, highly educated people, we have an oversupply of unemployed and unemployable individuals. This number, unfortunately, will continue to increase as new processes and new products render obsolete the limited skills of poorly trained, poorly motivated people.

We are faced in America with a massive task of education at all levels in our society which very few people now fully comprehend and even fewer people are preparing themselves for. Thoughtful businessmen and leaders in government, for these reasons, list education along with national defense and space exploration as the most critical challenges facing us as a nation today. I have been very much heartened by the recognition given by Governor Rhodes to the importance of higher education in the development of Ohio's economy and the priority given to universities in sparking the economic development envisioned for our great State.

One of the reasons why I was attracted to Ohio University and southeastern Ohio just a little over a year ago was the challenge of participating in the economic revitalization and development of our area. Many years ago the coal industry left our part of the State and small farms became unprofitable units in our national economy. Some of our people have clung wistfully to the hope that the coal industry will be revived or that some miracle might regenerate southeastern Ohio. Year after year tax funds have flowed from other counties in Ohio to support programs of welfare, mental health, and rehabilitation in the southeastern sector. Very few tax dollars have been generated by industry and agriculture in our area and returned to the rest of the State.

Happily enough, this picture is changing today, and it is changing more rapidly than many of you may realize. Just a year ago today we held a dinner meeting at Ohio University for business and community leaders from all over southeastern Ohio. More than 450 citizens came to our campus to discuss with us plans for the economic revitalization of our area. Shortly after that we designated a group from the university, headed by Assistant to the President Martin Hecht, to work with community leaders on projects designed to spur economic development. Then we went to Washington and secured a $70,000 grant from the Area Redevelopment Agency to assist us in attracting new industries to our part of the State. This was followed quickly by another ARA grant to promote commercial tourism. Then came another grant which enabled us to develop a working relationship with the Corps of Engineers to assure a flood control study. Hopefully, we shall find ways to tame our rampaging Hocking River and other rivers in our area, thereby creating large tracts of land suitable for industrial development.

These grants and others have stimulated a whole host of community development projects, plans for construction of new facilities, and new programs of training and research. Already a total of $11,650,000 has been committed in our immediate area for flood control, conservation, public facilities, and retraining activities. This is just the beginning. Studies and pilot projects will result in vast new programs financed by private and public capital. Our area is fast coming to life and leaders with vision and willingness to work are stepping forward in all of our communities.

But I do not wish to give the impression that these early signs of progress have come easily. Last April one of my classmates at the Harvard Business School who is now the president of a major corporation in the East visited Athens with a team of his top executives to explore the possibility of establishing a $20 million research plant in our community. Negotiations continued over a period of 2 weeks, and just at the time we expected a favorable decision, we lost this plant which would have created almost 1,000 new jobs. The lack of four vital resources in our area led to this unfavorable decision:

1. We had then an inadequate water supply in Athens.

2. Our community hospital which is overcrowded and inadequate for our present population could not possibly accommodate a much larger population brought in by the company and the rapidly growing Ohio University.

3. We have inadequate highway transportation leading north and west to the populous centers of Ohio and other States in the Midwest.

4. Our small airport cannot accommodate the light jet planes used by the corporation's executives.

Over the summer we solved our water supply problem by working with community leaders on the creation of five new wells. Plans are now being drawn for a magnificent new community hospital. With assistance from the university, I hope that this vitally needed facility can be built within 2 years. Our highway problem has yet to be solved. Until we do have first-class highways leading out of Athens, the State of Ohio will be passing up a tremendous economic opportunity. Sixty percent of the entire population of the United States is within 500 miles of us.

This summer another major electronic and research firm came to look us over and pointed out one or two other deficiencies which we are moving rapidly to correct with the help of community leaders in our part of the State. We have not given up on either of these companies because they each build an average of two new plants per year.

We have the fundamental prerequisites for attracting exotic industries to Athens. Highly intelligent people who work in research-based companies prefer to live in a university community with its rich cultural, educational, and recreational advantages. They must have ready access to faculty members, scientists, and engineers working on new frontiers of research. We have a fine engineering school at Ohio University which is over 100 years old. This past year we awarded 148 degrees in electrical, mechanical, civil, chemical, and industrial engineering. Our chemical engineering department is unusually strong; faculty members in the department are a valuable and much-utilized resource for the major chemical companies located in the Ohio River Valley. Several members of our electrical engineering department were awarded a contract by NASA to perform highly classified research

work on the Saturn missile project this past year. Needless to say, I was delighted when representatives of NASA concluded that th Ohio University research efforts were so promising that the scope of the project was expanded this past month. This same department is now beginning work on a phase of the Apollo project which, as most of you know, is the moonshot program.

It has been especially heartening to me to observe substantial developments in other areas as well. We received grants from the National Science Foundation in eight major fields of interest at the university during this past year; three more grants from the National Science Foundation and the Air Force have been received since the first of the year. Gifts from our alumni and other private sources were more than doubled this past year over previous years. Just this past month a group of leading citizens in Chillicothe undertook a private fund raising drive to raise $200,000 to acquire land to be ready for the establishment of classroom buildings and laboratories for our branch in Chillicothe. Already they have exceeded their goal and have $225,000 in hand. They hope to reach $300,000 by the end of this month. I am sure that many of you read about John Galbreath's plan to build a multimillion-dollar inn in Athens to take care of the needs of our growing university and our expanding community of Athens. This magnificent inn will be a significant stimulus to our educational and economic development activities.

Although our international activities do not directly affect the economic progress of our area, they nevertheless influence substantially the cultural and educational climate of southeastern Ohio. Ohio University was one of the first universities in America to undertake educational programs on the continent of Africa. For several years we have been conducting teacher training programs in east and west Nigeria. This past summer we signed a large contract with the Agency for International Development to extend our teacher training efforts into northern Nigeria, the vast Moslem region with a population of 18 million and a literacy rate of about 9 percent. We also conducted a Peace Corps training program on our campus and are now supervising the work of 50 Peace Corps volunteers in Cameroon, just south of Nigeria. We have further extended our oversea activities into southeast Asia by undertaking with AID assistance a program in Vietnam to strengthen the Universities of Hue and Saigon. In the same geographical area, under another grant from AID, we shall be developing a new engineering school in Pnom Pehn, the capital of Cambodia. Just across the city the Russians have established a technological institute. We shall be very much involved in the battle for men's minds in one of the explosive, critical areas of the world.

All in all, we have undertaken commitments involving the expenditure of AID funds totaling approximately $22 million over the next 7 or 8 years. Ohio University during the next year will be among the top 10 universities in America committed to extensive oversea programs. Our interest in these programs has been motivated not only by the desire to be of service in developing areas of the world, but we believe that oversea commitments provide a rich and revitalizing experience for members of our faculty which cannot help but be transmitted to students in our classrooms. Furthermore, these Federal funds have made it possible for us to recruit the faculty members we need to be ready for our rapidly expanding student enrollment at a time when State funds have not been available for the advance recruiting program so vitally needed by all of our institutions.

I have talked much more about Ohio University than I should have, but this is the story which I know best. I am sure that Novice Fawcett can and has presented an exciting story about Ohio State, and the presidents of the other State-assisted universities and our private colleges in their own areas are assisting in the economic development of other parts of our State.

I am convinced that all of us can play a vital role in the bold, imaginative program of industrial development which has been proposed by our Governor. Ohio State University needs every penny of the capital and operating funds which have been requested in order to become one of the very finest graduate and research centers in our Nation and to continue to serve well the needs of the growing number of undergraduate students who will be seeking an education here in Columbus. The other State universities desperately need the capital and operating funds they are requesting so that they can be ready for the doubled student population of the 1970's and so that they too can develop strong graduate research programs needed to spur economic and educational development in other parts of our State.

Last year the universities in the State of Ohio awarded only one-third as many Ph. D. degrees as the State of Illinois. Ohio ranks 42d in the Nation in the proportion of young people taking graduate work. Clearly, we must extend the graduate programs we now have and encourage the creation of other centers of graduate study. The private colleges which have played such a unique and vital role in our State must also be preserved and strengthened by new and enlarged sources of financial support. When all of us recognize what it takes to nourish great educational institutions and are prepared to provide the resources needed, then we shall see an educational system second to none in the Nation and an economic climate vigorous beyond our present bold expectations.

Sometimes I wish that universities could issue common stock and that our securities could be traded on the big board. All of us would be very wealthy individuals tomorrow. But there are other ways in which alert businessmen can benefit from rapidly growing, improving universities. Down in Athens we are trying to build a truly great university. While we are developing our undergraduate programs of instruction for a rapidly growing student body and while we are improving our programs of research and graduate study, we shall be creating magnificent investment opportunities for intelligent buisnessmen in our area and for forward-thinking Columbus businessmen. I invite all of you to come on down and take a look at what we are doing in Athens. A university community which will have a student population of 25,000 10 years from now and a faculty twice as large as it is today—and with new research-based industries moving in around us—presents sure-fire investment opportunities for you who are engaged in retail, construction, transportation, entertainment, or service industries. Stated in simple economic terms, I have tried to describe to you this noon a blue-chip investment opportunity with phenomenal growth prospects which today—compared to opportunities offered in other rapidly growing communities—is still available at less than $10 a share, figuratively speaking.

Effects of the Longshoremen's Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following, very thoughtful, letter from Mr. LaScala came to me this week.

Mr. LaScala is a constituent of mine, and a small businessman. It seems to me that he has made a good case for many whose voices are not heard, and therefore are not heeded.

On the other hand they are hampered, and sometimes ruined, by the frequent strikes that occur and for which there seems to be no cure.

My constituent feels, and I agree with him, that it is our job to find a solution to these problems.

The letter follows:

MIDDLETOWN, N.Y.,
March 11, 1963.

KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: The recent longshoremen strike has shown many of us how much a democratic government can stand in doing irreparable damage to private enterprise by not having the courage to help people who are helping themselves. Our Government is democratic in name only when it sanctions the monopolistic efforts of 70,000 people in tying up a nation and by so doing hurt many real American people. Needless to say the efforts of 12 such unions correctly spaced at 1 per month could cripple our country for 1 year.

We are small businessmen who have competed in the production and sale of onions both in the United States and in foreign countries without any Government aid, financial or otherwise. Like the signers of the Declaration of Independence we believe in the same principles of free enterprise and these same principles (regardless of how outmoded they may seem) made and will continue to keep our country great. When we lose these principles (and we are making great progress in this direction) we will cease to be a free country.

As small exporters, we in 1962 exported $172,000 worth of onions to Puerto Rico and foreign countries (Europe, British West Indies, Dutch West Indies, and some independent islands). The present administration has told us that securing gold for our country is an item of top priority. We have done exactly this at 100 percent risk to ourselves. To date we have lost approximately $6,000 in unpaid accounts receivables and claims. I say this to show that the risks are great in a free enterprise system and the successes are rewarding. All this we can cope with but how can we cope with a situation where we make contracts and can't deliver because a handful of people willfully tie our hands. It doesn't matter to them that innocent people, like ourselves, are hurt. We had no stake in this fight whatsoever, but because our Constitution says that we can live as free people we are encouraged to make these contracts never assuming that our very Government, who gives us these rights, also sanctions the removal of these very rights by a small handful of people. It stands idly by with its head turned and watches a handful of people send our produce back home, freeze on the piers or on the trucks, without the courage to lift its hand. Democracy means many things to many people; to us it means that after we brave the elements of nature, risk the storage of our onions for prices that may give us a small margin of profit, that we will have the right to transportation of our onions to any point on this earth if we so desire. Evidently our Government now believes that labor isn't a monopoly and can never be, that it can willfully exercise its own rights to democratic government and demands such, without sanction, regardless of how many free democratic people it hurts.

This season the 34 days strike crippled our export movements. Not only did we lose a great deal of money but this crippling

movement developed a glut which hurt us pricewise for this whole season. We have suffered innumerable claims for money connected directly or indirectly with this strike because of frozen or damaged onions. The steamship lines are still leery of accepting cargo (onions) because of delayed shipments and a full adjustment to normal has not taken place to date.

How long can farmers, like ourselves, who want absolutely no financial help from the Government, no interference in our right to conduct free business from our Government, continue to do business in the manner stipulated by our Constitution when it doesn't have the courage to stop a small group from hurting many. Would the forceful termination of this strike have been any less un-American than the longshoremen's forceful termination of our shipments abroad? Has the day come when our Government has two yardsticks in the measurement of democratic principles, one for labor and one for free businessmen?

We are sick and tired of the way our Government has indirectly hurt us time after time, us who are one of the very few segments of real Americans left in the United States. We think it is high time you people did something about it.

Thanking you in advance.

Very truly yours,

INGRASSIA & LASCALA FARMS, INC.,
ANTHONY J. LASCALA.

Poultry Farmer Frozen Out in Common Market Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Hammond, Ind., Times, entitled "Cutting Us Off," points out most significantly the possibility that U.S. farm exports, particularly poultry exports, may be frozen out of Western Europe.

My distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] recently conducted hearings on this matter at which the Secretary of Agriculture testified. Secretary Freeman emphasized that we would exercise patience, but that we would use every instrument at our disposal to see that U.S. agricultural goods are not kept out of Western Europe.

Mr. President, because this editorial points out most clearly the problem facing the American poultry farmer, I believe it is worthy of consideration by the Members of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUTTING US OFF

A real threat to U.S. agriculture is developing abroad. Evidence is mounting that U.S. farm exports are about to be frozen out of Europe.

Currently the United States sells about $1.1 billion of farm products to the six European Common Market countries. But the Market nations this spring are to consider import restrictions on wheat and feed grain. If these go into effect, imports from the United States will be cut by one-third, a loss to American farmers of a $400-million market.

This is bad enough, but when compared to the high hopes Washington had for an expansion of trade with Europe it is disastrous.

An effort is being made to persuade the six Market nations not to impose their import barriers—or at least postpone them. So far, this effort has had a howling lack of success. The Europeans argue that the Market was not established to help the United States and they aren't about to go out of their way to be nice to their old benefactor.

An example of the troubles faced by U.S. agriculture is found in poultry. Because of a high Common Market tariff, the U.S. poultry business is in a severe depression.

U.N. a Superstate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is many things to many people. To some it is the greatest force for peace in the world. There is little weight for this argument. In the final analysis I believe we must recognize that the military strength of the United States is the greatest force for peace simply because it is the strongest military force in the world. Unless we are to accept the premise that the best way to keep the peace is not to fight, regardless of what we are subjected to, we must recognize that communism would long since have broken out from behind the Iron Curtain were it not for the United States and its allies.

I think it is time we take a long look at the United Nations, individually and as the member nation which is host and largest single financial supporter. We must make a new assessment of the future of this entity which we helped bring into being. It is to be a superstate, with power to impose its will on member nations? Is it to be simply a debating society where world problems and disagreements are aired? Does the United Nations function as a representative parliamentary body? If so, upon what authority are representatives chosen, and to whom are they responsible? Are the representatives truly representative of the thinking of the population of the nations they represent? Does the member nation have a truly representative government which makes it possible for the people to elect their representatives to their own national government?

These questions, and many others would have to be answered before we could think of the United Nations in terms of a world governing body.

In determining the future of the United Nations, we must be guided by the experience of some of those nations in the world who have been most successful in governing themselves. We in the United States think our Constitution and system of government one of the finest ever established. No doubt some of the older representative forms of government think theirs superior to ours. One thing to be found in every truly representative government is that their representatives are chosen by the people, in free elections. This is true in only a small portion of those countries making up the United Nations. How much authority over all the member nations should be vested in a parliamentary body so constituted?

Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in his editorial in this week's U.S. News & World Report, raises more questions about the United Nations. I call this editorial to the attention of the Members of the House, and under unanimous consent, I include it following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

U.N. A SUPERSTATE?

(By David Lawrence)

Is the United Nations a superstate or just a voluntary association of governments?

Does the U.S. function as a parliamentary body in which a majority vote imposes obligations on the minority of the members?

Do the American citizens who represent the U.S. Government in the U.N. feel they are accredited to a superstate with a parliament of its own? Do they feel obligated to defend the U.N. majority and to criticize their own countrymen, including Members of Congress, who have denounced the U.N. action in voting to supply funds to the Castro regime in Cuba?

These questions seem pertinent as one reads in the news dispatches what American delegates to the U.N. are saying in their attempts to stem the tide of criticism of that organization which has arisen in Congress and which may result in cutting off extra contributions by the United States to the U.N.

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, in testifying on March 13 before a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee said:

"And if we were to pick up our marbles and go home whenever there is a disappointment, we would not only destroy the effectiveness of the U.N. but would abandon hope that nations can work out their problems most of the time by the same methods by which conflicting interests get resolved within democratic nations and communities."

Mr. Stevenson stressed that deliberations of the United Nations represent the parliamentary system in action on an international basis.

Another spokesman, Jonathan B. Bingham, U.S. representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council, said in a speech on March 11 that the United States cannot expect U.N. agencies "to act as if they were arms of our State Department."

These comments have a defeatist tone. They do not appear to reflect with any degree of vigor the words of the formal protest filed by the United States when the U.N. Special Fund voted economic aid to Castro.

Ambassador Stevenson pointed out, moreover, that, of the 288 projects of the U.N. Special Fund, 287 were approved by the United States and only 1—aid to Cuba—was disapproved.

The inference is that the United States should weigh the benefits of the many projects approved as against the disadvantages of the single project in Cuba.

When a basic principle—involving injustice and injury to millions of people—is disregarded, is it logical to argue that the U.N. must be excused for condoning a crime just because something constructive has been done by the U.N. elsewhere?

Why doesn't the U.N. see anything wrong in furnishing funds to and bestowing its

prestige on a cruel and inhumane leader who has murdered thousands of innocent people and has brought his nation to the brink of disaster?

The special agency of the U.N. which, despite the protest of the United States, insisted on supplying funds to Castro's government has been financed to the extent of 40 percent by this country. Apologists offer the equivocal excuse that no money from the United States is actually to be used in this particular project in Cuba.

The fact remains, however, that the United Nations, of which this country is a member, is furnishing aid and comfort to a regime of gangsters and is refusing to take sides between unmorality and morality.

The American people have a right to take sides. They need not support financially any organization which condones criminality.

The impression conveyed by the professional defenders of the U.N. is that it is a thing apart and that it is not very much concerned with the misdeeds of various member states but only with the votes of a group of nations which happen—most of them—to be ruled by one-man or one-party governments.

Twenty-five members of the U.N. have paid nothing on their Middle East assessments, and 48 members have paid nothing on their bills for the Congo operations—a total of $121 million in arrears. Yet all these governments have a vote and are able to hand the United States a humiliating defeat in its efforts to help liberate the people of Cuba.

The United States, of course, has paid not only its share—32 percent of the total cost of the two operations—but an additional 16 percent to make up deficits incurred by the failure of other members to pay their shares, and is being asked to pay more.

Some of the disciples of the superstate idea in and around the United Nations evidently think the American people can be easily fooled. If this country is to remain a member of the U.N., it has the right to insist that the moral principles written in the Charter of the United Nations shall be honored. Inhumane and unmoral governments not only should be deprived of any U.N. benefits, but should be expelled from the organization itself.

Communists Use United Nations To Promote Their Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, more and more we are learning of the double standard which has existed at the United Nations. Americans have clung to a hope through the past 17 years that this organization would help bring about world peace but increasingly we find evidence to indicate that we are being taken for a sucker in many of its efforts. This sad fact has come from the fact that in no sense is this organization a united nations. Working within the framework of this world organization is the hard-core Communist bloc which is not even remotely united in the same beliefs and aspirations which motivate American policy or interest.

A long series of instances including almost 100 Soviet vetoes which have blocked most constructive action can be recounted down to the happenings of the past month. After diligent inquiry, I believe I have received the only copy on Capitol Hill of the fraudulent 106-page booklet published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, commonly known as UNESCO, which is an insult not only to America but to commonsense. In the foreword, UNESCO indicated its duplicity in referring to "race discrimination" in the United States in the factual sense while semantically mentioning "a concise statement of the constitutional position of the non-Russian populations of the U.S.S.R. and an account of their economic and social condition at the present time." Note there is no reference to discrimination. This report, UNESCO concludes "will be found most useful." As a tool of Communist progaganda, I would say, yes, but as an objective treatment of the situation in the U.S.S.R. today, absolutely not.

Written by two Russian professors, S. L. Ronin and I. P. Tsamerian, the first 8 lines are a dead giveaway. They piously state:

> The purpose of this publication is to acquaint the public with one of the major social triumphs of our day, namely, the way in which the problem of nationalities has been solved in the Soviet Union. It is, in fact, the story of the successful establishment of full equality of rights between races and nationalities in the U.S.S.R.

The booklet states the Communist line of economic determinism. All problems relate to the economic. There is no morality, just the economic. On page 11, the two Reds state:

> Thus in czarist Russia, the inequalities between national elements, and the oppression of national minorities and colonial peoples, were consequences of a reactionary social system based on czarist absolutism, capitalism, and landlordism.

The Russians had their dirty capitalism but overthrew it. The line is then propounded throughout the book that only communism will answer this situation which is prevalent where neofascism and western colonialism breed discrimination. The writers observe:

> Only the revolution of October 1917, which overthrew this regime and instituted the Soviet system, enabled the peoples of Russia to achieve genuine equality of rights and freedom of development. * * * It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Rusia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression.

Just consider a few more of the quotes from this fantastic booklet which parrots the Communist Party line:

> Another well-known object lesson is the immense progress achieved by the great Chinese people in all economic and cultural fields since it freed itself from colonial domination, overthrow the reactionary regime, and established the rule of the people (p. 10).
>
> The Soviet Union is a brotherhood of free and equal peoples comprising 15 sovereign Soviet Republics in voluntary association on a footing of complete equality. Under the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., each of these Republics retains the right to secede from the union. Each of them embodies the collective will of its people and can decide its own future in entire freedom (p. 13).
>
> Socialist internationalism, fraternal union with equality of rights, steadfast friendship, and mutual aid, such are the true foundations of the sovereignty of the Union Republics (p. 13).
>
> Soviet citizens of all nationalities are working enthusiastically to build a Communist society. For that purpose it is essential to consolidate peace throughout the world. The Soviet Government is resolutely and firmly pursuing a policy of peace between the peoples and upholds the principle of peaceful coexistence between nations with different social systems (p. 15).
>
> The Soviet Union Constitution of 1936, which marks the triumph of socialism and the full flowering of Socialist democracy, sets out and confirms in the most definite and absolute fashion the principle of equality of rights for all nationalities and all races on the juridical plane (p. 28).
>
> The principle of national and racial equality of citizens of the U.S.S.R. is fully applied in the electoral sphere. All citizens have equal electoral rights and are equally eligible for election to all organs of the state—from the village Soviet to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. (p. 29).
>
> The multinational Soviet state, grouping the equal peoples of Russia in a single state in a manner unprecedented in history, was a mighty achievement of the October revolution which thus solved a highly complex problem (p. 33).

The lies are even more blatant when mention is made to the Baltic and Ukrainian affiliations with the U.S.S.R. It is well remembered how the many millions of Ukrainians were liquidated and yet the UNESCO booklet contains this mention on page 41:

> It was likewise thanks to the conditions created by the Soviet Socialist regime and the multinational Soviet State that the Ukrainian people were unified for the first time in history in a national Soviet State.

As to the Baltic States, the report notes:

> In 1940, the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia), which voluntarily joined the Union (p. 37).

One lie after another is propounded in this United Nations organization booklet. The writers say that the central feature of the new government in the U.S.S.R. "was the assertion of the peoples' right to self-determination, including the right of secession and self-government." Few American apologists of communism will even go that far. Can anyone believe that the right of secession exists in Russia. Could Hungary secede? The "cornerstone" of this wonderful system in Russia, the professors venture, was the solemn proclamation of Lenin in 1917 when he said:

"Your beliefs, your traditions, and your national cultural institutions are henceforth declared free and inviolable. Organize your national life in complete freedom and without hindrance; it is your right."

What about the millions of White Russians, Georgians, and Ukrainians who were liquidated—not purged as is popularly stated but murdered? What about religion in Russia today?

This is not an isolated case. It is happening all of the time. The more

obvious cases like the U.N. Special Fund expenditure of $1,157,000 in Cuba for an agricultural aid project receives great press but the day-to-day operations which are just as one sided in all too many instances, go unnoticed.

I have followed UNESCO particularly close because of my interest in education. This same double standard was obvious in their 1960 discourse on discrimination throughout the world. The October 1960 edition of their magazine UNESCO Courier depicts the Little Rock situation, and so forth, but not one word about discrimination in the Soviet Union where entire peoples are enslaved.

When questioned on this, the Director General of UNESCO wrote that the Soviet Union denies that minorities are persecuted in the U.S.S.R. and therefore nothing was said or could be said about it. On the other hand, the Courier only presented what American officials readily admit to exist within our country. A neat double standard, do you not think?

It is in light of this terrible double standard that we should start taking a second look at many of the programs of the United Nations. As long as we play by the rules of decent and civilized people we will be hamstrung. The Soviets use the veto, every cunning and deceit to promote their ends. I do not want us to change our high-principled ways but there is no need to be stupid either. Emotional cliches in behalf of the United Nations will not change the fact that the 17-year history shows a definite pattern of Soviet subversions which are working against our interests and the interests of all of the peoples of the world. The publication, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." is a good example of this. What makes it worse, the U.S. taxpayers are paying a great share of the cost of these efforts. Efforts are now being made by our Government to have the United Nations supervise our disarmament despite the fact that a Communist now heads up and, in fact, has always headed up the U.N. Military Secretariat which would supervise the world police force. One of these days we are going to wake up and ask, "Why did not someone tell us about all of this?"

One-Half of All Humanity Is Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in the March 14 edition of the Indianapolis News was an article based on a recent report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO).

The FAO report pointed out that one-half of all humanity today is hungry. Further, by the year 2000 the world will have to double its food production in order to maintain even our present inadequate nourishment.

These figures, Mr. President, causes one to stop and think. They are particularly overwhelming if one is an American. Here, we worry about farm surpluses and overproduction while people all over the world are starving. I believe the Members of the Senate should read this article and that they should be giving some careful thought as to how we as citizens of the world's wealthiest and most productive nation are going to do our part to help meet the increasingly difficult problem of feeding the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By James Long)

ROME.—One-half of all humanity today suffers either outright hunger or weakening malnutritions, the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) reports.

And this situation probably will become worse.

The problem is shown in statistical charts of two FAO reports, "The Statistics of Hunger" and "Six Billions To Feed." It is simply this:

It took tens of thousands of years from the dawn of man until 1830 for the world's population to reach 1 billion. It took only 100 years, from 1830 to 1930, to reach 2 billion. It took only 30 years, from 1930 to 1960, to reach the present 3 billion. And in the mere 40 years from now to the end of this century that population will double, to reach 6 billion; from then on population will skyrocket by increasing multiples.

Yet there is on earth only about 12.5 acres of land for every man, woman, and child living today.

Of this, only 1.1 acres per person is presently cultivated, and FAO estimates that 2.65 more acres per person could possibly be used to produce food. That would be little more than 3 acres per person at maximum.

FAO says that of the rest of the approximately 12.5 acres per person, 2.5 are too arid, 1.25 acres have inadequate soil, 2.5 acres are too cold, and 2.5 acres are too mountainous.

Thus if the maximum cultivation could be achieved in the next 40 years, there still would be only an acre and a half per person with the population doubled to 6 billion.

From then on the food-producing lands per person would shrink at the same tremendous rate as the increasingly rapid doubling of population.

The FAO surveys showed world food production must be doubled by the year 2000 to maintain even the present inadequate nourishment. For "even moderate improvement," the surveys predicted, world food production must be doubled by 1980 and trebled by 2000.

FAO said that with the present 3 billion population, 300 to 500 million people suffer outright hunger and up to one-half of the world's total population suffers malnutrition.

Hunger means simply not enough to eat. Malnutrition means a sufficient quantity, but of foods inadequate to supply the necessary energy or health.

Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of my recent questionnaire, distributed to every resident of my district whose address was available through telephone directories.

The questionnaire covered two main fields—domestic and foreign affairs. I feel sure the views of my constituents as expressed through this questionnaire will be of special interest to my colleagues. The questionnaire results are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
Domestic affairs:			
1. Do you favor tax reduction without an equal reduction in Federal spending?	10	88	2
2. Do you favor stricter controls over agricultural production and marketing?	11	84	5
3. Do you prefer the present voluntary medical care program for the aged over a compulsory plan, financed by increased social security taxes?	76	20	4
4. Do you favor establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC's of the thirties?	36	55	9
5. Do you favor the establishment of a domestic Peace Corps?	19	69	12
6. Do you favor aid to public schools below the college level?	36	58	6
7. Do you think the President is doing a good job in domestic affairs?	22	59	19
Foreign affairs:			
1. Should we continue to support the U.N.?	63	25	12
2. Would you favor elimination of the foreign aid program?	33	52	15
3. Do you favor substantial reduction in foreign aid?	84	9	7
4. Would you maintain the foreign aid program at about its present level?	15	64	21
5. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in Cuba?	28	62	10
6. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in the Congo?	20	49	31
7. Should the existing foreign Peace Corps program be expanded?	31	52	17
8. Do you think the President is doing a good job in foreign affairs?	26	53	21

The Gift May Lose the Giver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Star:

THE GIFT MAY LOSE THE GIVER

Federal Government for a long time has aimed at taking over private welfare and civic betterment activities. One of the items of President Kennedy's tax reform would advance that objective by undercutting the contributed fund sources of private agencies.

That would be the effect of changing the income tax rules on contributions, taxes, interest, and such, so that these would begin to count as deductions only after an

amount equal to 5 percent of the individual's income had been checked off.

This would mean that a family in average to moderate circumstances, with deductions amounting for instance to 15 percent of its income, might as well forget about itemizing deduction and just take the optional flat 10 percent. Such a family has little control over taxes, interest costs and such. If it decided to cut down deductible items in line with the reduced credit, the cut would have to come largely out of contributions to church, welfare campaigns, educational agencies, and the like.

In the higher income brackets, the effects would be more striking. The percentage floor gimmick would mean that the higher the individual's income, the larger the amount of deductible items for which credit now available would be lost.

Note how this dampening of voluntary contributions to private agencies would tie in with the persistent effort to extend and multiply Federal programs which duplicate the activities of private agencies. This trend has been intensified under the Kennedy administration. But resistance to it has also strengthened, partly because as new proposals continue to pour out it becomes more obvious that many of them are aimed at needs being met by other means.

One of President Kennedy's most recent proposals—for a domestic version of the Peace Corps—is an excellent illustration. The vaguely defined scope of the proposed National Service Corps would take it into a wide variety of social welfare activities, almost all of which are now covered by one or more private agencies.

Other examples can be found in the plan for medical care for the aged, and in both planned and existing medical and scientific research projects and educational aids.

Private agencies do get in the way of the philosophy of extending government to all phases of human needs, desires, and activities. If we tolerate and support the continuance of that philosophy, then government inevitably is going to find ways to push the private agencies out. There's a choice to be made.

And if we want to keep popular choice about them, we'd better choose to keep the private agencies and curb government's encroachments into their fields. Once a Government program is established it tends to become permanent, and all the people are taxed to support it whether they like it or not. The private agencies, on the other hand, remain continuously dependent on active public consent to carry on their work. It's better that way.

Germany Shall Be Reunited, but by Negotiation, Plebiscite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, His Excellency K. Heinrich Knappstein, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United States, made a talk before the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject "Germany Shall Be Reunited, but by Negotiation, Plebiscite."

I think his comments are exceedingly interesting and in order to give them wider circulation, I insert them, under unanimous consent, in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY SHALL BE REUNITED, BUT BY NEGOTIATION, PLEBISCITE

(Address by His Excellency K. Heinrich Knappstein)

Berlin is not a problem in itself. It is not as if the Soviet Union wanted to conquer Berlin this year or the next, or one of the next years to come. Berlin is only a lever, an instrument of blackmail to reach certain other objectives. It is an island in the middle of the Soviet zone. This geographical fact has enabled the Soviet Union to use her East Berlin colony for a colossal maneuver of blackmail by demanding it be recognized as a sovereign state and obtain this by a peace treaty signed by all participants. Only such a contractual recognition would lend status under international law to Germany's Soviet zone and thus guarantee its existence, at least for a time.

Germany, as all free nations, has refused to consider such recognition.

The threat to sign a separate treaty, conferring on the Soviet zone the right to stop access to Berlin, so far has got the Soviet Union nowhere, and—after 4½ years—the Soviets have not risked following up with action.

Since the Soviet adventure failed in Cuba, the U.S.S.R. thinks it still more risky to precipitate a Berlin adventure as well.

CANNOT NEGOTIATE SELF-DETERMINATION

The only language the Soviets understand is strength, and determination not to withdraw under threats. This by no means excludes readiness at all times to talk regarding sensible solutions of problems, but the principle of self-determination cannot be negotiated.

One could discuss, for example, means and time periods which would help save Soviet face in a withdrawal; also safeguards for all participants against attack by the other side.

In its own enlightened self-interest the Soviet Union must sooner or later desire a lessening of tensions on its western frontier to deal with an exploding China.

Communists call the Germany behind the Iron Curtain the German Democratic Republic. But the regime is not German, but Soviet; not democratic, but Communist; not a republic, but a dictatorship. The right name would be Soviet Communist dictatorship. The people in West Germany call it simply the zone.

A CONQUERED COLONY

In war the Soviets conquered a part of Germany and seek to keep it as a Russian colony. Whereas formerly one admitted honestly and freely that one had conquered a country, it is not thought decent in this second half of the 20th century, under the auspices of the United Nations, to conquer a country, so we do not call a spade a spade. Instead, this conquered territory is given the facade of a democratic republic.

But East Germany is a Russian colony, planned as a bridgehead for further expansion of the Soviet role in Western Europe.

Twenty-two Soviet divisions stand guard so that any uprising against the Communist regime will be drowned in blood, as it was June 17, 1953.

A small group of Communist functionaries—Germans trained for years in Moscow—rule the zone with an iron fist.

But the people of Eastern Germany are exactly the same as those of West Germany—with the same national history. Their thinking and culture are the same; composers, poets, and philosophers are held in common.

If there were free elections the votes for communism would be even smaller there than in Western Germany for they have had 18 bitter years under the Communists, yet have no real elections: not even freedom not to go to the polls.

NO DESIRE FOR SEPARATION

Some people in this country seem to believe that in East Germany something took place similar to what might have taken place here if the Confederates had been victorious 100 years ago: in other words, that a part of the country on its own initiative detached itself to conduct its affairs independently of the other part. No comparison could be more unreal.

It was not the people of East Germany—not even a part of them—who wished a state of their own. A foreign power, by conquest, founded a regime at gunpoint using German stooges trained for the purpose in Moscow.

The people in East Germany, except for the very tiny Communist minority, are all against such separation.

Until the Berlin wall was erected, 2.7 million had fled the Communist "paradise" to get to the "hell of captialism." Even since the wall has been built, several thousand have tried to reach freedom.

VOTED WITH THEIR FEET

During the Russian revolution, Lenin said that soldiers fleeing from the front had "voted with their feet" for an armistice. By fleeing, millions of people have "voted with their feet" against the Communist regime in the Soviet-occupied zone. But 17 million Germans have had to stay locked up in this huge prison.

We could achieve unification almost overnight if we were willing for all Germany to be Communist. Russia has made this offer, in concealed form, again and again.

But this would mean that all Germany would be a concentration camp behind barbed wire and mine fields. Freedom of self and speech would be banished, along with all intellectual and spiritual freedom. We would have to pay with our freedom for reunification. It is too expensive. What we desire can only be reunification in freedom.

REUNIFICATION BY WAR REJECTED

A second way—which the Soviets particularly fear—would be reunification by force and war. But we reject this way as utterly senseless.

After the Second World War, by great toil, we built our country from utter ruin. We do not have the least desire to have all this destroyed by a new war.

Reunification by force would make of all Germany an atomic heap of ruins, a huge cemetery. The Federal Government has pledged itself never to use force to achieve reunification.

MUST REUNITE BY PLEBISCITE

Only the third way is open. This demands endless patience, with no end in sight. This is the wise path of diplomacy and negotiation. It is based on the right of nations to self-determination. This right, which has been granted all young countries of Asia and Africa, must be granted to the Germans.

We request that each eligible German, east and west, be allowed to go into a polling booth and the result of this plebiscite put into effect.

We know that if the Germans are granted a free plebiscite (if need be under the United Nations) the vote will be for a free democratic Germany, reunited and desiring peace with all its neighbors.

We know why the Russians have turned this down again and again. They know the result will be "Ivan, go home."

The call for self-determination is our best intellectual weapon, which the Soviets fear.

The Trojans left Greece one day. The Romans returned to Italy from Gaul. No occupation lasts forever, Thus the Russians one day will leave East Germany.

The East Germans have given the Soviet viceroy, Ulbricht, so much trouble by his

bad government that the Soviet Government might have set free their East German colony long ago except for fear that this would cause collapse of their whole system of satellites.

NO NONCOMMUNIST NATION RECOGNIZES ZONE

One of the diplomatic means in our effort is to prevent the Soviet Zone from being recognized by other states.

The Federal Republic considers it an unwarranted involvement in German internal affairs if a foreign country recognizes as a sovereign state a forceably separated part of German territory. It will break off diplomatic and economic relations with any country that does so. The choice must be between relations with the Soviet Zone and relations with the Federal Republic.

Up to now we have been successful in this policy. Not a single country, except the Communists, has recognized the zone as a sovereign state, in spite of 15 years of desperate Soviet efforts. Nor has any neutralist nation recognized the Soviet Zone regime.

The Federal Republic has relationships with 97 countries; the Communist regime, in the zone, with no countries except those in the Communist bloc.

The national unification of Germany took about 70 years. Reunification of Germany will also take a long time but I think not 70 years."

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

W. M. STROTHER. Are Berlin and West Germany encouraging American industries to build new plants there? Has economy slowed down?

Answer. Economy has not slowed down. Berlin has no unemployment. Berlin and West Germany encourage American plants. The more American industry enters Berlin, the better the situation.

OTTO K. EITEL. Explain German-French treaty.

Answer. For 400 years France and Germany have battled each other. There is a deep longing to end that enmity. After the war Chancellor Adenauer expressed hope that German officers be trained in French military schools and vice versa. That has come true. Certainly there will be differences of opinion (as on British entry to the Common Market) but you can have difference of opinion and remain good friends.

J. C. RUSSELL. Do West Germans consider East German officials as traitors?

Answer. No—but as Soviet functionaries. One thing is certain. They have no right to speak for the German people of East Germany. They were installed by Soviet conquest. A man more clever than Ulbricht could have won over many more Germans. Do we want him removed? The more stupid he is, the better for us.

HERB ELLON. How can West Germany take on huge reunification obligations?

Answer. We don't think it would be huge. The destruction by World War II was a reason for our boom—we had to do so much. East Germany is on a very low economic level; has not been greatly reconstructed; we will be busy to produce goods for all Germany.

ERWIN KOCH. To what extent can we depend on France to maintain solid front against Soviet Union on Berlin?

Answer. We trust our neighbor. She has supported us against the common threat and will continue to do so. She firmly belongs to the Western alliance.

RALPH H. BOLLARD. Possibilities of German people permitting another Hitler, Kaiser, or Bismarck?

Answer. Dictatorship is like the measles; once you've had it you become immune. The Germans have learned a bitter lesson. They want no more dictators.

AYLETT B. COTTON. Might Germany welcome political federation with other NATO nations?

Answer. It was difficult to bring six European nations into the Common Market. It will be still more difficult to establish political union, and much more so to bring additional nations into a federation. I believe in an Atlantic community. In the long run it should come—including Europe, America, and Canada—but for a political federation it is still too early.

The Need for a Moral Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, since the 88th Congress convened, the well-publicized action of one Member of this body has served to cast a shadow over the moral stature of every Member of the House. Much has been said to the effect that Congress should do something to stop abuses of expenditures of public funds for unintended and personal purposes. Probably Congress should do something and it already has moved to reduce and restrict the use of funds allocated to the committee where these abuses were so flagrant during the last session.

I would submit, however, Mr. Speaker, that it is most difficult—to say nothing of the propriety—for Congress to pass judgment on the actions of one of its Members. This is the job of the voters of the various congressional districts. Who are we in Congress to pass judgment on the qualifications of the representatives selected by the voter in a free election? We point with pride to the fact that we in America truly have a government of the people. If this is to remain true, there must be a minimum of further qualifying judgment imposed by anyone other than the people themselves.

It is often said that people receive the kind of representation in government that they deserve. Where people elect irresponsible representatives they will in all probability receive irresponsible government. It follows then that the people who elect the type of representative who permits or fosters irresponsible government are, in the majority at least, irresponsible themselves. The blame for moral shortcomings of some Members of Congress should not be laid at the door of Congress but on the shoulders of the free citizens who elected the Representatives to Congress. If the people do not require the commonly accepted adherence to principles of honesty and decency in the people they elect to public office, they can expect further abuses such as have recently been well publicized in connection with a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Bismark Tribune in my home State of North Dakota makes some pertinent observations on the importance of society preserving its moral principles. Under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR A MORAL CODE

Nobody really questions that a loss of freedom anywhere, however small, diminishes freedom everywhere.

Yet not much is said about the idea that the same thought should apply in the realm of individual, national, and world morality.

At none of these levels is observance of the moral code ever even remotely close to perfect, and no practical person expects that.

But it is always fair to demand that the tenets of the code—at whatever level—be constantly reasserted, and that departures from such principles be noted and protested.

Where, then, are the indignant ones today?

When New York's Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL sought recently to answer charges that he had abused congressional privilege in a variety of ways, his defense was simply that he was only one of many who do the same things.

Undoubtedly there are more than a few who think such an answer is both clever and sensible. What he said is true, isn't it?

Very likely it is. But is that the kind of reply which ought to satisfy a nation concerned for its moral character? If not, where is the indignation?

The logic of POWELL's argument is that one transgression justifies another. Carried to its limits, that suggests that anything goes so long as somebody else is doing it.

The end product of such thinking is the destruction of the moral code. An individual or a society which seeks to rationalize immorality has no morality.

A people silently watching transgression pile upon transgression may well lose all capacity for protest. The young who note this silence are quick to perceive its meaning. "Everybody's doing it" is a powerful teenage weapon against parents who never wax indignant over the adult world's lapses.

And where is the lesson against stealing for children in homes cluttered with ash trays, lamps, and other objects lifted "sportingly" from hotels?

You can't sell morality to children if you do not practice it—and preach it widely. You can't teach self-control in a home or a society that exalts self-indulgence.

The same goes for countries and their leaders.

In his troubles with Red China, we offer India's Nehru help now not because he is a moral man who has been morally wronged by an aggressor, but because it is in the practical interest of world freedom to do so.

If Nehru had any pretensions as a moral leader, he subverted them when he could find no words of protest in 1956 against Russia's repression of Hungary.

Where was the wrath of the pious, self-serving Africans when Khrushchev resumed nuclear testing on his own? Their indignation appears curiously selective. They reserve it for old enemies.

Morality is a whole cloth. Practical men inevitably labor to cut it up. But if we are to have human dignity, we must—at the minimum—have other men who try to stay the cutter's hand.

As Portugal Sees Course in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, victory in the cold war demands unity, understanding, and good faith among all nations who are or who would be free.

The Atlantic alliance is a basis framework for success in the battle against communism. In recent months, it has been subject to considerable stress. Understanding must be restored.

Our relations with Portugal are a notable example of the strains and stresses which unless relieved may tend to further disrupt the unity of the Atlantic alliance. In the past, we have been all too quick to judge, all too quick to condemn, all too quick to misinterpret Portugal's problems and its attempted solutions.

It is essential that we begin to study and to understand the enormous complexity of both the internal and external problems facing Portugal. She is and has been a good friend and invaluable ally to the United States. We have been able to count on Portugal's cooperation. She must be able to count on ours.

A good many persons in and out of Government are beginning to realize this. Mr. Robert Estabrook, editor of the editorial page of the Washington Post, has spent considerable time in Portugal and is intimately aware of the complexity of the problem. He has written articles in the Post which have helped shed light on the problem and have promoted understanding. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to his latest, "As Portugal Sees Course in Africa:"

AS PORTUGAL SEES COURSE IN AFRICA

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—On the eve of discussion in Lisbon of a liberalized statute for Portuguese oversea provinces, British Labor Party Leader Harold Wilson proclaimed that a Labor government here would not supply arms to Portugal for defense of her interests in Africa. The wisdom of furnishing arms in such situations is certainly questionable. But to compare Portuguese policy to South African apartheid, as Wilson did, is to misconstrue the issue.

In objective the two policies are at opposite poles. South Africa aims at rigid racial segregation on the theory that the only way the African and white populations can coexist is to live in separate areas. Portugal is committed to a multiracial society in which, whatever the deficiencies in practice, all citizens have equal rights and opportunities. In the view of Prime Minister Salazar education and economic development in Angola and Mozambique must proceed together.

The most justified complaint against Portugal is not that her stated aims are evil, but that fulfillment has been agonizingly slow. Until the Angola terrorism in 1961 Portugal had done far too little to overhaul feudal economic practices or broaden education. Police repression plus centralized administration in Lisbon add to resentments.

But some earnest people, particularly younger administrators, understand the need for reform. Substantial improvements have been inaugurated. More than 2,000 oversea students—many of them Africans—are studying at Portuguese universities. New universities open this fall in both Angola and Mozambique.

Just now the Parliament is debating a plan for decentralized administration based on recommendations of the oversea council. Wholly elected legislative councils would have complete control over budgets—an essential of self-government. Simultaneously economic discriminations between oversea territories and the mainland would be phased out.

The question is whether the government will vitiate its own plan. Lisbon financial groups have been skeptical of liberalization, and Salazar himself is skeptical of relinquishing budgetary control. He has been dubious about Angola, where opposition is rife, ever since a revolt there when he was Oversea Minister more than 30 years ago. Salazar's deputy, Minister of State Correia de Oliveira, is perhaps even more conservative.

If the law should be gutted or postponed, the effect would be to brand Portuguese intentions as a sham. But if it should be applied in good faith, Portugal could contend that she had taken an important step toward self-determination. She has a better record in her oversea provinces than her stiff-necked attitude in the United Nations might indicate.

A U.N. investigation of conditions in nonself-governing territories was rebuffed on the principle that Angola and Mozambique are part of Portugal. In retrospect Portugal would have been wiser to cooperate. She did agree last fall to an American plan to admit representatives of the General Assembly but this was withdrawn after Afro-Asian protest.

Because of defense measures against terrorism which she insists is organized from outside, Portugal has proportionately the second highest military budget in NATO. Now she sees an arms threat from Algeria to two Angolan insurgent groups headquartered in the Congo. An American declaration to the U.N. investigating committee last week cautioned against outside attempts at control while again urging self-determination.

Portugal is hardly a model democracy, and her oversea policy reflects much stubborn pride. Some Portuguese would bring down the house rather than change. But a new breeze is blowing with reforms and admission of foreign capital. Delicate American efforts are required both to prod Portugal and support her liberalization.

To some African countries jockeying for primacy, probably nothing Portugal could do would make much difference—although the Portuguese say that privately certain African leaders fearful of domination urge them to hold on. To zealots Portugal represents the vestige of colonialism in Africa, and only expulsion of the white man will suffice. Perhaps the nationalist tide is irresistible.

Nevertheless, as we should have seen in the Congo, it does not follow that immediate independence automatically brings all good things. Without education and continued sources of development capital, independence can be an empty slogan.

Writer Finds Frost Poem Applies to Expense Account Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in a recent editorial of the Evansville (Ind.) Press, it is noted that one of that newspaper's correspondents found a poem by the late Robert Frost which, in the opinion of the Evansville Press, applies to the Internal Revenue Service's impending crackdown on expense-account accounting.

Since this editorial is worthy of consideration by the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPENSE ACCOUNT

One of our thoughtful and cultured correspondents, having read all about the Internal Revenue Service's impending crackdown on expense-account accounting, dug through the library and came up with a rhyme written years ago by the late poet, Robert Frost:

"Never ask of money spent
"Where the spender think it went,
"Nobody was ever meant
"To remember and invent
"What he did with every cent."

The correspondent says he does not know the title, if any, Mr. Frost used for this bit of philosophy, but in view of current events, the correspondent suggests:

"Owed to a Tax Collector."

Congressman Kirwan: Heidelberg, 1907

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening our distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] was the principal speaker at the annual St. Patrick's Day party held in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., my congressional district. It was a distinct pleasure having Congressman KIRWAN with us and I am sure, as a native son of my district, he enjoyed himself immensely. The Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of March 14, 1963, the largest newspaper in my district, carried a very interesting editorial on Congressman KIRWAN and it gives me great pleasure to quote the editorial.

The editorial follows:

GENTLEMAN AND SCHOLAR—CONGRESSMAN KIRWAN: HEIDELBERG, 1907

Representative MICHAEL (MIKE) KIRWAN, Plains native, who has been in Congress for more than a quarter century as a Member of the House from Youngstown, Ohio, will share the spotlight with President Kennedy at the National Press Club in Washington tonight when he will be host at the congressional party in honor of St. Patrick, perhaps the most important social gathering of the year, for the guest list constitutes a Who's Who in Washington and other points.

The affair has added interest locally this year because Representative KIRWAN is coming here on Saturday night to deliver the principal address at the annual St. Patrick's Day dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Wilkes-Barre at Hotel Sterling.

The program for this evening's doing in Washington features pictures of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. KIRWAN, together with drawings of PT boat 109 on which the President served in the Pacific during the Second World War, and also of Heidelberg 7.

Luke Quinn, Jr., chairman of committee in charge of the party, has this explanation of the program cover:

"The story of PT 109 and President Kennedy is known to everyone. It's a story of courage and triumph over adversity. The

story of MIKE KIRWAN and Heidelberg 7 is less well known, but equally appealing.

"When MIKE was 7, he went to work as a breaker boy in the coal mines of Pennsylvania (Wyoming Valley). He worked 12 hours a day, 6 days a week. The only time he saw daylight was on Sunday. It was a hard, cruel beginning for a small boy—the first test of fortitude in a career replete with them.

"Some 60 years later, MIKE was made a member of the University Club of Washington. In the course of his introduction, reference was made to Heidelberg 7. One of the members said he didn't know MIKE had been educated in Germany in 1907. Mike explained he hadn't been and told the story of the mine, adding:

"'I would have learned a great deal about life at the University of Heidelberg, but you can be sure I learned a great deal about life in the mines—the hard way.'

"From this humble beginning, MIKE went on to eminence in public life, earning the respect and affection of millions of Americans.

"We are proud of President Kennedy and Congressman KIRWAN on this St. Patrick's Day for the honor they have brought to their Irish heritage. The symbols on the cover of this program rest in the hearts of all of us."

James Law, former Wilkes-Barre postmaster and Democratic county chairman, has a slightly different version of the story of MIKE KIRWAN's alma mater, Heidelberg, 1907. He told it to guests at his table at the Brotherhood Week dinner last month when the late Andrew Sordoni, the Reverend Jule Ayers, D.D., and Con McCole received awards and it drew a big laugh.

We gathered that MIKE KIRWAN, member of the class of 1907 at Avoca's Heidelberg, possesses, among other assets, a rare sense of humor.

The Constitution of the United States Versus World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of an essay which was recently awarded a prize by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. It is entitled, "The Constitution of the United States versus World Government," and was written by Mrs. Elizabeth Files Wingo, of Shreveport, La. By unanimous consent, I insert this essay in the RECORD and call it to the attention of all my colleagues as a worthy item of study:

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES VERSUS WORLD GOVERNMENT

Forces and conditions which ultimately brought about the writing and adoption of that most remarkable of all documents, the Constitution of the United States, dates back farther than to 1789. That being true, for a more intelligent understanding, and deeper appreciation of the Constitution, let us turn back the pages of history approximately 175 years and note both the conditions as they obtained at that time, and the character and stature of the men in whose hands rested the grave and far-reaching responsibilities of governmental affairs.

Because there lies deep within the heart of man—placed there by divine decree—the compelling desire to be free, to be unhampered and untrammeled in the exercise of the prerogatives of individual thought, speech, and action, the American colonists had successfully thrown off the tyrannical yoke of the mother country, England, and were, though free and independent, faced with the Herculean task of solving the multiplicity of problems incident to establishing a government that would be suitable, not to a subject colony, but to a nation determined to remain forever free and independent. This independence has been achieved at a very high price and against overwhelming odds. Despite the joy and satisfaction of being free, they were confronted by many gravely serious problems which must be faced and satisfactorily solved. Many were of such gravity and magnitude as to deter those less strong and resolute, but, to those valiant patriots, deterrents served only as a challenge—an incentive to overcome the many and various obstacles and successfully and satisfactorily solve the perplexing and difficult problems with which they were confronted.

Among these challenging problems, the one considered the most immediate and certainly most important, was that pertaining to the affairs of government. Out of this need was developed a new philosophy of government. This philosophy was revolutionary both in nature and purpose, and was representative of the revolt of the human individual against all forms of enslavement. Down through centuries civilized man has been searching for, and striving to attain this personal freedom.

This quest had its beginning in the early 15th century with the beginning of the Renaissance. The Rennaissance created in the Western culture a belief in the dignity and self-sufficiency of the individual man. The ideas and principles inculcated by this Western culture were now beginning to find expression. For a full century before our Liberty Bell rang out its ultimatum, basic freedoms had been achieved by the English people, as a result of revolution. It was only natural then, that the men who made the early settlements in America brought with them deep and strong convictions concerning man's God-given rights to freedom and independence.

This spiritual concept that man is a creation of God, and as such is endowed with certain inalienable rights, which are given him by God, is an ideal that has grown and flourished in our beloved America since its beginning as a free nation and stands today as the most dynamic political doctrine in all the nations of the world. (This introduction is in part from an article in the DAR magazine of September 1957, by Cora S. Bradley. Apart is my own from general knowledge of U.S. history and general information.)

Prior to, and immediately following the close of the Revolutionary War, the Colonies had functioned governmentally under the Articles of Confederation. These Articles had come into being as the result of a resolution introduced in Congress in June 1776, by Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, in which he moved the appointment of a committee to draw up Articles of Confederation. The instrument, "The Articles of Confederation," which incidentally was drawn up by the committee in the brief period of 8 days, was not approved until November 1777. While this instrument was in some respects, an improvement over the former governmental system, it was far from perfect or even satisfactory. In reality, it was little more than a loosely knit league—lacking in many essentials and was conspicuously weak and contained many inadequacies and limitations.

One very objectional feature was that it was more a government of States rather than a government of men. This was clearly apparent to such men as Washington, Madison, Franklin and others and caused no little apprehension for they felt that to meet the needs of the new Nation the revision of the Articles was an imperative necessity—hence the calling of the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. Because of the momentous and far-reaching accomplishments of this Convention, it was termed by some the most important and altogether noteworthy gathering of men ever held at any time.

The purpose of the Convention was primarily to revise the Articles of Confederation, with little or no thought given to the establishment of an entirely new instrument of government. This Convention brought together men of decidedly different and unequal aptitudes and mental abilities. For the most part, however, it was an aggregation of men of exceptional ability, patriotic courage, and political sagacity. It has very aptly been said that one of the marvels of the Constitution of the United States was the exceptionally high character and ability of those who framed it. Truly, they were great and talented men, who faced an unparalled historical opoprtunity and created an incomparable masterpiece. The product of their combined wisdom and effort—the U.S. Constitution—may rightly be termed a document of divine inspiration. There were many brave and patriotic men who strove diligently and made such worthwhile contributions to this governmental instrument but space permits the naming of only a comparative few, such as Jefferson, Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Charles Pinckney, George Mason and others—and, towering above all others, stood the incomparable Washington—gentleman, soldier, statesman and, soon to be chosen the first President of the young Republic.

On most of the main issues the delegates were in complete accord. However there was a wide diversity of opinion in formulating the details of the structure of the Government. At times tempers flared and debate waxed heated. When this happened the role played by the mild-manner brilliant gentleman from Virginia, James Madison, was most helpful in calming tempers and clarifying ideas from his exceptional and profound wisdom. Franklin, then 81 years of age, rendered invaluable assistance in many ways, as did the others. A rather colorful member was Governer Morris, who possesed a remarkable command of the English language. Much credit is due him for the dignified and stately wording in which the Constitution is couched. Another Virginian, George Mason, deserves not only conspicious mention but also gratitude and high acclaim. But for his farsighted wisdom and determination, the rights and freedoms of individuals would not have been properly protected, for we would have had no Bill of Rights. To this man all Americans owe a tremendous debt of gratitude for because of his efforts and unyielding determination, the protection of individual freedom and the sovereign rights of the people were assured.

Having noted briefly a few of the men who worked so tirelessly to frame and write the Constitution, let us now turn our attention of the Constitution itself.

First of all, let us ask, What was the great, comprehensive purpose of establishing the Constitution, and what was the compelling and motivating power behind it? We find this answered very clearly and concisely expressed in the preamble which states, "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America." Where can one find another document comparable to it? Where can one find a document so clearly, so con-

cisely and yet so comprehensively stated? It is the charter of freedom, the cornerstone of our Government, the most outstanding example in history of a legal instrument that has served as a safeguard of individual freedom and foundation of national unity. In it are contained the treasures of almost unlimited potential. Because the partial utilization of this marvelous potential under the protection of, and within the framework of the Constitution, America has become the peer of all nations unequaled in all history—the greatest Nation ever known to man. How very correct Gladstone was when he described the Constitution as being "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Certainly all patriotic Americans concur in Gladstone's appraisal of this document and should be eternally thankful for its provisions and the principles of freedom which constitute the philosophy of our Republic. Fortunately for all, the Constitution, like the Ten Commandments, includes some emphatic "thou shalt nots" and places far beyond the reach of government rights, the rights of the individual. Maintaining and enjoying these rights was made possible by the guarantees of the Bill of Rights which includes freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press; right to keep and bear arms: quartering of soldiers; security against unwarranted search and seizure; rights of accused in criminal proceedings; right of speedy trial; right of trial by jury; right against excessive bails, fines and punishment; rights of the States and individuals. All powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution are reserved to the States or to the people.

What are we to think when, despite this constitutional guarantee, we have seen this 10th amendment completely ignored and the power of the States usurped by both the judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government? This is a most alarming procedure and should certainly serve to awaken slumbering Americans from their dangerous complacency and lethargic indifference and to cause them to discard the deceptive sophistry of "it can't happen here" and substitute for it the fact that "it has happened here."

In this time of peril, uncertainty and world chaos, it behooves every citizen to be alert and to be cognizant of the fact that our Constitution is not only a bill of rights, but also a bill of obligations—rights to enjoy freedom and obligation to defend and perpetuate it. Having noted the multiplicity of blessings and privileges which are granted and guaranteed us by the Constitution, it seems incredible that anyone should have to be admonished to preserve it or that anyone would desire to destroy such a government but it is a well-known fact that there are forces—both within and without—whose avowed purpose is to destroy constitutional government and substitute for it, godless, atheistic communism. This is to be accomplished through world government. Government presupposes a court, so to have world government there necessarily must be a world court. The World Court provisions in the United Nations Charter can completely destroy our Constitution and all it stands for and provides. Since the World Court and world government are the offsprings of the United Nations, let us turn our attention for a moment to the United Nations. The original purpose of the United Nations Organization were good and found acceptance by many organizations including the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution. As stated in its formation in 1945, it was to be a confederation of sovereign nations seeking to solve international problems and attain world understanding and peace. These were lofty world goals. Just how signally it has departed from these goals is shown by some frightening and indisputable facts. Instead of aiding democracy and freedom, the United Nations has achieved rule by the minority. One small Afro-Asian nation has the same voting power in the United Nations General Assembly as the United States, and it has been proven quite conclusively that the efforts of the United States to bring about a world opinion favorable to freedom have failed. The conflict between the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations is fundamental; there is no way of resolving it. Our form of constitutional government was set up for free people. The United Nations Charter attempted to set up a one world organization to govern many people, half free and half slave. These purposes oppose each other and to pretend otherwise is both futile and dangerous. Note these specific conflicts: our Constitution places authority to interpret treaties of the United States with our Federal Government. The United Nations Charter places this authority with the Court of International Justice. Our Constitution places power to declare war with a Congress made up of elected representatives of the people. The United Nations places such authority with the Security Council. Our Constitution declares that the President of the United States is commander in chief of our Armed Forces. The U.N. Charter places this authority with the military staff committee under the Security Council. (It may be added significantly that the head of this military staff committee has always been a Communist). Our Constitution requires the Government of the United States to protect the individual States of the Union from invasion. The United Nations Charter provides for rights of passage of armed foreign troops.

Our Constitution provides for elected legislators to make all the laws for the United States dealing with international affairs. The United Nations Charter places much of this authority in the hands of appointed members of the General Assembly, which includes nations where the meaning of freedom has never been known. Our Constitution provides for a republican form of government, built upon the foundation of responsibility, of Federal servants to the people. The United Nations Charter is built upon the sovereignty of appointed representatives. Our Constitution sets up a judicial system with the right of appeal. The United Nations Charter substitutes the procedures of the World Court which are final and without appeal.

With these contrasts established, let us now take a brief look at the World Court which is the offspring of the United Nations. An examination of this Court reveals this: It is composed of 15 judges, who are nominated by governments which are members of the United Nations and require for election a majority vote in both the General Assembly and the Security Council. The nominations therefore, are strictly political. The World Court judges take no oath of allegiance to any principles. There are no uniform qualifications for World Court judges—not even a legal degree. No nation may have more than one judge. This means that in the World Court, the United States is outnumbered 14 to 1. The decisions in the World Court are final and from them there is no appeal. The following are a few of the domestic issues upon which the World Court could rule:

First, tariff: The World Court, by decree, could abolish all U.S. tariffs—thus flooding our country with cheap foreign goods which would seriously injure American industries.

Second, immigration: The World Court could abolish our immigration quotas and security provisions.

Third, foreign aid: The World Court could decree that the foreign aid program be made permanent and could divert aid to any Communist country it chose to.

Fourth: through action of the World Court we could lose the Panama Canal, which would dangerously weaken the defense of our country. Under the domination of the World Court and world government, not only would we have to surrender our national sovereignty but our individual and personal freedom as well.

Article 55 of the United Nations Charter says that the U.N. "Shall promote higher living standards, full employment, social progress, solutions for health, culture, and educational problems and human rights and freedom." Certainly those are noble sounding aims, but let us look a bit further at the next article of the charter. Article 56 says "that all member states pledge themselves to put article 55 into effect." We did not say when we joined the United Nations that we would give consideration to the question of following U.N. policies in all these matters. We pledged that we would put article 55 into effect. The work of carrying out these aims and commitments has been mostly to specialized agencies which are far removed from the scrutiny of our Congress or our courts. Just how deeply we have become enmeshed in international efforts to regulate our domestic labor standards, minimum wage laws, immigration, etc., is revealed to us when we carefully study and digest the pronouncements of articles 55 and 56. Under these, the Federal Government has made a commitment to regulate all education, including public and private schools, in the way the U.N. agencies tell us to do. Further, the U.N. can regulate all matters affecting civil rights and other matters which are entirely domestic. This look at, and revaluation of, the U.N. World Court and world governments, shows us conclusively that they are directly opposed to the concept of limited government which is the basis of our constitutional Republic. Since we see that the World Court and world government present a sinister threat to our Government and American way of life, it behooves every American citizen to be alert and informed as to the consequences of surrendering our sovereign, constitutional rights to a World Court, and becoming a mere puppet vassal in a world superstate.

Down through the years, we in the United States have enjoyed the feeling of complete security, ensconced as we have been, behind what we considered an impregnable bulwark—our Constitution—but no longer can we have the assurance that constitutional rights will not be usurped, as they have been, and, too, those who are sincerely interested and informed, that in that otherwise almost perfect instrument, the Constitution, there is one dangerous loophole, one which the one worlders and internationalists are making full use of as a weapon handed them by modern intepretations of the treaty clause of the Constitution which states that "Treaties are equal or superior to the Constitution as the supreme law of the land." The Supreme Court has ruled that laws made by treaty, besides being immune to any test constitutionally, also supersede domestic law. Louis Budens has warned that Soviet Russia has planned for many years to use this loophole—the treaty clause—to destroy the sovereignty of the United States and lead us into world government, which, as we well know, would be dominated by Russia and her satellites. It is heartening to know, however, that this dangerous loophole could be eliminated by placing proper restrictions upon the power given the Chief Executive under these interpretations.

With this brief comparison of these two governmental ideologies, which seems preferable—to live our lives in freedom, as we have been able to because of our constitutional government, or to become slaves un-

der the domination of brutal, godless communism? When we contemplate the manifold blessings which make up our heritage, both as a nation and as individuals, it is incredible that any American could even for one moment, ever, consider making a choice. Being an American, he should automatically say to the world, "I unqualifiedly believe in and give my loyal support to constitutional government." Each and every American citizen should live with a song of praise and a prayer of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the provisions and protection of the Constitution; not only this, but he should remind himself that every blessing carries with it a corresponding responsibility. Therefore, it is his compelling duty and responsibility, not only to protect but to preserve and pass on to subsequent generations this liberty and freedom purchased at so dear a price by our brave and heroic forbears.

Our heritage is priceless, but we must ever bear this in mind. We did not earn it. It was dropped like a mantle of blessing upon us. If we do not appreciate, nurture, protect, and preserve this heritage, we are unworthy ingrates and are far from being representative of the valiant patriots who not only bequeathed to us liberty and freedom, but who had the foresight to erect protective safeguards for subsequent generations. These are dangerous, uncertain, explosive times. America needs our united, loyal, and sacrificial support coupled with a steadfast, unvacillating determination that constitutional government shall not perish nor be destroyed but will be successfully defended against all enemies, even the World Court and world government.

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler: Requirements for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, delivered a thought-provoking speech on leadership recently to the Cadet Corps at The Citadel—the military college of South Carolina.

In his eloquent talk, General Wheeler, a distinguished military leader, told this fine group of young American men how they can develop their leadership potential to the highest degree.

He exhorted the cadet corps to pick up the torch of American leadership and carry it forward to the utmost of their abilities.

Leadership requirements, he avowed, are confidence, initiative, truth, action, duty, explanation, and learning, and if the first letter of each word is put together, they spell out Citadel—the birthplace of their leadership training.

Mr. Speaker, General Wheeler's remarks are so inspiring I believe all America should have an opportunity to read them. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his address:

LEADERSHIP

On behalf of both Mrs. Wheeler and myself, let me first say that we're very pleased and honored to be invited to join you in your observance of Corps Day at The Citadel. This pleasure is compounded by the opportunity to learn at firsthand something about The Citadel, the corps of cadets, and the 120 years of Citadel service to South Carolina and the United States.

On occasions like this, before leaping from the security of silence into the dangerous void of a public address, I think of the British lieutenant who was drilling his company along the edge of the white cliffs of Dover. Somehow the column got turned so as to march toward the edge of the precipice. The lieutenant panicked. His throat tightened up; he couldn't think of the command to turn his men around. At this juncture, the sergeant ran up and yelled, "For God's sake, say something, sir, even if it's only 'goodby.'"

I want to say something to you today that you can use, something you will remember after I say goodby. It is for this reason that my subject is "Leadership." I want to offer a few ideas on leadership, and illustrate my remarks by giving you some conception, at least, of what leadership demands of a lieutenant in the Army today.

I know that you receive a good deal of instruction on leadership here at The Citadel, both in the classroom and in the practical leadership of the corps of cadets. I also know that many of you will serve in the Air Force, the Marines, or perhaps in the Navy, and not in the Army at all. Many of you will not seek a professional military career beyond your selective service and Reserve obligations; but my ideas, I hope, will serve you equally well whether you are in uniform or out, in any branch of the Armed Forces or in any civilian pursuit.

I happen to be one who believes that there are not born leaders. Leaders emerge in times of stress and crisis because through training, individual effort, and respect for responsibility the leader is prepared and ready. It is true, of course, that some men are gifted with those attributes of personality and understanding that gain them the faith and support of their fellows without much effort. In general, however, a study of the military or civilian leaders of any era of history will show that there are as many varieties of leadership as there are leaders. I don't need to labor this point particularly. The differences in personality and techniques of leadership among the great leaders of American military history—such as Washington, Grant, Lee, Jackson, Pershing, and Patton—make this apparent.

While any of us would like to think he is a Lee or a Pershing, men of that cast appear only out of the clash of great events. The problem most of us have, it seems to me, is to develop ourselves for the leadership tasks of day-to-day living in our chosen professions. For most of us, the reward will be neither the acclaim of history nor the accolade of society. For most of us, the reward will be little more than the knowledge that we met the challenges of the hours, the days, and the years to the best of our energy and ability: that we were good citizens who served our country well.

In my opinion, energy and ability can always be improved and enhanced. Most people, I think, do not reach their full potential of leadership because they do not develop energy or ability to the fullest extent.

The history and tradition of The Citadel is such that it would not particularly surprise me to learn someday that a great captain sits in this very audience, but only time and the surge of events will prove this. For now, we can consider those qualities and skills which any man should develop in himself and understand in others if he is to be a successful leader.

It might be useful at this point to define leadership, though this is not as easy as one might think. The books, manuscripts, and treatises written over the years on the subject of leadership would greatly overflow the Citadel library. Much writing on the subject avoids formal definition, an approach that reinforces the conclusion that leadership is, in fact, defined largely in terms of the personality and special techniques of the leader concerned. Other textbooks give rather stiff and formal definitions which in turn ignore the fact that leadership cannot be divorced from the basic human qualities of the leader himself.

For my own part, I offer two definitions, one a formal one and the other a good deal less formal. The formal definition is very short: Leadership is the art and science of influencing and directing men in such a way as to get their willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation to accomplish the mission.

The less formal definition was provided me years ago by a hard-nosed old sergeant I knew who spoke in soldier language to define leadership this way: "Leadership is when you tell your men you're going to take them to hell and back and they look forward to the trip."

When you think about it, these two definitions are not so far apart at that. Essentially, however, leadership is so complex a subject and so involved with human factors that a definition is only a beginning. We should examine the qualities and skills involved in order to perceive those which, as individuals, we might develop or strengthen so that regardless of the challenge of the moment, we can accomplish the mission at hand.

In the 16th century a man whose name comes down to us today as more of an expert on political intrigue than anything to do with leadership wrote a book called "The Prince." The man, of course, was Niccolo Machiavelli, and his book is a classic on the relationships of states and their rulers. Machiavelli wrote, "To exercise the intellect a man should read histories, and study there the actions of illustrious men, to see how they have borne themselves in war, to examine the causes of their victories and defeats."

No better advice was ever given to students of leadership. Study of the leaders of history is both interesting and rewarding, but I would qualify this advice by suggesting that any such reading should include more than the study of acknowledged great men and historically recognized leaders. Study should include also those men of lesser renown, whose place in the broad sweep of history may be quite small. Admiral Halsey said that there are no great men; there are only ordinary people like you and me who meet the demands of the day's events. Gen. Douglas MacArthur said the same thing a little differently. He said there are no heroes and no cowards; there are only those men who meet their destinies like soldiers and those who do not.

My point here is that the study of the leadership qualities of men like Army Capt. Terry D. Cordell, Citadel class of 1957, who was killed last October in south Vietnam, can be just as inspiring and illuminating as, say, the study of the life of Ulysses S. Grant.

Our Army historical reports on the actions of sergeants, lieutenants, and captains in times of military stress, such as the Chosin actions in Korea or the Battle of the Bulge during World War II, will furnish as much insight into leadership as will a study of the life of Napoleon. Leadership is tested in times of crisis, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, but the ability to meet the test, whenever it comes, is acquired day to day.

Accordingly, when you examine the character and fiber of leaders, great men or not, you find certain constants of leadership which emerge as qualities, attitudes, characteristics, and skills that all leaders have

possessed in one measure or another. The difference in the level of strength of these leadership factors in any one individual is both a matter of the man's own personality as it was shaped day to day, and the conditions of his practicing leadership.

I have made an effort to collect some of these constants that I recognize, and to list them for you under several different headings. I offer them to you with the thought that they can assist you in the tasks of leadership as these tasks may face you now and in the future. For my own part, I find that I agree with the famous physician, Sir William Osler, who commented some years ago in a lecture at Yale University that "* * * the load of tomorrow, added to that of yesterday, carried today, makes the strongest falter." Sir William was a believer in Thomas Carlyle's advice that "Our main business is not to see what lies dimly at a distance, but to do what lies clearly at hand." I agree with these sentiments, and it is this basic viewpoint that has influenced my selection of the particular qualities and skills I suggest now as the constants of leadership.

The first of these is confidence. Every leader needs confidence, the belief in himself that he is more than equal to solving the problems that beset him. Gen. Joseph Hooker, explaining his defeat by General Lee's lesser numbers at Chancellorsville during the period April 27 to May 6, 1863, said, "Well, to tell the truth, I just lost confidence in Joe Hooker."

Confidence is acquired by knowing your job, and you learn your job by studying the rules involved and the tools at hand. Most Army lieutenants these days are platoon leaders, and I would expect a good platoon leader to develop confidence by knowing more than his sergeant, his corporals, and his other soldiers about every aspect of platoon activity. The lieutenant learns the weapons, the vehicles, the equipment, and the tactics of his platoon. He must also know his men. Thus, he develops confidence in himself and inspires it in his men. Field Marshal Montgomery of Alamein thinks so highly of this quality of cconfidence that he includes it in his definition of leadership. He defines leadership as "The will to dominate, together with the character which inspires confidence." In my view, one facet at least of character, which is so important to leadership, arises out of confidence.

My next point is initiative, or self-reliant enterprise. No leader's sphere is so small nor his time so limited that he cannot bring a new approach, new ideas, and new energy to his task. Initiative and its related qualities of imagination, ingenuity, and innovation can take many forms, depending on circumstance and opportunity. It may provide a much-needed humorous boost for morale in a time of great adversity, as when Inspector General von Steuben at Valley Forge gave a dinner for his lieutenants on condition that none could be admitted who had on a whole pair of breeches. It may salvage an entire operation, as during the Normandy invasion of World War II when Sgt. Curtis Culin invented a cutting device to let American tanks clear the hedgerows holding up the advance. The Army lieutenant today has two continuing areas to challenge his initiative—the best use of limited manpower and the development of new tactics to get the most out of our new equipment. Initiative exploits those most valuable American characteristics of ingenuity and self-sufficiency.

My third point is somewhat more abstract, and I call it truth. This includes truth as you know it in The Citadel honor code, but is actually truth as it is the fountainhead of all Christian ideals. Gen. "Jumping" Jim Gavin, one of our great paratroop commanders of World War II and more recently Ambassador to France, is an old and valued friend of mine. He once defined the ideal officer as one-third teacher, one-third preacher, and one-third little boy who still likes to play cowboys and Indians. This is a very good thumbnail definition of the military leader. Any leader, military or not, has to be something of a preacher in the sense that he must know, believe, and demonstrate those ideals which make any man sound in himself and in his relation to others. The spiritual strength any leader or any organization needs to succeed from day to day is based on our great Christian ethic, and this is what I mean by truth. The Army leader today has to build and demonstrate such spiritual strength.

My next constant of leadership I have labeled action, or the courage to start, to begin. One of your own texts on leadership here at The Citadel, "The Armed Forces Officer," makes this point very well. The courage to start will carry a man far. Under any conditions of war or peace, it is surprising how many times all things come into balance for a man who has the courage to make a start, to do something. General Patton, when he was a colonel commanding a horse cavalry regiment, was fond of telling his young officers during tactical training, "Do something. Don't just stand and do nothing. Do something." This point is also very well made by Lt. Gen. Sir Giffard Martel, one of Great Britain's great tank leaders who said, "If you take a chance, it usually succeeds, presupposing good judgment." Commonsense is a great virtue inside the military or out, and I might remind you that commonsense is an acquired trait, not issued by rank.

Commonsense assists you to make decisions, but the decision alone is not enough. What you do after the decision is very important. Any officer of experience would advise the Army lieutenant today, I am sure, that it is steadiness after the decision, rather than certainty ahead of time, which carries the day.

This brings me to my next constant, duty, which I define as the leader's sacred obligation to accomplish the mission at hand. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his famous address to the cadets at West Point on May 12 last year spoke of duty as "* * * a tenfold beacon in the night." Duty is the wellspring of discipline. A number of students of leadership make the point that it is duty which is the basis of all that is greatest in any military structure, no matter how large or small it may be.

Field Marshal Rommel of the German Army said that the best form of welfare for troops is a superlative state of discipline. General Washington, in another era of history, said discipline is the soul of an army. These points are true in any enterprise, military or otherwise. It is the leader's task to so understand and accept the concept of duty that he can develop discipline in himself and his unit. I say this because if duty becomes only an abstract consideration in your mind, and is removed from the realities of day-to-day activity, you cannot succeed as a leader nor can you succeed as an individual.

Discipline begins in the heart and mind of the leader. You have to know yourself and be able to command yourself before you can know and command other men. General Lee once remarked that he could never trust command to a man who couldn't command himself. In the final analysis, on the battlefield or elsewhere, it is the difference in the state of discipline that gives one force the edge, the advantage, over another. The Army lieutenant in this era has the same continuing requirement leaders have always had in this regard. He should establish a firm concept of duty in his mind and being, and develop discipline from this basis in himself and in his unit.

This brings me to my next to last constant of leadership, which I have called explanation. I use this term in its largest sense, meaning communication, or the interchange of thoughts among human beings. I would say categorically that the ability to convey his ideas, his orders, and a statement of what he wants to those he leads is the most valuable skill a leader can develop. You will find, I think, when you take up your leader's duties wherever or whatever they might be, that most of the people you lead will respond if only you can get across what it is you want them to do. The leader is in constant communication of one kind or another with those under him. His very presence, his knowledge of his job, his attitude toward the mission all establish communication through personal example. Most important, however, is the way the leader expresses his ideas and his orders, either verbally or in writing. Every leader has to be able to speak and to write effectively. These two skills should be acquired and polished continually. Today's leader wants to avoid the uncommunicativeness of the officer we had during World War II who habitually kept silent around his troops. One of his staff suggested he might do well to talk to his troops once in a while. During the next inspection in ranks the officer stopped in front of one of his men and said, "Soldier, where did you start this war?" The soldier replied, "Sir, I didn't start this war. Hitler did."

My last point is learning, and here again I am speaking broadly. By learning, I am speaking of the continuing process of acquiring both knowledge and perception that a leader should pursue all his life. This includes basic academic learning such as you are now engaged in, and it includes the professional learning I mentioned earlier. In the long haul the learning I am speaking of is the process of seeking useful experience and applying this experience to the improvement of your leadership. Much of this is a process of using the little scraps of time. Marine Maj. Gen. Victor Krulak, now Special Assistant for Counterinsurgency to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, is a master at this. We recently took a trip to south Vietnam and I noticed that in the slack times, for example during the flight from the United States to Hawaii, General Krulak was always busy, studying, reading, or making notes. But you don't have to be a major general to use the little scraps of time. Marcus Aurelius, a Roman philosopher and emperor, said, "Don't act as if you have a thousand years to live." This is good advice. The young leader today, or the leader of any age for that matter, should certainly observe, study and evaluate. He should maintain the basic view that he is learning all his life, but will never have time to learn all that he will have opportunity for. Learning for its own sake is not enough. Along with this learning the leader must acquire perception, the ability to understand the values and the relationships of what he learns to what he is doing.

These, then, are the constants of leadership as I see them: Confidence, initiative, truth, action, duty, explanation, learning. When you put these seven together, as you probably have already done, you see that they have a built-in device for making them easy to remember. The first letter of each word, put together, spells citadel.

In closing my remarks, I want to leave you with two final thoughts. The first is this: the opportunity and demand for leadership was never greater in the history of our country than it is in this decade of the sixties. The many commitments of the United States, the international situation, the promises of technology, all create a challenge and demand for leaders such as we have never had before. You are the young warriors who will shortly go forth and pick up the challenge. How much you profit by this opportunity, how well you respond to the challenge

will be determined very largely by your own efforts within the great events before us all.

Second, in seizing this opportunity, you might give careful thought to the advice contained in a poem, written a number of years ago by Sir William Osler, to whom I referred earlier. Sir William gave no title to his poem, but it could very pertinently be called "Advice to Young Leaders." The poem:

"Listen to the Exhortation of the Dawn!
Look to this Day!
For it is Life, the very Life of Life.
In its brief Course lie all the
Varieties and Realities of your Existence:
The Bliss of Growth,
The Glory of Action,
The Splendour of Beauty;
For Yesterday is but a Dream
And Tomorrow is only a Vision;
But Today well lived makes
Every Yesterday a Dream of Happiness,
And every Tomorrow a Vision of Hope.
Look well therefore to this Day!
Such is the Salutation of the Dawn!"

Good luck to each of you, wherever the demands of leadership may take you. Thank you.

"The Indispensable Supports"—Article by J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, sometimes policymakers in government, as well as the American people themselves, forget two important aspects of our national policies: religion and morality. We tend to emphasize the practical expediency of our policies, and to neglect the consideration of how much of our foreign policy should be based on an inherent faith in the people of the world—a faith in them to be free to determine their own destinies.

Today, the free world is faced with the tremendous atheistic force of communism, which, in its effort to take over the world, is striving to undermine and destroy our faith in God. The West must stem this tide. Communism may quiet the tongues of those it suppresses; but it cannot quiet the spiritual strivings of every human being and his need for a higher authority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, an excellent and impressive article entitled "The Indispensable Supports," written by J. Edgar Hoover and published in the Sunday Visitor be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDISPENSABLE SUPPORTS

(By John Edgar Hoover)

(Today falls between the birth anniversaries of two great Americans, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. In honor of the memory of these two patriots, and to remind us of the things they taught us about love of country, we present this article written by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, United States of America.)

This Nation was born of faith. The handful of men who struggled through long and bitter years of war to gain our freedom had unquenchable faith. The dedicated little group who joined together to fix in place the soaring rafters of our Republic built firmly on a foundation of faith. For the Founding Fathers were blessed with a vigorous, indomitable, all-encompassing belief in God. That belief permeated their written words. It suffused their thought. It shone forth in their speech. Listen to Patrick Henry:

"There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us."

Witness the vow of Thomas Jefferson:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Above all, note these significant statements in the final words of advice which George Washington gave the people whom he had served so faithfully for 45 years:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tributes of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens * * *. And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

In every area of the earth today, powerful atheistic forces are striving to destroy belief in God, to eliminate every form of worship of God, to wipe out the concept of morality which is derived from Judaic-Christian thought and belief. In many areas, the attack on religion is direct and brutal. In areas of the world yet remaining free, the attack is more artful. Communist totalitarians know that as long as Americans remain true to the magnificent moral and spiritual principles on which this greatest of all republics was founded, our Nation will stand as an unbreachable bulwark in the planned path of Communist world conquest. It is, therefore, easy to understand why the proponents of absolute materialism, in the words of Washington, "labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens"—religion and morality.

ADULATION OF THE MATERIAL

Today subtle forces seek to secularize whole bodies of citizens—to substitute adulation of the material for worship of the spiritual. The men promoting such forces are hopeful that time is on their side and that, with unceasing effort and Machiavellian strategems, vast numbers of Americans can be broken from their traditional spiritual moorings and set adrift in a secular sea. They know that the human creature who is without spiritual resources and the moral scruples which stem from religious training and belief can, with great ease, be led into the arid desert of communism.

"Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

The preceding thought, attributed to William Penn, expresses unequivocal fact. When man transgresses the immutable laws of God, he opens the door to his own enslavement. Communist man does more than transgress those laws; he denies their existence. Indeed, the denial of God is a basic element of this evil philosophy. Communism's first premise is, simply: There is no God. And other basic ideas of this totalitarian tyranny are in keeping with that denial: There is no soul. Body is all. Nature is all. Man is merely a fortuitous product of the ceaseless interaction of chemical and physical elements. He differs only in degree and not in essence from the beast in the field and the stone kicked from the path.

But communism does not stop with atheistic theory. As expressed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, it teaches that all religions are false and harmful and must be destroyed. It goes even further. It outlaws traditional morality. It teaches that existing moral codes derived from supernatural concepts are false. The Ten Commandments become meaningless. Absolute principles of right and wrong are thrown into the discard. Communism substitutes a brutal end-justifies-the-means code which holds that it is entirely moral to steal, lie, torture, or kill if such actions tend to promote the advance of communism or to fix communism's brutal social order more firmly on a victim nation.

Other basic Communist ideas—the Communist view of history with its theory of economic determinism, destruction of the capitalist state, and translation of the theory of revolution into the fact of revolution—must be included in any fundamental study of communism. Here, however, we are referring to those primary ideas which would wrench God out of the life of the world and destroy the soul and spirit of man.

"There is something in the nature of things which the mind of man, which reason, which human power cannot effect, and certainly that which produces this must be better than man. What can this be but God?"

Cicero, the Roman orator, who lived and died before the birth of Christ, recognized that which many of today's moderns choose to deny. There is something in the structure of the human creature which causes man to remain unsatified unless he is able to reach outside himself—to become part of something beyond self. Through the centuries, saints and missionaries sought to serve God through service to their fellow men. The Christian religion, in particular, emphasized man's responsibility to his less fortunate brothers, and as this noble and spiritual concept of service permeated man's thinking, wonderful movements to alleviate hunger, privation, and suffering came into being and developed. Man's great concern for his fellow man is a spiritual manifestation, for it is rooted, basically, in religious training and conviction. It has, in general, been so recognized through centuries past.

DIGNITY AND RIGHTS DENIED

Today, however, there is a manifest effort to secularize the noblest aspects of human character. The proponents of atheistic communism seek to project a wholly false image. They strive to persuade a seeking world that brutal, totalitarian, power-mad communism is interested in one thing only—the best interests of individual man—and that communism alone has man's best interests at heart. Nothing could be more false. Under communism, the individual ceases to exist as a human being with human dignity and innate rights. He becomes a statistic subject to the whims of whatever creature is powerful enough to seize and hold the whip hand.

Unfortunately, many generous-minded persons have drifted from their religious moorings and are blind to the moral guideposts by which they once found the way. Lost to the worship of God, they lean toward the exaltation of man—and too many of them seem to be unaware of the fact that it is but a short step to man's degradation in the name of his glorification.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

It is to me a continuing source of amazement that those who apparently are enamored of mankind so often refuse to grant individual man those innate rights with which,

the Founding Fathers held, he is endowed by his Creator.

Our Nation was born of faith. It was brought forth in an agony of blood and tears by men and women devoted to God and to the moral principles which flow from that belief. It has faced fearful problems and strong enemies, but never before has this Republic faced an enemy which sought to attack it by secularizing its citizens in order to stultify their will to stand against encroaching communism.

How far that secularization has advanced is apparent in the moral rot which has blighted so many homes, filled so many prisons, and destroyed the lives of thousands of our youth. The advance of secularization is apparent in the colossus of communism astride so much of the earth. It is visible in instance after instance of the sellout of honor and integrity to a vicious, totalitarian enemy. It is visible in much of what we read and what we see.

This Republic was founded on great moral and spiritual principles which, for more than a century and a half, have drawn men's hearts and hopes toward America. When we deny those principles, we deny our great past and betray all that the Founding Fathers fought and died for, and all that succeeding generations passed on to us intact. Religion and morality are as vital to our survival today as they were when a handful of men, placing their reliance on the protection of divine providence, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in defense of principle. Today, as then, religion and morality are our stoutest weapons against the enemy. They are the indispensable supports of freedom.

Washington, D.C., Chapter, University of Alabama Alumni Express Confidence in Bryant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 20, 1963, the University of Alabama Alumni Association, of Washington, D.C., through its executive committee, adopted the following resolution expressing confidence in University of Alabama football coach Paul Bryant:

RESOLUTION OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C., CHAPTER, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Whereas charges reflecting on the University of Alabama and its athletic director, Coach Paul Bryant, have been made in the March 23 issue of the Saturday Evening Post: Therefore, the Washington, D.C., Chapter of the University of Alabama Alumni Association wishes to go on record as follows:

1. We believe that investigation will prove these charges baseless and their publication irresponsible.

2. We are proud of the standards of excellence maintained by our university, its athletic department and its athletic director, Coach Paul Bryant. We believe these high standards are reflected not only in the university's record in athletic competition, but in the exemplary record and conduct of students under Coach Bryant's instruction—on and off the athletic field, in college and in later life.

3. We join Dr. Frank Rose, president, and the board of trustees of the University of Alabama in expressing our confidence in Coach Bryant and our appreciation for his devotion to the university and its ideals of moral and spiritual excellence.

Approved by the executive committee, Washington, D.C., Chapter of the University of Alabama Alumni Association, assembled, this 20th day of March 1963.

Judge Frank T. Healey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night, March 15, the Honorable Frank T. Healey, judge of the Superior Court of Connecticut, died in my hometown of Waterbury, Conn.

In Judge Healey's passing, Waterbury and the State of Connecticut lost an outstanding citizen and I lost a friend of 30 years standing.

Judge Healey's interests were widespread. He was active as a practicing lawyer for 30 years and for the last 8 years had served as a judge of Connecticut's two highest courts of first instance, but his activities were not confined to his profession.

He was an active and industrious worker in a variety of Connecticut enterprises and he was a stanch supporter of his church which rewarded him by making him a Knight of St. Gregory. Judge Healey's energetic participation in State and community civic affairs provided a badly needed example in these difficult days when our system of government by citizens has been challenged. Waterbury and Connecticut will miss him greatly in the days ahead.

As a further expression of appreciation for Judge Healey's contributions, I include an editorial from the Waterbury Sunday Republican of March 17, 1963:

JUDGE FRANK T. HEALEY

Waterbury has lost an outstanding citizen.

The success which was attained by Superior Court Judge Frank T. Healey was founded upon intelligent, consistent service as a member of the bar and the bench as well as in the private practice of law and in a multitude of deeds for the community and his church over a great many years. He built his way of life on a firm foundation of character and hard work. He won his successive steps up the ladder by giving the best of himself in every position he held. There was no halfway service with him. Judge Healey did everything the right way, even if that way was also the hard way. This ardor for good accomplishment won him recognition, awards, and honors in his profession and other walks of life in which he was active.

Judge Healey fitted himself for service on the bench of Connecticut courts by years of practicing law in those courts. This gave him an intimate knowledge of the law itself as well as the quirks of human nature. He was natively a man of sound judgments—one not given to snap decisions but rather a person to look at all sides of a question before arriving at a conclusion. All of this made him a good judge—one who had the respect of all bar members.

Judge Healey was persistent in his public duties. He served in public office in many capacities and gave a great deal of his valuable time to forwarding the welfare of St. Marys Hospital. His good works for his church were recognized by a special award from the supreme pontiff. Frank Healey left a mark in Waterbury—an example of proper living that should be an inspiration for all young people who aspire to make the law their way of life.

Take a Look at the Ugly Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, after reading and hearing so much about the book, "The Ugly American," by William Lederer, it was refreshing and encouraging to read an article in the Columbia Record of March 19, 1963, entitled "Take a Look at the Ugly Communist."

This informative and well-documented article shifts the spotlight from our American shortcomings in international relations and discloses some Communist blunders in this field which have not heretofore been given wide coverage.

The author, Dr. Richard L. Walker, head of the Department of International Studies at the University of South Carolina, is one of the best informed persons anywhere in the United States in this field. I commend the article to every Member of Congress.

The article follows:

TAKE A LOOK AT THE UGLY COMMUNIST

(By Richard L. Walker)

We Americans seem to enjoy tearing ourselves down, and in our fixation about being liked, we often give disproportionate attention to our own mistakes and are not sufficiently aware of the blunders of our Communist opponents. Perhaps this is symbolized by the popularity of "The Ugly American" and now the wide distribution of its sequel, "A Nation of Sheep," by one of the coauthors of the first book. This book is irresponsible, inaccurate, and downright distorted. It plays up the American penchant for breast-beating. Mr. William Lederer, its author, makes the Americans into blundering idiots. The Communists are made to appear 10 feet tall and paragons of all the virtues of overseamanship. Certainly "The Ugly American" had a salutary influence in making our various agencies involved in foreign affairs more conscious of the need for language training and sensitivity for different cultural backgrounds. The second volume is entirely unnecessary.

In fact, the Russians have turned out to be the ugly ones—hu-lu-lao-mao-tzu, "crazy old hairy ones," as the Chinese call them. In our own paroxyms of self-criticism we have tended to overlook some of the Soviet and Chinese Communist blunders.

The recent protest parade and exodus of Africans from Sofia, Bulgaria, for instance, was just one of a number of acts of protest by African students against treatment in Communist countries. African students in China have protested over their inability to get any meaningful education except education for sabotage. The Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow is a flop.

CAMBODIA

In Cambodia, the Soviets, Chinese Communists and Americans are all engaged in extensive aid programs and have missions of roughly equal size. Yet the Russians and

Chinese have practically no one in their missions who speak Cambodian and relatively few of their representatives speak French, the only alternate language.

The Chinese are clannish, rude, haughty, and frequently difficult to deal with. On the other hand, almost half of the U.S. Embassy staff speaks acceptable Cambodian, and practically every member handles French.

Then there is the matter of quality. Equipment from the Soviet Union and other Communist states which comes as part of their aid program has frequently proved to be inferior. In Egypt, Nasser's government insists that Soviet plans and blueprints be written in English rather than in Russian in order that quality comparisons can be made with American products which are acknowledged to be superior. This must be rather galling to the Soviets.

A FEW ITEMS

It might be instructive to list a few recent items regarding the Soviet aid program:

1. In several countries in Africa where the Soviets have been giving economic assistance there have been charges of drunkenness, promiscuity, and high living on the part of Soviet personnel.

2. A Soviet-built road sank into a swamp in Indonesia after the first heavy use.

3. Soviet-built jeeps delivered in Egypt were found to have faulty steering—a real irony in a land where there is trouble keeping on the road anyway.

4. Russian technicians have been caught smuggling diamonds in coffee bags in Guinea.

5. Inadequate packaging has permitted cement to be ruined in Guinea, Ghana, the Sudan, as well as in Burma. No adjustment was made.

6. A Czech-built cement plant in Afghanistan yielded such poor-quality cement that it could not even be used to build a Soviet airstrip.

GRIEVANCES

The list could be expanded many times over. I talked personally in New Delhi just 2 years ago with high ranking Indian officials who had a whole catalog of grievances against Soviet aid officials in India. Said one of them: "The British at their worst were never as haughty as the Russians."

Why do we not hear more about these facts? Why are we not telling them to the whole world? These are the usual questions raised by Americans to whom much of the above material comes as a real surprise. The answer to the first question is difficult. Perhaps it is because of our tendency toward self-criticism and our preoccupation with events at home.

But the answer to the second question is that we are playing up the facts about "the ugly Communists" abroad. By law, our U.S. Information Agency is not allowed to distribute information within the United States. Thus we are unaware of its activities abroad.

But within the framework of a far too limited budget (given the task it has to perform and the 25-times greater funds the Communists have for propaganda), the USIA has been doing a commendable job of exposing Communist behavior and poor quality goods and performance abroad.

NO SHEEP

But then, perhaps we have little further need for propaganda around the world. The "ugly Communists" are our own best propaganda. The simple fact is that we are not doing such a bad job overseas after all. This does not mean that we can sit back smugly and complacently without self-criticism. There is always room for improvement. But we are neither ugly nor a nation of sheep—the Communists frequently are.

Baker-Herlong Advocated as Best Approach to Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting presentation to the Ways and Means Committee was made by Mr. Tyre Taylor on behalf of the Southern States Industrial Council. In addition to stressing the need for reduced Federal spending and the reduction of taxes advocated the Baker-Herlong step by step approach. He advocated no tax cut without a balanced budget. His views on the "Athenian Republic," Dr. Heller's "puritan ethic," the Keynesian and Admiral Burke are worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

His testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF TYRE TAYLOR, GENERAL COUNSEL, SOUTHERN STATES INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL, IN OPPOSITION TO THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSAL BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 20, 1963

My name is Tyre Taylor, my address is 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. I appear here on behalf of the Southern States Industrial Council, the headquarters of which are in the Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. The council represents virtually all lines of industry in the 16 Southern States from Maryland to Texas, inclusive.

On behalf of the council, its officers, directors and members, I wish to express to you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of this great committee our sincere appreciation for this opportunity to be heard.

I

At a meeting of the council's board of directors at Ponte Verda, Fla., last May, the following statement pertaining to Federal taxes and spending was unanimously adopted:

"The national debt now amounts to $298 billion—up 7¼ billion from this time last year. This does not include Government-guaranteed loans and other contingent liabilities, conservatively estimated to aggregate more than $200 billion.

"Taxes are far too high—in certain brackets closely approaching confiscatory levels.

"In the light of these facts the council urges the Congress to take the following actions:

"1. Reduce the Federal budget by reducing expenditures that are not essential to the functioning of the Government as defined in the Constitution with the ultimate purpose of eliminating entirely nonessential expenditures.

"2. Provide for an orderly step-by-step reduction of individual and corporate income tax rates."

I might add at this point that the council believes that such an orderly, step-by-step approach is found in the Herlong-Baker bill which the council supports.

"3. Avoid any further increase in the debt ceiling and the contracting of any obligations outside this ceiling."

As we understand the President's proposal, it would provide a cut in tax liabilities—phased over 3 years—of $13.6 billion—$11 billion for individuals and $2.6 billion for corporations. He says:

"Other adjustments, some of which lose and some of which gain revenue, would, on balance, provide a revenue gain of $3.4 billion, leaving a net reduction of $10.2 billion."

The council is opposed to many of the President's proposals for structural changes in the tax law. However, since he indicated to the American Bankers Association on February 25 that he would settle for the requested tax reduction alone without any tax reforms, I shall omit any reference to the recommended structural changes and confine my remarks to the single issue of tax reduction. On this the council's position was further clarified in a letter chairman of the council's legislative committee, Mr. J. Clifford Miller, Jr., of Richmond, Va., wrote to Chairman MILLS on January 14. Mr. Miller said:

"The council favors a substantial tax cut—say of the order of $8 to $10 billion—but not at the expense of a budget further unbalanced by the tax cut. By this we mean that any tax cut should be matched, dollar for dollar and in advance, by reduced spending."

In conclusion, Mr. Miller said:

"The council also favors a gradual, orderly approach to tax reduction such as was contained in the Herlong-Baker bill of last year, but I repeat, the council does not want any tax cut which would further unbalance the budget. That way, we think, lies certain disaster."

II

In the few minutes I have left, I wish to examine the question: Is it silly and unrealistic, a mere exercise in futility, to suppose that there can be any substantial reduction in nonessential spending?

The $11.9 billion deficit follows on the heels of deficits of $8.8 billion in the current fiscal year, $6.4 billion in 1962, and has been exceeded in peacetime only by the towering red-ink figure of $12.4 billion in 1959. We have had a deficit in our national budget for 27 of the last 33 years. Is it ordained on high that we shall keep on having them until our system collapses into chaos and a dictator fights his way to the top and takes over? The available evidence provides for this question a rather dusky answer. Prof. Alexander Tytler, writing nearly two centuries ago about the decline and fall of the Athenian Republic, said:

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess out of the public treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that democracy always collapses over fiscal policy, always to be followed by dictatorship."

Benjamin Franklin seemed to have some doubts on this score. Upon emerging from Independence Hall where the drafting of the Constitution had been completed, he was asked: "Dr. Franklin, have you given us a monarchy or a republic?" He replied with solemnity, "We have given you a republic if you can keep it."

Professor Tytler's thesis is elaborated upon by Lord Macauley in a letter to his friend, H. E. Randall, of New York, dated May 2, 1857. He says, among other things, that "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must sooner or later destroy liberty or civilization or both." Because of its pertinence to the fundamental issues now confronting this committee and the whole Congress, I should like to offer for the record at the conclusion of my testimony the full text of Lord Macauley's letter.

III

Not the least interesting thing about the President's proposals are some of the tech-

niques and reasoning whereby it is sought by Dr. Heller and other New Frontier economists to justify them. Thus, Dr. Heller suggests this new way of looking at debt:

"I think it is quite remarkable," he said, "that the basic puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reduction because of (a) their fear of deficits and the additions to the national debt, (b) because they do not understand that their spending, in effect, makes this contribution to the national growth and full employment."

In other words, spending and going into debt, whether practiced by individuals or government, are good for us, and frugality, living within our means, is unsocial and bad.

It makes no difference to Dr. Heller and his Keynesian-parroting colleagues that this so-called puritan ethic of the American people is supported by the entire history and experience of nations and peoples of whom we have any record; that up until the last 30 years, anyone preaching or teaching any such bizarre economic drivel would have been considered "off his rocker" and a fit subject for an inquest of lunacy; that during the past 33 years, 27 of which were deficit years, the dollar has declined to less than 44 percent of its 1939 purchasing power and, because of another and different kind of deficit, that is our balance of payments, the dollar is now deeply suspect in all the money markets of the world.

I might say parenthetically at this point that not even Keynes thought his theory of compensatory spending would work in the absence of rigid restraints on the cost of production, including, notably, wages.

IV

But suppose you do buy this $99 billion raid on the taxpayers with its planned deficit of nearly $12 billion. What then? Would it result in faster economic growth, more jobs, and a larger revenue yield? We seriously doubt that it would. For one thing, it is proposed to grant tax relief for the first year of only $2.7 billion, which is not enough to compensate for tax increases elsewhere, much less generate a significant amount of new purchasing power. More importantly, however, the large and repetitive unplanned deficits of recent years have not pointed the way to long-term economic growth and job creation.

The council wants a tax cut. It believes strongly that we cannot come close to approaching our potential for growth and job creation until tax rates are substantially reduced. It favors the Herlong-Baker bill as embodying the soundest approach to tax reduction that has yet been offered.

But first we want to see spending reduced to a figure which will compensate for and offset the tax cut. We regard this order of priorities, this puritan ethic, if you will, as crucial. In this connection I am reminded of something Admiral Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, said in a recent talk to the Washington Rotary Club.

"Although change is the requisite ingredient of an eon or a moment," the Admiral told his listeners, "* * * wood burns, leaves fall, men die, mountains are thrown up or worn down by glaciers, empires rise and fall; things have changed, so we know time has passed, but through it all there are truths that remain the same."

We respectfully suggest that one of the unchanging truths Admiral Burke might have been referring to is this: Whether a nation or an individual does it, consistently living beyond one's means can only lead to trouble.

Thank you.

Tampa Editor Cities New Facts About Fix Article in Saturday Evening Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many will be interested in the report by Mr. Tom McEwen, sports editor of the Tampa Tribune, providing additional details about the circumstances surrounding the publication of the Saturday Evening Post article, "The Story of a College Football Fix," which libels and defames the University of Alabama football coach, Paul Bryant.

I insert herewith the report of Alf Van Hoose, of the Birmingham News, which appeared in the March 18, 1963, edition of the News:

TAMPA EDITOR REPORTS BISHER IN BACKGROUND

(By Alf Van Hoose)

TAMPA, FLA., March 18.—Tom McEwen, sports editor of the Tampa Tribune, has injected the name of Furman Bisher into the background of current Saturday Evening Post article which has shocked the world of sports.

McEwen wrote in his Sunday column that Bisher, sports editor of the Atlanta Journal, was active in supplying information to author Frank Graham, Jr., for his "The Story of a College Football Fix."

Bisher is a defendant, along with the Post, in a $500,000 libel suit filed last January by University of Alabama's Paul Bryant.

Bryant is suing for damages from a Post article written by Bisher last summer entitled, "College Football Is Going Beserk."

Even before this article Bisher had long been brutally critical of Bryant's coaching techniques, and has also attacked the University of Alabama administration for building a football factory.

Bisher is currently covering baseball spring training and other sports in Florida. Before he came here, he was in New York briefly.

Coincidentally, maybe, rumors of the current Post story flowed heavily along Bisher's trail.

McEwen wrote:

"Bryant already has one suit against the Post (and Bisher) over an article charging him with intentional brutality.

"Bisher reportedly was active in securing information for the current story as well.

"The Post has been having some financial problems of late with declining advertising revenue.

"The current issue should be a sellout."

Graham's story, with a subtitle: "A shocking report of how Wally Butts and Bear Bryant rigged a game last fall," is built around testimony of George Burnett, an Atlanta insurance man.

Burnett, who is quoted in the story as admitting he is on probation after being convicted of writing bad checks, said he accidentally overheard a long-distance telephone conversation between Butts and Bryant during which the former Georgia coach and athletic director gave Bryant secret Georgia football plans for its Crimson Tide game.

Bryant and Butts have denied the allegations of collusion and fixing.

As Portugal Sees Course in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Robert H. Estabrook, in the Washington Post of March 19, 1963, has contributed another helpful column on Portugal.

He points out that much of Portugal's difficulty in mobilizing favorable world opinion has not come from her stated aims, but from inadequate implementation. As an aid to further understanding of the problems of Portugal in the great adjustments required in today's world, I include Mr. Estabrook's column, "As Portugal Sees Course in Africa," herewith:

AS PORTUGAL SEES COURSE IN AFRICA

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—On the eve of discussion in Lisbon of a liberalized statute for Portuguese oversea Provinces, British Labor Party leader Harold Wilson proclaimed that a Labor government here would not supply arms to Portugal for defense of her interests in Africa. The wisdom of furnishing arms in such situations is certainly questionable. But to compare Portuguese policy to South African apartheid, as Wilson did, is to misconstrue the issue.

In objective the two policies are at opposite poles. South Africa aims at rigid racial segregation on the theory that the only way the African and white populations can coexist is to live in separate areas. Portugal is committed to a multiracial society in which, whatever the deficiencies in practice, all citizens have equal rights and opportunities. In the view of Prime Minister Salazar, education and economic development in Angola and Mozambique must proceed together.

The most justified complaint against Portugal is not that her stated aims are evil, but that fulfillment has been agonizingly slow. Until the Angola terrorism in 1961 Portugal had done far too little to overhaul feudal economic practices or broaden education. Police repression plus centralized administration in Lisbon add to resentments.

But some earnest people, particularly younger administrators, understand the need for reform. Substantial improvements have been inaugurated. More than 2,000 oversea students—many of them Africans—are studying at Portuguese universities. New universities open this fall in both Angola and Mozambique.

Just now the parliament is debating a plan for decentralized administration based on recommendations of the overseas council. Wholly elected legislative councils would have complete control over budgets—an essential of self-government. Simultaneously economic discriminations between oversea territories and the mainland would be phased out.

The question is whether the Government will vitiate its own plan. Lisbon financial groups have been skeptical of liberalization, and Salazar himself is skeptical of relinquishing budgetary control. He has been dubious about Angola, where opposition is rife, ever since a revolt there when he was oversea minister more than 30 years ago. Salazar's deputy, Minister of State Correia

de Oliveira, is perhaps even more conservative.

If the law should be gutted or postponed, the effect would be to brand Portuguese intentions as a sham. But if it should be applied in good faith, Portugal could contend that she had taken an important step toward self-determination. She has a better record in her oversea provinces than her stiffnecked attitude in the United Nations might indicate.

A U.N. investigation of conditions in nonself-governing territories was rebuffed on the principle that Angola and Mozambique are part of Portugal. In retrospect Portugal would have been wiser to cooperate. She did agree last fall to an American plan to admit representatives of the General Assembly but this was withdrawn after Afro-Asian protest.

Because of defense measures against terrorism which she insists is organized from outside, Portugal has proportionately the second highest military budget in NATO. Now she sees an arms threat from Algeria to two Angolan insurgent groups headquartered in the Congo. An American declaration to the U.N. investigating committee last week cautioned against outside attempts at control while again urging self-determination.

Portugal is hardly a model democracy, and her oversea policy reflects much stubborn pride. Some Portuguese would bring down the house rather than change. But a new breeze is blowing with reforms and admission of foreign capital. Delicate American efforts are required both to prod Portugal and support her liberalization.

To some African countries jockeying for primacy, probably nothing Portugal could do would make much difference—although the Portuguese say that privately certain African leaders fearful of domination urge them to hold on. To zealots Portugal represents the vestige of colonialism in Africa, and only expulsion of the white man will suffice. Perhaps the nationalist tide is irresistible.

Nevertheless, as we should have seen in the Congo, it does not follow that immediate independence automatically brings all good things. Without education and continued sources of development capital, independence can be an empty slogan.

Closer Look at Mars Is Good News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, an editorial in the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, of March 16, 1963, indicates that one of the principal motivations for sending men to the moon has been underscored in the fact that a recently lofted telescope was able to peer into space without encumbrance by the haze that affects surface observatories.

The editorial, entitled "Closer Look at Mars," is worthy of consideration by my distinguished colleagues of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSER LOOK AT MARS

It seems that the atmosphere on the planet Mars is such as to support only some extraordinary form of life. This is the tentative conclusion of scientists who were involved in scanning Mars through a telescope high above the earth.

Well, the news ranks among the most pleasing we have heard of late. Had the finding been that something ordinary could exist on Mars, that would have been a grave disappointment. Mars and extraordinary go together like berries and cream.

And no real Mars buff is going to be disturbed by the strong hits that no life at all is the greatest likelihood. Until men set foot on the red planet and find that to be true, Mars fanciers will remain happily convinced that strange and wonderful things inhabit the Martian deserts.

There were other reasons for sending up the telescope than merely that of discovering whether Mars might be inhabited. The venture also underscored one of the principal motivations for sending men to the moon. The giant telescope, lofted above all but about 2 percent of the earth's atmosphere, was able to peer into space without encumbrance by the haze that affects surface observatories.

This will be one of the great possibilities when men have established a moon base. That is, telescopes on this airless satellite of the earth will be able to see the heavens without the distortions that earthbound astronomers must contend with. The balloon-telescope undertaking was one more example of the truism that development of our space capability is a step by step process. Many things must be done within the hold of earth's gravity before man can make his dramatic leap beyond it.

Are People Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rushville, Ind., Daily Republican:

ARE PEOPLE NECESSARY?

"Automation" is a word that is being heard more and more. It means, very roughly, laborsaving machinery—but carried to such lengths that a new word was needed to distinguish it. This machinery not only does work that formerly was done by muscles, but it also takes over jobs that formerly required brains. It isn't quite automatic, but almost.

It virtually takes over a huge factory and does everything aided by a few human beings to watch dials and push buttons. Such machines can process raw materials, inspect the finished products, package them and load them into freight cars. If they get out of order they can shut themselves off and signal for help.

Automation is also being used to design new automatic equipment. But it creates some problems which it is not equipped to solve. The problems are basically the same as those created by all labor saving machinery, but intensified. The jobs that men do and machines still cannot are becoming a smaller and smaller area.

Are people to become unnecessary? Well, no—not quite. People will always be needed to solve problems like those created by automation, even if they have the help of computing machines to work out the details of some of the more complicated ones.

Report to the People of the Third Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is my first report for 1963 to the people of my congressional district, bringing them up to date with factual information on the activities of this Congress:

YOUR WASHINGTON REPORT FROM STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, REPRESENTATIVE, THIRD DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, MARCH 1963

DEAR FRIEND: What actually goes on in Washington? You must often wonder. During my 10 years in Congress, it has always been my policy to keep my constituents fully informed. Now, at a time when you have indicated increasing interest in so many things that bear directly upon your lives and pocketbooks, it has become increasingly difficult for all of you to get an accurate and true picture.

With "managed news"—a situation being widely criticized in the press—it's harder than ever to separate fact from fancy. Assistant Defense Secretary Sylvester has said that deliberate distortion of the news is justified. I disagree—100 percent. Democracy can't work unless the people know the truth.

That's why I've decided to send you a factual, personal report from time to time, discussing public affairs and explaining where I stand, and why.

I'm a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which must originate all tax and tax-related legislation. In the last Congress, our committee handled the tax, trade, and debt-limit bills, social security and unemployment compensation proposals, customs and excise bills, and other important legislation. Our 25-member committee is currently holding hearings on the President's tax message of 1963.

What about your taxes? The President's new tax proposals are just part of the entire fiscal picture. They must be considered in the light of his evermore lavish spending program. And, although his tax reduction program urges cuts of $13.5 billion over 3 years, his matching tax reform program, to a great extent, is nothing more than the shifting of the tax burden from one group of taxpayers to another. For many Americans, these so-called reforms would actually mean higher taxes.

How about Federal spending? Here are some startling—and alarming—facts you should know: In 1961, the U.S. budget deficit was $3.8 billion. In 1962, Mr. Kennedy's first full year as President, it rose 68 percent to $6.4 billion; for 1963, it will be an estimated $8.8 billion—up another 37 percent. And now, by the President's own estimate, the fiscal 1964 budget will mean an $11.9 billion deficit—up 35 percent again, and 3 times bigger than 1961's.

Remember the story about the bachelor whose blanket was too short to cover his feet? He cut some off the top of the blanket, sewed it on the bottom, and then wondered why the blanket was shorter than ever. This seems to be the way the President's thinking has run on the tax-spending-deficit question. Senator John F. Kennedy, campaigning in Philadelphia on October 31, 1960, promised that "we are pledged to maintain a balanced budget except in times of national emergency or severe recession. Furthermore, we will seek to maintain a budget surplus in times of prosperity, as a brake on inflationary

forces." Walter Heller, the President's No. 1 economic adviser, said in 1961 that if the budget deficit ever reached $4 billion, he would recommend "higher taxes to offset the impact of spending," i.e., to prevent inflation.

What has happened here? Both the President and Mr. Heller have said, rightly, that deficits contribute to inflation—and promised that deficits would not be incurred except in national emergency or to stop recession. But, although he does not claim that either situation now exists, the President now proposes not only a tax cut but also this tremendous, inflationary $11.9 billion deficit. Why this switch?

Every time an American child is born, he or she inherits a $1,600 debt liability, his or her share of our staggering $308 billion national debt, highest in history. Treasury Secretary Dillon has said that he will ask Congress to authorize increasing this debt to at least $320 billion. We taxpayers now pay almost $10 billion of deadweight annual interest, with no debt reduction.

Many of you have written to me, supporting my constant demand that the Federal Government curtail needless expenditures. The President's proposals mean more inflation, an unsound dollar, greater drains upon our already strapped gold reserve, an unstable economy and increased unemployment.

Middle-income taxpayers would be hurt by certain of the President's tax reform proposals, for example:

(1) The 5-percent "floor" on itemized deductions: A taxpayer (say his annual income is $7,000) now may take full deductions, if itemized, for mortgage interest and other interest payments, real estate taxes, charitable contributions, and unreimbursed casualty losses. If his total expense here comes to $1,000, he may now deduct it all.

Under the President's proposal, the first $350 (5 percent of the $7,000 income) could not be deducted. The taxpayer could deduct only $650 of the $1,000 he had actually spent for these purposes.

(2) No more 4-percent, $50 dividend income exclusion: In 1954, I voted for the tax law permitting taxpayers to exclude from taxable income a part of their dividend income. This was intended to encourage investment in our Nation's economy, especially by people with limited incomes—and it did. Since 1954, the number of investors has risen from 7,400,000 to 17,100,000, more than double. President Kennedy now wants to repeal this investment growth incentive.

(3) No more $600 exemptions for people over 65: The President's tax reform program would knock out the present extra $600 exemption for people over 65 years of age, yet he publicly pleads for aid to the aging.

(4) Profit-sharing funds taxed as ordinary income: Under the President's plan, the value of your retirement nestegg will be materially reduced. Profit-sharing funds, when withdrawn, would be taxed at ordinary income rates rather than the lower capital gains rates at which such funds are now taxed.

(5) Small estates will be taxed: The President proposes, for example, that a widow, not liable for Federal estate taxes under present law, would be subject to a capital gains tax upon her husband's death, even though no sale of his property has taken place.

I will oppose all five of these Kennedy proposals, because they discriminate against the homeowner, the generous giver, the investor, the elderly person, and the workingman who plans to retire.

Here are some of the constructive proposals I have made:

The Derounian tax-reduction bill, designed not as a flashy "shot-in-the-arm" for a weak economy, but to free a great economic potential from the straitjacket of our punitive tax structure, would reduce personal and corporate tax rates over a 5-year period, provided that the budget be kept in balance.

To keep your tax money from dribbling out "the back door," a term describing administration spending for unauthorized purposes from the Treasury, I've introduced House Resolution 89, assuring congressional control over spending.

The Derounian commuter bill, House Resolution 2387, allows deductions for income tax purposes of expenses for transportation to and from work.

Removal of the present 10-percent excise taxes on phone calls and telegrams, on jewelry costing under $5, and on basic cosmetics and other toilet preparations, is another objective of my tax-reduction program. President Truman asked for, and got, these "wartime" taxes on a temporary basis; they should be repealed.

Tax relief for widows is provided by my bill which states that a widow 65 or older may sell or exchange the home in which she has lived, without including the gain therefrom in her gross taxable income, if the home is worth $30,000 or less.

The Derounian "school prayer amendment" has been introduced as House Joint Resolution 29, an amendment to the Constitution authorizing the States to permit the offering in any public school or any other public place of the same simple, nondenominational prayer used in New York State's schools until the Supreme Court forbade it: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The right to a secret strike ballot is essential to protect labor union members and the public against arbitrary exercise of power by union bosses. I have proposed legislation requiring majority approval, by secret ballot of the union membership involved, before a strike may be called. In addition, I am one of the cosponsors of the comprehensive civil rights bill introduced in Congress.

Removal of the limitation on outside income for social security recipients is proposed in another of my bills, permitting senior citizens to earn what they can while receiving social security benefits they have paid for over the years. The Social Security Act was never intended to prohibit people from working—to force older people into unwanted idleness. Equally important, their living costs keep rising, without comparable increases in their social security benefits.

What's going to be done about Soviet-occupied Cuba? On February 7, President Kennedy, speaking of dangerous situations, said "I cannot set down any time in which I can clearly see the end to the Castro regime. I believe it is going to come, but I couldn't possibly give a time limit." Yet Senator Kennedy pledged in 1960 that "we must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere."

Are we going to have to live with the Soviets in Cuba, indefinitely? Our President says that the Russian planes, tanks, guns and missiles there are all of a defensive character, and therefore no threat to us or to Latin American nations. The Russian troops? They are technicians. I say they are technical experts in subversion, now fanning out from Cuba to all of Latin America.

Has President Kennedy made another Yalta deal with Khrushchev? Why is it that we do not now insist, as we once did, upon on-site inspection of Red missile bases in Cuba? Have we promised not to invade Cuba? Why have we been withdrawing our missiles from around the world? Why have we reduced our nuclear testing requirements to a very dangerous minimum, about which we have been warned by Dr. Edward Teller, the world's outstanding nuclear physicist?

What are the answers to these questions? Only the President and his advisers know, and they aren't letting you and me in on the secret.

We do know that the world situation won't ease until the Russians are made to get out of Cuba. We do know that we can't tolerate the presence of the second most powerful—and exclusively Communist—military force in this hemisphere, just 6 jet minutes from Miami. The American people, if told the facts, can face any situation with courage and determination. The President must face it, too.

I supported the extension of the draft, as absolutely necessary to our national defense in these perilous times.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, prime target of U.S. Reds and their sympathizers, won another overwhelming victory as its 1963 funds were voted by a vast bipartisan majority in the House. Only 20 Democratic Members voted "nay." I voted for this appropriation, because I believe that the committee has helped to alert the American people to the dangers of subversion in the United States.

I opposed the President's effort to "pack" the House Rules Committee by adding to its membership.

Backers of President Kennedy's "revised" medicare proposal rarely mention cost, but its cost will determine whether or not the whole social security system goes bankrupt. Even the higher 1963 taxable wage base of $5,000 would bring in only about $1.5 billion annually to finance medicare—but medicare cost estimates go as high as $7 billion per year.

How much can you afford? Right now, without medicare, just under 10 percent of a man's pay, in employer-employee contributions, goes to social security taxes. Take a man with a wife and four children, earning $4,000 a year. He pays $5 income tax—but $145 social security tax. Can he afford the added tax burden of medicare? Can you?

I am in favor of medical care for the aged, but not the President's plan. I voted for the Kerr-Mills law, a Democratic-sponsored proposal now in successful operation in New York and most other States. I will support any responsible plan of improvement if done through the private sector of our economy. We have the finest medical system in the world. Why toss it into the ashcan for a will-o'-the-wisp socialized medicine program that means lower quality medical care, on a compulsory basis, at tremendous additional cost to the American people?

When you come to Washington, please try to include a visit with me at my office, No. 1627 in the New House Office Building, across the street from the Capitol. I'll see to it that you will get passes for the sessions of Congress, and I will be happy to arrange visits to the FBI and other places of interest in the Federal Government.

And I look forward to meeting and chatting with you.

In the meantime, your views on any issue will be most welcome. Your letter will receive my immediate attention and a prompt reply.

Your Congressman,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

The Honorable Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was a saddening shock to learn of the passing

of CLYDE DOYLE, of California. My office and his have been located on the same corridor for a number of years. Many times it has been my privilege to walk across to the House floor with him. Only a few days ago I stopped by and visited him in his new more spacious office suite which is on the back corner of the same corridor in the Longworth Building. He was quite proud of this new office and showed me through it, pointing out all of its advantageous points.

The first time I had ever known CLYDE DOYLE well was a few years ago when a congressional group visited the city of New York. It was a spring 2-day trip. We traveled with our families together by train. I came to know him and the members of his family on this New York tour. He was a kindly, genuine, and sincere man. I never heard him utter an unkind word about anyone. He was a dedicated public servant. He possessed humility, gentleness, and an even temper.

My sympathy goes out to his companion and helpmate and other members of his family. A true friend, he will be greatly missed by his colleagues on the floor of the House.

That 1954 Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by Raymond Moley in the March 18, 1963, issue of Newsweek.

Mr. Moley is certainly one of the most competent economic and political historians of our day, and I strongly commend to the reading of my colleagues his clarification of the American economic state in 1954 as it compares with the current situation. There is a very timely lesson here:

THAT 1954 TAX CUT

(By Raymond Moley)

Although John F. Kennedy was a Member of the Senate in 1953, 1954, and 1955, his interpretation of the reason for and the results of the 1954 tax cut is not in accord with what happened. In his recent address to the American Bankers Association he said, in support of his present plan for a tax cut:

"This program will, in a short time, result in increased tax revenues, as did the 1954 tax cut, and a substantial portion of that increase will be used each year to reduce the deficit until the budget is once again balanced."

Among the many differences between the 1954 tax cut and the one proposed for 1963 are these: In early 1954 we were in a real recession. What the President is talking about now is a recession "around the corner." The 1954 tax cut was accompanied by a drastic cut in expenditures. Expenditures in fiscal 1953 were $74.2 billion; in 1954, the first full Eisenhower fiscal year, they were $67.7 billion, and in 1955 the amount was $64.5 billion. Incidentally, the liberals then characterized the 1954 tax cut as a rich man's windfall.

TO SPEND OR NOT?

The history of the discussions within the administration during the years 1953–55, as I have pieced them together from participants and other sources, is this:

The first signs of a recession appeared in September 1953. The President and his advisers were genuinely alarmed. Cabinet meetings from then on centered upon means of stopping the decline. Some of the people around the President, such as Harold Stassen urged a massive or crash spending program. Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey favored caution and more economy. Dr. Arthur Burns leaned toward the Humphrey position but favored having a spending program ready if it should be needed. Also, there was a calculation of what unexpended appropriations could be used. President Eisenhower, while worried about the two options, leaned to a course of watchful waiting. This argument among his advisers went on through the early months of 1954.

Meanwhile, certain tax cuts were agreed upon between the President and Congress. In May 1954 there were signs of recovery which multiplied until July, when it was clear that recovery was definitely underway. Thus, the policy of watchful waiting and dependence upon natural means of recovery was vindicated.

CONFIDENCE THE KEY

Members of the inner circle at that time do not believe that the 1954 tax cut had any significant part in stimulating the recovery. The President's Economic Report in January 1955 had this to say about the reasons for the recovery:

"Consumers not only maintained their spending at a consistently high level (throughout the whole period), but reduced their rate of saving. * * * Businessmen kept up their capital expenditures at a high rate, increased the flow of dividends to stockholders. * * * Builders and real-estate developers stepped up their operations. Trade unions conducted their affairs with an eye to basic conditions and with a sense of responsibility. * * * Commercial banks and other financial institutions made ample supplies of credit available on liberal terms. States and localities carried out large and expanding programs of school, hospital, and road construction * * * continuing recovery of Western Europe helped our experts.

"The Federal Government also * * * influenced the economy in two principal ways: first, through the automatic workings of the fiscal system; second, by deliberately pursuing monetary, tax, and expenditure policies that inspired confidence on the part of the people."

The key word here is confidence—confidence in the fiscal responsibility of the Federal Government. As I have noted, expenditures fell nearly $10 billion in 2 years.

The lesson we can learn from 1954–55 certainly does not justify the President's insistence upon a tax cut as a single means of assuring continued prosperity. Confidence in the fiscal responsibility of the Federal Government certainly cannot come from gigantic, planned deficits.

Negotiations for the Proposed Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this body, the views of a prominent group of Maryland citizens regarding the negotiations for the proposed nuclear test-ban treaty. The text of their statement follows:

To the President of the United States and Others in Authority:

We are concerned that recent widely publicized statements of those opposing a nuclear test-ban treaty, e.g., Dr. Edward Teller, may drown out the counsel of the scientists, citizens, and Government representatives who believe a nuclear test treaty is in the best interests of the United States.

We believe that such a treaty will improve our country's security by slowing down the arms race, stopping the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, preventing further radioactive contamination, and setting the stage for eventual worldwide disarmament under international inspection.

With the differences narrowed to a few inspections a year, we are closer to an agreement now to end nuclear weapons tests under international inspection and control, than we have been in the 5 years of the negotiations which began under President Eisenhower's administration.

We affirm our support of our Government's efforts to resolve the few remaining differences and to negotiate a treaty to end nuclear weapons tests by all nations, for all time.

Dr. Allan C. Barnes; Henry H. Callard, Gilman School; Alexander S. Cochran; Hans Froelecher; Frank T. Gray; Sidney Hollander, Jr.; Arthur U. Hooper; Albert Keidel, Jr.; William L. Marbury; Theodore R. McKeldin; Dr. Eugene Meyer, Department of Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University; J. Jefferson Miller; Dr. William R. Neumann, Department of History, Goucher College; John B. Ramsay, Jr.; Rev. Alfred B. Starratt.

FEBRUARY 16, 1963.

Hon. William Calhoun Johnston of Anderson, S.C., a Distinguished Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Anderson Daily Mail, Anderson, S.C., under date of Tuesday, March 12, 1963, which salutes the magnificent public service which characterizes the life of William C. Johnston, outstanding citizen of South Carolina, former mayor of Anderson, and brother of the esteemed senior Senator from my native State.

This article recites his public service far better than I can; I know him as a man who loves the people of South Carolina and has been anxious to serve them. I am delighted that the Anderson Daily Mail gave him this recognition.

It is significant that this comes from his own hometown. Anyone who has been in politics and public life as long as he has and still commands the high respect of his hometown paper certainly deserves our recognition. It would be selfish for me just to say that he is my friend; he is, but he is a friend, I feel,

of every man, woman and child in South Carolina, and I know he will find great happiness in serving the people as home secretary for Senator OLIN JOHNSTON. He is qualified, he is dedicated, and he is experienced.

The article is as follows:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Daily Mail, Mar. 12, 1963]

IN RECOGNITION OF OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE THE ANDERSON DAILY MAIL HEREWITH INSCRIBES THIS SCROLL OF HONOR TO THIS DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

You spell Johnston like this: J-o-h-n-s-t-o-n.

You spell "open door' like this: o-p-e-n d-o-o-r.

They don't even look the same in print. The only similarity the naked eye can find is the fact both contain eight letters of the alphabet.

Yet they are practically synonymous.

If you don't believe it, we recommend this test. Walk down any downtown Anderson business street with either Bill Johnston or his brother, U.S. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, and see what happens.

If you aren't delayed a good 10 minutes in any single block's walk while the brothers Johnston greet friends, we'll take back our statement about the combination of letters being synonymous.

The friends appear every 10 or 15 steps, and Bill or OLIN stop and shake their hand and chat with them—be they street-sweepers, cops on the beat, homeowners, fellow businessmen, bankers, religious or civic leaders, or others.

Possibly that's why in at least two elections the name Johnston on the ballot has set South Carolina records as vote getters over political opponents. And the story dates back many, many years. Senator JOHNSTON's record possibly is the most widely known, because he has remained active politically on a national level. Brother Bill's is none the less industrious on the State and local level.

Both Johnston records exist and gain in brilliance and magnitude year by year, because each man is in touch with his people. What better combination could there be now than the melding of their talents so that National, State, and local levels are as one?

That is what has just happened—with the appointment of William Calhoun Johnston as home secretary to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. It's a continuation of their "open door" policy with their merged constituency.

Both were born on a farm near Honea Path, sons of the late E. A. and Leila Webb Johnston. "Bill" Johnston's birthdate was May 17, 1904. He finished grammar school in Spartanburg, working in the Saxon Mill as a doffer while attending the Textile Industrial Institute. He attended Honea Path High School, working his way through by running the janitor's job at night and operating a barber shop evenings and Saturdays. Then he attended the University of South Carolina where he also ran a barber shop to meet expenses.

In 1928, "Bill" Johnston wed the former Miss Sara Louise Power. They now have three daughters and five grandchildren: Mrs. Eugene F. Bobo, Mrs. Cary C. Doyle, and Mrs. William Hendrix; the grandchildren: Gene Bobo, Jr., and Bill and Andy Bobo; twins Cathy and Christy Doyle. Mrs. Hendrix and her husband William both are students at Erskine College.

In 1929, a year after his wedding, "Bill" Johnston was elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives to fill the unexpired term of the late Asa Hall. In 1930 he was reelected to the legislature, heading the ticket over 16 other candidates. At that time he polled 1,100 votes more than the next highest of 16 candidates to set a record of amassing the largest vote ever accorded a legislative candidate in a contested Democratic primary election for the legislature in Anderson County.

Then, in 1935, "Bill" Johnston served without pay as the personal representative of Governor OLIN JOHNSTON to help settle labor disputes. That was before the Labor Department was created—it was a time of the depression, when neither labor nor management knew which way to turn. "Bill" Johnston helped iron out those difficulties, just as he did in 1936 when he became the first secretary of the South Carolina Industrial Commission. Then farmers were losing their farms because they couldn't pay mortgages. It was "Bill" Johnston who moved for passage of the deficiency judgment bill, which allowed hard-pressed farmers to reclaim their land within a specified time, after foreclosure. This benefitted thousands of South Carolina farmers.

He was elected chairman of the commerce and manufacturing committee and was the youngest representative ever to serve in the legislature. He was recognized throughout the State as one of the most progessive and aggressive members of the general assembly, who concerned himself with the welfare of the people.

In 1937, unobtrusively "Bill" Johnston left public life for a time to become a partner with his aging father in the Johnston Furniture Co., which he now owns outright—with the death of his father in 1939. He purchased the half interest of his father and became sole owner.

But public life and service again called him, and in 1940 "Bill" Johnston was elected mayor of Anderson for 2 years. He started a program then that, 6 years later, he augmented. Between that first election as mayor and his reinstitution in that post, he served from December 1940, until 1948 as director of the Santee-Cooper Board under the late Gov. R. M. Jeffries. This now is the South Carolina Public Service Authority.

In 1948 he again entered the political arena and for five consecutive terms thereafter served as mayor of Anderson—until 1958, when he made a creditable race for Governor of the State.

During Mayor Johnston's administration, he carried out his "open door" policy. He feels that if a man is elected by the public to serve the public he always should be available to that public. During his terms as mayor, he had not one—but three—doors open to his constituency at all times. You might say truthfully it was on a 24-hour basis that, during those years, you could "bend the mayor's ear" if you so desired.

"Bill" Johnston changed the image of a city mayor. He'd meet anyone, at anytime, anywhere, and discuss even the most trivial issue in the belief that, to the person presenting the complaint, it was to them a legitimate issue. Not always could he help them. Sometimes requests were out-of-bounds; sometimes financially impossible or impracticable. But "Bill" Johnston listened—and did what he could in any given set of circumstances. That met with success among the populace. Best evidence of this is that in his final campaign, he was unopposed for reelection—after having held the post of mayor in Anderson longer for any consecutive period than anyone has to this date.

When "Bill" Johnston became mayor, the city's bonded indebtedness was between $900,000 and $1 million and there was a city financial deficit of some $100,000. When he left office, there was less than a $200,000 bonded indebtedness—plus a city surplus of some $165,000. So it was a little more than just an "open door" policy, too—it also was astute business acumen.

Mayor Johnston believes a public job is a public trust At the beginning of his second term as mayor, the city council increased the salary of councilmen from $25 per month to $100 per month and the salary of mayor from $150 per month to $400 per month.

Mayor Johnston's position was that he entered into a contract with the people of Anderson to serve as mayor for $1,800 per year and he declined to take the pay increase leaving $5,000 in the city treasury that had been appropriated by vote of council for his salary (taking only the $1,800 as his pay during the term for which he was elected.)

During his mayoralty, also, the city made giant strides in a mounting sanitation problem. When he took office, there were 285 outside toilets; at the end of his terms, there were none. That was because sewerage service has been extended to the areas involved. And dozens and dozens of unpaved streets and alleys existed when he first took the mayor's chair. When he left office, Anderson was the first city of comparable size in the State to have all of its streets paved and alleys surfaced.

Today's city recreation program also dates back to the time of the "open door" administration of "Bill" Johnston. The existing city recreation center was built, along with the white and Negro swimming pools; the living and working conditions of Anderson city employees improved greatly. It was "Bill" Johnston's proposal for cost of living increases that resulted in unanimous city council approval of these approximate 10 percent raises each term he held office.

While he was Mayor Johnston, that's just what he was—for 24 hours of each day.

But even with his official duties, Mayor Johnston found time for religious, civic, and fraternal activities as well. He to this day is an active member of the First Baptist Church and takes part in youth work; he also is a member of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants' Association, the Anderson County Farm Bureau, the South Carolina Farm Bureau; he is a Mason, a Shriner, a member of the Redmen Order and a member of the Advisory Board of the Salvation Army. He also has been a president of the South Carolina Municipal Association and the board of directors of that organization.

He also helped build the YMCA building and was past president and a member of the Board of the YMCA.

After his race for the Governor's seat in 1958, "Bill" Johnston again returned to the operation of the business he and his father had built up. In 1962, a demand for his "open door" dealings with the public found new demand as brother Senator JOHNSTON sought reelection to the U.S. Senate. "Bill" served as campaign manager, and visited every nook and cranny in the State to press the issue that brother OLIN'S seniority in the Senate was like money in the bank for South Carolina. Again the fact that "Bill" Johnston and brother OLIN JOHNSTON are "one of us" carried weight—and OLIN JOHNSTON won over Democratic rival former Gov. Ernest Hollings by a sweeping majority in the primary, and over Republican W. D. Workman, Jr., in the general election.

And "Bill" was happy—he knew South Carolina would continue to get topnotch representation in Congress of the United States. And once more he returned to his Anderson business.

That's the way it remained until just a couple of weeks ago. Then came another call.

As a Senator, OLIN JOHNSTON is busy—busier than most of his constituency realizes. He can't "come home" everytime someone calls asking him to do so; he can't visit a specific section of his State while Congress is in session—not and be on hand when the key votes are cast on issues that will affect his State. He wants to—but he just doesn't have the time to do it.

So who could handle the business of the Senator on the home front? It doesn't take

a second guess to figure out the answer: former Mayor "Bill" Johnston, naturally. He knows practically all of the people of the State, and more to the point, they know "Bill" Johnston. So what better "pipeline" to Senator JOHNSTON could there be than "Bill." During the Senator's campaign, "Bill" Johnston contacted more than 7,000 friends and supporters. There isn't even a single village in the State in which one person or more do not know him personally.

Ironically, "Bill" has been offered this same post several times in the past by Senator JOHNSTON, but he heretofore has turned it down. Now—pressured with OLIN's need for a man on the home front to keep him in constant touch with happenings here—"Bill" finally acceded.

Hundreds have said Mayor Johnston has been the unofficial home secretary for years, but just didn't have the title before this.

In accepting, "Bill" Johnston was not job hunting but feels in this post he can be of service to his fellowmen. So it follows that his acceptance is another link in the resolve he and brother OLIN have made to themselves to keep the door open to the State's constituency.

In the near future, "Bill" will open a "home secretary" office in Anderson to which people all across the State will be able to bring their complaints and requests for congressional action. He'll also keep in constant contact with Senator JOHNSTON's Columbia office, and on a varied schedule, visit this and that section of the State to check the people's needs and hear of their problems.

When you enter the home office marked Johnston in the years to come, you will find what we've said is true—"Johnston" spells the same as "open door." They are synonymous.

Fourth Anniversary of Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], in observing the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill passed by the Congress which granted statehood to Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

This is a memorable event for the people of Hawaii in their long and eventful history. It is also a memorable event in the history of the United States.

The people of the beautiful State of Hawaii have moved with great progress in the transition from a territory to a State. They should certainly be commended for the successful way in which this transition has been achieved.

Those of us who had the privilege of voting for the legislation giving the status of statehood to Hawaii may be assured that our support has been justified by the events of the past 4 years.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the wonderful people of Hawaii and their great Governor, the Honorable John A. Burns, who, more than anyone else, was responsible for Hawaii becoming a State of the Union.

A New Kind of Southerner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday was made much more pleasant for me as a result of reading a splendid, informative profile of one of our distinguished new colleagues in this body. In Sunday's Washington Star, Cecil Holland, with his usual writing skill, brought the readers of the Star a picture of Hon. CHARLES L. WELTNER, of Georgia, in an article entitled "A New Kind of Southerner."

Many of us knew a few things about our young colleague, but this article added greatly to our information as a result of which our admiration for this outstanding new Congressman was greatly enhanced. In spite of his youthfulness, he has already had a distinguished career which I am confident is but a prelude to a even more distinguished career as a Member of Congress. I am confident that all of my colleagues will enjoy reading this fine article which I now include as a part of my remarks:

WELTNER OF GEORGIA—A NEW KIND OF SOUTHERNER

(By Cecil Holland)

When CHARLES L. WELTNER, the new Member of the House from Georgia's Fifth District which includes Atlanta, came to Washington to take his seat he was pleasantly surprised.

"I never expected any one here had heard of me," the 35-year-old Atlanta lawyer said. "So I was surprised to find out that a good many people knew about the outcome of my race."

Mr. WELTNER, a slight individual who masks a seriousness of purpose behind a sense of humor, went on:

"I've found a large Washington constituency who were, I'm afraid, not so much interested in me as they were in a change."

What brought about the change was Mr. WELTNER's defeat of Representative Davis, a veteran of eight terms, in a hard-fought Democratic primary. Mr. Davis was a member of the House District Committee and was known unofficially as the mayor of Washington, and entertained some decided views on the racial question and home rule.

But Mr. WELTNER, who represents a new breed of officeholders from the South, has no ambitions to take over the role of Mr. Davis as a dominant influence in District affairs.

MAY BE DISQUALIFIED

"I think I disqualified myself," he said with a grin. "During the campaign I described Mr. Davis as 'the alderman' of Washington."

The youthful-appearing House Member said he had received numerous telephone calls and personal visits from his Washington constituency.

Some of his callers were interested in District home rule. From Mr. WELTNER they undoubtedly got a reception far different from what they would have received from his predecessor.

"I have a great affinity for people who can't vote," Mr. WELTNER said. "Under Georgia's old unit system (thrown out by a Federal court order) my vote didn't count either.

"I sympathize with people who want to vote. I sympathize with the people in the District who want to govern themselves. But I don't think they should expect full municipal powers because of the over-riding interests of the National Government. However, there is a good measure of powers that could be ceded to an electorate in the District."

RACE AND HOME RULE

Mr. WELTNER was aware of the racial question involved in the matter of home rule for the District. "But," he added, "I don't have much sympathy with people who don't want to let other people vote."

In his own case, the young Congressman added, he could never have been elected to Congress under Georgia's old unit system.

The Fifth district, second largest in the country, is made up of three counties: Fulton (Atlanta), De Kalb, and Rockdale. The unit vote is divided six, six and two. In his primary Mr. WELTNER said he carried Fulton by 10,000, lost De Kalb by 2,000 and Rockdale by 99 votes. Under the unit system he would have lost eight to six, although he had a majority in popular vote of nearly 8,000 in the district.

When Mr. WELTNER won the primary battle it was hailed as a victory of a moderate over one of the South's most conservative Members of Congress.

DISLIKES LABELS

But Mr. WELTNER himself dislikes labels of any kind. "It's difficult," he said, "unless you are going to be all one way or the other to peg yourself. This great term, 'moderate,' I don't know what it means."

If he has to be labeled, Mr. WELTNER would just as soon be called, in the late Speaker Sam Rayburn's words, "A Democrat—without prefix or suffix." Or maybe as his fellow Georgian, Representative VINSON, has said: "A constructive progressive who moves forward with caution." The only trouble with that, Mr. WELTNER added with a grin, "is how does one know when to move forward with caution."

He said he would be known by what he does. For him this involves representing a major urban center as effectively as many Members of Congress have represented their rural constituencies.

"I am anxious to bring to bear the great wealth of our country on urban problems," he said. "I based my political campaign on the things I hope to accomplish for the district which also would be good for the country."

For that reason, he was surprised and pleased to draw a top committee assignment, as far as freshmen Members go. He was placed on the House Banking and Currency Committee.

"It's very good for me," he remarked. "Atlanta is the financial center of the Southeast and also is a center for savings and loan associations."

COMMITTEE JOB

He also pointed out that the committee concerns itself with housing, urban redevelopment, and rapid transit plans—all matters of pressing interest to Atlanta.

Mr. WELTNER, who was born in Atlanta, December 17, 1927, attended school there, Oglethorpe University and the Columbia Law School. His father once served as chancellor of the State university system and president of Oglethorpe University in Atlanta.

"Like a lot of people," Mr. WELTNER said, "I harbored political ambitions."

Under Georgia's unit system, he decided, he could not win a statewide race. So he centered on the congressional seat and, starting in December, 1961, he said he spent full time until last November running for it.

He started with no political organization but, Mr. WELTNER said proudly, "we built a

crackerjack one." The organization was based on old friends and new friends who were made. His law partner, Edward Branan, became his campaign manager.

"Not having any money," Mr. WELTNER continued, "we started out soliciting speaking engagements before men's clubs, social organizations, anybody that would let me talk. I guess I made 400 talks in the campaign."

He said he developed a good memory for names and faces and at every meeting a list was compiled of those attending. "If anybody as much as wished me good luck," he added, "I wrote a letter thanking him for his support."

HOW ORGANIZATION WORKED

Mr. WELTNER and his campaign manager organized Fulton and Dekalb down to the ward and precinct levels. Out of a card file of names of people who had attended meetings at which he spoke and who had expressed an interest in his campaign an organization was built which covered a wide range of people and interests.

After winning the primary Mr. WELTNER still faced a major hurdle. With the end of the unit rule a two-party system emerged in the fifth district as Republicans entered L. J. (Jim O'Callaghan, a well-known businessman, against the Democratic nominee.

This was something Georgia voters were unaccustomed to, as Mr. WELTNER discovered while campaigning in the southern end of the district. "You won," a voter told him. "What are you doing out here? You're the Democratic nominee."

Mr. WELTNER said that "scared me" and he pushed his campaign even harder. He won by a little more than 50 percent of the votes and was among 67 freshmen Members who took their seats last month.

EXPECTS OPPOSITION

Mr. WELTNER expects he will have opposition when he seeks reelection. "There is a great appeal in the two-party system," he commented. "You can't run against it. I'll just have to run harder."

But he said he expected to overcome whatever opposition he has so decisively that the Republicans will start running for some other office than Congress. This he said he hopes to accomplish by doing an exceptionally good job up here.

The new Member, Mrs. Weltner, and their four children are getting adjusted to Washington life in a house they have rented in Bethesda. "I'm not in the social whirl and I don't want in," Mr. WELTNER said. "If you accepted all the invitations you received, you really would be in a whirl."

While Mr. WELTNER has no desire to follow in his predecessor's footsteps as a member of the House District Committee, he is interested in some of Washington's problems, particularly traffic.

He drives to Capitol Hill, and, for awhile, took the route down Massachusetts Avenue and wound up getting lost. "I'd like to see a sign or two put up somewhere over there," he said. "Massachusetts Avenue just disappears."

Dole a Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, if for nothing else, this administration is noted for its completely political attitude and its efforts to stifle the minority party in every conceivable way. A recent example involved the gentleman from Kansas, BOB DOLE, who last November soundly trounced one of the New Frontiersmen, third-term Democrat Congressman J. Floyd Breeding, after being thrown together in the new First District of Kansas. The district includes 58 of the 105 Kansas counties and some 550,000 residents.

I wish to submit for those interested in fairplay an editorial from one of Kansas' leading newspapers, the Southwest Daily Times, of Liberal, Kans. Congressman DOLE is still open for business despite the attempted political power play to oust him.

DOLE A FIGHTER

Congressman BOB DOLE, of this the big new First District, still keeps the title of being a fighter after being twice wounded and decorated highly during World War II.

The Omaha-World-Herald pointed out editorially the other day that the Post Office Department had occasion to learn he's still a fighter.

When a Republican President was in the White House, a Democratic Congressman, Floyd Breeding, of this district, was given space for a home office in the Hutchinson post office. He kept the space for 6 years, but last fall, after congressional redistricting, Mr. DOLE retired him to private life.

Subsequently, Mr. DOLE moved a secretary into the old Breeding office, to handle district matters. Soon, the Post Office Department told him the office had been reassigned to the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. DOLE told his secretary to refuse to vacate, and told the Post Office Department they'd need a U.S. marshal to evict him and employed Hutchinson lawyers to see that he got a fair deal. Then he learned from Internal Revenue Service it didn't want the office and never had.

In a few days another postal official informed him that the office space would remain his, and admitted some other post office officials "were inclined to be somewhat political."

Congressman DOLE, we believe, will always go down fighting, if he does go down. He is to be admired for standing up for what he feels is right, politics or no politics.

Believe in Your Teenager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, while home in New Jersey on a weekend, I chanced to take a taxicab in Paterson. The driver, James Homwey, engaged me in conversation about the teenage situation.

Shortly afterward, I received a letter from him. I feel that his thoughts deserve some serious consideration, and I include his letter in full:

WEST PATERSON, N.J., *March 9, 1963.*

CHARLES S. JOELSON,

Congress of the United States:

I am writing this letter in regard to the few words we had in the taxi the other day about our teenagers.

A few years ago while I was on police duty as a marshal I answered a call to disperse some teenagers who were being rowdy and disturbing the peace. I told them to go home and at the same time I kidded around with them and gained their confidence. As days went by they used to look for me when I was on duty. They asked, "Is Jim the cop on?" When I was on duty I would try and give them hints what to do to pass time, to stay out of trouble, and not hang on street corners. You see, Mr. JOELSON, for the sake of 1 bad teenager the other 20 are called bad and this is not so. According to them they are outcasts; the towns do nothing for them; their parents are too busy with the babies, or are working; so they are given money to go out and enjoy themselves, but that is not enough. One day a teenager asked me to meet with his parents. He had told his mother about what I had said and she liked the idea. So I met with the mother and father and discussed this. The outcome was that we formed a club called "Titan Teens." Our main object was to recruit teenagers that were interested in getting together so they wouldn't have to stand on street corners. They were coming in from three towns. We accepted them even though we ran into some disputes from parents of our town. You see by turning them away we were beating our own objectives. The volunteer firemen donated their firehouse twice a week. Without this we could not get started. But it was a hard struggle because with teenagers it takes a lot of patience and time and understanding. They are not used to taking orders. Fourteen to eighteen years of age is your hardest group because they are going through their own way of growing up. We must take time out to spend with our teenagers to get them on the road to success.

I call on you, Mr. Congressman, as a leader to promote public relations and as a father and as an American. This is what America is. We must unite to help each other or else we are lost. Just as the President said a few days ago about four volunteer fliers who were Americanss. They died for a cause, I believe, as other Americans have died throughout the history of our country to keep us free.

On November 17, 1960, the mayor and council in the Borough of West Paterson at the meeting of November 9, 1960, on my recommendation of a letter I sent, had proclaimed November 21–26, 1960, as "Believe in Your Teenagers of America." This is a movement that should be carried out by Presidential proclamation, a symbol of Americanism and our answer to Communists all over the world.

We must put forth this Nation under God to go forth as a leader of nations. We have set up a Peace Corps to show and help other countries and promote good will; we have set up a United Nations to promote peace and good will and help the weak. Now I call on you, Congressman, and the President to help our teenagers, to show they are wanted, to proclaim "Believe in your teenagers of America."

These are our future Americans, Mr. JOELSON and the future of our country will someday be in their hands. We must teach them and lead them along the path as our fathers and your fathers. As long as we have faith, believe me, we'll survive. Thank you.

JAMES HOMWEY.

Farm Leader Analyzes President's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau Federation through

Mr. Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer and director, was a very sensible analysis of the President's tax recommendations.

In addition to stressing the need for a balanced budget, the reduction of expenditures, he pointed out the danger in this administration of substituting "the judgment of relatively few Government officials for the judgment of millions of individuals in the day-to-day operations of our economic system"—society?

He agreed in cross-examination that our choice was not between a little or a big deficit but between a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility on the one hand and deficit financing on the other.

He further recognized the inconsistencies of the President's about-face on relating his tax recommendations to a recession and agreed that there would be much greater likelihood of a recession brought on by Government activities if the President's recommendations were adopted instead of a more sensible course of reduced spending and a balanced budget. Mr. Fleming's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS WITH RESPECT TO RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE PRESIDENT'S 1963 MESSAGE ON TAXATION

(By Roger Fleming)

We appreciate the opportunity to present the views of the farm bureau with respect to Federal tax policy. Farm bureau has a membership of over 1,607,000 families in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Through an extensive policy development process our member farm families discuss problems and develop recommendations on many issues which affect them directly in the business of agriculture; also, those matters which have an important impact upon them as citizens of the United States. The rates and methods used in assessing taxes obviously are of vital importance to American farmers and ranchers. The comments made in this statement are based upon policies adopted in December 1962 by the elected voting delegates of member State organizations.

Farm bureau's position with regard to Federal taxes is as follows:

I. Tax reduction is needed to improve the climate for economic growth.

II. It is necessary to reduce expenditures to make tax reduction economically feasible.

III. Tax reduction should be accomplished through rate reductions for individuals and corporations, scheduled in a series of steps and geared to responsible action with respect to the Federal budget.

I. TAX REDUCTION IS NEEDED TO IMPROVE THE CLIMATE FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

In our view, the U.S. economy has demonstrated considerable strength and is continuing to do so. Although we share the President's desire for a higher rate of economic growth, no one should depreciate the economic progress this country has made since the end of World War II. We should not be misled by glib comparisons with foreign statistics which reflect the recovery of industrial economies from the destruction of war.

Economic growth is a complex thing. It does not take place at a uniform rate, and we should not expect it to do so. We should also recognize the danger that too much emphasis on growth might unbalance the economy and lead to future trouble.

While our present tax structure is by no means the only impediment to a higher rate of economic growth, it undoubtedly is an important one. Excessively high rates drain off the private investment capital that is needed to create new job opportunities through the development of new industries and expanded markets for old industries. At the worst, high rates discourage risktaking, innovation, imaginative undertakings—the very motive power of progress.

Marginal tax rates that run as high as 91 percent are so punitive that they either kill incentive or lead to an erosion of the tax base by encouraging the enactment of numerous special rules and regulations for particular situations. Given the power to tax away such a high percentage of the return, the Government directs the use of private capital. This often means that income is virtually confiscated unless it is directed into an activity prescribed by the government through a process of political determination. In a very real sense, this substitutes the judgment of a relatively few government officials for the judgment of millions of individuals in the day-to-day operation of our economic system.

Tax reductions are needed to release funds for private capital investment in a wide variety of projects and to encourage the use of such funds in sound investments.

Tax reduction also is important to the solution of our international balance-of-payments problem. For more than a decade, the United States has spent more abroad than foreign countries have spent in the United States (the only exception was the Suez crisis year of 1957). In recent years we have been relatively unsuccessful in correcting the imbalance despite the fact that we have maintained a sizable surplus in our balance of trade. One of the critical factors in this problem is the persistent outflow of U.S. capital and the rather weak attraction the U.S. economy has had for foreign capital. For example, U.S. long-term investments abroad exceeded foreign long-term investments in the United States by $2.1 billion in 1960 and $2 billion in 1961.

Our present information indicates that the net dollar loss from this factor in 1962 again approximates $2 billion.

Our total international balance of payments deficit in 1962 amounted to $2.2 billion. It is widely recognized that action should be taken to correct this dollar outflow. Government restrictions on investment abroad are not the answer, nor should there be tax penalties applied to such investment. Rather, we must take those basic actions which will make investment in the United States more attractive to all investors and also strengthen our competitive position through reductions in U.S. production costs. One of the most important actions we can take in this regard is to reduce the burden of excessive taxation.

II. IT IS NECESSARY TO REDUCE EXPENDITURES TO MAKE TAX REDUCTION ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE

The fundamental purpose of taxes should be to raise needed government revenue in an equitable manner. Tax policy cannot be—or, at least, should not be—divorced from spending policy. Government spending must be paid for, either through taxes or inflation.

In our opinion inflation is a far more serious threat to our future economic well-being than is the present tax structure.

While taxes are undesirably high, our past record of fiscal management in the Federal Government has not earned us a tax cut. The fact is that, in recent years, we have consistently "borrowed from the future" through deficit financing. The Federal Government has spent more than its revenue in 26 of the past 32 years. The ever-mounting national debt which has resulted is a matter of grave concern to the American people.

Year	Budget surplus or deficit	Total gross debt
	Millions	*Billions*
1953	−$9,449	$266.1
1954	−3,117	271.3
1955	−4,180	274.4
1956	+1,626	272.8
1957	+1,596	270.5
1958	−2,819	276.3
1959	−12,427	284.7
1960	+1,224	286.3
1961	−3,856	289.0
1962	−6,378	298.2
1963 (estimate)	−8,811	303.5

This failure to meet our Federal obligations through current revenue has meant that every year the Federal Government must pay more interest on the Federal debt. In 1963 the budget must include $9.7 billion for interest on the national debt. Such charges are now $3.1 billion higher than 10 years ago.

The administration currently is requesting legislation which would extend the present $308 billion debt limit through the remainder of the current fiscal year. This is the result of a prospective deficit of $8.8 billion for fiscal year 1963. The administration claims that the deficit was unforeseen because (1) revenues were $5.4 billion less than expected; (2) revisions in the revenue code requested by the administration and made by the Revenue Act of 1962, reduced revenue by $2.1 billion; and (3) expenditures increased $1.8 billion over the administration's estimate.

The present estimate of expenditures during the current year (fiscal 1963) is $94.3 billion. The proposed budget for fiscal 1964 calls for an increase of approximately $4.5 billion in expenditures to bring the total to $98.8 billion. Since estimates have a way of increasing as the year goes by, it is a matter of real concern to note that the President's estimate for 1964 spending is approximately $6.3 billion greater than the estimate of 1963 spending made at this time last year.

Our present deficit, estimated to be $8.8 billion, is the result of a budget which initially indicated a $400 million surplus. Last year's $6.4 billion deficit resulted from a budget which indicated a $1.5 billion surplus. With this record in mind, a tax program based on an estimated $11.9 billion deficit could result in a deficit of even larger proportions and a fiscal program that in our view would be irresponsible and dangerous.

Budget estimates: receipts, new obligational authority, expenditures, and public debt

[In millions]

	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Budget receipts	$81,409	$85,500	[1] $86,900
New obligational authority	92,862	103,192	107,927
Expenditures	87,787	94,311	98,802
Excess of new obligational authority over expenditures	5,075	8,881	9,125
Public debt end of year	298,200	303,500	315,600

[1] Assumes net revenue loss of $2,700,000,000 from President's tax proposals.

Since over 80 percent of Federal revenue comes from individual and corporate income taxes, income tax rate reductions would have a significant effect upon the Federal Government's total revenue, particularly in the short run. If the Federal Government's expenditures are increased, a tax cut means more deficit financing, an increased national debt, the threat of inflation and a loss of confidence in the soundness of the economy, which would discourage investment and prevent sound economic growth.

Farm Bureau rejects the philosophy and the theory that the United States can have tax reduction without earning it through reduced expenditures. We reject the contention that the biggest budget in the history of this country cannot be reduced. Such a budget can be cut, and must be cut, if we are to provide the sound basis for a tax cut.

We are opposed to any general reduction in taxes until effective action has been taken to reduce Federal Government expenditures. Actual expenditures in the coming year, of course, cannot be completely controlled by Congress. However, new obligational authority can be reduced substantially. Farm Bureau recommends that new obligational authority for fiscal 1964 should be held to the level of estimated expenditures ($94.3 billion) in fiscal 1963. We will present specific recommendations to the appropriate committees of the Congress to implement our recommendations in this regard. You may be interested in knowing that we will recommend that the appropriations for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for price support operations and payments be reduced by $1 billion in fiscal 1964.

If and when a reduction of at least $13.6 billion in new obligational authority has been achieved, we will support a tax cut of the type outlined in section III below, provided the tax reduction effected the first year is less than one-third of the amount by which new obligational authority for fiscal 1964 is reduced, and, provided further, that tax reductions in subsequent years are made contingent upon the achievement of a balanced budget in each such year.

III. TAX REDUCTION SHOULD BE ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH RATE REDUCTION FOR INDIVIDUALS AND CORPORATIONS, SCHEDULED IN A SERIES OF STEPS AND GEARED TO RESPONSIBLE ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THE FEDERAL BUDGET

We believe tax reduction should—

1. Stimulate economic growth by giving primary emphasis to increased private capital investments;

2. Reduce the excessive tax burden for individuals in all brackets of the income tax schedule and also for corporations;

3. Be scheduled over several years in order to increase the incentive for investors to risk their capital in job-producing ventures by minimizing the threat of inflation;

4. Be contingent upon a reduction in new obligational authority for 1964 to the level of actual spending in fiscal 1963; and

5. Be contingent upon a balanced budget in years subsequent to 1964.

We recognize that such a reduction does not fit into the "quick boost" or "shot in the arm" philosophy. Rather it is predicated upon the principle of increasing net capital formation through private investment to solve the chronic and fundamental inability of the economy to realize its full potential and to move ahead at a satisfactory annual growth rate. It would stimulate investment, not inflation. It would emphasize opportunity and incentive to invest with expectation of proportionate return.

By reducing corporate tax rates and individual rates in the upper and middle income brackets, additional capital will be made available for private investment. By reducing the tax burden on all taxpayers, additional private purchasing power will be made available to stimulate the investment of such capital. The promise of additional tax cuts in the years ahead would increase confidence in our economy and thus give added confidence to additional investment.

At the same time, by making tax reductions contingent upon sharp reductions in new obligational authority for fiscal 1964 and a balanced budget thereafter, we would be providing additional incentives for the sort of self-discipline that is necessary if we are to have successful self-government.

If deficits were the solution to economic problems and economic growth our economy should be booming at the present time and there would be little need to extend foreign aid to many of the so-called underdeveloped countries.

The U.S. record for recent years has been as follows: Fiscal year 1961: revenue, $77.6 billion; spending, 81.5 billion; deficit, $3.9 billion. Fiscal year 1962: revenue, $81.4 billion; spending, $87.8 billion; deficit, $6.4 billion. Fiscal year 1963: revenue, $85.5 billion; spending, $94.3 billion; deficit, $8.8 billion (estimated).

It is politically easy to spend; it is politically difficult to tax. Our private competitive enterprise system is placed in jeopardy by a siren song which seems to say, "We can spend without taxing; we can solve without effort."

CHANGES IN TAXING STRUCTURE

Recent news reports have raised doubts as to whether the administration will continue to advocate adoption of the so-called tax reforms referred to in the President's 1963 tax message and in the statement and supporting exhibits of the Secretary of the Treasury.

In view of this uncertainty, the highly controversial nature of some of the proposed "reforms" and the more urgent need for expenditure control and rate reduction, we have not chosen to discuss the reform proposals in detail at this time.

We do have strong convictions that so-called loophole closing and recasting of tax procedures should be done in the context of equity, fairness, and justice; rather than on the basis of how much revenue is lost or how much revenue is recouped. In our opinion, the proposal to apply a capital gains tax to property transferred at the time of death is unfair and unreasonable. Such a tax on unrealized income could have the effect of forcing the breaking up of efficient farm or ranch operations which had been operated by the same family for generations.

We also note that the President's proposals with respect to the standard deduction and the taxation of persons over 65 would take a substantial number of persons off the tax rolls. In our opinion, rate reductions should have priority over such proposals.

In the main, we believe that the so-called tax reform proposals should be considered separately rather than as a part of a rate reduction bill. We would appreciate the opportunity of filing any additional detailed material which the committee may feel will be helpful in such deliberations.

Experienced Sports Reporter Says Saturday Evening Post Article "Proves Nothing"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House of Representatives today, March 21, 1963, I address myself to the article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post dated March 23, 1963, which libels and defames Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts, University of Georgia, entitled "The Story of a College Football Fix." Any thoughtful reading of the article will show the reader that it is an irresponsible piece of reporting.

Evening Star sports columnist Lewis F. Atchison has read the story and I insert herewith his report, which appeared in the Star for March 20, 1963:

MAGAZINE ARTICLE PROVES NOTHING

(By Lewis F. Atchison)

Don Ameche—or was it Alexander Graham Bell?—obviously had no idea how much mischief a telephone could stir up when he invented the darn thing. So, for a thin dime, a stranger supposedly listens in on a private conversation allegedly between Paul "Bear" Bryant, of Alabama, and Wally Butts, of Georgia, and assumes that they're up to some hanky-panky concerning the annual football game between the schools.

It is neither strange nor unusual for football coaches to ring up one another and spend time gassing about their teams. They love to talk, as anyone who has suffered through their speeches on the banquet circuit knows. This corner timed the late Jim Tatum one morning after asking for a comment which could have been "yes" or "no," about a news item concerning him. He talked 40 minutes. Bryant is a stayer and Butts never seemed lost for words. But what good is a coach who can't say a few words, especially on the telephone?

The initial reaction here after reading the magazine article charging Bryant and Butts with fixing a game was: Why didn't the guy hang up when he realized he was intruding on a private conversation?

If Bear and Wally were on the phone they certainly must have been talking football. We've known Bryant for years and never have known him to wax poetic over painting the house, needlepoint, or cutting the lawn. But he'll talk football all night. Nor is Bear one to be satisfied with three touchdowns if he can get six. Nine would be even better.

Bryant hardly needed information from Butts to beat Georgia. Football isn't the guessing game it used to be, not since the boys discovered how to crank a movie camera. Opponents are scouted with microscopic intensity by men trained to notice the slightest flaws. Teams exchange game films and even play diagrams.

Bryant's team was a 17-point favorite over Georgia and won, 35 to 0. Alabama simply overpowered the Bulldogs. Georgia might have needed vulcanizing at the finish, but there couldn't have been any "rigging" before the start of the game.

It is hard to believe Bryant and his squad didn't know almost everything there was to know about Georgia before going on the field. College coaches are just as thorough as the pros, who spend months scrutinizing films, exchanging notes and checking a thousand and one items the average fan wouldn't notice.

It was astonishing to read the allegation that "Butts outlined Georgia's offensive plays for Bryant and told him how Georgia planned to defend against Alabama's attack." We doubt that Bear needed such advice. The average coach usually can predict the next play with uncanny accuracy. Oh, the opposition crosses them up now and then, but most of them play the percentages and know what's coming next.

More surprising is the fact that Coach Johnny Griffith had no emergency plans ready when Alabama's linebackers were heard "hollering out our plays while we're still calling signals." Every team, or almost every team, getting the whey whacked out of it in the first half comes out for the second with a fresh set of plans. Perhaps Griffith was to blame for not being able to switch after discovering Alabama was on to his strategy.

It is an unfortunate piece of writing that has been set before the public. It charges nothing specific and proves nothing.

Mrs. Margaret C. Ells, a Member of President Kennedy's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, Discusses Need for Increased Vocational Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished retired assistant principal at Springfield, Mass., Trade High School, Mrs. Margaret C. Ells, is a member of President Kennedy's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education which made a study on vocational education and recommendations for improving and redirecting the program. These recommendations are now contained in the administration's bill on education before the Congress. Mrs. Ells recently discussed the need for increased vocational training with the Springfield Sunday Republican.

The article follows:

MRS. ELLS DISCUSSES SCHOOL DROPOUTS AND STRESSES URGENT NEED FOR INCREASED VOCATIONAL TRAINING

(By Irabelle L. Crim)

The constantly increasing number of school dropouts has plagued Mrs. Margaret C. Ells for many years. She has devoted much time and effort to discovering the causes, and also of finding ways of solving the problem.

During the many years she was a teacher in the Springfield public school system, Mrs. Ells' counseling and guidance helped encourage hundreds of pupils to select the right vocation and make adjustments that enabled them to remain in school. These pupils once had expressed their readiness to quit school for various reasons.

PERTINENT FACTS

Mrs. Ells, while assistant principal at Trade High School, spent hours with the pupils in hopes of finding a way to convince them of the importance of finishing school. After these sessions, it was her hope (which was sometimes realized) that the pupil would leave her office with the reason for his contemplated dropout eliminated.

Mrs. Ells, whose many outstanding accomplishments have made her "a legend in her own time" (she now is scholarship counselor at American International College), discloses some pertinent facts on this subject—school dropouts. From information gathered during the year (October 1961–November 1962) that she served as a member of the (Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, a panel appointed by President Kennedy to study the vocational education acts and make recommendations for improving and redirecting the program. Mrs. Ells outlines some of the reasons for the huge number of dropouts.

THREE CATEGORIES

1. The youth who loses interest in the subject the school offers. He wants freedom from restrictions. He is anxious to go to work and make money—big money. He wants to get the luxuries of life that he has read about and dreamed of enjoying. So, he leaves school to get a job. Soon he finds that he can't get the kind of job that will allow him to make the salary to realize his ambitions.

He is not trained in any specific vocation, so he must settle for menial labor jobs. He is unhappy in his work so he changes jobs frequently. Finally he tires of the struggle of trying to find "suitable" work and gives up the idea of working. He feels that he is too old to go back to school. He has no interest in learning a vocation, so the "streets" become his school—the corners his "college."

Here he picks up a good deal of knowledge, the wrong kind. Unlike an institution of constructive learning, this "street corner college" gives him a false idea of values. Therein are the dangers. He becomes an easy victim of wrongdoing.

Statistics show, as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau, that during the school months of 1962 there was an average every month of 700,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 out of work and out of school. Not surprising, then, that juvenile delinquency has almost doubled in the past decade.

THE HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT

He has a high school diploma, but he has taken a general course and is not prepared for any special vocation. The school authorities hope that he will return to school and further his education. He did not attend a high school where he could have benefited from a business or vocational course. His diploma, in this case, is little more than a piece of paper.

Pupils like this do eventually find out that they need further training and decide to take postgraduate courses in a business school or take advantage of the many vocational courses offered. This helps overcome their former barriers and enables them to find their place in the labor markets.

Still others enter military service where they have an opportunity to receive specific training in the various lines.

THE DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

These pupils concern Mrs. Ells the most. They usually drop out before they reach high school. They don't care to enter a vocational school, nor do they have the academic ability to meet the requirements of other high school courses.

The "disadvantaged youth" needs special attention. Under the old Massachusetts continuation law, which ruled that youths who left school under the age of 16 and went to work were required to attend school at least 4 hours a week, a dropout in this classification would have benefited. This law also stated that the teacher had to visit the student's place of employment and home.

This group needs courage to succeed. They have been on the list of academic failures. They are often of "limited" ability, but with proper inducement they can (and some do) overcome their academic, social or economic handicaps.

"I have lived long enough to see dropouts become managers of big businesses and members of our legislature," Mrs. Ells says.

There are millions of youth in all parts of the country who have left school for most or all of the reasons mentioned. In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a youth must remain in school until he is 16 years of age. School authorities urge such youths to stay in school and at least seek the benefits that a high school diploma offers. Schools are presently trying to add all types of courses to interest youth, stressing the importance and value of completing at least a high school course.

Mrs. Ells says that the most frequent reasons used for dropping out of school are: (1) Being bigger than most of the other students in the class; (2) being too large, too tall; (3) feeling unable to "fit in"; (4) not wanting to be called a "dumbbell," and not being able to keep pace with the regular work. These are seemingly small and inconsequential reasons to us, but to a youngster they are magnified to great importance.

"We have come to recognize the need for individual guidance for such students," Mrs. Ells adds, "but we still have a long way to go."

This is not a local or State problem; it is a national problem. A recent report from Vermont says that one out of five youths never finish high school. The State counsel of education recently suggested that more and varied vocational courses be made available to make students feel that someone really cares that they stay in school and get at least a high school diploma.

Speaking again of the "disadvantaged youth." Mrs. Ells says that it is no easy task trying to fit them into their proper places. They do not seem to fit anywhere. It is so important to find something that they can do and see that they do it.

She remembers a former student who was so "limited" that she just didn't seem to be able to grasp anything from the vocational courses she tried. With heavy heart, Mrs. Ells finally had to agree with the student's teachers that she just didn't "fit" anywhere.

RIGHT SPOT; RIGHT PERSON

One day while sitting at her desk, during the time when she was assistant principal of Trade, she received a call from the manager of an industrial concern in the local area. He needed workers for the cafeteria. Acting instinctively, she agreed to send a student to work for him, with the stipulation that he would accept this "limited" pupil. Mrs. Ells told the prospective employer the girl could be useful in drying trays, on one side, if he assigned someone to dry them on the other side. He agreed and the girl was hired. She is still employed there, a happy adjusted worker and an asset to the company.

Mrs. Margaret C. Ells is credited with placing over 50,000 students in business, industry and labor establishments throughout this area. She firmly believes that the right spot for the right person can be accomplished. Perhaps not so exceptionally as the above case, but eventually with the same results.

She emphasizes the importance of having teachers who have the quality of understanding and patience so necessary in working with students, not only in this age bracket, but youth of all ages.

One such incident she recalls particularly applies to the urgent need for more qualified teachers. A former student came to her and said he had quit school. Mrs. Ells asked the boy, "Why did you leave school, Robbie?"

"Because I had an old 'sourpuss' for a teacher," was his answer. "Last year we had a nice teacher and she liked us. We brought her apples and candy. This year it was different, the teacher yelled at us and was mean, so I left school."

THE TEACHER'S TASK

Granted that these cases are very rare, but they're worth mentioning since it meant so much to a pupil. To insure the success of these vocational training courses, it is necessary to employ teachers who love children. One who sees in each little frowsy-headed boy or girl the possibility of a future leader and good citizen.

Mrs. Ells says that she knows so well how hard our teachers try to help in the adjustments of pupils and to find the right places and the right courses where they can succeed. This is not an easy task. Often teachers try every method and type of course to help a pupil find that which will be of value to them—but often this is not possible and only time and maturity will help such a youth to find his place.

The "disadvantaged youth" needs patience especially, and also dedicated teachers with special interest and understanding of the handicaps that prevent such boys and girls

from succeeding in any educational programs.

Mrs. Ells further states, "Work is a great teacher." Each John or Mary must be interested in completing his school program in order to find the kind of work he or she can do and be given an opportunity to do it.

"Since the time when Christ worked as a carpenter in Nazareth, down to the time when Abraham Lincoln split rails, mankind has benefited from work with the hands."

"Unless we work, we die mentally, spiritually and physically," Mrs. Ells reminds us.

If we hope to decrease and discourage "school dropouts," a better vocational educational program must be established in more communities. More vocational courses must be added to the present rosters. More teachers trained in this specialized field. More personal guidance and attention given to the individual student. Last, but certainly not least, parental responsibility must be stressed more fully, for the pattern of the child's life is formed at home.

The Panel of Consultants on which Mrs. Ells served as the only representative from New England, completed its studies last November. Its recommendations have been incorporated into a bill presently before Congress. It is the hope of Mrs. Ells, as well as all who are interested in the vocational educational program, that this bill will be adopted.

The information the Panel compiled has been summarized in a booklet entitled "Education for a Changing World of Work." It contains the reports and recommendations of the Panel which was presented to President Kennedy with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze.

Some of the startling facts they reported briefly states: By 1970 there will be 87 million people working full-time. Fifty-eight million currently employed will still be working; 26 million young workers will start work; 3 million women will switch from housework to jobs between 1960 and 1970.

SOME CRITICAL NEEDS

Schools must help the 26 million youngsters work their way through the challenging decade ahead. Yet, contrary to the demands for higher education in the competitive field of business, industry, and the labor market, of every 10 youngsters now in grade schools, 3 will not finish high school, 7 will earn a high school diploma, 3 will go to work, some as wives and mothers, 4 will continue their education. Eight out of ten will not complete college, even though college enrollments will double.

The highlights the panel reported are summarized:

1. Education and training are sound investments in people.
2. Local-State-Federal partnership teaches skills the Nation needs.
3. Vocational education is not available in enough schools.
4. Vocational education is not available to all who need it.
5. Vocational education is not preparing for enough jobs.
6. Technical training after high school is a critical need.

To apply some of the above recommendations to our local situation, Trade High School was one of the vocational schools the panel visited. Springfield can take pride in this school, for each year hundreds of young people walk from its doors fully equipped and prepared to take their places in the competitive world today.

This city has a highly recognized vocational educational program, but there is still much to be done and not enough of our youth, in this or any community, avail themselves of these vocational courses.

Pittsburgh and Clean Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Pittsburgh, Joseph M. Barr, recently testified before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He appeared on behalf of the American Municipal Association in support of H.R. 4415, dealing with air pollution, and mentioned Pittsburgh as an example of cooperation by city and industry which is "second to none" in the country. I am happy that Mr. Barr has shown how such cooperation can contribute toward community development.

The article follows:

PITTSBURGH AND CLEAN AIR

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Joseph M. Barr, mayor of Pittsburgh, Pa., and chairman of the American Municipal Association's Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare. The American Municipal Association is a voluntary organization of municipal governments which represents 13,000 of the cities in the Nation.

I am here today to offer the firm support of my city and the American Municipal Association for H.R. 4415.

We have distributed to every member of the subcommittee a copy of our national municipal policy which was adopted last August in Philadelphia at the annual American Municipal Congress and which expresses our position on the subject of air pollution control. These recommendations were adopted by the American Municipal Association resolutions committee and by the membership without dissent.

The legislation before you meets the basic objectives sought by our member cities. This bill recognizes the urgency of the problem, calls for national research, proposes a matching grant program, provides for reasonable enforcement measures, and makes information available to the public and others interested in the prevention and control of air pollution. It seems to us a modest but essential approach to a growing national problem.

The members of this committee are familiar with the extensiveness of air pollution. All of the Nation's 215 metropolitan areas are affected and it is estimated that 10,000 communities in the United States have air pollution problems.

Its adverse effects range from actual causation of death, chronic illness, and general depreciation of land and building values. We know that air pollution constitutes a threat to public health and safety. We know that air pollution results in severe economic losses throughout urban areas. We believe that the time for corrective action is now, while the problem is still soluble.

As our policy statement indicates, we recognize that air pollution control is a basic responsibility of State and local governments. I am mayor of a city, which by present standards, has done an excellent job in the field of smoke control and air pollution.

But at the same time, we recognize that many aspects of this problem require national attention and that Federal assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

HOW LOCAL IS AIR?

It seems to me the clearly national character of this problem is pinpointed by pondering the question, How local is air? How do you prevent polluted air from passing from one political jurisdiction into another, from one county to another, from one State into a neighboring State? The answer, of course, is that pollution from one area does affect another and therefore national assistance is needed in meeting a problem which cannot be bottled up within a given region.

It is for this reason that our association is strongly supporting this bill. Consider the problem of enforcement, for example. It is meaningless to establish effective control programs in one locality, if another locality across a State line is unable for whatever reason to control pollution.

H.R. 4415 will still enable local communities to work out pollution problems on a reasonable basis at the local level. Failing a satisfactory solution, communities or States will then have the right to appeal to the Federal agency not limited by State or local boundaries. It seems to me the enforcement provisions in this bill get to the heart of the problem in a conciliatory but effective fashion.

The record will show that up to the present time, local governments and States, with a few notable exceptions, have not developed adequate programs for abatement and control of air pollution.

What we need now is Federal stimulus in the form of technical, financial, and research assistance to local and State governments. H.R. 4415 includes provision for each of these items—and the American Municipal Association is wholeheartedly in favor of them.

At this point, a brief history of what air pollution prevention and control has meant to the Pittsburgh area may be of interest to the members of this committee.

SMOKE CONTROL HISTORY IN PITTSBURGH

Pittsburgh, located in the heart of Allegheny County, is well known as one of the major steel centers in the world.

In years past, this also meant that Pittsburgh was equally well known for its mills enveloped in a haze of red and yellow dust and chimney stacks belching forth black smoke. It was not unusual, prior to 1947, to see street lights on at noon in downtown Pittsburgh. Before smoke control, frankly, Pittsburgh was not a pleasant place to live.

After World War II, Pittsburgh community leaders decided to do something about the layers of smoke and dust which had become identified without skyline.

Smoke and pollution control had been a problem for a long time. In 1895, the city of Pittsburgh passed its first smoke-control ordinance. Little was done to enforce it. In 1937 a new and stricter smoke-control law was enacted, but World War II delayed its enforcement.

In 1946 smoke-control enforcement began in earnest. The law was first applied to industry, railroads, and all solid fuel users except one- and two-family dwellings. In 1947 private homes came under the law.

Enforcement was difficult at first, and, of course, there were the skeptics and scoffers who said it couldn't be done.

However, cooperation from citizens, from industry and the news media was excellent. The key to success was the enlistment of all segments of the community in a cooperative effort.

When smoke control started in 1946, 90 percent of Pittsburghs dwellings were heated by coal. In 15 years a complete reversal took place as a result of smoke control, and

to some extent, economic and technological changes, and today more than 90 percent of Pittsburgh homes are heated by gas.

From 1947 to 1959 the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County maintained separate control programs. In March 1959 responsibility for enforcement was placed in one agency, the Allegheny County Health Department.

Subsequently, the health department developed an ordinance for Allegheny County with the most strict limitations in the United States on smoke and dust from open hearth furnaces, blast furnaces, other ironmaking and steelmaking facilities and from fuel-burning equipment such as that found in electric generating stations.

It provides for scheduling the installation of air-cleaning equipment in ironmaking and steelmaking facilities over a phased-out period. For example, the steel industry has adopted an air-cleaning program that will bring its facilities into full compliance with the new rules and regulations by 1970. This air-cleaning program will cost the steel industry in Allegheny County more than $30 million over the next 7 years.

In fact, without the interest and support of industry, the smoke control program would never have accomplished such success. Since the inauguration of smoke abatement in the mid 1940's industry alone has spent more than $250 million to advance the program in Allegheny County.

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS CONTROL?

How successful has air-pollution control been in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County? A few statistics provide the answer.

Pittsburgh and Allegheny County are recognized as the cleanest urban industrial center in the United States.

A survey just last year by the United States Public Health Service disclosed that Pittsburgh had less fine dust per square mile than 9 of the 11 cities tested. Only Salt Lake City registered a cleaner atmosphere.

More than $4 million was spent to scrub and polish large offices and commercial buildings for the first time in decades.

Today, 44 percent of the open hearth capacity in Allegheny County is equipped with modern electrostatic cleaners compared to 12 percent elsewhere in the country.

It is estimated that individual annual savings amount to more than $40 per year in laundry and cleaning bills and other personal economies.

However, the gains of air-pollution control in Pittsburgh cannot be measured solely in terms of clear skies and reduced laundry bills. Its striking results have affected every phase of life—in the immeasurable benefits that lift the spirit, the increase in sunshine, the brighter surroundings and cleaner living.

It is no exaggeration to state that the smoke control program was the mainspring of the entire urban rebuilding program in the area during the past 15 years. When it was proven that smoke could be removed from our skies, the other problems of urban blight and decay fell into manageable proportions.

In my judgment, without effective smoke control, there would have been no urban renewal, no mammoth rebuilding program in Pittsburgh.

As the keystone in the Pittsburgh-Allegheny County renaissance, air-pollution control has contributed immeasurably more to Pittsburgh's progress as an attractive place to live and work than any other single project in the community development effort.

We in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County do not suggest that the battle against pollution has been completely won. For many air-pollution control problems there are no easy solution and much difficult and intensive research still lies ahead.

I am convinced the same benefits Pittsburgh now enjoys can be achieved nationally. We need a strong, firm, clear national program to develop a comprehensive plan for the prevention and control of air pollution. The Federal program before you brings us closer to that goal without in any way impinging upon the fundamental responsibilities of State and local governments. I respectfully urge its passage by Congress without delay.

Dixon Made Its Mark With Pencils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 7, 1963, the Jersey Journal, a newspaper published in my hometown of Jersey City, N.J., pays tribute to the 50th anniversary of Dixon-Ticonderoga, the world-famous Ticonderoga pencils. The Joseph Dixon Crucible Co. located in Jersey City over a hundred years ago and currently affords employment to some 1,500 workers in the Jersey City plant.

I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the newspaper article appearing in the Jersey Journal, and call particular attention to the fact that this company is offering valuable cash college scholarships to the sons and daughters of stationers for essays on the significance in American history of the capture of Fort Ticonderoga by the Revolutionary War hero, Ethan Allen, in whose honor the company named their world famous product:

DIXON MADE ITS MARK WITH PENCILS

In these days of fast-changing products, brand names do not last very long, but the Ticonderoga pencil now is celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Manufacturer and owner of this trademark which is recognized all over the world is the Joseph Dixon Crucible Co., of Jersey City, which has sold, it estimates, some 2 billion Ticonderogas since their introduction early in 1913. The company itself is 126 years old.

Oddly enough, the first orders for Dixon Ticonderoga pencils were written before the pencils were born.

Julian H. Schermerhorn, in 1912 the company's executive vice president, was responsible not only for pencil sales but for the operations of the American Graphite Co., a subsidiary, as well.

In the fall of 1912, Schermerhorn had gone to California to drum up some pencil business and was playing host to a group of San Francisco stationers when the topic of brand names for pencils arose. One stationer expressed a wish for a pencil with a "ringing, old-fashioned American name." He predicted a considerable sale for a pencil so named.

"How about a pencil named Ticonderoga?" retorted Schermerhorn.

The name came to Schermerhorn's lips readily for the American Graphite Company which he headed owned a graphite mine and refinery in Ticonderoga, N.Y., and he was intimately acquainted with the history of the fort and its role in the American Revolution.

The name so pleased the stationers present, they offered orders for several thousand gross of Dixon Ticonderogas right on the spot.

Back in Jersey City, Schermerhorn had no difficulty selling the then president, George T. Smith, on the idea—particularly after he flashed his order pads.

In the beginning, Dixon hyphenated the name to make the spelling and pronunciation easier for the public. The hyphens were abandoned some years later when they had served their purpose.

In the beginning, too, the Dixon Ticonderoga pencil remained an advertising orphan. The pencil was not honored with an advertising program for quite some time. Somehow, however, unnurtured by advertising or promotion, Ticonderogas started to sell and rose in sales to the point where they could no longer be ignored.

Modestly the company started to advertise the pencil. The very first ad proclaimed, "Ti-con-der-oga is a Fine American Name for a Fine American Pencil. Its Rounded Edges are Pleasing to the Fingers."

The decision to link the pencil to the exploits of Ethan Allen and his Green Mountain Boys gave it the impetus which rocketed it to national fame.

The campaign was supervised by John Leckie, then the company's advertising manager, who retired several years ago.

Engaging an array of widely known American painters, he commissioned them to depict on canvas the heroic deeds of Ethan Allen and his "Boys." The stirring illustrations became the themes for a series of full page magazine ads. Among Dixon's artists were Jes W. Schlaikjer—whose works were to be found in many famous private collections as well as in such buildings as the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the War Department and State Department buildings in Washington—as well as painters Norman Rockell, Tom Lovell, Ken Riley, Clay Perry, F. C. Yon, and others.

Washington and Lincoln: Revered Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by my longtime friend and constituent, Harold J. Baily, as it appeared in the February 1963 issue of the Brooklyn Barrister, published by the Brooklyn Bar Association.

Mr. Baily, a trustee of the association, is also an active member of many of its committees.

The text of the article follows:

WASHINGTON AND LINCOLN: REVERED AMERICANS

(By Harold J. Baily)

George Washington, the Father of our Country, was hailed as first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen. Without Washington the colonies might not have won their independence from England. Without him on the bridge, our ship of state might not have weathered the storms of the first dangerous years. We owe him so much. Yet now we seem to take his greatness and his service to our country for granted. Three sentences from his Farewell Address of September 19, 1796, are pertinent today and show his farsighted statesmanship:

"The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

Washington could not foresee the Civil War and the rebellion which sought to rend our national Union. He could not imagine the covert and insidious efforts of Communists to interfere with our real independence, our tranquillity at home, our peace abroad, and our prosperity, safety, and liberty—yet how apt are his words.

Lincoln and the Civil War are now believed to be one and indivisible. Washington led in winning our independence and in establishing the unity of our Government. Lincoln led in preserving the Union. He stated that it was his duty "to maintain and preserve at once the Constitution and the integrity of the Federal Republic." In February—the month in which each was born—it is fitting that we should reflect upon what we owe to both Washington and Lincoln. Let us strive to keep their great deeds in remembrance by replacing them with new ones.

One hundred years ago effective on January 1, 1863, the Emancipation Proclamation made it clear to the South, to the North and to the world that the North was fighting against slavery and for freedom everywhere. The workingmen of Manchester, England, in a letter to Lincoln dated December 31, 1862, wrote: "* * * the vast progress you have made in the short space of 20 months fills us with hope that every stain on your freedom will shortly be removed, and that the erasure of that foul blot upon civilization and Christianity—chattel slavery—during your Presidency will cause the name of Abraham Lincoln to be honored and revered by posterity. We are certain that such a glorious consummation will cement Great Britain to the United States in close and enduring regards."

In his reply dated January 19, 1863, Lincoln said: "Under the circumstances, I cannot but regard your decisive utterance upon the question (of human slavery) as an instance of sublime Christian heroism which has not been surpassed in any age or in any country. It is indeed an energetic and reinspiring assurance of the inherent power of truth and of the ultimate and universal triumph of justice, humanity, and freedom."

The proclamation was presented by Lincoln as a war measure, yet he won undying glory throughout the world by "freeing the slaves." He insisted that the war was fought to save the Union. When he thought the right time had come he proclaimed emancipation to support his main objective. He told Seward and Welles in July 1862 that "* * * it is a military necessity absolutely essential for the salvation of the Union, that we must free the slaves or be ourselves subdued."

In the North the inspiration of the Emancipation Proclamation was tremendous. It rang throughout the land like a second "Battle Hymn of the Republic." Lincoln concluded his annual message to Congress on December 1, 1862, with these stirring words:

"We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it. We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give, and what we preserve. We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud and God must forever bless."

The work Lincoln began is not finished. One hundred years after the proclamation—loyal, living Americans have unfinished work to do. The Supreme Court can't do it alone. Lincoln's life inspires us to search without ceasing for ethical principles and day by day to live lives of integrity. Do you know any man who wishes to be segregated? Ponder Lincoln's words:

"I never knew a man who wished to be himself a slave. Consider if you know any good thing, that no man desires for himself."

If Americans pattern their lives after the characters, ideals, and principles of Washington and Lincoln the future of our country will be bright with hope. Then the history of the United States like the path of the just will be "as the shining light that shineth more and more into the perfect day."

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As an American citizen of Latvian descent I wish to express my gratitude for your understanding and conscientious work in Congress on behalf of former free and independent nations now slaving under Soviet domination.

As you seem to so ably understand, the United States will never win by appeasing communism. Therefore, it is difficult to understand how some of those who are in control oppose the resolution for forming a permanent occupied nations committee. Now, with so many difficulties besetting the Communists, would be the best moment to start an energetic offensive against them. Instead, it seems that our leaders are happy that Khrushchev is temporarily forced to wave the olive branch.

Of equal importance is the question of a double standard. If we are supporting the United Nations in its dissolution of western colonialism why do we not give at least equal effort to the liquidation of the very ruthless Russian colonialism and slavery? If the people of Africa are worthy of freedom then why not these former free and independent nations who have long histories of culture and civilization?

Again, I express my deepest thanks to you who are doing so much to bring life to American principles.

Very truly yours,

AUSTRA E. CURRENCE.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.—HAMTRAMCK AND NORTH EASTERN DETROIT BRANCH,

Detroit, Mich, March 6, 1963.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of our organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, we appeal to you to consider favorably the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) which calls for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Such a committee is vitally important both for our Government and for the American people at large. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many captive and enslaved nations eager to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism. As a nation we are not doing much to aid the imprisoned and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

The Committee on Captive Nations would become an important instrument in planning and carrying out the sound American policies in regard to the people's enslavement within the Soviet empire.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to favorably consider the support of the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Chairman.

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., January 10, 1963.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At the beginning of the 1st Session of the 88th Congress, I am privileged to convey to you the congratulations of the Assembly of Captive European Nations on your reelection to the U.S. House of Representatives. We wish you many years of fruitful service in the most respected legislative body in the world.

Ever since the establishment of the Assembly of Captive European Nations in 1954, to provide a voice for the freedom aspirations of the peoples of East-Central Europe, we have found in the U.S. Congress understanding and support for our cause, climaxed in the unanimously adopted Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959. This support, we believe, is nourished and sustained not only by the abiding allegiance of the American legislators to the principle of universal self-determination, but also by the realization than an East-Central Europe that resists the Communist system—and eventually throws it off—is of vital importance to the United States and to world peace and freedom.

This year more than ever before the eyes of the captive European peoples will be turned toward the United States and its legislative body. We trust that you will maintain your proven interest in the cause of the captive peoples and will propose and support measures designed to sustain their hope and to contribute to their liberation.

With heartfelt good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Dr. GEORGE M. DIMITROV,
Chairman.

MIAMI, FLA.,
January 17, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would like you to know that I am heartily in agreement with your House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. There is no doubt that such a committee would serve tremendously in letting those behind the Iron Curtain know that we have not forgotten them and are looking forward to the day when their shackles will be broken.

Since you have introduced your resolution another captive nation—Cuba—must now be included.

It is our sincere hope that you will be able to get this resolution passed during this session of Congress.

I might also add that in the past Captive Nations Week—except last year—the proclamation always condemned the Communists for their imperialistic and aggressive policies. Sad to say, however, that President Kennedy's proclamation issued last year was watered down so much that it had very little meaning. Let us hope that his proclamation this year will be much more forceful.

Respectfully yours,

C. R. MILTON.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Hartford, Conn., March 7, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Hartford, Conn. Branch we appeal to you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

If we intend to fight the Communist threat successfully then, I am certain you will agree, we shall explore the possibility of using the captive nations problem to their and our own advantage. The spirit of resistance of the captive nations is becoming increasingly important deterrent to the Soviet aggressive moves; and the collaboration of the captive nations with the free world depends on our attitude toward the subjugated nations in the U.S.S.R.

A committee on the captive nations in the House of Representatives would serve as a reservoir of true and unbiased information on various captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, which information will be available to the U.S. Government.

We seem to be condemning colonialism on the one hand, and condoning it on the other, while Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia.

We would be grateful to you if you would give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution presently in your Rules Committee.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN BOYCHUK,
President.

Democracy and the Emerging Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was highly pleased to see such a difficult subject as "Democracy and the Emerging Nations" explained well in a recent analytical and responsible speech. This was done by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs at the 13th Annual North Carolina Conference on World Affairs, on March 14.

The remarks follow:

DEMOCRACY AND THE EMERGING NATIONS

Discussion of the kind of democracy practiced by African governments and the State Department's reaction to it was touched off by a reporter's question to me in the Congo some 3 weeks ago. I was asked to comment on the prevalence of one-party governments in Africa. I answered by saying that naturally we Americans preferred a two-party system and observed that scholars had taken some note of the growing African practice. Since that time, the matter has tended to be no longer academic. Here, however, in this university atmosphere, I would like to put down a few thoughts on the subject without in any way attempting to be categorical or definitive on a subject which could well fill a Ph. D. thesis, and on which there can be shades of emphasis.

To begin with, I believe we all would agree that democracy revolves around certain philosophical concepts relating to government by the consent of the governed and human dignity. But we would find it more difficult to be absolutely categorical on precisely what forms have to be included or excluded to keep within a general definition of democracy. For example, we all think of ancient Athens as a glorious exemplar of democracy, but we would have considerable difficulty today in defining as democratic a system based on a salve economy.

But to be more modern, all over this country the debate goes on about whether each man's vote should be exactly equal to every other man's vote; or whether a system is still democratic where in one State a State senator represents about 6 million people and another senator represents only some tens of thousands; or where in another State one party often gets less than a majority of the popular legislative vote but nonetheless has a substantial majority of the representation in the legislature.

Of course, some of our States virtually have one-party systems, too. These are generally characterized by vigorous internal factions, which defenders of the one-party system can quite properly say represents real democratic expression. This situation, while not ideal, may also be a significant test of African one-party systems.

DEMOCRACY IS MANY FACETED

Before looking directly at African experience, I feel it is wise to recognize that democracy is many faceted—involving not only political but also economic, social and moral values. Superficially, we often think of democracy in terms of constitutions and forms of government almost exclusively. In the underdeveloped parts of the world, however, I am confident they think more emphatically in terms of achieving human dignity, freedom and an opportunity to enjoy a decent living—not unlike the unalienable rights of our Declaration of Independence: "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Prof. T. V. Smith in "The Democratic Way of Life" catches this idea well, where he says:

"Democracy is more than a form of government. It is also a way of life, variegated and full of growth. Like every manifestation of vitality, democracy is many-dimensional. Its leeways are legion."

At the beginning of this discussion, let me say that I cannot agree with all practices carried on in the name of democracy in Africa, just as many Africans would take vigorous exception to certain aspects of American society. But many different practices do exist, some of which have a special validity in the African context and others which resemble transitional steps that have characterized other evolving societies. I believe it is important to our understanding of Africa to know what Africans consider elements of democratic societies—always keeping in mind that there is yet no perfect democratic model. African mores are part of the context within which our African policy must be made and carried out. And although we may disagree with some African practices, we can ignore them only at the risk of failing to comprehend some of the major forces at work on that continent today.

American democracy evolved from the dual tradition of crown and town meeting. In Africa, the concept of democracy also started from a dual tradition. Some African kingdoms had privileged castes which kept the marjority in feudal detention. But other African societies existed for centuries in tribal structures that were in many ways as democratic at the grass roots level as American town meetings. African societies also experienced colonial systems which until shortly before independence were unrepresentative of the democratic ideals expressed by the European mother countries. In view of these mixed antecedents, it is not surprising that contemporary democracy in Africa has specific characteristics related to both pre-colonial and colonial African history.

AFRICAN OF, BY, FOR THE PEOPLE

Broadly speaking, the philosophical objectives most African leaders consider essential to the development of democracy in Africa are summarized in Lincoln's phrase "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

In the African context, "of the people" means transfer of power from alien suzerain-

ty to indigenous rule, or decolonization; "by the people" means government with the consent of the governed—one man, one vote; "for the people" means a government concerned with people having a decent living.

To these objectives must be added a word on the means most Africans feel feasible to achieve their goals—centralization of power to meet the tasks of building new nations. In their desire to attain their philosophical objectives, they do not always insist on, nor do they always deny, certain rights and checks and balances that we consider fundamental to democracy—freedom of speech and press, free enterprise, free labor, freedom from government control. Sometimes all or some of these are present; sometimes they are not. Just like other people, they sometimes recognize these values but fail to fully achieve them in practice. This is because many Africans believe the developmental problems faced by their new nations are so vast and urgent that these desirable Western values must wait until they have achieved their immediate goals of freedom and material progress. This is not wholly unlike the tendency in Western democracies to curtail certain rights during national or local emergencies.

While we cannot agree that basic freedoms need to be delayed and while we are unhappy when they are, we can be understanding if complete perfection is not immediately achieved. This was made clear by President Kennedy in his second state of the Union message, when he said: "Our basic goal remains the same: a peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system, so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others. Some may choose forms and ways we would not choose for ourselves, but it is not for us that they are choosing."

Of the three philosophical objectives I have indicated that Africans consider essential to the growth of democracy, there is the greatest consensus among African leaders on the first—the transfer of power from alien suzerainty to indigenous rule. All Africans believe the removal of colonial servitude is the beginning of democracy. Although we may feel that Africa's drive toward independence is progressing swiftly—29 new nations in the past dozen years—most African leaders are impatient because many Africans have not yet attained self-determination.

Most of the transition from European to African rule has successfully taken place under relatively peaceful conditions. This was not true in Algeria, and the Congo erupted violently after independence occurred. On the whole, transition to independence has been a tribute to African and European statesmanship alike, and throughout much of the continent cordial African-European relations have been established. There is definitely a place for persons of European origin as equal citizens in the new Africa.

Such relations are beneficial for the timely success of newly achieved independence, and African leaders realize they must rely not only on self-help but on help from external sources. Nevertheless they wish to avoid charges of neocolonialism arising from overly close or exclusive associations with former metropoles, and they feel impelled to seek associations with other industrialized nations. This generally means associations with the United States or the Communist bloc, and it is mutually preferable that such relations be with us. In all of these associations, however, Africans tread warily, because to them democracy means self-rule, and they want no relationships that threaten exercise of their sovereign choice.

GOVERNMENT WITH CONSENT IS GOAL

The second African philosophical objective is government with the consent of the people. This goal is easy for us to understand. In our own Constitution for example, power flows from "We the People of the United States," and government is merely an instrument to express the people's will. We believe with Lincoln that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent."

This philosophy is widespread in Africa, as the British authority, Thomas Hodgkin, points out, most African political parties seek to establish political institutions that enable the people to become, effectively, the ruling class. These institutions, he says, include: "government responsible to a popularly elected assembly; universal adult suffrage, with no discrimination on grounds of race, religion, sex, or educational level, and no special separate or weighted representation for minorities, communities, or interests; free elections."

Scrupulous attention to popular sovereignty is found throughout African political writing. A good example is this statement by President Julius Nyerere of Tanganyika:

"In my opinion, the two basic essentials to democracy are freedom of the individual and insurance that the government of a country is freely chosen by the people."

Democracy in Africa also means raising living standards and standards of education rapidly—the third African philosophical objective in democratic development. Africans are anxious to overcome their age-old enemies—poverty, illiteracy, disease, malnutrition—and unless this is accomplished rapidly, democracy will be a hollow theory to them.

In Africa, annual income is on the order of $100 per person compared to our $2,500, and many Africans have no money income at all. Only about 10 percent of the people have achieved literacy, and life expectancy is low throughout much of the continent. Although Africa has more arable land than we do, it produces only one-twentieth of the world's agricultural commodities compared to our one-sixth.

To meet the problems posed by low productivity, little capital, a lack of trained manpower and a shortage of entrepreneurs, many African governments feel they must turn to some form of state operation for swift economic and social advances. They feel full-blown capitalism is too complex a system for underdeveloped societies and believe state control of resources is necessary for progress.

AFRICAN SOCIALISM AND FREE ENTERPRISE

So-called African socialism, however, is as far removed from Marxian socialism as the American free enterprise system is from the Marxian concept of capitalism. It has no industrial proletariat upon which to build; it embraces all religions without causing conflicting loyalties; and it is cautious in its response to Communist overtures. As Senegal's President Senghor puts it:

"We are not Marxists * * * we are Socialists * * *. We stand for a middle course, for a democratic socialism which goes so far as to integrate spiritual values."

The emphasis on so-called socialism in African development has by no means ruled out interest in a domestic or foreign private sector. Indeed, such interest appears to be general and growing. Even in countries which most strongly profess Socialist beliefs, private investment is not only welcomed but eagerly sought. For example, last month in a speech in which he encouraged the flow of investment into Ghana, President Nkrumah said:

"Our ideas of socialism can coexist with private enterprises. I also believe that private capital and private investment capital, in particular, has a recognized and legitimate part to play in Ghana's economic development. We are consistent in these ideas. I have never made any secret of my faith in Socialist principles, but I have always tried to make it quite clear that Ghana's socialism is not incompatible with the existence and growth of a vigorous private sector in the economy."

While we can find much to support in the philosophical objectives most Africans hold, we are less happy about what many of them often consider an emergency necessity for national development—strong centralization of power. This reasoning leads them to the conclusion that at present democratic results are more important than democratic forms. In a slight majority of new African nations this means one-party government, although these systems are far from the monolithic structures of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. They allow considerable latitude for dissent and internal self-expression.

A strong case for one-party rule has been made by many articulate African spokesmen who assert that: The number of experienced leaders is too small to be divided; mature and loyal opposition is rare in a new state; they have classless societies, and the only genuine opposition to African nationalist parties came from the former metropoles or extremists; this is their time of emergency, and unity is essential to achieve national goals; they need strong central leadership to counter such divisive forces as tribalism; their present leaders are revolutionary heroes and have no mass opposition; the democratic processes are fulfilled by permitting full expression of opposing viewpoints in party councils.

President Touré, of Guinea, puts it this way:

"The concerns of the state of Guinea are the concerns of all the citizens of Guinea. The program of the party is discussed democratically. As long as a decision has not been taken, each one is free to say what he thinks or wishes. But when, after a long discussion in the Congress or Assembly, the decisions have been taken by a unanimous vote or by a majority, the workers and the leaders are required to apply them faithfully."

That there is some free discussion within party structures is borne out by Prof. Immanuel Wallerstein, of Columbia, who writes:

"There is no single party structure in African independent states where the observer cannot identify factions and tendencies which argue with each other to some extent over issues."

In some African states, moreover, there is strong opposition to the one-party concept from equally articulate Africans. Dr. Azikiwe, the Governor General of the Federation of Nigeria, which has a multiparty government, says:

"Unless an opposition exists—as a 'shadow cabinet' capable of replacing the Government, democracy becomes a sham."

And Prime Minister Obote of Uganda, who sees the need for a responsible opposition, has remarked:

"We have a vigorous and healthy people composed of tribes whose diversity, far from being a drawback, does constitute a wealth of cultural heritage and will constitute a source of great strength."

UNITED STATES ONCE HAD ONE-PARTY SYSTEM

For my own part, I believe a multiparty system is the best system for democratic government, but I recognize that we had only one party for the first 8 years of our national life, and even as late as 1820 James Monroe was elected President without any opposition. The absence of opposition is not unusual in countries new to independence.

While we hope the one-party system in Africa will be a short-term, transitional arrangement, the principal point of our concern at the moment is whether these governments remain free and independent and give the people genuine choice and an opportunity for democratic expression.

From this discussion today, I think what emerges is the fact that Africa is independently developing a way of life of its own. In many respects they seek the same objectives we do—sometimes in the same way we do, sometimes in different ways. Often they assign different absolute or time priorities to the attainment of these objectives. They have made real progress, but they have not achieved perfection any more than any other part of the world has. So we must continue to make a real effort to see Africa through African eyes, as well as our own, if we intend to conduct a successful African policy. And we must seek the substance and not be blinded by the form. Only in this manner can we possibly hope to understand the phenomenon of African nationalism and come to grips with the realities of that continent for our mutual benefit.

This does not mean, of course, that we must accept the unfavorable aspects of African Government as desirable, inevitable or eternal. There are a number of practices, some of them adapted from former colonial administrations, that we consider undemocratic. Apartheid, for example, quickly springs to mind. But there are others, preventive detention, summary deportation, house arrest, the outlawing of political parties, violation of the principle of political asylum, confiscation of foreign publications, restrictions on press freedom and the right to assemble, and the practice of restricting persons to their home villages.

Although we believe these practices retard the growth of democracy, many African leaders do not. In fact, many of them believe that these devices are essential at this time to permit the development of democratic institutions in the future. Although we can understand the realities that guide such thinking, we also feel we should work toward what have come to be considered indisputable democratic values, and whenever the opportunity presents itself, therefore, we suggest and try to help achieve the growth of these values.

Finally, what do I think of the chances for continuing democratic development in Africa? I would say that the chances are good, as long as we think of basic values and not simply rigid forms. After all, our Republic, as well as Britain, Switzerland, and Athens do not all fit into the same mold, but who will say that democracy has not breathed freely in all these forms?

As in many other parts of the world, many democratic values have not yet been attained. But, on balance, I believe Africa's future is hopeful, and I would like to conclude with a statement by Tanganyika's President Nyerere which expresses this hope compellingly:

"To those who wonder if democracy can survive in Africa, my own answer, then, would be that, far from its being an alien idea, democracy has long been familiar to the African. There is nothing in our traditional attitude toward discussion and our current dedication to human rights to justify the claim that democracy is in danger in Africa. I see exactly the opposite: The principles of our nationalist struggles for human dignity, augmented by our traditional attitude toward discussion, should augur well for democracy in Africa."

Independence Day of Tunisia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, the Republic of Tunisia celebrated the seventh anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba; and His Excellency, the Tunisian Ambassador to the United States, Habib Bourguiba, Jr.

The granting of complete independence by the French on March 20, 1956, was but an intermediate step in the political growth of the Tunisian state. Since 1881 when they had been forced to live under a French protectorate, Tunisians had gradually and steadfastly fought for their sovereign rights and liberty. With the formation of national parties in the 1920's, the political energy of the people became canalized and the national movement was accelerated. French rule was first challenged actively during the month of April 1938, when serious clashes occurred between French soldiers and the nationalist-led Tunisian populace. These riots caused the French to clamp down strongly on any political activity.

It was not until June 3, 1955, that the French authorities, pressured by internal disorders and by the nations of the world through the United Nations, bowed to the inevitable and ceded their powers of internal rule to the Tunisians, keeping only foreign affairs and defense matters under their control. A year of peaceful negotiations led finally to complete sovereignty for the Tunisian state.

The first obstacle which the Neo-Destour Party, the major political organization in Tunisia, had to overcome was an archaic government, both foreign and obsolete, headed by an unpopular hereditary ruler, the Bey. This party, guided by the competent Habib Bourguiba, was able, in 1 year, not only to depose the Bey and establish a republic, but also to promulgate a constitution whereby the rights of the people, freedom of religion, and equality of all citizens are guaranteed. This was the culmination of political growth and freedom for which the Tunisians had long hoped and fought.

The new Republic was immediately beset with many serious problems which had to be met and overcome; chief among them were exploitation of natural resources, insufficient housing, and unemployment. Because of political cohesion through the Neo-Destour Party, the Government made rapid gains. Children's villages were established to take care of the orphans and those small children who were forced to work for a living. Foreign investments, so important for the growth of a country, were guaranteed by public law. Attention was focused on mineral development and water resources—a 35,000 acre tract of irrigated land was opened for cultivation. And recently construction was begun on an oil refinery to supply fuel for local consumption, thus eliminating costly fuel imports.

Since our troops first fought to liberate Tunisia from the Axis Powers, the United States has proved itself to be a generous friend. Through foreign aid, we are helping the Government build electric power stations, enlarge port facilities, and extend airports to accommodate jet service for tourists who wish to see famous Roman and Carthaginian antiquities. When Mr. Bourguiba visited Washington in May 1961, the President promised further assistance for more noteworthy and necessary development projects. As one writer commented:

> This decision by the American Government to make of Tunisia a pilot project for long-term investment came as a clear recognition of the commendable progress the country (Tunisia) has made in every respect.
>
> (Lorna Hahn, "Tunisia: Pragmatism and Progress," the Middle East Journal, winter 1962, p. 28.)

Thus it is with pride that we in the United States salute our sister Republic, Tunisia, on its Independence Day anniversary and wish the people of the country continued success.

University of Alabama Senior Says "Tide Followed Usual Pattern, Prepping for Georgia"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the few days since the Saturday Evening Post published its libelous and defaming article called "The Story of a College Football Fix" in its March 23, 1963, issue, it has become apparent that the story is false generally as well as in many particulars. Today, March 21, 1963, I discussed this story with its damaging charges against Paul Bryant of the University of Alabama on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I believe that the following article, which appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald, March 18, 1963, and is an interview with University of Alabama senior, Jimmy Sharpe of Montgomery, sheds additional light on the story.

PREPPING FOR GEORGIA—"TIDE FOLLOWED USUAL PATTERN"

(By Charlie Land)

TUSCALOOSA, ALA.—"There wasn't anything unusual." That's the way Jimmy Sharpe, 22, of Montgomery, Ala., a senior starting guard on Alabama's football team last season, recalled preparation for the Crimson Tide's 1962 season opener against Georgia in Birmingham.

Alabama won, 35 to 0, following a 32 to 6 victory the previous season.

An article in the March 23 edition of the Saturday Evening Post will allege that the Alabama victory was aided by information given to Alabama Coach Paul Bryant by then Georgia Athletic Director Wally Butts.

Both men, long ranked among the best coaches in football, have emphatically denied the charges contained in the article.

Sharpe, a starter for the past two seasons, said Saturday that Tide coaches had followed normal procedures for the game.

Such preparation, in the Bryant method, involves hundreds of man-hours of scouting, studying and planning, he said.

"We worked harder than usual those first 2 or 3 weeks to get down our game plans," said Sharpe.

"But all our game plans and preparations were based on what they had done in their

spring game, plus all the games of the previous season.

"The coach who scouts the team will take all the films and look them over in the summer. He'll break them down into situations, offenses and so on, and that's what we base our plans on.

"After breaking it down, the coaches try to pick out their most vulnerable spots and then we work on the things we think would be best to use against them.

"We actually did more conditioning the week before the Georgia game than we would usually do, but I think that's because we had so many boys hurt," Sharpe continued.

"I remember clearly that some of our coaches were real concerned about the game just before the game.

"I'm sure they thought we could win, but I think they were afraid we might not be up for the game.

"We were up for that one, I guess, about as well as for any game up to the Auburn game," said Sharpe.

"As far as the game itself was concerned, Georgia was a real hard-hitting outfit. I thought the difference was that they weren't prepared for Joe Namath, Alabama's sophomore quarterback, and his potential, the short passes and accuracy, which wasn't shown before the game.

"Georgia had some good players hurt, too, which a lot of people seem to have forgotten. Len Hauss, Georgia's ace linebacker, was hurt, a couple of others were hurt and Larry Rakestraw, the Bulldog quarterback, had been hurt," said Sharpe.

"They didn't do anything different from the year before, either.

"I noticed that some of them were quoted in the article as saying that we kept calling their plays.

"That isn't unusual, either. The same thing happens to us a lot of times. People often have similar plays and numbering systems, and that might run all the way from high school to pro ball.

"I know that when we came out in our spread formation against Georgia Tech, they were calling our formation with the same numbers we used.

"And when we played Mississippi State, they called our formation and play as we broke huddle. I'd say they knew it because of something they'd picked up by scouting us or looking at some of our films."

Brazil Infiltrated—Target: Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., has been noted for its eloquent and hard-hitting editorial comments on important issues of the day. I have been impressed with an editorial in the March 16, 1963, issue of the Nashville Banner entitled "Brazil Infiltrated—Target: Latin America." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAZIL INFILTRATED—TARGET: LATIN AMERICA

Official U.S. (State Department) acknowledgement that, yes, Communists have infiltrated the Government of Brazil, was a long time in coming. How slowly it dawned as a fact is a commentary on blind spots at the policymaking level.

If President Kennedy and his advisers are surprised at the discovery, they should not have been. Others have known it, as a grim reminder of the spreading Red contagion, and have warned of the necessity of facing it realistically—not sweeping it under the policy rug with gestures of accommodation, in Brazil or elsewhere. Possibly these authorities have been brushing up on their reading.

Recently Banner Columnist Henry J. Taylor wrote that within a year the big news in the Western Hemisphere no longer will be Cuba, but the effective takeover of that South American giant, Brazil.

Supporting his thesis, he wrote:

Rio-based Soviets are advising Brazil President Joao Goulart.

The military is under Red domination.

Organized labor is in the Red vise.

The free press is being threatened.

Communists hold 78 top Government posts.

Information reaching the Banner in the wake of Mr. Taylor's report paints an even bleaker picture in Brazil and Latin America in general. Unfortunately, the situation is even worse than Mr. Taylor described it.

The lurid developments in Brazil, Cuba, and other Latin American countries are the fruition of plans laid years ago. Experts in the field of espionage, infiltration, and sabotage, all trained in Soviet Russia, first established a branch college in Mexico.

Those trained for the seizures of tomorrow in this hemisphere had as classmates the very Chinese who ousted the Chiang Kai-shek government following World War II. This is proof enough that these students of Communist action were apt pupils.

Since it has been further established that 85 similar schools, now known as friendship centers, exist in Latin America to recruit and train subversives and propagandists for Castro and international communism.

The objectives of this massive conspiracy were—and are:

1. To destroy inter-American cohesion.

2. To weaken the United States from a military point of view in time of war by denying it raw materials and other goods necessary for successful prosecution of a war.

3. To break the economic power of the various countries through confiscation of British- and American-owned companies and the destruction of the buying power of currencies.

4. To dispossess the Christian church and destroy its power.

5. To reestablish political organization according to Soviet totalitarian patterns.

International communism long has had an eye both on Brazil and oil-rich Venezuela. Though its timetable may be slightly out of kilter, there is a concerted move to get back on schedule. And as Mr. Taylor prophesies, Brazil very well may be the next to fall wholly into the Red pit.

The Banner's knowledgeable informant states with bluntness that the Red tide is rolling.

Obviously, if it is to be stopped, the United States must do it. If we fail through unwillingness to take action, the hemisphere would be further endangered, and the present Cuba situation would be pale in comparison.

Those who have a broad view of communism's grand strategy see Cuba as only the opening volley in the barrage to come.

Singing Boys From Poland Charm Two Audiences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Poznan Choir, of Poland, consisting of 75 boys and men, recently began a tour of the United States which includes many of our larger cities.

While performing in the Nation's Capital, the choir also had an opportunity to sing for President Kennedy on the White House lawn outside of his office. The President told the choir he was delighted that their songs going back 500 years reflect "all the influences which have played such a powerful part in making the character of the Polish people." He added that they would find during their tour of this country that the American people have the greatest admiration for the people of Poland, and that "you have come to a free country."

This past weekend, my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., was privileged to hear this outstanding choir at the Kleinhans Music Hall. It was my pleasure to be in the audience that was charmed by their performance.

I believe the following accounts which appeared in our local newspapers—the Buffalo Evening News and the Buffalo Courier-Express, respectively—best express their fine renditions of song and rhythm:

SINGING BOYS FROM POLAND CHARM TWO AUDIENCES

(By John Dwyer)

The 40 boys in the 75-member Poznan Choir of Poland captured the audience first, on sight alone, Saturday evening in Kleinhans Music Hall. Soon afterward, the sound of singing as a fine art began to take full effect.

Joined by 35 adults and directed by Stefan Stuligrosz, the young signers had appeared in a matinee program before an audience of 900.

The evening concert attracted 2,100. Put together, the attendances would have made exactly one full house, for the singers on their first American tour under auspices of international impresario S. Hurok.

Charmingly attired in beige jackets and formal fronts, short pants, and long white socks, changing to wine-colored etons for the second half, the young choristers sang like 20-year veterans of the world-touring circuit.

The Poznan choral tradition is five centuries old, starting in an ancient church in northwestern Poland, revived during and after World War II by Dr. Stuligrosz and a late predecessor.

They sang sacred works of the 16th century, Italian and Polish, the Ave Verum of Mozart, Brahms lieder, works of American composers Niles and Thompson, and a large group of Polish art and folksongs.

In an amazingly pliant but dynamic way, they were utterly in the director's hands. His least shading, rubato, or emphasis was felt instantly in the grooved response.

The trebles and altos matched difficult countervoicing and long, balanced phrases with the adult ensemble in a remarkable range of styles. Much of the program, wisely enough, was unaccompanied, revealing the clarity and blend, the intense training of this fine chorus.

Paderewski, Moniuszko, Szymanoski, and Chopin were among the composers in the Polish grouping, with some delightful solos here and in other sections.

The youngsters, their older colleagues, and director were applauded most enthusiastically. There was a consistent and high level of musicianship in the entire presentation.

POZNAN CHOIR GIVES SUPERB PERFORMANCE

(By Kenneth Gill)

Just as the string quartet is the zenith of instrumentalists, so is the male choir the fulfillment of the choral director. Such an achievement as the Poznan Choir must be the envy of the vocal leaders.

Saturday afternoon and evening this touring Polish unit appeared in Kleinhans Music Hall, winning the hearts of 1,000 at the matinee and 2,200 at night with its superb singing.

Fifty boys and twenty-five men comprised this choir that points with pride to the 15th century for its origin and to having survived two World Wars. It also looked with as much pride at its director, Stefan Stuligrosz.

Had not the director had this total respect there would have been little point in attempting such a schedule as liturgical music of Di Lasso, Palestrina, and Mozart, the operatic of Moniuszko or the complexities of Randall Thompson.

All these the Poznan singers handled with wonderful vocalizing and effects that were suggested only by a singing leader. This same leader was so dynamic that he often begged for oversinging that distorted the young soprano voices. But there was integrity and sensitivity in his readings and his choristers never let him down.

Particularly beautiful was the Passion anthem of contemporary Deakbardos when each of the seven words of the Crucifixion had its dramatic overlay. Equally lovely in secular meaning were the Polish folksongs and rhythms where the boys were noticeably more comfortable verbally.

There was a clever touch of staging as the white formal jackets with black shawl collars of the boys were changed for scarlet formal jackets during the intermission.

Director Stuligrosz could be exceptionally proud of his orchestra of male voices. And they could be just as proud of him.

Following their afternoon performance, a reception was held for the choir at the Stanislaus Parish Hall in Buffalo, which was hosted by Mr. and Mrs. Edward Posluszny who have been very active in local Polish cultural affairs.

Among those who extended an extra word of welcome to the members of this singing group were: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter J. Adamski, Buffalo Diocese; Mr. Stan Jasinski, prominent Buffalo radio announcer; Mr. Henry Osinski, president of the Polish Central Organizations; and Mr. Francis Martin, president of the local Nest, Polish Falcons.

Mr. Speaker, I laud the efforts that are made by our Government which result in such splendid cultural exchanges with other countries, particularly those countries that are harnessed with the yoke of communism or its counterparts. Likewise, I am most zealous for our country to send outstanding groups overseas which can achieve so much in the way of friendship and mutual understanding.

In Buffalo, we have a Chopin Singing Society, consisting of 165 voices—all Polish-Americans, which has been invited to perform in Poland. The good will and value that can be derived from such a tour is inestimable, and it is my every hope that our State Department will approve the society's request for assistance in this endeavor.

Economic Growth Must Be Measured in Sound Currency and a Free Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following pertinent editorial from the Chicago Tribune of March 20, 1963, which points out that President Kennedy is missing the point in his attempt to sell his tax program as an incentive for economic growth.

The editorial follows:

TAX CUTS AND GROWTH

Henry Hazlitt and Raymond Moley, sensible writers for the magazine Newsweek, have some interesting observations to offer on Mr. Kennedy's defense of his tax cut and scheme of tax reform before the American Bankers Association.

Mr. Kennedy told the bankers, "This program will, in a short time, result in increased tax revenues, as did the 1954 tax cut, and a substantial portion of that increase will be used each year to reduce the deficit until the budget is once again balanced."

The President informed the same audience that it was his object to push the economy to a 4 percent annual rate of growth instead of 3 percent. In 10 years, he thought, this increased growth would add $400 billion to the annual output of goods and services, which now is calculated at $554 billion.

Mr. Hazlitt asks, "But why just 4 percent? Why not 5 percent or 6 percent, which would mean many hundreds of billions more in goods and services?"

It could easily be done, Hazlitt says, for output of goods and services (what is called "the gross national product") is a highly elastic measuring stick. The gross national product can be pushed up to any desired amount simply by inflating the currency. There wouldn't be any increase in real wealth, and there might even be a reduction, but the product would be measured in a greater number of dollars.

Again, as Government spending is counted as part of gross national product, the bigger the budget, the bigger the apparent gross national product, which seems to be part of the Kennedy theory.

But, Hazlitt inquires, why a fixed rate of growth at all, and what does it really signify? For example, the output of television sets increased 2,757 percent between 1946 and 1947, 387 percent between 1947 and 1949, 211 percent between 1948 and 1949, and 146 percent between 1949 and 1950, after which growth stopped entirely. Why? Because the market by then was nearing saturation. And so what? The United States has more and better television sets than any country in the world.

So, says Hazlitt, the administration should stop worrying about growth and concentrate on its real job of protecting life and property. It should also stop killing incentives. It can best promote growth by preserving a sound currency, by insuring free and fluid markets in goods and labor, and by encouraging saving and investment.

Mr. Moley dissects the Kennedy argument from another angle. He says there is no parallel between the tax cut of 1954 and that proposed for 1963. In early 1954 the country was in recession. What Mr. Kennedy talks about now is a recession around the corner which hasn't happened.

The 1954 tax cut was accompanied by a drastic cut in Government expenditures. Spending in the fiscal year 1953 was $74.2 billion. In 1954, the first full Eisenhower fiscal year, spending dropped to $67.7 billion, and in the next year to $64.5 billion.

By midyear in 1954 the recession was on the wane. Recovery was not prompted by the tax cut, which was not effective until mid-August. The President's economic report of 1955 attributed recovery in part to the Government's having deliberately pursued monetary, tax, and expenditure policies that inspired confidence on the part of the people.

As Mr. Moley says, the key word is confidence. That was promoted by fiscal responsibility on the part of the Government, which reduced expenditures by almost $10 billion in 2 years. Mr. Kennedy, on the contrary, has increased them $18 billion in 3 years and is proposing a tax cut on top of a planned deficit of almost $12 billion. There is all the difference in the world between the tax cut of 1954 and the one he is pushing now, especially as regards the element of confidence.

Nora Co-Op News Scores Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we see an honest satirical statement that strips away all the sham and pretense and gets to the very core of the particular problem. This morning I received such a statement and it was as refreshing as a warm ray of sunshine.

The Nora News, printed by the Northern Rio Arriba Electric Cooperative in Chama, N. Mex., recently contained an article on the way that cooperative's activities would have to take on a new look to be consistent with the New Frontier.

The statement may have been written by Les Dumond, manager of the Nora cooperative. Mr. Dumond seems to be generally recognized as being the sort of old-fashioned, rugged individualist who made this Nation what it is through their own iniative and activities, rather than depending upon a federalistic government to do it for them.

I think everyone of my colleagues should read this article and enjoy it as I have. For this reason, under unanimous consent, I insert the article as a part of my remarks at this point:

NORA CO-OP NEWS SCORES AGAIN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Since Nora could not afford her own full-time Harvard professor, she sent her ace reporter to Boston and Wash-

ington to learn the latest in business planning and financing. Here is the story after his return.)

(By Snoopin' Sam)

After 3 weeks of intensive study in the Harvard Graduate School of Business, and in Washington, D.C., with a protege of Dr. Heller, it was very evident that Nora Co-op must make a complete turnaround immediately if she is to get in tune with 1963.

Your reporter made this trip with definite instructions to (1) get the experts to criticize Nora's present business policies, and (2) get a detailed plan drawn up to give the "New Look" to Nora's operation.

EXPERTS HIGHLY CRITICAL

For the sake of brevity, your reporter lists below Nora's present policies and the comments made by the New Frontier critics:

1. Now: Nora gears expenditures to a level 10 percent below her expected income.

New: The level of income should not be a factor in planning expenditures. Budget should include all desirable services to the area. If current income cannot support such a budget, the services must be provided nevertheless, with the loss passed on to future generations.

2. Now: The co-op has reduced total debt each year, when possible even in excess of the original plan.

New: An utterly disgusting idea. A growing business can support increased debt each year. A refusal to increase debt to the limit will thwart growth and brands the manager as "unpragmatic."

3. Now: Nora puts forth every effort to save the members' money, and to pass such savings back to the owners.

New: Miserliness with money ties your economy in a hard knot. Only increased spending can improve business. "Spend moah to save moah." Put every dollar you own or can borrow in circulation. It's like casting your bread upon the water.

HIGH RATES SLOW DOWN ECONOMY

4. Now: As soon as margin increases sufficiently, electricity rates to members are reduced, and cash refunds of members' capital are made.

New: You have been putting the cart before the horse. The rate reductions should come first. To cure your sluggish economy and your underemployment, cut the rates immediately. The question is not whether you will have a surplus or a deficit, but whether the deficit will increase your growth rate. Cut your rates, leave more money in your members' pockets. The more rapid growth will increase sales so much by 1970 that you will have an automatic surplus. (No one has ever proved that this is true, but Harvard research has proved that it must be.)

5. Now: As income permits, Nora has been happy to finance other public services to its members. Examples: Nora News and Nora Library.

New: Again, your approach is backward. The people of Nora country should be given all that they want immediately. If they are bashful about asking for extra services, sell them on wanting things they haven't yet thought of.

6. Now: Nora believes a small crew of hard-working top hands, well paid, makes for efficiency and thrifty operation.

New: Hard work and thrift went out of style 30 years ago. Who cares about efficiency? Hire more people, reduce the hours, increase the wages, promote more featherbedding. Put more money in circulation. If you have any trouble, call on the Teamsters, Longshoremen, New York Electrical Workers, or WAYNE MORSE.

7. Now: Nora believes in keeping her members completely and truthfully informed about their business through Nora News.

New: The use of Nora News is fine, but make it strictly a propaganda weapon. Since the retention of power depends upon votes at the annual meeting, you must follow the example of the politicians. Tell your people what they want to hear, promise them everything, make them believe you'll get 'em something for nothing. Avoid the truth like the plague.

After receiving this assistance from the government planners, it was next necessary to draw up a completely new blueprint for Nora's 1963 operation.

Essentially the principles to be applied were balanced budget and pay as you go are the bunk; increase debt each year; increase purchasing power by promoting increased wages without consideration to increased productivity (but don't let prices rise to cover increased costs); "and pep up the economy by charging less for your services."

THE NEW LOOK

Conscientious application of these principles to Nora's problems developed the following guidelines for Nora's future operations:

1. Increase services: To what Nora now does for her members, install new appliances on 20-year, 2-percent interest payment plans, free light bulbs, free electricity to all members over 65 and all members on welfare, give free appliance servicing. (This should eat up half the present margin.)

2. Hire more help: Hire at least four more employees, increase all wages 10 percent, reduce all work weeks to 40 hours or less, double the length of all coffee breaks, spread the work. This should increase yearly costs at least $20,000.

3. Build that new building: Feed the ego of the local residents and the hired hands. (Perhaps part of the cost could be included in accelerated public works appropriation.) Increased cost to the co-op might not be over $10,000 to $15,000 per year.

4. Foreign aid: Organize an effective program. Develop a youth corps—train them in modern procedures—send them to Jemez to help stretch the co-op to Arizona and Colorado—to Lovington to help build more publicity stunts like 5 millionth consumer—and to Public Service Co. to teach them how to absorb more State and Federal taxes. (All these organizations are slipping—they're badly underdeveloped.)

5. Above changes will bring expenses 10 percent about revenues. But the economy is sluggish. So—cut rates 10 percent. Put more money in circulation. Buy votes before next election.

NOW YOU'RE READY TO COOK

6. We now have estimated revenues of $180,000—estimated expenses of $220,000. This is about right. "Spend moah to save moah."

7. This modest deficit of $40,000 per year can be absorbed out of accumulated reserves for 4 years. But you must get ready for the day when your gold reserve has been squandered. So:

8. Use Nora News to fullest extent possible to sell members on necessity of operating at a deficit to protect against private utility encroachment, which, according to our national spokesmen is "more dangerous than communism." Sell this point hard. Paint it red. And at the same time, sell members on value of additional investment in this now deficit-ridden business. Sell it as the patriotic thing to do. Paint it red, white, and blue.

9. Work members up emotionally to the point that by 1965 they'll be willing to buy 4-percent Nora Co-op bonds to finance the deficit. (After all, there's nothing wrong with a big debt if you owe it to your own people.) Then, with good fortune by 1970:

10. The increased number of Nora bonds in circulation will result in decreased value of at least 25 percent, and then;

11. You'll be in tune with the times, Nora. You'll be in tune with the times. (Perhaps by the turn of the century you can make Nora's promises to pay utterly worthless.)

(Members reading this should keep in mind that this blueprint has not yet been submitted to the manager, the boards, or REA. You can imagine the roof rising off the office building when the board studies it. And REA will say "Are you crazy?"—an amusing spectacle of one Government agency vetoing a philosophical approach which seems to be dominant in the Government itself.)

Hopeful Trends in Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a subject of great concern to me has always been employment opportunities of our handicapped workers. I was pleased, therefore, to see a U.S. Department of Labor news release of November 1962 indicating that the placement of handicapped workers showed a 15-percent increase in October.

In spite of these advances, there is a continuing need for employers to discard their common prejudices against the handicapped and recognize the useful contribution which they can make in our society.

Because of my interest in this area, I wrote to Secretary Wirtz and requested additional information on handicapped jobseekers. The Secretary's reply shows that the job still to be done in this area is immense. As a matter of public interest, under unanimous consent, I insert the original Labor Department press release, my letter to Secretary Wirtz, and his reply, in the RECORD at this point:

PLACEMENTS OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS SHOW 15 PERCENT INCREASE IN OCTOBER

Public employment service placements of handicapped workers in October showed a 15-percent increase over the previous month, largely as a result of the annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, the U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security announced today.

State employment services affiliated with the Bureau's U.S. Employment Service reported a total of 29,800 job placements of workers with physical handicaps in October, of which 10,518 represented placements of disabled veterans. This is a 6.3-percent increase over October 1961, when such placements totaled 28,068, of which 10,064 were placements of disabled veterans.

The U.S. Employment Service said that during the first 10 months of the current year the public employment offices made 240,276 placements of handicapped workers, an increase of 26,272 over the same period last year. Each month showed an increase over the corresponding month in 1961.

Robert C. Goodwin, Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security of which

the U.S. Employment Service is a part, said that he attributed the continuing improvement in job placements for handicapped workers to the overall step-up in placement activity by the local State employment offices and the growing acceptance by employers of the value of such workers.

JANUARY 9, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for sending me U.S. Department of Labor-5523, release for Wednesday, November 28, 1962, entitled "Placements of Handicapped Workers Show 15 Percent Increase in October."

I am interested in obtaining additional data regarding the subject and would appreciate receiving your answers to the following questions:

1. How many handicapped persons are registered for placement service?
2. How many applications from newly handicapped persons are received each year?
3. Number of deaths versus those newly handicapped.
4. How many are rehabilitated?
5. How many are being rehabilitated at the present time?
6. What is the percentage of those who could be rehabilitated, but are not being rehabilitated?

Thank you very much for any information and advice you are able to provide me regarding the above.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: This is in reply to your request of January 9, 1963, for additional information on handicapped jobseekers. Your questions are answered below in the order listed:

1. A count of active applications on file in public employment service offices is taken twice a year. The November 1962 file count indicated that there were 227,168 applications of the handicapped jobseekers on file with the local public employment service offices throughout the Nation.

2. During calendar year 1962, there were 461,156 new applications filed by handicapped jobseekers.

3. Information on total number of deaths of handicapped persons is not available. However, the National Vital Statistics Division of the Public Health Service reports there were 1,454,000 deaths during the period from January through October 1962. The National Health Survey Division produced the figure on newly handicapped for the fiscal year ending June 1960, indicating that during this period there were 2.1 million persons of all ages who were physically limited in their major activity for 1 year. They estimate that there are some 13.6 million persons in the United States with some form of permanent disability. (Reference: Health Statistics Series B, No. 31 published by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)

4. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation reports that during fiscal year 1962 there were 102,400 persons rehabilitated.

5. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation further reports 34,400 persons were rehabilitated during the 5-month period (July-November 1962) of fiscal 1963. Their scheduled goal for 1963 is 110,400 rehabilitants.

6. According to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, approximately 2.5 million persons in the Nation need some form of rehabilitation. Based on their scheduled goal for fiscal 1963, the number of rehabilitants represents only 5 percent of the total number of persons that could be rehabilitated.

I trust that this is the information you need. Please let me know if I can be of further service to you.

Yours sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

A Parent Speaks on Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit a statement by Mr. Glenn Andreas, of Pella, Iowa, to call to the attention of this distinguished body the views of a leading citizen of the Protestant faith on Federal aid to education. Mr. Andreas as his statement reveals is an active member of his church and represents the views of many of his coreligionists as well as the views of many of all faiths. Mr. Andreas is active as chairman of the board of Citizens for Educational Freedom, an organization whose motto "A fair share for every child," should be the basis for any legislation in this field.

The statement follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

To: Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

From: G. A. Andreas, chairman of the board of Citizens for Educational Freedom, St. Louis, Mo.

My name is Glenn A. Andreas and my address is 1009 Main Street, Pella, Iowa. I am 46 years of age and am chairman of the board and principal owner of Pella National Bank of Pella, Iowa, a small country bank with assets of approximately $10 million. I personally handle all the investments of the bank.

I am an active member of Pella Christian Grade School Society and of Pella Christian High School Society. I am at present serving on the boards of trustees of the Calvin Foundation, affiliated with Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids, Mich., of Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa., and of the Association for Reformed Scientific Studies in Toronto, Ontario, also serving as vice president of the latter organization whose objective is the establishment of a Christian university.

As a member of the Christian Reformed Church, a Protestant denomination founded upon, historically connected with, and presently committed to the Reformation principles laid down by John Calvin in the 16th century, I have pursued my responsibilities to the above organizations all of which are based upon the same Reformation principles and none of which is ecclesiastical or part of any church organization. I am wholly committed to the "separation principle" of the Protestant Reformation. By "separation principle" I mean the idea that all human societal structures of any consequence have a God-given right and duty to pursue their God-given task in a manner autonomously separate from and independent of all other societal structures.

The term "societal structure" includes such human societal organizations as family, church, state, school, industry, labor organizations and service organizations. All of these and other societal structures have a sovereign, God-given right and duty, subject only to the norm of God's word as given in the Scriptures, to pursue their individual tasks without the interference or direction of any of the other societal structures, including the state. It must always be kept in view, of course, that the structure of society is such that there can be no "airtight" "wall of separation" among any of them. Rather, a proper intermingling and interrelationship must be maintained among all of them, for all are made up of the same basic element-members of human society.

With a total commitment to the reformation principles it would not, in my judgment, be proper for me to affiliate myself with the Catholic Church as an organization nor with any so-called front group of the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, I became an active member of Citizens for Educational Freedom, St. Louis, Mo., shortly after its inception in 1959 but only after careful inquiry and forethought. I did this because the persons who originally began the movement appeared sincere in their determination to organize and operate on a strictly nonsectarian basis. That my confidence in them was not misplaced was later confirmed by their unanimous adoption with me and other non-Catholic members a constitution which reads as follows: "In the pursuit of this freedom, as a nonsectarian organization, we welcome the support, cooperation, and participation in our program and organization of any and every citizen committed to the principles of civil liberty and equality under law, irrespective of his own commitment to any particular religion or way of life."

It is on this nonsectarian basis, gentlemen of the Congress, that we of the Citizens for Educational Freedom come to you as Catholic, Mr. Corley; Jew, Mittleman; and Protestant, myself; to urge you to remove from this education bill which you are considering all discrimination against the economic freedom and right of the family, the parents, to provide for their children an education which is in accord with their own free choice of religious or academic preference. We appeal to you in the words of our Citizens for Educational Freedom constitution (article I) to provide only "fair and just treatment of all citizens of the United States of America, including student citizens, in the distribution of governmental tax moneys for the purpose of education, with a view to assuring freedom of choice in education to the end that the civil liberties of our citizens shall be secured." And we would remind you that not only we, but an ever-increasing number of our citizens (if one is to believe the recent Gallup poll) are determined that (Citizens for Educational Freedom, article II "School") "the right of individual citizens or particular societal structures to own and operate schools of instruction on any level in accordance with their own choice of educational and religious principles must remain inviolate, and shall in no way be infringed upon by the State, either by direct regulation or by the inequitable distribution of tax moneys." This can be accomplished very simply on the Federal level by replacing the present provision for aid to primary and secondary education in this bill with the "junior GI bill of rights"

concept as so effectively worked out in the Delaney bill introduced last year and in this session of Congress.

But how is a subsidy to a parent, a family, who wants to send his child to a private or parochial school to be reconciled with the Protestant principle of separation? Is not this an intermingling of the societal structures, rather than a separation of them?

Before I answer that question I want to point out that the separation principle to which I have referred is a principle dealing with societal structures, i.e., organizations consisting of individual persons. These organizations must be permitted to operate independently of one another—according to their own particular genius and task or calling. They must be separate even though interrelated and cooperatively and unitedly developing. "Pluralism" is the word used by many to designate this separate, side by side development. It is a word increasingly being used by Catholics themselves. As the Catholics see the validity and significance of "pluralism" they show evidence of coming to a more accurate understanding than in previous centuries of the Biblical structure of our God-created society.

But the separation principle is valid only when applied to organizations, e.g., family, church, state, industry, etc. It does not apply to such a concept as religion. So far from being separable, state and religion, for example, are more accurately described as being inseparable. Religion, if seen as the human response to the Higher Power which man recognizes, be that a false idol or the true Creator—God, is simply all of life. You, gentlemen of the Congress, as you perform your political duties and fulfill your responsibilities here today or when you vote on the issues with which you are confronted are observed by, and are either obedient or disobedient to, the Higher Power which you recognize. That is true of Catholic, Protestant, and Jew. "Religion," as the Citizens for Educational Freedom constitution so accurately puts it, "is inextricably bound up with every educational process." And so is religion inextricably involved in every political process. Religion and state are inseparable just because life is religion, i.e., all of life is conduct before and response to, either obedient or disobedient, the Higher Power, the Creator.

Now my answer to the foregoing questions can be given. Tax subsidy of the education of all student citizens, without discrimination as to race, color, or creed, for the purpose of providing a citizenry capable of fulfilling its obligations as citizens, is a proper intermingling of the societal structures. But that subsidy must be channeled through the students themselves or through their parents in order to preserve the independent and free operation of these societal structures, in order to preserve the civil rights of the persons affected and in order to observe the requirements of justice in the collection and distribution of taxes from the citizenry.

The Reformation, with its separation principle, struck a fatal blow to the totalitarianism of the church as a human organization. But this destroyer of human freedom, totalitarianism, reared its ugly head soon thereafter in the form of the state.

The authority of the Bible and the church were replaced, in the French Revolution, with the authority of reason and commonsense. We have seen within our own lifetime the most dire forms of the new idol, the dictatorship of the proletariat in Joseph Stalin and the dictatorship of the superman in Adolph Hitler. It is really these serious and weighty matters that are involved in the educational policy of our Federal Government. The separation prinicple, is our only hope of not drifting inevitably into the trap of monolithic education and ultimately totalitarian government.

When I moved to Pella, Iowa, 15 years ago to provide my three boys with a distinctive Christian education in a school founded upon the Bible, my oldest son was in the third grade. Last year he graduated from Calvin College and is now serving in the Army at Fort Chaffee, Ark., in a strike unit. My youngest son is now a junior in Pella Christian High School. These schools, owned, controlled, and paid for by the parents, have faithfully and competently performed the public function of preparing my boys for responsible citizenship.

This has been done at no small financial sacrifice by our parents. We in Pella are educating approximately 700 out of a total of 2,100 of the student citizens of our community, entirely at our own cost while at the same time supporting with our taxes approximately one-third of the cost of the education of the remaining 1,400 student citizens being educated in the public schools. In the past 15 years we have spent approximately $500,000 on new buildings and at present our budgets run about $150,000 per year. These schools are associated with about 250 similar parent controlled schools throughout the United States and Canada through the National Union of Christian schools at a cost to their parents of about mately 50,000 children are attending these schools at a cost of to their parents of about $15 million per year. Since half of this is covered by tuition nearly $7.5 million is being paid each year by these parents out of after taxes income under the inequities of present law.

Some are saying that Federal subsidy of education to public schools only will soon force us to close our schools. I do not agree. We would, if necessary, pay our additional taxes and raise our budget to keep up with public school standards and teachers' salaries. We have no choice. We must provide our children with our choice of religious training in preference to the religious training (for that is what it is—all school life is religion) offered by the State. But the injustices of the present unfair tax program are becoming increasingly evident and felt by our parents.

On the basis of the civil rights to which we as citizens are entitled under law, in the name of justice, out of a simple human sense of fair play, gentlemen of the Congress, do not now extend the present tax inequity to the Federal level. We ask you to remove the offensive title of H.R. 3000 under title IV, part A, "Public Elementary and Secondary Education"—offensive because it excludes our children. We ask you to replace it with accredited elementary and secondary education, and to replace it with the plan contained in the bill offered by Congressman DELANEY of New York.

As you can see from the above, the plan of subsidy through the parents instead of directly to the school is with us no hastily conceived plan to circumvent the widely heard faulty views about separation of church and state. It is rooted in our history, a 100-year history, of parent-owned and controlled schools. Precisely what we are advocating has been in effect now in that small democracy in the Netherlands for nearly 50 years. Recently Dr. Maarten Rooy of the University of Amsterdam had this to say about it during a lecture at St. Michael's University in Toronto:

In my opinion, which is that of a philosophical liberal, and opposed to certain tenets of denominational parties, the Dutch school system reflects to the highest degree respect for basic human freedom, particularly for freedom of thought and religion, as well as mutual respect amongst citizens in regard to each other's creeds and philosophies. The Dutch constitutional school system is an excellent instance of the implementation of what Jacques Maritain terms the democratic charter.

"Bury": A New Unit of Measurement Appears in the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a new unit of measurement appeared for the first time anywhere in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The new measurement unit is "bury."

It is found in the proceedings of the House entitled "Disarmament Agency Spokesman States Inaccurate Test Ban Facts," and two accompanying tables.

Heretofore in evaluation of capabilities of seismic detection systems to check on possible underground test ban treaty cheating, seismic signals equivalent to those produced by an underground shot of 1, 2, 3, or more kilotons fired in alluvium soil formations have been used as a yardstick.

This yardstick has been used simply because the United States has fired underground shots in Nevada alluvium soil from which fairly accurate seismic signal readings have been obtained. Equivalent signals may be produced in other soft geologic formations. The equivalents also may be produced in harder formation by firing a shot of larger kiloton yield in a cavity which decouples the explosive force from the surrounding earth thereby reducing the seismic shock signal to that created by a smaller kiloton yield device which is not decoupled by a cavity.

I have adopted "bury" as the unit of measurement for this signal equivalent for shots fired in alluvium. Thus, "1 bury" is the seismic signal equivalent of a 1-kiloton shot in alluvium; "2 bury" is the seismic signal equivalent of a 2-kiloton shot, and so forth.

This unit measurement has been adopted because of the widespread confusion being created in the evaluation of capabilities of the seismic verification system in a new test ban treaty draft soon to be offered to the Soviets by the Kennedy administration according to its Disarmament Agency spokesmen.

In this connection, it was demonstrated in a recent report of the GOP conference's nuclear testing committee based on testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that cheat shots at "3 bury" and less, that is, 3 kiloton equivalents or less, can be kept from detection by the administration's verification system. The Soviets need only fire the shot underground anywhere in an area of approximately 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R. The testimony also revealed that almost the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of interest to the military, including the neutron bomb, could be developed clandestinely in this big hole of undetectability. Soviet cheating in this way could lead to Communist nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent, Communist world domination.

In fact, that is why the name "bury" was selected for this measurement unit. It seemed particularly appropriate in the context of Premier Khrushchev's threat: "We will bury you."

Public statements by persons who have not done their homework on recent testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy illustrate this confusion between the yardstick and the actual formations in which cheat test shots can be fired.

For example, Deputy Disarmament Administrator Adrian Fischer contends there is not much alluvium in the Soviet Union, and reasons therefore, that the Soviets would not have much chance to cheat without being detected. Inasmuch as he surely would not want to mislead anyone as to the deficiencies in detection, identification, and location of cheat shots under a test ban treaty, one must conclude he simply does not understand that undetectable seismic signals can be manufactured in soils other than alluvium or by firing in underground cavities. Use of the bury should clean this matter up.

Another victim of apparent confusion in this matter seems to be a vocal Member of the other body. The gentleman was moved recently to term as "irresponsible," "misleading" and "mischievous" the GOP's revelation of the big hole in the interior of the Soviet Union open for cheat testing toward Communist nuclear weapons superiority.

In the same statement to newsmen, the gentleman also asked, "If our proposals are as poor as HOSMER says they are, as full of loopholes as he says, why don't the Russians accept them?"

Perhaps that gentleman has forgotten that just a short time ago he, himself, gave the answer to that question in another of his recent interviews by the press. As I recall it, his statement was to the effect that the Russians are planning another series of nuclear tests in the atmosphere this year. They would, of course, stall accepting a treaty until they get them out of the way.

Also Russians well know the oriental bargaining technique of never accepting an agreement until the last possible concession is euchred out of the victim by sharp bargaining practices. U.S. negotiators certainly have given no reason for the Kremlin to assume that the long string of U.S. test ban concessions is anywhere near its end.

The Crisis in the Western Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, General de Gaulle's press conference of January 14, 1963, signaled a crisis in the Western Alliance. In order that our policy in this crisis be sensible we should have a rational understanding of what De Gaulle is after. General de Gaulle sees several things differently than we do.

First, he thinks that the balance of power has turned decisively against the Soviet Union and, consequently, the Western Alliance is obsolescent and of diminishing importance. Second, the further we get away from the brink, the less important to him is an agreement on the ultimate command decision to use nuclear weapons. Third, he is not too concerned about the economic matters in negotiation at Brussels as much as the political unity issue.

In light of this, Hans J. Morgenthau, director of the Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy at the University of Chicago, has recently written an American view of the crisis in the Western Alliance. This article appears in Commentary magazine for March, and is followed by a British view from Graham Hutton, formerly assistant editor of the Economist. I would like to call Mr. Morgenthau's views to the attention of my colleagues, as he attempts to place the recent events within certain political propositions of general validity.

De Gaulle's policy may well be wrong in that it will either prove unsuccessful or, if it should succeed, detrimental to France. It may also run counter to the interests of the United States and must therefore be opposed by American policy. Yet whatever one's conclusions are, they ought to derive not from emotional reactions but from a rational understanding of what De Gaulle is after.

The article follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE WESTERN ALLIANCE—AN AMERICAN VIEW

(Hans J. Morgenthau, director of the Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy at the University of Chicago, contributes bimonthly comments on political affairs to these pages)

Hans J. Morgenthau: "Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities."

For a century and a half, we accepted, and acted upon, this formulation of our relations with Europe which Washington's Farewell Address gave us. Our interventions in the two World Wars we considered at the time as temporary exceptions to the rule of noninvolvement, justified by "extraordinary" vicissitudes, combinations, and collisions. But in the spring of 1947, we radically changed the conception and course of our foreign policy by identifying our interests with those of Europe in what we thought was virtual permanence through the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the military containment of the Soviet Union.

Since then, Europeans have from time to time expressed their fear that we might again come to define our interests differently from theirs and go back into isolation. It was for us to reassure them. Now Europe is turning George Washington's formulation against us and proclaiming the separateness of its interests from those of America. I have advisedly attributed this proclamation to "Europe" and not to Charles de Gaulle alone; for De Gaulle has but given trenchant and uncompromising expression to a mood and trend which is by no means limited to the French leader.

It is revealing that both De Gaulle and Macmillan justify their contradictory positions as furthering the emancipation of Europe from America. De Gaulle opposes British membership in the Common Market because it would lead to the formation of "a colossal Atlantic Community under American dependence and leadership" (press conference of January 14, 1963). Macmillan, on the other hand, insists on British membership because only so can Europe become "great and strong enough to build a more equal and worthy partnership" with the United States (speech at Liverpool on January 21, 1963) and anticipates that the Alliance would end if the United States were allowed "for all time the sole authority" over the nuclear deterrent (broadcast of January 30, 1963.) Macmillan, having just been expelled from Europe by De Gaulle and having to choose between a far-from-splendid isolation and utter dependence upon the United States, cannot refrain from paying tribute to the emancipation of Europe while being careful to stress the American connection. De Gaulle, on the other hand, thinks he can afford to declare the independence of Europe from America in so many words and to make it perfectly clear to us that what he wants is the exact opposite from what we want.

We have responded to that declaration with surprise and indignation. While no American spokesman has gone so far as to suggest, as did the London Economist on January 26, that De Gaulle's scheme was "demented," we have certainly confirmed the point which the distinguished Italian paper Giornale d'Italia made on January 22 when it said that "It is perhaps easier to criticize De Gaulle than to understand him." De Gaulle's policy may well be wrong in that it will either prove unsuccessful or, if it should succeed, detrimental to France. It may also run counter to the interests of the United States and must therefore be opposed by American policy. Yet whatever one's conclusions are, they ought to derive not from emotional reactions but from a rational understanding of what De Gaulle is after. Whatever his chances for success may be and in whatever way his success or failure may affect the interests of France and the United States, De Gaulle's design is rational in itself and not devoid of audacity and even grandeur. That much is obvious from a dispassionate examination of De Gaulle's press conference of January 14—put into the context of his general political philosophy—and from certain interviews he held with prominent Frenchmen, especially in the military field, during the week following that press conference.

DE GAULLE'S FIVE PROPOSITIONS

De Gaulle's European policy derives from five propositions, which are not peculiar to France but are of general validity.

First, an alliance among nations unequal in power inevitably gives the most powerful nation a decisive voice in determining the policies of the alliance. This fact of political life, which Machiavelli recognized when in chapter 21 of "The Prince" he warned weak nations against making alliances with strong ones except by necessity, can be obscured, but cannot be eliminated, by talk about "interdependence" and "equal partnership." "Interdependence" means for the weak to be dependent upon the strong, and there can be no equality among those who are unequal in the qualities that count in the political scales.

Second, this dependence is tolerable for the weak only if there exists so complete an identity of interests between the weak and the strong that the policies pursued by the strong in their own interests also serve the interests of the weak. Such identity of

interests is rare in peace and cannot even be taken for granted in war. It exists among the members of the Atlantic Alliance only on the most general plane: the Atlantic Alliance is united in its opposition to Communist aggression and subversion. But this interest is not a policy in itself; it must be implemented by common policies. Such policies, to which all members of the Alliance are committed, do not at present exist.

It is striking that of the outstanding issues that face the Atlantic Alliance, there is not a single one on which all members of the Alliance see eye to eye. The United States stands alone in its policies vis-a-vis China, south Vietnam, and Cuba. In the Congo it had the support of neither Great Britain nor France. In the rest of Africa, the allies go their separate ways. With regard to Berlin; Great Britain, on the one hand, and West Germany and France, on the other, have taken contradictory positions, while the United States, after a period of vacillation, has ended up in the Franco-German camp. The same observation applies to the German question as a whole and the overall relations between the West and the Soviet Union; in view of irreconcilable divergences of interest and policies, abstention from initiative and a passive commitment to the status quo have been the order of the day. The policies of the United States and France toward the United Nations are diametrically opposed, with Great Britain taking an intermediate position. A similar cleavage separates France from the United States and Great Britain in the field of disarmament. As concerns military strategy and the policies implementing it, the United States is at loggerheads with its major European allies on two basic questions: the role of conventional forces and the disposition of nuclear weapons.

The third of the five propositions on which De Gaulle's European policy rests is that the availability of nuclear weapons to the United States and the Soviet Union has administered a death blow to the Atlantic alliance, as it has to all alliances. It has made alliances obsolete. In the prenuclear age, a powerful nation could be expected to come to the aid of a weak ally provided its interests were sufficiently involved, risking at worst defeat in war, the loss of an army or of territory. But no nation can be relied upon to forfeit its own existence for the sake of another. Thus the same doubt about American intentions which deters Khrushchev disheartens De Gaulle. Khrushchev cannot be sure that the United State would not be willing to blow itself up over Berlin, and hence is deterred. De Gaulle cannot be sure that the United States would be willing to blow itself up over a vital interest of France, and hence is disheartened.

The independent national nuclear deterrent, then, becomes the substitute for obsolete alliances. Since no nation can be expected to risk destruction for the sake of another nation, all nations must protect themselves as best they can. While France could not hope to match the deterrent of a major nuclear power quantitatively, she is capable of developing an invulnerable deterrent sufficient for her purposes. She could say to a major nuclear power: If you do this I shall cut off your leg. And the major nuclear power could reply: If you do that I shall kill you. But is it likely that an issue might arise between France and a major nuclear power for the sake of which the latter would be willing to risk losing a leg?

BISMARCKIAN CONCEPT OF ALLIANCES

Fourth, what has been said of alliances also applies to federations of states. Strong and weak nations can federate effectively only on a hierarchical and not an equalitarian basis. Here De Gaulle's conception is not so much Napoleonic as it is Bismarckian. That is to say, he applies to the unification of Europe the same principles through which Bismarck united Germany a century ago. Bismarck had two choices: the "greater German" solution including Austria, or the "little German" solution excluding her. Bismarck rejected the former solution on two major grounds: Austria would have been a rival to the predominance of Prussian power, and her imperial interests stood in the way of a full commitment to the German cause.

The unification of Germany in 1871, dominated by Prussia and excluding Austria, was preceded by two international organizations: The German Confederation established in 1815 under the leadership of Austria and composed of 38 sovereign German-speaking nations, and the German Customs Union established in 1819 by Prussia. Prussia was able to thwart Austria's attempts to join the Customs Union or to break it up, and by 1853 the Union comprised all German states with the exception of Austria. On the other hand, Prussia's attempts in 1849 to unite Germany politically under her leadership, with the Austro-Hungarian monarchy occupying an associate position, was frustrated by Austria in the so-called punctation of Olmütz. The defeat of Austria by Prussia in the war of 1866 led to the dissolution of the German Confederation and its replacement in 1867 by the North German Confederation under Prussian domination. The South German states rejoined the Cutsoms Union and sent representatives to an all-German customs parliament. This process of exclusion and integration culminated in 1871 in the so-called little German solution of the German problem, the establishment of a German Reich under the dominance of Prussia and without Austria, in the aftermath of the victorious war against France in which all German states except Austria participated.

In De Gaulle's design, the nucleus of Franco-German power takes the place of Prussia, Great Britain takes the place of Austria, and now as then economic arrangements are used as means for serving political ends. Faced with a similar choice, De Gaulle follows Bismarck's example and prefers a "little European" solution excluding Great Britain to a "greater European" one including here. De Gaulle sees himself choosing between a Europe dominated by the United States and a Europe dominated by the Franco-German combination. He sees Great Britain not only as the spearhead of American power but also as a non-European influence within Europe by virtue of its worldwide interests and commitments. Furthermore, the British presence in Europe would endanger the viability of the Franco-German combination; for the British political presence could offer Germany an alternative to the association with France and threaten France with isolation. In other words, it would be a threat to the predominance of France.

WHAT ABOUT THE REST OF EUROPE?

Lastly, De Gaulle realizes that Europe thus united under Franco-German auspices is but a fragment of the true Europe, the other half of which forms the western part of the Soviet Empire. To merge these two parts is the task of a united Western Europe and, more particularly, of France. The accomplishment of that task is of course predicated upon an accommodation with the Soviet Union. The main issue of such an acommodation is the stabilization of the territorial and military status quo in central Europe. The Soviet Union has tried to compel the United States to accept such a stabilization by raising the issue of Berlin. That attempt came to nothing in good measure because of West Germany's and France's veto. But might not France succeed where the United States failed if she could offer the Soviet Union a Europe without the American presence and a Germany immobilized in the French embrace? Such a vista must appeal to De Gaulle; for its portends power and security for France. It might also appeal to Germany, for which it holds out the prospect of unification in peace. And it cannot fail to attract the Soviet Union, threatened as the Russians feel themselves to be by the United States today and in all probability by China tomorrow; for here is the promise of security at the Soviet Union's most sensitive frontier and of the settlement of the single issue which at present most acutely endangers the peace of the world.

We said before that De Gaulle's grand design is rational in itself. The issue it poses concerns the power to carry it through. It is at this point that the analogy between De Gaulle and Bismarck appears to break down. The power of Prussia was supreme in Germany after 1866, and the power of Germany was paramount in Europe after 1870. The power of France, such as it is and is likely to be until France possesses, if she ever does, a nuclear deterent of her own, can come into play only under the umbrella of the American nuclear deterrent. As long as that umbrella protects him, De Gaulle can play the role of the Bismarck of Europe. Without that protection, he would be the Nasser of Europe, declaiming big lines in an implausible act.

It is De Gaulle's paradoxical good fortune that he can count upon the protection of America regardless of what he says and does. However much he may annoy American sensibilities and antagonize American interests, we cannot help but protect him, not for his sake but for ours. What was true in 1953 when John Foster Dulles threatened France with an "agonizing reappraisal" is true today. Regardless of what France does or does not do, we have a vital interest in preventing the addition of French and, through it, European power to that of the Soviet Union. In the awareness of that vital interest of the United States which makes France secure, De Gaulle can afford to attempt the realization of his grand design, the purpose of which is to be done with the need for American protection altogether. Hegel would have enjoyed seeing "the ruse of the idea" thus at work.

A CHAPTER HAS ENDED

Regardless of whether De Gaulle succeeds or fails, the relations between the United States and Europe can never again be what they were before January 14, 1963. For De Gaulle has laid bare in simple and stark outline the ills which have ailed the Atlantic Alliance for a decade and which governments on both sides of the Atlantic have been pleased to gloss over with fine phrases and manipulate with petty schemes. We may be able to continue this convenient yet self-defeating tradition for the time being; but the sooner we face the facts, however, startling and unpleasant they may be, and act upon them, the better will we be capable of molding them to our interests. So far we have talked and acted as though we were dealing here with the idiosyncrasies of one man and not with the revelation of objective conditions which concern all of us, not only De Gaulle and France.

Thus we have declared that we intend to go ahead with our proposals for a so-called multilateral nuclear deterrent to be put at the disposal of NATO as well as of selected allies, regardless of what De Gaulle has said and done. According to this scheme, NATO should have possession of a nuclear deterrent of its own. Yet the all-important question as to who shall determine its use has not yet been authoritatively answered; General Norstad, for instance, has suggested a committee of three. Furthermore, Great Britain and some other members of the alliance shall also possess a nuclear deterrent of their own whose use they could determine

independently "in moments of great national peril." It is this scheme which De Gaulle has almost contemptuously rejected. His reasons for doing so, it seems to me, are good, and they are losing nothing of their force by being brushed aside.

The issue which De Gaulle has raised and which our Government ought to join is an issue akin to that of sovereignty. It concerns the question of who shall die for what and under what circumstances. As long as the United States has that power of decision through the possession of a nuclear monopoly within the Atlantic Alliance, it has the power to make Frenchmen die for causes which may not be their own (e.g. Cuba), and to refuse to let Americans die for the causes of France (e.g., Suez). If Great Britain or France have that power of decision, albeit only "in moments of great national peril," while they are allies of the United States, it is they who have the power to decide that Americans should die in causes that are not their own.

There are only two possible ways to resolve this issue. Either the United States retains its power of decision, in which case the present Atlantic Alliance must be transformed into a true federation capable of reducing the political interests peculiar to its members to a common denominator. Or the power of decision must be put into the hands of those individual allies who wish to exercise it, in which case the alliance will for all practical purposes be dissolved. The former alternative requires for its achievement a series of constructive and delicate political settlements and arrangements, eliminating the present points of friction among the allies. The other alternative requires the return of the United States to isolation in a world which will be dominated by four power centers instead of two: the United States, the Soviet Union, Europe, and China. In other words, the alliance will either go forward or backward, but it cannot stand still. Nor is there a middle ground for reconciling the two alternatives.

It is such a middle ground which the administration has been seeking with its different schemes for a multilateral deterrent. Yet with the control of nuclear weapons it is as it is with sovereignty: it is indivisible. It cannot be shared. It is either here or there, and it cannot be in two places at the same time. We have learned through the bitter experience of a civil war how futile and dangerous it is to gloss over and obfuscate the issue of ultimate decision for the sake of a fleeting political advantage. We ought to be able to apply that lesson to the issue at hand. There are advantages and risks in either of the alternatives from which we must choose. But there is nothing but tremendous risk in a compromise which leaves the ultimate power of decision in the hands of the President of the United States under certain conditions and transfers it to individual nations or a committee under others, or, worse still, leaves it in abeyance.

Whether or not we find these policies to our taste or in our interest, we are indebted to De Gaulle for having posed the great issues of the day with simple and accurate clarity. De Gaulle has made clear what some of us have pointed to for a decade without anybody listening—that the political, military, and economic foundations upon which the Atlantic Alliance was constructed are in the process of erosion or have altogether ceased to exist and that hence the institutional superstructure of the alliance has lost its empirical supports. De Gaulle is hailed in France as the great realist who, after "demythologizing" Algeria and French parliamentarianism, is now performing the same beneficial operation on the Atlantic Alliance. His grand design may well come to naught. Yet great men are remembered even for their failures, and lesser men can learn from them. For even their failures shed an illuminating light upon a reality obscured by highsounding yet inaccurate words and distorted by spurious actions. So will De Gaulle be remembered, even if he should fail.

William Reid: A Quiet, Effective Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is proud to claim William Reid as one of its most loyal citizens. He has been a forceful, dedicated leader, respected by all.

On March 17, 1963, the Brooklyn Eagle published the following article which pays tribute to his devotion to city, State, and Nation during the last 50 years:

BOROUGH PROUD OF WILLIAM REID, LEADER WHO EXCELS IN BIG JOBS

On St. Marks Avenue in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn lives a quiet unassuming man who is chairman of a city agency that houses half a million people; chairman of the board of directors of a health insurance plan which services 665,000 persons, president of a credit union which has 50,000 members, and as a further tribute to his ability, is an appointee of both Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner.

In financial and administrative circles, he is known as "Mr. Integrity."

In Brooklyn, he is known as "Mr. Loyalty," for though he scaled great heights in many fields, once he discovered Brooklyn, he never left it—50 years of loyalty.

The name—William Reid.

As chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, Reid, former deputy mayor and former chairman of the old board of transportation, is now sometimes called the world's biggest landlord.

Only 28 cities in the United States have a population greater than the 1,477 buildings of the authority's 107 developments.

During his long and distinguished career, Reid has been the recipient of many honors. In the believe-it-or-not category might be placed the numerous tokens of esteem and affection he has received from his tenants. A Ripley might well be intrigued when tenants honor their landlord.

Last October, the Golden Age Club of Kingsborough Houses was named in his honor and he was given a handsome bronze plaque attesting to the senior citizens' appreciation of his interest in their welfare.

In 1960, he was given an original oil painting done by a member of the Senior Citizens Club of Fort Greene Houses.

The tenant-to-landlord tributes reflect the devotion Reid has shown to promoting the human and humane aspects of public housing. For him it is not just a question of providing housing for the city's unfortunate slum dwellers. Equally important is the supplying of services and facilities that will enable the tenants to enjoy full, constructive lives.

Under his chairmanship since May 1, 1958, the authority has established more and more community centers, preschool and school age programs, child health stations, clinics, special programs for the elderly, and recreational facilities for all ages.

It has also striven for a greater degree of racial and ethnic tolerance and integration in the developments and for the merging of those developments and their tenants with the local communities.

Typical of his concern for the welfare of his tenants has been his steady buildup of the authority's own police force. With 755 members, it is now larger than the police forces of all but 23 cities in this country.

In his approach to slum clearance, Reid has shown a readiness to experiment and to try innovations.

During surveys of dilapidated, substandard dwellings, he noted that often, while the interiors had been allowed to deteriorate, the buildings were structurally sound. This was the case especially in what are known as single-room occupancy dwellings where entire families were housed in one room.

The answer, as Reid saw it, was to rehabilitate these buildings by renovating the exteriors and rebuilding the interiors. Today, the authority has six developments of these rehabilitated buildings and more under construction.

Another innovation is the vest pocket development. This involves the construction of one or two buildings in the deteriorated portion of a city block while valuable private housing and commercial structures are left untouched. The first of these developments was opened last year and 17 more are under construction.

Largely as a result of Reid's prodding, State legislation was enacted in 1960 to make possible the sale of some of the public housing projects as nonprofit cooperatives. This represented a substantial contribution to solving the needs of the thousands of families whose incomes are too high for subsidized housing but not high enough for the rents in many private apartment buildings.

A slender, dapper man with sandy mustache and vigor undiminished by the years, Reid has earned a reputation as one of the finest administrators in the city's history. As an authority on virtually every aspect of city government, his advice has been sought many times on the problems of this and other cities.

He was named chairman of the housing authority by Mayor Wagner. By appointment of Governor Rockefeller he is a member of the State's advisory board to the office of local government.

Since May 1955, Reid has been chairman of the board of directors of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York. His tenure as president of the Municipal Credit Union of the City of New York dates back to 1929.

Born in Scranton, Pa., on May 31, 1890, he came to this city in 1912. In September of the following year he entered the Comptroller's office where he rapidly became an authority on all aspects of the city's finances.

In this respect he was following in the footsteps of his father-in-law, Duncan MacInnes. MacInnes was known for his Scottish burr and while Reid is minus the burr he is proud of his Scottish ancestry.

From 1926 to 1945, Reid served as New York City Tax Collector. In that job he directed and supervised the city's entire tax collection procedure. On December 1, 1945, he was named a member of the board of transportation by Mayor LaGuardia.

He became its chairman in October 1947, and held that post until January 1, 1950, when he became deputy mayor by appointment of Mayor O'Dwyer.

On October 1, 1950, he left the service of the city and became president and general manager of the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co. (the Hudson Tubes). He moved

on in May 1955, to become chairman of the board of directors of the Health Insurance Plan.

Three years later he was called by Mayor Wagner to take charge of the huge and expanding public housing operations of the city.

Despite his manifold activities, Reid has found time to participate in church and other community activities in his adopted borough. He is a member of the board of directors of Caledonian Hospital and chairman of the finance committee of the Union Methodist Church in Brooklyn. He is also a trustee and member of the executive committee of the Prudential Savings Bank in Brooklyn.

Further recognition of Reid's long and intimate knowledge of the city's government—his friends call him walking encyclopedia on the subject—came last year with his appointment as vice chairman of the 11-member New York City Charter Revision Commission.

Public Opinion Is Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I include a timely and well-written editorial by Mr. Ken Smith, editor of the Rochelle News-Leader.

I would like to commend Mr. Smith's excellent and revealing comments to the entire membership of this body.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

PUBLIC OPINION IS BOSS

When President Kennedy recently voiced sharp criticism of the union that has been striking New York City newspapers for almost 3 months he was reflecting an attitude that has been growing in the public mind for several years.

This settlement is behind the demands for legislation to curb the powers of the unions and force them to recognize a responsibility to the public interest.

The strike has been the major weapon of workers in their long and frequently bloody struggle to improve wages and working conditions and it remains a right that labor is certain to retain simply because there is no way to legislate effectively against its use.

However public sentiment is reaching the stage where strikes must be justified and used only as a last resort. The unions are headed for serious trouble if they adopt the "public be damned" attitude that lead to the breakup of the power of the industrialists of 50 years ago.

The labor organization has grown not only because of its own efforts but because the public was sympathetic to its aims of obtaining fair wages and fair treatment for employees.

The natural American instinct for the underdog led to curbs on industry and general support for the unions even in their excesses. As a result the labor unions have been relatively free from controlling legislation.

Now the unions have ceased to be the underdogs and are the equals and sometimes the superiors of the companies with which they bargain. The big unions have the power to shut down whole industries, shut off shipping and transportation and bring about a condition where the national safety is endangered.

It is possible for a small number of men to force idleness upon thousands of others and to disrupt the national economy. This might be justified in cases where the issue is of equitable wages or equitable treatment but too many of the strikers in recent years have been of a jurisdictional nature in which the quarrel is between unions and should be settled within the ranks of labor without inconvenience to the public.

The unions also are risking the loss of public support whenever they demand that jobs be continued even after the need for them ceases to exist or when they jeopardize the future of an industry by making excessive demands for higher wages and greater fringe benefits.

The unions could count upon steadily increased wages and benefits during the period of spiraling prices that began with World War II and continued almost unbroken until 1958. Since that time prices have stabilized, profit margins have narrowed, foreign competition has put a squeeze on the products of American mills, mines and factories and it is no longer possible to add wage increases to the selling price.

This is an economic fact of life that the labor unions must face. The era of labor versus capital is now long past and the time has come when cooperation must replace competition in labor-management relations.

There must be an awareness on both sides that we can continue our economic growth only if the interests of labor, industry and the public are kept in balance.

There are many important problems to be worked out including provisions for workers displaced by automation, by changes in consumer demands and by the movement of foreign goods into this country under new trade agreements.

Neither side can limit its demands to self-interest alone but must seek those things that are of mutual interest. The point has been reached when the third party in every major dispute is the public interest and it is far more powerful than either of the others.

The guardian of the public interest is public opinion and no force has ever been found that can sucessfully thwart it for long. The lesson that has been taught through the centuries is that what public opinion wants it eventually gets.

U.S. Relationship to U.N. Should Be Clarified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, just what is the relationship of the United States to the United Nations? Do our delegates to the U.N. owe their allegience to their country or to this world Organization? Are the decisions of the U.N. based on morality or do they condone international gangsterism, murder, and slavery? Are the members nations living up to the charter of the U.N. or do they merely give lipservice to it as a cover for aggression and conspiracy? These are questions which should be answered before the American people are asked to continue to bear the brunt of the financial burden of keeping the United Nations alive and to cloak its activities with respectability and prestige. Along this line I would like to call attention to the following editorial by David Lawrence in the March 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

U.N. A SUPERSTATE?

(By David Lawrence)

Is the United Nations a superstate or just a voluntary association of governments?

Does the U.N. function as a parliamentary body in which a majority vote imposes obligations on the minority of the members?

Do the American citizens who represent the U.S. Government in the U.N. feel they are accredited to a superstate with a parliament of its own? Do they feel obligated to defend the U.N. majority and to criticize their own countrymen, including Members of Congress, who have denounced the U.N. action in voting to supply funds to the Castro regime in Cuba?

These questions seem pertinent as one reads in the news dispatches what American delegates to the U.N. are saying in their attempts to stem the tide of criticism of that organization which has arisen in Congress and which may result in cutting off extra contributions by the United States to the U.N.

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, in testifying on March 13 before a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee said:

"And if we were to pick up our marbles and go home whenever there is a disappointment, we would not only destroy the effectiveness of the U.N. but would abandon hope that nations can work out their problems most of the time by the same methods by which conflicting interests get resolved within democratic nations and communities."

Mr. Stevenson stressed that deliberations of the United Nations represent "the parliamentary system in action" on an international basis.

Another spokesman, Jonathan B. Bingham, U.S. representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council, said in a speech on March 11 that the United States cannot expect U.N. agencies "to act as if they were arms of our State Department."

These comments have a defeatist tone. They do not appear to reflect with any degree of vigor the words of the formal protest filed by the United States when the U.N. Special Fund voted economic aid to Castro.

Ambassador Stevenson pointed out, moreover, that, of the 288 projects of the U.N. Special Fund, 287 were approved by the United States and only one—aid to Cuba—was disapproved.

The inference is that the United States should weigh the benefits of the many projects approved as against the disadvantages of the single project in Cuba.

When a basic principle—involving injustice and injury to millions of people—is disregarded, is it logical to argue that the U.N. must be excused for condoning a crime just because something constructive has been done by the U.N. elsewhere?

Why doesn't the U.N. see anything wrong in furnishing funds to and bestowing its prestige on a cruel and inhumane leader who has murdered thousands of innocent people and has brought his nation to the brink of disaster?

The special agency of the U.N. which, despite the protest of the United States, insisted on supplying funds to Castro's government has been financed to the extent of 40 percent by this country. Apologists offer the equivocal excuse that no money from the

United States is actually to be used in this particuar project in Cuba.

The fact remains, however, that the United Nations, of which this country is a member, is furnishing aid and comfort to a regime of gangsters and is refusing to take sides between unmorality and morality.

The American people have a right to take sides. They need not support financially any organization which condones criminality.

The impression conveyed by the professional defenders of the U.N. is that it is a thing apart and that it is not very much concerned with the misdeeds of various member states but only with the votes of a group of nations which happen—most of them—to be ruled by one-man or one-party governments.

Twenty-five members of the U.N. have paid nothing on their Middle East assessments, and 48 members have paid nothing on their bills for the Congo operations—a total of $121 million in arrears. Yet all these governments have a vote and are able to hand the United States a humiliating defeat in its efforts to help liberate the people of Cuba.

The United States, of course, has paid not only its share—32 percent of the total cost of the two operations—but an additional 16 percent to make up deficits incurred by the failure of other members to pay their shares, and is being asked to pay more.

Some of the disciples of the superstate idea in and around the United Nations evidently think the American people can be easily fooled. If this country is to remain a member of the U.N., it has the right to insist that the moral principles written in the Charter of the United Nations shall be honored. Inhumane and unmoral governments not only should be deprived of any U.N. benefits, but should be expelled from the organization itself.

If We Must Compete With the Government Let Us Have Fair Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this week I presided as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when hearings were held on my bill H.R. 2081, to establish a separate airport board to operate Washington National and Dulles International Airports.

I would like to call to the attention of all the Members of the House the need for enactment of this legislation, particularly since most of the Members use air transportation, and a great many of us like to travel by jet.

At the present time, the Federal Aviation Agency functions as owner, operator, and regulator of the two Washington airports, and this situation creates a conflict of interest which the Congress would not tolerate with any other Government regulatory agency. I do not think we should continue to let the FAA be an exception to this rule.

Many times during the past 10 years I have spoken out against appropriating money for the construction of Dulles Airport because we did not need another airport to serve Washington and Maryland. Friendship International Airport can handle all the flights we will need in the foreseeable future, and there is plenty of room for expansion. As you know, we have now dumped more than $110 million into Dulles Airport and more money is requested this year. I repeat what I have been saying for 10 years, and that is, the taxpayers have paid very dearly for this white elephant at Chantilly, Va.

Now that Dulles Airport is finally open for business, the FAA has exerted pressure on the airlines to force them to move from Friendship to Dulles if they want to serve Washington by jet. The FAA and CAB completely ignore the fact that more than 4 million people live within a 50-mile radius of Friendship International Airport, and less than half that number live within a 50-mile radius of Dulles Airport. Marylanders, and a great many people in the District of Columbia, must travel 70 miles to reach Dulles Airport, but this inconvenience does not bother the FAA and the CAB.

These two Government "regulatory" agencies are ignoring public convenience and necessity in an effort to make Dulles show a profit so as to justify the expenditure of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to build an airport which was not needed in the first place.

Last year, FAA officials made a statement to our committee that they wished to be "independent of Dulles." I think the Congress should grant their wish now, and establish a separate airport board to operate the two Washington airports. It is time for us to put these two airports in the same boat with all other airports in the country. It is time for the Congress to take the FAA out of the real estate business and let them get back to the job they were set up to do, that is—promote the development and safety of air commerce.

Yesterday the Baltimore Sun carried an excellent article concerning the problems involved in having the FAA function as owner, operator, and regulator of these Washington airports and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Mar. 20, 1963]

FAIR COMPETITION

No one will ever be able to show conclusively just what pressures the Federal Aviation Agency has put on airlines to shift their service from Friendship Airport to Dulles. This is not the kind of influence susceptible to statistical analysis. Yet the fact remains that one oversea line has said it moved because the FAA had declared that Dulles must be considered the official airport for Washington. The fact is, too, that the airlines are heavily dependent on the favorable attitude of the FAA, which regulates safety measures, licenses pilots, and crews, controls maintenance procedures, provides airport controllers and allots navigable airspace. When that Federal Agency is also directly responsible for a major airfield, and wants desperately to see it succeed, how much intangible pressure is there on the airlines to bend over backwards to cooperate?

As a matter of principle, the FAA ought scrupulously to tend to its regulatory knitting and stay out of the airport business. To try to do both, as the Agency now does, creates what might be called a conflict of official interest. As Representative CLARENCE LONG has noted, nobody would expect the Interstate Commerce Commission, which regulates railroads, to run a railroad itself in competition with others. Nor would the ICC run a railroad or bus terminal. The same reasoning applies to the FAA which is running Dulles and Washington National Airports in direct competition with Friendship.

The best way to end this anomaly, and remove both the reality and suspicion of pressure, is for Congress to pass one of the bills put in by the Maryland delegation which would establish an independent agency to run these Federal airports. Friendship would then know it was in fair competition with Dulles. It could point out the significantly lower fees at Friendship, the natural service area and convenience to passengers and expect that the airlines would decide how much service to put at which airports on a straight businesslike basis, without any suggestion of wanting to please the FAA. Friendship doesn't mind a fight. But it ought to be a fair one.

Technical Education Under the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include for the RECORD an article and other information about the technical education programs conducted under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It was my high privilege to sponsor this act in the House of Representatives, and it is gratifying to know that the technical training programs established under the act have been very successful. These programs are making a vital contribution to the defense of our Nation, and are providing individuals with skills and knowledge that prepare them for technical work which is of vital importance to the Nation's welfare.

The Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education, recently published a report on the placement of graduates from technical education preparatory programs for 1962. In the State of Alabama, which I am privileged to represent, 90 percent of the 1962 graduates in technician training programs were employed in the fields in which they received training, electronics and mechanical design. The average beginning salary in the electronics field was $4,600, and the average salary in the field of mechanical design was $4,800. In addition, 500 persons were enrolled in technical courses that upgraded and updated their skills and knowledge.

I am told by the division of vocational and technical education that present enrollments indicate that the number of graduates in Alabama this year will more than double the number graduated from technical education programs in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to include the following summary of the 1962 national placement study of tech-

nician graduates recently published by the division of vocational and technical education:

Of the 49 States and 1 territory participating in title VII programs, 47 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico reported graduates of 2-year preparatory programs in fiscal year 1962.

A total of 9,946 individuals successfully completed 2-year preparatory curriculums in 1962—an increase of 31 percent over 1961. Graduates of post secondary curriculums totaled 6,431 (an increase of 11.5 percent over last year) and 3,515 were reported as graduates of secondary schools (46 percent more than in 1961).

The reports indicates that 2,247 (23.6 percent) of the graduates continued their education and 678 (7 percent) joined the Armed Forces. In 1961 only 15.7 percent of the graduates continued their education. This is an indication that graduates of title VIII of the National Defense Education Act are qualified for advanced study as well as being productive in a technological field.

Available for placement were 6,612 graduates. A total of 5,523 (86.7 percent) were placed in a position either directly or closely related to the field for which they were trained. This is slightly higher than last year's 82.9 percent.

The average annual starting salary for graduates placed in the technical field for which they were trained was $4,935 for graduates of 2 year, post high school programs, and $3,830 for those who graduated from high school technical programs. Salaries ranged from $2,400 to $7,300 depending upon the field of work and location of the school.

In addition to the 9,946 individuals graduated from full-time, preparatory curriculums during fiscal year 1962, 95,763 were enrolled in extension courses designed to improve their competencies for advancement in their occupations or to upgrade them for new or more difficult jobs.

It is evident from the placements reported that the vocational educators responsible for technical education have been successful in providing programs that are rigorous in character and high in quality, thus meeting industry's needs for highly skilled technicians.

It is estimated that by June 1963 the 1961 and 1962 graduates of title VIII programs will have received salaries totaling $70 million. Income tax collected by the Federal Government on that amount will pay for about one-half of the Federal expenditures for the first 4 years of the program.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I submit for the RECORD an article by the Assistant Commissioner for Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education, which appeared in the American Vocational Association Journal, December 1962. This article is an excellent review of technician training under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

MEETING MANPOWER NEEDS THROUGH TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(By Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner for Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education)

It is generally true that an educational program is only as good as the community wants it to be. Quality standards are set by understanding attitudes toward the value and outcomes of education. And attitudes are reflected not only by the budget provided for a program but by the measure of creativity and initiative that is stimulated in teachers and supervisors.

But there is one educational program that is managing to transcend the handicaps of meager budget and shortage of teachers and is blossoming into a substantial segment of American public vocational education.

This is the intensive program of technical training being offered in hundreds of vocational-technical high schools, technical institutes, junior colleges, and municipal colleges around the country. In particular, it is the program of high-skill technical training that has been stimulated through title VIII of the National Defense Education Act (title III, George-Barden Act).

State legislators with vision, administrators attuned to the drastically changing needs in education, and a devoted nucleus of men and women in Congress and in the U.S. Office of Education, have succeeded in launching a trend despite pervasive public lethargy.

The National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958 as a 4-year crash effort to improve the quality of science, mathematics, and foreign language offerings in public schools. It was extended last year through June 1964, in recognition of continuing need for Federal aid to create a solid foundation for new education needs.

To date about $600 million in Federal moneys—and additional in State funds—have gone into the various NDEA programs. About $47½ million of the total Federal outlay has been appropriated for training highly skilled technicians—evidence that this area of public education is beginning to be viewed in proper perspective. Although the amount is not great, the Federal funds are more than matched by the States and the program is well underway.

Despite financial hindrances, the title VIII programs, surveyed from the national vantage point, show accomplishments in some directions that stir the hopes of those who see most clearly the inadequacy of technical education as a whole.

With requirements for vocational competence increasing constantly, it is evident that public education's big task is to recondition itself to preparing boys and girls for a changed world of work. Many parts of the country are aware and are taking action.

New construction, vastly improved laboratory facilities, curricula aimed at training individuals for high skills in a diversity of occupations, and an upsurge in technical education enrollments, all highlight the impact of the Federal aid program. Legislative actions to support area vocational schools, secondary, and postsecondary, have pyramided in the years since the beginning of the NDEA technical training program. Nearly half the States are building, or planning construction, for such area schools—not one school, but often a statewide network of them.

NDEA title VIII funds are finding their way increasingly into the postsecondary public school—the technical institute, the junior college, and special branches of State and city colleges. However, the secondary school in many communities is the focus of the technical training programs, which may run for 2 or 3 years.

The area vocational school, secondary or postsecondary, is a growing feature of public vocational education—and its character lends itself admirably to technical training courses. The area school represents a pooling of funds and efforts by the State or several school districts, to share construction costs, broaden vocational opportunities, extend adult education services, and make possible a wider range of offerings and a higher teacher salary scale.

Enrollments in technical programs aided by NDEA funds are expected to approach 200,000 in this fifth year of the legislation; a 150-percent increase occurred between 1959 and 1961. About two-thirds of the enrollees, interestingly, are adults seeking to update their skills through part-time classes, or, in some cases, preparing for first entrance into a technician occupation. For example there has been a program at Cape Canaveral for upgrading journeymen employed on the missile base, and a preparatory course, in addition.

Technical training is being offered in such fields as these: Electronics, instrumentation, data processing, and computer programing, plastics, optics, and in mechanical, electrical, aeronautical, chemical, metallurgical, civil and construction technology. A very new field is nucleonics. In Washington State, for example, local school districts have more than trebled their expenditures for nucleonics during the past year.

Most popular is electronics, with 49 percent of the total enrollment. Mechanical programs, including drafting and design, rank second with 24 percent of enrollment.

Job opportunities, and salaries, are almost universally excellent. A recent National Science Foundation study estimates that within the next 10 years at least 1 million new technicians must be added to our work force.

The rate of placement is typified by such facts are these:

One State last year reported that 600 students in data processing were placed before graduation. Graduates of the highway technology program at the Vermont Agricultural and Technical Institute at Randolph Center find their services in demand by private contractors and State highway departments throughout New England.

Boise Junior College has standing offers from the Hanford atomic installation for the graduates of the mechanical drafting and design program. These are just a sampling of the response of research agencies, public construction services, and industrial enterprises to demonstrate that the technical training programs are serving a real need.

Still, at the present rate of our technical training effort, we as a nation are turning out only about 20 percent of the number of technicians presently needed annually.

Two obstacles hinder expansion of present technical training programs to a level adequate to meet local, regional, or national manpower needs.

INSUFFICIENCY OF PHYSICAL PLANT

This is a chronic complaint in all fields of education, and probably has more validity for technical training than for any other field. The Federal appropriation for technical training under title VIII (NDEA) does not provide for school construction, a major need.

But in some cases the financial complaint may be used to obscure the real want—determination. In the case of NDEA technical training programs, there is a genuine shortage of sufficient money to do the job fully. The appropriation of the Congress is intended as a pump primer. Those States that have the initiative and resources and understand the urgency of the need have appropriated substantial sums to supplement Federal aid. Participating States are required to match the Federal dollars allotted. Some have overmatched by 5 to 1, with major contributions coming from local school districts. Other States have barely exceeded the one-for-one requirement.

On the other hand, some States in the South have dug into their treasuries to launch new area vocational technical schools. Aware that industry, attracted momentarily to their region, will not continue to look to the South if the South cannot supply trained manpower, such States as Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Florida and North and South Carolina are pushing hard to build a strong vocational-technical program.

Alabama has added 4 new State-operated schools to make a total of 10. Local schools are also growing in number.

Florida plans to have a community junior college, with technical education offerings, within commuting distance of every resident in the State, and at present has 29 such schools.

Georgia has added 6 area vocational-technical schools this year and 20 more are planned and provided for.

Louisiana operates 27 area vocational-technical schools, with 2 more scheduled to open next January.

North Carolina has 16 centers currently in operation for industrial education, including technical training programs, and 4 under construction or on the drawing board.

South Carolina, by legislative action, recently established a technical advisory committee to push expansion of technical training at the post high school level.

Their reputations already widely established, it is almost superfluous to mention the accomplishments of two coastal industrial States, California and Connecticut. Regional technical institutes have long been a major responsibility of public education in Connecticut and expansion continues.

California, during the past 20 or so years, has built up a network of 67 public junior colleges, many emphasizing technical programs, that will be expanded to 100 or more by 1970. Both States have moved ahead swiftly under the impetus of the technical training aid and both overmatch four to five times the amount of the Federal contribution to NDEA training programs.

SHORTAGE OF QUALIFIED TEACHERS

In a field in which technical changes are constantly occurring, a teacher must be a perpetual student as well as mentor. It is a real challenge to the brushbeating talents of administrators to find sufficient numbers of educators with up-to-date background in advanced modern science and mathematics to cope with the growing enrollment applications in area schools. The competition from industry for the talents of good instructors has been serious.

The teacher shortage is one of the problems to which all the States addressed themselves seriously last spring in seven regional conferences convened by the USOE to examine operation of technical education programs.

Inability of the schools to compete with salaries being paid by industry and often by other school systems has resulted in allout efforts in growing numbers of States to match the highest salary scales. In some cases, industry has provided additional funds to schools which are turning out manpower needed by the industry.

The working together of industry and vocational education is becoming increasingly common, a natural result of the reliance of local industry upon the output of the local schools for much of its working force. In one State a drafting council made up of industry representatives has been helpful to teachers of mechanical drafting and design in acquainting them with the special requirements of jobs available in industry in the area. A number of industries are cooperating with State departments of education and with teacher education institutions in providing workshops for upgrading of technical teachers.

The training of technical teachers is still a relatively undeveloped field. The report of the seven conferences on technical education states: "There is an urgent need for preservice and inservice technical teacher education programs in subject matter content and pedagogy. Likewise there is need for appropriate work experience."

Competency in technical subject matter was defined rigidly, indicative of the quality education goals in this field. A good technician—and, therefore, a possible teacher—must meet these criteria:

1. He must have proficiency in application of physical science principles, including advanced concepts and laws of physics and chemistry.

2. He must be able to employ algebra and trigonometry as tools in developing ideas that make use of scientific principles; and he must have an understanding of and facility with higher mathematics through analytical geometry, calculus, and differential equations.

3. He must have communication skills that include the ability to interpret, analyze, and transmit facts and ideas graphically, orally, and in writing.

4. He must have the ability to interpret and apply principles of economics and industrial relations.

5. He must have an extensive knowledge of a field of specialization with an understanding of the engineering and scientific activities that distinguish the technology in the field.

The States are increasingly providing special workshops to upgrade and update teachers in technical subjects. The USOE plans a series of such national workshops for teachers of data processing in the summer of 1963.

A national teacher education conference convened by USOE in 1961 has led to considerable progress in organizing curricula for preparation of technical teachers. There is growing feeling that special professional education in teaching methods, psychology of learning, content analysis and history and principles should be designed for technical teachers.

The technical training programs are not only keeping pace with changing needs—their goal is to remain so closely in touch with trends that they may plan programs to meet future needs. Actually, the needs today, as a student enters a technical study course may have changed substantially by the time he is graduated 2 years hence. Looking forward is an absolute necessity in vocational-technical education.

There have been charges from some quarters in recent years that vocational education is not doing the job it is supposed to do, that it is not training people for today's jobs. As long as there is one program, one community, one State that is not giving its schoolage boys and girls, and its adult citizens, a chance to learn so they can earn, then this charge against vocational education will be made. It is of little use to point with pride to a program that has reached the ripe old age of 40 years, as many vocational programs have, if that program is still geared to meeting needs that no longer exist.

The technical education program, small and only in its beginnings as yet, is an answer to such charges. It is a service that, by its nature, serves the immediate and future needs growing out of rapidly changing technology. It demands a solid background of science and mathematics, a grounding in the use of languages, and a perspective, derived from knowledge of modern industrial technology, that enables the student to relate his work training to industrial growth.

The one possible inherent drawback to this kind of program is that its worth is so self-evident it may tend to obscure the need for less skilled training for the vastly greater numbers of people who make up the whole labor force. It has been estimated that we need three technicians for every engineer today. But who knows the ratio of need of other workers to technicians? With every new scientific discovery, new technical jobs come into being. But the technician, a supporter of science, himself needs support.

If we are to modernize our public schools to meet with full realism the new needs of people for new kinds of knowledge and training, then our technical education program should be greatly expanded for itself, and should be the superstructure of a broad program of specialized training opportunities at all levels of ability.

Money is needed. Determination is needed. Teachers are needed. But above all, a real recognition of the role of technical education is needed by educators.

Boston Symphony Orhestra Conductor Erich Leinsdorf and Vice President Lyndon Johnson, Friends Since 1938, Good Samaritan Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct pleasure of being with Erich Leinsdorf, conductor of the Boston Symphony, at an after-symphony buffet Tuesday night at the home of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, following the Boston Symphony concert in Constitution Hall. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested to hear the story of how a new Texas Congressman befriended this young musician some 25 years ago.

Conductor Leinsdorf had come to the United States in 1937 and made his debut in New York conducting Die Walkure on January 21, 1938 at the age of 26. He was born in Vienna in 1912. When he was 20 years old he hiked from Vienna to Salsburg and took part in the famous festival. He worked with the festival every summer after that under Bruno Walter and Arturo Toscannini. It was that great Conductor Toscannini who recommended young Leinsdorf for the Metropolitan Opera in New York in 1937. He was an excellent performer at the Met. During World War II, Leinsdorf served in the American Army, and following the war he went with the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra, being at that time the youngest conductor leading a major American Symphony. He was with the Rochester Philharmonic from 1947 to 1956 when he again returned to New York to rejoin the Metropolitan.

Married to the former Miss Anne Fronhknecht, of New York City, in 1939, and now the father of five children, Leinsdorf assumed the conductorship of the Boston Symphony in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, the paths of Vice President JOHNSON and Conductor Leinsdorf first crossed by chance in 1938, but that first meeting was extremely important to the young Viennese musician and it determined his future in America. I think that this good samaritan story is better told by the well-known and distinguished Washington newspaper correspondent, Leslie Carpenter, in his article that appeared in the Springfield, Mass., Daily News on March 8, 1963:

WASHINGTON.—Two old friends named LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Erich Leinsdorf, who went through a crisis together 25 years ago and have kept in touch since, will have a reunion in Washington on March 19.

Today, JOHNSON is Vice President of the United States, and Leinsdorf is conductor of the Boston Symphony. But if they hadn't met by chance in 1938, Leinsdorf might not be in the United States now.

Occasion of their reunion will be a concert the Boston Symphony will play in Constitution Hall here March 19. Vice President and Mrs. Johnson will give a buffet in their home in honor of the conductor following the concert.

Back in 1938, JOHNSON was a young Congressman from Texas just starting his second year as a Member of the U.S. House. The Metropolitan Opera was on tour and was playing Washington. The conductor for the opera was Leinsdorf.

JOHNSON took his wife to the opera, and after it was over, a friend introduced the Texan to Leinsdorf.

Leinsdorf mentioned that he had a serious problem. An Austrian, his visa was expiring soon and he had been unable to get it renewed. Unless he succeeded, he would be sent back to Austria where Hitler's troops were marching in.

JOHNSON volunteered to help. JOHNSON recalls he had considerable difficulty, but he was determined to make it possible for a man with talent such as Leinsdorf to stay in the United States if that were his wish. Finally, JOHNSON obtained an extension of his visa. Later, it became possible for Leinsdorf to become a U.S. citizen.

During World War II, Leinsdorf joined the U.S. Army and was stationed as a corporal at Camp Lee, Va.

He and JOHNSON have corresponded through the years and have carefully followed the achievements in each of their careers.

Congressman Clyde Doyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress more than 18 years ago at the same time that the late Congressman Clyde Doyle joined our great House of Representatives. Our long, close association in representing constituents in California, has made his loss particularly personal for me.

Congressman Doyle had a distinguished record in serving the people of his area and I believe that his activity in Congress warranted the admiration of all of us who have had an opportunity to serve with him.

It was gratifying to see the tribute given to Congressman Clyde Doyle by a newspaper in my congressional district, the Oakland Tribune, which also is the newspaper serving the county of Clyde Doyle's birth.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert the fitting editorial tribute to Congressman Clyde Doyle:

CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE

Congressman Clyde Doyle, a Democrat from Long Beach, gave himself unstintingly to the service of his community, State and Nation.

He was born in Oakland in 1887 and he attended public school here. After obtaining his law degree from the University of Southern California, he resided in Long Beach, and later, South Gate.

During his long and unusually fruitful life he helped draw the city charter of Long Beach, organized the Long Beach Kiwanis club, chairmanned the sale of tuberculosis stamps for some years, served as a trustee for a crippled children's hospital, presided over the Long Beach Recreation Association, worked actively on various committees of the California Bar Association, and was a director of the National City Bank of Long Beach.

Congress beckoned, and in 1944 he won his first election, and after losing the next one, he returned to Congress in 1948 and stayed there until his recent death.

So widely appreciated was Congressman Doyle that in 1952 he was the nominee of both Democratic and Republican parties. In 1958 he had no opposition at all, and in 1960 he won reelection by a landslide 93,000 votes.

Congressman Doyle was a distinguished member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whose mission he heartily advanced. He believed that the committee's mandate was too vague, and urged Congress to transform the committee into a House Committee on Subversive Activities.

Undoubtedly Congressman Doyle was bewildered at times by the unremitting leftist vituperation directed against HCUA and its members. However, the committee received his undeviating support, and the investigations and legislation which the committee has produced, to the great benefit of the Republic, were partially the product of his wisdom and labor.

The loss of Congressman Doyle will leave a deep breach in the ranks of California's Representatives.

Strengthening Education the Hard Way—The Private School Dropout Plan or the Facts From Fairfax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the specified aim of school aid proposals in H.R. 3000, title IV is the strengthening of elementary and secondary education for all children.

There can be no serious question in this age of pledging our maximum local, State, and National resources to the improvement of every young American's capacity for mental and moral development.

In simplicities this means more and adequate classes of manageable size with teachers qualified and paid to meet the needs in every school in every district in every State. The needs for funds to achieve these necessary ends are so great that every conceivable economy in education should be encouraged.

That certainly should mean the maximum utilization of every existing school and classroom which meets State and local standards, public or private. When overcrowding or teacher shortage clearly exists the needs of the child should govern regardless of origin, color, creed, or school of attendance. In meeting those needs through maximum utilization and expansion of existing schools it is neither practical nor economical to price out, phase out, in effect, drop out, an entire school system.

Private school authorities have indicated that increased assistance to State-managed schools exclusively will, in effect, create a spending gap which would put them out of the education market in face of the greatest demand in history. If this is so, on the testimony of one witness before the committee, Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the loss of the Catholic parochial schools alone would have the following effect: To price out the Catholic schools in California would mean closing down a system larger than that in 17 States; to drop out the same school in Illinois would have the impact of closing down a greater number of schools than exist in 23 States; the loss of the Catholic parochial schools in New York would be equivalent to the termination of elementary education in any of 34 States in the Nation. Can any program which would have this effect be seriously called an economical and effective way of strengthening education?

Some of those who support selective aid to State schools only for the same subjects which are required to be taught in private schools have deprecated any adverse effect on these private schools. They suggest that the probability of spending the private schools out of existence is more fancied than real.

This no longer needs to be a matter of conjecture in the light of the situation which has developed in some of those areas which have received substantial aid on a selective basis to the exclusion of private schools under the impacted aid program.

Across the river from the Capitol the public schools in Fairfax County, Va., under Public Law 874, have received $11 million and under Public Law 815 $2½ million in the past 3 years. Fairfax City, in that county, has both public and parochial so that the effect of aid to one and not the other may be calculated. The experience in Fairfax might well be the advance sheet on what the effect of title IV or H.R. 3000 would be on the schools of the entire Nation. The article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 10, 1963, is entitled "Priests Cite Squeeze on Catholic Schools." In the light of the facts in Fairfax the one kultur concept in title IV of H.R. 3000 might be called "Strength Through Squeezing," just as the one kultur proponents of 1940 used to proclaim, "Strength Through Joy." That it can happen here is demonstrated by the Washington Post article to which I referred as follows:

PRIESTS CITE SQUEEZE ON CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

(By Gerald Grant)

Seventy-nine kindergarten children in St. Leo's Catholic Elementary School in Fairfax City are taught in a classroom that was built in a hallway.

There are 62 students in 1 second grade class and 13 others in with a third grade class under another teacher. The fifth and sixth grades are combined in one classroom under one teacher.

Hundreds of children who want to attend the parish school cannot be accommodated at all. Thus, St. Leo's pastor, the Reverend Walter F. Malloy, announced last week that the parish school would close its kindergarten and first three grades in order to improve the educational opportunities in grades four through eight.

St. Leo's decision is by no means an isolated example of one fast-growing suburban parish under unusual strain.

ENROLLMENT UP

Catholic elementary and secondary school enrollments have multiplied 6.2 times nationally since 1900, compared with 2.3 times for public schools. There are now 5.4 million children in Catholic schools being educated at an estimated cost of $2.6 billion a year.

One out of every eight children in the Nation attends a parochial school. In some cities, the ratio is much higher—in Pittsburgh, 1 of 2.

Space and teacher shortages, and rising construction and educational costs have forced a number of dioceses to curtail lower-level instruction.

In Green Bay, Wis., 15 parochial schools have dropped first grade. The Catholic School Board in Kansas City instructed parish schools to cut out kindergartens and first grades if enrollment in other grades is so high that they are overcrowded.

Some grades have been eliminated in Catholic schools in Cincinnati, Columbus and Newberry, Ohio; Spokane, Wash.; Clinton, Iowa, and St. Paul, Minn.

Last fall, public school officials in St. Louis expressed concern when Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, announced that no new Catholic parochial schools would be built until there were qualified teachers to staff them. Five new parishes have no grade schools at all.

The Reverend Neil C. D'Amour of the National Catholic Educational Association called the St. Louis decision a "retrenching" and predicts the policy will be adopted by many dioceses in the future.

However, Father D'Amour said he did not believe that eliminating grades represents a set pattern. But he granted that a number of other prominent churchmen think it is, and in fact are urging elimination of Catholic grade schools in favor of concentration of resources at the high school and college level.

It is argued that the adolescent years are the most crucial in the moral and religious education of the Catholic child. If a choice must be made it is better to do without the primary rather than the secondary years, proponents of this view state.

Father D'Amour identifies these problems as contributing to the "squeeze" on Catholic schools:

Broadening of the curriculum—science and foreign language teaching in the elementary grades, the "new" mathematics.

Costs of retraining teachers in the above areas and competition with public school salary scales that are making it increasingly difficult to keep lay teachers in parochial schools.

Efforts to reduce class size in the face of large birth rates.

Bigger construction bills and equipment costs.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

However, regardless of what educators may say about curtailment of the lower grades, Father D'Amour feels that Catholic parents will continue to demand a full-scale parochial educational system.

The priest said he thought "support from public funds will be forthcoming because of the basic sense of fairness of the American people as illustrated by the recent Gallup Poll."

The poll to which he referred showed that 49 percent of a cross section of the population believe Federal aid should go to Catholic schools as opposed to only 36 percent favoring it 2 years ago. Seven percent had no opinion and 44 percent said that aid should go only to public schools, in the current poll.

Father D'Amour said public schools are now at a crisis stage and if Catholic schools are forced to close, the resulting influx of students would seriously impair public school education. "A little relief for Catholic schools would go a long way," he said.

All-American Lee Roy Jordan Says Namath Passes, Not Collusion, Beat Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been alleged in a national publication that the September 22, 1962, Alabama-Georgia football game was fixed. This publication, the Saturday Evening Post, says the athletic directors of the two schools, Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts, University of Georgia, conspired to rig the game.

This scurrilous, defamatory, libelous charge is based on the flimsiest evidence I have ever seen. It is, in fact, based on hearsay of a very questionable source.

In the wake of these charges, reporters approached participants in the game. One of them, All-American Lee Roy Jordan, University of Alabama, gave the following account which appeared in the Birmingham News for March 18, 1963, and which I insert herewith:

NAMATH PASSES, NOT COLLUSION, BEAT GEORGIA, SAYS LEE ROY

(By Phil Oramous)

TUSCALOOSA, March 18.—All-America center, Lee Roy Jordan said today Alabama's football team won over Georgia last fall because of Quarterback Joe Namath's passing—and not because of any alleged collusion between coaching officials.

"Joe just ate them up with his passes," said Jordan. "Georgia tried to move against us on the ground. That was their mistake—that and not trying anything different."

Jordan summed up feeling on the Alabama campus about a Saturday Evening Post article accusing former Georgia Athletic Director Wallace Butts of giving his team's secrets to Coach Paul Bryant, of Alabama, prior to the schools' games last fall.

"We don't believe Coach Bryant would do such a thing," said Jordan, center-linebacker who finished his college football career last season. Student leaders agreed. Opinions ranged from stark disbelief to cries of hogwash.

Jordan, one of the players in the September 22 game which ended 35–0 in Alabama's favor, said in an interview:

"There is no foundation of fact either in the article or in its charges. If Alabama was supposed to have an advantage over Georgia, it stands to reason the players would have had to know something about it.

"None of the coaches told me anything that I didn't already know about Georgia. And any of the other men will tell you the same thing."

Jordan was asked about the magazine's statement that Alabama seemed to know Georgia's plays before the Georgia team lined up.

He said Alabama coaches and scouts spent the summer studying Georgia game films from the year before.

"Besides that, Georgia didn't have a thing that was new," Jordan said. "If we had an unfair advantage, they gave it to us by not having any new plays. And Georgia didn't know what to expect from Joe Namath."

Namath, a sophomore sensation, threw three touchdown passes, the first one a 52-yard scoring toss, in the game.

Jordan said: "Coaches swap plays all the time.

"I've been in Coach Bryant's office when he was talking to Oklahoma Coach Bud Wilkinson and writing down plays. Then in practice he would tell us that Wilkinson gave him such and such a play that worked for him, so we put it in our playbook."

A Lesson in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I include an article which I would like to commend to the entire membership that is a guest editorial by Thomas J. Shelly. It is from the Chicago Sunday Tribune.

I am deeply grateful to Attorney Stanton E. Hyer of Rockford, Ill., for bringing this excellently written article to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

GUEST EDITORIALS—A LESSON IN SOCIALISM

(By Thomas J. Shelly)

As a teacher in the public schools, I find that the Socialist-Communist idea of taking from each according to his ability, and giving to each according to his need is now generally accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes try this approach with my pupils:

When one of the brighter or hard-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on his test. Thus each would contribute according to his ability and—since both would have a passing mark—each would receive according to his need. After I have juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion, the result is usually a common ownership grade of between 75 and 80—the minimum needed for passing, or for survival. Then I speculate with the pupils as to the probable results if I actually used the socialistic theory for grading papers.

First, the highly productive pupils—and they are always a minority in school as well as in life—would soon lose all incentive for producing. Why strive to make a high grade if part of it is taken from you by authority and given to someone else?

Second, the less productive pupils—a majority in school as elsewhere—would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity to study or to produce. This socialistic-Communist system would continue until the high producers had sunk—or had been driven down—to the level of the low producers. At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the authority would have no alternative but to begin a system of compulsory labor and punishments against even the low producers. They, of course, would then complain bitterly, but without understanding.

Finally I return the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise—the market economy—where each person has freedom of choice and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare.

Gratifying enough, most of my pupils then understand what I mean when I explain that socialism—even in a democracy—will eventually result in a living death for all except the authorities and a few of their favorite lackeys.

At the Crossroads of the Heavens—Rest Here and Pray, Then Journey Unafraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of an address by my longtime good friend the Honorable Charles H. Silver, executive assistant to the mayor of the city of New York for education and industrial development. The address was delivered at a dinner held at the Americana Hotel, New York City, on March 10, 1963, celebrating the groundbreaking of the International Synagogue at Idlewild Airport. Mr. Silver is president of the synagogue.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL SYNAGOGUE, AT DINNER IN CELEBRATION OF GROUNDBREAKING, MARCH 10, 1963

We have met before to advance the same sacred mission that brings us together again tonight.

From my earliest affiliation with the concept of the International Synagogue, like many of you in this room, I felt that we had embarked upon one of the outstanding achievements of our people in our time, and this is a time of uncertainty and momentous decision. There is evidence of a growing awareness among people of every creed that the standards of secular living are no longer enough.

In the midst of our busy round of activities, filled with action, responsibility and seeming importance, suddenly, there is something empty at the very core.

We live in hours that are troubled by a sense of constant foreboding. The turbulent state of a world in torment has a way of invading even the smallest peaceful town and hamlet.

Here, in the heart of civilization's largest community, the seething unrest of nations reaches into all of our homes to disturb the complacency of every member of the family.

Religious precepts are taking on new meanings. Mechanical progress and even the startling advances of science no longer serve to make us feel secure.

Indeed, the scope and speed of our escape from the bonds of gravity into space may even make us a little afraid.

There is a latent panic underlying the usual pattern of our lives. We are losing confidence in the material fortresses we have built on false pride and the empty quest for profit. We reach desperately to strengthen the frontiers of faith.

In these days, so full of turmoil, so empty of trust, we seek, more and more, for the eternal truth—returning to the Torah, searching for God.

How right it is that we have joined hands and hearts to lift an enduring and dramatic evidence of our ancient covenant. How proud we may feel that, by our efforts, there will rise an edifice of the spirit, stamping across the skyways of the world, the seal of man's devotion to his Maker.

What a consummation is this, as we celebrate our miracle of faith.

The triumph is yours. You have helped to realize the hopes and dreams of the inspired men and women who first conceived this symbol of our people's allegiance to their Creator.

I don't know what feelings well up in your hearts tonight, but mine is bursting with pride that we are fulfilling this noble project. Yes, and that you have called upon me to serve as your president, and that, together, we are breaking bread as we break ground for the tabernacle to rise at Idlewild. It will be a citadel of mankind's better self, of human dignity and dedication—a peaceful place where man may seek infinite understanding in a house of God, but a house of God unlike any other—on the very crossroads of the heavens.

It can be a source of heartfelt satisfaction to our people everywhere that despite the fact that we represent only a very small proportion of this Nation's population, we have received identical recognition with the Catholic and Protestant denominations in the chapel area directly across from the international arrival building. There our synagogue will stand side by side with the structures of the other two great faiths, joined together in a magnificent demonstration of the common heritage that units all Americans in their commitment to the religious and democratic ideals that motivate the brotherhood of man.

Like the Lady With the Lamp, whose welcome thrills the hearts of thousands of ocean voyagers approaching these shores, our synagogue will hold high the torch of hope and happy landings to Idlewild's airborne millions.

On the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor we find the unforgettable inscription: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

On the cornerstone of our synagogue, I propose that we carve a new credo which will contain these words:

"Rest here and read the sacred scroll
Whose flaming words of faith will never fade,
While we preserve the Torah in our soul—
Rest here and pray, then journey unfraid."

In the basic philosophy of every sect, we find an emphasis upon the divine virtues of faith, hope, and charity. These are underlying principles of Judaic ethics, along with justice, truth, and mercy.

Faith, hope, and charity are, in a sense, the foundation stones upon which the synagogue itself must stand.

Faith is the flame which burns eternally before our ark of the covenant.

Hope is the bond of trust in the future that calls us to worship together, as well as in our own hearts.

Charity is our obligation to the community and the duty of the congregation to care for its ill and needy.

I am thankful that, tonight, one who is, to me, the embodiment of the man of faith has traveled from Israel to hail the birth of the International Synagogue, its honorary president, my own cherished friend and beloved rabbi, Dr. Israel Goldstein.

And I see hope, personified, in the presence among us of a man who held high the spirit of our people, in a land whose king and countrymen defied a ruthless invader to rescue the entire Jewish population from destruction at the height of the Nazi terror, the chief rabbi of Denmark, Dr. Marcus Melchior.

Finally, there is charity, a subject on which I felt myself to be well informed. That was before I met the gracious, modest merchant prince who had already given us $50,000 although our plans were scarcely underway.

His charming wife had become an active worker for the concert to be held in June, by our ladies auxiliary. So he pleased her, and all of us, by underwriting the entire cost of that evening at Philharmonic Hall. And, just recently, impressed with the progress being made in fulfilling our hopes for a library, meditation chapel, museum, and information center in conjunction with the International Synagogue, he added another $50,000, more than doubling his original gift, for a total of $107,000.

Let me say, then, that for charity, we can well salute two warm, wonderful people, a rare humanitarian and his lovely wife, who neither wanted nor expected these words of appreciation, Estelle and Eugene Ferkauf.

But I have named only a few of the many who have made this dream come true. Men like our energetic leader—6 feet of dynamic administrative dynamite—the treasured, tireless, and indomitable Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz, and his distinguished colleague, superbly qualified to advance our great cause, Rabbi Harold Gordon.

Then there is the inspired and eloquent rabbi of my own beloved B'nai Jeshurun, the man chosen by Israel Goldstein to inherit the mantle of his greatness—an honor and responsibility for which he has proved well endowed and altogether worthy, Rabbi William Berkowitz, and, of course, we should also salute those two stalwart supporters and spendid workers who have never faltered in their efforts to bring our plans and ambitions of yesterday to the glorious reality of today—Rabbis Simon G. Kramer and David I. Golovensky.

There are so many more. There is that fabulous guardian angel of good deeds and notable philanthropies who has never ignored any call for assistance which concerns the security and welfare of our people, Charles Frost; and I will not omit mention of a fellow who is not only the best comptroller the city of New York ever had, but, also one of the sincerest friends of our synagogue, Abraham Beame.

We owe much also to the delightful and charming dynamo of our ladies auxiliary, Mrs. Morris Diamond, and her capable coworker, Mrs. Doris Lipton.

But the list is almost endless. It would require hours to name the hundreds who have helped us to accomplish a thing that, only a few short months ago, seemed virtually impossible.

The soaring walls of our synagogue will testify to their wisdom and generosity—and yours. For we know how much we owe to you who have kindled this beacon of faith and hope and charity to shine forever through the clouds of distrust and dismay.

Thus do we fulfill our ancient obligation to bestoy upon humanity the blessing of our Holy Scriptures, and immortal Commandments.

Gathered on these shores of freedom, refugees from every corner of the world—hounded, beaten, and betrayed on almost every page of history—we have survived to enjoy the blessings of this God-loved land.

The synagogue we will build—this hymn of thanksgiving in stone and steel—is our expression of gratitude for the freedom and security that make such things possible. And such things are possible in few other parts of the world, as they are here—in this land whose very name—America, is like a prayer.

It is our prayer as we prepare to raise our new house of worship—a shrine for the Word of God—a refuge in the world of men—another Zion—lighting the way for those who travel on the wings of the future.

To them we say: "Rest here and pray, then journey—unafraid."

Concerned Citizen Calls for Greater Effort To Reduce Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Von Zell testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax recommendations and stressed what he felt to be the concern of many of our American citizens, that there needs to be a more realistic approach to the solution of our basic economic problems through the development of measures which will bring Government spending with the progressively closer relationship to Government income. In other words, a balanced budget. His key thought is the need for fiscal responsibility to be demonstrated by the Government. There must be confidence in the business community, in Government fiscal policies and this confidence is damaged by deficit financing. His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HARRY VON ZELL BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I come before you as one individual, a private citizen, unaffiliated with any organized group or faction, and yet, because it is my firm conviction that the views I hold in opposition to the administration's tax reduction and reform bill are in fundamental accord with those of literally millions of my fellow citizens * * * my capacity here may be in effect that of a representative of a vast number of American citizens who, like myself, grow increasingly concerned that we seem unable to progress in achieving the national economic stability and growth essential to our defeat of the avowed aim of world Socialist communism to collapse our great free enterprise system, and bury us.

There has already been presented much qualified testimony covering specific areas of this bill. My opposition to the measure is fundamental. My premise is fundamental: It is that to maintain an effective defense against the determined assault of communism, we must build our economic strength and growth to its maximum * * * and that in working toward this goal, an active and progressive economy is necessary.

While it is generally agreed among many qualified authorities that early tax reduction is necessary to our achievement of this goal, it has also been repeatedly and strongly emphasized that any measures of tax reduction or rate reform at this time must include provisions calling for counter-balancing reduction in governmental expenditures and budgetary commitments.

The bill now before this body takes no recognition of this vitally important condition—in fact, it admittedly would result in a greatly increased deficit. On this point, proponents of the bill have stated that its prime purpose is to provide protection, or offset against a possible serious recession. The premise appears to be that this return of some $13 billion to the private economy by reducing income taxes would have the immediate effect of stimulating consumer spending which in turn would create greater production, expansion in business and industry and ventures into new enterprise, all working toward creating greater employment opportunities and in general a more active economy. However, in evaluating how effective this bill would be in achieving these intended effects, there is a basic, and most vital factor to be considered. That factor is confidence. Spending and investment, new enterprise ventures, and expansion programs are not predicated merely upon income, profit margins, surplus funds or available credit. In the making of such decisions, the judgment of people is predominantly influenced by the extent of their confidence in the protected stability of the Nation's long-range economy and the protected strength of the monetary unit.

We are confronted today with a recurring and most significant inconsistency regarding the status of our economy: On the one hand, we are quoted statistics which tend to show that our general private economy is healthy, that production and consumption are at a high level, and that the per capita wealth is greater than ever in our history—figures which do not indicate any actual lack of purchasing power within the private economy. And yet there is this repeatedly voiced concern that our economy is dormant, not working, or moving, as it should, that employment figures indicate future problems, and that serious recession is a possibility. What is at the root of this obvious inconsistency—statistics which indicate a healthy private economy and yet facts which indicate that the potential, the force, of this economy is not being implemented.

It is my contention that over a long period of years, confronted by a constantly rising national debt, soaring into the multi-billions of dollars—the continuation of punitively high rates of taxation—an unexplainably fluctuating and uncertain stock market—a constant depletion of our gold reserve which forms the very foundation of our economy—and a continuing fiscal policy of unlimited deficit spending by Government, without regard for the essential safeguards of a balanced budget or reasonable legal debt limitations—the confidence of our people has been measurably shaken, and that, as a result, in attempting to protect and tighten their own economy, the people are holding back from capital commitments which are needed to provide the impetus for economic growth. It is my belief, and statistics substantiate it, that the productive capacity, and the wealth-producing capacity of the American people are as great, or greater than they have ever been.

What is imminently needed is something that will restore a greater degree of confidence within the people—and a most vital step in that direction would be the evidencing within our administrative and legislative bodies of a more realistic approach to the solution of our basic economic problems to the development of measures which will bring Government spending within progressively closer relationship to Government income and will serve in practical function to bring us progressively closer to a balanced budget. These factors accompanied by tax rate reform to serve long-range economic development will restore the sound active American economy wherein lies the fundamental source of our once unchallenged strength in this world of nations.

I respectfully submit that the administration's tax bill does not take into consideration these obvious, basic, vital needs. I submit that this bill in its fundamental aspects—embodying as it does what might be described as nothing more than a shot-in-the-arm to ease the pain of threatened increasing economic ills, embodying as it does the factor of further substantial deficit within a budget of unprecedented proportions which threatens our current legal debt limitations, and embodying as it does the very tagible doubt that it would achieve any of its intended effects—is not a constructive, workable measure toward solution of the basic economic problems, which bear with such vital significance upon the future strength and security of this country. I respectfully submit that there is another measure of gradual tax reduction and rate reform most worthy of consideration, the Herlong-Baker bill—a measure which in its basic conception takes full recognition of the vital essentiality of our relating any program of tax rate reform to our over-all economic future—a measure of tax rate reform which moves toward steady improvement in our long-range economic outlook—a measure which in effect rightfully places the horse before the cart, rather than continuing the picture of a horse hitched at each end of our economic cart, pulling in opposite directions . . . while the cart remains stationary in the middle, and strains mightily to keep from being torn asunder.

These are the views of one citizen, but in full confidence that they are views which find strong accord in the hearts and minds of millions of other citizens, in their behalf and in mine, I most fervently beseech of all who may be called upon to act officially on this issue your thoughtful consideration of these pertinent, fundamental premises and of measures drawn to insure the restoration of confidence within our people and will serve to activate the powerful economic forces which are our heritage.

Who's Against Victory?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious threats to our Nation's strength and security is the irresponsible attacks which are being made on our President, on the Congress, and on other leaders in our Government. One example of this has been the charge that our Government is against victory over the forces of communism and totalitarian tyranny.

Following is an interesting and excellent editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, and reprinted in the Harrisburg Patriot, which quotes Adlai Stevenson and gives the answer to these irresponsible critics:

WHO'S AGAINST VICTORY?

Adlai Stevenson knows attempted larceny when he see it, even though it is only the right wingers and some others trying to snatch the word victory and claim it as their own. It has been all a little silly, of course, seeking to make political profit out of allegations that some administration leaders are afraid to use that word under certain circumstances.

But Mr. Stevenson turns this to advantage deftly and provocatively. He likes the word, he says, especially in such contexts as these:

"Victory of commonsense over fanaticism.

"Victory of patience and endurance over dangerous distemper.

"Victory of the calculated risk over Russian roulette.

"Victory of firmness and maturity over the reckless rigidities of know-nothings.

"And finally, the victory of cool reason over hot air."

These are victories that must contribute to the final victory of the democratic, humanitarian way over the Communist way, hard and exasperating as is the long struggle that this seems apt to require.

The Future of Malaysia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a thoughtful, and at times disturbing article, Nick Williams, writing in the Los Angeles Times of March 12, has explored several aspects of the potentially explosive problem developing over the formation of Malaysia.

In particular, he has discussed the important matter of native—Malay, Chinese, and Indian—attitudes toward each other—toward the Western World—and toward the United States; attitudes with which we should be concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this excellent article contains a number of revealing insights, and I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

Luncheon at the Kuala Lumpur home of Donald McCue is a charming affair. Its setting is spacious—the wide halls and high ceilings of colonial architecture, vases of orchids everywhere, beautifully kept gardens beyond every window. The Malayan houseboys move silently on the marble floors, refilling the glasses of a dozen men.

It is strictly stag, honoring three travelbeaten newsmen from the Los Angeles Times, and everyone sheds his coat, relaxes, and starts talking, and as usual in southeast Asia the talk is political, opinionated and informed. Politics is not a sport in Malaya at present—it is life and death.

It was pleasant to spoon out the Mulligatawny cooked and served in a cocoanut, pleasant to work through the fish-in-aspic with its cream curry sauce, but what Ambassador Charles Baldwin was saying may well concern war in this corner of the world, or a far greater war. He was flying that afternoon to Manila for discussions.

The deadline for this possible war is August 31, 7 months from now. By that date, Tunku (Prince) Abdul Rahman of Malaya intends, despite any opposition, to ram through his unification of Malaya, Singapore, the Borneo territories, Sarawak, north Borneo, and Brunei—to create the nation of Malaysia, a nation predominantly Malayan, as a free-world bastion against Communist encroachment.

You ought at this point to get out your map and see exactly what Malaysia means.

It will provide, as your map will show you, a chain anchored in the east by Malaya itself, and curving westward all the way across the seas to the Philippines, cutting off a similar chain just south of it, that is now the Republic of Indonesia.

All this makes good sense, for a strong Malaysia, backed up by a strong Indonesia, and flanked by a strong Philippines—each of which recognizes an imperialist Red China as its eventual enemy, and each having ties to the other of race and religion—would create a new force, a non-Western force of great significance and potential power among the emerging nations.

But like all things that make good sense, the Tunku's plan has violent opposition. Indonesia's Sukarno is determined somehow to block the creation of Malaysia, and suddenly now he has gotten the support of the Phillippines in thwarting the Tunku.

The details of this struggle, including its threat of actual war, have been reported in the Times by Ed Meagher, our Hong Kong bureau chief, and for the last week or so by James Bassett, director, editorial pages of the Times.

The three of us were together in spooning out Donald McCue's superb Mulligatawny at Kuala Lumpur.

Our fellow guests included the part-Malayan publisher of Kuala Lumpur's finest English-language newspaper, a Hindu journalist, an editor of Asia magazine, the Ambassador and members of his staff. All the three elements of Malayan society were represented—Mayalan, Chinese, and Indian, and at that highly sophisticated level there is no racial stress. But out in the kampongs, out where the rubber and tin that feed Malaya's economy are produced, racial differences are a very major issue.

One of the men with whom I talked in Kuala Lumpur is a member of the Peace Corps, who lives in a world quite remote from diplomatic and official Malaya. Peace Corps members do not share the perquisites, the creature comforts, of most Americans in these Asian countries. Their work is to help, at the lowest levels—actually to help the people live better; to teach them, to nurse them, to join in well drilling and bridge building, to become neither more nor less than one of them, and in so doing to demonstrate in personal terms that Americans believe in a better life for the people of Asia.

It is difficult to fault that reason for being, and only cynics do.

My Peace Corps friend told me an interesting thing. In time, he said, he had become a friend of Chinese families, of Malayan families, of Indian families. They would drop in at night to talk a while, pleasantly, but never together with each other. The Malayans made the Chinese feel uncomfortable, and the Chinese fidgeted when the Indians came into the house.

The sophistication of Donald McCue's assorted guests does not extend down to the kampongs. There, where the work of any nation is done, and where the possibilities for subversion are greatest, these three races live uneasily, although not always hostilely, together in Malaya. And this will be true of Malaysia.

Down at the kampong level, where mud and sweat and even blood sometimes are mingled, there is also a potentially anti-Western feeling that could not exist at the sophisticated level of Donald McCue's stag luncheon. Down here, strangely, despite Red Chinese fulminations, there is no resentment of Americans. But there is indeed the always bitter feeling of a man toward his master—in the case of Malaya, the British.

All this will be denied, of course. Ambassadors and even newsmen rarely report it. But I can assure you it is there. The white man in Asia bears the mark of Cain, and the mark of the Raj, upon his forehead.

To an American who believes devoutly in the equality of man this is a little horrifying. And to conservative Americans, far more than to liberals, this ought to be frightening. For where there is built-in hatred, the West ultimately will lose.

I want to repeat, the mark is not yet upon the forehead of Americans. Asians can believe—and most Asians want passionately to believe—that the American is a new and possibly saintlier kind of white man. Asians want passionately to believe that Americans mean what they profess to mean. They want to believe that the hand we extend to them is the hand of friendship and equality, and not another hand to drag them into servility.

I am not certain we are always convincing. Even when our hearts are right, we sometimes blunder. But I am convinced, if the Asians are not, that both Americans and Asians seek the dignity of all men.

Even those they dislike.

The Future of the Wall in School Aid, by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, at this time of great concern with the proper education of our Nation's children, I suggest that we consider the remarks of Dr. Robert M. Hutchins on the "Wall of Separation."

I am in accord with his view that the metaphorical masonry must not hamper our educational processes. Federal aid directed to need should be available to all children.

Dr. Hutchins is the president of the Fund for the Republic and has been since 1954. Dr. Hutchins served as chancellor of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1945 and as dean of Yale Law School from 1928 to 1929.

I suggest that those of us who are charged with framing legislation for the good of all our children should turn a receptive ear to a man with Dr. Hutchins' background in education and dedication to the advance and preservation of democratic institutions:

HUTCHINS ON WALL OF SEPARATION

Its past has not been brilliant; its future is not bright. It first appeared in the opinion of Mr. Chief Justice Waite, in *Reynolds* v. *U.S.*, where it played no role in the decision, which was that interference with religious polygamy was not interference with religious freedom.

The reason the wall arose in this context was that the Chief Justice wanted to use another phrase in Jefferson's letter to support his decision: He could not edit the letter to leave out the wall. The remark of Jefferson on which the Chief Justice relied was that the powers of government could reach only the actions of men, not their opinions. Since polygamy was an action, and an unpopular one at that, it was open to the Government to deny the defendant enjoyment of it, even though he alleged that he was authorized, or even ordered, by his church to commit it.

All was quiet along the wall until *Everson* v. *Board of Education*. It assumed massive proportions then and has been growing ever since. Its growth has, however, been largely literary and ornamental. It has not produced those instant solutions which its apparent clarity and directness lead its devotees to expect.

In the Everson case, for example, the wall did not prevent the State from giving assistance, at least by the way of bus rides, to children attending parochial schools, even though four justices could see it blocked these payments; and in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, a far from unanimous court let the New York program of released time through the wall. But almost every Justice feels constrained to bow before it.

Only Mr. Justice Reed, dissenting in *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, has argued much against it. In that case Mr. Justice Frankfurter, concurring, raised the wall to new heights of eloquence by saying, "Separation means separation, not something less. Jefferson's metaphor in describing the relation between church and state speaks of a wall of separation, not of a fine line easily overstepped."

Mr. Justice Reed replied, "A rule of law should not be drawn from a figure of speech." He pointed out that Jefferson's letter says religion is a matter between a man and his God; he owes account of it to none other; and the powers of government reach actions only.

He could not see in these propositions any clear prohibition against the released-time program in Champaign. On the contrary, he suggested, Jefferson himself, with Madison's approval, had worked out a scheme by which the University of Virginia could see to it that all students received religious instruction.

The wall builders on the court may be accused of misplaced piety. Their devotional sentiments might better have been directed to the Constitution, which speaks only of the prohibition of establishment and the exercise of freedom, than to words appearing in what may have been a routine acknowledgment of a complimentary address, words written by a man, however great, who did not take part in the adoption of the first amendment.

The same may be said of Mr. Justice Frankfurter's quotation in the McCollum case from General Grant, who there receives what must be the first tribute ever paid him as a political philosopher.

The wall has done what walls usually do: it has obscured the view. It has lent a simplistic air to the discussion of a very complicated matter. Hence, it has caused confusion whenever it has been invoked.

Far from helping to decide cases, it has made opinions and decisions unintelligible. The wall is offered as a reason. It is not a reason; it is a figure of speech.

The problems of Mr. Justice Jackson are instructive. In *Everson* v. *Board of Education* he said in dissent that (1) Catholic education is the rock (another unfortunate metaphor) upon which the Catholic church rests, and aid to a Catholic school is the same as aid to the church. (2) "Our public school, if not a product of Protestantism, at least is more consistent with it than with the Catholic culture and scheme of values."

This would mean that supporting public schools is supporting Protestant churches, or at least something that by being more consistent with them tends to lend them support. (3) Public education is organized on the premise that education can be isolated from all religious teaching so that the school can inculcate all needed temporal knowledge and also maintain a strict and lofty neutrality as to religion.

Mr. Justice Jackson adds, as it seems to me indefensibly, "Whether such a disjunction is possible, and if possible whether it is wise, are questions I need not try to answer."

A man who rests his opinion on the necessity of separation is bound to try to answer the question whether separation can in fact occur. If it cannot occur, then, according to his own doctrine, the State will be supporting religious teaching.

Concurring in the McCollum case, Mr. Justice Jackson went in even deeper. There he said: "I think it remains to be demonstrated whether it is possible, even if desirable, completely to isolate and cast out of secular education all that some people may reasonably regard as religious instruction. The fact is, that for good or for ill, nearly everything in our culture worth transmitting, everything which gives meaning to life, is saturated with religious influences. But how one can teach, with satisfaction or even with justice to all faiths, such subjects as the story of the Reformation, the Inquisition, or even the New England effort to found a Church without a bishop and a State without a King is more than I know. When instruction turns to proselytizing and imparting knowledge becomes evangelism is, except in the crudest cases, a subtle inquiry. It is idle to pretend that this task is one for which we can find in the Constitution one word to help us as judges to decide where the secular ends and the sectarian begins in education. Nor can we find guidance in any other legal source.

"It is a matter on which we can find no law but our own prepossessions. If with no surer legal guidance we are to take up and decide every variation of this controversy we are likely to make the legal 'wall of separation between church and state' as winding as the famous serpentine wall designed by Mr. Jefferson for the university he founded."

And sure enough, in the Zorach case, Mr. Justice Jackson found that "the wall which the Court was professing to erect between church and state has become even more warped and twisted than I expected."

A man who proposes to erect a wall in the midst of a saturated solution and have the material on one side different from that on the other should not be surprised at the failure of his experiment.

Like Mr. Justice Jackson, the Educational Policies Commission holds that "knowledge about religion is essential for a full understanding of our culture, literature, art, history, and current affairs."

But if knowledge about religion is to be communicated, it will presumably be communicated by somebody who has a view of the subject and who cannot be expected to conceal it. If he is paid by the state, what has happened to the wall?

As Mr. Justice Jackson suggests, the wall is really a permeable membrane, and is getting more porous all the time. The well-worn catalog of so-called aids to religion that Mr. Justice Reed began in the McCollum case and that Justices Douglas and Stewart reiterated in *Engel* v. *Vitale* is getting longer every day.

Whenever public policy seems to require the expenditure of public funds for a public purpose, the incidental "aid to religion," if any, is disregarded.

This has been held true of bus transportation, free textbooks, and hospitals. It is true of aid under the GI bill of rights, of school lunches, of expenditures under the National Defense Education Act, of scholarships and fellowships awarded by public agencies, some of which are granted to theological schools.

And certiorari was denied when New York helped Fordham University acquire land in Lincoln Center at less than cost.

As nondiscriminatory tax exemption, which is solid financial aid, has never been successfully challenged when granted a church or church schools, so financial aid directed to a public purpose other than the support of religion has never been struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court even when the financial benefit to religious organizations was obvious.

This is as it should be. When something has to be done through schools, colleges, and universities, it should be self-defeating to try to act as though schools, colleges, and universities under religious auspices did not exist and did not have innumerable students, teachers, and scholars who ought to be involved.

If it is objected that nonbelievers are thereby taxed to aid religion, the answer is that by hypothesis the aid to religion is incidental to an overriding public benefit that cannot be obtained without including institutions under religious auspices, and that, since the object of the religion clauses of the first amendment is to guarantee and promote religious freedom, such incidental benefits, which do not limit religious freedom, do not invalidate the legislation.

Federal aid to education is inevitable, and the sooner it comes the better. The flagrant injustice, to say nothing of shortsightedness, in committing the support of education to 50 States characterized by wide economic disparities and highly mobile populations requires no elaboration here. Federal aid has arrived in a large way by the back door. Its formal admission through the main entrance cannot be long delayed.

Federal aid should go to all educational institutions that meet Federal standards. Mr. Justice Jackson is wrong in saying a school is a church if it is managed by a church and is important to its religious work.

A school is an educational institution and not a church if its object is intellectual development and if it is engaged, bona fide, in this task. The fact that it is owned by a church, or that it gives some religious instruction, or that its teaching is permeated by religion, or that aid to it is incidentally of some benefit to the church is immaterial.

Aid to all educational institutions that meet Federal standards would promote religious freedom as well as education. The overriding public purpose would be to improve education, including education in institutions under religious auspices.

Supporting them would no more be a violation of the first amendment than it would be to hold institutions under religious auspices to Federal standards as a condition of receiving Federal aid.

Since the object of the first amendment is to guarantee and promote religious freedom, including freedom from religion, it is a violation of the amendment to apply pressure, direct or indirect, upon the conscience of any person.

Such pressure may have been present, though Justices Douglas and Stewart did not detect it, in *Engel* v. *Vitale*. It may also lurk in the Zorach case and in *Doremus* v. *Board of Education*.

The "brief moment with eternity" the Supreme Court of New Jersey there said the statute compelled every child to have every day is not within the competence of the State, and excusing any pupil in the borough of Hawthorne upon request may substitute indirect for direct pressure. Distinctions among schoolchildren on the basis of their religion, or lack of it, are bound to seem invidious.

This brings us back to the perplexities of Mr. Justice Jackson. We may all agree that a school that children are compelled to attend should not hold religious ceremonies in which some children or their parents do not believe.

But suppose the educational authorities, taking the hint from Mr. Justice Jackson and the Educational Policies Commission, decide that every child in such a school, before he reaches the school-leaving age, must take a course in religion, or in the history of religion, or in comparative religion.

Since the object is education and not the propagation of religion, no question can be raised about the support of religion or the invasion of religious freedom. The only questions are whether the course and the teacher are adequate. It is doubtful whether these are questions for the courts, or even for the legislature.

We need to learn what education is and who is responsible for its general direction and its content. I suggest we might try to establish the distinction among edification, indoctrination, and education and then work toward the elimination of everything but education from educational institutions.

My principal objection to the prayer considered in *Engel* v. *Vitale* is not constitutional; it is educational. The prayer was a part of the so-called moral training program of the board of regents. It had little or no value as such training.

In any event, the primary responsibility of the board of regents is not moral training, which is the province of the family and the church, but education, which may supply the intellectual foundations of morality,

but which does not attempt to convey its moral message by way of edification or indoctrination. In general we may say that a teacher who tries to indoctrinate his pupils is incompetent and should be subject to discipline from the proper quarter.

In *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* the court said the child was not the mere creature of the state. Is the school the mere creature of the state?

We may admit the self-evident truth that an educational system supported by taxes cannot survive if it does not command the allegiance of the taxpayers. Does this mean that the policies and curriculum of schools are to be determined by the taxpayers?

Two ancient propositions are the starting point of any discussion of the autonomy of educational institutions. The first is, all men by nature desire to know. The second is, politics is the architectonic science, which determines what shall be studied in the State.

The first proposition is normative; the second is descriptive. Any actual educational system is judged by the degree to which it meets the standard of the first proposition and makes it possible for all men to know. The free speech, free press, and free assembly provisions of the first amendment proclaim this ideal for the United States.

The New York Supreme Court, dismissing a suit to compel the board of education to remove "Oliver Twist" and "The Merchant of Venice" from school libraries and classrooms, said:

"Educational institutions are concerned with the development of free inquiry and learning. The administrative officers must be free to guide teachers and pupils toward that goal. Their discretion must not be interfered with in the absence of proof of actual malevolent intent."

Concurring in *Wieman* v. *Updegraff*, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, joined by Mr. Justice Douglas, found that State and National power could not limit the functions of educational institutions, from the primary participation of teachers in "that restless enduring process of extending the bounds of understanding and wisdom, to assure which the freedoms of thought, of speech, of inquiry, of worship are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States against infraction by the National or State government."

The wall has no future. What has a future is the rational, nonmetaphorical discussion, in the light of all the provisions of the first amendment, of the methods by which we may guarantee and promote religious freedom and the methods by which we may obtain an educational system worthy of the potentialities and responsibilities of our people.

The first amendment is a charter of learning. It confirms empowerments as well as immunities. We are to learn how to use our freedom.

If we are to be metaphorical, let us recognize that the first amendment is not intended as a fence, or wall, around a vacant lot. Something is supposed to be going on inside. What is supposed to be going on is learning. A political community is an educational life in process.

The walls has no future because it cannot help us learn. If taken literally, it is arbitrary and unreasonable, pretending to separate things that are not in all respects separable, thwarting efforts to understand what education and freedom of (and from) religion demand, hampering us in our search for what we need above everything else, a national idea of education and a national program to carry it out.

If the West has a future, it is as the schoolmaster of the world. If democracy has a future, it lies in struggling to be what no big, advanced, industrial country has succeeded in becoming, a community learning together to govern itself and to achieve the common good.

American participation in these great enterprises should not be obstructed by a figure of speech.

Cuban Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a newsletter from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C., from our beloved and distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. The letter is as follows:

CUBAN PROBLEM

(By Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina)

Overshadowing all other problems facing the Congress is the needling and dangerous problem of Cuba. In a very short time, Castro and his brand of communism in Cuba has become a great funnel for world communism to pour in on the Western Hemisphere. Castro and Cuba do not just represent an island of Communist activity but a dynamite key which could blast us into world war if treated carelessly.

In view of this situation, it is my opinion that any public official making statements concerning the Cuban situation should do so only with care and when he is armed with facts. Officials of Government, whether they are elected like myself or appointed as they are in the State and Defense Departments, must realize that when they speak to the people of the United States and the world, they have the ability to inflame and excite or to calm and subdue.

REPUBLICANS RESPONSIBLE

The Kennedy administration inherited the Cuban mess from the previous Republican administration and the very ones who are now attacking the administration for its policy in Cuba, were a part and parcel of the Eisenhower administration which helped to put Castro in office. It was back in 1957 that I conducted an investigation into Communist activity in Latin and Central America. In my published report I warned the Republican State Department and President Eisenhower that unless we took affirmative action in the Caribbean area as well as in other points in Latin America to lead these people away from communism, that world communism would gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Those who now criticize President Kennedy, at that time laughed off my report and continued to ignore Latin America.

Later, when Castro's revolt was progressing in Cuba, the State Department under Eisenhower, together with his own executive orders, halted the shipment of arms and supplies necessary to protect the Cuban Government against the Rebel Castro. The Republican administration closed its eyes at shipments of American arms and other help to Castro's Communist guerrillas in the mountains of Cuba.

NAIVE STATE DEPARTMENT

Castro had hardly reached Havana to claim his new office of Dictator when the State Department rushed in blindly to recognize the new regime without even so much as asking a question. During all this time, I had pointed out in the Senate by speeches and press releases, Castro was surrounded by a brother and a number of key friends who had been trained by Russians in guerrilla warfare tactics and who had been schooled in communism. Long before the first Russian saw Cuban soil, the Eisenhower administration could have acted out of a just cause when our properties were seized and our citizens jailed and some even shot to death. This was the time to act.

The leadership in the Republican Party which now criticizes Kennedy for his policies toward Cuba, conveniently forgot the mess they made and handed to President Kennedy when he took office. The time to preserve the Monroe Doctrine should have been when it was being torn up and not wait until now when the Russians are holding the pieces.

NOT POLITICAL ISSUE

Any politician who harps on the Cuban situation to make it a political issue is doing his nation a great disservice. Those who cry invasion without just provocation should accompany their remarks with an estimation of how many Americans will die as a result. We are not cowards but neither do we wish to be foolhardy. So I urge every citizen to weigh carefully the charges and countercharges that may come as a result of major and lesser crises coming from the Cuban situation. We must rid Cuba of communism, but the means we use to achieve this end can be the difference between peace and war.

Message to Hibernian Society of Baltimore From President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as is customary, the Hiberian Society of Baltimore left no stone unturned to make their St. Patrick's Day celebration last Saturday one of the biggest and best the city has seen for a long time. Approximately a thousand members and guests were in attendance, including all the members of the Maryland congressional delegation.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, GEORGE FALLON, not only the dean of the Maryland delegation in the House, but obviously Irish, was honored by the society by being selected to toast the President. Incidentally, several years ago President Kennedy was the guest speaker at the annual dinner. Following the toast, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], read the following message which was sent to the group by the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

It has been said, by an Irishman I am sure, that the whole world is Irish on the 17th of March. Perhaps not the whole world, but it is indeed true and worth noting well that the joyful observance of St. Patrick's Day is now fully as much an American as an Irish tradition.

It is no simple matter to fix in words the teeming and contrary past, far less the bounding future of the Gael. Effort, even

some guile, is required to sort out the truth from the facts. But certainly the celebration of St. Patrick's Day is centuries old in America. It began before the Revolution; it has never ceased; may it never do so. It has taken root among us because it is an occasion dedicated to freedom; to national freedom and religious freedom, and to the great St. Patrick.

There was never a better cause. We stand in the mighty succession of those who first proclaimed it, and those who brought it to fulfillment in our land. It is our cause to defend and ours to advance. In that conviction, I send you the greetings of this day.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, all Americans should deplore the unfortunate political charges that have been made recently concerning Cuba.

The petty bickering which has been taking place can only give aid and comfort to the enemy.

In last Sunday's Washington Post, I feel that a penetrating analysis of the foibles of such a discussion at this time is made in an editorial by Philip L. Graham. This editorial entitled "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph," is certainly an excellent account of where we stand now on the Cuban matter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to incorporate this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's peremptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE IS NOT THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communications with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be rescued from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already a-building takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Viet-Cong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revoluntary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of war of liberation that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a smash and grab raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

Some Clear Thoughts on the United Nations Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Richard Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, recently gave some very clear ideas about the problems of financing in the United Nations. There is a tendency to confuse the ordinary operations of the U.N., where there are no difficulties, with the very special situation of the Middle East and Congo operations. Not only does Mr. Gardner show this difference in some detail, but he goes on to discuss the next steps, some of which are being taken already, to get the house in order. Certainly, the appearance of Eugene Black, former President of the World Bank, as chief financial adviser should make it clear any soft policies, if such did exist, are over and that it is time to face the financial consequences. The next few months should tell others will share in picking up the check and consequently what our attitude will be. I hope that our optimism is well placed.

Mr. Gardner's address follows:

SOME CLEAR THOUGHTS ON THE UNITED NATIONS' FINANCING

In treating this subject today I shall not speak about various long-term solutions to the U.N.'s financial problem, for example, the development of independent sources of revenue. Other participants in this panel may wish to deal with various possibilities of this kind. It is appropriate, it is useful, for discusions of the long-term problem to go forward. But you will recall the famous words of Lord Keynes: "In the long run we are all-dead." There will not be a long run in which to seek bold solutions for U.N. financing unless we can deal with the financial crisis which faces us here and now.

Therefore I propose to confine my remarks today to the present financial crisis of the United Nations and to consider in turn three specific questions: What has caused this financial crisis? What progress has been made in coping with it? What now remains to be done?

I

The causes of the U.N.'s financial difficulties are familiar to most of you. These difficulties do not arise from the ordinary operations which are paid from the U.N.'s "regular budget." The regular budget covers such items as salaries of members of the Secretariat, expenses of operating the headquarters building in New York, and the costs of meetings and conferences. It also includes some of the smaller peacekeeping expenditures such as the truce supervision activities in Palestine, Kashmir, and Korea.

The regular budget is financed principally by an agreed scale of assessments on members which is broadly based on capacity to pay. The United States contributes 32.02 percent of this amount. The payment record of the members is generally good and the arrears are not of disruptive dimensions.

As you know, however, the expenses for the Middle East and Congo operations were financed from the beginning from separate accounts. Taken together, these operations since 1960 have imposed on the members of the U.N. expenses of about $140 million a year, about double the size of the regular budget.

Because these costs were so large, opposition quickly developed on the part of many U.N. members to sharing the cost in the usual manner—that is, on the basis of the percentage assessments used in the regular budget. In order to gain approval by the General Assembly for resolution to finance these operations it was necessary, beginning with the Middle East operation in 1956, to reduce the assessments for members less able to pay, in other words to assess them for peacekeeping operations at only a fraction of the assessment they have to pay for the regular budget.

Over the last few years almost 90 percent of the U.N. membership has secured relief from the regular assessment rate with respect to the Congo and Middle East budgets. Of the 110 U.N. members, 42 countries have a regular assessment rate of 0.04 percent. For Congo and UNEF their assessment was reduced by 80 percent of their normal scale, to 0.008 percent. As an example of how this has worked out, we can look at the way the costs of the Congo and Middle East operations were shared in the first half of 1962. Instead of being asked to pay the $35,900 they would have paid at the regular budget scale these countries were asked to pay only $7,180.

Reductions by 80 percent were also given 43 additional countries whose regular budget assessment rate was more than 0.04 percent but who were recipients of U.N. technical assistance. Moreover, four additional countries received 50-percent reductions. Thus no less than 89 member governments were excused from 50 to 80 percent of their assessments to these vital peace and security operations.

UNITED STATES AND VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS

To finance these operations notwithstanding the reduced assessments on these 89 countries the Secretary General appealed for voluntary contributions. Starting with the Middle East operation in 1957, the United States has made large voluntary contributions each year in addition to its regular scale assessment to make it possible for these operations to go forward. In the last several years no other country has made voluntary contributions of this kind, with the sole exception of the United Kingdom which has made very small voluntary payments for the Middle East operation.

With these voluntary payments added to our assessed share, the United States in recent years has been assuming an average of about 48 percent of the burden of the Congo and Middle East operations.

This is the method of financing U.N. peacekeeping operations which has been in effect since 1957. It does not take very long to conclude that this system had two unacceptable aspects:

First, it placed a disproportionate share, nearly half, of the cost of these operations on the United States.

Second, and even more important, a large number of U.N. members were not even meeting their obligations under this arrangement:

The members of the Communist bloc refused to pay because they oppose peace-keeping operations in general.

France, South Africa, the Arab countries, and others refused to pay for at least one of the operations because they did not agree with this peace-keeping operation in particular.

Others, including most of the less developed countries, failed to pay even their reduced assessment and argued that they were too poor to do so.

To make matters worse, legal arguments were advanced by the Communist bloc and many other countries to the effect that the General Assembly could not levy valid assessments for peacekeeping operations outside the regular budget and accordingly that they were under no obligation to pay.

As a result of this nonpayment of assessments, the United States was in the unacceptable position of paying in even more than the 48 percent of the Middle East and Congo operations it had undertaken to pay, although of course the amounts are still due and payable by the defaulters. At the same time the gap between the assessments due for the costs of the two operations and the money actually received from the membership continued to grow until it reached about $100 million by the middle of 1962.

RESCUE OPERATION, SPECIAL FUNDS

To reduce the disproportionate U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping operations, to avoid the

imminent collapse of these operations as a result of the growing deficit, and to safeguard the future potential of the U.N. as a vital factor in maintaining peace and security, the U.S. Government joined with other free world countries and with the Secretary General to search for ways and means of solving the U.N.'s financial crisis. This search produced a rescue operation beginning in the 16th General Assembly which had four major elements:

First, one more General Assembly resolution for the emergency financing of the Middle East and Congo operations for the first 6 months of 1962 by the usual combination of assessments and voluntary contributions.

Second, a bond issue to finance these operations after June 30, 1962, while a more satisfactory solution to the financial problem was worked out.

Third, a request to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion which would establish a firm legal basis for the collection of arrearages by determining whether peacekeeping assessments constituted binding legal obligations in the same way as assessments for the regular budget.

Fourth, an intensified study of better ways of financing U.N. peacekeeping operations in the future.

Since this rescue operation was approved by the 16th General Assembly in December 1961, there has been progress on a number of fronts.

Purchase of U.N. bonds got underway in 1962. The U.S. Congress authorized a loan to the United Nations to purchase bonds up to the amount purchased by all other countries. Some foreign governments, such as the Scandinavian countries, responded handsomely to the bond issue by purchasing amounts far in excess of their regular budget percentage. And the 17th General Assembly in its budget authorization for 1963 included an amount of $4,650,000 for repayment of interest and principal of the bonds in the regular U.N. budget, in which the United States share is 32.02 percent.

ICJ ADVISORY OPINION

The International Court of Justice handed down last July a favorable advisory opinion which ruled that the costs incurred by the U.N. in the Congo and Middle East operations were "expenses of the organization" and that the assessments levied to pay for them constituted binding legal obligations. The General Assembly accepted this opinion on December 19, 1962, by a vote of 76 in favor, 17 against, and 8 abstentions.

The events in the General Assembly leading up to the acceptance of this opinion provided considerable grounds for satisfaction. A number of States, including the Soviet bloc and France, urged that the General Assembly should only "take note" of the Court's opinion. The effect of this language, as brought out in the debate, would have left it to the discretion of each state whether it considered itself bound to pay for the peacekeeping assessments. An amendment to change the wording of the resolution from "accepts" to "takes note" was proposed in the Fifth Committee and defeated by 28 votes in favor, 61 against, and 14 abstentions.

The debate on the advisory opinion made it abundantly clear that the term "accepts" used in the General Assembly resolution meant that the U.N. was adopting the Court's view as its operating rule. This means that the assessments in question have been determined to be binding obligations on member states and are therefore due and payable. If not paid, a member becomes subject to loss of vote in the General Assembly under article 19 of the Charter, if its total arrears exceed its last 2 years' assessments on accounts. This will apply to the Soviet Union as of January 1, 1964, if it pays nothing for the Congo and UNEF between now and that time.

With the question about the legality of past assessments out of the way, the Secretary General was at last in a position to mount an effective campaign to collect them. A number of governments which had declined to pay their assessments for the Middle East and Congo operations announced in the wake of the General Assembly resolution that they would now begin to pay.

The 17th General Assembly also decided to increase the working capital fund from $25 million to $40 million. This action establishes a more rational relationship between the present level of the regular budget and the need for reserves. It adds significantly to the financial capacity and resources of the organization.

As a further measure to put the U.N.'s financial house in order, the Secretary General appointed as his chief financial adviser Eugene Black, former president of the World Bank. Mr. Black will assist the Secretary General in dealing with the problem of arrearages as well as advise him generally on other aspects of the U.N.'s financial problem.

Finally, the General Assembly buckled down to work on the future financing of peacekeeping operations. It set up a working group of 21 nations, of which the United States is a member, to study and make recommendations on a cost-sharing formula for the future costs of these operations. The group is now in session and is under instructions to complete its work by March 31. A special session of the General Assembly has been called to convene on May 14 to act on its recommendations.

All this is on the credit side of the ledger, but the last year has registered serious debits as well.

Although the General Assembly authorized a $200 million bond issue, only about $74 million has been subscribed by 58 countries other than the United States, despite our readiness to buy up to $100 million of bonds on a matching basis. Assuming that all the bonds subscribed are actually purchased, the U.S. matching purchase would bring the total up to only about $148 million of the $200 million worth of bonds that was anticipated. Prudent financing dictates that the rest of these bonds be sold, and sold quickly.

Moreover, although many members have indicated their readiness to abide by the law declared by the International Court and confirmed by the General Assembly, they have not actually paid. The Soviet bloc, which apparently does not believe in abiding by the law even after it has been declared, has still not paid one cent toward the Middle East and Congo operations. France is still refusing to pay its past assessments for the Congo; indeed, it has announced that it will not even pay that portion of its regular budget assessment which is necessary to pay back the principal and interest on the U.N. bonds.

As a result of these and other facts, arrears owned to the U.N. as of January 1, 1963, amounted to $121 million. Twenty-five U.N. members have still paid nothing on their UNEF assessments; 48 members have still paid nothing on their Congo assessments.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the United Nations is not being supported and is not supporting itself when arrears have accumulated so far and continue to increase and when major and minor powers continue to refuse to fulfill their legal obligations.

If this situation long continues, public opinion in the United States will be forced to interpret these facts as a denial in practice by many members of the U.N. of something which all the members have accepted in principle, that peacekeeping operations are conducted in the interest of the well-being of the entire world and should be the responsibility of all the members of the organization. This is what we mean by the phrase "collective financial responsibility," it is, or should be, the cornerstone of the organization.

WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?

It is against this mixed record of success and failure that we must now consider what next steps to take in dealing with the U.N.'s financial crisis.

In discussing these next steps it will be useful to keep our eye on the central question. The problem currently before the working group of 21 in New York is very specific; namely, How to finance the Congo and Middle East operations beyond June 30, which is about when the money from the bond issue runs out.

When the General Assembly meets in special session in May it will have to adopt resolutions which will provide for the future financing of these two operations, at least from July 1 to December 31, or it will have to recommend their abrupt discontinuance.

This is the very practical problem immediately before us. It should receive prompt attention and not be lost sight of in a search for possible general principles to govern the financing of unknown operations which are not yet even a gleam in any member's eye.

To put it more broadly, the United States believes that for some time to come it would be wise for the U.N. to deal with the method of financing of each peacekeeping operation if and when that operation occurs, learning from each experience what might be desirable for the future and adjusting each solution to the particular facts of each case. We believe that this approach is the only sensible and practical one to follow at this time, given the present financial plight of the United Nations, the present deep political difficulties between its members, the unpredictable character of any future peacekeeping operations, and the virtual impossibility of now agreeing on any one single formula or any one single set of principles or criteria to govern unknown operations yet to be begun.

Assuming, then, that the immediate question is the financing of the Middle East and Congo operations for the 6 months of 1963, and that the answer to this question constitutes no precedent for the future—what is the answer to be?

In posing this question we are assuming that these operations must continue. Obviously the United States favors the most rapid possible reduction of the Congo force consistent with the increasing capability of the Congolese government to maintain minimal levels of security and insure its national integrity.

At the same time it would be the height of "pennywise pound foolishness" to reduce either operation so rapidly as to jeopardize all the substantial gains that they have brought to Africa and the Middle East with much sacrifice and effort over the past few years.

Assuming there will be a cost, though somewhat reduced, for the Congo and UNEF operations in the last 6 months of 1963, a strong case can be made for financing this cost at the regular budget scale for the following reasons:

1. The regular budget assessment scale is broadly based on capacity to pay. Very substantial adjustments in the regular assessments scale are made for low per capita income countries, beyond what would be called for by comparative national income figures. It is true that the regular budget scale involves a ceiling for the U.S. contribution. But this ceiling derives from a fundamental principle long accepted by the General Assembly, that, in an organization of sovereign states where each nation has one vote, it is not in the interest of the organization to depend too much financially on any one state.

2. The United States has been virtually alone in making voluntary financial contributions to the Congo and Middle East operations. It has thus been assuming an average of 48 percent of the burden. The financial load simply must be more broadly based, and the carefully worked out cost-sharing formula to accomplish this is the regular budget scale.

3. Since the establishment of the United Nations, the United States has been by far its largest financial supporter. Its assessed contributions have always been more than twice those of the second largest contributor. The proportion of its voluntary contributions has been even higher. It contributes 70 percent for the Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees, over 50 percent for the Congo economic assistance program, 42 percent for the U.N. Children's Fund, and 40 percent for the Special Fund and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

4. Quite apart from the United Nations, the United States is bearing a heavy load of foreign aid and defense burdens. Our total contributions for economic development abroad amount to over $5 billion a year—more than double the aid total of the rest of the free world and at least five times the aid made available by the Communist bloc.

5. The peacekeeping operations of the United Nations are not just a matter of interest to the great powers. The small countries have perhaps the greatest stake of all in their success and effectiveness. It is true that these countries are not well off, but the amounts involved are not substantial. For the last 6 months of 1963 the regular assessment share of the 42 countries in the 0.04 percent category would amount to the cost of two or three large limousines or a few big diplomatic receptions. Is this too high a price to pay for keeping the peace?

It is these reasons, coupled with the still inadequate record on the payment of past assessments, which have led to the present U.S. position in the working group of 21. Lest there be any question, the United States stands ready to pay its full 32.02-percent share of the Congo and Middle East operations. But until collective financial responsibility becomes a fiscal practice as well as a legal theory, it would hardly be fair for the United States to pay more than this percentage, either through assessed or voluntary contributions.

We are hopeful that a determination to get the U.N.'s financial house in order is beginning to manifest itself among the members. There are signs of recognition that only through a meaningful system of collective financial responsibility can the organization continue to carry out its current tasks and future responsibilities.

The hard fact of political life is this: Attitudes in the United States toward any possible future contribution above our regular scale assessment for peacekeeping operations will inevitably depend on whether the vast majority of the membership takes the necessary measures in the next several months to give the United Nations the financial support which is absolutely essential to its survival.

6. "The United Nations," said U Thant in his recent Johns Hopkins lecture, "does not represent a vague ideal of universal peace and brotherhood which has its appeal only to starryeyed idealists and moralists. Far from it. It is hardheaded, enlightened self-interest, the stake that all humanity has in peace and progress and, most important of all, survival that dictates the need for the United Nations as a practical, institutional embodiment of the needs of nations on a shrinking planet, as a potent and dynamic instrument at the service of all nations, east and west, north as well as south."

If this statement of the Secretary General is correct, and we most definitely believe that it is, then it is time to face the financial consequences.

The present financial crisis of the United Nations involves the survival of the organization itself, for no institution can long survive if it cannot pay its debts and if its members are not willing to supply it with the funds necessary to continue its operations.

The menu of the U.N. is substantial and important. The check is no less so. Countries cannot expect to take the benefits of membership in the U.N. without the burdens.

Air Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the 18th of March 1963, Dr. Charles L. Wilbar, Jr., secretary of health of the State of Pennsylvania, presented a most interesting analysis on the subject of air pollution control to the Roberts Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I believe Dr. Wilbar's statement of such importance that it should receive widespread publicity, and I urge all of my colleagues to carefully consider his remarks.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Dr. Wilbar's statement at this point in my remarks:

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

(Statement by Dr. Charles L. Wilbar, Jr.)

My name is Charles L. Wilbar, Jr., M.D. I am secretary of health for Pennsylvania and president of the Association of State & Territorial Health Officers. For the past 2 years I have been chairman of the Pennsylvania Air Pollution Commission, which has been in existence for 2 years.

The Association of State and Territorial Health Officers has been concerned with this country's growing air pollution problem for a number of years. The association has considered State air pollution control laws, ambient air quality standards, the role of the Federal Government in air pollution control and Federal-State-local relationships.

I am here today to inform this committee on the views of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, and the Pennsylvania Air Pollution Commission with respect to proposed Federal air pollution control legislation.

In many respects, H.R. 4415 provides for a realistic and needed strengthening of the Federal aid pollution control program. This bill, unlike other proposed legislation, recognizes accepted Federal-State relationships with respect to the control of intrastate air pollution problems. Also, unlike other proposed legislation this bill does not provide for a legislatively created advisory board which often results in diffused responsibility and the development of involved administrative procedures. In comparison to other similar legislation introduced at this session of the 88th Congress, H.R. 4415 appears to provide for the most direct and reasonable approach to the development of an effective Federal air pollution control program. It is our recommendation though, that this bill be so revised that approval by the appropriate State air pollution control agency is required prior to the initiation by the Federal Government of negotiations for the awarding of program grants to local agencies.

Sixteen States, representing more than 50 percent of the Nation's population, have enacted statewide air pollution control laws. These laws have been tailormade to fit the needs, cover the problems and conform to existing legislation in the respective States. A cursory examination of State air pollution control laws (and I refer the committee to "A Digest of State Air Pollution Laws," 1962 edition, Public Health Service Publication 711) indicates that they vary widely in character from State to State. A major reason for this nonuniformity in State air pollution laws is that each State must consider its existing and historical State-local relationships. Those relationships have been developed over many years and are an important factor in the day-to-day operations of State government.

At its 1962 meeting the conference of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers recommended "that the Public Health Service revise its policies on administration of grant programs to eliminate the practice of direct Federal-local negotiations, and that, instead, State health departments be authorized and urged to assume effective leadership in all matters concerning local applicants." The interposition of Federal activities between State and local government not only is inconsistent with accepted principles of Federal-State relationships, but can adversely affect State level programs and long-range planning.

The Pennsylvania Air Pollution Control Act provides for the adoption of air pollution control regulations by the State air pollution commission on an area-need basis. Regulations are adopted for specific areas of the State after studies have indicated the extent and nature of air pollution in these areas. These areas cross municipal and county lines.

In its present form, H.R. 4415 would permit the Federal Government to negotiate directly with local governments for the awarding of program grants. These negotiations can be conducted without the knowledge or concurrence of the appropriate State agencies. Such a procedure could adversely affect our State program and the implementation of the Pennsylvania Air Pollution Control Act. Our program calls for coordination between State and local programs. If the Federal Government were to interpose itself between the State agency and local air pollution control agencies in Pennsylvania, I believe that it would result in confusion, duplication of effort, inefficiency and a reduction in the effectiveness of present programs.

It is recognized that the Federal Government has a legitimate concern in air pollution control. Air pollutants recognize neither municipal nor State boundaries. Intermunicipal air pollution problems are a prime mover for the development of State air pollution control programs, and interstate air pollution problems should be considered in Federal air pollution control legislation. Existing State air pollution control laws recognize the role of the Federal Government. For example, the Pennsylvania Air Pollution Control Act provides that the Pennsylvania Department of Health is to "cooperate with the appropriate agencies of the United States or of other States or any interstate agencies with respect to the control, prevention, abatement, and reduction of air pollution, and where appropriate formulate interstate air pollution control compacts or agreements for the submission thereof to the general assembly." The act also provides that the State health department is to "serve as the agency of the Commonwealth for the receipt of moneys from the Federal Government or other public or private agencies, and expend such moneys

for studies and research with respect to air contaminants, air pollution and the control, prevention, abatement, and reduction of air pollution."

The present role of the Federal Government in air pollution control has permitted and assisted the development of effective and practical State air pollution control programs. The importance of the present Federal air pollution control program was recognized at the 1961 meeting of the Association of State and Territorial Officers, where it was recommended that "that the Federal air pollution program be strengthened by (a) providing for an expansion of research related to the causes, effects, and control of air pollution; (b) providing Federal technical and financial assistance to States and localities in the development and support of programs to apply more effectively existing and future knowledge of the actual control of air pollution; and (c) providing through the Public Health Service of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare vigorous leadership to obtain increased attention and devotion of greater resources to the problem of air pollution by all levels of government, industry, and the public."

Rapid increases in the rate of urbanization, industrialization, and population growth make it imperative that greater efforts be made to obtain cleaner air. Now is the time to expand our efforts, before a wasteful crash program is needed. Economic and health considerations justify greater efforts for cleaner air.

Air pollution can exert biological effects on man, vegetation, and animals and produce physical effects such as reduction in visability, corrosion of metals, and soiling.

Gases, vapors, and particulates that pollute the air exert many as yet poorly understood effects upon man. So far as has been discovered they act both locally upon the mucous membranes with which they have direct contact, and also generally upon many varied functions of the body through absorption into the bloodstream. The local effects apparently result from both chemical and physical irritation, whereas the systemic, general effects, are primarily chemical in nature.

Air pollutants occasionally are able to cause dramatic, sudden epidemics of illness, which first drew attention to the importance of the health effects of air pollution.

During a 2-week period in 1952, for example, more than 4,000 deaths in London were attributed to very high concentrations of pollutants, of which sulfur dioxide and carbonaceous smoke seemed the most significant components. Measurements made during the 1962 London smog incident indicated the presence of high atmospheric concentrations of oxides of sulfur. Oxides of sulfur were most likely an important factor in the October 1948 Donora, Pa., smog disaster. It is unfortunate that often disasters provide impetus for governmental action. The Donora disaster was a major factor in bringing the growing problem of air pollution to the attention of State and local governments.

But even more dangerous than these dramatic epidemics are the long-term insidious effects of prolonged exposure to lower concentrations of pollutants. Such air pollution is probably playing an important role in such increasingly common and serious diseases as lung cancer, chronic bronchitis, emphysema, asthma, and certain other respiratory disorders.

Air pollution undoubtedly has other effects upon man as well, including annoying eye irritation and objectionable odors. The importance of the changes air pollution causes in the kinds of solar radiation we receive and the possible physiological significance of such changes is yet to be determined.

Vegetation can be affected by gaseous and particulate pollution. Injury can range from reduced growth and yield to complete plant destruction. Transfer to man and animals of pollutants concentrated in edible vegetation is also possible. Among the pollutants known to have caused vegetation damage are gases such as sulfur dioxide, ammonia, ethylene, ozone, and photochemical smog reaction products, and particulate matter such as sulfuric acid mist, carbonaceous smoke, and metal dusts. Livestock may be indirectly injured through acute or chronic poisoning from eating contaminated forage.

Reduced visibility due to suspended particulates is an important physical effect and depends on the composition, size, and concentration of the suspended particles. Not only does suspended matter directly reduce visual range but it can also promote fog formation and increase its persistence. Carbonaceous smoke, sulfuric acid mist, aerosols from automotive exhausts, and perhaps photochemical smog are the main contributors to visibility reduction.

Metal corrosion due to both gaseous and particulate pollution, particulate damage to stone and masonry, and gaseous injury to textiles, leather, and rubber goods are among the most important physical effects. Soiling is the most obvious of all air pollution effects. Coarse particles can mar or damage buildings, automobiles, and scenic attractions. Fine particles can infiltrate homes and businesses soiling walls, furniture, and decorations, and can reduce the value of salable products, or interfere with fine products' manufacturing.

State and local governmental agencies are developing programs to effectively combat the effects of air pollution. A Federal air pollution control program, recognizing the effectiveness of State and local agencies, can be of considerable assistance. H.R. 4415, amended in accordance with our recommendations to provide for concurrence by the State with respect to the awarding of program grants to local agencies, can provide this assistance.

I sincerely appreciate being given the opportunity to appear before this committee and I hope that this statement of views will be of assistance in your review of proposed air pollution control legislation.

Petite Deterrent: Quandary for Western Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the decision by President de Gaulle to develop an independent nuclear deterrent has raised serious and important questions for both American and NATO defense policies.

Robert Keatly, in a March 6 Wall Street Journal article, has made a very thoughtful analysis of this difficult problem area, and I am sure that our colleagues will find it both interesting and of value:

PETITE DETERRENT—FRENCH A-FORCE MAY HAVE MORE VALUE THAN UNITED STATES CONCEDES

(By Robert Keatley)

PARIS.—"You Americans call ours a policy of grandeur; we consider it one of humility."

These words from a leading French military theorist sum up his Government's rationale for its independent nuclear deterrent—the often-belittled force de frappe, or striking force. It's clear the French are determined to push ahead with their weapons program despite strong American objections. It also appears the force may have more military value than U.S. policymakers generally like to concede.

This far-reaching effort, which will cost an estimated $4.8 billion by 1965 (and much more later), is General de Gaulle's solution to a problem that has vexed him for years: If shooting starts, he doubts if American strategists will consider France important enough to defend with nuclear weapons, despite the solemn pledges of President Kennedy and his predecessors, "Who can assure France that an aggression against her alone would unleash in time and unconditionally the riposte of an ally?" he has asked.

Without nuclear weapons, French leaders don't believe their territory can be defended against the Russians' 150 Red Army divisions. Therefore, France will build its own nuclear force with the most modern planes, missiles and explosives it can develop.

To do otherwise, an influential French admiral reasons, would be as senseless as using cannonballs while the enemy fires explosive shells.

A TWO-STAGE EFFORT

The force de frappe is being put together in two stages. Backbone of the first will be some 50 supersonic, needle-nosed Mirage IV bombers, each capable of carrying a French atom bomb with explosive power of 75,000 tons of TNT, four times as powerful as the one which destroyed Hiroshima. Three prototype models are now flying (a fourth crashed recently), and the entire group is expected to be operational in 1965. Not long after, defense officials hope to add an air-launched missile which will carry a nuclear warhead the last 300 miles or so to target.

But the second stage is more significant. Shut off from American technical aid, President de Gaulle's researchers are simultaneously developing hydrogen bombs, solid fuel ballistic missiles and nuclear submarines. Most observers believe the French will develop a submarine-launched missile system, though the possibility of choosing land-based missiles or more advanced aircraft still exists. Says a U.S. Navy officer familiar with both American and French programs: "We have no doubt at all about their ability to have a Polaris-type system operational by 1970." French scientists have already fired a half-dozen experimental rockets, including one with a complex guidance system, and are building a diesel-engined submarine which will be used for firing test rockets and training crews. Work on nuclear propulsion is also well advanced.

It's believed the French are considering a force of three nuclear subs, each armed with 16 missiles. Two would be kept on station at all times, providing enough firepower to destroy up to 32 Russian cities if France is attacked.

IMPACT ON NATO

American officials deplore this effort. They believe France's go-it-alone attitude is shattering Western unity, undermining effectiveness of NATO, and—along with recent rejection of British entry into the Common Market—is preventing formation of the interdependent Atlantic alliance which Washington sees as the only practical way to oppose Communist influence in Europe. Americans also argue that the French force has no significant military value in any case; that the Mirage is aptly named.

The French, of course, disagree strongly. If a war broke out, they say, the shooting would be over before officials of a multination nuclear force could decide whether or

not to fight back. They also argue that their deterrent has considerable military value, a point of view that wins grudging support in some not entirely friendly quarters.

Distrust of the United States is the base for much of the French activity. Perhaps the clearest exposition comes from retired air force Gen. Pierre Gallois, now an official of the company which produces Mirage bombers and often called General de Gaulle's chief military adviser (though for one diplomat, he is simply the only man "who can weave De Gaulle's prejudices into any rational pattern"). General Gallois, a short and energetic man, advances the humility argument, saying France's survival may not always be vital to U.S. interests.

"We are a small nation," he says, "and with the advent of new weapons, our strategic value is limited. So we want to be able to tell the Russians: If you attack us, we will respond with nuclear weapons and destroy 1, 2, or 20 of your cities. And what will that gain you? Your chief adversary, the United States, will remain undamaged while you will have merely added the rubble of France to some ashes in your own territory."

But if France could only respond with conventional weapons, the Russians might attack with their nonnuclear might and France "would fall in a matter of hours," he concludes.

The French don't view this as an attempt to replace America as the protector of Western Europe. "This force has no value other than to protect Continental France," concedes General Gallois. Defense experts here readily admit the force de frappe will never be strong enough to permit the country to embark on Suez-type ventures even if it wanted to.

But it seems, writes a leading submarine advocate, that "the unique striking power of the new weapon is such that a relatively restricted number of deployed units allowing them to be utilized with efficiency, can threaten the eventual aggressor with counterattacks grave enough to deter the employment of such arms against us."

American officials conceded this has a certain logic though one adds "like everything else in France it's somewhat romantic." But they argue that the first stage of the French force is obsolete before it's even completed. U.S. experts regularly criticize the Mirage bomber force; they point to strong antiaircraft defenses the Russians are building, and to the short range of the French planes (the Mirage IV can reach Moscow from here only if it flies at subsonic speeds; otherwise aerial refueling is needed).

Gaullists offer several counter arguments. For one thing, they have ordered 12 Boeing-built KC-135 jet tankers for $4.5 million each. They also claim launching all available planes will confuse Soviet radar and missile defenses and ease some Mirage IV's through to targets.

But more important, they believe the United States seriously overestimates the Soviet defense capability, and underestimates the effectiveness of low-level bombing attacks, for which the Mirage is designed. Officially, they claim 1 of 3 attack planes can penetrate Russian defenses; privately, they say 1 in 10 is more realistic but is enough to deter attacks. They believe the Mirage IV's can swoop in under radar beams, which can't bend to fit the curve of the earth.

A MODEL-T POLARIS

Many knowledgeable sources back up the French view. The U.S. Air Force's manned bomber advocates have been using similar arguments with Pentagon officials for years. And at the Ministry of Defense in London, a high British official says. "There is some question about whether radar has any value at all against low-level attacks."

Later weapons will be more sophisticated. Though French scientists would like American assistance, especially on warheads and missile guidance, it's generally acknowledged they can develop a Polaris-type system on their own not long after the British have theirs. For one thing, explains a U.S. naval expert, France may build a less refined system and save both time and money. Guidance may not be as precise as for the U.S. Polaris, and the sub may even have to surface to fire. "Theirs might be sort of a model T compared to ours, but all De Gaulle wants is to be able to blast Moscow off the face of the earth," he says.

Diplomats doubt little France's ability to pay the bills. One major reason: Since the Algerian War ended, it has cut down conventional forces; defense planners may further reduce the army from 700,000 to 450,000. "In the past 6 years," complains one disgruntled defense expert, "we spent $16 billion on soldiers' shoes, social security and barracks—we could have built three nuclear research plants a year for that."

RESEARCH BYPRODUCTS?

Even if the program flops militarily, some argue its basic research will aid the French economy. One American expert believes it may improve the French school system, which he says produces brilliant scientists but not enough engineers and technicians. For General Gallois, "even if the whole program is a failure, achievements in technology and science will have tremendous effect on our industry."

President de Gaulle hasn't convinced all his own countrymen that France needs a nuclear arm. Some French scientists apply themselves wholeheartedly to their work only because they believe peaceful byproducts will result; they have little regard for atomic weapons. A recent public opinion poll found only 42 percent in favor of the force de frappe, with 31 percent opposed and the rest undecided. But some parts of the program were launched a year or so before General de Gaulle even took office, indicating widespread support at high levels.

Thus it is apparent that both Moscow and Washington will soon have to treat France as a nuclear power, however petite, and one that will probably be less inclined than ever to take outside advice.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the world has watched with growing alarm the intensification of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. The problems faced by Soviet Jewry are extremely serious. My good friend, Dr. Judah Cahn, spiritual leader of the Metropolitan Synagogue of New York, which is situated in the congressional district I represent, has written a timely article entitled, "The Dilemma of Soviet Jewry." It appeared in the winter 1962–63 edition of American Judaism. I am pleased to bring the article to the attention of my colleagues.

The text of the article follows:

THE DILEMMA OF SOVIET JEWRY

One of the tragic results of recent developments in the Soviet Union is the dilemma which now faces the 3 million Jews in that nation. The roots of the dilemma are deep and complicated. It begins with the fact that within the Soviet Union, Jews are regarded not as a religious body but as a national minority. This was not always true. During the early years after the revolution, the Soviet Government had denied this status to the Jews.

The reversal of this decision was based ostensibly on the four-point definition of a nationality as promulgated by Stalin. He said that a nation or ethnic group should possess four characteristics: a common land, a common language, a common culture, and common economic interests. Within the framework of this definition it would have been logically impossible to give the Jewish population of the Soviet Union the label of a national group.

Biro-Bidjan, a region in east Siberia, was established as an autonomous Jewish republic. This was an attempt by Soviet authorities to make the Jews in the Soviet Union conform to their definition. Of the approximately 20,000 Jewish inhabitants who were there during the early days, over 11,000 had left by 1934.

This so-called Jewish republic turned out to be an admitted failure. All the other republics had been created on the same lands already occupied by the people who were designated as citizens of that republic. The situation with the Jews was quite different. A piece of land in Siberia which did not even have a trace of previous Jewish occupation was turned into a Jewish "homeland." The fact that the Jews of the Soviet Union were located in the great cities of western Russia and played a very important part in the cultural and economic life of the country, made no difference. Did the Soviet authorities seriously expect these thousands of teachers, scientists, poets, actors, and musicians to leave the cultural centers of the U.S.S.R. and migrate to Biro-Bidjan?

The results of these actions were inevitable. The Jews became a national minority group within the Soviet Union without possessing any of the advantages of such a designation. When choices were made for national posts in the many areas of Soviet life, the Jews could be designated only after all others who were citizens of that particular republic had been given the opportunity. The only place where it was possible for a Jew to receive preference over others would have been in Biro-Bidjan and in this barren spot there existed none of the institutions which permitted such participation. This also applied to college admission, professional training, and opportunities, which all depend on national identity.

Thus, the Jews became subject to the whims of the dictator. When Stalin thought it desirable, he utilized a literal interpretation of the law. When he thought it expedient, he utilized a loose interpretation.

During the life of Stalin, academic life was circumscribed by political expediency. The best of the Soviet academicians were harnessed to justify and rationalize the policies of the state. With the elimination of Stalin, this academic straitjacket was, for a time, loosened and matters heretofore forbidden for discussion were now brought into the open. At a meeting with Prof. Alexi Leondyev, a member of the Presidium of the Academy of Special Sciences and chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Moscow, and Prof. Fidore Savatkin, vice director of the Institute of National Schools and Professor of Methods of Teaching Language in the Professional School, this subject was first raised by me in the summer

of 1956. Neither professor made any serious attempt to justify the designation of Jews as a national minority. In the course of the discussion, I pointed out that in my contacts with Jewish university students, musicians, and government officials who were under the age of 35, I had found that they had either no knowledge or a sparse knowledge of Yiddish, which was supposed to be a national language for Soviet Jewry.

I indicated to Professor Savatkin that though he had organized schools and staffs for the teaching of approximately 50 languages, there were neither teachers nor texts for the teaching of Yiddish. A call was immediately put in to the Lenin Library, and this point was confirmed. Though there were texts in Yiddish concerned with the teaching of other subjects, there wasn't a single text dealing with the teaching of Yiddish. As far as Hebrew was concerned, both men refused to recognize it as a spoken tongue and referred to it as a language of prayer which was the concern and responsibility of the Jewish religious community. They claimed that they would neither help nor hinder such activities. When it was further charged that Jews were not permitted to create prayerbooks for the teaching of the language, this fact was attributed to the disinterest of Jews themselves: a common excuse among Soviet officials. Finally, both professors suggested that this was a vastly complicated question and that the complete assimilation of Soviet Jewry would be the desirable goal. Upon further discussion they admitted that the Jewish national group alone seemed superfluous in the eyes of the Soviet authorities.

The matter was then pursued with Prof. Ivan Podekhin, director of the Institute of Ethnology at the University of Moscow. This institute is responsible for the designation of national identities. After many hours of argument, it was finally divulged that the subject of Jewish identity was just then coming before the institute of ethnology for restudy. However, the research and discussions had not yet reached the stage where they could be made public. The latest information on this subject which we have been able to secure from the Soviet Union indicates that the problem of Jewish identity is now very much alive in Soviet academic circles.

This creates the dilemma for Soviet Jewry: whether to be or not to be a nationality. If national identity is taken from them, all that will be left will be a religious identity. In view of the fact that only a small minority of Soviet Jewry maintains identity with the synagogue and that the members of this minority, for the most part, are well advanced in years, it would mean the virtual disappearance by assimilation of this vast segment of world Jewry. Hitler destroyed 6 million Jews. The Soviet Union is suggesting to 3 million more the possibility of mass cultural suicide. The other alternative is to seek to maintain Soviet Jewry as a national minority. This would mean the continuance of certain disabilities, and perhaps an intensification of the current anti-Semitic wave now prevalent in the Soviet Union. But it would make possible the maintenance of identity for these 3 million people and the hope for their eventual freedom. These millions of Jews also recognize that even cultural and religious suicide may not necessarily destroy the virus of anti-Semitism. Among those who were liquidated in the Stalin purges were many men and women who had not only relinquished their Jewish heritage, but had become the enemies of those who insisted on retaining it.

No other Jew in the world can make this decision for Soviet Jewry. Of course, it may be that Soviet Jewry will have little voice in determining its own destiny. But where shall they, as a community, apply the little strength that they may have?

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Why We Need More Federal Aid for Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Dr. Sterling McMurrin served as U.S. Commissioner of Education for almost 2 years. He is now resigned to teach philosophy at the University of Utah. He is fully aware of the Federal aid programs we have at the present time and of the reasons why further Federal aid to education would be of great benefit to our Nation. His article in the last edition of the Saturday Evening Post is provocative and well worth consideration. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE NEED MORE FEDERAL AID FOR OUR SCHOOLS

(By Dr. Sterling McMurrin)

I insist that the specter of a Federal bureaucracy eager and ready to pounce on the schools and colleges is a politically inspired horror story that does not deserve the credence of intelligent citizens.

I do not believe giving more Federal funds to public schools will lead to Federal control of public education, for the simple reason that no one wants it. The educators don't want it, the taxpayers don't want it, and quite certainly the people in Government don't want it. Yet Washington has, as I believe it should have, a heavy financial involvement in all levels of education in this country. The Federal Government's part in education now costs about $3 billion a year, and this figure is certain to rise, whether or not President Kennedy gets what he has asked for in his vast new $1.2 billion education bill.

The problem of Federal control should be debated—and so, of course, should the weaknesses in our present system of local, private, and State control. The problem must be taken seriously—and as Federal investment in education rises, it will become more difficult. The Federal Government has spent many billions of dollars on education since the Morrill Act provided for the land-grant colleges in 1862, but no one can argue that we now have Federal control. The trouble is that most of what is said on the subject is merely an outpouring of political emotion, or else part of the grand debate on our economy.

I believe that we must preserve our present general pattern of educational organization.

The States should continue to control the public schools. Colleges and universities, public and private, should continue to have their present large measure of independence. But it is ludicrous to argue this, as some do, on the ground that the Federal Government is bad or incompetent. I suspect that the Federal education officials with whom I have worked have been, on the whole, more competent than most of their State and local counterparts, and their integrity is most admirable. It is just not true, as some critics find it useful to pretend, that they are questionable characters bent on destroying our institutions. My experience as U.S. Commissioner of Education showed me quite clearly that the people who administer the Government's educational affairs in such agencies as the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation are thoroughly opposed to Federal control.

IS WASHINGTON INEFFICIENT?

Nor does another argument against Federal participation in education hold water—the belief, fostered by a steady barrage of cliches, that Federal educational programs are less efficient and more costly than similar programs run by the States. If money were the only consideration, it would be hard to argue against Federal management of every school and college in the country. However, the clinching argument against a federally run educational system has nothing to do with money, nor with any easy presumption of villainy in Washington and virtue in the provinces.

We are told often enough that a nation's success depends on the quality of its education. What is perhaps more important is the extent to which the character of a nation is bound up with the kind (not merely the quality) of education it has. Our national character has always been one of enormous diversity, of people, languages, sects, and prejudices swirling about in disharmonious union. The great and frequently exasperating variety of American ways of life (there is, of course, no single American way of life) is squarely opposed to the block structure of totalitarianism. Our educational system reflects and nourishes this variety—and to change from the variety of State and local control to a central, monolithic structure would be to destroy the individual's best guarantee against the overwhelming power of the State.

Such would be the danger if education in the United States were controlled by even the most enlightened Federal officials. But recognizing this does not mean that we should continue our sometimes absurd educational provincialisms. The plain fact is that education is now a national as well as a State and local concern.

The problem is not—and has not been for decades—whether we should have Federal aid to education. We have it, and need more of it. The problem is what kind of aid to have. Actually few people, even those who are supposed to be enemies of Federal aid, oppose programs already in existence. Continuing aid to land-grant colleges, for instance, is one of the most popular programs in the Congress, and vocational-education programs have been established so long in some parts of the country that the most thoroughgoing conservatives would be shocked at the thought of discontinuing them—at least in their districts. Such programs are accepted as part of the normal pattern of school financing, and the Federal origin of the money is usually forgotten.

It is, of course, the new aid proposals that bring cries of outrage. So far, opposition has been overwhelming to any plan for general aid—all-purpose funds to be used at the discretion of college or school-district officials. The Congress has never passed a general aid bill, and it is conceivable that it never will. Yet a strong case can be made for general aid. It is surely in the national interest, for instance, to raise the level of education in the poorer States. The principle of equal primary and secondary education within each State is well established, so why not make the level of education equal throughout the Nation? But the ability of individual States to pay for education is almost impossible to measure accurately, and it is almost as hard to find agreement on what the national needs in education are. In any case, the parochial-school question complicates the discussion.

Many aid programs to meet specific needs have been established by the Congress. Specific aid programs now in force, in addition to the land-grant-college and vocational-aid appropriations mentioned earlier, include funds to provide loans for college and university dormitories, and to train and equip teachers of sciences and foreign languages. Much of the money is available in the form of matching funds, and local participation is, of course, voluntary. The President's new bill, a compound of such specific programs, calls for, among other things, continuing pinpoint aid to public schools in federally impacted areas; a 3-year, $1 billion plan for construction loans to public and private colleges; a new program of grants to public and private institutions for graduate schools, library facilities and technical education; aid to public junior colleges, and an expanded teacher-training plan.

I think the argument for specific aid of the kind the President has proposed is entirely persuasive. There is just too much to be done to improve American education that cannot, or will not, be done by the States or the local school districts. Some problems, such as upgrading high school teaching in the basic subjects, require a massive attack of both talent and money, beyond the means of all but the wealthiest States. In other areas, although the money required is not great the solution of a problem may require a concerted national effort rather than sporadic local activity. An instance is the present Federal investment of $3 million over a 2-year period to attract and train better teachers for the deaf. (I have heard it argued by critics who see "Federal control" in any specific aid program that if the same $3 million were added to a general-aid appropriation, the teaching of the deaf would be taken care of. I regard this as patent nonsense.) Finally, there are some areas, such as the teaching of important but uncommon foreign languages, for which there may be no local interest, although there is a national need.

Large Federal investments can, of course, unbalance our educational system. Currently the unbalance favors science and engineering. Huge Federal appropriations for defense research not only have built up the Nation's military strength but also have produced an explosion in knowledge, talent and creativity that has endless implications for the future. We cannot turn away from such achievements; the imbalance must not be corrected by having less science, but by a larger investment in the humanities and the arts. I seriously doubt that this can be done without Federal action.

Naturally, to say that a particular aid program is justified does not mean that it should continue indefinitely. Nor should use of Federal money be permitted to rob States, local districts or private groups of their re-

sponsibilities in education. It is quite true that Federal money can tempt a State or local board to make unwise decisions, say in the spending of matching funds. But this is no argument against Federal aid: we are entitled to expect wisdom and integrity in our educational leaders, and virtue often depends on the capacity to say "No."

WHO MAKES THE DECISIONS?

The seeming detachment of Government officials from the schools themselves is a drawback of Federal aid in the minds of some critics. Obviously men who approve or deny applications for Federal funds can influence a university or a school district. But their decisions are commonly made on the advice of experts from outside the Government, and money is spent according to regulations drawn up with the aid and approval of persons broadly representative of the schools and colleges. There is a constant flow into and out of Washington of university presidents, scientists, scholars, State and local school superintendents, and experts in every branch of educational finance.

A rich crop of confusion is reaped whenever Federal aid is mentioned merely because of the sprawling, uncoordinated nature of the Government's involvement in education. A man with time on his hands can identify over 250 separate U.S. Government educational operations carried on by 12 departments and 26 independent agencies. It is impossible to administer these programs from one department—many involve technical research geared to defense, atomic energy, space exploration, and the like. But better coordination is necessary.

The only way to achieve the necessary order, it seems to me, is to give full Cabinet status to education. At present the Office of Education is merely one of a conglomerate of agencies in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Considering the growing importance of education to our society, this makes no sense. Only a full-fledged department of education—perhaps a department of education, science, and the arts—will enable the American people to deal with the large problems of education at the national level.

Oil Depletion Allowance in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the February 1963 issue of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raiser magazine, on the subject of "Oil Depletion Allowance in Jeopardy." The editorial follows:

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE IN JEOPARDY

One of the most asinine of all politically inspired tax schemes is that which aims at the elimination of the oil percentage depletion provision of our tax laws. Already the consumer in Texas pays 9 cents or more in State and Federal gasoline taxes—national average about 11 cents a gallon.

To ranchmen the elimination of this depletion allowance would be a crippling blow. Not only would it affect adversely the price of land and the oil leases paid ranchmen but it would, it is estimated, increase the cost of gasoline about 4 cents a gallon. In the operation of the ranches of the Southwest, motor transportation, and therefore gasoline, is indispensable. Gasoline is a major expense item and its price is high enough—in fact, too high—as it is today.

Is this thrust at the oil industry and those the oil industry affects another politically inspired action to win votes, or is it a part of a carefully thought-out plan to socialize all industry in this Nation? Whatever the plan or its reason, it stinks. It is as senseless a method for raising money for an extravagant, spendthrift government as has come up in the past two decades.

Making the Most of Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the most beloved and respected persons in Georgia education is Mrs. Bernice McCullar, director of information for the State department of education.

Widely known for her authoritative, informative, and sometimes controversial views of education, Mrs. McCullar travels throughout the State and Nation, telling the story of Georgia and its schools.

On March 11, the National Broadcasting Co. commentator, Morgan Beatty, recognized the talents of Mrs. McCullar and paid tribute to her on an "Emphasis" program. Principally, Mr. Beatty noted that Mrs. McCullar knows the value of time and knows how to say what she means in a way that it will be understood by all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPHASIS—THE SCHOOL STORY

This is Morgan Beatty. "Emphasis," the ledger of life. Dateline, Atlanta, Ga.

The other day I bemoaned the tyranny of time in the news business. How the old man with the scythe interferes with communications by cutting down the time you have to devote to understanding events around you and our time to help you with the task.

And yet, time also is easily our richest possession. With the English cleric, Lee Richmond, we can observe that there is a time to be born and a time to die. Hence, the interval in between is of infinite importance.

Bernice McCullar, of the Georgia Education Department in Atlanta, is one educator in the United States who appreciates the relationship between time that flies and what we do with it.

She has embarked on a project, with permission of her State superintendent of schools, to save time in presenting the story of schools to parents.

This enterprising information director is mindful of the observation of Albert Einstein when he was asked to define his scientific theory of relativity. Said Einstein, "When you sit with a nice girl for 2 hours, you think it is only a minute. But when you sit on a hot stove for a minute, you think it's 2 hours. That's relativity."

Mrs. McCullar has decided to translate that formula to improve relations between educators and parents of the children who are being educated.

And she is especially angry at the teacher who turns up a sophisticated nose at the so-called 10-year-old mentality of Americans.

The Georgia educator relates in the NEA Journal an incident on a TV discussion panel. She observed publicly, that she did not like educational jargon on the program. She detested the use of such phrases as the total concept of the evaluation criteria in the schools.

A teacher on the program turned to a companion and said, "Now she will rap us over the knuckles if we use words beyond a 10-year-old mentality."

Mrs. McCullar's reply: "It is we—of the teaching profession who have 10-year-old mentalities if we can't find ways to tell our story simply and dramatically." She is well aware of the fact that the legal profession has fastened upon us a separate language that actually interferes with communication, that the modern scientists are doing the same thing in the space story. If lawyers and scientists cannot find simple words such as those used by Joseph Conrad in his beautiful novels, it is they who are the nitwits; they simply can't use English.

The old fetish of the so-called cultured mind that the average mentality is only 10 years old is a rather obvious display of ignorance on the part of the so-called cultured.

Mrs. McCullar's State superintendent, for example, makes 5-minute radio talks for local stations in Georgia. Their objective is to do no more than explain how a child can make better grades in school in a minimum of that valuable stuff called time.

Perhaps her biggest accomplishment to date is a story called "Tomorrow Has Two Legs." A woman's club appropriated several hundred dollars. Movie men gave their time along with actors and dancers and writers. The result—a simple story of the exuberance of youth, how to harness it for the future of the Nation.

Those who have seen it say it tells an indelible story to parents and to children in 45 minutes. A story that would take 2 days of meetings. And the meetings would put people to sleep.

Mrs. McCullar has made exciting a very simple story about people. And she has done it by making the most of that stuff called time, the stuff in between being born and being dead.

Morgan Beatty, NBC News.

Forward to the Rear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star:

FORWARD TO THE REAR

Another Kennedy victory has proved to be a retreat.

Upon entering office, President Kennedy assured the American people that the foreign exchange gap would be closed and that the drain on gold from the U.S. Treasury would

be stopped. A few months later, several suitably qualified announcements left the careful impression that this sticky problem had been solved. The implication was that the Eisenhower administration simply didn't know how to cope with the difficulty.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon has now belatedly admitted what has been common knowledge for months. There is still a sizable gap between what this country earns abroad and what it spends in foreign lands. There is still a steady outflow of gold from the U.S. Treasury amounting to about $900 million in the last year. The trade-aid deficit amounted to $2,200 million.

While the gap is the smallest since 1957, Dillon added that progress was limited. More than that, the head of the Treasury would not predict when there might be a surplus, or even a balance between dollars flowing into and out of the country.

This situation represents a threat to the financial structure of the country. It can affect every family should it become much more serious. This fact is disturbing enough.

Yet there is reason to believe that Secretary Dillon may have have broken official silence on the subject to prepare the way for some tampering with the Nation's monetary system in an effort to make the retreat orderly. One rumor currently suggests a reduction in the amount of gold Congress will require to back the dollar. This would permit such foreign creditors as France to be paid off should they demand hard cash rather than paper dollars for notes they hold.

The results of the Kennedy victory in the monetary field are as saddening as the results of victory in Cuba.

The 1963 Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Representative ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of the Fifth South Carolina District, last week made a most comprehensive detailed statement before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on the 1963 tax message. I ask that these remarks be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1963 TAX MESSAGE

(Statement of ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of Congress, Fifth South Carolina District, before the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, March 14. 1963)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am most grateful to you for allowing me to appear here today. I am not an expert on taxation, but my appearance here today is stimulated and inspired by the realization that I represent a precious segment of taxpaying American people, the people in the 5th Congressional District of South Carolina, who have a stake in your decision on any changes made in the tax laws in the 88th Congress. Let me assure you that I respect the position of decision and power which each of you holds as a member of this committee, and I recognize that you are members of this committee because you have been recognized by the respective political parties which elected you to this committee.

Let me begin by saying that I favor a tax cut. I also favor tax reform, although I am not in favor of certain proposals which I hope to discuss with you today, and which adversely affect the well-being of the people of my district, or the business which is carried on by or for or with the people of my district. I pause here to salute the President of the United States for his courage and his foresight in proposing tax legislation and change this year, particularly a tax cut. I have every confidence in his sincerity of purpose, his ambition to keep the American economy not only rolling along at the prosperous rate it has enjoyed, but to improve the status of the economy. When the President of the United States stated in his tax message of January 24, 1963, "Our present income tax rates structure now holds back consumer demands, initiative, and investment," he was saying the same thing that I have heard from hundreds of businessmen. Sadly I report that most of these businessmen are people who have expressed a dislike to Mr. Kennedy, and now that he has said it I am sure it is not as popular with them as if others had said it. Nevertheless, he has said it, he has spoken the truth and I am happy in the confidence that your committee will do something about our tax laws, and if any feeble effort on my part can be of assistance to the members of this great committee I am as near as your telephone.

Recently there came across my desk a little booklet entitled "Comments on the President's 1963 Economic Report," put out by the Department of Economics and Research of the American Bankers Association. I quote from that report:

"In our judgment, the requirement for implementing a tax cut 'within the bounds of fiscal prudence' would not preclude a temporary swelling of the Federal deficit—if this increase resulted from a tax reduction of the magnitude proposed by the President. For practical as well as economical reasons, our endorsements of tax reduction has not been coupled with the demand that the reduction be accomplished without exerting a temporary adverse of impact on the Federal budget. We regard tax reduction as an investment in future economic vigor, and we look upon the accompanying temporary enlargement of the deficit as the price, though the purpose, of the tax cut. Even a temporary enlargement of the Federal deficit resulting exclusively from tax reduction is not without risk at this time—the risk of generating renewed inflationary prices and compounding our balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet our confidence in the constructive forces that tax reductions can unleash leads us to believe that the price, in terms of a temporary and manageable swelling of the deficit, can and should be made."

I hope I have not taken this out of context. I respect the group that made the study.

I share your wishes that we could accomplish a tax cut without any enlargement of the deficit. I also share the belief that the President of the United States and those who have recognized the advantages of a tax cut at this time, that a tax cut will be of great benefit to this country, even with a corresponding rise in the national debt. My recollection is that this is the first time in the history of this country that the President of the United States has proposed a tax cut as a stimulation for business. All of us who are privileged to have enjoyed any length of maturity as American citizens, or as people privileged to serve their people as Members of Congress, recognize the fact that this is the last needle in the economic doctor's kit. We continue to be under the influence of a wartime military budget, which has become a basic foundation of our economy—or should I say we depend more than we realize on expenditures for military purposes to keep the plants running, the people employed, and production steady. We are going to have to face, someday, and soon, the impact of this economic factor, and the problem of reduction of defense outlay without hurting our economy. If we are to stimulate the economy in any way, the tax cut seems to me the last and only hope that we have in our store of possible remedies, under present economic realities.

Before I proceed into discussion of specifics of the proposed tax legislation that I will discuss with you because of the effect on my district, let me ask your indulgence in one area of tax practice. In any consideration of reform of the tax structure of the United States today, or tomorrow, or in the immediate future, one ambition of this committee should be to simplify the filing of tax returns to such an extent that a man with an income of less than $5,000, in order to claim the grace, the benefits allowed him by certain deductions, would be able to accurately and honestly fill out the form without having to hire someone to do it. I believe most of the accountants of this Nation would share that wish with me. I am a country lawyer, and I have filled out hundreds of tax forms; naturally, when I did, I had to charge people for them. I have not filled out any but my own since I have been a Member of the Congress, but I have observed others filling out their forms, and the forms today are too complicated. They encourage mistakes, and I think a major challenge to this committee, not today because I realize that this particular tax legislation you are considering today must be limited to the scope intended, is the challenge shining like a light in the faces of the members of this committee and the Members of the Congress of the United States, to do something about the difficulty of making a return. Perhaps you say that this is an administrative matter; it may be, but you and I as Members of the Congress have some responsibility, too, and the fact that the forms are so complicated, or maybe the laws are so complicated, that people have to pay to get their tax forms filled out, even simple ones, seems to me an added burden of taxation which I know the legislators who passed the tax laws never intended. I plead with you for a simple form at some future date.

I do not believe the average taxpayer in the Nation knows how big a stake he has before this Congress, and which we must meet before we recess this year. The business people know, as a change in travel and entertainment expense account procedure brought them home to reality: the business of the Government is the business of the businessman as well as the responsibility of the Congressman, the Senator, the executive branch of the Government. Everything we do here affects every businessman in America in some way.

I make no apologies for singling out matters of importance to the people of my district. Their problems are my responsibility. I wish time permitted my dwelling on more facets of the tax proposals.

REVISION OF CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES

In the committee print of the President's 1963 tax message, February 6, 1963, under subdivision XVIII, C-2(b) (see p. VI of index), at pages 142, 143, I find the following:

"Under present law, a lump-sum distribution of an employee's interest in a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan is taxed as long-term capital gain if the distribution is made to the employee on account of his separation from the service of the employer or is

made to the employee's beneficiary on account of his death. Under the recommendation, the recipient would not treat the lump-sum distribution as a capital gain; rather, it would be regarded simply as ordinary income. However, he would be permitted to average the lump-sum distribution in the manner described below.

"The special averaging treatment would generally be available in the case of lump-sum distributions which qualify for capital gains treatment under present law; that is, those that are made on account of separation from service or death. It would not be available, however, unless contributions had been made for the employee under the pension or profit-sharing plan for at least 5 previous years.

"This averaging technique will result in a tax comparable to that which would be payable if the distribution had been received over the first 5 years of the employee's retirement. For the average employee, the tax on his lump-sum distribution will be roughly the same as he would pay under the present capital gains rates. For those employees who are presently covered under pension and profit-sharing plans, the tax may be even lower because a portion of their distributions will qualify as capital gain subject to the new rates.

I am afraid the intended purpose of this proposal will be defeated if drastic change in the proposals are not made. I gather from exhibit No. 17 (p. 483 supra) that this is aimed at "highly paid employees * * * able to withdraw huge sums from the company's pension or profit-sharing plan when they retire or leave the company and pay only the low capital gains tax." The trouble is that we find ourselves at the muzzle end of a scattergun instead of watching someone shoot a rifle at a selected target.

In my district approximately 10,000 people share in a wonderful profit-sharing plan—I believe it is second to none in the Nation—as employees of Springs Cotton Mills. For the calendar year 1962 the employees' share was $4,240,485. I quote from the Springs Bulletin of Wednesday, February 27, 1963:

"In releasing these figures, H. W. Close, president of the Springs organization, pointed out that the company's contribution to the Springs fund was the largest since the fund was established in 1953. There are 9,310 employees in the Springs fund and their share accounts now total $15,420,004.

"PLAN REVISED

"The largest contribution made previously by Springs to the Springs fund was $2,800,000 in 1960. The increase in this year's contribution was made possible by the revision of the plan in 1962. As approved by the Internal Revenue Service, the formula for the amount of the annual contribution is now based on profits, after dividends, without regard to the amount of capital invested.

"On the recommendation of the Internal Revenue Service a division has been made in the Springs fund setting up one trust for hourly and piece-rate employees and another for those on salaries. This change does not affect present account balances but will give hourly and piece-rate employees a larger share in the future.

"The distribution of extra pay in the form of vacation and Christmas checks was begun in 1948 by Col. Elliott Springs. These checks add up to approximately 1 week's pay for employees with less than 5 years' service and range up to 4 weeks' pay for those who have been on the job 25 years or longer. This cash distribution amounted to $879,919 in July 1962 and $862,484 at Christmas.

"FUND GROWING

"Participation in the Springs fund has grown steadily since it was established in 1953. There were 8,836 share accounts in 1960, 9,222 in 1961, and 9,310 at the end of 1962.

"There has also been a steady increase in the total funds in these accounts. This total was $10,404,532 in 1960, $12,515,625 in 1961, and $15,420,004 at the end of 1962.

"The Springs fund has been built up entirely by contributions from the Springs Cotton Mills and through earnings on investments of the trust funds.

"Employees are eligible to participate in the Springs fund after 3 years' employment. They make no contribution to the fund nor is any deduction made from their paychecks.

"They are not compelled to remain in the Springs fund but the greatest benefits build up for those who stay in until they retire, die, or are disabled. Those who 'draw down their cash' forfeit part of the money credited to them and must wait 3 years before they may reenter."

From a little booklet on the profit-sharing plan, I call your attention to certain excerpts:

"The profit-sharing plan is for all employees. If you are an hourly paid or piecework employee, you may join the plan if you have worked for the company for 3 years or more.

"When you have been with the company for 3 years, you simply fill out a registration form, and you are a member.

"You also name the person you want to get your profit-sharing money in the case you die.

"You don't pay a cent to get into the plan. You don't pay a cent to stay in the plan, but it does cost you money to get out of the plan * * * if you pull out before you retire, get disabled or die.

"Let us take an example:

"We take the case of a typical weave room or spinning room employee, presently age 25, who earns $3,500 a year in wages. If he stays in our employ, and in the profit-sharing plan, until retirement at age 65, if his earnings continue at the same rate, if the company's profit experience continues at the present level until that time, and if the plan continues until that time with its current rate of earnings and forfeitures, our typical employee will have a credit at retirement of $36,268.

"Under present capital gain provisions, 50 percent of this credit or $18,134 would be included in taxable income. Assuming no other income and assuming exemptions and deductions of $2,000, our typical employee would pay a tax at current rates, of $3,268.

"Under the proposed capital gain provisions, our typical employee, on the same set of assumptions, would pay a tax, at the proposed reduced rates, of $6,994.20.

"The reason for this rather amazing consequence is to be found in Mr. Dillon's statement respecting the so-called 'averaging' or 'mitigating' provision. Thus, although the lump sum distribution is to be divided by 5 before computing the tax, it would appear that exemptions and deductions (where they exceed other income as in the case above) are to be 'subtracted from the lump-sum distribution before the averaging provision is applied.' (See the end of the fourth subparagraph under paragraph (2)(b).)

"If the exemptions and deductions were deducted after the averaging provision had been applied, our typical employee would pay a tax of only $4,128.25.

"To summarize:

"a. Under the present capital gains provisions and at current rates:

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Includible income (50 percent)	18,134.00
Less deductions and exemptions	2,000.00
Taxable income	16,134.00
Tax	3,965.00

"b. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted before averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	34,268.00
Divided by 5	6,853.60
Tax on the above	1,398.84
Tax (5 times the above)	6,994.20

"c. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted after averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Divided by 5	7,253.60
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	5,253.00
Tax on the above	825.65
Tax (5 times the above)	4,128.25

"With respect to an employee whose profitsharing credit at retirement is $20,000, the comparable tax figures are (a) $1,680, (b) $2,680, (c) $1,400.

"If we are correct in our reading of the proposal, it would appear that there is no real averaging, no real effort to spread the impact over a 5-year period, for only 1 year's exemptions and deductions are given any effect in computing the tax.

"Perhaps the most disturbing part of this proposed new treatment of lump-sum distributions, at least from the viewpoint of those charged with administering the plan, is the proposal that the new tax treatment shall not apply to that portion of a lump-sum distribution which equals the amount in the employee's account on February 6, 1963, plus future earnings, on this amount. (See the third subparagraph of par. (2)(b) of Mr. Dillon's statement.)

"In other words, the company, or someone, shall have to maintain two accounts for each participant. Instead of 9,310 accounts, there will be 18,620. Each time there is a forfeiture, or an appreciation in investment value, or a dividend or interest item, there will have to be thousands of additional computations in order properly to divide the item and allocate it between that part of each participant's account representing 'the amount in the employee's account as of * * * February 6, 1963, plus the future earnings on this amount,' and that part of the employee's account which represents the balance.

"I'm sure you are aware that this increases the burden imposed on industry to report this project, to make this return, or to supply that information, to Federal, State and local governments."

I represent the people who are in this pension plan. There are other pension plans in effect in my district. Every man, woman, and child in my district will eventually be affected, adversely, if this change takes place. I solicit your earnest consideration.

REPEAL OF UNLIMITED DEDUCTIONS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

As I understand the statement on page 100 of the committee print on the President's 1963 tax message, the recommendation for repeal of the unlimited deductions for charitable contributions was based upon the premise that such is a special deduction of limited application which enables individuals with substantial incomes to escape all Federal taxes on their income. I am frank to admit that I do not have enough expertise on taxation statistics or practice to refute that statement. Certainly, as a taxpayer, I want to pay my tax, but not more, but, at the same time, I want the other fellow to pay his share because the man who doesn't pay his share adds to the burden of the taxpayer who is honest about his taxes.

I recognize the concern about people who do escape all Federal taxes on their income.

I do not think that the rule of unlimited deductions applies only to people with large incomes. If this committee wants to write a limitation as to large incomes, since that is where any alleged inequity is pinpointed, I would certainly consider it proper if it means that the man with the smaller income is paying more tax because a man with a larger income is getting out of paying a fair share of taxes due because of this deduction. But let us consider the matter in the light of facts.

I am happy that I live in a portion of the country where people are moral, extremely religious. We have numerous churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish. Many of these churches have small congregations, a majority of which make $5,000 to $7,000 or less. Many of the individuals of these assemblies tithe and I salute them for doing so; they are not rich nor do they try to get out of paying their taxes. If you repeal their right to deduct contributions, it is my opinion that you will do great harm because you would discourage the working people of this country from making contributions to their churches, to their orphanages, to their church schools.

It is not that their contributions are motivated by income tax regulations allowing deductions, but this has been the practice over many, many years, and as a Member of Congress I do not expect to be a part of any effort, or support any legislation, which will reduce the contributions so necessary to the churches, the church schools, and the orphanages.

Many of our orphanages and other charitable and educational church institutions rely heavily on contributions from various groups, particularly those of incomes below $20,000 because, in my section of the country, $20,000 is a tremendous income, and the people who support the various orphanages usually give $5 to $10 at a time; I know because I read the bulletins from the various church orphanages and I am interested in them and I know of the good work that they are doing.

To put a damper on this method of financing charitable institutions would be a disservice to the Nation, a disservice to the churches of this land and the good works they accomplish because they are financed, in large part, by contributions.

Many ministers have talked to me about this and many lay members of the various churches. We today are laboring to improve the education of every American, and were this tax effort to put a stumbling block in the path of church schools that use contributions to help finance the education of pupils who need it, would be a backward step in American progress and not in keeping with our overall purpose as a nation.

I am confident in your consideration of this proposal and your ability to preserve charitable accomplishments. I believe this proposal can be amended to do justice and to accomplish the purpose basically intended, and at the same time take care of the people with smaller incomes, the smaller contributors, and thus take care of our charitable institutions.

Churches, church schools, church orphanages are necessary, magnificent, institutions of this free land. They deserve every consideration from the Members of Congress.

CARRYOVER OF EXCESS DEDUCTIONS

On page 33 of the committee print (Feb. 6, 1963), I read from the statement of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury:

Under present law, taxpayers are able to reduce their taxable incomes from other sources by deducting substantial amounts of development costs and other expenses incurred when a mineral property is not yet profitable. But they are not required to take these deductions into account in determining net income for the purpose of computing the limit on the percentage depletion allowance on the property when it does become profitable. Even if the deductions are carried forward in the form of a net operating loss carryover and used to reduce future taxable income, they are never subtracted from net income from the property for purposes of the percentage depletion limitation. As a result, the amount of percentage depletion deducted over a property's life may be far more than one-half of its total net income. This result would seem to be clearly contrary to the purpose of the 50-percent net-income limitation on percentage depletion. The operation of present law is illustrated in the technical explanation.

But let us reason about this.

The President stated in his budget message that deductions taken with respect to a mineral property to the extent they exceed the gross income from the property during the year taken must be carried forward to future years for the purpose of reducing percentage depletion through reduction of the limiting net income from the property all costs deducted with respect to the property would be subject to this provision, presumably even to State and local real estate taxes paid on idle mineral land a careful study of this proposal will show that it is based on an error in reasoning as to the history and intent behind the depletion provisions of the present law and that it would operate to the broad detriment of the mining and quarrying industry it would unfairly penalize both the small operator with a smaller margin of profit and the large operator who is required to incur heavy carrying costs to maintain levels of reserves in keeping with the size of his operations.

Secretary Dillon has stated that he felt the purpose of the 50 percent of net limitation is violated unless percentage depletion is limited to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property. A brief review of the history of percentage depletion will reveal this to be erroneous.

In 1918 Congress granted discovery value depletion which in effect placed the finders of any mineral deposits on the same level with those producers who had found their deposits prior to March 31, 1913, and were entitled to deduct the 1913 value thereof once the valuation of the mineral deposit was completed the per unit depletion deduction was established and did not fluctuate with prices thereafter as a result when market values decreased or when operations went sour causing a loss from the operation of the property there was still available. A depletion deduction based on the original valuation in 1921 Congress limited the discovery value depletion to 100 percent of the net income from the property during the taxable year and this was later changed to 50 percent of the net income from the property in 1924 subsequently when percentage depletion replaced discovery value depletion the 50 percent of net income limitation remained unchanged Congress did not give any reason for its action in 1924 and prior but it is quite evident that the purpose was not to limit the deduction of discovery depletion to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property it would seem on the other hand that Congress was somewhat unhappy with the fact that inherent defects in the valuation procedure could result in values for depletion which in light of subsequent events seemed absurd and permitted deduction against nonmining income without the actual expenditure of funds. If the present recommendations are adopted this move cannot be explained by alleging it will carry out the original intent of Congress. In essence this proposal is simply another method of reducing the benefits and effectiveness of percentage depletion and related provisions of the tax law.

The recommendation that carryover of excess deductions be used to reduce depletion in future years would cause some very inequitable results and would bear much more heavily upon the operation of a marginal quarry or mine than upon the operator of a heavily successful quarry-mine or mine; as an illustration let us assume that two properties have $10,000 excess deduction in the nature of development cost during the first year. In subsequent years assume that each property produces 20,000 units which market for $100,000; if property A makes a small profit so that it is already limited by the net under present law it will eventually lose $5,000 of its deleption deduction because of the proposed carry forward. However, if property B has net income of $30,000 in the first year of operation it will not lose any of the depletion deduction, even iif the proposed changes are adopted imposing heavier burdens on the marginal mine seems very inequitable and undesirable since these are the properties which will first be driven out of business by this type of taxation. The unfairness of the proposed carry forward can be further illustrated as follows: Assume that two different properties are adjacent, each producing 20,000 units selling for $100,000 with a net profit before depletion of $10,000; assume further that property A has operated at this rate of profit since commencing operation but property B had loss of $5,000: under present law each of these properties having the same gross and net income will have a percentage depletion deduction of $5,000. However, if the proposed carryforward is adopted, property A will continue to have a depletion deduction of $5,000, whereas property B will have its depletion deduction reduced by $2,500, simply because it had an operating loss in the preceding year.

The carrying costs on reserve mineral property would eventually operate under the proposed carry forward to reduce the percentage depletion allowance. Companies which move large tonnages are forced to acquire and hold reserve mineral properties if they are to survive. They cannot wait until a deposit is exhausted before searching for another to replace it. Where ad valorum taxes are imposed during this idle period the payment of those taxes should not reduce the depletion allowance in future years when the property goes into production. Nevertheless this would be the result under the proposed carryover provision.

We do not have lucrative quarrying or mining in my State, my district. As a result, the cost of removing overburden is a factor of economic life or death. I do have mining and quarrying in York, Cherokee, Fairfield, Lancaster and Kershaw Counties in my district and elsewhere in South Carolina. They must be kept in operation.

Actually the appellation excess deduction is a misnomer. We are talking about depletion, expense, and cost or production.

MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTIONS

The President has recommended in his 1963 tax message to the Congress that corporations which are members of an affiliated group should be restricted to one surtax exemption, both where a common parent holding company exists (parent-subsidiary group), and even went so far as to favor restriction to one surtax exemption, and to force a single consolidated income tax return on a group of corporations where, by the difficult and complicated attribution rule under section 318 of the code, 80 percent of the stock is owned by five or fewer individuals in substantially the same proportion (brother-sister groups).

In this brother-sister grouping, you are dealing frequently with grassroots, county seat, small, and family-owned businesses.

The relation of brother and sister and parents, some quite militantly independent of each other, is difficult to unify by wording of an attribution statute.

As to the impracticality in forced consolidated returns, let me give you an example of a widow aged 80, whose four sons and one daughter are in five separate incorporated businesses in one country town with each member of the family owning approximately 10 percent in each of the units except that the widow and the child who manages each separate unit own the remainder. Each son and daughter are very independent in the management of each of their separate units, three units are in retailing, two in farming and farm processing.

Merely because the elderly widow continues to live but is sick and is completely inactive, forces all of these business units under section 318 to file one consolidated income tax return wherein all in fact are on a different accounting basis or a different fiscal year basis, and would be in serious management and personal difficulties if forced consolidation were to occur. There is no business relevance to the contended longevity of an aged lady not engaged in business activity.

Section 318 of the Internal Revenue Code has been referred to as a Pandora's box of construal problems (Ownes, "Stock Redemptions and Partial Liquidations under the 1954 Code" 32 Taxes 979 (1954)). To force it upon family owned businesses is a serious mistake.

The feuding and difficulties in executive management resulting from such a situation would be incalculable, and would greatly hinder the formation of new business units at the family capital level, where the largest volume of new business units start. The difficulties of the average small business dealing with the vagaries of substantially proportionate ownership as set forth in the principal statement of Secretary Dillon, and the tremendous complexities of construing section 318 of the "Code on attribution of Ownership of Stock" will result in a reaction from small business units that would be violent. A mere list of topic headings under section 318 in Mertens, "Law of Federal Income Taxation, Code Commentary," is indicative of the complications:

"TOPICAL HEADINGS, SECTION *318* U.S. INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF *1954*

"From Mertens Law of Federal Income Taxation

"Section 318. Constructive ownership of stock

"Section 318:1. General

"Section 318:2. Legislative background

"Section 318(a)(1):1. Attribution between members of a family

"Section 318(a)(2):1. Attribution between partnerships, estates, trusts and corporations and their respective partners, beneficiaries and shareholders

"Section 318(a)(2):2. Meaning of 'directly' or 'indirectly'

"Section 318(a)(2)(A):1. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(A):2. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):1. Trusts—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):2. Trusts—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):3. Trusts—Meaning of "maximum exercise of discretion"

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):4. Trusts—Attribution to grantors from the trust entity

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):5. Trusts—Attribution to entity from the grantor

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):1. Corporations—General rules of attribution

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):2. Corporations—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):3. Corporations—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a)(3):1. Options

"Section 318(a)(4):1. Constructive ownership as actual ownership

"Section 318(b):1. Cross references."

I know that the recommendations as to the change and reduction in normal tax and surtax is worthy, but in the particular situation of attempting to unify individuals and families at the grassroots level of small business into one consolidated return under the concept of brother-sister affiliated group is one of the most inherently dangerous administrative problems faced in the President's tax message.

This entire matter of multiple corporations was thoroughly considered relative to section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code by your eminent committee in 1951 and many capital investments, creative to our citizens, have been made in the assumption of reasonable continuity and stability in this field of taxation. I urge your eminent committee not to disrupt business organization without compelling reasons which do not appear at present.

RELATION ALSO TO THE PARENT-SUBSIDIARY GROUPS AS WELL AS "BROTHER-SISTER" AFFILIATED GROUPS

I am opposed to the proposal to limit the surtax exemptions of a group of related corporations to one exemption. Congress in 1951, in considering section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code, gave to newly organized corporations which were organized as part of a program of expansion, a separate surtax exemption for each. This provision led to expansion. Expansion is what is now desired. Continuation of the present provision will encourage such expansion. Adoption of the Treasury provision on surtax exemption limits would curtain expansion with consequent loss of employment. If the Treasury provision were applied to existing corporations, this would be a breach of faith on the part of Congress and would unduly penalize stockholders who invested their capital in reliance on the existing provision. Denial of the surtax exemption to a small corporate enterprise, albeit a subsidiary, is economically unrealistic and discriminatory, since perforce, it must compete at the community level with other enterprises of surtax size and nature.

This is a matter which also deeply concerns small business.

I particularly refer to the well phrased testimony on March 12, 1963, of John A. Gosnell, general counsel, National Small Business Association where he stated:

"We have also had considerable comment about the proposal to eliminate the corporate surtax exemption in certain cases. This may appear to be primarily important to larger corporations, but it is pointed out that the expansion of small business by the asquisition of small corporations is a sound device, both from a legal and an economic standpoint, and it has a proven and useful place in the small-business segment of the economy. In cases where the separate corporation is established or acquired for a legitimate business purpose, the fact of common control does not destroy its local identity; its contribution to local economy, or its responsibilities under local statutes. It would seem that any attempt at this late day to make a fine distinction between those corporations which should pay the surtax, and those which should not, would result in many unjustified hardships and dislocations which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rectify. As a point of general tax law such a move would appear to be the imposition of an additional corporate tax on a discriminatory basis. The motive for the proposal is beyond us. The revenue would not be material, and the present safeguards are adequate to prevent abuse."

Let me assure you again that I am no expert, but the proposals so seriously affect the future of many businesses in my district, and the enterprising people who work there, that I must ask your serious consideration in opposing this recommendation.

ORDINARY INCOME ITEMS TREATED AS CAPITAL GAINS—TIMBER AND COAL

On page 145 of the President's 1963 tax message, we find the proposed treatment of capital gains on timber outlined. This involves a provision of section 631 and section 1231(b)(2) relating to timber and coal.

Under present law, a taxpayer who owns timber is accorded capital gains treatment upon the sale of the timber whereby an economic interest is retained by such owner whether the taxpayer is making a casual sale or whether the taxpayer is in the trade or business of selling timber.

The new proposal seeks to allow an annual exemption to each individual taxpayer only up to $5,000 of timber sale income for the purposes of capital gains treatment, but amounts in excess of $5,000 would be accorded ordinary income treatment. I fully recognize the loopholes of the present law in connection with some real estate tax shelters, but I must outline to this great committee the damage which might be effected if the proposal is honored by the committee as stated by Secretary Dillon.

We must realize that tree farming has become a major industry in certain parts of America. The growth of this industry has been significant since World War II, and thousands of people are employed in the pulpwood and lumber industry, who otherwise would be unemployed because of the decline in row crop farming, and particularly cotton farming in the South and Midsouth. As a result of the capital gains treatment of timber transactions, not only have many people been able to go into the business properly expecting a profit, but, in addition, this means employment to those who work in the woods as producers of timber or pulpwood, or employees of those producers.

Thousands of people are now employed in paper mills in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other Southern States. The proposal to limit, or put a ceiling on the capital gains expectations would be a blow to the future expectations or plans of this industry, possibly cause loss of jobs.

Frankly, we need this industry to replace the farming which the soil bank and mechanization have affected.

It is my opinion that capital gains offers the soundest procedure for taxing timber as a natural resource. It is the same for large and small producers, all growers of timber. If the treatment were only to large growers we might speak of special privileges but such is not the fact.

Perhaps the capital gains treatment which has been practiced was enacted in part to recognize the incentive for reforestation in America. Reforestation is expensive and we in Congress well know, for we have appropriated money for the soil bank and other programs. In addition the capital gains treatment, we believe, acknowledges the risk from fire, insects, diseases, and other hazards in that long period of growth (pine pulpwood about 20 years) between planting and harvesting.

Timber growing is a unique and somewhat new enterprise in some parts of our Nation, which now knows heavy investments in this sort of farming; money is tied up for long periods of time during which there are hazards of fire, insect, and disease, which constitute potentials of physical and economic risk.

Much of the timber farming in the United States is affected by small private forest owners.

Until World War II economic circumstances were adverse to private investment in forestry and only limited progress was made in developing the permanent productive use of the three-fourths of the Nation's forest land in private ownership. The postwar period brought greatly changed economic conditions. Classifications established in the Revenue Act of 1943 in essence permitted capital gains treatment of revenues resulting from long-term increases in timber growth and value, regardless of the method used in disposing of the timber. This removed a major tax barrier to investment in forestry by timber-processing companies and by investors who retain an economic interest in the forest being cut as required by sound forest management. This was of fundamental importance in releasing the flow of investment into private forestry which has occurred during the postwar period. The major improvement in the Nation's timber supplies, the large-scale investment in wood-processing facilities with related permanent employment in many rural areas, and the watershed and recreational benefits derived from forest management which have been achieved on private lands during the last 20 years are directly traceable to this classification of timber revenues.

Private forest land is held in a wide variety of ownerships, ranging from small farm woodlots to large corporate holdings. The owners of the larger holdings have taken the leadership in the development of private forestry; progress has been slower on the small holdings. Equity requires comparable classification of timber revenues regardless of the size of holding. Removal of capital gains treatment from large holdings would penalize the very ownerships which have made the greatest progress in forestry.

Because of the long period of timber production, the greater part of the investments in timber growing which have been made since 1943 have not yet come to fruition. Good faith requires a continuation of the capital gains classification of timber revenues which was a condition of these investments.

Let me give you some idea of the farming business in my home county, Chester County, S.C.

Number acres land in Chester County, 377,000; number acres woodland, 259,000; number farms, 1,322; average size farm, 157.4 acres; percent farm acreage in woodland, 51.5; percent of woodlands in farm woods, 41.3.

Annual farm income in Chester County, $4,156,000; percent income from forest products, 18.2; forest income, $717,000.

Number board feet lumber sold: Pine, 11,700,000; hardwood, 3,600,000; annual income, $319,198.

Number sawmills operating in county, 12; number sawmill workers, 120; weekly sawmill payroll, $6,000.

Number cords pine sold, 57,113; number cords hardwood sold, 10,627; wood chips sold, 250 cars.

Pulpwood income: Pine, $371,234.50; hardwood, $26,567.50; chips, $60,000; total, $451,802.

Number companies buying pulpwood, 10; number pulpwood dealers, 8; number pulpwood workers, 300.

Additional income from pulpwood employment, $664,784; annual income from all forest products and related services, $2,359,784.

Number trees planted yearly: 1959, 1,964,000; 1960, 2,879,600; 1961, 2,580,500.

Number tree farmers, 17; acreage in tree farms, 44,207.

Number professional foresters in county: Private, 1; company, 12; Government, 4.

Let us recognize the fact that growing timber is a long-term risk for every owner. When a tree is cut, a capital asset is gone, not matter how it is sold. The 1944 law placed an owner who cuts his timber or disposes of it under a cutting contract on the same tax basis as an owner selling outright. This was recognition that all such owners are essentially doing the same thing and should receive the same tax treatment.

It takes 20, 50, or 100 years to grow timber. Land and investment are tied up. There are many risks. The Congress recognized that it would not be fair to tax the gain from long-term increase in value under these conditions as if it all occurred in the year when the tree is cut. To tax this long-term growth at steeply graduated income tax rates was confiscatory in effect.

The 1944 tax reforms recognized the national interest in growing and conserving timber. They removed an existing impediment to the practice of sustained renewal of timberlands.

Since the capital gain treatment recognizes the long-term risk and the slow accrual of capital value, owners are now conserving and reproducing timber at rates never before achieved in the Nation's history.

Timber capital gain taxation has proved itself to be in the national interest for nearly two decades.

It has removed inequities in prior law, resulting from different tax treatment of similar transactions.

Our forest resources are expanding.

America's forest owners, 4,500,000 in number, have as a group taken great strides in forestry management and improved the supply of timber, on a sustained yield basis, for the Nation.

Their output is vital to the national economy.

Under fair and equitable taxation, they can be counted on to increase our national wealth in forest resources, meet the national need for forest products, and provide an enduring source of tax revenue to the National Government.

IN CONCLUSION

There are other proposals I would touch on, but I have concentrated on those possibly affecting jobs in my district, my State. I would like to borrow from the fine statement of Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, before the committee, February 6, 1963.

"In order to provide jobs for the unemployed, to accelerate the rate of economic growth and thus demonstrate to the rest of the world the dynamic strength of which we are capable, we must furnish greater incentives to the private sector to improve its performance. These incentives, I believe, are best provided by reductions in individual and corporate income taxes. The tax reduction approach to the solution of our present difficulty is two pronged. The reduction of the individual income tax rates in the middle and lower brackets will serve for the most part to increase consumption expenditures. These are the groups which spend the highest proportion of their incomes. With the expansion in consumer demand idle plant capacity will be put back into operation and employment will increase. Corporate profits, which are especially sensitive to increases in the rate of plant utilization, will increase. Corporate profits motivate investment in new plant and equipment. Therefore the gain in consumer spending will lead to greater corporate profits and more funds and incentive for investment.

"The second prong of the tax approach bears more directly on investment incentives. By reducing the tax rates on individuals in the upper brackets and on corporations, the motivation to exploit new opportunities in product and process investment is encouraged directly. Reduction of the corporate income tax to the recommended level will mean that Government is no longer the senior partner in sharing corporate profits. Furthermore, reduced income taxes mean greater cash flow for corporations.

"The President's tax program, therefore, would remove the overburden of taxation from the economy and provide the bigger markets and the greater incentives necessary for more vigorous economic growth."

Again let me assure you that I salute our President for the courageous approach to our tax problems. I hope to work with this committee in solving them. Thank you for listening to me today.

Success of Blue Cross Makes Medicare Proposal an Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand why there are some who stubbornly insist on solving medicare problems by Government intervention when such action is simply unnecessary. This bespeaks a lack of faith in our free enterprise system and in the capacity of the American people to find solutions for their own hospital and medical problems.

That fact is attested by the experience of the Harris Hospital at Fort Worth, Tex., where during the past year some two-thirds of the 406 patients who were drawing old-age assistance carried Blue Cross protection. Of the $128,927.45 charged for hospitalization, $89,269.48 was paid by the Blue Cross coverage. All but $2,193.49 of the amount not included in the private health insurance coverage has been paid, and of this only $538.28 has been charged off. That represents only four-tenths of 1 percent of the total cost of caring for these patients.

The Harris Hospital experience should be typical of others throughout the Nation. This stands as a complete refutation of the claim by politicians who say the people are not capable of solving their own health problems.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a magazine article on this subject. It follows:

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

The latest figures since the old-age assistance program in Texas went into effect, January 1, 1962, show that 406 OAA patients were admitted to Harris Hospital last year. Their average length of stay was 8.7 days, which is barely above the average of other medical and surgical patients.

The hospital care for these 406 patients totaled $128,927.45. Of this amount, Blue Cross paid $89,269.48, leaving a balance of $39,657 due the hospital from patients and their families.

ONLY $538 UNCOLLECTIBLE

Of this balance, only $2,193.49 remains outstanding, and still more remarkable: Only $538.28 of the latter sum has been charged off as uncollectible, or only four-tenths of 1 percent of the total cost of caring for these patients—truly a tribute to the willingness and ability of the families of older patients to pay their own way, as well as to Texas OAA program.

Byelorussian National Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, March 25, 1963, is the 45th anniversary of Byelorussian National Independence Day. In eloquent letter from Capt. John Shimchik, chairman of the Byelorussian Liberation Front. In his letter, Captain Shimchik retells the tragic story of the Soviet Union's absorption of Byelorussia and calls for the independence of the Byelorussian and other captive Iron Curtain peoples. I fully share these sentiments, and ask for unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Senators can read it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, BYELORUSSIAN LIBERATION FRONT,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 11, 1963.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in reference to matters closely connected with American ideals of freedom for Americans of Byelorussian descent.

The Byelorussian people are enslaved and oppressed in Byelorussian SSR by totalitarian Soviet Russia. They have no opportunity to express their opinions and wishes. Only the Byelorussians living in America and other free countries can freely reflect the real evaluation of Communist rule in Byelorussia as well as the desires of the Byelorussian Nation.

The history of Soviet Russian Government in Byelorussia, is a history of permanent terror, armed pacifications, national oppression, religious persecution, economic exploitation, mass arrests and shootings, deportations into Siberia, Russification and Sovietization.

In 1795 Byelorussia was, by force of arms, conquered and annexed to Russia. From that time on, the Byelorussian people have suffered a heavy yoke under the Russian colonial regime, while their religion and culture have been severely persecuted, and began to struggle for their freedom and for their independence. The Byelorussian people during this struggle have twice revolted (in 1831 and 1863–64) but each time were subdued by the Russians.

At the end of the First World War, in December, 1917, the First All-Byelorussian Congress convened in the capital of Byelorussia in Miensk, and elected democratic organs of Byelorussian National Council. But this national constituent was attacked and dispersed by the armed forces of Soviet Russia. However, later, on March 25, 1918 the Council of Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian state.

This reborn Byelorussian Republic lasted until August, 1920. It was recognized "de jure and de facto" by many governments of Europe and Asia, who exchanged with it diplomatic relations. But the young republic was not able in such a short time to gain sufficient strength to defend itself against Russian Communists, and not having any support from other sources, was occupied by the Communist forces in August 1920.

In series of armed revolts in 1920–29, in constant passive resistance, and in acts of sabotage, the awakened Byelorussian nation displayed its reaction to Moscow. The most important military movement against the Communists was the revolt in Slusk in November 1920.

In 1924 an official Communist source indicated the existence of 40 Byelorussian partisan units. In 1934 another revolt started in Velizh but it was quickly liquidated. On January 27, 1934, 316 partisans of the unit "Byelaya Svitka" (White Coat) were killed in this city by the Communists.

At the end of the Second World War the Second All-Byelorussain Congress convened in Miensk in 1944. This Congress annuled all treaties of the occupational governments concerning Byelorussia and approved proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. But again Byelorussia was conquered by the army of Soviet Russia.

The Government of Soviet Russia forcibly imposed on the Byelorussian nation a fictitious form of statehood, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which has no sovereign functions and exists on paper only for propaganda purposes. The Byelorussian people have no influence in their own affairs. The representative of the Byelorussian S.S.R. in the United Nations, really represents the Moscow government and not the people of Byelorussia.

The Byelorussian people in the homeland as well as the Byelorussian refugees, and Americans of Byelorussian descent want to see Byelorussia free and independent, liberated from the horrors enacted upon them by Communist Russia.

March 25, 1963, is being celebrated by the Byelorussians in all the free countries as the 45th anniversary of National Independence Day. This Independence Day of Byelorussia is a symbol of liberation from present slavery of Communist Russian. The Byelorussian people will never cease to fight for their freedom which was proclaimed by the act of March 25, 1918, and reaffirmed by the Second All-Byelorussian Congress in 1944.

In sending you this informative historical material on the coming 45th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of Byelorussia, we also ask you, Honorable Senator, to support the idea of the struggle of the Byelorussian people for independence. We shall be very grateful to you.

We remain,
Respectfully yours,
Capt. JOHN SHIMCHIK,
Chairman, Byelorussian Liberation Front.

The Tide of Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial column of my friend, John Lopp, which appeared in the March 21, 1963, edition of the Auburndale Star, Auburndale, Fla.

The column, entitled "The Tide of Tyranny," calls attention to the fact that each American must exercise the full privileges of his citizenship if we are to prevent the further loss of our freedoms as Americans. I hope all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will give thought to Mr. Lopp's reflections.

THE TIDE OF TYRANNY

(By John D. Lopp)

The right of the individual to shape the government under which he lives did not come into being by a stroke of a pen or the swish of an executioner's axe.

It was a slow won thing, a continuing process that began when serfs chafing under the bondage of the feudal system slowly claimed and gained tiny but ever-increasing rights and freedoms.

Freedom, as we in America know it, was attained only through determination, through sacrifice and through a willingness of brave men to die, if need be, in defense of a budding concept of the rights of the individual.

These freedoms—the greatest of which is the right of self-government, the privilege of speaking out and voting for those beliefs that one holds dear—must be guarded constantly if they are to endure.

Freedoms can, and have been, lost by lethargy of the people. They have been lost because of the counsel of sincere but incompetent leadership.

Freedoms have been lost due to usurpation by despots. They have been lost to ruthless conquerers and through the blandishments of demagogs.

But, mostly, they have disappeared because the people no longer were willing to defend them.

They did not vanish overnight, in most instances. They trickled away gradually as a babbling stream nibbles at the fertile farmland that confines it.

And then one day the erosion is complete—and liberty and freedom are no more.

The most powerful weapon against the erosion of the traditional freedoms is the right to vote—the right of each citizen to express his belief and his convictions on each and every issue, large or small.

Strip him of that privilege, delegate his right to the ballot to some centralized authority and the battle for freedom is half lost.

And therein lies the grim peril that menaces America today.

It is far more deadly, far more powerful, far more menacing than the threat of nuclear war.

It is far more threatening than the tramping of Soviet soldiers less than 100 miles off the U.S. mainland.

It is far more deadly than the might of the nuclear-armed submarines lurking in Cuban bases. It is more perilous than the Red bombers pinpointing our mighty warships in midmost ocean.

And that peril—the loss of the right of free expression—confronts America on every hand.

It is present in the actions of village, town, and city boards, that hold closed meetings, conceal their deliberations in a mask of secrecy and deny the people they represent the right of expression in referendums on issues of major importance.

It is present at the State level, when school administrations seek to shake off the control of politics by demanding the right of self-government without the consent, or, in many cases, even the knowledge of the people who pay the bills.

It exists at the national level, where an administration spoons out half-truths, or even less, on issues of paramount concern.

It is present in our judicial system, where appointed jurists, answerable only to their consciences and the Angel of Death, interpret the law in accordance with their own political, social, and economic concepts.

It is present in every crossroad hamlet, every small city, and every sprawling metropolis.

The keystone of freedom is loosened each time an individual citizen remains away from the polls on election day.

It is drained away every time a citizen, a community, a county, a State, or the Nation ignores an usurpation of power—bows to an abridgment of constitutionally guaranteed rights—or fails to raise a voice in protest to each new encroachment upon the sacred liberties that are his.

A liberty lost can never be regained. A sacred right abandoned or usurped can never be recovered.

A power delegated in face of a real or imagined emergency is never returned.

The declaration "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" was never more apt than it is today.

An action, by any board, commission, lawmaker, judge, or even the President himself, beyond the expressed will of the people, is a step toward tyranny.

Tribute to Educational Standards of University of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was recently announced that the University of Arkansas is the top-ranked public educational institution in the South and the fourth in the Nation in the number of National Merit Scholars enrolled.

This is a tribute to the educational standards at the university and the attractiveness of the university program and curriculum for talented young people. I ask unanimous consent that a news story from the Arkansas Gazette of March 10 pertaining to this matter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS FOURTH IN NATION IN NUMBER OF MERIT SCHOLARS ENROLLED

FAYETTEVILLE, March 9.—The University of Arkansas is the top-ranked public educational institution in the South and the fourth in the Nation in the number of national merit scholars enrolled.

The university's high standing was disclosed in the annual report of the National Merit scholarship program. There are 58 public universities and colleges that have the scholars on their campuses.

The university also ranks 20th among all higher educational institutions in the Nation, public and private. About 400 of the more than 2,000 universities and colleges in the country have enrolled merit scholars.

The University of Arkansas currently has 37 merit scholars enrolled on the Fayetteville campus.

Last year the university was one of the 40 higher educational institutions which had enrolled 60 percent of all the merit scholars.

Dr. David W. Mullins, university president, said the school's showing in the rankings was indicative not only of the caliber of students enrolled at the university, but also of the quality of instructional programs which draws such students to our campus.

Another contributing factor has been a widely recognized honors program at the university, he said. At the present time, 424 students are participating in the honors program.

The National Merit scholarship program was established in 1955 through grants from the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corp. Money for the scholarships comes from more than 120 business and industrial corporations, foundations, and professional associations.

News Register Becomes a Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I address the House of Representatives today on a most felicitous occasion. As you and many of my colleagues know, the most populous portion of the Ninth Congressional District is southerly Alameda County, an area of incomparable climate, rich farmlands, vineyards, and delightful cities and towns.

One of these cities is Fremont, northern California's largest city area. Formed in 1956 by incorporating the five rural communities of Centerville, Irvington, Niles, Mission San Jose, and a large amount of agricultural land, Fremont's population has risen since 1956 from 22,443 to nearly 60,000. The projected constant growth over the next 15 years is 8,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, such a rapid growth too many times means chaos for a community, but this is not the case in Fremont. The reason is that our city is a planned community in the most perfect sense, a city whose master plan has provided for a proper balance of industrial, commercial and residential development, of parks, recreation, and wildlife areas. As the American Institute of Planners stated in awarding Fremont the 1962 honor award for "outstanding achievement in comprehensive planning," Fremont is, of course, almost unique.

The fact that this explosive growth has been guided and controlled pursuant to sound and imaginative planning is a credit to the city government, its staff, its elected officials, and ultimately to the entire citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, this steady course that I have described has not been easy. After all, what has been accomplished here is the blending into one great city of five rural communities, each with its own leaders, its own points of view. It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to have done this continuing job without the existence of an enlightened newspaper, whose first loyalty was to the community and its people and not to any personal partianship of its publishers.

This newspaper is the News Register, Mr. Speaker, published by Mr. George P. Oakes and Mr. George H. Oakes, and serving, in addition to Fremont, the growing and vital cities of Newark, Union City and Milpitas.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in sending congratulations to the News Register on its joining of the great American family of daily newspapers. May it live long and prosper well, continuing to serve its community and its country in the fair and impartial dissemination of news, and in the honest and incisive criticism of its editorial page.

Record of the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a new concept in oversea Government service came into being just 2 years ago with the birth of the Peace Corps. Americans from all walks of life and from every age group have left cities, towns, villages, and farms all over the United States to serve not only their country, but their less fortunate fellow man in farflung countries throughout the world—not as soldiers—not as diplomats—not as bureaucrats—not as observes—not as advisers—yet they are all of these things—and more.

These volunteers are truly soldiers of peace—diplomats of good will—bureaucrats as representatives of a Federal agency conceived in helpfulness—observers of actual everyday life in these areas as they themselves live it day by day—advisers on self-help who demonstrate their know-how in shoulder-to-shoulder labors in the field, the classroom, and the factory, and not in the conference halls.

Moreover, the Peace Corpsman is the best possible example of the priceless value of freedom for the individual, for he is obviously motivated to his service by a desire to share with those less fortunate his talents, in the hope that this will help them maintain and preserve their hard-won liberty.

There are no material rewards for the Peace Corps man. But a world at peace will not be built with gold—human liberty cannot be fruitful in the sterility of totalitarianism—and the will to establish self-determination for the individual is not bred by fear. It is in his work and in its results that these selfless volunteers are rewarded for their sacrifices. For they are making the most priceless contribution possible—personal sacrifice—in building a world at peace, in which liberty thrives because of the healthy and unbreakable will of the individual.

The Kansas City Times recently gave its editorial congratulations and good wishes to the sparkling success of the Peace Corps. I believe it gives an excellent account of the record that makes the congratulations so very well deserved. Because the subject will be of

such general interest to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONG EARLY RECORD BY THE PEACE CORPS

The Peace Corps, at age 2, is a sparkling success. It has made some mistakes. There has been at least one known misadventure. But the record of setbacks is minor compared to the lengthening list of early achievements. Even the most partisan critics of 2 years ago have stopped ruing the still fledgling organization.

Figures tell only part of the story. Still, it is significant that on the second anniversary of the Corps last week, 3,965 volunteers were working in 41 countries. In addition, 630 trainees are preparing for assignments in 10 of these countries plus 3 new ones: Guatemala, Gabon, and Panama. The present total of 44 nations will increase to 45 when a unit destined for Indonesia completes its training this spring. The plan calls for 9,000 Peace Corps workers by the end of 1963 with the largest concentration of 4,000 in Latin America.

Ages of the volunteers range from 18 to 76, although the average age is 24 for men and 26 for women. Most work in education at various levels. Community action, both rural and urban, is the second largest field. Other projects are devoted to agriculture, health, and public works. Hundreds of special skills are enlisted. The Peace Corps—and the United States—is represented abroad by qualified geologists, surveyors, nurses' aids, nutritionists, carpenters, plumbers, veterinarians, and even professional fishermen.

Considering the amount of good being done for people who need help, the total cost is not great. Congress voted $30 million for the first fiscal year and $59 million for the second year. Volunteers draw no pay but receive allowances scaled to maintain them at the living level of the host nation. Only 3.2 percent of the volunteers sent abroad have been returned. None was asked to leave by a host government.

Of course, there was the celebrated case of the young girl in Nigeria whose indiscreet post card fell into unfriendly hands and was turned into anti-American propaganda. It was the only known instance of its kind. It is remarkable that more slip-ups have not occurred. The pitfalls were many in view of the general inexperience of the legion of young Americans who were scattered over the world in unfamiliar environments.

The last 2 years have made clear that the American spirit of humanitarianism flowers in the jungles and impoverished villages of foreign lands. Already there is a strong indication that the Peace Corps may turn out to be one of the Nation's most valuable efforts in the whole vast field of foreign aid.

American Legion Rehabilitation Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, I had the personal pleasure of presenting to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs a distinguished American, James E. Powers, national commander of the American Legion. Commander Powers presented to the committee the 1963 American Legion rehabilitation legislation program. Due to the importance of this subject, I feel it most important that Commander Powers' views in behalf of the American Legion receive the public attention which they are due.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Commander Powers to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on that occasion:

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. POWERS, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 12, 1963

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, may I begin by saying that I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee for the purpose of presenting the 1963 American Legion rehabilitation legislative program. To present the proposals of the largest veterans organization, on matters affecting the welfare of so many millions of beneficiaries, is a grave and important assignment.

I am grateful, too, for the special arrangements that have been made to accommodate this large group of legionnaires and ladies of the auxiliary. As you know, they, and others, are here to attend our annual Washington conference. The meeting that most relates to the activities of the Veterans' Affairs Committee is the one which begins this afternoon at 2 o'clock. It is the National Rehabilitation Conference, and it brings together, from every State, persons who have made service to veterans, either on a volunteer or professional basis, their life's interest. These persons represent communities in every State in the Nation. Together with the responsible Government officials, they will discuss veterans' problems and seek acceptable solutions. They represent 17,000 posts, where every one of the proposals I will present to you today originated.

Our meetings began Sunday and will last until Thursday. We consider this appearance before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee the most important part of our business sessions. Another highlight will be our annual banquet, Wednesday evening, at which we honor the Members of Congress. Present at that time will be constituents of every Congressman, anxious to meet and pay their respects to their elected representatives.

This tremendous turnout for our banquet, the largest ever, is typical of the spirit, interest, and activity that I have sensed and seen in my travels throughout the country. It gives me great pleasure to report to you that, everywhere, the American Legion is flourishing. Since my election, I have visited 43 States, and met with Legionnaires from all 50. I have witnessed an enthusiasm that was truly inspiring. Legionnaires are renewing their dedication to serve their comrades and their country. Legionnaires are reviving their interest in the affairs of their organization. Legionnaires are repledging their determination that this organization will continue to be the strong and effective force for good that it is and always has been.

This revitalization is manifested not only in enthusiastic meetings but also in an upsurge in membership. After concluding 1962 with a substantial increase over the previous year, we are, as of today, 65,000 ahead of 1962's figure for the same date.

And now to the main business of the hearings. Our current rehabilitation legislative program consists of resolutions approved by the 1962 national convention after the most exhaustive and comprehensive study and debate that I have ever witnessed. These are supplemented by resolutions approved by the fall 1962 meeting of our national executive committee. To discuss each proposal would consume more time than is available and would not be appropriate to this hearing. Therefore, I will select for a brief discussion those measures which affect the greatest number of people, or have the greatest impact, or require the most attention. Nothing in the order of presentation should be construed as indicating any priority. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will submit at this time an additional statement outlining in detail all of our current legislative proposals. I respectfully request that it be made a part of the record. We look forward, of course, to presenting complete discussions of each of our legislative aims as the committee conducts hearings throughout the session.

INCREASE DEATH COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

1. National convention Resolution 285 of 1962

Several years ago, the basic law governing death compensation was changed so that, for deaths occurring after January 1, 1957, the amount payable to the survivor was based, in part, upon the base pay the serviceman had received. Where the death had occurred prior to that date, the survivor could elect either to remain under the old death compensation law or to accept payment under the new law, dependency and indemnity compensation. DIC offered a greater benefit for many, especially where the serviceman had held a high rank while on active duty. However, for many others (especially widows with several children) the old death compensation law provided the greater benefit.

The old death compensation law rates have not been increased since 1954; actually, a great many survivors (widows with children) receiving under this law have not received an increase since 1952. The Legion strongly feels that these beneficiaries, whose husbands, fathers, and sons gave their lives for their country, should receive an adjustment in their death compensation payments to reflect the rise in the cost of living over the last decade.

House bill 4405, introduced by Mr. SECREST of Ohio, would accomplish the objective of our Resolution 285.

2. Fall national executive committee Resolution 14

In our view, the dependency and indemnity compensation law contains a fundamental deficiency. Under the old death compensation law, a widow was awarded extra money for each child of the deceased veteran. The new law does not generally authorize such payments. Congress recognized this inequity last year by making it possible for certain widows (with five or more children) to receive an amount equal to death pension. This means, however, that the widow has to meet the restrictive requirements that control nonservice-connected death benefits. We feel that there is a better approach to the solution of the problem. It is fundamentally wrong for a widow whose husband's death was the result of service to have to meet the conditions controlling nonservice-connected death benefits. We seek a return to the traditional and just concept of providing extra amounts for each child.

House Resolution 3502, introduced by Mr. DULSKI of New York, would accomplish the objective of our Resolution 14.

ELIMINATE INEQUITIES IN DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

National convention Resolution 157 of 1962

This resolution seeks a restoration of balance to the compensation structure; it seeks, also, alowances for dependents of those

service-connected veterans rated below 50 percent disabled, on the same basis controlling those rated 50 percent and above.

The entire rating schedule is based upon the premise that when a man is rated 90 percent disabled he should receive 90 percent of the amount payable for total disability. Strangely, he receives only 76.4 percent. The veteran who is rated 80 percent get only 68 percent. And so on. The compensation structure used to be in balance. Beginning in 1952, however, greater increases were granted to the higher ratings. The present system is inequitable to all those service disabled who are rated 10 through 90 percent. When you consider that the vast majority of all service-disabled veterans are rated below 100 percent, it becomes immediately clear how many veterans are being undercompensated.

The other point in our compensation program concerns veterans who have dependents. At present, veterans rated 50 percent disabled or above receive extra allowances for dependents. Those rated below 50 percent do not. We are unable to see the logic in this arrangement. The inequity is most clearly seen and felt by the service-disabled veteran, for example, with a wife and three children, who is reduced from 50 percent to 40 percent. Instead of losing $30 (the difference between 50 percent and 40 percent compensation rates) he loses $61 a month because he no longer receives any allowances for his dependents. The service-disabled veteran does not understand such an arrangement, and does not believe that Congress would permit a law so manifestly unjust and unfair to continue.

We frequently hear, in criticisms of certain other veterans programs, that nothing is too good for the service disabled. When one considers that more than 80 percent of the service disabled are rated below 50 percent (and, therefore, not receiving dependency allowances) you realize that here is a golden opportunity to extend a great and just benefit to a very large and deserving group.

House bill 2582, introduced by Mr. FINO of New York, would accomplish both objectives of our resolution No. 157, and remove these inequities in controlling disability compensation laws.

IMPROVE PENSION PROGRAM FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

National convention Resolution 317 of 1962

We in the American Legion view pension as the Nation's historical method of assuring its wartime defenders an honorable form of adequate assistance when they are unable to provide for themselves or their families and when they do not have sufficient resources to care for their reasonable needs. We believe that the current law, Public Law 86-211, falls below those standards, standards which were established early in the annals of our country.

For some time now, I have observed Public Law 86-211 in its application to veterans and their dependents. My experience in service work in Georgia has lately been supplemented by conversations with persons throughout this land. I want to convey to the committee, with all the emphasis at my command, the reaction that I have witnessed. There is widespread dissatisfaction with the law. Many feel that the rates of pension are meager. Many feel that the tests of need have fallen far below the standards previously set for veterans pensions. Many feel that some of the provisions are unduly restrictive. Many of those who have the alternative of remaining under the old law feel that the fact that their election would be irrevocable makes changing unwise.

We ask Congress to liberalize the tables of disability and death pension rates and the corresponding annual income limitations, to repeal the requirement that certain veterans must count a portion of their spouse's income as their own, to permit the exclusion from income of expenses incurred in connection with the last illness and burial of their spouse or child, to repeal the $30 limitation on payments to certain hospitalized veterans, and to give special consideration to those aged 65 or hospitalized for tuberculosis.

House bill 1927, introduced by Mr. LIBONATI of Illinois, would accomplish the objectives of our Resolution 317.

REOPEN NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

National convention Resolution 286 of 1962

Much has been said and written about this subject. In my view, there is one essential issue: did not the Government do an unfair thing when, in April 1951, it abruptly terminated the insurance program? The original program, begun during World War I, was continued in force without interruption or termination all through the years. When the Government decides to alter a policy so well established in history, tradition, and precedent, should it not serve adequate notice upon the interested parties?

The lack of notice of termination deprived many veterans of the opportunity to make adequate provision for the future needs of their families. As the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, John S. Gleason, Jr., wrote in a letter to the chairman of this committee, the withdrawal of the privilege came at a time when many veterans had not yet determined their insurance needs and "may well have caused hardship or unwise decisions in many cases."

Under our proposal, the program would be reopened for 1 year to afford a last chance to those veterans who for one reason or another—often because of factors beyond their control—did not retain their national service life insurance. Under our proposal, there would be no cost to the taxpayers. We urge favorable action on this long-standing important Legion request.

H.R. 2124, introduced by Mr. CLEVELAND of New Hampshire; H.R. 2136, introduced by Mr. HALPERN, of New York, and H.R. 3503, introduced by Mr. DULSKI, of New York, would accomplish the objectives of our Resolution 286.

EXPAND MEDICAL CARE OF AGED AND CHRONICALLY ILL

National convention Resolution 287 of 1962

The American Legion has long advocated that Congress authorize an expansion of the VA medical program for the treatment of aging and chronically ill veterans. The problem of the aging and chronically ill veteran is one of the most serious facing us today. Clearly, we must act now or the increase in the number of such persons will make a satisfactory solution difficult, if not impossible.

The plight of the aged veteran is obvious. He becomes ill more frequently and for more prolonged periods than his younger comrades. The diseases with which he is afflicted are more likely to be chronic and debilitating. He is less able financially to bear the cost of medical care. And, the facilities available to him are frequently below any acceptable minimum standards.

We are sure that Congress will accept a responsibility for these most deserving veterans. We ask the Veterans' Administration to extend all of its resources in their behalf. We ask that VA facilities be used, modified, or established to meet immediately this pressing problem. We are at present developing a substantive legislative proposal which will be subsequently presented to you.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, these are a few of the unresolved problems in the field of veterans affairs. Even this somewhat general discussion of them points up their importance. I am convinced that, although their resolution may not be easy, it is surely possible. In this connection, the American Legion will continue, as it has in the past, to work in partnership with the Veterans Affairs Committee. Together we can shape a program befitting this great Nation and its wartime defenders.

I believe that our organization has both rights and responsibilities. We approach the subject of veterans affairs with confidence born of a life of dedication and experience, and in the exercise of certain prerogatives that accrue to us as the largest veterans organization. Thus, satisfactory solutions to difficult problems will best be found with our assistance. At the same time, we acknowledge and accept the proportionately heavy responsibility to do everything within our power to insure that the program remains sound and unassailable and that our requests take cognizance not only of the welfare of veterans but also the common good. Our actions will be guided by those precepts in the future as they have in the past.

The important issues in the field of veterans affairs must be considered on a humanitarian basis, for we are dealing with human needs, and human problems, and, in fact, human beings. If any other approach is taken, justice will not be done even though the most expedient agreement is reached.

At the same time, due consideration must be given to economic factors such as the costs of the proposals weighed. Thus it is that we have in our deliberations related the cost of the veterans program to standards such as the income of the Nation, the number of those who served, the cost of living, the value of the dollar, and the gross national product. It is our conviction that the veterans program is neither excessive nor extravagant.

I wish to assure you that the American Legion will continue to conduct its affairs in a most responsible manner, faithful to its pledge to serve both country and comrade.

Thank you.

Hospital Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the National Observer today has published an interview in which reporter Robert Hermann interviews Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball on the administration's proposal for hospital insurance for the aged. Thirty-five Senators joined me in introducing the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, and I believe they will find Commissioner Ball's answers to basic questions about the bill extremely valuable. It will also be of interest to others who want to know the basis for the administration's proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE ON MEDICAL HELP FOR THE AGED

Question. Are most old people really so bad-off financially that they can't cope with medical expenses without Government help? A survey made at the University of Michigan shows that perhaps older people do not really need added medical protection.

Answer. According to the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan and all other reputable surveys, the aged are generally quite badly off financially, and once the aged fall to low-income status they seldom recover.

The aged have somewhat more assets than younger people, but it's necessary to distinguish between two kinds of assets: Those that you'd expect the aged to use up when they get sick and those you'd expect them to keep. The assets that older people have consist largely of their homes, and I do not think anyone would argue the home should be sold to pay for medical care. If you leave out the value of older people's homes—and the average value of their homes is not very large—older people generally have very small reserves; almost 50 percent have under $1,000 and one-third have practically nothing.

Question. Some critics believe that a Government health insurance plan for the aged would eventually be expanded to other age groups. What do you think?

Answer. I would say that the problem of the aged is a unique problem and that I can think of no other practical way to meet this problem than through the social security approach. The younger members of the population do not have the same problem.

The aged have a much higher incidence of illness than do others. They use three times as much in the way of hospital services. This means higher costs for hospital insurance for the aged, if they pay their way in old age. Some Blue Cross plans do not have a higher rate for the aged because these plans have shifted the extra cost for the aged to their younger members. But in the commercial plans, and increasingly I might say in Blue Cross plans, the aged are charged their full cost and this is relatively high, as much as $300 a year for an aged couple in Blue Cross. Higher costs of health insurance for the aged grow out of higher incidence of illness, so high insurance cost for the aged isn't anybody's fault. This is the way insurance has to work.

In the case of the aged, the increased cost of health insurance comes at the time when incomes are generally greatly reduced. These two factors work against each other. The income of the average aged couple is about $2,500 a year; that for the average single person living alone is just a little over $1,000. Now the social security solution to this problem of high cost and low income in old age is the same for hospital insurance as it is for cash benefits under social security. Pay small deductions from your wages during your working years and then in retirement you have the protection without further payment.

This arrangement avoids the difficulty of placing a high health insurance cost burden upon the individual when he can least afford it. No one has devised any other practical plan of general application that can meet this special difficulty of the aged, a difficulty which is not shared by the younger age group. The young can pay for current health insurance protection out of current income. The young can also afford the modest increase in contributions proposed to finance their protection in old age.

INCREASED CASH BENEFITS

Under the President's proposal for hospital insurance for the aged the contribution rate would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent of covered wages for employees and employers, and the wages covered would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200, thereby increasing contributions but also increasing future cash benefits for persons earning over $4,800 per year, a group whose benefits are becoming badly out-of-step with increased wages. The maximum increase in contributions for a wage earner would be $27.50 per year, with $17.68 going for hospital insurance and the remainder for the increase in cash benefits.

Question. Wouldn't it be possible to just expand the Kerr-Mills program, which we already have, and make the social security-financed health plan unnecessary?

Answer. I don't think so. There are several defects in the Kerr-Mills approach that no amount of improvement will get away from. One of them is that in many States and localities it is very difficult to raise from general revenues the funds that are necessary to support a comprehensive program. As a result, of the States that have programs (about half the States), most use very strict means tests and most have minimal medical benefits. Oklahoma provides hospital care only for life-endangering or sight-endangering conditions and then limits coverage to 21 days. Kentucky, with an income test of $1,800 per couple, covers only 6 days of hospital care.

New York has a means test limit of $500 on life insurance, has a requirement that relatives with modest assets pay the medical costs of the aged, and seizes the estate on death of the assistance recipient. There are just so many demands in other areas, education, etc., that having a comprehensive medical care program out of general taxation is too great a burden for many States.

Much more fundamentally, the major problem of health protection in old age is not the protection of the very poor. It's the protection of people who are neither very poor nor very wealthy—the 80 percent or 85 percent of the aged who have always paid their own way, who have perhaps an investment in a home, and who go into retirement with small assets and an income that's just about enough to cover their daily needs. Most don't have sufficient income to pay income tax, so they get no help from increased tax deductions. If they are faced with costly illness, it can force them to use up their assets, cash in their life insurance, or sell their home. Or it may force dependence on children, who may themselves have only modest resources and have other family responsibilities. True, if they use up the bulk of their assets and there is a good assistance program, they can get care paid for through assistance. But I believe it is preferable to have a plan that protects their assets, protects their self-respect, and makes it possible for them to continue to be self-supporting—on the basis that they have made social security contributions during their working years.

AN UNSATISFACTORY SOLUTION

I just don't think that making it necessary for this large group of people who have supported themselves throughout their lives to rely on a means test if serious illness occurs is a satisfactory solution. I think that letting them become poor and then coming to their aid is inferior to a method which prevents them from becoming poor.

Question. Many expenses would not be covered by social security health insurance, physicians' and surgeons' fees, for example?

Answer. That is true. I'd liken the hospital insurance proposal to the approach in social security generally, where for 25 years we have had a partnership of three methods to meet the retirement needs of the people for cash income.

We have a basic social security program, covering just about everybody. And it doesn't cover all needs. It's a base to which workers are encouraged to add protection through private pension plans, through savings on their own, and in other ways to build on top of social security. There are today over 30,000 private pension plans which are in a kind of partnership with social security. The third part of the approach is a sort of backstop, backing up everything that people do for themselves through social security, through their own savings, and private pension plans. This is Federal-State old-age assistance, which on a means-test basis makes provision for people whose needs are not met through the other methods. This same three-way approach is envisaged in the hospital insurance proposal. The President's insurance proposal was never intended to be a program which would meet all health needs of the aged.

Question. Would you say then that what is proposed is a rather limited program?

Answer. I would agree, of course, that the program covers far from the total medical bill, but it is aimed at the part of the medical bill that almost always accompanies really expensive illness. When people have a really expensive illness this almost always involves a spell of hospitalization. If you look at all health costs, doctor bills are a very significant part of the total. However, they are a smaller part of the very big bills associated with the most serious illnesses. In covering hospitalization costs, we're striking at a major part of the cost of expensive illness.

Question. This is called an insurance plan, but is it really? I mean, the social security taxes I pay now aren't put aside for my benefit when I reach 65. What I would get at 65, presumably, is what the younger people would be contributing to the fund at that time. Right?

Answer. There are significant differences without doubt between a social insurance program, which this proposal is, and a private insurance program. It is true that in social insurance your contributions are not set aside for you in your own account, but they aren't in private insurance either. Unlike savings accounts, insurance pools the funds of the insured so that if you die after making only one premium payment for life insurance your beneficiary is paid the face amount from the pool, not just an accumulation of your own contributions. One difference between the two forms of insurance is that in private insurance there is a legal contract, with permanently fixed premiums and benefits. You pay in a certain amount of money and, except in a few special types of insurance, an annuity of a certain exact amount of money is payable in return for that. In social insurance the benefits and contributions are statutory and may be modified as is appropriate to the times. Changes which have been made over the years in social security have proved to be a considerable advantage to those protected.

There are also differences in the requirements for reserves for the two kinds of insurance. In private insurance, you have to protect the beneficiary against the possibility that his company might go out of business. It's important to have enough money in reserve so that if a company were to go out of business, it would have reserves sufficient to cover its liabilities. This test of actuarial soundness has not been considered necessary in the case of governmentally backed social insurance programs. The test applied to social insurance is: Will enough money be collected at every point in the future so that all the obligations can be met as they fall due? There's an assumption of the continuance of the governmental social security plan; continuance of income in the future is assured in a social security program.

The advisory councils that the Congress has set up on the financing of social security have always come out with the conclusion that this is a proper method of financing social security and that the contribution

rates are sufficient, according to the best estimate available, to meet all benefit costs as they fall due and that no one need have any concern on that score at all.

Question. Does it concern you that people who might be getting medical benefits next year or the year after will not have contributed to the cost of the program?

Answer. The social security program has had its benefit structure liberalized several times since it began, and each time the individuals who were already receiving benefits received the increase. Under social insurance if you are a participating member of the program and improvements are made in it, you receive the benefit of those improvements. One of the reasons benefits in the system have been modified is to bring them more in line with increased prices and earnings. If benefits were paid strictly according to the dollar value of past contributions, benefits would get way out of date over the years. The addition of hospital insurance to social security is just like adding $7.50 to the monthly cash benefits, but it is in the form of a protection against hospital costs. All the precedents are for giving this increased protection to those who have already retired as well as to those who contribute in the future.

SIMILAR TO BLUE CROSS

Question. How would the Government plan compare, say, with the way Blue Cross or private plans work?

Answer. It would be more similar to Blue Cross than to commercial insurance in the benefits provided, in the way hospitals would be paid, and in most other ways.

One of the major differences between Blue Cross (and the administration proposal), on the one hand, and much of commercial health insurance, on the other, is that Blue Cross pays the cost of the services it covers without regard to the price of the service, which may vary from place to place and generally increases with time. Indemnity coverage of commercial insurance, on the other hand, pays fixed dollar amounts per day of hospitalization, for example, or up to fixed dollar totals on only 75 or 80 percent of charges. When the individual is responsible for say 25 percent of his hospital bill, a long stay may require a very large out-of-pocket payment.

Question. Another objection to this plan is that it gives health coverage to people who don't need it, who will be able to pay their own medical bills.

Answer. This is really the most amazing of all criticisms. It's an atack not on the hospital insurance plan but an attack on the whole idea of social security. There is no more reason to object to this hospital insurance approach because it is not limited to poor people than there would be reason to say that you ought to introduce an income test in the regular social security program and not pay the cash benefits after 65 to those who have contributed unless they are poor people. The whole approach of social security is to get rid of the test of income and to get rid of the idea that people are entitled to these benefits only if they meet a test of means—only if they demonstate that they are economic failures. On the contrary, we should make our provision of security as much as possible the result of contributions and work that the individual does.

If we had a means test in social security, it would mean that if additional private pension plans were provided or existing plans improved, individuals would lose their social security protection because their income wouldn't pass the means test. Social security would become a disincentive to providing good pension plans. Anyway, the income tax provisions already take care of the health costs of the very wealthy aged by returning through tax deductions as much as nine-tenths of their medical expenses. They'd get little from this proposal. Actually only 3 percent of the aged have income over $10,000, and even these people can have their assets wiped out by long-term illness.

Question. You mentioned that bills such as the King-Anderson would form part of a three-part health plan. Does this mean that you view the Kerr-Mills plan as a permanent part of our national health benefits in the future?

Answer. Yes, indeed; I think that the Kerr-Mills provisions are a very important part of our total security protection just as I believe old-age assistance is an important part of the protection of older people today. There are always going to be some unusual situations in which people will not have their needs met by the combination of social security and private protection, and it's as a secondary program that Kerr-Mills has a very important job to do. I hope every State adopts such a program, and actually once the King-Anderson bill is passed, relieving the States of some of their present assistance burdens, it will be more possible for the lower-income States to do so.

Question. One of the things that's hard to pin down, Mr. Ball, is the cost of a health insurance plan for the aged under social security. Some private actuaries estimate the cost would be much higher than Government estimates.

Answer. The largest part of the cost of the proposal is for in-patient hospital care. Experience with such costs is available to all of us, and both Government and private actuaries have drawn on experience to establish the utilization rates that were used to estimate costs of the proposal for hospital insurance for the aged.

The basic rates used by the private companies and those used by the Government are not far apart. I might mention that the insurance companies added a loading to their table solely on the ground that they assumed that under a Government program, people would be more apt to apply for insurance benefits than they would under private insurance. We don't see any validity to that.

OUR BEST ESTIMATE

Furthermore, the companies estimated an administrative cost of about 10 percent for the Government program. Our actuary used a generous estimate of administrative cost of 5 percent, which is the cost of the larger Blue Cross plans, including advertising and selling cost and the costs of collecting premiums from employers and other groups. Our best estimate on what additional administrative costs would be is closer to 3 percent of benefits. The collection costs of social security contributions would be the same if another quarter percent on employers and employees is added for hospital insurance. A very large part of the recordkeeping for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance would also serve hospital insurance. Certainly, administrative costs would not exceed the 5 percent that our actuary has used. There are several other reasons for differences in estimates, like the fact that insurance company estimates for both social security and railroad retirement beneficiaries have been compared with our estimate just for social security.

Question. There's also quite a difference in estimates on the impact of a Government program on hospital utilization, isn't there?

Answer: I'd say the two estimates are within 15 percent of each other on hospital utilization. There is a bigger difference in estimates of average daily hospital costs in relation to wages, but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with its Public Health Service, including the Division of Hospitals, is probably as capable of estimating this relationship now and into the long run as are insurance companies.

Question. Doctors perhaps have a somewhat different view of human nature than yours. They feel it may be a little hard to get a person out of the hospital when it's not costing him anything.

Answer. This is true in some cases and a real problem, but it's a problem that is common to Blue Cross and private insurance as well as to coverage under this proposed plan. It is true that you do increase the usage of hospitals when you insure people against the cost. This is a demonstrated fact and it was on this basis that allowances for increased usage were made by our actuaries. How much of this may be current need and how much unnecessary is a more difficult question, but most of the increase is certainly due to unmet need when the cost is not insured.

The point I'm making is that an increase in utilization of say, 20 percent, which we allowed for, in terms of the need for hospitalization not now being met for those not now insured or inadequately protected is reasonable, but increases far beyond that seem unreasonable for a program which should tend to reduce hospital usage (relative to usage under Blue Cross and commercial insurance) because it covers care in nursing homes and visiting nurse care at home and outpatient diagnostic services—a range of coverage many private plans do not have.

Question. Many doctors fear increasing Government encroachment in the medical field and that a program such as this will lead to Government control of medicine. Do you believe it will?

Answer. Emphatically no. In writing the bill great care was taken to avoid giving the Government authority over the practice of medicine or the operation of hospitals. The objective of hospital insurance through social security is to set up an arrangement whereby people can have the costs of their care met. Under the proposal, the doctors' decisions about what care patients should receive and under what circumstances and by whom the care should be given are what settle the matter.

Question. Do you foresee a fairly good chance of passage this year for President Kennedy's health-insurance plan?

Answer. One of the major problems in the way of passage this year is the time schedule in the Ways and Means Committee, which of course will be tied up for several months with the tax bill and presumably would not be able to get to hospital insurance until early summer. Then it's speculation whether there's time enough to go all the way through both Houses in the time the Congress would remain in session. In this area of speculation I am in no better position to predict than you.

Question. Is this Congress any more likely to pass on this bill than the last Congress?

Answer. I think that taken as a whole, the composition of the House and the Senate is slightly more inclined toward the proposal. I would think that the Senate has changed sufficiently to be quite clearly pro-health insurance.

Road to Prosperity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News:

ROAD TO PROSPERITY?

We have seen no more fitting comment on the administration's attitude toward national fiscal matters than that made recently during the course of a Manion Forum talk by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat and Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

In his discussion of expenditures and taxes, Senator BYRD said he didn't know of a better place to start than with the attitude of the new Federal Budget Director, Kermit Gordon, who had been testifying before members of a congressional committee.

"In effect," said Senator BYRD, "Mr. Gordon told a Congress committee that a balanced budget would lead to more unemployment and general economic decline. He said this would happen whether we reduce Federal expenditures to meet tax collections or increase taxes to meet expenditures.

"I submit," Senator BYRD went on, "that a man who thinks a balanced budget would be a catastrophe does not have the frame of mind to direct the budget of the United States. He should be removed from his office.

"A Budget Director's function is to balance our fiscal affairs in the Federal budget—and defend it—not destroy it. It seems that Mr. Gordon has fallen for the fallacies of too many of the so-called economists who are counseling Government officials. They say balancing the budget is still a goal, but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And, to make us richer faster, they think the Government should create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

"Such ideas as these, which are being expressed by Mr. Gordon and other Government economists, sound like John Maynard Keynes and Gunnar Myrdal rolled into one. They don't sound like men looking for New Frontiers—they sound like Rip Van Winkle. They must have been taking a long nap.

"We all know the Federal Government has run a deficit in 26 of the last 32 years. If Federal deficits would make work and make us rich, everyone should have been employed and rich before now. Instead, we still have unemployed and we have a $305 billion debt—and the administration says it must go higher. If we don't get crackpot economists out of Federal fiscal positions and get sound men in them, the American system will be lost."

The Public Defender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, last week the Supreme Court reminded us that our Nation's first citizens recognized the right to counsel in a criminal proceeding to be indispensable to liberty. In the Bill of Rights, they provided that in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to have the assistance of counsel for his defense. However, in the ensuing years, the Congress has failed to take the necessary action to fully implement this right.

Last year, 34,000 defendants were charged with crime in the Federal courts. Of this number, 30 percent could not afford to hire counsel. Therefore, it was necessary for them to rely on court-appointed counsel who received no fee. As a result, many of these defendants realistically had at best only superficial assistance of counsel. There can be no doubt but that some of those charged with crimes were innocent and possibly some of those who were innocent were convicted. Also, it must be remembered that in the eyes of the law all 34,000 were innocent when charged.

The Senate approved public defender bills in the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. Proposals have been introduced again in the 88th Congress to establish a public defender system. It is my hope that action can be completed on such legislation in the near future so the guarantee of the sixth amendment will become completely effective.

Mr. President, the Southeast Missourian recently printed an editorial urging the passage of a public defender bill. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which appeared on March 11, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southeast Missourian, Mar. 11, 1963]

THE PUBLIC DEFENDER

Americans should applaud, and Congress should pass, a bill submitted by President Kennedy last week providing for a system of public defenders to afford legal service in Federal criminal cases for defendants who cannot pay an attorney.

The Government, through its system of U.S. attorneys in each Federal district court territory, provides the prosecution of these criminals.

It also gives Federal judges the authority to appoint an attorney to serve without fee to defend the accused.

Frequently this defense consists of the lawyer, who generally accepts the role as a necessary evil and with complete lack of enthusiasm, taking the defendant to an anteroom and discussing the case with him.

A few minutes or a few hours later they come before the court once more and the Government attorney briefly states the facts and argues the case. Then the defense attorney, having obtained permission to enter a guilty plea from his client, states the facts and any mitigating circumstances, in effect throwing the defendant at the mercy of the court.

Rarely does the accused enter a plea of innocence, or does the case go into arguments which require a full jury trial. If there is some factor requiring more time, there usually is a continuance until the next term of court.

As a general rule in these cases, the attorney has his own clients and legal practice to handle and he is going to give it more attention, obviously, than he would preparing a case for a person he does not know and is serving by court appointment without pay.

Under our system of justice, every accused, regardless of how black his record might appear, has the right to a fair trial and should be represented by counsel as interested in defending him as the Government attorney is eager to convict him.

This is where the public defender comes in. These would be competent attorneys who would be paid proper fees and would engage in a last ditch battle on behalf of their federally accused clients. They would assure the accused he is being given every protection afforded by our system of justice.

The bill urged by the President also provides that trained investigators and technical experts would be at the disposal of the public defender and those he represents.

The American Bar Association, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Government, and many others who have business or association with the Federal courts, long have been concerned with the existing system of defending the destitute criminal.

President Kennedy's bill provides a means to end a practice that is not befitting our system of justice. Congress should look on it with favor.

Legislative History of Public Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the responsibility of preparing the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code, I am constantly concerned with methods of making the publications of the laws more understandable and useful.

I want to call to the attention of the House a most significant and valuable improvement in the publication of the laws by the General Services Administration; and I want to extend to the Administrator and to his staff in the Office of Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, responsible for this improvement, my warmest congratulations.

In my hand is a copy of Public Law 88-1, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. This print, which is popularly called a "slip law," is the initial publication of a Federal law upon enactment, and may be obtained at the National Archives. At the bottom of the page of this law is a legislative history, showing that this legislation was reported from the House Appropriations Committee, House Report No. 35, from the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Report No. 9, and that it was considered and passed by the House on February 27, 1963, and by the Senate on March 4, 1963—with a reference to volume 109 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This information, available for the first time as an addendum to the slip law itself, gives the essential information needed for research regarding the law. It will save untold hours of research. Without the information in this form it has, until now, been necessary for interested persons to have recourse either to the House Calendar or to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—which are not always readily available even here in Washington—presupposing that they have the necessary familiarity with those

publications to enable them to know what to look for. From now on, with the guide published in the legislative history, that part of the research is already done and all that is necessary is to obtain the reports from the Superintendent of Documents and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for the days indicated.

I understand that the legislative history printed on the slip laws may be expanded in the future to give a reference to printed committee hearings on the legislation. In this connection, I hope that it will be possible for all committees to adopt a uniform simple method of identifying hearings—such as by serial numbers—so that only a brief reference to a serial number in the legislative history will be adequate. This would avoid lengthy descriptions of the subject matter of the hearings now frequently necessary to identify them.

I also understand that it may be planned to present the legislative histories in tabular form in the volumes of the statutes at large in the future. These volumes are, of course, the cumulation of the slip laws for each session. Incidentally, one of the recent improvements in the printing of the slip laws is the marginal reference to the volume and page of the statutes at large in which the particular law will ultimately be printed. Another recent improvement was in the numbering of the laws by incorporating a prefix indicating the number of the Congress. For example, this law is Public Law 88-1 and the next one will be Public Law 88-2. This system precludes the uncertainty that used to prevail when reference was made to, let us say, Public Law 601, without identifying the Congress.

I know that the Members and all other persons who must have recourse to legislative history join me in expressing this commendation to those responsible for these notable improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, a copy of Public Law 88-1—called a slip law—to illustrate these improvements.

PUBLIC LAW 88-1, 88TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 284, MARCH 6, 1963

Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign assistance programs

Public Law 480

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480," to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation due to expenses and costs of sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), $508,172,000, to remain available until expended.

Approved March 6, 1963.

Address by Paul H. Nitze at Christening of Polaris Submarine U.S.S. "Madison"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the strength of the free world will soon have added to it the 19th Polaris submarine of the U.S. Navy, the U.S.S. *Madison.* Christening ceremonies for this new vessel were held on Friday, March 15, at Newport News, Va.; and it was the privelege of Mrs. Monroney to take part in the ceremonies giving this ship the name of the great fourth President of the United States.

The principal speaker upon that occasion was Mr. Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. His remarks summarize with great precision and clarity our present defense posture. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS) PAUL H. NITZE AT THE CHRISTENING CEREMONIES OF THE U.S.S. "JAMES MADISON," NEWPORT NEWS, VA., FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 1963

We are all honored to participate in the ceremony leading to the christening by Mrs. Monroney of this submarine as the U.S.S. *Madison.* It will be the 19th Polaris submarine to join the fleet of the U.S. Navy. We expect this ship to carry the name of the fourth President of the United States proudly and well. It is a fitting name for a ship destined to play an important and honorable role in today's turbulent world, where military strength is essential to the continued survival and independence of our form of constitutional government.

Three things come to mind when one thinks about President Madison. First, through his great influence in the deliberations at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, he earned a reputation as the master builder of the Constitution. Second, he shared, with Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, the authorship of "The Federalist," the extraordinary set of brilliant essays supporting ratification of the Constitution. Third, he was President at the time of the War of 1812.

The Constitution, to which James Madison made such a great contribution, established the system of government which the U.S.S. *James Madison* will shortly be defending as she slides down the ways and sets out to patrol the oceans on her military mission. These Polaris submarine patrols are part of a new chapter in the continuing history of the U.S. Navy.

In Madison's day, an earlier chapter was being written. In many ways, the War of 1812 was only a nominal victory for the United States. The British captured Washington and burned the White House; and the terms of peace failed to mention some of our key demands. But it was a victory, and one in which the sea was of great importance. The war had, as its ostensible cause at least, interference in American ocean commerce by Great Britain. British strategy included a naval blockade of our coasts from New England to New Orleans and much of the war was fought at sea. Francis Scott Key was a captive aboard a British ship engaged in the attack upon Fort McHenry when he wrote "The Star Spangled Banner." The war at sea was notable for the bravery with which the U.S. Navy stood up to the powerful British fleet and added luster to its own name. Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry is responsible for one of the most memorable events of the war and of America's naval tradition. Flying a banner quoting Captain Laurence's immortal words "Don't give up the ship," Commodore Perry won the victory on Lake Erie that assured control of the Great Lakes for the United States. He announced his feat in another dramatic and memorable declaration: "We have met the enemy, and they are ours: two ships, two brigs, one schooner and one sloop."

Today the Navy is still in the forefront of our national defense, and the Polaris submarine is perhaps its most significant weapon. In my judgment, no other weapons system has had such a profound effect upon the strategic picture in the nuclear age as the Polaris submarine. It has added a new element to military strategy. Today, our opponents face the dilemma that they cannot hope to disarm America's strategic power by initiating a first nuclear strike. In a full nuclear exchange, whether or not our opponents should strike first and without warning, they would not achieve a victory even in the technical military sense. The survivability of our nuclear forces assures a retaliatory attack sufficient to devastate their homeland. They must face the reality that a deliberate nuclear attack or other aggression leading to a full nuclear exchange is simply not a rational politicomilitary act. We owe this powerful deterrent posture to the relatively invulnerable Polaris submarine force, plus our other hardened and alert strategic forces. Today we have about 650 manned bombers on 15-minute ground alert and over 200 operational Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman missiles on launchers and 144 Polaris missiles in submarines. And this force is rapidly expanding as additional Minuteman and Polaris, including the Madison, enter our operational inventory. This strength is a potent new factor in the strategic planning of both the West and the Soviet bloc.

Behind this powerful deterrent, we are building military forces with the flexibility and strength to do the other military tasks which may be required by the complex array of military threats in the contemporary world. The sea lanes must be kept open; infiltration, insurgency, and subversion must be countered; probes of weak spots in the free world and military actions from the lower end of the military spectrum up to large-scale wars must be deterred or defeated.

This task is not solely a military task, of course. Political, economic, diplomatic, and ideological aspects are of equal or greater importance in the combination of factors which comprise a sensible response to today's challenges. Furthermore, none of these jobs are the sole responsibility of the United States. Our allies have formally joined with us in building a collective defense and have shared many of the other responsibilities of preserving the free world. Indeed, all of the non-Communist nations share with us, whether they realize it or not, an interest in frustrating the aggressions of the Communist powers.

Together with our allies, the United States maintains an array of strong, mobile, well-equipped, ready forces with a wide variety of military capabilities suitable for countering the wide spectrum of military aggression with which we may have to deal. This array of military forces, among which the U.S.S. *Madison* is shortly to take an honored place, has as its prime objective the preservation of the security of the United States by making it clear to aggressive-minded nations that aggression would be without profit. We are ready to fight if we must, but none of us wants the U.S.S. *Madison* ever to have occasion to fire her weapons in anger. However, we regard her readiness to do so as perhaps the best hope in today's world that this will not be necessary.

May the U.S.S. *James Madison* bear her name proudly and well. For she can carry out her mission confident that it serves to defend the Nation and the heritage symbolized in the U.S. Constitution, to which her namesake made such an abiding contribution.

VFW Support of High School ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House are well aware, the Pentagon's current budget submission called for the elimination of the high school ROTC program.

When the Secretary of Defense announced, in January, his planned discontinuance of the junior ROTC program, I immediately urged him to continue and strengthen the activity. The ROTC unit at New Hanover High School, Wilmington, N.C., in my congressional district, has made an outstanding contribution to the community and to the training of military leaders since 1937. It was also my privilege to appear before the Armed Services Subcommittee, on March 7, to support the continuation of this valuable program.

The high school ROTC, in spite of the relatively small scale of the system, is a program which pays large dividends in terms of national security and the development of good citizenship.

I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the Members of this House another example of the critically important service being performed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in helping keep our Nation strong in these perilous times.

The record will show that the VFW immediately recognized the danger of the Pentagon's proposal to kill off the high school ROTC system and took a lead in defending the system and urging its continuation.

The commander in chief of the VFW, Byron G. Gentry, of Pasadena, Calif., issued a strong statement voicing the VFW's opposition to the proposed discontinuance of the high school ROTC. In addition, Commander Gentry wrote to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, expressing, on behalf of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, opposition to the budget provision to end high school ROTC. In his letter the VFW commander emphasized the importance of the system and the relatively low cost of the high school ROTC in terms of the benefits derived from it. Very properly, Commander Gentry urged that, instead of being wiped out, the high school ROTC should be vastly expanded.

As many Members of this House are aware, the VFW has worked with exemplary effectiveness to assure the continuation of the high school ROTC. In so doing, the VFW has made another of its many important contributions to the strengthening of our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this time the press release by Comdr. Byron B. Gentry, expressing the VFW's endorsement of the recent Defense Department decision to continue the high school ROTC system through fiscal year 1964 pending additional study:

KANSAS CITY, MO., March 25.—Byron B. Gentry, Pasadena, Calif., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today expressed appreciation of the VFW for Secretary of Defense McNamara's decision to reconsider plans for the elimination of the high school ROTC system.

"The VFW is very pleased," Commander Gentry said, "with the recent announcement that the Pentagon is not going through with its current plans for stopping the high school ROTC. "This is," Commander Gentry continued, "a very sound decision on the part of the Department of Defense. I take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the VFW to Secretary McNamara and to Assistant Secretary of Defense, Norman S. Paul, who made the announcement, for this decision which continues this highly valuable ROTC training program in our high schools."

Reviewing the VFW's efforts to present the high school ROTC system, Commander Gentry recalled that, upon publication of the current defense budget, it was noted that plans called for discontinuing the high school ROTC system, and he promptly wrote to Secretary McNamara protesting the decision. In that letter Commander Gentry pointed out the relatively low cost of the ROTC training program and urged that instead of being terminated, the system should be vastly expanded.

Continuing, Commander Gentry said, "the VFW firmly believes that the proposed study by the Pentagon of the high school ROTC system will disclose the importance of this program, both in terms of citizenship training and directing the interest of young men toward military service. It is the hope of the VFW that the Department of Defense will decide to expand the high school ROTC system so that a larger number of high school students can participate in it."

Regarding the VFW's action in protesting the Pentagon's cancellation plans for the high school ROTC, Commander Gentry said, "The VFW received an unusually large amount of mail endorsing the VFW stand on the high school ROTC issue. Many of these letters," Commander Gentry said, "came from parents of boys who were participating or had participated in the program. These letters emphasized the great value which the high school ROTC system had been to these young men, and expressed the strong opinion that the system should be continued."

Commander Gentry emphasized that the VFW is anxious to assist and cooperate in any manner it can in helping to continue and expand the high school ROTC concept.

"In conclusion," Commander Gentry said, "the VFW is very interested in the bills introduced in Congress proposing the expansion of the high school ROTC on a truly national scale. This is an encouraging development and reflects, in principle, the VFW's views on this issue. It is hoped that legislation to accomplish this objective will be passed."

Comparison of Gross Tax Burdens of Various Nations in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, in order to compare the relative tax burdens of industrialized and nondeveloped countries, it is best to show total taxes either as a percentage of gross national product or national income. The generally accepted definition of national income does not include indirect taxes. Many countries rely to very different degrees on indirect taxes—some have a high proportion of indirect taxes in their tax structure, while others do not have such a high percentage. Thus using national income as a yardstick of tax load may result in an overstatement of the fiscal burden for the one class and an understatement for the other.

The United Nations Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics for 1961 gives latest available gross national product and tax figures for 1960. Since the data for gross national product are collected on a relatively uniform basis, percentages of taxes calculated as part of the gross national product of each country have the advantage of international comparability. These taxes include all indirect taxes collected as well as all social security contributions.

On the basis of latest available U.N. statistics, total taxes as a percentage of gross national product show the following relative tax burdens among various countries for 1960:

Country	Taxes as percent of GNP	Rank
West Germany	34.0	1
France	33.2	2
Austria	32.9	3
Norway	32.1	4
Sweden	31.3	5
Finland	30.8	6
Netherlands	30.1	7
Italy	28.7	8
United Kingdom	27.9	9
United States	27.5	10
New Zealand	27.5	11
Denmark	25.1	12
Canada	24.8	13
Belgium	24.2	14
Australia	23.5	15
Chile	22.9	16
Ireland	22.1	17
Japan	20.2	18
Burma	19.8	19
Greece	19.6	20
Mauritius	19.3	21
Portugal	17.5	22
China-Taiwan	15.5	23
Malta	15.2	24
Republic of South Africa	15.1	25
Ecuador	15.0	26
Costa Rica	14.7	27
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	14.2	28
Korea	14.1	29
Jamaica	13.0	30
Panama	12.2	31
Colombia	11.4	32
India	9.7	33

Telstar and Satellite Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, extraordinary problems and technical difficulties were met and overcome in the launching of the Telstar communications satellite last year. This experiment demonstrates the effective cooperation that can exist between the private sector and Government in this field, and presents a good omen for the success of the Communications Satellite Corp. which the 87th Congress established to carry forward this experiment into the realm of commercial communication. There is still a long way to go before all the problems involved in global communication by way of space satellites are solved, but Telstar points a way in which private enterprise and the Federal Government working together can successfully meet one of the greatest challenges of our time.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the address entitled "Telstar and Satellite Communications," delivered by Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., before the New York Chamber of Commerce, March 18, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELSTAR AND SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

(A talk by Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., before the New York Chamber of Commerce, Mar. 18, 1963)

It is a pleasure to be here and to talk about Telstar. When I was invited, I wasn't sure whether I would have much opportunity to get an orderly talk prepared. However that seems to have worked out all right, and to keep within the time limits, I hope you won't mind if I stay rather closely with these notes.

As you probably know, Telstar has been having some troubles these last few weeks. I'll come to them shortly, but I might say right off that they don't dismay us. After all, this is what you have an experiment for—to learn what the problems are and how to deal with them. And everything that has been learned and accomplished to date strengthens our confidence that a workable satellite communications system can and will be made a reality.

So let me start with some past events and work up to the present.

Telstar was launched last July 10. The response to its success was immediate and heartening. In fact, it was almost overwhelming.

This experiment in the practical use of space for peaceful ends has been acclaimed all over the world. Newspaper editorials and thousands of letters have told of the strong hope that space communications will help bring people together. Certain opinion polls that have been taken suggest that Telstar has meant more to people than sputnik.

Telstar has been seen, also, as proof that freemen, free enterprise, and elective government can work together effectively on the most complex problems.

Needless to say, we in the Bell System are pleased and proud that Telstar is an important "first" for the United States and for the American enterprise system.

What has Telstar done? Two kinds of things.

First, it has handled all kinds of communications between this country and Europe.

Second, it has reported a vast amount of scientific information about the space environment, and about its own condition and performance.

Taking all the results together, we are confident, as I indicated, that there is no basic scientific obstacle to the creation of a commercial satellite communication system.

Here in a nutshell is the story of the communications that have been handled:

In addition to more than 300 technical tests covering every aspect of transmission, we have conducted some 400 demonstrations via Telstar.

These demonstrations have included multichannel telephony, telegraphy, data, telephoto, and facsimile transmissions. Transatlantic television has been demonstrated 50 times, including 5 times in color. The quality of these transmissions has been fully comparable to the quality obtained over the most modern communication systems on earth.

In 2 data transmissions, using highly experimental equipment developed at Bell Laboratories, Telstar relayed data across the Atlantic at a speed of 1,460,000 words per minute; fast enough, by the way, to send the entire King James version of the Bible in 45 seconds. And if we wanted to spend another half minute, we could throw in all of Shakespeare's works.

I'll come in a moment to the reporting of scientific data from space. First, however, it will be helpful to describe the satellite itself.

It is 34½ inches in diameter, and about the weight of an average man, 170 pounds.

Right now, as I am talking, it is making its 2,295th orbit, traveling across the Pacific in a southeasterly direction, at a speed of 16,000 miles an hour. The orbit is elliptical, ranging from a high point of 3,502 miles above the earth, to a low point of 593 miles. Each orbit takes about 2½ hours.

Bell Telephone laboratories built Telstar at Hillside, N.J. Into it they packed some 15,000 components, including 3,600 solar cells on the outside that convert sunlight into electric power.

Also included among the components are 2,528 semiconductor devices—diodes and transistors. Of these, 93 percent are for reporting data.

The solar cells were specially made to resist the effects of radiation. To provide further protection, strips of artificial sapphire are fastened over them.

Telstar's communications receiver and transmitter are powered by 19 nickel-cadmium battery cells charged and recharged by the solar cells.

The satellite has a helical antenna for its telemetry or information-reporting functions, and two antennas around its "equator," or waist, for its communication function. One of these is for receiving, the other for transmitting.

The communication amplifier uses transistors and a highly reliable "traveling wave" electron tube, of a sort that has already proved its capabilities in land microwave systems. This amplifier can amplify the faint signals it receives from the ground about 10 billion times.

Now as to the reporting of information:

All in all, from July 10 until the latter part of February, Telstar made and reported measurements of 112 items each minute on command.

Temperature, for example, is extremely important. The satellite was designed to keep the outer skin temperature at about 30° for efficient operation of the solar cells—and to keep the inner cannister, which contains the electronics, in the 60° to 80° range. The reports have shown that the means used to accomplish this have worked well.

Again, we know that the spin imparted to Telstar when it was launched has slowed down, but not too much. This spin stabilizes the satellite so that its antennas will point in the right directions. Initially the rate of spin was 177 revolutions per minute. It is less now, and continues to diminish. But it appears to be adequate for a life of 2 years, which was our objective.

The greatest problem in the hostile environment of space is radiation. With regard to this, Telstar has given us a vast amount of information.

The solar cells have deteriorated, but at last report less than we thought they would. We anticipated that in 2 years their output might be cut in half. All indications are that they will do at least that well and perhaps better.

But radiation has been more troublesome in its effect on some other components of Telstar. In late November, what we call the command decoder receiver stopped functioning. This is the unit that turns on the satellite's communication system on command from the ground.

Meanwhile, however, the data reporting units continued to operate perfectly. Using the information thus supplied, the people at Bell Laboratories were able to simulate, on the ground, the conditions inside Telstar. When they put a command decoder into a cannister in the laboratory and gave it a dose of radiation, it behaved just the way the decoder in the satellite was behaving. Then they narrowed the trouble down to one transistor. Then, finally, they devised an ingenious new code for commanding the unit in Telstar to operate. In effect, they ordered it to bypass the poor transistor and get going. And it did so.

Telstar went back into full operation on January 4. Then, around mid-February, the same kind of difficulty that had previously occurred began to show up again. The corrective steps taken earlier were repeated. For a while they were successful. But on February 21, the satellite apparently misinterpreted a command and disconnected its storage batteries. So far, it has not responded to further commands, and it is not now transmitting any signals.

Here I should explain that Telstar's orbit, from about 600 to 3,500 miles, runs it back and forth through the Van Allen belt of radiation. Also, as the orbit changes in relation to our spinning globe, the satellite goes through 3-month cycles of increasing and decreasing exposure to this radiation. Both the present and earlier difficulties occurred on the uptrend, and the satellite's recovery in early January was accomplished when it was near the bottom of the cycle. Today the trend of radiation exposure is again downward, and so we still have hopes that we can again jog it into operation.

But even if we can't do this, we have no grounds for complaint. We have learned more from this first Telstar than we had dared to hope. In fact, our computers are still working on the data it sent back last year.

But to learn still more about avoiding or overcoming radiation damage, we have an important followup experiment in the works. Under our contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which launched Telstar last summer, they will launch Telstar II for us this spring. Regarding this let me stress two points.

First, NASA will use a new, more powerful Thor Delta rocket to get the satellite into a higher orbit than Telstar I. In this higher orbit, exposure to the high-energy radiation of the Van Allen belt should be reduced by nearly one-half.

Second, Telstar II will have a command decoder designed around new transistors that are far more resistant to radiation than any that were available when Telstar I was built.

As with Telstar I, we are paying NASA all costs of the launch, and we shall also provide NASA and the general scientific community with all data the satellite sends back.

A few words now about ground stations. They are important too.

For the Telstar experiments we built a ground station at Andover, Maine. Its giant horn antenna can track satellites easily and with remarkable accuracy, in fact to a few thousandths of a degree.

The signal from the satellite, at the ground receiver, is as little as a trillionth of a watt. The focusing effect of the antenna, plus the master amplifier in the receiving system, builds it up beautifully.

Ground stations already built in other countries, by their communications administrations, are at Goonhilly Downs, England; Pleumeur Bodou, France; and Fucino, Italy.

Using such ground stations with numerous satellites, we could make thousands of channels available for worldwide communications.

We have also used a small experimental ground station, housed in a trailer, to obtain a single two-way voice channel via Telestar. This proved that relatively inexpensive ground equipment, needing only a small amount of power, can be used with a satellite to obtain a limited number of circuits. Hence new, developing countries, with limited communication needs and also limited capital, may well find it practical to use satellite communications.

Some of you may be wondering whether space communications will use numerous satellites at medium altitudes, or a lesser number of very high altitude satellites, up 22,000 miles or so, in orbits that are synchronized with the rotation of the earth. In the former case, as medium-altitude satellites orbit around the earth, ground stations would lock onto one after another to provide continuous service. In the case of synchronous satellites, they do not appear to move, and ground stations need only be pointed at them.

I have no prophesy to make about this. The only points I would make are:

First, the Telstar experiment has proved that tracking is no great problem.

Second, the capacity of the first synchronous satellite was one voice channel, and efforts to communicate over this channel have not yet succeeded. I have no idea how long it may take to design and put into orbit a synchronous satellite that can handle a lot of business.

Third, we are having a communications explosion ,so to speak, so far as oversea services are concerned, and the need for plenty more channels is pressing hard.

So I would say that whatever the ultimate system may be, in the next several years we are going to have to do what we are best able to do, in order to meet the hard-pressing need.

This brings me to the question of why did the Bell System get interested in satellite communication in the first place, and why have we spent some $50 million, more or less, on our Telstar experiments?

First it is simply our job to come up with the means to give people the service they need and want. If we didn't do this we would be shirking our responsibility.

Over the years we have pushed down two broad avenues of development to create great numbers of communication channels. One line of development has been cables, including coaxial cables. The other is radio, especially microwave radio.

We have needed both cables and microwave to get the circuits, and on land we have them both. And we are continuing to develop them both for the years ahead.

Across the oceans we had radio first, but not microwave. Then we started with cables, the first one in 1956, numerous others since then, and more to come in the future.

The cables of today are much more efficient and capable than those of a few years ago, and the cables of tomorrow will have far greater capabilities than the ones we have now. In fact, we are sure that in a few years their capabilities will fully equal those of satellites. We have a transistorized cable under development at Bell laboratories, for example, that will be able to transmit television, and the scientists in other countries are not sitting on their hands either. They too have new cable developments in the works.

So much for cables. The other road of development, as I said, is the microwave road. And this is what takes us to satellites.

The reason is that for microwave systems we need relay points. The microwaves travel in straight lines, and without relay points they would leave the curve of the earth and get lost in space.

Relay points are easy on land. You have all seen the relay towers around the country. But you can't build towers in the ocean. So instead you use satellites, relay towers in the sky.

Now let me relate all this to the communications explosion I already spoke of.

In 1927, when we first put in radiotelephone service to Europe, there were 11,000 calls. Last year—1962—there were about 5 million oversea calls. By 1980 we expect something like 100 million.

Right now, with our foreign partners we operate about 700 oversea circuits. We expect that by 1980 at least 10,000 will be needed.

Last year's oversea conversations were 14 percent over the year before. At that rate the volume nearly doubles in 5 years.

A commercial satellite system will help take care of this explosive growth by putting microwave to work. And I think it must be clear to you that as we looked at future needs, we had to find out how microwave could be put to work. Our scientists started speculating about the use of satellites years ago, before the first Sputnik. And as our communications technology advanced it gave us all the tools we needed, transistors and traveling wave tubes, masers and antennas, wave guides and solar cells. Then came the Government's development of rockets. NASA, which has the authority and capability in the field of orbiting and positioning satellites, agreed to launch Telstar for us at our expense, and we are off to the races.

Thus we have been gaining the knowledge that could not be acquired in any other way: I mean concrete knowledge and experience under actual conditions in the space environment. And in the process, the United States has gained a clear edge in space communications technology.

But there is one other thing that is very important to say. In our judgment oversea communication via satellites is no more the exclusive method of the future than is microwave on land. All the eggs are not going in one basket. From the standpoint of dependability of service, it is essential to have diversity of routes and types of facilities. And taking a long look ahead, I am sure it will take the best we can accomplish in both satellite and cable communications to meet the future need.

The important thing is to make the best use of all the opportunities. On the space communication side, the new corporation authorized by Congress has many problems to cope with. Its ultimate success, in both performance and profits, will depend on many factors, including technological progress, the kind of system the corporation elects to use, the effectiveness of its business management, and the nature and extend of participation by foreign communication agencies.

Our wish and hope are to take an active, constructive part in this—and as soon as possible—for the need is great. When the Satellite Act was being debated, we said we thought there were other courses open that would speed progress faster. However, that is water over the dam, and we are certainly glad that Congress decided for a private enterprise, organized for profit, instead of Government ownership. We want to help build a strong, healthy enterprise, and given the opportunity, as I hope we will be, we shall do everything we can to help make it a great success.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE, INC.,
NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.,
Highland Park, N.J., March 12, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The local branch of the Ukrainian Congress Commit-

tee of America in New Brunswick would like to join all those who have requested you to submit House Resolution 14 to vote by your committee.

We feel that a Committee on Captive Nations would be of great importance to our Government inasmuch as it would provide unbiased information on all questions and issues pertinent to the various captive nations in the U.S.S.R. in this way assisting our Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations.

We would very much appreciate it if you, Congressman SMITH, gave your full support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,
JAROSLAW OSHCHUDLAK,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1963.

Hon DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Please, Mr. Congressman, send me a copy of House Resolution 14 establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, which you introduced on January 10, 1963.

As you know, I am very deeply interested in this matter because my goal is the freedom of all and independence for all captive nations.

The free world has been shocked and staggered by recent tactics of the Communist propaganda forces in the world struggle.

The most appalling fact of this century is the failure of the free world to recognize the enemy (communism) as it is—the international conspiracy.

On the European continent, long established independent nations have become colonies of the Kremlin's Socialist (communistical) empire.

On the continent of Africa hopelessly diversified groups of people took on the mantles of independent nationhood, a status for which they were demonstratedly not prepared.

This happened because we did not do enough to secure the freedom of the captive nations, and so, unopposed, communism won again.

Krushchev, unconcerned with the facts, wages a campaign for freedom for the colonial people of the free world.

In the captive nations of the Soviet empire, no one enjoys freedom, the right of justice.

The world cannot understand the silence of American leaders over the captivity and plight of the Soviet's colonies. We have even failed to demand free election in the Red-held colonies.

Please, Mr. Congressman, give me all the materials for this action.

Thanks.

Sincerely yours,
MILINKO D. ALEKSICH.

WATERVLIET, N.Y., *March 8, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member, U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of our organization we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman FLOOD, to give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE,
WASYL WASYLKING, *Secretary.*

MARCH 11, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I wish to express my wholehearted support for the establishment of a Committee on Captive Nations.

Wishing you success in all your endeavors, I remain,

Truly yours.
JUHAN SIMONSON.

Tribute to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison Who Is Retiring After Long Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress fully realize that in order to properly carry out our duties and responsibilities we must have efficient staffs, particularly competent administrative assistants. And not only do the services of these employees mean so much to each of us but to the successful operation of Congress as a whole.

It is most fitting to pay tribute to a congressional aid who will retire March 31 after 22 years of faithful and meritorious service. I refer to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison who has served as an assistant to Louisiana Members of Congress longer than anyone else, having begun her congressional employment in 1922 as secretary to former Representative Leonard Allen of the Eighth Louisiana District. When the latter retired from Congress, Mrs. Harrison became secretary to former Representative Henry D. Larcade of Louisiana's Seventh District and following Representative Larcade's retirement she has served as administrative assistant to his successor, Representative T. A. THOMPSON, since January 3, 1953.

Incidentally, Mrs. Harrison is closely vied for the longest service to the Louisiana congressional delegation by three other members of our staffs. Miss Florence "Flo" LeCompte, personal secretary to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, began her congressional duties May 1, 1942, while Mrs. Florence Cooley has been administrative assistant to Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, of the Sixth Louisiana District, since January 3, 1943. Bill Candler, who has been my executive secretary for a number of years, has been on the Hill since November 4, 1942, having previously served with former Representative James Domengeaux, of the Third Louisiana District, and with former Representative Larcade.

A native of Louisiana, Mrs. Harrison was born at Marthaville. She graduated from Northwestern State College at Natchitoches, La., with a bachelor of science degree, and from Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge with a master's degree in business administration, and served as supervisor of student teachers in Louisiana. She is a member of the Baptist Church.

Mrs. Harrison is the wife of Derwood D. Harrison, a career employee with the General Accounting Office. "Bud," as he is best known, came to Washington from North Carolina as an employee of former Representative and Comptroller General Lindsay Warren.

Mr. and Mrs. Harrison maintain a delightful home in Bethesda. In addition to her congressional work she is popular in Washington social circles, numbering among her close friends and personal acquaintances many Members of Congress and others in Washington official circles.

Since Representative THOMPSON has interested himself over the years in assisting young men to secure an education in Washington, "Miss Clara," as so many know her, has been a veritable Washington housemother to these young people, many of whom have successfully completed their professional educations.

After these many years of devoted, loyal and most helpful service to Congress and to her employers, and her years in the teaching profession, making approximately 30 years she has served the public, Mrs. Harrison is certainly entitled to a well-earned rest although she will no doubt continue many of her activities. Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation and their staffs join with all the many others in her wide circle of friendships in wishing for Miss Clara a very pleasant and happy retirement.

How Can I Help Preserve the American Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in presenting to the Congress, through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the winning essay in the American Legion contest of Ohio, written by Miss Jane Spencer a 17-year-old senior at the Cedarville High School, Cedarville, Ohio, on the subject of "How Can I Help Preserve the American Democracy?"

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

(By Jane Spencer)

Hello there, Statue of Liberty. How is the Nation tonight? Is the country still going merrily on its way, caring nothing about the future and forgetting about the past? Is the Nation oblivious to the great bulwark of our democracy or is it finally realizing that our democracy is slowly drifting from our grasp?

Yes, I see why you do get discouraged, standing there with your light that is a symbol of freedom to all lands, and then to have your own country let this freedom slip by without trying to retain this blessing.

Now, now, Miss Liberty, don't you blame me for the apathy on the part of the public. There is nothing that I, a teenage high school student, can do to preserve our American democracy; for I am not of voting age, I do not have time to read much about my country, I do not have time to write to my Congressman, and besides, who would listen to my ideas?

I am wrong, you say? What? I am helping some now, although I can do more than I am already doing? How can I do more, if I am not aware of the work I am doing?

Let us go through my activities and see how I can help my country. Shall we start with my church?

In church I participate in youth groups as well as adult groups. You are right: I can help in other ways beside being concerned about the people in my church and trying to talk with the visitors who come to my church. Also, somehow, I must be aware of the bridge between church and state and I must be able to express my profound belief in my God, upon whose ideals our country was founded many years ago. Through God and only through Him can we retain our freedom.

Now let us go to my school to see what I can do for freedom and democracy. True, I study history and government, but that is not enough. In school, I must prepare for my life as a future voter by learning and living the ideals of democracy. In school, honesty is the greatest key to our future success. I must be honest with myself and my fellow students.

By taking part in community affairs, which, of course, involve many persons, I can do my share of preserving my American democracy and freedom. I must stand for truth and right and disregard petty prejudices. I must practice clear thinking in order to find the truth.

In my home I practice love, understanding, and patience. In my opinion, a home is a nation in itself, and what applies to a home can be applied to a nation, because love binds all people together.

There, now, dear Miss Statue of Liberty, I have chosen some of the responsibilities that I can accept to help preserve American democracy. I have God, honesty, love, and clear thinking, along with faith in my ideals. I realize that each day of my life I shall be able to find more and more ways to serve my country. I must remember that the last four letters of American spell "I can."

Good night, Statue of Liberty; may your light of freedom continue to glow to light the way to freedom. May we as Americans continue to say to the world the inscription at your feet, written by Emma Lazarus:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Salute to Picatinny Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, as one who is always pleased to learn of the constant progress within the State of New Jersey I wish to include in the RECORD an article on the Picatinny Arsenal which ran in the Advance of March 20, 1963.

The article follows:

ARSENAL HAS NEW SIGNIFICANCE WITH ARMY MUNITIONS COMMAND

PICATINNY.—An establishment employing more than 7,500 people in one location, with an annual payroll over $40 million, that contracts each year for services and commodities amounting to even a greater figure, plus its scientific and engineering productivity * * * is big business with a five-star rating in any directory.

Picatinny Arsenal, site of the U.S. Army Munitions Command, the control center for 35 other installations throughout the country producing nuclear and nonnuclear weaponry for the Nation's defense, gives new meaning and significance to the word "arsenal."

No longer can it be defined as "a place for making and storing military equipment." The space age, with its round-the-clock advances in science and technology makes this meaning obsolete with birth of a new image and concept.

Today Picatinny Arsenal under the command of Col. Henry H. Wishart, gives visual evidence of this change, made by its own creation as a pioneer and frontrunner in the evolution of munitions.

To direct and regulate this vast, complex, and vitally essential research and development center, with its varied and widespread commercial commitments, Picatinny has developed management systems of control, communication, and guidance unmatched by any corporate industrial giants.

Few business corporations guard its stockholders' dollar more zealously for maximum productivity than does Picatinny Arsenal in its uses of the taxpayers' dollar. Few employ a rigid pattern of management and production controls that yield the degree of efficiency and effectiveness in accomplishing its program.

DOLLAR IS BUDGETED

Picatinny's budgeted dollar for current year has unit allocations as follows: Ammunition group, 26 cents; industrial services, 21 cents; nuclear weapons, 19 cents; support division, 13 cents; Feltman Research Laboratory, 8 cents; quality assurance division, 6 cents; staff division, 5 cents; program coordination division, 1 cent, and 1 cent for authorized miscellaneous use.

The ammunition group is primarily concerned with nonnuclear ammunition and related weapons systems. This includes missile warheads, rockets, bombs, grenades, pyrotechnics, artillery shells, fuses, and mines. Notably among Picatinny's missile family are warheads for Nike-Zeus, Jupiter, Pershing, Sergeant, and Hawk.

The work program is flexible. It can start from a promising concept by an inventive engineer, eliminating bugs on a contractor's production line, expediting production schedules, to stockpiling and issuing materiel as required.

NUCLEAR PROGRAM

Development of nuclear weapons is the world's most competitive, highly secretive and intensified program in today's business of munitions manufacture.

The arsenal's nuclear weapons group is the Army's key support division in this field. It is closely allied with the Atomic Energy Commission and is the main source of information and direction to industry, contracted to produce this type of weaponry.

It is here the Army's nuclear weapons are born. Months, even years of concentrated research and development are expanded by the nuclear weapons group before industry turns a wheel.

Industry performs its job along the specifics prescribed in the technical data package provided them. An engineering and standards of quality support that covers every facet of production.

Here are lucid instructions, all pretested, along with a pilot model of the weapon, that rule out any possible element of error.

A typical package, completed after years of preparation, could fill a small truck. Packed with reams of engineering blueprints, supply manuals, specification charts, technical manuals, test and handling equipment drawings, and inspection gage drawings.

It is this painstaking care, inventive skills, and engineering perfection that have given our Armed Forces the highly effective tactical atomic missiles, Little John, Honest John, Sergeant, Lacrosse, the atomic artillery shells plus others * * * and soon to include the Lance, now in the research and development stage.

STAFF DIVISION

Staff division, alloted the smallest amount of the budgeted dollar (1 cent), performs a major assist in helping the other groups to function smoothly in high gear.

Here are furnished aids and services that keep the scientific, engineering, and production branches free from time-consuming details and extracurricular activities.

From the Administrative Services Office is provided coordinating services, communication facilities, engineering and documentation files, reproduction services, medical staff, and protocol assistance.

Civilian personnel brings to the desk, workbench, and science lab, the required workers with the skills, experience, and qualifications needed to fill the jobs.

Management office provides the watchdog controls with manpower analyses, automatic systems development, analytical reports, and statistics.

The safety office prescribes the safeguards for protection of life and property and maintains constant vigilance. Security and intelligence police the entire installation, screening the life histories of new employees and guarding secret plans, documents, and restricted areas.

FELTMAN LABORATORIES

Feltman Research Laboratories, the fountainhead of science and research is the dynamo bringing into fact the usage of new discoveries and the creation of techniques.

Picatinny Arsenal like the industrial giants in private industry, recognizes the importance of conducting both basic and applied research within its own laboratories. It is here that a continuous search is being made in the engineering and physical sciences, as related to explosives, propellants, pyrotechnics, plastics and adhesives. The investment in these areas pay big dividends in providing new knowledge which can be applied to the arsenal's end product of new and improved ammunition.

Within this integrated pattern of checks and controls the arsenal's quality assurance division touches all the bases. Here is given depth scrutiny and objective evaluations to determine that the highly complex and costly material, when manufactured, is with design conformance and that the material will function adequately as designed.

SKILLED TEAMS

To achieve these objectives, highly skilled teams consisting of engineers, inspectors, statisticians, technicians are enjoined in a coordinated effort during all phases of the project, from concept to disposal.

Detailed specifications, drawings, test procedures, design and procurement of test equipment, engineering assistance, inspection programs, assessments, laboratory and range firing programs are some of the tasks performed to assure the utmost in reliability of material.

These are but part of the fabric that makes up the whole of the arsenal's strength and know-how to keep the Army the Nation's most formidable deterrent to global war.

How these and other arsenal divisions function, with speed and efficiency, to produce a product, a brief outline of a typical program would bring this into sharp focus.

TYPICAL PROGRAM

Let's assume an urgent request is made for a new component, a more powerful type of explosive, a new adhesive, a propellant or a pyrotechnic device.

An immediate meeting would be called, attended by the arsenal's most skilled specialists in the particular field. Scientists, engineers, military experts and division heads would outline a program of operation.

To direct and monitor the program a project manager is named, who is qualified as an engineer and business analyst.

The project is given a name and code number. The name could be "Sparky," "Fireball," etc. The code number is an absolute necessity which must be noted on every form of communication, requisitioning, engineering memorandum, or procurement data.

The project manager, with the help of the industrial services division, lays out a planning schedule and develops a scheme of coordination with other working divisions.

ESTABLISH COST

A cost budget is established and contracts for services and material are negotiated. Time schedules for deliveries are formulated. Specifications, designs, engineering blueprints are drawn. All are reviewed and scrutinized, evaluations made as to costs and quality. Revision or corrections are adjusted and corrected. The project is then given the go-ahead.

As the spearhead of the program, the project manager maintains a master file into which funnels every detail of the program's operation. From this he sends progress reports to every division head, key engineer, scientist, technician working on the project. Bottlenecks and production problems are met head on and solved before causing any costly delays.

Material delivered is tested by quality assurance division for any defects or nonconformity to specifications. Costs are rigidly examined and compared with original estimates. A constant flow of pointed communications preclude any chance of confusion or conflicts of understanding. Teamwork and hardheaded management wages an unrelenting fight against waste of time, money, material, and labor. The end product is produced, passes inspection, and provides the American soldier with combat effectiveness equaled by none.

Soviet Oil and Soviet Might

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Munday Times of Munday, Tex., pointed up a most serious problem which should be receiving the urgent attention of Congress, the President, the State Department and all responsible governmental officials.

The editorial, "Soviet Oil and Soviet Might," tells of the Soviet economic oil offensive now being waged. This intense effort on the part of the Soviet Union to provide low-cost fuel to neutral and Western nations, thereby making these nations dependent on the abundant Soviet oil supplies, presents complex problems which deserve our most urgent attention.

The editorial points up how the Soviets, through state ownership of the oil industry, are able to cut prices drastically and use commodity exchange programs to sell their oil. The Soviet oil output has increased rapidly and continues to increase at fantastic rates.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues:

SOVIET OIL AND SOVIET MIGHT

The Soviet Union is building her economic might through the sale of oil.

Back of this lies a story of increasing concern to the oilmen of this country. The volume of Soviet sales has steadily increased in Germany, Italy, France, and elsewhere. What troubles them, as an oil company publication phrases it, "is not the mere fact of Soviet competition, for that is a normal business risk. Their real concern is the system of state-controlled pricing and barter that Russia uses to penetrate free world oil markets."

The point is that in the Soviet system the word "cost" is likely to mean something entirely different from what it does outside the Communist empire. The state determines all prices, just as it determines all wages. Thus, costs are whatever the state says they are—even though the figure may be totally unrealistic by Western standards.

The importance of this oil offensive can hardly be exaggerated. Russia is buying huge quantities of industrial equipment—including complete factories and processing plants of the most advanced, automated type—from the West. And oil is the one commodity in general demand which she can export, and use for barter and exchange, without unduly affecting her ambitious domestic development program. These exports of Russian oil to the free world have reached 500,000 barrels a day and are expected to swiftly increase.

There is no simple solution to the problem. American oilmen, and their equivalents elsewhere in the West, are dealing with it with all the wealth of imagination and resources which they command. Meanwhile, to say the obvious, the American Government should pursue wise policies—in taxation and other matters—which will help, not hamper, the oil industry's ability to meet the Soviet offensive.

Ruby Jo Couch Wins Citizenship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, March 20, in New York City, a young lady from Wichita Falls, Tex., Miss Ruby Jo Couch, was presented with the Citizenship Award by the Girls Clubs of America. Miss Couch, who is 15 years old, won this national award because of her activities in her local girls club, the Northside Girls Club of Wichita Falls, activities in her community, and an essay she submitted. The essay was on the subject of "My Future Responsibility as a Woman in the Home and in the Community Means—."

It was my pleasure to attend the award presentation in New York last Wednesday, and to present at that time a flag for the Northside Girls Club which has flown over the U.S. Capitol.

This girls club program is worthy of the highest commendation. It honors girls who have made real accomplishments in community service, and whose outlook on life points toward adult community leadership.

Such a young lady is Ruby Jo Couch. She has worked on countless community charity drives. She works hard at home to help her mother take care of the family. She is active in church and school activities. She teaches a Sunday School class. She has taken part in numerous girls club activities, showing outstanding leadership capabilities, and the essay she submitted in competition for this award is indicative of her outlook on life, which will surely lead her to higher recognition for service to her fellow man.

Her essay follows:

MY FUTURE RESPONSIBILITY AS A WOMAN

My future responsibility as a woman in the home and in the community is the greatest responsibility I shall ever have. I hope to have a Christian centered home, teaching my children to be active in church and to support the church in the community.

As a homemaker, I will keep my home immaculate and a pleasant place in which to live. The atmosphere will be understanding and happy, my home a place of sanctuary and love for my husband and my children. I shall obtain this by being calm and patient and being aware of the problems and individual hopes and interests of each member of my family so that I may be of help to them. I shall endeavor to teach my children to be honest, responsible, dependable and reputable young citizens. My husband and I will work together to make them morally strong and help them to have an optimistic, outgoing attitude toward life.

As a woman, it will be my responsibility to be active in my community and town. I like to help those who may not be as fortunate as I am, and to assist with drives for good causes, such as the united fund and cancer drives. I have been on many of these drives and I plan to continue to take part in

them as a homemaker and to teach my children their responsibilitiy in these things.

I believe that it is through these projects, being aware of the problems of the community and our country and doing our part toward solving them, that we build a better world. If a family participates in community activities from the beginning, then I think the children will continue this interest in their lifetime.

Being a woman in the home and the community is a great challenge in this day and time. I hope to be able to meet this challenge, contributing to my home and making my community a better place in which to live.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a tribute to the freedom-loving Byelorussians on the occasion of the anniversary of their independence.

For more than four centuries the Byelorussians, one of the oldest and proudest national groups in Eastern Europe, have been living under Russian rule. Except for a brief period of independence, they have been subjected to the worst excesses of the autocratic czarist regime and the Communist totalitarian system. Although they have suffered more than any other national minority group, the Byelorussians have steadfastly maintained their national identity and their love of freedom. They have struggled for independence and liberty for centuries despite hardships, privation, exile, and death.

The turbulent events of World War I and the Russian revolution gave the Byelorussians their long-sought opportunity to break away from the Russian shackles. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed. The Byelorussian government quickly set to work to expand its activity in such fields as education, culture, and social protection, despite the wartime difficulties and devastation. With the retreat of the German armies in November 1918, the Red army began to advance into Byelorussia. The government, unable to oppose this aggression, was forced to leave the capital city of Minsk and withdraw to Grodno. The fledgling republic's leaders were unable to build up enough military strength to defend its independence and integrity. In 1921 the county was partitioned by Poland and Russia in the treaty which ended the war between these two powers.

Early in World War II Byelorussia was unified under Soviet rule as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. The freedom-loving Byelorussians are still under the heel of their Russian oppressors. They do not even have the freedom to observe the anniversary of their Independence Day. We in the free world celebrate the anniversary of that historic event and echo the deep-felt sentiments of the Byelorussian people.

Scott County, Iowa, Bar Association May Be Oldest in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an article by Keith Prescott in the March 16 edition of the Davenport, Iowa, Daily Times speculates that the Scott County, Iowa, Bar Association may be the oldest organization of its kind in the United States.

Since the association will mark its 100th anniversary on March 31, I feel that it is fitting to call attention to this century-long record in the public interest by placing the newspaper article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In doing this, I not only pay tribute to the Scott County Bar Association and its 160 members, many of whom are personal friends of mine, I also give further circulation to the suggestion that the organization may be the oldest of its kind, and barring evidence to the contrary, seek national recognition for this anniversary observance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, "Scott County Bar Association May Be the Oldest in the United States," in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

SCOTT COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION MAY BE OLDEST IN UNITED STATES—MARCH 31 PROGRAM TO NOTE 100TH YEAR

(By Keith Prescott)

The nearly 100-year-old Scott County Bar Association may be the oldest organization of its kind in the country.

While a special committee moved plans for a public program on March 31 to celebrate the organization's centennial year, Attorney Carl W. Schultz, committee chairman, speculated on the group's possible claim to antiquity.

The Davenport attorney said a letter received from an associate of Roscoe Pound, noted authority on the country's legal history, hints that the Scott Bar Association may be the oldest in the Nation.

THEORY

Schultz said the associate of the author of books on the history of lawyer groups and the courts based his theory on the Scott group's continuous pattern of activity since the association was organized on March 30, 1863.

Pound in tracing the history of bar associations in a recent volume points out that there were two specific types of lawyer organizations before the professional bar association as are found today began forming.

The author lists the earliest type of organizations as those consisting of lawyers who were admitted to practice in a specific court or courts.

The second type of lawyer organizations were formed for the purpose of sharing law libraries. Pound points out that most earlier historical references to bar associations refer to the two types described above and not the professional associations as are found throughout the country today.

GROWTH

The Scott County Bar Association has grown from the 28 lawyers who signed their names to the organization's first constitution and bylaws in 1863 to some 160 members.

County lawyers selected A. H. Bennett as first president, with J. N. Rogers as vice president; Charles Whitaker, secretary, and D. S. True as treasurer.

Bennett, the first president, served as a district court judge for 1 year from 1857 to 1858.

MAIN PURPOSE

Records kept by the bar show that one of the main purposes of the first organization was to have the means through an organization to take care of disciplinary problems which might arise involving possible unorthodox legal practices.

The charter members named a censorship committee at the initial meeting which was supposed to review complaints brought by private citizens against members of the bar.

This first censorship committee consisted of Charles E. Putnam, James T. Sam, and James Armstrong.

While the bar association still functions with a censorship committee, now called a grievance committee, its aims and purposes have expanded with the changing times.

Interests of the Scott bar now includes such things as the welfare of the individual attorneys and their families, an exchange of ideas on new laws and court procedures, and minimum fees for legal services.

Scott County over the years since its organization in 1838 has never had to take a back seat to any other county for the lack of able members of the legal profession.

ABLE LEADERS

Conspicuous among the most able members of the legal profession of the early years were Gilbert C. R. Mitchell and Jonathan W. Parker.

Mitchell, a native of Tennessee and a graduate of East Tennessee University at Knoxville, practiced law for a time in Alabama before coming to Iowa in 1835.

He established himself in practice at both Stephenson and Rock Island, and became widely known and served his section of Iowa as a mayor, a legislator, and as a district judge.

Parker, who was admitted to the Iowa bar in 1838, was a native of Pennsylvania. While he practiced in Scott but a short time, he became an active local official and served as president of the territorial council.

Another early Iowan who rose to fame in legal circles was James Grant.

A native of North Carolina, Grant was graduated from the University of North Carolina and established himself in practice at Burlington in 1838 after a short career as a schoolteacher.

He specialized in railroad law, and at one time had more cases before the U.S. Supreme Court than any other lawyer.

Two other early Davenport lawyers of prominence were Ebenezer Cook and John P. Cook, brothers and natives of New York. They were prominent attorneys in the river city of Davenport by 1838.

COUNTY SEAT

Both were noted for their activity in the battle between Davenport and Rockingham for the honor of being the county seat of Scott.

Ebenezer Cook was particularly prominent in political life, having served as clerk of Scott court under Judge David Irvin and again under Judge Joseph Williams.

Ebenezer was a leader in bringing steel rails to Iowa and ultimately rose to acting president of the Rock Island Railroad Co.

John P. Cook also was active in business and politics as well as the law, and served as a member of several sessions of the legislature.

Among other Davenport lawyers prominent in early days were Simeon Meredith, J. W. Drury, William B. Conway, Alexander McGregor, and W. J. A. Bradford.

The Half Speed Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues a column which appeared in the Belvidere, Ill., Daily Republican of March 19, 1963. The author is the Honorable Robert Coulson, recently elected State senator from the 52d Illinois State district, a former mayor of the city of Waukegan, Ill., a teacher, and a free lance writer. He is not only a legislator and a columnist, but a father who seeks to preserve and extend the best of our civilization for his and our children.

I commend it for your reading, as follows:

THE HALF SPEED EFFORT

When the dust and ruins of our civilization are uncovered in some future century, the scholars will probably call this age the age of the half speed effort. More than at any other time in history we are concerned with shorter hours of work, longer vacations, earlier retirement and postponement of growing up. Very few young people plan to start work early, work long and hard and retire late or not at all.

Much of the work in legislatures involves considering how far we could go in this direction. In this session in Illinois there are proposals to raise the age of compulsory school attendance, to establish maximum hours of work, to hasten retirement, and so on.

We know that we are competing for survival with the other nations of the earth and that many of these nations are working at full speed. We seem almost to be testing how far we can handicap ourselves and still survive.

Our dialog with ourselves goes something like this: We know that we can stay ahead of Russia and outproduce her in every way. Can we do it if we work 40 hours a week and the Russians work 50? Yes.

Can we stay ahead if we retire our people at 65 while the Russians accept production from everyone? Yes.

Suppose we save our children from labor until they are 21; can we still win? Yes.

Suppose we devote 10 percent of our talent to the fine arts, while Russia devotes only 5 percent of its manpower to this; can we still win? Yes.

Suppose we permit boycotts, strikes and lockouts, and Russia does not; can we still win? Yes.

Suppose we give every child a broad general education for 2 years longer, while the Russians begin specialization at an earlier year. This loses us about one-thirtieth of our productivity; can we handicap ourselves thus additionally and still win? Yes.

The answer we give ourselves is always "Yes," but if the answer is in reality "No," we will be the last to realize it. Sooner or later, if we continue the conscious slowdown of our productive effort, the answer must become "No" and we will lose the contest for survival.

Historically, we have always awakened in time. After Pearl Harbor, it was touch and go for a while, but we were able to roll up our sleeves and get back to work. But there will be no advance notice given, if we are too late next time.

Our racer can outrun the Soviets if we put 10 pounds on his back. We can win after giving a 12-pound handicap, but the margin of victory is less. How about 15 pounds? Twenty? Sooner or later, no matter how fast our racer can run, the added burdens he carries will equalize the race.

We in the legislature have to anticipate this moment, this breakeven point. We have to judge how far we can make life more comfortable without risking destruction; and we judge for the greatest possible stakes, survival.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the winning speech in the Voice of Democracy contest in South Dakota, delivered by Carol Ann Lee, of Rapid City, S. Dak.

Miss Lee topped a field of 390 high school entrants on the subject, "What Freedom Means to Me," and will be competing in the national contest here in Washington next week.

Her excellent speech follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Carol Lee)

Freedom—a short, simple, common word in America today. But what is its true meaning? Before we answer this, perhaps it might be well to find out what freedom has meant to past civilizations.

In the old Norse language, the original word was frithr, meaning love and peace; the Gothic was frijon, to love; and in the Sanskrit language priyate or priya meant dear or beloved, which indicated that freedom was the opposite of slavery.

Love, peace, and being free from slavery are all suggested by our word freedom, and yet it has deeper meanings for me.

In a land of free people there is a feeling of warmth and sincerity brought about by freedom of friendship. This is a very important right to me. Much of my life is spent with my friends, and the privilege of choosing them myself is precious. For instance, if I wish to converse with a Jew there is no Hitler to condemn me. If I make friends with a Negro or Indian, there is no one who can chastise or punish me. When choosing my friends, I don't have to worry about being condemned if they do something wrong, solely on the basis of my relationship with them.

To enhance my private life, there is the freedom of reading what I wish. Our books are not censored widely, as in many countries. We are credited with enough intelligence to choose our own material. We have many newspapers and magazines from which to choose and from them we can assimilate the true facts about what is going on in our world. Through radio, television, and motion pictures we hear both sides of a question or issue and we are able to make our own decisions.

Freedom also means religion: to worship or not to worship when, where, and why we please.

It means education. I am given the opportunity to choose any school and any curriculum I want so long as I am able, no matter what my capabilities or limitations. Of course there are examinations to be passed, but I am not dictated to as to whether I go into higher learning, quit and do manual labor, or go to trade school.

Freedom in a democracy provides for free enterprise. It is not unusual that I, a high school student, spend time thinking and planning what business field I want to enter, either as an employer or employee. And it is very disconcerting to realize, that without my freedom, someone else, entirely disassociated with me, might at that very moment be casually making the choice for me.

One of the basic ideas of freedom is freedom from oppression. My Federal Government, through the military organizations, protects me from foreign tyranny. The State and city governments, through the police forces, protect me from crime. The courts of justice make certain my right to be tried before being punished for any misdemeanor.

One privilege that is rarely connected with the word freedom is that of family life. Have you ever tried to imagine Christmas alone, with no family, no traditions, no Christmas Eve worship together? Life would be lonely without family activities. Many families in other lands have experienced separation. But I am lucky. Because of my freedom no one can forcibly separate me from my family.

Another freedom that may sound rather unimportant at first is the freedom of marriage. The person whom I marry is the one with whom I will spend the rest of my life. Instead of my parents or someone else choosing my marital partner, I have this right and privilege.

The most important freedom, however, is that of speech. Without this, our other freedoms wouldn't even be important, for if democracy is infringed upon, we have the right to voice our disapproval.

There are many more basic freedoms, but these are the first ones of which I think.

With freedom there comes responsibility. Every generation must realize that freedom is worth sacrifice, battle, and possibly death. Freedom is now our responsibility.

Bylorussian Democratic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1963, marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

I proudly join my colleagues in paying tribute to the inspiring courage and determination of Byelorussians all over the world. I am certain that the independence they once enjoyed, will be regained and that freedom will flourish.

Byelorussia was once an independent country and made important contributions to the medieval history of Eastern Europe. In 1795, this freedom was crushed when Byelorussia was made a part of the Russian Empire by force.

Since then, Byelorussians have fought to regain their independence, without success. Major attempts were made in 1812 and 1863; and in 1917, after creating a congress with the goal of establishing an independent Byelorussia, the democratic body was attacked and scat-

tered by the armed power of Soviet Russia.

Unconquered, despite this tragic defeat, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed independence by passing the Third Constitutional Act on March 25, 1918. But Soviet Russia attacked and defeated the young democratic state, consisting of 10 million persons.

Demonstrating their indomitable courage and love for freedom, the people of Byelorussia rebelled and fought in the Slutsk District in 1920, but were defeated by the Soviet armies, and again during World War II, when the central council organized armed forces.

Despite 45 years of Soviet despotism and exploitation, Byelorussia has not surrendered, and never will. The flame of freedom is never extinguished by the violent winds of tyranny. And as Byron wrote of those who perish in freedom's constant struggle, "they never fail who die in a great cause."

Freedom is the greatest cause of all and its ultimate victory is inevitable.

Byelorussia will be free and happy again.

Boom to South Jersey Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, when New Jersey State Senator Frank S. "Hap" Farley, Republican, of Atlantic City, said recently, in speaking of the proposed southern New Jersey expressway, "This is the culmination of an 8-year dream," the senior New Jersey State senator spoke of a dream which has been the aspiration and the hope of every citizen who lives in the southern New Jersey seashore area.

The new expressway provides speedy access to and from Atlantic City and the adjacent resorts. It is worth noting that the $46,800,000 road was made possible by the determined efforts on the part of State Senator Farley and Charles W. Sandman, Republican, of Cape May, and the Republican members of the New Jersey House of Assembly.

This new toll road will be open for the summer of 1964. It will enhance the travel of tourists to and from the area. It lends to the growth and development of business. I foresee, with the opening of the expressway, the beginning of a whole new era of employment and development in south Jersey.

In the not too distant future south Jersey will be highly industrialized, with an easy flow of traffic on a year-round basis into and out of the area.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, with the hundreds of thousands of miles of highways in our Nation, a simple expressway might not appear important. What is important is the fact that for many citizens travel to and from Atlantic City has been difficult, if not awkward. It has cost the area millions in employment, hampered industrial growth, and relegated the area to a place of second consideration for our traveling population.

Now, due to the forthright action and determination of our legislators, we see the dawn of a new day. A day when more of our citizens will come to the world's famous playground, to bathe in the Atlantic Ocean, and to walk upon the most famous boardwalk in the world.

The land of the salt water taffy will again take its rightful place in the hearts of people everywhere.

A Busy Druggist and Active REA Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Mr. C. M. Stanley, editor of the Alabama Journal, Montgomery, Ala., appearing in the March 24, 1963, issue.

For many years I have been fortunate in having the friendship of this outstanding leader and successful businessman. His contributions have made life in the rural sections of Alabama more attractive and profitable. A druggist by profession, he has at all times insisted on the highest requirements for the admission of candidates for entrance in this important segment of business and community service.

The article follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Journal, Mar. 24, 1963]

A BUSY DRUGGIST AND ACTIVE REA LEADER

(By C. M. Stanley)

No man in Alabama can laugh oftener and more heartily than Maury Alexander McWilliams, of Prattville. He is a big, robust man, a successful businessman, and is a bachelor in spite of his winning and attractive personality.

Mr. McWilliams is entitled to be called Alabama's "Mr. Co-op," for he is the big man in our electric cooperatives. He must have been happier than usual this past week, for the first production of waterpower electric current was begun at the new George Dam on the Chattahoochee River, and Alabama's cooperatives are to be awarded half of this dam's production, with the Georgia Power Co. getting the other half.

Mr. McWilliams is a prosperous Prattville druggist with a big, handsome, well-supplied drugstore, of which one side is devoted to pharmacy, and the other side to sundries, as is the custom of today's drugstore contents. Mr. McWilliams is a pharmacist by training and profession. He has served as a member of the State board of pharmacy, and in other ways he has done much to advance the standards of medical dispensing.

Along with his contagious laughter, Mr. McWilliams gets around and covers a good deal of territory. He is one of a group made up of Montgomery and Autauga County men who used to spend many happy hours at Bridge Creek Club beside the dam and lake formed by Autauga Creek.

They passed the time fishing, or hunting, or just resting and playing cards and other games in gentlemanly and good-natured fashion. In such a group lifelong friendships are formed.

Maury McWilliams is about as well and popularily known in Montgomery as in Prattville. In fact he knows nearly everybody, and those he does not know, know him.

Mr. McWilliams, in addition to his private drug business, is president of several Alabama electric co-op associations.

That, as is well known, makes him a modest competitor of the Alabama Power Co., in southwest Alabama and, next to the Tennessee Valley Authority, the chief public power agency in the State. It is quite a big job to be president of the REA of Alabama, but Mr. McWilliams has shown himself robust enough to have held down the post for a good many years.

He thinks in a big and growing State like Alabama there is room enough for everybody and that there is definite need for the REA because it assures that every rural home in the State will ultimately be reached by electric wires and will have electricity available in this essential age regardless of the cost. If Uncle Sam is willing to assist by helping to insure service far back in the hinterland, Maury McWilliams thinks it is all the better for Alabama farmers to take advantage of the REA service, even if the wires have to be paid for out of the general taxpayer's money.

But this brings a clash between the Government and private industry because the investor-owned Alabama Power Co. insists it can provide all the current Alabama can use and it is therefore unfair for the private company to have a Government subsidized competitor at its doorstep. This, argues the Alabama Power Co. is not only unfair but is misuse of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. McWilliams is on the other side of the issue and has been for years, and expects to remain indefinitely as president of the Alabama Rural Electrification Authority, something like the Tennessee Valley Authority except on a more modest scale.

Mr. McWilliams sails on in victory, happy under either victory or defeat. He is that way by nature. It explains why he makes a good president for the REA, just as he makes himself a popular druggist and businessman in Prattville.

That he should be a persistent and consistent bachelor is puzzling to his friends because his amiable disposition makes him as popular with the ladies as with men.

Maury McWilliams has had a busy life in spite of the fact that he has interspersed with business a lot of fishing and hunting, and when he has the time he now likes going out to his cottage at the Bridge Creek Fishing Club.

He was born in the grand old-time community of Lowndesboro, a historic spot in Lowndes County, the date of his birth being November 18, 1890. His father was Graham Alexander McWilliams and his mother's full name was "L. M." McWilliams. Most of his life however, has been spent in Prattsville where he attended the public schools, then Starke's University School in Montgomery, topped off with a college course at Auburn University .

He is a Democrat and a Presbyterian. He is a member of SAE fraternity and is a Mason and Shriner, and member of the Kiwanis Club.

His business connections cover an extensive range in addition to his retail drug business. He is past president of the Alabama Pharmaceutical Association and of the Alabama State Board of Pharmacy. He is president of the Central Alabama Co-op of Prattville; president of the Alabama Electric Co-op of Andalusia; president of the

statewide Alabama Rural Electric Association; with headquarters on South Perry Street in Montgomery; and is a director of the National Rural Electric Association in Washington.

He is a veteran of World War I in which he served as first lieutenant of the 56th Infantry, 7th Division.

Hawaiian Statehood and the Democratic Idea

SPEECH

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii, spoke eloquently of our beautiful 50th State on the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill which gave statehood to Hawaii, and I am honored to be able to add my few words of celebration.

The commemoration of the fourth anniversary of the Hawaiian Statehood Act is the time to recognize Hawaii as a unique revelation of what American democracy means. In Hawaii, we see not only a realization of the democratic ideal that people of different religions can cooperate in self-government on the basis of deeply inculcated respect for the rights of the individual person. We see also that this democratic consensus makes it possible for people of quite different races to cooperate in representative self-government, and to live and work together in a remarkable unity of spirit. The success of Hawaiian-American democracy is a triumph of the democratic idea over causes of division which elsewhere have set man against man.

Hawaii comprises an unusual diversity of religions. Protestant congregations number over 400; there are 115 Catholic churches; and more than 100 Buddhist temples in the State. On Oahu, the most populous of the Hawaiian Islands, of persons 20 years and older, 39 percent are Protestant, 27.6 percent are Catholic, 15.8 percent are Buddhist, 2.7 percent are Mormon, and smaller percentages adhere to some other religion or to none. Despite religious diversity, Hawaiians are united in the democratic idea.

There is likewise a wide diversity of ethnic groups in the State. Of the 1960 population of 632,772, 31.96 percent are Caucasian, 32.15 percent are Japanese, 10.91 percent are Filipino, 6.04 percent are Chinese, and 18.94 percent are of some other racial origin. Certainly no other State in the Union is made up of people of such differing racial backgrounds, and yet her sister States could well view Hawaii as an example of interracial justice and good will. Indeed, the Hawaii Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its 1961 report on civil rights in education, housing, voting, public accommodations, transportation, the administration of justice, and Government employment stated that—

> The Hawaii Advisory Committee has had no requests of any kind for action or assistance in the field of civil rights; and * * * the committee knows of no instance in Hawaii which calls for enforcement of any laws on civil rights; and * * * the committee knows of no areas in the field of civil rights that require enactment of Federal or State laws insofar as Hawaii is concerned.

Hawaii serves not only as a model for her sister States, but also mirrors for all of the peoples of Asia crushed under the tyranny of communism the possibility of popular self-government based on interpersonal respect without regard to race and creed. Hawaii's fulfillment of this possibility proves the value of the democratic idea.

Greg Samuels Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the State finals of the Indiana High School Athletic Association's annual basketball tournament was played last Saturday, March 23, at Indianapolis, Ind.

Garfield High School, of Terre Haute, Ind., which is located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, was one of the final four participants in this statewide competition.

An outstanding member of this Garfield team coached by Mr. Willard Kehrt, is Greg Samuels, who was awarded the tournament's coveted Arthur L. Trester Award for mental attitude and scholarship following the final game at Butler University Fieldhouse.

The Trester Award is the highest athletic and scholarship honor that can be attained by an Indiana High School boy and Greg Samuels certainly deserved the honor.

In addition to being a star player for Coach Kehrt, leading his team into the finals with a great performance in the defeat of defending champion, Bosse of Evansville, Greg has compiled an outstanding scholastic record at Garfield.

Greg has been president of his class for 4 consecutive years and has maintained an "A–B" average throughout his high school career.

Greg's achievement in winning the Trester Award is a tribute not only to Greg himself, but his teachers and coaches at Garfield High School, his parents and the entire community of Terre Haute.

Fortunately, for the State of Indiana, Greg is planning to continue his education at either Indiana State College at Terre Haute, or Wabash College in Crawfordsville. Both of these excellent colleges are also located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, and Greg could make no finer choice of schools than Indiana State or Wabash.

I am pleased to bring news of Greg Samuels' achievement to the attention of this body. This talented and dedicated youth deserves national recognition for his record at Garfield High School and his personal triumph as Indiana's outstanding athlete-student for this season.

Alabama Remembers the Gallant Pelham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1963, citizens from throughout Alabama and from neighboring States, met at Alexandria, Ala. to commemorate the death of Maj. John Pelham, CSA, who was killed by Union fire on March 17, 1863.

I would like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Thomas F. Hill and appearing in the Birmingham (Ala.) News:

ALABAMA REMEMBERS THE GALLANT PELHAM

(By Thomas F. Hill)

ALEXANDRIA, March 18.—Hundreds of persons gathered at a rundown frame house alongside busy Highway 431, Sunday, to pay tribute to the memory of one of the South's most outstanding heroes.

They came for miles to commemorate the deeds of a handsome, dashing young man, stricken down in the prime of life, who was described by one of the South's greatest generals as "the gentlest man outside a fight and the fiercest man during a fight" that he had ever seen.

The occasion, sad, somber, yet proud, was the 100th anniversary of the death of Maj. John Pelham, known to history as "Gallant Pelham," a title given the dashing Alabamian by Gen. Robert E. Lee.

The ceremonies Sunday afternoon were held at the frame house built in 1900 around the four-room hand-hewn log house in which Pelham was born in 1838.

A nonprofit organization, the Pelham Memorial Foundation, has been organized for the purpose of preserving the birthplace of Gallant Pelham. The organization's plans include tearing down the newer part of the old house and restoring the hand-hewn four-room structure to the condition it was in when Pelham was born there.

Details of the career of Pelham were told by Alabama Lt. Gov. James B. Allen, main speaker for the occasion, who told how Jeb Stuart kissed the brow of the hero after he died and cut off a lock of his hair.

Allen told how strong men and women alike wept at the news of the death of Pelham, who seemed to have had a charmed life up until that time.

Pelham commanded General Stuart's famed horse artillery. He fought over 60 engagements and never lost a gun. He won praise at both Bull Runs, Antietam, and Fredericksburg.

He was mortally wounded during a Union cavalary raid at Kellys Ford, Va., on March 17, 1863.

Music for Sunday's ceremonies was by the Alexandria High School band. Plans for

the foundation were discussed by Paul J. Anderson, its president.

Representative H. R. Burnham was master of ceremonies. Dan Gray, chairman of the Calhoun County Commission welcomed visitors. Lieutenant Governor Allen was introduced by Representative Hugh Merrill.

Allen told of Gen. J. E. B. Stuart's grief at learning of Pelham's death, a grief which Allen said led him to report "the noble chivalry of the Gallant Pelham is no more."

Allen said southerners could still feel a great pride in the deeds of their heroes of this great war and the sacrifices they made in fighting for a cause in which they believed

"The Confederacy, fighting against overwhelming odds," said Allen, "won one great victory after another until it collapsed from sheer exhaustion and a lack of resources and manpower."

Allen said this record was a tribute to the great military leaders of the South.

"Perhaps it is well that the Gallant Pelham did not live to see the collapse of the South he loved, nor have to endure the bitterness of the days of Reconstruction," said Allen. "He loved the South; he loved Alabama, and the cause for which he was fighting."

Allen said people of this area had a wonderful heritage, something in which they could take great pride.

"We will always love, admire, and respect the cause for which John Pelham gave his life," Allen said.

Firing of an authentic Civil War fieldpiece by the Lumsden Battery of Mobile was a highlight of the ceremonies.

The drone of traffic down the smooth 20th-century highway contrasted with the mood of those attending the ceremonies in the front of the old McGehee home.

But as the deeds of Pelham were recounted by the speakers, those in the audience no longer heard 20th-century sounds, but were carried back to the days of the old South. They relived the story of a young handsome man who left West Point shortly before graduation to serve the South. They were reminded of how the 24-year-old leader heard the sound of enemy fighting and borrowed a horse to rush off to a date with death in a battle he hadn't even been ordered to fight.

Address by Clifford Langford, Publisher of the Bolivar Commercial, Cleveland, Miss., Before the Jackson (Miss.) Kiwanis Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, for 5 weeks beginning January 4, 1963, Clifford Langford, publisher of the Bolivar Commercial at Cleveland, Miss., was in Africa with a study mission of newspapermen who are members of the National Editorial Association. The National Editorial Association consists of approximately 6,000 newspaper members, mostly weekly and small dailies. Mr. Langford, whom I know personally, is a good friend of mine. He addressed the Jackson, Miss., Kiwanis Club recently—February 27, 1963. I believe his observations and opinions deserve our thoughtful consideration:

ADDRESS BY CLIFFORD LANGFORD BEFORE THE JACKSON (MISS.) KIWANIS CLUB

In January and February, I spent 5 weeks in Africa with a study mission of the National Editorial Association. With 55 editors and publishers from 27 States, I visited 12 African colonies, provinces, or countries. Most were newly independent, but one has been free for 3,000 years, and another for more than a century. The others were provinces or colonies of European nations.

During our trip, we interviewed presidents, prime ministers, cabinet ministers, African politicians who will soon head independent nations, and one emperor. In almost every country, we also talked with the American Ambassador and his staff. These interviews—and the traveling—did not make us experts on Africa, but it did give us an almost unprecedented opportunity to see Africa and to ask questions of people who are supposed to know the answers. However, expert or not, I received some definite impressions and some conclusions that I believe are supported by events in the world today.

One cannot participate in such a study mission without becoming genuinely apprehensive about the gigantic troubles that lie ahead for Africa—and for the United States as well. Because as European nations move out, America is moving in. There really isn't much choice. If we don't, the Russians will. What is worse, the United States appears to be helping force out the Europeans—which means the white man—from Africa.

Most of the major difficulties of Africa can be understood by talking about tropical west Africa, which extends from the southern edge of the Sahara Desert south through Portuguese Angola. This region includes the former Belgian Congo, a trouble spot that will be with us for a long time. It also contains a part of former French Africa, a part of old British West Africa, and Angola, the biggest African province of Portugal.

Sub-Sahara has at least four king-sized problems. Some areas lack resources, others lack money to develop what they do have, and all lack education. Finally, intense racial hatred complicates all three.

Our study mission visited Senegal first, and later the former French Congo, whose capital is Brazzaville. These are French areas, now divided into five independent nations, each with a vote in the United Nations. They pinpoint the first problem—a lack of resources. None of these countries is viable, or even has much chance of becoming self-supporting. Each one will be dependent on richer countries as long as they remain the size they are today. Right now, we big spenders in the United States are lucky. France is providing the money to keep them going, and to keep the Communists out.

Senegal is reasonably typical of the ex-French areas that we saw. Its capital is Dakar, a fine port on the Atlantic Ocean. Its large airport was the landing place for most of the bombers flown across the Atlantic from Brazil on the ferry route to Europe during World War II. Senegal has fewer than 2 million people; the country depends on peanuts, its principal product—and on France. When Senegal became independent in 1960, it remained in the French community of nations. France is rewarding this loyalty with some $50 million a year in foreign aid. This $50 million is considerably more than Senegal gets from peanuts. The United States contributes about $2½ million a year, apparently just to show our interest.

Senegal is a Republic, and its President is Leopold Senghor, a French-educated Negro who is regarded as pro-Western, even though he follows the typical African policy of neutralism. Also typical of politics in most of Africa, President Senghor heads a one-party state. Shortly before we arrived in Dakar, Senghor called out the army to arrest his Prime Minister, Mamadou Dia, who was opposing the economic policies of the President. Dia was in jail a block from the American Embassy while we were in Senegal, and is still there awaiting trial.

President Senghor also speaks of state socialism as the best economic policy for his country. This is understandable in places where there aren't enough resources to attract much private industry. Foreign aid becomes the only source of money for development.

Senegal, however, has a remote hope that oil will take it off relief. The American Ambassador told us an American company had arrived a few weeks earlier and was searching for commercial oil possibilities.

Senegal also has poverty typical of so much of Africa. A sizable percentage of Dakar is covered with 10 by 10 shacks for native families. These usually are built of scrap lumber with a patchwork tin roof held down by rocks. The shacks have no floors, and naturally no toilets. The aroma that arose from the acres and acres of these great slum areas was nauseating. Yet, out of these shacks came laughing, chatting women and children, dressed in brightly colored African gowns, and seemingly happy for the moment with their lot.

The other French area we visited a thousand miles to the south was more of the same, only with even fewer resources. Brazzaville now is the capital of the French Congo, but it was built by the French as the government center for French Equatorial Africa. This largely unproductive semi-desert region now is divided into independent nations of Cameron, Gabon, Chad, and the Brazzaville Congo. The American Embassy officials told us the French originally intended to form the Central African Republic out of the area, but the African politicians decided four votes in the United Nations were better than one. Even then, the French had to talk Gabon into accepting independence.

In these areas, the African natives run the country, but almost every department has a French deputy who really keeps things running. France makes up any budget deficits; therefore, the Africans are free to practice politics, at which they usually excel. Again, these French areas are pro-Western, although they usually vote with the Afro-Asian block in the United Nations. However, the Brazzaville Congo under President Diu, a tribal chief, split with the Afro-Asians on the Katanga trouble. Diu supported Tshombe, the President of Katanga. Our study mission was in Brazzaville and Leopoldville when the United Nations troops captured Katanga. President Diu saw Tshombe was losing, so he became very practical. He climbed on the ferry between the two capital cities, and crossed the Congo River into Leopoldville to make peace with the victors.

Over in Nigeria, a former British colony, the problem is different. Nigeria has natural resources, but she doesn't have the money to develop them. Neither does Nigeria have a France to foot the bill. She was British, and today Britain doesn't have the wealth to put much money into Africa. The Minister of Economic Development told us that he didn't know of 10 men in all Nigeria who could raise £100,000, the equivalent of U.S. $280,000. This situation leaves the financing up to the United States—or to the Russians. The United States is stepping in, and now there are more Americans in Nigeria than English. We are investing more Government money in Nigeria than any other place in Africa—except of course, the former Belgian Congo.

Between 1949 and 1962, we put $49 million into Nigeria, or at a rate of less than $4 million a year. In the next 6 years, however,

the United States is committed to a total of $226 million, or a rate 10 times as great.

Britain did not do much toward developing the Nigerian economy, but it did instill in the Nigerians a great desire for education. The political leaders of Nigeria are the most astute we saw anywhere in Africa. We interviewed four cabinet Ministers, and all were extremely well educated. Lagos has four uncensored daily newspapers, which are distributed throughout the country.

Today, Nigeria is tremendously enthusiastic and the enthusiasm rubs off on visitors. The people obviously expect great things of independence. They expect a better life. The children who come out of the mud huts to go to school will expect a better life than that enjoyed by their parents. Therein lies a great danger to Nigeria.

If the lagging industrial development doesn't keep pace with the millions of young Africans who will soon be completing primary school, there won't be enough jobs to go around. Even stable governments fall when the people are bitterly disappointed. The Nigerian Government will have an impossible burden if the promises of a better life are not fulfilled.

Most of the American newspapermen on the study mission liked the Nigerians. They appreciated their frankness, and their determination to build a solid, democratic government.

The most unpleasant aspect of Africa is racial hatred. This is the cancer that creates the notorious Afro-Asian block in the United Nations. Racial troubles are insignificant inside the French and Portuguese areas. But they form the basis for most of the hysteria against colonialism.

In some areas you sense a fanatical determination to drive out the white man. In Kenya, we interviewed Tom Mboya, a young Negro who probably will be the Prime Minister of Kenya when the British leave within a few years. Mboya was polite to us but he was reported 2 years ago in the U.S. News & World Report: "Then the Europeans want to know if they can stay in Kenya. I tell them, sure * * * but if they stay, they must get out of politics. We are going to have an all-black parliament and all-black government. We are going to divide the land among our people. If the Europeans want to stay, they can stay on as squatters. If they want to work, they can work for us."

This is not multiracial talk. It is not integration. It is racism in reverse.

It doesn't matter how many generations the whites have been in Africa. It is not changed by the fact that the whites have brought what civilization there is to Africa. It does not even consider that money and skills from white countries are essential to the future.

We ran into this intense feeling first in Liberia, which is little more than an American colony. Liberia was started back in 1848 by Americans who wanted to find a place for the American Negro slaves. In a way these American slaves were colonialists. They landed on the West Coast of Africa, and with American help subjugated the native tribesmen who hated them. Even today, the bush natives are second-class citizens to the descendants of these American Negroes who still run the country.

The President of Liberia is William V. S. Tubman, who was educated in American Protestant mission schools. He is a clever, practical politician who runs Liberia in the way some of the American politicians use to run our larger cities, such as Kansas City or New Jersey. Tubman has been President since 1944 and his opposition candidates usually wind up in jail.

One of my group asked Tubman in a press conference if apartheid in South Africa wasn't something like the antiwhite section of the Liberian Constitution, which prevents non-Negroes from being citizens or owning land. Tubman tried to explain that the Constitution mentioned only "of African descent." He implied that color did not matter so long as you were of African descent. Another editor then mentioned the fact that records of descent did not exist for many generations. If there were no records, the editor asked, how do you tell who is of African descent? "Then," answered President Tubman, "we look at the color of his skin."

Liberia, by the way, is woefully underdeveloped. The United States apparently has neglected it badly. No African nation can progress without aid from the outside. But Liberia doesn't get much help. Our aid program is small. Many times in its history Liberia has been on the verge of bankruptcy. In the last crisis the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., which is the biggest industry in Liberia, put up the money to make the country solvent. Monrovia is practically all miserable slum area.

The best composite of what can go wrong in Africa today is in the former Belgian Congo. As almost everyone knows, it is the tragedy of independence too soon, and the bitter fruits of race hatred. We were in Léopoldville the day after a mob ransacked the British Embassy, while the Congolese policemen were mysteriously absent. The British locked themselves in a vault, and didn't come out until United Nations police from Nigeria drove off the mob.

Leopoldville is a frightening city. On the surface, it looks modern and beautiful. But it is far from pleasant in Leopoldville. The natives are sullen, and most of them are hungry. The American Embassy advised us to stay out of taxicabs, not to go out alone in the daytime, and not to go out at all at night.

The Congo is a country that is flying backwards. All of the systems that keep an economy operating have broken down. There is practically no transportation, which accounts for the shortage of food in Leopoldville. Industry is at a standstill. Inflation has ruined the currency, and the Congo franc is worthless in any other place in the world. Public services such as electricity, health and sanitation are barely operating under the direction of United Nations technicians. The only place in the Congo where there was law, order, and business as usual was in Katanga. But the Africans couldn't stand for cooperation between natives and whites there. The Afro-Asian nations in the United Nations demanded that Tshombe be subdued. So with the help of the United States, Katanga was turned over to the rest of the Congo, to join in its misery.

The National Editors Association editors interviewed the chief of civilian operations for the Congo. He was S. Habid Ahmed, an Arab who didn't give political explanations. He was very frank, and very upset over what was happening to the Congo. He told us the United Nations had several thousand nonmilitary technicians trying to set the Congo on its feet. But he said that this number was far below the minimum needed. The U.N. budget of $20 million was woefully inadequate. Ahmed said it would take at least 5 to 10 years to train even a minimum staff of Congolese to do what the United Nations is doing today. The problem of training the Congolese is so complex, he said, that what little has been done so far is a miracle. He complained that the Congolese were interested only in politics. He said they hadn't even thought about running the country.

The Congo was made independent in July of 1960. The Belgians were under heavy pressure from the United Nations, including the United States, to get out. When independence came, the white Belgian officers were removed from the Congolese army. The native soldiers revolted and began killing whites and each other. The Belgians fled and with them went all hopes of avoiding chaos. During 1962 the United States poured more than $200 million into the Congo. Just last week, the State Department announced that the United States would increase its aid to the Congo. I suppose we have little choice. The United States helped force this condition and now we must face the consequences.

Yet, we seem to be seeking more trouble in Portuguese Angola, which borders the Congo to the west. The Portuguese have been in Angola for 500 years. They were there when Columbus discovered America. They came to stay, and many of the 300,000 Portuguese can look back on several generations of Angolan ancestors. They have built some truly beautiful cities, like Luanda, the capital, Nova Lisboa, Benguela, and Lobito which we were permitted to visit on our study mission.

We went to Luanda from Léopoldville. And it was like stepping into a different world. The city was beautiful. The people were friendly and courteous. The city was busy, and there was no feeling of the tensions that were so ominous in the Congo.

The Portuguese have been buildng a multiracial society in Angola. The schools, industries, and housing are integrated. In fact, Angola is probably the one hope for the white man to stay peacefully in Africa. But the Portuguese have received no thanks for this multiracial society—either from the colored races around the world, or from the United States.

On March 15, 1961, a group of Congolese terrorists infiltrated across the border from the former Belgian Congo. They gathered several thousand Bakongo tribesmen, who populate the northern parts of Angola and the Congo on both sides of the border. These invaders, led by a man named Holden Roberto, who received his financing from mysterious places, launched a terrorist assault on Portuguese whites and friendly natives in the northern corner of Angola. Many of the attackers were drunk or hopped up on African drugs. They held small pieces of white wood in their mouths, which the terrorist leaders said would protect them from the white man's bullets. In two days these terrorists murdered some 1,500 Portuguese and their friendly Negroes. They tortured and killed women and children alike, and chopped up the victims in one of the most horrible orgies in modern times.

The plan was to terrorize the Portuguese and force them to run as the Belgians had fled less than a year earlier in the Congo. The plan failed, because the Portuguese stood fast. They organized vigilantes and retaliated. The Portuguese had only a few thousand troops in Angola at the time, and most were colored. The Negro troops were Bailundus, who hated the Bakongos. With the help of the white troops quickly shipped from Portugal, the terrorists were driven back across the border. Today, Portugal has around 35,000 troops in Angola, and they told us in no uncertain terms that they were going to stay in Angola.

But the Portuguese believe that they have two great enemies in Africa today. The independent colored nations, and tragically, the United States. On the day of the slaughter of March 15, 1961, the United States voted against Portugal in the United Nations on the very question of independence for Angola. The Portuguese credit the Communists with planning the whole affair. Three more times that same year, the United States sided with the Russians on U.N. votes against Portugal on questions involving Angola. No wonder the Portuguese look with disapproval and apprehension at the United States.

However, my group was treated with every courtesy in both Angola and Portugal. Once in a while the distrust of the Portuguese for their American NATO allies would creep through. One night at a reception in Luanda, a pretty young Portuguese girl, wife of a local doctor, said to me: "Why don't you Americans let us live in peace?" I confess I couldn't answer.

The 329th Anniversary of the Founding of the State of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the 329th anniversary of the founding of the State of Maryland. Yesterday, at a Maryland Day service, held in Trinity Episcopal Church, Saint Marys City, Md., Louis L. Goldstein, comptroller of the State of Maryland, gave an illuminating speech, entitled "Our Glorious Maryland History." In his speech, Comptroller Goldstein gave a detailed account of the founding of Maryland.

An excerpt from his speech follows:

THE 329TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Then Lord Baltimore began to explore to the north in a light boat with oars and sails called an English shallop.

When the boat entered the wide mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, George Calvert exclaimed, "Never before have I seen such a beautiful body of water."

"It's 12 miles across, my Lord," his guide replied.

They sailed on. A fish jumped out of the water and flopped back. Far off came a cry of a loon. Green forests lined the banks of the bay, great hickory trees, oak, and cypress, tall enough to make a ship's mast, with blue sky above and blue-green water all around. "Beautiful, beautiful," Calvert said again and again. In his heart he knew he had found the place for his colony.

Late in the night, George Calvert talked with his wife. "I must go to England and speak with King Charles face to face. I cannot trust a letter to bear my news."

Lord Baltimore left his wife and children in Jamestown, under the protection of the Governor, and returned to England. He soon had an audience with the King, who thought that Calvert looked tired and thin, and who urged this dedicated man to give up further plans for a colony and to stay in England where he could take better care of his health.

Lord Baltimore would not be turned from his purpose. Again and again he begged the King to give him a grant for his colony. George found, however, that changing the mind of a king takes time. He became anxious to see his family, yet he could not leave England without the grant. He sent a letter to the Governor of Virginia, telling him that the ship *St. Claude* would arrive shortly to bring Lady Baltimore and the children home.

The *St. Claude* made the voyage to Virginia safely, but on return trip it was wrecked off the coast of England. There were no survivors. George Calvert, deeply shaken when the tragic news reached him, wrote to a friend, who had recently lost his own wife, calling himself a man of sorrows. "All things in the world pass away," he wrote, "wife, children, honor, wealth, friends, and what else is dear to flesh and blood. They are but lent us till God pleases to call them back again."

Lord Baltimore now renewed his efforts to get the grant for his colony. After a time His Majesty offered George land south of Jamestown Colony, but this was not what he wanted. The Chesapeake Bay region was so perfect that he would settle for nothing else. At last the King gave him what he wanted. The grant read:

"All lands lying north of Virginia, on both sides of the Chesapeake Bay, and including the whole peninsula of the eastern shore. On the western shore, the grant is to extend from the 40th degree north latitude, which is the southern boundary of New England, to the mouth of the Potomac River."

In return for his charter, Lord Baltimore was to pay to the King, "One-fifth part of any gold and silver mined in the colony." He was to swear allegiance to the Crown, and to pay an annual rent to the King at Windsor Castle of two Indian arrowheads on Whitsuntide. Charles I directed that there would be no taxing between England and America and that "the laws governing the colony would be agreeable to reason and to the laws of England."

Lord Baltimore wrote the charter for his new colony himself, leaving a blank space for its name.

King Charles read the document and said, "Let us give it a name in honor of the Queen, Henrietta Maria. What think you of Mary Land?"

"Mary Land," George repeated. "Methinks it hath a noble sound. Mary Land it shall be." Taking the charter from the hand of his King, he filled in the blank, writing bodly, for the first time, "Maryland."

George Calvert began at once to work on the plans for establishing the colony of Maryland. First, he must interest the right people all over England in this venture. With the help of a young Jesuit priest, Father White, he wrote a pamphlet describing his colony, which was to be founded on religious freedom, where there would not only be a good life, but also a prosperous one, for those bold enough to take the risk.

Each colonist was told to take two hats, two suits, three pairs of stockings, shoes, one ax, one saw, one shovel, nails, one grindstone, one spit, one gridiron, a pot, a kettle, a frying pan and seven ells of canvas for a bed and bolster to be filled with corn husks in Maryland.

Besides this long list a man needed, "a musket, 10 pounds of lead, bullets and gooseshot, 10 pounds of powder, also a sword, a belt, a bandolier and a flask."

Twice the sailing was postponed but at last on November 22, 1933, the *Ark* and the *Dove* were loaded and ready in the harbor at Cowes.

Then suddenly on the 15th of April, 1932, George Calvert, First Lord Baltimore, died, leaving his son Cecil, the title Baron of Baltimore, and the responsibility for founding the colony of Maryland. This was indeed a heavy responsibility for a young man of 27. He had been given the ownership of Maryland and the power to make laws, levy taxes, confer titles, build towns, make war and peace, and coin money.

Cecil proved that he was man enough for the job and after several months of preparation, 200 people were finally signed for the voyage. Among the 200 were 17 gentlemen adventurers, a number of skilled carpenters, wainwrights, shipbuilders, brickmakers, farmers, one man who could "clave, lath, and pale" and a few brave wives and indentured servants.

On board were barrels of dried fish, and a large quantity of other food needs including cheese and flour, tools and all the provisions the colonists needed to take care of themselves until the first crops were in.

Cecil's brother, Leonard Calvert, who was to be Governor, and Father White who was to be spiritual leader of the colony, stood at the rail of the *Ark* which was the master ship.

A gentle east wind filled the sails of both ships as they weighed anchor and cleared the harbor.

The tiny ships were to have a rough ocean crossing, stormy weather, and other problems occurring during the voyage.

However, they made it safely to the Barbados in the West Indies where much rejoicing, feasting, and singing took place.

After the ships were loaded with fresh water, seed corn, and potatoes, they sailed on, stopping briefly to visit a few other Caribbean islands, where they traded knives, belts, and other trinkets with the natives for bananas, pumpkins, and melons. Then they went on to Point Comfort, Va., to deliver a letter from the King and gifts to the Governor.

The Virginians gave them a cordial welcome, and the 9-day visit was a pleasant one.

When the colonists left Virginia, they took a guide and an interpreter with them by the name of Captain Fleet, who had learned the local Indian languages while working as a Virginia fur trader.

At long last, after sailing up the Chesapeake Bay, the ships nosed into a protected harbor and dropped anchor.

Then they waded ashore from a small rowboat to a small island which Father White named St. Clements, after one of his favorite saints.

Once on the island, they knelt in a prayer of thanksgiving and the long voyage was over at last.

On March 25, 1634, the colonists planted a tall cross which the men had made out of a tree trunk. Father White said solemn mass, and with great emotion Gov. Leonard Calvert took possession of the land in the name of King Charles I and Lord Baltimore.

At sunup the next morning, Leonard Calvert, Captain Fleet, and a crew set out in the *Dove* to make friends with the Indians.

Upon reaching the Indian village of Pascataway, they went out to befriend the Indian emperor known by the Indians as the Tayac.

The emperor told the colonists in the Algonquin language that they could "sit down wherever you please in my land."

The next day, the *Ark* and the *Dove* left Saint Clement's and sailed down the Potomac River and stopped at a beautiful harbor large enough for 300 ships to anchor.

The chief of the Yoacomicoes received them with dignity and listened to their requests. He was willing to sell them land, for it so happened that the Yoacomicoes were planning to move away to a safer place, out of the warpath of the Susquehannocks, their enemies to the north.

Governor Calvert gave the Indians axes, hoes, hatchets, and many yards of cloth in payment for the land.

"Here we will build the first Maryland town," said Father White, when the Governor returned with the good news. "Let us call this town St. Marys."

And everybody agreed.

Governor Calvert announced jubiliantly, "This calls for a celebration and a feast in honor of St. Marys."

After the feast, when everybody was full of good food and good will, the Indians offered to move from half of their homes in the village and let the colonists live in them until new houses could be built.

The colonists were grateful for shelter against the weather and the forest, full of wild animals. Then, on top of this generous gift, the Indians gave the white men their gardens, already planted with corn, for the Indians were farmers, not warriors.

Leonard Calvert said to Father White, "I wonder what my brother Cecil will say when he hears we have a roof over our heads and gardens already planted, on our first day in St. Mary's?"

"This is the finger of God. Some great good is meant toward this people," answered Father White.

The colonists following directions of Lord Baltimore, selected the place for their fort on a bluff at the mouth of Key Swamp. The site overlooked the town and could guard against approaches from both land and sea. Next, the leaders made plans for the town, giving to each settler the land due him.

Governor Calvert chose for himself 100 acres northwest of the fort on Mattaponi Path, the trail that led to another Indian village 9 miles away. He reserved a large tract of land close by for his old friends, the Brents, Mistress Margaret Brent, her sister, and two brothers still planned to come to Maryland, once the colony was well under way.

North of the Governor's holdings, land was set aside for Father White's chapel. Still further north, on the east side of Mattaponi Path, was to be St. Peter's Freehold, future home of Thomas Cornwallis, Esq. From the very beginning, Cornwallis was a leader in Maryland, second only to Leonard Calvert.

As soon as a storehouse was built within the acreage where the fort would be, the colonists raised two flags—of England and of the Calvert family.

Leonard Calvert was proud to write to his brother Lord Baltimore, telling him that St. Mary's, after a few months, was further advanced than Plymouth or Jamestown had been at the end of a year.

At the end of the letter, a long one, Governor Calvert described the fort:

"We have seated ourselves within a one-half mile of the river within a palisade of 120 yards square with four flanks. We have mounted one piece of ordnance and placed six murderers (cannons) in parts convenient, a fortification we think sufficient to defend against any such weak enemies as we have reason to expect here."

After the harvest had been gathered, Governor Calvert called together the freemen of the colony. When they were seated before him, bolt upright, with wide black hats on their heads, the Governor said, "Gentlemen, at this first Maryland Assembly of 1634, we are met to ratify the laws, proposed by Lord Baltimore, for the governing of Maryland."

Thomas Cornwallis, one of the commissioners, rose to his feet, removed his hat, and addressed the Governor: "I, for one, object to ratifying these laws. Freemen of Maryland should be allowed to make their own laws."

A heated argument followed, but at the time, by referring to section 7 of the Maryland Charter, the freemen won out in making the laws.

A short time later, a ship arrived from England bringing the wives and daughters of Maryland landowners. They brought a few luxuries: silver, linens, and even a spinet or two. Among the gentlewomen were Mistress Margaret Brent, her sister, Mary; and Giles and Fulke, her two brothers. As soon as Margaret Brent's foot touched shore, St. Mary's sat up and took notice, for she was a strong woman, with a mind of her own and a quick way of expressing it. The Brent, close friends of Leonard Calvert, settled just east of his home, at a place called Sisters Freehold, in honor of the Brent sisters.

Soon, everyone in town was giving a party. The women hung up their linsey-woolsey dresses of dark color, and donned the gowns brought for them on the ship from London.

They were of silk brocade and velvet, trimmed with spangled lace. For the first time the tinkling sound of the spinet and the sweet notes of the flute were heard in Maryland.

Whenever Governor Calvert stopped in at Sisters Freehold to talk with Giles Brent about local affairs and to catch up on news of England, Margaret Brent listened and spoke her convictions. She was interested to hear from Leonard that during the second assembly in 1638, Maryland freemen had won the right to make their own laws, subject to Lord Baltimore's veto. She nodded and smiled when Calvert read aloud from his brother's letter:

"Offenders in murders, felonies and like mischiefs are to suffer such pains or fines as they would have suffered in like kinds in England. However, in Maryland, fines are to be paid in tobacco."

"It seems to me," she said, "if a man sows, cultivates, reaps, and cures his own tobacco he will think twice before breaking the law and losing all his labor."

Leonard and Giles agreed with her, and they all felt that Cecil Calvert had been wise to give the men of Maryland the freedom to make their own laws.

In the archives of Maryland, we have all the records of all the laws from the very first session at St. Mary's City to the present 1963 session of the legislatures.

It was a sad day for the Maryland colony when Leonard Calvert became ill and died.

The Colonists mourned him sincerely as a friend and as a strong Governor. For 13 difficult years he had served Maryland well.

On his death bed, he named Thomas Greene Acting Governor and Margaret Brent executor of his estate.

For Mistress Brent this was only the beginning. Now, as Leonard Calvert's executor, she came to the assembly, where, to the astonishment of the freemen, she asked for the right to vote. A woman asking for a vote. What was the world of 1647 coming to? The men shook their heads, and Acting Governor Greene replied firmly with a loud, "No."

It was just a short time later, that Lord Baltimore decided that Thomas Greene was not the man to lead the affairs of Maryland as Governor, and after much careful thought, he wrote a letter to the assembly appointing William Stone, a Protestant, as Governor of Maryland.

He signed the document and stamped it with the great seal of Maryland. It was a handsome new silver seal with the Calvert arms and Crossland arms of his mother's family, topped by the crown of England.

Cecil picked it up and read aloud the Calvert family motto, written in Italian: "Fatti maschi parole femine" (many in deeds, womanly in words). Cecil wished he had a chance for deeds. He sighed. Would the day ever come when he could go to Maryland instead of talking about it? He turned the seal over. On the other side there was a knight in full armor, and on the rim was inscribed, "Cecil Calvert, absolute master of Maryland and Avalon, baron of Baltimore." Enough to make any man proud.

In 1649, the assembly passed the Toleration Act and Maryland became the only spot in the known world where a man might worship God without discrimination. Maryland made unforgettable history by granting its citizens, freedom of religion and worship.

When reviewing our heritage, we are apt to pass too lightly over this historic milestone without reflecting upon the courage and foresight of our early legislators in abolishing intolerance. What a wonderful heritage this created for us when we realize that in this, the 20th century, there are still men who cannot live as freemen, with freedom of speech or freedom of worship. We can well understand why Maryland earned for herself the name of "the Land of Sanctuary" and later became known as "the Free State."

From the beginning of the colony, we know that the practice and custom was of the most tolerant nature, even though there was no written law on record prior to 1649 regarding religious freedom.

A written document does not necessarily give liberty; nor does the absence of such a document prove the lack of liberty.

Religious toleration was immediately the unwritten law of the land in Maryland.

I would like to refer at this time to some pertinent material from the January 27, 1963, issue of Quote, the weekly digest.

"We are a people with many resources. But our best hope in dealing with all these complex problems and others bound to arise is by standing firmly for the beliefs, rights, and principles that have made us that strongest and wealthiest nation on the face of the earth. The opportunity of 1963 is to continue to make America the showplace of freedom, as a shining example of a system of free enterprise that rewards individual effort and spurs men and women to ever greater heights of achievement. History proves that if we succeed in doing this, we will preserve the strength and unity needed to overcome the many problems that confront us."

My friends, this morning I have given only a comprehensive view of an extensive subject which would take much more time to cover in full detail.

We can be justifiably proud of our wonderful heritage and have confidence in a bright and glorious future which is unlimited for those of us who have the courage, wisdom, and determination to challenge it.

My friends, the sincere feeling of patriotic pride that I have experienced this morning will linger in my mind for weeks to come. I want to thank you for allowing me the privilege of joining you for this wonderful Maryland Day service at Trinity Church.

Now until we meet again, may God bless you all real good.

President Kennedy's Chicago Speech—A Sound Warning to Both Democrats and Republicans About America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the people of Chicago had the great pleasure of entertaining President Kennedy, who flew there to dedicate O'Hare Field. Huge throngs greeted the President along the 22-mile route from O'Hare Field to the Conrad Hilton Hotel, where the President was honored at a civic luncheon arranged by Mayor Richard J. Daley.

The President took this occasion to sound a clear and decisive warning to the Congress of the United States and the people of this Nation that unless we start meeting the mounting problem of creating new employment opportunities for the millions of additional Americans coming into the labor force, this Nation could face very serious problems.

President Kennedy's prophetic Chicago speech, in my judgment, is one of the great pronouncements of this century. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the compelling facts marshaled by President Kennedy in his Chicago address should, above all, serve to unite the Democratic majority in the Congress from North and South

into a common cause. But just as decidedly, Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues can no longer ignore the grim consequences that face our Nation if they do not face up to the staggering problem and instead oppose administration measures merely for the sake of partisan objection.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that every Member of Congress in both Chambers will take the time to read President Kennedy's vitally important message delivered in Chicago and then unite behind this common cause—not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans.

The President's address follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CHICAGO SPEECH—A SOUND WARNING TO BOTH DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ABOUT AMERICA'S FUTURE

I am grateful for the warmth of your greeting. My gratitude to this city, and to your dynamic mayor, goes back many years; and I shall always welcome the opportunity to come once again to Chicago.

On each trip I see new signs of progress. Today we dedicated a great international airport. Already this city is becoming a great international seaport. And when I contemplate Chicago's role as a hub of American commerce—as a point of concentration for north, south, east and west—and as a point of convergence for rail, highway, air, and waterway travel—I am reminded that the decade in which we live seems to have been given a similar role in history. For in almost every sphere of activity, at home and abroad, countless rivers and streams which began long ago as tiny hidden springs are now all converging at once, in full floodtide, upon the turbulent sixties.

Today I want to talk about one tide that is causing us particular concern—the tide of manpower. That tide could be either favorable or ill fated. If this Nation can provide enough jobs to make the most of that flow, it will surely be a tremendous asset to our economic strength; and those nations which are short of manpower—such as most of those in Western Europe—will then envy America's good fortune.

But if this tide continues to flood our labor markets with pools of idle men, then, I must warn you, this Nation faces a decade of chronic trouble and recession—characterized by the economic waste and the human tragedy of unemployment, by higher welfare payments and weaker consumer markets, by recurrent problems of crime and delinquency and unstable labor relations. Already the issue of job security is placing an undue strain on collective bargaining—as those out of work demand negative solutions, such as import restrictions, featherbedding rules and a 35-hour week—and those still on the job grow less secure in the face of so much labor surplus.

That is why our No. 1 domestic concern is, and must be, jobs—jobs for the sixties, jobs for the tidal wave of men and women now flooding our labor market. It is a concern which requires the best efforts of us all—Federal, State, and local governments—management and labor leaders—builders of education and moulders of opinion.

Some may think it strange that the issue of jobs looms as large in the 1960's as it did in the 1930's, when the Nation was in depression. The difficulty then was an inordinately low supply of jobs to meet the manpower demand. The difficulty now is an inordinately high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made to strengthen our economy so that the supply of jobs will equal the demand.

I would like to review with you today three of the principal causes of this manpower tide now converging upon our Nation. For if we can better understand these causes, we can see more clearly that unemployment in the sixties cannot be reduced by the usual platitudes and pious hopes. The effects of all three of these tides, I might add, can be felt right here in Chicago.

FARM

1. First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has long been this Nation's largest employer—engaging more people than steel, automobiles, public utilities and the transportation industry combined. But now one farmer can meet the food and fiber needs of 25 Americans, compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. High speed farm machinery is much more widespread, and much more efficient and automatic. New fertilizers, insecticides and research are multiplying the yield per acre and worker. Since 1947, our farms have increased their output by more than 30 percent at the very same time that the number of man-hours worked on our farms was cut nearly in half.

Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million—an average of 200,000 a year, comparable to the entire work force of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work each year.

In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by 500,000 while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated—as disturbing as it sounds—that not more than 1 out of every 10 boys now living on the farm will find full-time work in agriculture.

YOUTH

2. This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower—our Nation's youth. The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through the elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16—but this year there will be 3.8 million reaching that age. Altogether, in the 1960's 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market—an increase of 40 percent over the fifties and a far greater number than this country has ever had to train and absorb in any previous 10-year-period.

Already workers under the age of 25, though they comprise less than one-fifth of the labor force, constitute more than one-third of the unemployed. Last year the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was roughly 4.4 percent—but for those age 20 to 24, it was 9 percent; and for those age 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent.

Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts—4 out of every 10—is still far too high; for job openings for the untrained and the unskilled are declining, in factories and mines, on farms and railroads, in the construction and service industries. Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among unskilled and semiskilled workers. In our modern society, even high school graduates find their skills too often insufficient. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school but in later years as well. The latest available survey also showed a rate of unemployment among college graduates, whose job opportunities are broadening continually, to be only one-fifth as high as it was among those who had not completed elementary school; but unfortunately, only 1 out of 10 finishes college.

In short, as challenging as it will be to provide first jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problems posed by the 7.5 million of them who will not have completed high school, including nearly 2.5 million who will not even have completed the eighth grade. I ask you to mark those figures well; for youth unemployment poses one of the most highly explosive social and economic problems now facing this country—and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade, when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's.

AUTOMATION

3. Finally, underlying all of these trends is a third phenomenon, both cursed and praised; and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of "automation." During the last 6 years, this Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent—but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers; and the gain in white-collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours. I do not wish to be misunderstood; increasing productivity and advancing technology are essential to our ability to compete and to progress—but we also have an obligation to create an additional 2 million jobs each year for those displaced by these gains.

This city is no stranger to these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to more than 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to produce the coal dug by 100 workers in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only a short decade ago. (Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also provides the exception to this pattern—since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.)

This is not a blue collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processors. I know, for example, that the Farmers Home Administration processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with its efforts for Government economy—but we must also expand the private economy to find jobs for all who are willing.

OTHER FACTORS

There are other trends affecting manpower in the 1960's, in addition to those I have mentioned:

Far more women are in the labor market than ever before, now that so many more of them live in urban areas, receive a better education, enjoy more lavorsaving devices at home and find more acceptance in industry.

There are more older workers than ever before, and those who lose their jobs must endure an average period of unemployment that is far above the national average.

Job discrimination against Negroes continues to hurt every age and occupational group, with even skilled Negro workers finding that their race keeps them out of work much longer and more often than their white counterparts.

And particular communities, called distressed areas—46 out of our 150 major labor market areas in February—continue to be extra hardhit by persistent and substantial unemployment.

CHICAGO

All these trends you have seen in this city and State—workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm

or the mines or a railroad or a distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though, under Mayor Daley's hard-driving, hard-working leadership, this city is creating new jobs faster than most.

THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years, but the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years, we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total output (gross national product) grew at a rate of only 3 percent—while unemployment remained continuously at 5 percent or above. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find fulltime work, was a staggering 1 billion workdays, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks. Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962. And 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer—15 percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer. This Nation can do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grows worse after each recession—and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of our manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth—unless we create a supply of jobs that is more equal to the demand—our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession.

Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential. Without stronger consumer demand, plant capacity is not fully in use. Without full plant utilization, profit margins are reduced. Without higher profits, investment lags behind. And so the sagging spiral continues.

OUR MANPOWER PROGRAM FOR THE SIXTIES

Our task is to reverse this spiral—and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems.

Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth to create more jobs. Ten billion dollars more in tax savings, in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging on it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay. No world crisis strains our resources. The dollar is strong and respected. New investment incentives have been enacted. World raw material prices are stable. And the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb more expansion.

But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to distressed areas. And tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we have offered.

To mention but a few:

We urgently need to improve our schools and colleges—to reduce the number of dropouts—to reduce the number of unskilled workers—to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a new youth employment opportunities program, to give young people training and job experience, and to put their energies to good use.

We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, for more security for the aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment.

These are all controversial measures. They all take time to enact and take effect. But meanwhile the growing pool of manpower continues to grow, a burden that should be a blessing, a liability that could be an asset.

I have no doubt that these problems will someday be solved. The question is, Will they be solved in ways that impoverish us—with restrictions on the workweek, or on efficiency, or on competition? Or will they be solved in ways that enrich us—by expanding our economy and putting all hands to work? The choice is up to us all—to you in Chicago as well as to those of us in Washington. It depends on the will of the people as well as the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago.

"Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at its helm. And my fervent hope is that the United States of America, in meeting the needs of this decade, will also be peopled and governed by men able to use their opportunities.

What Peace Corps Is Doing in Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am calling the attention of my colleagues to an article in the Nigerian press on the subject of Peace Corps volunteers in Nigeria.

The article from the Morning Post follows:

WHAT PEACE CORPS IS DOING IN NIGERIA

One little unfortunate incident seems to have given the American Peace Corps a bad name.

But for how long can you give a dog a bad name and hang it?

Not for as long as there are devoted young men and women, dedicated to a cause of service, and giving of their best to help a young nation.

I asked a woman official of the Western Nigeria Ministry of Education: "What do you think would have happened if the Peace Corps had not come to Nigeria?"

GOOD WORK

The lady, Mrs. Fola Ighodalo, said in reply: "Maybe we would have had to look elsewhere or we would have had to divert our energies toward an accelerated program of producing more and more qualified teachers."

But she admitted that this could possibly have slowed down progress in other fields of development.

And her opinion of what the Peace Corps is doing in Nigeria was very high.

Most schools, she said, had reported that the Peace Corps personnel were doing very well.

In fact, by and large, there have been more and more requests for Peace Corps volunteers than are readily available.

She also said that she found the Peace Corps personnel enthusiastic and ready to work hard, and they were setting a very good example.

That, coming from an education ministry official, is very authoritative.

But I can add to that—the sincerity with which the young men and women in the Peace Corps devote their energies to the assignment they have been given, is one which makes it difficult to call them foreigners in Nigeria.

The young men and women involved realize that the benefit which can be derived from this service is two-way.

First, they are fulfilling a much felt need during a transitional stage in the progress of Nigeria.

At the same time, they are gaining considerable experience which will help them in their future teaching career.

Not many top American officials will admit this—maybe because they are blinded by propaganda about what America is doing or not doing.

But the young men and women themselves admit this.

What fascinates me most however, is the way they adapt themselves to their surroundings, whether at the village or at the city level.

NIGHT CLASS

In fact, one girl astounded me by the way she reacted everytime the name of Ogbomosho was mentioned.

The girl just loves the place like home.

In fact, she took so much personal interest in the social progress of the town that she not only helped to organize a local library but got her father in the States to send thousands of books for the library.

Teaching is not the only job the Peace Corps boys and girls interest themselves in.

Their contribution to social development is terrific.

Some of them run night classes where they help illiterate folks to read and where they coach young boys at school in preparation for their school certificate examinations.

In Benin for instance, one of the Peace Corps boys is a boxing coach, leader of an agricultural club and teaches swimming.

The story is the same all over the country where Peace Corps boys and girls take part in community development projects, and spend between 25 to 30 hours every week in extramural activities.

How does a young American feel when he suddenly has to be separated from his family in order to be of service to a young country.

John Evans, 23, one of the recent arrivals in the country, had just left school when he volunteered for the Peace Corps.

He had never left his two brothers and two sisters before.

He had never been out of home.

But within the first week he was in Nigeria, he was already adapting himself and feeling, as he told me, "This is a place one would love to be in.

"I certainly don't miss my family."

DIGNITY IN LABOR

Pretty Mildred Gault was looking forward to taking her pupils out on hiking.

She said: "I love hiking so much and I hope there will be no objection to my sharing some wonderful time with some of the kids I would be teaching."

Some good that these boys and girls are doing to Nigeria is the way they demonstrate that there is dignity in labor.

Some of them hold honor degrees and yet they perform all sorts of manual labor in public and without any inhibitions whatsoever.

Here in Nigeria, most men with doctorate degrees will consider themselves above manual labor.

Not so with these young boys and girls and some tribute must be made to their silent efforts in remote areas, which never catch the glare of publicity.

I saw the last batch of Peace Corps volvolunteers arrive.

You would expect them to be a morose, homesick lot, herded together in the dormitories of the technical college and living under conditions that provide little or no comfort.

Volunteers among those who have stayed long in the country were busy in the kitchen preparing their food and doing all their scullery.

Among the cooks and stewards were doctors and senior lecturers.

So what? They went at it with a gaiety that would have befitted a carnival.

Something worth learning from, and I hope the Nigerians who are coming in contact with these Peace Corps volunteers are learning the lesson of their lives, and getting to appreciate more and more the dignity of labor.

One interesting diversion is the story told to me by one of the volunteers.

TRIBUTE

During his reorientation course which takes about 6 months in the States—he had been learning Hausa with a view to adapting himself to the north and be able to get along easily with the common people.

When he came to Nigeria, there was a sudden change of plan and he was posted to the west where he had to learn Yoruba.

Was he disappointed?

Someday, the story of the Peace Corps will be retold in all its fascinating detail.

It will be a story of great achievement by a band of spirited young men and women, who gave so much in the effort to build a young nation and to contribute to world peace.

Only, before that time, it is doubtful how many will appreciate the many sacrifices they made and the devotion with which they carried out their assignment without hope of reward.

Professor Horgan Analyzes Ombudsman Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my proposal to use the Scandinavian office of ombudsman in America as an agent of Congress ready to handle constituents' problems referred to him by Members has been subjected to thoughtful, searching analysis by Prof. Robert J. Horgan, chairman of the political science department of Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa.

My remarks are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084.

Professor Horgan's comments follow:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REUSS: Initially may I express my gratitude to you for the honor extended in your letter concerning the "ombudsman" concept for the American scene. If my thoughts have any value to you in seeking a solution to the problem posed I will indeed be amply rewarded.

Having read the enclosed insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to make clear that my remarks will apply only to the system as you have indicated in your letter and not to the system as it is employed in foreign lands.

Should a separate organization be set up to cope with the problem? In answering this question I would like to make the following observations:

(a) A person working daily in the various departments and agencies of the Government would be thoroughly familiar with methodologies extant.

(b) Knowing where to direct the inquiries he could act as a control officer to see that such inquiries did not bog down in redtape.

(c) If the redtape was insurmountable he would be in an excellent position to make recommendations to the interested Congressman or Senator who could then propose the necessary solutions.

(d) Since the field of interest of the various departments and agencies may of necessity dictate varied procedures, this would avoid the blanket procedure rule which may be intolerable in a specific situation, or may even add to the redtape.

(e) The matter of selectivity by the Member of Congress as to which cases he will turn over to this individual would be less onerous under this system. (See further comment on this below.)

(e) The major investigating power of Congress would not be diluted by being transferred to another agency.

(f) This would also serve the function of leaving to the Congress the area of substantive matters and involving them in procedural matters only when the situation reached the proper scope.

(g) This system would also keep in the hands of the elected representative the prime responsibility of interest in the people. This can be done by assuring that every decision would be reported to the Congressman concerned whether that decision comes through his office or goes directly from the department or agency to the constituent.

On the negative side of this question I would make the following observations:

(a) That at the present time the country is conscious of the increasing cost of Government.

(b) That the passing on of the problems of constitutents by the Congressman to a bureaucrat might have political repercussions at election when it might be charged by the opposition that the Congressman is not really interested in the problems of his district.

(c) That this system might be used as a device for dodging responsibility by the Congressman, and so interpreted by the people.

I hope the above thoughts are of some help to you as you seek a solution to a problem which concerns every elected official. As one of the latter I can indeed appreciate your problem.

Respectfully,

ROBERT J. HORGAN.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 23, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 23, 1963)

THE STRUGGLE—CAPITALISM VERSUS SOCIALISM

The real struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. The free world, and especially we in the United States have allowed the Communists to put us on the defensive and have made us afraid to say what we are fighting for. They have made capitalism a dirty word and we have let them get away with it. We cannot win the struggle for survival and the freedom of mankind until the people and Members of Congress have the courage to stand up and shout that we believe in capitalism, that the choice man must make is between capitalism and socialism. The victory between these two basic systems will decide whether or not man will be free, for only under capitalism can he be free; he can be only a slave under socialism. The time has come for us to stop being apologists for a system which has given mankind its greatest opportunity and freedom in the history of the world. We know, and it is time to say it out loud, that profits are good, not evil.

The people know what the world struggle is all about. Members of Congress know the real isue, but few have the courage to name the combatants in this world struggle. We see the failure to say what we are fighting for in the stalling tactics of the present session of Congress. Nearly 3 months of this session have gone by and little, if any legislation has been passed by Congress. Indeed, no measures are being reported from the committees. Why? Because practically all of the New Frontier sponsored legislation moves us farther along the road to socialism and Congress is stalling in an effort to save our free enterprise system—capitalism. The only way we can save it is to face the issue openly and squarely, call socialistic legislation socialistic and serve notice that we are out to save and strengthen the capitalistic system.

The first step is to proclaim fiscal responsibility. Cut Federal spending and balance the budget. To be positive in support of capitalism and freedom a Member of Congress, in my opinion, must say "no" to new welfare porgrams and increased Government spending. The budget can be cut. I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week an excerpt from the U.S. News & World Report in which ways were listed to chop $3 billion from the President's spending programs. I suggested ways to chop off an additional $10.5 billion as follows: No public works until the budget is balanced; get the Government out of the power business; liquidate public housing; cut out federally sponsored urban renewal; eliminate Federal participation in depressed areas; cut the farm programs 20 percent; cut foreign aid by $3 billion; cut military authorizations 5 percent, and research 12.5 percent; knock $1 billion off the space program. This is the beginning of the way back to a sound and healthy economy, protection of the value of our dollar, renewed confidence in our system with the increased spur to individual and private initiative which are the weapons to win the war for capitalism and freedom.

DANGER SIGNS IN OUR DEFENSE STRATEGY

There are many danger signs in the various statements by the State Department and in the disarmament programs advocated by the White House and our military leaders. Each item in itself seems harmless, but pulling all the factors together a pattern seems to develop and in it I recognize a potential threat to the sovereignty and freedom of the United States. First, there was the establishment of the Disarmament Agency in the last session of Congress. Many

Members of Congress voted for it because they believed it to be a valuable means of propaganda, but would mean nothing. I felt otherwise and voted against the disarmament resolution and said we should not give the world the impression that we were ready to disband our military forces so long as we were faced with a powerful enemy with a military machine dedicated to our destruction. Second, the now-famous State Department statement 7277, "Freedom From War," in which the suggestion is made that we turn our military forces over to the United Nations. Third, a new concept seems to be developing (U.S. News & World Report, March 25) to withdraw all our forces from Europe and Asia and create a Fortress America. It is this pattern that worries me and should worry the American people because we are not being told by the Kennedy administration of its plans—as a Member of Congress, I have to read about the development of a Fortress America in a magazine. Fortress America may be a sound concept, it seems to me, but let's talk it over. Members of Congress and the people should not be bypassed.

WHITHER THE UNITED NATIONS

If the American people are to lose their sovereignty to the U.N., what about a bill of particulars on the purposes of the U.N.? In recent research I am making there are further disturbing signs. The U.N. support of Communist slave states such as Cuba—the tendency of some of our representatives of the U.N. to swear greater allegiance to the international body than to the United States—the throwing the cloak of respectability around international gangsters such as Castro—the acceptance by the U.N. of international immorality in the conduct of government. Additional research has revealed to me direct conflicts between the U.N. Charter and the Constitution of the United States (examples: the charter delegates power to the Security Council to declare war. Under our Constitution only Congress can declare war for the United States. We saw this part of the charter in operation in the Korean war. The Security Council may regulate the kind and size of armaments for our national defense.

Since we have only one vote out of seven our sovereignty is in the hands of seven European and Asiatic nations whose interests are hostile to the United States, and our foreign policy would be in their hands. The charter destroys the Monroe Doctrine and scuttles the Pan American Union by subjecting them to the approval of European and Asiatic nations. We cannot continue to foster an international organization whose authority supercedes our own Constitution unless the people are told the whole truth about our relationship to the United Nations are given an opportunity to decide for themselves if they wish to trade our Constitution for the U.N. Charter. I am pointing out the danger points in this area so that the people may know about them for whatever action the people see fit to take.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN COSTA RICA?

There are no apparent results in the President's trip this week to Costa Rica. We provided no leadership except to squelch any action or desire toward action to eliminate communism from Cuba. Little militant action on the part of the leaders of Latin-American nations against Cuba was indicated. No commitments have been made by Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile to tighten up on air travel to Cuba. Frustration continues throughout South America. Out-and-out Communists, according to late news stories, do hold key posts in Brazil's Government. The leftists are due to cause trouble in Argentina in the June elections. Americans fear the Communists will score heavy gains in Chile's 1964 elections. Khrushchev continues to thumb his nose at the United States in his arrogant withdrawal of a handful of troops from Cuba and no guarantee that he intends to do more than that. The stage is now being set for the successful subversion by the Russian Communists of Latin America and South America. I raise these points now as a warning in the hope tragedy can be averted, much as I did my best to sound warnings in my newsletters and on the floor of the House for 22 months before Cuba was blown into a crisis by becoming the armed base for Khrushchev and communism in this hemisphere. Our foreign prestige continues to slide as the world sees us, under this administration, unable to lead the cause of freedom and unwilling to exercise domestic discipline required to bring about fiscal responsibility. In hearings before my Committee on Ways and Means I am now seeing the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American bankers, the NAM, all who have denounced deficit spending and an unbalanced budget now accepting them in order to get a tax cut. In the cause of freedom for all mankind, America must face up to the struggle—we must name the war as a war between capitalism and socialism and win the war for capitalism as only in such a victory can man truly be free.

The $12 Billion Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago Tribune of Monday, March 25, 1963, there appeared a very significant editorial. The title of the editorial was "The $12 Billion Question."

This editorial calls to the attention of the American people the issue raised by Minority Leader HALLECK of the fallacy in supporters of the administration extolling the planned $12 billion deficit without even considering how it is to be financed. The editorial follows:

THE $12 BILLION QUESTION

Not even the best cough sirup is likely to do any good if rubbed on the scalp or if injected into the nether regions with a hypodermic needle. It makes still less sense for supporters of the administration's $12 billion planned deficit to extoll its highly dubious virtues without even considering how it is to be financed.

Mr. HALLECK, the Republican floor leader of the House, has called attention to this glaring omission. There are two ways to finance a deficit, he said, and neither of them is at all promising in the present circumstances.

One is to borrow money from the banking system—a trick which was not contemplated by the Federal Reserve Act but which the Treasury learned during World War I. This almost inevitably means creating new money and is the familiar road to inflation.

The other is to borrow from private nonbank investors, corporate or individual. This is the way to avoid inflation, because when an investor pays $1,000 for a treasury bond, that amount of money is removed from circulation and thus offsets the added $1,000 spent by the Government. But this, as Mr. HALLECK noted, would defeat what we are told is the chief purpose of the tax cut; to pump more money into the economy.

Thus the choice is to invite inflation or to nullify the tax cut, and there is obvious disagreement even in Washington over which is the lesser evil. Mr. Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, says that borrowing from the banks won't be inflationary this time and that, besides, a little inflation isn't so bad, anyway.

Mr. Martin, Chairman of Federal Reserve Board, has urged that any deficit be met "by borrowing from the real savings of business and individuals, not by the creation of money through the banking system." And Mr. Martin's views will, to a considerable extent, influence bankers in their decision whether to help finance the deficit.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and his Under Secretary, Mr. Roosa, whose job is to manage the debt, apparently lean toward Mr. Martin's views. Last year, indeed, the Treasury was conspicuously successful in borrowing money from outside the banking system. In 1961 the publicly held debt increased by about $6½ billion, and almost all of it was lent by the banks. Last year a similar increase was taken up almost entirely by nonbank investors.

Thus Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Heller are on the bridge, steering the ship into perilous waters and calling for full speed ahead, while Mr. Martin, in the engineroom, is urging caution—with evident, though inaudible, support from Mr. Dillon. As long as the administration's deficit planners ignore or disagree on the important matter of how to finance the deficit, their recommendations are meaningless.

Four Years for Congressmen—House Joint Resolution 35

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 35 to provide that terms of office for Members of the House to be 4 years.

In that connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Bernard F. Hillenbrand, editor of the County Officer, the official publication of the National Association of County Officials. The editorial appeared in the October 1962 issue of that publication and reads as follows:

FOUR YEARS FOR CONGRESSMEN

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand)

The Constitution of the United States should be amended to allow a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives and their terms should be staggered so that one-half are elected each 2 years.

The Nation is quite properly devoting much thought and discussion to the problem of fair representation in the House but almost no attention has been directed to the vastly more important underrepresentation of all Americans occasioned by a 2-year term in that great body.

Consider the almost impossible burden we have placed upon the Representatives of the 87th Congress (and particularly for the 55 freshmen who came to Congress for the first time). The bulk of the work of the Congress is in the committees and logically previous congressional experience plays a large roll in selecting committee chairmen. But to develop seniority you must get reelected. Because this vote comes every 2 years a Representative must be campaigning constantly. He (or she) must keep one

"face" back in the district and Americans demand instant service from their Congressman. He must answer thousands of letters, telephone and wire requests for appointments to Federal jobs; booklets on the care of sick hogs, award of Federal contracts; construction of local projects; contributions to hundreds of worthy causes; and endless demands for time, effort, and money for political activities. He is allowed one trip home at Government expense.

All this is vital to survival but has little to do with the legislative work of Congress. With his Washington "face" our Congressman (in this session) must master the complex parliamentary maze of the House; consider over 13,000 bills; review and study 285 major items of foreign and domestic legislation submitted by the administration; study some of the longest and finest study reports and messages ever advanced at one time; meet with representatives of more than 1,600 associations nesting in Washington; and keep up with the work of his particular committee. Above all he must constantly vote on controversial foreign and domestic programs.

NACO would be the very first to rise to a vigorous defense of the House even under the present system. But all Americans would benefit if we would lengthen the term to 4 years and give a Congressman a fighting chance to spend more time on legislation and less time on too frequent election campaigns.

By electing one-half of the House (and of course one-third of the Senate) each 2 years we could preserve popular control as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. But equally important our Representatives would have a better chance to consider the complex legislative problems of the jet age.

Address by Hon. Mae Gurevich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 and 4, 1963, the womens' division of the New York Democratic State Committee held its 12th annual political conference at Albany, N.Y.

During the conference, the honorable Mae Gurevich, the hard-working vice chairman of the Democratic State Committee, delivered a speech pointing up the woman's role in politics. I was very impressed with what Mrs. Gurevich said and under unanimous consent, I include the text of her remarks, as follows:

REMARKS BY MAE GUREVICH, VICE CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE, AT THE 12TH ANNUAL POLITICAL CONFERENCE LUNCHEON, ALBANY, N.Y., MARCH 4, 1963

We have been gathered in a Democratic political conference these past 2 days because of the vision, courage, and action of two women who are with us in spirit only.

The first was Eleanor Roosevelt, who truly was the First Lady of this State and later the First Lady of this Nation. What more appropriate time to remind this assemblage that it was her interest, her imagination and progressive thinking which inspired the founding of this women's division of the Democratic State Committee during her revered husband, Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term of office as Governor of our Empire State.

Mr. Roosevelt was often quoted on many subjects, by many people, in many places but I should like to quote her interpretation of the meaning of women in politics. "Many women enter the political arena largely because they are interested in certain issues and soon discover that they cannot achieve their goals except through governmental channels. Little by little, they find that if they need a law to achieve something, they must know something about the legislative process, the power of committee chairmen, the reasons for party discipline and even the necessity at times to compromise in one area in order to accomplish something in another. This is practical politics and women who are usually working in the interests of the committee where it affects children, schools, health and necessities of all kinds, find that practical politics is very valuable."

This, I believe is the credo of our Democratic women in politics.

The second woman responsible for our being here today was the late Angela Parisi, an intelligent, hard working, and fearless chairman. Angela was also an astute politician—she read the signals clearly. She perceived that after 30 years of having the vote, women all over the Nation were stirring restlessly. American women were ready to be drawn into the political sphere. Just to vote was no longer adequate—now they wanted a voice in the city councils, in the State assemblies and yes, in the Halls of Congress, as well. Angela realized also that because our party, the Democratic Party, since its inception, aspires to legislation which will insure the sociological and political dignity of human beings, was winning the votes of women in ever-increasing numbers. However, this was not adequate either. They not only had to vote Democrat—they had to be Democrats—and they had to be Democrats 365 days a year. They could not accomplish their goals of better housing, aid to education, safer highways, fair minimum wage laws, stricter antidiscriminatory laws, unless and until they became a vital part of the whole. Therefore, they had to be inspired, oriented and organized so as to take their rightful place in the councils of their party.

Twelve years ago, Angela sounded the clarion call. She intrepidly launched the first statewide Democratic Women's Political Conference. We were few in numbers in those early years—the conference was only 1 day. But you need only to glance around the room to measure the ultimate success of this venture.

I believe that the success of the Democratic Party in this State, in the past decade, is directly linked with the growing, forceful and dynamic leadership of its women in every community, town, village and city throughout the State. I also believe that the success of our party within the last 10 years parallels the growth in numbers and intensified activities of our Democratic women in the State of New York. President Kennedy and other Democrats on every office level, achieved success in areas that had been safely Republican for a century or more.

Women spend thousands of hours folding, sealing, stamping campaign literature; they participate in car pools, run rummage and cake sales, they sell rhinestone donkeys to raise funds; they are election board inspectors, district captains; they are delegates to State and National conventions—political conventions are vitally concerned with the appeal of their candidates to women. But the fact of the matter is, that however proud we are, and rightly so, of our efforts and attainments we cannot yet say that the vision of Eleanor Roosevelt or of Angela Parisi is an accepted reality.

For ladies, you will agree wholeheartedly, I know, that the good gentlemen recognize us publicly only in September and, like a fast romance, forget us again in the second week of November. Any eloquent testimonials to the miracles performed by women in every phase of politics, particularly during campaigns, is quickly forgotten. As I very often say to my wonderful volunteers when we're slaving away in our office at the Commodore, "We women have the labor pains and the men hand out the cigars and accept the congratulations."

Only in theory are the American women the political equal of men. Of the 100 Members in the U.S. Senate, there are only 2 women; of the 435 Representatives in the House, only 11 are women. Of the 58 members in the New York State Senate, there aren't any women; of the 150 members in the New York State Assembly only 3 are women.

But we are patient and we are persevering * * * the battle for women's rights began way back in 1848. We will carry on tirelessly and purposefully until the abstract becomes real. We will continue to campaign for the Democratic Party and for the equality of Democratic women. We will continue to bask in the national limelight as the outstanding women's division in the Democratic Party and we will continue to make inroads all around the State. This year our local victories are our primary concern. For these victories are the foundation of the structure for President Kennedy's victory again in 1964. So despite the odds against which we have been moving for over 100 years, I say roll up your sleeves once more girls. For when President Kennedy says we must move forward, he means girls as well as the boys.

Let Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call the Members attention to a most worthwhile project being advanced by the citizens of one of the communities in my congressional district.

On July 4, the residents of Mount Morris, Ill., will commemorate the birth of our great nation with an old-fashioned patriotic celebration. The highlight of which will be ringing of every bell in the city at the same time. It is hoped that this resounding simultaneous peal will ring out loud and clear the theme of the celebration—Let Freedom Ring—thus vividly reminding the community of the reason why the holiday is celebrated.

Since the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia typifies the Nation's heritage of freedom, it has been suggested that the ringing of the Nation's freedom bell be carried coast to coast by the national communication media, immediately to be followed by the ringing of every available bell in every community across the country. At this time of grave national concern a return to the traditional theme of the Fourth of July—flying the flag and ringing the bells—is needed. Thus I strongly urge the Members to impress upon every American the importance of this project and the need for their participation in this nationwide symbolic rededication to the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. Charles Himes, Jr., chairman of the Mount Morris Family Festival Committee, as well as the many other Mount Morris citizens who are working diligently to make this affair a success are to be commended for this concerted attempt to refresh our memories as to the true meaning of the Fourth of July.

Emancipation for the Railroads in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's message to Congress last week devoted considerable attention to the problems besetting the American railroads, and as was to be expected, was received with great interest throughout the country.

The ills of American railroads have been discussed in considerable detail for many years. The general public is aware that railroads represent the "sick man" of our transportation field.

The Orland Park, Ill., Herald, an independent weekly newspaper chain, carried in its March 14 issue a concise editorial providing its interpretation of the President's transportation message, which I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

[From the Orland Park (Ill.) Herald, MAR. 14, 1963]

EMANCIPATION FOR THE RAILROADS IN SIGHT

We were glad to see President Kennedy suggest to Congress last week that some legislation is needed to cure some of the ills that now beset transportation media, particularly the railroads.

The railroads, which have played a key role in the development and prosperous progress of this Nation, have for a long time been victims of discriminatory legislation and regulation.

We do not own any railroad stock nor do we have any family members employed by the railroads. We just believed they have been treated unfairly and that they deserve a better fate than to go broke or become Government owned. Therefore, we are glad to see the President speak up in their behalf.

One of the proposed bills would eliminate Government-prescribed minimum fares for intercity passenger travel by rail, air or bus.

Railroads would also be exempt from minimum rate schedules now imposed on bulk items, farm and fishery products. Water carriers are exempt now from such rate fixing on bulk shipments; trucklines are exempt from such minimum rates on farm and fishery products. The present system, the President points out, discriminates against the railroads by exempting competing carriers from minimum rates.

Other legislation advocated by the President would make domestic trunk airlines ineligible for subsidies; make trucklines pay reparations to shippers charged illegally high rates; compel private shippers to comply with the safety regulations which now apply to truck and bus lines; repeal the law against railroads shipping commodities in which they have an interest. Relative to banning domestic trunk airlines from receiving, they don't get any now, it was explained.

Unless Congress acts, the President says, "We face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the Nation."

It was one thing to regulate the railroads when they had a monopoly in the transportation field but distinctly another now when they are facing stiff competition in freight handling from the trucklines, the airliners and the water carriers.

The airlines and the use of the private automobile have dealt the railroads a fearful blow when it comes to hauling passengers. There are many railroads now seeking ways to get out of the passenger business.

It is the fashion to speak slightingly of the railroads as a means of carrying passengers, and many now rate the roads as just a cut above the oxcart and horse and buggy for getting one about the country.

Doubtless the planes we know today will give place to flying machines that will make all current means of transportation obsolete but we are still a long way from that point and the railroads can still do a wonderful job for the public if given a chance.

We hope that Congress will heed the suggestions of the President and give the railroads such other relief as may be required to keep them in business.

We still need the railroads.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in these times of international and domestic crises we tend to become hardened and cynical to the hopes and aspirations of our own people and of all freedom-seeking people throughout the world. Too often we overlook the greatest monument to mankind's dedication to mankind: democratic freedom.

On February 13, 1963, in the Taylor, Tex., Daily Press there appeared an essay, "What America Means to Me," by Miss Anne Matthews of Taylor, Tex. This essay won first place in the "Voice of Democracy" contest sponsored by the VFW chapter of Taylor. I think it gropes at the very heart of those hopes, fears, dreams and aspirations, and as Congressman from the 10th District, I am proud to know that there still is a bright sense of democracy kindled in our young people, and I, therefore, commend it to the notice of the other Members.

The essay follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

I am the voice of freedom. I am a symbol of your country. Some of you answer me loudly with pride; others answer with shame for being patriotic; others turn a deaf ear to my call. My call is a message of reality; it beckons you to recognize the true meaning of freedom. Why don't you respond? Why don't you answer me? Answer me; answer me.

I hear you, sir. I hear you loud and clear. I see your plight and I'm on your side. True there is a barrier against freedom. In all parts of the world, and in our own country, people do not know the meaning of freedom.

There is a barrier of ignorance against freedom. Some of this ignorance is not brought on by the people themselves but by the leaders of their country. There is another barrier which is the cause of too much pride in trivial matters. This is the wall which separates the humble from the pompous. But the highest and most dangerous barrier is that of indifference. This wall exists in our own country.

These invisible walls are crumbling slowly but surely. As people begin to realize their God-given fortunes, they become humble with thankfulness. This is freedom in itself.

Freedom to me means many things. It is not merely expressed in words but in every action and emotion.

It is a feeling of humility, unexpressible joy, awe, and love when the National Anthem is played. Freedom is a firm, friendly handshake between two people, regardless of creed or color. Freedom is the honest oath of a citizen when taking an office.

Freedom can affect people without changing their lives. Freedom has the power to show itself; the humble bowing of a head when the flag is raised; the tremble of a voice when singing "God Bless America"; the clear firm words spoken when taking the Pledge of Allegiance. Freedom has the power to erase the wrinkles in a frown, to bring joyful tears to one's eyes, and to put words of thanks into empty hearts.

To me, freedom will outlast all wars, every crisis, all hopes and all fears. Freedom will always be calling. Some have answered and will take up the call. For those who have not, I hope for their sake, the call of freedom will never stop.

Abraham Lincoln, America's National Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for the RECORD excerpts of a fine talk given about Abraham Lincoln by Loren A. Matthews, of the social science department of Oxon Hill Senior High School, Oxon Hill, Md. Lincoln endures as an inspiration to scholars and citizens—to Americans and men around the world.

Under unanimous consent, I include the excerpts in the Appendix:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, AMERICA'S NATIONAL HERO

Many races, many people, across the centuries have cherished the memory of a national hero—a patron saint, a keeper of the national tradition. England had her King Arthur, France her Joan of Arc, Israel her Moses; but the 13 American Colonies, so recently freed from their mother country, missed the security of all those national traditions upon which a people must lean. This new Nation, so steeped in British history, British traditions and customs, could not consistently cling to the heritage of her ancestry. The United States had screamed its political defiance too strongly, had clamored too blatantly for complete freedom from England, and had adopted a policy of isolation with "no entangling alliances" as its cardinal doctrine.

The young Nation had no traditions of her own or a national hero whose life and service to the country embodied all the elements of Americanism. What was to become Americanism had not yet developed. Washington, Jefferson, and the Adamses, were too continental in their thinking and way of living. Many of these honored "forefathers," born to wealth and social position, clung to the rights of the privileged classes. Some even suggested that Washington set himself up as a king and establish his family as the royalty of America.

Nearly a century was to elapse before a man rose to prominence in this country who possessed all the elements of Americanism. That man was Abraham Lincoln. Biologically, Lincoln is dead and his body has gone "the way of all flesh," yet Lincoln is not dead. He will live as long as there is an America.

Lincoln was of pioneer blood, and as such he was not shackled by precedents or protocol. Ingenuity, resourcefulness and adaptability were his weapons for survival. Like all pioneer trail-blazers, he had to find a way or to make one. He hacked out a trail which was to lead him from his obscure frontier home to international fame and glory. He enshrined himself in the hearts of each succeeding generation of his fellow countrymen.

His memorial in the Nation's Capital is America's most inspiring shrine. Nearly 2 million Americans visit it every year. Visitors assume an attitude of reverential awe as they gaze at the statue of this great American. Many remove their hats in silent meditation as a tribute to him.

As one stands before his memorial and observe his giantlike size, one sees the bigness of the country he represents. His outstretched arms, resting on his marble chair, represent the expanse of the Nation he loved. His head, held erect and undaunted, symbolizes the honesty and pride of the people he served. The straightforward glance of his eyes denotes confidence in the future greatness and leadership of his country in the world family of nations. His countenance is not the sad, melancholy Lincoln of the war years, but a triumphant Lincoln who achieved victory, vindication, and veneration in death.

Every American, as he gazes on the likeness of our national hero, and reflects upon the history of his life, can see in this great man something of himself. Lincoln experienced all the frustrations of life which are common to man. He was of humble birth, endured poverty in his youth, was seemingly void of opportunities for a successful life, faced myriads of disappointments and defeats, was misunderstood and mistreated by many of his friends.

No words ever written can better epitomize the soul of Abraham Lincoln than his own: "With malice toward none, with charity for all."

The last shot fired in the Civil War occurred 5 days after Appomattox. It was aimed at the President of the United States. At 7:05 a.m. the next day he was dead. The people of the Nation accepted his passing as their own personal loss. The popular demands for a mighty funeral indicated that the people were inconsolable. It was known that the majority regarded him as the wisest political and best moral leader of their day, but there was no reason to foresee the depth and universality of the popular woe. Seven million sobbing, fainting Americans passed by his casket as it journeyed from city to city on its mournful return to Illinois. Fourteen days of morbid frenzy around the bier of the martyred President were enough to nominate him to America's Hall of Fame. The devotion of succeeding generations has assured his last "election" to the office of America's No. 1 citizen.

Henry Ward Beecher, Lincoln's critic in 1861 and 1862, sang a different tune in April 1865. "And now the martyr is moving in triumphal march, mightier than when alive. The Nation rises up at every stage of his coming. Cities and States are his pallbearers and the cannon speaks the hours with solemn procession. Four years ago, O Illinois! we took from thy midst, an untried man and from among the people. We return him to you a mighty conqueror. Not thine any more but the Nation's, not ours but the world's."

The Reverend Theodore Cuyler eulogized Lincoln in these words, "Did Lincoln die too soon?" he said. "For us and the world he did. It has been too common to speak of Mr. Lincoln as merely a good, honest man whom the accident of politics made conspicuous—a man who merely drifted on a current of events that he was powerless to control. Such will not be the verdict of posterity. The next generation will acknowledge that the man, who rose from a log cabin to the Presidential chair, has no superior in the American annals."

From the tongues of his eulogists, Lincoln had already begun to lose the very form of man. His human qualities had commenced to fade in the exaltation of him which was mounting in the hearts and souls of his fellow Americans. Even before this great man had reached his final resting place, he was securely ensconced in the hearts of the people as their national hero. As the figure of Uncle Sam with his highly colored habiliments and goatee is the symbol of America, Lincoln is the symbol of its people.

"Sleep on, O brave-hearted, O Wise man,
That kindled the flame—
To sleep in mankind is far more than to
Live in a name."

History Repeats?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "History Repeats?" by David Lawrence—U.S. News & World Report of April 1, 1963—is worthy of recognition by any student of the American dilemma today.

President Kennedy proposes solutions to problems and then threatens recessions if Congress and the people do not accept his judgment. Congress and the people, on the contrary, do not believe that Mr. Kennedy's suggestions are the answers and that to follow his suggestions, as for example, his tax recommendations, including tax reform, would be self-defeating and build forces that might do the very damage he is trying to alleviate.

Mr. Lawrence has pointed out that the recognition of problems does not mean that Government can magically solve the situation. He also correctly points out the indifference of the electorate. He stresses the need for self-restraint and that in order to protect purchasing power of the dollar, pressure groups in the forefront, labor unions, must stop demanding wages and hours not matched by productivity. Indeed Mr. Lawrence simply reminds us that for a nation of free people, we must be self-restrained and self-disciplined. Surely this applies in Government and I commend this article to my colleagues:

HISTORY REPEATS

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has raised the question of what can be learned about recessions by studying the past. In a speech on March 13, he said:

"Economic history—specifically the history of 1957 to 1960, which produced two recessions from which the economy never wholly recovered—clearly warns us now that the wrong answer to each of these three questions (national-debt limit, size of the budget, tax reduction) would spell downturn for the American economy as a whole.

"I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during those crucial years have been previously acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face us now. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past—but we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future."

Perhaps a little light can be shed on the basic issues unsolved during this period by rereading the following from an editorial which appeared on this page just 5 years ago—on February 28, 1958:

"The main reasons why there is an economic recession in America today are clear enough, but we are reluctant to take the steps to cure what's wrong.

"We place reliance, unfortunately, on the erroneous concept that, if the economic situation gets very bad, the Government somehow, by one magic device or another, can prime the pump or, by reducing taxes, can create purchasing power, and then supposedly recovery will promptly ensue.

"The people themselves, however, must bear much of the blame for the present recession. For it is largely the indifference of the electorate to the growth of group power, group monopoly, and organized greed which is responsible for our present plight.

"Self-restraint is the most difficult form of discipline to administer in a free economy. But the need for it was never greater than it is today.

"Thus we now are faced with the effects of an inflation spree. Labor unions have utilized their stranglehold on business in recent years to extort higher and higher wages under penalty of strikes that would be so costly as to make it impractical for employers to resist the unions' demands. The only alternative for the companies was to raise prices.

"Gradually the purchasing power of the dollar has been depreciated. The laborer gets higher wages numerically, but his dollar buys half of what it did before. As for the vast number of persons with fixed incomes—those living on pensions or retirement pay—they are suffering hardships. They have been cheated.

"Time was when labor unions recognized that every dollar given in wages must represent a given schedule of work performed. This has been called the productivity of labor. Hours may be shortened and wages may be increased but sound economics requires that there be a corresponding increase in the productivity of labor. This can come from the use of improved machinery or from more efficient methods. Technological progress is essential if wages are to be raised. More pay for less work spells bankruptcy.

"But today the theory is advanced that union labor has a right to a share in the profits of industry even before adequate sums are set aside to modernize plant and

equipment or to accumulate the surpluses needed to finance deficits when depression comes.

"Naturally the volume of business grows as the Nation expands, and profits are larger numerically. But the rate of return on the investment has not grown perceptibly in many industries. Due to the monopoly exercised by national unions, the bigger businesses, with their large surpluses available to buy better machinery, can produce at a lower cost and can actually afford to pay the higher wages which many of their competitors cannot pay. Labor-union strategy nevertheless forces the marginal competitors to pay the same high wage scale or go out of business altogether. This kind of squeeze is largely responsible for the recent wave of mergers. It's the principal reason why big business gets bigger and small business suffers.

"Prices as well as wages must be stabilized if we are to get out of the recession. They cannot be stabilized unless labor unions are willing to sign 2- or 3-year contracts without wage increases so that their workers may be given a chance to increase productivity.

"Government cannot help us out of the recession by artificial measures, such as the reduction of taxes in the low-income groups. Two or three more dollars a week in the pay envelope for everyone does not create the general prosperity that makes possible purchases of more automobiles. Nor can this bring the resumption of employment in the hard-hit industries which manufacture durable goods.

"The way out of the current recession is to persuade the organized groups in our economic system to give us an assurance of stability in wages and prices. Only an enlightened public opinion can achieve that result."

Busy Season in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys, Pa., Daily Press of February 26, 1963, entitled "Busy Season in Washington":

BUSY SEASON IN WASHINGTON

As the mills of this Congress grind slowly along in their traditional way, the people of the Nation give greater and greater attention to the plans and prospects that are in the works. And one thing can be said with considerable certainty—the cleavage between administration thinking and proposing, and congressional thinking and action, are, in some cases, very deep indeed.

Tax reduction, to be followed by major revisions in tax policy, are at the head of the President's agenda, so far as domestic affairs are concerned. But the chance of Mr. Kennedy's program being approved in its present state seem to be exactly nil. He asks for a $13.5 billion tax cut, to be accompanied by changes in the law which would offset $3.5 billion of that. The net result would be a cut of $10 billion, with most of the advantage going to taxpayers in the lower and middle income brackets. At the same time, in other messages and proposed bills sent to Congress, the request has been made for greatly increased spending on an assortment of projects. The administration program, whatever its merits or demerits, is to spend more and collect less. Some have figured that, if this program was adopted in its entirety, the deficit would reach an incredible figure during the coming fiscal year—$15 or $20 billion or even more. And the administration's argument to the effect that great deficits are not necessarily producers of inflation is viewed with very cold and dubious eyes in some high congressional circles.

Also, there is next to no chance that Congress will accomplish the massive job an overhaul of the tax system involves during this session. There is just too much difference of opinion as to what is needed. Some of the proposals made so far by the President are intensely controversial. What administration advisers may call tax loopholes, for instance, are, in the view of others, fair and necessary exceptions to the general rules.

Last year the administration threw about all the weight it could muster behind the medicare bill, for providing an extensive list of medical services to everyone drawing social security benefits. The effort failed—the mountain didn't even produce a mouse. But, as the President has made clear, the bill, in similar if not identical form, will be back again. And, again, its chance of enactment seems very dim. What is probable is something more to congressional liking—an expansion and improvement of the existing Kerr-Mills law, whereby Federal funds are available for the medical needs of those who clearly are unable to pay for them, whether or not they are within the social security system, with administration of the program established at the local level.

The future of foreign aid is also in doubt. Increasing numbers of Senators and Representatives, within both the parties, think that this must be cut back. And France's action on vetoing British admission to the Common Market may bring an agonizing reappraisal of our whole international position, the western defense alliance included.

Finally, we have not heard the last, by any means, of discussion of the extent of Communist infiltration into this hemisphere, and what we must do about it. Secretary of Defense McNamara's conference, of February 6, in which he dramatically denied that Soviet offensive weapons are now in Cuba, did not convince the skeptics. Other evidence indicates that he is possibly mistaken. A determined, probably bitter, effort will be made to determine the truth of the matter.

To say the obvious—it will be a busy season at the White House and on Capitol Hill.

Foreign Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the December 17, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report carried a splendid question and answer exclusive interview with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [OTTO E. PASSMAN] on the subject of foreign handouts.

Mr. PASSMAN knows more about our foreign aid program than anyone else, either in or out of Congress. For the fiscal year 1964 budget he proposes a 50-percent cut in the appropriation for foreign aid.

I commend this interview to all who wish to be informed on a program which is rapidly undermining our economy.

HARD LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

(NOTE.—Are Americans getting their money's worth out of the foreign-aid billions? Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign-aid Appropriations, has studied the U.S. program more thoroughly than any other one Member of Congress. Mr. PASSMAN has just returned from a world tour, taking a look at foreign aid in operation. What are his impressions now? In this exclusive interview, the Congressman tells of widespread waste and mishandling, and what he thinks should be done about it.)

Question. Mr. PASSMAN, after this latest checkup at firsthand, what is your impression of the foreign-aid program?

Answer. I'm completely disgusted with foreign aid. I can convince any reasonable man that we've substituted aid for trade, we've substituted appeasement for a firm and fair foreign policy. The people are taking advantage of us all around the world.

Question. In what way?

Answer. It is a waste of the wealth of the American taxpayer to pour foreign aid into nations that are enjoying a good standard of living and where they do not tax their own people on the same basis we tax ours—we who are giving the aid.

Let me give you an example:

I was in Bangkok, Thailand, having dinner with one of the wealthier merchants, and I asked the specific question: "If you should earn $100,000 net from your business, how much income tax would you pay?" He said: "I'd have to pay $12,000. It's robbery."

I said: "Do you realize that if an individual in the United States earns $100,000 net he must pay the Government $72,000?" He couldn't believe it.

Question. You spoke earlier of waste in foreign aid—

Answer. I mean money going in on a political basis rather than going in actually to help the masses. That's almost the pattern of aid throughout the world, with the exception of a few industrialized nations.

I find the masses in many countries just don't know anything about American aid. The aid is going to governments, not to the people. It's not accomplishing the objectives we wish for it.

The money isn't being used effectively. In almost any country you visit, you'll find a few powerful individuals who are anxious to get hold of cash—and it winds up in some bank in the United States or Switzerland. It doesn't do the country any good.

Question. Is there some way to straighten out these things?

Answer. We're trying to apply the Marshall plan formula that worked successfully in industrialized nations in Europe to primitive and underdeveloped nations around the world. Well, the fact is, you see, many of these people are perfectly happy with things as they are.

Question. Are there fields where aid can be beneficial in these primitive, underdeveloped areas?

Answer. The aid program, in my candid opinion, is uncontrolled and uncontrollable.

Question. What makes you say that?

Answer. A lot of the appointments are made on a political basis. Men are placed in charge of huge programs who have never met a payroll in their lives. They may be good, patriotic Americans—of course, they are—but they just don't know anything about what they're doing.

And many times the aided countries, themselves, don't do anything like their own share to help their people.

Question. Can you give us a concrete example?

Answer. Take Hong Kong. I recommended the full amount requested for the refugee program out there because of suffering caused by a typhoon. Well, when you speak of funds for refugees, that doesn't just mean food. It involves resettlement, sending the children to school, many other things. These take careful, knowledgeable planning.

Another thing. Hong Kong has some of the wealthiest merchants in the world. There are some 3,000 shops there and practically all of the money they take in is either in dollars or can be converted into dollars. Still, a man in Hong Kong who makes $100,000 pays only $3,000 in taxes.

So what we're doing is taxing ourselves into destruction to help people all over the world before we make sure that they are taxing their own people on the same basis as we tax the American people.

Question. Do you expect any major changes as a result of the appointment of David E. Bell to head foreign aid?

Answer. I do not. I don't think the Director has any more to do with running the aid program than I have to do with the doctors who run Walter Reed Hospital. He may make certain decisions as to levels of aid, but, in the end, it is an arm of foreign policy. We're handing out dollars from the top level. It's hard for any man who has been successful in life to take the punishment he has to take as Foreign Aid Director. We've had, if I'm not mistaken, 12 Directors in 14 years.

I think Mr. Bell is quite able. I think he should have the opportunity to do a thorough job and cut down on expenditures. If he does, I'll cooperate with him.

But if he's being put in there to find ways to to spend money, I'm going to fight him with all the ability I have.

Question. How much will the administration want next year?

Answer. I hope the request is for far less. Since I became chairman I have had a foreign-aid goal of $2.5 billion annually. We did work it down to where we appropriated $2.8 billion, but then the thing started up again. This year it was almost $4 billion.

Question. Will you still work for that $2.5 billion ceiling

Answer. I shall. Since coming back, I'm just as disgusted with foreign aid as I've ever been—maybe more so. We've gotten to the point where we try to let the American dollar do everything in the world. The world has got to help itself.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians constitute one of the less numerous and little known Slavic peoples on the East European borderland, east of Poland and west of Moscow. Their modern history is inextricably blended with and sadly overshadowed by Russian history, because for centuries they were subjected to ruthless Russian czarist regimes. But the Byelorussians, who have had a longer history as a nation than the Russians themselves, were never willing to forego and forget their distinct national identity. They always longed to regain their national independence. This supreme goal was attained in 1918.

On March 25 of that year, after Russia's detested czarist regime had collapsed and the new Communist regime in Russia was still weak, the Byelorussians proclaimed the establishment of the Byelorussian Republic. At the time it was hoped that these 10 million hard-working and liberty-seeking people, having become sovereign in their historic homeland, would be able to enjoy the fruits of freedom in peace. Unfortunate-their subsequent history took a disastrous turn. Early in 1921, long before the Byelorussians had the chance to consolidate their new government and put their own house in order, Soviet forces attacked and overran the country. Byelorussia as an independent and sovereign nation vanished from the international scene. For more than four decades since that time these sturdy and stouthearted Byelorussians have been living under the unrelenting and ruthless rule of their Communist overlords in Moscow. As much as any other people subdued by Russia's massive might, these unhappy subjects have been completed isolated from the free world, and today they are no better off as a nationality group than they were under the most ruthless of Russian czars. Even so, they have not given up their hope for their eventual freedom and independence. They all cherish that noble ideal, and on the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their deliverance from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

Crerar Library in Chicago: A Great Informational Storehouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune in its Sunday edition of March 24 carried the first in a series of articles about the Crerar Library in Chicago. The Tribune's Clay Gowran, one of the Nation's most respected writers, has performed a most impressive task in describing the Crerar Library as one of the world's greatest storehouses of scientific, technological, and medical information.

Mr. Gowran's article is particularly timely because it demonstrates the work that is now going on in Chicago to make that city the great scientific research center of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to my proposal incorporated in H.R. 1946, which would authorize the establishment of a national scientific data processing center in Chicago. There is no question that sooner or later this Nation will have to establish such a center from which will be made available to the scientists of America and the world speedy methods of retrieving the vast array of scientific research now being conducted throughout our own country and the world.

The Crerar Library, which will dedicate its new $2 million building on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology, certainly would complement and supplement the facilities which would be made available under the proposals of H.R. 1946.

I am most grateful to the Chicago Tribune for beginning this very interesting series about the Crerar Library at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, the first of Mr. Gowran's articles about this inspiring storehouse of scientific data located in Chicago follows:

CRERAR LIBRARY IN CHICAGO: A GREAT INFORMATIONAL STOREHOUSE

(By Clay Gowran)

One of the world's greatest storehouses of scientific, technological, and medical information is a new glass and steel building at 35 West 33d Street, on Chicago's South Side.

Here are a million books and pamphlets, readily available to the research expert, the engineer, the physician, the student, or just the interested citizen. The quarter ton of mail which arrives each day contains journals and publications from all over the country and the globe.

Translators labor at the exacting task of turning technical reports in 22 languages into concise, accurate English. Physicists, chemists, and other specialists are on duty, so that a visitor seeking, for instance, a résumé of some new technique in thoracic surgery or perhaps older information such as the initial employment of soyabean oil derivatives in paint manufacture is met with understanding and help, not a blank stare.

FREE TO TAXPAYER

And, in sharp contrast to so many agencies or services today, this whole operation costs the taxpayers nothing.

The building, opened last fall on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology, houses the 66-year-old John Crerar library, a privately financed institution which is open to the public, but which receives no public tax support.

Because most citizens do little reading in the complicated areas of knowledge in which it specializes, Crerar is only a name to many. But to the experts who need and use it, the library is exceedingly well known and virtually priceless.

One patron years ago called the Crerar library "a university without enrolled students; without a faculty, but with advisers and subject specialists; without convocations, degrees, or other academic characteristics." Today's patrons would agree.

SURVEY OF USERS

Herman H. Henkle, Crerar's librarian for 15 years and before that an officer of the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., described the users of Crerar.

"A detailed study, made about 3 years ago, disclosed that 50 percent of our patrons are students, most of them heading for specialties in science, technology of various sorts, and medicine," Henkle said. "But a very few are high school pupils.

"Of the other 50 percent, the largest proportion consists of industrial research personnel, generally seeking information not contained in the libraries in their own plants and laboratories," he continued. "Then, there are medical doctors—hundreds of physicians and surgeons use our facilities—and consulting chemists and engineers. Lawyers patronize us frequently in patent litigation or damage suits with scientific or medical overtones."

Ninety-eight percent of the time Crerar can fill any patron's need, which is a terrific bibliographical batting average.

KNOWLEDGE IN DEPTH

"Crerar's great strength lies in the fact that its collections are not narrowed to a few areas, but extend in depth to almost all fields of science and technology," said Henkle. "We have books and periodicals on the physical and biological sciences and their applications in all fields of engineering and agriculture. Supporting the book collections are current periodicals from everywhere containing the latest information in any given area. We receive more than 11,000 titles a year.

"The medical collection is one of the most comprehensive in the Nation," Henkle said. "It contains current periodicals, new medical books, and a rich store from the past. It covers, again in depth, related basic sciences such as anatomy, biochemistry, physiology, pharmacology, and pathology, and such medical specialties as cardiology, pediatrics, surgery, ophthalmology, and radiology.

"Further, we struggle to keep up with the explosive growth in scientific and technological literature in such fields as atomic energy, automation, exploration of outer space, and other areas on the expanding frontiers of knowledge."

ROOM FOR GROWTH

Crerar's new and vastly larger home on the I.I.T. campus, a $2 million building whose cost was shared equally by the library and its host institute, provides the room for expansion which should make Crerar even better. Its former home, in its own building at 86 East Randolph Street, lacked both efficient collection space and any parking facilities.

"We now have about 7 years of growth space for collections," said Henkle. "But, beyond that, we have ample ground area around us for building expansion, if needed."

Chicago has this unique institution because, back in 1886 when he was preparing his will, Industrialist John Crerar wanted to do something for the city in which he had make a fortune in the railroad equipment and supply business. He decided on a library and assigned a residue of $2,500,000 for its establishment and maintenance, but was wise enough not to bind his executors and trustees too tightly as to what kind of library it should be.

EXCLUDED QUESTIONABLE TOMES

He specified only that it must be free to the public, and added this simple injunction:

"I desire the books and periodicals selected with a view to create and sustain a healthy moral and Christian sentiment in the community, and that all nastiness and immorality be excluded. I do not mean by this that there shall not be anything but hymn books and sermons, but I mean that dirty French novels and all skeptical trash and works of questionable moral tone shall never be found in this library."

John Crerar died October 19, 1889, at 63 years of age. The men he had chosen to oversee his estate sought out Prof. Henry Crew of Northwestern University for suggestions on what type of library would be most worthwhile to a city which already possessed a growing municipal library and the rich Newberry library. And, fortunately they followed Crew's advice, which was concentration on the sciences.

In a letter, Crew closed with these words: "No other body of men have, within their own hands, so much power to make Chicago, as through the next 30 years, a veritable scientific center as these gentlemen to whom Mr. Crerar has entrusted this foundation."

The Navy Comes Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans, young men and women, are serving in the defense efforts of our Nation in the free world at various outposts throughout the globe.

Their various assignments are all vital to the continued preservation of the freedoms and liberties of all of us.

It is highly gratifying to see efforts of community service being made by these service people. Recently in my home area, the personnel of the U.S.S. *Hancock* generously gave blood to a fellow citizen who was greatly in need of assistance.

Those who gave sought no recognition for their efforts and, in fact, were out at sea before any public knowledge was known of their heroic deed. I think this is a great tribute to the U.S. Navy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the account from the San Leandro, Calif., Morning News of the Navy coming through and, also, the efforts of a good civic leader, namely, Mario Polvorosa, in bringing this matter to the Navy's attention.

The article follows:

THE NAVY COMES THROUGH

(By Harre Demoro)

When someone needs a friend, or several friends, "the Wheel" is the man to ask.

Even though "the Wheel" is still recovering from surgery, he is willing to help a friend.

When William P. Marks, also recovering from an operation and doing very well, needed 60 pints of blood, it was "the Wheel," Mario Polvorosa, who knew the right people and got things rolling.

Polvorosa, also known as "the Mayor of East 14th Street," is home and well on his way back to recovery and getting his famous shoeshine stand back in business. He has also not lost his sense of humor.

It's all in knowing the right people and "the Wheel" knows plenty of the right ones.

Mrs. Marks met Polvorosa when she was visiting her husband in Doctors Hospital. "The Wheel" was in a room down the hall from her husband.

When her husband's operation required an immense amount of blood she contacted "the Wheel," by then recovering at his home. He offered to do what he could.

"I contacted my nephew who is in the Navy and a crewman on the Carrier U.S.S. *Hancock*," Polvorosa explained. "My nephew, Kenneth Golforth, contacted his commanding officer. They got the ball rolling."

Mrs. Marks said she needed 47 pints of blood for her ailing husband. Friends and relatives had already donated 13 pints.

So the men and officers of the giant carrier rolled up their sleeves and donated not only the blood needed for Marks, but another 90 pints which were given to the Erwin Memorial Blood Bank.

Marks is a leaderman at Todd Shipyards. He now lives in Hayward at 19247 Medford Court, but grew up on Williams Street in San Leandro, Polvorosa said.

Wednesday the *Hancock* sailed for Pearl Harbor from her home base in Alameda.

On the blood donation form it says: "From the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Hancock*."

There are 250 officers and 2,600 men on the *Hancock*. Polvorosa is the man to see when one needs friends—and no matter how many friends one needs—he has them.

And Mrs. Marks asked The Morning News to convey her deep appreciation and thanks to men of the *Hancock*.

Her husband came home from UC Hospital last week.

He's on the road to recovery.

The *Hancock* meanwhile is somewhere between Alameda and Pearl Harbor. The day after the blood donation was made, it weighed anchor.

The Test Ban Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the March 18, 1963, Washington Report of the American Security Council, entitled "The Test Ban Trap":

THE TEST BAN TRAP

By 1958, the long Communist propaganda campaign to arouse world hysteria over nuclear fallout had succeeded even beyond expectations. Perhaps that is why the United States, during that year, plunged into the Geneva nuclear test ban treaty negotiations without resolving the basic issue of whether any such treaty is in the fundamental U.S. national interest.

There have been attempts since then to resolve this basic question concurrently with a second vital one, namely, whether various proposed treaty terms under negotiation are safe. This has only served to confuse and obscure the answers to both.

The answers cannot be found in well-intentioned hopes for a less dangerous, more peaceful world; they must come from a realistic, hardheaded evaluation of today's risky facts of international life, among which are these:

1. The prime objective of the United States—survival of the Nation and its free world allies—is in direct conflict with communism's unalterable objective—world domination.

2. To deter Communist leaders from choosing nuclear war to quickly gain their objective, U.S. national policy is to maintain a superior nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation.

3. Risk-reducing international agreements are made difficult by communism's consistent

record of treaty breaking, which caused former President Eisenhower to warn, "We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party, except where such a treaty provides within itself for self-enforcing mechanisms."

IS A TEST-BAN TREATY IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES?

Any consideration of this question must assume that an enforceable treaty can be negotiated with the Soviet Union, that is, one under which significant nuclear testing by the U.S.S.R. and the United States would be equally inhibited.

Test-ban adherents contend such a treaty would bring about a net reduction of the risks faced by the United States and its free world partners. Prudence, however, requires that this assertion be examined in the light of whether an actual net reduction in risks would occur, or whether new and different risks might be created which would leave matters worse off than before.

On this score, the reader will be left to his own evaluation of the arguments for and against a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments—the air, underground, underwater, and outer space. Here are the arguments most commonly heard:

Pro. A treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons by limiting research to the laboratories, unassisted by the important element of practical experimentation.

Con. The Soviets can keep top-quality scientists working under these conditions; a free society cannot. Thus a shift of nuclear weapons superiority would be inevitable. What happens then?

Pro. A treaty will slow down proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries—holding down the chances of accidental war and the number of parties to be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached.

Con. It is dangerously naive to believe one nation can "handle" another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons—France, for example. Attempts by the United States to "handle" European allies will strain NATO to the breaking point.

Pro. A treaty will help to open up the closed Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent for working out other and more comprehensive arms control agreements.

Con. It is idle to think a very small number of inspections in the U.S.S.R would have significant impact on the structure and attitudes of a Communist society.

Pro. A treaty will eliminate whatever danger exists from fallout from U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons testing in the air.

Con. Only a simple atmospheric treaty is needed for this. Until the U.S.S.R. agrees, fallout from tests is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

Pro. A treaty will promote international good feeling and will spur arms control and disarmament.

Con. Artificially manufactured good will would generate euphoric pressures for schemes in fact disarming the West and only in theory disarming the Communists.

ARE TEST BAN TREATY PROVISIONS UNDER PRESENT CONSIDERATION SAFE?

Whether or not a study of the pros and cons leads to a conclusion that a test ban treaty is undesirable, the U.S. Government is in the process of negotiating one. Thus it becomes pertinent to inquire: Will provisions the United States now wants to put into the treaty stop the U.S.S.R. from conducting significant nuclear tests and clandestinely capturing nuclear weapons superiority?

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is writing a new draft treaty for submission at Geneva this spring. During recent hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the draft's "enforcement" provisions were outlined as:

1. Cheat detection machinery capable with fair reliability of spotting underground tests of 3 kilotons or larger in geologic formations of alluvium;

2. Seven "on-site" inspections annually on Soviet soil of "suspicious" events which can be detected; and,

3. Relatively unreliable machinery to detect cheating in space.

We need not examine here the possibilities of cheating in space or at yields above 3 kilotons. This is simply because the draft contains at least three other bigger and more attractive holes through which the Soviets could sneak forward secretly to surprise nuclear superiority and its equivalent: world domination.

HOLE 1: UNDERGROUND TESTS BELOW 3 KILOTONS

A parade of witnesses told the Joint Committee that tests underground—singly or in series—below 3-kiloton yield simply cannot be detected at all. In this testing range the United States would forego wholly any and all weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply trust to the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests and secretly develop nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

These are the significant weapons which Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's director of military applications, told the Joint Committee could be clandestinely tested and developed in this undetectable area:

1. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

2. Much high-yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from explosions as small as 1 kiloton without the necessity for proof testing.

3. At least one-half of all strategic weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military—also without the need for proof testing.

As an indication of where weapons development interest lies, General Betts stated that about 50 percent of all actual U.S. underground testing in Nevada is carried out in this low, undetectable, below 3-kiloton range.

HOLE 2: DECOUPLED UNDERGROUND TESTS

The simplest expedient of conducting tests in underground cavities drastically muffles their seismic effect. Shock waves from the explosion are decoupled from the surrounding earth. In this manner, seismic signals of 10 kilotons to 30 kilotons can be reduced far below the 3-kiloton threshhold of nondetectability.

General Betts authoritatively told the Joint Committee that by this means a cheater, without any possibility of detection, could develop a substantial fraction of all large yield strategic weapons of military interest. The remaining one-half of tactical weapons not sneaked through hole No. 1 could, of course, be sneaked through this hole.

HOLE NO. 3: SURPRISE ABROGATION

Surprise abrogation is possibly the most serious of all holes in the new test ban treaty draft. Even Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster admits surprise abrogation might put us "as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test." He minimizes its effect by saying:

"The Government will make it a matter of national policy to maintain readiness to test, and to provide funds necessary to keep competent scientific talent available. Under these circumstances, our scientists should retain incentives to continue nuclear weapons research and our weapons laboratories should function effectively."

This, however, is wishful thinking. The best answer to it comes from President Kennedy himself. On March 2, 1962, in announcing test resumption at that time, he said:

"But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other Nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

In summary, there is no rational ground to argue that the test ban treaty draft soon to be offered by the United States is safe—there is more ground to argue that it is not even sane.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.

Where Does School Prayer Decision Take Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a topic of great concern last year was the effect of the so-called school prayer decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. It brought heated comments from legislators, members of the legal profession, newspapers, and the public generally. My own mail was extremely heavy for several months, and it included a mixed reaction.

One of the most thoughtful comments is one made recently by Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard University Law School, in a lecture at the University of Utah. Passages extracted from it were reprinted as follows by the Washington Sunday Star on March 3.

Dean Griswold points out that minorities, like majorities, have the responsibility to be tolerant. Due to the significance of this decision on constitutional history, I am including extracts from Dean Griswold's address below.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Mar. 3, 1963]

THE SCHOOL PRAYER SYSTEM: WHERE IS IT TAKING US?

Absolutes are likely to be phantoms, eluding our grasp. Even if we think we have embraced them, they are likely to be misleading. If we start from absolute premises, we may find that we only oversimplify our problems and thus reach unsound results. It may well be that absolutes are the greatest hindrance to sound and useful thought—in law, as in other fields of human knowledge. I would like to suggest that the Supreme Court has, in recent years, been engaged in certain types of cases, in a species of absolutism in its reasoning, which is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light. It is, I think, a thoroughly unsatisfactory form of judging.

The most extreme form of the absolutist position has been taken by Mr. Justice Black, particularly in certain extrajudicial pronouncements. Thus, in his James Madison lecture at New York University, he said: "It is my belief that there are 'absolutes' in our Bill of Rights, and that they were put there

on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be 'absolutes.' "

And he reiterated this, and extended it in a publicized interview in which he dealt specifically with the first amendment, which you will recall, reads in the following terms:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedoom of speech or of the press;. or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Justice Black lays great stress on the words "no law" in the opening phrase which says: "Congress shall make no law." Just to make it clear that he would not be misunderstood, he went on to say that laws about libel and slander are invalid. And he added: "I have an idea there are some absolutes. I do not think I am far in that respect from the Holy Scriptures."

THE NEW YORK CASE

Within the last year, a case came before the Supreme Court which directly involved the interpretation and application of the first amendment. This was the New York school prayer case. Its name is *Engel* v. *Vitale*. It involved a prayer formulated by the State board of regents in New York, and recommended by them for use in the schools of that State. The prayer, in its entirety, was as follows:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence up Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The Court, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Black, held that the reciting of this prayer in the public schools of New York violated the Constitution. It was, the Court held, an "establishment of religion," forbidden by the first amendment. Five of his colleagues joined with him. Mr. Justice Stewart, dissented. Justice Douglas wrote a concurring opinion which, though differed some in his reasoning, showed the absolutist approach. He recounted all of the ways in which governmental bodies now finance some activity with a religious element or overtone: "Chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services;" "compulsory chapel at the service academies, and religious services * * * in Federal hospitals and prisons;" "religious proclamations" by the President; " 'In God We Trust' " on our money; "Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia;" and many other things, including exemption from "the Federal income tax" and "postal privileges" for "religious organization" A of this is bad, according to Justice Douglas. After recognizing that "Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with" such thing, he said, summarily, and absolutely: "Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." It's as simple as that. They are all bad. And perhaps they are if the absolutist approach to such matters can be accepted as sound. These are the lengths to which absolutism takes us.

LOOK AT THE WORDING

But is it all as clear as this? Do words convey such positive and overpowering meaning? Is there no room whatever for thought or consideration? Perhaps it would be worth while just to look carefully at the words of the first amendment, in all its majesty. I will not yield to any Justice of the Supreme Court in my respect for those words, or, in my conception of their importance not merely in our history but in their present function and worth in helping us to preserve a free nation. But what do they say? "Congress shall make no law."

Congress had made no law in the Engel case; no law of Congress was in any way involved.

What is it that Congress can make no law about? It is "an establishment of religion." What does that term mean? That takes some construing, too. Certainly there was much history behind the phrase. Not only did England (and Scotland) have an established church, but there were established churches in a number of the States at the time the first amendment was adopted. And they were something very different from a regents' recommended prayer. It takes a measure of construction to bring this prayer within the no-establishment clause. "No law" may well mean no law.

But "establishment of religion" might mean establishment of religion; and those who wrote the "establishment of religion" clause might be rather perplexed by the use which has been made of it in 1962. "No law" means no law. It is as simple as that—that is, if one ignores the other words which are involved in the task, such as "Congress," "establishment of religion," "the free exercise thereof," and "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." I do not say that these are meaningless words. I do suggest they are words which require construction, which are by no means absolute in form or content, and that to ignore them under the guise of the absolutist approach is to fail to recognize and perform the most significant and fundamental part of the task of judging.

UNFORTUNATE MOVE

Let me now turn to another aspect of the matter. I think it was unfortunate that the question involved in the Engel case was ever thought of as a matter for judicial decision, that it was unfortunate that the court decided the case, one way or the other, and that this unhappy situation resulted solely from the absolutist position which the court has taken.

What do I mean by this? I have in mind at least two separate lines of thought. One is the fact that we have a tradition, a spiritual and cultural tradition, of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution itself, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect. The other is that there are some matters which are essentially local in nature, important matters, but nonetheless matters to be worked out by the people themselves in their own communities, when no basic rights of others are impaired.

First, as to the long tradition. Is it not clear as a matter of historical fact that this was a Christian nation? Are the Mayflower compact, Ann Hutchison, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian nation, having developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought. Nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion.

PROVISIONS OF SWEEP

It is perfectly true that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These are great provisions, of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces, chapels in prisons, "In God We Trust" on our money, to mention only a few. Must all of these things be rigorously extirpated in order to satisfy a constitutional absolutism?

Does our deep-seated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the founders that it would. It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history. I do not believe that the contentions now made would occur to any man who could free himself from an absolute approach to the problem.

MATTERS FOR COMMUNITIES

Now let me turn to the other point—that there are some matters which should be settled on the local level, in each community, and should not become great Supreme Court cases. The prayer involved in the Engel case was not compulsory. As the Supreme Court itself recited, no pupil was compelled "to join in the prayer over his or his parents' objection." This, to me, is crucial. If any student was compelled to join against his conviction, this would present a serious and justifiable question, akin to that presented in the flag salute case. The Supreme Court did not give sufficient weight to this fact, in my opinion, and relied heavily on such things as the history of the Book of Common Prayer, which, under various acts of Parliament, was compulsory on all.

COMMUNITY DETERMINATION

Where there is no compulsion, what happens if these matters are left to the determination of each community? In New York, this determination was made by the elected authorities of the school district. It was, indeed, a fact that a large number of the school districts in New York did not adopt the so-called regents' prayer. Where such a decision was reached, there can surely be no constitutional objection on the ground that it was a decision locally arrived at, or that it amounts to an establishment of "no religion." But, suppose that in a particular school district, as in New Hyde Park, it was determined that the prayer should be used as a part of the opening exercises of the school day. Remember that it is not compulsory. No pupil is compelled to participate. Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? This would suggest that no school can have a pledge of allegiance to the flag if any student does not wish to join.

This is a country of religious toleration. That is a great consequence of our history embodied in the first amendment. But does religious toleration mean religious sterility? I wonder why it should be thought that it does. This is a Christian country, in origin, history, tradition, and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics, I think it can be said, that it developed its notion of toleration. No one in this country can be required to have any particular form of religious belief, and no one can suffer legal discrimination because he has or does not have any particular religious belief. But does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition? The Moslem who comes here may worship as he pleases, and may hold public office without discrimination. That is as it should be. But why should it follow that he can require others to give up their Christian tradition merely because he is a tolerated and welcomed member of the community?

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Though we have a considerable common cultural heritage, there have always been minority groups in our country. This, I am sure, has been healthy and educational for all concerned. We have surely gained from having a less homogeneous population. Of course, the rights of all, especially those of minorities, must be protected and preserved. But does that require that the majority,

where there is such a majority, must give up its cultural heritage and tradition? Why?

Let us consider the Jewish child, or the Catholic child, or the nonbeliever, or the Congregationalist, or the Quaker. He, either alone, or with a few or many others of his views, attends a public school, whose school district, by local action, has prescribed the regents' prayer. When the prayer is recited, if this child or his parents feel that he cannot participate, he may stand or sit, in respectful attention, while the other children take part in the ceremony. Or he may leave the room. It is said that this is bad, because it sets him apart from other children. It is even said that there is an element of compulsion in this—what the Supreme Court has called an "indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform."

But is this the way it should be looked at? The child of a nonconforming or a minority group is, to be sure, different in his beliefs. That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable, and educational, for him to learn and observe this, in the atmosphere of the school—not so much that he is different, as that other children are different from him? And is it not desirable that, at the same time, he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted? No compulsion is put upon him. He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and to respect what they feel is significant to them.

SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE

Is this not a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the majority group? They experience the values of their own culture; but they also see that there are others who do not accept those values, and that they are wholly tolerated in their nonacceptance. Learning tolerance for other persons, no matter how different, and respect for their beliefs, may be an important part of American education, and wholly consistent with the first amendment. No one would think otherwise were it not for parents who take an absolutist approach to the problem, perhaps encouraged by the absolutist expressions of justices of the Supreme Court, on and off the bench.

It is appropriate here to say something about the problems of the Sunday law cases. Because of the absolutist approach, these cases were very hard for the Court, when I think they should have been quite easy—as is evidenced, I believe, by the fact that no such question was ever raised for 150 years after the adoption of the first amendment. It is true that many of the State statutes were a hodgepodge, full of inconsistencies and contradictions. But it is perfectly plain that the observance of Sunday has religious roots and origins. This is equally plain as to the observance of Christmas and Thanksgiving. Is that bad? Are these things not all part of our history, our culture, our heritage, our tradition? Must we give them all up because of a newly found absolutist approach to a problem which cannot possibly be resolved wisely in absolutist terms?

THE DAY OF REST

A day of rest is very deeply seated in all societies. Generally, as in our culture, it was an origin which is at least partially religious. But it has a wider basis than that. And it is a thing, good in itself, which loses much of its good unless it is observed by all on the same basis. If a majority of the people want to observe Sunday as a day on which ordinary work is not performed, even though there may be some religious motivation in picking that day, I find it hard to see that there is anything wrong or oppressive in making that law applicable to all members of the community—as long as the persons who do not care to observe Sunday themselves are not compelled to do anything.

Cannot much the same thing be said for Thanksgiving and Christmas, and Christmas carols in the school, and simple, thoughtfully chosen Bible readings and Christmas decorations in public places, and all the many other things which are a happy part of the culture and tradition of a large portion of our society?

TOLERATION BY MINORITIES

In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities, who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant, too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves, and nothing is done which they cannot wait out, or pass respectfully by, without their own personal participation, if they do not want to give it? Is it not a travesty that we have brought ourselves, through an essentially thought-denying absolutist approach, to the point where such things as chaplains in our prisons, or chapels in our military academies, can be seriously and solemnly raised as threats to the religious freedom which is guaranteed by the first amendment—as made applicable to the States, in very general terms, by the 14th amendment? In saying this, I am fully mindful of the rights of those who have or profess no religion, and who are surely entitled to the same respect as anyone else—and should themselves give the same respectful regard to the rights of other citizens, accepting reasonable arrangements made in this area by the majority, with no compulsion on them to participate.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the smaller Slavic ethnic groups in the Soviet Union, the Byelorussians are little known in the West, and their distinct national identity is often confused.

This is partly because they have always intermingled with other more numerous and powerful Slavic peoples, and partly because for centuries they have been subjected to the oppressive rule of foreign overlords. For hundreds of years their far more powerful neighbors, the Russians, have done all in their power to subdue them and represent them to the world as Russians.

The history of Byelorussian people proves beyond any doubt that they formed a distinct national group in their homeland, east of Poland and west of Moscow, long before the formation of the modern Russian state. However, during most of modern times Byelorussia has been part of the Russian Empire just as it is part of the Soviet Union today.

The autocratic czars of Russia and their callous agents could not eliminate the Byelorussians as a distinct ethnic group. The more the Byelorussians were oppressed by their Russian overlords, the more these sturdy people clung to their traditional national ideals and longed for the day of their independence.

Finally, this came about in 1918, when the czarist regime in Russia was no more. On March 25 of that year Byelorussian leaders took the fate of their people into their hands and proclaimed the Byelorussian National Republic. Independent Byelorussia was recognized by the governments of numerous countries, and the new state seemed to be on its way to full sovereignty in historic Byelorussia with Minsk as its capital.

Unfortunately the independence thus attained and proclaimed could not last long without effective foreign aid. Such help did not come, and the Republic soon succumbed. It was under constant attack by the Communist forces of Russia. Once the Red army was effectively organized, one of its first tasks was to overrun and occupy, and then annex Byelorussia to the Soviet Union. The Byelorussian National Republic actually existed little more than a year. By late 1919 its status was very shaky and early in the next year it ceased to exist.

Since then, for more than four dreadful and dreary decades, some 10 million Byelorussians have been living under oppressive Soviet tyranny. It is no exaggeration to say they have suffered longer under Soviet communism and have sacrificed more than any other non-Russian people in the Soviet Union. But they have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence, and they ardently look forward to the day of their liberation from Communist tyranny.

On the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their freedom and independence.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Philadelphia Bulletin of November 11, 1962, telling of the unsatisfactory progress of water pollution abatement in the State of Pennsylvania. Along with this article I insert a clipping from the Berwick, Pa., Enterprise, chronicling a major fish kill in the Susquehanna River mentioned in the editorial above.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Nov. 11, 1962]

ARE CLEAN STREAMS A MYTH?

For something like 20 years, Pennsylvanians could pride themselves on the effectiveness of their campaign to clean up the streams of the State. But something has happened during the last 4 years.

A billboard, placed by the Catawissa Boatmen's Club at the bridge across the Susquehanna River in that community, succinctly points up the situation. The text reads: "You are now about to cross the filthy Susquehanna River. It wasn't always this way.

but the political bosses haven't the guts to stop pollution."

This may be an oversimplification. Nonetheless, it does call attention to a startling decline in the effort to purify the State's waters. The Susquehanna drains a third of the State or more. It is now an open sewer. It gets raw sewage from the communities along the Lackawanna River; it gets mine acid and raw sewage from the Wilkes-Barre area; it collects most of the mine acid from the Hazleton region, and it gets raw sewage from the capital city of Harrisburg.

So what is done? The sanitary water board, which had long spearheaded the fight, is putting the arm on the little Luzerne County borough of Nescopeck (population 2,000) to put up $350,000 for a sewage disposal plant. Before borough officials knew anything about it, a few days before election, officials announced a Federal grant of $182,-560, to help with the project. The sum the little community must raise is still prohibitive.

On the other hand, what happens in the meantime to the larger places like Wilkes-Barre and Harrisburg? Nothing.

While this is going on, another ominous development is taking place upriver. The sanitary water board has issued a permit to a soap manufacturing concern to locate near Mehoopany, with the right to dump its refuse and acids into the river for the next 3 years. Not only that, but another corporation said to have a bad pollution record in other parts of the country is to locate in Wysox, near Towanda.

New industry is vitally important, of course, but these two seemingly will be authorized to ruin the river far above the point where mine acid and sewage have been coming in, and thus not only destroy some of the best fishing grounds in the State, but make the river useless to other industries dependent on a supply of clean water.

These conditions exist, and the new industries are localities right in Governor-elect Scranton's backyard. His appointees will compromise the membership of the sanitary water board, which is charged with enforcement of the clean streams law.

None of these conditions affects only the immediate vicinity. The total result will be the destruction of the Susquehanna as a fishing and recreation area for close to 300 miles. Two-thirds of that has already been ruined.

A clean Susquehanna would be of benefit to hundreds of thousands of people almost from the New York line into Maryland. The new administration should lose no time in dealing with the problem.

[From the Berwick (Pa.) Enterprise, Oct. 16, 1962]

SLAUGHTER OF FISH SEEMS COMPLETE NOW

Dead fish continue to line the banks of the Susquehanna and John F. Harter, one of the most qualified river observers of the area due to his long association with fishing and the river, says, "I have never seen the Susquehanna in the condition it is in."

Harter stated that on Sunday particularly, the day when many thousands of additional fish were killed, the river was a chocolate color with gold tinges and was completely opaque. He said fish could be seen along the banks, by the hundreds, sticking their heads out of the water in attempts to get air. The mine acids made the fish extremely sluggish and great numbers were seen floating, belly up, on the river.

Maynard Bogart, Danville, a member of the State fish board, said he had been at Tunkhannock over the weekend and heavy rains in New York State and Bradford County had raised the river level there 5 feet.

He said the heavy rain may have flushed water with high iron content and other mine wastes into the river.

Bogart said his main concern, at present, is the health of the people. He said it is now possible to neutralize mine wastes by an inexpensive process using limestone. He added that once the river is cleaned up and safe for the public, fish will make a comeback.

WITNESSES KILL

Representative William Curwood, Shicksinny, agreed it was a deplorable and unfortunate situation when contacted last night. Curwood was one of the witnesses at Nanticoke.

He emphasized a statement that he had made during a recent meeting of the fish commission that it is about time the health and mine departments, fish commission, Glen Alden Coal Co., and representatives from the Federal level sit down together to determine a plan of attack.

He added "no one is getting any place at the moment and I cannot blame the present river conditions all on one company as civic water is entering river from various locations."

Wayne Schuyler, Berwick mayor and long time campaigner for a clean river, when questioned said that the "disgusting river situation has become nothing but a joke. Despite promises made from all political directions to prevent river pollution, conditions are now worse than ever before on both the north and west branches.

The new fish kill closely follows an order by Gov. David Lawrence for an immediate review of steps taken to prevent pollution of the north branch. The order was given with particular emphasis to be placed on the mine discharges of the Glen Alden Coal Co., of Wilkes-Barre, the firm found responsible for a kill last fall that nearly depleted the river of its stock of game fish.

The action was taken by the Governor after Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce protested the action and stated it may cost the jobs of 3,500 employees and $17 million in annual payroll.

Chemical and Engineering News Surveys Development of Biodegradable Detergents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a very comprehensive article on the development of biodegradable detergents has been published in the March 18 issue of Chemical and Engineering News. The report covers both scientific and commercial aspects of a switch to detergents that will not pollute our water supplies.

Although the article at some points tends to downgrade the seriousness of the present contribution of "hard" or nonbiodegradable detergents to our total water pollution problem, it is a valuable survey and I commend it to the attention of Members.

A bill to ban detergent pollution has been introduced in the other body by the Senator from Montana, Mr. METCALF, identical with H.R. 4571.

Excerpts from the Chemical and Engineering News article follow:

Detergents—a boon to mankind—have come in for a fair share of criticism these days. The reason: pollution. Although ABS accounts for only a minor share of water pollution, a spate of pending legislation would restrict the use of alkylbenzene sulfonate (ABS)—based detergents. Notwithstanding the fact that the role of ABS in pollution is probably overemphasized, industry spends more than $5 million annually on research aimed at reducing the problem of undegraded detergents in our water supply. This research takes many forms. At the one extreme, it is aimed at developing more degradable surfactants. At the other extreme, it attempts to prove—quite successfully, it might be said—that ABS is only a very minor contributor to overall water pollution.

Roughly 75 percent of all household detergents contain some ABS. In 1962, some 4 billion pounds of household detergents were sold—meaning about 560 million pounds of ABS. ABS-based detergents get most of the blame for pollution stemming from detergents, but other types—alkylphenol nonionics—are also at fault.

With pressure mounting to ban ABS detergents, raw material suppliers are scurrying around to come up with suitable materials. Alpha olefins are often mentioned as starting materials that would make a more degradable product. Five companies are building plants to make these olefins. It is generally agreed that they are more degradable than present materials; but, at present, their costs is in question.

Price may not be a factor though, if legislation forces a switch to new materials. Two Federal bills have been proposed by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, which would do just that; and States are also pondering such legislation. Meanwhile in West Germany, where the problem is more critical than in the United States, legislation has been enacted. German detergent makers must switch over to products which are at least 80 percent degradable by October 1, 1964.

U.S. makers, although not now saddled with a deadline, appear to be shooting for new products by about 1964–65.

* * * * *

Alkylbenzene sulfonate is the largest single surface active agent in household heavy-duty detergents. * * * Commonly referred to as ABS, it might be more descriptively called TPBS to distinguish it from proposed substitutes where the alkyl radical is some type of straight chain.

The scramble for a TPBS substitute has led to much discussion about straight-chain materials—and alpha olefins take up a good share of this. The list of companies known active in alpha olefins stands at eight and probably hasn't stopped growing. Most significant, apart from the implications of a new volume organic chemical, is the potential reshuffling among major alkylbenzene producers. This market today is under the predominance of California Chemical, Continental Oil, Atlantic Refining, and Monsanto. Eying the hassle over degradability as a chance to carve out their share are a number of newcomers, including Gulf, Enjay, Union Carbide Olefins, and Phillips.

West Germany has also come in for its fair share of activity in this area. With the deadline on its detergent legislation little more than 18 months off, producers of nondegradable detergents are readying substitutes to meet legal requirements.

Why all this activity in the United States and abroad? Contenders are vying for a piece of a multimillion pound pie. Total sales (active plus inert ingredients) of solid and liquid household detergents were about 4 billion pounds (containing about 560 million pounds of ABS) in 1962. Growth is roughly 4 percent per year. (These figures exclude floor and wall cleaners as well as scouring cleansers. The Soap and Deter-

gent Association reported sales at 3.75 billion pounds in 1962, but their reporting does not account for the entire industry.) The big three of the industry—Proctor & Gamble, Lever, and Colgate—have between 80 and 85 percent of the business, C. & E.N. estimates.

Detergent makers seem most interested in three qualities in any product to replace TPBS. First, it must be more biodegradable. As to how much more, the only answer detergent makers give is, "as much as possible." Second, performance must equal present ABS-based products. Third, the price must be in line. At present there are these prices to consider: Propylene tetramer at 4 cents per pound, alkylbenzene at 10 cents per pound. Since most detergent makers do their own sulfonation, the price to shoot for is a 10 cent-per-pound detergent alkylate.

Industry observers expect that initial offerings of straight-chain detergent alkylates will be about 15 cents per pound. These will be from commercial plants of 50 million pounds or more. These sources also qualify this further by saying that the materials will be obtained by cracking paraffin or by extracting straight-chain paraffins from kerosine or heavy naphtha. By 1963–64, this price will drop to 12 cents; by 1945–65, to 11 cents; beyond 1965, to 10 cents; and eventually down to eight cents per pound.

On the other hand, alpha olefins from ethylene polymerization can also be expected to go at 15 cents per pound as an initial offering from commercial plants. By 1965 this could come near the 10-cent mark, depending to a great degree on the ethylene situation of any particular maker.

* * * * *

Whichever the route, raw material suppliers are gearing for the change. Whatever the change is, and whenever it takes place, pressure is building. State and Federal legislators got off to an eager start this year, throwing "ban the detergent" bills into the hopper in quick succession.

The legislative action was topped off late in January, with Representative REUSS introducing a bill which would prohibit use of degradation-resistant detergents. H.R. 2105 would take effect June 30, 1965. Before then, standards of decomposability would be set up by the U.S. Surgeon General.

The bill is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearing date has been set. When such a date is set, the U.S. Public Health Service will probably put forth its opinion on the bill, which could easily affect its outcome. Should the technical people in PHS back the bill, its chances for passing would increase. On the other hand, should they take a stand against the bill, its chances of passing would be lessened. At last check, the bill was given a 50–50 chance of passing this year.

Latest word from Washington: Congressman REUSS has followed H.R. 2105 with a second bill. H.R. 4571, introduced about a week ago, plugs a loophole in the previous bill. Although H.R. 2105 would ban detergents that don't meet decomposability standards from interstate commerce, it would have no control on intrastate manufacture. So detergents made in a State could be sold within that State. But some of these products would presumably end up in interstate waterways, and here's where the second bill plugs the hole. It bans detergents completely which could possibly end up in interstate waters.

Also the new bill would empower the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out its provisions. H.R. 2105 gave authority to the Surgeon General.

Five State legislatures have seen some type of detergent bill introduced this year. These vary from calling for study committees to all-out bans on nondegradable detergents.

Maryland's bill (No. A464) would make it unlawful to sell detergents containing alkylbenzene sulfonate. Also in Maryland, a joint resolution requests the Governor to appoint a committee "to review the need for a standard of degradability in waste-treatment systems for detergent materials and to recommend a standard of, and method for, determining such degradability."

The third bit of legal action taken against detergents in Maryland would forbid the discharge of untreated detergents into streams and septic tanks from coin-operated laundries and car-washing operations. Effective date is Jan. 1, 1964. A new bill proposed in Maryland would defer this matter until the committee reports on degradable matters.

Wisconsin, also bothered by water pollution, has set up a study committee to examine the detergent problem. In addition, a bill has been introduced which would ban any nondegradable detergent.

Another bill will soon be introduced in Wisconsin to outlaw the use of nondegradable detergents and also set up authority for the State board of health to formulate rules and regulations for detergents.

Nebraska is also in the act, with two bills. One would place a 10-cent-per-pound tax on hard detergents, and the other would set up standards of biodegradability and ban detergents not meeting these standards after January 30, 1965.

The remainder of proposed State legislation comes from California and Connecticut. California would ban nondegradable syndets. The Connecticut bill would also ban these products, although biodegradability is not specifically mentioned in the bill.

* * * * *

As in the United States, however, German detergent producers feel the problem has been exaggerated as a result of constant pressure by the press and politicians. The producers don't deny that there is a growing problem and that detergents—especially TPBS, which is only about 25 percent degradable in West German treatment procedure—contribute significantly to it.

Alabama Alumni, Students Back Paul Bryant With Resolution, Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Paul W. Bryant, head football coach at the University of Alabama, has been under attack by the Saturday Evening Post for some months. Last October they published an article defaming and libeling him. The coach sued for $500,000. As yet that case has not come to trial. However, the Post has entered its countersuit in the form of a shoddy, slovenly piece of reporting in its March 23, 1963, issue, called "The Story of a College Football Fix."

In the days since that story was published it has become increasingly apparent that the charges against Bryant are false. Yet, in the minds of many, doubt has been cast upon the basic integrity of one of the finest football coaches and leaders of young men in the country.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the people of Alabama who know Paul Bryant best have confidence in him. I wish to insert, as my part of my remarks, the two articles from the Birmingham Post-Herald for March 19, and March 20, 1963, telling of alumni and student support for Bryant:

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Mar. 19, 1963]

FOUR THOUSAND UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA STUDENTS CHEER BRYANT AT "BACK BEAR" RALLY

UNIVERSITY, March 19.—"I want to win, but one thing you can bet your life on—you can bet a jillion to one on it—I never have or never would use the team to win a bet."

So Coach Paul (Bear) Bryant told a wildly cheering throng of nearly 4,000 students tonight at the University of Alabama.

Bryant, who has been accused by the Saturday Evening Post of acting in collusion with former Georgia athletic director Wally Butts to fix last fall's Alabama-Georgia football game, spoke at a "back the Bear" pep rally, organized by university students.

FULL-SCALE AFFAIR

The pep rally was a full-scale affair, complete with cheerleaders, student government leaders—and even the million-dollar band.

"I'm proud of the team," Bryant said, "I'm proud when they win. The good Lord willing, we're going to keep on winning.

"I wish we could put all this behind us now so you can start to study," he said. "I'm an old man, but I still have a lot of fight left. I'm still tough. But there are other things we all ought to be doing."

When Bryant walked down the white stone steps of the Student Union Building to speak to the students, the students roared a welcome.

STUDENTS CHEER

They cheered and clapped for several minutes while he looked around, grim-visaged, but obviously touched by the enthusiasm of the students.

Through the crowd waved posters: "We back Bear"—"Bear plays square"—and "To Hell with the Post."

A dummy, with a cover of the Post pinned on it was hanged in effigy on the campus last night and today.

Prior to Bryant's talk, Eddie Leighton of Birmingham, student legislature president, read a resolution adopted by the legislature in support of Bryant.

Prior to its release, the resolution was reviewed and approved by Don McDaniel, athletic director, and Dr. C. T. Sharpton, vice president for student affairs.

The resolution said:

"A resolution expressing the opinion of the legislature that the students legislature of the University of Alabama does hereby publicly express its confidence in and support of Coach Paul W. Bryant:

"Whereas certain ridiculous statements have been published in a national magazine which reflect on the character and integrity of Coach Bryant; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the legislature that investigation will completely uphold his personal integrity and his loyalty to the University of Alabama, its students, administration, faculty, people of the State and especially those students participating in the University of Alabama athletic program: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That this legislature does resent those defamatory accusations made against Coach Bryant, the University of Alabama and its students and administration, the State of Alabama and her residents by this publication; and

"Whereas we, the legislature, are confident that the inevitable result of this episode will lead to an even greater future for the University of Alabama: Be it hereby

Resolved by the Student Legislature of the University of Alabama, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Coach Paul W. Bryant, Dr. Frank A. Rose (university president), the board of trustees, the Alumni Association and the Alabama State Legislature."

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, Mar. 20, 1963]

ALABAMA ALUMNI BACK UP BRYANT

The University of Alabama's largest alumni group yesterday gave Coach Paul Bryant a strong vote of support and confidence.

In a special meeting here the 37-man executive committee of the Jefferson County Alumni, acting on behalf of the association membership, unanimously supported Bryant and at the same time "publicly deplored the untrue, unfounded and libelous character assassination made solely for selfish gain by the Saturday Evening Post."

The group's complete proclamation as released by President Frank Lee reads as follows:

"Whereas Paul W. Bryant has served the University of Alabama loyally and faithfully as a player, assistant coach, head football coach, athletic director; and

"Whereas Paul W. Bryant has at all times during this service to the University of Alabama exhibited the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and dedication; and

"Whereas Paul W. Bryant has during his years of service been an inspirational leader and mentor to the young men who have trained and performed with skill under him; and

"Whereas Paul W. Bryant has compiled an outstanding record of accomplishments and brought honor to the University of Alabama and to the State of Alabama during his long career of service to his alma mater:

"Now, therefore, the Jefferson County Alumni Association, acting by and through this committee does publicly deplore the untrue, unfounded, and libelous character assassination made solely for selfish gain appearing in the article, The Story of a Football Fix, which appears in this week's edition of the Saturday Evening Post;

"And this committee does with full conviction and strength extend a unanimous vote of confidence and support to Paul W. Bryant and his direction and administration of the University of Alabama athletic affairs."

Why Teacher Can't Teach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in the March 22 issue of Life magazine the editor takes occasion to commend the University of Wisconsin's Dean Lindley Stiles for his courage in joining "the battle of the century" in American education by instituting some basic and sensible reforms in teacher education with a view to improving the quality of teaching.

In placing greater emphasis on intellectual content and deemphasizing methods, Dean Stiles has encountered sharp criticism from certain quarters and incurred the displeasure of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, which has consistently sought to enforce and perpetuate established concepts of pedagogy for pedagogs.

The University of Wisconsin has enjoyed a reputation for innovation in the field of higher education that dates back more than 35 years when in the late twenties, its president, Glenn Frank, invited the former president of Amherst—that eminent philosopher and educator, Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn—to conduct his now famous experimental college on the campus of Wisconsin. In spearheading the reform movement in teacher education, Dean Lindley Stiles is maintaining that institution's praiseworthy tradition.

I would like to include the Life editorial here for the attention and interest of all who are concerned with improving the quality of American education and who seek an answer to the question, "Why teacher can't teach":

WHY TEACHER CAN'T TEACH

What the University of Wisconsin's Dean Lindley Stiles calls "the battle of the century" in American education has been joined. The fight is over how to educate—and accredit—better teachers, and it may take the rest of this century to win it.

Dean Stiles is already in trouble with the educationists because of the sensible reforms he has made. He has taken Wisconsin's School of Education out of isolation and exposed it to the main currents of the university's intellectual life. Teacher candidates at Wisconsin today are taught philosophy, mathematics, and literature by people who know their academic business, instead of being taught watered-down versions of the same subject matter by professional educationists. Wisconsin is not alone in trying to do something about undergraduate teacher training; other universities, like New York University and Stanford, have instituted basic reforms—and the teachers are trying too.

Nothing gets an old-fashioned educationist's back up faster than the news that pedagogy is losing out to pure education. One of the grounds on which the educational establishment's policing agent, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, decided to defer accreditation of Wisconsin's School of Education was that the place needed a well-planned building. One wonders how a university like Oxford or the Sorbonne would be graded following such an inspection.

What ought to be done is what Dr. James Koerner, president of the Council for Basic Education, advocates in his forthcoming book, "The Miseducation of American Teachers": convert all remaining teachers colleges into general-purpose educational institutions or shut them down. Koerner would eliminate undergraduate majors in education. Teacher candidates would have ample time to take a degree in an academic subject if the courses which now make many teachers colleges horror chambers of methodology were cut back to size. Pseudo-academic training in personal public relations, indoor group games, audiovisual aids, and community hygiene is distinguished by its dullness, lack of intellectual content, and institutionalized redundancy. Such a curriculum is guaranteed to attract weak students, and it's no wonder that education graduates show up poorly when compared with students in academic fields.

Correction is long overdue. Let's stop trying to teach more about a trade than there is to learn. Hardly anybody wants to do away with method instruction altogether; on the contrary, practice-teaching courses are extremely valuable. But method instruction should be subordinated to the real substance of higher learning—the arts, sciences, and humanities. When future teachers are directed primarily to grounding themselves in the best that has been known and said in the world—Matthew Arnold thought this was what education was all about—the battle of the century will have been won. It will be a famous victory for every parent and every child in the land.

Maryland Day—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate a significant anniversary in Maryland. On Monday, March 25, Maryland Day, the 329th anniversary of the first founding of the colony of Maryland when the tiny ships, the *Ark* and *Dove*, brought the first Maryland colonists to St. Clements Island in the Potomac River. Then they landed at St. Marys to found what has become a historic and a great State.

We should take time in 1963 to consider what the State of Maryland means to us now and what it has meant over the years. Maryland has been a place where great ideas have been developed, where great concepts of government have been tried. When proven they have been handed down to other States and to the world at large. Some of the institutions of Maryland have been preserved in the Government of the United States. And so we have good reason to examine what is great in our own Maryland history.

Last year on Maryland Day we recalled the Act of Toleration. That act was passed by the General Assembly of Maryland 3 centuries ago to give all persons in Maryland the right to practice their religion in their own manner. This was religious freedom and individual liberty which was unique in the 17th century. We can be very proud of our Maryland heritage for developing a climate of toleration which is now a fundamental part of our constitutional right as Americans.

There were other things which we can remember with great pride. For instance, in 1648 there was the incident in the general assembly in which a woman claimed for the first time in recorded American history the right to sit as a legislator. The Journal of the General Assembly of Maryland for Friday, January 21, 1648, records:

Came Mrs. Margaret Brent and requested to have vote in the House for herself and voice also.

On this occasion the Governor denied Mrs. Brent both voice and vote as a member of the General Assembly of Maryland, but she had asserted for all time the claim that a woman had a right to sit as an equal with other members of the legislature. Today, of course, Mrs. Brent's claim has been vindicated. There are women in Annapolis who are valuable members of the general as-

sembly. And in Washington the Congress, which is in a sense a direct descendant of the General Assembly of Maryland, also has valuable Members who are women. This is a principle which had its birth and its first expression in Maryland. It is another incident of Maryland history which can make us proud of our heritage.

If today we are sometimes discouraged because our political progress in Maryland seems to be slow; if we are discouraged because interest in good government seems to be limited to too few, we can look back to our long and proud history and I think gain good cause for our optimism for the years ahead.

Because of its historic interest I append the Journal of the general assembly for January 21, 1648, as follows:

[From Archives of Maryland, Proceedings and Acts of the Assembly of Maryland 1637/8–1664]

MARYLAND DAY—1963

The freemen bownd to attend the Assembly appeared except Mr. Ffenwick, Mr. Thorneborough, Mr. Brookes & George Saphyer.

Summons to George Saphyer to be att the Assembly forthwth. vppon sight & c

was read certaine orders to be obserued in the howse during the Assembly

Came Mrs. Margarett Brent and requested to have vote in the howse for her selfe and voyce allso for that att eh last Court 3d Jan: it was ordered that the said Mrs. Brent was to be looked uppon and received as his Lps Attorney. The Gov.r denyed that the s.d Mrs Brent should have any uote in the howse. And the s.d Mrs. Brent protested agst all proceedings in this pnt Assembly, unlesse shee may be pnt. and have vote as afores.d.

Appropriation for Conservation Program Should Not Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement I submitted to the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations urging that the 1964 appropriation for the conservation program of the Department of Agriculture should not be reduced.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO THE AGRICULTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am grateful for the opportunity to present to you and the distinguished members of your subcommittee a brief statement in regard to the 1964 appropriation for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

May I direct your attention to page 126 of the Budget of the U.S. Government, 1964, Appendix, where it is stated as follows in connection with the budget for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:

"A level of $150 million for the 1964 programs is proposed, a reduction of $100 million below the 1963 program. Payments for the 1964 program will be made from the 1965 appropriation."

The proposed reduction from $250 to $150 million for this program in the coming fiscal year—a reduction of 40 percent—is very disturbing. I have received letters of protest from the Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in the State of Connecticut urging that "this budget proposal should not be cut from $250 to $150 million". In a letter dated March 5, 1963, the president of this association, Mr. Erwin Kelsey of Middletown, Conn., in my Congressional District, informs me as follows:

"We feel that without the Federal cost-sharing our objective in developing the conservation plan with landowners on each acre of his holdings according to its needs and used within its capabilities will be greatly jeopardized."

Your committee is well aware, I am sure, of the aims of this program in encouraging conservation by Federal sharing with farmers of the cost of carrying out approved soilbuilding and soil and water-conserving practices, including also benefits to wildlife. Without this assistance from the Government the farmers would not and could not undertake these conservation projects by themselves with their limited resources. The rate of this cost-sharing program is approximately 50 percent, and that is a fair rate. These conservation measures include the establishment of permanent protective cover, improvement and protection of vegetative cover, conservation and disposal of water, protection of soil from wind and water erosion, and benefits to wildlife.

In Connecticut, the local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committees, participating in this Federal cost-sharing program, place particular emphasis on the physical type practices seeking to benefit wildlife, provide protection of vegetative cover and conservation of soil and disposal of water.

This program is extremely important to the State of Connecticut. A reduction of $100 million in the budget for this vital program is, in my view, shortsighted and may in the long run prove to be a waste of resources rather than an act of economy. I am interested in economy and will gladly support such efforts, but this is most certainly an example of false economy.

I urge you and the members of your committee to increase the amount of the conservation program to the same level as it was last year, namely, to provide the full amount of $250 million for this service which is beneficial to the whole country.

Cotton Acreage Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith a house resolution, introduced by the Agriculture Committee of the South Carolina House of Representatives, resolved to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture.

The resolution is as follows:

A HOUSE RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE APPRECIATION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TO THE HONORABLE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, U.S. SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, FOR HIS ACTION IN HOLDING THE SUPPORT PRICE ON 1963 UPLAND COTTON AT 0.032 AND 0.047 CENT PER POUND

Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on middling one inch upland cotton as 0.032 and 0.047 cent per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives: That the Members of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 Upland Cotton at 0.032 and 0.047 cent per pound; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from South Carolina and the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.

State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, S.C., March 21, 1963.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Justice Department Asked To Investigate Satevepost "Fix" Story Violations of Federal Wiretap Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Saturday Evening Post article in the March 23, 1963, issue entitled "The Story of a College Football Fix" is false generally in its charges against Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts.

However, it also is emerging more clearly now that the alleged source of the article has a record of convictions on bad check charges, various financial difficulties, and obtained the information on which the article is based illegally. It appears, from the story in the Sateve-

post, that the man, George Burnett, of Atlanta, overheard a conversation between two men over the long distance telephone. His reporting of the conversation appears to be in violation of title 47, section 605 of the United States Code.

I have written the Attorney General the following letter asking that appropriate action be taken. I insert the letter as a part of my remarks herewith:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am writing to call your attention to the Saturday Evening Post article entitled, "The Story of a College Football Fix," which appeared in the issue dated March 23, 1963. The article begins on page 80 and refers to a telephone conversation between Wallace Butts, University of Georgia athletic director, and Paul Bryant, University of Alabama athletic director, allegedly overheard by a George Burnett. The alleged phone call originated in Atlanta, Ga., by Butts calling Bryant in Tuscaloosa, Ala. The article referred to gives details of the conversation which Mr. Burnett "overheard" after he was "accidentally" cut into the conversation.

Although I am personally convinced that the alleged conversation in no way incriminates either of the athletic officials in a fix, it is apparent that the article is based on what Mr. Burnett says he overheard. It is my belief that the article is defamatory and libelous. But that is a civil matter which will be decided in the courts.

I believe that it is equally clear from the language of the article that the author, Frank Graham, Jr., of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Curtis Publishing Co., of New York, N.Y., publishers of the Saturday Evening Post, and George Burnett, of Atlanta, Ga., are in violation of title 47, section 605, United States Code, the Federal wiretap statute. The statute is, as you know, part of the Federal Communications Act. It reads in part as follows:

"And no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person; and no person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiving any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and no person having received such intercepted communication or having become acquainted with the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, knowing that such information was so obtained, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto."

I will appreciate your investigating the circumstances surrounding the alleged telephone conversation, keeping in mind the pertinent provision of the Federal wiretap statute, herein quoted, and taking appropriate action in the premises.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.,
Member of Congress.

United States Scrapping "Arms of Future"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, is the President, as Commander in Chief, basically altering our military preparedness? Is the Secretary of Defense attempting to alter our military capability? Some have observed that no new weapon systems have been inaugurated under this administration, and at the same time many have been scrapped. Others have suggested that members of the administration are intent on holding back American military development so that others may catch up with us, and there can indeed be a nuclear stalemate. Still others have suggested that members of the administration intend to put our military operation under the U.N.

Whether any or all of these observations are right is pure conjecture to me. True, I would find it hard to believe that our President would ever in any way decelerate our military preparedness. I am prone to make excuses for our President and our leadership who are intent on pushing disarmament conferences and furthering the timid and weak appearance of our country in our foreign policy.

But whatever the truth, the American people and the Members of Congress ought to be told. There is too much secrecy and too much news management and manipulation by the administration. Some have even said the Government has the right to lie and now we are confronted with the double danger of withholding information on the one hand and the distortion or misrepresentation on the other as inherent rights of the executive branch of the Government. With these views I disagree. I would disagree with anything that tends to lessen our rate of military preparedness in new weapons or present weapons if such action to any degree weakened our military potential.

Most of all, I believe it incumbent on the President and his lieutenants, including Mr. McNamara, to tell the Congress and the American people what our military plans are if they are indeed changing our basic policy from being the biggest and the best to any lesser stature, including parity nuclear stalemate, U.N. police force, and the like.

Therefore, I commend the following article entitled, "United States Scrapping 'Arms of Future'?" to my colleagues for consideration:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 1, 1963]

UNITED STATES SCRAPPING "ARMS OF FUTURE"?

Looking ahead, U.S. military planners are beginning to wonder just where their next generation of basic weapons is coming from.

The reason: Project after project now is being lopped off, or cut far back, by top civilian chiefs in the Pentagon.

Dyna-Soar, a rocket-boosted plane designed to go into orbit and glide to a landing anywhere on earth, is being reexamined now after an investment of $800 million. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara hints that it will soon get the ax.

This follows closely on Mr. McNamara's sudden cancellation of the Skybolt missile project, after 353 millions had been spent on its development. Earlier, a nuclear-powered aircraft program in which $1 billion had been invested over a 10-year period, was cut off from further military development. And the Air Force's only manned bomber under development, the RS-70, was cut back to token-project size.

Even before these cutbacks, a Senate committee had estimated that more than $2 billion worth of weapons contracts had been canceled over a 3-year period.

The casualty list: The items at the end of this article show some examples of big weapon projects of all three services that have been canceled over recent years, often after expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars and years of development. Cancellations have come under all Secretaries of Defense.

Mr. McNamara, however, is reported to be less reluctant to kill off projects under development than were his predecessors. One reason: the high cost of completing today's weapons.

In addition to conventional arms projects, a number of military space programs have been cut back or killed.

For instance: Midas, planned as an orbiting satellite able to detect the blastoff of an enemy ICBM, has been cut back to a study effort. Saint, another program designed to check on possible hostile satellites, also is cut back. Cold water has been dashed on Air Force hopes to get priority backing for orbiting space platforms.

At this time, in fact, few brand new weapons of any kind are said to be under development, getting the costly backing that is required to develop modern arms.

Questions are being raised, as a result, about where the line should be drawn in killing off tomorrow's weapons.

WEAPONS THAT DIDN'T PAN OUT

Skybolt missile: In advanced testing stage when canceled late in 1962 by Pentagon. Cost: $353 million, for research and development.

Atomic plane: Shelved in 1961, after research work lasting 10 years. Cost: $1 billion, mostly for airborne powerplant.

Jet seaplane: P6M SeaMaster was "washed out" in 1959 after nine planes and special base were built. Cost: $387 million spent.

Boron "exotic" fuel: Orders were canceled for this high-energy fuel for supersonic jets as two plants began to make it in 1959. Cost: $240 million, for development and plant construction.

Army heavy tank: 62-ton M-103 tank, carrying 120-mm. gun, was shelved after a few dozen were built in the mid-1950's. Cost: Several hundred millions spent on development.

Submarine missile: Regulus II, developed to be fired from surfaced sub, was dropped in 1958. Cost: $146 million actually spent and not recovered.

Navaho missile: Long-range ramjet missile, with self-contained guidance system, was abruptly canceled in mid-1957. Cost: $680 million.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am thinking, not only of the people of ancient Greece who laid the foundations of democratic government and the men, women, and children of modern Greece so close to our hearts, but as well of those of Greek ancestry and blood who as our fellow Americans have made such a mighty contribution to our own United States in culture, religion, business, the professions, in all of our activities, and so well in the new land of America have kept aflame the torch of democracy first lighted centuries ago in ancient Greece.

In my own city of Chicago no nationalistic group is held in higher esteem and affection. Its sons and daughters are numbered among the leaders in all the worthy activities of a great metropolis.

It is only natural that a nation's independence day have a particular significance for the people of that nation. This is the case for Greece, but her independence day is also meaningful for other peoples in the world. The Greeks, it will be recalled, were the first people to conceive and advocate the concept of independence in ancient times, yet for some 2,000 years they were deprived of this precious right. This is why the rebirth of free and independent Greece 142 years ago is such an important milestone in the history of mankind. The Greeks' unceasing determination to fight for their liberation from alien rule earned them the admiration of many people throughout the world, and the free and sovereign state of Greece was welcomed into the family of nations.

The past 400 years of Ottoman rule had proven particularly arduous. The Greeks who have also always cherished the ideals of individual freedom and dignity, were treated as mere subjects to be exploited, rather than as citizens. Their uprisings and rebellions were never successful, however, for the Sultan's forces were superior. It took a 9-year war of independence and the assistance of European powers to wrench Greece free from Turkish rule.

For 142 years now the Greeks have been independent, and their country has become a valued member of the community of free nations. Greece was admitted to the Council of Europe in 1949, to NATO in 1951, and is a party to the Balkan Pact with Turkey and Yugoslavia. Greece took a historic step last year in becoming associated with the European Economic Community. This association presents both a challenge and an opportunity for the Greek people in their efforts to modernize the economy of their country.

On the occasion of the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day we congratulate the Greek people on their achievements and reaffirm the close ties between our two nations, democratic Greece and democratic United States.

Courage in Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Krock is not only a great writer but a patriotic American dedicated to the preservation of our basic freedoms.

I commend the following timely article to the earnest attention of the Congress and the Nation:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) New York Times Western Edition]

IN THE NATION: A SMALL STATE BUT A MAJOR DECISION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—The picket line around any physical unit of production, large or small, important or minor, in the United States operates as a supreme law of the land. This is because U.S. laws since 1935 have been weighted with immunities from concerted acts by trade unions to paralyze the economy that are denied to all other economic groups. Also, because Government policy has generally been similarly weighted in organized labor's special interest since that year of the passage of the Wagner Act.

Not even during the Eisenhower administration has the Executive or Congress done anything fundamental to curb the effect of the picket line as a supreme law of the land. But in a few States it has been weakened by right-to-work statutes. Under the powerful political pressures against this legislation with which prolabor laws and responsive Government policy have equipped the union movement, some of these State laws have been repealed. But now Wyoming has joined the States where these pressures have been overcome by the voters at large. And this is noteworthy in the existing legal and political context.

OF NATIONAL CONCERN

Wyoming is, of course, a small State in the political system. While it has two Members of the U.S. Senate, like any other State, under a nonrepealable guarantee of the Constitution, Wyoming has only one Member in the House: hence a total of but three presidential electors. But the principle of its new law, and the comment made by Gov. Clifford P. Hansen when he signed it, are events of national interest and should be matters of national concern.

They directly involve the power of a mere picketline setup by any union, regardless of the justice of the strike it signifies, or the moral character of the union leadership, to blockade an employer's access to the labor he requires for his unit of production. In many cases no actual picketline, or even a token of one, is needed. The employer knows that the contracts he has made have given the trades unions a monopoly of his labor market. And he knows also that if he tries to break the monopoly by hiring labor willing to man his plant, in the rare event enough nonunion workers have been allowed to acquire the essential skills, experience has taught him that he must expose these workers to violence and other forms of intimidation which public law-and-order enforcement agencies more often than not fail to prevent or penalize.

Finally, to make and market his product, whether is be steelplate or basic food supplies—or, for instance, newspapers whose constitutional guarantee of "freedom of print" has been reduced to hollow rhetoric by the superior restrictive power of the labor movement—the employer must risk wearing the unpopular label of "strikebreaker," its opprobrious implication protracted long after the period when that was justified.

GOVERNOR'S VIEW

After the Wyoming Legislature joined the statutory effort of other States to restore individual rights and a free enterprise system in this country with a right-to-work law, Governor Hansen made these comments:

"The merits and disadvantages of the law will continue to be debated for many days to come. But the crux of the issue, in my opinion, is that the measure is designed to restore full freedom of choice to the working men and women of Wyoming * * * (and) the right of individual decisionmaking.

"The labor movement in America, which has done so much to raise the standard of living of our working men and women, will not be strengthened by making membership compulsory or obligatory."

But another crux of the issue is the reason why the support of one union's strike by others is also made compulsory or obligatory, or both, in contracts between management with labor; and why these contracts exist in labor relations in the overwhelming percentage of the vital units of production of goods and informational channels in the United States. This fundametnal reason is that prolabor laws—including antitrust immunity—and pro-Government policy that extends to city police precincts, bring the unions to the so-called collective bargaining table with power to shut down the plant of the industrialist negotiator. This power is freely used whether or not it cripples the national economy; or shuts off the flow of information to the people who cannot otherwise separate propaganda from fact, or know what they need to know to evaluate the caliber and performance of Government.

Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express, on behalf of the citizens of the State of Connecticut and myself, our great pleasure and pride on the occasion of the 4th anniversary of the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

It is indeed with warm feelings of gratification and genuine satisfaction that the people of Connecticut are able to point to Hawaii as a sister State. Like Connecticut, Hawaii has brought together people of many different ethnic and religious backgrounds living happily and prosperously together in one of the most liberal and progressive States of the Union. Unlike Connecticut, which had a rather homogenous Anglo-Saxon tradition, the forefathers of the Hawaiian nation were Polynesian kings, but the people of both States have consistently demonstrated over the years the

same industriousness, liberalism, respect for law, order and gradual evolution, combined with the inner strength and stability in times of peace or war to assimilate people of every race and creed into a powerful force for the common good. These sterling qualities have combined to make our Federation of Sovereign States the most amazing nation the world has ever known.

And so I feel honored and privileged as a Representative of one of the first and oldest States of the Union to extend our greetings on this happy occasion to the newest State and to add our heartfelt hopes of peace, prosperity, and happiness to the State and people of Hawaii.

The Great Brain Robbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article as it appeared in the February 1963 issue of Medicine At Work, published by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association:

THE GREAT BRAIN ROBBERY

Along with Pavlov in physiology, Nabokov in literature, and Rimsky-Korsakoff in music comes word of another prominent Russian—Reguspatoff, described as the greatest inventor of all time. If you want proof, so the story goes, just look at all the things on which his name appears. It is spelled differently, though: "Reg. U.S. Pat. Off."

Such whimsy in praise of a dynamic patent system has its serious side. So deadly serious, in fact, that the American-style guidelines which point to expanding productivity, rising standards of living, improving health, and an ever-brightening future, are in danger of being thrown askew. Why? Because part of the headquarters which make our Nation's scientific and technological progress possible are being blackjacked by gangs of secret stealers.

As these criminals stalk industrial research facilities, patents are circumvented, processes are copied, circuitry is duplicated, tissue cultures and formulas are stolen, research designs are surreptitiously microfilmed—all at minimum risk, time, and cost to the thieves but at the expense of vast numbers of dollars and man-hours by the innovators. Result: A sizable number of America's keenest brains are being robbed with pickpocket skill.

Some of these secrets end up behind the Iron Curtain for domestic use and as commodities in neutral country trade. At least as many are turned speedily into products for cut-rate sale in the free world, notably in those few places (one is Italy) which provide neither the protection nor the fair competition incentive of a good patent system. But any creative products firm in any land, including the United States, is rated simultaneously as a potential victim and a possible buyer by the illicit trafficker in research know-how. The intrigue makes many a war spy thriller tame in comparison.

Industrial spies operating at home and abroad have devised intricate procedures to pirate lipstick formulas, zipper designs, dress fashions, and even specifications of a neighing mechanical pony. In a classic switch from prewar days, one Baltimore man makes monthly trips to Tokyo to collect intelligence from agents watching preproduction developments in the Japanese toy industry. Detective agencies have uncovered spies among telephone operators who knew when to listen in, and among porters hired to turn over contents of executive wastebaskets.

BRAINWORK LARCENY

While this kind of rubbernecking is corrosive to a fair competitive enterprise system, it stands as a mere misdemeanor of peeping tomfoolery when compared to the grand larceny of brainwork from such nationally vital industries as petroleum, electronics, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals.

Late one afternoon at a suburban Minneapolis shopping center, a rifleman, camouflaged in outlying woods, fired a bullet into a tire of a parked car—then turned up in street clothes to "help" the owner, a physicist for a nearby industrial research facility. In the planned confusion of tire changing, an empty brief case was substituted for the one carried by the scientist. It contained preliminary drawings of a key component for a new seawater desalting process.

In Cairo, the stolen circuitry for a novel ultrahigh frequency broadcasting system was offered for sale by three vacationing engineers from a southern California electronics firm.

One case, in particular, has all the elements of cloak and dagger: Lives in peril, government high finance, invasion under the dark of night, counterfeited documents, and a falling out over the spoils. The central figure is Sidney Martin Fox, Ph. D., who spent 5 years as a research chemist at Lederle Laboratories, a 600-acre fenced and policed complex 40 miles from New York City. He resigned in 1959 "to accept a better opportunity."

According to affidavits on file in Federal court, Fox established a drug consultation business to supply Lederle's foreign competitors with formulas and directions for commercially producing antibiotics and steroids. Eventually, eight men were in the international operation, including two other Lederle ex-employees who penetrated the heavily guarded plant at night with counterfeit passes. Assumed names were used for clandestine meetings in hotel rooms. They traveled separately on plane trips to Italy, where antibiotics costing $12 million in research over a 7-year period were sold illegally to six firms.

The payoff, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars, was a bargain for companies which did not have to spend millions for development. As a result, they were able to underbid American firms to win huge U.S. agency contracts for the drugs.

The affidavits by two conspirators who have pleaded guilty, Chemists Leonard Fine and John Cancelarich, describe how secret Lederle files were microfilmed in Fox's basement workshop, how delicate organic cultures were taken from Lederle chill rooms and stored in his kitchen refrigerator, how the precious micro-organisms were concealed in glass cigar cases on flights to Italy, and how disputes over division of the illicit profits led to a split. All eight defendants have been ordered to appear for trial this month; Fox and two others also face action for civil damages of $5 million apiece.

ATTACKING A NATION

How can such cases illustrate a peril to the Nation's future? By dramatizing science-technology espionage as a direct attack on vital national resources; by identifying the ultimate casualties in this attack as crippled incentive, demoralized effort, injured leadership, a poisoned economy; by underlining the fact that tools for building physical and economic health can also be weapons in a cold war that is not simply between governments nor even between peoples—but between ways of achievement.

Says a Lederle official: "It is high time we recognize that our way of life and our freedom can be choked off not only on worldwide battlefields but also in worldwide marketplaces. To the extent our armies might prevent a hot war, we must be prepared to protect our interests in a long, hard cold war."

That the Communist world regards scientific advance as a weapon in cold war politics may be apparent in the space technology field, but it is not generally recognized in the area of health. The evidence is clear, however. Drug cultures stolen from U.S. firms are turning up in Poland and other Communist countries. An antibiotic dubbed "goldmycin," copied from a U.S. patent product, is being made and sold cheaply in Shanghai. In fact, Red China buys another American-developed antibiotic in Western Europe, then sells it below cost to selected customers.

"Communist countries are using drugs as cold war weapons," is the flat conclusion of reporter Jerry Bishop in the Wall Street Journal. "There have been at least a dozen instances of Communist-made drugs, some pirated from the West, sold to the neutralists. In India, where Merck Sharp & Dohme was seeking permission to set up manufacturing plants, the Soviet Union tried (but failed) to upset negotiations with offers of a low-interest $20 million loan and of technical aid to build an Indian pharmaceutical manufacturing complex."

This point was expanded in perspective by a university medical researcher attending a scientific conference in Philadelphia several weeks ago. "A generation ago," he said, "the theft of plans for a better can opener or a way of making creamier peanut butter or a more comfortable corset was not of world-shaking significance. But today the industrial development of an improved medicine or vaccine, a new surgical instrument or technique, or a process solving a major public health problem such as air or water pollution, could mean thousands of lives saved by the country of discovery. Health progress can thus represent the competitive edge in world leadership; it provides key support for our way of life, our freedoms.

"The crucial need to preserve this leadership by effectively guarding our findings against piracy may be difficult for the nonscientist or nonindustrialist to grasp. Yet, this is as much the concern of the consumer as of the manufacturer, of the laborer as of the manager, of the pensioner as of the disburser. In effect, the stealer of health science secrets may be killing the very unborn children of our next generation to whom this Nation would look for continuing incentive and progress."

GLIMMERS OF HOPE

Against that bleak picture can be seen glimmers of hope. Companies are tightening their security, and private investigators are becoming more adept at counterespionage. Several weeks ago a court ordered the British Ministry of Health to stop buying unlicensed hospital drugs from Italy, Poland, and other countries not having patent safeguards. Proposals for a patent law in Italy are proceeding alongside planning toward a uniform patent system for all of the European Common Market countries.

There is evidence that even the Soviet Union—impressed with the true meaning of "Reg. U.S. Pat. Off."—may be recognizing the value of patent incentives in developing better products. In this country, efforts are underway to revise antiquated legislation in order to protect realistically the research findings of electronics, chemical, and other vital industries. Fred Bartenstein, Jr., administrative vice president of Merck

& Co., Inc., told the American Society of Industrial Security last fall:

"We need stronger criminal laws against the science spy who looks for the secrets of the Nation's industrial strength. Unfolding now is evidence of multiple rings, with centers here and on other continents, and with markets for stolen research data so developed that spies can steal with the assurance of ready sale. Our criminal laws must be made to reflect the reality that products of the mind have value as great as products of the hand."

Meanwhile, although their days may be numbered, the research pirates go their snooping, swiping way. "What a tragic waste of talent" says a New York investigator who spent 2 years working on the Lederle case. "Those crooks have brains turned inside out. Why, if they'd put their minds straight, they might even come up with better stuff than the inventors whose work they steal."

When Ireland Starved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives the following article which appeared in the March 25, 1963, edition of Newsweek. I am sure this article entitled "When Ireland Starved" will be of much historical significance to many of my colleagues.

It reads as follows:

WHEN IRELAND STARVED

In the first half of the 19th century, the peasant population of Ireland was almost entirely dependent for its food upon the potato. Under the tenancy and sharecropping arrangements by which the Irish peasants occupied their land, all other produce—grains, vegetables, dairy products—went to pay their rents, and the peasants fed themselves huge quantities of potatoes that could be grown easily and cheaply on tiny bits of marginal land.

The tuber was a fickle support, however. Between 1728 and 1845, 21 official failures of the potato crop were listed, and at such times the peasant had nothing to fall back on. He had to pay his rent or lose his potato patch for good, and he dutifully starved as he sold all other produce for rent.

There was no immediate sense of catastrophe when British Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel received in August of 1845 a letter from the Isle of Wight reporting that the potato crop there had been struck by a mysterious blight. Later that month, though, reports came in of total potato failure from disease in many parts of England, Holland, and France. It was clear that the blight was fiercely destructive, that it must strike Ireland, and that for Ireland far more than any other nation it meant a major disaster.

MEN OF PRINCIPLE

Just how great a disaster the great famine was, not only for the Irish population but for the whole course of Irish-English history since that time, is the subject of this lucid, detailed, and harrowing book by the English historical writer Cecil Woodham-Smith. It is one of the few calamitous events in history to which there was only one side: British behavior during the long years of famine was unmitigatedly shameful, growing ever more callous the more wretched conditions in Ireland became.

At the time the potato blight struck, Englishmen were taking out of Ireland about £6 million a year in rents alone. As the extent of the blight became apparent, Sir Robert Peel took what was considered a bold remedial step, ordering £100,000 of American maize for emergency distribution (it has been estimated that about £3.5 million worth of potatoes had been ruined). In order to protect the private merchant and the principles of laissez-faire, however, the grain was ordered sold only to counteract any price gouging by private importers. The fact that there were no large food importers in Ireland, and no village grocers, and no money to buy from them if they existed, seems never to have got home to Peel or his successor, Lord John Russell, in the 5 years of the famine.

By June of 1846, despite the most parsimonious distribution, almost all the American grain was gone, but a fat crop of potatoes was in the ground. Then the second wave of disaster, worse even than the first, struck: the nature of the fungus was such that before the huge crop was dug, the tubers began rotting by the millions in the ground. Peasants died by the thousands in their huts, if they still had huts, or by the roadsides if they had been evicted. Meanwhile, almost every bit of produce raised in Ireland found its way to England. Desperate Irishmen sought ways to escape, hundreds of thousands emigrating to the United States and Canada in rotting hulls, untold thousands emigrating simply to a death at sea.

The famine's fury lasted until the end of 1849, and, from 1847 on, Britain's main reaction—so far from increasing or even continuing Peel's pittance of aid—was to look away. "Some means must be found in Ireland," wrote Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary, although England and Ireland were, by act of Parliament, one nation. But Ireland had no means, and by 1851 some 1.5 million out of 8 million Irishmen had starved to death, and another million had fled. The nation emerged pauperized and vengeful as few modern nations have been.

George W. Cooper—Excellent U.S. Information Service Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, George W. Cooper is a fine U.S. Information Service press officer and Embassy press attaché at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people the fine work being done by my friend, Bill Cooper, formerly of the Pittsburgh Press, who is now U.S. Information Service press officer and Embassy press attaché. A well-written column on Bill Cooper's service has come to my attention which I am pleased to place in the RECORD to show that many of our U.S. personnel abroad are rendering worthwhile service:

U.S. EMBASSY PRESS RELATIONS

(By Paul Vanorden Shaw)

In the increasingly tangled skein of relations between the United States and Brazil, official and unofficial press relations have grown in vital importance. We would say that just at this point in the relations between the two nations both the press of Brazil and of the United States are playing major roles. Critics in both nations are blaming the press of the other for poisoning peoples' minds and causing a crisis which they attribute to irresponsible newsmen and agencies. And it is at such times that official press attachés can increase or ease tensions.

An Embassy press attaché obviously has sources of information which outsiders do not. He has contacts with local newspapers and newspapermen which are of great value to the country he represents. He must have a better than average knowledge of the country to which he is accredited and must understand her problems. And last but not least, he must possess tact, diplomatic know-how and the kind of personality which makes him well received in local journalistic circles. And conversely, the kind of personality which is pleasing to those who seek him out for information.

For some time we have been looking for a news peg on which to hang a column about the present U.S. Embassy press attaché in Brazil. Last Sunday's Brazil Herald (Dec. 30, 1962) gave us such a peg. It was entitled "Santa Claus on Breezy Post for Friendship." It then tells how Mr. and Mrs. George W. (Bill) Cooper and their friends and neighbors who live in the same building, Mr. and Mrs. Pauló Pinto Carvalho, as a joint venture in overseasmanship made a Santa Claus 12 feet long and hung him out of their windows on Avenida Atlantica so that he can be seen miles away.

We have known and come to rely on Bill Cooper because in an amazingly short time he has learned Portuguese, amassed a mountain of useful information about Brazil and collected a large number of Brazilian friends. From Brazilian colleagues we have learned to what extent they like and respect him. And we ourselves, when we have sought him out for information or insights into almost incomprehensible situations have never left his office emptyhanded. During the Bahia Conference on International Tensions we saw him in action and actually accompanied him on some of his factfinding trips.

Bill and Eleanor, his wife, are excellent hosts as well as the father and mother of two cute little girls, one born only a few months ago. Their parties and receptions are attended by prominent Brazilians in and outside of the journalistic field. Bill has made friends with working Brazilian journalists, especially the ones with key positions on newspapers, who are only to glad to do him a favor: A break for the United States because it opens channels for the publication of U.S. news items that are important in promoting more accurate information about the United States. And Bill works this in reverse to prevent false information about Brazil from being sent to the United States.

Because of his intellectual interests and former experience as a newspaperman and because in a very short time he made himself the master of all the ropes and threads of his duties and responsibilities as U.S. press attaché in Brazil, he began to click almost from the beginning of his tour of duty in Brazil. He arrived, if we are not mistaken, not too long before Sr. Janio Quadros resigned, and during the crisis created by Quadro's desertion he had the whole situation at his finger tips. Though then a "novato" or novice in things Brazilian he un-

derstood perfectly what was at stake during August and September 1961.

Although primarily a newsman in his past incarnation, he now sees the problems of Brazil-United States in a wider and more statesmanlike frame of reference. He knows exactly what is at stake and has left no stone unturned to provide the people of Brazil with the news and facts they need to understand Uncle Sam and his nephews and nieces. As a man of excellent judgment he has not committed the mistake of making some matters worse by trying to explain things that are better ignored and allowed to die a natural death. He has carved out an excellent reputation for himself and is a press attaché any country can be proud of.

Industry Feels Effects of Army Services Procurement Regulation Revision No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress I expressed great concern about possible conflicts which could result from the passage of H.R. 5532 of the 87th Congress.

This bill did pass with major amendments which were inserted by the Senate, and, as I feared, conflicts are already beginning to arise. I submit herewith an article from the March 1963 issue of the Westerner which is the monthly publication of the Western Electronic Manufacturer's Association.

The revision No. 12 to the Armed Services Procurement Regulation which has resulted from passage of H.R. 5532 appears to have serious implications. The article follows:

OUR INDUSTRY FEELS EFFECTS OF ARMED SERVICES PROCUREMENT REGULATION REVISION No. 12

In recent weeks, officers of a number of western companies have contacted Western Electronic Manufacturers Association directors and staff, requesting the association's assistance in repealing or enervating Public Law 87-653 and in modifying its interpretation as reflected by revision No. 12 to Armed Services Procurement Regulation.

This law and the Armed Services Procurement Regulation revision went into effect only 3 months ago, but already their impact has been widely felt in the electronic industry. Companies both large and small have registered complaints.

Big prime contractors and systems managers, however, should not be affected as adversely as the smaller and medium-sized organizations that are science based and leaders in development of new or specialized components.

For the most part, the Armed Services Procurement Regulation changes affect only fixed-price, sole-source procurements of noncommercial items. Most of these procurements will have to be negotiated on the basis of cost analysis, subject to certification and the defective pricing clause in the new regulations.

COULD DISALLOW INDEPENDENT R. & D.

Industry leaders who have carefully studied the Armed Services Procurement Regulation revision 12 point out that DOD now has the opportunity on sole-source fixed-price contracts to disallow not only the prior development costs of a product for which it is negotiating procurement, but also part of the contractor's independent research and development program.

Thus a contractor may have no way of recovering his full investment in the development of a product. Component manufacturers who have established positions of leadership through independent research and development may find that they no longer can recover those R. & D. costs in the price of their products.

Western Electronic Manufacturers Association member companies have raised so many arguments against various sections in the Army Services Procurement Regulations revision that it is impossible to report all of them in this limited space. However, here are highlights of some of the criticisms being leveled against the new regulations.

MAY REDUCE PRICE AFTER CONTRACT COMPLETION

One paragraph (3-807.5) of Army Services Procurement Regulations permits the Government to reduce prices after contract completion under certain circumstances. This is interpreted as removing the "fixed" from fixed price negotiated contracts and from modifications over $100,000 to fixed-price contracts whether formally advertised or negotiated. This appears to contradict DOD policy statements that more emphasis would be placed on fixed-price contracts. In addition, this particular provision is being described by some industry spokesmen as unfair because it might leave contractors with the burden of risk of loss if contracts cost more than estimated, but with no possibility of gain if they cost less than anticipated.

Another paragraph (3-807.4) requires certification that cost data submitted is complete, current and accurate; false representations can result in criminal penalties.

Contractors question what is meant by "complete" data. This literally could mean amassing a great deal of information that is neither significant nor reasonably available.

THREATENS AVERAGING CONCEPT

The Renegotiation Act recognizes the necessity for averaging a contractor's gains and losses, or plus-and-minus variances between actual experiences and previous estimates. Industry believes the averaging concept also should be followed in contract pricing. In contrast, paragraph 3-807.8 states, "each contract shall be priced separately and independently, and no consideration shall be given to losses or profits realized or anticipated in the performance of other contracts."

Since companies often are competitors as well as suppliers to each other, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act might be violated as a result of a paragraph (3-807.3) directing any contractor who has been required to submit and certify cost or pricing data to obtain cost or pricing data from his subcontractors.

There is a growing feeling in the industry that the Army Services Procurement Regulation revision exceeds the bounds of congressional intent in enacting Public Law 87-653. It is argued, for example, that the law clearly limits the requirements for submission of cost or pricing data to contracts or subcontracts in excess of $100,000 in price, or contract changes or modifications of lesser amounts if prescribed by the head of the agency.

ONE SECTION NEGATES LIMITATION

However, one section of the new regulations (3-807.3) negates this limitation by directing the contracting officer to require submission of cost or pricing data on "any negotiated contract not expected to exceed $100,000 * * * provided the contracting officer considers that the circumstances warrant such action."

Representatives of the Western Electronic Manufacturers' Association board and the staff went to Washington in January to discuss with several Senators and Congressmen the detrimental effect the new law and its interpretation by DOD will have on our industry—and on the smaller companies, in particular, who may be forced to drastically curtail the independent research and development they have been conducting.

Further steps the association will take to bring this to the attention of legislators and government officials were discussed at meetings of the Western Electronic Manufacturers' Association executive committee last month and the entire board of directors March 1.

How a Simple Income Tax Could Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the need for tax reform has been ever present for many, many years. The progressive rate is wrong, in graduation and confiscation "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" is not the American creed. Basically, therefore, our present income tax is wrong in structure. This requires tax reform. Our present tax system is also at too high a rate, and this will require rate reduction. True, tax reform by its nature would eliminate today's difficulties in the high rates. However, big government spending requires high taxes. It is difficult to change, much less reform, tax law until we reduce the tremendous pressures of the high taxes caused by high Federal expenditures. It is very important therefore that we lower the rate of expenditure by the Federal Government so that in reforming the tax structure we can make both ends meet financially. Fiscal responsibility, that is, a balanced budget, is the necessary accompaniment of any change in our tax system. True, tax reform, that is, the correction of inequities, is appropriate at any time. But we cannot in good conscience reduce Federal income without attempting also to reduce Federal expenditures so that we do not jeopardize the value of our money.

Several solutions for tax reform have been suggested: First, the Baker-Herlong approach which is a scaled-down progressive year-by-year tax reduction in all brackets within the framework of a balanced budget.

Another tax solution would be a flat percentage tax of all income. This, of course, would be the more typical American system since all people would be treated equally, thereby fulfilling the word "equity" in its finest sense. This week—April 1, 1963—the U.S. News & World Report directed attention to the need for tax change in an article entitled "How a Simple Income Tax Could Work." Here is another attempt to provide a sensible framework for all our people to raise the necessary money to run the Government. I commend it to the study of my colleagues:

HOW A SIMPLE INCOME TAX COULD WORK

In brief a new plan for personal income taxes:

Tax rates: Range of 10 to 35 percent. Present range: 20 to 91 percent.

Income subject to tax: All of each taxpayer's income, whatever the source, except one-half of any social security benefits.

Personal deductions: None; no special concession for contributions, interest, etc.

Business deductions: No change in present law. Deductions allowed for office rent, other business expense.

Personal exemptions: None. Instead—

Tax credits: A flat allowance, to be subtracted from tax due, for each taxpayer and each dependent. Amount to be substracted from tax: Generally, $100 per person. For a married couple, $300. For a single taxpayer, 65 or older, $200. For a married couple, both 65 or older, $500.

Other special privileges: None. Capital gains: Taxed as ordinary income. Married couples: An end to tax benefits from income splitting, in all States, including community-property States. Dividends: No tax credit or exclusion. Interest on State and local bonds: Fully taxable.

Net tax cut: $8.6 billion a year—roughly the same as under Kennedy tax plan.

Revenue: About $40 billion a year from personal income taxes; again roughly the same as under Kennedy tax plan.

A simple tax on personal income—one that a child can understand and apply—is possible.

This "simplified tax" can raise the $40 billion a year that President Kennedy wants from individual incomes.

RATES: MUCH LOWER

The starting rate of such a tax can be 10 percent instead of the present 20 percent.

The top rate can be 35 percent instead of the 91 percent at present.

A simplified tax requires that Congress junk the present law on personal income taxes and write a new one.

At the moment, tax writers in Congress are bogged down trying to "reform" the existing income tax structure. Ever since the end of World War II, Congress has been seeking a real "reform" of tax laws, without success.

Today, more and more tax authorities are coming to the conclusion that the existing tax law simply cannot be patched up so that it will work fairly.

Instead, in their opinion, the remedy is an entirely new law.

The economic unit of U.S. News & World Report undertook to devise a simplified tax and rate schedule capable of yielding the desired $40 billion in annual revenue from personal taxes.

To achieve simplicity in an income tax, the tax specialists worked on a basic premise—that the existing law is so shot through with escape provisions it cannot be made to apply equitably.

Underlying all planning for a simplified income tax are these facts:

1. Individuals in the United States have incomes that total $450 billion a year.

2. Under present law, owing to escape hatches built in over the years, only $210 billion of this income is subject to the tax law. This means that $240 billion is beyond the reach of the tax.

3. Any simplified tax plan must be based upon taxing of all income. Start opening loopholes and concessions, and there is no stopping.

The plan arrived at in the economic unit study—just as a sample of what can be done—taxes all cash income alike, whatever the source.

No cash income would be excluded from tax, except one-half of social security benefits—reflecting the tax payments already made by those retired on social security pensions.

Personal exemptions would be wiped out. Instead, there would be a system of tax credits to be subtracted from the tax itself, once it is determined.

Generally, this credit would be $100 per person. A married couple would get $300, plus $100 for each dependent. For those 65 or older, there would be an additional $100 credit. A married couple, both 65 or older, would get $500.

LOST TAX ADVANTAGES

Capital gains would get no preferential rate. Such gains, whether long-term or short-term, would be taxed just like other income.

Splitting the family income between husband and wife would lose its tax advantage. A special rate schedule would be used to equalize the tax paid by married couples in community-property States and those in other States.

The present tax credit and exclusion on dividend income would disappear.

Interest on State and local bonds, now exempt, would be taxed.

All personal deductions would be eliminated.

Business expenses, such as the pay of a lawyer's office help, would continue to be deducted as now. Expense accounts are part of business deductions.

LOOPHOLES CLOSED

The idea is that, when a tax is applied to every dollar of individual income, tax loopholes will be closed automatically.

Tax savings, net, would add up to $8.6 billion a year. That is roughly the same as under President Kennedy's plan of tax reduction and reform.

The simplified tax plan set out here would offer some savings to virtually all individual taxpayers.

A few, protected now by concessions written into the tax laws, might pay slightly higher taxes.

The typical taxpayer, however, would come out far ahead, and millions would be relieved of tax altogether.

This should be emphasized: The simplified tax plan set out here is not put forward as a plan being advocated for adoption by Congress.

It is only an effort to show what can be done to simplify the tax if Congress and the White House are really interested in writing a simple law.

This plan, in short, would be only a starting point in devising a completely new tax law.

There is widespread demand for a tax law that not only gets rid of what many call confiscatory rates, but also is precise in its application and simple enough for ordinary people to understand.

All these demands have been kept in mind in forming the simplified plan outlined on these pages.

THE TAX RETURN

Making out a tax return would be a matter of minutes for the typical taxpayer.

It would take only a simple calculation in arithmetic to determine the tax liability. The taxpayer would multiply his dollars of income by the rates shown in the tax schedule, then deduct the tax credits allowed in lieu of personal exemptions.

There would be no anxious hours spent searching for loopholes, striving to itemize deductions, worrying about what questions the tax collector might raise later in checking the return.

A simplified income tax would have widespread effects, both in and out of Government.

The vast and growing bureaucracy now trying to police tax returns could face drastic reduction. An ordinary clerk could check the typical individual's tax return. Highly trained technical personnel could spend more time on corporation returns and others with complications.

Tax lawyers serving individual clients would have less work to do.

Some of the best brains in the country, now engaged in finding ways to avoid income taxes, would be released for constructive tasks. At today's high tax rates, nothing pays as well as success in finding tax loopholes.

EFFECT OF TAXES NOW

Today, the Government takes 50 percent of a single man's taxable income—after deductions and exemptions—starting at $16,000. For a married person, the 50-percent rate begins at $32,000. From there, the rate rises steeply to a top of 91 percent.

A good many working people, in effect, spend more time working for the Government than for themselves and their families.

The Government's demand for such a heavy slice of a man's income is recognized as having two effects: (1) It dampens effort as a person finds less incentive to make more only to have the Government take a rising share of his earnings. (2) It puts a great premium on finding ways to avoid taxes.

A simplified tax, with low rates, is urged by many as a way of correcting these problems. Many believe it would be the surest way of giving the general economy a lift.

WHO'D WIN; WHO'D LOSE

As for the practical effects of a simplified plan that would tax virtually all personal income;

In the lower brackets, married people get a better break on ordinary income than do single people.

In middle and upper brackets, where income splitting now offers major savings to married couples, this is reversed.

Renters get bigger savings, relatively, than do homeowners. Reason: deduction for mortgage interest and for property taxes would disappear.

Younger people, still working, generally get a better break than retired people. Most of the special benefits now given old people would be eliminated.

Charities, churches and other groups that get their income from donations would have to rely on contributions induced by low tax rates. These groups are now dependent on tax deductions for contributions to induce generosity on the part of givers.

Investors, generally, would come out with lower taxes. However, those who rely heavily on capital gains or tax-exempt interest would be hurt.

For example, the high-income man who now pays a tax of $25,000 on a long-term gain of $100,000 might have to pay as much as $35,000 under the simplified plan.

At more moderate incomes, as well, taxes can go up a bit if the taxpayer has capital gains, dividends and relatively large itemized deductions allowed under present law.

Take a family of four with $15,000 from salary, plus $1,500 from dividends and $1,500 from long-term gains. The total tax would rise by around $200 to about $2,750.

Thus, there would be protests against taxing capital gains at full income rates. Congress could, of course, retain the present limit of 25 percent in the effective rate on long-term gains. That would cost about $400 million in annual revenue.

Other groups, no doubt, would demand concessions in the law. This has been the history of taxwriting in this country.

ONE CONCESSION, AND THEN

The trouble is that, in devising a simplified tax, one concession would invite another and another. Revenue would be chipped away.

Tax rates would have to be adjusted upward from the range of 10 to 35 percent shown in the tax plan.

Complications would begin to reappear in the system. At some point, if concessions

were carried far enough, the basic purpose of simplifying the tax law would be defeated.

The fact is, however, that a simple tax system with low rates will require taxing virtually every dollar of individual income, with little or no variation in rates from one type of income to another.

Over the years, however, Congress has not shown much interest in starting all over again and making the income tax really simple.

Some Members explain that this is due to the fact that political advantages often can be found in voting special tax favors for big groups of taxpayers, and by opening loopholes here and there in the tax laws where important groups are interested.

SIMPLIFICATION VERSUS ABUSES

A good many Members recognize, even so, that a simplified tax plan, if Congress were willing to enact one, could put an end to many of the troublesome abuses arising from the present tax.

The plan outlined here is intended only to show that a simplified plan of tax can be written, and to outline the principle that must underlie any such plan. Many tax authorities believe the Government eventually will come around to a simplified tax plan in some form.

If you are younger than 65—What the "simplified tax" would mean to you

Income	Present tax	Simplified tax
Single person:		
$3,000	$422	$250
$5,000	818	540
$8,000	1,540	1,050
$10,000	2,096	1,430
$15,000	3,787	2,430
$25,000	8,324	4,830
$50,000	22,788	11,830
$100,000	58,116	27,830
Married couple, no children:		
$3,000	300	50
$5,000	660	340
$8,000	1,240	850
$10,000	1,636	1,230
$15,000	2,810	2,230
$25,000	5,774	4,630
$50,000	16,648	11,630
$100,000	45,576	27,630
Married couple, 2 children:		
$3,000	60	0
$5,000	420	140
$8,000	976	650
$10,000	1,372	1,030
$15,000	2,486	2,030
$25,000	5,318	4,430
$50,000	15,976	11,430
$100,000	44,724	27,430

NOTE.—Present tax assumes deductions equal to 10 percent of income. Simplified tax allows for no deductions.

Source: Study by U.S.N. & W.R. economic unit.

If you are 65 or older—What the simplified tax would mean to you

Assumption: All income from wage and salary

Income	Present tax	Simplified tax
Single taxpayer:		
$3,000	$300	$150
$5,000	686	440
$8,000	1,360	950
$10,000	1,900	1,330
$15,000	3,529	2,330
$25,000	7,988	4,730
$50,000	22,362	11,730
$100,000	57,612	27,730
Married couple, both 65 or older:		
$3,000	60	0
$5,000	420	140
$8,000	976	650
$10,000	1,372	1,030
$15,000	2,386	2,030
$25,000	5,318	4,430
$50,000	15,976	11,430
$100,000	44,724	27,430

Assumption: Retired taxpayer with $1,200 of earned income, plus Social Security pension and other income

Total income	Including social security division of—	Present tax	Simplified tax
Single taxpayer:			
$3,000	$800	$116	$98
$5,000	900	383	373
$8,000	1,000	1,021	860
$10,000	1,200	1,511	1,216
$15,000	1,400	3,010	2,190
$25,000	1,400	7,257	4,562
Married couple, both 65 or older:			
$3,000	900	0	0
$5,000	1,000	69	65
$8,000	1,500	585	515
$10,000	1,800	951	859
$15,000	2,100	1,970	1,820
$25,000	2,100	4,646	4,178

NOTE.—Present tax assumes deductions equal to 10 percent of income. Simplified tax allows for no deductions.

Source: Study by U.S.N. & W.R. economic unit.

A Salute to Sacony and S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1963, I was privileged to attend the celebration marking two decades in South Carolina for Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. On that occasion, along with Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, I flew to Cheraw and there visited the Cheraw Division of the Sacony Manufacturing Co. Later that afternoon I was privileged to stand in the receiving line at the reception when many of the citizens of Cheraw gathered for the purpose of speaking to the various guests. At 7:30 in the Cheraw armory an enormous banquet was held, and 500 people met to do honor to Sacony Manufacturing Co., S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and to salute the members of the Sacony family who have contributed to our growth for 10, 15 years, and more. It was a happy and festive occasion, and pins were given to those with 10 and 15 years of service. The pins were distributed by Mr. Sidney Augstein, president, and chief executive officer of S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

After the national anthem, a most appropriate invocation was given by Rev. H. Dwight McAlister, of Cheraw. The Honorable Reginald R. Sipe, mayor pro tempore, city of Cheraw, delivered the address of welcome in the absence of Mayor Russell Bennett, who had to be out of town on business. Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr., president of Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc., made appropriate remarks and presented to Mr. Adolph M. Augstein, chairman of the board of directors, a memento from the many officials and employees of Sacony, who were delighted to do him honor and pay him homage on the occasion.

Mr. Adolph M. Augstein then made an address which was followed by the presentation of the gold service pins by President Sidney Augstein. The list of those receiving the pins follows:

Cheraw—10 years: Loyd Allen, Martha Ammons, Dora Bailey, Ruby Baker, Ruby Baucom, Gladys Bone, Geneva Braswell, Edythe Brigman, Eva Mae Brigman, Annie Brock, Christine Brock, William Brown, Dorothy Bruce, Myrtle Campbell, Uzell Campbell, Annie Sue Carpenter, Allen Cassidy, Ramona Cassidy, Emma Jean Chapman, Flora Chavis, Grace Chavis, Mattie Cheves, Vernie Clark, Catherine Crawley, Cora Lee Curry, Lucy Deese, Eva Mae Dixon, Clara Mae Driggers, Mary Driggers, Kathryn Easterling, Rose Evans, Geneva Freeman, Doris Gardner, Edith Gardner, Jean Gaskins, Joan Gaskins, Jayne Gentry, Clyde Hair, Sue Harpe, Mary Etta Keith, Clyde Kimrey, Ruth Kimrey, Lawrence King, Kermit Q. Kirby, Tululah Knight, Charles Kudrna, Edna Lee, Oscar Lewis, Janie Livingston, Nellie Lofton, Geneva Lowrey, Margaret Mathis, Gertrude McDonald, Edith Miller, Alice Moore, Hester Moore, Nora Morris, Lucille Phillips, Betty Margie Pruitt, Virginia Quick, Mary Ruth Rivers, Nezzie Sings, Ethel Spencer, Robert Tanner, Clyde Tolson, Ethel Tolson, John Tucker, Ruby Turnage, Doris Wallace, Jessie Wallace, William Wallace, Ruby Watts, Margaret White, Thelma White, Ophelia Wood, and Irene Wooten.

Fifteen years: Louise Barfield, Beatrice Boatright, Doris Brigman, Viola Bruner, Ruby Butler, Mary Chapman, Victoria Crould, Ruth Culbreth, Mildred DeBerry, Mary Lee Eddings, Evelyn Fisher, Louise Frazier, Eva Graham, Grace Hall, Viola Mathis, Grace McDonald, Pearl McDonald, James McQuaige, Sr., Jaine Parker, Sarah Quick, Nelle Rivers, Josephine Russell, Sue Spease, Elizabeth Strickland, James Stuard, Howard Thomas, Bertha Tilley, and Virgie Wallace.

Chesterfield—10 years: Ethel Adams, Evelyn Adams, Ola Baker, Almeter Brantley, Mary Brantley, Mary Brock, Nell Burch, Frances Burr, Lucy Burr, Maggie Davis, Margaret Davis, Katie Lee Deese, David Douglas, Mildred Douglas, Evelyn Eddins, Barbara Evans, Marguerite Gaskins, Ruth Gaskins, Betty Harpe, Joyce Hinson, Mary Huneycutt, Flora Huntley, Martha Huntley, Mary Huntley, Bessie Lee Jackson, Hallie James, Sally Johnson, Otis Jones, Alberta Jordan, Betty Jordan, Melba Faye Jordan, Marie Kirkley, Mary Lee, Clara Belle Lisenby, Leila Lisenby, Mary Ella Lisenby, Mildred Lisenby, Vivian Lisenby, Eva Mills, Nell Moore, Mary Pate, Nealie Polson, Mary Raffaldt, Carolyn Rhyne, Alma Rivers, Betty Rivers, Elizabeth Rivers, Ralph Rivers, Leila Rollins, Anthel Sellers, Daisy Sellers, Essie Sellers, Ruby Sellers, Vera Sellers, Sara Shaver, Emma Mae Smith, Margaret Smith, Ruby Smith, Ruth Stroud, Marion Teal, B. Thurman Teal, Mary Vaughn, Geraldine Watson, Eleanor White, Eva White, and Leatha White.

Fifteen years: Bessie Oliver and Olivia Watson.

Manning—10 years: Maggie Alsbrook, Cecil Anderson, Margaret Ardis, Frances Broadway, Janie Campbell, Emma Clark, Eunice Clark, Edith Cook, Frances Evans, Mary Evans, Minnie Evans, Sally Gardner, Caddie Gibbons, Aurelia Green, Edna Hodge, Ella Hodge, Rachel Hodge, Mary Johnson, Coline Kennedy, Jewell Langston, Anna Lowder, Corrie Mae McElveen, Mary McRoy, Virginia Melton, Helen Morris, Vista Peebles, Azilea Plowden, Catherine Prescott, Corine Rhodus, Annie Richbourg, Louise Richbourg, Edith Ridgeway, Cornelia Spigner, Ola Spigner, Dorothy Strange, Lucy Tarte, Lila Mae

Thames, Corrie Thigpen, Lillie Thigpen, Richard Thigpen, Ruth Timmons, Hummin Tobias, and Luvenia Welch.

Pageland—10 years: Annie Allen, Betty Anderson, Laura Brock, Inez Byrd, Nell Carnes, Vera Cato, Ellen Clark, Evelyn Clark, Martha Clark, Crissie Clontz, Letha Donahue, Loretta Eubanks, Allie Evans, Henrietta Eans, Cleo Funderburk, Eva Funderburk, Marion Funderburk, Eunice Haithcock, Nettie Haithcock, Blondell Hamilton, Wilma Hancock, Azilee Hicks, Lavinia Hinson, Paul Hunter, Harry Jackson, Curtis Jenkins, Bessie Lee Johnson, Marsha Kelly, Lois Knight, Estelle Laney, Worth Lee, Theda Lynn, Cora aMngum, Johnnie Medlin, Virginia Mills, Joanna Nicholson, Lucy Nicholson, Mae Oliver, Mary Outen, Nelle Pigg, Lucy Price, Margaret Rallings, Gladys Rivers, Azilee Robertson, Grace Rogers, Bessie Rollings, Evelyn Rollings, Ola Rollings, Violet Rollings, Flora Rollins, Blanche Rorie, Winona Rorie, Maude Rushing, Clara Short, Grace Shrum, Annie Sims, Leila Sulivan, Cora Taylor, Mary Taylor, Grace Terry, Gladys Thomas, Minor Threatt, Mary Lois Timmons, Gladys Turner, Lessie Walters, and Helen Watts.

Fifteen years: Ovie Agerton, Christine Brewer, Mary Broome, Mildred Byrd, Henrietta Carter, Ethel Courtney, Mae Courtney, Vera Gibson, Lucy Griggs, Eva Gulledge, Ella Hancock, Lela Hicks, Jane Huneycutt, Bessie Jackson, Cloria Kirkley, Mae Laney, Bertha Little, Lillie Mangum, Mary Lee Maples, Janie Nash, Addie Price, Leona Price, Claire Robbins, Azilee S. Robertson, Nell Robinson, Rosa Robinson, Lee Roy Rollings, Lena Rollings, Thelma Rollings, Vinnie Rollings, Pearl Rorie, Mary Sanders, Zula Smith, Thelma Sutton, Allie Terry, Lennie Threatt, Willie Threatt, and Henry Watts.

Appropriate remarks were made by the Honorable Donald S. Russell, Governor of the State of South Carolina, who told of the happiness of our people in having Sacony as part of the South Carolina industrial family and pledged the continuing cooperation of the State of South Carolina in Sacony's magnificent production and posture.

As a pleasant and welcome surprise, Mr. Sidney Augstein presented to Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, dedicated legal counsel for the company, an appropriate plaque. This plaque saluted the wonderful legal services Mr. Wannamaker has rendered to the company over the 20-year period of its efforts in South Carolina. Mr. Wannamaker then introduced the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina, who told of the coming of Sacony to South Carolina when he was Governor. He recited the incidents surrounding the visits to the Governor's office when he was Governor and not only welcomed Sacony to South Carolina, but pledged the cooperation and effort on behalf of the State of South Carolina. Then Senator JOHNSTON took occasion to salute the Augstein family, whose significant history is intertwined with the company presently giving employment and production in South Carolina, and I am sure I speak the feeling of those present when I say that his address was heartwarming, appropriate and inspiring. I include Senator JOHNSTON's address. It was preceded by a magnificent introduction by Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, whose very cadence reflected the happiness of the occasion and his delight in participating. The address of Senator JOHNSTON is as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON

Caston, I am not quite sure what you want me to do for you but whatever it is, you let me know because I guess I will have to come through after all those nice things you said about me.

Governor Russell, Mayor Bennett, Mr. Adolph Augstein, and Mr. Sidney Augstein; and other distinguished guests: When I was first asked to attend this 20th anniversary celebration, I hesitated to agree to deliver any speech because I have been so close to the development and life of the Augstein Industries in South Carolina that I thought I might be a little handicapped, or you might say prejudiced, in what I would say.

Today in South Carolina when a great percentage of our people in business, government, and industry think in terms of the industrial growth of our State, we like to pat ourselves on the back, rightfully so, and talk about the miraculous changes that have taken place in our economy as a result of our efforts to bring new industry into our State.

Too often we fail to pat the backs of those who in the early days of our industrial development had the foresight and the pioneering spirit to come into our agricultural area and promote industry. Industry begets industry and I feel that today we owe a deep debt of gratitude to companies such as Sacony, headed by Mr. Augstein, for helping us in South Carolina to grow industrially.

Twenty years ago when Adolph Augstein first came to South Carolina, surveyed our assets and liabilities, I was in my second term as Governor of South Carolina. We had been fighting the freight rate battle and had established the first State development board, the industrial commission, labor department, as well as our ports authority and other institutions looking toward industrial development. Caston, many of the industries we have brought to South Carolina in recent years probably would not have come here if such men as the late Senator Jim Leppard, of Chesterfield and yourself, as legislators, had not followed my recommendations as Governor, and passed laws creating the labor department, the workmens compensation law, and other similar progressive acts necessary for a good industrial climate. But we did not have all the anwers to the industrialists who came into our State wondering whether or not they should move or start new industries within our borders. Anyone starting a new industry in a primarily agricultural society, necessarily took a certain risk in their development. Sacony is one of those industries which helped to lead the way for other industries.

In our early development years we pointed with pride to Sacony as an example of what other industries could do in our primarily agricultural economy. We looked to Sacony as one of our examples of success. I know Sloan Gable with the State development board can well remember in those early days how Mr. Augstein and Sacony helped us with the many industrial prospects who came to South Carolina. Once we had them inside a Sacony mill we let Mr. Augstein and his people do all the talking. We couldn't have hired better salesmen to help us get new industry to South Carolina. So you can see, Sacony has played a principal part in the overall industrial development of our State.

When Sacony located in South Carolina in 1945 the war had ended and it was before the great South Carolina industrial development revolution.

Today Sacony employs over 2,500 people in Pageland, Chesterfield, Bethune, and Manning plants, and the future, because of wise planning and cooperation on local levels, continues to be bright. Throughout these 20 years of growth in South Carolina, I have maintained close personal relations with Sacony and from time to time have been involved in some of the problems and some of the jobs that have come the way of Sacony.

Many people who hear the name Sacony, think of it in terms of just another plant or another industry and another payroll and another source of tax revenue, but the impact on our economy goes far beyond just these factors.

I guess people know more about Sacony through its products than they do about Sacony. Sacony has established high standards of plant operation and relations with employees. From the first day of its operation until now, Sacony's record in South Carolina has never been marred by any labor-management dispute. This speaks well for management and for those employed in these plants.

Sacony represents the kind of industry South Carolina needs and wants. We are glad in South Carolina that we had something to offer Sacony, but let it never be said that South Carolina has not been thankful for what Sacony has given her. I speak in terms of South Carolina because it takes the whole State to cooperate and keep an industry operating successfully and smoothly and to remain on its feet.

But certainly I cannot commend the relationship between Sacony and our State without singling out the people of Chesterfield County who cooperated in this pioneer venture 20 years ago. What the people in Chesterfield County did in cooperation with Sacony equals in contribution to our entire State's industrial growth to what Sacony contributed. The harmonious relationship and the success of Sacony in Chesterfield County has been a living example for other areas of our State to follow. No section of our State has met the challenges of industrial expansion and contributed to our State's growth in a more splendid manner than Chesterfield County.

Sacony is one company that has spanned the entire postwar industrial growth era of our great State, and I predict they will continue on matching their growth and success with our State's growth and success throughout the coming years.

I think I should cite here the executive management of S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. They are as follows:

S. Augstein & Co., Inc.; executive management: Chairman of the board of directors, Mr. Adolph M. Augstein; president and chief executive officer, Mr. Sidney Augstein; corporate secretary, Mrs. Carolyn A. Winik; treasurer-controller, Mr. Leon Reinharth; vice president, manufacturing division, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; vice president, women's wear division, Mr. Arthur R. Travis; vice president, assistant to chairman of the board, Mr. Saul N. Pollack; director, children's wear division, Mr. Irwin Alfin; director, fabric division, Mr. Albert S. Baris; and director, sportswear division, Mr. Chester S. Strasser.

Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc.; executive management: President, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; manager, quality control division, Mr. Charles G. Kudrna; manager, shipping and warehouse division, Mr. William J. O'Donnell; manager, Cheraw cutting division, Mr. Kermit Q. Kirby; manager, Cheraw sewing division, Mr. Clyde Hair; manager, Chesterfield sewing division, Mr. Otis M. Jones; manager, Chesterfield special manufacturing division, Mr. David F. Douglas; manager, Manning sewing division, Mr. Harold Lee; and manager, Pageland sewing division, Mr. Linwood Zeigler.

The young and vigorous president of S. Augstein & Co., Mr. Sidney Augstein, made a most significant address as part of the festivities of the occasion. He recalled the ambitions and the dedication

of his family, and in the audience were his father, mother, and his sister. Rather than try to embellish his statements, I include at this point the complete text of his remarks:

REMARKS OF SIDNEY AUGSTEIN AT CHERAW, S.C.

Honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I don't need to tell you how proud we are that you have taken the time to come here tonight to break bread with us, and remind us how warm and hospitable the people of South Carolina can be. It was Emerson who said: "Hospitality must be for service not for show." Certainly the hospitality of South Carolinians is one of service and the manner in which you extend it is gratifying indeed.

When we first came to this State 20 years ago, there were, undoubtedly, some among you who were dubious about the establishment of a factory to make women's and children's apparel. There has always been a certain precariousness about the apparel trades, a doubt that any given company can long endure. Justification for this attitude lies, no doubt, in the industry records which show that the average length of company life in the apparel trades is less than 10 years.

I am sure that you recognized something in Sacony, even 20 years ago. At that time we had been in business for over 50 years. I for one am ready to admit that the very real assistance which you gave us has made it possible for us to chalk up more than 70 years of continuous operation, something rare in the apparel trades.

But I want to stress that we are in an important industry, one that is often underrated in a Nation that has become accustomed to the workings of giant corporations; where total business and profits are measured in billions or hundreds of millions of dollars.

By contrast there are no apparel manufacturers who can show as much as $100 million in annual sales, maybe a half dozen have passed the $50 million mark, and only a handful do better than $10 million.

I repeat, we are in an important industry, nevertheless. It is one essential to the welfare of the Nation, and one that we can be proud of even though the individual producing units are relatively small.

Will there ever be a General Motors in the fashion industry? I doubt it. Sacony will grow and so will other apparel manufacturers, but not to a point where any one will ever account for more than 2 or 3 percent of total fashion industry sales.

As apparel producers, we are doing something more than just covering the human body; we are helping the wearer to create an image of good grooming and, I like to think we are helping to uplift her spirit to give a sense of security and well-being.

There is a subtleness in this business that precludes the use of any fully automated process. A good apparel style is like a work of art, but not a work or art that can be reproduced on a printing press. Each garment has in it, a little bit of the maker, his skill, his concern, a little bit of his love for humanity.

Women's apparel alone is a $12 billion industry in the United States. This is at the wholesale level, our level. Including infants' and children's and men's and boys', the figure would easily reach over $20 billion annually. Expenditures for apparel at the retail level are probably in excess of $31 billion a year.

This Nation boasts of the highest standard of living in the world. This is reflected in the expenditures our people make, not only for the essentials of living but for luxuries as well.

Expenditures are now running at a rate of $360 billion a year. Clothing stands high on the list of articles that consumers buy, and contrary to what many think, there is more money spent for the purchase of clothes than the purchase of automobiles. Clothing expenditures are also greater than those for furniture and household equipment.

The late Thorstein Veblen, a brilliant critic on modern business, wrote: "The material framework of modern civilization is the industrial system, and the directing force which animates this framework is business enterprise."

I quote Veblen only to spotlight something we are often reluctant to admit; namely, the goal of business is to make a profit. I believe this is a legitimate goal, but—and it is a big but—if this were our sole aim, we will have failed. We must take into account other human goals, and the hopes and aspirations of the people involved, their friendship, and the need to help the individual achieve a sense of personal identity, a sense of belonging to this endeavor.

It has been said that the ultimate goals in life are often achieved by indirect means. We have among our goals the desire to create products of true economic worth, to offer the buyer a genuine advantage, and serve him better than anyone else. In the Sacony philosophy there is the axiom that building of customer loyalty will pay off.

And we will invest in people, particularly those who work with us, we will seek to create a climate in which they will want to work with us, where they can do the best they have in them to do.

We believe that a company of this kind will prove more profitable in the long run than one in which the "fast buck" is the sole objective, regardless of human values.

We hope that we shall never get so big that we will be out of touch with those who work with us. It is physically impossible, of course, for management to come into daily contact with everyone in our factories, but we want you to feel that we are establishing policies that do fulfill our obligation to you, no matter what your task, and that our supervisory personnel will be ever mindful of these policies.

Someone facetiously once said: "A corporation is an ingenious device for obtaining individual profit without individual responsibility." I disagree. Rather I would subscribe to the thought expressed recently by Mr. Greenewalt, chairman of the Du Pont Co., and I quote him:

"A corporation is not a cold legalistic instrument existing without heart or emotional involvement, but a sensitive human institution, reflecting nothing more or less than the human cells and sinews of which it is composed."

Mr. Greenewalt also expressed a simple truth in successful business operation that we often lose sight of:

"The difference between the notably successful institution and one whose record is simply run of the mill," he said, "is seldom very great. It does not consist of brilliant and inspired flashes of genius—certainly not over a considerable period of time. The difference rather is the small increment of extra performance diffused over a very large number of individuals at all levels of the organizations."

Looking at the business prospects for 1963, I would say that we certainly will have to expend a little extra effort to insure a successful year. The American woman, in large city and small hamlet, is probably more fashion conscious than ever before. And more quality conscious, too. This does not mean that she is looking for the high price items. She expects quality in the meidum range apparel too.

The women we are concerned with mainly are those between the ages of 17 and 35. This market totals about 21 million. While this is less than 20 percent of the entire population, women in this age group are responsible for purchasing 35 percent of all women's apparel.

The children's market is constantly expanding. The segment of this market that we are concerned with is even larger than our women's market. There are 24,500,000 girls in ages from 1 to 12 years. The birth rate now is well over 4 million a year, soon it will be 5 million, and we can figure that about one-half will be girls.

But most important is the consumer's ability and willingness to buy. We haven't much doubt about his ability to buy. Personal income is at peak levels. There is the prospect of a cut in Federal income taxes that will put many more billions of dollars into the hands of the consumer.

In evaluating prospects for apparel, we never know for sure whether the consumer will show greater or less favor for soft goods as against hard goods, or whether he will decide to save more and spend less.

If we are going to forge ahead with Sacony products, we must make them well and make them attractive to insure that we get a fair share of the soft goods dollar. And this is what will take that little extra effort.

What about the future of Sacony? I can say that we have every intention of expanding our lines and our markets. We are not excluding the possibility of merging other apparel companies into our own. This will pose no danger for our factories in South Carolina, rather it will most probably bring more business and employment to this area.

I might add that apparel manufacturing has become an important industry in South Carolina. Plants turning our men's, women's, and children's apparel employ over 30,000 people, or more than 13 percent of all factory employees.

Our roster of employees who have been with us 10 to 20 years not only indicates that we have been here a long time but demonstrates a real measure of stability. With your help, we will continue to grow.

Thank you.

We welcomed Sacony to South Carolina 20 years ago. Our purpose on the evening of March 15 was not only to celebrate the 20th anniversary, but to assure Sacony our welcome continues, that they are an appreciated part of our industrial family, and to wish for them many more decades of successful production in South Carolina.

As we saluted those employees who have given such fine service over the years, we acclaimed also those who have made possible the fine record of this company. I hope I will have the privilege of attending the 30-year dinner, and many more.

Byelorussian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the date of March 25 marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The people of Byelorussia first proclaimed their freedom on March 25, 1918, but their young Republic was soon turned into a battlefield for the armies of Russia and Ger-

many and later of Russia and Poland. Engulfed from the east and from the west, Byelorussia was conquered and her territory divided. During the occupation resistance continued and during World War II Byelorussia was able to organize a free government and arm herself against Soviet Russia. Russian might once again crushed the Republic and, in an attempt to crush also the spirit of the Byelorussian people, the conquering Soviet Union ignored natural ethnographical order and redistributed the people.

During this 45-year history of persecution and oppression, the anniversary of that 1918 proclamation of independence has been honored. From their tragic history we have come to respect and admire the valiant courage and determination of the Byelorussian people. They have become an exceptional symbol of resistance to the flood of communism and it is proper that we should join them on this day in the rededication of their goals toward a free and independent Byelorussian Republic.

Max Freedman Urges a New American Initiative for Freer World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past winter have made it clear that this is a time for new moves toward the goal of freer world trade.

The logic behind a new American initiative to deal with the rising problem of European protectionism has been set forth eloquently by Max Freedman in the Washington Post of March 23, 1963. I call the observations of this distinguished journalist to the attention of the House:

TRADE DILEMMAS

(By Max Freedman)

The time has come for the United States to examine anew its attitude to the Common Market. The result of this examination may well be that the administration will decide that its policy and its strategy are right and should be continued without change. But it is equally possible that the review will bring new facts to light that will force a revision of policy. At all events, the stocktaking which followed the French refusal to treat Britain as a member of the European community has lasted long enough and it should now lead to a new American initiative.

This initiative will fail, and will deserve to fail, if it is intended as a reprisal against France. It should instead be seen as part of the campaign to set world trade in the broadest perspective of freedom. Nor should we conclude, even at this stage, that most of the nations belonging to the Common Market will wish to cut themselves adrift from that movement. But they must have a much clearer choice than has yet been offered to them.

The assumption on which American policy to the Common Market has been based for many years is that Western Europe would form a customs union that would, after a transition period, join with other nations in breaking down the barriers to trade. It requires an act of faith to hold that doctrine today. The Common Market, when judged by the ideals proclaimed by its own leaders 2 or 3 years ago, has been a disappointment. It has been an immense success in bringing new vitality and power to its European members; but it has begun to develop some of the very evils of a closed trading system which it had promised to avoid.

As one studies the hearings on President Kennedy's trade bill it becomes clear in retrospect that Senator DOUGLAS and Representative REUSS had a great deal of wisdom on their side when they questioned some of the assumptions on which the administration's case to Congress ultimately rested. At the time their criticisms seemed rather excessive but in truth they foresaw the disturbing trends which have now become visible to everyone. We cannot regain this lost ground but at least we no longer have to be stuck on dead center.

There is one decisive thing wrong with the suggestion that the United States should reduce its tariff barriers slowly and reluctantly. This policy assumes that tariff reductions are primarily intended to benefit other countries instead of the United States. If that were true, Congress would never have passed the trade bill. The United States will be acting against its own economic interest if it fails to open its own market to full competition in return for reciprocal concessions from other nations.

Before going to Europe recently I shared the accepted view in Washington that the Common Market cannot discriminate and still hope to enjoy the advantages of the new trade bill. I now believe that Christian Herter, in his negotiations with the Common Market, will be gravely handicapped unless he can make quick use of the powers to reduce the American tariff. The Common Market, in short, must have the incentive of access to the American market and of participation in an expanding world market in order to stand fast against the forces of protectionism now being organized by France and Germany.

How can one combine these two principles into one policy? How can the American trade program give new strength and hope to those in the Common Market who still believe in fair trade and are ready for free trade? The answer can be given at the Geneva meeting on trade in May. At that meeting the United States should show a strong preference for GATT over the Common Market. Indeed, it may be necessary to ask whether the Common Market in its present form is the kind of customs union sanctioned by GATT or whether it is in violation of the Geneva trade system. This challenge would at least open the debate on new terms and give America's friends in the Common Market the chance to be heard. They will have a steadily diminishing chance unless the United States, supported by Britain and other important trading nations outside Western Europe, come to their help in Geneva and enable them to withstand the pressures from Paris and Bonn.

A Long-Neglected Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material:

A LONG-NEGLECTED VALLEY

(An editorial by Mr. Harold C. Lund, vice president, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., an outstanding civic leader, of Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Industrial towns in the Chartiers Valley, near Pittsburgh, have been hit once again by a severe flood. It is an old, costly, and disheartening experience for the more than 75,000 people living in the Carnegie-Bridgeville-Canonsburg area. They have dug their way out of more than 50 floods in the last half century * * * an average of nearly 1 a year * * * and 7 were of a very violent nature.

The latest rampage of Chartiers Creek—coming on top of the closing of the Superior Steel plant—and loss of 1,200 jobs—is a paralyzing blow to the valley. Business, industry, and residents in the lowlands suffered heavy damage estimated at somewhere between $5 and $10 million * * * not to mention the human agony and crippling effect on the valley's drive for new industries.

However, the latest disaster at least has served to trigger action on the long-delayed Chartiers Valley flood control project. The U.S. Corps of Engineers now is recommending that the $17 million project be approved * * * and our Congressmen, State, and local government officials are working shoulder-to-shoulder to get it underway.

The biggest stumbling block is who will pay the $5 million cost of relocating sewers of the Allegheny County Sanitary Authority in the Chartiers Creek bed. This is a cost that normally must be borne by the local communities, but these towns are old and have suffered far beyond their ability to meet this cost.

At this critical point, we think it is up to the State and Federal Governments to rescue the communities in the Chartiers Valley by underwriting the cost of relocating the sewers, and it may take special legislation to do the job.

Chartiers has been a long-neglected valley * * * low man on the flood-control totem pole. We urge our Congressmen and States legislators to cut through the usual redtape * * * eliminate any further delays * * * and assign top priority to the Chartiers project. Only with floodproofing can this valley be changed from a depressed to a thriving industrial area.

RYERSON METALOGICS,
March 20, 1963.

Mr. HAROLD C. LUND,
Vice President, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. LUND: Representing the industrial committee of both the Chartiers Valley Flood Authority and the Carnegie Chamber of Commerce, I want to extend their thanks for your editorials of March 11, 12, and 13, regarding the pending flood control for the Chartiers Valley.

The industry in this valley appreciates the time and interest you have devoted to our problem. We would be remiss in our civic responsibilities if we would not thank you, in behalf of those citizens who cannot or will not take the time, for bringing their problem to the attention of all interested parties.

Official representatives of five of the communities affected by the recent flood, the chairman of the Chartiers Valley Flood Authority, and myself, met with Senator CLARK and Congressman FULTON in Washington on March 14, on this very subject. We hope we have convinced them of the urgency of this program and have asked for their assistance in expediting approval of the plans which, we understand, are in the U.S. Corps of Engineers office in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Thank you for your interest. It is greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

H. W. BECK.

Maryland Port Authority Brief on Mortgage Insurance for American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since all forms of transportation are of great concern to the Members of Congress, I believe they will be interested in the telegram and brief of the Maryland Port Authority concerning the application of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., for mortgage insurance:

BALTIMORE, MD., *March 21, 1963.*

Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

As representative of the maritime interest of the port of Baltimore we respectfully request that you having a vital interest read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the opening intervenor brief of the Maryland Port Authority dated December 17, 1962, filed by William L. Marbury, Donald MacLeay, and Harold Mesirow, attorneys voicing our objections to American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., title XI application for mortgage insurance under Maritime Administration docket S-137.

JOSEPH L. STANTON,
Maryland Port Authority.

OPENING BRIEF OF INTERVENOR, MARYLAND PORT AUTHORITY, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Docket No. S-137—American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., title XI application for mortgage insurance-intercoastal shipping investigation

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This proceeding concerns an application of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. for mortgage loan insurance, as provided for under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, covering three containerships which it proposes to construct and operate in intercoastal service between the port of New York on the Atlantic coast and the ports of Los Angeles and San Francisco on the Pacific coast. On April 5, 1962, the Maritime Administrator ordered a public hearing on the application and defined the issues to be there considered as: (1) whether the proposed American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. title XI application embraces a project which will be economically sound; and (2) what the impact of a grant of the application will be on other water carriers in the intercoastal trade.

The Maryland Port Authority (hereinafter referred to as MPA or Baltimore) intervened at the public hearings as its interests may appear. Maryland Port Authority is an agency of the State of Maryland, created by an act of the general assembly, charged with the responsibility for the protection and development of the ports of the State, and authorized and directed to do all things necessary to protect and increase commerce through the port of Baltimore. Maryland Port Authority's interest in this proceeding lies primarily with the latter issue noted for hearing by the Administrator—the impact of the proposed operation upon the intercoastal trade. There are, however, certain incidental aspects of the economic feasibility issue which require comment.

Specifically, the interest of Baltimore is in protecting what intercoastal service it still has from the additional competition of applicant's proposed service which would not serve Baltimore, but which could and very likely would injure the interrcoastal carriers upon which Baltimore must now depend.

BALTIMORE AND THE ISSUE OF IMPACT UPON EXISTING INTERCOASTAL SERVICE

Intercoastal service at Baltimore: The postwar decline in intercoastal service has left Maryland Port Authority with but two eastbound/westbound intercoastal carriers.[1] Clearly, service at Baltimore is not nearly what it used to be nor does it approach the level which Baltimore now requires. It, therefore, goes without saying that the service remaining—that provided primarily by a Calmar Steamship Corp. and Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.—is of vital importance to Baltimore. Although these carriers transport substantial quantities of proprietary cargo (Calmar—iron and steel articles; Weyerhaeuser—lumber), each does provide a common carrier service to Baltimore as well as other North Atlantic ports. (See their annual reports filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and transcript 920). Without them Baltimore would have virtually no intercoastal service.

Baltimore and the interior areas naturally tributary thereto are capable of generating and have generated substantial intercoastal traffic. The annual reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission of Calmar, Weyerhaeuser, and Pope & Talbot reveal that those carriers loaded 668,583 tons and discharged 123,174 tons at Baltimore in 1960. In 1961 loadings were 490,716 tons while 130,379 tons were discharged. Baltimore no longer has the services of Pope & Talbot which abandoned its intercoastal service at the close of 1961 (exhibit AH-R, p. 4).[2]

The cargo generating capabilities of Baltimore and its natural hinterland are demonstrated by exhibit PC-VI. Table 3 of that exhibit shows that the industrial concentration (measured by value added by manufacture) in the State of Maryland alone as far back as 1958 totaled some $1,447,989,000. In addition, because of its geographical advantage Baltimore has always been an important conduit in intercoastal movements from eastern interior origins. For example, iron and steel from western Pennsylvania have historically moved primarily through Baltimore or Philadelphia (transcript 936-37).

Intercoastal service has been and remains today of great importance to the port of Baltimore and the State of Maryland.

American-Hawaiian's intent as to Baltimore traffic: Although American-Hawaiian proposes to call only at New York on the Atlantic coast (exhibit AH-P, p. 2), the record reveals its intent to draw traffic from all of the North Atlantic States from Maine to Virginia, inclusive. Witness Nathan's estimates of available containerizable traffic are based upon obtaining cargoes from all of those States, as are the various traffic data which he has compiled. (See, for example, exhibit AH-P, tables 6, 11, 34, 35, 36, and 37 [not printed in RECORD].) Similarly, Witness Coyle has taken as the base for his projected operating figures the 1959 total traffic and revenues of Luckenbach whose service encompassed several North Atlantic ports in addition to New York (exhibit AH-P, p. 7; transcript 1271).

More specifically, as concerns Baltimore, American-Hawaiian apparently intends to go after not only Calmar and Weyerhaeuser general cargo, but also the proprietary cargo of each. The potential lumber movement contained in Witness Nathan's report includes the lumber carried by Weyerhaeuser (transcript 1126). As to Calmar, applicant's witness stated its intention to seek to carry whatever of Calmar's tonnage that is containerizable and that can be handled economically (transcript 1842).

The proposed efforts of American-Hawaiian to draw through New York both general and proprietary cargo moving to and from the entire North Atlantic area coupled with the fact that many of the wide variety of Witness Nathan's containerizable commodities[3] can and do move in conventional break-bulk service, clearly point to the crippling, if not extinction, of the remaining break-bulk intercoastal services of Calmar and Weyerhaeuser—all to the extreme detriment of the Port of Baltimore and the State of Maryland.

This result applicant cannot safely deny, for if it does not intend to siphon off all of the North Atlantic traffic through New York then its pro forma operating calculations, based as they are upon all such traffic, are seriously deficient.

The manner of impact upon Baltimore's intercoastal carriers: Those carriers providing intercoastal service at Baltimore are today faced with the competition of Sea-Land which operates a new intercoastal containership service between New York and the Pacific coast, and which while operating at much less than capacity (transcript 4680, exhibit SLE-App. 2) is already drawing off highgrade cargoes from Baltimore and its immediate hinterland. Baltimore's position therefore is not in support of Sea-Land itself, but rather is directed against the creation of a situation which would intensify a condition from which Baltimore is already suffering.

The introduction of an American-Hawaiian containership service serving only New York could not help but worsen the situation at Baltimore. Among others, the injury would take two immediate forms. First, an additional containership service at New York would intensify the syphoning off of highgrade cargoes to and from Baltimore itself and its hinterland, by truck movement to or from New York prior or subsequent to vessel carriage beyond. Such movement of Baltimore oriented traffic through New York would inevitably be increased by the intensification of competition between two containership services operating out of New York. This, of course, would deplete the reservoir of available traffice for the carriers actually serving Baltimore, thereby lessening their ability to continue to provide service.

Secondly, to the extent that the carriers serving Baltimore also serve New York (as do both Calmar and Weyerhaeuser) they would be injured by the intensification of containership competition at that port. In the struggle to obtain sufficient cargo to fill their containerships, both Sea-Land and American-Hawaiian would, and must, solicit and transport commodities equally adaptable to break-bulk operations (see AH-P, pp. 29-30, 144) and which are being satisfactorily handled in such operations at the present time. (See ICC annual reports of Calmar and Weyerhaeuser.) The loss of such traffic at New York would cause further injury to the carriers upon whom Baltimore must depend for service.

In addition, the introduction of a second containership service at New York which would draw high-grade cargoes originating at and destined to Baltimore and its immediate hinterland would be a strong deterrent to the institution of any new service at Baltimore.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The inevitability of these happenings requires little resort to specific examples. An excellent one, however, may be found in the evidence of applicant's witness Nathan. Appendix 11 to his exhibit AH–P is a tabulation of tonnages of dried fruit shipped from California by water to selected States during the years 1951 through 1961. The selected States are the North Atlantic States plus Virginia. The tabulation shows that in 1961 Maryland received 3,009 tons of dried fruit by water. The 1961 annual reports to the ICC of Calmar, Weyerhaeuser and Pope & Talbot—Baltimore's principal carriers in that year—reveal that only the latter transported dried fruits, in the amount of 4,267 tons. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that Pope & Talbot handled the 3,009 tons to Maryland shown by witness Nathan. With Pope & Talbot now out of the trade, it is also reasonable to expect that one of the remaining carriers is handling this quite substantial traffic—substantial enough to require individual treatment by witness Nathan. The diversion of this "containerizable" commodity to containership service through New York from Baltimore's break bulk carriers is a clear-cut example of the injury that could and would be worked upon them. Furthermore, the chances of its occurring would be more than doubled by the addition of the American-Hawaiian service.

CONCLUSION

Much has been said, both pro and con, on this record about the impact of applicant's proposed service upon Sea-Land—and properly so. However, it must not be forgotten that the second issue in this proceeding embraces the impact upon "other water carriers in the intercoastal trade." The "other water carriers" so mentioned include those carriers presently providing service at Baltimore. The adverse consequences of authorizing the institution of a second containership operation serving only the port of New York insofar as "other water carriers" are concerned are clear, and certainly would not comport with the basic principle of transportation policy laid down by the President in his message on transportation and cited by witness Nathan (AH–O, p. 6):—

"Equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation and their users, and undue preference to none."

Denial of the application is required.

Respectfully submitted.

MARYLAND PORT AUTHORITY.

(By William L. Marbury, First National Bank Building, Baltimore, Md. Donald Macleay, Harold E. Mesirow, 1625 K Street NW., Washington D.C., its attorneys.)

---

[1] American Export Lines (formerly Isbrandtsen) does serve Baltimore but eastbound only on the Pacific Coast/Puerto Rico/Atlantic coast leg of its round-the-world service.

[2] Pope & Talbot's Baltimore carryings were:

Loaded:

1960	136,588
1961	101,351

Discharged:

1960	42,842
1961	46,304

[3] Footnote 1 to table 11 of exhibit AH–P defines "containerizable" commodities as "nonbulk dry commodities and wine."

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Major Domestic Problems in the 1960's—Address by President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on last Saturday, March 23, the people of the city of Chicago were privileged to have as their guest the President of the United States. President Kennedy attended the dedication of Chicago's O'Hare International Airport and later addressed a civic luncheon. His remarks were an excellent discussion of the major domestic problems we face in the 1960's, and they deserve the study of every American. I ask unanimous consent that President Kennedy's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT A CIVIC LUNCHEON, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. Mayor, your eminence, Rabbi Mann, Bishop Burrill, Senator Douglas, Mr. Logelin, Mr. Lee, distinguished guests, Mr. Smith, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be in Chicago because I am struck every time I come by the strong public spirit which runs through this city in the determination to make Chicago second to none, and everything about Chicago to be the best, that men and women working together can provide. And also by the happy spirit of community effort which joins business, labor, the civic groups, and all the rest, in selling Chicago to the people of Chicago, to the country, and the world.

As Mr. Smith said, "All these things do not just happen; they are made to happen." And the reason they are made to happen, I think, in Chicago, is because of Mayor Daley. So I am glad to be here today.

I did not realize, which shows the advantage of getting out of Washington—I did not realize until I began to look up some of the details of O'Hare what an extraordinary effort this has been, the largest airport in the world here in the center of the United States. So I hope that Chicago will continue to tell its story, not only here but all across this country of what a great metropolis it is, its energy and vitality, and its commitment to the future. I don't think that there is any doubt that if this country continues to grow, if we can maintain a rate of economic vitality and prosperity, that Chicago will be among the leaders, and that the future of O'Hare Airport, named as the mayor has said after a great Chicagoan, who died a good many thousands of miles away from here, that Chicago and O'Hare will be symbolic of the progress of this country.

There is, I think, the central thesis, however, that we face serious problems in this country in the decade ahead if we are going to maintain that growth, and I want to mention one of those problems because I think it concerns us all, in government, in the city, the National Government, the State, labor, management, all of us as citizens. I think the No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's; the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us. Some people may think it strange that jobs, which was the great issue of the thirties, when we were in a depression, should also be the great concern of the sixties, when we enjoy a relative period of economic prosperity. The difficulty in the thirties was that there was an inordinately low supply of jobs for the men and women who wished to find work.

The difficulty now is the tremendously high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made by all of us to strengthen the economy so that we can find work for the people who want it. This involves not only Chicago in this country, but it involves our position of leadership in the world. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when he was able to demonstrate that his system could outproduce ours. The hinge of history will move if we are not able to find jobs for our people, not only during recessions, but also during periods of prosperity; and there are three reasons why I regard this as the number one problem we are going to face in this country in the coming years, and it is serious enough to warrant a careful examination by all of us to realize that it cannot be reduced by platitudes and hopes, and the effect of this problem is being felt and will be felt here in Chicago, Ill., and across the country. There are three reasons for it: First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has been this Nation's largest employer, engaging more people than steel, automobiles, and public utilities, and the transportation industries combined.

But now 1 farmer can produce the food and fiber needed for 25 Americans; compared to only seven at the turn of the century. New fertilizers, insecticides, research and all the rest have made this one of the great productive miracles of all time, has been one of the great stories for the United States around the world in contrast to the failure of our adversaries, but it is a fact that since 1947 our farms have increased their output 30 percent, at the very time that the manhours worked on those farms were cut in half. Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million, an average of 200,000 a year; comparable to the population of the city of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work every 12 months. In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by a half million, while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated that disturbing as it may sound, only 1 out of every 10 boys growing up on the farms of the United States will find a living in agriculture.

This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower, our Nation's youth. The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through our elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16. This year 3,800,000 will be coming into the labor market at that age. Altogether, in the 1960's, 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, and a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one-third of our unemployed. Last year, the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was 4.4 percent. But for those age 20 to 24 it was 9 percent, and for those 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent. Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts, 4 out of every 10, is too high, for job openings for the untrained are declining, in factories, mines, farms and railroads, in the construction and service industries.

Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. In our modern society, even high school graduates find that their skills are inadequate. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school, but in the later years.

The latest surveys also show that unemployment rates among college graduates are much lower than among those who come out of high school. But unfortuantely, only 1 out of every 10 finish college. In short, as challenging as it will be to provide, first, jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problem of absorbing the 7.5 million who will not even finish high school, including nearly 2½ million who will not even finish the eighth grade.

I ask you to mark these figures well, for youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing this country and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises to 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's?

Finally, underlying all of these trends is the third phenomenon, both cursed and praised, and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of automation. During the last 6 years, the Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent, but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers, and the gain in white-collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3 percent rise in man-hours.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Increasing productivity and advancing technological skills are essential to our ability to compete and to progress. But we also have an obligation to find the nearly 2 million jobs which are displaced by these advances.

This city is no stranger to any of these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermarkers, as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to dig the coal that 100 men dug in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only 10 years ago. Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also proves the exception to this pattern since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.

This is not a blue-collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processes. The Farm Home Administration of the U.S. Government processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with Government economy, but we also have to find in the private economy jobs for these people who are willing.

All these trends you have seen in this city and State, workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm, the mine, the factory, the railroad, or the distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though under Mayor Daley's hard-driving leadership this city is creating new jobs faster than almost any city in the country. The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years. But the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs, outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total gross national product output grew at a rate of only 3 percent, while unemployment remained continuously above 5 percent. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion work days, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks.

Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962, and 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer. Fifteen percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer. This Nation must do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grow worse, after each recession, and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of the manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth, unless we create a supply of jobs which is more equal to the demand, our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession. Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential, without strong consumer demand plant capacity is not fully in use, without full plant utilization profit margins are reduced, without higher profits investment lags, and so the sagging spiral continues downward.

Our task is to reverse this spiral, to recognize it in the first place, and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems. Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth in order to create more jobs. Ten million dollars more in tax savings in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls, and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging upon it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year that we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay, no world crisis strains our resources, the dollar is strong, new investment incentives have been enacted, world war material prices are stable, and the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb this expansion. But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to a distressed area, and tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we must put forward. To mention but a few, we urgently need to improve our schools and colleges, to reduce the number of dropouts, to reduce the number of unskilled workers, to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a youth employment opportunities program to give young people training and job experience instead of hanging around the streets, out of work, and out of hope. We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, particularly in those areas where it has been chronic, for more security for our aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment, which helps increase, of course, the chronic unemployment of minority groups.

These are all controversial measures. There may possibly be others that are needed or others that are better, but at least it is a problem that we should all concentrate our attention on and not merely assume it is going to be settled if we ignore it.

O'Hare Airport was not built in that spirit and this problem will not be solved unless we concentrate the best energies of this country on the solution of a serious national problem. I have no doubt these problems will some day be solved. The question is will they be solved in ways which impoverish us, with restrictions on the work week, or inefficiency, or in competition, or will they be solved in ways which enrich us by expanding our economy and putting people to work.

The choice is up to us all, to you here in Chicago, to those of us in Washington, depends on the will of the people and the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago: "Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at their head, and my fervent hope is that the United States of America in meeting the needs of this decade will also be peopled by "men able to use their opportunities." Thank you.

Legislative History of Public Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the responsibility of preparing the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code, I am constantly concerned with methods of making the publication of the laws more understandable and useful.

I want to call to the attention of the House a most significant and valuable improvement in the publication of the laws by the General Services Administration; and I want to extend to the Administrator and to his staff in the Office of Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, responsible for this improvement, my warmest congratulations.

In my hand is a copy of Public Law 88–1, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. This print, which is popularly called a "slip law," is the initial publication of a Federal law upon enactment, and may be obtained at the National Archives. At the bottom of the page of this law is a legislative history, showing that this legislation was reported from the House Appropriations Committee, House Report No. 35, from the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Report No. 9, and that it was considered and passed by the House on February 27, 1963, and by the Senate on March 4, 1963—with a reference to volume 109 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This information, available for the first time as an addendum to the slip law itself, gives the essential information needed for research regarding the law. It will save untold hours of research. Without the information in this form it has, until now, been necessary for interested persons to have recourse either to the House Calendar or to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—which are not always readily available even here in Washington—presupposing that they have the necessary familiarity with those publications to enable them to know what to look for. From now on, with the guide published in the legislative history, that part of the research is already done and all that is necessary is to obtain the reports from the Superintendent of Documents and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for the days indicated.

I understand that the legislative history printed on the slip laws may be expanded in the future to give a reference to printed committee hearings on the legislation. In this connection, I hope that it will be possible for all committees to adopt a uniform simple method of identifying hearings—such as by serial numbers—so that only a brief reference to a serial number in the legislative history will be adequate. This would avoid lengthy descriptions of the subject matter of the hearings now frequently necessary to identify them.

I also understand that it may be planned to present the legislative histories in tabular form in the volumes of the statutes at large in the future. These volumes are, of course, the cumulation of the slip laws for each session. Incidentally, one of the recent improvements in the printing of the slip laws is the marginal reference to the volume and page of the statutes at large in which the particular law will ultimately be printed. Another recent improvement was in the numbering of the laws by incorporating a prefix indicating the number of the Congress. For example, this law is Public Law 88–1 and the next one will be Public Law 88–2. This system precludes the uncertainty that used to prevail when reference was made to, let us say, Public Law 601, without identifying the Congress.

I know that the Members and all other persons who must have recourse to legis-

lative history join me in expressing this commendation to those responsible for these notable improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, a copy of Public Law 88-1—called a slip law—to illustrate these improvements.

PUBLIC LAW 88-1, 88TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 284, MARCH 6, 1963

Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign assistance programs

Public Law 480

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480," to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation due to expenses and costs of sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), $508,172,000, to remain available until expended.

Approved March 6, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 35 (Appropriations Committee).

Senate Report No. 9 (Appropriations Committee).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109: February 27, 1963, considered and passed House; March 4, 1963, considered and passed Senate.

Acceptance Remarks by Representative Ben Reifel, of South Dakota, Vice President of Arrow, Inc., Acknowledging the Abbott Laboratories Gift of Paintings Depicting the Practice of Medicine by American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Abbott Laboratories presented to Arrow, Inc., on March 6, 1963, a collection of 36 original paintings which effectively portray in the form of an art the pressing human problem of health and its maintenance among the American Indians. The Honorable BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, my own distinguished Representative, delivered the acceptance address on behalf of Arrow, Inc., which is an organization working on behalf of the American Indian—health, education, housing, welfare, development, and crafts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "Acceptance Remarks by Congressman BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, vice president of Arrow, Inc."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN BEN REIFEL, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, VICE PRESIDENT OF ARROW, INC.

It is with both extreme pleasure and profound gratitude that I accept, on behalf of Arrow, this striking collection of paintings. It is refreshing to note that a pharmaceutical company such as Abbott is not only in the business of developing medicine for saving lives but, through its program of fine art, also enriches our lives.

I think it must be obvious to everyone here, on seeing the thrilling works of the four very talented artists commissioned by the Abbott Laboratories, that the results represent not only a significant contribution to the art world, but also to the enhancement of a better understanding of the American Indian in general and his health and medical problems in particular.

In fact, it was the development of a more realistic understanding which the people of Abbott were striving for when, 14 years ago, they sent their writer-artist teams across 20,000 miles of Indian reservation lands to portray Indian life as it then existed. Looking at these paintings today, there's little doubt that they have helped to achieve a better understanding, for the progress in Indian health care, a progress which could only have come about with increased understanding, has been striking.

Let me give you a few illustrations. In 1950, when these paintings were first reproduced in the Abbott Laboratories' magazine, What's New, the accompanying text revealed some shocking medical statistics. The death rate among Indians due to tuberculosis was then 10 times higher than it was for the non-Indian population. Today, that figure has been reduced to less than four times, and TB, no longer the scourge it was 14 years ago, now ranks ninth among causes of Indian deaths.

The same article also told of a tragically unbelievable infant mortality rate. Out of every 1,000 Indian babies born, 89 died. Today, that death rate has been reduced by more than half. And this, despite the fact that the Indian population is increasing more rapidly than the general population.

With disease rife and medical care at a minimum, how long could the American Indian so vividly portrayed in these paintings expect to live? This is a quotation from a Papago report cited in the article of 14 years ago: "Of approximately 260 infants born each year, one-fourth die within 12 months, at the age of 6 there are only 160 left; at the age of 18, only 125. The life expectancy of a Papago infant is 17 years."

Today, that Papago can expect to live 42 years.

Unquestionably, there has been tremendous progress in the medical and health care of the Indian, and today he can aspire to a life more nearly comparable to that of his fellow Americans. These paintings have contributed to that progress. So have many of you here this afternoon, and I would not wish to let this opportunity go by without acknowledging and commending the efforts of such Government agencies as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Agriculture, the Interior Department, and the Division of Indian Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The cooperation of many private organizations working in the field of Indian welfare has provided a step up the ladder toward acceptable health standards. Much advancement is due to a sympathetic and farsighted Congress which saw and understood the need, and appropriated the funds necessary to make achievement possible. Perhaps most deserving of commendation are the Indians themselves who have struggled to bring about understanding, cooperation, and advancement among their own people.

We can look at these paintings today and feel justifiably proud of our progress. But we cannot look at them and fell complacement. Much still remains to be done.

It is true that the Indian infant mortality rate has been cut in half, but it is still twice that of the non-Indian population.

It is true that TB is no longer the leading cause of death among Indians, but the overall Indian death rate remains frighteningly higher than the death rate for the general population.

It is true that the Indian can expect to live longer, but his life expectancy still falls 20 years short of yours.

As you look at the colorful and articulate brush work in these paintings, you will read a story at once heartening and discouraging. It is a story of the great improvements that have been achieved, and the progress that is yet to be made. It is a story that must be told, and we hope to use these paintings in such a way that it will be.

They will remain displayed here tomorrow and we ask that you invite your friends to view them. Later, during the 1964 New York World's Fair, the works will be housed in the American Indian pavilion where they will bring their message to millions of Americans. What their specific future use beyond the fair will be, we do not yet know, but we would welcome suggestions from any of you here today which would assure that the story they have to tell remains prominent. For we of Arrow, along with all of you, I'm sure, look forward to the time when the true value of these paintings will be measured not by their portrayal of the work that remains to be done, but only by their creative beauty and their symbolization of a history of suffering that has passed.

We are indeed highly honored to be made permanent custodians of this valuable and unique collection. Thank you.

The TFX Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including four newspaper editorials concerning the TFX decision. One is from the Washington Star of March 21, another appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, one is from the Fort Worth Star Telegram of March 19, and another is a column by Joseph Kraft which appeared in the Washington Star of March 21.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 21, 1963]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There are two ways of looking at the conflict of interest insinuations, aimed at Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric, which have been oozing out of the Senate committee study of the TFX warplane contract.

One is that these charges or intimations are politically inspired. If so, this is thoroughly reprehensible.

The other is that the sponsors of these intimations really believe that there may be

a basis for the complaint. If this is the case, we would like to cast our vote on the side of the proposition that this is the rankest sort of nonsense.

Presumably it is necessary, or at least expedient, to erect some kind of conflict of interest barrier between temptation and a prospective Government official. It may take the form of sworn testimony that he has severed all former professional connections or a statute requiring a businessman to impoverish himself in return for the "privilege" of serving his country. In either situation, the efficacy of the "barrier" is open to grave question. Conflict of interest procedures will not make an honest man out of a thief. What the Senate, in its confirmatory process, ought to do is to take a long, hard look at the man. If his integrity is suspect or questionable, confirmation should be refused. The real looting in Government jobs has resulted from confirming nominations on the dotted political line. And as long as this is the practice, conflict of interest procedures will accomplish little.

But, back to Mr. Gilpatric. We do not believe there is the slightest basis for raising any question with respect to him and the TFX contract. His superior, Mr. McNamara, assumes full responsibility for that contract. And, we trust, there is no prospect that Mr. McNamara is going to be accused of getting his under the table cut from this deal. The real danger in a situation of this kind is that politicking and wild blue yonder stuff will discourage honorable, decent, competent men from taking any kind of Government job. Only those with sticky fingers will apply. And this, it seems to us, raises the real conflict of interest—from the point of view of the public interest.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Mar. 22, 1963]

THE ISSUE IN THE TFX CONTROVERSY

Any suspicions that the projected TFX fighter plane should really be named the L.B.J. after Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, has been pretty well knocked in the head since the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee under Senator MCCLELLAN began its inquiry into the letting of the $6.5 billion contract to build the plane.

It is now widely conceded that politics did not enter into the awarding of the contract to the General Dynamics Corp. of Texas.

Defense Secretary McNamara has given the committee his reasons for rejecting the Boeing Co. bid and made it plain that the decision was made by him and his civilian advisers.

His calculation that a billion dollars could be saved if a single fighter plane could be developed that could be used by both Air Force and Navy met with objections from both services. They wanted separate planes, but the Defense Secretary decided that the fighter the General Dynamics people came up with was near enough.

Mr. McNamara may be right or he may be wrong, and it is proper that he should be asked to justify his decision as best he can. It is equally true that the military objectors to the single plane may be wrong.

From suspicions of undue political influence, the controversy has flowered into the basic question of civilian versus military control of the Pentagon. A good deal more than idle fear has been expressed in and out of Congress lest our tremendous Military Establishment should slip out from under traditional civilian control. Mr. McNamara has applied the civilian constitutional principle. The findings of the McClellan committee could very well determine the direction of the civilian-military relationship.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Mar. 19, 1963]

EXPERT'S DECISION ON TFX

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, chairman of the committee investigating the awarding of the TFX fighter plane contract to General Dynamics, says Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's defense of the decision does not convince him that it was justified. The Secretary's statement makes sense, nevertheless, and while it includes bits of technical information, an ordinary layman—or a Senator—should have little trouble understanding the reasons he has given for the action.

For example, the report easily disposes of one of the main points offered in support of the charge that the contract award was decided on the basis of politics and would have gone to General Dynamics "no matter what." That point is that the continuous postponement of the award and repeated further study orders were prompted by political interference in order to give General Dynamics a chance to catch up with the design submitted by Boeing, the principal rival.

Mr. McNamara reveals, however, that there was extensive disagreement among the Pentagon agencies involved in the selection procedure as to what action should have been taken after the first design proposals were considered in January 1962. All agreed that very substantial change would be very substantial change would be required in designs presented by both of the leading competitors, General Dynamics and Boeing. To accomplish these changes, the Source Selection Board appointed by the Air Force and Navy recommended that the services work exclusively with Boeing in a design study contract. But a number of other agencies, including both the Navy Bureau of Weapons, and the Tactical Air Command, for whom the aircraft is being built, and the Air Force Systems Command, which has overall production and testing responsibility, favored a joint study with both companies. The joint study was chosen partly on the assumption that the competition between the two firms would produce a better product in less time and at least cost.

After the second and third design proposals were submitted last spring a further study again was ordered. Again the Source Selection Board had recommended Boeing. But the fact was that neither design suited the Navy, and Mr. McNamara detected also that neither firm had understood the fundamental goal of the project—a single aircraft that could be used by both the Navy and the Air Force.

Accordingly, still another joint study contract was awarded. This time, however, the Secretary directed a letter to each of the firms attempting to make clear his position. His three main points were that the acceptable design would have to: (1) satisfy Navy and Air Force requirements for improvement in their tactical air capabilities; (2) provide a minimum divergence from a common design for both services; and, (3) show a demonstrably credible understanding of costs for development and procurement of the aircraft.

In its report on the fourth and final design submission, the evaluation group stated that both aircraft satisfied point No. 1, the performance requirement, although the Boeing design scored a bit higher. But it conceded that General Dynamics scored much higher on No. 2, the so-called commonality feature, and somewhat higher on No. 3.

On the basis of General Dynamics' advantages in these last two points, Mr. McNamara says, he made his decision. In amplifying his reasons, he ranged somewhat into technical matters. It suffices to say that the judgment of both the Secretary and the evaluation group was that Boeing's bid amounted to two separate designs and was less than straightforward in the approach to development and production programs. The General Dynamics proposal appeared to the Secretary to be far more in line with the original goal, more practical and dependable, and more realistic in its approach to design problems.

In short, Mr. McNamara seems to have felt that once the military requirements were met by both planes, the only basis for further comparison was in the realm of production techniques and cost. Considering the Defense Secretary's civilian background, it would seem safe to say that the final TFX decision was made by an expert in such matters.

Mr. McNamara's instructions from President Kennedy, on taking over as Defense Secretary, were to: (1) develop the force structure necessary to U.S. military requirements; and, (2) to procure and operate this force at the lowest possbile cost. The TFX episode represents a bold attempt to fulfill this assignment at the expense of some long-used methods of procedure. The outcome is one with which neither the military nor the taxpayer should find fault.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 22, 1963]

REASON IN REALM OF TECHNOLOGY—MCNAMARA DEFENDED IN TFX DECISION AS PRACTITIONER OF COMMONSENSE

(By Joseph Kraft)

All the facts are not yet in on the conflict of interest charges leveled against Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric. But the insinuation looks to be the work of desperate men. In origin and thrust, it is of a piece with the intimation that Secretary McNamara is a walking computer, good at figures but deficient in understanding of military problems. And that charge can be shown to be a canard.

Behind all the fuss are the victims of rapid advance in weapons technology. For the Air Force in particular, and for its clients in business and politics, the advent of missiles, and their rapid improvement, has made slim pickings where once there was cornucopia. The big bombers—the B-47, the B-52, and the B-70—are out, or on the way out. The Navy's Polaris has replaced the Jupiter missiles in Italy and Turkey, and overtaken the Skybolt missile. The handwriting seems to be on the wall for the Titan III missile and the Dyna-Soar project. Lastly, the Air Force is being obliged to share a fighter plane—the TFX—with the Navy, while the Army looks in a fair way to get masses of its own fighters for support of conventional operations.

Many highpowered careers, as well as billions of dollars and thousands of jobs, are at stake, so it is not surprising to find resistance to these changes. In the past, however, the argument centered around the military necessities. But in the TFX hearings before Senator MCCLELLAN'S committee, and in last month's budget hearings before the House Armed Services Committee, it has been channeled into a personal campaign against the Secretary. His service record, which is short, has been compared ad nauseam, with that of the Joint Chiefs, which is very, very long. Phrases like "walking machine" and "human computer" have been bandied about. Then come the usual homilies on the fallibility of machines. "I'm not against progress," Representative BOB WILSON of California put it, "I like computers and Univacs, and so forth, but I don't

think you can crank all the basic information into a Univac or a computer that will get you the right answer. * * * The Univac can be wrong."

It can, indeed. And no one knows it better than Robert Strange McNamara. He has repeatedly observed that the figuring required for most of his basic decisions could be done on the back of an envelope. He actually cut the sums requested by the services for computers in the 1964 budget. Far from being technical and difficult, moreover, his own presentations are models of commonsense reasoning—as direct as the bark of a dog. For example, his decision to substitute the Polaris for the Jupiter missiles in Italy was based on the following explicit factors: (a) that the Jupiters, being liquid-fueled missiles, had to be fired from above ground in a slow and delicate process; (b) that their locations were well known, being situated near a main highway; (c) that they could easily be sabotaged, even by rifle fire; (d) that they were based in an area heavily populated by Italian Communists; (e) that the Polaris, hidden underwater, could do the same job, and was available as a substitute.

Given that kind of commonsense argument, there is a supreme irony in the charge that Secretary McNamara is a puppet of machines. It is a little like saying that Milton was really mute and inglorious. For as no other American public man, the Defense Secretary has had the patience, the diligence and the acumen to enter the thickets of modern weaponry without losing his wits. His lucid presentation of the underlying logic, his relentless forcing out of alternatives, has brought within reach of all intelligent Americans an understanding of decisions that were once hidden in clouds of military and scientific expertise. For the case that man can master the machine, he personally is exhibit A. Whatever his faults, his preeminent virtue has been to assert the rule of reason in the realm of technology.

Inconsiderate Highway Planning in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from a good friend of conservation in support of my bill, S. 468, designed to help protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources from damage due to Federal-aid highway construction. In his letter, Mr. William Voigt, Jr., of Mechanicsburg, Pa., cited instances of what he described as "inconsiderate highway planning" in his State.

Mr. Voigt is immediate past executive director of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, and can speak with authority on the subject of stream damage due to highway construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report sent to me by Mr. Voigt be printed in the RECORD.

After hearing from Mr. Voigt, I received a letter from his successor as executive director of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, Mr. Albert Day, pointing out additional possible stream damage from highway construction. Mr. Day sent a copy of a letter from Mr. Gordon L. Trembley, chief acquatic biologist for the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, addressed to Mr. J. J. Kelmar, district engineer for the Pennsylvania Department of Highways, regarding threatened damage to Big Fishing Creek in Clinton County, Pa., because of the proposed route of the Keystone Shortway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Day, as well as a report entitled, "Fishing Creek, Clinton County," prepared by the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, and the letter from Mr. Trembley to Mr. Kelmar, be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMPLES OF INCONSIDERATE HIGHWAY PLANNING, PENNSYLVANIA

No. 1, Pennsylvania Highway 872, Cameron County: This highway runs north-south, along First Fork, Sinnemahoning Creek, normally one of the northern Pennsylvania's better clean streams, averaging some 50 to 60 feet wide, meandering through a narrow, mountain bordered valley. It has been rich in fish life, and the area is excellent for deer, turkey and grouse. The road ran along higher edges and benchland, often within sight of the stream but not encroaching on its banks. About seven miles up from the southern end of the highway lies a combination flood control and recreational reservoir, built by the State. The State Department of Highways is now in late stages of building a widened highway No. 872, so more people can travel faster to and from the reservoir. In the relocation and new construction, the department is removing sand and gravel from the stream bed, widening and flattening the stream bed and thereby removing habitat or damaging it and raising summer temperatures. The stream has been straightened in some areas and scenic values have been impaired. This is a Federal aid project, probably with 50 percent reimbursement.

No. 2, Keystone Shortway, Interstate System: This multilane highway runs east-west across Pennsylvania. A Fish and Wildlife Service (Federal) trout hatchery is located near the village of Lamar on Fishing Creek, in Clinton County. This is one of the best trout streams in Pennsylvania. The planned route of the Keystone Shortway is right down the middle of the valley of Fishing Creek, bordering it, covering parts of it with bridges, widening and flattening the stream, eliminating habitat and raising summer water temperatures, increasing evaporation and seepage. The hatchery may possibly have to be abandoned or relocated. This is a 90-percent Federal aid project.

No. 3, a miscellany of examples: Bridges: The Pennsylvania Department of Highways is engaged in a vast program of relocating and rebuilding bridges across fishable streams. Each one is built wider and longer than the one replaced. At each the department has for years widened, straightened and flattened the affected stream, degrading it for fish. After 3 years of effort when I was executive director, the Pennsylvania Fish Commission persuaded the department to specify that a V-shaped channel be cut in stream beds under 80 feet wide, hoping that in time nature would cut and reshape the bed in these areas and restore fish habitat, and hoping that the V would provide cooler water for the fish. The earlier damage is now somewhat mitigated, but the conditions left still are far from desirable in numerous cases. Most of these are Federal aid projects.

Channel straightening: Where highways parallel streams, the Department of Highways carries out straightening projects, and these may run anywhere from a hundred yards or so to a mile or more. Fishable stream beds are widened, straightened and rendered less habitable for fish.

Emphasis in the above accounts has been largely on fish and fish habitat, but it may readily be seen that wildlife and wildlife habitat are also adversely affected, especially the water loving furbearers.

All the information herein is presented as a public service by an interested individual citizen.

WILLIAM VOIGT, Jr.

MECHANICSBURG, PA.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
PENNSYLVANIA FISH COMMISSION,
Harrisburg, January 31, 1963.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The copy of Bill Voigt's letter of January 23 to you reminds me that we have not sent you the details on several of our most important possible losses to new highway construction in Pennsylvania. We refer to the probable effects on Big Fishing Creek, Clinton County, by the proposed route of the Keystone Shortway.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter by our Chief Aquatic Biologist, Gordon Trembley, addressed to the District Engineer of the State Highway Department which lists the values involved in this stream and the possible damage to them by the proposed highway construction.

Although we are hopeful that the State Highway Department and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads will recognize the dangers to this important resource and select a different route for this road, we have as yet no assurance that this will be done. Any help that you can give us through your committee will be much appreciated.

Sincerely,

ALBERT M. DAY,
Executive Director.

FISHING CREEK, CLINTON COUNTY

(Prepared by the Pennsylvania Fish Commission and submitted for reading at the hearing at Lock Haven, Pa., Jan. 17, 1962.)

Fishing Creek in Clinton County, Pa., is unique in character in that it is one of the few limestone streams in the United States in which the habitat is primarily trout. The excellent trout fishing afforded by this stream has been recognized for many years and as early as the 19th century British fishing books referred to the fine fishing in this stream. Recently it has been listed among the top trout streams in America by outdoor writers.

The watershed drains 183 square miles of woodland and farmland. The stream is about 32 miles long—18 miles of which are stocked annually with trout. Natural reproduction of trout is successful in the stream and its tributaries.

The stream is heavily utilized by fishermen. Angler counts in the early trout season of 1958 and 1959 showed about 100 anglers per mile of stream. Since that time the stream has undoubtedly received heavier fishing pressure since nearby Spring Creek in Centre County is no longer attractive to trout fishermen.

The best known portion of the stream is locally called "the Narrows." This stretch leaves a mountain valley and flows down a mountain side to a lower valley. Stream flow is quite rapid in this 3.5 mile stretch—falling about 45 feet per mile. This stretch is famous for its mayfly hatches which at-

tract anglers from great distances. Studies have shown a varied and plentiful supply of trout food in the stream. Fish population studies have demonstrated a population of trout in excess of 80 pounds per acre remaining in the stream after the close of the trout season.

To summarize—Fishing Creek is without doubt one of the best trout streams in eastern United States by virtue of the excellent physical, biological and chemical conditions maintained there. It receives heavy use by anglers who bring an unknown amount of revenue to the community. It is thus a great natural resource which, once lost, could never be regained.

Word that a proposed route of the Keystone Shortway would lead through the Fishing Creek valley has caused grave concern in the fish commission who must represent the interests of licensed anglers in such matters. It appears to us that in the section known as "the Narrows" the valley is so restricted in width that irreparable damage to the stream would result. This would be especially true if changes in the course of the stream are contemplated. In fact, any channel change in this rapid section would undoubtedly result in a straight sluiceway and thus destroy all of the natural features which make this such an excellent trout stream. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the department of highways give deep consideration to locating the Shortway elsewhere than in Fishing Creek valley. In the event that no other route can be found, we request that every precaution be exercised to minimize disturbances and siltation of the present stream bed. We further request that the fish commission be fully informed of any proposed channel changes and that such changes be accompanied by the installation of low dams, deflectors or other devices as a means of at least partial restoration of the stream sections affected. The Pennsylvania Fish Commission will be pleased to furnish designs and locations for such structures.

MAY 10, 1962.

Mr. J. J. KELMAR,
District Engineer,
Pennsylvania Department of Highways,
Clearfield, Pa.

DEAR SIR: On January 17, 1962, we presented testimony at the Lock Haven hearing relative to the proposed route of the Keystone Shortway along Big Fishing Creek in Clinton County. We pointed out that this stream is presently one of the outstanding trout streams in eastern United States and stated that the building of the Shortway along this stream would cause irreparable damage to the stream.

On May 7, 1962, at a meeting in the office of the district engineer, department of highways, Clearfield, we reaffirmed our opposition to building the Shortway in this valley.

The purpose of this letter is to emphasize once again the great value of Big Fishing Creek as a natural resource and as a center of outdoor recreation and to define more specifically the possible impact the construction of the Shortway would have on this stream.

At the Clearfield meeting it was stated that building the Shortway along the alternate route (i.e., to cross Long Run) would cost $2,000,000 more than construction along Big Fishing Creek. Thus the problem is resolved basically to the question of whether this great natural resource, Big Fishing Creek, is worth $2,000,000 over the coming years.

Certainly this problem is not unique to Pennsylvania. Senator LEE METCALF has introduced a bill (S. 2767) in Congress which would protect fish and wildlife and other recreational values in highway construction by requiring approval by the Secretary of the Interior of project surveys, plans, specifications and estimates for Federal-aid roads. Senator METCALF stated: "Of course, we all want good roads. They are being built. But I am alarmed by the destruction of an irreplaceable resource, sport fishing streams, by road routing and construction."

About 18 miles (107 acres) of Big Fishing Creek extending from the mouth to above Tylersville are approved for stocking under the coordinated program of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The stream receives a minimum of 15,000 legal size trout annually plus some supplemental stocking. Natural reproduction of trout is highly successful and contributes appreciably to the trout population in this stream. We believe this stretch would suffer irreparable damage from the proposed construction.

We wish to make the following points which illustrate the damage that will or could be done to this stream if the shortway were built along it:

1. In the three stretches to be rechanneled, straight sluiceways would result which would destroy all of the present excellent habitat for trout and trout food organisms. Since the stream velocity would be swift in these stretches, we doubt that any permanent stream improvement devices for restoring the habitat could be incorporated in the streambed. Good trout streams are composed of about half riffles, where trout food is produced, and half pools, which are used as areas of retreat and rest by trout. To restore this pool-riffle ratio after rechanneling would be an impossibility and thus these three sections, which include some of the stream's best fishing water, would be permanently lost.

2. Because of the present shading of the stream by trees and shrubs and because of the spring-fed source of this stream, temperatures are now optimum for trout. Cutting and clearing along the streambanks will most certainly result in raising stream temperatures and hence render the stream much less attractive or even untenable to trout. Furthermore, without adequate bank protection or stabilization severe bank erosion results. There are many examples in Pennsylvania of good trout streams having been lost due to the removal of protective vegetation along the banks.

3. It is to be expected that erosion and siltation will exist for years in Big Fishing Creek watershed if this route is used for the shortway. Silt is classified as a type of pollution and has a very deleterious effect on streambeds. This stream now has an excellent food supply, most of which is produced in the streambed which is composed of gravel and rocks of various sizes. The major types of bottom organisms utilized as food by trout are not produced in a silted bottom. Thus when a blanket of silt is spread over the bottom, the production of trout food is quite largely wiped out. Trout require clean gravel for successful spawning. A silted bottom not only reduces greatly the areas where trout can spawn successfully but may even smother trout eggs which have been deposited.

Thus siltation very seriously affects two life functions of trout: feeding and natural reproduction. In addition the presence of silt in a stream results in an unstable and unproductive bottom type. Siltation would, of course, have a pronounced ill effect on the water supply for fish cultural purposes at the Lamar Hatchery.

4. Big Fishing Creek is in an area honeycombed with limestone caverns. General disturbance of the stream bottom or adjacent areas might well cause a portion of the stream to be lost by sinking. In a similar manner disturbances in the area might change the underground water courses which rise to the surface at the Lamar Hatchery and are used as a water supply.

5. The close proximity of a major highway to this stream might have other serious effects. There would naturally be considerable drainage from the road to the stream carrying with it cinders and salt causing an additional decline in the productivity of the stream.

Big Fishing Creek now has a high esthetic value. Since the proposed route of the Shortway would follow the best portions of the stream closely, much of the natural beauty of this fine fishing area would be lost. Also a busy highway is hardly the best atmosphere for a quiet, restful day of fishing recreation.

6. It is difficult to set any dollars and cents value on a stream such as Big Fishing Creek. Streams of this high quality are rare and we know of no instance in which a stream similar to this one has actually been sold in recent years. We have learned that the fishing rights only on a trout stream in eastern Pennsylvania were leased for $25,000 per mile.

Although no one has as yet set a price on the value of a day's fishing to an angler, some information is available on the money expended by anglers. The following estimation seems reasonable:

In early season more than 100 anglers per mile have been counted in the 18-mile stretch from Tylersville to the mouth. A conservative estimate would be about 10 anglers per day per mile of stream in this area. This multiplied by 18 miles gives 180 or the average number of anglers per day using this section of the stream. There are about 140 days in the open trout season during which fishing is legal, which multiplied by 180 gives 25,000 or the total man-days fishing on the stream per trout season. According to the National Survey of Fishing and Hunting for 1960 (circular 120) produced by the U.S. Department of the Interior, fishermen spend an average of more than $4 per day in the pursuit of this sport. We know that this stream is not fished entirely by local people. In fact, the shadfly hatch of late May and early June is so important that anglers come from remote distances to fish there during this period. We feel that a $3 expenditure per fisherman per day on this stream is very conservative. Multiply total man-days fishing per trout season by $3 gives $75,600 or the average annual expenditure by anglers fishing this stream. In order to realize this amount annually an investment of $1,890,000 at 4 percent interest would be required.

Above all, it must be constantly kept in mind that once this great natural resource is destroyed or decimated it can never be replaced and with it will go one of the most valuable recreational areas in central Pennsylvania. We trust that the above information will explain more fully why we feel that the Keystone Shortway should not be constructed in Big Fishing Creek Valley.

Yours very truly,

GORDON L. TREMBLEY,
Chief Aquatic Biologist.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to this correspondence and report as further evidence that legislation is needed to insure that our desires for more and better highways are balanced with the necessity of protecting fish, wildlife, and recreation resources from damage during Federal aid highway construction.

S. 468, better known as the SOS—save our streams—bill, proposes a step toward balancing these interests. It would require approval by the Secretary of Interior, in consultation with appropriate State agencies, of plans, esti-

mates, and specifications for Federal aid highway construction.

Joining me in sponsorship of S. 468 are the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

National Gallery of Art, Calendar of Events, April 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, CALENDAR OF EVENTS, APRIL 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New reproductions: 11- by 14-inch color reproduction: Filippino Lippi "Tobias and the Angel," 25 cents each, postpaid. Color postcards: Domenico Veneziano, "Saint John in the Desert"; Sassetta, "Saint Anthony Leaving His Monastery"; French, Chalice of the Abby Suger, from Saint-Denis, 5 cents each, postpaid.

Concerts: the gallery's 20th American music festival, sponsored by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, will open on April 28 and continue through June 2.

Twelfth annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts: On April 7, John W. Pope-Hennessy, Keeper of the Department of Agriculture and Sculpture, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, England, will complete his series of six lectures on "The Artist and the Individual: Some Aspects of the Renaissance Portrait."

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m.; Sunday, 4 to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 1, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 7

Painting of the week:[1] Canaletto: "The Square of St. Mark's" (gift of Mrs. Barbara Hutton), main floor, west stair hall, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Archeological Reconstructions of the Past," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the collection: Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture, 12th annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts: "Artist and Individual: Donor and Participant," guest speaker, John W. Pope-Hennessy, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: University of Richmond Choir, Jack Jarrett, director, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 8, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 14

Painting of the week:[1] "Jan Davidsz. de Heem, "Vase of Flowers," (National Gallery of Art Purchase Fund, Andrew W. Mellon gift) gallery 44, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Nostalgic Evocations of the Past," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection: rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Antonio Canova," guest speaker, Hugh Honour, author. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 15, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 21

Painting of the week:[1] Renoir, "A Girl With a Watering Can," (Chester Dale collection), gallery 88, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6.30.

Tour of the week: "Stylistic Inspirations From Artists of the Past," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection: rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Renaissance Experimenters," speaker, Margaret Bouton, Associate Curator of Education, National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Chamber Singers of Indiana University, Hugh Johnson, director, east garden court 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 22, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 28

Painting of the week:[1] Filippino Lippi, "Tobias and the Angel" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 9, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Rejections of the Past," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection: rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Culture of Sicily as Seen in Its Illuminated Manuscripts From the Middle Ages Through the Renaissance," guest speaker, Angela Daneu Lattanzi, Superintendent of Libraries for Western Sicily, Palermo, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twentieth American Music Festival: American Arts Trio, east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the educational office, REpublic 7-4215, extension 272.

[1] An 11- by 14-inch reproduction with text for sale, 15 cents postpaid. (Special price this week only. Regularly 25 cents.)

NATO: Present Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, NATO Secretary General Dirk Stikker made a very thoughtful address at the National Press Club on the problems of NATO on March 8. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY GENERAL DIRK U. STIKKER AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB OF WASHINGTON MARCH 8, 1963

First of all, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be back in the United States and to have this opportunity of talking to you.

Last time I was over here was, as you know, to undergo a major operation; and I cannot speak too highly—or too gratefully—of all the skill, experience, and kindness I encountered here. As far as the results go I have now been back at work for 3 months, tough months, and I feel in fine form.

I think that many of you know that at these meetings I like to give you first a kind of general survey of some of our present problems and that you then fill in the inevitable gaps by questions which I will try to answer. So I will start straightaway on my part of the proceedings, and try to give you my general ideas.

Over the past few months there has been, and quite naturally so, a lot of talk and comment about NATO and its affairs, not all of it based on full information, sometimes too critical and not always calculated to advance the causes we all have at heart.

There has been a good deal of uncertainty, misunderstanding, and, therefore, exasperation, in Europe itself and on this side of the Atlantic. It is up to me, in my position as Secretary General of the Alliance, to do what I can to put things in a rather clearer perspective.

Personally, I believe very strongly in three things:

First, I believe that your NATO allies support U.S. efforts toward our common and indivisible defense.

Second, I think that all your allies were deeply impressed and heartened by the U.S. handling of the Cuban crisis.

Third, I am convinced that they believe that there is an absolute need to maintain the unity of NATO.

Those points are, to my mind, basic.

What I should like to do is to try to show how in my view they have been affected by the major developments of the past few weeks—namely:

(i) The breakdown in Brussels;
(ii) the Franco-German Treaty; and
(iii) the Nassau communique.

There is a lot to be said for getting the worst over first, so I will begin with Brussels. While NATO was not—and could not be directly involved, the possible repercussions for the Alliance were—and remain—great indeed; it is of course to this aspect that my remarks are directed.

A development which could have led to the political and material strengthening of the Alliance in the direction indicated by your President [in his last Independence Day speech] has suddenly and brusquely been halted, just as it seemed to be on the point of reaching success.

A great deal has been said about the circumstances in which the negotiations came to an end. Recognizing all that, I should be doing no service to the Alliance or to the causes which we have at heart if anything I said were to add in any way to the bitterness which many felt last month.

I have been mixed up in this business of European cooperation for a very long time, and my memories go way back beyond the Brussels negotiations—to more than 15 years ago to the very beginning of European cooperation in the time of Marshall aid, Euro-

pean Payments Union, and the European Coal and Steel Community.

Looking at the origin of the present obstacles from three different angles, then, to be quite objective, I must first remind you that the British Government in those days were by no means so keen as they now—quite rightly in my view—are to enter an economically integrated Europe. Maybe, at that early stage of the game, they were not fully convinced that a united Europe was either feasible or, from their point of view, entirely desirable. Maybe, at that stage they were not quite as flexible or as receptive to new ideas as they might have been. And to be frank, my own feeling has always been that the United Kingdom made its effort to join the European Economic Community too late to insure that its ideas would get an adequate hearing.

Turning now to the Six, I must say that even all those years ago, I was very much afraid that if the Six rushed ahead too fast with plans for a tightly integrated economic Europe and built up a structure without Britain, with her worldwide interests, the Commonwealth, and her worldwide trading system, they would have great difficulty when the United Kingdom changed its attitude in fitting it all together. Then, the chances were that we should sooner or later be faced with exactly the sort of trouble which has now developed.

This is not just hindsight—I backed my judgment in 1952 to the extent of preferring not to continue as Foreign Minister of my country, because I was afraid that in the long run things would go as they have.

Finally, one remark about the French attitude: We should not forget that during the negotiations on the Rome Treaty, France obtained a strong position in the agricultural, industrial, and political fields.

We must recognize that enlightened sacrifice for the common cause of Europe and Atlantic unity is not an easy thing to bring about. It takes time to change these things.

Where do we go from here?

I don't think that now we in NATO should overdramatize the situation. A lost opportunity does not alter the basic logic of history and geography. On the contrary, I believe that what has occurred enhances the role and importance of NATO. I believe that our alliance has acted as a stabilizing factor.

My own view—and all these views I am giving you are very personal ones and do not commit anybody but myself—my own view is that the wise thing to do is to let the dust settle, and then to see calmly and quietly and without argument and recrimination how to map out the path ahead.

First and foremost, we must remember that NATO and the unity of the West constitute the essential precondition on which all economic and political progress must be based.

We must stand together to defend ourselves.

Second, everything must be done to insure that the door of the EEC is not closed against the United Kingdom—and by that I mean that it would be dangerous if the Community were to develop in directions, both economic and political, which would widen the gap between the United Kingdom and the Six.

Third, if progress on the Brussels front were to slow down, we must in any case do what we can to advance on others.

In NATO we have the opportunity to move ahead on defense generally, and in particular explore the immense possibilities opened up by President Kennedy's and Prime Minister Macmillan's Nassau communique—I shall have more to say about this later.

But let me at this stage underline that we have made a great deal of progress in recent years in deepening and broadening the scope of our political consultation—more, I think, than is easy to put across to the general public, as for obvious reasons we cannot advertise our achievements on the housetops—or in the headlines.

More, too, than we in NATO perhaps realize ourselves, for nothing—fortunately in this case—is more insidious than habit, and we are apt to take our advances for granted. But there is still a lot we could do to exchange views at the early stage when policies are being formed; to identify potential trouble spots before they start giving trouble; and generally to try to get one jump ahead of events instead of reacting to them.

Fourth, we should realize that the European Economic Community is not the only expression of European unity. On the political and military side, it may be possible to make use of the links which proved so valuable in 1954 after the breakdown of the EDC, the links between Britain and the Six afforded by the Western European Union. OECD is a powerful instrument for many aspects of economic cooperation.

Finally, the European partners of the Alliance must forget their narrow national or West European interests and realize that their economic problems are not theirs alone.

The United States and U.S. foreign trade are deeply involved. The problem of reducing barriers to trade is a worldwide one and cannot be solved in isolation; and here we have an instument ready to hand in GATT which perhaps should become more flexible.

The U.S. Government has a major role to play; and I welcome such initiative as the "Kennedy round"—though I hope the administration can and will go even further in this direction.

All this will require political courage and determination, the strength of mind to persist despite setbacks, and above all mutual comprehension based on the recognition that even if internal relationships are changing, our Atlantic Alliance is indispensable to its members.

I should like to turn now to some of the more positive aspects—and perhaps I might begin with a word or two about the Franco-German Treaty.

I do consider this as a positive achievement, the more so now that after several statements made by the German authorities, we can see more clearly the context and purpose of the treaty. To my mind it was a welcome demonstration that a long process of reconciliation and the healing of old wounds had at last reached its fulfillment. Those who like myself have lived through two World Wars can only rejoice that an end has been put—let us hope and pray forever—to centuries of blood and tears.

And as we do so, let us not forget that it was NATO with its guarantee for liberty and security for the West which created the atmosphere in which France and Germany were helped to find each other. It is against this background that France and Germany must continue to work together toward a pattern of friendship and cooperation.

It is my conviction that they will do so; and that their actions will demonstrate that they have not lost sight of the fundamental importance, for them and for us all, of maintaining the solidarity and unity of our Alliance. Unless we hold fast to that, their and our efforts are in vain.

Lastly, I should like to say something about the defense policy of the Alliance and in particular the extremely important decisions taken at Nassau.

As you know, the Alliance is faced with two major and closely interrelated problems—the problem of modernizing its tactical nuclear strike forces—and the problem of associating the Alliance as a whole more closely with nuclear policy generally. There has been a good deal of public discussion of these problems, and I need not, and indeed I could not, go into all the background here. Earlier discussions in NATO centered around the problems of the control of nuclear weapons—on which we made a start at the Athens Ministerial Meeting last year—and the possibility of the constitution of a NATO nuclear force.

Now, the United States and United Kingdom Governments have taken the initiative for the creation, by those countries that are interested, of a multilateral mixed-manned nuclear force as part of that NATO nuclear force. They have offered to contribute part of their existing national capabilities to such a NATO nuclear force and in due course to place Polaris submarines at its disposal.

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of these proposals. As I have already said in public it is a major development, not only because it is an immediate and practical contribution to the problem by those who have nuclear weapons but because it opens the way to participation at the appropriate stage by those who have not.

Here again, I do not feel unduly disturbed by General de Gaulle's reception of these proposals.

The ideas which he expressed at his press conference of January 14 are consistent with the views he was already known to hold. If it was disappointing to many of us that France could not see her way to reconciling her present position with the imaginative and flexible concept put forward by your President and the British Prime Minister at Nassau, it was not entirely a surprise.

Meanwhile the NATO council's discussions continue and it may be—you know I have always been an optimist—that as we go along, we shall be able to find some way of fitting the French "force de frappe" into the general scheme, for instance in the area of targeting.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I have covered very rapidly the ground I set out to cover, though I expect you will find plenty more points when it comes to your turn. But before I hand over to you I should like to spend a minute or two summing up and trying to give you some idea of how I view the future.

We have all made mistakes and errors of judgment in the past. We have all tended to lose sight of essentials.

As I said, the United Kingdom has come perilously near to missing the bus over the European Economic Community.

France, for the time being, is tending to concentrate on a view of her national interests which some of us may think a narrow one, and has—so many of us may think—underestimated the strain which the assertion of those interests has placed on an alliance which she herself has acknowledged as indispensable.

The United States has come a long way in recent years; and I hope I have said enough already to show how much I appreciate the constructive initiatives which have been taken and the new thinking they reflect.

But the processes of democracy are slow: and even the United States has been slow to realize that the Europe of 1963 is not the Europe of 1949.

If the Europe of today is stronger, more united and more prosperous than ever before, the credit is due overwhelmingly to the wisdom and foresight of those on this side of the Atlantic who first came to the aid of our devastated economics and then committed themselves for the first time in history to a permanent military alliance for the defense of the European continent. That must never be forgotten.

But, of course, time moves on, and it is precisely because Europe has been restored by your exertions and her own to economic prosperity and political health behind the sure shield of NATO that Europeans have begun to feel that if they are to make the full contribution to the alliance of which

they are capable, they must have rather more of a share in determining their own destinies.

The United States, if I may say so, has still to find a pattern of relations with its allies in the defense field which accords with the conditions of the sixties. If the European partners are to make a greater contribution to common defense, I think it follows that they must have a greater say in determining how this defense is to be conducted and thus sufficient access to the facts and considerations which govern the defense policy of the strongest partner—the United States.

If the United States were able to take her partners more into her confidence in regard to the immense responsibilities which rest on her in the sphere of defense, I feel certain that that confidence would not be abused.

If I were to set out to enumerate the mistakes that all of us have made since 1949 the catalog would be a long one; I do not, of course, pretend that we, on our side of the Atlantic, have always been as reasonable and sensible as we might have been. But you know people sometimes call me NATO's "dutch uncle"; and the function of a dutch uncle is perhaps to speak up and say things which otherwise might not get said at all—not because I want to start a series of recriminations, but because I think it is essential for the health of our alliance that we should be able to call a spade a spade.

What we have got to do is—slowly and unspectacularly though it may be—to make progress in the fields where progress is possible—in our political consultation, in the whole vast field opened by Nassau, and in the many other fields I have suggested.

That is nearly all I have to say; but before I end, I should like to repeat just once more what I regard as the most important point of all. The whole structure of security and prosperity we have built up in the West rests on Western unity and on NATO, which gives that unity its practical expression. We stand or fall together. There is no alternative to NATO and no substitute for it. The defense of the Western World is indivisible. Let us see that we keep it so.

Address by Congressman Ross Bass at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am delighted to insert in the RECORD an address by our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS]. This address was delivered at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, at the Statler Hilton Hotel here in Washington, D.C.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN ROSS BASS AT THE 18TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC., STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you very much. I'm happy to be with you at the National Limestone Institute.

I was introduced as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture. I left the committee recently, but, as I leave I take with me an abiding and a keen interest in the affairs of agriculture because I represent a rural district in Tennessee, made up of 16 counties. We have a direct interest in almost every phase of agriculture in the United States that exists without either the use of extreme irrigation or tropical weather. Our agriculture is diversified, and for that reason, over a period of years, I have made an intense study of its programing and planning. Thus leaving the Committee on Agriculture is not due to my lack of interest. To the contrary, I felt that I could broaden the service that I have done in the Congress, and at the same time, still work with agriculture.

I was billed today as a speaker on conservation matters. I am not going to stick to that script entirely. Instead, I'm going to talk in the general field of agriculture, somewhat in the vein of a farewell address, or parting advice to my friends who make up the official family in the world of agriculture. I do not consider myself being a member of that official family any longer.

The 88th Congress has started its usual course of arguing over various facets of our organization and rules. Following the usual pattern, Congress got off to a slow start. This year the primary fight in the House of Representatives was on the Rules Committee. In the Senate, they are fighting about their rules, not the Rules Committee. The surprising thing that I have learned since I have been in Congress, is that there are so many experts in the lay field on the organization, and makeup of the Congress. The late, great and beloved Sam Rayburn, for whom I had the highest regard of any man in public life, told me in the last year of his life, "Ross, no man ever gets to know the rules of the House of Representatives. Therefore, regardless of who is Speaker of the House, he must have a good parliamentarian." Being familiar with the organization and the internal affairs of the Congress does not come without long experience and study. My surprise came about this year when I received advice from my constituents instructing me how I should vote on the size of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. And I don't believe that 1 out of 10,000 of them even knows what the Rules Committee in the House does. Having voted to enlarge the Rules Committee, will not have any effect on your everyday living. I think it was something that was important in the internal affairs, the domestic makeup of the House of Representatives, and I am glad we succeeded.

This year, we had two vacancies on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. For the first time in more than 25 years this became another internal fight in the House. I was a candidate for the Committee on Ways and Means. I had long wanted to serve on that committee. A gentleman from the State of Georgia, a gentleman from Virginia, and I were candidates for the Ways and Means Committee. Instead of it being worked out as it has been over a period of years where there was only one candidate for one vacancy or two candidates for two vacancies, we had a little fight among ourselves. It developed that I was fortunate enough to be elected; and, for that reason, I have left the Committee on Agriculture.

Being a new member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I shall say to you that I have not been there long enough to become an expert on taxes. Therefore, I shall not attempt to make a speech about taxes. The President is sending a message to Congress Thursday, the 24th, which will deal with his tax program for this Congress. He has recommended in his state of the Union message that we have a tax decrease. I am glad that I have become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in the year when we can expect a tax cut instead of a tax raise. So, I will say that, in all probability, there will be some revisions, some adjustment downward in the taxing situation in the United States this year. Just how it will affect your interests, your industry, I cannot say. The President has recommended a decrease in the corporate taxes so that, as he stated, "The Federal Government would not be the major partner of corporations. Some of you men are in the larger corporations and some in the smaller ones, but you can expect a tax cut, I think, in both areas.

I cannot speak to you as an authority on agriculture; I cannot speak with authority on taxes. Having been on the Committee on Agriculture for the past 8 years I have never seen an expert on agriculture. In the 8 years I have been in the Congress, I do not believe there is a single man in the world who has the answer to the multiple problems that confront American agriculture. I have served under two Secretaries of Agriculture. I think they are both outstanding men. They are high-type, well-informed Americans, but I do not believe that the Great Man who walked on the shores of Galilee himself could be the Secretary of Agriculture and please even a majority of the people involved in agriculture.

Therefore, as I leave the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to use this forum to make a few pertinent remarks relating to the agriculture situation in the United States at this time. Operating as you do on the fringe of agriculture, and being interested in the conservation programs of agriculture, I know you are interested in the overall picture and the influence agriculture has in the United States.

Conservation is a word that might well be used today in trying to cure some of the ills of agriculture. In my opinion, this is a great oasis that has gone dry. Only a few years ago agriculture constituted the greatest part of American industry, of the American economy. At the same time, is constituted a great part of the political influence in the United States. But, three things have happened in recent history which have caused agriculture to decline, both in its influence and its interest, as far as Americans are concerned.

I think the basic reason for the plight of agriculture today and particularly agriculture legislation can be found on Capitol Hill, in the House of Representatives. While making this statement, I want you to know that I am making the statement about myself because I was a part of this very situation. In my opinion, the influence of the Committee on Agriculture has declined immeasurably in the past 8 years. We say this in no uncertain terms recently. Let me illustrate. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I also become a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees. We completed the committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House this week.

When I was elected to Congress in 1954, it was my immediate concern and desire to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The chairman of the Committee on Committees at that time was the late Mr. Jere Cooper from Tennessee, who was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The fact that my State happened to chair the committee was, I think, the reason I was able to secure a seat on the Agriculture Committee. We had, I think, five vacancies in the 84th Congress, January 1955, and we had about 30 applicants for the Committee on Agriculture. Many of them gave this as their first choice in committee assignments in that Congress. Last week when we met to give our committee assign-

ments on the Democratic side of the House, there were six vacancies on the Committee on Agriculture—one Member of the Congress made this his primary choice and this was only because he could not get his colleague from the same State to go on the committee. He didn't really want to become a member, but he felt it was important to have a member from his State on agriculture. This means that the Committee on Agriculture 8 years ago had 5 vacancies and about 30 applicants and this time it wound up with 6 vacancies and 1 application.

This is a sad commentary on American agriculture. What has brought it about? First of all, the Committee on Agriculture, of which I was a part, is the most partisan group in the Congress. It is the most strongly divided committee on party lines that I have had the opportunity to observe during my service in the Congress. If Secretary Benson proposed something, then I would say that more than 90 percent of the members on the Democratic side were immediately against it, and the same situation in reverse exists with Secretary Freeman. If he proposes something, immediately the Republican side of the committee opposes it. So what happens? Last year in Congress, we ran a bill through the House of Representatives twice; watered it down both times; finally had to take everybody's views in the form of a compromise; and then we called it a great victory. This is how difficult it has become to legislate in the field of agriculture. Now, gentlemen, there are some reasons for this. The two reasons listed below are partially responsible for the one I just gave you.

The second reason for the decline in the field of agriculture is farm organizations. I am not going to term your organization a farm organization. I am talking about the major farm organizations that deal specifically with farmers, have farmers, or pretend to have farmers only, for their membership, and try to deal specifically in farm interests and farm legislation. I'm not talking about any one of them; I'm talking about all of them. I have never in all of my "put togethers," as we would say down in Tennessee, seen organizations that are as biased, so narrow, so prejudiced, and so selfish in my life. They are interested only in the following questions: Is this program mine? Did I get it through the Congress? Did I recommend it to the Secretary? Will it get me more members? Can I go back and tell our membership that we got this program through, good or bad, regardless of what it does or does not do. I think the greatest thing that could happen to agriculture today is to have a summit meeting of farm organizations, but I believe it would be easier for Charles de Gaulle, John F. Kennedy, and Mr. Khrushchev to sit down and agree on foreign policy than it would be for the heads of these organizations to get together on farm legislation.

I'm saying some things that sound depressing. They sound tragic. But from my observations, they are the truth. My advice to the official family of agriculture is to try to have some sort of an organization of organizations that would sincerely make an attempt to work out a program that all members could endorse before they recommend it to the Congress. They might lose some members next year; they might not have so much to go back and tell about "our program" or what "our President" said to the Committee on Agriculture, they might not even need a great statesman who could make speeches on things other than agriculture. You read more edicts today from the presidents of farm organizations on things like taxes, foreign aid, education, roadbuilding, and everything else than you do agriculture. This is partially responsible for the first reason I gave you.

Of course, the third reason is the decline in the political influence of the farmer on American life. There was a time, when I was a very young man, when 50 percent of the American population derived their income directly from the soil. Today only 9 percent of the American population actually work and make a living from agriculture, and part of them are composed of hobby farmers. Therefore, it only follows that the decline in the political influence is sensed in the Halls of Congress.

I just read where one of my good friends, who is a Senator and a Democrat, made a speech the other day on the farm situation. He said that all farm subsidies, all farm programs, should be wiped out. Last year we had an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives, which would have cancelled the conservation programs, all payments; and, if I'm not mistaken, it received more than 100 votes. I am not sure how long it is going to be before that amendment would receive the necessary votes to pass and become law. So, as I have stated, I am a party to all of this. I am not telling you this to castigate anyone or try to condemn any particular part of American agriculture. I am telling you what situation exists in the Congress and in the country today. I'm telling you this only through the hope that you gentlemen who have influence on the fringes of agriculture can try to do something about the dilemma.

In parting, let me commend you and your organization on the work you have done. Certainly conservation, agriculture conservation, in which you play a great part, is of vital interest to us in the United States. We are dammed with the greatest blessing in the world, surplus amounts of food and fiber. Where 9 percent of our population work in agriculture, we produce enough food and fiber to feed not only our country, but many, many other countries and much of the population of the rest of the world. To the contrary, in many countries, up to 85 percent of the population work on the farm today and they can't produce enough to feed and clothe their own people. We are blessed with ability to produce and your interests have been a part of this. So, I say to you, keep up the good work. Keep agriculture well supplied with the ingredients of conservation to keep damning us with this great blessing, because I hope I never see the day when we do not have enough food and fiber.

I thank you very much for the privilege of being with you.

George C. Biggers, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the passing of George C. Biggers, Sr., saddened hearts throughout the Nation. Especially sorrowful were his many friends and associates in the newspaper profession.

Mr. Biggers began his newspaper career on the ground floor as a cub reporter in 1910, and rose to the presidency in 1953 of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. At the time of his retirement in 1957, he was president and general manager of Atlanta Newspapers, Inc., being named to this position in 1950 after serving for 4 years as president of the Atlanta Journal.

His death March 25 at Orlando, Fla., was a great loss to those who knew and loved him and to journalism.

The Atlanta Journal and the Atlanta Constitution paid well-deserved tributes to the memory of Mr. Biggers and to his outstanding contributions to the newspaper profession.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal]

GEORGE C. BIGGERS, SR.

In the death of George C. Biggers, Atlanta lost one of the most vigorous of those who led the city to its postwar greatness.

As a newspaper publisher, he had the courage to call his shots as he saw them, and knew that in the long run this brand of honesty and bluntness paid off in public respect for a product which the public knew could not be bought and which could not be intimidated.

Mr. Biggers was a Kentuckian born and bred and spent most of his working years in Atlanta before his retirement to Florida in 1957. He was forthright with his enemies and fond of and loyal to his friends.

There are many ways to measure success, and one of the best is the measurement used by a man's close associates. He won many honors in his life but the two that did him the most honor were the presidencies of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association and the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

The Journal, which owes so much to him, joins his family in mourning his passing.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution]

NEWSPAPER PROFESSION LOSES A LEADER

The newspaper profession has lost one of its most valuable members in the passing of George C. Biggers, Sr., in Orlando, Fla. Although he retired from active management of The Constitution and Journal in 1957, the pattern he set for honest, dedicated journalism has been an inspiration and guide for all privileged to have worked with him.

A tireless worker, Mr. Biggers set an example for the profession, as publisher, that extended far beyond Atlanta. A man of unquestioned integrity, he demanded that all his associates uphold the finest traditions of a free press. He supported vigorous editorial policies and reporters who covered the news fearlessly and without favoritism.

His services to journalism earned him the presidencies of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association and the American Newspaper Publishers Association. Yet with all his activities, he found time to participate in civic affairs and distinguished himself especially in service to young people. He believed and proved in practice that success of a newspaper depends upon its serving the best interests of all the people.

The Constitution joins in sorrow at his passing and extends sincere sympathy to the bereaved family.

The Rise of Secularism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I I have been impressed by many columns

written by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones who is a syndicated columnist for the Washington Evening Star. The March 25, 1963, issue of the Star contains one of Mr. Jones' most outstanding columns entitled "Minority Rights Ad Absurdum: If Court Bars Baltimore School Prayer, How Far Can An 'Intolerant' Few Go?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a newsletter I recently prepared on this subject be printed with this column in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY RIGHTS AD ABSURDUM—IF COURT BARS BALTIMORE SCHOOL PRAYER, HOW FAR CAN AN INTOLERANT FEW GO?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The U.S. Supreme Court now has under advisement another school prayer case, and if it hasn't learned anything since its decision on the New York regents prayer last fall it is likely to come up with another dizzy ruling.

The new suit came out of Baltimore, where a mother who is an avowed atheist sued the Baltimore School Board because a passage from the Old Testament and the Lord's Prayer were part of the daily opening exercises at her son's school.

When she complained in the lower court the school board promptly offered to let her son be excused from hearing the offensive words. But now the mother claims that this sets her son apart and subjects him to ridicule and abuse. She has demanded that no Bible readings or prayers be made in the hearing of any Maryland child while in public school.

Now some day the majority are going to get tired of being pushed around by the minority. Because we have moved into an era where the minority is demanding satisfaction for itself even where it interferes with the satisfaction of the majority. This can get absurd.

The overwhelming majority of Marylanders are not atheists and they think it is a good idea if their children listen to a few preachments. The Communists think so, too. They smother Russian and Chinese children with preachments, most of them from their pickled god, Lenin. Well, the Bible contains preachments. So do the Koran, the Zend Avesta and the sacred books of Budda—all filled with good advice to youth. But all but a handful of Americans subscribe to religious bodies that venerate the Old Testament

Yet the angry lady in Baltimore holds that even though it is OK with the majority of Marylanders that her son duck out when the Bible is opened, his "rights" are being outraged. They will only be satisfied if all Marylanders agree to conform to her taboos. Otherwise, Maryland shall be damned as "intolerant."

It is possible for the minority to be intolerant, too?

Both Houses of Congress open with prayer. Isn't this an affront to atheist citizens? Let's fire the chaplains.

On most of the coins and bills we carry there is the legend, "In God We Trust." Aren't we being cruel to sincere atheists in forcing them to purchase their groceries with this pious money?

The school assembly salutes the flag. The students stand with their hands over their hearts intoning the words—"this Nation under God * * *." Surely the cops should be called and the principal arrested.

School lunches offer meat. Meat is an abomination to honest vegetarians. Shall we, therefore, feed our children pea soup and yogurt?

Last December, three public schools in Sharon, Mass., removed all Christmas trees and Christmas decorations from their classrooms on the theory that they were an affront to Jewish students. Bye-bye Santa Claus, because St. Nicholas was a Christian saint. However, the Russians have shown us how we can still get our presents. We welcome Grandfather Frost. Merry Present-Giving Day.

And bye-bye to all the school Easter Bunnies. Easter is a Christian festival in which the resurrection of living things from the death of winter is symbolized by observance of the story of Christ's resurrection, which you may or may not believe. This has got to go. But on the other hand, the millinery business, the garment industry and the candymakers need something like Easter. So let's train our children to look forward to New-Hat-New-Dress-Chocolate-Egg Day.

We've got to clean up Thanksgiving, too. These silhouettees of obviously Protestant Pilgrim Fathers that we have the kindergarten kids cutting out are an insult to all other sects and religions. And the whole business is a slam at our atheists. For Thanksgiving means giving thanks to God. What shall we substitute? The United Nations?

American Negroes have properly battled for the right to live where they choose and go to school where they live. In some places the reluctant majority have had to be spanked. These rights have long been guaranteed there.

Yet, at the urging of the NAACP, Negroes are boycotting a school in northern New Jersey because 90 percent of the students are colored. Why? Because white families exercised what Negroes have been demanding, namely the right to move where they pleased. And they moved out of the neighborhood. So the Negroes are demanding that white children be driven back into that school.

It is one thing to insist that the majority accord a minority the rights the majority enjoys. This is justice. But it is another thing to chase the majority around the block with a stick, demanding that it behave in a way decreed by the minority.

We're getting close to that point. The tragedy is that a growing public consciousness of minority rights is likely to be soured by the arrogance of some minority leaders. This could set us back—way back.

The majority will stand just so much kicking.

STROM THURMOND REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE—THE RISE OF SECULARISM

On February 17, 1962, Dr. Billy Graham warned our Nation that "there is a movement gathering momentum in America to to take the traditional concept of God out of our national life."

Since that time we have witnessed a steady advance of progress being made in this country by the forces of secularism, those who would take God out of our national life. The most notable victory for the secularists came on June 25, 1962, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled out a noncompulsory New York school prayer which merely acknowledged dependence upon Almighty God and requested His blessings on the children, their teachers, and their country. The prayer was found to be an attempt to establish a religion in conflict with the first amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Millions of Americans protested the decision, and for a while it appeared that the Congress would be forced to overrule the decision, even if it meant amending the Constitution. The forces of secularism were quick, however, to counter the mass of public opposition through the propaganda devices of the so-called liberal news media and also with the blessings of many national leaders who hailed the decision as a victory for religious freedom. It was a victory of sorts for freedom, but a victory for freedom from religion rather than freedom of religion.

Since that decision, the secularists have scored new gains in their fight to eradicate public recognition of a Supreme Being. The singing of Christmas carols has been ended in some schools. During the past Christmas season, a group of secularists in New England were able to pressure some school principals into abolishing the Christmas tree from their schoolrooms. On January 5, 1963, two Protestant leaders, in an article in the Washington Post, called for acceptance of the establishment in America of a new religion, which they called secularism, Mr. Martin Marty called secularism "the fastest growing group in America."

Now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court are two cases which could give the secularists their greatest victory to date. Both are concerned with the right of a local school to permit its students to engage, without any compulsion, in the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in morning exercises. One case is from Maryland and the other is from Pennsylvania. Many other States permit their schools to have such exercises, including South Carolina, where most schools have a similar program.

The principal argument being made by the secularists is that their liberty is being compromised. Many of the same people who have done the most to destroy liberty in this country through support of centralization of power and softness toward the enemy are the most vocal in defense of absolute liberty in some areas. For instance, we are told that academic freedom is fostered when we permit communism to be taught in some of our institutions and also when Communists are invited to lecture on the campuses of America. Now we are being told that we must remove acknowledgement of God from our national life in order to appease secularists or atheists, who are not required to participate in these public school acknowledgments. These arguments overlook the important truth that, as our Constitution and other important national documents state, we derive our blessings of liberty from God, whether we call Him by the term of "Jehovah," "God," or "Divine Providence." When we scratch the Giver and Provider of our liberties from our national life, we likewise imperil those remaining vestiges of liberty and turn our Nation to secularism or even national atheism, as is required in Communist societies today.

I am repulsed by the false notion that we should destroy the pillars on which our liberties rest in order to advance some cause in the name of liberty. Such actions constitute a fraud and sham not only on God, but also on liberty itself and the people of America.

Montoya Scores Smash Hit at Parliamentary Conference With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the congressional delegation appointed to represent our Congress in meetings with

members of the Mexican Congress has returned from the Parliamentary conference. Much good was accomplished. The fruits of better understanding were cultivated. Those of us who had the privilege and responsibility of representing our Congress in this series of meetings are certain that they were mutually beneficial. We feel that they have resulted in a better understanding among leaders of the Mexican Government of our position and our policy in certain very vital areas.

By any standard of measurement, one of the highlights of the entire conference was the forceful and stirring address delivered by our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, at the final plenary session. Speaking in flawless Spanish, Congressman MONTOYA undeniably made a deep impression upon our hosts. In relatively few words, he presented our Nation's position, identifying it with the legitimate aims and aspirations of the Mexican people and pointing out the identity of interest we have in presenting in this hemisphere a strong and united front against the spread of communism. His remarks were enthusiastically applauded.

Since Congressman MONTOYA's address was heard not only by many leaders of the Mexican Government but also by a great number of interested citizens including professors and students from the University of Guanajuato who attended the final plenary session, it undoubtedly accomplished a great deal by way of developing a sympathetic understanding appreciation of the U.S. position. Under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pleasure in submitting herewith the English translation of this moving address:

LIBERTY CONCEIVED IN BLOOD

As we return to this great Republic for this the Third Parliamentary Conference between representatives of our respective Congresses, I cannot help but avail myself of the great honor and exalted privilege which attaches to one whose name is heir to a revolution such as yours here in Mexico. This great honor is further punctuated by the God-endowed opportunity to address you in the Spanish language which I first learned in the arms of my mother and which was emitted to my understanding by the palpitating caresses of my mother's heart and heritage.

I am proud to be an American and my heritage makes me appreciate with complete comprehension the great patriotism and heritage which adorns the liberty-loving people of this Republic—a nation consecrated by the blood of your patriots so that the winds of freedom and dignity would permeate the atmosphere to shelter your libertarian existence.

Abraham Lincoln gave sustenance to liberty in my country as Father Hidalgo and Benito Juarez forged the rivers of adversity and colonialism in order to mold a new life in yours.

Guanajuato was the altar from which Juarez presided over the liquidation of foreign rule—from which he infused new blood into the constricted and hungry veins of your determined people.

Liberty conceived in blood can endure only when it is dedicated to elevating the dignity of man. Only a people grateful for its sustenance and shelter can perpetuate it. Without this vital element, it would perish. Today, as we dedicate ourselves in the open fields of endeavor to promote the well-being of our compatriots, we are threatened by the empty propaganda of the Communist ideology. We have heard the utopian, yet hollow claims of communism. Its proponents have extolled the virtues of communism, yet if communism is so great, why must it be maintained by the bayonet? If it is so sacrosanct, why have 250,000 liberty-loving people abandoned Cuba? Why the Berlin wall? Why Hungary?

These are not the crops of freedom. These are not the bills of liberty. These are not the shelters of dignity. This is why your country and mine are on the frontline in our determination to eradicate this cancer from our midst. Our attack upon this disease must be both remedial and preventative.

The Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress symbolize the dedication of this hemisphere to eradicate this menace to our liberties. In this struggle, our efforts must never cease, rather, they shall continue.

Freedom, preciously won, must not and shall not be buried in the graveyard of complacency. The lamp of liberty must burn to light the hopes of men everywhere. Our esteemed President, John F. Kennedy, and your great leader, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, are predestined to protect the legacy we have inherited from Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt in my country and from Benito Juarez in yours.

In our effort to nurture a better way of life, my country's people bear a heavy burden. Your people also shoulder a great responsibility. Since 1946, my country has extended the total sum of $1 billion in loans and grants to yours. That this was done within the framework of the good neighbor policy and reciprocal advantage no one can deny, but it is an accomplished fact.

Today, under the leadership of our great President, John F. Kennedy, and your great Chief Executive, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, we in this hemisphere are marching upon the road toward our mutual goals.

The Alliance for Progress has united the liberty-loving peoples of this hemisphere as brothers, proud to carry the torch of freedom to the tops of our mountains, led on by the rythmic tones of the freedom bells which were tolled by Jefferson and Washington, and by Hidalgo and Juarez and the other great liberators of our glorious history. Our common effort and great sacrifice are destined and dedicated to insure the greater dignity of our peoples and the economic development of our sister nations in this hemisphere.

The Allianza is the soul of this movement. Its vital components are agrarian reform and internal fiscal responsibility. In this respect your country mirrors a great example of compliance. Much remains to be done and I am certain that we shall continue in our dedication to this task.

We will not allow our high purpose to be threatened from within or from without by those who would subvert our freedoms. Our people are still in mourning because of the blood spilled to insure that government is a servant of the people and not the master. With this lesson we cannot permit communism to become the master and oppressor of the people.

I compliment your great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, who leads you in this worthy struggle. I commend you, the great Representatives and Senators of this Republic, for your constructive efforts and high sense of duty.

On behalf of the American delegation, I thank you, your most able Governor, Juan Jose Landa, and the people of Mexico for the gracious hospitality which has insured the success of our joint endeavors.

Crop Damage From Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article reporting Dr. John Middleton's statements published in the March 1963 issue of the California Farm Reporter, "Crop Damage From Air Polution." Dr. Middleton is chairman, Department of Plant Pathology, Citrus Experiment Station, University of California, Riverside. In addition I would like to include the note preceding the article regarding an earlier statement by Dr. Philip A. Leighton.

The note and article follow:

CROP DAMAGES FROM AIR POLLUTION

NOTE.—The February issue of the Farm Reporter quoted Dr. Philip A. Leighton, who told the January 15 Steering Committee Conference on "California in the 1980's," that 70 percent of Californians live in areas subject to eye irritation, 80 percent in areas subject to plant damage. The air pollutants chiefly responsible are oxides of nitrogen, which come from all combustion, and hydrocarbons, which come chiefly from petroleum fuels. The following article deals specifically with plant damage.

"Air pollution damage to vegetation has been recognized for more than a century, but only recently has its seriousness to California farmers been established. Estimates of such damage amount annually to about $8 million for field and vegetable crops, according to Dr. John Middleton, chairman, Department of Plant Pathology, Citrus Experiment Station, University of California, Riverside.

"Food, flowers and ornamentals in polluted communities, and agricultural crops in contiguous rural areas, are plagued by what is called 'photochemical' or 'community' air pollution.

"Growth of alfalfa, sugarbeets, endive, and spinach is suppressed. Where tomatoes are abundantly irrigated and subject to air pollutants, growth is likewise retarded. Citrus groves close to intersections where exhaust gases accumulate, drop their leaves. Fruit is smaller. This is also true for apples and grapes.

"Ozone and oxidants affect the lower leaf surfaces of plants. This takes place where leaves have just begun to function actively, rather than where they are immature or fully matured.

"'Smog'—smoke and fog—by itself, does not cause plant damage. But oxidized products of hydrocarbons, in the presence of sunlight, are responsible for damages in large areas of California.

"These are the south coastal counties: Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and San Diego; the valley counties from Madera to Tulare, centering in Fresno; and the bay area, especially San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. Pole beans, commercially grown flowers, and even the leaves of strawberry plants have suffered in these counties to the extent that much of this production has been moved to Santa Cruz County. The Monterey Bay area has so far been free from this damage.

"Projected population concentrations will appreciably increase 'community' air pollution and plant damage unless effective methods are developed for adequate control.

"The oxidized hydrocarbon contaminants from uncontrolled combustion devices in community air which cause the damage are oxidate, ozone, ethylene, fluoride, and sulfur dioxide in descending order of importance.

"Significantly, farmers who use more intensive methods of cultivation and heavy irrigation to speed plant growth are the ones most adversely affected.

"Motor vehicles are now responsible for about 80 percent of the pollution in Los Angeles and San Diego, and 80 percent in the San Francisco Bay area. They are the major source in the central valley and other areas without heavy industries.

"Devices now being tested by the Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board are expected to be ready for installation, as required by California law, later this year.

" 'A dramatic improvement in air quality is expected following installation of exhaust control devices,' Dr. Middleton stated in a paper dealing with standards for such devices which he presented May 20, 1962, at the 55th annual meeting, Air Pollution Control Association, Chicago."

The Challenges of Tomorrow's Industrial Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1963, the Diocesan Labor College, Buffalo, N.Y., celebrated a quarter century of education in the field of labor-management relations. On this silver jubilee celebration, the bishop award ceremonies were incorporated.

The opening remarks, made by Very Rev. Msgr. Stanley A. Kulpinski, diocesan director of the Labor College follow:

THE CHALLENGES OF TOMORROW'S INDUSTRIAL LIFE

The faculty, the alumni and graduates of the diocesan labor schools graciously welcome your presence at the silver jubilee graduation and bishop's award ceremonies.

A silver jubilee is a special occasion. It reflects a quarter of a century of cooperation and efforts of various fields of endeavor.

At a moment like this, our first impulse is to send a great prayer of gratitude to God Almighty through St. Joseph, the patron saint of the workingpeople. It is only through the power of Almighty God, guiding us, inspiring, illuminating our minds, protecting us, leading us ever on, unswervingly, toward proper goals, filling us with divine courage and strength and tenacity and perseverance that we are able to stand before you today having you share with us the joy of this jubilee.

At a time like this we must also bring to our grateful recollection the persons who initiated this divine work. First on the list is His Excellency the late Most Reverend John A. Duffy, who gave permission and encouraged Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Boland to establish the labor college. Monsignor Boland must be given credit not only for founding this college, but also for this prophetic vision, where he foresaw the service and the need such a unique institution will fulfill for the community of western New York. Then came a succession of bishops who personally nourished the continuation of this work; viz, His Eminence the late Cardinal O'Hara and of recent beloved memory, His Excellency Bishop Joseph A. Burke and now present with us His Excellency Most Rev. Leo R. Smith.

Hundreds of persons went through the portals of this school, some to learn and others to teach. Time does not permit us to mention by name those on the previous teaching staffs who gave of their time and efforts and money, whose self-dedication was an inspiration to their students. We bow our heads in reverent memory to those amongst us on the faculty who have already passed to their eternal reward. Their names and their self-dedicated teaching will live on in the hearts of their living students. Just to mention a few, the late Jack Cassidy—a sales executive from Alleghany Ludlum, the late Henry Manka—on the grievance committee of United Rubber Workers Local 135, the late Congressman Radwan—all made self-sacrificing contributions to this cause.

Ours is a unique institution, perhaps even regarded as peculiar in the minds of some. It is not accredited, that is, it does not give college credit. It does not create specialists for any particular profession as such. It does not give any homework to its students. It holds no examinations.

Yet as the graduates who will come to get their diplomas will prove it attracts persons from all walks of industrial life, from the president of a company to the lowest classified factory laborer.

The secret is that this diocesan labor college teaches an industrial way of life that has been verified to be successful not only for the last 25 years but for the last 70 years.

The students are taught in such a manner that what they learn on Monday evening at the college they can immediately put into practical use next day on the factory floor, business conference room, or a union meeting.

To be more specific this school insists that it is not enough to know the technicalities of industrial relations but that in order to bring harmonious and just relations between labor and management and the community the whole man, the complete man must be educated with special emphasis on his heart, his conscience, his immortal soul. That is why one subject is always compulsory to all, that is, Industrial Ethics, this subject is based on the Pope's Encyclicals especially now on the latest Encyclical of Pope John XXIII, "Mater Et Magistra," which Encyclicals in turn are based on the Ten Commandments of God—acceptable to Catholic, Protestant, and Jew.

We believe that the answer to the challenges of tomorrow's industrial life will be found, not so much on the field of technical scientific programs, but on the bedrock moral principles as found in Pope John's Encyclical "Christianity and Social Progress."

As Pope John puts it, "The recognition and respect of a moral order that is valid for all, which recognizes its foundation in God, the protector and defender, distributor of goods, riches, and mercy, and the terrible avenger of injustice and inequality from whom no one can flee."

The following awards were then presented:

The Bishop's Plaque, the highest honor that the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College can bestow, was awarded Sunday to three Buffalo men at the college's 25th anniversary dinner.

They are: William J. Ryan, assistant executive director, United Fund of Buffalo and Erie County, for his leadership among labor groups in support of the fund;

Martin A. Wersing, mediator in the State Mediation Board's Buffalo District office, for promoting labor-management peace;

J. Edmund Kelly, Jr., Buffalo Evening News labor reporter, for consistently excellent and unbiased reporting.

Special silver jubilee plaques went to Joseph A. Beirne, Chevy Chase, Md., international president of the Communications Workers of America (AFL-CIO), for enlightened labor leadership.

COURSES PROVIDED

Edgar F. Kaiser, president, Kaiser Industries Corp., Oakland, Calif., for promoting labor-management peace and for inaugurating a sharing-of-savings plan. His administrative assistant, Norman E. Nicholson, accepted his award.

Mr. Kelly's citation read:

For serious guardianship of the code of journalistic ethics; for skill, courage, and prudence in positive reporting of the total industrial picture—an example of correctness in truth and justice.

Mr. Wersing's read:

For contributions in achieving the prospect of labor and management working together for the benefit of both in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

CONTRIBUTIONS NOTED

Mr. Ryan's read:

For a distinguished and outstanding service to the industrial community of Erie County and dedicated stewardship to the common man.

Mr. Kaiser's read:

For his contributions to the changing American economy in the cherished traditions of the free enterprise system and free collective bargaining—his effort to eliminate the need for long negotiations or strikes and sharing with the workers the gains from new processes—for a full generation of personal achievement as an outstanding, intrepid American.

Mr. Beirne's read:

For his inspiring, enlightened leadership in the American labor movement, in promoting the social principles of justice and charity—for his more than 25 years' devotion to organized labor—for his militancy in preserving the democratic way of life based on the dignity of man—for his unending campaign to unite all segments of society for the common welfare of all.

PRAISE FOR CITIZENS

In accepting the plaque, Mr. Kelly said:

I shall cherish this award not only for its own significance but also for the memories which attach to it.

It will remind me of the many fine, decent, conscientious people whom it has been my pleasure to meet in the unions, compaines, and government services in the Buffalo area.

It will remind me, too, of the great newspaper I am privileged to represent—a newspaper which, in the highest traditions of journalism, has always permitted me freely to report local labor-management news as objectively as possible and which has always gladly given me the broadest possible freedom in commenting upon the labor-management scene in my signed column.

ADULT COURSES PROVIDED

Finally, and importantly, this award will remind me always of the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College—an institution whose efforts in behalf of order and justice ennoble our community.

For this award then, and for the memories it will mean, I am humbly and sincerely grateful.

The college provides adults educational courses in labor-management relations, labor history, industrial ethics, collective bargaining, job evaluation, and public speaking.

The Most Reverend Leo R. Smith, administrator, Catholic diocese of Buffalo, who presented the bishop's plaque, said in the world of automation there is danger man may forget about God.

There is danger to religion that methods of technology may make truth unimportant.

URGES ABSOLUTE STANDARDS

It is up to not only the church but every one interested in humanity to devote some thought to the problem. The longer we live in a technological world, the longer we realize the limits of human knowledge.

The bishop concluded with a plea for absolute standards of good and evil for men to live by.

TWO JOIN IN TRIBUTES

Mayor Kowal presented keys to the City of Buffalo to Mr. Beirne and to Mr. Nicholson for Mr. Kaiser, Common Council Majority Leader Stanley A. Makowski presented an engrossed resolution passed by the council in commemoration of the anniversary to Monsignor Kulpinski.

Mr. Nicholson said the plan to share savings will result in payments to workers even though the Kaiser Co. is losing money this year. He noted its basic premise is that no one should lose his job as a result of any laborsaving devices installed.

DISCARDS SPEECH

New-product manufacture and retraining will be utilized in an effort to employ workers on new jobs, he said. Difficulties in the plan will be worked out through negotiation.

Mr. Beirne discarded a prepared speech to stress his conviction the American worker's strength lies in his belief in God, in the family and in our Nation. He said the greatest enemy is communism.

The Communications Workers' president predicted that, while the laws and economies of our democracy and the Communist nations might draw closer together, there is one unbridgeable gap—belief in God and in human kind.

Mr. Beirne noted that the world is changing and labor and management cannot cling to the views they held in the 1930's.

HAILS ENCOURAGEMENTS

He said the fact labor leaders did not strike to win "does not mean we have become soft or that we have sold out."

He warned against compulsory arbitration, advising that a third party also might be called in to regulate profits and production.

Mr. Beirne concluded with a tribute to the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College for encouraging adults to think for themselves in fields where there was an opportunity to provide justice.

Erie County executive, Edward A. Rath, expressed his felicitations which follow:

May I extend the official greetings of the county of Erie and my own personal greetings to you on the occasion of the silver jubilee celebration of the Diocesan Labor College.

This dinner tonight with the attendance here of people representing every segment of our community testifies to the high regard that all of us have for the excellent work in this very vital area of human relations which you have done in the 25 years since your founding. Twenty-five years ago the labor movement in this country was making an excellent beginning in bringing into the ranks of organized labor millions of people including those in the unskilled classes. The aims and objectives of this movement designed as they were to bring about better and safer working conditions, improved wage scales, and all those things which are consonant with the inherent dignity of man had and have the overwhelming support of enlightened persons everywhere. But with the increasing membership of unions, it was imperative that some individuals or organization should be ready to train persons in the movement to their new responsibilities and opportunities. It was this purpose that the Diocesan Labor College has fulfilled so ably and well in our own particular community. Yours has been an excellent record. You have our hearty congratulations and best wishes for an even greater future.

Thank you.

It was my pleasure to pay high tribute to the college for its outstanding work and its contributions to the labor-management relations in the Niagara Frontier.

I would like to include a telegram sent by President John F. Kennedy to Monsignor Kulpinski on the occasion of the silver jubilee celebration.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Very Rev. Msgr. STANLEY A. KULPINSKI,
Buffalo Diocesan Labor College,
Silver Jubilee Banquet,
Lafayette Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y.:

I am very pleased to extend congratulations and warm best wishes to the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. I would also like to commend you for the contribution you are making to labor-management affairs by awarding such a distinguished member of the business community as Edgar Kaiser your Bishop's Plaque for industrial statesmanship. Too often, attention is focused on failure in labor-management relations rather than achievement.

In honoring Edgar Kaiser, you acknowledge the achievement of one whose industrial leadership benefits the entire community, whose confidence in the process of collective bargaining has strengthened it, and whose vision has yielded programs for meeting the challenges of technological change.

To Monsignor Kulpinski, Edgar Kaiser, and to all participating in the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College silver jubilee go my very best wishes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The program began with the advancement of colors by the Adam Plewacki American Legion Post, Buffalo; the National Anthem was sung by Mr. James Wolford, business agent; and the invocation was given by Rev. Gerald R. Forton, associate director of the college.

The master of ceremonies was Mr. Edward J. Kanowski, director of public relations, Diocesan Labor College, United Fund.

His Excellency, Bishop Leo R. Smith, was introduced by Mr. Henry J. Osinski, and the benediction was given by Rev. William Grau, director, Lackawanna Labor School, Lackawanna, N.Y.

On March 9, 1963, an editorial appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., commenting on one of the recipients of an award. The editorial follows:

MERITED AWARD

J. Edmund Kelly, Jr., labor reporter of the Buffalo Evening News, will receive one of four plaques for outstanding contributions to labor at the silver jubilee dinner of the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College tomorrow evening.

He is cited for "consistently excellent and unbiased reporting in the field of labor-management relations." He has been on the labor "beat" for 12 years and his column "Ed Kelly's Comment on Labor" appears in the weekend edition of the News. Coming as it does from the Labor College—a unique institution dedicated to promoting ethical conduct and moral values in relationship between management and employees—the award is extremely gratifying to the News and a merited tribute to a fine reporter.

Our Naval Shipyards in Time of Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire and I both represent the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, one of the most outstanding naval facilities in the United States. The skilled craftsmanship of Portsmouth shipbuilders has been a joint Maine-New Hampshire tradition since Revolutionary times. The Polaris missile bearing submarines *Abraham Lincoln, John Adams,* and *Nathaniel Greene* either have been or are being constucted at the Portsmouth yard.

Because of the role of the naval shipyard in safeguarding our Nation's security, I am pleased to call your attention to the junior Senator from New Hampshire's remarks before the East Coast District Metal Trades Council on March 11, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator McINTYRE's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NAVAL SHIPYARDS IN TIMES OF CHALLENGE

(An address by U.S. Senator TOM McINTYRE, of New Hampshire, to the East Coast District Metal Trades Council, Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and members of the East Coast District Metal Trades Council, I am delighted to be with you today to discuss naval shipyards and their importance in keeping America strong. This Nation's response to the military and economic challenges of the Communist empire is an effort of unparalleled complexity and scope. The greatest military machine in the history of the world is poised in constant readiness to meet any test at any time. We have designed an electronic web to scan the earth from outer space and to penetrate under the sea. We are this moment designing weapon systems to counter military threats whose nature cannot yet be predicted with certainty.

Across the face of the world our technical and aid missions are challenging the forces of superstition and neglect, trying at the same time to outrace glib Communist promises of quick industrialization and easy progress. More than a million Americans are serving overseas on military duty, Peace Corps projects, volunteer health services, religious missions, and in other ways. This

effort—beyond compare in the history of mankind—requires the utmost in resourcefulness, endurance, and imagination from Americans.

This Government's efforts on behalf of freedom involve many high-priority industrial, construction and research efforts. One of these I would like to mention by way of introduction to the problems of public policy confronting the naval shipyards. The greatest project of its kind ever undertaken in the United States is the construction of missile and rocket launch facilities. The preparation of sites for Atlas, Titan and Minuteman missiles involves 100,000 square miles of land. More than 400,000 people are actively engaged in this gigantic effort, which will cost more than $700 million in this fiscal year alone. At the same time, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is building huge static test facilities, and the enormous launch complex at Cape Canaveral. Testing and launching of the Saturn, Nova and Apollo rocket systems will be accomplished on facilities for which Congress appropriated some $500 million in the current fiscal year. These projects are urgent. They are important to our national security. Delay cannot be tolerated. The cooperation of industry, Government and most particularly labor has been essential.

Two years ago, the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, of which I have since become a member, disclosed startling facts about strikes and work stoppages on the national missile sites. Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the subcommittee, called some of the practices which were uncovered both reprehensible and astounding. The conflicts between labor and management, aggravated by jurisdictional disputes, seriously crippled the all-important aerospace efforts of the Defense Department and the space agency. What was needed most urgently in this troubled situation? It was a spirit of cooperation and the active interest of all parties in achieving the No. 1 objective—the security of the United States of America.

In May of 1961, President Kennedy created the Missile Sites Labor Commission. Under the effective guidance of the Department of Labor, and with the splendid cooperation of George Meany and Walter Reuther, the number of days lost due to strikes on missile sites began a steady decline. The 1960 figure was 1 day lost out of 96. In 1961 the loss was 1 day out of 1,100. And by 1962, only 1 day was lost out of 2,200. The sense of responsibility and discipline which we associate with national security, combined with the outstanding record of cooperation among all parties, led to gratifying results. It is precisely this combination of responsibility to our national security objectives and sound labor-management relations that is so important to our naval shipyards. It is about the need of national security and the problems which may be created by labor unrest that I want to speak today.

While the missile and space program occupies the headlines, it must not be forgotten that our navy yards are vitally important for the Nation's security and would be overlooked at our peril. It is true today as it has been down through history that there can be no substitute for seapower. But in this nuclear age the seas have changed. No longer are they a barrier behind which we can feel safe from the intrusion of foreign aggressors. The seas have become highways which knit the world together, and it is therefore essential that we protect our national interests everywhere on the waters, from Antarctica to the North Pacific.

Our need for the Navy, our dependence, upon it, is clear. The pressing question is how best we can maintain it at full strength and combat readiness. We have been successful in times past of world conflict, having had time to tool up before entering World War I or reaching full strength in World War II. But in Korea there was no time. Our ability to put 600 ships to sea quickly was a decisive element in our strength. Those ships had to be there on the spot which they were needed. And now the need for speed is with us even more. Our Navy must be ever ready, and it is our naval shipyards that guarantee our readiness. The yards and their loyal and devoted workers stand today among the sentinels of our liberty.

The naval shipyards are basic to our strength for other reasons. They are subject to unified command with the fleets they serve. They maintain facilities and capabilities which, while they might not be economical in a profit-type organization, permit the Navy to take on any job with adequate reserves. Naval shipyards carry an extensive inventory of spare parts and shipboard equipment. You, as experienced shipyarders, are well aware of the importance of our readiness to our Navy.

A second element that makes the shipyards so important from the standpoint of national security, is their status as home ports for ships in the fleet. Naval bases provide ship's personnel opportunities for training, recreation, medical and dental care and other needed services. Above all, they give the men an opportunity to have a home life. The morale of our sailors is greatly heightened by the knowledge that they can keep their families near home ports. No one will argue with the right of these men who are serving our Nation, to have a home. It is a right we must recognize and preserve.

Still a third important contribution made by the naval shipyards arises from their close connection with the naval laboratories operated by the Bureau of Ships. As I study the achievements of today's Navy, I am amazed by their complexity. For instance, I learned that aboard a Polaris submarine there are upwards of 50 computers, of some 20 different types. The development of High Point and other water-skimming hydrofoils of immense speeds indicates the shape our Navy may take in the years ahead. I have come to realize the importance of uniting ship repair and construction with advanced research under common management.

There is yet another way, perhaps somewhat more intangible, in which shipyards contribute significantly to our national safety. As a representative of the State of New Hampshire, I am indeed proud of the long and distinguished history of the Portsmouth Shipyard which was authorized by Congress in an appropriation act of 1799. The first warship to fly the flag of the United States—the *Ranger* commanded by John Paul Jones—was built at Portsmouth. This tradition is ever in the minds of our shipyard workers. The exceptional morale of the Navy yards, their proven ability to meet the needs of the Nation again and again, and their tradition of excellence are factors of great importance in keeping existing organizations strong. A tradition this deep and real is precious to our American heritage.

But it is not the shipyards alone. The tremendous force that keeps the yards strong is the workers. Government workers, of course, are denied the right to strike. In a way this prohibition increases the reliability of the shipyards. But I would like to discuss the positive side of Government's employee-management relations. The employee who is denied the right to strike, I believe, certainly has a right to have just as great a voice in discussing working conditions as he would have otherwise. He ought not to be penalized because he is using his craft to help build the instruments of our security.

For years the chaotic procedures governing employee-management relations have been the Achilles heel of the Federal service, denying to the people the efficiency and improvement they have every right to expect. The voice of the Government worker must be heard, and it must be heeded to the greatest possible degree.

President Kennedy in June of 1961 instructed the Secretary of Labor to head a task force to work out new arrangements for employee relations in the Federal service. The President's Executive order of January 17, 1962 recognized for the first time the Federal employee's right to seek exclusive recognition through a unit to represent him in actual negotiations. This right to negotiate, is now extended where a unit achieves majority recognition. An organization receiving 30-percent recognition is entitled to be consulted on matters of interest to employees. The public interest in this field of improving employee-management relations is strong. The need is acute, I am gratified that we have begun to meet the need.

The Federal employee has not won the right to strike or the right to seek wage increases, other than by congressional action. But negotiations may now take place in such areas as working conditions, promotion standards, grievance procedures, transfers and demotions.

Let us not forget that the Executive order is still very new and much remains to be worked out. For example, it may take some time to work out guidelines for unit recognition. It would not be realistic, for instance, to insist that no unit smaller than an entire installation could be recognized. I think the last few months have witnessed more and more flexibility on the part of the Defense Department and other Federal agencies in encouraging the recognition of smaller groups within installations.

Of course, the first decision has yet to come down from an arbitrator at the top level of appeal in the Labor Department. Once we have a series of decisions, discussions on this point can be renewed if necessary. Meanwhile, like most other Members of Congress, I will wait with interest to see what policies emerge.

The organization of labor unions in our naval shipyards sretches back to the beginning of the last century. You must be very proud of that tradition and the vital part played by your members in meeting the challenges of their jobs. The new voice given your organizations by the Executive order will, I am certain, lead to many improvements in shipyard work. And it will yet be another source of strength. It will serve the national security interest and ths Government's obligations to its employees. The Kennedy administration has in my estimation taken a long step forward in the direction of the finest type of relations with the Federal employee.

The most important point I could make here today would be to emphasize the combination of national security and sound labor organization in our naval shipyards. You are all aware, I am sure, that a campaign is underway to discredit the naval shipyards. The commercial yards are eagerly seeking a greater share of naval ship-repair work. It is their claim that tax-financed navy yards are driving them out of business by taking an undue share of repair work. Let's examine their claims in some detail—particularly from the standpoint of labor, peace, and the national security.

First, there can be no doubt that the assets which make the naval shipyards so important to the Nation are largely lacking in the commercial yards. Moving a ship from yard to yard denies it a home port, with the related important facilities we discussed earlier. The commercial yards are not integrated with naval command and lack the resulting readiness so vital in these

troubled times. And the commercial yards are subject to delays arising from labor-management difficulties.

The agreements under which the shipbuilding and repair unions are now operating were concluded in 1960. The 3-year agreements expire this year, and we have yet to see whether harmful and dangerous interruptions to naval construction and repair will occur. But let us take a look at a few examples of what has happened during the life of the present agreements.

In 1960 strikes at one leading east coast commercial yard tied up work on 10 Navy ships.

In 1961 12 strikes involving 6,900 workers resulted in 124,000 idle man-days in the shipbuilding and repair industry.

In 1962 a strike in an eastern shipyard delayed the Polaris program for 10 days, despite the urgent priorities of putting nuclear submarines to sea.

This is not to criticize the labor record of our commercial yards, which in many respects has been excellent. But the danger of work stoppage is one the Secretary of the Navy must have the authority to weigh in assigning urgent modernization work. It is shocking to realize, in this year of contract expiration that efforts are underway to tie his hands, to deny the Navy the flexibility and discretion it must have in dealing with the uncertainties of schedules in commercial yards.

In fact, if the Navy did not have the ability to allocate its work after a day-to-day assessment of the labor situation, the strike threat in the commercial shipyards could well increase. As it is now, labor, management, and the Government have an equal interest in steady working conditions and the speedy settlement of difficulties in commercial yards. This balance should not be upset by hasty action dictated by short-term self-interest.

It is the natural and legitimate aim of the commercial yards to seek business. But where the national security is involved, and the good name of our naval shipyards is involved, the public has a right to the truth. Naval shipyards are not unfair competition. The Navy is not the enemy of private business. In fact, before a decision in 1951 to send a definite amount of repair work to private yards, the commercial shipyards did not have any share in modernization and repair. And, of course the private yards always have had the lion's share of initial construction.

More recently, one-quarter of repair and modernization—amounting to $159 million in the last fiscal year—has been allocated to the commercial yards. Thirty-seven private firms have participated in a construction and conversion program worth more than $4 billion since the end of World War II.

But this has not satisfied the commercial yards. They want to cut deeper and deeper into the share of work now being done so efficiently and expertly by the naval shipyards. Two bills now before the House Armed Services Committee would give the private yards a whopping 75 percent of the Navy's conversion and repair work. These bills, introduced by Representatives WILLIAM COLMER, of Mississippi, and ALVIN O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, present a real threat to the naval shipyards and the job they are doing to aid in the Nation's defense.

The history of last year's military appropriation bill bears ample evidence of just how real is the danger to the naval shipyards. In April of 1962, the House Appropriations Committee reported out a bill directing that no more than 65 percent of the repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels be carried out at naval shipyards—although close to 75 percent was then being done at these Government installations.

Chairman CARL VINSON, a seasoned and astute student of our military needs, led the floor fight against the restriction. This provision could have led to a reduction of 5,000 workers in the naval yards, as well as weakening the management ability of the Secretary of the Navy. On April 18, Chairman VINSON offered an amendment to strike out the 65 to 35 provision. This amendment was defeated in the House by a standing vote of 130 to 64.

In the Senate, where the bill was reported June 8, the committee took the teeth out of the 35-percent requirement by permitting the President to disregard the requirement if he determined it "to be inconsistent with the public interest, based on urgency * * * capability and economy." In conference between the House and Senate, the Secretary of Defense was authorized to ignore the 35-percent requirement if it imposed delays or additional expense. It was by this narrow margin, then, that the attack on the naval shipyards was in part defeated. But this attack has not subsided. Those who would damage the whole structure of our naval shipyards are still at work.

One of the least publicized but more obvious reasons for the campaign of the private shipyards has been the decline in commercial shipbuilding and repair. Private yard employment on Navy work has increased from 26,000 in 1957 to more than 50,000 today, while overall employment in those yards decreased from 127,000 to 117,000 over the same period. It is the decline in commercial work, and not any weakness in the Navy's program, that has provoked the attack on the naval shipyards. This is important to remember in our fight to keep the naval shipyards operating at full force.

There was a time when 90 percent of our American exports and imports were carried in American merchantmen. But our early failure to build steel ships, inept Government management of the commercial fleet after World War I, and an off-and-on mail subsidy weakened the commercial fleet. By 1938, 90 percent of our fleet was thought to be obsolete.

The 1936 Shipping Act regulations for subsidized operations are so restrictive, that few shipowners have participated. The losses of American Export Lines on the construction of the *Independence* and the *Constitution* did little to raise the confidence of American operators. The construction subsidy has not helped the American yards as much as it might due to Government mismanagement and restrictive regulations. The remedy for these very real problems lies with the Maritime Administration and the Shipping Act—not in attacks on the navy yards.

World trade grew by 6 percent last year, and there are many opportunities for American ships. I am more than willing to work for the future of the merchant fleet, once the leading industry in my own State of New Hampshire.

But it is short-sighted in the extreme to attempt to cure the ills of this industry by threatening the very foundations of the naval shipyards whose history is interwoven with the growth and security of this Nation. I shall devote my energies as a Member of the U.S. Senate to promoting this country's security and honoring the inspiring traditions of its naval shipyards.

Disclosures of Eisenhower Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a review by David S. Broder of the book "The Ordeal of Power: A Political Memoir of the Eisenhower Years," by Emmet John Hughes. The review, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, seemed to me worth reading, and to indicate that the book itself might be of interest to other Members.

SOME DIM "DISCLOSURES" OF EISENHOWER DAYS

Of all the improbable figures swept into the White House by Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1952 victory, none seemed more out of place than Emmet John Hughes, the Luce empire journalist who turned presidential speechwriter and gave General Eisenhower the "I shall go to Korea" line.

Mr. Hughes is, by his own definition, "a comrade, in purpose and temper, of the Democrats, and not the more conservative ones." Emotionally and intellectually, he was scarcely attuned to the mood of the last administration.

As a result, his insider's account of the Eisenhower years reads a little like a stowaway's log of a naval voyage. The unspoken question, throughout, is: What was I doing there?

WHOPPERS

Even a stowaway picks up some juicy bits of shipboard gossip, however, and Mr. Hughes—for all his irritating self-conscious pretentiousness—has some wondrous indiscreet White House whoppers to tell. Republicans who read his book may think it should be entitled "The Enemy Within."

General Eisenhower already has denied the accuracy of published excerpts dealing with his alleged lack of confidence in Richard Nixon. How will he react to Mr. Hughe's "disclosures" of his views on the Supreme Court, segregation, Senator Knowland, and sundry other subjects?

The author, who knows General Eisenhower's temper better than most, has decided to spill the beans and risk his spanking.

More seriously, "Ordeal of Power" is the story of the progressive disillusionment of a man who saw in the Eisenhower of 1952 hope for salvaging the Republican Party and with it, effective two-party democracy; hope for regaining the initiative in foreign affairs and, with it, the last real chance for peace.

In his disillusionment, Mr. Hughes came to blame John Foster Dulles and George M. Humphrey for turning General Eisenhower from the paths that might have led to success. His indictment of the late Secretary of State is particularly bitter; the General's affection for Mr. Dulles apparently still baffles and angers him.

But Mr. Hughes, ultimately, argues that the faults in the Eisenhower presidency lay in the President himself. He was not a weak man, manipulated by others, he insists. He was a strong man, true to his own conception of the office, but fatally crippled by his lifelong sense of self-restraint.

POLITICAL POWER

"Through all the span of his presidency," Mr. Hughes writes, "no man * * * could match the resources of political power commanded by Eisenhower, both at home and abroad. Yet it had been the pattern of action, if not the purpose of the man, to husband and to guard these resources like savings earned by the sweat of a lifetime, so that they not be spent in the rough and contaminating play of power and politics. The pattern had been almost faultlessly consistent, whether the arena of world challenge was outer space or the nearby Caribbean, whether the issue was a menace to national sovereignty in the Middle East or a menace to civil rights in Little Rock."

Mr. Hughes strives mightily to avoid judging Mr. Eisenhower's presidency a total failure; if nothing else, he wants to make his

own hopes in 1952 seem something other than absurd.

But in the end, the best he can manage for the General is to quote Winston Churchill's eulogy of a predecessor: "The only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions."

The predecessor was Neville Chamberlain.

Cotton Industry in Life-and-Death Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing problems confronting our economy today is a solution of the cotton problem. The House Committee on Agriculture has been working on cotton legislation and our Subcommittee on Cotton started hearings back in December of last year, to bring out legislation that would have applied to this crop year. Our efforts to make the legislation effective in 1963 have not been successful up to this time; the difficulties facing the cotton industry have not been resolved.

Recently, on March 22, the distinguished chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, was the principal speaker before the annual convention of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, and the address he presented to that group of mill owners and operators and textile manufacturers outlines the scope of our studies and the differences still existing before we can hope to bring legislation to the floor. Mr. COOLEY outlined the history of the problem, explained the position of the committee, and concludes with his own personal suggestions for a solution.

I believe that Members will find the entire speech enlightening and informative, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Chairman COOLEY's remarks delivered on that occasion:

REMARKS OF HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, HOLLYWOOD, FLA., MARCH 22, 1963

COTTON INDUSTRY IN LIFE AND DEATH STRUGGLE

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I acknowledge with great gratitude the kind and gracious remarks of my friend Charlie Cannon. He has presented me to this great audience in fine fashion and in complimentary terms. Mr. Cannon has been referred to as "Cotton Cannon." In my opinion he is worth his weight in gold to the cotton industry of America. In the cotton industry he has always stood like the Rock of Gibraltar, and has been a beacon light.

I am delighted to be here with many close personal friends, and to have the privilege of meeting so many nice people. Bill Ruffin, your distinguished president, whom I have known since childhood and whose friendship I have cherished through the years, was very kind to invite me to this convention, and to arrange for me to have a part on this program. I am also very happy to be here with my friends Bob Stevens, Gordon McCabe, Bob Jackson, Charlie Myers, Rea Blake, Bob Coker, and others, all of whom are devoted to the institutions of freedom. They are courageous men of vision—they are not cry babies. When Charlie Cannon, Bob Stevens, Charlie Myers admit that they are in trouble, it is time for all of us to take notice.

Yesterday I heard with great interest the speeches delivered by Bill Ruffin, and our great Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon. With their permission, I shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to perpetuate for posterity, the wisdom of their remarks. I shall also insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Bob Stevens' acknowledgment which emphasizes the fact that "Rome is burning."

I am grateful to all of you for the warmth and cordiality of the welcome accorded us and the hospitality and many courtesies extended to us during our sojourn here. I am very happy to have the privilege of discussing with you some of the problems in which all of us have a community of interest.

BIG BUSINESS

Agriculture is the biggest business in America in dollar value involved and people employed, and the cotton industry is the biggest part of American agriculture. Perhaps more than 10 million persons—almost one-sixth of the Nation's labor force—is engaged in the production of cotton, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

Cotton is competing with synthetic fibers. I do not like synthetics in cotton anymore than I do synthetics in tobacco. I do not want synthetic socks, shirts or shorts and I certainly do not want synthetic sheets, towels, or pillow cases. Neither do I want alfalfa to take the place of tobacco. Personally, I do not like filter-tip cigarettes. I agree with Edward R. Murrow—a chain smoker—when he said that to smoke a filter cigarette was like kissing a beautiful girl through a nylon veil.

Cotton maintained the financial integrity of the United States before the world for perhaps a century or more prior to World War I. The white fleece from southern fields up into this century accounted for approximately one-third of all U.S. exports, of crops and industrial products combined.

Cotton still comprises about 20 percent of all our agricultural exports and 5 percent of the total shipments abroad from agriculture and industry.

No one crop has had such an intimate relationship to the well-being and, indeed, the culture of so many Americans.

Cotton relates directly, through exports, to the flow of dollars back to the United States, amounting in years past to around $1 billion a year—dollars returning to the United States to balance against the huge sums we ance of payments and financial strength in ports of goods from abroad.

Thus it is plain to see: Government policy relating to cotton goes far beyond the immediate interests of the cotton farmer—it goes far, far beyond the immediate interests of you cotton manufacturers.

THE CRISIS

Gentlemen, I have opened these remarks in a way intended to impress upon you the importance of cotton—in terms of the Nation's economy, in terms of our Nation's balance of payments and financial strength in the world, and in terms of the well-being of millions of our citizens.

We are here in a serious purpose, a very serious and critical purpose.

Cotton is now in a life or death struggle.

Cotton is assailed, and is losing ground, on two fronts:

1. A flood of cheap textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry.

2. Synthetic fibers make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged.

Generally, these losing battles for cotton are explained, though oversimplified, by blaming the imports upon the two-price system—one price for our own mills and a lesser price for competing mills abroad; and by a high price for cotton here at home, in relationship to the lower competing price of rayon.

We have been aware of this approaching struggle for a number of years. Some of us in and out of Congress have tried to do something to forestall and avoid the crisis that is now upon us. But our efforts have been subjected to pressures, strains, and warps.

THE DESTINY OF COTTON

I shall not need to dwell at any length upon the fix we are in. You people are painfully aware of this. So are the people who produce the cotton that you spin.

A quarter of a century ago, U.S. cotton was the dominant factor in the world fiber market. This is no longer true. U.S. cotton faces competition from foreign-grown cotton and a host of man-made fibers.

Thirty years ago, if we exclude wool, silk, and linen, which do not directly compete with cotton on a price basis, cotton enjoyed about 93 percent of the total fiber market, with rayon and acetate accounting for the remainder. In 1961, the latest year for which comparable information is available, cotton had only 66.5 percent. In other words, cotton holds only two-thirds of the market in which it competes directly.

In the last 12 years, cotton has dropped from 30 pounds consumed annually by each individual in the United States to 22 pounds. Man-made fibers today account for over one-third of this market.

Seven years ago we were faced with the virtual loss of our export markets. U.S. cotton stocks on August 1, 1956, were at the record level of 14½ million bales. Our exports were only 2¼ million bales in 1955. Foreign cotton and rayon producers were taking over our markets by moving their products into consumption at prices lower than ours. From 1948 to 1955, cotton acreage in the free foreign world increased more than 60 percent. Foreign rayon production rose 2½ times.

We met this with our export program in 1956 that made American cotton available for export at competitive world prices. From 1956 through 1960 the rise in foreign cotton acreage and foreign rayon production were practically halted. Our exports during the last 7 years have averaged to about 6 million bales annually.

We are now faced with the identical situation in our domestic markets that we confronted in our export markets.

Between December 1960 and December 1962 cotton has suffered a total competitive loss of 1,150,000 bales. Over this period consumption of rayon in cotton-type spinning mills rose 63 percent. Consumption of dacron and similar-type fibers rose 118 percent. For the past 14 months, cotton's share of the fiber consumed on the cotton spinning system has declined every single month.

Rayon's price advantage to the textile mill over cotton was about 6 cents a pound in early 1960. Cotton's superior quality overcame this disadvantage. In its competitive fight with rayon, cotton was making gains. In the first half of 1960, the rayon industry cut the price of rayon staple fiber 4 cents per pound. On the other hand the price support for U.S. cotton was raised in February 1961. This resulted in a 3½-cent rise in prices from January to October of that

year. Rayon's net mill cost advantage over cotton rose to about 14 cents per pound.

Cotton textile imports have increased sharply. In 1962, they reached a record 650,000 equivalent bales of cotton compared with 100,000 bales in 1954. Imports of cotton textile products over the past 4 years have had an average annual increase of 100,000 bales.

The deteriorating cotton situation is sharply increasing Government costs. Two years ago, CCC's investment was about $300 million. Today it has increased to over $1½ billion.

It is plain to all of us that American cotton is rapidly losing markets—both at home and abroad. Domestic consumption and exports during the current season are estimated at the lowest level since the 1958–59 season. This will be the third straight year of decline.

The Department of Agriculture currently is forecasting a carryover of around 10 million bales on August 1, 1964, up about 2¼ million bales from last year.

AN ADMONITION

This is the sad and sorry situation as of now.

The responsibility lies in many directions and rests upon many people. The House Committee on Agriculture and I, personally have worked long and hard to avoid the crisis now at hand. We may not have done always the right thing at the right time. But we have worked against very great odds, being ever handicapped by the lack of unity among farm organizations, among farmers themselves, and in the textile industry generally, as to the direction we should pursue.

All of us no doubt must bear some of the blame. I suggest that you in the manufacturing end of the cotton examine what you might have done, or now can do, differently.

Right here I want to speak to you frankly.

I am deeply disturbed by your headlong rush into the use of synthetic fibers.

I beleive you are playing with a time bomb. You may get hurt. You may get hurt badly.

Is it not significant to you that the greatest increase in competitive imports of cotton goods has occured simultaneously with your increases in blends of rayon with cotton and your presentation of these blends and mixtures into markets where consumers have preferred and asked only for cotton? Maybe you might say you are blending to compete pricewise with cheap cotton goods from abroad. But is there not a valid question as to whether foreign goods are moving, or will move into and take over our markets for quality cotton goods, as these markets are abandoned by you here who favor various blends, mixtures, and adulterations?

Let me admonish you that you—the textile industry of this country—may rue the day if ever the American consumer gets the idea that she must look for a foreign trademark, from Europe or from Asia, to be assured of getting a sheet, a towel, a piece of fabric, or a shirt, made of pure, unblended, unmixed and unadulterated cotton.

I submit that this is something for you to think upon.

A NEW START

The cotton industry—all of us—farmer and the miller—must make a new start. We must commence from where we are and from where we stand.

I want a cotton program to accomplish these things:

1. Fair and stable income for the cotton farmer;

2. Protection of the livelihood of the millions of workers associated with cotton;

3. A healthy cotton trade and merchandizing system;

4. An efficient and prosperous cotton textile industry, and

5. A fair share of the world cotton market.

I fully understand these objectives can only be accomplished by a return to a one-price system for cotton. I know that otherwise cotton's markets will deteriorate unless we move in this direction and I know a competitive position for the cotton fiber will expand markets and put cotton back where it should be. Now, I have said all along that it is useless for me to consider this matter further until the textile industry, the producers and the administration can get together.

I realize that the textile industry has taken a firm position for an immediate return to one price for cotton. As you well know, this was also my position and was embodied in my bill, H.R. 2000. However, as we all know, subsequent developments have made it impossible to secure enactment of this legislation. In recent weeks I have spent a great deal of time conferring with the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates in the Department, leaders of cotton producer groups and other branches of the industry, in an effort to find a practicable approach that would get the job done and upon which general agreement might be reached. At this time I would like to suggest for your consideration and the consideration of all others involved what seems to me to be the best solution to this problem. Here are my specific proposals:

(1) Effective upon the enactment of legislation and until August 1, 1964, the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to make payments in kind that would move as far as possible toward a one-price system for cotton within the budgetary limitations already prescribed. In order to prevent market disruption, this payment would also be made on raw cotton in consuming establishments on date of enactment.

(2) Beginning August 1, 1964, and thereafter U.S. cotton would be made available to American mills at the same price as it is made available to foreign mills under existing law.

(3) Beginning with the 1964 crop the national marketing quota would be not less than the average off-take (domestic consumption and exports) for the 5 cotton-marketing years immediately preceding the year for which the determination is being made. It is only logical that our minimum production goal for a given year should be related to a historical average of consumption rather than estimates of potential off-take on a year-to-year basis. Under this provision our minimum acreage allotment for 1964 would be approximately 17 million acres.

If additional consumption indicates a production above the minimum, this should be equitably apportioned between an increase in the national allotment and an acreage reserved for producers who desire to grow cotton above their individual share of the national allotment for the world market at world prices.

(4) Immediately upon enactment of this legislation the Commodity Credit Corporation should be directed to make available to the Agricultural Research Service of the Department not less than $10 million annually to be devoted to research designed to reduce the cost of producing cotton. This section of the legislation should also provide that as unit costs of producing cotton are reduced the price support would be lowered accordingly, thereby reducing the cost to the Government without impairing farmers' net incomes.

I want to emphasize the extreme importance of this matter of research to reduce our production costs and also I wish to emphasize the fact that we do have extremely promising opportunities to actually reduce cost of producing cotton. We have documented testimony before our cotton subcommittee by the Director of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department, the director of research for numerous State experiment stations and private industry that cost reductions in excess of 10 cents per pound are feasible and can be attained in a reasonable number of years. The plain fact is that research offers the only permanent solution to the problem.

Unless everybody gives a little there will be no legislation and up to this point I have not seen any sign of anybody giving, but if this is not done our markets will deteriorate.

As you no doubt are aware, the House committee is divided sharply along political lines, and unless Democrats on the committee are in virtually unanimous agreement, it is not likely that we shall have any legislation at all.

CONGRESS OUR LAST HOPE

Congress is our last hope, and this is our situation. Not only in our Committee on Agriculture, but in the House, there is not one Republican vote we can count for sure, on legislation now being proposed to deal with our desperate problems.

We have exhausted every other recourse.

We first tried through the Office of Emergency Planning to bring into action the emergency powers of the President to stem the flow of foreign textiles into this country. Everybody admits it is an outrage that foreign mills can buy our cotton at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than our own mills, and then send unlimited amounts of their cheap cotton goods into our markets. But we failed to get action.

We went before the Tariff Commission seeking import quotas and import fees to check this rising flow of foreign textiles. But again we failed.

We went the route of an 18-nation agreement, to bring within reason the shipment of foreign textiles into our markets. But this has been far from effective.

Thus rejected, we have turned again to the Congress.

We in the Committee on Agriculture recognized the urgency of the situation, and our Cotton Subcommittee began work last fall to have legislation ready for action immediately upon the convening of the 88th Congress in January. Meanwhile, the Advisory Committee on Cotton appointed by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was working to find a meeting of minds among cotton producers. People in the textile industry were putting their heads together, for the same purpose.

This concerted effort was an inspiration full of promise.

I soon got the impression that everyone was agreed, from Houston and California to Boston, on the proposition that we would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments-in-kind, in a way to erase and remove the two-price cotton system as a burden upon our own textile industry.

When the new Congress was only a few days old, I introduced H.R. 2000, to provide payments-in-kind in such a manner as to remove the 8½-cents-a-pound advantage to foreign mills, gained through the export subsidy, and to assure our industry a fair competitive position.

Moreover, by reducing the price to our mills to the world price of cotton, I expected that cotton would be freed of the competitive disadvantages that now so strongly favor the synthetic fibers and pose such a great threat to the total production and use of cotton in our domestic markets.

But I found later to my amazement that the administration was not willing to pay the 8½ cents to completely equalize the

price situation, but would support payments-in-kind only to the extent of 4 to 6 cents a pound.

Meanwhile, in a bill introduced by Chairman E. C. GATHINGS of the Cotton Subcommittee, and by amendments offered in our committee, we had before us a proposal for overplanting of cotton by farmers who were willing to take the world price for cotton on acreage they tilled above their allotments. We had also a proposal for a far-reaching program of research into ways and means of bringing down the cost of producing cotton, with the long-term view of reducing the price of cotton to place this fiber in a fairer competitive position with synthetics.

Confronting a stalemate, I had prepared by the committee staff and was ready to introduce a bill, containing the overplant and research provisions, but giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretion in determining the level of the payments-in-kind—instead of insisting upon the full payments of 8½ cents per pound.

I very soon learned that this was unacceptable to the textile industry—that is, to you people here.

THE SITUATION TODAY

You are a discriminating, and a brilliant audience. In full consideration of this, I had hoped to bring to you more than an exercise in language. I wanted to lay before you a program for the good of all of us—a program that the Congress could enact swiftly, so that we could get on with the job of putting cotton back where it should be. However, all is yet confusion.

Nevertheless there are two things I have said that I want to repeat here in this forum. I implore you to listen carefully.

When I found on February 21 that the textile manufacturing industry would not support legislation that provided anything less than a full subsidy representing the difference between the domestic price and the world price for cotton, I issued a statement to the press, and I quote from that statement:

"I have decided not to introduce a new bill until all segments of the cotton industry and the administration can reach an agreement and indicate a willingness to support legislation to carry the agreement into effect."

That is my position today.

In a public appearance on March 9, I said this:

"There is danger that the Nation's farm program will collapse, setting off a severe depression in the general economy. Great difficulties now confront the House Committee on Agriculture in writing legislation to deal with an urgency in cotton resulting from the flood of foreign textiles moving into our markets and from the severe competition of synthetic fibers for markets formerly held entirely by cotton. This effort to remove the inequity suffered by the textile industry has been blocked by partisan politics and by the opposition of one farm organization. However, I expect a cotton bill will be taken to the House floor for a vote.

"I think that if this effort to do justice to our textile industry and to cotton farmers is defeated, no other farm legislation will be forthcoming at this session of the Congress. This would be the beginning of the end for farm programs."

That is the situation today.

Let me say to this distinguished group that to end farm price and production adjustment programs would bring on a terrible farm depression. This would be reflected quickly in a downturn for the entire economy.

Certainly the collapse of the farm program would mean cheaper cotton, at least for a while. But if you younger men in textiles think that in itself is good, I suggest you consult with some of your older colleagues, on what a mess they were in when cotton was 5 cents a pound.

In these circumstances, and in all the confusion on cotton policy, I can leave with you but one message, and this is the message: You must insist upon, and there must be, a meeting of minds. There must be agreement upon policy. Whatever it takes to bring together the views and the positions of honorable men, this must be done. Cotton legislation must come out of this Congress.

The consequences of failure are too dismal to contemplate.

In parting, I assure you I shall be pleased to work with you in your own self-interest, and in the interest of our farmers, and in the interest of the millions of other people who are bound to cotton for their well-being, and for the health of our economy and for the power of our country. I wish you Godspeed.

Alexander Boyd Campbell: Tribute to an Illustrious Mississippian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Mississippi has been saddened by the death of one of its most beloved citizens, known throughout the length and breadth of Mississippi as its greatest ambassador at large.

Alexander Boyd Campbell had lived among his fellow Mississippians for 73 years—nearly three-quarters of a century—before he died on February 20, 1963.

Boyd Campbell was a humble man, but his humility was never obscured by his illuminating pride as a Mississippian.

Born in Montgomery County into a wonderful family of modest means, he rose to a position of great strength and influence in the educational, business, and civic life of the State he loved so fervently.

Boyd Campbell began his adult life as a schoolteacher and principal and a superintendent. After years in that beloved calling, he entered the business community of Jackson, Miss., and there broadened his knowledge and keen interest in finance, commerce, industry, and government.

Through all of these achievements, Boyd Campbell never lost the common touch. All who knew him were enriched by the association.

His friends and associates in the business world felt a great sense of pride in Boyd Campbell's remarkable qualities of leadership. In recognition of his leadership, ability, and unselfish devotion to his fellow man, he was chosen president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

From this focal point, he spread his message of fairness and honor to all who were privileged to meet him in the market places of the world.

He attained great stature and commanded wide respect in the world councils of business leadership.

He was a world traveler, but he was always Mississippi's No. 1 booster.

The success enjoyed by Boyd Campbell was not a personal triumph alone. His deep reverence for God underscored this man's recognition of an all-powerful force for good that shapes the lives of all men everywhere.

Boyd Campbell's faith was unshakeable, his convictions unswerving. In a world too smart for God, he was proud to be God's man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, of February 21, 1963, entitled "Boyd Campbell Was Truly No. 1 Citizen of Our State."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOYD CAMPBELL WAS TRULY NO. 1. CITIZEN OF OUR STATE

At the height of his brilliant career, Alexander Boyd Campbell was called the No. 1 citizen of Mississippi.

It was a title not lightly bestowed, but an estimate arrived at on the basis of considered judgment.

He was a citizen whose makeup included all the elements of civic virtue that go to compose true greatness in constructive leadership.

He was a merchant prince of most substantial achievement who called himself modestly "a pencil peddler."

He was an educator who continued his interest, his efforts and his crusading spirit in the area of more and better schooling even after he had left the practice of the profession.

He was a churchman whose pastor delighted not only in the many responsibilities he discharged with such success and devout dignity, but in the spirit and the attitude which he maintained in every religious undertaking.

He was a country boy from the hills of Montgomery county who never lost the common touch, though he walked with kings of finance, industry, commerce, and Government, in the Nation and in many parts of the world.

He was a man who became an ambassador for the United States at many international gatherings but never neglected to be Mississippi's No. 1 booster in all States of the Union.

Despite the national and international scope of his travels and assignments, he was to the very end a proud Jacksonian who never let an opportunity pass to support, magnify, and multiply every good program offered for the material, educational, cultural, social, and religious advancement of the capital city.

The recital of positions attained and responsibilities fulfilled is left to the stories found in the news columns of the paper. But the listing of his jobs, from rural and smalltown school principal to the presidency of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is not an adequate measure of the man.

For the spirit of Boyd Campbell was the secret of his greatness. His was a friendly, cooperative forcefulness. He led people, rather than drove them.

Though he was never a candidate for political office, he possessed more political influence than almost any given man in the State, because solid and substantial people knew and trusted his spirit.

Mississippians fortunate enough to be in Washington with him at U.S. Chamber of

Commerce meetings basked in reflected glory of the great stature this man attained in national councils.

In national forums, the voice of Boyd Campbell spoke out amid the respect of both those who agreed with him and those who disagreed. In a telegram to a national publication which had requested his views on "the southern state of mind and specific American attitudes necessary to avoid violence and bring healing to a deteriorating situation," Mr. Campbell telegraphed:

"The vast improvement in race relationship and the progress of southern Negroes in education, health, and economic opportunity was brought about by the enlightened leadership of men of good will in both races. This progress came to a jarring halt when the NAACP usurped local Negro leadership and undertook speedily to compel a condition by methods that are abhorrent to the American tradition.

"Meantime, there are heartaches aplently on both sides as we witness the result of years of patient effort being swept away ruthlessly by methods that engender hatred rather than good will. We can only hope that those who condemn us would first try to understand us, and to understand the vastly complex problem which is ours and which lends itself to no superimposed solution."

Two years later, he appeared before a congressional committee considering a so-called civil rights bill, and on this occasion his penetrating statement, a masterpiece, was printed in full in the Clarion-Ledger.

Some quotations from this statement reveal his spirit and his wisdom in that situation:

"I am the grandson of two nonslave-owning Confederate soldiers, both of whom returned from the war with wounds that crippled them for life. In their reminiscences and discussions of the war, I never heard from them one word of recrimination or bitterness. From them I learned the meaning of good will. I did not appreciate its value then. I do now. In too many of our relationships, domestic and foreign, the factor of good will appears to be eroding at a time when our national well-being requires that it should be increasing.

"For all of my mature life, as have thousands of my white neighbors in Mississippi, I have advocated better education, better economic opportunity, better living conditions, better health services, and equality before the law for Mississippi Negroes."

Speaking then of previous civil rights legislation and court decisions, Mr. Campbell declared:

"They are creating a chasm of bitterness. As history repeats itself, they are setting neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend, and brother against brother. Human dignity cannot be preserved or protected by penalizing one minority to befriend another.

"In a dynamic society like our own, change is inevitable, but change in attitudes, change in human relationship—the kind of change that endures because all men accept it and live with it—does not come suddenly. It is a maturing and ripening. We of this generation should have learned that it cannot be accelerated by the enactment of Federal laws. The mores and traditions of 40 million free people cannot be changed by compulsion."

In assuming the presidency of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Campbell took over the role of spokesman for the business community of the Nation. Never has more eloquence and commonsense emanated from that summit.

At his inauguration, he spoke of his faith that "we shall not walk in darkness. With the help of God, we will go forward to a better tomorrow."

"Ours is a great country. We must keep it so by preserving the principles that made it great and by perfecting the practices with which we implement these principles. In striving for that objective, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States will not only be enhancing the great American tradition, it will be contributing vastly to our national well-being."

As president of the chamber, he went around the world for conferences and confrontations with leaders of many nations, including Communists, at many of these sessions.

He came back to Mississippi to tell a State PTA convention:

"Communism is a glittering illusion, nothing more than the promise of a full belly and a warm body.

"Our system is not perfect. No political, economic, or social system is more perfect than those who administer it, but ours is the greatest vehicle that the mind of man has ever devised for the expression of individual initiative and the maintenance of human dignity. But this country must find a new way to underscore the priceless boon of freedom."

In an early address as president of the U.S. Chamber he emphasized the moral accountability of business when he said:

"Free enterprise is a stewardship. To retain leadership, it must maintain a climate in which moral and spiritual values are dominant.

"This is true on grounds of commercial expediency alone. As community leaders, our businessmen must face growing responsibilities in community improvement, community welfare, and character building."

All these quotations indicate better than words of ours the stature and the character of Boyd Campbell as a national and international figure.

And yet, when we come right down to it, Jackson was his home, his beloved city and Mississippi was his native State and cherished commonwealth; and what he did for city and State is beyond measure. On every side can be seen improvements and expansions in which Boyd Campbell had a large part, and in which he took great but always humble pride.

We have not often seen his match, nor shall we. And as we sympathize with the bereaved family and closest friends, we cannot but congratulate them upon having had such an illustrious kinsman.

As Jackson joins the rest of Mississippi in mourning at the bier of this great and truly distinguished man, we could wish that many young people may catch a gleam of what is possible in the way of combining great personal success with great civic service. A clue as to the method may be found in this final quotation from our honored deceased who said to young people:

"The qualities for success don't change. It still requires the will to do, the willingness to pay the price in long hours of work. Above all, do the thing you most want to do, and never forget that security is not to be had by statute or contract. It is something within you."

That is a fitting epitaph for Mississippi's No. 1 citizen. His greatness arose from something powerful within him.

Thirty-five Years a Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding members of the legal profession in the Midwest is Marks P. Alexander, who recently retired after 35 years' public service. Federal Judge Omer Poos describes Mr. Alexander's knowledge of criminal law this way:

I think he knows more about it than any other man in the United States.

Mr. Alexander recently observed his 76th birthday and is recovering from surgery. He is retiring as assistant U.S. attorney for southern Illinois.

It is noteworthy that every U.S. attorney who has taken office since 1927 has asked Mr. Alexander to remain on the staff.

Educating Voters for the Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when public attention is focused on the inefficient management of news and information released by the administration, let us not overlook the license enjoyed by one Cabinet member. The Department of Agriculture is one of the biggest tax-supported information machines ever assembled and it has done its work well over the years. But at the present time it is being used at public expense to panic farmers into a vote on the wheat referendum in line with the Secretary's wishes. Tens of thousands of his ambassadors on Federal, State, and local payrolls throughout the country are being made part of an all-out assault to educate voters for the referendum. Under unanimous consent, I include this fact, as most capably outlined in the following statements by the editors of Nation's Agriculture and Successful Farming in the March and April 1963 issues, respectively, in the RECORD at this point:

[From Successful Farming, April 1963]

WHEAT REFERENDUM

(By Dick Hanson)

Whether you're for, against, or neutral on the proposed new wheat program, there are some distributing elements in the debate.

One thing that bothers me is the massive amounts of your money and mine being used by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to get you to vote "yes" for the new program.

Even former Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, in his zeal to free farmers from Government, officially took an educational approach in informing farmers ahead of referendum. In this campaign Secretary Freeman is propagandizing as well as educating.

1. He has a staff of paid Government workers extending from the Nation's Capital into every county in the United States. He's bringing them in to meetings—at Government expense—to give them impressive documents and other ammunition for the fight.

2. Secretary Freeman has access to the Federal Treasury in sweetening the pot for the program. Actually, it appears to me that from a strictly financial standpoint, in the

short run, it may be pretty hard for farmers to vote "no."

3. The power of high Federal officials to reward and punish voters is substantial. In this case, Secretary Freeman has told wheat growers that if they don't vote his way, he'll drive the price of wheat down to a dollar—one fact booklet mentions 90-cent wheat. Is this really right in a democracy? It's our money and our income he's using to bang us over the head for votes.

This power to reward and punish voters was exhibited recently when Secretary Freeman began selling Government corn to the Southeast at cutrate prices. Regarding this action, E. Howard Hill, Minburn, Iowa, farmer and president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, wrote Freeman about three injustices:

"1. An agency of the Government has determined that the feed grain producers in the Southeast cannot expect a higher price for the crop which they may be holding for an improved market.

"2. Some feed grain producers in Iowa and other States had hoped to sell their product, directly or indirectly, in the southeast portion of the United States at something better than present prices, as a result of normal seasonal improvement, and

"3. A subsidized feed grain price for the southeast portion of the United States will result in more livestock being fed there. This is subsidized and unfair competition for livestock producers in other parts of the country."

In this case I agree with Mr. Hill's conclusion, "We are not questioning your motives in announcing this policy, but any policy subject to abuse will eventually be abused by someone. A policy of this kind will lead to favoritism and penalties for political or other reasons. At best, it is discriminatory."

I think that in a referendum, a democratic procedure where citizens are given an opportunity to tell their Government what they want that Government to do, the Government shouldn't so blatantly threaten and propagandize voters to get what it wants.

[From Nation's Agriculture, March 1963]

REFERENDUM ON WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

(By Donald T. Donnelly)

Members of Congress, whose jobs depend on the approval of voters in their States and districts, have a healthy respect for the wishes of citizens as expressed at the polls. They know that there is power in the people. They respect that power.

This is my Congressmen—especially those who represent any sizable number of farmers—are interested in the forthcoming referendum on the wheat certificate plan.

Washington lawmakers feel that the 1963 wheat referendum will give them a clear indication of farmer sentiment on restrictive Government supply management programs for agriculture.

The certificate plan, Congressmen will tell you, is a real example of Government supply management. It would eliminate the 15- and 30-acre exemption. It would impose controls on diverted acres. It would come closer to restricting a farmer's volume of production than any farm program ever submitted to a referendum in the past.

If the wheat certificate plan is approved by farmers, you can look for more proposals for Government supply management in agriculture. And you can be sure that many Congressmen will believe that farmers and their families really want more controls.

But if the certificate plan is not approved in the referendum, Congress will almost certainly never pass another one of Secretary Freeman's supply management programs.

Mr. Freeman appears to understand this attitude of Congress. He's making certain that no stone is left unturned in his drive for a favorable vote. After first proposing that the referendum be decided on facts—not fear, he and his associates have now begun a scare campaign to frighten wheat growers with the bogey of dollar wheat.

Freeman's dire predictions of what would happen if the wheat certificate plan is rejected by farmers have riled Congress for two reasons—first, because many lawmakers don't agree at all with the Secretary's reading of the future in his crystal ball, and, more importantly, because he is acting as if Congress would do nothing to improve the situation if farmers vote "No."

Veteran Senators and Representatives remember how little time it took for Congress to pass new farm laws after the Supreme Court voided the original Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1936 and after President Eisenhower vetoed the first farm bill in 1956.

All but the newest Members recall that when Congress rejected both the Cochrane-Freeman bill of 1961 and its 1962 successor, Freeman himself was the first to advocate "emergency" legislation. He can be expected to propose a new law after the wheat certificate plan is rejected. Congress certainly will. Several members have bills ready for introduction, including a number who are ready to sponsor the sound proposals of the Farm Bureau.

Members of Freeman's own party are bound to try for new legislation. Why? Because, if things were to get half as bad as the Secretary says they would, no Congressman would care to accept the responsibility. Many wheat-State Senators, including several prominent Democrats as well as Republicans, face elections of their own in 1964. So will President Kennedy and all Members of the House of Representatives.

Some members of Congress feel that the Secretary's campaign for the wheat certificate plan is an all-out assault against the Farm Bureau—a campaign motivated by a desire to descredit the farmers who have been in the forefront of the opposition to restrictive government supply managment programs.

Farm Bureau's many friends in Congress resent this assault on a farm organization by a cabinet official. Even some Senators and Representatives who aren't friendly to Farm Bureau don't approve of Mr. Freeman's actions. They may not always agree with the organization, but they don't want anyone to think they don't like farmers. Congressmen know the importance of voting. So, they think, do farmers.

Foreign Aid Foolishness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, William S. White, columnist for the Washington Evening Star, has forcefully called attention to the need for commonsense in our foreign aid program, as it was so commendably spelled out last week by the Presidential Committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay.

The Clay Committee, urging a general tightening up of the aid program and an end to the utopian policy of trying to do too much for too many, said the United States cannot continue aid "which is inconsistent with our belief, democratic tradition and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

As Mr. White points out, we do not expect nations which we aid to completely toe the U.S. line, but neither should we spend money in countries where we are not respected and where governments act contrary to American interests.

Mr. President, the Clay Committee did this country a great service by closely examining the foreign aid program and putting before the American people its forthright report. It is time, as General Clay said, for the United States to put more emphasis on quality and results than on quantity and to find out what it wants its aid dollars to accomplish, what they can accomplish and to pursue a course accordingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONSENSE IN FOREIGN AID

(By William S. White)

The moment of truth in which the United States must decide once and for all whether it will cling to the absurd line that there should be no strings anywhere on American foreign aid has been long delayed.

But though commonsense in this field commonly runs a Perils-of-Pauline race with arrant nonsense, two current developments give some hope that the showdown cannot must longer be put aside.

One of these is a calm, clear-minded and adult series of recommendations to the President for putting complete rationality into the aid program. These have just been issued by a distinguished and nonpolitical commission of review headed by Gen. Lucius Clay. Among the great contributions of this hero of the Berlin blockade, General Clay, is a firm warning that we must not continue to extend aid "which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

While the document was still being digested, the U.S. Government agreed to give some $400 million in assistance, in the form of 40-year loans paying three-fourths of 1 percent interest, to Brazil. This is a country which has persistently refused to join the United States in any real effort to isolate Castro Cuba.

This is a country in the very process of the loan negotiations which was denounced by the State Department itself as having been infiltrated by Communists in official position. This is a country which, on the very day the aid was extended, refused to put a Federal ban upon a Communist, pro-Castro conference to open in Rio de Janeiro for a weeklong contrived spasm of "hate-America" demonstrations.

Here was the Clay Commission earnestly admonishing against allowing American generosity to repeal American self-interest. And here was Brazil coolly insulting its American benefactor at the very hour of its benefaction. No two episodes in all the history of foreign aid have more clearly illustrated the long dilemma for the United States.

Only those who have not thought it all through really believe that we should demand total submission, every day and on everything, from the recipients of our assistance. For foreign aid, to the degree that it stabilizes conditions and avoids the chaos which sometimes is followed by Communist takeover, is, indeed, in American interests.

But if it is not necessary for us to be liked, it is absolutely necessary for us to be respected. And only the incurably naive believe we should consistently subsidize governments which consistently take up positions contrary to those American interests.

Such people, however, do exist in the United States—as General Clay has learned in the shrill winds of criticism now blowing from the American left because he dared to raise the slightest question of those one-way aid policies in which we are graciously permitted to pay for the privilege of being abused and obstructed.

Still, the fact of the business is that the Brazilian loan and this predictable tumult against General Clay from the old ladies of the left are more likely to be constructive than otherwise in the end. For reasonable people—and this definitely includes a great majority in both parties in Congress—are simply not going to stand much longer for this sort of thing. This sort of thing will forward the day when public opinion will force one of two great decisions: Either a cleansing of foreign aid of servile unwillingness to make any demand whatever upon its recipients; or the destruction of foreign aid itself.

If the Clay Commission recommendations are ultimately ignored, it will be foreign aid itself which will fall. But because foreign aid—rational foreign aid, that is—simply must not yet fall, must rid itself of this servility. And the hero of Berlin will once again have served all the West even though the old ladies of the left—whose vehemently uncritical suport of even the most indefensible forms of foreign aid is the program's worst enemy—will shriek against him to the end.

Subsidizing the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the farmer is being utterly ignored in the legislative program of the session.

Cattle and hogs are selling at a new low. The price of farm machinery, fertilizer and insecticides, and every factor entering into the farmer's cost of production is steadily rising.

And farm bankruptcies have increased 20 percent.

Although the decline in livestock prices have cost the farmer millions of dollars, the price of beef and pork and other farm-produced foodstuffs across the counter of the retailer show no corresponding reduction. The consumer is paying the same price he paid when the farmer was getting the highest prices in the last 2 years.

Never before has the American farmer produced with such efficiency. Never before in any land has the consumer been offered such a variety of farm-produced foods of such uniform excellence. Never before has food been sold to the consumer at so low a price in hours of labor. And never before has the farmer received such an inadequate return on his labor and investment.

I am including in my remarks a letter just received in this morning's mail and an accompanying newspaper clipping which are typical and are self-explanatory:

MARCH 21, 1963.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am a livestock farmer at Old Monroe, Mo. I have been engaged in farming all my life and only once before, during the depression, have I witnessed such unprofitable times.

It seems to me that the poor old farmer is nothing but the underdog. Everything that we must purchase constantly goes up in price, and everything that we sell seems to hold steady or weaken in price. Economist say the answer to declining profits is to enlarge production and increase efficiency. Well, this is what I have tried to do in the last several years and it has helped to a certain degree, but how far out on the limb can one go until the limb crumbles beneath him.

With the theory of increased production for more profits, in the last 10 or so years I have increased my beef feeding operation so as to produce several hundred cattle for slaughter each year. In years past, this operation has been basically profitable, but this year the tables have turned completely. Why should the price of fat cattle drop $7 per hundredweight in 3 months?

One could say, well it must be the 9.2 percent imports of beef (why does that staggering amount come into this country?) or the increased production of beef or the seasonable unemployment and many more suggested reasons. These probably are all contributing factors, possibly these are the sole reasons. The thing that puzzles me, Mr. Congressman, is why hasn't the price of meat in the supermarkets and food stores decreased their prices accordingly? How can we ever expect to decrease the beef surplus if these prices are not reduced with respect to slaughter prices?

I maintain that somebody is taking unfair advantage of the helpless farmer and to the advantage of themselves. I also maintain it is about time this corruption be stemmed and the farmer be treated fairly.

The "Livestock Reporter," which comes from the National Stockyards in Illinois, has an article explaining the problem as "meat counter featherbedding." I am enclosing the article and urge you to read it carefully. This article states, "I will exhaust every possibility in correcting this unjust price situation." This is a very encouraging statement, but is it just political talk?

Mr. Cannon, this is a pressing problem and one that requires immediate action. I have written to you expressing my thoughts and beliefs, in hope that you can get results from this ever mounting discrepancy.

Waiting your reply.

THOMAS W. DYER.

ASK "MEAT COUNTER FEATHERBEDDING" PROBE—LIVE MARKET OFF, OVER-THE-COUNTER PRICES FAIRLY STABLE

OMAHA.—State officials from the cattle-rich Plains States Wednesday asked Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman to investigate what a union leader called meat-counter featherbedding.

They said the Federal Government should look into discrepancies between falling prices paid to livestock producers and fairly stable over-the-counter prices housewives pay for meat.

The livestock market collapse has dropped the average price paid for a fat steer to its lowest point in 18 months.

This unfortunate decrease in the price of beef paid to the producer is not reflected in the price the housewife pays over the counter.

With each passing day, more and more operators will be forced into unbearable financial situations.

Demands for a Federal investigation came from Iowa and Nebraska.

Iowa Agriculture Secretary L. B. Liddy said his department was not going to let the matter drop. He said "immediate action" is needed to boost livestock prices or some producers are going to be "wiped out." He said market prices dropped nearly 20 percent since last November while retail meat prices have not dropped accordingly.

Nebraska Agriculture Director Pearle F. Finigan said he continued to receive support for his demands for a thorough investigation. Finigan said the Nebraska Swine Council has pledged its wholehearted support to the proposed probe.

Other groups, including the Nebraska Livestock Feeders Association, opposed an investigation. Opponents said a probe would cause further injury to an already shaky livestock industry and might destroy the housewife's confidence in meat.

Some said they did not want the Federal Government to have anything to do with livestock production.

Earlier this week, the Agriculture Department said the drop in livestock prices was caused by the newspaper and dock strikes which cut into advertising promotion in east coast markets; increases in the supply of broiler chickens; and a glut in fed steer beef on the New York livestock market.

Small Business Dairy Farmers Win Vital Supreme Court Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Supreme Court gave small business and the dairy farmer a badly needed helping hand. The Court slapped down a great corporation for engaging in predatory price cutting by selling milk below cost.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article in the Cincinnati Enquirer by that great friend of small business, Ed Wimmer, analyzing that decision, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY IN ROBINSON-PATMAN CASE GIVES NEW HOPE; SUPREME COURT RULES OUT "PREDATORY PRICE CUTTING"

(By Ed Wimmer)

The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, convicting National Dairy Corp. of violating the Robinson-Patman Act by selling milk (Sealtest) below cost in the Kansas City area, could lead to the salvation of thousands of small businesses now facing certain destruction. Said the Court:

"It is illegal for any person engaged in commerce to sell goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or to eliminate a competitor" * * *. Predatory price cutting is entirely different than price cutting to eliminate excess merchandise, or to meet a competitor's equally low prices."

In little more than a quarter of a century, the National Dairy combine grew into a corporate octopus embracing some 500 operations, one of them the huge Kraft Cheese Corp., and its Sealtest sign has replaced those of independents in one market after another. By 1950, this one company controlled 12 percent of the U.S. fluid milk business; up to 51 percent of the ice cream business in some States; more than 7 percent of the butter trade, and its share of the U.S. cheese business has reached monopolistic proportions.

Congress, and Government agencies delegated with the responsibility of enforcing our antitrust laws, has sought in numerous ways to place curbs on such an undemocratic growth of giantism in American business, but loopholes in the laws have prevented any real progress in this direction. This was especially true with regard to price discrimination between the big chains and their suppliers, and the use of such products as loss leaders to destroy not only smaller retailers but smaller suppliers of both the chains and independents.

Enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act, as now interpreted by the Court, could save a million small businesses marked for liquidation and end the merchandising of dairy products at below cost—except where lawful justification can be proven.

It should, be noted, also, that after long-contested investigation by the Federal Trade Commission, National Dairy has been ordered to halt its acquisition drive, and was recently cited by the Commission for selling its Kraft preserves on a basis of one case free with every case purchased, in selected areas. The Commission also won a decree divesting Foremost Dairy Co. of 10 plants, and is seeking divestiture of 6 divisions of the National Tea Co.

Progress is being made, despite all indications to the contrary.

Tennessee's Supreme Court has upheld the State fair trade law, permitting a manufacturer of a name-brand product to enter into a contract with one retailer on an agreed resale price, and bind all other retailers in the State to maintain that price. Loss leader sales of popular brands that are in open competition with similar brands, may thus be prohibited, awaiting only the passage of the Quality Stabilization Act by Congress, to guarantee protection against shippers outside the State.

What we have been getting in this country are business practices that are based entirely on materialistic, cannibalistic ends, completely devoid of the Christian ethic—that "economic and spiritual progress is an inseparable problem." As Pope Pius XI stated: "Capitalism is becoming so cruel and hard, it ceases to serve the common man." * * * In a Jewish temple, where I spoke recently, I found the warning to: "Pray for good government, since, but for the fear of government, men would swallow each other."

For what better reason do we turn to government, but to preserve freedom?

To Right a Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Friday, March 22, 1963, edition of the Milton Evening Standard in Milton, Pa., in connection with the bill I introduced to restore the full citizenship posthumously of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

TO RIGHT A WRONG

The War Between the States ended some 98 years ago, but its scars are still noticeable both in the North and South of the United States. Southerners, generally, are more sensitive to some of the results of the conflict, since their forbearers had the questionable distinction of being on the losing side. The wounds left by the South's loss have been passed on from generation to generation, with some of them redressed, others still existing like open sores.

Perhaps it was this sense of being wronged which this week prompted freshman Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, a Tennessee Republican to introduce in the House a resolution asking that full citizenship be restored to Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee. QUILLEN asserted that Lee never recovered all the rights of citizenship taken away from him for his part in the conflict.

To Americans, North and South, the name Robert E. Lee remains eternally linked with honor. A top graduate of West Point, which he also served as superintendent; a veteran of the Mexican War, Lee, in 1861, refused command of the Union Forces to cast his military lot with the State that gave him birth, Virginia. His action was not alien. Dozens of other distinguished West Pointers and private citizens with military training threw in with the Confederacy because it embodied what they believed in as a way of life.

After Appamattox, Lee lived out his illustrious life in his native Virginia as president of Washington and Lee University. It was to the eternal credit of the U.S. Government that it did not prosecute the popular Confederate general for war crimes as others prominent in the Confederacy were prosecuted. Seven years after he surrendered his army to Grant, he died still assuming the blame for the Confederate disaster.

If there are grounds for posthumously restoring to this American any portion of his citizenship lost through devotion to his home State or through his pursuing, even in defeat, the principles in which he believed, it appears to be an obligation of the Congress of the United States to do so.

Statement of Representative Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida, on H.R. 4663 and 4664 Before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 26, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER, DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, ON H.R. 4663 AND 4664 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman, you know that I am deeply grateful to you and your subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to testify on H.R. 4663 and 4664, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, these two bills are identical to those introduced by Representative HARRIS, the honorable chairman of your full committee. All of our bills have the full endorsement of the present administration.

H.R. 4663 would authorize grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of centers for research in mental retardation and related aspects of human development, to assist in means of finding causes thereof and the means of prevention or means of ameliorating its effects. The bill would authorize $8 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–66 and $4 million for 1967 and for 1968 for this purpose. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service would administer the program and approve or disapprove applications for grants which could not exceed 75 percent of the necessary cost of construction.

H.R. 4663 would also authorize grants to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded, including facilities connected with college and university hospitals or other appropriate parts of colleges or universities under State plans approved by the Surgeon General upon the basis of population, the extent of the need for the facilities and the financial needs of the respective States. Under the bill, $5 million would be appropriated for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965 and $10 million for each of the next 4 years.

Title I of H.R. 4664 would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make allotments to States on the basis of approved plans for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress beginning with the year ending June 30, 1965. The primary factors which the Secretary would take into account are population, the extent of the need for such centers in each State, and the financial needs of the respective States. Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to make grants to public or nonprofit institutions to which a grant was made under title I to meet the cost of the initial staffing of community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress. Any such grant may not exceed 75 percent of the staffing cost during the first 15 months, 60 percent for the next year, 45 and 30 percent, respectively, for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, Congress recognized this problem during World War II. During the war I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which made a study of the problems and needs with respect to mental illness and mental ill-health in the United States. That subcommittee held a number of hearings on the health needs of our veterans and our civilian population. In January 1945 the subcommittee issued its Interim Report No. 3 in which the staggering extent of mental illness was first disclosed. For example, the report pointed out that of 4,212,000 young men 18 to 37 years of age who were rejected for military duty by the selective service as of June 1, 1944, 1,282,800 or over 25 percent of the total rejected were for mental diseases and deficiencies. The report stated:

"It has long been known that approximately two-thirds of the illness encountered in general medical practice is essentially neuropschyiatric in origin and that half of the patients in hospitals at any one time are there because of serious mental disorders. Indeed, one may safely predict that in any group of 15-year-olds 1 out of 22 will some day be committed to a mental institution."

Our subcommittee recommended the establishment of community psychiatric clinics, hospitals in planned medical centers and for the training and education of professional personnel. It said:

"From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child-guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments."

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in 1946 the chairman of your full committee then, the late Hon. Percy Priest, Representative from Tennessee, sponsored H.R. 4512, and I sponsored in the Senate S. 1160. These two bills were merged into Public Law 487 of the 79th Congress which authorized the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health at Bethesda, a broad national program of research into the causes and prevention of mental ill-health, training of personnel in the treatment of psychiatric disorders with some experimental research in community mental health centers.

This act gave the impetus to Congress for a rapid growth in the appropriations for a national mental health program. This growth is reflected in the following figures of Federal funds provided in 1946, 1950, and 1963: 1946, $66,000; 1950, $10,019,000; and 1963, $143,599,000.

In 1949 Florida had only one State mental health hospital at Chattahoochee. It was 540 miles from Miami. It had at that time only 3,000 beds and 6,000 patients. Many patients from south Florida had to spend their time in Tampa jails during their travel to the hospital at Chattahoochee.

In the Miami area, there was only one nonpublic institution. It had no psychiatrist and no neurologist.

At the present time there are in addition to the State mental hospital at Chattahoochee, the South Florida Mental Hospital in West Hollywood just outside of Dade County, the Northeast State Hospital and the George Pierce Wood Memorial Hospital.

Dade County now has facilities at the Jackson Memorial Hospital, the above mentioned South Florida State Mental Hospital, a new day care center at the Veterans Facility at Coral Cables, a mental health department within the Dade County Health Department, and the Dade County Child Guidance Clinic.

But the record clearly shows that these facilities in Florida are wholly inadequate to meet the pressing needs in the field of mental health. The Florida Association for Mental Health pointed out in December, 1962:

"At Chattahoochee many patients are housed in substandard, unsafe, old buildings. It would be preferable to eliminate the need for these buildings than to replace them." The association recommended that facilities be provided for mentally retarded patients and special facilities for older nonpsychotic offenders.

The South Florida Mental Hospital at West Hollywood in December, 1962 had about 430 geriatric patients, one-third of the total. Of the 430, about one half are not really mentally ill, although they do suffer from mental lapses which are concomitant with old age. In addition 70 percent of those on the hospital's waiting list are in this category.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the mental health appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, made by Congress, $4,200,000 was included to assist the States in developing broad State mental health care programs. The State of Florida has taken advantage of this appropriation by making use of a Federal grant thereunder for the development of a comprehensive program of mental health care in Florida.

Moreover, the American Psychiatric Association with the assistance of the State and local mental health groups made a survey and held hearings in Miami on July 25–27, 1962, and other hearings in Pensacola, Tallahassee, Jacksonville, Orlando, and Tampa. This survey was summarized in the October 1962 monthly bulletin of the Mental Health Society of Greater Miami expressing the need as follows:

"Facilities and services for the mentally ill and seriously disturbed children, more and better services for the patient coming out of the mental hospitals, low cost clinics, psychiatric services in general hospitals, day and night hospitals, more and better facilities for the senior citizen, psychiatric services in the courts, pails and stockades and probation services, better legal definitions of sane and insane, and more appropriations for training and research".

It also recommended that the seven different State units which now deal with mental illness should be combined into one State department of mental health, regional treatment centers for children, and community mental health centers. Similar recommendations have been made by the Florida Association for Mental Health.

Mr. Chairman, Florida, and particularly south Florida lacks the proper facilities for the proper care of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. Federal facilities for all practical purposes do not exist in Florida. Almost all of the seriously mental sick veterans must be sent to the Veterans' hospitals at Augusta and Atlanta, Ga., and at Gulfport, Miss. These hospitals have long waiting lists.

In the 2-year period 1959–61 the following data shows that Florida expended less than 2 percent of the total State expenditures for the care and treatment of mentally ill persons. In the United States the comparable figure was about 3 percent.

The table at the end of my testimony with respect to all Florida State mental health hospitals and the South Florida Hospital clearly shows the inadequacy of mental health facilities in Florida.

The State of Florida and all the communities therein now spend per capita, respectively, $2.60 and 21 cents in 1960 in comparison with $5.19 and 36 cents for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I need not relate the details or the data published by the Joint Information Services of the American Psychiatric Association and the National Association of Mental Health in its 1962 edition of 15 indices of mental health. These data show clearly the great need for expanded community health centers, for the staffing of these centers with highly trained professional personnel, and for the construction and servicing of facilities for the mentally retarded. Florida in these respects is highly deficient. It is my belief that the quicker Congress passes the legislation now before your subcommittee, the faster the comprehensive mental health programs will be able to get under way. Dade County needs it, Florida requires it, the national health and safety and defense demands it. We must move forward to conquer the great emergency created by existing mental ill health and the lack of facilities for treatment and prevention. I urge you strongly to report these bills out favorably at the earliest possible moment.

Data on Florida and south Florida State mental hospitals

	1959–61 budget	Number of patients	Patient-days	Cost per diem
Florida	$28,923,198	9,466	6,919,039	$4.180
South Florida	5,209,700	1,018	743,581	7.006
	Estimated 1961–63 budget	**Estimated number of patients**	**Estimated days**	**Estimated cost per diem**
Florida	$38,630,483	10,166	1,638,790	$5.21
South Florida	7,158,206	1,423	7,420,815	6.89

Youth's Challenge in the Labor Market of the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we are all conscious of youth's primary needs in our changing times. Our young people are growing up in a world that becomes each day more complex and technologically intricate. Their need in today's world is education. In tomorrow's world, it is certain to be employment.

It is almost a commonplace observation that the upward spiral of chronic unemployment among certain groups, expansion of automation in industry and a threateningly large number of school dropouts are certain to develop an acute labor problem into a critical one.

Youth and our national labor policy can be said, therefore, to suffer a common future.

It does not necessarily follow, however, that American youth is aware of these risks and the depth of these problems.

The radio network of the American Broadcasting Co., has, for 3 consecutive years, sponsored the Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest. ABC Radio President Robert R. Pauley said that the purpose of this annual national collegiate competition is to increase the awareness of American youth to its national and international responsibilities.

In close association with the AFL–CIO, longtime sponsor of the enlightening daily news commentary by Ed Morgan, the radio network has thus shown the highest possible regard for a philosophy of public service in broadcasting and in our society.

The subject of the 1962–63 Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest was "Youth's Role in the Labor Market of the Sixties."

The competition this year honored the Department of Labor on its 50th anniversary, and received the fullest cooperation of the Labor Department's staff.

ABC Radio succeeded, additionally, in attracting a list of eminent Americans as judges: Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz; former Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins; former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell; Supreme Court Justice and former Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg; Senator Jacob Javits; AFL-CIO President George Meany; John McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire and former dean of Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations; ABC Newsman Edward P. Morgan; and Mr. Pauley.

Carla Lipsig, a 17-year-old freshman student at Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass., and Richard C. Frazier, a 32-year-old senior attending night school at Queen's College in Flushing, N.Y., were the winners of this year's competition.

The two top winners received graduate school scholarships and visited Washington where they met a distinguished group of national leaders including President Kennedy.

Runners-up, each of whom will be awarded a 24-volume set of the new Collier's Encyclopedia, are: Mary Treacy, College of St. Katherine, St. Paul, Minn.; Sandra Lee Miller, San Francisco State College; Richard J. Cassidy, Sacred Heart Seminary, Detroit, Mich.; Dock Burke, Jr., Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Tex.; and Terry Segal, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

I ask unanimous consent to have the winning essays printed in Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH'S CHALLENGE IN THE LABOR MARKET OF THE SIXTIES

(By Carla Lipsig)

The challenge is twofold: it is presented by youth to the labor market; it is presented to youth by the labor market.

The challenge to youth is manifested most clearly by the fact that those under 20 in the labor market have the highest unemployment rate of any age group. And the trend seems likely to continue.

Automation creates a growing dilemma—not only is it displacing blue-collar workers, but it is encroaching upon white-collar jobs. The number of those engaging in competition for jobs is in an almost inverse ratio to the number of new jobs created by economic growth. New jobs are quickly swallowed up by workers displaced by technical advances elsewhere.

President Kennedy has pointed out that "in this era of rapidly changing industrial techniques and new approaches to many aspects of our economic life, the development of this Nation's skilled craftsmen is of vital importance to the continued national security and economic growth of the United States." The view, then, is dim indeed for those with a high school education or less, aspiring to jobs in this fiercely competitive labor market of the sixties.

Young people must meet this challenge by extending their education as far as possible, and by acquiring needed skills. But the cost of higher education is heavy. They cannot meet it alone. A more massive program must be adopted than has yet been proposed of governmental aid to education, scholarships, loans, and grants.

The second challenge presented, therefore, is that the labor market is faced with the task of providing jobs for these many young, unemployed workers.

But the labor market in the United States is an inevitable outgrowth of our so-called free economy. For this reason, there is no social or governmental institution that can create jobs by fiat.

There are institutions that aid in channelling the course of economic development, notably the U.S. Department of Labor, but with limited power. As a commissioner of Labor pointed out 7 or 8 years ago, "* * * a bureau of labor cannot solve industrial or social problems, nor can it bring direct returns in a material way to the citizens of the country; but its work must be classed among educational efforts. * * *"

Therefore, it is the task of those directly or indirectly affected by the labor market, to assert what influence is possible to direct it toward its most productive state, an economy growing dynamically, at no less than a rate of 5-percent annual increase in productivity.

The burden of intelligent participation must lie with the more fully educated youth. His is the prize of a college education, carrying with it the broadening of his horizons, the deepening of his comprehension. To a lesser, but nevertheless important degree, this will also be true of the student who has had expanded vocational training. When he enters the labor market, he will not be an unknowing competitor. He will have an understanding of the market in which he is involved. Through this comprehension of its virtues and its vices, he will be able to criticize intelligently. In his union, his office, the school or university where he will teach, this well-educated youth has the ability to offer ideas to stimulate the economy, to harness automation, to decrease unemployment.

There is yet another, more abstract challenge that youth presents to the labor market, which lies in the fundamental nature of youth itself. Youth is of a new generation, and wants to wreak changes. It is energetic, it is optimistic. It looks to the solution of internal ills through world peace and idealistic perfectionism. By its very nature, youth may bring vast, as yet unseen, changes to the labor market, changes yet unborn even in the minds of the new generation.

YOUTH'S CHALLENGE IN THE LABOR MARKET OF THE SIXTIES

(By Richard C. Frazier)

Whither American youth in the labor market of today and the remainder of this decade? With each passing month, this question assumes a greater and greater urgency. The challenge to American youth is not only that of the income which will be earned by each young man and woman, it is also that of dedication to, and support of, the American ideal and ethic. If American youth fails to answer this challenge in an affirmative and imaginative way, no degree of affluence and material well-being will suffice to preserve our heritage of freedom and democracy. Young, working America will be rich and self-satisfied; America, the nation, will have lost her soul.

Enlightened and intelligent citizenship is a demanding responsibility. Voting and knowing the political issues of the day are only a small part of this obligation. True citizenship demands that each member of society develop his individual capacity to the utmost, as did the Greeks during the golden age of Athens. The young American worker facing the future owes it to himself, to his fellow citizens, and to the survival of his country to prepare himself as completely as his intellect and circumstance will permit. To sacrifice a longer period of training and mental cultivation for immediate personal gain or profit is not only a selfish and shortsighted decision, it also undermines the future development and existence of America. As President Kennedy so aptly remarked in his inaugural address, "Ask not what America can do for you, ask what you can do for America."

In today's fast-moving world of technical progress and change, America and the youth of America are best served by a continuing growth of skills and training in the young worker. A grade or high school education is no longer a sufficient preparation for further acquisition of the skills that are necessary if the youth of America is to exploit its natural endowment to the fullest extent possible.

The young American who is undereducated is, in reality, a wasted natural resource. Today, brainpower and intellect are assets that we can ill afford to lose; they are resources that are to be valued far above the more prosaic ones of metal and fiber with which nature so generously blessed this great land of ours. Today's youth will squander this greatest of all God's gifts only at his own risk and the peril of the United States.

What, then, can youth do to meet this challenge? What manner of man will be needed in the future to answer the summons of destiny? Education and training, as has been suggested, are the font of future growth and progress both for the individual and the Nation. However, formal education is not the complete answer. Each American, after he has completed all the education that his own situation will allow, must never cease to grow and to nurture his skills and knowledge. Each achievement must be a spur to further study and learning. Curiosity, one of humanity's greatest boons, must not be allowed to wither; stasis and reaction are the cancers that have destroyed many civilizations in the past.

With educational maturity comes self-confidence and a belief in the power to accomplish just ends. The man who lacks a sense of adequacy cannot be expected to produce to his ultimate capacity. With freedom from a feeling of inferiority will come the power and the strength to meet the unknown, to accept the challenge of tomorrow, secure in the knowledge that he has heeded the stricture, "To thine own self be true."

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Monday, March 25, marked the 45th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. One of my good constituents, Mrs. Vera Z. Romuk, of Peoria, Ill., has always been thoughtful enough to remind me each year of this important date.

This year, Mrs. Romuk included in her letter much of the history connected with this event. In addition, she has made four excellent points as to the need of increasing the number of Byelorussian broadcasts over the Voice of America.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to include excerpts from Mrs. Romuk's letter and urge that my colleagues note that Russia still attempts to propagandize the Byelorussians in this country by broadcasts as indicated in the newspaper, Holas Radzimy, which is sent to

the United States and Canada from the Soviet Union.

The excerpts follow:

The commemoration of the 45th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia will be held by all American citizens of Byelorussian descent this Sunday. Our aim is to promote the existence of the Byelorussian nation and to acquaint our citizenry with the just attempt of the Byelorussian people in their Russian Communist occupied homeland in regaining their national independence, which they declared in 1918.

The idea for the independence of Byelorussia was conceived already in 1863, which centennial we also observe this year, when all Byelorussian nation, under the leadership of Kastus Kalinouski, rose against Russian oppression. The uprising was suppressed but not the determination of the Byelorussian people. When in 1917 the revolution broke out in Russia and the principle put forth by President Wilson of the right of every nation to self-government, it again roused the people of Byelorussia,, who were under Russian subjugation, and gave them an opportunity to fight for independence of their country. Already in 1917 a general congress was called at Minsk and the Byelorussian people sent 1,872 delegates there. Every corner of Byelorussia was represented and a national council (Rada) of 71 members elected and given full powers to proceed with the formation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Thus, on March 25, 1918, the independence of Byelorussia was declared to the whole world. Czechoslovakia, Germany, Austria, Poland, Ukraine, Turkey, Latvia, Estonia, and Finland recognized the Byelorussian Democratic Republic de jure while most other governments in the world recognized it de facto.

The young Byelorussian Republic did not last long and was reoccupied several times by different governments since that time and again by Soviet Russia at the end of World War II, but the Byelorussian people have not given up their hopes in regaining their independence once again. Despite the suppressions, repressions, and repercussions, the Byelorussians, who were one of the first prey of the Russian communism, have still managed to carefully safeguard and preserve their national entity, their language, their beliefs in their willpower and those of their future as well as their customs and traditions, their songs, and legends. It is also hoped that this will be taken into consideration by our Government and given proper support to.

I also wish to offer my comments at this time to the reply given you, Congressman MICHEL, on April 26, 1962, by the U.S. Information Agency regarding your inquiry on behalf of the Byelorussian language broadcasts over the Voice of America. I was going to submit them at that same time last year, but due to prolonged illness which occurred on April 9, and death in our family, was unable to do so until now.

I disagree completely with the opinion of the U.S. Information Agency that in Byelorussia a larger percentage of people understand Russian than in Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine, in whose languages the Voice of America has been broadcasting to the U.S.S.R. besides the Russian language and wish to offer the following facts in support of my arguments:

1. It is true that the people of Byelorussia understand the Russian language well, but so do the Ukrainians, Georgians and Armenians. Starting with the grade school, the Russian language is a compulsory subject in all schools in the national republics of the Soviet Union and has been taught extensively to all regardless of race or nationality.

2. Those in authority at the U.S. Information Agency either must have an inaccurate information regarding the Byelorussian nation, their history, their language, culture, customs and traditions, and their struggle for their national independence or they sanction the expansionist claims of certain of the neighbors of Byelorussia at the price of Byelorussian ethnographical territories and therefore prevent broadcasts in the Byelorussian language, knowing that such broadcasts would rouse even more so the Byelorussian people in their attempts to regain their independence.

3. The Russian language broadcasts over the Voice of America are directed toward the people of Russia and they never refer or address the Byelorussian people directly or tell them that the United States wants peace and no nuclear war as they have been told by the Russians.

4. The Vatican and Spain, which is of poor economic standing, can afford to finance broadcasts in the Byelorussian language and have been doing so for several years already, but the United States, which is the most prosperous country on earth and the bastion of freedom and democracy and which not only promotes freedom and democracy throughout the entire world but also spreads the truth, has failed the 8 million of the Byelorussian people by denying this opportunity to them to be heard in their native language. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, still conducts broadcasts in the Byelorussian language to the Byelorussian immigrants in the United States and Canada.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest I should like to publish a portion of my newsletter which was released today:

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Thousands of fifth district constituents responded to my recent poll requesting their opinions on some of the issues to come before Congress this year. It was extremely gratifying that almost 18,000 people took the trouble to reply. Many sent letters expanding on the answers they had given in the form, which included some 17 questions.

The replies indicate a 17 percent response, since I sent the questionnaire to just over 100,000 homes. Of those responding, 63 percent were listed as registered Republicans, 5 percent were Democrats, and 32 percent were Independents. I plan later to release the responses by party breakdown. The following is the final total tabulation without respect to party affiliation:

QUESTIONNAIRE, 1963

Do you favor:

1. Reducing Federal income taxes: (a) Geared to reduction in Federal expenditures, 83 percent; (b) Without a reduction in Federal expenditures, 11 percent; (c) No response (presumably against a tax cut), 6 percent.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
2. Increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65?	35	58	7
3. Federal aid for construction of—			
A. Public primary and secondary school facilities?	49	43	8
B. Private primary and secondary school facilities?	12	75	13
C. College academic facilities?	42	46	12
4. Federal aid for public school teachers' salaries?	22	72	6
5. Federal scholarships for higher education?	55	38	7
6. Legislation providing tax credits for parents paying college tuition	70	25	5
7. Legislation requiring secret ballot of union members before strike can be called	93	3	4
8. Federal aid for commuter railroads	39	47	14
9. Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs	22	58	20
10. Establishment of Domestic Peace Corps	35	50	15
11. Increased pay for military personnel	42	37	21
12. Increased pay for Members of Congress	17	62	21
13. Optional nondenominational religious activities (prayers, bible reading, etc.) in public schools	79	14	7
14. A strong United Nations fully supported by all member nations	85	9	6
15. Aid to underdeveloped countries that are—			
A. Pro-Western?	72	16	12
B. Nonalined (neutral)?	34	44	22
16. Do you prefer the services provided by the Federal Government to— *Percent*			
Be increased 10			
Be decreased 53			
Remain at present level 31			
No response 6			
If your answer favors increased services, are you willing to pay increased Federal taxes to obtain them?	63	30	7
17. What is your opinion of the President's record on—			
A. Domestic matters: *Percent*			
Good 18			
Fair 44			
Poor 34			
No response 4			
B. Foreign affairs:			
Good 24			
Fair 41			
Poor 31			
No response 4			

Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, economic growth has always been a subject of great interest to Government officials, businessmen, and academic economists. In recent months, many of these observers have claimed that our Nation's economy has become sluggish and has been achieving a very disappointing rate of economic growth. Contrary to these pessimistic opinions, Austin H. Kiplinger, president of the Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc., has expressed a very strong vote of confidence in our economy in an article in the December 2 New York Times magazine section.

Mr. Kiplinger bases his confidence upon the dynamic attitudes he has found among American industrialists, as well as the very nature of our competitive market system. His article carefully points out that economic growth will not be "accomplished by a master plan charted in a central economic bureau. Far from it. It is the very diversity of the American economy, with its unlimited sources of imagination and enterprises, which gives us unusual vigor."

Mr. Kiplinger offers a very thought provoking analysis of our Nation's future economic growth, and, under unanimous consent, I include his article in the RECORD at this point:

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE IN OUR ECONOMY

(By Austin H. Kiplinger)

WASHINGTON.—Ironic though it may be after 17 years of unprecedented growth, the U.S. economy is being challenged today on the very issue of growth itself. Confronted by the rapid expansion of other economies, the American industrial system has failed to operate at full capacity, and the specter of caution has risen to temper the buoyancy of some earlier forecasts.

Typical of current appraisals were the remarks at a recent economic outlook conference of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington. While a majority of the panelists predicted modest growth for 1963, all of them made their assessments in a tone of mild disappointment: "A tendency toward sluggishness," "Not enough growth," "Not enough new jobs," "Too little investment."

No one denied that there had been growth in the postwar years, even in the more recent period of moderation. This basic fact was underscored in a Bureau of Labor Statistics survey which found that average family purchasing power had risen 30 to 40 percent in various cities throughout the decade of the fifties.

That much is history. The vital questions now center on the years ahead—the years of the sixties, which have already passed their first-quarter mark. Will the sixties ever soar? Will they live up to their advance billing? Will we ever get back to the expansion rate that we came to expect in the earlier postwar years?

Questions like these have become so prevalent in public discussion that, for the first time in nearly a generation, there is a virtual consensus among economic analysts. It is a consensus of concern—about growth.

One consequence of this new concern is a widening support for tax reduction. And it is no coincidence that this support comes hand in hand with concern about growth. For tax reduction is viewed in all quarters—business, Government, and labor—as an essential to renewed economic expansion.

Yet even if tax relief is voted in the next session of Congress, it does not automatically follow that it will stimulate the kind of growth the United States is looking for. Will tax cuts, depreciation allowances and investment tax credits be a sufficient stimulus? Will there be the psychological catalyst to create action? Will businesses spend the available funds? Will management take the lead? Will investors venture into new ground?

I believe they will. It is my observation, after talking with a representative cross section of American businessmen, that they are in a state of readiness—readiness to move ahead faster. In thousands of offices and conference rooms and in drafting rooms and shops, the businessmen of American are making solid plans. These plans are not based on mere Pollyanna sentiment. I remember in particular one midwestern manufacturer who said, "We don't relish the idea of investing more right now, because our profit margin is so thin, but we don't like to stand still either."

Another executive, the No. 2 man in a nationwide building materials company, said, "We're finding more profit in higher quality, so we're adding all manner of lines that we wouldn't even have considered a few years ago. We're upgrading in keeping with the upgrading of the American consumer."

The head of a major electronics concern pointed out that 90 percent of his company's profits came from products that had not been on the market just 10 years before. And still another man, whose firm is one of the corporate mammoths of the world today, told me that the growth of science was the most promising single development in the outlook for his company.

Every one of these men was looking ahead to further the growth, either because he had to run to keep up, or because the habit of growth has become almost an automatic reflex.

The dynamic attitude of the American businessman is an intangible, but it is an asset worth as much as all our tangible equipment put together. It is a kind of mental and spiritual equipment, without which any economy will go flabby. The presence of such mental muscle is one of the main reasons for feeling confident about the U.S. economy today.

Another reason for confidence is competition itself—the very devil that is getting blamed for part of our current weakness. Competition is the kind of thing everybody speaks well of in the abstract, but abhors in the particular. Yet a free economy thrives on competition. It is like a cold shower—not always pleasant, but always stimulating. And it has been having a stimulating effect on the United States in recent years. To all the challenges and competitive threats that have arisen, there has been a continuing reaction of agonizing reappraisals.

Russia's sputnik gave a shove to American education and stuck a needle in the U.S. space program. The stock market slide reestablished a sense of perspective in investing. The inventory excesses in recent years led to more careful business management in 1962. Competition from the Germans, French, Italians, and Japanese forced American producers to sharpen their own production tools. Competition from trucks convinced Government to give railroads more freedom. Competition of European small cars nudged Detroit into economy cars of their own. And now the clear and present prospect of competition from the whole European market is focusing attention on ways to modernize further the U.S. industrial plant.

So regardless of the stresses engendered by this new competitive era, its consequences are not entirely negative. Nor are the doubts about America's economic future new. Many times before, responsible people have questioned whether we could make the grade.

Think back 17 years. It was late autumn, a war had just ended, a time when economic prospects are usually on the rise, when things are fairly normal. But nobody knew then just what normal was. It was 1945, and for three and a half years, the United States had poured its material wealth into every known kind of weapon. The Federal budget had reached the record level of $98 billion. The national debt stood at $258 billion. As suddenly as a summer storm ends, we were at peace. A kind of bewilderment seized many economic analysts and forecasters.

Deep doubts prevailed about the ability of the U.S. economy to adjust smoothly to civilian production—to meet the problems of reconversion. Most people believed that a slump was likely, and that it might be quite severe. It was expected that we would have difficulty regearing our manufacturing facilities to the production of toasters, washing machines, and automobiles. (Not TV sets, mind you, for these were still in the future.)

But a handful of men in Government and business believed that a successful transition could be made, if we applied forethought to the problems. So they formed the CED—the Committee for Economic Development. Along with other public-minded men in the Brookings Institution, the National Planning Association, the Twentieth Century Fund, and other such agencies, they recommended policies which became the closest thing to a blueprint for industry's conversion from war to peace.

As it turned out, we "transited" from war to peace with only a slight pause for catching our breath. We successfully avoided a repeat of the sharp recession of 1920–21 when commodity exchanges cracked and a short-lived panic swept the business world. We averted the sudden "morning after" crisis, and we learned a new lesson about our economy: that it is not an unguidable juggernaut. We had taught ourselves that, by looking at the problems and working out practical solutions, we could promote economic strength.

Does this mean that all the solutions must be governmental? Certainly not. Neither does it imply that economic growth will be accomplished by a master plan charted in a central economic bureau. Far from it. It is the very diversity of the American economy, with its unlimited sources of imagination and enterprise, which gives us unusual vigor.

Granted that we bridged the immediate gap from war to peace in 1945–47, the question persisted, "Could we do it again?"

Many top-flight economic analysts and business people worried about whether we could get onto a solid peacetime plateau in the fifties. In 1947 I made a reportorial inquiry into the question: "Can We Prevent Depressions?" Though the conclusions of this study were hopeful, they were not cocksure. "The race is on," I concluded then, "the race against time—to decide whether over the next few years we can make those adjustments in our economy that are needed to avert a major depression in the fifties."

You know now how that story turned out. We did avert a major depression in the fifties. We also grew more than in any period in our history. In the postwar years from 1947 to 1960, television and air conditioning became commonplace in American homes. Prefabricated houses and totally planned communites sprang up in every part

of the country. Automatic washers, dryers, dishwashers and freezers became household words. Drip-dry fabrics made their debut. Antibiotics came into common use. Health standards rose spectacularly. Automobile ownership doubled. Our gross national product rose from $213 billion to $500 billion. Average family income rose from $3,000 to $5,600, providing, even after inflation, an increase of 40 percent in the real standard of living.

That was the story of the fifties. But by the middle of this year, a number of doubts had gained currency. The "soaring sixties" had not yet soared. There were some unboyant facts to be reckoned with: marginal unemployment, sluggish commodity prices, unused industrial capacity; a gold drain and balance-of-payments problem, a break in stock prices, skepticism toward the dollar in foreign capitals, growing competition at home and abroad, and an atmosphere of tension between business and the White House.

Had the outlook really changed? To answer the question, I decided to go back to many of the same sources I had seen earlier. And then I added a number of new ones. I put aside all previous conclusions, took off the rose-colored glasses, and went to work.

What I found nearly bowled me over. The expectations of growth were just as firm as they had been. Only now the companies were hard at work on the plans they had only talked about before.

Company after company was working to phase new products into its line and to expand the sale of its updated products. What kinds of products? All kinds. Miniature home appliances—lighter, occupying less storage space (byproducts of the miniaturization principle borrowed from missiles and space equipment). More use of electricity for home heating. Electronic computers for smaller businesses. Elaborate inventory control and instantaneous credit-checking devices. Materials-handling equipment. New kinds of sporting goods. New types of covers for books. Whole menus of prepackaged foods, both plain and exotic. Quick-cooking devices. Ever-bigger earth-moving equipment. New types of commuter cars for mass transit. Water purification apparatus for cleaner rivers.

Among specific products that companies showed me or told me about were:

A sonic pile drive that sinks a beam without noise or jarring, many times faster than a conventional hammer.

A compact home refrigerator, noiseless, motionless, that cools by passing an electric current through different metals.

Self-adjusting cameras, virtually foolproof.

A miniature radio-TV broadcasting set that can be placed on a bedside table and used as an instant alarm for fire or burglary.

Paper threads that can be woven into clothlike fabrics.

Synthetic bedsheets that can be laid down like paper.

Irradiated foods that require no refrigeration.

Turbine engines with fewer moving parts and less maintenance.

Disposable plastic substitutes for bottles, boxes, and crates.

A television console for industrial gatekeepers, to monitor half a dozen entrances from an air-conditioned control tower.

This is just a sampling, but it demonstrates the kind of evidence that you find when you go out and ask what's cooking for the markets of the next few years.

Backing up this kind of business planning are some explosive underlying facts about the American populace:

From the present population base of 187 million, the prospect is for a rise to 215 million by 1970. This is a Census Bureau projection, and it is almost a certainty, for population trends do not change suddenly. The people will be here. And new families will be here, too. Marriages, now running at slightly more than 1,500,000 a year will rise to 2 million a year by the late sixties. The young people who will marry then are already with us—in their teens.

These will be the new workers of the future. But will they have the education and skills needed for the new technology? Not precisely and in every detail. But the level of education has been rising steadily. This past June, more than 50 percent of the boys and girls who were graduated from high schools went on to further education—in colleges, junior colleges, or technical and professional schools. The outlook for skilled workers, therefore, is better than it has ever been, and the trend is still pointing upward.

Then what about the other elements of economic growth? What about jobs, wages, income, output, profits, and investment? From a great deal of careful checking come these conclusions: By 1970 there will be 80 million jobs (compared with about 70 million now). Average factory take-home pay will rise to $120 (against $86 now). And a shorter workweek (about 37 hours instead of 40 now) will be in force. By 1970, one-half of all American families will have incomes between $5,000 and $7,500 a year. Our total output (gross national product) will be in the neighborhood of $750 billion versus about $560 billion now. Total corporate profits will be around $70 billion, against about $50 billion now.

Will there be enough capital for all this? The evidence says yes. Private savings are running at a high rate, and being cached away in savings accounts, savings and loan associations and mutual funds. In addition, approximately 17 million Americans are direct owners of stock in one or more companies. And each week a new flood of investment money flows into insurance companies and pension funds. These are built-in investment channels, and they are much more powerful than anything we have had in the past.

Population alone, of course, does not create jobs. But new workers, plus training, plus research and development, plus investment funds, plus incentive, plus marketing know-how, plus competitive urgency, all put together, do create new jobs. And these things are present today.

But what about government? Will all administrations adapt their policies to the idea of growth? This is about as close to a sure thing as there is in politics today. Both major parties are committed to the support of growth policies. Starting with the Full Employment Act of 1946, the bipartisanship on this has been as firm in the postwar years as the bipartisanship on foreign policy (and perhaps a little firmer).

What, then might come along to upset our economic applecart?

War? Always a danger. And if major war erupted, there would be no point to any of our careful analyses of economic prospects. The best that we can say today is that nuclear war appears too cataclysmic to be regarded as a serious likelihood.

Foreign competition? Always present. Yet the interesting thing about competitive pressure on the United States is the seldom-recognized fact that the worst may already be behind us. Within the past 10 years, Germany, Italy, France, and Japan (to mention only the most conspicuous examples) have modernized their industrial systems and have poured out goods in spectacular quantities. They have done this with most of the economic facts in their favor: Low wage rates, ample materials, public cooperation, policies of financial restraint, backlogs of consumer demand, currencies which started from an undervalued base, and billions of dollars of aid from the United States itself.

Now, however, the workers of these prospering economies are demanding more of the fruits of their own prosperity. The natural consequence is a rise in the manufacturing costs within their nations. The record shows clearly that basic costs have risen much more rapidly in these nations than in the United States within the past 2½ years. And this reversal is not being overlooked throughout the world. The Economist of London recently referred to "the reappraisals that are being made in favor of the dollar" and noted that "it is being asked, not unreasonably, whether the prospects for economic growth could not be better in the medium term in the United States, with its substantial margin of spare capacity, its rapidly growing population, and its relatively stable costs, then is the prospect in the now largely overstretched economies of continental Europe."

The United States has another advantage, frequently overlooked, vis-a-vis foreign competitors. When it comes to selling in the new combined European market of 300 million customers, American companies can draw on the experience of having done business in the already combined market of the United States, with 187 million customers. Many small European companies are only now beginning to extend themselves into mass production, mass merchandising, mass credit, and (perhaps woefully) mass debt.

A case against growth can take its cues from any of a number of different problems which are present in embryo or in well-developed stages today. Some fear that high American wages or a resumption of inflation would price American goods out of world markets. This is a problem, but despite our higher labor rates we are now selling abroad more than foreign countries are selling to us.

One of the most persistent fears about the future is weight of population itself. Yet this is an old fear, clearly identified more than 150 years ago by Thomas Malthus, and it has never permanently crippled any of the highly technological economies of the Western World.

The shrinking proportion of profits in the total economy gives pause to many business-minded analysts, and there is no doubt that this has been a brake on new investment. But for the long pull, there is reason to believe that the U.S. economy can operate effectively on a high-volume, low-margin policy. This principle was an American invention and has been applied most successfully in this country.

Problems there will be. And dislocations; too many workers in one place and not enough in another; too many young and not enough middle-aged; too few of the right skills for advanced technology; too many retired and not enough productive; too slow an adjustment of the unemployed to new facts and new conditions.

Yet these are expectable and integral parts of the new normalcy in which we are now living. We certainly are not going to produce the best of all possible worlds. But it is entirely realistic to count on a U.S. economy that will continue to grow and continue to produce a higher standard of living for American consumers in the two decades ahead.

This Fourth of July—Let Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I received a letter from the fifth

grade class of Miss Uretsky in the Winthrop School in Melrose, Mass. The children were interested in my comments on a proposal that all church bells, bells in government buildings, and in colleges and universities be rung simultaneously for 4 minutes each Fourth of July. They received the idea from an article which appeared in This Week magazine on February 17. It is always a pleasure to find a group of young Americans turning their energies in such a constructive direction.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MAKE FREEDOM REALLY RING

This is the story of two This Week readers and an idea which we believe can sweep the country, stir a new wave of patriotic feeling, and turn this Fourth of July into the most inspiring celebration in our Nation's history. We are sure all This Week readers will be interested in it. Here is the idea:

On July 4, 1963, and each year thereafter, all church bells, all bells in government buildings, and all carillon bells in colleges and universities will ring for 4 minutes in every part of the country. Every radio station will broadcast the sound of bells for 2 minutes, followed by a reading from the Declaration of Independence.

The idea's proponents are a pair of Connecticut Yankees with a lifelong interest in the American heritage—Eric Hatch, a distinguished writer, many of whose stories have appeared in This Week, and Eric Sloane, a meteorologist, artist, and writer who is an expert on early American barns, covered bridges, and tools.

HEARTBEAT OF THE NATION

Since it is fitting that the Nation's birthday be celebrated where it began, Hatch and Sloane suggest that a special ceremony be televised from Philadelphia, in front of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, and that across the Nation the bells ring out at this same moment.

As the great chorus of bells swells across the land, it will be heard by families at home, on the lakeshore, in the mountains, wherever Americans gather on the Fourth. The sound will come as a thrilling reminder of what the Fourth of July stands for, challenging each of us to remember the heroic resolve formed by the men who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor 187 years ago.

July of 1776 saw the Declaration of Independence, democracy's greatest manifesto, approved by the Continental Congress. Delegate John Adams went to his Philadelphia boardinghouse and penned a leter to his wife Abigail, in Massachusetts:

"I am apt to believe," he wrote of the great event in which he had taken part, "that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires and illuminations from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore."

Perhaps a little of the noble grandeur that John Adams felt has been dulled in our hearts by the passage of time. The Fourth of July has evolved into more of a summer holiday than a patriotic festival and games and sports have taken over perhaps a little too much of the stage. The illuminations—or fireworks, were a dominant Fourth of July sound for decades, but have largely disappeared. The bells, which John Adams also mentions, Sloane and Hatch now propose reviving as a uniting feature of the whole day—much like the national observance of 2 minutes of silence at 11 a.m. on Veterans Day.

SPIRIT OF THE FIRST FOURTH

Adams wrote of an Independence celebration "from one end of this continent to the other," at a time when the newborn Republic scarcely penetrated beyond the Appalachian Mountains, when the whole West was a wilderness whose title was in the hands of Britain and Spain. Alaska belonged to Russia, and Hawaii had not even been discovered. Today, the grandeur of the Independence Day he envisioned should certainly be remembered.

What can you do to help bring about a truly reverent and patriotic Fourth?

Writers Sloane and Hatch appointed themselves a committee. They obtained the endorsement of Governor John N. Dempsey and Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF of Connecticut. Here's how you can get the project started in your community:

1. Write to or call on your State and city officials. Show them this article—ask them to sponsor the observance. Then organize a committee of volunteers who share your enthusiasm, and go out after community support. Contact groups that would be especially interested.

2. Make a survey of the bells in your town—the church bell, the bell on the county courthouse, the college chapel bell, the firehouse bell—how many more are there? Find out who rings them and who gives the order to ring them—and sign them up for July 4. against bellringing? It can surely be waived for a special observance like this one, but be sure your town officials have handled the necessary technicalities well in advance of Independence Day.

3. Write letters—and get friends to write—to your local newspapers, radio, and TV stations. Ask editors to give their support on the editorial pages. Give them all the information they need, both to take part in a national ceremony and to publicize the program in advance.

LET US HEAR YOUR IDEAS

If you need assistance in organizing your committee, Mr. Sloane and Mr. Hatch are anxious to help. Write Let Freedom Ring, Box 4140, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N.Y. We'll share your questions and ideas in future progress reports.

In the pealing of the bells across the land, we will have, every year, on our Nation's birthday, a fitting reminder of the exalted words and heroic decision that founded America.

The Cuba Fixation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently I expressed myself on the subject of Cuba in terms of objecting to the wildcatting, unproved round of rumors and prowling half-truths and falsehoods that have been distributed within and without Congress on the matter.

In the March 23, 1963, edition of the Washington Post there appeared an editorial based on the maiden Senate speech by a distinguished colleague and friend and former Member of this House, Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, of South Dakota. I hope by obtaining unanimous consent to have this editorial placed in the RECORD's Appendix to have Senator MCGOVERN's commendable position receive wide circulation:

THE CUBA FIXATION

"I am constrained to speak out against what seems to me to be a dangerous Castro fixation that is not worthy of this great Nation," Senator MCGOVERN remarked the other day on the Senate floor. "I submit that we have become so involved in charges and countercharges about our Cuba policy that we have come close to losing sight of the real interest of the Nation in the hemisphere. We have ignored the Biblical warning against straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel."

How right the Senator is. Every day's newspaper brings stories that suggest that the only topic worth discussing is Mr. Castro's beard. What Walter Lippmann aptly calls the war whoop party releases daily communiques steeped in defeatism and despair, calling on the country to do "something"—though all the whooping obscures the martial faction's lack of any real prescription for responsible measures.

In a speech on Wednesday before the Inter-American Defense College here, Vice President Johnson ably set forth the facts about Cuba. The first fact is that the island is a sorry showcase for communism. These are the figures that the Vice President ticked off: (1) Under communism, the gross national product has fallen by 25 percent; (2) food consumption has declined 15 percent; (3) this year's sugar crop will be Cuba's smallest since the end of the Second War; (4) Cuba has cost Russia $1 billion and Moscow is now spending more than $1 million a day simply to keep the economy afloat; (5) finally, nearly 250,000 have fled Castro's utopia and another 600,000 have requested visas to leave.

Moreover, short of an all-out war or a blockade that would be an act of war, the United States and its neighbors have taken virtually every available meaningful step to contain Castroism. As the Vice President notes, total trade between Cuba and Latin America sank to $12 million last year and is expected to reach the vanishing point this year. Free-world shipping in Cuban ports is now one tenth of what it was before last October. Castro's popularity has plummeted in Latin America and his diplomatic isolation has never been more complete.

The far more explosive facts about Latin America were set forth by Senator MCGOVERN. These conditions, he noted, were the "real bombshells" in the hemisphere: (1) 2 percent of the people of Latin America own more than half the wealth; (2) 80 percent dwell in squalid huts; (3) over half the region's population is illiterate; (4) one-crop economies plague development hopes as commodity prices decline; (5) many regimes are weakened by archaic tax structures, top-heavy military budgets and feudal patterns of land tenure; (6) and finally, the rate of population growth in the fastest in the world.

These are the facts that explain President Kennedy's reference to Latin America as the "most critical area" of the world. To his credit, the President has repeatedly sought to explain the conditions that exist. He has tried—as he did again at his news conference on Thursday—to place the problem of Castro within the context of a hemisphere caught in the swift tides of change. More voices like those of Vice President Johnson and Senator MCGOVERN are surely needed. While Castro may not beat us, the Castro fixation could.

Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate's highly respected and distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has recently made a very eloquent and sound radio address over the "Manion Forum" which is broadcast over hundreds of radio stations across this country. I have just received a transcript of the Senator's address, which is entitled "Now Is the Time to Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government." I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW IS THE TIME TO OUTLAW ALL DEFICIT SPENDING BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

DEAN MANION. Did you ever see a dream walking—or a nightmare galloping around your bedroom? For your health's sake I hope not. But to simulate this experience, you need only to listen to some officials of the Kennedy administration who have been testifying before congressional committees in favor of the President's tax and spending proposals.

If you close your eyes while you are listening you may well believe that you have been lifted into the fantastic "Ministry of Truth" which is used to make fact out of fiction in George Orwell's horrible fantasy "1984." You may remember that the book "1984" is Orwell's grim and ghastly picture of our world when all of it has been reduced to the complete control of Communist dictatorship.

A basic ingredient of this Red establishment is the official reversal of every elemental concept of fact and truth that civilized people have accepted since the beginning of recorded time. In "1984," this reversal is enforced by the promulgation of a complete new Red vocabulary in which "war" is called "peace," "Truth" is regarded as "falsehood" and "slavery" is translated as "freedom."

In "1984," the end result of this transformation of language and ideas is called "newspeak" and this dictionary of the diabolical dictatorship is a horrible thing to behold. Nevertheless, the recent testimony of administration officials is definitely suggestive of a "newspeak" arithmetic which Congress is now being asked to buy, believe, and adopt.

For instance, these witnesses have testified that it is a good thing for the Federal Government to spend more than it takes in. They predict that the resultive debts and deficits will be a blessing to our economy in the form of full and profitable employment for the American people. Their solution for our business troubles is sweet and simple; namely, reduce Federal taxes and increase Federal spending. In the light of all that we have previously learned about addition, subtraction, profit and loss, this testimony presents a deeply moving picture of Alice in Orwell's bueraucratic Wonderland of 1984.

But these witnesses hold high and important positions in our Government. They are serious, dedicated, and determined. Their testimony is backed up by the immeasurable force and pervasive pressures of the presidential administration which has demonstrated its ability to bring congressional votes into the administration lineup—commonsense and simple arithmetic to the contrary notwithstanding.

For a Congressman or a Senator to stand up and be counted against the full power of the Presidential Office requires moral and political courage of the very highest order. Measure therefore if you can the character and integrity of a Senator who is a distinguished leader of the President's political party but who, nevertheless, takes the leadership against administration policy when that policy violates that Senator's solid conception of fiscal responsibility and the best interests of this country.

When you have done that you will have taken the measure of a truly great American statesman, HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. Senator BYRD, welcome back to the "Manion Forum."

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Dean Manion, for the kind personal remarks in your gracious introduction.

You have asked me to discuss briefly expenditures and taxes and expenditure control and tax reduction. I don't know a better place to start than with the attitude of the new Federal Budget Director, Mr. Kermit Gordon, who has been testifying at the Capitol.

In effect, Mr. Gordon told a congressional committee that a balanced budget would lead to increased unemployment and general economic decline. He said this would happen whether we reduced Federal expenditures to meet tax collections or increase taxes to meet expenditures.

I submit that a man who thinks a balanced budget would be a catastrophe does not have the frame of mind to direct the budget of the United States. He should be removed from his office.

A budget director's function is to balance our fiscal affairs in the Federal budget—and defend it—not destroy it. It seems that Mr. Gordon has fallen for the fallacies of too many of the so-called economists who are counseling Government officials. They say that balancing the budget is still a goal, but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And, to make us richer faster, they think the Government should create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

Such ideas as these, which are being expressed by Mr. Gordon and other Government economists, sound like John Maynard Keynes and Gunnar Myrdal rolled into one. They don't sound like men looking for new frontiers—they sound like Rip van Winkle. They must have been taking a long nap.

We all know the Federal Government has run a deficit in 26 of the last 32 years. If Federal deficits would provide work and make us rich, everyone should have been employed and rich before now. Instead, we still have unemployed and we have a $305 billion debt—and the administration says it must go higher. If we don't get crackpot economists out of Federal fiscal positions and get sound men in them, the American system will be lost.

So much for the academic theories and prognostications of the self-styled economists—I'll just talk in terms of simple facts. Federal taxes are high—too high—as every taxpayer knows, and, they should be reduced.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, nothing would give me more pleasure than to report a bill for responsible tax reduction. But, as we all know, the basic reason for Federal taxes is to meet Federal expenditures. If Federal taxes are too high—and they are—it is basically because Federal expenditures are too high.

It is true that Federal tax collections totaling 80-odd billion dollars are at their alltime peak. But Federal expenditures, which will exceed $100 billion next year, are higher.

This simpy means that we are going further into debt each year by the amount that expenditures exceed tax reduction. We now owe in Federal debt alone more than $300 billion, and this debt is costing us $10 billion a year in interest.

By simple arithmetic we know that 4 percent interest on debt, compounded semiannually, doubles the principal in 17½ years. For the sake of our children, responsible people must begin to think of reducing this burden of debt we are leaving to them.

ONLY YOU—THROUGH CONGRESS—CAN CUT EXPENDITURES

But, the administration in Washington proposes to cut taxes and raise expenditures while we are already running a deficit. This simply means that we would go another dollar deeper in debt for every dollar we take in tax reduction. Short of grave national emergency, this would be sheer fiscal irresponsibility and most of us, deep down in our hearts, know it.

Yet, a sound and responsible tax cut could be made possible by first cutting out unnecessary Federal expenditures. Admittedly, this is made more difficult by the fact that the President says that Federal expenditures must and will rise.

This leaves it up to Congress to cut expenditures without assistance from the executive branch, if not against its opposition. If Congress is to cut expenditures under these circumstances, it will need both the demand and active support of everyone in this audience and more effective procedures in its actions on appropriation measures.

I shall conclude with some remarks concerning public demand and support for reduction in expenditures. But, first let me report that I have introduced what is known as the Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to limit expenditures.

Congress now acts on appropriations but it does not limit annual expenditures where money is available for more than 1 year. Under the resolution an annual expenditure limit would be fixed on every expenditure including "back door" items.

Congress now acts on appropriations in a dozen or more bills over a period of months, never seeing the whole at any one time. Under the resolution every expenditure would be brought under one cover and limited.

Under this procedure the expenditures allowed could be added up at the end of the bill and checked against estimated revenues. By this direct expenditure control Congress can make deficit financing illegal or unlawful.

With or without tax reduction, direct expenditure control has become an obvious and urgent need. I hope the resolution will be adopted, or that the objective of the resolution will be accomplished otherwise. Public demand can bring this about. And, public demand and support for expenditure reduction can bring that about, too.

CONGRESS WILL ACCEDE TO YOUR DEMANDS

The principles and fundamentals which have made this a great Nation have been dangerously undermined in the past 30 years. But, great power still resides in the people. If you exert that power for sound government, the government will be made sound. If the people in this audience want sound and responsible tax reduction, you must use your power for expenditure reduction first.

As a Member of the Senate for 30 years, I can tell you that your Representatives and Senators will respond to your demand. Most Members of Congress want to vote for sound government. What is lacking too often is your support.

Sound and responsible tax reduction is an issue affecting every citizen. It can be had if expenditures are cut accordingly. If the public demands and supports sufficient expenditures reduction first, sound tax reduction will surely follow.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity of being on this program.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia.

I am sure that this convincing appeal for popular support in your fight for commonsense in the fiscal management of our Federal Government will bring an enthusiastic response from this audience.

I and millions of your fellow Americans are deeply grateful to you, sir, for your courageous and scholarly leadership in the truly desperate cause of a sound and solvent Government for the United States. Let me assure you that what you have said here today will be reprinted and repeated thousands of times throughout this country during this crucial congressional debate.

My friends, passage of Senator BYRD's pending Senate Resolution 12 will frustrate the economic "Pied Pipers of the Washington Wonderland" and nail down the solvency of this country once and for all. Remember what this distinguished and experienced Senator has said; namely, "If you exert your power for sound government the Government will be made sound."

Literally, this puts upon you and me and each of us a frightful but inescapable personal responsibility. In substance, Senator BYRD has said that, in the last analysis you are the director of the budget for the United States.

You hold the key to the U.S. Treasury. You can sell this country down the river of debts and deficits or you can save the solvency of the United States by making proper use of this great speech by Senator BYRD, now. This is the time for decision; what are you going to do about it?

Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of recent events which highlight inadequacies of operations both in the Congress and in the Executive branch, and in light of serious questions which have been raised regarding expenditures of committee funds, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of February 25:

MR. PRESIDENT

Surely one must look on President Kennedy's last public statement on Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, as no more than an illustration of the hazards inherent in the off-the-cuff nature of press conferences.

Asked to comment pro or con about the notorious Congressman from Harlem, the President demurred, saying, "What I am most interested in is the passage of legislation which is of benefit to the people * * *." And, he added, the House Education and Welfare Committee, of which POWELL is chairman, has processed some good bills.

We can hardly believe the inescapable implications of such a comment accurately reflect the President's standard of political ethics. The man who said "ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country" certainly must judge politicians on something other than "what can he do for me" (in getting the Presidential program through Congress).

That kind of expediency may have suited the old boss-ridden politics of, say, Boston before our young President's day. But it is ill-suited to the image of a youthful New Frontier.

Nation Suffers From Errors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include as a portion of my remarks an editorial from the San Diego Union of March 8, 1963, entitled "State of Stagnation—Nation Suffers From Errors."

The editorial follows:

STATE OF STAGNATION—NATION SUFFERS FROM ERRORS

It was a tired-appearing, rather listless President who stood up to the questions on Cuba and the state of the Nation. It had been a long road back from promise to performance.

Gone were the exuberance and eloquence of yesterday. He acknowledged that if he were asked if things were going as well this winter as last fall, he would have to say no.

The liberals are disappointed, businessmen uneasy, distrusting, and our allies alarmed. The President wryly referred to Shakespeare's "the winter of our discontent."

Mr. Kennedy has listened to the false prophets. He has tried to follow the Hellers and Schlesingers toward a Keynesian guided economy, into a half-world between capitalism and socialism. He believed he could lead the people into the 1960's which Schlesinger wrote "will probably be spirited, articulate, inventive, incoherent, turbulent, with energy shooting off wildly in all directions. Above all, there will be a sense of motion, of leadership, and of hope * * *. When this happens, America will be herself again."

All that has happened, however, is stagnation. Events haven't moved by command as they were expected to. He hasn't found the way to release the American energy and initiative; and has, in fact, restrained them.

It all comes, probably, from misreading the past decade, when Americans, true to their nature, wanted an end to crises and regimentation, and a freer economy in which they could catch up with themselves, and find their own way.

Nothing illustrates the President's dilemma more than Cuba.

He let slip away a firm leadership of the free world, when he showed the administration would act decisively only when the security of the United States was directly threatened—when missiles were pointed at our heart.

The security of Cuba itself was sacrificed. This was not lost on Europe, which now insists more than ever on deciding its own security and the right to participate in the control of nuclear power.

In his last press conference, Mr. Kennedy said the administration believes "the wisest policy is the isolation of communism in this hemisphere" by trying to confine it to Cuba. Thus was Cuba written off, and thus has communism advanced. Are we always to "confine" it to whatever country succumbs next?

In his own retreat from his tax program Mr. Kennedy revealed that he had been guided by politics and liberal dogma. He proved what he tried to deny, that he believes government spending and government control are the answer to economic growth.

For him, a tax cut and more government spending were enough.

For Mr. Kennedy the world has not behaved in a rational way. The genie has not jumped out of the magic bottle to wipe away the uncertainties and provide the solutions. He has been left with his own strength and his own convictions, and the country is in the winter of its discontent.

The New Reactionaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is experiencing both the bright promise and the difficult problems resulting from automation and rapid technological advancement, there is a danger that various groups may attempt to block the way to a more smoothly functioning economy.

According to an editorial in the New York Times—Western edition—of January 21, this has, indeed, been happening. The Times points out that the longshoremen and railroad brotherhood unions are the "new reactionaries" because of their "stubborn insistence on defending archaic work rules—and—in their bitter resistance to the introduction of laborsaving machinery." The Nation can ill afford impediments to economic growth such as those represented by resistance to change.

Labor leaders—

Says the Times—

have an obligation to cooperate with management in retraining, in sharing the benefits of increased productivity, (and) in taking positive steps to improve the country's competitive standing.

Mr. Speaker, because of the important warning note this editorial sounds, under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE NEW REACTIONARIES

In their stubborn insistence on defending archaic work rules, in their bitter resistance to the introduction of laborsaving machinery, such unions as the longshoremen's and the railroad brotherhoods are the new reactionaries. They are replacing in this category the employers who, in the not so distant past, fought against the recognition of organized labor. Public sympathy was then rightly with the unions. Now it is not.

The new reactionaries can create havoc, particularly when unemployment is high. They are hampering growth by their insistence on preserving outmoded work practices and unproductive jobs. Management, of course, has a share in the blame, because it acquiesced in featherbedding and other practices whose added costs could be passed on to consumers. But in today's competitive situation, these are luxuries that the

economy cannot afford. In many industries, automation is the only real hope of survival; it is absolutely essential in transportation.

The specter of man replaced by the machine is an ominous one—but it is a false threat. Technological improvement, although provoking temporary and sometimes painful dislocations, has always brought rising productivity, new products, expanding markets and vastly increased job opportunities. It will not be easy to find solutions to the human problems posed by automation; yet to play the part of wreckers is the one course calculated to be most harmful to labor itself.

A faster rate of economic growth, one that presents new job opportunities, will help curb the power of the new reactionaries. But this is not the complete solution. The responsible leaders of labor have an obligation to cooperate with management in retraining, in sharing the benefits of increased productivity, in taking positive steps to improve the country's competitive standing.

This approach cannot be forced on labor by Washington; but the clear and present danger facing labor is that Congress, incited by public revulsion against some of the senseless strikes that have erupted, will press for onerous restraints on the power of the unions. It would be far better if labor leadership abandoned its reactionaries and promoted the real welfare of wage earners through the fostering of industrial growth and productivity.

Intelligence Indicates Rotating, but Not Reducing, Troops in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a column earlier this week by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, concerning the question of Russian troops in Cuba, would be of interest to the House. Accordingly, I am including it at this time:

INTELLIGENCE INDICATES ROTATING, BUT NOT REDUCING, TROOPS IN CUBA

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

The Kennedy administration is either kidding itself, the American people or both on the withdrawal of Russia fighting forces from Cuba.

Absolutely no firm evidence exists that any combat elements have been removed.

This is particularly true as regards the four mobile (armored) battalions, numbering approximately 5,000 elite troops, and the numerous antiaircraft and coastal missile batteries that ring Cuba. These powerful units are still there, with no sign of any reduction in size of weapons.

In other words, Russian military strength is the same today as it was last fall, following the loudly acclaimed removal of the nuclear-armed ballistic missiles and the IL-28 bombers.

On the other hand, there are numerous indications that Khrushchev's ambiguous promise to withdraw "several thousand" by March 15 is a characteristic Communist fraud.

Intelligence authorities have increasing reasons to believe that what the Soviet actually is doing is rotating its large garrison instead of cutting it; in effect, playing a covert put-and-take game.

Following is the basis of this disquieting intelligence belief:

Of the five Red bloc ships that docked in Havana in recent weeks to transport Russians home, three disembarked an estimated 2,000 new arrivals. That is approximately two-thirds of the number reportedly withdrawn as Khrushchev pledged.

The Baltika, with 1,400-passenger capacity, is scheduled to reach Cuba this week. It is positively known to be carrying around 500 "technicians." Naval surveillance planes and other sources that have observed these men on the ship's deck report them as having a distinct military appearance.

All new arrivals are being billeted in the barracks built for Soviet combat units. It is not Red army practice to mix military and civilian personnel.

Very little Soviet fighting equipment has been withdrawn. Air photos reveal a few "Frog" missiles on the docks, apparently to be loaded on the departing ship, as well as some jeeps and trucks. And that's all. No tanks, artillery or other heavy weapons.

One highly significant fact so far not disclosed by the White House or State Department is a blunt statement Ambassador Dobrynin made to Secretary Rusk.

In a conversation between them, the Russian diplomat flatly declared his country proposes to keep a considerable number of military "technicians and advisers" in Cuba as long as the United States does that in South Vietnam.

Dobrynin blandly contended there is no difference between these two situations.

The Red envoy admitted some new Soviet arrivals in Cuba. But he claimed they are "agricultural technicians" needed to bolster Castro's steadily worsening economy.

According to Dobrynin, no new Russian troops are being sent to Cuba, and all combat forces are being slowly removed. This assertion is flatly denied by the Defense Intelligence Agency and Central Intelligence Agency. Their evidence wholly contradicts Dobrynin.

The DIA reports not only large numbers of Russians being brought to Cuba by ship, but between 100 and 200 flown in weekly. The Soviet now has a weekly giant TU-114 jetliner flight between Murmansk and Havana.

Astonishingly, the United States supplies weather information to the Russians for these nonstop 5,000-mile flights.

It will be several weeks before intelligence authorities can fully reassess Soviet military strength in Cuba. DIA experts believe the new compilation will reveal no diminution in these forces; that is, that the sum total of all the coming and going will add up to 17,000 combat troops that have been there for months.

Secretary Rusk and Defense Secretary McNamara don't agree with this opinion. Privately they are saying they expect Moscow to reduce its Cuban fighting garrison to around 10,000.

On the basis of the record, such optimistic hopes are wish-thinking.

Troop estimates by high Kennedy administration officals invariably have been unrealistic—to put it mildly. Without exception, they have been heavily on the cheerio side.

Inexplicable crackdown—Federal agents are getting ready to squelch Cuban refugee efforts to train commando and guerrilla forces for raids and underground operations in Cuba.

McGeorge Bundy, highpowered special assistant to the President on foreign policy, has sent a directive to Attorney General Robert Kennedy ordering this crackdown. According to Bundy's backstage edict, all Cuban refugee anti-Castro activities not approved by the Central Intelligence Agency are to be barred.

The Secret Caves of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Saturday Evening Post dated March 30, 1963, carries an important editorial which I feel deserves the attention and consideration of all Members of the Congress. It is entitled "The Secret Caves of Cuba" and points up the importance of determining beyond any question what weapons the Soviets have stored in these carefully prepared storage facilities in Cuba. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

As many geologists have known for years, and many so-called intelligence experts are beginning to discover, the island of Cuba is honeycombed with thousands of underground caves. Many of these caves, as the geology textbooks point out, open directly on the sea. It is quite possible for a Soviet submarine to steam directly into some of these caves.

Cuban refugees and exiles have warned our Government for 3 years that the caves of Cuba have been the scene of mysterious and possibly sinister activity. Curiously, when Castro took over, Antonio Nuñez Jiménez, Cuba's leading spelunker (a person who explores caves), was appointed to a top government position. Some of the Cuban exiles now in this country actually worked in these caves, cleaning them and pouring concrete. Then they were barred from further work in the caves. Today, if reports of the refugees can be believed—and we should not be quick to doubt them—the entrances to many of these caves are heavily fortified and no Cubans, not even top-level military personnel, are permitted near them. Whole villages have been relocated away from the caves. The caves are guarded by military personnel of the Soviet Union or satellite soldier, reportedly including Czechs.

What is inside these caves? The exiles and refugees say some of them contain intermediate-range ballistic missiles, complete with guidance and launching systems. Other caves, they charge, house Soviet-built and Soviet-manned supersonic jet fighters, any of which could be easily converted to carry nuclear weapons. At least five of the caves, those opening on the sea, are said to be complete, operational Soviet submarine bases. Appearing before a congressional committee recently, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch said, "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations through the island. In numerous caves, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military officers, are not permitted access.

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba," General Fitch continued, "and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large

and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography has further revealed the extension of roads to known and suspect cave locations. In view of the shortage of aboveground facilities and the requirement for storage of the large amounts of military supplies and equipment believed to be in Cuba, and the relatively simple adaptation of caves for this purpose, it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

General Fitch does not believe that the Soviets have installed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the caves, as the exiles insist. He says, "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed." General Fitch, an Army man, did not comment on the possibility of underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. Thus far, our Navy experts have remained silent on this point.

To date the Government's intelligence-gathering activities in Cuba have inspired little confidence. Defense Secretary McNamara's theatrical television briefing raised a good many more questions than it answered. Moreover, McNamara recently admitted that, when the going got tough, CIA surveillance aircraft were inadequate to cope with Cuba and airplanes of the Strategic Air Command had to be pressed into service. But even those skilled SAC recon experts cannot photograph the inside of a cave. If the Soviets do not even permit the "highly placed military" of Cuba near the caves we would doubt that our CIA men have penetrated them either. Thus, it seems to us that we really don't know what might be inside the caves. We think it is dangerous to assume that they do not contain IRBM missiles and submarine pens.

If, as the exiles contend, the caves are loaded with IRBM's and submarine facilities, then Cuba, in fact, has become a Soviet Gibraltar. Only a few Soviet IRBM's in Cuba dangerously tilt the balance of power in Soviet favor. If the Soviets are allowed to operate Polaris-type submarines from Cuban bases, the Reds can attain a serious "third force" threat, with only one-third the number of nuclear submarines required to operate from Soviet home bases. This is the grave threat of the caves of Cuba.

To Americans, the important point is that we do not know what the caves conceal. We think it is vital that our Government find out, beyond doubt, and soon. Having failed once to listen to the warnings of Cuban exiles, it seems to us the Government now has an obligation to disprove their present charge, by whatever means are necessary, including force.

The Chicago case certainly promises no quick decision; it is immensely complicated. Hoffa, furthermore, has not reached his present eminence in a hoodlum-infested union without learning a great deal about the uses of power; and he has a corps of extremely shrewd legal minds ready to jump at a snap of his fingers. Nevertheless, Justice Department agents have been quietly sifting evidence for more than 18 months. Grand juries have investigated Teamster pension and welfare funds not only in Chicago but in 13 other major cities.

This time the Government knows its case, however complex, must be solid. Each past failure to make its charges stick has only lent apparent substance to Hoffa's carefully wrought self-portrait as the blameless victim of a personal vendetta. "There aren't many bites left in the apple," one Government official explains, "so the next one better be good."

It particularly had better be good because of Hoffa's goal of negotiating a coast-to-coast trucking contract in 1964. The prospect of any one man's holding such extraordinary power over the country is a chilling one, and no one who has seen Hoffa in action thinks that he would hesitate to use that power to enforce his will on the Nation.

Hoffa himself scoffs at fears that he might call a nationwide strike. He maintains that it wouldn't be necessary, that the mere threat to strike one or two major lines would be enough to break employers' resistance to his demands. He may well be right. Even now most of the trucking industry is at his mercy.

Against Hoffa's sinister power no bargaining is possible. Contract terms are dictated. The employer can either accept them or be struck. "How do you bargain if you can't say no?" asks Joseph M. Adelizzi, managing director of the Empire State Highway Transportation Association. "How do you bargain if the other fellow holds a strike gun pointed at your belly? Saying no to Hoffa would be like committing suicide."

Eleanor Roosevelt—The World Orphaned by Her Passing

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the wife and widow of the 32d President of the United States died at 6:15 p.m. on November 7, 1962. The time of passing was such that it might well have been obscured by the other diurnal events in the world. The floodwaters of the Cuban crisis had receded only slightly from their high-water mark of tensions as that same night Khrushchev had announced formally, "we have taken our rockets out and they probably are on the way."

That day too was one of reaction to the national election, a readjustment in the body politic. The Democrats had scored a remarkable midterm election success, opined the New York Times. In India, a not-so-passive caucus cheered at Nehru's announcement that Mr. Menon had "resigned."

Thus, the passing of an ex-President's wife might have been lost in the shifting sands of the world, but for the fact that she was an international figure in her own right—a noted humanitarian, symbol of woman's new role, author and columnist, delegate to the United Nations General Assembly and chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, and an active force in political life. "In the death of Eleanor Roosevelt," said the Reverend Dr. Gordon L. Kidd, "the world has suffered an irreparable loss. The entire world becomes one family orphaned by her passing."

And so it is. For the woman who lived by the inspiration of the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi and who observed: "One must never, for whatever reason, turn his back on life," will be remembered not so much for the early controversies stirred by her ceaseless activity and energy but by her warmth, sincerity, zeal, patience, and intellect. To these qualities our present United Nations Ambassador addressed himself when he said:

Like so many others, I have lost more than a beloved friend. I have lost an inspiration. She would rather light a candle than curse the darkness, and her glow warmed the world.

San Francisco's Registered Voters Express Opinions in Congressman Mailliard's Survey on Controversial Legislative Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, some 18,000 of my San Francisco constituents have responded to my annual questionnaire mailed last month to every household containing one or more persons who registered for last November's election in California's Sixth Congressional District.

The following tabulation of the replies may interest my colleagues:

I. TAX REDUCTION AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

With an estimated budget deficit of $8.8 billion, the President has recommended tax reduction and reform programs estimated to create a budget deficit of $11.9 billion next year. These measures are intended to stimulate the economy to produce greater revenues in future years. Some of the most important questions to be decided follow. Do you want to:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Maintain existing tax rates and expenditure patterns?	19	66	15
B. Maintain existing expenditure patterns but enact tax reduction and reform measures including—			
1. Reduction of individual income tax rates from the present 20 to 91-percent range to 14 to 65 percent, decreasing revenues by $11,000,000,000?	55	33	12
2. Limiting itemized deductions, including charitable contributions, to those in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income?	34	52	14
3. Reduction of corporation tax rates from 52 percent to 47 percent, decreasing revenues by $2,600,000,000?	43	43	14
4. Elimination of $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividends?	23	60	17
C. Reduce the budget deficit by cutting expenditures for—			
1. Foreign aid to America's allies and underdeveloped countries?	66	26	8
2. American farm price supports and surplus storage?	80	13	7
3. Other domestic programs, i.e., welfare benefits and low-income housing?	50	40	10

II. MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Two basic plans will probably be considered by the 88th Congress. Do you favor a plan—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Managed by privately owned insurance companies with the Government paying the premiums of those who could not afford to pay themselves?	47	39	14
B. Managed by the Government and financed by greater social security taxes?	38	51	11

III. LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Recent strikes in the defense, maritime, and publishing industries have cast doubt on the effectiveness of present labor laws. Would you favor new laws to—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Compel Government arbitration with a decision binding to both parties in disputes declared by the President to endanger national welfare?	64	27	9
B. Subject labor unions to antitrust legislation on the same basis as corporations?	80	14	6

IV. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Do you favor Federal aid to—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. College and postgraduate education?	51	42	7
B. Grade and high school education:			
1. For general operations including teachers' salaries?	31	60	9
2. For classrooms and equipment only?	32	53	15

Essays on the Three Greatest American Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, who were the three greatest American presidents? This was the subject chosen by Newsday for the American history contest which started last September. Newsday sponsors one contest every month and selects one boy and one girl as winners. In October, Susan Berggren, a junior at Locust Valley High School and Larry Grobel, a junior at Jerico High School received the first prizes. Their essays, which are very thoughtful and imaginative in content, reflect a genuine interest in knowledge of American history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two winning essays of Newsday's October contest be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST ON "AMERICA'S THREE GREATEST PRESIDENTS"

(By Susan Berggren)

Who were the three greatest American Presidents? The Presidency of the United States has been held by some of the greatest men of all time. To me, the one who stands above them all is Abraham Lincoln. He was one of the few men in history that I know of who was greater than his own legend. And, of course, no list of great American Presidents is complete without the "father of our country." George Washington, whose death was mourned by friend and foe alike. But what of the third great President? So many have contributed their greatness to the realization of the American dream. Their influence can be felt every day, in the courts, the schools, and in the American per-

"He was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Thus did Henry Lee describe our first President. It has often been thought sophisticated by cynics to ridicule Washington and belittle his achievements. Unfortunately, they forget that he was the chief reason we won our independence. Although lacking in true military genius, he had an unswerving faith in our country and her ideals: a faith which was much more urgently needed than military prowess. This faith made him a symbol of inspiration to his troops at a time when inspiration was all that kept them from defeat. He was foremost in an era of great statesmen, respected by even his bitterest enemies. Never was a leader more desperately needed; and never did a man more nobly rise to his destiny.

A GIANT AMONG MEN

"Now he belongs to the ages." As Stanton stated at the President's deathbed, Abraham Lincoln does in truth belong to the ages. His ideals are timeless, for they deal with the basic rights of mankind. In his writings he left a legacy of beauty and truth that is unexcelled anywhere. He was a giant among men, both physically and spiritually. He had a humility and a sensitivity that enabled him to reach both rich and poor alike, but his humility did not stop him from doing his duty as he saw fit. He had a great respect for his office and for the Constitution, and sharply answered anyone who questioned their inviolability. But to personal criticism he was silent. As is too often the case with greatness, men used him, belittled him, and learned too late how much they needed him.

And for the third President, there is no one with the universal acclaim of Washington and Lincoln, no one who was as vital to his time as they were to theirs. Therefore I have taken the liberty of choosing a man whom many would be appalled to hear described as great. His name was Andrew Johnson. It was his fate to always be on the minority side; and in a time of national chaos, he was called upon to take the lead. He was doomed to failure before he even started.

Although shy, tactless, overshadowed by the many brilliant minds of his time, he stubbornly fought for his program and beliefs in the face of relentless opposition. He was a small, unimportant man, unexpectedly thrust into a position of great importance, where he found himself fighting for the life of the South against such towering giants as Sumner and Stanton, who wanted its blood. His achievements are unappreciated even today, for they came on the heels of the achievements of one of the greatest men the world has ever known. But where would we be today if he had not assumed leadership then?

The career of Andrew Johnson is a tragic one, but to me it embodies the most important characteristic of greatness: the spirit of a man who knows he can never be as great as he must be, but tries to his utmost to be as great as he is able to be in the face of the undying opposition of the country he so faithfully serves.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST ON "AMERICA'S THREE GREATEST PRESIDENTS"

(By Larry Grobel)

The three Presidents that I selected for this essay—Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson—each held the stage at a critical moment in American history and by timely action attained timeless results.

I chose Jefferson because he was such a devout believer in democracy and a champion of human rights. He was the chief author of the Declaration of Independence which affirmed the "inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as well as the right of self-government, the basic ideals of American democracy. In the Virginia legislature, he fought for religious freedom and the separation of church and State, free public schools, abolition of the slave trade, and the gradual emancipation of the slaves. He also advocated the need for Federal taxes, realizing that without a strong government, all that had been achieved by the American Revolution would be lost.

Jefferson expanded the original area of the United States to include the huge region stretching westward from the Mississippi to the Rockies. He widened the concept of popular rule by word and example, and in acquiring the vast trans-Mississippi domain, he sought, among other things, to check the growing power of the eastern business interests with an expanding agrarian west. Jefferson perfected what Washington instituted—the policy of isolationism or neutralism toward the chronic power struggles embroiling Europe.

I chose Abraham Lincoln because he was the Nation's Great Emancipator. His claim to that honor, if it rests uncertainly upon his famous proclamation, has a sound basis in the support he gave to the antislavery amendment. It is well founded also in his greatness as the war leader who carried the Nation safely through the 4-year struggle that brought freedom in its wake. And, finally, it is strengthened by the practical demonstrations he gave of respect for human worth and dignity, regardless of color.

Lincoln, given no choice in the matter, settled on the battlefield the question of whether the minority has the right to break up the government whenever it chooses in a free government, and while doing so he advanced the cause of human rights by outlawing the anachronism of slavery.

Lincoln even suspended the writ of habeas corpus and assumed dictatorial powers when he thought this necessary for the war effort, his primary objective being to "save the Union."

WILSON THE IDEALIST

I chose Woodrow Wilson because of his sincere and eloquent idealism. Wilson had a powerful faith in the American common man. As an historian, he could easily document his thesis that the government had been used too long "for private and selfish purposes."

He was a liberal in politics, author of the idea called "The New Freedom." He tightened the restraints on big business and finance and carried the Nation successfully through World War I. He sponsored reform measures such as popular election of Senators, income taxes and woman suffage. He

also had a deep influence on economic development (i.e., Underwood Tariff of 1913, Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts, Federal Reserve Act) and other aids to business.

At the end of World War I, Wilson, the idealist, desired nothing for his country, but was determined to create a peaceful world. He sacrified many of his Fourteen Points to secure agreement among the allies. However, he felt that the League of Nations (forerunner of the United Nations) would insure his most important goal—world peace.

Mr. Virgil Gunlock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very distressed to return home this past weekend and learn of the death of one of Chicago's most distinguished civic leaders, Mr. Virgil Gunlock, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority. He was a man whose work for his city covered numerous public improvement projects and many other worthwhile efforts that truly made Chicago a better city in which to live.

Among his many services to the city of Chicago and its citizens were direction of the operations of Chicago's mass transportation system, prominent roles in such major programs as the digging of the two downtown Chicago subways, the construction of the system of expressways, and the development of the O'Hare International Airport. He was a most active member of the Chicago Planning Commission; and he also found time to participate in his neighborhood community groups, such as the Lincoln Park Community Conservation Association.

Virgin Gunlock was born May 18, 1905, on a farm near New Canton, Pike County, Ill. In 1927 he was graduated from the University of Illinois with high scholastic honors and a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering. While at the university, he was a member of the Big Ten championship wrestling team in 1926 and 1927. His first job after graduation was with the Chicago Sanitary District, where he worked for more than 10 years as an engineer. In 1938, when the city of Chicago started construction of the State Street subway, Gunlock was appointed resident engineer on the first subway contract. He advanced quickly to the position of chief subway engineer, and in 1945 was appointed commissioner of subways and superhighways and then become commissioner of public works in 1952.

Mr. Gunlock was named to the Chicago Transit Authority board in June, 1954, by the late Mayor Martin H. Kennelly to replace the late Ralph Budd, who had retired as transit authority chairman. Mayor Daley named Mr. Gunlock to a full 7-year term on the Chicago Transit Authority board in 1959.

It was in the latter capacity that Mr. Gunlock made frequent trips to Washington to testify before House and Senate committees as an expert on mass transportation and its relationship to our big city problems. It was my pleasure last year to invite him to appear before the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I was a member, when we were considering the Mass Transportation Act. Mr. Gunlock impressed the committee with his grasp of the problems confronting all big cities in grappling with the chaos and confusion in transporting our rapidly growing population in and out of large metropolitan areas every day. He was a man to get his ideas across and also to carry them out. I learned much from him in our discussions of the problems Chicago faced in this era of tremendous growth.

Every citizen of Chicago whether he knew Mr. Gunlock personally or not will feel the absence of him because he gave so much of his superior time and effort to help make Chicago a better city.

Current Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has taken effective measures to make the annual budget message and proposals of the President more readable and understandable. But, I would judge that relatively few American taxpayers are offered an opportunity to have in their homes a concise, understandable report on Government expenditures and a graphic analysis of the current Federal budget. In the most recent issue of the magazine Current, which he edits, Sidney Hertzberg advances the suggestion that such a report accompany every income tax return form mailed to taxpayers. Furthermore, he commendably suggests that such reports be distributed through such avenues as made available in volume at such Government installations as post offices. At this point, under unanimous consent. I include in the RECORD's Appendix a text of the Current editorial by Mr. Hertzberg. I am asking the Director of the Internal Revenue Service for his comments. The idea on first encounter sounds most feasible and valuable and should subsequent study bear this out, I would propose legislation to this effect if for some reason it cannot be accomplished administratively.

The editorial follows:

CURRENT AFFAIRS

Perhaps the most easily obtained of all Government documents is a Federal income tax return. If it does not come in the mail, it can be picked up at any post office or bank.

But if the taxpayer would like a copy of the Federal budget or some other document which tells him what the Government has done or intends to do with his money, he will have to exert himself. He can write to the Government Printing Office, if he happens to have heard of that labyrinth, find out whether the document is still in stock and how much it costs, send his money and wait. If he is in the know, he will write to his Congressman and probably get it free. If he is a teacher or a discussion leader who wants a couple of dozen copies, he will run into trouble.

This is not as it ought to be. The public should, as of right, have free and ready access to the basic raw material of government: Presidential messages sent, congressional laws enacted, Supreme Court decisions rendered.

The fact that it does not have such access was emphasized by the newspaper strikes of the past winter. For essential documents, the public depends not on the Government, but on a handful of newspapers, none of which are obligated to print them. For the substantial number of citizens who read, or at least savor, these documents in the New York Times, the winter's events will never be quite in focus. And nobody seems interested in making up the documents missed, not the newspapers, not the foundations, not the Government.

No, it is not as it should be. We will not pretend that ordinary mortals can understand the budget, any more than they can understand the Internal Revenue Act—a balance of confusion which at least eliminates the issue of taxation without representation. But there is a lot the concerned citizen can understand and it is not the business of government officials, educators and journalists to underestimate him or his capacity for improvement. Religionists do not ask how many Bible readers there are and where; they saturate the globe with copies of the Scriptures as a matter of course.

We would like to see every taxpayer get, with every income tax return, a report on Government expenditures. We would like to see copies of major government documents in every post office, public library and school library in the country, available free and in any quantity, regardless of newspaper, radio or television strikes.

Until this happy state is reached, Current will do its share. This month our readers may obtain free from our readers service copies of such Presidential messages to Congress as we were able to obtain from such Washington officials who were able to rise above bureaucratic indifference and redtape.

SIDNEY HERTZBERG.

Prayer in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, a letter to the editor written by a constituent of mine on the issue of prayer in schools was recently printed in the Record-Herald, Washington Court House, Ohio. Because of its thought-provoking and inspiring message, I would like to take this opportunity to bring the letter to the attention of my colleagues.

Following is the letter:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

EDITOR, RECORD-HERALD:

Just tell me what happened to the backbone of the American people?

We're living in a country that offers us nothing but freedom and what are we doing with it? We're giving it to these so-called atheists who seem to be creeping in the news lately. They don't believe in God. They want the Supreme Court to ban the prayers in the schools and Bible reading.

Well, let me tell these atheists a thing or two. This God that they don't believe in just happened to create me and them. Then He placed us on a place called earth, created by His hands, to live and enjoy all the fingertip luxuries that this wonderful world has to offer us.

They breathe in the fresh air, created by this God, they walk on the soil and build their homes and grow their crops on this ground, also created by God. They couldn't begin to look around and point to one thing that God didn't have a hand in, unless it was sin. There's plenty of sin in this world and it will get worse.

These people that want to ban the Bible and prayer in the schools won't be doing so much squawking when sin takes over. The children of the world growing up and running about and one day being the world's leaders in one way or another.

Remember, atheist, one day they could have heard a small simple prayer or some Scripture from the precious Holy Bible, but you didn't want them to hear it. All you wanted was "Ban this and ban that," "do away with God." "They don't need to know about God."

Why some of those poor kids would never hear the name of God or realize what it meant to pray if it weren't for a simple prayer in school or some Scripture reading. Some of them come from homes that use the name of God only in vain.

Some of them surely must hunger to know a little about God. What right do you few have to stop them from hearing.

Maybe you don't want your kids to hear the truth, but here's one mother of two small boys that does. I'd like to add, also, that mine know quite a bit about this wonderful God, because we attend a gospel preaching church and both my husband and myself are Christians serving this God that you atheists want our children to forget about.

If the American people would slow up from their busy pace in life and wake up before it's too late, then we wouldn't have to worry about things like this happening right before our eyes. Wake up, American people. This is just the beginning of sorrow, unless something is done and done now, not by the "other fellow" but by all of us.

JUDY BOCK.

Problems of Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal to cut taxes and increase spending raises the problem of larger Federal deficits and the means of financing them. Essentially, the debt managers have the choice between selling bonds to banks or tapping individual savings held by insurance companies, savings and loan associations and pension funds. Both methods could lead to serious economic problems, principally inflation. At the present time, administration theorists prefer to finance the deficits through the banks, which is the most inflationary method. They believe that reliance upon the savings alternative would tighten credit and push up interest rates as well as diminish purchasing power.

According to a Wall Street Journal editorial of December 26:

"The only way to do away with the dangers is to do away with the deficit.

In other words, to avoid even more difficult problems of debt management, tax cuts must be accompanied by expenditure reform. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial from the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—MR. MARTIN'S DELICATE TASK

Everyone agrees that a Federal tax cut, whatever its ultimate effect, would tend at first to assure a Federal deficit, even if there weren't already one. This raises the threat of inflation, so President Kennedy was asked the other night whether a new deficit would be financed in a way that would lessen the inflation danger.

"This will be a job which is primarily that of Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve," Mr. Kennedy replied. "I would hope, however, that any deficit * * * will be financed in the maximum degree possible to stimulate the economy without increasing the prospect of another inflationary or speculative spiral."

William McChesney Martin, as Chairman of the Reserve Board, thus faces a task of extreme difficulty. The pity is that there is no logical reason why it has to be so difficult.

The trouble stems not from any lack of experience on Mr. Martin's part. In his 11 years at the helm of the Nation's central bank, he has had to deal almost continually with the job of financing Federal deficits.

Nor is the Federal Reserve Chairman lacking in sound ideas for coping with next year's possible problems. There are two principal ways a deficit can be financed—by selling bonds to the banks or by trying to tap savings, such as those held by insurance companies, savings and loan associations, and pension funds.

Mr. Martin has correctly insisted that sales of the bonds to the banks carry a serious threat of inflation. And that the Treasury should try to minimize the danger as much as possible by leaning hard on savers. And that's just where Mr. Martin starts running into trouble.

Administration theorists are convinced that heavy reliance on savers would tighten credit and push up interest rates. They still see easy money as essential to economic growth, though it certainly has had no electric effect the past couple of years. Moreover, if thrift-minded folk buy Government bonds with the money they save from that promised tax cut, the economy will not get the shot in the arm that the administration envisions.

Thus there will be strong pressure on Mr. Martin to go along with financing the deficit through the banks. The banks will pay for the securities by setting up new deposits on their books, and when the Treasury spends these deposits they are added to the money supply. Even Government economists realize this sets the stage for an inflationary spiral.

But these economists argue that the curtains on that stage need never open. Their proof is the experience of the past couple of years. Since mid-1960 bank credit has expanded by close to 25 percent, yet the money supply—demand deposits and currency has grown hardly at all. The reason is not some anti-inflation hocus-pocus but the simple fact that the rise in bank credit has been about offset by the growth of time deposits, funds that individuals, corporations, and others have been saving up in the banks.

If these time deposits continue to soar next year, perhaps there will be no inflation. But these deposits can be converted into money at any time, at the whim of the depositor. So the inflation threat will be steadily growing.

The problem won't be solved even if Mr. Martin is somehow able to talk the administration into going after the funds of savers. The bonds, like time deposits, can be converted to money at the whim of the bondholder. And if enough bondholders decide to unload all at once, the Federal Reserve will have little alternative but to try to prop up the market by buying bonds from the banks. This increases the banks' lending power and all but assures a wave of inflation. So even though the savings route may be the safer way, it still carries with it inflation dangers. The only way to do away with the dangers is to do away with the deficit.

Instead, administration theorists would have us believe that we can safely have tax cuts, easy money and heavy deficits all at the same time. For Mr. Martin will wave his wand and conjure inflation away. Yet the truth is that the potential for inflation is being stored up like powder rammed into a gun.

We hope no one blames Mr. Martin if the gun goes off.

Minnesota's Close Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 25, a new Governor assumed office in the State of Minnesota. The entire Nation is well aware of the historic recount which the State has been engaged in since last November 6. During the 4½ months between election day and last Monday, governmental operations in Minnesota proceeded without interruption. The gubernatorial transition, though delayed, has been an orderly one.

Throughout this period of waiting to find out who their next governor would be, the people of Minnesota conducted themselves with the patience and responsibility expected of a free citizenry. The conclusion of the recount process proves that the election process in Minnesota in an honest one. Though over a million and a quarter votes were cast, counted, and recounted, not one single evidence of fraud or deceit by the candidates, political parties, election officials, or the voters was uncovered.

The following editorial from the March 26 Washington Post commends the people of Minnesota for their political maturity and stability. They are indeed a credit to America and to our philosophy of free, democratic government responsible to the people themselves:

MINNESOTA'S CLOSE ELECTION

Minnesota's gubernatorial election finally has been settled and the candidate with the greatest number of votes, as determined by the canvassing apparatus and the courts, is Gov. Karl Rolvaag. The Democratic victor now has assumed his office.

The delay was embarrassing to the candidates, to the election machinery, to the canvassing boards, to the courts, and to the citizens. Yet, in retrospect, the State of Minnesota has occasion to congratulate itself. The complete canvass of the returns disclosed no evidence of fraud, corruption, ballot stuffing or other deliberate irregularity. Minnesotans can say, with more evidence than the citizens of any other jurisdiction, that their election was honest.

The business of the State government probably was not seriously interrupted by the prolongation of Gov. Elmer L. Anderson's term. The provision for the extension of an official's term until his successor qualifies has a new endorsement by demonstration. There was no vacuum in the direction of the State's affairs.

Perhaps new machinery can be perfected to expedite the settlement of political contests that are as closely contested as this one, but the task of carefully going over the results of a statewide election is not a small one. On the whole, the Minnesota system functioned well. There were no departures from the plan laid down. Canvassing boards and courts systematically and methodically dealt with every challenge. There seems to be complete confidence in the electorate that the officials involved functioned well and that the courts performed their duties without reproach. Such a close contest could easily provoke chaos in a less settled society. The calm and orderly demeanor of Minnesotans in a difficult and trying situation is a tribute to their political stability and maturity and to their faith in democratic government.

Portrait of a Family Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 I took occasion to salute Sacony and S. Augstein & Co., Inc., on the occasion of the 20th anniversary dinner on March 15, 1963. At that time I was tempted to include in the RECORD a story of this illustrious family. I thought it best to wait and include this at a later date.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a remarkable saga of a family who came to this country and made good in the best American tradition. This article was taken from the Sacony Sentinel:

PORTRAIT OF A FAMILY BUSINESS

A boy not yet 14 years old, arriving alone in America 80 years ago, carried into the New World the tradition of a family business probably older than our Nation.

The chain of that tradition, whose beginnings have been lost in the past, remains today unbroken. It has a slightly different company now, and carries a product name which is even better known. It is immeasurably larger than the founding company was in Bohemia in the 18th century. Its markets cover far vaster areas, and its catalog of products is infinitely broader.

But its concern for integrity of product and business ethics is no less than it was in its era of hand looming and personalized craftsmanship.

The history of the company may reach much farther back than the time our Declaration of Independence was being signed, but that is about as far as it can presently be traced.

It was then the I. Augstein Textile Co., already spreading into markets beyond its small manufacturing town in Bohemia—then part of the Austrian Empire and since 1919 in Czechoslovakia. It loomed its own textiles and fabricated from these a wide assortment of women's and children's attire.

It is now formally S. Augstein & Co., Inc., which has been wholly American-owned for a half-century and carries proudly on its label an envied name—Sacony.

From these earliest known beginnings, six unbroken generations bearing the Augstein name have carried the company across ever-newer frontiers. Its continuity as a business is probably older than that of any American manufacturer in our industry, and gives it a top seniority rating among American business enterprises of all kinds.

To compare its durability with that of the average member of its own business field, however, might be less than fair. In the apparel industry—beset by intense competition and frequency of style change—a good many new companies fall by the wayside.

The reason for our phenomenally long life and continued robustness is no secret. We have remained alive and have prospered because our founder, and those who succeeded him in responsibility, were always alert to change and had the ingenuity to set the pace for the industry.

Though the name was not to emerge in physical form until 20 years later, Sacony had its genesis in 1883, when Sidney Augstein arrived in New York on a steampacket. Behind him were three known generations who had developed the family business.

Earliest on record—though others may have preceded him—was Isaac Augstein (1762–1830). His son was Israel (1792–1870); his son was Adolph (1883–1889); and his son was Sidney.

Sidney's father had felt sure that America would give his products a warm welcome. Someone would have to go. Sidney was the logical man, for had he not turned a ripe 13 earlier that year? Could he assume a simple, normal responsibility of manhood only when he had become a decrepit 21? Sidney sailed.

But he didn't much like New York. It was too big, too hectic.

ON TO SAN FRANCISCO

A few months later, he entrained for the other side of the continent, another world away—San Francisco. He had some family ties there. It was at least as hectic as New York was, this raw frontier of a burgeoning nation, but he set up a sales agency for the Bohemian company. He hit the road with vigor, traveling the Pacific coast by the relatively primitive means then available.

The then young man prospered in the young world, and his success gave the Bohemian firm, already a century old, fresh impetus. But there was an obstacle. Shipments took months to arrive from the factory. There was first the tedious stretch from Bohemia to the sea, and then the weeks of sailing across the Atlantic. If the ship docked on the east coast, it meant another endlessly long haul by train on newly laid routes across the continent.

If the vessel went directly to California, it meant the marathon voyage around the Cape of Good Hope, at the southern tip of South America, then up the Pacific coasts of two continents.

The answer was obvious: An American factory.

It begain operating as the S. Augstein Textile Co. in San Francisco in 1890, and we consider that year, 73 years ago, to be the one to which our present form of existence dates back. Sidney Augstein was married in San Francisco, and there was born his son, Adolph M., first to bear the title of company president and now our board chairman.

BUSINESS GOOD

Business was good with the new manufacturer—so good that it was frustrating for its one-man management to have to do the selling on the road while, back at the factory, there was a sharp lack of skilled help to fill the orders he was sending back.

Eight years after he had gotten his American production off to such a promising start, Sidney Augstein wound up his affairs in San Francisco and took his family East—to Philadelphia. That was in 1898. But Philadelphia did not have it for him either, as he found out within 2 years, and by 1900 he had overcome his indifference to New York and was in business there. By 1905 it was S. Augstein & Co. of New York—to avoid confusion with the parent company in Europe—and to its founder the use of its initials was the most obvious abbreviation in the world.

Thus, Sacony.

At first, it was only a means of identifying the company quickly and easily—but its use as a brand-name quickly grew out of it.

The new symbol had a clear psychological effect, for it gave the company a fresh identity and a sort of "personality" for its fashions. Among the customers it had—and those it kept acquiring by its dependability of styling and quality—it helped to create a solid loyalty to the brand name, which consumers also shared in growing numbers. It became a symbol of meaning.

The manufacturing lines, too, had broadened. From fabrics, infants', children's and women's wear, they had spread to sweaters and bathing suits for all ages and sexes.

In 1907 came a significant event in the company's history, though it happened quietly. Sidney's son, Adolph M., had just turned 13 and there was to be no dawdling in his case, either. At that tender age, he became the fifth generation to enter the business. He went out on the road, selling. He went alone.

"I WENT ALONE"

"Of course I went alone," he recalls, with some surprise that the point should be raised. "It would have cost far too much to send someone with me. It took all of $10 a day to travel then."

In 1913, his father died, and the young man, not quite 20, took over as head of the business, though his mother and brother-in-law helped administer it. In that year, too, he made a decision which had been deferred for some time.

He yielded the interest he held in the parent company in Europe, in return for a clear title to the company his father had founded in America. (Luckily, too. The next year came World War I and Austria was overrun.)

Sacony was not indeed on its own.

It reached out for expanding markets again, and turned to the newer arts of sales promotion. It was among the handful of apparel manufacturers to pioneer in consumer advertising, and the Sacony name became more widely familiar.

In that part of the century, the Campbell Soup Co. had come up with a new advertising symbol that caught on rapidly—a pair of apple-cheeked youngsters called the Campbell Kids. They're still around.

The woman artist who created them was engaged to do as much for Sacony. She came up in 1914 with Sacony Sue and Sacony Sam, who were seen frequently in advertising, wearing Sacony apparel. This pair, too, became quickly identified with the company's styles.

(Mr. Augstein says the lady artist, using a mirror, was herself the model for the Campbell Kids. He recalls that he saw her once—and she and her Kids were identical.)

Thus Sacony continued through the post-World War I era to grow and sink its roots deeper into the fabric of public acceptance. But the late twenties, with its deepening economic crises around the world, brought des-

peration to European manufacturers, and they flooded this country with low-priced apparel, particularly children's wear.

FLEXIBILITY READY

American manufacturers, unable to cope with that kind of competition, foundered by hundreds. Sacony, unwilling to surrender, reached for its flexibility—and found it ready. It lead to an important and far-reaching decision. The company swung over to the women's knitted dress field, and the move proved one never to be regretted.

Sacony remained vital through the great depression of the thirties and continued to expand its line. By the early forties, it was one of the Nation's largest producers of women's suits.

Another milestone was reached by an agreement with the Goodall-Sanford Co., the creator of the high-prestige Palm Beach fabric, to become the exclusive manufacturer and distributor of Sacony Suits of Palm Beach for the women's and children's industry. Thus, Sacony and Palm Beach were merged on a label that came to be identified as America's best known brand of women's and girls' suits.

That critical personality development of our products was, of course, a goal not easily reached—but reached it has been.

One of the avenues leading to it was the development of special fabrics of high quality in our own mills. Among them have been the famed jersey, Sacony Ciella, and other fine knits. Another major contribution to reputation has been the tight techniques of quality control so painstakingly built into our manufacturing processes.

This combination of superior fabrics, outstanding design, and manufacturing integrity have not escaped the notice of either retailer or consumer. To them, Sacony products have grown to have top-rated acceptance.

A business cannot endure merely by manufacturing—which is a vacuum if its products are not distributed. To that second dynamic phase of our existence we have devoted vigorous efforts. Our merchandising operations are critical.

Several years ago, when we became persuaded that the leotard would catch on as a major new style, our first samples were met with cool caution by the buyers. They bought lightly—and skeptically.

Then, recalling our other experiences with successful promotions over the years, we packed the leotard in an attractive box. Its transparent cover was cut out in the shape of a girl wearing one of these garments. We called our product Susie Long Legs. The package caught on among the buyers at once, and production quickly fell behind the orders.

Now, to give our skills continuity of sound direction, we have the sixth generation of Augsteins joining at the helm. Our president since October 20, 1959, Sidney Augstein, is now 40 and is deeply immersed in Sacony's operations. In keeping with the trend of our times, he brings sound technical training to the substantial experience he has already acquired. After graduating from the Valley Forge Military College in Pennsylvania, he attended the Philadelphia Textile College, where he acquired a solid grounding in the most modern sciences related to textile and apparel manufacturing. He carries off with distinction the multiple burdens he has assumed.

Yes, our company has the years, but not the hardened arteries that often go with them. We remain—as a large company family made up of individuals—more flexible and supple than ever in our thinking, and our sights are trained on our century mark ahead.

We believe we can confidently envision greater growth and prosperity, with each member of the Sacony family sharing in that shining future.

Can We Afford a Tax Cut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a most timely essay has just been brought to my attention. It is entitled "Can We Afford a Tax Cut?" and was written by Mahon B. Garry, Jr., a senior student at Taylor High School, Taylor, Tex. This young man was just recently named one of the finalists in the National Merit Scholarship competition, and it was my privilege to give him a principal appointment to the U.S. Military Academy.

In my opinion, this essay is an excellent discussion of the problem of a tax cut, and I am sure that the Members of Congress will be interested in reading this essay.

The essay follows:

CAN WE AFFORD A TAX CUT?

Recently, the United States has been stirred by a controversy over a proposed tax cut. This cut, proposed by President Kennedy, has as its purpose stimulating business by reducing the corporate tax, by releasing more money for investment, and by increasing the purchasing power of the individual.

Some conservative leaders have denounced such a cut as economically unsound, because it would temporarily increase the national deficit. These men have a limited point, but, essentially, they are being penny wise and dollar foolish, because the United States would lose some $30 billion in the next 3 or 4 years from such a tax cut. This money, however, would not be lost to the Nation, but would be returned to the economy where it would help to build industry by increasing investment and retooling, and by increasing the individual's purchasing power, so that the inevitable increased production could be utilized. This money would increase corporate profits, and the increased tax gross from the increased profits would make for substantially more revenue in about 10 years than would be brought in by even a moderate tax increase.

Anyone who uses foresight and commonsense can see the positive advantages of a tax cut. Some of our older and more conservative leaders, however, feel that such a cut will be dangerous to the Government, because it will temporarily increase the national debt. They suggest that taxes should not be cut unless the budget is cut proportionally. However, these men have failed to make any concrete suggestions on where the budget should be cut. The reason for this is that there are few places where our present budget can be cut; defense has been slashed to the bone, cuts are impossible, further expenditures desirable; agriculture is in no state to support itself, withdrawal of Federal aid would cause a collapse on the farm and possibly a general depression; welfare might be cut some, but the solution to our unemployment problem is not to starve the unemployed; research and development need big increases, cuts are out of the question; foreign aid could be cut only at the risk of losing the rest of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to communism. Some saving might be made by administrative reform, but these would make no appreciable dent in the $30 billion estimated as our loss.

A tax cut which increased business and industrial activity would have another worthwhile benefit which is partially removed from Government finance. Business expansion would mean more jobs, more jobs would lower the unemployment figure, and more people would have money to spend. More money would mean higher corporate profits. Higher corporate profits mean more expansion, more expansion means more jobs, and the spiral continues until a labor shortage slows it down. This has happened in the European Common Market. It can easily happen in America.

This tax cut issue has produced, as a sidelight, a real paradox in American politics. The liberals, who have often been referred to as antibusiness and Socialists, have initiated a tax cut plan which has only one purpose, to stimulate business, while the conservatives, who often have advocated the complete abolition of the income tax, now oppose such a cut vehemently.

In summary, a tax cut would create a temporary deficit, but this would be made up in 10 years by the stimulation to the economy. In ten years business would be booming, and the United States would be entering a new period of prosperity. Such happenings are not, of course, inevitable, but all the facts point to them. Faced with such facts, the American public should ask, not "Can we afford to cut taxes?" but "Can we afford not to cut taxes?"

Connecticut Shares in Important Anniversary of Greek Orthodox Church of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is a great stirring in the interest of unity among Christians throughout the world, I believe that it is appropriate for this House to take notice of an anniversary which is a significant one for an important part of the church of Christ.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Seminary of the Greek Orthodox Church of the United States. I am proud to say that my own State of Connecticut shares in this anniversary in an important way, because it was in Pomfret, Conn., that the seminary was established. This is the wellspring from which have come the American-trained clergy to serve the faithful of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America.

In 1947 the seminary was transferred from Connecticut to Brookline, Mass., where presently it has a student body of 80 young men, with a faculty of 20.

Until the founding of the seminary, the million and a quarter persons who comprise the Greek Archdiocese depended on the Patriarchal Seminary of Constantinople and on the Theological School of the University of Athens for their clergymen.

The need for American-trained Orthodox clergymen became increasingly acute, until, in 1937, a tract of land and buildings were acquired in Pomfret, under the leadership of the then Archbishop Athenagoras of North and South America, now ecumenical patriarch of

the Greek-Eastern Orthodox Church and first recognized among all equals of the rank at Istanbul, Turkey. The first dean appointed was another Athenagoras, the late Athenagoras Cavvadas, bishop of Boston and later archbishop of England and central Europe.

In its 25 years of service to God, the seminary has graduated 264 students, of whom 225 have been ordained as priests of the Greek Orthodox Church, and are now serving the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. More than one-third of the graduates have received further degrees from colleges, universities and theological schools.

The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, which they serve, has 380 churches in its judisdiction, in nearly all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. There are 14 churches of the archdiocese in my own State of Connecticut.

The zeal and the pioneer spirit in education, religion, and in patriotism, of the two holy men who were the founders of the Greek Orthodox Seminary, and all of those who were associated with them and who assisted them through the past quarter of a century have made possible a rich contribution to the religious and cultural life of the people in our own State and in our own country as well as all of the Western World.

The 30th Anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, March 31, 1963, marks the 30th anniversary of one of President Roosevelt's first and most important domestic programs—the Civilian Conservation Corps. April 17 will note the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the first CCC camp—in the George Washington National Forest, near Luray, Va.

These two anniversary dates take on additional significance this year because during the first part of April the House will consider and, I certainly hope, pass legislation establishing a Youth Conservation Corps.

This proposal, part of President Kennedy's overall program to do something positive to remedy the continuing problem of youth unemployment, is modeled on the CCC experience. As a former educational director of the unique and renowned CCC, I believe I can speak with some authority, and I think with justifiable pride, of some of its accomplishments.

For the 3 million young men enrolled in the program, the CCC provided—in camps located in every State and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—shelter, clothing, good food, and wholesome and healthful surroundings. But far more important, it proffered the individual stimulus and discipline, and not infrequently the incentive needed by many of those depressed young men of the thirties to seek and to acquire more in the way of formal education.

At is termination on June 30, 1942, the CCC could review with pride its record of achievements in conserving our natural resources. Three million acres of trees had been planted, 4 million acres of wooded land cleared, 8 million acres of forest lands freed of insect pests and tree diseases. Through the building of dams and other conservation facilities, other millions of acres of grassland had been saved from erosion. In addition, and directly attributable to the efforts of the CCC, picnic facilities, fishing areas, and other recreational sites had been improved, and a better environment provided for our wildlife.

Again today there is a critical need for similar work in our national parks, forests, and other public areas. This has been evidenced most vividly by the testimony of the numerous witnesses appearing in support of the Youth Employment Act of 1963 before the House General Subcommittee on Education. Our backlog of conservation projects is astounding. Included on the list of things to be accomplished are such diversified undertakings as reforestation of public and private lands, timber stand improvements, fish and wildlife and western rangeland works, the development of parks and recreational lands and the construction of access roads, and soil and watershed conservation. To bring these programs in line with our present needs, we would have to spend a total of $12.2 billion.

But what strikes me as being even more detrimental to the welfare of this great country is the present unemployment situation which is forcing 1 million of our young people who are out of school and out of work to remain unemployed. The alarming figures indicating a serious upswing in the high school dropout and the juvenile delinquency rates have a direct and most pertinent relationship to the incredibly high proportion of youth unemployment. Indeed, this Nation seems to be again experiencing some of the social maladjustment which appeared during the bleak depression days.

The excellent work in reviewing the YCC legislation performed by the General Subcommittee on Labor under the able leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], both in 1961 and in 1962, can atone only in part for the indifference and neglect of years in trying to meet the snowballing problem of youth unemployment. The years of procrastination since the first Youth Corps bills were introduced in 1950 visit upon us all a guilt which can only be eradicated by our swift response to duty and necessity in this year 1963.

In 1933 the CCC legislation was introduced in the Congress on March 21, and just 10 days later President Roosevelt signed the bill into law.[1] Now no one contends that the current economic situation, serious as it is, compares with the dark days of the thirties, nor does anyone advocate such extraordinary legislative speed. In the 1930's with the whole of society out of focus, the immediacy of the need was obvious. Today's problem of youth unemployment is glossed over by the apparent general prosperity the country is experiencing. We look at the Nation with our sunglasses of affluence, and everything seems lush and green with promise. But the pockets of structural unemployment and the almost total elimination of unskilled labor may erupt into a serious national crisis. The need for palliative measures is only too evident to those of us from distressed areas.

No one considering the attempts over the past several years to alleviate this potentially explosive situation by establishing a Youth Corps would regard the record of the Congress with any feeling of pride, nor would one view it as a model for future emulation. If anything, it is but a lesson in persistency on the part of the realistic and informed.

It is fitting, however, on this anniversary occasion, to review briefly the history of the dedicated efforts which have been made in the Congress to aid our Nation's unemployed youth.

In the 2d session of the 81st Congress—1950—four proposals to revive the CCC spirit were introduced in the House and one in the Senate.[2] No action was taken on the Senate bill, and the House action was limited to a second referral of three of the four bills from the Committee on Education and Labor to the Committee on Public Lands. On June 27, 1950, this country entered into the Korean conflict, negating, at least for a time, any need for a program such as the YCC.

In the 1st session of the 85th Congress—1957—a bill entitled the "Youth Conservation Act of 1957" was introduced in both the House and the Senate,[3] but no action was taken on either proposal.

Two years later, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress—1959—14 bills relating to the establishment of a YCC were introduced in the House,[4] and in the 2nd session—1960—8 more bills were submitted.[5] Again, although 2 days of hearings were held, no action was taken.[6] The Senate story for the 86th Congress was somewhat different. Senator HUMPHREY and 20 others introduced S. 812, providing for the creation of a YCC.[7] After hearings by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the bill was reported out, with amendments, on July 20, 1959.[8] On August 13, by a rollcall vote of 47 to 45,[9] the Senate passed S. 812. The 45 supporting Democrats were joined by 2 Republicans, whereas 15 Democrats and 30 Republicans opposed the measure.[10] This Senate bill was then referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor,[11] where it died.

In the 87th Congress—1961–62—some legislative progress was made though neither the House nor the Senate actually voted on the YCC proposal. Twenty-one bills were introduced in the House during the first session.[12] Hearings were held on H.R. 7536, the administration bill. The General Subcommittee

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

on Labor, under the excellent guidance of the chairman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], reported out a clean bill (H.R. 8854) on August 2, 1961.[13] The House Committee on Rules, however, took no action.[14]

As reported, H.R. 8354 not only contained recommendations comparable to those in the legislation now proposed in H.R. 1890 and in my bill H.R. 1, but also included provisions for an on-the-job training program. These latter suggestions were subsequently incorporated into the Manpower Development and Training Act. Thus, the House Committee on Education and Labor once again reported the bill, this time as H.R. 10682.[15] The House Committee on Rules still refused to take action.[16]

In September 1962 several of us attempted to bring H.R. 10682 to the House floor under the Calendar Wednesday procedure. After some hours taken up with rollcalls, quorum calls, and a demand for the reading of the House Journal, we had to abandon our efforts[17] in behalf of the YCC in the House.

In the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY and 22 of his colleagues cosponsored S. 404 early in the 1st session of the 87th Congress.[18] Later, in June, Senator HUMPHREY sponsored the administration bill, S. 2036.[19] Hearings were held on both bills, and S. 404 was reported, with amendments, by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.[20] The Senate, however, did not vote on S. 404, because, as Senator HUMPHREY then stated:

> The policy committee of the Senate has approved S. 404 for action, but * * * we want to make sure that this time we are going to have the cooperation of the other body that the bill will become law, and that we will not be engaged in a mere exercise in legislative processing.[21]

This brief legislative chronology of our efforts to establish a YCC program brings us to the present—to the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

As of mid-March, 36 bills had been introduced in the House. Also, the House Committee on Education and Labor had scheduled and completed hearings on the YCC proposals in the General Subcommittee on Education, under the able leadership of my good friend and distinguished colleague, CARL PERKINS of Kentucky. Congressman PERKINS, after the recommendations of his committee had been approved, submitted a revised administration bill, H.R. 5131.

In the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY was joined by 34 of his fellow Senators in support of the administration bill, S. 1. Last week the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare favorably reported S. 1, after public hearings very similar to those held by Mr. PERKINS' House committee. Today, the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will meet in executive session to vote on reporting this measure.

I am sure that many of my colleagues here in the House join me in urging our colleagues in the Senate committee to favorably report S. 1, so that President Kennedy's wish to have this bill on his desk about the time of the Easter recess will be fulfilled.

---

[1] S. 598, 73d, introduced on Mar. 21, 1933, by Senators Robinson, of Arkansas, and Wagner, of New York; reported by the Committee on Education and Labor (with an amendment in the nature of a substitute) on March 23; passed the Senate on March 28; passed the House, amended, on March 29; again considered in the Senate, which concurred in the House amendment on March 30, and signed into law on Mar. 31, 1933. Became Public Law 5 (48 Stat. 22): (77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 652, 853, 937, 995, 1013, and 1102).

[2] S. 3144 introduced by Senators Murray, of Montana; Thomas, of Utah; Pepper, of Florida; Green, of Rhode Island; Kilgore, of West Virgina; Taylor, of Idaho; Humphrey, of Minnesota; Neely, of West Virginia; and Lehman, of New York.

[3] S. 871 by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and H.R. 4618 by Representative ROOSEVELT, of California.

[4] H.R. 425 (Roosevelt, of California), 3709 (Blatnik, of Minnesota), 3744 (Pfost, of Idaho), 4247 (Addonizio, of New Jersey), 4462 (Rabaut, of Michigan), 4516 (Miller, of California), 4651 (Roosevelt, of California), 5188 (Diggs, of Michigan), 5856 (Boyle, of Illinois), 7686 (Stratton, of New York), 7777 (Kee, of West Virginia), 7831 (Toll, of Pennsylvania), 8303 (Sikes, of Florida), and 8404 (Perkins, of Kentucky).

[5] H.R. 9334 (Kasem, of California), 9767 (Doyle, of California), 9704 (Bailey, of West Virginia), 10057 (Holland, of Pennsylvania), 10691 (Murphy, of Illinois), 11072 (Daniels, of New Jersey), 11715 (Green, of Oregon), and 12086 (Fulton, of Pennsylvania).

[6] Hearings were held on April 20–21, 1960, but apparently not printed.

[7] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1317. Cosponsors included Senators Murray, of Montana; Byrd of West Virginia; Church, of Idaho; Gruening, of Alaska; Hart, of Michigan; Hennings, of Missouri; Jackson, of Washington; Johnston, of South Carolina; Langer, of North Dakota; Magnuson, of Washington; Mansfield, of Montana; McCarthy, of Minnesota; Morse, of Oregon; Moss, of Utah; Neuberger, of Oregon; Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Randolph, of West Virginia; Yarborouth, of Texas; Cannon, of Nevada; and Carroll, of Colorado.

[8] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 13753.

[9] Ibid, at p. 15792–15793.

[10] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 15793; 1959 C. Q. Almanac, p. 433.

[11] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 15916.

[12] H.R. 110 (KEE of West Virginia); 268 (ROOSEVELT, of California); 272 (ULLMAN, of Oregon); 363 (GREEN, of Oregon); 600 (ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin); 1089 (STRATTON, of New York); 2375 (ADDONIZIO, of New Jersey); 3256 (DANIELS, of New Jersey); 3327 (MULTER of New York); 4002 (PFOST, of Idaho); 4158 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); 4264 (PUCINSKI, of Illinois); 4531 (O'HARA, of Illinois); 4971 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); 5004 (HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania); 5167 (ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois); 5418 (TOLL, of Pennsylvania); 5586 (SLACK, of West Virginia); 6039 (DIGGS, of Michigan); H.R. 7536 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); and 7541 (BLATNIK, of Minnesota).

[13] H. Rept. No. 833, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Aug. 2, 1961; 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 14369.

[14] 1962 C. Q. Almanac, p. 228.

[15] H. Rept. No. 1540, 87th Cong., 2d sess., March 29, 1962; 108 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5019 (daily edition).

[16] Supra, fn. 15.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Cosponsors included Senators RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; BYRD, of West Virginia; BURDICK, of North Dakota; CANNON, of Nevada; CARROLL of Colorado; CLARK of Pennsylvania; CHURCH, of Idaho; GRUENING, of Alaska; HART, of Michigan; JACKSON, of Washington; LONG, of Hawaii; LONG, of Mussouri; MAGNUSON, of Washington; MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; METCALF, of Montana, MORSE, of Oregon; MOSS, of Utah; NEUBERGER, of Oregon; PELL, of Rhode Island; WILLIAMS, of New Jersey; YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

[19] 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9698.

[20] S. Rept. No. 976, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Sept. 12, 1961; 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 18986.

[21] 108 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 13745 (daily edition), July 25, 1962.

Responsibility: An Escape and an Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have had the opportunity to expose to the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the perceptive thoughts of my good friend, Frank McCallister, professor at Roosevelt University in Chicago, and a very literate spokesman for, among other things, the interest and viewpoint of SANE.

More than that he is a philosopher who seeks to understand and hopes to kindle a spark of awareness in his fellow man who, in his mind, is paying little attention or regard in the progress of man toward his apparent destiny.

In his continuing dialog with me, from time to time he brings to my attention articles that should be given wider distribution, particularly to those who exercise the responsibility of leadership. One such article appeared in a current issue of Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists entitled "Responsibility: An Escape and an Approach" by Warren E. Olson. I highly commend this article to my colleagues and those other readers of the RECORD who will find this more than of passing interest.

The article follows:

RESPONSIBILITY: AN ESCAPE AND AN APPROACH

(By Warren E. Olson)

"In the one case, my state of indecision is resolved by forces external and invisible to me, which limit my activity as well as my immediate consciousness of it—that is, my will—to a single course; that is the way in which the indeterminate state of the plant is resolved. But in the other case it is I myself, independent and free from the influence of all outward forces, who put an end to my state of indecision and determine my own course according to the knowledge I have freely attained of what is best."—Johann Gottlieb Fichte, "Vocation of Man". Despite statements by such diverse figures as Norman Cousins, Herman Kahn, Harrison Brown, and former President Eisenhower concerning the imminence of a third world war, the unspeakable toll of lives such a war would entail, and the probability of killing untold millions who have no part in the East-West quarrel, recent surveys indicate that few Americans are deeply troubled by the threat of a thermonuclear

holocaust. One is immediately forced to ask, "Why? How could men fail to be concerned with so momentous an issue?" A comprehensive answer to this complex question would undoubtedly involve many avenues of exploration and explanation. However, what may be a major factor behind American indifference is reflected in what people say when confronted with the realities of the situation: "What can I do about it? I am powerless to change the tide of events. I don't make the crucial decisions. I am merely affected by them." Here we find a declaration of the modern impotence, the disclaimer of personal responsibility which appears to be characteristic of men in a mass society. In adopting this position, the individual says, in effect, that it would be psychologically unbearable to concern himself with possible horrors over which he has no control; thus he is indifferent and apathetic.

However, if the individual denies that he is personally responsible, that he is not somehow accountable or answerable for certain events, then something or somebody else must bear the burden of responsibility. Shifting the locus of responsibility involves placing it in ever more abstract entities, a practice quite consistent with the increasingly hierarchical, bureaucratic structure of modern society. Thus, the most inclusive collectivity, the state, comes to be viewed as the instrumentality which must be held accountable. However, the net effect of holding the state responsible is to assert that the state is an organism, a being capable of expressing its will in decisions and of maintaining the stance of accountability for its actions. As an organism, the state is unitary; no distinct line of demarcation can be drawn between the parts and the whole. Whatever happens to the state affects all the parts equally; concomitantly, whatever the state does is a result of the parts acting in concert. Since all members of the organism, the state, are equally accountable for what the state does, it follows that no one member may be singled out for censure or praise. If all are responsible, no one is. Thus, the concept of collective responsibility emerges, and its great utility lies in affording the individual a rationale for disclaiming personal responsibility for events which are apparently outside the area of his control.

While most of us might deny the preceding as constituting our theoretical position, nonetheless we use it as a justification when we do not wish to be held personally responsible for something the state has done. To be sure, not all disclaimers of responsibility take this form, but since the nature of modern society reinforces and institutionalizes the concept of collective responsibility, invoking it tends to become the rule rather the exception. Thus, Adolf Eichmann's plea that he was only acting under orders in handling the "Jewish problem" and should not be found guilty of genocide is a perfect case in point, for it symbolizes contemporary man's rationalization of personal responsibility.

The primary reason for the escape from personal responsibility lies, I believe, in modern man's tendency to view himself as an object, and its ultimate effect will be destruction of the human community. If a meaningful approach to personal responsibility is to be attained, the individual must adopt a different perspective and experience himself as an agent, in which case the concept of responsibility must be amplified and conceived as a moral ideal. If men become aware of themselves as active, moving forces, the ideal of human community may be achieved.

The tendency to view oneself as an object, a passive, relatively inert instrument propelled by forces over which one has no control, is itself a product of various factors which have been of decisive importance in molding the 20th century mind and society. Karl Marx astutely singled out the role industrial capitalism plays when he asserted that the worker is forced to become a commodity and is dehumanized in the process. Being a commodity culminates in the individual's awareness of himself as a commodity, says Erich Fromm, who sees the dominant character type of our era as that of a marketing orientation, as the kind of person who is dedicated to selling himself on the personality market, much as he might vend caddy carts or Cadillacs. He sees himself as a piece of goods, and although he has some discretionary control over the packaging and trademark, his success depends largely on the reactions of others. He is a product in more than one sense of the term. Reinforcing this concept of the self, is one of the most decisive intellectual developments of modern times, namely, science.

The scientific enterprise rests upon the assumption that every event must be preceded by a cause or causes. The law of casuality or scientific determinism has become an invariable presupposition of the modern mind and has been extended to practically every area of experience in which man has interested himself. Thus, following the lead of the physical sciences, the social or behavioral sciences were quick to adopt mechanistic explanations of individual and institutional behavior, explanations based on studies in which the individual could be viewed only as an object. Psychologists and sociologists have tried to formulate laws expressing the relationship between the individual and his present and past environments, and between the social group or institution and its antecedents. Economists and political scientists have used comparable techniques of study, and the historian, particularly if he embraces some form of economic determinism, has often viewed man in relation to the tidal wave of forces working through history. Even the novelist has come to see and to characterize man as a hapless bit of protoplasm pushed, pulled, and crowded by the forces of society and human nature. Of utmost consequence in each of these attempts to describe man and his strange ways is that he is looked upon as the product of forces working upon him. The dominant impression arising from such analyses is that the individual is powerless, lacking in efficacy, and basically unable to do anything but respond to the pressures which surround him.

Given the extent to which this view of man has been accepted in our society and given the confusion of a man who is looking for answers in a world gone sour, is it any wonder that he sees himself as he has been depicted; that he accepts as constituting the very stuff of human reality, answers based on a way of studying human behavior? In short, I am suggesting that the individual's awareness of himself is squeezed and drained, then replaced by a self-image not very far removed from the social scientist's view of man.

THEORY OVER FACT

But there is a corollary factor to be considered; namely, the degree to which modern man has sought to bring everything within his purview under the control of reason. In a most provocative essay entitled "To the End of Thought" (the Cambridge Review, Nov. 4, 1955) Jack Jones claims that the rise of totalitarianism in the modern world can be attributed largely to man's desire to make everything conform to reason, to emphasize theory at the expense of facts. The Soviet rewriting of history and the Lysenko controversy over genetics, or the degree to which many Americans preferred to believe the commentary accompanying the movie "Operation Abolition" rather than to trust their own visual experience are examples of the victory of theory over fact. In short, Jones says, modern man has become increasingly distrustful of facts, and when distrust is converted to repugnance, when the ideology reigns unfettered, the supremely rational totalitarian state is just around the corner.

The revelance of Jones' essay to this discussion is simply this: Man's externalization of himself in objective form is magnified when the theory that the individual is only the product of impersonal forces replaces man's trust in his own concrete experience. When he concludes that his consciousness of being free is only an illusion not to be trusted, what alternative has he but to resign his fate to the working of destiny? As a result he becomes passive, acquiescent, inert, and responds only to the pressures of the state, the organization, and the weather. Such a man has, in fact, forfeited his status as an agent in the world.

The advent of the mass society must also be recognized as contributing to the individual's passivity and escape from personal responsibility. When society becomes rationalized, when social control is effected through official bureaucracies for more and more areas of life, when the citizen is summed up by holes punched in an IBM card, the concept of the human being becomes statistical, abstract, and depersonalized. The mass media of communication accept and reinforce this concept by presenting the individual with a manufactured self-image which he comes to substitute for a concrete awareness of his identity. He is told who he is, what he wants to be, how to get that way, and how to feel that way even when he is not. "Further," says C. Wright Mills in "The Power Elite," "the mass man loses his independence, and more importantly, he loses the desire to be independent: in fact, he does not have hold of the idea of being an independent individual with his own mind and his own worked-out way of life."

The extreme example of this nascent tendency is described by Bruno Bettelheim in his book, "The Informed Heart." In the Nazi concentration camps the goal of the SS was to dehumanize the individual and destroy his sense of identity; to make him a pliable, barely reactive mechanism. The end products of this rationalized tyranny were the so-called Muslims, the walking dead who were no longer human beings. While we do not approximate this condition, the example is nonetheless instructive, for when man is consciously aware of himself as an object—a thing—he is quite unable to recognize himself as the author of his own actions and to that extent has forfeited his humanity.

And how does the mass man view responsibility? What can he do other than deny his responsibility, except for the more trivial choices he may make? If he is merely the product of social forces, he is quite powerless to resist encroachments upon his privacy, his civil liberties, and his mind. If society has made him, society is to blame for whatever happens to him. Society, officially embodied in the state, is responsible and yet no individual can be, for the individual is a powerless particle caught up in the whirling vortex of the state's tornadic path through history. Under such conditions, reasons the mass man, responsibility must be collective rather than personal.

Those who assert this position do so as a defense against the intolerable idea that the self is not a passive object, that the individual can be an agent in his world. Instead of a one-way road into the unknown, he prefers the safety and security of the town square where he can embrace the anonymity which mingling with his fellows offers. But, as Bettelheim says of concentration camp prisoners, "such defenses, aimed at retaining self-respect by denying all guilt, actually weakened the prisoners' personalities; by blaming outside forces on their

on Labor, under the excellent guidance of the chairman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], reported out a clean bill (H.R. 8354) on August 2, 1961.[13] The House Committee on Rules, however, took no action.[14]

As reported, H.R. 8354 not only contained recommendations comparable to those in the legislation now proposed in H.R. 1890 and in my bill H.R. 1, but also included provisions for an on-the-job training program. These latter suggestions were subsequently incorporated into the Manpower Development and Training Act. Thus, the House Committee on Education and Labor once again reported the bill, this time as H.R. 10682.[15] The House Committee on Rules still refused to take action.[16]

In September 1962 several of us attempted to bring H.R. 10682 to the House floor under the Calendar Wednesday procedure. After some hours taken up with rollcalls, quorum calls, and a demand for the reading of the House Journal, we had to abandon our efforts[17] in behalf of the YCC in the House.

In the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY and 22 of his colleagues cosponsored S. 404 early in the 1st session of the 87th Congress.[18] Later, in June, Senator HUMPHREY sponsored the administration bill, S. 2036.[19] Hearings were held on both bills, and S. 404 was reported, with amendments, by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.[20] The Senate, however, did not vote on S. 404, because, as Senator HUMPHREY then stated:

> The policy committee of the Senate has approved S. 404 for action, but * * * we want to make sure that this time we are going to have the cooperation of the other body that the bill will become law, and that we will not be engaged in a mere exercise in legislative processing.[21]

This brief legislative chronology of our efforts to establish a YCC program brings us to the present—to the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

As of mid-March, 36 bills had been introduced in the House. Also, the House Committee on Education and Labor had scheduled and completed hearings on the YCC proposals in the General Subcommittee on Education, under the able leadership of my good friend and distinguished colleague, CARL PERKINS of Kentucky. Congressman PERKINS, after the recommendations of his committee had been approved, submitted a revised administration bill, H.R. 5131.

In the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY was joined by 34 of his fellow Senators in support of the administration bill, S. 1. Last week the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare favorably reported S. 1, after public hearings very similar to those held by Mr. PERKINS' House committee. Today, the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will meet in executive session to vote on reporting this measure.

I am sure that many of my colleagues here in the House join me in urging our colleagues in the Senate committee to favorably report S. 1, so that President Kennedy's wish to have this bill on his desk about the time of the Easter recess will be fulfilled.

---

[1] S. 598, 73d, introduced on Mar. 21, 1933, by Senators Robinson, of Arkansas, and Wagner, of New York; reported by the Committee on Education and Labor (with an amendment in the nature of a substitute) on March 23; passed the Senate on March 28; passed the House, amended, on March 29; again considered in the Senate, which concurred in the House amendment on March 30, and signed into law on Mar. 31, 1933. Became Public Law 5 (48 Stat. 22). (77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 652, 853, 937, 995, 1013, and 1102).

[2] S. 3144 introduced by Senators Murray, of Montana; Thomas, of Utah; Pepper, of Florida; Green, of Rhode Island; Kilgore, of West Virgina; Taylor, of Idaho; Humphrey, of Minnesota; Neely, of West Virginia; and Lehman, of New York.

[3] S. 871 by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and H.R. 4618 by Representative ROOSEVELT, of California.

[4] H.R. 425 (Roosevelt, of California), 3709 (Blatnik, of Minnesota), 3744 (Pfost, of Idaho), 4247 (Addonizio, of New Jersey), 4462 (Rabaut, of Michigan), 4516 (Miller, of California), 4651 (Roosevelt, of California), 5188 (Diggs, of Michigan), 5856 (Boyle, of Illinois), 7686 (Stratton, of New York), 7777 (Kee, of West Virginia), 7831 (Toll, of Pennsylvania), 8303 (Sikes, of Florida), and 8404 (Perkins, of Kentucky).

[5] H.R. 9334 (Kasem, of California), 9767 (Doyle, of California), 9704 (Bailey, of West Virginia), 10057 (Holland, of Pennsylvania), 10691 (Murphy, of Illinois), 11072 (Daniels, of New Jersey), 11715 (Green, of Oregon), and 12086 (Fulton, of Pennsylvania).

[6] Hearings were held on April 20–21, 1960, but apparently not printed.

[7] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1317. Cosponsors included Senators Murray, of Montana; Byrd of West Virginia; Church, of Idaho; Gruening, of Alaska; Hart, of Michigan; Hennings, of Missouri; Jackson, of Washington; Johnston, of South Carolina; Langer, of North Dakota; Magnuson, of Washington; Mansfield, of Montana; McCarthy, of Minnesota; Morse, of Oregon; Moss, of Utah; Neuberger, of Oregon; Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Randolph, of West Virginia; Yarborouth, of Texas; Cannon, of Nevada; and Carroll, of Colorado.

[8] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 13753.

[9] Ibid, at p. 15792–15793.

[10] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 15793; 1959 C. Q. Almanac, p. 433.

[11] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 15916.

[12] H.R. 110 (KEE of West Virginia); 268 (ROOSEVELT, of California); 272 (ULLMAN, of Oregon); 363 (GREEN, of Oregon); 600 (ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin); 1089 (STRATTON, of New York); 2375 (ADDONIZIO, of New Jersey); 3256 (DANIELS, of New Jersey); 3327 (MULTER of New York); 4002 (PFOST, of Idaho); 4158 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); 4264 (PUCINSKI, of Illinois); 4531 (O'HARA, of Illinois); 4971 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); 5004 (HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania); 5167 (ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois); 5418 (TOLL, of Pennsylvania); 5586 (SLACK, of West Virginia); 6039 (DIGGS, of Michigan); H.R. 7536 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); and 7541 (BLATNIK, of Minnesota).

[13] H. Rept. No. 833, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Aug. 2, 1961; 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 14369.

[14] 1962 C. Q. Almanac, p. 228.

[15] H. Rept. No. 1540, 87th Cong., 2d sess., March 29, 1962; 108 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5019 (daily edition).

[16] Supra, fn. 15.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Cosponsors included Senators RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; BYRD, of West Virginia; BURDICK, of North Dakota; CANNON, of Nevada; CARROLL of Colorado; CLARK of Pennsylvania; CHURCH, of Idaho; GRUENING, of Alaska; HART, of Michigan; JACKSON, of Washington; LONG, of Hawaii; LONG, of Mussouri; MAGNUSON, of Washington; MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; METCALF, of Montana, MORSE, of Oregon; MOSS, of Utah; NEUBERGER, of Oregon; PELL, of Rhode Island; WILLIAMS, of New Jersey; YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

[19] 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9698.

[20] S. Rept. No. 976, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Sept. 12, 1961; 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 18986.

[21] 108 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 13745 (daily edition), July 25, 1962.

Responsibility: An Escape and an Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have had the opportunity to expose to the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the perceptive thoughts of my good friend, Frank McCallister, professor at Roosevelt University in Chicago, and a very literate spokesman for, among other things, the interest and viewpoint of SANE.

More than that he is a philosopher who seeks to understand and hopes to kindle a spark of awareness in his fellow man who, in his mind, is paying little attention or regard in the progress of man toward his apparent destiny.

In his continuing dialog with me, from time to time he brings to my attention articles that should be given wider distribution, particularly to those who exercise the responsibility of leadership. One such article appeared in a current issue of Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists entitled "Responsibility: An Escape and an Approach" by Warren E. Olson. I highly commend this article to my colleagues and those other readers of the RECORD who will find this more than of passing interest.

The article follows:

RESPONSIBILITY: AN ESCAPE AND AN APPROACH

(By Warren E. Olson)

"In the one case, my state of indecision is resolved by forces external and invisible to me, which limit my activity as well as my immediate consciousness of it—that is, my will—to a single course; that is the way in which the indeterminate state of the plant is resolved. But in the other case it is I myself, independent and free from the influence of all outward forces, who put an end to my state of indecision and determine my own course according to the knowledge I have freely attained of what is best."—Johann Gottleib Fichte, "Vocation of Man". Despite statements by such diverse figures as Norman Cousins, Herman Kahn, Harrison Brown, and former President Eisenhower concerning the imminence of a third world war, the unspeakable toll of lives such a war would entail, and the probability of killing untold millions who have no part in the East-West quarrel, recent surveys indicate that few Americans are deeply troubled by the threat of a thermonuclear

holocaust. One is immediately forced to ask, "Why? How could men fail to be concerned with so momentous an issue?" A comprehensive answer to this complex question would undoubtedly involve many avenues of exploration and explanation. However, what may be a major factor behind American indifference is reflected in what people say when confronted with the realities of the situation: "What can I do about it? I am powerless to change the tide of events. I don't make the crucial decisions. I am merely affected by them." Here we find a declaration of the modern impotence, the disclaimer of personal responsibility which appears to be characteristic of men in a mass society. In adopting this position, the individual says, in effect, that it would be psychologically unbearable to concern himself with possible horrors over which he has no control; thus he is indifferent and apathetic.

However, if the individual denies that he is personally responsible, that he is not somehow accountable or answerable for certain events, then something or somebody else must bear the burden of responsibility. Shifting the locus of responsibility involves placing it in ever more abstract entities, a practice quite consistent with the increasingly hierarchical, bureaucratic structure of modern society. Thus, the most inclusive collectivity, the state, comes to be viewed as the instrumentality which must be held accountable. However, the net effect of holding the state responsible is to assert that the state is an organism, a being capable of expressing its will in decisions and of maintaining the stance of accountability for its actions. As an organism, the state is unitary; no distinct line of demarcation can be drawn between the parts and the whole. Whatever happens to the state affects all the parts equally; concomitantly, whatever the state does is a result of the parts acting in concert. Since all members of the organism, the state, are equally accountable for what the state does, it follows that no one member may be singled out for censure or praise. If all are responsible, no one is. Thus, the concept of collective responsibility emerges, and its great utility lies in affording the individual a rationale for disclaiming personal responsibility for events which are apparently outside the area of his control.

While most of us might deny the preceding as constituting our theoretical position, nonetheless we use it as a justification when we do not wish to be held personally responsible for something the state has done. To be sure, not all disclaimers of responsibility take this form, but since the nature of modern society reinforces and institutionalizes the concept of collective responsibility, invoking it tends to become the rule rather the exception. Thus, Adolf Eichmann's plea that he was only acting under orders in handling the "Jewish problem" and should not be found guilty of genocide is a perfect case in point, for it symbolizes contemporary man's rationalization of personal responsibility.

The primary reason for the escape from personal responsibility lies, I believe, in modern man's tendency to view himself as an object, and its ultimate effect will be destruction of the human community. If a meaningful approach to personal responsibility is to be attained, the individual must adopt a different perspective and experience himself as an agent, in which case the concept of responsibility must be amplified and conceived as a moral ideal. If men become aware of themselves as active, moving forces, the ideal of human community may be achieved.

The tendency to view oneself as an object, a passive, relatively inert instrument propelled by forces over which one has no control, is itself a product of various factors which have been of decisive importance in molding the 20th century mind and society. Karl Marx astutely singled out the role industrial capitalism plays when he asserted that the worker is forced to become a commodity and is dehumanized in the process. Being a commodity culminates in the individual's awareness of himself as a commodity, says Erich Fromm, who sees the dominant character type of our era as that of a marketing orientation, as the kind of person who is dedicated to selling himself on the personality market, much as he might vend caddy carts or Cadillacs. He sees himself as a piece of goods, and although he has some discretionary control over the packaging and trademark, his success depends largely on the reactions of others. He is a product in more than one sense of the term. Reinforcing this concept of the self, is one of the most decisive intellectual developments of modern times, namely, science.

The scientific enterprise rests upon the assumption that every event must be preceded by a cause or causes. The law of casuality or scientific determinism has become an invariable presupposition of the modern mind and has been extended to practically every area of experience in which man has interested himself. Thus, following the lead of the physical sciences, the social or behavioral sciences were quick to adopt mechanistic explanations of individual and institutional behavior, explanations based on studies in which the individual could be viewed only as an object. Psychologists and sociologists have tried to formulate laws expressing the relationship between the individual and his present and past environments, and between the social group or institution and its antecedents. Economists and political scientists have used comparable techniques of study, and the historian, particularly if he embraces some form of economic determinism, has often viewed man in relation to the tidal wave of forces working through history. Even the novelist has come to see and to characterize man as a hapless bit of protoplasm pushed, pulled, and crowded by the forces of society and human nature. Of utmost consequence in each of these attempts to describe man and his strange ways is that he is looked upon as the product of forces working upon him. The dominant impression arising from such analyses is that the individual is powerless, lacking in efficacy, and basically unable to do anything but respond to the pressures which surround him.

Given the extent to which this view of man has been accepted in our society and given the confusion of a man who is looking for answers in a world gone sour, is it any wonder that he sees himself as he has been depicted; that he accepts as constituting the very stuff of human reality, answers based on a way of studying human behavior? In short, I am suggesting that the individual's awareness of himself is squeezed and drained, then replaced by a self-image not very far removed from the social scientist's view of man.

THEORY OVER FACT

But there is a corollary factor to be considered; namely, the degree to which modern man has sought to bring everything within his purview under the control of reason. In a most provocative essay entitled "To the End of Thought" (the Cambridge Review, Nov. 4, 1955) Jack Jones claims that the rise of totalitarianism in the modern world can be attributed largely to man's desire to make everything conform to reason, to emphasize theory at the expense of facts. The Soviet rewriting of history and the Lysenko controversy over genetics, or the degree to which many Americans preferred to believe the commentary accompanying the movie "Operation Abolition" rather than to trust their own visual experience are examples of the victory of theory over fact. In short, Jones says, modern man has become increasingly distrustful of facts, and when distrust is converted to repugnance, when the ideology reigns unfettered, the supremely rational totalitarian state is just around the corner.

The revelance of Jones' essay to this discussion is simply this: Man's externalization of himself in objective form is magnified when the theory that the individual is only the product of impersonal forces replaces man's trust in his own concrete experience. When he concludes that his consciousness of being free is only an illusion not to be trusted, what alternative has he but to resign his fate to the working of destiny? As a result he becomes passive, acquiescent, inert, and responds only to the pressures of the state, the organization, and the weather. Such a man has, in fact, forfeited his status as an agent in the world.

The advent of the mass society must also be recognized as contributing to the individual's passivity and escape from personal responsibility. When society becomes rationalized, when social control is effected through official bureaucracies for more and more areas of life, when the citizen is summed up by holes punched in an IBM card, the concept of the human being becomes statistical, abstract, and depersonalized. The mass media of communication accept and reinforce this concept by presenting the individual with a manufactured self-image which he comes to substitute for a concrete awareness of his identity. He is told who he is, what he wants to be, how to get that way, and how to feel that way even when he is not. "Further," says C. Wright Mills in "The Power Elite," "the mass man loses his independence, and more importantly, he loses the desire to be independent: in fact, he does not have hold of the idea of being an independent individual with his own mind and his own worked-out way of life."

The extreme example of this nascent tendency is described by Bruno Bettelheim in his book, "The Informed Heart." In the Nazi concentration camps the goal of the SS was to dehumanize the individual and destroy his sense of identity; to make him a pliable, barely reactive mechanism. The end products of this rationalized tyranny were the so-called Muslims, the walking dead who were no longer human beings. While we do not approximate this condition, the example is nonetheless instructive, for when man is consciously aware of himself as an object—a thing—he is quite unable to recognize himself as the author of his own actions and to that extent has forfeited his humanity.

And how does the mass man view responsibility? What can he do other than deny his responsibility, except for the more trivial choices he may make? If he is merely the product of social forces, he is quite powerless to resist encroachments upon his privacy, his civil liberties, and his mind. If society has made him, society is to blame for whatever happens to him. Society, officially embodied in the state, is responsible and yet no individual can be, for the individual is a powerless particle caught up in the whirling vortex of the state's tornadic path through history. Under such conditions, reasons the mass man, responsibility must be collective rather than personal.

Those who assert this position do so as a defense against the intolerable idea that the self is not a passive object, that the individual can be an agent in his world. Instead of a one-way road into the unknown, he prefers the safety and security of the town square where he can embrace the anonymity which mingling with his fellows offers. But, as Bettelheim says of concentration camp prisoners, "such defenses, aimed at retaining self-respect by denying all guilt, actually weakened the prisoners' personalities; by blaming outside forces on their

actions, they not only denied having personal control of their lives, but also that what they did was of any consequence." Thus, paradoxically, while the concept of collective responsibility is aimed at protecting the individual, it has the net effect of destroying the very individuality it was intended to defend.

MORAL INSENSITIVITY

Viewing the self as an object or instrument has other manifestations and consequences, however. Individual impotence in the 20th century is very much reflected in the growth of moral insensitivity. The inability to react in a human way to those occurrences or trends which have shocked and horrified men in all ages is a cancerous growth which could well signify the moral, if not physical destruction of our civilization. And the view of self under discussion certainly seems closely related to the gradual diminution of man's ability to respond appropriately to disaster and to man's inhumanity to man.

When the individual loses confidence in his ability or power to play the role of agent, he gradually comes to accept horror, degredation, and rottenness as inevitable. "The tide of events inundates me," he reasons, "and I can do nothing about it; therefore, it would be madness to become emotionally involved. Better I should close my eyes or repress the upwelling of disgust than to be foolish enough to express my feelings in action." Escape into mindless tranquility is his dominant reactive mechanism, not moral outrage and a desire to correct the infamous conditions. What is this but a deadening of the self, rigor mortis of the moral sensibility?

The casual acceptance of violence as a common part of daily life is an example of moral insensitivity. Few adults, let alone children, seem to react with incredulity and horror to the mayhem and cool killing which is currently the mainstay of television. Few of us appear willing to mount an offensive action against the use of ever more efficient means of killing human beings in warfare, instruments such as napalm bombs, germ warfare, or neutron bombs. One might answer this accusation by maintaining that our responses have been atrophied by the constant barrage of atrocities to which the mass media subject us. However, such a response merely underlines my point, namely, that we have become morally insensitive. Would we, during World War I or the Civil War, have given our approval to saturation bombing of cities and the indiscriminate killing of women and children? But we do today, and isn't this approval possible only for the man who has lost the ability and the desire to be held accountable for his choices and actions, the man with an externalized self?

A corollary of this condition is the inability to respond to injustice. Lacking moral sensitivity, our mass man is unable to identify with his fellow man in a meaningful, moral sense; when his neighbor becomes the victim of injustice, he is unable to react to it by demanding some form of redress. When a man is jailed for insisting upon his constitutional rights, when Americans are deprived of employment because of their relatives' past associations, or when police use lawless means to enforce the law, the morally insensitive do not raise their voices in protest, for they fail to recognize the need for protest. Insensitivity to injustice occurs even where some might not expect it, for as one commentator remarked: "The average professor in an American college will look on an act of injustice done to a brother professor with the same unconcern as the rabbit who is not attacked watches the ferret pursue his brother up and down the warren." Of importance in this case is that even though the individual may pay official obeisance to some values or principles, academic freedom or due process, his inability to act in accordance with these principles when they are violated proves their essential meaninglessness to him; in effect, he accepts whatever happens as necessary.

The myth of collective responsibility reinforces all of the foregoing points. Abdication of personal responsibility and moral insensitivity go hand in hand; in fact, the cultivation of a myth which absolves one of responsibility helps to convince the mass man of the rightness of noninvolvement in affairs beyond his immediate ken. The AEC scientist who is unfortunate enough to survive a third world war will undoubtedly disclaim responsibility by pleading impotence to prevent it. He will explain that he had no part in the decision to employ the bombs, that he was merely hired by the nation-state and had no business meddling in affairs outside his jurisdiction. When this response becomes generalized, when men fail to experience themselves as agents in the world, when they accept the myth of collective responsibility, then the possibility of ever achieving human community is shattered.

In speaking of community, I have in mind the distinction Martin Buber makes in "Between Man and Man" between a collectivity and a community:

"Collectivity is not a binding but a bundling together; individuals packed together, armed and equipped in common, with only as much life from man to man as will inflame the marching step. But community, growing community (which is all we have known so far) is being no longer side by side but with one another of a multitude of persons. * * * Community is where community happens. Collectivity is based on an organized atrophy of personal existence, community on its increase and confirmation in life lived toward one another."

In other words, community depends on and presupposes a bond between men based on respect, responsibility, and love. But if modern man denies that he is his brother's keeper, if he refuses to admit the moral tie between men by accepting the myth of collective responsibility, true human community can never exist. The collectivity may hold men together through the myth of the organic state, but that kind of social cohesion is obtained only through the manipulation of men's minds or the constant threat of force. Force and fraud can never achieve community, for their implementation as means negates the moral ends upon which community is based.

Community requires justice as a cornerstone. But when men do not react to violations of justice, anything goes and the possibility of achieving community is lost. In fact, one may view rebellion as a prerequisite of community, for rebellion is man's way of expressing his outrage against injustice. And it is in the act of rebelling that man is most keenly aware of his freedom and responsibility. But if rebellion does not occur when conditions demand it, as it does not when both freedom and responsibility are rejected, the collectivity wins out over the community and, ultimately, over humanity.

Having urged that personal responsibility and the tendency to view oneself as an object are antithetical, let us turn to another type of self-awareness, one which entails an approach to responsibility rather than an escape from it, one which might make community possible.

In his "Vocation of Man," Fichte concisely centers on the point at issue here: The ways in which the individual may view himself. Of importance here is Fichte's declaration that the individual may decide (and is thus responsible for his choice) to conceive of his present and future as the product of external forces and unconscious processes; or he may choose to play an active determining role in which case he assumes the deterministic nature of his human universe but chooses to emphasize the possibilities which his various freedoms indicate. Thus, it would seem that the views of self as object and agent are indeed opposites, and that if one completely embraces either view, he must deny or negate the other.

However, it would appear more sensible to consider the two views of self as being dialectically related, and that any individual who is not either a Muslim in a concentration camp or a psychotic who can see no obstacles to his will is caught somewhere between the two extremes. Then the decision as to which of the views of self one will gravitate toward does not imply a complete negation of the other; it is rather a matter of degree. Assuming that most men maintain a stance somewhere between the poles of self-as-object and self-as-agent, there is ample reason to assert that the dominant attraction or pull is from the former, and that anyone who opts for the status of agent, who seeks an authentic as opposed to a nonauthentic existence, must overcome—and yet not completely reject—the socially reinforced view of self as a relatively inert end product.

But the individual who seeks authenticity doesn't intend to see himself as this or that; rather, he is aware of himself as a conscious, willing being. He is alive to his own sensations and trusts his experience rather than rejecting it in favor of objective theories; he is convinced that he is free to make meaningfull choices and to determine his own future; he is also cognizant that realizing his intended goals may not be possible, yet he rebels against those who are only too happy to offer him an easy way out. In short, he is dedicated to the creation of himself as a truly unique, authentic human being.

And one would certainly expect that man as originator would approach responsibility differently than the man who is an end product, Rather than emphasizing accountability or answerability, he would, with Sartre (in "Existentialism and Human Emotions"), define responsibility as "consciousness of being, the incontestable author of an event or of an object." While this definition certainly implies accountability, it entails a quite different emphasis than the creditor-debtor quality of accountability, which stresses the consequences of some action rather than the act itself or the state of mind of the agent. Accountability alone is punitive in tone, for as such it is a suitable definition for the man who denies his active role in the world; he need only point to the state as the responsible agent and thus escape the guilt.

On the other hand, to emphasize man's incontestable authorship of something is to stress his consciousness of having chosen to create it. Indeed, this conception of personal responsibility is much closer to the Latin root "respondere," which means "to promise." To promise is to declare oneself accountable, but the significance of promising lies in its being a declaration, the act of an agent. The following statement by Nietzsche from "the Genealogy of Morals"—despite its hyperbole—has real relevance to this discussion:

"This autonomous, more than moral individual * * * has developed his own, independent, long-range will, which dares to make promises; he has a proud and vigorous consciousness of what he has achieved, a sense of power and freedom, of absolute accomplishment. * * * Being truly free and possessor of a long-range pertinacious will, he also possesses a scale of values. * * * His proud awareness of the extraordinary privilege responsibility confers has penetrated deeply and become a dominant instinct. What shall he call that dominant instinct, provided he ever feels impelled to give it a name? Surely he will call it his own conscience."

Noteworthy is Nietzsche's emphasis upon the strength and confidence of the man who rules himself, and his avowal that responsibility actually confers a privilege. He seems to mean that, rather than being limited and cramped by a nagging accountability to others, such a man exults in the opportunity to make a binding promise, for in doing so he becomes sharply and keenly aware of his own moral strength. Insofar, then, as he strives to act in accordance with his scale of values, he achieves self-fulfillment. Responsibility is thus something to seek rather than escape.

CONSTITUENTS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Drawing upon Nietzsche's discussion, I should like to formulate what appear to be the ideal constituents of personal responsibility: (1) an awareness of one's freedom to choose and to act; (2) a hierarchy of values which one has actively chosen; (3) a ready willingness to act in accordance with those values; and (4) a desire to be held accountable for one's actions. Should these four criteria be realized, the individual concerned would be responsible and would have attained a significant degree of autonomy.

How would this kind of responsibility affect the human community? I am convinced that it is the only kind that can make community possible. Personal responsibility is a source of power, not impotence. Rather than being disruptive to the community, this ideally responsible man would help to consolidate it, for he would realize that the individual has meaning only in the community, a realization which would bind him to his fellow man, for it would be his own free act which accomplished it. "Bundling," to use Buber's term, happens to the man who is powerless; it implies an external agency over which he has no control. Further, the man who "binds" himself to his neighbor must be morally sensitive; that is, he binds himself because of his hierarchy of values. And his reaction to an injustice done to his neighbor would be rebellion, not an averted glance. "I am my brother's keeper" could well be his motto, and it would provide the sinews which would hold the community together. As an individual he would be one, a whole, indivisible; and he would have attained this state because he had sufficient self-mastery to overcome the fragmentation of self imposed by the view of self-as-object and the easy way of collective responsibility.

Finally, instead of avoiding the issue of personal responsibility in relation to the imminence of a third world war, the man who wishes to be an agent in the world must assume that if he does not seek some means of working toward eliminating the threat of thermonuclear war, he will be morally and personally responsible for its occurrence. His recognition that he ought to do something must lead to his conviction that he can do it, whatever it may be. To assume that he cannot, that for some reason he is not free to do so, or that he is powerless to act, is to opt for the status of a vegetable, and quite possibly a radioactive one at that.

Quillen Leads Move To Aid General Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Friday, March 22, 1963, edition of the Bristol Herald Courier, Bristol, Tenn., in connection with the bill I introduced to restore full citizenship posthumously of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

QUILLEN LEADS MOVE TO AID GENERAL LEE

Congressman JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, freshman Representative from the First District of Tennessee, created quite a stir yesterday when he introduced a resolution in the House to reinstate the citizenship of Gen. Robert E. Lee. Even in this, the third year of Civil War centennial celebrations, most Americans were not aware that the greatest of the Confederacy's military geniuses died as what today's do-gooders would term a "second-rate citizen."

Actually, Lee was allowed to vote at the time of his death, but was restricted from holding office. Technically, he was not a citizen.

In a day when northerners continually preach the theme of antisectionalism, it seems inconceivable that our Yankee brethren would raise a hand to block this proposal. Even so, a similar resolution introduced only 6 years ago by former Senator Homer E. Capehart, Republican of Indiana, died in committee.

Representative QUILLEN is asking only that one of America's—and, for that matter, Virginia's—greatest sons be recognized for his contributions in war and peace through a simple citizenship act. The Kingsport Republican noted in requesting passage of the resolution that a similar move is afoot in regard to citizenship for former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, a man certainly deserving of the honor but whose mark on American history does not approach that carved by Robert E. Lee.

One thing's for sure—General Lee won't care whether the resolution wins approval or not; thousands of southerners and Civil War buffs, on the other hand, will.

True Politician Praised by Writer Harry Golden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when Harry Golden, the sage of North Carolina, was in Davenport, Iowa, recently filling a speaking engagement, he made some remarks about the "true politician" which I feel should be called to the attention of my colleagues. He also had some kind words to say about Iowa. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that a newspaper account of Mr. Golden's appearance in Davenport be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The account follows:

TRUE POLITICIAN PRAISED BY WRITER HARRY GOLDEN

A plaintive cry for the overdue recognition of the true worth of politicians rose up Wednesday night in Davenport from best selling author and editor Harry Golden.

In the Quad Cities to lecture to the Knife and Fork Club, at Hotel Blackhawk, Golden declared: "What has happened to the true politician?

"For years now everyone has had a false image of the politician colored by some knucklehead who declared: 'I ain't no politician so elect me' and so a bunch of other knuckleheads did elect him.

"But 'politician' is a wonderful word.

"Lincoln was a politician and what a politician he was.

"They've tried since to make a backwoods hillbilly out of him—but can you imagine what kind of a backwoodsman he must have been?

"Remember Lincoln was the man who said: 'This is a situation too vast for malice.'

"That was a politician talking. And people still want to run down politicians."

Golden, who is editor of the Carolina Israelite and author of "For 2 Cents Plain" had this to say of Iowa: "This is the State which is more American than America itself.

"When you're in a foreign country, like England, or Korea, lecturing, and you let your mind flick back to America to think of an example, the thing you think of is the amber waves of Iowa grain.

"No matter how far away you get from the United States of America it seems somehow you just can't forget Iowa.

"Sure you can forget Carolina for a moment.

"But you just try and forget Iowa. You can't do it."

Attention, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most illuminating contributions to the current debate over the state of our economy appeared over the masthead of the Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Sun on March 24. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be inserted in the RECORD. It illustrates the very good point that constant references to an impending recession may very well talk us into one.

ATTENTION, MR. PRESIDENT

President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in his inaugural address on March 4, 1933: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes efforts to convert retreat into advance."

We believe that the President with his persistent predictions of a recession may really talk us into one.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1963 No. 46—Part 2

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY APR 1 1963 DETROIT

Appendix

(Continued from Part 1)

Indonesian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to meet with Mr. Arnold C. Brackman, an author and journalist who has this month published a book called "Indonesian Communism: A History." Written out of Mr. Brackman's 10 years of experience as an observer of the Indonesian scene, the book already has achieved widespread acclaim as a factual and probing history of the rise of the Communist Party in Indonesia.

Because of the growing importance of Indonesia, and the impact on the world political situation should it go communistic, Mr. Brackman's findings and conclusions should be of interest to us all. In order to further acquaint my colleagues with this enlightening new book, I am including book reviews of "Indonesian Communism: A History," which have appeared recently in the Saturday Review, the Chicago Tribune Magazine of Books, and the Reporter.

The reviews follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune magazine of Books, Mar. 17, 1963]

THE CLOUD ON THE FUTURE OF THE PRIZE OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Reviewed by Percy Wood)

("Indonesian Communism: A History," by Arnold C. Brackman (Praeger, 336 pp.))

Here's something else to worry about: Indonesia's Communist party has 2 million members and has developed fronts joined by 10 million others—a total of 12 million in a population approaching 90 million.

What would it mean to the United States if Indonesia, the fifth or sixth largest country in the world, became dominated by the Reds. Arnold Brackman, an American newspaperman with 10 years' experience in Indonesia and elsewhere in the Orient, says it would greatly complicate our Pacific defense problems under our present commitments and probably would result in the loss of the southeast Asian states already threatened by Communist China.

Will it happen? The Indonesian Red leader, D. N. Aidit, told the author: "Time is with us * * * there is no question about this. We are in no hurry. Indeed, the country runs faster than we do." But Brackman wonders if the party is running faster than its boss.

What about Sukarno, the wily President of Indonesia who takes help wherever he can get it, from the United States, the Russians, and the Chinese? Aidit's followers support him. Will he hand over to them?

Brackman says no. Sukarno, while talking about "guided democracy" for his country, and about a "national democratic" revolution, has written in a political manifesto that he opposes "the founding of a proletariat dictatorship." Of course, there always is the chance that the worsening economic situation will force him out, or that the next would-be assassin will be successful.

What if he does go out—head or feet first? The author says that then his successor probably would be determined by the army, led by a canny general, Abdul Haris Nasution. It is not improbable, Brackman thinks, that the military would turn to a relatively conservative figure—at least when compared with Sukarno—such as Mohammed Hatta, one of those who led the 1945–50 revolt against the Dutch.

That could well bring some sort of democracy to the 3,000-mile, 3,000-island archipelago; closer to it, anyway, than under either Sukarno or Aidit.

Indonesia is a prize, and anyone can understand why the Dutch were so reluctant to give it up. In natural resources, the string of islands is the third richest nation, after the United States and Russia. It has all sorts of minerals, "and some of the islands," Brackman writes, "are said literally to float on underground, untapped lakes of oil."

The people, as this reviewer found out, are likable and industrious—the politicians excluded. It is a pity they are pawns of two such unsavory characters as their President and Aidit, the Red.

[From the Saturday Review, Mar. 9, 1963]

BOLSHEVIKS IN BALI

(By Burton Raffel)

("Indonesian Communism: A History," by Arnold C. Brackman (Praeger, 336 pp., $6.50), warns that Western assistance to the current regime would not only dishearten democratic foes of Sukarno but drive the country's Communist Party into an effective underground opposition. Burton Raffel, a member of the Indonesian Council of the Asian Society, lived from 1953–55 in Indonesia.)

This is first-rate political history, a pioneering book that has none of the deficiencies forgivable, but usually predictable, in path-breaking investigations. Arnold Brackman is clear, accurate, and concise; he is detailed, though never pedantic or dull. His fairness is admirable, as is the calmly honest, calmly outspoken tone he displays throughout "Indonesian Communism: A History." The fine chapter on the abortive Communist putsch (Madiun, 1948), e.g., reads like the best of current military history, and the concluding chapters have the ring of analytical prophecy:

[President] Sukarno secured Irian [West New Guinea], as he pledged he would—albeit at the cost of wrecking the economy, snuffing out representative government, trampling on civil liberties, mortgaging Indonesia's future to Soviet arms shipments, and providing the Communist Party with a rare opportunity to develop a base of mass power. * * *

Indonesia's Communist Party, the oldest in Asia (its Dutch progenitor, one Sneevliet, was also instrumental in founding the Chinese Communist Party), only emerged from gray, conspiratorial obscurity after the war and the August 17, 1945, proclamation of independence. Mr. Brackman shows us the party's careful organizational planning, sponsored and directed from Moscow: Indonesian Communist students returning home, disguised as Socialist, Social Democrats, and what-have-you; ancient "Bolsheviks" sent back from 20 or more years of exile; the local party faithful maneuvering this way and that with the dogged devotion familiar the world over. An excellent example of the last, cited by Mr. Brackman, is that of a former party chairman, Sardjono, who was asked in 1942 to join the allied cause:

"I harbored no personal animosity toward the Dutch despite 17 years of confinement," Sardjono explained later. "My attitude was conditioned by my impersonal ideology. I was glad to have the opportunity to fight Fascism." Here was the dedicated, disciplined Communist.

However, even independence, with the turmoil introduced by the Japanese invasion and continued by the Dutch reinvasions of 1947 and 1949, was not a fertile enough field to enable the Communists to take power. There were several attempts, Madiun being only the most prominent, but none of them were successful—except in eliminating most of the old-line party leadership, killed in their putsch attempts or shot by the Indo-

nesian military after arrest and in the face of Dutch armies. In 1949 Indonesian communism was fragmented, ineffective, and largerly discredited.

Its renascence was due, as Mr. Brackman brilliantly shows, to two men, President Sukarno and, secondarily, the young party chairman, D. N. Aidit. This is a fascinating tale, masterfully unfolded on any number of levels simultaneously, and far too involved, as well as too important, to be briefly summarized here. (The index is excellent.) Mr. Brackman gives us, neatly, and expertly, the world Communist scene at each stage, and patiently weaves the Indonesian Communist scene into that basic pattern. Indonesian politics are, in a word, messy; Mr. Brackman works his way through them with the ease and clarity of a wise, experienced hand, unraveling motivations, confessing to speculation where solid evidence is lacking, analyzing, and—praise be—criticizing as he goes.

The Dutch (reinvasion) dealt the West a hard blow throughout the Afro-Asian world and made a mockery of the Western contention that colonialism was in its death throes. * * * The West's folly, of course, would be perpetuated in Indochina and later repeated in Algeria and Anglo. * * *

Nowhere in non-Communist Asia did the Communists masquerade so successfully in nationalist guise—and accordingly enjoy so free a hand—as in Indonesia.

It may also be added that nowhere in non-Communist Asia was the national leadership as irresponsible or unaware as in Indonesia. * * *

The success of the Marshall plan in Western Europe, which was technically capable of absorbing massive assistance, prompted Washington to embark (in 1951) on a similar program for Asia. The United States indiscriminately made a similar assumption about the new states, despite their diverse political, economic, cultural, and religious backgrounds, and temperaments. The United States failed to appreciate the starkly different psychological climate.

"Indonesian Communism" is full of important political lessons, many of them quietly underlined by Mr. Brackman's frequent paralleling of Indonesia and Chiang Kai-shek's China. He does not overestimate Communist strength: "the Communists have attracted a mass movement not because the masses have endorsed the Communist program, but because the Communists have promised * * * (prosperity and land), and the peasantry is unaware that the Communists know that they cannot fill this cornucopia." On the other hand, Mr. Brackman writes, "If the party could gain direct control of the armed forces, or failing in that, neutralize the army's effectiveness by encouraging war lordism or by subverting ill-paid troops, the party would be on the threshold of power." The author's summation of President Sukarno's position, and of any possible westward tack that skillful opportunist may take, applies far more widely than the borders of even the sixth largest nation in the world:

It would be folly for the West to reward such opportunism. A program of Western assistance would not only dishearten the democratic opponents of Sukarno's regime, many of whom are now in jail, others under surveillance, but would also drive the PKI (Communist Party of Indonesia) into an underground opposition from where they could fan the smoldering fires of popular discontent. In such a situation, the West would find itself backing the wrong horse. Western errors of omission and commission have been manifest in Indonesia for more than a decade; they would be compounded by shoring up the incumbent regime and, therefore, the status quo.

[From the Reporter magazine, Mar. 28, 1963]

A LAND BEYOND HELP?

(By Denis Warner)

("Indonesian Communism: A History," by Arnold C. Brackman, Praeger)

"Those poor Russians," said Sutan Sjahrir when the first significant deliveries of Soviet military equipment arrived in Indonesia 20 months ago. "They could spend 10 percent of their gross national product here for the next 10 years and still not be sure of the result."

Sjahrir, a right-wing Socialist with a profound appreciation of democracy and personal liberty, emerged during the struggle for independence between 1945 and 1949 as Indonesia's ablest and most responsibile political leader. A measure of Indonesia's current irresponsibility is that Sjahrir and others like him are now involuntary guests in Sukarno's political prisons. "They have no place in our society," says Dr. Subandrio, now Foreign Minister and Sukarno's choice as his heir. With this remark Sjahrir would agree. Surkarno's "guided democracy" is the negation of everything Sjahrir believes in. Built on a framework of meaningless slogans, it has served primarily as a platform for Sukarno's own demagogy. His regime, Mr. Brackman finds, has been corrupt, demoralized, and inept. Such goals as the acquisition of West New Guinea's worthless real estate have been achieved only "at the cost of wrecking the economy, snuffing out representative government, trampling on civil liberties, mortgaging Indonesia's future to Soviet arms shipments, and providing the Communist Party with a rare opportunity to develop a base of mass power in Indonesia."

In a decade the Indonesian Communist Party has increased its membership from fewer than 8,000 to 2 million. What are its chances of coming to power and turning Indonesia into the Cuba of southeast Asia? As the Indonesian Communists see it, the chances are very good. In Mr. Brackman's words, they were lifted to "ecstatic heights" by Cuba. Time, they are now sure, is on their side, and the process that has led to the party's spectacular growth will also lead to power. As the biggest and best-organized political party in Indonesia, with every island of consequence honeycombed with cells and with front organizations controlling another 10 million, including 4 million peasants, their chances might indeed seem very good. But Mr. Brackman is a qualified optimist of the Sjahrir school. In the chaos and the crumbling of guided democracy that will follow Sukarno's death, either naturally or by assassination, he believes the army, not the Communists, will move into the void and probably turn either to the Sultan of Jogjakarta or to former Vice President Mohammad Hatta, in either case with Sjahrir quietly in the background, to restore republican unity and hope to the disillusioned Indonesian people.

Yet with General A. H. Nasution, the defense minister, and General Jani, the army chief of staff, now out-Sukarnoing Sukarno in the dispute with Malaya over Malaysia and even threatening a direct military invasion of the British Borneo territories, Mr. Brackman and all other serious students of Indonesia must be troubled by the growing irresponsibility of the army leadership. Given their Russian weapons, the military now seem all too anxious to get on with the job—any job. Sukarno has not given up the front running when it comes to expansionism; but jogging at his heels are that ill-matched pair, Nasution and Subandrio, and, of course, the Communist leader Aidit. A good many Western hopes, including Mr. Brackman's have been shaken by the new ambitious Nasution, who only a year ago dismissed Malaysia as of no concern to Indonesia but is now prepared to go to war to destroy it.

This does not detract from the value of Mr. Brackman's book, which is easily the most important on Indonesia since George McTurnan Kahin's Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia (1952). Communism in any of its forms presents the historical author with the most difficult of tasks, inasmuch as fact and what the Communists claim to be fact rarely bear any relation to each other. Over a period of many years, however, Mr. Brackman has sifted and screened his material, and the result is an admirable account not merely of the rise of the Indonesian Communist Party but also of the far from happy history of Indonesia through independence to the present day.

Mistaken Western policies and Sukarno's ambitions both contributed to the Communist advance. But Sukarno has no intention of putting the Communists into power—though he may do so by folly or miscalculation, neither of which Mr. Brackman feels can be completely ruled out. As the self-styled "Great Leader of Our Revolution," he wants no competitors for the revolutionary leadership. The perpetual dilemma for the Communists is whether to continue to identify themselves with Sukarno's disastrous internal policies or to move into revolutionary opposition. By choosing the first course they will someday bring upon themselves the people's inevitable wrath and revulsion; by adopting the latter they would risk destruction, for though the Communists have the numbers, the army still has the guns. The Communist following is concentrated among the Javanese, especially in the central Java area and, to a lesser extent, in east Java and around Djakarta and the south and east coasts of Sumatra. Even if a Communist coup in overpopulated Java were possible, it could be achieved now only at the cost of anti-Communist uprisings throughout the other islands. By following either course, therefore, the Communists stand to lose.

What should the West do? Mr. Brackman's formula will surprise some Americans and please others. The worst thing we can do now, he believes, is to shore up the régime. We have blundered enough, and we shall compound our blunders if we help Sukarno recover from his self-inflicted economic wounds. "The West," says Mr. Brackman, "should continue to disengage. Indonesia's internal problems can only be solved by Indonesians, and only from within, not without."

Laws Alone Can't Make Drugs Safe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the great dilemma that medical science faces in the research and development, testing and introduction of new drugs is discussed in a penetrating article in the current—March 1963—issue of the magazine Fortune by Associate Editor Lawdence Lessing.

Among other things, Mr. Lessing makes the entirely valid point that new laws and regulations, however strict, cannot absolutely guarantee against a

repetition of last year's thalidomide tragedy. A new drug must eventually be tried widely in humans, and as Mr. Lessing points out, "that inevitably means risking lives."

It is our responsibility, in Congress and the executive branch of Government, to do what we can to insure that the risk is reduced to the absolute minimum. This can be accomplished in part by enactment of adequate laws designed to assure the American people about the safety and effectiveness of our drugs, and in part through painstaking efforts of responsible regulatory agencies in the application and administration of the laws.

The fullest animal experiments and evaluations must be conducted before any new drug is tried in a human patient for we must not forget the bitter lesson of thalidomide and its toll of human suffering. And the greatest care must be taken in the clinical research that has to be accomplished before a drug can be proved effective and safe in the treatment of disease.

But no one should lose sight of the magnificent progress of the last two decades in drug research and development, which has made possible the saving of thousands of human lives and the amelioration of pain and distress for thousands of others.

Assuredly, some who participated in the research that led to this outstanding progress have suffered from adverse drug reactions, but for every one of these there have been thousands who were saved from death or disability. Unfortunately, humanity must always pay a price for its halting progress in scientific research.

So we must make certain that a proper balance is maintained in the regulation of medical research, lest our heartfelt desire to protect even the least of those among us lead to the erection of administrative and regulatory barriers that will unnecessarily slow the much-needed advance of medical science, which can make life fuller for every one of us.

In view of the timeliness and pertinence of Mr. Lessing's article, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWS ALONE CAN'T MAKE DRUGS SAFE

(By Lawrence Lessing)

In the wake of the thalidomide tragedy that hit headlines last summer, with its pitiful legacy of deformed babies, the United States enacted a whole new set of laws and regulations for the stricter control of drugs. Whatever its other virtues and defects, this legislation is hardly likely by itself to avert the recurrence of such tragedies. And it may impose such costs and burdens on pharmaceutical companies as to slow down the development of life-prolonging new products. Indeed, no set of regulations can get around the great dilemma that confronts medical science, the industry, and Government in the testing and introduction of new drugs. It is impossible to determine definitely whether a drug is free from harmful effects unless it is tried widely on humans—and that inevitably means risking lives.

The dilemma is nowhere more clearly seen than in the case of thalidomide itself. This compound was first synthesized by the small West German firm of Chemie Grünenthal G.m.b.H. in 1953. It was built on one of the natural amino acids found in all protein synthesis, glutamic acid, and it early showed promise as a sedative. After 3 years of tests on animals and humans, it was released to the market in West Germany in 1957, and soon after to other countries in Western Europe. Thalidomide was an almost immediate success, for it had some unique properties. Unlike the common barbiturate sleeping pills, it had no apparent troublesome side effects, was non-habit-forming, and nonlethal even in large doses. The importance of the latter is underlined by the fact that in the United States some 1,500 deaths a year are caused by overdoses of barbiturates. Within a short time thalidomide was selling at the rate of some 20 million tablets a month in West Germany alone.

In 1958, U.S. license rights to thalidomide were acquired by the Wm. S. Merrell Co., division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc. Merrell began animal and clinical testing of its own, later including distribution for experimental use of some 2,500,000 tablets to 1,627 selected U.S. doctors. On the basis of a year and a half of these tests and of nearly 3 years of widespread use in Europe, with no known unfavorable effects, Merrell in September 1960, made application to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for approval to market the drug.

Then disturbing reports came in from Europe of peripheral neuritis or a tingling in fingers and toes of a few long-term takers of thalidomide. And late in 1961, after nearly 5 years in which many thousands of patients had used the drug without apparent serious incident, came the first reports suspiciously linking thalidomide with a rising number of deformed births. The drug was pulled off the West German market in November 1961, similar action in Britain followed closely, and Merrell promptly notified the FDA. Then, as the terrifying evidence mounted in 1962, Merrell and the FDA worked around the clock to recall all test supplies.

Birth defects caused by certain drugs have not been unknown in the past. For instance, quinine has been found to harm the human embryo, and morphine used to allay labor pains can cause severe respiratory failure in the newborn. But never before in medical history had a drug apparently triggered so massive an eruption of deformities of so peculiar a type as did thalidomide, in which the hands, feet, or whole limbs of infants failed to form at all. By the end of 1962 at least 3,000 such malformed babies were estimated to have been born in West Germany alone. And hundreds more were spread over Europe, Japan, Canada, and South America, where the drug was also widely sold. In the United States owing to the wariness of the FDA and a single worker, Dr. Francis O. Kelsey, approval of the drug for marketing was held up, and the toll was kept to a handful of possible cases linked to thalidomide. All togther, it was one of the major medical disasters of recent times.

SOMEBODY HAS TO BE FIRST

Could such a distaster have been prevented? Generally, European laws controlling the introduction and sale of new drugs are laxer than those of the U.S. Presumably some closer, faster checking up and reporting of the drug's effects on people might have lessened the worldwide tragedy. And perhaps Merrell was leaning too heavily on the European experience in its early, stepped-up distribution of experimental tablets to doctors. But all this is hindsight. The fact is that thalidomide, long before it came a cropper, had met all the testing procedures under which hundreds of new drugs are released each year. It had first passed the usual tests for safety in animals. These did not include tests on pregnant animals. So far these have been almost wholly unsatisfactory in predicting effects in humans. Indeed, on the evidence of the usual animal tests alone, a number of U.S. drug houses had earlier turned down thalidomide because it showed so little activity—sedative or otherwise.

The animal tests did prove the drug reasonably safe to try on humans. And here thalidomide passed all the usual clinical tests for safety and effectiveness. But there were no formal tests on pregnant women. Doctors generally are reluctant to give new drugs to them because of all the unknowns and the fragility of the human embryo. Hence thalidomide came only gradually into widespread use as a relaxing, antinausea drug in pregnancy. Then recognition of its effect was further delayed by the fact that once the deformed births began to appear—of a rare type known as phocomelia—it took a long search among all possible causes to pin suspicion on thalidomide. To confuse things still more, many mothers taking the drug gave birth to entirely normal babies. Thus it took a massive rise in phocomelia cases for the effect to be recognized at all.

As researchers dug in to find out what had gone wrong, the chances of earlier discovery narrowed even further. It appeared that thalidomide has its baleful effect in only one short period of early pregnancy—not more than about 2 weeks and possibly as little as a few hours long—when limb buds are forming on the embryo. One speculation is that the drug's unnatural form of glutamic acid blocks some critical organizing or protein-forming process at this crucial juncture. Taken only briefly before this period or after it, thalidomide appeared to have no ill effects, thus accounting for the many normal births. Nothing like it had ever been observed before.

Most medical, clinical, and drug authorities now believe that the thalidomide case shows up certain deficiencies in clinical testing procedures, which will be examined later in this article. But they also believe that the tragic thalidomide effect was almost wholly unpredictable and therefore largely unpreventable in the present state of knowledge. No series of control tests yet devised can uncover all the possible and unexpected side effects of new drugs in the complex human body. And every new drug presents a risk and a danger, for at some point the first humans must take it to discover whether it works—and this is the heart of the dilemma. It is not resolved by political charges, such as rose at the height of the thalidomide fright, that drug companies are using human beings as guinea pigs. "We must face up to the fact," says one eminent clinician, "that somebody has to be first, or we could have no new drugs."

THE UPRUSHING PROBLEM

The best hope of reducing the risks is the continued improvement of scientific clinical testing or clinical pharmacology, a relatively new, and far from fully developed branch of medicine. In the not remote past, drugs still came into use slowly by the historical trial-and-error method that sometimes produced disasters rivaling thalidomide's, in horror if not in scope. As science began to penetrate medicine, less than a century ago, the development and initial testing of new drugs became the province of the individual scientific investigator of a disease, mainly in the universities, and most of the basic discoveries continue to come from this source. But then, starting with the sulfa drugs in the thirties, came the great chemical-pharmaceutical industrial revolution, building on and extending these discoveries through research into mass production. The introduction of efficacious new drugs—antibiotics, antimalarials, anticoagulants, antihypertensives, tranquilizers, diuretics, ste-

roids, polio vaccines, to name but a few—rose to a flood.

Today over 400 new drug applications are filed with the FDA each year. About 90 percent of all prescriptions written today are for drugs that were unknown to therapeutics some 15 years ago. Formerly the pharmaceutical industry made only what the doctor prescribed; now the doctor prescribes what the industry makes. In the last 30 years or so, medicine has encompassed more advances than in the preceding 500. In countries practicing modern medicine, these have made possible the control of nearly all infectious diseases and the spectacular rise of life expectancy in this century from an average of about 50 years to close to 70.

The sheer volume of new drugs, however, poses an immense problem in clinical testing. It is lessened only somewhat by the fact that of the more than 400 new drugs each year perhaps only 40 are entirely new chemical entities; the rest are new formulations, new dosage forms, or slight molecular modifications of existing products. Since even the slightest change in a chemical compound often markedly alters its biological or therapeutic effect, the modifications must generally be tested with all the care of entirely new drugs. The problem is heightened as research turns to attack the more deep-seated degenerative diseases, such as cancer and heart disease, by the emergence of ever-more powerful and more toxic new drugs. And with the rapid distribution of new drugs—the very success of the pharmaceutical revolution—the problem and risks are widened still further.

THE DESIGN OF A CALCULATED RISK

From conception through all the intricacies of research and development, the odds on developing a new, safe, and efficacious drug have been estimated at about 1 to 30,000. To test the flood of new compounds adequately, swiftly, and safely, the pharmaceutical industry long ago had to work out, by necessity and later by law, a system for clinical testing. Indeed, organization of clinical pharmacology as a separate discipline has been more a commercial art than a science up to now. It is a system still developing, still imperfect and chaotic, open to abuse and to criticism. But the leading reputable pharmaceutical companies, large and small, generally have pursued high standards. In fact, their research and production techniques have set most of the quality and control standards there are. The arduous process of clinical testing, as it has developed, may be seen in the diagram above. Some programs may take a longer or shorter time, some may have more bypaths or restarts, some may be telescoped or shortcut, depending on the nature of the drug, but in general this is the average route of a new drug from conception through testing to market.

In pursuit of a research lead suggesting a new drug for a specific disease, a pharmaceutical company's chemical laboratories may synthesize and study thousands of new compounds. These are first run through rapid, highly organized screening tests in mice or rats to discover which compounds have some biological activity. With luck, a handful will. The most promising are then put through the major preclinical stage of testing on laboratory animals. This has two parts. First, the compounds are tested to find out which, if any, have the desired pharmacological effect. Then, if a sufficiently active compound is found, it is put through more elaborate, more expensive tests to detect toxicity and measure it. All together, these preclinical tests may take up to 2 or 3 years.

The most critical and difficult of the tests are those for toxicity. Some compounds, of course, are so highly poisonous in any amounts that they must immediately be discarded. But all substances are toxic in some amounts, even pure water, and all drugs, designed to kill or block diseases, are toxic in large measure. An overdose of aspirin can kill. Hence the prime purpose of toxicity tests is to determine the dosage that will produce the greatest desired effect with a minimum of harmful side effects.

Adding to the complexities is the fact that no two animal species react to drugs in exactly the same way—morphine depresses the dog, excites the cat—so that tests must be performed on at least two species to cover the possible variables. And the gap between animals and man is even wider. Some drugs are highly toxic in dogs but not in men, and vice versa. No strict correlation of drug effects has been established between animal and man, though some valuable guidelines have been gained by long experience. The best that animal tests can do is to forestall most of the grosser accidents an suggest some of the possible effects in men.

IT'S SAFEST TO AVOID THEM ALL

After the thalidomide case, toxicity tests on pregnant animals, despite their shortcomings, will probably be required for all drugs that might be used by pregnant women. Researchers working diligently after the event have now succeeded in producing thalidomide's effect in some pregnant rabbits, rats, and mice, at fantastically high dosage levels, and the hope is that this will open the way to new understanding of birth anomalies. But there is no certainty that other drugs will work in a similar way or that pregnant animals will show their hidden effects. "Unfortunately," writes Dr. John T. Litchfield, Jr., who heads Lederle Laboratories' large animal-testing facilities, "a negative finding in an animal test predicts very little as far as human hazard is concerned. It is only after the fact that it is known whether or not the test conditions were appropriate. In this special area of drug effects on fetal and newborn animals the test conditions are extremely critical and not well defined at present." Knowledge is so meager in this area that a seminar on birth defects at the University of Michigan last fall concluded that the only safe procedure is to avoid all pills and drugs, from aspirin on up, in early pregnancy, except where the health or life of the mother is clearly at stake.

At the conclusion of animal testing, after statistically analyzing the data from hundreds of blood, liver, kidney, and other histological studies, weighing species differences, balancing off good against bad effects, extrapolating data and dosages from mice to men, and searching the soul, the pharmaceutical company's medical director must make the momentous decision whether the new compound is safe enough to try on a man. In one recent year, it is estimated, the industry examined some 114,000 new compounds, of which only about 1,900 were considered safe and active enough to test on human beings, only about 40 proved worthy of marketing, and possibly only 3 or 4 will eventually be judged real contributions to medicine.

THE CLINICAL BARRIER

For initial clinical tests on humans, a pharmaceutical house must generally go outside its own laboratories to find medical investigators or specialists, attached to universities, hospitals, clinics, or other institutions, willing to take on the job as part of their research. As will be seen later, finding the right clinical investigators to carry on this work has become a major problem itself, one that is intensified by the flood of new drugs to be tested.

Testing on humans is cautiously approached in two phases, which are the reverse of those in animal testing; i.e., safety is tested before pharmacological effect. Both are usually performed on healthy human volunteers—to try a new drug immediately on the ill would be too dangerous. Volunteers are almost always available among medical students and prison inmates, who are rewarded with a small fee and a sense of serving society. In the first phrase a small group is generally fed the drug in tiny, gradually increased amounts to test its toxicity. As an added precaution, one volunteer may be given 30 percent more in each dose than the rest of the group, so that if a level of undue toxicity is suddenly reached there will be only one sick man to treat rather than half a dozen. If all goes well, the drug is tested for the desired pharmacological effect on another small group of volunteers; since they are healthy, the effect can be observed and measured only by delicate systematic studies. Occasionally drugs are tried on near-terminal cases that have nothing to lose by experiment. In these two phases of testing on humans, a large percentage of new compounds that have shown promise in animals are generally eliminated, because they are too toxic or inactive in man.

If a drug is designed for some chronic disease, meaning that it must be taken over an extended period, it must go back into animal testing for a period of 6 months to a year or more so that its long-term effects can be explored. These may be quite different from, and more dangerous than, those exhibited in short-term trials.

The drug that passes muster moves on, in larger and larger test samples, to the patients for whom it is designed. This is the final stage of human testing, which also has two phases. In the first, the drug is given experimentally to a limited, controlled group of patients in a hopsital, clinic, or other institution, where its effects can be closely watched and studied. Duplicate tests must be run in more than one institution to make the results as objective as possible. Care is taken to balance the test groups as to age, sex, and condition, and to design the experiment in suitable statistical form. A common one is the blind test, in which the conductor administers, unknown to the patients, either the drug or a harmless, inactive placebo, which acts as control. For pain-relieving or sedative drugs, in which subjective reactions can confuse the issue, the double-blind test is used, in which both the conductor and the patients are kept in the dark as to which is the drug and which the placebo. Variations are numerous, including the testing of a new drug against an old one to measure any gain in effect.

In the final phase, large experimental amounts of the drug are distributed to complying specialists and physicians for judicious testing on patients to discover, if possible, the aberrant effect or side effect that usually shows up only after it has been administered to a large sampling of people. The clinical tests up to this point may have taken another two or three years. Only after all the data is in, showing no serious or catastrophic side effects, is an application filed for FDA release of the drug to the market. Since 1938 pharmaceutical firms have been required to submit to the FDA all relevant test data, often amounting to a 5-foot stack, proving the safety and, by inference, effectiveness of a drug before marketing. And in the usual course of events the agency holds up the application a number of times with requests for additional information or testing.

SURPRISES, PLEASANT AND UNPLEASANT

This long course of development is necessarily expensive. Costs have run into the millions of dollars in developing and testing such major new drugs as Upjohn's Orinase tolbutamide, an oral antidiabetic that frees many patients from daily insulin injections, and Merck's Diuril chlorothiazide, an agent used in the control and even, in some cases,

the remission of essential and usually fatal hypertension.

No matter how costly and careful the development is, however, totally unexpected incidents and effects will often still crop up, long after a drug has been approved for marketing. Only a short time before it was hit by the thalidomide blow, the Merrell company was suddenly forced to recall an approved drug, MER/29 triparanol, an anticholesterol used in hundreds of thousands of arteriosclerosis cases, when it was suspected of causing eye cataracts and other adverse side effects in some long-time users. The inventory loss alone was close to $2 million. Much less seriously, Lederle's Declomycin, a tetracycline-type antibiotic, was widely used as a treatment for a broad spectrum of infections, mainly throat and pulmonary, before it was discovered that it caused an unusual susceptibility to sunburn in some patients. None of the usual tests, conducted indoors, could have uncovered this.

Occasionally, a drug developed for one purpose turns out to have another, quite different one. Lederle's Diamox, acetazolamide,-a new diuretic used in the treatment of congestive heart diseases, was unexpectedly found useful in the treatment of glaucoma, another eye disease.

It is now axiomatic in medical circles that in the normal course of marketing a new drug "the favorable reports will always appear before the unfavorable." The history of the so-called wonder drugs bears this out. The reason is not only that the pharmacist, investigator, and physician are always optimistically hopeful of new cures, but also that, given the complex and intransigent nature of patients, all the possible effects of a new drug are slow to appear.

The only way this situation can be improved is by a better fundamental understanding of the mechanisms of the human body and disease, and of the biological actions of drugs on both, so that nasty jolts can be foreseen and forestalled. There are still large gaps in knowledge of drug action and of the body's complex reactions and interactions. Even if all reactions were fully known and coded into a giant computer, it would still be impossible to predict every chance effect or disaster. For the human is a highly mixed breed, genetically. No two individuals ever respond in exactly the same way to a drug, and a joker or two is always lurking somewhere in the genetic deck. In truth, the giving of a drug, old or new, is always an experiment. In this immensely complex situation more knowledge, rather than more politics or regulation, is urgently needed.

THE BURDEN OF PROOF

Nevertheless, new amendments to the food-and-drug law were passed last October on the crest of the thalidomide panic. Often in the past an uncommonly aroused public has spurred useful and needed reforms. It took long exposés of the horrifying effects of noxious patent medicines and Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle," painting disgusting conditions in the meatpacking industry, to get the first Pure Food and Drugs Act passed in 1906. So far as drugs were concerned, this law only mildly required that medicines be honestly labeled as to content. And the first major strengthening of the law came in 1938, only after a careless manufacturer mixed an "Elixir of Sulfanilimide," using diethylene glycol (related to permanent-type antifreeze) as a solvent, which killed over 100 people. Up to then there was no legal requirement that a drug had to be tested or approved as safe before marketing. The pharmaceutical industry now agrees, after some early opposition, that the 1938 amendments put a firm base under the last 25 years of spectacular drug development. But the new legislation that grew out of the thalidomide case is something quite different.

For nearly 3 years before thalidomide's toxicity was heard of, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and his Antitrust Subcommittee had been fishing in pharmaceutical waters, spreading the bait for new legislation aimed mainly at curbing drug prices and profits, excessive numbers of brand names for essentially similar products, and other commercial practices. KEFAUVER also incorporated in his proposals some long-considered provisions from an omnibus bill designed to strengthen the 1938 law, mainly in the area of drug effectiveness. Conservative Congressmen, responding to industry opposition, had practically emasculated the Kefauver bill by the time the thalidomide story broke. Using that as a lever, administration forces proceeded to reinvigorate the bill. None of KEFAUVER'S key commercial strictures were restored, but some old regulatory ideas were revived and some new provisions were rushed in from the White House, ostensibly to meet the thalidomide situation. Congress quickly passed the salvaged measure.

The main provision of the new law is an extension of the old, requiring a new drug to be proved not only safe but also, by "substantial evidence," effective against the disease it claims to treat. Since reputable ethical-drug firms have been doing this all along, they object only to the redundant bureaucratic detail involved. Mainly, the new provision seems to be aimed at eliminating such things as questionable cancer "cures" and cutting down the 20 percent or so of new drugs that the American Medical Association's Council on Drugs found had been slipping by without sufficient clinical data to support their claims. The only substantive change is that henceforth the burden of proof of a drug's effectiveness will be on the manufacturer, whereas heretofore it fell to the FDA to prove that a drug was ineffective in order to remove it from the market. Needless to say, nothing in this would prevent another thalidomide, which was shown to be effective and safe as a sedative and still remains so in all instances except early pregnancy. Indeed, thalidomide has been returned to restricted use in Britain at the request of doctors.

Other provisions of the new law give the FDA authority to inspect and control manufacturing procedures, quality, and standards more closely; to consider a new drug application initially for 180 days (previously, clearance was automatic if the FDA did not act in 60 days); to designate official generic names for new drugs and require them to be printed on all labeling in type at least half as large as that of brand names (a vestige of the curb KEFAUVER wanted to put on brand names); and to withdraw a cleared drug from market if substantial question arises as to safety and effectiveness or if it shows signs of being an imminent hazard (a power that the FDA has in effect exercised all along). Another provision requires all pacakage leaflets to contain a full disclosure, and all prescription-drug advertising a brief summary, of known hazards, side effects, and contraindications. About the only new provision bearing on the thalidomide problem is explicit authority to monitor and control the clinical testing of experimental drugs, including the required reporting of clinical experience as it emerges. This power had been implicit in the old law but never used.

Nothing in these provisions would insure that a hidden side effect like thalidomide's would be detected any faster than it was. For nothing in the standard clinical tests required by the FDA is likely to reveal such far-out anomalies, and nothing is so dangerous as a false sense of security. It is simply impossible to regulate or prevent with any certainty what is not yet known.

A PAPER MONUMENT

Last August, even before the new law was passed, the FDA rushed out a set of new regulations under the old law to govern the clinical testing and investigational use of new drugs. The medical profession and pharmaceutical industry were given 60 days to file comments or objections. Almost all the comments were mixed or hostile. Early this year the regulations, revised somewhat in response to objections, went into effect.

A pharmaceutical company is required to notify the FDA of each new drug it proposes to test. Each notification must contain complete data on the drug's composition, sources, purposes, and manufacturing procedures; data and evidence from preclinical chemical and animal tests to prove reasonable safety, with names and qualifications of the preclinical investigators; and outline of the plan for clinically testing the drug, by phases, and the names and qualifications of all investigators, with certification that they are suitable experts. The clinical investigator will have to supply the drug's sponsor with full data on his training, qualifications, and facilities, keep adequate records and case histories, transmit periodic reports to the sponsor, and certify that consent of patients has been obtained to use the drug, except where this is not feasible or in his professional judgment is contrary to the best interests of patients. In each clinical phase the company will be required to make progress reports to the FDA at intervals not exceeding a year, and promptly notify it of any changes in plans, any alarming side effects discovered, or any decisions to discontinue tests, with the reasons therefor. At any point the FDA may step in to review the program, examine records, and halt trials if they are not conforming to plan or regulations.

On each of the thousands of experimental drugs clinically tested each year, this will produce a monumental pile of papers, details, and investigational lines to follow, with endless opportunity for controversy. In addition to the massive data accompanying every application for release of a new drug to market, a pharmaceutical firm will now have to file reports from the moment it begins clinically testing a new compound, on all the quirks and turns of its testing, even on all the compounds that lead nowhere. All together, it is estimated, the number of required reports flooding in on the FDA each year will run between 300,000 and 500,000.

Many in the industry concede that some check over the mushroom growth of clinical testing has been needed, and that some curb was long due on such abuses as insufficient clinical testing or excessive promotional use of the final phase of this testing, in which the still experimental drug is widely distributed to doctors. But they are also certain that the new regulations will greatly increase costs and prices, slow down the introduction of new drugs, and, if arbitrarily administered, constrict in endless red tape the experimental advance of medicine. At an extreme, this new experiment in regulation might be more devastating than any experimentation with the drugs themselves.

STOPPING THE VIVICOSMIC DISC IS NOT ENOUGH

Seriously at question, first of all, is the FDA's capacity to enforce the highly complex new regulations. Two congressional investigations, one headed by that redoubtable ex-pharmacist, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, are scheduled this year to dig into FDA organizational shortcomings and problems. And last autumn a distinguished citizens advisory committee appointed by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff came in from a year-long study with a flat recommendation that the FDA be completely reorganized. It should be reoriented, in the committee's view, away from its punitive policing role, toward a more strongly based scientific, cooperative agency, aimed primarily at educating the consumer and gaining voluntary industry compliance.

Conceived as an agency to crack down on the more outrageous patent nostrums and adulterated foods flourishing at the turn of the century, the FDA is still heavily at it. Only last November, for instance, it reported the seizure of some apparatus called the Vivicosmic Disc, the Radiant Life Meter, and the Household Analysis Set, shipped by Radiant Laboratories out of Tum Tum, Washington. While such frauds still bulk large, they are now a relatively minor backwoods problem compared with the highly subtle ones posed by the enormous growth of modern drugs. "The statistics of FDA's enforcement activity," concluded the Kefauver vommittee report in 1961, "indicate that most of its effort is focused elsewhere than on the quality of ethical drugs." At the time of the thalidomide crisis, only a little over one-fourth of FDA's staff of 3,000 worked on drugs, and it is estimated that an additional 470 will be needed to handle the new drug regulations. But getting them is something else again. When a supplemental $2,600,000 was requested last fall for additional staff, Congress, which had just made a heoric play in voting the new law, turned down the request to implement it. And even if its budget were increased, FDA would still have difficulty getting the right kind of men. Its heavy quasi-legal cast and low federal pay have never made it attractive to outstanding medical men.

IF THEY COME LIKE POLICE

Seriously at question, too, is whether legislators and the FDA are competent to regulate in this new experimental area at all. One of the original proposals in Congress, which was revised in the final bill, was that all patients must be informed and their permission secured before a new drug could be tried on them. This proposal might seem a reasonable protection against using people as guinea pigs, but it not only would have violated the ancient discretionary rules of medical practice but also would have ruled out all scientific blind testing. Another regulation, in its original form, would have required clinical investigators to provide complete plans of their testing programs beforehand and to keep and make available to the FDA on request complete reports of their progress. Not only would this have put a straitjacket on experimentation, but it would have snowed investigators in report writing, leaving less and less time for research. After wide protest, "complete" was changed to "adequate," and other flexibilities introduced. But the final wording still allows the agency too much leeway in intervening in the long-sacrosanct, confidential, and confidence-building relationship between physician and patient.

What dismays a leading clinician like Dr. Irvine H. Page of the Cleveland Clinic Foundation, noted pioneer in the study and control of hypertension and associated heart diseases, is that the FDA made no effort to mobilize interested medical and scientific people before it put out the first-draft regulations. Only later were meetings held. Says Dr. Page: "Some of the regulations are unsophisticated and show little understanding of how clinical research works. If you're going to legislate these matters, you have to have firsthand knowledge of clinical testing—which means have you done any? What we need to have is a sufficiently knowledgeable group of men at the FDA, so that when something occurs they along with the clinical investigator can study the problem together, rather than turn it over to the political panic boys."

The major interest of most competent clinical investigators is research into the basic mechanism of a disease, and clinical testing of new drugs is only a part, a necessary but pedestrian part, of this research. Too close or officious administration of the new regulations will put off the competent men from clinical testing, leaving only the pedestrians. "If they start coming around like police," says Page, a blunt-spoken man, "they know what they can do with it."

THE MIDDLE AT THE HUB

The new law and FDA's new regulations almost entirely miss the main issue: how to get more competent clinical investigators and improved techniques into the testing of new drugs. This cannot be done by rote or by regulatory supervision. The best chance of catching the earliest subtle signs of harmful side effects, as well as leads to the improvement of drugs or techniques, is to have the clinical testing done by the best independent investigators in a field, men who have special background in a disease and expertise in testing. In this aspect of the situation, much is left to be desired.

The drug companies rely on a rather haphazard system of clinical testing, grown up over the years, into which they have so far put much less efficiency and money than into their chemical-pharmacological research and development. Of some $248 million spent all told by the industry on research and development last year, only $25 million went to research outside the firms; i.e., mainly clinical testing. Most of this was in grants to hospital clinics, medical-research institutes, and universities. The doctor, who must be sought out to do the clinical testing because he has medical access to patients, is a more or less free agent attached to such an institution. He usually gets nothing directly out of the drug company's grant to his institution. In fact, he is given little incentive for doing this vital investigating job. Generally, since the drug is passed out to a number of investigators for testing simultaneously, he can expect little professional glory. And the whole matter of payment is an uneasy muddle, ranging from nothing at all to a luncheon, a check passed under the table, or a fee openly paid if his institution permits. The hunt for competent investigators willing to do testing under these conditions becomes feverish and open to abuse, with the jobs often going to the not so competent.

A MEETING OF MINDS LONG OVERDUE

Last spring the Committee on Public Health of the New York Academy of Medicine issued a report calling for a strengthening of the whole clinical-testing system. It found that some drug companies seemed to regard mere possession of an M.D. or Ph.D. degree as sufficient to qualify a man as an expert in testing. It cited an AMA attempt, as long ago as 1946, to bring together qualified investigators and drug companies through its Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry, an attempt that quickly faded for lack of industry interest. It noted that to date no official or professional body has set or applied any professional standards for clinical testers. (In fact, it is only in recent years that clinical testing has begun to be taught as a separate discipline in some medical schools.) The new FDA regulations sidestep this issue because, quite properly, the FDA wanted to avoid interfering in medical practice by putting all responsibility for selecting "suitable experts" on the industry. But this leaves everything as before, with nothing to raise the standards of testing.

Page believes that two measures, if adopted by drug firms, could go far to get more competent testers. First, a clinical investigator should be given some priority in testing a new drug, particularly in the initial clinical phases. As he explains, a scientist not in industrial research generally gets his main reward and reputation from being first in a development; he finds no charm in doing what half a dozen other investigators are doing at the same time, under industry pressure to get quick and often superficial results. Second, an investigator should get some regular form of payment. Most top clinicians don't want to accept money from a company to test a drug, because they feel it would tie their hands as to objectivity, and because it would not look objective to the outside world or to the profession. This stigma, Page suggests, might be removed by having the drug companies pay periodic sums into a general fund administered by the AMA, which would then pay investigators for this necessary work, with no specific company strings attached. But, ultimately, the whole final responsibility for testing new drugs rests on the medical profession, which must soon set some standards and find more efficient ways of using the available supply of competent clinical investigators.

So far there has been little meeting of minds between the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry on clinical testing or on other great problems caused by the proliferation of modern drugs. An exchange of views among thoughtful leaders and the establishment of a common policy is long overdue. Where self-regulation does not clearly operate, government legislation, often bad legislation, moves in. Indeed, in this current attempt to carry regulation for the first time back into the intricate, uncertain bypaths of scientific experimentation and freedom of research, fraught as it is with matters of life and death, the benefits of the past may well be dissipated and those of the future jeopardized.

Government Aid Would Help the Church, But—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Kenneth H. Hopp as it appeared in the March–April 1963 issue of Liberty, a publication of the International Religious Liberty Association:

GOVERNMENT AID WOULD HELP THE CHURCH, BUT—

(By Kenneth H. Hopp, B.S., LL.B.)

Just now this country is experiencing one of the greatest periods of religious growth in its history. When we consider what religion can do to reform and reclaim men, we can rejoice at this. Many are doing more than rejoicing; they are looking for ways of further promoting that growth. Some, realizing that a major hindrance to the work of the church is the perennial shortage of money, are looking to the Government for help. Others are requesting Government favor for religion. It is true that the requests are hardly as badly stated as this, but they are made.

It is not enough to say that no good would come from such aid. Probably a great deal of good would be accomplished. It is in spite of this good that aid should be opposed, because the good will be more than paid for by much greater harm. It is the lesson of history that state support to a church corrupts both the state that gives it and the church that accepts it.

For the first 300 years of its existence the Christian church was at best only tolerated—at worst, savagely persecuted. These 300

years of oppression were a period of great growth, percentagewise, the greatest in history. Beginning with a group of 12 uneducated men, the church dotted the Roman Empire with its congregations. From Britain to Egypt, from the Crimea to Mauretania, the message was proclaimed, and thousands upon thousands were converted. Nor was its work limited to the Roman Empire. Ethiopia and other areas also heard its message. This growth under persecution, which continued up to the time of Constantine the Great, is proof of the sound and flourishing condition of the church.

Early in the fourth century Constantine became at least nominally a Christian, and from that time on Christianity was the favored religion in Europe. Its opponents suffered the persecution familiar to earlier Christians.

THE MOSLEM CHALLENGE

Let us skip over a thousand years to the 14th century and examine the consequences of this policy of favor. Looking at the map depicting the spread of Christianity, we do see growth. But looking at areas where Christianity had, at the time of Constantine, already conquered, we see many blank spots. North Africa, home of many flourishing churches and birthplace of distinguished theologians, is lost. So is Egypt, with its great center of learning at Alexandria. Asia Minor is also lost, and with it Nicea, site of the greatest general council of Christendom. Syria is lost. Worst of all, the Holy Land is lost, and with it Jerusalem and Bethlehem, names dear to all Christians.

These areas have stayed lost. In a few areas scattered congregations of Christians exist, in others there are substantial numbers of Christians, but the great mass of the people is solidly Moslem. Even the Christians that are there are mostly immigrants and their descendants. This is not the way the early church made its converts.

What is the reason for this loss? Is it that Christianity, victorious against the decadent paganism of the Roman Empire, could not compete with the vigor of Islam? Or is it that the protection and aid of the state turned out to be a smothering and confining embrace?

It is no answer to say that the areas listed were all conquered by Moslems. True, they were. But the conquerors were only a small minority in the lands they conquered. By the standards of the time, they were quite tolerant of other religions. (See Edward Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," ch. LI.) They were much more considerate of Christians than the Romans had been. Yet whole nations became Moslem. Why?

Mohammedanism originated in the city of Mecca, a distance of 800 miles from Jerusalem. This distance was not great even for those times. Why had not Christian missionaries traveled to that city and converted its inhabitants?

There is an incident in history that is highly illuminating. We have all heard of Marco Polo, his travels in China, and his description of the court of Kublai Khan. What we often forget is that his father, Niccolò Polo, and his uncle Maffeo Polo, had already made a trip to China when Marco was a boy. When they were about to return to Italy, the Khan gave them letters to the Pope, letters asking that the Pope send 100 learned men to teach Christianity in his domain. What an opportunity. What a chance for the Gospel to reach those who had never heard it.

Yet, when this request arrived, only two men could be found to answer it. These two, a pair of Dominican monks, in company with the three Polos, left for China. Long before they reached their destination, the monks, frightened by reports of a war along the way, returned. The Polos went on. In short, the attraction of gold was enough to cause the Polos to complete a trip too perilous for those entrusted with the souls of a continent. And this occurred during what has been called "the thirteenth—greatest of centuries." (For a description of this episode, see H. G. Wells' "Outline of History," ch. XXXII, sec. 3.)

CONSEQUENCES OF A FAVOR

It is now in order to ask whether the favors shown to Christianity by Constantine and his successors had anything to do with these conditions.

When we examine the course taken by Constantine and his successors we see that they did not merely legalize Christianity and free Christians from the threat of persecution. They went further, and favored Christians over non-Christians. Of the many ways in which they were favored, perhaps most outstanding was favoritism in appointments to official positions. It soon became plain that the way to advancement was to "take up the cross." To paraphrase a certain hymn, "It paid to serve Jesus, it paid."

This policy had its natural effect. Thousands upon thousands of pagans poured into the church. Were they convinced of the spiritual superiority of Christianity? Hardly. They were attracted to the church because of its temporal advantages.

Once in the church, what then? It must be remembered that being a Christian means that some activities are eschewed. In the words of Christ, His follower will "deny himself." But most pagans did not join the church to deny themselves. Far from it. The general result was a reduction in the spiritual level of the church.

Previously, converts had really believed the church's teachings; potential torture and death were hardly reward for "rice" Christians. Hence they had had in themselves a burning desire to preach the message of Christ to all who had not heard it; now they were succeeded by those who had joined the church from reasons of policy, not conviction. To them a trip to an insignificant and uncomfortable little city like Mecca for the purpose of teaching ignorant Arabs was the height of folly. So, when, 300 years after Constantine, Mohammed preached his message to those same Arabs, he had not the competition of a vigorous Christianity.

After the death of Mohammed, his successors carried his message across North Africa to the Atlantic Ocean, to Asia Minor, to many other places in which Christianity had apparently a thriving life. In almost all the lands they conquered, they converted the populace. The Christianity that thrived under the savage persecution of pagan Rome died under the much milder rule of the Moslems.

We need not be surprised at this. After all, the descendants of those who became Christians for reasons of policy can scarcely be blamed for becoming Moslems for reasons of policy. Added to this factor is the strong probability that during this time Christianity had become less attractive, less worth suffering for.

With these developments occurred another. The kings and princes who gave special privileges to the church expected their reward—support of the church in their rule. The result was that submission to authority and nonresistance to the most exorbitant demands of rulers became the burden of sermons. An illustration of the support given by the church to such rulers is found in the attempted revocation of the Magna Carta, the great charter of English liberties, by Pope Innocent III a few months after it was granted by King John.

This development explains why many citizens began to identify their oppressors with their priests. Resistance to one met opposition from the other. The prominent and often successful liberal movements throughout the world have generally regarded religion as an opponent. All too often they have been justified in doing so.

Surely Constantine and his successors never desired these results. Surely they wanted the church to be vigorous, strong, and loved by the people. They would have indignantly denied any charge that their own policies were weakening and corrupting the church. Yet they were. Those who seek government favor for their church, or for religion in general, should give serious thought to whether they are asking for a blessing or a curse.

THE MODERN CHALLENGE

A policy that goes no further than government support for a church's welfare and educational program has its own corrupt influence. To begin with, church groups become initiated in the time-honored practices of log-rolling and, of course, threatening retaliation at the polls. Conditions would deteriorate further if a number of churches were competing for funds. Spirituality cannot but suffer during such procedures.

Government subsidies invite government regulations. It has been aptly stated that "it is hardly lack of due process for the state to regulate that which it subsidizes." Churches relying on government aid must live in fear that an unsympathetic administration will force regulation on the whole of its program. This it can easily do by using the threat of withheld funds. Even friendly administrations would be forced to impose some regulations. After all, even after funds are appropriated, the government can hardly hand them over to churches and promptly forget them. It owes a duty to the taxpayers to insure proper spending. This means, first of all, that the purposes of the appropriations must be stated, so that both church and government know what they may be spent for. Another way of putting it would be that the appropriation acts must spell out what of the church's activities receive official aid and what do not.

Next, recipients of funds would be required to keep record of expenditures and of the results of the expenditures. Third, the right to investigate the inevitable reports of misappropriation must be established. Finally, with the use of funds for purposes not authorized established, legal proceedings would be instituted to recover them. If it were necessary to cut off the funds of groups declining to cooperate in the reasonable requirements of report and investigation, what an uproar that would make.

There are other ways in which the policy might affect the churches. Church leaders who are most effective at persuading appropriations committees to vote large sums might not be the strongest spiritual leaders. If such men rose to leadership in a church, it might be at the expense of the spiritual tone of the church.

The process would go on from one dreary decline to another. Carrying a program to congregations and persuading them to sacrifice to support it has a salutary effect on church leaders. If they have the resources of the state, they can set up programs, carry them out with hired workers, and then wonder at their members' lack of interest. On the other hand, church members not consulted by their leaders and not sold on the need of their contributions would respond in an entirely foreseeable way—they would lose interest in their church's program.

Contrast this with the situation that exists today, where churches look only to their own people for support. Freed from the quest for public funds, church leaders now see the connection between the spiritual condition of their flocks and the support they give to their church. Separated from the need to study the changing political picture, they can study the needs of their people. Church members, realizing that the

church has no other resource, give for its needs. Jesus said, "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also" (Matthew 6: 21). The giving of money is closely connected with the giving of time and effort, and with the spiritual health of the church.

Any departure from a position of strict neutrality on the part of the state from a policy that neither favors nor hinders religion paves the way for the next compromise. No line can be drawn that persistent pressure on behalf of special interest, whether religious or secular, cannot breach. Were a series of concessions made, even to accomplish the most obvious good, the results would be the ends we all now rightly abhor.

Those who oppose efforts on the part of churches to obtain favors from the state are not enemies of religion. Far from it. With one eye on the sad history of compromise and another on the sad potential, they seek to protect religion from the dangers to which some of its well-meaning supporters would subject it.

America's "March King"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert in the RECORD a tribute, taken from the Royal Arch Mason, to Mr. Karl King, internationally known composer and conductor, and a former Iowan.

The tribute follows:

KARL L. KING BECAME AMERICA'S "MARCH KING"

Brother Karl Lawrence King, successor to John Philip Sousa as America's "march king" is a composer, bandsman, bandmaster, and publisher. He has been honored with a memorial bridge bearing his name; holds an honorary degree of doctor of music, and is the recipient of innumerable medals and musical honors. Indeed Karl L. King stands today as the dean of American march composers for he has written more marches than any other bandmaster.

Possessed of a quiet, unassuming manner and an inherent dignity, Companion King, now 72, is an impressive figure with his 6 feet 4 inches of height. His composing career dates from the publication of his first march in 1908, at the age of 17, to his latest composition for the massed bands playing at Mason City, Iowa, last spring when Meredith Willson's "Music Man" was previewed.

Born in Paintersville, Ohio, February 21, 1891, Karl King grew up in Xenia, Cleveland, and Canton, Ohio. He affiliated with Freemasonry at an early age and has been a member of Canton Lodge No. 60 for almost 50 years. At the age of 11, he studied baritone and other brass instruments with William Strassner, director of the Thayer Military Band at Canton, as well as playing in the band. Forced to quit school when in the eighth grade, he worked in a printing shop until he was 18. During this time, he spent many of his free hours poring over a harmony and instrumentation text and studying the band compositions available to him.

At the age of 17 Karl King published two pieces: a march entitled "Salute to Camp Harrison," and a dirge, "Our Last Farewell." Since that time he has written approximately 200 marches, overtures, intermezzos, serenades, dirges, waltzes, rags, novelties, and galops. He is best known for his marches, which as of 1961 totaled 102.

When he was 19, following a brief engagement with the Neddermeyer Band of Columbus, Ohio, King began an illustrious career with circus bands, starting as baritonist and later acting as conductor during the glorious golden years of the circus on the American scene. He began with the Robinson Famous Shows in 1910 and the following year became a member of the Yankee Robinson Circus. The year 1912 found him playing under the baton of W. P. English in the Sells-Floto Circus Band and the following year with the Barnum & Bailey Circus Band under the conductor Ned Brill. It was at this time that he composed one of his most famous marches, "Barnum and Bailey's Favorite," which he dedicated to Brill.

The next three seasons found him directing the band for the Sells-Floto and Buffalo Bill Combined Shows. In 1917 he returned to Barnum & Bailey Circus Band, this time as conductor. In 1918–19 he conducted the Grand Army Band in Canton, Ohio.

The next step in the career of this versatile brother was the establishment of the K. L. King Music House in Fort Dodge, Iowa in 1920, where today he combines music publishing with composing of band music as well as directing the Fort Dodge Municipal Band.

Companion King is past president of the American Bandmasters Association, past president of the Iowa Bandmasters Association, and in 1953 was presented with an honorary degree of doctor of music by Phillips University, Enid, Okla. He is a member of Delta Chapter No. 51, R.A.M., Fort Dodge; Medina Council No. 26, R. & S.M., Eagle Grove, Iowa; Calvary Commandery No. 24, K.T., Fort Dodge; Des Moines Consistory, A.A.S.R., (S.J.), Za-Ga-Zig Shrine Temple, and St. Bartholomew Conclave, Red Cross of Constantine, all of Des Moines. He is also past president of the High Twelve Club of Fort Dodge.

German-Egyptian Rocketry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the past weeks I have followed with great interest the press reports concerning the controversy over United Arab Republic missiles and the role of Germany in their development. Frankly, I am very concerned that given the usual Arab-Israeli animosities, a miscalculation at any time could set the world on fire. It disturbs me that Germany, which has stood firmly on the side of the Western Nations in the last decade, should now, by her help to the United Arab Republic in construction of weapons of mass destruction, add fuel to an already burning fire. Those of us who have had a continuous and keen interest in the affairs of the Middle East know the danger a change in the military balance would represent.

I believe we are well aware of the inherent dangers to our own security should hostilities break out anew in the Middle East. Now is the time for our country to make very clear to the United Arab Republic that a military move against Israel would have grave implications.

I am also aware of the recent denials in regard to the role of German scientists and the scope and development of missiles in the United Arab Republic. If one is to believe the denials, then what is actually going on? Certainly the United Arab Republic must be striving for some sort of weapons superiority.

My hope is that our State Department, in its preoccupation with other matters, has not overlooked the signs of growing danger in this vital area. Therefore, with the previous in view, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the article on German-Egyptian rocketry which appeared in the winter of 1962–63 publication of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., which follows:

GERMAN-EGYPTIAN ROCKETRY

The decision of our Government to make available certain defense weapons to Israel has unleashed a torrent of abuse from Egypt. President Kennedy himself has come under attack by the Cairo government's controlled radio and press. A cartoon in one of the leading Egyptian newspapers Al Ahram depicted the President in the role of the notorious gangster Al Capone. A prominent Egyptian commentator, Tawfiq Hasan, told Egyptian radio listeners that the United States held "contempt for the United Nations" and was pursuing a policy of "aggression against the Arabs" (Oct. 2, 1962). Another broadcast over Cairo Radio (Oct. 5, 1962) described the United States as "the commander of the * * * imperialist camp." Parenthetically, American taxpayers ought to bear in mind that Egypt has received over $700 million in U.S. aid and expects an additional $500 million from Uncle Sam in the next few years.

That Egypt should let loose this wild fury reveals at least two significant things: (1) The professions of Egypt's friendship for the United States which some of our policymakers are trying to convince the American people as being genuine, turns out to a thin veneer concealing a profound contempt and animosity toward our country. (2) In view of the fact that the Hawk missile which the Israeli Government intends to purchase, is designed solely to oppose invading aircraft, why should the Egyptian Government complain unless it contemplates some dangerous adventures?

CAIRO'S BOAST

The story of missiles in the Middle East has serious implications and deserves careful thought by all security minded Americans. We may be able to understand what is involved if we examine the problem by retracing some of its background. On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Nasser's seizure of power Radio Cairo (July 21, 1962) broadcast to its listeners the following: "Rise of Sun of our Arab Nations, illuminate the world and tell everyone we shall always be glorious and triumphant. * * * The United Arab Republic has successfully launched a missile." President Nasser himself was at the scene when four missiles were fired and he boasted in a speech that their missiles were in "large scale production." Press reports indicate that all of Cairo's propaganda guns made the most of the occasion. Cairo Radio devoted 2 hours to martial music. It was, indeed, a gala event.

The missiles were given specific names as though each of them possessed super heroic qualities. For example, one of the missiles, having a range of 400 miles, was called the Conqueror. When reporters asked Presi-

dent Nasser to explain the military significance of this rocket, he replied that it should be regarded in terms of the range that it can reach. Pressed still more for a specific answer, Nasser blithely replied that the exact range was "a little south of Beirut." On the map the target is obvious, namely, Lebanon's southern neighbor Israel.

It is interesting to note that military experts have declared that Egypt's rockets are of minimal value without nuclear warheads. In this connection, the London Economist (July 28, 1962) wrote the following: "President Nasser gave a nightmare glimpse into the far distance when he casually answered the Pravda correspondent's question about nuclear warheads with: 'We have not reached that yet'."

As for the cost of this ambitious program, Cairo has been very coy. The Egyptian Government has not published any figures but in the latest budget allocations for the armed forces there is a substantial increase over the previous year's total. The increase, according to the London Times (July 23, 1962), is about 12 percent of the state budget. Thus, while President Nasser continues to promise his people all of the good things of life and even boasts that "we manufacture everything from sewing needles to rockets," the statistics show that the Egyptians will have to continue to forgo better living standards for the greater glory of Nasser's rockets. Indeed, Nasser has attached a sacredness to these rockets. The day before they were displayed he declared that "God willing, you (the Egyptian people) will be able to see these rockets." In that same declaration he boasts that "we have war factories" and he assured his listeners that "the will of the people is bound to triumph."

BONN AND CAIRO

When Cairo's entry into the missile age became front page news, stories began to pop up about a mysterious group of German scientists and technicians who were said to have contributed to the development of Nasser's rocket arsenal. When the Cairo government was asked to comment, it remained silent. On the other hand, the New York Times (August 5, 1962) reported that the Bonn government "denied this week that any German company or individuals officially were known to have participated in Cairo's rocket effort." The formulation of this denial, as reported by the Times, is fascinating. Please note the word "officially." This is the key to the denial for, in effect, the West German Government is telling the world that it knows all about the rocket deals with Cairo, but not officially. In the same issue of the Times a report from Vienna reveals that Dr. Eduard Lenzo, Economics Minister of Baden-Wurttemberg, said that a West German company had been established to export rocket parts to Egypt.

Let us examine the relations of Bonn to Cairo on this sensitive question a bit more closely. Apparently, these relations seem to have a comparatively long history. As far back as December 8, 1960, the official "Bulletin" of the West German Government announced that a meeting of German officials connected with atomic energy had exchanged ideas with Egyptian authorities in West Germany on "nuclear scientific and nuclear technical questions." The communiqué further declared that, after both sides had explained their mutual atomic programs, "different possibilities for collaboration between the two states were discussed." The leading German representative in these negotiations further said that his Government was "basically ready to help the United Arab Republic in the development of its atomic research for nuclear development." Other reliable reports revealed that the West Germans had agreed to furnish "a stream of nuclear scientists and technicians" to the United Arab Republic. These same reports said that the University of Gottingen would supply scientific personnel to aid in the implementation of the agreement. It is noteworthy that the Science Division of the Gottingen University and scientific circles in Egypt "have had close relations over the years." Hence, we can see that the Germans had made official agreements, some of them still secret, with Egypt on the development of that country's nuclear power.

SAENGER AND "COMPANY"

The key German scientist in this operation is Dr. Eugen Saenger, a man who is comparatively young. His background is interesting. Saenger opened a rocket research institute for the Nazi Air Ministry as early as 1936. He worked on a number of developments which were designed to improve the Nazis' striking power. One of his pet projects was the development of a long-distance bomber capable of attacking New York. After the war, Saenger became director of the Stuttgart Institute for Jet Propulsion Physics.

Last year Saenger was dismissed from his post in Stuttgart when his tieup with Cairo was publicly exposed. However, this did not faze him at all since he, together with a couple of his German colleagues, were paid a yearly salary of about $500,000 for services rendered to the Egyptian Government. Saenger was also given Egyptian funds to buy in West Germany all of the equipment and the materials needed for Nasser's missiles. On this point the AP (July 23, 1962) reported that the German newspaper Abendzeitung revealed that about 250 West German rocket experts and technicians were working secretly in the UAR. It also stated that the four rockets which had been fired on the occasion of the Egyptian Government's 10th anniversary, "were bought earlier from the United States and worked on by German experts." This same German newspaper also reported that these German scientists and technicians were employed through Swiss concerns in Zurich "which act as camouflage for their activities."

Associated with Dr. Saenger in this work are the German scientists Brandner and Pilz. According to European press reports, West German officials gave them their passports, made sure that their pensions were in good standing and "treated them as honored citizens." Brandner, while ostensibly a prisoner in Russia after the war, helped to perfect Russian bomber planes capable of carrying nuclear weapons. Pilz, who had worked with Wernher von Braun, now an American citizen, on Hitler's V-1 and V-2 projects at Peenemünde, worked for the French after the war on that country's rocket projects. In short, these scientists made sure that Germany's military defeat would not interrupt the march of German science. As for Bonn's involvement, C. L. Sulzberger wrote in the New York Times that "Bonn has been aware for many months of this special German role in the Middle East arms race" (New York Times, Aug. 6, 1962). In short, all of the evidence concerning the sinister activities of these German scientists leads directly to the authorities in Bonn.

"EXPERIMENTING" ABROAD

Since the story broke, there have been new reports concerning these scientists. We are now told that some of them have disappeared—allegedly kidnapped. While the Egyptians have pointed an accusing finger at Israel, it seems clear that these scientists are in Cairo. Apparently, these German scientists who have embarrassed their Allied partners, have quietly moved on to Egypt where they can continue their work without the glare of publicity. The revelations which we have outlined in brief, must have shocked a number of policymakers in Washington and London who have been advocating a greater exchange of nuclear know-how with Bonn. It must have been quite vexing for them to observe how the Germans were able to leap into the field of atomic weapons development through the activities of such scientists as Herr Saenger in Cairo. Bonn, of course, was quite embarrassed, too, and, according to press reports, German officials expressed their chagrin over what these German scientists were doing. Nevertheless, they claimed that they were helpless to rectify this situation. After all, so the official explanation goes, these scientists do not work for the Bonn government. Therefore, they are free agents. Moreover, since West Germany is a free country, how can these scientists be stopped from earning their bread and butter in Egypt?

This sounds like a plausible predicament and may convince those who are unaware of German techniques. Let us be specific. After World War I, leading members of the German General Staff managed to become key advisers to the Chinese military establishment. The head of this mission was Col. Walter Bauer, one of General von Ludendorf's chief assistants and a friend of Adolf Hitler. The Bauer mission turned out to be an embarrassment to the Weimar government. When certain Chinese leaders publicly revealed that great quantities of war material were being shipped into China in violation of the Versailles Treaty, the Weimar government was in a tough spot. It sought to absolve itself of the responsibility by pretending that this was not an official mission and had nothing to do with the government. Obviously, this denial was made to forestall any Allied probe.

Under Weimar the German military practiced their profession in other lands, i.e., Russia, Holland, Spain, Sweden, and even in South America. The aim was twofold: (1) to help the German industrial war lords to grab some of the armament business and (2) to preserve and improve Germany's military know-how in the face of the restrictions laid down by the Versailles Treaty. In both instances German objectives were accomplished in the main and it is doubtful that Hitler would have been able to confront the world with such a powerful war machine in so short a time, had it not been for the extracurricular activities practiced by the German military while German officials looked the other way.

German activities in this field since the end of World War II have a startling similarity with the past. In places far removed from each other, politically and even geographically, like Spain and Soviet Russia, German scientists have been peddling their wares. They have been welcomed in the United States, too, and they seem to be doing a good job for President Nasser. As one French newspaper remarked, the Saengers and other German scientists have "become the foot soldiers of science. They work in France, in the East, in Italy, in Egypt * * *" (Carrefour, Sept. 26, 1962). Let it not be forgotten that above all they work for the fatherland.

A REAL SOLUTION WANTED

This article would not be complete without an evaluation of our Government's wise decision to permit Israel to acquire defensive rockets. Given the accelerated arms buildup in Egypt and Nasser's expressed determination to launch war when the time becomes opportune, our Government showed farsightedness in terms of our own national interests.

When a house is about to be set on fire and threatens to spread, there is little time for making long-range plans to fireproof the house. The immediate need is firemen but one should not mistake the firemen's task for the real job that needs to be done.

The Middle East is a tinderbox of boiling hatreds. The arms race there is spurred on by Soviet machinations and by the stubborn, almost fanatical warlike policies of the Nasserites. Yet, one must plan for the future, for the delivery of arms to counter this dan-

ger is no real solution. Much more needs to be done. Certainly, the United States in its own national interest as well as in the interest of world peace and security, must actively seek ways and means of breaking the vicious circle of arms buildup. Of one thing we are certain. It cannot be brought about by appeasing the aggressive forces in the Middle East nor by merely maintaining the fragile balance of military power among the states involved. Constructive and positive action is imperative. In the search for a genuine program for world disarmament, the possibilities of initiating such a project via the Middle East deserves the closest attention and thought of U.S. policymakers.

Ties That Bind Common Market Are Binding on Twin Cities, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important factors in the future of the American economy is the trading relationship this country has developed with the Common Market countries of Europe. This relationship is especially significant to my own district and to the State of Minnesota as a whole.

Through the Great Lakes port of Duluth and the Mississippi River traffic of Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., is one of the major exporting States of the Nation. Approximately 375,000 Minnesota workers—including 200,000 on farms—are affected by foreign trade, and can claim a $203 million share of U.S. exports.

If the U.S. negotiators do not now skillfully use the legislative tools given them by the Congress in 1962, that vast trade will be seriously jeopardized, as the following articles from the March 19 Minneapolis Star point out:

TIES THAT BIND COMMON MARKET ARE BINDING ON TWIN CITIES, TOO

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is an excerpt from "Minneapolis and the Common Market: The Ties That Bind" in Greater Minneapolis, published by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce.)

Minnesota has a large stake in foreign trade and stands to fare well with expanded markets. Approximately 375,000 workers—including 200,000 on farms—are affected by foreign trade and can claim a $203 million share of U.S. exports. In the Twin Cities, foreign trade affects 112,000 manufacturing workers—2 out of every 3. The cities' share of exports is estimated at $87.5 million.

Exports of manufactured goods from Hennepin County amounted to $40.7 million in 1960 and 42 businesses each exported more than $25,000 in that year. Approximately 29,400 workers were employed in these establishments out of 72,822 manufacturing workers in the county.

Major exporting industries in Minneapolis are: Nonelectrical machinery, instruments and related products, food and kindred products, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, fabricated metal products, and rubber and plastic products.

"Tools for the modernization of industrial processes will be imported from many cities in the United States," said one executive from an important Minneapolis manufacturing firm. "There will be a great boon for Minneapolis firms in the small components and computers field, farm equipment, and processed foods, if these firms desire to do business overseas," he said.

Major Minneapolis imports come from non-Common Market countries and are mostly the raw materials that are noncompetitive with our own industries.

The main exception is Minnesota iron ore which cannot compete successfully in regard to grade or price. Food imports are mainly in the noncompetitive area of tropical fruits, nuts, spices.

There are many possible trade arrangements between the United States and Western Europe. Congress has recently given President Kennedy a powerful negotiating authority in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which enables him to cut U.S. tariffs and deal with foreign import restrictions.

One of the reasons for the urgent need for the act is to maintain and expand markets for U.S. goods in the European Economic Community. Former authority was totally inadequate for this purpose because it was too limited in scope and enactment was too slow.

As EEC internal tariffs are removed, competition will be more difficult for businessmen outside the Common Market, and it may encourage investment in the EEC area simply to get inside the external tariff barrier.

On the other hand, if the level of the common external tariff were lowered, opportunities would incerase for American business to compete in the large EEC market by using productive facilities in the United States and by directly employing American workers.

That is why the President requested the authority to negotiate for the widest reduction of the EEC common external tariff at the earliest opportunity.

BRUSSELS SQUEEZES OUR FARMERS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Agricultural ministers of the European Common Market meet in Brussels tomorrow to consider a report by the European Commission on agricultural price criteria.)

What goes on in Brussels these days is of compelling pocketbook interest to the American farmer. From $1 to $1.5 billion of American farm exports go to Europe annually. The future of much of this market depends on decisions by the agricultural ministers of the European Economic Community (EEC) on farm policy within the Common Market Six.

U.S. poultry raisers already have been hurt. The six nations—France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, West Germany, Luxembourg—early in 1962 agreed on a common policy for eggs and poultry, fruits and vegetables. The import duty on chickens was boosted from 4½ cents a pound to 12½ cents. The levy in West Germany, our biggest outlet, rose from 4.8 to 13 cents a pound.

The result has been that poultry exports to EEC slumped fast after midyear—to $12.6 million in the 4-month period ended November 30 from $20.3 million a year earlier.

The poultry market was doomed, anyway. As soon as European producers learned to mass-produce birds as we do they would be able to meet our prices. But in the meantime the Six have, in effect, erected a wall against our chickens.

The Six were to have worked out an agreement on cereals by April 1, but now that deadline has again been set back. Smooth negotiations within the Market weren't helped by President de Gaulle's veto of Britain's entry, and so talks may drag on and on.

When a common policy is worked out, feed grains, wheat, flour, rice, and vegetables are the most likely candidates for additional tariff protection. Rule out cotton; Europe is not a major producer of that fiber.

Take wheat. France has a support price of about $2.30 a bushel, as against the $1.82 price support here. West Germany supports wheat at $3.15 a bushel. According to Farm Journal, the upper limit for the eventual marketwide support already has been set even higher than the present German level, which is the highest in the world.

Now the prophets of gloom predict that De Gaulle will push for the higher German price to make France Europe's granary. France grows more than three times as much wheat as West Germany.

The current gloom presupposes a Gaullist common market. But Jean Monnet, the architect of EEC, looks to an agricultural community in which inefficient farmers will be discouraged, efficient producers will be encouraged, and needed agricultural products that cannot be efficiently produced will be imported.

And even De Gaulle should be able to see the dangers of a strict protectionism for the Common Market—overproduction, inflation, high wages, and hence high prices for the very industrial products the Six must ship to thrive.

The Muffled Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the York Dispatch of York, Pa., carries a "Mail Bag" section in which it features "Letters From the People." One of the recent letters which appeared in the March 14 edition is from Wayne Burg, who writes eloquently concerning the need for more minority staff members on congressional committees to prevent what he calls the muffled minority.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this "Letter from the People" in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Burg's letter follows:

THE MUFFLED MINORITY

To the EDITOR:

There is little public knowledge to date on an exceedingly dangerous threat to the two-party system in the United States. The problem of minority committee staffing is currently being given high priority by Republican Members of Congress.

The Republican House conference headed by Representative GERALD FORD, Republican of Michigan, has set up a subcommittee on minority staffing. Its function is to study and recommend solutions to the 10–1 unbalance among the majority and minority staff members assigned to the standing committees of the House of Representatives and Senate.

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, is heading the subcommittee which, through its investigations has found that there are 461 majority staff members in the House as opposed to 43 for the minority. The Joint Committees of both Houses show a 70-to-2 ratio for the majority.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 litical affiliation. All committee chairmen

should appoint staff members according to skill and professional experience and not political affiliation. All committee chairman are of the majority party. It would appear from the above figures that some committee chairman have forgotten about the Reorganization Act.

Most of the legislative work of Congress is done by the committees, the Senate having 18 and the House 22. There are eight Joint Committees composed of members of both Houses. The personnel assigned to these committees conduct investigations, analyze reports, arrange hearings, and propose recommendations that with committee approval guide legislation through Congress.

Representative SCHWENGEL has proposed a resolution which would provide for a 60–40 distribution on committee staffs. This has been given little support by the Democrats. I believe the American public should be aware of this inequity because of its far-reaching implications. It does not take a political scientist to see that good Government under the two-party system suffers when the minority is deprived of the means to, (1) develop constructive alternatives, (2) offer sound criticism and evaluation, (3) document and communicate its views, and (4) check information supplied by the majority against impartial sources.

A "muffled minority" cannot effectively implement these activities. Every democratic form of government must in some way provide for a collision of viewpoints to insure legislation which reflects the will of the people, and not merely partisan thinking. Dictatorships thrive on the death of political minorities; Democrats and Republicans alike are responsible for the preservation of minority views at all levels of government. Public support for equitable representation of both parties on congressional committees should be urged by all citizens and letters to your congressman and senator can help get the job done.

WAYNE N. BURG.

National Boys' Club Week, March 31–April 6, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that coming this week is National Boys' Club Week throughout the Nation. Boys' Clubs of America which is chartered by Congress is doing an outstanding job in serving more than 600,000 boys in 625 local organizations in nearly every State in the Union.

The Boys' Clubs of America under the chairmanship of the Honorable Herbert Hoover, who has led this movement for more than 25 years; the presidency of Mr. Albert L. Cole, of Greenwich, Conn.; and Mr. John M. Gleason, the national director, has reached an impressive degree of importance, and now have buildings, facilities, and equipment valued at more than $150 million. Their clubs are staffed by 5,000 professional workers and they have amassed more than 80,000 volunteers to help in the cause of "juvenile decency."

The Herbert Hoover Headquarters Building of Boys' Clubs of America at 771 First Avenue, New York, N.Y., stands directly opposite the United Nations for millions of national and international visitors to see this symbol of the American way of life.

Their code—

I believe in God and the right to worship according to my own faith and religion.

I believe in America and the American way of life * * * in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I believe in fairplay, honesty, and sportsmanship.

I believe in my Boys' Club which stands for these things—

Is also dramatically indicative of our heritage and I find it most fitting to call it to your attention.

On this, the occasion of the 103d anniversary of the founding of the first Boys' Club in Hartford, Conn., a resident and author of my congressional district, Mr. Robert J. Murrin, wrote a poem in honor of this organization and the significant contribution it is making in "Building the Citizens of Tomorrow" and strengthening our democratic principles.

Under unanimous consent of this body, I insert here the text of Mr. Murrin's poem and join with him in paying tribute to this worthy American institution:

BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

It's an organization throughout our land
Which extends to boys a helping hand.
Guiding and leading as each goes his way
Down paths to the future in his life of today.

With dedicated leaders, all friends of the boy,
They fill his free time with learning and joy.
With diversified programs geared to his needs,
The Boys' Clubs are planting good character seeds.

Through hobbies and crafts, and libraries new,
Dramatics and game rooms—a group club or two;
Through informal guidance and a place of his own,
A boy need not feel that he walks alone.

Strengthening of body and development of mind
Are among the objectives of Boys' Clubs, you'll find.
To encourage the boys who need it the most,
Is a basic philosophy of which they can boast.

From the hazards of streets and temptation to wrong,
They divert his energy and help him "belong."
"Fun with a purpose"—so adequately phrased
Yes, Boys' Clubs of America deserves highest praise.

Kennedys Fear One Man in 1964 Election—Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr Speaker, one of the best kept secrets of the Republican Party at the present time is the weakness of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller as a presidential candidate. In fact, it is getting to be less and less of a secret each week as his lack of appeal to Republicans begins to show. As usual, it can be expected that the Democrats will build him up since he is the man they would like to place in opposition to President Kennedy in 1964. Former Postmaster General Jim Farley propounded the "my friend, Nelson Rockefeller" line in a statement last week and we, in truth, read these statements all of the time. Of course, it will be Republicans and not Democrats who will nominate our candidate next year.

It is becoming more obvious that Republicans want a bona fide candidate who will not run on a "me too" platform. The strong position of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is ringing clearly to Republicans throughout the country and I believe a genuine ground swell of opinion is forming in behalf of this great Senator. He speaks forthrightly about the affairs of state, is not deluded by the Communists and offers a positive free enterprise approach to preserve the sovereignty of our Nation internationally and fiscally at home. The bungling of this administration and its frightening lack of economic horsesense coupled with the inept handling of foreign affairs would naturally cause the Kennedys to fear a man who would speak out in honest contrast in the 1964 campaign. Americans are looking for a candidate like BARRY GOLDWATER—North, South, East, and West.

Walter Trohan hit the nail right on the head in his "Report from Washington," which appeared in the March 27, 1963, Chicago Tribune. I commend it not only to Republicans but to all of my colleagues in the House:

KENNEDYS FEAR ONE MAN IN 1964 ELECTION—GOLDWATER

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—President Kennedy and his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the grand vizier of the New Frontier, fear only one man in 1964, and it is not Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York.

The man they dread is a true frontiersman, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona, the personable and articulate conservative who would rather be Senator than Vice President. They fear that GOLDWATER would carry the South, where he is viewed as an exponent of State rights and not as a hated Republican, and that he would rally the rightwing of the Republican Party in the North, which has shown little enthusiasm for GOP me-tooism.

Early this year the Attorney General, the second most powerful man in Washington who runs the Democratic National Committee and foreign and domestic policy, was interviewed by U.S. News & World Report. He was asked to guess who the 1964 Republican nominee will be.

"Well, I know, but I don't think he does, so I don't think I'd better say," was his reply.

The reference was not to Rockefeller, obviously. Since that time, the Attorney General and his brother have confided to intimates that GOLDWATER would make a tougher race for the Presidency than would the New Yorker. Rockefeller has two heavy strikes going against him in facing Kennedy—the lack of a war record and his divorce.

GOLDWATER A MODEL FAMILY MAN

GOLDWATER flew the hump between Burma and China in the war. He is a jet pilot in the Reserve with the rank of brigadier general. And he is a model family man, whose views of divorce as an Episcopalian are no less strict than those of the President.

Rockefeller would like GOLDWATER as a running mate, but the Senator made it clear that he will not run for second place, noting how Vice President JOHNSON has fallen from the position of the second most powerful man in Washington as Senate Democratic leader to the anonymous obscurity of the Vice Presidency.

"I watched what happened to one of the strongest men in the country in a short space of 2 years," GOLDWATER said last week. "I would rather be a live Senator than a sort of backwoods man in the Vice Presidential chair."

Of course, the fact that the Kennedys have the strongest fear of GOLDWATER's rivalry doesn't mean that he will necessarily get the GOP nomination. He will face the "nice fellow but can't win" treatment from defeatist Republicans, who employed this line to kill off the hopes of the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio. GOLDWATER comes from a small State with a handful of convention votes, while Rockefeller has a bagful in New York.

ROCKEFELLER IS THE MAN TO BEAT

There is no doubt that Rockefeller will be the man to beat for the GOP nomination, as he was in 1960 and as he will be in 1968 if he doesn't get it in 1964. For this reason many Republicans want to give it to him next time around, much as many Democrats gave their nomination to Alfred E. Smith in 1928 to remove him as a factor in 1932, when they expected Democratic fortunes to improve, as they did.

The Kennedys have a map of the United States which shows the areas the President took in 1960 in black and those which Richard M. Nixon took, in white. The map shows that Nixon took more area of the country than the President did because the President captured most of the less extensive but more populous city areas.

They feel that they could improve the picture against Rockefeller, but fear that the man from the wide open spaces of the west might threaten to let down their political fences to more white space on the map.

A Doctor Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Hutchinson (Kans.) News, March 15, contained an excellent statement by C. R. Openshaw, M.D. It clearly illustrates basic problems confronting individuals within our society who espouse the cause of conservative, constitutional government, but either sit idly by or beat the drum for expanded Federal programs which might benefit them directly or indirectly. Many Members of Congress and other elected officials are many times frustrated by conflicting and inconsistent views of constituents.

Dr. Openshaw in clear, concise language presents the problems and solution. Those who really believe in individual responsibility should appreciate his statement.

The statement follows:

A DOCTOR SPEAKS

As it becomes painfully apparent to even the most naive that a struggle of epic proportions is being waged today between the free world and those who would enslave it, the voices become increasingly louder that war (meaning all-out nuclear effort) is increasingly unthinkable.

Although nuclear explosions have not yet occurred in our cities, war is nonetheless real and declared by actions if not by formal decree.

Despite optimistic notes sounded by world travelers, the evidence is good that we are continuing to lose this war. Let me hasten to state that I do not refer to the overt struggle with Russia, with Castro, or even with internal communism. The overall status of these fortunes is so colored by controversy, interpretation, and political intrigue at a given moment, that even Government experts often disagree.

Instead, I refer to two other aspects of the war, about which there is little doubt of our progressive deterioration.

THE HOME WAR

The first is the home war, and here there can be no question that we are losing. By this, I mean that very few are fighting wholly, sincerely, and unreservedly on the side of strength for freedom. Individuals and groups fight on one side one day and on the other the next, or else fight with one hand while accepting bribes from the opposition with the other.

Who will not claim to be in favor of national solvency, individual incentive, and freedom of private and economic life from political domination: Who is not opposed to preemptive statism and fiscal irresponsibility? Who, that is, except when it might apply to his own community, or add a few temporary extra dollars to his personal pocket?

Try to close a military installation in the name of economies to be realized, try to cut a subsidy of any kind or eliminate expense of Federal involvement in real estate mortgages, pork-barrel projects, or loans at less than cost. The screams will come from all quarters, depending on who is personally affected.

What businessmen's organization has not been guilty of passing resolutions which support programs or projects which weaken our fiscal or economic strength and aid the trend toward defeat?

Here then, is where the real war is being fought: the war at home for simple principles and policies that will keep us strong. If we can be victorious here, we will defeat communism and international slavery on whatever terms they choose: political, diplomatic, ideological or (God forbid) military.

PERSONAL MINIATURE

And how can this critical war be won? Only by winning still another war—that war which each must fight inside himself. Deep inside each of us is going on a personal minature of this domestic war. A war to determine which side we are really on, rather than the one we claim to support. On this front is a tremendous array of forces; appeal of immediate benefits, business advantage or personal profit; power of inertia; reluctance to get involved; the tendency to convince ourselves that one man doesn't really count. We even see a peculiar belief that America is somehow immune to the same germs of decay that have destroyed other civilizations. On the other side are conscience, judgment and historical facts regarding the fall of other strong nations.

How are you coming with your personal war? First, if you are to win, you must practice what you profess to believe. The temperance lecturer who is discovered staggering about his back yard is a heavier liability to his cause than the confirmed drunkard. So, too, is the businessman who preaches free enterprise, then participates in programs of political interference.

Secondly, you can start a program among those immediately about you to help them with their personal wars. Each of us can be effective, through precept and example, with those whom we see and talk to daily.

How much can you—one man—do? No one knows. But if you will work with the same zeal, the same crusading fire, loyalty and drive possessed by the enemy, you will be amazed at what you can accomplish. But no one can win, regardless of how our international and domestic fronts fare, that does not win his own personal war. Nor can one lose who has applied the principles he believes right to his ultimate best.

This is the rocky road; often lonely, never easy. Freedom is threatened not because it has failed, but because it has been tried and found difficult. When it seems insoluble, this prayer may help: "I am but one man. Still I am one man. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I should do. What I should do, with God's help, I shall do."

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it always gives me pleasure to bring to the attention of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers the amusing remarks of Arthur Hoppe, San Francisco Chronicle columnist, who has gained a tremendous group of followers here on Capitol Hill.

His articles for March 17, 19, and 21 follow:

IN SIBERIA LADIES ARE FREE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We have all given a lot of thought, I'm sure, to those poor Russians who get exiled to Siberia by the dictatorial Communist regime. But did you ever stop to think how the Siberians feel?

They're getting pretty sore, let me tell you. In fact, Mrs. V. Marina of Irkutsk, who sounds like the president of the Siberian garden club, has fired off an irate letter to the Moscow newspaper, Literaturnaya Gazetta. What finally blew Mrs. Marina's stack was the news that a young lady of the evening named Tosca was being banished to Siberia to mend her ways.

"This is simply offensive and insulting to us Siberians," writes Mrs. Marina. "Won't this piece of goods from the Capital find admirers even in a new place?" demands Mrs. Marina. "She probably will," concludes Mrs. Marina gloomily. And you can kind of see her eyeing Mr. Marina as she writes.

Oh, it's going to be a stirring scene when the train from the Capital pulls into Irkutsk. And Miss Tosca steps daintily down, the slit in her tight black skirt revealing a well-

formed patella. And there to greet her will be a militant band from the Garden Club, each wearing no-nonsense galoshes and a look you could pickle beets with.

"Comrade ladies," says the local Commissar nervously. "Let us remember we are all comrades in the glorious Revolution. Let us welcome Comrade Tosca joyously to our gracious Siberia. And leave us put down those rocks."

"Hah," says Mrs. Marina as spokeslady. "For 50 years we are working under our banner: 'Make Siberia a Wonderful Place to Live.' So the winters are freezing. So the summers are not so hot either. So who's complaining? It's all we got. So for 50 years from Moscow they are sending us hooligans, iders, no-goodniks and political nuts. Do we protest, maybe? No. Like Florence Nightingales, we are. But now they send us her. A flashy homewrecker. It is too much. Revolution-shmevolution. We are revolting."

"True," says Miss Tosca disdainfully. And with that the Garden Club overthrows Miss Tosca, the Commissar and Siberia (not to mention the train), sets up a new authoritarian regime and exiles all young ladies in tight black skirts back to Moscow.

Well, it all goes to show that even the most dictatorial regimes have their limits. They can tell their people where to work, how to live, what to create and even what to think. And if the people are cowed enough, indoctrinated enough or uncaring enough, they'll do it without protest. But don't mess with the ladies.

For if there's one indestructible human freedom, it's the right ladies feel they have to keep a ball and chain on their husbands.

JUST PLAIN JACK ALWAYS LOOKS NEW

(By Arthur Hoppe)

(Newsflash from the world of haute coutre: "The Jackie Look is definitely out.")

Good morning, friends in television land. It's time for another visit with Just Plain Jack, the warm-hearted story of a young man's search for a lasting understanding with his wife. And the country.

As we join Just Plain Jack today, we find him in the Blue-Green-Rose Room, absorbed in the latest issue of Vogues Bizarre. As he puts it down, frowning, the beautiful society girl he married gallops in on horseback, pursuing a fox and being pursued, in turn, by 47 photographers on roller skates. Just Plain Jack catches her stirrup.

Jack: Tallyho! Could I speak to you for a minute, dear?

Society girl: Well, I'm terribly busy, Bunny, just being me.

Jack: It's about your hair.

Society girl: My hair? Silly, that isn't the real me. (And she removes her perfectly coiffed bouffant wig and pillbox hat to reveal her perfectly coiffed bouffant hair and pillbox hat underneath.) There, is that better?

Jack: It's lovely, Dear. But aren't you getting a little—er—tired of that look?

Society girl (wide-eyed): What look?

Jack: And that wide-eyed look, too. And those overblouses. And * * *

Society girl: You don't love me any more.

Jack: Madly. But that look is passe. And we can't have images around here that lack popular appeal. Now I'm not making threats, dear. Exactly. But you do remember Chester Bowles?

Society girl (wide-eyed): Oh, what can I do?

Jack: Squint a little. And dress to please me. Won't you wear the kind of clothes I like? Just for me?

Society girl: Oh, Bunny, you know I will.

Jack: Great. Now here's an old sweatshirt of Bobby's. See? It's still got his 50-mile medal on it. And here's some sneakers Ethel forgot after our last formal garden party. I think they'red ry. And * * * Boy. (This'll beat Republican cloth coats all hollow.)

Society girl (viewing self in mirror): But it doesn't fit the real me. And that goes for the sweatshirt, too.

Jack (thoughtfully): You're right. You need a new hairdo to go with it. A poodle cut? An artichoke cut? No, something brandnew. We'll call it "the Bipartisan Tax Cut."

(He whips out a pair of scissors and begins trimming her hair, snipping a little off here and saying "Oops," and a little off there and saying "Whoops." The hands of the authentic antique jazz combo clock whirl to indicate the passage of an hour.)

Jack: There. If it weren't for that wide-eyed look, you'd be perfect. Because you look just like the one person the whole country loves and admires.

Society girl (flattered): Who, Bunny? Ava Gardner?

Jack: Teddy. (She scowls and glowers at him, furious.) Darling, now you are perfect. At last we've got it. "The New Frontier Look." It'll sweep the country.

Will the country be swept? Will housewives scowl and glower? Have you ever told yours you don't like her hair? Be sure to tune in to our next episode, folks. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, friends, remember: All it takes to bring out the real you is just plain jack.

DR. VAN ALLEN DESERVES A BELT

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I don't wish to say I told you so. But I told you so. I'm speaking, of course, of the only time I was ever right. That was in 1962 when I said our sicentists' plan to blow up our Van Allen Radiation Belt didn't sound very constructive to me.

But our scientists said, "Pooh. What do crummy laymen know about it?" And Dr. Van Allen, who discovered the thing, insisted his vastly complex studies proved blowing up his belt would be good for us ignoramuses.

So our scientists happily blew up the belt to see what would happen. What happened? They knocked out three of our satellites and generally loused up outer space for decades to come.

And at long last, Dr. Van Allen himself has come out in public (clutching his waistband) to admit he was wrong. Manfully. But do you know why he was wrong? Because, he now tells us, all those scientific reassurances he gave us were based on "intuitive expectations." Intuitive? Good gravy.

"Mr. Kennedy, as chairman of your Distinguished Scientific Advisers on What Should Be Done About the Moon, I am glad to report we have reached a unanimous decision. In 32 seconds.

"As you know, we scientists have long studied the moon. We have photographed it, measured it, weighed it, and analyzed it. And, frankly, we can't think of anything else to do with it. So we've decided to blow it up. To see what will happen.

"Naturally, we expect a few protests from the lay public. Who don't understand these things. But, after all, whose moon is it? Everybody, I'm sure, will agree that anything in the cosmos nobody understands belongs to us scientists.

"True, there may be a couple of scare headlines, claiming chunks of the moon may, ha, ha, land on people's heads. Or the sky will, ho, ho, fall down. But, as distinguished scientists we are thoroughly convinced the world will be better off without it.

"Dr. Denton here, the renowned astronomer, feels it in his bones. Dr. Carter, the respected physicist, has a twinge in his right knee which invariably bodes well for enterprises undertaken in the lunar descendency. And Dr. Gerber, who will himself trigger the explosion, just rolled eight straight passes during our coffee break.

"So, if you will kindly fork over an H-bomb or two, Mr. President, we will be selflessly off to continue advancing man's knowledge of the cosmos. As long as we got a little of it left."

Well, I've been saying our scientists were neither old enough nor wise enough to play with H-bombs. Because any science, when faced with cosmic forces, is an inexact science. But intuition. I didn't know it was that inexact.

And if our scientists are going to trust their intuition to tell them whether to blow something up to see what will happen, they're going to blow it up. That being the essence of science.

But nuts to that, Dr. Van Allen. Now you've lost your belt, I hope you lose your—er—reputation. Because if our leaders continue to think you scientists infallible, we're all going to be squashed by a chunk of green cheese one of these moonless nights. That's what my intuition tells me.

Action on Cuba Must Be Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, every minute the administration delays facing a showdown with the Soviet Union over Cuba we are bringing this Nation closer to the possibility of war and closer to the destruction of our free society. The President should brook no further delays on the part of Khrushchev to get his troops out of Cuba, not merely several thousand at the Communist dictator's whim, but all of them and right now. Unless we face up to the danger Communist aggression in the Western Hemisphere, we will encourage further adventures by Soviet Russia in Central and Latin America. This increases the possibility of all-out war because Khrushchev may mistake our refusal to force a showdown as timidity and weakness and having drawn such a conclusion misjudge our willingness to fight to protect our freedom and World War III will then be inevitable.

David Lawrence, in his column in the Washington Evening Star, has warned of the refusal to force a showdown over Cuba. His editorial follows:

FOR AN EARLY SHOWDOWN ON CUBA—U.S. ACTION TO END SOVIET FOOTHOLD IN THIS HEMISPHERE CALLED NECESSARY

(By David Lawrence)

Will the United States permit a complete Communist takeover of Central and South America similar to what has already happened in Cuba?

One by one, the Latin American countries are currently being subjected to the most intensive penetration by the Soviet Government. What is the answer?

It will be of no avail to blame a preceding administration. There is an unfortunate

tendency in Washington nowadays to condone evil by enumerating mistakes of the past, as if these furnish an alibi for present errors or neglect of duty.

The problem is really nonpolitical. It is every day becoming more difficult to handle. Billions of dollars are being taken away from the taxpayers of the United States annually to support so-called foreign aid programs on all continents. Almost everyone familiar with the situation agrees that financial aid of some kind from the United States is essential to thwart the Communist intrusions in the internal affairs of various countries to the south of us. When the United States lends or gives money to another country, however, the Washington government cannot exercise complete control over what happens to such funds.

The spread of communism in Latin America is due largely to economic conditions that have long prevailed there. Poverty and a low standard of living provide fertile areas for Communist infiltration. Weak governments, influenced by selfish leaders, have retarded progress. Even in a country as friendly to the United States as Brazil has been for the last 150 years or more, there is today a threat of a Communist takeover. Guatemala is also in peril. Argentina and Chile have had their Communist troubles, too. It certainly is time for a much more forceful policy toward Communist sabotage and subversion than the United States has thus far been willing to adopt.

Foreign policy in this field, both under the present and preceding administrations here, has been based on a belief that the Organization of American States can be made to function as a kind of supervisory police body which would employ armed forces in a collective manner. But almost every one of the Latin American countries faces such a serious threat from within that it is doubtful whether any firm policy which really comes to grips with the Communist problem will ever materialize through the OAS. The United States bears the major responsibility, and must go it alone when it becomes necessary. That time has arrived.

It will be argued, of course, that public opinion in Latin America is opposed to any armed intervention by this country, and that the Communists will capitalize on such a step. But although the Latin countries were at first dismayed by the attempted invasion at the Bay of Pigs, many of the leaders of various governments to the south of us now have seen the light and want Cuba freed from the Communist yoke by any means possible.

The United States inevitably has to take the risk of offending the Kremlin, and can adopt the very contention that nations have put forward in the past—respect for international rights. To protect American property by force, if necessary, is a right granted under international law. It involves a decision that has to be made sooner or later. Under the Monroe Doctrine, the United States has maintained that no European power shall be permitted to establish a base or its "system" in this hemisphere. Historical precedent under international law therefore would justify a move to rid Cuba of Communist troops, technicians, and subversive organizations as well.

What the United States does or fails to do in Cuba is directly related to the future freedom of all the Latin American peoples. The cry will be raised that intervention could bring on world war III. But a Communist takeover of Latin America, including Mexico, would mean a world war just the same. So it's a question of not what shall be done, but when. All signs today point to a Communist conquest of the Latin countries of this hemisphere if the United States continues to wait for the weak Organization of American States to act, or mistakenly delays action until the Communists have built another wall around all of Latin America just as they have around West Berlin.

Cuba is the natural place for an early showdown with communism in this hemisphere.

County Has Abundance of Hidden Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Elizabethton Star on Sunday, March 24, 1963.

Carter County, Tenn., has an abundance of hidden treasures in the way of remote, not easily accessible, sceneries. It is connected to Avery County, N.C., and is approximately 15 miles from the Virginia State line.

Frank Robinson, publisher and his staff are doing a wonderful job in promoting his area, and I commend him:

COUNTY HAS ABUNDANCE OF HIDDEN TREASURES

Carter County has an abundance of hidden treasures in the way of remote, not easily accessible sceneries, overlooked by its own citizens but attraction to tourists from other parts of the country.

One of the most interesting scenic parts of Carter County is Laurel Fork. The rushing stream has its source in the Buck Mountain section not far from the Avery County line. It drops from 3,500 feet elevation to 1,800 feet at its confluence with Doe River at Hampton over a distance of some 12 miles through and between steep mountainsides.

Laurel Fork rivals in wildness the better known Doe River Gorge through which "Tweetsie" used to run and which Roan Mountain Citizens Club is endeavoring to reopen as a tourist attraction. The gorge and Laurel Fork are separated by Cedar and Black Mountains and the White Rocks.

Laurel Fork can be divided into two sections, the lower one from Braemar to Dennis Cove, the upper from Dennis Cove to its source. The upper section is slightly longer than the lower, but the gorges of the lower are steeper.

There are beautiful waterfalls in both sections, below and above Dennis Cove.

Laurel Fork is in part privately owned. In part it belongs to the Cherokee National Forest. Moreover, in part it constitutes the Laurel Fork wildlife management area, noted for its deer hunts and excellent trout fishing.

In former years the recreation area above Dennis Cove with picnic and camping facilities was one of the most popular in Carter County. Now, it is less frequented with more easily reachable facilities at Watauga Lake.

The easiest way to take a trip into Laurel Fork is to start at the two small concrete bridges just east of Braemar. The Appalachian Trail at that point leaves Highway 67 and enters Laurel Fork. There is space for the parking of a few automobiles.

To proceed farther up with a car is not advisable. From here on out the only means of transportation is on foot.

In the spring, a few weeks hence, columbine, blood root, rue anemone, violets, Marybells, Solomonseal, irises, bleeding heart, trailing arbutus and other flowers are in bloom along the old road that leads up some way or along the trail. Doghobble and ferns are in abundance.

In summer, red campion or catchfly, and the cardinal flower closer to the stream, are striking members of the flowers in bloom in the gorge.

Turning down the trail to the stream, instead of following the old road, one faces a high cliff on which sarvis trees bloom in April and the Carolina rhododendron in its delicate pink early in May.

Fondren's Cliff is the name of the bluff, according to George Brown, who grew up in Braemar.

The Appalachian Trail leads through shady deciduous woodland along the stream and in places approaches the edge of the River. Foot bridges cross Laurel Fork in several places.

Wherever one looks, steep mountain sides are all around. The trail leads up through pines and huckleberry bushes before it turns down again and approaches the roaring about 90-foot beautiful lower precipitous waterfall.

From the waterfall one may continue up along winding Appalachian Trail which on some stretches is an old railroad bed and after crossing the stream on another foot bridge wind up at Dennis Cove.

Here the Appalachian Trail turns in southern direction to Whiterock Tower.

The Dennis Cove recreation area is about a half mile from the Dennis Cove settlement.

A trip along the upper part of Laurel Fork from Dennis Cove recreation area is just as interesting. The stream has to be crossed in several places, Paul B. Senter, area manager of Laurel Fork wildlife management area, said.

Past a waterfall of outstanding beauty one may continue as far as Froglevel, a more open place in the landscape. The beaver-dams in that area have in part been washed away by recent heavy rains, but probably will be rebuilt by these aquatic animals.

Froglevel may also be reached by driving from the Dennis Cove recreation area up Walnut Mountain Road, parking at the Pond Mountain trail and walking some 2 miles down a primitive woodland road to the stream.

Still another approach to Froglevel is from Cherry Gap on the Buck Mountain Road above Shell Creek from the upper end of the stream. It takes inquiry in the locality to find the proper place to turn off.

Fishing, for trout only, in Laurel Fork opens April 10, Wildlife Area Manager Senter said, and will last until August 7. There are lots of carryover trout in the stream, but stocking before the season opens will be done from one end to the other, he added. Fishing will be permitted Wednesdays, Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays. As a special regulation, above Dennis Cove artificial lure only will be allowed.

Another restriction is that no firearms are allowed in Laurel Fork.

Persons planning to hike the Appalachian Trail from Braemar to Dennis Cove should make arrangements to be picked up at Dennis Cove as there is no public transportation.

Dictionary of Occupational Titles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor recently announced

in its publication, Employment Security Review, that a new and completely revised Dictionary of Occupational Titles will go to press sometime this year. This is a vital and long-needed step in an economy characterized by rapid technological change and rising living standards.

When old skills are becoming rapidly obsolescent and are being replaced by new skills, it is critical for education, including vocational education and job retraining, to know precisely what the new skill needs of the Nation are. I have been urging for some time that a new Dictionary of Occupational Titles be produced in order to reflect these changes in our job structure.

The article describing the new dictionary bears out the contention that the nature of jobs in our society has been changing dramatically since the end of World War II. The new dictionary, for example, will show that as many as 6,000 new jobs will appear in the 1963 edition which did not appear in the 1949 edition.

So that those persons who are interested will know of the coming publication of this new and revised dictionary, the article from the February 1963 Employment Security Review follows:

THE NEW DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES

(By A. B. Eckerson, Division of Occupational Research and Publications, U.S. Employment Service, Bureau of Employment Security)

A third and completely revised edition of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), published by the U.S. Employment Service, will go to press this year. It will be in two volumes. A larger, three-column page format will permit thinner volumes than the 1949 edition.

Volume I will continue to consist of job definitions arranged alphabetically. These definitions are based on observation and reanalysis of jobs in all industries during the past 3 years. Obsolete jobs will be deleted, and perhaps as many as 6,000 jobs new to the dictionary will appear. For example, the number of professional and technical workers has doubled in recent years, and the number of occupational specialties in this area also has increased. The new DOT will provide expanded coverage of professional and technical occupations, and the code range allocated to these jobs in the classification structure will be doubled.

EACH DEFINITION WILL TELL MANY THINGS

Each job definition in volume I will include not only what is done, and how and why, but also, directly or by implication, the functions performed by the worker and the critical physical demands, working conditions, interests, temperaments, training time, and aptitudes involved.

Volume II will include the occupational classification structure, which combines those features of the present volume II and part IV structures and of recent occupational research that appear most useful in the placement of counseling processes. Individual classifications will be identified by six-digit code numbers. The distinctions between professional and semiprofessional, and among skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled, will not appear in this structure.

Although the classification structure will be presented in two arrangements, the code numbers used to classify jobs are the same in both arrangements. An explanation of either arrangement will illustrate the meaning of the code number. In the first arrangement, which will represent the structure of Employment Service local office files, the following principles will be followed:

1. Throughout the structure, jobs will be grouped first by some combination of work field, material, product, subject matter, service, generic term, and/or industry. This grouping will be reflected in the first three digits of the code: 000.000. (This system involves no change in the traditional concept of the three-digit group. It is planned only to apply this concept consistently throughout the structure, and always to reflect its meaning in the first three digits of the code.)

2. Within each three-digit group, jobs will be grouped according to kinds of activities performed and skills and abilities required, and will be arranged generally in descending order of level of complexity. This information will be reflected in the last three digits of the code: 000.000. These digits indicate the workers' involvement with data, people, and things and will reflect the worker functions and worker trait requirements. (This will permit designation of levels and kinds of skills, without limiting them to only two or three possible levels, and without the stigma of allocation to categories labeled "semi" professional or "un" skilled.)

The two halves of the code number provide the two basic dimensions of the classification structure presented in volume II. This volume will include two arrangements of all job titles: The arrangement in straight numerical code order will group jobs by work field, material, product, subject matter, and service; the second arrangement, based on an inversion of the halves of the code number, will group jobs in terms of worker functions and worker trait requirements.

OCCUPATIONAL GROUP ARRANGEMENT

The first classification arrangement groups jobs into six categories: [1]

00 through 19: Professional, technical, and managerial occupations.

20 through 24: Clerical and related occupations.

25 through 29: Sales and related occupations.

30 through 38: Service occupations.

40 through 45; Farming, fishery, forestry, and related occupations.

50 through 99: Industrial occupations.

The categories will be divided, in turn, into about 90 divisions. These may be useful as a table of contents for the three-digit groups, as a filing system for occupational information in schools and guidance centers, and as classifications for other than fully qualified applicants. For example, the first category, which now has only three divisions (professional, semiprofessional and managerial), will have the following divisions, based on subject matter: [1]

00 Occupations in architecture and engineering.

02 Occupations in earth sciences.

03 Occupations in mathematics and physical sciences.

04 Occupations in life sciences.

05 Occupations in social sciences.

06 Occupations in interdisciplinary sciences.

07 Occupations in medicine and health.

09 Occupations in education.

10 Occupations in museum, library, and archival sciences.

11 Occupations in law and jurisprudence.

12 Occupations in religion and theology.

13 Occupations in writing.

14 Occupations in art.

15 Occupations in entertainment.

16 Occupations in administrative specializations.

18 Managers and officials, n.e.c.

19 Miscellaneous professional, technical, and managerial occupations.

Each two-digit division will be subdivided into more specific three-digit groups. For example: [1]

05. Occupations in social sciences.
050. Occupations in economics.
051. Occupations in political science.
052. Occupations in history.
053. Occupations in psychology.
054. Occupations in sociology.
055. Occupations in anthropology.
058. Occupations in social and welfare work.
059. Social science occupations, n.e.c.

Within each three-digit group the individual jobs will be listed and classified by complete six-digit code numbers. The last three digits, which identify the worker functions and worker trait patterns, will serve to arrange the jobs generally in order of level of complexity. This will provide clues to entry and progression possibilities within the group.

WORKER TRAITS ARRANGEMENT

The second classification arrangement regroups all jobs into seven categories to indicate whether the worker's primary involvement is with data, people, things, or any combination of these.

The categories will be divided into about 90 groups, identified by the last 3 digits of the code. Each group will consist of jobs that are homogeneous in terms of worker traits, regardless of the workfield, subject matter, or industries from which they are drawn. The definition of each group will identify not only the kind of work done, and the functions he will perform. It will include not only identification of the training time, aptitudes, interests, temperaments, and physical demands common to the group of jobs, but also an indication of the aspects of the work to which each critical worker trait relates.

THE DOT AS AN OPERATIONAL TOOL

In Employment Service operations, the occupational group arrangement will be considered a "placement-oriented" tool and the worker traits arrangement a "counseling-oriented" tool that will replace part IV, "Entry Occupational Classification," of the dictionary. While this is generally true, the interrelationship of the two arrangements of the classification structure through the use of a single coding system will make both arrangements useful in counseling as well as placement. An example will illustrate this interrelationship:

The occupation mechanical engineer might be classified 007.081.[1]

The three-digit group 007. is called "Mechanical engineering occupations." In the occupational group arrangement, all jobs involving mechanical engineering (engineers, technicians, draftsmen, etc.) are listed under 007. to reflect homogeneity in subject matter. The jobs have different six-digit classifications to reflect different skills and worker traits. This arrangement presents information about entry and progression possibilities within the group.

The last three digits, 081, will identify a group in the worker traits arrangement called "Engineering and Scientific Researching." This group will include some of the engineers from 007, (but no technicians or draftsmen, whose worker traits are different), as well as engineers, chemists, pharmacologists, and scientists from many other three-digit groups. They are brought together because of homogeneity in worker traits.

In this manner, all of the information in the dictionary will be cross-referenced so that whether you begin with information about a job or about an individual, you will be able under the system to locate all related information.

[1] Code numbers cited are for illustrative purposes only. Final code numbers are still in a developmental stage.

JEC Holds Defense Procurement Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Defense Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee began 3 days of hearings into the economic impact of military procurement and supply. These hearings, scheduled for today, Friday, and Monday, will help move forward the job of the Joint Economic Committee of giving insight into our Nation's economy and the factors of importance to it. I believe it is important that all of the Members of Congress know of the existence and purpose of this study.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, who chairs this subcommittee, recently issued a press release on the scope of the background papers that have been prepared for the hearing and the scope of the hearing itself. To give a better idea of the areas into which the subcommittee will be looking, the Joint Economic Committee press release follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
March 25, 1963.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, today released a committee print entitled "Background Materials on Economic Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply," March 1963. This updates a similar publication of the subcommittee that came out in February 1960.

These materials have been prepared for the subcommittee hearings which were announced March 21 and are scheduled for March 28, 29, and April 1, 1963.

Among the materials are:

MAGNITUDE OF OPERATIONS

Military real and personal property holdings have increased from $155 billion at the end of fiscal year 1960 to $165 billion at the end of fiscal 1962, an increase of $10 billion.

Personal property holdings have increased about $7 billion in that time, to $128 billion.

Expenditures for Department of Defense military functions were 8.7 percent of the gross national product at the end of fiscal 1962 compared to 8.5 percent the year prior.

From June 30, 1959 to June 30, 1962, the number of civilian personnel had decreased by 3,127, but with a payroll increase of $523 million.

The Department of Defense supply systems had unissued stores inventories costing $41 billion at the end of fiscal 1962. Eleven billion dollars (27 percent) of this was in the mobilization reserves.

The net value of military procurements during fiscal 1962 was $27.8 billion—up $3.5 billion from the previous year.

One State (California) had 23.9 percent of procurement actions and 27 States had less than 1 percent each.

The 100 largest prime contractors had 72.3 percent of the military prime contract awards (fiscal 1962).

Negotiated procurement amounted to 86.7 percent in fiscal 1962 compared to 86.9 percent in the fiscal year 1961.

Savings of 25 percent result when items can be "broken out" from more complex equipment and bought competitively.

There are $13 billion of excess and long stocks in military inventories.

The total surplus property disposals dropped from $6.791 billion in fiscal 1961 to $4.061 billion in fiscal 1962. The percent of total gross proceeds to acquisition cost was 3.87.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS—GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (GAO)

An index and digest of 207 GAO reports to Congress on the militiary procurement, supply and related subjects.

A report by the GAO on "Uneconomical Procurement of Certain Aircraft Engine Bearings by the Navy."

OTHER REPORTS

A progress report on organization, accomplishments, and programs of the Defense Supply Agency.

A statement by Secretary McNamara on the Department of Defense's 5-year cost reduction program.

Two case studies (one from GAO) dealing with the mobilization reserves.

Legal background and agreements affecting the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense relationships.

Hew to Paths of Forefathers, National Leader Urges Civitans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, 1963, the Civitan Club of Mount Vernon, Va., was privileged to have the president of Civitan International, Mr. Fritz Kuler of Dallas, Tex., at a service at the tomb of George Washington.

I believe Mr. Kuler's address, and the newspaper story describing it, which appeared in the Alexandria Gazette, are worthy of the attention of all true Americans. I therefore am pleased to have this opportunity to read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HEW TO PATHS OF FOREFATHERS, NATIONAL LEADER URGES CIVITANS AT MOUNT VERNON PROGRAM

Americans, and particularly those who profess to such principles of freedom and good citizenship as Civitans, were urged to return to the paths hewn by the Nation's first President and such others of the Nation's great, when the leader of Civitan International used Washington's Birthday in a key address of the service group's Americanism and citizenship programs Sunday.

The speaker, President Fritz Kuler, of Dallas, Tex., was speaking at the tomb of Washington at Mount Vernon in a tribute to Washington and others of the Nation's founders, sponsored by the Civitan Club of Mount Vernon.

The Mount Vernon program has become an annual gesture toward greater dedication to the principles on which the Nation was founded by Civitan International and its Chesapeake district. It took place in the afternoon following the close of the district's winter quarter council meeting at the Southgate in Arlington.

Escorted by the Mount Vernon Guard—the Mount Vernon Club's famed youth unit—international President Kuler led a large group of Civitans and their ladies to the Washington Tomb in an impressive processional. His remarks, in recordings, will find their way into meetings of Civitans through North America.

President Kuler declared that Americans enjoy more freedoms today than men of Washington's time could dream their efforts would gain. "Yet the future of our freedoms is endangered again—from within and without," he declared. "The price of freedom cannot be paid in full by any single generation. Each must pay the price for itself—and the price is constant vigilance that freedoms are not assassinated by overindulgence of one, without protection of all."

In his tribute to Washington at his tomb, the Civitan chief declared:

"First there was a boy—like any other son born to a family of responsible people—loved and in his own way loving, curious about the world around him, and not in the beginning with a worry to cloud his happy days.

"The loss of his father at an early age hastened the development of a boy into a man—for even a somewhat overprotective mother, the loss of fatherly compassion, the solicitude of elder brothers who's start had been made before the loss of their father, seemed only to create within a youth the insatiable determination to stand on his own feet and make a mark upon his time.

"Even those early years were later to become the province of fiction writers and overanxious historians as they sought to cloak first the boy and then the man with false legend the world would not soon forget. How foolish the hero worshipers who could not realize the man George Washington was so real, so human, so much a flesh and blood American that the role destiny ordained for him would, in the end, need no false facade to assure this man immortality in the hearts and minds, not only of his countrymen, but those of every nation in every generation since, and those yet to come.

"Physical strength he gained from early labor. Mental strength he gained from determined effort to learn what was needed to succeed in his time. Spiritual strength he gained from communion with God, who gave him the head and heart and hands to make himself a man of the ages.

"Here at Mount Vernon—home—is where the heart was. Through all those years he built and planned and longed to be here. This, as his journals and letters prove, was where he wanted desperately to be and yet, so great was the heart of the man, so all encompassing his patriotic loyalty to the land of freedom that was his birthplace, that the greater number of his years would be spent away from this spot in service to his fellow countrymen.

"Leadership, that elusive quality that escapes most men, was preeminently his—and yet curiously this man had not those qualities of easy friendliness, warm expression, superior scholastic achievement, facile tongue, powerful pen or common touch we would expect men of exceptional leadership to possess to command respect. Neither in his mature years had he the burning ambition to be the figure of importance he had sought so avidly to achieve in his early manhood.

"Yet a nation-to-be turned instinctively to this man for leadership and he knew no fear in his acceptance. The sting and shame of defeat in battle were as nothing compared with the same and defeat he felt for those who followed his orders ill-equipped to cope with shot, shell and elements they faced because support was not forthcoming. By the sheer power of his confidence in what was right that men could do in whose veins

flowed the red blood of courage, he held in his palm the destiny of freedom. And, having finally entrenched it firmly in the land, came home—here to Mount Vernon—to grasp a few brief months of the happiness home could lend him before the call to final rest was issued by the Lord of Hosts.

"Here then lies a man at rest—enshrined forever in the hearts of all who know the blessings of freedom. But still his spirit cannot lie so long as freedom's future is in doubt. The spirit of Washington stirs men even today, through all this land, to action in the protection of freedom's future.

"Knowing the freedom that is the heritage left us by Washington and his kind, then and through the years since, we must never let the torch of freedom fall from our hands—for it lights the way into frontiers of faith and knowledge and understanding yet to be conquered and for which all mankind yearns.

"So long as the breath of life is with us, may we never falter in living the challenging life of stalwart men and free—and pass the challenge along to our progeny. This is, this must be, as with George Washington, our destiny.

"There comes not to this place, this hallowed ground, this tomb, man or woman or child of school age, who fails to feel the glory of this Nation's heritage, which, in large measure, was earned for us by him who held fast to the courage of his convictions. The patch hewn by such men in the wilderness of bigotry and power seizure, bent on enslaving the minds and bodies and souls of men, has been kept open, widened and extended by Americans of each generation, since, through good times and bad, reverses and triumphs, peace and war our Nation has known.

"Yet we must confess there have been times—there are times in our generation—when we look frantically about for today's men of courage. Who is protecting freedom's future today?

"Washington understood well this was too big a job for one man alone and must be the job of all who would live in freedom. To the preservation of liberty, those who claim American citizenship pledge—even as though they took pen in hand July 4, 1776, and signed their names to the Declaration of Independence—'our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor.' Those who claim American citizenship are pledged, by virtue of that claim, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States—not just those we choose to serve us in government—but every American. Who is protecting freedom's future then? We, all of us together.

"If there be even one among us who shirks this honored task, freedom's future is in doubt. May this never be you. I pray God, let this never be me.

"There must be happiness and peace and prosperity for every man in such a land as this. And none of these is of true consequence without the others. A true measure of each that each man is capable of enjoying is determined by his personal ability to measure up to and assume the responsibilities that are his birthright.

"Every man has the free moral right to seek his full personal level of happiness and peace and prosperity—and every loyal American will accord him full opportunity to do so. But let no man shirk his opportunity to do so in good faith and conscience, with responsibility assumed for his full share in the principal and interest that each must pay in living up to our potential as God-fearing, law-abiding American citizens.

"The principles and interest accorded by Washington to sharing in the procreation of the Nation is the symbol of what we hope our children may measure up to in their time. Before this can be, we too must measure up to the standard. Be frightened not by this standard. George Washington was also a human being with the same temptations, the same desires, the same frustrations, the same problems, the same joys, the same sorrows that can be ascribed to any of us. These were a part of him as they are a part of us. He did not use them to excuse himself from responsibilities in the protection of freedom's future. Can we who have enjoyed the fruits of freedom do less?

"Freedoms are like muscles—properly exercised they grow strong. Misused or diseased they grow flabby and finally wither away to be replaced by bands of captive steel from which escape is the hope that furnishes the enslaved one's master with the strength he needs to maintain his power.

"The exuberant laughter of our children, the songs of * * * that swell from our churches, the shouts of pure joy that ring from the lips of loved ones greeting the traveler returned, the happy faces we see on crowded streets or walking country lanes, the rich harvests of free enterprise, the free press, happy music on the air, the opportunity to go anywhere, anytime, the chance we have to be what we want to be, the privilege of speaking our minds, of having whom we choose for friends, of helping others to help themselves—the flag flying there.

"These are all part of living in freedom's land. This is our heritage. Live it. Enjoy it. Speak up for it. Maintain it. Guard it well."

Bonneville Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by T. E. Roach, president of the Idaho Power Co., relative to a proposal to extend the Bonneville Power Administration's power marketing area into southern Idaho, where ample electric power is now being furnished by taxpaying electric utilities at rates well below the national average. The fact that Bonneville is now and has been operating with annual losses in excess of $15 million apparently means nothing to the exponents of the socialization of all electric power in the Nation.

Mr. Roach has sent the Secretary of the Interior a letter dated March 1, 1963, protesting the proposed invasion of the market area now being so well served by his company. Mr. Roach aptly points out that Bonneville's subsidized low rates for electric power have not prevented the development, in Bonneville's present market area, of "every one of the 26 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment as declared by the U.S. Department of Labor." Mr. Roach amply documents the fallacy of the claim that subsidized Federal electric power is a "harbinger of prosperity" to an area. His letter follows. I commend its reading by all my colleagues:

IDAHO POWER CO.,
Boise, Idaho, March 1, 1963.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. UDALL: Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation have prepared a study on the feasibility of extending the BPA marketing area to include all of the State of Idaho. A preliminary report of that feasibility study was made public early in December 1962 and was followed on December 13–14 with meetings in Pocatello and Boise, Idaho, for review of the study by people selected by the two agencies.

Careful reading of the transcripts shows that many points of both disagreement and omission were raised about the study, and that numerous commitments were made by agency representatives to make corrections and additions, and even to make further studies. At the same time those attending the two meetings made clear that their comments could only be presented in brief, due to the limited time available for discussion, and therefore their comments were not to be regarded as all-inclusive as to the points of objection.

Because the transcripts of the two meetings have just become available, and because no assurance was given that copies of the revised study would be made available to the public prior to a marketing area determination, this statement regarding the proposal to extend the BPA marketing area to take in southern Idaho is necessarily based upon the material released to date.

The proposal to declare southern Idaho a part of Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area has previously been before Secretaries of the Interior in both 1946 and 1952. The arguments then were the same as today—"low-cost power from BPA is essential to the economy of southern Idaho and expansion of the phosphate industry." After careful examination of the actual economic realities involved, no Secretary of the Interior to date has found that such a marketing area declaration would be in the public interest.

There are fewer practical reasons today to justify the addition of southern Idaho to BPA's marketing area because:

1. Southern Idaho today has ample supplies of electric power, and has an assured potential power supply for the area's future growth. Sending Bonneville power into southern Idaho would be like sending coal to Newcastle. No claim of any power shortage, present or future, can be sustained.

For 20 years the rate of electric load growth in Idaho Power Co.'s service area has been substantially greater percentagewise than the growth of BPA's area or any other area, privately or publicly served, in the entire Pacific Northwest. That load growth has been responsibly met by a program of continuing plant construction, a program that has seen Idaho Power's capacity increased 10 times in the past 15 years.

Most recent projects added are Brownlee, 450,000 kilowatts completed in 1959, and Oxbow, 220,000 kilowatts completed in 1961, boosting Idaho Power's capacity to 1,045,000 kilowatts.

Idaho Power Co. and Utah Power & Light Co., which provide electric service for the largest part of southern Idaho, have ample dependable supplies of firm power available for sale today. These companies also have new generating capacity planned and under construction to fully service all new area requirements in the years ahead.

Contrasted with this record of full area supply is the admitted shortage of firm power on the BPA system, and likewise the shortage BPA has predicted by 1970 of 1,300,000 kilowatts.

The BPA feasibility study sidesteps southern Idaho's power supply capabilities by assuming that the investor-financed companies will stop all generation plant construction once their present construction is completed. Thus an artificial shortage is created in future years. This assumption is, of course, wholly without foundation.

Should Bonneville power be brought into the area it must come in competition with existing supplies, resulting in needless and wasteful competition between Government agencies and a taxpaying enterprise.

2. Electric rates of investor-financed companies in southenr Idaho are fair, reasonable, considerably below the national average cost to electricity, and under the control and jurisdiction of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, which exercises the responsibility of assuring equitable rates.

The feasibility study makes much of certain electric rate comparisons, which appear to have been carefully selected to place the investor-owned companies in the most unfavorable light possible. BPA representatives, at the Pocatello meeting, admitted that many of the rate comparisons are not accurate and promised correction in any revised study to give effect to differing conditions, such as customer density per mile, taxes, etc.

This is the actual rate situation today in Idaho Power Co.'s area: Residential rates are at least 27 percent below the national average. Moreover, Idaho Power's residential rates are considerably lower than rates available from the north Idaho REA's, which presently receive their power supply from BPA, and the company's rural service area is more extensive.

Idaho Power Co.'s irrigation pumping rates are the lowest available in any concentrated pumping area anywhere in the entire West, if not the Nation, for installations of the size most common in the area. The success of the pumping rates is attested to by the fact that at present over 600,000 acres of land are irrigated by pumps served by Idaho Power.

Idaho Power's industrial power rates are favorably low for the attraction of new commerce and industry. As a direct comparison, Idaho Power's rate to the phosphate industry is substantially lower than that of any other taxpaying utility in the United States, and approximately the same as the rate of TVA for this type of service.

Additionally, among the considerations that should be included in any objective comparison of rates between BPA and Idaho Power are these:

(a) There are, for example, far more customers in the city of Portland alone than in the entire 20,000 square-mile service area of Idaho Power Co. Population and customer density directly affect the amount of investment required to supply electricity, and likewise affect the operating expense per customer. The population density of Oregon is 18.4, Washington 42.8, and Idaho 8.4 persons per square mile. Moreover, the ratio of taxes to revenues in Idaho is much higher than in Oregon and Washington.

(b) Idaho Power has long recognized the importance of agriculture to the economy of southern Idaho and has therefore maintained an areawide residential rate common to farm and city customers alike. The merit of this concept is apparent from the solid and healthy growth of Idaho agriculture. This contrasts with rate schedules in coastal areas, where the rate advantage is to the urban customer. An urban-rural differential would be dertimental to southern Idaho, yet the advantage of Idaho Power's systemwide single rate is not mentioned in the BPA study.

(c) Comparisons should recognize that none of the coast-area companies used for BPA comparison purposes has anywhere near as many rural customers percentagewise as does Idaho Power, nor the extremely low population and hence customer density.

(d) Nor does any coast-area company maintain an irrigation pumping rate as favorable to agriculture.

(e) Any direct rate comparison between distributors—to be meaningful—must recognize the tax differentials which affect costs. This differential is particularly sharp when comparisons are made with public utility district rates.

These factors all strongly affect rate levels and, unless recognized, give a completely improper and unfair comparison.

3. The rates at which Bonneville power is being sold do not accurately reflect BPA costs. Any assumption that these rates would become available to southern Idaho also assumes that BPA will continue to operate at a deficit. Moreover, BPA enjoys two built-in subsidies: (1) In freedom from the taxation investor-owned companies must pay, and (2) a subsidy in its access to tax-free money. These two BPA advantages provide a cost advantage over Idaho Power Co. amounting to 48 percent. In other words, BPA starts out with a 48-percent advantage over Idaho Power Co. This is an 18-inch yardstick and an unfair basis for comparing industrial rates.

Despite this, if Idaho Power rates and those of BPA power distributors are compared with all differing cost factors considered, Idaho Power's rates are the lowest notwithstanding the sparse customer density of its service area.

4. To create the dollars of anticipated revenue necessary to attempt justification of the proposed expenditure, the study assumes that BPA will not only capture the phosphate loads of Idaho Power Co. and Utah Power & Light Co., but further assumes that these phosphate loads will multiply four times by 1980. Additionally, it assumes the sale to Utah Power & Light Co. of substantial quantities of secondary energy for fuel replacement when that market is being adequately met by dump hydro energy already available in Idaho and Montana.

J. R. Simplot, largest phosphate fertilizer producer in Idaho and one of the largest in the Nation, stated at the Boise meeting that "as of right now the fertilizer and phosphorus business is well taken care of—somewhat over produced."

Today's plant capacity of elemental phosphorus for the chemical, food, and drug trade is in excess of demand, already causing a setback in plant expansion programs of several producing companies. Demand for the product, not Bonneville power, will ultimately determine the rate of growth in the phosphate industry.

With the advantageous electric rates available from the investor-financed companies in the area, southern Idaho phosphorus production increased from 18,522 tons in 1950 to 174,242 tons in 1961 or 114 percent of the increase in the TVA area. More significantly, this increase in southern Idaho is in sharp contrast with the total lack of increase by Bonneville's only direct phosphorus customer, Victor Chemical Co. at Silver Bow, Mont.

Last December the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, in a rate finding which involved much testimony on the relationship of price of electricity to the growth of the phosphate industry, determined that an Idaho rate of 4.8 mills (which includes taxes) will assure the continued growth of the phosphate industry in the State. Idaho Power Co.'s revenue per kilowatt-hour will average only 4.25 mills from its elemental phosphorus business. This is a rate 13 percent lower than that at which the commission found the industry could grow and prosper. It's actual growth is the best proof of the truth of this finding.

Moreover, if freight rates are handicapping the phosphate industry, as BPA seems to emphasize, then its efforts should be directed to seeking a reduction of those rates. Neither Idaho Power nor Utah Power & Light are responsible for the existing level of freight rates and, as a consequence, there is little logic in singling out electric rates as an avenue for producing in effect the equivalent of a freight rate reduction. However, the undeniable growth of the phosphate industry in southern Idaho is ample evidence that neither freight rates nor electric rates are handcapping that industry and any claims to the contrary are purely selfserving on the part of BPA.

Unless it is the contention of BPA that the Federal taxpayers should single out the phosphate industry for a direct subsidy, there can be no argument for importing Bonneville power to southern Idaho, as no electric load exists which cannot be competently served at fair reasonable rates by taxpaying companies.

5. The $60 to $80 million transmission proposals contained in the feasibility study contain serious discrepancies of both an engineering and economic nature. Because of the tremendous sums of money involved, let alone any other reasons, the transmission studies should be the subject of comprehensive public hearings. A full discussion of the questions which arise over the transmission proposals would require a lengthy and separate report. To demonstrate the complexity of those questions, and their seriousness, here are a few of them:

(a) The studies propose a line from Lewiston to Soda Springs, Idaho, and the cost estimates are for that line only. Additional transmission facilities would be required to reach the other sections of southern Idaho to serve customers BPA assumes it would take over. Nothing has been included for the cost of these added facilities nor has consideration been given to their effect on project feasibility.

(b) No consideration appears for the cost of solving technical problems involved in effecting connections between d.c. transmission and necessary a.c. connections.

(c) Protection against a possible trip or outage on any single high voltage line would necessitate costly protective equipment on the Idaho and Utah systems for which no cost figures have been included.

(d) The cost of transmission to southern Idaho, added to the cost of any new source of firm energy which will become available to BPA, would raise the actual kilowatt-hour cost delivered in southetrn Idaho to about double BPA's existing rates. This would increase BPA's annual deficit several million dollars a year.

(e) The report assumes the interest rate on money borrowed by the Government to build the transmission lines would be only 2½ percent per year instead of 3½ to 4 percent which is the current rate.

(f) The assumed 250 MW transmission capacity limitation between Idaho and the Pacific Northwest is wholly incorrect, as is the assumed need for stream replacement energy in southern Idaho.

These questions indicate that the actual proposed transmission line investment would probably exceed $100 million. This is ample justification for a full technical hearing on this subject alone.

6. The "feasibility study" develops statistics purporting to show that the economy of southern Idaho lacks diversity, and it assumes that Bonneville Power would favorably change the area's economy. Were that assumption accurate, then the economy of the areas already served by BPA should be better than that of southern Idaho. The fallacy of such assumption is demonstrated by the fact that southern Idaho's economy shines brilliantly in comparison with BPA's area, as the following facts illustrate:

(a) Every one of the 26 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment as declared by the U.S. Department of Labor is in BPA's present marketing area.

(b) Idaho's increase in employees working in nonagricultural establishments is greater than Oregon's or Washington's.

(c) Idaho's gain in employees engaged in manufacturing leads the other two States.

(d) Idaho leads in increase in per capita personal income.

(e) Idaho Power's gain in industrial customers during the past decade exceeds BPA's.

(f) The percentage increase in use of electricity on Idaho Power's system exceeds the increase on BPA's.

(g) A test of economic health is comparison of the State debt burden. Washington's State bonded debt per capita is 15 times that of Idaho, and Oregon's is 19 times Idaho's.

(h) And Idaho's taxes per capita are lower than either Washington's or Oregon's.

7. Future investment in taxpaying generating and transmission property by investor-financed utilities would be displaced by nontaxpaying government property. Idaho Power Co., for example, is already Idaho's largest single taxpayer, with tax payments spread over 27 counties. The company's State and local tax payments presently exceed $6 million in Idaho and $1 million in Oregon, with 60 percent of the company's property tax going directly for the support of schools.

Idaho Power will construct $140 million of new taxpaying generating and transmission facilities in the 6 years ahead, unless foreclosed from doing so by the displacement of this property by tax-free government property.

What southern Idaho needs is not more tax-free property in the State, but more taxpaying businesses, such as that of Idaho Power, to help meet the ever-increasing revenue demands of our schools and local and State government units. And what we need at the national level, with our enormous Federal debt and ever-mounting cost of Federal Government, is a curtailment of unnecessary and wasteful spending.

8. If BPA is substituted for the Bureau of Reclamation as marketing agency for reclamation power in Southern Idaho, and the lower BPA rates are substituted for Bureau rates, the revenues from power sales earmarked for support of irrigation projects in the area will be largely erased.

It is a fallacy to assume that BPA can pick up these irrigation supports at BPA rates. Irrigation benefits cannot be paid from BPA deficits. Hard dollars are needed—and if not forthcoming from Bureau power sales they must come either from increased payments by the irrigators themselves or from the taxpayers generally.

At stake are all future irrigation projects in southern Idaho that must depend upon adequate power revenues for financial aid.

Notwithstanding Mr. Carver's solicitation of certain legislative signatures to a favoring petition, the proposal to expand BPA's marketing area into southern Idaho has little public support and much public opposition, as is evidenced in part by resolutions of Idaho Reclamation Association, representing Idaho irrigators; Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Idaho's largest farm organization; Idaho State Chamber of Commerce; and Idaho Insurance Agents Association.

Southern Idaho newspapers have likewise expressed opposition to the proposal as you will observe from the enclosed copies of representative editorial comments.

We submit that the study creates more questions than it answers and provides no justification for the investment of between $70 and $100 million or more of taxpayers' money for the express purpose of creating needless and wasteful competition with the investor-owned, taxpaying utilities of the area.

Yours very truly,

T. E. ROACH.

How Big Is Maine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Maine people customarily exhibit a certain reserve in advertising the vastness of their State, leaving it to others to remark upon its bigness.

This is very well done in an article appearing in the March 1963 issue of the New Englander, a publication issued by the New England Council. I think this article is deserving of a reserved place in the RECORD:

HOW BIG IS MAINE?

Unfortunately, most American tourists who come to crow over New England's doll-sized farms and villages believe that the West has a national corner on immensity, and even worse most of our region agrees.

Brace up, New Englanders, and take a look out the back door at your own geographical wonderchild, Maine. If its bulk belonged to Canada instead of the United States, the region would be sawn in half. A journey from its uppermost tip down its 320-mile length to Boston puts more miles on the speedometer than the leg from Boston to Washington, D.C. If a traveler with stamina enough could cover Maine's total public highway mileage he would journey just a few thousand miles less than the distance around the earth. Iron out the kinks in Maine's tidewater coastline and the Maine shore would stretch into a whopping 3,478 miles, roughly 1,400 more than the length of the general contour of the entire Atlantic coast.

Taken as a whole, Maine's 33,215-square-mile area is larger than that of the Netherlands and Belgium combined, or of either Austria, Albania, Denmark, or Ireland. New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont and Connecticut fit into its boundaries with room to spare.

Pulled apart chunk by chunk, its Aroostook County ranks largest east of the Mississippi, swallows up Rhode Island and Connecticut and tops the total area of Hawaii by 400 square miles. Even the water in Maine covers more than Rhode Island. Totaling almost twice the square mileage of the rest of the region, Maine's 2,500 lakes and ponds, 5,000 small rivers and streams and 5 large rivers add up to more miles of inland water than is found in either New York, Alaska, Michigan or Wisconsin. Moosehead Lake, largest in the region, runs 40 miles long and 2 to 10 miles wide. Its 17,088,000 acres of forest lands yield the largest per capita acreage in the Nation.

Maine also outgrows the region agriculturally. Out of New England's 9,315,000 acres of farmland it cultivates a near third. In 1961 it ranked highest in harvested acreage and value of crops in the region, and handily grew more of oats, potatoes, sheep, lambs, eggs, chicks, chickens and broilers than any of its five sisters. In potato production it ranks second in the Nation, yielding one-seventh of the country's white potatoes.

Its other harvests include 90 percent of the country's low-bush blueberries, 30 percent of its softshell clams and 20 million pounds of lobster.

Maine is big.

Power Pooling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Federal power agencies are parading before us some of the biggest plans for public power generation and transmission in history, I call the attention of the House to even greater and far more significant plans of the Nation's electric utility industry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I urge every Member to read the following account of some of the industry's plans outlined in the March 1963 issue of News Front magazine. I want to add also that, in Illinois, plans were recently announced by three investor-owned electric companies for a $192 million extra high voltage system of transmission lines across the State by 1970, to be financed entirely with private capital.

At a time when the administration is trying to encourage more rapid growth in the economy and particularly initiative in expansion by industry, it is most encouraging to see that the electric utility industry is moving forward. Interconnections and power pooling are not new developments, but such large-scale plans add a new dimension to the Nation's electric power resource. Let us be most prudent in considering plans for Federal power generation and transmission, that they neither duplicate nor undermine these projects of free enterprise.

The above-mentioned article follows:

POWER POOLING—NATION'S ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY UNVEILS PLANS FOR SUPERHIGHWAYS OF ELECTRICITY

Plans for the formation of giant power grids, linking the Nation's vast electric power resources into huge transmission systems for the interregional exchange of large blocks of power, have been unveiled recently by members of the Nation's electric utility industry.

Development of million kilowatt capacity generators, coupled with improved design of extra-high-voltage (EHV) transmission lines capable of handling over 500,000 volts of power, has made it possible for investor-owned electric utilities to think in terms of superhighways of electric power.

Four California utilities plan to begin construction this year on a 500,000-volt transmission line extending from the Oregon border to Los Angeles, the longest EHV line of its size proposed to date.

In addition to the California project, plans are underway to construct 600 miles of 500,000-volt transmission line connecting huge mine-mouth generating plants in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia with outlets outside Philadelphia and New York.

A third plan calls for construction of a 345,000-volt transmission line connecting Minneapolis with St. Louis, Mo., 490 miles away.

Funds allocated for these three projects total $480 million.

A fourth project, if completed by the current 1966 target date, wil be the Nation's

first commercial 500,000-volt transmission system.

The plan, to be financed by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. at a cost of $152 million, consists of a 350-mile loop extending from a new 1 million kilowatt generating station in West Virginia to the suburbs of Washington, D.C., to Richmond, Va., and on to the Shenandoah Valley.

Interconnections and power poolings are not new developments but never before have they been assembled on such a large scale.

Nearly all the Nation's major electric power systems which provide 97 percent of the Nation's energy requirements are members of 1 of 6 principal interconnected groups.

The largest of these covers a 31-State area and combines the resources of 100 electric utilities. This pool of power enables generating capacity in Florida to serve loads in Montana, 2,000 miles away. However, none of the present interconnecting lines has a 500,000-volt capacity.

The economy achieved by power pooling on EHV lines is tremendous. The larger the generating unit, the greater the efficiency resulting in lower costs for producing power.

Interconnection makes it possible for utilities to stagger construction of new plants while drawing needed power from the pool. In addition, plants of 1 million kilowatt capacity require no greater work force than considerably smaller plants.

The mounting trend toward big voltage power systems has led Edison Electric Institute President William W. Lynch, to comment:

"We are well on the way to accomplishing the $8 billion transmission line program which will add 100,000 miles of backbone transmission line during the 1960–70 decade."

Rothman To Head Section of United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note the other day that a distinguished Minnesotan has again agreed to head the Government Division of the United Jewish Appeal. Stuart Rothman, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, has an outstanding record of public and private service.

He was first appointed Solicitor of the Labor Department in 1953 by President Eisenhower. In recognition of his fair and judicial handling of this job, President Eisenhower then appointed him to his present position of General Counsel of the Labor Relations Board. Mr. Rothman continues his service under the present administration, with an outstanding performance of his duties in an effective and impartial manner.

Despite his difficult job, he has continued to contribute his talents to private organizations concerned with the welfare of people and this is reflected in his willingness to head the Government UJA division for the fifth straight year.

The following news story in the March 15 Washington Post reports on this service by Mr. Rothman:

ROTHMAN TO HEAD SECTION OF UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

Stuart Rothman, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, has agreed to serve a 5th term as chairman of the Government Division of the United Jewish Appeal, it was announced yesterday.

The 1963 UJA campaign goal for Metropolitan Washington is $2.5 million according to Dr. Seymour Alpert, campaign chairman. The national goal is $96 million.

Rothman, a former solicitor for the Labor Department, will be charged with mobilizing the UJA's estimated 6,000 supporters among District and Federal employees in the area. The division he heads in this, the UJA's silver anniversary drive, is the organization's largest.

Hymen Goldman is local UJA president.

Control of Seas Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the following lead editorial in the San Diego Union on March 13, 1963:

CONTROL OF SEAS ESSENTIAL

There is growing uneasiness in Navy circles that Secretary of Defense McNamara is contemplating a phaseout of large aircraft carriers and possibly all large surface combat ships.

A special board has convened to study the role of the big carriers in modern warfare as part of a probe into overall Navy doctrine. Such studies generally indicate Secretary McNamara is considering some radical change in the defense setup.

Frank Macomber of the Copley News Service wrote: "McNamara usually tips his hand when he decides to make a move. He did so in the case of the Skybolt air-to-ground missile and the RS–70 supersonic bomber. He has killed the Skybolt and has all but smothered the RS–70 program."

If Secretary McNamara is considering a phaseout of the big carriers, Congress should act quickly to stop him. In our opinion failure to take such action would be a tremendous disservice to national defense. The carriers are and will continue to be the backbone of the greatest mobile seapower in the world.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, said recently: "Salt water itself makes no distinction between the merciful and the merciless. It is our seapower—the ability to maintain the freedom of the seas in peacetime and to control them in wartime—which permits us the option of freedom over slavery."

Any retreat from the principle that seapower is essential to America and Americans is to invite disaster. Carriers are key units in the maintenance of such power.

Secretary McNamara made it quite plain in recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee that he sees no need for bolstering the carrier force.

He said the Navy's 20-year rule of thumb for obsolescence of a ship is "an artificial standard for measuring the useful life of naval vessels." The Secretary believes that carriers of the *Essex* type, all nearing the 20-year mark, will be operational for another 10 years.

The implication is clear. Secretary McNamara seems to believe there is no need to keep our carrier force at top strength—that other types of weaponry can adequately handle our defense problems.

This is fallacious thinking. There can be no free world security unless we retain mastery of the sea lanes. Our big carriers are needed for the retention of that mastery. Secretary McNamara would be ill advised if he refuses to accept that fact.

Who Asked for It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the February 1963 issue of Packaging. The editorial is well written and makes several exceedingly important points which need to be emphasized:

WHO ASKED FOR IT?

The suffocating atmosphere that has come to permeate our Nation, resulting from the almost compulsive need of liberal legislators to protect us, today threatens to stagnate our economy as it has already stagnated much of our population.

It began with the New Deal and continued with the Fair Deal. Even under 8 years of a so-called Republican administration we saw the paternalistic and protective arm of Government grow longer and more sweeping.

Despite its promises and high-sounding phrases, the result of the New Frontier has been only to emphasize and accelerate our movement toward national socialism.

We pose this direct and obvious question: Who asked for it?

And we pose this less obvious but perhaps more important question: What has this growth of benevolent governmental paternalism done to our economy, to our society?

We live today in a nation which the businessman is distrusted because the liberals continually hammer away at the premise that the interests of business and the interests of the rest of us are diametrically opposed. The business community makes no response.

We live in a nation in which the "working man" is protected by his labor unions, while union bosses protect their own pocketbooks.

We live in a nation verging on overall Federal insurance, rather than one in which individuals are encouraged to create their own insurance through their own efforts.

We see legislators so cocksure of assumed paternalism that they introduce a bill to "protect the housewife" against the "artificial nonprice competition of deceptive packaging."

Where does the spiral stop? When do we get off this merry-go-round?

What has happened to the traditional concepts of democracy and free enterprise that built this country and made it great? Why have the "liberals" been permitted to paint that black picture of the businessman as a devil incarnate? Why have corrupt labor unions been given dictatorial powers? Why do so many of our citizens except Government to take care of them?

And why has a "truth in packaging" bill been introduced—a bill that could put many of us out of business and out of jobs, and return our Nation to the crackerbarrel days of merchandising?

The answer to all these questions is as important as it is basic. And the answer can be given in one word: apathy.

It is apathy by the most powerful group this world has ever seen: the American public. More important, however, it is apathy on the part of the segment of the American public to which the world should expect to look for leadership: American businessmen.

If our Nation is to avoid suffocation, if our society is to return to its position of world leadership, we must pointedly ask ourselves again the obvious question: who asked for this? Who requested this benevolent paternalism?

Our answer screams at us from the cemeteries that hold the pioneers, the gold prospectors, the builders of railroads, the churners of homemade butter: nobody asked for it.

With that as our answer let us throw off this moral turpitude that stagnates us. Let us reevaluate this society in which we live. Then let's start taking care of ourselves again.

Offensive and Defensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a portion of my remarks the article by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs of the VFW, entitled "Offensive and Defensive," from the VFW American Security Reporter:

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE

As the discussion of the Cuban crisis so well indicates, there can be much confusion as to what is offensive and what is defensive. In the strictly military sphere of activity there can be a tactical offense within an overall strategic defense. There can be individual defensive actions within a broad strategic offense. All too frequently the question of what is defensive or offnsive in conflict resolves itself into a hazy and frequently meaningless semantic exercise. And semantics have little influence on the outcome of struggles to the death.

From the standpoint of the Kremlin, the Cuban situation could be evaluated as a strategic gain of tremendous value. By the takeover in Cuba, the Kremlin has leapfrogged the Atlantic and has achieved a strategic lodgement in the Hemisphere of the Americas. Communism has a base for exerting diplomatic, political, economic, and military pressure.

Whether long-range missiles are currently in place in Cuba is not, from the Soviet standpoint, really significant. Long-range missiles are only necessary when the launching sites are so distant from enemy targets as to require long-range capabilities. Cuba is so close to the United States that intercontinental ballistic missiles are not necessary because of the relatively short range to some vital U.S. targets.

It would, additionally, be dangerous wishful thinking to assume that the Soviet Union does not have ready-made plans for using Cuban harbors as permanent or temporary bases for Red submarines. Rather, it must be assumed that the Kremlin with its strategic insight as to the free world's dependence upon sea lanes, recognizes that a Red Cuba stands squarely astride the north-south sea lanes between South and North America, and is strategically placed to threaten the Caribbean exit and entrance of the Panama Canal.

In broad strategic context, the Red takeover of Cuba has advanced the Kremlin spearhead across the Atlantic and into the midst of the Americas. It would appear to be, in final analysis, an offensive gain for communism of historic magnitude.

Jobs Out of Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the shortcomings of the Nation's unemployment statistics have always been of deep concern to me and others interested in seeking workable remedies for our unemployment problem. An editorial in the Wall Street Journal emphasizes the need for improvement in the quality of the Government's employment measuring-sticks in order that they more accurately reflect the family impact of unemployment.

If we could ever get a more accurate picture of our unemployment situation, we would not only have a better perspective of the economy as a whole, but we would also "see more clearly what needs to be done for those for whom unemployment is a real hardship." An important job needs to be done in improving these statistics along the line suggested by the Wall Street Journal, and I include the editorial of December 7 in the RECORD.

I wish we would add as another category to our employment statistics a series showing those who are engaged in study, from age 14 to 65. A person being educated really is not unemployed, nor is he actually employed, we need a new category. A new phenomena of recent decades has been the increased amount of time our people spend in being educated before they enter the labor force as well as while they are part of the labor force. The use of the archaic age of 14 in setting up our basic employment statistic illustrates how out of date and inaccurate we are. Today the average age of the young person entering the labor market is over 19.

Furthermore, the amount of adult training, on the job or off the job, has increased spectacularly in recent years. We need to measure this if we are to know what truly goes on in the labor market of a dynamic economy.

I am pleased to note the development of the new statistical series "unfilled jobs" by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and trust that it will soon be published with regularity.

JOBS OUT OF FOCUS

The poor quality of the Government's unemployment measurements is emphasized in the figures just published. The jobless rate jumped to 5.8 percent in mid-November almost entirely because of a rise in teenage unemployment.

At the very least this kind of calculation gives a distorted picture of the Nation's unemployment problem. In fact, Labor Department officials felt compelled to explain that the rise in the rate did not herald a slump, because the rates among adult men and women showed little or no change.

Looking at the matter a little more deeply, there is surely a big difference, in terms of family impact, between teenage unemployment and adult unemployment. Though some youths are the only potential source of family income, their number is small. Most of the unemployed kids didn't want to stay in school and many just won't take jobs they could get. Yet this group counts for no less than one-fifth of the unemployment total as officially reckoned.

A similar distortion results from the rapid increase in the number of adult women in the labor force; they now hold more than one-third of all nonfarm jobs. It is obvious that many are not the only or principal family breadwinners, but the unemployment statistics make no such distinction. And women now account for nearly two-fifths of all the jobless. Add that to the teenage category and you get three-fifths of total unemployment among people many of whom need not work to support the family.

None of this argues for discrimination against working teenagers and women. But it certainly reveals a lopsided Federal perspective on unemployment. If we could ever get the picture in focus, we would not only have a better idea of what our economy is doing. We would also be able to see more clearly what can be done for those for whom unemployment is real hardship.

Time To Name Names

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the recent magazine article with its allegations concerning Members of Congress is certainly a shocking story. Even more startling is the fact that the charges were supposedly made by an anonymous Congressman.

There are serious charges that cloud the House of Representatives. The alleged abuses should be investigated.

I heartily endorse the thoughts expressed by the following editorial from the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune:

TIME TO NAME NAMES

Serious charges of cheating made by an anonymous Congressman against some of his colleagues could, if true, place Congress in a bad light with Americans who must find the unknown lawmaker's allegations shocking. If there is foundation for his charges, Congress should waste no time cleaning up its own house.

Incidents of nepotism and pleasure trips abroad under the guise of official business have been well publicized. To these, the anonymous Congressman adds instances of misuse of funds, padded payrolls, and the sale of influence. His disclosure in a story

in a widely distributed Sunday newspaper supplement paints a sordid picture of a legislative body whose Members are looked upon as leaders.

He points out that most Congressmen are honest, but his allegations reflect unfairly on all Members of Congress. However, he properly condemns honest Congressmen for remaining silent about the abuses of a few dishonest ones.

In hiding behind a cloak of anonymity to safeguard, as he says, his effectiveness as a Congressman, the informant himself contributes to the continuance of abuses he deplores. He urges citizens to write to their Congressmen, demanding that lawmakers "put an end to secrecy" on Capitol Hill. But might not other Congressmen remain silent for the same reasons he gives?

It is far easier to make anonymous allegations than to bring charges into the open and stand behind them. If the Congressman has evidence to document his charges, he could perform a valuable service for Congress and the Nation by making it known and spearheading a movement among his colleagues to restore congressional integrity.

Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. E. H. Lane, chairman of the board of the Lane Co., Inc., Altavista, Va., recently prepared a statement for the House Ways and Means Committee, which I feel deserves the attention of the membership of the House at large, and under the unanimous consent of the House, I quote the same herewith:

I asked your honorable committee for permission to appear and orally testify, after March 15, on two features of the proposed tax measure which I consider completely unsound; namely, the capital gains tax on gifts and estates, and the 5-percent floor on gifts.

I was advised that due to the schedule of hearings by classification, I could not be scheduled to testify later than February 26, which seriously conflicted with other engagements that I had. Therefore, I am now filing the testimony that I intended to orally present to the committee, to be included in the record of the hearings of the committee on this proposed bill.

I started my company in June 1912 with three employees, in a plant that was bought at a bankruptcy auction sale for $500. Today we are giving employment to approximately 2,000 people in our three plants.

My business was started with a very limited capital, as many such others, especially independent, family-started businesses, which is about the manner in which most of our medium-size and small businesses are started, and it was practically impossible then, and is now, to sell stock in such businesses to raise capital until they have proven themselves. So, we had to plow back our earnings until such a time as we were a proven business success. So, our shares of stock or interest in such companies is nearly 100 percent capital gains.

You can readily see where applying capital gains to accumulated values, on either gifts or inheritances, along with gift or inheritance taxes, goes a long ways toward destroying an interest in such business that you may want to hand down to the members of your family or to your associates in management, whom you expect to carry on the business in the future.

It is by no means certain that the theory of taxing long-term capital gains as income is sound, but at least it has been our consistent rule that no tax on any gain is to be imposed unless and until there has been a realization of gain—a sale of property or its virtual equivalent. In my judgment, to impose a tax on capital gains which have not been realized seems completely indefensible. What a hardship such a rule could cause.

In this era of high income taxes which prevent the easy accumulation of wealth through the direct method of savings, many a man dies leaving as the overwhelmingly major part of his estate a corporate business interest which represents a venture built up from scratch.

Providing for enough liquidity to pay the heavy estate taxes which may be due is difficult enough. To impose a death-precipitated income tax on an unrealized gain, and then an estate tax on the balance, would add tragically to the burden of many of these estates and often prevent the continuance of an enterprise which the deceased had the right to expect could be carried on by his family.

Consider also the proprietor of an enterprise who wishes to give some of his stock to his son—or perhaps to an executive—for incentive reasons.

To compel this donor to pay a capital gains tax—as well as a gift tax—on the theory that he has made a gain does seem oppressive. In addition, he might even be obliged to raise the capital gains tax by selling some stock and thus having to pay a capital gains tax to pay a capital gains tax.

If Congress should be ill advised enough to enact such a proposal, it would be found necessary to make exception after exception, and then exceptions to these exceptions. That has happened before in our law.

Let's look at one of the more simple complications: Are the new capital gains rules to be coordinated with the respective gift tax and estate tax exemptions? As an expert on our taxing system recently said, "You try to think that one through. It is too much for me."

I have struggled hard over 50-some years to build a business of which a large portion could be handed down to my four sons, and I have tried to accumulate enough assets outside of my stock in my company to pay my inheritance taxes, so my stock in this company could be handed down to my sons. Now, if this feature of the President's tax message is enacted, a considerable portion of my Lane Co. stock will have to be sold to pay a capital gains tax, in addition to the inheritance taxes.

Why does a man start a business? As I see it, to make a living for himself and then his family when he marries; and the next motive is to secure his family's future. I know that was what motivated me.

The question I would like to ask of this committee is: Do we want to discourage still further the formation of such businesses as I have described? By far, most of our businesses today were started by some individual, family, or group of people who started in such a manner.

Do we want to go still further down the road of state socialism, so as to remove that much more of the incentive from our incentive system?

Generally, when legislation is passed which affects a taxpayer's previous position, it is not retroactive, but only prospective, in order to avoid creating and generating a hardship situation. The application of this principle would call for the proposed legislation to apply only to future acquired property and not to property held for many years as a result of the planning by taxpayers of their affairs over these many years, such as I have done. Otherwise, the legislation would act as a bolt from the blue, which is not consistent with the democratic process.

Another principle that has been applied in connection with tax legislation is to recognize the period of ownership. That has been proposed by Secretary Dillon in connection with capital gain status on realty sales. To apply the same principle, here, for property and securities held for over 10 years, no portion of the appreciation should be considered. Appreciation could be considered, if at all—since we have previously indicated that unrealized appreciation does not constitute income—on a sliding scale with 50 percent for 1 year of ownership scaled down to zero for property including securities held for 10 years or more.

We are told by supposed experts that we have excessive unemployment and that we must have a reduction in taxes, and that was the object of this tax measure, to create more jobs. To my way of thinking, it doesn't do anything of the kind. In the first place, it will give very little tax relief to those with incomes in excess of $10,000 a year, and to those with incomes in excess of $50,000 a year, who are the only ones who have the money to build plants to furnish more employment, there will be a rare few of them who on balance will get any tax reduction at all—quite a few will probably get increases. When I look at this bill, it looks to me as if it was designed to help the low income groups, the great mass of voters. They haven't the money to start or modernize or expand businesses that will create more employment.

Getting back to capital gains on accumulation of values for gifts and inheritances, if it is the desire of this administration to increase gift or inheritance taxes, so that businesses cannot be handed down from one generation to another, then why don't they come right out and do it in an above-the-board way, rather than by such a left-handed procedure?

On the matter of a 5-percent floor on gifts, in my judgment, this will greatly discourage gifts to charitable institutions, churches, colleges, hospitals and other such institutions. This, on Secretary Dillon's own testimony, is just a way of raising taxes, and I would like to call to your attention that it only affects those with incomes of more than $10,000 a year, where most of the sizable gifts come from—another way of taking more of the incentive from our incentive system.

If this administration really wants to encourage the building of more businesses, thereby creating more jobs, they are going to have to encourage those who have the money with which to do it.

Most all of our tax laws for thirty-some years have been aimed at soaking the rich, and this is no exception, as far as I can see and analyze it.

Taxes could be cut on the upper income brackets to 65-percent maximum and it would reduce our Government's revenue by only some couple of hundred million dollars. That and a reduction in the corporate income tax would do more to create more jobs than anything else you could do.

Following a policy that it doesn't constitute a sound practice to criticize something without offering something better in its place, I have the following suggestions to offer:

In the first place, our tax structure apparently has been designed to win votes to bring about socialism rather than to give us a good, sound system of taxation, and the present tax structure is too dependent on income taxes, and in periods of depressed business, the Government's revenue will certainly suffer extreme reduction, due to this weakness in our tax system.

I would suggest that we consider appointing as unbiased and as little politically moti-

vated a committee or commission as is humanly possible to study our tax structure and to write an entirely new revenue act for our Government. That would be a sound procedure, in my judgment.

I do not think the provisions of the President's tax message will help to stimulate business, because his reforms, in my opinion, will discourage the average business man more than the reductions that he proposes.

In lieu of those reforms that have been suggested in the President's tax message, I would suggest that your honorable committee consider a manufacturers' sales tax to produce enough revenue to offset any reduction in income taxes that is made. This, in my judgment, will not cause inflation, because there is no use of any of us kidding ourselves that the present corporate income taxes, as well as the personal income taxes haven't fully saturated our economic system to the extent that they are already being passed on in the prices that are asked for the various things that we buy.

In closing, I should like to say that I, personally, (and I am sure there are many others who think as I do) would prefer no change at all in the present tax laws to what is being offered in this new bill. From the standpoint of a sound Government fiscal policy, I can't see for the life of me where any tax cut is in order, as long as our Government is spending more than it is taking in.

I thank you.

Kennedy Policies Hurt Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a portion of my remarks the article entitled "Kennedy Policies Hurt Economy," by David Lawrence:

KENNEDY POLICIES HURT ECONOMY—PLANNED BUDGET DEFICIT, TAX REFORMS SEEN CAUSING UNCERTAINTY IN BUSINESS

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has just told the country that his tax proposals must be adopted by Congress to prevent a recession. But, due largely to psychological factors, the recession has already begun. The only question now is how deep it is going to get and how long it will last.

The recession started when the President announced that he was deliberately planning a budget deficit in addition to the deficit already being incurred. Momentum was added when the President declared that, coincidentally, taxes would be raised by so-called reforms and that the reduction in tax rates would be spread over 3 years.

This combination of giving and then taking away much of what is given frightened business, especially since there was no sign of any policy to stop the spending spree of the Government. Projects that could readily be postponed—new appropriations—were urged just the same by the President, irrespective of their impact on the fiscal condition of the country.

Today labor calls the tax program inadequate. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce favors a tax cut but insists on a reduction in Government spending as well. Economists are nervous. Investors are cautious.

Tax changes of major proportions involving a planned deficit are similar to a surgical operation. Sometimes the patient gets worse and sometimes he recovers. But nobody ever plans an operation on the body that he really doesn't need—or a deficit that he can't afford.

A tax cut by itself would be a stimulus to business. But if unaccompanied by corresponding savings of a substantial amount in the budget, it causes fear of inflation. This means upward price changes and instability due to a decline in the purchasing power of the dollar.

What has happened in the last 30 days is that, upon reading the President's tax proposals, business became confused. Uncertainty developed. Hesitation is an inevitable sequel. Only those expenditures in which commitments have already been made are carried out. Anything that can be deferred is postponed indefinitely. A wait-and-see attitude ensues. Business doesn't usually operate on a 3-year basis, and neither do most individuals. It's the 10 or 12 months ahead that constitute the main horizon.

Tax cuts are always helpful, but they can be ruinous to the fiscal soundness of the Nation unless expenses are cut, too. It may be "puritanic," as one of Mr. Kennedy's advisers termed it, to balance the budget, but the American people want to see a trend in that direction instead of away from it.

The President often asks critics for alternatives. A program of tax cuts plus a program of economies in spending appears to be the only answer to Mr. Kennedy's dilemma. Tax "reforms" should be postponed. Most important of all now is the necessity for the administration to recognize the danger and meet it at once before the recession intensifies.

A persuasive example of how dangerous tax "reform" can be is already available. The Democratic Party in Congress is just as much responsible for the blunder in this case as is the President. Carelessly and without weighing the consequences, Congress passed the new law on expense-account deductions, phrased in vague language. The Treasury has recently interpreted these vague phrases, and this has brought depression in the restaurant and hotel business. But it will be said, That's a small part of the economy. The facts, however, prove how shortsighted such a view can be.

For over the weekend Clyde Davis, president of the Chicago Livestock Exchange, made a speech in Chicago declaring that cattle prices have suffered their worst setback in years. He said a wide combination of developments has hit the cattle and beef market almost simultaneously in the last 3 months. The dock strike hurt, too. Foreign beef came in last year at a record-breaking pace. Finally tax rulings curbed business dinners and entertainment expenses in business, which in turn caused a cut in the buying of top beef by some of the higher-priced restaurants and hotels. It was the straw that broke the cattle market's back. Mr. Davis said:

"The tax ruling on expense accounts makes it more difficult to wine and dine customers. This development is becoming a more important factor in the depressed beef markets."

Certainly cheating on expense accounts is reprehensible, but the Government ought surely to be able to catch up with fraud without penalizing innocent citizens and injuring the cattle business, the hotel business, the restaurant business, and related trades and industries.

This is but one illustration. Already churches, colleges, and other charitable institutions are worried about contributions because of the 5 percent floor on individual tax deductions. Far from stimulating consumer spending, the administration's program may cause the citizen to stop some of his spending.

To keep the people uncertain about tax rates and reforms for several months is dangerous. The sooner the President agrees to a separation of tax-cut measures from tax-reform proposals, the quicker the new recession will end. There is time enough in periods of prosperity to make reforms. What is immediately urgent is to stop the new recession in its tracks.

Latin Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, my distinguished colleague, Representative DANTE FASCELL, of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, and myself conducted hearings in Miami at our own expense on March 14 and 15 with regard to the problems created in our county by the absorption of Cuban refugees fleeing Castro and communism.

Many suggestions were made at the hearings about approaches to solving the problems which are created by the absorption of many thousands of these fine people.

Paramount in the minds of many of our local people, who have earned a Nation's gratitude for extending open arms to these people, is the need for increased resettlement of the overflow to many other parts of the Nation. This has been the key phrase used, so far as I can determine, in regard to resettlement—"to other parts of the Nation."

I should like to invite attention of the House to a proposal I have made to the Honorable John Thomas, Director of the Cuban refugee program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I respectfully invite my colleagues to explore with me a new approach which could have a tremendous impact in combating the efforts of Castro and Moscow to "brainwash" our good friends in other Latin American nations:

MARCH 28, 1963.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
Director, Cuban Refugee Program, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: You are aware of course, of the growing public sentiment in Miami for increased emphasis on relocation of refugees from Castro's communism to other parts of the United States to relieve the pressure on our area which has been caused by the absorption of so many of these fine people.

I am aware, of course, that the Department has done a commendable job to date in transferring more than 50,000 of the refugees to other parts of the Nation. It was pointed out at our Miami hearings, you will recall, that many of the refugees return to Miami because of its geographic location to Cuba; because of the climate and because of the desire to be close to people of their own tongue and social customs. A strong underlying motive, of course, has been the compelling desire by these people to do something actively to rid the hemisphere of Castro and to free their homeland. To a large extent, they are frustrated in this area because of limitations on their activity.

It occurred to me that we might develop an original program to put the energies of these active people to work in an all-out psychological and intellectual "cold war" against Castro and communism. These people, many, many of them, could be our first line of offense in building public opinion throughout the Latin American and South American countries against Castro's current effort to export communism to those countries and infect other nations with the long-range plan by Moscow to infiltrate and bring about the downfall of these nations.

The President's outstanding Peace Corps program has done much to help the people of Latin America, as it has throughout the world, and to let the people of many nations see democracy in action.

I want to explore with you a plan for creation of a Latin Peace Corps under the Cuban refugee program with the following objectives:

1. To provide a program under which Cuban refugees could volunteer for assignment to Latin American nations to tell the story as eyewitnesses about what has happened and what is happening in Cuba.

2. The program should be devised so that their skills can be used according to their occupations in such fields as teaching, medicine, law, writing, and engineering.

3. Those volunteering under the Latin Peace Corps program would receive benefits comparable to those they now qualify for as refugees while on assignment.

It seems to me that this approach would have a strong appeal to thousands of these people who want to do something actively to fight Castro and communism. This approach to "resettlement" is one that should have considerable appeal to the refugee colony in Miami, and an approach which could be useful to our country.

I respect your experience as an expert in the field of resettlement activities based on your 18-year career, and solicit your opinion, and suggestions with regard to the creation of a Latin Peace Corps as described above.

Kindest regards, and

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

Oglethorpe University Basketball Team Places Third in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my alma mater, Oglethorpe University, near Atlanta, Ga., has recently appeared in some favorable headlines. Its basketball team, under the expert direction of Coach Garland Pinholster, finished third in the Nation in the NCAA small college division. Oglethorpe University, with just 400 students, was the smallest of all small colleges competing for the national championship.

Coach Pinholster, long recognized as one of the finest young coaches in the United States and author of three best-selling books on basketball, was selected as head coach of the Small College All-Stars for the Pan-American Games' playoffs next week in Kansas City. He was chosen over more than 700 other coaches in the NCAA and over more than 700 in the NAIA.

Coach Pinholster, who also serves as athletic director of Oglethorpe, has been named "Coach of the Year" in Georgia four times during his 7-year college career. His teams have been to two national tournaments and have won five other regional or conference championships.

At the same time, Oglethorpe University players have maintained an excellent scholastic record, averaging in the eighties as a team. This is a remarkable achievement in a college noted foremost for its academic standards.

Coach Pinholster and Oglethorpe University were featured on a national television program last year commemorating the 75th anniversary of basketball.

Coach Pinholster and Oglethorpe's "Stormy Petrels" have earned their places in the sun.

They have proved that victory need not come at the expense of high educational standards.

Jobs Here and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the common impression, one of the keys to the apparently lower rate of unemployment in Western Europe and Japan is not so much rapid economic growth as widespread inefficiency. According to a Wall Street Journal article of December 21:

> Millions of people in Europe and Japan are employed in jobs that in America have been mechanized or simply no longer are performed.

Throughout the agricultural, industrial, transportation, and distribution sectors of their economies, per man productivity is considerably lower than in the United States. As one U.S. Government productivity expert stated:

> If foreigners used manpower as efficiently as we do, unemployment levels overseas would be a lot closer to the rate here.

In addition, featherbedding is a widespread labor practice which contributes to the high rate of inefficiency and lower rate of unemployment. Many extra workers are hired to perform one job, and temporary layoffs due to a slack demand are almost unknown. According to an American steel man:

> When you hire a steelworker in Japan, for example, you've usually got him for life, good times or bad.

Comparing rates of unemployment here and in other countries is a hazardous undertaking at best. However, if we do it in an attempt to draw lessons for our own economic policy, it behooves us to look behind the figures for an understanding of why the rate abroad may be lower. The Wall Street Journal article is important for the light it throws on this subject and I wish to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

JOBS HERE AND ABROAD—FOREIGN INEFFICIENCY, NOT GROWTH, IS KEY TO LOWER UNEMPLOYMENT—FRENCH, ITALIAN FARMHANDS TRAIL PRODUCTIVITY HERE—JAPANESE STEEL MILLS LAG—FEATHERBEDDING IN EUROPE

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Is U.S. unemployment really high compared with levels overseas? And if so, why?

There's no doubt, after allowing for differing methods of computing unemployment statistics here and abroad, that a higher percentage of the work force is jobless in the United States than in Europe and Japan. But the explanation does not lie primarily in differing economic growth rates. It lies in this vital fact: Millions of people in Europe and Japan are employed in jobs that in America have been mechanized or simply no longer are performed.

Automation is by no means the only factor behind the difference in American and foreign employment patterns. Every tourist notices that in London each bus has a conductor and each subway station has ticket collectors. Factory "featherbedding" is much more a way of life than in the United States.

BIG CONTRAST ON FARMS

Agriculture provides a jolting example of how mechanization and larger farming units give Americans a big productivity edge. Only one-fifteenth of all U.S. workers now labor on farms. But France, heart of the bustling Common Market, still has nearly a fourth of its workers tilling the soil. And in Italy the figure is about a third.

If the United States still had to devote as large a portion of its manpower to farmwork as does Italy, it would need nearly 25 million farmhands instead of 5 million; the United States could put every one of its 4 million unemployed men and women to work with hoe or spade and still be short 20 million workers on the farm alone.

And agriculture doesn't tell the whole story. Lower per-man productivity overseas means it takes many more persons to do a given amount of work in industry, transportation and distribution. If per-man production of American steel mills were as low as in Japan, for instance, the steel industry here would now need 900,000 workers instead of 400,000.

The productivity gulf persists despite the rapidly increasing output per man abroad and despite evidence that scarce labor is hampering growth in some foreign lands.

COMPARISON OF JOBLESS RATES

The bare statistics of unemployment leave no doubt that the U.S. jobless rate is higher than abroad. At 5.8 percent of the labor force last month, the U.S. unemployment level far exceeds recent comparable rates in West Germany (1 percent), Japan (1.1 percent), France (1.9 percent), the United Kingdom (2.4 percent), and Italy (4.3 percent). A special Presidential study group adjusted the foreign rates to the U.S. definition of who is employed.

"If foreigners used manpower as efficiently as we do, unemployment levels overseas would be a lot closer to the rate here," declares a Government productivity expert. It's by no means certain, of course, that unemployment abroad would climb quite to the U.S. level even if by some magic, foreign economies were suddenly as efficient as this Nation's. For one thing, continuing pent-up demand for some goods would doubtless absorb part of the slack resulting from greater efficiency.

A glance at key industries, however, demonstrates clearly that if unemployment abroad is very low by comparison with the United States so is foreign productivity.

FARMWORKERS' OUTPUT

Agricultural output per farm worker in the non-Communist world's four largest agricultural producers is compared below. The annual amounts, expressed in dollars, are based on a recent report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The figures necessarily are based on imprecise comparisons, but the trend is clear.

Output per farmworker	
United States	$2,883
France	1,153
West Germany	1,112
Italy	774

"The average farm in Western Europe is much smaller than in America," says a U.S. agriculture specialist. "Big agricultural machinery just doesn't work out on small farms." Despite recent efforts to increase the size, the average West European farm covers only some 20 acres, the official estimates. The average American farm is about 300 acres.

In the factory, too, American productivity far exceeds foreign performance. Japan is not the only foreign industrial nation whose steel workers trail the production of American steel workers. The table compares the tons of steel produced per worker yearly in the six chief non-Communist steelmaking nations. The data, based on 1960 operations, is supplied by the American Iron and Steel Institute.

	Tons per steelworker
United States	220
West Germany	174
Italy	171
United Kingdom	168
France	144
Japan	99

An American steel man who has visited mills overseas explains the United States lead this way:

"In some foreign steel plants you'll see the most modern equipment in the world, but right next to it men will be performing questionable chores, such as repeatedly cleaning floors. This stems from an attitude that traditionally has given first consideration to job security. When you hire a steelworker in Japan, for example, you've usually got him for life, good times or bad."

The list of manufacturing industries where U.S. workers produce more per man than their oversea counterparts extends beyond steel.

FACTORY WORKERS

Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges recently estimated U.S. factory workers "on the average produce more than three times as much in an hour as the average European worker and seven or eight times as much as a Japanese worker."

And a recent Government study places the value of hourly output of U.S. factory workers at $3.66 per man, far above comparable totals in France ($1.32), Italy ($1.01), and Japan (50 cents).

The list of industries where America's productivity lead is large extends far beyond farm and factory.

It includes, for instance, transportation. The table compares the number of rail workers employed per mile of road, as reported by the Association of American Railroads.

Employees per railroad mile	
United States	3.7
France	14.6
Italy	16.2
West Germany	16.2
United Kingdom	29.2

Noting the gulf between the United States and foreign totals, the AAR report explains, "European railroads, being state owned, tend to be considered instruments of national social policy, rather than profitmaking enterprises." Anticipating the argument that West European nations, because they are small and have shorter routes, need more rail employees per mile, the report notes that sprawling Russia uses 29.6 workers per railroad mile.

FEATHERBEDDING IN EUROPE

A rail executive recently back from Europe adds: "Featherbedding is bad here, but much worse in Europe." Also, he reports such technical advances as pushbutton control of cars in freight yards and mechanized track repair are the rare exception in Europe, rather than the rule as in this country.

The relatively small capacity of European freight cars also limits rail efficiency abroad, he says. The capacity of U.S. freight cars averages about 52 tons, dwarfing car capacity in France (25 tons), West German (24 tons), Italy (21 tons), or the United Kingdom (15 tons).

America's productivity edge extends down into coal mines, where the U.S. lead is overwhelming. Bituminous miners in the United States produce over 14 tons of coal per man daily, latest estimates show. That's about seven times the daily tonnage mined per man in Europe.

As tourists who've shopped abroad can confirm, foreign retailers rarely rely on self-service counters. Instead, a battery of sales clerks stands ready to assist shoppers. In Britain the average retailing employee sold roughly a third as much merchandise last year as the comparable U.S. worker.

Less than 10 percent of the food purchased last year by French and Italian housewives was bought at stores with self-service counters. In no West European country did the total exceed a third. In the United States, by comparison, over 90 percent of retail food sales were in self-service stores.

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion concerning the news policy of this administration. Many of us are convinced the American public has been misled by spokesmen for this administration in repeated efforts to present the most favorable image through a tightly managed news policy.

The gentleman from Kansas, Hon. WILLIAM AVERY, discussed managed news, completely and objectively, at a recent meeting of the Kansas Federation of Collegiate Young Republicans, March 2, at Hutchinson, Kans. I submit his remarks for the benefit of those who may be interested in the right to know:

MANAGED NEWS

Each mistake the Kennedy administration has made could very well be the subject matter of a full-length speech and would further provide enough topics for a speech every day for the remainder of the New Frontier—January 1965. I can tell you for sure that there are quite a number of Republicans in Washington, and I think across the Nation, who intend to point out these blunders to the voters and taxpayers of America. It is always the responsibility of the minority to point out policy differences and philosophical diversities from the majority party. This is not just to be partisan for the sake of being partisan, but to give the voters in a democracy a clear choice on issues.

In the last few months of the Kennedy administration, this responsibility becomes almost awesome because of the almost successful attempt of the Kennedy administration to manage and sometimes misrepresent the news. This operation of news management did not suddenly commence, as it was initially just a projection of the magnificent job of public relations and selling that was done on candidate Kennedy himself in the 1960 election. With the services of some most intelligent and resourceful public relations representatives, the Kennedy family image was projected widely and favorably to the people of this Nation. The campaign managers did not overlook one small opportunity, all the way from Caroline's admittedly attractive appearance, even to the President's appearing forceful in a rocking chair. The latter accomplishment, I assure you, required a great deal of skill.

This very cozy and admittedly effective public relations presentation of the New Frontiersmen suddenly lost some luster after the Cuban invasion but took a different turn during the tense moments last fall during the Cuban crisis. On October 30, Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, told reporters that "news flowing from actions taken by the Government is part of the weaponry." Reducing this combination of words down to an understandable premise means that the Kennedy family had decided it is quite all right for them to use the dignity and the official news media from the White House to portray or to indicate a favorable result or conclusion as justified in the interests of national security.

Now at the outset, I think we will all recognize that certainly it is not in the best interest of our Nation during an emergency to make all information and intelligence known to news sources and thereby to our adversaries. This is just as axiomatic as not revealing a bridge hand to your opponents. But you don't want a bridge partner who indicates he was dealt aces when they were indeed only "jacks." In times of war or even during international bargaining, it is obviously necessary to reveal only as much information as can be helpful in obtaining the objective that is being sought. This is a much different context, however, than misrepresenting what now appear to have been well-known facts, not only to our adversaries, but to the American people themselves.

It is perhaps more dignified to refer to this manipulation as "managed" news, but managed news in many instances is misrepresented news. If the question has presented itself as to what I am referring, there are quite a number of known instances of so-called managed news, and it appears that each day there is being revealed another basic incident associated with the Cuban crisis whereby the American people were not told the truth.

You will recall the controversy over the air cover that was alleged to have been promised the Cuban invaders on their ill-fated mission at the Bay of Pigs. The official Pentagon news sources were rather vague as to whether or not air cover had been promised, and who called it off at the critical hour. Then recently, Attorney General Robert Kennedy took it upon himself to announce to the Nation that no air cover had been promised. A careful review of all the incidents revealed that he was trying to misrepresent the whole incident by a play on words. "Air cover" for the invading troops apparently had not been assured, but at least two air strikes preceding the invasion to disable Castro's aircraft had been promised. One was made. It is the opinion of most ob-

servers in Washington that the effect of calling off the second air strike permitted Castro's small air force to riddle the invaders as they attempted to land on the beach.

And then you have learned just this week, not from the White House, not from the Pentagon, or not from any official source, but from Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader of the Senate, that four American pilots were killed in this poorly managed operation. Again, the New Frontier made no mention of American citizens being involved until this announcement was made, and then it was confirmed by Majority Leader MANSFIELD.

You are generally familiar with the successive allegations by Senator KEATING last fall and again this month over the extent of the Communist military strength in Castro's Cuba. It can be categorically stated that Senator KEATING's charges were immediately denied by White House sources, but then subsequently admitted to be generally true. I do not believe that our official intelligence sources, either the Central Intelligence Agency or any branch of the service, is so inefficient or so incapable of performance that this same information would not have been known to the administration spokesmen. If our military intelligence is so inept, it needs a complete reorganization. It is a sad state of affairs when information that finally affects our very national security must be obtained from voluntary and unofficial sources, and we are told that these facts were not known to the military or to the policymakers in the administration.

This list could be added onto almost indefinitely. But the important point that I want to make is that now responsible people in the Washington press corps, as well as a large number of Members of the House and of the Senate, are not sure how to interpret any official administration announcement. This should not be interpreted as being only a partisan point of view, and I am the first to confess that I personally hope it is a conclusion that has been reached by many persons with no political affiliation. It has been commented upon by one very close to the Kennedy family themselves.

Arthur Krock was chief of the Washington bureau for the New York Times for 21 years. Mr. Krock is the recipient of two Pulitzer prizes and a citation that is equivalent to a third. He described himself as "absolutely personally fond of President Kennedy and a long-time friend of the entire Kennedy family." Despite this personal attachment to the Kennedys, his professional ethics prompted him to speak out last week. In a cynical statement, he denounced the attempt to manage news by President John F. Kennedy and his associates. The Associated Press quoted him as saying "that the weapon of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba." Mr. Krock further accuses Mr. Kennedy of creating a false impression last fall that a balanced budget was in prospect. He charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which Krock says is "visibly growing worse."

Mr. Krock is critical of the working press themselves for being overwhelmed by this unorthodox operation. He completed his criticism by saying that "for any degree to which this project has been successful, the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

These are very serious indictments indeed, and similar charges were apparently brushed off by most persons as the usual political criticism until the cryptic article by the senior New York Times reporter. This had caused quite a lot of reflection on the part of Members of Congress, and I think the working Washington press corps.

This criticism, supplemented by a Republican comment, has not taken place without results. The first printed report was that a retreat had been arranged by White House Secretary Pierre Salinger and representatives of the working press and organizations representing the various news media. This so-called retreat is to take place next week, and I understand that this is an attempt on the part of White House policymakers to either explain or apologize to the press for the apparent arrogance of White House and administration spokesmen. I thought there was an amusing note in the press release. Although we have a committee in the House known as the Moss "Right To Know Committee," the administration wants these representatives of all news media gathered for a briefing session, for which, it was announced, "No news coverage permitted." In other words, if the administration has a confession to make, they want to make it on a classified basis and not confess their mistakes to the public.

When I left Washington, the last episode in this rather sordid tale was an answer from the assistant White House press secretary to a question if Mr. Kennedy had any expletives to announce after reading the Arthur Krock story. The press secretary's reply was "Yes, but I wouldn't want to pass them on to you." The word expletive was a new one to me, but its meaning was rather clear from the way it was employed in this story. To confirm my interpretation of it, I did refer to the dictionary. As you might imagine, the explanation was an "oath" or "exclamation." In other words, the President was not favorably impressed by the comments made about his administration's responsibility in the news, even from a personal friend.

There is one further facet to this entire matter that I think should be mentioned in connection with the management of news. You have read for the past several weeks of the objection of administration spokesmen to the criticism of responsible Republicans on the handling of the Cuban debacle, the breakdown of the Common Market negotiations, and the obvious meddling of Mr. Kennedy in the affairs of our neighbor Canada. You have read that the Republicans are urged not to be critical of the foreign policy of this administration and to adhere to the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy that allegedly has been the practice since World War II.

Now in theory, this sounds rather commendable indeed, as we would like to believe the old axiom that our political differences in this country stop "at the water's edge." This would certainly be an ideal situation, if it could be attained, and under certain circumstances it could become a reality. On every major foreign policy decision during the Eisenhower administration, responsible leaders of the Democratic Party were briefed and consulted with before a decision had been finally reached or an announcement had been finally made. Under such a procedure, there would be a bipartisan or a nonpartisan foreign policy, because the minority would have had some responsibility in developing this policy. Just because the leaders of the House and Senate are called down to the White House to be advised of a major foreign policy action a few minutes before it is given to the press, does not make it a bipartisan foreign policy in any sense of the word, but only a slight consideration in deference to their position for information.

Since the development and administration of foreign policy is the prerogative of the Executive under the Constitution, I can find no fault with the present practice of this administration. But if it is to be made solely by the majority party, then the majority party and its leaders must take full responsibility and not expect to be immune, to criticisms for blunders.

And I wonder how long are the memories of some Democrats. You might get the impression from reading news releases from Washington that criticism of the Kennedy mistakes in the field of foreign policy is something entirely new in national politics. If our memories were no longer than theirs, we might initially feel that we had become overly partisan and that our criticism was not in good taste nor in the public interest. Just let me comment that the mighty elephant was not chosen for our party simply by more accident. Elephants are reputed to have long and accurate memories, and so it is the Republicans who recognize them as their emblems. With this capacity to remember, I would like to submit to you some examples of Democratic bipartisan support of foreign policy previous to and during the 1960 election campaign. Here are just a few:

1. Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee, May 5, 1957: "The Eisenhower-Dulles administration of our foreign affairs has substituted improvisations for policy, appeasement for leadership, posturing for deeds and advertising slogans for information."

2. John F. Kennedy, New York, October 20, 1960: "* * * under Republican leadership our prestige has fallen so low that our Latin American allies are no longer willing to follow our leadership in the fight against communism in this hemisphere."

3. Adlai Stevenson, May 20, 1960, to a Cook County Democratic Committee dinner: "But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either."

4. Chicago Tribune, shortly after the U-2 incident, quoted Senator FULBRIGHT:

"The American Government's 'attitude of smug self-righteousness,' following disclosure of the U-2 episode, in FULBRIGHT's opinion, 'must have been unbearably provocative to the Soviet Government and contributed substantially to the violent and intemperate bad manners of Khrushchev in Paris.' "

And I have documentation of many other such examples.

Although this is obviously a political meeting and this is a political speech, I want to summarize as an American citizen.

The danger to American institutions has not historically come from a political campaign nor a political wrangling that takes place during any administration. This has been the history of our democratic system since it was founded almost 200 years ago. The real danger that I see from the distortion and management of news that has become a symbol of this administration is that such manipulation could very easily mark the beginning to the end of a constitutional guarantee, the freedom of the press. It is a fine line indeed that separates suppression of news, management of the news, and official propaganda doctrine. I would hope and I feel confident that the ethical and moral responsibility of the working press will restore reliable and free news reporting to all the conventional news media and that one of the great institutions of America, freedom of the press, will be restored to its rightful position in the conscience of this Nation.

Agricultural Research Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an editorial which appeared in the February 1963, issue of the Vegetable Growers Messenger, published in Preston, Md. So that this article might receive wider attention, I wish to include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH NEGLECTED

No one seems to recall a time in the past when the U.S. Department of Agriculture was so vulnerable to hard criticism as during the past year, or when there was more need for marketing research on certain crops and research to improve the efficiency in the production of others. Quality of product from both the production and marketing viewpoints need more attention.

The USDA, which has done so much good work, and many of whose servants are so dedicated, has divisions that are without proper funds for long-range research and planning. It is a shame that scandal had to show up during the Department's 100th birthday year, but 1963 is another year full of promise. Especially since the administration seems to be switching from its hard core marketing controls to volunteer plans.

Could it be that the die has been cast for future farm bills? Will they be purely partisan and painted up to suit city voters? One publication has said that the era of farm bills by farming for farmers has ended. This is questionable in the light of the terrific opposition the Farm Bureau gave the 1962 farm bill, the national turkey referendum, and the current farm bill which the Farm Bureau severely criticizes.

Government controls and supports for some crops create problems in other crops. If the circle is ever closed will American agriculture be completely controlled? The Supreme Court action is knocking out USDA milk compensatory payments and Baltimore Federal Judge Thomsen's action in throwing out the total Baltimore milk marketing order are growing evidences that "administrative law" has superseded legislative law. The Congress and Federal judges seem to be a little fed up with some executive departments spreading their umbrellas over all they can see, and interpreting the law to make everything in sight their captive. A reversal of this trend can be an important first step in the revitalization of agriculture, and USDA's service to agriculture.

Farmers under price supports of one kind or another are in constant turmoil. They might well take a careful look at the free enterprise segments of agriculture, including a large part of the vegetable growing industry.

The USDA annual budget has reached the outer space figure of $7 billion. Could the Congress ask the Secretary of Agriculture if he would consider the allocation of an additional small portion of that $7 billion to long-range and continuing agricultural research?

Could the Secretary spare only one-seventieth more for research? Surely a very small piece out of so big a hunk. Many taxpayers cannot even write such a tremendous figure, most of us can not comprehend it, but only a $100 million more would give the agricultural community that extra share of research it so direly needs now. Now. There must be a number of places in the USDA where a little one-seventieth part wouldn't be missed. Would it?

Here's a good place for the Government to give new encouragement at home where it will count quickly and get headway in a hurry.

It was new money in research that put the United States way ahead in missiles. Let's get way ahead in agricultural research by finding new uses for old farm commodities, and new commodities and methods for a new age.

In America there's no excuse for being late. There are world rewards for being early.

Free enterprise vegetable growers need a lot more research help on marketing and production efficiency.

Funds can be made available by July 1, 1963, for long-range research programing to let freedom reign—if the Congress and the USDA get together fast.

Who will start the move?

How many will help?

Now?

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

MARCH 1963.

DEAR FRIEND: March was a busy legislative month, with the House taking action on several important bills. I voted for the defense authorization bill, including an extra appropriation for greater development of the manned supersonic bomber. The manned bomber will play a vital part in our defense structure for many years. With the new defense appropriations, our country stands stronger than ever before, on land, sea, and in the air. In line with this, I also voted to extend the military draft another 4 years. For our internal security against the spread of communism, I voted for an appropriation to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Federal money poured into the sixth district during March, with $144,440 going to Altus for a new National Guard armory, $64,000 for Mangum's new water system, and $10,571 to Riverside Indian School at Anadarko for remodeling of the fieldhouse.

It was a pleasure to assist cotton farmers, gins, cottonseed oil mills, and compresses in my district by protesting any change in policy in storing Government cotton. I hope that the present policy of negotiating rates will be in effect for a long time. It will benefit the local cotton interests.

Although the proposed Deep Fork project in central Oklahoma is not in my district, I joined the other members of the Oklahoma delegation in support of the project at a hearing in Oklahoma City. When the project is completed, Oklahoma's greatest dreams will be realities.

A prominent resident of the Sixth District, Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn of Sentinel, was honored in Washington in March for her contributions to the Outdoor Advertising Association's film, "In More Ways Than One."

In order to keep residents better informed on matters affecting their interests, I am presenting a series of monthly 5-minute radio and television programs featuring interviews with prominent Washington officials in Government. Response to the first two programs has been very good. Interviews have been held with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and former Under Secretary of State, now Ambassador to West Germany, George McGhee. My April program will feature an interview with Mr. Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of the Breau of Reclamation, who will discuss the present status of proposed Bureau of Reclamation water projects in my district.

It was a privilege to help secure permission from the Government for district court at Mangum to use the Federal district courtroom. For some time, the district courtroom has been unusable and the graciousness of the Government in allowing a State court to use the courtroom is appreciated.

My award for "letter of the month" goes to a woman who wrote me, "About 20 years ago you asked me if I knew of anyone who might be interested in going to the U.S. Naval Academy and these many years later I am answering you." I am always glad to help constituents, even if it takes 20 years just to get the request.

If I may be of service to you at any time, just phone, wire, or write.

Cordially your friend,

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Serious Problem of Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Waycross, Ga., Journal Herald of June 18, 1962, telling about pollution in the State of Georgia and indicating the need of additional Federal, State, and local efforts to abate pollution in all parts of the United States:

SERIOUS PROBLEM OF POLLUTION

The warning issued by the Georgia Department of Public Health about pollution of the Lake Lanier area could well apply to other parts of the State, including our own community.

Water pollution is, in fact, still a serious problem in Ware and surrounding counties.

To be specific Kettle Creek, particularly in the area west of Waycross along Highway 82, has been shamefully polluted.

Odors emanating from this stream are strong enough to sicken passers-by.

Sewage disposal plants here and at Blackshear have reduced pollution of the Satilla River in our area but we are told that the problem remains along some sections of the river.

Health officials are hamstrung in their efforts to enforce laws against pollution.

Yet, to our way of thinking, the matter of pollution control should have top enforcement priority. This is a matter that affects the health and well-being of all Georgians.

The police powers of a State have been interpreted broadly to afford protection to the public from those who would disregard the rights of others.

We urge that steps be taken to bring this pollution problem under control in our area, in the Lake Lanier counties and wherever else it exists in Georgia.

Report From Project Concern: A Sense of Deep Satisfaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article entitled "Report From Project Concern: A Sense of Deep Satisfaction," which appeared in a recent issue of the San Diego Union:

REPORT FROM PROJECT CONCERN: A SENSE OF DEEP SATISFACTION

HONG KONG.—A 4-year-old Chinese girl named Liu Lum clutched a cracker and a package of bubble gum and chewed on a vitamin tablet as she waited to see the doctor—the first time in her life she'd ever seen one.

When her turn came, she marched forward and tilted her head so that Dr. James W. Turpin could have a look at her infected ear. Turpin treats almost 60 children such as Liu Lum each day in his Project Concern clinic in the walled city of Kowloon, one of Hong Kong's most densely populated refugee areas.

The clinic is the first part of Turpin's Project Concern program to be realized. A floating clinic is now being built at a local shipyard. It will serve the needs of some of Hong Kong's 200,000 "boat people" who spend their entire lives on sampans and junks. Many have no opportunity for medical care of any kind.

A 60-foot former cargo junk was purchased for $5,000 to serve as the floating clinic. Turpin, his family, and another Project Concern official, Paul Fleener, and his family, will live aboard the junk.

"The floating clinic should be ready by the end of January." Turpin says. "The best part of living on the junk will be the opportunity we will have to go to the sick if they can't come to us," Turpin has explained.

Turpin, 34, a former Coronado city councilman, is returning to the United States on a Project Concern fundraising tour this month, and to accept recognition as one of the United States 10 most outstanding young men as chosen by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

What is Project Concern and what prompted a successful young doctor to give up his practice to treat refugees for charity?

Turpin cut short a lesson in the Cantonese language to show me his floating clinic.

"We thought a long time about a program of medical relief," he said. "We considered linking with existing church or welfare programs. The examples of Drs. Albert Schwietzer, in Africa, and Tom Dooley, in Laos, helped us to decide to set up our own organization.

"Frankly, we're here for what we can get out of it—a sense of deep satisfaction at being truly useful in a situation where the need is desperate."

Hong Kong was chosen because of its vast population of refugees from Communist China, a population that severely taxes existing medical facilities. Turpin and his associates organized Project Concern, raised funds, set sail for Hong Kong, and then ran into a barrage of problems. "Most of these were caused by my own inexperience, lack of information and misinformation," Turpin explains. For one thing, his American medical license was not sufficient for practice in this British crown colony. He was forced to go through a series of steps that included an examination in Canada and final approval in London.

The first floating clinic will be anchored at the Yaumati typhoon shelter. Others will be anchored at Aberdeen, Causeway Bay, and other places where large numbers of boat people can benefit from the medical care. Patients will come aboard the floating clinic from their own sampans, pay an initial registration fee of one Hong Kong dollar (about 17 cents) and be examined and treated. The U.S. Navy's Operation Handclasp program aids in transporting drugs.

In addition to Turpin and Fleener, there are nine adult workers in Project Concern, including Mrs. Turpin and Mrs. Fleener. Two Chinese doctors also are part of the team. One of them, Dr. Peggy Chu, 22, is a graduate of the Tsing Tao Medical School in Shantung Province of China.

Although Dr. Turpin is an ordained Methodist minister, he plans no active missionary or political efforts. He feels Project Concerns' efforts will better demonstrate humane concern and the democratic way of life.

Standing on the partially completed roof of his floating clinic, in a Kowloon waterfront shipyard a long way from home, Dr. Turpin spoke earnestly:

"Unfortunately, our frame of reference in the United States doesn't allow us to fully appreciate the significance of the problems here. The basic needs of these people must be met before they can give abstract questions any real thought."

"We feel that through person-to-person endeavors such as this we can exert definite anti-Communist influence, or, as I prefer to say, a very definite pro-American viewpoint."

Tribute to Hon. Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, CLYDE DOYLE was a truly noble man. He was a credit to this House, to his State, and to his Nation. All of us were honored to have been his colleagues. CLYDE was too big for pettiness; he always had time for little acts of kindness and courtesy; and he went out of his way to help the new Members. CLYDE DOYLE had a deep belief in democracy and in the rights and freedoms of individual men. Democratic government works because of men like him.

I shall always remember this good man as a friend and as a fine public servant.

Crisis in Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. William H. Ruffin, president, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, delivered on March 21 before the 14th annual convention of the institute.

I commend this address by a distinguished American to the attention of all the Members of this body, for he deals with a problem that intimately affects the livelihood and well-being of millions of Americans. Mr. Ruffin presents this problem forthrightly and forcefully:

AN ADDRESS BY WILLIAM H. RUFFIN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE BEFORE THE 14TH ANNUAL MEETING, HOLLYWOOD BEACH, FLA., MARCH 21, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Dillon, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with a sense of great personal privilege that I am serving as your president, and with much pride in our industry that I act as your spokesman today in making this annual report.

We are extremely happy that the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury has honored us with his presence here today, and we are looking forward to hearing his address in a few minutes. Like the Secretary and other thoughtful Americans, we are concerned that some of the storm flags of recession are beginning to fly. Figures of the U.S. Department of Labor show a continuing rise in unemployment, and as such figures are often the prelude to troubled economic waters, the textile industry, as one of the Nation's largest provider of jobs, must inevitably be a part of that picture. In fact, Government policies which control wages and its principal raw material, cotton, make it inevitable that this industry be sensitive to outside stimuli.

Mr. Secretary, we recognize, of course, that one of the principal motivating factors available to Government is an adjustment of the tax structure, and in this connection we have urged a reduction in the general corporate rate. At the same time, of course, we have urged that appropriate reductions be made in nonessential Federal spending so that income and expenditures may be brought more nearly in line.

The textile industry in recent years has made giant strides in modernization and automation. As a result, its prices, on the average, are lower today than they were in the years following World War II, and no other major industry can make that claim. To be honest about it, we are not sure we view this situation with pride, but we do point to it as a fact.

In short, Mr. Secretary, the textile industry is a vital part of the economy of the United States. It has a major stake in what happens to the tax structure of this country, which we believe is now stifling initiative and discouraging full employment. If the shackles which have been placed on us by the Federal Government are removed, we pledge that this industry will lead the way into a new era of job opportunities and economic expansion.

As this meeting unfolds through today and the next two, we shall become keenly

aware that the textile industry is in a significantly paradoxical situation, and perhaps closer than most of us realize to great moments of far-reaching decisions.

On one side of this paradox is the fact that the American textile industry should be able to speak today from a position of absolute strength and confidence.

In 1962, many of us reported very favorable operating conditions to stockholders and our financial positions were greatly improved over 1961. We have been investing heavily in new plants and equipment. We have the most modern production facilities in the history of our industry, turning out practically every kind of textile material known to man.

We utilize every worthwhile textile fiber that nature and man have provided, and we eagerly greet new ones. We have learned to blend the natural and man-made, the old and the new, the good and the best into textile materials that have made Americans the best dressed, the best sheltered, the best decorated people on earth—and at a reasonable price.

But there is another side to this paradox.

Rather than speaking from a position of absolute strength and confidence, we are beset in some basic areas by frustration and uncertainty.

The optimism expressed in business reports for 1962 has been drastically curtailed by a very poor first quarter this year.

We are beset by a deteriorated foreign trade situation, including both imports and exports.

We are beset by a patently unfair price structure for our major raw material.

We are beset by seeming uncertainty on the part of Government as to what should be done about the industry's Government-imposed burdens.

These are matters of far-reaching significance to us. We recognize them as such. Perhaps we should recognize them also as symptoms of something much broader than imports or two-price cotton or Government action.

Perhaps we should begin to believe that we have finally come face to face with the question of the industry's future, and what we are going to do about it.

We have talked for many years about a coming transition in the textile industry. We have looked for a time when we would be carried into a brave new world of textile manufacturing by massive technological breakthroughs, keen insight into production methods, a new concept of marketing, and a dozen other internal forces.

While we have talked, the looked-for transition has been pushed and prodded by both internal and external forces, and the transition has surrounded us.

The question that remains for us is what do we do with it.

This is, I consider, a time of monumental crisis, memorable challenge, and infinite promise for our industry.

The crisis lies in our foreign trade situation. The challenge lies in our raw material situation. The promise lies in the manner in which we respond to the crisis and the challenge.

It is realistic to assume that we shall not reach the day when we can in truth say that the textile foreign trade problem is solved to anyone's satisfaction. The industry has become too universal, too truly international to expect that world textile trade patterns will ever again be what they were 5, 10, or 15 years ago.

Yet, there must be a continuing, serious effort to fulfill the rights, privileges, and opportunities of the United States in international textile trade. This is especially true in view of the inequities in wage and tax costs between domestic and certain foreign situations.

This effort must be made because the textile industry is basic to the well-being of this Nation. It has a tremendous responsibility in the continuing development of the wealth and total resources of the United States. It has served this Nation well for 170 years, in war and peace, and it has been the major industry most affected by changes in trade policy during the past generation.

World textile trade changes since the end of World War II have been paramount factors in the industry's loss of annual markets for the equivalent of 2 billion square yards of cotton goods alone. Our annual export trade in cotton goods has dropped from one and a half billion square yards in 1947 to about one-third that amount in 1962. Imports during the same period have increased from less than 100 million square yards in 1948 to more than a billion square yards equivalent last year.

Massive increases in imports of wool, man-made fiber, and silk textiles are tremendous burdens for the affected segments of the industry. Combined, they are a tremendously powerful force in shaping the future of the industry as a whole.

The textile industry has a genuine appreciation for the value of trade among nations of the free world. It has not asked for any advantage; rather, it has sought only for fair treatment in its home market.

The industry believes that such an even break lies in establishment and enforcement of reasonable levels of imports for all textile products, regardless of fiber content. Reasonable, equitable controls, soundly and impartially administered, are basic to the stability and orderly growth of domestic textile markets, and in the long-term interests of our foreign friends.

Most important, too, is equal access for American textiles to foreign markets. Tariff reductions and other trade concessions by the United States are yet to be effectively reciprocated by an estimated 52 foreign countries which presently restrict the importation of American textiles almost to the point of embargo.

The realities of this trade crisis—the changing patterns of trade, the upward trend of imports, the downward trend of exports—reemphasize the obligation this industry has to call constantly for fulfillment of all of our Nation's rights, privileges and opportunities. We cannot afford anything less.

In 1951 textile trade earned for the United States a credit in the balance of payments of almost $300 million. In 1962 the imbalance in textile trade cost the United States more than $400 million.

This is a situation the industry cannot afford.

More importantly, it is a situation the Nation cannot afford.

We cannot expect the Government to do everything in reversing the current course of events and we are not waiting for the Government to do it all. However, there are certain things that only Government can do. Heading the list is a practical and equitable solution for the grossly unfair cotton situation.

There will be a very detailed discussion of cotton's problems at tomorrow morning's session. I will not presume on the remarks which are to be made at that time, but there are certain inescapable conclusions.

Primarily the cotton problem must be solved by the Government, before the cotton problem solves itself to the disadvantage of every person in the cotton industry.

I was interested to hear of a speech less than 2 weeks ago by the cotton buyer for one of our major mill organizations. This man, a lifelong cotton man, told his audience that it was inconceivable that the textile industry will continue to try to operate in the face of such a staggering inequity as two-price cotton.

He pointed out that additional mills are beginning to process other fibers in large quantities on an increasingly broad basis, in addition to their cotton operations.

Each of us in this room knows personally of a company or a plant—perhaps his own—turning more and more from cotton to the other fibers. It is a simple matter of economics.

The trade changes I have referred to previously have increased the competitive aspect of textile manufacturing. A penny a pound in the price of raw material can mean the difference between profit and loss over a year's time. If the advantage is held by a competitor, and if the advantage suddenly balloons to 8½ cents per pound, the difference can be disastrous for cotton in domestic markets.

We are vigorous and steadfast in our insistence that cotton prices be equalized here and abroad. If they are not equalized, then the raw cotton market will continue to deteriorate. That would be inescapable.

It is distressing to realize that the Commodity Credit Corporation is becoming more and more the real market for U.S. cotton. It is distressing to see such a large portion of the crop going into Government warehouses where it is of absolutely no value to anyone. It is distressing to see an already inequitable cotton price made more inequitable by the addition of carrying charges and other fees incurred when raw cotton goes into the Government loan.

But an expression of distress about the cotton situation is doing nothing more than begging the question.

The only real question that comes out of the situation is this: What difference does the price of cotton make to a mill that no longer buys it, spins it, or sells yarn or cloth made from it?

That, perhaps, is a brutal question. But, more to the point, it is a realistic question.

There is, to me, a great deal of significance in the fact that the world's largest textile corporation was built on one man's faith in rayon. There is significance to me in the fact that manmade fibers are capturing more and more of the total fiber market. It is significant that our industry is being recognized more and more as a customer for all fibers rather than a captive of any particular fiber.

All of this is the well-spring of the paradox which faces us and the muzzle on our expressions of absolute strength and confidence. It is the basis of the transition which has surrounded us with internal and external forces which are shaping the future of our industry.

There is no way we can avoid the crisis and the challenge posed by these forces.

We must stand firm on the need for adequate import controls to maintain the stability of our domestic markets. We must continue to seek vigorously the extension of present controls to all textile products, regardless of fiber content. We must continue to demand that our products be granted access to foreign markets equal to the rights of entry foreign goods have to our domestic markets.

On the question of two-price cotton, there is no room for compromise. The two-price system is inequitable by any measure, it is harming not only the textile industry but the raw cotton industry as well, and anything less than full and complete equalization would be inadequate.

In holding fast to our demands for one-price cotton, we have never sought and do not now seek a Government payment to our industry of any type. All that this industry wants is a chance to buy American-grown

cotton at the same price it is sold to foreign competition.

In the past few years, we have seen the textile industry become the most truly international industry in the world, with textile plants in virtually every country, and with a resulting increase in competition for both established and new markets.

We have seen our industry move more and more away from traditional methods to encompass new and perhaps more realistic ways of doing business. The industry has broadened the foundations of its raw material sources, and it has rebuilt, renovated, and expanded to meet the needs of the people it serves.

Finally, we have seen our industry state its position firmly, stand up for it, and work to maintain it.

These forces will continue to influence our industry, and if we are to see the industry grow, it will be our task to guide them constructively.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not here to weep about the past, to wail about the present, or to look fearfully at the future. We are here to learn more about our industry, its assets and liabilities, and how we might act and react to them and for them.

We have no right to weep about the past, for what is past is merely prolog.

We have no right to wail about the present, for what is present is to be accepted, and, if necessary, changed.

We have no right to look fearfully at the future, for what lies ahead is to be molded and shaped by our own efforts.

Panama Canal: Republic of Panama Could Oppose A-Blasts for Sea-Level Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, much has been published about blasting a canal across the American Isthmus by means of nuclear explosions, but little or nothing has been published about the views of the Republic of Panama concerning that proposal.

In a statement published in the January 20, 1963, issue of the Sunday American of Panama, Republic of Panama, Foreign Minister Solis of that country is quoted as stating that Panama would oppose nuclear blasting by the U.S. Government for the construction of a canal at sea level. He also was quoted as saying that the desire of Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., of the Canal Zone that a qualified Panamanian be employed as a Panama Canal pilot as "encouraging."

The news story follows:

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA WOULD OPPOSE A-BLASTS TO BUILD SEA LEVEL CANAL

Panama would be opposed to the use of nuclear blasting by the U.S. Government in the construction of a sea level canal on the isthmus, Foreign Minister Solis Friday night told a gathering of school of diplomacy students of the Panama University.

Solis, who gave the talk at the university on the invitation of the students, said that nuclear blasting would shorten the construction period by at least 2 years. But, he added, in the interest of safety, Panama would insist that the proposed waterway be built by conventional methods.

Solis, who declared that according to estimates a sea-level canal would take a total of 10 years to be completed—3 years of studies on the project and 7 years of actual construction, said the signing of a new Republic of Panama-United States treaty, which would be a prerequisite for the proposed waterway's construction, would have to be signed before 1970.

The Foreign Minister, who is one of his country's representatives in high-level talks currently being carried on between the two Governments, estimated that discussion on a possible new treaty would be held in 1965 and 1966.

He based this opinion, he declared, on the fact that 1964 is a presidential election year in the United States and that it would be unwise for President John F. Kennedy, who is expected to seek reelection, to concentrate on a matter as politically touchy as a new treaty.

Solis reiterated that Kennedy gave his word to President Roberto F. Chiari, during the latter's state visit to Washington last year that the equal-pay-for-equal-work clause in the existing Remon-Eisenhower treaty would be carried out to the letter.

The Foreign Minister said he considered it encouraging and significant that, in a recent conversation, he was told by Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., it was the Governor's personal desire that a qualified Panamanian be employed to the coveted position of Panama Canal pilot.

Others in the audience were Deputy Minister of Government and Justice Manuel J. Mendez Guardia and Camilo O. Perez, both professors in the school of diplomacy; and Assemblyman Julio Linares, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the National Assembly.

Stalemate in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and the American people are gravely concerned and deeply troubled by what seems to be a stalemate in Cuba. We are all rightly disturbed by the reality of a Russian satellite and military base just 90 miles from our shores. We hear endless debate on the question, and are promised solutions almost daily for resolving the issue. Yet the Nation suffers the endless frustration of seeing no results of those promises. Instead, the situation seems to worsen daily.

The Costa Rica Conference of the Organization of American States is just one more example of the foreign policy pattern being followed by the Kennedy administration—high promise but no performance, flowing rhetoric with little result.

A little over 1 year ago the United States had to exhort and plead with Latin American nations to oust Cuba from the OAS and take other steps which would supposedly seal off the Caribbean island from the rest of the hemisphere. But now, every Central American government has firsthand knowledge of the danger of the Cuban Communist menace. Hoping that the United States would lead the way, they pressed for strong, affirmative, effective action against the Castro regime at the Costa Rica Conference. Instead they learned that the United States wants a new psycology to "evolve" in relation to Cuba.

Some timid antisubversion measures were proposed in the final communique issued by the Presidents at the conference. But as one Panamanian official commented, "You call those meaningful steps against Cuba? Those are details that should have been left to police officials, not to Presidents."

The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs said in its March 14 report to Congress:

No plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect. Communist potential aggression cannot be measured solely in terms of regular military forces or offensive capabilities.

What are the facts on Cuba today? Is the administration withholding information from the American people once again? Are we going to silently and docilely admit defeat and accept the status quo in Cuba? Or are we going to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, protect our national integrity and security, and protect and defend the individual freedom of our own citizens as well as those of this hemisphere whom we are pledged to protect?

The following articles by Mr. Richard Wilson of the Cowles publications in the March 24 Minneapolis Tribune and Mr. William S. White in the March 25 Minneapolis Tribune raise some pertinent questions on these issues. What are the facts?

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune of Mar. 24, 1963]

SOVIET CUBAN GARRISON APPEARS TO BE ONE UNITED STATES WON'T ERASE

(By Richard Wilson, chief of the Tribune's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps the time has come to look at Cuba with the blinders off. In the several recent statements of high officials on Cuban policy, one point stands out clearly:

The Russians now have in Cuba an organized military force and if they have decided to maintain it there nothing that the United States contemplates doing will remove it.

The public may draw a different impression from the statements of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Assistant Secretary of State Edward Martin, and President Kennedy.

But when these statements are examined with more care, and when other circumstances are taken into conisideration, it is quickly found that officials are merely defining a policy. They have found no way to enforce that policy.

Enforcement of a policy to remove Russian troops from Cuba, in fact, is considered as dangerous, or more dangerous, than the demand that Russian missiles be removed from Cuba. All forms of effective blockade are ruled out as forcing the issue to the point of war with the Soviet Union.

The realistic outlook, therefore, is that the Russians can maintain in Cuba a garrison of some thousands of personnel which would be the counterbalance in this hemisphere to the American garrison in Berlin.

This Russian garrison in Cuba will undoubtedly have its contacts throughout the Western Hemisphere. Communist agents and revolutionaries of various sorts now pass in and out of Cuba through Mexico City. Revolutionaries from many Latin American countries are now being trained in Havana.

Firsthand journalistic accounts of life in Cuba today carry little suggestion of a collapse of the Communist regime. These reports suggest, on the contrary, an acceptance of Communist disciplines which would be likely to outlast Castro. No opposing force, either externally or internally, appears to threaten the Communist position in any greater degree than in many Communist satellites.

It is difficult to see just how President Kennedy's conferences with the Latin American Presidents in Costa Rica has made any change in this basic condition. This can be said without in any way demeaning the President's effort to organize "a wall of determined men" around Cuba. Mr. Kennedy is doing what he can. He evidently has gotten greater cooperation from the heads of Latin American governments, at least for the time being.

No amount of opposition oratory, no calls for direct action, are likely to change the situation much, either. But Mr. Kennedy will have to live with this, and counter it as best he can through political channels.

There are two obvious and clear dangers. One is that rising American exasperation inflamed by the oncoming presidential campaign will push a harassed administration into overt action it otherwise would not take.

Another contingency is that the mounting pressures for a solution before the presidential election next year could conceivably push the administration toward some kind of a diplomatic deal.

It does not take much imagination to equate the Russian garrison in Cuba with the American garrison in Berlin. It can be expected that the Russians would be quite happy to do so. Nor is it hard for harassed officials to conclude that a solution in Cuba, so far as Russian troops are concerned, could only come as a part of some give-and-take diplomatic settlement with Khrushchev.

What former Secretary of State Dean Acheson deplores is that the Kennedy administration's "flirtation with Russia" apparently continues. The idea will not die in Washington that the Russians have wanted to make a deal, either on nuclear testing or some other issue.

If any aspect of the Berlin problem is compromised in a deal for a Russian withdrawal in Cuba, the Kennedy administration is likely to find itself in deeper political trouble. The impression still lingers in Congress, rightly or wrongly, that some kind of a deal must have been made to trade off our missile bases abroad for the missile withdrawal in Cuba.

Neither of the contingencies, an invasion or a diplomatic trade-off, actually seems real. The reality seems to be that we will be forced to accept the Russian lodgment in Cuba, and exert our best efforts to contain it and strangle it, until such time as the Russians no longer find this penetration worth the cost. That may be a long time.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Mar. 25, 1963]

BIG POWERS NEEDED FOR ANTI-CASTRO PLAN

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The harsh truth about Castro is that the more inter-American conferences are held on the subject, the more ambiguous appears the policy of the United States against this chronic Caribbean danger.

President Kennedy's mission to the six-nation Central American meeting in Costa Rica was an undoubted personal diplomatic success for the President, as the leader of the United States. There is a greater, if somewhat vague, friendship between those nations and ours.

We have all come out of it pledging various steps against the export of Castro communism into Latin America. But most of all we have come out chanting the same tired old slogans about meeting the military menace of international communism by social reforms and economic improvements.

The six Central American nations—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Panama—are represented as pleased at the results.

The fact remains that at least two—Guatemala and Nicaragua—had hoped for strong affirmative actions against Cuba, but the United States went to Costa Rica determined to play down Cuba.

All the planning undertaken in Costa Rica toward the isolation of Cuba will not accomplish much so long as Mexico remains an open gateway to the south for Castro agents.

There never was any hope, however, that the Costa Rican Conference could do anything substantial toward that total isolation of the leftwing dictatorship in Cuba that was achieved by total inter-American action against the rightwing Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic.

The big leftist powers in Latin America—Mexico and Brazil in particular—are not with Central America, or us, in this affair, so the United States could not sensibly have offered any hard and effective anti-Castro plan in Costa Rica, even if it had one.

No true pan-American front truly to cut off Cuba will ever be formed until the Mexicos and Brazils can be brought into it. In the meantime, to attempt to make a grand strategy against Castro resting solely upon the weakest countries in Latin America would be as pointless as preparing such a design against the Soviet Union within the Western alliance based, say, upon Portugal and Holland but not Britain, France, and West Germany.

So all solutions for Cuba remain unsatisfactory, and the United States seems committed all over again to the appealing, but up to now wholly fallacious, notion that armed and militant communism can be stopped by "improving the living standards of the people."

U.S. Withdrawal of Bases Raises Grave Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by Dr. Robert Morris, who was formerly with the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, raises some very grave questions as to the wisdom of the current defense policies of this Nation. At the same time we are withdrawing our forces from oversea bases, and while we watch the expansion of Soviet power and domination, our spokesmen in the Department of State are telling us we are winning tremendous victories. Mr. Speaker, something is wrong and the Congress and the American people should know the truth. We must know who is making policy in the Department of State. We must know why we are allowing the Russian Communist empire to expand, and indeed, seem to assist in its expansion by withdrawing our bases in Europe and Asia to make room for the establishment of Soviet bases. Before it is too late, I believe it is vital that action be taken for a thorough investigation of the personnel and policies of the Department of State. At the moment my resolution, House Resolution 210, is pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it seems to me it would be better for the State Department, and certainly for the self-interest of the United States, if action were taken now on this resolution to clear the air and allow the people to know the facts concerning our foreign policy and who is responsible for it, especially the repeated failures.

The column follows:

BLACK IS WHITE

(By Robert Morris)

From time to time I look at Communist resolutions of the past, not out of historical interest, but with a view toward seeing how successfully they have been implemented. This practice certainly improves one's perspective but does not augment his sense of security.

One of the Communists' more determined campaigns has been that directed against the ring of bases we had forged around the world. At all levels Communists have put pressure on us to withdraw these bases.

A detached view of what we are doing in the face of this campaign reveals a shocking performance. We are retreating on all fronts back to the United States, just as Communist resolutions have directed. And as we retreat, Khrushchev is aggressively moving forward and, as everyone now realizes, has bases at our very doorstep.

Tripoli, Morocco, Britain, Italy, and France all contain or will shortly contain dismantled bases of ours. Not only are we dismantling our missile bases but we are pulling back our B-47's and other jet bombers from far-flung bases around the world. We are not even producing in quantity our RS-70's although Congress keeps appropriating money for them. Not only are we beginning to cut back on our troops serving abroad but also on the nuclear weapons they carry.

This military retreat is having an undermining effect on our prestige and influence all across the world. It is heightening the image of Soviet success and the decline of the West.

The announcement of our abandoning our Jupiter missile bases in Turkey has shaken up the hitherto strong friendly government in that country. This and the whole posture of retreat has alienated General de Gaulle.

As we have written, the withdrawal of our bases from strategic Morocco has been accomplished in a most suspicious fashion. We pretended that rising nationalism was forcing us out when actually some State Department officials against the wishes of the King of Morocco and our military, initiated the evacuation. By the end of this year our remaining three air bases and one naval base will be evacuated there. The airbase at Boulhaut and Rabat-Sale have already been dismantled as well as the radar sites for controlling air defense.

In Morocco the picture falls readily into focus because as soon as we moved out, Soviet Mig's moved into Boulhaut and Soviet technicians have been constructing a naval base at Alhucemas, in the shadow of Gibraltar. Worse still the Moroccan Government is being driven into the arms of the pro-Soviet-African bloc when it could easily be converted into our foothold in Africa, the Mediterranean, and the Arab world.

In Morocco, too, we can see the counterfeit quality of the State Department's anti-Communist masquerade which is being used to justify the retreats. State Department officials there used a dubious public opinion chart to demonstrate that we would be taking an issue away from the Communists if we withdrew our bases. The two officials who directed this evacuation in Morocco were promoted to higher positions in State and USIA.

The fact that the State Department uses an anti-Communist rationale for its moves toward retreat and surrender is concealing from the American people the dramatic changes between the situation just a few years ago and today. Then Khrushchev was encircled—now we are being encircled.

The day before I wrote this column there were three prominently reported speeches of high officials of our Government that stressed Communist weaknesses and inadequacies. These same speeches contained brave words and optimistic forecasts. Over and over State Department-written speeches of high officials tell, like falling snow, that we are winning and that the Communists are losing.

I submit that a realistic view of the world reveals the very opposite to be true. Not only has Khrushchev extended his military frontier directly across the Atlantic and deep into Oceania but the datelines of the cold war incidents are now the Florida Straits, Alaska, and our coastlines. We are retreating on virtually every battle front back to the United States. At the same time we are making more and more concessions at conference tables on nuclear testing, disarmament and other issues bearing on our security.

Yet in State Department parlance, our retreats are victories and "bold thrusts forward." Soviet victories are weaknesses on their part. Black is white. Up is down. No wonder the American people cannot see what is taking place before their eyes.

Returning Ingratitude for Blessing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the miserable, deplorable treatment accorded the Reverend Benjamin O. Leonard of St. Paul, Minn., by both Pakistan and India when all he was endeavoring to do was help eliminate illiteracy and poverty in those countries ought to be taken into account by those who formulate our foreign policy; those who vote the taxpayers' money for foreign aid; and those who administer our foreign aid program.

More and more does foreign aid to many countries prove to be an exorbitant exercise in futility, and exposes the malevolent ingratitude on the part of certain recipient governments.

The Reverend Mr. Leonard's letter to me dated March 16, 1963, speaks for itself, and, I might add, its conclusions speak for me as well.

The letter follows:

MARCH 16, 1963.

To All Who Are Concerned About a Realistic American Foreign Policy:

I write the following summary of a mission which failed, in order to impress upon my Government the need for a reevaluation of its foreign policy, because I feel that there are countries which, while demanding aid in many forms, make it difficult if not impossible for unofficial though sincere Americans to carry out missions of mercy aimed at lifting their masses to a better life.

In August of 1962 I was commissioned by a well-known literacy organization to engage in literacy work in the city of Bangalore, India. My family and I were scheduled to leave New York October 13. However, permission to work in India had not been granted by that time, so it was decided that I should postpone the India venture until visas were granted and in the meantime meet an urgent need for help at the East Pakistan Adult Education Center in Dacca, East Pakistan. The opportunity arose there to effect a contract with the Pakistan Government whereby literacy could become an effective arm of its ministries of social welfare and basic democracies. This would have also made possible the use of U.S. Public Law 480 funds to aid in the provincewide literacy program of East Pakistan. After this was completed, I was to go to Bangalore as originally planned.

Because of the necessity of interviews with officials of West Pakistan while en route to Dacca, I thought it would be well to bring my 1960 Rambler station wagon along. I was supposed to see people in Lahore and Rawalpindi, and a car would have made travel more economical, especially since I could then carry our luggage. Being concerned about customs duty requirements, I called the Pakistan Embassy in Washington and, after outlining the nature of my mission, was told that no import duty would be required on the car. The only restriction was that if I sold the car in Pakistan, I would have to pay customs three-eighths of the value of the car. Unfortunately, I demanded nothing in writing to this effect and was later to regret having taken the Pakistan Embassy's word for it.

Upon arriving in Karachi with the car, I was told that the Embassy had erred in giving me this concession and that I could not bring the car into Pakistan without paying 250 percent duty. I was further shocked to find that the duty, rather than being figured on the depreciated value, was levied on the original price of the car plus the cost of transporting it from New York plus 12 percent tax. This came to the impossible figure of around $8,000. I spent a week in Karachi in the offices of almost everyone who had anything to do with imports. I also solicited the aid of the American Embassy which did all it could, but no success was to be had in freeing the car. I was told that I was not the first to have met with this kind of situation. Two years previously, a trade fair had been held in Karachi and an American manufacturer of farm implements was invited to bring some tractors to the fair duty free. A formal contract had been drawn up but was flatly ignored when the machinery arrived and an exorbitant duty was demanded. I had to abandon the car in Karachi, and, as far as I know, it is still in the customs shed. In my dealings with the officials, customs, and otherwise, I found no one of them expressing any interest in the work I had come there to do. By the time I left Karachi I was short of time and money. I had to skip the meetings in Lahore and Rawalpindi, and my family and I traveled the 2,400 miles to Dacca by train with all of our luggage.

We found another impossible situation awaiting us in Dacca. There was no housing available, and to stay at the only decent hotel cost $20 a day, far beyond what we could afford. The American consulate very generously allowed us to live in their one vacant apartment. We remained there for 3 weeks while they and we searched in vain for living quarters that we could afford. We did manage to find an upstairs flat which would have rented for $250 a month. Our budget wouldn't stand this, however, and to make matters worse, the owner demanded 2 years rent in advance. I visited the Baptist Mission hoping they could give me a lead. The only house they knew of was a 3-room bungalow that was under construction and would have been ready in 2 or 3 months. The owner asked $160 a month and wanted 2 years rent in advance. A German consular official was also looking at the house and told me that he couldn't afford it either because the Bonn Government could not allow that much money. This man had been living in the hotel for 6 months.

The American consulate is having its troubles there too. They have been wanting to build a consulate-U.S.I.S. building, but an acre of land in Dacca now sells for $30,000, and they have had no luck in shaving the price down. Since they are also having difficulty in meeting these advance rent demands, they told me they might have to build a private compound for consular employees.

At any rate, we found it impossible to remain in Dacca. We were still, however, determined to carry out our mission if we could, so we did what we considered the only thing left. We headed for Bangalore, India, to see how we came out with the visas we had applied for back in August of 1962. In Calcutta we learned that trains to Madras were booked solid for 2 weeks, so we had to continue on to Bombay. After reaching Bombay, I flew to Bangalore, and was promptly informed that our visas had been refused by the central government, and I was not allowed to know the reason why. I visited the Ministry of Home Affairs in Bangalore and was told that the only way to reapply was to return to the United States of America. I was later given the same answer back in Bombay. The American Consul in Bombay was most sympathetic, but she could give me no assurance of success since many similar situations had arisen within the past year, and none of them had worked out.

Having met with frustration at every attempt to remain in India, I finally returned to the United States with my family on February 17, 1963.

In view of the foregoing account, I feel that there are some grim facts facing America which she had better awaken to. We are bending over backward to help the underdeveloped countries of the world, and yet people such as my family and I, who go there to engage in missions of mercy, are having the door literally slammed in their faces. My summary opinion is that these countries want our money and technical assistance out of an egoistic desire for power. They don't seem interested in smaller programs that would help where the help is really needed—among the poor illiterate masses. Their governments are corrupt and abound with legalized theivery. Their policy toward the United States is nothing short of blackmail. They readily accept all the money we can hand them, yet the newspapers in Karachi and Dacca are filled with invective against "American imperialism."

As a Lutheran minister, I believe in showing Christian concern for my brothers and sisters wherever they may be, and I think my Government should show like concern. But I am also convinced that we are doing these people no good by succumbing to the blackmail methods of their governments out of fear that they will go Communist. We have a responsibility to teach them some ethics. America is equalled by no other nation in its concern for the smaller nations, but we had better begin to draw some pretty clear lines as to how we expect our generosity to be met in kind, at least with common courtesy toward those who are coming to help them. Our Government has been unselfishly busy in meeting the demands to the smaller nations. We have a perfect right to make demands as well, and it is time we do. How else can we prove an example of strength and moral stature in a world breaking on the rocks of expediency and deceit. We will never be respected as an example to be admired and followed as long as we remain a door mat for the nations to walk on.

It is my hope that the above statements will prove helpful in improving a rather jaundiced world image of America. I want my Government to be looked up to with respect. Our giveaway programs are not winning that respect. I do feel, however, that standing firm on principles and demanding those principles of others will win an esteem that communism will never be able to prevail against.

Sincerely,

REV. BENJAMIN O. LEONARD.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, World War I provided an opportunity for the suppressed nationals under czarist Russian control to strive for national identity. One of these ethnic groups, the Byelorussians, had never before experienced sovereignty. As a part of Lithuania, they had formed a powerful unit within the empire, extending their influence to such an extent that the Lithuanians used the Byelorussian tongue as the official language of their court. When joined with Poland to form the greater Lithuanian-Polish empire, Polish supplanted Byelorussian as the official idiom. With its dominance diminished, the Province became only a name.

In its expansion westward, Russia was able to annex the territory in 1795 and changed its name to the northwestern territory. The spirit of nationalism was not extinguished, though, by this apparent move to obliterate all which was not Russian. In 1906 the first Byelorussian weekly appeared, but was immediately suppressed. Not until the World War and the fall of the czarist government did the Byelorussian people achieve their hopes and ambitions. Although occupied by the German troops in 1915, nationalist fervor soon reached overwhelming proportions. Permitted to establish their own local government, the National Council proclaimed, on March 25, 1918, an independent republic.

With the collapse and retreat of the German Army, the newly sovereign nation was left to the mercy of the Soviet forces. Proclaiming on January 1, 1919, a Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Red army soon occupied all the land belonging to the stricken state. But Polish troops attacked and conquered almost half of the contested territory. As in war, so was it partitioned in peace. In March 1921, Soviet Russia and Poland divided what was once the independent republic.

Today, the Soviet Union controls the entire area, having reconquered the Polish western half during World War II. There is a Byelorussian Republic in existence, a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was even a charter member of the United Nations. Yet it is a sovereign state in name only. Control emanates directly from the Soviet Government in Moscow.

We in the United States, who are the champions of democracy and freedom, honor the Byelorussians who fled from persecution and terror by saluting on March 25, the 45th anniversary of the true independence of their country, and hope that the Byelorussians will once more be able to enjoy democratic rights and privileges under an independent and sovereign government of their own creation.

Career Girl Hits Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Special Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor is holding hearings on bills to provide equal pay for men and women doing the same job, a letter to the editor in the Minneapolis Tribune seems most timely. It was written by a woman worker with firsthand information on the injustice of unequal pay. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert the letter which apeared in the February 3, 1963 issue of the Minneapolis Tribune:

LESS PAY FOR THE SAME WORK—CAREER GIRL HITS DOUBLE STANDARD

To the EDITOR: As a liberal arts graduate with a career in business, I read with great interest your article, "What Kind of Jobs Can Women Get After College" in the January 27 Sunday Tribune. I would be even more interested in a follow-up article on "What Kind of Job Future Can Career Women Look Forward To?" It is true that most women graduates get married, but after marriage many go on to full-time, permanent careers. What are their prospects?

That question would furnish subject matter for dozens of articles, but let me here cite one example from business—me. If my case is not typical, it is at least common enough that I have heard firsthand quite a number like it. I have been with one of Minnesota's largest companies for 8 years, starting as a typist-editor and working into a nonclerical position as editor-writer. (As you so correctly pointed out, clerical skills are an important stepping stone to better jobs for college women.)

In recent years, our office has hired more editors—all men. We all have the same educational background, though I have the advantage of more practical experience, and we all perform the same job, but with one important difference: I make substantially less money.

Why? Because my employer, like most, openly subscribes to a double standard—not in work accomplished or expected, but only in salary and consideration for advancement. My answer when I bring up the subject is always the same: I am high paid—for a woman.

I enjoy my job and perhaps I should be content with that, but like many women today I am supporting a family and cannot help but resent a system which senselessly causes deprivation to my children. Compliments in the wake of a job well done are gratifying, to be sure, but they don't pay the grocer (who incidentally does not have a double standard—I pay as much for groceries as any male breadwinner).

And though I feel a rewarding sense of satisfaction and achievement in my work, I wonder how long pride in doing a good job can stand up against the frustration of knowing that no matter how much special training and experience I get, how many extra hours I put in, how high a level of performance I reach, I will still be earning less and have less chance for advancement than the least experienced, most indifferent, mediocre male employee bearing the same job title.

The American female college graduate represents a substantial percentage of our Nation's brainpower. Today, when this country needs the contribution of every citizen, can we afford to throw away this tremendous potential? How many married, nonworking graduates could be lured back into the working world to combine a career with marriage if they felt they would have a fair chance on an equal basis rather than as a minority group not covered by the "equal opportunity" pledge espoused by many companies?

These women are not going to be attracted to the working world—particularly the business world—as long as they remain second-rate citizens within it.

MARILYN LARSON.

LAKEVILLE, MINN.

Medicare for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I recently received from one of my constituents a copy of a notice which he had received from his insurance company informing him that, due to his age, his quarterly rates for health insurance were to be nearly doubled—from $12.48 to $23.93.

The text of the notice from the insurance company follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Re health insurance policy No. —. (Anniversary date April 10, 1963.)

DEAR POLICYHOLDER: You are aware that medical costs have increased considerably during the past few years and there is every indication they will continue to do so.

During this time we have not had a general rate increase to policyholders because we have maintained our operating costs at the lowest possible level commensurate with efficiency.

We are now paying out more in benefits and expenses than we are collecting in premium. This makes it necessary to increase our rates generally in accordance with the attained age of each policyholder. Because of this fact, beginning with the above anniversary date of your policy, the premium will be the amount shown below. You will be pleased to know that we have not reduced any of your benefits.

We regret the necessity of this action and solicit your understanding.

Very truly yours,

_____,

Chief Underwriter, Group Health Insurance Department.

Quarterly $23.93.

The policyholder receiving this notice was 64 years of age and his main source of income was a $89.90 monthly social security check.

I cite this case because it is typical of the situation faced every day by a growing number of Americans who find at a period in their life when they are most in need of medical benefits that they are least able to pay for these benefits. This case is but another that points to the System. The enactment of such a program of medical assistance to the elderly financed through the Social Security System. The enactment of such a program would enable all Americans to pay the cost of their future medical care during their working years when they are best able to meet these costs.

Address of the Honorable Wayne Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of our distinguished colleague in the other body, the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE.

The commonsense of Senator MORSE in evaluating foreign affairs strikes me as of value to all of us. His remarks about our relationship to our European allies are applicable to the other nations of the world also. In a recent speech before the annual dinner of Bnai Zion, Ambassador Philip Klutznick came to virtually the same conclusions about what that relationship should be: a working together of friends. We are not interested in supporting Europe or any other entity if they do not want our assistance and we do not want their cooperation if they are unwilling to give it.

Senator MORSE's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, OF OREGON, U.S. SENATE, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

On January 16, I spoke here about some of the original purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and why I believe those original purposes have largely been achieved. It was, and is, my contention that if NATO is to continue to be worthwhile to the United States, it must be forged into a new alliance with new purposes. Yet at this turning point, a loud and very important objection to a broadening of the Atlantic alliance is being heard from France, one of its principal members.

Since my earlier remarks were prepared and delivered before President de Gaulle's press conference was available for study, I would like to add some further reflections on what I think our situation is, judged from the attitudes expressed by President de Gaulle.

CONTENTION THAT UNITED STATES MAY NOT DEFEND EUROPE

One of his major contentions is that Western Europe cannot depend upon the United States to come to her aid with nuclear weapons, and that therefore Europe must have her own nuclear arsenal and France in particular needs a nuclear arsenal under her exclusive control.

Yet in the history of the 20th century, France has not been able to defend herself, much less anyone else. The United States and Britain have twice in my lifetime gone to France to defend her against an invader; the last time, France was liberated by these British and Americans whom she now claims cannot be relied on.

Another fact of the history of Europe in the 20th century has been that if any one nation is going to dominate Western Europe, it is probably going to be Germany, and not France at all. Indeed, had France been left to her own devices in the last 20 years, or 50 years, she would very likely be a province of Germany, along with much of the rest of Europe.

It is my personal opinion that De Gaulle and France are kidding themselves if they think the hegemony of a Western European entity would remain very long in France.

And what of current history? It is a fact that there are more than twice as many U.S. ground troops under the common defense command of NATO right now than there are French forces. France is today the chief delinquent in the common defense of Western Europe. As I have already pointed out, the $9.4 billion in American aid which she has received since the end of World War II is the largest sum we have furnished any country and is in large part responsible for the economic and military strength which now enables President de Gaulle to flex his muscles.

In short, it is France and not the United States that has yet to make good on its existing pledges to participate in the common defense of Europe. I frankly see nothing in the recent past, the present, or the future which supports any contention that the United States is unreliable, compared to France, in its willingness to use its strength to defend and protect the freedom of others.

CONTENTION THAT AMERICANIZATION OF EUROPE IS UNDESIRABLE

A second contention widely attributed to De Gaulle as a reason for his feeling that Europe should exclude the United States from its political, military, and economic organization is a dread of the Americanization of Europe.

To him, this is said to imply mass production, mass marketing, and perhaps a loss of the sense of individuality and the loss of a sense of history.

But the United States became the richest and most powerful nation in the world by virtue of its vast unified market and the use of mass techniques in the production and distribution of goods.

And the Common Market of Europe was itself created to bring the same advantages to Europe. That is what the Common Market is for. It, too, will have a vast and even more populous market than exists in the United States. If it serves the purpose for which it was created, it, too, will expand its mass production and mass marketing techniques.

President De Gaulle and those who share his view cannot avoid this trend by keeping either Britain or the United States out of Europe. They can only avoid it by breaking up the Common Market and retaining their small family sized business operations serving a small local market.

REAL OBJECTIVE IS POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

To my mind, at least, these allegations offered in explanation of De Gaulle's policy are excuses, not reasons. They do not withstand the light of reason. They are excuses De Gaulle is offering in the hope of convincing others to accept his real objective, and that is to achieve for France the political leadership of Western Europe.

Perhaps some nations which would reject so bald a statement of the French objective are gullible enough to accept one of the other arguments put forward by France and by individuals in other nations who support her position.

WHERE WE GO FROM HERE IS PRIMARILY UP TO EUROPE

The future degree of closeness in relations between the United States and Western Europe now turns not upon a U.S. decision but upon a European decision. Our intentions and our objectives are clear. They have been supported by American blood and by more than $41 billion in American money. Our disinclination to dominate Europe is evidenced by the fact that we could easily have done so in 1945, but we did not.

Instead, it was our policy to make Europe strong, free, and independent. To carry out that policy we instituted the Marshall plan and later participated to the hilt in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Thanks in no small part to these instruments, Western Europe is now in a position to select her own future course of action.

It does not seem to me that there is anything we can offer Europe that we have not already delivered, or offered. Europe has the choice of welding itself into a new community, either with the United States and Britain, or without them. If it is without them, such a community will presumably be under French-German hegemony.

Either way, the United States will be able to take care of itself. I shall not repeat the many advantages that would flow to us from a loosening of our ties with Europe, if that is her choice. The financial advantage alone would be substantial.

NO REASON TO TRY TO OUTBID FRANCE

Above all, I am not interested in any American policy of trying to outbid France for the leadership of Europe. Our only interest in that continent is that she be free of Communist domination, just as that is our interest in nations elsewhere in the world. If Europe can now do that for herself without further help from us, so much the better for the United States.

A "third force" in Europe would suit this policy adequately, even though we might prefer a closer relationship in which our partners would carry a full share of the financial and military load.

The main point of American interest, in my opinion, is simply that European cooperation is not so important to us that we must go on paying for it forever. If Portugal and Spain, for example, now want to raise the price on American bases in their lands, we are better off to withdraw and let those countries submit their demands to De Gaulle, instead.

When our Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric goes to Spain, I hope that he will include on his agenda a study of how quickly we could close our air bases in Spain, and a review of possible alternative sites for bas-

ing Polaris submarines in the Mediterranean area.

A future for America free from further special obligations to Europe does not frighten me at all. The prospect of a military withdrawal on our part, and the withdrawal of our military privileges in Europe on its part, does not frighten me at all. Our defenses there are for the protection of Europe, not of the United States. If she no longer wants or needs that protection, I see no reason whatever for us to stay.

This is primarily a European decision, too, because the major confrontation with the Soviet Union is in Europe. If Europeans have more confidence in leaders of their own nations in the reaching of political decisions with Russia to the extent of excluding American leaders, then I have no objection to that, either. Berlin and the two Germanys, which are the main points of conflict, are, after all, in Europe and not in the United States. If Europeans want to handle that problem themselves, I see no reason for the United States to object to letting them handle it.

There are already being heard the voices of timidity which counsel a policy of staying on in Europe by ignoring the French challenge and trying to work around De Gaulle. They warn against any hint that U.S. aid, U.S. trade, and U.S. Forces in Europe are in any way affected by the talk of a third force, apparently on the assumption that if we ignore it and offer enough to the other nations of Europe, they will choose us rather than France.

I reject such an approach entirely. For my part, I am emphatically opposed to keeping American forces in Europe if they are not wanted, not needed, and not matched. I am emphatically opposed to further financial aid to nations that seek to exclude the United States from the economic, military, and political life of Western nations.

It is nonsense to say that discussion of a U.S. withdrawal would be a threat on our part, or that it would tend to prove that De Gaulle is right and that we cannot be depended upon. We have already proved that we can be depended upon. It is no threat to say that if De Gaulle's concept is accepted, then the United States will have no further business in Europe. Our withdrawal in such a case is not a threat; it is more of a fact.

SAME FACTORS APPLY TO CANADA

In many ways, we find ourselves in the same situation with regard to Canada.

Here again, you hear counsels of timidity, and warnings that our relations with Canada must be left to the diplomats. I could not disagree more. That advice is an insult to the free people of Canada and to the free people of the United States.

As the political campaign in Canada proceeds, I very much hope there will be a great deal of discussion of her past, present, and future relations with this country. In both countries, our governments are but servants of our people. An alliance between diplomats only, is worse than no alliance at all, where democratic nations are concerned.

American politicians and American voters have a deep interest in our relations with Canada and we should talk about them. The same goes for Canadian voters and Canadian politicians and even more so, now that they are embarked on an election campaign.

To pass judgment on the future of their country, Canadians have to know what Americans think, just as we have to know what they think. I do not fear any Canadian election result that follows a full discussion of our relations on both sides of the border. I do fear a decision that may flow from ignorance of U.S. views.

NEED FOR WIDE PUBLIC DISCUSSION

The same is true of all the Atlantic allies.

Let us face up to the fact that we are all at a turning point. Our NATO alliance has, in my opinion, served its original purposes and served them well. The Atlantic countries have more than recovered from World War II; in the material sense, we are all better off than we were before the war, despite its horrors and its terrible destruction.

We have done very well working together for one common purpose. But none of us is quite sure whether we want to continue the partnership in pursuit of new purposes.

This is a time for wide public discussion of foreign policy within every nation of the Atlantic alliance. I would like to see a lot more of it here. I hope it will be a key issue in the Canadian election. I would like to hear more opinions from West Germany, from Britain, and from France, as well as from the other members of NATO.

This is not a matter that can be left to diplomats, nor to a few insiders in each country. This is a time for each of us to air our complaints, to explain our changing interests, and our hopes for the future. It is a time for getting grievances off our chests, and for exploring each other's interests to see whether—and how—they can be accommodated.

I think we need to do that, and to do it in public, if we are to know whether there is still a community of interest among the Atlantic nations that can form the basis for a new alliance.

Just as war is too important to leave to the generals, so a major alliance is too important to leave to the diplomats. Let neither the generals nor the diplomats ever forget that they are dealing with self-governing people in these nations. In Norway, in Italy, in Belgium, in Canada, in the United States, and each other member nation, the people must understand and support the general objectives of an alliance.

The American people have the right to know whether any further investment in the defenses of Europe, and further reliance on joint defenses with Canada, are going to be matched and shared by Europeans and Canadians. If not, then we must get busy revamping our military and economic policies accordingly.

Familiar Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial appeared in the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., on March 26.

The editorial is brief and to the point. The situation in South Korea has deteriorated, largely because we have, once again, let our friends down and given comfort to our opponents.

Mr. Speaker, the story of South Korea is being repeated all over the world, and it is certainly time that we do a little more than "view it with alarm:"

FAMILIAR PATTERN

The trend of events in South Korea is following a pattern that has become too common in recent years.

That is the decline and fall of regimes hostile to communism and friendly to the free world, many of them regimes elected by the people. Too often these governments have toppled after the United States has condemned them or sided against them in matters of foreign or domestic policy.

In South Korea, Syngman Rhee was elected by the Republic of South Korea through its own democratic process way back in 1947. He was an aged patriot who had dedicated his life to seeking freedom for Korea, first from the Japanese and later from the Communists. He was reelected severall times but public demonstrations about 3 years ago led to a U.S. rebuke and his retirement.

The Republic of Korea hasn't had a popularly elected government since, and violence and arrests of political leaders have marked a deterioration of this outpost of the free world.

Now, in an Associated Press news analysis by Conrad Fink we are told that American hopes are fading of bringing stability, anti-communism and democracy to South Korea.

Meanwhile, we daresay, the Communists are watching from the other side of the 38th parallel. If it weren't for the token force of U.N. troops (virtually all of whom are probably American), they probably would have struck before this.

If South Korea goes the way of so many countries where friendly regimes have been struck down or repudiated by the United States, there should be an attempt in Washington to determine who is responsible for this and similar attacks on friendly governments in France, Canada, Portugal, the Netherlands, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Belgium, and Spain.

Is there someone or some group in a position of power trying to isolate us from our friends and leave us alone to face the Communist menace?

City Council of Los Angeles Honors Eddie Cantor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 276, authorizing the expression of appreciation of the American people and the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor by the President, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Today I received a resolution from the City Council of Los Angeles, expressing their support of my resolution in recognition of Mr. Eddie Cantor's many years of unselfish and unstinting service to mankind. I am most gratified to learn of their support and, under unanimous consent, I insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Whereas nationally and internationally famous entertainer Eddie Cantor, throughout his outstanding lifetime, has rendered great service to his country and fellowmen throughout the world; and

Whereas Eddie Cantor's activities on behalf of the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis, which began with the original March of Dimes campaign 25 years ago at the request of President Franklin D. Roosevelt,

contributed greatly in raising funds for research enabling the foundation to achieve great success in its goal toward the eradication of polio; and

Whereas Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT introduced a resolution in Congress on February 21, 1963, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, requesting joint authorization of the Senate and House of Representatives for an expression of high esteem and appreciation of the American people and the presentation of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor by the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Los Angeles City Council, through the adoption of this resolution, go on record in wholehearted support of Congressman ROOSEVELT's resolution recognizing Mr. Eddie Cantor's many years of unselfish and unstinting service to mankind; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Committee on Banking and Currency and to Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Attest:

WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.
By M. B. WILSON, *Deputy.*

Too Much Money, Too Little Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, at last we have a provocative critique of our foreign aid program. The special committee headed by Gen. Luscius Clay has pointed out the absolute necessity for the continuance of an American foreign aid program. At the same time, as recorded in the following Wall Street Journal editorial of March 26, the committee has reminded us that all such aid is political by nature. It is high time that we recognize that fact, and make the most judicious application possible of our assistance, giving what we can afford to those who need it and will make proper use of it.

As General Clay reported to the President, past experience has demonstrated that unless a reasonable degree of U.S. direction remains attached to the purse strings, the dollars seldom if ever get where they were intended to go, or do the good they were appropriated to do.

Furthermore, with a planned deficit for the next fiscal year of $12 billion or more, and the current critical stage of the cold war, it is more important than ever that we be sure each dollar is spent wisely in terms of America's national goals and those of the free world.

The editorial follows:

TOO MUCH MONEY, TOO LITTLE THOUGHT

The United States is attempting too much aid for too many and often in the wrong ways; it should curtail the program and pay more attention to its own interests and less to the sensitivites of others.

That is about the sum of the thoughtful report to President Kennedy by a committee headed by General Clay. Qualified individuals and groups have been saying it for years, and the surprising thing is that the Government always seems to find it so extraordinarily difficult to reform foreign aid. For it has hardly ever been a question of being for or against aid in principle; the informed criticism has sought to make an effective policy instrument out of a largely ineffective program.

All aid, to begin with, is political by nature. Where the United States has got off base is in the frequency with which it puts a premium on shortsighted political objectives—gifts to foreign potentates in the fashion of a barbaric past, gambles to maintain an existing government that maybe shouldn't be maintained.

Such behavior, as the Clay group rightly observes, encourages those getting the aid to believe that we will accept promises instead of performance and hence to increase their demands. The United States comes to appear neither firm nor strong nor even very sensible; its sound political goals in the world are undermined.

Still worse is the longstanding failure to understand what our objectives actually are. It ought to be self-evident that aid from the United States of America should foster individual initiative and private enterprise. Instead it often does just the opposite, specifically encouraging statism and socialism.

The Committee puts it forcefully: "We believe the United States should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government-owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with existing private endeavors. While we realize that * * * we cannot insist upon the establishment of our economic system, despite its remarkable success and progress, we should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition, and knowledge of economic organization and consequences.

"Countries which would take this (statist) route should realize that while the United States will not intervene in their affairs to impose its own economic system, they too lack the right to intervene in our national pocketbook for aid to enterprises which only increase their costs of government and the foreign assistance burden they are asking us to carry."

The plain implication is that the United States should reduce its emphasis on aid to foreign governments and instead make a conscious effort to promote the kind of economic freedom that offers the best hope of economic development. A program so redesigned would be a less costly program and a far more effective one.

The question is whether any such basic redesigning will be done. And for once there are some signs of fresh thinking besides the Clay recommendations. The aid administrators themselves are talking of taking a tougher stand, weeding out nations that no longer need help or have demonstrated an incapacity to use it intelligently. More than ever, Congress is demanding a workable program.

In the woolly atmosphere that once prevailed—when a critic was likely to be denounced as either ignorant or isolationist—the Clay report might have been dismissed. It will not be dismissed today. Whatever happens, that is a gain for commonsense, the taxpayer, and the national interest.

Tribute to Dr. Frank Walton Burge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I think that the tribute to Dr. Frank Walton Burge by a college student, Pleas L. Hailey, Jr., which appeared in the Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, on March 15, 1963, and the article by Joseph Shallit, "Rx for Teenage Hoodlums," in the Sunday Bulletin magazine of March 3, 1963, could be read with profit by our colleagues:

TRIBUTE TO DR. BURGE

I am a sophomore in college and would like to submit a sincere hoorah for Dr. Frank Walton Burge.

In the Sunday Bulletin magazine of March 3, 1963, Mr. Joseph Shallit revealed to Bulletin readers Dr. Burge's courageous and much-needed fight against juvenile delinquency.

This is a prime example of what is needed in this fight for a desirable generation of youths. Many more civic-minded men and women are needed to give time and aid in this battle against unrest among Philadelphia citizens. It obviously takes time, work, courage, and patience, but for those interested in seeing that Philadelphia's youth find their places in this society, these qualifications should not be inhibitions.

Our local police force cannot accomplish this alone. The sight of a badge to most delinquents is one to scorn and rebel against.

Excuse the cliche, but these kids need love and a show of interest—a kind of help that our police force is not able to give. This is the job for you—the people of the communities.

Unfortunately, all of us are not gifted with the attributes that make a man like Dr. Burge go into such a situation alone, but community organizations can be formed. Interest must stem from within the hearts of the people. These people are as worthy of social status and position as any.

Hats off to Dr. Burge. If only there were more like him.

PLEAS L. HAILEY, Jr.

RX FOR TEENAGE HOODLUMS
(By Joseph Shallit)

The doctor's secretary opens his office door and says, "One of your Viking boys is here."

"Send him in," says Dr. Frank Walton Burge, noted chest specialist.

In walks a wiry, tough-looking youth. "Passing through the neighborhood, Doc—wanted to say hello," he says casually. Then he grins. "I just got me a job doing labor work for a builder."

"That's wonderful," says Dr. Burge.

What's wonderful is the fact that the youth formerly was the leader of the Vikings, rated as the roughest teenage gang in Philadelphia, and he never gave a thought to working for a living.

In 1958 Dr. Burge adopted this gang. Through virtually daily association with the young hoodlums, he led them away from violence, helped make them employable, guided many to jobs. Today, at the police department's juvenile aid division, the Vikings are listed in a file drawer marked "Inactive gangs."

But individually most of the 50 gang members have maintained contact with Dr. Burge. Almost every week, one or two will call at the doctor's office, 229 South 22d Street, to discuss personal or family problems or ask help in getting a new job.

Dr. Burge is a gray-haired, soft-spoken man of 68. He is former chairman of the board of regents of the American College of Chest Physicians and former editor in chief of the journal, Diseases of the Chest. He and his wife live in a rambling Bala Cynwyd house filled with more than 2,000 items of English china he has collected—his main hobby. He also does a lot of hunting and fishing, and travels widely.

Recently he took up water colors and developed what is practically a new art form: He paints on fungus growths which he gathers from rotting trees. These fungi, he

discovered, take water colors perfectly, and their fantastic shapes can be transformed into human and animal forms through adroit placement of the colors.

How a man like this became involved in the world of street gangs is a roundabout story:

Back in the 1940's, Dr. Burge pioneered in the use of miniature X-ray films for large-scale tuberculosis surveys. Five Burge Chest X-ray Clinics were established, and to date they have done more than a million films.

This work turned Dr. Burge's attention to the slum areas where many of the TB cases were found. And this, in turn, aroused his interest in juvenile gangsterism, which seemed to him as virulent a disease as tuberculosis itself.

Why, he found himself wondering, were these boys different from his own children?

One of the main reasons, he decided, was that his children had always had somebody who cared for them—who not only punished them when they were bad but rewarded them when they were good. These young delinquents got punished from time to time, by arrests and jail sentences, but who rewarded them for any good behavior?

With parents on relief or separated, many of these boys didn't know what it was to receive, say, a new baseball mitt as a reward for a good report card. And if there was no recognition for good behavior, why be good? Being bad—fighting, mugging, stealing—would bring not only material rewards but the esteem of the young hoodlums around them.

These boys, starved for love, found it in the gang, Dr. Burge reasoned. The gang filled a need nothing else filled. People who urged that the gangs be broken up were on the wrong track, he argued. Keep the boys together, he said. Retain the gang's natural leaders. Work through the leaders to redirect and reform the whole group.

Dr. Burke went to the Juvenile Aid Division, outlined his ideas, and asked to be put in contact with the worst gang in town. "If my theories work with the worst you've got, they'll work with any gang," he said.

In August 1958 a juvenile aid officer set up a meeting for him with the Vikings' leaders. Dr. Burge was able to convince them that he had no angle—that he simply wanted to aid them with personal guidance, medical attention, carfare for job hunting and other needs. They accepted his offer—but they tailed him for several weeks to make sure he wasn't an undercover police agent.

First thing Dr. Burge did was arrange a work project: renovating old toys for Christmas. He obtained use of the basement of a church at 21st Street and Columbia Avenue and offered the boys $2 a day. He had a double purpose: to put spending money into their pockets and so reduce the incentive for thievery, and to have the boys do something that would benefit others—to give them an idea of what altruism feels like.

Dr. Burge set up an organization under the name of Boys Aid, Inc., with a board of 12 public-minded citizens, including Municipal Court Judges Theodore Spaulding, J. Sydney Hoffman and Herbert E. Millen.

About 20 boys showed up daily to work on the toys. That was encouraging, because only 25 of the 50 Vikings were out of jail at the time. But the boys' behavior was appalling. They'd squabble over paint brushes, slap paint at each other.

And one day, Dr. Burge heard the gloomy news that six Vikings had been arrested while heading into the territory of the rival Tioga T gang and lugging a duffel bag containing a shotgun, a revolver, zip-gun and hunting knife.

"But we wasn't aiming for a gang war," a Viking explained to Dr. Burge. "The Tioga T's heard we wasn't fighting anymore and they started pushing our boys around. So we wanted to put a scare in them and show them we haven't punked out."

By Christmas, the Vikings had a sizable collection of toys ready. They distributed them through their whole territory. "Merry Christmas from the Vikings," they called out after leaving each house. The warmth on the people's faces gave the boys a glow that was a novel experience.

The toy-fixing project indicated to Dr. Burge that these boys urgently needed training in manners or they'd never graduate off the street into jobs, so he set up a "finishing school." He held classes 3 hours each morning, Monday through Thursday, carrying on his medical practice in the afternoons.

The first subject was "Talking." "You'll never get a job if people can't understand you," he said. The second project was "Walking." "No more slinking, shuffling, or strutting; that's hoodlum stuff." The third subject was "Being Polite." The fourth was "Being Considerate."

Dr. Burge paid $1 a day to each boy attending school. This raised eyebrows among some of the board members of Boys Aid, but he insisted on his principle of reward for good behavior. He even set up rewards for the junior Vikings, the ones still in public school. He paid 50 cents for every report card that showed substantial progress in grades or attendance.

Gradually the Vikings' behavior improved. Their relations with the cops got so much better that Capt. James N. Reeves, of the 23d police district, came around to congratulate them. A few Vikings still got into trouble and went to jail, but the number coming out of jail was larger, and most came around to the doctor's meetings.

Dr. Burge arranged the purchase of a row house to serve as a clubhouse. Dances were held, attended by respectable girls who formerly would have nothing to do with Vikings.

One peaceful night, when only four of the Vikings were in the house, half a dozen young men came around looking for a dance, and when they found there wasn't any, they smashed up the place.

The Vikings were able to identify one of them. But, amazingly, they made no plans to waylay him. Instead, they helped the police find him, and testified at the magistrate's court, where the man was held for a further hearing.

Dr. Burge exultantly felt that the boys had at last accepted a basic rule of society: punishment by law instead of personal revenge.

But the boys went beyond that—all the way to forgiveness. "That guy only did the same kind of thing we used to do," one of the Vikings pointed out. So at the second hearing no charges were pressed. The man was released. And the Vikings invited him to come visit them.

However, the clubhouse idea brought strong disapproval from police officials. They felt it was a serious error to let these boys have a house without constant and strict supervision. There was trouble: Neighbors complained to police about foul language outside the clubhouse, and a girl brought a sex charge against one of the boys.

In August 1959, a year after he had first met up with the Vikings, Dr. Burge brought his program to a close. Despite the unsatisfactory experience with the clubhouse, he felt that his year's work had borne out his theory—that teenage gangsters could be reformed through love and understanding. These boys hadn't been transformed into angels, but their basic outlook had changed: A job had become more desirable than a fight.

During the year, Dr. Burge had contact at some time with 99 senior and junior Vikings. The expenses, covered by the Boys Aid board, totaled about $8,000. A bargain, in Dr. Burge's opinion. For every boy that was straightened out and kept out of jail, the community was saving $1,800 a year in custodial costs, plus police and court costs, plus the social costs of thievery and violence.

Usually, when boys graduate out of a gang, the junior auxiliary provides replacements. That didn't happen here: As the senior Vikings gave up gang life, the junior Vikings disbanded.

Most of the Vikings who now visit Dr. Burge have jobs—as messengers, stock boys, bus boys, service station helpers, laborers.

"They tell me they just won't let a new gang get started in their neighborhood," Dr. Burge says.

That's a relaxing thought to a man of 68 who now wants very much to concentrate on his water colors.

Anti-Americanism Turned to Respect by Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, in the field of effective foreign aid and understanding of the humanitarian side of the United States, it is difficult to surpass the people-to-people work being carried on by Project Hope, and the following story by Relman Morin of the Associated Press in the Washington Star on March 24, gives a clear picture of what I mean. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article as follows:

NEW YORK, March 23.—Nearly a year ago, the American hospital ship, *Hope*, dropped anchor off Trujillo, Peru, a hotbed of anti-Americanism where her arrival touched off "public demonstrations of disgust and distrust."

Her mission: To train medical personnel, to fight pain, and, as a corollary, to present a side of the United States that few Peruvians then knew.

The *Hope* is back in New York today. Mission accomplished?

Dr. William B. Walsh, founder of the unique foreign aid project, gives this picture of Trujillo when the ship docked—

"The city was plastered with 'Cuba si. Yanqui no' signs. Many medical students were wearing Castro-style beards. I was stopped on the street and warned not to go into the slums—where the Communists have their greatest strength—unless I used them as intermediaries. Not being a hero, I didn't argue."

That was May 26, 1962.

TWO THOUSAND MAJOR OPERATIONS

In the next 10 months the ship's medical staff performed more than 2,000 major operations, treated 46,000 diseased persons, inoculated 80,000 against poliomyelitis, 56,000 against other infectious diseases, and in other ways—through distributing milk, medicine, supplies, etc.—reached 500,000 Peruvians in 10 cities and towns.

In spite of the Communist threats, about 100 clinics were set up in the slums. Doctors and nurses worked there, unharmed.

Magically, the atmosphere of hostility to the Americans began to evaporate.

"Within a month," Dr. Walsh says, "the 'Yanqui No' signs began to disappear and so did the beards. They're all gone now."

Then, in July, a military junta overthrew the government. Disorders broke out in Tru-

jillo—sparked by a rumor that the *Hope* was about to pull out because of the revolution.

FORTY THOUSAND AT FAREWELL

An officer and a squad of soldiers hastily came to the ship and guaranteed the safety of the Americans. They stayed to lunch and each donated a pint of blood to the ship's blood bank.

"The only buses that kept running anywhere during that period," Dr. Walsh says, "were those marked 'Servicio Hope.' "

Another gage of the ship's impact came in the last days before she left Peru. These events took place:

More than 40,000 people crowded into a stadium in Trujillo for farewell ceremonies that lasted 8 hours.

Every member of the ships medical staff—85 doctors, nurses, technicians and librarians—was called to a dais and introduced individually to the crowd. Among them was Jacqueline Harris, a laboratory technician. She is a relative of Dr. Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations.

"GRINGOS" NOW BELOVED

A newspaper editorial captioned "The 'Gringos' Won't Leave Us" went on to say: " 'Gringo is no longer a synonym of Yankee capitalism, of injustice, of economic monopoly. 'Gringo,' since May of 1962, has meant for Peruvians he who saves lives and alleviates pain."

When the *Hope* sailed, she was garlanded with flowers.

This before-and-after picture of her experience was described last week by Dr. Fernando Cabieses, president of the Peruvian-North American Medical Association, in a statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He said:

"Trujillo has been for many years the cradle of anti-Americanism on the coast of Peru. No other (Peruvian) town has been so responsive to Castro's Cuba. And no other city * * * could have made better public demonstrations of disgust and distrust at the arrival of the ship."

"HOPE'S" SECOND MISSION

The Peruvian operation was the *Hope's* second. In 1961, she sailed on a similar mission to Indonesia and south Vietnam.

Dr. Walsh, 43, an ebullient, persuasive, ever-optimistic Washington, D.C., physician, is the creator and moving spirit behind Project Hope. It began 4 years ago when President Eisenhower asked him to help in the people-to-people project.

Dr. Walsh persuaded the Navy to demothball a hospital ship, now the *Hope*. The Grace Line operates her at cost. Dr. Walsh raised the money, largely from private organizations and individuals to finance the operation. It costs $2.8 million a year to run the ship alone.

Pharmeceutical firms have donated large amounts of drugs, medicine, and other equipment.

The doctors and nurses are volunteers—at considerable financial costs to themselves. The nurses are paid $300 a month, which is less than half of what they would earn in a large hospital. Dr. Walsh said one nurse left a $12,000 a year position to go on the Peruvian operation.

MANY WERE REPEATERS

Yet, a number who gave up the better part of a year to work in southeast Asia in 1961 were repeaters on the trip to Peru. He named 5 doctors, 37 nurses, 12 technicians, and a medical librarian in this group. Some doctors are "rotaters," devoting 3 months to the *Hope*, the next 3 to their private practice, etc.

In 3 years, Dr. Walsh has all but abandoned his own practive. "I'm earning a hell of a lot less money now," he says, "but having a lot more fun."

The *Hope's* primary objective in a given country is to train local doctors and nurses—and even primitive midwives—in the latest medical techniques and American hospital methods. They then train others in their country. Dr. Walsh said 24 nurses came from Bolivia to Peru to work on the *Hope*.

What's next?

He said Peru recently completed a $3.5 million hospital and has asked Project Hope to operate it. A number of American doctors and nurses already have signed up. "The Peruvian Government provides everything, apartments, food, cars," Dr. Walsh said. "All the foundation will pay is their salaries, about $200,000 a year."

Next, he said, he wants to establish a chain of health stations along a remote stretch of the Amazon River. "The average lifespan there is 24 years," he said. "The people there are dying early from ailments that are both preventable and curable."

Finally, when the *Hope* is ready—she is refitting in New York now—he expects to take her to Ecuador next autumn. Why Ecuador?

"Well, they've invited us," Dr. Walsh says. "And besides, I was spit on in Ecuador. Must be anti-Americanism there, too."

Panama Canal: Republic of Panama Should Ask United States To Pay for Chagres River Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the years that I have watched the steady deterioration of our relations with the Republic of Panama, I have become increasingly impressed with the cleverness of the agitators who must have little to do except to think up schemes by which they may "milk" the United States. Instead of meeting these demands by forthright declarations on the part of our agencies of Government, the Congress and the Executive, there has been a paralysis caused by an overgenerous spirit of conciliation to a mob-dictated country. This spirit, as often predicted, has merely served to encourage new extortions after each concession.

The latest idea in this direction is a proposal featured in an Isthmian newspaper of recent date for Panama to demand compensation for use of the water of the Chagres River Valley, and this notwithstanding the fact that the 1903 treaty provides for the use of such water within the Republic of Panama as may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be informed about this preposterous demand, I quote a news story from a recent Panamanian newspaper as part of these remarks:

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA SHOULD ASK UNITED STATES TO PAY FOR CHAGRES RIVER WATER

The director of the Hydraulic Resources and Electrification Institute yesterday urged President Chiari to demand compensation for the use of the waters of the Chagres River by the Canal Zone.

In a letter to the President, Juan A. Morales, the director, said that as a result of having granted the use of the Chagres River free of charge to the United States, Panama is now forced to use a less attractive source of electric power like the Bayano River.

Morales also complained over the fact that recently when the institute asked the Canal Zone Government to supply electric current for the town of Chilibre on the Trans-Isthmian Highway, it was notified by Canal Zone authorities that it will cost $100,000 to build a small substation in order to fulfill the request.

Morales asked, "are not the concession of waters and land worth those $100,000?"

Morales, also declared that it was painful for Panamanians to see high tension wires strung from the Madden Dam hydroelectric plant to serve other areas without the republic deriving any benefit from it.

He described Panama's failure to obtain compensation for these rights as one of the "capital errors that fill our history."

The official declared that it was his opinion that the Panama Government should not only request compensation but rather demand it. He suggested that if a satisfactory agreement was not reached, Panama should seek nullification of any existing treaty because of the lack of reciprocity between the two contractual parties.

He said that while the Bayano project is being set up, electricity generated at Madden Dam should be sold to the residents of certain areas of the Trans-Isthmian Highway.

Some Navigational Lights for Troubled International Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at a luncheon meeting of the Executives' Club of Chicago at the Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., on March 15, 1963:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., EXECUTIVES' CLUB OF CHICAGO, MARCH 15, 1963

SOME NAVIGATIONAL LIGHTS FOR TROUBLED INTERNATIONAL WATERS

When Lindbergh first flew the Atlantic Ocean to Paris, the wife of a major business executive rushed to tell her husband the news. "Think of it," she said, "Lindbergh has just flown the Atlantic—alone."

"It would have been even more remarkable," said her husband thoughtfully, "if he had done so with a committee."

My point is that the American ship of state is in an international storm of increasing ferocity; and to ride the mounting hurricane we need, like Lindbergh, not the reports of committees, but the courage and resolution within our own hearts.

This is overlooked by many Americans but it most certainly is a matter of prime interest to the Kremlin. Night and day its propaganda is directed toward breaking the will of the American people to resist. And, very unfortunately, there are well-meaning Americans who unwittingly assist them. They argue that this is a time of greatest

danger, and therefore greatest care must be taken. This is certainly true but there is a vast difference between taking care, and taking to the woods, in the face of an armed enemy. No one wants a fight—but if there is going to be one the surest way to lose it is to start running away from it. It is my belief that the first line of defense is to arm every American heart—with the truth. The cold, hard truth is that there is grave danger of a devastating world war. The risk is great, but it will not become less by denying that it exists. On the contrary, it will become greater.

But even as those of faint heart note that this is a dangerous century—I wonder if they would, sometimes, be kind enough to mention a century which wasn't. Do you think there was much safety in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776, when John Hancock scrawled his name to the Declaration of Independence? Do you think they rang the Liberty Bell as an alarm signal for Americans to flee for their lives—or as a call to arms—to stand up and fight for their country? This has been a century of marvelous inventions; but no man yet has found a substitute for a truth by which millions of Americans have lived, and hundreds of thousands have died. That fundamental truth is the rock upon which this Republic was founded, and by which it continues to live. That basic conviction is that we are determined to lift up our heads as free people though the price of that freedom is to risk our necks. It seems to me that any American's answer to the villainous Red propaganda is just this simple; you commissars may have a weapon which will blow me to kingdom come, but the weapon has not yet been invented which can put a yoke on my neck. There is nothing startlingly original about this American sentence. I assume Patrick Henry meant it when he said, "Give me libery or give me death." I certainly mean it now, and I have tried to bring up my children and grandchildren to repeat it after me. It's just that plain and simple, and the truth of it is marked by a half million gravestones from Bunker Hill to Tarawa. In blunt terms, to stand as an American you must be prepared to fall as one.

So many of the traits of our national character have been subjected to scurrilous Red attack, that it alarms me, on occasion, that such attacks seem to have raised doubts in the minds of a small section of American youth.

It seems to me that these attacks can best be met—not by a rebuttal of palpable lies—but by a more intensive study of the American heritage in our schools.

Thus, it is charged that we are a soft people, afraid of hardships. But the pioneers who settled our land have provided a complete answer. Only a short century and a half ago, nearly every American settler started out with a wagon, a plow, an axe and a good woman as his wife, to cut a home for them both out of the wilderness. Certainly, these people were not seeking security; they were leaving it to accept the challenge of a continent. Certainly, they were not seeking ease. They expected to work because they did not intend to starve; and they knew that even their children would be born in a wilderness cabin. Nothing but belief in themselves, and in God, could have carried them through. It seems to me that our youth might well be taught that while these are present, all is possible, and that if an enemy ever deprives them of this belief, all is lost. I, further believe, that strength is a continuing asset of the American people. Captain Hull demonstrated it from the decks of the *Constitution;* Farragut, from the decks of the *Hartford;* Dewey at Manila Bay; Halsey with Task Force 58, and Lieutenant Kennedy from the PT-109. King George III did not believe that Americans would fight; the Kaiser thought we were a cowardly and unmilitary people; Hitler thought Americans would never wake up, and it is a great pity that Mr. Khrushchev does not read more history.

I think our schools should teach that for nearly two centuries Americans have made their way by trusting in each other and in God. That is what counts, in the end, as in the beginning, and it can't be calculated on an electric computer.

No more than our famed Navy and merchant marine could have been built and manned—if every man was for himself—can our ship of State be maintained—if each citizen thinks only of his own immediate problem. Our children should be taught that it is not in our tradition for an American to leave his post because it is dangerous. We are not that kind of people. We do not scuttle; we do not abandon ship. In times of danger we go to our battle stations and await the orders of our commander in chief. This discipline of a democracy has carried us through two centuries of turbulent history, and it will carry us through the storms which are immediately ahead.

It is my considered opinion that this basic truth has not been brought home to the American people. All the committee reports in the world will not wash away the lines on the map; and the lines on the map, as certainly as the calendar on the wall—indicate that this country is under attack. I had no higher formal education, but I have had extensive dealings with American statesmen for nearly half a century enough to defy any professor who tries to peddle the nonsense that the Communist occupation and arming of Cuba is not a threat to the security of the United States, and therefore, to the whole free world. In my opinion, that menace must be removed. To remove it, World War III may have to be risked; and, for myself I am prepared to take that risk. But the decision is not mine. That decision rests with the loneliest man in the world—the President of the United States. He bears burdens heavier than Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt. Where they had to risk armies and navies, this man may have to risk a whole civilization. It does not lessen his burden for people to insist that the risk need not be taken at all; it increases it.

Let me speak in unvarnished terms. The ramparts we watch are now—of necessity—worldwide. And, every time an American falls in maintaining them the President is boldly and brutally asked—is this death necessary?

Do they think the President doesn't feel the anguish of Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt? Do they suppose that the President who knows the agony of the battlefield has forgotten his own wounds? Do they think that a man who has offered his own life for his country does not know the sacrifice it involves?

I say this not of John F. Kennedy because he is a member of the Democratic Party; I say it because he is President of the United States, and I urge him to act firmly on a free Cuba, as I publicly urged President Eisenhower to stand firm on Berlin.

That, it appears to me, is the duty of every American so-minded. I believe it fortifies an American President to know that the American people stand behind him whatever the risk involved in the defense of our country and of the free world.

The decisions of a President are agonizing enough without adding to them the task of being messenger of bad news for the American people. I suggest the reverse; we know the news is bad, but let us bring to the President—any President—the good news that we back him and this Republic as Americans always have; with our fortunes, our lives and our sacred honor.

I believe our greatest trial is immediately ahead. I also believe that no man, and no nation, can stand trial, without a clear heart. Our clear record proves our clear conscience. Let us consider it carefully. The Reds accuse us of trying to conquer the world. But, when their armies were reeling under Hitler's blows, we sent them the weapons to repel the Nazi armies. Stalin himself publicly thanked the American people stating that without their treasure and their sacrifice, the Red army could not have been victorious in the East. Were we imperialist then when we rescued Russia from the Nazi terror?

When the war ended, we grounded our Air Force, mothballed our fleet and brought our armies home. Are these the acts of a nation which seeks to dominate the world?

When we had atomic weapons, and they had none, we offered to internationalize the process, subject only to international inspection. With the greatest weapon superiority in world history, we offered world disarmament, and they refused the offer. Was the offer of America the act of a nation which sought to enslave all others?

And did our Nation seek to exploit the war-weary world? No, we did not. For the first time in history, a victorious nation—the most powerful in the world—taxed itself more than $60 billion—to go to the aid of the fallen and defeated countries. And did the Communists join—in the name of humanity—to assist the starving and homeless hundreds of millions? No, they did not. As our tractors arrived, and our Army departed, they sent in their tanks. They derided the Marshall plan, even as they removed the American labels and pasted on their own. All this we might have ignored. The fact that they declined our offer to disarm, that they ignored our pledge of good faith by disarming ourselves, and even that they refused to allow our products to help their own people would not, of itself, have produced this world crisis.

But, like a python attacking, they progressively threw the Communist coils around helpless free peoples. They substituted for the totalitarian state of Hitler the terrorist state of Stalin. The great peoples of central Europe—the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians and seven others—all of them found that victory had brought them nothing more than one brand of barbed wire for another—and the firing squad for the gas chamber. Like the Nazis, men in opposition were met with murder, and even the kidnaping of their children.

They, not us, were bent on world domination. They, not us, were the encirclers. Invariably the pattern was the same. First, Communist fifth columns brought internal disorder to a country. Then the Red Army massed on its borders. Then the internal Communists offered a coalition government. Once in a coalition government they seized the communications and police department, and the Red Armies massed on the border stood ready to march as they squeezed the life of liberty from the victim state. To do this, they had to violate over 70 treaties. Their success has been spectacular. Over a billion people and 15 free nations have fallen victims to this technique without loss of a single Russian division.

Now, commonsense tells you that they are not going to abandon a technique which has proved so successful. Today, they dominate China; they threaten India, and with unbelievable cruelty they have put much of the whole population of Tibet to death. They expanded west until stopped by NATO. They marched into Korea, and then down into southeast Asia. They have exploded a dozen Communist wars in the Middle East and Africa. And now they have advanced to Cuba. Do you need a committee to tell you what they intend?

Would you take their word that their hearts are filled with the desire for peaceful coexistence?

Again let us look at the record. For a few years, there was a mutual understanding that there would be a moratorium on nuclear weapon testing. They violated that treaty by exploding a 100-megaton bomb. Now they hint at offering another treaty. But would any sane man trust the ink of a contract signed by a man who had just broken a previous contract?

Before the world, the United States proved that the Kremlin lied when it stated there were no atomic weapons in Cuba. Finally, even the Reds had to admit that they lied. But if the Reds lied about putting the weapons into Cuba, can any one believe them when they say they have taken them out? Or, after they have demonstrated that they can put atomic weapons into Cuba secretly, would you take their word that they will not put them back?

The peril, of course, is not only to us. The Communist python is already throwing its coils southward into Latin America. Communist attempts have been made to assassinate President Betincourt of Venezuela; Communist saboteurs have blown up a sixth of that nation's oil supply. Arms and trained operators—from student agitators to professional terror squads—are flooding into South America.

Unlike some of our statesmen, I do not think the danger is subsiding. I am sure it is mounting—mounting to a challenge which must be met decisively.

I expect to be called an alarmist and even a warmonger. My answer is to point to the map.

The map proves that we are not moving toward war with the Communists; they are moving war toward us. Each time that we seek to disengage with them they confront us nearer home. Today they are on our front doorstep.

One of the world's most powerful transmitters has been installed in Havana—to bombard the will of the American people with Communist propaganda—a propaganda designed to incite racial and class warfare.

In a sense, I am sorry that I must speak on this grave note. But in truth, I have no apology to make. I believe the American people must face the danger and the risk involved. How, when and where the will of the American people must exert itself is the sole decision of the American President. But I think it is the duty of every American to share the burden of the President, to convey to him that however, wherever, or whenever he seeks to assert the will of the American people that the American people stand behind him in the awful risk—confident that as the great American Presidents who preceded him—he will exert that will, only because he can do naught else, and again prayerful that it is also the will of God in whom we trust.

In the meantime, as our ship of state ploughs through the international hurricane there are two great and unwavering beacons upon which we can rely: the light of liberty handed down to us by the Founding Fathers, and the light of clear conscience in our heart.

Jobs Going Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, while 6.1 percent of our civilian labor force is unemployed, countless job vacancies exist throughout the Nation. If we are ever to solve the unemployment problem, we must put more stress on employment and job vacancies. One area where critical manpower shortages exist is in the health field.

According to a recent editorial research report, "Problems of the Hospitals," by Helen B. Shaffer, "Hospitals are chronically short of help at both the professional and the housekeeping levels." The physical facilities of these hospitals are expanding rapidly, but fulfillment of staff requirements are falling very short of their marks. In this area of endeavor alone, 4,000 of 31,600 openings for approved residencies went unfilled in 1960, while the vacancy rate for full-time professional nurses was nearly twice that of 3 years earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the area of health services is only one example of where jobs are going begging in our society. In order to emphasize this aspect of our employment problem, I wish to insert selected excerpts from the editorial research report, "Problems of the Hospitals," at this point:

EXCERPTS FROM "PROBLEMS OF THE HOSPITALS," BY HELEN B. SHAFFER

As it is, there are not enough medical school graduates to fill thousands of vacant hospital internships and residencies. Although the number of professional nurses has doubled in the past 20 years, a recent spot check disclosed that one-fifth of the budgeted nursing posts in non-Federal general hospitals were vacant. The vacancy rate was twice as large as in 1958. (See p. 31 of report.)

Average payroll costs per patient-day jumped from slightly under $3 in 1946 to more than $12 in 1961. Furthermore, the increased complexity of medical services has required an expansion in the size of the hospital work force; it doubled in the 1946–61 period.

Charitable donations no longer figure prominently as a source of hospital operating funds. Instead, the hospitals receive a major part of their income from so-called third-party agencies such as Blue Cross plans, commercial insurance companies and public agencies which compensate them for services to patients who are on public assistance rolls or who are entitled to benefits under other government programs.

Growth of third-party financing of hospital care has encouraged hospitals to develop uniform rate schedules based on actual costs of operation (p. 112).

Mechanization is appearing in nearly every branch of hospital service. Perhaps the most significant measure to reduce hospital costs, however, will be development of ancillary services that will cut down the need for full hospitalization.

REPORT

Page 27: "During 1962 the number of States praticipating in the program rose from 9 to 27 (Kerr-Mills Act of 1960), the number of beneficiaries from 46,000 to 102,000, and total monthly payments from $9 million to $17 million."

Page 28: "The United States on January 1, million beds, but there was said to be need for 2.5 million beds. Because 300,000 of the available beds do not fully comply with health and fire standards, more than a million additional beds, or an 80 percent increase in the existing approved supply, would have to be provided to meet currently stated requirements.

"* * * The number of approved beds in those hospitals increased 63 percent between 1948 and 1962, but one-half of the increase was absorbed by growth of the population. However, the supply situation in that category has greatly improved. Acceptable general hospital beds now meet 80 percent of the estimated need, compared with only 60 percent 15 years ago."

Page 29: "State plans prepared for Federal hospital construction assistance indicate a need to double the present total of 256,000 beds for long-term care.

"* * * Mental hospitals constitute another area of continuing need despite an expansion of facilities."

Page 30: "The trend in current planning is away from construction or expansion of large state mental institutions and toward provision of a variety of local facilities, such as out-patient units, mursing homes and 'halfway houses' for mental patients."

Page 31: "Hospitals are chronically short of help, at both the professional and the housekeeping levels. * * * Over the period 1940–60, the number of approved hospital residencies increased fivefold and in 1960 more than 4,000 of 31,600 openings went unfilled.

"Although the number of professional nurses has doubled in the past 20 years and now exceeds half a million, three-fifths of whom work in hospitals, there is a continuing shortage of nurses. A nationwide spot check of hospitals conducted about a year ago by the American Nurses Association disclosed that 20 percent of budgeted positions for full-time professional nurses in non-Federal general hospitals were vacant. This was nearly twice the vacancy rate 3 years earlier."

Page 32: "The ANA believes that a ratio of 300 nurses per 100,000 population is a reasonable standard; in 1960 there were 257 nurses (counting 2 part-time nurses as 1) per 100,000 population. The association points out that there is great need for nursing specialists, such as those qualified to care for mental patients and for patients who have received heart surgery or radioisotope treatments.

"A Labor Department bulletin has attributed the nurse shortage to the following factors: Increased demand resulting from improvement of general economic conditions and from growth of health insurance; development of new medical techniques requiring increased or special nursing care; increased attention to prevention of illness and to rehabilitation of the handicapped, both creating a need for larger nursing staffs; and a trend toward shorter working hours. 'Many of these influences will persist in the future and will no doubt contribute to a further rise in the overall demand for nurses,' it was said.

"* * * Hospitals have long had difficulty maintaining stable staffs in the nonprofessional areas of service. * * * A study of 60 hospitals conducted about 5 years ago indicated a turnover of 60 percent in 1 year, particularly among maids, nursing aids, and orderlies."

The Business of Keeping Business in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interest-

ing and informative article from Life Lines, a newspaper published by the Life Line Foundation here in Washington:

THE BUSINESS OF KEEPING BUSINESS IN BUSINESS

Suppose you ask an average high school student the question, "Are business profits too high?"

There is a very good chance he will say, "Yes." This is true for two reasons. The first is that he may not know how our personal enterprise system works, and the second is that he probably thinks prices are too high and that business profits should be cut.

The fact that prices are high does not always mean that profits are high. It merely means that the consumer pays a big price. Profit is that sum of money left the businessman after he has paid the costs of producing and selling his product and has paid the taxes imposed on his company. If his costs are unusually high, he may be operating with virtually no margin of profit. He must, of course, show a profit or go out of business.

High prices are indications of inflation, that government has spent too much money, has issued too much currency, and has gone too far into debt. High prices indicate that money has little value when it comes to making purchases.

High prices should be a matter of concern to everyone, because the resultant inflation and elimination of profits eventually doom a nation by causing its economy to collapse.

Under the personal enterprise system in America, you can go into almost any kind of business you desire. You can produce and sell any type of goods and services needed by the people. Your reason for entering business would be to make a profit on your investment.

Because you have faith and confidence in your ability, you work hard and skillfully plan the operation of your business. You seek to cut the cost of raw materials, to streamline production methods, and to market the product or service efficiently. You know that you must operate an efficient business, because anyone else may enter the same field, and if he does a better job, he will eventually put you out of business.

This is the way our competitive free enterprise system works. It imposes upon the businessman the responsibility for doing a good job. That is the only way he can stay in business.

The rewards of doing a good job under the personal enterprise system are great. They spell success, financial security, and a high standard of living. The operation of this personal enterprise system, with its great incentive for achievement, has brought to the United States the highest standard of living ever known to man.

Competition is the lubrication which keeps our personal enterprise system working.

If competition is the lubrication which keeps the wheels of business turning smoothly, profits are the goal toward which all business is aimed. Profits form the incentive that makes the effort worth while.

In these times, when there is much said about big business, you often hear critical remarks concerning corporation profits, including that such profits should be reduced. The trouble is that they have already been reduced—drastically.

Here are some facts:

Each year the American work force swells by 1 million men and women. This huge army wants and needs jobs. On the average, it takes a $20,000 investment to provide the plants and tools that result in just one new job in industry. In some major industries, the investment is many times that figure.

The Secretary of Labor has said it will cost $90 billion to replace our obsolete plants and equipment, and to make them competitive with newer facilities abroad.

You may ask, "What is the significance of these facts?" Simply this: job creation, at these enormous costs, is vitally dependent on industry's profit situation. In most enterprises, a high percentage of profits is plowed back into the business to build new plants and to modernize old ones. Therefore, the health of profits is the key to the health of the entire economy.

The profit picture is not very healthy in this country today. From 1950 to 1961, the gross national product increased 42 percent, reaching $521.3 billion. Wages and payrolls rose 96 percent, reaching $302.9 billion. But profits increased hardly at all, from $22.8 billion to $23.3 billion. Putting it another way, the sales of our corporations doubled in the past 15 years, but profits declined from 5 percent to only 3 percent of those sales.

Commenting on these figures, the Industrial News Review says:

"Adequate profits buy progress, growth, opportunity for organizations and individuals alike. Inadequate profits lead to economic lethargy, unemployment, the undermining of the strength and security of the Nation."

There are some planners in our Government who would continue to place a squeeze on profits. They operate by confiscatory taxation on the one hand, and increasing Government regulations on the other. The more extreme of these planners would purposely make profits impossible, knowing that when business fails, the Government would step in and take over the means of production. The result would be state socialism and the death of the personal enterprise system.

Here are some of the things which profits mean:

Expansion, with its attendant increase in employment and payrolls.

Reserves, as a bulwark against depressions and bad business years.

Research, so a better product can be made and marketed.

Replacement of antiquated machinery and processes, by modern methods.

Pay raises and fringe benefits.

Taxes for support of government, which now takes more than 50 percent of corporation profits.

A return on the investment of shareholders in the company.

It should be unmistakably clear by now that the future of the American way of life as we know it and the existence and perpetuation of our personal enterprise system depend upon the ability of our business enterprises to make profits.

Our Government can do much to see that this opportunity is present.

The most important thing our Government should do is to get out of business—to stop competing with private enterprise. Government should sell its hundreds of corporations and enterprises which are competing in many ways with private concerns.

If the Government sold its business ventures, the money could be used to make a substantial payment on the public debt, which is now more than $300 billion.

If the Government sold its business operations to private enterprise, it could begin receiving taxes, instead of using tax money to operate them. This would help broaden the tax base and relieve the burden on the taxpayer.

Government in business is a big step toward state ownership of production. In fact, it is really a long way on the path to state socialism. Who among us wants to trade off the personal enterprise system for state socialism? Most of us do not. We will have made a big step toward promoting our personal enterprise system if we can get Government out of business. Our Constitution never intended Government to get into this position in the first place.

The second big step is to eliminate the growing regimentation and regulation of business. Private businesses are surrounded by regulations unheard of a few years ago. Voluminous and frequent Government reports, which must be filed in triplicate or quadruplicate, require extra employees to satisfy Government requirements.

There is no justification for the great amount of regimentation which has been placed on business in recent years. Some of the regulations often appear aimed at making it impossible for legitimate business to show a reasonable profit. Businessmen and their employees are working for the Government an increasing number of hours each month.

The third major way in which Government can aid business is to revise its tax program so that it would not confiscate so much profit. Possibly, some help may be on the way in this particular area.

So long as more than half the profit of corporations is taken by the Government, there will be little incentive for expansion, new production, and new plants, or for increased earnings. After all, the Government will benefit more than the owners. It is not worth the risk, as things now stand.

Our business comunity, the backbone of our economy, depends upon the ability of industry and business to earn profits. If we deliberately shut out the opportunity for profits, or if we are in doubt as to the important part they play in the life of our Nation, we deserve the fate we shall have—a completely regimented socialist state.

Remember that only under our personal enterprise system can we have freedom and the high standard of living which we now enjoy.

Let's Work Together for Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in some parts of our country right now heavy rains and melting snows have swollen rivers. People are battling against too much water. But when the floods recede, even those areas of seeming abundance face increasing difficulties in obtaining enough water. And in some parts of the Nation, including my State of Arizona, declining water tables threaten the existence of present levels of activity.

Our rapidly increasing population, production and per capita use of water have created a national crisis. To insure water for us and, particularly, for our children, we must continue to press for projects to utilize fully the waters of our great river basins and to develop new sources of usable water.

This effort will require cooperation, a theme touched upon recently by Under Secretary of Interior James K. Carr. In an interview in Phoenix, Ariz., Mr. Carr called upon the States of the Lower Colorado Basin to cooperate in the fight against water scarcity. And Mr. Carr rightly recognized the very important role which continues to be played by Ari-

zona's farsighted statesman, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. Carr was interviewed by Ben Avery, reporter for the Arizona Republic and himself a distinguished authority on Arizona water problems.

Following is the article as it appeared March 8, 1963:

COLORADO BASIN COOPERATION URGED—CALIFORNIA CHALLENGES STATES TO GET ALONG

(By Ben Avery)

As soon as the Colorado River lawsuit is concluded, the States of the Lower Colorado River Basin must work together to solve water problems for the benefit of future generations.

That challenge, mainly to Arizona, Nevada, and southern California, was issued yesterday by James K. Carr, lifelong reclamationist and now Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Carr is here as a member of the board of regents of Santa Clara University. The board is meeting at Mountain Shadows resort at the invitation of regent vice chairman, James C. "Jay" O'Malley, Carr's roommate at Santa Clara during the 1930's.

The Under Secretary met yesterday morning with Clifford Pugh, engineer in charge of the Reclamation Bureau's Phoenix office, which is engaged in studies dealing with the central Arizona project. After reviewing project plans, Carr told the Arizona Republic:

"I am convinced that the only sensible solution to Arizona's water problem and the problems of the other States in the lower basin is a comprehensive basin plan.

"Arizona is using ground water at least twice as fast as it is being replenished. You are falling behind more than 2 million acre-feet a year. And if you are able to bring in an additional million acre-feet a year under the court decision, you still will be dropping behind 1 million acre-feet a year.

"The only sources of additional supply for the basin are to bring water down from north of the Tehachapis in California, and this is being done; divert and purify salt water from the Pacific and Gulf of California; and reclaim as much as possible through conservation measures."

Elaborating, Carr declared that the first step in coping with these problems on a basinwide basis is to put all of the reservoir projects on the river into the basin development plan.

"California must go along with putting Hoover, Parker, and Davis, with their power generation facilities, into the regional plan," Carr said. "And Arizona cannot hold out Marble Canyon.

"If she does, California will be demanding Bridge Canyon Dam, and, in effect, another fight over the 'last water hole' will be on, and it will destroy the opportunity that now exists for long-range development of the basin," Carr declared.

The northern California native, who resigned as chairman of the California Water Commission to become Undersecretary to Arizona's Stewart L. Udall, said he thinks a new California water leadership wants to work with other Lower Basin States.

Carr said the basin account idea was developed by him and Udall. He said they have received complete cooperation from Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, chairman of the House Interior Committee, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate committee.

Carr declared that the strongest force for bringing the two States together is the respect held in California for Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, dean of Congress.

"In California, Governor Brown and all of our leaders realize that we would not have been able to develop many of our water projects except for the unselfishness and vision of Senator HAYDEN in being willing to work for all of the West," Carr declared.

On the possibilities of water conservation, Carr estimated that the largest gain possible would be about a 1-million-acre-foot saving, of which Arizona might gain as much as 300,000 acre-feet.

He said the first step in the comprehensive plan is to meet with representatives of the States and plan for main stem Colorado River projects, then see what assistance can be given the Dixie project in Utah, the Hooker project in New Mexico, and municipal and industrial water needs around Las Vegas, Nev.

Responsibility: The Key to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I would like to insert an editorial, "Responsibility: The Key to Freedom," in the CONRGESSIONAL RECORD.

The author is my constituent, Ward L. Quaal, who is executive vice president and general manager of WGN, Inc., of Chicago, and who prepared this editorial for the Kiwanis magazine. It has attracted so much favorable attention and is so timely, I commend it for your reading pleasure:

RESPONSIBILITY: THE KEY TO FREEDOM

Years ago, when James Russell Lowell was the American minister in Great Britain, he was once asked: "How long will the American Republic endure?"

"As long," he answered crisply, "as the ideas of the men who made it continue to be dominant."

Lowell, of course, was speaking of the ideas of the Founding Fathers as expressed in the Constitution of the United States, as documented in such publications as the Federalist, and as implicit as the causes and objectives of the United States' own great Revolutionary War.

I believe these ideas are admirably expressed in the Kiwanis theme for 1963, "Responsibility—The Key to Freedom." Today, these ideas need to be ever present in our minds. Apathy, indifference, selfishness, and complacency can best be defeated by the personal dedication of North Americans to the fundamental principles of their nations. We must preserve individual responsibility if we in the West are to preserve the independence and freedom all of us enjoy.

With the possible exception of Benjamin Franklin, no man in the history of the United States personified more surly the rewards of personal initiative than did Thomas Jefferson—writer, inventor, architect, educator, and political leader.

The study of his life, and of other great personalities whose contributions to the development of our nations have been unquestioned, brings one to an interesting postulate: What one can do for his country relates to what he does for himself.

The philosophy of individual responsibility, recorded in civilization since the time of the stone carvers, was believed in and practiced by Jesus, by the world's great philosophers (such as Socrates and Plato), and by political leaders since tribal times.

In my opinion, where individual irresponsibility identifies leadership, as well we know within our own generation, chaos is followed by collapse. This is true whether it involved the destiny of a nation, an institution, an industry, or even individual endeavor. Therefore, we should ask ourselves what we, as responsibile citizens, can do for our country rather than what our country can do for us.

What can we do for our country? For one thing, we can see to it that our country does not do too much for us. When that happens, in the sense that the State not only admonishes through law but administers through alms, then the undergirding of liberty will collapse and our destiny will be that of a totalitarian nation.

In a statement on May 10, 1962, former President Eisenhower addressed himself to this very area:

"It has long been my judgment that the real threat to liberty in this Republic will come not from any sudden calculated assault; rather, the threat to our liberties will be primarily found in a steady erosion of self-reliant citizenship and in excessive power concentration, resulting from the lodging of more and more decisions in an ever-growing Federal bureaucracy."

We all know that each step taken by government, any government, to supplant our right to choose is a step closer to leaving us with only one right, if such it can be called—the right not to choose.

I have spent my entire adult life in broadcasting where the basic responsibility is programing, because better programing, through balanced fare, is really the only way to improve broadcasting as an instrument of community service.

I doubt very much that we will ever reach the millennium in attaining universal agreement on what constitute programing in the public interest. In the words of Jefferson: "Whose foot is to be the measure to which ours are all to be cut or stretched?"

Let me assure you, however, that we in radio and television have not and will not ignore public sentiment. Abraham Lincoln put it very succinctly: "Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed."

My philosophy in broadcasting can be summarized simply by quoting a passage from Walden, Henry David Thoreau's account on his experiences living in the woods.

"I know of no more encouraging fact than the unquestionable ability of man to elevate his life by conscious endeavor. It is something to be able to paint a particular picture, or to carve a statue and so to make a few objects beautiful, but it is far more glorious to carve and paint the very atmosphere and the medium through which we look, which morally we can do. To effect the quality of the day, that is the highest of arts."

Your objectives for 1963 set the theme that all of us can well strive to emulate: "Accept responsibility with your head high, face challenges with your head straight, and thank God with your head bowed."

The Hole in His Proposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to another incisive comment

on the budget, spending, and the economic theories of the present administration, which appeared recently in the editorial columns of the Canton Repository, my hometown newspaper:

THE HOLE IN HIS PROPOSITION

Everything about the proposal to cut taxes and spend more money in pursuit of a balanced budget cuts across the grain of accepted practice in Washington.

But coming now on top of everything else is Walter W. Heller's prediction as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. He says the country can have a boom by 1965 only if it follows the tax-cutting, higher spending advice.

Is not this like saying the only way to get over the flu is to run to the nearest drugstore to buy the latest nostrum?

And is it not like saying the only way to survive a harsh winter is to do thus and so on the advice of some young expert on the care of the body, ignoring the patent fact that before this expert there were other experts with other expertise and the human race survived, either because of them or in spite of them?

Nothing is necessarily so on the say-so of the latest crop of young experts in Washington. They may or may not know what they are talking about, though when they talk as if they alone knew how to make the Nation's economy jump through hoops they are plainly taking in too much territory.

More and more observers are noting this singular fact about the Kennedy administration—that as a group of individuals and as a mass it is utterly charming, completely plausible, well-briefed, highly articulate, and broadly purposeful and at the same time is becoming a victim of its own frustration. It is taking in too much territory.

It commits itself and the country to a tax cut and a budget rise, staking everything on the combination, then runs the risk of being unable to carry out its program. What happens then?

It commits itself and the country to a course of action in Cuba, staking everything on completion of the action, then is obliged to compromise its position item by item until little is left of its original position.

It bases its claim for political favor on the necessity for infusing the Nation with a new spirit of derring-do, yet halfway through its term is still in the embarrassing position of yelling "Giddap" at an economy that didn't know anyone ever had said, "Whoa."

Mr. Heller may know more about the national economy than anyone else alive.

The question is whether he knows enough about the American people and their way of doing things to say the only way there can be a boom is to swallow his particular nostrum.

Bless the young man. We were having booms and busts in this country before anyone ever heard of him or John Maynard Keynes, either.

Forgotten Principle in the News Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit the following article by James Reston which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette issue of March 27, dealing with the current news strike:

FORGOTTEN PRINCIPLE IN THE NEWS STRIKE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The worst thing about the New York newspaper strike is that it has settled nothing of a fundamental nature. What has been arranged is not a peace agreement but an armistice between two hostile and two resentful forces.

Fortunately, the armistice is for 2 years, so that, after a reasonable cooling-off period, there will still be time for both sides to sit down together, hopefuly with one or two professional labor relations experts from the outside, to redefine the principles and procedures for reaching a long-range settlement.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz is already pressing for such a study and review. He has recognized that New York tends to set the pattern of labor-management agreements in other cities, and has proposed, therefore, that an objective study of the problem be started as soon as possible.

Ideally, such a study should begin with a definition of what a newspaper is in a democratic society, or at least, what it should be. For part of the trouble in the New York dispute was that the weapons of both strike and lockout were used as if there were no fundamental obligation on the part of either the unions or the publishers to supply news to the community.

This obligation, however, is the basic principle. The Founding Fathers forbade the Congress in the first article of the Bill of Rights to pass any laws that would abridge the freedom of the press. They were convinced that a free and constant flow of information was essential if people were to have the facts necessary to make sound individual judgments.

They thought that freedom from censorship and other government interference would assure that constant flow of information. It did not occur to them that printers and publishers, by strike and lockout, could interfere with the distribution of news for more than 3 months, precisely at the time when the Government is setting out its legislative program for the entire year.

Maybe it's too idealistic now to talk of first principles. It could be that the war over wages and profits has dominated everything else to such an extent that neither the unions nor the publishers are willing to put the obligation to publish before anything else.

Yet it was precisely by going back to this first principle that Sweden finally ended its newspaper war and devised a system that has respected both the freedom of the press and the freedom of labor for more than a generation.

This agreement was negotiated in 1937. It was recognized on both sides as an experiment, that could be abandoned after a certain length of time by either side. But it rested on the principle that newspaper publishers have not only the right but also the duty to furnish the public with newspapers, and a voluntary agreement was reached between proprietors and workers to bargain to gather and submit any unsettled dispute to a court of arbitration selected by both sides.

There was no question of compulsory arbitration ordered by the State, but merely a voluntary agreement to accept arbitration for a limited number of years after which both sides were at liberty to denounce the whole procedure.

Article I of the agreement read: "Lockout, strike, boycott, or blockade, whether veiled or open, shall not take place at the plants of employers who are members of the Newspaper Proprietors' Association, in connection with personnel belonging to the Swedish Compositors' Union."

This agreement did not result in every dispute being submitted to the voluntary arbitration court. Hard collective bargaining prevailed and the court was seldom used, but despite many difficult periods, the agreement was honored and has avoided strikes or lockouts for 25 years in a country where the rights of labor are respected more than almost any other country in the world.

Is it too much to suggest that a similar experiment be explored in the United States? Secretary Wirtz thinks not. "We are all going to do some very serious looking at these situations in the light of the Scandinavian experience and others." he said the other day.

"It's an interesting thing that in each of the major disputes which we have had in the last 2 years (the steel industry, dockworkers, airlines, etc.) there has been a followup in which the parties have sat down together to decide how they can work out private methods of avoiding this situation in the future. That is very important, and the Scandinavian experience will be part of the experience to which we will look."

Unfortunately, the publishers and unions made no provision for a followup review, but Wirtz may be able to bring it about. For while both sides were opposed to arbitration in the New York and Cleveland disputes, everybody has suffered in the process and may now be more willing to consider new approaches.

The principle of uninterrupted publication, however, is fundamental. Out of fear of being put out of business by new automatic machinery, the printers have violated the principle by the strike, and out of fear of being picked off one by one and negotiated out of business by the unions, the publishers have violated the principle by resort to the lockout.

The right of the public to know what's going on, however, stands above the right of strike or lockout, or should in a democracy, and after these last 3 months, which have deranged the economy and health of more people than will ever be known, the higher principle is at least worth a try.

Bay State River Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Pawtucket (R.I.) Times on August 18, 1961, indicating not only failure of local water pollution control authorities to abate pollution in the Blackstone River, but also failure by the Public Health Service to enter and to abate interstate pollution according to the provisions of Public Law 660.

If we are to have clean water in this country, vigorous efforts by all levels of government must be made to abate pollution. This editorial is a strong argument for taking water pollution activities away from the Public Health Service and vesting them in an Administration of Water Pollution Control with authority and vigor to initiate a real pollution cleanup.

The editorial follows:

BAY STATE'S CLEAN-RIVER DUTY

In the official family of the State of Massachusetts there is a chief of water pollution control. It is his duty to war against

river pollution. The current water pollution chief, Richard R. Greeley, is concerned with the Charles River as it meanders around Boston before it enters the harbor. Mr. Greeley finds the Charles is foul smelling when there is little rainfall. He would have the bordering towns curb their dumping of raw sewage into the stream. For reasons other than health Mr. Greeley calls for controls. He notes the rising importance of rivers and streams for bathing and boating.

As long as Mr. Greeley is expressing concern for filthy rivers we suggest he interest himself in the upper stretches of the Blackstone River, from the Rhode Island State line at Woonsocket, north to Worcester where the river rises. First, let Mr. Greeley visit Pawtucket and observe the surface of the river after it tumbles over the Main Street falls. There, on many occasions, he will see the river covered from bank to bank with white fluff, the end product of textile cleaning processes on the Massachusetts side of the State line.

Here Pawtucket area citizens spent more than $15 million to end river pollution. That purpose has been negated by Massachusetts and its official unconcern for pollution of the Blackstone.

Over the years Rhode Island Governors have asked Massachusetts to cooperate to end river pollution. Rhode Island has done its job on this end of the Blackstone. Massachusetts has not. The Bay State cannot plead lack of funds because under the pollution control program the Federal Government makes $800 million available, and $2 million is the Bay State's annual portion.

The $104 million sewage treatment program now being developed in Massachusetts will be of little worth if pollution of the Blackstone continues.

Tribute to Prince Jonah Kalanianaole, of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, March 26, marked the 92d anniversary of the birth of Prince Jonah Kalanianaole who served as Delegate to the Congress of the United States from the Territory of Hawaii for nine successive terms from 1903 to 1922.

Prince Kuhio, as he was generally known, was not only an influential leader of his Hawaiian people but he was also a most effective representative of our new Pacific territory in its early and formative years. The Prince was a link with Hawaii's past; he had been a loyal supporter of the Hawaiian monarchy during the revolutionary troubles of the 1890's. It is greatly to his credit and his sense of statesmanship that he was able to translate his loyalty to an independent nation, the Kingdom of Hawaii, into long and effective representation of the new Territory of Hawaii in the Congress of the United States. Prince Kuhio was a link with the past, but he was also a prophet of the future; it was Kuhio in 1919 who introduced the first Hawaii statehood bill in the Congress.

In Hawaii Kuhio's memory is still bright, particularly among the older citizens—the kamaainas, if you will. One of the brightest accomplishments of Kuhio, in the memory of many, was his introduction and passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. For years Kuhio had led the fight to put Hawaii's people back on the land that had been theirs to use in the ancient days. The Prince recognized the need, under modern Western society, for the independent freeholder. To own a bit of land on which to raise your family or from which to draw your sustenance, is a basic building block of the free American society.

Perhaps history will record that one of the tragic ironies of Prince Kuhio's political career was that he died before he could see his Hawaiian Homes Act put into effect. I am afraid history will also record that his crowning effort has not been used in the manner which he must have desired. Perhaps history will record that Kuhio's opponents, the large land users, have in the years since his death exercised influence over the administration of the law is such a way as to render its programs relatively ineffective. Kuhio's dream lives on, but its execution has lagged.

Now, in Hawaii, in the new State that Prince Kuhio envisioned, we live in a day removed from many of the political forces and tactics of 1920; yet many of the same problems still remain. The need for the freeholder is still with us in Hawaii. I hope that those of us in Hawaii who revere the memory of Prince Kuhio will apply his vision to the present day Hawaii and work all the harder to insure that all of Hawaii's people—and there are many more of them now—will be given their free American right to own the land on which their homes rest, and to make their way in a free and fluid economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to digress for a moment from the mainstream of these remarks to note an action of this House today which relates in a very real way to the problem of land ownership in Hawaii, and in a very substantial way to the freeholder problem which bedeviled Prince Kuhio during much of his public life.

On this day the House has given final approval to H.R. 1597, sponsored by Congressman FRIEDEL. Certainly the Friedel bill has an indirect but definite effect on the unique and widespread leaseholding system in Hawaii. If the State of Hawaii passes a lease-redemption law similar to that in existence in the State of Maryland, H.R. 1597 will allow many residential leaseholders in Hawaii the right to deduct their lease payments in the same manner as they now deduct interest on a mortgage.

The passage of H.R. 1597 today gives great impetus to the passage of the Maryland type ground rent law now before the Legislature of the State of Hawaii. Passage of this law will give the ever growing number of residential leaseholders the option, enforced by statute, to buy the land on which their homes are built. It is not a radical measure; it provides for a slow, evolutionary development of fee simple ownership of houselots; it adequately protects the rights of the large holders and will insure their receipt of compensation which in many cases will be hundreds of times what the land cost them in the first place.

The timing of the final passage of this bill in the first session of the House since the anniversary of Prince Kuhio's birth is both coincidental and fortuitous. History does not record how the Prince might have voted on this measure today, had he been able to vote. But history is replete with his many efforts to open the lands of Hawaii to homesteaders and to keep large tracts from being concentrated in the hands of those who would keep the people from owning and using the land. Kuhio's action in 1908 and 1910 in backing changes in the Hawaii Organic Act to facilitate homesteading, and his opposition to the appointment in 1911 of Governor Frear because of alleged maladministration of these homestead laws, are strong indications of his real concern for the fate of the freeholder of the need for the small man to own a portion of his native soil.

There have been many misuses in the history of our Territory and State of the memory of Prince Kuhio and the things for which he stood. Often the trustees of some of the large landholding entities have attempted to use the name of the native Hawaiians and the memory of their early leaders, such as Kuhio, to protect the narrow and selfish financial control that monopolistic landownership gives them. I do not want to be party to the missue of Kuhio's memory today. However I do feel that in the context of history that the Prince, were he living today, would applaud the passage of the Friedel measure and the encouragement it will give to the ownership of land by the small homeowner in his native Hawaii.

Thank you for an opportunity to pay homage to a great Hawaiian and a great leader of the Territory of Hawaii.

Big Government or Big People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental issue of our time is the choice between big, centralized Federal Government and constitutional-limited government. Unfortunately, the conservatives in this country and my own Republican Party have not made this basic issue clear. Consequently there is a growing attitude among the people that there is no difference between the parties. Mr. Speaker, this is far from the truth. There is a very real difference between the two major parties in this country. On the one hand the Democratic Party

has come to be the advocate of big government and Federal domination. The principles of modern Republicanism are just the opposite—we believe in the people, we believe in the freedoms of the States and the people to realize their own destinies without coercion or dictation from Washington.

The people are entitled to make the choice as to what kind of Government we are to have and they cannot make such a choice unless the two major parties give them a clear-cut program. It is my personal belief that the conservatives must enunciate a bold and clearly understood set of principles.

Mr. Paul Harvey, a fine newscaster, has put the choice in simple language in the text of his broadcast last Friday, March 22. Mr. Harvey said let the exponents of big government line up on one side and the proponents of big people line up on the other in order to give the voters the clear distinction between the parties. I agree with Mr. Harvey, when he states the conservatives and the Republican Party will lose unless they give the people this choice. I think members of both parties would welcome the thinking of Paul Harvey on this subject and for that reason I include, herewith, his broadcast:

CONSERVATIVES COULD WIN—WON'T

The North will vote blindfolded and the South will vote holding its nose and the conservatives are going to get squashed like a toad under a tractor.

It couldn't happen to nicer people. Conservatives, generally, are so nice they can't find any politician nice enough to deserve their support. So unless some nice knight in shining armor comes riding out of nowhere and sweeps them up in his arms and carries them bodily to the polls, they'll sit this next one out.

And you can't lick somebody with nobody.

Conservatives are adamantly anti-this and anti-that and anti-lots of things. They're a bunch of old maid "anti's," but they don't seem to know what they're "for," anymore.

Conservatives, inspired to turn out 90 percent on election day, would be unbeatable. They don't need New York. They don't need Pennsylvania. They could give up those States plus Michigan, Missouri, Washington, Oregon, California, and all of New England and still win.

They could corral 311 electoral votes outside those States—enough to win without the big cities, the big States.

But instead they'll wait until too late to start developing a genuine conservative slate, and yield the election by default.

Republicans, as a party, have refined the art of competing but have neglected the science of cooperating. The Republicans, a hybrid compromise between what's left and what's left over keep trying to out-Democrat the Democrats.

They keep losing, yet they keep compromising. The party of Rockefeller and Stassen and Nixon no longer merits a conservative label.

So conservatives, with no way to turn next election day, will not even bother to turn out.

You know what would have happened if Harry Truman had been a conservative in 1948? Up to his neck in scandal and over his head in Korea he would have thrown up his hands and said, "Oh, my, I have bungled things so terribly" and he'd have stepped aside and let the outs move in.

Instead he rolled up his sleeves and whistlestopped the hinterlands and, promising everything to everybody, he rallied the gallery which always cheers an underdog, and he retired the nice Mr. Dewey from public life forever.

I am not saying the conservatives should emulate a barnstorming technique which promises everything to everybody. Indeed, they'd better leave that device to those who have had more experience with it.

I'm not even sure the nice conservatives deserve a turn at the tiller. Maybe they're such good losers they'd be gutless in a crisis.

But it sure would be nice if the American people—just once before we drown in red ink or blood—could have a clean, fair, definite choice.

If the exponents of big government would line up on one side and the proponents of big people would line up on the other, we could find out once and for all whether man is ready, yet, to walk erect.

Or whether we, overgrown babies, refuse to be weaned, insist on going back to suckling a big government teat until the motherland goes dry.

If that is our choice let it be a clear choice because that's such a pathetic way to live and such an ignominious way to die.

Highways of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned with the problem of transportation, be it long haul or rapid mass transportation; be it rail, air, or highway. For several years, as vice chairman of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, my special interest was the development and operations of freeways.

Transportation—the efficient movement of people and material—is essential to our economy, vital to the future growth of the Nation. It is fortunate that some of the best engineering and executive minds in the country are engaged in the development and operation of our highway system. One such official is Mr. William J. Flanagan, executive director of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority. Mr. Flanagan recently addressed the annual meeting of the New Jersey Bituminous Concrete Association. What he has to say on the subject of highway traffic problems of the future is especially informative.

I know Mr. Flanagan to be an able and extremely perceptive public official. His comments are especially timely and of such significance that I feel they should be brought to the attention of every Member of the House.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. FLANAGAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEW JERSEY TURNPIKE AUTHORITY

I would assume the only real concern of this organization of businessmen dealing in bituminous concrete is the threat of competition from the cement companies. There is another far greater problem, however, which concerns the future of every member of this association.

Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, executive vice president of the American Road Builders Association, in the March issue of that organization's magazine, stated: "Talk of a revival of rapid transit in this country poses a distinct threat to the highway program."

Meanwhile, at the recent 61st Annual Road Building Convention in Chicago, Nello T. Teer, Sr., founder of one of the world's leading highway construction companies, urged Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges to title his convention speech, "Trends Threatening Highway Development in America Through Curtailed Motor Vehicle Use."

The great and still growing production rate of new cars in this country not only has produced new traffic jams, but also promises traffic strangulation by the mid-1970's. Last year, the New Jersey Turnpike handled more than 55 million vehicles, an increase of almost 3½ million over the preceding 12 months. With favorable weather and favorable road conditions, 1963 should show an increase of almost 5 million vehicles over last year's figure. This has added up to an increased volume for the turnpike, but these figures also add up to a deep concern throughout the country which has led to a rapid transit use revival movement as a possible solution. Already, the National Capital Transit Agency in Washington, D.C., has recommended the cancellation of expressway improvements totaling $655 million in favor of a costlier regional rail transit program costing $793 million.

Everywhere, rail transit enthusiasts argue that urban road improvements should be deferred or even abandoned in favor of construction of improved rail facilities.

Although the role of mass transit must be considered in any balanced transit system, there is real danger in the growing trend of thought which claims that the only answer to our problem is the construction or development of rail facilities.

The controversy has raged in State capitals, in and out of newspapers, and even in the Congress of the United States.

The difficulty in finding a solution, it seems to me, has been that in pursuing their parochial interests, the various factions have failed to seek advice and counsel from the most important man in the entire picture—the commuter.

Before World War II, the greater percentage of our citizens were city dwellers. They lived where they worked. New Jersey Highway Route 1 between Linden and Trenton in those days offered lush green countryside, with a few farmhouses, an occasional gas station, and here and there a roadside oasis. Those who lived beyond the city limits bought homes within walking distance of the railroad station.

During the war, industries grew in size and progressed in methods. When peace finally came, they expanded until the cities no longer could accommodate them, and when they took to the road, employees went with them. The housing shortage and the building boom combined to transform one-time woodland areas into developments of houses for thousands of families, and all you needed to live in the country was a mortgage and a car.

At the same time, automobile production was back in full swing, and weary of wartime shortages, inconveniences, and hardships, Americans sought an easier, more relaxed way of life.

One-time soldiers, who went to bed, got up, and reported for work details at the sound of a bugle, rebelled at the prospect of living by a train schedule. After years of standing in chow lines, pay lines, lines for this and lines for that, they didn't relish crowded subways, the fight for a seat on the 8:07, and exposure to the elements.

The answer to their problem sat in their driveway—a car, whose departure they alone could manage, a comfortable seat, privacy, heat, radio, and sometimes air conditioning.

The people left the cities in such great numbers to buy a house with a little green around it, that drive-in shopping centers,

drive-in theaters, drive-in restaurants, and drive-in banks soon followed. The exodus to the suburbs was a noble experiment. Man could live anywhere in the State and still enjoy the convenience of city living. Highway use grew phenomenally, and passenger rail service was doomed to virtual bankruptcy.

The decline of the railroads and the great increase in motor transportation created a greater demand for new highways, that could not be met by the States. Toll road authorities jumped in to fill the need, and in 1956 the Federal Government entered the picture with its Federal interstate program. To be sure, traffic volumes have grown at an alarming rate, and Federal officials, doubtless cheered on by weak and starving rapid transit lines, are arduously plugging their theory to call a halt on highway development and concentrate on rapid transit.

At this moment the U.S. Senate is now considering a bill to appropriate $500 million of Federal aid to mass transit. Inasmuch as the advocates of rail transit argue that construction of these facilities will reduce the need for new highway construction, the road building business could be facing lean days.

The man who can reverse this threat and this trend is the chap I mentioned a few moments ago—that anonymous, iron-willed individual called the commuter. His great desire for personal mobility has all but wrecked the railroads, made automobile stocks a blue chip investment, and road building a lucrative profession.

While he spends money for everything from frozen pizza to membership at Vic Tanny's, he has displayed a historical resistance to the cost of mass transit and every increase in fare over the last 15 years has resulted in a drop in business.

Commuters are voters, too, and in Georgia they recently rejected a referendum that would have permitted counties to levy taxes for the purpose of acquiring and operating public mass transit systems. Even that drastic and controversial report issued by the National Capital Transportation Agency in Washington takes the commuter into consideration in this manner: They predict the high-income commuters are more likely to drive rather than use a rail system. There is little sense in investing billions in rail transit if people will not make use of the facility, and less sense in investing in a system that is carrying less than half of the riders it carried in prewar years.

On the other hand, I predict that the American motorist is likely to continue driving to work until someone invents a railroad that will pull into his driveway, to take him to business at a time he chooses to leave, and one that will stop at the bakery or at the drycleaners on the way home.

As incomes continue to rise, the higher percentage of annual wage is spent on service, and this includes transportation. Today there is less need for a minimum cost system of transportation than ever before.

New Jersey's population is in the midst of tremendous growth. Its transportation problem will be of greater magnitude in a few short years. It is important that we move with purpose. Blind change for its own sake is inadequate. New Jersey must create hundreds of thousands of new jobs for its expanding economy. To accomplish this we must provide the kind of transportation climate that will attract new industries and encourage the present companies to remain and enlarge their facilities.

Long lengths of railroad right-of-way never produced anything more than a trip through slums and other people's backyards. Yet every highway in this State has attracted housing developments, attractively landscaped industries, hotels, motels, eating places, recreational centers, shopping centers, and prosperity.

It is my hope therefore, that our public officials both here and in Congress, will conclude that our transportation system must be a balanced one and that our problems will not be mastered by curtailing our road program in favor of a rail program, but by providing better highways and more of them.

Beloit College President Speaks Out on President Kennedy's Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, a most learned and profound treatise on the President's tax proposal is that presented recently by Dr. Miller Upton, president of Beloit College in Beloit, Wis., before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Dr. Upton articulates with clarity and reasonableness his dissent from the President's proposal. Moreover, he offers constructive suggestions of his own. I am the more honored to represent in Congress such an educator and the outstanding college to which he gives leadership.

Dr. Upton's statement follows. It should be read by every Member of the two bodies of the Congress:

STATEMENT OF MILLER UPTON BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WITH REFERENCE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TAX PROPOSAL MARCH 14, 1963

Congressman MILLS and members of the Ways and Means Committee, I am appreciative of this opportunity to appear before you with reference to the President's proposal for tax reduction and reform.

INTRODUCTION

By way of general background information in support of my qualification to appear before you on this subject, my name is Miller Upton and I am president of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. I have been a college teacher of finance and economic. Prior to becoming president of Beloit College I was dean of the School of Business and Public Administration of Washington University in St. Louis. In 1959 and 1960 I served as chairman of the Continuing Revenue Survey Commission for the State of Wisconsin responsible for studying the total tax structure of that State for the purpose of recommending broad revisions and structural improvements. I am a member of the American Economic Association and the American Statistical Association and a member and past president of the American Finance Association. I am also a past president of the Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities and the immediate past president of the Wisconin Association of Independent Colleges.

My interest in making a statement before you is twofold: First, as a private citizen with special training, experience and interest in the subject before you I am constrained to make certain observations which I feel might offer something to your important deliberations. Second, and more importantly, as president of a private, nonprofit institution of higher learning, of which there are many in this country, I am anxious to present a point of view which I am confident needs to be represented with urgency in the interest of protecting our Nation by preserving an element of it which is essential to its continued strength and vitality as a society committed to individual freedom.

THE ESSENTIAL NEED FOR PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY IN A FREE SOCIETY

My point can be introduced most quickly by reference to a phrase which we employ at Beloit College to establish the essential rationale for our existence. It is "Public enrichment through private endowment." This is not merely a catchy phrase or an idle slogan; it is an expression in capsule form of the essential philosophical foundation of our society.

The existence of a free society is dependent upon the quality of the voluntary choices made by its citizens. It is commonplace that if we are not capable individually to accept our social responsibilities voluntarily we are not capable of being free. And the more Government intrudes itself into the sector of private decisionmaking and substitutes centralized direction for voluntary individual action, the more the basic foundations of our free society are eroded.

The nature of our fiscal policies and our tax structure is critical in this regard. If the Government resorts to fiscal policies which are inflationary, the endowments of private social service agencies across the country, particularly colleges and universities, are made subject to evaporation of value. And if the Government fails to encourage private philanthropy actively by allowing an individual in effect to tax himself voluntarily for approved social service activities, then compulsory taxation becomes the only alternative and our society loses that much more ground in its presumed effort to advance individual freedom. Because freedom responsibility are interlocked, to discourage private philanthropy in support of social service activities is to weaken the most essential strand in the fabric of a free society.

THE WEAKNESSES OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROPOSAL—ITS ADVERSE EFFECT ON PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY

It is on both counts that I oppose the tax program that has been proposed by the President: it moves in the direction of discouraging private philanthropy and it is bound to contribute to further inflation. The structural changes with regard to charitable deductions while not overly great are a definite move in the wrong direction and are bound to affect adversely private philanthropy just that much. If there is to be any change in the relationship of taxes to private philanthropy it ought to be in the direction of encouraging more not less. The proposals to allow only those charitable contributions in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income and to tax a capital gains rates all net gains on capital assets at the time of transfer by gift represent the start of a vicious circulatory process of destroying privately supported social service agencies and expanding the scope and influence of centralized government.

As it becomes less easy for individuals to make contributions to private agencies it becomes less possible for these agencies to serve adequately the growing needs of our society in education and elsewhere. And as these growing needs cannot be served by voluntary philanthropy, government at all levels—local, State, and National—is encouraged and even forced to take over. The costs of government thereupon rise greatly, and tax revenue has to be increased accordingly. As tax pressures mount, there is both less available in the private sector to be given voluntarily and there is added inducement to reduce again the amount of allowable deductions, including charitable contributions. And so it goes, until eventually all social services are financed almost wholly by the compulsory tax route, and the spectre of the monolithic state assumes clearer dimensions.

THE WEAKNESSES OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROPOSAL—ITS INEVITABLE STIMULUS TO INFLATION

Of equal importance, however, is my concern with the inflationary implications of the whole proposal. Our private institutions have been harmed seriously from the ravages of our endowments by the war and postwar inflation. Further inflation is bound to compound our financial difficulties and make us easy prey for the lure of governmental handouts.

I am not unaware of the fact that it is claimed that the President's tax proposal would not contribute to inflation. The argument runs that the increased purchasing power resulting from the tax cuts would increase general economic activity, thus increasing output and income sufficiently over time that the lower rates would produce enough tax revenue to balance the budget. Frankly, I am appalled by such reasoning in high places. For one thing, no account is taken, apparently, of the differences in shortrun and longrun effects. Tax reductions result in an immediate increase in purchasing power, and since production cannot adjust simultaneously, there is bound to be an immediate upward pressure on prices.

However, my concern primarily rests on even more fundamental, long-range considerations. The notion that we can eliminate current unemployment and stimulate the general economic development of the country by reducing taxes and not reducing expenditures is a proposition that is supported neither by established economic theory nor historical fact. It is a theory, to be sure, but not one that is accepted by professional theorists at large. For the present it is at best a bit of wishful thinking, and I submit that it would be reckless exercise of legislative responsibility to make a judgment on such wishful thinking when the possible consequences to our society are so dire.

We must be wary not to rationalize ourselves into doing something simply because of the great temptation that exists. There is no one among us who does not want his taxes reduced. A general state of mind exists, therefore, which leads toward our trying to justify something which to us individually has great appeal. However, if you are to be faithful to your great responsibility for the financial stability of our country and the financial welfare of its citizens and institutions, you must be careful not to become hypnotized by the siren song of lower taxes.

I read with surprise the other day that the President in one of his press conferences warned that if his proposal was not adopted the economy would drift toward general deflation. His economic advisers must have winced. For in his special message on tax reduction and reform, dated January 24, 1963, he states:

"My recommendation for early revision of our tax structure is not motivated by any threat of imminent recession—nor should it be rejected by any fear of inflation or weakening the dollar as a world currency. The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, underinvestment, unused capacity and persistent unemployment."

If the President has reason to believe that deflation or depression is imminent, then his proposal for deficit financing through tax reduction may have some short-run validity as a form of economic stimulant. But if the deficit is spent for this short-run gain it cannot also be counted on to produce long-range economic recovery. If the adrenalin of reduced taxes is injected to stem the forces of acute deflation, it cannot at the same time attack the problem of chronic unemployment of labor and capital. Such unemployment is a special disease which must be attacked in a selective fashion through careful identification of the contributing cause and not dealt with in an indiscriminate fashion through general monetary and fiscal policies. In not attacking the true cause of unemployment the increased purchasing power can only have the effect of pushing prices higher.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since I do not look with favor upon an approach which merely criticizes and fails to offer constructive suggestions, I would like to be able to offer my own ideas with regard to resolving the three great issues at stake. These issues are (1) how to cope with our present state of chronic labor unemployment, (2) how to increase our rate of economic growth, and (3) how to deal with the need for tax reform. Because I am limited in my formal presentation to 10 minutes, I am attaching to this statement an addendum which covers very briefly my principal thoughts along these lines. I hope they may be of some value to your deliberations.

Again I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for granting me this special opportunity.

ADDENDUM TO STATEMENT OF MILLER UPTON BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WITH REFERENCE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TAX PROPOSAL, MARCH 14, 1963

Some thoughts on alternative ways to cope with the current problems of chronic labor unemployment, long-range economic development and tax reform.

Chronic labor unemployment: The situation which prevails in the labor market is not one of general weakness. Those individuals who are currently out of work have, for the most part, been left stranded in the economic stream by technological change, shifts in the consumption patern of our society, and increased domestic purchase of certain foreign goods. These islands of unemployment must therefore be removed by selective programs of retraining and relocation through counselling. I grant that these are tedious and difficult methods but under the circumstances they are the only ones that offer any realistic prospect for helping this situation in an enduring way. Dumping more liquid purchasing power into the economic stream may cause it to flow faster, but it will still flow around and past the islands of unemployment.

Economic development: So far as long-range economic development is concerned, the only way we are going to stimulate our economy to reach an enduring stage of greater vitality is by removing the shackles which inhibit such vitality. There is no evidence that we are chornically lacking in economic fuel. Personal disposable income keeps rising, consumer credit keeps rising, retail sales keep rising, and even consumer prices keep rising. Rather, all evidence suggests that the economic machine is not firing properly.

In his special message the President states:

"But it has become increasingly clear—particularly in the last 5 years—that the largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources and to a higher rate of economic growth is the unrealistically heavy drag of Federal income taxes on private purchasing power, initiative and incentive. Our economy is checkreined today by a warborn tax system at a time when it is far more in need of the spur than the bit."

We have in this statement the essence of a half-truth. The largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources is our debilitating lack of confidence in freedom in the market place. The "checkrein," if you will, is not the tax structure per se but the attitude which has produced all manner of restrictive business legislation, including a tax structure which is nearly confiscatory at certain levels and which places political and administrative convenience ahead of economic reason. For example, I know of no one who can justify a corporation income tax on economic grounds.

It is a biological and economic truism that we can't experience stability and growth at the same time. The conditions that make for the one do not make for the other. If what we want is economic vitality and growth we have to be prepared to accept change, and with economic change comes economic disruption, including unemployment. If the economy is vibrant and growing, however, such unemployment will be of a temporary rather than chronic sort. If, on the other hand, we want economic stability primarily, we must impose centralized direction and controls over individual initiative, in which case we dispense with the creative—and disruptive—attribute of free individual expression. Stability through controls and vitality through freedom are mutually exclusive conditions. We have to choose one or the other; we can't have both.

If we are sincere in our desire to regenerate the economic vitality of our country, then we must have confidence in freedom in the marketplace as surely as we have it at the polls. There is sufficient evidence in our history and the recent history of Japan and West Germany to support the contention that economic vitality, like all human vitality, is dependent upon free expression of the individual members of society. Although our country established the precedent for this and reaped remarkable benefits in economic development because of our leadership in the application of the principle, we have become disenchanted with such economic freedom and our whole attitude toward it as a society has become contaminated.

We have damned the system for individual abuses of the system, and as a result we have put the collective brakes on our economic progress and development. We ought to punish severely individuals who abuse the social trust that is implicit in this economic freedom and not penalize society as a whole. It is irrational to poison all the livestock in the barn in order to get rid of the rats.

We who operate in the academic community are great champions of the importance of the free competition of ideas. But the validity of the principle is not limited to the academic community; it applies equally to the economic and business community. When an individual teacher abuses his great trust we do not consider delimiting academic freedom in general. By the same token we ought not restrict and shackle economic freedom generally in a misguided effort to protect society against individual abuse of the freedom.

Tax reform: As for our tax situation, we have reached the place where we must dispense with the use of patent medicines in the form of rate reductions and isolated amendments and resort to surgery in the form of a complete overhaul. Anything less than this will merely be temporizing and no worthwhile effect will be had on long-range economic development. Everyone who has given any serious consideration to the matter has had to admit that the present tax structure is a monstrous concoction without any governing rationals—a burdensome and ugly mass of unrelated accretions that have accumulated over time as an outgrowth of different political and emergency pressures. It can readily be shown to be inequitable, overly cumbersome, overly expensive to administer and a severe deterrent to economic vitality and growth and development.

Although taxation is as old as human society, general reliance on the income tax is relatively new. Certainly it is new in this country. We have learned much from our

experience over the past 50 years which we should draw upon in developing an entirely new tax structure. The present tax law should not be considered sacrosanct simply because it is the prevailing law. We should not allow ourselves to become enslaved by a monstrous creature which has been fashioned by the combining of separate and disparate acts designed to deal with immediate needs which vary with the passage of time.

In the final analysis, tax reform is fundamentally simple if it originates from a real desire to deal with fiscal and economic realities and does not confuse the issue with political pressure. If the government would proceed in such reform on the known fact that all taxes, however called or however collected, must be paid out of individual income, a new structure could readily be developed which would be simple, direct, equitable, and efficient.

Such fundamental reform should also reckon with the fact that in any society there should be only one taxing authority. The situation that prevails now wih local communities, States, and the Federal Government vying with one another for the citizen's tax dollar is one of utter confusion and leaves the individual taxpayer a pawn that is pushed around rather callously by the separate governmental authorities, each passing the buck to the other. Either the Federal government should raise its revenue by an assessment on the individual States on the basis of each State's contribution to the national income, or it should become the central taxing authority and take care of the separate needs of the States. In keeping with the Federal character of our national governmental structure the assessment approach would be by all odds the better, but we seem to be drifting rather indifferently and dangerously toward the other.

Certainly there would result from such a major overhaul a substantial amount of temporary disruption within the economy. Some businesses and business practices have come to be tied directly to the ramifications of the existing tax law. But to preserve a bad law to protect its economic spawn would be the height of irrationality. The economic disruption resulting from a complete tax overhaul would not last long, and the great benefits that would result to our society at large would be worth far more than the price of temporary inconvenience that would have to be paid.

Administration and Other Comments on Obscene Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe the membership of the Congress will find of interest an exchange of correspondence in regard to the great problem in this country of controlling the pornographic and obscene material, especially as it pertains to young people.

A few days ago I had occasion to write to the President and to urge him to exert the great leadership which he has at his command in order to assist the many citizens and Government officials who are working in this area. A copy of my letter of March 7 follows and the reply from the administration is also printed.

Following this exchange of correspondence, I will include a copy of the latest report from Operation Yorkville, which is a communitywide nondenominational civic endeavor in New York City, which is aimed at stopping the flow of obscene literature. I would mention to my colleagues that Operation Yorkville and other similar groups across the country are very concerned about this problem, and they have pressed endorsement of two of the major bills in this field which I have had the privilege of sponsoring, H.R. 319 and H.R. 470.

MARCH 7, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am sure your office has been increasingly aware in recent months of the concern which Americans—especially parents—feel over the obscene material which passes through the mail or is distributed over and under the counter and which finds its way into the hands of our youth.

Indeed, your Attorney General just a few days ago met with leaders of one group which is dedicated to action in this field, Operation Yorkville, from New York City. I know there is concern within official circles over this problem.

As a member of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee and its ranking minority member for three Congresses, I am well aware of the work of the Post Office Department, Bureau of Customs, and Department of Justice. Unfortunately, there is a limit as to what can be accomplished by the most sincere and dedicated official, be he local, State or Federal. That limit is drawn by court decisions as to what constitutes obscene material. Increasingly in recent years, court decisions have allowed greater laxity and license in printed matter. I do not need to mention recent "literature" which has been held not obscene and thus mailable.

This problem is an acute one. Leading experts have testified that there is a direct causal relationship between obscene material and the startling increase in sex crimes and juvenile delinquency. J. Edgar Hoover has said, "We know that an overwhelmingly large number of sex crimes is associated with pornography. We know that sex criminals read it, are clearly influenced by it * * *. I believe that if we can eliminate the distribution of such items among impressionable school-age children, we shall greatly reduce our frightening sex-crime rate."

The late Dr. Benjamin Karpman, chief psychotherapist at St. Elizabeths Hospital, left no doubt as to his conclusions: "There is a very direct relationship between juvenile delinquency, sex crimes, and pornographic literature."

And finally, I refer to an appearance before the Postal Operations Subcommittee by Dr. Nicholas G. Frignito, medical director and chief neuropsychiatrist, county court of Philadelphia, in late 1961. He said: "In too many instances the increase in sexual offenses was traced to the persistent and constant exposure to obscenity in all media of communication. The reading of erotica is not a harmless psychological aphrodisiac; it is a serious danger and threat to morality."

These authorities are certainly competent enough to convince me that the control of obscene material will be a significant factor in the control of juvenile crime.

Thus the problem is that much material is allowed in the mails and on the newsstands legally, even though it offends the morals and sense of decency of nearly everyone. However, there is a remedy, and it is simply public opinion.

No publisher will stay in business, nor will his filthy wares be distributed or displayed when public opinon runs strongly against him. Committees of both Houses of Congress have cooperated with such groups as the Citizens for Decent Literature, church leaders, community groups such as Operation Yorkville, and anyone else who is willing to lend leadership in this fight.

I think that a strong statement by you, Mr. President, would be a vital part of this fight. As a parent, as a man of Christian training and background, as one who encourages the good literature of which we have an abundance available, and as the President of the United States, you have the opportunity available to no one else to encourage those who emphasize the good in literature and condemn the filth to the trash pile, to encourage the youth to ignore the peddlers of such filthy matter, and to set a climate which will encourage the courts to recognize the existing moral climate in this country is considerably higher than some rulings have seemed to indicate.

I believe it most appropriate to suggest that you send a special message to the Congress on this matter, encompassing legislative recommendations and calling attention to the scope of the problem, recommending at the least urgent study at all levels of government. In the event they will be of some use to you in this regard, I enclose copies of two bills I have sponsored in this field. The Commission approach is one which a number of Members of both Houses have favored, while the approach in H.R. 319 is one which grew out of hearings in the Postal Operations Subcommittee.

I appeal to you to examine this issue through your personal staff and through the departments of government, but to give serious thought to personal participation in the nationwide effort to end this traffic in filth. It has been said that pornographic material in the hands of the young is as dangerous as dope; one attacks the body, the other the mind.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: This is in reply to your letter of March 7, 1963, to the President concerning the distribution of obscene material to young people.

As you recognize, the President and this administration have shared in the widespread awareness of the problem your letter deals with. Interested executive branch agencies are in the process of reviewing legislative proposals to deal with noxious and obscene material preparatory to reporting to the congressional committees concerned.

There are substantial differences of view, however, as to what organized efforts—governmental or private—should be undertaken to cope with the problem. This situation undoubtedly stems in part from the wide diffusion of responsibility for dealing with the problem; it is at once a matter of concern for families, community organizations and churches, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. In part, too, the differences grow out of the wide range of views as to what is "obscene and noxious," with questions of free speech, censorship, and civil liberties involved.

These concerns are, of course, as basic to our Nation and our society as the matters dealt with in your letter, and the continuing search for effective methods of dealing

with the problem of obscenity must be carried on without jeopardy to our free institutions.

Thank you for your thoughtful views on this important subject.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

OPERATION YORKVILLE,
New York, N.Y.

Operation Yorkville, the fast-paced New York City community campaign organized to combat the $2 billion "cesspool publication" racket, this week received the endorsement of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

In a letter to Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., cofounder of the movement along with Dr. Julius Neumann, rabbi of the Congregation Zichron Moshe, and Rev. Robert E. Wiltenburg, pastor of Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, Governor Rockefeller said: "My sincere compliments to you and to all others engaged in the laudable purpose of Operation Yorkville. The vending of obscene literature is odious in the eyes of all civilized people and about as low an occupation as human greed can undertake. You are to be commended for your plan to conduct a campaign of moral suasion to remind citizens and storekeepers alike of their responsibilities to youth and parents of the vicinity."

New York City Police Commissioner Murphy also expressed interest in Operation Yorkville this week. At his invitation, a member of the executive committee of Operation Yorkville, attended a 1-hour meeting with the commissioner and his staff, at which they discussed the enforcement of existing antiobscenity laws.

Latest to offer Operation Yorkville cooperation is the New York County American Legion. Mr. Peter Massimino, chairman of the Americanism committee, said this week that his goal is to bring a resolution to the national convention of the American Legion, enlisting the support of over 3 million Legionnaires throughout the Nation.

Operation Yorkville's "Petition the President for Action" campaign, begun March 4 at a meeting of area community leaders, continues to gain in momentum. To date, thousands of letters and wires have been sent to the President, expressing shock at the massive waves of pornographic literature flooding America, informing him of the dangerous effects it is having on the physical and mental fitness of our youth, and the resultant anxiety of parents, and finally, urging him to action.

Latest to sign group telegrams were people attending Operation Yorkville meetings at Cornell Medical Center and Hunter College.

Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, respect by local communities and citizens for learning is necessary for the improvement of education.

The teacher frequently does not receive deserved community recognition. This local recognition is a prerequisite for top-quality schools.

Sid Lanfield, editor of the Mount Sterling (Ill.) Democrat-Message, has written a timely editorial in which he says teachers can be the keynote of a renewed Western civilization.

The editorial follows:

A FEW COMMENTS ON TEACHERS

Today, technology has made even the 12-year-old mind superfluous in the industrial process. But we are confronted on all sides by problems requiring vast amounts of intellectual power. The great immediate task is the development of this power. That is one reason why our teachers are still more important than our generals.

There are inherent weaknesses in the American character, as well as great virtues. The overwhelming weakness is probably lack of respect for the mind. There is no special reason why Americans should have a tradition of respect for the mind, as far as practical operations of our lives are concerned. In 1776 Adam Smith said that the best investment a man could make in the colonies was to marry a woman with four children. There was so much work to do that anybody who had someone to do the work, and whose wages he could pocket, would get rich in no time. The aim of the whole industrial system was to reduce all operations down to the level where they could be performed by a 12-year-old child and demand very little of his attention, at that. Teachers all along have been classified as necessary evils, never having maintained the respect of the community at large, as is the case in most foreign countries. Compared to lawyers or accountants, for example, in our Nation, teachers are second-rate citizens, and compared to doctors, teachers are just along for the ride. This is disastrous, to be sure.

Examine some of the new nations which have come along since World War II. In Israel, by way of example, all children, starting with the first grade attend school 6 days a week and school starts at 8 a.m. At the high school level, it's school 6 days a week from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m. Over here, basketball and football interfere with such a routine.

What we need desperately is a renewed sense of Western tradition, really a sense that we are involved in a living, evolving civilization. Teachers can be our keynote.

Preservation of Birthplace of Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 4963, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by purchase, donation, or with donated funds the site of the Jacob Graff House in Philadelphia for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park. The city, State, and various patriotic groups, including the Philadelphia Continental Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, are supporting efforts to restore this famous house where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence.

Independence National Historical Park, still in process of improvement and completion, has been described by the Park Service as "the greatest concentration of historic buildings and sites in the United States." The annual number of visitors to this shrine of our Nation and its founders is in the millions. The principal section of the park covers a one-block-wide area extending from Sixth to Second Streets. The adjacent site of the Graff House at the southwest corner of Market and South Seventh Streets is strategically located for addition to this basic area.

This bill which I have introduced will have, I hope, the wholehearted support of Congress and of Americans throughout our country. The preservation and development of a site of such nationwide historic significance in the establishment of the American Republic transcends local boundaries. The birthplace of the Declaration of Independence may well be termed one of the basic cornerstones of such a national shrine.

Statement of Principles Adopted by Republican Associates of San Diego County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution. In so doing, I wish to focus widespread attention on this clear and forward-thinking statement of principles adopted recently by the active Republican Associates of San Diego County:

Whereas one of the great weaknesses of the Republican Party has been its inability to make understood by the general public the fact that the Republican Party is now and always has been the champion of the rights of the individual; and

Whereas great numbers of potential Republicans have been misled into the belief that there is really very little difference between our two major political parties; and

Whereas Republican Associates of San Diego County believes that a clear and forthright restatement of the Republican Party's sincere belief in and dedication to the great fundamental principles of the "American Way of Life" will do much to dispel public and party apathy and will engender enthusiastic support for the cause of Republicanism: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That Republican Associates of San Diego County adopts and urges the Republican Party at all levels, all Republican candidates, and other Republican organizations to endorse the following statement of principles:

In this time of moral and political crisis, it is our responsibility to affirm certain eternal truths.

We, as Republicans, believe—

That the foremost among the transcendent values is the individual's God-given free will, whence derives his right to be free from the restrictions of arbitrary force;

That liberty is indivisible, and that political freedom cannot long exist without economic freedom;

That the purposes of government are to protect these freedoms through the preserva-

tion of internal order, the provision of national defense, and the administration of justice;

That when the Government ventures beyond these rightful functions, it accumulates power which tends to diminish order and liberty;

That the Constitution of the United States is the best arrangement yet devised for empowering government to fulfill its proper role, while restraining it from the concentration and abuse of power;

That the genius of the Constitution—the division of powers—is summed up in the clause which reserves primacy to the several States, or to the people, in those spheres not specifically delegated to the Federal Government;

That the market economy, allocating resources by the free play of supply and demand, is the single economic system compatible with the requirements of personal freedom and constitutional government, and that it is at the same time the most productive supplier of human needs;

That when government interferes with the work of the market economy, it tends to reduce the moral and physical strength of the Nation; that when it takes from one man to bestow on another, it diminishes the incentive of the first, the integrity of the second, and the moral autonomy of both;

That we will be free only so long as the national sovereignty of the United States is secure; that history shows that periods of freedom are rare, and can exist only when free citizens concertedly defend their rights against all enemies;

That the forces of international communism are, at present, the greatest single threat to these liberties;

That the United States should stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, this menace; and

That American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: Does it serve the just interests of the United States?

Mrs. Maude Greenwell Faris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce to the House the passing of one of the fine citizens of my home city in Ogden—Mrs. Maude Greenwell Faris.

Mrs. Faris died quietly at something after 2 o'clock Thursday morning, March 21, 1963. On February 24, friends and acquaintances had observed her 85th birthday. Her husband, the late Philip Arthus Faris, passed away in Ogden on February 24, 1954. As an Ogden businessman, he was well known to many.

In this day and age, I think we may be inclined to pass by over lightly the lesson and example to us all in the lives of such as Maude Greenwell Faris. Hers was not the eventful sort of earthly existence that moves quickly into the history books; instead, it was the quiet resolve of her life to live well with friends and neighbors, to be true mother to her family and abiding helpmate to her husband. At an early age, she was trained in music and for it and the rich bounties of her church she was always deeply grateful.

Her family—and particularly her mother—dared and faced much to make their home in Ogden, Utah. And I think it well to recall that the life span of Maude Greenwell Faris and her father covered a period of a century and a quarter.

Ambrose Greenwell was born September 29, 1938, in Dunton-Bassett, Leicestershire, England where generations of Greenwells had lived before him. His wife—Elizabeth Brinkley Hill, was born July 29, 1835, at Wolverhampton, not far distant. At Walsall in Staffordshire he was baptized at the age of 19 into the Church of Latter-day Saints—the Mormon Church. In 1855 he was ordained an elder. His wife had been baptized at an earlier age—14. They were married in 1853.

In 1854 the young couple came to the United States and for 4½ years lived in Philadelphia. There they met two Utah emissaries, William H. Wright and Carl G. Maeser, who were instrumental in their moving West.

At White Cloud, Mo., a son was born to Elizabeth Hill Greenwell. Four weeks later, their party started West across the plains to Utah—under direction of Capt. James "Big Jim" Brown. Carrying her child and with her 3-year-old son at her side, she walked the entire distance—900 miles arriving with her husband and party in Salt Lake City on August 28, 1859.

Her husband—Ambrose Greenwell—was a familiar figure in Ogden business circles thereafter for nearly 40 years. He opened a meat market there in 1860. His business prospered and in 1869 he built a two-story brick business building, the Greenwell Market. He died on October 27, 1898, and is buried at Ogden.

Of their children, Maude Greenwell was born February 24, 1878. She attended local schools. Soon after her 20th birthday, on May 3, 1898, she married Philip Arthur Faris, an Idaho Falls, Idaho, businessman. After their marriage she went to live for a time in Idaho Falls where Mr. Faris was in the employ of the banking and general merchandise firm of Anderson Brothers. Thereafter, the couple removed to Ogden. Mr. Faris, as a buyer for the firm of Taylor-Wright, in Ogden, was well known for his attentive, businesslike and gentle ways. He had many friends.

Mr. Faris' people had long been residents of the United States. He himself was born at Time in Pike County, Ill., July 13, 1873, a son of Elijah Faris—who served in an Illinois regiment with Union forces later prominent in the siege of Vicksburg, Miss. Elijah Faris was born near Georgetown, Brown County, Ohio, an area in which members of his family had been resident since before 1778 when that region was a portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Philip Arthur and Maude Greenwell Faris were blessed with many children and grandchildren. To them all I have expressed the sympathy—in their most recent loss—of this House.

Among the surviving children is Mrs. Leonard Davidson of 560 24th Street, Ogden, Utah. Mr. and Mrs. Davidson have been outstanding members of my hometown. Mr. Davidson was a conscientious member of the Ogden Board of Education for many years, during which time great strides forward were made in building new schools and in the improvement of teaching. He also has been and is now very active in the Weber County Safety Committee, which has done much to promote good safety practices in our area.

Among the recent staff employees of the U.S. Senate is a member of Mrs. Faris' family. George W. Seidl, who formerly served on the staff of Senator Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, is the husband of Louise Hoggan Seidl, whose mother—Mrs. Ellis R. Hoggan, of 1324 Walcott Street, Ogden, Utah—is the former Marjorie J. Faris, a daughter of Philip Arthur and Maude Greenwell Faris.

Bishop Oxnam: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, America recently lost one of its most eminent clergymen, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. His death creates a void in the ranks of the progressive churchmen of this Nation. No one will be able to match the dedication with which he worked for the highest principles of Christian brotherhood and social reform.

A complete list of Bishop Oxnam's interests, activities and honors would probably fill an entire page in this RECORD. Therefore, I shall only briefly outline some of his major accomplishments. He was a native Californian, studied at the University of Southern California, and was ordained in 1916. Shortly thereafter, he founded the Church of All Nations in Los Angeles and was its pastor and director for 10 years. During this time he taught at his alma mater and later at Boston University. He became president of De Pauw University in 1928 and served in that capacity for 8 years. In 1936 he became the youngest bishop in the Methodist Church, at 44. He was successively bishop in Omaha, Boston, New York, and Washington.

During his 8 years in Washington, Bishop Oxnam performed some of his finest services to his church. He took a special interest in American University and it made some of its greatest strides under his leadership. At his urging, the School of International Service was established and the Westminster (Md.) Theological Seminary relocated on the campus of the university, where it is now known as Wesley Seminary. In recognition of Bishop Oxnam's work in its behalf, the chapel of the seminary is named for him.

The bishop devoted his life to the goals of the Methodist Church and played an important role in many of the organizations which advanced them. He served as president of the World Council of Churches, vice president of the National Council of Churches, and president of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Despite being engaged in a wide range of activities, Bishop Oxnam never lost touch with the human problems of his congregation. His concern with these matters and the energy with which he tackled them are shown by the fact that during his first 2 years as bishop in Washington he visited each of the 1,700 ministers in the Middle Atlantic States area.

Bishop Oxnam was a fearless and forthright advocate for the causes in which he believed. He was a stanch defender of individual freedom. As such, he was an ardent foe of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He was attacked by the committee and demanded a hearing to refute the charges against him. This hearing was held on July 21, 1953, and lasted far into the night. In his statement, Bishop Oxnam pointed out that the committee, by issuing unverified and unevaluated releases and then refusing to accept responsibility for the accuracy of these statements violated basic principles of honesty and fair dealing. He also objected to the false and biased manner in which the information concerning him had been compiled.

One of Bishop Oxnam's friends related a story to me about his appearance before the committee which illustrates how this man imbued all those around him with his righteousness and zeal. When the committee recessed for dinner, the bishop took a taxi to a nearby restaurant. When he left the restaurant a short while later, the same taxi was waiting to return him to the hearing. When Bishop Oxnam asked the driver why he had waited for him, the driver replied that he knew that the bishop was testifying before the committee and thought that he might need some support. He said that since the bishop was speaking for him and millions of others, he felt that this was the least he could do. The driver refused to accept any payment for the ride back to the hearing.

Bishop Oxnam completely cleared himself of every charge against him and finally, at 12:20 the next morning, on motion of my recently deceased colleague, Congressman Doyle, the committee voted unanimously that its records show that Bishop Oxnam "has no record of any Communist Party membership or affiliation."

After 44 years of service, Bishop Oxnam retired in 1960. I can find no more fitting summation of his life and work than the words of his successor in Washington, Bishop John Wesley Lord. He said that Bishop Oxnam was "one of the 'summit souls' with whom God on occasion blesses mankind."

The National Power Survey and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, at noon yesterday, the Honorable Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, made an interesting speech to the American Bar Conference, Chicago, Ill., on the highly interesting subject of "National Power Survey and the Public Interest." This problem is of unusual importance at this time since a survey of the Nation's electrical power supply has been underway for some time. Chairman Swidler refers to the future, that the survey has passed the midpoint, that within another year it is expected a report will be made to the Congress and the American people.

In view of the importance of this subject, its interest to the Congress and the American people, I include, under unanimous consent, the address of Mr. Swidler in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE NATIONAL POWER SURVEY AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST, MARCH 26, 1963

The national power survey on which the Federal Power Commission has been working for more than a year is past the midpoint, and in less than another year we hope to report the results to Congress and the American people. I believe that this activity is one of the most important ever undertaken by the Commission, and that it holds promise of profoundly and beneficially influencing the course of development of the American system of electric power supply. There is evidence that it is already having a good influence on the industry's planning for meeting its future load requirements. The survey is bringing into the open the many latent policy problems affecting the shape and destiny of the electric power economy of this country. It seems particularly appropriate to identify and discuss some of these problems before this gathering of men whose careers are devoted to the welfare of this great industry and the improvement of its technology.

The Nation has a paramount interest in a low-cost energy base because it is a decisive factor in economic growth. Low prices for electric power are a key element in achieving a rising standard of living for the people of this country and in enabling many of our industries to maintain their competitive position in markets both at home and abroad. The electric power industry has always been regarded as affected with a public interest. We have also come to realize that the industry is impressed with a national interest. The national power survey is an effort by the Federal Power Commission to exercise leadership in asserting the national interest by encouraging all segments of the industry to accelerate their efforts to lower electric power costs in the years to come.

While the Federal Power Commission will draft the survey report and take full responsibility for its contents, the national power survey is a joint effort in which all segments of the industry are making major contributions. Advisory committees have been constituted, composed of executives and experts from all segments of the industry and from outside agencies. They have been making intensive studies of a wide variety of technical, economic, and legal problems. We have been relying heavily on their recommendations and reports in carrying on our own engineering and planning studies.

In the national power survey we are making an intensive study of the Nation's power requirements and supply arrangements in order to set forth broad technical and economic guidelines. I emphasize that the survey will propose voluntary guidelines and not blueprints. The intent of these guidelines is to aid the industry in meeting its requirements to 1980 and beyond as efficiently as possible from a national point of view. Our goal is the development of a pattern of power supply in 1980 that will meet the Nation's electricity requirements at the lowest possible cost.

A brief look at the industry today provides some insight into what it may be like in 1980. The industry is the Nation's largest from the standpoint of investment. Virtually every American home and factory depends heavily on electricity for its everyday functioning, and this dependence is increasing. The 80-year history of the industry has been one of constant growth, and in the last four decades the growth has averaged 7.5 percent per year. This phenomenal rate of growth seems likely to continue without substantial slowdown at least to 1980 and perhaps beyond. In standards of service, in universal availability, and in overall technology, as well as in size, the electric power industry in this country is outstanding among those anywhere in the world. More than any other single industry, the electric power industry is the foundation of the American standard of productivity and the American way of life.

The structure of the American power industry is complex and diverse as might be expected in a country which permits its citizens a wide range of choice of economic instruments and institutions. It consists of four segments, for the most part physically related. By far the largest is the private or investor-owned segment which accounts for 74 percent of the investment, 76 percent of the generating capacity, 82 percent of the revenues and 79 percent of the customers of the entire electric power industry. Of the total of private electric power companies, 225 class A and B companies account for more than 70 percent of the industry by almost any of the criteria I have mentioned. This segment of the industry consists predominantly of companies which are vertically integrated, each company taking the responsibility for generating and transmitting the power it requires for its distribution market.

The next in order of magnitude are the power supply systems owned by the United States and operated as a part of multipurpose programs for the river basin developments. These consist of TVA, Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration. Of the industry total they account for almost 9 percent of the investment and 13 percent of the capacity, of which 15.1 million kilowatts are in hydro and 8.2 million kilowatts are in TVA steamplants.

The Federal systems are not vertically integrated but limit themselves to generation and transmission functions and sell their output either at wholesale or to very large industries and to other Federal agencies. Statutory preferences under which these agencies function result in the sale of most of their output, above the require-

ments of the Atomic Energy Commission and other direct governmental and industrial loads, to the two remaining segments of the industry, the State and municipal—mostly municipal—and the cooperative systems.

For our purposes the stake in the industry of the cooperatives and of the State and municipal systems may be combined. Together they account for 17 percent of the investment and 11 percent of the generating capacity, 18 percent of the revenues and 21 percent of the customers. The power systems in these two branches of the industry are not vertically integrated to the same degree as the private systems and produce perhaps half of the power they sell. They comprise, in effect, a large part of the market for the Federal generating and transmission systems. In recent years a number of generation and transmission cooperatives have been created to serve the wholesale power needs of groups of distribution cooperatives. The municipalities and cooperatives also receive a substantial part of their power needs from the private power systems. Relatively little power flows in the opposite direction, that is, from the municipals and cooperatives to private companies.

One thing is clear from this description of what may loosely be called the American power system—there is no single authoritarian center for major decisions affecting the industry. On the contrary, the present shape and structure of the industry results from the separate decisions of the approximately 3,600 separate electric power enterprises of this country—2,200 public, 400 private, and 1,000 cooperative—under such pressures and restraints as may have been applied by the communities and States in which they operate, as well as by the Federal Government. The notable record of the industry as a whole is attributable to this freedom of individual and local initiative, and to the competition (for the most part by example) among different power enterprises, as well as to direct competition between the electric power industry and suppliers of competing forms of energy. Our system encourages the vitality, imagination, competitiveness, and toughness of mind which are the essence of the American way. It has also created problems for the industry, and they are serious problems. They have grown out of the institutional complex which I have just described, and out of the impact upon this complex of the rapid technological pace of the industry. They are a drag on the progress of the industry and its ability to take advantage of the opportunities for cost reduction which the new technology is making available.

Let us take stock a moment of these new technological opportunities. Breakthroughs in extra-high-voltage transmission have greatly increased the economic attractiveness of transmitting huge blocks of power over long distances. The efficient size of generating units has increased markedly in recent years. In 1950 a 100-megawatt unit was considered large. Today, 1,000-megawatt units are on order. Nuclear technology, which is advancing rapidly, promises even more dramatic economies of scale. Conventional and nuclear plants of several thousand megawatts are probable within the next 20 years. The large capacity pump-turbine plant for peaking is another new development with a high potential for reducing the cost of power supply when used in combination with economical base-load plants in large integrated power pools. It seems apparent that in the national interest the industry should put itself in position to seize these opportunities for public benefits.

The American power system has not developed without controversy. Each segment of the industry understandably believes that it has a wider potential of usefulness than its present position in the industry permits, and nationally, as well as in many local situations, there are sharp rivalries. Edmund Burke said of Americans when they were still colonists that they were especially "acute, inquisitive, dexterous, prompt in attack, ready in defense, full of resources * * *" The description fits aptly the factions of the American electric power industry. Despite these rivalries, however, on a nationwide basis there is a considerable degree of stability in the operations and markets of each segment.

It is not the purpose of the national power survey to prefer one kind of power enterprise over another or to disturb the status quo. Neither, may I say, do we consider it our function to entrench the status quo. Rather, we think that the survey should be an instrument for bringing together all of the segments of the industry for planning on a voluntary basis to make the best possible use of our electric power resources in the national interest. The ultimate purpose is to reduce the cost of power so that it can be made more widely available than ever and at constantly lower cost, and thus to strengthen the energy base of the Nation.

One major avenue for reducing electric power costs is to reduce the number of small and inefficient generating units in the industry. The Federal Power Commission's staff recently made a complete inventory of the steam-electric generating units in the many plants owned by the electric power industry as of January 1, 1961, the latest date for which figures are available. There were 3,562 generating units in operation, totaling approximately 133,000 megawatts. The average unit size was only 37 megawatts, ranging from 450 megawatts for the largest unit to 1 megawatt for the smallest. More than a quarter of the total capacity was in units of 50 megawatts or less, practically all of them low pressure, low temperature units. The best of these small units use approximately a pound of 12,000 B.t.u. coal per kilowatt-hour, or about a third more coal than a 450-megawatt unit of high temperature and pressure.

Even the units under construction are a mixed lot. As of late 1962 there were under construction or in the definite planning stage 52 large units, each 300 megawatts or more, and totaling 22,000 megawatts. At the same time, there were 65 units underway from 5 to 50 megawatts in size with heat rates ranging 20 to 50 percent higher than the large units. Other operating costs and fixed charges will also be much higher.

We need more of the large efficient units. They will be installed as the many power systems are interconnected and integrated in large regional power pools and ultimately in a nationwide pool tied together by EHV transmission lines.

If one thing seems clear about the technology of the future it is that in the field of generation and transmission the advantages of scale will continue. With the increasing use of nuclear power sources, we face a technology in which both capital charges and energy costs diminish rapidly with increasing size. The trend also continues upward in size of conventional steam units even though a plateau may be reached in the 1,000 to 1,500 megawatt range. The trend toward the 1,000-plus megawatt level is likely to be stimulated both by transmission developments and the movement toward power pools in which baseload steam units are combined with large pump-turbine stations.

The economies of scale which are so determinative with respect to generation and transmission do not seem to apply in the distribution of electricity, and this is a fact of considerable importance as we speculate about the future shape of the industry. When the economic task is one of producing electric power in bulk supply or of transmitting large blocks from one point to another, size is a great advantage. When the task, however, is to bring the power from a central point to individual homes and shops, the evidence indicates that the way to reduce unit costs is to build up high average use per consumer, which can be achieved in small systems as well as in large. For rural systems, density per mile of line is also important.

A look at these facts suggests the conclusion that it would be in the national interest if the power systems of this country were to accelerate the movement toward greater size, better integration, and consequent economy in the generation and transmission of electric power. If the industry is to shoulder this responsibility, it seems to me it must be made possible for small distribution systems as well as large to share in the benefits of such large scale generation and transmission.

Ideally, this country should have a power supply network which is planned, built, and operated by all 3,600 systems as though they were one, but without sacrificing the benefits of the stimulation and invigoration which come from a multiplicity of management organizations, diverse in structure, each with special responsibilities to particular communities or regions. Like any other goal of perfection it can be approached but not attained. This is what gives meaning and direction to the utility executives, public and private, who strive each day to improve the service they provide. That we are still a long way from the goal—which is the goal of the National Power Survey—provides all the more incentive to work toward it.

There are other obstacles which slow the pace of the industry in working toward this goal, but I dwell today on one of the most important and pervasive, the bitterness which has developed in the relations between the public and cooperative segments of the industry, on the one hand, and the privately owned companies, on the other. I know that in many, many cases public, cooperative, and private systems live side by side with peaceful and friendly relationships among their executives and staffs. In other cases, however, feelings are strong and animosities are deep-seated. Some spokesmen for the two groups pit themselves in a collision of programs and values. Both sides embrace the doctrine that the best defense is a good offense. Each group, wearing its own nerve ends on its sleeves, is nevertheless quick to challenge the good sense and good faith of the other. Partisans are not lacking even to impeach the patriotism of the people on the opposing side.

In my judgment this situation is not healthy for either side of the industry nor is it good for the people of this country as consumers or as citizens. The benefits of size and diversity in electric supply systems cannot be realized when each group not only plans alone but plans against other industry segments. The extremes of antagonism divert and waste the drive and talents of management on both sides which could better be devoted to programs to benefit the industry and the country. The competition for public support leads to extravagant attacks which confuse and divide our citizens. Many important programs only peripherally related to the struggle between public and private power proponents have become enmeshed in its ramifications. Programs which should stand or fall on their own merits have been expanded, or curtailed, or distorted, or even destroyed, because of a real or supposed impact on the public-private power struggle. Programs of public works, for river development, for research, for tax revision, for foreign aid and other elements of foreign policy, and even for national defense, have been seized upon as weapons in this struggle.

I do not say to the industry, forget your differences, avoid all contention and dispute. Such advice would be neither realistic nor sound. There exist genuine differences among the various segments of the electric power industry as to how this country's electric power needs can best be met. These differences are important. They are of the essence of freedom of choice by consumers. The country needs to hear them debated. I am sure, however, and I believe that the great majority of the leaders of the industry have come to realize, that this fight has been carried beyond reasonable lengths; that it is becoming an increasing burden upon them as businessmen and public servants; and that its cost to the Nation is one that we cannot easily afford and should not continue to pay. The time has come for the various groups to work toward each other and toward a reduction of tension and hostility.

To achieve any measurable progress is not the work of a day, nor can it come except as a result of the efforts of many leaders throughout the industry. I think it will come in part from working together on common projects, such as the National Power Survey. As the various elements of the industry work together they will concentrate more on positive solutions to common problems and come to think of themselves more and more as a single industry. Collaboration on joint plans for generating plants and transmission lines will yield such large dividends as to provide powerful persuasion to further cooperation. But tensions will not disappear merely by meeting together at friendly occasions like this one, nor even by collaborating on specific plans or construction programs. In addition, the industry must isolate the areas of disagreement, agree to disagree on those points, and then move along together on the main job of reducing costs and expanding supply. In this spirit I should like to make specific suggestions on some of the major problems which divide the industry, especially as they relate to the goals of the National Power Survey.

First of all it is my judgment that each of the major segments of the industry is now sufficiently well entrenched, and is doing a sufficiently good job, so that the industry is in a period of relative stability. In these circumstances it becomes the part of good sense for each segment to accept as a fact of life the continued existence of the other segments. I believe the private power systems will continue to be the backbone of this country's power supply, and that they will constantly improve their standard of service. But TVA, Bonneville, and other Federal systems are here to stay and to share in the growth of the regions which they have helped to develop. The State and municipal and the cooperative systems are on the whole doing an excellent job and one which meets with the approval of the areas which they serve, both urban and rural.

There is no justification at this time for wars of extermination against neighboring power systems or for bitter doctrinal campaigns in the pages of our national magazines. I repeat, this does not mean freezing the status quo or denying communities a right of choice. Certainly both sides must be free to state and defend their positions. What I have in mind, rather, is that the peripheral changes in the pattern of power supply, the shifts from public to private service and vice versa, which over the years tend to balance out, should be accepted as one of the costs and benefits of the freedom of choice which is a part of our way of life and that the inevitable conflicts which occur should not be allowed to become rancorous. Whatever our differences, we must continue to work together on common problems.

If the industry is to work together for greater industry efficiency and the reduction of power costs, it is essential that the smaller systems, whether private, public or cooperative, should have access to power at wholesale from the integrated generating and transmission grids which constitute the most efficient and lowest cost power sources. This means access on fair terms which insure that the purchase of power from a neighboring company or system will not be used by the seller as a club to destroy the buyer. The small distributor must not only be able but willing to buy, and its preference for purchased power rather than for producing its own will not be dependent on price alone. As a part of the bargain for power supply, the small distributor has the right to expect that the seller will recognize the buyer's right to exist, will not compete for retail customers by invading the buyer's own territory, will share fairly the economies of low-cost power sources, and will provide security for meeting growth in loads over the long term.

The small distributors for their part should be willing when power at wholesale is available on fair terms to obtain all of their power requirements from the cheapest possible sources and to enter into agreements with their wholesalers on a long-term basis which will permit firm planning to carry their loads. This does not necessarily mean that the small systems should rely on the large for their wholesale power supply. The cooperatives, for example, may well be able to contribute their pro rata share of the capital required to establish or to expand the integrated power pools which will serve them. We already have examples of power pools which embrace public or cooperative and private companies, but there is far too little of such pooling. The rule should be that each element of the industry, rather than building in isolation should make its contribution to an integrated network of the best and most efficient generating and transmission facilities that this Nation can plan and build. We should be satisfied with nothing less than the maximum efficiency from each input of fuel and equipment and site resources, no matter who puts up the money for a plant or where title may lie.

Practices in the past at variance with these standards have created an aura of mistrust that taints the relationship between wholesale power suppliers and distributors, and a part of the mistrust is directed to the ability of the regulatory agencies, State and Federal, to do their job. The regulatory agencies have a responsibility to dispel this mistrust by positive programs, such as the national power survey, to lower the costs of power supply, and by exercising their responsibilities with such firmness and impartiality that all parties will have confidence that their just interests may be entrusted to the administrative process.

This is a field in which the Government rightly intervenes to assure fairplay. The Federal Power Act was intended to provide protection to wholesalers and retailers of power in interstate commerce. Indeed, the Supreme Court has said, that "This is a major purpose of the whole act." (*Pennsylvania Water Co.* v. *F.P.C.*, 343 U.S. 414, 428.) The Federal Power Commission intends to exert its authority in order to provide this assurance, which is the foundation for healthy relationships between buyers and sellers of power. If it should develop that our existing authority needs strengthening we shall not hesitate to ask Congress for further legislation.

The larger systems have a special leadership responsibility in encouraging their smaller neighbors, public and private, to participate fully in integrated area planning and operation. They must be willing to provide wholesale power at rates which permit their smaller neighbors to share fully in the economies of the integrated network. They must undertake to meet the long-term needs of their wholesale customers without restrictive provisions which deprive their smaller customers of the freedom to carry on their businesses. The small systems on the other hand must be willing to subordinate their preference for autonomy and self-sufficiency whenever the cost of power can be lowered through wholesale purchase from an assured long-term supplier.

Plato described a democratic society as "A charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike." Perhaps it is this variety and disorder which constitute a part of the charm of the electric power industry. There is room, however, for large improvement in the economy of power supply and for the abatement of feuds among power suppliers without diminishing unduly the interest, variety and challenge of this great American industry.

Salute to a Federal Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Federal agencies are often the brunt of criticism, seldom the object of praise. Certainly we taxpayers have the right to complain about mismanagement, inefficiency, discourtesy or other defects in the operations or personnel of our Federal Government.

But I feel there are times when some people and groups—perhaps to serve their own ends—unjustifiably heap abuse upon Americans who work for the Federal Government and upon the agencies themselves.

Therefore, it is refreshing when citizens salute an agency for a job well done. It certainly must do wonders for the morale of faithful public servants. In this regard, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent letter sent by the Arizona Conservation Council to Mr. Fred J. Weiler, State director of the Bureau of Land Management in Arizona. The letter follows:

ARIZONA CONSERVATION COUNCIL,
Phoenix, Ariz., March 7, 1963.

Mr. FRED J. WEILER,
State Director,
Bureau of Land Management,
Phoenix, Ariz.

DEAR MR. WEILER: On behalf of the members of the board of directors of the Arizona Conservation Council (which is composed of 16 statewide recreation, conservation and education organizations representing a total membership of over 30,000 through its affiliates) we, the officers, are pleased to write this letter as a commendation to the Department of the Interior and the Federal and State offices of the Bureau of Land Management for the much improved service that the Bureau has rendered since the implementation of the new administrative plan in the State office a few months ago.

Prior to the establishment of the present organization plan, it was the opinion of many engaged in conservation, recreation, education, and other fields that due to the lack of adequate personnel and a continuous heavy workload, requests were slow in being acknowledged and processed and that, too often, results were not forthcoming within a reasonable length of time. I am pleased

to note that this has not been the case since the reorganization. Quite the contrary, the service to all sections of the State has improved immeasurably. Those agencies, both public and private, engaged in the conservation, recreation, educational, and other multiple use fields are now being given first-rate consideration and service.

There are many examples where the Bureau personnel are now working on a grassroots level with municipal, county, State governments, and private agencies, and the results are of a positive nature to all concerned. As you are aware, citizens usually take this type of service for granted; thus, this letter is being written with the intention of making the Bureau aware that the excellent service which has been, and is being rendered on a grassroots level is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

KENNETH J. SMITHEE,
President, Representative, Arizona Parks and Recreation Association.

FRED W. GREENWALD,
Vice President, Representative, Arizona Game Protective Association.

MARGARIT J. HENSING,
Secretary, Representative, Arizona Federation of Garden Clubs.

DEVENS GUST,
Treasurer, Representative, Arizona State Parks Association.

Nothing More Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the longstanding events in connection with the annual St. Patrick's Day observance in Cleveland, Ohio, is the civic luncheon given under the auspices of the Irish Good Fellowship Club. It was my pleasure to address that gathering of outstanding Cleveland citizens on March 17.

Under leave previously granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I delivered on that occasion:

It is the custom of the Irish, when in clan encamped, to speak with candor and frankness, to examine the state of Irish affairs, and to recognize the dangers to the commonweal.

We are now in clan encamped. A happy St. Patrick's Day is the password and I pass it to all here gathered, sons of the clan and their friends.

The state of Irish affairs in the American encampment reflects a steady advancement of our welfare, of our opportunities, and of our hopes. With this goes a corresponding increase in our responsibilities for all those things that have made our life in the United States such a full and happy one. We accept those increased responsibilities in the same spirit that we accept the many blessings of life in the United States. We Irish have learned well that the good life must be earned and it can not be maintained without a willingness to sacrifice and to participate actively in the conduct of our public affairs.

It is timely to recall that the Irish began to participate in our public affairs at the earliest point in the history of our Nation. A quick look at the Revolutionary War period will reveal that at least one-third of Washington's Army was composed of Irish volunteers.

The Irish have always had an unbreakable attachment to the cause of human freedom. The teachings of St. Patrick left upon them the strongest marks of Christian tradition and it was only natural that their feelings about the rights of all men to be free should be foremost in their attitude towards all things. The Irish came to the United States to secure freedom, denied them in their homeland by an alien occupier. They were quick to identify themselves with freedom's cause in the United States where opportunity was given to them and to all others to exercise it. This they recognized as the greatest asset of our country and their dedication to it has been complete in each generation. And the Irish contribution to our Nation has been noteworthy in peace as well as war.

Life in the United States was not always ideal for the Irish. When the heaviest waves of Irish immigrants reached our shores, a wave of discrimination and exploitation broke out against them. On the whole, they were improverished people—many were illiterate, having been denied the opportunity of learning by the alien occupier of their homeland. This made them objects of exploitation. At the peak of this particular period, employment opportunities of the Irish were limited by a campaign of prejudice. This took the form of public notices known as NINA—meaning—no Irish need apply.

Under these adverse circumstances the Irish did not call out for legislation to remove this prejudice. They did not ask to be recognized as a martyred minority. They did not cry out discrimination at every turn, rather, they set out to prove their worth to the Nation. They wove their worth into the fabric of our Nation and they won by the sweat of their brows the right of equal opportunity, which is all any real Irishman ever asked for because that was all he ever needed.

The harder the Irish were pressed or abused—yes, persecuted, the greater became their mark on any country to which they emigrated, and the countries are many. The United States is no exception to their truism of history.

Those who contemplate an attack or assault upon the Irish because of their heritage would do well to remember this lesson of history, and let us, as Irish, never forget that if we grow soft and too contented with our lot, unmindful of our public responsibilities, that assault will surely follow.

Human freedom, so dear to the heart of the Irish, is in serious jeopardy throughout the world today. Indeed we are witnessing a world crisis in which the forces of organized paganism are seeking to overthrow all civilized life and to turn back the pages of history to the age of barbarians. This threat emanates from Moscow, the historic seat of despotism which has threatened the existence of Christian Europe for over five centuries.

The world of our times moves from crisis to crisis. First it is Greece and Turkey, then Berlin, then it is Korea, then it is Vietnam, and now it is Cuba. The United States has been called upon to defend the cause of freedom on farflung fronts. Until recent years that struggle seemed a long way from our shores. There was a tranquility and a comfort of peace in the Western Hemisphere which no other part of the world enjoyed. Now that peace and tranquility has been broken by the Russian occupation of Cuba and the direct threat which this poses to all the nations in the Western Hemisphere.

Let us make no mistake about this problem—Cuba is a threat to the security of the United States. The Russians have now established a military, political, espionage, and propaganda beachhead on all the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. That threat can not long be tolerated.

When the Russians were caught redhanded in Cuba, President Kennedy met this challenge head on. A sea and air blockade of Cuba accompanied his demand that the Russians forthwith withdraw from their Cuban beachhead. The United States was fully prepared to face any consequences resulting from this action and President Kennedy warned the Russians that any attempt on their part to use their Cuban missiles against the United States or any nation of the Western Hemisphere would be met with a full retaliatory response on the Soviet Union. It is no exaggeration to say the President's stand thoroughly frightened the Russians whose only real strength is bluff and blackmail. That is why they lost no time in admitting their treacherous act and in promising to withdraw their military equipment and forces from Cuba under open, on-site inspection. It was clear in a matter of 48 hours that the United States had won a decisive victory over the Russians, that the Russian bluff could not be backed up, that their bluster of rattling atomic bombs was as phony as all their other claims.

When the victory was won, when we should have picked up all the marbles, the voices of accommodation, of weakness, and of faint-hearted men, argued that the door should be left open for the Russians to make a face-saving retreat. Those voices prevailed in the councils of Government and the victory won slipped away as the Russians used the door, opened for their graceful retreat, as a means of solidifying their position in Cuba and to default on their promises made when all the chips were down.

Two weeks ago former President Truman made this astute observation about the manner in which President Kennedy handled the Cuban crisis. I quote: "It again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their hit-and-run type of international piracy." The Russian empire is weak. It is shot through with internal tensions. Ninety million Russians are sitting atop an empire which is a powder keg ready to explode from the human force of the several hundred million non-Russian captives within it.

The Russian pagans try desperately to hide their vulnerabilities from Western eyes. That is why they carry on a massive propaganda program of bluff and buster. That propaganda program is devoted to war, the threat of war and the specter of thermonuclear desolation. The Russians believe they can frighten the councils of free men, that they can impose upon our Nation a political paralysis marked by indecision, fear to take risks and a willingness to accept accommodation with evil. In my judgment the dangers of political paralysis of free men are far more serious than the dangers of a nuclear war. Today we possess what has been demonstrated to be a frightening superiority over the Russian pagans. But we have yet to demonstrate our willingness to use this power as a shield for political action calculated to ignite the human powder keg on which the Russian empire rests.

President Kennedy is not only confronted by the Russian druids in the Kremlin, he is also confronted with a beachhead of Russian druids in our State Department. The Russian druids in Washington have openly defended the right of the Russian pagans to persecute the Christian nations of Eastern Europe. They have denied, as a matter of policy, the right of national self-determination to many great eastern European Christian nations now in Russian bondage. Specifically, I refer to Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia. Concurrently, these same druids of American foreign policy are asking that the great Christian nations of central Europe such as captive Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and others seek an accommodation with the evil forces of communism through what is known as the policy of political evolution. Those druids of high

policy believe the Russian barbarians are the untouchables of international life.

How different was the approach of St. Patrick in his contest with the Druids of Ireland. He too was confronted with the pagan philosophy of might makes right and to the victor belongs the spoils. The Druids of Ireland were the high priests of that philosophy. Patrick did not seek accommodation with them. His purpose was to expose them as fakers and to convince their followers that Christianity was the way of their salvation. St. Patrick walked this dangerous course alone, with but a handful of faithful followers. He knew not fear—he feared no man or men. He was supremely confident in the purpose of his high mission. The Druids once exposed fell from favor and the door was opened for St. Patrick to lead the Irish race out of the wilderness of pagan life.

The spirit of St. Patrick is needed today if we are to turn back and ultimately to defeat the hordes of paganism which now threaten the ramparts of all civilization. Nothing less can save us from war or political paralysis, but nothing more is needed to prevent war and to win a universal peace worthy of the name.

Adm. Edwin A. Anderson: North Carolina Naval Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces of the United States have produced many leaders who were recognized during their active careers. Unless they were fortunate enough to have led some pivotal military or naval operation, or to have pioneered in a new field of basic importance, their fame has usually receded after retirement.

A notable example of such a naval leader is that of Adm. Edwin A. Anderson, 1860 to 1933, of Wilmington, N.C., former commander in chief of the U.S. Asiatic Fleet, whose distinguished service spanned the period from 1882 to 1926, a total of 44 years.

I am indebted to Harry W. Frantz, well-known Latin American correspondent of United Press International, and Mrs. Lorain Anderson, widow of the admiral, for an interesting summary of Admiral Anderson's career by Cavlin Jarrett, which was published in the February 24, 1963, issue of the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News.

In order that a suitable statement about Admiral Anderson's contributions may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, I quote the indicated article:

NORTH CAROLINIAN WON TOP HONORS AS NAVAL HERO

(By Calvin Jarrett)

North Carolina has from the very beginning of our Nation played an important role in the development of the U.S. Navy.

Joseph Hewes, a signer of the Declaration of Independence from North Carolina, was the first man to head the Maritime Commission in the Continental Congress. He appointed John Paul Jones as senior lieutenant in the U.S. Navy and Jones had lived with Willie Jones, a prominent colonel from eastern North Carolina.

Five North Carolinians served in the office of Secretary of the Navy. Capt. Johnston Blakeley, the hero of the War of 1812, was from Wilmington and so was a later Tar Heel naval hero, Adm. Edwin A. Anderson.

WON MANY HONORS

Anderson reached the highest military rank of any North Carolinian. He had the distinction of being recognized by Congress three times. He was advanced five grades for extraordinary heroism in the Spanish-American War; he was decorated by the Japanese Government for his services in the earthquake of 1923. He also helped to quell the Boxer Rebellion in China.

Anderson was born on Masonboro Sound near Wilmington on July 16, 1860. He was appointed by Alfred M. Waddell to the Naval Academy in 1878 and was graduated with a high average in 1882.

On his midshipman cruise he served aboard the historic *Kearsarge* and later on the *Quinnebaug*. While he was serving on the *Quinnebaug* he was taken ill with pneumonia and was invalided ashore at Port-au-Prince, Haiti. He remained there ill for more than a month, the only American in the throes of a revolution before he was able to catch a streamer north.

In 1890 Anderson, now a lieutenant, was ordered to California to serve aboard the *Alert*. From this ship he was transferred to the fish commission steamer *Albatross* in 1891.

While serving on the latter vessel he was engaged in an exploring and deep sea scientific expedition conducted by Prof. Louis Agassiz. This expedition was around the Gallapagos Islands and the Gulf of California. His ship also made the first survey of a cable route between California and Honolulu.

Anderson spent three summers on the *Albatross* doing scientific research in the Bering Sea and on the coast of Alaska. Later his ship did patrol work protecting the seals from unlawful hunting. While he was engaged in this work he was given charge of the smallest sealer ever to sail in the Bering Sea, the captured scooner *Winnifred*. She displaced 12½ tons and he took her from Unalaska to Sitka, a distance of over 1,300 miles.

In 1897 Anderson was ordered to the *Marblehead*. This was the ship he was serving on when the Spanish-American War began.

BLOCKADE DUTY

On the outbreak of the war the *Marblehead* was ordered to Havana to take part in the blockade of that port. Then the *Marblehead* was ordered to join the *Nashville* and the *Eagle* to blockade Cienfugoes, Cuba.

On arrival at this port the *Marblehead* engaged the Spanish steamer *Argorata*, loaded with ammunition and supplies. The Spanish ship was captured and the *Marblehead* sailed on to engage several Spanish gunboats and batteries ashore. The gunboats were driven back into harbor and several of the shore batteries were silenced.

Orders were given to cut the lines of submarine cables in the port and two boats from the *Nashville* under the command of Lieutenant Winslow and two boats under command of Lieutenant Anderson from the *Marblehead* were detailed to do the work.

There were enemy troops on the beach and the small-arms fire was terrific. Because of the coral formation the cables could not be gotten to by dragging grapples so the boats had to go close to the shore where the cables could be seen in about 12 feet of water.

On the night and morning of May 11, 1898, the sea was running heavy with waves breaking high on the shore. At about 7 on the morning of May 11 the boats from the two ships pulled in close to the beach, about 50 feet from the shore, and began cutting the cables. The actual cutting was done by Winslow and Anderson in the large rowboats while an armed steam launch from each ship stood off about 200 yards from the beach and tried to protect them with their fire.

The cables were very heavy, being about 6 inches in diameter, and they were covered with two layers of steel. Much difficulty was experienced in lifting them to the surface where they were cut with a hacksaw while the boats plunged in the heavy sea.

It took about 3 hours to cut sections of the two main cables and all this time the enemy troops were firing on them with small arms and machine guns plus one automatic one-pounder cannon. The enemy soldiers were joined by about 1,500 civil guards who had previously been insurgents.

Anderson had one man killed and five seriously wounded. He had difficulty keeping his boat afloat because of the many bullet holes.

All the crews of the two boats were rewarded by promotion and Medals of Honor. Winslow and Anderson were given commissions by the President advancing them five numbers on the list of lieutenants for "extraordinary heroism" but on account of the Sampson-Schley controversy no promotions for gallantry in the Atlantic Fleet were confirmed by the Senate.

While the "flying squadron" under the command of Commodore Schley was lying off Cienfugoes looking for Admiral Cervera's fleet, the *Marblehead* arrived from Key West and Anderson was sent ashore where he obtained the information from the insurgents that the Spanish fleet was at Santiago. With this information Schley proceeded to Santiago and bottled up the Spanish fleet.

BOMBARDS FORTS

The *Marblehead* participated in the blockade of Santiago Harbor until June and she bombarded the forts. The *Marblehead* was then sent to capture Guantanamo Bay and to act as guardship and to be in charge of the coaling station to be established there. All of this was accomplished and the *Marblehead* drove the Spanish gunboat *Sandoval* to Caimanera under shelter of the fort.

In this harbor Anderson saw much service in open boats, cutting cables, communicating with and giving stores to the Cubans ashore. At night he patrolled the bay in a steam launch, dragging for submarine mines in the channel to Caimanera.

Anderson was dispatched with a flag of truce in a launch to Caimanera and while he was there he visited the Spanish gunboat *Sandoval*. He was later to be given command of this vessel.

The young naval hero was detailed to take command of three pieces of artillery, a company of Marines and sailors and join the insurgent leader, General Perez. Their mission was to capture Guantanamo and Caimanera. The fall of Santiago interfered with this duty.

Anderson was placed in command of a party of sailors taken from different colliers in the harbor and they assisted the Marines during one night's fighting at Camp McCalla. This was heavy action.

When the Spanish steamer *Adula* was captured in July, Anderson was placed in charge of her and he took her to Savannah, Ga., where he delivered her to the prize court and then returned to the *Marblehead*.

Upon returning from Savannah the young sailor was placed in command of the Spanish gunboat *Sandoval*, which had been sunk by her commanding officer and raised by the *Marblehead*. The *Sandoval* was taken north by Anderson and put out of commission at Portsmouth, N.H. About this time the Span-

ish-American War ended in victory for the United States.

TOP AWARD

During the occupation of Veracruz, Mexico, in 1915 Anderson, now a captain, was the skipper of the *New Hampshire*. He went ashore in command of a regiment of Blue Jackets and Marines and for extraordinary heroism he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Two years after his heroic action at Vera Cruz, the United States entered World War I. He was attached to the American patrol and for his services he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. He served as brevet admiral, 7th Division, and later was Governor of Puerto Rico.

A short time after the war, Admiral Anderson was recognized as the "plum" of the American Navy and was detailed as commander in chief of the Eastern Fleet with the full rank of admiral. This was the highest military rank ever obtained by a North Carolinian in the service of the United States.

Admiral Anderson rendered great humanitarian service in the emergency when the terrible hurricanes and earthquake devastated Japan in 1923. Each year thereafter the Japanese Government sent the admiral a Christmas present.

Out of his class of 120 at Annapolis only 2 rose to the rank of permanent rear admiral. Anderson was the first of the two.

Admiral Anderson retired from the Navy in 1926 and returned to his hometown, Wilmington, to live his remaining years. The great naval hero, three time winner of medals in action, died at his home in Wilmington on September 23, 1933.

American Interest in Thailand's Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of our foreign assistance programs has been, and should continue to be, helping less fortunate nations help themselves in attaining economic viability and social stability. One of the nations in which our aid appears to be achieving those aims is Thailand, a country which has been our longtime friend and ally. The results of Thailand's efforts at self-development, with the help of the United States, were described recently by our Ambassador to that country, the Honorable Kenneth Todd Young, Jr., in a speech given at Bangkok. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I respectfully urge the attention of my colleagues to this enlightening address by Ambassador Young:

AMERICAN INTEREST IN THAILAND'S DEVELOPMENT

I

The world today is rocked by winds of change and storms of violence. From our own revolutionary tradition and with a new generation taking over, we welcome much of the social and technological revolution transforming mankind.

Yet, despite all the new science and technology, too many people still suffer the consequences of isolation, ignorance, and ignominy in remote villages and forgotten slums where they do not have simple everyday things; schoolbooks and balanced diets, good water and decent homes, better jobs and more comforts. Unless all countries—large and small—relieve the distress of the hungry millions, we will all face a volcanic eruption of resentment and violence.

For to the ignorant and the hopeful, false promises of paradise and distorted pictures of freedom make a strong appeal. The poor and the ignorant can be readily subverted into supporting an alien cause. How many in Asia, for example, realize Communist China's tragic mockery of welfare for the people? Upset by the strains of modernization, many people want quick, ready, tangible solutions. In hope and expectation they will listen to the quacks, fakers, and scavengers who exploit this difficult transition period for their own ends.

For isolation does not destroy imagination. Ignorance does not inhibit hope and ignominy can never kill the spark of human dignity.

To cope with this worldwide challenge, the United States wants to promote social justice at home and abroad by means of political, social and economic developments. We are for progress by humane and controlled revolution conducted under law by dynamic societies cooperating in united strength to achieve higher spiritual and material levels of living for all the people in villages and towns.

In southeast Asia, as elsewhere, we certainly do not want colonies or copycats, satellites or stooges, even if that were possible, which fortunately it no longer is. We want to see truly independent nations create their own new societies, fashion their own social justice, establish their own defense against the hungers and aggressions of our imperfect world, and stand on their own feet in vigorous, hopeful self-respect. As President Kennedy declared in his state of the Union message on January 15: "We seek not the worldwide victory of one nation or system but a worldwide victory of man."

II

In this setting, Thailand's progress in its own development is of particular interest to the United States. We have long been friends. We want to see our friends continue to gain strength and vitality, but in their own way. We are impressed with the advances which Thailand is making in many directions. Thailand's gross national product is increasing every year. Per capita incomes and standards of living are improving. Significant new exports have emerged in the last few years as a result of integrated development efforts. The number of skilled, professional people is growing rapidly. Thailand is devoting more of its own resources to development in a widening area of self-help. The leaders and people of Thailand are determined to modernize their country and stand on their own feet.

We are also interested in Thailand's development because Thailand can play a leading role as a "demonstration nation" in the process of development. Thailand's example of different kinds and levels of development and new approaches to agrarian improvement can help us all find new answers to new problems. Moreover, Thailand's progress in the center of southeast Asia can strengthen this key area's stability and growth in freedom. This significant peninsula has been a delta of human movement and dynamic change for thousands of years. It is even more so today. It is in our interest and the whole world's interest that Thailand and southeast Asia move together in orderly modernization and evolutionary change to full freedom.

III

The Government of Thailand has shown that it clearly recognizes the threats of discontent and subversion. Of particular concern are its outlying areas in the northeast and north near the Mekong River where small villages have long been relatively isolated from the heartland of Thailand and exposed to alien agents from the north. The people in the remote areas of the northeast and north express a desire for a better livelihood, but, in their desires, they can fall prey to Communist propaganda and the erosive process of "aggression by seepage."

Thai leaders and officials are attacking these problems by setting in motion a series of civilian and military programs. They are intended to secure protection for the people while improving their livelihood through positive economic, social, and political development effected through integrated action. This will end rural isolation and alleviate ignorance, poverty, and distress.

The United States, as a long time friend and close ally, is assisting, at Thailand's request, wherever appropriate, in these constructive programs. Substantial U.S. economic and military assistance will continue, subject to congressional approval. Of course, changes in form and content will be made to meet new requirements. In any case, we intend to do our part to support the efforts of our Thai friends to modernize and become self-supporting.

IV

In the last year, some important new ideas and devices in Thailand development have been put into effect. I would like to tell you about five of the newer ones in which the United States is assisting in a modest way. Each supplements the other in meeting long and short term needs and are full of promise for the future.

First of all, the Thai Government decided early last year to explore the conditions, needs and dangers of the more remote villages of the northeast and north. Under the leadership of the Ministry of Interior, mobile information teams, with representatives from the ministries in Bangkok, and some U.S.-supplied equipment, have made eight journeys so far. The teams moved into the most inaccessible areas, cheerfully undergoing considerable hardship for 2 or 3 weeks. They traveled mostly by Land Rover and jeep but sometimes by foot, by oxcart, by boat, and by train.

Each trip followed the same pattern of activity—talking with villagers in their homes, in the fields, at the temple and the school; discussing village needs and interests with the leaders in the evenings; showing films about Thailand's king and queen, government leaders, Thai railways and other developments, and providing medical treatment.

I have found the reports of these mobile information team journeys extremely interesting and valuable. They describe the political, social and economic conditions upcountry, analyze the villagers' felt anxieties and needs, and pave the way for the fulfillment of those needs through community development and civic action programs. The mobile information teams have produced objective criteria for village and rural development.

The second project was a natural sequel—the resourceful and constructive mobile development program. Combining community development with civic action, it brings a team of experts into a remote area for several months of intensive work on the spot with the villagers. The initial mobile spot velopment unit in Kalasin Province covered an area of some 100,000 people. The program concentrated on the most pressing needs—roads, water and public health.

From what I have seen there, the accomplishments in a few months are impressive.

Over 140 kilometers of roads, including village streets, were built or repaired. An asphalted runway was finished with adjacent parking areas. Five wells were drilled and equipped with pumps to provide urgently needed water for domestic use and vegetable gardens. Women now walk only a short distance rather than several kilometers to get safe drinking water. Storage tanks were built and water piped to convenient points for village use. Medical treatment and immunization were given to thousands of people. Eleven persons found critically ill were flown out by helicopter to the Kalasin Hospital. In addition, a generator was installed to provide electricity for street lights, radio and television. Many privies were built. Agricultural advice was given together with seeds for kitchen gardens.

The people of the area contributed free labor. When the mobile phase of the project was over, they expressed considerable satisfaction regarding the many improvements. Their continued satisfaction, however, must depend largely on how well the followthrough program is conducted, particularly in the area of programs which will help the villagers to increase their income.

The second mobile development unit is now developing the area northwest of Sakron Nakorn, particularly Ampur Wanornniwat and its three neighboring ampurs. It will cover an area including some 300,000 people. I understand that the next mobile development unit project is scheduled for April and 12 such projects are planned in all. The United States is assisting by furnishing equipment such as tractors and medical supplies, road graders and well-drilling rigs.

The third program is more long-range. It is the Thai Government's plan, already being carried forward, to apply intensive agricultural development to three changwats or provinces at one time. The objective is to raise the farmer's income. It is called the trichangwat program of area concentration. It means simply this: Instead of spreading the various parts of developmental process over the wide areas of the country, the Government will concentrate all aspects of the process in one area at a time. The five major fields of emphasis are agricultural research, extension, irrigation, credit and marketing. It is hoped that progress will be rapid enough to permit moving into 3 new changwats and in 5 years to cover the 15 changwats of the northeast.

This new program was started a few months ago. The first three changwats are Kalasin, Mahasarakam and Roi Et in the northeast. They were chosen partly because past efforts have provided this area with over 100 water tanks or reservoirs which, in effect, will give the program a good start.

The United States is assisting by providing technical advisers, commodities which cannot be obtained locally and some training support. Thai and American specialists will work together in close cooperation.

The fourth type of new activity is the Thai-American Combat Development and Test Center established a few months ago here in Bangkok at the Ministry of Defense. Here we find Thai and American scientific brainpower working together in combined projects. These men come from various fields of science, electronics, armaments, and even sociology. They are engaged in analysis of a potential counterinsurgency environment and of the kinds of weapons, equipment and organizations which would be most effective to cope with fluid village warfare in "aggression by seepage." What is needed is mobility and versatility.

The fifth new activity is the encouragement of local administration. Governors' conferences have been started to promote executive development, while 4-week seminars have been started for deputy governors and district officers to strengthen district administration and improve relations between the Central Government and local officials.

The Government has brought over 3,000 township chiefs (kamnan) to Bangkok for training to improve their functioning. A similar training program was started for village chiefs in the north and northeast frontier areas to improve local government at the rice roots. The United States has been assisting these interesting programs of local government in the form of audio-visual equipment, station wagons, books and publications and other services.

We have great expectations in this new kind of development represented by these five examples. It is full of motion, but scaled for different levels; primary development for a village, medium development for an area cluster of towns and villages, and large-scale development of nationwide projects. All change brings pains as well as gains—ulcers as well as progress. But this strategy of development will not abruptly change the way of living of the farmer and his family. Instead of disrupting rural patterns, the technique of mobile development will bring modern trained people to the farmers—teachers, development workers, and village administrators who know the community. On the other hand, medium-scale development will set up new ways and modern services, facilities and institutes in a nearby central location where the farmers can find a market for their increased production and young people can learn new jobs. Thus, new technology and new ideas for both rural and urban living and working can be systematically and effectively introduced according to the appropriate stage of development. Eventually, the electricity, water, highways, and industrial products of large-scale, time-consuming development will reach and help the people in the cities and then in the villages.

Thailand's process and method of development along these and many other lines facilitates U.S. assistance and benefits both the people of Thailand and the United States. We will learn much from Thailand's experience. We will prove the validity of the emphasis on self-help and maximum use of local resources. The five new activities which I have sketched epitomize that principle. Thai leaders and experts are in the forefront of each one, while Thai resources exclusively began the mobile development program.

Eventually, if all goes speedily and well, these many strands of development will knit together to unify and to strengthen the nation for the people's welfare. Thailand's cohesion and vitality will contribute greatly to the progress and stability of our world.

Today, more than ever before perhaps, Americans know that they are the instruments of change, not the guardians of the status quo. But we must be wise, prudent, and understanding in our innovations. There will be difficulties and disappointments all along the way. We all realize that. But we can learn to absorb maladjustments, to slow our pace to avoid excessive strain, and ease the journey of people from the old ways to the new. The emerging world will be utterly different than anything in man's past history. We must be prepared to move with a new world as well as make it. As President Lincoln once said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present * * *. As our case is new so must we think anew and act anew."

Young Americans for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, December 10, 1962, witnessed the observance of Human Rights Day. Unfortunately there is undermining progress toward world peace the fact that many peoples of the world remain shackled and chained because they are denied these basic human rights. Sadly some countries pay lipservice only to the fundamental freedoms as guaranteed in our Constitution and the U.N. Charter. The cold war observes much tribute to the form, but very little application of its substantive content, as Communist leaders continue to pervert the meaning of words to their own willful definitions. It was an acute awareness of this situation which prompted the Young Americans for Freedom of New York State to send the following letter to the Ambassador of the U.S.S.R. to the U.N. on the observance of Human Rights Day last December.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a copy of the letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM,
New York City, N.Y., December 8 1962.

Hon. VALERIAN ALEKSANDROVICH ZORIN,
Ambassador of the U.S.S.R. to the U.N.,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR AMBASSADOR ZORIN: The members and friends of Young Americans for Freedom ask you to convey to the youth of your nation our greetings on Human Rights Day, December 10. We know they share with us the desire that all men shall one day be able to enjoy, as we in the United States do, basic human rights, including freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom of movement, and self-determination that are inherent to the dignity of man. We know they, too, look forward to an end of imperialism and colonialism that exploits and degrades so many people throughout the world.

Unfortunately, we must also ask you, the Russian Ambassador, to extend our greetings to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and the other nations and territories that the U.S.S.R. is holding captive. Areas in which the aforementioned human rights are nonexistent and hold a place in the hearts of the inhabitants usually reserved for a missing loved one.

Also, may we request that you convey our message to the people of East Berlin, Hungary, and the rest of Eastern Europe that are dominated by the imperialistic designs of your nation, and to the people of Cuba who are reminded daily by the sight of your troops and "technicians" that colonialism is not a thing of the past.

Finally, we must ask you to convey sympathy to those unfortunates in your own country who made the mistake of thinking the the Human Rights Declaration applied to them and are now suffering from the error of such thinking in your political prisons and Siberian penal colonies.

Please let all of these people know that there are places in the world where their

plight is not forgotten and where their eventual return, with dignity to the brotherhood of man is hoped, prayed, and worked for each day.

Very truly yours,

EDMUND ZANINI,
New York State Chairman.
WILLIAM BOERUM,
New York State Vice Chairman.

Peace Corps Couple in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read, in the February 18, 1963, issue of Chemical & Engineering News, an article about a new trend toward the use of technically trained people by the Peace Corps overseas. The article singled out a young couple, Carl and Jane Gibson. I know Carl's parents, who are my constituents from Middleton, Wis., very well, and I am pleased and proud to commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

PEACE CORPS COUPLE TYPIFY NEW TREND—MOVE TOWARD SENDING TECHNICALLY TRAINED PEOPLE OVERSEAS PERSONIFIED BY CHEMICAL ENGINEER-CHEMIST COUPLE IN INDIA

Last fall, Chemical Engineer Carl Gibson and his wife Jane, a chemist, left for Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University at Pantnagar, India. They are there as part of a 50-member contingent to help expand and teach the school's science curriculum, as well as to do research and agricultural extension work. The Gibsons are Peace Corps volunteers.

They represent a new trend in Peace Corps volunteers—a trend toward more highly skilled technical manpower. "We would like to have at least 10 percent of our manpower scientifically oriented," Jules Pagano, Director of the Peace Corps' Professional and Technical Division, says. "The problems facing developing nations call for above-average volunteers," he adds.

The Gibsons are certainly that. Carl, 28, is from Middleton, Wis. He received his B.S. and M.S. in chemical engineering from the University of Wisconsin and his Ph. D. from Stanford. Jane, who is 26, hails from Paris, Tex. She completed her undergraduate work in chemistry at the University of Tennessee before moving on to Stanford for her master's degree in physical sciences.

Although volunteers are encouraged to choose a country that especially interests them, the Gibsons did not. They were assigned to India because of that country's critical need for university science teachers and for help in modernizing its agriculture.

TRAINING

To prepare for their 21 months in India, the Gibsons, like all Peace Corps volunteers, were subjected to rigorous training and indoctrination. They put in ten 60-hour weeks at the University of Illinois, and a month in India getting a working knowledge of the country—its language, history, culture, and traditions. They also learned how to handle questions about the United States and its policies.

Language makes up about 40 percent of the total training program; area studies about 17 percent; and the role of the United States in world affairs about 16 percent. Another segment of the program—about 8 percent—helps volunteers brush up on their skills and shows them how to use their skills most effectively in the host country. They learn:

What the working environment is in the host country—the social strategies needed and the technical problems likely to be encountered.

What equipment, tools, references, and the like are needed and what facilities, such as laboratories and supply rooms, will be available abroad. They also learn how to build and improvise things not available.

How to evaluate and get the most out of the skills of native trainees.

The balance of the training program consists of first aid instruction, physical conditioning, Peace Corps orientation, and instruction on how to recognize and combat communism. Thus far, more than 30 universities in the United States and 2 training camps in Puerto Rico have participated in the program.

Although the Peace Corps is strictly a volunteer service, the volunteer gets $75 a month, banked or allocated to someone, from the time he is invited on a project (including the training period) until his 2-year tenure is completed. He also receives transportation and medical services, plus an allotment to cover food, clothing, housing, and incidentals. While in the host country, this allotment is based on what nationals in similar occupations earn.

Some countries now foot the bills for the volunteers' living expenses. But volunteers receive no special privileges, such as post exchange benefits and diplomatic immunities. They are urged to live as close to native standards as possible.

BUSY LIFE

In India, the Gibsons have a varied work schedule. During school months, both teach chemistry at the university. Carl also conducts some graduate work, and his wife assists.

After school, they help with community development activities. Helping to bridge social distances found in highly stratified societies is one of their most important functions.

When school is out this spring, the Gibsons will work informally with their students, leading discussion groups and taking them on field trips. And they will do research on specific problems of the area, such as farming techniques, soil conservation, and nourishment.

"In this capacity we have found people like the Gibsons to be of far greater benefit than just teachers or farmers because they have the ability to relate classroom theory to the real problems of the country," says Mr. Pagano.

Americans of all ages and backgrounds are responding to the Peace Corps call for volunteers. The Indian contingent, for example, includes the Gibsons, a 19-year-old boy with 2 years of college who is teaching livestock improvement, and a woman, 69, who formerly taught English in South Dakota.

SCIENCE TEACHERS PLAY A BIG ROLE IN THE PEACE CORPS

Number of Peace Corps volunteers teaching science [1]

Country:	
Ethiopia	36
Nigeria	24
Philippines	22
Somali	13
Malaya	13
Ceylon	12
Ecuador	10
Sierra Leone	9
Liberia	6
Ghana	5
British Honduras	5

Number of Peace Corps volunteers teaching science [1]—Continued

Country—Continued	
Pakistan	4
India	3
Nepal	2
Cameroon	1
Ivory Coast	1
Thailand	1
Total	167

[1] All of the volunteers listed are qualified to teach scientific subjects, but reports on the actual teaching assignments of some have not yet reached Washington.

Source: U.S. Peace Corps.

Many, like the Gibsons, volunteer at great sacrifice. They give up promising futures at home to spend 2 years at low pay in less-than homelike conditions.

Jane sums up what motivated her and her husband: "We would like to be in a position to let people know what Americans are like by being a good example. We will try to win friends for ourselves and for our country. Maybe these efforts will mean that the next generation won't be going to the same countries to kill." A willingness to serve and a useful skill are the two most essential qualifications for Peace Corps service, Mr. Pagano says.

TRAINING FOR THE FUTURE

What does the future hold for the volunteer when he returns from abroad? "We've established a division of volunteer field support to deal with the personal problems of the volunteer," Mr. Pagano explains. "It gets information to him on what is happening while he is away and what will be available to him on his return."

According to Mr. Pagano, many schools and industries, as well as Federal agencies, already have expressed interest in interviewing returning volunteers. "Volunteer files will be available to these people," he says, "so they can see the record of achievement—the kind of reaction a volunteer received from other countries and the people he worked with."

For returning volunteers who have not finished their education, and would like to, the Peace Corps, working with a number of colleges and universities, is exploring the possibilities of giving some form of academic credit for Peace Corps service. Then, too, the $1,800 severance pay will be a big help to those who had to curtail education for lack of money.

Some companies have expanded their military or government leave policies to include employees who join the Peace Corps. This insures the volunteer that his job will be waiting for him when he returns.

But the Peace Corps is limited in what it can do to further the careers of its returnees. "Congress has specifically forbidden us to be an employment agency in any sense," Mr. Pagano stresses. "We can't give people special treatment just because they are in the Peace Corps."

Local draft boards have been cooperative, he points out. "But, here again, we offer no assurance to prospective volunteers that they won't be called into military service upon completing their tour of service," he adds.

GROWING NEED

As the Peace Corps enters its second year of operation even some of its most vociferous early opponents now admit that it is a surprising success. Since its first mission of 51 to Ghana in 1961, the Peace Corps has grown until today there are more than 5,000 volunteers serving in 40 countries. In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy predicted that by 1964 more than 9,000 volunteers will be serving overseas.

Even now, demand for PCV's is so great that no country has received the number it

has requested, Mr. Pagano says. This is particularly true of secondary-school science teachers. "More and more countries are asking for volunteers trained in science and technology," he says. "The success of our future projects to a large extent hinges strongly on the cooperation and support of the scientific community."

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MARCH 12, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We would like it to be on record that we strongly urge you to submit to your committee and vote in favor of the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14). The captive nations that are enslaved under Russia certainly could use any support from our country.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would be invaluable.

Please give the Flood resolution your support.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

AMERICAN-UKRAINIAN CITIZENS CLUB.

STAMFORD, CONN.

HARTFORD, CONN., *March 12, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am taking the liberty in urging you to submit the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14) to vote by your committee.

A Committee on Captive Nations will play an important role to counteract Soviet propaganda in regard to equality of human and religious rights of nations now oppressed by Russian imperialism.

Guided by the importance of such a committee, may I ask for your favorable support to the Flood resolution.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

MYRON W. ZIELYK, Ph. D.

MARCH 12, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: In the interest of the Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes, I earnestly ask you to favorably consider the Flood Resolution (House Resolution 14). A Committee on Captive Nations is very important for us, Americans, at the present time, when everywhere Communistic Russia has been calling for "national liberation" in Africa and Asia. We, as a democratic power, have not done everything in our ability to aid the enslaved non-Russian nations in their fight for greater freedom.

A Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would indeed help to supply much needed information concerning the status and want of independence among the captive nations. Added sources of knowledge have proven to be of great value in this particular branch of work.

Therefore, we once again urge you, Congressman SMITH, to consider and support the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

JULIAN BACHYNSKY,
Secretary, Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.

MICHAEL KUCHAR,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 14, 1963.*

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I would like to receive from you information re Permanent Captive Nations Committee and a résumé, if possible, of any action (effective action) which has been taken to free these slaves of the international Communist conspiracy, almost one billion of them.

What is the present status of the Permanent Captive Nations Committee? Who are the members?

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

D. GRANT.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 15, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am writing to you in regards to the House Resolution 14, presented by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD. I strongly urge you to present this resolution before your committee with your favorable comment.

We know that Soviet Russia is our enemy. In order to combat the enemy, we must know him, his weaknesses especially. Recent information and statements emanating from our State Department showed such an abysmal ignorance in this respect that it is simply appalling. We cannot win the cold war with such a knowledge of our enemy.

An objective and impartial study conducted by the Congressional Committee on Captive Nations will supply the sorely needed information which will be of a great help to our State Department in forming a dynamic and winning foreign policy.

I sincerely urge you, dear Congressman SMITH, to submit the House Resolution 14 to vote in your committee with your favorable support.

Sincerely yours,

MYRNA H. HAYDAK.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I think that all who understand the actual situation in Eastern Europe, deeply appreciate your interest in the question of captive nations. The only way to avoid becoming a "captive nation" ourselves is to study the questions and to form a real winning policy.

Most sincerely,

M. H. HAYDAK.

HARTFORD, CONN., *March 11, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: In the name of our 250 members we are taking liberty to urge you to submit the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14) to vote by your committee and to give it your favorable opinion.

Your qualified support to the Flood resolution, Mr. Chairman, will be most gratefully appreciated. We thank you.

Respectfully yours,

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN CITIZEN CLUB IN HARTFORD.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *March 18, 1693.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: A Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would give our people—our country—the unbiased truth on the submerged nations, which will be of enormous aid in carrying out foreign and worldwide policy, in turn to make this world a better place to live in.

We, the undersigned, urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Ukrainian National Association Brotherhood No. 150: Walter J. Huska, President; John Tormesosky, Secretary; Wierj Saurij, Stanley Smichesko, John Nipordnt, Stephen Nekorhuk, Mrs. Anna Smichesko, Thomas Kinnas, Rev. G. Ans Whaj, Michael W. Janewyy, Walter W. Kopychak.

MARCH 19, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAN: Thank you so much for sending me the booklet on the 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence, and I surely will make every effort to be on the floor on March 27 when you discuss the resolutions proposing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

D. R. MATTHEWS,
Member of Congress.

Greendale: Urban Era Pacemaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, another outstanding community in my congressional district has been featured in a "profile" by Milwaukee Sentinel Reporter William Janz. This time it is Greendale, Wis.

Greendale is a truly unique community. One of the "green town" triplets, it was born during the depression as a federally built, owned, and operated community.

Methods of urban planning, then just in their infancy, were used to create a town that combined the best of an English "garden" village with housing which could be made available at low rents to families with limited means.

Its originators designed Greendale to be planned as no other town had ever been, as a model for the future. It has lived up to that aim. Methods which were originated for Greendale have become basic principles for modern urban planners.

But more than a place of historical interest, Greendale is a fine residential community. Since 1952 when the project was sold into private hands, it has continued to grow and thrive.

In Greendale—unlike other Federal housing projects which were sold—the people had full opportunity and first chance to purchase the homes in which they were living, for a reasonable price. At the same time, the plan used in selling Greendale saved the Federal Government over $2 million.

I was happy to have been of assistance in this transaction. Last Monday I was honored to give the main address at the 10th anniversary banquet of the Milwaukee Community Development Corp., an organization formed to buy vacant land within the community.

At that time I expressed my confidence that Greendale would continue to enjoy the fruits of community planning and cooperation, and that the next 10 years would find the town even more flourishing than it is today.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to Greendale, a pacemaker of our urban era:

GREENDALE URBAN ERA PACEMAKER

(By William Janz)

The development of Greendale, a planned Federal housing project, helped mark "the birth of the urban nation."

In its plans for Greendale, the Federal Government took equal parts of the city and country and combined them without destroying either.

Greendale is a community crisscrossed with parks and streams in a valley in southwest Milwaukee County.

Greendale has been called "the garden city" and the names of many of its streets are associated with gardens and the countryside.

There are Basswood, Balsam, Butternut, and Bluebird; Dahlia, Daffodil, Dellrose, and Dendron; Cornflower, Currant, Conifer, and Crocus—street names all.

The village was built on farmland as a Federal community in 1938 to provide work for those who didn't have work and homes for those who couldn't afford homes in such a beautiful setting.

More than 60 farms were scattered throughout the valley along the Root River and Dale Creek. The Government bought 3,400 acres and planned a country village with the advantages of city life.

Greendale, one of three such communities in the country, was built with a central business area, surrounded by homes and a green belt of woods. The two other communities are Greenbelt, Md., and Greenhills, Ohio.

The Government wanted to show how model communities should be built.

One Federal housing and planning expert said Greendale and its two planned sister cities showed "the beginning of a new urban era in the United States, an era in which the emphasis will no longer be on more and bigger cities, but on better ones."

The village started out as a community for low income groups, mostly industrial workers making between $1,200 and $2,200 a-year. Rent in the white concrete block homes ranged from $19 to $32.50 a month.

Through orderly expansion first planned by the Government, Greendale has changed and is now a middle income community.

Village President Edmund Blondin said, "Greendale is fortunate that it inherited a fully paid for capital plant from the Federal Government. We have been able to expand without making substantial additions to that plant."

It was proved with successful planning, Village Manager John Kuglitsch said, that "a community under Government ownership can expand under private enterprise. We are thankful to both the Government and private enterprise."

Though it was criticized for what was called "a socialistic real estate venture," the Government successfully watched over Greendale for 14 years.

Then, in the early 1950's the homes were sold to their tenants and the vacant land was bought by the Milwaukee Community Development Corp., and organization formed by the Boston Store Foundation, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., and the Kearney-Trecker Co.

In the American City magazine, Kurt Bauer, head of the southeastern Wisconsin planning commission, praised Milwaukee Community Development Corp. for its foresight.

Bauer said, "Alarmed at the interest shown by several large national real estate speculators in the greenbelt tracts, three large Milwaukee corporations decided to join forces and purchase the land.

PLANNING RESULTS SHOW

He wrote that Milwaukee Community Development Corp. was formed "with the expressed intention of conserving the improved property and of sponsoring the planned expansion of the original townsite in as much harmony with the original greenbelt concept as the economics of private enterprise would permit."

The planning the Government did and Milwaukee Community Development Corp. carried on is visible in the village. Greendale has avoided many suburban problems that would have resulted had there been no thought before development.

In the old section of the village, electric and telephone wires are underground so storms don't cause power shortages.

Many of the residential streets are circular or dead end streets so only the people who live there drive on them. This was a new planning concept in the 1930's when Main Street was usually a highway that ran through the center of town.

With so many dead end streets, pedestrian paths were put behind the homes and children walked to school or mothers went shopping without having to cross more than one major street.

STILL OBJECT OF STUDY

Highway 36 runs through Greendale, yet when driving on the highway one isn't aware of the community because there is little development along it. Greendale was built out of the way of traffic, but near it.

"Whenever someone would see the community for the first time," Kuglitsch said, "he'd say he never realized the village was here."

In the last few years, the residential area has expanded so that homes have now been built across the highway in the vicinity of Scout Lake. These homes are in the $20,000 to $40,000 class.

Even though the Government and its planners are long gone, Kuglitsch said foreign visitors as well as planners in this country still stop in the village to inspect "one of the planned communities in the country."

EXPECT LARGE GROWTH

But, as indicated by Blondin, planning is a continuous thing. It didn't stop when the Government left and it can't stop now. The village has 9,500 residents and will have 13,200 by 1967.

"Greendale faces the challenge now of taking the steps to insure that future development rests on a solid economic foundation," Blondin said.

The foundation of the future will include more than just fine homes. It is hoped that light industry and commercial businesses will be attracted to the area, officials said.

Mrs. Martha Frances Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to salute a gracious and talented journalist from the Fifth District of Georgia. Mrs. Martha Frances Brown has distinguished herself in the field of journalism. As editor of the weekly newspapers, the Tri-County Graphic and the North DeKalb Record, Mrs. Brown has been the recipient of numerous awards.

Her latest award was presented by the Georgia Conference of Social Welware "in appreciation of Mrs. Brown's interest and concern for a local social problem and in recognition of her outstanding service in writing a series of articles in her community weekly newspaper." Mrs. Elizabeth Marshall, chairman of the conference journalism awards, made the presentation.

Mrs. Brown, who was cited in 1961 by the Dixie Business magazine for "public service in reporting," recently authored a series of articles dealing with the needs of Lynwood Park, an area in De Kalb County.

Mrs. Brown is a native of Atlanta and a graduate of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism of the University of Georgia. She has been editor of the North De Kalb Record since 1948.

Other series written by Mrs. Brown deal with traffic and zoning problems, the need for accurate registration lists in various communities, the need for citizen participation in civic affairs, and many others directed at helping the communities served by her newspaper.

This recent series of stories written by Mrs. Brown is a fine example of the vitality of the weekly newspaper, the dedication of weekly editors, and the service that weeklies can perform.

Program To Eliminate Indecency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply concerned with the youth of our Nation. We wish to see every child in our great country grow up to be a responsible, straight-thinking adult. We know we have not achieved this goal and there are forces at work which, if unchecked, make this goal impossible of attainment. I refer to the "hucksters of immorality."

If we, as adults, are to curb this menace to our youth, we must muster our forces and fight it wherever it "crops its ugly head."

The Queens County chapter, Catholic War Veterans, in the State of New York, has mapped out a program to guide us in this fight. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which as gone out to the membership of this organization, as I believe that it maps out a program worthy of the consideration of every adult American:

Hucksters of immorality are using every known media of visual and oral communication to arouse improper, immoral, and destructive thoughts and acts in children and adolescents. Every day youngsters between the ages of 8 and 18, in every city and town and hamlet across the 50 States, are bombarded with the most revolting kind of filth through the mails, in magazines and books, in some movies, and even now in millions of phonograph records.

The sale of smut is no longer an under-the-counter business. The producers and the marketers of filth have emerged brazenly into the light from their slimy haunts. You can walk into any one of thousands upon thousands of bookstores, stationery stores, candy stores, drugstores, bus, rail, or air terminals and you will find row after row and rack after rack of neat, handy little magazines, paperbacks, books, and greeting cards openly displayed with contents that would turn the stomach of any vice-squad detective.

Only an all-out battle in the grassroots of each community by an informed public can halt the big business of pornography now eating the moral tissue of our great Nation.

You can help in the battle to eliminate the indecency in our country by initiating the following five-point program in your post and community:

1. Literature:

(a) Never buy or allow indecent literature in your home.

(b) Send all indecent literature you find in your travels to the police, giving location.

(c) Try to help in eliminating indecent literature from newsstands, candy stores, your place of business.

(d) Distribute the leaflet entitled "Poison," obtained from Franciscan Marytown Press, 8000 39th Avenue, Kenosha, Wis.

2. Movies:

(a) Make your wishes known to the theater owners by patronizing good films and staying away from those which do not merit support.

(b) Check always with the Legion of Decency list before you take your family to the theater.

(c) Arrange theater parties to Blackfriars Guild, 316 West 57th Street, New York City, where clean and wholesome stage productions are shown.

3. Radio and television:

(a) Write to both sponsor, radio and television company; remind them you expect clean and wholesome fun from companies which depend upon you for success of their productions.

(b) Supervise all television programs for children.

4. Records:

(a) Make your preference known to the radio stations.

(b) Write to the recording companies expressing your views.

(c) Buy only recordings of high standards and decency.

5. Legislation:

(a) Rally public opinion behind new and stiffer legislation on obscenity.

(b) Above all, write to your legislator yourself.

Yours for a home devoted to God and country,

LEONARD J. DEMCHAK,
Catholic Action Chairman.
JOHN SHAMEN,
Commander.
FREDERICK F. STAFFORD,
First Vice Commander.

Support for a Good Idea Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of a letter dated March 19, 1963, which I received from the National Federation of Catholic College Students in connection with my vote on the House Un-American Activities Committee appropriation, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
CATHOLIC COLLEGE STUDENTS,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MULTER: In the name of the National Federation of Catholic College Students, we would like to thank you for voting against the administration committee's resolution for a $360,000 appropriation to the House Un-American Activities Committee. As you may know, the National Federation of Catholic College Students has taken a stand in favor of transferring the House Un-American Activities Committee to the House Judiciary Committee.

With every best wish, we are,

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
CATHOLIC COLLEGE STUDENTS,
PEGGY ROONEY,
Executive Secretary.
ROSELYN REUTER,
Administrative Assistant.

Letter Written by Hon. Henry W. Edgerton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a letter appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, March 25, 1963, written by the Honorable Henry W. Edgerton, judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Judge Edgerton, as all who have been privileged to know his work appreciate, is an excellent judge with an enviable reputation for astuteness. But Judge Edgerton is also that all too rare citizen who is concerned with the direction this Nation and the world is taking. As he has done in the past, Judge Edgerton has applied his judicial wisdom to the most urgent of national affairs—survival. His letter, like his judicial opinions, is cogent, well reasoned, and makes eminently good sense. I commend it highly to the attention of my colleagues.

The communication follows:

"Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation, or madness." The words are President Kennedy's.

A sword hanging by the slenderest of threads will fall. We shall not survive unless the thread is strengthened or the sword removed. Nuclear weapons are in the hands of many men, any of whom could start the nuclear war.

Although the men have been carefully selected, not all can be proof against "accident, miscalculation, or madness." Unless nuclear weapons are abolished, the nuclear war may be started and the world may no longer be habitable. There is not much comfort in reflecting that death grieves survivors and when there are no survivors there will be no grief.

Most Americans ignore these facts. The President rarely mentions them and sometimes contradicts them. He has said the state of the Union is good. He has said, "We do not want to fight, but we have fought before," as if the nuclear war would be like other wars. He implies that we have national security: "We will not test again unless we are forced to or unless our security is threatened, or because as a result of new Soviet tests we find ourselves unable to meet

our commitments to our own people and those who are allied with us."

"As long as national sovereignty and nuclear bombs coexist, national security cannot coexist with them. As long as there is a nuclear sword of Damocles there can be no national security. Before atomic weapons were invented, it might reasonably be said that we had national security, although it might be threatened. We have nothing remotely resembling it now. But the myth of national security is part of our national folklore.

Governor Rockefeller has said: "Weakening the proposals of March 1961 by the Kennedy administration even further seems to me to run a high risk of endangering our national security." The Washington Post replied that the administration's revised proposals somewhat approached the Soviet position but "that is to be desired if it facilitates agreement without compromising American security."

A sense of urgency is lacking in America. The myth of national security is both a cause and an effect.

It is normal to assume that a danger not apparent to the eye will go away if we do not admit its existence. When nothing can be done about the danger it is comfortable, and therefore wise, to rest on this assumption. But it would be possible to abolish nuclear weapons. It is, therefore, unwise, although comfortable, to forget that unless we destroy nuclear weapons they will destroy us.

That we may be wiped out by nuclear bombs at any moment, yet the state of the Union is good and we have national security, is an obvious paradox. Another paradox is that we should continue the arms race although it increases our danger.

President Kennedy has said, "In a spiraling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase." The destruction of arms is "no longer a dream—it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race."

The Secretary of Defense agrees: "The expanding arsenals of nuclear weapons on both sides of the Iron Curtain have created an extremely dangerous situation not only for their possessors but also for the entire world. As the arms race continues and the weapons multiply and become more swift and deadly, the possibility of a global catastrophe, either by miscalculation or design, becomes ever more real." He also says we now have a strong enough force to absorb an initial Russian blow and then "destroy the Soviet Union."

These statements taken together mean that we can gain nothing and may well lose much by continuing to increase our destructive power. We have no reason to doubt the statements. Why then does the administration continue the arms race? Why does it propose a military budget of $52 billion for next year, up more than $2 billion from this year and including $15 billion for nuclear weapons alone?

No doubt real or supposed political expediency, considerations of pride and prestige, the pressures of the military and of the vast and vastly profitable arms industry, are among the reasons. But it seems probable to me that the chief reason is the patriotic tradition in which we were all brought up, a tradition of invincible power, invulnerable defense, inevitable victory, moving words like "Death for noble ends makes dying sweet," and stirring words like "We'll all feel gay when Johnny comes marching home." We continue to feel the warmth of this tradition. We continue to be consciously or unconsciously influenced by it. But it cannot be reconciled with the facts of life and death in the nuclear age.

Both President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev have indicated that in some circumstances they would start the nuclear war. Each recognizes the words and acts of the other, but not his own, as the threats they literally are. However peaceful the purposes of the Kennedy administration, Mr. Khrushchev may believe that it means what its budget seems to mean and what its spokesmen say. He may conclude that he might better anticipate overkill than await it. For this reason, among others, the Nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

Grenville Clark, coauthor of "World Peace Through World Law," thinks there will probably be a disarmament agreement by 1972 and actual disarmament by 1982. But the sword of Damocles is unlikely to hang for 10 years.

If everyone realized that the alternative to peace is annihilation, the administration might be ready and willing to do everything possible to promote peace. Some of the steps it might take are obvious. It might try to convince the American people that the Soviet Union is not necessarily aggressive toward us in a military sense. It might remind us that the Russians know as well as we do that if they attempted to destroy our national independence and our personal freedom, neither the United States nor Russia would survive. Without abandoning efforts to agree about nuclear testing, it might cease insisting that agreement must precede action and simply stop testing. It might dismantle our bases near Russia as the Russians have dismantled theirs near us. It might cease to make war in support of dictatorship in South Vietnam and let the people choose their own government. It might reduce instead of increasing our military budget. Above all, the President might use the moral force of his great office to create a peaceful climate of opinion.

We have nothing to lose. Such measures as these could not increase our present danger. If we gave all possible proofs of good will and got nothing in return, we should be no worse off. We should be better off, for we should have reduced the danger that the Russians may strike for fear of being struck. And it is not impossible that our steps toward peace might be reciprocated. It might turn out that we had started a trend away from mutual suicide and toward the national security that is now a myth. We need not assume that the Russians lack either the normal wish to live or the normal tendency to meet suspicion with suspicion and trust with trust.

HENRY W. EDGERTON.

Panama Bridge Ceremonies Marred by Mob Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the Canal Zone was the scene last fall of two memorable occasions. The first was the opening on October 12, 1962, of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal; the second, the dedication on October 13 of the Stevens Circle in Balboa.

Attended by notables from Panama and the United States, the bridge dedication ceremonies, which had been efficiently planned, were marred by violence on the part of University of Panama students. Headed by trained Communist leaders, these demonstrators, displaying banners favoring Castro and claiming Panamanian sovereignty over the Panama Canal, broke Canal Zone barricades and police lines and disrupted the orderly proceedings of the official program.

In contrast with the disorders at the bridge ceremonies, the dedication of Stevens Circle was carried out without interference. Isthmian newspapers featured both programs in considerable detail.

Because information about the disorders during the bridge dedication program was not widely published in the papers in the United States, I quote the following news stories from Isthmian newspapers as part of my remarks and commend them for reading by Members of the Congress, officials in the executive branch, editors, publicists, and educators:

[From the Panama American, Oct. 12, 1962]

IMPORTANT RELATIONS AGREEMENT REVEALED

Agreement between Panama and the United States on important issues were revealed today by George W. Ball, U.S. Under Secretary of State during his speech at the dedication ceremony of the new $20 million Thatcher Ferry Bridge.

Ball confirmed that arrangements have been made for the flying of Panama and U.S. flags together at various sites in the Canal Zone and that foreign consuls who hold exequaturs issued by Panama "will be authorized * * * to perform their function in the Canal Zone."

"And I look forward to successful conclusion of the negotiations regarding the use of Panamanian stamps in the Canal Zone post offices," Ball declared.

Panamanians who opposed the official name "Thatcher Ferry Bridge" probably got some satisfaction out of the fact that Ball, in concluding his address, referred to it as "this Bridge of the Americas."

Earlier, the official Panama spokesman at the ceremony, Minister of Public Works Max Delvalle, described the bridge as a "partial" solution to the "situation created by the ratification in December 1903 by Panama, and the United States in February 1904 of the Canal Treaty."

Delvalle emphasized that "the formal acceptance I am making in the name of the Panamanian Government of this project (is) teeming with positive significance of our people."

"This ceremony uniquely coincides with Columbus Day, a date that will perpetuate in the hearts and memories of those here present at the official opening of so important an achievement that links, once again, the name of Panama to the conquests of modern man in making available for her convenience the natural advantages with which she was equipped by mother nature," Delvalle declared.

In his address Ball declared that "this massive yet graceful span of gleaming metal that now leaps from hemisphere to hemisphere . . . makes Panama more than ever a crossroads—and like so many other of the world's crossroads—this confluence of world geography is also a confluence of world history: a relay post where destiny changes horses."

Ball said the Western Hemisphere had "moved beyond the policy of good neighborliness to the policy of common endeavor. This new policy finds a noble expression in

the Alianza para el Progreso—the Alliance for Progress."

Referring to the Cuban question, Ball pointed out that just last week the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics' "renewed their historic pledge that the Western Hemisphere will never tolerate intrusion or invasion of foreign despots into the life and affairs of this hemisphere."

Ball also referred to the bridge "as a new and brilliant step toward the fufillment of that old dream now a reality—the Panamerican Highway system."

"The great bridge we are opening today—truly a bridge of the Americas—complete the last lap of the Inter-American highway running from the United States to Panama.

"Lying ahead of us is still the untracked and formidable wilderness of Darien. But we may be confident that this last gap will be filled in our lifetime: this last barrier of jungle and wilderness will be conquered by the travelers and the tourists from North and South America.

[From the Panama American, Oct. 12, 1962]

BRIDGE OPENED DESPITE MOB TACTICS—CEREMONY CUT AS STUDENTS USE VIOLENCE

A mob of Panamanian students, waving banners and shouting "America si, Thatcher no," broke barricades and police lines and disrupted inauguration ceremonies on the Thatcher Ferry Bridge today.

Swinging fists and launching hefty kicks against a wooden barrier and nonretaliating Canal Zone police and Panamanian bomberos on the $20 million bridge's approach paved the way for a group of 30 chanting youths and girls to come within feet of the official guest seating and unfurl a white and green banner reading "The Bridge of the Americas—symbol of unity."

As more and more flag and banner waving enthusiasts joined the initial mob the police lines had to retreat and let the surging crowd through. The bridge opening ceremonies were cut short and guest of honor, Maurice H. Thatcher, failed to make a previously announced speech.

Minor injuries were received by several women and children caught in the massive crush. Cut knees and torn clothing were suffered by a number of bystanders unable to move out of the way of the advancing mob which at its peak numbered approximately 150.

Spanish speaking detectives and policemen appealed to the crowd, listed unofficially by Balboa Heights at between nine and eleven thousand, time and again, asking them to remain calm.

One Canal Zone police captain appealed over a loudspeaker system "please remain calm, we want everyone to relax and enjoy themselves." But those determined to halt the inauguration succeeded.

"These people aren't students, they're young hoodlums," an official at the ceremony said today. Bystanders voiced opinions that the mob was largely composed of a collection of people out to make trouble.

The university Christian democratic movement was the first group to break the police line. "We had too let them through," one of the policemen at the barrier said. "There were too many innocent bystanders in danger of getting crushed if we didn't."

Police and bomberos, stationed behind a low wooden barrier about 50 yards from the official stand, had to rescue several women and children directly behind the barrier when their cries indicated that they were being crushed between the barricade and the close-packed crowd.

All during the speeches the mob slowly pushed its way closer to the main stand chanting slogans and insults and making it difficult for the audience to hear the ceremonies. A loudspeaker system set up along the length of the bridge was drowned out on more than one occasion.

The huge crowd gathered along the bridge approach was quiet and orderly right up to the moment the ceremonies started. When Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming and U.S. Ambassador Joseph F. Farland left the official stand at 9:30 a.m. and moved down to the barrier to greet Panama President Roberto F. Chiari and his party, the crowd parted and let them through without incident and with applause.

Chiari had chosen to approach the stand from Fourth of July Avenue and up the approach road through the crowd. All other official guests made their way to the ceremony by car and bus and entered the inauguration area at a point midway up the bridge approach.

As soon as the ceremonies got underway shortly after 9:30 a.m., the students made it clear they weren't going to stay in the background. When a number of people broke the police barrier ROTC members started folding up rows of empty metas seats to prevent their use as weapons.

Flags, paper, and cardboard placards were used by the rioters as missiles in their efforts to drive forward into the inauguration area. Although the Canal Zone police bore the brunt of the blows, the Bombers took their share but removing their firefighting helmets, used their hats in attempts to force the crowd back.

The Balboa police unit was reinforced by a number of men brought over from Cristobal for the inauguration but despite the strong force the mob could not be stopped unless violence had been resorted.

When the ceremonies were finally shut down, shortly after 10:30 a.m., no time was wasted in getting official guests and members of Panama's diplomatic corps off the bridge. This left the new structure in the hands of the crowd and they took little time to take advantage of it.

Minutes after the conclusion of the ceremony close to a hundred men and youths started the long and perilous climb to the topmost center span—nearly 400 feet above the water. With them they took a large Panamanian flag.

Thousands of human and camera eyes turned upward as the long line of men slowly inched its way up. Finally, to a multitude of cheers, a group reached the center span and draped it with the Panamanian flag.

A report from the Balboa police at 12:45 p.m. said that "no reports have been turned in of anyone falling off the bridge." This quelled the fears that someone was going to go over the side—a fear that had the police launch cruising around the bridge area throughout the morning.

Reports that the American flags flying from high points at each end of the bridge in company with Panamanian flags had been torn down proved to be false. Two of the flags had been wrapped around their supporting poles by the wind, making it hard to see them from a distance.

The reason why the flags were not flown is allegedly because no one could be found willing to make the climb to the flagpoles to put them up. The flags are the responsibility of the Engineering and Construction Division, according to a Balboa Heights spokesman.

At the time today's edition went to press, thousands of people were still milling about on the bridge approaches and the superstructure. It had evidently been decided to leave them alone until they had enough and came down on their own accord.

With the huge crowd present the close confines across the bridge played a big part in the terrific crush started when the crowd started pressing forward. "We should have put up trucks across the bridge. That is the only thing that would have stopped them," one source said.

Immediately after the ceremony those Canal Zone people present started making their way back to the office. With a civic holiday declared in Panama the bridge walkers were predominately Panamanian.

[From the Star and Herald, Panama City, Oct. 13, 1962]

STEVENS PARK DEDICATION AT BALBOA TODAY—NOISY DEMONSTRATORS DISRUPT BRIDGE FETE

The opening of the new bridge linking the Americas at the Panama Canal having been accomplished despite the raucous presence of extremist students, the second major public dedication ceremony of the week takes place this morning at Balboa.

The Stevens Circle—named after John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Panama Canal from June 1905 to April 1907—will be placed in community use during a ceremony starting at 9:30 a.m. The park is located opposite the Balboa Service Center.

A handful of extremist University of Panama students—the faction that imposed by force the recent campus strike—carried out the strident demonstration. They displayed Panamanian flags, posters with nationalistic slogans, and the Cuban colors.

In marked contrast, another small group of university demonstrators, composed mostly of Christian Democrats, displayed their flags and posters in silence and made no attempt to disrupt the ceremony.

Even as the troublemakers set up a din of yells and shouts that all but drowned out his words, U.S. Under Secretary of State George W. Ball was announcing in his speech new agreements favoring Panamanian demands over the Canal Zone.

"Arrangements have been made for flying the flag of Panama together with that of the United States at various sites in the Canal Zone," Ball said. "Foreign consuls who hold exequaturs issued by the Government of Panama will be authorized by the U.S. Government, in accordance with agreed procedures, to perform their functions in the Canal Zone. And I look forward to successful conclusion of the negotiations regarding the use of Panamanian postage in the Canal Zone post offices."

The bridge dedication was carried out in the absence of most of the Latin American ambassadors accredited to Panama. Papal Nuncio Msgr. Antonio Pinci, dean of the diplomatic corps, attended as did the Ambassadors of Colombia, China, Spain, Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, and the Chargé d'Affaires of Peru. The Chiefs of Mission of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, Salvador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Mexico, Nicaragua, the United Arab Republic, Dominican Republic and Venezuela stayed away.

A statement issued by the latter said their absence was due "exclusively, to irregularities in the invitation issued by a joint committee, and to the fact that it was not until the last minute that they knew officially that His Excellency, the President of the Republic, and his distinguished wife, would attend the ceremony."

The Panama Foreign Office issued a communique expressing regret over the absence of many of the diplomats, but adding: "In view of the informal manner in which the invitations were made, these could not be regarded as official invitations for the diplomatic corps and therefore attendance was optional."

A Foreign Office source who confirmed that the diplomats' main complaint was having to ride a bus to the site of the dedication ceremony, indicated the diplomatic incident is regarded as closed.

A vast crowd which zone police estimated at between 20,000 and 25,000 spectators gathered at the foot of the east approach to the bridge, on the Chorrillo side of Panama

City. Throughout the ceremony, the crowd was orderly and made no move to take part in the student demonstrations.

A cordon of Canal Zone police, aided by a small detail of Colon firemen and Panama plainclothesmen, held the crowd in check at the barrier set up at the foot of the approach. But as the program advanced, the extremist students pushed their way through and succeeded in crossing the police cordon.

Their group included, besides students, a number of high school youngsters and some demonstrators who showed no trace of being students. The shouting, yelling band was stopped by a second cordon of zone policemen about 50 paces from the speakers' platform, where President Roberto F. Chiari sat with other dignitaries. Many of the demonstrators milled among the invited guests, who sat facing the platform.

By that time, the Very Rev. Mainert J. Peterson had delivered the invocation, Panamanian Minister of Public Works Max Delvalle had read his address, Rabbi Nathan Witkin had recited a prayer and a Latin American Military Glee Club had sung "The Hymn of the Americas."

Secretary Ball was halfway through his speech when the ruckus began. He kept on, as police held back repeated charges by the demonstrators. A number of times the police line gave way and a few of the troublemakers ran through, but arms were quickly linked again to hold back the others.

The program was cut short after Ball finished his speech. The ceremony of presentation of the bridge by the contractors to the canal organization was omitted as was the brief speech that Maurice H. Thatcher, for whom the bridge was officially named by the U.S. Congress, was to have delivered.

Mr. Thatcher, 90 years old, who as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission headed the Department of Civil Administration of the Canal Zone from 1910 to 1913, was introduced to the guests by Governor Robert J. Fleming, who acted as master of ceremony. He received a warm ovation.

Then the Panama and United States anthems were played, Msgr. José Maria Carrizo, Domestic Prelate of Panama, blessed the bridge, and while "The Thatcher Ferry Bridge March" was played by a joint U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force band, Mr. Thatcher cut the ribbon beside the platform with a pair of silverplated scissors.

While the bulk of the crowd below the approach waited patiently for the roadway to be cleared of chairs and the platform, the extremist student demonstrators tangled again with the police cordon to break through. Numbers of them plus spectators who had made their way forward along the pedestrians' walk along the side of the approach succeeded in crossing the police cordon.

By the time the official party was organized in official automobiles and buses the number of people on the bridge roadway—demonstrators and spectators—had reached such proportions, that the scheduled ride by the officials across the bridge could not be carried out.

Finally, the barriers were put down and the thousands of spectators swarmed onto the approach for the 5,124-foot walk across the bridge. Several score made their perilous way to the top of the central arch to drape a Panamanian flag over a beam.

The crowd had free run of the entire bridge until 3:02 p.m. when the first private vehicles were allowed on the structure. From then on and far into the night, there was a steady stream of automobiles, buses and trucks crossing the structure in both directions. The intersection at The Limits became the busiest traffic spot on the Pacific side.

No further incidents, except an act of vandalism on the shaft bearing the name of the bridge at the West Bank entrance, were reported. The words "Thatcher Ferry" were ripped from the name plaque. An apparent attempt to do the same thing on the East Bank shaft was foiled by the presence of Canal Zone Police, although one letter at least was ripped from the plaque.

There was widespread praise, both among Panamanians and North Americans, for the coolness and extreme patience displayed by zone policemen in the face of the hostile demonstrators. Although there were no serious injuries among police personnel, two had dirt thrown in their eyes, another was dealt a fist blow on the back of the neck and a fourth was struck by a stone in the face.

In Panama, there was general condemnation of the action by the extremist students and friends of the Panamanian guests at the ceremony expressed embarrassment over the demonstrators' coarseness.

Today's principal events in connection with the dedication of the Stevens Circle at Balboa are as follows:

7:30 a.m.: Special train for Atlantic Side and Gamboa residents attending Stevens Circle Dedication Ceremony departs Colon Railroad Station. Train arrives Balboa at 8:45. Buses will be waiting to provide transportation to Stevens Circle.

8 a.m.: Series of ferry trips for pedestrians only will start. The ferry will cease operations at 4 p.m.

9 a.m.: Band concert starts at Stevens Circle. There will be no vehicular traffic along the Prado and on Balboa Road from the Chase Manhattan Bank to the Retail Store Annex, and the main Balboa Retail Store will be closed until after the ceremony, about 11 a.m.

9:30 a.m.: Dedication ceremony begins. Expected to conclude in one hour. Public invited. Seats will be provided.

George Froehlich To Receive 1963 McAuliffe Medal for Labor-Management Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, early this month, Mr. George Froehlich of Naugatuck, Conn., a constituent and a friend of mine for many years, was in Washington, D.C., to attend a legislative seminar sponsored by the International Union of the United Cork, Linoleum, Rubber, & Plastic Union of America, CIO–AFL. His interest in national or legislative affairs is in keeping with his long record of service to his fellow employees and to the local union he heads.

I say this as a prelude to my statement of gratification that Mr. Froehlich has been selected in my home State as recipient of the 1963 Bishop McAuliffe Medal Award for notable service in labor-management endeavors to the promotion of justice and the betterment of industrial relations. I call this award to the attention of my colleagues because it testifies that Mr. Froehlich has worked tirelessly and unselfishly for the betterment of labor-management relations. I have been personally cognizant of his work as president of Local 45, United Rubber Workers of America, U.S. Rubber Co., Naugatuck, Conn. I am aware of his contribution to the civic betterment of his home community and of the contiguous Naugatuck Valley communities.

The McAuliffe Award has been established by the Diocesan Labor Institute of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Connecticut as a tribute to the memory and the exemplary social action of the late Bishop McAuliffe whose zeal for the promotion of justice, peace, and charity among all men led to the establishment of the Diocesan Labor Institute. Mr. Froehlich will be presented his award by the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien, archbishop of Hartford, at the 15th annual McAuliffe Award banquet, May 14, at Waverly Inn, Cheshire, Conn. This is an award that he richly deserves.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include an article concerning the award to Mr. Froehlich from the Naugatuck, Conn., News of March 21, 1963:

GEORGE FROEHLICH SELECTED MCAULIFFE AWARD RECIPIENT—LABOR RELATIONS MEDAL TO BE PRESENTED MAY 14

George Froehlich, president of local 45 for many years and a well-known Naugatuck Valley labor leader, has been selected as recipient of the 1963 McAuliffe Medal Award for Labor Relations, it was announced today by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph F. Donnelly of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Connecticut and director of the Diocesan Labor Institute.

Mr. Froehlich will receive the award from Most Rev. Henry J. O'Brien, bishop of Hartford, at the 15th annual McAuliffe Award banquet May 14 at Waverly Inn, Cheshire.

A native of Naugatuck, the labor leader was born November 28, 1907, and was educated in the borough schools. His first job was with the footwear plant, U.S. Rubber Co., but for a short time during the early part of the economic depression he worked for the borough as a supernumerary policeman. He returned to the footwear plant in 1933 and since that time, except for years he has served as president of local 54, United Rubber Workers of America, he has been affiliated with millroom operations at the plant.

Mr. Froehlich began his union activities in 1940 as a steward in the millroom and 2 years later was elected to the local's executive board. He was elected president of the local in 1943 and was reelected continuously until 1952. Three years later, in 1955, he returned to the presidency, serving until October 1957.

He was elected to his present term as president in the fall of 1961.

In addition to serving as president of the local, the largest single labor organization in the borough, Mr. Froehlich also served as a member of the executive board of the International Union of the United Cork, Linoleum, Rubber and Plastic Union of America, CIO–AFL, from 1949 through 1953. During one of those years, Mr. Froehlich was out of the State 28 out of 52 weeks, traveling to the union's headquarters at Akron, Ohio, and several conventions.

Mr. Froehlich holds the distinction of experiencing no strikes during the many years he headed local 45, although there have been occasional unauthorized work stoppages affecting only a few employees.

In addition to his labor activities with local 45, Mr. Froehlich also served as a member of the executive board of the old State CIO Council and he was a member of the CIO merger committee when CIO and AFL

forces merged in Connecticut. He is presently a member of the executive board of the State CIO–AFL Council.

Mr. Froehlich also served for 4 years, two terms, as president of the Naugatuck Valley Industrial Labor Council.

In addition to his labor work, Froehlich was vice chairman of the original Naugatuck Housing Authority which built Naugawam Village and the first project at Lewis Meadows. He also served for the first 4 years of the borough's redevelopment agency. He was a member of the Democratic town committee for many years and served as chairman for 2 years.

Among the benefits secured by the union during the years Froehlich headed the local union and served on the international executive board were companywide bargaining, improved vacation benefits, pension and insurance programs, additional paid holidays, union shop, funeral pay and supplementary unemployment benefits.

Married in 1934 to the former Anna Praines, of Beacon Falls, he and his wife are the parents of three children. Mrs. Margaret Ann Mascola and Miss Barbara Froehlich, both of Naugatuck; a son, William Froehlich, a student at St. Anslem's, Manchester, N.H., and one grandchild.

The McAuliffe Award has been established by the Diocesan Labor Institute as a tribute to the memory and the exemplary social action of the late Bishop McAuliffe, whose zeal for the promotion of justice, peace and charity among all men led to establishment of the Diocesan Labor Institute, according to Monsignor Donnelly.

The award is given annually to Connecticut representatives of labor and management who have given notable service to the promotion of justice and the betterment of industrial relations.

Sfc. Charles S. Hawkins Writes Concerning High School ROTC Cadets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include in this statement a copy of a timely editorial from the Star Presidian by Sfc. Charles S. Hawkins, Headquarters Company, 6th Army Special Troops. As concerned for the direction and stability of the youth of our country is increasingly widespread I found this article most pertinent and I hope all Members of the House will deem it worthy of serious consideration.

The editorial follows:

HIGH SCHOOL ROTC CADETS: NCO TOPICS

(By Sfc. Charles S. Hawkins)

Last Saturday I escorted a group of ROTC cadets from George Washington, Galileo, and Polytechnic High Schools on a tour of the Presidio. The group took in a demonstration of missile operations at the San Francisco Air Defense School, toured Fort Point, heard a lecture on the history and mission of 6th U.S. Army, at a meal in an Army messhall, and fired on the rifle range.

Frankly, I was impressed by the appearance and conduct of the 50 young men. They were in marked contrast to the so-often-seen high school lad wearing tight pants, long duck tail haircuts, and a cigarette hanging from tight thin lips.

I could not but compare the organization with some of the street gangs so well known to our contemporary society. Here in a young ROTC group we had bright teenagers responding to directions of leaders of their own age group with willingness, snap, and precision. Pride in uniform and organization was very evident.

On the other hand I gave thought to the leadership of the street gang based on blind loyalty to a leader with nothing more to offer than a record proving his defiance of society.

There was something else I noted about the young cadets. They were graciously polite. Their conduct in the messhall and their table manners were outstanding. I found that in conversation with a cadet the discussion was marked with something almost forgotten by many youngsters. "Yes, sir" and "no, sir" spoken in such a manner to indicate this is a norm of the group made for a most pleasant change.

I've come to the conclusion that it was no act and that the ROTC program has made a difference in the actions. To me this is more important that the fact that they are receiving military training and that we might interest a young man in an Army career.

The sociologist is constantly pointing to the decline of teenage society and placing the blame on a myriad of circumstances. Elaborate plans are put forth for the guidance and rehabilitation of our youth.

Recent news releases indicate that high school ROTC will be dropped at the end of this school year. Maybe we have overlooked a good thing and are allowing it to die an untimely death.

If my observations (and the observations of a great many of our educators since the ROTC death knell announcement) have any merit it may be that we have the solution to our youth problem at hand and "can't see the forest for the trees." If the small group I met here last week is indicative of the total ROTC training, I say this: Let's retain ROTC or an equivalent at high school level and make it compulsory for all physically fit young men.

Tolerance of Slovak Apostles 11 Centuries Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1963, I published a tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1430, about the invocation by Very Rev. Joseph Baran, VF., who mentioned in his prayer at the opening session of the House of Representatives the 11th centennial of Slovak apostles, SS. Cyril and Methodius.

In order to understand better the mission of these two apostles 11 centuries ago and their tolerance with people and leaders of other races and religions, I hereby wish to introduce a story, which appeared in the Hazleton Standard-Speaker, Monday, March 11, 1963, the author of which was John C. Sciranka, well-known American Slovak journalist, native Pennsylvanian:

APOSTLES TO SLOVAKIA WERE AIDED BY A JEWISH LEADER NAMED COHEN

The following story was submitted by John C. Sciranka, Passaic, N.J., in observance of the 11th centennial of the successful mission of SS. Cyril and Methodius, citing brotherhood and friendship for true justice, peace, and preservation of America's ideals.

"This is written at the close of Brotherhood Week, known also as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, observed for the 30th year from February 17 to 24.

"In tribute to this week, I wish to recall in this year of the 11th centennial observance of arrival of apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia, which is remembered by their admirers in this city and State, that during the mission of these two brothers from Constantinople to the Khazars in Crimea in 860, they were befriended by a Jewish leader named Cohen, also known as Kagan, who according to all writing was a very amiable and learned Jew.

"He is also mentioned as the lord of the Khazars. He was pleased to meet the two holy men and invited them to his palace, where he introduced them to a Hebrew scholar from Jerusalem, who was very busy transcribing the worn out Old Testament scrolls onto specially prepared new sheepskin parchments, which Cohen and his rabbis used for Hebrew religious services.

"Some historians claim that it was there and then that St. Cyril, known then as Constantine was inspired to compile a new alphabet, which bears his name and translated the Holy Scripture into the Slavonic language, which was a key to the success of his and his brother's mission among the Slovaks and the Slavs in 863 A.D., and through which close to 350 million Slavs are now Christians.

"Both apostles were familiar with Hebrew and felt at home with Chief Cohen and his Hebrew scholar, whose life ambition was to restore Old Testament scrolls on new parchments.

"This Jewish Chief Cohen, no doubt, aided SS. Cyril and Methodius in discovering the body of St. Clement, fourth Pope (87–97), who died a martyr's death in Crimea and whose relics aided in conversion of the Slavs.

"The capital of Khazars was Kherson or Cherson, which at that time was an important city. It is a resting place of Howard, the philanthropist, and has a monument in its vicinity erected to his memory by Emperor Alexander.

"In tribute to this year's Brotherhood Week of Christians and Jews, and the 11th centennial of the successful mission of SS. Cyril and Methodius, let us emulate in similar brotherhood and friendship for true justice and peace and perservation of our democratic ideals."

Sciranka, a newspaperman for the past 40 years, is well known in the Greater Hazleton area. He submitted an article concerning the centennial of Rev. Andrew Pavco, which appeared in the Standard-Speaker February 8.

Economic Growth of Northeastern Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Connecticut Industry, published monthly by the Manufacturers

Association of Connecticut, contains a very interesting article in its March 1963 issue entitled "What's Ahead for Northeastern Connecticut?" The article is written by Dr. William T. Fisher, of the University of Connecticut, who is active in several organizations concerned with the development of this area.

The northeastern part of Connecticut discussed in Dr. Fisher's article is a section of the Second Congressional District, which I represent. We have been troubled in this area with substantial unemployment in the past, and to this day unemployment is a major factor there, so that many of us are vitally concerned about the future. We are pleased, however, to note the tremendous economic growth of this area in recent years, and are very much encouraged by its industrial potential for the future. Enterprising firms throughout the country should take note of this potential and learn more about northeastern Connecticut as a possible location for their plants, factories and offices.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the article by Dr. Fisher, as well as an editorial published in the Willimantic Daily Chronicle, March 16, 1963, which discusses the article and its findings. They are as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR NORTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT?

What is life going to be like in northeastern Connecticut during the next 5, 10, or 15 years? Will prosperity come to the 10-town area which includes Brooklyn, Canterbury, Eastford, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfret, Putnam, Sterling, Thompson, and Woodstock? Will business and industry flourish? Will there be jobs for all who wish to work, and at wages which provide a standard of living equal to other areas of the State? Will the Quinebaug Valley be looked upon as a bright spot in the State, or as a problem area? Such questions and their probable answers, because of their far-reaching influence, are of interest, not only to the citizens of the region under discussion, but to the entire populace of the State of Connecticut.

Many of the answers we need in order to plot our course effectively in the years ahead are simply not available without careful economic research followed by a great deal of thoughtful appraisal. Still, some answers can be given; and at least a clear enough picture of the area and its economic problems can be presented.

We may say at the outset that prolonged and substantial unemployment has been one of the major factors leading the people of the area to be concerned about the future. The region needs many jobs to achieve the same proportion of full employment labor force participation as characterized by the State as a whole.

The employment problems of the Quinebaug Valley region strike us with special force because of the truly remarkable growth of Connecticut. Connecticut has been and is one of the busiest States along the Atlantic seaboard where a considerable proportion of the productive power of the Nation is concentrated.

NUMBER OF MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS

Data reveals that northeastern Connecticut has had a considerable increase in manufacturing and mechanical establishments since 1960. In addition, many plants have expanded or are planning to do so. The Connecticut State Development Commission data show that expansions by existing companies were more numerous than plant move-ins. Operating records of the commission present an encouraging picture for 1962. Diversified industries have continued to locate in the area, resulting in greater economic balance. An area in which manufacturing activity is heavily concentrated in any one industry group tends to be seriously affected by ups and downs in that particular industry. The diversification in industry in the region has resulted in a greater amount of employment stability.

Specifically, the following increases in manufacturing establishments have occurred since 1960:

TOWN AND COMPANY NAME AND PRINCIPAL PRODUCT

Killingly: Danielson Draperies, Inc., draperies; Doring Labels, Inc., pressure sensitive labels; Venus Corporation, girdles, garter belts.

Plainfield: Allied Control Co., Inc., commercial electrical relays; Porcumac Tool and Die Co., molds and dies; Pivals Non-Ferrous Foundry Co., sand coatings of brass, bronze and aluminum.

Putnam: Colony Manufacturing Co., dress manufacturer; The Hale Manufacturing Co., nylon yarn and staple fiber; Hindle Transformer Division of York Research, dry type power transformers; Westfall Chafee Laminates, fiberglass reinforced plastics, custom molders.

Sterling: The Duraphene Corp., phenolic molding compound; Pace Tool and Die Co., tools and dies.

Thompson: Asco Supply Co., shoe parts; Ivanhoe Tool and Die Co., Inc., injection and compression molds; Preferred Plastics Corp., custom molded expanded polystyrene parts; State Line Asphalt, bituminous concrete; Thompson Processing Co., Inc., plastic coating.

Woodstock: Webster Spring Co., Inc., mattress innerspring units for bedding trade.

CURRENT MAJOR INDUSTRIAL CONSTRUCTION

Worcester Corrugated Products Corp. is contemplating construction of a 40,000-square-foot, $300,000 manufacturing building in Thompson as the first stage in their construction program.

Putnam Herzl Finishing Co. is planning construction of a 10,000-square-foot manufacturing plant in Putnam. Principal products: dyeing, finishing rayon piece goods.

Plastic Film Corp. recently completed a $1 million, 132,000-square-foot manufacturing and storage facility in Plainfield. Principal products: vinyl, polyethylene films, and electronic recording papers.

Knox Glass Co. is planning to construct a 117,000-square-foot furnace plant and warehouse addition in Dayville (Killingly). Principal products: flint glass containers.

The foregoing include those projects either in the planning stages, in some phase of construction, or newly completed.

Kaman Aircraft Corp. in Plainfield constructed a 8,500-square-foot, $85,000 factory addition. Principal products: helicopter air frames.

William Prym, Inc., a 14,000-square-foot factory addition in Killingly.

While these data on increases in the number of manufacturing establishments do not present an unqualified picture of industrial growth, the list and figures do lend encouragement to the belief that the spirit of enterprise still flourishes in the region.

FUTURE EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTS

Job prospects are on the increase. The tendency is to underestimate the degree of prosperity that may be ahead of us. Many new and unforeseen developments in and near the area may occur which will cause the region to prosper. As an example, the proposed research park in association with the University of Connecticut might well be located northeast of our State university and this development would affect the entire northeastern Connecticut planning region.

Leroy Jones, managing director of the State development commission, has said, "Some people may consider northeastern Connecticut the wilderness, but I submit that it is 'Shangri-La'." Northeastern Connecticut is an attractive place to do business. There is a rather standard list of factors that are taken into account by manufacturers in selecting a location. This region has the following factors to commend it: ample labor, numerous sites, adequate transportation facilities, nearness to markets, adequate water and other utilities, good living conditions, a reasonable tax structure, expanding school systems, many cultural advantages, and the cooperative "spirit" of the communities as reflected in the tax structure and in services necessary to industry and business.

COMMUNITY ACTION

The Quinebaug Valley Action Committee with Stefan Grapnel as chairman, the Quinebaug Valley Industrial Development Council, the Industrial and Development Commissions in the various communities, and the Industrial Foundations have shown interest in the organization of the northeastern Connecticut planning region. These groups also favor zoning for industry. They are fully cognizant of the fact that industrial firms are reluctant to choose a plant site and then arouse community conflicts when an attempt is made to have it rezoned for their use.

The construction of reservoirs in Massachusetts along with redevelopment in Putnam has alleviated, to a great extent, the possibility of flood in the area. The flood control project scheduled for West Thompson is presently in the initial stages of execution. This flood control dam, to be constructed by the Federal Government at a cost of approximately $7 million, will, upon completion, transform the region from a flood prone to a flood proof one.

A spirit of cooperativeness on the part of community governments is apparent in making such facilities as sewer and water available to new industries. Some communities are planning "industrial parks" with the thought that sites and facilities may be made available in advance. Local financing of industrial and mechanical establishments is important, and some communities have, while others are planning, local industrial development corporations.

INDUSTRIAL PROMOTION

Under the leadership of Gov. John N. Dempsey and with the assistance of the Connecticut State Development Commission, which serves as the State coordinating agency in the administration of the Area Redevelopment program in Connecticut, and the Quinebaug Valley Action Committee, the sum of $30,000 has been made available for a 6-month industrial survey of the 10-town area. The firm of Dyer, Schoeller and Wirth, of Wilton, has begun work on a survey of the area's 155 industries and 400 businesses under the technical assistance grant approved in Washington by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

The Wilton firm is using a grassroots approach with 55 area people involved in the project. The firm's survey is determining opportunities for future expansion or diversification of existing business.

SUMMARY

On balance, we can assume that the industrial potential of northeastern Connecticut will continue to be realized. On any reasonable assessment of the plus and minus factors mentioned in this article, we are forced to conclude that industrial growth lies ahead for the 10-town northeastern Connecticut region.

Few things or places are, of course, really typical. Each has its own individual character, but northeastern Connecticut does embody to a remarkable degree those characteristics which are fundamental to a full and rewarding life. After all other factors have received their full measure of credit for a predicted positive future for northeastern Connecticut, we cannot help but conclude that the real character of the 10-town area stems from the friendliness and good will of its people.

[From the Willimantic (Conn.) Daily Chronicle, Mar. 16, 1963]

LESSONS TO REMEMBER

The March issue of "Connecticut Industry" has an article with some lessons for the Greater Willimantic area.

William T. Fisher, of the University of Connecticut has written an article entitled "What's Ahead for Northeastern Connecticut?" Dr. Fisher is a member of several organizations concerned with the development of northeastern Connecticut.

The article is a summary of what is happening in the northern half of Windham County in such towns as Killingly, Plainfield, Putnam, Sterling, Thompson, and Woodstock.

The growth in these areas is nothing short of amazing. Since 1960 many big plants have been built. Worcester Corrugated Products Corp. is planning a 40,000-square-foot, $300,000 building, in Thompson. Putnam Herzel Finishing Co. is planning a 10,000-square-foot plant in Putnam. Plastic Film Corp. recently completed a 132,000-square-foot plant in Plainfield at a cost of $1 million. Knox Glass Co. is planning a 117,000-square-foot furnace plant and warehouse addition in Killingly.

Already constructed is an 8,500-square-foot, $85,000 factory addition in Plainfield to go with a plant that employs about 1,000. William Prym, Inc. has expanded its operations with a 14,000-square-foot factory addition in Killingly.

Dr. Fisher sees hope that the proposed industrial research park at the University of Connecticut might spur further industrial growth. Dr. Fisher says the research park "might well be located northeast of our State university." Citizens in the Greater Willimantic area would hope that the park would not be located too far to the northeast. The southern part of Windham County would like to share in any future industrial growth.

Leroy Jones, managing director of the State development commission says northeastern Connecticut has the following factors to commend it:

The region has "ample labor, numerous sites, adequate transportation facilities, nearness to markets, adequate water and other utilities, good living conditions, a reasonable tax structure, expanding school systems, many cultural advantages, and a cooperative spirit of the communities as reflected in the tax structure and in services necessary to industry and business."

The southern part of Windham County shares in many of these positive factors.

On the matter of adequate transportation it would seem that the northern half of Windham County has a slight advantage. An extension of the Connecticut Turnpike has been built into Danielson. Due for construction in the near future is a connecting link that will tie in the Massachusetts Turnpike with the Connecticut Turnpike extension via Route 12.

That is another reason why area residents should get out to the State Capitol next Friday to shout loud and long for the reconstruction and relocation of Route 6. While it may not be possible to get funds for actual reconstruction, it is possible to get some money for preliminary surveys and land purchases.

A new Route 6 would considerably enhance the chances of the southern part of Windham County in getting new industry. Windham, for instance, is midway between two big markets, Providence and Hartford. It shares with the northern part of Windham County advantages of being on the line between Boston and New York.

It is also interesting to note that the Quinebaug Valley Action Committee and other organizations favor zoning for industry.

As Dr. Fisher notes: "They are fully cognizant of the fact that industrial firms are reluctant to choose a plant site and then arouse community conflicts when an attempt is made to have is rezoned for their use."

Lessons to remember.

Fear of Snakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my friend, J. Fred Eden, of Claxton, Ga., who runs a very fine weekly newspaper, has published an editorial that I think could very well be the final word before this House about Operation Water Moccasin III.

I went personally to Fort Stewart, Ga., after hearing reports that the United Nations and the Congo were taking over down there, and I found that the charges were ridiculous. The U.S. Army was in complete charge of the routine exercise, and it appeared to be the kind of training which is vital in the fight against communism. Of course, no Congolese were involved.

I would like to submit for the Members of the Congress a portion of Mr. Eden's editorial, with the hope that they will enjoy reading it as much as I did:

[From the Claxton (Ga.) Enterprise, Mar. 21, 1963]

FEAR OF SNAKES

A national furor has been raised over the Army exercise recently underway here, known as Water Moccasin III. Our office has received numerous letters from such places as Richmond, Va.; Savannah; New Orleans; and Minneapolis—all expressing a grave dread over the operation.

Evidently a lot of folks are scared of snakes, and in their sick minds anything with the name of a snake conjures up visions of a viper or a man-eating reptile that sets them off on weird fantasies that defy description.

One Congressman went so far as to suggest that the United States was training "barefooted Africans as guerrilla warriors," to be used to subjugate other African nations.

Another had it figured that the United Nations was sending in foreign troops to be trained to overthrow our Government. Another decided we were being trained in how to surrender our cities to insurgents.

Still another imagined all of this area being "invaded by hordes of Mongolians" who were overrunning the entire area.

It is fantastic what the human mind can dream up over the simple statement that a few foreign students will act as observers in the operation. We were in almost daily contact with an English major, and an Italian police officer. We also were visited by an Army team that had a Turkish officer as an observer. But we missed out on the "hordes of foreign Communists."

Some of the statements we have read amount to hysteria, the result of a sick mind, carried away by the self-induced hallucinations. Our experience with the people involved directly in the operation left us with the feeling that we were taking part in some important training that may one day aid our Nation in its struggle for world peace against a foe that uses all kinds of unorthodox tactics. We are glad to know that we have people in our Armed Forces with the ability and training that these men showed during our observation of this operation.

We look forward to operation No. IV, but we suggest that the Army change the name to "Primrose Path IV"—or "Azalea Trail" or some such title—"Water Moccasin IV" seems to make people dream bad dreams, and act like dope addicts.

Deepest Regret and a Great Loss Is Felt by All Veterans and Members of the American Legion in the Passing of a Truly Great American, "Brad" Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved to learn of the sudden death of Bradley R. Taylor, of Rhinelander, Wis., who during his lifetime probably contributed more than any other Legionnaire to the success and influence of the American Legion. It has been my extreme good fortune to have known and have the wonderful opportunity to be associated with this outstanding American for more than the 20 years that I have been in Congress.

Throughout our association I developed a great affection, a great respect, and a great admiration for him as a leader and champion of our American way of life. He was one of the most unselfish human beings I have ever known, and he worked hard at his private business for twofold purpose: to take care of the financial needs of his family, and next to provide for his expenses involved in devoting a great deal of time and effort to helping the American Legion and thereby being extremely beneficial in assisting all veterans in their many and varied problems. His work with the Legion was one of dedication. It was his main interest and actually his whole life.

He traveled constantly, anywhere and everywhere, in all parts of the United States to further the American Legion and served on many of its most important committees.

He was one of the most modest and generous persons I have ever known, never wanting anything for himself but always wanting to further the work of the American Legion and the veterans of the United States. He was held in the highest esteem by his fellow Legionnaires not only in Wisconsin but throughout the United States. Among

those whom he was closely associated with in Legion work was Col. Roscoe Turner, one of the most famous fliers of all times, Hon. Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense, Hon. Monroe Johnson, former Chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, Gen. Louis Renfrow, Hon. Earl Cocke, past national commander, now a member of the World Bank as U.S. representative, former Congressman Tom Miller, of Reno, Nev., and countless other Legion officials and great Americans.

While he was always doing something for someone, working unceasingly for the American Legion, he was awarded an honorary colonel and honorary citizen by the Governors of the States of Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Texas, Indiana, and Louisiana. In Wisconsin, he was a member of the Wisconsin Aeronautics Board, a member of several governmental boards, and a delegate in 1958 to the White House Conference on National Security.

Brad Taylor was born in Rhinelander, Wis., in 1895 and attended public schools there, following which he attended the University of Kansas and the University of Wisconsin. His high sense of patriotism and love for his country was clearly demonstrated when with only one semester remaining to obtain his college degree, he left college and volunteered in the Army in World War I ending up with a very distinguished and outstanding record. Throughout his life this attribute characterized his every official act in public and private life.

Where the United States or the American Legion was involved, no job was too small or too large for Brad Taylor to attempt. Some of his accomplishments were not only outstanding but amazing and when he thought he was right, he had the tenacity of a bulldog to fight his way to an ultimate and successful conclusion.

The American Legion, Rhinelander, Wis., and the United States will miss Brad Taylor as well as many of my colleagues who knew him intimately. We will all miss him, his inspiration, his love of life, his devotion to his family and friends, his courage, his integrity, his effervescent personality and his diligent efforts in behalf of the American Legion, the organization which he truly loved.

When I attended his funeral recently in Rhinelander, Wis., he was mourned by hundreds of his townspeople and his many colleagues with whom he was associated in the Congregational Church, the Masonic Lodge, the Elks, the Rotary Club, the American Legion, the Disabled Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mrs. Morrison and I extend to his lovely and devoted wife, his 2 sons and daughter, and his 11 grandchildren our deepest sympathy with a feeling that the many wonderful memories of Brad Taylor will live on forever and be a constant source of comfort to them in the days to come.

Having the friendship of Brad Taylor not only has been a great inspiration that has made me a better Congressman than I would have been, but his friendship over the years had a great influence on me, made me a better man. I know that he has affected so many in the same respect. As I look back over his life, and realize the great love and devotion for his family, his amazing capacity for friendship of so many people, and his years of unselfish devotion and work for the American Legion, I feel that he has certainly earned the title of not only a great American, but justifiably could be given the title of "Mr. American Legion."

Of him and others like Brad Taylor a poet has once said:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time,

Gene Hoffman Writes: Mentally Ill Occupy One Out of Two Hospital Beds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1963, the President sent a message to this body which laid before us squarely the inadequacies now in existence in every State and community throughout the Nation in meeting the needs of the mentally ill and retarded.

It seems impossible that any Member of Congress or any citizen of the United States could fail to be moved to action once the facts have been made known; but unfortunately this has been the case in the past, and thus today there are some 800,000 mental patients occupying 1 out of every 2 hospital beds in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, attempts to provide more humane care for the mentally ill and to transform insane asylums into hospitals and clinics true to the healing purpose of medicine have occurred periodically during the past two centuries. But each gain seems to have been followed by backsliding—loss of professional momentum and public indifference—in overcoming the disturbances that are destroying the self-respect and social usefulness of thousands of Americans.

However, I feel that today we stand on the threshold of new advancements in mental health. The President's mental health program gives us a comprehensive picture of the full scope of the problems and concludes with sound recommendations for direct and effective action to wipe out the custodial care now providing so little hope to the mentally ill.

The arsenal for combating mental illness envisioned in the proposed program will dispense with the conventional weapons of asylums and large overcrowded institutions and turn to the new and improved drugs and treatment methods for mental illness and immediate action against the enemy. Then to insure the continued weapon supply, it calls for greater appropriations for mental health research. Thus, armed as never before, we have hope of complete and final victory over this common enemy.

Dr. Robert M. Felix, Director of NIMH, speaking on the program called for by the President, says:

> Once we get rolling, we can reduce the population of State mental hospitals by 50 percent in 10 years. In 25 years, the State hospital as we know it—a custodial warehouse for patient storage—will disappear.

One of the basic concepts of this new attack is community treatment clinics. The individual treatment and guidance which such clinics will offer will not only allow the release of patients heretofore hidden away in mental institutions by aiding them in adjusting themselves as they are reinstated as useful and active members of society, but also will prevent untold numbers from having to face such confinement.

Limited experiments with such clinics have been carried out by various groups and communities throughout our Nation, and their results offer one of the strongest arguments for immediate and unanimous support for the President's program.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert portions of an article written by Mr. Gene Hoffman in the Monitor recently. It describes just such a community-oriented service and offers us a preview of the restoration and revitalization of the lives of the mentally ill which can be achieved:

[From the Monitor, Feb. 22, 1963]

MENTALLY ILL NUMBER 2 TO 1 IN HOSPITALS

(By Gene Hoffman)

One of the most frustrating and costly aspects of social welfare work is the case of the mentally ill, a person who may be terribly agitated but only temporarily out of contact with reality, or a mild, serene person who may be suffering from one of the major and more serious forms of mental illness. The latter can be a real burden in many ways.

Each county in the new Archdiocese has its own Catholic Social Service facility under the supervision of a priest-director and a staff of lay social workers. All work is under the direction of Msgr. James M. Murray, secretary and general director of Catholic charities with headquarters on Mission Street. Archbishop Joseph T. McGucken is president of Catholic Charities.

Euphemize it by whatever nomenclature you choose, the fact remains that the great bulk of Catholic Social Service caseloads have their roots in some form of mental maladjustment * * * an alcoholic mother, or father, a youth who has been rejected and abused at home, a manic depressive with suicidal tendencies, and so forth. Some are merely highly neurotic, others are obviously psychotic.

Catholic Social Service tries to get all the facts possible and then determines a correct diagnosis before any course of counseling or therapy can be recommended. On borderline cases the caseworker always calls the doctor.

Says one Catholic Social Service caseworker-director, "We are not psychiatrists and make no attempt to diagnose borderline cases. Two or three years ago we worked out an arrangement with a local clinic and through a contact with an eminent doctor, a member of the clinic, we have access to five psychiatrists on a consultant basis.

The doctors spend an average of 2 to 3 hours a week, observing, and consulting with the more serious cases, observing all aspects of their behavior, and in lecturing to Catholic Social Service social workers so they will be more familiar with psychotic symptoms.

DOCTORS' CHARITY

This service is not furnished free by the doctors. They all have patients of their own, but they do give a special rate, which is all the more charitable of them because their time is mostly overtime hours.

Juveniles who are found to be psychotic are referred in accordance with the severity of each individual case. If the case seems mild and incipient rather than deep seated, a proper foster home may be found for him, or he may be referred to the psychiatric section of the local hospital for observation and therapy. However, if his condition is found to be already well advanced and protracted treatment is needed, he is sent to a private sanitarium in Mendocino County where Catholic Social Service pays $385 a month for his care.

The real tragedy in mental illness lies in cases where the mother of a number of small children, or the father and breadwinner of the family is found to be psychotic. If these cases are serious, as most of them are, they are placed in State hospitals. But what about the children? Here is a real problem. The family is kept together wherever possible, and a housekeeper is hired to take care of the children until the mother is well enough to come home. Often the housekeeper is kept an extra week or two until the mother can readjust herself.

Homes To Be on Exhibit in New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that a prominent feature of the New York's World Fair should be housing. This week it was my pleasure to assist in a groundbreaking ceremony for three homes which are to be built at the fair as an American showcase for the construction industry, for the home furnishing industry, and for countless related industries upon which home ownership and home maintenance are dependent.

As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, I joined with my friend and colleague, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, who is chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, to break ground for the construction of these fair homes. They will be known as "The House of Good Taste" exhibit and millions of people will view them as examples of how Americans live as a result of the initiative of a free enterprise system and a democratic form of government.

I understand that over 200 business firms are represented in these homes and the many products which this exhibit will display should be a stimulus to better housing and better living for all who view them.

I believe that the "House of Good Taste" will be a highlight of next year's great exposition and I hope that all of us in Congress will have an opportunity to visit it.

Dillon and Stevens Address Textile Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute held its annual meeting last week at Hollywood Beach, Fla. Among the distinguished persons to address the textile manufacturers were the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Robert T. Stevens, president, J. P. Stevens, Inc., a former Secretary of the Army and one of the foremost men in textiles.

Secretary Dillon presented a clear and concise discussion of tax reform, and Mr. Stevens responded with forceful references to the present difficulties of the textile industry resulting from cotton pricing policies. With the consent of the House, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. Dillon and excerpts from the remarks of Mr. Stevens:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Last month nearly 5 million Americans who were actively seeking jobs could not find them. More than 6 percent of our labor force was unemployed. Those are dark statistics, and they cast a long shadow over our future—as was made quite clear in the recent testimony of President W. P. Gullander of the National Association of Manufacturers before the House Ways and Means Committee. President Gullander pointed out that, should our economy create new jobs no faster than it has over the past 5 years, then by 1970 our unemployment rate would climb to a shocking 12.7 percent.

This would be the terrible cost, in human terms, of our lagging growth rate—to say nothing of the cost in idle plant capacity, lower Government revenues, and unrealized business profits.

Such a situation would inevitably create irresistible pressures for the Federal Government to play an increasingly larger role in our economy to compensate for the failure of the private sector to meet the basic needs of our people. That prospect, I can assure you, is no more attractive to those of us in Government than it is to you in private industry. Therefore, the President has proposed a major overhaul of our outmoded tax system designed to get our free enterprise system back on the track at full speed so that it can provide more jobs, increased productive capacity, and higher profits.

The President's proposal for a broad, top-to-bottom cut in our tax rates has met with a remarkably favorable response. There is a growing national consensus that our economy must be released from the shackles of an income tax structure that, having outlived its usefulness in restraining the inflationary tendencies of wartime, is now stifling our growth. For example, during the month-long public hearings on the President's tax proposals before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington not one single witness has so far disagreed with the need for significant rate cuts. Since the testimony has been primarily concerned with the important details of the tax program, such as the manner in which the forthcoming rate reduction should be applied or the difficulties involved in various suggestions for structural reform, the remarkable and equally important unanimity of support for significant rate reductions has sometimes been obscured. As you know, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute joins in this consensus. Such support greatly eases the always difficult and time-consuming task of tax reform.

Tax reform is a matter of deep concern to this administration. One of its very first acts was to recommend a tax credit for new investment designed to stimulate business modernization and expansion—a credit that would help to give American businessmen the same sort of tax incentives long enjoyed by many of their foreign competitors. You will recall the surprising difficulties we encountered in obtaining acceptance of this concept, which was new to our tax system, but had well proved its worth to our competitors overseas. Your support was crucial in writing the investment credit into law.

Coming from an enterprising and forward looking industry such as yours, support for a new concept was no surprise. The vitality of the textile industry has been amply demonstrated during the past year by its quick reaction to depreciation reform and the investment credit. You will recall that the Treasury, in accordance with the President's desire to give special attention to your difficult problems, put more liberal depreciation rates into effect for the textile industry in the fall of 1961, 9 months before the promulgation of the overall reform.

Your response was dramatic. Your expenditures during 1962 on new plant and equipment, excluding apparel, were $110 million, or 22 percent higher than in the previous year, whereas in the Nation's manufacturing industries as a whole expenditures increased by only 7 percent. And for the current quarter, your estimates of capital expenditures total $150 million—15 percent or $20 million higher than your actual expenditures in the first quarter of last year, again compared to a 7-percent increase for all manufacturing industries.

And now, following your lead, manufacturing industries as a whole are beginning to respond to depreciation reform and the investment credit. Corporate appropriations and new orders for all types of plant and equipment are mounting, foreshadowing an early and substantial increase in overall plant and equipment expenditures.

But important as they are, and will continue to be, depreciation reform and the investment credit were only a significant first step in the administration's efforts to achieve a free market economy that could perform more nearly and more consistently at capacity levels.

Consider, for a moment, the direct effect of the President's tax program on the incentives for business investment: The combined effect of the 7-percent investment credit and depreciation reform was to lower business tax liabilities by a total of $2.5 billion. President Kennedy's proposal to lower the corporate tax rate from 52 to 47 percent by 1965 will reduce those liabilities by another $2.5 billion. This total reduction of $5 billion a year in business tax liabilities will not only increase cash flow, but will also increase the profitability of business, hence offering a strong double stimulus to the incentives for investment that are the very foundation of our market economy.

But business will benefit perhaps even more from other measures in the tax pro-

gram. The reductions in personal rates will lower the taxes of millions of small firms which operate as individual proprietorships or partnerships, thus providing these businesses with additional internally generated funds to finance their expansion and modernization. In addition, the reductions in individual rates will raise the incentives for increased personal effort and risk-taking and will enlarge outside sources of money for business investment—directly through the stock purchases of individuals, and indirectly through their savings deposits and insurance policies.

The proposed reductions in the personal income tax would also greatly increase consumer demand which is the basic justification for any steady and long-range rise in business output. As leaders of an industry which depends heavily upon consumer demand, you are particularly well aware of how strongly business investment decisions turn upon present sales volumes and future sales prospects. Several weeks ago in Philadelphia, the president of Botany Industries predicted that if the proposed tax cuts become effective by July 1 of this year they could well result in a boom year for consumer goods industries. In fact, if as a result of the proposed tax program our economy approaches estimated levels of full employment output, then by the first quarter of 1966 we could expect annual personal consumption expenditures for clothing and shoes to be $2 to $2.5 billion, or some 7 percent higher than it would otherwise be.

But to describe separately the impact of rate reductions upon consumer demand and investment incentives ignores the fact that, in our complex economy, these reductions would interact continually upon each other. Increased consumer demand creates greater investment which, in turn, creates additional jobs and profits and further demand for both consumer goods and investment. Through this kind of interaction the President's tax program would release within the economy its own inherent powers for expansion and would reinvigorate the marketplace—the prime mover in our economic growth.

Our economy is undeniably growing, and we have made genuine progress over the past 2 years. But we are gaining far too little ground toward our goal of a full employment economy at near capacity levels. Last year, for example, we set new records in nearly every area of aggregate economic activity. Yet, in effect, we marked time in our rates of employment and capacity utilization.

Our record of five postwar recessions—two within the past 5 years—should drive home the fact that we cannot continue indefinitely at our present rate of growth without increasing the risk of recession and magnifying its impact should it occur. Certainly no one would predict a recession in the near future. But it would be a foolhardy man indeed who would rashly refuse to provide against its occurrence. Such provision is inherent in the President's tax program by the very fact that it offers a strong and permanent stimulus to the forces for growth within the economy.

For that reason, also, the President's tax program offers us an essential element of any long-range, realistic answer to the problem of Federal deficits. For, if we have learned anything from our postwar economic record, we have learned that our deficits result more from underproduction by the economy than from spending by the Government. In fiscal 1959, to cite an extreme example, an anticipated budget surplus of $466 million became, as a result of a recession, an actual deficit of $12.4 billion.

The lesson is clear: With our heavy burden of free world leadership in the cold war—a war that only last fall threatened to grow very hot indeed—we simply cannot hope to achieve balanced budgets unless our economy operates at full capacity. Paradoxical as it may seem to some, lower tax rates can bring us larger Government revenues from an economy operating at full speed, than can our present repressive rate structure from an economy that is prevented by that very rate structure from ever reaching its full potential. That is why today true fiscal responsibility demands a reduction in our tax burden.

Certainly no one welcomes the prospect of a deficit in this fiscal year and the next. The administration had hoped to present its tax program in conjunction with a balanced budget. But the growth of our economy has simply not kept pace with our increased national needs, and particularly with the needs forced upon us by considerations of national security. It can easily be demonstrated that if our economy had operated at relatively full capacity since 1957, the past 5 years would have shown an overall budget surplus, rather than the $30 billion deficit we have actually incurred.

The administration has presented its tax reduction program together with a budget for fiscal year 1964 in which civilian programs were stringently held below the levels of the current fiscal year. The entire budget increase was in response to the demands of defense, space, and interest on the national debt—demands which have accounted for nearly 73 percent of the total expenditure increases that have occurred during this administration. The President has also accompanied his tax proposals with a firm commitment that, as the tax cut becomes effective and the economy expands in response, a substantial part of the resulting revenue increases must go toward eliminating budgetary deficits until balance is once more achieved.

This program of expenditure control is an integral part of the President's tax recommendations. It is a practical program to seek out and eliminate soft spots in the budget. This is the responsible way to cut spending. It contrasts sharply with the extravagant claims we have recently been hearing so much of—claims that meat ax budget cuts are possible; claims that have a habit of vanishing into thin air when the time for action comes.

The President is making good on his pledge. He is already translating it into action. Since the submission of his 1964 budget only 2 months ago, he has sent to the Congress revisions which reduce his fiscal year 1964 requests by $126 million, and his 1963 requests by $236 million, or a total reduction of $362 million. These substantial cuts stand in sharp contrast to the recent action of the House of Representatives in increasing the authorization for defense expenditures over and above the President's recommendations.

Built into the tax program itself are two vital safeguards again an excessive budgetary impact: the phasing of the program over a 3-year period, and the revenue-raising reforms. As a result of these two measures—and particularly the reforms—the tax program is able to offer rate reductions far larger than would otherwise be acceptable.

The way to achieve the largest possible rate cuts—and thus the greatest economic stimulus—within the limits of fiscal responsibility, is to combine them with base-broadening tax reforms. And that is exactly what the President's program will do. The only fiscally responsible alternative—as I pointed out to the House Ways and Means Committee, and as was so clearly recognized in the recommendations submitted on your behalf by Mr. C. E. Connelly, chairman of your tax committee—would be a substantially smaller reduction in rates than the President has recommended. Whether at the bottom of the scale, at the top, in the middle, or all along, tax rates simply could not come down as much as we had hoped.

While talking of structural reforms, I should also point out that many of the reforms—those, for example, that involve income-averaging, deductibility of moving expenses, more favorable tax treatment of expenditures on equipment used in research and development—would either relieve hardship or encourage economic growth.

In addition, when we consider tax revision we cannot lightly dismiss the ever-present need for equity and simplicity. A number of the provisions in our current tax code are justified primarily by our oppressively high rate structure. Since lower rates would remove the main reason for their existence, we have recommended that they be modified or repealed.

The President's program represents a fair balance between the goals of revenue, growth, equity, and simplicity. It does not satisfy those who have long recommended far-reaching reforms that would radically alter the nature of our tax system. Neither does it satisfy those who have cried for a "quickie" tax cut with no consideration for anything else. The President's program is a rounded program, a moderate program. Coupled with firm but realistic expenditure control, it can generate a strong upward lift throughout our economy, while still adhering to the requirements of fiscal responsibility.

Through a balanced combination of increased incentives to invest, and increased consumer demand, it will permit our citizens to produce more, earn more, buy more, and invest more. In this way it can set us well on the way toward achieving our major long-range economic aim: a free market economy which utilizes all of its abundant resources of men, money, and machines, and which offers to every American the incentives and the opportunities to prosper in accordance with his capacities.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY ROBERT T. STEVENS

Mr. Secretary, permit me to say once more how honored we are to have you with us and we know, certainly I know, and appreciate your efforts looking toward a more dynamic American economy in the overall picture of the world situation as being in the final analysis the best defense not only of the United States but also of the free world.

I would like if I may to make an observation in regard to your remarks which I have heard for the first time as you made them in their reference to the commitment of the President to budgetary and fiscal policy. I like them and believe in them exactly as you have said them for us.

I think, however, in this presence it is not out of order in the most respectful manner, Mr. Secretary, to say and express the hope that you will carry back with you the fact that there are Presidential commitments in respect to the problems of this industry. Personally I am deeply satisfied the President intends to carry these out, but many others in this room will join me in feeling that it is surprising, if not astonishing, that the Chief Executive Officer of our great country, the President of the United States, has been unable for one reason or another, to carry out up to this time, the commitments which he made in good faith and which he stands behind today and which are now approaching the 2-year-old mark. So that I sincerely hope, Mr. Secretary, you can carry back with you the respectful, the constructive and the sincere thinking of this group of people in the textile business that we do have the faith. We know he will discharge this obligation. But, frankly, Rome is burning.

Orbiting of H-Bomb Hinted by Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a news analysis by staff reporter Howard Simons which appeared in the Washington Post edition of March 27. I believe this is a thought-provoking analysis which will be of interest to my colleagues:

SOVIET HINT ABOUT ORBITING H-BOMB PRESENTS U.S. EXPERTS WITH DILEMMA

(By Howard Simons)

Repeated Soviet hints that they can and might orbit nuclear weapons in space have presented U.S. weapons experts with this dilemma:

Militarily, an atomic or hydrogen bomb in orbit offers no apparent advantage over present and planned earth-launched intercontinental ballistic missile systems. Indeed, an orbiting bomb has fewer advantages at the present time.

But psychologically, a Soviet bomb in orbit could have a devastating impact if one morning Americans awoke to learn that someone up there didn't like them.

The most recently publicized Soviet hint about nuclear weapons in space was disclosed this month by Air Force Lt. Gen. James Ferguson. Ferguson told a congressional committee that Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky noted recently that an important problem now is warfare with artificial earth satellites, which can be launched for diverse reasons, even as carriers of nuclear weapons.

FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF

Sokolovsky, onetiem chief of staff of the Soviet armed forces, is known to be one of Russia's top military strategists.

Mindful of the repeated Soviet suggestions about orbiting nuclear weapons, Defense Department experts have continually studied and reviewed such weapons systems for possible use in the U.S. arsenal. But to date no study or review has demonstrated that such a weapons system can effectively compete against present weapons systems with the same aim—to devastate an enemy.

Indeed, the Air Force, which has sought long and hard to define possible military roles in space, has never advocated bombs in orbit.

This is not to say that Pentagon weapons planners have foreclosed on the possibility that nuclear weapons may find a place in space someday. They have not.

NEED TO COUNTER

However, for the present, Pentagon experts are convinced that the greatest threat of space-borne nuclear weapons would be psychological, even though Americans have apparently learned to accept a more serious threat—from Soviet ICBM's that presumably are already pointed at U.S. targets.

One official speculated that if the Soviets elected, for their own strategic or political reasons, to orbit hydrogen bombs, the United States might be forced to do likewise. This would be not because the orbiting Soviet weapons would constitute a serious military imbalance, but because the administration might have to counter the psychological, political, and propaganda gains that would accrue to the Soviets.

Who do American defense planners discount orbiting bombs as advantageous weapons?

Essentially, experts both in and out of the Government are convinced that for the present, land and undersea-based ICBM's can do everything that an orbiting bomb would be able to do, and do it far more effectively and accurately.

Although Defense Department officials are limited in what they can discuss about bombs in orbit, Ralph Lapp, nuclear physicist and author, is not. In a recent speech, Lapp told why he does not think an orbital weapon is a good investment.

REASONS MATCH

Lapp's reasons closely match those known to be held by Pentagon experts. These include:

An orbital weapon payload is much smaller than one that can be hurled at ICBM range by a rocket of equal thrust.

Accuracy of delivery from orbit is scarcely likely to compete with present ICBM accuracy.

The launching of an orbital arsenal would inevitably involve a significant number of bombs accidentally returning to earth or being lost in space. The very enterprise might well be taken as an act of war.

Prolonged in-orbit times raise the requirements for command and control systems. Once in orbit, a weapon and its carrier would be subject to mishap by an artificial radiation belt, or just old-age crippling of highly sensitive and highly complex electronic components. As such, one could never be certain that when the button is pushed the weapon would fire.

WEAPONS EXPENSIVE

Moreover, orbital weapons are expensive and require an immense technological effort. And, until such time as satellites can be readily maneuvered in space, orbital weapons are a "sitting duck" whose every place above the earth can be accurately predicted.

An orbiting bomb can be set off in two ways. The first is to detonate it at a certain altitude above a target where it can sear and singe the target area. The second way is to bring it down on the target in the same way that Vostoks and Mercury capsules are brought down to a predetermined landing area.

As regards detonation at high altitudes, estimates of present satellite launching capabilities and studies of what happens when a nuclear blast occurs in space indicate that detonations at altitudes that can seriously hurt an enemy are impractical.

As regards bringing the orbiting bomb down upon a target, experience with manned spacecraft and other recoverable capsules indicates that the accuracy of guiding such vehicles to a specific target is still too imperfect to guarantee hitting the target.

It is for these reasons that Lapp, as well as Pentagon experts, consider orbiting bombs as "a highly dubious military enterprise."

From Milk to Mink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Morning Herald, Hagerstown, Md., on Monday, March 18, 1963, entitled "From Milk to Mink," which points out so vividly the situation facing our farmers due to the Government's farm shenanigans.

The editorial follows:

FROM MILK TO MINK

Back in 1961, when Agriculture Secretary Freeman asked permission of Congress to dump Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of feed grains onto the market, the American Farm Bureau warned that such an action "would ultimately adversely affect poultry, dairy, and livestock production and prices for those commodities."

But, somewhere in the labyrinthal workings of our farm program, the feed grain stocks got dumped, and down went the poultry, dairy, and livestock prices, as predicted.

The cheaper feed grains caused farmers to enlarge herds and flocks, and the resulting bonanza of milk, eggs, beef, pork, and other products sent prices plunging. The plunge was helped, in some cases, by the Internal Revenue Service's stiff expense account regulations, but the plunge would have occurred, in any case.

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, Farm Bureau president, now is pleading with Congress to hold up any new action of Mr. Freeman's feed grain program until the wheat referendum is voted upon by farmers, and then consider wheat and feed grains together. They have to be considered together by sensible men, because wheat can be used as a feed grain, and because wheat farmers and feed grain farmers may be the same people quite often.

Mr. Shuman points out that the fall in livestock prices cost farmers more than the feed grain payments gained them. He makes a persuasive case for trying to take time enough to work some sense into new legislation.

Meanwhile, Charles A. Smith, of the Necanicum Fur Farm, Oregon, doesn't care. He got so fed up with Government farm shenanigans that he quit raising cattle and dairy products. Now he just raises mink, and hopes it will be some years before the Government moves from milk to mink.

City people might hope that something sensible comes out of Washington before the rest of the farmers, in desperation, do likewise.

National Lutheran Council Resolutions Support the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many of us as Members of Congress and as citizens believe the United Nations with all its shortcomings is mankind's hope for a world of peace and human progress. Others would have the United States withdraw from the world body to isolationism.

In view of this controversy it is encouraging to those of us who believe in the U.N. that a highly respected and prominent religious group represented by the National Lutheran Council gave its support to the U.N. at their 45th annual meeting held recently in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the resolution which makes a strong case for world order and the United Nations:

The National Lutheran Council, having received the memorandum of the Commission of the Churches on international affairs regarding selected actions of the 17th Assembly of the United Nations and taking note that the United Nations has continued to serve effectively as—

A forum for world opinion, where representatives of more than 100 nations express their positions and share in decisions on matters of world concern;

A meeting place for the discussion and resolution of international tensions, and as a center of influence toward the orderly reduction of armaments and the peaceful uses of nuclear power;

An agency through which the nations have been able to establish peacemaking and peacekeeping machinery, whereby in some instances serious threats of worldwide conflict have been reduced;

A channel of cooperation among the nations for scientific study and technological advance;

A coordinator and administrator of efforts being made to assist developing nations through the decade of development, the U.N. Special Fund, expanded program of technical assistance, regional economic commissions, and in other ways;

A primary force in mounting an organized attack on disease through the World Health Organization, and on hunger through the Food and Agriculture Organization and the freedom-from-hunger campaign;

A means of developing a world conscience against injustice, inequality, and inhumanity through the formulation of covenants on human rights, including religious liberty, freedom, the status of women, and other matters, and as a vehicle for specific assistance to victims of international disputes, such as the Arab refugees; and

A symbol of the God-given aspirations of men toward responsible international conduct and more brotherly relationships among men;

1. Expresses its gratitude for the United Nations not only as a forum of world opinion and a useful instrument of national policy, but also as an agency which is making a significant contribution to the welfare of mankind;

2. Encourages the Government of the United States to continue its strong support of the United Nations as a means of interpreting and extending the ideals of our Nation in an international setting, as an effective way of making a contribution toward the alleviation of human suffering, and as a major factor contributing to the development of more peaceful, just, and orderly relationships among nations and peoples;

3. Commends those representatives of both the religious and secular press and the broadcast media who have made responsible efforts to interpret the United Nations and its work, and in view of the importance of understanding this principal organ of international cooperation, encourages them to continue and intensify such efforts;

4. Recognizes the service and dedication of the many Christians who along with others are fulfilling their vocations and serving humanity by working in or with the United Nations, and remembers in particular that two gifted and courageous sons of the Lutheran Church, Count Folke Bernadotte and Dag Hammarskjold, have given their lives in this service;

5. Calls upon Christians in our land to make greater efforts to know and understand the United Nations, its strengths and weaknesses, its problems and achievements, to the end that intelligent and prayerful support may be given to the efforts of nations to regulate their affairs for the best interests of all humanity.

U.S. Industry Battles Measurement Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Evening Star and one of its staff writers, Don Bacon, for an excellent article appearing in the March 22 issue pertaining to the work of the National Bureau of Standards. The title of the article is "Alarmed U.S. Industry Battles Measurement Gap."

The Bureau of Standards is one of the unsung heroes in the continuing effort to put science in the fore. The things they do at the Bureau are not the glamorous breakthroughs that fascinate America. They are the essential and indispensable efforts that allow us to proceed with celerity in applying the fruits of scientific discoveries to our everyday economy.

Dr. Allan Astin, the Director of the National Bureau of Standards, and the fine staff he has assembled have brought honor and dignity to our country.

Here is the splendid article by Don Bacon:

ALARMED U.S. INDUSTRY BATTLES MEASUREMENT GAP—THE NEED FOR APPLYING FINITE ACCURACY GROWS

(By Don Bacon)

Manufacturing industries in the United States are becoming increasingly alarmed over an old problem: their inability to measure accurately.

Errors in judging such things as size, weight, and temperature can be responsible for failures in space, for air disasters and for the sometimes unreliable performance of consumer items like automobiles and washing machines.

Experts in the burgeoning science of measurement estimate that these mistakes cause waste costing billions of dollars each year. Measurement errors in the area of space exploration alone have added several hundred million dollars to the Federal budget, they figure.

ADVANCES UNUSED

Technical advances, which have mushroomed over the last 5 years, are staying locked in the laboratories because science and industry have not yet been able to develop the exacting standards of measurement required for their adaptation to everyday life.

"Industry is demanding more accuracy more rapidly than it is likely to get it," comments William A. Wildhack, Associate Director of the National Bureau of Standards, where the most exacting measurements are made and where most of the research in the field is conducted.

Moreover, measurement problems, particularly in the aerospace and electronics industries, are increasing. Industry calls the situation "the measurement gap," and this gap between scientific potential and its current practical limitations is considered quite serious.

One aerospace company, for instance, says it could reduce the number of times it test-fires its rocket engines, at a cost of $125,000 a test in fuel alone, if accurate temperature measurement methods were available.

GYROSCOPE ERROR

Another company notes that an error of one-millionth of an inch in the bore of a gyroscope can cause a rocket to miss the moon by a thousand miles or so.

Accurate measurement to the millionth of an inch is a common requirement of modern industry. In setting up his first assembly line, Henry Ford never worried about tolerances that close, but in making a complicated radio, smaller than a postage stamp, today's assembly line worker does.

Advanced defense systems, space hardware and electronic computers demand extreme accuracy in their manufacture. Often, according to Mr. Wildhack, new military contracts are awarded even though the Government and industry know full well that no means are yet available to meet the exacting degree of accuracy they will require.

The science of measurement, of course, has not been standing still. "We are trying to keep up," says Mr. Wildhack, "but the needs of industry are extremely diffuse and hard to find."

GREAT STRIDES MADE

Great strides, nevertheless, have been made in man's ability to measure, particularly since the rise of the Soviet space challenge.

Industry can, for example, measure the temperature of a jet engine to within a few degrees of accuracy.

It can measure the thickness of a film to 0.0000001 (a tenth of a millionth) of an inch.

It can accurately weigh items, or measure the thrust of a rocket engine, up to about 100,000 pounds.

It can build a clock that will gain or lose only 1 second every 1,000 years.

These advances in determining temperature, time, length and mass, the four basic measurements, are striking, but not good enough to meet present and future industrial demands.

Measuring the 4,000° F. heat of a jet engine (an error of 15° may cause the engine to fall apart) seems easy when compared to the immense problems involved in determining the temperature (perhaps as much as 100,000,000°) of a thermonuclear fireball.

Despite progress in the high-temperature measurement field, electric power companies still waste millions of dollars worth of fuel and power because they cannot accurately determine the heat of their furnaces.

The situation has vastly changed, but for many years measurement standards were well ahead of the needs of industry.

The standard of length, which helped to make possible America's mass-production techniques, was a slim bar of platinum, 1 meter long. A manufacturer needed only to compare his own measuring equipment with the official standard of length, the meter bar, and he could be sure his products were on the same scale as all others in the country. A gear made in Cleveland, for example, could be fitted in a car assembled in Detroit.

The meter bar, however, is no longer accurate enough. Machine tool manufacturers, for instance, have to produce bearings precise to the two-millionths of an inch, a demand that the simple meter bar cannot guarantee.

NITROGEN WAVELENGTH

To help meet these new industrial requirements, length is now determined, under international agreement, by the wavelength of the orange-red light emitted by a Krypton-86 lamp in a liquid nitrogen bath. This space-age ruler is much more accurate.

Time, another age-old measurement problem, has also undergone some changes. Al-

though the United States is officially still on solar time, which can be measured accurately to within 1 second in 30 years, the Government's official time broadcasts are really based on the nearly precise waves of energy given off by the cesium atom. Left alone for a thousand years, the atomic clock would be off only about a second.

The Aerospace Industries Association recently surveyed 70 of its member firms to find out their needs in calibration (checking instruments against a known standard to detect variations in accuracy). The survey turned up more than 100 areas where existing measuring techniques were deficient.

Examining the results, the Bureau of Standards noted that in many cases "the accuracy required was not available."

"This survey clearly showed the immediate need for more basic research on measurement problems and increased industrywide dissemination of calibration procedures," the Bureau said.

Nyasaland Leaders Visit United States—Nyasaland Newspaper Praises American Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I had the great pleasure a few days ago in Washington of meeting two distinguished African leaders at a luncheon arranged in their honor by the Honorable Chester Bowles, the President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs.

These leaders were the Honorable Murray William Kanyama Chiume, Minister of Education, Social Development and Information of Nyasaland; and Masauko Chipembere, Minister of Local Government of Nyasaland.

Both these African Government officials are in the United States under the State Department leadership program and are visiting a number of cities and States in our country with particular attention to seeing our schools and universities and to discussing problems of local government.

At the same time that I had an opportunity to talk with Mr. Chiume and Mr. Chipembere, I was shown a copy of the Malawi News, a newspaper published in Nyasaland and was especially interested to read a front page article in this newspaper, dated January 18, 1963, discussing the work of American Peace Corps volunteers in Nyasaland.

The article pays a most impressive tribute to the work of the Peace Corps volunteers as well as to the outstanding work of a U.S. Foreign Service officer stationed in that country.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

"YOU WILL HELP US EXPAND OUR EDUCATION," KAMUZU TELLS AMERICAN PEACE CORPS

BLANTYRE, Thursday.—Welcoming the 42 American Peace Corps volunteers who have come to Malawi to help in teaching in secondary schools, Ngwazi Dr. Kamuzu Banda, Prime Minister of Malawi and life President of the mighty Malawi Congress Party, said that he had asked for them to help "us expand our secondary school education. With your help, we hope to have a secondary school in every district," he added.

The Ngwazi was addressing the Peace Corps volunteers at Soche Hill College, the new teachers training center in Blantyre where they are having a short orientation course organized by the Ministry of Education.

The young American volunteers arrived in the country on Tuesday to help in teaching in secondary schools. Their coming is a result of the negotiations between Ngwazi Dr. Kamuzu Banda and President Kennedy of the United States of America.

Kamuzu told the Peace Corps, "We have a bottleneck at the high school level. We have not got enough secondary schools. That is why," he added, "I have asked for you, Peace Corps to help us expand our secondary education. With your help, we hope to have a secondary school in every district."

With a broad smile, the Ngwazi said, "It is a great pleasure to me to be here this morning to welcome the Peace Corps which has come to work for this country and amongst our people. I thought I would come myself to welcome the Peace Corps because I asked for them. I wrote to President Kennedy.

The Ngwazi explained that he made arrangements with the President to get the Peace Corps come to this country. President Kennedy was willing and cooperative, he said. "As a result," the doctor said, "not only the Peace Corps, but other friends from the United States are in this country helping us. But the biggest group, the largest number that has come to us at one time is you. So I thought it was fit and proper that I should come and welcome you myself."

Acknowledging the U.S. Government assistance, the Ngwazi paid tribute to Mr. Remole, the American Consul here. He said, "Before I begin to say anything about our country, I would like to express my gratitude to the Government of the United States and President Kennedy for taking personal interest in this country. The President of the United States would not have taken interest in the subjects reported to him without his high officials supporting us on the situation and problems in our country."

PRAISES U.S. OFFICIALS

The doctor praised Mr. Remole, "We have a good man in this country. I refer now to Mr. Remole, the American Consul in Blantyre. We in Nyasaland do not only like and admire him but also love him. Since he came to this country he has taken much trouble to learn about us in order to really know us. He is the only white man so far as I know who really gets around the people so as to get to know them. He went everywhere in the country, even to Nkhota Kota Conference in 1960 to collect information for himself. As a result of it our case has been put across effectively in Washington."

Kamuzu related that he and his people were labeled extremists because of demanding for the "breakup of their stupid Federation and the granting of self-government to this country." He told the Peace Corps, "You have been told about this country by the newspapers. You have read about us. You have heard about us on the radio. The picture you have about us is not a very, very pleasant one. I and my people, particularly my people of the Malawi Congress Party, have been branded as extremists, xenophobic. Why all this? he asked. "You have come just at the very best time to be in this country," he said. "All this has been levelled at us because after many years overseas my people recalled me home to do two things: to break their stupid Federation and to get my people self-government. And when I came in 1958, I did not beat about the bush. I had come to break their stupid Federation and to get self-government. If that meant death for me, I was ready for it. Because of that I was condemned."

Condemning the Central African Federation, the Ngwazi asked, "What was this Federation? What is the so-called Federation? In my opinion," he said, "and from what I known, federation is a state built by states which are either already independent or about to be independent which come together by their own choice. For instance," he explained, "in your case, the 13 States after winning their independence decided to form a Federation. The same was true with Australia.

"In Central Africa," the doctor said, "it was a scheme cooked by European settlers of Rhodesia in order to gain political power over Africans of central Africa, as they are doing with the Africans of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. They said," he recalled, "they wanted federation for political defense and communications reasons. But the real reason was political. Why do I say that?" He added, "In 1951, Sir Godfrey Huggins, Roy Welensky demanded for the scheme. The talk about federation started in 1915. In 1931 it was amalgamation. In that year there was a man in the colonial office called Sydney Webb or Lord Passfield who issued a memorandum that in Africa when the interests of the immigrant community conflicted with those of the Africans, the interests of the Africans should be paramount. It was that statement that made the settlers of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and some in Nyasaland want to get rid of colonial rule so that they could extend to the northern territories the rule of Southern Rhodesia. In 1938 the British Government sent a commission. The commission collected information in all the three territories. The report of the commission did not recommend an amalgamation. After the Second World War, the settlers, on the fear that their objectives could not be achieved, changed from amalgamation to federation and talked about defense and communications I know what they wanted, so I opposed the scheme. In 1953, the Tory government imposed the scheme.

He went on. "My people called me in 1957 and I came in 1958 to break the Federation and get self-government, Because of that, they condemned me as an agitator, a man who hated white men just because they were white. They imprisoned me and from jail, I went to London and got a new constitution, and under that constitution my party won the elections. Even then, they said I had no people to run the Government but with the material in my hands, I began to work and even my political opponents in London admit that I am not doing so badly."

SPEAKS ON RACE RELATIONS

Speaking on the race relations in the country, the Ngwazi said, "The picture you have of us is of people who hate others. That is not true. I am glad at least Mr.

Remole knows that. We are not against white men in this country. We are against domination—domination of one race over the other—domination of Europeans over Africans.

"I have broken their stupid Federation and very soon this country will be an independent, sovereign state. Mr. Remole will tell you that over 3 years ago the situation was tense. Now there is peace and calm, friendship amongst races and whites and Africans mingle at social gatherings. You do not see that in Southern and Northern Rhodesias."

The doctor explained why he was saying all that. He said, "I say all this because I want you to write back home that we have no hatred. All we say is that Nyasaland is a black man's country on a black man's continent and since we are in the majority we must rule. We concede no one the right to judge what we are. We mean to be masters in our own country.

"Any European who accepts that this is a black man's country has nothing to fear. But the other kind that has southern Rhodesia or South Africa ideas, I say to him 'pack up and go now.' There is no place for you. This is our home whether or not we are educated or civilized; we mean to run this country as we think it best."

On their arrival at Chileka Airport, members of the Peace Corps were received by Mr. Paul Geven, the American counsul general who came from Salisbury, and Mr. Remole, American counsul in the country; Mr. Aleke Banda, assistant secretary of the Malawi Congress Party and editor of Salawi News and members of the League of Malawi Youth.

Next Monday, Mr. Kanyama Chiume, Minister of Education, will address the Peace Corps on the subject of educational system in this country.

Mr. John U. Tembo, Deputy Minister of Finance, will also speak to the Peace Corps on Tuesday. He will speak on the Malawi's 3-year development plan.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

West Virginia Is Proud of Goodyear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as you drive along Route 2, the Ohio River Road, midway between Huntington and Point Pleasant, W. Va., you reach one of the most modern industrial facilities in the entire region, the $12 million plant of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

There are great industrial opportunities in the booming Ohio River valley, and few concerns have taken better advantage of these opportunities than Goodyear. Half a dozen years ago, the electric news streaked through West Virginia that Goodyear planned to construct a new plant at Apple Grove, devoted to some strange new products which seemed a far cry from the automobile tires which our fathers always associated with Goodyear.

ACCIDENTAL DISCOVERY

Actually, the Goodyear chemists 20 years ago were bent over their test tubes and microscopes in a restless laboratory search for a fiber which would make an improved cord for tires. When the chemists came up with their answers, they came close to being fired because they produced fibers which were useless for making tire cord. Fortunately, the moguls of Goodyear told them: "Go on back to your test tubes and see what you have produced." Out of this polyester research came a new polyester resin. The researchers never dreamed they would be producing something which might revolutionize the textile industry and the building industry.

The magic new products were Vitel, a resin from which manmade, synthetic fibers are spun; and Videne, a laminating film with tough, resistant qualities.

The Appalachian Electric Power Co., which has done so much aggressive work for West Virginia industrial development, negotiated the sale of a 300-acre tract along the Ohio River so that Goodyear could have the elbow room to manufacture these new products. It scarcely seems possible that less than 5 years ago, on May 15 1958, ground was broken at Apple Grove, W. Va., for the new Goodyear plant. As a bulldozer took a tentative bite from the rich soil to symbolize the groundbreaking, national, State, local and industrial leaders were there to point to the significance of the great event. They were mighty men, men of vision, some of whom have moved upward to greater responsibilities, some whom God has called to eternal duties. There was George E. Hervey, district manager of the Appalachian Power Co., whose magnificent achievements in the Point Pleasant region are too numerous to mention. Mr. Hervey leaves today for an even more challenging assignment in flood-torn Logan, W. Va. There was the late U.S. Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., a tireless, dedicated worker for greater industrial development in West Virginia. Point Pleasant was also represented by Mayor B. W. Krodel and Chamber of Commerce President John Hushion. Jack Lloyd, aggressive young industrial development representative of the Appalachian Electric Power Co., who has also moved up the ladder of responsibility, was present, as was Stanley C. Higgins representing Governor Underwood. And then there was the boldly imaginative Goodyear plant manager, Swedish-born Oka Carlson.

WHY WEST VIRGINIA?

We asked why Goodyear would decide to locate in West Virginia. The answer was that West Virginia provided the best river, rail and truck transportation facilities, a good labor supply, and a good geographic location for distribution of the Goodyear product.

Work proceed rapidly on the five-story main building, which provides 100,000 square feet of floorspace. Four years ago, in 1959, production got underway. The miracle in the Ohio Valley actually happened. Spreading over the level acres once devoted to a truck farm, the mighty industrial facility was in production.

One of the fairly obvious but much talked-about discoveries which the Goodyear plant managers made was that West Virginians proved to be conscientious, steady, dependable, and highly productive employees. Some of them drive great distances to get to Apple Grove. Many of them live in Point Pleasant, that warm and fast thriving community 15 miles north. Enriching Point Pleasant with their energy and community spirit was a new group of Goodyear plant executives, who played an important role in civic activities.

Steady employment was provided for 120 workers, and the Point Pleasant plant built up to provide a yearly payroll of $850,000. The vitel produced at the Point Pleasant plant is utilized by Beaunit Mills, Inc., which produces vycron, for extensive use in shirts, suits, dresses, and other textile products. The videne laminating film is used to laminate textiles, metal, wood, paper and plastics. Important new uses in the housing construction industry may multiply the production of videne in the coming months.

A NEW EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Point Pleasant plant has just started an expansion program which will increase capacity by 50 percent. The construction of these additional facilities will start right away. It is expected that the expansion will be completed by September. These new process facilities are being added in order to boost the production of what is called pelletized resin, from which manmade fibers are spun for clothing and other textiles. This expansion signals another forward surge of activity in the industrial Ohio Valley.

West Virginia is proud of Goodyear. West Virginia is proud of the new industrial growth in the Point Pleasant area, which adds up to a brighter future for the people of Mason County and the Ohio Valley.

Future Farmers of America Do Fine Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during Future Farmers of America Week, which was February 16–23, the Bowie News of Bowie, Tex., published a remarkably informative newspaper concerning the immeasurable importance of this organization.

One article in the paper was written by Mr. Jarrell D. Gray, head of the Department of Agricultural Education of East Texas State College.

Because it emphasizes the preparatory work for college that is done by FFA, and because this organization, the vocational agriculture teachers who direct it, and all those who work in it, are deserving of the highest recognition, I ask unanimous consent that the news article by Mr. Gray be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bowie (Tex.) News, Feb. 21, 1963]

FFA GOOD GROUNDWORK FOR COLLEGE

(By Jarrell D. Gray)

A college education is worth approximately $100,000 more than a high school education.

According to the U.S. census information, a person with 4 years of college education can expect to earn in his lifetime approximately $100,000 more than a person with only a high school education.

With the increased emphasis that is on education in our present time, it behooves the high school student to consider further educational achievements. Such increased emphasis will no doubt continue as we progress further into the space age.

Of course there are many reasons for one obtaining a college education. Increased earning capacity is only one—and perhaps a minor one at that. For most people, a college education is valuable because it provides

them an opportunity to be of further help to their fellow man, gives one a feeling of achievement, increases his potentials for acquiring and progressing in occupational positions, and adds economical security for himself and his family.

The high school student who is making plans to attend college is naturally concerned with preparing himself for college work. How, then does participating in the organization of Future Farmers of America increase one's chances for success in college?

The FFA is most beneficial in two areas—the area of leadership training and the area of scientific agriculture.

Why is training in leadership and scientific agriculture important for success in college and how does the FFA help students in these areas?

A partial answer to these questions is found in a recent scientific study among college students to determine the success of college students with and without agricultural training in high school. It was found that students who had had vocational agriculture in high school did as well as, or, in most instances, better than those students who did not have such training. Students having had vocational agriculture in high school were found to be more persistent in their college work. Such students who were studying agriculture, engineering, education, and arts and science had higher grade averages than those without vo-ag training.

Results from a study indicate that courses in vocational agriculture are acceptable as preparation for students who pursue a program in either an agricultural or a nonagricultural college.

Results such as these are no doubt brought about by the fact that students studying vocational agriculture in high school and who belong to the FFA receive much training that is most beneficial in college.

In FFA judging contests, for example, students must know much scientific agriculture in order to make proper selections of animals, crops, plants, and meats. They must also exercise good judgement in such selections. There, knowledge and judgment have a carryover in college that is of great value.

Through FFA leadership training, students learn many skills that are beneficial throughout life, regardless of whether they pursue an agricultural or nonagricultural occupation. This leadership training is also most beneficial to college students. The outstanding students in any college are those who are leaders.

To provide the leadership training, FFA members spend considerable time studying parliamentary procedure, radio broadcasting, farm skill demonstrations, and public speaking.

Becoming proficient in any of these areas makes it possible for one to become a better college leader. The college student, to be most effective, must be able to lead others. To do this, he must possess the ability to speak properly and to preside efficiently at group meetings. Acquiring these leadership abilities in high school gives him a distinct advantage in college.

The high school student, then, who is bound for college can feel certain that experiences gained in FFA will do much to increase his chances for success in college, regardless of whether he is preparing for an occupation related to agriculture or whether he is preparing for one in a nonagricultural occupation. He may also feel certain that his college education will pay dividends in later life through increased earning capacities or through self-satisfaction of being able to render greater contributions to one's fellow man, to our society and to our democratic way of life.

FBI Does 1962 Job Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Michigan City, Ind., News-Dispatch published an editorial on Tuesday, January 8, 1963, calling to public attention that the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1962 did a job "well done."

This editorial has been called to my attention by Mr. Richard L. Scholl, vice president and general manager of the Arno Adhesive Tapes, Inc., at Michigan City. In his letter, Mr. Scholl said he felt that this matter deserved attention of all Members of Congress and he suggested that the editorial titled "Well Done, FBI" be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that not only the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, but also Mr. Scholl's fine letter commending the FBI.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARNO ADHESIVE TAPES, INC.,
Michigan City, Ind., March 18, 1963.

The Honorable VANCE HARTKE,
State House, Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Attached is a copy of an editorial that appeared in the Michigan City News-Dispatch concerning the 1962 accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

If you have not already seen and digested this report, I respectfully suggest you do so, as soon as time permits.

This is one Federal Bureau that is giving the citizens and taxpayers their money's worth, and more. What a shining example for the other agencies, bureaus, departments, et cetera to follow.

This outstanding record should be brought to the attention of all our Senators and Congressmen, and a vote of thanks and appreciation recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,
ARNO ADHESIVE TAPES, INC.,
RICHARD L. SCHOLL,
Vice President and General Manager.

[From the Michigan City (Ind.) News-Dispatch, Jan. 8, 1963]

WELL DONE, FBI

By custom, FBI agents toil in quiet anonymity, preferring effectiveness to personal glory. Consequently the public often is unaware how well these modernday "untouchables" fight crime.

Appreciation of the FBI's remarkable record can be gleaned from Director J. Edgar Hoover's year-end report to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Here, briefly, are a few of the things FBI men accomplished in 1962:

1. Apprehended 11,400 fugitives, compared with 10,668 in 1961; provided evidence which led to 12,700 convictions against 12,418 the prior year.

2. Ran up a total of fines, savings, and recoveries well over $200 million—considerably more than it costs to operate the FBI and much higher than 1961's $148.4 million.

3. Located 19,000 cars stolen and driven out of State—and 2,500 fugitive felons for local authorities.

4. Processed 23,000 fingerprint cards a day while maintaining an unmatched identification file that contains 165 million sets of prints from an estimated 77 million persons.

5. Made 236,000 scientific laboratory examinations of evidence for local police in all 50 States, without charge.

6. Assisted, upon request, in more than 3,600 local and regional police schools—and trained another 165 picked lawmen at the famed FBI National Academy, bringing the Academy's graduate total of 4,258 since 1935.

7. Furnished more than 100,000 items of criminal intelligence to other law-enforcement agencies, resulting in some 2,400 arrests and $32.5 million in recoveries—plus the smashing of an international dope ring and seizure of $20 million worth of illicit drugs.

On the security front, the FBI continued to enfeeble the Communists' American apparatus; nabbed three pro-Castro saboteurs and seized their cache of explosives; caught a Navy man passing military secrets to the Russians and developed evidence leading to the expulsion of several Communist-bloc diplomats.

In addition, it was largely the FBI which turned up witnesses and information leading to conviction of the U.S. Communist Party as an organization for failure to register with the Attorney General—a decision which puts American Reds in a tighter straitjacket.

In the South, FBI agents turned up church burners who tried by intimidation to keep Negroes from the polls. In Chicago—for the first time in years—they brought gangland killers (of union official John Kilpatrick) to justice and ultimately to prison.

Impressive as it is, the FBI's record of accomplishment is not the only reason Americans should be grateful to Director Hoover and his quiet crime fighters. There are others even more important.

No police agency in the world is more scrupulously considerate of individual rights. None works more harmoniously with other lawmen. And rare indeed is the police force anywhere in the world which can match the FBI's dedication of purpose and incorruptibility.

If you feel, as we do, that these splendid public servants deserve a "Well done," why not say so in a letter to the Director? The address is: J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington 25, D.C.

Our County Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are proud of the wonderful work that has been done by the Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with land-grant colleges over the Nation.

The work of the Extension Service in Tennessee has been outstanding in every respect. In the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee, which I have the honor of representing, we have outstanding men and women who are certainly devoted to this work. Their con-

tributions have meant much in the years gone by in helping the economy of our section of Tennessee.

There recently appeared in the States-Graphic, an outstanding weekly newspaper, published at Brownsville, Tenn., of which J. Owen Burgess is the editor, an editorial which expresses the feelings of the people in our congressional district.

This editorial is so outstanding and so well deserved that I thought it should be called to the attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

OUR COUNTY AGENTS

Our county, like most counties with a predominant agricultural income, depends a great deal on its county agents.

They not only must have the answers to technical questions concerning agriculture and related subjects but must be qualified to share in family problems of a personal and social nature.

Our county agents, J. D. Pettigrew, Joe Martin, and Mrs. June Walker, seem to have all the qualities that are necessary in technical as well as extracurricular departments.

Thanks to them we have a well-organized Feeder Calf & Pig Association, an active 4-H Club organization and growing home demonstration clubs throughout the county.

We take great pleasure in commending this group for their fine leadership and successful efforts.

Self-Regulation in the Securities Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday next, the Securities and Exchange Commission is reporting to the Congress on the results of its study this past year and a half of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of the stock exchanges and of national securities associations.

In view of the imminence of this report, and of the fact that the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, contemplates that both the exchange and over-the-counter markets should be substantially self-governed by certain rules for the protection of investors, I think it appropriate to bring to the attention of the Members of the House, a speech by William L. Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

This address before the Investment Bankers Association of America last November 28, 1962, entitled: "Self-Regulation in the Securities Industry" is as follows:

SELF-REGULATION IN THE SECURITIES INDUSTRY

I

Self-regulation is a concept more widely cited and relied upon in the securities industry than in any other specifically subject to regulation by Federal agencies. Indeed, it has the imprimatur of statute, in the 1934 act's provisions relating to exchanges as well as the more elaborate effort at regulating the over-the-counter market through the Maloney amendment. This is as it should be: we are dealing with business practices, the spectrum of ways in which day-to-day financial transactions are being conducted, and with evolving standards. No one, including even the most hardened bureaucrat, would conceive that the Government can or should prescribe a fully detailed pattern of doing business fairly.

Self-regulation is a phrase that calls for definition. Some think it means total autonomy. My effort today is to convey some impression of what self-regulation means to the Securities and Exchange Commission, and how it can flourish. I should like to suggest that it means autonomy somewhat in the same relative sense as the SEC is said to be autonomous. We are called an independent regulatory agency. But anyone who thinks we are completely independent has not been long in Washington. We are subject to oversight, by the Congress. And that is as it should be. I am always mindful of the experience of another bureaucrat from a university who recently appeared before a congressional committee. After he had expounded the law, the chairman said, "That's a very good lecture, professor, but remember, down here the class gives the marks." Furthermore, our budget and legislation must pass through the Chief Executive via the Bureau of the Budget. And, finally, on occasion we are reminded that our decisions are subject to judicial review.

I do not say there is a precise parallel with the SEC. But I do say that in an industry dealing with securities, with the complexities which they pose and with liquidity second only to bank deposits, some oversight is called for. Quite properly, the profit motive is at the root of our economic system. But given this motive, regulation of the industry in the interest of the public cannot be left exclusively to the practitioners, public spirited though they be. That was settled in principle some 28 years ago and has been proven by experience. Of course, the public participant should not be arbitrary or oppressive. As I said a year ago, we have tried to be responsible both in action taken and the way in which our special study is being conducted, and we have tried to keep our promises made here.

II

Furthermore, we believe that oversight need not and should not stifle initiative for self-regulation. Although the need for outside regulation may be accepted by an industry, the leaders within it should nevertheless have the freedom to suggest and effectuate improvements in standards without discouragement. This is true for the exchanges and the NASD on the one hand, and for this Commission on the other. I firmly believe that any institution, private or public, can be run honestly and tirelessly and yet at the same time it can die. Rigor mortis will set in if all of us do not reexamine ourselves, find out where the industry has been moving, and accordingly how we should redefine our responsibilities.

III

In recognizing the need for oversight, we hold no brief for empire building. The Commission has expanded by a third since early 1961 when I came. This much was imperative: no one had time to think beyond ad hoc problems and see where we were going. The registration backlog was at an alltime high. We had some notion that all such problems could be cleared up by a fresh mind and we brought in a businessman experienced in reorganizing companies. The answer came back that the problem was manpower. Expansion thus was called for to meet existing problems. At this time I feel our internal job is consolidation and improvement. We are not interested in growth as such. As evidence of our desire not to enlarge, we have recently had an ironic difference with the NASD before a House committee. During the past 2 years the SEC has been faced with a real regulatory problem in the District of Columbia. We greatly accelerated our enforcement activities, but vigorous enforcement can never be a substitute for high standards. We therefore recommended adoption of a strong blue sky law for the District of Columbia administered by local government as preferable to expanding SEC jurisdiction. Wallace Fulton, on the other hand, favored broadening our powers to meet the special problems of the District of Columbia. We appreciate the vote of confidence, but we feel our responsibilities are national. And we do not believe our activities should supersede local regulation, nor I might say self-regulation.

IV

Our attitude toward self-regulation has been demonstrated concretely this year in connection with the American Stock Exchange. It seems to me in poor taste to exhume the problems explicity set forth in our report and well known in the financial community. These problems are now being resolved. If the SEC worried about its "image," it might have brought immediate proceedings and publicly forced through a reorganization plan. Then we might have been hailed as vigorous (a politically attractive label). But we do believe in the principle of self-regulation, and we mean what we say. As an understatement encouragement was indeed necessary. Here was a dramatic example of the need for oversight. But once the situation was fully appreciated by the American Stock Exchange community, responsible members assumed leadership and reorganized the exchange. They have taken an interest in it, reframed its constitution, abolished the committee system, strengthened staff responsibility, and elected an able president.

On this general subject, I should like to attempt one generalization about achieving effective self-regulation through membership organizations in the securities industry. It appears safe to conclude that success depends in substantial part on the adequacy and ability of the professional staff and the amount of responsibility vested in them. This in turn rests upon the wisdom and vision of the board of governors. But the staff provides a continuity and objectivity which is needed to raise standards in the industry. I appreciate the philosophy of the NASD that the members should regulate their fellow members, but as the scope of self-regulation enlarges, it will become increasingly arduous without an effective staff.

V

Keith Funston has framed his attitude toward self-regulation in a somewhat different light. Who, he asks, can best set operating standards and determine the most effective level of service to the public? The securities industry? Or the Government? He did not answer that rhetorical question, but I doubt if we need be more explicit with this distinguished audience. I can appreciate the basis for his point of view. After all, he is the head of the New York Stock Exchange, and has been emphasizing the lifting of standards in the industry. The exchange, for example, has enacted rules that stock may not be listed unless it be voting stock, or unless the shareholders have the right to vote on acquisitions. It has required interim financial reports and has regulated the qualifications and conduct of its members. In general these rules demonstrate the dynamic element of self-regulation of which Mr. Funston may well be proud.

At the same time, I do not think his question calls for an answer of one or the other: the securities industry or the Government.

It seems to deny the need for oversight or public participation at all. I cannot agree that any exchange or any other institution including the SEC has achieved perfection. Certainly, I shall not attempt to justify every action we have ever taken. We make mistakes, but are doing the best we can. Thus I take the position that Commission participation is not only required under the statute, but also healthful. Interaction is stimulating. Every member of the New York Stock Exchange will concede that the characteristics of a private club, a very good club, I might say. Without prejudging the facts, it seems to me that periodically the role and performance of its members, whether floor traders, odd-lot houses or specialists, or the rate structure, should be reexamined. I can assure you that we recognize most of these problems are in the grey area, without black or white solutions. The public is intimately involved, and any institution having public responsibilities but operating as a private association benefits by oversight.

Philosophical limits upon unchecked self-regulation are suggested by consideration of antitrust principles. One purpose of the Sherman Act is to prevent private groups acting in concert from exercising their power to the detriment of competitors and the public interest. Now the exchange says there must be either exemption from antitrust or erosion of self-regulation. If the exchange wants absolution, can it be achieved without some other form of governmental participation, that is, the SEC? In legal circles today there is much talk of primary jurisdiction, for example, the Federal Power Commission versus the Department of Justice as to pipelines, the Civil Aeronautics Board versus the Department of Justice as to airline mergers. In the securities industry the exchange tends to sponsor a maximum freedom from both. Whether or not the antitrust laws apply, some Government oversight is warranted, indeed necessary, to insure that action in the name of self-regulation is neither discriminatory nor capricious.

In sum, I do not agree that the Commissions should have to resign itself to a vestigal role in dealing with an exchange and its members. I feel we must become directly involved, as we have in major disciplinary proceedings involving exchange members, where important questions of principle are at stake. I have in mind cases involving improper credit devices, or even Cady, Roberts & Co., of which some of you may have heard, and which the New York Stock Exchange has sought to interpret responsibly. I further believe the general rules and practices should be scrutinized by the Commission. There is some health and vitality in interaction, just as Congress forces the Commission to keep alert.

At the same time, I forsee no major expansion of the SEC, which must still focus on broad scale problems of self-regulation, on policy rather than day-to-day administration.

VI

The preceding discussion turns us logically to the NASD. Here a self-regulatory institution was deliberately created and its functions were concretely spelled out in the Maloney Act. Recently the NASD has demonstrated its initiative in developing policies as to unconscionable underwriting compensation and, we hope, suitability, that is, what is suitable for the customer. As the NASD moves ahead and raises standards, the SEC should encourage this initiative. I cannot yet outline the conclusions of our special study, but I can go so far as to say that in the over-the-counter market self-regulation has much room for growth. The opportunity is there. The industry should accept it, and finance it with adequate budget.

For example, the wholesale quotation system is of basic importance to the operations of the over-the-counter market. At present, this system is a privately owned enterprise. By immense good fortune it is under the direction of a person having a high sense of integrity. But what if subsequently one of less scruples and responsibility were to assume control of the system? Many responsible people in the securities industry believe the quotation system is clearly affected with a public interest. What steps in the long run could be taken that would insure responsible management or control over its operations?

Again, we now find that many of you who opposed reporting requirements for a broader spectrum of companies as recently as 1957 believe the time has come when the public needs more information about stocks not listed on the exchanges but traded over the counter. If this is a logical development, there is still the problem of how such information (once public) can become more widely available to broker-dealers and their customers, and more closely tied to the selling process. (We have recently had an example of essential information available in our periodic reports totally unused by the advisory services.)

Finally, some industry regulatory agency, presumably the NASD, must assume a more active and vigorous role in connection with the retailing aspects of the over-the-counter market, including selling literature and market letters.

For the NASD and any association with which it may share duties, I can see an expanding role for self-regulation. The Commission is reluctant to assume the primary responsibility and detailed supervision over an area which requires more regulatory attention that it has had thus far. Thus I anticipate substantial growth on the part of the exchanges and the NASD. Those members who are budget conscious should bear this in mind. Do not begrudge the funds to increase self-regulation. Governmental action is called for when there is a void, but the SEC is sincerely anxious that any vacuum be filled by industry policing.

Finally in this connection may I say that Government officials, outside the SEC, congressional and otherwise, have asked us whether our fees should be raised to make the Commission self-sustaining. Our own suggestion was that heavier charges might be deferred. We believed a much greater financial burden will be placed upon you as self-regulators, and that you should be in a posture to tolerate it.

VII

Turning now to the Investment Company Institute, we come to an industry in which self-regulation has been generally rejected thus far. This point was highlighted by my colleague, Commissioner Whitney, before the institute last spring. In one area which we discussed concretely with the institute and its chairman, the paradox is that the SEC is in favor of less governmental intrusion and industry prefers more. All of us, the ICI and the Commission, seem agreed upon the principle that more inspection of investment companies is called for. With our limited personnel to date, we have had roughly a 12-year cycle. This is inadequate, indeed absurd. The industry believes we should perform the inspection, if necessary financing ourselves in a self-sustaining way akin to national bank examinations. Since this would require a statute, one can see future delays while inspections continue to lag. We suggested that the institute take the initiative. It, or some association connected with it, could retain independent certified public accounting firms to carry out a major role in the inspection program. They would thus be independent of the particular investment company, and of this Commission as well. Their work, duly certified, could then be submitted to the SEC. Thus the fundamental responsibility would fall upon the institute and its agents, and Commission personnel need not be measurably increased. I can understand how the industry would quibble over the content and scope of the inspection, but cannot fathom the reason for rejecting the idea in principle. We need only go back to 1933 to recall that a large staff of Government personnel was suggested to audit companies seeking to register their securities. Happily, the alternative of thrusting the burden upon the independent CPA was adopted. Accountants, conservative like all of us professional people, might hesitate to accept this innovation as to investment companies which might broaden their auditing responsibilities. But looking back to the thirties they can appreciate the enormous stimulus for raising standards which resulted.

Perhaps the problem in the Investment Company Institute is that there is little common ground among its members. This is a point frequently made by its officers. As we said upon publication of the Wharton school report, we have no preconceptions about this industry. Perhaps in order for some measure of self-regulation to develop, the members must recognize their many diverse facets:

Are the problems of load and no-load funds the same?

Are the problems of funds with management companies the same as those few which have no management contracts?

Are the interests of the management company members of the institute the same as those of the fund members?

Are the problems of closed-end and open-end funds alike? The industry itself seems to recognize distinctions, as evidenced by the formation of the Association of Closed-End Investment Companies.

VIII

In conclusion, what is self-regulation and what are the prospects for it? It does not exclude participation by the Commission with the industry associations. You need suggestions, and so do we. As my predecessor on the Commission, now Mr. Justice Douglas, said in 1938: "The point where self-determination should cease and direct regulation by Government should commence must usually be determined not by arbitrary action but by neatly balanced judgment and discretion on both sides." Our participation should not reduce your initiative any more than Congress' oversight should stifle ours. As we see it, the opportunity for self-regulation is abundant: both for the exchanges and the NASD. As I said earlier, this Commission is in no mood to expand, to seek growth for growth's sake. Government steps in to fill an evident public need; we urge you, indeed entreat you, to acknowledge this need and fulfill it yourselves.

Aerospace and Arizona Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of history's greatest airmen and an outstanding American patriot spoke before the Air Force Association in Tucson,

Ariz., on the 8th of February of this year. It is not of great length but it contains much of significance to our position in aerospace and should be read by all Members of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that Gen. James Doolittle's remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AEROSPACE AND ARIZONA DAYS

(By J. H. Doolittle)

It is a pleasure to be back in Tucson with you today, and I am honored by your invitation. The occasion—Aerospace and Arizona Days—is important and it is timely.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base was named for two personal friends and oldtime military associates of mine—residents of Tucson—who gave their lives in the advancement of aviation. It has long been one of the primary SAC bases. Two years after World War II, the B-29 *Pascuan Dreamboat* set a record nonstop flight of 6,214 miles in 22 hours and 27 minutes. And in March 1949, *Lady Luck II* of the 63d Bombardment Squadron made the first nonstop world circumnavigation; demonstrating the aerial refueling capabilities and high mobility of the Strategic Air Command. Both flights were from Davis-Monthan. (Shortly before hanging up my flying clothes I checked out in a B-47 here. That was back in 1955.)

This visit brings back many familiar faces and memories of old places. Yet they are in such new surroundings that they take on a freshness which makes them seem to belong as much to the present and the future as they do to the past. I flew out of Tucson long before there was a Davis-Monthan or a municipal airport. The tiny, dusty field I remember was very different from today's great military airport covered with concrete runways, taxi strips and hard stands and with all the facilities necessary to handle the powerful jets of the Strategic Air Command.

I see many old friends here—Jim Kinney, Maj. Gen. Slim Turner who commanded the 1st Division of the 8th Air Force; John McCulloch, who was one of my bosses in the First World War, and Joe Moller, another World War I flier with whom I was associated in World War II. Joe was determined to fly combat in 1944 even though I was cool to the idea because of his age. (Joe and I were both in our 40's at the time; he middle, I late.) But Joe went on to become one of the best group commanders in the 8th Air Force; leading his unit, the 390th Bombardment Group, the 13th Wing, the 3d Division, on occasion, the entire 8th Air Force and, the only time they all flew together, the 8th, 9th, and RAF Bomber Command on bombing missions over Germany. Now he has become one of the leading citizens in the progressive city of Tucson, and the 390th Bombardment Group has become the 390th Strategic Missile Wing based here at Davis Monthan. The old has become the new, and the new has changed many things. But some things have not changed, and it is these things, as well as the new, that I would like to talk about today.

It is appropriate that we are participating in an event called "Aerospace and Arizona days" and that it is being held in Tucson and on an Air Force base. "Aerospace" is more than a new word; it is a new challenge. And the Air Force has accepted this challenge. Here, dispersed around Tucson are 18 Titan II missile sites and, on the Air Force base, more than 45 powerful B-47 airplanes which are integrated into our strategic strike system. This flexible force of manned aircraft and missiles, together with our Polaris submarines, and, of course, the Air Defense Command, provide the deterrent power which permits us to negotiate from strategic strength. The importance of this was well illustrated in the recent Cuban crisis.

The missiles and aircraft were built and put here by our Nation's tremendous scientific ingenuity, technological skill, and productive capacity. And equally important, by our determination to pay freedom's price with freedom's treasure. Our strength is the product of the conscientious efforts of all of our people.

It is our national strategy as well as our deepest hope that weapons such as we have here will never be used, but will continue to buy security and time; time to find other and more satisfactory solutions to our international problems. We must remain militarily strong, as our opponent respects only strength. Military strength is our soundest investment in an uneasy world. And we must properly exploit the time we buy to be sure it works to our advantage.

We speak of the uneasy peace. But in a deeper meaning we do not have peace. We are engaged in a cold war. This was declared in 1917 when the Russians started aggressively to exploit the 1848 Marx-Engels Manifesto stating world domination as the Communist goal; but it was not generally recognized by the United States until sometime after World War II, when we began to see the Soviet plan of aggression unfold in Eastern Europe and Asia and then spread to Africa and to this hemisphere. The Moscow Declaration of 1960 reiterates the goal of world domination and adds that the United States is the main enemy of communism. The cold war is a new form of war. The battle is not only for territory, but also for the minds of men. But if the form of war is different, the basic principles remain the same, and to lose is not to survive. The cold war presents a real and abiding peril. It is a war which we must fight to win. Admiral Rickover defined the problem quite succinctly when he said not long ago: "I think most of our people cannot understand that we are actually at war. They need to hear shells. They are not psychologically prepared for the concept that you can have a war when you don't have actual fighting."

The cold war is, I believe, more total and more dangerous than any war we have ever known. It demands a strength far broader than mere military strength. If armies were fighting armies, and the battle were so confined, then the better—or perhaps the bigger—army would win. But where political system is fighting political system, then it is total national strength—political, economic, and moral—as well as military—which will prevail. Moral, in this sense, includes courage and the will to survive—and win. This is why we cannot neglect any aspect of our national sources and resources in the cold war. We must remember that all the components of our national life are committed to the cold war, and we can no more afford to waste or misuse any of these than we could afford to lose infantry divisions, naval ships, or air units during World War I and World War II. It is important that our military strength does not unduly drain our economic strength so we become weak on that front, for collapse here can be deadly in the cold war.

We must maintain a well-balanced Military Establishment. The backbone of our military force is our strategic deterrent capability. We must also be able to deter—or promptly to win—limited wars. The building up of our small war forces must be on the foundation of—and not at the expense of—our capability to deter—or prevail in a—nuclear war.

We should have all the military strength we need. And I believe we can afford all we need. We must use good judgment in deciding which weapon systems will give us the most strength, and I think that our uniformed military leaders and their scientist advisers have that good judgment. I do not believe the manned aircraft is or will soon be obsolete, although the missile, as it is proved and improved, will become increasingly important.

Missiles and manned aircraft give our military two hands, a right and a left. Certainly we do not want our fighting man or our fighting team, to have only one hand—or an atrophied hand. We must give our combat personnel what they require to do their job—and a fair chance to survive while doing it.

I think today America is strong in the ways it must be strong. If there is a weak spot in our defense it is our historic susceptibility to complacency—or apathy. In the past we have dropped our guard when there was no apparent danger. Suspicious of power in others, we felt that our own weakness was witness to our good intentions. We have paid the costly penalty for this mistake in the past several wars; we cannot afford it in the next one. To remain strong we, as a nation, must see the need to be strong. This is a highly individual thing, this belief. It is up to each of us to believe it and make whatever sacrifice is necessary to bring it about. This we owe to our country. Our obligation was pointed up by the President, in his inaugural address, when he said: "It is not what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country."

We must realize we are at war. We cannot have "business as usual" while our opponents work harder than we do. We are presently stronger than they—but they are catching up with us. We must speed up. There can be no malingering. The cost of indifference, carelessness, and lethargy could be the loss of our freedom. Before concluding I would like to discuss two phrases that are frequently used and—I am afraid—not always clearly understood. They are:

1. Start an arms race.
2. Assure a favorable world opinion.

Certainly no one wants to start an arms race. We should not, however, be afraid of an arms race. What we should be afraid of is becoming weaker—militarily—than the Soviets. An upset in the military power equation—where we become substantially weaker than they—might well cause them to endeavor to accomplish their objective of world communization and domination through a prompt military coup. Certainly if they believed they could, in this way, quickly communize the world, without unacceptable damage to themselves, the temptation would be great.

Both the Soviets and we are striving hard to develop a counter to the submarine and a defense against missiles. If they were to achieve a substantial capability in these areas before we did they would have a distinct military advantage. We would then have to depend, almost entirely, upon our manned bombers to deter nuclear war, or to prevail if all-out-war was thrust upon us. In this case it would be very important indeed that we have the most modern and effective vehicles and weapons. (I say "vehicles" because, in the future, the manned bombers may well be "aerospace" planes that can operate either in the atmosphere or in space.)

If there is an arms race we are in a far better position to win it than the Soviets. We have an economy of surplus. They have an economy of scarcity. An increase in military spending would hurt them much more than it would hurt us. We could absorb it in a little more work. For them it would mean a further reduction in their standard of living and, quite probably, internal dissension.

We should avoid wasteful spending and we must make every effort to balance the national budget. We must practice economy and effect savings wherever we can. This

includes military expenditures. But we must not cut our military budget below that minimum which will unacceptably reduce our ability to deter nuclear war.

And certainly we should do nothing to make the Soviet military problem simpler. A great deal of their substance is presently being utilized to install and maintain their defenses against the manned bomber. If we were to retire the manned bomber it would be to their economic advantage because they would effect large military savings in not having to defend against it.

We are often told we must so comport ourselves that we may always enjoy a favorable world opinion. Let's look at this one: Most of the free world is indebted to us. No one likes to be under obligation. The embarrassment of owing is frequently reflected in dislike of the benefactor. As a result we cannot—no matter what we do—have world affection. We can, and must obtain and retain world respect. We can achieve this through strength and through the proper application of that strength. This is something which the Soviets—and the rest of the world—will really respect. (Again I refer to Cuba as an illustration.)

In conclusion, we must, through hard work and—if necessary—sacrifice, be militarily, economically, politically and morally strong. For only through strength can our great Nation remain secure and free.

Will United States Yield to Nehru?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott report that Prime Minister Nehru, in seeking massive military aid from the United States, has demanded that no strings be attached. He wants the aid, but on his terms and his terms alone.

For the United States to grant military aid to Nehru on what the Allen-Scott report calls his own highly suspicious terms would be incredible. Under such an arrangement, there would be absolutely no guarantee that the arms would not be employed against Pakistan, an ally of the United States, and on whose borders India reportedly has massed 70 percent of its army and air force.

The issue of military aid to India bears close watching, and I commend to the attention of my colleagues the excellent Allen-Scott report, which appeared in the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier of March 27.

The report follows:

NEHRU REQUESTS AMERICAN ARMS ON HIS OWN TERMS—WON'T VOW NOT TO USE ON PAKISTAN

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Prime Minister Nehru wants to have his cake and eat it too.

Despite the badly mauled Indian Army's urgent need of modern weapons, Nehru is insisting that the $200 million in military aid he is seeking from the United States be granted on his own highly suspicious terms.

These exceptional conditions, as expounded to State and Defense Department authorities by Biju Patnaik, personal emissary of Nehru, are:

Permission for the United States to send some military advisers to accompany the new weapons to India, but they will be barred from operational areas; that is, the disputed Chinese border regions for which the arms presumably are intended.

Flat refusal to sign an agreement that U.S. military aid will not be employed against Pakistan.

No payment for these weapons to be made until after settlement of the Chinese border controversy—if ever. Even then, the question of payment is to be negotiated, thus in effect, putting this $200 million in military aid in a "lend-lease" category.

Particularly desired by India are large numbers of tanks, rifles, antitank weapons, ground-to-air and air-to-ground missiles, and radar and other communications equipment.

These arms would be in addition to the $40 million rushed to India last year after the Chinese Communists' aggression. Much of this hardware was taken from depots in West Germany, which have not yet been replenished. U.S. commanders in Europe are much concerned about this delay.

Patnaik, 47, a wealthy businessman, is a friend of leftist former Defense Minister Krishna Menon, who was forced out after the Indian army's rout. Patnaik makes no secret that he financed a Socialist magazine strongly favorable to Menon.

As is frequently the case, Secretary of State Rusk and the Joint Chiefs of Staff differed squarely on what to do about Nehru's terms.

Rusk, supported by McGeorge Bundy, powerful special assistant to the President on foreign affairs, favors bowing to the Indian leader on the ground his still gravely threatened army is sorely in need of modern weapons.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff don't dispute the urgent necessity for these arms. But they contend the United States should get absolute guarantees regarding their use. The Joint Chiefs see no reason why Nehru is opposed to U.S. officers going into operational areas for that purpose.

This contention is particularly stressed by the Joint Chiefs in view of Nehru's plea for U.S. aid in developing counterinsurgency forces to resist similar Red Chinese elements. The Joint Chiefs point that trained observers must accompany such units to insure their effectiveness.

Pentagon authorities are frankly critical of India's continued massive mobilization of military strength on its Pakistan borders.

Notwithstanding the serious situation on the Chinese border, where new attacks are threatened, India still has more than 70 percent of its army and air force stationed on the Pakistan borders. That country has been a strong U.S. ally, and the Joint Chiefs hold full precautions must be taken to insure that the massive military aid Nehru wants is not used again Pakistan.

The Joint Chiefs argue there can be no valid reason for Nehru's opposing that.

Patnaik has told Assistant Defense Secretary Paul Nitze that Peiping is preparing new aggressions in the disputed border regions. According to Patnaik, the Communists are pushing a vast military buildup in Tibet with much road and airfield construction. Chinese forces also are massing on India's northern and eastern borders for obvious attack purposes.

"There can be little doubt Red China is getting ready to strike again," said Patnaik. "The only question is when. We have nothing definite on that."

The issue of Nehru's terms unquestionably will be put up to President Kennedy. His decision is conjectural. But it's being closely watched by congressional leaders, particularly those critical of his $4.9 billion foreign aid budget.

His action on the backstage Indian controversy could importantly affect what Congress does about more large-scale foreign aid spending.

Managed News Hurts Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial in the San Diego Union on the important subject of news management.

The editorial follows:

TRUTH IS FIRST CASUALTY—MANAGED NEWS HURTS NATION

A Berlin wall erected against the hope of freedom is nothing compared to obstacles raised against the pursuit of truth.

The congressional hearing in Washington into the management of news by the administration shows beyond doubt that the Kennedy brothers have deliberately embarked on a program of influencing and perverting public information.

Though we technically are in a state of peace, there never has been a time, in peace or war, when the public knew less about how our international affairs were being conducted. An aura of secrecy surrounds everything.

The right to lie to the people has been defined as a privilege of Government.

The Kennedy brothers have exhibited a certain ruthlessness in their application of a policy of political self-interest. On one hand, there is a tendency to give the public what they think it hopes to hear, and on the other hand, to shut off sources of news to those who report uncomfortable truths, and thus deprive them of the ability to form true judgments.

While, in kindness, it might be said that the administration, in seeking to influence the news, is merely practicing practical politics to assure its reelection, the effects are widespread and reach out to every decision that must be made on the future of the United States.

The British military expert and historian, Capt. B. H. Liddell Hart, in the process of writing the history of the last war, studied comment on the progress of the war, and wrote:

"The effort was worthwhile—as a lesson, and a warning. In retrospect, the accumulation of error was staggering. It seemed amazing that so many serious students of war could have been so often wrong and rarely right in their calculations. The most reasonable explanation was that they had been constantly misled by the scarcity or falsity of the information available under wartime conditions, and that, in these circumstances, they had either allowed their hopes to guide their judgment or chosen to give the public what it hoped to hear."

The same thing is happening today in the United States—in peace.

The manipulation and management of news has been bringing about in the public mind an accumulation of deceptive pictures about our relations with even our own allies let alone the Communist world. Vital decisions are made in secrecy and then their results hit us like thunderbolts.

By that time it is too late for the people to exert an influence on the course of fateful events.

As Captain Hart commented, it is difficult enough to write truthfully in peacetime, even in a democracy, when there is no avowed censorship. But when control of news is applied, truth recedes into half truths and then untruths.

Hiram Johnson once said that "truth is the first casualty of war." Today, truth is the first casualty of political power.

Maine Tops in Skill and Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the State of Maine is honored in having the two best high school basketball teams in New England, Stearns High, of Millinocket, the New England champions, and Morse High, of Bath, Maine, champions and runners-up to Stearns in the New England tournament.

If we can rely on the judgment of Jerry Nason, Boston Globe sportswriter, Maine not only has New England's best basketball players, but New England's most courteous and sportsmanlike fans. Mr. Nason wrote:

Maine folk last week gave us big-city dwellers a lesson in the home fan virtues of fairplay, enthusiasm, sportsmanship, and disposition.

I take pleasure in extending my congratulations to the Stearns and Morse players, and to Maine's basketball fans, who are all a credit to their State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nason's article which appeared in the Boston Globe of March 25 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASON FINDS MAINE FINAL REFRESHING

(By Jerry Nason)

This is an undisguised "Oscar" award to the fans-with-the-most for 1963—the Stein Song set.

Maine folks last week gave us big-city dwellers a lesson in the homely fan virtues of fairplay, enthusiasm, sportsmanship, and disposition. Drat 'em.

There were 12,048 witnesses Saturday night to the Boston Garden's final-round contest of the New England basketball tournament between two Maine high schools—Stearns of Millinocket, Morse of Bath.

When John Kiley at the organ broke out "The Stein Song" as his preliminary offering at the pipes, 12,048 stood in bareheaded reverence.

A happy roar of recognition swept through them as the realized their common origin, and how their number inundated the site.

There were no furtive clutches of odds players congregated in dim lobby corners, exchanging vital betting information.

No paper currency passed in open defiance from one fist to another in the stadium section, as the score of the exciting game first favored one team, then the other.

No ridicule was hurled upon one team by the supporters of the other; good plays were applauded generously by both partisan groups.

No cymbals crashed a deliberately disconcerting tumult—no rival fans bellowed and booed in distracting unison—when Stearns and Morse players stood poised on the foul line for important shots.

There was no bickering, name calling, or mutual exchange of insults among opposing fan factions.

No fist was swung in either anger of petulance in the postgame lobby scene. No kids had to be frisked for lethal weapons. The losers took it hard, but clean; the winners tooks it high but with generosity.

There were no rumbles.

One of the gendarmerie assigned to the garden remarked, "It was like having a night off."

A nearby restaurateur said, "We like having the Maine fans in town. They know how to have a good time. They are well behaved, and they don't come with their hands stuffed in their pockets."

It was a hard, tough, clean game in the stands and on the garden court. It was a completely honest, emotional one, too. Stearns' hearts almost burst with joy for winning, Morse hearts were obviously broke with losing.

When little Stearns captured the 56 to 54 game, Morse players made no insincere pretexts that losing, even gracefully, was a badge of honor. They wept with uncontrolled sobs on their bench.

You remember too, that when rival Stearns had upset another, bigger, more powerful opponent (Rindge) in the Friday semifinals, the first to rush onto the floor to acclaim them had been these same boys from Morse High of Bath.

(The teams had played into double overtime in their own State final, Morse winning by a point.)

Thus, Saturday's final had turned out to be the "Maine event," literally. The garden staff was soon to discover the fact.

During the day ticket-reservation calls began coming in from Bangor, Waterville, Kittery, Lewiston—places in aMine located far from the contending towns of Millinocket (Stearns) and Bath (Morse).

Saturday afternoon's stouthbound lanes of Route 1 were black with cars. Most of them bore Maine license plates—the kind on which the paint hasn't eroded.

One cluster of blanket-wrapped fans came all the way down from Millinocket in a half-ton pickup truck of ancient vintage.

Asked by a gas station attendant in Saugus just how far up Millinocket was anyway, the driver dryly quipped, "Nawth of Mill'nocket, they only speak Eskimo."

When "the Maine event" was over and the garden floor writhed with throngs of rejoicing Millinocket rooters, there was their hero, Terrance Carr, aloft on willing shoulders, joyfully severing the strings from the basket at the east lobby end of the court, as a memento.

Sunday night, in a little town of northern Maine, 10 boys slept with a serenity denied kings—a treasured twine under each pillow.

"The Maine event"—it was like a breath of sweet, cool air borne to us on a northeast breeze.

Indiana Proud of Marine Corps Gen. David M. Shoup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the State of Indiana is proud to have as a native son, Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps. General Shoup, a native of Battle Ground, Ind., is married to the former Zola DeHaven of Covington. The Indiana Society of Washington recently honored General Shoup by naming him 1963 Hoosier of the Year. This award was conferred on him in recognition of his long and distinguished service to his country.

Two editorials recently appeared in the Indianapolis News commending General Shoup. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 14, 1963]

SALUTE TO GENERAL SHOUP

The News is proud to join in the congratulations of Gen. David M. Shoup for being chosen as the recipient tonight of the Indiana Society of Washington's Hoosier of the Year citation.

General Shoup, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, long has served his country with distinction and his name adds luster to his native State.

Shoup's career has been a success story in the Hoosier tradition. Born at Battle Ground, educated at DePauw, married to the former Zola DeHaven of Covington, and a frequent visitor to the State with close contacts through the years, General Shoup comes by his 1963 Hoosier of the Year title through a long Indiana pedigree as well as his military eminence.

We hope he will number it among his most cherished awards. And we would like to have it thought that the Indiana Washingtonians who are conferring the title represent the unanimous opinion of the rest of us at home.

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 15, 1963]

FOUR-FORK BANQUET FAILS TO RATTLE GENERAL SHOUP

WASHINGTON.—Gen. David Shoup, Marine Corps Commandant, after being honored as Hoosier of the Year, said he hopes he hasn't started a worldwide campout campaign.

The Nation's No. 1 marine, a native of Battle Ground, Ind., received the award last night at a party at the International Inn. Representative E. ROSS ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana, president of the Indiana Society of Washington, presented Shoup with the title.

A surge of 50-mile hikes has swept the country since Shoup sent an original letter from former President Theodore Roosevelt to President Kennedy. In it, Roosevelt wondered if marines could march 50 miles within 24 hours.

Mr. Kennedy then asked Shoup if his leathernecks could do it, and the parade of hikers, both military and civilian, began.

THANKS FROM SHOE INDUSTRY

Shoup said he has received many letters of thanks from shoe and boot manufacturers who welcome the hikes, but he said he hoped he hadn't started a "campingout spree."

The Congressional Medal of Honor winner said he was dumfounded over being named Hoosier of the year.

"I was dumfounded 50 years ago when I went to my first big dinner away from home," Shoup recalled. "I started out by telling my mother, 'I have two forks.'

"Tonight I took on this four-fork meal without a qualm. A fellow can learn a lot in 50 years."

Speaking to about 500 persons at the awards banquet, Shoup reminisced about his farm days when "2 million hills of Indiana corn passed slowly between my legs when I worked in the field."

CONGRATULATORY TELEGRAMS

ADAIR read congratulatory telegrams to Shoup from President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and Navy Secretary Fred Korth.

Shoup, a four-star general, received a flourishing salute from a crack Marine drum and bugle team, and the Washington Opera Guild provided an hour of music after the banquet.

For a touch of humor, a Marine recruit wearing fatigues ran through the room

periodically with a sign on his back indicating the number of miles he had traveled.

But he never completed 50 miles.

The youthful leatherneck finally collapsed on the floor with a sign saying:

"What the hell."

A Bill To Permit Deductions for Federal Income Tax Purposes to Persons Who Are Paying Educational Expenses at the Primary, Secondary, or Undergraduate College or University Levels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes to persons who are paying educational expenses at the primary, secondary, or undergraduate college or university levels. I am convinced this legislation is timely in terms of national economic and educational objectives. It is in the national interest that all young people complete the highest level of education of which they are capable. Through their educational attainments these students will benefit themselves and the Nation and improve their ability to contribute to our society and our economy. Those citizens who support the public schools through taxation and also bear the burden of educating their children in private schools and colleges are entitled to some relief for the double expenses they bear on behalf of education.

The growing demands of our society for educated citizens makes it desirable for persons of moderate income to provide the highest level of education possible for their children. Many students of high ability are forced to discontinue their education for financial reasons. We must recognize the national importance of encouraging and assisting able students to remain in school and to go on to and graduate from college.

In the United States, we have consistently raised the level of educational opportunities. We provide not only the teachers and buildings but also public transportation of students and in many cases books and supplies as well. We have done these things because our youth require educational opportunity to meet the increasing complexity of society. The world continues to grow more complex. The educational levels that led to intellectual maturity yesterday do not go far enough today. There has been a continuous upgrading of jobs. The increasing use of the products of scientific technology clearly calls for a higher degree of education and technical skill in every line of work. The bill I have introduced is one means of providing an incentive for remaining in school and some tax relief for those who must finance the costs of this education.

To encourage increased investment in our advancing economy, it has long been our practice to provide for tax-free recovery of income-producing capital outlays through allowances for depreciation and replacement. By the same principle, the tax treatment of investment in education should be at least as liberal as it is for investment in capital goods, since education is at least as important a basis for producing income as is investment in physical capital.

For some years, we have provided for tax deductions by professional individuals who must upgrade their educational training in order to meet the rising educational requirements of the work they are already doing. There should be some tax relief to encourage investment in the education of those preparing to enter the trades and professions, especially since the amount of education required at the threshold level of most professions is rapidly increasing—and must continue to increase—to provide for the flexibility and adaptability needed to cope with our advancing technology.

My bill restricts its tax deductions to tuition and fees, books and supplies, and the cost of living away from home when necessary. The limitation to not more than $200 per month for each month of enrollment is a safeguard to prevent abuses by those who might choose expensive preparatory schools and colleges.

While tax relief would accrue before the individual receives income from the investment in education, it must be pointed out that in the long run increased individual incomes would more than offset initial tax income foregone in allowing deductions for amounts invested in education. Studies have shown that the median income of families with heads having 4 or more years of college is almost 40 percent higher than the median income of families with heads whose education stopped with completion of high school. Also, the high school graduate earns about 27 percent more than does the eighth-grade graduate during his peak earning years. Obviously, then, education is an income-producing investment, and whatever tax relief we grant to encourage it will not only contribute to the economic progress of the Nation but will be more than recovered out of taxes on increased future earnings.

It is currently estimated that about 40 percent of the students who enter college go on to graduate in regular progression from the institution of first registration, that another 20 percent transfer or return at a later date to complete the requirements for graduation, and that about 40 percent withdraw and never finish. Financial difficulties are reported to be among the chief reasons for dropping out, especially in the loss of the better students. This impetus to stay in school would also tend to encourage high school students to complete their secondary education in many cases in preparation for higher education. It is presently estimated that almost 40 percent of pupils who reach the fifth grade do not graduate from high school. A college graduate earns about $175,000 more in his lifetime than a high school graduate, and a high school graduate earns about $50,000 more than an eighth-grade graduate, according to recent estimates. If the provisions of this bill are successful in salvaging a fraction of those students who fail to graduate from high school and continue through a higher education because of financial difficulties, the loss of tax revenue will eventually be offset and conceivably the amendment would improve the overall position of the Treasury.

Trotters Shoals Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Honorable Peyton S. Hawes, a distinguished Georgian and chairman of the Trotters Shoals Steering Committee, recently appeared before Gov. Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina, and put into its proper perspective the Trotters Shoals controversy.

The position taken by Mr. Hawes is the same as that which my senior colleague, Senator RUSSELL, and I have on the subject, and we have pledged to continue our efforts until the Trotters Shoals project is completed.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hawes' fine statement to Governor Russell be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Independent, Anderson (S.C.), Mar 27, 1963]

AREA CAN HAVE BOTH DUKE AND TROTTERS DAMS—ALSO MEAD PLANT

The two proposed dams on the Savannah River are compatible.

Both the Duke Power Co. and the Trotters Shoals installations can be built. They would complement each other.

The Mead papermill at Calhoun Falls would also fit into the picture if the problem of pollution of the river can be solved, which is a likely probability.

Why not have all three?

In speaking for the people of Georgia—which owns half of the Savannah River—Chairman Peyton Hawes, of Elberton, the able chairman of the Trotters Shoals Steering Committee, underscored with facts the foregoing conclusions.

His comment to Gov. Donald S. Russell at a hearing on March 22 follows:

"My name is Peyton S. Hawes, and I am appearing as chairman of the Trotters Shoals Steering Committee. On behalf of the delegation from Georgia, may I thank you for granting us this audience.

"My political life started over 30 years ago under a Governor Russell of Georgia. With the beginning of this career, began my interest in the Savannah River. His political philosophy and mine have very seldom differed. In regard to the comprehensive development of the Savannah River, we have never differed. This river, which an illustri-

ous southerner once said, 'is more than a bond between our two States than a boundary.' A large part of the blood that flows in my veins is from South Carolina ancestry, so I have an additional bond with you.

"The fact that you are holding this hearing shows that you have every desire to ascertain the truth. The only way that the truth can be arrived at is to review a little of the past; apply it to the present; and see if we can determine the future.

"Our progress in the comprehensive development of the river has been slow. We have had to fight dam by dam. In each instance, truth prevailed in favor of the masses of the people, and the dams were eventually built.

Why do you find such a solid position on the Georgia side? On the Georgia side, we feel that the principles have already been established and the policies formulated. We feel that our position is one of public interest. We do not apepar before you for political expediency or for any special group. We are here today to urge you, sir, to hold fast to a course already set and stand firm in the support of the previous thinking of the people of our respective States and of the United States through their representatives in the Congress. We feel that we cannot repeat too often that the general plan for the comprehensive development of the Savannah River was included in the Flood Control Act which passed Congress in 1944.

The act reads:

"The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Savannah River for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 657, 78th Congress, 2d session, is approved and the construction of the Clark Bill Reservoir on the Savannah River in South Carolina and Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in that report at an estimated cost of $35,300,000."

House Document No. 657 further recommended the building of a series of 11 dams in the upper reaches of the Savannah River, all above Clark Hill, including Carter's Island, Goat Island, and Middleton Shoals which would back up to Hartwell.

We, today, are talking about Trotters Shoals, which replaces these three dams and only was replaced after Senator RUSSELL called for a study; and, it was proven that this dam was more feasible and practical than the former dams.

Be it also remembered, sir, that the Flood Control Act of 1944 was before Congress a long time, a year or more; and that during that time there was no objection raised against the plan for the comprehensive development of this basin.

In the beginning of Clark Hill, it was the mighty Georiga Power Co. that came forth with a proposition to build. Theirs was not a positive proposal, but merely a tentative plan for the future. But when the people demanded action, they took the position that the main thing they needed was power. Irrespective of who built the dam, it would adhere to the benefit of the power company, as well as the general public. Too, the Government dam would offer to the people the conservation services and the recreational facilities and flood control that private builders could not afford.

Then, came Hartwell Dam. There are those in this room who, along with me, attended the hearings all over South Carolina, Georgia, and in Washington. In each instance, we were indirectly fighting the same hidden forces.

The next step: The board of engineers for rivers and harbors suggested that Carter's Island be constructed. There are those in South Carolina's leadership who have sent word to us in Georgia that this dam is now acceptable. However, sir, I hold in my hands the minutes of the public hearing held by the board of engineers of rivers and harbors February 17, 1960, in which the argument was advanced that if this dam was built, Duke could not build its powerplant.

At that hearing, I made the following statement:

"How can they—Duke Power Co.—take this position when there is competent evidence, as shown in our exhibits attached hereto, that both the Government plans and the Duke Power Co. plans would be compatible and they could stand side by side for the benefit of the area.

"This statement is further substantiated by the fact that the Duke Power Co. itself has built three of its steam plants on its own reservoirs; and by the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority has built substantially all, if not all, of its steam plants on its reservoirs."

Although they questioned our position then, they are forced today to admit that they are compatible. I might add here that the Georgia Power Co. builds its steam plants upon its own reservoirs. Engineers say that it is not necessary for Duke to build its dam; they can pump direct from a Trotters Shoals basin at an enormous savings to the company and the customers.

Why all of this rush of opposition?

Governor, I do not wish to get into a fight or an argument over public and private power for I know the advantages of both. What is the real issue?

Governor, have you ever heard anybody mention "pump back" or "pump storage"? This fear is an illusion and I can prove it, but those words are now trying to block Trotters Shoals.

With the building of Trotters Shoals, we could both have a steam plant, which some say, we would have the largest in the world. We could also have a hydroelectric plant and reservoir which would have international recognition. We are talking about a revolutionary movement of power generation, which could come to pass in our generation.

People from all over the world would come to South Carolina and Georgia to see it, leaving their tourists' dollars with us. Not only would these powerplants be compatible but they would benefit each other. A steamplant cannot be cut off like waterpower; therefore, at their low demand, which is at night, the Government could buy from Duke and other companies the power to reverse her turbines. Then, during the peakload, they could rush this same water back through to the advantage of both.

The officials of our great power companies will admit that these multipurpose dams only generate a small percentage of the power needed by preferred customers.

Who are these preferred customers?

They are the cities and towns and rural electrics who own their distribution systems.

Who, Sir, furnishes the rest of this power? The Georgia Power Co., Duke Power Co., etc.

Now, mind you, who created all of these additional demands for power? The people through their own efforts and the efforts of the Congress.

So, who benefits most? It is the power companies adjacent to the dams and the industries and the people located in the general area. In other words, the private companies have realized many new customers in a vast new market which they did not create.

May I also remind Your Excellency that the private power companies are paid a fee in the millions for wheeling this power to the preferred customers.

I think the power companies would admit if dams were built on all available sites on our rivers that our industrial expansion and our exploding population will reduce this percentage of power furnished to preferred users rather than to increase it.

We are here not to object to Duke, but to help Duke by building Trotters Shoals.

Governor, it is a known fact that with ample waterpower, comes not one industry, but lots of industries. With industry comes employment. With employment comes taxes and a general improvement in the standard of living.

With this added income from industry and tourism, which is the second largest industry in this country, the sales tax would far exceed the revenue received from the ad valorem tax that Duke Power Co. might pay.

We want South Carolina to have both.

Governor, I am for private enterprise or private power, but I am not for private monopoly.

In Paul Nelson's handbook on 1958 Power Facts, he shows the influence and effect of public power as compared to private power. This book shows a comparison of the power rates where the private utilities are influenced by public power. We find that the people in these areas affected by public power are getting their power for practically one-half the cost of power in the regions where there are no public power developments.

For instance, Washington State 250 kilowatt-hours of residential service as of January 1, 1958, cost $4.53. In the State of California, the same amount of power cost $6.28. In the State of Tennessee, under the influence of TVA, the cost was $4.87. In the State of Alabama, $5.48. In the State of Georgia, $6.40. All of these States were under the influence of public power.

In the States that had no public power, nor were they influenced by the cost of public power served entirely by private utilities, the cost of 250 kilowatt-hours of power in the State of Vermont was $8.90. In the State of New Hampshire, $8.73. In the State of Maine, $8.43. In the State of South Dakota, $8.42. In the State of Iowa, $8.03. In the State of Florida, just south of us, $8.21.

The national average for the whole United States was $7.23.

We call your attention to these figures in order that you may understand how the public is generally the recipient of the blessings of public power influence in this Nation.

In the early days of rural electrification the wholesale cost of power in Georgia to the cooperatives amounted to about 11 to 13 mills per kilowatt-hour. Since the development of the Savannah River, the building of Clark Hill, the development of the Buford project on the Chattahoochee River, and the Alatoona project near Cartersville, Ga., the wholesale cost of power to the Georgia electric membership cooperatives has been reduced to approximately 6.7 mills. This reduction in rates to our people came as a result of the development of the various river basins in our section.

Let us now take up the Mead plant—on the property which they bought knowing these dams were to be built.

It means just as much to us in Georgia as it does to the people of South Carolina. The only difference is that we look upon it with cold logic and cold reasoning.

The Rome Kraft plant, partly owned by Mead, in Rome, Ga., has already spent millions in trying to treat its water discharge sufficiently to keep from polluting the lake 28 miles below it. Remember that Mead would be located only 4 miles above the Clark Hill Reservoir.

We all know, and Mr. Whitaker admits, that he must have a continuous flow of water. Anyone who crosses Memorial Bridge as much as we Georgians do, going to Calhoun Falls, knows that on the weekends, when they close the gates at Hartwell, the basin is practically dry.

Let us see what Colonel Harris, of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, in a letter to me recently stated:

"A reservoir such as will be created by Trotters Shoals assures ample supply of good quality water at less construction expense to the user. As to waste disposal, it is considered that this subject is not directly related to the problem since it is unlikely that any untreated waste will be permitted to be discharged into the existing Clark Hill Reservoir."

In all fairness, I would suggest that Your Excellency contact Mr. John R. Thoman, Water Supply and Pollution Control, connected with the U.S. Public Health Service in region 4. He will tell you what the Government's position is in regard to discharges in an interstate stream.

We are for Mead; if it can be built on the river, it can be built on the Trotters Shoals Reservoir.

I do not know, but I have heard, that your Excellency questioned both Duke and Mead as to when they intended to build. The answer was "in the distant future". With this answer, the people of Georgia and South Carolina can only hope. Yes, that hope, in the words of the poet, "that springs eternally in the human breast; where man never is, but always to be blest."

Governor, this is something that you can do today and not be heeding the rumble of the distant drums. Trotters Shoals can be a foreseeable reality.

Those who have led the negative fight here have their own forum. We have wondered in Georgia why they are so desperately trying to get you to pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

If you approve of this dam, it will go for consideration by the Congress of the United States which has jurisdiction over interstate streams. Let those who have fought so negatively here before you, fight their battles there.

Wise Management of Resources for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for the past decade a private research organization in Washington, "Resources for the Future," has been doing valuable work in studying the Nation's needs in many key areas. The organization's staff has become well known to many of the committees of Congress, and they have now added to their list of accomplishments a lengthy and detailed study of the Nation's resources over the next 40 years. The theme running through the study is one of continued growth of our Nation but an awareness also that this growth will require wise management of resources. Among our needs will be greater emphasis to both the shortage and deterioration in the quality of water. While there may be differences voiced as to the conclusions reached by the study, I believe it will be useful and I ask unanimous consent that a story which appeared in this morning's Washington Post on the study be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1, 1963]

CROWDED BUT RICH UNITED STATES EXPECTED IN 40 YEARS

(By Julius Duscha)

The United States will be a crowded but prosperous country 40 years from now if the economy continues to grow the way it has since 1920.

This conclusion emerges from a 1,000-page study published yesterday by resources for the future, a private research organization.

The report, which took 5 years to compile, is the first comprehensive study of the Nation's resources since the Paley Commission report of 1952.

LONG-TERM OPTIMISM

While the Paley Commission was pessimistic about America's ability to meet its resource needs, the resources for the future study sees no general running out of resources in this country during the remainder of this century or for a long time thereafter.

The new report cautions that considerable work will have to be done to improve the discovery, production, transportation and use of natural resources not only in the United States but throughout the rest of the world.

It recommends "maintaining and expanding a world trading and investing system that can enlarge the opportunities of the United States and other countries for importing raw materials at low cost."

YEAR 2000 PROJECTIONS

But the most fascinating aspects of the report, which is called "Resources in America's Future," are its economic projections both for 1980, which is only 17 years from now, and for the year 2000. Here are some of them:

U.S. population will more than double by the year 2000, reaching 331 million compared with 180 million in the last census in 1960, and will reach 245 million by 1980.

The gross national product—the value of all goods and services produced in the United States—will double by 1980 and will be four times what it now is by the year 2000. The 1960 figure was $504 billion; the year 2000 projection is for $2.2 trillion.

The value of all goods and services amounted to $6,900 per person in 1960, will total $10,400 in 1980 and will be $15,500 in the year 2000, more than double the 1960 figure.

The present labor force of 73 million will increase by more than one-third to 102 million by 1980 and will almost double by the year 2000, when the figure will reach 142 million.

The number of households, which was 53 million in 1960, will nearly double, totaling 99 million by the year 2000; per capita purchases will more than double, going up from $1,800 to $4,000; personal consumption spending will increase more than four times, jumping from $329 billion to $1.3 trillion.

Federal Government expenditures, which are now near the $100 billion mark, will more than double by 1980 and will be over five times what they now are by the year 2000. The projected figure is $551 billion.

And the number of automobiles jamming the streets will be twice as great in 1980 and four times as large in the year 2000 as they were in 1960. The number of autos will accelerate from 59 million to 120 million to 244 million.

During the next 40 years the greatest resource problems are likely to be water and energy, the report indicates.

"The chief water problems of this country," the study concludes, "are impending shortage of supply in the West and serious deterioration of quality in the East."

It says that the West faces serious "social, economic and legal problems of facilitating a shift toward higher value industrial and municipal uses (of water) and away from the low-value use in irrigation agriculture."

POLLUTION TO BE PROBLEM

Water pollution problems in the East probably could best be handled by "the development of additional storage so that with less elaborate treatment there will be a sufficient flow of fresh water at all times to dilute the concentration of pollution and to flush contaminated water out to sea."

Discussing energy resources, the report points out that coal deposits are adequate but that oil and natural gas deposits will decline to dangerously low levels.

But the report notes that enormous oil deposits probably can be recovered from shale rock in the West and from the tar sands of northern Canada.

The report also forecasts that nuclear reactors will generate about half of the Nation's electrical energy by the year 2000.

NEW ENERGY SOURCES

The study goes on to note the possibilities of obtaining energy from the sun, the wind, the heat sources deep inside cell that converts bacterial the earth and a biological fuel growth into electricity.

Solar energy is most hopeful, says the report, noting that by the end of the century the sun might be harnessed to provide heat for homes and even for some commercial uses.

"Some 50 companies" the report adds, "are currently doing research work on the fuel cell, a device that utilizes the electric current arising when two different gases react upon one another in the presence of a catalyst. It is difficult to believe that the fuel cell will not eventually become a commercial product."

Also stressed is the importance of increasing research and development spending for resources.

Of the $12 billion to $15 billion that it estimates was spent by Government and private groups on research and development in 1960, about $1.2 billion went for resource work.

A doubling of research and development expenditures is suggested in each of the next two decades. This would bring the total to $5 billion to $6 billion by 1980.

The study was written by Joseph L. Fisher, president of Resources for the Future; Hans L. Landsberg, of the organization's research staff; and Leonard L. Fischman, an economics consultant. It is published by Johns Hopkins Press of Baltimore.

Resources for the Future, which has its offices in Washington, is supported by Ford Foundation funds. It was set up in 1952.

How To Succeed in Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader of March 21, 1963. The editorial points out some operations of the New Frontier feed grains program which were predicted by

congressional Republicans before the program was adopted.

The text of the editorial is as follows:

HOW TO SUCCEED IN FARMING

Delaware's Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has a gift for coming up with some astounding anecdotes of life on the New Frontier. Last week he reported upon a neat scheme of the Farmers Investment Co., of Tucson, on how to succeed in farming without really trying.

The company first leased 582 acres of land in Maricopa County from the State of Arizona, at a rental of $3 per acre, or something less than $1,800. Then the company went to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and offered not to grow anything on the land it had just rented. The Department happily agreed to pay the company $37.90 per acre, or a total of $22,069, not to cultivate the same acreage.

Pleased by this achievement, the company then rented three tracts of land in Pinal County, one of 81 acres, and two others of 38 acres, at an average rental of $4.50 an acre. This was better land for not cultivating, so the Department of Agriculture agreed to pay $41.30 per acre on the first tract, $43.20 on the second tract, and $51.70 on the third tract, provided the company would not raise anything on them.

The net result was that the company paid less than $2,500 to rent the land, which it then got paid $26,500 not to cultivate. This is nice nonwork if you can get it, and apparently in the feed grain program you can get it if you try.

America's Three Greatest Battles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, "America's Three Greatest Battles" was the subject Newsday decided upon for their November American history contest. The two winners were Carol Sabel, a junior at the Academy of the Sacred Heart of Mary in Sag Harbor, and Jonathan Krown, a senior at Malverne Senior High School in Malverne, N.Y. Their choices of America's three greatest battles included America's struggles against prejudice, ignorance, fear, disunity, and materialism. Their essays demonstrated a great deal of individual thought and originality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the texts of the two winning essays from Newsday's American history contest in November be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST NAME AMERICA'S THREE GREATEST BATTLES

(By Carol Sabel, junior, Academy of the Sacred Heart of Mary, Sag Harbor)

What is it that constitutes the making of a great battle? Can we call a battle great because thousands of lives were lost, as in the D-day invasion of Normandy? Can we call a battle great because the tactics of warfare that were used were incredibly difficult, as in the islands of the South Pacific in World War II? Can we measure the greatness of a battle by these standards? I say, "No." The greatness of a battle, for the United States, must be measured by the importance that battle played in the future of our country.

Certainly, then, those battles of the Revolutionary War and the Civil War might have changed the form of our country. They were important to its future. Yet, I think that there are more important battles that the United States has fought. These were not limited to achieving greatness only for the United States but for the entire free world. She is still fighting them today.

The United States today is involved in, perhaps, the greatest of all conflicts—one which is not being fought with conventional military weapons, but rather with words and ideas. But before we can expect to win this conflict, we must look within our Nation. We must fight those battles with ourselves which threaten to destroy the very core of our ideals. We are faced, have been faced, and will be faced with great inward conflicts. There is the battle against prejudice, the battle against disunity, and the battle against materialism. These three evils have been nibbling and gnawing at the core of democracy. They are certainly difficult to overcome and they are certainly great—for they hold in their outcomes the question of freedom in the future world.

Our Nation was founded on a basic principle of equality. To this day prejudice has kept our country divided into sections, which are on opposite sides of this controversy. There should be no controversy, and this is the issue of the battle. We must dissolve this prejudice which is ripping our Nation apart. There is no room for a battle of racialism in a world that is searching for ideals—in a world that would like to respect and admire the inward tranquillity of the United States. The battle facing our Government is to erase the prejudice that has haunted our land, but to erase it in such a way that new prejudice does not erupt.

In our country, as well as in the Western alliance, there are petty differences. The problem is that we have allowed these differences to become all important, rather than hold them in the proper perspective. The leaders of the supposedly unified states or countries have permitted disunity to creep in—slowly loosening the bonds of alliance. The problem assumes greater depth as we realize that "A house divided against itself cannot stand." We threaten our very existence by allowing petty differences to separate us—making it impossible to stand firm for our really basic goals. We have to fight this growing disunity if we plan to make any progress at all.

Today we are engaged in a conflict of ideologies and philosophies. We are fighting a battle of materialism versus spiritualism. Materialism and our new values under this philosophy have changed. They are reaching the lowest depths ever known to man because we cannot remain civilized in a world where the bywords for success are "better," "faster," "cheaper;" in a world that relies on the work of machines, not men. Man must set up goals and ideals for himself, goals that are consistent with a code of morals and ethics. If we do not successfully fight the growing menace of materialism, we cannot be described as a civilization, but as barbarians.

We see these three dread evils spreading out and encompassing our society. The battles have presented a challenge, and we must meet it if we plan to succeed as the United States or as a part of the alliance that stands for the ideals of democracy.

(By Jonathan Krown, senior, Malverne Senior High School)

Lexington and Chancellorsville, the Wilderness and Shiloh, Corregidor and Iwo Jima; these are the places where Americans have left their mark on history, places resounding with the blood and sweat of men; instinctive nominations in the search for America's three greatest battles. However, probing deeper, problems arise at the thought of stacking one opponent against another, or one man's death against another's survival. How can we judge the "greatness" of a battle?

There is a way. How many battles were fought more heroically in our history than those against the very things in us with which we would destroy ourselves? The most deadly enemies of America are not as material as a missile or an army, for actually our greatest battles are similar to those waged all over the world by men striving to be free. These battles have no equals—the pages they fill in our history are 10 times more glorious than Yorktown ever was. They are those we have fought against our three greatest enemies; battles against ignorance, fear, and prejudice, and each is continuous in that we are stil contesting the issues today. They echo not of gunshot and mortor fire, yet, the deeds recorded in the struggles far surpass the capture of a tank or the downing of an aircraft, and the resulting casualties far exceed those of all the wars in history. They resound with the cries of men yearning for a better life, with the aspirations that shape the American ideal. The opponents in these battles could defeat us where no enemy army could survive.

The battle against ignorance is probably the most hotly contested and the most vital to our survival as a nation. It is not only our ignorance of the world that has placed us in the circumstances we find ourselves enveloped in today. It is an ignorance of ourselves, both as individuals and as a people—of the reality and progress that has made us what we are. It is an ignorance of our own ideals, and a resulting apathy toward associating these with the hopes of other nations seeking to reach the standard of living we have attained. Upon the result of this battle depends, not only our victory or defeat in the cold war, but the ultimate survival of democratic thought.

The age-old battle against fear speaks for itself. The recent sensation of a book called "Lord of the Flies," by William Golding, is an illustration of its pertinence in today's society. The lives of many Americans are controlled by fear: fear of losing a job, fear of death, fear of living. And lately, many of the actions of America in the world conflict have been a submission to our inherent fear of death. Unless this battle is won, we will regress until even temporary peace, with ourselves and with others, is unattainable.

"All men are created equal" is a statement every schoolboy of six has memorized. Yet it is being disputed here (in the very country where it originated), distorting everything America stands for. Here, perhaps, in the battle against prejudice, victory is nearer. We cannot have a truly democratic America until equality in thought replaces oppressive rationalization, and every American can stand as tall as his mind and soul empower him.

These are, and have always been, "America's three greatest battles." The proof of this is furnished by a mere reflection on our history, for history does not lie. This undisputed testament can be found in every human being, and is within everyone's grasp.

Henry Steele Commager wrote, "America is the proving ground of history." Upon the outcome of these three battles—against ignorance, fear, and prejudice—lies the future and greatness not only of America and her people, but of the entire earth.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you for your letter of March 20 and the enclosed brochure on the 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence.

I will indeed find it useful as a reference source and appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending it to me.

Regards.

Sincerely,

BILL STINSON,
U.S. Representative.

P.S.—I shall support you in this.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *March 18, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of our organization, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations would with honor and truth understand and present to the world, knowledge and information as to the plight of submerged nations. This in turn, will aid our Government, our peoples, and our foreign policy.

Respectfully yours,

AMELIA STEFEUNCK,
President.

EUGENIA TYMESUK,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN CENTER, INC.,
Passaic, N.J., March 13, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter sent to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH in which we ask him to submit to vote on his committee your resolution (H. Res. 14) for establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CHOMKO,
President of the Ukrainian Center, Inc., in Passaic, N.J.

UKRAINIAN CENTER, INC.,
Passaic, N.J., March 13, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the Ukrainian Center, Inc. in Passaic, N.J., we urge you to submit the Flood resolution calling for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations to vote by your committee.

The creation of this Special House Committee on Captive Nations at this particular time would serve in a most effective manner to combat Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism and would serve as vital reservoir of the true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which would be very helpful to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We wish to thank you in advance, sir, for anything that you can do in supporting the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN CHOMKO,
President of Ukrainian Center, Inc., in Passaic, N.J.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 18, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This land of Washington has always been the only hope for many enslaved nations in their struggle for liberty and human rights denied to them by tyranny of communism.

To keep this hope alive we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

The creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations and will help the American people to recognize the true dangers of Communist aggression.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ANATOL LYSYJ, M.D.
MRS. DARIA LYSYJ.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 15, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We understand that Congressman FLOOD presented a resolution (H. Res. 14) concerning establishment of a congressional Committee on Captive Nations. We urge you to submit this resolution to vote by your committee. We also sincerely ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

The necessity of establishing such a committee is evident from the fact that even in our State Department there is a confusion concerning the situation in Eastern Europe. The information given in 158 issue of the State Department Research News Letter on the Soviet Union and the letters of Secretary Rusk to your committee in connection with the proposed establishment of Captive Nations Committee are a good illustration to this.

While the Soviet Union has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations, constituting a decided weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

The objective study performed by the proposed congressional Committee on Captive Nations will tremendously help in bringing the authentic information for our State Department and will clarify the confusion in the minds of American public concerning the true situation behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

We sincerely urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM DOMBROWSKY,
President.

MYKOLA DERBUSH,
Secretary.

ST. JOHN'S SOCIETY,
Hartford, Conn., March 11, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of the 600 members of the St. John's Society in Hartford we urge you to submit the resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee.

The fact that many millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain are enslaved by Russian imperialism today cannot be overlooked by those who are now enjoying freedom which is one of the blessings of our democracy.

It is our opinion that nations which have lost their political and cultural independence became subjugated by Russian imperialism now taking form of communism deserve to be helped in their continuous struggle for independence which is also an incorporation of their beloved freedom and democracy.

Your qualified support to the Flood resolution, Congressman SMITH, will be most gratefully appreciated. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER WASYLENKO,
Chairman.

STANLEY HOMOTIUK,
Secretary.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *March 18, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: With regard to the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, we strongly urge your support, and to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations would be of great value and we hope you will give it your favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,
UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN MEN'S CLUB.
WILLIAM NYKONCHUH,
President.
STANLEY F. SMICHUKO,
Secretary.
WILLIAM HOWE,
JOHN JORMOROSKEY,
WALTER J. HUSKA,
MICHAEL W. JANSWYEZ,
WALTER W. KOPYCHOK.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAN: Many thanks for your letter dated March 20 together with the brochure on the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence.

Be assured of my cooperation.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Cordially,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

HARTFORD, *March 11, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The members of the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc. Branch 5 in Hartford, Conn., appeals to you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist imperialist Russia pose as "defenders of liberation of the Asian and African nations from colonialism", but at the same time they practice the worst possible form of colonial oppression and enslavement over the non-Russian nations under their domination and use all and every means at the disposal of their cruel and totalitarian regime to suppress and strangle every manifestation and aspiration of these non-Russian nations to freedom and national independence.

Existence of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a real reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
ALEXANDRE RUDZINSKY,
President.

Grafton, W. Va., Fights Economic Problems—Wins Acclaim as "All America City"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Grafton, W. Va., has been named one of the Nation's "All America Cities" in an annual competition sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

According to a United Press International wire story in the March 29 issue of the News-Tribune, Keyser, W. Va., this city of 7,365 was the smallest to gain "All America" recognition, and was praised as "the community that refused to die."

Threatened by economic shutdowns and changes in the employment structure Grafton was faced with gradual declines in prosperity, income, and population potential. However, with a determination which has become characteristic of most West Virginians, the citizens of this Taylor County city applied themselves in an imaginative program of civic redevelopment. As a result they have attracted new industry, enhanced the appearance of the downtown area, and most important, fostered a new confidence in the hearts of local residents.

Mr. President, Grafton is but one sector of the Mountain State wherein conscientious citizens are expending every energy to improve, through their own efforts, the economic climate in which they live. We are proud of the manner in which our people have borne the adversity of underdevelopment and unemployment, and prouder still of their desire to win for themselves a better way of life.

I request that the article "Grafton Refused to Die," in the March 29, 1963, issue of the Keyser, W. Va., News-Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Keyser (W. Va.) News Tribune, Mar. 29, 1963.]

GRAFTON REFUSES TO DIE

NEW YORK.—Grafton, W. Va., cited as "the community that refused to die," was among 11 All-America cities announced Thursday by the National Municipal League and Look magazine, cosponsors of the annual competition.

Grafton, Taylor County seat and home of 7,365 residents, was the smallest city to win the "All America" title for local efforts to tackle and solve major community problems.

Officials said "facelifting" programs this year were much to the fore. Many of the winning cities are in the midst of rejuvenation projects, with downtown areas the focal point of renewal efforts.

Grafton's troubles began with the shutdown of a large pottery firm and a drop in local railroad development. The climax came in 1958 when the city's last major industry, a glass plant, closed its doors.

In an effort to revive the sagging economy, Grafton's citizens formed a 1,300-member Grafton Area Development Council to attract industry.

The Tygart Valley Development Association, armed with $30,000 in voluntary subscriptions, began to develop industrial sites.

Local women, who had turned out 2,000-strong for an "operation survival" parade, took a labor inventory, listing skills available.

Improvement of the community's physical appearance was started and an urban renewal program is well underway, centered around Andrews Methodist Church and development of a Mother's Day shrine in honor of Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day 41 years ago in the Taylor County community.

Today, the united citizens' effort is beginning to pay off with the location of two new industries in the community and hope of a third.

Grafton, W. Va.: The Town That Refused To Die—Now an All America City

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are all doubtless aware of the All America Cities Awards given each year to 11 U.S. communities selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League which is the cosponsor with Look magazine of the annual awards competition. This program is now in its 15th year.

This year, I am happy to report, Grafton, W. Va., was chosen as one of these cities, along with Allentown, Pa.; Bartlesville, Okla.; Boston, Mass.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Dade County, Fla.; Grand Junction, Colo.; High Point, N.C.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Quincy, Ill.; and San Diego, Calif.

No individual is more pleased than I at the honor bestowed on Grafton, for since it is located in my first congressional district, I have worked very closely with Grafton's officials in dealing with the problems confronting the community. Therefore, I have more than a passing interest in her accomplishments.

Many of you will remember that Grafton is the town that refused to die. In 1958, its only major industry, a glass plant, closed its doors, forcing 480 peo-

ple out of work. This came close on the heels of the closing of a large pottery and a drastic drop in local railroad employment. But Grafton citizens were determined to keep their town alive, whatever the cost, and on a bitterly cold December day, more than 2,000 women turned out in an Operation Survival parade.

Forward-looking civic leaders formed the 1,300-member Grafton Area Development Council to attract industry, and the Tygart Valley Development Association, armed with $30,000 in voluntary subscriptions, began to develop industrial sites. Local women took a labor inventory, listing skills available in Grafton.

Efforts were made to improve the town's physical appearance. Streets were paved, sidewalks repaired, storefronts modernized and 54 condemned houses were torn down.

Two new industries did come into Grafton and there is a good prospect that a third will follow. I am especially elated at this for I have attempted to aid and direct civic leaders in their attempts to interest industry in locating in Grafton.

Today Grafton's unemployment problem is far from solved, but we all feel that "things are looking up." The indomitable spirit that refused to let Grafton die will find ways and means to restore her to a healthy, thriving city.

We are grateful for this opportunity to bring Grafton to the attention of all the Nation. Industries desiring to relocate should capitalize on this strong will to survive and grow.

I commend Grafton again for its devotion to the cause of industrial development and civic improvement, and recommend its recipe for recovery to other cities which may find themselves in distress.

Gross Replies to Editorial on Churchill Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, although not mentioned by name, my colleague, H. R. GROSS of Iowa, and I were referred to in an editorial carried by the Des Moines, Iowa, Register on March 14, 1963, because we had voted against granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill.

Congressman GROSS submitted a letter to the editor of the Register which rebuts the position of the editorial that a "sense of shame" should be felt for the action of two Members of the Iowa delegation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Congressman GROSS' letter to the editor appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letter follows:

GROSS REPLIES TO EDITORIAL ON CHURCHILL CITIZENSHIP

To the EDITOR:

In your March 14 editorial, concerning action of the House in granting honorary U.S. citizenship to Winston Churchill, you state in part: "We feel a sense of shame at the bad manners and ill grace of one Iowa Congressman who asked whether this gesture was designed to influence an extension of the British debt to the United States. We regret that another Iowa Congressman voted against the honor, though he at least did it on a matter of principle, believing it would set a bad precedent."

Had the editorial writer taken the trouble to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Mar. 12, 1963, p. 3794), he would have found abundant proof that I opposed this legislation on the grounds of a bad precedent as well as questioning its influence on another suspension of all payments (interest and principal) on the multibillion dollar loan which the then Prime Minister Churchill negotiated following World War II.

Again referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Mar. 12, 1963, p. 3794) I said: "Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detract from the leadership Mr. Churchill gave to the British Isles and the Commonwealth during World War II, but this, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee frankly admits, would be an unprecedented action. This apparently would be a granting of U.S. citizenship, no matter how limited, on a basis accorded no other citizen of a foreign country in the history of this Republic. Who will be the next?"

On the walls of the House are two huge portraits: of George Washington and of General Lafayette. No citizen of a foreign country made a greater contribution to the creation of this Republic than did Lafayette. Not only did he give of his military and diplomatic talents, providing the invaluable help of the French Government to the revolution, but he gave of his personal fortune. Yet throughout the years Congress never bestowed any form of citizenship upon Lafayette.

It should also be pointed out that, only 5 years ago, when approached on the subject of honorary U.S. citizenship, Mr. Churchill made it plain that he would refuse. What was the reason for his change of mind? Having been repulsed by Churchill himself, what motivated Congress to reinitiate this action? Is U.S. citizenship, honorary or otherwise, a commodity to be dealt out on the basis of whimsy?

Britain's debt to this country is some $13 billion as a result of obligations incurred in World War I and subsequent thereto. Payments on the $4 billion "loan," which Mr. Churchill negotiated shortly after World War II, and which were suspended by Congress for 8 years, must be resumed in the near future or another extension voted. Is there anyone gullible enough to think that the British have any intention of paying the full $4 billion, much less $13 billion?

And it can well be noted here that some 10 years ago the Churchill influence was instrumental in prevailing upon the U.S. Government to relinquish its interest in more than $1 billion in counterpart and similar funds which were then applied to retirement of the British internal debt.

Churchill once said in effect: "I have not been selected as the King's First Minister to liquidate the British Empire." As a nationalist and spokesman for Britannia he has few equals. Neither has he had many peers in his ability to open the doors of the U.S. Treasury.

If, as the Register laments, it be "bad manners and ill grace" to protest a very bad precedent and at the same time question the influence that such a precedent may have indirectly upon the debtridden taxpayers of Iowa and the Nation, then so be it.—H. R. GROSS, U.S. Representative, Third Iowa District, Washington, D.C.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Lafayette and all of his male heirs were granted citizenship by Maryland and Virginia before the union was formed and so automatically became full U.S. citizens.)

Too Busy To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Idaho's first citizen in the minds of thousands of our citizens is U.S. District Judge Chase A. Clark.

Judge Clark started his law practice in Mackay, Idaho, in 1904 and went on to serve in both houses of the State legislature and as mayor of Idaho Falls. Later he became one of our most outstanding Governors. I know that in my short career in public life I have been greatly encouraged by the example set by this outstanding man, and have benefited from his counsel and advice.

Judge Clark is also the father-in-law of our distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. One of the more satisfying experiences I have received from serving in the Congress has been the close association that Mrs. Harvey and I have enjoyed with Senator FRANK CHURCH and his lovely wife, Bethine, the daughter of this distinguished jurist and public servant.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to include at this point in the RECORD an article which was printed in the Boise, Idaho, Daily Statesman, on Friday, March 15 commenting on Judge Clark's 80th birthday and his life of accomplishment.

The article follows:

TOO BUSY TO RETIRE—JUDGE CHASE CLARK STARTS 21ST YEAR ON U.S. BENCH; RECALLS APPOINTMENT BY LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

When the Boise Federal Building personnel started arriving for work this morning, striding along was a spry and smiling young man of 80, showing up for his day's work. Greeted on all sides by coworkers and fellowtownsmen, Federal Judge Chase A. Clark was starting his 21st year on the Federal bence, stretching out a determination to keep busy rather than accept a deserved Federal retirement at a $22,500 salary.

The legal problem that confronted Judge Clark on his anniversary day had to do with an estate problem involving minor children. That kind of legal challenge will keep the venerable jurist busy for most of the morning. Every detail will receive careful attention. Judge Clark happens to be one of the kindest men ever to sit in any court. The children are in good hands.

His legal work out of the way, Judge Clark will have a heavy calendar as friends come by to congratulate him, not only for his long period of service, but for the great personal trait that has kept him in his assignment, monthly in the Boise court but in special

work in Federal courts all over the Nation. Just last month Judge Clark was presiding judge in Federal court at Phoenix.

Ask why he continued working long after his retirement age 10 years ago when he was 70, Judge Clark said:

"I could have retired when I was 70. My salary would have come along just the same the rest of my life. I'm really working for nothing but I love my work.

"No one has suggested that I retire. A person is not able to judge himself correctly. I figure I have enough friends who, if they thought I was in my dotage, they'd come and tell me. They haven't."

Judge Clark is perhaps as well and favorably known as any other Idaho citizen. His Idaho career was climaxed by a term as Governor from 1940 to 1943. He has served in both Idaho legislative houses, and was mayor of Idaho Falls when he was elected the State's chief executive. He started his law career in Mackay in 1904 when he was 21. Later he practiced law at Hailey.

"How did I get this job?" Judge Clark was asked.

"I happened to be in Washington while I was Governor trying to get some Federal money into Idaho. I had an appointment with President Roosevelt. I was going to talk about getting the Navy into Pend Oreille. As I was going into the White House an Associated Press man came up and showed me a dispatch which said Judge Charles Cavanaugh had resigned as Idaho's Federal judge.

"I went in and talked to the President about the money matter and when I got up to leave I said 'Mr. President, I note that the Federal bench in Idaho is to be vacant. Why don't you give me that job?'

"The President replied: "All right, Chase, you can have it.' "

I was appointed March 15, 1943. And I've been in this nice office ever since.

Some observations from the judge:

On being a legislator: "In the legislature in 1913 there weren't any problems at all. It was just a question of getting some money for Custer County. In 1932 in the senate it was different. Very strenuous. Relief for the unemployed was the problem."

On his daily life: "I'm busy here in my office. The work is most of my life. I get up at 7:30, earlier if I have a problem on my mind.

Most satisfying experience: "In 20 years on the bench I have admitted more than 2,000 citizens to citizenship. This is my biggest thrill. I am also satisfied by the fact that men who have been conviced in my court and placed on probation have made good a hundred percent. This is a great thing. It is forgotten they were ever in trouble."

Most interesting case: "Not one. Many. During the war a lot of men came into court to get their jobs back after fighting the war. We saw it to it."

The lawyers obligation: "The lawyer must render public service. I believe lawyers give more service gratis than any other profession. I have found them very conscientious in their work."

About young people: "I urge young folks to seek the job they feel they would like. A paycheck isn't most important. Young folks are getting along as well today as they did when I was one of them."

Politics: "I have always been a Democrat. I believe all a person needs to be is a loyal American. Politics is no good if it goes over everything else."

Judge Clark's job has not only made him a familiar figure in Idaho. He is often assigned to sit in for judges in other States. Doing this he has traveled to Alaska, Hawaii, North Carolina, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Arizona and California.

The judge was married to Mrs. Clark, the former Jean Burnett of Mackay in Mackay 57 years ago.

"Our golden wedding anniversary," he said, "was a great day. Every day is a great day."

"Jean told me not to have my picture taken smoking a pipe so I didn't. Don't wear your glasses, either," she said.

"Which reminds me," he recollected. "I didn't have to put them on to pass my last driving test."

Barron's Slashing Attack on West Kentucky, Our Largest Employer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Barron's Slashing Attack on West Kentucky, Our Largest Employer," which appeared in the March 25 issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

As everybody in our county, and the western Kentucky coal field generally knows, Judge William E. Miller in the U.S. district court at Nashville ruled not long ago that Tampa Electric Co., a big Florida utility, should recover from West Kentucky Coal Co., our county's largest industry and our largest employer, the sum of $2,991,501.19. involved was a long-term contract to supply Tampa Electric with coal.

Everybody in or out of the coal industry knows too that the Tampa Electric contract was negotiated by the late Justin Potter and his Nashville Coal Co., and that when West Kentucky acquired the Potter coal enterprises by purchase, it acquired the Florida contract in question.

As of now, this decision by U.S. Judge Miller in Nashville is the current status of litigation begun by Tampa Electric several years ago to force Nashville Coal to perform a contract made before it became a subsidiary of West Kentucky Coal Co., though Tampa Electric knew that West Kentucky had been advised by attorneys of long experience in such controversies that the contract violated the antitrust laws.

To fill in further the background of what the Messenger is to say about the latest development in the Tampa Electric suit, the following should be said in order that the citizen can form an opinion about a vicious and entirely unwarranted attack which has been made in the financial press upon our leading industry and our largest employer:

The same Judge Miller decided in favor of West Kentucky on November 18, 1958.

On appeal, the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit decided in favor of West Kentucky. This was on April 4, 1960.

The U.S. Supreme Court—or a majority of its members—held that these two lower courts were wrong, and sent the case back to Judge Miller in Nashville to assess damages. This Judge Miller was obliged to do, in spite of his earlier opinion that the contract was illegal. Thus the $2,991,501.19 judgment against West Kentucky came about.

This paper lacks the legal competence to analyze the line of reasoning by which Chief Justice Earl Warren and his associates on the Nation's High Court arrived at their decision, but we have heard it suggested, by competent attorneys, that the Supreme Court "wrote law" in the West Kentucky case. At any rate, it seems to us, the Court has worked a great hardship and a practical injustice, and an instance of the damage done this local enterprise and major employer in our coal field turns up in the March 11 number of Barron's, a national business and financial weekly.

Now Barron's, praise the good Lord, can count its Hopkins County circulation on the fingers of one hand. It circulates in the marts of trade, unfortunately, and it is read by financial institutions, by firms which purchase coal, and by others who have it in their power to affect one way or another the volume of coal produced by West Kentucky Coal Co. and the days of work available for its almost 2,000 employees.

With an irresponsibility which is shocking in a magazine of its supposed standing in its field, Barron's Weekly prints a gloating, vicious diatribe which it heads "Capital Sin—A Note on the Woes of West Kentucky Coal Co."

It is not possible in the space allotted this article to comment on all of the unfair and inaccurate statements and inferences in the Barron's article. We think it is fair to ask, however, when the conduct of the coal company involved in the dispute with Tampa Electric became a sin? From 1957 to 1961 the conduct of West Kentucky was a proper reliance on the antitrust laws, a public policy of the United States. And this should be kept in mind:

Under the rulings of two competent and honorable courts—the U.S. district court in Nashville and the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit—it was improper for officers of the coal company to jeopardize the interests of its stockholders by proceeding with the performance of an illegal contract.

West Kentucky Coal Co. did not begin the litigation but it conformed to the judgments of the courts from 1958 to 1961. This was proper and no other course would have been permissible. If the company is penalized now by this heavy award of damages—and further injury by the gloating and amazing article in Barron's financial weekly—the customers of Tampa Electric, individual and industrial, will be the sole beneficiaries. West Kentucky and our community will be the losers because what was the only course proper or possible from 1958 to 1961 became, after 1961, in the language of Barron's Weekly, "a capital sin."

West Kentucky Coal Co. has been a mainstay of this area's economy for more years than most of us can remember. Thus the Tampa judgment and the slashing attack in Barron's are blows aimed at our business community, and should justly be resented here. If there should be a reversal of the damage award, which may be hoped for, the Messenger would like to know if Barron's Weekly will publish another article—a retraction of the damaging things said in its issue of March 11?

We suspect not, just as we suspect Barron's motives in publishing its article in the first place.

Meanwhile, verdict or no verdict, reversal or no reversal, West Kentucky Coal Co. is a solvent, expanding company of which any community and any State could be proud.

Who Will Pay United Nations Costs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Denver Post of March 18, 1963. The editorial points out that the United Na-

tions is not getting financial support from other nations and that its future is in jeopardy. Text of the editorial is as follows:

WHO WILL PAY UNITED NATIONS COSTS?

If the United Nations were an ideal organization in an ideal world, each member nation would cheerfully pay its fair share of U.N. expenses, the world organization would be solvent and effective, and everyone would be happy.

But since such utopian bliss patently does not exist, the United Nations is teetering on the edge of bankruptcy, and because of the myopia and intransigence of many of its members, the future effectiveness of the organization is in dire jeopardy.

The sad facts of the U.N. economic life were spelled out last week by Secretary General U Thant. The costs of the peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo, combined with the refusal of many U.N. members to contribute to either one or both operations, have created a U.N. deficit that currently stands at about $75 million and is likely to amount to $127 million by the end of June.

The financial gloom became even gloomier last week when the United States—long the principal supporter of both the U.N. regular and emergency operations—announced that it will pay only its assessed share of future peacekeeping operations and nothing more unless other nations meet their part of the costs.

The United States pays 32.02 percent of the regular U.N. budget, and it is therefore assessed the same percentage for the emergency operations. But because of voluntary contributions, the United States has paid 48.5 percent of the cost of keeping U.N. forces in the Congo and the Gaza strip.

The U.S. decision to pay only its fair share is eminently reasonable, but even if Uncle Sam had decided to continue laying the extra-large golden eggs, the United Nations still would face financial disaster.

The U.N. members have been giving serious attention to this grave problem, and a 21-member committee has now come up with a proposed solution.

The committee's recommendation is that to meet the costs of any peace-keeping operation, the first $5 million would be raised by assessing the entire membership on the basis of the percentage of their regular budget assessment. The industrialized nations would pay an increasing share of the next $95 million, starting with 50 percent, increasing to 75 percent and finally to 90 percent.

Since it is precisely some of the most important of the industrialized nations—Russia, France, Belgium, etc.—that have refused to pay their special assessments, the committee proposal would leave the same old nations—most notably, the United States and Britain—holding the bag.

The proposal has little chance of being approved at the special session of the General Assembly called for next May to consider the U.N.'s financial plight. Indeed, there is little expectation that the May session will make any significant accomplishments.

It is likely that no action will be taken until the United Nations is dead broke and unable to continue operations for more than a few weeks. Then in a whirlwind session, the members will decide that the organization has to be saved to function at least as a debating society.

When this time comes, hopefully a majority of the members will realize that if the United Nations is to be anything it must be more than a forum for debate. Maybe even some of the hitherto recalcitrant nations will cough up the money they owe, but there is little reason to be optimistic about this.

The Wall Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News of March 20, 1963. The editorial points out that while Central American nations talk of leadership, President Kennedy prescribes the standard New Frontier formula for dealing with any problem—try to spend it to death. Text of the editorial is as follows:

THE WALL BUILDER

It is a measure of the leadership of John F. Kennedy that, as Central American nations clamor for action against Fidel Castro, he speaks to them of increased foreign aid.

During Monday's meeting in Costa Rica, President Ramon Villeda Morales of Honduras sounded a clear call for action. "The battle of Cuba," he said, "must not terminate with the withdrawal of Soviet ships and rocket bases. The battle of Cuba must terminate with the return of thousands of Cubans whose life is incompatible with the presence in their oppressed country of arms offensive to the dignity of America."

President Kennedy, apparently, has a different conception of America's dignity. His response was a promise to "build a wall" around Castro, to dole out more foreign aid, and to strike trade agreements with our Latin neighbors. The idea of ousting Castro from the Western Hemisphere was notable for its absence—indeed, that idea is denied by the concept of walling Castro up. If we are going to build a wall around him, he obviously is going to stay put for a long time.

Thus did President Kennedy once more acknowledge the permanency of communism in Cuba, and once more renounce the Monroe Doctrine. The United States in his view, is not committed to getting Soviet influence out of Cuba; it is committed merely to containing it.

With these words, Kennedy has brought our Nation to a new low point: We are unwilling to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, even as our smaller neighbors in the hemisphere (Guatemala being the most vocal example) plead with us to enforce it. That fact makes Kennedy's words abou the ultimate triumph of democracy virtually meaningless.

Freedom can never be safe in this hemisphere so long as Castro maintains his privileged sanctuary for subversion and terror. No amount of Alliance-for-Progress dollars can render Latin America immune from sabotage and deliberately fomented, violence—a fact of which the beleaguered Central American presidents are all too well aware.

These nations are looking hopefully to the United States for leadership in the struggle against communism. But they are receiving only words and promises of money. Until America assumes the responsibilities of a leader, rather than those of a hemispheric philanthropist, the problem of communism in this hemisphere is going to persist.

The presidents of other American Republics have realized this fact clearly. It is a pity our own President has not done the same.

Reeks of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of March 26, 1963.

REEKS OF POLITICS

Governor Romney has been in Washington seeking settlement of the dispute that threatens Michigan's program for aid to dependent children of unemployed persons. There was a decided smell of partisan politics before the Governor hade his trip. It reeks of politics now.

The Governor tried to convince Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that the bill, as written, conforms with Federal standards. Secretary Celebrezze says it doesn't. The Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington, which wrote the Federal law in the first place, says Governor Romney is right. Senator Patrick McNamara stands behind Secretary Celebrezze; Senator Philip Hart, another Democrat, is noncommittal.

Matters were brought to a head a few days ago when Wilbur Cohen, Assistant Secretary for Legislation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, raised objections to the bill. He declares that the measure discriminates against certain types of workers and Secretary Celebrezze agrees with him.

They base their complaint on the point that the bill would deny Federal-State aid to families of fathers who had not been eligible for or who had not received unemployment aid since January 1, 1958. The legislature's intent was to exclude the chronically unemployed—they are eligible under other welfare legislation.

The Federal law specifically provides that States coming within the program may define what they mean by "unemployed." But Secretary Celebrezze, supported by Mr. Cohen, says the Michigan measure is discriminatory and arbitrary and Michigan cannot qualify for Federal money under it. The bill does define and limit those eligible, as does every piece of welfare legislation, local, State, or National. The laws for veterans aid define the limit and veterans eligible for aid.

Actually the measure was submitted some time ago to the Federal agency's Chicago office and given the go-ahead signal there. Mr. Cohen, a University of Michigan law professor on leave in Washington, got into the act late. He waited until the last possible minute before raising any objection. Mr. Cohen knows Michigan well. He knows the legislature is inclined to move slowly on such programs; he certainly ought to know that any attempt to bludgeon the legislature into going further than it wishes to go is likely to defeat the entire measure.

A former Democratic Governor failed to get passage of similar legislation. Governor Romney tried and succeeded. The measure does not go as far as some Democrats want, but it is a big start in the direction they have wanted to go. Mr. Cohen who objects that the bill does not go far enough, obviously would not disqualify all the children if he were writing the law. Yet his opinion given against the Michigan bill denies the program to all needy children because he says the legislature has discriminated against some.

Mr. Cohen's attitude, which Secretary Celebrezze in effect endorses, is punitive and vindictive. It is entirely contrary to the clear intent of Congress to permit the States to decide how far they want to go in extending welfare benefits. It's another instance of Washington insisting it's always right and must be obeyed.

Charitable Contributions To Suffer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium of March 27, 1963:

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUFFER

President Kennedy's tax cut plan has been criticized generally because of restrictions it would place on Federal tax deductibility of contributions of all kind.

There likely will be those who feel that this opposition stems principally, if not solely, from political reasoning. That is not true, as testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee has revealed.

One of those objecting sincerely to the President's plan because of potential loss of revenue for charitable organizations was John S. Hayes, president of the United Community Funds and Councils of America.

The President's plan would lump contributions with other types of deductible expenses and would require that they be subject to a floor of 5 percent of one's adjusted gross income. That means that these expenses would be deductible only in the amount in excess of the 5-percent floor.

At present, drugs and medicines must exceed 1 percent to be deductible. Medical expenses, including doctor bills, hospital charges, etc., are not deductible until after they reach 3 percent.

Hayes testified that the organizations he represents obtain about $520 million a year from some 31 million contributors for 35,000 health, welfare, recreation, and youth services. Their total expenditures exceed $1.6 billion each year.

Large contributors will be handicapped. So will smaller contributors who each year try to reduce their almost prohibitive income tax bills by being permitted to deduct contributions of various kinds.

As Hayes pointed out:

"We believe the psychological impact of the 5-percent floor on many givers of strategic importance to charitable organizations will, at best, be to offset any beneficial effects of lower tax rates and, at worst, to discourage charitable giving and generosity * * *. It will make financing of charitable organizations more difficult."

As Hayes pointed out, contribution deductibility is one of the "few practical means by which the Federal Government can encourage voluntary citizen activity for community betterment."

President Kennedy seems determined that a tax cut is the answer to all economic ills. But a tax cut which would deter contributions to charitable organizations hardly seems the answer.

The President seems disinclined to make any appreciable cut in Federal spending. Unless he does that, a tax cut would mean more deficit spending, and charitable organizations would be hurt at the same time.

Does that make sense?

West Virginia Maintains Balance Between Scholarship and Athletics—Rod Thorn Named to Academic All-Star Basketball Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the West Virginia tradition in athletics is a fruitful and worthwhile segment of citizen interest in the Mountain State. Throughout our history West Virginians have been among the leaders in sport and have contributed significantly to the emergence of America as a Nation respected for athletic achievement throughout the world. Men such as Fielding Yost, Ira E. Rodgers, and Greasy Neale have been among those who have earned fame through their lifelong devotion to sport.

It is also heartening to note that along with a deep interest in athletics, the colleges and universities in West Virginia maintain a high standard of scholastic excellence, and require that intellectual growth remain the center of campus life.

An effective evidence of this commendable balance between college curriculum and athletics is the recent selection of All-American basketball player Rod Thorn as a member of the country's first academic all-star team. Named to several honorary teams as a result of his prowess on the court, Rod Thorn also attained a 3.01 scholastic average in his prelaw course at West Virginia University. He averaged 21.3 points per game in leading the Mountaineers through a challenging basketball season which saw them advance to the semifinals of the eastern regional playoffs for the National Collegiate Athletic Association title. He is an excellent baseball player as well.

Rod Thorn has brought credit to himself and to his native State through dedication to the principles of good sportsmanship and scholarship.

I request that the article "Thorn Picked on Academic All-Star Team," in the Washington Star of March 28, 1963, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 28, 1963]

THORN PICKED ON ACADEMIC ALL-STAR TEAM

NEW ORLEANS.—The country's first academic all-star basketball team averaged 19.6 points on the court and a 3.1 grade in the classroom.

The scholastic honor quintet, named by the College Sports Information Directors of America, is composed of Rod Thorn of West Virginia, Ken Charlton of Colorado, Gerry Ward of Boston College, Art Becker of Arizona State and Ray Flynn of Providence.

A straight A scholastic average is 4.0.

Charlton, a English literature major, averaged 19.4 points per game and 3.2 in his grades.

Thorn had a 21.3 scoring record and a 3.01 classroom average in pre-law. Ward racked up a 20.0 scoring average and a 3.0 grade record in mathematics. Becker had 19.2 points per game and a 3.06 academic standard in history.

Flynn had a 17.8 game average and a 3.0 average in political science.

On the second team are Joe Dan Gold of Mississippi State, Brian Generalovich of Pittsburgh, Jay Buckley of Duke, Terry Baker of Oregon State, and Don Clemetson of Stanford.

The third team has Tony Cerkvenik of Arizona State, John Wideman of Pennsylvania, Dale Easley of Washington, Jim Caldwell of Georgia Tech, Buzzy Harrison of Duke and Ron Terwilliger of Navy.

An Asian Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 21, 1963. The editorial reveals that Sukarno has pulled the wool over the State Department's eyes and is getting money from all sides to continue his campaign to become ruler of all southeast Asia.

The text of the editorial is as follows:

AN ASIAN CUBA?

While lighting the fires of aggression against some friendly neighbors, Indonesia's Marxist-minded President Sukarno is staging some impressive financial shenanigans on the international scene. His pro-Communist government closed a $20 million deal for three American luxury jet liners, grabbed another $17 million of American economic aid, and expects to win $350 million in new credits from the International Monetary Fund and friendly Western governments.

Sukarno is pulling this Indonesian "hat trick," to use a hockey term, in the midst of an economic and financial crisis while showing signs of turning his island republic into the Cuba of Asia. With a $1 billion Russian arms buildup, Sukarno now has the most potent military force in southeast Asia.

Last year his 250,000-man army threatened the Netherlands' hold on western New Guinea, which the Dutch finally yielded under pressure from Washington. Now the threat is directed against the new anti-Communist Federation of Malaysia, scheduled to come into being in August.

Sukarno's divisions have been moved up in Borneo to threaten the British territories of North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei. Along with Malaya and the free city of Singapore, these are to form Malaysia. Sukarno's spokesmen promise to aid anti-British rebels in the Borneo territories. Although no one has threatened Indonesia since it won independence after World War II, Sukarno contends that he is surrounded by enemies.

The cry is reminiscent of Castro. Like Cuba, Indonesia has been loaded with Russian armament. Since Sukarno obtained his last Russian credit of $400 million 2 years ago, his forces have been beefed up with Soviet MIG fighter planes, bombers, submarines, cruisers, ground-to-air missiles, and artillery.

The Russian buildup has not prevented Sukarno from milking Uncle Sam. Exclusive of the new $17 million agreement to be signed this week, Indonesia has received $671 million

in economic aid from the United States, of which $402 million is in so-called loans.

Now the enfant terrible of Asian Marxism is about to dip further into the American taxpayers' pockets. Rather than another multimillion dollar handout to a man who spurns private enterprise, strangles his own economy with Marxian regulations, and threatens to invade his neighbors, the appearance of the U.S. 7th Fleet would speak with greater eloquence in the troubled waters of the Indonesian Archipelago.

A Backward Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the House's attention to the following editorial in the San Diego Union on March 25.

Pointing up the paternalistic role of the Federal Government inherent in the administration's proposed youth employment schemes, the Union notes significantly that "the overall program smacks of a further trend toward socialism."

All the heartrending rhetoric of the administration over the plight of the Nation's unemployed young people simply does not negate the fact that there are more jobs available in this country today than there are adequately trained individuals to fill them. Perusal of the classified ad section of almost any newspaper immediately shows this.

The real problem in unemployment is that in this technologically advanced age, the jobs have become complicated faster than our people have become equipped to fill them. The conclusion is inescapable that the gap will continue to widen unless we call a quick halt to the tired approach of the 1930's and divert our attention instead to the need for retraining workers whose skills must be upgraded and training the individuals coming into our expanding young labor market.

What solid equipment a young man is provided from manual labor on a Government makework project as preparation for a future in which his job opportunities are ever more demanding of mental labor is beyond me. I issue an urgent call to my colleagues to join me in rejecting the administration's proposed makework schemes and focusing our attention on the gap between job requirements and labor skills. It is enough to have the problem of displaced workers. Let us not be accomplices to a crime of misplaced workers.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 25, 1963]

A BACKWARD STEP

The youth employment program, as approved by the Senate Manpower Subcommittee, is the New Frontier version of the makework Civilian Conservation Corps of the thirties.

During its first year the program would receive $120 million. The Youth Conservation Corps would get $60 million for its 15,000 members to work on Federal projects in national parks, forests and reservations.

The balance would be spent on a separate youth program to provide employment on State and local projects financed up to 50 or even 75 percent by the Federal Government. The States and local communities would be asked to provide matching funds in most instances.

The overall program smacks of a further trend toward socialism. The Federal Government would cast itself in the role of a paternalistic "big daddy," handing out $60-a-month allotments to youths not employed in private business and industry. We doubt whether the lines of young people waiting to be recruited would be long because they could draw that much or more for simply being unemployed.

As Republican leaders in Congress have pointed out, equal or better employment would result from improvements in existing programs such as in vocational education and manpower development and training.

Also, fewer Government restrictions on business would encourage the expansion of private enterprise to create new job opportunities. The measure warrants nothing but a thumbs down vote by the Congress.

Enforcing the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative article by Mr. Constantine Brown, distinguished European correspondent of the Washington Evening Star, Washington, D.C., was published in the March 21, 1963, issue of that newspaper.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 21, 1963]

ENFORCING THE MONROE DOCTRINE: GROWTH OF CASTRO'S COMMUNIST REGIME BLAMED ON FAILURE OF UNITED STATES TO ACT

(By Constantine Brown)

A small item lost among the daily ration of headlined crises was that Guatemala's Foreign Minister Jesus Murillo asked for stricter enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine. It could be used, he said, to kick the Russians out of Cuba.

This recalled that my wife had attended a luncheon of her DAR chapter a couple of years ago at which Laurence Hose, a direct descendant of President Monroe, spoke. He told the Daughters that he had been attempting to have a postage stamp made to commemorate the Monroe Doctrine. He visited several offices in the State Department on this project and in each was told: "We don't talk about the Monroe Doctrine around here any more; all the Latin American countries hate it. They remember that we used the Doctrine as an excuse to send U.S. Marines down there to interfere in their internal affairs."

However, had we used the Doctrine in 1958, a small contingent of U.S. Marines could have ousted Fidel Castro and his few guerrillas from the mountains in Oriente Province without any trouble or fear of sparking a nuclear war. When the Castro forces grew, the United States clamped an embargo on all arms aid to the Batista regime (already bought and paid for) while official eyes were shut to the gunrunners operating out of Florida and Texas supplying Castro.

A review of the early Castro days perhaps will remind us of things forgotten. Mr. Castro seized power New Year's Day, 1959. Soon after, Washington announced that it could find very little traces of Communist influence in the higher echelons of the Cuban revolutionary movement. And a month later, President Eisenhower recognized the new regime, and sent a new ambassador, Philip W. Bonsal, who carried the President's "heartfelt good wishes" to the Cuban people.

After having threatened to kill all the gringos if the United States ever sent Marines, one of the first acts of Mr. Castro on coming to power was to make a quick flight to Venezuela to thank President Betancourt for his aid. Mr. Betancourt had been working from headquarters in New York in helping to build the Castro army for invasion.

Mr. Betancourt and Mr. Castro had been friends for a long time. According to the eminent Negro writer, George Schuyler, Mr. Castro "is a veteran of the 1948 Bogotá shambles sparked by Romulo Betancourt, the Red 'typhoid Mary' of the Caribbean who, entering Colombia under diplomatic immunity, staged the Molotov cocktail vandalism in order to sabotage the Ninth Pan American conference."

The chronology of events shows that Mr. Castro was virtually stalemated until the Jimenez dictatorship in Caracas was ousted in January 1958, by the junta led by leftist Admiral Larrazabal, a friend of Vincente Lombardo Toledano, the well-known Mexican Communist.

In April of 1958, after Mr. Betancourt became president of Venezuela, Mr. Larrazabal ordered the minister of defense to prepare 4,000 rifles, 200 machineguns and corresponding crews to aid Fidel Castro in the mountains.

President Betancourt has changed his mind in regard to Mr. Castro since those days, and realizes that communism can destroy Venezuela as it has Cuba.

Since January 1, 1959—the turning point in Latin-American history—there have been many warnings of a Cuban military buildup from a wide variety of sources. As early as September 1959, Adm. Arleigh Burke stated that Soviet submarines had recently surfaced in Cuban waters. This was hotly denied and protested by Havana. In June 1960, a native Cuban of British-American descent, Edward J. Whitehouse, told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that Cuba purchased 16 Mig's from Yugoslavia. He also said that all instructions and procedures for the operation of Conelrad, our civil defense system, were in the hands of Cuban authorities, making sabotage of the system simple.

Now, the milk has been spilt and the Kennedy administration finds it a ticklish business to kick the Russians out of Cuba. But Russian military is not the only danger. Cuba can still be the home base for Communist revolutions all through Latin America. And one nonmilitary but dangerous aspect of a Communist Cuba is that the Cuban radio has been for some time broadcasting to the Negroes in the United States urging them to commence an American revolution.

Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to join with my fellow Members of the House in tribute to the memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—truly "The First Lady of the World."

Millions of people the world over mourned her passing last November—for her life touched the lives and earned the lasting affection of people everywhere.

As the years go on, Mrs. Roosevelt will continue to gain in respect and esteem for the great causes she supported, and the great missions she pursued.

She was the friend of the oppressed, the champion of the victims of tyranny, and discrimination around the world. Her memory will forever stand for the power of the human spirit over the destruction of war and the poverty of economic distress.

A truly noble person, embodying many of the fine qualities of what we might term the "New Woman" of the 20th century. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has bequeathed to us a boundless faith in the perfectability of man and the worth of each and every human being, regardless of that person's condition or circumstance, his race, religion or color.

As President Kennedy expressed it, our grief at the death of this extraordinary woman will be "tempered by the knowledge that her memory and spirit will long endure among those who labor for great causes around the world."

Santa Clara County Bar Association Supports Chief Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to advise my colleagues of the action taken by the Santa Clara County Bar Association on March 26, 1963, in support of our most illustrious Californian, Chief Justice Warren and the Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, the wording of the resolution itself explains better than can I the wise and enlightened principles guiding this action by my fellow attorneys of Santa Clara County.

I am indeed proud to be able to ask unanimous consent of my colleagues that the entire resolution be printed in the Appendix, so that it may receive the widest dissemination.

The resolution follows:

SANTA CLARA BAR ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS CHIEF JUSTICE

RESOLUTION

Whereas this Nation is dedicated to the rule of law under the Constitution of the United States; the administration of justice pursuant to the rule of law is the special concern of members of the legal profession. An independent judiciary is essential to the impartial and administration of justice; and

Whereas lawyers champion every man's right to dissent but judges must be protected against intimidation and reprisal for their official acts; canon 1 of the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association declares "Judges, not being wholly free to defend themselves, are peculiarly entitled to receive the support of the bar against unjust criticism and clamor"; and

Whereas recently Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States have been the object of intemperate criticism from certain organized groups of citizens who disagree with particular decisions of the Court, some of which were unanimous, Chief Justice Earl Warren is the special target of personal abuse; and

Whereas this conduct tends to subvert the rule of law and constitutes a threat to the administration of justice, lawyers throughout the United States have publicly proclaimed their support of the rule of law, the Supreme Court, and Chief Justice Earl Warren: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The members of this bar association join other lawyers throughout the United States in expressing respect for and confidence in Chief Justice Earl Warren and each of his colleagues on the Supreme Court of the United States.

How Much Politics in ADC–U

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot of March 26, 1963:

HOW MUCH POLITICS IN ADC–U

You can't help wondering how much partisan politics is involved in the Washington-Lansing hassle over Michigan's new aid to dependent children unemployed bill. We suspect there is quite a bit.

It should be noted that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare found the State ADC–U measure unacceptable after being queried almost frantically by Michigan Democrats.

Governor Romney was looking good as the bill moved to final passage. He had been successful in getting it through where his Democratic predecessor had failed.

Democrats were committed to the ADC–U principle, but could and did complain that it was too restrictive. That was their best bet to play politics with the measure.

The bill was consistent, however, with principles and methods the State has applied to welfare through the years. The biographers of the late Welfare Director Willard J. Maxey, who had a hand in drafting the ADC–U bill before his death, chronciled his running battles with HEW and its predecessors. He insisted on keeping Michigan welfare functions on a sound basis and when he thought the "Washington do-gooders" were out of line he stood his ground. And he always won.

Now Michigan is a State which figures largely in the Democratic scheme of things. The loss of the governorship to Republican Romney last fall was a terrible shock to persons high in the party councils.

And Mr. Romney himself is a figure politically important, even around the White House. He already has achieved national stature and someday may run against one Kennedy or another for the presidency.

Unless the political rulebook has been rewritten overnight, it would be the most natural thing in the world for the administration to hear the distress calls from Michigan Democrats and to go along with a plan for blighting the fruits of Mr. Romney's victory on ADC–U. All that was required is an adverse ruling from HEW on the new bill. Those things are easy to come by. It takes just a scratch of the pen, to coin a phrase.

But, as William Kulsea, chief of our Lansing bureau, pointed out in his column Governor Romney is going to make a fight of it and has something going for him in the Maxey tradition.

HEW may make its ruling stick, but in doing so it could give the Governor a terrific buildup of publicity. He could snowball this thing into a national issue of the States being pushed around by the Federal Government. You see, Romney's name already is well known in every State. No matter where you travel, the natives want to know about him.

If the political rules hold, the administration would very quickly reverse itself if the Michigan Governor and his aids begin to make a national splash with this issue.

In any event, it is going to be a really interesting fight. At this point it seems possible that the Democrats, in their rush to play politics with ADC–U may have trapped themselves.

Chattanooga: All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, Chattanooga, Tenn.—the dynamo of Dixie—has been awarded the coveted title of "All America City" by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. To those of us who know and love Chattanooga, this justified honor comes as no surprise. But I know that Chattanoogans are even more proud of their city now that others have appropriately recognized their action programs taken to bring about needed major improvements. Out of nearly 70 applicants, Chattanooga was chosen for this award in keen competition by an expert jury.

Chattanooga is truly a great city, steeped in history and tradition, yet possessing a fervor for accomplishment and municipal progress. The honor of being designated "All America City" is the result of many enthusiastic citizens dedicating their time, energy, resources and initiative to solve the city's problems. Yes, civic cooperation—a community pulling together, yet unafraid to correct its shortcomings—has made Chattanooga worthy of this cherished title. But brick, mortar, and stone do not make a city, rather it is a spirit—that marvelous yet intangible attribute—that builds lasting progress. Chattanooga was born in adventure and has matured in times of turmoil and peace by using its greatest asset, its individual citizen, in an unrestrained determination to meet its own problems through sound and sensible action.

An inscription on the Federal Archives Building in Washington reads "What Is Past Is Prologue," and so it will be with Chattanooga, as community-minded citizens go forward together to build an even greater city.

Believing the Chattanooga story well worthy of emulation by other cities

throughout our Nation, I include several newspaper articles on Chattanooga, "The All America City," and commend them to my colleagues.

The articles follow:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Mar. 29, 1963]

CHATTANOOGA, ALL AMERICA CITY

Chattanooga is a city whose people are intensely proud of it and loyal to it, and therefore are highly gratified that our community has been honored by selection this year as one of the 11 cities given the All America City Award in competition sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

Chattanooga's projects that brought the high honor to this city are distinctly different from the kind of projects that some other cities have listed. Ours are different because most of them, rather than being examples of concrete completed improvements, are programs that indicate only a beginning of community action that may be expected to have broad ramifications in the years ahead.

Our city is not saying, "Look here, we're through; look what we have accomplished." Rather, the presentation made for Chattanooga says, "Look what Chattanooga is beginning to do and may accomplish in many years of steady and solid improvement ahead."

This is a unique approach. It is also a hopeful and encouraging one. It calls for us not to rest on our laurels, of which Chattanooga may claim many, but to begin to move ahead with imagination and confidence and enthusiasm to great attainments that will make our wonderful community more so and our people the residents of a section that offers them more opportunity and advantages.

There is much satisfaction among our own people that recognition has been given the home community we all believe in. But there is more to it than just the honor. From a highly practical standpoint, the favorable national attention that will come to Chattanooga as a result of this award will have unmeasured but very real value in promoting the name of Chattanooga as this community seeks the industrial and other economic interest necessary for growth and improved prosperity.

Many people are responsible for the various projects that were listed in Chattanooga's presentation. Former Chamber of Commerce President DeSales Harrison, under whose administration the Chattanooga entry was made, and John Popham, who presented this city's case articulately before the selection jury, and many others played a part in bringing this welcome recognition to Chattanooga.

Now it is the responsibility of all our citizens to join in unity of purpose for great fulfillment of Chattanooga's promise.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Mar. 29, 1963]

THE CHATTANOOGA STORY: OUR EPIPHANY

(By Martin Ochs)

Twenty million or so persons within the direct circulation range of Look magazine will be reading "The Chattanooga Story" this week. It is a story worth reading. It tells of priceless assets: civic energy and ability. It brings into shape things that perhaps many Chattanoogans, including those of the gripe-and-grumble, rip-and-tear school, never realized we had.

In becoming one of 11 cities to win Look's All America Award, Chattanooga competed against cities of every size—70 of them—for this coveted honor.

Now we can bask a little in the recognition.

Not only that, Tennessee and the administration in Nashville can take note of the fact that this State was the only one to produce two award winners: Knoxville and Chattanooga. And an interesting tale hangs somewhere thereby.

Knoxville won on the basis largely of one project—its wonderful shopping mall which revitalized a downtown area.

DeSales Harrison and John Popham, who went to Washington for Chattanooga's presentation to the All America City just last November, were struck by the emphasis on some single accomplishment in the other cities' presentation.

Chattanooga had no one spectacular eye- and publicity-catching feat. In fact, it had admitted problems. But it had determination to do something about them. And it had solid, impressive evidence of progress. In one instance, it had an achievement unequaled in modern American history.

Last summer, the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce, to which the credit goes, decided to enter the competition in which George Gallup was to be chairman of a distinguished jury (the members' names are printed in the news columns this morning).

The effort was under the direction of Harrison, chairman of Coca-Cola Thomas here and one of the great presidents of the chamber.

To a wealth of material supplied by the chamber of commerce, Popham, general managing editor of the Chattanooga Times, applied 30 years of newspaper experience and chose the eight specific areas of civic endeavor, which he wove into the Chattanooga story. If a colleague may say so, Popham is one of the most eloquently articulate Virginia gentlemen who ever came down the pike. Harrison is one of the South's most strikingly handsome business figures. To put it another way: Harrison had the looks and manner. Popham had the gab.

The Chattanooga story began with the vast, 403-acre West Side urban renewal project—12th largest in the land and a product of the vision of the city's greatest building mayor, P. R. Olgiati. The work of the citizens' committee for the project was outlined.

This was the brick-and-mortar aspect of the call to civic action. This aspect, Popham wrote, reflects the fact that "Chattanooga, like so many other urban complexes throughout the Nation, is challenged by population increase, urban sprawl, downtown congestion, core city deterioration and the breathtaking impact of modern technology.

"This means that all our cities must be restored to an efficient working order with a new sense of beauty and esthetic values that will make them viable in terms of their greatest treasure—the citizens who live there in quest of meaningful community that enriches the soul of man."

Realization by resourceful Chattanoogans of what the West Side project meant to Chattanooga was the first grasp of what the above paragraph is all about. It was, as the Chattanooga story said, an "epiphany"—an inspired and revealed manifestation of destiny and a better life.

Sweeping freeway vistas and open spaces on the West Side invite attention to another facet of the story—an esthetic facet, as illustrated by the cooperative work involved in creation of the Scenic Cities Beautiful Commission.

Economically, there was the establishment of industrial parks, still a pressing area of need, and the long drive for an advanced technical training institute. This work is about to bear fruit.

Culturally, the tremendous push necessary to acquire the magnificent Tivoli Theater for city use, in the heart of downtown, was chronicled.

In government, the onset of change and the restoration of an efficient working order require new structure. The Metropolitan Government Charter Commission is pushing to complete its task. Similarly, the problem Metro seeks to lessen finds its symptoms in the law enforcement area. And another citizens' group has worked hard for improvement.

It was this rounding out of civic cooperation and efficiency in different, though interrelated, community fields that evidently struck the All America Cities jury.

Lastly, one other field was mentioned: human, educational, ontological. It encompassed the desegregation of Chattanooga's schools last fall, under Federal court order.

Not a single incident, or threat of incident, occurred. Nor has there been an unpleasant episode since.

It has never happened before in the South.

When it happened, nothing happened. The happening of nothing is seldom news in this country. And there was an interesting lack of coverage from the national news media which would have pounced with all their globe-spanning cameras and purple prosers if Chattanooga had failed, and violence had erupted.

Later, one or two publications, including the New York Times, noted in detailed, supremely important accounts, what had been done.

And with this facet, the All America Cities jury was duly impressed.

Honesty Is the Best Policy at Home and in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizens Patriot of March 28, 1963:

HONESTY IS THE BEST POLICY AT HOME AND IN WASHINGTON

Whatever happened to the old-fashioned belief that honesty is the the best policy?

Many are the adults today who, in their childhood, made that frightful trip to the woodshed to atone for a little white lie. And while the woodshed treatment is frowned upon today by child psychologists as too severe and traumatic, modern day parents have been known to punish their children when caught in falsehoods, by withdrawing use of the family car, decreeing no Saturday movies during a period of penance, or other similar severe penalties.

But when a government official states publicly that it is perfectly all right for a government to lie to its people, the parent suddenly finds he has no leg on which to stand in meting out punishment to an untruthful child.

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs—in fact the Pentagon's publicity chief—this week admitted in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Government Information, that he had told a New York audience last December that "the Government has an inherent right to falsify information in an emergency." He was referring to last fall's crisis in Cuba and the Government's handling of information regarding it.

After first denying that he had made the statement, Mr. Sylvester admitted that he

had after learning that his December remarks had been recorded on tape.

Pressed by Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, and Representative OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York, as to why a government had a basic right to lie in such a case, Sylvester said, "a nation has the right to preserve itself by any means necessary."

Our Puritan forefathers, who laid the foundation on which the image of the United States as a truthful and forthright nation was built, probably are spinning in their graves.

Can we have a dual standard in this country by which our actions as citizens and as a government are gaged? Can we expect to rear our children as honest truthful citizens and at the same time condone lying from our Government and its administrators?

Once we find our children lying about their actions, we, as parents often find it difficult to continue our faith in their honesty and dependability.

We must agree with a group of editors and publishers which has condemned the practice of government deception on the basis that "a government can lie only once; after that its credibility is undermined."

The image of the United States before the world has become more than slightly tarnished in the past few years. Can we afford to add to this tarnish by wilfully painting Uncle Sam as dishonest and unreliable? We think not.

While some juvenile authorities have advocated a return to the woodshed treatment for delinquent children, it might be wise for us as a nation to return to the paths of forthrightness and honesty.

We subscribe to the statement of Robert J. Manning, State Department Chief of Publicity, that while some interludes of privacy are necessary to conduct diplomatic negotiations successfully, the "obligation of the Government official is to tell the truth or, if security dictates, to button his lip."

Socialism: A New View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 29, 1963:

SOCIALISM: A NEW VIEW

Chester Bowles remarked in Boston the other day that after some 20 years in Government service, he becomes each year more aware of Government's limited capacities.

"I don't think, like many Americans, that democratic socialism is immoral; I just think that it doesn't work very well," he stated.

Discussing the underdeveloped countries he pointed out that Government is only one factor in nation building, that universities, labor unions, private businesses, and other institutions are equally important and often more so.

"Governments of new nations," he continued, "have enough harassments without having to decide where to locate a bicycle factory."

Of course, he added, if private capital is unable or unwilling to do what is necessary then Government must step in, just as it has done in past and present American society.

Mr. Bowles, long considered a liberal and sensitive observer of the developing countries, has made a frank and significant comment. It holds a hint of the growing American awareness that although U.S. aid remains necessary, development comes fundamentally from within the aid-receiving peoples themselves.

The Mayflower Compact and the Pilgrims—Address by Hon. Renah F. Camalier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, is a very fine, patriotic organization, with a large membership of several hundred made up of lineal descendants of Pilgrim ancestors who came to the New World on the good ship *Mayflower*, in 1620, and founded the famous colony at Plymouth Rock. These members are to be found in the District of Columbia and adjacent areas of Virginia and Maryland.

Annually this Society holds a dinner-meeting in November celebrating the anniversary of the signing and promulgation of the Mayflower Compact on November 21, 1620. This great, but simple document is said to be the first—in the New World, at least—ever to set forth the basic provisions for free and representative government. It had within it the essential bases of our Federal Constitution; and under the Compact the Pilgrims were wisely governed throughout the life of the Plymouth Colony. The Freedom Train some years ago carried the compact as one of the first documents of historic interest displayed. The Pilgrims came to present-day New England for the purpose of establishing civil and religious liberty, and their efforts and example did much to promote these aims.

On November 19, 1963, at the annual celebration of the compact by the society it had as its guest speaker, Hon. Renah F. Camalier, the well-known Washington lawyer, publicist, and former Commissioner of the District of Columbia. Under leave accorded I am glad to include as a part of my remarks the indicated address.

ADDRESS BY RENAH F. CAMALIER, SOCIETY OF MAYFLOWER DESCENDANTS, NOVEMBER 19, 1962

My friends of the Society of Mayflower Descendants: 3 centuries and 42 years ago, in a New World, the American Pilgrims launched a new concept, later to blossom into an enlightening civilization. Not alone for themselves did they come and build and die—but for you and me, and for generations beyond.

The sordid past of the Old World they buried—except for the bitter memories of the hardships and the miseries seared into the fibre of their being by the bondage of the despot.

If present-day Americans are to carry on, we must remain vigilant that no man—or any group of men with sinister motives—shall disturb or destroy our precious heritage. And it would be well to know how this heritage was born, and then nurtured to its full and glowing maturity of the 21st century. History relates no voyage comparable to that of the *Mayflower*.

These tough, durable and stern enemies of oppression, who journeyed through trying days and weeks to escape—were building for this night that you and I might be privileged to enjoy the fruits of their efforts—and for nights when the same joys or better, might be for those who follow in our footsteps.

Great patriots were to follow these Pilgrims. It would indeed seem that Daniel Webster must have been looking back to those early days at Plymouth Rock, as he wrote this meaningful message:

"If we work upon marble, it will perish,
If we work upon brass time will efface it,
If we rear temples they will crumble into dust;
But if we work upon men's immortal minds,
If we impress on them high principles,
The just fear of God, and the love of their fellow men,
We will engrave upon those tablets something which time cannot efface, but will brighten and brighten all eternity."

These Pilgrims were filled with high principles. They feared their God. They loved their fellow creatures by reason of common suffering, and each became a missionary among their own, working not upon marble or brass, or even building, in their hopeful contemplation of the future, great temples of learning or of religion but, taking hold of each other's immortal minds, they filled their innermost recesses with the attributes outlined by Daniel Webster many years after the historic landing. Such did they bequeath—such did we inherit.

They sealed their mission with a compact before treading the sands of the western land—there in the cabin of the *Mayflower*. It was a compact arrived at without fear or reservation—mental or otherwise—that any of the signers thereof would be derelict in their duties—a trust that this document, designed to forge this little band into a body politic for the betterment, the preservation and the furtherance of their objectives, could not and would not be violated.

The pledged their individual and collective efforts and fortunes to live under the banner of just laws, ordinances and other elements of a form of government founded upon man's voluntary consent that his chosen fellows should govern with justice, with impartiality, and for the good of all.

They agreed that obedience and submission to lawful authority would be part and parcel of their lives—a principle, a way of life for others to follow—and today we still witness this universal struggle for freedom, and the right to govern and be governed.

This America of ours could not want a finer heritage, and we hold high our heads that we know from whence it came. Thus did the Pilgrims lay the groundwork of a new concept of human guidance, and to borrow from the immortal Lincoln—as he acknowledged the accomplishments of America's Founding Fathers—they "brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

This speaker is well aware that he stands reflected in matchless glory tonight—for seated beside him is one of your greatest living members—Maurice H. Thatcher. Who but Maurice Thatcher could have given the world such a succinct yet far-reaching word

picture of the Mayflower Compact as the one this speaker now reads:

"Under the provisions of this grassroots instrument the little band of intrepid colonists, shortly after they landed at Plymouth Rock, undertook to found their colony and to govern it. The compact, in the briefest and simplest possible form, set forth the substantial bases of free and enlightened self-government; that is to say, of democracy itself. This was the first effort of the kind attempted in the New World, and the compact may be fairly said to have been the most fruitful of the germs from which free institutions of our great Republic sprang."

"Many students of history regard and acclaim it—though of such brief compass—as deserving a rank with the great documents that constituted stepping stones to free and representative government, beginning with Magna Carta and ending with our Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution."

Engaging words, and, again, who but Maurice Thatcher could have given the world the pledge of the Pilgrims—this speaker now also feels impelled to read:

"In the Name of God. Amen.

"I pledge myself to help hold aloft the lamps of civil and religious liberty lighted by the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock; to recall and cherish the sacrifices and struggles made by them for the common good; to study their lives, deeds, faith, courage, and character, and to draw inspiration therefrom; to emulate their spirit; to be loyal to the flag and institutions of the country whose founding was so greatly aided by their work and wisdom; to do everything within my power to deserve and preserve the heritage; and in all things, and in all ways, to profit by the Pilgrim example."

Everyone present tonight is solemnly and sincerely rededicating his life to his country as he again contemplates this pledge.

Thus we know from whence this heritage of freedom in America emanates, and how extensively and deeply it touches those gathered before me. First, it came from the men and women who sailed the broad Atlantic, and now from him whose words have just been read, and a host of others here with us tonight—or whose forms and faces and contributions live forever in our memories.

The descendants of these pilgrims have reason to be proud that their country was set by their forefathers upon this high plane—that they established individual human dignity—that that dignity has remained the watchword—that these freedoms were created and preserved and defended by vigilant and valiant men—that the concept of government by and with the consent of the governed was their ruling obsession; and that these teachings and tenets—America's bulwarks against the onrushing tides and would-be destroyers of these new world concepts—are to be found today in our homes, our churches, our assemblies, and our public schools—institutions which form the crowning and indestructible landmarks of this land of the free and the home of the brave. To perpetuate them is our calling, but to do so we must enlist the aid of the law, the State and the citizen.

The law of our land stands supreme. American judicial determinations of the rights of its citizens come from those very rights under advisement. They stem from the compact, they are found in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. "Equal justice under law" is no idle inscription over the majestic entrance to our Supreme Court.

The church stands as the bedrock of these United States. The church says to the citizen "love mercy, do justly, and walk humbly with thy God." It urges all to abide by the civil as well as the moral law.

But there is a limitation to the role of the church—set by our Constitution, upheld by our courts, and perpetuated by the votes of our people. The law says "thus far shalt thou go." Our fraternal and patriotic relationships—together with our natural and national inclination to remain free—sustain us in the belief that American solidarity depends upon the continued and continuing emphasis that union can be preserved only by a complete separation of church and State in governmental operations.

The law, the State, the citizens, and the church, through orderly processes, should remain stanch and firm in their respective fields of free government—the State in its position of protector of the rights of the people through law—the church in its appointed task of keeping the citizen cognizant of his spiritual and neighborly natures.

The State, the church, and the citizen would do well to bow to the wisdom of the Nation's declaration—emblazoned above the rostrum of our U.S. House of Representatives on Capitol Hill—"In God We Trust." Such words guarantee government of self-expression, for God has given men the faculty to think.

Judge of all nations—lest we forget or appear unmindful—it was not men alone who sealed this heritage. The wife and the mother shared the inevitable loneliness and the hardships of frontier life. Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University, paid this magnificent tribute to the women of the Pilgrim band—words worthy of our deepest thought:

"We are apt to think of the men who bore these hardships as stout and tough, but what of the tenderer women? Generations of them cooked, carried water, washed and made clothes, bore children in lonely peril, and tried to bring them up safely through all sorts of physical exposure without medical or surgical help; lived themselves in terror of savages; in terror of the wilderness, and under the burden of a sad and cruel creed, and then sank at last into nameless graves, without any vision of the grateful days when millions of their descendants should rise up and called them blessed."

This stirring tribute to the oft-forgotten founding women of America, causes us, the descendants of these pioneers, these pilgrims, tonight and always, to rise in unison to call these women blessed, for out of them and their determination and fortitude comes this America.

We are truly and eternally indebted to all, and this speaker feels constrained to say that descendants of the original 104 passengers on the *Mayflower* can best honor their forebears, and repay, in part, their debt of gratitude, by becoming "ascendants" in the body politics of their Nation and their community.

Failure to be a good citizen produces an ungrateful citizen—whose name should be remembered never by his fellows. But, in America, there are none so low—we endeavor to be good citizens—we have not forgotten, so we join with Katherine Lee Bates, and raise our voices in praise and thanksgiving for our God-given heritage—coming down from these dedicated men and women of our early times:

"America, America!
Oh beautiful for patriot dream
That sees, beyond the years,
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears.

"America, America!
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea!"

United Fruit Co. Cited for Part in Cuban Prisoner Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the very fine letters of congratulations written by the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, and Gen. Alfred Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross, to Mr. Thomas Sunderland, president of the United Fruit Co., for that company's humanitarian service in providing one of its ships for the shipment of supplies to Cuba in connection with the prisoner exchange program, and for the return of some 750 Cuban refugees to our country.

The United Fruit Co. certainly is to be commended for this unselfish service to the Cuban Families Committee; the ship, SS *Santo Cerro* and her crew were most welcome in this humanitarian project, and this act of generosity will always be remembered among the finest ones in our Nation's history.

Under unanimous consent, I include the letters from the Attorney General and from General Gruenther to Mr. Sunderland in the RECORD, along with Mr. Sunderland's gracious reply to General Gruenther.

The letters follow:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1963.

Mr. T. E. SUNDERLAND,
President, United Fruit Co.
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. SUNDERLAND: The recent return of the Cuban prisoners to their families has been a source of satisfaction to all of us. Your company is to be commended for its willingness to help the American Red Cross and the Cuban Families Committee in this outstanding humanitarian project, and I hope you will accept my sincerest congratulations.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

Mr. THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND,
President, United Fruit Co.,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. SUNDERLAND: The American Red Cross is most grateful to the United Fruit Co., for the use of the SS *Santo Cerro* for the shipment of supplies to Cuba in connection with the prisoner exchange program, and for bringing 750 Cuban refugees to Port Everglades on the return voyage.

Several of our Red Cross personnel had an opportunity to work with officials of your company and with personnel aboard the *Santo Cerro*. The cooperation was perfect at all times.

I was especially impressed by the warm attitude of the crew toward the refugees on the return voyage. I am sure this created a most favorable impression of their new home.

Thus far three ships and several planes have carried supplies to Cuba totaling approximately $28 million. Twenty-nine hun-

dred refugees have been transported to Port Everglades. A fourth ship is scheduled to sail from Baltimore within a few days.

It is clear that we shall be in the shipping business for at least 2 more months. Please pray that we do not have any natural disasters in the United States during that period. Our key disaster experts are heavily engaged in the Cuban program.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., March 12, 1963.

Gen. ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President, the American National Red Cross, National Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL GRUENTHER: Thank you for your letter of February 20 concerning our donation of the use of the SS *Santo Cerro* and its crew in connection with the prisoner exchange program. We appreciate your very generous comments, particularly with respect to the attitude and action of our personnel.

Our personnel enjoyed working on this project, especially as it was concerned with the people of Latin America with whom we have enjoyed such a long relationship. Although the Cuban exchange program is a controversial matter, we could not permit this to stand in the way of the humanitarian aspect of the exchange. It was this latter aspect which was a major factor in our company decision to contribute over a quarter-million dollars in addition to the use of the ship and its crew.

I am certain you join in our hope that the day will come when Cuba will again be governed by the democratic, freedom-loving Cubans.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND.

Brazil Resentful: United States Violated Rules of Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following column by Edgar Ansel Mowrer relative to U.S. foreign aid:

BRAZIL RESENTFUL: UNITED STATES VIOLATED RULES OF GAME

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

In making public the charge of the American Ambassador in Rio that Brazil's Government is infiltrated with Communists, the State Department was merely revealing common knowledge. Nevertheless, the resentment of the Brazilian Government over the charge is perfectly natural. For the United States was violating the rules of the game.

For many years, and particularly under the New Frontier, there has been a sort of unwritten agreement between Washington and any number of other capitals: the more Communists other countries can muster, the more assistance they get from the United States.

A joke? If you think so, look at the full table of the foreign aid to various countries given by the United States since the end of World War II.

Yugoslavia, an all-Communist country, which has now returned to the bosom of Red Mother Russia, has received more aid than the Netherlands, which has no Communists to speak of. Poland, an all-Communist country (so far as the government is concerned), has received more assistance than Portugal, one of our firmest allies where Communists are forbidden.

IT PAID INDIA TO WAVER

India, a country that, until the Red Chinese invasion, could not make up its mind which side it was on, has received twice as much U.S. assistance as Pakistan, the one country between Turkey and Formosa which could be counted on to fight beside the United States if trouble came. Afghanistan, a country that flirts with the U.S.S.R., has managed to get a sizable chunk of dollars.

In Africa it is no different. Ghana, which denounces American imperialism in and out of season, has received more American bakhsheesh than trusty Liberia. The United Arab Republic, king among area troublemakers, chief denouncer of "Western imperialism," aggressor in the Yemen, continues to rely upon Washington to avoid bankruptcy.

Latin America is no exception. Brazil ranks first in the receiving line. Argentina, threatened by an unholy combine of Communists and Peronistas; Chile, a country notoriously soft on communism; Mexico, which provides Castro with an intangible headquarters abroad for his subverters of the other countries—these have all been richly rewarded by big-hearted Uncle Sam.

Brazil, the largest Latin American country, has naturally had the most aid. But since it began admitting Communists to high places, its allowance has been going up.

NO STRINGS ATTACHED TO AID

Moreover—the strangest feature of the whole aid plan—in most places American aid has been strictly a one-way street. Our leaders have gone out of their way to insist that we want nothing at all from our beneficiaries—no strings attached. See Yugoslavia and Poland.

Small wonder then that the Brazilian Government resents a breach of the rules on the part of Washington. Since the more Communists, the more money; the more neutral, the more attention from the boys in the State Department; President Joao Goulart obviously feels entirely justified in taking a lofty tone with President Kennedy. In fact, instead of asking for a big new loan, I should not be surprised if he demanded it or else. What is more, I think he would get it.

Our leaders believe that this is the way the incredible economic power of the United States can best be exercised. Maybe they are right—our job is to shut up and pay up. But sometimes I find myself in full agreement with ex-President Truman: the next time some government insists that without more help from us, it will "go Communist," President Kennedy should answer, "Go, see how you like it and don't yell when it hurts."

Welcome South, Mr. Chisholm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 of this year, I inserted an editorial in the RECORD taken from the Daily Reveille, written and edited by the students of Louisiana State University. The title of the editorial was, "Is ELLENDER Wrong?"

The editorial, written by Colin Chisholm, a student at the university, dealt with the remarks of the senior Senator from Louisiana, the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, who had questioned the wisdom of our foreign giveaway program. It contained the following statement:

ELLENDER, in a few choice words, said what probably a majority of Americans have been thinking for many years, that African nations are simply not ready for self-government.

I inserted the editorial because I was impressed by the young writer's obvious ability to cut through the verbiage and the fog of uncertainty surrounding our giveaway program and to see right to the heart of the matter. His display of clearmindedness was worthy of note by all of us here in the House.

Since that time, I have received a letter from Mr. Chisholm thanking me for sending him a copy of the insertion. His brief reply is equally worthy of note. Again he has shown that same instinct for stripping away the smug, the obvious and the false to find the truth hidden away in the center.

A hundred writers have written scores of thousands of words, particularly in the past two decades, on a subject to which most of them were ill prepared to address themselves: the South and its so-called conditions and problems.

Here, in 200 words, Mr. Chisholm tells of doing what few, if any, of these self-appointed savants have ever done: investigated these conditions and problems for themselves with a mind uncluttered with muddled presuppositions.

His two paragraph summation is a brilliant statement in which I would not want to change a single word:

Before coming to Louisiana, I had lived for 20 years in the State of Colorado. I was born and raised there. During the time I lived there I was filled with the usual ballyhoo about the South and the conditions that were supposed to exist there. When I had finally had enough, I decided to come to the South and take a look for myself.

Since the day I first came to Louisiana, I have fallen in love with the State and its people. I have made many friends over the past 2 years. The kind of friends that are lasting and ready and willing to help with any sort of problem I might have; something I could not find in my native State. I have found employment, not on the second or third try, but on the first attempt; something I had been unable to do in my native State. Illusion after illusion about the South has been shattered before me and I have grown to love Louisiana more and more as each day passes by. I plan to remain in Louisiana, to marry and raise my family here and to establish my own business here someday in the not-so-far-off future. I am most happy to be able to say that on September 13, 1963, I will be able to register to vote as a citizen of the State of Louisiana. It is also my pleasure to say that my parents, also native Coloradans, will move into a new home in Pascagoula, Miss., this summer after some 62 years of residence in the West.

I would like to welcome this young man to Louisiana, though selfishly I know he could serve the State and the

South better by returning to those parts of the Nation where these illusions and delusions are still held and still, sadly, passed on from one generation to another. He would make the South an illustrious missionary.

Welcome south, Mr. Chisholm.

Anti-Missile-Missile Base In Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the Allen-Scott report of March 25 points up the very serious situation in Soviet Cuba relative to anti-missile-missile defenses. The reported installation of a complex missile tracking system on that island linked to a new antimissile control center near Moscow further highlights the highly dangerous situation 90 miles from our shores and warrants urgent reappraisal of the administration' Cuba policies.

The text of the report follows.

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 25, 1963]

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: ANTI-MISSILE-MISSILE BASE IN CUBA

Russia is converting Cuba into a menacing anti-missile-missile base that could force the United States to make vast changes in its nuclear defenses.

Soviet technicians are installing a complex missile-tracking system in Cuba that is connected directly with a newly established antimissile control center near Moscow.

This highly important Kremlin command post in turn is linked to the world's first operational antimissile base that has been constructed on the outskirts of Leningrad.

The startling discovery of these sinister Red missile installations was made by an Air Force Samos reconnaissance satellite and subsequently by other intelligence sources.

The satellite's highly sensitive camera photographed 11 modified SA-3 missiles on launchers at the Leningrad base. These antimissile missiles have the capability of shooting down intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is so disturbed by those intelligence findings that he has set up a special three-member subcommittee to make a thorough study of the new threat.

RUSSELL asked Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, to determine the full extent of the calculated risk President Kennedy is taking on the following crucial decisions:

1. Deferring missile defense of American cities and other key centers until 1970.

2. Doing nothing to eliminate Russia's anti-missile-missile base in Cuba before it becomes fully operational this fall.

The report of these Senators is expected to determine whether the Senate Armed Services Committee will demand that the President take stern measures to counteract this new Soviet menace.

Already, the group has ascertained that major surgery performed on the anti-missile-missile program in Defense Secretary McNamara's budget has, in effect ,eliminated the Army's Nike-Zeus as a potential weapon system.

Under McNamara's backstage plan a new so-called improved Nike-X antimissile missile would be developed by 1970.

This "missile gap" would give the Russians a 4- to 7-year lead in the deployment of an antimissile. Important U.S. military authorities believe this would be suicidal for the country.

Panama Canal: Republic of Panama To Press Sovereignty in Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement in the RECORD of March 18, 1963, I mentioned that among the matters to be discussed at the Costa Rica Conference, March 18–20, would be the Panama Canal and expressed the hope that the President of the United States would meet with a rocklike stand any proposals that would further weaken our treaty rights concerning the Canal.

Though much has been published in the papers of the United States about that Conference, virtually nothing has appeared in the press about the Panama Canal. In contrast with the silence here about this vital matter, isthmian newspapers have revealed that on March 20, Presidents Kennedy and Chiari spent 41 minutes discussing steps to give further impetus to the conversations of the joint commission now considering Panama's aspirations in the Canal Zone. This Commission is composed of Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., and U.S. Ambassador John S. Farland to Panama.

In commenting on the San José Conference, President Chiari stated that the meeting had more or less fulfilled the objectives for which it was called and that Panama would continue advancing its case until it had "eliminated any doubt in regard to our sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone which we maintain is complete."

A feature news story by Luis C. Noli in the Star and Hearald of Panamá, Republic of Panama, on March 21, summarizing the results of the San Jose Conference, is quoted as part of these remarks follows:

[From the Panama Star & Herald, Mar. 21, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA TO PRESS SOVEREIGNTY IN CANAL ZONE—CHIARI DECLARES COSTA RICAN MEETING SATISFACTORY

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA.—Panama will continue advancing until it has "eliminated any doubt in regard to our sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone which we maintain is complete," President Roberto F. Chiari emphatically declared at a press conference here today.

As an example of the advances already achieved by Panama, the Chief Executive cited the flying of the Panamanian flag at the Administration Building of the Panama Canal and the recognition in the Canal Zone of exequaturs issued by Panama to foreign consuls.

When he was asked what would happen if a Canal Zone court ruled that the Panamanian flag should be withdrawn from the Canal Zone, Chiari replied: "That's a matter for the North American Government. I don't believe that such an eventuality is possible."

In connection with the Conference of Presidents just closed here, President Chiari said: "It seems to me that this meeting has more or less fulfilled the objectives for which it was called. This meeting, in general terms, has been satisfactory." Chiari emphasized the results achieved in connection with the Central American common market.

Central American newsmen attending the press conference posed a number of questions in regard to Deputy Thelma King who one of them described as "the person carrying subversive means from Cuba to Panama." Chiari replied that as a deputy, Miss King has parliamentary immunity and it would be up to the national assembly to deprive her of this immunity.

When one of the attending newsmen said that he had a recording of the call for a revolution made by Thelma King, Chiari replied that it would be interesting to hear this recording.

There were several questions on Panamanian politics. Chiari said that he would soon reconstruct his cabinet.

Asked whether it was true that one of the possible presidential candidates of the ruling Liberal Party of Panama professed the extremist ideologies, Chiari replied that all of the prospective candidates of his party are Liberals in principle, temperament and conviction. He added that the proliferation of political parties in Panama will not return the country to the former great parties. Not only Dr. Arnulfo Arias but any other citizen can be candidate for the Presidency, he declared.

At the conclusion of his press conference, Chiari said that during the President's meeting here the problems of the Darien Gap and the Inter-American Highway were taken up with a view to giving further imeptus to the work already underway.

CHIARI AND JFK

President Chiari met with President Kennedy for 41 minutes this afternoon to discuss steps to give further impetus to the conversations of the joint commission which is considering Panama's aspirations in its relations with the United States.

Chiari told Panamanian newsmen that upon his return to Panama he will report to the nation on his conversations here but he added that "one is always comforted by the interest which he (President Kennedy) shows in our affairs."

Chiari said that "he (Kennedy) was frank with me and I was frank with him."

In addition to the discussion of measures for a more speedy advance of negotiations being carried out by the personal representatives of the Presidents of the United States and Panama in United States-Panama problems, Chiari said that he and Kennedy reviewed the results of what has already been achieved and discussed economic aid for Panama aside from the problems of the Alliance for Progress.

In regard to the latter item, Chiari said that Kennedy told him once Panama presents duly approved plans, he will consider them with sympathy.

Chiari stressed Kennedy's interest in Panamanian problems.

The interview between the United States and Panamanian Chief Executives took place at the residence of U.S. Ambassador Barri Escazu in the outskirts of San José. The U.S. Chief Executive greeted his Panamanian colleague together with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and U.S. Ambassador to Panama Joseph Farland, posing with them for pictures.

Hoosier Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Indianapolis News, an excellent column by Lou Hiner, Jr., on the Peace Corps volunteers from Indiana. I am pleased to say that Indiana is well represented in the Peace Corps program, ranking 18th among the States. There are at the present time 65 Hoosier volunteers who are working in 29 countries, and there are several more in training. Besides the volunteers, three of our institutions of higher education in Indiana are aiding in the Peace Corps training program. I would like to bring these articles to the attention of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 18, 1963]

ONETIME CRITICS NOW PRAISE JOB

(By Lou Hiner, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The Peace Corps, a baby in our vast bureaucracy, has observed its second birthday anniversary, and surprisingly it was toasted admiringly, even by onetime critics.

On its second anniversary, the Corps has 3,965 volunteers, including 65 from Indiana, working in 141 countries, and 630 other volunteers are training for work in various countries, including 3 new ones.

Although it's generally conceded the Corps is doing a good job, there are many persons who wonder if it isn't turning out to be another agency that will continue to grow and grow and spend and spend.

In its first year, the Corps had a budget of $30 million; the second-year cost approximately $60 million, and the budget calls for $108 million in its third year.

The purpose of the Peace Corps, as defined by President Kennedy, is to provide "skilled Americans to interested countries in need of manpower." The side product, of course, is to promote understanding.

When it was first suggested, critics predicted it would be a children's brigade, a sort of adolescent missionary society.

The "I-told-you-so" types had a field day when a young woman volunteer dropped a post card in Nigeria and it became an international incident momentarily because of critical remarks about the African nation.

Another rare incident of adverse publicity occurred when a 69-year-old grandmother blasted the Corps, in general, after she failed to snap through an obstacle course in the training program.

Of significance, only 3.2 percent of the volunteers sent abroad have been returned to this country, for various reasons including sickness and death. No volunteer has been asked to leave by a host government.

Every country in which volunteers work has asked the Peace Corps to double, triple, and even quadruple the supply of Americans.

Under present programing, the number of volunteers abroad will reach approximately 9,000 by the end of the calendar year. The largest concentration of these—about 4,000 volunteers—will be in Latin American countries.

ONE 76-YEAR-OLD SERVES

Here is some miscellany about the Peace Corps:

Who are the volunteers? They come from every State. About 63 percent are men. The average age is 26 for women and 24 for men. Minimum age is 18 with no maximum. A 76-year-old engineer now serves in East Pakistan.

What do they do? The greatest number works in education. Community work is the second largest field. This includes homemaking, construction, social work, and so forth. Agriculture and public works projects rank third.

What do volunteers receive? They are not on salaries but receive a living allowance sufficient to maintain them at the level of the people of the host nation. At the end of service, they receive an adjustment allowance of $75 a month, not to exceed $1,800 in all. Cost of the program to the taxpayers is about $9,000 a year per volunteer.

SIXTY-FIVE FROM STATE WORK IN 29 COUNTRIES

WASHINGTON.—In its first 12 years, the Peace Corps has drawn 65 volunteers from Indiana who now are working in 29 countries.

Four Hoosiers are in training now and will be assigned roles in the programs within the next few weeks. In the last 2 years, 324 other Hoosiers have taken the examination to join the Corps.

In addition to the Indiana volunteers' participation, three Indiana institutions of higher education have aided in the Peace Corps training program.

The University of Notre Dame, South Bend, and Purdue University, West Lafayette, both have trained contingents to work in Chile. Volunteers for Thailand now are training at Indiana University, Bloomington, and the same school has sent trainees to Tunisia.

As a provider of Peace Corps volunteers, Indiana ranks 18th among the States. California's 510 volunteers give that State top place while Alaska's 4 corpsmen rank it in the 50th spot.

Following are the Indiana volunteers, listed alphabetically, with their address and their assignments:

Anabel R. Stafford, Hobart, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Barbara A. Rush, Indianapolis, nurse, Sierra Leone.

Bernard J. Winburn, Richmond, nutrition, Peru.

Billie J. Sweany, Seymour, metalworking specialist, Ecuador.

Carole E. Harris, Indianapolis, cooperative worker, Dominican Republic.

Caroline L. Siedling, Brookville, English teacher, Thailand.

Charles E. Schimmoeller, Indianapolis, agricultural extension, Ecuador.

Cynthia A. Campbell, Columbus, elementary education, Philippines.

Dale E. Stickel, Elkhart, poultry extension worker, Brazil.

David E. Harris (husband and wife), Indianapolis, cooperative worker, Dominican Republic.

David E. King, Waterloo, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Donald W. Yancey, Madison, animal husbandry, Malaya.

Dorothy M. Freed, Waterloo, nurse, Afghanistan.

Edwin N. Viorol, Monroeville, commercial subjects teacher, British Honduras.

Eiden L. Katter, Stendal, art teacher, Ethiopia.

Emilie A. Clevenger, Brookville, chemistry instructor, Thailand.

George J. Craciun, Indianapolis, forester, Malaya.

Hamilton J. Bims, Gary, elementary education aid, Philippines.

Helen McGill, Gary, English teacher, Ivory Coast.

Henry Dalleave, Ragsdale, carpentry instructor, Somali Republic.

Henry Leroy Jennings, Frankfort, physical education, Tunisia.

Jack L. Crowell, Tipton, physical education teacher, Ivory Coast.

James Crandel, Brookville, agricultural extension, Niger.

James Michael Justice, Newport, community development, Ecuador.

Julius J. Macy, Columbia City, irrigation specialist, Morocco.

James T. Mullins, Fort Wayne, mechanic, Colombia.

John T. Evans, Madison, physics teacher, Nigeria.

John D. Harvey, Indianapolis, construction worker, Jamaica.

John M. Summers, Middletown, teacher's aid, Philippines.

John R. Swallow, Cambridge City, English teacher, Dominican Republic.

Karel A. Crowley, Anderson, elementary education aid, Philippines.

Lance S. Dodson, Wheeler, 4-H worker, North Borneo and Sarawak.

Lawrence West, Goshen, agriculture, Chile.

Kenneth D. Buckstrup, Indianapolis, cooperative worker, Chile.

Kay E. Aylor, Muncie, home economics teacher, Ethiopia.

Linda A. Cover, Gary, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Linda Elaine Oatman, Fort Wayne, laboratory technician, Thailand.

Margaret M. Heineman, Connersville, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Marsha Anita Luzzi, Hammond, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Marvin S. Adams, Huntington, 4-H worker, North Borneo and Sarawak.

Mary T. Atwood, Indianapolis, nurse, Chile.

Mary E. Craig, Beech Grove, home economist, Chile.

Mary J. Smith, Sullivan, English teacher, Ethiopia.

Michael E. Connelley, East Chicago, cooperative worker, Chile.

Michael B. Murphy, Peru, teacher, Costa Rica.

Murray M. DeArmond, Indianapolis, physician, Malaya.

Myrtis Jean Becker, Elkhart, social worker assistant, Bolivia.

Paul D. Meier, Anderson, construction, Peru.

Peggy L. Davis, Worthington, home economist, Philippines.

Ralph B. Thomas, North Manchester, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Richard L. Kunz, Indianapolis, builder-engineer, Colombia.

Richard L. Vittilow, Rockport, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Robert T. Milhous, South Bend, civil engineer, Tanganyika.

Robert B. South, Bloomington, community development, Chile.

Robert B. Taylor, Fort Wayne, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Roger U. Schneidewind, Richmond, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Rosalie A. Replogle, Bremen, teacher, Costa Rica.

Ruth Ann Becht, Floyds Knob, home economist, Brazil.

Stephen T. Cockerham, Elwood, agronomy, El Salvador.

Thomas D. Carpenter, Portage, teacher's aid, Peru.

Susan J. Miller, North Manchester, primary teacher, Liberia.

Thomas R. Reno, Plymouth, physicial education teacher, Iran.

J.F.K. and San Jose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 21. The article points out that Kennedy's publicity trip to Central America has not helped solve the basic Cuban problem, but has succeeded in pledging a huge sum for an aid program.

Text of the article is as follows:

J.F.K. AND SAN JOSE: TALKS AID KENNEDY'S LATIN IMAGE BUT WILL DO LITTLE TO QUIET CONGRESSMEN ON CUBA

(By Allan L. Otten)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA.—President Kennedy winged homeward yesterday satisfied his 3-day Caribbean visit accomplished most of what he had hoped for in improving U.S. relations with Central America.

But the trouble is his expectations never were very high and the congressional pressure on Mr. Kennedy to do something about Castroism has been great. Thus, even administration officials concede the south-of-the-border sojourn will do little to quiet, and might conceivably aggravate, back-home criticism of the Kennedy policy toward Cuba and Communist activity in the Western Hemisphere.

Viewed in this larger context, then, the Kennedy trip looms largely as a public relations triumph that will do more to enhance the Presidential image in the isthmus than to curb Castroism and, in the process, ease the political impact of the Cuban issue on Mr. Kennedy and the Democrats come election day 1964.

It's quite true the steps discussed here, if ever carried through, would be stronger than the United States expected. Top representatives of the six Central American nations that took part in the isthmus summit—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—agreed to meet again next month with U.S. officials to devise ways to inhibit travel to and from Cuba and to slow the flow of money and propaganda from Cuba to Latin American lands.

At the same time the Organization of American States is to be prodded to urge tougher stands on other hemisphere nations still soft on Castro. There's to be additional sea and air surveillance and inspection of shipping in Central American waters and improved exchange of intelligence on subversive activity.

Nevertheless, the "ifs" are big. As they head for home, U.S. officials seem optimistic that the Central American nations, which now do not grant visas for travel to Cuba but which do not penalize citizens who manage to get there anyhow through Mexico or some other gateway, will get tough. They also seem hopeful that Mexico will cooperate.

FREE TRAVEL GUARANTEED

But most of the isthmian nations have constitutional guarantees of free travel and it remains to be seen just how strongly they move to clamp down on indirect travel to Cuba by their citizens. If Mexico does cooperate, some new shipment point may open elsewhere.

As for exchanging intelligence, most Central American nations sharply distrust each other still. "I just cannot see Costa Rica, for example, turning over its list of suspected subversives to Nicaragua," a Latin American official says.

Similarly, there seems no good reason for official optimism here that several of the nations still having diplomatic relations with Cuba may sever these ties in the next few months. There are five nations in this group—Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay—and U.S. officials are convinced Cuban Embassies in these countries are major sources of propaganda and money for local subversive movements.

U.S. sources suggest that the OAS may soon put pressure on these five, but the very fact that relations still exist, even after the Cuban missile crisis, shows just how tough a domestic political problem the diplomatic break must be for the governments involved.

But perhaps most importantly of all, some Government spokesmen—both United States and Central American—suggest that, even though there unquestionably is real concern among Central American groups over Communist subversion, some countries stress the Castro menace largely to keep the United States handing out money.

If that is a motive, then it worked. Mr. Kennedy promised "substantial" aid on a wide variety of fronts to help promote regional economic integration and development, at the same time stressing the need for local reforms in these nations.

Just how much financial help has been pledged was not revealed, but apparently it is a very large sum indeed. There will be a long-term loan to permit the Central American Bank for Economic Integration to study a raft of new economic development projects. There will be an "immediate substantial initial contribution," with even more to come later, for a new fund to carry out regional development projects. Other financial help will be extended to help each country set up a bank for low-interest loans to private industry, for a regional bank to provide a secondary home mortgage market, and to give vocational training to young men and women in agriculture and business practices.

FOCUS ON ECONOMICS

All this, of course, contributed mightily to the President's public relations success. Indeed, Mr. Kennedy and the Central American presidents, for the most part, focused their discussions on economics. Kennedy speeches throughout his visit stressed U.S. support of regional integration and the need for action to raise Latin American living standards as the most effective long-term defense against communism.

On Cuba, U.S. officials say, the President scored with major impact in a long and detailed briefing of his fellow presidents on what the United States is already doing and is prepared to do: The pledge against reintroduction of Red offensive weapons into Cuba; intensive air surveillance of the island; a determination, communicated to the Soviet Union, to move against any Hungary-type action to suppress an uprising in Cuba; a policy to fight attempts by Castro to ship arms to other Latin American nations or to overthrow another Latin American government; the campaign to cut back free world shipping to Cuba; increased U.S. propaganda activity in the hemisphere.

Back home, of course, the administration's task will be much more difficult. Despite the expected pledges of anti-Castro action by our south-of-the-border neighbors, White House officials have resigned themselves to continued and perhaps intensified criticism of the administration's Cuban policy, and that this unpleasant prospect will never really end so long as Cuba or any other Latin American nation remains in Communist hands.

Eyewitnesses Refute U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to include my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial appearing in the Santa Ana, Calif., Register of Friday, March 22, dealing with the U.N. atrocities in Katanga, and points up the fact that it is high time to sever relations with the United Nations.

EYEWITNESSES REFUTE U.N.

The American Association for the United Nations has sent out another batch of propaganda, this time in defense of the U.N. "rape" of Katanga. A covering letter from Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director of the A.A.U.N. says it is in "an effort to set the factual record straight."

One piece is a beautifully printed piece from the United Nations called The United Nations and the Congo—Some Salient Facts. It is an effort to defend the U.N. stand in the Congo where more than 20,000 troops have imposed the collective will of the U.N. on the former prosperous Katanga area.

Here's a good example of the propaganda: "There have been many allegations of atrocities against civilians by United Nations troops. For the most part, these have been wild, irresponsible, and a deliberate product of propaganda sponsored and paid for by the Katanga information machine.' "

Well, how about that? We have received a copy of a letter from R. H. Wentland, president of the Congo Union Mission of Seventh-day Adventists. Here are two paragraphs from his letter to Bob Bartlett of Cleveland:

"Before the U.N. came into Katanga we had prosperity, peace, and order. The U.S.-backed U.N. came in and brought war, lawlessness, murder, looting, ruination, poverty, and chaos and general destruction on the state of Katanga. Those of us who live here, can't see why civilized nations can ever think of doing such a thing.

"The idea is that if Katanga does not go back into the Central Government then Central Government will fall. Why should it? Only for this reason, that Mr. Gizenga wants all of the Congo to turn over to communism. The Central Government is far over the majority on the side of communism, and all they want is Katanga to make it complete, Russia gets it and America pays for it."

Here is part of a statement by Julia Hoel, a medical missionary associated with Mr. Wentland:

"We see and hear of tragic cases every day out at the refugee center. Today a man was standing at the desk with a foot bandaged. We asked him about it and he told us a woman had called the Red Cross * * * saying she was under constant fire and could not get out. When there was a lull in the shooting, they went out in an ambulance after her. The driver and hospital assistant were Katangans. They found the woman and on the way out the Gurkhas shot and killed both of them and wounded the woman in the head and the Belgian in the foot. They had to stay there all night with the bodies of the two Katangans and with their wounds sore and bleeding until the next day when others came to rescue them."

Here are a few selected quotes from the Reverend Kenneth Jones, a Methodist missionary:

"The United Nations has started all this scandalous mess, destroying a prosperous young country where black and white were working and living together.

"Eyewitnesses have seen the Indian U.N. troops shoot down Katangan soldiers with their hands raised in surrender. They have thrown Katangan troops off the top of the post office building. They have fired on civilians. They have carried ammunition in trucks carrying Red Cross flags. Their every tactic has been Gestapo-like, and contrary to the usual conventions of war."

Here is a small part of the report of a Catholic mission located 15 miles from Elisabethville in Katanga:

"Meanwhile, the Ethiopian (U.N.) officers said that if ever anyone fired on them when they returned to Elisabethville they were going to come back and shoot indiscriminately at everyone in the mission.

"They showed themselves more expert in the art of shoplifting than in finding Katangan soldiers. It's more profitable and less dangerous. A few minutes later disarmed Katangan police arrived and tried to persuade the refugees to return to Elisabethville, where the U.N. would not harm them. Naturally, no one returned."

The U.N. publications claim that they had a right to move in and force the Katangan people to become a part of the Central Congo Government, because of the fact that they were both part of the Belgian Congo. It's the same as the civil war, they contend, and that they should keep Moise Tshombe and his group from seceding. Here is what Dr. Albert Schweitzer, the dean of medical missionaries in the Congo said about these two parts of the former Belgian Congo:

"Neither part has any right over the other or has obligations to each other. No war made by one against the other for the purpose of domination has any legal foundation. No foreign state has the right to oblige one of these two independent people to submit to the other. It is unthinkable that in our time a foreign state should be at war with Katanga to force it to pay tribute to the other Congo state. But there is more: The United Nations joins that foreign power and its enterprise at the risk of losing the well-earned respect it enjoys in the world.

"Reason and justice demand that this foreign power and the U.N. withdraw their troops immediately from Katanga and henceforth recognize and respect its independence."

Those are parts of reports from the scene by individuals who were on the payroll of President Moise Tshombe. We'll take their word over the claims of the United Nations and its supporters.

We think the above material clearly demonstrates why a great many people who once saw the United Nations as a potential for bringing peace to the world are now in favor of JIMMY UTT's resolution to get the United States out of the U.N.

Commonsense and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared in the March 26 issue of the Levittown Times, a leading newspaper in Bucks County, Pa. This editorial is on the subject which has been occupying much of our thoughts these last few days and certainly shows how the people back home feel about this problem.

The editorial follows:

COMMONSENSE AND FOREIGN AID

At long last one of the citizens' Committees appointed periodically to review foreign aid has come up with a commonsense appraisal of the program, an appraisal that Congress and the administration should not hesitate to adopt.

The Committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay and named last fall by President Kennedy, has stated that foreign aid should be slashed by one-half billion dollars immediately, limited to $1 billion within a few years and in the not too distant future eliminated altogether.

These recommendations, if effected, would go a long way toward bringing us back from the brink of bankruptcy. That alone is one argument in their favor. It is not the only one. From almost any point of view, the Committee's logic is excellent, clear, and forceful.

In India, for instance, our funds are used to build government industries which compete with private firms, thus restricting the very basis of economic responsibility. Thus we are not helping India to fiscal independence; our foreign aid funds are working against it instead. This, said the Committee, should end.

In Indonesia we are supporting a government committed to territorial aggrandizement. In the Alliance for Progress we are to some extent ignoring our original stipulation, domestic reform aimed toward self-help, as we hand out funds. In Africa we are taking over the responsibilities of Western European countries that for years bled the Africans until financial independence was all but impossible.

Welcome words these. President Kennedy earlier has stated that he will seek to implement the Committee's recommendations and we trust that he will live up to this word even though he originally asked for $4.9 billion in foreign aid, Congress has cut it to $3.9 billion and General Clay's Committee of 10 wants to lower it to $3.4 billion. Congress, too, should go along, ignoring the inevitable bleats of the ultraliberals whose panacea for all ills is spend, giveaway and tax, tax, tax.

Patuxent River Naval Air Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the naval air station on the Patuxent River at Lexington Park, St. Mary's County, Md., today is 20 years old. This unit has made an extraordinarily fine record for itself, of which all Marylanders, and particularly those of us from southern Maryland, can be proud. The station is a key element in the economy of the entire area, and the station personnel, whether assigned to Patuxent for a long or a short period, have made themselves beloved by St. Mary's County residents. It also is a vital weapon in the Nation's arsenal, and is contributing importantly to the security of our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in the RECORD at this point a very excellent article from the St. Mary's Enterprise, one of the State's finest and ablest newspapers, commemorating the naval air station's 20th birthday.

The article follows:

TIME MARCHES ON; NAVAL AIR STATION OBSERVES 20TH YEAR IN COUNTY ON APRIL 1

The Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., celebrates its 20th anniversary next Monday, April 1. Since its commissioning in spring of 1943 this sprawling military establishment has become one of the most important bases in naval aviation as well as being a giant economic and social factor in St. Marys County.

"NAS Pax" was born in an effort to centralize the widely dispersed air testing facilities in the Navy. In September of 1941 a committee from the Bureau of Aeronautics was formed to select a site at which these varied units could be consolidated. Cedar Point, Md., was the committee's choice.

Two months later Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox approved the southern Maryland location and authorization to begin construction of NAS was issued. Possession of the land was obtained and ground was broken for building on April 4, 1942.

The name of Patuxent River was chosen for the new station in order to avoid any possible confusion with the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point, N.C.

The 6,800-acre site which was acquired for the air station included a considerable acreage of well-developed farmland with numerous existing farm buildings, a small town called Pearson, and a summer colony along the Chesapeake Bay shore. A large portion of the area was heavily wooded.

Construction contracts were given to the Cummins Construction Corp. and Riggs Distler & Co. Both contractors were from Baltimore.

At the time construction on NAS began, the prime difficulties lay in the remoteness of the site and transportation from large cities. The population of entire St. Marys County was less than 15,000 and the nearest metropolitan center was Washington, D.C.—some 60 miles away. Access to Cedar Point could be gained only by a narrow winding State highway. The nearest railroad operated to Waldorf, a distance of 40 miles from the building location.

Two bus trips a day connected Washington with Leonardtown, the county seat. This still left 15 miles to be traveled before reaching the air station site.

Within 9 months nearly 9,000 workmen poured into this sparsely populated location. The problems arising from this influx soon assumed formidable proportions. Aside from the apparent problems of housing and feeding this large group, there were other, more touchy, situations.

Since recreational facilities were practically nil, and the workmen were averaging high above the normal wages for the time, gambling and drinking inevitably set in. Fighting and brawling, coupled with other intemperate habits, soon became serious problems.

To make matters worse, several professional gamblers infiltrated and, in spite of efforts by management and labor officials, the situation began to affect the sincere workmen who were in the vast majority.

Through the efforts of naval intelligence and the arrival of the early contingent of naval forces (including Marines), the illicit liquor trading was broken up and the undesirable element deported from the area.

On April 1, 1943, the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, was commissioned as an activity of the Potomac River Naval Command. Its mission during the war was twofold: to act as an aviation test center and to serve as the east coast terminal for the Naval Air Transport Service. On June 16, 1945, the station was redesignated naval air test center with the air station becoming a subordinate command.

During the ensuing 20 years great strides have been made in the Patuxent River area both economically and socially. Center Gardens contributed 1,000 more units of housing. Many employees originally residing in Lexington Park have built homes throughout the county, established suburban communities, and developed waterfront housing. Churches of all major denominations have been established. Additional schoolhouses have been provided and many new business enterprises have been established.

The population of St. Mary's County is now approximately 56,000—an increase of 300 percent since the beginning of the air station. Main roads have been added, improved, and widened. The economy of the county has been further stimulated by the tremendously increased investment in services rendered by the electric and telephone companies.

In the Naval Establishment the air station has carved a niche that is impressive to say the least. As a supporting activity of the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River has seen scores of pilots assigned here fly their way into the pages of aviation history.

Among some of the better remembered names to serve in this area are astronauts John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, Alan Shepard, and Walter Schirra. Many others have set speed and altitude records that still stand.

The Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., can look back on 20 years of full activity. With an eye to the future, NAS sees much more of the same.

Is It Fact or Fancy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include my "Washington Report" of March 29, 1963, together with the attached reprint from the Civic Center Sun of Los Angeles, Calif., August 31, 1951.

The articles follow:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

This report could well be entitled "Is It Fact or Fancy?" My recent report on Exercise Water Moccasin III produced a torrent of inquiries, and some condemnation, from people who like to play games. I have no objection to training some of the officers of our allies. I do not consider that Communist Indonesia is an ally, but rather a member within the Communist orbit whose attacks are leveled against our allies, Great Britain and Holland. Liberia is not a NATO ally, but is a member of the U.N. as is Indonesia. Therefore, the Operation Water Moccasin III took on somewhat the nature of a United Nations operation.

I was fully aware that similar operations had been conducted in this country over a long period of time, but the original plan for Water Moccasin II was much greater than was actually carried out. An Army release dated January 14, 1963, stated that "between 2,500 and 3,000 men will participate." Subsequent releases reduced the figure to 1,000 and the final Army release indicated something under 600 participants, scattered over 1½ million acres of land.

I am unalterably opposed to subjecting the civilian population to massive psychological, counterinsurgency warfare. I objected to the military secrecy surrounding the operation, and I recalled a similar operation in California in the summer of 1951, when the "U.N. Military Government" took over Culver City and arrested the mayor and established martial law. Included as a part of this report is an additional reprint covering the Culver City operation and the "United Nations Forces Military Government Proclamation No. 1" which is reprinted in full, and which should be read by all patriotic Americans.

In May of this year, there will be a similar operation in the State of Washington entitled "Coulee Crest." This operation will be started by a special forces unit which is now in the area. In a picture and interview with four members of the special forces unit, which appeared in the Wenatchee, (Wash.) Daily World, of March 12, 1963, it is interesting to note that these men wear the type berets such as those worn in the Katanga takeover by the U.N. forces. From now on, however, and during the maneuvers, these men will be wearing civilian clothes. They will be underground agents for the "red army" which will try to gain control of Wenatchee, Wash., from the "blue army." This special underground unit will call on civilians to hide them and to transport them to points of demolition, and will urge that they not be turned over to the Army.

My question is, how will a resident know whether the man knocking at the door is a part of the maneuver or whether he is a robber, seeking to gain admission to the home, or actually a foreign spy requesting transportation to a demolition site such as a bridge or a hydroelectric power plant? It is simply more psychological warfare practiced on the American civilian population.

During a similar action in Lampasas, Tex., on April 3, 1952, we are informed on excellent authority that greenclad aggressor troops took over the city, a ranching town of 5,000 people, closed churches, bullied teachers and set up concentration camps. Businessmen were arrested; brief one-sided trials, minus habeas corpus, were conducted; and guards were posted in school classrooms. An AP dispatch for April 3 said in part.

"But the staged action almost became actual drama when one student and two troopers forgot it was only makebelieve. 'Ain't nobody going to make me get up,' cried John Snell, 17, his face beef red. One of the paratroopers shoved the butt of his rifle within inches of Snell's face and snarled, 'You want this butt placed in your teeth? Get up.' "

There can be only two reasons for this type of operation, both of them bad. The first is that our defenses are weak because of the abandonment of our first-strike capabilities, which are the only war deterrent we have had, plus the fact that we are dismantling our missile bases around the world and programing a unilateral disarmament in general, which by 1970 will place us at the absolute mercy of Russia.

The second is that we are probing the resistance of the American people to an internal takeover, fantastic as that may seem, although the present tendency is to deliver this country into the tender hands of the U.N. peacekeeping army. I recall that Abraham Lincoln said, "If this Nation is ever destroyed, it will be from within, not from without."

A MOCK MILITARY GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OR REHEARSAL FOR THE REAL THING IN THE UNITED STATES?

The Army Military Government Reserve units "occupied" nine small cities around Los Angeles in July 1951. The "guinea pig" village taken over sometime prior to these nine was the fashionable winter resort of Palm Springs.

The press in Palm Springs, referring to these military government summer maneuvers for the reservists, said that the action was thought to be one of the first of its kind in the country.

This first-of-its-kind exercise, conducted by an authority whose title has as alien a ring as ever was heard in a republic; namely, military government, was carried on one weekend in September 1950.

COINCIDENCE?

Is it coincidence that this military government resembles the recent legislation for universal military training?

The date of September 1950 places these military government maneuvers 9 months before the passage of the present universal military training legislation whose hidden provisions make possible the military dictatorship of the United States.

SLICK TRICK? TRIAL BALLOON?

Was the military so sure of its dictatorial powers that it pushed the dateline forward by 9 months in a tryout, under the guise of maneuvers, which could show how somnolent or submissive the American public was?

The press reports indicated that during the proceedings in Palm Springs the civilian activities were taken over, the mayor and city manager jailed, and all persons in the town over 16 were to be registered for "labor uses."

This act of regimenting civilians for labor service has its counterpart in the universal military training bill.

Senate bill 1 (unamended) called for all citizens to be trained for civilian as well as military service so that there might be a ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

Provisions such as these plainly would make possible permanent labor service (regimentation) for civilians in the United States, not in some faroff Lilliput.

SOOTHING SYRUP

Of course, these military government takeovers are presumably for action in some distant lands. To assure the nervous Nellies that it could never happen here, the Culver City press, during the takeover of that area, carried a single line stating that such action would not operate in the United States.

Phooey.

A UNITED NATIONS FORCE

At Palm Springs maneuvers in 1950 the Stars and Stripes were accompanied by a newly-designed flag intended for use of the unit, according to report.

This new flag was blue, not unlike the United Nations flag, and had a center design. Only, not the world with a wreath around it.

However by July 1951 the military government took over the Huntington Park area boldly in the name of the "United Nations Forces Military Government of Agressi." Agressi is the name of a mythical state contrived by these "summer project" pranksters.

Where does fun end and military dictatorship take over? When the emergency arises?

We recall that world government advocates continually refer to "the rule of law," "world law," regulation "by law." What law? Universal military law?

We likewise remember that world government advocates tell us that the international

system will operate directly upon the individual wherever he is.

Do you like to be operated upon directly by that international debating society known as the U.N. which conducted its continuing conversations at Lake Success while our boys died at the 38th parallel in Korea?

WHAT CONCLUSION?

What attitude are we, the everyday God-fearing Americans who love our Republic, to assume toward a hitherto unherd of military government in the United States?

Has not the day come when we are to stand up and be counted for our country? Are we afraid?

The scripture says, "Be ye strong, therefore, and let not your hands be weak: for your work shall be rewarded." (II Chronicles 15: 7).

UNITED NATIONS FORCE OR FARCE?

HUNTINGTON PARK.—Military government occupancy of Huntington Park last week aroused indignation from many responsible sources and many local people expressed misgivings over such a development. All concerned were outspoken regarding the Bulletin's coverage of the so-called occupation and it is believed that this newspaper was the only one, at least locally, to feature the seizure proclamation.

Huntington Park, South Gate, Los Angeles, Eagle Rock, and Hollywood guardians of freedom obtained hundreds of extra copies of the Bulletin and it is known that officials in Washington, D.C., have been deluged with telegrams and letters protesting the invasion.

It has been stated that the entire program of occupancy of Huntington Park, South Gate, Culver City, Long Beach, Torrance, Hawthorne, Compton, Redondo Beach, and other cities was planned at an Army officers' meeting at which prominent civilian law enforcers were present.

The original idea, it is believed, was for the maneuver to be conducted without previous or advance warning. Since it was impossible to keep the idea secret, reports state, it was decided to inform the public of this.

Observers have pointed out that military men are being taken into governmental departments with alarming rapidity and many locals believe seizure to be a forerunner of events to come unless immediate precautions are taken.

There is a definite indication that Huntington Park city officials and those of other cities will not permit a repetition of this maneuver this year, next year, or otherwise unless circumstances beyond their control compel them to do so.

They agree that if it was purely a tactical maneuver for the education of Army personnel it has merit, but if it is the beginning of any other procedure it is dangerous.

In the meantime the Bulletin will watch the picture closely to see if the seizure is, as many irate readers believe, the Army's lesson to civilians.

UNITED NATIONS FORCES MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF AGRESSI

Proclamation No. 1

To the People of Agressi:

Whereas in prosecuting the war against Agressi, it has become necessary for the armed forces of the United Nations under my command, to occupy this town, adjacent areas, and other portions of Agressi, and

Whereas it is the policy of the armed forces of the United Nations not to make war upon the civilian inhabitants of the occupied territory but to protect them in the peaceful exercise of their legitimate pursuits, insofar as the exigencies of war and their own behavior will permit, and

Whereas in order to preserve law and order and to provide for the safety and welfare both of the forces under my command and of yourselves, it is necessary to establish military government in the occupied territory: Now, therefore,

I, Jones Smithman, general, U.S. Army, commanding U.S. Forces Oceania, and Military Governor of Agressi, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the United Nations Security Council, do hereby proclaim as follows:

I

All powers of government and jurisdiction in the occupied territory and over the inhabitants thereof, and final administrative responsibility are vested in me as Commanding General of the Forces of Occupation and as Military Governor of United Nations Forces, Military Government of Agressi is hereby established to exercise these powers under my direction.

II

All persons in the occupied territory will obey promptly all orders given by me or under my authority and must not commit any act hostile to the forces under my command or helpful to the Agressi forces; must not commit acts of violence or acts which may disturb public order in any way.

III

Your existing customs, religious beliefs and property rights will be fully respected and your existing laws will remain in force and effect except insofar as it may be necessary for me in the exercise of my powers and duties to change them by proclamation or order issued by me or under my direction.

IV

All Agressi civil and criminal courts and all universities, schools and educational establishments will be closed until further order of United Nations Forces Military Governor of Agressi.

V

All administrative and police officials of towns, cities, counties and States and all other Government and municipal functionaries and employees, and all officers and employees of State, municipal or other public services, except such officials and political leaders as are removed by, or under my direction, are required to continue in the performance of their duties subject to my direction or the direction of such of the officers of the armed forces of the United Nations as may be deputed for the purpose.

VI

So long as you remain peaceable and comply with the orders of the forces of occupation, you will be subject to no greater interference than is made necessary by war conditions, and may go about your normal vocations without fear.

VII

Further proclamation, orders and regulations will be issued by me or under my authority from time to time. They will state what is further required of you, and what you are forbidden to do, and will be displayed in courthouses, city halls, or other public places.

VIII

In case of conflict or ambiguity between the English text of his proclamation or any other proclamation, order, or regulation issued under my authority, and any translations thereof, the English text is to prevail.

JONES SMITHMAN,
Commanding United Nations Forces Oceania, General, United States Army, Military Governor of Agressi.

Probers Failed To Look Behind Morgan Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently Federal Power Commissioner Howard Morgan, wrote President Kennedy notifying him that he would not be available for reappointment to the Commission when his term expires June 30, 1963.

As a result of publicity stemming from his letter, Mr. Morgan appeared before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. At that time Mr. Morgan put forward 12 recommendations, designed to improve the administration and operation of the Federal Power Commission. I ask unanimous consent to have these recommendations placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as a newspaper article by A. Robert Smith, Washington correspondent for the Portland Oregonian.

Mr. Morgan's 12 recommendations seem to me eloquent testimony to his dedication as a public servant and his conscientiousness in desiring that the powers of the Commission be fully carried out.

The recommendations and article follow:

TWELVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

(Testimony by Federal Power Commissioner Howard Morgan Before Special Subcommittee of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, February 28, 1963)

Mr. MOSS. Now, the letter, I think, in my opinion, and there are those who will disagree, but in my opinion it is excellent and stands on its own feet if it is read objectively.

The chairman, in outlining the purposes of the hearing yesterday, stated that we were to pursue a study of how to improve the procedures of the Commission.

That being the principal objective, I would like to know if you have some proposals which you feel would be beneficial to this committee as it discharges its obligations to the Congress and to the public.

Mr. MORGAN. I wonder if I could answer your question, Mr. Moss, by reading some notes which I drafted since the meeting yesterday, setting forth the answer to a question which I haven't been asked yet, which is: Why I am leaving the Commission?

Mr. MOSS. Well, I would be interested in a fuller statement on that, if you——

Mr. MORGAN. And also including some suggestions as to possible avenues of correction for these ailments and dislocations and imperfections, which are the reasons for my leaving.

Would that satisfy you, sir?

Mr. MOSS. I would like very much to hear it.

Mr. MORGAN. One, the Commission does not have the freedom and independence which it needs in order to carry out the powers delegated to it by the Congress.

The Commission is not independent externally and it does not have freedom and independence internally. The reasons can plainly be seen through an analysis of Reorganization Plan No. 9, under the act of 1950.

The President has the power to designate the chairman and, presumably, he also has the power to withdraw that designation.

The chairman, under the plan, has almost complete administrative control over the staff, including personnel authority with respect to hiring and termination, promotions, pay increases, and assignments of duties.

This committee and the Congress should understand that more than administrative control is transferred to the chairman under that plan, because these powers are translatable into control over policies so far as the staff is concerned.

Policies not favored by the chairman will not be developed by staff members whose futures and careers are directly influenced by the chairman's actions and policies.

A standing criticism for many years has been that the Commissioners are captives of their staffs. To a degree this is unavoidable, owing to the size and complexity of the workload.

Commissioners must rely in the making of informed judgments on the expertise and information furnished by the staff. The best safeguard for a truly independent Commission, therefore, is a truly independent staff, free to think imaginatively and creatively under Commission policy.

If the flow of information and legal interpretation from the staff to the Commission has been influenced initially by preselected policies, the Commissioners may be deprived of alternative facts and alternative approaches.

Therefore, the way is open for Commissioners to become captives of staff members who are captives of the chairman, who is, in turn, a captive of the White House.

In my view, this system holds grave perils for the freedom and independence of regulatory agencies created by the Congress, and I urge the members of this subcommittee to look hard at this matter and think hard about it.

Now, again, I want you to understand that I am making no charges, but I am pointing to a situation which exists and, to a greater or lesser degree, hampers the independence and freedom of these so-called independent agencies.

I do not say this situation is bad, but it is not perfect, and it can become very bad, in my opinion.

2. The present Commission has inherited a system of attempting to control the price of natural gas in the field which is extremely cumbersome, raises countless legal problems, involves certain procedural encroachments on producer and consumer alike, is illegal, in my opinion, in its effects upon both the producer and the consumer interests and, in my opinion, is neither a fair nor an effective way to control producer prices.

For an elaboration on this, I refer you to my concurring statement in *Amerada Petroleum Corp.*, docket No. CI62-1544, and my dissent in the fifth amendment to the statement of general policy No. 61-1.

After inheriting this cumbersome, unwieldy price mechanism, this Commission has done little to improve it, and let me say that I am one of those who, with deep reservations, agreed to accept this pricing mechanism and try to make it work.

I left the door open for future attempts in other directions to handle pricing controls, and I am sorry that the Commission has not yet, although I have hopes it soon will, enter those doors and try some other methods.

Still this Commission has done little to improve it despite the fact that a growing body of economic facts indicates that it has been ineffectual, and that the price of gas today is more the result of competitive forces in the marketplace than the result of the so-called area pricing regulation.

I believe we should work instead for the exemption of small producers, and concentrate our resources upon the regulation of the large ones.

I believe, too, that we should regulate strictly the pipelines purchasing programs and equip the Commission with an up-to-the-minute inventory on all gas available in the United States and use competitive forces to the extent that we possible can.

We need a uniform system of accounts for such producers, a long-postponed responsibility and one under which no steps whatsoever are being taken toward its discharge.

3. In an effort to clear up its backlog of caseloads and paperwork the Commission has resorted, on an enormous scale, to the settlement of pipeline rate cases instead of full litigation and proper adjudication of those cases.

Partly, this is because we are short of staff and a large reason we are short of staff is the tremendous manpower we are devoting, under the present method, to the control of gas prices at the producer level.

These settlements in my opinion, are a very expensive device, from the consumer's point of view, for the clearance of the Commission's backlog.

I will cite as an example, the Tennessee Gas Transmission rate case, which we settled a few weeks ago and in the decision of which I did not participate. I will tell you why.

There were approximately $320 million of rate increases subject to refund in this case.

The FPC staff was of the opinion that the refund should be about $210 million of that total; over two-thirds. Tennessee went to 100 intervenors in the case and got their approval for a voluntary refund of $134 million.

This is $76 million less than the staff recommended, and I did not participate in the decision of the case because of that tremendous gap.

Now, of the $350 milion that we have accepted or ordered as refunds in settlement cases, if you apply those figures I think you will come up with a conservative estimate that the staff would probably have recommended about $500 million refunds instead of the $350 million that were refunded.

Now the question that this presents, gentlement, is this:

Is $150 million of hard-earned consumer's cash paid out, that they will never get again, which will never be returned to them, a proper price for helping to clean up the FPC backlog of rate cases?

Now, I am not persuaded that it is, and I think this matter of pipeline rate settlements has got to the point where it requires as examination.

I know that I, after voting for many of these settlements, have finally had enough, and the one that cured me was the Tennessee case I just talked about.

This is far too expensive, in my opinion, a way to clean up a backlog.

4. The electric and gas utilities of the United States are currently syphoning off hundreds of millions of dollars a year of consumers' money by means of paying taxes to the Treasury on a basis of accelerated depreciation, while reporting their tax expenses to the Commission for ratemaking purposes on the basis of the full taxes they would have paid without accelerated depreciation.

This means that the consumers are being charged huge amounts representing phantom taxes which are not paid and in the opinion of most, if not all, disinterested students of taxation, will never be paid.

Worse still, these funds are reinvested in the corporations with the result that the ratepayer must pay a return on capital involuntarily extracted from him by the utilities.

As a result, equivalent amounts are paid out to stockholders, in many cases, as dividends which are in part or in whole tax free.

Some companies have been paying dividends to stockholders which are 100 percent tax free because of the operation of this device. Thus, the ratepayer is charged for taxes which never go to the Treasury and stockholders receive income on which they pay no or little taxes.

This Commission should have moved in to abate this abuse many years ago, as Commissioner Connole pointed out in a brilliant dissent in 1956, and as many progressive State commissions have done in the interim.

This Commission is inexcusably remiss because it has done nothing to change the policy in this vital area. These moneys, in 1961, were accumulating at the following rates: Gas companies, $52,886,000 per year; electric companies, $191,926,000 per year; the total of these moneys, accumulated at the end of 1961, were: gas companies, $306,643,000, electric companies, $1,495,938,828.

Not all of the companies holding these funds are under our jurisdiction, but that should not prevent us from moving to end this abuse within our own jurisdiction and to set an example for those State commissions which have not yet dealt with the problem.

This is a flagrant example of ratepayers, who look to the Commission for protection, being forced to pay totally unjustified charges.

5. The same must be said of the problem of tax consolidations, but I shall not elaborate on this point because it involves cases now pending for decision, other than to say here again we should have acted years ago.

6. The unprecedented action of the Commission in setting up, with my reluctant concurrence, technical advisory committees representing the electric and natural gas industries has raised the gravest questions regarding improper influence by industry directly upon the Commission and its staff. These committees have some value, and I emphasize that they do have some value. But I am not persuaded that the value is sufficient to offset the dangers to the Commission's integrity.

If these advisory committees are not abolished, each of them should be broadened to include more consumer and outside independent interests, such as labor, the universities, genuinely independent Commission staff members; and should contain representatives of all other industries serving as energy sources.

Their meetings should be open to the press and the public, even though this may require such committees to meet in a public auditorium.

7. The Commission's regulation prohibiting ex parte communications with Commissioners and other employees involved at the decision-making level, concerning cases in litigation before us, should be broadened to prohibit improper communications with those members of the staff who are charged with participation in such cases in behalf of the public interest.

If such staff presentations are altered or weakened as the result of industry pressure, the public's side of the case obviously will be poorly presented, and this will have an inescapable impact on the quality of the decision which finally emerges from the record thus made.

Such a prohibition, in my opinion, would add to the independence of the staff, and perhaps this would obviate the creation of a needed public defender panel within the staff for presentation of the public's case, as has often been recommended.

8. The Federal Power Commission is charged with the responsibility of close

liaison with other Governmental agencies, but the liaison is not close enough or cooperative enough to enable the Commission to adjudge properly the impact of its actions on the programs set up by the Congress to be administered by those other agencies.

Further, the liaisons presently existing are tinged and colored by jurisdictional rivalry and squabbling of the most pettifogging nature, with the result that the attempts at coordination contain within them the seeds of interagency discord.

In my opinion, this is one of the gravest failures of all of the regulatory agencies, as many reports have pointed out, and steps should be taken by the Congress to deal with the problem of interagency policy formulation.

9. The Federal Power Commission and, in my opinion, all other regulatory agencies need more insulation not only from the blandishments and enticements of the industries they regulate, such as ex parte communications, offers of future jobs, and so on, but also more insulation from uncertainties with respect to reappointment, reconfirmation, and the like.

I concur with the many suggestions which have been made with regard to increased compensation, drastically increased retirement benefits, and longer tenure of office.

I would suggest that 10 years is an appropriate term.

The absence of such protection and insulation is presently an impediment, in my opinion, to the independence of these agencies which the Congress contemplated when it delegated its responsibilities to them.

10. Each Commissioner needs a larger personal staff of specialists, or assistants, to assist him in analyzing the huge volume of cases which flow through his office each week.

No Commissioner, working with a single assistant and hampered to some extent by the fact that the staff may not always be free and willing to advance its own independent judgment and assistance, can hope to deal accurately and fairly with a weekly load of some 65 to 90 cases brought before the Commission in a single weekly working meeting lasting approximately 6 to 8 hours.

11. One of the most important achievements of the present Commission is the establishment of an Office of Economics within the staff. This was accomplished only last year and is a sad commentary on the administrative standards existing in the agency from its inception until that time.

When one considers that this agency regulates the largest industry in the United States in terms of investment: the electric power industry, and the fifth or sixth largest; the natural gas industry, it speaks much for what has transpired to point out the tardiness of this agency in turning to the tools of economic analysis in dealing with problems which very often involve more important economic than legal problems.

This Office should be strengthened drastically.

I also recommend that the Commission at all times in the future have not less than two trained economists within its membership at the Commissioner level.

12. The Commission has shown signs of relapsing toward the old system of issuing anonymous opinions, couched in obscure and confusing terminology, baffling to the members of the bar and even to the attorneys in the case and, of course, even much more so to the general public.

Necessary steps should be taken to insure that every opinion issued by the Commission shall be signed by an individual Commissioner so that the views set forth in that opinion, as well as the coherence and reasoning of the opinion, are directly attributable to him.

Now, there, gentlemen, I have set forth the reasons that impelled me to decide that the chances of accomplishment in this agency at this time are not sufficient to balance the sacrifices dislocations imposed on my family and to leave the Commission.

And I have attempted, on very short notice, to offer some suggestions concerning most of them.

FAILED TO LOOK BEHIND MORGAN CHARGES

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The so-called congressional investigation of the Howard Morgan affair turned out to be an exercise in obscurantism by several master practitioners, if not a calculated vindication of the present and past practices of the Federal Power Commission.

Beyond displaying the forceful individialism of Morgan and FPC Chairman Joseph C. Swidler, the committee failed completely in the primary responsibility of a congressional inquiry: Namely, to examine thoroughly the roots of conflicting testimony so that they and we outsiders might have a factual basis for judging right from wrong, in terms of advocates and divergent policy views.

Morgan gave the committee a provocative list of 12 suggested reforms, some of which involve millions of dollars for either the gas and electric utilities or their consumers. The substance of these issues merits analytical attention from Congress. But the House Commerce Committee devoted only passing notice to this list and made no attempt to determine whether the proposals were incisive suggestions or half-baked ideas.

Swidler was quick to try to relegate them to the latter category, just as he was insistent on laying the lash to Morgan personally in an effort to discredit him and his suggestions. This is not to say whether Swidler or Morgan was right, but to declare that the committee made no genuine effort to establish what is really going on at the FPC or its impact on either the utilities or the ratepaying public, much less to evaluate the agency's fulfillment of its regulatory responsibilities.

The most useful congressional inquiries are those in which the professional staff thoroughly probes the subject in advance and then questions witnesses in an orderly fashion to separate fact from opinion, to resolve conflicts of testimony. This, incidentally, was one of the strong virtues of investigations in which Robert F. Kennedy, as a congressional staff counsel, participated.

Last week's hearings on the FPC didn't approach this standard. All questioning came from Congressmen, most of whom obviously knew little or nothing of the inner machinery of the FPC. Instead of probing substantive issues, they belabored the obvious—that Morgan's departure, announced with a literary flourish in a letter last month to President Kennedy, is out of the ordinary.

Rather than behaving like board of investigation, they were more like medieval alchemists who were unshakably convinced that Morgan's letter to Kennedy contained some magic formula which would make us all richer, wiser and ageless if only they could solve the riddle of its intriguing phraseology.

One by one they cross-examined its author, now coaxingly ("Don't you think, Mr. Morgan, your colleagues were dishonest?"), now furiously ("I think it's a lot of hot air."). They got little more than an uncharacteristic Mona Lisa smile from Morgan about whom he was taking aim at when he warned in that letter of the dangers of "conformity, timidity and personal security."

With the exception of Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat, of California, the committee, in short, appeared to be as soft on the utility industry as Morgan contends the FPC has been.

If Morgan was treated like an ill-mannered mutineer, the committee seemed content to let him off with 50 lashes instead of hanging him from the yardarm. And if they saw in Swidler a Captain Queeg, they failed to mention it as the skipper was sent back to the bridge with a commendation and no orders to change course.

With Morgan staying aboard for another 4 months, it's safe to forecast more dueling at the helm, and if those insistent members of the Harris committee really want to know who fits that phrase about timidity, they might examine the faces they see in their shaving mirrors.

Union Friends Dominate Federal Labor Panels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Nation's Business, February 1963:

UNION FRIENDS DOMINATE FEDERAL LABOR PANELS—MORE GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION THROUGH THESE MEN WILL AFFECT BUSINESS

Businessmen face increasing intervention in labor-management decisions by supposedly neutral outsiders who actually sympathize generally with union objectives.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz claims the world situation has made collective bargaining as we have known it obsolete, and businessmen can expect a "converging of public and private decisionmaking in the whole area of labor relations."

This, of course, means more Government intervention and more use of outside experts who are supposed to represent the public interest and serve as neutral mediators, arbitrators and members of Government boards, panels, commissions and the like.

Most experts picked by the Government to intervene have been associated together in wartime handling of labor disputes. They include Secretary Wirtz and William E. Simkin, director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, who now make or influence most of the selections.

Secretary Wirtz and Director Simkin both gained experience in the labor-management field as members of the National War Labor Board, headed by George W. Taylor.

The Labor Secretary headed the successor National Wage Stabilization Board, which phased out wartime wage controls during the reconversion period. He and Dr. Taylor, on whom Government officials lean heavily to arbitrate major labor-management disputes or to help formulate labor policies, helped set up the second Wage Stabilization Board which handled both wage controls and made recommendations for settling disputes during the Korean emergency of 1950-53.

Mr. Simkin also was associated with Dr. Taylor on the War Labor Board and as an umpire in the hosiery and men's clothing industries.

The attitudes of most of the outside mediators on labor-management issues are fairly well known or can be surmised from their experience, associations, previous decisions or public statements.

They tend to confirm the suspicion among some management executives who deal with these problems that professional arbitrators too often favor unions because of personal bias or because they feel they have to give them something out of fear that, if they

don't, they will be blacklisted by union officials and be barred from future service as Government mediators or private arbitrators.

It is an open secret among arbitrators that opposition by one union may cause all unions to reject their services and impose an effective blacklisting, whereas opposition by one employer usually is not enough to make much difference.

One may anticipate that any public intervener who served on the War Labor Board or the Korean WSB will favor compulsory union membership, currently a highly controversial issue in the aerospace industry.

The WSB recommended compulsory union membership—an all-union shop—in the steel industry in 1952. The decision, resisted by the industry, led to Government seizure by President Truman and an 8-week strike after the Supreme Court dissolved the seizure as unconstitutional.

The Wage Stabilization Board Chairman at the time was Nathan P. Feinsinger, whom President Kennedy made head of a special commission to help resolve the dispute between airline pilots and flight engineers over which union would fill the third seat in jet cockpits when crews were reduced from four to three.

Mr. Feinsinger asserted in defense of Wage Stabilization Board's union shop recommendation in the steel industry that the union shop was legal and that the board had to grant it to prevent a strike.

The Wage Stabilization Board vice chairman was Frederick H. Bullen, who is on a panel the President appointed to help settle the current dispute over compulsory unionism between Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and the International Association of Machinists while the 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction is in effect. It expires February 21. Arthur M. Ross, chairman of the Lockheed panel, was associated with both Mr. Feinsinger and Mr. Bullen on Wage Stabilization Board as well as War Labor Board.

The original panel appointed by President Kennedy to intervene in the dispute involving Lockheed and other southern California aerospace firms (before he invoked the Taft-Hartley Act), consisted of Dr. Taylor and two former associates on War Labor Board and Wage Stabilization Board, Ralph T. Seward and Charles C. Killingsworth.

This panel recommended that all workers be required to join the union if the employes represented by the union favor it by a two-thirds vote. General Dynamics, North American Aviation and Ryan Aeronautical employees rejected compulsory membership. Lockheed refused on principle to agree to the polling of its employees, despite the likelihood that they, too, would reject forced unionism.

The War Labor Board, as a matter of course in settling the union security issue, invariably ordered a form of compulsory unionism called maintenance of union membership. This did not require that workers join a union, but once they did, they had to remain members or lose their job.

This form of security may seem innocuous because the worker presumably joins the union voluntarily, although he usually is subjected to pressures from union officials and fellow workers. But a President's panel in the dispute between Boeing and the Machinists Union just last month described this form of union security as embodying "an important element of compulsion" which "limits employe freedom of choice."

The panel recognized the compulsive elements even while criticizing Boeing management for not granting the union's wish for even stronger compulsion—forcing all workers to join. Two of the three panel members, Chairman Saul Wallen and Lewis M. Gill, served on the War Labor Board.

On this issue of compulsion, the attitudes of Dr. Taylor and two other mediators frequently used by the Government, David L. Cole and John T. Dunlop, are clearly on the record.

Besides being associated together on the War Labor Board, the three sat on a nine-man independent study group whose report on "The Public Interest in National Labor Policy" was published a year ago by the Committee for Economic Development.

The report urged repeal of a section of the Taft-Hartley law which permits States to forbid compulsory union membership, as 19 States have done, through what are called right-to-work laws. Repeal is a top legislative objective of the AFL–CIO and other labor organizations.

The report also suggested that workers who object to being forced into a union "develop a 'consent to lose' and a willingness to live with the majority choice at least temporarily."

Dr. Taylor and Mr. Feinsinger were among a group of former War Labor Board members and professors of administrative law who in 1947 urged President Truman to veto the Taft-Hartley bill, which he did. Congress, however, overrode the veto.

Dr. Taylor and Mr. Cole are public members of the tripartite President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy which recommended that Congress take away authority the President has under the Taft-Hartley law to obtain an 80-day court injunction to end strikes which threaten a national emergency.

The President would be granted authority, under these recommendations, to step into major disputes before they reach a critical stage, which would mean more frequent intervention. He also would have the power to name a panel to investigate a dispute and make recommendations for settlement during an 80-day cooling-off period, a device President Kennedy utilizes now, when he can get consent from both sides.

Some criticism surrounded the choice of Dr. Taylor to sit on the presidential panel in the aerospace industry because of his views on compulsory unionism, which was the main issue.

He told Nation's Business that his function as an intervenor in labor disputes is to develop an acceptable procedure for arriving at a settlement as a substitute for the strike and that was what his panel did in the aerospace controversy. The recommendation was that the companies grant the all-union shop if approved by a two-thirds vote of affected employees.

Arbitrators should have views "and let them be known so that those using their services don't buy a pig in a poke," he said.

Jonathan C. Gibson, vice president and general counsel of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, contends that on some issues, such as compulsory unionism, "The appointing power can determine the result by his selection of the personnel of a mediation panel."

Mr. Gibson also criticizes most arbitrators as tending to split their awards down the middle to please both sides to a certain extent in order to get appointed to other cases in the future.

Mr. Cole and Mr. Dunlop both deny that is true and cite instances in which they either completely rejected union demands or did not "split the difference."

Mr. Cole is best identified on the compulsory unionism issue as chairman of the Presidential Emergency Board which recommended the all-union shop on the railroads in 1952—a recommendation Mr. Gibson described as "completely one sided." Although Mr. Cole has intervened for the Government in some of the biggest disputes in airline, coal, railroad, steel and other industries, he personally believes that intervention is destructive and the Government should avoid it if possible.

Once the Government decides it must intervene in the public interest, in Mr. Cole's opinion, it is necessary that the intervenor be empowered to make recommendations for settlement.

Mr. Cole says that there is never an even balance of power in a labor dispute.

"Always one side is stronger," he says, "and we try to stop the stronger from exploiting his strength beyond what is right and what will work.

"We try to search out from our experience and the studies of others what kind of solution is fair and reasonable to each of the parties. If either side exacts too hard a bargain, he is borrowing trouble for the future."

Dr. Dunlop has had a wide range of experience, but his specialty has been construction industry labor problems. For years he was the first chairman of the industry's joint board for settling jurisdictional disputes. Currently, as a member of the Federal Missile Sites Labor Commission, he usually handles disputes related to construction.

Dr. Dunlop warns that intervention in the wage and price areas should be watched with care. He agrees that intervention is fraught with all sorts of dangers.

"But there are also dangers," he says, "if the parties don't solve their problems in a way that is economical and meets the quantitative standards (suggested by the Government as being in the public interest)."

What should the businessman expect from a public intervenor?

"The businessman should expect certain attitudes and comportment usually associated with neutrality," Dr. Dunlop says. These include a willingness to explore, understand and be sympathetic of each side's position, otherwise he will not have the parties' confidence. This doesn't mean the neutral shouldn't have preconceived views.

"Both sides should also expect from the neutral a certain amount of initiative and imagination in making suggestions which they are equally free to reject. They may use the suggestions to trigger new ideas of their own."

Dr. Dunlop and Mr. Cole were members of a public panel appointed by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell in 1954 to make recommendations for improving the labor situation in the Government's atomic energy plants.

They recommended gradual elimination of the Atomic Energy Labor-Management Relations Panel which the Truman administration had set up to handle atomic disputes.

The availability of the special panel encourages disputants to lean on it instead of settling their problems themselves, the public panel said. Nothing came of the recommendations.

Some criticism has been directed at Mr. Cole and David H. Stowe, an arbitrator who is also on the Missile Sites Commission, because they are paid by the AFL–CIO as arbitrators of jurisdictional disputes within the AFL–CIO and within the industrial union department.

"We are rendering a professional service for a fee, just like a lawyer or a doctor," claims Mr. Stowe. "Only one company brought this up in the hundreds of cases I have arbitrated."

Mr. Stowe is one of the few who did not serve on the War Labor Board. But he worked closely with WLB staff members during the war handling Presidential seizure of struck plants as a member of the Budget Bureau staff. Later he was a labor aid to President Truman.

Many companies try to resist third-party intervention. One of the most successful in this respect is General Electric Co., which may face Government pressures when it bargains over new labor contract terms in the fall.

The expectancy of intervention removes any incentive for either party to state its real position or put everything on the table, knowing that it will have to give a little, Philip D. Moore, manager of employee relations services, says in explaining the company's position to its management employees.

"We do not subscribe to this kind of bargaining. We believe in putting everything that we honestly feel is warranted in our initial proposal and then changing it as negotiations reveal what is in order.

"From a practical standpoint, it is clear that disinterested third parties have no responsibility for the business and are therefore not accountable for business results as they may be affected by the outcome of negotiations.

"The company's risk in the financial area is very great and management cannot delegate the responsibility for decisionmaking to a third party, who does not bear the responsibility for the operation of the business or for the welfare of employees.

"The union has nothing to lose, and usually much to gain in submitting disputes to third parties. About the only risk they do run is not being granted all of their demands, and this risk can be minimized by starting out with such a fantastically all-inclusive set of demands that even if they are granted half of them they are still ahead of what they reasonably deserve."

General Electric's hard bargaining policy is being challenged before the National Labor Relations Board by the International Union of Electrical Workers as a violation of the Taft-Hartley law.

Except in railroad and airline disputes, the President has no authority to solicit recommendations from panels he appoints in labor disputes if either side objects.

Proposals that he be granted this authority under the Taft-Hartley Act are usually criticized on the grounds that it would be ineffective, destroy collective bargaining, and lead to compulsory arbitration.

After 35 years of Presidential panel recommendations under the Railway Labor Act, the railroads are reluctantly embracing compulsory arbitration—making the recommendations binding—as a way out of the situation which has developed in their industry.

Panel recommendations, which once were readily accepted, are now more often rejected by unions and used as a floor from which to bargain for more.

The Government panel which made construction recommendations for minimizing wasteful work rules which the railroads claim cost $592 million a year was headed by former Federal Judge Simon F. Rifkind of New York, rather than a professional arbitrator.

The operating brotherhoods involved have rejected the recommendations and threaten a national railroad strike this spring.

COLD WAR LABOR BOARDS

Government labor panels to which President Kennedy is appointing an increasing number of wartime mediators to help settle cold war labor disputes have been dubbed cold war labor boards.

Former National War Labor Board and Wage Stabilization Board personnel serving as public representatives on permanent Government labor panels include:

President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy: Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, Chairman; George W. Taylor, Clark Kerr, David L. Cole.

Missile Sites Labor Commission: Secretary Wirtz, Chairman; Director William E. Simkin, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Vice Chairman; Mr. Cole, John T. Dunlop.

Atomic Energy Labor-Management Relations Panel: Cyrus S. Ching, Chairman; Rev. Leo C. Brown, S. J., Robben W. Fleming.

Named to special panels in disputes involving the following companies or issues have been:

Dock strike: Senator Wayne Morse, Theodore W. Kheel, James J. Healy.

Lockheed Aircraft Corp.: Dr. Taylor, Ralph T. Seward, Charles C. Killingsworth, Arthur M. Ross, Frederick H. Bullen.

Boeing Co.: Saul Wallen, Lewis M. Gill.

Commission on Jet Crews Dispute: Nathan P. Feinsinger, Richard A. Lester.

1961 maritime dispute: Mr. Cole, Mr. Healy.

Development and Use of the Waterways in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address on "Development and Use of the Waterways in Germany" which was delivered at the 49th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress last year by Mr. Gerhard M. Krause, shipping attaché of the Germany Embassy.

The address follows:

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF THE WATERWAYS IN GERMANY

My remarks can only be brief. This, of course, does not mean that the waterways of Germany are not playing a very great role in the overall picture of its economy. It has been always like that. It goes for our country as it is true for almost every other area in this world. Human culture has been developing along rivers and streams. The first transports of greater shipments have been effected on these waterways. Just recently somebody has stated that of the 23 great cities of Western Germany with a population of at least 200,000 inhabitants each, including Berlin, 19 are situated at the banks of our streams and 4 at their tributaries.

The natural waterways have been complemented by canals since the 17th century. Among the first princes to realize the importance of those connections for the welfare of their states was the Grand Elector of Brandenburg who had received his education in Holland. He had been deeply impressed by the methods of constructing waterways he had been shown there. A great part of the network of inland waterways which has developed since that period is now outside the area of the Federal Republic of Germany. Particularly in view of the limited time, I am going to confine myself on the waterways of Western Germany.

Speaking about waterways we distinguish between sea waterways and inland waterways. Sea waterways are inlets, estuaries, and the lower stretches of our rivers and streams which connect the open sea with the seaports. Also the well-known Kiel-Canal which cuts through Jütland thus shortening the way from the North Sea to the Baltic, is a sea waterway. Inland waterways are the stretches of the streams upriver from the seaports, the parts of international rivers running through our territory and a number of canals. The extension of the West German inland waterways is about 2.2 miles. Eighty percent of these are natural streams and rivers and 20 percent are canals.

Contrary to the situation in the United States many of our waterways are, as indicated, not running only through our country. The Danube River leaves Germany at Passau to flow through a number of states before it falls into the Black Sea. The Rhine River comes from Switzerland. For a certain part it is waterway as well as borderline between Germany and France. Its lower end flows also through foreign countries. A special problem is the Elbe River. You know about the particular situation created by the present division of Germany. Only with a limited part of its length the stream belongs now to our waterways system. The same is true for the greatest of our man-built waterways, the Middle Land Canal, once constructed to connect the grain-producing eastern areas of Germany with its densely populated and highly industrialized west.

Of course, since the first cargoes were carried by barges on rivers and canals the overall structure of transportation has changed everywhere. And with this change everything existing from the past has become controversial. This is inevitable all the more as there is no waterway system which would not require maintenance, modernization, adaptation and expansion. All this, of course, costs money. The expenses have to be borne by the community which means they form part of a public budget. In Germany like in the United States construction and maintenance of waterways is a Federal responsibility. The Government, however, has many other responsibilities, many of those in competing fields of transportation. Nowadays everything in transportation is a problem, whether it may be railways, road, shipping or aviation. Hence, in our country, like in others, we find ourselves in the middle of constant vivid discussions on the necessity and the merits of inland waterway transportation. You can imagine that in Germany, too, there are people who say that construction and maintenance of waterways is too expensive a proposition and that the money planned for that purpose should better be spent elsewhere. Discussions like that are always useful. They offer an opportunity to reexamine thoroughly the question, What is the real use of the matter of controversy? And I am under the strong impression that the discussion on the usefulness of the waterways in my country has brought out without any doubt that this means of transportation has still a great future and an important function for the development of our economy.

Of course, in the first place waterways are lines of transportation. It begins in our seaports. The percentage varies from place to place, however, the barge is still and will always be the cheapest facility for the transfer of commodities to and from the seagoing vessels. For every visitor of a harbor it is a very impressive picture when he sees all the barges flocking around an ocean ship arriving with grain or other bulk cargo. Every port has its problems with the piers. The barges permit an operation independent of the availability of berths. Immediately after the loading off they are to the inland. It has been mentioned many times that, for example, our port of Emden has taken its development to the present importance only since the Dortmund-Ems Canal connecting Emden with the Ruhr area was completed in 1900.

However, much greater is the function of the waterways for transportation between inland points. Along our waterways we have 245 inland ports which handled 252 million tons of cargo in 1960, about three times as much as the 78 million tons transferred through our 15 seaports during the same period. Traditionally, plants of the heavy industry have been established mainly at the banks of inland waterways. Seventy-four percent of the pit coal produced in Germany comes from so-called wet mines, that is mines located at waterways. Of the steel produced in West Germany 75 percent originated from plants with locations at rivers

or canals. Moreover, recent studies have shown that along certain waterways which have been channelled during the last decades only, not only many new places for transfer of cargo have been developed but also industries have settled down offering employment to the population, and power plants have been constructed. With respect to the new facilities for transfer of cargo it is worth mentioning that in many instances those places had, before, no connection by railway or highway.

Combinations between waterways as a means of transportation and, as we say, the "floating wave" as a factor in production of power are as popular in Germany as they are in the United States. They form an important part, also, in the planning of future projects.

Time does not permit to refer more than superficially to the fascinating developments in the modernization of tonnage used on the waterways. Some gentlemen present may remember the studies made by German and French inland waterway experts on push tow operations in the United States and they will have read with satisfaction about those operations now becoming more and more frequent on the Rhine River.

Apart from the usefulness of waterways, as we have seen, not only for transportation but also for other purposes of the national economy, studies referred to also have proved that the difficulties of other branches of transportation, particularly in the railways and in the road situation, have neither been created nor have been seriously influenced by the existence and utilization of the waterways system. The percentage held by their traffic in the overall volume of national transportation has not changed considerably since the thirties. It is still about 30 percent of the total volume.

Let me, before closing, draw your attention to the fact that the inland waterways of Germany as well as those of the other European countries play a significant role in the integration of our continuent. Fifty-six and five-tenths percent of our waterways are subject to international treaties, they have been since long. Hence cooperation in the field of technological as well as economical development of waterways has been something the people in charge of waterways in Germany have been accustomed to for many years. The basis for close coordination of measures and plans between the participating governments is laid and will make the European waterways system one of the most useful instruments of the integration of Europe.

What About Profit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "What About Profit?" from the Jeffersonian Democrat:

WHAT ABOUT PROFIT?

To some people, apparently, the word "profit" is an evil word. Why, the dogma goes, should one man or one group make money out of labor of others?

The answer is simple enough. And a statement by one of this country's oil companies tells the substance of it. This company, like innumerable others in all fields of enterprise, has met a constantly growing public demand for its products, and has had to invest millions upon millions to produce and market them.

So the question is, Where does all this money come from?

Again, the answer is simple. A substantial part of it comes from profits which are plowed back into the business. Other parts come from borrowing which, in each case, came from funds resulting from profits made somewhere, in some way, by someone.

This company makes another and little recognized point concerning the public revenue the Nation gains from profits through taxation. Each year, it says, the taxes on profits of U.S. corporations provide the Federal Government with enough revenue to pay the entire cost of operating the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and State; plus the Atomic Energy Commission, the CAB, the FHA, the Veterans' Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Finally, it is pointed out, practically every product you use owes its existence to profits, as do the 68.5 million jobs which men and women fill.

It is to everyone's interest to encourage, not discourage, reasonable profits.

A Concept of Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "A Concept of Aid," which was printed in the February issue of the Industrial Bulletin of the New York State Department of Labor.

The article explains the pioneering efforts of the harness racing industry to establish a meaningful health and welfare program for employees—grooms—of that industry.

This fund is an excellent example of what can be privately accomplished in the field of health and welfare by the interested parties.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONCEPT OF AID—HARNESS TRACK WORKERS PROTECTED BY WELFARE PLAN

One day last year, a harness horse groom employed by an American was injured in Vienna, Austria, and was hospitalized. The American was in Vienna for an international race and the groom, also an American, was with him to care for his trotter. Because most grooms are low paid workers, the hospital wanted assurances that it would be compensated for his care. Fortunately, his employer was a member of the Standardbred Owners Association and raced his horses regularly in New York State.

Despite the fact that the groom had become ill in Austria, his hospital bill was paid by the Roosevelt and Yonkers Raceways Standardbred Owners Association Welfare Fund. The fund is financed by the two tracks and costs the horseowners and trainers nothing; the grooms and other stable workers who receive its benefits also pay nothing. It covers the grooms and caretakers whenever they become ill or need medical and hospital care for themselves or their families in the United States, Canada, Europe or anywhere else in the world.

The fund is an unusual project because the grooms work for drivers and trainers and are not the employes of the racetracks. Nonetheless, the two tracks take care of their life insurance, medical, hospital and burial expenses. It is a voluntary program that is a tribute to the humanity and pioneering foresight of George Morton Levy, founder of Roosevelt Raceway and chairman of its broad of directors.

The welfare fund was established in 1958, mainly through Mr. Levy's efforts. Prior to that time, indigent, ill and disabled grooms and caretakers were dependent upon the charity of friends and racetrack associates when they needed help. Although Roosevelt Raceway had no contractual obligation to care for these unfortunate workers, Mr. Levy had made it the track's policy to help them meet their medical bills when they became ill, and to pay funeral expenses and save them from a pauper's grave when they died.

The fund was established as a result of the negotiations whereby the Standardbred Owners Association reached an agreement with the two New York raceways setting the size of purses to be paid to the owners for a 10-year period effective April 1, 1958.

It was a fortunate decision. The welfare fund has helped save the lives of many grooms, and removed the spectre of sickness without resources from their daily lives. It covers the workers and their families, in racing season and out. It provides insurance coverage to more than 550 eligible stable help and their dependents.

Protected by the fund are grooms and caretakers employed by members of the Standardbred Owners Association, which is composed of more than 1,200 owners, trainers, and drivers of trotting and pacing horses. It is managed by a board of trustees representing the association and the two race tracks. The board is assisted by legal counsel and consultants. Its books and records are regularly audited by independent certified public accountants.

The fund has increased its benefits from time to time and is now about to take another step forward. Plans are underway for the establishment of a group blood bank that could be drawn upon any place in the United States and Canada, whenever the grooms and their families need blood or blood derivatives. This project has elicited the enthusiastic support of Robert A. Glasser, chairman of the New York State Harness Racing Commission. Mr. Glasser has volunteered to make the first blood donation to the bank. It is the hope of the fund's trustees to have the bank in operation during the 1963 racing seasons.

So successful has the fund proved in meeting the medical and hospital needs of the low-salaried stableworkers, that it has led to its adoption by racetracks in other States. Last year, a similar plan, but on a smaller scale, was established by the Bay State and Suffolk Downs harness racing tracks in Massachusetts, and Rockingham Park harness track in New Hampshire. The United States Trotting Association is studying the project for possible extension to tracks in other parts of the country.

The Roosevelt trustees of the fund are Mr. Levy and S. Harvey Fosner. For Yonkers the trustees are Stanley Tananbaum and Thomas E. Lynch. The horseowners trustees are James Scileppi, Francis P. Smith, Adolf Karl, and Benjamin Kaiden. Carl Benevento is the fund manager, Mr. Fosner the fund counsel, and Martin E. Segal & Co. are its consultants.

To realize how the welfare fund has changed the lives of the stable help, it is

necessary to go back before 1940. That was the year that the New York State Legislature legalized parimutuel wagering at race tracks, and franchises were granted to conduct harness racing at nighttime. Roosevelt Raceway began to run races that year at its track in Westbury, Long Island. Before that harness racing in the State was mainly a country sport, conducted at farm fairs.

Because of its country fair, nonbetting character, harness racing before 1940 gave little economic protection to the grooms. Their employment was as transients, layoffs were frequent, and the driver-trainers, hardly prosperous themselves, could give little if any attention to the health and welfare of their workers. It was this situation that Roosevelt, under Mr. Levy's leadership, tried to alleviate voluntarily.

As harness racing grew and more tracks were established in New York State, it became obvious that an effective long-range program would have to be established for health and welfare coverage of the stable employees who participated in the racing operations. This was particularly needed at Roosevelt and Yonkers, the two largest harness tracks in the Nation.

Since private, independent efforts to care for the health needs of the grooms had proven inadequate, it became obvious by 1958 that such a goal could only be achieved if Roosevelt and Yonkers initiated new social welfare concepts under their purse agreements with the Standardbred Owners Association. Thus came into being the pioneer welfare fund in American harness racing.

The first year the fund was self-insured. Because of the farflung travels of the horsemen and their stable help, it was difficult to get insurance companies to handle the fund. The next year, after extensive negotiations, the fund was successful in getting insurance coverage, and its claims have since been processed all over the world. Originally, the fund only took care of the stable workers themselves. Two years ago it was extended to include the workers' dependents, and the fund has served literally as godfather to many newborn babies in the past 2 years.

The fund receives two types of contributions from Roosevelt and Yonkers. The primary contribution pays for the actual costs of the death, hospital, and surgical benefits for the workers. The other type, predicated upon a percentage of the commission derived from parimutuel betting at the respective tracks each week, is used for supplementary benefits.

Since April 1, 1959, the fund has been insured under the laws of the State of New York, with hospital benefits covered through the Associated Hospital Service of New York, medical and surgical care through the Group Health Insurance, Inc., and with life insurance provided by the Aetna Life Insurance Co.

Grooms can become eligible for minimum insurance after working for 15 days at either Roosevelt or Yonkers. This gives them the coverage of a $1,000 life insurance policy on a month-to-month basis. To get full coverage, the workers must have 125 days of employment at the combined race meetings held at the two tracks during the calendar year. Full coverage includes a $2,500 life insurance policy, Blue Cross hospitalization benefits, and the group health insurance benefits that include surgical services, in-hospital medical care, anesthesia, laboratory tests, and X-rays.

A supplementary program has been established informally on a self-insured basis that tries to give emergency hospital, surgical, and medical assistance to drivers and trainers who have no other private insurance programs. This is designed to help active horsemen who would otherwise be unable to obtain such assistance other than through governmental or private intervention and relief.

A beneficiary of this supplemental program was a driver-trainer who suffered a severe heart attack during a recent racing season. He was rushed to a Long Island hospital where he was placed in an oxygen tent for 10 days. The supplementary fund helped pay for his expenses, and the stricken man recovered and was able to resume his driving career again.

Every effort is made to keep the administrative costs of the welfare fund at a minimum. No trustee, board officer, raceway or standardbred association's representative receives any compensation directly or indirectly from the fund. The only administrative salaries are those of the fund manager, his clerical assistant, counsel, consultant, and the outside accountant.

Since the fund was launched, the two tracks have contributed about $750,000 toward its maintenance. Prudent investment of this money has enabled administrative expenses to be paid without sacrifice to the health and welfare needs of the grooms.

One person grateful for the fund was the ailing wife of a groom who had been unable to join her husband in Orlando, Fla., where he was at work. The groom died suddenly. The fund paid his funeral expenses and arranged for the shipment of his body to his northern home where he was buried.

Another worker who is thankful to the fund is a groom who was found to have a serious illness that needed surgery. He was in California when the condition required emergency treatment. Several operations were performed by skilled surgeons at a cost to the fund of about $5,000. When the 1963 racing season resumes this spring in New York, he will be back at his job caring for trotters and pacers as of yore.

Just a Reminder, Reverend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Worth-Palos Reporter is one of the truly independent weekly publications serving a growing community in south suburban Cook County, Ill. It is noted for its precise and effective editorial commentary.

Its edition of March 21 contains a concise editorial relating to a recent item in the Reader's Digest. Under previous consent, I wish to place this editorial into the RECORD at this point:

JUST A REMINDER, REVEREND

The Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich put a cart before a horse recently in a Detroit News item quoted in March Reader's Digest. Wrote the reverend:

"A nation that is conceived in liberty has a government that deliberately gives to the people freedom of speech, press, assembly, etc."

Right there, Whoa.

The cart is the Government, the horse is the people. The cart can't get anywhere without that horse out front.

So let's straighten out the wording a little. Let's change it to:

A nation that is "conceived in liberty" creates its government with the consent of the governed. Any rights not specifically granted to the government by the people are retained by those people.

The government cannot give any rights or freedoms to a free people, for it has none to give. Whatever governing powers it has came from the people in the first place, and can be changed, curtailed, or even abrogated by those people under due process of law.

Lincoln reminded us once that men had died "to insure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

No freeman ever fought and died for a government over the people.

Fed-Up Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the other day, an unidentified citizen, concerned with the security of the United States and the privileges accorded citizens under our Constitution, including the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, sat down and wrote the following letter to a California newspaper. This letter was subsequently reprinted in the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News. This fed-up citizen characterized himself as an ordinary man—not brave—not even big—just average; but a man who is, with the present-day image of America however, almost sickened unto death on the world scene as compared to the image that was projected in his great-grandmother's time. I only wish that every American would read this letter, and by so doing, become infected with this same sickness, and that its virus would spread across this broad land as no plague of ancient or modern history ever did; so that as a Nation we become "sick Americans who intend to get well."

The following letter is recommended as means of assisting in our Nation's convalescence:

ONE CITIZEN WHO IS SICK OF U.S. TREND

FELLOW AMERICAN: I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world. For some time now, this has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one. I suppose I would have to admit that I am, among my own neighbors and in my own culture, the typical, average, well-educated, genteel suburbanite, to whom family, the mortgage, and security have been the all-important items.

I am now 50, and soon my wife and I will see the first of our three children married. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account at the Bank of America. I am a law-abiding man of the quiet side, and dissension makes me terribly nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone, ever.

FOUND OLD FAMILY BIBLE

My wife had me cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I hadn't thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon and oxen when she and great-grandpa were youngsters coming out to settle in California in the great migration.

Great-grandma wrote about it as the wild, new land, rich and abundant in mythical

proportions. On the trail she wrote of sickness and hunger, and heat and cold, and dust and thirst, and the deaths and births like beads strung together on a thread of hope—hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn.

And when she viewed the new land, she wrote in simple word pictures of the cities and farms and schools, and happiness that would someday bloom in the greatness of the vast new land. She wrote of her tomorrow and my today.

The ink was badly faded, but the message was clear. As I read, I began to think about America and being an American and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to America, to those rich lands and farms, to the cities and the people, to its freedom and its hope * * * and suddenly, I realized I am a sick American. I mean really sick.

I am sick of panacea and of backing up. I am sick of reaction where there should be initiative. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants.

I am sick of government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its offices. And I'm sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-fingered diplomats and lily-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

SICK OF "COMMUNISTIC GODLESSNESS"

I am sick of 40 years of relentless, creeping, cancerous, communistic godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering the flag and seeing it trampled in the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances.

I am sick of educators who teach tolerance and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do. In all honesty, the thing of which I am most sick is the man who let these things come to me: myself * * *. And by the living God who made me, sir, I am a sick American who intends to get well.

FED-UP CITIZEN.

Foreign Aid Sense at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 28, the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle-Tribune commented on the Clay Committee report on foreign aid. The Tribune points out that much of our funds have not been used effectively and urges our Western Allies to bear a greater share of the foreign assistance burden.

The editorial follows:

FOREIGN AID SENSE AT LAST

A Commission set up by the Kennedy administration has said emphatically what thousands of Americans have been saying for years—that millions of the taxpayers' dollars are being wasted in foreign aid.

Foreign aid, used with wisdom, has an important role in the American scheme of things. But profligate distribution of foreign aid can do more harm than good.

Foreign aid as administered by American Governments has too long been distributed on the theory that the success of the Marshall plan could be duplicated anywhere in the world.

The Marshall plan was the first great American investment in foreign aid. It brought about the rebuilding of Western Europe from the ruins of war to a degree of prosperity that surpassed anything the Continent had recorded in its brightest eras. The success convinced too many Americans that all they had to do to build economic prosperity anywhere was pour in American dollars.

They overlooked the vital fact that no other part of the world anywhere near equaled Western Europe in ability to spend the dollars wisely. Most of the countries that were—and are—beneficiaries of foreign aid were feudal structures or barely emerging from primitive tribal economies. They needed hundreds of dollars for plows rather than millions of dollars for hydroelectric power dams.

A vital purpose of the Marshall plan was to strengthen Western Europe to resist communism. The same purpose was conspicuous in foreign aid adventures almost everywhere. Poverty was recognized as soil fertile for communism. Dollars were poured into primitive economies to sterilize the soil against communism. Foreign aid was used as a supplement of military bases to contain communism. Neglected in this use was the fact that many of these primitive beneficiaries could not distinguish between communism and freedom and that American aid enriched local politicians for exploitation by communism.

Foreign aid is military as well as economic. It reaches a nadir of absurdity in military assistance to the prosperous and powerful countries of Western Europe.

The Kennedy Committee would cut back military aid, call on well-to-do allies to assume a larger share of foreign aid and distribute it through international organizations, reduce and eliminate aid to countries that have no direct relation to American security, deny aid to countries that nationalize business in competition with private enterprise, leave African aid largely to the countries that formerly possessed African colonies, and require self-help and internal reform as conditions for foreign aid.

Foreign aid appropriations can be cut a half billion dollars this year, the Committee concluded, by adhering to these wise standards. Principal flaw in the conclusion, as we see it, is the relatively small amount of the reduction this year.

It will not satisfy Congressmen who have long resisted huge foreign aid expenditures. Neither will it satisfy Congressmen who insist on reduction in expenditures to justify the tax reduction the President calls for. And it can't satisfy the numerous Americans who have long resented the lavish distribution of their tax dollars to remote, ungrateful recipients who do not appear to have been benefited in any way that justifies the cost.

Opportunities for Small Business in Export Trade Are Being Expanded and Significantly Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee last week held extensive hearings on the organization and operations of the Small Business Administration, including the opportunities for small business in foreign trade.

It is significant to point out that small business is continuing to increase in both number and dollar volume of participation in export trade and that although this increase is encouraging much more needs to be done, not only in the interest of promoting the sale and export of American manufactured products abroad, but also because of our balance-of-payments situation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, which discusses our committee hearings be reprinted in the RECORD.

My newsletter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HOLDS IMPORTANT HEARINGS

(Capitol Comments by JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

With the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee having completed hearings on budget requests except for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and with the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee not scheduled to begin hearings on the TVA and the Corps of Engineers budgets until after Easter, this week provided an excellent opportunity for the House Small Business Committee to hold hearings on the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration and to develop information on the opportunities for small business in foreign trade.

With the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 there were dire predictions that the lowering of tariffs made possible by this bill would adversely affect many small businesses and that many would fail because of foreign competition.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I felt that it was very important that we hold hearings on the effect of the European Economic Community on small business and gather information on what effect the implementation of the Trade Expansion Act might have on the small business sector of the economy. Our committee felt that it was also extremely important to document for small businesses the foreign trade opportunities that are open to them and the means by which small businesses might most effectively use these foreign trade avenues.

Among the several top Government officials which presented testimony to the committee were John Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Jack N. Behrman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business; Ben David Dorfman, Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission; Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of Export-Import Bank; Draper Daniels, National Export Expansion Coordinator; G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

Testimony showed that the various agencies and departments of our Government are vitally concerned with expanding our foreign trade and with increasing the opportunities of small business to participate in foreign trade. Mr. Daniels, who has the responsibility of coordinating all parts and phases of the export expansion program, pointed out that through governmental assistance and encouragement 1,197 new exporters were introduced to international trade last year. He also stated that 36,000 businessmen attended export seminars in 1962 and that he estimates at least 85 percent of these businessmen were small businessmen.

Testimony indicated that our various Government agencies are doing a creditable job in expanding foreign trade but more must be done. Expanding our foreign trade so as to provide a stimulus to our economy and to help in solving the balance of payment problem is one of the most important tasks facing us today. Small business should be encouraged and helped to participate in foreign trade to the fullest extent possible and I so pointed out to agency, bureau, and department heads which appeared before our committee.

Taxes and Political Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fiscal responsibility, self-discipline, balanced budget, debt reduction and other sensible economic principles for the proper conduct of Government may not be out of style. It may be too much to hope but it is possible that those elected and appointed officials who believe it is politically wise to be for every appropriation and against every tax may be displeasing to an awakening public.

True, some witnesses testifying on the tax bill before the Ways and Means Committee tried to have their cake and eat it by saying they were both for a tax cut and a balanced budget, by accepting a transitional deficit, but some knowledgeable and influential representatives flatly stated that tax cuts must be earned first by a balanced budget.

So it is that I would like to point out the editorial in the Wall Street Journal which bears on this point of tax cut and fiscal responsibility for politicians and constituents alike.

LEAVES FROM A POLITICIAN'S HANDBOOK

One of the most persistent cliches about democracy is that the thoughtless masses, being given their head, would run headlong to disaster by whooping it up for all spending by the Government while howling down the taxes.

This has been the stereotype fear of philosophers about America since the beginning, moving De Tocqueville to concern and Emerson to indignation. "Of all debts," said the man from Concord, "men are least willing to pay the taxes. What a satire on government."

For politicians this thought has been a cynical truism. The successful officeholder, so it is said, is the one who votes for all appropriations and against all revenue measures. And in the politician's handbook, nothing is supposed to be more sure-fire than a tax cut.

So it has been fascinating to watch the parade of witnesses before the House Ways and Means Committee on the pending tax-cut bill, which in the words of one of its proponents was going to have the voters with their tongues hanging out.

True, there have been few witnesses not in favor of reducing the burden of taxes on the people. Economists, labor leaders, businessmen, all have testified to the stultifying effects of the present taxes on their personal affairs and on the growth of the Nation itself. If the question were simply a yea or nay on tax reduction, the tax cuts would win hands down.

But the question is not so simple. For what is actually proposed is that taxes be cut while spending is increased, the result being a deficit in the Government's account of at least some $12 billion and very likely much more. And the truly amazing thing is that witness after witness, looking at the facts, is resisting the temptation the administration has put before him.

Most of the support for the presently proposed tax cuts, and this is the quaintest irony of all, has come from some professedly learned economists, who presumably should be the men standing against the tide of the masses clamoring for more spending and less taxes. The people whose self-interest should make them in favor of the proposal, according to the cynic's cliche, are the ones opposing this apparently lovely gift.

Their opposition, moreover, is based on something more than a Puritan ethic. As Roger Fleming, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, put it, "If the Federal Government expenditures are increased, a tax cut means more deficit financing, an increased national debt, the threat of inflation, and a loss of confidence in the soundness of the economy, which would discourage investment and prevent sound economic growth." Dr. Charles Walker, of the American Banks Association, was equally outspoken on the present proposal. "If the Congress cannot find effective ways to prevent the planned increase in spending * * * the entire tax proposal should be rejected."

Not all the people Congress has been hearing from have been so economically informed in their arguments. But every Congressman has noted with astonishment the number of letters instinctively opposing bigger spending and smaller taxes simultaneously. If there's a clamor for this fiscal proposal it has not been heard on Capitol Hill, which may explain why many Congressmen are losing their enthusiasm for it.

All this doesn't necessarily mean that the solemn plausibilities of its proponents may not carry the day; whatever the mind says, each man's heart hopes for lower taxes and hopes that he anyway can come out ahead. Certainly it doesn't mean we aren't going to get the bigger spending, the smaller taxes, and the bigger deficit all together. It will still take a brave politician to say "Nay."

Nonetheless, we find this public mood a rather heartwarming reply to philosophers gloomy about the commonsense of the common man. And maybe—well, just maybe—somebody is going to have to rewrite the politician's handbook.

Kennedy Talks One Way to Cuban Patriots, Acts Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has mastered the art of being on both sides of an issue. The current one is what to do about the Cuban refugees who are patriotic enough to risk life and limb for a free Cuba.

We all recall the dramatic visit the President made to Miami to welcome back the Cuban prisoners of war, whom the President himself had helped to become prisoners. He promised them that some day there would be a free Cuba. This promise is reminiscent of the many others made during the campaign of 1960, very few of which have been kept.

In today's New York Herald Tribune, Roscoe Drummond, who can hardly be called a rightwinger, brings into bold perspective what Mr. Kennedy is doing to the freedom lovers he loudly proclaimed, before a TV audience, he wanted to help:

REFUGEES VERSUS CASTRO: A PUZZLE TO AMERICANS: WORDS AND DEEDS ON CUBA

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably President Kennedy seeks the goal of a free Cuba. He told the released Cuban invasion prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident that their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugees' harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in their way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pinpricks. So were Castro's first hit-and-run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any prudent man could have told the latent and fermenting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and handmade grenades. But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil." It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba. The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that finding things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Mr. Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we should do more to help the Cuban resisters "both inside and outside Cuba." Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba. If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong then, at the very least, it should be suggesting to them and helping them to do it right.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, a young lady in my congressional district, Miss Susan Cardwell, of Barkley Drive, Middlesboro, Ky., has succeeded in winning the Voice of Democracy contest in my State of Kentucky that was sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Miss Cardwell submitted a splendid and eloquent essay under the title "What My Freedom Means to Me" and I now wish to insert her essay and make it part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that many people throughout our Nation may read this very fine, prize-winning essay written by one of our Kentucky high school girls. The essay is as follows:

WHAT MY FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Tonight, I am doing as I usually do about this time of day, I am doing as girls all over the world do at one time or another in their lives, I am doing as old men do sitting in front of a country store, as the young man does while receiving his high school diploma, or as he leaves for war, I am doing as children do, I am dreaming.

I am dreaming of my senior year and of my graduation. I am dreaming of becoming an airline hostess, a veterinarian, a lab technician, or a writer. I am dreaming of my college years, of my marriage, and of the children I will raise, happy, free children.

There is one element that makes my dreams special, the element lacking in the dreams of girls in other lands. And that element is behind each of my dreams lies the hope of opportunity. Only in America does this hope exist. Only in America could I dare to hope that my dreams would ever be fulfilled. America is the land of opportunity, the land of dreams come true.

Over 350 years ago, in another land, there existed another dream. This dream conceived in a land of oppression and monarchy, was the dream of a free nation. It was this dream that helped our forefathers as they crossed the ocean in the *Mayflower*, suffering hunger, storm, and disease. It was this dream that brought them through that first winter, when food was scarce, and Indian attacks were everyday things. This dream grew and prospered, until it now stands as a brilliant symbol of the greatest nation on earth.

Yes, my dreams are special, because I am an American. Only in America will my dreams have the opportunity to grow and develop into realities. Only in America could Edison's dreams of the electric light have existed. Only America would allow the dreams of Thomas Jefferson, Jonas Salk, or Robert Frost to develop into the important achievements that they are today. Our Nation was born of a dream. This dream was behind Washington at Valley Forge. Behind "our boys" at Okinawa, Iwo Jima, and Pork Chop Hill. This dream brought about the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Constitution of the United States. This dream inspired the speeches of Daniel Webster, Thomas Paine, Samuel Rayburn and all of the other great statesmen who dedicated their lives to the duty of making America and her people the free individuals that they are. This dream makes America's waters bluer, her pines taller, and her wind fresher and freer than that of any other nation on the face of the earth.

And yet, America is more than a dream, she is reality in its truest sense. She is a living, prospering, symbol of prosperity, justice, truth, and brotherly love. She is "One nation under God."

She is my Nation, the Nation in which I invest all my hopes, my dreams, and even my future.

And so, with this in mind, I return once again to my dreams. And perhaps I have gained a better understanding of my Nation, of her past, her present, her future, her hopes, her dreams, and of what my freedom means to me.

Ban the Bombers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Chicago Sun-Times editorially endorsed H.R. 4058, which I introduced on February 21, 1963. This legislation would make the bombing of any building or other real or personal property a Federal offense.

It is my earnest hope that the Judiciary Committee will give serious consideration to my proposal. I believe the editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times very convincingly spells out the reasons this legislation should be approved.

It is most encouraging to see a responsible newspaper like the Chicago Sun-Times take a positive stand on this much-needed legislation. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege to call the attention of my colleagues to this very fine editorial.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

BAN THE BOMBERS

Last week Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, asked the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee for reports and an early hearing on H.R. 4058, a bill sponsored by PUCINSKI.

PUCINSKI's bill would make the use of explosives to damage or destroy any building or other real or personal property a Federal offense. The bill creates the rebuttable presumption that the explosives used in the bombing were transported in interstate or foreign commerce with the knowledge or intent that the explosives were to be used for such purposes.

The Sun-Times questioned Representative PUCINSKI about applying the same logic of rebuttable presumption of interstate commerce in every other crime. PUCINSKI takes the stand that bombings are peculiar and special unto themselves in that this is a premeditated crime, not only against an individual, but against the entire community. Speaking from his years as a Chicago newspaperman before PUCINSKI went to the Congress he further noted that for the most part these bombings are done by hired mobsters who come into Chicago from out of State and who leave the State jurisdiction after the crime to avoid detection and arrest.

If the bombing of a place of business—or, as covered in PUCINSKI's proposed bill, "any building or other real or personal property used for educational, religious, charitable, residential, business or civic purposes"—were to be made a Federal offense, as kidnaping was, the bombers would think twice. It is one thing to terrorize and bomb a helpless restaurant owner. It is quite another to take on the full might of the Federal Government.

A businessman has the right, under the Federal Constitution, to conduct his business without the interference of syndicate hoodlums. PUCINSKI's bill (H.R. 4058) is a good one and should receive the support of every businessman in Chicago.

U.S. Aid Calls for Attack on Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of Salt Lake City, Utah, on Thursday May 10, 1962, in which the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gave warning of grave danger to the people of our beloved land from the fearful amount of poisoned and toxic substances which we are inserting into our waters today.

U.S. AID CALLS FOR ATTACK ON POLLUTION

The United States still hasn't solved water pollution problems which have arisen during the postwar period, said James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare during a visit to Salt Lake Thursday.

Mr. Quigley, who is here to dedicate a water pollution laboratory, said "We would be kidding ourselves if we thought we had solved the problem."

He referred to such homely pollutants as detergents, which were unknown before the war, and said these are real problems for water sanitation.

INSECTICIDES, TOO

"Insecticides and pesticides are also a problem," he said. These have increased in use among farmers since the war, and are being washed into the Nation's streams.

These poisons are "potentially a real problem and could develop into a serious situation soon in some areas," he said. "It depends on the water supply available."

He said the country had not developed adequate techniques to take care of these pollutants. "For those problems that existed before the war all we have to do is be more vigorous in our enforcement," he said.

DIFFICULTY OF VIRUSES

Another problem which has defied technology is treatment of water with viruses in it. To date there is no evidence that these are harmful, but sometime the country will have to find a means to filter them, he said.

Speaking at the dedication Thursday afternoon, Mr. Quigley said the "Federal Government has the resources, the scientific capabilities and the enforcement power to clean up all our Nation's streams and keep them clean.

"We plan to use these resources as we need them and particularly will we use them in the critical Colorado River Basin," he added.

He urged all those interested in water to work toward new national goals described by President Kennedy—that of having sufficient water, sufficiently clean, at the right place and at the right time.

"As the country develops its efficiency in use of water, the water is bound to increase in salinity," he said.

"We have a challenge facing us there," he said. "Two years ago our concern was with radiation. Today it is salinity," he added.

"One thing we know is that we won't get more water," he said, "but we will get more people. We've got to increase our efficiency. The matter of controlling pollution is becoming a real challenge."

Officials Press Orchard Mesa Sewage Cleanup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Grand Junction (Colo.) Sentinel of March 14, 1962, describing some of the problems of sewage disposal and the way the Colorado River has come to be referred to in the language of the Grand Junction Sentinel as "one of the country's longest sewer lines."

OFFICIALS PRESS ORCHARD MESA SEWAGE CLEANUP

(By Alice Wright)

Something must be done about Orchard Mesa sewage, and soon. That's the word from health officials.

The sewerline dumping raw sewage into the Colorado River at the Fifth Street Bridge has been branded as intolerable.

So has the seepage bubbling up from dozens of septic tanks: Some of the seep undoubtedly drains into the river.

Health authorities, both county and State, are preparing to apply the squeeze if necessary, to correct the situation.

Either the citizens get together and come up with a concrete plan, or, there's always the court order route.

Willing cooperation is preferable, because it is less costly and faster, according to Frank Brown, the State health department's sanitation engineer on the Western Slope.

"We feel the citizens themselves should decide how they want to handle the matter," according to Everett Marsden, acting director of the Mesa County Health Department.

Both men, incidentally, live on Orchard Mesa.

The situation there points up a problem prevalent along much of the Colorado River, which has been referred to as one of the country's longest sewerlines.

Two solutions are possible locally, Brown says. The residents could form a sanitation district to construct a collection system and build a treatment plant. Or it could use the city's two plants, which probably would mean annexation.

While the line dumps considerable raw sewage into the river, it serves only a very small portion of the area, Brown says. Chief contributors are a dairy, a trailer court, and several businesses along Highway 50 immediately south of the river.

The problem area actually extends out to around 29 Road, between the river and Highway 50. All of the residences and businesses in this area use septic tanks.

Those residents who have been having tank trouble will not be hard to convince of the necessity, Brown says. Others may be.

Septic tanks in general are usable for about 20 years, Brown says, although many of them will not last anything like that long. Their lifespan depends on the amount of water usage, the size of the tank, and soil conditions.

The Mesa County Health Department is conducting a survey of the area to see how many residences and business places are tied into the existing line, and how many have been having trouble.

The State health department has made some tests of effluents reaching the river and will make more, Brown says.

When the survey is complete, the next step will be to call a public meeting and lay the facts on the line.

Whatever plan the citizens adopt is bound to be expensive, Brown says. He believes annexation would be less expensive in the long run, because sewage collection lines could be tied into either or both of the city's treatment plants.

Lines could bridge the river, one to the plant which is immediately east of the Climax Uranium Mill, the other tied to the Fifth Street Bridge and dumping into the lift station there, for routing to the plant at First Street and North Avenue.

Prayers Asked for the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians alike throughout the Nation were saddened last week to hear that the presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, is suffering from Parkinson's disease, and will in all likelihood have to retire at the next convention of the Episcopal Church to be held in St. Louis next year.

The Episcopal diocese of Springfield covers a substantial part of my congressional district, and it is with deep pride that I noted that our newly consecrated bishop, the Right Reverend Albert A. Chambers, was the first Episcopal bishop in our country to ask for diocesanwide home and public prayers for the ailing Episcopal presiding bishop.

The leadership of Bishop Chambers is typical of the firm and constructive things he has done since he was consecrated October 1, 1962, as the bishop of Springfield by Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger.

I join the many members of Bishop Chambers' Church and his friends in commending the diocese of Springfield's leadership in this matter, and I hope that the example being set in Illinois will be followed in other parts of the country.

In a statement the Right Reverend Albert A. Chambers, bishop of Illinois, said:

Like the human body, the holy, catholic, and apostolic church, of which the Episcopal Church is a living part, suffers when one of its key members suffers from a disabling disease. Since the church is moreover the communion of saints, we ought to pray for one another, even as the faithful of other ages pray for us.

Hochstein Sinfonia Achieves Merit Early

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, an orchestra from my home community of Rochester, N.Y., has won outstanding acclaim for its rapid development. The Hochstein Sinfonia, after performing widely in its home area, recently took its talents on tour. One of the tour points was here in Washington, D.C., where the orchestra gave a notable concert in the Cramton Auditorium on the Howard University campus. This concert thrilled the audience and brought critical praise to the performers. I take pleasure in noting the Hochstein Sinfonia's enthusiastic reception in the Nation's Capital and commend to the reading of my colleagues this review from the Washington Evening Star:

HOCHSTEIN SINFONIA ACHIEVES MERIT EARLY

(By John Haskins)

(NOTE.—Hochstein Sinfonia, of Rochester, N.Y.; Paul Freeman, conductor. Soloist: Calvin Dash, baritone. At Cramton Auditorium, Howard University. Program: "Toccata," Frescobaldi-Kindler; "Allegro Moderato," from "Symphony No. 8 in B Minor," Schubert; "Dance Rhythms for Orchestra," opus 58, Riegger; orchestral prelude to act I, "Pelleas et Melisande," Faure; "Il balen del suo soriso," from "Il Trovatore," Verdi; prolog, from "I Pagliacci," Leoncavallo; "L'Arlesienne Suite," Bizet.)

The Hochstein Music School in Rochester was founded as a memorial to a Rochester violinist named David Hochstein, who was a combat casualty of World War I. Originally established as a school to train musical children, its enrollment has expanded to include some 400 students, 4 to 73 years of age, with a specialized faculty of 48.

The Hochstein Sinfonia, a 45-piece ensemble led by the school's director, is one of those hybrid faculty-community groups which abound in musical centers, and its membership is mostly quite young.

Conductor Freeman, born in Richmond, is a product of the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, and is currently a candidate for a doctorate in music at that institution. He is a properly schooled batoneer, somewhat florid in a stately old-fashioned way, but businesslike on the podium. His orchestra plays well what it like to play, with good string tone.

Baritone soloist Calvin Dash displayed a voice with a ringing top and an insufficient bottom. Nerves seemed to trouble his projection during his recitative and aria from

"Il Trovatore," while there were times during the Pagliacci prolog when he suffered the embarrassment of being covered by the orchestra. He did not always receive perfect support, which may have caused him to press a little.

The best moments of the evening came in Hans Kindler's very free transcription of the Frescobaldi toccata, in Wallingford Riegger's "Dance Rhythms" and in the Faure prelude. For an orchestra formed as recently as 1960, and one of such heterogenous character as usually distinguishes voluntary groups, the ensemble has merit.

Words Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News of March 20, 1963. The editorial points out that President Kennedy has issued great oratory, but has taken little action toward moving Cuba out from under its Communist sphere. Text of the editorial is as follows:

WORDS NOT ENOUGH

"We will build a wall around Cuba, not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men to protect their own freedom and sovereignty." The words—by President Kennedy at the Inter-American Conference in Costa Rica—may strike a responsive chord or appeal to the idealistic purposes of this Nation and its neighbors. But what do they mean?

What is a wall of freedom? How does it, or how can it, protect the sovereignty of nations and the liberty of their peoples?

Was there not a wall of freedom surrounding Cuba before Fidel Castro came out of the hills to tyrannize its people? If the wall did not stop him then, how can it be expected to overthrow his regime now so well guarded by Soviet troops and weapons?

Did a wall of freedom confronting the Soviet Union a few years ago prevent that aggressive colonialist nation from overrunning its neighbors in Eastern Europe?

Has a wall of freedom overthrown the totalitarianism which enslaves the people of Hungary, Tibet, Red China, and other Red spots around the globe?

Two months ago President Kennedy addressed a crowd of Cuban exiles and prisoners liberated from Castro's dungeons and told them it was "the strongest wish of the people of this country, as well as the people of this hemisphere, that Cuba shall one day be free again."

Then, as now, the President's wish was sincere and correct. But there is a vast difference between wishes and effective action, a deep gulf between words and deeds. Each time the President makes one of these anti-Castro pep talks, his words demand the immediate response: "Fine, but how are we going to do it?"

At the same time Mr. Kennedy gave lip-service to the maintenance of freedom and sovereignty in the hemisphere, he rejected appeals from several of our Latin American neighbors for specific hard-line measures which might accomplish precisely what Mr. Kennedy has set forth as our ultimate goal.

Too many people—perhaps the President included—seem to share the naive notion that we are able to deal with Communists in the same way that we are able to deal with civilized nations.

The fact is otherwise. Communists don't play the game by our rules. They don't gain power by a majority vote. They grab it by subversion, sabotage, infiltration, dishonesty, and intrigue.

Only yesterday, syndicated Columnist Victor Riesel noted on the pages of this newspaper how the Soviets have used at least nine hot-, cold- and class warfare training centers in Cuba to expand their subversive operations in this hemisphere. This subversion is not going to be combated by presidential phrases uttered from the White House, Miami, or San Jose, Costa Rica. It must be met head on by concrete elements of defense.

At the very least, those elements should include stronger and more effective diplomatic and economic sanctions against Cuba than we have instituted to date.

Ultimately, however, the threat of subversion can only be ended by eliminating its nerve center, the Cuban Communist regime. Measures directed toward this end—including the recognition of a free and democratic government in exile, the training and supplying of an effective underground network and the use of psychological warfare to build a sturdy resistance to communism within Cuba—must begin. And the sooner the better.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962: Where We Stand Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eugene Braderman, Director, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce, recently appeared before the House Small Business Committee and presented testimony on how the Trade Expansion Act is being implemented. He also testified as to the opportunities of small business in foreign trade.

As a supplement to his testimony, I am pleased to have reprinted in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, a recent speech by Mr. Braderman on the present status of the Trade Expanison Act.

The article follows:

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962: WHERE WE STAND TODAY

(Address by Eugene M. Braderman, Director, Bureau of International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, prepared for delivery at the business conference on expanding California's share of world markets, presented by the Los Angeles Regional Export Expansion Council, Town Hall, and the University of Southern California at the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., March 15, 1963)

I am very glad to be with you. It is a real pleasure to meet with so many of the businessmen who make Los Angeles and the State of California grow bigger and faster from year to year.

As Secretary Hodges says, one of the greatest challenges we in this country face today is to make our economy move ahead faster. We must expand business profits and employment opportunities more rapidly in order to meet the needs of our expanding population.

You are rising to the challenge. You are making every kind of economic enterprise flourish in California.

As the head of the Bureau of International Commerce, where we work day in and day out to expand the international trade of the United States, I am sure you expect me to be especially mindful of the benefits of a rising tide of trade. I will not disappoint you.

I think you do not really need to be persuaded that export business is excellent business. This meeting is an impressive demonstration of your awareness of the importance of export expansion.

California businessmen want to sell more goods abroad. They want to earn more export profits.

Export expansion will advance both the interests of business and the interests of the Nation. For business, exports mean greater profits; for the Nation—increased economic growth and a better balance-of-payments position.

Last year we sold just under $21 billion in U.S. goods in oversea markets. If we could increase our exports by 10 percent—by about $2 billion—we could just about wipe out the deficit in our international balance of payments.

Can you think of a better way to show the world that the U.S. dollar is worth a dollar—and that our free-enterprise economy is as good as we say it is?

Business and Government share responsibility for expanding U.S. exports.

Business has the job of selling. U.S. businessmen have shown outstanding ingenuity, enterprise, and salesmanship in developing markets here at home. The same kind of drive will win the same kind of success in makets abroad.

The Government has a twofold responsibility: (1) To help businessmen sell more oversea and (2) to help remove unreasonable tariff and other barriers so that U.S. business can compete on a fair basis for a larger share of world sales.

In the Commerce Department, it is the job of the Bureau of International Commerce to help you sell more of your products abroad. In the development of trade policy we present the views of industry in the councils of government. In terms of services, we offer you the possibilities of using trade missions, trade centers, and trade fair exhibitions to bring your products to the attention of potential customers abroad. With the advice of U.S. industry, we have developed a wide variety of specialized services to help you make judgements respecting the choice among export techniques, to size up overseas markets, and to provide information on concrete business leads developed by our commercial officers in the Foreign Service.

Over and above this, the Government must do every reasonable thing within its power to make it easier for U.S. goods to enter world markets. We must gain truly competitive access to the European Common Market. This is our best regional market. But we must also concentrate on fair conditions of access to other world markets, which now buy more than two-thirds of what we sell outside the United States.

Tariffs impede our access to many oversea markets. But tariffs—as you well know—are not the only barriers to trade. Licensing controls, customs restrictions, and other administrative and technical regulations—and practices—often make it difficult for U.S. goods to enter markets abroad.

Both tariff and nontariff barriers to trade must be reduced, if U.S. trade is to be expanded successfully. The Government is taking a close look at all barriers that keep U.S. goods out of world markets or make it

difficult for U.S. goods to compete abroad. We are working to free the flow of international trade.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is our best single instrument for opening the door to a freer flow of international trade. It has been called the most important single piece of legislation passed by the Congress last year. But the real task ahead is to translate this law into meaningful results for U.S. industry and trade.

The Trade Act provides the new American trade initiative President Kennedy urged to meet the challenges and opportunities of a rapidly changing world economy. I am happy to say that Secretary Hodges in particular, and the Department of Commerce as a whole, played a significant role in developing the Trade Expansion Act and in presenting to Congress the Government's views and those of large segments of U.S. business.

With the enactment of this measure, we in the United States have announced to the world that we intend to share in and contribute to a rising tide of trade. We have assured the entire free world of our intention to join our trading partners at international conference tables and work with them for mutual reduction of trade barriers, for mutual benefit.

By itself, the Trade Act does not open any trade opportunities for us. It is an instrument for us to use, and we must use it to our maximum advantage.

In brief, the Trade Act enables the President to bargain with other nations for freer entry of our products by giving him broad authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements.

The President has two principal kinds of negotiating authority under the Trade Act.

He has general authority to reduce duties by 50 percent in return for comparable tariff cuts by other nations. This is the basic authority. It can be used in negotiating with nations throughout the free world, including the six-nation Common Market. Gradual, reciprocal reduction of tariffs over 5 years, as provided by the Trade Expansion Act, would lower present barriers and raise the flow of free-world trade substantially.

The President also has authority, in negotiating with the Common Market, to bargain tariffs down to zero on broad categories of goods in which the United States and the Common Market together supply 80 percent or more of free world exports. At present, however, this authority is of very limited significance as a result of Great Britain's unsuccessful attempt to join the Common Market. Therefore, in the forthcoming negotiations, we will be dealing primarily with the general 50-percent authority. The administration believes that it offers broad latitude for fruitful bargaining.

The Trade Expansion Act runs for 5 years. Many things can change in that time, and I for one would not absolutely preclude the possibility that this zero authority to negotiate with the Common Market might still be used.

As I have said, the 50-percent authority is the basic one, but, in addition, the President has authority under the act to reduce to zero the tariff on any U.S. article now dutiable at 5 percent ad valorem or less. He can also reduce or eliminate duties on agricultural commodities if this would benefit U.S. exports of like commodities.

On tropical agricultural and forestry products which we in the United States do not produce in significant quantities, he can reduce duties to zero, provided the Common Market countries agree to admit these tropical products on a comparable, nondiscriminatory basis.

Many less developed countries depend heavily on their earnings from exports of bananas, coffee, and other tropical products. They need export earnings to advance their domestic progress and to pay for imports from the industrialized countries. This provision of the act will be used to encourage such industrialized areas as the Common Market to reduce the barriers that now impede imports of tropical products from the less developed countries. We look particularly for benefits to Latin American trade from use of this authority.

In addition to providing these various types of authority for bargaining down tariffs, the act strengthens our hand in dealing with the problems of nontariff barriers. It directs the President to withhold tariff concessions or to take other action to obtain the removal of unreasonable or unjustifiable foreign import restrictions.

President Kennedy, of course, will not engage personally in negotiations with other nations, even though he is ultimately responsible. In the past, tariff negotiations were handled for the President by the Department of State. A major change under the new Trade Expansion Act provides that the whole negotiating process be directed by the President's special representative for trade negotiations.

Christian A. Herter, whom the President has appointed to this important post, and his deputy, William Gossett, are hard at work, preparing the ground for fruitful negotiations.

Working with Governor Herter and Mr. Gossett is a small staff, including experts recruited from the Commerce Department.

The legislative authorities provided in the Trade Act, of course, are to be used as part of a negotiating package. This means that Governor Herter, working with the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, State, and other agencies in the executive branch having principal responsibilities in this field, will develop a number of approaches to the negotiations which will permit maximum bargaining pressure to be brought to bear during each critical stage of negotiation.

An interagency committee, established by the act, participates with Governor Herter in developing U.S. policies for the negotiations. It will also participate, with him, in guiding the entire course of the negotiations. This group is now at work.

Secretary Hodges is a member of this top advisory committee. Commerce Department representatives, together with representatives from the State, Agriculture, Treasury, Defense, Interior, and Labor Departments, serve on various staff groups. These groups are developing facts, figures, and negotiating proposals for use by the Cabinet-level committee in directing the program.

Governor Herter has already met with certain key Common Market and oversea government officials to explore the major phases of the negotiations that lie ahead. Additional meetings, in which a group representing Mr. Herter's office and the State and Commerce Departments is participating, are under way this week in Brussels, London, and Geneva.

The task of working out precise, mutually agreeable arrangements for the formal negotiations to be carried on later is what engages our closest attention now. This is where we stand today.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is our channel for meeting and negotiating with other nations. The United States is 1 of 44 contracting parties to this multilateral trade agreement. Other countries also participate by special arrangement.

We hope the next round of GATT negotiations will start early next year. The timing, as well as the scope and principles of negotiation, will be decided at the GATT ministerial meeting, which is scheduled tentatively for May 16 of this year.

Meanwhile, there are many decisions that we—in Government and industry—must make.

As in previous negotiations, U.S. businessmen will have full opportunity to give the Government their views. There will be hearings, at which all interested parties can present their formal views on items which they feel should be withheld from consideration in the negotiations as well as on tariff concessions which they wish the United States to seek from other countries.

These hearings, which will take place some months from now, will be announced well in advance by Governor Herter's office. The results of the hearings will be submitted to the President, together with comments and evaluation by Commerce and other interested departments.

The Commerce Department is deeply involved in the preparatory effort. We in the Bureau of International Commerce, with the assistance of colleagues in other parts of the Department, are especially active. It is up to us to develop and evaluate a large share of the information which will be used in determining the U.S. position and in carrying on the negotiations.

We need information from industry to do a good job for industry.

This is what we must find out:

1. On what specific items do you want the United States to bargain for tariff concessions from other countries? Precisely how important are such tariff concessions in opening oversea markets to U.S. goods or in expanding export sales? We want to develop the best possible want list. We need this information on a country-by-country and product-by-product basis.

2. What are the specific nontariff barriers that interfere with your exports to particular oversea markets? We need examples, with as many facts and figures as you can give us, so that we will know what problems you encounter, and how serious they are. In this way we can decide on the best way to attack these barriers.

3. What tariff concessions should the United States offer in return for tariff cuts by other nations? On which items should we not offer tariff concessions, and why? We must have this information to develop our offer list.

Right now in Washington, our most urgent task in preparing for the negotiations is to make up our want list. This is the list of items to which we will give top priority when the time comes to bargain for tariff concessions from other nations.

You may wonder why we ask for your specific wants when the tariff authority permits reductions on a linear, or across-the-board basis. The reason is that across-the-board bargaining means different things to different people, and we have not yet decided, with other governments, what the precise procedure will be. We do plan to bargain for mutual concessions of up to 50 percent but not on the item-by-item, country-by-country basis which was practiced in the past.

No one expects every duty within a commodity grouping to be cut the same amount, straight across the board. Exceptions will be proposed on both sides. This is why we want the best detailed estimates U.S. businessmen can give us on the importance of bargaining down tariffs on particular items. We want to be certain to insist that these high-priority items stay in negotiation and are not excluded by the other side.

Industry alone can give us the factual information we must have.

To get it, the Commerce Department is holding separate consultations with groups representing the various segments of U.S. industry. The first consultations were held 2 weeks ago. In all, we will be consulting with about 50 industry groups, including many of those represented here today.

I have a tentative schedule with me. I will be glad to give more information about these consultations to anyone who asks.

To do industry and the Government the most good, there must be careful preparation for these consultations, both by industry and Government. I suggest that you start your homework right away. Now is the time to begin writing your briefs on what you need in the way of tariff cuts, country-by-country and item-by-item.

I also suggest that you write detailed briefs on the nontariff barriers you are encountering abroad. Are your export markets limited by import quotas, administrative practices, special taxes or fees on imports, standards or specifications which tend to discriminate against U.S. exporters?

As tariffs are reduced abroad, nontariff barriers could become the limiting factors in U.S. sales abroad. Obviously, it would be unrealistic to clear away tariff barriers, only to have nontariff barriers nullify our effort.

You who are hurt by these nontariff obstacles to trade are the only ones who know specifically what they are and how they affect your oversea business. I urge you to give us the details.

We will use this information in our dealings with other governments and work to have them eliminate or relax their restrictions.

If any of these restrictions are illegal under the GATT or trade agreements or other international rules, I can assure you that our Government will press for their elimination by every means at our command.

But we cannot proceed without the facts. We must rely on you to supply them.

I want to say a few words about the problem of negotiating with the European Common Market. In a few years, the Common Market countries will reach their goal of a common external tariff, the so-called CXT, applicable to all countries outside their own area. Inside the Common Market, there will be virtual free trade.

Our objective in the forthcoming negotiations is to get the common external tariff down as much as possible as quickly as possible. We want the CXT to come down before industry and agriculture in the Common Market become too accustomed to the favored position which the common external tariff gives them in markets within the six member countries. Hence our interest in speed.

There are conflicting reports from Europe as to the real interest of the Common Market in negotiations at this time. Certainly, protectionist forces are present in the Common Market and may develop further. No doubt some Europeans would prefer to "leave well enough alone" and relegate tariff reduction to the indefinite future.

We hope—but right now we cannot say more than this—that the forward-looking elements in the Common Market will prevail and that the Common Market will prove to be outward looking rather than inward looking.

Our great bargaining strength with the Common Market is that tariff negotiations by all the major and many minor trading countries offer the possibility of more markets and better markets throughout the world.

This brings me to my next point. The forthcoming negotiations, of course, will not be bargaining sessions for the United States and the Common Market alone. We expect all GATT countries to participate meaningfully.

The United Kingdom has already indicated its intention to do so. Canada, too, has always played an important part in tariff negotiations. It continues to offer a great market for U.S. goods, just as the United States offers an important market for Canadian goods.

We expect Japan, our second best customer after Canada, to participate meaningfully in the tariff negotiations ahead of us. We think there are important reasons for Japan to participate. A particular inducement is that the United States and the prosperous Common Market offer ever increasing prospects for Japanese goods. Japan, in order to earn the right to tariff and other concessions which would open markets to Japanese goods, obviously must be prepared to make meaningful concessions itself. By this I mean not only tariff cuts, but also the elimination of quantitative restrictions and other nontariff restrictions on imported goods.

We have good reason to believe that countries such as Japan and Canada will find it desirable to participate seriously in the negotiations.

The less developed countries pose a somewhat special question. We know that in general their foreign exchange earnings are inadequate to meet their development needs and, in some instances, the consumption requirements of their people.

However, we do not propose that the less developed countries should get a free ride by receiving tariff concessions from all the developed countries and making no similar concessions themselves. It is in their own interest that they develop a reasonable cost structure and that they promote a rational development of their economies.

Tariff reductions may help them do this. Certainly, these countries should be willing to consider committing themselves to binding their existing tariffs and to forego the possibility of arbitrarily raising duties in the future. Beyond this, they might be urged to accept a type of overall ceiling on tariff rates.

In the coming months many questions are bound to arise. Each country will naturally have particular problems it will want left out of the negotiations or considered in some special way. We will be reasonable but firm in pursuit of our objectives. But we must not—we will not—let ourselves be sidetracked.

The aim of the United States is to get meaningful, trade-generating concessions. We want to open more markets for U.S. goods, so that U.S. firms that want to sell abroad—and all U.S. producers should—can do so. We are determined to move ahead to our goal—and yours.

The President and His Keynesian Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes an observer who is neither a Republican nor a Democrat can see a picture more clearly than the artist who either has painted it or who may want to paint it.

In the present, confused state of White House policy on our economy, it is refreshing to read an article by Wilhelm Roepke, a German scholar, on the direction this country is taking. The following article appeared in today's Wall Street Journal and is an excellent analysis:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 1, 1963]

WASHINGTON'S ECONOMICS: A GERMAN SCHOLAR SEES NATION MOVING INTO FISCAL SOCIALISM

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

(NOTE.—This article, originally written in German, has been adapted by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman of Bucknell University. Professor Roepke, a longtime student of the American economy, left Germany when Hitler came to power. Since 1937, he has been on the faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies of the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He is the author of "Economics in the Free Society," translated by Professor Boarman and recently published in this country by Henry Regnery Co.)

Thirty years ago, I published an article severely criticizing the economic policies then being pursued by President Roosevelt in the name of a "New Deal." "The grave question arises," so my article concluded, "of what will become of us all when the economically most powerful country in the world allows itself to be led by anticapitalist slogans to certain ruin."

If, today, one were to subject the economic policies of the Kennedy administration to a similar analysis, the criticism would doubtless be less severe. It is hardly possible to equate what the "New Frontier" has thus far accomplished with the upheaval of the American economy engineered by Roosevelt. But enough has been done to warrant deep concern. Of particular interest to the economist is the fact that the overall policies of the Kennedy administration, including those pursued in the arena of world politics, are shaped to an unusual degree by specific economic theories. It is these theories which help explain, in particular, the clear defeats which the administration's economic program has thus far suffered.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that the two principal problems which confronted the Kennedy administration at its inception are still unresolved. The deficit in the balance of payments and the associated gold loss still continue, nor is there any evidence that the ship of the American economy is any nearer than before to the open waters of full employment and full production. Both of these phenomena, however, are intimately interrelated.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

Where a country suffers from a balance-of-payments deficit, there is always a strong temptation—and the Kennedy administration has succumbed to it to a degree—to shift the burden of the blame, if not to unlucky juxtapositions of the stars, then to other countries. The weakness of the dollar is attributed not to discrepancies between cost and price levels in the United States and abroad, especially in respect to internationally traded goods, but to excessive capital exports. From this the conclusion is easily drawn that the dollar is less in need of an internal policy of strict monetary and fiscal discipline than of a reduction of the burden on the balance of payments stemming from capital exports. To help in the accomplishment of the latter objective, proposals are advanced which would restrain the outflow by exchange control, discriminatory taxation of foreign earnings, and other drastic devices which have little in common with a free enterprise economy. Simultaneously, other countries are cordially (and sometimes not so cordially) invited to assume an increased share of the U.S. burden of defense and foreign aid.

The theory is seductive in its simplicity. A country suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, no matter how rich (and the United States remains far and away the country with the richest endowment of capital) must curtail its export of capital. Corresponding to this is the view that a country "enjoying" a balance-of-payments surplus, however capital-poor it may be (West Germany, for example), must on this very account strive to achive a net export of capital. The truth is that the one argument is as untenable as the other, for in both cases disturbances of external equilibrium are wrongly identified with changes in internal capital wealth. What is needful is that a country adjust its balance of payments (by means of appropriate internal

policies) to its capital resources, not its capital resources to its balance of payments.

THE WAGE SPIRAL

The root cause of the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States is the internal wage and fiscal inflation which has been allowed to develop in that country. The official assurances that these sources of inflation have been stopped up carry little conviction because both wage inflation and budget deficits financed by bank reserves rather than by genuine savings have increased uninterruptedly. It is not sufficient in the American case merely to hold wage increases within the limits which the Government has designated as politically or socially desirable. What is necessary is that wage increases be held well below productivity increases; realistically, they should be suspended altogether. But in fact a number of the most powerful American unions have not even managed to hold their wage demands within the administration's "guidelines."

It is the labor unions, in the final analysis; whch must be accounted responsible for the fact that wages for the past 5 years have been pushed ever higher, in spite of persistently high levels of unemployment, placing the American monetary authorities in the perpetual dilemma either of accepting the unemployment caused by high wages or of overcoming it by inflation. The intemperance of the American unions, in turn, is bolstered both by the administration's policy of deliberately favoring labor and by its overall economic philosophy. The latter is based for the most part on monetary expansionism of an extreme type, distilled from a schematic and mechanical Keynesianism. Almost routinely, the managers of the New Frontier look upon any and all economic problems as ultimately soluble by an increase in the level of effective demand.

It is no accident that the principal architect of the administration's economic policy. Prof. Walter Heller, is the same person who in 1953 urgently advised the Bonn Government to cure the then substantial unemployment in West Germany—unemployment which was clearly due to a shortage of capital and hence definitely not of the "Keynesian" variety—with a bold program of monetary expansion. His advice, had it been followed, would have pushed the young German market economy ineluctably to its doom over the cliffs of inflation. The Heller philosophy, which the West Germans fortunately rejected, is one characterized by a perpetual impatience to give free rein to the money-creating mechanisms of society. Obsessed by fear of deflation, it is blind to the danger of inflation which persists undiminished in the almost ritually recurring "rounds" of wage increases. Nor is the danger of inflation any less serious because it emerges in the American case in conjunction with unemployment and business pessimism. Indeed, it is precisely in this combination that it is most to be feared.

It is not easy to restore the world's confidence in a currency which has suffered, as the dollar has, from protracted illness. Even the support for the dollar provided by the international community, as indubitable a sign as it is of the price which other countries are prepared to pay to underwrite the "key currency," cannot dispel the disturbing possibility which has been summed up in a famous phrase of Talleyrand's: "A ministry which needs support is a ministry which will fall." Of decisive importance, therefore, is the overcoming of the basic deficit itself.

EMBERS MAY FLAME UP

Doubtless the current inflationary tendencies in Europe will ease the task of the Americans in moving in an anti-inflationary direction. The probability is then that the balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced, providing other circumstances are favorable. But to the extent that this hoped-for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever higher levels of "effective demand," the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too precipitate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persists that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilization of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and "repressed inflation." As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Government's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the New Deal and New Frontier finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked but in an openly defiant glorification of "big Government" and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the development countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German Parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that "the continuous enlargement of the government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population." The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that Government expenditures insure a wiser use of the people's income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary government expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular, is verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized state of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

Clearly, there are limits to the process of continuing growth of government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political, and economic foundations of a healthy democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it takes off like an airplane from the ground. The development process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of takeoff has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of high mass consumption. In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by democratization and liberalization. This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forbearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millenium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistible desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuousness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accouterments of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most egregious and alarming defect of the Rostovian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE RICH GOT RICHER

Progress in science and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary but by no means sufficient conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The rich countries of today

are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the onesided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social and practical system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of a pseudo-religion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is the mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely because it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with a network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

One of the Most Dramatic Moments in All Industry—The Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan Christens the SS "Export Champion," and Explains Its Significance to Our Nation's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and as a Member of Congress who for 16 years has had the honor of representing a district which includes one of the greatest ports in the world, the port of Baltimore, I have had occasion frequently to attend the launchings of new ships for merchant marine and Navy. A launching is always a most impressive event, and represents the culmination of many man-hours of labor and of great investments of funds in creating a new ship which will carry the American flag on the high seas.

Customarily, a charming lady smashes a bottle of champagne against the bow as the ship slides down the ways, and then, later, she expresses her pride in the vessel.

A ship launching which I attended last Thursday in Chester, Pa., was another such occasion, but with a very significant difference. The ship was the SS *Export Champion*, built by Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., for the American Export Lines—one of our sister ships of 12,528 deadweight tons, with a cargo capacity of 800,000 cubic feet, a speed of 18½ knots, rated horsepower of 13,750, and overall length of 493 feet. The four ships display an unusual profile for cargo vessels, with an engine-aft arrangement for maximum cargo carrying capacity. J. J. Henry Co., Inc., was the naval architectural firm for the four ships, which have General Electric cross compound steam turbine main engines with double reduction gears, and 20-foot diameter, 5-blade propellers revolving at 110 revolutions per minute.

These are outstanding cargo ships, and are part of our subsidized American flag-merchant marine. The SS *Export Champion* is designed for use on trade route No. 10—line B—U.S. Atlantic/Mediterranean and Black Seas—freight service.

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN ACTS AS SPONSOR

I said the ship launching Thursday of the SS *Export Champion* was an occasion similar to many others I have witnessed, but with a very significant difference. As is customary, a charming lady smashed a bottle of champagne against the bow at the exact split second, and then later expressed her pride in the vessel. The lady who performed the important role of sponsor of the SS *Export Champion* was our own colleague in the House of Representatives, and my esteemed colleague, a senior member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentlewoman from Missouri, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, and it was her participation which made this an unusual occasion.

Mrs. SULLIVAN not only performed the customary tasks assigned to a sponsor of a ship, but made an outstanding address following the launching, and discussed the importance of this ship, and of our entire American-flag merchant marine to the people of the United States. Never before, to my knowledge, has the sponsor of a cargo vessel been a woman with as great an understanding of the significance of the event to our Nation as the conscientious and well-informed Congresswoman from Missouri, who is now serving for the 11th year on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and is chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN described the moment when the ship started on its way to deep water as "one of the most dramatic moments in all industry." I think it was a very apt description, and, as she performed the sponsoring rites, she made me proud, as all of us in the House of Representatives would have been proud, at that moment.

Later, in her remarks following the launching, she made me even prouder of her as a colleague in the Congress for her eloquent and informative talk. I want to share that pride with the rest of the Members, Mr. Speaker, and so I submit the text of Congresswoman SULLIVAN's address, for inclusion as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, FOLLOWING LAUNCHING OF SS "EXPORT CHAMPION," SUN SHIPYARD, CHESTER, PA., THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 28, 1963

My wish today—my prayer—in christening the SS *Export Champion* is that all who serve aboard this vessel in the years ahead will always have the same pride of identification with her that we will always have as a result of participating in her launching.

The men and women of Sun Ship, who have devoted nearly 1 million man-hours of skilled hard work in transforming assorted lengths and shapes of steel and pipe and other materials into a rugged, fast, seaworthy carrier of the cargoes of world commerce, cannot help but be deeply proud of their handiwork, and I congratulate them for the excellence of their labors.

And to Admiral Will and his associates of American Export Lines, there is the pride of seeing their industrial vision become a reality here, in seeing a great project for the expansion of a great shipping line come to fruition in the form of the fourth ship in this unusual new design.

As a woman who has just enjoyed one of the great privileges traditionally reserved to women—the opportunity to officiate at one of the most dramatic moments in all industry—the moment when a high-and-dry hull suddenly begins its plunge into deep water and its emergence as a ship—I shall always treasure my memories of that moment, and relive again and again the glorious experience of christening a fine ship.

My pride of identification with this ship goes even deeper than that, however, for the SS *Export Champion*, which I shall always regard now as a personal possession I have merely placed on loan to its operators, symbolizes for me the entire American merchant marine, with which I have become closely familiar during 10 years in Congress as a member of the committee of the House of Representatives which has legislative jurisdiction over merchant marine affairs. In that capacity, I have attended numerous launchings for a variety of vessels, and have invariably been thrilled when the champagne crashed against the bow, and the blocks were battered away, and the ship slowly moved, and then raced down the ways. But thanks to those who have given me the privilege today of sponsoring the *Export Champion*, the merchant marine will hereafter always be symbolized for me by this one vessel. I shall watch for the reports of her comings and goings. Each time she returns to home port from her travels in the Mediterranean or Black Sea, I shall have the feeling that "my ship has come in."

The SS *Export Champion* belongs, in a sense, to all of the American people, as do all of our vessels in the subsidized American-flag merchant marine. Congress is providing currently about $300 million a year for assistance in the construction of such ships, and in their operation. But this is no gift, no handout, to a few ship builders or fleet operators. This is an investment by the people of the United States in a major arm of national defense, the bridge of ships which helped so decisively in the winning of World War II, the ships which today speed our cargoes to our troops abroad, and to friends and allies around the world—modern ships, fast ships, designed for today's needs, including the possible needs of wartime military support. The so-called subsidies are necessary in order to enable American enterprise to compete on a more equal basis with foreign firms in both the operation of and the construction of our merchant ships. Otherwise, our flag would virtually disappear from the masts of the world's cargo ships. And there are reciprocal requirements: The operator must provide for the periodic, systematic replacement of ships on a long-range basis, and must agree to return to the

Government a share of profits exceeding a specified level.

Above all, he must operate under the American flag, which means under conditions of employment and safety on the high seas which far exceed those of any other maritime power. Incidentally, our merchant marine employs more than 200,000 people from every section of this country, at wages equal to the best in American industry as a whole.

But lest we fall into the mistake of considering these programs of aid to the merchant marine and to those who work in related activities as an expensive drain on our Treasury and our economy, it should be realized that the economic aspects constitute a two-way street; for instance, this industry, including seagoing, shoreside, shipbuilding, and ship repair segments, contributes better than $5 billion annually to the U.S. economy, and helps to reduce the deficit in our balance of payments by between $600 million and $1 billion a year. And, of course, such an industry and its employees pay very, very substantial Federal taxes.

These are facts I had to learn 10 years ago as a midwestern Member of Congress serving on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I was, and am, from Missouri, and had to be shown. And I was shown. I have always supported the American merchant marine in their united efforts to obtain legislation needed to expand and strengthen this industry.

Is it any wonder, then, that I am deeply proud, highly honored, and profoundly moved by the privilege I have had today to sponsor a great new addition to the American-flag fleet? The SS *Export Champion*, long before any cargo is loaded into her holds, already carries our great pride in the role she will fulfill.

May this ship, a true champion always, and those who man her, meet their forthcoming challenges of time and space and the elements with resolute confidence born of the strength you have built into her solid steel hull. And may each voyage not only be undertaken with eager excitement, but also be completed in harmony, and with full success.

Fiscal Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a timely warning is given the people of this Nation by a modern scholar, Prof. Wilhelm Roepke, in his article entitled "Washington's Economics," in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, April 1, 1963. Fiscal socialism is the goal of the New Frontier, continuing the master plan of the New Deal.

Mr. Heller, Mr. Rostow, Mr. Galbraith, and Mr. Schlessinger are among the chief proponents abetted by devotees of Keynesianism and the labor leaders of our day.

The lessons and truisms of capitalism, of a free people in a free society, are forgotten, as the liberal-radicals try to replace these bulwarks of a spiritual and moral people, a people answerable only individually to their Creator.

Will our people wake up to the designs of these architects of socialism, of slavery, enough to change our course back to capitalism or not? That's the burning question today.

The Members of Congress should be in the forefront of preserving our liberties and capitalism, the only economic system possible for a free people. So it is I commend this article to my colleagues:

WASHINGTON'S ECONOMICS: A GERMAN SCHOLAR SEES NATION MOVING INTO FISCAL SOCIALISM

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

(Note.—This article, originally written in German, has been adapted by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman of Bucknell University. Professor Roepke, a longtime student of the American economy, left Germany when Hitler came to power. Since 1937, he has been on the faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies of the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He is the author of "Economics of the Free Society," translated by Professor Boarman and recently published in this country by Henry Regnery Co.)

Thirty years ago, I published an article severely criticizing the economic policies then being pursued by President Roosevelt in the name of a "New Deal." "The grave question arises," so my article concluded, "of what will become of us all when the economically most powerful country in the world allows itself to be led by anticapitalist slogans to certain ruin."

If, today, one were to subject the economic policies of the Kennedy administration to a similar analysis, the criticism would doubtless be less severe. It is hardly possible to equate what the "New Frontier" has thus far accomplished with the upheaval of the American economy engineered by Roosevelt. But enough has been done to warrant deep concern. Of particular interest to the economist is the fact that the overall policies of the Kennedy administration, including those pursued in the arena of world politics, are shaped to an unusual degree by specific economic theories. It is these theories which help explain, in particular, the clear defeats which the administration's economic program has thus far suffered.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that the two principal problems which confronted the Kennedy administration at its inception are still unsolved. The deficit in the balance of payments and the associated gold loss still continue, nor is there any evidence that the ship of the American economy is any nearer than before to the open waters of full employment and full production. Both of these phenomena, however, are intimately interrelated.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

Where a country suffers from a balance-of-payment deficit, there is always a strong temptation—and the Kennedy administration has succumbed to it to a degree—to shift the burden of the blame, if not to unlucky juxtapositions of the stars, then to other countries. The weakness of the dollar is attributed not to discrepanices between cost and price levels in the United States and abroad, especially in respect to internationally traded goods, but to excessive capital exports. From this the conclusion is easily drawn that the dollar is less in need of an internal policy of strict monetary and fiscal discipline than of a reduction of the burden on the balance of payments stemming from capital exports. To help in the accomplishment of the latter objective, proposals are advanced which would restrain the outflow by exchange control, discriminatory taxation of foreign earnings, and other drastic devices which have little in common with a free enterprise economy. Simultaneously, other countries are cordially (and sometimes not so cordially) invited to assume an increased share of the U.S. burden of defense and foreign aid.

The theory is seductive in its simplicity. A country suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, no matter how rich (and the United States remains far and away the country with the richest endowment of capital) must curtail its export of capital. Corresponding to this is the view that a country enjoying a balance-of-payments surplus, however capital-poor it may be (West Germany, for example), must on this very account strive to achieve a net export of capital. The truth is that the one argument is as untenable as the other, for in both cases disturbances of external equilibrium are wrongly identified with changes in internal capital wealth. What is needful is that a country adjust its balance of payments (by means of appropriate internal policies) to its capital resources, not its capital resources to its balance of payments.

THE WAGE SPIRAL

The root cause of the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States is the internal wage and fiscal inflation which has been allowed to develop in that country. The official assurances that these sources of inflation have been stopped up carry little conviction because both wage inflation and budget deficits financed by bank reserves rather than by genuine savings have increased uninterruptedly. It is not sufficient in the American case merely to hold wage increases within the limits which the Government has designated as politically feasible or socially desirable. What is necessary is that wage increases be held well below productivity increases; realistically, they should be suspended altogether. But in fact a number of the most powerful American unions have not even managed to hold their wage demands within the administration's "guidelines."

It is the labor unions, in the final analysis, which must be accounted responsible for the fact that wages for the past 5 years have been pushed ever higher, in spite of persistently high levels of unemployment, placing the American monetary authorities in the perpetual dilemma either of accepting the unemployment caused by high wages or of overcoming it by inflation. The intemperance of the American unions, in turn, is bolstered both by the administration's policy of deliberately favoring labor and by its overall economic philosophy. The latter is based for the most part on monetary expansionism of an extreme type, distilled from a schematic and mechanical Keynesianism. Almost routinely, the managers of the New Frontier look upon any and all economic problems as ultimately soluable by an increase in the level of effective demand.

It is no accident that the principal architect of the administration's economic policy, Prof. Walter Heller, is the same person who in 1953 urgently advised the Bonn Government to cure the then substantial unemployment in West Germany—unemployment which was clearly due to a shortage of capital and hence definitely not of the Keynesian variety—with a bold program of monetary expansion. His advice, had it been followed, would have pushed the young German market economy ineluctably to its doom over the cliffs of inflation. The Heller philosophy, which the West Germans fortunately rejected, is one characterized by a perpetual impatience to give free rein to the money-creating mechanisms of society. Obsessed by fear of deflation, it is blind to the danger of inflation which persists undiminished in the almost ritually recurring "rounds" of wage increases. Nor is the danger of inflation any less serious because it emerges in the American case in conjunction with unemployment and business pessimism. Indeed, it is precisely in this combination that it is most to be feared.

It is not easy to restore the world's confidence in a currency which has suffered, as

the dollar has, from protracted illness. Even the support for the dollar provided by the International Community, as indubitable a sign as it is of the price which other countries are prepared to pay to underwrite the "key currency," cannot dispel the disturbing possibility which has been summed up in a famous phrase of Talleyrand's: "A ministry which needs support is a ministry which will fall." Of decisive importance, therefore, is the overcoming of the basic deficit itself.

EMBERS MAY FLAME UP

Doubtless the current inflationary tendencies in Europe will ease the task of the Americans in moving in an anti-inflationary direction. The probability is then that the balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced, providing other circumstances are favorable. But to the extent that this hoped-for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever-higher levels of "effective demand," the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too precipitate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persists that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilization of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and repressed inflation. As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Bovernment's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the New Deal and New Frontier finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked but in an openly defiant glorification of big government and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the developed countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German Parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that "the continuous enlargement of the Government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population." The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that government expenditures ensure a wiser use of the people's income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary Government expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular, is verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized state of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

Clearly, there are limits to the process of continuing growth of Government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well as in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment, the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it takes off like an airplane from the ground. The developmental process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of takeoff has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of high mass consumption. In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by democratization and liberalization. This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forbearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millenium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistable desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuuosness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular, constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accoutrements of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most agregious and alarming defect of the Rostowian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE "RICH" GOT RICH

Progress in science and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary, but by no means sufficient, conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The rich countries of today are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the one-sided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social, and political system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of a pseudoreligion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is the mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely becouse it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with a network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but in increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

Reporter Queries Saturday Evening Post Regarding Story—Calls It Incredible, Preposterous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the question surrounding the Saturday Evening Post article alleging the fixing of the University of Alabama-University of Georgia football game last September 22, 1962, it has become apparent that the Saturday Evening Post was very gravely in error. It was obvious to the football fans that the story was false and irresponsible. However, many people, after reading the Post story, saw that the story was carefully designed to support the ill-founded conclusion that the game was fixed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit herewith an article by Mr. Robert W. Kincey, of the Birmingham News, a man best described as an avid nonfootball fan. Mr. Kincey's enthusiasm is for trains and circuses. I believe that Members of the House will be interested in reading his comments about the Saturday Evening Post article.

WHY RIG GAME ON PHONE?

(By Robert W. Kincey)

I have been wondering about this allegation that Coaches Bryant and Butts fixed or rigged last September's Alabama-Georgia game. I believe your old correspondent can view the proposition objectively and without bias or prejudice simply because we are not a football fan, never saw but half a game in our born days and wouldn't recognize either of the two men except through their pictures in the newspapers.

But here's what I have been wondering about. Hard to believe that a national magazine would come up with something like that unless and until it was pretty certain of the fact; isn't it even more preposterous to conceive of this:

That two men who are smart enough to originate and direct the intricate plays and formations of a top-ranking football team could possibly be stupid or just plain dumb enough to flagrantly do their rigging over the telephone in a conversation from one city to another?

It does look like to me that Mr. Bryant and Mr. Butts, both being pretty sharp-minded fellows, if they had something crooked up their sleeves, would have arranged a rendezvous in the most secret and inaccessible place they could find.

And, with a betrayal in mind of many thousands of fans and the public generally, they would have talked in whispers in a darkened corner far removed from the beaten path.

But brazenly over the telephone? It's inconceivable.

WHAT ABOUT PLAYERS' REACTION?

Here's another thing. What possible value could the information that fellow said Mr. Butts gave Mr. Bryant have been unless at least essential parts of it had been passed along to members of the Alabama team?

And would there not have been an explosive reaction to any such session the coach might have had with his ball players? How could it be reasonable to expect that at least one man would not have long ago spilled the beans? Human beings are that way. A proposition as momentous as that simply could not have kept—probably not even until game time.

No, I am not what you might call crushed over the situation other than as a matter of general principle. And this is not meant in defense of Mr. Bryant nor Mr. Butts.

The conclusion is inevitable that they have simply got more sense than to rig a major football game over the telephone if indeed, any such thought ever occurred to either of them, which I doubt very much.

POST REALLY SKATING ON THIN ICE

The Saturday Evening Post must really be skating on thin ice. Wonder if the copy boys and girls are running the editorial department. But, after all, two major Southern teams were involved and it seems to be the order of the day to seize upon and broadcast anything detrimental to the South.

But what business have we got trying to discuss football rigging never having seen, like we told you, but half a game when the weather was blustery and cold and it started to rain and we got up and went home where we should have stayed to start with?

Never shall forget one time, a few years back, when we had two complimentary tickets to one of the big games and was offered $50 for them. What a temptation. But the opposition, who especially wanted to see that particular game, knew we had them.

Besides that, we figured maybe the would-be buyer might have been a detective ready to put us in irons for ticket scalping and not wanting to be shackled and not looking for trouble at the estate, we took them home and sat there where it was warm thinking how it is that some people say we're nuts because we are so devoted to trains, the circus, and fishing while they'll go yell their heads off and nearly freeze to death out at Legion Field.

But it's all right, we won't bother them if they'll just leave us alone.

Dr. Joseph F. Montminy, Sr., Receives Doctor of Ocular Science Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week Dr. Joseph F. Montminy, Sr., of Lowell, Mass., was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of ocular science by the Massachusetts College of Optometry. Now in his 82d year, Dr. Montminy is a past president of the college, and has been active in civic and political activities throughout his life. Formerly a member of the Lowell City Council and a State senator from the First Middlesex District, Dr. Montminy is a credit to his community and his profession. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a recent article from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, outlining Dr. Montminy's achievements, at this point in the RECORD:

MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE CONFERS HIGH HONOR ON LOWELL OPTICIAN

(By Joseph Massa)

LOWELL.—An honor richly deserved, but tardy in coming, has been conferred upon a Lowell optician, now in his 82d year, and in retirement because of illness.

First to be so honored and recognized publicly, is Dr. Joseph F. Montminy, Sr., of 16 Standish Street, for many years an outstanding Lowell citizen and public servant. Conferred upon him by the Massachusetts College of Optometry, of which he is president emeritus, is the honorary degree of doctor of ocular science.

At a special convocation held earlier this month, the honorary degree was conferred in abstentia, and was accepted for his father by Dr. Joseph F. Montminy, Jr., also of Lowell, and his father's successor in the profession. The conferment by the trustees of the college recognized Dr. Montminy's many contributions to optometry generally and optometrical education in particular.

Dr. Montminy was elected to the board of trustees of the college in 1946 and served as president of the board from January 1951 to October of 1962, when he was elevated to the position of president-emeritus—the first to hold this title.

In the realm of public service, Dr. Montminy served as a Lowell City councilor and as council president in 1937 and 1938. He also served the First Middlesex District as a State senator.

Dr. and Mrs. Montminy have six children, four sons and two daughters—Prof. Edmond Montminy, of the University of Missouri; Dr. Joseph F. Montminy, Jr., of Lowell; Rudolph Montminy, a printer with the Lowell Sun; and Leo Montminy, in California; Mrs. Esther Moore, of Lowell, and Miss Claire Montminy, a nurse in New York.

The 442nd Combat Team: Hawaii's Gift To America's Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, last week veterans of the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team celebrated in Honolulu the 20th anniversary of their organization.

It was on March 18, 1943, at historic Iolani Palace in Honolulu that 2,600 volunteers, all Americans of Japanese ancestry, were sworn in en masse into the Army of the United States. They were later to be joined by more than 1,000 other Nisei who had volunteered from behind barbed wire fences of the so-called "relocation centers" to form the 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Before the call for volunteers was issued, the quota for Hawaii was set at 1,500 men. Within a few days after the call was issued, more than 10,000 had volunteered, the first of whom was Joseph Itagaki, who died of a heart attack almost to the day on the 20th anniversary of his volunteering, and the best known of whom is your former colleague and now U.S. Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE.

This tremendous and almost unbelievable response helped to quelch the talk of evacuating all of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii, and the Army boosted Hawaii's quota to 2,875 men.

On the mainland United States the Army experienced an even more remarkable response. From within the confines of concentration camps more than 3,000 men wearing Japanese faces had volunteered to serve the country whose Government had placed them behind barbed-wire fences despite their American citizenship. Among them was the first volunteer of them all, Mike Masaoka, described by Reader's Digest as the "most successful lobbyist" on Capitol Hill, and his four borthers, Hank, Tad, Ike, and Ben.

The Army's decision to organize the 442d was largely based on its observations of another Japanese-American outfit which had been organized about a year earlier on June 2, 1942 and which was in training at Camp McCoy, Wis., and Camp Shelby, Miss.—the 100th Infantry Battalion—separate—of which I was a member, and which subsequently became the first battalion of the 442d Regiment.

Together on the battlefields of Europe, men of the 100th Battalion and the 442d Regimental Combat Team won the respect and admiration of all who knew them. Gen. Mark Clark re-

ferred to them as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." They had fought for and died for ideals which they had learned to uphold in the democratic process. They had died so others could have a better world in which to live—men like Private Kawano, my messenger, who, in his last few words on earth, told me in effect:

Well, Lieutenant, I know I'm going to die, but I have no regrets. I know that as a result of my dying, those of us who will go home and our folks back home will be recognized as true Americans and will live a better life.

The veterans of the 442d Combat Team and the 100th Battalion and, lest we forget, of the Military Intelligence Service, irrefutably proved on the fields of battle through sacrifice of blood and life that Americanism is a matter of the heart and mind and not of race or color, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt so aptly stated.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the people of Hawaii, I call your attention to Hawaii's gift to America's heritage, the 442d Regimental Combat Team, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

The Black Watch To Be at Quincy, Mass., Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives the following letter which I have received from the office of the Canadian Consulate General signed by the Honorable S. D. Hemsley.

CANADIAN COUNSULATE GENERAL,
BOSTON, MASS.,
January 15, 1963.

Mr. JAMES A. BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: I am sure that you will be glad to know that agreement has been reached at last for a marching detachment and band of the 3d Battalion, the Black Watch (Royal Highland Regiment) of Canada to be present at the Memorial Day services to be held on May 30 of this year in Quincy.

Those in Quincy who are concerned with this operation have been advised of this decision and they are, I understand, now working out arrangements with the commanding officer in Montreal.

I can only add how glad I am that the unit will be coming down for I am sure that many new friendships—stemming from the old valuable associations—will result from it.

With my kindest regards I am,
Sincerely yours,

S. D. HEMSLEY,
Consul General.

The above information has been received in a very enthusiastic way not only by the citizens of my congressional district but throughout the entire New England area.

The purpose is to honor the Americans who served with the 236th Battalion, MacLean Kilties of America, during World War I, from the Greater Boston area, under the command of Lt. Col. Percy Guthrie. Permission was granted by the United States for Lieutenant Colonel Guthrie to come from Canada and recruit men from the Greater Boston area, for the 236th Battalion, known as the MacLean Kilties of America.

Invitations were sent in November 1961, by Sfc. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiter in Quincy, at the request of the city of Quincy, the Quincy Veterans Council, and the Royal Canadian Legion to possibly obtain a unit from the Royal Black Watch—R.H.R.—of Canada, to participate in the Veterans Day parade, November 11, 1962, in honor of those Americans who served in the MacLean Kilties, many of whom were transferred into the Royal Black Watch upon their arrival overseas, during World War I. However, they notified Sergeant Johnston, that they were laying away their old colors on that day, and were unable to accept the invitation. However, an invitation was extended to Sergeant Johnston and Sgt. George J. Matta to be the guest of the 3d Battalion, stationed at Montreal, Canada, when the regiment received their new colors on the 8th of June, 1962. Arrangements were made by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, 11th Congressional District, to assure every assistance possible during their visit.

Due to the great disappointment of all concerned, Sergeant Johnston was again asked to try to obtain the same Black Watch unit for the Memorial Day parade and exercises, to be held in the city of Quincy on May 30, 1963. This time, with the assistance of the Canadian Counsulate General Mr. S. D. Hemsley, and by the Deputy Minister for External Affairs from Ottawa, Canada. Sergeant Johnston was notified by Mr. Hemsley on January 9, 1963, that the Canadian Government has accepted the invitation and a contingent from the 3d Battalion, Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.), to include 70 men of all ranks, would handle the commitment for the Memorial Day parade. Also the keen interest of the visiting unit and the enthusiasm here in the city of Quincy and the greater Boston area is certainly a sign of good will. This was the result of a continuous effort which lasted over a year.

A committee has been formed to welcome the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) on the evening of May 29, 1963, by having a military ball, which is to be held at the Massachusetts National Guard Armory, 1000 Hancock Street, Quincy, Mass., starting at 8 p.m. This will include many Federal, State, and local dignitaries.

On Memorial Day 1963, a preparade ceremony will be held in front of city hall in Quincy, starting at 9 a.m. This will include playing of both national anthems and raising of both national colors, also the inspection of the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) and the U.S. Army honor guard. Wreaths will be laid in the tomb of the second and sixth Presidents of the United States, John Adams and John Quincy Adams. Upon completion of the short ceremony, both units will proceed to School Street, Quincy, the starting point for the main parade. The parade will proceed to the Mount Wollaston Cemetery for the main Memorial Day exercises.

Arrangements have been made to billet the unit at the President City Motel, 845 Hancock Street, Quincy, and messed at a local U.S. Army installation.

The advanced party is scheduled to arrive 8 hours prior to main unit. A welcome committee will be present. When information is received as to approximate time and place of arrival the proper authorities will be notified.

It is anticipated due to the large population of Canadians residing in the greater Boston area a large turnout can be expected.

ASSISTANCE

Decorations for the National Guard armory and Memorial Day parade, will be arranged by Mr. Richard Koch, park and recreation division, city of Quincy.

Billeting and messing arranged by the U.S. Army, recruiting station, Quincy.

Publicity: U.S. Army recruiting main station, army base, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Gertrude Whitney, chairman Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. John Harding, cochairman, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. Thomas F. Blasi, sergeant of arms, Quincy Veterans Council; Mr. Ron Redquest, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. Percy N. Lane, reporter, Quincy Patriot Ledger; Mr. Henry Bosworth, reporter, Herald Travelor, Boston, Mass.; and Mr. Herb Fontaine, announcer, radio station WJDA, Quincy, Mass.

Master of ceremonies, Mr. James Asher, of radio station WJDA, Quincy, Mass.

Commander Mr. Francis S. MacKenzie, of the Quincy Veterans Council, ex officio all committees.

Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) Committee: Past Commander Veterans Council, Mr. David Alexander, chairman; Sfc. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiting, cochairman; M. Sgt. George J. Matta, U. S. Army recruiting, cochairman; past commander, American Legion Post No. 95, Quincy, Thomas F. Blasi, sergeant at arms; Mrs. Grace M. Blasi, deputy sheriff of Norfolk County, secretary; Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, director of music; and Mr. Alec Smith, city of Quincy auditor.

Canadian: Comdr. James Fraser, Royal Canadian Legion, Eastern States Command; Past Comdr. Dave Boucher; Mr. John Harding, Royal Canadian Legion, publicity; Mr. John Tompson, Royal Canadian Legion; Mrs. Gertrude Whitney, secretary; Alfred Walker, former 236th Battalion; Kent Brydle, treasurer and ticket chairman; and Douglas Cummings, former 236th Battalion.

Main Memorial Day Parade Committee: Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie, Quincy Veterans Council; Past Comdr. Charles N. Ross, Quincy Veterans Council, chairman; Sgt. James Johnston, U.S. Army Recruiting, Quincy, cochairman; Arthur I. Senter, and John Wipfler.

Aides to the distinguished guests, unknown at this time.

Invited dignitaries and guests for military ball, tentative list: President John F. Kennedy, Congressman James A. Burke, Governor of Massachusetts, Endicott Peabody, Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa, S. D. Hemsley, Canadian Consulate General of Boston, Mass., Quincy City Council, Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie, Quincy Veterans Council, Comdr. James Fraser, Royal Canadian Legion, Eastern States Command, clergy, military representatives, living members of the 236th Battalion and Royal Black Watch, and Gold Star Mothers.

Mr. Speaker, in a few years the famous Black Watch will be 250 years old. That is a long time to sustain a reputation of distinction; but that is what the soldiers of the Black Watch have done. Famous for their outstanding military performance, their honor, bravery, and devotion, as soldiers they have ever been considered exemplary. Long since a regiment, the Black Watch originated in 1725, formed from a group of four companies of Scotch Highlanders for the purpose of preserving order in the area.

It is interesting that from the first the Black Watch was a distinctive group. The companies were composed of men of good family, who were eager to bear arms and to wear the Highland dress, both of

which practices had been forbidden by law since the Scotch uprising against the English in 1715. The name Black Watch originated partly from the dark hues of the Highland tartan of which their kilts were made. To this day the particular dark blue and green plaid is a favorite and bears the name of the regiment. Their bright scarlet jackets are the British red.

The British, quick to perceive the superior character of these independent Highland companies, added four more, forming them into a regiment. In 1739 the Black Watch became a part of the regular British Army.

From the beginning the Black Watch was noted for its shining example of loyalty, courage, and endurance. It has maintained that reputation throughout its brilliant history. A mere listing of the battle honors won by this regiment fills a closely printed page. They date from 1759, "Guadaloupe," and during World War I were so numerous that a selection had to be made to emblazon them on the King's or Regimental Colors. Among them is one for "North America," for their achievements during the French and Indian Wars.

The Black Watch fought with distinction in numerous campaigns in India, in the Indies, in France against Napoleon—notably at Waterloo—and in the Crimea. They fought in South Africa before and in the 1850's, and again in the Boer War in 1899–1902. They gained 69 battle honors in World War I. During World War II the itinerary of the 6th Battalion alone starts at Perth and, covering various parts of England, includes Dunkirk—the very name is now synonymous with heroism—France, Belgium, and back to the Isle of Wight, to defend England, then on to north Africa, Egypt, Italy, and Greece.

The 6th Battalion was but one of those of the Black Watch, which took part in almost every theater and nearly every principal campaign of World War II. Besides the early days in Belgium and France, there were Somaliland, Crete, the defense of Tobruk, in the Middle East, Gibraltar, the conquest of north Africa from El Alamein to Tripoli, the capture of Sicily and the Italian campaigns, back to the fierce struggle at Normandy, the crossing of the Rhine and on to the German capitulation. In the Far East, Burma and Malaya are some of the milestones passed by units of the Black Watch in the long trek to victory over all the King's enemies.

The fine reputation of the Black Watch has been enhanced in every war that the British have fought since 1725. They have earned the highest praise for unstinted good work, for gallantry. Their untarnished record of high achievement has been attributed to the continuous spirit of trust and good fellowship which has united all ranks of the regiment since its earliest days. In an officer's "History of the Black Watch" he comments that history shows that it was this spirit which inspired the great victories and sustained the heroes and filled the hearts of those who gave their lives in the service of their King, their country, and their regiment.

Unconstitutional Usurpation of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD the text of a speech made by my good friend and our colleague, the gentleman from California, JAMES UTT. I believe every Member of Congress should make it a point to seriously study Mr. UTT's views in connection with his liberty amendment which would return the power of government to the people and reinstitute the constitutional limited government envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Briefly, the liberty amendment would, first, take Federal Government out of all activities except those specified in the Constitution; second, keep the Government from reentering such activity through later agreements, laws, edicts, or treaties; third, liquidate Government-in-business assets, properties, and facilities within 3 years; and fourth, at the end of 3 years repeal Federal personal income taxes.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that the basic struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. Which of these two philosophies will prevail will determine if your children will live in a free country with unlimited opportunities for all, or as subjects in a federally controlled dictatorship. For added emphasis to the very fine talk by Congressman UTT, I would like to emphasize some major points he has made.

We ought to recall George Washington's warning that, if government "is not controlled, it will destroy you."

The Federal doctrine of preempting authority over a field—that is, subversive activities—usurps State prerogatives. The doctrine can carry into every field of activity until there is no State. UTT recalled a plan some years ago which envisioned the demise of States into nine territories, each run by three bureaucrats.

Bureaucracy is the invisible government which really governs the country. There are more administrative laws on the books than there are statutory laws passed by Congress.

These bureaus control 20 percent of America's industrial capacity, compete on a tax-free basis, and cost taxpayers $20 billion a year in subsidies.

After defining the understood restrictions on Federal Government written into the 9th and 10th amendments—personal and States' rights—Mr. UTT pinpointed events which inspired the liberty amendment:

Attorney General Francis Biddle—1941–1945 under F.D.R.—justified Justice Department intervention in a Chicago stockholders' fight by claiming "the Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution."

UTT said the first part of the liberty amendment was to return to the principle that the Government can do only what is provided by the Constitution.

The second and third parts are to protect against time and inaction eroding the bill's intent.

The fourth part was written in 1957 when it was shown that the reduction in Government spending would offset the $45 billion personal income tax revenue.

Congressman UTT's speech in full follows:

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES B. UTT, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great privilege and honor to be invited to address this meeting. Especially am I honored by the very kind invitation of my distinguished colleague and outstanding citizen of your great State, the Honorable Elmer Hoffman, for whom I have a high regard and deep affection.

The subject matter of my talk is somewhat controversial, and I know there are many here today who disagree with my position. To them may I say that I respect the sincerity of their convictions and hope that I may be able to shed some convincing light upon a grossly misunderstood subject. I only ask that the same respect for my sincerity be granted to me in return.

I have never demanded that people conform to my political philosophy, but, having been born an American, and expecting to die as an American, and in between the dignity of birth and the glory of death, I intend to live my life as an American. I have always adhered to the moral absolute that if something is right it is right, though all men think that it is wrong, and if something is wrong it is wrong, though all men believe it to be right.

Your most distinguished citizen, Abraham Lincoln, expressed that moral absolute in this manner: "If I am right, history will vindicate me, and if I am wrong, all of the angels in Heaven cannot justify me." And surely Abraham Lincoln had far more difficult decisions to make than any of us will ever be called upon to decide. But in these days of rapid communication, mass media, economic and political pressure groups, many of these decisions are difficult.

A hundred years ago, a great Civil War was being fought to test whether a nation conceived in liberty could long endure. Today, we are engaged in another civil war testing the same premise. It is not a hot war, but a cold war, which can be just as deadly. During that hundred years, the poles of the compass have swung in a 180° arc. At that time it was a question of whether or not the sovereignty of a State or a group of States transcended the sovereignty of the Union. That conflict was resolved in favor of the Union. The conflict is whether or not the sovereignty of the Union transcends the sovereignty of the States which created the Union. That conflict has yet to be resolved.

Our Founding Fathers were well aware that man's eternal enemy was government, whether that government was a dictatorship, a benevolent monarchy, a democracy, or a republic. Usurpation of power is the natural trend of every government. George Washington expressed it in these words: "Government is like a fire, which, if it is properly controlled, will light your homes and cook your food and run your factories, but if it is not controlled, it will destroy you."

Based on this concept, the Government of the United States was founded upon a Constitution of delegated powers with checks and balances of the executive, the legislative,

and the judicial. Beyond these three checks and balances against usurpation of power, the rights of the sovereign States were well defined in the 10th amendment, which reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There were no inherent powers derived from the Constitution to the Federal Government. The powers were specific, enumerated, and limited. Government is not wisdom, it is not benevolent, it is plain brute force.

Washington, in his farewell address, said: "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way in which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use itself can at any time yield."

The Federal Government has ignored many of the provisions of the Constitution, while the sovereign States have condoned this usurpation of power, not realizing that these invasions of State sovereignty would lead to the ultimate subjugation of the States. On this I will have more to say later. Suffice for the moment to say that the liberty amendment is the vehicle which will return to the States their rightful possession of power.

There is only one basic issue, national and international, and that is socialism versus capitalism. They are incompatible, they cannot coexist, and only one system can or will survive the current conflict.

The graduated income tax, as provided in the 16th amendment, is the most deadly weapon in the arsenal of socialism. Its genesis rests firmly in the philosophy of Marx and Engels, two men dedicated to the destruction of capitalism. Capitalism is the American way of life, and let's quit apologizing for it. Why should we have a guilt complex over the system which in a century and a half brought this Nation from a weak and unimpressive beginning to the highest plateau of economic production, military strength, and the highest standard of living known to man?

America as a nation seems to have something of a guilt complex over our success, and feels that we are obligated to scatter our substance all over the world. This theory flies in the face of the Parable of the Talents, and violates the admonition that we should not cast our pearls before swine, "lest they turn again and rend you."

I should like to address a few remarks to the doctrine of preemption. This important subject attains its highest magnitude as it relates to the several States, and my remarks are especially directed to State legislators who may be present.

It is a doctrine that has too long been endured by the States. It reached its height in an opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Steve Nelson. Nelson had been convicted under the anti-Communist laws of the State of Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court held that the antisubversive laws of Pennsylvania or any other State had been nullified by the passage of the Smith Act, a Federal law in the field of antisubversive activities. There was no question as to the fact of Nelson's guilt, but the Supreme Court opinion held that no one could be prosecuted under State antisubversion laws, as Congress had preempted the field of antisubversion.

California had convicted the now-famous "Hollywood ten" for violation of our State antisyndicalism laws which had been on our State statute books for more than half a century. These 10 convicted Communists were released because of the Supreme Court decision.

In the Smith Act, there was not one paragraph, not one line, not one word, to indicate that Congress intended to preempt the field of antisubversion to the exclusion of the States. The Supreme Court decision, therefore, was a usurpation of legislative power by the judicial branch of our Government, and should not be tolerated.

For 5 years, Congress has been attempting to pass legislation to the effect that, if any Federal law did not specifically state that it was the intent of Congress to preempt any field of legislation, that field was not preempted. The Senate has refused to go along with the House on two separate occasions. I bring this to your attention to show to you what can and may happen in any other field of State legislation, especially in the field of taxation, which surely is one of the attributes of State sovereignty.

The insatiable demand for Federal revenue, not only to run the constitutional governmental processes, but to make grants to the States so that the Federal Government can extend its control over the States, may very well cause the Supreme Court to rule that Congress has preempted the field of income taxes, next the gift tax, next the estate or inheritance tax, and even sales and excise taxes. This would deprive the States of most of their sources of revenue to provide the necessary State government, the State school systems, and other services. The States will then have to turn to Uncle Sam for financial assistance to administer State programs in accordance with Federal standards.

Federal grants to the States are like a blood transfusion in which you draw the blood from the right arm and transfuse it into the left arm, losing at least 15 percent in the transfer.

Examples of this Federal control are evident on every hand. The State of California could administer its welfare programs for half of the sum which it is now spending if our legislature were free to set up its own standards, but they have been warned by Federal administrators that if they do not conform to Federal standards, they can get no more money from the Federal Government.

Just last week, the U.S. Supreme Court rendered a far-reaching decision requiring that State criminal proceedings conform to Federal standards, and opening up purely State matters to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

May I direct your attention to the fact that the Federal Government has strayed from constitutional provisions and prohibitions of power in many other fields. Article I, section 8, paragraph 17 of the Constitution reads as follows:

"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings;"

The Federal Government has no right to acquire land in any State without the consent of the legislature of that State, and even then it must be acquired by purchase. The price is not important. As an example, the Federal Government acquired the San Francisco Presidio with the consent of our legislature for the sum of $1. This property happens to be worth over $300 million today, but at least the acquisition fell within the constitutional provisions.

It was not until the admission of the State of Ohio that the Federal Government began to withhold the land which the Government owned when the State was a Territory. In California, the Federal Government has withheld and acquired nearly half of our land area—in Nevada, nearly 90 percent. The Federal Government not only withheld the land, it withheld the natural resources on the land, and now even claims the rain and snow that falls on those lands.

The Federal Government now owns and controls 20 percent of our industrial capacity, engaging in business activities not permitted to it by the Constitution. I have here a fact sheet published by Willis E. Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Fact sheet No. 1 lists 700 corporate activities, competing with private industry on a tax-free basis, which cost the American taxpayers $20 billion a year in subsidies.

The liberty amendment provides that these corporations shall be sold to private industry and further provides that natural resources which rightfully belong to the States or to various State compacts shall be returned to the States or to the compacting States.

Some of these corporations have been returned to private industry. The synthetic rubber industry, formerly owned as a monopoly by the Government, has been sold to private industry. While owned as a Federal Government monopoly, this business was losing money, but private industry has turned it into a profitable venture, producing better rubber, and contributing millions of dollars in taxes. While the synthetic rubber program was sold at a profit, others are a total loss. Some of them will bring from 5 to 50 cents on the dollar, but, even if they were given away, the taxpayer would save money.

Some of these corporations we don't have to worry about any more. For instance, the Cuban nickel company Grand Design which cost the American taxpayers $100 million plus an annual loss, was taken over by Castro. Little did he know that it was bankrupting the American taxpayer and that it will probably bankrupt him.

The Abaca production and sales program will be phased out this year at a total loss. This was our great experiment in growing hemp in Latin America, and was a dismal failure. It wasn't very good hemp, and could not be sold on the open market. But they did sell it, and guess who bought it? We did. Yes, one agency bought it from another agency—the strategic stockpile bought it, and we had to build a warehouse to put the stuff in while it rotted.

Incidentally, the Federal Government has a strategic stockpile which cost us $8 billion to say nothing of the annual rental for storage. We have more than 20 years' supply of tungsten, and, believe it or not, we are still buying it.

Your tax dollars built the Rama road through the jungles of Nicaragua. It originally cost $12 million. It is interesting to note that it starts nowhere and ends nowhere. So, after it was built, Congress appropriated $3 million to survey the road. It would seem to me that it should have been surveyed first. When they surveyed the road, they found that the jungle had overgrown it, and so they are building it over again, at a cost of $24 million this time around.

The Texas City tin smelter has been sold to private industry, and has gone from the red into the black.

Your tax dollars helped to give a new look to the Eskimo igloo. It started out as a lending program for igloos, but it didn't work out very well, so it was turned into the Alaska housing project, which was just as bad. Then they tied it in with seven other lending programs into one great liquidation

program of about $2½ billion; $1½ billion has been lost with no recovery possible. Of the other billion dollars, about 70 percent has been recovered, and the balance is now being written off.

The Alaskan Railroad is another pet Federal project. Even tax and interest free, it is losing money, and should be sold or given to the State of Alaska, who probably won't take it on a bet. This railroad does have one distinction, however, it is the only railroad in the world that had a steamheated tunnel, with a small settlement inside to run it. The only trouble was, when the train came along, they had to open the doors, and everything got cold again. This was easily resolved. They routed the railroad around the tunnel. I could go on for hours regaling you with these stupid, costly projects, but I must hasten on.

The easy availability of revenue from the graduated income tax feeds the fires of bureaucracy, and supports foolish and unnecessary projects. Bureaucracy is the invisible government which really governs the country. There are more administrative laws on the books than there are statutory laws passed by the Congress. The bureaucrats are men you have never seen. They govern without the consent of the people, and you cannot recall them from office.

You have heard of the "tree that grew in Brooklyn." I want to tell you about the tree that grows in Washington. The seed is planted by a new program calling for a very small expenditure, and then proceeds to proliferate like a cottonwood tree. May I cite you an example or two?

In 1948 there was an appropriation for the National Institutes of Health of $3,776,311. This has now grown to $166 million. They have so much money that they are at a loss as to how and where to spend it, so here are a few of the activities of the National Institutes of Health:

"Empirical tests of a theory of interpersonal behavior, $17,250.

"Juvenile delinquency in Japanese-American population, $50,180."

That's an insult to the Japanese-American people, as that is one group in which I have never been able to find juvenile delinquency.

"A stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain, $9,775.

"Role of behavior of frontal monkeys, $15,998."

I could suggest a fertile field for that one.

"The establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony, $13,816.

"Initiation and support of a colony of baboons, $61,985."

These are just a few of the examples of waste and the duplication of what is now being carried on by private research.

I received a bulletin from the Department of Agriculture which was most enlightening. It told me that if I dropped a ripe tomato it would bruise more easily than a coconut, and that if I dropped it twice it would be very badly bruised. That was a real production in genius.

In a bill just passed by the Senate, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was made official. It was pictured as a small Bureau with a moderate budget. Last year it started with $28,000 and 15 employees. This year, it jumped to $1,100,000 with 95 employees, and next year it is requesting $2,462,000 with 218 employees. If you project that for 10 years, the cost will exceed $24 million annually with over 2,000 employees.

Here is the ultimate in bureaucracy: There used to be a room in one of the Federal buildings in Washington which had this legend stenciled on the door: "4156—General Services Administration, region 3; Public Building Service, Building Improvement Division, utility room, custodial." It was a broomcloset.

When Richard Nixon was Vice President of the United States and considered by many not to be the most popular man in the world, he was assigned two Secret Service men. Now we have what is regarded as a very popular Vice President, but two Secret Service men are not enough to guard him. He now has 18 and is asking for 36 for the coming year, at a total cost of about $300,000.

Without debating the pros and cons of the Peace Corps, I think you should know that, without the knowledge or consent of Congress, we now have an International Secretariat for the Peace Corps at a cost of $150,000 a year. Congress did not appropriate the money. It was simply given to the Peace Corps by the State Department, which is always complaining about a shortage of appropriations.

You will recall that I said there were no inherent powers derived from the Constitution. For 150 years this was the accepted understanding by everyone, and it was not until the Justice Department intervened in a stockholders' fight in Chicago, and threw Sewell Avery, long-time president of Montgomery Ward, bodily out of his office, that the concept changed. At that time, the action was justified by Attorney General Francis Biddle when he said that Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution. This was one of the most outstanding pronouncements ever made, and had the effect of reversing the idea that the Federal Government was a government of limited and specific delegations of power.

Fortunately, when President Truman, relying on this statement, attempted to take over the steel mills, under the guise of "implied or inherent powers" as delineated by Attorney General Biddle, he received a stinging rebuke by Judge Pine who rendered the opinion in the case, stating that there were no implied or inherent powers derived from the Constitution. Still the Federal Government persists in operating on supposed inherent powers. It was the action and statement of Attorney General Biddle that started the liberty amendment.

The liberty amendment will not add to, nor substract from, the powers delegated under the Constitution, but has for its purpose the restoration of government to its original, fundamental and basic purposes. The liberty amendment is in four sections.

"Section 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution." Now this language is very clear is section 1. It prohibits that which had been implied for prohibition. When Mr. Biddle said that the Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it, he reversed the intent and purpose of the 9th and 10th amendments. The ninth amendment says that the enumeration of certain rights in the Constitution does not deny nor disparage others retained by the people. The 10th amendment is a little more explicit, but it deals with powers reserved to the States and to the people. Attorney General Biddle reversed this in his viewpoint. Now, we have the problem of knowing that law is, as Aaron Burr said, "whatever is boldly asserted and plausibly maintained." Law is the way it is enforced. And this is what we are living under. If we don't like it, there are three things we can do about it. We can either live with it, or violate it, or change it. And if we want to restore the Constitution, we are going to have to change and alter the interpretations and get it back to a fundamental base. And the liberty amendment's first section does exactly this, because, if you you read it again, the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise, except as specified in the Constitution. These are clear, definitive terms, and the last six words, "except as specified in the Constitution," reconfirm every delegation of power and authority contained in the Constitution, but it has the capacity to retrieve all that has been usurped. And, as Washington said, it is this usurpation of power that is our danger.

Now, to defend this constitutional arrangement of this first section for the same erosion that has happened to other parts of the Constitution, we have added section 2. Section 2 says the Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment. In other words, it is protected from any group of people, or combination of groups, foreign or domestic, or both, that might at any time, by edict, invade this constitutional provision and alter it. This is a simple protective device, but it works.

Section 3 describes the time limit for the liquidation and transfer of these properties to the States and local jurisdiction, and to private enterprise where it is deemed best. Section 3 says that the activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purpose of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated, and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

That was all of the language of the liberty amendment for a long while. It wasn't until 1957, when we had documented the fact of the scope of these invasions upon our private enterprise system, and could clearly identify the potential savings under the terms of these first three sections, that we even talked about the taxation problem. We recognized the truism that, if you cut a dollar off the spending, you cut the dollar off the need for taxation, and when you cut enough off the spending proclivities of the Federal Government, you have cut all of the need off for this particular tax which was applied in 1913. We proved by 1957 that the potential savings under the terms of the first three sections of the liberty amendment were adequate to offset the loss of revenue that would result from the repeal of the 16th amendment.

On June 10, 1957, the language of the fourth section was added to the liberty amendment. It provides: "Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

Taxing and spending are so interlocked that they cannot be separated. The more you tax the more you spend, or the more you spend the more you tax. That is a truism.

Contrary to the popular concept, the repeal of the 16th amendment does not repeal the tax on corporations. The corporation tax is not an income tax but is an excise tax which was passed in 1909, and held constitutional prior to the adoption of the 16th amendment. The repeal of the 16th amendment simply repeals the personal graduated income tax and the graduated gift and estate tax. This would mean that $45 billion now collected from this source would be retained by the people, increasing purchasing power, and eliminating many controls burdened upon the individual.

The question uppermost in your mind is, How can the Federal Government function with the loss of this $45 billion?

Disposal of the assets which I consider to be held by the Federal Government in violation of the Constitution would produce from $60 to $70 billion, which would reduce the national debt by that amount, and result in an annual interest saving of nearly $2.5 billion.

There would be an annual saving of more than $20 billion now being paid out in subsidies to maintain the various unconstitutional Federal activities.

There would be an annual saving of $5 billion in the Federal payroll when the persons employed by the Government corporations are transferred to private industry.

There would be an additional $8 to $10 billion annual saving by the elimination of goods, services, and facilities now required to support this payroll.

There would be a $2 billion saving by eliminating foreign economic grants and credits. There would be at least $4 billion additional revenue generated from the sale of 20 percent of our industrial capacity to private enterprise.

There would be an additional $5 billion revenue generated by extending the corporation excise tax to unincorporated businesses to place them on an equal competitive basis.

These savings, plus the additional revenues generated, are equal to a total of $46½ billion annually, or a complete offset for the elimination of the personal income tax.

For years, my opponents at election time have charged me with wanting to sell the U.S. Post Office Department, shipyards, and even the Defense Department, because I introduced and support the liberty amendment. Now let's look at the facts. The liberty amendment in the first section states: "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution." What are these exceptions? Article I of the Constitution provides among other things, for the Congress to establish post offices and post roads, to coin money, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to acquire land from the States for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. But my opponents have never taken the trouble to examine the Constitution.

The question has been raised from time to time as to the status of our national parks under the liberty amendment. For example, Yosemite is a national park in California. This park was acquired by the Federal Government without constitutional authority, as the Government did not have the consent of our State legislature, nor did they purchase it. Under the liberty amendment, the Federal Government would have to make arrangements either to relinquish this park to the State of California, who could, if they wished, sell it back to the Federal Government for $1, and grant the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction. On the other hand, it can become a State park, and I can say to you that there is not a State park in California that is not operated more cheaply and efficiently for the benefit of all people than any national park. So you see, there are two alternatives.

I have been questioned about the disposition of the dams and hydroelectric facilities owned by the Federal Government. Their status would be simplified, and most of them are, or should be, self-liquidating. The impounded water belongs to the States, and the Federal Government would own the dams as trustee in perpetuity for the benefit of the people of the State or the compacting States. For example, Hoover Dam would be held in trust for the seven compacting States by the Federal Government and the financial obligation would be paid off in the same manner in which it is now being liquidated.

When it became apparent that the people in the States were looking upon the liberty amendment with favor as a vehicle to recapture their sovereign rights, the U.S. Senate caused to be printed and widely distributed what is known as Senate Document No. 5. This document has little, if any, authenticity. It is impossible to find out who prepared it, and it has been thoroughly debunked. The printing was authorized by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The document does not address itself to the liberty amendment, but to some other fantastic subject matter. It is a scare-head document to frighten the people as to the dire results of limiting the graduated income tax. The document boldly states that the liberty amendment would repeal the corporation taxes, which of course, it would not. The front page of the document boldly states that the subject matter deals with the proposals to repeal the 16th amendment, and then it proceeds for 26 pages to a subject matter not closely related to the liberty amendment, and purports to warn the people that our defense posture would be ruined for lack of money to support it. On page 5 the heading is "Proposals for a Constitutional Limitation of Federal Taxing Powers." The document then states that the elimination of Federal income, estate and gift taxes would cost the Federal Government $6.5 billion. Apparently those who drafted this document are unaware of the fact that corporation taxes are in the form of excise taxes, because they included the tax revenue from corporations in this figure. They then proceed to discuss various proposals for limiting rates of income taxes. All of their computations include corporation tax revenue.

While it is impossible to get important Senate documents that are out of print, such as Edward Hunter's testimony on Communist psychological warfare, there was no hesitation on the part of the Senate to reprint 50,000 copies of Senate Document No. 5 and get them into the hands of the legislators of the 50 States. U.S. News & World Report played up the Senate document in one of its issues 2 years ago, and when I took them to task for the falseness of this document, their simple reply was, "We have a right to rely on a Senate document."

I am happy to report that some Members of the Senate have become alarmed over the rapid intrusion of the Federal Government into the private sector of industry, and on March 14 of this year Senate bill 1093 was introduced by Senator BENNETT, Republican, of Utah; Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas; Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota; Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia; Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware; Senator THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina; Senator TOWER, Republican, of Texas; Senator MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, and Senator DIRKSEN, your own Senator from Illinois.

The title of this bill is "a bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes." That is the greatest breakthrough we have had for the liberty amendment to date.

The liberty amendment is properly sponsored by the National Committee for Economic Freedom. You cannot have human freedom without economic freedom. They are one and inseparable, and all of us who believe in human freedom must preserve economic freedom.

Several years ago it was proposed that the States should be eliminated. There was a map designed by a former Secretary of the Interior based on the idea that State governments will cease to exist, as a matter of economy, and that, by having them cease to exist, Government would be transferred to regional authorities—nine of them—with three appointed administrators in each of them to govern all of the affairs within the regional authority. That would mean that 27 men appointed by the President would constitute our entire governing body. That program was temporily put aside, but it still simmers on the back burner, and the Department of the Interior is still rapidly increasing its vast domain.

If the liberty amendment is not adopted, the various States will cease to be sovereign. The counties and cities within the States will lose their sovereignty, and the State legislatures will become mere errand boys for a vast and monolithic Federal Government. Action must be taken positively and promptly to put the Federal Government in its constitutional place and thus preserve a Union of 50 sovereign States.

For this reason, I have again introduced House Joint Resolution 23, known as the liberty amendment to the Constitution, with a firm conviction that he who is governed best is governed least. In order to attain this amendment, all good Americans should give it active support by urging their State legislature to adopt a resolution in support of the liberty amendment.

Among the Tax Reform Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the battle of words over the President's tax proposals continues to mount. Public hearings have been concluded by the Ways and Means Committee and the controversy now lies entirely in the laps of our colleagues who will struggle to produce some form of a tax bill.

The greatest shock the public experienced once the full meaning of the President's proposals became clear was the realization of the effect on charitable contributions that the proposed tax changes would have.

The Chicago Heights Star, of Chicago Heights, Ill., in its issue of Sunday, March 24, vigorously discusses this element of tax "reform." In view of the continued interest of Members in this aspect of the administration proposals, I place the editorial into the RECORD as a valuable addition to scrutiny and discussion of the 1963 tax issue:

AMONG THE TAX REFORM VICTIMS

Not the least concerned over President Kennedy's proposal that income tax deductions for charitable contributions be reduced are south suburban residents who periodically address themselves to working on fund drives and the like.

The penalty would fall hard over a wide area, ranging from Community Chest activities, hospital drives, annual church pledge canvasses, church building fund campaigns, and no end of other worthwhile enterprises.

In the unconvincing name of reform, the President would allow tax deductions only on contributions exceeding five per cent of gross income. For many donors, it would be almost essential to reduce their gifts in order to compensate for loss of the full deduction. The alternative would be downward revision of their standard of living, a most difficult and extraordinary volunteer effort.

Countless taxpayers would also turn their sights immediately to the standard deduction table. This permits a fixed deduction for charitable gifts, even if no gift whatever is forthcoming. Any contention

that removal of a significant incentive for giving generously is certain to result from the foregoing cannot be supported.

Who, then, would make up the deficits in charity and health fund drives? The Government, which is depending on the reforms to offset revenue lost through tax deductions? This would place the Federal Treasury back where it started, but with additional bureaucracy.

The more you study the administration's approach to the income tax problem, the less sense it makes.

Reforms That Don't Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a generous description of foreign aid and related programs is often given in statements of the benevolence and charity involved in our operations. Certainly, benevolence and charity are virtues which most Americans practice.

However, our foreign aid programs produce the opposite results that charity and Christian principles would expect to receive, especially when applied to impractical solutions to deep-rooted problems in various parts of the world.

The Chicago Tribune in a scholarly editorial Tuesday, March 26, discusses this aspect of the foreign aid program. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point.

REFORMS THAT DON'T HELP

In the hope of saving his throne and heading off communism, the shah of Iran has decreed, perhaps in panic, the same sort of misguided reforms which many U.S. officials are urging in Latin America.

The shah has forsaken the artistocrats, businessmen, and religious leaders, and has dissolved the parliament which they controlled. To win support among the peasants, he has decreed the redistribution of land which is now concentrated in the hands of a few families and the Mohammedan church. For the workers he has decreed a 20-percent share in the profits of private industry.

Reforms like these may win votes, for the time being, and may elicit more American aid. But, as many Cubans would gladly testify, they look better on paper than in practice.

J. L. Robertson, a member of the Federal Reserve Board, recently pinpointed the problem in relation to Latin America, where our theory, like the Shah's, is that agrarian reform will disarm the opposition.

"We often hear that land reform is vital in Latin America," Mr. Robertson said. But, he added, "the problem is not that of appeasing the deep hunger of the people for land, but rather to find men and women willing to pioneer and open up new areas.

"The Venezuelan experiment rudely shatters the fond American notion that you can make people more stable politically by taking them out of the slums and giving them good housing. To the dismay of the Government it has discovered that the hotbeds of communism in Caracas are not the miserable squatters' hovels that blight hillsides, but the striking high-rise apartments that the Government built to provide decent, low-cost housing for the squatters."

There is no denying, in Iran as in much of Latin America, that the peasants have been exploited. But suddenly giving them deeds to land is not going to provide them with the equipment, ability, and initiative to develop it. As for the share-the-profits scheme, what will the Shah do when the workers get tired of 20 percent and demand 30 percent, 50 percent, and then perhaps all of the profits? Where, then, will he find people willing to undertake new ventures? How safe will his throne be then?

We commend the Shah's willingness to jump, but we reserve judgment on whether he is jumping from the frying pan into the fire, or vice versa.

Worker Retraining by Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, rapid technological changes in industry and agriculture have contributed to our unemployment problem by resulting in the displacement of unskilled workers. Several States, as well as individual companies, have undertaken retraining programs to meet this problem and, during the last Congress, the Manpower Training and Development Act was passed to offer a nationwide program to upgrade worker skills.

Because of my great interest in these programs, I was pleased to read in the December 18 issue of the Wall Street Journal of the efforts of the Du Pont Co. to retrain and relocate displaced workers. Emphasizing the importance of new products in creating jobs, Du Pont has planned ahead "to locate plants for new products close to old plants where employment is expected to decline." Through a long-range program of on-the-job training, workers are able to shift easily to new jobs without losing a day of work.

Du Pont is demonstrating great initiative in its imaginative and practical retraining program. I hope that other companies will benefit from this example and, therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the Wall Street Journal article in the RECORD, as follows:

DU PONT EASES IT BY LOCATING NEW PLANTS NEAR THOSE IT CLOSES, PUSHING RETRAINING

(By John F. Lawrence)

DEEPWATER, N.J.—Sixty production workers at Du Pont Co.'s aging Chambers Works lost their jobs earlier this year when the company closed an outmoded chlorine making facility, but they didn't lose a day of work. Instead, they moved immediately into other parts of this rambling plant, some of them to make a new chemical used in polyurethane foam.

The smoothness of the switch these workers were able to make attests both to the importance of new products in creating jobs and to the effectiveness of Du Pont's efforts to avoid even temporary employment dislocations. It stems in large part from Du Pont's farsighted planning to locate plants for new products close to old plants where employment is expected to decline. It's also the result of extensive training and retraining programs conducted by Du Pont, enabling workers to shift easily to new products and to more highly skilled jobs.

Du Pont is by no means the only company making some effort to keep workers on the payrolls in the face of changing manpower requirements. "I am quite sure that responsible businesses, with careful planning, are making every reasonable effort to avoid contributing to technological unemployment," Lammot du Pont Copeland, Du Pont's president, said recently. But Du Pont's well tested practices are worth a closer look in light of recent industry and Government efforts to step up worker retraining programs, partly at public expense.

BRIGHT SIDE OVERLOOKED

Then, too, in the publicity given to layoffs tied to automation, the bright side of technological progress is overlooked. The new jobs created by new products aren't always in the same industry or the same region as the plant where jobs are disappearing. Here at Chambers Works, however, the balancing effect of these countertrends is dramatically clear.

In contrast to many old plants around the country, this World War I unit actually has expanded its payroll in the last decade. Employment in its many buildings, which stretch along the Delaware River across from Wilmington, currently totals 5,025 compared with 4,544 in 1950. This is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that production of the original product here, dyes, has declined considerably in that period and output of two others, camphor and chlorine, has been halted entirely. In these 3 areas some 370 jobs have been eliminated and there's been further loss as a result of more efficient new equipment.

"If it hadn't been for new products, employment at this plant probably wouldn't be one-fourth what it is today," says Bernard Hess, manager of Chambers Works.

The biggest saving factor recently has been a new group of chemicals called isocyanates, chief ingredients in the fast-growing foams being used for insulation, cushioning, and artificial sponges. Du Pont built its isocyanate unit here in 1954 on the rubble of an old building that until 1949 had turned out synthetic rubber. Isocyanate employment now has risen to 750.

Many companies have been forced to hire new employees to get the skills necessary to run a new facility at the same time they've been discharging men in older plants. Du Pont, however, as it was about to launch its isocyanate venture, set up a working model of the new plant. It selected 50 workers from various parts of the works, avoiding a drain on any one operation, to train for 3 months on the model. From this nucleus, Du Pont built its isocyanate staff.

As evidence of the lengths to which the company will go to make possible this switch between the old and the new, management at its Old Hickory, Tenn., rayon plant in 1959 made arrangements with a local board of education to provide the staff for evening courses in elementary arithmetic and other courses for 275 workers otherwise threatened with layoff. The rayon plant was soon to close and Du Pont wanted to move these workers into a nearby Dacron plant opening in 1960. The company found, to its surprise, it had to fill some gaps in basic education before the men could handle slightly more complex jobs in the new plant.

The Old Hickory site illustrates further how new products have been a key to stable employment at Du Pont. Closing the rayon plant, once the biggest operation there, could have hurt the community drastically. When the last rayon output ended last year the potential layoff could have amounted to 1,800. Instead, Du Pont had started mov-

ing people into the Dacron plant the previous year and finally had only 250 workers it couldn't place. Of these 200 were furloughed, 50 pensioned.

NEW PLANTS RISING

At one time the Old Hickory site contained only two operations—for rayon and cellophane. The latter plant still remains but in addition there's now a plant making an ingredient for Dacron, opened in 1960, two Dacron plants, opened in 1960 and 1961; a plant for making a new type of material out of Dacron, to open in 1964 and, what could become the most important plant of all at the site, a facility for making Du Pont's new manmade leather, also to open in 1964. The 2 plants under construction together will require about 450 employes.

Similarly, at Richmond, Va., Du Pont is closing the last of all its rayon facilities, but at the same time it's expanding a nylon plant located there in 1958 in anticipation of the rayon shutdown.

How much has this plant location policy cost Du Pont? There's no way to calculate the figure, but it's an inconsequential sum, at worst, say Du Pont officials. Explains one:

"Locating at an old site you get the benefit of the power facilities, the roads, and the general services already there for older units, but you may have to tear down before you can begin building, pushing up construction costs. You know there's a ready supply of employees, but on the other hand it might be cheaper to hire younger workers who might learn the new methods faster." Counting in such rewards as better employee morale and community relations, however, it's conceivable the company's policies produce some cost savings, however intangible.

Du Pont is battling yet another factor forcing men out of jobs—technological improvements within existing plants. Du Pont figures that over a recent 10-year period its overall employment increased 20 percent, but the number of skilled jobs climbed 125 percent. At Chambers Works, for example, automation has done away with most of the so-called helpers jobs—primarily men who moved things around the plant. But the more complicated equipment now requires more than 75 cents of wages to skilled repairmen for every $1 paid machine operators. In the 1930's, the ratio was only 30 cents to the dollar.

The company's main weapon against this trend is training and retraining to keep upgrading the abilities of its employees in step with the increasing skills required. Much of the training is handled on the job by experienced supervisors. At Chambers Works, there are only two full-time training advisers and their job is to teach other Du Pont men how to train less-skilled personnel. "We believe the only truly effective training is done on the line," says Frederick McEnany, superintendent of employee relations at Chambers Works.

To increase the mobility of its employees, Chambers Works makes a practice of moving its production workers into other jobs for several weeks at a time to broaden their training. Then, when a major shift is necessary, the men are better equipped to move.

WORKERS GO TO SCHOOL

There is, in some cases, more formal training. New or old employees at this plant who pass an aptitude test can enter an apprentice program to become highly skilled mechanics. They're required to go to a local vocational school 2 nights a week at their own expense—the fee is small—for 4 years while they get on-the-job training at full starting wages.

In the midst of its efforts to provide continuous employment, Du Pont has lost none of its zeal for cost cutting. A unit recently installed at Chambers Works allows six men a shift to turn out up to 300,000 pounds of one chemical every 24 hours. Older units require 12 men a shift to make half the amount.

But Du Pont figures such new processes are protecting many more jobs than they're eliminating. As the company's employee magazine, Better Living, observed recently, "If Du Pont made cellophane today by the same process which was used 35 years ago, the film would have to sell at $6 a pound, or about 10 times the current market price. The upshot is obvious. All the king's horses and all the king's men couldn't sell cellophane at $6 a pound today." And what of the men who made the product? Their jobs "would long since have evaporated." Thanks to careful company planning nothing of the sort has occurred.

American Small Business Favors President Kennedy's Tax-Cut Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Sterling Green, a reporter for the Associated Press, has recently written a news story in which he points out the benefits to small business which are contained in President Kennedy's tax program.

This very informative article points out that date from the Small Business Administration indicates that small businesses would save roughly $1.2 billion through the individual income business tax changes under the President's program. This would be roughly half of the proposed $2.6 billion reduction provided for corporations in the proposed program and would mean much to the small business segment of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the RECORD. The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS—TAXES

(By Sterling F. Green)

WASHINGTON.—Small businessmen would be among the most favored beneficiaries of President Kennedy's tax program, a study indicated today. Their cuts would total about $1.2 billion if the plan wins approval.

Small business spokesmen were among the gentler critics of the tax proposals in House Ways and Means Committee hearings on the tax bill last week. But, in language exactly like that of the big business witnesses, they:

1. Urged curtailed Federal spending to offset the revenue loss; and

2. Opposed many of the tax "reforms" by which Kennedy hopes to cushion the loss—including even some changes which were designed expressly to help small firms.

The small business witnesses, however, left the net impression that they want tax reduction badly and would be pleased to take the Kennedy plan—with several reservations.

"We are well aware that probably the greatest benefit flowing from the proposed reduction in rates would accrue to the small business community," said John A. Gosnell, general counsel of the National Small Business Association.

Although the Treasury has pointed out that the Kennedy tax package is stuffed with special bonbons for small businesses, the Department never has added up the tax savings which would accrue to the several types of firms affected—sole proprietors, partnerships and small corporations.

Data from the Small Business Administration indicates, however, that these groups would save roughly $1.2 billion under the individual income and business tax changes—a surprisingly large figure, since it is equivalent to nearly half the proposed $2.6 billion reduction in corporation rates.

The savings would go to these groups:

About $233 million, by Treasury estimate to the 475,000 corporations having earnings of $25,000 a year or less. This would result from cutting the corporation "normal" tax rate from 30 to 22 percent.

Another $200 million, as indicated by SBA figures, to firms classed by that agency as small businesses but having profits above $25,000. This would result from the drop in the total corporation tax rate from 52 percent to 47 percent.

About $800 million for unincorporated small business owners and partnerships. This is the estimated effect of the individual income tax cuts on smaller operators, excluding most professional groups and individuals engaged in farming, fishing, and forestry.

The immediate rate reduction of nearly 27 percent for the smallest corporations would compare favorably with the 9-percent reduction for larger firms which would not be fully effective until 1965.

Another provision specifically aimed at helping small firms would permit them to deduct, as a current business expense, their outlays on equipment for research and development.

SBA officials believe this would remove the squeeze on many small firms which must otherwise seek SBA loans for research and development machinery.

However, demands for spending cuts to accompany any tax reduction were echoed in the testimony of Gosnell and a witness for another small business group, George J. Burger of the National Federation of Independent Businesses.

Burger said 83 percent of his members who answered a questionnaire favored spending cuts that would match, dollar for dollar, any tax reduction.

Kennedy's proposal for a 5-percent floor on personal income tax deductions was described by Gosnell as having "heavy opposition" from members of the National Small Business Association.

A substantial number of NSBA members, he said, also oppose the administration's plan to "double up" the tax payments of corporations, even though the bill expressly exempts firms with less than $100,000 of tax to pay. The aim is to bring the tax payments of larger corporations to a current basis.

Florida Community Cited for Low Crime Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it sometimes seems that everywhere we turn these days statistics are hurled at us substantiating the prevalence of crime in the community. Particularly tempting, it seems, is the desire to uncover statistics in the areas of race relations. I should like to draw to the attention of

my colleagues a newspaper article in the Detroit, Mich., Courier, of March 2, 1963.

This article sets forth the fact that a south Dade County, Fla., community, comprising nearly 7,000 persons of the Negro race, has been singled out for a special award by the public safety department for maintaining an outstandingly low crime rate through the previous year.

Tapped for the honor was Richmond Heights, a quiet section of well-kept homes that would do justice to any racial group. There the per capita crime rate was only one-sixth of the average for other unincorporated areas of this county.

While the average number of crimes per 1,000 for the rest of Dade County's unincorporated area was 36, the figure for Richmond Heights was fewer than 6 per 1,000. During 1962 the community recorded no homicides, no robberies, and no rapes.

In presenting Richmond residents with a plaque commending them for their "outstanding accomplishments in making the community a respectable place to live," Metro Sheriff R. A. Buchanan stated:

Richmond Heights' low crime incidence indicates that a large number of individuals and organizations have devoted attention to the problem of crime prevention and community pride with a great degree of success.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I wish to place the complete news story of this inspiring Dade County record before my colleagues for their information and edification:

FLORIDA COMMUNITY CITED FOR LOW CRIME RATE

MIAMI, FLA.—A south Dade County Negro community of nearly 7,000 persons recently was singled out for a special award by the public safety department for maintaining an outstanding low crime rate throughout the previous year.

Tapped for the honor was Richmond Heights, a quiet section of well-kept homes that would do justice to any racial group. There the per capita crime rate was only one-sixth of the average for other unincorporated areas of this county which surrounds the fabulous Miami Beach.

At a gathering of civic leaders, Metro Sheriff T. A. Buchanan presented Richmond residents with a plaque commending them for their outstanding accomplishments in making the community a respectable place to live.

In a letter of commendation Buchanan stated, "Richmond Heights low crime incidence indicates that a large number of individuals and organizations have devoted attention to the problem of crime prevention and community pride with a great degree success.

"We of the law enforcement profession sincerely appreciate your excellent efforts and commend you. You have set an example for Dade County which warrants this recognition."

This phenomenon did not occur spontaneously. It was the result of concerted action growing out of a series of community meetings, an instrumental figure being newsman Jim Ried, a Richmond resident.

As a result, during 1962 the community recorded no homicides, no robberies, and no rapes. There were only 2 auto thefts, 5 grand larcenies, 20 burglaries, and 11 assaults.

While the average number of crimes per 1,000 for the rest of Dade County's unincorporated area was 36, the figure for Richmond Heights was fewer than 6 per 1,000.

The American People's Concern About Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the concern—indeed the alarm—of the American people about the continuing active Communist government in Cuba, and the imminent danger of the spread of the communistic plague in other parts of the Western Hemisphere is well evidenced in a resolution just adopted by the City Council of Trussville, Ala.

I want to call to the attention of my colleagues and to all who read the RECORD the sentiments which the Trussville City Council has unanimously voiced and, thus, I insert herewith in the RECORD that resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TRUSSVILLE, MARCH 26, 1963

Whereas the citizens of the city of Trussville, Ala., are gravely concerned about the welfare of this great Nation composed of 50 united States, embracing and furnishing the livelihood for 180 million people, we feel that with the threatening menace of communism supported actively, advocated and diligently pursued by the Soviet Union in an attempt to control and destroy utterly and completely the Christian concepts of the rest of the world, and feeling that the target is the soft underside of the continent of South America and its Latin speaking countries, and in this endeavor, using every conceivable deceitful and treacherous and malicious approach to accomplish their goal of worldwide communism;

Therefore, we, the mayor and council, unanimously supported by our citizens, request that action be taken by you, as the final authority in the governmental processes of the United States of America, as expediently as possible to forestall any further activity by this diabolical conspiracy, as follows:

1. Enact any strong reliable law that will prevent from this day forward the use by the United Nations of any moneys that are furnished by the U.S. Government (that are derived from a tax burdened people) for the use of feeding, or supplying or nurturing any group of people who have embraced the communist philosophy, so that they may use their good health and well-being to enslave by their sinister methods the very people who so willingly gave of their susbtance as a Christian act that they might live.

2. Use every means at your disposal to see that the Monroe Doctrine is applied in every instance pertaining to any moves or guise put forth by the Soviet Union or any of its satellite countries, Red China, or any political doctrine that might attempt to violate this act, as originally written and enforced since the time of its inception, and to guard against any maneuver that might through any act circumvent its intent.

3. Realizing the widespread publicity given to the activities of the Soviet agents and their fellow conspirators in Brazil at a time when this same government is attempting to hedge on previous debts to the United States and attempting to borrow additional moneys to boost their economy, while at the same time holding or permitting to be held anti-American meetings in their large cities, have the United States, on behalf of the American people, withdraw any economic support from this nation or any other nation embracing and continuing to promulgate the Communist philosophy.

And whereas, it is understood by the governmental departments—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—that we, the citizens of Trussville, are not complaining of the extra tax burden required by these expenditures, nevertheless, we do feel that these departments, being the custodians of these moneys, should endeavor to see that they are spent wisely in regard to any U.N. action or loans or grants to any country, either as a military, sanitary, health and welfare or a capital improvement, so as to bring the best dollar return to the United States and its citizens in regard to their well-being and their safety; if these conditions cannot be met, and if these moneys are spent to hasten the day in which this great country might be enslaved by this unholy communistic conspiracy, then we feel that the citizens of the United States should not be taxed so as to bear the burden of their own downfall; and

Therefore, we urge that all partisan politics cease to be played and every effort made to present a united effort by all elected and appointed officials to eradicate from this hemisphere the threats of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc nations.

Adopted this 26th day of March 1963.

JAMES W. BARR, *Mayor.*

Arab Refugees Problem Reassessed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph B. Schechtman as it appeared in the March 18, 1963, issue of Congress Bi-Weekly published by the American Jewish Congress:

ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM REASSESSED

(By Joseph B. Schechtman)

There is growing reason to believe that the Kennedy administration, perhaps emboldened by the successful outcome of its diplomacy in the Cuban crisis, intends also to press for some form of Arab-Israel settlement during the current year. High on the agenda is an effort to break through the Palestine Arab refugee deadlock. For both the State Department and the White House seem to be convinced that the start toward peace must be made with the question of the refugees. The administration sees in the refugee problem the major, if not the sole, cause of the implacable Arab hostility to Israel and is confident that the road to peace can only be cleared in the wake of its removal.

This approach, it appears, is to be made the basis for the expected American initiative in the Middle East. A notable role in the creation of the "rationale" for this concept was undoubtedly played by Dr. Don Peretz, whom influential molders of the

State Department's policies consider one of the best informed students of the Arab refugee situation. His book "Israel and Palestine Arabs" (Washington, D.C., 1958), published under the auspices of the authoritative Middle East Institute, has become a highly regarded document in top-level governmental circles. Dr. Peretz, as Roger Baldwin described him in the foreword to "Israel and Palestine Arabs," has been "one of the few American Jews to move freely" between Israel and the Arab States. He is, wrote Mr. Baldwin, possessed of "a single bias, which is basic to his whole treatment: it is that peace and the guarantee of its future * * * can be achieved only by Jewish-Arab cooperation, both within Israel and outside. * * *" Mr. Baldwin summed up: "Dr. Peretz is as balanced and fair as any man could be." It was this studiously cultivated "bias" for being "balanced and fair" to both sides in the Arab-Jewish dispute, which largely accounted for Dr. Peretz's stature among U.S. Middle East policymakers.

Intent on cultivating the objectivity of his 1958 study, Dr. Peretz has, in the words of the Middle East Institute, "refrained from imposing his answers upon the reader." He did, however, "make clear that it is his conviction that solution of the refugees' plight is the central problem of the Middle East peace." As Mr. Baldwin put it: "One gathers from Dr. Peretz that * * * the refugee problem is central to all others and that progress on it is progress toward peace."

It was with this basic notion that Dr. Perezt last year undertook, on a Rockefeller Foundation grant, a trip to the Middle East to study the latest conditions of the Arab refugee situation. Shortly before his departure I took part in an hour-long discussion with him over CBS radio, followed by another hour or so of heart-to-heart talk in a neighborhood cafeteria. It was a sharp yet friendly confrontation of widely differing approaches. A major point of difference between us was the place and role of the refugee issue in the overall context of the Arab-Israel conflict. Dr. Peretz opined that "first things first," that the settlement of the refugee issue was the key to peace, and that Israel—as the more "mature" (as he put it) partner to the conflict—must make the first constructive move, thus enabling the Arabs to reciprocate in some way without losing face.

We parted without having reconciled our views. I expressed the vague hope that his forthcoming study trip would lead to an at least partial revision of his approach. He neither encouraged nor eliminated such a contingency, and merely promised to "keep an open mind."

Now, after his return from the Middle East, Dr. Peretz has submitted a 10-page "Arab Refugee Report." It offers some significant revisions of his former stand, of which the most important is the revised approach to the interdependence between the refugee problem and the prospects for an Arab-Jewish peace settlement. In sharp contrast to his earlier view, Dr. Peretz firmly establishes the thesis that—

Today the refugee problem is not a cause, but a symptom of Arab hostility to Zionism. To reduce or even to remove the symptom, would not end the hostility. * * * The refugees are the central issue in the Palestine dilemma neither to extremist nor to moderate Arab nationalists.

"Continued identification of a refugee solution with a solution of the total Palestine issue," the report describes as illusory. However, in an obvious attempt to justify his former stand, Dr. Peretz argues that "10 or more years ago, before the new generation of Arab political leaders and Palestinian youth had come into its own, a rapproachment with Israel on the basis of a refugee settlement might have been possible; Arab unity was still quite a vague sentiment, and the deep-seated antagonism to Israel was because of refugee personal loss." But now, no arrangement, however "worthy and justified," would "remove Arab political opposition to a Jewish state in the Arab homeland."

Coming as it does from a student of the Arab refugee problem who for years was the main protagonist of the illusion he is now denouncing, this statement should be carefully weighed by those American officials who propose to focus on a solution of the refugee issue as the key to a peace settlement in the Middle East. They would then realize the utter futility of trying to concentrate on the symptom while bypassing the cause. A shortcut to peace via the isolated treatment of the refugee issue per se simply does not exist; there is no alternative to direct peace negotiations.

Another notable innovation in Dr. Peretz's report is his appraisal of the extent of the refugees' integration in the Arab host countries. During our radio debate he had argued that the backward economies of these countries offered scarce prospects for the overwhelming mass of unskilled Palestinian refugees to find gainful employment and to become self-supporting. The picture Dr. Peretz now paints is quite different. Though his report fails to mention the fact that, according to the latest UNRWA figures, 61 percent of the refugees now live out of camps, he stresses that for the minority still remaining in the camps existence is far from being dismal and hopeless:

Once the symbol of refugee degradation, the camps, in many instances, have developed into permanent quarters of the towns and cities onto which they were grafted. There are no longer tents in UNRWA camps.* * * The schools, social welfare stations, clinics, and feeding centers are often constructed according to the latest architectural models. Indeed, the Palestinians live far better than refugees in India, Pakistan, and Hong Kong.

In Syria and Lebanon, development of agriculture, industry and trade has facilitated the economic absorption of most employable refugees. * * * UNRWA relief received in these two countries is a necessity for only a few; for most it is a welcome supplement to low wages.

Thus in Syria and Lebanon, which contain some 250,000 former Palestinians, the refugees are no longer a problem, at least economically. Of the 600,000 refugees in Jordan, Dr. Peretz believes, "nearly half" could not be integrated "in the foreseeable future"—which means that the other half, some 300,000, could be. Only for the 250,000 refugees in the Egyptian-controlled Gaza strip are there no prospects of integration; these must be relocated or continue to receive relief to survive. It would, therefore, seem that the prospects of integration are not at an discouraging for more than one-half of the refugee mass.

Far-reaching changes have also occurred in the refugees' attitude toward integration. The older generation is still suffering from the "trauma" of their flight, which engendered deep bitterness and found its expression in absolute refusal to cooperate in transplanting their community to new soil * * * rejecting permanent housing, employment and all other assistance which would further its relocation. * * * Such negative forms of opposition still continue among many who fled 15 years ago. The younger generation is, according to Dr. Peretz, "no less bitter about its refugee status * * * and no less determined to regain its homeland, but its reactions are far less self-destructive".

The youth realize that only through strength can they attain their ultimate objective, and strength will be created through self-improvement, not self-destruction. Consequently, they are not only willing to accept, but eagerly search out opportunities for education, vocational training, and employment. Refugee youths realistically appraise the possibilities of an early return to Palestine, and see that that objective may take more than a lifetime. Thus, they seek normal lives now. They want to marry, raise children, and enter the mainstream of national life until the day of their, or their children's or their children's children's return.

To this young generation, who relegate the "day of return" to some indefinite future, belong over 400,000 Palestinians born outside of Palestine. "Thus," says Dr. Peretz, "nearly 40 percent of those classified as refugees have never been in their homeland; they, and those who were infants with little if any first recollection of Palestine, are more than half the refugee population. * * * Soon a whole new generation of Palestinians will have grown up in the Arab 'diaspora' where they will have acquired only second-hand knowledge of their homeland."

This being so, how is it that—again according to Dr. Peretz—both the old and the new generation, those who have become economically absorbed and those still not resettled, are equally "intense in their attachment to Palestine" and continue to cling to their refugee status? The explanation given in the report is twofold: (1) "[The refugees] are constantly reminded by their families, their UNRWA-UNESCO schools and by the most governments and populations that they are Palestinians"; and (2) the relief ration cards of UNRWA serve as "a token of continued identification as displaced Palestinians * * * in effect, the UNRWA ration card has become the identity card of the displaced Palestine Arab."

UNRWA thus appears as something of an overgrown umbilical cord, which is artifically keeping alive the refugees' vanishing identification with Palestine. It intensifies their feeling of apartness from their Arab kin in the host conntries and impedes rather than encourages their integration in these lands. As things now stand, UNRWA, a United Nations agency which has thus far spent well over $300 million, is actually defeating the purpose for which it had been established: to extend temporary philanthropic assistance to the displaced Palestinians with a view to gradually putting an end to their refugee existence. What the UNRWA leadership is now practicing and planning is just the opposite of this assignment.

In his 1962 report to the U.N. General Assembly, Commissioner General Dr. John Davis described relief as UNRWA's sole activity. Dr. Peretz, who investigated the situation at first hand, says bluntly that while "assistance is still essential for the majority of refugees in Gaza, for large numbers in Jordan, and for a few, mostly of the older generation, in Syria and Lebanon * * * to continue with primary emphasis on relief encourages perpetration of a refugee mentality and undermines the initiative of the younger generation eager to end the refugee status."

The principal cause of this paradoxical state of affairs, his report avows, is again twofold: (1) "the reluctance of the United States and the United Nations to face changing realities"; and (2) vested interests of the large UNRWA staff. As the report puts it:

The Agency employs thousands of former Palestine mandatory Arab officials, physicians, teachers, and clerks. The number of individuals in families who depend upon UNRWA for employment is approximately 50,000. They constitute a great political pressure group, especially in Jordan. No politician in any of the host countries dares to recommend abolition of their livelihood.

There are many more interesting and unrevealing items in Dr. Peretz's report. But

in its totality the report is inconclusive, self-contradictory, and at least as frustrating as it is enlightening. What largely vitiates its usefulness is the author's inveterate efforts to appear "dispassionate" and "balanced." This inexorably leads him to a proliferation of mental reservations. Almost every observation or argument is accompanied by one or more qualifications; and it is difficult indeed to discover what is the author's own ultimate position. Dr. Peretz, it would seem, is still holding fast to the same cult of "objectivity" which established his reputation in influential government circles. But objectivity, particularly in public matters, can be a dangerous course. As Dr. Albert Burke has noted: "I am concerned about objectivity in people. They are the people who hide from things around them. The greatest injustices I know have been created in the name of objectivity."

One looks in vain for any notion of "injustice" or "justice," of right and wrong, throughout Dr. Peretz's report. It contains repeated references to the Arabs' fierce determination to eliminate Israel—immediately by force, or at some later date by less drastic means. But there is no atempt to evaluate the justification and/or the practicability of such a policy, let alone to indicate what could and should be the reaction on the part of the United States and the United Nations. Dr. Peretz neither endorses nor refutes the "dire forecast," as he calls it, of continued Arab commitment "to redeem their homeland * * * regardless of how much economic assistance the refugees receive or of the success in attempts to integrate them." Nor does he even tentatively suggest any solution. He simply predicts that no Arab-Israel agreement "is in the cards."

Thus, with all due regard for its thoughtfulness, Dr. Peretz's "dispassionate" report is "balanced" to an extent which renders it sterile.

Taxation of Profit-Sharing Trusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention has been given the question of the taxation of profit-sharing trusts in the current hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee on the administration's proposed tax reforms. This technique of labor-management relations, a relatively new technique, is very important in the future development of industrial negotiations in this country. A noted and highly respected expert in the field of profit-sharing plans, Mr. William J. Howell, Jr., recently wrote an article for the magazine Iron Age giving an insight into the present operations of these plans and the prospects for them in the future. Because of the interest which has been stimulated by the Ways and Means hearings dealing with profit-sharing plans, I am placing the article of William Howell, as reprinted from the November 29, 1962, issue of the Iron Age, in the RECORD at this point:

SOARING LABOR COSTS SPUR SWING TO MORE PROFIT SHARING

(By William J. Howell, Jr.)

Early in 1960, Small Tube Products, Inc., a medium-size producer of brass and copper tube, came to the crossroads that faces more and more companies today.

The company's problem was elemental—survival in the face of intense, almost vicious price competition, both foreign and domestic.

In the words of Small Tube Products' president, E. A. Oliphant: "Our company faced the alternative of going bankrupt or finding some means of reducing cost to meet the competition."

Clearly, something more than patchwork cost-cutting was needed. Telling department heads to tighten budget belts was not enough.

The company, in finding a solution to its problem, joined the parade of companies turning to profit sharing.

REPORT PROGRESS

Here is a brief progress report stated by Mr. Oliphant:

"In the first 6 months this year, we are producing and shipping 65 percent more than we did prior to installation of our profit-sharing plan. And we are doing this with the the same number of people in the plant.

"Profit sharing, in the first 6 months this year, will amount to approximately 30 percent of each employee's basic earnings. Since we eliminated an individual incentive plan equal to an average 20 percent of base rates, the net effect was a 10 percent hike in pay."

It is obvious that the Small Tube Products' profit-sharing plan has employee backing as well as management endorsement. And this element, worker backing, is the key to fresh impetus in industry toward profit-sharing plans.

In 1956, some 2,000 new profit-sharing plans were installed in U.S. industry. Last year, more than 4,000 new plans were put into operation.

And ground was broken on a new level of industry last year when the American Motors Corp. profit-sharing plan was set up. The full report of the first year of this plan was recently announced by the company. Here's the record:

Some 27,000 American Motors Corp. workers shared a $9.8 million "progress sharing" pie. The plan was worth about $361 per worker. This comes to 18.5 cents per hour per worker.

Progress sharing at American Motors Corp. is not one way. Management likes the plan and freely credits it with recent company gains. These gains include subsequent negotiated improvements in local work rules and in body plant production standards.

Not all profit-sharing plans are as successful as the ones at Small Tube Products and American Motors Corp. Plans have been dropped at a number of companies. But the direction of the big swing to profit-sharing plans is clear. And unions are beginning to get squarely behind the push to profit sharing.

In fact, management can no longer afford to reflect idly whether profit sharing may be the best way to stimulate and to share the gains of increased productivity.

The very real possibility exists that in the 1960's unions will grab the profit-sharing ball from management. This has precedence: Just as unilaterally determined pension plans gave way to pension negotiations and union demands in the 1940's.

Management now must ask themselves if they are informed and ready to take the initiative, or to counter promptly, profit-sharing demands.

UNION INTEREST

What's the evidence that points to stepped-up union interest and activity in profit sharing?

First, there has been a decided change in attitudes of some union leaders toward profit sharing.

In 1938, John L. Lewis told a Senate investigating committee that "labor can't eat or work on the hope of participating in a profit-sharing plan."

In 1940, Philip Murray was saying, "conceding the very best of intentions, the odds are all against the success of any profit-sharing scheme." At that time there existed only a few hundred profit-sharing plans. Now, there are more than 50,000 in force.

As late as 1960, a spokesman for the United Steelworkers of America said that hell would freeze over before they would get enthusiastic over profit sharing.

But in 1961, Walter Reuther referred to the American Motors-United Auto Workers agreement as, "the most significant settlement since the beginning of collective bargaining."

TEAMSTERS, TOO

And the head of a big Teamsters local in the Midwest who deals with several profit-sharing companies, said, "I wish we had profit sharing in every one of our contracts. Our employees make more, the companies like it, and by making our members more conscientious and productive employees, it increases their bargaining power."

Another sign pointing to union acceptance of profit sharing is the fact that while there has been some bargaining out of profit-sharing plans, there have been far more cases of successful plans.

These latter plans have, in most cases, been unilaterally designed by management. But they are often made a part of the company-union agreement, and enthusiastically accepted by organized workers.

One example of such profit-sharing companies in metalworking is the Midwest Metals Corp. of Davenport, Iowa (plan since 1953). Two results here have been low turnover and excellent relations with the unions.

Another is the Rolled Steel Corp., of Skokie, Ill. Top management of Rolled Steel claims you can buy from profit-sharing employees "higher quality time." This means more productivity.

And Joslyn Manufacturing and Supply Co. extended its profit-sharing plan (begun in 1918) to USWA workers in an Indiana primary steelmaking acquisition.

BALANCE EFFECTS

Still another current attraction of unions to profit sharing: It permits getting top wages from the most profitable companies in an industry without causing unemployment in less profitable companies. The unemployment results when "standard" wages are raised in an industry and not all companies can equally meet the added burden.

Union temptation to "bleed" the most profitable companies has a built-in self-correction. This is the inevitable disaffection of union membership in marginal companies, despite better employment stability of below-peak wages.

There are plenty of examples of unions resorting to the "ability to pay" principle in non-profit-sharing situations. It would be a mistake not to expect this in some cases of negotiated profit sharing.

And, sooner or later, there are two built-in features of profit-sharing plans that are bound to have an appeal to unions: Upward pay flexibility with downward wage rigidity.

Several unions have later learned—sometimes have been shown—that if an attitude of trust can be developed, profit sharing can give a tool previously lacking when they confront inability to pay in a bona fide profit squeeze situation. It offers a way of getting more than they had been able to get without jeopardizing the life of the small company.

Under a plan worked out by top management of Indiana's Wells Aluminum Corp., a share of gross profits (considered to be most directly within employee control) up to 5 cents per hour is to be paid into a retirement fund. If pension benefits being built up after 2 years' time are not satisfactory,

then the profit-sharing plan can be replaced with a pension plan through negotiation.

Most negotiated profit-sharing plans of the past year fall in this category of trying to get the best deal out of a small company in a tight profit squeeze.

NEW APPEAL

As younger workers enter union ranks it may be expected that they will find profit-sharing plans more appealing than pensions (which have been so widely achieved already for older workers).

It is evident employers must be alert to union interest and initiative in profit-sharing planning. What is needed by management is a reliable notion of probable consequences of bargaining for profits. There are some presumptions that can be made about this in the light of experience to date.

At the outset it should be noted that only a small minority of plans will probably ever be negotiated plans.

Unions will never organize a majority of profitmaking enterprises.

And in unionized companies, most profit-sharing plans may continue to be designed by management, not negotiated in detail with unions.

And it is certainly hard to see how a sound profit-sharing plan could ever be negotiated by multiemployer bargaining. This seems almost as repugnant as legally compulsory profit-sharing planning. There is abundant evidence of failure of compulsory planning in many foreign countries.

SOFTER DEMANDS

Profit sharing may well lead to a moderation of bargaining demands. Negotiations for a share of profits, while at first forbidding, may turn out to be more temperate than the profit sharing that is always implicit in fixed-wage bargaining. Bargaining for profits requires facing up to a greater recognition of the countinuous need for profit.

Moderation of bargaining under the new spirit of profit sharing has been borne out in every one of the dozen or so profit negotiations the past year.

A few large companies have found that greater flexibility in employee benefit costs can be worked out with the addition of profit sharing.

Example: The American Motors Corporation-United Auto Workers agreement partially undermined the annual improvement factor. It did this by using AIF to defray certain increased costs of insurance provided profit-sharing contributions and reserves were not large enough to offset these cost increases.

In a recent trailblazing profit-sharing development, Wisconsin's Belle City Malleable Iron Company, bolstered by a long record of top union relations, was able to bargain out the AIF so burdensome to many small companies. The company was also able to turn the cost-of-living allowance into deferred compensation in support of insurance.

By calling a halt to runaway fringe benefit costs, and by pulling some costs of benefit improvements into a profit-financed framework, the breakeven point of most companies can be substantially decreased.

BARGAINING TOOL

Profit-sharing negotiations of 1961–62 showed for the first time that profit sharing can be a very down-to-earth, potent bargaining tool. For example, Emerson Electric Manufacturing Corp. presented the profit relationship as the way out of the impasse of their inability to grant the fixed raise demanded by the International Union of Electrical Workers.

In earlier days, the unions would have regarded profit-sharing as a stick; it was now for them a carrot. And the profit expectations of the union made the deal.

And if it wasn't for a long-established profit-sharing plan, the UAW probably would not have accepted a recent wage cut in Detroit's Commercial Steel Treating Co. The purpose of the cut was to maintain dividends, attract capital and protect jobs.

The negative incentive side of profit-sharing, explicit loss sharing, is controversial among profit sharers. Holding back some profit shares to provide a source of extra compensation during loss periods is done, and makeup of past losses before reinaugurating sharing following a loss period is a feature of many plans.

In most cases, however, it is not considered practical to share losses with employees.

WORKABLE

The practice of profit sharing has a proven history of working out one's own salvation and of avoiding need of government intervention. There is not the slightest probability of profit-sharing negotiations becoming a political football. The framework of profit sharing serves to pull management and labor closer together, to reduce conflicts despite differences of interests, and to shoo away all third parties.

There is no question that profit sharing can succeed in metalworking companies of every type and size.

It is obvious that management must be informed on profit sharing.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 30, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

TAX HEARINGS CONCLUDED

The hearings on the President's tax recommendations are concluded. For the time involved a good record of pros and cons has been made. All witnesses agreed on the need for a tax cut. Few approved of the tax hikes, called structural reforms. The background for these hearings was the least favorable possible. The President and his Secretary of the Treasury recognized no relationship between Federal spending and tax revenue, that is, the balancing of income and outgo. On the contrary, the premise of planned deficit underlay the recommendations, although periodic lip service was paid to fiscal integrity and Government self-discipline. Comic relief, although hollow as a bad joke, was provided by Budget Director Gordon, who spoke of the tight or strict budget of $122.5 billion, $20 billion more than the budget for fiscal 1961 inherited when Mr. Kennedy took office. The President's goals of (1) economic growth, (2) freeing of investment funds, (3) curing unemployment, (4) increasing consumer purchasing power, according to the witnesses, were, separately and collectively, contradicted by the tax recommendations. The results would be: (1) Growth would be impeded; (2) investment funds would be less fluid; (3) unemployment would result in industry after industry; and (4) consumer purchasing power would drop.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon threatened a Presidential veto if the reforms did not accompany the rate changes. The President promptly contradicted this, agreeing to postpone reforms consideration. The President disavowed tax legislation consideration as related to recession, then reversed himself warning of possible recession if we failed to accept his recommendations. The witnesses repudiated this threat, saying that acceptance of the President's recommendations could aid in bringing on recession. Some, the bravest, bluntest, agreed that the recommendations showed an appalling lack of knowledge of the industries involved. Generally, there was agreement that (1) high tax rates intensified the tax inequities involved; (2) the recommendations would result in a shift of present tax burden from lower to middle income groups. Some areas of disagreement were (1) disallowing the first 5 percent of itemized deductions for individual income tax computation; (2) taxing as ordinary income (instead of capital gains) (a) lump-sum pension distribution, (b) real estate gains, (c) stock options when exercised, (d) sale of timber; (3) change depletion allowance on mineral resources; (4) capital gain treatment of assets at time of death or gift (treating both as though a sale).

ADMINISTRATION CONFUSED

The contradictions, ignorance and/or misrepresentations by the President and his advisers will now undoubtedly result in further reversals, repudiations and new proposals, so that it is impossible to forecast with any certainty at this time, what the outcome will be. My prediction, most tentative, is that no tax changes will result this year but a strong chance of tax rate change next year, an election year. It is my hope that rate adjustment will be of the Baker-Herlong-Alger bill type, a several year transition bill tied to a balanced budget reducing individual rates from the present rates of 20 percent to 91 percent to 15 percent to 42 percent; corporation taxes 52 percent to 42 percent with more realistic depreciation rates. My ultimate goal is the flat percentage tax which would result in everyone paying the percent necessary to balance the budget and retire a percentage of the debt, or a rate of tax approximately 20 percent of income with reduction possible as Government spending decreases.

GOLD SQUEEZE

H.R. 4413, a bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, because of a transfer tax in it, came before the Ways and Means Committee this week. Since the Treasury (through the Banking and Currency Committee) proposes to demonitize silver, except for coinage, it is proposed that the transfer or transaction tax be repealed. While this 1934 Act is obsolete and undoubtedly should be repealed, the spectre of devaluation of our currency looms now in front of us. The Treasury now proposes that $1 bills, silver certificates, be retired and replaced by $1 Federal Reserve notes (compare a $1 and $5 bill), backed by gold. Here's the hitch—the silver certificate is worth the face value in percious metal (silver), the Federal Reserve note is worth only 25 percent in precious metal (gold), and the latter is not redeemable in gold as is the silver certificate in silver. Unquestionably, this is devaluation of our currency. The new 25 percent gold backing will require approximately $35 million per year additional gold be earmarked to add to the $11.7 billion undergirding our total currency. As this official gold reserve underpinning goes up our gold outflow continues, a sort of gold squeeze. At our current rate of outflow of $100 million per month, money devaluation (by reducing gold backing of currency) is less than 4 years away. In addition, the liquid liabilities of foreign nations totals now about $24 billion. In the last 2 years of 1961 and 1962 our gold outflow was $1,748 million ($1.7 billion) and the

increase of foreign liquid liabilities was $4,640 million ($4.64 billion). Liquid liabilities are convertible into our gold, at the pleasure of foreign banks (a privilege not extended by our Government to United States citizens). As the world's banker any so-called run on the bank by foreign nations would wipe out the precious metal backing of our money. Then, only the good faith of our Government would undergird our money and there is always some question in the minds of people, at home and abroad, over our fiscal responsibility, in view of our debt and deficit financing policies. It is of some significance to note that free societies that have fallen always tampered with the value of their money. Is this to be our fate? What do you think?

GREED MAY COST US OUR FREEDOM

We, as a Nation, are spending ourselves into bankruptcy. If the people and Congress do not soon begin to exercise some self-discipline and reduce Federal spending, we may, indeed, witness the death of our Republic in our lifetime. The cause of our astronomical Federal spending spree is simple, everyone has his hand out. Attached to the this week's newsletter is an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing some remarks I made in the House pointing out the danger we face.

KEEPING THE PEOPLE INFORMED

It is my firm belief that the survival of this Republic depends upon an alert an dinformed citizenry. To help in getting the facts to the people I make weekly television and radio reports. On television, channel 8, WFAA at 10:15 a.m. Sunday. (For April 7 only, the program will be presented at 1:15 p.m.) Check your favorite radio station in Dallas for the time of my radio report.

President's Commission on Registration—Why We Don't Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, our President has become so alarmed at the widespread failure of American citizens to exercise their vote—as well as the restrictions which have prevented many Americans from voting—that he has issued an Executive order creating a commission to find out why so many Americans fail to exercise their right to vote. Less than 63 percent of the U.S. population over voting age cast ballots for presidential electors in 1960.

I am sure that my colleagues join with me, Mr. Speaker, in backing the administration and the newly appointed President's Commission on Registration in its search for the underlying reasons for this ominous laxity to exercise a right so precious and one which was earned with great difficulty and sacrifice.

The recent elections in Dade County, Fla., are typical of the problem into which the Commission on Registration will inquire.

On March 12, south Florida held its second Democratic primary, followed on March 26 by a general election to select State representatives to the Florida State Legislature, now in session. Parenthetically, I add, with pride, that all the Democrats were elected. Such pride is tempered, however, by the sobering fact that of 412,000 registered voters, only 102,372—or a ratio of 1 to 4—went to the polls an election day.

Of particular import, then, is an editorial recently broadcast over WTVJ channel 4, Miami, by its vice president in charge of news, Ralph Renick. A week before the primary, on Tuesday, March 5, Mr. Renick broadcast, under the heading of "Kremlin Extends Congratulations to Nonvoters," an exposé of a shocking communique then circulating in Dade County.

Addressed to all Communist Party members and sympathizers and headed from the Kremlin, the communique proceeds along these lines:

Headquarters wishes to congratulate all of you in the Dade County area for the magnificent success you achieved in the primary election of February 26, when only 26 percent of the voters went to the polls. * * * This lack of interest is irrefutable evidence that representative government is a hypocritical farce. You must now keep up the good work and show an improvement in the runoff election next Tuesday. We have established 15 percent of the registered voters should go to the polls on March 12.

Then follows a description of the technique by which lazy or indifferent citizens may be influenced to stay away from the polls and neglect their responsibility to vote.

The broadcast went on to state that at the bottom of the memo was a notation:

The above memo was found on a bus seat that had been occupied by an individual who was loudly speaking against all politicians and bragging that he had not voted on February 26 and had no intention of voting on March 12.

Editorially, Mr. Renick concluded that he did not know the source of the memorandum "but the message does sink home." Perhaps this broadcast by the public-spirited WTVJ channel 4, Miami, may have been one of the contributing factors to a voting turnout of approximately 25 percent rather than the desired—by enemies of democracy—15 percent.

So that all may ponder the significance of this broadcast and the need for more active participation in all levels of government by all our citizens, I am placing the entire broadcast editorial in the RECORD.

KREMLIN EXTENDS CONGRATULATIONS TO NONVOTERS

A shocking communique was widely distributed by mail today in Dade County. One copy was sent to our office. The memo is addressed to all Communist Party members and sympathizers. It is from the Kremlin. It reads as follows.

"Headquarters wishes to congratulate all of you in the Dade County area for the magnificent success you achieved in the primary election of February 26 when only 26 percent of the voters went to the polls."

"This lack of interest is irrefutable evidence that representative government is a hypocritical farce. You must now keep up the good work and show an improvement in the runoff election next Tuesday. We have established 15 percent of the registered voters should go to the polls on March 12.

"Our study indicates that use of the following in all conversations was effective in discouraging voters from going to the polls:

"1. The ballot is confusing—there are too many names.

"2. It doesn't make any difference who gets elected—all politicians are the same.

"3. I can't make up my mind and I'd rather not vote than vote for the wrong candidate.

"4. Most of the candidates are just running to get their names in the paper.

"5. One vote doesn't make any difference.

"6. State government is not important to Dade County.

"7. I've got more important things to do than waste my time voting."

Then, at the bottom of the page is this notation: "The above memo was found on a bus seat that had been occupied by an individual who was loudly speaking against all politicians and bragging that he had not voted on February 26 and had no intention of voting on March 12."

We don't know who is sending out the memo, but the message does sink home.

This is the ballot for next Tuesday's election.

There's no excuse for not voting. If you'll be out of town, absentee ballots are available until 5 p.m., Thursday, at the County Registrar's Office.

Our system of government can only succeed with the active participation of all citizens.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my full support of the newly established President's Commission on Registration and to remind my colleagues that in daily practice the statement "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" resolves itself into the necessity for active participation in representative government by all citizens.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Vice President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, Saturday, March 30, 1963, was an outstanding day for North Carolina and the Democratic Party everywhere.

On that date, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON delivered one of the most inspiring speeches I have ever heard. The occasion was the annual North Carolina Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

I think it is most significant that more people turned out to hear Vice President JOHNSON than have ever before turned out for a Jefferson-Jackson dinner in our State, and the tremendous speech the Vice President delivered gave all of us not only new faith in the Democratic Party but also new faith in our State and in our Nation.

I hope that those who are entertaining any thoughts that our part of the country is going to be easy pickings for the opposition will take the time to read the newspaper accounts of last Saturday's activities, of the thousands of Democrats who came hundreds of miles, and of the enthusiasm with which the Vice President's speech was acclaimed throughout the State. They will find that the Democratic Party is not going to be cut up into pieces like a pie and passed around the table for those who would divide and conquer us.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, RALEIGH, N.C., SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1963

When I come to North Carolina, I never come as a visitor. I am just "back home," because many of my ancestors came from your State.

Some of my forebears first settled in the Albemarle Sound section. Others lived in Rowan County in the Piedmont. Eventually, they grew restless and began moving westward. As my father told me, they went two directions, some of them when up in the world, the others went to Texas.

If I can't claim close relatives in North Carolina now, I do claim as some of my closest friends the wonderful North Carolinians, past and present, whom you have sent to Washington.

There are no men I have met in public life whom I respect more, or whose friendship I value more highly, than Luther Hodges, Sam Ervin, and Everett Jordan. I am privileged to work closely on the space program with one of the ablest administrators in the Nation, another North Carolinian, James E. Webb. Two of the most valuable Members of the House of Representatives are your distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, HAROLD COOLEY, and the Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERBERT BONNER.

These fine Americans serve your State and the Nation today in the outstanding tradition of such great North Carolina public servants as O. Max Gardner, Uncle Bob Doughton, Clyde Hoey, Josiah Bailey, Frank Graham, Melville Broughton, Kerr Scott, and many others.

I must say, also, that I am especially fond of, and highly privileged to know as a friend, the man whose outstanding service is winning new respect throughout the Nation, your Governor, Terry Sanford.

For many generations, North Carolina has stood, as it stands today, tall among the States. The respect you enjoy is respect won by the quality of leadership, progressiveness, and integrity so long offered by men and women of North Carolina who have been proud to call themselves Democrats.

Some years ago, I asked a North Carolina friend what the Latin motto of your State means. He told me that it means, "to be rather than to seem." I think that motto captures not only the spirit of North Carolina but the spirit of your national leadership in the United States today. If I may, I would like to borrow that motto as the theme for my remarks tonight.

Since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the people of the United States have, in every period of great national challenge and peril, entrusted the national leadership to the Democratic Party.

That was true under Cleveland and Wilson. It was true under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. It became true again 2 years ago under John F. Kennedy.

Why? Why, at the great and decisive moments in the history of our land, has the Nation's leadership most often been entrusted by the people to Democratic hands?

I believe the answer lies in the spirit of the words of your own State motto, that it is better "to be rather than to seem."

America is young. America is strong. America is not an old and aging country. The cause of America is not a worn and fading cause. America is not on the downhill side of greatness, staring disaster or ruin or oblivion in the face.

America is a nation still climbing upward toward the summit of its destiny. America is a nation of hopeful and resourceful and confident men and women. When there is a time of trial, when there is a time of testing, when there is a challenge to be met, the people want leadership of hope and resourcefulness and confidence—leadership which expresses the true strength of America. That quality of leadership Americans have found for 163 years in the party of all the people, the Democratic Party.

The leadership afforded by great Democrats is leadership which expresses the real America, America as it is, not merely America as some would have it seem. This is the kind of leadership America needs now, and it is the kind of leadership America is getting.

America is getting courageous leadership. When the Communist tyranny attempted to plant its weapons of destruction in the Western Hemisphere, the Communists found themselves face to face with resolute, decisive and unhesitating American leadership which left no doubt about the will or the ability of this Nation to eradicate that threat to the peace of the world. The result as all the world knows was one of the historic turning points of the cold war and one of the most decisive victories in history over armed aggression.

America is getting confident leadership. Even as the military strength of a prepared and vigilant nation has been and is being kept at the ready, American leadership has displayed the confidence to continue pressing in the forums of the world for agreements which will bring peace to all nations. Through such confidence, American leadership has demonstrated that this generation of Americans is not afraid to stand against aggressors nor is it afraid to stand up and be counted for the cause of peace.

America is getting resourceful leadership. While our responsibilities to freedom have required continuous attention to the great and grave questions of world security and peace, America's leadership at home has been both able and willing to give the attention needed to overhauling outmoded and burdensome tax structures. It has been able and willing to give attention to those things necessary for strengthening American economy, to improving the life for all our people at home, young and old.

As this American leadership has shown courage against our enemies abroad, it has not failed to show compassion for America's needs at home.

In saying these things, I realize that I speak to a partisan assembly. I realize that it is expected that I should, or any speaker should, use this occasion to make claims of partisan success. But that is neither the spirit nor the purpose of my remarks tonight.

The problems confronting your national leadership at this time are not partisan problems. There is not a Democratic side or a Republican side to the threat of Cuba, to the hopes for world peace, or to the urgent necessity of domestic tax reform and economic growth. There is only an American side.

Today, in our Nation and in our individual States, we need to remember that example. We need to remember that party does not come first. We need to remember that the problems we face as a nation are not created for us by our parties, and we will neither solve those problems nor make them go away by switching allegiance and support from one party to another.

At this particular moment in our Nation's history, and in our destiny as leaders of the free world, we must not allow ourselves to be persuaded that partisanship is patriotism.

Our system would soon cease to function at all if the debate between our two parties were permitted to degenerate into a dispute over which party is the more patriotic. Individual parties may "seem" bolder, may "seem" more wise, may "seem" to be many things. What matters, all that matters, is what our Government actually is, not what our parties appear to be.

In our Nation today, many more Americans are preoccupied with politics than are occupied with government. In every State where I go, I find Democrats and Republicans, and even, once in a while, members of the press, asking questions about the

nominees and the elections of 1964 and 1968. Yet, the real question always is not who is going to occupy what office, Federal, State or local, but, rather, what are we, the people, going to do together about the problems and challenges with which we are faced.

Politics, in the highest sense of that term, is never a spectator sport. We are not going to get the kind of politics or the kind of government these times require by sitting on the sidelines and watching with fascinated amusement and detachment to see who emerges as winners of political free-for-alls. The test of our parties, the test of our own partisanship, is not the public show we stage politically but the accomplishments we make together in serving the people's needs.

Here in North Carolina your State has made remarkable progress. The Tar Heel State, where the weak grow strong and the strong grow great, has been a leader of a vital region of America because you have never allowed partisan politics to obstruct nonpartisan good government. You have held to your motto.

You have shown the world that deeds speak louder than words. You have used your resources prudently and progressively to support education and agriculture and industry.

You have invested in your youth. You have built outstanding State universities. You can be very proud of the fact that last year the largest single source of scientists and engineers hired for the national space program by NASA was North Carolina State College.

In agriculture, where once your total farm income was limited to tobacco and cotton, today no State has a more diversified range of farm commodities, from apples to soybeans, bringing in $1¼ billion in cash income annually.

While North Carolina is still, as it has long been, the Nation's No. 1 textile producer, your growing industrial complex now turns out everything from processed chickens to chainsaws and you are building major basic industries in chemicals, electronic equipment, and paper products.

The quality of governmental leadership you have had, and have now, in North Carolina, has made this progress possible because partisanship and politics have not come ahead of service to all the people, all the time.

Democrats and the Democratic Party have meant good government in North Carolina, at the State level and the local level.

Through the Democratic Party, North Carolina has won respect and influence at the national level. Few other States can claim three major committee chairmanships in the Senate and House today or the influence in the Cabinet and the executive agencies that is held by North Carolinians.

We say these things with justified pride. But we never claim that the past holds a mortgage on the present. Democrats are never Democrats by inheritance, they are Democrats by conviction.

We of the Democratic Party hold the conviction that our national interest and the interest of each of our regions is served by maintaining a responsible, united and effective national party which truly represents the diversity of America. America is stronger when there is a party which speaks for the farmer and the businessman, for the wage earner and the professional people, for the producer and the consumer, for the northerner and for the southerner, for the easterner and the westerner.

In the past and in the present only the Democratic Party fills this role. Together we are strong. Divided we are weak. Always there are those who would take strength away from all of us by false and fleeting promises of special strength for some of us.

In politics as in any other endeavor which involves the concept of contest—there are two ways in which a victory may be won.

The first is to render service to the people and attract to the banner of the party such overwhelming numbers that success is assured.

The second is to provoke quarrels among the opposition in the sure knowledge that if such quarrels are allowed to spread, the opposition forces will be divided, permitting a minority to work its will.

Looking at the days that lie ahead of us, I can predict that we, as Democrats, are going to be subjected to the second type of campaign. A certain political party, and I see no reason to dignify it by giving it a name, realizes full well that it cannot possibly attract the majority that is necessary to win an election. But at least some of its leaders hope that we Democrats will be sufficiently softheaded to succumb to a strategy as old as the Roman empire, divide and conquer.

I suspect that we will hear a great deal of conversation from members of another party seeking to pit one Democrat against another.

I suspect we will be subjected to charge after charge that one branch of the Democratic Party is seeking to drive another branch out of the fold.

I suspect that very loose language will be thrown around concerning the ambitions of individual Democrats and the desires of some to dominate others.

I suspect that as election day draws near and desperation mounts, some mud will be hurled in the hope that it will stick.

I just want you to remember one thing. The source of the charges and the accusations is not one which can be considered either objective or friendly. And if we Democrats make the mistake of paying attention to the partisan charges of the opposition, we will snatch defeat out of the jaws of victory.

I do not believe that we Democrats can be defeated unless we defeat ourselves.

As Americans first, and as Democrats second, we must demand that those who would sway us from tested loyalties offer performance instead of promises. The southerner is proud to be a southerner, as are residents of each of the great regions of our land. But regional pride does not equal—and certainly does not excel, the greater pride of being an American.

Our country's interest is not served by those who indulge in special appeals to divisive regional interests. Partisans who obstruct or resist or delay the solution of national problems for the sake of their partisanship are not likely to bring solutions to our problems of regional or State concern. Certainly, we of the Democratic Party welcome the contention of other parties in every region and every State. There are no one-party regions in America. But there are regions where one party has served the people and won their trust while the other party failed to serve and did not deserve the trust.

Let those who would make special appeals to the South understand one thing. Nobody lives in these States and in this historic region but Americans.

The appeal which is most persuasive to southerners or westerners or easteners or northerners is the appeal of effective service to build our Nation's strength and unity and success in the world and at home.

In Cuba, communism has established a showcase of failure within the Western Hemisphere. Communism has proved in Castro's Cuba that it does not have the answer to the problems of the New World. No small part of that failure of communism off our shores is the result of the unity of the Republics of this Hemisphere. The Americas united are causing communism to fail without plunging the world into nuclear devastation.

This is only another example of the convincing evidence of history that the greatest strength of freedom lies in the unity of free men. In our own country, we must not permit partisanship to deny us that same unity which will make our strength, our resources, our abilities more forceful and more effective in answering the challenges we face.

As we would not tolerate partisanship seeking to exploit religious and racial histories in a divisive way, so we must not permit partisanship to exploit regional histories against the essential unity of our land. Our parties must be instruments of service, as the Democratic Party has been in North Carolina and in the Nation. Our parties must not be instruments of division, bias or prejudice. As responsible partisans ourselves, let us at home as in Washington put service to the people first. If we do, the people will, in the future as in the past, put the Democratic Party first at the polls.

Too Busy To Retire

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, Idaho's first citizen in the minds of thousands of our citizens is U.S. District Judge Chase A. Clark.

Judge Clark started his law practice in Mackay, Idaho, in 1904 and went on to serve in both houses of the State legislature and as mayor of Idaho Falls. Later he became one of our most outstanding Governors. I know that in my short career in public life I have been greatly encouraged by the example set by this outstanding man, and have benefited from his counsel and advice.

Judge Clark is also the father-in-law of our distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. One of the more satisfying experiences I have received from serving in the Congress has been the close association that Mrs. Harding and I have enjoyed with Senator FRANK CHURCH and his lovely wife, Bethine, the daughter of this distinguished jurist and public servant.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to include at this point in the RECORD an article which was printed in the Boise, Idaho, Daily Statesman, on Friday, March 15 commenting on Judge Clark's 80th birthday and his life of accomplishment.

The article follows:

TOO BUSY TO RETIRE—JUDGE CHASE CLARK STARTS 21ST YEAR ON U.S. BENCH; RECALLS APPOINTMENT BY LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

When the Boise Federal Building personnel started arriving for work this morning, striding along was a spry and smiling young man of 80, showing up for his day's work. Greeted on all sides by coworkers and fellow-townsmen, Federal Judge Chase A. Clark was starting his 21st year on the Federal bench, stretching out a determination to keep busy rather than accept a deserved Federal retirement at a $22,500 salary.

The legal problem that confronted Judge Clark on his anniversary day had to do with an estate problem involving minor children. That kind of legal challenge will keep the

venerable jurist busy for most of the morning. Every detail will receive careful attention. Judge Clark happens to be one of the kindest men ever to sit in any court. The children are in good hands.

His legal work out of the way, Judge Clark will have a heavy calendar as friends come by to congratulate him, not only for his long period of service, but for the great personal trait that has kept him in his assignment, monthly in the Boise court but in special work in Federal courts all over the Nation. Just last month Judge Clark was presiding judge in Federal court at Phoenix.

Asked why he continued working long after his retirement age 10 years ago when he was 70, Judge Clark said:

"I could have retired when I was 70. My salary would have come along just the same the rest of my life. I'm really working for nothing but I love my work.

"No one has suggested that I retire. A person is not able to judge himself correctly. I figure I have enough friends who, if they thought I was in my dotage, they'd come and tell me. They haven't."

Judge Clark is perhaps as well and favorably known as any other Idaho citizen. His Idaho career was climaxed by a term as Governor from 1940 to 1943. He has served in both Idaho legislative houses, and was mayor of Idaho Falls when he was elected the State's chief executive. He started his law career in Mackay in 1904 when he was 21. Later he practiced law at Hailey.

"How did I get this job?" Judge Clark was asked.

"I happened to be in Washington while I was Governor trying to get some Federal money into Idaho. I had an appointment with President Roosevelt. I was going to talk about getting the Navy into Pend Oreille. As I was going into the White House an Associated Press man came up and showed me a dispatch which said Judge Charles Cavanaugh had resigned as Idaho's Federal judge.

"I went in and talked to the President about the money matter and when I got up to leave I said 'Mr. President, I note that the Federal bench in Idaho is to be vacant. Why don't you give me that job?'

"The President replied: 'All right, Chase, you can have it.' "

I was appointed March 15, 1943. And I've been in this nice office ever since.

Some observations from the judge:

On being a legislator: "In the legislature in 1913 there weren't any problems at all. It was just a question of getting some money for Custer County. In 1932 in the senate it was different. Very strenuous. Relief for the unemployed was the problem."

On his daily life: "I'm busy here in my office. The work is most of my life. I get up at 7:30, earlier if I have a problem on my mind.

Most satisfying experience: "In 20 years on the bench I have admitted more than 2,000 citizens to citizenship. This is my biggest thrill. I am also satisfied by the fact that men who have been convicted in my court and placed on probation have made good a hundred percent. This is a great thing. It is forgotten they were ever in trouble."

Most interesting case: "Not one. Many. During the war a lot of men came into court to get their jobs back after fighting the war. We saw to it."

The lawyers obligation: "The lawyer must render public service. I believe lawyers give more service gratis than any other profession. I have found them very conscientious in their work."

About young people: "I urge young folks to seek the job they feel they would like. A paycheck isn't most important. Young folks are getting along as well today as they did when I was one of them."

Politics: "I have always been a Democrat. I believe all a person needs to be is a loyal American. Politics is no good if it goes over everything else."

Judge Clark's job has not only made him a familiar figure in Idaho. He is often assigned to sit in for judges in other States. Doing this he has traveled to Alaska, Hawaii, North Carolina, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, and California.

The judge was married to Mrs. Clark, the former Jean Burnett, of Mackay, in Mackay 57 years ago.

"Our golden wedding anniversary," he said, "was a great day. Every day is a great day."

"Jean told me not to have my picture taken smoking a pipe so I didn't. Don't wear your glasses, either," she said.

"Which reminds me," he recollected. "I didn't have to put them on to pass my last driving test."

Peace Corps Volunteer From New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has been in operation for a little more than 2 years and as of late, we are beginning to see some of the practical results of this young project. Ben Sharman, formerly an IAM lodge president in Jamestown, N.Y., is presently finding his Peace Corps station in the newly independent Caribbean island of Jamaica interesting and challenging. Mr. Sharman is a machine shop instructor at the Kingston Technical High School in the capital city. In addition to giving machine instruction, he teaches mechanical drawing and engineering technology. New York is very proud of Mr. Sharman and other dedicated Peace Corps volunteers from our State for the fine job they are doing to promote the well-being in the lesser developed countries of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the February 21 issue of the Machinist be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBER DESCRIBES LIFE IN PEACE CORPS

Ben Sharman, a former Jamestown, N.Y., IAM lodge president, is finding challenges in his Peace Corps post at Kingston, Jamaica.

Sharman wrote recently to Arthur B. White, representative for IAM District 65, Jamestown. The 35-year-old former president of lodge 1791 is now a machine shop instructor at Kingston Technical High School in the capital of the newly independent Caribbean country.

He reported that in addition to teaching machine shop he is instructing in engineering drawing and engineering technology. He wrote White:

"I don't know how the lodges in the district are financially situated, but if any of them feel like donating something for a good cause I am awfully short of technical books, hand tools and drawing equipment.

"The boys who come to the school are mostly on scholarships and come from poor families. Some of them walk miles to come to school and some cannot afford the 14 cents a day for lunch so they just don't eat. You can see what a hard time these boys have with books and drawing equipment which they have to provide."

During the Christmas holidays, Sharman reported, he volunteered to help build a concrete block community building at the small village of Walderston outside Kingston. The villagers, he said, donate a day a week to the project. Most are either small farmers or bauxite workers.

Sharman said that at the completion of the first school term recently he was complimented for his work by the school principal and the school board. That's a Peace Corps volunteer's main reward. His address: Ben Sharman, 7 Tucker Avenue, Kingston, Jamaica, West Indies.

Robert H. "Bob" Mendenhall of the Robbinsdale City Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, there are always a few people in every community who serve as collective keystones to hold it together, to anchor and lead the life of the community in every phase of activity. The city of Robbinsdale, Minn., in the heart of my district, has many such people, and one of the finest is Robert H. (Bob) Mendenhall.

Bob Mendenhall's official job is to serve as the band director for the Robbinsdale High School. But his hobby has been another job to which he has devoted nearly every free moment for 15 years.

Robbinsdale has received nationwide attention for its outstanding volunteer city band made up exclusively of residents who enjoy music and the rigorous grind of public appearances that comes with belonging to an award-winning group. Now, because of a well-earned desire to spend more time with his family, Bob is resigning as director of the Robbinsdale City Band.

I cannot say in a few moments what Bob's leadership has meant to the youth of Robbinsdale and to the city as a whole. But the following article from the March 28 North Hennepin Post points out some of his outstanding public service to his community:

We do not know of a more popular choice the Robbinsdale Chamber of Commerce could have made than when it voted to give its first annual Man of the Year award to Robert H. Mendenhall, leader of the Robbinsdale city and high school bands. Although Mendenhall's activities have been confined to the North Hennepin area, his name has become a county and statewide symbol of good music. There is probably no other high school band leader in the State who has directed his bands to so many championships. There would not even be

room in the Mendenhall home to store and display all of the awards.

As far as the records reveal Mendenhall is the only band director who has led his city band to permanent possession of the trophy that is awarded the musical organization which wins both the afternoon and evening Minneapolis Aquatennial contests for three consecutive years.

Mendenhall starts having an influence on the lives of the youngsters of this area at an early age. Those interested in becoming a band member come under his influence when about 14 years of age. He plays in Mendenhall's bands for about the next 10 years, graduating to the city band when he is through with the school band. This keeps a youngster out of mischief because he doesn't have time to get into it with his band practices and public appearances.

Although Mendenhall's bands have traveled many places, participated in many events, and won many prizes, there has never been a record of misbehavior or a bad report sent back from any of the cities or towns his bands have visited. The Robbinsdale bands are, in fact, the most sought-after musical organizations in this area. The baton Mendenhall has used in directing the behavior of these young men and women has been just as effective in keeping them on other good trails that do not end at some deadend.

Mendenhall has always been a strict disciplinarian. He has always stressed punctuality because, when a band promises to be at a certain point for a parade at a given time, it is important they fulfill such promises.

Mendenhall must have started his music career while still a youngster. The records reveal he was a member of the Robbinsdale City Band for 10 years before he became the director 15 years ago. Mendenhall is attempting to resign as director of the city band so he can spend more time with his family. His formal resignation to the city council was rejected, but Mendenhall says he will not recall it. He is recommending that Roy Olson, his assistant, be named to replace him. He said Olson is very capable of taking over the post.

A Future Farmer Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, many of my colleagues from urban States during my service in both the Senate and the House of Representatives have given sympathetic attention to the problem of rural areas. They did so in the national interest. As the representative of an agricultural State like North Dakota, I try to appreciate and understand the problems faced by our cities, likewise in the national interest.

The need for a mutual understanding by farmers and city people was extremely well stated by Jerome Broadhead of Carson, N. Dak., State Future Farmers of America public speaking winner, whose speech was printed in the Dakota Farmer on March 2, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY JEROME BROADHEAD, CARSON, N. DAK., STATE FFA PUBLIC SPEAKING WINNER

Agriculture today is as dependent on public relations as it is tillage of the soil.

Many of our farmers are guilty of forming a one-sided view. If they would take into consideration problems of the urban population, then the nonfarmer may return the compliment.

Nonfarm people are surely evading their duty in educating themselves on the farmer's success story, as well as becoming informed on some of his problems. Actually, the nonfarmer does not hate the farmer, but neither does he love the farmer. Attitudes of urban people are easily swayed to oppose the farmer by influential politicians and groups not having a keen appreciation of agriculture.

The farmer is accused of raising food prices and making an exceptionally large income. But does the nonfarmer know that today's farmer receives 12 percent less for his products than in 1948, and that, during the same period of time, marketing and processing costs have risen 36 percent?

Our small rural communities are closely connected with farming, and people in these communities have a deeper understanding of the farmer. I believe the real problem of public relations lies with the masses in our large cities and urban communities. Facts concerning agriculture can be very interesting if presented properly.

What should the farmer do? He can start by realizing that farming is a very noble and worthy profession. The farmer should also realize the importance of education in fields other than farming so he can understand and better discuss things with nonfarmers.

Our farmers must learn to live and work with the nonfarmer under the most favorable conditions they can promote. The farmer must take time to listen to urban problems with the enthusiasm that he expects of the nonfarmer in attempting to understand the farm situation. I am looking forward to the day when farmers and urban people have mutual understanding.

North Carolina's Tercentenary Year

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marked the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II of England. We North Carolinians proudly trace our American heritage to this historic document.

When the charter was granted, North Carolina as we know it today is estimated to have contained but 2,000 people. They had emigrated to a wild, unexplored, undeveloped wilderness seeking religious and political freedom and an opportunity to improve their economic status. From this humble beginning, North Carolina has grown to the point where our State now contains over 4½ million people.

We are all rightfully proud of the advances our State has made in agriculture, industry, education and the arts during three centuries of progress. The emphasis in North Carolina today is on industrial expansion and the improvement of our educational facilities, in short, on the future. This is well and good because no civilization can progress by resting on its oars and reliving the past. But as the French poet Lamartine said, "History teaches everything, even the future."

So I think it is important that in the year 1963, which marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the charter from which comes North Carolina as we know it today, the attention of the people of our State and the Nation should be focused on some of the lessons to be learned from the past. Our forefathers brought representative government to this land and they earned their freedom by a great outpouring of blood, sweat, and tears. Many of us take this heritage too lightly. We can all glibly recite the things we feel we have a right to expect from our country but many fail to realize that there is a corresponding obligation. The North Carolina General Assembly in 1959 established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission and the commission is planning a series of festivals and ceremonies designed to refresh the memories of our people about some of the significant events in our State's great history.

A cordial invitation is extended to our fellow citizens from the other States of the Union, and to friends from abroad, to visit North Carolina during this tercentenary year. They will find that North Carolina indeed has a glorious past and a bright and promising future.

The Congress of the United States recognized the importance of this anniversary by creating a North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission composed of four Members of the Senate, four Members of the House, and seven members appointed by the President of the United States. I am very proud to serve as a member on that Commission by appointment of the Speaker of the House.

Assault on Congress Charged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. William S. White, which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star on April 1, 1963:

ASSAULT ON CONGRESS CHARGED

(By William S. White)

The most vehement attack upon Congress as an institution since the first Roosevelt New Deal—when for a time it seemed that

the just and constitutional powers of the National Legislature might be forever destroyed—is now being mounted.

The old assault of the thirties was led by a President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who wanted to have it all his own way, all at once. There was some small color of justification then. For the country was in a massive and malignant depression in which it appeared, to some good men who were too much afraid and too much in a hurry, that the alternative to a thoroughly cowed and docile Congress might be mobs in the streets.

For the new assault of the sixties there is no justification whatever, save the self-justification of unreasonably demanding pressure groups which see in Congress' constitutional right to reject their proposals simply some evil denial of what, in their own minds alone, is best for the Republic.

LEFT LEADERSHIP

This new assault of the sixties upon the last home of representative government, Congress, is being led by a combination of leftwing men and forces, almost all of them Democratic and some of them actually Members of Congress.

Their objective of all objectives is to pressure the present Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, to join them in discrediting the actions, the procedures, and sometimes even the motives of a currently Democratic Congress.

These forces have, in every instance, two things in common.

In 2 years of the Kennedy administration their legislative desires have repeatedly been frustrated by their own simple inability to marshal an effective majority for them.

And in 2 years of the Kennedy administration they have repeatedly been unable to force Congress to agree to change itself and its procedures in such a way as to forward the adoption of those desires over the manifest objections of a majority in Congress and the country.

Thus, unable to win the game under the rules, they demand changes in the rules. Thus, unable to persuade the public to back their notions and bills, and convinced of the infinite righteousness of those notions and bills, they conclude that only some giant conspiracy or some dreadful weakness in Congress, is to blame for their own minority ineffectuality.

They follow the classic pattern of well-intentioned reformers. They know for a fact that what they propose is "good for the people." When the people and the people's forum, Congress, refuse those proposals, it is, in their minds, the Congress which is wrong and the people who are deluded and defrauded.

NEW DOUBLETALK

They have evolved a whole new jargon in which old words have new meanings. The defeat of their measures in Congress becomes not merely defeat but obstructionism. The inability of the present President to persuade Congress to do everything he wants—where what he wants is suitably liberal—becomes not merely ordinary disagreement, but deadlock.

Congressional unwillingness to listen overmuch to them automatically means that Congress is foolish—or worse. Congress undoubtedly hesitant and plodding present pace is, to them, not simply an obvious reflection that Congress prefers just now to go slow. It is, instead, some large and glitteringly frightful thing like "a paralysis of government."

To them, to go slow is automatically to go wrong—if not worse. To them, deliberation becomes defiance; caution becomes cravenness; dissent from them becomes conspiracy; the refusal of a congressional majority to surrender to a minority becomes the capital crime of "not moving the country forward."

But whose country is it? And who is to define "forward?"

Dangers in President Kennedy's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many excellent editorials and articles have been written about President Kennedy's proposed tax reform legislation.

In the Fort Scott Tribune, issue of March 27, there was an editorial entitled "Danger Signals," by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, taken from the February issue of the Tax Report of the Tax Foundation, Inc.

Dr. Burns is an outstanding economist and is so recognized by every authority in the economic field.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGER SIGNALS

An analysis of President Kennedy's tax program which ought to help Congress reach sound decisions is presented in a bulletin published by Tax Foundation, Inc. It is the report of Arthur F. Burns, taken from testimony he gave before Congress' Joint Economic Committee.

Dr. Burns is an economist of note at Columbia University, a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor Management Policy, and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

What he has to say about the tax program should carry weight because of his background and experiences as an economist, and as much so because of the inherent good sense supporting his recommendations. Some of the things he proposes may not be popular with Members of Congress, or with some groups of citizens, but they are sound and credible, as contrasted with proposals of other New Frontiersman economists.

Dr. Burns agrees with the proposal to reduce taxes, and in the amount Mr. Kennedy asks. He agrees that excessive taxes are throttling the Nation's economy.

But another basic trouble, he argues, is that there is a serious lack of incentive on the part of business to make new investment in capital goods. That incentive is needed just as much as consumer buying, he says, and will give a faster boost to economic growth.

The proposed tax program is weak, Dr. Burns says, because it does not provide the incentive for the higher income groups to make big new capital investments in factories and manufacturing facilities.

Another grave weakness of the tax program, this economist says, is that it departs from the principle of a balanced budget and accepts spectacular increase in Federal debt. "We are not dealing here with a proposal for a temporary deficit," he acknowledges.

He has this further to say about excessive debt:

"I believe that the danger of inflation and the risk of devaluation of the dollar are being understated these days.

"I seriously doubt if we could have a protracted and substantial increase of the Federal debt without exposing our currency, and with it our economy and international prestige, to a very grave risk.

"Nor is inflation or its speculative anticipation the only danger of a policy of long-range deficits. A nation's mood can change suddenly. A series of large deficits in times when the economy is advancing may cause a revulsion of feeling and later paralyze the Government's ability to deal with a recession."

If reduction in Federal expenditures cannot be effected to offset tax reductions, Dr. Burns suggests that Congress consider raising new funds through a sales tax or other form of indirect taxation.

These may not be popular ideas, but to people who still believe in having to pay one's own way, and having to work and sacrifice for everything of value achieved, these danger signals being sounded by Dr. Burns and a few others should be heeded.

The Secret Service Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the activities of the Secret Service in protecting the President of the United States and waging a ceaseless battle against forgery and counterfeiting deserves wider knowledge on the part of every American. Under leave to extend my remarks, I therefore wish to insert in the RECORD and call to your attention a recent article which presents a revealing and informative portrait of the Secret Service and its distinguished head, James J. Rowley.

The article, entitled "The Secret Service Chief," by Joseph P. Cosentino, is from a recent issue of Redman, the alumni magazine of St. John's University in Brooklyn, N.Y., Mr. Rowley's alma mater. As well as a member of a number of remarkable insights into the character and personality of this distinguished St. John's alumnus, it contains a fascinating account of the innermost workings of the Service which should be of absorbing interest to all Americans. Mr. Speaker, the article by Mr. Cosentino follows:

THE SECRET SERVICE CHIEF

(By Joseph P. Consentino)

When President Kennedy announced 2 years ago that James J. Rowley would be the next Chief of the U.S. Secret Service, he underscored Rowley's "considerable experience in Presidential protection." By its nature, the task of protecting a President can hardly be amusing. Yet his reference to the 54-year-old alumnus' 22 years on the White House detail prompted Kennedy to remark wryly, "And he hasn't lost a President in all that time."

Ironically enough, shortly before his inauguration, Kennedy himself came as close as had any President to losing his life at the hands of a potential assassin. In December 1960 Richard Pavlick, a 73-year-old

former mental patient, was arrested in Palm Beach, Fla., after threatening to kill President-elect Kennedy, and at the same time, blow himself into oblivion. Fortunately, the "human bomb" waited too long. As the result of intensive investigation, Secret Service agents got to him before he could make good his threat.

Since the turn of the century every President of the United States has been forced to live with the thought that there is almost a 50-50 chance that somebody will try to kill him. But it wasn't until after McKinley was fatally wounded in 1901—the third American President to be assassinated in 37 years—that Secret Service agents were regularly assigned to guard the President and immediate members of his family. Since then no assassination attempt against a President while in office has succeeded. This is chiefly due to the finest security system of its kind in the world, developed by a vigilant band of plainclothes agents known as the White House detail of the U.S. Secret Service.

The key to the protection the White House detail offers the President is system. Agents don't just follow the President wherever he goes and merely try to keep someone from shooting him. On the contrary, besides learning how to handle sidearms and other weapons, they are taught judo, firefighting, and first aid. They also know how to use Geiger counters and other devices against atomic, chemical and biological warfare. Moreover, Special Agent in Charge Gerald Behn and his detail must operate according to plan and under strict discipline, supervised by Secret Service Chief, James J. Rowley.

For example, the moment President Kennedy won, agents moved in and took charge of his daily routine and schedule of trips. Actually, the entire 350-man Secret Service force participates to some extent in these different arrangements, which are always carefully worked out in advance for different situations. Thus, the detail must rely on field offices and local police which reinforce the guard the President receives when he leaves the White House.

Besides the special detail, guarding the President in the White House is the task of the White House Police, a separate, uniformed unit of the Secret Service. Stationed throughout the residence and its grounds under the command of Maj. Ralph Stover, they are expert marksmen as proven in the 1950 attempt against President Truman's life. Together with Secret Service agents, they shot it out with the assassins, killing one and wounding the other at the cost of one police officer's life.

Another important operation of the Secret Service is carried on by the protective research section headed by Robert Bouck, which tries to anticipate threats to the President's safety. In addition to investigating hundreds of threatening letters addressed to the President each year, its job is also to keep abreast of the latest advances in the electronics and communications industries—everything from listening devices to remote-control bomb detonators. For instance, they recently learned of plastic bombs that can be built into a piece of furniture and exploded by radio signals from hundreds of feet away.

Where the President's safety is concerned, the Secret Service Chief leaves little to chance. "Our research also carries us into the area of concealed weapons," said Rowley, "some no larger than your thumb, which fire poison-tipped bullets. The fact that weapons such as these have been used in assassination attempts against political leaders in foreign countries disturbs the imagination. For this reason we don't overlook the possible use of tiny, radioactive pellets as an assassin's tool."

All eventualities are taken into account, including last-minute changes in the President's schedule which might require deviation from prescribed plans. As Secret Service Chief, Rowley theoretically can forbid the President to take a walk or a trip abroad, to go sailing, to go to a particular summer residence or even to see a Broadway show. But in actuality he always accommodates himself to the President's wishes within the limits of security.

Each President, of course, is different: security and protective techniques must be modified and adapted to his personality and physical capacity accordingly. For instance, because of F.D.R.'s physical handicap, special ramps were built in the White House. Wherever he went agents tried to remain even closer to him because of his inability to move alone. With President Kennedy, the soft sounds of muted buzzers precede his movements throughout the White House, alerting agents at each corridor. Away from the White House, however, although he knows the problems and cooperates with the Secret Service, President Kennedy will sometimes walk into the middle of a crowd to talk and shake hands or stroll onto a public beach for a swim. When that happens, the agents must sweat it out and try to stay as close as possible.

Recently Congress authorized the Secret Service to provide 24-hour protection for the Vice President instead of only when he requests it. In addition, protection will also be extended to Vice Presidents-elect (it has already been charged with protecting Presidents-elect) and to former Presidents for a reasonable period after leaving office, if they so desire.

Serving at the side of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and now Kennedy, Rowley joined the White House detail in 1939, a year after shifting from the FBI. Throughout his career, he has had a unique front seat to history, from Yalta to Potsdam, from India to Vienna.

Everyone, it is said, remembers where he was the day F.D.R. died, and so does Jim Rowley. "I was in Warm Springs," he said. "We were waiting to go to a picnic. There was a delay. I called Mike Reilly (head of the White House detail at the time) and Mike said, 'Come up to the house.'" Rowley hurried to the little cottage where Roosevelt lived, and just outside of it Reilly turned to him.

"The boss is gone," said Reilly.

"What do you mean, gone?"

"He just died."

There were other, happier moments with F.D.R. During the early part of the war, Rowley was an advance man in protective planning, making preparations for secret presidential trips. Wherever Roosevelt's plane was to land, Rowley would have a ramp assembled at the last possible moment. When the President was wheeled down the ramp, he would spot Rowley waiting at the bottom. "Look who we have here," F.D.R. would say in mock surprise, and he never appeared to tire of the joke.

Secret Service men as a rule are a humorless, uncommunicative lot, weighed down with the responsibility of protecting the President around the clock. There are, however, two dominant impressions of the Secret Service Chief, and they depend upon the angle of observation. Those who have met him in casual social situations describe him as a pleasant, quietly urbane man of relaxed charm and good humor. Those who observe him at work, see him as unassuming, terse, and to the point—willing to answer questions but somewhat guarded because of his responsibilities. When he speaks, he cocks his head slightly, gestures only for a specific reason, and looks right through you.

Mr. Rowley's mien ranges from the guarded, alert air one might associate with a Secret Service agent to the confident, smiling manner of an athlete who has mastered the ability to relax when the pressure is off. Both extremes are, in fact, more than similes. His earliest ambition was to be an athlete, and as a youth in the Bronx, he was considered one of the finest college prospects of his day.

The detachment of the Secret Service man and the athlete have both been helpful traits in the 15 years he served as special agent in charge of the White House detail. In that period, Rowley once compared the job of guarding the President to that of the zone defense in basketball. "This is a team job," he explained. "Every move has to be planned on a precise schedule and every man must know what he's going to do. When one man is pulled out of position, another moves into his defense zone."

When Rowley became the first head of the detail to reach the top of the Secret Service, the agents on his White House team were elated by the announcement. Called fast and fair, he is admired by his colleagues, a tribute considered the Service's highest compliment. "He's strict but only enough to get the job done," one said.

Said another: "I don't know of a better qualified man in the Service. Jim's a quiet, positive guy who does things in an easy way. Problems don't excite him."

Mr. Rowley remembers as one of his toughest assignments President Eisenhower's Asian trip in 1959. In New Delhi, he and his agents were nearly crushed to death by the press of enthsiastic well-wishers eager to get close to the President. Never had an American President encountered a larger and friendlier mass of people, who were at times absolutely out of control. "Our main concern was that in such a milling mob," said Rowley, "overenthusiastic people might accidentally overturn the President's car." Another concern was the unusually large number of flower bouquets tossed to the President. "I'm sure you can appreciate our lack of enthusiasm in seeing articles hurling around the President. Fortunately, they were tossed in gestures of friendship—the majority of these bouquets were either caught or deflected by our agents."

Along the route, Secret Service agents aided by local police literally forced passage for the car bearing President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Nehru. According to Rowley, some problems occurred primarily because drivers furnished by Indian officials were not familiar with Secret Service protective driving techniques. "Because of the drivers' failure to keep the cars of the motorcade close to one another," he pointed out, "people were infiltrating between the lead car, the car bearing the President, and our followup cars, eventually forcing us to a standstill." In all, the trip from the airport to the Presidential palace—a distance of 9 miles timed by advance agents at 30 minutes—took over 2 hours.

Merriman Smith, the dean of the White House reporters, who was along on the trip, described this scene in his book, "A President's Odyssey."

"One of the Secret Service agents was bleeding noticeably about the hands as he warded off the backswing of the police clubs flashing dangerously close to the President. * * * Indians crushed to the front of the crowd used what English they knew in calling out to Eisenhower. Dusk had turned to night, but some of the Indians proudly shouted, "Good morning, Ike," and with all the smiling dignity possible under trying circumstances, Eisenhower replied, "And good morning to you, sir."

Although Presidential protection is the prime responsibility of the Secret Service and its parent agency, the Treasury Department, its original function when established in 1865 (and still its prime function

in budget terms and man-hours) is that of protecting the money, securities and other obligations of the U.S. Government. Today, essentially, this means running down counterfeiters and other criminals who forge Government checks and bonds.

For the fiscal year 1962, which ended June 30, criminals were making more money and enjoying it less, according to Rowley's annual report to Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon. Well-organized gangs, using the latest techniques, plus jet travel for their distribution operations, manufactured some $4 million in phony bills. "During the past 12 months," Rowley said, "counterfeiting activity in the United States almost doubled, reaching the highest level on record. But we confiscated $3½ million before it ever got into circulation and arrrested nearly 700 counterfeiters. Of course, it's almost impossible to keep a man from trying to make counterfeit money, but we can and do prevent him from victimizing the public with it."

Recently, Secret Service Deputy Chief Paul J. Paterni talked about the generally poor quality of today's counterfeit. "The work is necessarily hurried and careless," he said. "But equipment is so improved that even slapdash bills are good enough to get passed around. Here, take a look at these $20 bills we finally traced to a little print shop in New Jersey." He spread out some of the false twenties. The fronts seemed dull, and the backs were worse. "Traditionally," he said, "counterfeiters pay less attention to the back of bills."

In their fight against counterfeiting, the Secret Service maintains a close liaison with the printing and photoengraving industries, to learn of any development which might be of the slightest use to a counterfeiter. "I shudder to think what would happen if we became lax for even 30 days," said Rowley. "The counterfeiters could severely damage the integrity of our currency in even that short a period."

The Secret Service doesn't overlook Government-check forgers, either. They made over 3,100 arrests in this area alone during the past year—an alltime high. One of the tools of the Secret Service forgery section is a confidential back-check file. This system keeps tabs on the whereabouts of all known forgers in the United States, filed under their point of origin. To stay one step ahead of the forger, they are constantly exploring new developments in the field of electronics. "For example," said Rowley, "we are now looking into the use of computers to speed up the job of identifying repeaters who keep trying to forge Government checks and bonds. Each forger has his own handwriting peculiarities which can be analyzed and coded. When a forgery turns up, the giveaway traits are fed into the machine and within seconds we can identify the forger, no matter what name he happens to be using."

But even with technological advances at his fingertips, there is still no substitute for the highly trained Secret Service man who makes all these tools work—as three St. Paul, Minn., high school boys recently learned. Posing as German exchange students, they claimed to have bluffed their way past Secret Service agents, fooled Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, and met with President Kennedy in his Minneapolis hotel suite. Actually, all the trio managed to achieve was a Presidential handshake in a corridor along with scores of other persons. After the hoax was unveiled, one of the boys said he had tried pretending to be a German exchange student before, "so I figure the Secret Service people around the President might not be as sharp as some people think." Perhaps Irving Berlin's comedy number, "Secret Service Man," in the musical "Mr. President," can settle the problem. It ends, "The Secret Service makes me nervous and I can't."

Congress Under Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, William S. White, the syndicated Washington columnist who is noted for his authoritative views on the function and responsibilities of the Senate, has again struck a blow for the preservation of this body as envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Mr. White, in a column in the April 1 edition of the Washington Evening Star, writes of those who would subvert the Senate's legislative responsibilities and whip it into line with their way of thinking, though it be over the objections of a majority of the people of this country.

Thus far, their efforts have been unsuccessful because they have been unable to muster a majority. So now they want to make it easier for their wishes to be imposed upon the people by changing the time-honored rules of the Senate.

Success would mean more than just a change in the rules of the legislative branch of Government. It would mark the beginning of the end of our republican form of government as we now know it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. White's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSAULT ON CONGRESS CHARGED

(By William S. White)

The most vehement attack upon Congress as an institution since the first Roosevelt New Deal—when for a time it seemed that the just and constitutional powers of the National Legislature might be forever destroyed—is now being mounted.

The old assault of the thirties was led by a President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who wanted to have it all his own way, all at once. There was some small color of justification then. For the country was in a massive and malignant depression in which it appeared to some good men who were too much afraid and too much in a hurry that the alternative to a thoroughly cowed and docile Congress might be mobs in the streets.

For the new assault of the sixties there is no justification whatever, save the self-justification of unreasonably demanding pressure groups which see in Congress constitutional right to reject their proposals simply some evil denial of what, in their own minds alone, is best for the Republic.

LEFT LEADERSHIP

This new assault of the sixties upon the last home of representative government, Congress, is being led by a combination of leftwing men and forces, almost all of them Democratic and some of them actually Members of Congress.

Their objective of all objectives is to pressure the present Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, to join them in discrediting the actions, the procedures, and sometimes even the motives of a currently Democratic Congress.

These forces have, in every instance, two things in common.

In 2 years of the Kennedy administration their legislative desires have repeatedly been frustrated by their own simple inability to marshal an effective majority for them.

And in 2 years of the Kennedy administration they have repeatedly been unable to force Congress to agree to change itself and its procedures in such a way as to forward the adoption of those desires over the manifest objections of a majority in Congress and the country.

Thus, unable to win the game under the rules, they demand changes in the rules. Thus, unable to persuade the public to back their notions and bills, and convinced of the infinite righteousness of those notions and bills, they conclude that only some giant conspiracy, or some dreadful weakness in Congress, is to blame for their own minority ineffectuality.

They follow the classic pattern of well-intentioned reformers. They know for a fact that what they propose is good for the people. When the people and the people's forum, Congress, refuse those proposals, it is, in their minds, the Congress which is wrong and the people who are deluded and defrauded.

NEW DOUBLETALK

They have evolved a whole new jargon in which old words have new meanings. The defeat of their measures in Congress becomes not merely defeat but obstructionism. The inability of the present President to persuade Congress to do everything he wants—where what he wants is suitably liberal—becomes not merely ordinary disagreement, but deadlock.

Congressional unwillingness to listen over much to them automatically means that Congress is foolish—or worse. Congress undoubtedly hesitant and plodding present pace is, to them, not simply an obvious reflection that Congress prefers just now to go slow. It is, instead, some large and glitteringly, frightful thing like a paralysis of Government.

To them, to go slow is automatically to go wrong—if not worse. To them, deliberation becomes defiance; caution becomes cravenness; dissent from them becomes conspiracy; the refusal of a congressional majority to surrender to a minority becomes the capital crime of not moving the country forward.

But whose country is it? And who is to define "forward"?

Hon. Gordon H. Scherer and Hon. Morgan Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the recently released 1962 Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities contains a resolution of commendation for the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer and the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder, both of whom retired at the end of the 87th Congress after serving in an outstanding manner for a decade or more as Members of the House and

of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

At an executive meeting of the committee on September 26, 1962, this resolution was unanimously adopted by their colleagues who expressed the desire not only that it be included in the committee's annual report, but also that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of the House and the public as well would know the esteem in which Mr. Scherer and Mr. Moulder were held by their colleagues. It is a pleasure for me to place this resolution in the RECORD:

Whereas the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer has announced his intention to retire from the House of Representatives of the United States after serving the First Congressional District of Ohio with distinction for 10 years; and

Whereas he is the able and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on which he has served faithfully and well during his entire tenure in the Congress; and

Whereas he has at all times revered, defended from all enemies and tirelessly promoted those characteristics of freedom which have given this Nation the most cherished and lasting independence the world has ever known; and

Whereas his indomitable spirit and wise counsel will be sorely missed by the 88th Congress; and

Whereas the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder declined to seek reelection to the House of Representatives after serving the 11th District of Missouri with distinction for 14 years; and

Whereas he brought to the committee valuable experience gained by years of work as a judge and also a keen insight into the aims of the Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas his loss to the committee will be keenly felt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities extend their deep appreciation to Gordon H. Scherer and Morgan M. Moulder for their many years of truly outstanding service to this committee and wish them a most rewarding future in all endeavors they may pursue.

Dissension in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with free world unity at stake, there is need for positive, skillful leadership by the United States in the conduct of its foreign policy. This is especially urgent in our relations with the European nations, where economic conditions and political associations are closely related. Our policies with respect to the Skybolt issue and the establishment of a surface nuclear force, the oil pipe issue over trade with the Soviet Union, our overall approach to the European Common Market, and other major issues are all under constant examination and reevaluation.

Some comments on our policies were made recently by J. D. Zellerbach, chairman of the board of the Crown Zellerbach Corp., and I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD his address entitled "Dissension in the West," which was delivered on the occasion of his being awarded the 1963 Human Relations Award of the American Jewish Committee at Palm Springs, Calif., February 9, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISSENSION IN THE WEST

(By J. D. Zellerbach)

To receive this award, associated as it is with the name and the contribution to human relations of Jesse Steinhart, is a great personal honor, and I am deeply grateful to you for it. And yet whatever is accomplished in the improvement of human relations by definition is never accomplished by one individual. I am sure you will understand if I also accept the award on behalf of many friends and colleagues with whom I have worked over the years.

As you are aware, I have spent nearly half of the past 14 years serving in Europe; if this evening I share with you some observations about our Government's policies toward Europe, and about our relationships with the Continent, please attribute it to this rather intensive exposure to the subject, as well as to a more than casual interest in American-European relations since returning home.

There are two types of critical situations in international affairs: those involving your enemies, and those involving your friends. Some diplomats would say that those involving your friends are the most difficult and complicated of all.

Since the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949 we have been trying to build with our European allies a strong, unfied, defensive alliance that would provide a protective shield for the entire North Atlantic area. The most important strategic element in this arrangement, recognized by Europeans and Americans alike, has been the nuclear power of the United States. That power has defended Europe while more conventional forces could be mounted for deployment by the NATO command. Behind it, Western Europe has prospered and made significant advances toward the establishment of a third great world center of economic, political and military power.

The North Atlantic alliance has been affected not only by the policies and actions of the Soviet Union, against which it was erected, but also by the changing relationships among its members. And if we look back over the past 10 or 12 years, we find a curious interplay between the tensions prevailing between the Western alliance and the Soviet Union, and those within the alliance itself. It is this interaction of tensions and conflicting interests that can produce the firmest expressions of European-American solidarity, as in our confrontation with the Soviet Union in Cuba, and yet lead 3 months later to the collapse of the Brussels negotiations over Britain's application to join the Common Market.

In crisis the Western alliance holds together. In the absence of a sense of crisis it drifts apart.

There is little that is especially new in this discovery, for this has been the life cycle and the rhythm of alliance through history. What is regrettable in the current instance is that the common danger is as great as ever, and that dissension in the West plays directly into the hands of its two principal opponents.

Under sober analysis, we find that world power relationships have not been fundamentally changed by the firmness of our stand on Cuba, and indeed there are signs that a new Soviet threat in Cuba may be developing. It is true that we have successfully defended our position in Berlin, that we stopped the Communist attack in Korea and that we are holding the line in South Vietnam. But these have all been eruptions, tests of strength, which we have survived, and survival in the nuclear age is not lightly to be dismissed. It is only prudent, however, to assume that other probes will follow, and that even if they do not occur in the same form, or with the same virulence, the slower process of attrition and nibbling away at Western positions could prove to be a more effective strategy against us in the long run.

Unfortunately it is a failing in international, as well as human relations that we can become overly accustomed to danger from living too long with it. When this happens our sensitivity to the underlying peril is dulled, and our power of judgment begins to atrophy. I suggest with the keenest regret that the Western alliance, whose strength has depended far too much on a diet of crises with the Soviet Union, is once again showing the unmistakable signs of malnutrition.

It is ironic that, at the very moment when the Soviet Union is quarreling with Communist China, the West should match this rift with serious divisions of its own. It is also ironic that these difficulties should stem from France after what would appear to be some fairly obvious historical lessons on the need for friends and allies abroad. And the supreme irony of all is that France and President de Gaulle are in a position to work toward a small Europe under French direction and influence because American nuclear power, as well as our strength on the ground in Europe, provides the required protection for such a policy.

Bernard Baruch, in a memorandum recently quoted in the New York Times, spoke for many American friends of France, of whom I count myself one, when he said:

"General de Gaulle's policies in regard to the Common Market, NATO, and nuclear weapons seem clearly to say that France no longer needs the United States and that the unity of the West is no longer an essential for peace. His policies reflect the sort of nationalism, which Frenchmen and others were wont to attack the United States for not so long ago. These policies could lead to the collapse of the Western alliance. In obstructing Great Britain's entry into the Common Market, France is attempting to limit the benefits of economic cooperation for her own selfish advantage. In failing to fulfill, after all these years, her commitments to NATO, she is weakening the shield which protects Europe from the East."

In the shock wave which followed President de Gaulle's famous press conference in Paris on January 14, in which he read Britain out of the Common Market, and what appeared to be the coup de grace administered by Couve de Murville, the French Foreign Minister, in Brussels 2 weeks later, it has not been easy to get a perspective on events. Only time can sort out the new situation, and quiet down some of the emotion raised on both sides of the Atlantic. But there are high stakes in Western unity, and it will demand the utmost of American as well as European diplomacy to restore it and if possible make it sounder than before. And just as De Gaulle reflects the national interests of France, so should we be firm about the national interests of the United States.

In considering our own interests, we must remember that a cornerstone of American policy in the Atlantic area has been support for a strong and united Europe. From the earliest days after the war, through the Marshall plan and NATO, the United States has endorsed this very fundamental concept, which clearly implied a Europe that would

one day be fully capable of making its own decisions and its full contribution to the strength of the West. That support has been underwritten by substantial material assistance and continues in full force today.

It was inevitable that sooner or later our European policy, combined with the resurgence of the European countries, would result in the establishment of a third force in the world, call it what you will, which we assumed would work in concert with North America. This has always represented a correct and sensible approach to Europe on the part of the United States, it has seemed to me, and one in which the interests of nations and peoples on both sides of the Atlantic coincide. The countries of Western Europe have, in fact, been moving toward economic and eventually political integration, including supranational bodies that would be responsible for foreign and economic policies and the defense of the Continent.

The Europe that was to fulfill this concept of its future development had to start at some point, presumably with a nucleous of countries that would launch a movement toward integration that would eventually attract and include others. We have seen this process dramatically at work in the European Economic Community and in the strong gravitational pull this has exercised on Britain and many other countries outside the original Six. Moreover, it was clear that the goal of a united Europe could only be achieved through the imagination and the hard work of the Europeans themselves, and we must not forget that two brilliant and farsighted Frenchmen, Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet, have shown the way.

We seem to have now reached a point at which Europeans are aware of their increasing strength, of their ability to play a much larger role in the Atlantic partnership, but still lack the ways to channel and institutionalize their new power for more constructive purposes.

This situation represents a vacuum into which De Gaulle is moving, without the invitation of his European partners. In doing so, he has embarked on a course of promoting French national interests in line with his long-held concepts about the destiny of France.

It must be remembered that De Gaulle's ideas about French national greatness go back at least 30 years, when he began to write that France "above all others was created for brilliant deeds." His attitude toward the United States developed later, and in 1945, when millions of American troops had just taken part in the liberation of France, he stated: "The United States has not given us the impression that it regards its own destiny as linked with that of France, that it is doing all it can to help her remain or become strong once again."

Finally, in the years since the war he has promoted the idea of a Western Europe, led by France, which would pull together the states along the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees. The bloc resulting from this coalition he has described as a power which could be "the arbiter between the Soviet and Anglo-American camps."

To the French language the world owes a great linguistic debt, and the French phrase which comes to mind about De Gaulle's view of France and Europe is "idée fixe." He has thought in these terms far too long to change now, and so long as he remains President of France the Gaullist "idée fixe" is one of those realities which American and European diplomacy will henceforth have to accept and reckon with.

And yet in all candor we would have to agree that General de Gaulle is not speaking for France alone when he seeks to reduce European dependence on the United States, as well as our pervasive influence in the affairs of the Continent. He is, as we know, proceeding with the development of an independent French nuclear force. But it must also be recognized that our unilateral control over the use of nuclear weapons is a most sensitive subject within the alliance, and has become more so since the Soviet Union has moved from intermediate range missiles aimed primarily at European targets to longer range weapons aimed at the United States. Our European allies ask themselves whether we would rush to the aid of Europe if we knew American cities would be devastated in the process? Questions of future constancy and good faith have been raised against us, particularly by the French, and we resent the insinuations bitterly.

But emotion and sentiment are not the best handmaidens of diplomacy, and we must recognize what geography and history do to perspective, including our own. Indeed, we have begun to take steps toward broadening the concept of the nuclear deterrent into multinational forms within the alliance. Furthermore, we have in no way interfered with the development of an independent British nuclear force, and in the Pact of Nassau agreed to supply Polaris missiles to Britain to be fitted with British warheads. I doubt very much that we can in any serious way prevent the French from developing their own deterrent, sound as our military arguments against it may be.

Keeping in mind De Gaulle's own long-range view of France and Europe, therefore, I believe we can recognize three of his basic foreign policy objectives—greater influence in the major decisions of peace and war, the development of an independent nuclear force and its corollary of reduced dependence on American power—for their basic appeal to many Europeans. The fact that he expresses them annoyingly in terms of French gloire and grandeur should not blind us to their continental implications.

The question I would pose, however, is whether Europe or France can realize these objectives under the policies and with the attitude that De Gaulle has adopted. There is, I think, sound reason for believing that he may prolong excessive American influence on the Continent and excessive dependence on the United States if he continues to follow the road of French nationalism, as he seems to be doing. In this event, a more equitable distribution of responsibilities within the Atlantic community would be delayed, and the heavy international load we are carrying, assuming our willingness and ability to do so, would continue without the relief which our European partners can and should provide.

I base this argument on two assumptions. First of all I am assuming that no European country wants or needs to turn over the conduct of its affairs to a larger neighbor, and if it did so would run the risk of serious political repercussions at home. This is altogether different from granting power and authority to a common pool from which all can draw and benefit, such as the European Coal and Steel Community, Euratom and the Common Market itself.

It would appear likely, therefore, that should De Gaulle continue to move toward a Europe that was merely a larger expression of France, his neighbors, including Western Germany, will tend to look increasingly to the United States for support. Instead of decreasing European dependence on the United States, De Gaulle would be raising it, against the interests of France, Europe, and ourselves.

The second assumption I would make is that the weakening of the Western Alliance by the policies and actions of one member might require a greater, rather than a lesser American commitment in Europe and NATO. Since other members of NATO cannot entrust their nuclear defense to France, which is not in a position to provide it on the scale required, they may lean more heavily on us for military support of all types.

Indeed, a general reassessment of the defense needs of NATO could very well produce requests for an increase in our military establishment in Europe, and an even more disproportionate American investment in the security of the North Atlantic area. This, in turn, would lead away from General de Gaulle's objective to reduce European dependence on U.S. power, not toward it.

If on the other hand France were to reconsider seriously a European solution to the problem of excessive dependence on the power of the United States, a Europe that begins to move much more rapidly toward, political, as well as economic integration, the goals which De Gaulle wishes to achieve could well be realized. That Europe would not exclude Britain, but welcome her as a full and willing participant.

There was a time some years ago when Western Europe was economically dependent on the United States, a period that vanished with the unprecedented economic growth that has followed the Treaty of Rome. Dependence has continued largely in the military and political sphere. This has been due not only to our acknowledged leadership position in the West, but also because many thoughtful Europeans have felt themselves caught between the two largest nuclear powers, unable to speak and act for themselves. As the largest and most powerful country in NATO, backed by our tremendous arsenal of nuclear weapons, we have had to play the dominant role in developing the strategic concept for the defense of the Continent.

Our problems with De Gaulle, with the British over the abandonment of the Skybolt program, and now here in North America with Canada, stem largely from the power relationship within the Atlantic Community. While Europe has grown and developed to the point at which it rivals and competes with the United States economically, the power relationship remains unchanged.

A brilliant European commentator—I am happy to say he is Italian—Altiero Spinelli, Secretary General of the Italian branch of the Movement for European Federation, provided an interesting, if slightly satirical analysis of the problem, as he sees it, in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs. Urging a reduction of American hegemony in Europe and the creation of a supranational European authority to handle foreign policy, he writes:

"Since as things stand, the European states cannot develop a realistic picture of the role Western Europe must play in the world today, they tend to look backward for sources of inspiration and guidance. Once again we hear the former great themes of foreign policy—the grandeur nationale of France, the Wiedervereinigung (reunification) for Germany, the temptation of double dealing for Italy, the role of the wise mediator for Britain. For the most part these are themes that in the present world have lost their meaning. Summing it all up, Western Europe, thanks to American protection, has become a paradise of political, military, and social irresponsibility."

Granting some possible overstatement to make his point, Signor Spinelli has nonetheless raised a most significant question for us to consider: Have American policies, however soundly conceived from our side, actually contributed to the very situation we now deplore in France? This may or may not be the situation. At least the point merits examination.

If the subject is worth pursuing, does it not suggest a most thorough review of our present relationships with Europe, of our role in NATO, with the objective that American power, influence and leadership might provide a new incentive for European politi-

cal integration and the assumption by Europeans of a new Continental sovereignty? Or can we be sure that the present trend of events will lead to any more distinguished result?

There are two objections to such a course that must be considered. The discussion of alternatives to our present policy in NATO and in Europe connotes the idea of withdrawal, even a return to isolationism, despite the rather obvious fact that a major world power cannot isolate itself in the nuclear age. What is suggested here is not withdrawal, but a reallocation of responsibilities between Europe and North America, in which their mutual interdependence is fully recognized. Indeed, there would be no change in solemn defense commitments and possibly little change in the physical deployment of NATO forces. But it would imply greater recognition that the profoundest elements of sovereignty in the nuclear age might well be shared on both sides of the Atlantic, as in fact they are beginning to be shared today.

We can no longer deny the relationship between sovereignty and the nuclear deterrent, however painful this is to the United States as the major nuclear power. We are opposed, and rightly so, to the spread of nuclear weapons from one nation to the next, not merely because this represents an enormous waste of resources, but because it makes the problem of control increasingly difficult and dangerous. Yet I wonder whether we might not view the matter differently if we were dealing with an integrated Europe, a European authority that had the responsibility for the development and control of a nuclear deterrent for the protection of the Continent and within the NATO framework.

Tentative moves in this direction have already been made by the United States in our plan to establish multinational Polaris submarines attached to NATO. Secretary of Defense McNamara has gone further by saying: "We have no desire to dominate NATO. If our European NATO partners wish to create a European strategic nuclear force, we certainly have no objections."

Secondly, there is the objection that by pushing more energetically for European political integration, the United States will be interfering in European affairs and in effect be working against its own interests. Clearly this is another situation, rather like that of the Marshall plan, where the initiative must come from Europe. I would suggest that if we develop our objective of a united Europe with good judgment and clarity, and were prepared to consider suitable alternatives to assist it in determining mutually satisfactory relationships with its American partner, some progress might be made.

We have no way of knowing, of course, whether more positive support for a united Europe on our part would produce constructive results. We do know that we are not making much headway at the present time, and that alternative approaches might at least be studied with our European allies.

In considering these approaches, we will have to take into account with our European friends General De Gaulle's dream of a French greatness "that cannot be shared," as he once put it, although I would say the world is better for having shared it. We will have to accept his policies and his European concept as a fact in our relations with Europe and make the necessary adjustment to the situation he has created. We should endeavor to persuade him and the French Government to support the Western Alliance and to integrate their policies and resources with it to the extent they will agree to do so. Perhaps in the meantime his European partners will be able to persuade France to see grandeur in an integrated and united Europe, which France joins but does not dominate.

We have now seen the juxtaposition of two "grand designs," the Atlantic Community and Gaullist Europe. If we and most of Europe cannot support and must oppose De Gaulle's grand design, we might in turn reassess our own. At the present time, the Atlantic Community is out of balance, since it consists of one major industrial and nuclear power on this side and several much smaller powers on the other. With our European friends we should be devoting more time, energy, and statesmanship toward building a Community that is better balanced than it is today. Our first priority should be to renew and increase our efforts to help build the European side into the great world power it is destined to become. In this eventuality, the Atlantic Community would become a partnership of true equals, and our European ally could stand with us in providing a secure future for both Europeans and Americans, as well as assistance and security to the rest of the free world.

Professor Salmon Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most distinguished historians, and one of America's great teachers, Prof. E. Dwight Salmon, announced recently that he will retire from Amherst College in June of this year. Professor Salmon's career, Mr. Speaker, was a noble one. First and foremost a dedicated teacher, he was also a prominent author, a specialist in military affairs, a newspaperman, and a great American citizen who served with the AEF overseas in World War I, and headed the historical section of the Army's north African theater section in World War II. His career is summarized very well in the following article from an excellent weekly newspaper in my district, the Amherst Journal Record, of March 28, 1963:

PROF. E. DWIGHT SALMON RETIRES JUNE 30 AFTER 37 YEARS AT AMHERST

E. Dwight Salmon, Winkley professor of history at Amherst College and one of the college's best known teachers, will retire June 30 after 40 years of classroom work—37 of them at Amherst.

Professor Salmon, a modern European historian with a major interest in military affairs, was Chief of the Historical Section for the Army's north African theater of operations in World War II, 1943–45, and Chief of the Planning Section for the Historical Division of the War Department in 1945–46.

A dynamic lecturer who at various times taught courses in Russian history, Latin America, the Far East, the French Revolution as well as on the two world wars; Professor Salmon came to Amherst in 1926 as a former student of the late Laurence Packard who headed Amherst's history department for many years. On Professor Packard's death early in 1955 Professor Salmon took charge of Amherst's required freshman history course—"The Development of Western Civilization."

During Professor Salmon's tenure at Amherst, the college achieved a leading position in the number of graduates who went on to become professional historians.

In his teaching, Professor Salmon drew on personal experience in both world wars, on frequent travels abroad, and on study that covered subjects ranging from naval control of the Mediterranean in the 16th century to the history of modern Spain. Professor Salmon's major concern, however, was and is with the college and its students. Seeing generation after generation of students, he said recently, "develops your pride in this place. There's something about it that gets you." His close connections with students have made him a popular speaker at campus functions and alumni affairs.

Professor Salmon is a graduate of the University of Rochester and of Harvard where he received his Ph. D. He taught at Harvard from 1923 to 1926 when he came to Amherst. During World War I he served as a lieutenant with the American Expeditionary Force overseas. In World War II he served in the Army in various capacities. He was retired from active duty as a colonel in 1946. For his war activities he received the U.S. Legion of Merit, the Order of the British Empire, and the Medaille de la Reconnaissance Francaise. After World War II he served as a staff member of the task force on organization of national security for the Hoover commission and as a lecturer at the National War College.

In 1937 Professor Salmon was accredited as a special correspondent of the Springfield Republican to cover the Spanish Civil War which enabled him to see persons and places not generally accessible to travelers.

Professor Salmon is the author of "Imperial Spain" (1931) and "Americans Together" (1943) and coauthor of a report on the American military operations in North Africa.

On his retirement Professor and Mrs. Salmon will live in Chilmark, where they have built a home.

Crabcake Recipe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, recently there has been some discussion about the crabcakes served in the Senate restaurant. I am not prepared to make any official judgment on what is or is not a Maryland crabcake. This is something that I must leave to those who are more informed on crabcakes and Maryland, and both.

Nevertheless, I want to defend crabs themselves—and more particularly North Carolina crabs, which I believe show up in some of the finest crabcakes in the world, including Maryland crabcakes. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial that recently appeared in the Goldsboro News-Argus be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I think the editorial makes some excellent points about the crabs and oysters and shrimp we produce in North Carolina, and I want to make it perfectly clear that those who love crabcakes have every right to call them Maryland or any other name they choose, but from my own knowledge I want them to know that they will enjoy any crabcake a great

deal more if they are made of genuine North Carolina crabs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRABCAKE RECIPE

Up rose in the U.S. Senate chamber a Maryland Senator to complain that his State was being slandered by the serving of crabcakes in the Senate dining room under the name "Maryland crabcakes."

The Honorable complained that there wasn't enough crab in the cakes to warrant the name of crab, let alone Maryland crab.

In furtherance of his promotion for his State's seafood resources, the Senator offered this recipe for true crabcakes, one prepared by the wife of Governor Tawes.

Combine 1 pound crab claw meat with 2 eggs, 2 tablespoons mayonnaise, 1 tablespoon horseradish mustard, ¼ teaspoon salt, ⅛ teaspoon pepper, dash of tabasco sauce, and 1 tablespoon chopped parsley. Mix lightly together and form into cake. Do not pack firmly. Roll out a package of crackers into fine crumbs. Pat crumbs lightly on cake and fry in deep fat until golden brown.

We call on Senators ERVIN and JORDAN to protect their own. We want them to do some research on whence comes the crabmeat used in the Senate dining room. We are told on top authority that Maryland when need requires sends to Hyde or Dare or Carteret for real crabmeat, North Carolina crabs. Everybody knows that North Carolina oysters and shrimp are shipped to various States and sold under names of those States. We want Messrs ERVIN and JORDAN to stop this business.

More immediately the honorables of the U.S. Senate should be made acquainted through their dining room with Craven County deviled crabs produced in the clean-as-a-hospital plant on Neuse River, 6 miles east of New Bern on U.S. 70. Some uplanders will find them in their food stores. Or the passerby can stop, go off the highway a bit, and pick up the delicious food in quantities of three to a dozen.

The New Bern deviled crabs have plenty of meat in them with the sauce and seasoning caressing to the most finicky taste.

Showdown in Foreign Aid Appears Near

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, few special commissions or committees have drawn the favorable attention or provoked the bitter criticism that the Clay Committee on foreign aid has received since making its report to the President.

For too long the Members of Congress have been waiting for just such a study to coherently and logically tie together the strong belief on both sides of the political aisle that foreign aid is a requirement in the current cold war struggle, yet badly in need of overhaul in design and spending.

The Clay Committee has provided much in terms of sensible direction for the Congress, and has further pointed out the current dilemma which our foreign aid program faces.

The following article by William S. White in the March 28 Minneapolis Star illustrates this point:

SHOWDOWN IN FOREIGN AID APPEARS NEAR

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The moment of truth in which the United States must decide whether it will cling to the absurd line that there should be "no strings" anywhere on American foreign aid has been long delayed.

But two current developments give some hope that the showdown cannot much longer be put aside.

One is a calm, clear-minded and adult series of recommendations to the President for putting complete rationality into the aid program.

These have just been issued by a distinguished and nonpolitical commission headed by Gen. Lucius Clay. Among the great contributions of this hero of the Berlin blockade is a firm warning that we must not continue to extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition and knowledge of economic organization and consequences.

While this document was still being digested, the United States agreed to give some $400 million in assistance, in the form of 40-year loans paying three-fourths of 1 percent interest, to Brazil. This is the country which persistently refused to join the United States in any real effort to isolate Castro Cuba.

This is a country which, in the very process of the loan negotiations, was denounced by the State Department itself as having been infiltrated by Communists in official position. This is a country which on the very day the aid was extended refused to put a Federal ban on a Communist, pro-Castro "conference" for a weeklong contrived spasm of "hate America" demonstrations.

No two episodes in all the history of foreign aid have more clearly illustrated the long dilemma for the United States.

Only those who have not thought it all through really believe we should demand total submission, every day and on everything, from the recipients of our assistance. For foreign aid, to the degree that it stabilizes conditions and avoids chaos which sometimes is followed by Communist takeover, is, indeed, in American interests.

But if it is not necessary for us to be liked, it is absolutely necessary for us to be respected. And only the incurably naive believe we should consistently subsidize governments which consistently take up positions contrary to those American interests.

Such people, however, do exist in the United States—as Clay learned in the winds of criticism now blowing from the American left because he dared to raise the slightest question of those one-way aid policies in which we are graciously permitted to pay for the privilege of being abused and obstructed.

Still the fact is that the Brazilian loan and this predictable tumult against Clay are more likely to be constructive than otherwise in the end. For reasonable people—and this definitely includes a great majority of both parties in Congress—are simply not going to stand much longer for this sort of thing.

This sort of thing will hasten the day when public opinion will force one of two great decisions: either a cleansing of foreign aid or servile unwillingness to make any demand whatever upon its recipients, or the destruction of foreign aid itself.

If the Clay Commission recommendations are ignored, it will be foreign aid itself which will fall. But because rational foreign aid must not fall, the administration at last must rid itself of this servility. And the hero of Berlin will once again have served all the West even though the old ladies of the left will shriek against him to the end.

Reduced Taxation and Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REDUCED TAXATION AND EXPENDITURES

The current rate of Federal taxation on both individuals and corporations is such as to dampen personal incentives and severely reduce the amount of capital available for the expansion of old or the establishment of new job-creating industries. This severely inhibits our rate of growth. We are, therefore, in full agreement that constructive action needs to be taken to bring about equitable personal and corporate tax reduction at an early date. A farmer can't provide a tractor-driving job unless he can accumulate funds to buy a tractor and he can't do this if the tax system siphons off the funds needed for the tractor's purchase. American industry as a whole now finds itself in a like predicament.

However, if we are to enjoy the right to a tax reduction, we must earn that right by our willingness to do without some of the costly and unnecessary tax-eating proposals now being made and agree to a reduction in the cost and scope of existing programs of marginal value. This we can do without crippling any essential governmental program or function and at the same time provide badly needed relief for taxpayers.

To continue adding to the burdensome interest payments on the national debt, which already amounts to approximately $210 per family, will eventually prove disastrous.

Equally disastrous will be a program to partly finance the cost of government through inflation which progressively erodes away the value of personal investments in social security, bank deposits or other forms of savings to cover future needs.

We, therefore, insist that any program of needed tax reduction be coupled with reductions in expenditures sufficient to bring the Federal Budget into balance. Any other course of action will, in our opinion, in the long run reduce our strength and effectiveness as the acknowledged leader of the free world.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintro-

duced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MARCH 25, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: It is always a pleasure to write to you, sir, and once again I am doing so, this time to urge that you support, and bring before your committee, an important resolution submitted by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, entitled, I believe, the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14).

This resolution calls for the setting up of a Committee on Captive Nations in the House.

It is in the satellite nations of Central and Eastern Europe that the Soviet Union, our enemy, is weakest and most vulnerable. In those countries, unlike many of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the Soviet Union is clearly recognized as the enemy, and the United States as a friend.

In our worldwide struggle with the Soviet Union, we can accomplish much more if we will emphasize and increase our efforts in Eastern Europe, and a House Committee on Captive Nations would be a fine step in that direction.

Congratulations again, sir, for all your splendid work in Congress. Best wishes, and more power to you.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. STYLES.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

ANTI-COMMUNIST ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIANS OF REVOLUTIONARY-DEMOCRATIC PERSUASIONS IN THE U.S.A., INC.,
March 25, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of our organization we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. The adoption of the resolution, which calls "for the creation of a special permanent committee to deal with the captive nations in the grip of Soviet Russian tyranny and enslavement," will have a historical meaning in the foreign policy of the United States of America.

This committee will be a first step toward the downfall of the Russian colonial empire, that is in the interest of the United States of America and the world.

Sincerely yours,

M. SEMENEC, *Secretary.*

UNITED BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE,
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 24, 1963.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We, Americans of Byelorussian descent, assembled at mass meeting, in Biltmore Hotel, in New York City to commemorate 45th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, wish to express our sincere congratulations on your introduction of the resolution (H. Res. 14) calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, and pledge our full support of your measure in Congress and will urge other U.S. Congressmen to vote for this resolution.

The Soviet Union's goal is to dominate the world, and the Americans should know it, because Soviet Russia has become a great imperialist peril which threatens all free nations and particularly our country, the United States of America.

Your resolution to create a committee is a great step in the right direction. It would serve as an information center on the enslaved peoples in the U.S.S.R. and formulate current American policy concerning the captive nations of Soviet Russia according to national interests of America. The present policy of the State Department regarding the enslaved peoples does not correspond to these needs in full.

Activity of this committee will be an inspiration to the captive nations for resistance against the Soviet Russia occupation for their national liberation.

For the Byelorussian emigrants in the free world as well as for the Americans of Byelorussian descent this committee will be the central point of support in their activity directed to the support of the country of their origin in the struggle for her liberation.

In the future conflict with Soviet Russia the captive nations will fight for their liberation and will be allies of America in this common struggle.

We believe that this committee will be a most competent organ to deal with the national question of Soviet Russia in the most advantageous way for the United States of America.

Sincerely yours,
For the assembly:

MICHAEL BACHAR,
Chairman.

NEWINGTON, CONN., *March 23, 1963.*

Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a new resolution proposing the establishment of a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

Please give me the assurance that you will support this extremely important resolution.

Sincerely,

EDWARD H. FENN.

BYELORUSSIAN LIBERATION FRONT,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 23, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Old House Office Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We, Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussian emigres, organized in the American-Byelorussian organizations in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, on March 24, 1963, commemorated the 45th anniversary of the day of the proclamation of the independence of Byelorussia and marked this historic event by assembling in American Legion Hall, 1205 Starkweather Avenue, for solemn exercises commemorating the 25th of March 1918, when Byelorussia was proclaimed an independent democratic republic.

In marking this historic day, we all, Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussian immigrants, expressed to you, Mr. Congressman, the deepest thanks of all Byellorussians for your assistance during many years and your moral support for the Byeorussian people in their struggle for independence as a national state, for those human rights and justice which have been and are being still denied by the Communist occupants of their country.

We sincerely believe that the time will come when all the peoples enslaved by communism will, together with the nations of the free world, secure a final victory over Communist evil and slavery, and we Byelorussians are always ready to put forth the greatest efforts to achieve that victory.

In expressing our thanks for your sincere help and for your sympathy, we hope that in the future you will continue to the best of your ability to support the Byelorussian people in their struggle against the Communist occupant.

In signing this, we say, with the approval of the officers of the American-Byelorussian organizations—glory to America.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN SHIMCHIK,
Chairman, Byelorussian Liberation Front.
A. SACEWICZ,
Chairman, American-Byelorussian Cultural Relief Association.
K. MATYLICKI,
Representative, American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.
R. MIKULICZ,
Chairman of the Observance Committee.

MARCH 20, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of the people whose signatures appear below, we respectfully ask that you submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) for vote by your committee and trust that you yourself will recognize the need for passage of this vital bill.

A Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would be of vital aid in combating communism.

Thanking you in advance to give the Flood resolution your full support, we are

Very truly yours,

HENRY HARRISON,
ANNE HARRISON,
MANÉ BENAS,
PETER BENAS,
WILLIAM R. BENAS,
OWEN F. JONES,
ALEXANDER HARRISON.

COSSACK-AMERICAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE INC.,
Queens Village, Long Island, N.Y.,
March 22, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of our organization (or a group of citizens un-

dersigned below) we urge you submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

_____ _____.

President Kennedy's Proposals in the Field of Mental Health—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution on mental health, adopted by the Psychiatric Society of Westchester County, N.Y., on February 20, 1963, together with the letter of transmittal, dated March 11, 1963, from Dr. Laurence Loeb, secretary of the Psychiatric Society of Westchester County.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PSYCHIATRIC SOCIETY
OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, INC.,
March 11, 1963.

The Honorable JACOB JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am enclosing a copy of a resolution passed by the membership of the Psychiatric Society of Westchester County and of the Section on Neurology and Psychiatry of the Westchester Academy of Medicine concerning the legislation proposed in the field of mental health.

We feel that passage of this proposed legislation is important to the development of facilities in this field, and ask your support.

Respectfully submitted.

LAURENCE LOEB, M.D.
Secretary, Psychiatric Society of Westchester County.

RESOLUTION ON MENTAL HEALTH ADOPTED BY THE PSYCHIATRIC SOCIETY OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY ON FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

The Psychiatric Society of Westchester County endorses President Kennedy's proposals in the field of mental health. In his message to Congress on February 5, 1963, the President advocated new assistance for the development of community mental health services. In this message, the President has taken the first major step in implementing the chief proposals of "Action for Mental Health," the final report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illnesses and Health which was empowered by Congress in 1955 to make a thorough analysis of the Nation's mental health needs.

The Commission recommended a planned system of professional community services for the care of the mentally ill which would stress prevention, research, and the training of an adequate number of professional personnel. In order to accomplish the goal of intensive preventive and treatment efforts centered in the community in which the patient lives, the Commission recommended that Federal, State, and local government expenditures for mental health be increased appropriately.

It is the goal of this program to reduce by 50 percent the hospital admissions for mental illness through the prompt and efficient use of out-patient and day care treatment centers, integrated with family, educational, and vocational rehabilitation services. It is also expected that hospital treatment where indicated will be more effective as well as briefer. There is emphasis in the program on follow-up treatment and rehabilitation services.

We endorse the President's program as constituting a sound long term financial investment as well as on humanitarian and scientific grounds. As representing the psychiatrists of Westchester County, we, therefore, urge our fellow citizens and elected representatives to support the President's enlightened mental health program.

SAMUEL ROSMARIN, M.D.,
President, Psychiatric Society of Westchester Co.

Stuffed Shirts in High Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, each year, during the vacation of their editor, Mr. George Shannon, the Shreveport Journal invites well-known business and civic leaders to submit guest editorials. In the past, a number of telling observations on the American scene have been written.

One in particular appeared last October under the title, "Stuffed Shirts in High Places." It was written by one of Shreveport's prominent businessmen, Mr. H. H. Bain, president of H. & M. Enterprises, Inc. I am impressed by the content of Mr. Bain's editorial.

The reading matter most Members are faced with daily is monumental, I know. But the message contained in Mr. Bain's editorial is well worth the 2 or 3 minutes it will take to read it. In the hopes that all my colleagues will take that few minutes, I insert this editorial below:

STUFFED SHIRTS IN HIGH PLACES

(By H. H. Bain)

The human race has always bowed down like a camel to receive whatever load a fanatical and despotic power has seen fit to place upon it.

We owe eternal thanks to our Heavenly Father for inspiring our Pilgrim Fathers who braved the turbulent Atlantic in the *Mayflower*. They brought with them the seed, or grassroots, of unselfishness, integrity, and justice, the material from which patriotism has evolved. From this stock came such immortals at Franklin, Marshall, Warren, Jefferson, and many others, whose lives and deeds will always be a glowing tribute to the humanity of the past. They are now known, collectively, as our Founding Fathers.

These men had logical minds and a burning love for their country, which is evidenced by their sacrifices, prayers, and tireless labor of love for their fellow man.

History had taught them the weakness of human nature, which knowledge must have been their inspiration in writing their immortal masterpieces, and shown them that, even over the bodies of the dead, ambition and oppression always marches toward a despotic power.

History carried them through the countless bloodcurdling examples of the Roman despotism; the flames of Smithfield; the dark days of St. Bartholomew; the Spanish Inquisition; Scotland, the prey of Calverhouse; and the Sicilian Vespers. For a longer list study Alva's Saturnalia of Hell in the low countries; follow the armies of Titus as he ravished and slew everything alive in Jerusalem; then step across the border into our own backyard to the Teocalli of Mexico and read again its history, streaming with the blood of human sacrifices.

Would-be dictators will try to brush that off by claiming all of it is only a relic of other and darker days that tell the story of man's savagery. But what about the countless murders in this generation by the dictators of Spain, where unknown numbers of American citizens have long languished in prison while we, like a foolish and unwise mother, have been sending them billions of our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, all of which seems to be running true to form and to a pattern adopted by a Congress that the taxpayers have elected to represent them.

Within the last two decades the dictators of Germany and Italy and Japan have appeared upon the stage, acted their part, and like all the rest, have withdrawn into eternal oblivion.

Now, faced with these historical facts, and knowing that for many, many years our form of Government and our Constitution have been considered by wise men to be the greatest documents of their kind ever conceived by the mind of man, polluted politics has seen fit to give it the kiss of death and throw it all into the discard.

The functions of our Supreme Court are to interpret the written law—not to create or enforce it.

One wonders what kind of an anathema has come over our Congress that they repeatedly stand by like zombies or babes in the woods and permit nearly everything and anything to pass that is proposed.

If extremes create reform, then reformation is long overdue.

Again we wonder what has become of our patriotism, our integrity, our sense of right and wrong which even ignorance does not bungle every time. And that reminds us of Potsdam, Teheran, Little Rock, and Cuba.

Frank Lybock, who has taught more jungle people to read and write than any man who has ever lived, says "it will take the prayers of 100 million people to save us," yet, in our stupidity, we are too busy playing politics and integrating to hear Red communism pounding on our back door.

Of course, it is paradoxical, but it does seem that the more science reveals to us of the miraculous meaning of the divine plans spread out on our trestle board of modern life, the more we forget the glories and blessings of an infinite God.

If we are indicted for our opinion on the tragedy of polluted politics, the rape of our Constitution and the selling down the river of the taxpayers of America, the hand of Heaven will defend us, and history will absolve us.

A Survey on the President's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I know of no more important subject to come before the Congress this year than the program of tax reduction and reform which has been submitted by the President. Therefore, I venture to place before you the results of a survey reported recently to the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. Mr. Burger's testimony includes results of a poll taken among the federation's 188,000 members on a number of major issues relating to the President's tax proposals. I think you will find the results most interesting.

Accordingly, I present herewith Mr. Burger's testimony:

A SURVEY ON THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

I am George J. Burger, vice president of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. We are a national organization composed solely of smaller, independent business and independent professional people. Our headquarters is at San Mateo, Calif. I am in charge of the Washington, D.C., office.

Presently we have over 188,000 individual, directly supporting and participating members throughout all 50 States. This number is increasing every week. From the standpoint of number of directly supporting and participating members, we are the largest business organization in the country.

Our main function is one of providing these independent enterprisers with a means to, and encourage them to, take an informed, active interest in Government affairs, State as well as National.

I will not describe our method of operation. Most, if not all, the members of this committee have become familiar with the federation over the 18 years of our Washington activities. I will say only that in the federation the member is the direct boss. Throughout the mandate polls—regular reports on which have been furnished to you—we determine the majority position of the membership. This sets the federation's course.

Naturally you are interested in what the members of this federation, independent enterprisers throughout all 50 States—many in your own district, and you have been receiving mandate ballots from them—have told us they think about tax revision proposals.

Necessarily I will deal with percentages and figures. But let no one think of these as mere statistics. To the contrary, they are based on the reasoned opinion of these smaller, independent business and professional people. As you know, in mandate polls we present concise, objective arguments on both sides of each issue. Above and beyond this, we urge each and every member to familiarize himself with all issues by reading at least one good weekly news magazine and one daily newspaper, of his choice. It is out of this mix of information, plus the concrete daily experience they have in conducting their vocations, which gives them the ability to measure the practical effect of proposals at the grass roots, that their mandate and survey opinions flow.

In this connection the federation surveyed its members during January on five issues directly involved in or directly relating to the administration's tax measure proposals in the Mandate No. 281 (copy attached marked "A"). The federation reported results of this survey in its the Mandate No. 282 (copy attached marked "B"). Briefly, our questions and the responses to each are as follows:

1. Are you in favor of the President's proposal to reduce personal and corporation income taxes in three stages (first part to come in 1963, second in 1964, and final in 1965)? The President pledged to cut total spending except for defense, space, and interest. This would mean cuts in Government employment, welfare programs, other nondefense projects. For, 66 percent; against, 29 percent; no vote, 5 percent.

2. Are you in favor of the President's proposal to reduce personal income tax rates (this involves 28-percent cuts on taxable incomes up to $5,000, 23- to 25-percent cuts on $10,000 to $50,000 incomes, and 15-percent cuts on all larger incomes)? Personal income tax rates apply to all unincorporated business and professional operations. For, 70 percent; against, 26 percent; no vote, 4 percent.

3. Are you in favor of the President's proposal to reduce corporation tax rates to 22 percent on the first $25,000 taxable income, and to 45 percent on all above that figure? Corporations now pay 30 percent on the first $25,000 taxable income, and 52 percent on all above that figure. For, 53 percent; against, 40 percent; no vote, 7 percent.

4. Are you in favor of the plan urged by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Small Business Committee to cut the corporate tax rate to 22 percent on the first $50,000 taxable income, leaving the rate at 52 percent on all above that figure? For, 59 percent; against, 34 percent; no vote, 7 percent.

5. Do you believe that Congress should match tax cuts by Federal spending cuts on a dollar-for-dollar basis, before finally enacting tax reductions? For, 83 percent; against, 14 percent; no vote, 3 percent.

Of course the majority vote has determined the federation's position. I might note that Congressmen themselves have already received the signed ballots underlying these foregoing percentage figures.

Further, we have just commenced circulating the attached special survey for 1963, "Let's take care of our business—government" (sample copy, marked "C" attached). Briefly, our questions in the field of tax reductions and the 1,884 responses received from the membership during the initial two weeks of this yearlong survey are as follows:

ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

a. Reduce individual income taxes evenly all along the line regardless of size of incomes involved. For, 900; against, 370; no vote, 614.

b. Reduce individual income taxes to afford greater savings to firms and people with incomes of $8,000 or less. For, 794; against, 279; no vote, 811.

ON CORPORATION INCOME TAXES

a. Reduce corporation taxes as suggested by Senate Small Business Committee to make greatest percentage reductions for firms earning under $50,000. For, 951; against, 216; no vote, 717.

b. Reduce corporation taxes by 5 percentage points all along the line, regardless of size of corporate income. For, 483; against, 473; no vote, 927.

SHOULD CONGRESS CUT TAXES THIS YEAR?

Corporations now pay 30 percent tax on first $25,000 of taxable income, and 52 percent in tax on earnings above that figure. The committee proposes to substitute for this a 22-percent tax on the first $50,000-taxable income, followed by a 52-percent tax on all earnings in excess of $50,000. For, 889; against, 296; no vote, 699.

Additionally we posed the following questions concerning tax and spending reforms in this survey to our members.

TAX REFORM, GOVERNMENT SPENDING

a. Believe revenue losses should be recovered by tax reform (loophole closing). For, 1,011; against, 427; no vote, 446.

b. Believe losses should be recovered by reduction in Government spending. For, 1,535; against, 85; no vote, 264.

c. Cut foreign aid. For, 1,400; against, 130; no vote, 354.

d. Cut Federal payrolls employment. For, 1,355; against, 244; no vote, 285.

e. Cut public works (dams, highways, buildings). For, 613; against, 781; no vote, 490.

f. Cut social welfare programs. For, 1,125; against, 348; no vote, 411.

Of course the foregoing information is based on responses during only the first 2 weeks of this year-long survey. It is possible that a trend has not yet definitely established itself. If so this will become clearer in the succeeding weeks and months. But there is one thing we can tell you: those of our members whom we have been able to contact to date are studying it most carefully, in fact some are counseling with their lawyers and accountants, before responding to the questions. In other words, all indications are that opinions expressed in the survey will have been most deeply thought out before being set down on paper. Naturally, this fact will vastly increase the usefulness of responses to those in Congress.

In addition to the current reaction on the tax problem, we are glad to supply you the following background information about opinions which mirror the needs of our members, and relate to the administration's tax reduction proposals as determined in mandate polls during 1962, and in the special 1962 factfinding "How's Business With You?" survey (copy, marked "D" attached).

First, the administration advances the idea that tax revision is the No. 1 domestic problem facing the country today, and that this subject requires your immediate and deepest attention. A majority of our members agree with the administration on this point. For instance, in the Mandate No. 280 (December 1962) we asked: "Should Congress make tax cuts for individuals and corporations its No. 1 order of business in 1963?"

As reported in Mandate No. 281, 62 percent of our responding members declared that Congress should give taxes this attention. Thirty-three percent replied in the negative. Five percent expressed no opinion.

Further, during 1962 we received almost 57,000 signed replies to the Federation's "How's Business With You?" questionnaire. Approximately half of these responses bear comments setting forth opinion and fact in support of positions taken by the members. We covered seven different problem areas in this survey. By far the greatest number (40,191) of responding members indicated they felt that "Congress should make tax reductions now." A cross section of the actual signed comments bearing replies to this survey is on file with the Senate Small Business Committee and can be seen at their offices. Additionally, we have transferred the files of these comment bearing responses, many of which are in the field of taxes, from our San Mateo headquarters to our Washington office. It is quite possible that some of you gentlemen on this committee will be interested in having one of your staff members come to our office and go through the files for your own States. If so, on behalf of the Federation, I extend a most cordial invitation for you to do so. We will be happy to render all possible assistance in such visits as a service on behalf of independent business and the professions to members of this committee as well as to all others in Government.

Second, as part of its planning, the administration proposes to make tax reductions even if the result is an increase in the national debt. Of course, the hope is that this will be only short-term, and that increased activity in the private enterprise sector will in time produce more total tax revenues, in fact enough to bring the budget into line. Our members have been almost divided on this point. For instance in Mandate No. 277 (July 1962) we asked: "Should Congress cut personal and corporate tax rates across the board this year? Some business and labor groups suggest this to strengthen the economy, even if it results in an increased national debt."

As reported in Mandate No. 278, 50 percent of our responding members favored this action, even at the risk of greater deficit spending. On the other hand, a solid 47 percent responded in the negative. Three percent expressed no opinion. This, coupled with heavy votes in favor of such economy actions as reducing foreign aid, would indicate there is considerable sentiment among federation members for spending reductions to run concurrently with tax reductions.

Third, the program proposed by the administration bears heavily on across-the-board rate reductions for individuals, unincorporated enterprises, and corporations. In the tax reduction phase of our "How's Business With You?" 1962 survey, we also asked our members: "If you think Congress should make tax reductions now which of the following do you think would most promote the welfare of those in small business and the professions?" We furnished them with four alternatives, and this is how the answers came out: (1) 18,208 checked the "lower tax rates" alternative; (2) 11,496 checked the "faster depreciation" alternative; (3) 16,216 checked the "plowback allowance" alternative; (4) 20,679 checked the "self-employed retirement plan" alternative.

This, then, would indicate that there is considerable sentiment in favor of the tax rate reduction proposed by the administration. However, since these are the findings in a special survey, not in the Mandate poll, they do not bind the federation.

The sense of our membership as to the tax needs of those in smaller, independent business and the professions, as evidenced in 1962 polls and surveys, would seem to indicate that our members feel that: (1) Congress should make tax reductions its No. 1 order of business in 1963; (2) tax rates should be lowered for all smaller firms, unincorporated and corporate; (3) but care should be taken at the same time to effect meaningful economies in Government spending.

For the federation, its staff, and myself I thank you, and leave you with the thought that if the federation can ever be of additional direct assistance to your committee, by providing direct contacts with what is the largest membership of any organization in the country, all you have to do is to call me at the Washington building, and we will set the wheels in motion.

U.S. Strategic Goods Flow to Soviet Bloc Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Fulton Lewis, Jr., one of the most perceptive commentators in America, has directed attention to some disturbing U.S. trade policies with Communist countries.

Citing evidence turned up by my colleague, GLENN LIPSCOMB, in his hard-driving investigation of this matter, Mr. Lewis shows how, unbelievably enough, American taxpayers are actually contributing to the economic and military strengthening of the Soviet bloc. The instances mentioned suggest an incredible lack of awareness in high executive positions in the administration to what is going on in our international trade situation.

I hope an administration explanation is forthcoming. In the meantime, I call the House's attention to Mr. Lewis' column and commend Congressman LIPSCOMB on the exemplary service he has performed in bringing this matter to light.

Mr. Lewis' article follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 26, 1963]

U.S. STRATEGIC GOODS FLOW TO SOVIET BLOC CONTINUES

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Little more than a month ago, bureaucrats in the Department of Commerce granted an American firm permission to sell synthetic rubber valued at $460,000 to Communist Czechoslovakia.

Informed the rubber was to be used in the manufacture of tires, Representative GLENN LIPSCOMB opened a one-man investigation into recent trade and discovered that U.S. shipments to Iron Curtain countries are continuing at a shocking rate.

To the Soviet Union, United States firms ship industrial chemicals, petroleum, coke, technical data of all kinds.

To Hungary, industrial chemicals, pneumatic metalworking tools, microfilm, scientific instruments, automotive parts.

To Poland, chemical concentrates, spectrum measuring instruments, precision boring machines.

To Czechoslovakia, crude sulfur, carbon black, semiconductors, raw cotton, optical measuring devices.

One of the biggest recipients of U.S. goods is Yugoslavia's Josef Broz Tito, who recently kissed and made up with Premier Khrushchev.

On February 21, the Commerce Department issued a license authorizing the shipment to Yugoslavia of rolling equipment worth $3.6 million to be used in a steel mill under construction at Jesenice. The license, which had been applied for only 3 weeks earlier, covers equipment and spare parts for a combination blooming, slabbing and plate mill.

This type of mill, LIPSCOMB discovered, is used to reduce steel ingots to intermediary sizes and shapes before further processing into steel plates, rails, wheels, sheets, bars, tubes, rods, and a variety of other items. "Obviously," says LIPSCOMB, "such equipment is essential to the manufacture of many strategic goods."

On February 25, 4 days after Commerce first approved the export of equipment for that mill, another license was granted. The Department authorized the shipment to Yugoslavia of a 7,000-horsepower electric motor, two 600-horsepower electric engines, and special purpose controls and parts. Total value: $685,120. These products, too, will be used at the Jesenice steel mill. According to the Department of Commerce, products of this mill will be used in the ship construction industry.

Incredibly, the Yugoslav purchases are being financed through credit extended by the Export-Import Bank, which has just loaned Marshal Tito $50 million. Congressman LIPSCOMB told my office: "The American taxpayer is therefore contributing greatly to the economic and military buildup of the Soviet bloc."

On February 19, Commerce issued 12 licenses approving the shipment of copper scrap worth $2 million to Yugoslavia. When LIPSCOMB asked the Department for what purpose the copper would be used, he was told it would be converted into copper sulfate and used in an agricultural spray.

The Special House Committee on Export Control, of which LIPSCOMB is a member, discovered last year that Yugoslavia supplies the U.S.S.R. with copper rods, copper plates, copper tubes, and pipes. "All of course are important in the manufacture of many strategic commodities," he notes.

Since the beginning of January, the Commerce Department has approved the shipment to Tito of the following: Electron tubes, communications equipment, construction machinery, electrical testing machinery, petroleum drilling parts, coaxial cable, waveform measuring instruments, copper alloy wire, aircraft parts, scientific and professional equipment.

Vote of the Commonwealth Club of California in U.S. Attitude Toward Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently the study section of the Commonwealth Club of California completed a 1½-year study of the question of U.S. Attitude Toward Red China."

As is the custom of the club, the study section reported its findings to the entire club where again the pros and cons of the subject were debated. Afterward, a confidential vote was taken of the entire membership with the following results:

VOTE OF THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA ON U.S. ATTITUDE TOWARD RED CHINA

Results of the secret mail ballot submitted to all members of the Commonwealth Club of California immediately following distribution of the transaction, "U.S. Attitude Toward Red China":

As regards Communist China, should policy of the United States be to defend the status quo by a policy of containment, and resistance to attempts by the Red Chinese to extend their control and influence beyond their present borders? Yes, 2,209; No, 585.

As regards Communist China, should policy of the United States be to seize the initiative and direct our influence and efforts, by all means short of war, to displace the Red China regime? Yes, 1,863; No, 972.

(a) Should the United States continue to deny recognition to Red China? Yes, 2,325; No, 640.

(b) If we do not grant recognition, should we increase contacts with Red China:

1. By meeting with Red China's representatives in conference on disarmament and on such other issues when we deem it likely to be to our advantage? Yes, 1,952; No, 823.

2. By establishing trade relations? Yes, 730; No, 1,935.

3. By extending food or other forms of relief to Red China, if requested? Yes, 959; No, 1,693.

Should we extend U.S. trade, aid, and other concessions only in return for the changes we desire in Red China's policies and programs? Yes, 1,667; No, 1,121.

Should we continue to oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations? Yes, 2,344; No, 625.

Should we withdraw from the United Nations if Red China is admitted? Yes, 682; No, 2,252.

Should we continue support to Nationalist China along current lines? Yes, 2,376; No. 524.

Should we endeavor to induce Nationalist China to withdraw from Quemoy and Matsu? Yes, 357; No, 2,534.

Should we continue to assist the free countries of Asia in their resistance to Communist attack? Yes, 2,870; No, 79.

Should we extend support to any Asiatic government which opposes communism, without regard to its form of government? Yes, 1,510; No, 1,351.

Coin-Op Drycleaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding young men of my home city, Mr. Arthur C. Antonopoulos, general manager of the Highland Cleaners in Lowell, Mass., was one of the featured participants in the National Institute of Drycleaning in Washington last week. His remarks, revealing as they do his deep knowledge of the Industry to which he, his father and brothers, have devoted their lives, qualify as expert testimony on a new development in the field of clothing care.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to share Mr. Antonopoulos' speech with my colleagues.

The speech follows:

SPEECH ON COIN-OPS TO NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DRYCLEANING, WASHINGTON, D.C., BY ARTHUR C. ANTONOPOULOS, GENERAL MANAGER, HIGHLAND CLEANERS

Ladies and gentlemen, our industry has a new offspring. It's known as coin-op drycleaning. To exist, it needs coins.

Many important things have been decided by the flip of a coin but my mission here today is not contingent upon the flip of a coin but rather to give you our impressions as to the direction we feel the coin is to be flipped.

There is no doubt that our new offspring will mature with us. The direction it will take is of great importance to us. Let us look at how this offspring is growing within our organization.

First of all, here is what our firm has done over the past few years to try to keep abreast of the industry changes as they developed and at the same time keep the parent healthy and growing along with whatever developments might be forthcoming.

In 1952, we as a professional drycleaner recognized the tremendous importance of offering shirt laundering in conjunction with our drycleaning services. Highland Cleaners pioneered this concept at our newly modernized parent plant in Lowell.

It wasn't long after, that the package plant concept came to the forefront offering fast, convenient, cash and carry drive-in facilities. Again the spirit of Plymouth Rock, Anton's of Andover was opened in 1956. Here we incorporated the entire package plant concept as it was then known consisting of professional drycleaning and shirt laundering on the premises.

Folowing in the footsteps of our package plant in Andover, similar operations were opened in Lowell in 1958 and Wilmington in 1959.

The next service that appeared on the horizon was the coin-operated laundry. Highland Cleaners felt that it might bring additional traffic to our package plants and thus established our package plant in Lowell as a pilot plant by opening a coin-operated laundry next door.

Because of the results of the Lowell experiment, we confidently opened another convenient package plant in the town of Reading. A complete professional drycleaning plant with shirt laundering similar to our Andover plant but now something else had been added to the picture, attached to it and part of it was a complete coin-operated laundry.

It was felt however at this time that there should not be a direct opening from the coin-op to the professional side, thus the two separate doors and the complete wall separating the two as two separate entities but each looking to the other for greater income.

During the construction of the Reading plant, already the distant rumblings of he advent of a coin-operated drycleaning machine was heard. It didn't take long for our seismographs to become aware of this. In October and November of 1960, being acutely aware of the latest development, I addressed the Ohio and Massachusetts drycleaners associations and gave our thoughts as to coin-operated drycleaning. It might be of interest to you for me to quote what was said 2 years ago.

"As far as we are concerned, don't ridicule coin-operated drycleaning, keep an open mind, think before you jump. We definitely feel that coin-operated drycleaning in one form or another is a reality. We disagree with the way it is being introduced. We feel at present that the manufacturers have not shown that they are our ally as they claim.

"Coin-op drycleaning will definitely 'pick' at our business. Gravy items which have been very profitable items for us are going to be lost to coin-op drycleaning.

"However, how profitable the entire picture will be, still remains to be seen; many questions are still unanswered." These statements were made 2 years ago.

Then in 1961, I traveled to different parts of our country looking at coin-operated installations, talking to the owners. I spoke to suppliers and to the manufacturers of coin equipment. There were definite areas of confusion. I listened to great promises, to the untried opportunities of making a killing in coin-op drycleaning by being first, everyone seemed to be up in the clouds and many became experts on the subject overnight. We were confused, but, we decided that we would invest $25,000 in research, that we would put up a coin-operated installation to learn firsthand where are we going. We decided to find out the facts for ourselves. We wanted true, realistic figures, unbiased results, and we wanted to be in a position to analyze for ourselves the effect coin-op drycleaning would have on the professional drycleaner. This was our reason for going into coin drycleaning, and subsequently we installed eight coin drycleaning machines in our coin laundry next to our Lowell package plant which is now 1½ years old.

In May of 1962, in Lawrence, Mass., we opened one of the first textile maintenance and fabric care centers in the United States. Anton's of Lawrence, we felt, was to be the plant of tomorrow. This plant offers under one roof, professional drycleaning, shirt laundering, fur storage vault on the premises and the largest and most spacious coin operated laundry with coin drycleaning in the entire area.

We have tried to create the atmosphere of a supermarket of laundry and drycleaning services. The coin department remains open 24 hours a day and an aluminum screen separates the two when the professional side is closed at 9 p.m.

After the Lawrence fabric care opening, I ventured forth again, this time across three-quarters of the country, culminating my trip at Denver, visiting en route many coin-operated installations which confirmed the fact that we were on the right track as to the place coin-op would occupy in our industry in the future. Also, as a result of this sojourn, it appeared to me that the coin-op picture was and has developed into four definite stages. The four stages are:

Stage No. 1 is the infancy of the coin-operated drycleaning business. Here we have the first investor with the sole outlet in a given area. This operation properly located can be extremely profitable.

Then, stage two starts. Other installations open around the sole installation, within a mile, wthin one-half mile, around the corner and then it happens, the profitable single operation becomes a marginal unit almost overnight and as more installations open, they all become loss factors. I saw tremendous installations with 16 and 24 pockets that were doing 150 to 300 loads a day when they opened, now averaging 30 to 40 loads a day, certainly a far cry from the bonanza that existed previously.

Then, stage three develops. In an effort to try to combat the other coin-ops and to regain business lost, the war between the coin-operators themselves starts. Installations start to offer 4 pounds for $1 instead of $2 per load to enduce customers. Customers then use two pockets at $1 each instead of one, splitting light and dark garments, thus getting better results at the same cost but the cost of operation doubles for the owner-operator.

Premium stamps are being offered as an inducement to do business with one installation over another. In one city, one operator had started a key club which would open the front door and permit you to use his equipment after midnight when the business was normally closed.

Then as a final effort, they add pressing machines and spotting boards hoping to attract their customers by offering pressing at very low prices, but, gentlemen, this doesn't work out.

Then, what we choose to call stage 4 develops: With the influx of coin drycleaning and now that the area is educated to what is meant by coin drycleaning the professional drycleaners aggressively start to offer coin type drycleaning, taking away some more business from the existing operations.

What has happened to the professional drycleaner through these four stages?

1. During the first stage, the professional drycleaner saw little or no effect in his trading area, but the professional operator who had it next to him saw a definite effect on his drycleaning volume and the majority of professional drycleaners were indifferent to the whole matter.

2. During the second stage, professional drycleaning volume started to drop and the percentage of drop was in direct proportion to the number of installations in the area. The drop ranged anywhere from 3 percent to 30 percent.

3. During stage 3, the professional situation remained stagnant while the coin-op operations battled it out. And, the marginal professional drycleaner, sorry to say, went out of business.

4. During stage 4, the professional started to level off this downtrend and noticed a definite pickup in the complete professional service since the number of coin-op installations became practically stagnant. By the way, in stage 4, the marginal operator in coin-op went out of business and this definitely was a factor in many areas of slowing down the growth of new installations.

At this time I would like to show you the sales chart for 1962 drycleaning sales versus 1961 of our professional drycleaning plant where next door to it we installed our first coin-op drycleaning installation.

You will notice that drycleaning sales of this plant were down for 1962 in a 4-year-old plant where sales should have been on the increase. This lost business and the loss of anticipated growth business we lost to coin drycleaning which bore out what we found out would happen to the professional plant during stage 2. However, shirt sales were on the increase.

Chart No. 2 shows the number of loads processed at our coin-op for the year 1962. You will notice that the overall pattern is similar to that of our own professional pattern except in the summer the dip in the coin-op is more severe than in the professional side.

We find that our breakeven point is 196 loads as shown by the darker line. We also know that coin drycleaning alone would have been suicide. The coin laundry is carrying the load at this operation at present.

It is interesting to note that in the fourth and eighth weeks of 1962 we offered a price reduction coupon in the newspaper and this really brought in business, but look at what happened the next 3 weeks. This confirmed for us the fact that when price inducement is offered by other coin operators, users of coin-ops shift from one operation to another proving to us that there is little loyalty to a coin-op installation. We also feel that users take advantage of a price reduction and clean up their closets but they do not frequent a coin-op on their own initiative as often as we were lead to believe.

We were the sole operation from September 1961 to the 20th week of 1962 with eight pockets. At present, there are 40 pockets in our trading area.

What has happened at our fabric care center to date? The professional District of Columbia side is doing better than we had budgeted for—for the first 10 months of operation, shirt laundering has exceeded our budgeted figures, the coin laundry is running just about at budget but the coin-drycleaning department is doing poorly.

This is not to say that people who are using coin drycleaning are not happy with it, they certainly are and for the most part like it very much but the issue here is, for the investment required, can we get a proper return to justify the money expended.

In summary, our reason for our second coin-op installation was that we wanted to achieve what we felt was the epidemy in our industry. We wanted to handle anything and everything pertaining to clothing care maintenance. We wanted to give our customers an opportunity of availing themselves to any type of service they might desire, under one roof. We felt that we as professionals were better qualified to handle any and all clothing care problems and if there was a need and place for coin drycleaning it belonged here. We felt that we wanted people to come to us with all their clothing maintenance dollars.

Insofar as coin-op is concerned our attendants are instructed to oversee each load, if possible, and to casually recommend that all suits and any other garment they feel requires professional care be handled for complete fabric care in the professional department.

I must say that it is more difficult to promote this entire concept and we are experimenting with this.

We feel that the future of our industry lies in the complete fabric care center. We feel that we must provide all services under one roof, however, the amount of investment that we should make for each department in the overall concept is the big question. We must think in terms of our investment.

We are convinced that we have placed too great an investment in the coin drycleaning department for the return that appears likely.

We feel that within another year we will be able to come to some very definite conclusions.

We realize one thing, that we cannot sit back and become complacent about coin drycleaning. It has convinced us more than ever that we must do a better professional job, we must really turn out workmanship that is complete in every respect.

We must truly be professionals, not only by talking but in the product we are turning out. The future of the professional drycleaning is bright if we will face the future boldly and turn out the type of workmanship that truly is professional in every respect, and try to educate consumers to want the complete fabric care to look right. We must try to educate people to insist on good grooming and not a casual appearance. We feel that we can channel coin drycleaning to our advantage.

In conclusion, I would like to draw a parallel about a woman, a very distraught woman who went to a psychiatrist about her husband. She was greatly upset and told the psychiatrist that her husband said for her was a chicken. The psychiatrist said for her to relax, give him the facts and he would try to cure her husband. The woman blurted out, don't cure him, we need the eggs.

Well gentlemen, as she needs the eggs, we don't want a cure for coin-op but we need the coins.

What Happened to That Corner Grocery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, last fall I visited the Snohomish general store operated by Mr. Allan Swoboda, a constituent of mine. Recently he wrote me a letter which I feel is of general interest. It asks the question that many of us ask today: "What Happened to That Corner Grocery?"

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include it in the RECORD:

WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT CORNER GROCERY?

DEAR SIR: I suppose sometimes you wonder what's going on back home—back at the grassroots so to speak. Well, today we took down the Christmas street decorations in Snohomish. Some of the fellows from the Lions Club and the Kiwanis Club and some of the businessmen and some of the fellows around town got together and got the job done in good time and everything put away for another year.

Hal Rothgob and I were loading up decorations on Main Street and as we were picking up in front of one empty building I asked Hal "Whatever happened to that grocery store that used to be in there?" He said, "Guess they just didn't do enough business to make it pay."

Then I began to ask "What happened to the electric shop that used to be over there and that appliance store and that dress shop and that men's shop that used to be along here?" Hal says, "They just couldn't make it I guess, couldn't meet the competition of the big stores in Seattle and Everett." Then I began to wonder, "Didn't there used to be a grocery store in this building where these cars are stored now?" Hal says, "Sure, they went out and built the Thriftway supermarket—couldn't make it in one of these small stores, you know."

"Well, if they couldn't make it in a small one, how could they make it in a big one?" I asked. "Well you see now they can do enough business in a larger store so they can belong to the Associated Grocers and can buy in carload lots and get a better price" was Hal's reply. "You mean they buy everything in carload lots to get a better price?" "That's right," he says. I asked, "You mean to tell me those outfits like A. & P., Safeway, Thriftway and Tradewell and the other big ones buy a carload of avocados and cloves and eggplant and things like that? Even as big as they are, a carload of avocados or eggplant would spoil four times before they could use it up and a carload of cloves would last the whole State of Washington several years." "Well," Hal says, "They don't have to buy a whole car of avocados because they probably get them from the same outfit from which they get the oranges or something else, so you see they can just take what they want and still get the price."

When I let that one soak in I came back with "Then what you are trying to tell me is, when the suppliers are convinced that you are a big grocery store or a big clothing store or big appliance store or that you have a chain of stores you can usually buy what you want, when you want it but you buy on a different price sheet? Then we could say that the small store is in effect subsidizing the large stores by paying the manufacturer a higher price for what he buys, which actually makes it possible for the manufacturer to sell to the larger outfit at a lower price and then makes it possible for the larger store, chain store and discount house to sell at a lower price to the public and a greater volume thus forcing this small merchant out of business?"

Hal thought a moment and then said, "I guess that's about the way the cookie crumbles. Just the other day I heard that some of those Harvard professors or some other big economists figured that by 1970 there would be just a few big outfits competing with each other and the small businessman would be gone from the scene. In fact, did you know right now, of the 4½ million business firms in the United States about 500 of these firms (large corporations) do more than half of the gross national product and service volume"?

Gentlemen, you might think repeating this conversation is corny but I think it brings into focus a serious problem confronting out country today, that is, the disappearance of the small business, the disappearance of the opportunity for a person to move forward on his own initiative, to start from scratch and grow as Henry Ford did, to create and invent as Thomas Edison did and to improve as Luther Burbank did. Our young people will not have that opportunity—we are watching this opportunity being traded for a slot on a big assembly line. We are like the professor in the science fiction thriller who built the big robot and did such a fine job of it that the robot finally got out of control and devoured him.

What is the solution for small business? subsidies? Federal aid? low taxes? I suppose these things might be welcome and might provide temporary relief to some but

the real answer is forcing the manufacturer of all commodities to sell to all of his customers at the same price regardless of quantity purchased or size of the customers' account. This means the businessman could buy 1 case or 5,000 cases and the price would be exactly the same per case. This would put every business on an equal competitive footing and the retailer could sell at any price he would care to and could make as much money as his desires, his competition, and his efficiences would permit.

Yes, I am asking you to force someone to do something—forcing the manufacturer to something which his conscience should be making him do anyway.

What happened to the corner grocery? It looks from here like he has been buying off of the wrong price sheet. What do you think?

Sincerely,

ALLAN C. SWOBODA.

SNOHOMISH, WASH.

The Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest in the March 18 Appendix of the RECORD the results of an annual opinion poll conducted among her constituents by the distinguished gentlewoman from the 22d Congressional District of Ohio. The tabulated replies to Mrs. BOLTON's questionnaire should be especially meaningful to Members on both sides of the aisle, because the registered Democrats and registered Republicans in her district are approximately equal in number.

It was particularly gratifying for me to observe that 73 percent of the more than 16,000 replies favored continuation of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am proud to be a member. Only 14 percent opposed its continuation, while 13 percent expressed no opinion. In short, 84 percent of those who expressed an opinion on this question gave their complete support to the committee.

Numerous other Members of the House poll their constituents from time to time on matters of national and international importance. Over the years I have noted that whenever a question about the Committee on Un-American Activities is included in these polls, the answers reflect overwhelming support for the committee and its operations in the grass roots of America, and that this is true no matter what section of the country is represented in the poll.

Thus, it is evident that what many people mistakenly believe to be a "controversial" committee enjoys overwhelming popular support and is really not so controversial at all. It is also apparent from these polls that the drive to abolish the committee, though powerful and well organized, is a distinctly minority movement, albeit a loud and frenzied one. In this light, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following statement which appeared in a column by attorney and author George N. Crocker, published in the San Francisco Examiner, of March 10, 1963:

One of the noisiest, most phrenetic, and most hopeless demonstrations of sheer doggedness on the American political scene for 25 years has been the opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which investigates the Communist apparatus of subversion and espionage in this country. "Abolish House Un-American Activities Committee" has been scrawled on so many signs hoisted above picket lines and marches, and appeared in so many paid advertisements, that many people believe the committee holds a precarious tenure.

This is a delusion, fostered by experts in the techniques of mass agitation. The clamor has been like that of barking dogs in a tunnel; the crescendo of echo upon echo raises a tumult far out of proportion to the source.

Whenever abolition of House Un-American Activities Committee has had to meet the test of a practical issue, it has fizzled out. Congress has never seriously thought of abdicating its duty to investigate. The American people would not tolerate it.

Twice in this Congress, the move to abolish the committee has, to use Mr. Crocker's words, "had to meet the test of a practical issue"; and in each case, again to use Mr. Crocker's words, "it has fizzled out."

The Rules Committee carefully considered a resolution to transfer the Committee on Un-American Activities' functions to the Judiciary Committee and rejected the proposal by a vote of 12 to 1.

The House gave equally careful consideration to the committee's appropriation request for the year 1962 and approved the appropriation by a vote of 385 to 20.

Crime in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., has printed an editorial which I feel is particularly appropriate for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it is concerned with the need for curbing the crime rate in the District of Columbia. This editorial entitled "Marine Help for District of Columbia Police?" was printed in the March 29, 1963, issue of the Greenville News. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with my newsletter for April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARINE HELP FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE?

A Member of Congress has suggested in a speech that the Federal Government should bring in two companies of Marines to augment the Metropolitan and Capitol Police forces in an effort to control at least a little, if not stamp out, the rampant crime in the Nation's Capital.

And the blindest New Frontiersman should be able to see the need even through the rose-tinted glasses used in viewing every act of the administration and projecting the image to the public.

Washington, D.C., has become the most lawless city outside of the remotest jungles. Robbery, mugging, beating people up just for kicks, aggravated assault, stabbings, shootings, criminal assaults, and just plain rape are commonplace, even in broad daylight and within shouting distance of the Capitol itself.

It isn't safe for individuals, with or without an escort, or for parties to visit the national monuments which abound the Capital.

It is bound to be more than mere coincidence that the crime rate has gone up proportionately, or at a higher rate, with the increase in the Negro population of the District. The whites are fleeing to outlying communities not only to escape integration but seeking safety for their persons and their property.

The number of crimes charged to Negroes is far out of proportion to their number among the population and a high percentage of the crimes are committed by Negroes against whites.

Perhaps two companies of marines as suggested by the Congressman might be enough, or two companies of any other group of the Nation's elite combat troops. But only if they were well commanded, given a free hand to be as tough as necessary to make arrests and to defend themselves from mobs of cophaters.

And the courts would have to learn to deal realistically enough with the accused criminals, especially the repeated offenders, to enable the supplemented police force to obtain convictions and make them stick on the inevitable appeals.

Even so, there is something ironical about the fact that a Congressman has suggested only two companies of troops to cope with the Washington violence problem, while the administration sent more than 20,000 troops (something like 10 combat companies with supporting troops) and hundreds of U.S. marshals to Oxford, Miss., last fall.

Perhaps what Washington really needs is a period of outright martial law with the authorities using, instead of regular troops, a few detachments of guerrilla warfare specialists who could beat the muggers and the attackers at their own game of stealth, the sudden and unexpected attack, silent mayhem and, in self-defense, a quick and clean job of legal killing.

That last phrase may shock our liberal friends, but whose life is more precious, that of the vicious attackers and killers or those of the innocent victim and her or his protector? And the choice all too often boils down to just that.

THE NATION'S PILOT MODEL

The Nation's Capital City, once described as the "pilot model for the Nation" and as "integration's show window," has become a cesspool of conflict, corruption, and crime within the past decade. For several years all evidence that the "show window" was falling apart was well suppressed. Attempts to point up Washington's troubles, such as the 1956 investigation of the District of Columbia school system by the House District Committee, were scoffed at and played down. In the past 2 years, however, the evidence has been bursting out at the seams.

Crime statistics, especially street crimes such as yokings, rape, and robberies continue to soar and highlight national crime statistics. Last year Senator ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, a liberal and a friend of the District, conducted an investi-

gation of the administration of the District's public welfare program. The Senator found in a fair investigation of 236 cases selected at random that approximately 60 percent of those receiving aid were not even eligible.

Then, the boiling undercurrent of an atmosphere of lawlessness in the public schools—where "fear rages through many school buildings" and there are acts of "violence, assaults, disrespect of teachers"—burst into the open in the Thanksgiving Day race riot at District of Columbia Stadium. The facts on the riot were brought out by a biracial citizens committee. It showed that hundreds of white persons were attacked—as were some Negroes who sought to defend the whites—after a high school football game. The investigation uncovered the problems teachers have been having since the District of Columbia school system was suddenly desegregated to serve as the "pilot model for the Nation." Many of the committee's recommendations and findings were very similar to the ignored 1956 House investigation. In one recommendation, the committee suggested that the schools be given a code of conduct "to allow teachers to return again to the field of teaching instead of fulfilling the role of policemen."

The continuous increases in criminal acts, which the Attorney General now describes as explosive, certainly cannot be attributed to a lax police effort or capability. The Washington police force's record for solving crimes is among the Nation's best. Chief Robert Murray attributes the crime statistics to court decisions which protect and pamper criminals. He has said: "Our convictions are constantly being reversed by 5-to-4 decisions in the U.S. Court of Appeals on technicalities—not on the evidence. The criminal is being afforded more protection than the ordinary citizen."

District of Columbia police have been greatly hampered in their work by the court rulings which limit drastically the time a suspect can be held for questioning, which require proof that the defendant is free of mental disease or defect, and which prohibit investigative arrests. Then there is the large number of cases which are never prosecuted because of pressure from the NAACP, CORE, and other Negro groups. In fact, politics is the key to the entire mess in which the District finds itself today—it is the play for the Negro bloc vote, and this has been going on under the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations.

Political pressures and the national policy of creating a welfare state are responsible for the public welfare cheating by the recipients and the overly generous administration of the program. Beyond any doubt, the pellmell rush to desegregate Washington schools has been responsible for many of the District's school problems. In fact, desegregation has now brought on resegregation, not only in the schools, but in residential Washington as well. In 1953, the year before the desegregation decision, the District of Columbia schools were 57 percent Negro. Now they are almost 84 percent, as whites continue to move to the suburbs.

National administrations have demonstrated that they will not face up to the basic causes of Washington's problems. The play for the 18 million Negro votes will not permit this, no matter what the facts show. So, the Congress must act, under its constitutional authority and responsibility to get at the root causes of District of Columbia problems by investigations void of political overtones and approval of legislative proposals which can extricate our National Capital City from the blackboard jungle into which it has been permitted to sink.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Farley Sees Kennedy by Landslide in 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley's success in political prophecy is legendary. His method is no secret and yet is not available to the less successful pundits for profit—one of whom has just announced his retirement from the Delphic political ring. General Farley uses, first, his unmatched experience in successful Democratic campaigning; second, his balanced judgment in politics; third, his devotion for his party and his country, and his passion for the best in both; and, fourth, his sensitivity to the pulse of America—gained by his boundless affection for the people of this Nation and the accord they have with him in the understanding of our way of life.

In the light of his latest prediction it might be well for the opposition party to hold its convention in Dorado Beach, Frenchman's Cave, or Montego Bay. In that way they will at least enjoy their moment of nomination in a salubrious atmosphere. It would appear that in the light of the article which follows there will be little to celebrate in the election which follows:

FARLEY SEES KENNEDY BY LANDSLIDE IN 1964

(By Edward T. Folliard)

NEW YORK, March 24.—James A. "Big Jim" Farley, who predicted (correctly) in 1936 that Franklin D. Roosevelt would carry 46 of the 48 States, is ready now to call the 1964 election.

He says that President Kennedy will be reelected, probably by a landslide.

"I just can't foresee anything that will prevent his reelection," Farley says. "He has shown fine qualities of leadership under the most trying of circumstances. He is probably the greatest campaigner this country has ever produced.

"Others may not like this, but it is my judgment that Mr. Kennedy came to this office better equipped for the job than any President in this century. He served 14 years in the House and the Senate. He was in World War II, and so became fully aware of the problems that confronted the United States then and in the postwar years. He has one of the most inquisitive minds that I have ever encountered in public life.

"I think that Mr. Kennedy will be far more successful with his program in his second term than in his first, and I expect that he will be rated as one of America's greatest Presidents."

"Big Jim" was reminded that he was a strongly partisan Democrat, one who carried a torch at the age of 8 in a Bryan-for-President parade, and that, therefore, it was really not surprising that he foresaw a Kennedy victory in 1964.

"True," he said, "but I'll tell you this: I never made a prediction that I didn't honestly believe."

Who would be the Republican that would be smothered by the Kennedy landslide next year?

Farley thought it undoubtedly would be his good friend, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York. He thought also that Rockefeller's running mate would be Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, or U.S. Senator Thomas Kuchel, of California.

The onetime political drummer of the New Deal predicted that President Kennedy would carry New York in 1964 by an even bigger majority than in 1960, when his margin over Richard M. Nixon was 383,666. He also predicted that the New Frontier leader would again carry Pennsylvania and Michigan (despite the fact that both States elected Republican Governors last year), Texas, California, and border States that he lost in 1960—Kentucky and Tennessee, for example.

Farley expressed the opinion, shared by Republican leaders, that Mr. Kennedy's religion will hardly rate as an issue next year.

The Irresponsibles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis News has admirably taken the Governor of my State to task on his charge of dangerous irresponsibility by former Vice President Richard Nixon in calling for positive action against the Communist menace in Cuba.

While Governor Brown is noted neither for his meticulous memory on Cuba nor his affection for Mr. Nixon, he sinks to an incredible low in attempting to denounce a great American who has spoken with courage and the knowledge of vast experience on the undeniable danger 90 miles from our shores.

If it is "irresponsible" to be concerned about Communist infiltration into the Western Hemisphere; if it is "irresponsible" to support the President foursquare in any firm action he takes to eradicate this cancer from Latin America; if it is "irresponsible" to offer constructive alternatives to "hush, now, the thing will go away eventually" thinking, then I proudly stand with fellow Californian Dick Nixon and the many Americans who have not desecrated the Monroe Doctrine as a useless instrument which should be relegated to history's scrap heap.

The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 18, 1963]

THE IRRESPONSIBLES

In a speech last week, California's Democratic Governor Edmund G. (Pat) Brown denounced onetime opponent Richard Nixon.

The charge: "Dangerously irresponsible" conduct by the former Vice President in calling for a blockade of Cuba.

Governor Brown apparently thinks the American public cannot remember anything more recent than yesterday's sport results. Unfortunately for his argument, however, there are a few people around who keep files, and who have the embarrassing habit of collecting their contents and publishing them as memory-refreshing books.

For instance, Journalists James Daniel and John G. Hubbell,, authors of "Strike in the West" (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston), a wrap-up of the events surrounding last year's Cuban crisis.

The book reviews the period in which New Frontier politicians self-righteously proclaimed—just as Brown is doing now—the "irresponsibility" of those who demanded action on Cuba. And it relates the stunning reversal of October 22, when President Kennedy declared the same "irresponsible" blockade his partisans had denounced, and proved his critics had been right all along about the military buildup of Cuba.

Daniel and Hubbell document the see-no-evil course pursued by Governor Brown's friends on the New Frontier. They quote, for example, the 1961 statement of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT: "I suppose we would all be less comfortable if the Soviets did install missile bases in Cuba, but I am not sure that our national existence would be in substantially greater danger."

The blindness suggested by that remark continued into the summer of 1962, when charges of precisely such a buildup were rife. The administration at first denied anything of the sort was going on, then switched to the theory that the Soviet weapons in Cuba were merely defensive. This attitude persisted right up to the week preceding the President's action.

On an October 14 TV program, Kennedy adviser McGeorge Bundy—often mentioned as the next Secretary of State—made the bland assertion: "I know there is no present evidence, and I think there is no present likelihood, that the Cubans and the Cuban Government and the Soviet Government would in combination attempt to install a major offensive capability."

Similar comment came from Assistant Secretary of State Edwin Martin, who on October 15 said "the present military capabilities in Cuba would not materially increase the Cuban ability to undertake offensive action outside the island." (At this time, Cuba was armed not only with missiles but with long-range bombers.)

On the eve of Kennedy's action—October 22—Oklahoma Senator MIKE MONRONEY asked, concerning his Republican opponent: "Does he want to go to war now? A blockade is an act of war; one overt act would lead to the use of force, I am certain."

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON delivered himself of a similar profundity, October 6, declaring that "The stopping of a Russian ship is an act of war."

All of this was backed up by cries of irresponsibility from New Frontier publicists. Newspaper Columnist Walter Lippmann declared, on October 9, that "the present Cuban military buildup is not only not capable of offensive action, but also it is not capable of defensive action against the United States."

James Reston of the New York Times, writing October 11, said such missile sites as had been found in Cuba were "not the long-range missile sites mentioned by Senator KENNETH KEATING but antiaircraft sites with a range of 20 to 25 miles, far short of the range necessary to reach the United States."

All of these expert statements, of course, turned out to be 100 percent dead wrong; the so-called irresponsibles turned out to be right.

Against that background, Governor Brown would be well advised not to raise the question of who has in fact dealt irresponsibly with the menace of Cuba.

North Texas Oil & Gas Association Group Welcome in Wichita Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week the North Texas Oil & Gas Association held its annual meeting in Wichita Falls, Tex. Wichita Falls and the north Texas area are proud of this organization and the contributions it has made to our area and the oil and gas industry throughout its 33-year history.

An excellent editorial, praising this organization and welcoming its members to Wichita Falls, appeared in the March 29 edition of the Wichita Falls Times. The editorial follows:

WELCOME, OIL FRATERNITY

Anyone who has lived in Wichita Falls even for a short time is aware of the importance and esteem in which the oil industry and the oil fraternity are held in this community.

The discovery of prolific natural gas fields in the Petrolia area of Clay County about 60 years ago gave Wichita Falls a cheap fuel which stimulated this city to boast a considerable industrial establishment; and the April 1, 1911, big discovery oil well at Electra touched off the development of the petroleum industry here into one of the major centers in the Nation.

Oil runs deeply through the history of Wichita Falls and occupies a prominence in its past to the extent its future also looks through a veil of oil as a reliable potential of what the years ahead hold in store.

A contributing factor to the strength of the oil industry here and in the vast oil producing area around Wichita Falls has been the North Texas Oil & Gas Association. Leaders in oil here who have been among the leaders in the oil industry in Texas and the Nation 33 years ago founded the association as an organization through which mutual problems might be discussed and overcome.

The depression had come into being when N.T.O. & G.A. was born. There were diverse and difficult problems with which the oil operator was confronted.

Some old problems have been solved, others are still being attacked and some new ones are being sized up as the N.T.O. & G.A. proceeds, in a series of meetings that opened Thursday and will continue through tonight, with its carefully planned annual program of technical and general information and entertainment.

Leaders in the oil industry are gathered here for the annual meeting and the organization has a very special guest speaker in Frank Ikard, the new president of the American Petroleum Institute, who formerly represented the 13th District in the House of Representatives in the Congress.

Wichita Falls welcomes the oil fraternity and expresses to the North Texas Oil & Gas Association appreciation for what it is doing not only for oil men themselves but also for the communities throughout the area in meeting today's problems and the need of petroleum.

Increased Value of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the ever-increasing value of water is pointed out in a recent editorial of March 21, 1963, issue of the Charleston, Ind., Courier. Recent heavy rainfalls have been looked at as a blessing by some people and as a curse by others. Although some people are forced to move different times each year because of floods, conservation of water continues to be a great problem.

New industrial sites and housing developments continue to require more water each year. In the years to come the supply of water will become even more critical. Development of new watershed projects will conserve water, eliminate flooding, and preserve valuable water. New emphasis, development, and research is needed in this area.

Mr. President, I believe this issue to be of great significance to our future development, and therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (Ind.) Courier, Mar. 21, 1963]

WATER INCREASES IN VALUE

The recent heavy rains have been welcomed by many, and cursed by many more. Spring flooding always causes a great deal of hardship. It is especially bad this year since some families have been forced to move out of their homes twice already.

But with all the surface water and flooding, conservation of water continues to be a No. 1 problem in this area.

The Muddy Fork watershed project will be a step in the right direction. It will conserve water and eliminate flooding along the stream. Clark County seems fortunate in having a high priority to handle this problem and construction of the dams may get started this year.

The watershed will also furnish the area with some recreational sites. This too has become a big problem in urban areas.

People living in rural areas of Clark County are progressing to the point that they too want and need fresh water piped into their homes. Henryville and Memphis are due to have running water in their homes by fall. Now, New Washington and Hibernia neighborhoods have started a drive to organize a water system to alleviate the water shortages that come from privately owned water systems.

People living in Marysville and Otisco will shortly be attempting to organize a water corporation to bring water to residents of the area.

Water will become the No. 1 problem in the country in the next few years. Once wasted, and neglected, water is rapidly becoming one of our most precious commod-

ities. In the years to come every drop of water will have to be accounted for and preserved and used to its best advantage. We have neglected the problem because Indiana has an average rainfall of 45 to 50 inches a year. However, in the years ahead water will become an ever more important resource to be used wisely.

Charlestown is most fortunate in having access to one of the finest pools of underground water in the country. However it too will be expanding its water pumping and storage facilities in the very near future.

Sellersburg has extended its water production by tapping sources near the Ohio River and running lines across country to Sellersburg. Henryville and Memphis are purchasing water from this source.

The Wonders of Scientific Exploration: David Sarnoff's Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the name of David Sarnoff is synonymous with the communications industry. His foresight and genius have brought about a revolution in communications with enormous benefits to mankind.

General Sarnoff, like many of us, is concerned about indications that America has become a nation of scientific illiterates. One way to bring up a generation of scientifically oriented Americans, Mr. Sarnoff says, is to catch them young and expose them early to the wonders of scientific exploration. Mr. Sarnoff believes he has hit upon a plan which will stimulate a great many young people to dedicate their lives to science. His plan is described in an article on General Sarnoff in the February 16 Saturday Evening Post. I invite the attention of my colleagues to this interesting article and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID SARNOFF'S VISION

(By Harold H. Martin)

In the year 1891 a British scientist named G. Johnstone Stoney gave the name electron to a minute particle of electrical energy which he believed to be one of the basic components of all matter. In the same year an impoverished White Russian house painter named Abraham Sarnoff gave the name David to a small bundle of kinetic energy who was his firstborn son. Thus the electron and David Sarnoff have grown up together, and between the two of them they have changed the lives of nearly everybody alive.

Out of the happy collaboration between the electron, which bears a negative charge and moves with the speed of light, and Mr. Sarnoff, who carries a positive charge and moves almost as fast, have come such blessings as the radio and the broadcasting network, television in both black and white, and color, and tiny devices which enable men on the ground to give orders to, and receive information from, satellites cruising millions of miles away in outer space.

Mr. Sarnoff did not invent these things, nor did he discover the basic principles which make them work. He is neither a scientist nor an inventor. He is a businessman who over the past 30 years has guided the mammoth Radio Corp. of America through many financial crises—some of which, by his pioneer daring, he created himself. He is a Reserve officer, now retired, who for his skill in communications rose to the rank of brigadier general, and he still likes to be addressed by his military title. He is also a philosopher, dreaming of a better world, and something of a prophet.

His greatest asset is a quality of mind which enables him to understand the abstruse language of the scientists, and to translate their laboratory discoveries into practical applications which the scientists themselves are often unable to foresee. His genius lies in his capacity to envision some electronic device which he believes will benefit mankind—and which RCA can manufacture and sell at a profit. He then orders his scientists and engineers to build it, often over their skeptical protests.

"I have always had more confidence in my research people than they have had in themselves," says Mr. Sarnoff.

A few weeks ago, in the 6-story marble-and-brick townhouse on East 71st Street in Manhattan where has has lived in modest opulence for 30 years, General sarnoff, as is his habit, turned his mind inward toward the atom and outward toward the stars. Around him, in glass cases, were a museum's hoard of medals, plaques, and certificates, and honorary degrees from 30 universities, attesting to the scholarship of a man whose formal education ended in elementary school. On the wall hung framed letters from Presidents, Prime Ministers, and the world's leading scientists, congratulating him on his past achievements. He was not interested, however, in talking about what had gone before. He was far more eager to discuss what is to come.

"No man is wise enough to predict the future," he said through a gray cloud of cigar smoke. "But I am sure of this: In the field of electronics the next 10 years will see more progress than the past 50. Global television in full color, relayed by orbiting satellites moving in a fixed position in relation to the earth, will relay knowledge throughout all the world. The delay in communications which troubled President Kennedy during his exchange of messages with Mr. Khrushchev at the time of the Cuban crisis will be eliminated. Sitting in their own offices, national leaders will be able to see each other face to face, hear each other speak, and understand each other's language through automatic electronic translators."

Mr. Sarnoff at the moment was recovering from a gall bladder operation, an experience which naturally has caused him to give much thought to the ways by which the electron can serve the medical profession. He visualized the setting up of a television medical school of the world, enabling doctors in every country to watch surgical operations, hear lectures, and observe demonstrations by the world's leading practitioners, over closed-circuit TV broadcasts in full color.

"Worldwide medical television would permit a heart specialist in London to examine a patient, display on the television screen his X-rays and cardiograms, and discuss a diagnosis with heart men in New York, Paris, Berlin, anywhere."

He also foresaw the time when great central computers, storing medical data in their electronic memories, would serve as an instantaneous source of information for any doctor needing to know the latest developments in his specialty. Similar computers could also store away the medical records of every person who had ever been under a doctor's care. By dialing a patient's code number, he said, a physician in Seattle could obtain the complete medical history of a patient who might have received his previous treatments in Miami, Houston, and New York.

The electron can serve the patient as well as the medical profession, Mr. Sarnoff pointed out. Several hundred cardiac cases today are living almost normal lives because a tiny electronic device, implanted in the body, stimulates a weak heart muscle to pump at a regular, steady beat.

"Someday," he said, "devices like this may operate other human organs—the lungs, for example, or the kidneys. In fact, it is probable that the time will come when there will be complete electronic substitutes for wornout human parts."

A marriage of the electronic computer to fast electronic communications systems could serve the lawyer as well as the doctor, said Mr. Sarnoff. The great law libraries of the world could be codified and programed into a computer, their information retrievable in any language the questioner might speak. Thus a lawyer in New York or San Francisco could tune in on Buenos Aires or Stockholm and have instant access to whatever laws, regulations, and court decisions might be pertinent to the international case in which he was interested. Research scientists could benefit in the same way, if the status of experiments going on in laboratories all over the world were channeled into a central computer's memory.

"The utimate in communications, of course, will come when men anywhere on earth can talk to each other face to face, as easily as we sit here talking across this desk," he said. "A man equipped with a vestpocket receiver-transmitter will connect with a nearby switchboard and be able to see and hear another man, similarly equipped, anywhere in the world. The channels available for this run into billions, and each individual will have his private frequency, just as he now has his private telephone number."

THE DRAMA OF SCIENCE

Mr. Sarnoff's confidence in the rapid realization of these goals dims somewhat when he contemplates the apathy with which many young Americans today look upon the sciences as a profession. We are still a Nation of scientific illiterates, he points out, and our great achievements so far have been the work of a relatively few men. To meet the challenges of the expanding universe, we need a great outpouring of young scientists.

"To me it has always been a curious fact that we, as a people, do not regard science as a part of education," the general said, "No man can be considered educated, in the sense that this age must think of education, if he does not know why an airplane flies, or how his telephone works, or what happens when he turns his radio on.

"Science is changing the world," he went on, "and most Americans neither know nor care how these changes are being brought about. Today every officer of government, every lawmaker, is confronted with all sorts of scientific and technical developments which affect the political, economic, and social problems that are a government's main concern. A businessman, no matter what his field, is confronted every day with technical and scientific breakthroughs that may threaten him with disaster—or hold out the promise of great achievement. Yet lawmakers and businessmen alike must turn for advice to technical people whose language they may not even understand."

One way to bring up a generation of scientifically literate Americans, Mr. Sarnoff said, is to catch them young and expose them early to the high drama of scientific

exploration—to inspire them by bringing them in contact with top scientists from the great research laboratories, where the frontiers of science are forever expanding.

"I know what my association with Marconi meant to me when I was young," he said. "I remember how patiently he explained to me the theory of the propagation of electromagnetic waves in space. 'David,' he said, 'we know how things work. We don't know why they work.' That is the exciting quest—the search for the why of things, the ultimate truth. That is a career to which a man can dedicate his life."

Mr. Sarnoff feels that he has hit upon a plan which will stimulate a great many young people to dedicate their lives to science, and he hopes that the heads of other big industries will follow his example. Since last October, on his orders, scientists and engineers from RCA's research laboratories at Princeton, N.J., have been giving a series of 50 lectures and seminars at 4 junior and senior high schools in Brooklyn. The presentations are tailored to the curriculum, but their purpose is to stimulate intellectual curiosity, to go beyond the textbooks to the edge of the unknown, where the excitement and the challenge lie.

In making RCA's top research people available for this teaching project, Mr. Sarnoff's reasoning is simply this: More than 60 percent of all American scientists work for industry or the Government. Their laboratories and workshops are scattered across the land, in close proximity to school systems where youngsters are often denied a scientific education because of a shortage of teachers. He feels sure that thousands of these research scientists would be happy to give a few hours of their time to schools in their own communities, and that their companies would be glad to bear the expense of such a project. He will not know whether his plan has succeeded until school starts again next fall. If there is an appreciable increase in the number of students in the test schools who go on to further study in the scientific field, his idea has paid off. If not, he'll seek some other way to motivate them.

Mr. Sarnoff himself was neither nudged nor prodded into a scientific career. He fell into it by purest accident at the age of 15, and his only motivation was the basic urge to survive—to keep himself and his widowed mother alive in the dog-eat-dog world of Manhattan's lower East Side at the turn of the century. In 1895, when he was four, his father left his family to come to America seeking work, and young David was sent to an uncle, a rabbi of sternest orthodoxy who set him to work memorizing 2,000 words of the Talmud every day. Five years later David and his mother and two younger brothers followed his father to New York, traveling steerage and carrying their kosher food for the journey in a market basket.

Even before he learned English he went to work, selling newspapers and running errands for a butcher in the early mornings and after school. On holy days he picked up a few dollars singing in the synagogue. When he was 15 his father died and, to support his widowed mother and the young brothers and sister who had been born in America, he quit school to find a steady job.

A FATEFUL WRONG TURN

Here chance stepped in to change his life—and indirectly the lives of millions of others. When he entered a downtown office building to ask for a job on the old New York Herald, he turned through the wrong door. He was promptly hired as an office boy by the Commercial Cable Co., at $5.50 a week.

The first thing he learned about the cable business was that a telegraph operator earned a great deal more than an office boy. Saving $1.50 out of his first week's salary, he bought a telegraph key and set out to learn the Morse code. A few months later, feeling confident, he applied for an operator's job with the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. The traffic manager laughed and hired him—as an office boy.

Six years later, however, he was one of the fastest operators in the business, with a "fist" that could send 45 words a minute in staccato Morse for hours on end. His head was full of technical knowledge, gleaned from home study, and of business knowledge gained by watching and questioning the traffic and commercial managers under whom he had served. He was also friend, confidant, and worshipful errand boy of the great Guglielmo Marconi, the father of wireless telegraphy. But he was still an operator on April 4, 1912, when his big break came. At the Marconi station atop the John Wanamaker store in downtown Manhattan, his key began to chatter, and out of the stormy Atlantic came the story of one of the world's great sea tragedies. The "unsinkable" *Titanic*, on her maiden voyage to New York, had struck an iceberg and was going down. For 72 hours, while President Taft cleared the air of all other wireless traffic, Sarnoff stuck to his key, the only link between the world and the rescue ship *Carpathia*.

The *Titanic* tragedy propelled both young Sarnoff and "radio"—a new coined word—into the limelight. Sarnoff became, in swift succession, assistant chief engineer, assistant traffic manager, and commercial manager of the Marconi Co. In 1915 he submitted to the company's general manager a memo that has become a legend in the business:

"I have in mind a plan of development which would make radio a household utility in the same sense as a piano or phonograph," he wrote. "The idea is to bring music into the home by wireless."

The country was moving toward war, and Mr. Sarnoff's suggestion was ignored. After the war, when the British-owned Marconi Co. had been absorbed by a new company called the Radio Corp. of America, controlled by Westinghouse and General Electric, he brought up the idea again. The directors, dubiously, appropriated $2,000 for its development. With this slim push Mr. Sarnoff's radio music box was off and running. Sales in the first 3 years, from 1922 through 1924, were $83 million. But, as millions of householders huddled raptly over their new radios, Sarnoff's restless mind was pushing on to new frontiers. In 1923 he wrote another memorandum:

"I believe that television, which is the technical name for seeing as well as hearing by radio, will come to pass in due course."

Due course proved to be a long and rugged route. It took a quarter of a century of experimenting and $50 million in research funds before television sets went into mass production in 1948.

Mr. Sarnoff was not idle, of course, while waiting for his new brainchild to gestate in the laboratories. To bring to the radio-listening public the great music and the cultural programs he felt they ought to hear, he had organized the National Broadcasting Co. in 1926. He hired Dr. Walter Damrosch to conduct his famous Music Appreciation Hour. He created the NBC Symphony Orchestra and hired Arturo Toscanini to conduct it. He bought the Victor Talking Machine Co., married the radio loudspeaker to the record player in a radio-phonograph combination, and thereby saved the dying talking-machine business.

Television in its first 3 years earned back the $50 million he had invested in it. Before the black-and-white image was perfected, however, Sarnoff was already prodding his sicentists to develop a color television set that would also receive images in black and white. After 13 years of research and development, at a cost of $130 million, sales of color television sets finally began to show a profit in 1961. And in 1962 the company sold more than twice as many color sets as it had during the preceding year.

With color television now safely over the financial hump, Mr. Sarnoff's main interest today is in electronic data processing. RCA has spent $100 million in computer research and manufacture, and it will be 1964 at least before it begins to get its money back. In this field Mr. Sarnoff knows that he is going up against IBM, the champion, but the prospect of a great competitive battle does not disturb him. He has faced stern challenges before. When he took over as president of RCA in 1930, the whole radio industry was beginning to stagger under the impact of the depression. RCA's income in 1929 had been $182 million; by 1933 it had dropped to $62 million. In 1932 the Government had struck the sprawling company another blow, ordering it to sever itself from General Electric and Westinghouse, its parent companies. Unperturbed, Sarnoff kept on pushing huge and costly research programs, while steering the newly independent company skillfully through the economic shoals. In 1937 RCA paid its first dividend, and its overall operations have never shown a deficit since. Today, with Sarnoff, at 71, still its chief executive, it is the 26th largest company in the United States, with annual sales of more than $1.5 billion. Its profit margin in 1961, the last year for which final figures are available, was a thin 2.3 percent, but the figure for 1962 is expected to be substantially higher; and even this should improve once the computer business moves into the black.

Mr. Sarnoff has always been willing for his corporation to skate on thin financial ice, despite the warnings of more careful men, so long as he himself had clearly in sight the outlines of the farther shore. Nor has he ever been too much concerned with the state of his own finances.

"Not money, but the opportunity to express the forces within me is my motivation, and will be until I die," said Mr. Sarnoff, "Whether a man is a plumber or an artist, a musician or an industrialist, his mission on earth is to express the creative forces within himself. Too great a concern with making money deflects a man from this purpose.

"I have made many millionaires. I have not made many millions, for money has never been my main concern. I pay many men in my company more than I make. (The general's last published salary was $200,000 a year.) That's not important to me. That's not of interest. I don't want to mislead you, though, I am doing all right."

His years of living on the frontiers of science have brought to Mr. Sarnoff a great serenity of spirit, born of a deep religious faith.

"Science begets humility," he once wrote. "Its every discovery reveals more clearly the divine design in nature, the remarkable harmony in all things from the infinitesimal to the infinite."

Religion and science, he has said, are in no sense antagonists. They are partners in man's constant effort to learn the truth about himself and the universe—two potent and compatible forces through which, in time, a world of peace and brotherhood may be achieved. "But the mortar of brotherhood is not a product of the laboratory," Mr. Sarnoff said. "It must come from the human heart and mind, and therein lies the crux of man's dilemma. He has not yet learned, as a social and economic creature, to keep step with his science. He is technologically mature, and a spiritual adolescent. Having conquered nature, he must now learn to conquer himself.

"The devices which science has given us are neither good nor evil in themselves. Their capacity for good or evil lies in the use

we make of them. Thus, not in the laboratory, but in the human heart, in the realm of the spirit, lies the challenge of the future."

Brotherhood—Oratorical Contest-Winning Speeches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Benjamin N. Cardozo Lodge, of B'nai B'rith, conducted a brotherhood oratorical contest last February 20. I was fortunate enough to serve as one of the judges in that contest. I was most impressed with the students who represented various high schools in the New York City area. Their speeches showed originally, ingenuity, and a great deal of perception into the concept of brotherhood.

The speeches of the first- and second-place winners have already been inserted in the RECORD. The other winners from the New York schools are James Doody, Thomas Murray, and Rosalinda Ramirez.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of their three speeches be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE FORGET

(By James Doody)

Emerging from the war-torn years of the American Revolution came a new nation, conceived in liberty and granting to all men the God-given right of equality. Freedom had been won but only at a costly price. The victorious Colonials had fought diligently for the right to be free. Now they fought even more diligently than before to preserve that right. For although the war was over, many of its devastating aftereffects were just beginning to take place. Poverty and unemployment rose throughout the yet young America.

History tells us that this new land to which freedom was so dear, possessed in its people an inexhaustible spirit, a spirit needed to endure the many hardships which every promising nation must face and overcome. It was this spirit, this tough fiber of perseverance which survived young America in times difficult to her survival.

We Americans have come a long way since our humble beginning. But have we really grown in the ideals of freedom to which our forefathers were so dedicated? Have we always been willing to share with our fellow man the freedoms that we brag about on the Fourth of July? Judging from the present the answer unfortunately seems to be negative. For in our modern world people continue to enforce racial discrimination—American people, to whom the rights of freedom and equality should be so predominant. Experience has by no means justified the diabolical belief that there is more virtue in one class of men than in another. Yet today, we see the American Negro—and that name "American" is indeed justified, because these people as much and maybe even more than our forefathers have contributed their share of sweat and toil to make this Nation what it is today. We see them persecuted and reviled by many of our supposedly enlightened society. When in our Nation's birth the rights of freedom, livelihood, and the achievement of these were first stated by Jefferson, they were meant for all Americans regardless of faith or origin.

However, every American is not guilty of prejudice. Thank God it is only a small minority. But if given sufficient time it will become larger if it is not overcome. If given enough time a small leak will sink a great ship. Shall we stand by idle and allow the evil and devastating flow of racial discrimination to sink our great ship of state? Shall we, as citizens of the United States, a country for which freedom was so difficultly won, permit our society to slowly fall into ridicule and shame?

We owe an unfailing determination as a free people to uphold rather than forget our founding principles—to administer justice to all, to maintain liberty and equality of opportunity, to eliminate poverty, intolerance, and crime, to protect everyone in the pursuit of happiness, and to guarantee the rights of man to every citizen. This we must do. Violation of any of these rights is prohibited under our law. But laws are of no avail unless they are obeyed by the people, to whom the right and power of legislation belong, for God in His infinite mercy has granted equality to all men, but man himself has not. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Let every American swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least the laws of the Nation, and to their support, pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor."

The men of America have in many times past fulfilled these words of Lincoln. In two world wars and again in the Korean war they pledged never to violate the Constitution, nor tolerate its violation by others. To its support they rendered their most valuable possession, that of life itself. As the patriots of '76 fought for a United States and strived to establish brotherhood within its boundaries, so also do American men of today contend with injustice, bearing the costly shield of freedom so that all men everywhere may one day come to enjoy the lasting reward of universal brotherhood.

Let us now, here resolve, you and I, and every American, that the freedoms of our Nation shall be granted to all of its citizens and that we will be the first volunteers in the fight against America's deadly enemies, those who would destroy us from within by destroying the heritage of America.

NOT TO BE REMEMBERED?

(By Thomas J. Murray)

I consider it a great honor to be able to speak to you tonight, ladies and gentlemen, because in my mind the question of understanding the brotherhood of man is of the greatest importance today. In our strife-ridden world, we must realize that if there is to be true peace, it must be based on the brotherhood of man. Perhaps if we take a look into our own history, perhaps if we travel back into our past, we will gain a deeper insight into the meaning of brotherhood.

It seemed a day like any other. It dawned bright and pleasant. The sun was high in the sky and the air was strangely warm. And as old Ben Franklin made his way to the old statehouse on Chestnut Street, he somehow knew that today would not be like any other—that today would be a day to be remembered. Because, you see, it was on this day—one different from any other—that the city of Philadelphia truly earned its title as "Guardian of Brotherly Love." It was on this day that our Nation's Constitution was formulated—a constitution which first set forth the universal beliefs that all men are created equal—a constitution which really gave us the true meaning of brotherhood.

Here was a document that could be the norm of a free people. A document that is greater than any other, and yet it is a document which many of us forget. Even in the famed Quaker City, in the shadow of the footsteps of men like Washington, Adams, and Franklin, one can find bigotry and intolerance. Just 12 blocks from that old statehouse on Chestnut Street, one will find a diner—a diner which represents our Nation's growing indifference toward true freedom—a diner that bears a small sign outside, stating simply, "White only."

Just a little over a year ago, a small group of Negroes gathered here and tried to order. They waited quietly and made no outcry and yet within minutes the local police had whisked them off to the county courthouse. The magistrate, of course, dismissed the charges against them—but only after he warned them not to return to the diner again. So it was, my friends, that a small group of Americans were deprived of their rights as freemen. So it was that the true meaning of brotherhood was forgotten in the very city where it was first born.

But this is but one example of the indifference shown by many men toward the concept of brotherhood. People today seem to think that documents alone can promote freedom and equality. True, the world has indeed seen many great works. Yet, not a single one of them—of itself—has fostered a spirit of brotherhood. For the principle of brotherhood cannot be set down with parchment and quill; true brotherhood is a state of mind, a school of thought, a living and growing spirit in the heart of man. No document, no words, no ideology can promote such a spirit—only public action can. Documents are only written down on paper; spirit is engraved on one's heart. Man's words may be hollow or idle; action can never be forgotten. Beliefs and ideology can come and go; the unselfish spirit lives on forever.

The true meaning of brotherhood then lies with the individual. He must learn to follow the precepts set forth in his nation's documents, to listen to the words of his leaders, but most of all to put forth his ideas in the form of action. In our own case, we have been given an intricate system of law and justice, a framework of political records and documents, and the right of self-government. And yet many of us today abuse this right, persecuting the minority groups, forcing our ways upon them, and all supposedly within the realm of justice.

But perhaps it isn't our fault. Perhaps our Constitution was wrong in its evaluation of brotherhood. Perhaps old Ben Franklin and the rest were mistaken. Perhaps that day in Philadelphia was not one to be remembered. Perhaps I, too, am a fool, defending an even more foolish cause.

But whatever your conclusion may be, when you think of brotherhood, remember the old statesman from Philadelphia making his way down Chestnut Street to a place we know today as Convention Hall—remember a segregated diner which stands just 12 blocks away from it, today—and when you think of these things, remember that no document can promote brotherhood but only the unselfish spirit of every American.

WHAT BROTHERHOOD MEANS TO ME

(By Rosalinda Pilar Ramirez)

Lofty sentiments, utopian dreams, a flow of tenderhearted words, a sympathetic tear—this is not brotherhood to me, and I cannot believe that this is brotherhood to you. What, then, is brotherhood? Let us ponder over it together.

A room—dull, quiet—lawyers, jurors, spectators, all shift nervously in their seats—

waiting. Then, like a thunderclap comes a cry from the defense: "Yes, out of prejudice and hate, I killed. But I can point to the world and say, so have you, and you, and millions of you." The man is Eichmann. The incident is fictitious, of course. Such a counterattack could never have excused his inexcusable crime, but it would have made men think.

Now let us shift the scene to one not so fictitious.

A young man dashes down a dirt road. Tears streak his cheeks as he clutches a trembling child close to his heaving chest, for behind him, down the road, you can see the red glare of a burning home, and nearer, in hot pursuit, a mob of white-hooded men. Suddenly, they rein back. Their prey has hurled himself headlong over the precipice at the dead end of the road. Prejudice, hate, and their end product—murder.

"But," you ask, "what has this got to do with me? I wasn't there."

Well, let us go back to that scene once again. This time, though, you are the man running down the street. Feel your child trembling. See the charred body of your wife in the blazing home behind you. As you run, you look in vain for the outstretched hand of one good Samaritan. You cry for help, but no help comes. You feel a stinging hate for those men behind you. But you feel an almost sharper hate for those who stand aside, condemn what is being done, give you an occasional glance of pity, but do not lift one hand, not one finger—to interfere.

Now return to your original place. When that black man ran that race of death, I ask you, as I ask myself, where were you, where was I? In the mob, by the roadside, or placidly reading a newspaper miles away? It makes no difference. Wherever we were, we shared the guilt of that man's death. We killed him, insofar as we neglected to recognize and assist a fellow human being, as an alter ego, another self, a brother.

Yes, how many have we pressured down that dead end road to destruction? Children forced to grow up in the filth and terror of slum streets; youths barred from their rights to a first-class education; men whipped before they start, last hired, first fired, never promoted; underdogs presumed guilty before trial; all condemned because of the color of their skin, the land of their ancestral origin, their way of worshiping God; hounded by the contagion of a hate brewed in the emotional insanity of prejudice.

Yes, you want to know what brotherhood is? Put yourself in the place of each of these. Ask yourself what you would want, then see that they get it. This is brotherhood to me.

Control of Seas Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been an increasing suspicion in recent months that the present administration is seriously endangering our security through its unprecedented policy of so-called nuclear stalemate which, in effect, would encourage the Soviet Union to build a second strike force inferior to none in the world, including our own. The theory behind this peculiar thinking is that Russia, once she is capable of destroying any or all American targets at will if attacked, would have nothing to fear and thus would be in a better mood to peacefully coexist with the West.

As an adjunct to this program, the Secretary of Defense has ordered dismantled our Jupiter bases in Italy and Turkey and our Thor bases in Great Britain, is closing down American air bases which formerly ringed the Russian periphery, has killed the Skybolt program, and is phasing out our long-range bomber fleet. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are reports that the next unilateral disarmament move will effectively junk our Navy, which is the mightiest in the world, by phasing out our carriers. These suspicions are being voiced in many quarters, including some of our great newspapers.

An editorial which appeared in the San Diego Union on March 13 deals with this very vital subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of this body may have an opportunity to read it.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Mar. 13, 1963]

FLIRTING WITH DISASTER: CONTROL OF SEAS ESSENTIAL

There is growing uneasiness in Navy circles that Secretary of Defense McNamara is contemplating a phaseout of large aircraft carriers and possibly all large surface combat ships.

A special board has convened to study the role of the big carriers in modern warfare as part of a probe into overall Navy doctrine. Such studies generally indicate Secretary McNamara is considering some radical change in the defense setup.

Frank Macomber of the Copley News Service wrote: "McNamara usually tips his hand when he decides to make a move. He did so in the case of the Skybolt air-to-ground missile and the RS-70 supersonic bomber. He has killed the Skybolt and has all but smothered the RS-70 program."

If Secretary McNamara is considering a phaseout of the big carriers, Congress should act quickly to stop him. In our opinion failure to take such action would be a tremendous disservice to national defense. The carriers are and will continue to be the backbone of the greatest mobile seapower in the world.

Adm. George W. Anderson, chief of naval operations, said recently: "Salt water itself makes no distinction between the merciful and the merciless. It is our sea power—the ability to maintain the freedom of the seas in peacetime and to control them in wartime—which permits us the option of freedom over slavery."

Any retreat from the principle that sea power is essential to America and Americans is to invite disaster. Carriers are key units in the maintenance of such power.

Secretary McNamara made it quite plain in recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee that he sees no need for bolstering the carrier force.

He said the Navy's 20-year rule-of-thumb for obsolescence of a ship is "an artifical standard for measuring the useful life of naval vessels." The secretary believes that carriers of the *Essex* type, all nearing the 20-year-mark, will be operational for another 10 years.

The implication is clear. Secretary McNamara seems to believe there is no need to keep our carrier force at top strength—that other types of weaponry can adequately handle our defense problems.

This is fallacious thinking. There can be no free world security unless we retain mastery of the sea lanes. Our big carriers are needed for the retention of that mastery. Secretary McNamara would be ill advised if he refuses to accept that fact.

Statement of the National Commander of the VFW, Byron B. Gentry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the exceptionally fine statement made by the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Byron B. Gentry, before the Veterans' Affairs Committee on April 2, 1963.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF BYRON B. GENTRY, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, APRIL 2, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to express my deep appreciation, as well as that of my fellow officers, and all the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for this opportunity to meet with your committee.

Of all the congressional committees which serve the varied interests of our Nation, none is more important, in our view, than this one. Certainly none can ever be as dear to the hearts of veterans and their dependents. We are grateful to you specifically, and to the Congress generally, for the wise and perceptive legislation which has given us the most comprehensive veterans' program in the world.

It has been called to our attention that there are a few individual veterans whose distorted concept of truth apparently impells them, on occasion, to malign certain members of this committee. I wish to take this opportunity to make it clear for all time that these misguided individuals do not speak for the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

THE VETERANS STATUS

Because our current legislative requests are not extensive, for reasons which will soon become apparent, I ask permission to direct my opening comments toward a subject far more basic than specific veterans' needs. It is my hope to stem the growing tide of anti-veteran sentiment by clarifying the true nature of the veteran status.

Between his wars, man clamors incessantly of peace. Even famous generals profess to woo the dove, once their hands have grown too feeble to embrace the sword. Whether this be sheer hypocrisy, or an honest attempt to curry favor with divine providence, I cannot say. Yet war appears, on the records of human history, to have been the most indispensable of all man's group activities.

It is reported that since 3600 B.C., the world we dominate as the most enlightened members of the animal kingdom has enjoyed just 294 years completely free from war. It is estimated that man, in his evolutionary quest for peace, has put 3,560 million of his fellows to the sword, in the wars that he has waged. When he can find no other cause, he goes to war over his divergent views

regarding the best method for perpetuating peace. Whether we like it or not, fighting is a basic human instinct.

Because of this unhappy tradition, together with the recurring mania of conquest, people who would remain free have no alternative but to maintain a military establishment adequate to the defense of their sovereignty. It is for this reason, and no other, that we establish and support professional military forces. Young men whose interests and ambitions so direct them, voluntarily elect to enter the honorable profession of arms, and thus commit themselves to fight our wars for us.

Since we deem their service essential to the nation as a whole, and because it leaves the vast majority of us free to pursue our own interests and ambitions, we routinely recognize their maintenance as a proper charge upon the public treasury. We educate and train them. We guarantee them job security and reasonable compensation. We provide them with numerous fringe benefits—medical and hospital services for themselves and their families, both during active duty and after retirement. We pay them substantial pensions, and authorize retirement at an early age. We then offer them civilian employment which enables them to capitalize upon their military skills, as well as their military service, without the loss of pension or of medical and hospital benefits.

This is as it should be. When the people of a nation, in order to pursue their own ambitions and to avoid the rigors and the dangers of war, prevail upon those who are willing to fight to go to war for them they naturally expect to pay for the service. The Veterans of Foreign Wars unqualifiedly supports each branch of the profesional Military Establishment in both the retention and the expansion of all the benefits attached thereto. We recognize the continuing need for professional military forces. Their deterrent effect upon potential aggressors undoubtedly prolongs our periods of peace. Their combat readiness and technical skills are essential to our national security.

Yet stipulating all this as uncontroverted fact, this Nation's military history in time of war is not the history of professional soldiers. It is the history of civilians whose interests and ambitions were completely alien to the ways of war.

Civilian soldiers fired the "shot heard round the world" at Lexington and Concord. They wrested an infant nation from the British professionals at Philadelphia and Yorktown. Civilians manned the cotton bales at New Orleans in 1812. It was civilians who achieved immortality at the Alamo. Civilian soldiers, on both sides, wrote the bloody and heroic pages of the War Between the States. The Spanish War was fought and won by volunteers. Both World Wars and the Korean conflict added volumes to the colossal history of the heroism and effectiveness of civilians in the art of war.

Thus we submit, upon the record, that it is long past time for that vast majority of Americans who do not fight this Nation's wars to recognize the civilian soldier as an essential element of our national defense. The civilian soldier is a permanent and indispensible part of this Nation's Military Establishment, and as such, must be included when we count the costs of war.

He turns from his chosen way of life; abandons his pursuit of peaceful goals; assumes a role completely alien to his youthful dreams, and detours down the violent road of war. Years later, a completely different man, he comes back to start again.

The cost of his readjustment; of rehabilitation; of education he has been denied; of medical and hospital care; and all the things essential to return him to status quo, are a just and legal obligation of the people as a whole—just as are the far more generous benefits routinely incident to professional military service. Postwar rehabilitation and readjustment benefits to the civilian soldier upon whom we call for military service in time of war must be accepted as a normal incident of national defense, just as the cost of maintaining the regular Military Establishment has long been recognized to be. This is the premise upon which both the need and the justification for veterans benefits are founded. They are neither gratuity nor compensation for personal loss.

If intended as the former they would be a flagrant insult to the dignity of man. If intended as the latter they would be a shameless confession of man's immorality—of the perversion of his sense of values.

They are, in fact, much more than veterans' benefits. They are national benefits—because they are instrumental in restoring to maximum productivity in our peacetime economy that vast array of young Americans who have been delayed and confused by war.

THE VFW PURPOSE

It is for all the reasons inherent in this philosophy, together with our continuing obligation as citizens to protect this Nation from her enemies in both peace and war; and to strive unceasingly to perpetuate her free and independent sovereignty, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States exists, and thinks, and works, and grows. Our purpose, as an organization, is clearly and unalterably defined in section 3 of the charter granted us by Congress. We are mandated by that charter to serve both the veteran and the Nation. And since the welfare of each must be eternally entwined, so long as men wage war upon each other, there can never be the question of conflict of interest.

The vast majority of the men who fill our ranks were civilian soldiers. They are men who sought by choice to walk the roads of peace. They were content, in youth, to leave the military role to others. But having found it essential in four wars to take up the sword themselves, they have earned the right to be heard on matters pertaining to the welfare and security of this Nation.

In a sincere effort to abide by both the spirit and the letter of our collective purpose; utilizing all the wisdom of our experience and learning, our delegates meet each year in national convention—to consider and adopt a multitude of resolutions directed toward that end. Each year our legislative recommendations are formulated from the resolutions so adopted. These resolutions express the thinking and the will of a majority of our 1,300,000 members.

Thereafter, our top committees meet for the purpose of analyzing and evaluating the product of that collective effort. These committees are comprised of men whose experience and learning, whose dedication to purpose, are unsurpassed in all the history of human forums. They are judges and lawyers; generals and admirals; college presidents and scholars; businessmen and public servants; clergymen and doctors. In normal times we call the product of their deliberations our legislative program.

This year, however, such a designation would be a misnomer. In fact, I must confess that much of it does not even fall within the specific jurisdiction of this committee. It may even be an undue imposition on your time for me to read it, but if I may, I shall take that calculated risk. It demonstrates the continuing good faith of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to serve the purpose for which it was chartered by Congress. I quote:

POLICY STATEMENT

"These are troublesome and perilous times for America. As veterans we recognize that our primary responsibility is the security of our country, the protection of our citizens, and the strengthening of our American ideals.

"We shall continue to promote and seek improvement of legislation assisting needy, disabled, aging veterans, and their wives, widows, and children.

"We shall at all times endeavor to adhere to the code of conduct given us by Gen. Douglas MacArthur: 'For duty, honor, and country.'

"It is with this spirit that we present our priority program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for 1963."

KEY OBJECTIVES FOR 1963

Veterans

Establish a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate.

Immediate development by the Veterans' Administration of a plan for long-term care of chronically ill veterans.

Vigorous opposition to administrative and legislative efforts to weaken veterans preference in Federal service.

Separate pension program for World War I veterans and liberalize Veterans Pension Act of 1959.

NATIONAL SECURITY

No appeasement in West Berlin and Guantanamo Bay.

Strict enforcement of all provisions of Monroe Doctrine.

U.S. withdrawal from U.N. if Red China is admitted.

Increase, balance, modernize, and stabilize strength of Armed Forces.

Accelerate development and production of RS-70 weapons system.

Speed up and expand Army modernization.

"Crash" expansion of Navy's antisubmarine warfare program.

U.S. supremacy in space, including limited military participation.

A positive civil defense incentive program.

Continued support of Joint Chiefs of Staff system.

These, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, are the 14 top priority matters with which the VFW is concerned. This does not mean, of course, that we have no other mandates from our convention delegates. There are, indeed, many other matters with which we are almost equally concerned. In order to complete the record, it would be deeply appreciated if a digest of all our resolutions may be inserted at this point, to be made a part of my remarks.

Time does not permit a detailed consideration of these resolutions here today. Beyond that, I do not perceive it to be consistent with good manners to abuse your hospitality by endeavoring to argue evidentiary matter at this meeting.

Through your courtesy we have been permitted to state our case. Through your generosity our official views and attitudes on many matters have been entered in the record. We know from repeated experience that yours are friendly ears.

Perhaps even more persuasive than the individual logic to which you will be subjected when our members call upon you personally during the next few days, is the fact that each of those recorded views is supported by a vigorous and growing organization. It might be of interest to you that our membership has increased each year for the past 7; that our total membership on March 15 just past, was 63,628 ahead of the same date in 1962.

The views presented are honestly and seriously held. We earnestly solicit their favorable consideration. We do not advance them simply to give lip service to some fancied cause. To those of us who occupy the speaker's role, they are binding mandates which preclude substantial compromise.

CONCLUSION

We shall continue to suport legislation which provides for veterans' benefits in all their phases—not only because it enables the civilian soldier to readjust to the ways

of peace and regain a status of equality in civilian life, but because it is a measurable benefit to the Nation as a whole. A singular example is the GI bill of rights. There can be no valid doubt that the educational provisions of that legislation provided us with the scientists and engineers who are making it possible for us to compete on equal terms in the space-age contest with the Russians.

Beyond even that, the increased earning power and added taxpaying potential of the veterans who participated will eventually offset the cost, and ultimately make the program show substantial profit.

The GI bill, itself, points up a major reason for our support of a separate pension for the needy veterans of World War I. They had no special benefits through which to prepare themselves for the eventual infirmities of age. They came from an era in our Nation's history when the pursuit of higher learning was scarcely an accepted way of life. They were denied the opportunities of younger veterans to build up financial security for the evening of their lives.

We applaud the Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary program, not only for the care and treatment provided veterans, but because it has assisted in the education of one-third of the Nation's doctors since the end of World War II. We still urge, however, the general development of facilities for the treatment and care of chronically ill veterans in need of long-term care, including part-time nursing. We compliment this committee for having established a Special Subcommittee on Aging, for the specific purpose of studying this particular problem. We know too that this committee has helped immeasurably in making the VA hospital system the very finest in the world.

We believe implicitly in the Veterans' Administration as a continuing separate entity with exclusive jurisdiction over all the affairs of veterans. We will stand shoulder to shoulder with this committee in resisting any effort to effect the transfer of veterans' programs to other agencies.

These are but a few of the views and attitudes of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to some of the great programs which this committee has initiated and approved. May I again express our sincere gratitude for the privilege of appearing before you. And may we hope to return your hospitality in some small measure by playing host to you at our annual congressional dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel tonight. All Members of the Congress are cordially invited. The dinner will begin promptly at 7, with a somewhat less confining hospitality interlude at 6.

Again, we thank you.

Both Worker-Investor Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President a recent editorial in the Evansville, Ind., Press impresses upon us the necessary partnership of the free enterprise system. In Evansville, the Whirlpool Corp. statistics tell us that at year's end Whirlpool had 12,647 employees and 12,505 common stock holders. Many people do not realize big business has this many individuals putting up money to finance productive forces. Together these two forces form a needed partnership typical of our free enterprise system, and we must not forget that both worker and investor are needed to turn the wheels of industry.

Mr. President I should like to share this thought with my distinguished colleagues and therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press]

IT TAKES BOTH KINDS

Whirlpool Corp.'s annual report has recently come to our desk, and we note with satisfaction the company's good earnings record for the past year and good prospects for the months ahead.

All who live in this community know that Evansville's economy is greatly affected by the prosperity of Whirlpool.

But aside from the profit picture, past and future, we found in the report another highly interesting bit of information.

That is the fact that the company at year's end had 12,647 employees (about half of whom were in Evansville, incidentally) and 12,505 common stockholders.

We doubt if many people realized that this big company had almost as many individuals putting up their money to finance the operation as were working to make and sell the products.

Together they form a necessary partnership that is typical of our free enterprise system. And none of us should forget that it takes both—the worker and the investor—to make the wheels go round.

Rights-of-Way Over Federal Lands for Electric Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of January 1963 I learned that the Secretary of the Interior had inserted in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, a set of proposed new regulations relative to the granting of rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands under the jurisdiction of his Department.

I was astounded by the arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions in the proposed regulations. I also questioned the constitutional authority of the Secretary to place such restrictions in the proposed regulations.

On February 5, 1963, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives, asking that he schedule public hearings on the matter at the earliest possible time.

Much to my surprise, I received a letter of reply 10 days later which not only denied the request for a public hearing but which indicated support for the Department's proposal, with such a play on semantics that one might well believe the letter had been prepared by the Department itself.

Apparently part of the reason advanced by the chairman for not having hearings by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee relate to his statement that, after all, these proposed regulations just reinstated procedures which were in effect from 1949 to 1954 and which were changed on August 11, 1954, without notice to the public and without any opportunity for interested groups or individuals to express their views.

What the chairman failed to point out in his letter was the fact that the 1954 change in the regulations relative to right-of-way permits over Federal lands resulted from an opinion of the Interior Department's Solicitor that many of the regulations in effect from 1949 to 1954 were "beyond the legitimate power of the Secretary to issue."

The chairman's letter to me of February 15, 1963, points out that:

> Interested persons and groups are being given an opportunity to present their views to the Department on the proposed reinstatement of the language and the period for accepting such views has now been extended to March 15.

It is fully evident that this extension of time was merely a sop to dull the opposition to the proposed regulations, which were put into effect on March 23, 1963, through publication in the Federal Register.

The regulations as promulgated are, with very minor exception, identical to those proposed on December 29, 1962. These minor changes, if anything, make the regulations worse.

As I have so forcibly pointed out before, these regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the similar regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture relative to Federal lands under their jurisdiction, are ambiguous, capricious, and confiscatory and without authority in law. Of course, it is not the first time the New Frontier has assumed power way beyond those granted by the Congress and the Constitution. However, the time has come, for those of us who believe in the Constitution of the United States, to protest these attempts by the executive to take unto itself powers not delegated to it by the Constitution or the Congress.

The matter should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress and action taken to curtail this unwarranted assumption of power by the executive bureaucracy. The matter should also be taken to the Federal courts if the Secretaries involved attempt to enforce these patently illegal assumptions of power.

My letter of February 5, 1963, and the chairman's reply of February 15, 1963, follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary of the Interior placed in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, proposed new regulations relative to the granting of rights-of-way over Federal lands under his jurisdiction.

These proposed regulations astonish me no end. I cannot understand how any fair-minded American would dare issue such

arbitrary and unreasonable restriction on the granting of rights-of-way over Federal lands.

These proposed regulations and restrictions are ambiguous, capricious, and confiscatory, and without authority in law. Certainly, by no stretch of the imagination, can anyone read into the laws, which the Secretary claims as his authority, a congressional intent to grant him or any other Secretary of the Interior the unbridled power he is now attempting to assume. I believe further, that certain of the actions which he could take under the regulation or restriction proposed would be completely unconstitutional in character. It is noted that the proposed regulations would apply equally to both public and private non-Federal electric utilities.

I again say I am astonished that he would propose such an unconstitutional assumption of power unto himself. One illustration of such power is the provision for denying a right-of-way permit for a non-Federal transmission line if he considered such a line was not consistent with the Federal power marketing program as determined by him. I cannot believe that Congress ever intended such a grant of power or that it could grant such power under the Constitution.

Another illustration would be an application for a right-of-way permit over a strip of Federal land of less than a mile wide, where the total length of the proposed transmission line would be 200 miles. Under the proposed regulations, the applicant could be required to agree to permit Federal use of any surplus capacity that might be available initially, and/or permit the Interior Department to reconstruct and enlarge the applicant's transmission lines and related facilities, not only on that portion of the line which would be on Federal land but also on the 99½ percent of the line not on Federal lands.

A third illustration is the provision in the proposed regulation under which the Secretary could require the applicant for a right-of-way permit over Federal lands to agree to the transmission of electric power to serve non-Federal public utility loads and Federal loads now being served by the applicant. Certainly this would constitute a destruction of non-Federal assets without due process of law. No good man should want and no bad man should have such unlimited and unwarranted power to destroy segments of the free enterprise system under which this Nation has prospered.

It seems to me that these new regulations proposed by the Secretary of the Interior and the similar proposal by the Secretary of Agriculture covering the Federal lands under his jurisdiction, are part and parcel of a continuing attempt to socialize the entire electric utility industry of the Nation.

In view of the indicated lack of congressional authority and constitutionality, I ask that you schedule a public hearing on the matter at the earliest possible time. Not only should the Secretary be heard on the matter, but all other interested parties should be given an opportunity to testify on these regulations.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 5 regarding the proposed changes in regulations covering rights-of-way for transmission lines across Federal lands.

I do not agree with your analysis of the proposed changes or share your concern as to what will happen if the proposed changes are put into effect. While the revised regulations would require applicants for new rights-of-way permits to agree to allow the Federal Government to utilize excess capacity in their lines, any such capacity that was used by the Federal Government would be returned to the permit holder upon request. The revised regulations would also permit the denying of a permit if the proposed non-Federal line is determined to be in conflict with the Federal power marketing program. To me, this is different from your phrase, "not consistent with," and I believe its purpose is to protect the Federal power system and the Federal investment therein. We must remember that the Federal Government is itself a large supplier of electric power and the Congress has authorized a large network of transmission lines for the marketing of this power.

I view these proposed changes as involving the administration of both the public land laws and the Federal power marketing program. I believe that the decision as to whether to put them into effect will be made on the basis of what is determined to be in the best interest of the United States. It is my understanding that, in addition to providing the means for protecting the Federal power system and the Federal investment therein, the provision for possible Federal use of excess capacity in a non-Federal line might effect some economies in the marketing of Federal power.

The proposed changes in the regulations would reinstate procedures which were in effect in the Department of the Interior from 1948 to 1954 and which were changed on August 11, 1954, without notice to the public and without any opportunity for interested groups or individuals to express their views. All interested persons and groups are being given an opportunity to present their views to the Department on the proposed reinstatement of the language and the period for accepting such views has now been extended to March 15. At the present time it is my view that, in order to assist the Secretary of the Interior in making his decision, it is he who should receive the views and comments of interested parties and not our committee.

I do not know whether these proposed changes in the regulations will be put into effect or not, but, if they are, I do not want to try to prejudge their administration. I have no reason to believe that the administration of the regulations, if they are revised, will not be in the best interest of the United States, or will not be entirely fair and equitable from the standpoint of the non-Federal electric utilities seeking permits over public lands.

On the basis of the above expressed views, I do not believe it would be appropriate for the committee to hold hearings on this matter at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

Minnesota Aids Have-Nots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, hardly a day passes when someone associated with a branch of the Federal Government does not try to tell the American people that the Government in Washington can solve a problem better, quicker, more easily, and cheaper than State or local government.

The same people say that Washington has to take on the current everyday problems of American life if they involve raising tax revenues, because State and local governments have expended their tax bases and cannot raise the necessary funds. At the same time they neglect to tell their listeners that Federal revenue comes from the same place as does that of the State, county, or municipal government, the American taxpayers.

The following news story from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 24 clearly points out what happens when such a philosophy is put into practice. The free Federal handouts are not so free after all.

MINNESOTA AIDS HAVE-NOTS—STATE LOSES $400 MILLION IN BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(By William Broom)

WASHINGTON.—Minnesota has a balance-of-payments problem with Uncle Sam.

The Federal Government collects about $1.5 billion each year from the State. It pours a fortune of about $1.1 billion right back in a steady stream of treasury checks for everything from the postman's salary, to legbands for migratory birds.

What accounts for the approximate $400-million gap between put and take?

Oversea defense spending accounts for a major chunk. About 12 percent of all Federal spending never shows up in the income of any State. It winds up abroad—in Korea, Okinawa, Vietnam, West Germany.

The costs of administering Federal programs are not returned to the States, either. But this sum is far smaller than some critics of Federal-State aid programs have stated. It is about 1.6 percent.

Basically, Minnesota is paying the price for being a "have" State. Like Michigan, New York, Illinois and other well-to-do States, Minnesota shoulders its share of the burden of defending, educating, and upgrading the have-not States like Mississippi and Alaska.

It is not easy to figure out where the Federal dollar goes. Only one definitive study has been made. It was by I. M. Labovitz, an economist, a native of Duluth who now works for the Library of Congress as senior specialist in social welfare.

Labovitz warns his figures cover an average of 3 years from 1959 to 1961. He has, however, come up with what he calls a rough, but useful measurement of income and outgo for each State. Their chief value is in providing comparisons between States. When supplemented by statistics collected by the Treasury Department and the Census Bureau, the Labovitz study gives a close approximation of where the money goes after the taxpayer ships it to Washington.

From 1959 to 1961, Minnesota taxpayers forked over an average of $1,510 million each year to Washington.

They got back an average of $1,035 million. Of this sum, a little more than 60 percent, $626 million went directly to individuals in the form of paychecks, social security checks, relief checks, pension checks, et cetera.

The remaining $400 million was funneled through the State government, or to local county and city governments, or to institutions like universities, research laboratories, or defense contractors.

Minnesota's share of the Federal gravy train was one of the lowest in the Nation. The State ranked 18th in population, 26th in per capita payments to the Federal Government, and 48th in per capita receipts from Washington.

For every dollar they paid the Federal Government, Minnesotans got back 74 cents. It should be remembered that the break-even point would be 88 cents, because 12 cents of every Federal dollar goes abroad.

Where does the Federal money go once it is returned to the State?

The Federal payroll alone is about $140 million. The Census Bureau counted 26,040 Federal workers, almost half of them in the Post Office.

Military outlays for defense contracts and salaries totaled about $297 million.

Veterans and retired folks mined a rich vein of Federal payments. The former servicemen received a total of $127.5 million in compensation and benefits. Social security checks totaling $263 million were mailed out.

In addition, there were 86 different types of Federal aid to Minnesota. These took the form of grants to the State or local governments, to educational institutions, and to individuals. They totaled $208.4 million in 1962, according to the Treasury Department.

Agriculture payments, loans, and grants were another source of Federal dollars to the State. Senator HUMPHREY had a study done which showed the total in 1962 was about $136 million.

(The Humphrey survey covered 1962. It estimated the total of Federal payments into the State is currently about $1.2 billion each year, and also determined that spending for military procurement in Minnesota is up 50 percent over 1960.)

The job of tracking down Federal payments was a complicated one, which Labovitz says required some arbitrary assumptions on his part.

There was, for example, the problem of determining where military outlays go. The Air Force orders missiles from—California, but the prime contractor may purchase parts from 12 or 15 other States.

Interest on the Federal debt amounts to more than $10 billion each year, but Labovitz derived a formula to apportion it to each State.

It was no easier figuring out where the money came from. Most cigarette taxes, for example, are paid in North Carolina and Virginia by the tobacco manufacturer. However, it would be a distortion to credit the total to these States, since manufacturers pass on the tax to consumers all over the Nation.

Labovitz said the main value of his figures is for comparison. Thus, while Minnesotans got back 74 cents for each $1 paid to the Federal Government, Alaskans were the biggest feeders at the public trough. They got $8. The lowest return was paid in Delaware where $1 brought back only 56 cents. In Wisconsin, the figure was 69 cents.

TAX BOXSCORE

Minnesota pays: U.S. taxes, $1.5 billion.

Minnesota gets back: Military, $300 million; military payroll (civilian and military), $35.6 million; salaries, $140 million; old age benefits, $26 million; veterans' benefits, $127.5 million; public aid, $13.1 million; highways, $58.3 million; unemployment pay, $13.3 million; school lunches, milk, $3.5 million; hospital, health construction, $4.3 million; agriculture, $58.7 million; public works, $9.8 million; education, $3.2 million; other forms of aid, $27.5 million.

What Foreign Tourists Think of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in This Week magazine of March 24, 1963. This article describes how the visit U.S.A. program has been able to improve understanding among people from all parts of the world and the Americas.

The article follows:

[From This Week magazine, Mar. 24, 1963]

WHAT FOREIGN TOURISTS THINK OF AMERICA

(By Volt Gilmore)

(Ever since the big Visit U.S.A. campaign started, everyone's been wondering how visitors would react to us and our ways. Here's a report that will surprise and please you.)

WASHINGTON.—For years the American tourist has been the world's greatest, and most laughed at, gadabout. He's been chided for his mad charge through a blur of countries, his fretfulness when manners and mores of places he visited didn't match his own.

But now the shoe is on the other foot. The worldwide Visit U.S.A. campaign, a joint Government-industry program, is drawing international tourists into the United States, 604,000 of them in 1962 alone. They're being encouraged to find out that a trip to the United States is easier, friendlier, and less expensive than they ever imagined.

HOMESICK AND HUNGRY

Not surprisingly, a lot of them miss home just as much, and make just as many social goofs as Americans are supposed to. (One oriental gentleman shocked his hostess by belching loudly after dinner, a compliment in his homeland, but not in Albuquerque.) The American who was peeved because he couldn't get a malted milk in a Paris bistro has his counterpart in the Parisian who complains of no wine at an Illinois roadside diner.

But, though there will always be good travelers and bad travelers, most of the new visitors to the United States are getting a fresh perspective and a better understanding of the picturesque natives of New York and Des Moines.

Europeans who shook their heads at crazy Americans who whipped through the Louvre in 20 minutes or drove across Holland in an afternoon are now finding out why. As one traveler put it, "This is my first and possibly my only trip to America. I have only 17 days and I am rushing from city to city, museum to museum, just as frantically as the Americans I used to laugh at."

And we can learn, too, from their reactions to aspects of America we take for granted. I was moved by a Swiss group at Arlington National Cemetery who knelt spontaneously as their leader placed a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

To check up on the reactions of our new visitors, I have scouted some of their haunts: Disneyland, the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, the Seattle's World's Fair, Miami Beach.

Do they enjoy the United States? Emphatically yes. They offer many reasons, but American friendliness rates highest. "You made us feel welcome and wanted," a Swiss wrote.

Other reactions we've screened at U.S. Travel Service headquarters in Washington:

British travelers: "Prices were not so high as we expected and nobody tried to pull a fast one.

"The people were what we liked most about New York.

"We love your warm hearts, but we hate your cold tea."

Dutch housewife: "All the food was wonderful. Plus the United Nations, Empire State Building, in short, everything."

Italians were impressed by the number of our museums, and liked particularly natural history museums and zoos. Still others couldn't find "decent" spaghetti or lasagna. One Italian said, "Look, there's a Negro driving a car. I did not know they could own automobiles in the United States."

French lady: "Your wonderful Indians will become extinct if you aren't careful. The Government should give a prize to the Indians every time they have a baby."

Australian: "Your hotdogs, coffee, and fruit juices are amazingly good."

Colombian: "I liked Miami most, and the ice cream."

Hong Kong resident: "I liked baseball best."

No trip, of course, is the same for all travelers. The Irish almost invariably like our weather; the English often complain of the South's heat. Some find us materialistic; others admire our energy, ingenuity and our climate of prosperity. Some find our prices too high; many more are amazed that they aren't higher.

In interviews with several hundred first-time visitors the U.S. Travel Service found that more than 75 percent wanted to come back again, and will urge their friends to come. In these interviews, conducted at terminals in New York City and Honolulu, homebound travelers mentioned these as some of their favorite U.S. destinations: New York City (they loved the 5-cent ferry ride to Staten Island), San Francisco (the city they most wanted to revisit), Washington ("watching Congress is a thrill"), Niagara Falls, Disneyland, Chicago (its Art Institute opens European eyes), Grand Canyon ("the most awesome sight of all nature"), New Orleans ("but its French quarter is more Spanish than French"), Miami Beach ("a fantastic hotel room, with meals, at under $10 is unbelievable"), Philadelphia (the story of American independence stirs visitors), Boston ("what language do these natives speak?") and Knoxville (the TVA story means much to people from power-starved nations).

Americans have been guests instead of hosts so long it's become traditional. By 1961 travel abroad had become the biggest single item in our global balance-of-payments deficit.

In June of that year Congress created the U.S. Travel Service to encourage travel to the United States. Our mission was to cut red-tape involved in getting here and assure

visitors a warm welcome that would promote international good will.

TIME FOR MANY TONGUES

The travel industry turned to with gusto. Restaurants have blossomed with multilingual menus, and have urged waiters not to scowl at Continentals who dawdle 2 hours over lunch. Hotels and motels inventory their staffs for language abilities. Around-the-clock travel information centers are appearing at major terminals, staffed by multilinguals.

The visitor from overseas finds himself showered with exclusive travel bargains rarely offered touring Yankees: for only $99, a ticket for 99 days of unlimited bus travel anywhere in the United States; for another $99, 30 days of unlimited flying on two regional airlines which serve more than a dozen of our largest cities; $6 per person per night at quality hotels of a major U.S. chain, plus only $6 more for three meals per day, tips and taxes included. Such travel bargains are refuting the argument that we're too expensive for the average pocketbook.

But it takes friendly Americans in hundreds of communities, big and small, to prove that we mean our "Visit United States of America" invitation. They're working out ingenious ways to make their guests glad they came. Maryland has a language bank of citizens who speak foreign languages and want to help oversea visitors. Asheville, N.C., has multilingual signs at its gateways, offering free translator-guide service. An Iowa housewife invites strangers in for a coffee klatch and a look at the inside of a U.S. home.

Every day another community asks the Visitor Services Division of USTS how to organize a good host program. Such services as free interpreters, information centers, currency conversion counters, open homes and plant tours are being developed so energetically that we are planning honor city awards for U.S. communities which already have or are developing outstanding hospitality programs built around our theme of "Friendly Americans will win America friends."

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Anyone who would like to know how his own community can begin a good host program should write to Visitor Services, U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. We will send you a guide which includes a checklist of activities which many communities have found effective in setting up or strengthening their programs for visitors from other countries.

Wherever you may live, you have the opportunity to help your country by extending warm, real hospitality.

Threat to Local Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, each day my mail contains warnings against the invasion of the Federal Government into the affairs and prerogative of individuals and local governments.

Often these invasions are in the field of taxation and revenue. The recent tax proposal of the administration is an example of how the Federal Government would invade the traditional tax prerogative of many State and county governments.

Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. W. J. Daly of Port Townsend, Wash., brought to my attention an article which appeared in the County Officer, which is the official publication of the National Association of Cities. This article points out how the administration's tax proposal would increase revenues for the Federal Government at the expense of local governments.

I believe the article entitled "A Major Threat to Local Government" by Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the association, will be of interest to Members of Congress. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

A MAJOR THREAT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand)

If President Kennedy's tax proposals are passed in their present form, they will do more to kill off grassroots local government than all of the so-called welfare state measures ever considered in the United States.

Briefly, the President proposes to give the country an economic shot in the arm by granting a 3-year Federal income tax cut that will reduce their rates from the present level of 91 percent to 65 percent in the top brackets and from 20 percent to 14 percent in the lowest. Very modest reductions are also envisioned for the great American middle tax group. But this group is to be all but eliminated by what is in effect a tax of $2.3 billion per year, which will fall almost exclusively upon the shoulders of this same middle income middle tax group.

Now why is this a threat to local government? Because the President's new tax proposals would do away with or sharply curtail the exemption from Federal taxation of money paid by homeowners for (1) interest on their home mortgages; (2) taxes paid to their county, city, and State governments; (3) contribution to their churches and their community charitable organizations; (4) casualty losses to their homes through storms and other causes.

Treasury Secretary Dillon has now admitted that these measures are not designed to close loopholes, but are bareface new revenue raisers.

Make no mistakes. These new taxes are designed to transfer a major portion of taxes to the homeowner. If they pass, the economic balance will suddenly shift and make homeownership unsound financially.

For 350 years Americans have considered homeownership to be the very backbone of local democracy. Until recent times (when it was quite properly eliminated), homeownership was a prerequisite for voting and other civic rights and responsibilities. Even today most jurisdictions require homeownership as a prerequisite for jury duty, which is a sacred responsibility in a democracy.

Americans have always understood that homeownership, with its direct property tax obligations, sharpens interest in local elections, creates keen interest in local public policy, and fosters sensitivity to all aspects of community life.

This is not to say that those who rent are inferior citizens. This is nonsense. But because they do pay property taxes directly, homeowners are more immediately responsive to local affairs.

It seems incredible to us that the Federal Government which spends two thousand million dollars each week and possesses a near monopoly over the personal and corporate income tax, would now try to invade the local property tax from which we in local government derive nearly all of our locally collected revenue.

It is no argument at all to say that most taxpayers will receive a slight reduction. A Congress that can reduce tax rates can also increase them. Once the burden is passed on to the homeowner the next proposals can be to increase Federal tax rates to fight the inflation which may be caused by massive Federal deficit financing.

If the President's plan to shift the tax burden to homeowners passes we in local government can expect intense local opposition to all local and State tax levies.

We have no quarrel with tax reduction but this gimmick-ridden proposal is dangerous to our democracy. The President has received very, very poor advice.

Vice President Tells of Need for Big Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few nights ago many of the Members of this body and our colleagues in the House, attended an affair at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington. The event was the Big Brother dinner, and it is the dream come true of our friend, the renowned columnist, author, and newscaster, Drew Pearson.

Mr. Pearson has done our country a great service in calling to our attention, the need for us to adopt a young boy and to him become a big brother.

The guest speaker at the Big Brother dinner was the Vice President of the United States LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who, in his remarks, illustrated how he, as a big brother to his own brother and sisters, helped them to become useful citizens. But more than that, Vice President JOHNSON made other comments with the great humility which he possesses, that are deserving of the attention of us all.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Vice President at the Big Brother dinner be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON AT THE BIG BROTHER DINNER, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 29, 1963

If a fellow could choose his own big brother, I think most would choose one just about the size of Sonny Liston.

Sonny was doing fine in the world until he took up the Republican game of golf. While we all regret what happened to the champion's leg when he swung at the golf ball in Florida and missed, I can't help thinking how much better that golf ball must feel.

I am grateful to Drew Pearson for asking me to come here tonight. The Big Brother program is one of the finest activities of its kind in America, and I think the work he is

doing with this program shows the real character of our friend, Drew Pearson.

I feel a strong personal attachment to the concept of this program because in my childhood, I was the big brother for a large family, a family that was both large and poor. There were times when I had to do some of the scrapping to take care of my younger brother and sisters. There were also many times when, as the big brother, I had to sit with my father and mother and talk about the things I could help do to make sure that my younger brother and sisters had the shoes they needed, the clothes they needed, and the food on the table that the whole family needed.

Many years, many miles, and many events have passed since those days. But I never forget them. I never forget that a boy born and raised in such circumstances—working as a bootblack, a goatherder, a highway construction gang laborer—could, under our system, rise to the second highest office of public trust in the strongest and most powerful nation of the world.

Remembering the great distance that has been spanned by my own career, and remembering how great the odds seemed against any opportunity at all when I was a boy in grade school and high school, I live with constant thanksgiving and gratitude that I am an American. I hope that through programs like these we can help many young Americans in our cities and on our farms, to keep the hope they ought to have for their own future and keep the faith they must have in the justice and greatness of our country and our system.

Nowhere else in the world does the circumstances of a boy's birth, who his parents are, where he was born, what his religion is, or any other such factor matter less to determining what he should be in life than here in America. Opportunity must be open to all, and to all alike. Every day we are swinging those doors of opportunity a little wider. We are approaching the reality of equal opportunity a little more each passing year. The key to success for every young American is education and faith and determination.

I would say to each of the young guests tonight stay in school, because that is where your country needs you. Keep your faith, because you need that. Set your goals high, because you cannot afford to set them lower. Remember that if you may not entirely fulfill every aspiration in your heart, your own determined effort to reach your highest goals will make it easier for your sons and your daughters to enjoy after you a better childhood and a better life than you have known.

One Nation Indivisible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith part 2 of a series of articles written by State Representative Karl Wiesenburg of Jackson County, Miss., which were printed in the Chronicle, Pascagoula, Miss., on December 17–21, 1962.

The article follows:

ONE NATION INDIVISIBLE

The people of Mississippi have been told that the actions of Governor Barnett preceding the Oxford riots were justified under the Constitution of the United States, and specifically under the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It is argued that the State of Mississippi alone has the right to determine for itself what powers are reserved to it under the 10th amendment. Under the American system of government the Supreme Court of the United States alone can determine what powers are reserved to the States. To hold otherwise would result in 50 States traveling in 50 different directions. The Federal Union would be a nullity.

Chief Justice Marshall established the doctrine of the judicial supremacy of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1803 in the famous case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*. This doctrine has been accepted by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Federal Government, and is recognized and followed by our 50 highest State courts, including the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

Were the actions of Governor Barnett illegal and in open defiance of the law? In *Cooper* v. *Aaron* (the Little Rock School case) decided on September 29, 1958, the Supreme Court of the United States said:

"No State legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it. Chief Justice Marshall spoke for a unanimous Court in saying that: 'If the legislatures of the several States may, at will, annul the judgments of the courts of the United States, and destroy the rights acquired under those judgments, the Constitution itself becomes a solemn mockery,' *United States* v. *Peters*. A Governor who asserts a power to nullify a Federal court order is similarly restrained. If he had such power, said Chief Justice Hughes, in 1932, also for a unanimous Court, 'it is manifest that the fiat of a State Governor, and not the Constitution of the United States, would be the supreme law of the land; that the restrictions of the Federal Constitution upon the exercise of State power would be but impotent phrases.' "

The doctrine of interposition, that is the right of the State to interpose the sovereignty of the State as against asserted illegal Federal action, has never been accepted in the United States. However, even this last possible argument was stricken down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Louisiana*, decided on December 12, 1960. In that case, quoting with approval the language of the lower court, the Supreme Court of the United States said:

"The conclusion is clear that interposition is not a constitutional doctrine. If taken seriously, it is illegal defiance of constitutional authority. The main basis for challenging this ruling is that the State of Louisiana 'has interposed itself in the field of public education over which it has exclusive control.' This objection is without substance, as we held, upon full consideration, in *Cooper* v. *Aaron*."

The President of the United States has been censured, vilified, and maligned because of his use of the National Guard and military forces in restoring peace and order at the university and in the city of Oxford. It is argued that his actions violate various sections of the U.S. Constitution. These arguments are utterly without merit. Historically the President of the United States as Commander in Chief has always used the powers vested in him by law and by virtue of his position as Chief Executive to cope with disaster, riots, and insurrection. The Governor by State law is vested with the same powers and could have exercised them to preserve peace and order. In the Mississippi case of *State* v. *McPhail* the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, speaking of the powers vested in the Governor, said:

"It was foreseen, however, by the framers of the Constitution that for one cause or another, local conditions would sometimes arise which would render the local authorities powerless to enforce the laws, or unwilling or afraid to do so. It was to meet such conditions, as one of its purposes, that the constitutional and statutory authority which we have above mentioned in respect to the execution of the laws was vested in the Governor. * * * Every power at his command given by the Constitution and statutes may be brought into play so far as needed to effect the enforcement of the law. He may select the military as agents to act for him: for it is manifest that he cannot personally do all executive acts."

Mississippi cannot become a great industrial State while engaged in an undeclared war with the Federal Government. It cannot maintain the respect of its sister States and the Nation if it permits State's rights extremists to be its spokesmen.

When our country has been threatened, patriotic Mississippians have been among the first to rally to its defense. Our State is now threatened from within, not by the Federal Government, but by those who insist they are Mississippians first and Americans second.

We are Americans by allegiance, and Mississippians by residence. Section 8 of the constitution of the State of Mississippi expressly declares "all persons, resident in this State, citizens of the United States, are hereby declared to be citizens of the State of Mississippi."

A citizen of Mississippi can change his State citizenship at any time by moving his residence to another State. He carries his U.S. citizenship wherever he goes. We are Americans first and Mississippians second.

THE LAW OF THE LAND

The political leaders of Mississippi who led the people to the tragedy at Oxford have evidenced no repentance, shame or remorse. Instead, they have used the executive, legislative and judicial agencies of the State government to place the blame on the President of the United States, the Federal courts, the Attorney General, and Chief Marshal James P. McShane.

Edwin A. Walker, the former general accused of leading rioters, has been eulogized on the floor of the State legislature, and was permitted to address the legislature at a time when he stood charged with insurrection, conspiracy and sedition against his country.

The powers exercised by the President of the United States were exercised not by choice, but from necessity. It was his duty, as it has been the duty of Presidents from the time of George Washington, to see that the decrees of the court are complied with. In the absence of maintenance of peace and order by the State, it became the duty of the President to see that order was maintained. As a matter of fact, the riot was underway, two human lives had already been taken, scores had been injured, and property had been damaged, before the Federal troops appeared on the university campus or in the city of Oxford. Had they not come when they did, the carnage would have been worse.

The Federal courts, without exception, have been denounced as puppet courts by a resolution of the State senate. The Kennedy administration has been accused of having "appointed little men to the judiciary."

These unjustified attacks on the integrity of our Federal courts are an attack on the entire U.S. Senate, upon our Mississippi Senators, and particularly upon Senator JAMES

O. EASTLAND. As chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee of the Senate he has personally been responsible for the recommendation and appointment of our Mississippi Federal judges. The entire U.S. Senate must confirm the appointment of Federal judges. Are we to believe that our Senators would vote to appoint little men?

We can be proud of our Mississippi Federal judges. Although as native Mississippians they may disagree with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in civil rights cases, they recognize that the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are the law of the land and that they are bound thereby. Contrast their conduct with the intemperate utterances of some of our State judges. Which are the little men?

The claim that the Attorney General precipitated the riot because he was unwilling "to await the completion of judicial processes" is directly at variance with the facts. Meredith first filed suit for admission to the University of Mississippi on May 31, 1961. Between that date and September 10, 1962, myriad phases of the Meredith case had been heard by the U.S. district court, and three times by the U.S. circuit court of appeals. The order issued by Justice Black was issued with the full knowledge and concurrence of all other Justices of the Supreme Court.

Under our system of government there is no appeal from the orders of the Supreme Court of the United States, it being our constitutional court of last resort. How could there be any "judicial processes" beyond the final pronouncement of the Supreme Court of the United States?

It has been urged that since Governor Barnett was not a party to the original suit, he should have been made a party defendant and given his day in court. According to this theory he would then have been able to get an adjudication as to the validity of his interposition proclamation. The fallacy of this argument is that by virtue of the Constitution of the State of Mississippi the Governor was neither a proper nor a necessary party to any action involving the admission of a student to the university. The sole power to admit or deny admissions to students is vested in the board of trustees of State institutions of higher learning, as acknowledged by the Governor himself. The only defense he wanted to assert was "interposition." The "interposition" doctrine had already been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to be "illegal defiance of constitutional authority."

Governor Barnett could have ordered the closing of the University of Mississippi. Section 213B of the Mississippi Constitution and section 6232-21 of the Mississippi Code of 1942 purport to grant the Governor such authority. Governor Barnett did not choose to order the university closed.

Were the series of proclamations and executive orders issued by the Governor in his attempt to block the admission of Meredith a usurpation of powers not granted him by the constitution of his own State and expressly denied him? Was his status that of an interloper meddling into the affairs of a great university in violation of Mississippi's Constitution? He was charged by the Southern Association of Colleges with such political interference in the affairs of the university. In his letter of October 25 to the association, Governor Barnett said "all statutory and constitutional authority for operating the State institutions of higher learning in Mississippi is in the hands of the duly appointed members of the board of trustees of State institutions of higher learning."

In the ultimate analysis, can any defense be made for a public official who publicly proposes to defy the Federal courts? Such defiance is what set into motion the sequence of events that led to the Oxford riots.

That innocent blood was shed was not the fault of the President, the Federal courts, the Attorney General or Chief Marshal James P. McShane. It was the price of defiance.

STATES RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES

The first responsibility of a State is to preserve law and order within the State by the exercise of its police powers. States rights must be coexistent with State responsibilities. If a State ignores its responsibility to its citizens, then no man's life or property can be safe in such a State. If citizens of this State can be permitted to defy laws they do not like and obey only such court orders as they may agree with, then we will have no government at all. Anarchy and confusion will prevail.

Maintenance of law and order at the University of Mississippi, or at any public school in the State, is the primary responsibility of the State. If we want to maintain our State's rights, we must accept our State's responsibilities.

The people of Mississippi were deluded into believing that Governor Barnett had some well conceived plan that would insure him the final victory in the Oxford crisis. The truth is he had no such plan. So long as he had only to contend with a few unarmed Federal marshals, he was a lion in his defiance. Faced with the full power of the Federal Government, he unconditionally surrendered. He made a serious mistake in believing that he could bluff the President of the United States, the same mistake Khrushchev made in Cuba, and with the same result.

But many political leaders still maintain their attitude of defiance, and still urge the people to continue to resist constituted authority. The people are being told they must not submit, they must not surrender, they must preserve their freedom. Submit to what? Surrender to whom? To a restoration of law and order, to acknowledgment that we are a government of laws not of men? This is not submission, this is not surrender, this is the American way of life.

Unless these political leaders change their attitude, further bloodshed is inevitable. No one can doubt that similar situations will arise. How shall these problems be met? Shall every school become a battleground? Shall innocent blood again be shed for political advantage? We must meet these problems sanely and sensibly, as many of our sister States have met them. To do this we must have leaders who are willing to acknowledge that the orders of our courts must be obeyed. We must have leaders who will maintain law and order within the State with the police powers of the State, even if they disagree with such court orders.

We cannot afford to repeat the errors that led to the riots at Oxford. We cannot continue to elect to office politicians who think they can curry public favor by advocating defiance of constituted authority, disrespect for their Government, and open defiance of the law. A public officer of this State who invites imprisonment by defying court orders violates both his oath of office and his public trust.

Law and order seem to be controversial in Mississippi. Pastors, businessmen, and other citizens of this State who have spoken out in favor of a return to law and order have been castigated by some newspapers whose columns are filled with vitriolic denunciation of the Federal Government.

The editor of the university newspaper the Mississippian, who spoke out for law and order was reprimanded by a student group for not presenting the views of the entire student body, including the rioters.

The time has come for the many citizens who have been afraid to speak out for law and order to make themselves heard. Every citizen who has come to the realization that we must have law and order, that we cannot continue to condone open defiance of our courts, and who now remains silent must accept full responsibility for other tragic events that inevitably will take place.

Let us join together in a common resolve that the Oxford tragedy shall not be repeated, that the public schools of Jackson, Greenville, Pascagoula and elsewhere in our State shall not be invaded by mobs. This will take courage. Men will have to take a stand, to speak out and make themselves heard. Women, who share the highest stake of all, the safety and welfare of our children, must make their influence felt in the home, in the community, and at the polls. When you speak out for law and order, the politicians will speak out for law and order. The lunatic fringe that would destroy our schools, our State, and our Nation must be exterminated from political life as ruthlessly as vermin from the kitchen.

Our school boards, both on the State and local levels, must receive our full support in their efforts to meet the problems of today and tomorrow. Our schools must remain free, public, and open. Our administrators and faculty must be allowed full academic freedom. Our children must be given the opportunity to obtain a decent education without being subjected to the dangers of mob violence.

Lastly, we need to search our souls for the answer to why the Oxford tragedy was allowed to happen. It is easy to blame this on others, to defend our State officials and the young people involved in the riot and to exonerate ourselves. The Prince of Peace said "let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

We need to let our public officials know, the Nation know, and the world know that we insist on the maintenance of law and order. We can do this with dignity, honor and pride. The price of defiance is destruction, disgrace, disaster and death.

Ikard Opposes Oil Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week, March 30, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, Frank Ikard, appeared in Wichita Falls, Tex., as the principal speaker at the annual banquet of the North Texas Oil & Gas Association.

Mr. Ikard is now president of the American Petroleum Institute. During his 10 years of faithful service in the House he was a most respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I feel that his knowledge of the oil and gas industry and his knowledge of tax matters make him one of the most competent spokesmen in the field of oil and gas taxation.

It was my pleasure to attend the banquet in Wichita Falls and hear Mr. Ikard explain the dire consequences which would result if the current administration proposals on taxation of the oil and gas industry were adopted.

A report on his address was printed in the Wichita Falls Record News on Saturday morning, March 30. The story was written by Mr. Frank O. Hall, knowledgeable oil editor of the Record News.

I commend the article, which follows, to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record News, Mar. 30, 1963]

KENNEDY TAX PLAN RAPPED

(By Frank O. Hall)

If the Kennedy administration's tax proposals should be approved in whole or in part by the Congress the oil industry would be dealt a blow which would tend to put many independent oil producers out of business.

This viewpoint was expressed here Friday night by Frank Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, when he addressed a banquet session that concluded the 33d annual meeting of the North Texas Oil & Gas Association.

The banquet, held at the Women's Forum, attracted one of the largest crowds in NTOGA's history.

Adoption of the President's tax reform proposals "would certainly decrease further any efforts toward exploration and development of new oil reserves," the API president declared.

He continued by saying:

"The economic results of such action would make it harder to stimulate the growth rate of the economy because the decline that has occurred in exploration and drilling in the domestic industry and the prospects as to the amounts of oil and gas needed over the next 20 years suggests to me that a reduction of incentives to invest, as proposed in the tax message (to Congress), would jeopardize the future supplies of energy needed for an expanding economy.

LEAD TO LOSS

"Even from the standpoint of total tax revenues, the proposed changes could lead to a loss rather than a gain because of the effect that lower production and consumption of petroleum would have on economic activity and on the taxes collected directly and indirectly as a result of petroleum operations."

Ikard pointed out that four changes affecting petroleum are proposed in the administration's tax message to the Congress.

"They are all rather complex and run counter to the objective of simplifying the tax structure," he declared. "Changes of this nature create uncertainties for taxpayers, which often require years for clarification by regulations and litigation, and impose additional accounting burdens and expenses."

The API president told the oilmen that the administration, in making the proposals for changes pertaining to oil and gas, said it was asking for corrections in "unintended defects" in the tax code.

MISLEADING

"It is inappropriate and misleading to say these proposed changes are correcting 'unintended defects,'" Ikard said. "The basic intent of Congress with respect to petroleum depletion has been clearly defined and has remained unchanged for many years.

"The administration's recommendations are designed to impose additional taxes of $280 million per year on U.S. oil and gas producers. This sum is equivalent to the funds needed to drill about 5,000 wells. Such a reduction in the number of wells drilled each year, based on the average experience of the industry since World War II, would mean a loss of 350 million barrels of oil reserves and 1.5 trillion cubic feet of gas reserves.

"Such a drastic change in tax policy could have a cumulative effect, resulting in far greater reductions in drilling and losses in reserves."

DOWNWARD TREND

These tax reform proposals, the speaker pointed out, come at a time when the domestic oil industry is in a downward trend. He added that the trend in exploratory activity, always an indicator of significant value in our history, has declined steadily during the last 8 years.

"In 1962" Ikard continued, "the total crew months of geophysical work showed a decline of 50 percent in the search for new oil and gas reserves since 1955. There has been a sharp decrease in the number of drilling rigs in operation. New oil and gas reserves can be found only by drilling, and the number of active rigs has declined by 40 percent since 1955.

"As would be expected, with less geophysical activity and fewer rigs in operation, the number of exploratory or wildcat wells has been reduced 30 percent from the 1956 level.

"When we look at total drilling activity we find that there has been a decrease of almost 12,000 wells from 1956 to 1962. This is a 20-percent drop, and includes producing oil wells, producing gas wells, dry holes, and service wells.

"EMPLOYMENT REDUCTION

"Naturally, these curtailed activities in the oil production industry have brought about a reduction in employment in this branch of the industry. The number of employees has declined steadily, with 40,000 fewer employees in 1962 than in 1957.

"Furthermore, the number of students enrolled in petroleum engineering at 29 major universities in the United States is also declining sharply. In 1962, only 1,330 students were enrolled in petroleum engineering, a decrease of almost three-fourths from the 4,800 students enrolled in 1957. This represents a vast, expensive and irreparable loss of trained scientific personnel which is the very foundation of the oil production industry."

NOT CLEAR

Ikard said that technical ramifications of the tax proposals as they affect U.S. companies seeking and producing oil in foreign nations are not crystal clear—but that it is clear that Congress has been asked to breach the nondiscriminatory principle followed in the past and thereby "establish a double standard of taxation which would discriminate against those who search for mineral resources in foreign lands, while retaining that principle intact and undiminished for those who engage in other kinds of foreign business."

He said the U.S. oil company, large or small, which has been encouraged by his Government to expand into foreign lands in order to expand his scope of operations as well as his country's in the international oil trade finds the incentive to do so is threatened by a proposed discriminatory double standard of taxation.

SOVIET THREAT

Speaking on the subject of "Challenges Facing the Industry," Ikard cited the Soviet oil threat and said Russia is using petroleum as a principal weapon in the cold war. Since the close of World War II Russian production of crude oils has increased at a faster clip than worldwide production.

Ikard made this observation on Russia's threat to the West through the use of oil as a weapon:

"Oil, so important to modern manufacturing, transportation, and to military power, is the perfect vehicle for Communist influence. Russian oil, priced at 10 to 30 percent under free world prices, is tempting bait. The hook of Communist influence is sometimes overlooked, despite the frightening case histories of such nations as Finland and Cuba."

Ikard said that challenges facing the petroleum industry must be confronted by a unified industry.

"These challenges," he concluded, "must be solved by oilmen, dedicated to their industry and sure of its mission."

Ikard was presented by Marvin L. McCullough, outgoing NTOGA president, who presided.

A special entertainment program, arranged under the direction of Edward G. Kadane, president of Kadane-Griffith Oil Co., followed Ikard's address.

Lone Star Steel Co. was banquet host.

American Agriculture: Our No. 1 Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 22 I spoke in Moorhead, Minn., on the occasion of Greater Moorhead Days. Moorhead is located in the heart of the Minnesota-North Dakota Red River Valley.

Much of my talk dealt with what the farmers of America have done and are continuing to do for the people of our country and those in other nations throughout the world. Among other things, I pointed out that the 188 million men, women, and children of the United States have more food of better quality in greater variety than any people in any country in all the recorded history of man.

I also emphasized that the $6.5 billion budget estimate for the Department of Agriculture is not a farmer's budget, but a budget for all Americans. Nearly three-fifths of the expenditures proposed for fiscal year 1964, about $4 billion of the $6.5, will go for programs which clearly benefit consumers, business, industry, our foreign policy and national defense, and the general public.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues this speech and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER MOORHEAD DAYS, MOORHEAD, MINN.—SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I tired a long time ago of those who make critical comments and talk at length about what the country is doing for farmers.

The truly great story of our time is a factual report on what farm families have done and are doing for our country.

The 188 million men, women, and children of the United States have more food of better quality in greater variety than any people in any country in all the recorded history of man.

The hunger which haunted civilization since its beginning has been driven from the land. This doesn't mean everyone is getting enough to eat every day, but it means when hunger does exist it is due to failure to distribute production; not lack of production.

In the last 2 years the proportion of consumer income required to purchase food has dropped to the lowest ratio in history, 19 percent of take-home pay.

If Washington, D.C., has room for one more statue, it should be one that expresses a nation's gratitude to the men, women, and children who live and work on the Nation's family farms.

While producing more and better foods, farm families have been sending workers

from the land into other areas of the Nation's economy, in manufacturing, transportation, business, and the professions and services.

Americans are familiar with the growth in industrial productivity.

A fact too often overlooked is that it hasn't nearly kept pace with agricultural productivity.

In the last decade, production per manhour in agriculture increased by 77 percent, as compared with a 32-percent increase in manufacturing.

A century ago one worker on the farm supplied food and fiber for less than five persons. By 1940 the figure had risen to only 10. Now, just 23 years later, each farmworker supplies food and fiber for 30 persons.

Unfortunately, those who feed us so well do not themselves live "too high on the hog." It is true that farm incomes have improved substantially the past 2 years, but they still average only 60 percent of nonfarm incomes. The farmer is subsidizing consumers.

There are fewer than 15 million people living on our farms, only about 8 percent of the country's population. The population of the State of California exceeds our total national farm population.

Yet farmers create millions of jobs for fellow Americans. Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Six million have jobs providing the supplies farmers use. Thousands in rural communities across the land make their livings providing services required by farmers.

The investment in agriculture exceeds $200 billion. That figure is comparable to about three-fourths of the value of current assets for all corporations in the country. It represents three-fifths of the value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

The investment in agriculture represents $21,300 for each farmworker as compared with a manufacturing investment of $16,000 for each worker.

In 1961, when our farmers had a gross income of nearly $40 billion, they spent over $27 billion to operate their businesses.

Farmers spend over $2 billion a year for trucks, tractors, machines, and other equipment.

Farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry, more than $3 billion is spent by farmers each year for fuel, lubricants, and equipment maintenance.

You could provide Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, San Diego, and Chicago with electricity for a year and the kilowatt consumption would be about the same as the total needed to keep our farms going.

The next time someone starts to tell you what the country is doing for agriculture, just ask what would happen if this Nation lost three-fourths of the assets of all corporations, or three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York exchange, or more than 16 million nonfarm jobs.

The answers to these questions are, in part, the answers to what farm families do for the country.

American agriculture also is exerting an influence felt throughout the world.

Our productive capacity supplements the efforts of farmers in countries which pay cash for our food, and in the underdeveloped countries where food for peace not only combats hunger but strengthens our foreign economic development efforts.

Another major export is the know-how developed by our farm families, through informational and technical assistance programs.

Likewise, events abroad affect U.S. agriculture.

In fiscal year 1953, exports of farm products from the United States amounted to $2.8 billion. By fiscal year 1962 the export figure had jumped to a record $5.1 billion. That year we harvested 305 million acres of cropland and the products of 63 million of those acres were shipped abroad.

The $5.1 billion worth of farm products went to two general types of destinations. About $1.6 billion worth of our food and fiber, 30 percent of our total agricultural exports, went to underdeveloped countries under the food-for-peace program.

The big share of the food and fiber exports, some $3.5 billion worth, or 70 percent of the total, was sold for dollars. Most of these shipments went to the industrialized nations such as the United Kingdom, the European Common Market, and other Western European countries, and Canada and Japan.

In recent months the European Common Market has been receiving increased attention in the agricultural export area. This is understandable, because the Common Market is our largest single foreign outlet for farm production.

In fiscal year 1962, U.S. exports to the Common Market had a value of $1.2 billion, representing about a fourth of total agricultural shipments and over a third of the volume sold for dollars.

We are uneasy about the development of tariff protectionist patterns in the Common Market. It represents the largest economic merger ever attempted.

Suppose high fences separated Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and North and South Dakota. Suppose these fences had gates so small they limited movement of goods, services, and labor among the five States.

Now, tear down the fences between these States, but leave the outer fence separating them from the other States of the Union.

That, in effect, is what the Common Market is; the fences are being torn down between France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, but the outer fence that separates this merged area from other countries still stands.

Because of the resulting free movement of goods, services, and labor between the six countries, spectacular economic growth has occurred. Employment, wages, and purchasing power are at record highs.

When agriculture in the Common Market countries saw what economic merger had brought to the industrial sector, it started pushing for revelopment of a common agricultural policy. In January of last year the Common Market announced agreement of these six points:

1. Control of farm products through common marketing authorities.

2. Establishment of common prices and abolition of trade barriers within the area during a transition period.

3. Control of imports from outside countries through variable levies, fees, minimum prices, and, in some instances, quantitative restrictions.

4. Use of funds to finance market operations and subsidize exports.

5. Establishment of quality standards.

6. Harmonization of veterinary, plant health, and similar regulations.

Implementation of these points has had some favorable and some unfavorable results for U.S. agriculture.

We can be optimistic about future export prospects for commodities the Common Market does not produce at all or produces in small volume, commodities like cotton, soybeans, protein meal, tallow, hides and skins, and certain fruits and vegetables. These products had a value of $578 million in fiscal year 1962 and made up about 50 percent of that year's shipments.

We did not do as well on tariffs negotiated for tobacco and vegetable oils. Common Market tariffs on these products, value of which accounted for $123 million or 10 percent of our fiscal year 1962 exports, are too high.

We didn't do well at all in keeping access to Common Market countries for those products Common Market farmers want to produce more of—wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, poultry, and rice. The Common Market is developing for these commodities a protective system based primarily on variable import levies. The variable levy always keeps the cost of imported commodities to at least the level of Common Market-produced commodities. Because price competition is canceled, traditional importers tend to do their buying locally. In the case of poultry, the variable levy is already in operation. Altogether, wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, poultry, rice, and a few other products in that category had a value of $483 million in fiscal year 1962, representing 40 percent of our exports to the Common Market that year.

The United States has vigorously protested the decisions that are taking the Common Market in the direction of restrictive trade policies. The Common Market has agreed to reconsider tariff decisions on wheat, corn, sorghum grain, rice, and poultry. These will represent a takeoff point for the United States during the next bargaining rounds.

The Common Market's agricultural exports to the United States are relatively small, but it has been shipping us a sizable volume of industrial goods and would like to sell us more. We can use them, and the Common Market can use more of our farm products.

We must keep in mind, however, that all of our agricultural export future isn't wrapped up in the Common Market. Those countries have been taking only about a third of the farm products we export for dollars.

The other two-thirds of our sales are outside that area. In fiscal year 1962, our sales to the EFTA countries, including the United Kingdom, amounted to $719 million; to Japan, $485 million; and to Canada, $430 million. Japan could use more of our feed grains and soybeans. Canada could use more of our poultry; the United Kingdom more of our citrus fruits and feed grains.

A glowing potential for future cash sales of U.S. farm products abroad rests with the so-called underdeveloped countries that we are now assisting through our food-for-peace program. As our food helps improve their economic and social structures, we are also utilizing useful outlets for our agricultural abundance and providing additional income for our farmers.

Since 1955, food-for-peace exports have amounted to about $12.5 billion. Feeding the hungry is sufficient reason for these contributions to human health and happiness. Yet we are realizing substantial economic and national security benefits. Our foreign policy is strengthened. People who have to make a choice between the free world philosophy and that of the Communist world are given a graphic comparison of the efficiency of the family-owned farm under a free enterprise system with the inefficiency of the state-owned farm under a totalitarian system.

The friends we are making now can well be friendly cash customers for American farmers in the future.

Earlier this month, when the Senate was considering an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, I repeated a plea I had made many times before, a request that the Department of Agriculture budget accurately reflect farm and nonfarm expenditures.

When the President's budget estimate for this coming fiscal year included $6.5 billion for the Department of Agriculture, the old cry that farm programs cost too much money was again heard across the land. This is

not a farmer's budget. It is a budget for all Americans.

Nearly three-fifths of the expenditures proposed for fiscal year 1964, about $4 billion of the $6.5 billion, will go for programs which clearly benefit consumers, business, industry, our foreign policy and national defense, and the general public.

More than $2 billion, or 31 percent of the total, will go to programs vital to our foreign relations and national defense. Most of this will be spent on food-for-peace activities. As an instrument of peace, this program is a significant part of American foreign policy, not just farmer foreign policy.

Another $499 million, 8 percent of the total budget, is to be spent for domestic food distribution programs for our needy at home.

About $994 million, around 15 percent, will go for long-range programs for disease and pest control, meat inspection, protection of soil and water resources, forest and public land management, and market development and services. These activities benefit every one of our citizens.

Then there is a budget item of $448 million for Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration loans for which the repayment record by cooperatives and farmers is excellent. This is sound business.

Right down at the bottom of the proposed budget expenditures is an item of about $2.5 billion for the support of programs directed primarily to the farm economy, price-support activities including those for feed grains and wheat, agricultural conservation, the conservation reserve, and the sugar and wool programs.

Realistically, the Department of Agriculture budget should show $2.5 billion for farm programs and $4 billion for foreign aid, for food distribution, for public welfare and health services, for the maintenance of our forests and public outdoor recreation facilities, and for research carrying major benefits to business and industry.

Triggered by the feed-grains program, which was the first major farm legislation offered by the Kennedy administration, farm income has risen substantially the last 2 years.

Net farm income in 1961 was $12.7 billion, a rise of a billion dollars over the figure recorded for 1960.

Net farm income in 1962 moved up to $12.9 billion. While these figures do not represent the fair share of national income farm families earn and should have, a billion dollar improvement is a welcome step in the right direction.

The benefits of the feed grains and wheat programs have not all moved into the farm sector. Taxpayers are major beneficiaries, too. Like farmers, they haven't been happy about having unneeded, unwanted supplies in storage that put an unnecessary drain on the Federal treasury.

Government holdings of wheat and feed grains were better than a billion bushels less on February 15 of this year than the peak quantities held in 1961 before new programs became effective. Total stocks at the end of the 1963 marketing year will be 2.5 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

The fact that Government doesn't now own the billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is saving the taxpayers $770 thousand a day in carrying charges, $280 million a year.

The 1964 Federal budget includes $246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million, or $2.2 million a day, less than the annual rate that would have occured by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

The 1961 and 1962 feed grains programs have been successful. The 1963 program, which contains the new feature of a direct payment to cooperators, is an improvement. I suggested this revision for the 1963 crop year and it is this type of program, a permanent, voluntary, direct payment program, that I will propose and support for the 1964 and subsequent crop years.

The Nation's wheat farmers, in the wheat referendum will go to polling places to make a significant decision.

They will be voting on more than approving, or rejecting, a wheat program developed in the last session of the Congress.

They will be deciding, in substantial measure, the future of farm legislation. They will be deciding between a wheat price of around $1 a bushel or $2 a bushel. They will be deciding on how effectively we can negotiate in the European Common Market.

The 1964 wheat program carries these potentials for farm families if approved by more than two-thirds of those voting in the referendum: Farmers will receive $2 a bushel or more for nearly all of their 1964 wheat marketings.

Prices will be stable and predictable. Consumer prices, as they reflect the cost of wheat, will be the same as in 1962.

The total value of wheat production and the farm value of wheat production will be more than $2.3 billion.

World markets, influenced by the International Wheat Agreement, will be stable. Negotiations leading to satisfactory trade agreements can proceed without the uncertainties attached to unstable U.S. wheat prices.

Wheat surpluses will be reduced, and the cost to the taxpayer will be cut in comparison with recent years.

Should our wheat farmers reject the proposed 1964 wheat program we can expect:

A drastic reduction in the market price for wheat; a sharp reduction in farm income despite a rise in wheat acreage; an unfavorable impact on the total economy as wheat farmers necessarily reduce expenditures for goods and services.

The Congress of the United States, to which rural voters elect a distinct minority of the Members, is keeping a sharp eye on the wheat referendum.

The wheat referendum result will doubtless play a part in determining congressional attitudes toward a 1964 feed grains program, and in the success of efforts to modernize the cotton program in a way that will maintain producer income while facing realistically the relationship of domestic and world markets.

Yes, the wheat referendum decision will have impact far beyond the wheat acres.

Niagara Falls: Thunder of Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, everyone knows Niagara Falls as one of the greatest and most breathtaking wonders of the world. There is, however, much about Niagara Falls' hydroelectric power complex that is not generally known. Inco magazine, which is published by the International Nickel Co. of New York, includes in its winter issue an excellent story on Niagara Falls, entitled "Thunder on Waters." As noted in the article, the utilization of this enormous natural power resource offers a remarkable example of the historic neighborly relationship between the United States and Canada. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THUNDER OF WATERS

The Niagara River's awesome falls have been attracting tourists ever since the French explorers De La Salle and Fr. Louis Hennepin first visited them in 1678, and they have been drawing industry to both the Canadian and American sides of the river since 1757 when, history records, the Niagara was first harnessed to provide power for a sawmill.

Niagara Falls stands today as the site of the mightiest hydroelectric power developments in the Western World. More important, the enlightened utilization of this great natural resource to the mutual benefit of the United Sates and Canada serves as an unparalleled example of international cooperation and friendship.

Nature endowed the Niagara River with all the attributes required for electric power production on a massive scale, a large, uniform flow, averaging 202,500 cubic feet per second; a total descent of 326 feet, much of it concentrated in the 8-mile stretch of falls and rapids, and a location near the population and industrial centers of both Canada and the United States.

The 36-mile Niagara River empties four of the five Great Lakes, flowing from Lake Erie into Lake Ontario. Goat Island, part of New York State, splits the river into two channels at the head of the upper rapids. The greater part of the flow cascades over Canada's Horseshoe Falls, which have a crest length of 2,200 feet and a drop of 176 feet; the American Falls are 1,000 feet wide and 182 feet high. The roar of the river dashing headlong over the falls emphasizes the aptness of the Indian name Niagara, "Thunder of Waters."

The very factors that make Niagara Falls a rich source of power also make it one of the world's great natural wonders. From the very beginning of the falls' carefully planned development for power purposes, the United States and Canada, working together in harmony, have been at pains to maintain and enhance its breathtaking beauty.

Formal international cooperation in the provident use of the Niagara's waters dates back to a 1909 treaty between the United States and Great Britain, under which diversion of water for power and industrial use on the American side was limited to 20,000 cubic feet per second and, on the Canadian side, to 36,000 cubic feet. Starting with World War II, when heightened industrial activity greatly increased power needs, water diversion quotas were steadily raised for emergency purposes by notes exchanged between the United States and the Government of Canada in 1940, 1941, and 1948.

In 1950, the United States and Canada concluded a treaty which, while increasing the amount of water diverted for power production, declared that, "in order to reserve sufficient amounts of water in the Niagara River for scenic purposes, no diversions * * *shall be made for power purposes which shall reduce the flow over Niagara Falls to less than 100,000 cubic feet per second each day" during daylight hours of the tourist season (April 1–October 31). During the rest of the year, the flow over the falls must be at least 50,000 cubic feet per second. The diverted water is shared equally by Canada and the United States, according to the terms of the treaty.

The treaty also called for the construction of remedial works in the Niagara River to "enhance the beauty of the falls by distributing the waters so as to produce an un-

broken crestline on the falls." To stem the erosion process that had caused the crest of the Horseshoe Falls to recede more than 865 feet in the past 200 years. The Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario and the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, cooperated in the building of a 13-gate control dam, now being expanded to 18 gates, on the Canadian side of the river. The cost of the works was borne equally by power entities in Canada and the United States.

The waters of the Niagara were first used for power on a significant scale in 1895, when a hydroelectric power station was built in Niagara Falls, N.Y. A number of small stations, on both sides of the river, followed in the next two decades. Then, in 1917, The Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario, which came into being in 1906 by act of the Ontario Legislature as a corporate body administering a provincewide enterprise for the production and distribution of electric power at cost, began construction of the falls' first great power project. The first generating unit was placed in service in 1922. Called the Sir Adam Beck-Niagara Generating Station No. 1., in honor of Ontario Hydro's first chairman, the station was for many years the largest hydroelectric generating plant in the world. Its 10 generating units have a capacity of 440,000 kilowatts.

But the power needs of Ontario grew so rapidly during and after the Second World War that, within a few weeks after the ratification of the 1950 United States-Canada treaty, Ontario Hydro began work on a vast new project more than three times as great as the Sir Adam Beck No. 1 development. Located adjacent to the first station on the riverbank near Queenstown, the Sir Adam Beck Generating Station No. 2, together with an associated pumping-generating station, has an installed capacity of 1,370,000 kilowatts.

The Sir Adam Beck Plant No. 2, officially opened in 1954, has 16 generating units powered by turbines. It operates on the same fundamental plan as the other major hydroelectric stations on both sides of the Niagara River. Water is diverted from the river into intakes, concrete structures built parallel to the riverbank. Water enters through slots in the vertical face, designed to permit uniform flow under all river conditions. As a precaution against the influx of ice, the tops of the slots are well below the normal river level. Control gates for the tunnels which carry the water to the plant are immediately downstream from the intakes.

There are 2 parallel tunnels, each 5½ miles long and 45 feet in diameter. The tunnels pass directly under the city of Niagara Falls, Ontario, and empty their water into an open canal leading to the station's forebay, a reservoir or pond at the head of the penstocks (19-foot-diameter steel tubes). The water rushes down from the top of the sheer cliff through 16 penstocks, 1 for each generator, and hits the turbine runners, which are similar to paddle wheels. The turbines, rotated by the rushing waters very much in the manner of the ancient waterwheel provide in turn the driving force to spin the generator shafts, thus generating electricity.

The turbine runners are made of carbon steel and operate for about 4 years before maintenance is required because of cavitation, according to engineers at the Sir Adam Beck Station No. 2. Because the areas of cavitation cannot be predicted with certainty, it has been found economical to operate the runners in their raw state, rather than give them a protective coating in advance. Then, when the ravages of cavitation become too severe for effective operation, the runners are repaired with a type 301 stainless steel welded overlay. From 1,100 to 1,500 pounds of stainless steel are welded to the runners of each turbine. No maintenance has been required by turbine runners after they have been overlaid, the engineers report.

Power produced at the 2 Sir Adam Beck stations and at over 60 other hydroelectric and 4 major thermalelectric stations is fed by Ontario Hydro into a grid system which serves an area of 250,000 square miles. The commission, which is financed by revenue from the sale of electricity and by issuing bonds, provides 90 percent of the power needs of Ontario.

Ontario Hydro's grid system is interconnected with other grids extending over more than half the North American Continent. A power pool with a capacity of more than 115 million kilowatts stretches from the James Bay watershed in northern Ontario, west to Montana, east to Maine, and south to the Gulf of Mexico. The electric power grid provides just one more example of Canadian-United States cooperation and interdependence.

There was an example of good-neighbor cooperation, too, in the building of the new Robert Moses Niagara Powerplant of the Power Authority of the State of New York, across the river from the two Sir Adam Beck stations. Ontario Hydro's infinitely detailed scale model of the Niagara River was used to locate, design, and detail the works required for the intakes of the Moses plant.

In the spring of last year, the 13th and last generating unit went into service in the Moses plant, thereby assuring that the full share of water allotted to the United States for power generation could be used.

There had long been a pressing need for additional hydroelectric power developments to serve the highly industrialized Niagara Falls-Buffalo area of New York State. The Power Authority of the State of New York was licensed by the Federal Power Commission in 1958 to meet that need.

The authority's Niagara power project is the largest hydroelectric development in the Western World, with a total installed power capacity of 2,190,000 kilowatts, 1,950,000 kilowatts at the Robert Moses plant, and 240,000 at the Lewiston pump-generating plant.

The $720 million project was financed entirely by capital raised from the sale of bonds to private investors.

Like the Sir Adam Beck station described earlier, the Robert Moses plant consists basically of an intake structure at the top of the gorge and generating equipment at the bottom connected by penstocks. The 2 river intake structures, located 2½ miles above the falls, are each 700 feet long, with 48 slotted openings, the tops of which are 13 to 26 feet below the river's surface. Rising impressively from the handsomely landscaped shoreline, behind the intakes, are two nickel stainless steel gate structures. Almost 100 feet high and 55 feet wide, each structure contains a 49- by 68-foot vertical lift gate, which can be lowered to prevent water from entering the conduit to permit inspection or repairs.

Type 316 stainless steel with a nonreflective finish developed for architectural applications was used for all exterior exposed surfaces of the structures, with the exception of the hatch covers and access door panels. These, also made of type 316 stainless, have a No. 6 architectural grade finish applied at the fabricator's plant. Some 150,000 pounds of the alloy were used in the structures, which were designed by the authority's engineers, Uhl, Hall & Rich. John B. Peterkin was consulting architect.

A spokesman for the Power Authority of the State of New York explained, "The intake gates and their function dictated the actual architectural shape and geometry of the enclosing structures. The extreme verticality of this design requirement further influenced our selection of a metal-skin type enclosure, particularly from the standpoints of cost, ease of fabrication, installation and meeting the requirements of our construction progress schedule, in addition to the architectural durability and esthetics of the material."

Type 316 stainless and the finishes mentioned above were selected only after many lengthy tests of a number of stainless steel alloys and finishes, the power authority spokesman pointed out. "These tests also included aluminum and various aluminum finishes, bronze, various paints applied to metals, painted coatings in general, porcelain finishes on various metals and even unusual metals for building purposes, such as vanadium and titanium sheet. Because various areas on the project had a history of a highly corrosive atmosphere, test racks were constructed at the site of the intake gate structure and also between the site of the Lewiston pump-generating plant and a chemical plant. With proper normal maintenance we believe it reasonable to assume that the stainless steel skin as designed will remain functionally and esthetically acceptable for many, many years, and probably as long as the plant is in operation. Once all major construction in the adjacent areas has been completed and the structures are given a final cleaning it is expected that the panels will become considerably more self-cleaning and that maintenance will be kept to a minimum."

Water from the intakes courses through conduits over a 4½-mile route to the forebay-afterbay of the Lewiston pump-generating plant and to the power canal which takes it directly to the Moses plant. The Lewiston plant uses surplus power from the main plant to pump extra water, which is available at night under the 1950 treaty, into a storage reservoir for use in the day, when less water can be diverted from the river. During the peak power-demand periods of daytime, the stored water is released to flow through the Lewiston plant units which are reversed to function as power-producing turbine generators. This water then serves as fuel a second time, flowing from the reservoir into the power canal and then to the Moses plant.

An ancillary benefit of the Niagara power project has been a major redevelopment program to beautify the American side of the Niagara River. Prospect Park, near the brink of the American Falls, has been completely rebuilt, and a 270-foot observation and elevator tower has been constructed by the Niagara Frontier State Park Commission. Scenic Niagara Parkway, replacing eyesores that huddled near the river's edge, runs for 10 miles along the shore, affording a magnificent view of both the upper and lower river. Visitor facilities on Goat Island have been modernized, and the new American Rapids Bridge links the island to the mainland.

A recent major improvement of international significance, which symbolizes the bridge of friendship and understanding which has so long existed between Canada and the United States, was the opening of the new Lewiston-Queenston Bridge last November. As the Evening Tribune of Welland and Port Colborne, Ontario, stated editorially at the time, the bridge represents "$16 million worth of confidence in development and friendship embracing Canada and the United States." The newspaper pointed out that the new bridge is a reminder that "we really have something to talk about in our spirit of understanding with the United States and that we have both a right and a duty to reemphasize the proud and neighborly relationship."

The vast two-way traffic of tourists and business people traveling freely between the United States and Canada over the friendship bridges that span the Niagara River testifies each day to this historic neighborly relationship.

The Oxford Disaster—Price of Defiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the State of Mississippi have focused worldwide attention on the results of inflammatory behavior in an area of great sensitivity, school desegregation. The following articles provide valuable insights into the price of a course of defiance. They were written by a Mississippian, State Representative Karl Wiesenburg, of Jackson County, Miss., and were printed in the Chronicle, at Pascagoula, on December 17–21, 1962. I think the thoughtful and scholarly approach of the author well merits the attention of all Members of Congress:

THE OXFORD DISASTER: PRICE OF DEFIANCE

(By Representative Karl Wiesenburg, Jackson County, Miss.)

FOREWORD

Legal means exhausted, physical defiance at an end, Gov. Ross Barnett submitted to Federal law enforcement on September 30, 1962. That was not the end but the beginning of Mississippi's agony. For emotions that had been enflamed over the admission to the University of Mississippi of James Meredith, a Mississippian from Kosciusko, erupted into riot and murder.

Since then, Mississippians have been washed by waves of accusations that attempt to place blame for the consequences of defiance on everything and everyone connected with the Federal Government.

This booklet paints another picture. In it, State Representative Karl Wiesenburg, of Pascagoula, discusses the Meredith case in five chapters devoid of emotional fervor and inflammatory verbiage. A well-known legal scholar, Wiesenburg traces court actions that preceded Meredith's registration at Ole Miss. He discusses the Mississippi constitution that places our State's sovereignty in a position subordinate to that of the United States and he asks, Was a solemn oath of office violated in Mississippi's handling of the Meredith case?

No repentance, shame, or remose has been expressed by our political leaders since the Oxford tragedy, Wiesenburg points out, and he predicts that their continued defiance and their attitude that "we are Mississippians first, Americans second" will lead to even bloodier tragedy in the months to come.

In the chilling words of his final chapter, Wiesenburg quotes the price of defiance: "Destruction, disgrace, disaster, and death."

The Wiesenburg articles first appeared on the editorial pages of the Chronicle. We think they are a major contribution to the welfare of Mississippi and form a reasoned viewpoint around which may rally all Mississippians who are appalled at what is happening in their State. It can be the foundation for their credo.

IRA HARKEY,
Editor and Publisher, the Chronicle, Pascagoula, Miss.

DECEMBER 31, 1962.

PART 1: THE ROAD TO RIOT

On September 10, 1962, Justice Black, speaking for the Supreme Court of the United States, reinstated a Federal court injunction ordering the immediate admission of James A. Meredith to the University of Mississippi.

That evening a series of conferences was held by Mississippi's Gov. Ross R. Barnett. He was advised by lawyers of highest repute that no further legal action was possible. The Meredith case, which had been in the courts since May 31, 1961, had been finally terminated. He was told that regardless of the personal opinions, feelings and convictions of native-born Mississippi Federal district judges, they would carry out the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Governor knew that he was faced with only two alternatives: compliance or defiance.

Governor Barnett's background counseled compliance. His religious convictions, legal training, and his duties and responsibilities as Governor of the State of Mississippi called for maintenance of peace and order, respect for constituted authority and obedience to law.

On the other hand, his political career had been staked upon successfully maintaining segregation as Mississippi's primary policy. He had avidly sought and won the support of the powerful citizens councils. He had accepted their leaders into his confidence and as his trusted political advisers. His speeches reflected the official citizens councils position. Again and again, he had cried "never, never, never," to the ever-increasing threat of the integration of the public schools of his State.

This fateful day marked a day of decision for Mississippi. Had the Governor urged compliance, had he said that although he disagreed with the order of the U.S. Court, that the order would be obeyed, the tragedy of Oxford would not have taken place. The people of Mississippi would have followed his leadership.

Instead, pressured by advisers who continued to cry "Never, never, never," he led his State down a path that inevitably led to riot, destruction, and death.

That night Governor Barnett denounced Justice Black's order as "illegal," and said he "would not allow Meredith's entrance at Ole Miss despite the order."

On September 13 Governor Barnett in a television address to the people of the State said, "No schools will be integrated while I am your Governor." He submitted himself to the possibility of Federal imprisonment and declared, "If there be any official who is not prepared to suffer imprisonment for this righteous cause, I ask him now to submit his resignation." He invoked the doctrine of "interposition" and issued a proclamation placing the sovereignty of the State against the enforcement of the Court's decree.

Governor Barnett's words met with overwhelming public approval and support. Both of Mississippi's Senators, five of six Congressmen and nearly all elective and appointive State, district, county, and municipal officials strongly endorsed his actions. The Mississippi Legislature, meeting in special session, with only two dissenting votes, adopted resolutions commending him for his stand. Congratulatory resolutions, messages, telegrams, telephone calls and letters from throughout the State and South flooded the capital.

The voices urging caution were few. Congressman Frank Smith stated on September 14 "Whether we like it or not the question of State versus Federal law was settled a hundred years ago." He further said that Barnett's acts "threaten the existence of our great university" and that "Barnett would lead the State down another blind alley." One of two members of the Mississippi Legislature who placed themselves on record as opposing the Governor, predicted that the result would be "strife, discord, and violence." The other member foresaw "inevitable bloodshed, insurrection, and anarchy." The overwhelming roar of public approval drowned out these few futile protests. Indeed, anyone who dared to disagree with the Governor was immediately tagged as an "integrationist."

In the days that followed, the people of Mississippi were treated to the spectacle of their "Ross" twice successfully confronting Meredith and the Federal marshals and routing them. The enthusiasm of the people reached fever pitch. In this mass hysteria reason and logic were abandoned. The leaders of nearly every community, bankers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, and workers went on an orgy of rebellion against constituted authority and their Federal Government.

The marshaling of the State highway patrol, sheriffs, peace officers, and "deputies" on the campus of the University of Mississippi on September 26 to openly challenge the hated "feds" brought back visions of the War Between the States. A State senator prepared a resolution for introduction in the State Senate calling for Mississippi to secede from the Federal Union. Another State senator was cheered by his colleagues when he called for "victory regardless of the cost in money, regardless of the cost in prestige, regardless of the cost in human life."

In this atmosphere of hate, it was inevitable that blood would be shed. It simply became a question of whose blood, and when.

The sudden capitulation by Governor Barnett on the afternoon of September 30 shocked the State. Many refused to believe that he had surrendered. The sheriffs and peace officers standing by ready to oppose the Federal marshals had no advance warning. Some organized hasty "posses" and sped to Oxford. Among the grim "volunteers" who appeared in the city of Oxford that tragic night were men who had been organized, recruited and armed by peace officers of the State sworn to maintain peace and order. Others were no better than members of a lynch mob, and animated by the same spirit. Denied their prey, they stoned Federal troops, including their own fellow Mississippians in the National Guard, and made the peaceful city of Oxford a scene of confusion, disorder and despair.

Two men met their death that night, scores were injured, property damage was high, and a great university was deluged in turn by Federal marshals, a rioting mob and Federal troops.

We had not won the victory but indeed we had paid a price "regardless of money, regardless of prestige, and regardless of human life."

PART 2: AN OATH VIOLATED?

Many of Mississippi's lawyers, jurists, historians, businessmen and politicians have circulated propaganda purporting to give the people of the State and the Nation the "facts" about the Oxford disaster.

Typical of these are articles by a former president of the American Bar Association, by the president of the University of Southern Mississippi and a booklet published by the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce. These documents are remarkable in that they seek to justify the conduct of Governor Barnett as being lawful under the Constitution of the United States. They ignored the question of whether or not Governor Barnett's actions were illegal under the Constitution of the State of Mississippi.

These sections of the Constitution of the State of Mississippi are applicable:

Section 7 provides "nor shall any law be passed in derogation of the paramount allegiance of the citizens of this State to the Government of the United States."

Section 8 makes U.S. citizenship paramount to citizenship of Mississippi.

Section 268 provides that the Governor shall "solemnly swear that he will faithfully support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of Mississippi and obey the laws thereof."

Section 123 provides "the Governor shall see that the laws are faithfully effected."

Section 213A places the University of Mississippi "under the management and control of a board of trustees to be known as the board of trustees of State institutions of higher learning * * * such board shall perform the high and honorable duties thereof to the greatest advantage of the people of the State of such educational institutions, uninfluenced by any political considerations."

Section 217 of the Constitution provides that "the Governor * * * shall have power to call forth the militia to execute the laws, repel invasion and to suppress riots and insurrections."

In the case of the *State* v. *McPhail*, the Mississippi Supreme Court, speaking of the powers of the Governor of our State, said: "the constitutional and statutory provisions requiring the Governor to see that the laws are effected * * * mean * * * that the law shall be carried into effect, that they shall be enforced * * * not that there shall be an arbitrary enforcement by the executive of what he may consider the law to be, but the enforcement of judicial process that is, the enforcement of a right of remedy provided by law and judicially determined and ordered to be enforced. * * * All these provisions when taken together mean that whatever the Governor does in the execution of the laws * * * must be * * * in strict subordination to the general law of the land."

In the case of *Thomas* v. *Taylor* the Mississippi Supreme Court said:

"The Constitution of the United States is not merely a league of sovereign states, for their common defense against external and internal violence, but a supreme Federal Government, acting not only upon the sovereign members of the Union, but directly upon all its citizens in their individual and corporate capacities. * * * This Constitution, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, and treaties made under the authority of the United States, are declared to be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. ing.

"The Constitution of the United States provides that the Senators and Representatives in Congress, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bounded by oath or affirmation to support that Constitution. We cannot think that so important a provision in the paramount law of the land was intended to be merely directory, and not absolutely necessary to be complied with."

In the case of *Mississippi State Tax Commission* v. *Brown* the Mississippi Supreme Court said:

"The requirement that the members of several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States, and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution, imposes upon all those exercising the powers of any office the duty of supporting the Constitution, which carries with it the duty of careful examination of the Constitution, and of the construction placed upon it by the highest Court * * * which interpretation is binding upon every officer of the Federal Government, and of the State government."

The law in Mississippi may be summarized thusly:

(a) The constitution of the State of Mississippi expressly recognizes that the Federal law is the paramount law of the land.

(b) The constitution of the State of Mississippi vests full management and control of the affairs of the Universtiy of Mississippi in the board of trustees for the institutions of higher learning. This includes the question of the admission of students to the university.

(c) Under the constitution of the State of Mississippi the Governor of the State has no authority or control of the internal affairs of the University of Mississippi, nor can he admit or deny admission to any student.

(d) Under the constitution of the State of Mississippi it is the duty of the Governor as the chief executive of the State to see that law and order is maintained in the State, and to suppress riots and insurrections.

(e) Under the constitution of the State of Mississippi the Governor cannot determine what the law is, or what laws should be obeyed, but he is bound under his oath of office to enforce the laws of the land as judicially determined by the courts of the land.

(f) Under the constitution of the State of Mississippi neither the State legislature nor the State courts can interfere with the enforcement of the final decrees of the Federal courts of the United States.

(g) The Mississippi Supreme Court, construing the constitution of the State of Mississippi and the Constitution of the United States, has held that the interpretations of the Constitution of the United States by the Supreme Court of the United State are binding upon all State officials and constitute "the law of the land."

Governor Barnett clearly acknowledged that he had no statutory or constitutional authority to interfere with the admission of James Meredith to the university. In a letter dated October 25, 1962, he wrote the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as follows:

All statutory and constitutional authority for operating the State institutions of higher learning in Mississippi is in the hands of the duly appointed members of the board of trustees of State institutions of higher learning. It is not my wish or purpose to accept or assume any of these prerogatives.

If Governor Barnett had admitted that this was the law on September 10 instead of waiting until October 25, the tragedy at Oxford would not have taken place.

Did he violate his solemn oath of office to "faithfully support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of Mississippi and obey the laws thereof"?

Toleration of Inconveniences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Cannelton (Ind.) News notes the many discomforts which often accompany construction and progress. In the spring and summer of 1963 the public of Cannelton, Ind., will be amidst the construction of Cannelton locks and dams. This is only typical of progressive areas around the country. Tolerance and good will of the public is indeed appreciated, for we must realize the inconveniences which arise with these developments. Only through these inconveniences of progress are we able to provide the needed improvements for a better, cleaner, and more healthy nation.

Mr. President, I believe this editorial warrants my colleagues attention, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cannelton (Ind.) News]

BE TOLERANT OF INCONVENIENCES

Cannelton is launched into a period of considerable construction. Not only will Cannelton locks and dam bring extensive commotion our way in the summer of 1963, we will find programs going on right here at home that will have our streets torn up, dust flying in abundance and many inconveniences.

That is always the case when a city launches widespread improvements.

In the spring and summer of 1963, Canneltonians will see work going on in improving the present water system and also development of a sewage treatment plant here. This means considerable digging. That brings on dust and other problems.

There is no way out. Cannelton will be a better, cleaner, more healthy community when all the work is done. However, to get it done, we will have our hardships. But let us endure them patiently. For without them, we could not get the things that we need and must have to keep us rolling along the road to complete modernization of our facilities.

Not only will the digging cause us discomforts, it will keep our streets torn up and hold up extensive spring and summer repairs that generally keep these streets smooth and ready for auto traffic. There will be some patching to keep the streets smooth as possible. However, it would be foolish to spend great sums of money to repair streets that will be torn up.

We are pointing all of this out because we know such hardships are coming. At the same time, we have great respect for the tolerance and good will of our people. Thus, properly informed, we expect them to react with consideration for the people who are doing this work and the public officials who authorized it. It is all for our own good, we simply must put up with the inconveniences that will come with these developments. There is no other way, so let's all make the best of it.

A $5.6 Billion Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a logical presumption here in Washington that once the Ways and Means Committee struggles through the tax proposals for 1963, the next matter on their

agenda might well be the administration's schemes to socialize our medical services.

This prospect draws consistent interest throughout the country, and the Harvey, Ill., Tribune, in its issue of Thursday, March 28, editorially commented on certain phases of the proposal. This comment is worthy of attention and study to emphasize the consistent interest of the country, and I ask leave to place this article into the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

A $5.6 BILLION NAME

The bill providing for health care for the elderly which has been introduced in this Congress varies from the medicare bill of last year only in minor details. It would bring everyone drawing social security benefits under the Federal tent whether or not they wanted or needed the aid.

Administration estimates place the cost at $5.6 billion over a 4-year period, and that is hardly pin money, particularly when looked at in the light of current budget and tax problems. Other estimates, from informed sources, place the possible figure at twice that sum.

Peter Edson, a well-known Washington columnist, provides an interesting footnote to the proposal. An effort is being made to get rid of the name "medicare," which is in obvious bad odor in and out of Congress, and to substitute a term such as hospital insurance. But social security is not insurance in any accepted sense of the term, and the Internal Revenue Service itself is authority for that statement. In the case of an Amish farmer who refused to make his social security payments on the grounds it was insurance, the IRS ruled that it was a tax. And it seized and sold the farmer's horses in order to meet the tax.

That aside, the American Medical Association News does a good job of summing up the grave faults in the bill in these words: "It would lower the quality of health care, it would lead to the decline of voluntary health insurance and prepayment plans, it would take another bite out of the take-home pay of America's wage earners to provide benefits for millions who can well afford to take care of themselves, and it would impose Government controls on medical practice."

It would be hard to think of a more dismal prospect than that.

Dollars for Veterans Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Stan Allen, executive secretary of the American Council of the World Veterans Federation, and which appeared in the December 1962 World Veteran magazine:

DOLLARS FOR VETERANS OVERSEAS

(By Stan Allen)

More than $26 million in American veterans' and survivors' benefits are sent out of the United States every year by the U.S. Veterans' Administration in pursuit of wandering ex-GI's and their legal dependents all over the world—and the volume will probably increase gradually for years to come.

Veterans' dollars are now being injected at the rate of over $2 million a month into the economic bloodstream of more than a hundred countries ranging from the lonely Solomon Islands of the Pacific—where a single pensioner resides—to booming Italy with its record total of 7,500 U.S. beneficiaries.

Yet this dollar impact represents less than a third of all the money spent overseas at the direction of the Veterans' Administration. It does not include the additional $57 million a year disbursed just in the Philippine Islands alone to citizens of that Republic who served under the American flag in war and peace.

Altogether, VA's total oversea expenditures exceed $83 million in annual pension payments, service-connected disability compensation, insurance benefits and readjustments stipends for a worldwide army of some 80,000 veterans, widows, orphans, dependent parents and, here and there, a few ex-girl-friends.

No records are kept on the ratio of U.S. citizens to noncitizens among these beneficiaries because citizenship is not a factor in qualifying for benefits administered by the VA. However, each is either a former U.S. serviceman or the dependent of a former GI and, as such, is just as qualified as any stay-at-home American. Nor does the United States presume to tell beneficiaries where they may live. In fact the Government goes to unusual lengths to honor commitments to its pensioners wherever they may be.

The record shows they may be almost anywhere.

Here, for example, is a numerical breakdown, published for the first time, showing as of June 30, 1961, the location by world regions of VA's beneficiaries abroad:

Area	Compensation and pensions	Readjustment benefits	Total
Africa	99	0	99
Asia	57,717	1,942	[1] 59,659
Europe	16,348	441	16,789
North America (Canada, Mexico, and Bermuda)	3,922	123	4,045
South America	425	0	425
Australasia	419	0	419
Central America	240	0	240
Oceania	2	0	2
West Indies	258	0	258
Total	79,430	2,506	81,936

[1] Includes 58,672 Filipinos.

Here, too, also published for the first time, is a sampling of how payments are distributed in a single region—in this instance, Europe, because it has the largest number of beneficiaries, again excepting the Philippines. The VA dollar payments that follow are totals in 26 European jurisdictions for the month of October 1961:

Austria	$5,967
Azores	1,221
Belgium	20,912
Cyprus	2,414
Denmark	27,961
England	82,143
Finland	6,239
France	48,215
West Germany	46,352
Greece	163,691
Holland	4,823
Iceland	273
Ireland	8,259
Northern Ireland	8,259
Italy	644,354
Luxembourg	1,615
Malta	1,296
Norway	44,336
Poland	51,438
Portugal	$9,299
Rumania	4,313
Scotland	10,243
Spain	10,792
Sweden	44,550
Switzerland	7,738
Yugoslavia	26,212
Total	1,377,269

American taxpayers (including veterans) who foot this bill are mostly unaware of the percentage of VA benefits spent abroad by virtue of the foreign residence of the recipients. And compared to the full cost of the whole American veterans program the volume of exported dollars is not especially significant. In fact they total less than 2½ cents of each dollar committed to pensions and compensation which account for $3.5 billion of the annual VA budget. (With total expenses in the current fiscal year of $5.2 billion, the Veterans' Administration is the largest single independent agency in the U.S. Government and, outside military commitments, is the most expensive item in the entire Federal budget.)

By far the biggest of all VA oversea operations is still centered, of course, in Manila where—except for the World War II years—some form of U.S. veterans contact facility has been maintained since 1922. In the years before World War II the peak U.S. veterans load in the Philippines reached 7,500. But after the war the VA had to establish a regular regional office in Manila to adjudicate the claims and meet the needs of some 334,000 Filipino veterans and their dependents.

When America relinquished its sovereignty, it did not, however, relinquish its obligation to Filipinos who served under the American flag. In 1946, following establishment of the independent Republic of the Philippines, the U.S. Congress enacted a law authorizing continuance of VA's regional Manila office until 1970. Today, 58,672 Filipino veterans and their dependents draw VA benefits. Thousands of wartime guerrillas and irregulars are also still pressing their own claims for benefits. All recordkeeping is centered in Manila and Filipino payments are made in pesos rather than dollars.

A special program of American grants also exists in the Philippines for hospitalization of veterans from the Commonwealth and recognized guerrilla veterans of World War II. This program is scheduled to end next year.

The program developed as a result of the construction by the United States in 1955 of the 722-bed Veterans Memorial Hospital in Quezon City, completed at a cost of nearly $9½ million. It is generally considered to be one of the finest hospitals of its kind in the Far East.

(The writer was privileged to attend the hospital dedication ceremonies in November 1955 as a guest of the late President Magsaysay, with a party that included the then VA Administrator Hervey Higley and Representative OLIN TEAGUE of Texas, then as now chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and a strong advocate of justice for Filipino veterans. The structure compares favorably with the best VA hospitals in America.)

And how long, it may be asked, will the distribution of this global largesse be continuing?

The end is not in sight. Some years ago a Special U.S. Commission on Veterans' Benefits headed by Gen. Omar N. Bradley and appointed by then President Eisenhower attempted to estimate both costs and the size of the veterans' population in the future. Assuming no future wars to alter the existing balances, these experts foresaw a peak of 78 million wartime veterans and their families by 1965, representing 41 percent of the total increasing U.S. population.

By 1975, they estimated, there would still be 65 million veterans and families although they would represent only 29 percent of the expanding population. And pension and compensation costs continue to rise proportionately with increasing age even as the ranks dwindle numerically.

Past experience is another guideline. Few Americans—or others—realize that VA benefits are still being paid today to a handful of dependents from America's war with Mexico (1846–1848) and to more than 3,000 dependents of the American Civil War (1861–65) and to veterans and dependents of all subsequent wars in which America has participated. Indeed, the last veterans' dependent of the American Revolution (1775–83) did not die until 1906—at the age of 92.

Clearly, American veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea and their dependent next-of-kin will be drawing benefits of some form or another far into the 21st century—always providing, of course, mankind finds it possible at long last to achieve the goal of permanent peace with freedom for which so many of the world's people and so much of its treasure have been sacrificed.

Cotton Mills Seek Equality in Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of this date carries a very interesting article on the two-piece cotton situation. The article was written by Don Bacon, a staff writer for the newspaper.

The thought occurred to me that this treatment of an important subject would be of interest to our colleagues. Therefore, I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

COTTON MILLS SEEK EQUALITY IN SUBSIDY

(By Don Bacon)

In the United States a textile mill pays $172.50 for a bale of raw cotton. For the same cotton, a foreign mill pays only $130.

That difference in cost, $42.50, is the crux of a problem plaguing the American cotton industry. At long last, businessmen and lawmakers believe, a solution may be at hand.

Congress is due soon to vote on a new subsidy, designed to reduce the cost of price-supported domestic cotton fiber to the manufacturer and thus to make American textiles more competitive in the world market.

Mill operators believe the subsidy will help to end a slump that has existed in the cotton textile industry for several years. With Government price assistance on the cost of cotton fiber, textile manufacturers foresee a reversal of the steepening decline in U.S. cotton textile exports and a halt to the steady rise in textile imports.

WOULD BENEFIT CONSUMERS

A reduction in the cost of raw cotton, which can represent as much as 50 percent of the total cost of a piece of cloth, would naturally bring about a lowering of consumer prices for shirts, dresses, underwear, and other cotton goods, textile manufacturers contend.

Lower prices, they argue, would win back to domestic producers some of the market they have lost to cheaper foreign imports.

Textile imports, according to Agriculture Department figures, have increased an average of 22 percent a year during the last 6 years, while cotton textile exports have declined an average of 6 percent a year. In 1960, for the first time in history, American imports of cotton textiles exceeded exports.

Problems of domestic cotton producers have been heightened by a sharp rise in the use of synthetic fibers, such as rayon, nylon and acrylic, as substitutes for cotton. Some mills have been switching from cotton to rayon, which costs less and has many of cotton's characteristics.

Although cotton no longer is the dominant economic force in this country that it once was, the industry still throws a lot of weight around on Capitol Hill. And Congress cautiously is refusing to act on relief legislation until the industry decides how much of a subsidy it will settle for.

The Kennedy administration has offered to support legislation to subsidize part of the 8½-cent-a-pound difference between American cotton sold at home and that sold to other countries at the lower world prices.

Textile manufacturers say they desperately need Government assistance. But so far they have refused to consider anything less than the full 8½ cents. The Government believes about 5 cents is a fair subsidy, considering the transportation and other expenses incurred by competing foreign imports.

President Kennedy, who calls the two-price cotton situation "a unique burden" on American mills, had expected quick action from Congress. Some administration policymakers had hoped for legislation by the end of march.

They had not reckoned, however, on the impasse between the Government's subsidy offer and the industry's 8½-cent-a-pound demand. The House Agriculture Committee, which must draw up the final bill, began cotton hearings early this month, but recessed until some agreement, or compromise, could be worked out by cotton interests.

Observers believe the cotton industry may be willing to accept a 7-cent subsidy this year, with some assurance that the entire differential would come next year. Publicly, though, the industry is firm.

"Compromise is definitely not in the air," says a delegate just returned from the American Textile Manufacturers Institute convention at Hollywood, Fla.

Meanwhile, domestic cotton consumption is sharply declining. With the prospect of lower priced cotton, mills are reluctant to maintain their inventories. Cotton textile imports for the first 11 months of 1962 were up 71 percent from the year before. In addition, the use of synthetics rose 25 percent.

FURTHER DECLINE SEEN

Use of cotton by U.S. mills is expected to decline by about 700,000 bales in the 1962–63 season, despite prospects for a near-record cotton crop.

Much has happened to cotton since Senator James H. Hammond, of South Carolina, arose on the Senate floor in 1858 to warn his colleagues that "cotton is king" in economic and political power.

Consumption, except for the extraordinary demands during the war years, reached a peak around 1930. Depression, uneconomical farming methods, changing clothing fashions (toward lighter fabrics), lack of technological advancement in the textile industry, development of new synthetic fabrics, and the boll weevils, all have contributed to cotton's troubles.

Thirty years ago, cotton had about 93 percent of the total fiber market; today it has about 67 percent. In the last 12 years, the consumption of cotton per person in the United States has dropped from 30 pounds to 22 pounds.

The inability of the various segments of the cotton industry to agree on a legislative remedy could be damaging, warns Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

"There are so many people who need cotton legislation so badly that they are simply going to have to get together," he says.

Youth Unemployment: Effective Local Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, effective programs on the local level are being undertaken to meet the problem of youth unemployment and juvenile delinquency.

Local programs efficiently handling youth problems have been overlooked by Federal planners in their excited eagerness to spawn new governmental agencies.

The following Life editorial describes programs in Georgia and California, and an article in the Christian Science Monitor tells about an effort in Chicago:

[From Life magazine, Apr. 5, 1963]

TWO NEW WAYS TO CURB JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

With a substantial percentage of the U.S. prison population under 21, one can easily get the impression that juvenile delinquency is virtually insoluble. Fortunately that isn't true. Two dramatic new approaches to the problem, both preventive in nature, have just been instituted in Georgia and California. In Georgia the aim is to scare; in California it is to teach.

Georgia's "Operation Teenager" puts half a dozen inmates of the State's Industrial Institute for Boys, all between 16 and 20 and all volunteers, before high school audiences to explain how they wound up in prison. None is serving less than 4 years; one committed 75 burglaries, one got life for murder. Here are some of the things they say:

"I met a couple of fellows and decided that I was a man and they were men and I looked up to them. We bought guns, I stole a car and we went on a long spree. Finally out of money, I went in alone with a .32 caliber pistol in my belt and robbed a cafe."

"We lived like kings, but only at night in dark alleys and beer joints. Everthing I started I quit. Maybe that's why I was caught. I've always been a quitter."

"My parents got me out of trouble and asked me to avoid the crowd I ran around with. I took this as a poke in the face."

Teenage reaction to these stories is a mixture of amazement, shock, and tears. Industrial Institute Superintendent Walter Matthews, who conceived the idea, is now getting more invitations for his boys than he can handle; the Governor is considering making a movie on what they say for statewide distribution and out-of-State educators are interested in the experiment.

The news from California concerns high school dropouts. A Los Angeles housewife, Mrs. Lester Stewart (a depression dropout herself), has organized Dropouts Anony-

mous, now incorporated with 90 members, some of them with police records. Mrs. Stewart's primary aim is not to get them back into high school but into vocational schools like Pacific States University, where 34 are now working on B.S. degrees in electronics and engineering and getting mostly A's and B's. She operates on practically no money, aided by a handful of friends and her husband, who makes coffee for Friday-night AA-type sessions in the Stewart home.

There is no broad agreement among our hardest-thinking sociologists on a master antidote to juvenile crime. But the Georgia and California experiments—along with organizations like Big Brothers of America, Inc., which now has chapters in 28 States and Canada—do suggest that the volunteer-worker approach has undeveloped potential. More power to Superintendent Matthews, Mr. and Mrs. Stewart and others like them.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 22, 1963]

DOOR OPENS TO YOUTH GANGS

CHICAGO.—A wide-open door at Erie Neighborhood House has let in boy groups that are commonly called gangs. These are teenagers from low-income families who ordinarily form themselves into clubs without adult guidance for activities of their own.

"You can hold your meetings here," the understanding Erie House workers told the boys. "Just come. We won't make you join anything."

"Honest? We don't have to go to ceramics class or woodshop or anything?"

"No. Just come and we'll give you a room for your club." Rev. Dick Prosser, in charge of group activities, and his young Mexican assistant, Joe Davila, gained the confidence of a number of neighborhood group leaders, and the boys came.

IDENTITIES KEPT

All the groups have kept their identity—the Latin Aces, the Lazy Devils, the Royal Knights, the Turtle Techs, and a number of others.

The Gaylords, a leading group in local teenage society, joined the march to Erie House, but this group has been able to establish its own headquarters with a charter which the city makes available to supervised clubs. However, the Gaylords still meet at Erie House to play basketball and to participate in the teen council, along with some eight other groups represented.

The teen council is a means for giving the youngsters a chance to participate in decisionmaking for the community. It is made up of two delegates from each club and meets monthly at Erie House. Recently, when adult community organizations came together to discuss neighborhood problems, the teen council sent delegates and participated.

BUSINESS MEETING

The Latin Capris, the Titans, and the White Angoras, a girl group, assisted in ushering. This was an important first step in bringing the gangs into the whole community organization and appears promising, although some of the young delegates thought the mass meeting "dull."

What do gangs do when they meet at Erie House? Take a look at the Tuesday night meeting of the Royals, boys in the 13- to 16-year-old range. One of the smallest of the 16 lads present sits casually on a table and speaks authoritatively as presiding officer pro tem.

"We've got to have officers," says this lad, Ralph Mascripinto. "We need a president, a vice president, a secretary, and a treasurer and I think we ought to have a sergeant at arms. Raise your hands if you want five officers."

DELEGATES TO COUNCIL

"Okay, now we'll vote." Of course, Ralph got elected president. Next project is to raise money so the boys can rent a clubhouse (possibly an old vacant storefront). Most of the boys have jobs and can pay dues. If they are financially able, have three adult sponsors, agree to close meetings at 10:30 nightly, and are willing to have police officers visit their club regularly, they will be able to get a charter from the State.

When this happens, says the Reverend Mr. Prosser, the boys will probably still maintain their association with the neighborhood house, going with settlement leaders on trips around the city and into the country, enjoying athletic facilities of the neighborhood house, and sending delegates to the Teen Council. Some may even enroll in classes, knowing they don't have to.

Foreign Aid Won't Improve Lot of Underdeveloped Nations Unless Population Growth Rate Declines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Gen. William H. Draper on March 15 addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject of "Foreign Aid Won't Improve Lot of Undeveloped Nations Unless Population Growth Rate Declines."

General Draper, investment banker, former Under Secretary of the Army, and Chairman of President Eisenhower's Committee on Foreign Aid, has in my opinion made statements which merit the attention of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His speech follows:

FOREIGN AID WON'T IMPROVE LOT OF UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS UNLESS POPULATION GROWTH RATE DECLINES

(By Gen. William H. Draper, Jr.)

The present excessive rate of population growth threatens the peace, security and well-being of the entire human race at least to the same degree as does the nuclear bomb.

Too rapidly growing population is already preventing, in most underdeveloped countries, the per capita increase in living standards promised to their people and necessary to peaceful future development.

More than 60 billion American dollars have been given or loaned as foreign economic aid since World War 11.

For the past 10 years, three-fourths or more of our economic aid has gone to help the less developed countries.

UNDEVELOPED NATIONS HAVE U.N. MAJORITY

With a combined population of about a billion and a half people they now wield the majority vote in the United Nations. They are largely uncommitted in the cold war, are burdened by ignorance and weighed down by poverty.

Unless these many millions share in some of the benefits of modern living, unless their hopes of improved conditions are at least partially realized, we can look forward only to revolt and bloody civil war.

These societies are largely illiterate, and have little technical experience either in government, in industry, or even in agriculture.

FIFTY MILLION PEOPLE A YEAR

The world census is now going up more than 5,000 every hour, about 50 million people a year. The annual increase is growing larger year by year.

In this decade alone, the crop of newcomers, according to United Nations estimates, will exceed the combined numbers living today in Germany, France, the United States and Russia.

Just 10 years ago, the population of the world was about 2½ billion people; it had increased only 1 billion in the previous 50 years. But another half billion was added in the last 10.

If present growth rates continue there would be a further increase of 3 billion in this century, more than doubling the 1963 population within the next 40 years.

BIRTH RATES UP, DEATH RATES DOWN

Modern medicine, antibiotics and better child care have brought death rates tumbling rapidly down throughout the world. The comparatively high birth rates so necessary during past centuries to maintain the world's population in the face of pestilence and plague are still being maintained.

Birth rates must be brought into reasonable relationship to death rates. Otherwise the peril is great.

In 1948, as Under Secretary of the Army, I had responsibility for supervising our occupation of Japan. With a group of businessmen invited by the Army, I visited Japan to review the economic policies of our military government there.

JAPANESE TOOK ACTION

American medical science had stamped out plagues and disease that in past years had taken heavy toll of Japanese lives. However, this achievement had already thrown Japan's birth and death rates rates badly out of balance.

The Japanese leaders themselves recognized this threat. Through education, legislation, and by drastic measures such as legalized abortion which we do not approve, the Japanese people successfully reduced their rate of population growth and brought it into line with the capacity of their economy.

PLANS NEGATED BY POPULATION GROWTH

India too is wakening to the necessity of keeping its huge population within bounds. In attempting to bring the food supply above the subsistence level, India has had to find food for 7 or 8 million new Indian mouths each year. The Government hopes that education, contraception and voluntary sterilization may some day keep down the mounting population.

In 1961 census counts showed nearly 30 million more Indians and 6 million more Pakistanis than Government estimates had predicted. The previous development plans were completely inadequate and had to be drastically revised.

A few months ago I spent several days in northeast Brazil. There a poverty-stricken 25 million is increasing by nearly 3.5 percent a year. At this rate the population of northeast Brazil would increase in the next hundred years not 3 or 4 times, but 20 times, to 500 million people.

The present average income in northeast Brazil is estimated at only $100 per capita. Present increases in agricultural and industrial production are less each year than the rate of population increase, so the desperately low per capita income is declining.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ACTION

For all of Latin America food production and food consumption are less today, per capita, than before World War II. No wonder Castro has such an appeal.

I served as chairman of a Presidential committee asked by President Eisenhower to recommend future U.S. policy in foreign aid. After exhaustive investigation and discussion, we felt compelled to recommend that the U.S. Government "assist those countries with which it is cooperating in economic

aid programs, on request, in the formulation of their plans designed to deal with the problem of rapid population growths" and "strongly support studies and appropriate research * * * to meet the serious challenge posed by rapidly expanding populations."

CHURCH OPPOSITION NOT OVER FAMILY PLANNING

The Government's unwillingness to act in this area stems from Catholic opposition to so-called artificial birth control. Public opinion, however, judging from every poll taken, overwhelmingly favors assisting foreign countries in the population and birth control field when they ask for our help.

Actually, I do not believe that the Catholic and non-Catholic positions are as far apart as has been commonly supposed. Pope Pius XII stated some 10 years ago that "we affirm the legitimacy and at the same time the limits—in truth very wide—of a regulation of offspring."

The eminent Catholic, Dr. John Rock, of the Harvard Medical School has stated flatly that Catholics and non-Catholics do not disagree over the objectives of family planning but only over methods.

The National Institutes of Health now supervise the spending each year of many hundred million dollars in research to improve the health and postpone the death cycle of the American people, compared with less than 3 million they reported recently for research on human reproduction which could affect the birth cycle.

Let me propose what should be an acceptable solution to all. First, the dangers to humanity of excess population growth should be frankly and openly recognized by our Government, by the Catholic Church, and by all our people generally. Second, birth control should not be imposed on anyone. Third, each individual and each religion and each country should apply only those controls considered admissible by their own conscience and their own religious or national customs.

This solution would mean no imposition of birth control by its advocates and no imposition of veto power by its opponents.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOORS

Question. A professor told us "Don't worry about birth control, there are 26 billion acres of temperate land, 1 acre can support 160 people." Comment? Answer. Probably true if the land is as arable as Iowa. But we can only develop resources so fast; if population growth is faster, you have less to divide among more people. Increased production should come first.

Question. If there were no wars? Answer. Even after World War II, there were more people on earth than before. Population pressure on Japan led to Pearl Harbor. China is gaining 15 to 20 million people a year while Siberia is almost unpopulated. I think this is basic to Sino-Soviet situation and why Russia does not want China to develop atomic bomb.

Question. Are U.S. technical foreign-aid programs as effective as more obvious Soviet construction aid? Answer. Our programs are not perfect, but have accomplished resurrection of Europe and staved off communism in undeveloped countries. Theirs, small in proportion, are largely for propaganda.

Question. Should nations strive to maintain optimum population levels? Criteria? Answer. Population growth should be well below gross national product increase—so there will be an improving, not a downward or static, standard of living.

Question. How answer Dr. Clark's statement that Britain's decline in world status is largely due to birth restrictive measures? Answer. Britain, with about 30 million people, controlling about two-thirds of the world, was unnatural situation—could not be expected to continue when industrial revolution spread to others. I doubt if population question was factor.

Question. Does economic prosperity depend on population growth? Answer. No, though some slow increase is probably desirable. Our population growth rate is about the same as India, 1.7 a year, which we are apparently able to absorb although we're chewing up acreage all over the country. Our problem is the tremendous new capital required for water, schools, highways, and other construction needs. With us, too, if growth is too rapid, slums will increase and our living conditions decline.

Question. Could Brazil feed all South America? Answer. In northeastern Brazil they're getting about a million additional people each year. The area, largely in sugar, can't support many more. Slums in Recife and Rio are unbelievable—800,000 people in Rio squat in shacks made out of tin and pieces of wood. Millions of acres are not cultivated, or even surveyed. An agronomist told me first thing needed would be aerial survey, then a crop study. I asked how much it was then cost to set up one family in business. Answer: $27,000.

Garden City Junior Chamber of Commerce Supports Herlong-Baker Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Garden City Junior Chamber of Commerce recently adopted a resolution in support of the Herlong-Baker tax bill, following which I received a letter from the president, Jonathan Hicks, which reads as follows:

We, the members of the Garden City Junior Chamber of Commerce, at a recent meeting adopted a resolution to express to you our support for the Herlong-Baker tax measure.

It is our belief that the Herlong-Baker bill represents the best, currently available proposal for reducing the tax burden on the American people and American business.

Moreover, we strongly favor the postponement feature of Herlong-Baker, which, as we understand it, would provide that after 2 years of the 5-year Herlong-Baker approach, tax cuts would be granted only if the Federal budget were in balance. We believe this is a sane and sensible way to begin controlling the alarming expenditures of the Federal Government.

We favor the Herlong-Baker approach to tax reform in addition, because it contains none of the oppressive reform measures proposed by the President. In our community, and the other communities which you represent, the 5-percent floor on deductions would create a real hardship. This is true not only for the individual wage earner, but for the homeowner, and the various charitable organizations that function in your district, including churches.

The Herlong-Baker bill would also, we understand, finally begin to tame the onus of the graduated income tax, whereas under the President's program, the graduation feature would actually be worsened.

We believe Herlong-Baker represents a reasoned approach to tax relief, and would be accepted joyfully by the American people.

We strongly urge you to support the Herlong-Baker bill. We also urge you to impress on your colleagues the merits of this bill.

In keeping with the request in the letter, I submit its contents for consideration by my colleagues, as I believe the letter to be a sound approach to the current dispute over tax reduction. The group proposing the Herlong-Baker bill as opposed to the administration's bill is nonpolitical and sincerely interested in the future, not only of this year's budget, but of our Nation.

Aid to Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the views of our colleague, Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, 24th District, California, concerning aid to and trade with Communist-dominated countries, particularly Yugoslavia. Information Mr. LIPSCOMB has gleaned through his membership on the Select Committee on Export Control is covered in the following article "LIPSCOMB Opposes 'Romancing' Tito," by Dick Tracy, which appeared in the Sunday, March 24, 1963, edition of the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, West Covina, Calif.:

LIPSCOMB OPPOSES ROMANCING TITO

(By Dick Tracy)

It's spring and romance is in the air.

One of the strangest, most incomprehensible love affairs of this or any spring is that one which apparently exists between the U.S. Department of Commerce and Communist Yugoslavia.

It is not a new and casual fling. It is a romance renewed periodically, deliberately and stealthily.

The American people, as a whole, are not happy about the love affair. But they do little about it because they know little about it.

Representative GLEN P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, has been trying for months to inform them.

No one knows exactly how long this relationship between an official U.S. agency and Premier Tito's Yugoslavia has existed.

But revelations in 1961 of U.S. gifts to Yugoslavia of jet fighter planes and an atomic reactor set off spirited opposition to the Government's policy relative to this Communist country. After a few weeks, little more was heard of such goings on.

That same year, the Select Committee on Export Control for the 87th Congress (of which LIPSCOMB was a member) released findings that the Commerce Department had authorized licenses for U.S. firms to ship strategic goods to Yugoslavia, East Germany, Poland, and even the U.S.S.R.

Some of these goods, in product form, turned up in Cuba.

With these disclosures, Congress tightened the Export Control Act of 1949.

However, the Commerce Department-Yugoslavia romance flared again early this year.

A fresh look by Representative LIPSCOMB turned up this:

On February 21, the Department issued authorization for shipment of $3.7 million

worth of machine parts to a steel mill in Yugoslavia.

On February 25, shipment of $685,120 in electrical and other parts for the same steel mill was authorized.

The string of authorizations for shipments of various goods to Yugoslavia went as far back as January 2 and was still going on March 7.

Since January, shipping authorizations have been made for other Communist countries, too: synthetic rubber to Czechoslovakia, raw cotton and biochemicals to Russia, electronic detection equipment to East Germany. The list goes on.

Materials sent to the steel mill in Yugoslavia particularly irk LIPSCOMB.

"According to the Department of Commerce, the products of this mill are to be used in the machine building and ship construction industries," he said.

Among other things, the Russians plan to get nine 20,000-ton tankers and five 12,000-ton freighters from Tito by 1965.

On the surface, it could be argued that 14 ships will not tilt the scales in communism's favor.

True, the 14 ships are but a miniscule part of the Soviet economic offensive against the West.

But they are extremely important in the vital oil offensive. In 1962, the Soviets ordered 74 new vessels with a combined carrying capacity of 1,894,400 deadweight tons from Japan, Italy, Finland and Yugoslavia and its own shipyards.

The Russians have stated in no uncertain terms they will wage this oil offensive as a major part of the economic battle.

In addition, Yugoslavia has economic ties with other Red bloc countries, LIPSCOMB points out.

"Yugoslavia has been engaged in shipping and trade with Cuba which is certainly contrary to our national interest" he says. And further, he points out that Yugoslavia and Russia—already engaged in large-scale trade—plan to double it in 1963.

Verifying LIPSCOMB's assessment is the Soviet magazine Vneshnyaya Torgovlya (Foreign Trade) which reported that trade between the two countries will increase to $180 million in 1963, almost double.

Why should the United States help build up this trade?

It has been argued, in the past by W. Averell Harriman (now an adviser to President Kennedy) that the United States should increase trade relations with the Communists in hopes of encouraging better relations.

It is argued that Tito bought his communism at a different store than Khrushchev and Stalin and is therefore a "different kind of Communist."

Few Americans believe that. LIPSCOMB is one of them.

"I do not see how it can be seriously contended that Yugoslavia is not part of the Soviet bloc and I do not accept that determination," he states emphatically.

"There was an exchange of visits last year between Soviet President Brezhnev and Premier Tito. According to statements put out at that time, Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. were reported to hold 'identical or similar' views on international affairs."

And probably most Americans remember Tito's even more emphatic declaration that in the event of a showdown, he stands with the Kremlin.

Anyone who's ever had troubles with an income tax form knows how reluctantly bureaucracy gives direct answers—or even indirect ones.

Representative LIPSCOMB asked the Department of Commerce to explain its reasoning for granting the licenses, particularly the steel mill shipments.

The Commerce Department replied that the licenses were in line with U.S. policy to strengthen economic ties between Yugoslavia and the world, that the policy "helps maintain Yugoslav independence against Soviet pressure."

The Department answered LIPSCOMB's questions about the synthetic rubber shipments to Czechoslovakia. He asked what types of tires were to be made with them.

"I regret that explicit answers to your questions are not available," was the reply from the Acting Director of the Office of Export Control.

Representative LIPSCOMB is not satisfied with these answers. He has urged re-creation of the Select Committee on Export Control. He hopes for even tighter trade rules with the Reds.

Whether the commtitee will be set up again is problematical. With or without it, LIPSCOMB is sufficiently riled that he will continue to dig into export license authorizations.

To those who will say to him, in effect, "Don't rock the boat in these perilous times," the valley Congressman will give little attention.

He believes that for the United States to accept the craggy theory that we might win Tito to the West through a romantic economic attachment is borderline insanity.

Strip Mining on National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the following correspondence was sent to the President, with an information copy to the Secretary of Agriculture:

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to stop any further development of plans for strip mining national forests in Pennsylvania.

It appears that my State is being selected for a guinea pig experiment on strip mining by the Department.

Mr. President, Pennsylvania has had many years of experimentation in this field. Some has been good, but a lot has been bad.

We do not need more experiments; we need cooperation from the Federal Government in helping us to take the bad features out of strip mining by leaving us alone while the issue is being debated in the general assembly of our State.

Right this moment the question of strip mining is the number one issue before the general assembly.

For the Department of Agriculture to interfere in this debate by announcing a contract to strip 60 acres atop a knob in the Allegheny National Forest near Kane, Pa., is poor timing if indeed not poor judgment.

Allow our legislators to come up with controls that will guarantee our State against damages in the future and then if coal is needed in excess of supply, there will be time enough for the Federal Government to start ripping open national forest lands.

From my knowledge of the coal industry, I would hazard a guess that coal removed from Federal parks and forests would further depreciate the already overproduced coal supply.

I especially request consideration for this resolution before the reported contract between the Department of Agriculture and Westmore Coal & Construction Co. can be consummated.

The following news items show the feelings of our Pennsylvania conservationists and sportsmen as well as the citizens in general.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

H. J. RES. 363

Joint resolution to prohibit the strip mining of coal in the Allegheny and other national forests.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all strip mining of coal being carried on in the Allegheny National Forest, or in any other national forest, on the day this joint resolution becomes effective shall be terminated forthwith. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not hereafter enter into any contract for, or otherwise authorize, the strip mining of coal in any national forest.

[From the News-Herald, Franklin and Oil City, Pa., Mar. 4, 1963]

DON'T TRUST THEM

A new business venture was launched in the great Allegheny National Forest, a few miles west of Kane, this year.

It was given about the same kind of fanfare demanded by an international jewel thief about to move into a new territory.

The Wetmore Coal & Construction Co. was authorized by the U.S. Forest Service to conduct an experimental strip mine operation on an inconsequential 60-acre tract.

W. W. Wentz, supervisor of the vast 700,000-acre public forest, is a bit miffed at the number of complaints he has been receiving from sportsmen, conservationists and others denouncing the project.

"This is a little odd," Mr. Wentz observed last week in a Pittsburgh Press news article, particularly since it is just these people we are trying to help and protect.

"We want to prove, once and for all," the stern Mr. Wentz states, "that strip mining doesn't have to pollute streams, that the land doesn't have to be turned into a desolate wasteland, and that strip mined areas can be restored economically."

It strikes us that this is something Mr. Wentz and the U.S. Forest Service do not have to prove.

We believe the burden of proof is on the strip miner—not the taxpayer. We also believe these experiments can just as well be conducted on land already under lease to the coal companies in areas outside the public domain.

Forest Service officials admit coal stripping interests have made repeated attempts to invade national forest lands, particularly in West Virginia and Kentucky.

They have bravely stated they will fight any attempt to expand the experimental strip mine in Allegheny National Forest.

That is like inviting termites onto your back porch and then threatening them to go no further.

It is well to note this tiny, insignificant operation near Kane is expected to yield 350,000 tons of coal with a current market value of well over a million dollars.

A million dollars from a worthless 60-acre slice of a 700,000-acre forest. Now there is a real argument.

Make no mistake about it. This is not a penny ante game. The stakes are high for both coal stripper and the public.

All the coal interests need is a "model case" to show the mineral can be extracted without water pollution and that the land can be reasonably restored.

Once the wraps are off, larger and larger slices of public land can be opened up to bigger operations. Mistakes can happen, rules

can always be changed, fines can be paid. The foot in the door is the important thing.

There is no indication the extraction of this coal is imperative to the safety or economy of this country, or even this section of the State.

There is every indication this operation will provide a dangerous loophole for ravaging what few acres of untouched land we still possess.

We grant strip mining its position as a fairly important Pennsylvania industry. It will not, however, last as long as its scars and can certainly not compete with the timeless value of clean streams and wooded hills.

[From the News-Herald, Franklin, Pa., Feb. 28, 1963]

STRIPPING ALLEGHENY FOREST

(By Steve Szalewicz)

Many local sportsmen are not holding their tongue or bearing with tolerance a recent announcement by the U.S. Forest Service at Warren that Wetmore Coal & Construction Co. will soon strip a 60-acre knob in the forest as a "test." They have thought forest lands to be the last verdant forts, unassailable by land and water despoilers.

The test on public land, according to Forest Supervisor W. W. Wentz will provide "full safeguards for soil and water resources." Furthermore, says Wentz, this rip-out of trees and terrain will be watched with "utmost care and responsibility." He adds, "a daily analysis of water quality of runoff will give immediate indication of changing conditions and permit corrective action to be taken before damage can occur."

Local, vocal conservationists can't buy those definite promises easily when they look around at dead Scrubgrass, East Sandy, and Hemlock Creeks. Beautiful streams they are, flowing through scenic gorges of hemlock, but floating nauseating water. Their purity was once assured by definite State laws. While they may agree that test projects involving strip mining may be desirable and progressive, why in the frying fires of torture conduct them on land that has, more or less, been enshrined and endowed as America's future playground? And besides, private, responsible operators have already proved abundantly that stripping for coal can be done economically and with a result that returns land to production, play, and pro rata.

A POISONED POOL AT KINZUA?

What local conservationists dread basically is the added load on the Allegheny River, which at Warren has already in recent times tested "acid." Could it be that stripping, if continued on private lands and encouraged in the forest draining into the Allegheny above the Kinzua Reservoir will ruin that impatiently awaited playwater before the pool fills? Such a fisherman-thwarting fate once befell Pennsylvanians at the Johnsonburg Reservoir, according to reports.

But it does little good to carp and cluck about this experiment in mixing morals and methods, unless the complainants contribute imaginative and hopeful alternatives. Perhaps the least hackneyed and most tolerant fromthe outdoorsman's approach is put forward by Roy Frank of Deep Hollow Road, Venango County's conscientious watchdog of western Pennsylvania's natural resources, and by Representative Harry Gramlich, of Franklin, equally interested in a solution least painful to operators and coal owners and pleasing to outdoorsmen.

CREATE A COAL RESERVE

Frank suggests that since coal is already overproduced and both Federal and State Governments are allocating funds with which to study other possible uses for the unrestrained abundance, why not have coal deposits bought up by Government agencies as reserves? This should be done where it is determined the strip mining would ruin water supplies or bring on local destitution. If governments can reserve forests, seashores, and sand dunes, swamps and moraines, and oil deposits, why not coal?

The "reserves" proposition is the one solution which could stop experiments which imperil our soils and our cold, clear springs which feed the few remaining good fishing streams in Pennsylvania. There is no doubt that with the Forest Service as watchdogs, the stripping in McKean County will be conducted with regardful responsibility. And while it is uncomforting to know it's being tried at all, let's hope, to use the President's recent words, it turns out to be a "milestone of conservation progress."

SPORTSMEN POLLED ON STRIP MINING

What do outdoorsmen think of the proposal to strip 60 acres of hilltop in the Allegheny National Forest near Kane as a test project to determine how open pit mining can be conducted so as to conserve both land and water?

Six delegates to a meeting of the Northwest Division, Pennsylvania Sportsmen's Clubs, when polled Sunday replied:

"Man cuts timber for lumber. He takes the sand and gravel from the shores. He pumps oil, gas and water, mines ore, gold, silver and coal. All these things he takes from the earth and then uses them to cover the earth with wide bands of concrete and steel. Man returns nothing for all that he takes. He only does more damage. Man must be stopped. Someday nature will revolt. Perhaps we can prolong the time till nature revolts by stopping unnecessary waste and unnecessary scars upon the earth. No one will freeze next winter if these 60 acres are left to nature," James F. Donahue, secretary of Erie County Council of Sportsmen Clubs.

"I do not think public land should be open to strip mining," Mrs. Eleanor Donahue, past Secretary, Gem City Outdoorsmen Club of Erie.

"I am not in favor of the stripping in the American national forests. I feel that past practices of some of the more conscientious strip miners have proven that restoration can be accomplished reasonably. Further tests are not needed," George H. Land, Sr., clean streams chairman, Crawford County.

"I am not in favor of any commercial interests destroying our natural resources. Everyone knows that coal can be stripped in most locations and the land restored, but no one wants to do it. I am sure that the Federal and State Governments can stop this if enough interest is shown by the majority of people," William A. Adams, president, Springfield Sporstmen Club.

"The national forest should be conserved as it. Strip mining should be contained for private acres," Robert Wank, secretary, Corry Rod & Gun Club.

"I think that is an opening wedge to subject our national forest to an additional onslaught of strip mining. In the case of Wetmore Coal & Construction Co., Inc., these lands were sold under the Weeks law, and in this case were subject to a mineral reservation which did not permit removal by strip mine operations. Why strip that property?" Roy Frank, Venango County delegate to Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.

The American Host Program Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the American Host Program is a nonprofit, people-to-people type project which makes it possible for teachers from the free nations of Europe to spend a month in the United States living as the guests of American families in order to gain a true understanding of our way of life.

Each of us who has traveled in any foreign country is well aware of the false and distorted image of our nation which is prevalent in most foreign countries. Movies such as "The Blackboard Jungle," novels dealing with the problems of our society, and the usual sensational press items carried in the international press have given European teachers, and others, a very false and distorted picture of the United States.

In addition, each year millions of dollars are spent to print and distribute communist inspired anti-American propaganda in Europe.

The American Host Program was started in order to give our European teacher friends an opportunity to visit with us and to see for themselves the true meaning of the American way of life by spending their time with American families in typical Amercan communities.

Hundreds of American families from every walk of life have opened their homes to act as host families for the visiting teachers. Doctors, businessmen, educators, mechanics, truck drivers, lawyers, all having in common a concern for the future of the free world, have become a part of this dynamic program.

The program is administered by The American Host Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit foundation which is supported by contributions from individuals who are interest in the success of the program. No Government funds have been expended nor solicited for this program.

The mechanics of the program are not complex. Teachers in the free nations of Europe are contacted through their teachers associations and informed about the American host program. Those teachers who are interested in taking part in the program then make application to do so, specifying if there is a particular area of the United States which they would like to visit. Host families are then matched with teachers as well as possible. Once host families and teachers have been matched, they are given each other's name and address so that they may correspond prior to the visit.

The European teachers travel together from Europe to New York City by aircraft. After 3 days in New York City, each teacher proceeds to the city of his or her host family. During the next 4 weeks, the visiting teacher spends his or her time with at least two different host families in the same general geographic area. At the end of the 4-week period, the teachers reassemble in New York and return to Europe by air.

In addition, a host family is expected to meet the visiting teacher when he or she arrives in the city of the host family; provide a room and meals for the visitor while he or she is with the family; treat the visitor as one would any other guest in one's home—a host family is not expected to entertain the visitor 24 hours a day; see that the guest has an opportunity to meet friends

and neighbors of the host family; and arrange for the guest to be taken to the train, bus station or airport when he or she is ready to leave the city.

Host family accommodations are usually for 1 or 2 weeks' duration; only in unusual circumstances are the visiting teachers scheduled to spend longer than 2 weeks with the same host family.

The part being played by the American host program in correcting the many false and distorted impressions of our nation which are held by many in foreign lands is indeed worthy of commendation. What could be better for our Nation which are held by many in creasing number of teachers in foreign lands who are armed, able and anxious to refute the falsehoods and misconceptions being spread about the United States?

The total cost to the participating European teacher is less than $400, and in some cases, up to 50 percent of this amount is paid by sponsoring groups here in the United States.

The responsibilities of a host family are not extensive; the main qualification is a desire to further the primary objective of the program—to increase understanding between ourselves and our European friends.

The program was founded by a Garden Grove, Calif., teacher, Tom Murphy, and his wife, Frances. I commend them for their tireless efforts in making their wonderful plan a reality.

I considered it a great honor to be named to the board of directors of this fine organization, and to have its national headquarters located in the district I represent.

Statement by New York State Senate Minority Leader Joseph Zaretzki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement by New York State Senate Minority Leader Joseph Zaretzki with further reference to Governor Rockefeller's fiscal program:

STATEMENT BY SENATE MINORITY LEADER JOSEPH ZARETZKI

I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not oppose the proposal to permit the city of Albany to finance the construction of the State's South Mall project in Albany with city issued bonds, but it must be shown to what lengths Governor Rockefeller is going to maintain his pay-as-you-go myth.

He now proposes to take out of the budget, out of normal State expenditures which traditionally have been included in the budget, $250 million worth of bonds. He is going to have the city of Albany sell the bonds for him and he is going to pay the debt service on those bonds with tax money out of the general fund. The Governor calls it rent instead of debt service, just as he insists on calling taxes fees.

The Governor's latest "keep-it-out-of-the-budget" gimmick will have the city of Albany issue bonds to construct buildings for the State in the south mall and lease them to the State under 40-year lease-purchase agreements. The State will make payments to the city and the city will pay off the bonds. If that isn't using bonds for borrowing purposes, then what is it?

There is nothing wrong with using bonds prudently for worthy and needed purposes. But it is wrong to do it and then attempt to deceive the people by telling them you are not deficit financing. That is exactly what Governor Rockefeller is trying to do.

There is no end to the lengths to which Governor Rockefeller will go in his frantic attempt to sell himself to the country as a pay-as-you-go fiscal genius, no matter what it costs the New York State taxpayers.

It isn't pay-as-you-go, it's fake-as-you-go.

Governor Rockefeller has performed the same sort of fiscal hocus pocus with the $1 billion needed for State university expansion, using an elaborately devious plan to have the State housing finance agency sell bonds for him. He intends to pay off these bonds with general tax and tuition tax revenues, calling the payments rent instead of the debt service they really are, and the subterfuge will cost the taxpayers of the State $400 million more than if he sold the bonds directly because of higher interest costs.

He deleted more than $306 million in State university capital construction expenditures from the budget this year and says it isn't money spent, but first instance appropriations. But the $306 million will be spent in the next year just the same.

The Governor has the sheer effrontery to think that the people are so stupid that he can get away with anything, that they will believe black is white because he says it is. He insults the intelligence of the people when he thinks that because he calls a tax a fee the people must believe it and those who don't are dishonest. Now he calls debt service rent and thinks once again that the people must believe him.

The whole pattern of the Rockefeller administration has been one of fiscal fakery. He removes from the budget normal expenditures which he can't finance except by borrowing and, having removed them, declares that he is balancing the budget. He simply has other agencies do the borrowing for him. But he uses the same tax money to pay them off with full interest.

This is only the beginning. We can expect more of these fiscal shenanigans in next year's budget. By the Governor's own admission, he already is planning to take mental hospital construction out of the budget next year. We can expect creation of another front agency, a mental hospital construction fund, to do the borrowing for him.

I predict he will do the same thing to finance highway construction, taking this item out of the budget and creating a highway construction fund, selling more bonds through this new front, always using tax money for debt service.

In this fashion, following the pattern he has set, Governor Rockefeller eventually will eliminate all capital construction from the budget.

The Governor's novel financial theory is the more you spend the more you save. That's a fine way to balance a budget.

VA Administrator Answers Reader's Digest Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, calls and letters received by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs indicate that Members of Congress are receiving quite a few letters about an article entitled "Veterans Hospitals: Government Medicine in Action," which appeared in the March 1963 issue of Reader's Digest. In view of the interest in this article, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter written to the editor of Reader's Digest by the Honorable John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, setting forth the position of the VA regarding the article.

The letter follows:

VA ADMINISTRATOR ANSWERS READER'S DIGEST ARTICLE

MARCH 14, 1963.

Mr. DEWITT WALLACE,
Editor, the Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: Reading the article, "Veterans' Hospitals: Government Medicine in Action" in the March 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest wryly reminded me of the story about the backwoods judge who listened only to the prosecution, never the defense. His reasoning was simple, as the story goes, for he said hearing just one side of the case didn't confuse him, and it made rendering the verdict easy.

In reprinting this article by Dr. Richard S. Dillon, which first appeared in the November 1962 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, the Digest is showing the same solicitude for its millions of subscribers by carefully shielding them from the confusion of a balanced presentation. Thus, the impression of readers of the Digest is carefully guided to the conclusion desired by the magazine that government medicine is wasteful, inefficient, and evil.

Your magazine does its readers and Veterans' Administration medicine a double journalistic injustice. A complete and detailed VA analysis, giving the facts about the longer Atlantic article, was made available to your editors on January 4, 1963, well in advance of your March reprint. Yet, the Digest not only disregarded these facts entirely, but went even further in the process of condensing by carfully retaining only those portions of the original article that would mold public opinion in the fashion desired by the Digest.

With your many duties as editor of the Reader's Digest, it is possible that you were not personally acquainted with the one-sided treatment accorded VA medicine in the Digest condensation. Because this may be true, I am enclosing for your personal perusal the analysis we made of the original Atlantic article, and urge that this other side of the story be presented to your readers in another Digest article hopefully to be published at an early date.

I can well imagine what your reaction might be if a young man just out of journalism school worked on the Digest staff for

several months; then, based on this experience, wrote a highly critical article, not only about the Digest, but the entire magazine industry. I am sure you would think such an article might be less than authoritative.

The analysis, which your staff ignored, notes that Dr. Dillon, author of the Atlantic and Digest articles, "was graduated from medical school in 1959 at the age of 26. The very next year, and again in 1961, he served short periods first as a junior grade, then as an intermediate grade resident physician—in furtherance of his medical training and development—at a midwestern VA hospital. Yet despite the fact he served only a matter of months during two short tours as a young resident (under the tutelage and supervision of senior physicians) at just 1 of VA's 169 hospitals, he feels qualified to sweepingly conclude that VA hospitals are 'inefficient and wasteful,' that the veterans medical program established and supported by Congress through the years should be scrapped, and that VA hospitals should be leased or sold."

In the Digest condensation of the Atlantic article even the title has been altered to include, "Government Medicine in Action." At least this is more subtle than the title given an earlier article, "Must We Follow the VA Route to Socialized Medicine?" which appeared in the March 1954 Reader's Digest.

The meticulous pick and choose method the Digest followed in epitomizing the Atlantic article is fascinating, starting with the opening sentence. The Atlantic version said, "There is much good to be said for the hospital system run by the Veterans' Administration." The Digest version left out just one word—the word "good."

The second sentence of the Digest story says, "It provides medical and nursing care for patients who otherwise might not seek it," not bothering to complete the Atlantic sentence which added, "because they have not the financial resources, have not the proper awareness of their disease, or have not concern enough about their illness to pay a private physician for care."

These opening sentences seem to set the pattern of the Digest article: (1) Don't confuse the readers with praise of VA medical care, and, (2) edit out anything contrary to our position against medicine which in anyway involves the Government.

Thus, we find missing in the Digest such statements as these in the original Atlantic article:

"The VA hospital system is not to be criticized for the caliber of its professional service. This has improved tremendously as a result of the VA policy of fostering ties with medical centers and promoting research.

"The VA in the last few years has produced many excellent research papers, both in the basic sciences and in clinical investigation. In such things as evaluating drug therapy, the VA organization has demonstrated definite advantages over independent medicine.

"The VA nursing service is also excellent.

"All in all, the patients do get good medical care, and their treatment need not be cut short because of financial need.

"When hospitalization is required for these chronically ill patients, Government medicine may be at its best. Such illnesses bankrupt the patients and undermine medical insurance programs.

"It is not my purpose to question the gratitude we owe the men who have made sacrifices in the defense of our country."

Even one of the original Atlantic recommendations was bobtailed. The Digest dutifully repeated the first part of this recommendation, "Present VA hospitals affiliated with community or university hospitals should be leased or sold to these institutions, and the VA staff incorporated in them. A more elastic system would result. When the need for VA beds falls off, the beds could be utilized by non-VA patients." However, the magazine saved 21 words by deleting the last sentence of the recommendation, which said, "If a need for more VA beds should arise, the Government should subsidize the expansion of these private and community institutions."

To buttress the picture it wanted to paint for its readers, the Digest took the liberty of going beyond the Atlantic original article to include this wording, "The Hoover Commission made recommendations similar to these in 1955." This quote apparently came from a letter Dr. Dillon wrote the Atlantic editors after he had been informed of a letter that magazine had received from Dr. William S. Middleton, VA's chief medical director.

In this reaching, too, the Digest chose only the wording it wanted, for it ignored the first part of Dr. Dillon's letter saying, "I agree with Dr. Middleton. Four years of medical school and 7 months with the VA hardly makes one a VA expert. Nor did I claim to be; but may I point out that I used official VA statistics, averages of all VA hospitals."

The Digest also managed to ignore entirely Dr. Middleton's letter which was published in the same Atlantic "letter to the editors" column (Jan. 1963 issue) that contained the Dr. Dillon letter. The Middleton letter said in part, "Your article contains a vast amount of misinformation. Although we welcome informed criticism in our constant effort to do an even better job, I am afraid the author of this article hardly qualifies as an expert on VA hospitals.* * * Despite allegations of 'waste and inefficiency'—which are not substained by the facts—the author does, I note, salute VA's professional personnel and the excellent medical research and training programs, and concludes that VA patients do get good medical care."

It was interesting to me to reread the 1954 Digest article, "Must We Follow the VA Route to Socialized Medicine?", and notice the accuracy of some of the dire predictions in that article in the light of the present-day facts.

The 1954 article stated in part that: "The American people had better decide soon whether or not they want free Government medical care. For it is descending upon them with bewildering speed.

"Within about 10 years * * * half of all ablebodied American men * * * will be able to claim free hospital-medical care by simply deciding and stating that they cannot afford to pay for it."

The 1954 article pointed out that VA then operated 169 hospitals, and added, "One of the foremost authorities on veterans' affairs in the United States conservatively estimates that, if present policies permitting nonservice-connected care at Federal expense are continued, the current VA system will have to be augmented by at least 200 more hospitals of 1,000 beds each."

Continued the article of 9 years ago: "If left to themselves, the veterans' close coterie in Washington may be counted on to sweep aside the few remaining safeguards of existing law, and bring a state of socialized medicine into being for every man who ever wore, or will wear, a U.S. uniform. After that victory, it may be counted on to lobby incalculably costly benefits for the wives and children of exservice men, for this lobby earns its salaries by producing ever-increasing benefits for its memberships at the public expense. This is a powerful lobby, largely unknown to the American public. If its designs are carried out, socialized medicine may in the end be foisted upon a people who do not want it."

What are the facts today? The VA operates 169 hospitals, exactly the same number as when the article was written.

In commenting on the Digest article in 1954, the VA said: "Statements that the VA is or will be providing free medical care for all veterans just are not realistic. Under the law, hospital care is to be given first to service-connected veterans, and then to nonservice-connected cases if a bed is available, and if the veterans states under oath he cannot defray the cost of hospitalization. VA hospitals can provide care for no more than one-half of 1 percent of the veteran population at any given time. In the course of 1 year, VA hospitals could accommodate no more than 2½ percent of the veteran population." That VA statement is as correct today as when it was made 9 years ago.

The predicted medical benefits for wives and children of ex-servicemen have not materialized, and, furthermore, no proposal for such benefits has ever been made or even entertained by veterans' organizations to the best of my knowledge.

I have written at length, but I have done so in an effort to make it clear that there are a great many positives in the veterans' medical program, and that the American people can take pride in the manner in which this program is carried out by the Veterans' Administration. As a matter of simple justice and fair play, isn't it about time the Reader's Digest gave its readers at least a glimpse of the positive side?

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

Herbert Lehman's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Robert F. Wagner designated March 28 as Herbert H. Lehman Day in New York. On Herbert H. Lehman Day the city paid deserved tribute to one of the most beloved and respected Americans of our time on his 85th birthday. I want to call my colleagues' attention to a New York Post editorial for March 28 which captures some of the greatness of Senator Herbert H. Lehman in pointing out:

What is in fact most striking about his life is that the passage of years has heightened rather than diminished his depth of humane conviction, his passionate concern for social justice, his fiery dedication to freedom.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Post, Feb. 28, 1963]

HERBERT LEHMAN'S DAY

In honor of Herbert Lehman's 85th birthday, Mayor Wagner has officially designated this as Mr. Lehman's day in our city. We warmly second the motion.

It is tempting to describe Lehman as the grand old man of our town. But the phrase would be a misnomer; it would imply that he had become sort of lofty emeritus, remote from the battles of the day.

What is in fact most striking about his life is that the passage of years has heightened rather than diminished his depth of humane conviction, his passionate concern for social justice, his fiery dedication to freedom. He was long a good Governor and a conscientious citizen; but it is actually in the last decade that his full resources of spirit have been most dramatically revealed—in the time of his lonely, valorous challenge to Joe Mc-

Carthy, and of his subsequent return to New York to lead the crusade against machine rule.

At a time in life when most men have felt that their major works were done, he had, it might be said, just begun to fight. This is the deep drama of the Lehman story, and one of the memorable sagas in the annals of U.S. liberalism.

Lehman is currently recovering from a fractured hip, but let his enemies take no comfort from this injury. He has upset all the form charts that bracket age with caution; his voice is sorely needed in both State and Nation; it will be heard again.

Rejecting Racism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the accomplishments of the 88th Congress will include a fundamental change in our immigration policy to reflect the solid foundations upon which our democratic way of life was conceived and developed. A Nation founded upon the powerful ideals contained in the Declaration of Independence cannot justify nor condone racial arrogance in any form. The national origins quota system of limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of our Nation. It is past time to eliminate this policy of deliberate discrimination and to adopt a plan that is consonant with our ideals of equal treatment for all men. To this end I have introduced H.R. 3870 to allocate our immigration quotas on a fair and reasonable basis. Most Americans will agree with an excellent editorial entitled "Rejecting Racism" in the Newark News of February 24, 1963, that "to discriminate against prospective citizens solely because of their place of birth perpetuates an injustice".

The editorial in full follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 24, 1963]

REJECTING RACISM

U.S. immigration policy was thrown into sharper focus with the recent announcement by President Kennedy that he was in favor of liberalizing the law to permit redistribution of quotas, particularly those unused. The administration's position lends support to a bill introduced by Representative MINISH, Democrat, of New Jersey, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, the law has been under continued discussion since Congress passed it over President Truman's veto in mid-1952. Criticism has centered on the discriminatory provisions of the law which were frankly designed, according to the late Senator Pat McCarran, Democrat of Nevada, to prevent the bloodstream of the country from being poisoned.

The bill introduced by Mr. MINISH last week would base quotas on comparative populations of foreign countries and on the proportion of immigration into the United States from these countries in recent years. This seems to be a more sensible approach than the present quota system which is based on national origins.

Since World War I, Congress has been sharply divided over the immigration issue, Members' view depending mainly on the numbers of foreign-born and second-generation Americans among their constituents. The chief point at issue, of course, is the national origins concept, a product of prejudice.

There is no question whatsoever that prospective immigrants should be carefully selected with due regard to such factors as national security and their morals, health, and employment opportunities. But to discriminate against prospective citizens solely because of their place of birth perpetuates an injustice.

I am also pleased to call to the attention of the Congress a letter from Mr. Sidney Reitman, chairman, New Jersey Commission on Civil Rights, in which he states that the legislation sponsored by me in the House constitutes the "best proposals so far offered to correct the undesirable features of the existing imigration laws which discriminate against persons because of the source of origin."

Mr. Reitman's letter in full folows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
DIVISION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION,
Trenton, N.J., March 20, 1963.

The Honorable JOSEPH G. MINISH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MINISH: The New Jersey Civil Rights Commission has had occasion to consider the impact of the Federal immigration laws upon those concepts of freedom and equality of opportunity fostered by the Division on Civil Rights in the administration of our State and antidiscrimination laws.

New Jersey has always been in the forefront in the adoption of legislation to prohibit discrimination. Our commitment to the elimination of discrimination because of race, creed, color or national origin is set forth in the State Constitution and in our antidiscrimination laws which implement the constitutional proscription.

It is the feeling of our commission that the philosophy implicit in the McCarran-Walter Act which places disproportionate restrictions upon persons seeking to enter the United States from Asia, Africa and Southern and Eastern Europe, is predicated upon the concept that such immigrants are inferior to others because of their particular origin. This conclusion is in conflict with the aforementioned public policy of New Jersey.

The commission has examined Senate bill 747, introduced on February 7, 1963, known as the Hart bill; and House bill 3870, introduced on February 18, 1963, known as the Minish bill. We believe that these identical bills constitute the best proposals so far offered to correct the undesirable features of the existing immigration laws which discriminate against persons because of source of origin.

Accordingly, the Commission wishes to convey to the New Jersey congressional delegation their endorsement of the Hart bill and Minish bill. The proposed legislation would amend the discriminatory national origin quota provisions which appear to be based on a person's race, religion or national origin. You are urged to press for the enactment of this legislation.

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY REITMAN,
Chairman, New Jersey Commission on Civil Rights.

In conclusion, I should like to submit an editorial "The Heart of the Matter" appearing in the West Orange, N.J., Chronicle of March 28, 1963, that brings home vividly that immigration is a positive factor which has contributed to our growth as a nation. Immigration has actually been the life history of this Nation, and Mrs. Miele and the 40 million other immigrants of the last 100 years have contributed to our national strength and welfare. The editorial reads as follows:

[From the West Orange, (N.J.) Chronicle, Mar. 28, 1963]

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

On St. Patrick's Day, a little gray-haired woman was guest of honor at a dinner in a local restaurant. There were 60 people present in the flesh to do her homage. In addition, there were warm congratulations in the form of various means of communication from such as Pope John XXIII, President Kennedy, Governor Hughes, Senators Case and Williams and Congressman Minish.

What grand dame was this to earn such plaudits?

She was just a wise, kind mother who happended to be marking her 100th birthday. She did not take part in world shaking conferences, she never invented a lifesaving serum, she did not legislate in the halls of government.

What Mrs. Rachel Miele did is as old as the story of America itself. She came here many, many years ago as a little child from Italy. In her adopted land, she melted into the mainstream of life in her community, raised strong sons and bright-eyed daughters, taught them to love their country and their home.

In the long run, aren't these the virtues which make a people great, make a nation strong?

Potential for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, I was privileged to attend one of the most outstanding civic events in which I have ever participated. Six hundred men and women of my home city assembled at the fourth annual dinner of the Greater Lowell Chamber of Commerce. An inspiring program, directed by Chairman Arthur C. Antonopoulas, was focused on the theme of Greater Lowell's "Potential for Progress."

Following the national anthem and a solemn invocation by Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, pastor of St. Margaret's Church, the immediate past president of the chamber, Mr. Thomas J. Hickey of Chelmsford, reported on his stewardship. The newly installed president, Mr. Walter C. Wilson, Jr., of Tewksbury, then delivered a short but inspiring inaugural message.

High point of the evening was the superb address delivered by a distinguished Member of the other body, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. The illuminating and timely remarks of Senator RANDOLPH, calling for greater citizen participation in public affairs, deserves wide circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that his splendid message be included in the RECORD.

The evening closed with benediction by Rev. Victor F. Scalise, pastor of the Cavalry Baptist Church.

The entire affair, directed by the capable general manager of the Greater Lowell Chamber of Commerce, Donald A. Cook, provided solid evidence of the fact that Greater Lowell is indeed on the march, that it in truth has a great "potential for progress."

Mr. Frank Makarewicz of the Lowell Sun provided a superb description of the event in the March 28 issue of that newspaper, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Makarewicz's story be included in the RECORD following Senator RANDOLPH's inspiring address.

The address and article follow:

THE BUSINESSMAN AND HIS GOVERNMENT

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell, Lowell, Mass., March 27, 1963)

In meeting with numerous and varied professional and business groups, I have detected a common denominator in a new note of seriousness and gravity of purpose. It is doubtless related to some extent to the generally sombre atmosphere of world affairs and the crossroads at which we find ourselves today.

Yet this feeling is not solely in response to any temporary emergency condition. Rather, it stems from the growing awareness of the need for reappraisal in all sectors of our society. It is as though we know that we are approaching, or have already reached, one of the great watersheds of history and that it is now time for us to take stock of ourselves, to reexamine our basic assumptions, and clearly to define our individual and national goals.

Let us then discuss the role of the businessman in public affairs.

This is a subject which has long been of interest and personal concern because I have been a businessman as well as one professionally interested in public affairs.

During the 1960 political campaign an incident occurred which highlights an aspect of our thinking. As I was walking along the street in my home community of Elkins, W. Va., talking with the voters and outlining the issues, I was stopped by a citizen who directed me into a doorway to discuss the election. After finishing our conversation, I asked him why he had drawn me off the street and into such privacy. He replied: "You know I am in business and I must be very careful of what I do and say."

Though this man may have dramatized his fears somewhat, he does not represent an isolated state of mind. The rule of prudence, the precautionary attitude against speaking one's mind on controversial problems, has taken seed among too many of us. It is a measure of the failure of the democratic process when anyone, whether he be businessman, farmer, professional man, or teacher, fears to participate in the political dialogue.

It is appropriate to refer also to our national attitudes toward the Soviet Union. Russia seems at one and the same time to have become our national demon and gage by which we measure our own progress. We are too frequently confronted with such questions as these:

Are we behind the Soviets in space exploration?

Are American schools as advanced as those of Russia?

Do we offer enough support for basic research in science and technology compared with our adversary?

Thus, in recent years, we have to frequently approached our problems not in terms of finding the best possible solutions, but in terms of the cold war with Russia and communism in general. This is unfortunate because the solution to any problem is determined, in large degree, by the questions which one addresses to the problem.

I devoutly hope, therefore, that the political actions of men in private enterprise will not be restricted, that they will ask questions not in terms of whether a particular policy will circumscribe this or that power, but, rather, whether it is in the best national interest as well as their own legitimate self-interests.

This is only an instance, however, of the need to avoid the general tendency of interpreting public problems in terms of opposite solutions. Our political discourses, and hence the solution to political questions, is too often restricted by the use of polar or opposite terms, liberal and conservative, radical and reactionary, labor and management, farmer and consumer, socialist and capitalist.

We are all familiar with the old platitude: "There are two sides to every question."

Such a polarization of public problems, however, falsifies the realities of political life. There are, in fact, as many sides to every question as there are parties or interests involved. And the great genius of the democratic process is that it offers a wider variety of solutions than can be encompassed by mere opposites.

Politics in a democracy is the art of the possible, the serious effort of compromise and conciliation. We reach consent by mutual concessions. This understanding offers us a clue as to how the citizen can make one of his chief contributions in the arena of public affairs. We know that the life of business and commerce is, in large measure, a life of offering mutual concessions, of arriving at a mixture of interests whereby each party gains some satisfaction.

Wise decisions in business require not only a knowledge of how to conduct a commercial transaction, but, also, knowledge of personnel relations, of community relations, and of the whole process of communication. From this point of view, therefore, a businessman, the modern businessman, is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs. He must be willing to commit himself beyond the confines of the immediate community, and cause his voice to be heard in the broader arena of representative government.

In this regard, he acquires new responsibility. As a respected and successful member of society he is an opinion maker, one whose words and thoughts are heard and heeded. It follows then, that his must be an educated, informed, and sincere voice; one whose convictions are the product of study and thought, and one thoroughly familiar with the institutions and processes of government. In short, the businessman must know his government. This knowledge must cover not only areas which bear on his own economic interest, but must include a familiarity with the entire progression through which proposed legislation moves before becoming law. Unless he is conversant with the dynamics of the legislative system he cannot hope to serve effectively in formulating public opinion; he cannot generate and stimulate informed opposition or intelligent support for a given measure.

An experienced Washington correspondent for a leading weekly news magazine has expressed to me strong personal concern over the lack of familiarity with the processes of government which is found among average citizens. He has noted a widespread and appalling ignorance of governmental operations among those citizens who are generally accepted as educated and well informed.

This newsman reports that shortly before the congressional elections of 1962 a researcher for one of the large broadcasting networks telephoned a campaign office and asked, "How many Members of the House are up for election this November?"

This question despite the fact that for 174 years a constitutional requirement has been that the entire membership of the House of Representatives seek election every 2 years. A fundamental and elementary fact of our electoral process had escaped this researcher entirely.

Another example is this:

I recently heard of a $14,000 a year correspondent with a national publication who had insisted that no law passed by Congress can go into effect until it is first ruled on by the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, these incidents are hardly exceptions.

Our first task is therefore to seek a thorough understanding of Government, and then to strive to make ourselves heard on issues in which we have special knowledge.

In this regard, I would offer comment on the relations of businessmen with Congress, and these observations apply as well to all individuals and professional and trade associations. The legislative process is an involved and intricate one, and the drafting and enactment of any bill of national significance requires the reconciliation of many interests and often many conflicting points of view.

It is vital that all legitimate interests be represented and all important opinions be expressed early in the legislative process. Your Representative or Senator receives little assistance or guidance from a last minute telegram requesting a "yes" or "no" vote at the time a bill reaches the floor. By then, if it is a proposal with which he has been personally identified, he has participated in the hearings or read the testimony, he has examined the committee report and conferred with staff members and his colleagues. And he has usually made his decision before the day the measure comes to a vote.

Therefore, if you desire your conviction to count in the legislative process, on matters affecting your own enterprise or in other areas, I urge you to initiate early and maintain continuing contact with your Representative and your Senator. I assure you that constituent conviction is a powerful influence in the halls of Congress. But it is best offered in a manner and at a time when such counsel is of value. None of us gives the weight to a deluge of last minute form letters or telegrams that we give to the correspondence that clearly reflects independent thought and considered evaluation or governmental problems. If these suggestions are followed, the citizen-businessman can become a very valued counselor to his Congressman.

An editorial in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette included a thought-provoking paragraph. Its central theme was this: In a democratic nation it is fair to assert that the people get in their government—local, State, and National—precisely what they themselves represent. If, in their own personal lives, our people are wasteful (and most Americans are); if they tend to be arbitrary (which is another American trait); and if they are relatively undisciplined in private affairs, then their government is certain to demonstrate to a marked degree exactly the same traits.

I feel that I have a duty and responsibility in a discussion of this nature to express the admonition that organizations such as yours have an obligation to help develop and promote the best possible understanding between government and business, between government and the financial community.

It has been appropriately said by an authoritative observer and commentator that the business outlook today would be much better than it is if the gap in relations between government and business could be

closed or so substantially narrowed that there might develop a cooperative and constructive team effort.

The American economy, during significant periods, has shown a capacity to grow at an average annual rate between 4 and 5 percent without inflationary strain during periods other than depression or war. This growth rate is measured by changes in total national production, stated in uniform dollars.

But during the period 1953–61, the average annual growth rate was only 2.5 percent, or hardly better than half the rate required, in view of the ever-accelerating technology, to absorb increases in the labor force and in productivity per man-hour.

This deficient record has been compounded of a fairly rhythmic succession of booms, periods of stagnation, recessions, and inadequate recoveries.

The deficient growth rate has led to a chronically rising level of unemployed manpower. Indeed, the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. I assure you that the facts reaching us demonstrate very clearly that unemployment, far from being concentrated in a few, has become very generally distributed throughout most of the important sectors of the economy. And we find, too, that very large and consistent increases in the chronic level of idle plant capacity have accompanied the chronic increases in idle manpower.

For the period 1953–61 as a whole, the aggregate forfeiture of total national production, resulting from the low growth rate, is estimated at about $344 billion, measured in uniform 1960 dollars. The forfeiture of employment opportunity aggregated almost 22½ million man-years. Practically all types of income earners and all major types of business activity suffered accordingly.

President Kennedy has correctly indicated that chronic unemployment is the country's No. 1 economic problem and has expressed regret that there does not seem to be the sense of urgency and awareness that there should be on this subject. In February some 4,918,000 men and women were unemployed, 6.1 percent of the total work force, seasonally adjusted. And, projected annually, this unemployment represents a loss in potential American production of between $30 and $40 billion in goods and services; goods and services that our Nation will never see.

How serious is this economic waste? Need we be alarmed? Economist Gunnar Myrdal, former Swedish Minister of Health, has been quoted as saying:

"I am inclined to believe that the most important problem in the world today is how to get America out of the automatism of relative economic stagnation. A continuation of the present trend means frustration in its foreign relations as well as in its internal life, which, because of the size and weight of America and the role it has to play is extremely dangerous."

The challenge cannot be ignored. By 1975 our total work force will increase from its present level of approximately 75 million to a staggering 93 million, a growth which will be far more rapid than in any other 15-year period in our history. Economic acceleration must therefore include a speedup of the rate in which jobs are created.

Since World War II, 10 million jobs have been opened in the United States, and throughout 1962 total employment hit new highs month after month. The gain in jobs from 1947 through 1962 was 17 perecnt, but the corresponding growth in the labor force amounted to 22 percent, hence unemployment.

Business volume as a whole is breaking records. Profits and incomes are up, though the rise has recently slowed, and yet the unemployment problem persists. It becomes obvious that if we are to open more jobs we must inject new life into our economic structure, we must speed the rate of business expansion.

Responsible and experienced leaders of the administration are convinced that a cut in taxes, to release new billions for spending, is the most effective way. Such a cut in taxation, however, cannot be regarded as a panacea which will automatically cure the financial ills of the Nation, and bring prosperity to its poorer citizens. It can be but a step, albeit an important one, toward achieving a healthier financial climate throughout most segments of our society.

Income taxes at their present level appear to act as an automatic brake on business upturns. As activity rises, taxes siphon off so large a share of the rising incomes that demand for goods fails to reach the level at which industry could produce profitably.

Surplus capacity discourages business investment, a major ingredient in any strong rise in economic activity. Recovery slows down, and the groundwork is laid for another recession. Through a reduction in taxes, new impetus can be injected into demand and investment, and stepped-up growth thereby stimulated.

This effort to induce expansion is not the sole responsibility of government. The private sector of the economy cannot be content to assess blame while waiting calmly for "someone to do something." All can take part. Specifically, business and organized labor must exercise self-discipline in order to prevent an evaporation of those benefits gained through a tax cut. Increased prices or wages would necessarily divert funds made available through tax reduction, and would tend to counteract beneficial effects on unemployment levels. Restraint is essential to insure that the desired results are achieved.

And, as we face current economic challenges we must maintain a flexibility and a willingness to meet change with change. Experience is said to be the best teacher, and yet our experiences of the past may not necessarily provide clear indications of the path we must follow, or the steps we must take.

For example, we are just beginning to feel the impact of automation. Until now, our belief has been that technological advances create a sufficiency in new jobs, perhaps at some other area or level of production. By and large this was true when rapid restructuring was taking place in isolated segments of the economy, and where changes brought on price reductions or increases in quality naturally resulting in increased demand.

Today, however, we are facing technological change of a rapidity and scope never before encountered. Throughout the entire spectrum of our industry the effects of automation are being felt. Change is now moving in geometrical rather than arithmetical progression, and imaginatve and resourceful responses must be found. You, as informed and responsible citizens, will be called on to participate in the search for answers to these, and other questions. I am confident that your response will be one of intelligent inquiry and dedication in the building of a better America.

Yes, the role of the individual businessman in public affairs is a significant one. His primary obligations are those which square with the general responsibilities of all citizens, namely, those of keeping informed, participating in determinations on vital issues, and voting in elections at all levels of government.

Inasmuch as viable democracy depends on an informed electorate, the businessman should function as a source of information on matters which affect his livelihood and on which he is especially knowledgeable. The Congress and the executive branch need your reasoned counsel. Do not withhold it.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Mar. 28, 1962]

CALLS FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

(By Frank Makarewicz)

LOWELL.—Nearly 600 persons of all walks of life in the Greater Lowell community turned out to attend the 4th annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell at the Memorial Auditorium last night and to hear a U.S. Senator sound a call to citizen participation in government.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, who is on the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Employment, Welfare, and a Special Committee on Aging, warned his listeners that there must be a greater urgency to solve the growing unemployment problem in the country. He also warned of the serious consequences of a lack of interest in government by the people.

"We will not be driven into dictatorship, but we can drift into it," Senator RANDOLPH declared. Lack of a thorough understanding of government is a serious handicap, he said, because issues require compromise and conciliation often that must include ideas from a wide range of thought, not only from the extremes.

"The modern businessman is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs," he said. "He must be willing to commit himself beyond the confines of the immediate community, and cause his voice to be heard in the broader area of representative government. He must be an educated, informed, and sincere voice whose convictions are the product of study and thought."

Urging the public to accept a greater responsibility in giving counsel to its governmental representatives, the Senator said, "It is incumbent on individuals and professional and trade associations to express your convictions. It is vital that all legitimate interests be represented and all important opinions be expressed early in the legislative process."

"The national interest is composed of special interests," he said.

The speaker then discussed with emphasis, the growing and serious problem of unemployment. He said that while there were more people working today there was also greater unemployment, due in part to automation. Senator RANDOLPH predicted the situation would worsen unless steps were taken to find ways to accelerate the economy by creating new jobs.

"By 1975," he said, "our total work force will increase from its present level of approximately 75 million to a staggering 93 million, a growth which will be far more rapid than in any other 15-year period in our history."

He told his audience that they as business people will be called on to participate in the search for answers to the problems facing the country, and said that by being informed and by participating in the determinations of vital issues and voting in elections at all levels of government they will be assuming the responsibilities of citizenship.

The Senator was introduced by Lowell's Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE who spoke of Senator RANDOLPH'S many achievements in diversified careers. He noted that RANDOLPH had been a college professor, a dean, an industrial executive, and an editor and publisher as well as an author and had served as a Congressman from 1933 to 1947.

MORSE listed the many Senate committees and subcommittees RANDOLPH is working with and pointed out that he was the coauthor of the Randolph-Sheppard Act which

established small business stands operated by the blind.

The program for the dinner opened at 7 p.m. with the playing of the national anthem and an invocation by Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, pastor of St. Margaret's Church.

Arthur C. Antonopoulos, who presided as toastmaster, introduced the guests at the head table, who included Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Tellier, Rev. and Mrs. Victor F. Scalise, Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Cook, Mr. and Mrs. Walter C. Wilson, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Hickey, Mayor Joseph M. Downes, Mrs. Antonopoulos, Congressman MORSE and Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Lamson were unable to attend.

In addition to offering the official greetings of the city, Mayor Downes made a few remarks as the first speaker.

Thomas J. Hickey, retiring president of the chamber, who was introduced and praised by the dinner chairman as a distinguished leader of the community and the chamber, offered the president's report before turning over his gavel of office to the newly elected president of the organization, Walter C. Wilson, Jr.

In accepting the token, Wilson promised to continue efforts to bring to a fact Lowell's "Potential for Progress," the theme of the chamber's program. His remarks were followed by the presentation to the retiring president of a plaque for distinguished service. Besides the plaque presented to Hickey, two retiring board members, who were unable to be present, Matthew J. Brown and Walter B. Reilly, Jr., were awarded certificates for their service to the organization and the community.

The next speaker who was introduced was Donald A. Cook, general manager of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell. Cook praised the members and officers for their support and participation in the activities of the chamber which, he said, made progress possible.

Cook named, in special appreciation, the officers who include Edward N. Lamson, vice president, James P. Curran, vice president, Eugene Tellier, treasurer, and Arthur C. Antonopoulos, immediate past president. He also praised the members of the board of directors who include Sheppard Bartlett, of A. G. Pollard Co.; Matthew J. Brown, of Scott Jewelry Co.; Donald A. Caswell, of Bon Marche, Inc.; David F. Connors, of Lowell Sun Publishing Co.; James F. Conway, Jr., of the Courier-Citizen Co.; Albert P. Gaumont, of Gaumont Bros., Inc.; J. Russell Havey, of Educator Biscuit Co.; Dr. Brendan D. Leahey; Allan L. Levine, of Towers Motor Parts; Harry J. Patterson, of the Lowell Gas Co.; Walter B. Reilly, Jr., of the Courier-Citizen Co.; Daniel E. Walker, of the Union National Bank; Harold E. Wright, Sr., of Wright Trucking Co., as well as the retiring and the new president.

The general manager also singled out for praise Errington A. Brigham and Henry Gaumont who headed the retail division. He also presented to newly elected board members, Joseph Alyibrandi and Michael DeMoulas, and recognized the services of several committee chairmen who include John F. Gleason, Richard R. Flood, Robert H. Goldman, Dr. Costas Kokinos, Kenneth Harkins, Vincent P. Morton, Jr., Raymond E. Noiseux and Harold Hirsch who was not able to be present because of illness.

At the conclusion of Senator RANDOLPH'S address, Rev. Victor F. Scalise, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church delivered the benediction to conclude the meeting.

Dinner committee chairmen included Edward F. O'Dea, attendance; David F. Connors, publicity; Joseph Sullivan, Jr., program; Hans H. Schliebus, banquet; John H. Gardiner, hall; James C. Shannon, Jr., decorations; Joseph M. McDonough and Cortlandt J. Burkinshaw, reception.

How Do We Look to Those Foreign Tourists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in Reader's Digest of April 1963. This article describes how the visit U.S.A. program has been able to improve understanding among people from all parts of the world and the Americas.

The article follows:

HOW DO WE LOOK TO THOSE FOREIGN TOURISTS?

(By Robert Littell)

Two years ago U.S. citizens, for decades the most tireless of globetrotters, were suddenly asked to make their country as attractive as possible to tourists from overseas. We need foreign visitors to help close the gap between the tourist dollars trickling into the United States and the dollars streaming out. A U.S. Travel Service was set up within the Department of Commerce, and this year, with branches in nine foreign cities, it will spend $3,350,000 promoting travel to America. For the first time in our history we who had always been the innocents abroad began to entice to our shores the skeptics and sophisticates of other lands.

Last year half a million visitors, more than twice as many as 5 years ago, came to the United States from overseas. Three out of five were Europeans. Many of those were questioned: How had they been treated in America? What had they liked best? What had they not liked?

On one point the tourists were practically unanimous: they were overwhelmed by the openhearted hospitality, courtesy, and kindness of the people they met casually in America. For the thousands of foreigners who expected Americans to be brash and brusquely efficient, like many of the characters in movies we send abroad, their holiday in the United States closed something more important than the "dollar gap"—it closed a gap in human understanding and mutual esteem.

The sheer size of this country staggers foreign tourists. The map of the continental United States, if placed on the map of Europe, stretches from Lisbon to Stalingrad, from Helsinki to Palermo. West Germany would just fit into Oregon and, in area, Italy and Arizona are almost twins. Over and over again strangers to our landscape are lifted out of themselevs by its sweep and infinite variety, by the limitless horizons, by the great oaks of the bayou country asleep under their Spanish moss, by the lunar shapes and crystal distances of the Southwest, by the white farmhouses and red barns like islands in the wheatlands' golden sea.

The Lebanese painter Aida Marini, as she flew westward, saw "lakes of steel and blood in a desert of orange sand." Philip Calow took home to Australia in his mind's eye an indelible picture of "expressways stalking across the cities on their concrete legs." Chicago particularly astonishes foreigners. "Nobody told us that it is such a beautiful city," they say. "All our notions about it came from gangster films." Of the great national parks one traveler said, "I wouldn't mind if I had seen nothing else."

Eighty-five percent of the oversea visitors "do" the United States in groups. Most of them have time for little but the famous sights: New York, Niagara Falls, Ford's River Rouge plant, Washington, Williamsburg, the Grand Canyon, Las Vegas, Disneyland, San Francisco. But a few bolder spirits wander off, unguided, to discover America by themselves. You might catch sight of them in Oregon at the Pendleton Roundup, in Maryland hiking along the towpaths of abandoned canals, in Tennessee leaning over the bow of a river steamer, in North Carolina spellbound by the patter of a tobacco auctioneer. And in any city you will find them sauntering down the aisles of supermarkets as if they were in a museum.

One morning in New York an Italian tourist missed his group's sightseeing bus. "So I walk," he told his hotel's manager later. "I see a big hole in the ground. Down in the hole I hear Italian. So I go down in the hole, talk Italian with two paesani. They take me home, we eat spaghetti. For 3 days I no go with the group tour but I see New York with my friends from the hole in the ground."

More and more oversea visitors are learning that travel up and down America can be less expensive than they had feared. The Nation's railroads offer foreigners a 15-percent discount on roundtrip coach fares anywhere from the port of entry. This summer, plane fares within the United States, already about 40 percent cheaper than air fares in Europe, can be further reduced by new triangle fares—flights from New York to Los Angeles via Miami, and vice versa, for only $25 more than the direct flight. Two local airlines jointly offer 30 days' unlimited flying in 17 Eastern States for $99.

Most foreigners tour the United States by bus. A growing number are taking advantage of the bargain offered by both Greyhound and Continental Trailways: 99 days' travel, on buses with toilets and reclining seats, anywhere on either line for $99—provided the tickets are purchased abroad. One tourist followed the "99 and 99" route for 3 months; a retired English major rolled up 30,000 miles.

To eat well in the United States—well, that is, by European standards—costs $8 to $10 a day, including tips but not drinks. Apart from seafood and ice cream, the American cuisine gets a mixed reception from foreign tourists. Some think the raw material superb, but that it is "ruined by cooking." The British, Australians, and Germans seem to like it better than the Italians or French, who wonder if there is a law compelling all American potatoes to be fried, who despise the pallid, flabby bread, who ask in vain for fresh fruit, who deplore the way salad dressing is sprayed on lettuce, like some insecticide, long before it is served. The British miss their tea, the French their wines, "As far as beer is concerned," said a man from Denmark, the land of Carlsberg and Tuborg, "Americans simply have no culture."

Though German tourists are pleasantly surprised by the number of Americans—many former GI's—who speak German, in general the worst frustration is caused by language. American tourists abroad find many more people who speak their language than do foreigners traveling here. A European who stayed in 20 first-class American hotels reports that not one of their reception clerks could deal with questions in French, German, or Italian.

But the nationwide drive for tourists is bringing about improvement. Hotels are combining their staffs for those on whom can be pinned badges reading "Ich spreche Deutsch" or "Hablo Espanol." At our international airports, attractive uniformed young women speaking a number of languages have been added to the customs staffs.

Macy's, New York's huge department store, has more than 700 employees who speak one or more foreign languages (a total of 42 different tongues). A sightseeing bus company in New York offers passengers ear-

phones through which they can hear, in one of four languages, recorded descriptions of the city's sights as they pass by.

Visitors approaching Asheville, N.C., see a huge sign in several languages asking them to telephone 253-3351 if they need an interpreter. A group called "Los Angeles at Home" maintains a list of 100 Los Angeles families versed in various foreign languages who can be called on as hosts to visitors from abroad.

When several hundred homebound tourists were asked whether they would like to come back to the United States someday, 7 out of 10 said yes. But the tourists took the opportunity to get a few complaints off their chests. Among other things, they dislike the confusion of local sales taxes ("Why weren't we told about them beforehand?"); they are repelled by the cheap jokes of so many of the professional sightseeing guides, and their overemphasis on size or cost; by the ugliness of roadside car cemeteries; by the way some American women go about the streets with curlers in their hair.

Tastes differ, of course, and you can't displease everybody. One visitor thinks the Indian dances staged for tourists on the rim of the Grand Canyon "depressingly artificial"; another craves more such Indian dances, handicrafts and ceremonials. A Danish woman was "instinctively repelled" when a New York salesgirl called her "honey"; a Swiss woman thought it "lovely," when a New York waitress called her "dear."

"I love you Americans," foreign travelers often say, "on a person-to-person basis. If I meet you on a train, in the street, you can't do enough for me, you want to take me home with you. But if I meet you as a hotel clerk or waiter, a bus or taxi driver, all too often you are rude. What is it about those occupations that seems to change your character?"

But the private Americans are garlanded with gratitude. "When Americans say 'make yourself at home,'" remarked an English architectural student, "they really want you to take what you like from the icebox." An Australian sheep farmer, en route to Chicago by plane, sat next to an Iowa farmer who wound up by taking him home for the weekend. Miss Alberta Evans, a South African, swears that "if I had accepted every invitation I got while traveling on a Greyhound bus, I could have stayed in America the rest of my days."

For a group of 76 boys from the Forest Hill School in London, red carpets were rolled out wherever they went. A Rotary Club near New York gave them a barbecue; in Buffalo a steel company treated them to a lunch of turkey and pumpkin pie. In the Adirondacks, when one of the boys tried to buy some chocolate, the shopkeeper said, "Oh, you're one of the boys from England—take the whole box," (which held 100 bars). A complete stranger, when he heard they were leaving, turned up at Idlewild with two crates of peaches for them.

In the course of their ventures into the New World, foreign tourists are discovering America's greatest treasure: a frontier hospitality that greets and accepts the stranger and warms his heart and makes him say, as the tourists interviewed said over and over again, "Of the many sights we saw, the best of all were the Americans themselves."

The Despicable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the constant struggles that has had the combined attention of our executive, legislative, and judiciary branches of government is the effort to control the smuggling and use of narcotics.

This is an area which has received consistent legislative attention, ceaseless action by our law enforcement officials and time-consuming attention by our courts.

Widespread public support is evidenced for the endeavors to control the evil effects of narcotics. I am pleased to note that our Nation's newspapers are in the forefront in emphasizing the importance of this struggle.

The Suburbanite Economist, an independent publication serving south suburban Cook County areas recently commented editorially on the court's decision, and law enforcement aspects of this subject. I am pleased to place this concise and effective editorial into the RECORD at this point:

In sentencing two wholesale peddlers of heroin to long prison terms, Federal Judge Hubert L. Will said from the bench:

"You were engaged in the most despicable form of economic activity in our society today."

Narcotic addiction is life in hell. Medical treatment rescues some, but most never escape. The craving increases, as does the need for money with which to buy the poison. To obtain funds, an addict will steal, risk murder, even sell his or her soul.

Addicts rarely become narcotic slaves by accident. They are lured into the plunge because they immediately become life customers for peddlers.

Investigation has revealed that addiction has increased greatly in recent years and that the victims are in all strata of society.

It is doubly unfortunte that more suppliers are not caught and sent to penitentiaries. A life sentence would not be severe enough in view of the horrible suffering and tragic consequences they cause.

The Small Business Administration Must Remain an Independent Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1963, I called to the attention of our colleagues an exchange of correspondence between George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and President Kennedy.

Since that time I have received much correspondence on the subject, all in agreement with the views expressed.

One such letter from Max T. Bird, executive vice president of the Stockmans National Bank of Lusk, Wyo., dated March 29, 1963, is set forth below:

STOCKMANS NATIONAL BANK OF LUSK,
Lusk, Wyo., March 29, 1963.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: I have received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the remarks made on the Small Business Administration. I indeed wish to thank you for the remarks you stated and also for the information received from President Kennedy.

I too believe that the Small Business Adminstration should remain as an independent agency. Here at this bank we have made a number of loans through the Small Business Administration in Denver, Colo., and have received some wonderful assistance from them. If it was not for this agency I can assure you that the bank would not be able to take care of some of our valued customers and our city would not have progressed as it has.

The Small Business Administration has indeed done a wonderful job.

I thought I would send my thoughts and my thanks to you.

Yours very truly,

MAX T. BIRD,
Executive Vice President.

Concern for Children Who Drop Out of School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, many Minnesotans, like other good people all over the country, are gravely concerned about those youngsters who have dropped out of school and found themselves in a labor market unable, and sometimes unwilling, to provide them with employment.

A recent resolution passed by the Minnesota Governor's Advisory Council on Children and Youth stresses what I have been saying before my colleagues in this House for a number of years—that immediate action is required to motivate the character development of these young men and women and to rectify the dismal attitudes created among them by their frustrating plight. Under unanimous consent, I include this excellent plea for the youth of this Nation in the RECORD for the general edification of all. I also include the accompanying fact sheet on population and unemployment in Minnesota:

RESOLUTION BY THE MINNESOTA GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Whereas the Governor's advisory council on children and youth continues to be gravely concerned about those young people who are no longer in school and unable to obtain employment; and

Whereas the ever-increasing number of young people means that this problem will be faced by more and more of our youth; and

Whereas the steady decrease in the jobs available for unskilled labor means that the problem of employment is increasingly complex, at the same time it affects more and more young people; and

Whereas only immediate action can prevent further deterioration in the character, moral fiber, and attitudes of these young people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States pass into law as soon as possible the Youth Employment Act (S. 1; H.R. 1890), which, through its provisions for the employment of youth at the same time it enables them to extend their education and training, offers vitally needed help to out-of-school, out-of-work young people; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, of the U.S. Senate; to the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, U.S. House of Representatives; to all members of the Minnesota delegation in Congress; and so they may have it for reference, to the 256 leaders who are members of the Governor's advisory council on children and youth, and who represent all geographical areas, and those individual disciplines and segments of our people devoted to the principle of helping every child develop his full potential.

FACT SHEET

Minnesota's population is expected to grow to 3,881,563 by 1970, an increase of 14 percent. During this same period our youth population (14 through 20 years) will increase 36 percent.

In 1961, 55,500 Minnesota young people reached age 18.

By 1965, 67,000 Minnesota young people will reach age 18.

By 1970, 76,000 Minnesota young people will reach age 18.

On January 1, 1963, Minnesota's total labor force was 1,412,000. Minnesota's total number of unemployed—115,600 or 8.2 percent. The total number of youth (14 through 20) in the labor force, 84,756. The total number of unemployed youth, 23,120 or 20 percent.

The extension of automation and the improvement of technology throughout our economy may be more meaningful if we realize that in one major industry, farming, the use of unskilled labor will decrease from 25.3 percent of the labor force in 1960 to 17.4 percent in 1970. Under such conditions the increasing importance of education or specific vocational training for our young people becomes obvious.

In 1961, 11,000 of Minnesota's potential 55,000 high school graduates failed to graduate.

SUMMARY

In the present decade Minnesota's young people (14 through 20 years) will increase 36 percent while the general population increases only 14 percent. These young people now make up 6 percent of Minnesota's labor force while the number of their unemployed comprises 20 percent of their labor force as compared to 8.2 percent of the general population who are unemployed. Although Minnesota rates very near the top in comparison with other States in its ability to hold high school students through graduation, still there were, in 1961, 11,000 Minnesotans who dropped out of school before completing high school.

Adoption by Congress of the Youth Employment Act is one important step that can be taken to aid the out-of-school, out-of-work young people. (The figures in the above material have been furnished by the Minnesota Departments of Education, Employment, and Security, and by the Federal Census Bureau.)

Remarks of Roy H. Millenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Mr. Roy H. Millenson, opening the 15th annual conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House on March 28, 1963. Mr. Millenson is chairman of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House and is the national representative of the American Jewish Committee. Those of us who have had the privilege of working with Mr. Millenson know that he is deeply dedicated to the achievement of civil rights and the preservation of civil liberties of all citizens. Mr. Millenson, who has a profound insight into the problems of the civil rights-civil liberties area, is making a substantial contribution to the fight for liberty and dignity.

I recommend his remarks to all my colleagues:

REMARKS OF ROY H. MILLENSON

Just as the convening of a new Congress serves to dramatize the issues facing the Nation, the priorities given them and the means advanced for their resolution, so does this 15th annual meeting of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House serve to place the issues with which we are concerned in perspective in relation to the national scene. In the first rank of national concerns we find the problems of the cold war, national defense, the budget, tax reduction, national economic growth, and persistent unemployment. The so-called social issues, except insofar as they have a direct relation to these, tend to be shunted aside, not only in terms of emphasis by the administration but also, in some instances (e.g., immigration) because of a lack of public enthusiasm.

In civil rights, where many changes are occurring, what is significant is not so much the lack of a very real push here in Washington for civil rights legislation but the fact that there has been so little public outcry with respect to this slackening of drive, a falling off which has been discernible on other civil rights fronts.

In addition, the elections last November, especially the results in Ohio and New York, have given force to an increasingly held belief that the key to the Negro vote is not shedding blood for civil rights but rather making successful appeals to the colored electorate through other issues and by political astuteness while at the same time maintaining a correct civil rights posture. In New York, for example, Senator JAVITS, well known for his leadership in civil rights battles, running for a second term against an opponent who publicly opposed further civil rights legislation, actually dropped in his percentage of votes in Negro precincts. The lesson is not lost on the politicians.

A further index of change—and a warning for the future—has been the increasing number of articles in the think magazines both with respect to what one writer has termed "the liberals' retreat from civil rights" and also regarding the mounting Negro impatience with the elements which up to this time have been most closely associated in the popular mind with Negro aims, the liberals, and organized labor.

A perspective New York City politician observed to me recently, in appealing to the predimonately white voters of his area, it is necessary to pay homage to the principles of civil rights to assuage the liberal instincts of his constituency most of whom are of moderate income, including many union members, with minority-group backgrounds; but if he places too much emphasis on the issues of equality and integration in housing, education, and employment he can write his political obituary. The Negro community is much more aware and sensitive to this cynicism and self-deception than is the white community which so self-righteously indulges itself in brotherhood dinners and cliched tributes to democracy. And the white community, on its part, is becoming more sensitive to the realities of black racism whose scarlet sister white racism has been host to much of our Nation's social disease.

Here, then, is a pattern of changing attitudes discerned some time ago by the sociologists—and a pattern about which many of us here have been aware for some time—but one which is only beginning to be truly appreciated in the community at large. The force of the winds blowing in many directions is now beginning to be felt. The fight for civil rights and equality—whose battlegrounds are increasingly being found away from Washington, although the medals for valor are usually awarded here—is one which will be causing more soul searching and self-analysis among its white cheerleaders than among the black participants on the field. For confused as they sometimes may seem to be as to who is the quarterback and which way the ball is to be carried, they are the ones who are always playing to win.

An Educator Speaks on the Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert a statement by Dr. Clarence C. Stoughton, president of Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio. It expresses clearly and concisely the concern and the fears of many educational leaders over the proposal to place a limitation upon deductible contributions under the 5 percent floor feature of the administration's tax recommendations. With the increased clamor for providing a stimulus in facilities for higher education in the country, it appears entirely inconsistent that any action be taken that would discourage private financial assistance to colleges and universities. Instead of the approach of government paternalism in the field of higher education, we should be looking to a provision of incentives in the private area. Furthermore, laws that would grant at least a partial tax exemption for parents sending children to colleges and universities would be more in keeping with the tradition of our great free educational system in this country.

Dr. Stoughton's letter follows:

WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY,
Springfield, Ohio, March 12, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: I write both as a private citizen and as president of Wittenberg University to express my hearty approval of the move to decrease income taxes, but also of my equally strong negative reaction to some of the proposals for changes in income tax regulations. I am particularly disturbed at the effect of the possible elimination of the present regulation for unlimited deductions for charity up to 30 percent of income and the proposed 5 percent deductions in computing itemized gifts on individual returns. The proposal to charge capital gains tax on appreciated value of personal gifts is also disturbing.

Many independent colleges feel that the U.S. Government has previously given generous treatment in its gift deduction pro-

visions because it was convinced that this was a better way of financing such institutions than by direct governmental support. The allowable deductions, therefore, have not been loopholes to avoid taxation but, rather, incentives for people to give much more generously than they normally would have done if such allowances were not provided. I am sure that all colleges and universities and other charitable institutions will suffer severely if the changes proposed are made law. I hope, therefore, that your committee will feel sympathetic toward our position. We desperately need such governmentally stimulated incentives to insure continued private gifts to our institutions.

I must confess to you that it does not make sense to me to eliminate the possibilities of substantial giving on the part of our citizens and then require us to turn to the government for greater aid from the moneys that would presumably be recovered by such legislation.

Year after year I have tried to give 20 to 25 percent of my income to my church, my college, and other charitable causes that I believe worthy. This has been a religious compulsion that I have felt keenly. My possessions are modest. To have the first 5 percent of my giving deducted would seem to me to be highly unfair and almost indecent. Others who give generously would undoubtedly feel the same. The resultant resentment, I believe, would be bad from every standpoint.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE C. STOUGHTON,
President.

Benjamin Selvin, a Credit to His Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief biography of my good friend and neighbor, Ben Selvin, who has retired from his chosen field of music, upon reaching the age of 65.

Ben Selvin has been a tremendous asset to his community. I am sure that RCA is sorry to see him retire but we in Roslyn are very happy that he will now have more time to spend with us.

The biography follows:

SELVIN RETIRES FROM MUSIC

Benjamin B. Selvin, of Roslyn, for the past 10 years artists and repertoire manager for RCA Victor's custom record department and who, for over 58 years has left his mark on the musical world as a violinist, internationally acclaimed band leader, radio director, and recording manager, was honored last Thursday night at retirement dinner attended by many notables of the music and record industry.

Approximately 200 people were present at the St. Moritz Hotel, including representatives from the American Federation of Musicians, the music publishing and record industries, all departments of the RCA Victor Record Division, and the Radio Corp. of America.

Ben Selvin began studying music at the age of 7. At 21, while conducting an 11-piece orchestra at the famed Moulin Rouge night club, he recorded four songs for the Victor Talking Machine Co.—at a set fee of $100 per song. One of them, "Dardenella," became the first dance record to sell over 1 million copies. Other hits by the Selvin orchestra included "I'm Forever Blowing Bubbles," "A Pretty Girl Is Like a Melody," and "Isle of Golden Dreams." Throughout his career, Ben Selvin has recorded more than 9,000 selections under 9 different names for 9 companies.

In 1927, established as an artist, Ben left night clubs to become musical director with Columbia Phonograph Co., was eventually appointed director of artists and repertoire, and assisted in the formation of the Columbia Broadcasting System. After serving as vice president in charge of recording and programing for the Muzak Corp. from 1934 until 1941, Ben took a leave of absence to work with James Petrillo and the American Federation of Musicians in preparing the first comprehensive survey of recorded music.

After returning to Muzak, Ben joined Majestic Records as vice president and in 1947, rejoined Columbia Records in Hollywood as director of artists and repertoire. In February 1953 he was named artists and repertoire manager for RCA Victor's custom record department, and in recent years his primary duties have included the responsibility for many of the recordings made by the department in the United States and Europe. Discussing his memorable career on the eve of his retirement, Ben Selvin, just turned 65 years of age, stated: "My only regret is that I didn't join RCA Victor as an executive in 1919 instead of as an artist, since the last 10 years have been the most interesting of my career."

Mr. Selvin, has long been active in real estate, in addition to his musical activities. He plans to devote more time in this area, plus serving as a musical consultant to the Top of the Fair, Inc., at the New York World's Fair, among other ventures.

Close Call but Representative Davis Is Still Going Strong at 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, we in the Tennessee delegation are very fortunate to have as dean of our delegation Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, of Memphis.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], has certainly been a guiding light to all of us in the delegation in his thorough understanding of legislation and problems that face us all.

He has had a most outstanding career as a public servant and assisting him has been his fine, sweet wife, Carrie Davis, whose record speaks for itself, as twice president of the Congressional Club and all of the splendid projects that she has supervised to a successful completion.

On Sunday, March 31, in the Nashville Tennessean, of Nashville, Tenn., an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, there appeared a splendid story about the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. This story was written by Lois Laycook, the Washington correspondent for the Nashville Tennessean. Mr. Laycook is an outstanding writer and I think that you will agree with me when you read the article that follows regarding the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]:

CLOSE CALLS—BUT REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS IS STILL GOING STRONG AT 65

(By Lois Laycook)

WASHINGTON.—Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, 65-year-old dean of the Tennessee congressional delegation, has led a charmed life during his 23 years in the House of Representatives.

Like any job, service in Congress has its occupational hazards. But the veteran Memphis Congressman has had more than his share of close calls, physically and politically.

In 1954 DAVIS and three other Congressmen were shot and wounded by a band of Puerto Rican fanatics who slipped into the House gallery with concealed pistols and opened fire on the House floor. All four Congressmen were seriously injured but recovered.

Last August, DAVIS and his wife were among 70 passengers aboard an airliner that crashed and burned at Knoxville, McGhee-Tyson Airport. They escaped serious injury.

In 1953 DAVIS' automobile skidded on a slippery road in Washington's Rock Creek Park and crashed into an embankment. The Congressman suffered only minor injuries.

Politically, his narrowest escape came last November when he won reelection by a scant, 1,200 votes over a Republican political unknown, Robert James, of Memphis. At one point DAVIS was trailing in the ballot count.

LAST SURVIVOR

Finally, DAVIS is one of the last surviving members of the old Crump political organization which dominated Tennessee politics for more than a quarter of a century. That in itself is a tribute to DAVIS' political astuteness.

Now ranking 25th in seniority among the 435 Members of the House, DAVIS reached the peak of his influence in Congress 3 years ago when he managed the hard-fought battle to get a TVA self-financing bill passed by the House. It was an uphill fight against strong Republican opposition but the measure finally put TVA on solid financial footing for the first time in the agency's stormy history.

As second ranking member of the House Public Works Committee, DAVIS presided over the long days of hearing on the controversial financing bill. He also headed the committee's conference with the Senate in working out differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

DAVIS was cosponsor in the House of the big interstate highway program in the middle 1950's. In 1958 he cast the deciding vote in conference on a plan authorizing a bonus of one-half percent of all highway funds allocated to States which prohibited unsightly bill boards on the Interstate Highway System. For his action, DAVIS was honored by the National Garden Clubs of America.

When DAVIS was first elected to Congress in 1940 he served for a short period on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. During World War II he served on the House Military Affairs Committee and then switched to Public Works after the war.

In addition to his regular committee assignment he also is chairman of a special committee to investigate congressional campaign expenditures and a newly created select committee making a 2-year study of Federal land acquisition policies.

MOVED TO MEMPHIS

A native of Hazelhurst, Miss., Davis is the son of Mrs. Jessie Davis and the late Odom A. Davis. His father was a merchant and cotton compress manager in Mississippi until the family moved to Memphis in 1911.

After graduation from high school DAVIS attended the University of Mississippi Law School where he received a law degree.

DAVIS worked for a short period as a law clerk in the office of Walter Chandler. He became active in politics and was soon taken under the wing of the late Memphis political boss, E. H. Crump.

His first public job was as secretary to the late Mayor Rowlett Paine. While in this job, DAVIS met the former Miss Carrie Leigh of Memphis. They were married the following year.

Working his way up in the ranks of the Crump organization, DAVIS was elected city judge of Memphis in 1923 and served in that post until 1927. He is known to most of his friends as Judge to this day.

VICE MAYOR

He was elected vice mayor and commissioner of public safety in 1928 and held that position until his election to Congress.

DAVIS is active in the First Baptist Church of Memphis. He is a Mason, Shriner, Odd Fellow, Elk, Moose and a member of the Greek AHEPA.

The Davises have three children: Clifford, Jr., an attorney who lives in Cockeysville, Md., Mrs. George Chauncey of Danville, Ky., and Ray Davis, an engineer in Hartford, Conn.

AUTHORITY ON PROTOCOL

Mrs. Davis is active in Democratic women's affairs in Washington. She is a former president of the Congressional Club, the second congressional wife from the South ever to be elected. She started a speaker's bureau especially designed to assist congressional wives.

Mrs. Davis is recognized as an authority on Washington protocol. She recently gave a series of talks to wives of new Members of Congress on the subject.

There has been speculation that DAVIS may retire at the end of the current term. However, the veteran Congressman has told friends he has made no decision.

Freedom To Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Dr. Harry Halpern as it appeared in the March 22, 1963, issue of the Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center.

FROM WHERE I STAND

The legislators of New York State have broken a precedent of long standing by establishing tuition fees in State colleges. The general of the forces which accomplished this change is Mr. Walter J. Mahoney, majority leader of the State senate. Whether this is one of the moves designed to pull the Chief Executive of the State, the titular head of the majority party, out of certain difficulties with his budget, is irrelevant to my purpose.

The important thing is that students who attend State colleges where there were no tuition fees before must now pay for their education. Parents who may be having difficulties in balancing their budgets will now be saddled with an additional burden. This legislative move, it must be realized, comes at a time when all over the country there are demands for more scientists, more trained individuals for specialized tasks which require a college education.

Many students who rightly resented the change in policy went to Albany to register their dissatisfaction by a peaceable demonstration. The Senate majority leader, irked by the audacity of anyone who dared challenge the supreme wisdom of himself and his fellow solons, expressed his displeasure by calling the demonstrators "beatniks," and summed up his resentment in the question, "Who do these kids think they are?" I'd like to answer that question. First, however, we should ascertain who these young people are before we decide what they thing they are.

These young people are the sons and daughters of parents who came from many foreign lands to find freedom and opportunity here. They are members of various races and adherents of different religious faiths. They are the people to whom speeches are made at commencement exercises, telling them that they constitute the future of America. These are the individuals whom we tell that the opportunities offered to them are unbounded.

Who do they think they are? They think they are Americans whose parents pay the taxes which make it possible for Senator MAHONEY to sit in the seat of the mighty and decide what rights we have as citizens. These young people think that they have every legal right to protest against legislation which they think is unfair. They have read the first amendment to the Constitution which says that "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." They went to Albany with that assurance in mind.

It is said that a Jew always answers a question with another one. And so, Mr. MAHONEY when you ask "Who do these kids think they are?" I answer that they are Americans who take the Constitution seriously, and I ask, "Senator, do you?"

A Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself and the people of my district with the general sentiment here declared today, and to express the deepest condolences on the tragic loss of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

And yet, although we mourn her departure from this earth, that is not the only sad occurrence to darken the occasion, for her death marks the culmination of her dedicated labors, and therein lies another disaster for mankind.

It will now be necessary for some new champion to come forward in behalf of the poor and the politically weak and the socially downtrodden. By this, I do not mean merely some part-time champion; a good hearted, public-spirited citizen, willing to devote some of his time to alleviating the suffering of those in need. On the contrary, I mean someone like Eleanor Roosevelt, who regarded as a national catastrophe the condition of the poor and the depressed and the persecuted, and who never rested in her battle in their behalf.

This was a role that was necessary for someone to play, as a prelude to much of the social legislation that has come about in the period following World War II. For many years, millions and millions of persons of means in this country spent considerable time in cultivating the knack for looking the other way whenever the poor people and the persecuted passed by.

In this manner, they were able to avoid the pangs of conscience that would have driven them to action in behalf of those less fortunate than themselves.

What Eleanor Roosevelt did was to sound the battle cry in behalf of the American conscience, with the result that the Nation responded, to an astonishing degree.

I shall never forget the scene and some of the events surrounding the arrival of Mrs. Roosevelt at Medford, Oreg., some years ago. The occasion was the gathering of a group of persons who meet annually at Medford to honor the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. On this particular day, Mrs. Roosevelt appeared, with the object of delivering an address. Notwithstanding the fact that it was her late husband whom all were there to honor, it was nonetheless clear, by the way the audience responded in terms of friendship and affection, that Eleanor Roosevelt was also the object of love and admiration in the eyes of everyone on hand.

In paying our last respects to this great lady, we can only hope that there will appear, in the near future, others of her caliber, to aid in the work that she began. To do any more than hope, in this regard, would be presumptuous, indeed.

Annual Address of President Bradford Brett Before the Independent Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Bankers Association, with more than 6,200 members in 40 States, and dedicated to the fundamental conviction that the homeowned and homemanaged community bank plays a vital and essential role in the growth and development of the American community, held its 29th annual convention, with a record attendance of more than 1,500, in New Orleans last week.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to call attention to this circumstance because the president of the Independent Bankers Association for the past year has been Bradford Brett, president of the First National Bank of Mexico, county seat of Audrain County, in my own Ninth Missouri District. Mr. Brett is a member of a distinguished banking family, serves his own bank with credit and distinction, and during his administration, the

IBA has prospered, and increased both its membership and its stature and influence.

Mr. Brett's grandfather, R. R. Arnold, Sr., was a founder of the First National Bank in Mexico, in 1873, and served as cashier, and president, for 44 years, until his death in 1917. The bank has had a national bank charter for 80 years, since 1883. An uncle, R. R. Arnold, Jr., entered the bank's employ in 1898, and served it until his death in 1935, and as its president after his father's death. Two other uncles from Mexico, Mo., rose to banking positions of responsibility in the business or profession, Morris A. Arnold, as president of the First National Bank of Seattle, Wash., and John B. Arnold, as president of the Midland National Bank of Billings, Mont.

Bradford Brett, son of Julia Arnold and H. B. Brett, and a grandson of the bank's founder, entered the bank's employ in 1935, after the death of his uncle. He had been graduated from the University of Missouri, in 1933, and spent 2 years with Ely, Walker & Co. Learning the bank responsibilities at all levels over the years, he has been its president since 1941, and has served continuously since, except for wartime duties as a naval officer. He distinguished himself throughout the State of Missouri in 1958 by leading a successful campaign against branch banking, resulting in the rejection of branch bank proposals by Missouri voters in the general elections of that year, with 70 percent of the vote recorded against the branch banking proposals, which were defeated in every city and every county in Missouri, and by an overall majority of some 400,000. And, Mr. Speaker, letters by former President Harry S. Truman and myself, in opposition to the branching proposals, were on the record in the campaign.

He has been an officer in the IBA since 1961, and was second vice president before his election to the presidency, at the Pittsburgh convention in 1962. In climaxing his administration, Mr. Brett delivered the keynote address at the New Orleans convention.

A vigorous, and even militant advocate of the independent banking role, and the dual banking system in our country, currently observing its centennial this year, Mr. Brett fearlessly addresses himself to self-proclaimed prophets and self-styled experts of little knowledge, who have openly attacked independent banking from various quarters. He challenges the influential membership to strengthen National and State holding company laws, continue banking education for the membership and the public, and make every effort to achieve fiscal responsibility in our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we in the Congress need the support of more organizations in pursuit of this objective, and in order that all Members of the Congress may have opportunity to read the full text of Mr. Brett's courageous and eloquent remarks, I include in the RECORD at this point the text of President Bradford Brett's keynote address in opening the 29th Annual Convention of the Independent Bankers Association, at the Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans, La., on March 26, 1963:

ANNUAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT BRETT BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION

The IBA has had a most interesting year. Your officers believe that we have made progress toward our goals. We have strengthened our management staff and opened an IBA office in Washington. It has been my great privilege to be the last president serving with Ben DuBois as our executive director. Fortunately, his advice and counsel will be available to our future officers for many years.

For the first time in the history of this association, we have had internal problems with two of our directors. These problems have been solved—our association has not been hurt but has gained in strength and unity.

As you know, we increased the dues as of January 1, 1963. Some believed that we might lose membership. Instead, we have increased our membership to an alltime high of 6,244 banks and, by raising the dues to a reasonable figure, we have increased our annual income substantially.

We have added a publication, our monthly Newsletter. The Newsletter, complementing the Independent Banker magazine, gives better news coverage to all the membership and has been most cordially received.

When the final figures are in tomorrow, we will have recorded the largest crowd ever to attend an IBA national convention. The tremendous attendance at this convention is most encouraging to all your officers and directors.

The past year has seen changes in banking, with resulting new challenges. Your association has geared itself to meet these challenges by the addition of key personnel. The new Washington office is managed by C. Herschel Schooley. Mr. Schooley is a veteran on the Washington scene and is eminently qualified as our Washington manager. For 5 years he was Director of Information for the Department of Defense and has held other top public relations posts in the Capital. He is a man of great judgment and ability. I urge you to contact our Washington office whenever you believe it might be of assistance to you.

Another staff change since our last convention resulted in Gene Moore joining us as secretary. Like Herschel Schooley, Gene is a veteran newsman who has the public relations and other skills needed to do a good job for the association. Many of you will, I know, meet these gentlemen personally during the convention. You will find them able, cooperative and cordial and they are already working as a tremendous team under the direction of our most able veteran executive director, Howard Bell.

On a number of occasions during my term as president, we have gone directly to you, our members, to get your sentiment on key issues facing the association. We have done this by mail questionnaires and we have done it because we have wanted you, the members, to guide us in making our decisions.

In our first poll last summer, we learned that our members wanted our headquarters to remain in Sauk Centre, Minn. The vote was heavily in favor of remaining in Sauk Centre and this decision made good sense to me. I believe there is real merit in having the organization headquartered in a community such as Sauk Centre, a city closely identified with the association since its founding.

In another poll, we found that some 56 percent of the banks responding favored an increase in FDIC insurance from $10,000 to $25,000. The result of this poll has been communicated to the House and Senate Banking Committees.

In our most recent poll, we asked member and nonmember banks for their opinion on the President's proposed tax reduction and the proposal of Comptroller Saxon's committee to permit branch banking by national banks within 25 miles of their main office without regard to State law. The returns in this survey demonstrate overwhelming objection to both proposals.

These polls of our membership have served their purpose very well. I strongly recommend that they be expanded in the future.

It has been a good year for the Independent Bankers Association and I want to publicly thank from the bottom of my heart the officers, directors, staff members, committee chairmen, and committee members. Steve Babington, Lee Stenehjem, Art Hoese, Ben DuBois, Howard Bell, Bill McDonald, and Paul Lagomarcino, and more recently Gene Moore and Herschel Schooley, have worked like Trojans for you and your association. The advisory committee, headed by Royal Mullins and O. D. Hansen, has been of invaluable assistance in advising the President. The legislative committee, headed by Buddy Milner, and the taxation committee headed by Glenn Baugh, have worked closely together and have advanced our program.

The Government fiscal policy committee, headed by O. K. Johnson, has worked closely with the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department and has done a fine job. The bank study committee, under the chairman of Reed Albig, has ably advanced our principles in the internal banking field. The headquarters and dues committee, led by Bill Bryan, helped fashion the association's new management setup. And the agricultural committee, chairmanned by Pat DuBois, has worked long and hard to initiate a workable national agricultural program. The chairmen and the members of these committees should have the everlasting gratitude of all of us.

We have accomplished things this year, yet there is much to be done. Independent banking, as we have known it, is being openly attacked in various quarters. Self-proclaimed prophets have emerged upon the banking scene. While they may not seem to advocate the same avenues of change, all actually are recommending the same thing, revolution in the great American banking system.

Most of these prophets do not come from the banking profession. They are self-styled experts of little knowledge and, in my opinion, are completely and utterly wrong. They do not understand the American banking system and they never will. They fail completely to recognize that we have the greatest banking system for the people in this world. There is no other banking system that can possibly compare favorably to it.

We have many rough problems ahead but if we stand and fight we can meet them successfully. As objectives for the future of our association, I challenge you to stand foursquare and fight for the following:

1. A national program for agriculture that will work for the whole Nation.
2. A strengthening of the National Holding Company Act and the introduction of proper State holding company laws.
3. A continuous review of tax revisions and reforms, fair to all concerned.
4. A strong demand for fiscal responsibility in our Federal Government.
5. Formation of more State independent banker associations.
6. A continuing study of bank management, internal controls, and general banking education for our membership and the public.
7. An all-out defense of the dual banking system.

The above-listed objectives are worthy of our association. Work has already been done on some of them but, again, there is much to accomplish. A real national agri-

cultural program is in itself a tremendous challenge, but we can do it.

With the exception of the farmers themselves, I submit to you that our independent bankers know more about agriculture than anybody else in this country. Five thousand of our banks deal with agriculture across their desks every day. Let us use our knowledge and our experience and our good offices to help solve this pressing national problem. For 25 years we have watched this rotten mess develop. It is in the national interest for us to play a key role in fashioning a real workable program.

Expansion of holding company influence in banking continued the past year, with a rash of holding company activities in a number of States. Independent bankers have had a fight in Oklahoma, a fight in Nebraska, and a fight right here in Louisiana which you will hear about later when Larry Merrigan, president of the Bank of New Orleans, addresses you.

State holding company laws are an absolute must in order to prevent concentration of money and credit by the holding company device. The Federal act is fairly effective in preventing interstate expansion of holding companies, but has not been an effective deterrent to holding company expansion within the States. The expansion of holding companies in banking is not in the national interest. Let's strengthen by amendment the National Holding Company Act and let's work for proper holding company laws in the respective States. We know what to do, let's do it.

We must constantly review the tax laws and push hard for revision and real tax reforms. The $90 billion tax-sheltered savings and loan baby has grown up. At last they will pay more Federal income taxes this year. But they still will not pay their fair share to carry the burden with the rest of us. It is high time to wean this $90 billion baby off the backs of the people and into the Revenue Department. And we should urge our Government in no uncertain terms to press for comprehensive tax reforms all up and down the line.

I know that I do not need to advocate a sound fiscal policy to you. Many of you in this audience have told me how strongly you oppose a $99 billion annual budget to run this country. I know that you are sick of the modern self-styled utopia—Washington, D.C.

Let's insist that our representatives in Washington are fiscally responsible or let's put those in that will be responsible.

I urge you to help form new State independent banker associations in all our member States. Branch banking laws differ from State to State. The independent bankers in their respective States, banded together in strong State associations, can greatly influence State branching legislation and regulation. We are having branch banking troubles in Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, Colorado and West Virginia.

Efforts to open up Colorado and West Virginia to branching were defeated this year because the independents organized to present their side of the story. Special commendation is due our West Virginia director, Essie Bailey of Princeton, and our Colorado director, John Ellis of Craig, for their leadership in mobilizing the independents in their States.

Ben Ryan of Illinois tells me that they will lick the branch banking boys again. And I understand that we are preparing at the grassroots in Florida and Minnesota. Our national association can help at all times but the bankers in their own backyards can really get the job done at the State level. Wherever we do not have State independent banker associations, I charge our respective directors with the responsibility of establishing such organizations. These State associations are imperative.

In these changing times, we must be sure that management of the independent banks gets better and better. We can do this by education and by the exchange of our views and suggestions through our association. Our seminar for senior bank officers at Harvard has served us well, but it is too limited in scope. I propose the establishment of three or four regional schools instead of the one in Cambridge. I believe such a plan would enhance the attendance and general interest among our bankers all over the country.

And last but not least of these objectives is a fierce all-out defense by every member of our association for the great dual banking system of America. It is an ironic tragedy to find the great American banking system, upon its 100th anniversary, under attack from various quarters. And the most vociferous and dangerous enemy of all is the present Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon.

Mr. Saxon, the personable young comptroller, has been in office less than 1½ years. In that short period of time he has tried to wreck the dual banking system. This young man, trained as a lawyer, is not a banker, has never been a banker, and I believe will never be a banker.

Ten days after he took office he started changing his entire veteran office staff and started out to uproot the whole national banking system. He inferred that he spoke for the national bankers of this country. I say that he does not speak for us but only for himself and his few chosen friends.

He handpicked a committee to give him some backing. The minority on the committee, in disagreement with certain proposals, were not even permitted to file a minority report.

Proclamations, regulations, and Saxon opinions on various matters flow from his office like the Mississippi River. He promptly ran into trouble with national bankers, the Federal Reserve Board, the FDIC, and the Department of Justice. When he ran into State laws, he advocated that the national banks be turned loose regardless of State laws. And he strongly urged the States to change their laws to suit him.

The present Comptroller seems dedicated to the proposition that our banking system must be remolded into what he believes it should be. Let's take a look at his record.

In Chicago on January 22 the Comptroller said, "Bank expansion may take place not only through internal growth, but also through the merger of existing institutions, in the formation of holding companies. Perhaps the most common criticism of our banking structure by foreign observers relates to the emphasis we place on the maintenance of unit banks. Those critics argue that bank expansion through new charters and new branches is often more costly than expansion through mergers or holding companies, and results in a waste of resources. These criticisms usually come from countries in which there is no tradition to maintain competition. Nevertheless, even within our own competitive traditions, there are many circumstances in which bank expansion through mergers or holding companies will be socially preferable to new charters or the establishment of de novo branches."

My question to the Comptroller is: Since when did we need foreign observers, from Europe or elsewhere, to tell us how to run our American banking system? The policy in America, which has been set forth again and again by laws passed by the Congress and by court decisions, is to maintain, as far as possible, our system of unit banking.

The Comptroller has been granting charters right and left. And by granting hundreds and hundreds of branches he has triggered off a competitive race between himself and State banking authorities. Recently, a witness appearing before a committee of the New York State Legislature in Albany had this comment, and I quote: "Our New York State Superintendent of Banks meets each month with the banking board to consider applications for charters and branches, while the Comptroller of the Currency convenes with himself 365 days a year to grant applications."

There has been trouble in North Carolina, and trouble in North Dakota, trouble in Missouri, and trouble all over the country. This trouble started about 10 days after James J. Saxon took office.

In Kennett, Mo., a city of 9,000 where two State-chartered banks were doing a fine job of serving the community, the comptroller granted the application for a new charter despite the fact that there are 22 banks within a range of 25 miles of the town. One of my good friends, Joe Welman of Kennett, had this to say. "I suggest the Congress might well look into the unreasonable power of the Comptroller of the Currency to charter national banks without appeal and, automatically without consultation and consent, provide insurance of deposits by the FDIC and membership in the Federal Reserve System. In my opinion, it would be much easier, cheaper, and less disturbing to the affected communities, and just about as sensible as the present methods used, to merely list national bank charters in the Sears, Roebuck catalog and order them by mail."

My guess is that the record of the comptroller since the Kennett case might even prompt Mr. Welman to amend his thinking to include the possibility of getting national bank charters from vending machines.

There is general agreement that the Saxon proposal for branching by national banks without regard to State law has a poor chance of being enacted by this or succeeding sessions of Congress. However, he is gaining many of his objectives by administrative decree. And, as the Comptroller of the Currency, he is the straw boss of 4,500 national banks. If he can accomplish his ends, he will completely wreck the dual banking system.

I know that you want gradual evolution, not revolution of our banking system. I say to you, let's really start to fight. Let's go to work and do the job that has to be done. There is only one question anymore and that question is, Which is more important to our country—the American dual banking system or the present Comptroller of the Currency? You know that answer and you know what to do. And may I suggest that you start to work the day you arrive home from this convention.

In conclusion, I urge the new officers and our directors to tauten ship. There are rough seas ahead but we will sail them. I urge you to conduct a strong membership drive. I urge a new militancy on all fronts for independent banking. I urge you, above all, to act and not react. We must strike hard for independent banking and for this great Republic.

We stand and we have always stood for the true principles that have made our country great. We know the people. We deal with them face to face every day. Our cause is just. The torch of liberty still burns high. Our people believe in it and love it.

I am confident that you will carry the banner of independence and freedom as did our forefathers. Let us stand together and rally the people. Let us fan the flame all over the land.

Let us say to these insufferable Washington bureaucrats: "You are our servants not our masters. You have been appointed and elected by the people for the good of all the people. As free Americans we deeply resent your constant meddling, your ceaseless directives and inane regulations, your chipping away of our cherished freedom and independence. We have had more than enough.

We intend to show you that the people still believe in independence as they did in 1776."

Let's join together in defense of our freedom. And you, the independent bankers of America, should and will lead the way. Let's strike and strike hard, again and again, for our independence and the freedom of all the people.

Thank you, and God willing, we shall succeed.

Prerequisites to Successful Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, last month A. J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, spoke at a conference on collective bargaining and arbitration at Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Tex.

I have read Mr. Hayes' speech, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of interest. At a time when collective bargaining, as a technique in labor-management relations, is under critical, careless attack, I think that the statements of Mr. Hayes present a viewpoint that should be very carefully considered. I think, too, Mr. Hayes' observation on proposals to place trade unions under antitrust statutes deserves very thoughtful consideration.

Mr. Hayes' speech follows:

PREREQUISITES TO SUCCESSFUL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Remarks by A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, at Texas Christian University, conference on collective bargaining and arbitration, Fort Worth, Tex., March 14, 1963)

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you and to discuss some of the issues and trends which seem to point to a crisis in collective bargaining in America today.

Apparently a great many people have been convinced, by some of the organizations of big business, by some of the pundits of the political podiums, and by many of the keepers of the press, that collective bargaining has failed in America, and that some alternative method of settling labor disputes is inevitable and desirable.

Perhaps a hint of what has gone wrong with collective bargaining—if anything actually has gone wrong, was contained in an article by A. J. Liebling which appeared in the New Yorker recently. With tongue-in-cheek, Mr. Liebling noted that under the rules by which newspapers report strikes, employers always offer and unions always demand. He pointed out that since no newspaper has ever written about an employer who demanded that the workers accept his terms, the public has been conditioned to believe that employers make nothing but benevolent offers, and unions make nothing but greedy demands.

In the somewhat murky atmosphere of this kind of reporting it is not surprising that so many people are convinced that a crisis truly exists in labor relations. The dock strike, the combined lockout and strike in the newspaper industry, and threatened breakdowns in railroad and defense occupations have not only solidified this crisis complex, but generated a new drive toward laws designed to dilute, and even destroy collective bargaining in America.

So I want to talk about collective bargaining, and the implications of the efforts to supplant it with other methods of settling labor disputes. Specifically I want to analyze the prerequisites to successful collective bargaining. And let me say at the outset that one of the most important prerequisites of all is a recognition, by employers, politicians, and the press that in a free society, with a free work force, there is really no acceptable alternative to collective bargaining.

If collective bargaining is breaking down today part of the reason is that certain influential employer organizations, newspapers, and politicians are determined to replace free collective bargaining with State compulsion. In effect they are creating a sickness in order that they may prescribe a cure.

Since the 88th Congress convened, a flood of antiunion bills have poured into the hoppers. For example, one bill, by Senator DIRKSEN, would establish compulsory arbitration in the maritime trades.

Another, by Senator CURTIS and Senator MUNDT, would bring unions under the antitrust laws, which means breaking them into small isolated locals completely incapable of bargaining effectively with the kind of huge nationwide corporations that dominate so many industries in our economy.

Still another, by Senator MCCLELLAN, would prohibit strikes in defense industries and substitute compulsory arbitration by a board appointed by the Secretary of Defense. The Senator would also bring transportation unions under the antitrust laws and bar them from striking, picketing, or acting in concert with other unions.

Senator GOLDWATER has recognized that some of the other solutions being offered, particularly compulsory arbitration, would inevitably lead to Government control of prices, profits, and the prerogatives of management. Therefore, his solution is more direct and one sided. Without touching the privileges, prerogatives, and powers of management the Goldwater bill would destroy the ability of unions to bargain by hedging the right to strike in a thicket of bureaucratic and time-consuming restrictions.

In the face of bills such as these, proposing such drastic changes in the structure of collective bargaining and trade unionism in the United States, one might assume that collective bargaining has failed completely, and that the need to find some alternative method of regulating relations between labor and management warranted the most extreme and severe countermeasures.

And yet, despite the profusely publicized labor disputes that have hit the headlines recently, the facts clearly show that collective bargaining has not failed, and that no public or private emergency demands that collective bargaining be scrapped in America. True, some recent strikes may have caused inconveniences and perhaps even some shortages. But inconveniences and shortages are not, in themselves, a national emergency.

A shortage of bananas, for example, or even the several weeks' absence of your favorite newspaper does not justify a panic-stricken rush to destroy the rights and values that differentiate a free country from a Communist one.

Far from being a failure, collective bargaining has been spectacularly successful in America. Over the years, and at a time when swift technological changes have generated great apprehension and unrest in the workplace, collective bargaining has provided labor and management with a beautifully balanced mechanism for achieving industrial stability.

In fact, despite all the highly sensationalized accounts of recent strikes the total impact of strikes on the total economy is so infinitesimal as to make the current hysteria about a crisis in labor relations look ludicrous.

Not only are the total man days lost as a result of strikes in an average year, less than two-tenths of 1 percent of all the time that is worked, but the trend through the years has been steadily down. Last year, for example, fewer workers were involved in strikes than at any time since the end of World War II.

Invariably I have noticed that those who shout the loudest about the man-days and production lost because of strikes are the least concerned about the man-days and production that are lost because of unemployment or job injuries. And yet strikes cause only about one-fourth as much production loss as do job accidents, and only about one-sixty-fourth as much wage loss as unemployment. In fact, more time was lost last year due to unemployment than was caused by all the strikes that have taken place in America in the past 35 years, since 1927.

Thus collective bargaining is working, and working better every year. The so-called crisis in labor relations is a phony crisis.

Millions of workers and tens of thousands of employers are producing peacefully under the terms of agreements amicably achieved through collective bargaining.

Thus, I repeat, the crisis is phony. However, the danger that we may recklessly destroy collective bargaining in America is very real indeed. Against a background of public hysteria shortsighted men have tried to set the stage for the destruction of the rights and freedoms of every member of every union in our country.

They are shortsighted because they have not considered the price they will pay to destroy the rights of the working people. That price is, of course, the eventual but inevitable loss of their own rights. It is axiomatic that what Congress can do to organized labor this year, another Congress can (and will have precedent to) do to management in another year.

So let me suggest that as a people we must decide what it is we seek in our labor-management relations. If our total goal is simply industrial peace at any price, the way to achieve it has been blueprinted by every totalitarian dictatorship in history. Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy had industrial peace in the days of Hitler and Mussolini. The Soviet Union, Franco's Spain, and Castro's Cuba all have industrial peace right now. So industrial peace as such, is not hard to come by. It can be achieved by any society that is willing to sacrifice the freedom of the work force.

But certainly this is not a legitimate goal for America. For it is obviously not possible to sacrifice the freedoms of the work force without compromising those of business, managerial, and professional classes. And our goal is not to achieve an industrial peace based on submission and subjugation but to provide human beings with an effective voice in their own economic destiny.

And this goal has never been more important than it is today. Due to new developments in technology the scales of economic power are being dangerously tipped in favor of huge concentrations of impersonal corporate wealth. So the question is not whether collective bargaining is perfect, but whether, in a free society, any of the other methods being suggested would result in more industrial peace and greater industrial justice.

These are the tests, the true tests, against which we must measure the proposals that are being made in such profusion today.

Probably the most superficially appealing, at least to those who have never worked in

a factory, is the proposal that unions be brought under the antitrust laws. On the surface it sounds so reasonable and fair to say that since corporations are covered by the antitrust laws unions should also be.

But the absurdity, or downright intellectual dishonesty, of those who profess to see no difference between the associations of working men and the predatory combinations of big business, can be easily demonstrated by a few historic and economic facts.

1. What a worker has to sell is not property but a part of himself. Property can be withheld from the market, without loss of value, when the price is not satisfactory. But labor is highly perishable. Any attempt to withhold it from the market when the price (that is, the wage) is too low results in an immediate and permanent loss to the worker.

2. Commodities can easily be transferred from an unfavorable to a favorable market. Labor, on the other hand, is relatively immobile, being rooted in a particular locality not only by such ties as family, friendship, church affiliation and familiarity of surroundings, but by lack of knowledge of employment opportunities elsewhere.

3. Buyers of commodities are vastly more varied and numerous than are employers of labor. In fact, in recent years a trend of corporate mergers and absorptions has concentrated greater and greater control of production and jobs into fewer and fewer hands. At the present time, for example, more than 38 percent of America's total productive capacity is accounted for by its 200 largest corporations.

4. Owners of commodities, corporate and otherwise, have far greater financial resources in cash, credit, property and inventory than do workers. Not only do they have greater resources, but while employers have piously preached individualism, they have customarily practiced combination. As Adam Smith pointed out in his bible of laissez-faire, "The Wealth of Nations," about 200 years ago, "Masters are always and everywhere in a tacit but constant and uniform combination not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate."

5. On a commercial market it is the seller of a property that sets its price. But in the labor market it is not the seller—that is the worker—but the buyer—that is the employer—who establishes the amount to be paid for labor. This is because even in times of prosperity the need, and competition, for jobs is greater than the need, and competition for workers.

For reasons such as these, workers, even the strongest unions, have never been able to create a monopoly of labor which is anything like the monopoly of management over goods and markets. And today, with technological unemployment rising rapidly, the critical danger to our economy comes not from the efforts of unions to protect workers but from the cutthroat conditions which are generated when desperate men compete for jobs.

In view of these considerations it is clear that those who prescribe antitrust laws for labor, either have no conception of what they propose, or no conscience for the consequences. Despite the hopes of the kind of reactionaries in the business world who view right-to-work laws as a contribution to industrial relations, legislation of the antitrust stripe cannot be fairly considered a suitable or desirable alternative to collective bargaining.

The second great cureall being offered to the country today is, of course, compulsory arbitration. It is said that we must adopt compulsory arbitration, at least in transportation and defense industries, because we cannot risk strikes or lockouts in occupations that connect so closely with the national health, safety, and welfare.

But before we get carried away with the idea that compulsory arbitration is a magic remedy, let us at least compare it with collective bargaining, to see which is most likely to create conditons leading to true industrial stability.

In free collective bargaining, where the ultimate right to strike exists, both parties have a reason to reach agreement. For neither normally wants a strike. A strike means lost, or at least delayed, profits for the employer. And it obviously means lost wages for the worker. This possibility of mutual loss serves as a powerful incentive for discussion, persuasion, facts, reasoning, and compromise. It means that no union will refuse to comprise, and risk a strike, over any but the most important issues which the membership will fully support.

The possibility of a work stoppage provides both parties with a compelling motive to reach an agreement that is not only mutually satisfactory but which forms the foundation for a harmonious relationship throughout the life of the contract.

This is what collective bargaining will do. And, as I have indicated, that is what it does do in the overwhelming number of negotiations that take place in America each year. In our union we have studied the records and we have found that our objective of bargaining for settlements, not strikes, is achieved in almost 98 percent of our negotiations every year.

By way of contrast, this process of the parties actively seeking a mutually satisfactory agreement is completely negated by compulsory arbitration. When the right to strike disappears, and the parties have no reason to reach agreement, the chances are they will not. They won't because each side will start from an extreme position (to impress the eventual arbitrator) and will refuse to compromise (believing that the more they claim the more the arbitrator may give them).

Certainly compulsory arbitration will never lead to the kind of mutually satisfactory agreements that are normally achieved through collective bargaining. The chances are that neither party will be satisfied, that production will suffer, and that, as time goes on, the settlements will become increasingly political.

If nothing else the experience of other countries should warn those who think compulsory arbitration would be a labor relations cureall. An arbitration is a quasi-judicial proceeding. As such it replaces negotiators with lawyers, issues with technicalities, and substance with form.

In Australia disputes between employers and employees have been dragged through one proceeding after another for as long as 5 years. By the time an award is handed down the issues often no longer matter. The result is not industrial stability, but a work force that takes its frustration out in slowdowns, sitdowns, wildcats, and other disruptive displays of industrial antagonism.

A study made a few years ago showed that Australia had as many strikes, despite compulsory arbitration, as other countries in the British Commonwealth where disputes were settled by collective bargaining.

In at least one country, the Philippine Republic, a compulsory arbitration law was repealed when experience proved that it provided neither better industrial relations, nor fewer strikes, than did free collective bargaining.

This is not to say that there is no place for arbitration in labor-management relations. As a union we agree to arbitration of disputes arising under the contract in about 95 percent of our negotiations. And every year we are involved in thousands of arbitration hearings at all levels of our organization.

But there is a vast difference between submitting an existing contract to a third party for a ruling on its meaning, and permitting a third party to write the contract itself.

The facts show very plainly, that neither compulsory arbitration nor application of the antitrust laws to unions will lead to greater industrial stability than collective bargaining carried on in an atmosphere of mutual respect and good will between labor and management.

And this of course, is what we are missing in the relationships between unions and management in the United States today.

Though the workers of America approve and support the free enterprise system, the organizational spokesmen for management do not in turn accept the fact that unions play a needed and beneficial role in a free enterprise economy. Thus, instead of accepting the union as a partner in production many employers tend to look at it as the enemy.

In this atmosphere it is miraculous that collective bargaining has been as successful as the figures on strikes, settlements, and days lost have shown it to be.

Even though collective bargaining has been a long-term success in America, there is undeniably some public sentiment to prohibit strikes which actually jeopardize the national welfare. Of course, there is some question of definition here.

When is a strike really jeopardizing the national welfare? And when is it merely embarrassing whichever administration happens to be in power?

If it is necessary to enact a Federal law to deal with strikes in industries directly affecting the public health, welfare, and safety, I suggest that the principles on which our country is based demand that it be a fair law, and not one which places all the penalties on one side regardless of which party is guilty of a breakdown in negotiations.

This, of course, is exactly what the present Taft-Hartley Act does.

And the inequities of the injunction procedure under Taft-Hartley were never more dramatically illustrated than they were in the recent negotiations in the aerospace industry.

In the two negotiations that reached an impasse, the union in both cases accepted the overall recommendations made by impartial Government panels, even though they fell short of goals previously selected by the membership.

It is interesting to note that this was one of the very few times in which a significant number of daily newspapers throughout the United States editorially condemned management's attitude and blamed the companies instead of the unions for bringing about the threat of a work stoppage.

And yet, when the chips were down, and the Government moved to act to avert a shutdown, the Taft-Hartley Act provided only one remedy and that was to enjoin the union even though most objective observers believed that it was the company that precipitated the breakdown in defense production.

The lesson, I think, is clear. If we want to minimize the risk of work stoppages in defense industries we ought to set up a procedure under which penalties are levied not against labor alone but against the party which is shown by the evidence to be guilty of a refusal to bargain in good faith or accept the recommendations of impartial panels.

I suggest, for example, that if courts could seize a factory, and impound the profits as well as enjoin strikes and force workers to accept conditions they would otherwise reject, very few disputes would ever reach a stage calling for public intervention.

But more than laws, and penalties, and continued Government participation in labor-management relations we need to bring the institutional relationships between business organizations and unions into harmony with the personal relationships that exist between businessmen and union representatives.

At the institutional level, the organizations of business, the NAM, the U.S. Cham-

ber of Commerce, the National Right-to-Work Committee and the like, are waging war, class warfare, against the American labor movement.

Make no mistake about it, the existence and purpose of such a center as the NAM's so-called center for the study of union monopoly power is well known to the union members of America. This and other weapons of the class war, spewing out their poison, can only obscure the basic compatibilities of labor and management within the framework of the free enterprise system.

It is ironic that these institutional and organizational hatreds (which, incidently, are becoming stronger every day) do not reflect the feelings which most employers have for the particular union with which they deal, or the particular union representatives with whom they have contact.

Normally, the personal relationships between labor and management are characterized by mutual respect, trust and appreciation.

Most business executives are wise enough to know that unions perform an essential and valuable service by handling day-to-day grievances, by providing workers with a constructive form of protest and expression, and by insuring that human values are not lost in the punchcard jungle of personnel administration.

But they must also recognize that there are no alternatives to collective bargaining consistent with the traditions that have grown out of our basic documents of Government the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And the organizations that speak for them must stop chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of compulsory arbitration or the destruction of unions through antitrust laws.

At a time when America seeks to provide the world with a suitable alternative to communism, it is dangerous for labor and management to engage in a class struggle which has no relevance or place in America.

So rather than continue to seek the destruction of unions and collective bargaining, I would seriously urge the leaders of American industry to bring this pointless and potentially dangerous class struggle to an end.

Let them recognize the obvious: that there is really no alternative to collective bargaining and let us replace class warfare with a determination to make collective bargaining work. In the new climate which results a climate which reflects institutional as well as personal respect, trust and mutual appreciation, America will achieve far more than a successful system of collective bargaining. It will solidify the foundations of the good and just social order which labor and management are both seeking in America.

Professor Rogow Backs Proposal for Use of Ombudsman in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have proposed that serious study be given to the possibility of adapting the Scandinavian ombudsman for use in this country. In remarks to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084, I suggested that the American ombudsman should be a servant of Congress, ready to handle professionally constituents' problems referred to him by Congressmen. Prof. Arnold A. Rogow, of Stanford University, has been kind enough to consider the proposal and has given it his support.

To further acquaint the House with the opinions of the noted political scientists who have considered the possible use of the ombudsman, I call the Members' attention to Professor Rogow's comments below:

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford, Calif., March 22, 1963.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for sending me the material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with the American version of the Scandinavian Ombudsman. I have read this material carefully and I can find nothing at all wrong with the proposal that an American equivalent of the Ombudsman be created to serve Congressmen. I am well aware that much of the time of Congressmen is given over to a variety of "errands" in behalf of constituents, time that might better be devoted to larger issues involving the Nation and the world community. As for myself I am glad to support any proposal that would increase the time and energy Congressmen can give to policy questions. I, therefore, am glad to give you my vote which you can use in any fashion you deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD A. ROGOW.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

A Message for Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Annual Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for 1962 devoted only a paragraph or two to the operation of the Kerr-Mills Act passed by Congress in the Eisenhower administration to help our senior citizens who are in need of medical care and who are unable for financial reasons to provide such care. It is not a little astonishing that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has failed to give this program the attention it merits so that its benefits might be brought to the atttention of every senior citizen over 65 throughout the land. This statement is an endeavor in the shortest compass and in the simplest way to tell our senior citizens about medical care for the aged in the State of Illinois.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

If you are over age 65 and if your yearly income as an individual is not over $1,800, or in the case of a married couple not over $2,400, and if the value of the property of any kind, excluding your home, is not over $2,400 and if you need major medical care, you are eligible for such care under Illinois law.

HOW IT CAME ABOUT

In 1960 Congress passed what is known as the Kerr-Mills Act, named after Senator KERR of Oklahoma and Congressman MILLS of Arkansas. This act provided that if a State legislature would pass a law to provide the benefits of Kerr-Mills for the people of the State, those benefits would become available. The Illinois Legislature did pass such a law in July 1961, and hence Illinois senior citizens are entitled to the benefits of the Kerr-Mills Act. These benefits became available to Illinois residents on August 1, 1961.

BENEFITS AVAILABLE

The benefits made available by this action include first, unlimited hospital care; second, physician care in the hospital and for 30 days after leaving the hospital, the decision with respect to physicians care in Cook County to be made by the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

WHERE TO APPLY FOR BENEFITS

Any citizen can go to the Illinois Public Aid Commission office in the county where he resides, or he can write to the Illinois Public Aid Commission, Room 2000, 160 North LaSalle Street, Chicago 1, Ill., and ask for information relating to benefits under this program.

THE RECORD IN ILLINOIS UP TO JANUARY 1, 1963

The State of Illinois began operations under the Kerr-Mills Act on August 1, 1961, and this record runs to January 1, 1963. More current figures will show that the record is even more impressive than this. However, as of January 1, 1963, first, the number of applications received was 10,721; second, applications disposed, 9,670; third, applications approved for payment, 5,907; fourth, applications denied or withdrawn, 3,763; fifth, applications pending for further disposition on January 1, 1962, 1,051; sixth, total amount paid, $2,429,980; and seventh, average amount paid per case, $626.

MAIN REASONS FOR REJECTION OF APPLICATION

First, the medical costs involved were estimated at less than 10 percent of income; second, relatives were able to meet these costs; third, the income or assets of the applicant exceeded the limits set out in the Illinois law; fourth, refusal to comply with Illinois Public Aid Commission policies; fifth, the applicant applied for services which were not offered; sixth, applicant died; seventh, applicant had not yet reached age 65; eighth, applicant was eligible for assistance under some other State program; ninth, the applicant's medical needs were met by insurance; tenth, applicant's needs were met in other ways.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Illinois program under the Kerr-Mills Act does provide for medical care for our senior citizens who need such care and is financed by the Federal Government and the States about half and half and is administered at the State level. Any State can avail itself of these services by having its State legislature enact the appropriate legislation. It is intended for you, the senior citizens of the country, who need medical care and who can qualify in respect of age and need. One wonders why the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington has not made a greater effort to bring all this to the attention of our citizenry.

Dr. Stafford L. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost pleasure that, as a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of California, I welcome to Washington a very prominent former member of the University of California's faculty at Los Angeles, Dr. Stafford L. Warren. I use the term "former" knowing full well the loss this signifies to our great university in Los Angeles. Dr. Warren resigned from his position as vice chancellor of health sciences at UCLA to accept an appointment in Washington, D.C., as special assistant to President Kennedy to aid in the development and coordination of various programs in the field of mental retardation.

Since I served on the city council in Los Angeles I am well aware of the many contributions Dr. Warren has made toward the curtailment of the smog problem, as he was instrumental in having measures enacted into local law. Through his voluntary work, the citizens of Los Angeles are rewarded by the fact that over 5,000 tons of pollutants are banned from contaminating the atmosphere of Los Angeles County every single day. In accepting the new Washington assignment, Dr. Warren also resigned from the air pollution control District's scientific advisory committee, where he will be sorely missed. This committee was largely responsible for the 64 rules and regulations concerning the control of the stationary sources of smog.

Dr. Warren also resigned as a member of the Los Angeles County Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection Committee.

In recognition of his many achievements, Dr. Warren was presented with a scroll at a local civic program. The scroll states in part, "deep appreciation for outstanding contributions to his community in the long struggle for cleaner air." The scroll also cited his long record of accomplishments since he received his doctorate in medicine at the University of California in 1922; these included his outstanding work as medical chief of the Manhattan A-bomb project and chairman for radiological safety in the Bikini nuclear tests.

"The World Around Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to "The World Around Me," a new project in international journalism.

"The World Around Me" is designed to bring human interest stories of daily life in other countries to the attention of citizens of this country.

The average American citizen knows practically nothing of the daily life of

citizens of foreign countries. The U.S. papers usually contain little more than the international news stories covering politics, disasters, and personal scandals. "The World Around Me" will attempt to fill this international news gap with informative, interesting, and exciting stories of daily life and customs in foreign lands as written by citizens of the countries represented.

The originator and coordinator of "The World Around Me" is Betty Campbell of Washington, D.C. She has located the local correspondents throughout the world who will contribute to this weekly, syndicated newspaper column. Contributions are already being received. I congratulate Mrs. Campbell on her originality to conceive this idea and her determination to bring it to fruition. "The World Around Me" should provide a welcome and lively supplement to the usual diet of news and comment related solely to the major daily events in other countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several advance columns of "The World Around Me" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL FROM "A" TO "Z"

(By Antoinette Sher-Simon)

"Rachel, I want to take out 'Clochemerle' please."

I stared. Rachel did not bat an eyelid.

"I don't think that will interest you. I've something much better for you," she said.

"It's not for me. It's for my big sister. She saw the film. Oh, and for my mother * * * just a second, I have to look at my list. Oh, yes, 'Cheaper by the Dozen.' My father wants something like 'Science and Life.' Then for my little brother and my grandpa * * *."

"Are you going to carry all those?"

"Yes, the others can't come today, and I've already finished my homework. I just want to look at Dvar Liledim and choose a book for myself to read at home. What do you think I should take out this week?"

I gazed in wonder at this bookworm. He was a boy of about 12, alert and bright. He seemed to be perfectly at ease. Standing at the head of a queue of people who had come to exchange library books, he took his time, discussing literature with Rachel, the director of the public library of Kiryat Hayovel, a suburb of Jerusalem.

JOINT PROJECT

This library was opened on January 12, 1958 under the auspices of Hadassah, UNESCO, the National and Hebrew University Library, the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Jewish agency and the Jerusalem municipality. But it is no ordinary library. It is part and parcel of the Hadassah Community Health Center in Kiryat Hayovel. The community health center comprises a complex of buildings in no way "institutional" in atmosphere. On the contrary there is a homelike feeling. Here health services are maintained by a team of a doctors and nurses, as in all the health fund clinics. But the hall is also put to other uses such as for weddings and even serves as a synagogue.

The orginality of the library lies in the fact that doctors and librarians work together. Every borrower has a medical card at the clinic. As soon as a child can distinguish "alef" from "bet," he makes use of the library, and has his individual reading card on which is to be noted all his subsequent reading habits. Thus, the doctor can follow a child's physical and intellectual development at leisure. At the same time the librarian is kept informed of each of her reader's state of health. On the advice of a doctor, she refrains from giving a reader with heart disease books that are too exciting and cause too much tension, or to a depressed individual a book which could add to his melancholy. If a borrower is confined to bed for a certain length of time, a social worker sees to it that he has ample reading material. The social worker selects books in accordance with the doctor's advice and after consultation with the library's director. Of course, the director and her assistants have to be highly qualified and are trained at the school for librarians at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

LARGE SELECTION

Borrowers have a selection of 12,000 books in 15 languages to choose from. More than 2,000 books are constantly in circulation. Carefully arranged on open shelves there are books to satisfy all tastes: novels, books on history, geography, education, travel, religious and philosophical works, law and medicine. Browsing at random you will find "The Adventures of Babar, the Elephant," side by side with the complete works of Shakespeare, Victor Hugo, Dumas, Dickens, the Bible with commentary, "Bambi," books by Malraux, Duhamel, Somerset Maugham, Saroyan, Wells, Werfel and literary works in Russian, Hungarian and German. The famous albums published by UNESCO are there, revealing to astonished and delighted eyes the unknown wonders of the world.

In the spacious reading room are journals and magazines in Hebrew, French and English which can be read on the spot. Many children come there to make use of books which they need for their schoolwork. They find it easier to do their homework in the quiet atmosphere of the library than at home in a poorly heated room, perhaps with relations chattering in loud voices, or younger children romping around.

So that children should not have to wait too long before they can change their books, certain days are set aside for them (according to their age or class at school) and other days for adults.

But the activities of the library are not only literary. In a hall annexed to the library proper—a hall whose walls are of a turquoise blue and windows curtained in lemon-yellow—artistic performances take place: concerts, lectures, film shows and plays. With the help of the Bezalel National Museum, exhibitions are organized. There might be, for example, engravings from the 15th and 16th centuries, an art which is unknown to most of the children. Exhibited for a month it would be the subject of a competition, the children having to describe these works from memory, and explaining them in accordance with the knowledge they had been previously given.

READERS' TASTES

Youngsters themselves organize shows at the community center for schoolchildren of their own age. There is a puppet theater "Joeli" directed by a girl of 11, which has already given performances of "Little Red Riding Hood" and "The Sabbath Dress," all the puppets having been created by her.

An interesting study has been carried out by the school for librarians of the Hebrew University to examine readers' tastes and find out what influences their choice. It seems that women are the keenest readers, at least if numbers are a reflection of keenness, but very often they are only exchanging books for their husbands. Of course the number of students is four or five times greater than that of laborers, yet many of the latter come to the library to find technical books which will help them develop their ability. The survey demonstrated that the most voracious readers were people between the ages of 15 and 16. This is explained by the fact that at 18 young people go into the army. The reading curve rises again for 25-year-olds, but one surprising feature revealed by the study was the large number of old people who steadily frequent the library. Many of these are of middle-class European origin, and have acquired a taste for reading early in life.

If Hebrew books are more in demand by younger readers, those in foreign languages are the favorites of riper ages of Israelis who came here when still young. The latter love to read in their mother tongue or perfect themselves in a foreign language. After Hebrew, English books are the favorite, then French followed by German.

One can only hope to see a similar institution in other quarters of Jerusalem, equally successful.

MALAYA-SINGAPORE-BORNEO—CHINESE SCROLLS

(By Lee Siow Mong)

One should avoid looking at paintings when the weather is overcast and dark, when there is a strong wind whirling about, in a room which is not properly lighted, at night, or under artificial lighting. Each painting should be hung up for appreciation for only 3 to 5 days at a time, then dusted front and back and kept in a wooden box above floor level.

That, in a nutshell, is the rule laid down many hundreds of years ago by connoisseurs and collectors, and accounts for the way the Chinese scroll has developed to its present form through the centuries. It is only in its present form that a Chinese painting can be handled in that way to the delight of its owner. Apart from these physical conditions, one must also remain completely calm and gentle when looking at a painting, as if one is looking at a beautiful lady. It therefore follows that one must not touch the painting because the finger might be dirty or constant touching might produce stains.

Painting is, of course, older than the scroll itself. The walls of temples, halls and palaces were decorated with frescoes thousands of years ago, long before the invention of silk or paper. Later, these immovable paintings on walls gave way to movable paintings, the "shou-chuan" or hand scroll which is laid on the floor or table and unrolled from right to left for perusal or contemplation. Judging by the history of the development of the book, the development of the hand scroll must have been very early. It would be rash to mention a definite date, but I think it would be safe to say some 2,000 years.

The hand scroll developed into the hanging scroll, and from all historical accounts it is safe to say that the process of making the hanging scroll was perfected by the A.D. 9th and 10th centuries.

DIFFERENCES

The main difference between the hand scroll and the hanging scroll is in the method of handling. The principle of both, however, is the same in that both are in a form that can be easily put away and they occupy very little space. A framed painting is clumsy and cannot be easily put away or carried about. The hand scroll can be any length varying from a few feet to 50 or more feet.

A hanging scroll very rarely exceeds 8 to 10 feet because if it were too long it would be impossible to find a wall high enough to hang it on. The hand scroll is not meant to be hung. It is unrolled from right to left, and as it unrolls the eye follows the landscape or picture that is revealed. While one end is being unrolled, the other end is being rolled so that at any one time not more than 1 or 2 feet of the picture is visible.

Because of this mode of handling, the composition of a painting on a hand scroll is different from that on a hanging scroll. This must be so because the hanging scroll is exposed as a whole at any one time and the composition of the painting must therefore have a fixed point to attract the beholder. It is important to note here that Chinese perspective is different from the West.

What is the distant point in a landscape in Western perspective, the Chinese painter puts at the top of his, so that a Chinese landscape is what one would see if one were flying in an airplane or sitting on the top of a hill. That Chinese landscape perspective has taken the form it did is not entirely without reason. Landscape painting is the highest form of pictorial art and the landscapist contemplates, high up in a lofty tower or on a hill, the surrounding country, absorbs the atmosphere, and returns to his studio to paint. If sufficent inspiration has not been obtained in one contemplation, he would return for a second or third time or until such time as he felt inspired enough to wield his brush.

However, whether it is a hand scroll or a hanging scroll, the painting is mounted on paper with a border, sometimes of paper and sometimes of silk, depending on the taste of the painter or the collector. The border gives the painting an appearance of completeness. Invariably, when a painting is mounted into a hand scroll, there will be left long empty spaces at the beginning and at the end. This is to enable connoisseurs, critics and other scholars to write their comments on the painting. These writings add value to the scroll and in some cases could be more valuable than the painting itself.

INSCRIPTIONS

Before the Yuan dynasty, 13th- and 14th-century inscriptions on paintings were few. Only the artist's name is tucked away in the lower left-hand corner of the painting and if there were inscriptions they were usually quite insignificant and hidden away in some obscure part of the painting in order not to injure it. Then there developed a scholar-painter class who decided that in every picture there must be a proper place for a dedicatory inscription, and from then on calligraphy and painting were made together.

The calligraphy gracefully completes a painting. The calligraphy and the painting should explain each other mutually. There is poetry in a painting, and painting in poetry. Sometimes, instead of a dedicatory inscription, a title is written and the rule has been to use an old title rather than to compose a new one. If no suitable old titles can be found it is better to go without one. Until the birth of this scholar-painter class, all artists were probably classified as artisans.

Together with the dedicatory inscription or the title will be found the artist's name and his seal to which collectors and connoisseurs attach great importance. Apart from the fact that seals are works of art, they provide a means of identification. Sometimes, where a painting has passed through the hands of collectors, the collectors' seals can be found, invariably at the lower right-hand corner of the painting, and these too provide a means of identification.

TYPICAL PRODUCT

The scholar-painter class which was born during the Northern Sung dynasty (A.D. 10th and 11th century) is a typical Chinese cultural product who influenced the art of painting and calligraphy until the last dynasty when Western influence began to exert itself in China. It also marked the beginning of antiquarian studies which developed into modern archaeology.

The scholar-painter was an accomplished amateur or dilettante. He was a real master of ink painting as well as calligraphy, poetry, and prose. He shunned the name or position of a professional. Artistic occupations to him were something to be pursued during his leisure hours and by which he could express his most intimate feelings or experiences of nature. Masses of writing on art were written by this group of men who had become widely known and idolized by the Chinese people. Few people in Chinese history have reached a place closer to the hearts of the cultured than these men.

A great number of them were statesmen or high officials, but it is their reputation as scholar, painter, calligrapher, or poet, that has earned them this respected position rather than their officialdom. For a long time paintings and calligraphy were given away freely to friends and others who understood or appreciated them.

No monetary value was attached to any, and indeed, to ask the value or price of a painting would be an act of vulgarity, and a scholar-painter would be greatly insulted if he were asked to do a painting for a sum of money. Indeed, when one was sent silk and money with a request for a painting in return, the answer was, "I never in my life paint for the vulgar and ostentatious."

Those were the days when every painting or writing was a natural and spontaneous expression of one's thoughts or feelings and not something produced for the sake of money. This is one of the reasons why the ancient scrolls are highly prized.

(Reprinted from Pelita, vol. 1, No. 2, published by Esso Standard Eastern, Inc., Malaya-Singapore-Borneo.)

INDIA: ELECTIONS IN INDIA

(By Sarana)

On a Saturday afternoon, my bus was forced to move slowly near Flora Fountain where it ran into a huge procession of campaigners. "Vote for" the leader shouted, "Congress" his followers rhymed. The crowd grew denser as the bus proceeded but also a little more orderly. The police officer on duty directed the bus to turn right and take a side lane; and I lost sight of the crowd.

This is one of the scenes in Bombay early this year. Between February 16 and 25, people of India reaffirmed their faith in their sovereignty by casting their vote to choose their masters. The total electorate was 126 million. The ballot papers printed numbered 420 million and paper consumed was 700 tons. There were 240,000 polling stations throughout the country and 1,680,000 persons were employed in the election work. About 3,525 seats were contested in the country. By any proportions, it was a gigantic effort.

These elections were conducted by the election commission, a body sanctioned by the Constitution. It was an independent body uncontrolled by any organs of the state. Among its functions were framing of rules and regulations, allocations of symbols, appointment of personnel to conduct elections, preparation of electoral rolls, registration of candidates wishing to contest elections, announcing the results and the settlement of disputes arising out of the elections.

ELECTORATE

The electorate consisted of all citizens over 21 years of age and of sound mind. A citizen to enroll as a voter should ordinarily be a resident in a constituency for at least 180 days during the qualifying period. He was disqualified by any law relating to corrupt and illegal practices in election. He could be a voter only in one constituency and was not permitted to register in the same constituency more than once. The candidates contesting the elections were all above 25 years of age. These practices were common to the Lok Sabha (lower house of the Parliament) and the state assemblies.

METHOD OF VOTING

All elections, save in Hiamchal Pradesh and in the Kangra district of Punjab, were held in a week. To insure smooth voting, a polling booth was opened for every 900 persons and care was taken to spread them in such a way that ordinarily a person need not have to travel more than a mile to vote.

The returning officers were in charge of the elections. Their contingent was strong and every Lok Sabha seat (two to three assembly seats) had a returning officer. At each polling booth, there was a presiding officer. He had assistants to distribute ballot papers, to check identity of the voter and to make a mark on the finger of the voter by an indelible ink to prevent the voter from voting twice. In addition to these electoral officers, there were polling agents, the representatives of the candidates, at each booth. They remained there until the ballot boxes were sealed and were taken to the place of counting.

BALLOT PAPERS

Indian electorate, largely, was illiterate. Symbols and colors were employed to enable the voter to distinguish the candidates and the bodies. Lok Sabha ballot papers were white, while the assembly ballot papers were pink. Each of them contained the names of candidates and their symbols. The voter was required to put a cross in front of the candidate he supported. To provide uniformity in crossing, the voter was provided with an inked stamp.

SYMBOLS

Each of the candidates had a symbol. This was allotted to him by the election Commission. If the candidate was a member of a party, he used its symbol. The parties were allotted symbols on the basis of their performance in the earlier election. If they had then secured 4 percent of the votes cast for the Lok Sabha, they were recognized as an All India Party. Similarly, the performance of the parties at various legislatures was also evaluated before recognition was accorded to them in a state. Thus a party was given a symbol over an area. Besides, in each state there was a list of free symbols. The following table shows the parties, their symbols with areas:

Name of party	Symbol	Area
Congress	2 bullocks with yoke on	All States and Union Territproes.
Praja Socialist	Hut	All except Punjab, Rajasthan, and Tripura.
Communist	Ears of corn and sickle	All except Madhya Pradesh, Mysore, and Hemachal Pradesh.
Jana Sangh	Lamp	Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Delhi.
Socialist	Tree	Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Madras, Uttar Pradesh, and Himachal Pradesh.
Hindu Mahasabha	Horse and rider	Madha Pradesh, West Bengal, and Delhi.
RamaRajya Parishad	Rising sun	Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.
Republican	Elephant	Maharashtra and Punjab.
Jharkhand	Cock	Bihar.
Muslim League	Ladder	Kerala.
Dravida Munnetra Kashakgam	Rising sun	Madras.
Peasant and Workers'	Cart	Maharashtra.
Guantantra Parishad	Bow and arrow	Orissa.
Akali Dal	Hand	Punjab.
Forward Bloc	Lion	West Bengal.

The first eight of the above parties were included in the list of free symbols in some states as well. But their allotment was subject to three restrictions. First, the candidate of a party had preferential claim over others to a symbol; secondly, the symbol used by a condidate to the Parliament could not be used by any candidate to the assembly unless he, too, was a member of the same party; thirdly, when there was a claim of two or more candidates for a symbol, it was allotted by drawing lots.

MARKING SYSTEM

The "marking" system introduced in the last elections permitted the use of one ballot box for a booth, instead of one for a candidate. Each ballot paper had on it the names and opposite the facsimiles of the symbols of all the contestants. The ballot box was placed before the presiding officer within the view of the polling agents and other officers on duty.

CASTING A VOTE

A voter entered the booth, where he was given the assembly ballot paper (pink). He then entered the polling compartment to mark his preference. Each of these polling compartments were provided with inked stamps with which he secretly made an impression on or near the symbol of the candidate of his choice. The voter then folded the ballot paper so as to conceal his vote before coming out of the polling compartment. In the presence of all officers and polling agents he inserted the folded ballot in the box. He had cast his vote. The voter was then given the white ballot paper. He repeated the earlier performance.

POSTAL BALLOT

This was supplemented by the postal ballot to enable people who were unable to vote personally. Broadly, there were five categories of voters in this group. First, there were the members of the armed forces and persons working in Indian missions abroad. Secondy, there were special voters like the President, Speaker, and the Cabinet members and their wives, who formed the third category. Fourthly, the personnel involved in the election work were permitted to vote by post. Finally, the electors held in preventive detention, if any, could cast their vote by post. Persons entitled to vote by post were not permitted to vote in person.

For the third time in succession the Indian people voted without violence. The peaceful elections showed that they preferred to count hands instead of heads. The 1962 results showed 45 percent of the votes being cast for the Congress Party, with the Communist Party next with only 9.96 percent of the votes. The largest democracy in the world, once again, proved that freedom and prosperity go together. I concluded that democracy has come to stay in India and she can, both by precept and practice, persuade others to desist from the temptations of quick progress through autocratic rule. "Here is a society," I murmured to myself as I boarded the plane, "where everyone is somebody, and nobody is anybody."

A New Approach to the Juvenile Traffic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the outstanding work done by our esteemed district judge of the First Judicial District of Montana, the Honorable Lester H. Loble, in the field of solving juvenile problems arriving in the delinquency of juveniles. The startling reduction in juvenile crime in that judicial district wherein Judge Loble has jurisdiction is 49 percent, as compared with periods previous to his assuming that high office. Judge Loble credits the reduction to his policy of "open trials and publication of the names of juvenile hoodlums and their parents." Available on request is indisputable verification by the court records, reviewed by a certified public accountant and by probation officers, county attorneys, sheriffs and chiefs of police. So that all my colleagues can share the review that has been made of Judge Loble's record, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article from the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin of January 1963.

The article follows:

CRIME PREVENTION: A NEW APPROACH TO THE JUVENILE TRAFFIC PROBLEM

(By Hon. Lester H. Loble, judge of the juvenile court, Helena, Mont.)

(Hon. Lester H. Loble, judge of the juvenile court, Helena, Mont., has been for 40 years one of the outstanding trial lawyers in the Northwest, both in civil and criminal cases. He has been both a prosecutor and a defender, a member of the legislature, active in civic affairs and public life, and an independent thinker. He is active in the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and was honored by President John F. Kennedy by being appointed Special Adviser to the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. He has brought to the juvenile problem many effective and unusual procedures. Here for the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin he points out a new approach to the juvenile traffic problem which is being widely used in other jurisdictions.)

The system here explained is being successfully used. Under the laws of Montana, juvenile traffic violations are tried in the juvenile court and not in a police court. That is as it should be. The law gives the court the power to fine up to $50, not imprison, revoke and suspend licenses, and impound automobiles. I found fines ineffective.

THE SYSTEM

Upon the first moving violation (such as speeding, running a red light, stop sign, and so forth), the parents of the juvenile are notified by a letter from the chief of police, and their cooperation is asked. On the second moving violation a complain is filed, charging the juvenile with the traffic violation. On his plea of guilty, or when he has been found guilty, I suspend his driver's license and have the juvenile turn it over to my chief probation officer. By order of court he is required to attend the Helena High School driver's training school.

The driver's school consists of stationary automobiles in which the student simulates driving. He watches a motion picture that gives him the impression that he is driving on a road. The instructor requests him to turn left, back up, or a variety of things. His responses are recorded on a card, similar to an IBM record, so that he sees whether or not he drove correctly. The school has a wide variety of pictures of all types.

COURSE PURSUED

The full course is usually 10 weeks, meeting for 2 hours once each week in the evening, and it includes 6 hours of road driving. The juvenile pays $10 to the school for this course. When the youngster has demonstrated that he is a competent driver, and it is so certified to me by the driver's training school, his license is returned and an order is made exonerating him from his past traffic violations. If a boy drives without a license after I have taken it from him, he is in contempt of court and I will send him to jail, and he knows it. Up until this time, I have never had to resort to this measure.

The juvenile traffic act is not under the secrecy rule. The hearing is open and published in the newspapers as is the fact of a juvenile's exoneration.

THE RESULTS

Set forth below are some of the encouraging results:

1. Often the parents, after the letter from the chief of police, will take action to curb the violator.

2. Insurance is more easily obtained and at a 10-percent reduction by many companies.

3. The psychological effect is good. The other youngsters comment on the fact that he had to go to school to learn to drive. It's getting smart to be a good driver.

4. I have only had one repeater after attendance at driver's school. His license I revoked until he reaches 18 years of age. His mother came in my chambers and thanked me.

Freedom of Reading Not Enjoyed by All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, March 21 to 27 marks National Library Week. A recent editorial in the Danville, Ind., Gazette emphasizes the importance and value of our "fifth freedom—reading." Newspapers, magazines, and books are often taken for granted. However, the United Nations report of last year points out that of the world's 198 countries or territories, 97 have illiteracy rates of moe than 50 percent, while 20 of these countries have populations with illiteracy rates of 95 to 99 percent.

People of the United States are certainly fortunate to have libraries at their disposal. This is one privilege we should appreciate wholeheartedly for many people do not realize the same freedom.

I believe that this editorial should be available to every Member of the Senate, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FREEDOM TO ENJOY

"Reading—The Fifth Freedom. Enjoy it" is the theme of National Library Week, March 21 to 27.

Too often we take reading for granted. Newspapers, books and magazines are a part of our lives. They are something we turn to for information, relaxation, amusement, entertainment, enlightenment, recreation and inspiration.

Considered in this light, reading is a freedom which many people of the world are not permitted.

A report to the United Nations last year revealed that 44 percent of the world's population is illiterate. Of the world's 198 countries or territories, 97 have illiteracy rates of more than 50 percent. In 20 of these countries, 95 to 99 percent of the people are illiterate.

Many people of the world do not know the meaning of the word "library." It is not even a part of their vocabulary. The stone age still exists in many minds.

We who live in Hendricks County are fortunate to have library facilities available. Our youngsters can learn the meaning of the word "library" at an early age. We can look forward to the time when they express with awesome wonder, "You mean that whole building is full of books."

Reading is truly a freedom. It frees us, not only from our own ignorance, but from our ignorance of others.

Enjoy it.

A Student's View of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a speech which a young constituent, Mr. Donald Trump, gave while competing in this year's American Legion oratorical contest. The work is a tribute to the Legion in that it exemplifies their interest in today's youth; to the faculty of Hudson High School, where Mr. Trump will graduate as class valedictorian this coming June; Mr. Trump, his parents, and youth as a whole. It is also reassuring to me as it demonstrates the high caliber of today's educational system in New York State in general, and the city of Hudson in particular. The award-winning speech is as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION—MAINSPRING FOR A CHANGING ORDER

(By Donald Trump)

Ever since time began man has sought to bring order and form into his daily life. No mechanical device has so well accomplished this task as the simple timepiece, the clock. At first, man made use of imperfect devices, the hourglass and the sundial. But now these exist merely as curiosities since the invention of that mechanical wonder which, with little change, has given system and order to our daily comings and goings for 700 years. And what is the working core of this device? The mainspring.

But man has sought to regulate his life in ways other than through a system of hours, minutes, and seconds. Through a system of laws, of administration, of Government, man has attempted to give order and form to the daily life he lives with his fellow man. At first, here too, man made use of imperfect devices, monarchy and depotism; and unlike the discarded curiosities, the hourglass and the sundial in the field of government, man continues to make use of these archaic and defective systems. This is true despite the fact that in 1789 in America was invented a new kind of wonder which, with little change, has given system and order to our daily comings and goings for 173 years. This invention was a system of government; and what is the working core of this system? Its mainspring? The Constitution of the United States of America. Of course, it has often been said that necessity is the mother of invention, and before the year 1789, necessity had begun to experiment with a new order. Even before the Pilgrims landed, they had met on the decks of the *Mayflower* to formulate a policy of self-government for their little band unrelated to any government they had previously known.

These experiments which were to reach culmination in 1789 may perhaps best be exemplified through the words of the preamble of "The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut" of 1639 which said "Where a people are gathered together the Word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such people there should be an orderly and decent Government established to God to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require." This disposal of the affairs of the people by orderly and decent Government was also to be the purpose of our Constitution. This was not an easy task. The most ambitious experiment to date, "The Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union" of 1778, though they had brought our country successfully through the Revolution, was grossly inadequate for the needs of a growing nation. To retain order and yet provide for change within that order as the passage of time might demand—this was the necessity of 1787 and those men who met to draw up our Constitution had the foresight to envision change in our country's future. Consequently, they allowed for a flexible Government. This flexibility is perhaps the one element which has made our Constitution the great document that it is.

Flexibility has been instituted through the application of article I, section 8, of our Constitution, which says "The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for the carrying into execution of the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States * * *."

Former Chief Justice John Marshall expressed his profound agreement with this flexible character of our Constitution by saying "The Constitution was intended to endure for ages to come and consequently to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs." To have prescribed the means by which Government should in all future times execute its powers would have been to change entirely the character of the instrument and to give it the properties of a legal code. It would have been an unwise attempt to provide by immutable rules for exigencies which if foreseen at all must have been foreseen dimly, and can best be provided for as they occur.

On various occasions in our country's history, it has been beneficial and convenient for our Government to assume certain powers for the country's good on the basis of these "implied powers." The "implied powers clause" has allowed our Congress to establish the social security system, the national bank, the Atomic Energy Commission, and has permitted the institution of a minimum wage. These occurrences were never foreseen by the framers of the Constitution, yet they allowed for their evolution through the "implied powers clause." Thus, just as the mainspring of a watch bends under stress, so does our Constitution flex with the pressures of the world.

However, it is not to be assumed that our Constitution is subject to every whim and caprice. Our system of government is so constructed that only those laws which are for the good of the majority will be passed. In addition, no amendment can ever be made to our Constitution without great difficulty. It takes a vote of two-thirds of all our Congressmen and three-fourths of the legislatures of the States to pass an amendment. By instituting a certain rigidity in our Constitution our forefathers insured that only truly important and weighty matters would affect our Government. This combination of rigidity and elasticity in our Constitution has insured our Nation of a Government which will resist all but the most important changes, yet will easily flex with the necessities of the Nation. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said: "Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis without loss of essential form."

One of the most practical aspects of our Constitution can be illustrated through the passage of the first 10 amendments. Those freedoms which we all know so well were initially proposed in the inspiring words of the preamble and since their inception, they have become for all Americans inalienable rights and never have they been significantly modified. Their form has remained though changes in emphasis have occurred. To illustrate—the preamble states that one of the primary reasons for framing our Constitution was—"to secure the blessings of liberty." Indeed it was the search for liberty that led the Puritans to our Nation in 1620. Both in Holland and England these separatists has been unable to practice their religion freely; consequently they came to America seeking liberty.

Edmund Burke, the English orator and statesman, has defined the type of liberty granted us by the Constitution by saying, "The only liberty that is valuable is a liberty connected with order; that not only exists with order and virtue but which cannot exist at all without them." This then is our constitutional liberty. We are not free to do and act as we please. We are subject to a pattern or order initially set forth in the Constitution and amplified by additional laws. For example, in the first amendment to our Constitution, our freedom of speech is definitely guaranteed. However, in 1940 our Congress passed the Smith Act which made it a criminal offense to advocate or teach the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. By this act our freedom of speech was regulated. This act was aimed at the subversive groups whose purpose it is to annihilate or bury the United States. Thus a system of liberty connected with order has arisen in our Nation. The fact that our Constitution is a combination of these fine qualities has served to preserve it.

Had our Constitution been merely designed to meet the needs of the 18th century, we would have fallen. Had it been constructed so loosely that it could be twisted and manipulated by judges and legislators, we would have fallen. Had a system of complete freedom without order been instituted our Nation would have crumbled into chaotic ruin. However, our Constitution was not drawn up by a group of shortsighted men; rather it was formulated by some of the greatest minds of all time. Washington, the tacit leader of the Convention; Franklin, the elder statesman who led the Convention through its many violent disputes; Madison, the "father of our Constitution." These were the men who helped make our Constitution a flexible, yet sturdy weapon of the people. Just as the best clocks which have served mankind for ages were constructed to remain in perfect working order despite continual abuse and to regulate the lives of the individuals, who depend on them, so has the Constitution managed to achieve unbelievable accuracy in conducting the affairs of men for over 150 years, to withstand the abuses and corruptive measures hurled at it to regulate the lives of the American people with unfailing skill.

The virtues of flexibility, stability, and regularity have been bound together in a concise document. These factors are those which truly contribute to the distinction

between the inadequate constitution and legal documents of man and that truly magnificent manuscript "The Constitution of the United States of America."

The Business Outlook and Its Implications for Current Economic Policy Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Business Outlook and Its Implications for Current Economic Policy Issues," delivered by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, before the Bond Club of Boston, in Boston, Mass., on March 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESS OUTLOOK AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRENT ECONOMIC POLICY ISSUES

(By Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier)

At this late date in March we are, of course, in a position to speak with some confidence about the record of business activity in the first quarter of 1963. And I think we are also in a position to speak with some assurance on how things may go in the second quarter of the year. Accordingly, I should like in my remarks this noon to outline the conclusions I have reached on these two points and then, going beyond that, to say what I think can be said at this time about the likely course of developments over the remainder of 1963. Because these are matters in which all of us have both a lively interest and a clear responsibility as citizens I should like to comment also on what the business outlook suggests as to the economic policies which will serve our country best at this time.

First, it is clear that even though industrial production didn't increase in the aggregate there has been a good rise in gross national product in the first quarter of this year. Official gross national product figures are not yet available, of course, but there must be at least a million private estimates in circulation. I have made one myself and I put the figure somewhere between $568 and $570 billion. This, we seem to have added from $5 to $6 billion to gross national product, measured in current prices and on an annual rate basis, in these first 3 months of the year even after allowing for some reduction in the level of new construction expenditures from the fourth quarter of 1962 to the first quarter of 1963 and for a small decline in the net exports figure.

Whether you take the upper or the lower limit of the $568–$570 range depends mainly on how much of an increase in consumer spending you think is occurring right now. I am inclined to put the figure midway, at $569 billion. However, I have the impression that retail sales in March have been quite good and the figure could prove to be a bit higher than $569.

What about the second quarter of the year?

A good many question marks confront us as we try to look even 3 months into the future, but I think we can make estimates for this period with some confidence. There is currently a momentum in the economy and I would expect a further increase in gross national product in the second quarter, say of around $6 billion, which would bring us to an annual rate of $575 billion.

I don't want to carry you through all of the arithmetic behind this second quarter estimate but my methods are simple and I can describe them quickly.

In the first place we can draw some encouragement from the fact that there has been a distinct improvement in the last few weeks in the so-called leading indicators to which we look for clues as to near-term developments in the economy. The March issue of Business Cycle Developments, the Census Bureau publication in which many of these figures are presented, has just been released and, while it may not be as inspiring as the spring issue of your favorite seed catalogue, I think you will find much in it to lift your spirits. There was a definite improvement in the employment situation in February and unemployment in those lines of work covered by unemployment compensation, which is a significant and rather sensitive index of our economy's pulse, stabilized and improved in late February and early March. New orders and contract awards have also improved. This is certainly true of the evidence relating to probable business expenditures on plant and equipment, though the outlook for residential construction is clouded by serious conflicts in the evidence which relates to it. The so-called diffusion indexes, which give us an indication of what might be called the widespreadness of a cyclical movement and some clue as to its likely direction of change, also improved in February. Without a doubt, therefore, such signs as we can see in the "indicators" are favorable. This supplies part of the basis for the confidence I think we can feel in the outlook for the second quarter of this year.

Next, we can get some advance idea of what the second quarter may look like by projecting gross national product estimates for an additional 3 months. Let me take this piece by piece. First, I think we can allow for a further sizable increase in consumer expenditures. Consumers' buying intentions as registered in various sample surveys have been favorable and should be strengthened by the economy's upward momentum. I find very little inclination to allow for an increase in auto sales over present rates, but I think we can safely assume a continuation of these rates until midyear, at least, and I gather that there is a fair amount of optimism among those who follow closely the outlook for sales of consumer durables other than autos. Together, these seem to spell a rise in sales of consumer durables as a whole and I am inclined to look, also, for further increases in the sales of nondurables. I assume that we can count also on another increase, say $2 billion or so, in that mysterious area of gross national product which we call consumer expenditures on services. Perhaps it is because we know so little about this part of our economy that we feel such confidence in jacking it up, quarter after quarter, at pretty regular rates but I see no reason at this time to dispute this practice.

Second, I am sure you have observed that government expenditures have been a major factor in the gross national product increases scored in 1962 and in those that have been achieved so far in 1963. On the theory that total Federal payments to the public for the fiscal year 1963 will at least equal the amount that the January 1963 budget message said they would reach and that State and local expenditures will continue to rise I think we can anticipate a further increase in total Government purchases of goods and services in the second quarter of this year, say around $2 billion on an annual rate basis.

Given these expectations for two major elements in the gross national product accounts, and allowing, third, for a small increase in inventory accumulation; fourth, for an increase in business expenditures on machinery and equipment in line with the official projections of this spending; fifth, for some declines, additional over those sustained in the first quarter, in new construction expenditures; and sixth, for a small drop in net exports—I reach a gross national product figure for the second quarter of 1963 of $575 billion; that is, an increase of $6 billion over my first quarter estimate. This, I think you will agree, would be quite a good result, and I believe we can be reasonably confident that it will be achieved.

What about the second half of the year?

I am not going to be so valiant or so foolhardy as to recite any detailed gross national product arithmetic for this period. This is not because I am particularly apprehensive about the second half outlook, because I am not, but only because I think it is more constructive at this time to concentrate, first, on trying to foresee the shape of the principal factors and conditions that will influence the pitch of business activity in the second half of the year; and, second, on defining the economic policies, private as well as public, that will help assure an extension of economic growth into that period and into the next year.

There are several respects in which it seems to me that the economy will be rather vulnerable in the second half of this year but there are a number of expansionary factors that can be expected to be operating, also. Let me turn, first, to the latter.

As you know, rising levels of expenditures by business concerns on plant and equipment have been projected officially through the remainder of this year and I expect correctly so. These imply a rate of expenditures on plant and equipment of something over $41 billion, on an annual basis, in the fourth quarter of this year. This would be an 8-percent increase over spending of this type in the fourth quarter of 1962 and would provide an excellent underpinning for general economic expansion. Parenthetically, it should benefit the New England area especially, where a good deal of our country's machinery and equipment production is centered.

Second, I expect we can look for an increase in the rate of accumulation of business inventories in the second half of 1963, though I would not expect the change to be very great. At the moment we are living on borrowed activity, as it were, in the buildup of steel inventories but the effect of this as it develops can hardly be as drastic as the steel inventory buildup and subsequent reversal in 1959. Also, it seems reasonable to expect some increase in rates of inventory accumulation in other areas of the economy as overall activity increases. Fortunately, we have been building inventories for sometime at a slow rate and, for this reason alone, some acceleration would be expected, provided other things go reasonably well.

Furthermore, unless we are being misled by the early warnings on the future trend of the prices of industrial materials that are currently being given out by the movement of the diffusion index of the prices of those materials, there should be a basis in some strengthening of prices for the emergence of a firmer inventory policy.

Third, it looks as if there will be a further increase in Government expenditures in the second half of 1963 over the first half of the year, though probably at a slower rate than between the first half of 1963 and the preceding 6 months. I say at a slower rate because the Federal

Government's expenditures are currently so high that there is not a great deal of room for them to increase within the levels of expenditure that were projected in January for the fiscal year 1963, and because there is something going on at the State and local level that is sufficiently like a taxpayer revolt to suggest some moderation, for a time, in the rate of increase in spending by State and local governments. I don't want to underestimate the capacity of Government to grow, but it has grown so vigorously of late that we may be on the threshold of a period of somewhat slower expansion.

So much for the expenditure increases that seem more or less certain to occur. What about the respects in which it might be said that our economy will be vulnerable as the year unfolds?

First, increases in automobile sales over present levels seem unlikely and some reduction in production schedules may be required as inventories build up even with sales remaining at present levels.

Second, and bearing on the outlook for automobile sales, the consumer has been taking on additional installment debt at a very rapid rate. Indeed, the consumer has been indulging in a species of deficit financing that threatens to outdo even the exploits of his Federal Government. Surges of this kind do not last forever and, on the rhythm theory that is increasingly accepted nowadays, we might well look for a return, later in the year or in 1964, to a balance between installment repayments and new extensions of this type of credit. At any rate, this is the way things have gone in the past.

Third, there is a good deal of uncertainty about the level of construction expenditures later in the year and in 1964, especially in the construction of apartment houses and office buildings. There appears to be some saturation of present effective demand in both of these areas.

Fourth, the increase of industrial production abroad was moderated considerably in 1962. It may accelerate in 1963 and provide a more active market for U.S. exports but I rather doubt that we can count on this. My inclination is to regard net exports as potentially a small negative influence in our economy in 1963.

Fifth, while corporation profits were good in the closing quarter of 1962, in fact very good, and while they seem to have extended these gains in early 1963, it must be observed that the ratio of price to unit labor cost in manufacturing has been tending to decline in the last few months, suggesting that some narrowing of profit margins is currently taking place. In 1962 this reflected primarily a softening in the prices of manufactured goods, but more recently it seems to have reflected an upturn in labor cost per unit of output. If these unit production cost increases are extended in 1963, and I must say that this seems likely in view of the labor-management contract settlements that are being made currently, then we may miss over the rest of this year the improvement in profit margins which has been a powerful help so far.

Finally, I think we must respect the teaching of history which has it that the strength of economic expansions varies more or less in proportion with the severity of the declines from which they represent a rebound. It is not clear now just how we should interpret recent history in this respect. The question is whether the upward momentum we are feeling now is a continuation, without interruption, of a recovery and expansion following the 1960–61 recession or whether it is a rebound from a kind of pause in 1962. In either case, however, would there be little basis for expecting an advance of unusual strength. Despite the fact that the administration repeatedly describes the 1960–61 recession as a desperate circumstance, it was in fact a mild and short-lived downturn by all relevant historical standards. Peak to trough the unemployment rate, although starting from a higher level, rose relatively less than in any other postwar recession; and, percentagewise, employment declined by only about half as much. Gross national product fell in 1960–61 by an amount that can be accounted for entirely in terms of the inventory adjustment that took place. In the most recent revision of our GNP statistics we see that there was no decline whatever in 1960–61 in final sales. One would expect only a fairly moderate expansion after such a mild cyclical downturn and that is exactly what we had. We will do very well, indeed, if our next recession remains within similarly narrow limits.

In the latter part of 1962 we had a rather special type of cyclical experience. Gross national product continued to rise, but industrial production declined a bit. Employment barely held steady and unemployment rose. Other measures by which we normally determine whether our economy is in recession or in expansion either ceased to rise or declined. Indeed, with few exceptions the more sensitive the economic measure that one looks at the more the experience looks like a mild recession, but I would call it only a pause in the advance following the 1960–61 recession and would say that what we are now experiencing is a kind of second recovery. Considering its background, I would expect the present advance to be quite moderate.

And no one can say with certainty whether the present advance will continue without interruption through the second half of the year. But if it does, and if it accelerates a bit as the year moves on, we will achieve the $578 figure for 1963 as a whole that was officially projected last January. Whether we do will depend in good part on the policies, public and private, that we follow and I should like, therefore, to conclude my remarks with some observations on what I think would be a sound strategy for extending the current advance well into the future.

I have felt for some time, and I continue to feel, that the key policy problem is the large and continuing deficit in our balance of international payments. My reasons are twofold. First, the continuation of a payments deficit is a major source of uncertainty in our economy and its elimination, or at least the prospect of its eventual elimination, would have an enormously clarifying and strengthening effect on business and financial confidence. Second, the existence of the deficit has handicapped monetary policy and is forcing us into an easy fiscal policy which, in my judgment, threatens to undermine our capability to raise enough revenues to run our Government on the scale that most people, myself included, wish to see it run and to do this on a noninflationary basis.

We have done a good deal, beginning in 1959, aimed at correcting the payments deficit but the job is by no means complete. Given assists such as we received last year from advance debt repayments and other sources we should be able to do as well in 1963 as we did in 1962, and possibly a bit better. But it is expecting a good deal to count on these assists; and, clearly, we need a more fundamental correction. A correction that is consistent with liberal trade and financial policies will, I fear, require some retrenchment in our foreign aid and assistance programs. In the news blackout that continues in New York City the report by the President's special committee on these programs was not available to me as I prepared these remarks, but from what I have heard of it I gather that it may provide a basis for the needed recasting of our foreign assistance efforts.

Second, we need to keep production costs under control. When we talk about there being a drag on our economy we must not overlook the effect of cost increases, notably of increases in wages and related labor costs, that outrun productivity improvements and which cannot, for one reason or another, be passed on in price increases. In my judgment, these have been the principal drag on our economy in recent years and we must be quite sure that their grip is not tightened in 1963 and 1964. Government can have some influence in this area, but it is primarily a matter for private action.

This brings me to taxation, which I put in third not in first place in my ranking of policy questions. I realize that taxation overshadows everything else in popular discussion and in the administration's policy program but I think it must be conceded that if we don't solve our balance-of-payments problem and if we don't avoid an increase in the pressure of costs on prices we are not going to solve many problems for very long merely by cutting taxes.

I had the privilege of testifying last August before the House Ways and Means Committee on the subject of emergency tax cutting. My view at that time, and it continues to be my view, was that neither the outlook for our economy, which I thought was pretty good, nor the rapidly increasing costs of operating our Federal Government justified indulging ourselves in a large, broad-based emergency-type reduction in individual income taxes. I said then that I thought we needed a program of incentive-increasing, growth-promoting tax reduction and reform and suggested that this should take the shape of a reduction in the corporate income tax ,say from 52 to 47 percent, and a reduction in the near-confiscatory rates of taxation on the top brackets of individual income, say from 91 to 50 percent, and that these changes should be enacted as soon as possible in 1963. My third choice for tax reduction would be to take at least a first step to eliminate once and for all the hodgepodge of Federal excise taxes, especially those levied on goods and services at retail.

My first objection to the tax proposals now before Congress is that although they make provision for changes of the type I have mentioned, and for which there is very broad support, their major emphasis is on individual income tax cuts of the type that, as I see it, will be considerably less effective in creating permanent jobs and in strengthening the productive facilities of the country.

My second objection has to do with timing. I felt last August, and I continue to feel, that the need for tax legislation is urgent. But the character of the administration's tax program, in its inclusion of numerous structural reforms of a highly controversial nature, is serving to delay the passage of a bill. And in the end it may not provide much tax reform, anyway.

My third objection to the proposals is that they contemplate revenue losses that are too heavy in view of the present budgetary deficit and of the level and current upward trend of Federal spending. I believe the package should come to somewhere between $3 and $4 billion and that it should be accompanied by an expenditure control program which would put a ceiling on Federal expenditures, for a time at least, at their fiscal 1963 levels. On other occasions I have indicated the kinds of budget economies, and made a suggestion for sales of federally held financial assets, which would make it possible to accommodate within the limits of an unchanged total of Federal expenditures the specific program expansions which are necessary and, I believe, justified.

Finally, let me comment on the relation of tax changes to the problem of recession and unemployment. I understand perfectly well that the case being made for large-scale tax reduction is that if we do not have it, and if we do not have it substantially in

the way the administration proposes, we will find ourselves falling into recession with rising levels of unemployment. I want to say, most respectfully, that if this is true it is true not because there is any lasting benefit to be obtained from deficit-increasing tax reductions but because so much has been said about lightening everybody's tax burden that, if it is not lightened, people will be so disappointed that a recessionary reaction might set in. No none can be entirely sure what is right in these things, but I do not regard the American economy as being in so precarious a position as to warrant what is almost an emergency type kind of tax reduction program. This is not an emergency situation in any true sense of the word. There is a momentum in the economy and what we need to do is to build on it in a way that will help sustain growth over a long period. This, in itself, will help reduce unemployment, but I believe we will learn as time goes on to place more reliance for correcting chronic unemployment on selective measures in the field of education, in training and retraining, and to put less reliance on efforts to bolster aggregate demand by large-scale, broad-based tax reductions. What we need for creating jobs is not a shot in the arm but a strengthening of the internal forces in our enterprise economy that make for growth.

This brings me back to the outlook for our economy in the second half of 1963. As I have said, there are forces that will make for further expansion, but there are respects, also, in which our economy will be vulnerable to a setback. I believe that policies of the type I have outlined would tip the balance in favor of sustained growth. I cannot say that a large, broad-based, deficit-increasing tax reduction, and certainly not one that encompasses a large part of the tax changes I am proposing, would not be stimulative, too, though I do believe that its stimulative possibilities are being greatly overestimated. What I fear most is that its stimulus will be only temporary and that in order to extend the impetus further we will be tempted into genuinely inflationary measures. This would spell endless trouble for us and for our friends throughout the Free World. This is my reason for preferring the more moderate approach.

Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

SPEECH
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today in this great tribute being paid to the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose passing last November was mourned not only in her own State of New York but throughout the world.

Mrs. Roosevelt was a most amazing and remarkable woman, with not one but many different careers of service—social worker, mother, nurse, teacher, adviser, and special confidant of the President of the United States, political party worker, lecturer, diplomat, political reformer, author, columnist, and friend.

No one has ever surpassed her in the breadth and intensity of her interests. Deeply involved in some of the most significant issues and movements of her day, she nevertheless always had time for plain, simple, friendly, and gracious acts, and she was willing, almost until the day of her death, to put herself out to be of service to the humblest individual.

When her husband was President of the United States, Eleanor Roosevelt exerted a profound influence on the shape of his administration. In many ways she served to keep the New Deal true to its basic humanitarian purposes; she was a constant force for good in a steadily growing Federal bureaucratic establishment.

When war broke out Mrs. Roosevelt saw to it that the top planners did not overlook some of the human problems that this vast undertaking of ours was bound to create. And as her husband's personal emissary to the far-flung battle fronts she not only brought back invaluable personal estimates of the progress of our operations, but she is a very real sense represented home and mother to the hundreds of thousands of troops she met in forward combat areas. I know from my own experience the impact of her visit to the South Pacific theater in 1943, for example.

With the end of the war and the death of her husband, Mrs. Roosevelt continued to assume an active and an independent career. She was one of the most eloquent and effective spokesmen for the whole concept of international cooperation embodied in the United Nations. And let us not forget either that she proved herself long ago to be one of the sharpest and most articulate critics of the kind of sabotage of genuine international cooperation which the Soviet Union has been conducting both within and outside of the United Nations. The Soviets never fooled her in the United Nations.

But perhaps most significant of all was the leadership which she gave in my own State of New York some 4 years ago to a new movement designed to revitalize her own Democratic Party, to make it more directly responsive to its traditional goals and objectives as the party of the people, and more directly representative of the views and wishes of the rank and file men and women who make it up.

In a way the success of that movement which Eleanor Roosevelt, together with Senator Herbert Lehman, headed is typical of her whole life. It was easy to brush Eleanor Roosevelt off. It was easy to make light of her efforts. Many in fact did, attacking her with even more virulence than was directed against her husband. But in spite of all their attacks, in spite of all the condescension, she got the results she went after, as those who opposed her discovered to their sorrow. Political leaders who had been regarded as invulnerable fell before the movement which this kindly, considerate, soft-spoken lady directed.

And over the years she has remained, not only First Lady of the World, but the woman most girls have respected, admired, and hoped to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, as one who had the privilege briefly to know Mrs. Roosevelt and to observe her service over a much longer period of years, I am proud to be able to share in this tribute today. I know that my State of New York, the United States of America, and indeed the whole world are better today because Eleanor Roosevelt has lived and worked among us for a little while.

East Orange Centennial: Address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on March 23, 1963, before the East Orange, N.J., district Boy Scouts of America, an address was delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow in which he gave due recognition to the Boy Scouts for their role in East Orange and in the Nation as a whole in building and maintaining fine community and family standards. Mr. Stringfellow, a former business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, a long-time resident of East Orange, and past imperial potentate of the Shrine, is a fitting choice for the position of general chairman of the East Orange centennial. Mr. Stringfellow's excellent tribute to the Boy Scouts of America is well worth our notice.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the introductory remarks of Mayor James W. Kelly, Jr., of East Orange, N.J., and the address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the introduction and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST ORANGE CENTENNIAL

(An address by George E. Stringfellow, past imperial potentate, general chairman of the East Orange centennial and former business asociate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the East Orange district Boy Scouts of America, March 23, 1963)

Mayor James W. Kelly, Jr., mayor of East Orange, Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, Boy Scouts and friends of Boy Scouts, greetings and best wishes.

East Orange is, as most of you know, celebrating its 100th anniversary as a municipality this year. It is my pleasure as mayor to present the general chairman of the centennial committee, Hon. George E. Stringfellow, a resident of our fair city for almost 40 years.

In presenting Mr. Stringfellow on another occasion, the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, U.S. Senator from New Jersey said of him:

"George Stringfellow has, without the hope of fee or reward, rendered great service to humanity in many walks of life.

"Some men are extraordinarily competent in their own private affairs and in their own interest, but fail to exert themselves in the affairs of their community and Nation. George Stringfellow makes no distinction between his own business and public affairs, between what brings profit and what brings satisfaction to others. The public welfare is his principal private concern. No nobler life can any man lead."

As mayor of East Orange, I should like to associate myself with the remarks Senator Hawkes made about Mr. Stringfellow, whom I am happy to present.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Chairman, his honor the mayor, distinguished guests, and fel-

low Boy Scouts, thank you sincerely for your complimentary introduction and thank you for the warmth of your reception. Mr. Mayor, it is my fervent hope that during our efforts to present the true image of our fair city to the county, the State, and Nation, my efforts may measure up to your expectations in which event my efforts have not been in vain. I should like to say to the audience and to you, Mr. Mayor, that I have found you a delightful person to work with. You have been gracious, and you are blessed with plenty of know-how and the initiative to use it to the benefit of the people of East Orange, whom you serve so well.

May I say to the management of this Boy Scout rally that I am highly complimented by your invitation to participate in your centennial rally.

I know of no national organization of boys and men that is more American than the Boy Scouts of America. We in East Orange are justly proud of our Boy Scouts. They are one of our greatest assets.

There are more than 28 million former members of the Boy Scouts of America in our Nation. There are about 4 million boys currently enrolled in this great movement. There are approximately 1½ million adults serving these boys. There are more than 135,000 units and there are 80,000 organizations in partnership with these units.

There are about 300 professional men employed by the national council. There are 3,400 professional men approved by the national council to be employed by local council in executive positions. It is good to know that scouting in East Orange is an active, successful, and important part of Scouting in our Nation.

East Orange was chartered on March 4, 1863. We are celebrating, as the mayor told you, our 100th anniversary as a municipality. We are honored by the fact that the East Orange Boy Scouts have named this activity their centennial rally. In 1960 the Boy Scout movement observed its 50th anniversary. We are proud of troop No. 1, sponsored by the Arlington Avenue Presbyterian Church, who are now in their 53d year of Scouting in East Orange.

We congratulate troop 14, sponsored by St. Agnes Episcopal Church on their 50th birthday this year. Troops 8 and 16 will also mark their golden anniversary within the next 2 years. There are some 1,200 boys in East Orange's 39 Scout units. It is gratifying to learn that so many of our Scouts are training to be topflight citizens, not only in our community but in our Nation as well. Mayor Kelly informs me that 34 Scouts took part on our Scout Government Day last February 11. Such evidence of civic pride illustrates how scouting promotes the American way of life, the hope of the free world.

The 1963 theme of the Boy Scouts of America is: "Be Prepared—Be Fit." Americans are concerned about the fitness of their young. Physical fitness, mental fitness and most important, spiritual fitness.

Since 1910, physical fitness has been one of the principal objectives of the Boy Scouts of America. Physical fitness, however, has always been accompanied by character building and citizenship training. The Scout program is admirably planned and has been outstandingly successful in developing these essential American qualities.

Fitness is developed through Cub Scout achievement programs, Boy Scout advancement and merit badge programs and Explorer emergency service programs.

Fitness is developed through the Cub Scout promise, Boy Scout oath and law, Explorer code with the emphasis on "Duty to God" and the Boy Scout, a Scout is reverent. Fitness is developed through the Cub Scout motto "Do Your Best." Boy Scout motto "Be Prepared," Explorer motto, "Our Best Today for a Better Tomorrow." Fitness is teamwork; a Scout works with the home, the church, and the school.

Through their Scouting experiences, boys are able to accept change, to learn, to respect the rights of others, to control their feelings, to gain self-reliance and to understand themselves and their families.

Charles Dudley Warner must have had the Boy Scouts in mind when he said, "One of the best things in the world is being a good boy; it requires no experience, but needs some practice to be a good boy." Scouts get the practice they need and that makes them good boys. One could receive no finer compliment than to have ones friends and neighbors say, "He is a good boy."

We adults must be sure of our young people's fitness as defined by the Boy Scout in his oath, "I will do my best to be physically fit, mentally awake, and morally straight." Yes, we must strengthen America by seeing that our boys are prepared and fit.

It can be truthfully said and uttered in sincerity that scouting builds the best qualities of young America. Gen. David Sarnoff gave sage advice when he said, "Don't be misled into believing that somehow the world owes you a living.

"The boy who believes that his parents, or the Government, owes him a livelihood and that he can collect it without labor, will wake up some of these days and find himself working for another boy who did not have that belief and therefore, earned the right to have others work for him."

As we celebrate our centennial this year, we recall East Orange's constructive past and we justly look forward to a glorious future. It is with pride that we witness you Scouts, our future leaders, participating in this centennial year.

That you may ever be fit and worthy to serve our great country whenever you have an opportunity is my fond wish.

Thank you.

The Late Bishop Garfield Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that I announce to this distinguished body, the death on March 12, 1963, of one of America's most illustrious citizens. Bishop Garfield Bromley Oxnam has given some 47 years of his lifetime to the service of the Methodist Church, and was until his death one of the foremost and respected members of Methodism.

I ask unanimous consent that the following story of his life be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

G. BROMLEY OXNAM

Garfield Bromley Oxnam was born in Sonora, Calif., on August 14, 1891. His parents were Thomas Henry Oxnam and Mamie (Job) Oxnam. His father was a mining engineer and a member of the board of trustees of the University of Southern California. The relationship between father and son was a close one and they traveled over the world together. Young Oxnam attended Los Angeles High School and received his A.B. degree from the University of Southern California in 1913. On August 19, 1914, he married Ruth Fisher. In 1915 he received the degree of S.T.B. from Boston University and then did additional graduate work at Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He also traveled and studied in Japan, China, India, and England.

He was ordained in the Methodist Church in 1916 and began his career as pastor of the Methodist Church in Poplar, Calif., where he remained about a year. From 1917 to 1927 he was pastor of the Church of All Nations, Los Angeles, Calif. From 1919 to 1923 he served as professor at the University of Southern California, teaching a course in social ethics. In 1927 and 1928 he was professor of practical theology at the Boston University School of Theology. In 1928 he became president of De Pauw University at Greencastle, Ind. There, according to Time, he was popular with the students because he permitted dancing, but unpopular with the American Legion because he abolished the ROTC. He remained at De Pauw until 1936, when he was elected a bishop of the Methodist Church and assigned to the Omaha area, where he remained until 1939. He was successively bishop of the Boston area from 1939 to 1944, bishop of the New York area from 1944 to 1952, and bishop of the Washington area from 1952 until his retirement in 1960.

Bishop Oxnam, for many years a prominent figure in the religious world, became more widely known as a result of his appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1953. He had been asked to answer charges not only against him but against the body of liberal clergymen. Under questioning that covered a period as far back as the 1920's, Oxnam conceded that he had been associated at times with organizations later cited as being Communist-controlled or inspired. But he made it clear that whenever he detected an indication of Communist influence he got out of the organization. The hearing ended in complete vindication for the bishop, for the committee voted unanimously "that the records of this committee show that this committee has no record of any Communist Party membership or affiliation of Bishop Oxnam."

In addition to his episcopal duties he served as president of the Federal Council of Churches from 1944 to 1946, and as one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches from 1948 to 1954, and as a member of the President's Committee on Higher Education from 1946 to 1948. At various other times he was president of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, chairman of the Methodist Commission on Chaplains, member of the executive and central committees of the World Council of Churches, and president of the Board of Governors of Wesley Theological Seminary.

Bishop Oxnam was the recipient of numerous honorary degrees from universities in the United States and abroad. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Sigma Phi, Alpha Kappa Delta, Pi Gamma Mu, Phi Eta Sigma, and the 33d degree of Masonry.

Bishop Oxnam's published works included "The Mexican in Los Angeles" (1920), "Social Principles of Jesus" (1923), "Russian Impressions" (1927), "Youth and the New America" (1928), "The Ethical Ideals of Jesus in a Changing World" (1941), "By This Sign Conquer" (1942), "Behold Thy Mother" (1944), "Facing the Future Unafraid" (1944), "Preaching in a Revolutionary Age" (1944), "Labor and Tomorrow's World" (1945), "The Stimulus of Christ" (1948), "The Christian's Vocation" (1950), "The Church and Contemporary Change" (1950), "Personalities in Social Reform" (1950), "On This Rock" (1951), "I Protest" (1954), and "A Testament of Faith" (1958), as well as numerous articles on social, international, industrial, and religious subjects.

Bishop Oxnam moved to Scarsdale, N.Y., following his retirement in 1960. He died

on March 12, 1963, at the Burke Rehabilitation Foundation in White Plains, N.Y., where he had gone to recover from an operation for Parkinson's disease. He is survived by his wife, two sons, Robert F. Oxnam, president of Drew University, Madison, N.J., and Philip H. Oxnam, of Kenwood, N.Y., and a daughter, Mrs. Robert McCormack, of Scarsdale, N.Y.

Speaking of his passing, Bishop John Wesley Lord, who succeeded him as bishop of the Washington area, said: "The whole religious community, both national and worldwide, has suffered an irreparable loss." He added that "it would be hard to name a great social movement within the Methodist Church during the years of his effective ministry that did not bear the imprint of his dynamic personality."

Our Sugar Policy and Program: Speech by David G. Gartner Before Minnesota Beet Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently Mr. David G. Gartner, my able staff assistant on agricultural legislation and policy, delivered a sensible, intelligent, and hard-hitting address on the importance of the Federal Government's role in providing the kind of laws that help to equalize opportunities among our people and help the individual lead a fuller and more satisfactory life. Mr. Gartner gave special emphasis to the need for close and harmonious cooperation between the Federal Government and the individual farmer.

This good commonsense was delivered before the First Annual Seminar on Sugarbeet Research and Production at the Red River winter shows and University of Minnesota Northwest School Farmers Week at Crookston, Minn., on February 22. I am sure the sugarbeet producers profited from these observations; others should have a similar opportunity. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gartner's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY DAVID G. GARTNER BEFORE MINNESOTA BEET PRODUCERS

No one need apologize for asking and expecting the Federal Government to enact the kind of laws that will help to equalize opportunities among our people and help the individual to lead a fuller and more satisfactory life. It is, indeed, the responsibility and obligation of the Federal Government, under our Constitution, to enact such laws. This is plain even in the preamble to the Constitution, in which the familiar statement, to "promote the general welfare," is included in the list of fundamental reasons for establishing and ordaining the basic document upon which our Government rests.

The Federal Government since its very beginning has recognized that obligation and, in varying degrees, the extent depending upon the situation at the time, has sought to fulfill that obligation. The second law passed by the First Congress under the Constitution, enacted on July 4, 1789, in the first term of George Washington, extended the protection of the Federal Government to one economic group in the then new and struggling United States of America. This law was a tariff act, and in the act it is stated that "it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufacturers, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported." Thus, early in our history as a nation was established the principle that the Federal Government has the power to aid an economic group.

That first tariff law included a tariff on sugar—1 cent a pound on brown sugar, 3 cents a pound on loaf sugar, and a cent and a half a pound on all other sugars. Although there was a small sugar refining industry in New York in those days, the sugar tariff was designed primarily for raising revenues. Our first lawmakers apparently found that sugar was a good source of revenue for the Government, because the next year they raised the rates to a cent and a half on brown sugar, to 5 cents on loaf sugar, and to 2½ cents on all other sugars.

In view of that small cane sugar refining industry, however, I believe it is more than coincidental that on June 5, 1794, another sugar tariff law was passed, continuing the rates then in effect on brown, loaf, and other sugars, but adding a stiff 5 cents a pound tariff on refined sugar.

American sugar producers—such as yourselves—as a group distinctive from refiners—came to have the protection of the tariff only by accident. The sugar tariff was already on the books when the sugar producers in Louisiana came under the American flag through the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. The same thing was true—there was already a sugar tariff on the books—when the beet sugar mill Ebenezer Dyer and his associates built on San Francisco Bay in 1870 finally achieved commercial success in 1879. The tariff on sugar at that time, incidentally, was as much as 5 cents a pound on fully refined sugar, ranging downward to a little more than 2 cents a pound on lower grades, and raw sugar from the Kingdom of Hawaii came to U.S. refineries duty free.

I have mentioned these things to underscore the fact that the fostering and protection of American industries through Federal legislation have been a part of our national policy since the very first days of our existence as a nation. Anyone who reads American history with any degree of objectivity, however, realizes that for the first 150 years of our life as a nation, that fostering and that protection were predominantly business oriented and eastern oriented. The tariff, for example, was and remains today largly a protection for the manufacturer rather than for the agriculture producer.

The reason the needs of the East and of the manufacturing industries, located principally in the East, were given preference during most of this period is simply that during this time the country was dominated politically by the more populous Eastern States and dominated economically by the more wealthy eastern interests. I recognize this is a broad and sweeping generality, and I recognize also that during this period there were a certain few, and I emphasize few, notable exceptions to the general rule.

Agriculture was given important recognition 101 years ago, when Abraham Lincoln, on May 15, 1862, signed the act creating the Department of Agriculture. The Morrill Act, which created the land-grant colleges, was signed by Lincoln on July 2 the same year. In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act, formalizing the cooperation of the Federal Government and the States in farm extension work, was passed. The Federal Farm Loan Act, establishing the cooperative Federal Land Bank System, was passed in 1916, and for the first time gave farmers access to long-term mortgage credit, geared to the needs of agriculture rather than to the demands of the eastern moneylenders. And in 1922, the Capper-Volstead Act, so important to farm cooperatives, was passed.

True, these measures and some others enacted during this period, did recognize that promoting "the general welfare" of the Nation should include promoting "the general welfare" of agriculture, along with other segments of the economy. But for the most part, legislation, during this entire period from 1789 to 1933 that was of any special economic benefit to any segment of our Nation, was intended to benefit and did benefit a segment other than agriculture. The measures that were taken in behalf of agriculture were principally in the educational and research fields and were taken only after there had been long and vigorous agitation for them by farmers, farm editors, and some farsighted leaders outside of agriculture.

But there were ills in agriculture which farmers alone could not cure, ills that were basically economic rather than educational, ills which required Government action which the Government was not taking. This is attested by the formation during this period of various agricultural "action" organizations, some of which are still in existence today, and some of which flashed briefly, if sensationally, on the pages of history and then disappeared. Some put their emphasis on educational and cooperative activities while others emphasized political action, and some combined education, economics, and politics. The list is long and includes such groups as the National Farmers' Alliance, the People's or Populist Party, the Grange, the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau Federation, and Milo Reno's farm holiday movement, among others.

There are many among you who lived through and remember the 1920's. From what I understand, if you lived through the 1920's and early thirties you would remember it. I wasn't around then, and can only recount what others have told me, and what I have read and studied about that era. The Nation appeared to be booming, but the economy was basically unsound because its greatest industry, agriculture, was sick. When you had bumper crops, the prices were disastrous. When the prices were good, because of a short crop, you had little to sell. The records of mounting farm foreclosures during the late 1920's and early 1930's tell an eloquent story of what was happening to agriculture. The problems were too big for individual farmers or even their organizations to solve without effective nationwide action that could be taken only by the Federal Government. And no effective action was taken by the Federal Government until 1933.

Since 1933, effective action for agriculture has been taken in Washington, and it continues to be taken. Effective national governmental action was essential 30 years ago if American agriculture was to survive, and it continues to be essential if American agriculture is to continue to survive. All of you have a personal stake in what happens to farm programs in Washington.

Perhaps you, as sugarbeet producers, have a greater stake than anyone else engaged in agriculture—for the sugar program, while it has long been haled as one of the most effective and successful of our farm programs, is also the most comprehensive. But I think the two go together: the sugar program is successful because it is comprehensive.

Let me enumerate some of the things, on which decisions are made in Washington, that directly affect you as sugarbeet pro-

ducers and that go a long way to determining your opportunities for success.

First, there is the size of the basic sugarbeet quota. In each revision of the law, you have a stake in seeing that the basic quota, at the level of consumption that exists at that time, recognizes your level of production at that time. It is here where your representative, Al Bloomquist, has been, and can continue to be of such value to you as producers.

Second, there is your share of future growth in the market. I am sure you agree that your share of growth should be large enough so you can accommodate your future increases in average yields per acre and also provide for an economic and equitable expansion of the industry.

Third, the price objective in the law should be attainable and when attained, should provide you who operate efficiently with an opportunity for a reasonable profit at a level that is fair to consumers.

You also should have an interest in seeing that the law provides enough of a balance among the various groups that also have a stake in legislation so that widespread support for its passage can be obtained.

In the administration of the law, you also must depend upon a great many decisions that are made in Washington.

The size of the consumption estimate should provide enough sugar for consumers, at reasonable prices, but not so much that price-depressing surpluses will develop. When acreage restrictions are in effect, the regulations should provide for a fair and equitable distribution of the acreage. When marketing allotments are in effect, the regulations should provide that the company with which you contract receives an equitable share of the total beet sugar quota. And so on.

This is not to say that all of your decisions are made for you in Washington, because they are not. You still have a number of individual management decisions to make that may determine your success or failure as a sugarbeet producer: when to plant, and how close to plant; when to thin and how much of a stand you want left in the fields; when and how much to fertilize; how much to mechanize your production; and, of course, the basic decision as to whether you want to produce sugarbeets at all.

Nevertheless, the fundamental opportunity for you to produce, and to do so profitably, depends upon certain basic legislative and administrative decisions, as I pointed out a moment ago, that must be made in Washington.

Now how can you be sure that these decisions, both legislative and administrative, will be right for you?

First and foremost is to elect people to represent you who do represent you, and who understand your situation and your problems and your aspirations. This is important not only for enactment of the legislation but also for its equitable administration. I do not mean to say this in a partisan sense, for I am aware that sugar legislation historically has been bipartisan, or maybe I should say nonpartisan, legislation. But I think it is of prime importance to your own welfare that you support the people in the Senate and House of Representatives who know your problems and who are in a position to develop the kind of legislation which works toward a solution to those problems—whether it is in sugar or in anything else affecting agriculture and "the general welfare" of the Nation. Here again, let me remind you of an equally important representative you have—your executive secretary, Al Bloomquist, is doing an excellent job for you in ably representing your interests.

Second, you have a responsibility to be worthy and to show you are worthy of the support of the people you effect to office. With the continuing decrease in the farm population, it's now only about 8 percent of the total population, and the inevitable reduction in the number of representatives who come from districts that are predominately rural, farmers, to be successful in life-and-death legislative matters, need to have the esteem of their city cousins. Senator HUMPHREY and others in the Congress who are vitally concerned with the future of agriculture, are attempting to rebuild the true image of the American farmer as an efficient producer, who provides food for Americans for a lower percentage of the consumer's income than in any other country of the world. But this is a job in which every farmer needs to take part, not only through his organizations, but also in his daily contacts with people in the towns and cities.

In conclusion, I want to repeat what I said at the beginning: that no one need apologize for asking and expecting the Federal Government to enact the kind of laws that will help to equalize opportunities among our people and help the individual to lead a fuller and more satisfactory life. But it is a never-ending job, and has been from the beginning of our Government, to see that such laws are enacted and properly administered. This is a duty of the responsible citizen, in every economic group in our Nation.

Federal Aid to Education: Stampede to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following address delivered by Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, marks him as a courageous and fearless educator. In reading the speech, I have found many arguments against Federal aid to education which I knew existed, but which I have never found expressed so clearly and forcefully. Dr. Howard is an articulate exponent of a cause which needs to be explained at a time when the present administration is pressing the issue of more spending and more Federal agencies. I commend the speech as required reading for everyone interested in preserving the independence of higher education.

The speech follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION: STAMPEDE TO DISASTER

(An address by Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, before the 27th Annual Conference of the Central States Group, Investment Bankers Association of America, Chicago, Ill., March 13, 1963)

We are being rushed into ill-advised remedies for education which violate the nature and neutralize the vitality of the educational system that has ably served this country's needs under circumstances the most various. If our Nation permits our educational machine to be circumscribed and distorted as the agricultural machine has been, well, shame on us. The qualities of the educational system, strength or weakness, wisdom or folly, diversity or uniformity, will inevitably be reflected in the society some years later. As we may undermine the effectiveness of our schools and colleges, we circumscribe the potential of our society.

The title of these remarks, "Federal Aid to Education: Stampede to Disaster," makes use of strong terms. They are intentionally arresting. It is my belief that we, as a nation, are unwittingly placing in jeopardy our entire system of education and that the tocsins of alarm must be sounded so loudly and so frequently that the people and their representatives in Congress and even the educators, themselves, will think through the consequences of the course we now pursue and change its direction.

What is a stampede? It is a rapid mass movement. It is engaged in thoughtlessly. It is caused by fright. It is dangerous, and it is exceedingly difficult to stop. The press toward Federal subsidy of education, in my judgment, meets precisely each of these qualifications.

Except for a few lonely voices, the men and women in our Federal Government when they turn their attention to education are discussing not whether the U.S. Treasury shall pay more of the costs of education but rather which costs and in what manner. On January 29 of this year President Kennedy issued a White House message on education. "Our concern as a nation for the future of our children," said the President, "and the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist, make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special programs." The requested expansion is set forth in a single comprehensive bill entitled the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 of which the purpose is "strengthening, not weakening, the independence of existing school systems, and aimed at meeting our most urgent education problems and objectives, including quality improvement; teacher training; special problems of slum, depressed and rural areas; needy students; manpower shortage areas such as science and engineering; and shortages of educational facilities." The program proposed seeks Federal funds to meet all of these problems and more besides. Shortly after the President's message, the Republican members of the House Committee on Education and Labor reported in a news conference that they would propose legislation of their own to provide Federal funds to meet the problems of education. Even before the President's message more than 120 bills affecting education had been introduced in this Congress. The most influential educational associations of this country are all on record repeatedly urging the Federal Government to provide money for buildings, scholarships, research, and many other items including, in some cases, faculty salaries. The mass movement aspect of the Federal aid stampede is an assertion that will be readily granted.

The charge that it is a thoughtless movement will require more elaboration. Let us take an example of what passes for thinking among the advocates of Federal subsidy of education. Recently there appeared in the Princeton Alumni Weekly an article entitled "The Blessing That Is Federal Aid." It was written by McGeorge Bundy at the behest of Princeton's President Goheen. Mr. Bundy, you will recall, had served for some years as a dean at Harvard before joining the White House staff of advisers. If anyone is in a position to phrase convincingly the argument for Federal subsidy of education, it is this man who is one of the key formulators of national policy and who has the perspective of substantial academic and administrative service at our most renowned university. His proof of the blessing rests on four points. The first is that Federal funds for education have been productive. No one would be foolish enough to contradict his statement that Federal funds have been productive. They have indeed been productive. Who could spend a billion and

a half dollars a year on anything without producing quite a lot of something? The question is not "Have Federal funds been productive?" It is instead, "How productive in contrast to the same amount of money from other sources and what have been the byproducts?" A claim that much has been accomplished begs the issue.

Dean Bundy's second point is no more relevant than his first. He states that Federal funds produce freedom in education because if the scientist and the scholar do not have the funds to carry on their work their poverty limits their freedom. The Federal moneys certainly do liberate scholars to practice their profession. Again the logic is incontrovertible, but the argument completely misses the mark. The federalness of the money which is presumably the bone of contention, is totally unrelated to the fact that the funds received by the scholar free him to do his work. Any money, regardless of source, does as much.

Mr. Bundy's final two efforts to prove the benefits of Federal educational subsidy are one, the claim that the restrictions governing the use of Federal funds are fewer than those that govern the use of money from other sources, which is errant nonsense, and two, that the method of determining the specific details of Federal educational programs is more in keeping with the great academic tradition than is the method of determining the scope and the nature of programs paid for by funds that come from other places. Here he refers to the fact that representatives from a number of educational institutions are consulted in the planning of programs subsidized by the Federal Government. This process assures that the standardized programs subsidized by Government represent the best thinking, or at least the best compromises, that can be obtained from the most highly regarded scholars in a given field. An admirable practice it is if you must have standardized programs, but it is certainly not in the American academic tradition in which each college or university plans its own programs according to its own specific opportunities and limitations.

These four points constitute the proof offered by Presidential Adviser Bundy that Federal aid is a blessing. If this were an isolated example of justification for Federal aid by something less than thought I would need to support further my contention that the Federal aid movement is an unthinking stampede. However, it is about as effective a case as has been made and Princeton's president must have so judged it for he presented it to his alumni apparently in an offer to qualm their fears about Federal funds. Except in the case of those people who candidly seek to centralize all functions of society, there is not any sound argument for using Federal funds in preference to other funds.

The third characteristic of a stampede is that its cause is fright. Here our postulate needs little in the way of support. A whole new Federal invasion of education was launched in response to the great fear that struck on October 4, 1957. Sputnik I sent a chill into the hearts of all of us. The startling realization that Russia had outdistanced us in space technology rocked us as a nation. We were suddenly willing to grant new powers to Government and suppress historic and well-reasoned objections to certain Federal activities, out of plain, old-fashioned fear. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 put into being vast new programs some of which can be labeled "defense" only by an interpretation of the word so broad as to render it meaningless. Furthermore, it seems as if the fright is being perpetuated by many who are committed to the Federal support of education. The President's message already referred to closes with the recitation of Soviet superiority in the number of scientists produced each year. The implication is clearly that we cannot hold our own in the cold war if the legislation is not enacted. The Federal aid movement is urged on by scare techniques and the stampede gains momentum.

Before we consider the consequences of this movement, let us turn back the clock 15 years when President Truman proposed a similarly sweeping program of Federal legislation to pay educational costs. The storm of protest he aroused, although now largely forgotten, demonstrated a degree of unanimity on the part of educators at all levels seldom witnessed before or since. Typical of the comments of that era was a statement by President Gould, of Carleton College:

"I miss no opportunity to reiterate my opposition to Federal aid for education. As a matter of fact, the more I talk about it and the more I think about it, the more serious does that threat become. It is almost stupefying that intelligent people cannot see what may happen if we continue to promote movements in that direction."

Joining Dr. Gould in the opposition were the presidents of Columbia, Northwestern, Stanford, Brown, Beloit, Grinnell, and a host of others. These were not the narrow-minded reactionaries of the period but the most highly respected statesmen of their profession. Theirs was not a newly conceived attitude. Listen to another statement issued in March 1945:

"The first purpose of this document is to warn the American people of an insidious and ominous trend in the control and management of education in the United States.

"For more than a quarter of a century and especially during the last decade, education in the United States, like a ship caught in a powerful tide, has drifted ever farther into the dangerous waters of Federal control and domination.

"This drift has continued at an accelerated rate during the war. Present signs indicate that unless it is sharply checked by an alert citizenry, it will continue even more rapidly after the war.

"It is the deliberate and reasoned judgment of the two educational commissions who join in the appeal which this document makes to the people of the United States that the trend toward the federalizing of education is one of the most dangerous on the current scene.

"Education should be placed high on the list of services to be continued under State and local control. The ability to make distinctions as to what should and what should not be centralized permits some nations to preserve their liberty."

The quotation comes from a joint report issued by the problems and policies committee of the American Council on Education and the educational policies committee of the National Education Association. These two committees were speaking, in effect, for the whole power structure of American education.

It is to be wondered what has taken place in recent years to bring about a complete reversal of the firm position of the education leadership of our country. The principles which underlay earlier objections remain intact. No new discoveries have outmoded the principles. I am suggesting here that the principles have been lost sight of in the stampede and that we will be a people of little wisdom if we do not return to principles as the basis for action in meeting education problems.

The new thinking which buttresses the clamor for Federal subsidy cheerfully rejects principles as an all-important consideration. In a book published last spring, "The Federal Interest in High Education," the authors candidly recite a list of fictions which were introduced by the Congress in order to obtain the passage of educational legislation. Several brief quotations from that volume illustrate this astonishing point.

"In general, the potentially divisive character of the issue has been avoided by the creation of a number of polite fictions which allow the substance of the legislation to be considered without too much argument over its implications for the separation of church and state. Such adjustments are not made without a price being exacted somewhere. Sometimes the price has been the excision of program elements that could not be covered by the agreed-on fictions, and at other times the price has been the setting of precedents that encumber future action. Some examples will help make this point clearer.

"As we have said, there is nothing inherently wrong wtih such fictions. Indeed, in cases like the one just cited, they allow implementation of what a majority feel to be desirable social policy by providing an honorable way to avoid a contentious issue. The difficulty is that ruses good for one set of circumstances may not be good for, indeed, may be positively obstructive to, another set.

"In a broader sense, it is surely true that no society, in the world, at least has ever been able to afford the luxury of facing squarely all the issues that divide its people. The use of fiction as an instrument of cohesion is an indispensable social tool."

Now let us examine some of the reasons which underlie the traditional rejection of the Federal Government as the means of support for education. In the first place as the Federal Government becomes the largest single source of funds for college after college, and there are a number already in this category, the institution becomes beholden to the Government. This is not a chimera born of a doctrinaire distrust of Government. Recently I wrote to the president of a large well-known university inviting him to join a group of college presidents in making known the arguments against the ever-growing Federal subsidies of education. He replied that although he was in full agreement with our position that the subsidies are not in the long-range best interests of the colleges or the country, his own university was now so dependent upon funds from Washington that he could not exercise his rights as a citizen on this issue without jeopardizing the university he served.

Think about that answer, if you will. The mere flow of the money has silenced the opposition. This loss of freedom on the part of those who depend on Government for their income was the reason for refusing suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Let us project the Federal aid programs ahead, not too many years the way things are going, to the time when all colleges and universities will receive the largest part of their budget from the U.S. Treasury. Is it possible that all faculty members in that day will feel some obligation to vote for whichever party promises the largest amount of additional educational subsidies regardless of other partisan differences? This is not an unlikely result. Political freedom is sacrificed by those who depend upon government resources. Can we afford to sacrifice the political freedom of the whole academic community?

Earlier we referred to the byproducts of Federal programs of education. First let us be quite clear that there is no need to depend upon conjecture for ascertaining the effects of Federal funds in education. I recently received a manual of almost 800 pages devoted to a brief description of each of the educational programs in which the U.S. Government now engages. As a matter of fact, college executives may now subscribe to a periodical solely devoted to the presentation of new Federal programs, and new interpretations or new changes in old programs. Indeed the scope of current Federal programs

offers plenty of opportunity for observation.

The current issue of Nation's Business contains an article describing the overlapping, the inconsistencies, the distortions and the general confusion which characterize the aggregate of Government educational programs. The source of information for that article is John F. Morse who has just completed a 9-month study for the Higher Education Subcommittee of the House of Representatives. I commend to you Mr. Morse's statements. The inescapable conclusion seems to be that we must have a Washington superauthority to make plans for the academic segment of our society and to coordinate as well as pay for education through a central bureaucracy. This will be the disaster referred to in the title.

The predominant characteristic of American higher education has been its diversity. Each collegiate institution has its own particular nature, totally distinguishable from every other. The degree to which spiritual concerns affect the student during his undergraduate years ranges on different campuses from predominance to insignificance. Similarly the political impact upon the student varies from pure conservatism at one college to extreme liberalism at other institutions. The curricula are varied to a much greater extent than is generally recognized. Scripps College in California and St. John's in Baltimore place primary emphasis upon the humanities. Antioch in Ohio and Northeastern University in Massachusetts plan studies to support directly intermittent vocational experience. The programing of class schedules, the division of the academic year into time units, the presence or absence of fraternities, the size of the town, the percentage of students who carry jobs, the mores prevalent on the campus, and the strength of the student government are just a few of the many variables which color and mold student attitudes and vary the scope of student knowledge, totally apart from the nature and persuasiveness of the particular teachers in whose classes the student enrolls.

As graduates of these various institutions come together in any enterprise bringing with them their own views, their own bands of knowledge, their prejudices, and their experiences, that enterprise is the livelier and the more creative for the variety in the constituent personnel. I subscribe to the hypothesis that it is this convergency of diversely educated people in a free interchange of thought that has been the one condition which more than any other has enabled our Nation to make the achievements it has in commerce, in culture, in comfort, and in all the other aspects of our society.

What fosters this diversity? Principally it is the autonomy of the various institutions. As a college executive conceives or receives a new idea that seems promising, he has to sell it to only his own faculty and board of control. If he can convince them that it is a sound project and can find the financial resources to implement the plan, it is tried. The innovations of each college will arise out of its own peculiar circumstances, the particular strengths of the faculty, the philosophical objectives, the limitations or the advantages of the facilities, and, yes, the personal biases as well as the imagination and courage of the president and his governing board. It is the independence of each collegiate body which fosters diversity.

Each new educational undertaking of the Federal Government reduces the diversity of American education. Indeed, I do not know of one college executive who would not quickly agree that those programs now supported on our campuses by Federal funds could be carried on at least as effectively by a comparable amount of funds from other sources, and in many, many cases could be conducted with more creativity, more imagination, more flexibility, less bother, and at a much lower cost if the funds came from the traditional sources. Given such an agreement, why then do not the same executives oppose Federal aid? The answer is money.

Money is a good servant but a dangerous master. The reason that it is so difficult to justify Federal aid to education is that except for the few who admit to a philosophical commitment to the centralization of the services of society, the only justification for Federal aid is money, and the awkward, ugly fact is that the Federal Government is far more prodigal with its funds than are other sources. If only the proponents of Federal aid would come right out and state this fact we could face the issue head on and measure what the easy money buys against what we must sacrifice in order to obtain it from Washington.

It is undeniable that our increasingly technical society requires an increasingly skilled and knowledgeable population and to accomplish this end a larger part of the gross national product must be invested in education.

The issue is whether this urgent objective is to be achieved through congressional action, which forces the people to pay more for education and at the same time diminishes the diversity and circumscribes the creativity of the separate colleges, or whether the Nation can be persuaded to provide the necessary funds through the traditional sources and thus preserve the freedom and the strength of American education.

The latter course takes hard work. Fundraising is often a frustrating and thankless task, but no priceless asset is earned or retained without labor and sacrifice.

I cannot believe that my colleagues in college administration would so readily forfeit the full potential of their respective institutions, nor would shirk the task of local financing if they fully realized what was at stake. As black as their financial future may appear to them, it cannot be the reason for abandoning integrity. The course of educational statesmanship is to protect the greatest creative potential and the greatest institutional individuality. I don't believe that course lies via the Federal Treasury.

The college executives and the officers of Government who may have a part through their silent or vocal support of Federal subsidy will have to answer to history for the consequences of their work.

May this Nation recognize in time the stake it has in keeping education decentralized and unfederalized. If these views make sense to you, I urge you to do everything in your power to defeat any forthcoming educational subsidy bills and also to increase the flow of funds to higher education through other channels. The accomplishment of both objectives is essential to the strength and vitality of the Nation.

Tribute to the Late Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President a recent editorial in the Bloomington (Ind.) Star Courier, honored Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam retired president of DePauw University and nationally known liberal leader of the Methodist Church, who died recently at the age of 71 in New York City.

Dr. Oxnam was often a controversial bishop. This is a designation I am sure, Bishop Oxnam would have approved. His outspoken advocacy of Christian involvement in social issues caused him to be termed pro-Communist by the House Un-American Activities Committee, an accusation which later brought public apology from the committee.

To be called a controversial person in these days of troubled times is a sign that you are not among the living dead who pass their lives in conformity.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial tribute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTROVERSIAL BISHOP

Last week, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, retired president of DePauw University, and nationally renowned liberal leader of the Methodist Church, died in New York City at age 71.

In a front page obituary headline, the Indianapolis Star tagged Dr. Oxnam as a controversial bishop.

We think that Bishop Oxnam would have been proud of this accolade, particularly in newspapers like the Star.

This is a case of the greatness of a man being gaged by the identity of his enemies.

As a Methodist bishop in Omaha, Boston, New York, and Washington, D.C. (having at first been the youngest bishop in his church), Dr. Oxnam spoke out often on vexing public issues, defending labor, the civil rights of minorities, and the economic have-nots.

His outspoken advocacy of Christian involvement in social issues of the day, earned him the ire of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which labeled him pro-Communist. Later, the committee was publicly forced to make apology to him for its blast.

Men like Bishop Oxnam have made America great and have kept her strong.

Fortunately, his is a hardy breed and others of like instincts have his example to follow. Indiana's present Methodist bishop, Richard Raines, has proved himself a courageous and outspoken leader of the Oxnam school.

To be called a controversial person in these demanding and troubled times is often merely a sign that you are not one of the living dead who merely exist their humdrum lives away in passivity and conformity.

Sukarno's Belligerent Bankrupt Pro-Communist Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a most interesting and informative letter from Mr. Thomas H. McKaig, of Hamburg, N.Y.

Mr. McKaig is a consulting engineer who has made a number of visits to southeast Asia. His letter strongly urges that the United States exert its political

and economic resources to contain and restrain the pro-Communist and anti-Western threatened aggressions of Indonesia.

He also recommends that the United States give diplomatic, political, and economic support to the proposed Federation of Malaysia. This Federation would be composed of Malaya, Singapore, and the three British territories of Sarawak, North Borneo, and Brunei, all three of which are part of the island of Borneo. This Federation is proposed to become effective next August 31. Sukarno threatens to prevent its inception.

I am in complete accord with the views expressed by Mr. McKaig.

The excellent summation of the dangers inherent in the Indonesian pro-Communist policies, contained in Mr. McKaig's letter, is worthy of the attention of both this Congress and the State Department.

The pertinent parts of his letter follow:

SUKARNO'S BELLIGERENT BANKRUPT PRO-COMMUNIST INDONESIA

And now here is the item for which I am starting this letter so soon. I have made a few remarks in my former letter about Sukarno and his Communist inspired State of Indonesia. Through his mismanagement, Indonesia has deteriorated in every way since he took over from the Dutch in 1956. I told you what he has done to the financial structure of the country—how the rupiah has gone down to the point where it is practically worthless and the people are far more interested in barter than they are in selling anything for worthless rupiahs. The country is practically bankrupt and Sukarno has mortgaged the whole future of his country to Russia and Red China. Most of the country's wealth is spent on self-aggradizement, on an expensive military layout to support his sabre-rattling communistic policies, and still Mr. Kennedy's government continues to add to the hundreds of millions in foreign aid to enable him to build up his forces to be used for the spread of communism against the free nations of southeast Asia, primarily Malaya and its successor state Malaysia which will come into being August 31 of this year. Sukarno is already rumbling threats against this new federation and claiming north Borneo as part of his rightful territory. The Dutch Government, at the instigation and with the blessing of the U.S. Government has already given him a large slice of New Guinea which never was part of Indonesia. The people of Malaya, Singapore, North Borneo, and so forth, have voted overwhelmingly for this new federation of Malaysia, but they are anxiously awaiting the blessing of our Government as a guarantee of their safety for the development of a much stronger state as a bulwark against communism. The situation here is even more explosive than it was in Cuba, and with more far-reaching potential, but Kennedy continues to withhold any word of commendation for Malaysia and to send foreign aid to another Castro in this part of the world.

I am not generally in the habit of expressing opinions on matters of political import because others are probably better informed than I am.

In this instance, however, I am urging you to write to your congressman, suggesting that he look into the matter of what any foreign aid to Indonesia is spent for, before voting approval, and also to attempt to give our State Department a boost toward the construction of another strong bulwark for democracy in southeast Asia. I certainly intend to do this and so do many others on this cruise who have seen firsthand what Sukarno's rule has done to Indonesia and have read the papers from this part of the world with the accounts Sukarno's threats about the formation of "a state created for the purpose of threatening Indonesia and its free democracy." Unless our Government takes some action, our representatives in Congress who have permitted it to happen, will be responsible for the communistic explosion which is sure to come. Indonesia has the third largest Communist Party membership in the world surpassed only by Russia and China.

The following editorial from the Paris edition of New York Herald Tribune of March 11 applies to this situation.

"Indonesia's President Sukarno keeps offering fresh evidence that being a troublemaker on the world scene isn't the exclusive prerogative of big or long established powers.

"His chief current target is the proposed Federation of Malaysia, scheduled to come formally into being August 31. His interest in the federation, is understandable; it would join Malaya and Singapore with the three British territories of Sarawak, North Borneo and oil-rich Brunei, all of which are on the otherwise Indoneisan island of Borneo. But the bluster and bombast with which he has attacked it suggest, in the light of his bullying record, that his Soviet-supplied armed forces might again be put to aggressive use.

"A few weeks ago, his Foreign Minister bluntly warned that 'physical conflict' between Indonesia and the Federation would be unavoidable unless Malaya, which will be its dominant member, were to change its 'hostile' attitude toward Indonesia. And last December he aided and supplied anti-Federation rebels in Brunei in their quickly quashed effort to take over the territory.

"If Sukarno has reason to be interested in the Federation, the Federation also has reason to fear Sukarno. The purposes of its formation are partly economic; partly political. It is expected to form an anti-Communist union in a highly vulnerable area between Red China to the north and Sukarno's Indonesia in the south. Sukarno has long had a covetous eye on the Borneo enclaves and he proved in west New Guinea that he was quite ready to use military force to seize territory that he wanted.

"Moreover, Sukarno has made such a colossal botch of running his own country that foreign adventures provide a useful distraction. He has mortgaged his economy to the Soviets to buy arms (about a billion dollars worth) with which to harass his neighbors; his efforts to centralize in Djakarta a dictatorial control over all the islands have been ruinous; inflation is rocketing skyward. The United States has tried to bail him out with hundreds of millions in foreign aid and even through U.N. tried to appease his imperialistic ambitions by abetting his unprincipled grab of west New Guinea.

"Now he's attacking the Malaysia Federation as a form of 'neocolonialism' and a military threat only to the extent that it might help to thwart his own or Red China's aggressive designs. Britain is pressing ahead with plans for the federation, as are Malaya and the other members. Australia (which shares New Guinea with Sukarno) has weighed in with its support and has been trying diplomatically to soften Sukarno's antifederation stance. But it's likely to require more than diplomatic niceties to restrain a dictator of Sukarno's stripe, and he's been allowed to seize too much already."

Newsman Honored by Teaching Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today I am honored to speak on behalf of our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself in paying tribute to a reporter of public affairs whose reputation for excellence in our State is second to none. I speak of W. Preston (Luke) Wright, the dean of Montana political reporters and, since 1945, the chief of the Capitol bureau in Helena of the Great Falls Tribune.

It is not uncommon for Montanans to speak highly of Luke Wright. For years he has set the standard for political and public affairs reporting in our State, and a very high standard it has been. In my years of public service, dating back to 1936, I have never had the pleasure of knowing a more conscientious and capable newsman than Luke Wright.

Mr. President, the Luke Wright byline in the Great Falls Tribune has become synonomous with accurate, precise and thorough reporting of public affairs in my State. His readership is wide; his influence great. In short, the people of Montana have learned over the years that they can depend on the reporting and interpretation of Luke Wright. He has not let the people of Montana down; he has maintained the same high standard of excellence since his byline first appeared in the Tribune.

That is why the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I feel it is a genuine privilege to join our fellow Montanans in saluting the achievements of Luke Wright, dean of Montana political and public affairs reporters.

Mr. President, the Montana Education Association recently added another honor to Mr. Wright's collection by presenting to him the teaching profession's Golden Apple Citizenship Award. The award cited Mr. Wright for "contributions to an informed citizenry in the State of Montana." It was presented in recognition of "outstanding reporting of affairs of state, and especially for objective news coverage of education at all levels."

Other recent winners of the Montana Education Association's Golden Apple Award have included Judge W. W. Lessley of Bozeman in 1959. Mr. Russell Hart of Billings in 1961, and Mr. Randall Swanberg of Great Falls in 1962. The MEA last week issued a news release describing the award to Mr. Wright and summarizing his accomplishments.

Mr. President, on behalf of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the MEA's news release about its award to Mr. Wright be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSMAN HONORED BY TEACHING PROFESSION

Teachers don't always get the apples, occasionally they give them. This happened in Helena when W. Preston "Luke" Wright, of Helena, chief of the Capitol bureau of the Great Falls Tribune since 1945, was awarded the teaching profession's Golden Apple Citizenship Award at the banquet session of the Montana Education Association's annual delegate assembly which met in Helena March 29–30.

The award, consisting of a gold lapel pin in the shape of an apple and a hand-lettered certificate which cited Wright for "contributions to an informed citizenry in the State of Montana," was presented in recognition of "outstanding reporting of affairs of state, and especially for objective news coverage of education at all levels."

Wright was introduced to an audience of several hundred delegates attending the banquet by Mrs. Valborg H. Graham of Billings, chairman of the Montana Education Association's citizenship committee which sponsors the awarding of the honor to a lay person who makes a significant contribution to the advancement of education in Montana. Presentation of the award was made by Maurice Hickey, of Ennis, president of the Montana Education Association.

The Helena newsman, dean of reporters on affairs of state, was nominated for the teaching profession's award for his reporting of legislative affairs, and coverage of meetings of the State board of education and the board of university regents. By translating difficult legislative interpretations and educational terminology into layman's language, Wright has done much through the years to give the public a better understanding of the important educational problems that have confronted Montana citizens.

A native of Indiana, Wright started his newspaper career in Colorado, covering his first legislative session in that State in 1923. In addition to working on papers in Denver and Pueblo, Colo., he has worked on papers in Des Moines and Newton, Iowa. Prior to coming to Helena, he spent a year as a research assistant to the publisher of Business Week magazine in New York City.

A capable speaker who punctuates factual reporting with witticism, Wright has addressed several school administrators' conferences, a summer seminar of administrators at the university, and a Montana Education Association convention. He has a standing invitation to address the Great Falls Rotary Club after every session of the legislature. He is proud of his 25-year pin as a member of the Great Falls Newspaper Guild and his membership (the only one in Montana) in the Education Writers Association, a select national organization.

His wife, the former Lois Swanke, has been operating a readiness school in the Capital City for the past 5 years. She is a former public school teacher, having taught at Malta, Chinook, Great Falls, and Helena. The Wright's one son, John, is an engineer at Helena's TV station, KBLL.

U.S. Policy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1960, the then candidate John F. Kennedy said in Johnstown, Pa.:

> We must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

This statement is in striking contrast with the State and Justice Department announcements over the past weekend and subsequent United States and British naval action based on those statements.

The following columns by Roscoe Drummond in the April 2 Washington Post, Virginia Prewett in the April 2 Washington Daily News, and David Lawrence in the April 2 Washington Star effectively point out the desperate need for the Kennedy administration to explain its Cuba policy to the Congress and the American people:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1963]

WHY STAND IN THE WAY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the Administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably, President Kennedy seeks the goal of a "free Cuba." He told the released Cuban invasion prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugee's harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in the way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pinpricks. So were Castro's first hit-and run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any prudent man could have told the latent and fermenting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and hand-made grenades. But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil." It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba. The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that finding things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we would "do more" to help the Cuban resisters "both inside and outside Cuba." Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba. If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong, then at the very least it should be making suggestions and helping them to do it right.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 2, 1963]

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA DEPLORED

(By Virginia Prewett)

The U.S. State Department spokesman who called the daring and gallant Alpha 66 raids on Cuba irresponsible acts that helped Castro's cause, reached an alltime low in pronouncement of U.S. foreign policy.

In Biblical times, the authors of this statement would have assailed young David for going up against Goliath. They'd have said his inspiring victory of right over might "helped the Philistines." And they'd probably have taken away his slingshot.

In colonial times, these spokesmen would have condemned the Boston Tea Party as "irresponsible"—and said it helped the British.

They would have deplored the French maquis' harassment of the Nazi occupation troops while Hitler ruled Europe.

OFFICIAL

For years, U.S. cold war propaganda has hailed the gallant Hungarian Freedom Fighters who challenged Communist power. Yet last week, the world's greatest democracy officially chided Cuba's dedicated young patriots for proving that the fortress Cuba is not invulnerable.

When the State Department calls these raids irresponsible, by inference they re-

pudiate every freedom fighter who takes up arms against communism.

In Vietnam, young Americans are being killed by Communists with Russia-supplied arms. Yet in the Caribbean, when young Cubans harass their betrayer, Castro, and the Russian occupation, the U.S. State Department deplores it.

STANDOFF

Why? Will the nuclear set now tell us that unless we stop the Alpha 66 raids against Communist Cuba, there'll be nuclear conflict?

This will sound fairly thin, since Defense Secretary Robert McNamara himself last week told Congress that we are in a "nuclear standoff" with Russia.

The U.S. State Department knows very well that the Alpha 66 raids are part of a strategy aimed at overthrowing Castro. Every raid is followed by a burst of sabotage against the Russian occupation. Does our State Department not want this occupation harassed?

Responsible members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tell me they cannot believe the Department spoke seriously against the Cuban patriots. They believe this is another example of our Government's use of the forked tongue—as advocated in the managed news policy. If this is true, the authors of this latest managed lie ought to be taken out of their fear-distorted environment and subjected to the influence of ordinary people who respect courage and hate tyranny.

The U.S. Information Service Chief, Edward R. Murrow, last week pleaded with Congress for a 25-percent increase in his operation's budget. So long as the U.S. State Department's spokesmen are too terrified to stand behind the principle of freedom and to "help our friends," as President Kennedy promised in his election pledges, then all the money spent for U.S. propaganda will be so much paper and tarnishable silver down the drain.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla actions such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

Texas, Minnesota Radio Stations Join in Effort To Save Hemophilia Patient in Baylor Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at Baylor Medical Center in Dallas, a 17-year-old boy from Muskogee, Okla., Fred Wallas has received more than 900 blood transfusions, believed to be a record in medical history. Many of the hundreds of donors of blood for this young hemophilia patient were recruited as a result of the efforts of News Director Dick Moore of KBOX radio in Dallas and other members of the KBOX staff, and members of the staff of KDWB of St. Paul, Minn. These radio stations have jointly waged a stirring fight to save a life.

I ask that an editorial from the Dallas Times Herald of March 9, 1963, and an editorial broadcast by News Director Moore of radio station KBOX be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as an example of an unusual and stirring public service project.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Mar. 9, 1963]

SIX FLYING TO DALLAS TO AID HEMOPHILIAC

ST. PAUL, MINN.—Six employees of radio station KDWB scheduled a flight to Dallas Monday to donate a pint of blood each to a young hemophiliac.

The station said it is undertaking the project named "Flight for Life," to call attention to the plight of Fred Wallas, 17, of Muskogee, Okla., a patient at Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, and to National Red Cross month.

Wallas has had nearly 800 pints of blood since he underwent surgery last October.

KDWB announcers and diskjockeys who will make the trip are Hal Murray, Art May, Jim O'Neill, Randy Cook, Don Duchene, and Dan Ronald. They will be greeted on their arrival in Dallas by diskjockeys from station KBOX.

KBOX RADIO EDITORIAL—WRITTEN AND BROADCAST BY DICK MOORE, NEWS DIRECTOR, DALLAS, TEX.

At Baylor Medical Center in Dallas there's a young man from Muskogee, Okla., who needs your help. He is 17-year-old Fred Wallas. Fred holds a dubious distinction. Since he entered Baylor Medical Center last October he has received 800 pints of blood by transfusion, an alltime record in the history of medical blood transfusions. Fred suffers from hemophilia. He is what we commonly refer to as a "bleeder." Authorities at Baylor and at Wadley Blood Center tell us they can see no end to the transfusions. Monday, diskjockeys from two radio stations, KBOX here in Dallas, and KDWB, St. Paul, Minn., join forces in a combined effort to bolster blood donations for Fred Wallas. The six diskjockeys from Minnesota will arrive by Braniff Airlines Monday morning at Love Field in Dallas. They will be met by six air personalities from KBOX. Together the 12 will go to Wadley Blood center and give of their blood.

Today, KBOX radio asks that you, the citizens of Dallas, follow the lead of these 12 air personalities from KBOX and KDWB. Visit Wadley Blood Center. The hours: Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. until 7:30 p.m.; Saturday, 8:30 a.m. until 4:30 p.m., and Sunday, 1 p.m. until 4 p.m. KBOX radio says, "Come on Dallas, turn out in force, give young Fred Wallas, 17 years old the blood he needs to continue life * * *"

Buffalo's 10th Bishop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on February 13, 1963, Pope John XXIII appointed the Most Reverend James A. McNulty, of Paterson, N.J., as Buffalo's 10th bishop. Bishop McNulty's appointment, which ended a 4-month period of uncertainty, is the last in succession of many distinguished bishops who have served the 115-year-old diocese of Buffalo. The energy and dynamism of this man, his vision as revealed in his concepts of social and spiritual needs, are clearly evident in his lifelong accomplishments. Buffalo, in fact all New York, is proud to welcome Bishop McNulty.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a special report which appeared in the April issue of the Victorian be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUFFALO'S 10TH BISHOP

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Believing that Victorian readers will be interested in the bishop who has been appointed to guide the destinies of the diocese of Buffalo in which this magazine is published, the presses were stopped on February 13 so this sketch of the career of Bishop James A. McNulty might be brought to readers at the earliest possible moment. It was written on February 14.)

On February 13, 1963, the ever-amazing Pope John XXIII, almost as if by design, sent the people of the diocese of Buffalo a Valentine Day greeting in the appointment of Bishop James A. McNulty of Paterson, N.J., as the 10th bishop of the 6,357 square-mile diocese of Buffalo, comprising 8 counties with a total population of 873,089 Catholics cared for in parishes which are staffed in part by 603 secular priests and by 543 religious priests.

Bishop McNulty's appointment ended the 4-month period of speculation among priests and people as to the identity of the man who would succeed such great bishops as John Timon, Stephen V. Ryan, James Edward Quigley, Charles Henry Colton, Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, William Turner, John A. Duffy, John Francis Cardinal O'Hara, and Joseph A. Burke who had served as chief shepherds of the 115-year-old diocese of Buffalo.

Significantly enough and as usually happens in such cases, the appointment of Bishop McNulty came as a complete surprise. His name was one of the few names not frequently mentioned in the popular guessing games.

His appointment to the Buffalo diocese left the people of Paterson saddened, just as it rejoiced the hearts of the people of western New York. Lead editorials in the local Paterson papers expressed a keen sense of loss in Bishop McNulty's transfer to the diocese of Buffalo.

Mr. Joseph R. Thomas, managing editor of the Advocate, a Catholic weekly which serves both the archdiocese of Newark and the diocese of Paterson, enthused over the phone: "What wonderful news—for you people in Buffalo. He's a go-go-go bishop, a tremendous person, vitally interested in the Catholic press. In his diocese, he secured 100 percent coverage for the Advocate, but when I stop to think about it, he's interested in everything. I can't think of a phase of either Catholic or civic life in which he is not interested, he's a 100 percent doer, you people sure are lucky."

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, a longtime friend of Bishop McNulty, characterized him as "the most outstanding and promising bishop in the United States."

Msgr. William F. Louis, Chancellor of the Paterson diocese under Bishop McNulty, said, "He is a most affable and gracious person. He works with zest, a man of indefatigable energy and dedication to the church and God. He is the best preacher I have ever heard."

And so the tributes poured in with descriptive phrases and adjectives which might to assembled into a thesaurus of tributes to personal dynamism and greatness. Such characterizing words as "charm, drive, energy, loyalty, prudence, generosity, leadership, strength, progressiveness," etc., kept occurring as those who know Bishop James A. McNulty tried to imprison the multifaceted jewel of this personality into the straitjacket of words fitted to do justice to the man they were honoring.

The 13-year-old picture of Bishop McNulty which the Buffalo Evening News displayed under the front page banner headline made the tributes come to life in the minds of the readers who saw before them a rugged, smiling, handsome man well graced by nature. Conversation throughout the city of Buffalo that day was largely centered in the new bishop of Buffalo.

Bishop Leo R. Smith, auxiliary bishop of the diocese of Buffalo and administrator during the vacancy of the see, whose appointment as bishop of Ogdensburg ended his 30 years of outstanding leadership and service in the curia of the Buffalo diocese, said to the writer: "I am very happy. You know how much I love this diocese and its people. I am thankful that Bishop McNulty has been appointed as your bishop. He has been my friend for many years. You are getting a great bishop." The formal statement which Bishop Smith released to the newspapers eloquently and scholarly developed the theme of the personal greatness of the man who had been appointed bishop of the diocese.

Msgr. Thomas Little, national director of the Legion of Decency in New York City, who had worked closely with Bishop McNulty during the latter's term as chairman of the Episcopal Committee of the Motion Picture and Television Division of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, spoke glowingly of his years of personal friendship with the bishop. He commented in part, "The contribution of Bishop McNulty in his 4-year term of office, will be considered as inestimable when the history of the National Legion of Decency is finally written. I consider my close, personal association with Bishop McNulty as more than a privilege. It was an education in wisdom and prudence. His guidance, counsel, and direction greatly strengthened my relations with the motion picture industry in the United States."

While today (February 14), the image of the new bishop is largely one as seen through the eyes of friends and acquaintances, it is buttressed by the data of Bishop McNulty's scintillating career as a priest and bishop. Significantly enough, in the news furor which greeted his appointment, silence shrouded the principal actor in the ecclesiastical drama. He was in the interior of Bolivia, South America, beyond the reach of telephone or telegraph, visiting three Paterson priests who had volunteered to man three mission parishes which had been established by Bishop McNulty.

It was not necessary, however, for Bishop McNulty to speak. His record was eloquent in itself. Born in New York City on January 16, 1900, he received his early education in Immaculate Conception School, Montclair, N.J., and in Seton Hall Preparatory School, where he was graduated with honors to Seton Hall College in South Orange, N.J. There also, he so distinguished himself in his studies that he was selected to attend the great University of Louvain in Belgium for higher studies leading to the priesthood. Then, after completing his seminary course with honors, he was ordained on July 12, 1925, in the American College Chapel of the University by the Most Reverend Jules de Wachter.

Returning directly to the United States, Father McNulty was assigned as curate in St. Joseph's Church, Jersey City, where he immediately began to demonstrate the special gifts which he brought with him into the work of the priesthood. He became known as a "guiding genius" in various educational, cultural, spiritual, recreational, and physical development phases of youth work. Some observers began to speak of him as an "American Don Bosco."

His achievements during the next 10 years were so outstanding that his archbishop, Thomas J. Walsh of Newark, in 1936 appointed him to several administrative posts in the archdiocesan curia. He became executive secretary of the Bishop's Association for the Immaculate Conception Seminary, director of diocesan cemeteries, director of the confraternity of Christian doctrine, and of the archdiocesan Catholic Youth Organization, where he again set up a typhoon of organizational improvements in the operation of these varied departments.

In 1939, in addition to many other duties, he served as administrator of St. Bridget's Church in Newark. In this period, he was also appointed as director of the Mount Carmel Guild, moderator of the Nocturnal Adoration Society, and Defensor Vinculi (defender of the marriage bond) in the archdiocesan marriage tribunal (court).

Two years later, on April 10, 1941, Pope Pius XII gave paternal recognition to the excellence of his work by elevating him to the rank of papal chamberlain with the title, very reverend monsignor. Six years later, his priestly career was splendidly fulfilled when on the Feast of the Holy Rosary, October 7, 1947, he was raised to the Episcopacy as the titular bishop of Methone and auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of Newark. He was consecrated in Sacred Heart Cathedral, Newark, by his friend and mentor, Archbishop Walsh, who many years before had been chancellor of the diocese of Buffalo.

When Bishop Walsh died in June 1952, his aide, Bishop James A. McNulty, was elected administrator of the diocese until January 15, 1953, when the appointment of Archbishop Thomas A. Boland to Newark was announced. The new archbishop had previously been bishop of Paterson.

A few months later, on April 15, 1953, Pope Pius XII appointed Bishop McNulty as the third bishop of the 25-year-old diocese of Paterson.

In the 10-year period of Bishop McNulty's episcopate in Paterson, he established the reputation which Mr. Thomas, the managing

editor of the Advocate, picturesquely characterized as "a go-go-go bishop." He welded his priests together with his gracious and affable leadership and he forged a bond of universal affection between himself and the people of his area. He constructed three diocesan high schools in two of the three counties of his diocese and a fourth is now being constructed in the remaining county. New parishes and new elementary schools began to appear throughout the diocese. He launched a diocesan development program which even included plans for a low and middle income housing development program to be handled by a nonprofit corporation. His establishment of the Mount Carmel Guild in his diocese, which included facilities for the rehabilitation of alcoholics in an affiliated hospital, attracted nationwide attention.

Bishop McNulty's wide range vision of social needs and his energetic measures to meet those needs are based on the solid bedrock of intense personal spirituality. The motto which he adopted for his episcopacy, "Ad Jesum per Mariam (to Jesus through Mary) proclaimed his special devotion to the Mother of God, which he recommended to the people in his care. He personally leads the nocturnal adoration program, of which he was moderator in Newark. Unlike the men who participate in the program by an hour of prayer scheduled at various times through the night on the Thursdays before first Friday, Bishop McNulty is frequently found spending the entire night in prayer during these vigil hours of adoration. His unceasing interest in the missions of the church is clearly evident in his establishment of three Bolivian missions.

Bishop McNulty's interest in movements involving Catholic men is celebrated. Despite the demands that are made on a bishop's time, he frequently drops in unannounced on the functions of Catholic men's organizations and spends an entire evening in easy, informal conversation with his friends who are also his spiritual sons.

Bishop McNulty is expected to return on February 24, when he will make arrangements for his installation as bishop of Buffalo.

His roots in Buffalo are already deep for he served under Archbishop Walsh, whose interest in his own native diocese of Buffalo was one of his outstanding characteristics. Bishop McNulty also worked with, and greatly admired Bishop Duffy, the seventh bishop of Buffalo, whose early career was spent in the curial work of the Newark archdiocese. He has maintained a close personal friendship with Bishop Smith, whose entire 30 years of curial experience has been gained in the diocese of Buffalo. Even though Bishop McNulty, until the present, has been a stranger to most people in the diocese of Buffalo, the diocese is not a stranger to this great man whose work will soon begin in western New York.

The Meaning of Patriots' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, April 19 is Patriots' Day. This day is set aside each year to commemorate a small band of Colonial patriots who dared, against overwhelming odds, to fight for freedom.

In the early dawn, 188 years ago, 77 Colonial Minutemen stood their ground in the town Common at Lexington. They fought a delaying action against 700 crack English troops that was to provide the men at Concord precious time to prepare for the encounter.

Each year, at this time, the Hardware Mutuals-Sentry Life Insurance Co., in my congressional district commemorates the courage and the memory of these men. Fittingly, Hardware Mutuals-Sentry Life has chosen, as its official symbol, the bronze statue of Capt. John Parker, the leader of that small, courageous band of Colonial Minutemen.

An illuminating article has been prepared by the Hardware Mutuals–Sentry Life on "The Meaning of Patriots' Day." I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE MEANING OF PATRIOT'S DAY

April 19, only 4 days after the income tax filing deadline, is the day set aside to commemorate patriots who refused to pay taxes, reports a researcher for a leading mutual insurance firm.

The Hardware Mutuals-Sentry Life writer admits that these nontaxpaying patriots didn't have to face the Internal Revenue officers, only the muskets of 700 disciplined troops of the King of England.

However, we are sure modern taxpayers will agree that no matter what the tax bite, the current price of freedom is at a bargain rate compared with the cost paid by those first patriots 188 years ago. And we are proud to, annually on Patriots' Day, pay homage to those men who dared the consequences of the nonpayment of taxes.

It was at dawn on April 19, 1775, when American patriots, having tired of British taxation without government representation, mustered in the common at Lexington to face the British under the command of Major Pitcairn.

This small band of colonials stood their ground and fired the shot heard round the world in defense of freedom that set off the Revolutionary War. These men were not the remembered greats, Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, or Hancock, but embattled farmers and tradespeople whose independent spirit and sacrifice provided the shoulders from which America's greats have risen.

They were men who were willing to fight until death if necessary for a system of states under which each State would manage its own affairs and would have a voice in parliamentary affairs which concerned them. For several weeks, Boston patriots loyal to this cause had been stockpiling war materials in various locations throughout the Colonies. One location was Concord, but first the British would have to march through Lexington.

Led by Capt. John Parker, a farmer and mechanic elected by fellow farmers, 77 colonists stood ready in the early dawn of April 19, 1775, to hear their captain's command: "Don't fire unless fired upon. But if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

Accounts vary as to which side fired the first shot, but nevertheless a shot was fired and blood was shed.

The colonists who gathered on the Lexington Green had been alerted by the midnight rider of Longfellow's famed pen. However, Paul Revere did not ride alone. A second rider, William Dawes, took a longer route from Boston to Lexington warning the countryside as he rode. Both men met in Lexington before continuing on to Concord and both were stopped by a patrol of British officers.

The warning to Concord minutemen was given by a Dr. Prescott, who had joined Revere and Dawes in Lexington. Dr. Prescott managed to escape the British. Dawes also escaped but tumbled from his horse in a mad dash to freedom.

Paul Revere was released shortly before dawn and was busy helping John Hancock save a trunk of official papers when the dawn encounter between the colonial minutemen and the Redcoats began.

The colonials called themselves minutemen, as their purpose was to be ready to fight at a minute's notice. Until 1774, these minutemen had been a part of the town militia organized to fight marauding Indian bands.

During those first 150 years of colonial America there was no deviation from military service. All men over 16 and under 60 were required to own a firelock, a bayonet, and quantity of ammunition.

The militias elected their own officers annually and paid fines for not attending the four meetings a year unless they had ample reason. Failure to pay the fine meant dismissal from the company.

Captain Parker's group was made up of volunteer freemen who could elect or remove their officers. Since Indian fighting had long since ceased in Massachusetts, these men had had little more military experience than parading on holidays in the village common.

Yet they stood defiantly in the path of the King's superior forces, knowing that they were starting a war that even the most optimistic must have had qualms of winning. And some were sure to die. Eight were killed and nine wounded on that first Patriot's Day. They had fulfilled their pledge to sacrifice life itself in support of the common cause.

The delay provided by the Lexington martyrs gave the men of Concord, 5 miles away, a chance to prepare for the advancing army and to save their stores of ammunition and a precious cannon.

As the British marched onward, the Lexington minutemen regrouped to become flanking snipers. Minutemen from all over the countryside, now aroused, joined in the fight to rout the British.

Today a bronze statue of a colonial minuteman stands on a triangular park in Lexington, marking that first battleground for American freedom. There Capt. John Parker stands as a sentry overlooking the busy thoroughfare of traffic streaming from Boston.

The statue was commissioned in 1898 after Francis B. Hayes left $10,000 for the memorial under the terms of his will. Boston sculptor Henry Hudson Kitson created his own conception of the farmer leader, as no drawing, portrait, or likeness of Capt. John Parker could be found.

The bronze minuteman stands on an impressive foundation of New England fieldstone, "The Hayes Memorial Fountain," representing the stone fences from which Lexington minutemen fired at the British troops.

On Patriots' Day, April 19, 1900, the memorial was dedicated to the first chapter in America's history of freedom.

The sentry symbolizing Hardware Mutuals-Sentry Life is a specific photographic view of the minuteman statue in Lexington. The sentry symbol reflects the insurance organization's up-to-the-minute action and philosophy of protection to policyholders just as the statue reminds all Americans of colonial Americans' acceptance and defense of their own way of life.

Despite devotion to self-reliance, the colonists did not hesitate to band together to resist oppression. It was this same self-reliant spirit that first prompted individuals to band together into mutual insurance societies for protection against disaster.

Florida's First Legislative Assembly Over 200 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have read a most interesting discussion of Florida's first legislative assembly held in Pensacola 200 years ago. It is written by Dena Snodgrass of the Jacksonville Historical Society and was published in the Florida Times-Union on Sunday, March 31, 1963.

Florida's first legislative assembly, meeting some 200 years ago, passed laws which are strangely modern in tone.

These early laws reflect in miniature some of the basic needs of today and some which must be met by the legislative session convening in Tallahassee this week. A necessity for providing for new growth and development links the two periods for then, as now, new situations and changing times demanded solutions.

In 1763 the twin Floridas, East and West, were British owned with St. Augustine and Pensacola as capitals. Duplicate colonial governments were set up providing for a Governor, judges, a council (all appointed by England) and an assembly elected by the freeholders in the Floridas.

These assemblies were the first lawmaking bodies elected by Floridians. Because the provinces were new and virtually unsettled, the setting of the time for the election of assemblymen was left to the Governor's discretion.

This time came early in West Florida where the first assembly met on November 3, 1766, a little more than 3 years after the British arrived. The council made up the upper house and the members of the lower house were elected from Pensacola, nearby Campbell Town, and from Mobile, for West Florida extended then to the Mississippi River.

Little Pensacola was packed with visitors during meetings of the assembly. Though an air of festivity reigned in the town, the assembly conducted its affairs seriously and with dignity. The council and assembly together varied from 20 to 30 members at different sessions as no exact number was set by law. The Governor called the assembly to meet approximately once each year, but at irregular intervals.

The weather, too, affected the meetings of this early legislature.

Records of 1778 reveal that "the reason of no business being done in the house of assembly from the 9th to the 15th of October was owing to a very melancholy cause—the severest hurricane ever felt or known in this part of the world since West Florida has belonged to the Crown of Great Britain happened on the night of the 9th with such irresistible fury and violence as entirely to sweep away all the wharfs, stores, and houses contiguous to the water side, with part of the front batteries of the garrison, besides destroying several houses and making a general havoc of the ferries in the town of Pensacola. All the ships and vessels in the harbor were either lost, or driven ashore, except His Majesty's sloop of war, the *Sylph*, which with difficulty rode out the gale. The great loss of property by this general calamity affected the whole community and particularly some members of the assembly, which prevented their attending the house and therefore it was thought proper to put a stop to going on business till matters were a little settled and all the members could and with some degree of convenience attend." (From the Colonial Office, London, as quoted by Clinton N. Howard in Florida Historical Quarterly, April 1941.)

Roads were one of the assembly's first concerns as none had been built prior to English ownership. An old trail between Mobile and Pensacola was surveyed and widened to make a road for fast travel and mail delivery connecting with the ships which docked at Pensacola. Troops stationed in the province helped to build this first road.

The construction of government buildings, public hospitals and markets; the establishment of a new court; the drainage of land and the regulation of boats using the waterways were subjects of legislation.

In an attempt at beautification, the assembly provided for the cleaning of streets and requested that landowners cut all offensive weeds.

The number of stores licensed to sell liquor in Pensacola was set at three and receipts were earmarked to help pay the cost of building a public market.

Salaries for themselves were voted by the assemblymen. Each member was to receive 5 shillings (about $1.25) a day for the days he attended sessions and the speaker was rewarded with 7 shillings a day. The clerk was paid £70 (about $350) annually. Evidently he had other means of livelihood as £200 was considered a living wage at that time. By comparison, a cow was given a high value, £4, because good livestock was not plentiful.

The need for wharfs and docks was recognized and private business was urged by the assembly to invest in these facilities in order to take advantage of the potential port trade.

Each of these subjects has its close counterpart, if not equivalent, today.

Other laws mirrored the pioneer Florida of the 1760's and 1770's. They provided for the building of forts and batteries for protection against the Indians and from invasion.

The sale of rum and other strong liquors to the Indians was forbidden in the towns. Sales beyond the settlements were not regulated as catching the culprits in the Florida forests and swamps was recognized as well nigh impossible.

Debtors were jailed but the legislature kindly arranged that they would be separated from the jailed criminals.

Butchers were required to hang hides of all animals killed in the stockade for 4 hours each day, evidently to show the cattle brands in an attempt to prevent thievery.

Two public baths or washing places were provided east and west of Pensacola.

Laws were translated into French for the convenience of the French residents in the western part of the Province so that none could plead ignorance of the law.

No assembly was summoned in east Florida's capital, St. Augustine, until 1781, a short 2 years before Britain lost the Floridas and they reverted to Spain. The Governor and the council made the laws, a less complicated and speedier method than one involving an assembly. It is likely that this feature appealed to the Governor, a former military officer, and led him to postpone calling an assembly.

In both East and West Florida the expenses of government were borne by the British Parliament. Consequently no echo of the cry, "taxation without representation," heard in the 13 Original Colonies, came from Florida. Although there were quarrels, the mother country was better liked in these two new provinces and opposition to the American Revolution burst out in a demonstration in St. Augustine where effigies of the colonial leaders, John Hancock and Samuel Adams, were burned in the plaza.

The colonial governments of East and West Florida were described in a proclamation of October 7, 1763, empowering the Governors "as soon as the situation and circumstances * * * admit * * * to summon and call general assemblies of the freeholders and planters * * * and by and with the advice and consent of the council and assembly * * * to make laws * * * as near as may be agreeable to the laws * * * of Great Britain."

By similar proclamations the basic ideas of self-government had been extended to all the American colonies and they served eventually as the basis of present-day State governments and legislatures.

Tribute to Harry B. Haines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Paterson Evening News reporting the action of the Passaic County Board of Freeholders in paying tribute to Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson Evening News.

New Jerseyites who know Mr. Haines and his fine efforts in behalf of his city, his county and his State recognize that this tribute was very well merited indeed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY HONORS NEWS PUBLISHER

Members of the Passaic County Board of Freeholders yesterday paid a significant tribute to Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson Evening News.

Six members of the board, accompanied by County Counsel Harry L. Schoen and County Planner Harvey Moskowitz, visited Mr. Haines at the News office and presented him with an illuminated scroll embodying resolutions of felicitation on the new News Building and the publisher's contribution to the county's welfare.

BOARD MEMBERS ATTEND

Present for the ceremonies were Director Joseph Lazzara and Freeholders Robert A. Roe, Joseph D. Donato, Joseph Ryan, John Jay Sullivan, and David Krugman, County Counsel Harry L. Schoen, and County Planner Harvey Moskowitz. The only board member absent was Freeholder Sam Bruno.

A keynote phrase in the resolution sums up the sentiments of the board of freeholders better than any other recounting:

"No man in the city of Paterson has shown more faith in the progress and future of the city and county than the Honorable Harry B. Haines."

Read the resolution: "Being cognizant of the helpfulness to this county of the Paterson Evening News, and in particular, the Honorable Harry B. Haines, does hereby personally congratulate the News and the publisher upon their great achievement in moving into this new and modern building where they will continue to serve all people in the city of Paterson and the county of Passaic with renewed vigor."

THE BOARD'S PRIDE

In making the presentation, Freeholder Director Joseph A. Lazzara said, "We're proud to come here to pay you this tribute. We know the task you do every day to make Paterson and Passaic County a wonderful place in which to live."

Other members of the board echoed the sentiment.

Mr. Haines responded:

"It's with a deep sense of appreciation that I accept this document from men who are working to make the county a better place in which to live and work. We have a common purpose—to help people and to strive to make our area the very best possible as a place in which to live and to maintain progress in the fast-moving tempo of the times."

Receiving the document in his new office was especially meaningful, said Mr. Haines, because the News Building epitomized the keynote of progress for which, he said, the freeholders stand.

"This is it * * * the integral part of my life is here" he said, gesturing toward the expansive building.

Lazzara, speaking for the board members, said, "I can only say again how very proud we are to be able to come here."

A TRIBUTE TO FAITH AND DEDICATION

THE COUNTY OF PASSAIC—STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Resolution

Whereas the Honorable Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson Evening News, reposing great faith and confidence in the future of the county of Passaic, has brought into being a modern new building at News Plaza which is one of the most modern newspaper facilities in the country to meet the needs of a growing area and to further demonstrate his faith in the future of Passaic County as the hub of a burgeoning metropolitan area; and

Whereas the new News plant is planned to meet present growth and anticipated future expansion and is the News' contribution to the "Forward Paterson" movement which envisions a tremendous growth here and which Mr. Haines helped organize; and

Whereas the said Harry B. Haines has spent his entire lifetime exercising his sympathetic understanding, kindness, keen judgment and great affability; and

Whereas during the span of his career he has given freely, energetically, and wholeheartedly in every endeavor to further the interests of the county of Passaic; and

Whereas no man in the city of Paterson has shown more faith in the progress and the future of the city of Paterson than the Honorable Harry B. Haines; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Passaic, That this board, being cognizant of the helpfulness to this county of the Paterson Evening News and, in particular, its publisher, the Honorable Harry B. Haines, does hereby personally congratuate the News and the publisher upon their great achievement in moving into this new and modern building where they will continue to serve all people in the city of Paterson and the county of Passaic with renewed vigor; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread in full upon the minutes of this session and that a certified copy thereof be forwarded to the Paterson Evening News and the Honorable Harry B. Haines.

The Board of Chosen Freeholders County of Passaic, State of New Jersey: Joseph A. Lazzar, Sam Bruno, Joseph F. Ryan, David Krugman, John Jay Sullivan, Robert A. Rose, Director, Jos. D. Donato, Deputy Director, Harry L. Schoen, Counsel.

The Peace Corps Physical Training Camps in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, since the very inception of the Peace Corps, I have been a firm supporter of this new concept in our Government which is promoting world peace and friendship by making available to interested countries Americans who would help the people of these countries, meet their needs for trained manpower, and promote a better understanding of the American people.

A vital part of the training through which all volunteers must go is the physical conditioning. There are presently two camps established near Arecebo in Puerto Rico. Recently a member of my staff, in order that he might better understand the motivation of the volunteers and their training, visited, entirely at his own expense, Camp Crozier and Camp Radley.

Upon his return he submitted a report to me of his observations. I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF PAUL GOULDING'S VISIT TO THE PEACE CORPS PHYSICAL TRAINING CAMPS IN PUERTO RICO

Upon arriving in San Juan, P.R., on February 18, I visited the headquarters of the Peace Corps there and met with Dr. William Craig, director of activities in Puerto Rico of the Corps. I found Dr. Craig to be a most courteous, intelligent individual who spoke with candor about the problems of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. He made arrangements for me to travel by van to the physical training center which is 70 miles from San Juan or 20 miles inland from Arecebo. It took about 2½ hours by long, tortuous, twisting roads to reach their camps up in the mountains. I arrived at Camp Radley about 8 in the evening, and at that time there was a night panel discussion going on in the messhall concerning communism. All the volunteers attended this meeting. After this ended at about 10 p.m., the camp became quiet for the evening.

The next morning at 6 a.m. the camp suddenly became alive with the scurrying of feet as all the volunteers raced to get into formation for physical training calisthenics. Volunteers are separated into about seven groups based on their age and fitness. After approximately 30 minutes of calisthenics, rope climbing, etc., all groups ran down a long hill and then turned around and went back up the hill. The distance and speed at which they ran once again was determined by their fitness and ability. Men and women of all ages participated in both of these activities. Later I found out that the age of the men and women varied from 21 to 63 in the group at Camp Radley, which numbered about 70.

After this they retired to the messhall, where they were given a substantial breakfast. Then they again divided up into groups and went on such functions as a work party, where the volunteers cut the jungle brush which threatens to overflow onto the main road that goes to the camp, or they go to the swimming pool to learn drown-proofing techniques, or to a large granitelike face of rock which extends 75 to 100 feet above a road which had been blasted out by dynamite and attempt to scale this precipice by using mountain-climbing techniques.

During my stay I also vited Camp Crozier, where I met two Rhode Islanders—Neil Ross, of Cranston, and Anthony Gasbarro, of Providence. This camp contained about 50 volunteers and is training these people for a forestry project in the Dominican Republic. And, while there I observed a language class where they divided the volunteers into small groups of five or six and taught them verbal idiomatic Spanish. Also, I observed the volunteers at Camp Crozier go through a "confidence" course, where the Peace Corps volunteers learn physical coordination and agility. In fact, during my stay I observed practically all the functions of the camps except the treks which are when volunteers in groups hike across the jungle to a designated spot by using a compass and map and where they attempt to eat and live off the land.

Of course, I was very pleased to meet again George Araujo and discuss with him training facilities. He stated to me that in his entire 71-professional-fight career, he had never worked so hard to prepare himself for any fight. And, after seeing the training that he was going through, I was apt to believe him. The most interesting impression that I deduced from my trip was not the actual training itself but rather the almost spiritual motivation, the dogged determination, the initiative, and the enthusiasm of the volunteers. This zealotlike energy or enthusiasm radiates to the staff who likewise seem to be caught up in the high spirits and esprit de corps of the volunteers.

Frequently I found that at the end of a long, tiring day both volunteers and staff were still active and then at nighttime were still asking each other questions or discussing our policies abroad or just actively enjoying themselves by playing native games of the country where they are to work. It is difficult for me to capture this spirit, but it is there. And, it is probably the most underlying factor which helps these men and women go at such high speed for 26 days without seeming to falter. They are never pushed or driven or even cajoled to do anything. There isn't even a group influence. Their motivation is simply one of personal conviction on an individual basis and a desire to do well that which must be done. Both the staff and the volunteers put in a 16-hour day without hesitation, a day filled with activity, imagination, and responsibility. There would seem to be a great willingness to learn, to work, and to serve. I talked to many volunteers and found that they were not necessarily a group motivated entirely by intellectual, idealistic thinking but rather by more realistic thoughts, such as the desire to help those in need throughout the world and at the same time by example, apostles of freedom.

More Support for Truth in Lending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Chicago Daily Defender recently ran an editorial in support of the principle of

full and clear disclosure of credit costs to consumers which S. 750, the truth in lending bill, would require. I am pleased that this outstanding newspaper which has national circulation has come out for this principle and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of March 26 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Defender, Mar. 26, 1963]

INSTALLMENT CREDIT

"Interest is the rent you pay for the use of borrowed money." This, in effect, is the way some of the writers on economics put the subject.

A few years ago many people in America did not seem to care how much interest they were paying so long as they could get a car, a television, a fur coat, or a trip to Europe on time. They wanted only to know the amount of the down payment and the monthly installments.

Today that mood seems to be changing. In addition to ordinary installment purchases and finance company personal loans there have come revolving credit plans, budget accounts, and other innovations. Faced with these, the consumer begins to wonder just how much he is paying for credit.

The Federal Reserve Board has endorsed the general policy of a bill in Congress by our Senator PAUL DOUGLAS to require full and clear disclosure of consumer credit costs.

If a loan rate is 2 percent a month, not every borrower stops to think that this amounts to 24 percent a year. The most effective legislation probably would be to require interest charges to be stated as an annual rate on unpaid balances. In fact, some States have such laws.

U.S. Base Rights in the Azores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the original Clay report on foreign aid mistakenly stated that the United States paid the Portuguese Government for base rights on the Azores and this was properly corrected by the State Department. Having been stationed on these delightful islands during part of World War II my interest in them is a natural one. I can assure my colleagues that a visit to the Azores is a wonderful experience, one that I recommend to all. Its beauty is matched by the warmth of its people. I might add that it is also one of our most valuable bases and because of this we owe a great deal to the Portuguese which we should never forget.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles on this error and correction.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERROR ON PORTUGAL

Speaking through Press Officer Lincoln White, the State Department has made a timely correction of an error in the Clay Committee's report on foreign aid. The error is the report's statement that Portugal has already been "more than adequately compensated" for the base rights it has granted the United States in the Azores.

Actually, as Mr. White has explained, the Portuguese have neither asked for nor received any compensation in connection with this important understanding between them and our own country. It is unfortunate that the Clay Committee has suggested otherwise at a time when there are delicate negotiations to renew the rights Lisbon granted years ago without asking a nickel for them.

In the circumstances, the State Department has done well to set the record straight. What must be hoped for is that the Portuguese will understand that the error in the Committee's report was a sort of slip of the pen. Certainly it should have no bearing on current talks to keep America in the Azores for the defense of the free world.

UNITED STATES DENIES PAYING PORTUGAL FOR BASE

The State Department, taking issue with part of the Clay report on foreign aid, yesterday said the United States does not pay Portugal for U.S. base rights in the Azores.

A foreign aid advisory committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, said in a report issued over the weekend:

"Every effort should be made to reduce assistance to foreign countries in return for these (base) rights, especially Spain and Portugal, which are already more than adequately compensated."

State Department Press Officer Lincoln White said that Portugal has not asked for or received U.S. aid in return for the Azores-base rights granted to the United States since 1951. The United States is currently seeking a renewal of the rights.

White said Marshall plan aid to Portugal ended in 1951, arms help extended to Portugal is due to her membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and surplus food aid to Portugal is a program carried out by voluntary relief agencies.

Helen Harriman Keith, Massachusetts' Cherry Blossom Princess for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proud to take part with delegations from every section of our great Nation in the annual Cherry Blossom Festival here in Washington.

I am especially delighted that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will be represented by Helen Harriman Keith, 18-year-old daughter of my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts Congressman HASTINGS KEITH and his wife.

Congressman KEITH's daughter, as you know Mr. Speaker, has been selected by the Massachusetts Society of Washington, D.C., as the Commonwealth's cherry blossom princess for 1963. I commend the society for its good judgment. Helen is a natural and I am certain she will brighten the festival with her charm, beauty, dignity, and poise.

Helen is a freshman at the University of Vermont. The pretty, blue-eyed, brown-haired daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Keith, of West Bridgewater, Mass., is the older of two daughters. She is a graduate of the Northfield School for Girls and her interests include riding, swimming, and skiing. She hopes one day to follow her father into the field of government, and is majoring in political science at the University of Vermont, his alma mater.

Massachusetts is proud and fortunate to have such a lovely representative in this year's Cherry Blossom Festival activities.

The Government and U.S. Agricultural Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Senator KARL MUNDT, for the Aberdeen American News, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Portions of the article were published in the farm edition of that paper on March 24.

The article, as written by Senator MUNDT, presents a great deal of information about the operations of our Public Law 480 program and I commend it to the reading of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT AND U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

With the beginning of this session of the 88th Congress, and at the request of the leadership of the Republican Party I was advanced from the Agriculture Committee of the Senate to the Foreign Policy Committee. This has now given me an opportunity to look back to my service on the Agriculture Committee with some degree of perspective.

In my opinion the single most important piece of legislation approved during my 14 years, service on the Agriculture Committee is the Agriculture Trade and Development Act of 1954 of which I was cosponsor. I feel that the single act known all over the world as Public Law 480—or the food-for-peace program—has done more for U.S. foreign relations and for U.S. agriculture than any other single piece of agriculture legislation. It is a potent instrument in our search for a better world in which to live.

When the 83d Congress authorized, and President Eisenhower signed Public Law 480 into law not one of us could have envisioned the long list of major accomplishments of this legislation. Neither could we foresee the variety of interests this act would serve.

Among current U.S. operations are foreign currency sales under title I and other activities under Public Law 480, which represent for the United States an unusual but effective opportunity to use our bounty as food for peace. We turned to foreign currency sales when we found that many friendly countries needing and wanting our products were unable to buy them. It wasn't that the United States was short of farm prod-

ucts—far from it. Neither did the difficulty trace to prices, because we had reduced the export prices to the world level for our surpluses. The trouble was dollars—or, rather, a lack of them. Under laws and regulations existing prior to 1954, we could sell our excess products only for dollars. Countries lacking dollars couldn't buy.

Section 2 of Public Law 480 spelled out the policy of the Congress. It follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to expand international trade among the United States and friendly nations, to facilitate the convertibility of currency, to promote the economic stability of American agriculture and the national welfare, to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and to stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels, and foreign currencies accepted in payment therefor. It is further the policy to use foreign currencies which accrue to the United States under this act to expand international trade, to encourage economic development, to purchase strategic materials, to pay U.S. obligations abroad, to promote collective strength, and to foster in other ways the foreign policy of the United States."

Under Public Law 480 four different means are authorized for the disposal of the bounty of our farms into useful avenues abroad. The most important in terms of volume is the sale for foreign currencies under title I to friendly countries. Title II authorizes grants of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of farm products for famine relief and other assistance, including economic development. Under title III, CCC-owned commodities are authorized for domestic and foreign donation programs and for barter for an equal value of strategic or other materials. Title IV provides for long-term sales of agricultural commodities on a long-term dollar credit basis.

This law has been amended seven times and in each case has provided for additional authorization. The most recent amendment, approved August 8, 1961, extended the legislation until December 31, 1964.

It is important to note that these foreign currency sales represent extra marketings for the United States and extra consumption for the recipent countries. That's because the bulk of the commodities sold for foreign currencies go to underdeveloped countries, which lack funds to buy in the world market. In the absence of a foreign currency sales program, the underdeveloped countries would be unable to buy as much food and fiber as at present and American farm product surpluses would be very much larger than they are now. The whole operation fits in with the food-for-peace concept.

This program is tangible recognition that availability of food and fiber are basic essentials if underdeveloped countries are to move upward to becoming economically developed. This food-for-peace program reflects our outstanding ability as the world's greatest agricultural producer. This is a field in which the Soviets cannot compete. With the fruits of our soil, climate, industry, science, and technology we are giving expression to our ability to help meet human needs and promote human development both at home and among friendly neighbors abroad.

To American farmers who are producing quantities of food and fiber in much greater quantities than can be consumed here, this program has provided additional export outlets for over $9 billion worth of agricultural commodities. More wheat has moved under this program than the combined harvests of the last 2 years. The equivalent of over 300 million bushels of soybeans have been exported in the form of vegetable oil. Exports under this law have accounted for 27 percent of total agricultural exports in the last 8 years.

Every major commodity is represented in these sales—wheat, feed grains, edible oils, cotton, tobacco, dried milk, fruits, meat, poultry, and many more. This program has been in operation in dollar-short countries having a total population of 1.4 billion persons. The biggest participant is India which has entered into agreements to purchase commodities valued at over $2 billion. Other large purchasers have been Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Spain, Poland, the United Arab Republic, Turkey, Brazil, and Indonesia.

Over the years this program has enabled countries to purchase with their own currency far more than would have been possible if payment with dollars had been necessary. These currencies have been used in many ways beneficial to both the United States and the purchasing country. The United States has used a portion of the funds to finance its expenses in these countries including military assistance, market development and research. Good use has been put to the funds in developing and expanding markets for U.S. agricultural products.

The poultry market in West Germany was developed through the initial use of sales of poultry under Public Law 480, and subsequent expenditure of funds for market development purposes. Foreign trade, fair exhibits and trade centers showing U.S. products have been utilized as a means of advertising our products.

Also, experience has indicated that countries that have begun to use and know U.S. products as a result of the foreign currency purchase, later on become good dollar customers when their foreign exchange situation makes this feasible. For example, Japan which started out as a purchaser under title I of Public Law 480 is our biggest dollar market for farm products. Soybean oil was originally purchased by Spain from the United States for pesetas. It has now become the largest dollar buyer of this commodity. Italy, similarly, has become a leading commercial outlet for U.S. Hard wheats.

This special export program enables us to help meet the food needs of the developing nations, and at the same time permits us to find a useful outlet for our abundant production. This is all to the good. Public Law 480 is such legislation. It is no discredit to the surplus disposal aspect of the law that it also meets the needs of our friends abroad. And it is no discredit to its foreign policy attributes that it also helps move our heavy inventories. That the law serves two purposes rather than one does not diminish the importance of either.

This program has helped turn our large supplies into an asset. At one time we looked upon our agricultural surpluses almost wholly as a problem. Now we can see that part of the abundance made possible by our efficient agriculture is serving us well in the area of foreign policy.

With respect to the food-for-peace program, I must conclude:

First, the program has been a success in improving the diets of millions of people living in poverty.

Second, the program has prevented an internal explosion or complete collapse of several of the farm programs as they affect certain commodities. The outstanding example of this is with respect to wheat. We all may ask ourselves with candor what the explosive impacts of an additional 2 billion bushels of wheat in Government hands would have been. What type of farm and area reorganization would have been necessary?

Third, farmers are getting higher per unit prices in the open market as a result of Public Law 480 program, and

Fourth, finally, our abundant food supply is the most potent weapon available for intelligent and constructive use among the developing nations in the cold war.

For the Nation as a whole, the equivalent of 1 acre out of every 5 harvested moved into export channels. The production from 63 million acres of U.S. cropland moved abroad in 1961–62. Exports accounted for over half the output of wheat; about 40 percent of the tallow and nonfat dry milk production; about one-third of the soybeans; one-fourth the rye, and one-fifth of the barley production.

The bounty produced by the American farmers, who are the most efficient in the world, enables us to be the world's largest exporter of farm products. By moving an average of 12 ships a day, U.S. farmers were able to export over $5.1 billion worth of farm products in 1961–62. For South Dakota, the value of exports was about $46 million. This is of great significance to the people of South Dakota.

Of the $5.1 billion of U.S. agricultural exports in 1961–62, a record of $3.5 billion were commercial sales for dollars, and $1.6 billion moved under Public Law 480 and AID programs—foreign currency sales, donations, barter, and long-term supply and dollar credit sales. Recent export gains stem mainly from dollar sales.

Our major commercial markets in fiscal year 1962 were the European Economic Community, Canada, Japan, and the United Kingdom. These areas took 76 percent of all agricultural exports for dollars, while other West European countries, excluding the United Kingdom, bought another 8 percent. The Common Market countries took $1.2 billion, about one-third of all dollar sales.

For several years I have been stdying the progress of the Common Market, especially as it moves toward a common agricultural policy. I am deeply concerned by the growing evidence that the EEC is leaning toward protectioning trade restrictive policy oriented toward itself. In the last tariff negotiations the EEC refused to give fixed tariff bindings on agricultural imports of many competitive products. These include wheat, wheat flour, poultry, and most meat items. These commodities comprise about 40 percent of the exports to the Common Market. Furthermore, EEC is in the process of developing a protective system based on variable import levies. In the case of poultry the variable levy is linked with minimum import or "gate" prices.

The variable levy system equalizes the value of the imported product by bringing its price up to the price of competing items produced in the Common Market. For example, a German importer may want to buy corn from an American exporter. However, the importer must pay the German Government a levy that brings the importer's total cost of imported grain to at least the level of German produced grain. Because this system cancels out any price advantage to the importer of U.S. corn, he tends to buy German grain to the extent that it is available. Under such a system there can be no price competition from imports with grain produced in the Common Market.

For an important group of U.S. farm products such as soybeans, meal, cotton, tallow, hides and skins, and fruit and vegetable products, we fared well in the negotiations. Many of the duty-free or low tariff bindings, previously existing in individual EEC countries, were carried over into the Common Market, and, for the group, the tariff levels fixed were generally satisfactory. For these items which comprise about half our exports to the Common Market last year, we can look forward to a growing volume of exports in the years ahead.

High-level internal target prices implemented by variable levies and minimum im-

port prices give EEC producers a degree of protection which is detrimental to all. This situation is serious. The poultry regulations are illustrative of this fact. They combine excessive minimum import or gate prices with variable levies. Germany is our most important poultry customer in the Common Market. Through a combination of levies made up of the difference between the offering price and the minimum import price, and a series of other levies, there are collected total import charges which have nearly trebled the import levies. Our markets are shrinking fast.

U.S. flour millers have been adversely affected by Common Market regulations through loss of exports. Practically all U.S. flour exports to the EEC have been going to the Netherlands. This was valued at about $7 million in 1961–62. Here is what happened. First, there was set a threshhold price. Then, there was added a margin for milling plus an additional amount to protect EEC millers, less an allowance to offset returns from bran sales, minus a consumer flour subsidy. Quite a complicated formula, isn't it? What did it mean? First, the Common Market levy which had been $14 per ton was more than tripled. Second, it practically shut off this export business.

Also, I am greatly concerned about the proposed increase in import duty on crude soybean and cottonseed oil entering the Common Market. The proposed levy will double the rate from 5 percent to 10 percent ad valorem. European oilseed crushers have access to U.S. soybeans with no import duty. This provides them with a basic source of raw material which can be converted into both oil and meal. It would appear equitable that no special favors should be made for European crushers, and that soybean and cottonseed oil should enter free of duty, just as soybeans are.

The crucial elements are the internal target prices or support prices to be established for grains by the Community. These prices will give us the signal as to the direction which agricultural policies of the Community take. If these price targets are established at unreasonably high levels, then uneconomic production within the Community will be substituted for imports from friendly supplying nations. Consumer prices for animal products within the Community will be unnecessarily increased and imports of feedgrains, dairy, and livestock products will gradually disappear.

If the United States and other agricultural exporting nations are to be assured an opportunity to sell in the EEC markets, it is of major importance that these price goals be set at moderate levels.

The United States will bring a new tool in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to future negotiations with respect to trade matters with other nations. This act provides the framework for U.S. participation in trade negotiations. One of the mandates of this law is to maintain access to export markets for all our products—industrial as well as agricultural.

This Congress stated its purposes in passing the Trade Expansion Act, as follows: "Through trade agreements affording mutual trade benefits, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States and maintain and enlarge foreign markets for American products, to strengthen economic relations with foreign countries through the development of open and nondiscriminatory trading in the free world, and to prevent Communist economic penetration."

Section 252 of this act directs the President to take all feasible and appropriate steps to eliminate unjustifiable import restrictions maintained by any country against U.S. agricultural products. Such steps may include retaliatory action against imports from the country in question and withholding of concessions and most-favored-nation treatment from that country.

Fundamentally, I am opposed to an apparent increase in agricultural protectionism by the Common Market. I believe that it is essential that the EEC fully understands our determination to hold on to our traditional markets.

While the Common Market takes about a third of the farm products we sell for dollars—we should not forget that other free world countries take two-thirds. We should review and strengthen our trade ties with the rest of the free world.

In fiscal 1962, sales to the Outer Seven countries of Western Europe amounted to $719 million, including $460 million to the United Kingdom. Sales to Japan totaled $485 million, and to Canada $430 million.

There are substantial opportunities for expansion in our trade with most of these areas. Japan, for example, is a rapidly growing market for our feedgrains and soybeans. She could take more if her tariffs were cut further. Canada could take more of our poultry, especially turkeys. Recent events have emphasized the need for strengthening all our trade ties, so that our eggs are not all in one basket.

In my opinion, we must be completely realistic in our approach to Common Market trade. I think that we can obtain access to the Common Market, but it requires shrewd, tough negotiating. In my new position as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I will insist that this be done.

National Conservation Organization Supports Oregon Dunes Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the Nation's leading conservation organizations, National Wildlife Federation, took notice at its recent annual convention of the necessity for action to establish a shoreline recreation area at the Oregon Dunes and elsewhere in the Nation. This endorsement by a devoted group of conservationists is greatly appreciated by me in connection with the bill I have introduced—S. 1137—to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

I ask consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks a copy of the National Wildlife Federation resolution, and editorials and news articles from the Eugene Register Guard, the Oregonian, and the Coos Bay World concerning recent developments on the Oregon Dunes Seashore proposal.

There being no objection, the resolution and related items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVATION OF SHORELINE AREAS

Whereas the immediate preservation of suitable shoreline areas is viewed as necessary for a program of varied public outdoor recreational opportunities; and

Whereas the acquisition of such suitable shoreline areas can be assured only through coordinated and cooperative long-range planning; and

Whereas to be most beneficial such areas should be situated near large population centers and thus are the subject of many competing demands; and

Whereas the need for shoreline preservation is acute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby urges the U.S. Department of the Interior to assume a vigorous leadership in the preservation of shoreline recreation areas for public use and that immediate attention be directed to establishment, either by the Federal Government solely or in cooperation with appropriate State agencies, of these proposed areas: Fire Island on the south shore of Long Island, N.Y.; Assateague Island, Md. and Va.; the extension of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, N.C.; Channel Islands, Calif.; the Oregon Dunes, Oreg.; Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich.; and Pictured Rocks, Mich.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard]

MAURINE REVISES DUNES BILL

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon,, Tuesday introduced her Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill with modifications which represent concessions to private property owners in the area who opposed her earlier bill.

The new Neuberger bill contains these substantial changes:

It would not include all the land around Woahink and Siltcoos Lakes where many homes are situated, but it would include the western shoreline of these lakes so as to guarantee public access from the park for boating or swimming. This means that about 7,000 acres less private land in the vicinity of these two lakes would be included in the park under her new bill, as compared with previous versions.

The Federal Government would not be granted the power to condemn improved residential property, so that any home owner who wound up inside the park could remain there as long as he chose not to sell to the Government. The Government would have condemnation authority over commercial property, however.

The park would be longer than earlier versions by including the dunes that extend along the coast almost to the mouth of Coos Bay, making a park about 40 miles long and 42,000 acres in size. Virtually all this additional land is now under Forest Service jurisdiction.

"This new legislation will give Oregon and the Nation a seashore area of unparalleled beauty, with proper protection for its scenic, scientific, and recreation values," the Senator said. "In addition to the magnificent beach area, the boundaries would include all or part of 14 lakes."

The boundary which Mrs. NEUBERGER has sharply changed in the vicinity of the lakes comes off the southeast corner of Honeyman State Park due south through Woahink Lake and into Siltcoos Lake, then bends eastward through the heart of Siltcoos Lake, then south, and emerges along the Southern Pacific spur line near the southern edge of the lake. Then it breaks westward toward Highway 101.

"This new version excludes from boundaries of the new national park unit the highly developed residential and summer homes section of Woahink and Siltcoos Lakes," she told the Senate. "Moreover, this new bill prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from acquiring improved residential property by condemnation. Property of this type within the boundaries of the national seashore can only be acquired by exchange, purchase, or donation."

The bill defines improved property as a detached, one-family dwelling built or started before March 1, 1963, and such land as the National Park Service may designate to be "reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling" for residential noncommercial use.

Mrs. NEUBERGER's bill would include land on both sides of Highway 101 for a stretch of about 10 miles, from the point where the road emerges from Honeyman Park to its bend eastward just south of Tahkenitch Lake. Her bill carries no provision for possible acquisition of Tahkenitch Lake's surrounding properties, where a tree farm is located, as did earlier bills. It provides public access to the lake on the west shore.

"In redrafting this legislation, I have endeavored to meet all the various points of view that have been expressed and, in the process, to make certain that we will protect an important scenic and recreational resource, while at the same time promoting both economic growth and stability in this important area along the Pacific Coast," she said.

Like DUNCAN's bill, hers provides for hunting and fishing in the park under Oregon State law.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Mar. 13, 1963]

UDALL IN PORTLAND TO VISIT DUNES PARK AREA

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall flew into Portland Tuesday night and said he was "quite optimistic" about the creation of an Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park.

The Secretary said that he believed "we're on the verge of legislation" to establish the proposed park but that some "intricate" details were still to be ironed out.

PROPOSAL STALLED

Udall said he will visit the dunes area—a strip of land in Lane and Douglas Counties between Florence and Reedsport—with Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER Wednesday.

The proposal has been stalled in the past by local opposition to the size of the park and whether to include Siltcoos, Tahkenitch and other fresh water lakes east of highway 101, among other things, and no bill has been introduced so far in this session of Congress.

The Secretary said he has viewed maps of the dunes territory in Senator WAYNE L. MORSE's office in Washington, and said he thought Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN of Oregon's Fourth District has worked hard for the project.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Mar. 23, 1963]

SUPPORT FOR PRESERVATION

We were glad to see Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and Interior Secretary Stewart Udall arrange to toss the ball of the dunes-seashore issue to the people throughout the State of Oregon and the Nation as a whole, preliminary to the congressional resolution of the long-debated question. It has been logical, over the many months stretching into years that the argument has flared up sporadically, that local interests would be the most concerned. Practical, self-interest issues have a way of taking precedence over abstractions, public principles, and moral values. We can talk valiantly about what we owe our neighbors, humanity, and future generations, but let's not tromp on my cabbage patch or kick over my sandpile while we are doing it.

The past week or so has seen the issue lobbed over the local back fences, where the debate often has sounded like narrow bickering, into the broader area of public policy. Statewide press and television coverage is doing much to define the broad issues inherent in the controversy—significant issues, expressed in a generally wholesome controversy.

The World has, from the outset, consistently maintained the righteousness of the proposal to establish a National Park Service protective jurisdiction over a dunes-seashore area. With camera and typewriter, we have urged favorable consideration of a measure adequate to insure that not only this generation, but future generations would know the joy of an unspoiled seashore, the charm of a wooded area secluded by natural clumps of rhododendron, huckleberry bush, and ferns.

The past 5-year period has demonstrated the speed with which our industrial civilization can encroach on the natural area. We have seen industries spread over waterfronts; we have been the blacktop of industrial plants and parking lots take over sandy shorelines, and housing developments push back the wooded areas surrounding our growing communities.

Industry, such as the International Paper Co. complex on the Umpqua shoreline at Gardiner, or the Menasha plant at North Bend, can have a functional beauty of its own.

A well-planned housing development, with ordered lawns, graceful contours of geometrically spaced streets, can have beauty—as a housing development. Even a shopping center can be a thing of architectural charm.

But they do not replace the grove of conifers aaginst the sand dune, or the waterfall tumbling from the spring about the sandstone cliff, or the place where the foxgloves' spires spread over the hillside, and the trilliums grow in the musty leaf mold in the spring.

These features of our Oregon coastal area are assets that, once traded for blacktop and housing projects, cannot be recovered. And when they are used up, there aren't any more.

The few thousand acres involved in the dunes-seashore program represent a minor fraction of land resource. Devoting it to recreation and the scenic wonders of our special geological creation will make for a balanced economy, as well as a balanced concept of living for our people.

Our advocacy of the National Park Service program for the dunes-seashore area in no way reflects on the work of the U.S. Forest Service, in whose Siuslaw National Forest much of the proposed unified recreation area lies. No one who has visited the Crater Lake camp, or the Tahkenitch camp, can feel anything but appreciation and respect for the manner in which the Forest Service ranger crews have provided camping and recreation facilities compatible with the utmost natural integrity of the land.

Our concern is not for the job they would do for our generation, but for the future. The very concept of multiple use of our forest lands which makes the Forest Service a tremendous force for balanced management of the forest land resource could cease to be a virtue if the dunes and seashore area should become the target of future commercial or industrial use pressures.

We hope that the Congress will act favorably on whichever bill sponsored by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN provides the maximum measure of recreational and scenic land use of the dunes-seashore area now, and the maximum protection possible for the benefit of future generations.

Newsday: American History Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Newsday, which has sponsored an American history contest every month since September, recently announced the winners of their January contest. They are Margaret McGarry, a senior at Sacred Heart Academy in Hempstead, and James Steinman, a sophomore at Hewlett High School in Hewlett Harbor, N.Y. The topic they wrote on was the "Three Greatest American Inventions." Noteworthy is the fact that their essays emphasized abstract principles ranging from American democracy to freedom of the nonconformist, rather than the mechanical devices of our past.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the text of the two winning essays of the January contest be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST NAME "THE THREE GREATEST AMERICAN INVENTIONS"

(By James Steinman)

The word, "invention," derived from the Latin, "invenio," literally means "a coming upon." The connotation of this word, in essence, implies a discovery that is new or original. Yet, with the exception of the wheel, there seems to be no invention totally new, for each inventor has built imaginatively upon the scientific or intellectual conclusions of his predecessors.

From the mass of great American inventions, I might have chosen three, such as the electric light, the telegraph, or the steamboat. Upon close scrutiny, however, these achievements, magnificent though they are, seem neither as original nor as specifically American as the ones which I have chosen. Before Robert Fulton's *Clermont* could steam down the Hudson, James Watt had produced his steam engine in England; before Samuel B. Morse's telegraph in America, came the English Charles Wheatstone's magnetic telegraph; and before Thomas A. Edison's electric light could be presented to the world the Englishman Faraday, the Frenchman Ampere and the Italian Volta had to contribute their experiments in electricity. However, the three greatest inventions which I have chosen are basically principles, not objects. They are American democracy, mass production, and the American system of education.

These are inventions in the literal sense of the word. All are the objects of inductive and deductive reasoning, in a society of enlightenment, by men who came upon them just as Morse came upon his telegraph, or as Edison came upon his electric bulb. They are American in the true sense of the word, for at this time they exist in their most perfected state in America. Most important, they are original because they are not mere material applications of scientific principles, but great ideas formed from the intellectual fusion of ethical principles. And, who would deny that ideas have a more profound effect on society than objects?

BIRTH OF DEMOCRACY

It is true that democracy had its birth in Greece, but it was not a complete idea then, its benefits having been denied to all women, slaves, and foreigners living there. It did not really come to fruition until it reached the fertile soil of America, with its mixed racial seeds. We may not have a wholly perfect democracy, yet it comes nearer to a representative form of government than any other in a world where monarchies still exist inside democracies, and autocracies flourish in so-called republics.

Democracy would be meaningless in itself without the discovery of mass production methods to insure equal employment to millions of people, and to return to them the enormous fruits of their labors. Our dynamos, built on many streams, our textile

mills, and our assembly-line techniques have made food, clothing, and the luxuries of automobiles, washing machines, and refrigerators available to everyone. To those who would assail mass production as anticulture, I would point out that the freedom from continual drudgery and the extra leisure time accruing therefrom are, for the first time, affording people of every class the means and opportunity of entering the cultural world.

Our third great invention is our system of compulsory and free education. Nowhere else in the world is so much education given to so many people. Perhaps the charge will be made that the quality of education is higher in Europe. That may be true, but since only a small proportion of the population profits by it, education there has become an inbred thing, offering little or no communication with the masses. No other country except America spends so much money on its schools—elementary, secondary, and even college level. Education, available to all, arouses intellectual curiosity and helps in the understanding and solution of problems, in the promulgation of ideas and ideals.

Out of this fusion of democratic ideals, mass production methods to assure employment, and the education with which to extract the ultimate from them both, have come America's greatest contributions to the world.

WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST NAME "THE THREE GREATEST AMERICAN INVENTIONS"

(By Margaret McGarry)

Before him stretched a vast wilderness—raw, new, untouched. He reached down and picked up a handful of dirt. It slipped through his fingers, feeling soft and warm. This was his land—his to dream about, to build with, to mold and shape. But this man was of a cursed race that had been mocked and scorned and laughed at in derision for centuries. This was a man with soft hands and gentle eyes. This man was a dreamer, and this was a land of dreams. He could not know it, but some day this land would give to a weary world three very precious gifts, gifts that were his dreams come true. They would be three timeless inventions. They would not be mechanical, constructed of bolts and metal, but rather ideas that men would find good—worth living for, worth fighting for and, if necessary, worth dying for. And who can question that they are truly America's "inventions," for is not an invention simply something new brought into existence by someone with a dream? These three inventions are the dignity of the dreamer, the freedom of the nonconformist and the nobility of the laborer.

In a materialistic world such as ours, dreams are a very dear commodity, a luxury that only the idle have time in which to indulge. Our smug, sophisticated little 5-percent security philosophy has dismissed the dreamers of dreams as misfits and outcasts. Yet they have a dignity and it is a very special one, for our mighty industrial country was conceived and given birth by a vision—a vision that some day there would be a place where men cold dwell in equality, governed by truth. American sons died for this dream and American mothers wept for it. Through blood and battle we waxed strong, and this dream became a reality. So it was that we gave to the world a new value—the dignity of the dreamer. We have made our land a haven for those with dreams and we do not mock them, for we know all to well that only a nation that dreams great and beautiful dreams can become truly great and truly beautiful.

FREEDOM TO BE DIFFERENT

It has often been said that we are a nation of common men, but we are also a nation where a man may be uncommon if he so chooses. There is no official, state-approved mold into which our children's minds are pressed. We may search, question, and learn. We do not have to be a Democrat or a Republican. We may be a conservative, a socialist, or a liberal. We may not like progressive jazz, but it still may be expressed as freely as classical music. We do not have to subscribe to the beliefs of the street corner philosopher, but he may still preach what he considers the truth. In this lies our strength—that all men are equal but not common. Our freedom is not only the freedom of the 9 to 5 officeworker, but it is just as truly that of the beachcomber, the beatnik, and the angry young man. Proudly do we display to the world our greatest freedom—the freedom to be different.

Booker T. Washington once said, "No race can prosper until it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem." We have learned that lesson and given it to the world. It was not so very long ago that crude farmers, fresh from their plows, bought our freedom with their lives. We have never ceased to repay that debt. In our land the illiterate factoryworker was first given the right to hand together with his fellows for the common good. We preached the equality of labor and management and acted accordingly. We taught the world that there is no disgrace in having grime under your fingernails as long as it is honest grime.

These are three very precious inventions, to be sure, for in these few simple things we find the basic concept of our way of life—that there is a spark of divinity in the human being. Every man has a dignity that is his right and heritage. This is America's greatest dream, America's greatest gift, America's greatest invention.

Senator Vance Hartke Winning Nationwide Acclaim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the exceptionally able and distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], one of this country's most tireless and dedicated public officials, is capturing the imagination and support of many Americans with a new proposal for teaching foreign businessmen free enterprise.

The Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, in an editorial captioned "Exporting Capitalism," has commented with enthusiasm on Senator HARTKE's suggestion.

This is a proposal for recruiting retired American businessmen, a part of our population in which some of the world's finest leadership is an untapped natural resource, for active service to their country. They would be asked to teach the business principles that have placed our country, in the forefront of the world powers.

Because of the great interest and potential in this plan set forth by Senator HARTKE, I ask that the commendatory editorial from the Dallas Morning News of Sunday, February 17, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORTING CAPITALISM

Far be it from this newspaper to recommend new Federal employees for a new Federal bureau, but Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, has an idea that is novel and pointed in the right direction.

On a trip abroad recently, he found our Peace Corps helping certain nations to solve their problems in public health and education. But the businessmen of those countries were getting little, if any, technical aid. The Senator proposes to recruit retired American businessmen to teach foreign businessmen the arts and sciences of free enterprise.

The plan has been endorsed by retired men all over the country. Many have volunteered to serve. Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges liked the idea and prospects are good that such a program will be adopted.

Under HARTKE's plan, the United States would export capitalism. The new nations would receive the benefits of the skill and experience of the old pros of American business.

Before they retired, these men helped to build the system that has given their country the highest standard of living in the world. Under that system Americans have shared in the wealth of their economy, yet retained their individual freedom.

While lacking in the high-sounding promises and slogans of socialism and communism, capitalism does have a strong point to recommend it to emerging nations: it works.

A Treasury already mired in the red cannot afford to finance new Government payrolls, but perhaps adjustments could be made in existing programs to give this idea a chance. In far too many of our foreign aid ventures of the past we have exported long-haired dreamers with no practical business sense and no vision of a real America.

If a businessmen's corps could impart even a fraction of its savvy to pupils overseas, both the United States and foreign recipients would gain.

Incidentally, while the proposal is in the news, some of the business pros might be sent to Washington to teach some free enterprise.

Expense Account Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a thoughtful editorial recently appeared in the March 1963 issue of the Florida Motel Journal concerning the new Internal Revenue Service regulations on expense accounts. This editorial points out, contrary to the exaggerated and untrue information coming from some quarters, that the new rules have not hurt the motel business in Florida and that, in this journal's opinion, the rules are not designed to hamper legitimate travel expense business for the food and lodging industry. I think Members of Congress will find this refreshing editorial useful and of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE THESE THOUGHTS ON EXPENSE ACCOUNT LIVING ON THE RIGHT TRACK?

A great deal has been written lately about the new rules and regulations concerning expense accounts, or at least about the effect they have on business. One news release revealed that one motel referral group has had a drop of over 16 percent in room sales during the first 45 days of 1963.

A recent survey in Florida showed that the new rules have not affected business at motels, primarily because an excellent winter season overshadowed the business expense travels. However, even the motels which usually have over 50 percent of their occupancy in expense travel have not been hurt. Most of the motels with lounges and entertainment supper clubs are the resort motels that have very little business travel and they cater to vacationists.

The Journal does not like to see any motel have a drop in sales because of any Government rules and regulations, or for any reason for that matter. Yet, we do not like to see motels or any type of firm build their business on anything but legitimate business, including travel income.

The Journal realizes that the regulations have been a bit confusing to many. This has probably caused a lot of companies to play it real close right now with expense account spending. Misinformation is currently the biggest problem with the new rules and has undoubtedly led to more curtailment than should have been expected.

But abuses of expense account living are the targets, not the lodging industry. We do not feel that the tax regulations were designed to hamper legitimate travel expense business for the food and lodging industry.

Nobody thought up the new law merely to cut into room and food sales or to throw 30,000 people out of work in the motel industry. Operators of motels which have catered to or received business from commercial travelers on legitimate travel expenses do not seem to be too worried. Those who have built up their sales in lounges or entertainment rooms will no doubt have their sales cut to some extent, because many have included this type of spending as tax deductible items.

As a service to the industry and as an interesting way to compile opinions of the motel operators about this important subject, the Journal would like to receive comments from owners of all types of facilities on the question of what is wrong with bringing an end to abuses in personal expense account living and entertainment.

The law was passed to end abuses, putting money into the National Treasury that should have been there all along. When this money is not paid into taxes, it causes others, who cannot bring themselves to report items other than legitimate expenses, to pay more taxes to make up for the amount not paid because of their abuses. Doesn't this make sense?

Expense account living is where a businessman (and we're convinced it's just a small minority of traveling businessmen) live mighty high on the hog while on the road. There's nothing wrong with stopping even at a prime room in a top motel and then enjoying a good dinner in their dining room, or in a good restaurant. And the majority of traveling businessmen will continue to do just that.

But there is something wrong when a businessman slips $10 entertainment tickets or other costs into his expense account and lolls on a deductible yacht over the weekend and helps the airport bar stay in business because, "Well, it's deductible."

There's something wrong when a company can charge off a weekend on the town and other abuses, and it's bad for our industry in the long run when some operations base their profits on income from travel expense accounts other than legitimate expenses.

A motel room, a meal, automobile expenses and many other items certainly won't be affected, but why should a cocktail or a bar drink ever be anything more than a personal expense for personal taste?

You say everybody's doing it. Does that make it right? You say that Government agencies and Congressmen and others are reported to pad their accounts, and if they are going to do that, why does the Government have the right to prevent such padding in the businessman's expenses? We agree that such Government spending isn't right either. But two wrongs will never make a right.

Yes, some of the drop in sales caused by these regulations may hurt some of our readers. The majority of motels and restaurants will not be affected, in our opinion. The only ones that will suffer, and some of whose employees may regrettably be thrown out of work, are those whose revenues have been built on too great a proportion of expense account living-it-uppers.

It is not morally right to defend expense account living when it has been based on rampant spending of money with this result: Those who use these reasons to cut down on the taxes they pay are causing those of you who are honest with yourself and with your country to pay more taxes to make up for less tax returns because of these abuses.

Convention bookings may suffer a little, probably more from confusion on the part of the firms that have screamed about the rules, but haven't told their treasurer to sit down and study the revised rules. (Certainly we do not agree with all of the rules.)

Some employees—yes, and owners—of plush clubs and restaurants will suffer. But we would like our readers to tell us where should the line be drawn in this respect?

This people and this Nation have gone on too much "at all costs" with too few people standing up for right regardless of consequences. This is the fruit of the type of living that has been growing in this country, of things being right just so long as you are not caught. The expense account problem in our industry is one of those things that have come back to make us "reap what we sow." We might as well face up to the situation, even if it means that some operators must face the need to base their operation more on legitimate innkeeping and travel expenses rather than on profits from sources that have always been outside legitimate expenses or in thin-iced areas, but are just now being caught.

We have spoken our piece. We would like to hear from you as to whether this thinking expressed here is on the right or wrong track.

We want to see the motel industry prosper, but we want more to see it successful, based on income and practices from legitimate and honest sources.

Israel Advises, Helps Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, many of us are aware of the magnificent accomplishments of the State of Israel as the valiant people of that new nation have successfully carved a prosperous homeland for themselves out of the desert. This could not have been done were it not for the liking for hard work, the spirit, and the dedication to their task of the Israelis. Now, I am pleased to note, this fine spirit is being carried to the nations of Africa, most of which are even newer than Israel.

For those of my colleagues who may have been unaware of this promising development, I respectfully submit the following:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 10, 1963]

AFRICA TURNING TO ISRAEL FOR HELP, ADVICE

(By Tom Stacey)

TEL AVIV.—One does not have to spend long among the young politicians, trade-union leaders and university graduates of emergent Africa to become aware of the third ideology.

There used to be one—communism. As the shades of independence began to close about the growing nations, Africans insisted on the presence of another ideology, the Western one. The third, which has appeared since independence, is the Israeli one.

All Africans are philosophers and fundamentalists. When a people, a whole race, is required to build up an international personality and its political beliefs from scratch, it is interested in acquiring more than solutions and techniques. It wants sublime principles, too.

This is part of the answer to the phenomenon of Israel's influence in Africa. Most (but not all) educated Africans tend to identify the European view of life with colonial appetites and summarily reject it. The economic imperialism of the Americans is widely viewed with the same acid suspicion. Yet the anti-Communist propaganda put out by the former colonial powers and the missions and the Americans has sown its seeds; the Russian way, and to a lesser extent, the Chinese way, are both viewed with caution.

DISTINCTLY SOCIALIST

But not the Israelis. They do not have the power to entertain colonialist fancies. They are by no means in the pocket of the West, and are distinctly Socialist in their approach.

After all, when Israel was part of Palestine, the Israeli-to-be were a colonial people, under the same old British heel. The Israelis are not above reminding their distinguished African visitors and numerous African students of this useful piece of history.

Africans have heard about anti-Semitism. They know about the pogroms of the past, and about Hitler. That is why the fuehrer, though he fought the colonizing French and British and Belgians, is a villain in Africa. And they know, too, about anti-Semitism to this day. At once they liken it to their own experience. Nothing binds like mutual suffering.

WHITENESS FORGOTTEN

In this way, Israel's whiteness is forgotten. Here is a people whose history has proved that other physical characteristics no less absurd than shade of skin can arouse the scorn of the mean and narrow. It comforts.

And here, above all, is a people who were cast into independence with the merest expectation of survival, in a small land with exiguous resources, who have somehow triumphed so decisively that in 15 years of independence, while quadrupling their population, they are already fit to teach and share their success with those more lately come to sovereign statehood.

This is the image Africans receive of Israel; and as they come into actual contact

with its people they discover that the inferences they had drawn are true.

Israelis, they find, have no predisposition to despise them. This is something almost unique in African experience. Israelis take them unhesitatingly at face value.

Africans discover, moreover, that all that Israel has achieved at home against formidable odds has been done by sheer exertion, resourcefulness, comradeship, and intelligence, all of which assets they count among themselves.

In Israel they see the "bootstrap miracle" taking place on a small scale they can apprehend at once: Fruit trees in the desert; factories to make every kind of product Africans seemed condemned always to import; new crops, new industries, new ways and means; roads, bridges, dams, airports, and even nuclear power stations all built by native ingenuity.

Israelis at work make things possible. They are a defiantly rational people, but a rationality that generates its own magic. This they impart to Africans.

And all this soon becomes an ideology. Africans want more of the Israeli method.

Ghana forms her builders' brigade on Israel's Nahal pioneer worker teams; the Ivory Coast, her youth movement on Israel's Gadna. Eight African countries seek Israel's advice on agricultural settlement.

BUILDING HOSPITALS

Israelis are building hospitals, running clinics, reorganizing health departments, training airline pilots, teaching and technically training all over black Africa, without giving a single loan or grant of money to a government. Not many more than a thousand Israelis are so engaged in Africa, but their influence far exceeds their proportion in numbers; not many more than 1,000 Africans are students in Israel, but they are returning home at a fast enough rate to have injected into Africa the third ideology.

Why does Israel spare so much energy in Africa, and, to a smaller degree, in Asia? Some will tell you Israel is already cynical, that with every gesture of assistance she is buying a vote against the Arabs in the United Nations.

A vein of cynicism may have appeared in Israel in the past decade; but in Africa it is the old idealism at work. Once it was the kibbutz communal farming settlement that best illustrated the essential Israel; today it is Israel in Africa.

The University and Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. J. D. Williams, chancellor, the University of Mississippi, before the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco:

THE UNIVERSITY AND INTEGRATION

(An address before the Commonwealth Club of California by J. D. Williams, chancellor, the University of Mississippi, February 21, 1963, Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco)

The history of the Commonwealth Club of California, the widespread influence for good that it has, and the list of illustrious persons who have preceded me on this rostrum make me keenly aware of the honor you have done me by your invitation.

At the same time, when I reflect upon the train of events that brought me to this place to speak to you on "The University and Integration," my pride in being here is somewhat chastened. I have given some prominence by the integration crisis at the University of Mississippi but, to recall the anecdote about the man being ridden out of town on a rail, it has been a mighty uncomfortable way to achieve the honor.

The months just past have been ones of terrible stress for me, for the faculty and staff, for all those who love the university. When I consider the price that has been paid for this determined attempt to integrate the University of Mississippi and the equally determined attempt made by powerful forces to resist such integration, the cost in money, in reputation, in good will, in human suffering, I am appalled.

It is not my purpose to spend the moments you have allowed me in giving just one more version of the Meredith case, and yet the Meredith case is the obvious point of departure for all that I do have to say. Let me begin, then, with a swift recapitulation of the more salient facts.

By constitutional provision, the University of Mississippi is under the management and control of the board of trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning. Such policymaking and administrative powers as the university has are delegated to it by the board. Until last September, none of the State institutions of higher learning had admitted Negroes except the three institutions specifically established for them.

In January of 1961, James Meredith, a Negro, applied for admission to the university. He was advised that he did not meet certain of the university's requirements for admission. In May 1961, he filed a complaint in Federal district court, maintaining that he had been denied because of his race and requesting an injunction requiring his admission to the university, and further requiring that all the State institutions of higher learning admit Negroes under the same terms and conditions applicable to other students. The defendants in the case were the members of the board of trustees and administrative officers of the university.

The district court found for the defendants. The case was immediately appealed, the circuit court ruled for the plaintiff, and a sweeping Federal injunction was issued ordering the board of trustees and the university to enroll James Meredith. It was at this point the the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Mississippi State government all went into action.

Without going into all the complexities of the case, let me note that both the State and the Federal Governments claimed paramount jurisdiction. The board was enjoined against admitting Meredith and enjoined against denying him admission. The board members could not permit Meredith to enroll without breaking a State law carrying a prison sentence, and they could not block his enrollment without risking imprisonment on Federal contempt charges. At one point, under provisions set forth in the State constitution, the board delegated certain authority to the Governor of the State to act for them. On instructions from a Federal court they later resumed this authority, but the Governor continued to act in the case under the police powers of his office.

Meredith was twice prevented from registering as a student by the Governor and once by the Lieutenant Governor. A fourth attempt was begun but was canceled before Meredith reached the campus. Finally just before dark on Sunday, September 30, with less than 1 hour's notice to the university's administration, Meredith was admitted to the campus under the guard of hundreds of Federal marshals. Their arrival touched off a bloody riot which provided a roman holiday for newspaper readers and television viewers, and which gave our university its unenviable notoriety. In the mob were some of our own students and students from at least 13 other universities and colleges; there were Mississipians other than students, but the majority of the mob were outsiders from all over the South and Southwest. When the thousands of troops who were rushed to the scene finally quelled the riot, 2 men were dead, perhaps 200 were injured, and property damage amounted to thousands of dollars.

Meredith remained at the university under a heavy guard of marshals and of armed soldiers, but for weeks the campus seethed with unrest. It is quiet at Oxford now, and I pray God it will remain so; but the present peace does not take away from the tragedy of last autumn.

This is what happened. No doubt here in California, 2,000 miles away, you have asked, "Why did it happen? How could it have happened?"

I can in some measure answer these questions. As an American citizen I cannot condone defiance of law, rioting, willful destruction of property, murder. I make no attempt to achieve your acceptance of what happened but only your understanding of it.

The Civil War is not so far away from us in Mississippi. My office is in the building which housed the entire university in 1861. From it marched away the University Grays, a Confederate unit made up entirely of our students, not one of whom ever returned to the university.

A defeated and pillaged people do not easily forget. The bitterness of that defeat was burned into our memory by the savage rule, imposed from without of the Reconstruction era. Jealousy and a certain distrust of the Federal Government exist throughout this country. It is an established fact of political life in Mississippi and in the rest of the Deep South.

Then there is the southern way of life, the social pattern of the complete separation of the races which not even the bloodiest war in our history and the century since then had changed in its essentials. You who hear me may be utterly opposed to this system; but again, in Mississippi, it is a fact of existence. No other way of life appears acceptable.

Even so, you may well ask, Could not Mississippians see in recent years that the advancing tide of school integration would not stop at the State's borders? Perhaps it was an unwillingness to see, yet once more the attitude was understandable. Most of the State's citizens sincerely believed that the old solution of separate but equal facilities would answer in Mississippi in spite of the Supreme Court's decision to the contrary in 1954, and that we needed only to upgrade our Negro schools. In consequence, since 1954 Mississippi has spent nearly twice as much money building schools for her Negro minority than for her white majority.

What else was the average Mississippian to believe when he read nothing else in his newspapers, when he heard little else from his political leaders? A practical politician in the Deep South would no more advocate school integration than a candidate for mayor in your city would run on a platform advocating earthquakes.

Add to this the fact that for nearly 7 years after the Supreme Court decision there was no serious attempt to integrate a Mississippi school, and you can better understand how the feeling of it can't happen here could settle into a conviction.

I am reminded of the anecdote of the old farmer who was attending his first religious revival service. The preacher was an imaginative man, and he described in dramatic detail the tortures which the Devil would in-

flict upon the damned. At the end of the sermon the old farmer worked his way down to the pulpit and told the preacher he just couldn't believe the Devil would behave so. Folks just wouldn't stand for it, he insisted.

So Mississippians believed about integration in their State, folks just wouldn't stand for it, and I am convinced that much of the fury of our campus that black September night sprang from frustration, ffom a kind of intellectual outrage that comes when one is forced to acknowledge what he could not believe was possible.

There was more involved than the question of racial integration, however. The question of States rights enters in. States rights is an increasingly important political issue in many parts of the country. In the Deep South substantial men, men of good will, men like yourselves, find it a matter of deep concern. Many citizens who would be considered very liberal on the race question are deeply concerned about the constantly decreasing role of the State in the government of its citizens.

Southerners have been shaped and molded by their history, and they are a proud people. They believe they know best how to settle their own issues, and they want no interference—even so compassionate a man as my famous fellow townsman.

William Faulkner felt this. I think the character Gavin Stevens, in "Intruder in the Dust," speaks for Faulkner when he says, "I'm defending Sambo from the North and East and West—the outlanders who will fling him decades back not merely into injustice but into grief and agony and violence too by forcing on us laws based on the idea that man's injustice to man can be abolished overnight by police. Sambo will suffer it of course; there are not enough of him yet to do anything else. And he will endure it, absorb it, and survive because he is Sambo and has that capacity; he will even beat us there because he has the capacity to endure and survive but he will be thrown back decades and what he survives to may not be worth having because by that time divided we may have lost America. * * * I only say that the injustice is ours, the South's. We must expiate and abolish it ourselves, alone and without help nor even advice."

Thus, when the time came for Meredith to enroll at the University of Mississippi, there were many issues at stake. This was a test, and it was recognized as a test by all those concerned. Unwillingly, and almost unwittingly, our quiet, tree-shaded campus became the battleground for a decisive struggle between opposing schools of thought—ethical, political, and sociological.

That battle is certainly not over; but, 3 weeks ago when James Meredith registered for our spring semester without the slightest appearance of an incident, I saw reason to hope that there would be no more violence over this issue on American campuses. Perhaps out of our suffering has come the wholesome determination that our experience shall not be repeated elsewhere. Possibly Clemson College owes something to us for her own peaceful integration last month.

Just how seriously have we been damaged by our crisis? It is too early to assess the cost as yet, but we know that we have been hurt. For one thing, we have been attacked consistently and almost unanimously in the national press. Some of the attacks I think have been unfair. We have made mistakes—certainly I have made mistakes; but I might remark that a sparrow caught in a badminton game is not always in the best position to make the wisest decisions.

We have lost some prestige in the academic world. We have had to defend ourselves against the threat of loss of accreditation. We have lost some good faculty members, and we may lose more. We have lost some good students, and some good students who would once have come to us may not do so now. We have been turned down on some projects that we believe would otherwise have been approved.

And yet, at least within the context of my own educational philosophy, we have won a notable victory. We might well have been destroyed; yet we have survived. I believe we shall continue to survive, and survive as a truly strong university, not merely as the husk and shell of a university.

I shall return to this point in a few moments, but first let me recapitulate. In dealing with my topic, "The University and Integration," I have tried to convey to you what has happened at the University of Mississippi, why it happened, and what some of the implications of those happenings are. Now I want to turn to the broader topic of integration in all the State-supported institutions of higher learning in the South.

We can be sure there will be attempts to enroll more Negroes in schools previously closed to them. The aggressive organizations pressing this campaign will not slacken their efforts. On the political scene, the Democratic Party is committed to furthering such integration, and the Republican Party cannot abandon its historic role as the defender of the rights of the individual. The Supreme Court is most unlikely to change the tenor of its decisions. As Finley Peter Dunne's Mr. Dooley observed, "The Supreme Court follows the election returns."

Just as certainly there will be continued Southern opposition to integration. Neither laws nor sermons nor logical arguments nor economic expediency can work a rapid change in social attitudes so deeply rooted and so charged with emotion.

What will come in the next few years out of this struggle to integrate the Southern universities is difficult to predict. Many Deep South State institutions may maintain a de facto but not ade jure segregation, using social pressures to accomplish what was once accomplished by State laws. More probable is a pattern of token integration, such as now exists at the University of Mississippi and Clemson College. Most desired by liberal Negro leaders and most bitterly opposed by most of the South is full integration, with Negroes admitted freely to all universities and finding sufficient social acceptance there to lead the normal life of a college student.

This last, this situation which is considered ideal by so many Americans, let me say frankly, shows no substantial signs of achievement in the State universities of the Deep South.

A State institution is very close to the people of the State. In many ways this is good, for the ideal State university is delicately responsive to the varying needs of those whom it serves. At the same time, this closeness makes for effective political and social pressures which are hard to withstand. Instances of their influence come readily to mind, Bertrand Russell's being forbidden to teach in New York because of his controversial views on marriage, the forcing out of an Iowa State professor who published a factual study of the relative merits of oleomargarine and the high-price spread, the long and painful loyalty-oath controversy at your University of California. The controversy over the integration of Southern State universities will not be settled on the university campuses alone; and the administrators of those universities must look forward to stormy years.

What those who direct the course of these universities, and those who teach in them, must do is to keep their perspective with regard to this tangled question of integration. We must keep our eyes firmly fixed upon the true mission of the university. Our trinity must be teaching, research, and service.

A university does not exist for the purpose of holding the line against racial mixing. Neither is its primary function to lead the campaign for integration. Its supreme obligation, which no lesser purpose must be allowed to supersede, is to pass on to our youth through teaching the knowledge so painfully accumulated in centuries past, to add to that knowledge through research, and to use that knowledge for human good through service. We must meet the trials that lie before us with the best wisdom we can muster, and that best wisdom will keep us true to our real vocation.

The South needs good educational institutions desperately, needs them now as never before. A great university is too precious to be sacrificed to the demands of the extremists of either the right or left wings groups. We must make every effort to guard our effectiveness as educational institutions, whether the threat comes from demagogues or if you will accept the paradox, from idealists.

Because of this problem of racial integration, I look to the future of the university in the South with deep concern, but also with deep faith. All around me in the southern universities I see dedicated men of character, men who know how much they are needed in the South, men who see the worth of what they are doing, men who realize that nowhere else in America can their weight count for so much. Some able men will leave us, I know, shaking the dust off their feet as they turn away; but others will stay to see this struggle through.

May I say in closing that this struggle is not ours alone, but yours too. America is one nation. What hurts a part, hurts the whole. The South today is the Nation's frontier, a rich land, still unexploited. The South has a tradition and a culture that America cannot afford to use. The South has a tremendous contribution to make to America which cannot be realized if her universities lose their vigor and effectiveness through dissension.

My own conviction is that the university's real mission is neither to integrate nor to segregate, but to educate. That is our calling, and it is not too much to call it a sacred one.

Says Government May Step in To Clean State Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News of Friday, January 11, 1963, chronicling the stories of danger to public health, fish, wildlife, and various water users of pollution in the gulf coast of Mississippi from the Pearl River, Laurel, and Tallahala Creek and the jeopardy to human life from pollution affecting the shellfishery in the area.

The article follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Jan. 11, 1963]

SAYS GOVERNMENT MAY STEP IN TO CLEAR STATE POLLUTION

(By Virginia Woodward)

HATTIESBURG, MISS.—Dr. Ben Q. Ward, director of the Mississippi Institute of Microbiology at the University of Southern Mississippi, said yesterday that if south Mississippi does not clear up pollution of its water-

ways the Federal Government can, and will, step in and do something about it.

Dr. Ward bases his statements on an initial bacteriological survey of the contamination of all major waterways south of an east-west line drawn through Jackson, using the results of student assignments in a formal course in water bacteriology at the university.

Water pollution, Dr. Ward said, was considered a problem of industrialized areas until the students' finding shattered this complaisance. Starting with an examination of local conditions, student followed student at additional test areas with the most recent report covering the gulf coast beaches and oyster beds.

Dr. Ward, long time exponent of eradication of contamination in Mississippi's waterways, said that the situation is not merely a local one, but common to the South.

"Public health agencies possess few powers, and even less money," he said, "for efforts beyond the urban and public school areas. A feeble control of industrial pollution is largely the prerogative of State boards and no law whatsoever restrains municipalities.

"The prompt imposition of controls governing the disposition of municipal and industrial wastes, would seem advisable. Delay, in the face of further industrialization and attendant population increases, can only make the application of such controls an increasingly critical necessity and an ever-mounting monumental task."

As for the gulf coast, from Bay St. Louis to Ocean Springs, Dr. Ward says this: "Storm sewers are in plain view throughout the entire length of the Gulfport-Biloxi waterfront. That they carry more than the washings of local downpours is obvious upon the most superficial examination.

"The contamination in some areas is evident in routine testings; at other points the positive results are only periodic, but render the entire area unacceptable."

INVALUABLE GUIDE

"Considering the known bacteriocidal powers of salt water, the tremendous dilution factor offered by the sea, and the recent outbreak of hepatitis at Pascagoula, we can come to only one conclusion: Danger, contamination."

The compiled information forms an invaluable guide for further investigation, Dr. Ward believes, and pinpoints a wedge up the center of the State to the Pearl River at Jackson as the offending area.

The student findings show these statistics:

"Pearl River, fed by four population areas, Jackson, Columbia, Bogalusa, La., and Picayune, has rendered appreciable segments of the river unfit for wildlife and potentially dangerous to the health of man.

"Contributions of Laurel to Tallahala Creek, render the stream unfit for fish or man and the condition is worsened by addition of wastes at nearby Ellisville, consequently elevating bacteria count of the lower Leaf where creek waters are received by a material amount."

OYSTER BEDS THREAT

"As the Leaf River flows between Petal and Hattiesburg it is befouled by several raw sewage outlets, surface washings, and at least one packing plant. (Since the findings Petal has gone along with cleaning up the situation, Hattiesburg has not.)

"In every river, stream, or creek where population is concentrated to any extent contamination is found to an injurious degree.

"The U.S. Department of Health is taking a dim view now of the oyster beds on the Mississippi coast and will look even more closely," Dr. Ward said. "Unless Mississippians make some move toward cleaning up the situation."

The Kennedy Administration's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the justified constructive criticism of the administration foreign policy continues to mount as the public becomes increasingly aware of the inconsistencies, vacillation and defeatist attitude so evident in our foreign policy field.

I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point three editorials dealing with various phases of the foreign policy field which collectively reveal the inconsistency and ineffectiveness of New Frontier diplomacy.

These editorials are "Which Side Are We On?" from the Chicago Tribune of Tuesday, April 2; "Policy of Inaction Against Cuba," by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star of Tuesday, April 2, and "Mr. Rowan Does the Dirty Work" from the Chicago Tribune of Wednesday, April 3.

The editorials follow:

WHICH SIDE ARE WE ON?

Yesterday a British warship guided by an American patrol plane intercepted and captured a Cuban exile raiding party headed for Communist Cuba. The anti-Castro Cubans were taken under escort to Nassau. The action was in consonance with the policy announced over the weekend that the United States would take all necessary steps to prevent raids from this country on Cuba.

At the same time Cuban exile leaders were warned to remain within Dade County, Fla., on penalty of revocation of their right of asylum in the United States.

There are two ways of looking at these actions. One is that the Kennedy administration prudently seeks to avoid incidents which might invite reprisals from Cuba. There are some thousands of Russians there, with rockets and planes. Although Mr. Kennedy has continued to insist that all these Soviet arms are defensive, his caution in restricting the exiles suggests he thinks they might be used offensively, if the need arose.

Another reaction to the Kennedy policy would be that Mr. Kennedy has developed an even worse case of cold feet than at the time of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. He not only tacitly guarantees the Castro regime from American military action, but he even underwrites its protection from exiles who think they have at least as good a right to Cuba as Castro, the Communist usurper.

Khrushchev has none of these scruples, nor has Castro. Mr. McCone, the Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, has said that many hundreds of agents from other Latin American countries are being trained in Cuba to export subversion and terror. Khrushchev has proclaimed a doctrine that communism considers wars of liberation to be holy. That is, the Soviet Union will support the Communist overthrow of any existing government anywhere, and will do so in the open, without apology.

Maybe Mr. Kennedy is to be commended for caution. Maybe, also, he has carried the scuttling of the Monroe Doctrine a step further, for the foreign system of communism has not only been implanted in Cuba, but it is to be preserved there with his coöperation.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA: U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning, not directed to the Russian Government, but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in south Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary

interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the South may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke neutrality laws against the only individuals who wish to risk their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 3, 1963]

MR. ROWAN DOES THE DIRTY WORK

First the Kennedy administration was going to send Pierre Salinger, the Presidential press secretary, to Chicago to deny that there is administration news management. Then Salinger was benched and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY was coming. Then HUMPHREY was withdrawn and a third stringer was assigned. He turned up before the Headline club of Sigma Delta Chi.

The administration's counsel for the defense was Carl T. Rowan, lately Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. He is leaving shortly to serve as U.S. Ambassador to Finland.

To nobody's great surprise, Mr. Rowan announced that allegations of news management were a fad of nonsense, though administration spokesmen themselves had publicly proclaimed the policy, also the Government's right to lie to save itself.

Mr. Rowan was qualified for the job that brought him to Chicago. He has done some news managing of his own. At the time the administration was supporting the second of three United Nations armed assaults to kill off independence in Katanga, Rowan made a speech in Philadelphia. That was on December 27, 1961.

Anyone supporting secession in Katanga, said Rowan, could be identified with "a conglomeration of arch-conservatives: people who oppose the income tax; avowed defenders of racial segregation; opponents of fluoridation of water; those who want to destroy the Supreme Court, largely because of its ruling on school segregation, and so forth."

To this Rowan added the thought that those crying loudest against U.N. punitive action against President Tshombe of Katanga "wouldn't be caught dead having lunch with the Katangan leader."

In due course Rowan was summoned before the Senate subcommittee on internal security to explain his remarks. He was submitted an extended list of persons who had spoken out against the U.N. lynching of Katanga. Among these were former President Herbert Hoover, members of the Senate, the Reverend Billy Graham, the Methodist bishop of Kantanga, and numerous editors and writers.

Mr. Rowan was asked whether any of these fitted into his oratorical pigeonholes. He failed to specify a single person, but he did say he considered two prominent American Negroes, George Schuyler and Max Yergan, who had supported Tshombe, to be reactionaries. It was suggested that Rowan had sought to smear people by guilt by association. He denied that intention, but volunteered that certain citizens who had signed a protest advertisement were members of, say, the John Birch Society and so forth. But he could remember no names.

It was developed at the same hearing that the State Department's official spokesman had spawned a story that Katanga had tried to bribe Costa Rica into extending diplomatic recognition. The price was said to have been $1 million. Lincoln White, for the Department, volunteered that "we believe that such an attempt was made" and that Michel Struelens, the Katanga information officer in New York, was involved in it.

This report was pure invention. It was denied by the President and Foreign Minister of Costa Rica. It was denied by Struelens. When White was put on the witness stand, he could supply no basis for the canard he had planted with the press. He didn't know who in the Department had originated it. It just came to me down through the pneumatic tube.

These are the kind of people who, having been caught redhanded managing the administration's propaganda, have the effrontery to tell the press and the public that there is no news management in the Kennedy administration.

Captive Nations Committee

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again it is a pleasure for me to join with my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in urging in terms as emphatic as I can command the establishment in this body of a Select Committee on Captive Nations. As the gentleman knows, I have joined with him in sponsoring a companion resolution to establish such a committee.

Last year we came closer than we have in some time toward realizing this goal of ours when the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on our proposals and filed a report on it. But we still have not succeeded. And so, the fight must go on as the gentleman has eloquently said.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the mere creation of such a committee is not in and of itself overnight going to free the millions of peoples who are now captives behind the Iron Curtain. But the creation of such a committee will dramatically signal to the world our determination as a nation to continue to work for the freedom of these peoples and not just to forget them.

It is a cinch if we do not continue to remind ourselves of this policy objective we will never help them become free again. If we do remind ourselves, then we are more likely to move in the direction of policies and actions that will bring them ultimate freedom from the Communist yoke.

As I see, it is as simple as that. Let us stop maneuvering, as the gentleman has phrased it, and get the committee created.

Target: South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Africa is today one of the prime targets of the international Communist conspiracy.

An excellent South Carolina journalist, Mr. Anthony (Tony) Harrigan, associate editor of the News and Courier at Charleston, S.C., has written an enlightening analysis of the situation in South Africa.

I highly recommend his article for those interested in a deeper understanding of the problems confronting South Africa and our foreign policy in dealing with such perils.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his article as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Feb. 23, 1963]

TARGET: SOUTH AFRICA

To understand the military campaigns against Katanga, it is necessary to realize that this region is the threshold of the rich subcontinent of Africa that the Soviet Union and its neutralist allies seek to conquer. The ultimate target in the Katanga invasion, to be sure, was not one province of the Congo but the Republic of South Africa and Southwest Africa.

South Africa constitutes a base for African power in the future. That central fact is what Great Britain long ago recognized. The Communists clearly understand that fact today. India, which eyes South Africa with imperial ambitions in mind, knows the truth as well as any nation. Only American liberals seem unable to comprehend the role of South Africa as a base for power.

Even the most cursory study of the African Continent should make plain the facts, however. For most of Africa south of the Mediterranean coastal strip is not worth conquering. Vast deserts and fever-ridden forests, barren soil, eroded hills, and an absence of minerals characterizes great portions of the African Continent. But South Africa is a different story. It is the powerhouse of Africa.

If South Africa, like Ghana, were to declare itself neutral in the cold war, if it were to flirt with the Russians or the Communist Chinese, immediately the United States would be forced to attempt to win its

friendship, perhaps with the offer of developing the Orange River hydroelectric project as funds have been supplied for Ghana's Volta River project.

But whereas, as Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams said, the United States gave $210 million to new African countries last year (not counting agricultural commodities and Export-Import Bank loans), South Africa is not asking for a cent from the United States and never has done so. Nor is South Africa trafficking with the enemies of the West in the slightest degree. It is openly and totally committed to the cause of Western civilization without any inducement from the U.S. Government.

Americans who realize that South Africa is the most logical ally of the United States on the African Continent can only wonder what ideological attachments cause State Department policy planners to turn their face against the Republic. When the United States votes with the Communist bloc and the neutralists against the interests of South Africa, the United States votes against its own security—its own investments and its own need for naval and air bases in time of world conflict.

Nothing in all of Africa is more important in the cold war than keeping sea communications around the Cape of Good Hope in Western hands. If a Communist regime were to occupy Cape Town, it would represent a terrible threat to the United States, England, Australia and associated countries.

Of equal importance is keeping South Africa's tremendous industrial machine and wealth of natural resources in the free world camp. If revolution should take place in South Africa, or if that country should be plunged into chaos as a result of outside interference, the only industrial power in Africa might fall into the hands of the Sino-Soviet bloc. South Africa's gold supplies, so essential to the Western economy, would then be an extra tool with which the Communist world state could prepare America's burial.

A free, Western-oriented South Africa is a major source of strength for the United States and its Allies. Indeed one can be sure that unless subverted by Afro-Marxists and their masters in Moscow and Peiping, South Africa will be the industrial colossus on the African Continent in the years ahead. Already, while other African states talk of the beginnings of generating electric power, South Africa is buying its first nuclear reactor.

Thousands of university students, trained by professors who received their education at Iowa State, Cornell, Stanford, Oxford, the Sorbonne, and the University of Berlin, are being graduated from South African institutions. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research is putting these students to work in development of the most modern type of economy.

What this adds up to is realization that South Africa is the key to the future of Africa and the one essential ally for the United States on a continent that will be involved in the shaping of the world in the next half century or more.

In all likelihood, South Africa is the only nation in Africa that has a destiny as a major power on a par with European countries. The reasons are clear: a European population with high standards of education, tremendous investment in science, mineral riches, abundant lands for growing food, a super rail and air transportation system, a free press, established parliamentary government, and a vigorous way of life steeped in the values of the Christian faith and European civilization. In short, the South Africans are the Americans of the African Continent.

While South Africa should enjoy the confidence and sympathy of the U.S. Government and the American people, the truths are obscured by the lies told about the country. Indeed it must be the most lied about nation on earth. But statistical studies of the country are eye opening to those who are willing to see the truth.

South Africa, for example, produces 85 percent of the coal in Africa and 92 percent of the gold on the continent. The Republic is a big producer of iron ore, and shipments of pig iron to Japan will be a major item in its oversea trade during the next few years. In addition, South Africa produces 64 percent of the gold outside of the U.S.S.R., 48 percent of the world's platinum; 39 percent of the gem diamonds; and is the third largest producer of chromium, manganese, and uranium. This is only part of the story of its mineral wealth (its supplies of coal are practically unlimited), and thus South Africa is the prize on the African Continent. Is it any wonder that the Communists wish to dominate its Government?

Industrialists from many nations have commented on the wealth and power of South Africa. Mr. Takeo Haragutshi, director of one of Japan's largest industrial companies, Hitatshi, Ltd., recently compared three industrially growing countries—South Africa, Australia, and Brazil. He declared that South Africa in a decade will be in a very high state of industrialization and that, with the resource of gold, it will be one of the most economically secure economies in the world.

Dr. Anton Rupert, one of South Africa's leading industrialists, has asserted that his country could become the workshop of the continent of Africa. He has pointed out that South Africa is the obvious and natural leader of Africa. Although only 4 percent of Africa in area, South Africa is responsible for 30 percent of the production and income of the continent.

An American observer whose views deserve the closest attention is former U.S. Ambassador Philip K. Crowe. Ambassador Crowe, who served during the Eisenhower administration, has noted: "America has an important financial interest in South Africa. Our total private investment of upward of half a billion dollars is more than we have invested in all the rest of Africa put together. This investment, moreover, is based on a viable and expanding economy."

Yet there are elements in America that would disregard this United States stake in South Africa precisely as they disregard a similar stake in Cuba and where, like in South Africa, they support a revolutionary change in the form of government. But the truth that should be apparent to every reasonable American is that a Luthuli regime in Cape Town would be exactly like a Castro regime in Havana, only more primitive and given to atrocities.

Marcus D. Banghart, vice president of the Newmont Mining Corp., an American business man who knows and understands South Africa and its potential, speaks ably for those U. S. citizens who are appalled at policies that lead to abandonment of the Republic. "The Republic of South Africa," he has said, "is an outstanding example of the benefits to a new land of individual enterprise, capital and know-how."

The sum and substance of the South African industrial story is that the Republic is a prime example of capitalist success. All the people of South Africa, white and Bantu, are profiting from a system that holds even greater opportunities in the future.

The question for Americans is very simple: Do we want South Africa to remain on our side—a part of our world and civilization? Or are we content to see South Africa swallowed up in an Afro-Marxist revolution and, in short order, become a satellite and powerhouse of the Soviet Union or the Chinese People's Republic?

This is the question Americans must answer for themselves.

Kennedy Deterioration in Cuban Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has allowed the action in Cuba to deteriorate to such an extent that it is now critical to the future security of this hemisphere. David Lawrence wrote on this in yesterday's Washington Star as follows:

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russion Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way to power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only it not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on United States territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the United States Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built MIGs, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erec-

tion of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke neutrality laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

The Shame of Our Cuban Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, just how far is President Kennedy prepared to go in retreating from all the ideals upon which this Nation of ours is founded? We, who have been the champions of freedom, are now in the strange position of defending Fidel Castro, a ruthless and murdering dictator, against the loyal Cuban people whose crime is that they want to be free and are willing to die to restore freedom to their homeland.

Are we, a once proud people, now going to grovel in the dust under the bloody heels of Communist gangsters, afraid to protect our own freedoms plus using our might to prevent others from seeking freedom?

The following column, written by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of April 2, 1963, points up the confused thinking of the Kennedy administration. Let us hope the American people will soon demand a rational leadership which is unafraid and determined to protect our freedom, not merely keep the peace. No American worthy of the name can ever accept peace without honor.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA: U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in south Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called "neutrality" laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of "neutrality". The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly "neutral".

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's Navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counter-revolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

Predators on the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the March 1963 Field & Stream chronicling the sad feeling of frustration which lovers of the outdoors feel in connection with the wilderness bill now pending before the Congress of the United States. The article by Mr. Richard Starnes, a distinguished outdoorsman and conservationist, should be read by people interested in leaving a meaningful outdoor heritage

to our children and grandchildren and to others who will look to us with regard to our stewardship and trusteeship of the last of a wonderful but vanishing outdoor heritage.

The article follows:

[From Field & Stream, March 1963]

PREDATORS ON THE POTOMAC

(By Richard Starnes)

Lately my travels have taken me to Washington, D.C., an imaginary city on the banks of the Potomac River, where the natives support themselves almost exclusively by shooting angles and trapping the unwary. The cries of the taxpayer being skinned are piteous, of course, but long experience in public service has taught the tribal elders in Congress to ignore these fearsome shrieks and to get on with the grisly business at hand.

Take, for a case in point, the wilderness bill.

The wilderness bill has a nice, remote sound to it, one that quickly conjures up mind pictures of lonely campfires under the northern lights, great empty sweeps of primeval prairies, and picture-postcard trout pools untouched by any angler more sophisticated than a brown bear. The wilderness bill doesn't sound as immediate or as close to home as, say, income tax reduction or a bill to extend the draft. This is a pity, because the wilderness bill is probably as important a piece of legislation as Congress will consider during this session. It goes to the heart of the sort of national heritage we are going to pass on to our children and our grandchildren. What happens to the wilderness bill in this session of Congress is going to determine in large measure what happens to our disastrously dwindling patrimony of natural wealth.

What is in this wilderness bill that brings the ravening predators to the feast? Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, summed it up this way: "The wilderness bill is an effort to achieve a highly desirable objective—the preservation of significant wilderness tracts still owned by the U.S. Government—with as little adverse effect as possible on individuals, on private institutions, and on the economy of communities, regions, and the Nation. By the enactment of the measure," Senator ANDERSON continues, "I believe we shall bring about the establishment of a wilderness preservation area of between 35 million and 45 million acres—about 2 percent of our more than 2 billion acres of national land area—without real injury to anyone, and to the perpetual benefit of the Nation and its citizens today and for many generations to come. This is in a very real sense last-chance legislation."

What happened to the bill in the last session of Congress does not bear repeating in the presence of women, children, or men of the cloth. It was eviscerated, chopped up into little pieces, stomped out of shape, and chucked out into the gutter, and all to the accompaniment of Fourth of July speeches that would make a man weep if he didn't know better. Sad to say, the same thing is going to happen again (and again and again and again) if all the men and women here who cringe at the sight of a hillside littered with beer cans, gag over the fumes from automobile engines, and hunger for the preservation of the eternally peaceful beauty of unspoiled nature do not band together to make their voices heard in the Capitol.

Make no mistake about it: The predatory interests who believe that public lands exist solely for the benefit of the lumber industry make themselves heard, openly or silkily in the corridors. So do the mining interests, which in 2 years can level a gentle hillside that the Creator spent several million years in perfecting. So do the cynical western gents whose brand is the dollar sign and who are passionately convinced that lands that belong to all of us should be used to fatten cattle that belong to them. The brazen lobbying of special pleaders has always been a sorry sideshow in the Nation's Capital, and it is traditionally at its cynical worst when the spoils are the irreplaceable treasures of our out-of-doors.

Our grandchildren, indeed, are the only ones who don't have a tame lobby working for them in Washington today, and they are the ones who need one most. Those of us who have read enough and seen enough to understand the unexampled rape of North America wring our hands over the maniacal exploitation of our natural resources that took place before we were born. We wish we'd been alive in another century. We shed tears for the great, rolling plains, horsebelly deep in grass, which man in his endless selfishness has replaced with dust bowls. We lament the great forests that have vanished, the sweet streams that have been poisoned, the mighty rivers that greed has corrupted, the very air around us that has been befouled. But not one of us in 10,000 knew enough or cared enough to lift a hand to prevent the knife work that gutted the wilderness bill in the last Congress.

This, unfortunately, is also in our tradition. We will rise in righteous wrath to destroy a foreign army that threatens to plunder our land. But, except for a handful of dedicated and despairing conservationists, historically we sit on our hands while homegrown predators blandly rob us of our birthright.

Even before the continent was spanned by railroads, thoughtful men recognized the urgent necessity of preserving our natural heritage. In 1864, President Lincoln approved an act transferring to the State of California an area including the present Yosemite National Park for preservation as a wilderness area. In 1872 Yellowstone National Park was established by Congress. By 1906 Congress passed the National Monuments and Historic Sites Act, which authorized the President to preserve landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic and scientific interest on Federal lands. On the eve of World War I, Congress established the National Park Service to insure conservation of "the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife" of the Nation, and directed that the park system should be administered to "provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

In the time-honored manner of bureaucrats all the way back to clay-tablet clerks who ran the lost city of Ur, the National Park Service promptly erected an administrative superstructure on the law that had brought it into being. The concept of preservation with reasonable access was adopted, and largely pursued to this day in spite of its built-in contradiction. Anyone who has shuddered over the slicked-up, anything-but-primitive atmosphere of such national parks as Shenandoah must realize that reasonable access and the enjoyment of future generations cannot be made to mesh any more than preservation of womanly virtue with a reasonable amount of rape can be made to mesh. Thus, even in the pitifully disproportionate portion of our public lands that have escaped the attention of the mining, lumbering, and cattle-feeding robber barons, the true preservation of our wilderness areas has been lost to blacktop, neon, chrome, and concessionaire.

In its report on the wilderness bill, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs noted that "Increases in (national park) visitors have caused mounting pressure for more roads and service facilities which impinge on remaining primitive areas." There remain, the committee report warned, only about "22 million acres in 27 parks, 20 national monuments and one seashore recreational area regarded as suitable for consideration as part of the wilderness system." There are 14½ million acres or so in our 181 million acres of national forests.

What this means is simply this: In all the 50 States, all that remains that can be preserved as wilderness is an area about as large as New York and Vermont. If this relatively small area is to serve the needs of our growing population, with its growing leisure time, it will require all the wisdom that we are capable of exercising. Judging by the dismal record to date, we must conclude that this sort of wisdom is in woefully short supply in Washington. Powerful men in Congress, conditioned by a lifetime of sneezing every time some noisy special interest takes snuff, seem determined to see to it that not even this remnant of the continental wilderness shall survive for the benefit of generations to come.

Indeed, the whole history of attempts to preserve a part of America's wilderness heritage is a cheerless chronicle of the losing battle fought by conservationists and outdoorsmen against the rapacious moneygrabbers who see a forest only as something to be cut up into lumber, or ancient mountains as nothing but sites for strip mines.

The precursors of protected wilderness areas were the so-called primitive areas that were set aside during the twenties and thirties to the extent of 14.6 million acres. Timber sales were forbidden in them, mineral prospecting was closely regulated, cattle grazing was sharply limited. Naturally this protection of natural resources enraged the robber barons.

It takes no soothsayer to know what quickly happened to those first protected primitive areas. A review was undertaken almost as soon as they were established (to the surprise of no one who has ever seen the lobbyists of the special interests descend on Washington) and, again in the words of the Senate committee, "areas more valuable for timber, mining, and other purposes than for wilderness preservations have been eliminated."

The result? Less than half the acreage contained in those first primitive areas is wilderness today.

It was to prevent this sort of cynical hanky-panky that the wilderness bill was drawn. In 1948 Congress ordered the first study of the feasibility of wilderness legislation. Even a decade and a half ago, the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, which made the study, warned: "With the growing population and the resulting utilization of more and more previously unutilized land, it is becoming evident that before many years have passed there is danger that the original wilderness which was met and conquered by our forefathers in building our country will have disappeared entirely. It will exist only in the history books. If, then, there is reason for preserving substantial portions of the remaining wilderness it must be decided upon before it is too late."

That was 15 years ago, and the wilderness bill remains stuck in the gumbo of congressional committee consideration.

There can, of course, be honest disagreement over the methods we should follow in preserving our priceless heritage. Take reasonable access. To me, what has happened to many of our national parks is the result of wholly unreasonable access. We've made them too easy for the beer-can set to reach, in the opinion of many. But there is room for debate on questions of access, hunting, fishing, and administration.

Unfortunately, however, more of the troubles besetting the wilderness bill have been the result of chicanery notable even by Washington standards. Bureaucratic empire builders could give lessons to Genghis Khan

himself, and for too many years too many Government functionaries subordinated the urgent needs of wilderness conservation to the squalid considerations of bureaucratic self-aggrandizement.

But this is the accepted way of life in Washington, and it's probably unavoidable in a democracy. What really killed the wilderness bill was the sorry collapse of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the face of the voracious lobbyists for commercial interests. After the Senate passed the bill, 78 to 8, it went to the House.

One journalistic colleague, whose past transgressions have condemned him to spend his life watching the gyrations of Congress, said this when I asked him for his candid appraisal of the chances of a real wilderness bill emerging from Washington this year:

"Unless an awful lot of people take the time and trouble to raise unshirted hell with their Congressmen, the wilderness bill has precisely the chances of that proverbial snowball. The lumber boys are here already, and the mining interests never left. The only people who aren't represented here by a high-powered lobby are the people the land belongs to—all of us."

All of us, and our grandchildren. I think it's time somebody organized a grandchildren's lobby here in Endsville-on-the-Potomac.

Library Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a resolution recently passed by the executive board of the Connecticut State Library Association. This association has a membership of 820 persons and is composed of those interested in library work and the development of libraries. The membership includes librarians from public schools, college, university, and private school libraries as well as trustees and lay members of library boards and institutions. They perform an inestimable function for our libraries and Connecticut is extremely fortunate to have the benefit of their interest and activity.

It is not necessary to remind my colleagues of the tremendous service rendered by our country's libraries, nor of the duty and responsibility we have to assure that these libraries continue to be adequately staffed and supplied. A library, more than any one other place, is the repository of learning, of all that comprises culture and education. Its shelves contain records of the ideals and principles upon which the free world was founded. We cannot expect future generations to continue fighting to safeguard ideals to which they have not been fully exposed, and proper understanding comes in the main from the written word. We must assure that all citizens have the opportunity for full individual intellectual development, which is symbolized by the library. Our future progress, economically and culturally, is directly dependent upon such a program as this legislation proposes.

The free public library was probably the greatest contribution ever made to the intellectual growth of man. It has made it possible for generations of citizens to become exposed to ideas, to profit from the records of the past and build on the hope of the future. It has helped make of us a learned people.

We have the opportunity, indeed, the obligation, to assure that the principle embodied in the free public library system is continued and that each and every community, each and every public school, each and every institution of higher learning can provide library facilities for its citizens and its students.

I believe that the resolution of the Connecticut Library Association express the sentiments of many people in this country and I commend both the resolution and the library services program to the especial attention of the Members of this House and the American people.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CONNECTICUT LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 13, 1963, AT ITS MEETING IN HAMDEN, CONN.

Whereas the Connecticut Library Association has long been interested in the development of all types of library service throughout its State; and

Whereas at the request of the Connecticut Library Association a study recommending improvements of all types of libraries has recently been completed by a committee appointed by Gov. John Dempsey. Therefore be it

Resolved, By the Board of the Connecticut Library Association that the members of the House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee be urged to give careful consideration to the library provisions of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (S. 580, H.R. 3000 and companion bills); and be it also

Resolved, That particular attention be given to the extension of the Library Services Act to urban as well as to rural areas and to aid in the construction of public library buildings; increase in graduate fellowships and teacher preparation programs; liberalization of provisions for student loans; strengthening of provisions for educational research and demonstration; authorization for grants to institutions of higher education for materials, construction, equipment, and expansion of faculty, and be it further

Resolved, That the committee authorize the appropriation of the increased funds to implement the provisions for library development and improvements mentioned above.

VA Bed Shortage in Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD the following resolution of the Long Beach Detachment, Marine Corps League of the United States, which details the critical VA bed shortage problem in southern California and proposes reasonable solutions:

Whereas the Veterans' Administration is cognizant of the ever-increasing veteran population in the southern California area, particularly Long Beach and vicinity; and

Whereas the present Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital hasn't the necessary funds and beds to operate this institution to its potential capacity to meet the ever-increasing demands of eligible veterans for hospitalization; and

Whereas the ever-increasing daily (300 bed shortage) and monthly waiting lists for hospitalization have been increasing due partially to the highly specialized medical and surgical services provided at this institution with these services occupying some 650 beds more or less on a permanent basis, but mainly the lack of operating funds; and

Whereas several wards have been closed due to the lack of funds and another ward, G1, has been taken over by the U.S. Navy, due to the U.S.S. *Haven* being laid up for repairs for about 6 months, thereby cutting down the available bed occupancy by 35 and making a total shortage of approximately 150 beds; and

Whereas there are areas in the United States with population increases similar to that of Long Beach and vicinity and these areas should also be included and considered in this resolution; and

Whereas there are many VA facilities throughout the Nation occupied by as little as 20 to 25 percent of capacity but fully staffed; and

Whereas since the Long Beach hospital performs four highly technical and specialized surgical and medical services for veterans occupying four different wards, however, these wards are not fully ocupied by veterans having the same ailments. These veterans come from any VA hospital, west of the Mississippi River for these specialized services which are only performed in the Long Beach hospital. Now that Long Beach VA Hospital has a cobalt bomb for the treatment of cancer and other diseases perhaps another ward shall or will be utilized for this service thereby cutting the bed occupancy by perhaps another 20 beds; and

Whereas the Long Beach hospital serves an area from Santa Barbara and Bakersfield on the north; to Phoenix, Ariz., on the east; and then south to the Mexican border (five large counties); and

Whereas there are only 125,000 beds in the whole VA setup and when there are still 20 million veterans as potential hospital cases throughout the country and eligible for hospitalization at some VA facility: Be it

Resolved, That the Long Beach Veterans' Administration facility be increased, and that funds be allotted by Congress, to accommodate a minimum of 2,500 beds to adequately serve the needs of veterans in this area and community; and be it further

Resolved, That the Marine Corps League aline itself with other veteran organizations, especially the American Legion whose representative so vehemently and positively presented the deplorable bed shortage situation that exists at our VA hospitals in heavily populated areas in a speech before California Congressmen at Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963, requesting expanded hospital facilities for these "most critical bed shortage areas such as exist in Long Beach, Calif."; and be it further

Resolved, That the Veterans' Administration take another look at the vast area served by the Long Beach facility comprising five large counties in southern California with a predominately heavy veteran population and an estimated 12 million people; and be it further

Resolved, That the national body assembled in convention in Cleveland, Ohio, this coming August 1963 look with favor upon this resolution, which the writer deems most

imperative and necessary at this time and to take appropriate action.

ARTHUR HELD,
Commandant, Long Beach Detachment, Department of California, Department Service Officer, Long Beach Hospital-VA VS Representative.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson's Address Before the National Rocket Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the text of the Vice President's address before the National Rocket Club dinner, held March 22, 1963.

I think it points up the need for this country's continued efforts in the field of space and the need for a greater understanding between our scientific, civil, and legislative communities:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

In recent weeks, others of the Marine Corps and of the administration have been engaging in the pastime of hiking together. Your honor guest and I have refrained from such hazardous practices. Instead, we have indulged in the pastime of eating together.

I assure you it is the colonel—and not the calories—that brings me here tonight. Certainly, one of the most pleasant—although unofficial—duties of the office I hold has been the privilege over the past year of speaking at banquets honoring John Glenn. I am not sure whether he regards this as a pleasure, also. I understand the colonel has suggested that an extra tube of food be put aboard the capsule to the moon as a precaution against the possibility that when the first meal is being eaten there, the Vice President might show up to make a presentation.

Tonight, at this Goddard memorial dinner, it is appropriate for us to concern ourselves with the fundamental issue of our national space effort: the matter of public support for our public policy in this field.

This is an audience of experts—experts on the meaning and potential of the space age and on the needs of the space program of our country. Individually and collectively, you appreciate what a dynamic force the space program is for our economy. You know it means improved technology, greater security, a rising level of business activity, a higher standard of living for our people. Above all, you understand the essential fact that if the United States is to be a source of leadership for freedom tomorrow as it is today, we must succeed in our space efforts now during this decade.

In all realms of specialized knowledge, there is the ever-present danger of parochialism. Many of my scientist friends think that the most narrow and parochial men they know are engineers. Nearly all engineers I know think the same of scientists. But both scientists and engineers agree on one thing: nobody is more parochial and narrow and shortsighted than politicians.

I hardly need to say that some of my best friends are politicians. I can say of them that what you think of them, they in turn think of you. That is precisely the point to which my remarks tonight are addressed.

We are at a point in our national history in which the future capabilities of our country, and the future of our country's role as a leader of freedom, depend decisively upon both mutual understanding and mutual trust, as well as mutual comprehension, between the community of technology and the community of public affairs.

To say this, and to weigh the merits of each side, does not automatically lead to the conclusion that one side or the other is the right side. The concern of the space scientists for maintaining the schedule of space projects is right and proper—beyond dispute. The concerns of the political community for the implications of supporting those programs are no less right and proper—beyond dispute.

Between these viewpoints—each responsible, each prudent, each sincere and conscientious—there exists what we must frankly acknowledge to be a dollar gap. Those charged with responsibility for public policy know that the total space program has cost us about 20 cents a week per capita. They also know that in the near future the program may cost as much as 60 cents a week per capita. On the other hand, those in the technological community know that as a nation we are spending more on cigarettes, alcohol or recreation than we do on space. Last year alone, Americans bet more on horse races than on space.

Personally, I believe—as I am sure you believe—that we must be concerned with where America finishes in the space race; and I am not content to bet on America merely to place or show, and certainly not to finish out of the money altogether.

In either case, from either viewpoint, the present period of preoccupation with the dollar aspects of space is symptomatic of a failure to bridge the gap of understanding between the two communities which are jointly responsible for our national success or failure in mankind's age of space. In the long term, dollars alone will not be the decisive factor of either our success or our failure. We shall succeed only in proportion to our understanding of what is at stake and of how the stakes of space relate to those qualities of our society and our heritage to which no dollar value can be attached.

Of those qualities, none is more priceless than the fact that in our representative democracy public policy must be an expression of the public's will and support. The technological community which understands the stakes of space has a responsibility, therefore, for helping the public to understand those stakes. Unless and until this is done, the technological community cannot justifiably be impatient with those who are chosen to represent and express the public's own will.

Throughout our national history America has moved forward on waves of new invention. The individual inventors of 50 and 60 years ago have been uniquely honored as virtual national heroes in this century. They have become a part of our folklore—not to mention of our textbooks and motion pictures, as well. But we can only wonder what would have happened if Thomas Edison or Samuel Morse or Alexander Graham Bell had come to Congress and to the people and had asked for funds with which to invent an electric light bulb or a telegraph or a telephone.

We can imagine that the response would have been somewhat less than enthusiastic.

Today, the age of space is an infinitely more inventive age for America—and the world—than the era at the beginning of this century. Our national space program already has produced more than 3,000 new products and processes of private commercial potential. These achievements already are being put to work. Today's inventor is working on a much surer course, with a much greater certainty of what will be accomplished, than were the men who changed history by tinkering in their bicycle shops not so long ago.

Experimentation is still present in our efforts now but the factor of uncertainty has never been so small. We know what we are likely to do. We can be more certain of what our efforts are likely to produce. If there is a consistent pattern of error, it is error on the side of underestimation—not overestimation.

This simply means that we are able to tell the people more of where we are going and more of why we should go there. If we fail to do this, if we fail to utilize this greater capacity, then the responsibility for lack of public support will fall upon those who had the knowledge but failed to impart it to the people.

Along with the knowledge of our own capabilities and directions, we are also possessed of knowledge about the capabilities and directions of our principal competitors in the space adventure. I believe it is a part of our responsibility to keep the public better informed about the relative progress and capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Let us look at a few basic comparisons:

1. Rocket power: Today the Soviets have in operation more powerful rockets than do we. We are trying to catch up. We have under development much more powerful rockets than the Soviets now have in operation. But we must assume that the Soviets are likewise working to improve the power of their own rockets.

2. Number of successes: At the end of 1962, the United States had successfully orbited 120 payloads in space. This means that we have put about four times as many payloads into earth orbit as have the Soviets. But at the same time the smaller number of Soviet payloads have weighed substantially more than the total of our larger number of payloads.

3. Ratio of failures: We can say with reasonable assurance that the Soviets have had a ratio of successes to failure comparable to our own. Our failures as well as our successes are known to the world. The Soviets have announced their successes and concealed their failures. But the basic fact is that in both nations the reliability of launching vehicles has shown a remarkable and comparable increase. For example, through 1960, the United States had about one failure for each success. In 1961, the ratio of successes was 3 to 1. In 1962, the ratio reached 5 to 1.

4. Space applications: In utilizing space technology, to improve mankind's lot on earth, the United States is well ahead. Weather satellites, communication satellites, navigation satellites, and many other activities are measures of this. In this realm, the Soviet Union—despite the potential of its technology—is not choosing to compete.

5. Scientific information: Comparisons between the nations as to which has obtained the most useful scientific data cannot be exact. Both nations have done remarkably well. The United States is sharing much of its information with the world scientific community. The Soviet is more selective and secretive.

6. Manned flights: Soviet cosmonauts have put in more flying time than our astronauts. Certainly the U.S.S.R. is ahead in the total knowledge obtained from manned space flight.

7. Guidance and control: Both countries have made rapid progress in this technology. Last year's dual near-rendezvous launch by the Soviets is the outstanding single accomplishment by either nation, thus far. However, the United States has shown remarkable progress particularly in the Mariner shot and the Schirra flight.

We can say that competency is growing in the space programs of each nation. What space gap exists is not due to a lack of ability or resources on our part but exists because we started later and do not have a surplus of time.

The year of 1962 was a rewarding year for the United States in its space efforts. We demonstrated convincingly through both showcase successes and supporting scientific progress our ability to translate sound decisions into significant accomplishments. A gratifying number of historic successes were achieved by our efforts last year.

In this year of 1963, our program will be passing through a year of concentrated development. Concentrated development does not always produce spectacular events, and it is possible that our efforts may be overshadowed by Soviet space shots. I urge, therefore, that we not be discouraged by publicized events but rather be stimulated to even greater efforts for the coming years.

The United States is, at all times, cognizant of the fact of competition in the development of space technology. At the same time, neither the pattern nor the purposes of our program are controlled by other than our own national purposes to develop the peaceful uses of outer space. We do what we do in space because of our national faith, not our national fears. We proceed on the program scheduled because of our confidence, not because we are seeking to copy or duplicate what others have done or may do.

In the long prospect of the space age, our national efforts to this point are to the future as a minute is to a millennium. We cannot measure our continuing advance by the calendar. We are compressing generations of progress into months or even weeks of time.

This very speed at which the U.S. effort is moving makes it imperative that we not form tomorrow's goals on yesterday's thinking. It is also imperative that we not set our purposes by the narrow horizons of a dollar debate.

There would be no reason for us to be concerned with space at all except for the clear and compelling implications of space to those values of our system and our society for which no price is too great. Freedom is a sturdy plant, but it cannot grow and flower on this earth if the universe which envelopes us is poisoned and contaminated by tyranny.

If we are to be successful in freedom's cause, we must, as I have said, concern ourselves with bridging the gap between space science and political science. Nowhere else has science served freedom as nobly and abundantly as under our system. Likewise, nowhere else has the political system supported scientific inquiry and achievement more effectively or more understandingly. Our achievements of the past 5 years dramatically demonstrate both of these points.

Americans now are able to be infinitely more confident about the future than in the first anxious days after Sputnik I in 1957. We can say now that on our present course there is no danger of a default by our Nation in space. We can also say with equal confidence that there is a growing prospect of decisive success for our free society in the competition to preserve the realms of space for the peaceful benefits or mankind in this century.

In a day when machines can talk to each other and work with each other, it is neither too much to ask—nor too much to hope—that responsible men of the technological comunity and the political community can and will find their way to mutual understanding to assure our greater success in achieving the goals essential for our freedom.

German-Egyptian Rocketry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last week I made some remarks concerning German-Egyptian rocketry which appeared in the Appendix of the March 28 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At that time I indicated I was aware of the recent denials in regard to the role of German scientists and the scope and development of missiles in the United Arab Republic. In view of the denials and the conflicting reports, once again I raise the question, what is going on? My hope is that our State Department may soon give us an answer.

For the RECORD, I am submitting a number of articles from the Washington Post which update the present controversy.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1963]

A-THREAT TO ISRAEL BEGAN IN 1954 WHEN GERMANS ARRIVED IN EGYPT

TEL AVIV.—The affair of the German atomic scientists in Egypt, which Israelis see as a growing threat to their survival as a nation, all started 9 years ago, when the Arab-Israel border warfare was nearing its peak.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser, then new to office, was seeking new allies against Israel. He concluded an arms deal with the Soviet Union, and his representatives also began enlisting likely Germans.

The first group of West German technicians arrived in Egypt in 1954. They helped to establish an iron and steel plant—now producing 300,000 tons annually. A growing stream of German scientists has followed them during the past 2 years.

According to Israel information, they now number almost 500. And have succeeded in laying the foundations of Egypt's heavy industry and war plant. These items include the construction of an atomic reactor plant for the production of heavy water, a jet aircraft factory, rocket and missile installations and bacteriological and poison gas warheads.

Prof. Otto Bahn is said to be engaged on the construction of a nuclear reactor with a planned capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. When completed, this will be considerably bigger than Israel's Negev reactor and will be the largest in the Middle East. Its plutonium production will only theoretically enable Egypt to produce atomic bombs.

The rocket installations, which he considered the most menacing aspect of the German contribution, are believed to be situated in Helouan.

Concern over the Egyptian rocket development program has increased considerably since the launching of four Egyptian rockets last August—the "Al Zafir" (Victor) of 180 miles range and the "Al Kahir" (Conqueror) of 360 miles. Commenting on these launchings, President Nasser then said they were capable of reaching "just south of Beirut"—thus including Israel's entire territory.

In an interview on the Israel radio this week, Eugen Saenger, who once headed the German rocket team in Egypt, expressed his willingness to work for other countries including Israel. He also said that President Nasser would not be able to launch military rockets within the near future due to a number of technical reasons.

Two particular problems are hindering the rocket program, Israelis believe. The first is the question of accurately guiding the rockets. The other problem is what warheads the rockets should carry.

According to an Austrian who worked in Egypt and has since been arrested in Switzerland as an Israel spy, the Egyptians are experimenting with genocidal weapons, including so-called death rays, biological and bacteriological warfare, and poison gas.

It is feared that German scientists also are trying to help the Egyptians develop a cobalt warhead. A cobalt bomb would scatter radioactive particles over large areas: This also falls into the prohibited weapons category.

Some light on possible ties between the Bonn government and Egypt's rocket development program are disclosed in a letter written by Sanger's Stuttgart lawyer, Adolph Karch, to a correspondent of a German press agency.

It pointed out that the Egyptian Government undertook to put at the full disposal of the German Federal Republic all the results of the (rocket) development works and, as the occasion arises, to also put at German disposal the Egyptian ground installations and launching pads for such German experiments as could not be carried out in the Federal Republic.

The orginal of this letter, dated August 14, 1962, has been shown to this reporter.

The Knesset (Israel Parliament) this week proclaimed that "the German people cannot absolve itself of responsibility for the continuation of this vile work." The resolution also said: "It is the duty of the German Government to put an immediate end to this dangerous activity of its citizens and to take all steps required to prevent this cooperation with the Egyptian Government."

Alvin Rosenfeld, correspondent for New York Herald Tribune, reported from Jerusalem:

"This week's session of the Israeli Knesset was in fact sitting in judgment on Premier Ben-Gurion's policy of conciliation with postwar Germany, according to the influential and respected Israel newspaper Haaretz.

"This and other bitter editorial comment in the wake of the Knesset resolution appeared to reflect a deep public resentment of Germany's position and a revival of the old wounds and memories of the Nazi period. It seemed clear that Ben-Gurion's policy had suffered at least a psychological defeat which may postpone full Israel-German reconciliation.

"The Knesset session had been forced upon a reluctant government by the opposition. The overwhelmingly approved Knesset resolution was more strongly worded than the government's official statement delivered in Parliament.

"The liberal nonparty Haaretz, known for its staid responsible views, noted with surprise that Ben-Gurion was not at the Knesset session—he is officially on vacation—and said the Premier had good reasons for not appearing. Ben-Gurion's pro-German policy had once been acceptable to the Israeli public, Haaretz said, but he went too far in his belief that in Western Germany we could find an anchor in all storms.' "

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 26, 1963]

BONN WOULD HALT GERMANS' AID ON EGYPT ROCKETS

(By Sterling Slappey)

BONN.—West Germany today began intensive studies toward forcing German scientists to quit work on an Egyptian rocket project, a Government spokesman announced.

"There are a number of measures that might be taken," the spokesman said. "Which one will be adopted depends on the circumstances that our investigations develop."

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has ordered that a full report of the inquiry be sent to him at his vacation home at Lake Como, Italy.

Representatives of the Interior, Foreign, Economic, and Justice Ministries opened separate discussions today on the problem.

News that a small group of German scientists, plus 300 German rocket technicians, was at work in Egypt has caused a furor in Israel. The Knesset, Israel's Parliament, adopted a strongly worded resolution demanding that West Germany take immediate action to force the German scientists out of Egypt.

The German Government today confirmed some of the Israel charges and said that none of the scientists in Egypt is working on so-called A-B-C weapons—atomic, bacteriological, and chemical. A spokesman said their work is concerned only with the missiles and fuels.

One of the main phases of the investigation here in Bonn is a search of West German statutes in an effort aimed at finding legal means of forcing the scientists to stop their work. Under the German Constitution, a citizen is guaranteed the right to go where he wishes and to work where he wishes.

In Cairo, an Arab League Council resolution released today asked members to urge the West German Government to ignore Israel demands that German scientists be prevented from working in the United Arab Republic, United Press International reported. The Arab League resolution charged Israel was "resorting to criminal methods, including blackmail, explosives, and kidnaping" to prevent Germans from working in the United Arab Republic.

(In Washington, the State Department said it had "no evidence that weapons of mass destruction are being produced or that the United Arab Republic has the capacity to produce them," Associated Press reported.

(The statement said "our evidence supports the German Government's statement" that scientists employed in the United Arab Republic are "for the most part employed in the field of aviation with only a small number engaged in the production of rockets with conventional warheads.")

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 27, 1963]

GERMANS IN EGYPT CALL WEAPONS REPORT A LIE

CAIRO.—Three West German scientists today described the reports that they were working on the development of nuclear and bacteriological weapons for the Egyptian Government as "a blatant lie."

The statement, issued through an intermediary, was apparently in answer to recent Israeli charges that German scientists were developing such weapons for Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir told Parliament in Jersusalem earlier this month that West Germany should prevent its scientists from working on rocket projects for Egypt.

A West German Government spokesman said in Bonn, meanwhile, that the Cabinet would discuss the Israeli complaint Wednesday.

The Cairo statement, signed by Paul Goercke, Hans Kleinwaechter and Wolfgang Pilz, all scientists, said they and their families were being "threatened in a criminal and most evil way and that fabrications about our work in Egypt on the part of the Israeli Government authorities are being made."

It said there had recently been an assassination attempt against Kleinwaechter and that Pilz had been severely injured when opening a letter containing explosives.

Two alleged Israeli agents are now in custody in Switzerland under suspicion of trying to exert pressure on Goercke through his 25-year-old daughter Heidi, to make him stop working in Egypt.

Fair Trade and/or Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fair trade or quality stabilization, the new name, are the names given to the same old proposition of price control. By any name this proposed legislation would permit the manufacturer to set the retail prices. There is no more accurate way to say it. It is anti-fair-trade, it is assured higher prices, it is control of the retailer, it is monopolistic. Most of all it is anticapitalism; it violates every premise of the capitalistic system which has made us, as a nation, what we are today. Prosperity, freedom, pursuit of happiness and right to own property are implicit in capitalism. This editorial from the Wall Street Journal calls this spade a spade and I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

BEHIND THE FAIR LABEL

Some manufacturers certainly owe a debt to the fellow who first applied the term "fair trade" to the system by which retail prices in most States can be maintained at fixed levels.

For fair trade has a good sound, like "fair play." It certainly does not connote, for instance, "price fixing," which to most people doesn't sound good at all.

But the truth is that fair trade is a label in masquerade. Under fair trade a manufacturer can force retailers in an area not to sell his product below a minimum price set by him. So all fair trade really amounts to is legalized price fixing. And, as reported in this newspaper the other day, it is making new headway, especially in the major appliance field.

In 13 States, if a manufacturer can get just one dealer in his State to sign an agreement not to sell his product below a certain price, every other dealer in the State who handles the product must observe the price agreed on. In 18 others, only dealers signing agreements are bound to fair-trade pricing, and in the rest this form of price fixing has no legal sanction.

But however this gimmick is operated, its intended victim is the consumer. The manufacturer and dealer are, in effect, conspiring to deprive him of the opportunity to shop around for the best price he can get.

Just for that reason, fair-trade pricing where challenged has been repeatedly rebuffed in the courts. It has also been rejected in the marketplace, as evidenced by the rapid rise and success of discount houses whose highly competitive operations have led to lower prices in retailing generally.

It is, then, too bad that more businessmen and politicians have failed to get the message. And for those who cling to the illusion that fair trade is as good as it sounds, the proof of how far it departs from sensible business practice is that it works only where it can be constantly and thoroughly policed. Fortunately, even then it doesn't work very well.

President's Tax Program a Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the April 1 issue of Forbes, an outstanding business magazine, makes some appropriate comments on the confused tax program, as enunciated.

The editorial follows:

CUTE TAX CUT—ACUTE MESS

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Forbes was almost alone among business periodicals in the country to thump early and enthusiastically for the administration's intention to seek a sizable tax reduction. The Secretary of the Treasury many months ago expressed to me in his office how thoroughly he agreed with those of us who felt existing onerous corporate and income taxes were stifling incentive and repressing the growth and expansion of business. It was on this basis that Forbes favored a tax cut, even at the cost of a temporary deficit, as a stimulus to business expansion and business incentive.

We still believe that failure to pass a tax reduction measure would indeed put a damper on the economy. But passage of the administration's so-called tax reduction measure as it currently exists would not stimulate business expansion. It would curtail it.

I still happen to think the President's intentions were sincere and sound, but those advising him that this measure would accomplish the objectives he had in mind have sold him a bill of goods. A lot of small print guts much of the intended good.

Specifically, I refer to the so-called tax reforms. Houdini's fame as a sleight-of-hand artist now takes a poor second to the Treasury Department's now you see it, now you don't wizardry. With one hand the Treasury Department provides those with a five- to six-figure income with a beguiling reduction in exorbitant rates; with the other hand, in the fine print, they reform away existing deductions that in countless cases greatly exceed the amount saved.

What is the essence of this touted reform of loopholes? Is it a tackling of specific abuses? Oh, no: a flat prohibition of deductions for interest payments on mortgages, State income taxes, presently permitted medical deductions, local property taxes, charitable contributions, union dues, childcare expenses and several others—except as the total of these might exceed 5 percent of one's gross income.

I asked 11 friends with incomes varying from $12,000 to $100,000 to apply the administration's tax bill to their 1962 returns and let me know how much it would have cut their taxes.

Every one of them would have paid more taxes in the first year, varying from $5 more to several thousand dollars more. This is supposed to provide incentive? This is supposed to provide funds for greater investment?

How, conceivably, will the virtual elimination of the deduction for interest on mortgages help stimulate housing expansions?

How does the elimination of the presently curtailed medical deductions square with the administration's concern, as expressed through its medicare bill, for the high cost of illness?

How does the virtual elimination of deductions for local property taxes and State income taxes square with tax reduction?

How about churches, local charities, and the like? What would this bill do to them?

There is another cutie in the administration measure. One way of getting, holding, and rewarding young men with responsibilities in business, as well as rank-and-file employees, has been company-provided group insurance policies. Under the administration's proposal anyone provided with more than $5,000 of group insurance would pay an income tax on the corporation-provided premium payments. Thus, in effect, there is an additional tax to be paid on an existing incentive. How in heaven's name does this square with the bill's announced objective?

It is unfashionable, I know, in some circles to cry in one's beer about the plight of people making over $10,000 a year. Yet so long as we have a free enterprise system, it is from this group that much of the stimulus for business expansion must come. It is to this group that the administration must look for growth and expansion leadership. Why should the man with one service firm, store or other small business expand it and increase his headaches and his investment when, even if the growth is successful, he can't net more income?

So much for the great profits and stimuli provided in the proposed administration measure as it applies to individuals.

How about corporations? Another cutie in small print accompanies the reduction in corporate income taxes. In the first year, by further advancing the time of payment, the administration will insure that many large corporations will have substantially less cash. Is this supposed to stimulate business investment, expansion? The corporate rate reduction won't be completely effective until 1969. Any businessman, large or small, who is successful, today has had quite enough experience to be wary of investing substantial funds today on promises of tomorrow's tax reductions. Without exhausting my limited memory, I can recall a few temporary tax measures that didn't come off with the war's end. There are even some unenlightened business types who seem to think that $9 billion Federal deficits might eliminate the proposed corporate tax cut even before it can take effect 3 years from now.

In short, the administration's tax bill as presently constituted is not the bill most of us were led to expect. It will indeed put more spending money in the pockets of low-income taxpayers. It will remove a million of them from the taxpaying roster altogether by reason of an intricate change in deductions, which will benefit middle-income taxpayers not at all. Perhaps such proposals will hypo consumer spending a bit. But the economy does not need a short-range, shot in the arm of this kind: It needs a long-range program for sharpening the individual incentives on which free enterprise depends. And I am old fashioned enough to question the wisdom of removing so many people from tax rolls at a time when so many still seem to think that things and services provided by the Government are free.

The bill, in short, defeats its own best purpose. This, I think, is tragic. For there is much that is good in the tax cut proposal. The cutting of tax rates for the middle- and upper-income brackets is certainly a major step in the right direction. So is the more liberal treatment of capital gains and the lightening of the tax burden on corporations. But the kickers in the bill effectively emasculate its original, commendable intent. The sad truth is that it would be better to have no tax cut bill at all than the administration's bill as it now stands.

Do I sound disenchanted?

I am.

I just don't get it.

The administration, with what I felt was sincerity and soundness, courageously proposes to stimulate investment and incentive by a substantial reduction of the tax burden. Then some joker persuades the administration to submit a bill, which in effect amounts to some sort of redistribution of the wealth or pump-priming program, a bill which certainly on analysis is going to provide in the near future precious little individual or corporate incentive. On this questionable measure the administration proceeds to stake a major measure of its prestige.

What happened?

I don't know, but I suspect a Surrey in the woodpile. What a nice little quandry his financial experts have put the President in. Having so built up tax-cut prospects, the President is undoubtedly right in saying failure to enact such a measure will hurt the economy. On the other hand, his brain boys have written a bill which if passed would reduce revenues by some $10 billion and yet lessen, rather than stimulate, incentive. Perhaps Congress can be counted on to give the heave-ho to most of the miscalled reforms. Unfortunately, the patent contradiction of some of these specifics in relation to the bill's objective may well serve to aggravate existing deep reservations on the part of many in Congress about any tax cut when Federal spending gets more out of hand every day. The net—and most unhappy result—could well be a junking of the vitally needed tax cut itself.

HOW'S THAT AGAIN, MR. DILLON?

Two years ago last month Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon wrote to the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee urging confirmation of Stanley Surrey, professor of tax law at Harvard, as Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy. Certain Senators had been concerned over taxation ideas expressed by Professor Surrey. Here is a substantial excerpt from Secretary Dillon's letter:

"MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The concern of some members of your committee with Mr. Stanley Surrey's writings as a professor of tax law and as a private citizen has been brought to my attention. In this connection, I though it might be helpful if I gave you some of the background of Mr. Surrey's current operations and of the circumstances leading to my recommendation to the President that he be designated as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy.

"In considering and interviewing various people who were suggested for this post, I had detailed conversations with Mr. Surrey prior to coming to any decision. One of the chief points of discussion with him was whether he would feel bound in his official role by personal points of view on various tax matters which he had previously expressed as a private citizen. Frankly, I told him that I wanted to be sure that he would not feel obliged to stick by everything he had written and that he would be in a position and frame of mind to take a completely objective and fresh look at specific tax problems as they arose.

"I found that Mr. Surrey felt very strongly that he should undertake any official position with a completely open mind. * * * I also found him completely in agreement with my position that no program or tax policy should be advocated as a firm Treasury policy until after a decision made by the President and me that a given policy or program was in the national public interest.

"Mr. Surrey and I both agreed that it would be important that he put aside his writings as a professor in performing his task as a public official; that it was one thing to write on the outside as an observer or commentator and another to operate within the Government where his responsibility is quite different.

"DOUGLAS DILLON."

A $200 Billion Uncuttable Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the way to fiscal responsibility and Federal self-discipline by Congressmen is to reduce Federal appropriations—the new obligational authority.

The almost laughable and rather ridiculous posture of the President and his liberal advisers is best seen by the stern statements of strict or tight budgeting, that not a cent can be cut from a program—and then the President cuts the program himself, anticipating the hostility of Members of Congress, who reflect the people.

To reduce Federal spending, cuts in spending start with reduced, not enlarged, obligational authority. The Wall Street Journal article illustrates the point. I want to applaud this approach. With $87 billion unspent from earlier appropriations, where is the hurry to double the ante? Let us cut spending by cutting spending—the new obligational authority.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 2, 1963]

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE BILLION

So where would you cut? This is the familiar official reply to anyone who suggests that the Federal spending budget not only can but should be reduced. The assertion is that any cuts would impair essential services.

Actually the administration itself has given the lie to the argument in a couple of cases; it reportedly will suggest paring several hundred million dollars out of its own foreign aid request. And the contention that a $98.8 billion budget is uncuttable never could impress anyone with any commonsense or familiarity with Federal finance.

One of the men most versed in that subject is Virginia's Senator HARRY BYRD, who has now put out his recommendations for spending reductions. While it is certainly unlikely that Congress will go along with them, we trust no one will suggest that this venerable statesman is plotting to do the country in, any more than the patriotism of General Eisenhower can be impugned when he calls for deep cuts, emphatically including defense spending.

The great virtue of the Byrd budget is not only that it pinpoints, function by function and agency by agency, where savings can be made without impairing any essential service at all; he proposes a spending reduction of slightly over $7 billion in fiscal 1964. It is also that his report underscores some fantastic facts about the carelessness with

which Washington deals with the people's money.

Unless Congress cuts the budget, the Senator shows that Federal agencies, in the 1964 fiscal year beginning next July 1, would be authorized to obligate and spend a total of more than $195 billion. True, the administration expects to spend only $98.8 billion of that sum. But it has asked new appropriations and other obligational authority of $107.9 billion; in addition, it has on hand, unspent, $87.2 billion in appropriations from previous years.

The customary justification for this seemingly weird setup is that the Government must have on hand more money than it spends in any given year; it must be prepared to pay, for example, for a weapons development that may take several years. Even if that is granted, the total amount available—$195 billion—is ludicrously out of line with commitments.

For a concrete case, most of the available foreign aid money is not even obligated; that is, committed for specific spending purposes. Taking all foreign aid money that would be available at the start of the new fiscal year, Mr. BYRD finds a formidable total of nearly $27 billion, of which a little over $8 billion is obligated, and not even all of that represents firm commitments.

The practice of carrying over these prodigious unspent balances is one of the more serious weaknesses in the Federal financial structure. How can you expect a tapering off, let alone an end, of foreign aid so long as these appropriations billions keep piling up? How can you expect thrift or prudence from the administrators in general when they have all these billions beyond what it is proposed to spend? How much good is it to cut the 1964 spending budget, should Congress be so bold, while the Government keeps right on amassing these appropriations?

Therefore an important key to rediscovering fiscal control is, as the Senator stresses, to tackle appropriations. He recommends reducing the new requests by $12 billion; in this way there could be considerably more hope of holding down spending not only in fiscal 1964 but in later years as well.

That such reasonable proposals have scant chance of adoption is only a reflection on too many Members of Congress, just as it is a reflection on the budgetmaking officials who prize carelessness and care not a whit about fiscal control. But at least they shouldn't insult the people's intelligence by calling uncuttable a budget of nearly $100 billion, especially when it is more nearly $200 billion.

Mr. Speaker, as for foreign aid, we have borrowed $100 billion since World War II to give away. It can and must be cut—even eliminated—in the future. "A Promise of Pruning" shows the way to a more sensible program:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 3, 1963]

A PROMISE OF PRUNING

For the first time in many a year a President has outlined substantial improvements in foreign aid. If some of the ideas in Mr. Kennedy's message to Congress yesterday are carried further, there could be a turning point in this long, costly, and often maladministered program.

The message properly credits some of the new thinking to the Committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay; along with other experts, this group has been scrutinizing the whole problem of foreign assistance. Accordingly the administration promises, for one thing, to apply stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries.

What this can mean in practice is less aid or none at all to nations which are obviously not making good use of it. It can mean ending aid to nations which no longer need it. Thus the administration opens the prospect of a program smaller in scope and cost; in this message it recommends a $400-million reduction from its own original $4.9 billion request for fiscal 1964.

Other potentially useful new directions are indicated: More emphasis on loans instead of grants. And, significantly, fresh efforts to spur private foreign investment in underdeveloped areas and more private enterprise within them; up to now we have been mostly aiding foreign political authorities rather than fostering free economic institutions.

How far this and the other proposed reforms will be carried in practice is another matter. There is a built-in bias in favor of aiding other governments rather than people, and it is noteworthy that the Clay report was much more forceful than the administration on this point; it said we should not be in the business of aiding statist economic institutions which are in conflict with our own traditions and inefficient besides.

As for self-help and reform on the part of the aid-receiving nations, practice strikingly diverged from theory the other day. Brazil has been wallowing in inflation for years, and the United States has repeatedly bailed it out; now Washington has just given it a new $400 million handout to tide it over once more.

In Latin America, generally, the government still seems too ready to take the promise of reform for its performance. It may be all very well for a nation to announce a land-reform program, but land reform is not something virtuous in itself; much depends on the specifics of the program and the manner of its application.

Even taking the most optimistic view of the suggested aid improvements, they remain too limited. The program as a whole is still excessively expensive, no matter how the cost is rationalized.

It is too costly in the perspective of the $100 billion already spent for this purpose since World War II; in relation to the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit; in terms of the enormous Federal budget deficits. Stricter standards than the Government is so far discussing would be healthier all around.

Moreover, the Government's basic approach to foreign aid could stand a good deal more realism. For all its promised pruning, the Government still seems to be under the impression that the masses of Latin America and Asia, their populations outrunning anybody's resources, can somehow be made reasonably prosperous in the near future. As yesterday's message puts it, "Two centuries of pioneering and growth must be telescoped into decades and even years." That is unlikely, to say the least.

It is indeed encouraging that the Government is finally making a serious effort to make foreign aid more effective, but the new ideas inevitably emphasize how much more needs to be done. Not the least of the requirements is a clearer look at the existing world and the U.S. Government's ability to go on carrying so many of its burdens.

Statistics "Management" or Manipulation of Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, overlooked in the discussion of news management—Government control of news—is the fact that the Federal Government itself has become the Nation's principal statistical source. This makes it easy for officials to manipulate statistics to tell the story they want. Old-fashioned bushbeating news coverage is becoming a lost art.

To win political points in agriculture, for example, Secretary Freeman used statistics unfairly to show an erroneous achievement in stockpile reduction—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3822–3831, 4323–4324. Secretary of Labor Wirtz did the same thing last fall in attempting to show employment gains which did not exist. In handling the Cuban affair, the administration even claimed the right to misinform the public.

Withholding information is one thing. Twisting facts and telling falsehoods is quite another. To an alarming degree the American people are dependent on Government interpretations for vital information.

Being American Proves Inspiring to Salem Pupils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following newspaper story about the second annual Americanism program in the Salem-Washington Township public school system in the Ninth District of Indiana. Following the news story are the four winning essays on the theme "What It Means to Me To Be an American," which I believe will be of interest to every Member of Congress:

BEING AMERICAN PROVES INSPIRING TO SALEM PUPILS

The second annual Americanism program, which carries the message and faiths of old-fashioned patriotism to about 2,000 pupils in the Salem-Washington Township public school system, will reach its climax on George Washington's Birthday anniversary, Friday, February 22.

The total pupil enrollment will gather in Brooks Memorial Gymnasium for a special patriotic program. At that time, four pupils who were selected winners of an essay contest, will read their essays that sum up their feelings and beliefs about the heritage, meaning, and mission of America.

Theme for the essay contest, winners of which were judged last week, is "What It Means to Me To Be an American."

This is the second year of the school's unique Americanism program which was organized by School Superintendent Jack Davidson.

The four winners are Odetta Episcopo, 17, junior, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. A. R. Episcopo; Blair Stephenson, 15, sophomore, son of Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Stephenson; Johnny Blackman, 13, eighth grader and son of Mr. and Mrs. Kennis Blackman; and Teresa Williams, 9, fourth grader, and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Williams.

The essays these students will give at Friday's Americanism program appears on other pages in this issue.

In commenting on the goal of the program, Superintendent Davidson said: "We are trying to foster a positive approach to the feeling of Americanism, a concern for patriotism on the part of each individual. The title of the program indicates this."

WHAT IT MEANS TO ME TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Blair Stephenson)

Thousands upon thousands of years have passed and gone; great civilizations have risen, struggled, and have fallen into obscurity. Today, as Americans, we are living under a form of government that has been and will be the most brilliantly successful of these experiments ever made by man in governing himself.

Our Nation was not conceived by mere chance, but was founded by men, fearing and trusting in God. They brought forth a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. The Constitution they laid down as a guide for this country is a statement of law that has never been equaled. In it they reserved the specific rights of the individual and established the very basic unchanging principles upon which the essence of our Government rests. These men set examples of firm unwavering loyalty to their beliefs. They stood at all costs, even at the expense of their lives, for their convictions.

Through the periods of the growth of this country when those principles for which she stood were in peril, her citizens defended those things they loved and cherished with a courage and self-sacrifice unsurpassed.

As citizens of this Nation and as heirs to that which has preceded us, our country should still mean as much in the same basic ways as it did to those patriots whom we so greatly admire. Today, too many people want liberty without discipline, life without death, and adventure without risk. Fellow Americans, this ought not to be so. Our America has been paid for with the blood of patriots. Our freedoms if we hope to keep them, are going to cost us and we must be prepared to pay to hold them.

Day after day, many Americans go about their affairs of living, little caring or realizing the cost of the principles and liberties that they are enjoying. They are not grateful to their Creator who allows them to live in a country where they have the right to worship as they please, to receive at will an extensive education, to equal justice under law, to succeed or to fail in life, to take part in the government, and to live in a free society.

Many people do not realize the debt we owe to God and our parents for life and to America for a way of life unparalleled. How grateful we as free citizens of this Nation should be that the constant terror of tyranny does not overshadow our lives; that we may live each day with the hope of waking on the morrow unmolested; that we may raise our children as we see fit and not be witnesses of the total seizure of their minds from us by a hateful, domineering, governmental power.

We truly have been blessed in many wonderful ways, and yet, what do they really mean to us? Where has the spirit of true patriotism such as was evident in Washington, Franklin, and the great, humble Lincoln, departed to?

As we look into the sky on a beautiful, calm day, we are able to see a true symbolism of America, open and spacious; abounding with equal opportunities, rights, and privileges for all.

God grant that our great America will mean enough to her citizens that they will come forth to meet any challenge courageously, and will not at any price allow this way of life, this United States of America, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people to perish from the face of this earth.

WHAT IT MEANS TO ME TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Johnny Blackman)

It means a lot to me to be an American. It means that we are blessed with many privileges and blessings. America, my country, is the most beautiful and the richest country in the world. We can enjoy her great oceans, sunbathed beaches, mighty rivers, placid lakes, boundless forests, fertile plains, rolling prairies, and an ideal climate.

In America we can live under a government of the majority of our people, hence being free from a tyrannical form of government.

We are bestowed the right to think for ourselves and to express orally, or in writing, our criticisms or opinions of any public issue. We have the freedom to attend the church of our choice and a right to a free public education. We have the freedom to assemble peaceably to discuss, openly, any matter of worthy concern. We also have freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom from want and fear.

Another great freedom we have is that of the free enterprise system. This economic system provides each person with the right to choose his own vocation, to sell the products of his occupation, in goods, or in services, to use the proceeds of such sales as he wishes, and the right of the individual to own private property. It is our American right to enjoy this freedom, so long as we do not interfere with other people's enjoyment of the same rights.

To really appreciate our many freedoms we have to consider others in this world who do not have as much freedom as we do. Many other governments are not as democratic, but are controlled by only one political party. Such governments own and control the transportation, communication, land, and factories. They have control of who is permitted to go to school, the work their people must do, and the amount of money they can receive.

The schools must teach according to what the government wants them to teach. In such countries there is no freedom of the press and all the planning nations are greatly handicapped.

In America we have a democratic form of government which allows each citizen of the United States a voice in the government. We elect citizens to represent us in Congress, State legislatures, and in city and county governments over the entire country to establish our laws. In this way we, as Americans, can make sure our rights are asserted and enforced.

Many of us take for granted the many rights and privileges this country once did not have. The work of our forefathers provided the foundations of this country's greatness. These were the men who suffered and died in wars and the men who proposed great documents, such as the Constitution of the United States, which provides for justice, tranquility, the common defense, general welfare, and the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

To be an American also means to me that I must be willing to help keep these wonderful freedoms for myself and my fellow Americans by obeying the laws and by trying always to do that which is best for all the people, regardless of race, color, religion, political belief, or economic or social position. It even means that I must be willing to risk my own life, if that becomes necessary, to defend our way of living and governing from those who wish to take all these freedoms away from us.

This sacrifice I must be as as willing to make as were the many brave patriots who have risked their lives in the past in order that I might enjoy the privilege of being an American.

WHAT IT MEANS TO ME TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Teresa Williams)

To be an American is a great privilege. Here we may enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and the right to vote. We must not take our freedom for granted. We must not be indifferent if we are to protect our great democracy. Boys and girls as well as adults must be ready and willing to help their country in time of need. It is our responsibility to prepare ourselves in the best possible way to become citizens worthy of this great country.

With the help of teachers and leaders of our country, we may become well-informed Americans ready to defend our Constitution, a heritage which gave us many freedoms, rights and blessings. Our blessings did not come to us without hardships and war.

These hardships were suffered by our forefathers, men who worked and fought that we might have freedom of speech, freedom of press, and the right to vote as we please.

With all of these rights to protect, we need the Army, Navy, and Air Force. When the need arises we should all be willing to take part in these services in order to defend our great country, and the supreme privilege that says, "We, the people, rule ourselves."

If we are to enjoy living in this great country, we must be willing to take part in upholding its principles, as well as defending it. Patriotism of our people has always been an essential to our country's growth and success. If we are patriotic, we will not allow communism to creep in and destroy all that great men have struggled for and helped us to attain.

Let us keep the faith of our Constitution. Let us protect our rights to be different from others in likes, dislikes, and ideas. Let us protect our right to vote so that we may have good leaders. Finally, let us always trust in God so that we may be able to defend our precious heritage.

WHAT IT MEANS TO ME TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Odetta Episcopo)

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Everyone thrills to Patrick Henry's stirring words "Give me liberty or give me death." In many lands orators have cried out these very words. Yes, people everywhere are seeking these certain inalienable rights that are endowed by their Creator, among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And the people of America have found their happiness. They are no longer searching, for America is known all over the world as the land of liberty, the land of the free.

I am an American. But just what does that mean to me? It means the feeling of freedom, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and from fear for the whole world. Now, one may ask, what is the meaning of this freedom?

Freedom is a matter of making choices; consequently, it must be kept under control. Therefore, one may say it is also a matter of restraint. Freedom is something everyone loves. It is, as Daniel Webster once said, "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it." America stands for the idea of freedom, freedom for everybody—poor or rich, weak or strong, young or old.

Liberty is gained only by struggle and it can be kept only by everlasting vigilance. The men and women who founded America were refugees—refugees from tyranny. They came to America to find freedom—

religious, political freedom, and a chance to make for themselves honest, decent, respectable lives. They came to make a place where, by hard work, they could find happiness in their own way and do as they pleased. As a result of their struggles, America has its share of national heroes—men who have found a place in the hearts and affections of the people. The fact that we revere them shows who we are—the kind of people we want to be. America's heroes are the measures of America's ideals.

What it means to me to be an American is the wonderful feeling of living in a country that is supreme. Yes, the United States of America is supreme—supreme in many ways, for instance, in its Government. Democracy is a form of government in which the emphasis is put upon the people. The people govern themselves, consequently democracy substitutes self-restraint for external restraint. It is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is based upon the idea of freedom and on the principle of equality.

Our democracy was founded on noble principles, and by and large, "we the people" have stuck to them. Whatever the fears, whatever the successes or failures of our age of challenge, one fact resounds like the blare of a bugle. In the world today, and in the future as far as anyone can see, the United States will lead the free world. What it does within its own borders will be closely watched by all people who are debating whether to take the road of totalitarianism or of democracy. The skill with which the United States uses its power and wealth in dealing with underdeveloped peoples will gravely affect the answers to the question: In the new nations, will nationalism, science, technology and industrial organization be used to serve democracy or tyranny? The wisdom with which the United States conducts itself could determine the answer to the most haunting of all questions—Peace or annihilation.

I am proud to be an American and to live in a land of such abundance and variety. Besides her wealth and prosperity, America is also a beautiful country. And I love her beauty, from her giant hilltops to her beautiful green and fertile valleys, from her babbling streams to her tall, wooded forests. In every sight there stems a note of freedom. There is a mighty sound, the sound of a strong, determined country; a progressive country. It is a country of industry and knowledge, of art and music, of writers and poets. Walt Whitman once said, "The chief reason for the being of the United States of America is to bring about the common goodwill of all mankind, the solidarity of the world.

All these things that I have just expressed are my feelings of what being an American means to me. It is my feeling of love for my home, for the soil of my country, for the trees that give me shade, and the hills that stand in my pathway.

Yes. I love liberty and the American idea—the great idea, the idea of perfect and free individuals. I, too, may cry out, "Give me liberty or give me death."

Receiving an Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Todt, who is a columnist for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, recently received a Special Freedom Leadership Award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa. The citation was granted for Mr. Todt's "continuing fight against the deceit and dullness of socialistic communism and for his continue teaching through editorials, of the spirit and greatness of our spiritually based constitutional Republic with its democratic methods."

The Special Freedom Leadership Award represents the highest award by the foundation to a member of the mass communications media in its 14 year history and I would like to add my congratulations to Mr. Todt on receiving this honor.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a recent column from the Herald-Examiner by Mr. Todt in which he discusses the experience of having received the award:

RECEIVING AN AWARD

(By George Todt)

"The American credo: A teachable definition of the great principles of the founding documents and our free enterprise structure," Don Belding.

VALLEY FORGE, PA., February 22, 1963.—It was a great thrill for me today when I received a Special Freedom Leadership Award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge on the 231st anniversary of the birth of George Washington, our first President. His spirit seemed on this occasion to prevail everywhere here.

I was told by Dr. Kenneth Wells, president of the Freedoms Foundation, that mine was the top honor ever accorded a newspaperman by this organization during the past 14 years of its existence.

He said it was awarded to me not because of the negative principles I was against—but the positive ones I stood for. Not the things I hated, but those which I loved. Not for destructiveness, but for being constructive. Soft-spoken and self-effacing, Dr. Wells is a very fine American.

The magnificent plaque I received was presented me after some kind words of praise by Adm. Arthur Radford, previously chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Pentagon under former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

GALLANTRY

He is a man I have always admired for exemplary patriotism and practical wisdom. The same goes for Adm. Arleigh Burke—who was my companion on the way to the awards luncheon. The message to me from each of these gallant Americans: courageous leadership is more important now than ever before.

Our need is for dedicated and adept fighters in every department—press, military, government, religious, moral, or what-have-you? We are facing the most capable and dangerous enemy we have met on any battlefield until this time. Can we survive the awful threat?

I think we can if we arm ourselves with the 100 percent U.S. ideology of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. It is based on the ethical and moral bedrock of the liberty-loving heritage left us by George Washington and the American Revolution.

UNDERSTANDING

This nonprofit, nonpolitical and nonsectarian organization was founded in March 1949. Its aim is to bring about a better understanding of the basic principles underlying our divinely-inspired Republic. Who are its officers?

The honorary chairman is former President Herbert Hoover and former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is chairman of the board of directors. President is Dr. Wells. The Honorable James A. Farley and Adm. Felix B. Stump, USN-ret. are vice chairmen. Chairman of the executive committee is Don Belding of Los Angeles.

All Americans are eligible for membership in the Freedom Foundation.

Engraved on the Special Freedom Leadership plaque I received were these revealing words: "George Todt, Los Angeles, Calif.—for his continuing fight against the dullness of socialistic communism and for his continued teaching, through editorials of the spirit and greatness of our spiritually, based Constitutional Republic and its democratic methods."

HERE TONIGHT

Upon receiving the honor, I told the large audience that I wished to share it with my publisher, George Hearst, Jr. and the workers of The Los Angeles Herald-Examiner who have made it the patriotic newspaper of the Southwest.

Tonight, Dr. Wells will be chief speaker at the Freedom Foundation Southern California awards dinner hosted by Don Belding at the California Club in Los Angeles.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal by Mr. Gordon J. Berry, president of the Electric Products Co., dated March 26, 1963.

Mr. Berry's suggestion is excellent:

THE ELECTRIC PRODUCTS CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 26, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Wall Street Journal,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I noticed with considerable interest the comments of Mr. Samuel Lenher, of Du Pont, in one of the March 21 editorials under the subject "Shortages in Logic."

I disagree with Mr. Lenher when he states that it is wishful thinking to expect any hurry up Government program to ease the situation as there are immediate and logical steps which can be taken.

We have hardly begun to tap the real technical resources of this country which lie in the tremendous reservoir of stable and proved capabilities immediately available from a large number of widely experienced engineering talent in smaller companies. We live in such a technical age that almost every manufacturing company has to have some specialized technical talent. In many cases, these are the real brilliant nonconformists who have gravitated toward the smaller companies because the atmosphere was more compatible with their temperament. This same atmosphere through force of necessity is one of achieving rapid and efficient success on projects.

Since the majority of the money being spent for research and development in this country is Government sponsored, the matter must then go back to determine how this can be organized to effectively use these available and interested resources.

It is obvious that these small firms are not capable of maintaining the sales and negotiating staffs necessary to solicit this business and prepare the complex proposals

required. The problem is further complicated by the complete veil of secrecy that seems to develop when such proposals are presented and the extended periods before any action is taken, which becomes most discouraging.

It is in this regard that I believe that the established organization of the SBA could be directed and provided with the facilities to first, rigidly qualify these smaller manufacturers as to their capabilities and then enforce the very limited number of major contractors and Departments of Defense to use the lists of these qualified manufacturers as sources of supply for research and development work. Further, if there is an adequate qualified number, this business can be set aside so that these firms will be further encouraged by feeling that they can engage in such activities on a permanent basis.

We find innumerable situations today where the large and well organized prime contractors are engaging in every type of research activity, covering areas where there is plenty of existent talent, both interested and capable of performing the assignments. These firms then go out and hire the talent necessary, many times coming from smaller firms, and disturbing the longer range capabilities of this technical talent.

Yours very truly,

GORDON J. BERRY,
President.

Lord Beveridge's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, human beings want security. Everyone wants to be secure. Everyone wants to be assured of security. Government blandishments and promises for political gain is as old as human life in society. Social planners with some one else's lives, property, and money is the raw material of this human drama.

Lord Beveridge had his "cradle to grave" security plan. We have our social security plus countless Federal subsidies, checks, assurances, and protections for the future in housing, bank deposits, and the like.

The United States is becoming a welfare society. Social security is called insurance when even the Supreme Court, no less, has properly labeled it a "gratuity." Yet the wisdom of the ages has not daunted the social planners, as they scheme in the White House and Federal agencies today.

Lord Beveridge, security, government controls, and currency devaluation are found properly joined in this editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

LORD BEVERIDGE'S DREAM

William Beveridge, who died in England recently at the age of 84, was one of the very few men who have drawn up ambitious plans for society and have seen the plans come largely true. Lord Beveridge was the author, in 1942, of Britain's "cradle to grave" social security system, which includes a generous pension plan and nationalized medicine.

The irony of Lord Beveridge's life was that in his later years, as the Economist of London said, he was "sad, even soured, about the inflationary and inconsistent ways in which others had evolved his Frankenstein's monster—the 'welfare state.'"

"Inflation," Lord Beveridge said in an interview printed in U.S. News & World Report in 1959, "is one of the major evils that we have to get rid of. It makes social security very difficult because the pensions which were sufficient when they were fixed by the state are not sufficient."

What caused this inflation? "A lot of associations of workers and employers," Lord Beveridge said, "are debasing the currency by asking for more shillings for the same amount of production."

Doesn't the welfare state itself, leading as it does to frequent deficits, contribute to inflation? "Not in the very least."

Lord Beveridge was right about the damage caused by inflation, but wrong about its cause. The only way wages and prices can rise, without quickly putting factories out of production and laborers out of work is for the money supply to rise. And only the Government can bring about a substantial rise in the money supply, chiefly by spending more money than it takes in. True, labor leaders often urge inflationary government policies as a means toward higher wages; but neither they nor management can "debase the currency" without the government's help.

The welfare state itself is, from a political point of view, the easiest path to deficit spending. The costs of Britain's plans have mounted year by year and have consistently kept well ahead of the taxes which were supposed to pay for them. Our own social security program has run into the same problem and taxes have been raised to a point far higher than originally planned. Other welfare scehemes are advanced and too often adopted without even the pretense of raising money to pay for them.

This is why the money is debased. It is why any government which tries to be a welfare state or to create "full employment" by government spending—another of Lord Beveridge's plans—is almost certain to bring about inflation. And it is why planners like Lord Beveridge, no matter how well meaning, will never be satisfied.

U.S. Naval Academy: Two Points of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to every question, and in the April issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Midshipman 1c. J. M. DeFrancia presents his views of the training given midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

Midshipman DeFrancia's article is written in rebuttal to an article appearing in the January issue of Harper's.

He speakes his mind well and strongly defends the training given to midshipmen at the Academy. His article should be read by every American who is interested in the type of leaders we are turning out to defend our Nation against our enemies.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his article for the information of the Congress:

(By J. M. DeFrancia, midshipman first class, U.S. Navy)

In his article, "Teaching Young Sea Dogs Old Tricks," in the January 1963 issue of Harper's, Prof. David Boroff, presented his views on various aspects of life at the U.S. Naval Academy. His conclusions and criticisms were based on a few interviews with a small number of midshipmen and officers. I should like to present my opinions on the basis of having had contact with hundreds of fellow midshipmen and a large number of officers. Mr. Boroff considers himself qualified to present a picture of the U.S. Naval Academy after spending a few days here in research. I feel equally qualified after living the life of a midshipman at the Naval Academy for 3½ years.

The first point of Mr. Boroff's criticism was the vocational curriculum taught by the Naval Science Department. He questions whether it "is in sound alinement with vocational realities," on the grounds that only 375 of 765 graduates of the class of 1961 actually entered the Navy line. He fails, however, to analyze the curriculum before criticizing it.

During second class (junior) year a midshipman takes two semesters of navigation. This course is directly applicable not only to the 375 line candidates, but also to the 200 naval aviation candidates and the 80 Air Force candidates. (The principles of air and sea navigation are the same.) The navigation course is, then, valuable to at least 655 of the 765 graduates, not taking into account those men who enter Marine Corps aviation. Military law and leadership, which includes psychology and the analysis of personnel problems that have arisen in the fleet, together occupy two semesters of a midshipman's education. These courses are obviously of use to all graduates whether they enter the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force.

Naval operations is a course dealing with tactics, logistics, and amphibious operations—all of which subjects are useful to line officers, naval aviators, and Marine officers. And the course is at least partially beneficial to Army candidates (amphibious warfare) and supply officers (logistics), which gives us a total of 683 of the 765 graduates who derive applicable knowledge from this operations training curriculum.

The Weapons Department curriculum centers around computers, the principles of modern electronic weapons systems, and ballistic missiles. This course is valuable to al graduates; even future supply officers will probably deal with computers in their service billets.

While Mr. Boroff questions the worth of the vocational curriculum on the basis of its value to less than half of the graduates, I have tried to indicate the value of the curriculum to at least 85 percent of Naval Academy graduates. And to criticize a vocational curriculum at the Naval Academy for its own sake would be analogous to criticizing the study of anatomy and biology in a pre-med course.

Mr. Boroff further criticizes the course of study at the Academy when he states that the "curricular time [25 percent] allocated to the humanities and social sciences doesn't quite make sense." His argument is that graduates may find themselves assigned to foreign-aid missions, liaison NATO billets, or planning groups which deal wtih complex political and social factors, and hence may need more education in the humanities. I should like to point out, however, that only a minute number of officers below the rank of lieutenant commander will ever occupy such billets, which allows for more than sufficient time to obtain proficiency in the social sciences through later post-graduate

and correspondence work. Furthermore, in comparison with the vast number of officers, who need primarily the engineering training provided at the Academy, only a small number of officers will ever occupy the billets Mr. Boroff alluded to, which require a more extensive humanities background.

The primary duty of all naval officers is the operation of ships and weapons systems. This demands a fundamental education in engineering and electronics. The humanities and social sciences are not by any means neglected; rather the midshipmen are provided with a sound foundation in these fields, a foundation which allows for further development. And a strong foundation is provided in engineering, too, but a more extensive one. The majority of junior officers have an immediate need of engineering know-how for their shipboard duties and a less immediate need of the humanities simply because they lack the experience necessary for planning boards and foreign aid missions. When, because of the press of time, a choice must be made, then the choice must be heavy on engineering and lighter on humanities.

Further criticism was aimed at the Academy system by the dispraisal of senior officers (captains) heading the various academic departments. It should be noted that these officers are well qualified in the field of the department they head. (For example, the head of the English, history, and government department is a former Rhodes scholar.) We must remember that the purpose of the Academy is to provide officers who will fill the needs of the service. Who is better qualified to determine what background a junior officer will need in today's Navy than a senior officer fresh from the fleet who has observed the fortes and shortcoming of his juniors? And as for the fact that only 15 percent of the officer faculty possess advanced degrees, Mr. Boroff himself pointed out that a program is now underway which will provide officer instructors having at least an M.A. or M.S. degree within the next few years.

A most illogical basis of criticism was Mr. Boroff's reference to the midshipman's slang terms. He states: "As long as midshipmen dismiss the humanities as 'bull' and foreign languages by the unspeakable term 'Dago' the Academy is not fulfilling its mission." I might point out that we midshipmen also refer to engineering as "steam," and to electronics as "skinny." To criticize the mission of the entire program because midshipmen refer to their courses in slang terms is ridiculous. We no more dismiss the humanities by using the term "bull" than the American people dismissed their respect for General Eisenhower by calling him Ike. Slang names for courses are common to all college campuses, and, quite frankly, it's easier to tell your roommate you're off to "bull" class than to say English, history, and government class. We have been doing it for a hundred years.

Mr. Boroff points out that midshipmen cannot pursue special academic interests because of their heavy schedule (compulsory intramural sports, lights out at 11). But he fails to remember that the Academy emphasizes the "whole man" concept—athletics and social graces, as well as academics. It takes more than a knowledge of the arts to run a ship and lead men in battle. He then calls attention to the fact that Harvard students have a higher average on the college boards (they lead by a 61-point average). I concede that Harvard is a better school for its purpose. But the Academy's purpose and mission, and hence its curriculum, is different. It naturally follows that its entrance requirements on the college boards need not necessarily parallel those of Harvard.

And his examples of first-class research papers (he called them senior essays) were very poorly selected. He chose but three, on cross-country track, gambling, and rifles. He might better have selected as a cross-sectional view such topics as "An Analysis of the Truman-MacArthur Controversy Over American Strategy in Korea," or "The Influence of the Yalta Conference on the World Today," or "The Dismantling of Indochina." All these are controversial historical topics, and the research paper is intended to be an essay on an important occurrence in history wherein the midshipmen present a logical argument to justify their conclusions. It might also be noted that in recent years several research papers were of sufficient quality to merit publication.

Mr. Boroff then proceeds to criticize the midshipmen themselves as being of a "brother rat" mentality. In reference to the Academy he states that "the prevailing tone is rambunctiously adolescent." I would ask what he terms the cavortings of my civilian peers. It is well known that college students all over the country indulge in such antics as telephone-booth-stuffing and bed-pushing contests. Football rallies here parallel those of any other large college, as do the dances, both formal and informal; we even do the twist.

In attempting to justify his criticisms, he attacks the brigade's magazine, the Log, as full of schoolboy humor and sentimental fables of old admirals. The Log is quite comparable to any other college magazine in that it emphasizes subjects of interest to its readers, the midshipmen, such as sports, and yes, sentimental fables. Essentially it is a humor magazine, and collegiate publications on the same footing also have humor articles and quips about their administrators. But the error is one of omission, for Mr. Boroff fails to mention our professional magazine, the Trident, which contains articles on serious professional and political topics. Nor does he mention the fact that most midshipmen also subscribe to the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, the professional magazine of the Navy.

He calls our culture monolithic and adolescent. I could say the same about any college, if I cited only their football rallies and humor magazines as proof of their depth of thinking. Our culture might better be exemplified by the Naval Academy Foreign Affairs Conference, which deals with modern social and political problems and brings in speakers such as G. Mennen Williams, of the State Department. Is there a lack of culture here when students the Nation over flock to an Academy-led convention on the problems of the modern world?

Midshipmen dating habits, which were also subject to Mr. Boroff's criticism, can be explained quite simply. Midshipmen are like young men anywhere else—they enjoy escorting, and like pretty girls. Some girls like midshipmen, more often one midshipman in particular. And some don't like us at all. But the whole matter is largely on a personal basis, as at any other college, and is, I feel, quite irrelevant to a critique of the Academy in regard to its ability to produce qualified officers. It is as illogical an argument as would be my quoting young ladies who don't like Massachusetts Institute of Technology men in criticizing that school's ability to educate young men as engineers. After nearly 4 years here, I feel that I am in a position to say with authority that regardless of what brainwashing we might or might not incur, it is quite definitely not along romantic lines.

Mr. Boroff has categorized us as lacking spontaneity, naturalness, and freedom of mind. I find this to be untrue, unless questioning the orders of seniors, or even openly opposing them, can be termed freedom of mind or naturalness. And what do you suppose would result if this occurred? Any student of military philosophy can tell you that it would result in the breakdown of any effective fighting machine. But if this is not the freedom of mind to which Mr. Boroff was referring, then I say that freedom certainly does exist. We are not dictated to in regard to our thinking or brainwashed into stereotyped reasoning. On any given topic, be it medicare or nuclear testing, you can find as many opinions as you find midshipmen. It is unfortunate that because we dress alike and march in step, we must be accused of lacking the individuality to reason on our own.

Mr. Boroff states that we cheer in the messhall when penalties are announced, which is untrue, at least during my stay here. And as for the "gloomy respect" which we are attested to have for our rigorous existence, I can say that we might complain about having less free time than our civilian contemporaries, but given the choice, we wouldn't trade. And any man in this Nation who has served his "hitch" can support me, when I say that a certain amount of "griping" is natural to any military unit. None of us came here expecting to be free to come and go as we pleased. It is discipline, which is necessary in the service, and we do understand that, though we sometimes voice a little discontent.

Mr. Boroff refers to our training cruises as "junkets" which are, by definition, pleasure trips. Speaking from personal experience, I can say that cleaning bilges and chipping paint, not to mention cold lookout watches and hot (100°+) engineroom watches, do not fit the definition. These are the types of duties we performed on "youngster" cruise in enlisted billets. During second-class summer, there was a questionable amount of pleasure in somersaulting over barbed wire, in marching a few miles to the barracks, under a hot sun, with packs and rifles (Marine training). And there was equally dubious pleasure in crawling through a submarine's confined engine spaces while tracing a pipeline, or on a midnight-to-4-a.m. watch on a cold bridge in the Arctic while on first-class cruise. But neither should these duties be cast in the negative for they are our business, our job. And we like our business.

To be sure, there were many very pleasurable moments. We have seen faraway lands and have made friends in distant parts of the world. The latter is in direct opposition to Mr. Boroff's accusation that "midshipmen go around in all-American groups, insulated against indigenous culture." We are encouraged to make as many foreign acquaintances as possible. I correspond currently with friends in Italy and England, friends I made while on cruise—hardly possible if I had been "insulated." And sending midshipmen to cruise with allied navies on foreign ships, as the Academy does annually, could hardly be called insulating. All of us here realize full well the unfortunate existence of the "Ugly American" and do our utmost to compensate for him while on cruise.

Mr. Boroff cites the remark of "the superintendent of a swank suburban school system," who, when asked if any of his boys entered the service academies, said, "some do, those who are interested in that kind of thing." It is indeed unfortunate if the public conceives, as Mr. Boroff intimated, honorable service to one's country as "that kind of thing." Men risk their lives daily on, above, and under the sea, so that the old saying might hold: "Sleep well, America. The Navy guards your shores tonight." It is unfortunate that these men do their duty only to be thought of as doing "that kind of thing." It is unfortunate that men died at Leyte Gulf, Iwo Jima, and Guadalcanal doing "that kind of thing." Yet the Academy's purpose is to produce officers who will dedicate their lives to just "that kind of thing."

Mr. Boroff concludes his article with the statement that "Annapolis gets good boys, but not the very best." This is not true if we can rank men like Halsey, King, Leahy, and Nimitz, five-star admirals all, among the very best. And any man who died in the service of his country, be it in peacetime while flying patrol, or in wartime on the shores of Okinawa, can without a shadow of a doubt be counted among the very best. If the Naval Academy's methods can produce men like these, there is no need for radical change. Modern technological advances dictate a change in curriculum, true; and these changes are taking place. But the basic system in itself, with its principles of military discipline and the instillment of a will to win and unswerving allegiance to this country, is no more outdated than are the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

There are at least two viewpoints to every issue. If the Naval Academy's system of training is to be discussed in the press—before the public—both sides ought to be heard. Mr. Boroff has every right to his opinion, and I have every right to mine. We both have the right to express our views openly—that is why the Naval Academy exists: so that as free men we may continue to do so.

Attica To Show How Small City Can Fight Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the people of Indiana are alert to the dangers of communism and its threat to the national security of the United States.

Hoosiers are not only alert to the threat, but are actively combating communism on the homefront. One of the outstanding manifestations of this effort by the people of Indiana to engage and defeat communism will be a program at Attica, Ind., on May 4, entitled "A Small Town Fights Communism."

The sponsors of this program have very graciously invited me to participate in this anticommunism program, which I have very readily accepted. Attica is one of the leading cities in the Sixth Congressional District which I represent in the U.S. House of Representatives, and it will be a great privilege for me to take part in this program at Attica on May 4.

Attica's desire to show the world what a small town can do to fight communism has gained statewide attention and recognition.

One of my constituents, Mrs. Melvin Bales, of Crawfordsville, Ind., rural route 7, read of Attica's leadership in sponsoring an anti-Communist program in her hometown newspaper, the Crawfordsville Journal-Review, an outstanding Indiana daily edited by my very good friend, Mr. Tom Showalter.

Mrs. Bales suggested that Attica not only receive statewide attention, but enlisted my help to give the program nationwide publicity.

Mrs. Bales very correctly characterized Attica's anticommunism program as one of the best ideas yet, and suggested we need more towns and cities to sponsor patriotic programs and observations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article about Attica's anti-Communist program, published in the Crawfordsville Journal Review, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to give other towns and cities throughout the Nation an example of how one Hoosier town is combating communism.

The article of March 27, 1964, follows:

ATTICA TO SHOW HOW SMALL CITY CAN FIGHT REDS

ATTICA.—On May 4, Attica will show the Nation what a small community can do to combat communism in its May 4 celebration built around the theme, "A Small Town Fights Communism."

One of the features of the daylong event will be the climax to the Miss Freedom Contest being presented by the Attica Chapter of the Junior Chamber of Commerce. Entries will be accepted by the Attica Jaycees until April 20.

A queen symbolic of the beauty and glory of American freedom will be crowned to reign over the festivities as the community dedicates the day to the Nation's heritage of freedoms. Coronation of Miss Freedom is just one answer to the sword-rattling show of the Communist's May Day, a Jaycee spokesman declared.

The queen will be publicly crowned the morning of May 4 at 11 o'clock.

Entrants in the contest will be cut to a small field of finalists by five judges on the basis of character, appearance, personality, and the relevance to the occasion, creativeness, and ability to express thoughts as shown in the composition.

Jaycees are expecting keen competition in the contest, which will be covered by various news media.

A Living Memorial to the Men Who Died Aboard the U.S.S. "San Francisco"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a remarkable project that is now underway in my home city of San Francisco. The project was started and organized by the men of the Naval Reserve unit at Treasure Island. In cooperation with them, the mayor of San Francisco has proclaimed the months of February, March, April, and May 1963 as U.S.S. *San Francisco* Months. During this period the reservists will create a living memorial to the men who died in action in World War II aboard the great fighting cruiser, the U.S.S. *San Francisco*. A total of 218 men lost their lives, most of them in the battle of Guadalcanal, and the naval reservists intend to recruit one new man for every one who made the ultimate sacrifice for his Nation.

At the end of the recruiting period the names of the men who make up the living memorial will be placed on the battle-scarred bridge of the U.S.S. *San Francisco*, which was preserved as a permanent monument and placed at Lands End, a point of land outside the Golden Gate overlooking the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, a plaque bearing the names of the new men will remain on the bridge until November 13—the 21st anniversary of one of the most ferocious battles in the history of naval warfare. Some of the men who have already responded by joining the Reserve unit actually served during World War II in the South Pacific. Some of the others who are joining the living memorial had not been born when the U.S.S. *San Francisco* went into action on that fateful night of Friday the 13th, November 1942.

This was a crucial battle in the Pacific war. American ground forces had a precarious foothold on one end of Guadalcanal Island and were under constant enemy ground and air attack. The Japanese decided on a major counterattack to recapture all of the island and sent a powerful fleet of 18 to 20 ships to bombard the American transports, ground positions, and airfield.

An American task force of 13 ships under the command of Rear Adm. Daniel J. Callaghan went straight into the enemy fleet in a single line, making contact at 1:48 a.m. of a black, moonless night. Admiral Callaghan, a native of San Francisco and a graduate of St. Ignatius High School there, was aboard the U.S.S. *San Francisco*, which was second in line and commanded by Capt. Cassin Young. In the furious give and take of big guns, the Japanese fleet was stopped and had to abandon its mission in order to deal with the outgunned American task force.

It was during this battle that Admiral Callaghan issued one of history's most famous combat command orders, "get the big ones first." This statement ranks high among notable orders issued by a naval officer throughout recorded naval history.

In 34 minutes the engagement was over and the enemy was in retreat. The cost was high. Five American ships had been sunk and the other eight were badly damaged, including the U.S.S. *San Francisco*, which at one time had to fight it out on both sides with a battleship, a cruiser, and a destroyer. Admiral Callaghan was killed in the first 15 minutes and Captain Young was mortally wounded when an enemy salvo crashed into the bridge. When it was over the ship had been riddled by shell fire, 25 separate fires were burning, and the sick bay had been knocked out.

But the U.S.S. *San Francisco* stayed in the war and saw more action before receiving a hero's welcome on returning to her home city. The citizens of San Francisco are justly proud of this great record, and the reserve unit at Treasure Island is making a fine constructive effort in memory of the 218 men who spent their last days on the U.S.S. *San Francisco*. Lt. (jg.) Arthur Hodgdon, himself a veteran of Solomons naval action, is to be commended for spearhead-

ing this living memorial project in his role as Reserve recruiting officer at Treasure Island Naval Base.

Having been a personal friend of the late Admiral Callaghan, his distinguished brother Vice Adm. William Callaghan, retired, and Judd Callaghan, it is my great pleasure to bring this program to the attention of our colleagues.

The Criterion, Weekly Publication of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Indianapolis, Endorses Youth Conservation Corps and National Service Corps Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "New Peace Corps," which was published in the February 22, 1963. issue of the Criterion, the weekly publication of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Indianapolis.

I think this editorial is one of the finest I have seen on the importance of these two proposals of President Kennedy and on the way in which the President has responded to the needs and problems of young people.

The editorial follows:

NEW PEACE CORPS

One of the side effects of having a youthful President, surrounded by youthful advisers, seems to be—quite naturally—a knowledge of the special needs of youth.

Mr. Kennedy has captured the imagination of the country's young people by offering to them the challenges and opportunities to contribute toward the common good. Whether it be physical fitness (with or without 50-mile hikes) or the Peace Corps, response to the administration's programs has been marked by typical youthful exuberance.

Even the severest critics of the Peace Corps a short time ago have now completely reversed themselves because of the project's dazzling success around the world. In fact, the current 9,000 authorized limit for the Peace Corps will probably be extended by Congress to 13,000 volunteers to keep pace with the demands.

Last week President Kennedy, in a special message to Congress about youth, called for the establishment of two new programs—a domestic service corps and a renewed appeal for a Youth Conservation Corps for jobless young people.

The proposed National Service Corps is "urgently needed," according to the President, to provide aid in mental health centers, hospitals, Indian reservations, migrant labor camps and organizations serving slums or poverty-stricken rural areas. As outlined, the project would ultimately involve 5,000 volunteers. It would be administered by local professional personnel on locally planned projects.

The Youth Conservation Corps, similar to the old Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in the depression years, is intended by President Kennedy to give work to some young people who can't find jobs. One phase of this proposal would employ 15,000 young people initially to improve forests and recreation areas. It could ultimately be expanded to include about 60,000 in this work.

Another phase of the Youth Conservation Corps could be implemented in cities facing chronic unemployment. Matching Federal funds would be made available to local communities for hiring jobless young people for work in nonprofit community service organizations—hospitals, schools and settlement houses.

Every sizable community has problems of school dropouts resulting in a surplus of unskilled jobseekers. The unemployment rate among young people is more than twice the national average, even higher among minority groups and among those who don't finish high school.

We believe the administration's proposals for youth are sound. The amount of money required to implement them is small compared with the vastness of the needs and the good the programs could accomplish.

Half of New Jersey Bays Closed to Shellfishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Philadelphia (Pa.) News of October 15, 1962, pointing out that half of the New Jersey bays are now closed to shellfishing because of pollution. The economic loss of this pollution will run into millions of dollars. This is one more reason why additional vigor is required in Federal, State, and local activities to abate pollution of our rivers, streams, and offshore waters.

The article follows:

HALF OF NEW JERSEY BAYS CLOSED TO SHELLFISHING

For several years New Jersey's inland waterways along the coast have been contaminated. This year, however, the pollution is so bad half the areas have been closed to shellfishing.

The ban covers clams, oysters, and mussels; not crabs. The economic loss is expected to run into the millions.

Behind the ban is prevention of hepatitis which can result from eating contaminated shellfish.

Areas affected extend from Raritan Bay to Cape May. Worst spots, it is reported, are at Atlantic City, Margate, Ventnor, Absecon, and Pleasantville.

A Cape May County health official called the situation there "terrible." A State conservation man estimated half of New Jersey's shellfish areas have been condemned.

Chief contamination cause is growth of seashore communities, officials said. Overtaxed sewage systems result in only partially treated wastes, which spill into the backwaters and sink to the oyster and clam beds. Then tides spread it.

Also blamed are industrial waste, failure of some sewage systems to work properly, and overflowing of cesspools and septic tanks. Laws on sewage disposal are adequate, one official noted, but often are hard to enforce.

"How can you check on every marina?" he asked.

Farmers Want Program That Will Enable Them To Compete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, our Democrat friends are fond of accusing Republicans of not being sympathetic with the economic problems of farmers. The record, of course, does not justify such a ridiculous contention and the voters in the principal farm States have indicated in the past couple of elections that they believe their economic well-being is best served by Republicans. Farmers in farm States have indicated with their votes that they do not buy the Kennedy-Freeman and company, economist-conceived supply-management idea of farm legislation. Farmers want a program that will enable them to compete in an economy that contains built-in price protection for other segments of our economy, but retains for the farmer a maximum degree of opportunity to exercise initiative and utilization of their land and management capability. This administration gives lipservice to this concept in farm legislation, but every major farm bill sponsored by this Democrat administration has provided for more strict production controls and price management.

I do not have time here, Mr. Speaker, to go into all the failures of this administration so far as farmers are concerned, but just to keep the record straight, I want to point out some recent results of Mr. Freeman's professed effort to help farmers.

The Department of Agriculture, in a release dated March 29, 1963, reveals that the parity ratio of prices received by farmers on March 15 was 77. The report says:

The parity ratio slipped off 1 point to 77, the lowest since 1959.

This is hardly a solid achievement in the area of improving conditions for agriculture in general.

Let us look at cattle prices. The USDA report referred to above states:

Beef cattle, at $19.60 per hundredweight were the lowest for the month since February 1960.

It is a well-known fact that fat cattle have suffered a decline in price of 7 cents per pound since December. This is a loss of $70 per head or more on every fat steer or heifer a farmer is sending to market. If this is a side effect of Mr. Freeman's management of feed grain prices, I doubt that cattle feeders are impressed with the results.

Now let us take a look at hogs. The USDA reports that at $13.70 per hundredweight hogs were lower than in any month since 1960. I am advised today hogs are selling for $13.10 at country buying points in Iowa.

This March report of the Crop Reporting Board of USDA is reporting facts as it traditionally has for many years. These facts must not be a great comfort

to Kennedy, Freeman and company and we could perhaps wonder how long before the White House news management policy will be applied to the Department of Agriculture's role of providing factual statistical information for farmers.

Let us look briefly at some other direct quotations from the report:

The commercial vegetable index dropped 8 percent during the month.

The March index (for dairy products) was 3 percent below a year earlier and lowest for the month since 1956.

Lower prices for eggs and commercial broilers dropped the index 1 percent during the month to 155.

I point out these instances of declining farm prices as a means of explaining the continued decline of the farmer's parity ratio and more specifically, the farmer's income. I do this for the purpose of keeping the record straight as to the real effect of the administration's farm policies.

Soviet Troops Still in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared recently in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House the Herald Tribune's excellent commentary on the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba.

A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

A not-so-funny thing happened on the way to no place at all this week.

At his news conference, President Kennedy was asked a three-part question. Did the administration have accurate information on the number of Soviet troops actually withdrawn from Cuba? Was Mr. Kennedy satisfied with the rate of withdrawal? Was there any arrangement with the Soviets for verification of the withdrawal? "No," said the President, "the answer to your question would really be 'No' to all of them." He grinned. The reporters broke into laughter. And that was that.

It may have been a clever way to handle an embarrassing question, but the answer—or at least its implications—didn't strike us as particularly amusing. Or reassuring.

The situation in Cuba is certainly better today than it was last October, before Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviets to dismantle their offensive missile bases. But it's far worse than it was a year ago, or 2 years ago. And one of the principal reasons is the continued presence of those Soviet troops which, the President acknowledged, are not being withdrawn at a pace he considers satisfactory. Nor are most other Americans likely to consider the pace satisfactory.

The troops may not be preparing to invade Miami, but they do constitute a clear and present danger to the hemisphere. They are in Cuba precisely because it suits Mr. Khrushchev's purposes to keep them there. And we all know what his purposes are.

Khrushchev, Castro and Co. aim to subvert free governments throughout the hemisphere and we have recently been treated to some expert testimony by CIA Director McCone on the extent of Cuban efforts to export revolution. Mr. McCone told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "at least 1,000 to 1,500 persons" from other Latin American countries went to Cuba in 1962 for training in such subjects as sabotage and guerrilla warfare. Soviet "technicians" can play a major role in such training; they also bolster the Castro regime against threats from the Cuban people. And as long as they remain, the possibility remains that Mr. Khrushchev might clandestinely reintroduce his missiles.

Whatever their activities in Cuba, we can be sure of one thing: we—the free nations of the hemisphere—are the target of those activities. Mr. Khrushchev didn't send his troops to the Caribbean for a holiday, and he isn't keeping them there to spare them a Moscow winter.

The Reds—What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Tablet, the weekly publication of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, N.Y., is one of the most respected and effective publications of this nature in the country.

In its issue of March 28, it carried an article by Louis F. Budenz which emphasizes the obvious fact that aid to Red Poland strengthens Moscow.

In view of the proposals in this year's foreign aid bill which have just been made at the insistence of the administration, showing extremely favorable consideration to Poland and Yugoslavia, I feel this article is extremely timely, and I insert it into the RECORD at this point:

THE REDS—WHAT NOW?—AID TO RED POLAND STRENGTHENS MOSCOW

(By Louis F. Budenz)

Praise for Joseph Stalin as "a good Marxist and good Communist," uttered by Khrushchev in early March, to be understandable, must be linked up with a big Kremlin endeavor. As highlighted in the February International Affairs, this is the re-creation of Stalin's victims, the captive nation, into economic battering rams against the West.

The aim of the enterprise, as set forth in that issue's leading article, "Council for Mutual Economic Aid and the Six," is to prove "that the planned socialist economy is superior to the 'coordinated' capitalist economy." The narrative covers the alleged differences between the Red-ruled Council for Mutual Economic Aid and the European Common Market. It is naturally directed against us.

RATES FIRST

The first of Stalin's victims among the captive nations, Poland, now allegedly stands highest as an agency to destroy the free world economically. Of 273 industrial enterprises, constructed in "the Socialist countries" with Soviet technical assistance, Poland rates first in number with 74. Also, it is pointed out, that "in Poland, per capita power output increased tenfold." There are many other statistics leading to the same effect.

In this connection, it may seem strange that I suggest that you study the March-April 1963, number of Mission. This miniature magazine is a publication of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen. In pointing out the Communist persecution of the Catholic Church, it dwells conspicuously on Red Poland.

We are reminded that Cardinal Wyszynski suffered several years in prison, that 91 priests were killed, 260 disappeared without trace, and that 550 were deported. We are also told that 2,133 Catholic churches were closed. We learn, too, surprisingly, that two priests were sent to prison for 3 years for translating Bishop Sheen's own books into Polish.

His Excellency is not concerned with any political or economic aspects in giving us this review. But we as laymen and as American citizens can soberly ask ourselves: What sort of friendly "image" is the United States creating for itself, as some newspapers suggest, by giving favorable trade treatment and support by aid to this atheistic Communist regime?

The answer was furnished last year by Wladyslaw Gomulka himself. He should know, for he is the head of the Polish Communist Party and the Red Polish Government. Gomulka has given an interview which was bitterly anti-American. The Worker of July 15 and 22 published it in full, and I invite you to look it up.

SUPPORTS K.

In the interview, Gomulka started right off by saying: "If it depended on the Soviet Union only, the prospect for peace would be very bright indeed." But he showed that the United States was the other big factor in the international scene and that it indicated no desire for peace. From thence on, he supported item by item Khrushchev's demands on the free world. He raised aloft the banner of peaceful coexistence, implying that America opposed such an idea.

Gomulka knew full well that peaceful coexistence had been the slogan under which Poland had been taken over by Stalin in agreement with Hitler. I have in my hand at this moment No. 9 of the Communist International for 1939, the predecessor as directive giver of the World Marxist Review.

There we have the speech of Premier V. M. Molotov of the Soviet Union on "The Meaning of the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact," in other words, the Hitler-Stalin alliance. His chief thought is expressed thus: "In our foreign policy toward non-Soviet countries, we have always been guided by Lenin's well-known principle of the peaceful coexistence of the Soviet state and of capitalist countries."

So it was, that peaceful coexistence was the excuse for the betrayal of the West, just as it was for every other major Soviet move. In a word, as Gomulka knows, peaceful coexistence constitutes that favorable cover under which Soviet power can best advance at any particular period.

The great weapons of the socialist bloc against us economically are to be twofold, says International Affairs. They are great joint electric power and oil pipeline systems through all the Red-ruled countries and regimented trade with the West. Socialist trade will gain because of its stable prices, which means the cheap results of slave labor. It is no wonder that the Worker of March 17 advertises many Red Polish products along with East German exports as though they represented Communist buying.

Waste Causes Third Fish Kill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article appearing in the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of September 11, 1962 entitled "Waste Causes Third Fish Kill."

This is another example of failures of State and local agencies and the U.S. Public Health Service to appropriately carry out their high responsibility of abating pollution by rulemaking, education, and by appropriate enforcement activities.

WASTE CAUSES THIRD FISH KILL

HARRISBURG, September 10.—Poison contained in industrial waste dumped into the Lackawanna River north of Carbondale was responsible during the past weekend for the third large fish kill in the last 12 months.

Walter Kohler, secretary of the State sanitary water board, said the offending company was the Plymouth Lamp Co., manufacturer of lighting fixtures, at Simpson in Lackawanna County.

It was estimated by Clair Fleeger, area fish warden, that 45,000 fish were killed by cyanide discharged in the plant's wastes. Kohler said the source of the poison was determined by analysis of samples taken from the water in the plant area.

The sanitary board official said the Plymouth Co. was one of several others ordered to stop dumping cyanide-polluted waste or other impurities in the rivers or construct treatment plants to handle their sewerage.

The first fish kills from poisoned wastes occurred in September and October of last year. Cited as the sources of the pollution were the Glen Alden Corp., a Wilkes-Barre coal firm, and the Bethlehem Steel Co.

The Glen Alden was fined and paid $45,000 for its part in the pollution of the Susquehanna River in October.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. paid $6,521 in damages to the Pennsylvania fish commission for fish killed in the Lehigh and Delaware Rivers in September of 1961 and January of this year. The company said an "abnormal and formerly unknown condition developed in the operation of the blast furnaces."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Canal Zone Flag Suit: Report of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order to apprise Members of the Congress as to the progress of the suit now pending in the U.S. District Court for the Canal Zone, which seeks removal of all official Panama flags currently displayed in the Zone as evidence of Panamanian sovereignty, I include a news story appearing on March 29, 1963, in the Star and Herald of Panama, Republic of Panama.

In this connection, attention is invited to House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and others, including myself, which resolutions expressly forbid such official display of the Panama flag in the Zone as evidence of Panamanian sovereignty.

The article follows:

[From the Panama Star & Herald, Mar. 29, 1963]

CHALLENGE CLAIM OF PRESIDENTIAL FLAG OK—DISPLAY SEEN AS CESSION OF SOVEREIGNTY—ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF IN FLAG SUIT FILE MEMORANDUM IN DISTRICT COURT IN ANCON

Attorneys for Gerald Doyle have challenged the contention that the President of the United States has authorized the flying of the Panamanian flag alongside the Stars and Stripes in the Canal Zone.

Asserting that the Canal Zone is U.S. territory, they charged Gov. Robert J. Fleming Jr. and Secretary of the Army Cyrus R. Vance with arbitrary, capricious and invalid actions in violation of the United States Code provisions governing the display of the North American flag in U.S. territory.

They said the presence of the Panamanian flag in the zone involves cession of sovereignty and this threatens Doyle's job and the security of his home. In addition, the attorneys argued, "the constant and daily viewing of the American flag on flagpoles within the Canal Zone of equal height with those from which a foreign flag flies without question offends plaintiff and other American citizens."

The statements are contained in a memorandum filed yesterday in District Court in Ancon in opposition to a motion by counsel for Fleming and Vance for the dismissal of Doyle's flag suit. In support of that motion, the defense had invoked presidential authority as the basis for the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

Doyle, Chief of the Architectural Branch of the Panama Canal Company, has filed suit against Fleming and Vance to stop them from displaying the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone and from carrying out other agreements worked out by a joint Panama-U.S. Commission appointed by the Presidents of the two countries.

With the briefs for both sides now on file, the next development in the case will be oral arguments before Judge Guthrie F. Crowe by attorneys for the plaintiff and the defendants. April 5 has been set for the arguments.

The plaintiff's memorandum challenged every one of the grounds on which counsel for Fleming and Vance based their motion for dismissal.

It began by quoting the sections of the United States Code which provide that no flag may be displayed in a position of equal or superior prominence to that of the United States at any place within the United States or in any territory or possession thereof, and that any changes must be proclaimed by the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy.

Attorneys for the plaintiff said: "There is no record of any directive from the President of the United States requiring defendants to perform such acts. Nor is there any document of record, by way or regulation or otherwise, directing the use of Republic of Panama postage stamps in the Canal Zone, or recognition by the United States in the Canal Zone of exequaturs who have been recognized by the Republic of Panama. It ill behooves the defendants to come into this Court and argue that their acts are a consequence of orders from their superiors when no such evidence has been presented. The press release attached to defendants' motion has no official standing and does not refute the statements made above."

(The press release was issued by the U.S. State Department and concerned the agreement by the joint Panama-United States Commission for the joint display of the flags of the two countries, the use of Panamanian stamps in the zone and the recognition in the Canal Zone of exequaturs issued by Panama to foreign consuls.)

"The flag of the United States," it was further argued, "for over 50 years has been displayed alone in the Canal Zone, under treaties entered into between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama. This display and manner of display has established a custom and practice under the Constitution, treaties, and laws of the United States. But now defendants have, by their own actions, unilaterally altered this custom and practice."

Plaintiff's attorneys also refuted the contention that the case involves the conduct of foreign affairs by the U.S. Executive. They held that under a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, the courts are authorized to determine the application of the statutory law of the United States to the Canal Zone.

The next point attacked in the plaintiff's memorandum was the defense argument that Doyle lacks standing to sue. After reciting that plaintiff pays for a Canal Zone automobile license tag and rent and makes purchases at Canal Company-owned commissaries, the memorandum said:

"As a taxpayer, plaintiff has a direct and immediate interest in precluding the expenditures of these moneys for illegal purposes, as alleged in the complaint."

"Plaintiff," it added, "as an employee of the Panama Canal Company, depends for his very livelihood and existence upon his position in the Canal Zone. The direct and immediate injury he would suffer, if his job is abolished because of the cession of sovereignty to the Canal Zone as a result of the illegal acts of the defendants is abundantly plain."

It went on:

"The outward cession of sovereignty as symbolized by the illegal display of a foreign flag in U.S. territory reflects adversely upon his (Doyle's) employment in that it implies that he is in the employ of a foreign power and endangers the security of his home by suggesting that it is not under the sole protection of the United States.

"Indeed, plaintiff is forced by defendants' acts to pay homage, and in a sense, allegiance to a foreign flag and country. As a resident of the Canal Zone and because of his employment, he is required to live and work in strict accordance with the rules and regulations established by defendants. Along with other thousands of U.S. citizens, he is required to see, and hear, and act as the defendants order, if he is to continue to maintain his residence and employment in the Canal Zone. Thus, by virtue of the action of defendants, plaintiff is required to view and observe on every occasion when he goes to and from work or travels within the Canal Zone, a foreign flag illegally placed on an equal basis with his own flag. But, even more important, since both flags are displayed together and on an equal basis, plaintiff is forced whenever he pays homage and swears allegiance to the flag of the United States, to do likewise to a foreign flag and country."

Finally, the memorandum opposed the motion for quashing the service of summons on Secretary of the Army Vance—which was done by registered mail—asserting that the Canal Zone District Court is a full-fledged U.S. District Court on the same footing as other U.S. Federal courts. The defense had pointed out that the Canal Zone Court is not included in the list of district courts in the United States Code.

All of the contentions in the memorandum filed in behalf of Doyle were preceded by the following statement:

"At the outset it should be stated that the issues here are purely internal between citizens of the United States. Plaintiff and his counsel have the highest respect for the Republic of Panama, its citizens and its flag. No statement herein should in any way be construed or interpreted to the contrary."

Doyle's attorneys are Engelbert J. Berger, of Cristobal, and William S. Tyson, of Washington, D.C.

What Foreign Tourists Think of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the March 24 issue of This Week magazine carried an excellent article on the reactions of foreign visitors to our shores written by Voit Gilmore, director of the U.S. Travel Service.

As a representative of a State famed for Western hospitality and one which receives a large share of its income from the tourist industry I was delighted to read of the favorable impression our country has made on this new influx of visitors.

These visitors will do much to broaden understanding and to erase the unfortunate image of our country that has developed in many lands through the stereotypes provided by Hollywood movies, communist propaganda and other unfavorable and nontypical examples of the American way of life distributed abroad.

The article is also an attest to the efficiency of Mr. Gilmore and his staff.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FOREIGN TOURISTS THINK OF AMERICA

(By Voit Gilmore)

WASHINGTON.—For years the American tourist has been the world's greatest, and most laughed at, gadabout. He's been chided for his mad charge through a blur of countries, his fretfullness when manners and mores of places he visited didn't match his own.

But now the shoe is on the other foot. The worldwide "Visit U.S.A." campaign, a joint Government-industry program, is drawing international tourists into the United States, 604,000 of them in 1962 alone. They're being encouraged to find out that a trip to the United States is easier, friendlier, and less expensive than they ever imagined.

HOMESICK AND HUNGRY

Not surprisingly, a lot of them miss home just as much, and make just as many social goofs, as Americans are supposed to. (One Oriental gentleman shocked his hostess by belching loudly after dinner, a compliment in his homeland, but not in Albuquerque). The American who was peeved because he couldn't get a malted milk in a Paris bistro has his counterpart in the Parisian who complains of no wine at an Illinois roadside diner.

But, though there will always be good travelers and bad travelers, most of the new visitors to the United States are getting a fresh perspective and a better understanding of the picturesque natives of New York and Des Moines.

Europeans who shook their heads at crazy Americans who whipped through the Louvre in 20 minutes or drove across Holland in an afternoon are now finding out why. As one traveler put it, "This is my first and possibly my only trip to America. I have only 17 days and I am rushing from city to city, museum to museum, just as frantically as the Americans I used to laugh at."

And we can learn, too, from their reactions to aspects of America we take for granted. I was moved by a Swiss group at Arlington National Cemetery who knelt spontaneously as their leader placed a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Solider.

To check up on the reactions of our new visitors, I have scouted some of their haunts, Disneyland, the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, the Seattle World's Fair, Miami Beach.

Do they enjoy the United States? Emphatically yes. They offer many reasons, but American friendliness rates highest. "You made us feel welcome and wanted," a Swiss wrote.

Other reactions we've screened at U.S. Travel Service headquarters in Washington:

British travelers: "Prices were not so high as we expected and nobody tried to pull a fast one."

"The people were what we liked most about New York."

"We love your warm hearts, but we hate your cold tea."

Dutch housewife: "All the food was wonderful. Plus the United Nations, Empire State Building—in short, everything."

Italians were impressed by the number of our museums, and liked particularly natural history museums and zoos. Still others couldn't find "decent" spaghetti or lasagna. One Italian said, "Look, there's a Negro driving a car. I did not know they could own automobiles in the U.S."

French lady: "Your wonderful Indians will become extinct if you aren't careful. The Government should give a prize to the Indians every time they have a baby."

Australian: "Your hot dogs, coffee and fruit juices are amazingly good."

Colombian: "I liked Miami most—and the ice cream."

Hong Kong resident: "I liked baseball best."

No trip, of course, is the same for all travelers. The Irish almost invariably like our weather; the English often complain of the South's heat. Some find us materialistic; others admire our energy, ingenuity, and our climate of prosperity. Some find our prices too high; many more are amazed that they aren't higher.

In interviews with several hundred first-time visitors the U.S. Travel Service found that more than 75 percent wanted to come back again—and will urge their friends to come. In these interviews, conducted at terminals in New York City and Honolulu, homebound travelers mentioned these as some of their favorite U.S. destinations: New York City (they loved the 5-cent ferry ride to Staten Island), San Francisco (the city they most wanted to revisit), Washington ("watching Congress is a thrill"), Niagara Falls, Disneyland, Chicago (its Art Institute opens European eyes), Grand Canyon ("the most awesome sight of all nature"), New Orleans ("but its French Quarter is more Spanish than French"), Miami Beach ("a fantastic hotel room, with meals, at under $10 is unbelievable"), Philadelphia (the story of American independence stirs visitors), Boston ("what language do these natives speak?"), and Knoxville (the TVA story means much to people from power-starved nations).

Americans have been guests instead of hosts so long it's become traditional. By 1961, travel abroad had become the biggest single item in our global balance-of-payments deficit.

In June of that year Congress created the U.S. Travel Service to encourage travel to the United States. Our mission was to cut red tape involved in getting here and assure visitors a warm welcome that would promote international good will.

TIME FOR MANY TONGUES

The travel industry turned to with gusto. Restaurants have blossomed with multilingual menus, and have urged waiters not to scowl at continentals who dawdle 2 hours over lunch. Hotels and motels inventory their staffs for language abilities. Around-the-clock travel information centers are appearing at major terminals, staffed by multilinguals.

The visitor from overseas finds himself showered with exclusive travel bargains rarely offered touring Yankees: for only $99, a ticket for 99 days of unlimited bus travel anywhere in the United States; for another $99, 30 days of unlimited flying on two regional airlines which serve more than a dozen of our largest cities; $6 per person per night at quality hotels of a major U.S. chain, plus only $6 more for three meals per day, tips and taxes included. Such travel bargains are refuting the argument that we're too expensive for the average pocketbook.

But it takes friendly Americans in hundreds of communities, big and small, to prove that we mean our Visit U.S.A. invitation. They're working out ingenious ways to make their guests glad they came. Maryland has a language bank of citizens who speak foreign languages and want to help oversea visitors. Asheville, N.C., has multilingual signs at its gateways, offering free translator-guide service. An Iowa housewife invites strangers in for a coffee klatch and a look at the inside of a U.S. home.

Every day another community asks the Visitor Services Division of USTS how to organize a good host program. Such services as free interpreters, information centers, currency conversion counters, open homes, and plant tours are being developed so energetically that we are planning honor city awards for U.S. communities which already have or are developing outstanding hospitality programs built around our theme of "Friendly Americans will win America friends."

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Anyone who would like to know how his own community can begin a good host program should write to Visitor Services, U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C. We will send you a guide which includes a checklist of activities which many communities have found effective in setting up or strengthening their programs for visitors from other countries.

Wherever you may live, you have the opportunity to help your country by extending warm, real hospitality.

United States-Red Missile Deal Seen as Fact by French

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 of this year, I called the House's attention to the fact that the State Department obviously had made a concession to Russia and agreed with her to remove our missile bases in Turkey and Italy as a token to the Russians for withdrawing some of their missiles from Cuba.

General de Gaulle heard of this nefarious agreement and immediately made inquiry prior to this date. He was assured by the U.S. Government that these missile bases would not be removed. Subsequent to this assurance, he was informed of this agreement with Russia to remove them. This entered into his decision to refuse the U.S. nuclear weapons and to continue France's nuclear program.

One of General de Gaulle's great fears is that in the event of a showdown, the United States would not see fit to employ its nuclear forces to defend France from a Russian onslaught.

Since news leaked out of this deal on the missile bases with Russia immediately after it was concluded last fall, there have been rumblings in the semi-official French press of the agreement. Yesterday, in the April 3 issue of the Washington Evening Star, appeared an article by Bernard Kaplan establishing the fact, at least in the eyes of the French, and making it a matter of French doctrine that the United States

and Russia had entered into this nefarious agreement.

I include this article in my remarks and recommend it to my colleagues. Certainly, this article and the facts it reveals, bears out my contention that all is not cricket in the State Department.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 3, 1963]

U.S.-RED MISSILE DEAL SEEN AS FACT BY FRENCH

(By Bernard Kaplan)

PARIS.—The idea Russia and the United States made a secret bargain involving the withdrawal of American missiles from Europe in exchange for the Russians pulling their missiles out of Cuba is now official French doctrine.

This was revealed in an article in the Revue Militaire d' Information regarded as the most authoritative publication put out under the imprint of the French Defense Ministry.

The two great powers bypassed their allies, the magazine asserted, and came to an arrangement between themselves. This was the meaning of the disclosure so soon after the Cuban crisis that Jupiter missile installations in Turkey and Italy would be dismantled, it added.

ARGUMENT ON AGREEMENT

The magazine went on: "There was thus indeed an agreement between the great powers on the demissilization of Western Europe, an operation evidently demanded by the Soviets in return for their own nuclear disengagement in Cuba. This is a strange alliance in which the most exposed allies are deprived of a part of the means of assuring their security through an accord reached over their heads between the principal ally and the principal opponent."

The article's anonymous author declared the whole idea of a NATO multinational nuclear force, which France has spurned, was cooked up afterwards as a maneuver to disguise the truth.

"Western public opinion was tricked," he declared. There was clearly nothing to America's insistence that a multinational force based on seagoing Polaris missiles was a decisive step forward in modernizing Western Europe's defenses.

STARTLED BY VEHEMENCE

Allied diplomatic sources here were startled by the vehemence and bitterness of the article, appearing as it did in an official publication. They agreed it could not have been published without President de Gaulle's approval and confirms that he regards present American nuclear policy as, first, a step toward total subjugation of Western Europe to American strategy, and, second, a Soviet-American settlement prejudicial to the interests of America's allies whose views, in the final analysis, Washington will simply ignore.

The article in the defense ministry publication dismissed the Nassau agreement between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillian as nothing more than a move to insure Britain also would be dependent on American strategy and her nuclear independence limited. It implied that Britain had been foolish to fall into the trap.

The article makes clear that General de Gaulle regards the multinational nuclear force proposal as more of a political move designed to give Washington absolute control of allied destinies than fulfilling a genuine strategic need.

DISCUSSION OF JUPITER

The French military writer declared that whatever the vulnerability of the Jupiter missiles on the ground, they compelled a potential aggressor to use nuclear weapons first in order to destroy them before mounting his main attack.

But, he added, removal of missiles from the soil of Western Europe meant that the decision on whether nuclear weapons were to be used to check an attack on the Continent had switched from the aggressor to Washington.

He declared "under the pretext of modernizing the armaments of Turkey and Italy, the United States has cleverly disengaged itself by absolutely reserving for itself the privilege of an eventual intervention."

American Agriculture in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recently the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] was guest speaker at the Independent Bankers Association 29th annual convention at the Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans. While in my State addressing this meeting, he delivered an interesting message with reference to the situation of agriculture in a changing world. I thought each Member of the Senate would be very much interested in what the Senator from South Dakota had to say on this occasion and I, accordingly, ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN A CHANGING WORLD

(Address by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, at the 29th Annual Convention of the Independent Bankers Association, March 26, 1963)

In the early years of our national history, Thomas Jefferson observed that "the small landholder is the most precious part of the state."

Jefferson asserted his conviction that "those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever He had a chosen people * * *."

Throughout our history, most Americans have shared to varying degrees Jefferson's lofty view of the importance of agriculture in American life.

It is true that for many decades the glitter of the city has held a strong attraction for American farm youth. No one has fully answered the question: "How ya gonna keep 'em down on the farm after they've seen Paree."

But at least until recent years, agriculture has occupied a high place, not only in public opinion, but also in the Congress of the United States.

Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, told me that when he first came to Washington 26 years ago, Senators considered agriculture and appropriations the two most desirable committee assignments open to any Senator.

Yet, this year I was the only Member of the Senate to request assignment to the Committee on Agriculture, and five Senators presently on the committee asked to get off. Only three of them were permitted to do so.

What has happened in recent years to explain this turn of events?

I suspect there are several factors.

First of all, agriculture has become an extremely complex industry afflicted with problems that are frustrating and difficult to solve.

Secondly, the farm population which embraced 9 out of 10 Americans in Jefferson's day now comprises only 8 percent of the American people. This inevitably spells a relative decline in the political power and public appeal of agriculture.

Thirdly, there is no organization to speak for agriculture with a single voice. This not only frustrates the friends of the farmer in Congress; it means that the farmer's story is told poorly to the Nation.

I am constantly appalled by the distorted views on agriculture of my urban friends. For example, they labor under the false impression that the farm price support program results in excessively high food prices to the American housewife. Actually, consumer food costs are $4 to $6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the last 8 years.

Again, urban taxpayers look askance at the $6 billion budget of the Department of Agriculture and assume that this is a gigantic subsidy to farmers. Of course, the major portion of this budget is not a farm subsidy at all. Much of it goes to finance such programs as the school lunch and special school milk program, our oversea food-for-peace program, the consumers meat-inspection program, repayable loans for rural electrification, management of our national forests, and storage fees to commercial storage companies.

Many city dwellers call for oversimplified "solutions" to the farm problem, such as eliminating the "marginal" farmer. This recommendation overlooks the fact that thousands of farmers who are now at the margin of financial failure would not be in that plight if they were receiving a fair price for their produce.

I know that the independent bankers of America are keenly aware of both the problems and the importance of agriculture. Because you are in daily association with the hopes, the anxieties, and the difficulties of our farm families, you know better than most of us the integral relationship between a healthy agriculture and a prosperous main street.

One of the most eloquent statements on the current challenge to American agriculture was delivered by one of your distinguished spokesman, Mr. Pat DuBois, before a congressional committee a year ago. That statement refuted in unmistakable language the false notion that we can eliminate the farm problems simply by eliminating farmers.

As Mr. DuBois put it: "Move the people from the farms and you also remove the banks and other service institutions. The farmers came to the prairies before the towns and when the farmers are gone there will be no further need for the towns."

If we could assure the farmer a fair return on his products, it would be a powerful stimulus to business and industry. Prosperous farmers are the Nation's best customers for basic commodities such as steel, rubber, machinery, appliances, and a host of other items that keep the factory wheels turning. The most effective way I know to reduce unemployment, get the economy moving, and retard the exodus of young people from the rural areas to the cities is to strengthen our farm economy. In my view, if we could correct the imbalance between agriculture and the rest of the economy, it would do more to stimulate the economic life of the Nation than the President's proposed tax cut.

A strong and prosperous agriculture is essential not only for the welfare of our farm families and our domestic economy but in a broader sense because the food and fiber of America is one of our most valuable assets in today's world.

As the former director of the Nation's food-for-peace program, I came to a new appreciation of the enormous advantage this Nation has in our marvelous capacity to produce food.

Indeed, I believe that the productivity of American agriculture is coveted more by our competitors in Russia and China than any other U.S. asset.

Having traveled in most of the underdeveloped nations of the globe, I am equally convinced that the most serious barrier to the development of those nations is their backward agricultural system—inefficient production, lack of rural credit, and a decadent system of land ownership and taxation.

One of the major weaknesses of our foreign assistance program has been its overemphasis on industrial development at the expense of more urgently needed rural development. The capital investments we made in Western Europe under the Marshall plan were effective because Europe had the technical and administrative experience to use such aid efficiently. But those factors are missing in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Basic rural and community development must come first. We take our own food production for granted, but this is the crying need in most of the rest of the world.

We have been awed by the achievements of our astronauts in outer space. But the world which these remarkable men left behind for a few hours is a world where two-thirds of the inhabitants till the soil with crude implements and primitive techniques—little changed in the past 3,000 years.

It is still the fate of most of the inhabitants of the earth to see their children suffer the listlessness of body, the dullness of mind, and the weariness of spirit that are the companions of malnutrition.

This paradox of plenty in the midst of hunger prompted Congress to enact in 1954 one of the most imaginative laws ever placed on the U.S. statute books.

Public Law 480, passed with broad bipartisan support, made American surplus food available to friendly countries who were unable to meet their needs through traditional commercial arrangements.

Since its passage in the summer of 1954, U.S. food and fiber valued at over $11 billion have moved to more than 100 countries and territories under concessional sales arrangements or as outright grants.

In the opening hours of his administration, President Kennedy gave new force to Public Law 480 by an Executive order creating a food-for-peace office in the White House which I was privileged to head. The President called for an expanded effort to use our "agricultural abundance as a national asset to meet foreign policy objectives."

This far-reaching Executive order has given a dynamic new dimenison to American food reserves. It has done much to replace the negative concept of surplus disposal with a positive view of U.S. agricultural abundance as a precious national asset. It has given the American farmer a vital stake in foreign policy. It has focused worldwide attention on the achievements of American agriculture in a world of food shortages. It has strengthened the political and moral position of the United States in international affairs.

There is, of course, a double thrust behind food for peace. It is first of all clearly in the self-interest of the American people to reduce costly storages, to protect our farm economy from price-depressing surpluses, to stimulate our shipping industry by massive food shipments, and to develop long-range commercial markets. Food for peace does all of these things.

But the other thrust behind food for peace stems from the philosophy of the scriptural admonition to "feed the hungry." No one can doubt the genuine, humanitarian desire of the American people to see our food reserves shared with the world's hungry.

There have been two especially important breakthroughs in food for peace recently which hold exciting future prospects. The first of these is the use of food to pay the wages of workers engaged in building schools, roads, clinics, and rural improvements.

Today in a dozen countries, American cereals and other foods are financing part of the wages of workers employed on valuable public works projects. Wheat and corn and rice and milk from across the Nation are being converted into classrooms, roadways, and better communities abroad.

A second challenging breakthrough is a greatly expanded oversea school lunch program. The most precious asset of any nation is its children. Their health and education are the twin foundations of social growth.

School lunches not only give new physical energy and health to the children, they result in sharply improved school attendance and academic performance. A pilot school lunch agreement with Peru resulted in a 40-percent increase in school attendance in its first year of operation. Eight and one-half million children in Latin America are now enjoying this American assisted school lunch program. Thirty-five million school children around the world are now participating in our food-for-peace program.

In Japan where the program has been operating since the end of World War II, the Japanese have now taken over the entire responsibility. Japanese children who learned at school to enjoy American milk and wheat flour and other U.S. commodities help explain why Japan has become our best dollar customer for American farm products.

America's agricultural know-how has not only resulted in invaluable contributions of food to a hungry world; it has also enabled us to offer vitally needed technical assistance to the developing countries. Through our overseas point 4 program and our Peace Corps units, we have offered the skills of hundreds of our trained agricultural technicians. We are also cooperating in the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization and the Freedom From Hunger campaign.

When one considers that three-fourths of the people of the world are rural residents, it is clear that the amazing efficiency of the American farmer is our most appealing material asset. This is one area of competition in which we have no serious challenge from the Communist world. It is, perhaps, our greatest opportunity to lead the rural societies of Latin America, Africa, and Asia into the solid social and economic growth which makes peace and freedom possible.

I would like to think that more of our enormous reservoir of agricultural technicians, extension workers, and retired farmers might become involved for a time in pointing the rural people of the world toward higher standards of life.

There is one final challenge that I think is worthy of the careful thought of everyone concerned with the future of American agriculture—the European Common Market.

This new trading bloc composed of France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—absorbed a third of our entire oversea dollar sales of agricultural produce in 1962. Other West European countries including the United Kingdom are seeking entrance to the community and will doubtless be admitted eventually.

The burning question for U.S. agriculture turns on whether or not this huge historical outlet for our farm produce will throw up a trade wall to hold out future agricultural shipments from the United States.

Recent actions by West Germany against American poultry and some of the pronouncements of the French are genuine cause for concern on the part of the United States. There is other solid evidence of European efforts to block imports of American farm products.

Our Government, and especially Secretary Freeman, has very properly sounded a strong note of protest against these efforts. If the United States were to lose a major part of our agricultural markets in Western Europe, it would have a disastrous impact on our farm economy and also on our balance of payments.

It is hoped that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will strengthen the President's bargaining power with the Common Market countries. It is imperative, however, that the President keep agriculture and industry in a package when he negotiates our arrangements with the Common Market. He must not grant trade concessions to European industrial producers who desire to sell in the United States until we are assured of favorable treatment for our normal agricultural exports to Europe.

In addition to vast economic aid to Western Europe after World War II, the American people have, for many years, financed a significant portion of the cost of Europe's defense. Our troops and weapons commitments to Berlin and the NATO forces have been most generous. These commitments have seriously affected our balance-of-payments position.

I think, therefore, that if necessary, the President should make it clear to the Common Market countries, that if they exclude our farm exports, we may find it necessary to withdraw part or all of our military forces from Europe. The defense of Europe is now primarily a European responsibility in any event, and we can permit no further deterioration of either our balance-of-payments position or our agricultural economy.

The trade negotiations ahead will not be easy, especially in view of Mr. de Gaulle's apparent desire to use French agriculture as his chief instrument in establishing a Western Europe that is much more independent of the United States.

But in the long run, if our negotiators are tough and intelligent, we can face the future in the firm knowledge that the unparallelled efficiency of American agriculture will assure us of an expanding trade.

Nearly a quarter of a century ago, the Department of Agriculture published a great yearbook entitled, "Farmers In a Changing World." In a postscript to the foreword of that 1940 publication, the editor identified the underlying theme of the book as the necessity in the modern world for constant and adequate adjustment to change.

And he added: "The fundamental problems of our agriculture are not likely to be lessened by the changing international situation. They are more likely to be intensified, and there will be more need than ever to meet them with courage and intelligence in order that we may strengthen our country to the utmost."

I can think of no more fitting words on which to conclude this consideration of the prospects facing our farmers in a changing world.

Health Care Facilities: The Nursing Home Construction Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the debates and studies which have been conducted over the past few years on the subject of assuring adequate health care for all of our citizens, one fact has been developed without dispute. That is that there presently exists a lack of health care facilities in our society. This is a problem which relates to the financing of health care, for the scarcity of facilities the price of medical attention upward, but goes beyond it since no amount of financial assistance to an individual will provide him with health care if the facilities do not exist.

One of the most important areas for consideration in the general field of health care facilities is that of nursing homes. A well planned, properly staffed and equipped nursing home provides high caliber medical care, beyond that available in the home where conditions might not be right for caring for one with an infirmity, care which is sufficient for many of those who are ill, and at half the cost of hospitalization or less.

A 1959 amendment to the basic Federal housing legislation, which I am proud to have had a part in drafting and carrying through to enactment, has been effective in providing a stimulus to the construction of hundreds of new nursing homes. This boom in nursing home construction is noted in the April 1963 issue of the magazine Today's Health. This article gives an insight into the part which the nursing home plays in the overall health care program for our people and shows the encouraging recent increase in the availability of this important medical facility, an increase given impetus by the 1959 amendment which provided for FHA guarantees for construction loans for "skilled" nursing homes, those best able to fulfill the medical role of the nursing home.

Because of the importance of the need for health care facilities in this country, and the success which has come about from the enactment of the FHA loan guarantee amendment, I am placing this article, "New Horizons for Nursing Homes," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NEW HORIZONS FOR NURSING HOMES

(By Ted Lewis, Jr.)

John Wilson and his wife were worried about his aged mother, who lived with them. She was ill and bedridden most of the time, and physicians and nurses were on almost constant call when she was home from her frequent stays in the hospital. The cost was getting to be prohibitive, but the Wilsons were horrified when a friend suggested they place the elderly woman in a nearby nursing home. "Why, I wouldn't put my mother in a place like that," exclaimed Wilson. "They're for poor people who don't have anywhere else to go."

Some Americans, like the Wilsons, still cling to the idea of nursing homes as clap-trap structures where sick, old people pass their last years under the care of unsympathetic attendants. But more and more are discovering (as the Wilsons did eventually) that most nursing homes are clean, modern buildings with cheerful atmospheres and highly trained staffs. Scarcely a community does not have a skilled nursing home today as a result of a phenomenon in the history of health care for the aged chronically ill—the mushrooming of nursing homes in the United States in the last 20 years.

These homes, 9 out of 10 of which are privately owned, represent a sort of "half-way house" between the hospital and home. They are for those persons—mostly of advanced age—with chronic conditions who aren't sick enough to warrant expensive hospitalization, yet who need more skilled care than is feasible at home.

As rapidly as nursing homes have sprung up, there is still a large unmet demand from the increasing numbers of elderly in the population. But free enterprise and the Government are moving fast to meet this demand, with signs of an explosive growth in the next few years.

A little-publicized program enacted by Congress 3 years ago is playing a key role in stimulating the building of nursing homes. This bill extended to privately operated nursing homes staffed by skilled personnel the same type of mortgage insurance the Federal Housing Administration makes available for residential dwellings.

Provided a projected nursing home meets certain standards, the Government will sign an agreement with a private lender to stand behind the mortgage and pick up the obligation in event of a default. A guarantee that private lenders will suffer little or no loss on loans for construction of qualified nursing homes naturally makes these mortgages much more attractive to banks, savings and loan institutions, and other lenders.

This program did not really swing into full operation until 2 years ago. It is now firmly based and about to "take off," according to housing officials.

Today there are some 1 million beds in institutions supplying some type of nursing home care. This is almost double the number 8 years ago when the U.S. Public Health Service completed its first nursing home inventory.

Skilled nursing homes increased in number from 7,000 to 9,700 from 1954 to 1961. But total capacity in skilled homes nearly doubled—from 180,000 beds in 1954 to 338,700 in 1961. Practically all of these beds—337,300—were reported as assigned to skilled nursing service. Infirmaries or facilities having personal or residential care as their chief function provide an additional 24,900 skilled nursing home beds, bringing the total to 362,200 beds.

Only "skilled" nursing homes can qualify for the FHA program. Such nursing homes must have staffs of trained nurses, with medical care on the premises or easily available. Not all nursing homes meet these standards, but the industry's goal is to have all nursing homes eventually qualify as "skilled" homes.

The U.S. Public Health Service study showed that 87 percent of skilled nursing homes were privately owned, accounting for nearly 9 out of 10 skilled nursing homes and more than 7 out of 10 beds.

In the next 5 years the number of nursing home beds could well be doubled again. The FHA program alone is expected to produce directly 100,000 new beds in skilled nursing homes and perhaps another 100,000 indirectly.

Few would have predicted such success when the mortgage insurance proposal was introduced in Congress by Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, in 1958. Two organizations—the American Nursing Home Association and the American Medical Association—developed and pushed the bill. Spokesmen for these associations and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican of Missouri, were the only witnesses to urge enactment. But through their diligence and the cooperation of the House and Senate Banking Committees, the proposal became law as part of an overall housing bill.

The administration took no stand on the nursing home provision, largely because FHA officials believed the program might not be self-sustaining and that at any rate it should be under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Now it appears FHA's nursing home program will run in the black at no cost to taxpayers starting next year.

The inevitable complications involved in setting up a new Government program took nearly a year after President Eisenhower signed the bill in 1959. In the intervening 2 years, 19 homes were completed under the program and put into operation, 71 more were being built, and 110 additional applications had been approved as of November 30, 1962. Another 244 applications then were in the works, with more coming in every day.

As of November 30, the 225 active projects promised to accommodate 20,136 beds with a replacement cost of more than $125 million. When the additional 244 projects materialize, the program will have accounted for 40,000 beds in modern nursing homes meeting strict FHA qualifications at a cost of some $250 million.

On top of this, some 300 preliminary contacts involving possible applications are being made each month at FHA offices throughout the country.

FHA officials say they believe this is just a beginning. "This program, which has been challenging and exciting from the start, has really caught fire and is on the verge of a much more rapid expansion in the near future," said Mrs. Rush Holt, special FHA assistant for nursing homes.

The FHA statistics, she notes, are only part of the story. Publicity given the Federal program has aroused widespread interest in nursing home construction. Many applicants, after discussing FHA mortgage insurance with FHA officials, and even having received approval, have secured conventional loans instead. The Government's willingness to back up such loans has given lenders more confidence in the future and stability of the nursing home industry.

For example, a projected Fort Worth, Tex., nursing home of 96 beds, after receiving a commitment from FHA for mortgage insurance, obtained a loan from a teachers' annuity fund. A 92-bed nursing home in Ridgewood, N.J., borrowed from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. for construction. Other major life insurance companies are considering entering the field after discussions with FHA officials.

Holiday Inn motels is planning to operate a national chain of nursing home facilities. Two are being constructed with FHA insured loans and others have been acquired or started with conventional loans.

The Evinrude Corp., manufacturer of outboard motors, is also considering entering the field of nursing home construction. Mrs. Ralph Evinrude, the former Frances Langford, singer and actress, has become interested in nursing homes due to an episode involving her mother.

The American Nursing Home Association estimates that currently 50 percent of new proprietary skilled nursing homes are being built with FHA-guaranteed loans. The Small Business Administration, with a 10-year loan program carrying higher interest, is financing about five nursing home projects a month, most of them expansion or renovation of existing facilities. These loans average about $60,000.

The area redevelopment program is expected to get into the nursing home field and aid in construction in economically hard-hit areas.

Nonprofit nursing homes have been receiving substantial Federal help for years through the Hill-Burton program. Federal grants of some $30 million a year are made for these homes, spurring some $100 million of construction a year, since the grants must be matched.

Alfred Ercolano, executive secretary of the American Nursing Home Association, Washington, D.C., says that one of the most encouraging aspects of the FHA program is the further stimulus it gives the ANHA's own efforts to raise the levels of nursing home care in this country through accreditation and to increase the proportion of licensed skilled nursing homes in relation to unlicensed homes where occasional abuses occur.

Explaining the need for the program in congressional testimony R. B. Robins, M.D., member of the AMA board of trustees, testified 4 years ago:

"Most of the aged ill or disabled can, and are, best cared for in the physician's office or in their homes. Still others require care in a medical facility. The question is, do these people need care in a general hospital at a cost of $20 to $25 per day? Some of them do, but others could receive the maximum professional attention their condition calls for in a much less expensive facility—a properly constructed and operated nursing home, with professional medical and nursing care at hand or readily available. I am speaking now of older people with conditions that are chronic, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, arthritis, paralysis.

"There is a much larger group who require some nursing and medical care, and who could be provided for quite satisfactorily in private homes. Yet, for many reasons, the relatives—if there are relatives—are not in a position to take in these older people. They need housing and some medical care, but not hospital care in many cases. Yet many thousands of them are in hospitals, merely because there are not suitable nursing homes or other chronic disease facilities.

"This situation points up the critical need for new and improved facilities tailored to the specific health requirements of chronically ill older citizens. Nursing home administrators have appeared before your committee earlier. They have convincing evidence, accumulated over recent years, that they can't provide the services they want to provide in quality or in quantity because they are unable to obtain the credit they need on reasonable terms.

"The normal lending agencies just are not making loans to proprietary nursing homes in any significant volume. The lenders have their reasons—because the homes generally are one-purpose structures, unattractive as a straight commercial risk, even though foreclosures are rare."

In the 4 years since Dr. Robins testified, the situation has improved dramatically. The snowball effect of nursing home construction and the growing demand by the public for beds in them has almost reversed lenders' attitudes, with many now considering private nursing homes sure-fire commercial investments.

How does the FHA program work? The borrower makes his loan from any lender—a bank, an insurance company, etc. He pays no more than 5¼ percent on the outstanding balance. Additionally, he pays one-half of 1 percent on the outstanding balance to finance FHA operating costs, making a total carrying charge of 5¾ percent. Loans are made for 20 years, giving the nursing home ample time to repay its indebtedness. Only 90 percent of the total cost of the land, facility, and fixed equipment may be borrowed and included in the mortgage which is insured by FHA. This means that the borrower must have 10 percent, either in land or cash, as a prerequisite.

Nursing homes will not be built with FHA mortgage insurance assistance in areas which do not need such facilities.

The average rates charged in the nursing homes which have been completed thus far range from $5 to $15 per day, with the median being about $10.

A survey of applicants made by FHA shows that the greatest number of applicants are experienced nursing home operators. Second numerically are physicians. Heading the other categories are persons who have been patients in a nursing home or who have had experience in seeking nursing home facilities for some member of their family and have found either inadequate facilities or a long waiting period for admission.

The nursing home "revolution" has stimulated growing interest in broadening the roles of nursing homes to cover, for example, the mentally retarded, alcoholics, and convalescents of all kinds and of all ages. The day may not be be far off when nursing homes throughout the United States will be considered as indispensable a part of communities' health facilities as hospitals are today. Free enterprise, with, in some cases, the helping hand of the Government, is contributing through nursing homes a valuable asset in our war against disease and the infirmities of age.

Carl K. Bates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, Walter Hines Page, himself a distinguished public servant, once said, "There is one thing better than good government, and that is government in which all the people have a part."

One reason, perhaps, that our Government does not so closely approach the perfection we would like is that so few people want to have a part in it.

As Governor of the State of Oklahoma, I was fortunate to know a man who did want to have a part in government and who was prepared to make sacrifices in order to participate. His name is Carl K. Bates and I appointed him chairman of the State board of affairs.

The outstanding record "Sailor" Bates made in that office is outlined in a recent editorial of the Tulsa Tribune.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One day soon a short man in a slouchy suit will slip quietly out the side door of the Capitol at Oklahoma City and Oklahoma may never be quite the same without him.

Carl K. Bates was an appointee of Gov. J. Howard Edmondson, who leaves behind a record of achievement as chairman of the board of affairs unparalleled in the recent history of the State.

Born on a Missouri farm, Bates lost his father at 11 and was in the Navy at 15. He was a chief quartermaster at 17 and worked as a merchant marine officer until 1921, when he returned to Muskogee to launch a successful business career in investments, banking, motors, lumber, and rental property. He saw service in World War II and today is a Naval Reserve commander.

In his quiet, friendly manner, Bates for years was a living definition of citizenship at work. The bands play and the headlines roar for elected officials, but good government most often is the day-to-day job of the good obscure bureaucrat who gets a real chance to do his stuff.

Bates would be the last man to claim all the credit for the achievement of the affairs board, but he was the catalyst for these reforms:

Establishment of central purchasing, one of the most forward advancements since statehood.

Installation of vocational training programs in the State's penal institutions.

Construction of the McLeod Honor Farm, providing a farm program and minimum security prison for the State.

Construction of the capitol office buildings and renovation of the Capitol Building and grounds.

Bates gives much of the credit for his successes to a fellow board member, Mike Pedrick, of Tulsa, a dynamic innovator who prodded the more cautious Bates. Alas, Pedrick is already out of the State's service, a sacrifice to politics.

Gov. Henry Bellmon says with a good deal of bitterness that many of the people who prodded him into the Governor's race now refuse to make the sacrifice to serve in State government. Bates made the sacrifice and served his State well.

Export Credit Insurance Available to Small Business Concerns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee, in attempting to develop and document services and opportunities available to small business in foreign trade, heard from officials of various agencies at its hearings last week. One of those who testified was the Honorable Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

On February 6, 1961, President Kennedy directed the Export-Import Bank to undertake new programs of export guarantees and insurance. In September of that year, Congress enacted legislation giving the Bank broader authority for this purpose. Mr. Linder, in his statement before our committee, pointed out that, pursuant to this action by the President and by Congress, the Bank had instituted a program of insurance designed to provide all U.S. exporters with facilities comparable to those available in many European countries.

The new insurance program, which is set up in cooperation with the Foreign Credit Insurance Association—an association of private insurance companies—is especially geared to be of assistance to small business firms who cannot afford to become involved to any great extent

in foreign trade without guarantees of payment for their exports. The expansion of foreign trade by the United States is necessary, not only to meet the balance-of-payments problem, but also to insure a healthy competitive economy.

Mr. Linder's statement describes this program, which should be brought to the attention of the entire small business community of the Nation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of Mr. Linder's statement above referred to be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The excerpt from his statement is as follows:

EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE AVAILABLE TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

The balance-of-payments problem has underlined the necessity for increasing our exports. It is through the medium of the Export-Import Bank that the Government is furnishing the credit assistance that is needed to give stimulus to this export drive. And so, in his message on the U.S. balance of payments of February 6, 1961, President Kennedy directed the Bank to undertake new programs of export guarantees and insurance. In September 1961 the Congress enacted legislation which gave the Bank broader authority to insure and guarantee export transactions, including the power to issue, on the basis of a 25-percent reserve, up to $1 billion of export credit insurance and guarantees.

Under this 1961 legislation, the Bank instituted a program of insurance designed to provide U.S. exporters with facilities comparable to those available in many European countries. The Bank took the initiative in getting private concerns to set up the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, which today includes more than 70 leading U.S. marine, casualty, and property insurance companies. Its headquarters is in New York City with insurance agents throughout the country who serve the various member companies acting also as brokers for insurance written under this program.

The FCIA issues, on behalf of itself and the Export-Import Bank, insurance covering comprehensive risks—both credit and political—or political risks alone, on both short-term as well as medium-term export transactions. In general, sales on terms of up to 180 days are considered short term, and those from 181 days to 5 years, medium term. Under short-term policies, the exporter must insure enough of his eligible foreign shipments to give the insurers a reasonable spread of risk. Medium-term policies are issued on an individual case basis.

Credit risks include failure of payment to the exporter due to insolvency of the buyer or protracted default on payment by the buyer. Political risks include actions taken by foreign governments which prevent payment by the buyer, currency inconvertibility, expropriation, cancellation of import licenses, et cetera. The exporter is not covered 100 percent by the insurance policy. He is obliged to carry on his own account from 5 to 15 percent of the political risk under either the comprehensive or political risk policy, and 15 percent of the credit risk under the comprehensive policy. Premium rates vary according to the country of the importer and the terms of the credit. Export-Import Bank carries all of the political risk. Under the comprehensive policy, the Bank also carries 50 percent of the credit risk and the FCIA carries the other 50 percent.

Export credit insurance permits the exporter to extend credit to his oversea customers with assurance that unforeseen adverse developments abroad will not expose him to large losses or seriously impair his working capital. Exporters who have insurance find it easier to obtain financing for their transactions from commercial banks, to which the policies or their proceeds may be assigned. From its inception in February 1962 through February 15, 1963, FCIA issued 1,240 comprehensive policies in the amount of approximately $500 million. Of these policies more than 150 were issued to small- and medium-sized companies that never exported before. FCIA informs me that no application for export credit insurance has been turned down because of lack of previous experience in exporting or because of the smallness of the applicant.

Our Vanishing Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is a continuing growth of concern among the American people for the preservation of their national heritage of wilderness.

Demand is growing for the passage of the wilderness bill among newspapers, magazines, as well as from representatives of the Government and conservation organizations, and now we have heard from the pulpit.

On last Sunday, March 31, 1963, the Reverend Duncan Howlett spoke from his pulpit in the All Souls Unitarian Church here in the Nation's Capital in a sermon entitled "Our Vanishing Wilderness."

There are many dimensions to the life of the spirit, he said:

In carelessness or ignorance, let us not cut off from ourselves the voice of the spirit that speaks to us from the world of nature.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Duncan Howlett's sermon entitled "Our Vanishing Wilderness" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR VANISHING WILDERNESS

Many of you will recall the aged joke about the man who turned a neglected plot of city land into a lovely garden. A pious neighbor seeing him at work there observed one day, "You and God have done wonders with that ugly piece of land," and the man retorted, "Yes, but you should have seen it when God had it all to himself." I used to enjoy telling that story 25 years ago when it was still relatively fresh, because it illustrated my conviction that God works through man. Well, I have changed my mind—not about God but about the story. I still believe that God works through men, but the story now seems to me to be blasphemous. It assumes that we can praise men for cultivating a lovely garden, but blame God for an empty city lot, overgrown with bushes and weeds, and littered with bottles and beer cans.

But what did that piece of land really look like when God had it all to himself so to speak? To answer that question shut your eyes, and in your imagination, roll back the years; roll them back through the time when that debris-strewn eyesore was part of a clean, well-kept field; roll the years further back, to the time when it was part of a clearing in the surrounding forest; in your imagination go all the way back to the time when that bit of land was part of the primeval wilderness itself, known only to the natural wildlife of the region and to a scattering of Indians. Picture it then as Longfellow describes it. Picture it as "the forest primeval," where the trees, "bearded with moss, and in garments green, indistinct in the twilight, stand like Druids of eld," and you will know what that ugly little plot of city ground looked like before man came to despoil it—when God had it all to himself.

If your imagination is not quite equal to such a stretch, leave the city, leave the suburbs, go out beyond exurbia, until you find yourself in an area where the world is more or less the way it was when men began to change it, supposedly for the better. You will have to go a long way, for there is not much land left in the United States which has not in some way been altered by the hand of man.

But if you cannot go so far, there are many nearby areas in which you can still get a notion of what the world was like before the bulldozer scarred it and the steam shovel gouged it out: before the products of the steel mill and the oil well transformed its surface. You can go up onto the Blue Ridge; you can go out into the Maryland and Virginia countryside; you can go over to the shore and look out across the bay. If you have no ready means of getting out of the city at all, you can go into Rock Creek Park and even there find an occasional spot free from the evidences of civilization. Even there, in the midst of the city, you can, without too great a stretch of the imagination, think of yourself as standing beside the stream as it comes tumbling down over the rocks, just as you might have 400 years ago.

If you listen closely while you are musing there, you can hear above the sound of the thousand little waterfalls in the brook, the same birds singing that sang when the forest was still undisturbed, and the stream had no concrete walls to hem it in. You can see the same buds swelling on the same kinds of trees, the same mosses turning green beneath your feet, and the same red blossoms on the maple trees that bloomed there long ago.

But you can also hear the roar of the nearby traffic if you listen and you can smell its smoke. In the slanting rays of the sun as it filters through the trees you can see its murky substance, poisoning the birds, the trees, and you alike.

Out in the Maryland and Virginia countryside it is the same. Wherever you go, the hand of man has been before you. There is scarcely a plot of ground left within the confines of this Nation which has not known his depredation. If you want to know what it looked like before the Europeans came, bringing their civilization with them, you must go far, to an ever diminishing number of regions in this country that are today as they have always been.

If there were some prospect that things would improve, we could sigh as we do over so many of the things we would like to change and console ourselves with the fact that we are making progress; that it has to be slow, but that if we will only work hard, keep striving and be patient we shall at the last bring about the end we desire. But there is no prospect that things will improve. There is, on the contrary, every prospect that things will get worse, and that the rate of deterioration will accelerate.

Why is this? It is not that we are unconcerned. We care very much. But the population of the world is rising so rapidly, all the world's land which happens to remain untouched will soon be devoured by the everswelling mass of people. Every person added to the present population of the world will require more acreage to live in,

to move about in and to eat from. Even if we are all reduced to eating pellets of plankton, the problem will not be solved. We will merely have postponed the day of reckoning a little longer.

You are familiar with the statistics of the world's population growth, and there is no need for me to review them. But their meaning in terms of land use will come home to you vividly if you will recall for a moment the town or city in which you grew up. Unless yours is an exceptional case, the fields and woods you knew as a boy or girl have long since been enveloped by the great maw of urban sprawl. A sentimental song my parents used to sing tells the story. The lines as I recall them went:

"I wandered today to the hill, Maggie
To watch the scene below
The creek, and the creeking old mill, Maggie
As we used to long ago
The green grove is gone from the hill, Maggie
Where first the daisies sprung
The creeking old mill is still, Maggie
Since you and I were young."

Cannot each one of us duplicate this experience in his own life? None of us remembers the mill which the old folks could once recall but somewhere there is a hill each of us can remember where the grass was green and the trees were tall, a hill which has been stripped bare and is now carefully strewn with little split levels, a naked mound of earth baking in the afternoon sun, devoid of growing things except for the carefully tended lawns and the little shrubs and trees hopefully planted here and there to relieve the dread monotony of it all.

We shed a tear, perhaps, for the fields and woods we loved in our youth. But with a shrug, we throw off the mood, for in the magnificent expanse of land that is ours in this Nation we can still flee to the country. Our great road system sweeps us out into our rural areas with little effort and in less time. We have a large and justly famous system of national forests, parks, monuments and wildlife preserves. They are ours as a people to enter as we will. But even there we have our problems. Our national parks in summer are now as crowded as our city streets. We have traffic jams on our waterways to match the tieups on our highways.

One reason is, of course, many people who think they want to get away from it all, really want to stay with the crowd. The National Park Service has made the unbelievable discovery that campers in our natural wonderland prefer to camp tent peg to tent peg rather than go to a less populous area where there is more room. This so puzzled the Service they hired a team of psychologists to find out why. I had hoped to get a copy of the report when it was finished. I'd like to know why myself. But the project has been given up.

It is a good thing for one aspect of the matter alarmed me very much. The psychologist who was to have been in charge of the project was quoted as saying. "We hope to find out if people would like to see bowling alleys, golf courses, swimming pools or airports at national parks where these facilities don't exist under private enterprise."

Can you believe that any member of the National Park Service would seriously consider asking such questions? Every lover of our natural wonderland knows that the mass of our citizenry wants to take his civilization with him wherever he goes, be it into the forest or out upon the sea. He would glady see us build bowling alleys in the Redwood Forest, a swimming pool under Yosemite Falls, and an airport on the north rim of the Grand Canyon. We don't need a team of psychologists to tell us that a nice little battery of pinball machines installed near Old Faithful would receive more attention than the geyser itself. After all once you have seen the jet come up, what else is there to look at. But a pinball machine offers infinite variety as any player can tell you. Not that anyone has proposed pinball machines on national forest or park property. But in my innocence, I wouldn't have supposed anybody would have thought we needed bowling alleys or golf courses in our National Parks either.

And yet, inconsistent as it may sound, the same people who would ask for bowling alleys and use them, want our natural wonderland preserved. As a people we rejoice that the Redwoods and Yosemite, the Olympic Forest, Mount Desert, and Yellowstone were set aside for us by our forefathers before they were marred forever by the strip-miner, the lumberman, and the developer. Find anywhere if you can the citizen who is not proud and glad that we as a people hold intact these magnificent treasures.

But if we are to bequeath to our children some of the wild wonderland that still remains as we found it so that they may see and know at first hand what the forest and the desert primeval were really like, we have not only to acquire lands for this purpose, which we have done to a remarkable degree, we have also to keep them intact while we hold them. This is much more difficult to do. Once a desirable tract of land is acquired by the Government, we relax, and public concern dies down. But it is then that the real struggle starts. How will the land be used? Shall mining be permitted, or lumbering? Shall dams be built; or roads, hotels, marinas? The issue is never settled for private interests never relax their pressure upon Government agencies and upon Congress, to make what they are pleased to call "multiple use" of public lands.

To remedy this defect in our system, and to assure the preservation of at least some of our vanishing wilderness, a group of farsighted citizens a few years ago devised some legislation now known as the wilderness bill. Last Wednesday the Senate Interior Committee approved the bill. Favorable action upon it is expected because the Senate passed a similar bill a year ago by a whopping 78 to 8 vote. However, the opposition is still strong and if it is to be passed again this year, the Senate needs to know that the people really want it.

Actually the bill is a very conservative measure. (1) It does not provide for the appropriating of new lands by the Government to be set apart as wilderness areas. The bill applies only to lands already owned by the Federal Government. (2) It would not terminate any lumbering or mining operations now in progress. It would prevent new operations from being initiated, unless genuine public necessity could be demonstrated. (3) It would not nullify State water rights; it would protect them. (4) It would neither prevent nor permit hunting. The present regulations would continue to stand.

If these are things the bill would not do, what does it provide for? Something very simple, yet fundamental. It establishes a policy. Upon its passage certain lands already within our national forests, national parks and national wildlife areas would be declared to be wilderness. There would be no change in the status of these lands. All of them may properly be described as wilderness now. All of them are already in Government possession, and all are already set aside under the various designations "wilderness," "wild," "primitive," "wildlife refuge," or "game range." If the wilderness bill were passed, there would be no change in the situation as it now exists. And that is just the point. There would be no change.

The wilderness bill establishes through legislation a policy whereby most of our present Government-owned wilderness areas would be kept as wilderness areas. Under the bill, they would no longer be threatened by our ever-eager private commercial interests. The generations gone before, whose business it was to conquer the wilderness, but who loved it too, preserved a part of it for us. The wilderness bill enables us to be faithful to our trusteeship in the natural wonderland our fathers bequeathed to us.

But why go to so much trouble to establish a policy we are already pursuing anyway? In the early stages, Howard Zahniser, who initiated the legislation, was often asked that question. "At first we weren't really sure," he told me last week, "but when we saw the opposition lining up, we knew we had to have the bill."

Who then are its opponents? Among them is our old friend Senator BARRY GOLDWATER with whom we have crossed swords before on quite different issues. * * * In a statement opposing the bill he and three other Senators said it deprives Congress of its constitutional authority to set aside public lands. But when you learn what this principle means as these men would apply it in practice, you discover that they advocate our going through the same frustrating runaround the wilderness bill has encountered, every time it is proposed to set aside a piece of public land. In simple language, they want, if they choose, to be able to delay the process of setting land aside or to obstruct it altogether.

These four Senators argue that the bill would lock away from the use and enjoyment by the people of America, great tracts of land and thus keep from them the benefits of recreation, as well as other uses this land might afford them. * * *

You may have noticed that the Senators' statement cautioned against "locking away great tracts of land * * * from the benefits of recreation, as well as other uses." Whether by other uses the Senators intended to refer to commercial interests is an open question. But there is no question that virtually all the opposition to the bill outside the Senate and the House comes from mining interests, petroleum, natural gas, cattle, and sheep growers (grazing), pulpwood and lumber interests. I have not read all the 275 pages recording the hearings on the bill held February 28 and March 1 of this year, but I have read a good part of them. The testimony and the supplementary statements recorded there fully bear out the observation of Mr. Zahniser. When you see where the opposition is coming from, you know why we need the bill and why we need it now.

The opponents of the bill talk grandly about the prerogatives of Congress and the needs of the people for recreation, but they are also clear as to their desire for the private use of public lands. On reading their testimony, and noting who they represent, the issue raised by the wilderness bill becomes crystal clear. After all the pious protestations about the importance of preserving the wilderness have been boiled out of these statements, we learn that private interests wish to use public lands for private gain. The wilderness bill says they may not do so in wilderness areas, unless it is necessary in the public interest. That is all there is to it.

The bill will be debated in the Senate soon, I am told. It should pass if there is strong and vocal support for it, and then the battle will shift to the House. * * *

To know why this Nation needs the wilderness bill, WAYNE ASPINALL, U.S. Congressman from Colorado, has only to look westward from the Capitol to the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial lying beyond. He has only to ask himself whether he thinks the Mall beautiful, and whether he is proud to show it to his constituents when they visit him from Colorado. If he is proud as we know he is, let him ask himself why it is there. Surely he knows. The Mall is there because L'Enfant laid it

out so when the land was empty and unused. And surely he knows the struggle of the American people since that time to keep the Mall as relatively clear as it now is. Surely he knows an ugly railroad station once stood upon it. Would he have it back?

How does the Congressman feel when he stands in the midst of the Rocky Mountain National Park in his home State of Colorado, 260,018 acres in extent? Is he proud? Is he glad it was set apart by an earlier Congress, and kept free from exploitation? How does he feel in the midst of the 240,000 acres of the San Juan primitive area; in the 152,259 acres of the Dinosaur National Monument; the 117,800 acres of the Flat Tops Primitive Area, the Mesa Verde National Park, and many others—16 of them in all in Colorado alone totaling well above a million acres? Is he proud? Is he glad that men of wisdom, sensitivity and foresight before his time set those tracts aside? We feel sure that he is, and we ask that he join with the people of this Nation in making these and similar lands inviolate forever, never again subject to exploitation and defacement by private commercial interests, but always subject to use if public policy requires it as in the mining of uranium for example.

With the wilderness bill we enter the realm of values where commercial interests are irrelevant, provided they can be satisfied elsewhere as in our rich and fruitful country they still can be. The very language of the bill is often poetic. In defining "wilderness" it reads: "a wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

We men of earth ought never to forget how close to us in time, if not in space, the wilderness lies. But a few generations separates most of us from it. And whatever our personal history may have been, and however many generations of city-dwellers may have preceded us, we cannot forget either, that as a biological species inhabiting the planet earth, man as man finds the wilderness very close to him in time.

There we were conceived: there we were born: there we roamed as children, and there we grew to manhood. The wilderness, not the city or suburbia or exurbia or the farm nurtured us. It is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. And if at this time of the year we find our souls expanding within us, as the buds swell on the bushes and the birds sing in the trees, it is because untold generations of men and women before us have known the same inner quickening as the sun passed the vernal equinox. We cannot deny our own nature and we dare not try. For we cannot subsist in an environment of asphalt, brick and stone.

"In the wilderness prepare ye the way of the Lord," sang the prophet Isaiah long ago. In the wilderness Moses and the Children of Israel wandered for 40 years; in the wilderness dwelt John the Baptist and in the wilderness Jesus knew temptation, even as you and I. There man himself first lifted his eyes in awe and wonder and worship. There, in the natural world where he dwelt and which was very close to him and very much a part of him he found the divine spirit which gave light to his life and hope for his future.

Today we worship in temples made with hands. Gathered here, seeking truth and right together, we may hear the voice of the divine within us. But in the forest and by the sea, by the lake at dusk, and on the mountain top as day breaks; in bud and leaf and flower the spirit of all that is speaks too, as it does also in the love we bear to one another. There are many dimensions to the life of the spirit. In carelessness or ignorance, let us not cut off from ourselves the voice of the spirit that speaks to us from the world of nature.

God of time and eternity, as we strive on toward a better day, grant us to cherish this living emerald, the broad green earth, our home. Amen.

Memo to the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during my special 3 hours devoted to the residual oil problem last Thursday, my colleage, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], was most vociferous in opposition. I gladly listened to him at that time, and feel that I refuted his arguments which were not based on facts. A number of arguments that I made at that time are listed here in an excellent sheet prepared by the New England Council of Boston, Mass., under the direction of Gardner A. Caverly, executive vice president.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the "New England Council Statement in Answer to Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR," as follows:

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL STATEMENT IN ANSWER TO REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. SAYLOR

In answer to charges made by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania and other critics of the administration sponsored Office of Emergency Planning report on residual oil restrictions, the New England Council makes the following statement.

Representative SAYLOR's charges are completed unfounded and contrary to any reputable reports on residual oil, especially the Office of Emergency Planning report which essentially says:

1. Residual oil restrictions do not contribute to national security. That national security cannot be separated from hemispheric security.

2. They harm inter-American economic and defense alliances because Venezuela is the leading exporter of residual in this hemisphere.

3. American petroleum refiners don't want to produce residual because they can market other petroleum products more profitably.

4. That residual oil has little to do with coal mining unemployment.

5. Restrictions prevent free competition among residual suppliers and users, a point emphasized by the Department of Justice.

Representative SAYLOR is reported to have said that the residual oil import quota system "has at no time been used to benefit affected coal-producing regions." This would indicate that Representative SAYLOR is either not familiar with the residual import situation or he is purposely trying to mislead his constituents.

Residual import restrictions have forced the cost of residual oil to 27 cents per barrel more than in Canada and other countries. It is obvious that without these restrictions the price on residual would have been much lower and this in turn would have resulted in more competitive coal prices in the utilities market along the east coast, all this without Government intervention. The added coal profits help buy more capital equipment and, therefore, speed up mechanization. Without Government control, added profits and mechanization are, of course, a healthy development. But the fact remains that this mechanization and not residual imports is the principal cause of unemployment.

Mr. SAYLOR is also reported to have said, "To put an umbrella over one region exclusively while exposing the rest of the Nation to the damaging effect of a torrent of imports is not in keeping with the Nation's concept of equitable treatment." The supposed umbrella over New England mentioned by Mr. SAYLOR is nothing more than the restoration of free enterprise, the real umbrella is protecting the monopoly profits of the coal barons by continuous oil import quotas.

New Englanders only want that which was found to be in the best interest of this Nation by the Office of Emergency Planning.

We appeal to congressional delegations in the so-called coal States to look at the facts and stop being misled by the unsupported arguments of coal producers.

We are all concerned with coal mining unemployment but residual oil restrictions are obviously not the answer and may even aggravate the problem.

Tribute to Rudolph T. Anselmi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the last session of the Wyoming State Legislature marked a milestone that many of the citizens of the State, including myself, noted with extreme regret and sorrow. For that legislature passed a redistricting bill which eliminated the senate seat of State Senator Rudolph T. Anselmi.

Mr. President, there is no one in the political circles of the State of Wyoming better liked, rather I would say more loved, and more respected than Rudy Anselmi. I am among the many who count themselves fortunate to be able to call him a friend.

The Alumnews, the alumni magazine of the University of Wyoming printed an article about Rudy in its March–April 1963 edition. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSIGNMENT: LAWMAKING

Once he was the youngest Wyoming State senator. When the recent session of the legislature met he was the oldest—in point of years served in that body. He is Rudolph T. Anselmi—familiarly known as Rudy.

Mr. Anselmi was elected to the senate first in 1937 and has served continuously since. The reapportionment of the legislature this year will eliminate his seat for the next session. When it became apparent that the "dean of the senate" would not be returning in 2 years, his colleagues outdid themselves to give him a fitting farewell. First they wrote a nonsensical poem paraphrasing Longfellow's "I Shot an Arrow Into

the Air." But as the final session closed they presented him with a senate gavel and flocked about his desk to get his autograph.

Rudolph Anselmi is the oldest son of the late Joseph and Maria Menghini Anselmi, pioneer Wyoming settlers who migrated to the United States from the Tyrol in Austria. He was born May 1, 1904, in Rock Springs and was reared there. He was educated in the Rock Springs schools and graduated from high school in 1921. He attended the university on a scholastic scholarship for 2 years. During his third year he found it necessary to drop out to assist his father in his business in Rock Springs. During that year he took correspondence courses and returned the next year to graduate with his class and with honors. He was elected a member of Phi Kappa Phi honorary society and was awarded a fellowship to Oklahoma University, which he was unable to accept because his father again needed him in the family business.

Always an active Democrat, Mr. Anselmi was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1956 which nominated Adlai Stevenson for President. Again in 1960 he was a delegate to the convention which nominated John F. Kennedy.

During his 28 years of service in the Wyoming Senate he has served for 10 sessions as the minority floor leader, as he was in the 37th legislature just completed. He has served on each of the legislative interim committee, and the research councils and was chairman of several of the subcommittees. He has been on the ways and means, highway and transportation, education, mines, mineral products, rules and apportionment committees, to name a few.

His prime interest in the legislature has always been education, and he was influential in obtaining legislation for the university building program, starting with Knight Hall on through to the recent building authorization by the 37th legislature. He sponsored legislation which established the nurses' training program and the college of nursing at the university. He introduced legislation providing for a medical education program by which Wyoming students could attend medical schools in other States without having to pay out-of-State tuition. This program laid the foundation for the present WICHE program of cooperative education among several Western States.

Rudy Anselmi has served continuously on the Rock Springs school board since 1936, and is now president of the board. He is a past president of Lions Club, a member of the Elks, Eagles, and a 4th degree member of Knights of Columbus. A member of the Rock Springs Roman Catholic church, he is a past grand knight of the Knights of Columbus. He is an active member of the Rock Springs Chamber of Commerce and for many years was chairman of the Sweetwater County Fair board.

He took over the business founded by his father and has for many years been manager of the Miners Mercantile Co. He is also a director of the Rock Springs North Side State Bank and secretary of the Hutley Construction Co.

He and Mrs. Anselmi, the former Louise Shuster, daughter of another pioneer Rock Springs family, have three daughters, Mary Lou, Lynn, and Jeri, all of whom have graduated from the university.

Last spring the college of commerce honored Mr. Anselmi as its distinguished alumnus for 1961–62. At the presentation banquet it was noted that he was probably the first person to graduate with honors from the college of commerce.

News Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, a television station in my district recently presented editorial comment on the subject of news management which I think will be of interest to my colleagues. I know that every Member of this House feels as strongly as I do that the public has a right to know and all phases of Government should be an open book, except in those matters which are classified for security reasons.

The editorial follows:

CHANNEL 13 COMMENTS: NEWS MANAGEMENT

You are seeing a program that brings together some of the points on the subject of news management. It is a vital subject and one that deserves your thoughtful attention. And, your voice in the matter should be heard.

Channel 13 urges you to write to Senators MARGARET CHASE SMITH and ED MUSKIE, or Representatives STAN TUPPER and CLIFFORD MCINTIRE expressing your views.

It is our concept as a station that a news department reports for you, the audience, that a newsman takes your place at an event simply because you cannot be there, that he sees, and asks questions for you and reports back to inform you of any given situation. Thus, it would also seem that if a newsman feels that a high official might be pulling his leg, just a little—maybe managing the news to a degree, the reporter has the right to a final question which says, "O.K., now tell me the truth."

As broadcasters, we are charged with the responsibility of active and accurate news reporting. Accuracy is drilled into every practicing newsman, and every newsman worth his salt is as accurate as his facts will allow. But, this is only one part of a good newsman, activity is the other.

As Merriman Smith pointed out in his talk with Robert Pierpoint, the stories are still there for the reporter who wants to get out and dig, even when the facts are slim, unsubstantial, and the press release points in an entirely different direction.

Few of us would deny the fact that aid and comfort to an enemy is a poor way to help our country in time of stress. And, certainly, giving out information that would seriously damage our effectiveness would be called aid and comfort. But, there is a wide difference between the actions of government elements in secrecy, and the outright dumping of misinformed garbage on the public ear.

We have a right to know, short of damaging the country's economic or military well-being. Channel 13 here goes on record to say that if our Government cannot tell the truth, then we prefer that it says nothing, until, in its best judgment, information can be released explaining the situation. It serves no useful purpose to lead us up the wrong path.

We suggest that recent charges of news management, made by newsmen, may, to a degree, reflect simply a growing national habit of asking the Federal Government to do everything for us with our own money, while we scream about the high cost of government. It's easier that way, and if we aren't careful, we soon won't even need reporters to sit back in soft leather chairs to complain about news management. The Government will hand them a mimeographed statement of complaints to print, and read on the air. "Oh, what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive."

Summer Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in recent editions of the Evening Star, Mr. Joseph Young, who writes "The Federal Spotlight" has touched on a subject of grave personal concern to many hundreds of youngsters living in my congressional district, youngsters who must seek summer employment to defray the expense of their college educations, and who must naturally turn for such employment to our area's principal industry, the Federal Government.

Their problem is certainly not political, Mr. Speaker, and yet they are being funneled into a political clearance situation by those who would demand a vote for a job in a manner unheard of in Washington since most of us can remember.

I am pleased to insert into this RECORD, so that all my colleagues may know of this problem, the text of Mr. Young's columns of March 28 and March 31, 1963, which deal with this subject.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 28]

AT LAST: STUDENT JOB CLEARANCE IS AN INNOCENT MISUNDERSTANDING

(By Joseph Young)

Oh, the curse of a suspicious mind.

How ashamed we are of our suspicions that, perish the thought, the Kennedy administration was requiring all student summer Government jobs to be cleared through the White House for political patronage purposes.

The administration after a long silence has now told Congress the real true blue reason why such clearance is required.

It isn't because of patronage. Heavens, no. The White House merely wants to know the number of student summer jobs there will be so that it can plan the staging of student seminars that will be held in connection with summer employment and will be addressed by President Kennedy and other top officials. Seating arrangements and all that sort of thing, you know.

At least, this was the explanation given a House Civil Service Subcommittee yesterday by Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy.

After a stunned silence, Representative BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, wryly complimented Mr. Macy for the explanation.

"You deserve a medal," Mr. BROYHILL remarked.

Representative ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, was puzzled.

If all the White House was interested in was knowing how many students would attend the seminars, why did it require the agencies to list the jobseeking students' names and the States they came from, she asked.

"I don't know. I'm not in a position to," Mr. Macy acknowledged.

The subcommittee delved into the situation as a result of the Star's story of the White House student job clearance plan. Mr. Macy did not challenge the main details of the story, nor its statment that CSC officials were dismayed over the plan. However, he said the whole situation resulted from a misunderstanding.

Therefore, the Government's management and job patronage officials who attended the White House meeting on the subject can be excused, too, for having misunderstood.

After all, when Lawrence O'Brien, President Kennedy's chief congressional liaison assistant and his chief patronage dispenser, walked in on the meeting and beamingly gave the clearance plan his approval, they could hardly be blamed for having a wee suspicion that patronage was involved.

How were they to know the administration was just playing a game, the numbers game as it were.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 31, 1963]

COLLEGE DEMOCRATS ARE TOLD HOW TO GET SUMMER GOVERNMENT JOB

(By Joseph Young)

The Kennedy administration's disavowal of political patronage intent in the filling of student summer jobs in Government is sharply contradicated by one of the Democratic Party's own publications, the National College Democrat.

Only last Thursday, administration officials told the House Civil Service Committee that there was no political patronage involved and that the only interest the White House had in these jobs was in planning the student seminars which are held in connection with the summer employment.

However, the National College Democrat, the official publication of the National Federation of College Young Democrats, has this to say in its current issue:

"You may have noticed in recent newspaper stories that responsibility for such summer jobs has been transferred to the White House.

"The Young Democrats Division has checked out what this means for you.

"FORM TO WHITE HOUSE

"We have been recommended to suggest the following procedure. Write to your Senator or Congressman, asking him for a form 57. When you return it, ask him to enclose an accompanying letter of recommendation and to forward it with the form 57 to Mrs. Dorothy Davies at the White House."

Mrs. Davies is an assistant to Kenneth O'Donnell, special assistant to President Kennedy, and is handling Government summer employment for the White House.

The Democratic student publication mentions that "Washington's summertime lure is getting to many college Young Democrats this time of the year."

With such competition among the Young Democrats, it reminded them that a political letter of recommendation to the White House from one's Senator or Congressman may not be a guarantee of getting a summer job. It urges the young Democrats to follow up any personal leads you may have in pursuing a Government job.

The article concludes by reminding the Young Democrats that if they have an further questions they should contact Jim Hunt, the college director of the Democratic National Committee.

The Most Expensive Word in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 this House considered a Department of Agriculture supplemental request for more foreign assistance funds, amounting to $508 million. During floor discussion a question was raised concerning the shipment of surplus commodities to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia, to which the answer was given of almost $1.5 billion worth since the program began. In spite of this fact, a majority of the Members of the House gave their unqualified support to the supplemental request. The naivete of such action haunts us. How long will we continue to aid the very forces seeking to bury us? May I urge the Members who support foreign aid to Communist sympathizers and collaborators to read the following article from the April 6, 1963 issue of Information Bulletin. I also recommend careful reading of these facts by Members who believe in interminable bureaucratic supply-management control of agriculture, and the big "If" in the administration's plans for our farmers.

The article follows:

THE MOST EXPENSIVE WORD IN HISTORY

On the first page of the November 28, 1962, issue of Borba, Yugoslavia's official Communist Party newspaper, was the underlined pronouncement, "The community has the right to demand from agriculturalists all over the country that the land be used in the best manner." The article over which this headline appeared reported the grand opening of a new factory for the manufacture of fertilizer in Pancevo (a city in the north of Yugoslavia near the Romanian border), an occasion of great celebration for the Communist regime of Yugoslavia. The ceremony was attended by Mr. John Kennan, U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia and Mr. Edmond Hachison, director the U.S. agency for international development. The principal speaker was Mijalko Todorovic, third vice president in Tito's government. Among other things, Todorovic said:

"It is with satisfaction and pleasure that I say that part of the equipment for this factory was imported, purchased with money lent to our government by the United States under very agreeable credit conditions. This credit arrangement is characteristic of the collaboration, equality, understanding, and mutual benefit of the economic relationship which exists between our country and the United States. Our government is concerned to see this collaboration continue, for it is in the interests of both countries."

If we keep in mind the billions of dollars that Tito's government has cost the United States, not counting the millions for this factory, we can see that each word expressed "with satisfaction and pleasure" by Todorovic cost the American people about $50 million. Or, if we assume that this expression of "satisfaction and pleasure" came also from Tito and other members of the Yugoslavian government, we can conclude that each word of "satisfaction and pleasure" cost the American people about $5 million, making those words the most expensive words in history.

What compensation has the United States received? In spite of these words of Communist "satisfaction and pleasure," Tito's delegate in the United Nations has voted with the Communist bloc and has consistently supported Soviet interests on all important questions. Moreover, Tito has supported Castro against "Western imperialism."

The United States, England, and France have given billions and billions of dollars so that "Yugoslavia might stand on her own two feet and become more and more independent of the Soviet Union." Yet, in the meantime, Yugoslavia has grown closer and closer to the Soviet Union, not to mention the principal fact that, in any event, Yugoslavia, as a Communist country, has a destiny identical to that of the Soviet Union.

Also, we have the question of whether Yugoslavia is standing on her own feet today, particularly in regard to agriculture, for we know that agriculture in all Communist countries, from the Soviet Union to Yugoslavia, is in critical condition. There are some answers to this question on page 5 of the very same issue of Borba, in an article on the production of tobacco. The article first calls attention to a serious crisis in this phase of agriculture and then suggests a remedy. It states:

"There is a large number of tobacco growers—75 (all controlled by the State). It is impossible for them to improve their production of tobacco because administrative prices (prices dictated by the State) are insufficient to cover the expense per acre of producing tobacco.

"The situation in the manufacture of cigarettes is no better. The total consumption of cigarettes is 23,000 tons; yet the cigarette factories have a capacity of 32,000 tons, which means a one-third disutility. Between 1958 and 1961, there were 10 cigarette factories; now we are astonished to see that 10 more such factories are being built. Why?"

Why have 10 more cigarette factories been built? For dissipation and nothing else. This situation is typical of agriculture as a whole, not only in Yugoslavia, but in all Communist countries.

The fertilizer factory which was the cause for such celebration was also built in spite of the fact that existing factories had the capacity to supply the needs of Yugoslavian agriculture. What did Tito and Todorovic expect to accomplish with this new factory? Todorovic said that it was built (with help from the United States) "because our socialistic country has the right to expect and demand from all agricultural producers, from all who cultivate land, whether that land is common or private property, that the land be used in the best manner. If both our collectives and individual proprietors follow all the directives and words of Comrade Tito. * * * If our workers * * * in agriculture assure high quality in their products * * * we can expect, not only faster agricultural growth, but faster growth in our whole economy.

"If—if." These "ifs" signify the problem which is the basis for the bankruptcy of communism. On these "ifs" all hopes are hoped—but in vain. These "if's" cannot be realized because factories and machines do not work automatically. Man works. But man under a Communist regime has no reason for, nor interest in, his work. He produces only the minimum—just enough to keep from being hungry. The state calls on its people for more and more work, but the people feel no real usefulness or purpose. The people know very well that they have no real representatives and that to express their true feelings about the Communist regime is impossible. The principal source of Communist failure is that the people do not like—the people are against—a Communist regime.

To summarize, Communist agriculture is the most expensive agricultural method. Slave labor has never produced and never will produce as much or as well as free labor.

No comparison between the quality and quantity produced by slave and free labor is even possible. There can be no greater bureaucracy and extravagance than under a system where all—from man to factory—are under state control. Such a system of agriculture is a bottomless barrel. Nothing and nobody can help such a system. The one remedy is a radical change from a Communist regime to a regime of full liberty. A firm stand must be taken on the side of democracy in Yugoslavia—power must be returned to the people.

Statement of Draper Daniels, National Export Expansion Coordinator, Before House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings held last week by the House Small Business Committee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, it was refreshing to find that the President and his administration appear to be moving forward in assisting businessmen, and particularly small businessmen to enter into an expanded program of foreign trade. Although there is much that needs to be done, it appears that definite and positive progress have been made by the administration in this direction.

Mr. Draper Daniels, the newly appointed National Export Expansion Coordinator, appeared before the House Small Business Committee and, in explaining his functions, quoted the President's memorandum to various agencies involved concerning the functions of this new post. The memorandum quoted by Mr. Daniels and which explains the scope of his office follows:

On July 12, I appointed Draper Daniels, of Illinois, National Export Expansion Coordinator.

Stationed in the Department of Commerce and reporting to Secretary Hodges, the National Coordinator functions across departmental lines.

Anything designed to facilitate the expansion of this country's export sales is his concern, and increased exports help our balance of payments which is the concern of all of us.

Specifically, he is charged with coordinating all parts of the export expansion program, regardless of origin, with keeping the program focused on major and meaningful targets, and with moving it toward specific and possible goals on a workable timetable.

All programs in being designed to aid export expansion should be reviewed with him and any new programs to be initiated should be reviewed with him.

Although Mr. Daniels has been in his post only since July of 1962, the presentation he made to our committee indicates that his office is already beginning to function effectively in coordinating activities of various agencies in relation to foreign trade. In summarizing his statement, Mr. Daniels briefly set out some of the accomplishments in this field, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues and others. The conclusion of his remarks follows:

This has been a long statement, Mr. Chairman, and I expect that you and the committee may be wondering, "What if anything has happened as a result of all this?"

If I may summarize quickly as a result of the combination of things I have been talking about:

One thousand one hundred and ninety-seven new exporters were introduced to international trade through Department of Commerce field offices and completed at least one successful international transaction in 1962.

Businessmen attending export seminars in 1962, 36,000.

The Department of Commerce Field Office Director estimates that 85 to 90 percent of these were small businessmen.

Of all applications for export credit insurance through FCIA 17½ percent came from firms that had never before exported.

U.S. exports increased to $20.901 billion an increase of 4 percent.

If this sounds good, let me assure you that it isn't nearly good enough. If we are to solve our balance-of-payments problem by increasing our exports, we need to do more than twice as well.

I do not believe that this is at all impossible.

Disability Retired Pay Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. H. L. McLeod of Bemidji, Minn., currently living in California, recently sent me a document pertaining to disability pay for servicemen. Mr. McLeod requested that I share this information with my colleagues in the Congress. In order to do this, I am inserting his document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Chronological history of disparagement of company grade heavily disabled officers—Retired pay for 80- to 100-percent disability

CAPTAIN

	Under 2 years	Over 2 years	Over 3 years	90-day E-1, married VA compensation 100 percent
1949	$235.13	$235.13	$235.13	$171
1952	244.53	244.53	244.53	202
1955	259.20	259.20	263.25	202
1958	262.75	262.75	277.16	248
Recomputation 1958 plus 5 percent, 1963	256.76	275.63	282.75	[1] 273
1958 rate plus 5 percent, 1963	275.89	275.89	291.02	[1] 273
New crop, 1963	288.75	307.50	330.00	[1] 273

1ST LIEUTENANT

1949	$186.04	$197.72	$197.72	$171
1952	194.52	205.63	205.63	202
1955	206.19	217.97	251.56	202
1958	218.56	230.05	266.14	248
Recomputation 1958 plus 5 percent, 1963	204.25	229.16	283.50	[1] 273
1958 rate plus 5 percent, 1963	229.49	241.55	279.45	[1] 273
New crop, 1963	228.75	258.75	315.00	[1] 273

2D LIEUTENANT

1949	$160.32	$171.00	$171.00	$171
1952	166.74	177.84	177.84	202
1955	176.72	188.51	222.30	202
1958	187.31	199.81	235.69	248
Recomputation 1958 plus 5 percent, 1963	175.06	197.66	247.28	[1] 273
1958 rate plus 5 percent, 1963	196.88	209.80	247.47	[1] 273
New crop, 1963	187.50	210.00	266.25	[1] 273

[1] H.R. 3006.

NOTE

1. In 1949, 1952 and 1955 maximum ¾ pay was the rule for all except in 1955 "short service" officers got a 6-percent raise as base pay for subalterns was not raised in 1952 and computation would leave them in the red, but the counterparts in 3-year bracket of pay, then introduced, got full raises of their rank. The figures show how the squeeze took place, forcing men to VA.
2. In 1958 all officers got 6 percent over whatever they were getting from the 1955 scales or as "short service" officers.
3. In 1963 proposal is recomputation on 1958 scales plus 5 percent or 5 percent over 1958 rate paid, whichever is greater.
4. Those retired currently got computed at current rates of basic pay according to percent of disability with 75-percent pay limit.
5. Above figures relate to those retired prior to 1958 except in the case of the 1963 proposals.
6. The point to remember is that it is the most severely disabled "officers" that are being treated in this manner of demotion to get more at VA on 90-day recruit basis. VA has a $23 wife allowance in the $273 and services do not, but so long as most men are married anyway the above figures will tell the story. Most of the junior officer disabilities are "wartime" incurred, hence they would be eligible for compensation at VA, but only about 10 percent of all officers become 100 percent disabled, so the cost of justice to them is not great enough to generate the malice shown toward them.

Following is the suggested wording of an amendment to be section 402(j) of the Career Compensation Act: *"Provided however,* and notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary any officer who is now or hereafter rated 80 per centum to 100 per centum disabled shall have his retired disability pay computed from a minimum of the over six years bracket of active duty pay."

SUBJECT: 100-PERCENT DISABLED "SHORT-SERVICE" COMPANY GRADE OFFICERS' DISPARAGEMENT WHEN FORCED FOR POVERTY REASONS TO DEMOTE THEMSELVES TO 90-DAY ENLISTED MAN DESSERTS AT VA WHICH H.R. 3006 DOES NOT CORRECT

Due to vindictive basic pay manipulations aimed at current active duty retention problems, not germane to realistic heavy disa-

bility unemployability problems at all, and the philosophy of no raises for subalterns since 1952, the heavily disabled retired company grade officers from the past, shown in tables below are maliciously continued to be degraded, their commissions repudiated by the ridiculous process of demotion to get more no other private business or Government agency dare to practice. Imagine a civil service retiree taking a few notches demotion to get more money.

The tables below also show the bizarre pay rate differentials between officers of the same rank and degree of disability where only a slight actual difference in longevity status exists that is magnified all out of proportion in valuation by literal interpretation of the rule of thumb requiring disability pay to be computed according to degree of disability and attained longevity bracket, disregarding the fact that disability of unemployability proportions is the really momentous consideration for evaluation. For example: True longevity is definitely set at $15.60 per month per 2 years for active duty, which is $11.70 on three-fourths pay basis, or $5.85 per month per 1 year, but in tables below you will see first lieutenant, 3 years paid $79.25 more per month than a just under 2 years first lieutenant of same degree of disability, the big, big evaluation factor minimized by a petty year and a day on the calendar. It is overemphasis on longevity again, that was criticized by the Hook Commission and all notables called in for advice on pay. This plays down the S.O.L. factor of early disability no man should be discounted for, and makes a gravy racket out of honorable longevity increments, justly due everyone.

Services' 80- to 100-percent disability pay rates—75 percent of basic pay maximum

	Under 2 years	Over 2 years	Over 3 years	Veterans Administration pay rate for E-1, 90 days service, married, 100 percent disability compensation by election
CAPTAIN				
Present	$262.75	$262.75	$277.16	$273.
¾ 1958+5 percent	256.76	275.63	282.75	$273 (recomputation, H.R. 3006).
Present+5 percent	275.89	275.89	291.02	$273 (sec. 5 choice, H.R. 3006).
New crop 1963	288.75	307.50	330.00	$273 (¾ base pay, H.R. 3006).
1ST LIEUTENANT				
Present	$218.56	$230.05	$266.14	$273.
¾ 1958+5 percent	204.25	229.16	283.50	$273 (recomputation, H.R. 3006).
Present+5 percent	229.49	241.55	279.45	$273 (sec. 5 choice, H.R. 3006).
New crop 1963	228.75	258.75	315.00	$273 (¾ base pay, H.R. 3006).
2D LIEUTENANT				
Present	$187.31	$199.81	$235.69	$273.
¾ 1958+5 percent	175.06	197.66	247.28	$273 (recomputation, H.R. 3006).
Present+5 percent	196.68	209.80	247.47	$273 (sec. 5 choice, H.R. 3006).
New crop 1963	187.50	210.00	266.25	$273 (¾ base pay, H.R. 3006).
NONCOMS				
		E-7	E-6	
Present		$267.50	$217.50	$273.
1963 proposed		281.25	247.50	$273.

20-year, 80 percent to 100 percent disabled noncoms below E-7 get more at VA.

Solution, to preserve sanctity of even 2nd Lt. commission, it is necessary to equalize all company grade heavily disabled officers by setting up a minimum of over 6 years basic pay bracket for disability computation purposes which will prevent the necessity of demotion to E-1 status to get more.

It has frequently been brought out in pay hearings that company grade officers, particularly lieutenants have the highest rate of casualty of any category of all the military and naval forces, magnified in wartime, of course. Lieutenants comprise about 45 percent of all officers, and in wartime as high as 80 percent of officer population is non-Regular which means, in itself, noncareer, short service, civilian patriot, college trained, business executive, part-time National Guard and Reserve officers and noncoms every one of whom experience the loss of a specialized main vocation with military but an avocation in the event of the tragedy of unemployability from wartime disability. Yet the victim gets paid off by the United States only on the basis of low rank and short service pay brackets measuring stick, nothing for the loss of the main vocation, education, and previous business attainment.

It was testified in the 1949 hearings that about half the non-Regular officers of long World War II had under 3 years service longevity status and that puts them in disability brackets of pay on the preceeding page tables. The worst part is that the heavy disability unemployable case suffers most by current neglect. That is why my suggestion of using the 6-year pay bracket as a minimum basis from which to compute these patriots' disability retired pay is not unreasonable and it is the second lieutenants predicament that requires that high a bracket to avoid running to VA to get 90 day recruit desserts as good enough for them. It is not a privilege to elect to demote oneself to get more money as a tranquilizer to forget one's self respect. Try it on yourself.

It is realized that the noncom situation depicted in the tables is not solved by the young officers now stigmatized by the demotion for more vicious machination of disparagement. When 20-year career men get disparaged you run into a real blind alley. There is a solution to that I have already broached to the Veterans' Administration and which has the sympathy of the veteran organizations per letters I received from them, and is under study at VA. Inasmuch as widows get paid according to rank in cases of service-incurred deaths of their husbands, it follows it is equally reasonable that a noncom's warrant and an officer's commission should rate the 10-percent disabled entitled noncom or officer at VA, so that he be granted a percent overage above the 100-percent compensation rate according to rank in the form of a statutory award, simply because they proved themselves more than "average men," the basis of the VA rating schedules, and to give them a token gesture of court justice for their "lost longevity" from disability in the military as well as their civilian education and business achievement losses unrecompensed for as is. No price tag is put on patriotism by this process, just a whisper of American court justice even a young Communist gets in full measure in a civil damage case. Huge verdicts in which potential loss is the big, big item, not "just how far in the success ladder did this man get?", but how far has he got to go in life expectancy. From 5 percent to 20 percent range should cover the overage suggested. It relieves the Services of a big headache.

Respectfully submitted.

First Lieutenant, EORL Army.

Mr. President, You Said:

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Evening Press:

MR. PRESIDENT, YOU SAID:

In a major speech before a group of advertising and business executives in Washington, President Kennedy declared:

"Economic history, specifically the history of 1957–60, from which the economy never fully recovered, clearly warns us now that the wrong answer * * * would spell downturn for the American economy as a whole."

Note the flat statement that the country has "never fully recovered."

Now remember President Kennedy in a special message to Congress on May 25, 1961:

"The first and basic task confronting the Nation this year was to turn recession into recovery. An affirmative antirecession program, initiated with your (congressional) cooperation, supported the natural forces in the private sector; and our economy is now enjoying renewed confidence and energy. The recession has been halted. Recovery is underway."

The question is, what stopped the recovery that was "underway" in 1961?

But wait. In Washington the other day Mr. Kennedy also said the 1957 "recession" came about because the Federal Government decided to: "keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy and to reject all efforts at tax reduction."

However, in the special message in 1961, Mr. Kennedy said: "If the budget deficit now increased by the needs of our security is to be held within manageable proportions—if we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar—it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards; and I must request the cooperation of the Congress * * * to refrain from adding funds to programs * * * to end the postal deficit * * * to provide full pay-as-you-build highway financing."

So we have our answer. What halted the recovery that was underway in 1961 must have been the "prudent fiscal standards" recommended that same year.

We've wondered why they got such a short workout.

Merrimack Cleanup Needs $68 to $99 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Robert A. McLean, writing in the Boston Sunday Globe, has pointed out one of the most important reasons for the establishment of a Water Pollution Laboratory in the Merrimack Valley area of Massachusetts.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. McLean's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 31, 1963]

MERRIMACK CLEANUP NEEDS $68 TO $99 MILLION

(By Robert A. McLean)

The river named Merrimack can be spelled about 22 different ways, including a couple of Indian signs.

Whatever version is used, they all spell one thing, pollution.

Merrimack valley cities and towns got a rough idea this week what it will cost to clean up their river in the most economical way, between $68 and $99 million.

They also were warned that footdragging in the cleanup project by any community might land the dilatory one in court, by action of Federal or State authority, or by a neighboring community.

Plans for a system of sewage treatment plants and intercepting sewers along the Merrimack's banks in Massachusetts were outlined at a Dracut meeting of the Merrimack Valley District Pollution Abatement Commission.

The Boston engineering firm conducting the study will prepare final project plans by September, and the program should be ready for the legislature before the end of the year. A State sanitation official urged the Dracut delegates to launch immediate, earnest efforts to find ways and means to finance and administering the program.

At the same time he warned that all valley communities must keep pace, or at least show some progress from one phase of the overall project to the next. Otherwise, he pointed out, a community which is doing its part and still bearing the brunt of pollution from lax neighbors could seek legal relief.

Briefly, the engineering plan calls for nine sewage treatment plants, three of them regional. Westford would have two plants, another would be located in North Chelmsford, and Chelmsford would get an intercepting sewer link to the Lowell regional plant. This plant would also serve Dracut and later on, Billerica and part of Tewksbury.

The Lawrence regional facility proposed would serve that city, along with South Tewksbury, Methuen, Andover and North Andover. Haverhill and part of Groveland would be linked to the third regional plant.

Newburyport, Salisbury and Amesbury would have separate plants, the last including a possible tiein with Merrimac. West Newbury and Tynsgboro, according to the report, do not yet have populations which warrant treatment or sewerage connections, and should strive to improve local facilities.

A trunk sewer line from Lowell to the sea, which has been a strongly advocated alternative, would cost about double that of the three regional plants, the engineers asserted. The commission will meet again in Amesbury on April 24.

Basic American Policy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following column by David Lawrence, "Basic American Policy on Cuba," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BASIC AMERICAN POLICY ON CUBA

(By David Lawrence)

Why has it taken 5 months for the American people to be told just what the policy of the U.S. Government is toward the Soviet military activity in Cuba? Why was it necessary for Members of Congress of both parties to keep prodding the administration before a clear-cut statement of the intentions of the United States became available in the form of a speech by Secretary of State Dean Rusk this week? These questions are being asked on Capitol Hill, but haven't as yet been answered.

Plenty of comments have been made by administration spokesmen in denouncing as "irresponsible" or "partisan" those Members of Congress who feel the American people are entitled to have their questions about Cuba answered. But, at last, Secretary Rusk has made clear the essentials of American policy, as follows:

1. The United States under no circumstances will "accept or tolerate the reintroduction of offensive weapons into Cuba."

2. The Armed Forces of the United States and other countries in this hemisphere are available to see to it that any arms now in Cuba shall not be used outside of that country, either in "an organized effort of through piecemeal infiltration."

3. Surveillance will continue and, if necessary, force will be used to protect "the free and active use of international waters and air space" in the Caribbean.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, moreover, told the House Armed Services Committee in testimony released this week that, if there is an uprising in Cuba and the Soviets send in more troops, the United States will consider this "an invasion."

Broad statements indicating a firm policy toward Cuba were made originally on October 22 last by President Kennedy, but, unfortunately, the modifications and interpretations which the administration itself has permitted to circulate since then have confused the American people and led to assertions by critics that the policy actually had been weakened.

Thus, for instance, President Kennedy in his television address of October 22, 1962, said:

"To halt this offensive buildup, a strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba is being initiated. All ships of any kind bound for Cuba, from whatever nation or port, will, if found to contain cargoes of offensive weapons, be turned back. This quarantine will be extended, if needed, to other types of cargo and carriers."

But at his news conference on March 6, 1963, the President said that oil—usually considered a strategic commodity—could not be kept from entry into Cuba by a blockade, because this would be "an act of war." No such interpretation was given by the President last October, and hence Members of Congress are again questioning why there is a seeming relaxation of the basic policy of "quarantine" or "blockade." Also, it is being asked why it took 5 months to bring to a head the question of Russia's failure to withdraw 17,000 of her troops and technicians from Cuba.

There's a lack of clarification, too, of the issues in the dispute over whether the United States, in order to secure Moscow's withdrawal of offensive weapons last autumn, made a concession, in effect, both to Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev by allegedly pledging that there would be no invasion of Cuba by U.S. forces. State Department officials have repeatedly denied that any pledge against invasion was given and have said that any proposals along this line were dependent upon acceptance by Moscow of Washington's demand for onsite inspection to verify whether the Soviet weapons had been withdrawn.

But Mr. Kennedy, in a television appearance on December 17, 1962, told a nationwide audience that he didn't really expect the Russians to agree to onsite inspection, because he felt that "a totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection which really is desirable."

Now that Secretary Rusk considers that Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba could be used in an offensive action against Latin American countries and says that the United States will use force to prevent any such action, there are Members of Congress who wonder why a quarantine of ships carrying strategic supplies to Cuba can't be undertaken at once without involving an act of war, any more than did the interception of Russian ships last autumn.

Secretary Rusk made one comment in his speech this week which will add to the emotions of the political debate. He injected, perhaps unwittingly, a partisan note when he said that "having failed to take the steps that might have prevented, in years past, the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, the problem of finding a cure is more difficult." But it will be recalled that in October 1960, after many vigorous protests, our Ambassador was recalled from Havana, an embargo was placed on most exports to Cuba, and the Organization of American States was alerted to the growing capacity of Cuba to give armed support to the spread of its revolution in other parts of the Americas. Finally, on January 3, 1961, diplomatic relations with Cuba were severed by the Eisenhower administration.

The massive military buildup which finally brought matters to a climax didn't really begin, however, until early 1962—after the Kennedy administration had been in power for more than a year. When the military threat arose the "cure" came clearly into view—to rid Cuba of Soviet armament and troops by whatever means are necessary.

Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Francis Bacon took all knowledge for his sphere. The great and gracious lady whom we honor today—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—took all humanity for her concern. When death took her great husband, and her career of exemplary and inspiring wife ended, she stepped out alone upon the stage of the world to fight man's inhumanity to man. Whatever cause was good and just, whatever was right, whatever would help mankind to walk on higher ground, was her personal cause for which she fought with unrelenting

zeal and unfaltering faith and courage. Whatever degraded the dignity of man, whatever held people anywhere down or back, whatever threatened the peace and therefore the lives and the happiness of humanity, against these she fought with an unquenchable fervor and fire. She literally spent her precious life for others. So when she finally came to the end of what had appeared to be her illimitable strength and lay down for her long delayed rest the whole world mourned. Every man, woman and child who lived and those to come to birth in the ages not yet arrived had lost a friend. The glory of her life shall ever glow in the memory of her deeds and throughout the long span and reach of time all who love their God and their fellow man shall call her name blessed.

They Have the Nerve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of March 23:

THEY HAVE THE NERVE

The United States has labored since 1945 to strengthen the peace of the world. It has been a tremendous and costly effort for a Nation with about one-sixth of th total global population. What have we to show for all this sweat? Jibes. Jeers. Gimme this and gimme that. We've been donating blood and all we're offered in return is bigger bottles.

The people of this country have accomplished the incredible, so far as their participation in the burdens of the free world are concerned. Has another people or government done as much since the beginning of recorded history? We are all alone in this league. We stand out in it. We say it's about time the people we call our allies stopped griping, stopped complaining, and started giving back some of the strength they have feasted on for nothing and for so long.

We don't deny the fact that other governments have donated funds and stationed troops away from home to help create order in distant lands. History tells us they have stimulated foreign economies and built industry. We don't belittle such help, except for the obvious. It was always done for conquest or to preserve an empire.

The American people extend help, not for conquest, but to prevent it. They extend help, not to preserve an empire, but to preserve the peace of all peoples. This Nation has been the bulwark of the free world for a long time. Never has it spent one dime to enslave a family or to conquer a people.

We support thousands of Americans in alien lands ready to fight against aggression. We pay for helping foreign families we never see and don't know. What do we get in return? The jibe that we have too much and suffer too little. The jeer that we're no longer the giant among the nations of the world. The gimme this or we'll to communism. The gimme that or we'll do business with it. Nuts, it's about time we used the word ourselves.

We say gimme cooperation. Gimme self-help. Gimme some sweat and some blood and some appreciation. Gimme some reason to believe that our allies know why we help. Gimme a reason to go on helping them.

We're not at war. Our allies are not at war. The world isn't at war. This is the reason we help. This is the reason we spend. Disgustingly, they have the nerve to gripe about it.

A Tribute to the Nurses of Lawrence General Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will agree with me that there is no vocation more worthy of respect and encouragement than that of nursing. Describing the training program at the Lawrence (Mass.) General Hospital in a March 20 article in the Lawrence Eagle-Tribute, Fred A. Sullivan has captured much of the hard work and sacrifices as well as the real feeling of accomplishment on the part of the young women who enter this fine profession. Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Sullivan's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LONG, HARD WORK TO NOBLE GOAL WHEN GIRL TRAINS TO BE NURSE

(By Fred A. Sullivan)

This is the second in the series of articles on "Youth on the March." It is the story of a girl, whose mind, heart, and hands are devoted to learning to be a nurse, one of life's great callings.

The 26,208 hours which stood last September between Edith M. Carrie and the first major objective of her life must have seemed like an eternity.

Such length of time always does when one is only 18. Flaming ambition cries for haste.

Edith Carrie, continuing a family tradition, is going to be a nurse. Such a professional career has been her prime interest as far back as she can remember.

As one of the 39 freshman students who entered the nurses' training school of the Lawrence General Hospital last fall, she has been indoctrinated in much of the theory and practice of human healing.

"Her" hospital, and it is always such a personal application to those on its staff, has not, as to some school associates, been a revelation. As a junior volunteer, she contributed 167 hours of assignments in out-of-high-school hours. These involved delivering mail, arranging flowers, running errands, keeping bedside carafes filled with cool water and writing cards and letters for the handicapped.

She devoted the vacation following her junior year at Lawrence High School to the work of a hospital diet aid.

On the first day of her first class, she brought to the school a basis of great promise. The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert Carrie, 14 Leslie Street, she won a scholarship medal at the Rollins grammar school. Her high school diploma was awarded her with "great distinction," and the Quota Club of Lawrence awarded her its 1962 nursing scholarship.

She is still more than 2 years away from her diploma, and the State examinations which test her competence to be a registered nurse, but she is making good progress. At this writing she is winding up freshman semester I. The next step is "capping." To reach it she passes through 26 weeks of instruction in basic sciences, anatomy, and physiology, microbiology, chemistry and nutrition; fundamentals of nursing, professional adjustment I, and psychology I.

In semester II, she will be taught medical and surgical nursing with such units as dermatological nursing, orthopedic nursing, eye, ear, nose and throat nursing, pathology and diet therapy.

In her second year, she will plan, cook and serve to a patient the diet prescribed by the attending physician. She will learn operating room procedure, and the purpose of the recovery room. She will study children from birth through adolescence. In her third and final year, she will travel on occasions to a nearby State hospital to learn other duties of the nursing profession.

It costs $8,487 to mold a young woman into a qualified nurse. Except in the case of Edith Carrie, a student pays a tuition fee of $900 for the 3-year course, or $300 a term. Since the 1962 quota scholarship underwrote the first year tuition for her, her tuition will cost her $600 for the next 2 years unless there is another scholarship available and she becomes heiress to it. In addition, the hospital invests $2,529 a year to educate a professional student, or $7,587 for the 3-year term.

When a student nurse receives her diploma, the hospital imposes no obligation on her. Her instructors expect, however, that she will wear her hard-won cap with pride, honor, and dedicated service to ailing mankind.

Mustard-Cutting Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of March 12, 1963:

MUSTARD-CUTTING TIME

This is mustard-cutting time for State legislatures across the country. Most of them are now in session. How well they perform will determine how much more centralized Federal Government will become.

From under the wool hats of many State legislators have traditionally come the loudest cries against Uncle Sam's invasion of "State rights"—an invasion often requested by urban interests within their own borders because the legislature has failed to recognize or meet legitimate needs.

So we would respectfully suggest to those State bodies now in session that they might do something more positive than gripe. For instance:

Reapportion themselves fairly to reflect needs and wishes of all of their people, if they are not now so apportioned.

Provide a workable alternative to President Kennedy's plan for medicare under social security, if they don't like it. Including Pennsylvania, only 25 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam are now participating in the more modest Kerr-Mills program, and some of them only minimally.

Pick up the ball in other ventures that the Federal Government has invited them to help with. Billboard control is an example. In the 5 years since the Federal act was passed, only 17 States, again including Pennsylvania, have qualified to participate and earn bonus payments.

Deprive central government of its growing role by acting themselves to meet such urgent social problems as housing, education, civil rights. Pioneering in these fields has been left to Uncle Sam.

Talk is cheap. Only legislative deeds count in the effort to keep Government close to home. State legislatures that abdicate their responsibilities are ill qualified to complain about Federal fulfillment of vaccums they ignored.

Action Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the time is now for immediate and drastic executive action, for accelerated legal procedures by the Attorney General, for positive congressional action to strengthen and extend the law by giving to the Attorney General the legal authority to protect the rights of the Negroes of Mississippi, as well as the rights of minorities everywhere in the United States, to the limit.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to solicit the aid of every Member of the Congress of the United States to join me now in protesting and denouncing the illegal actions on the part of the authorities of Mississippi and elsewhere insofar as the actions of those authorities in anyway hamper the constitutional rights of Negro citizens.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a long series of outrages suffered by Negroes of Mississippi and I emphatically state that these crimes cry out for positive and courageous action, not tomorrow, but now.

CHRONOOGY OF VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION IN MISSISSIPPI SINCE 1961

1961

January 1, Greenville, Washington County: Two young white men rode a motorbike through a residential area and, according to the local police chief, fired a volley of shots into a group of Negroes. George Mayfield, 18, was seriously wounded in both legs; Percy Lee Simmons, 19, was shot in the right leg.

March 30, Jackson, Hinds County: Club-swinging police and 2 police dogs chased more than 100 Negroes from a courthouse where 9 Negro students were convicted for staging a sitin demonstration. Several were struck by the clubs and at least one person was bitten by the dogs.

May 7, Jackson, Hinds County: Several white youths, riding in an open convertible, lassoed 9-year-old Negro Gloria Laverne Floyd with a wire and dragged her along the street. The girl suffered a deep gash in her head that required three stitches, cheek bruises, a laceration of her right shoulder, and burn marks on her neck. Police made arrests.

August 15, Amite County: Robert Moses, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—registration worker, and three Negroes who had tried unsuccessfully to register in Liberty, were driving toward McComb when a county officer stopped them. He asked if Moses was the man "who's been trying to register our niggers." All were taken to court and Moses was arrested for "impeding an officer in the discharge of his duties," fined $50 and spent 2 days in jail.

August 22, Amite County: Robert Moses went to Liberty with three Negroes, who made an unsuccessful attempt to register. A block from the courthouse, Moses was attacked and beaten by Billy Jack Caston, the sheriff's first cousin. Eight stitches were required to close a wound in Moses' head. Caston was acquitted of assault charges by an all-white jury before a justice of the peace.

August 26, McComb, Pike County: Hollis Watkins, 20, and Elmer Hayes, 20, SNCC workers, were arrested while staging a sit-in at the F. W. Woolworth store and charged with breach of the peace. They spent 36 days in jail.

August 27 and 29, McComb, Pike County: Five Negro students from a local high school were convicted of breach of the peace following a sit-in at a variety store and bus terminal. They were sentenced to a $400 fine each and 8 months in jail. One of these students, a girl of 15, was turned over to juvenile authorities, released, subsequently rearrested, and sentenced to 12 months in a State school for delinquents.

August 29, McComb, Pike County: Two Negro leaders were arrested in McComb as an aftermath of the sit-in protest march on city hall, charged with contributing to the delinquency of minors. They were Curtis C. Bryant, of McComb, an official of the NAACP, and Cordelle Reagan, of SNCC. Each arrest was made on an affidavit signed by Police Chief George Guy, who said he had information that the two "were behind some of this racial trouble."

August 30, McComb, Pike County: SNCC Workers Brenda Travis, 16, Robert Talbert, 19, and Isaac Lewis, 20, staged a sit-in in the McComb terminal of the Greyhound buslines. They were arrested on charges of breach of the peace and failure to obey a policeman's order to move on. They spent 30 days in jail.

September 5, Liberty, Amite County: Travis Britt, SNCC registration worker, was attacked and beaten by whites on the courthouse lawn. Britt was accompanied at the time by Robert Moses. Britt said one man hit him more than 20 times. The attackers drove away in a truck.

September 7, Tylertown, Walthall County: John Hardy, SNCC registration worker, took two Negroes to the county courthouse to register. The registrar told them he "wasn't registering voters" that day. When the three turned to leave, Registrar John Q. Wood took a pistol from his desk and struck Hardy over the head from behind. Hardy was arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

September 13, Jackson, Hinds County: 15 Episcopal ministers—among them three Negroes—were arrested for asking to be served at the lunch counter of the Greyhound bus terminal. They were charged with inviting a breach of the peace. They were found not guilty of the charge on May 21, 1962, by County Judge Russell Moore.

September 25, L berty, Amite County: Herbert Lee, a Negro who had been active in voter registration, was shot and killed by white State representative E. H. Hurst in downtown Liberty. No prosecution was undertaken, the authorities explaining that the representative had shot in self-defense.

October 4, McComb, Pike County: The five students who were arrested as a result of the August 29 sit-in in McComb returned to school, but were refused admittance. At that, 116 students walked out and paraded downtown to the city hall in protest. Police arrested the entire crowd, but later released all but 19, all of whom were 18 years old or older. They were charged with breach of the peace and contributing to the delinquency of minors and allowed to go free on bail totaling $3,700. At the trial on October 31, Judge Brumfield, finding the students guilty, and sentencing each to a $500 fine and 6 months in jaid, said:

> Some of you are local residents, some of you are outsiders. Those of you who are local residents are like sheep being led to the slaughter. If you continue to follow the advice of outside agitators, you will be like sheep and be slaughtered.

October 5, McComb, Pike County: Charles Sherrod was arrested on the street, thrown into a police car, and charged with resisting arrest. Cordelle Reagan was also arrested and charged with contributing to the delinquency of a minor. Both were fieldworkers for SNCC.

October 11, McComb, Pike County: Paul Potter of Philadelphia, a vice president of the National Student Association, and Tom Hayden of Atlanta, both white, were dragged from their car and beaten as they drove alongside a group of Negroes making an antisegregation march. When the two slowed their car for a traffic light, a heavy-set white man opened the door and dragged the driver out and hit him several times. He then walked around to the other side of the car, opened the door and knocked the second man to the street. The incident occurred in the business section of the city.

October 13, McComb, Pike County: Police Officer B. F. Elmore shot and killed a Negro motorist. Police Chief George Guy said that Elmore said he had stopped Eli Brumfield at 4 a.m. for speeding. Brumfield allegedly jumped from his car with a pocket knife in his hand and attacked Elmore. A coroner's jury ruled Elmore fired in self-defense.

October 22, Jackson, Hinds County: Dion Diamond, a SNCC worker, was arrested for "running a stop sign" after being followed all day. In court the next day, the arresting officer told the judge:

> "He is a Freedom Rider. Throw the book at him."

Diamond was refused legal counsel and fined $168.

November 9, McComb, Pike County: Jerome Smith, 22, Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—field man, and four companions, Dorothy Smith, 18; Alice Thompson, 22; Thomas Valentine, 23; and George Raymond, 18, were attacked by a mob of 30 to 40 whites when they sought service at the lunch counter of the Greyhound bus terminal in McComb. Smith, who suffered head injuries when he was slugged with brass knuckles during the attack, said FBI agents were present at the time of the attack, but did "nothing but take notes" while the mob kicked and beat his companions. The victims were rescued from the mob by a Negro truck driver and Negro cab drivers.

November 10, Jackson, Hinds County: Jessie Divens, 12-year-old, was arrested for refusing to move to the rear of a city bus. Judge Carl Guernsey released the girl to the custody of Rev. G. R. Horton, chaplain of Campbell College where she attended classes. Judge Guernsey continued the case until November 17:

With the understanding that the Reverend Mr. Horton and the child come back with a workable plan which would cause the child's mind to be concerned with education rather than social reformation.

November 18, McComb, Pike County: Persons unknown fired a shotgun blast into the bedroom of Dion Diamond and John Hardy at 702 Wall Street. Investigating officer Frank Williams found shotgun pellets embedded in the window frame.

December 1, McComb, Pike County: Four white men attacked three newsmen on the street, sending one crashing into a plate glass window of a store. The newsmen were Tom Uhrborck and Don Underwood, Life magazine, and Simmons Fentress, Time magazine.

December 2, McComb, Pike County: Police broke up an attempt by white attackers to drag three Freedom Riders from an automobile at the Greyhound bus terminal. Four men kicked at the locked car and beat upon the windows in an attempt to reach the young Negroes and their driver, Thomas Gaither, field secretary of CORE. The police, who were standing by when the riders arrived aboard a bus from Jackson, pulled the men away from the car, but made no arrests.

December 26, Jackson, Hinds County: Rafford Johnson, Negro, was severely beaten by two law officers after being involved in a minor collision with a car driven by a white woman. Johnson underwent surgery for skull injuries.

1962

February 6, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Miss Bessie Turner, 19, a Negro, was walking with a young man down a Clarksdale street when Clarksdale police officers stopped them and accused Miss Turner of having been involved in a theft. Miss Turner said the officers took her to the jail, forced her to unclothe and to lie on her back. She said one of the policemen then beat her between the legs with his belt. A few minutes later, Miss Turner said, the other officer beat her across her naked breasts. Miss Turner filed Federal charges against the officers.

March 15, 1962, Shelby, Bolivar County: Aaron Henry, State president of the NAACP, was convicted in Justice of Peace court on charges of making perverse advances on a white teenage hitchhiker. Henry stated that the charges were a complete fabrication, and presented an alibi supported by sworn witnesses. The conviction has been appealed. When he later stated in a press conference that the prosecutor and the police chief, who figured in the trial, had conspired to frame him, Henry was sued by the two for defamation. A Mississippi white jury awarded the prosecutor $25,000 and the police chief $15,000.

April 12, 1962, Taylorsville, Smith County: Cpl. Roman Ducksworth, Jr., U.S. Army, a Negro, was shot and killed by Policeman Bill Kelly, when, according to an NAACP news release, Duckworth "insisted on his right to sit where he chose on an interstate bus." Policeman Kelly claimed that Ducksworth was drunk and started fighting. No charges were brought against Kelly. Ducksworth was en route from Camp Ritchie, Md., to see his wife who was ill in a Laurel, Miss., hospital.

April 1962, Lucedale, George County: Mrs. Ernestine Denham Talbert, who lives in George County but teaches in Green County, was notified by the Green County School Board that her teaching contract would not be renewed. Mrs. Talbert had tried in January to register to vote but had been refused.

May 17, 1962, Rankin County: The Negro editor, of the Mississippi Free Press, said he and a companion were beaten by Rankin County officers and a highway patrolman. Lawrence Hudson, Jr., of Jackson, said the beating occurred after he was stopped en route from Jackson to Forest to check on a rumor that a Negro man had been killed by a white man. He was jailed, refused permission to phone a lawyer, tried the next day on several charges and fined $151.

June 21, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: A white lawyer from Jackson and four college students were jailed in Clarksdale for 20 hours without outside communication. One of the students was a Negro. William Higgs, the lawyer, and the students were jailed on a Sunday night by county officers and were released the following day, without charges being filed against them.

July 5, 1962, Jackson, Hinds County: Jesse Harris, 20, and Luvaghn Brown, 17, SNCC workers, charged that they were beaten and threatened with death while serving a 30-day sentence in the county jail for contempt of court. The young Negroes had refused to move from a court bench customarily occupied by whites while they were attending the trial of Mrs. Diane Nash Bevel. The young men said that, in the courthouse elevator, a deputy sheriff called Harris "a damned nigger" and beat him about the head with his fist. At the county farm, they were singled out as freedom riders and wore striped uniforms. Both were beaten by guards. Harris was beaten by a guard named Keith while other prisoners held him. Keith beat him across the back with a length of hose threatening:

Nigger, I'll kill you.

August 16, 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: Samuel Block, 23, SNCC field secretary, said three white men accosted him in a parking lot and "started beating me with their fists." He said they threatened him and then beat him for about 5 minutes.

There is no use reporting it to local authorities—

He said.

August 17, 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: SNCC workers Samuel Block, Luvaghn Brown, and Lawrence Guyot were forced to flee from the second story window of their voter registration office. They said armed white men invaded the premises intent upon doing them harm.

August 17, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Mayor Charles Durrough asked Mr. Lenard Davis, a Negro employed by the city, what he knew about the registration school being conducted at a Negro church. Mr. Davis replied that he did not know anything at all about the school, and did not attend any of the classes. The mayor then told him that he, the mayor, knew what kind of school they were having. The mayor said he knew it—presumably, civil rights for the Negro—was coming, and he was not going to allow it to be forced on them. The mayor said that anyone attending the school would be given a one-way ticket out of town, and if that would not do it, they would use whatever they had available. See entry below for September 3, 1962.

August 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: Welton McSwine, Jr., 14-year-old Negro, was arrested by police after a white woman's house had been broken into. When police got the youth to the station an officer said:

All right, nigger, you know why you are here, and we want to know who broke into that white woman's house.

McSwine told them he knew nothing of the incident, saying that he spent all his time in the cottonfield, and suggesting that his mother could corroborate this. McSwine said officers then took him to a cell and beat him, first hitting him in the head with a blackjack; then one of the policemen beat him in the face with his fist while another hit him in the stomach with his club; then the officers made him lie naked on the floor on his side while they beat him with a whip. McSwine was released after intercession of his father's white employer.

August 21, 1962, Liberty, Amite County: Sam Wells and Tommy Weathersby went to the courthouse to register. While they were waiting to get into the registrar's office, they stood on the front porch of the courthouse. Deputy Sheriff Daniel Jones told them:

Get your ——— off the front porch, and don't come back on.

Weathersby and Wells got off the porch. A few moments later, rain began, and the two wanted to take shelter in the

courthouse, but Deputy Sheriff Jones would not permit it.

August 21, Liberty, Amite County: Dewey Greene, Jr., Mississippi Free Press reporter, was taking pictures of Negroes waiting to register at the courthouse. An unidentified young man working in the office down the hall from the registrar's office snatched Greene's camera away, and refused to return it. Greene was told to leave town by three white men, one of whom was flourishing a length of lead pipe. He left.

August 29, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Seven Negroes were arrested after attending a voter registration meeting. David Dennis, CORE field secretary, was charged with failure to yield right-of-way after a police officer had forced him to submit to a long harangue of threats and abuse. Samuel Block, John Hodges, J. L. Harris, Richard T. Gray, and Albert Garrer, SNCC field workers, and Dewey Greene, Jr., reporter for the Mississippi Free Press, were forced by Clarksdale police to alight from their car, and were charged with loitering in violation of the city curfew.

August 30, 1962, Indianola, Sunflower County: SNCC workers C. R. McLauren, Albert Garner, J. O. Hodges, Samuel Block, and Robert Moses were arrested by Indianola police on a charge of distributing literature without a permit. The registration workers had been taking leaflets announcing a registration mass meeting door-to-door in the Negro community. Lafayette Surney, 17, another SNCC worker, was arrested and then released to Rev. James Bevel, of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC.

August 31, Indianola, Sunflower County: During the trial of Samuel Block on charges of distributing literature without a permit, the Municipal Judge informed Block that he could cross-examine the arresting officer. Block asked the officer:

Did you actually see me hand out a leaflet?

The judge turned to the officer and said:

He can ask you anything he wants to, but you don't have to answer.

The judge told Lafayette Surney if he was caught in Indianola agitating again, he would be sent to the penal farm.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Because of registration activity, two Negro-owned dry cleaning establishments were closed—allegedly for violating city ordinances.

September 3, 1962, Rulevile, Sunflower County: Lenard Davis, 49, sanitation department worker, was told by Mayor Charles M. Durrough:

We're going to let you go. Your wife's been attending that school.

He referred to a registration school conducted by SNCC workers in Ruleville.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Fred Hicks, 40, who drove field-workers to the plantations, was told he could no longer use a bus without a commercial license. Hicks said the bus owner told him that, because Hicks' mother had registered to vote:

We gonna see how tight we can make it—gonna make it just as tight as we can. Gonna be rougher and rougher than you think it is.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Moses and Amzie Moore, a local Negro leader, were walking down the street. A white man in a pickup truck drew up alongside and asked if they were the "folks getting the people to register." Moses and Moore answered yes, they were. The man asked if they could come out to his plantation to register people. The two answered, yes, they could come. The man said then:

I've got a shotgun waiting for you, double barrel.

September 3, Ruleville, Sunflower County: A letter from Mayor Durrough notified the Williams Chapel Missionary Baptist Church that tax exemption and free water were being cut off because the property was being used for "purposes other than worship services." The church was a meeting place for voter registration workers.

September 10, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Marylene Burkes, 20, and Vivian Hillet, 19, were severely wounded when an unidentified assailant fired through the window of Miss Hillet's grandparents' home. The grandparents had been active in voter registration work.

October 3, Biloxi, Harrison County: A Negro frame residence and a gasoline station were targets for two "Molotov cocktails" which caused more than $4,000 damage. One of the bombs struck the home of Dr. Gilbert Mason, a Negro physician, who is active in integration efforts. The other crashed through the window of a service station operated by Emmett Clark, a Negro.

October 5, Harmony, Leake County: Night riders fired shotguns into eight Negro homes and a Negro store. An elderly Negro said he was struck in the knee by a squirrel shot while he and his 9-year-old grandson were sleeping. He said he was not seriously hurt. Harmony Negroes had recently petitioned authorities for school desegregation.

October 10, Columbus, Lowndes County: A "Molotov cocktail" was tossed from a speeding car into the home of Dr. James L. Allen of Columbus, vice chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

October 29, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Charles McLaurin, SNCC registration worker, was stopped by police as he was walking a group home from the courthouse. The group had tried to register to vote. The officer asked to see McLaurin's driver's license. McLaurin showed it. The officer asked McLaurin what he was doing there. McLaurin told him he worked in voter registration. Then, accompanied by obscene remarks, the officer said:

Nigger, do you know the way out of town?

McLaurin replied:

Yes.

The officer said, with more obscenity:

Nigger. Can't you say "Yes, sir?"

The officer's partner asked the officer what charge should be put on the tickets.

The officer said:

Charge the —— $26 on both charges. Nigger, you got $52?

McLaurin replied:

No.

The officer said:

Then you're going to jail.

At the jail, McLaurin learned that the officer was Clarksdale Police Chief Ben Collins. McLaurin was in jail a few minutes when his companions posted bond for him in the amount of $103. They decided to forfeit bond rather than run the risk of a higher fine or incur the legal expense of an appeal.

October 31, Jackson, Hinds County: Thomas E. Johnson, a white minister, and a member of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commisison on Civil Rights, saw a group of neighbors dumping garbage on his lawn. Johnson had just returned from taking his car to a safe place because of threats by neighbors to damage it. Johnson sought a peace bond against the man whom he had observed leading the garbage-dumping operations of his neighbors. The man presented 11 witnesses who swore that he had been in their presence at all times on the evening in question. The justice of the peace accepted their testimony and refused the bond. Then the Hinds County Grand Jury indicted Johnson and his wife on perjury charges, because of their testimony at the peace bond hearing.

November 6, 1962, Greenville, Washington County: Two WAF's and two airmen—all white—from the Greenville Air Force Base were fined $55 and given 30-day suspended sentences on charges of creating a disturbance by entering a restaurant and seeking service with two Negro voter registration workers.

December 26, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Ivanhoe Donaldson and Benjamin Taylor, students from Detroit, brought a truckload of food, clothing and medicines for distribution to the Delta's needy families who had been cut off from Federal surplus commodities. The medicines had been donated by a physician in Louisville, and were consigned to Aaron Henry, a licensed pharmacist. They were arrested by Clarksdale police and held for investigation. After police searched the truck on December 27, and found what they described as a drug used to ease the pain of middle-aged women, Donaldson and Taylor were charged with possession of narcotics and bond was set at $15,000. Bond was later reduced to $1,500.

1963

January 17, Canton, Madison County: The castrated and mutilated body of Sylvester Maxwell, 24-year-old Negro, was found by his brother-in-law less than 500 yards from the home of a white family. Mississippi NAACP Field Secretary Medger Evers termed the slaying a "probable lynching."

February 2, Greenwood, Leflore County: Willie Peacock, SNCC registration worker, complained to the Justice Department that officials had refused to register him on two occasions, and had rejected his poll tax payment for this year.

February 20, Greenwood, Leflore County: Four Negro businesses on the same street as the SNCC voter registration office were burned to the ground. Mrs. Nancy Brand, a worker in the SNCC office, reported an anonymous telephone call in which a man's voice asked her if she ever came to the office. When she said "yes", the voice said:

You won't be going down there anymore, that's been taken care of.

The burned businesses were Jackson's Garage, George's Cafe, Porter's Pressing Shop, and the Esquire Club. The pressing shop is next door to the SNCC office, and SNCC workers believed the businesses were burned by mistake. Sam Block, SNCC field secretary, was arrested 2 days later for suggesting there was some connection between the burnings and the registration efforts of SNCC. He was charged with circulating statements calculated to create a breach of the peace.

February 28, Greenwood, Leflore County: Three registration workers were attacked with gunfire on U.S. Highway 82 just outside Greenwood. The shots were fired from a 1962 white Buick. The car in which the workers were riding was punctured by 11 bullets. One worker, James Travis of SNCC, was wounded in the neck and shoulder.

March 4, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: The show windows in the Fourth Street drugstore were smashed, as they have been several times in the past. The proprietor of the store, Aaron Henry, found the damage when he returned from speaking at a mass meeting in Leflore County in connection with the voter registration drive there.

March 6, Greenwood, Leflore County: Samuel Block and three others were fired on from a station wagon which pulled up beside their car as they were parked in front of the SNCC voter registration office. Both front windows were shattered. Police later found the wadding from a shotgun shell buried in the headliner of Block's car, and several pellets in the wall of the building in front of which the car had been parked.

March 12, Greenwood, Leflore County: A 12-year-old Negro girl was attacked by an egg-throwing truckload of white teenaged boys. The girl suffered facial bruises.

March 20, 1963, Jackson, Hinds County: Three shots were fired through the windshield of a car belonging to Mrs. Mattie Dennis while it was parked in front of the home of Mrs. Dennis' cousin, whom she was visiting. Mrs. Dennis is the wife of David Dennis, CORE field secretary for Mississippi. Both have been active in voter registration.

March 24, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: Fire destroyed partially the interior of the voter registration office at 115 East McLaurin Street, making the office unusable and necessitating a search for new headquarters. Witnesses said they saw two white men fleeing the scene shortly before the fire was discovered.

March 26, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: A shotgun blast ripped into the home of Dewey Greene, Sr., father of the latest Negro applicant to the University of Mississippi. Another of Mr. Greene's sons and a daughter have been active in the Leflore County registration project. Greenwood police said they were investigating.

March 27, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: James Forman, executive secretary of SNCC, Bob Moses, and about 10 other registration workers were arrested and taken from a group en route to the courthouse to register after the police dispersed a group of more than 100 Negroes with the use of police dogs.

A Voluntary Medical Care Plan for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, FRANK BOW, has had the foresight to present to this Congress a constructive program dealing with the problem of providing adequate medical care for our elderly citizens. The Bow bill is a progressive approach to the problem, meeting it head on and provides the care required by the free enterprise approach without the stigma of socialized medicine. On April 1, 1963, my distinguished colleague presented his program to the American Academy of General Practice at Chicago, Ill. In this speech he explains the merits of his bill and I am happy to include his speech in my remarks:

A VOLUNTARY MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

(Address of Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, before the American Academy of General Practice, at Chicago, Ill., April 1, 1963)

In his invitation to me, Dr. Rhoades suggested that I might be considered the middle-of-the-road member of this panel. Perhaps that is a fair description, because in almost every aspect of political philosophy I am certain I stand far to the right of Secretary Nestingen, and with respect to medical care for the elderly, I am certainly to the left of those who want to stand pat on the present laws or programs in this field.

Insofar as the provisions of my own legislation are concerned, I am neither left nor right of them but far out in front for I propose to do more and do it better than either of them.

As I said to some of you in Detroit a few weeks ago, you are entitled to an explanation of why FRANK BOW, a conservative member of the House Appropriations Committee, is here at all, for it is most unusual to find such a man sponsoring something drastically new in the field of social legislation.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF HEALTH CARE

Let me say, first, that I have been concerned by efforts to federalize—or nationalize or socialize, you can choose your own term—the health care of this Nation for many years. My interest was stimulated 16 years ago when I became the counsel of the Harness Committee, a congressional committee investigating the lobbying activities of Federal agencies. One of the worst offenders of that era was the Federal Security Agency, predecessor of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Oscar Ewing, Chief of the Agency, was engaged in a widespread lobbying campaign to place the Federal Government in control of all health services of the United States and guarantee cradle-to-the-grave security for every American, the object of his affections was the old Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. His principal agent, who has now returned to Government as a close associate of my fellow panelist, was Assistant Secretary Wilbur Cohen.

The Forand bill of several years ago, the King-Anderson bill of the 87th Congress, and the present Kennedy bill are the direct descendants of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell measure.

When it was discovered that Americans were not ready to accept Government control of all medicine, and compulsory health insurance for everyone, the approach was modified in the Forand bill to include everyone who receives social security benefits. And when the American people refused to buy that package, it was further modified to include only people over 65 who are covered by social security.

Each step of the way Mr. Forand and the other sponsors of the legislation assured their supporters that the retreat was temporary. They say that if we can get hospitalization for the aged under social security, we can get the next Congress to add doctor bills and house calls, and the next Congress to add widows and orphans, and so on, year by year, until we will cover everyone for every health need by a compulsory tax. That would be a sad day for the American people, for as I have often said, government medicine is not good medicine.

ELDERLY NEED PROTECTION

However, I find merit in the proposal to provide a special program to help retired men and women meet the cost of medical care. I am convinced that this is a serious problem and one that deserves the attention of the Federal Government. It is a problem because people who retire must live on reduced income, sometimes greatly reduced. They often lose the group health insurance benefits that protected them during their years of active work or, if they can afford it, they can continue the protection at higher individual rates. However, sadly enough, very many of our retirees cannot afford to pay the premiums necessary to obtain adequate protection.

Most of these people can get along insofar as the customary expenses of a modest or even frugal living are concerned. Their difficulty arises when they are confronted with an unusually large extra expense, such as that of a severe illness, and they simply cannot meet such additional expenses on retirement income.

As members of the medical profession, you know far better than I some of the hardships that older people encounter.

The administration proposal as presently advanced does not solve the problem. The Kerr-Mills law does not solve it, for these people are not medical indigents. They become so only after severe illness wipes out their resources.

It seemed to me that someone must develop a better plan than King-Anderson or Kerr-Mills, and that it should be a plan embodying these fundamentals:

1. It should be voluntary.
2. It should provide generous coverage to take care of major medical expenses, to the maximum possible extent.
3. It should avoid establishing a new Federal bureaucracy.
4. It should avoid Federal control or interference in health care.
5. It should cover everyone who cannot afford to take care of himself.

6. It should be supported by all of the people of the United States who pay taxes, just as almost every other national need is satisfied out of national income.

7. It should encourage family responsibility toward older people.

THE BOW BILL

The basis of the Bow bill is incentive. The incentive is found in tax credits. We state that the United States believes in medical care insurance for everyone. We believe that the special problems of retired people merit a special incentive to encourage insurance protection for them.

I would allow a tax credit up to $150 for each individual over 65 who is covered by a comprehensive medical care policy. The credit would be equal to the actual cost of premiums up to $150. In the income group covered by the bill, those with incomes less than $8,000 per year per couple, there are probably at least 2 million who could take advantage of this tax credit themselves.

Among the other 12 million, many, and I think the great majority, could obtain the same protection if someone else would buy the insurance for them. My bill offers them an incentive to do so. A son for his parents, or perhaps an older man for his widowed sister-in-law, could get a tax credit up to $150 if he provided the protection.

And finally, this, I think, is most important for the future, the tax credit would be made available to any employer who provides the protection for retired employees.

These are incentives that would work.

There will always be some who cannot take advantage of these incentives. For them the bill provides that a medical care insurance certificate with a value of $150 will be issued which may be used by the individual to enroll in an insurance plan. The certificate will be redeemed for cash by the Treasury from the insurance carrier who provides the protection.

PROTECTION AFFORDED

The entire plan would be administered insofar as the Government is concerned by the Internal Revenue Service. That service already handles the special exemptions for the aged. It handles millions of collections and refunds each year. It would be no great administrative burden to add this program.

My bill establishes the minimum benefits which must be included in a medical care insurance policy if the insured wishes to take advantage of the Government incentive or assistance.

These minimum benefits were developed with the help of experts in the insurance business. They inform me that either of the two plans spelled out in the bill could be offered for $150, although this is close to the pure premium cost. And they assure me that if Government assistance opens up a market of 14 or 15 million people, the competition for that market will make certain even richer benefits than the bill prescribes. Approximately half of these people already have some kind of health insurance, and they will be encouraged to provide better protection for themselves. The remainder will certainly take advantage of at least the minimum $150 package.

There are two plans, one a "first dollar" coverage which includes up to 90 days hospitalization, ancillary charges up to $120, physicians services, convalescent home care and surgical charges on the basis of a $300 fee schedule.

The second plan is a co-insurance plan with a deductible feature, which makes it possible to offer more comprehensive benefits.

Either plan offers the elderly person far more protection and assistance than is proposed by the administration bill.

The burden of the plan, on the Federal Government, would appear as a reduction in income rather than an added cost. And it would not be as expensive as my critics claim. If one multiplies $150 by some 14.5 million people the cost appears to exceed $2 billion. We must remember, however, that the protection provided would relieve Federal, State, and local governments of a great part of their current spending for medical care of the aged, and to a large extent it would eliminate the deductions for medical care that are now taken by elderly taxpayers. These considerations bring the actual loss of revenue down to approximately $1.25 billion. This is far more favorable than the unrealistic and far underpriced estimates of the cost of the President's program.

POLITICAL FACTS OF 1963

I regret that there are many people in this country, including many of my friends, who are willing to go along with me on tax incentives, but who draw the line when I propose taking care of those less fortunate who cannot take advantage of the tax incentives for themselves, because they have no income to be taxed, and who have no relatives or former employers able or willing to provide the insurance and take the credit. For some this appears to be too radical, and they tell me that these people can be cared for under the Kerr-Mills Act, or the excellent welfare programs of some States, or by the charity of individual physicians.

I can tell you this today just as surely as I can tell you that I enjoy sharing this fine meeting with you. We are going to do something to take care of the health problems of persons of small income over 65 on a private, voluntary, free enterprise system such as I have proposed, or we are going to have forced upon us a Federal compulsory health system with Federal control and direction of hospitals, doctors, nurses, and everything else connected with hospital care. The provisions of King-Anderson made this self-evident.

My friends who wish to stand pat on Kerr-Mills, those who each day must check nervously the attitudes of members of the House Ways and Means Committee or Senate Finance, those who rely on one or two men in one or the other of these committees to hold off socialized medicine, they are going to lose this battle unless they adopt some constructive alternative, something better.

And it must be done soon.

The Bow bill is not a perfect vehicle, but it is a vehicle around which can be built a satisfactory bill, a program that will serve its purpose, and one that will take the entire issue out of the political arena once and for all.

INADEQUACY OF PRESIDENT'S PLAN

How different would be the case if Congress were to enact the President's proposal.

As you know, he has modified it somewhat. He proposes to give an option on the kind and extent of hospital coverage an oldster can get. This is in answer to our criticism of the $90 deductible feature. The bill last year presumed that an indigent person who needed hospitalization could pay the first $90, and that is not true. Also, he is covering out of general revenue those old people who are not members of the social security or railroad retirement system, a concession to another point of criticism of his 1961 proposal.

The bill is admittedly inadequate. If it were enacted steps would be taken in the next Congress, as Mr. Forand has promised, to broaden the benefits and then to broaden the age group covered and these enlargements of the plan would be accepted and we would be on the way to complete Federal control of health care from the cradle to the grave. That is the alternative to something like the Bow bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

I would like to speak for a moment about financing the administration's proposal.

As you may know, it is supposed to be financed by an increase of one-half percent in the social security tax and an increase in the base to $5,200. This is expected to yield $1.3 billion per year. Social security estimates that the King-Anderson bill will cost only $1.06 billion per year, but these figures are open to serious challenge. Experts in the health insurance industry who have experience in this field estimate the first-year cost at $2.2 billion.

At best, social security financing is in precarious balance. If the health insurance experts are even half right, the proposed tax increase will fall far short of paying the bill. I am inclined to place my faith in the experts in this matter.

And what does that mean to the present system of social security benefits? Admittedly, the present payments are woefully inadequate and they become less adequate as this administration continues its inflationary course. The average retired woman worker receives $62.40 in benefits, the average aged widow $65.40, and the average retired couple $127.10. Social security was supposed to supplement other retirement funds, but in fact it has encouraged many to put off the thought of acquiring such funds.

Also, we must remember that the people of whom we are talking reached maturity about the time of the First World War, came home from war to encounter a bad recession, weathered a 10-year depression at about the time when they should have been in their years of highest earning power. It has been very difficult for the people of that generation to lay aside a great deal for retirement.

PRESENT PROGRAMS INADEQUATE

If we are going to increase social security taxes, we should do something about the present rockbottom benefits. We should do something about the widow who at age 55, having never worked a day, finds herself left on her own without benefits until she reaches 62. We should do something about the high school student whose orphan benefits run out at his 18th birthday, while he has perhaps a year of high school remaining, and who may be forced to drop out and go to work. We should continue those benefits until he graduates from high school. What about the man who is 10 years older than his wife, who retires at 65 when she is 55, and they must struggle along on his meager benefit until the wife's benefit becomes available. There is plenty of room for improvement in the present social security system if social security taxes can be raised, and I think it is dangerous indeed to ignore these needs and jeopardize the entire program by adding this hospitalization experiment to the load.

For there is a limit to what people will pay. Social security taxation is a levy against gross income. There are no deductions. It falls most heavily on the person whose income is least, on young people raising families, working people everywhere. Present law will increase it to 9¼ percent of the first $4,800 of gross income by 1966. Senator RIBICOFF, when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, predicted that people would not be willing to pay more than 10 percent. Increase the base to $5,200 and the tax to support medicine, and we may have reached the limit on our social security program.

Perhaps I have been dwelling too much on why I believe it is important to reject the social security approach.

FREE ENTERPRISE SOLUTION

Let me close on a positive note. The cost of medical care is a problem of our old people. It can be solved without unnecessary Federal interference by using tax incentives and assistance and the facilities of the free enterprise health insurance carriers of the Nation. I believe this is the proposal that must win support of all people who believe,

as I do, that big government is always the enemy of freedom and must be closely controlled by a people who wish to preserve their liberties.

If you agree with that philosophy, you will join me in rejecting absolutely every suggestion for a Government program that is not clearly required in the public interest. And this carries with it the obligation to propose comprehensive and constructive solutions, in accord with our ideas about liberty, whenever new problems clearly require Government intervention. It is easy to say "No" to everything but it is not always right.

I hope that I have contributed something, from the practical political viewpoint, to your thoughts about the medicare issue. I will welcome your comments and suggestions concerning my proposal, for I know that you who are so close to the problem will have a great deal to offer those of us who are dealing with the issue in the Congress.

Judge Loble's Experiments With Juveniles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of my colleagues in the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article by Donald John Giese, which very justifiably praises as well as in detail describes the activities of the Honorable Lester H. Loble, district judge of the first judicial district of Montana, in effectively curbing juvenile crime.

The article, from the March 1963 edition of the Catholic Digest, follows:

JUDGE LOBLE'S EXPERIMENTS WITH JUVENILES

(By Donald John Giese)

Juvenile crimes in Montana are growing fewer, and the credit for it goes to Judge Lester H. Loble, of Helena. Montana had been keeping abrest of the national trend: juvenile crime outpacing population growth by a ratio of better than 4 to 1 until this maverick juvenile judge stepped into the picture.

A recent police study of juvenile crime in Judge Lobles' district (population 50,000) showed felony cases down 49 percent, nonfelony cases down 68 percent, and traffic cases down 75 percent. To appreciate these figures, place them against FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's recent warning that nearly half of all major crimes (robberies, burglaries, murders, assaults, auto thefts) reported in the United States in 1961 were by offenders under 18.

Judge Loble's success took a lot of doing, and involved drastic changes in long-established court procedures. The gray-haired, 69-year-old jurist came to the bench in Helena 8 years ago, from a background of nealy 40 years as a prominent Montana trial lawyer. He took a long look at Montana's juvenile problem.

"Juveniles were being coddled. Their crimes were increasing. They were being protected from the glare of publicity by Montana law, and their parents could hide behind the same cloak of anonymity. People were losing their confidence in the juvenile court system," Judge Loble says, "and in general, the picture was black.

"On top of all this the so-called experts were spoonfeeding us the idea that all juvenile lawbreakers were basically sick, had no free will, and were the helpless victims of society's ills. This, of course, is a lot of high-grade baloney."

The first thing that had to be done, the judge decided, was to get Montana's juvenile court law changed so that all underage felony (serious crime) offenders would appear in an open court (not a closed court, as in most States) and be exposed to the piercing glare, along with their parents, of newspaper, radio, and television publicity. Getting laws changed, as Judge Loble knows better than most, isn't easy.

"I drew up a draft of a new law that would provide an open court for juvenile felons, and sent it to J. Edgar Hoover," Judge Loble recalls. "He sent it back with his complete approval. Then I started touring the State, giving talks, buttonholing legislators, drumming up support for what was a radical new law. When the legislature met, I tried to get the law introduced. It didn't even get out of committee. I decided to try it again the next session."

While Judge Loble waited, he didn't sit quietly. He stumped the State from end to end. People, tired of being victimized by youthful criminals, began listening. They passed along their views to their legislative representatives. Legislators listened. The next time around, in July 1961, the law passed. Juvenile felony offenders would now be treated as adults.

The first juvenile felon to appear before Judge Loble for trial saw a different kind of courtroom. Reporters were present. The public was admitted. Photographers took pictures outside the courtroom. The under-18 offender's name and background were published. All the details—age, address, previous offenses, parents' names—were released.

The result was electrifying. No longer did Montana newspapers print news of a 15-year-old robber. The offender was identified. His friends, neighbors, and relatives saw his name in black print, and heard it on the air. His parents suffered the shock and humiliation of seeing their boy's name bared before the public as a lawbreaker.

One distraught father of a 16-year-old offender rushed up to Judge Loble just before court opened, and pleaded that the judge keep the court closed. "I'll lose my job if this gets in the papers," he cried. Judge Loble was unmoved. "You should have thought of all this 16 years ago," he said.

Cruel treatment? "No," Judge Loble says. Effective treatment? "Very effective," he says.

"We are no longer indicting a whole class of youngsters before the public, as we used to do when we referred in the press to 'a 16-year-old burglar' rather than 'John Doe, 16, convicted of burglary,'" Judge Loble claims. "Now we are putting the finger of publicity where it belongs—on the individual, not the group.

"Parents are no longer getting off easy. Their indifference as parents is exposed, and they suffer consequences they could have avoided by being good parents in the first place. The day of coddling juvenile lawbreakers and their families is over in Montana. We are breaking new ground, and we are getting results."

The police survey of juvenile court cases in Judge Loble's district covered the 18 months before the new law was passed and the 18 months following its passage. It strengthened the judge's decision to go on being a maverick, even at risk of harsh criticism by such fellow judges and progressive juvenile authorities as embrace the philosophy that the juvenile lawbreaker is "sick."

News of Judge Loble's success in Montana has traveled far. He was recently appointed a special adviser to President Kennedy's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. On the long list of authorities who endorsed him was J. Edgar Hoover. A formal report of his progress under the new open-court law has been sent to the FBI Director.

"The people are solidly behind me," says the judge. "They continually support my decision to treat juvenile hoodlums as hoodlums. The people want protection. I owe them protection. That's what they are getting."

Underage felons who go before Judge Loble invariably leave with lasting impressions. "If some young hoodlum slugs and robs a citizen out my way," the judge says, "he gets the full treatment. He might be smiling when he comes in, but when he goes out with the sheriff on his way to the reformatory, he isn't.

"When a kid needs help, I'll help him to the limit," the judge says. "But when a smart aleck; young tough comes in, he's not feeling so tough when he goes out.

"By being firm I've stopped a lot of kids from going on to more serious trouble. Swift and certain punishment, despite what the progressives think of it, is often a great teacher.

"The judges who coddle the youthful offender and embrace the foolish philosophy that he's sick and can't choose between right and wrong are hurting the juvenile himself, society, and the juvenile court.

"Some judges are probationing young lawbreakers to death—sometimes literally, if they go on to more serious crimes and suddenly get hit by a police bullet. Sure, I'll give a good kid—and I think 97 percent of them are darn good kids—a break; but when I do I tell him that if he comes back a second time he'd better bring his toothbrush, because he's going."

While Judge Loble swings a big stick in his court, and appears all business as he sits on the bench in his black robe, he has a heart as big as all Montana. Periodically, at his own expense, he makes trips to the State's reformatory and prison to visit inmates he has sent there.

"I want them to know that the mean old buzzard who sent them away cares about them, and will do all he can to help them—without coddling," he says. "No one has taken a swing at me yet, and the only complaint I've had was from a youngster who said I should have sent him to reform school the first I saw him, instead of the second."

All of the many fees the judge receives for his numerous speeches before civil groups go to the Judge Lester H. Loble Trust Fund, and from there to correctional institutions to be used for the personal needs of the inmates. Thousands of dollars have gone to the Montana State Industrial School, at Miles City; Yellowstone Boys' Ranch, at Billings; the State Vocational school; the House of the Good Shepherd; and the Twin Bridges Children's center.

One man heard Judge Loble speaking on radio, and left $10,000 of hand and machine tools to the Yellowstone Boys' Ranch, which now has one of the finest shops in the country.

Money from the fund has been used to buy dresses for girls who all their lives have worn nothing but hand-me-downs; to make it possible for a youngster to send home a post card, or a small present. It is also used to help send the kids home for Christmas.

"Some of my colleagues, who endorse the currently popular progressive approach, think I'm some kind of fossil, living in the past" the judge says. But, in the face of an evermounting juvenile crime problem which contributes heavily to the $16 million daily cost of American crime of all kinds, Judge Loble is getting unexpected support

from many of those who are now reexamining delinquency.

Speaking at the National Institute on Crime and Delinquency held recently in Seattle, two psychiatrists reported on their success with what they called a reality therapy.

Dr. William Glasser, consultant psychiatrist at the Ventura, Calif., School for Girls, and his colleague, Dr. G. L. Harrington, advised delinquent-youth workers to quit explaining to wrongdoers why they are doing wrong, and point out instead how and why they ought to do the right thing.

"Regardless of what causes his bad behavior," Dr. Glasser reported, "the child is primarily responsible. We assume, as traditional therapists rarely do, that he has a workable set of principles, standards or values. If everyone working with a delinquent child holds him responsible to himself for what he does, the child soon learns the pleasure of doing well and getting credit for it."

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, the newspaper editor and syndicated columnist whose speech on "Moral Decay in America" was one of the most widely discussed talks of 1962 recently wrote in his column that "the more we blame society for youthful outrages and the more society struggles to remove the causes, the more outrages we have."

Jones also observed that "listening to a psychiatrist explain that father rejection caused you to rob the filling station may only give you the idea that some force you can't control is going to make you rob another. If you pay enough attention to the garrulous characters and oddballs who provided material for the Kinsey report, you get the impression that morality is a vapor, and that anything goes.

"No one gains strength as long as he is preoccupied with finding reasons for his weaknesses," Jones wrote. "While self-blame can be overdone by a few overly conscientious individuals, the effort to avoid self-blame at any cost is a far commoner and more debilitating disease."

J. Edgar Hoover agrees with Judge Loble that parents must be made, through publicity or otherwise, to assume their parental responsibilities.

In a recent letter to me, Hoover stated: "Unquestionably, the greatest blame for the current surge of youthful criminality can be placed on parental neglect of children. Due to this neglect, an increasing number of young people are growing up without compassion or concern for their fellow man. In case after case of vicious crimes committed by youth which I have studied, there has been gross neglect of the children on the part of the parents."

In Montana, because of its new open-court law, parents are suddenly taking a greater interest in the activities of their children. Judge Loble feels they are doing a better job of being parents because the penalties for doing a poor job are now more severe, in terms of painful exposure and public censure.

Even though only felony and traffic cases are open to the press and public when a juvenile is involved, Judge Loble feels that nonfelony cases, which are still held in closed chambers have also decreased, 68 percent and 75 percent, respectively, "because parents now know that if they lie down on the job of being parents, the consequences are going to be painful."

Judge Loble makes no claim that he has the answer to the juvenile delinquency problem, but he feels there is a lot of room for improvement in the progressive system.

"Before the progressives judge my system too harshly, I wish they would look at the record, examine the hair-raising statements that J. Edgar Hoover has been making about juvenile crime, and then take a look at how my old-fashioned ideas are working in Montana. That's the main point—they're working. The progressive theories, by any measurement, are failing every day.

"Americans are tired of watching the juvenile crime rate climb year after year. They are beginning to cry out for commonsense in our courts and for action by our judges. That's what we are trying to provide in Montana: commonsense, action."

Emancipation: the Record and the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Chester Bowles:

EMANCIPATION: THE RECORD AND THE CHALLENGE

(Address by the Honorable Chester Bowles, President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, at Lincoln University, Oxford, Pa., Friday, February 15, 1963)

Last autumn I made a month-long trip through 13 African countries. At each of my stops one question was inevitable, urgent, and recurrent: What about James Meredith at the University of Mississippi?

Time and time again, at press conferences, official dinners, and meetings with students, I was asked to explain events in Mississippi, their meaning for the future, and the views of the U.S. Government.

I soon found that the most effective means of extricating myself from a difficult tactical position was to take the offensive.

Where else, I would ask, have you ever heard of a government with such strong convictions about racial equality and such respect for law that it was willing to muster 16,000 soldiers to enforce the right of 1 Negro student to an integrated education?

The Meredith case, I would add, demonstrated that the United States is dedicated to the rule of law and to equal rights, despite the most bitter opposition from many Mississippians.

Fortunately, my questioners were so polite that they failed to ask me what surely occurred to them as an obvious followup question: Why, 100 years after our Emancipation Proclamation, was it necessary to call up an army division to secure a basic human right established under the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution?

The answer to that unasked central question is clear to all of us: The process of fully integrating the 10 percent of our Nation which is Negro into the fabric of American society has been painfully slow—tragically and outrageously slow.

In regard to the democratic rights of our Negro citizens we have lived for nearly a century in a condition of moral sickness—relieved to have ended slavery, but callously indifferent to the child of slavery.

We have refused to face up to the implications of our faith and our democracy; we have postponed the action that our national conscience must demand of us.

And so a majority of Americans have continued to procrastinate and to refuse to become involved—sometimes out of malice or fear, more often because their attitudes have become insulated by the hardened cake of custom.

Yet when the history of our era has been written, it will be said that the pace of progress toward true emancipation has been far more rapid in the last decade than in the preceding nine decades, and that in 1963 the struggle for equal dignity and opportunity at long last began to assume promising new forms and extraordinary new vigor.

It is startling to remind ourselves that only a few years ago Negroes were still segregated in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Indeed I recall my own astonishment in 1949 when, as Governor of Connecticut, I desegregated our State National Guard and discovered that I was the first State Governor to do so.

Of all the changes that have marked these years of progress, however, none has been so important and so dramatic as the change in the attitude of Negroes themselves. In the last few years there has emerged a new sense of urgency, of impatience, of determination.

I might illustrate the pace of this change by citing a personal experience in 1954, the year of the Supreme Court decision.

I had recently returned from service in India, deeply conscious of the influence of Gandhi and especially of the moral power he had used in gaining freedom for his people from British rule: the moral power of passive resistance, victorious against the physical force of an empire.

In the spring of 1954 I was invited to speak at a distinguished Negro institution in Atlanta. In my talk I said that I knew of no case in history where one race had been able to deliver both freedom and dignity to another. Freedom, I said, was something that had to be fought for and won; regardless of the rights and wrongs, it could never be achieved without struggle.

I then described the role of Gandhi in leading such a fight for Indian freedom and how, through a passive but militant program of action, he and his followers eventually triumphed over the vastly superior military and economic power of the British Raj.

I concluded my talk with an appeal to the Negro students present to hold up their heads with pride and confidence and to develop a comparable program of cooperative action directed at achieving the equal opportunities guaranteed under our Constitution and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court.

To my surprise, I found that what I had regarded as a logical, temperate appeal had left my audience in something of a state of shock.

This was later explained by a student leader on the grounds that most of my hearers had never felt any personal responsibility for group action designed to establish their rights as citizens—and were hesitant to accept such responsibility now.

In the following months a remarkable pioneer, Dr. Martin Luther King, a man deeply influenced by Gandhi, assumed leadership in an historic first step toward firm, direct action on the Gandhian model: the Montgomery bus boycott.

Yet the temper of the times was slow to change. Even as late as 1958, when I wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post entitled "What Negroes Can Learn From Gandhi," I received many letters from thoughtful Negroes who questioned my central thesis. Though sympathetic with my objectives, they felt that action by Negroes could not be expected to solve their problem; responsibility belonged to others.

How dramatically the atmosphere has changed in these last 5 years. Today it is evident that Negroes with a new vision and a new commitment to results have taken command.

This is true not only among student groups—although many of them have led the way—but among the older and more established elements as well.

Indeed, what has been most striking about this new movement among our Negro citizens has been its dynamism, its depth of moral

commitment, and its explicit charge of inaction against many leaders of previous generations.

Impatience is the watchword of the new generation of Negro students—and high time it is for such impatience.

Yet impatience is a quality of mind, not a program. What lies ahead? And—the most important question of all—what are the implications of the Negro's struggle for the future of American society?

In the last 10 years the principal focus of the continuing battle for equal rights has been twofold: In the area of school integration—the route to intellectual excellence, and peaceful human relations both inside and outside the school building; and in the area of voting rights—the route to political responsibility.

Let us consider in some detail the first of these basic areas: What has been accomplished, and what we have learned for the future.

Much has been said about progress toward school desegregation, and we should be gratified by this progress. Yet 9 years after the Supreme Court's historic decision, out of 3,200,000 Negro children attending schools in the 17 Southern States and the District of Columbia that formerly practiced segregation, only 200,000 are in fact now attending integrated schools. And of these 200,000 the vast majority are in schools that are either 95 percent Negro or 96 percent white.

In other words, the record still shows that old patterns of segregation remain largely unchanged for the vast majority of Negro students. And because of the complexities of our laws, the opportunities for delay, and court acquiescence in so-called token integration as evidence of compliance, this situation will be slow to change.

As our new Ambassador to Finland, Carl T. Rowan, pointed out in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post "There is something about these legal dodges, these obvious frauds, that leaves me baffled."

Nine years after the Supreme Court's decision, it seems to me that not just Negroes, but all of us, are entitled to ask: Precisely what is the meaning of "all deliberate speed"?

I for one think it means something more than the so-called token integration that we have witnessed so far. I am tempted to say that the 14th amendment, as the "law of the land," should be regarded as exactly that—and enforced like any other law.

Yet it is far easier to deplore the slow pace than to provide effective answers. On the basis of our experience, what can be said about the nature of segregation as a problem?

In the first place, it would be simple but unfair smugly to castigate the South for the snail's pace of integration—for its failure by and large to comply with a court decision that is overwhelmingly unpopular in that region. In view of the equally slow rate of change in many parts of the North, this would be sheer hypocrisy. Segregation is clearly a national problem, not a regional one.

Now can we escape from our national dilemma and responsibility by thinking of integration as purely a legal question dividing those who believe in upholding the law from those who seek to circumvent it. This turns the problem inside out. The Supreme Court acted because the constitutional guarantee of equality involves the deepest political principles of this Nation; on the basis of these principles, segregation poses a moral issue which goes to the heart of our society.

In short, the primary reason why racial discrimination in America must ultimately be ended is not because of a clause in our Constitution, nor, as we sometimes hear, because of the Communist challenge, nor because of the need to curry favor with the new African states which now account for nearly one-third of the United Nations.

The reason is purely and simply because racial discrimination is fundamentally wrong. It flies in the face of our Judeo-Christian heritage, our democratic ethics, our sense of how man should treat his brother.

And it is every bit as wrong in the North, where custom and economics serve unwittingly as the enforcement agency, as it is in the South, where the local police and often the school boards themselves more dramatically strive to hold back the clock.

Let us look the facts squarely in the face: In many northern cities which customarily elect liberal mayors, liberal city councilors and liberal Congressmen, the professed equal protection under law still hides extensive segregation in fact—by residential exclusion and by the natural selection of poverty. As a result, in only a handful of northern cities do more than 20 percent of the Negro students now attend school with white children.

If we are to be honest, therefore, the conclusion seems to me inescapable that an immediate and perfectly executed legal application of the Supreme Court's order—welcome though it would be—would not by itself eliminate the pattern of segregation; it would only establish it along new lines.

This is not to minimize the tremendous achievements of a whole generation of able lawyers and strategists who have fought and won literally hundreds of legal battles on behalf of racial democracy. Without the dedication and leadership provided by such men as the late Walter White, A. Phillip Randolph, Lester Granger, Roy Wilkins, Thurgood Marshall, Robert Weaver, Whitney Young, and many more, we would not be making the extraordinary progress we are achieving today.

Yet these great leaders would be the first to agree that their efforts have been designed to establish the legal rights of our Negro citizens in order to create a solid framework for the civil rights breakthrough which is yet to come—that legal action alone is inadequate to free the 15 million Americans who still suffer discrimination because of the color of their skin.

To illustrate the point, let me briefly consider the present results of integration in the city of Washington, D.C., from a hopefully impartial viewpoint.

Here is a city that has rapidly evolved from a Southern to a Northern community. Yet after a program of successful school integration, approximately 80 percent of the schools in Washington, although theoretically integrated, are in fact still attended mostby by Negro students.

The problem does not lie, as some have charged, in the mechanics of integration. If responsibility can be fixed anywhere, it should focus on the totally inadequate social, health, welfare, and educational programs forced on the District of Columbia by a long record of congressional stinginess, indifference, and neglect.

What can be done about it? A great deal can be done about it—starting with home rule for the Capital City of the United States, continued White House pressure along the lines of the President's recent message, and increased welfare and educational program funds.

In the meantime, our experience in Washton underscores the fact that school integration alone is not an adequate answer. The Supreme Court decision and the enlightened and courageous action of many school boards and city governments in carrying out its provisions are important steps toward the elimination of all discrimination. Yet such action cannot be expected by itself to solve the basic problem.

What can we conclude from these first years of struggle towards full equality for the Negro student?

The primary lesson for us, I believe, is that what has to be changed is not simply the school districting and admission process, but the attitude of the whole community—white and Negro alike.

Court orders cannot transform the hearts and minds of people. A reluctant and grudging acceptance of the inevitable force of the law will prove inadequate, for laws can win support only if they embody the moral purposes of our society.

Therefore, the task of those who are determined to establish equal rights, opportunities and responsibilities for all Americans goes beyond victorious court decisions and becomes a task of persuasion: to convince people that these decisions are right—and especially, to convince white people that integration is not personally or economically damaging.

Only in this way can we bring the divergent elements of every community into growing harmony.

This particular aspect of the problem was aptly put in a recent magazine article in which the writer described our objective in terms of persuading the man who wouldn't mind a Ralph Bunche as a next-door neighbor also to accept a Ralph Brown.

Unless we can so broaden his perspective, white neighborhoods will remain white, Negro will remain Negro, and all the laws, court orders, and Federal directives in the world will not suffice to make a fundamental alteration in the ugly persistent pattern of segregation.

What I am saying is that school integration is not an end itself but one means among many of reaching the fundamental objective of our democratic society which is nothing less than complete social, economic, and political equality for all Americans.

A second means to full democracy, of course, is the right to vote. On this vital issue I am proud of the record that the present administration has made toward the enfranchisement of Negroes in Southern States.

But here again progress is inevitably slow, with a tangle of legal obstacles to be overcome, county by county, State by State.

The 1960 Democratic platform, which as committee chairman I helped to draft, pledges this administration "to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities."

In my opinion, that pledge still stands at the top of our agenda in dealing with the unfinished business of our society.

So much for the lessons of the past decade. What are our responsibilities for the future?

Let me begin with the task facing Negroes.

It seems to me that the basic question that confronts the Negro community today is essentially a tactical one of how our democratic objectives can best be achieved.

As I see it, there are three courses of action available:

At one extreme is the strictly legalistic approach through continued court action and patient efforts at public education.

At the other extreme are those, such as the Black Muslims, who assert that the only answer lies in violence and separation.

A third course which lies between these two extremes can perhaps be best described as a policy of continued legal action backed by a persuasive militancy among all Americans—white and Negro—directed toward the conscience of the white man. It is this combination approach which in my opinion offers the greatest hope to Negroes and to the future of our society.

This brings me to an important point: One of the most remarkable phenomena of the struggle for equality in this country has been the extraordinary patience of most of our Negro fellow citizens.

James Baldwin recently wrote, in "The Fire Next Time," of his immense respect

for generations of Negro Americans who understood that "the country was in no hurry to educate Negroes," and who "put their pride in their pockets in order to do it." He spoke of "that unsung army of black men and women who trudged down back lanes and entered back doors saying, 'Yes, sir' and 'No, ma'am' in order to acquire a new roof for the schoolhouse, new books, a new chemistry lab, more beds for the dormitories, more dormitories."

I share Mr. Baldwin's respect. After 100 years of penitent "Yes, sirs" and "No, ma'ams," it is extraordinary that the Negro's patience has not long since erupted into violence.

However much we may deplore it, a sense of frustration, antagonism, and belligerence after a century of patient and until recently largely fruitless effort, is understandable in human terms. Indeed, it is possible that the new dynamism we are witnessing among today's Negro students and leaders may, in fact, be turned toward negative and destructive channels.

This would be both tragic and self-defeating. Instead of eliminating the evils of segregation, it would tend to perpetuate them.

On the other hand, blind, unquestioning patience, I regret to say, is unlikely to produce results, either. After a century of waiting for the courts and the Government fully to implement the 14th amendment, we may conclude that in this revolutionary era "trickle-down democracy" is much too slow a process.

What is needed is not just equal rights in law but equal skills in fact, leading to equal opportunities. The quality of Negro education must be improved, through local school boards, by court action, by militant pressure from local citizen groups, and by more adequate budgets.

There must also be a greatly invigorated new effort to strengthen and to assist Negro youngsters who are now handicapped by inadequate housing, education, and cultural opportunities.

Can this be done by whites working in behalf of Negroes? Can it be done by legal recourse to the courts, the Federal Government, and State legislatures? To some degree—perhaps to a large degree—it can.

But I believe the major progress that has been made in the last decade has been due, not to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, great as it was, which acted essentially as a trigger, nor to meager and long overdue legislative handouts, but to the new militancy, the new unity of purpose, and the new willingness to make sacrifices which is becoming evident throughout the Negro community.

The problem for the Negro community is to find a constructive approach that is vigorous enough to produce results, yet not so provocative as to close doors that have already been opened or are in the process of opening.

What now can we say of the chief responsibility of all Americans, both white and Negro, in this struggle for the realization of our democratic objectives?

One easy reply is reliance on Government action.

Yet there is a clear limit to what even our Federal Government can do. To be sure, Government must be prodded and pressured; but Government has to deal with scores of problems; and its attention is necessarily divided. Discrimination is only one among many problems, all important, all clamoring for solutions.

For this reason alone, it is shortsighted and inadequate to look wholly to Government. What white Americans need is a new climate of urgency, a new framework for action, a new perspective on the basic problem and the means of dealing with it on a local neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis.

Basic to such an approach, in my opinion, is a nationwide inventory, an analysis, of the civil rights problems of every community in the United States as a basis for community action.

I am not suggesting a critical exercise by unfriendly snoopers armed with slide rules and IBM cards. What I have in mind is an honest evaluation by a committee of public-spirited local citizens of both races, working through religious and civic groups with the support of the community.

The efforts of these committees would be narrowly directed at factfinding. But their reports would inevitably become vehicles for discussion, disagreement and, I am sure, in many cases an evolving consensus about the unfinished business of local democracy and what can and should be done about it.

If the growing national concern about discrimination can be channeled into hundreds of community programs throughout the country, spectacular progress may be achieved in the finest tradition of American democracy.

A citizen's "checklist" for communities both north and south of the Mason-Dixon line might include the following questions:

How many Negroes are members of the police force? The fire department? City hall? The school system?

Do Negroes have a full opportunity to get such jobs? And if so, are they promoted solely on merit and performance?

What kind of housing, both public and private, is available to Negroes? What kind of medical and hospital care?

Is there direct or indirect discrimination in public housing and entertainment facilities?

What about private enterprise jobs? Do Negro workers have jobs which use their skill to the fullest?

Is vocational and professional training freely available to qualified Negroes?

Are the police and the courts as fair to them as to other sections of the population?

A widely publicized, objective study by nongovernmental groups in each city under the sponsorship of a national committee of outstanding citizens, with able and respected local leadership, supported by churches and synagogues, could do much to develop agreement in thousands of communities in regard to such questions.

And once the facts are agreed upon, responsible Negroes and whites working together can learn to deal with them effectively through constructive democratic action.

In closing, let me add a few words about the vitally important role of the Negro in contemporary American history.

Thoughtful observers recognize the new Negro movement toward full equality and first-class citizenship as a unique phenomenon in American society. No other cause is compelling the allegiance of so many young Americans with such intensity and fervor.

This fact has deep significance in the present condition of American society. For the Negro's struggle is taking place within a Nation that too often appears to have forgotten its own moral values, and to have largely lost its sense of positive purpose. Indeed, it may be said that our Negro citizens have a clearer idea of what they really want than any other American.

In our efforts to deal pragmatically with a vast agenda of new and unfamiliar problems, we Americans have been losing something of the moral direction which has always been basic to the health and vigor of our society.

We have not only condoned the slick operator and cynical manipulator; in a backhanded sort of way, we have glorified them. We have adopted the semantics of materialism and manipulation to explain some of our most admirable actions. It is as though we felt it necessary to justify decency by proving that the real reasons for our actions are not so decent as they might seem.

Indeed, at the very moment in history when the true nature of our world contest with communism is coming into focus, we find ourselves faced with a crisis in values. The moral standards in which we profess to believe are marred by our immoral tolerance of tax evasion and false expense accounts, of fake advertisements, the thumb on the scale, the adulterated product, and the exploitation of violence as entertainment.

In our national effort not to seem gullible, not to seem vulnerable to criticism from any quarter, to avoid controversy, and to prove that we are realists who do not "go off half-cocked," we have developed a moral gap between the beliefs to which we subscribe and our actual day-to-day performance. This moral gap can become an increasing danger to our survival as a free society.

It is in this context that I see a special responsibility and opportunity for American Negroes. For in the course of removing our national curse of racial discrimination, the Negro can force all Americans of good conscience to reexamine their own sense of values.

And so the leaders in the civil rights struggle can help to bridge the dangerous gap which increasingly exists between beliefs and actions. They can reawaken in their fellow Americans a commitment to the moral objectives on which our society was founded—and this reawakening can give a new tone, a new vigor, and a new honesty to the American Nation.

Regardless of color, most Americans now know in their hearts that the time for explanations is over and that the time for action is here on the great frontier of civil rights.

The challenge to the American Negro is enormous.

Today we see him increasingly accept that challenge—and in so doing set a standard for all Americans to follow.

Human Frailty and Public Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government have for several weeks been under sharp attack by many segments of the American press. Some of this criticism is deserved. Much of it is not.

While I think many journalistic critics are irresponsibly motivated by partisan politics, I also believe that much hostility stems from genuine disappointment and frustration with the complex affairs of the Nation and of the world. Publishers, editors, and reporters are human. And because they are human they are unwittingly omitting one simple fact from their thinking.

What the fourth estate is forgetting is that we in public life are also human. We are not miracle men. We are not wonderworkers. We are humans. We are subject to all human frailty.

Mr. Speaker, to these well-intentioned critics who often mistakenly assume that to err is un-American, I would like to

call attention to what the San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune—a responsible, conservative newspaper—had to say in a March 6 editorial about human frailty and public figures:

[From the San Gabriel Valley (Calif.) Daily Tribune, Mar. 6, 1963]

TO ERR IS UN-AMERICAN

A paradox afflicts us in the late decades of the 20th century.

We have developed an astonishing tolerance of human frailty as it exhibits itself in individual private lives—even when that frailty leads to the commission of crime.

But we show surprisingly little tolerance of human mistakes and weakness when they crop up in public life.

Admittedly the standards among our public men are intended to be high. If we are sensible we do not deliberately put in positions of authority our weaklings and misfits.

Yet even men chosen for their evident higher caliber have their flaws. Moreover, they are plunged today inta a welter of problems whose size and number are without any shadow of a precedent.

Why should it be assumed, as it evidently is by some, that American officials can—out of the blue—quickly master the delicate, difficult business of lending effective military, political and economic aid to a small Asian land like South Vietnam, a country which has only half a will to help itself?

In our national lifetime, this is an effort totally new.

Why is there such haste to demand great, visible economic improvement in South America, a continent that has languished for centuries in poverty and political immaturity?

The Russians, using the most crushing dictatorial power ever amassed, have been trying to lift their own millions out of the mire for 45 years and have not succeeded yet. Their massive farm problem is unsolved.

Is there any reason we should not make mistakes when, in an unparalleled upsurge, more than 50 new nations suddenly appear on the world scene and we try to cope with them? We have the rough job of nurturing their independence in a world beset by aggressive communism. The guideposts are few.

When, ever before, did we have to figure how to defend a great free city like Berlin, totally encompassed by a hostile enemy?

Spin the globe and note such other trouble areas as Korea, Laos, Indonesia, India and, highest in our thoughts now, Cuba. Each raises unique problems. All can be labeled critical—in varying degrees and different ways.

Not even Franklin D. Roosevelt in World War II had a daily agenda so staggeringly complex as has confronted Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and their free world counterparts in other lands.

And hovering over these men today is the awful knowledge that error can be compounded, in hours, into the near nuclear ruin of this planet.

Surely those persons unable to tolerate imperfect effort must have sure-fire proposals of their own to make Vietnam securely free, turn Latin America toward booming prosperity, snuff out all threat to Berlin and erase the last vestige of Castro from Cuba.

Let's have the perfectionists' plans right now. Human frailty obviously has already cost us dearly.

Foster's Test Ban Treaty Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster directed a letter to Members of the Congress relating to the administration's test ban treaty proposals. I have sent the following letters to colleagues discussing the Foster letter. The American Security Council Washington report referred to in the first letter has been reprinted at page A1697 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: If a nuclear test ban treaty will serve to reduce the world's risks, it is only an effective treaty which will do so—one which in fact stops nuclear weapons progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Negotiation of an ineffective treaty would surrender the benefits an effective one might achieve.

Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster wrote you on April 2 declaring "significant Soviet advances" by cheat testing "would require a series of tests." He added that under present U.S. treaty proposals "the probability is high that any meaningful series would be discovered by seismic and intelligence means."

I respectfully differ with Mr. Foster based on scientific facts brought to light during recent hearings on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The AEC's Director of Military Applications testified that all nuclear weapons of military interest except very large super H-bombs, which the Soviets have anyway, can be developed by underground tests which create seismic signals of very small size.

The Defense Department's seismologist testified about the inherent limitations on seismic instruments to detect and identify as cheat tests signals of this very small size (10 millimicrons and less).

The net effect of this testimony was that intelligent Soviet cheating would create signals which might be detected outside the U.S.S.R., but would be too small to identify as cheat tests. This is because such signals cannot be distinguished from the seismic signal of hundreds of small earthquakes occurring annually in Soviet territory.

Therefore, there exists a big hole for cheating and clandestine development of Soviet nuclear weapons superiority under U.S. nuclear test ban treaty proposals.

This big hole can be closed, and an effective treaty achieved, only by U.S. insistence on manned seismic stations inside the U.S.S.R. Unmanned black boxes won't do the job because they are not tamperproof.

Although Mr. Foster mentions "intelligence" as another means to spot cheating, when one recalls the difficulties even of finding out what is going on in nearby Cuba, wisdom dictates little reliance be placed on this alternative.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban treaty.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Yesterday you received a letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, mentioning the risk of "surprise abrogation" inherent in test ban treaty.

This would be the situation if Soviet's prepared clandestinely in their laboratories for a vital testing series. This could be done over a period of years behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union then would suddenly announce withdrawal from the treaty and capitalize on this surprise factor by conducting intensive tests.

The Director states the risk of Soviet achievement of nuclear superiority in this manner could be reduced by a U.S. policy of maintaining readiness to test in such eventuality.

However, the impossibility of keeping U.S. progress up under these circumstances was adequately stated by President Kennedy on March 2, 1962, in announcing U.S. test resumption following the breach of the then existing informal testing moratorium.

The President's words were as follows: "In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

The Director's letter briefly mentions arguments for a test ban treaty. A more complete and fair discussion can be found at page A1078 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1963.

The subject also is covered in the American Security Council's March 18, 1963, Washington Report which accompanies this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Proposed Shift of the Internal Revenue Service From New York to Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the proposed shift of the Internal Revenue Service office from New York to Boston, and, while I believe in more efficient Government operations, find it difficult to understand how moving operations to the area of lesser demand will save money. It ap-

pears to me that just the opposite will be the result.

The Senate Finance Committee will meet in executive session tomorrow, April 5, to study the matter, and I have made my views known to that august body, recommending that the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to reconsider this decision.

The text of my letter to Chairman BYRD is submitted for the future consideration of my colleagues:

I want to place my views and recommendations before the Senate Finance Committee for consideration at the executive session tomorrow, April 5, being held to investigate the reasons behind the removal and transfer of the New York City regional internal Revenue office to Boston.

The announced reason is that a consolidation of the two district offices will save money. If this is true, I think it would also be true that more money will be saved by consolidating the much smaller district into the much larger district.

The logic of this, it is argued, is upset by the proximity of the Boston site to the Record Center. I submit that unless the proximity is such that material is under the same roof no substantial saving will be realized for this reason.

The plain fact is that the New York district is the main district, and geographically is much better located than the proposed Boston area.

I have just been informed that although it has been publicly stated that the Secretary of the Treasury is reviewing this matter, the entire transfer is proceeding without delay. New York's top officials were sent to Boston on March 15 to arrange the transfer, and on April 3 officials from Boston will come to New York so that plans might be completed by May 1. It would appear that the Secretary's announcement may just be an instance of managed news.

I request the Senate Finance Committee to ask the Secretary of the Treasury to reconsider this decision.

The Need for Hospital Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, President Kennedy sent a message to this body relating to the elderly citizens of our Nation. He said:

Our national record in providing for our aged is a proud and hopeful one. But it can and must improve.

One important measure which would do this, in a most equitable way, is the proposed Hospital Insurance Act of 1963.

The pains and indignities of old age under our present system of medical assistance continue while Congress considers the social security approach to hospital insurance embodied in this bill. It is time that our considerations result in the passage of this bill. It has been thoroughly discussed, its every ramification has been analyzed, and now its benefits should be clear beyond question.

Recently, in the New Hampshire Legislature, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ivan Nestingen presented answers to charges made by American Medical Association spokesmen. Mr. Nestingen described the provisions of the bill and some of the principal reasons why the proposal should be adopted.

Mr. Nestingen's speech is a thoughtful and perceptive one which lists again the overwhelming arguments for the program. It deserves to be read by everyone interested in the problems of our elderly citizens, and particularly by the spokesmen for the American Medical Association. Then, I think, our "proud and hopeful record" will become even better with the passage of this bill.

The speech follows:

THE NEED FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY [1]

(By Ivan A. Nestingen)

It is an honor and a pleasure for me to appear before this joint session of your legislature this morning. I had the good fortune to serve in the Wisconsin Legislature in the mid-1950's, and to return to the State legislative setting, if only for a brief appearance, is a most pleasant experience.

A few weeks ago, Dr. Edward Annis, president-elect, American Medical Association, appeared here and delivered a bitter and grossly inaccurate attack on the President's proposal for hospital insurance for the aged under social security and applied the terms charlatans and quacks to its supporters. I regret his intemperance as well as his distortions and mistruths in discussing this important legislation.

My purpose in appearing before you today is not to join with Dr. Annis in recriminations and abuse, but I want to explain as fully as possible what the President's bill provides for and some of the principal reasons why we believe it is essential that the proposal be adopted.

Before doing so, however, you might be interested to know who some of the charlatans and quacks are who support the President's bill. They number such distingushed people as three doctors who have won the Nobel Prize for medicine. They include Dr. Benjamin Spock, your own Dr. Sven Gunderson, and a list of more than 1,000 doctors. They also include more than half the Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, more than 30 Governors and a host of prominent leaders across the country in the fields of health, education, welfare, government, labor, business, and religion—independent of economic means or political conviction.

We have found support for the bill to be widespread and strong, and there are good reasons for this response.

We owe a great deal to the medical profession, medical science, and others for the brilliant successes in the 20th century in extending life expectancy by a generation since 1900. Due to the fact that many more people are living into the later years and due also to vastly increased costs for medical care, our older citizens are faced with a need for a broad answer of how they can best meet the cost of illness during their retired years.

Most of the young can afford the medical care they need. They are working, and most are covered by adequate health insurance. Further, their illnesses are usually far apart and of shorter duration.

But, many of the 17½ million Americans 65 and older find it difficult, if not impossible, to pay the price for the care that is available. They cannot afford to be ill. Most of them live on their social security income, and have limited savings or other assets. Added to this is the fact that they will be ill more often and longer than younger people.

Modern medicine has handed us the challenge of meeting this problem. A rich nation like ours can no longer ask its proud older people to live in the constant fear that serious illness will make them paupers.

I believe, as do the men and women I mentioned, that social security hospital insurance offers Americans the only logical, practical answer to the critical problem of financing health care for today's and tomorrow's older people. It is the American way. It is the logical extension of a principle established in the social security system 28 years ago.

Stated simply, the basic principle of social security is that Americans should not live out their later years in poverty and deprivation or in fear of such tragedies. Our cash payment program is already meeting one aspect of this. All that the President's hospital insurance program would do is add a new layer of protection against poverty.

Some people may feel that this protection could be better provided through private health insurance. But, for most older people that is not the answer. The problem lies in the high cost of an adequate private health insurance policy and the low incomes of the aged.

The typical older couple in this country has an income of only about $50 a week—less than half the average income of younger couples. Widows and other aged people living alone have an average income of only about $20 a week.

Here in New Hampshire, the average couple 65 or older has a weekly income of slightly more than $54. About one-third of the aged couples have weekly incomes of less than $38. In fact, half of all your retired people have almost no other income than their social security.

Among your older people living by themselves, the average income is $21 a week. If they live with a relative—such as a son or daughter—their average income is slightly more than $11 a week.

Such income can only provide the bare essentials. There is no leeway to buy adequate private health insurance which, when it is available, costs from $150 to more than $200 a year per person.

Today most older people with small incomes and serious illnesses must turn to their children, relief, or charity, if they are to obtain the medical care they need. This should not be the American way.

When aged parents must turn to their children for financial support in serious illness, it all too frequently forces deprivation not only on the children but the grandchildren. Massive medical bills for our older citizens should not be allowed to force younger parents to choose between their elders and their children.

Hospital insurance under social security would make it largely unnecessary to be faced with such a choice.

On the other hand, we cannot in good conscience, give public assistance the leading role in dealing with the health problems of the aged. It is far better to prevent poverty than to force older people to accept pauperism before they can be assured of adequate care.

Dr. Annis would give public assistance the major role in providing medical care. But, he rarely mentions some important facts.

Only half of the States have medical assistance for the aged plans in effect. Many of these States have only a skeleton program. And, of all the money spent for this program,

[1] Before a joint session of the New Hampshire State Legislature, Concord, N.H., Thursday, Mar. 28, 1963.

more than three-quarters of it is spent in three States: California, Massachusetts, and New York—yet those States have only 20 percent of our population.

In New Hampshire, during the month of December, only 106 of your 72,000 citizens over 65 received medical assistance, and it totaled only $3,000.

As State officials, you well know of the demands on the tax dollar—not only at the State level, but the municipal level of government as well. You know, in addition, of the difficulty in obtaining the revenues to meet the many worthwhile requests and proposals you must consider. Public assistance and welfare needs constitute a major consideration in that picture.

A program of hospital and nursing home benefits as provided under the President's bill would be a virtual impossibility for State governments to finance under the Kerr-Mills legislation. Conversely, the savings to State and local government in welfare and public assistance costs can be considerable if the President's proposal is adopted. No better illustration of this can be found than in the income maintenance principle of the social security system, where the number of those over 65 receiving public assistance has steadily declined. Imagine the impact on the relief rolls on State and local government if the 18 million social security recipients of 1962 did not enjoy the benefits of payment of about $15 billion during this past year.

We can translate that experience to this situation where we find, for example, that hospital costs have increased from an average of about $9.30 per day in 1946 to over $35 per day in 1963. The question is not will these costs be met?" but "how can we best meet these costs?"

Even if it is true, as some assert, that the typical aged couple may be able to handle one spell of illness without undue difficulty, the problem remains a serious one. A second illness then means wiping out of assets.

The harsh fact is that the average person can expect two or three hospital spells after age 65; an elderly couple can expect about twice as many, and the average cost of illness per hospital stay for those over 65 is $700.

For these older people, the miracles of medical science which have kept them alive become a painful financial reality.

Before giving you some of the details of the President's social security hospital insurance plan, you should understand this about it: It mainly furnishes a foundation upon which supplemental, private plans can be built--just as social security retirement payments provide a floor of financial security on which greater security can be built.

Furthermore, the program would pay the costs of health services without interfering with the way the treatment is provided. It would not interfere in any way with the freedom of choice of doctor, hospital, or nurse. It would not specify in any way the kind of medical or health care or treatment to be provided.

The program would provide the following benefits:

1. Payment of hospital bills. Each older person would be given his choice of one of three plans—whichever he thinks best meets his needs. He could choose to take 90 days of hospitalization for each illness with him paying $10 a day for the first 9 days, or 45 days of hospitalization for each illness at no cost to him, or 180 days of hospital care for each illness with him paying the national average cost for 2½ days or the hospital's customary total charge for the care provided, whichever is less. The national average cost of 2½ days of hospital care for the first 2 years of the program (1965–66) has been established as $92.50.

2. Hospital insurance would provide for the payment of up to 180 days of skilled nursing-home care following discharge from a hospital.

3. The plan would provide for the payment of all costs over and above the first $20 for each outpatient diagnostic study by a hospital.

4. And, lastly, the plan would provide for the payment of all costs for up to 240 visits a year by visiting nurses and other health workers in the patient's own home.

These benefits would be available to all the social security and railroad retirement beneficiaries over 65. In addition, the protection would be extended to all others who are over 65 and have not had the opportunity to participate in the social security program.

In the long run, almost everyone will receive the health insurance on the basis of his participation in the social security program during his working years. The cost of providing the health insurance benefits to those who are not social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries would be paid by general tax revenues. The cost of the benefits for those eligible for social security would be paid by an increase in social security contributions.

The increase would be one-quarter of 1 percent each on employers and employees and an increase from $4,800 to $5,200 a year in the amount of earnings on which social security taxes and benefits would be based.

The cost, stated another way, to the average worker would be 25 cents a week or $13 a year. The maximum it could cost any worker would be $17.68 a year.

Let me assure you, we shall be doing everything possible to have Congress pass this legislation this year. I believe it will pass. The President wants it passed. As he told Congress in his message asking approval of his program: "We urgently need this legislation and we need it now."

Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while President Kennedy continues to watch and wait Soviet Russia spreads the insidious poison of communism throughout the Western Hemisphere. What will it take to force the President to invoke the Monroe Doctrine and serve notice on Khrushchev to get his troops and his agents out of the Americas? Surely the President cannot be as naive as he seems to be concerning what is going on in Central and South America. Then why does he hesitate while Communist subversion grows and threatens to take over more of the countries in this hemisphere? Mr. Speaker, it is time for the American people and Congress to demand of this administration that it take action to protect this Nation and our neighbors to the south who are struggling to remain free. How fast developments are taking place is pointed out in the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

CLOUDS TO THE SOUTH

Most of Latin America seems to be in turmoil, but the troubles south of the border are not entirely of domestic origin. If anyone doubts the fact that troublemakers outside the hemisphere are stirring the caldron, let him look at developments of the last few days.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev, in statements to the Brazilian newspaper, Ultima Hora, has boldly proclaimed his intentions to penetrate the hemisphere and to undermine U.S. influence. His prime target is Brazil itself, the largest and one of the most unstable of the Latin-American Republics.

Meanwhile, from Yugoslavia comes news that Khrushchev's Puppet Tito is planning a visit to Mexico in the fall, in connection with a scheduled trip to call on his friend Castro.

Mexico's President Lopez Mateos has just paid a visit to Tito and is on his way to Communist Poland. While in Yugoslavia, Lopez described his political relations with Tito as "very good, very satisfactory," adding that he only expected them to improve. It should be obvious that if Mexico and Yugoslavia move closer together, the United States and Mexico may drift further apart. And that means trouble.

Biggest news from Latin America, of course, was the weekend military coup in Guatemala. The story behind the swift takeover of the reins of government by Guatemalan military leaders is fairly clear. Although the ousted President Ydigoras Fuentes was a firm anti-Communist, agitation against his regime by Red and leftist elements both within and without the country had endangered the stability of the Guatemalan Government.

Ydigoras was not what could be called an extreme rightist. He was elected President of Guatemala 5 years ago by a fair, popular vote on a center-democratic ticket. During his term of office he set up more schools than had been built in the past generation, pushed through many liberal reforms, and promoted a series of welfare programs.

This was not enough to satisfy a small band of agitators, who were more interested in creating chaos and instability.

A year ago a series of violent riots, strikes, sabotage, and assassination attempts took place in Guatemala. The agitators were domestic Communists and agents of Castro.

Cuba's second-in-command, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, who learned the tricks of his trade under the tutelage of Col. Jacobo Arbenz, head of the Communist regime in Guatemala from 1950 to 1954, has made no secret of his activities aimed at recovering the lost Red colony on Mexico's southern border.

Although last year's agitation set the stage for the fall of Ydigoras' government, the final spark was lit only last week, with the return to Guatemala of former President Juan José Arevalo, who has been in exile in Mexico.

Ten years ago, the New York Times had this to say about Arevalo: "The start of the rise of the Communists (in Guatemala) can be dated from the moment Professor Arevalo assumed power."

His return to Guatemala last Friday was a signal to the military leaders of that country that the Reds were preparing a full-scale attempt to take over the country.

Although the halting of constitutional democratic government in Guatemala certainly is unfortunate, it is not difficult to understand that the move may have been necessary to preserve long-range freedom and stability in that land. What the violent critics of the new military regime in Guatemala fail to understand is that if communism is allowed a free reign in this or any other country, freedom and stability will have no future.

How a Lobby Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, those who are knowledgeable in the operations of the Congress recognize the important functions which are performed by that group lumped under the generic name of lobbyists. Too often those on the outside of the Congress, those who do not understand the important informational function which the lobbyists play in the legislative process, consider lobbying a mean and underhanded process of wining and dining legislators, playing on their personal weaknesses and vices to gain unfair advantage and undermine the national interest. This is just not the real story, although there are abuses which occur in the lobbying process.

James W. Foristel, legislative representative of the American Medical Association, recently addressed the American Political Science Association congressional fellows on the operation of the AMA as a trade organization and a lobby, commenting on its procedures and feelings. I believe that Mr. Foristel does an excellent job of showing how a lobby goes about the very necessary and honorable process of digging into legislative measures that are of interest to it, letting its members know what the issues are and bringing to the attention of the Congress its feelings on these measures.

Under unanimous consent I include the remarks of Mr. James Foristel, as given before the American Political Science Association Congressional Fellows, at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF JAMES W. FORISTEL

It is my understanding that you folks want to know how the American Medical Association informs itself and its membership about medical legislation at the national level, how the association reaches an official position on such legislation, how it transmits its viewpoint to legislators and, specifically, you wish to know how the physicians of the United States view the current issue of medical care for the aged under social security and what they are doing in a positive way to meet whatever problem exists with a minimum of Government participation and control of the medical profession.

I think you must know something about how physicians organize themselves before you are ready to fully understand the mechanics of how physicians attempt to affect the course of medical legislation. When a physician obtains his license from a State licensure board (and there is no national licensure), just about 100 percent of the time he joins the county medical society for the county wherein he intends to locate his practice. This lowest level of organization for a physician happens to be the most important organization which he will ever join, because, at the monthly meetings normally held by county societies, the physician makes himself a part of the community in which he lives. His county medical society has liaison with all of the local hospitals, with the public health officer for the county, with all of the voluntary organizations that touch upon the health life of the community. It is at these metings with his colleagues that he learns about the new bug in town that is causing an epidemic. It is by this close association that he continues his medical education.

In 95 percent of the cases, the physician also joins a State medical society which holds one or more meetings each year and it is through this organization that he expresses himself on legislative matters which are of statewide interest. Such questions as licensure of physicians and also of licensure of the kindred healing arts are discussed and dealt with. The State health department and the State welfare department, with all of their programs, are dealt with by State officials and many State committees of physicians who look into every facet of public health on a statewide level. It is at these annual meetings that delegates are chosen to represent all the physicians in the State at the American Medical Association.

The AMA has the least disciplinary authority of all levels of medical organizations. But it is through the AMA that 190,000 of the 260,000 physicians deal with problems affecting medicine at the Federal level. It is through the AMA that national policy is set concerning accreditation of medical schools and of hospitals and of many other paramedical groups. In most cases AMA is not the sole judge of accreditation. In the case of hospitals, the American Hospital Association and the College of Surgeons are also members of the accreditation team.

Enough of the background—but just enough to let you understand that AMA plays a minor rather than a major role in the everyday life of a physician who is dealing with members of a local community in his everyday practice.

Now you will want to know how the national association of physicians—the AMA—informs itself and its membership on national medical legislation and how it reaches an official position of either support or opposition to such proposals. The AMA maintains a Washington office of 10 men, 1 of whom is an attorney charged with reading every new bill introduced in Congress and calling to the association's attention any which has an impact on medicine or health. At the present time about 750 such pieces of legislation are introduced in a single Congress (this is a 2-year period). An objective analysis is made of each bill, which is then placed upon the agenda of the AMA's legislative committee—14 men who meet about every 5th week during sessions of Congress and go over medical legislation to recommend a position to the board of trustees and the house of delegates. These recommendations are acted upon in many ways. Sometimes they are accepted in whole; other times in part; and still other times the board or the house will decide in a manner completely foreign to the recommendation made. In any event, once an official position is reached, four other men in the Washington office, charged with the duty of informing Congress of the association's position, carry the word to Capitol Hill.

These men are known as legislative representatives of the association. You may wish to call them lobbyists because they are registered under the Federal Lobby Registration Act. Additionally, physicians all over the United States, made acquainted with the provisions of the bills and the official position of the association, are every one lobbyists at the grassroots rather than in the Nation's Capital. A field service of eight men (with the consent of the State medical societies) traveling about the country out of the Chicago headquarters of the association, with many duties other than legislative, are charged with the responsibility of alerting the profession regarding the seriousness and the imminence of possible action on medical proposals. The rest of the lobby action comes from the grassroots. It is a powerful influence on the course of legislation and it is quite natural that it should be, as these men are schooled in medical matters and their opinions should be based on expertise, experience and education. And they carry a powerful influence, too, because the physicians of the United States are respected persons in their communities, they do much charitable work, they see 2¼ million persons each day and are most often the best posted persons on public affairs that are to be found within a community.

You folks probably find exciting this air about the Nation's Capital. The word "lobbyist" is intriguing to most all Americans. But from the lobbyist's viewpoint let's have a look at his job and especially the people he calls on. Congress, at present, is made up of approximately 58 percent lawyers, 17 percent farmers, 11 percent journalists, 15 percent who stem from the teaching profession, and 3 Members happen to be physicians. Additionally, one delegate from Puerto Rico is a physician. He doesn't have a vote, however. And one Senator might be classified as a physician, since he graduated from medical school, but he chose not to practice even a single day after his graduation. Ten Members of Congress happen to be former FBI agents. Well, this is a look at the men who make up the Congress. They are all well educated. Most all are professional men and their staffs are, too. An administrative assistant to a Senator is paid $17,500 a year. An administrative assistant to a Member of the House is paid approximately $15,000 a year.

You might wonder how a lobbyist who represents an organization with a conservative point of view might get along in the present Congress. The Senate is made up of 67 Democrats and 23 Republicans, and the House has 259 Democrats and 176 Republicans. But the party label means nothing to a national organization which has members in both political parties. The test is how many of these Congressmen are conservatives and how many are liberals concerning the issue in which the association is interested. Fortunately for the physicians, a majority of the Congress still rejects the ultraliberal aspects of the President's program for health care for all people, irrespective of the fact that most of them are able to provide health care from their own resources.

You might wonder how the legislative representative works. With the AMA, where we have 4 men calling on Congress, each has one-quarter of the 535 Members of the 2 congressional bodies. That means about 130 people that each legislative representative must keep track of. In the early part of the Congress, the lobbyist writes to each Member of Congress on whom he calls, notifying him that during the 2-year Congress he will be responsible for maintaining the liaison between the medical profession and the Congressman. He will remind the Congressman of the facilities and information which the association possesses and how the association might be able to assist the Congressman in answering the various questions posed to him by his constituents, especially in the medical field. There are many materials during the course of the year which are furnished by the Washington and Chicago offices of the association to congressional offices. Some of these materials find their way to high school students who are considering a career in medicine—materials which show him the requirements demanded by certain medical schools, the tuition, the enrollment opportunities, and so forth. Some of the materials find their way to high school, college, and even grammar school students who are interested in health statistics or debate material.

The Member of Congress often appears as a speaker before the medical or even lay groups on medical legislative topics and frequently he obtains from AMA information

and the viewpoint of organized medicine which he uses in such appearances.

And it is said, and truly said, that a Congressman would have a hard time with the 25,000 or more bills before each Congress, keeping up with the details and the necessary information for understanding, were it not for the organized lobbies throughout the United States and especially those located in Washington.

And one example of what I consider to be a good lobbying technique is to originate and spread among Members of Congress an idea like the one reflected in this newspaper article.

The AMA Washington office, in addition to the men already mentioned, has three physicians on its staff, one of whom is the director. The other 2 perform liaison with all of the approximately 90 going Federal medical programs. Finally, there are two men in the office from the staff of the headquarters communications office who cover Washington news and report Government and legislative happenings to publications of the association.

Now let's get to the most important legislative issue which confronts, not only the physicians of the United States, but the patients. The real issue is: shall the Federal Government, with a compulsory tax on people of all ages, supply services—in this case, medical services—to all persons past 65, irrespective of the fact that 70 to 80 percent of them are quite capable of providing such medical services for themselves? Or shall we continue to improve voluntary health insurance—which now covers 75 percent of the general population and about 55 percent of the aged—and shall we extend and improve Government assistance to the small fraction of our aged population who need help? This latter choice is the AMA's positive program, or at least a major part of it.

New Government help for the aged comes in the form of the Kerr-Mills legislation, wherein the Federal Government generously contributes anywhere from 50 to 80 percent of the total dollars to any State providing health services for all persons over 65 who, while able to meet ordinary costs of living, cannot meet the cost of an expensive illness.

You know, it continues to amaze me that some social workers argue that we must provide a program for 100 percent of the aged because 15 or 20 percent of them can't provide for themselves. Social workers are engaged in their life's work in administering one or more of the 21 Federal welfare programs already on the books, every one of which is aimed directly at the small percentage of people who cannot help themselves. These people support the King-Anderson concept for all people because they bring themselves to expose any of the aged to what they consider a degrading means test. These social workers obtained college degrees in the methodology of handling public assistance clients and other needy people in such a way as not to embarrass them or even expose to one outsider the fact that the applicant is asking for assistance. And, yet, they talk about a degrading means test, which they themselves must conduct under every Federal welfare program on our books.

What are these 21 Federal programs? Well, one concerns itself with housing for the elderly. Do you believe for 1 minute that we are building housing for all the elderly? Of course not. We are building housing for the needy elderly, as it should be.

We have a Defense Education Act which Congress placed upon the books so that we might add something extra in the race to compete with Russia in the fields of mathematics, the sciences, and in medicine. But does this act provide tuition for every good student? Heavens, no. It provides assistance to defray the tuition and living expenses of those people who are unable to provide tuition for themselves.

And then we have a program for the nonservice-connected veterans. For all of them? Of course not. Just for those who can properly fill out a form 10P10, which in effect says the veteran cannot himself provide for the medical care which he needs from private sources.

And we have programs for aiding dependent children. Does that mean all children? Of course not. Just those children from poor and broken families who cannot afford to raise the child at a minimum level of decency.

And I could go on through the list. You see, if Congress had provided Government assistance for all these things—housing and education and children, etc.—for all our citizens—without regard to income, we would be living under a Socialist government—that is what socialism is—providing for everybody, irrespective of whether the person could provide for himself.

I will not go through all our arguments in opposition to government medicine. You have read most of them in your newspapers and magazines. Suffice it to say we are the only major world power without government medicine. Medical practice in most countries today can properly be defined as socialized medicine. In none of these has the foreign country ever stopped short of covering all of the population. So, to speak of a compulsory financed government health system for all of the aged is only one step away from covering all of the population under such a system, with the experience of all of the rest of the world as proof of such progression.

Do you for one moment wish to imitate inferior medical systems of the rest of the world? Perhaps you are not old enough to remember, but your parents do, 35 or 40 years ago, when American physicians yearned to study in the fine medical schools of Europe and to do residencies there under the fine physicians who stood at the top of their specialties. Today it is unheard of, or at least it is newsworthy that Americans would wish to either study abroad or practice there. The fact is that the doctors of the entire world are flocking to this country. Not only are there 12,000 foreign graduates doing their internships and residencies in this country, representing a large fraction of our hospital staffs today, but there are untold thousands of others who, after completing such training, have become American citizens.

Some of you may have believed some of the vicious arguments that physicians are opposing the President's program for dollar reasons, rather than on the proposition of preserving our highest of all quality care. For those of you who don't live in Chicago, let me read this short article from the October 11, 1962, Chicago American.

It is true at the present time that the leadership of labor unions is dedicated to the proposition that the President's program must succeed in Congress. More than that, their annual meetings contain resolutions urging national compulsory health insurance for people of all ages, which is clearly socialized medicine, however thin or thick you cut this animal.

But the physicians of America do not stand alone. The farm organizations, the business community, the dentists, the druggists, the great insurance industry, are but a small part of those who stand against the socialization of medicine.

I hold in my hand the New York Stock Exchange report which appears in the financial pages of the Washington Star, reporting the market price of stocks and bonds of the thousands of free enterprise organizations in this country. These are all the allies of the fight which physicians make. It is companies like these for which you may work after graduation. These are the companies that hire more than 65 million American employees. These are the businesses which produce the jobs and profits that produce the wealth which ultimately provides the taxes which support our form of government. Would you change this system? Can government feed on itself? Socialization of medicine or socialization of business—what's the difference? Do you stand with this kind of government or would you prefer that this country imitate the socialism, the strong centralized, highly regulated governments of the Old World? If the latter be your choice, will our standard of living drop to the level of the economies of these countries? What country stands strongest, most prosperous? What country is the creditor nation of the world? Can you name one Socialist government which is a creditor nation? Make your own free choice and with that choice will be expressed your active attitude or your inactive acquiescence during, say, the next 20 years of your life. Yes, during this period many decisions about the kind of government and the kind of economy which we will have will surely be made.

Now, I shall be very happy to answer questions for as long as you folks wish to ask them and I will do my best to provide you with the rationalization which the medical profession uses in its reasoning. If I can't answer one of your questions, I will be glad to seek out the information and furnish it to you.

Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Memphis, Tenn., Press-Scimitar, of June 21, 1962:

EVERETT'S OWN MEDICARE PLAN, KERR-MILLS, PLUS REFERRAL SYSTEM

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Representative ROBERT A. (FATS) EVERETT of Union City, Tenn., has organized his own medical referral plan for indigent sick persons in his district.

EVERETT is opposed to the administration's pending King-Anderson plan to finance medical care for needy oldsters under social security.

He contends the existing Kerr-Mills program of grants to States to administer their own programs is preferable and should be given a fair trial.

"I met last fall," he recalled, "with doctors from northwest Tennessee and told them I didn't know how I was going to vote on the King-Anderson bill.

"I told them I'd had a number of complaints from constituents who said they needed treatment but couldn't afford it. The doctors, of course, opposed King-Anderson.

"So, at my insistence, they formed a committee in each of the district's nine counties, with the understanding that any time I had a complaint from a needy constituent I could refer him to the appropriate doctor's committee.

"Since that time I've had three or four complaints and have referred them to the physicians. These people have all been cared for. One man wrote me bragging about the fine service he got from the doctor to whom he had been referred.

"If physicians would do something like this all over the State and the Nation, there wouldn't be any problem."

EVERETT said his mail indicates majority opposition to King-Anderson and approval of a fair trial for Kerr-Mills. Tennessee, he noted, is planning to liberalize its coverage under the Kerr-Mills program.

Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Chicago American, of October 11, 1962:

U.S. MEDICINE SOCIALIZED BY 1972, BRITISH DOCTOR SAYS

NEW YORK.—A British health service specialist yesterday accused the American Medical Association of distorting the truth about Britain's government health plan and predicted socialized medicine will exist in the United States within 10 years.

The British visitor, Dr. D. Murray Stark, said the association tried to wreck President Kennedy's medicare plan by bringing British doctors here to speak against national health systems.

BACK DOWN AT HOME

Murray said the same doctors, when they returned to Britain, "made great efforts" to say they had not spoken against the British health plan in the United States.

Murray is touring this country on a leave of absence from his job as group pathologist at the Kingston Hospital in Surrey, England. He will address medical and other audiences here.

At a news conference in the headquarters of the American Socialist Party, which is paying expenses of his visit, Murray said there is no public opposition to nationalized medicine in Great Britain, and "only a very minor amount" from the medical profession.

HITS A.M.A. "BOGEY"

"It is our impression," he said, "that Britain's medical system has been built into a kind of 'bogeyman' by the AMA in its campaign against President Kennedy's medical proposals."

He said he came to the United States "to tell the truth about our medical system, of which we are justly proud."

The 41st Anniversary of Carl Follen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today, April 4, 1963, marks the 41st anniversary of the establishment of Carl Follen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America. This unit has its headquarters in my congressional district and most of its members reside in the Seventh Congressional District of New York.

The aims and purposes of the Steuben Society of America, in part, call upon the members to loyally support the Constitution of the United States of America by advocating the proper application of its provisions and inculcating the principles underlying true democratic government. Truly, it can be said that the Carl Follen Unit No. 103 has in every way exemplified this aim of the society. Its members are active in local, State, and National matters of importance to our citizenry. Many of them have risen to important positions in their community, State, and Nation. My predecessor in the House of Representatives, Albert H. Bosch, has been a member of this unit since he reached the age of 21.

It gives me pleasure today to congratulate Carl Follen Unit No. 103 on its 41st anniversary and wish for the membership many long years of continued good fellowship and service.

Quincy, Ill.: All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with great pride I announce that Quincy, Ill., has been selected as one of the 11 cities to be designated as "All America Cities for 1963."

The selection was made by the editors of Look magazine in cooperation with the National Municipal League. The distinguished panel making the final selections was headed by Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion. The award to Quincy was for vigorous action of its citizens in bringing about major improvements in their city and thus setting an example of good citizenship to the Nation. The All America City program is now in its 15th year. The names of the winners and the story of the winning cities will appear in the April 23 issue of Look. That issue will show a picture of the "light the bridge" project in which 4,000 Quincy schoolchildren helped to collect $13,000 to install lights on this mile-long bridge over the Mississippi.

The artice will include this statement concerning Quincy, Ill.:

"Quincy just never grew into the 20th century," says its mayor, Wes Olson. "Back in 1899, we were the second leading city of Illinois, and 3,000 steamboats a year came into our landing on the Mississippi River. Fifty years later, we were still back in 1899."

Quincy's ancient sewer and water systems were inadequate, the overcrowded hospitals stacked patients in hallways. Taxpayers refused to vote funds for new schools; slums dotted the river bluffs. Young people were leaving home as soon as they got their high school diplomas, for better opportunities elsewhere.

Now, after years of stagnation, Quincy is moving forward. Its citizens have joined together in a score of civic groups and set to work. They voted nearly $9 million for a new sewer and water system; they raised several million dollars for 400 new hospital beds; they approved a previously defeated plan for civic improvements; they voted $5 million for two high schools. "Our young people like what we've done," says Mayor Olson. "They're not leaving home like they used to."

Quincy was also honored last month by the Toastmaster magazine, the official publication of Toastmasters, International. Featured on the cover of the magazine was a reproduction of the park plaque in Quincy commemorating the Lincoln-Douglas debate which occurred there October 13, 1858, and inside the publication is an interesting review of the city.

Because of the significant award made to Quincy, and because of its unusual character, I include the text below:

The article follows:

QUINCY, ILL.: TOASTMASTER TOWN OF THE MONTH

Quincy, Ill., the "Gem City," was named for one president, John Quincy Adams, and was the scene of an important event in the life of another. It was here that the sixth of the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates was held. An impressive memorial comemmorates the event, and was photographed for the Toastmaster cover picture by Quincy photographer Ray E. White.

As early as 1673, explorers and fur traders were well acquainted with the Indian trading post on the east bluff of the Mississippi. Settled by eastern pioneers in 1822, by 1834 Quincy was incorporated as a city, and became an important stop for travelers and a business and political center. Here Stephen A. Douglas presided in the Circuit Court, and was later elected to Congress. Another famous Quincyan, Nehemiah Bushnell, conceived the idea of a railroad connecting Quincy on the Mississippi with Chicago on the Great Lakes—the great Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad.

Quincy today is a modern industrial city at the heart of a large and fertile agricultural area. Manufactures are many and diversified: electronics and communications equipment, air compressors, mining and oil drilling equipment, ranges, furnaces, wheels, truck and trailer bodies, paper, pulp board, and many others. Wide, tree-lined streets lead to gracious homes. Modern elementary and secondary schools, a 4-year college, business college, and school of horology provide educational opportunities for all; excellent hospitals and nurses training schools guard the community's health. Many clubs give social and cultural advantages in literature, art, and music.

In the natural beauty of hills and bluffs, a system of parks provides many forms of recreation, while the great river offers excellent fishing and boating. Many privately owned boats from rowboats to cabin cruisers, anchor in Quincy Bay.

Quincy has two active Toastmasters Clubs, Downtown 538, and Quincy 129. The city is proud of its popular and able toastmaster mayor, Wesley Olson. Quincy toastmasters are frequently heard and seen on local radio and television, and their services are in great demand on many civic occasions.

When traveling north or south, east or west, stop at Quincy, and attend a Toastmasters meeting. You'll be most cordially welcomed.

Representative O'Konski Urges Continuation of High School Trips to the Capital

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 21 years it has been my privilege to represent the people of my district in Washington, one of the greatest constant pleasures and thrills I receive is to see the stream of visiting high school students to this Nation's Capital.

Certainly in no other city can these youngsters get a sounder and more realistic feeling of the greatness and the stability of this country than by seeing history being made day by day. They actually live through the experience of the processes of legislation, executive action, and the administering of justice under the law—the three facets of the great democratic process under which we live.

Recently I have been disturbed by statements in the press and in other media about the danger to students visit-

ing this city. Because of my fondness for this city and wishing to see every high school student in the country take advantage of a visit to this Federal City, I have done some investigating of the prospects of anything unfortunate happening to a visiting student. The facts I have discovered are most revealing. Police figures in Washington show that of the approximately 600,000 students who visited Washington in 1962, only 1—and I repeat—only 1 from outside the area of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia was the victim of an assault; and this was a case of simple assault. Certainly this does not indicate that any school group need have any hesitancy about coming to this great city.

Further evidence on this matter of crime in the District shows that of the 16 cities in its population bracket, the District ranks seventh in the rate of serious crime reported. Obviously, there are many other cities in the country in which the crime rate is greater than it is here.

But we must face the fact that what happens in this world Capital makes news everywhere. There are perhaps more accredited highly qualified news correspondents in this city than in any city in the country and they do report on all happenings here. Consequently, an event here gets publicity everywhere. Therefore, while I am not trying to minimize our crime rate, I am convinced that while it is not the highest, it is certainly the most widely publicized.

I emphasize that our high school students from throughout the country should continue to take advantage of the opportunity to visit this great Capital of the United States.

Let's Look at the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, few can honestly dispute that what today is often billed as critical objectivity is in reality a partisan opiate of opposition. Like many opiates it distorts the vision, dulls the brain and damages the spirit.

The State Department, as we all know, has received more than its share of astringent abuse from a variety of sources. I do not say that the State Department is always right in what it does. Such a statement would be totally irresponsible. On the other hand, it would be just as irresponsible for me to argue that the State Department is always wrong in what it does.

Yet this is precisely what many foes of the administration would like to have the public believe: The State Department can do no right. It can do only wrong.

It is ludicrous to hear this vitriolic view repeatedly prefaced by the reassuring remark: "Let's look at the facts." It sounds like a simple thing to do, those five little words: "Let's look at the facts." But each day we see new evidence that the simple is the impossible for a great many people.

Should the State Department be open to criticism? Of course, it should. In an open society there must be open criticism. But an open society must also be a responsible society, and in a responsible society there must be responsible criticism. There must be a blending of the two. In recent months we have seen an abundance of the former, but very little of the latter.

Many of my colleagues, I know, share my concern in this regard. It is to offer them encouragement in their quest for responsible criticism that I call attention to an editorial which appeared February 15 in the Long Beach Independent, a newspaper that still looks at the facts in what is rapidly becoming an era of partisan acrimony.

The editorial follows:

BRIEFING CONFERENCE—SNOW JOB OR A SERVICE

Foreign policy briefing conferences are one of the many devices of public relations used by the Kennedy administration. These conferences, conducted on a regional basis, enable the press throughout the Nation to get firsthand background material (usually without attribution) from key officials of the U.S. Department of State.

The value of these conferences is disputed among the journalists. Some feel they are getting a gigantic snow job and no information that is really new; others consider the meetings worthwhile as summaries of U.S. foreign policy and as opportunities to meet some of the people responsible for making and executing that policy.

Having attending several of these conferences, the most recent in Los Angeles, our own feelings are mixed.

For one thing, the conferences are conducted with great organizational confusion on the part of the sponsoring groups, which sometimes seem to know more about remote foreign problems than about how to hold a meeting. There are long stretches when the listener feels that he has been given a massive anesthetic. Occasionally, however, there is illumination, usually during the question and answer periods when the speakers abandon their stuffy State Department speeches and engage in spontaneous discussion.

Some of the more illuminating interludes of the Los Angeles conference this week had to do with:

1. Surpluses: A listener asked the inevitable question about American food surpluses and the hungry peoples of the world. The State Department speaker gave an answer that is not always heard but which makes much sense. First, he noted, there is a limit to the ability of the hungry nation to absorb a particular product. Second, the real solution is for the underdeveloped nation to develop agriculture of its own. Third, the United States must take care that its acts of humanity do not interfere with this development and delay the permanent solution. These are realistic points the earnest humanitarian does not always consider when he urges good works with America's mountains of surplus food.

2. Defense strategy: Contrary to a growing belief, this Nation does not depend entirely on missiles for defense. It still operates strategic bombers and will do so for a long time to come. This is reassurance for the citizen who fears that the Government's preoccupation with space age weapons may leave it helpless to cope with the stone age-type of war which the Communists like to conduct in the swamps and jungles of the world.

3. Nuclear tests: Secretary Rusk, in an on-the-record news conference, was questioned about the progress of test ban negotiations. He stated that the United States cannot engage with Russia in a test ban treaty on trust and good faith. Under such a treaty Russia would have nothing to fear, but the United States obviously would. Said Mr. Rusk, "We need mechanisms of assurance." Our impression is that the administration does not intend to accept any treaty which lacks such mechanisms.

These clarifications are helpful in evaluating the conduct of foreign policy, they justify the time spent by the Department in giving them and of the press in listening to them.

There were, of course, the less satisfying moments—as when a State Department official justified strong United Nations action in the Congo but doubletalked his way out of a question about the lack of strong action in Goa or Cuba or Hungary. Double talk was necessary because the truth is that the U.N. polices offenders who are weak but not those who are strong. Also unsatisfactory was the picturing of Khrushchev as a cooperative chap embarrassed by a recalcitrant Castro. This concept of Castro as other than a puppet on the Soviet knee doesn't square with the history of that relationship. By the way, one might ask: Who is keeping those 17,000 Soviet troops in Cuba, Khrushchev or Castro?

The answer to that one is obvious. Hearteningly, Mr. Rusk used the conference as a forum for stating the Government's deep concern over those troops and for promising that Cuba will not become a base for offensive military operations against other countries of this hemisphere.

This is one of many assurances given regarding Cuba without any elaboration of future U.S. policy. One is left to assume that strong, effective planning is taking place far behind the scenes. Our deep hope is that this assumption is correct.

Lefrak Organization's Rent Freeze Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a most unusual announcement was made a few days ago in New York City by Mr. Samuel J. Lefrak, president of the Lefrak Organization, Inc., and one of the outstanding builders in the country. He is the guiding force behind construction of the apartment development known as Lefrak City in the Forest Hills section of Queens County, my own home county, in New York. This is a city within a city, geared for middle-income families, and when completed in 1965 will house more than 6,000 families, or approximately 25,000 people.

Mr. Lefrak called a news conference to announce a precedent-making program which I believe has been unheard of in the building and construction industry. As its contribution toward stopping in-

flation and stabilizing the economy, the Lefrak Organization is putting into effect a voluntary 6-year rent freeze at Lefrak City based on the April 1963 rent scale.

I feel that this is a most worthwhile move, which most certainly deserves the commendation and the attention of all leaders in the fields of labor, government, and private industry. Mr. Lefrak and his organization have my heartiest congratulations on this unsolicited attack on inflation, one of the country's most serious problems.

I would like to set forth at this point in the RECORD Mr. Lefrak's statement at the news conference on April 2, 1963, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SAMUEL J. LEFRAK, WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to see the press working again. Radio and television did a fine job in your absence, but frankly an awful lot of people missed you.

This news conference has been called for two purposes.

First, as was indicated in our invitation, we want to tell you about our 1963–64 building program which approximates $200 million worth of construction. It will include another Lefrak City for the middle income wage earner to be built in the Borough of Brooklyn, a midcity center in the Borough of Queens with additional office buildings and shopping facilities, our continued participation in the city and State Mitchell-Lama middle income program which the Lefrak Organization pioneered, and our participation in nationwide urban renewal programs including the West Side urban renewal program here in New York.

Secondly, and most important to all of us, is we are advancing what we believe is a procedentmaking program which will have far-reaching effects in our industry. If adopted by the business leaders, it will help check inflation and the further erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar. We hope that everyone will share our deep concern on this point because it strikes directly at consumer purchasing power and the very heart of our Nation's great standard of living.

The Department of Labor recently announced that we have hit an alltime high cost of living index, and we must do something to stabilize our economy.

As we all know, there are three basic family needs—food, clothing, and shelter—and it is these factors which ultimately determine most of the costs of services and goods. It is the cost index of all of these items which determine whether or not our free enterprise system can continue to supply goods in our own market as well as successfully compete in the markets of the world. Already our country is finding it difficult to further stimulate and broaden its markets because of astronomical costs. The loss of highly competitive oversea markets has a direct bearing on the dwindling gold reserves and results in an unfavorable balance of trade.

As we see it, if there is to be any hope in preventing further inflation, we must declare a halt to runaway prices.

How can we achieve an era of stabilization with all its attendant benefits? Shall we do it by denying social benefits provided by our Government to those of our citizens less fortunate than we? Shall we do it by pruning and cutting our defense budget when our very lives and security are involved? Shall we do it by cutting off aid to our allies and the underprivileged nations of the world at the risk of our free institutions under which we enjoy the highest standard of living in the world? Shall we do it at the expense of the white collar worker, the common laborer or the fixed income employee on whose ability to absorb our productivity we must rely?

I believe that the responsibility in the first step for a stabilized economy rests on the shoulders of the leaders and it is their obligation and responsibility to take the lead in their industries for a voluntary stabilization program, with the realization that their individual contributions to a program such as we advocate will endure for all of us and future generations to come, continuing the opportunities which are afforded by the system under which we live and prosper.

In the 58-year history of our company, we have been first in many programs, and it is with great pride that I wish to make the following announcement.

Effective immediately, we are initiating a rent freeze at Lefrak City based on the April 1963 rent scale. We must hold the line.

As one of the leaders in the building industry, we have decided to adopt this program which we call "the Lefrak plan" of rent control on new buildings. This will be another first in the history of our industry. Rent control is not a new concept but voluntary self-imposed rent control is unprecedented. Rent control on prewar apartments is not a new concept but rent control on postwar apartments is. Under this plan, we will stabilize the cost of basic shelter for a minimum of 6 years, under a tenant option program. We strongly urge the real estate industry to follow suit. If this is successful and the concept is followed by management and labor everywhere, then we intend to expand the rent stabilization program throughout our entire portfolio. If this stabilization plan is adopted by basic industry, then the march toward the desirable new era of economic solidarity will have begun.

I intend to personally carry this message wherever possible and by whatever means are at my disposal.

As a matter of fact, I have sent telegrams announcing our program to President Kennedy, Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Wagner, and other leaders of business and labor throughout our country.

I would like to read the telegram that we sent to President Kennedy this morning:

"All Americans should share your deep concern over the eroding force of inflation because it strikes directly at consumers' purchasing power, heart of our great standard of living. The business community must take its place in the forefront in the fight to arrest inflation's crippling progress. To this end, I have today pledged my building organization to freeze rents for 6 years at present levels at Lefrak City, Forest Hills, N.Y., which when completed by 1965, will house 25,000 middle-income residents. I hope that this self-imposed rent control will spur similar cooperation from not only the real estate community throughout the country but from business and labor leaders as well to help stabilize our economic welfare in the years to come."

Ladies and gentlemen, need I say more? Thank you.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable RALPH HARDING, of Idaho, is already well known for his defense of the public interest in matters involving the protection of our great natural resources. In particular, his advocacy of sound soil conservation practices marks him an expert in this field which is of such vital importance to the continued prosperity of our Nation.

On March 29 Representative HARDING appeared before the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in support of additional funds for conservation activity for the coming fiscal year. In his statement he spoke not just on behalf of the farmer who works the soil, but for everyone—producer, processor, and consumer. His remarks reflect my interest in the need for adequate funds for important conservation programs. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his statement to the subcommittee.

We cannot hope to adequately meet the demands of the future unless we take the steps needed to conserve what we already have. Representative HARDING asked that funds be provided to allow merely a realistic minimum program of conservation. I commend his statement to the attention of my colleagues.

REPRESENTATIVE RALPH HARDING TESTIMONY BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, MARCH 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate your courtesy in granting me sufficient time to come personally before your Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations to discuss with you again this year some of my concerns as I look over the funds which have been requested for conservation purposes in the fiscal 1964 budget.

First I would like to say that while I represent an agricultural State and serve on the House Agriculture Committee it is not strictly my interest in the farmers alone that brings me before your subcommittee today.

For conservation of our natural resources concerns all groups in our country, the businessman in the metropolitan area just as much as the farmer. There is no one who does not directly or indirectly benefit from the wise use of our soil and water resources.

That is why so many of us from widely divergent areas are following your actions on these appropriations so closely and hoping that adequate funds to meet the increasing needs for resource improvement and development can be provided.

My first concern this year, as last year, is over the fact that sufficient funds have not been set aside to increase the level of technical people to staff our soil conservation districts.

It is true that the fiscal 1964 budget sets aside an additional $1,072,500 for existing soil conservation districts. But let us take a close look, if we may, at what this amount means when it is distributed on a State basis.

In my State of Idaho, where soil conservation districts number 54 and some 18,598 persons are participating in resource improvement activities, I am informed that of this amount only $12,000 additional will be forthcoming if the total appropriation requested is approved.

And how many additional technicians can be added to these Idaho soil conservation districts where the man-years of technical assistance for each office are continually decreasing as the workload grows, not more than 1½ persons for the entire State.

Conservation district supervisors, both in my State and nationwide, report that each of these districts if adequately staffed would need 1½ additional persons or a total of 81 statewide.

Recognizing the great demands on the budget for other purposes, it was hoped by

the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, as well as the Idaho association, that this staff increase of 1½ persons for each district might be accomplished over a 4-year period.

If this were the case, Idaho should have funds to employ 20 more technicians this year instead of the 1½ persons the present budget would allow.

Right here let me point out that in many ways our conservation program is an unusual one. Locally people organize themselves into conservation districts, choose unpaid leaders and then come to the Federal Government for the technical assistance they need through the Soil Conservation Service. These districts also seek financial help from local and State governments.

If adequate technicians are not available, it can only serve to stifle local initiative and progress. And I am afraid this will be the case in Idaho if we cannot soon provide our people with the aid they request and require.

States the Yellowstone Soil Conservation District in Fremont County in their annual report mailed to my office the middle of this month:

"Requests for assistance from the district are increasing quite rapidly from all phases of agriculture; irrigated, dryland, woodland, and range. The most consistent requests come from the irrigated section, because this area is within short distance of the district office. These requests alone are enough to keep the present work unit staff busy."

The Yellowstone district reports to me that they need at least two more technicians to handle their workload. And this report is typical of the workload situation in the other conservation offices in Idaho and throughout the Nation, I know.

Adequate technical people must be supplemented by sufficient soil and water research staff and facilities. They are part of the same package. One cannot operate efficiently and progressively without the other.

Yet a look at the fiscal 1964 budget reveals that not only are funds for the construction of new research facilities being curtailed, but inadequate funds have been set aside to utilize already existing facilities.

For example, the middle of this month at the Snake River Conservation Field Station at Kimberly, Idaho, we had a dedication and cornerstone laying ceremony with great enthusiasm evident among the participants over what this facility was going to add to the State and to the agricultural industry in particular from the soil and water research planned there.

The construction of the project is well ahead of schedule, I am told, and should be ready for occupancy in July, but the funds set aside in the budget for this plant would leave it standing nearly idle for at least a year. The budget request for an increase of about $50,000, along with other funds in the State which can be allocated for this field station, provide for only a little over $100,000 for this research facility which will benefit not only Idaho, but also our surrounding neighbors—Wyoming, Nevada, Oregon, Montana, Utah, and California.

I urge that the increase for the coming year be $643,300 required to complete the projected implementation instead of the $50,000 included in the budget.

Proving that conservation does concern more than the farmer, the Twin Falls, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce joins the conservation districts in this plea for more funds for the Snake River Field Station.

"We feel there must be some error in providing funds. At the present time the level of proposed appropriation would leave the plant standing substantially idle for at least a year. This would be most difficult to explain and understand."

Then there are the research facilities at Pullman, Wash., whose assignment is to investigate water erosion control on the frozen wheatland soils of the Palouse region. Although not located in my State, Idahoans, too, have much to gain from the results of these studies.

Therefore, I again join Idaho soil conservation experts in urging that the present budget request of $78,000 be increased by at least $200,000 which they tell me would "provide for a sizable effort to tie in with wheatland work proposed at the Snake River station at Kimberly and the proposed soil and water research activities at Pendleton, Ore."

Last year when I appeared before the subcommittee I expressed my concern over the fact that the authorization for agricultural conservation program assistance for aiding farmers and ranchers in bearing the cost of accomplishing soil and water conservation measures had been reduced by $100 million from the $250 million of the previous year to $150 million.

The current budget again carries this proposed reduction. As you know, the committee last year restored this to $250 million. I commend you for this action and urge that this be done again.

Greater emphasis is also needed on weed control research which causes greater agricultural losses than any other pest or crop impediment.

In view of the fact that the University of Idaho is so ideally geared to research of this type, I hope that when such a facility is established it can be at this land-grant college.

Now I ask your subcommittee to look closely at the need for greater emphasis on watershed planning. As perhaps many of you read in the national press, Idaho was hit by raging floodwaters in the early spring of 1962 and again early this year.

The areas most severely damaged are small farming areas in need of the kind of structural and land treatment assistance which can be provided under the Public Law 566 program.

I am told by Lee T. Morgan, Idaho's State conservationist, that in our State alone we need to be engaged in watershed planning at at least double the current rate and the Idaho State Association of Soil Conservation Districts assures me this is true on a nationwide basis.

The water problems in Idaho are extremely complex and frequently it is necessary for the local people to call on the services of both the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Army Engineers. As we all know, the corps' work is devoted to the main water stems, but their efforts need to be supplemented by work upstream on the small watersheds.

The need for greater watershed planning is no more dramatically demonstrated than looking at what happened in the little community of Bancroft, Idaho, hit twice by the floodwaters since 1962.

It is the view of the supervisors of the local soil conservation district that an adequate watershed treatment program, carried out under Public Law 566, could have reduced the amount of runoff during these two floods almost in half and saved many damaged homes and businesses in their community.

I would prefer to provide funds now for adequate watershed development than to extend our tax money on flood recovery after the precious water has been lost and taken a terrific toll of public and private property.

The current budget request of $5½ million, which is the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 1963, for watershed planning enables Idaho to handle only two water planning applications a year. The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts has asked that this be increased to $7½ million.

I urge the approval of these additional funds as does the Idaho Soil Conservation Association.

But watershed planning is just the beginning. Funds spent for planning are not of value unless these plans can be carried out.

The current requests for construction under the watershed program provides for only 36 new starts for 1964 nationwide. This is less than one per State I urge, as do conservation experts, that this be increased by $20 million.

It is noted that the budget request for conservation contains a new item—$6,275,000 for resource conservation and development projects. These were authorized last year under Public Law 87-703. It is the hope of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service that 10 projects can be initiated in 1964.

Several soil conservation districts in my State are interested in this and busy at work with county commissioners and other local people developing applications for consideration.

While one of these initial projects may not be located in my congressional district, nevertheless I want to support this item since indirectly any work of this type does benefit my State and the Nation generally.

I also note in going over the agricultural appropriation requests that there is only $500,000 in the budget for scabies control and eradication. While this departs somewhat from my emphasis on conservation needs, I did not want to overlook this opportunity to call your committee's attention to the need for adequate funds to eradicate this disease which attacks sheep.

My own State of Idaho has fortunately not had a scabies outbreak for many years, but as long as it exists in other areas it does constitute a threat to our sheep industry in the Western States.

Since the States contributed over $1 million last year to fighting scabies I would hope the Federal Government could more adequately supplement their efforts by at least matching the amount of money they are expending for eradicating this disease and eliminate the need for the amounts we spend annually for control purposes.

While I am sure your Subcommittee hears mostly requests for funds and gets few commendations on the vital decisions you must make on appropriations, I do want to take this opportunity to commend you for the action taken last year in strengthening the snow survey and water forecast phase of our program. This has proved of inestimable value in my state in that we have been able to increase the number of soil moisture stations, have added snow survey courses and currently provide our water users with the best forecasts that have ever been available.

With current reports indicating that the snow in Idaho this year is at the lowest level ever recorded, this information will enable our farmers to start immediately to use their short supply of water to the best possible advantage.

I hope you will allow me one last comment on the work on the Soil Conservation Service generally. In my travels throughout my congressional district I am continually impressed with the excellent reports I am given on the work which is being provided by these technicians and the local conservation districts. I have yet to hear one complaint which as your subcommittee members know is unusual for any program, be it Federal, State or local.

These soil conservation people are doing a tremendous job, and I hope the Congress can give them the monetary assistance they so desperately need to carry out their vital work programs.

Federal Spending Fails To Solve Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the mistaken theory that any problem can be solved by throwing Federal money at it, has been disproved time and time again over the past 30 years. The New Deal failed to solve unemployment through hugh increases in Federal spending as did the Fair Deal and now the New Frontier. In spite of the proven record of failure, the big spenders and fuzzy thinking economists who now surround President Kennedy, blithely try to convince the American people that the way to a healthy economy is through more Federal spending. The Kennedy economic proposals show clearly the lack of understanding on the part of the President of our economic system and the people. Unless we can soon reduce Federal spending and loose the forces of private investment and initiative which are the only ingredients for a strong economy, our private enterprise system must collapse and with it go our freedoms. The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News exposes the colossal hoax which has been visited upon this Nation for the past 30 years:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 1, 1936]

COLOSSAL HOAX?

For more than 30 years, liberal economists and Federal bureaucrats have promoted the theory that Government spending is essential to curb or eliminate unemployment. Anyone who looks back over these years—and attempts to match this theory with the facts—is immediately forced to consider the possibility that what the bureaucrats and economists have been promoting is a colossal hoax.

While Federal spending has increased 25 times over this period, the level of unemployment has remained relatively even. Spending by Washington has not solved the problem.

It seems entirely possible that the theory which has maintained for 30 years that the problem could be solved in this way has merely been an excuse for expanding the budgets and activities of the Federal Government.

In his excellent book, "Capitalism and Freedom," Dr. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago explains how this theory has been applied in several different stages over the years.

At first, he says, Government spending was supposed to serve as a pump primer to get the economy moving and to provide jobs for the unemployed. The idea was that the expenditures would be temporary; when the job was done the Government would step out of the picture. This pump priming failed to eliminate unemployment, of course, and in fact was followed by a sharp economic decline in 1937–38.

This failure, however, did not get the Government out of the picture. A new twist was merely given to the theory. It was argued that we had reached a period of secular stagnation, that the economy had become mature and therefore major investment opportunities were already exploited and no new ones were likely to arise.

The solution advanced was permanent Government spending and debt to meet the normal demands for employment of population expansion.

In the years that followed, those who concocted the secular stagnation theory were completely discredited by the vast opening of new avenues for private investment they had never dreamed of. Yet Government remained in the spending and deficit business, still insisting that it alone could solve the unemployment problem.

A new twist to the theory was needed, however, to justify the Government's role. Thus, according to Friedman, the idea of the balance wheel was conceived—an idea still popular with many economists and bureaucrats. By this concept, Government expenditures should rise whenever private expenditures decline, in order to keep the total level of spending stable.

By the same token, Government spending should decrease whenever private spending is on the upturn. But it never works that way. The balance wheel, unfortunately, is not balanced. And that, according to Friedman, is the first mistake in the balance wheel argument. There are others.

When a recession threatens, Government spending is usually much too late to do anything about it. The effect of such spending usually hits after the economy has begun to recover; thus it actually slows down the recovery without helping to mitigate the effects of the original recession.

Moreover, Friedman says, increased spending by the Government under the balance wheel theory only adds to the inflationary bias of the economy.

Sometime soon, no doubt, the balance wheel theory will be as generally discredited as the prime pumping and secular stagnation ideas. But that doesn't mean the Government will stop expanding its budget. As long as there are liberal economists and Federal bureaucrats, there will always be another argument to explain why Government spending is necessary to end unemployment.

Until that basic theory is acknowledged as a fraud, there will always be increases in Government spending. Meanwhile, the unemployment problem will remain unsolved.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of 1943—Their Struggle for Freedom Shall Inspire Mankind for Centuries To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the civilized world has never ceased to marvel at the undaunted courage of poorly equipped patriots who have risen in the face of impossible odds to confront callous oppressors. The Hungarian freedom fighters of 1956 and the Tibetan insurgents of 1959 are cases in point. But with these recent episodes of heroism freshly imprinted on our minds, let us not forget one of the most heart-rending tragedies in this century; namely, the uprising of the 40,000 Jews in the Warsaw ghetto who exactly 20 years ago this month defiantly chose to confront almost singlehandedly the mighty German war machine. They announced to a startled world that they would not die meekly as hundreds of thousands of their brethern had, sacrificial victims on the altar of Nazi superracism. Instead, they elected to die as martyrs, fighting the hated enemy, gun in hand, knowing full well there was little hope their uprising would succeed or that they themselves would live through the conflagration.

It is doubtful whether even a year previous to the uprising these stalwart defenders of human dignity realized the fate that would be forced upon them. They were fully acquainted with Nazi anti-Semitism, but they, like most of the world, could not believe that any human being could stoop to the barbarity and butchery which soon became synonymous with Nazi actions.

But the Nazi noose had been slowly suffocating the hapless remainder of the more than 3 million Jews of prewar Poland, whose ranks had been swelled by the addition of their coreligionists uprooted from their homes in Western Europe. Immediately after the defeat of Poland in the fall of 1939, the Germans had promulgated special laws for the Jews, who were all subject to forced labor and whose assets above a certain amount expropriated. Gradually other restrictions followed which curtailed their religious, economic, and personal freedom—freedoms which should be the inherent right of every human being. Jews were separated from their Aryan neighbors, being forbidden to buy or sell bread with them or doctor them. Every Jew above the age of 12 was compelled to identify himself with a Star of David on his clothing. Violators of these regulations were killed.

This policy of separation entered a new phase as the Nazi masters sought to effect their plan for mass annihilation of the despised Jews. On November 15, 1940, nearly half a million Jews in Warsaw were squeezed into a ghetto whose area of only 100 square city blocks was then sealed with brick walls 10 feet high and barbed wire fences. The Nazi masterminds sought to slowly starve their defenseless victims. Death and demoralization within the compound soon proved the effectiveness of their plan. With only a minority of the inmates employed, ration cards and thus food became exceedingly scarce, although those receiving provisions gave to their less fortunate neighbors. Besides starvation, overcrowding and the lack of sanitation facilities encouraged the spread of epidemics. Bodies were dumped into the streets to be carted away to a common grave. But the spirit of the oppressed Jews was not completely broken. A government sponsored by the Germans existed among them and social services such as schools, libraries, and even a symphony orchestra were kept alive.

This method of separation and starvation proved too slow for the Nazi killers. In the summer of 1942 they turned to more extreme ways of exterminating the inferior race. On July 22, the Germans ordered the Jewish Council to provide 5,000 Jews daily for deportation to labor

camps in the east. Actually these Jews were to be sent to the extermination ovens of Treblinka and Auschwitz. Most Jews were skeptical, but some 40,000 were so demoralized that they lined up to receive the promised 7 pounds of bread and 2 pounds of marmalade with which the Germans had baited them. Of the dubious majority, those who did not succeed in escaping the trap were mercilessly beaten and dragged to the waiting railway cars if they resisted. The daily quota of Jews was raised first to 7,000 and then 10,000 per day. In October the Germans announced that henceforth only 40,000 ration books and jobs would be available instead of 120,000. The unlucky two-thirds were to join their brethren on the nightmarish journey to the dread concentration camps. By the end of that month, only about one-tenth of the original number or 50,000 Jews remained in the ghetto. The other 450,000 had either died of starvation or disease or been shipped to the east. Before the end of the year the area of the ghetto was greatly reduced, being split into two separate ghettos.

One might ask why it was that the Jews in the face of these Nazi provocations did not revolt until 1943 when numerically they were much weaker. Let us remember that before these requisitions, the horrors and the grisly intent of the concentration camps were not fully known.

No effective machinery for resistance or arms existed. It was only when hope died, when the remaining Jews no longer feared Nazi retaliation for their acts against all, especially the weak and the old, that they armed to resist. Then they knew that no matter what course was followed, all were doomed. Retaliation meant nothing. By that time generally the younger and physically more able were left to organize and arm a resistance movement.

The necessary machinery came into being with the formation of the Jewish Fighter Organization—ZOB—which ultimately encompassed all Jewish organizations from the Zionists to the Socialists. They were soon strong enough to assassinate some hated German officials which raised morale in the ghetto. But they were not yet strong enough to openly defy the Nazi master.

This stand could only be possible if arms could be obtained. The Polish resistance movements contributed some guns and ammunition and other weapons were bought, but in the face of German military might, they were still greatly underarmed. But their spirit of choosing death embattled against their German oppressors rather than a quiet end in a gas chamber compensated for much of their material weakness.

Their opportunity to strike back came on January 18, 1943, when the Nazis, after waiting 4 months, resumed their campaign of deportation against the remaining 40,000 Jews. To their surprise, they were met with pistols, hand grenades, and homemade gasoline bombs. In 3 days they quelled, but did not subdue the disturbance. The flame of resistance still burned brightly.

Each side knew that the final encounter was yet to come. The Jews used this period of quiet to further arm and organize themselves. Underground shelters, or bunkers, arms factories, and intercommunication lines were perfected. Defensive operations were subdivided and authority meted out by the central ZOB command. Another clash in March convinced the Germans that a new plan was needed. In the middle of April a new German commander, Gen. Juergen Stroop, arrived with orders to liquidate the ghetto. The Jews were ready to face him.

The clash came on April 19. The Germans, angry that only 200 Jews responded to their order for workers for the Trawniki concentration camp, determined to strike on, ironically, the day before the Passover. The reading of the Sedar gave the defiant defenders courage to repulse this new oppressor, just as they had stood up to Pharoah thousands of years before. The blue and white flag of David was rung up alongside of the flag of Poland as the Jews prepared to defend every tenement and every alley with their last drop of blood. Every Jew had an assignment. The ablebodied were at their battle stations, while the children were ready to run messages and the weak were guarding and distributing food.

The battle raged 12 hours. Deadly fire met and repulsed the German, Ukrainian, Polish, and Lithuanian police who had come to escort the Jews to their place of labor. The Germans retired, although some outlying buildings had fallen into their hands. Each side made preparations for the next round of fighting. Daring Jewish commandoes, dressed in captured German army uniforms, fell on Nazi arsenals to carry away badly needed ammunition. Later, again dressed in the stolen uniforms, they liberated the Polish, Jewish, and German prisoners from the Paiwak jail who then joined their benefactors to face the Nazi fire. Polish Socialists—non-Jews—crept into the ghetto to fight side by side with their Jewish compatriots.

Larger German forces now attacked the ghetto as Nazi planes swooped down to seek out the bunkers of the well entrenched defenders. Tanks rumbled forward, many to be blown up by Jewish suicide squads, clothed in the captured German uniforms, who crawled under them with hand grenades blowing themselves up along with the hated war machines. The Germans began to realize that the determined defenders could only be snuffed out with more systematic, coldblooded methods. A new battle would have to be fought for every block and bunker.

Since they cared little for saving the beleaguered survivors or the rows of houses, the Germans embarked on a policy of leveling the ghetto. Artillery was mounted outside the ghetto and heavy machineguns were installed on roofs of buildings near the Jewish quarter. Their bombardment was complemented by flamethrowers and incendiary bombs and hand grenades. The ghetto was a sea of flames. Victims fleeing the burning buildings were cut down. Blocks of houses were mined and blown up so that they could not become refuges for Jewish snipers. All persons found within shelters were massacred, sometimes with poison gas. During the day, the Germans invaded the ghetto, but at night, when the Jews often executed sorties against them, they left.

With ammunition running low, the Jews were forced to retreat turning from organized military maneuvers to guerrilla tactics. From the rubble of their buildings, they shot at the approaching Germans and emerged to lead forays against the enemy. On May 8, after a 2-hour battle, the Germans blew up the main operational bunker of the ZOB. All 200 defenders, including the main leaders, either died in the blast or were killed or committed suicide. A week later on May 16, the Germans dynamited the great Jewish synagogue. The Nazi General Stroop could report to his superiors in Berlin that there was no longer a Jewish quarter in Warsaw. However, this statement was not entirely correct. Although by the end of May only a flicker of resistance remained among the few remaining Jews who eked out a shadowy existence amongst the rubble, the last guerrillas were not wiped out until the end of September.

As to the survivors of this worst of all Nazi atrocities, the Germans gave no quarter. The sick in Jewish hospitals were shot in their beds. Except for the few that managed to escape and join the partisan forces, the remainder were shipped to the dreaded death camps. The city itself suffered greater destruction than in 1939 when the Germans conquered Poland. In the ghetto itself, only eight buildings remained standing—and these were not intact. But the price was not small. For the thousands of Jewish martyrs dead, the Germans had lost hundreds dead and a thousand wounded besides countless war material.

But more important, the true nature of Nazi savagery was starkly revealed to the world by this handful of doomed Jews who knew that they would lose. Under Nazi oppression, the Jews had turned the other cheek more than 70 times 7 times. But when their only choice was that between which kind of death, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto did not hesitate. They scorned the passive death of the gas chambers or ovens of the Nazi concentration camps which were the reward for those Jews who managed to survive the inhuman train ride there, packed in railway cars for days. This method of destruction was the one chosen for them by a victor who, in typical Nazi fashion, showed a sadistic contempt for human values. Instead, these heroic Jews of Warsaw elected the death of martyrs, upholding not only their own pride and dignity, but that of the whole human race.

Mr. Speaker, the heroic struggle of these Jewish martyrs during the Warsaw gettto uprising shall serve as a monument to the courage of the Jewish people for centuries to come. As we pay tribute this month to their tremendous sacrifice in the cause of human dignity, let us resolve that the free world shall

never again permit such genocide against any people because of their race, religion, or ethnic background. If this can be done, then their tragic death was not in vain but instead shall serve forever as a beacon, reminding mankind of its responsibility toward its fellow man.

Nursing Home Care in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, introduced a bill, H.R. 244, which would accomplish several needed reforms in the Veterans' Administration. Among other things, this measure seeks to provide authority for the Veterans' Administration to operate at least 2,000 beds of the nursing-care variety.

Chairman TEAGUE has appointed a Special Subcommittee on Intermediate Care, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, the other members being the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable RAY ROBERTS; the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT SECREST; the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable HENRY SCHADEBERG; and the gentleman from Kansas, the Honorable ROBERT ELLSWORTH.

The Veterans' Administration expects to conduct a study some time after the first of July 1964, and to spend some $150,000 surveying various facilities which provide care of this type.

The full Committee on Veterans' Affairs is currently receiving testimony from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr. As soon as these hearings are completed it will be my purpose to hold a series of subcommittee hearings to develop the facts about nursing care and thereafter make a report on the needs, with suggestions as to possible avenues to solve this pressing problem.

It is encouraging to have the support of the national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans, Mr. Chet Huber, in this program as indicated by his article which appeared in the April issue of the DAV magazine.

Under unanimous consent I include this letter as part of my remarks:

CAPITOL REPORT

(By Chet Huber)

We are especially pleased to actively support a fine humanitarian measure that has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, OLIN E. TEAGUE.

Anyone who would have cared to inform himself would have concluded long ago that the Disabled American Veterans has always been vitally interested in all disabled veterans. As a matter of fact, it has always been our position that hospitalization and medical care are outstanding benefits which should be provided by the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabilities and the non-service-connected who cannot defray the cost of hospitalization.

The purpose and intent of this bill (H.R. 244) is to provide additional pension and medical assistance to veterans suffering from seriously disabling non-service-connected disabilities and to provide for expansion of health facilities for them. An increase in pension is provided for those in need of regular aid and attendance and those who are housebound because of disability.

The Administrator of the Veterans' Administration would be authorized to establish and operate 2,000 beds for the furnishing of nursing care. In other words, it would provide nursing homes run by the Veterans' Administration for veterans.

Everyone is aware of the growing need for attention to the health problems of our elder citizens. The President has expressed an interest in support of the basic plan for intermediate care.

Intermediate care is needed for that group which exists between those for whom hospitalization is essential and those for whom domiciliary care is indicated. They require more care than can be given at home. For instance, those suffering unduly from advancing age, recovery from strokes, chronically ill, frail and needy; and otherwise severely handicapped. What better program could be supported than one which provides help for veterans who not only served in the Armed Forces during wartime but also contributed to the development and strength of the Nation by their early labors and who are now beset by severe infirmities?

We have heard many expressions from others of undying concern for the old and needy veteran. Here is a chance to do something substantial and practical to aid him. Our continuing interest in the disabled veteran is again manifest by our active support of H.R. 244.

We are gravely concerned about the need for increased rates in death compensation for the surviving widows, dependent parents and minor children of veterans who died from wartime service-connected disabilities. The death compensation rates for this group have not been increased since January 1, 1957, even though the cost of living has increased over 6 percent during this period.

We feel that a substantial raise in compensation is in order and we will actively support legislation to bring about the desired result. Dependent parents are in dire need of additional assistance due to their advanced age and the rising cost of living.

Trade Between United States and Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, trade between the United States and Japan has been assuming increasing proportions in recent years. Second only to Canada as a market for U.S. exports, Japan accounting for close to one-tenth of total U.S. exports. This growing market is of great significance to a number of our domestic industries.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two articles which very succinctly illustrate this point: "Growing Market in Japan for Many U.S. Manufacturers" from the February 25, 1963, issue of Export Trade; and "Japanese Order Here—Utilities Spend $91.5 Million" from the Journal of Commerce of January 21, 1963. The articles follow:

[From Export Trade, Feb. 25, 1963]

GROWING MARKET IN JAPAN FOR MANY U.S. MANUFACTURERS—ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS BASED UPON U.S. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AMONG BEST

(By Samuel Ishikawa)

NOTE: Mr. Ishikawa is secretary-treasurer of the Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., an organization comprised largely of U.S. importers.

A widely held conception of trade between this country and Japan pictures U.S. exports as consisting mainly of raw materials, involving a limited amount of man-hours in production, while imports, for the most part, are of low-cost standardized manufactured items, produced with intensive, underpaid labor.

This picture was never completely accurate, though Japan has been and continues to be a major outlet for raw materials, such as coal, petroleum, and surplus farm products. In recent years, however, while continuing to buy items in the United States, Japan has sharply stepped up its purchases of manufactured products in this country.

On the one hand, for example, U.S. exports of machinery and vehicles to Japan rose 259.5 percent, from $84 million in 1956 to $302 million in 1961. But, on the other hand, U.S. exports of grains to the same country rose only 1.5 percent, from $96 million in 1956 to $97.8 million in 1961, and during the same period, raw cotton exports from this country to Japan were up only 23.1 percent from $189.1 million to $221.5 million.

TEXTILE IMPORTS DECLINED

The raw cotton export level, incidentally, was maintained and increased, although cotton textile imports from Japan, harassed by U.S. restrictions, declined 17.1 percent, from $84.1 million to $69.7 million, over the same period.

A typical example of the increased importance manufactured goods now play in U.S. export trade with Japan occurred when the General Electric Co. announced that it had obtained orders totaling $91.5 million from two major power companies, Chubu Electric Power Co. and Tokyo Electric Power Co.

The equipment ordered included turbine generators, and other highly technical electrical mechanical equipment, such as electronic data processing machines. Work on this major Japanese order, according to General Electric officials, is taking place in several of the firm's plants throughout the country.

THE NEW APPROACH

General Electric's success in this heavy electrical equipment order reflects the approach a number of leading American manufacturers are taking toward industrial development abroad: The assumption that the mushrooming industrial growth in countries like Japan offers, not a threat to the domestic market, but rather an opportunity to increase export sales volume.

It is true, that transportation costs combined with an often exaggerated but still existing wage differential limits the export potential of consumer products, such as transistor radios, watches, and most apparel items, to Japan.

However, as proved by the mammoth electrical equipment order obtained by GE, plus U.S. Department of Commerce export figures over the last several years, Japan

is a steadily growing outlet for many types of advanced, highly engineered U.S. products including machine tools, office machinery, for example electronic computers, industrial machinery, such as air and gas compressors, paper mill machinery, woodworking machines and recording and controlling instruments.

CHEMICAL EXPORTS RISE

Machinery is not the only product category that has been finding ever increasing acceptance in export trade with Japan. The actual sales figures of U.S. chemical exports to Japan reveal a more than 100 percent rise from 1956 through 1961, with annual sales volume over that period increasing from $70.4 to $153.2 million.

Major chemical items purchased by Japanese industry include polyethylene and synthetic resins and plastics, detergent alkylates and other organic surface acting agents, additives for lubricating and fuel oils, coal-tar and other cyclic chemical products, medicinal and other pharmaceutical preparations and pigment paints and varnishes.

FALSE FEARS

Significantly, the changing nature of U.S. exports to Japan provides abundant evidence that this country need not fear that the development of industry in foreign democracies threatens the stability of our domestic manufacturers. In fact, it is more likely that new technologies now being developed by U.S. firms will stimulate even greater export volume to Japan. In order to accomplish this, not only for export trade to Japan, but also to many other countries with an expanding industrial base, many firms are stepping up their research and development outlays.

TRADE PARALLEL

Of course, as the flow of U.S. products to Japan grows, a parallel increase in Japanese manufactured imports to this country will take place. During the 1956 through 1961 period, while total U.S. exports to Japan were rising from $887.3 to $1,731 million, Japanese imports into this country were also rising—from $547.6 to $1,076 million. Virtually every import category in the 5-year period covered showed a marked increase in dollar volume except, as previously noted, cotton textiles, which were down 17.1 percent, and plywood down 29.5 percent.

In 1961, machinery and vehicle imports from Japan to this country, although substantially less than our exports in that category, which totaled $302 million, still amounted to a very significant $176.8 million. This represented a marked increase over the 1956 machinery and vehicle import total of $23.6 million.

DIFFERENT EXPORTS

But the machinery items imported from Japan differ widely from the products exported to Japanese industry. For example, although U.S. sales of sewing machines and radios to Japan are virtually negligible, imports of these items in 1961, totaling $20.7 million and $85 million respectively, account for over 50 percent of the manufactured hard goods shipped by Japan into this country.

In 1956, imports of Japanese radios and parts totaled only $2.5 million; the increase of over 4,000 percent is in large measure due to the rapid growth of the Japanese transistor radio industry, built largely through extensive investment in research and development consumer goods by Japan's electronic industry. One leading Japanese manufacturer, Standard Radio Corp., as a case in point, spends roughly 7 cents out of every sales dollar on research and development. The U.S. research and development average is approximately 1.5 cents per sales dollar.

It is apparent that this country will continue to import Japanese consumer goods—not only radios and sewing machines, but also cameras, toys, etc.—products that Japan's industry, because of its ability to maintain high standards of quality in manufactured goods requiring precision in workmanship, can sell in the United States at prices that are competitive with those of U.S. industry.

THE TEXTILE QUOTA

Japan will also seek to sell a reasonable amount of textile products into the U.S. market. For the past 5 years, however, Japanese cotton textile exports to this country have been limited by quota to roughly 2 percent of the output of the domestic industry. Due to the inflexibility of the quota, Japan has never been able to ship in the maximum allowable amount that she could fulfill.

It is doubtful if all restrictions on cotton textile imports will be removed in the next few years. But, Japan may be expected to press this country for larger quota limit—say 3 percent of the domestic industry's output—especially in view of U.S. favorable balance of trade with her.

50-50 PROPOSITION

As far as this country's exports to Japan are concerned, the growing Japanese industrial base will absorb a significant volume of advanced machinery and equipment in coming years. How substantial this volume will be is largely contingent on the supply of dollar exchange, earned through exports to the United States, available for purchases here.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Jan. 21 1963]

JAPANESE ORDER HERE—UTILITIES SPEND $91.5 MILLION

An announcement that two Japanese electric utility firms will spend $91.5 million for turbines, substations and electrical distribution gears in General Electric plants scattered throughout the country was widely hailed by U.S. public officials, because the work involved will help provide thousands of jobs, and thereby reduce unemployment, according to George N. Spitz, assistant, to the secretary-treasurer of the Association on Japanese Textiles Imports, Inc.

Here is his report:

This heavy electrical equipment order from Japan followed closely on the heels of a statement by Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, that Sekisu Chemical Co., Ltd., one of Japan's largest chemical firms, would erect a plastics plant in one of the most depressed areas of Pennsylvania.

But despite these two excellent, though far from unique, contributions to this country's welfare by Japan, the impression persists in many influential U.S. circles that Japanese imports from here consist only of raw materials, such as cotton, wheat, minerals, etc., which involve little man-hour time in preparation.

It is true that Japan does absorb a substantial portion of this country's raw materials. In cotton, as a case in point, the Japanese are a major buyer of our surplus stocks, purchasing, for instance, slightly over 1 million bales (21 percent) of all exports from our most recent crop—by far the largest amount.

However, only a small portion of this returns in the form of cotton textiles. For example, less than 15 percent, above 130 million bales, of Japan's raw cotton purchases from the aforementioned recent crop came back in processed form (i.e., manufactured into fabric or apparel, etc.).

SET VOLUNTARY QUOTA

Actually, shipments of cotton textiles into the United States have been, for some years, restricted by an export quota voluntarily imposed by the Japanese themselves. The 1962 quota limit was fixed at 275 million square yards. U.S. manufacturers, on the other hand, annually produce in the neighborhood of 11 billion square yards.

Although of little significance to domestic textile manufacturers, who are now reaping record profits, Japan's cotton goods exports are vital to her economy, providing the necessary dollar reserve for purchase of U.S. products (e.g. the electrical equipment now on order from General Electric or the plastic plant planned for one of Pennsylvania's depressed areas).

For these reasons, this country might well consider encouraging Japan to reasonably increase her cotton exports to a more realistic limit—say, 400 million square yards in 1963.

An increase, such as this would hardly be noticed by a domestic industry, which annually produces in the neighborhood of 11 billion square yards. In fact, it would contain Japanese cotton goods imports at a level slightly above 3 percent of U.S. output—only a little more than the approximately 2 percent now permitted to enter.

At the same time, however, a modest increase, such as the one suggested could be of far-reaching benefit to both countries. For one thing, Japan would obtain more U.S. dollar exchange, thus, enabling her to spend more money on U.S. products. This might spur a further downward movement in domestic unemployment. In addition, as is usually the case, when trade between nations grows, the standard of living in each might advance.

Finally, by encouraging Japan to modestly step up her cotton textile exports to this country, the bonds of friendship between two leading industrial democracies would be further cemented. This is of no small importance in a world threatened by the mammoth trade offensive now being mounted by the Sino-Soviet trade bloc.

NRECA's Clyde Ellis Replies to Slanted Article in Fortune Magazine Against Rural Electrics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, earlier an article from Fortune magazine was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe that it is highly proper to insert the following letter to the Fortune editors by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association written by the general manager, Mr. Clyde T. Ellis.

The Ellis letter to the magazine is reproduced below:

MARCH 13, 1963.

EDITOR, FORTUNE MAGAZINE,
Time & Life Building,
Rockefeller Center,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Fortune magazine (February) paints a highly distorted picture of the rural electrification program. We regret that a publication of the caliber of Fortune has accepted as fact so many of the cliches of the power companies' campaign against rural electric cooperatives.

The article is manifestly unfair to the rural electric cooperatives and to the nearly 5 million American families who own and operate these enterprises.

Contrary to the thesis of your article, rural electrification has not deviated from its origi-

nal purpose. Today, rural electric cooperatives remain in their original territory—the areas which they pioneered and helped to develop. The fact that some of this territory has prospered does not obviate the responsibility and the right of the cooperatives to continue serving the areas.

Despite the fact that some areas have grown in population, rural electric cooperatives continue to serve the most difficult and the most sparsely settled areas of the Nation. Nationwide, the coops average little more than three consumers per mile of line. Today, just as in the 1930's, no commercial company will accept the risks and the challenges of serving this kind of territory.

To meet the growing power needs of these areas, rural electric cooperatives must have low-cost financing. The 2-percent interest rate set by Congress has proven to be a workable formula which has enabled these far-flung areas to develop and to contribute to the total economic and social strength of the Nation. Averaged over the life of the rural electrification program, the 2-percent interest rate has essentially covered the cost of the money to the Government. And, of course, this does not take into account the enormous economic and human benefits which have accrued to the Nation from rural electrification.

In comparing rural electric cooperatives and the commercial power companies, it is regrettable that Fortune did not fully inform its readers of the tremendous subsidies and preferential treatment enjoyed by the commercial companies. As regulated monopolies, these companies have benefits and special treatment not accorded any other American business.

One of the most obvious subsidies to the companies comes under provisions of the 1954 Internal Revenue Act. Under sections 167 and 168 of this act, the companies have collected more than $1.5 billion as taxes from ratepayers that they have not paid to the Federal Treasury. This interest-free money is an outright subsidy.

Now that Fortune, in its own fashion, has surveyed rural electrification, it seems only fair that the magazine take a look at the commercial power industry. We believe that simple detailing of the activities of this industry, unvarnished by editorial comment, will shock the readers of Fortune, regardless of their political or philosophical outlook.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS.

The Professor's Notebook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, John Edwards, owner, publisher, editor, and general factotum of the West Side News, of Kingston, Pa., deserves our compliments on his fine newspaper.

In the edition of the West Side News of February 28, 1963, appeared an excellent and challenging article which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call it to the special attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people:

THE PROFESSOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Dr. Hugo V. Mailey)

Most talk in recent years has been about the welfare state and how it is running away with our democracy. But perhaps we should devote more study to the warfare state and how it is running away with our economy.

No one argues that this country needs an adequate defense system. If the United States is to protect its own borders and the free world (except France, of course) then the paramount concern should not be money.

The President forcasts a $12 billion deficit for next year. Many economists have offered their comments on whether the proposed budget deficit is dangerous to the economy. There is no need to add to those voices.

But has the average citizen ever had a look at the budget to see where the spending goes? The major part of the spending is military spending. Close to 80 percent of the Federal Government's budget is assigned to defense—directly or indirectly; for past or future wars. The spending is so heavy and great that many sound minds now claim that military spending is a drag on the economy of the Nation. And what's more, the benefits of the military drain accrue to just a few States to the disadvantage of three-fourths of the States and more than three-fourths of the population of the country.

Wouldn't it be paradoxical if we stumble into peace because we cannot afford war? Wouldn't it be ironical if we all embraced disarmament because we are committing economic hari-kiri?

It has been argued that military spending would create millions of jobs. And jobs are created. But military spending is never plowed back into the domestic economy. The products of military spending sit until they become obsolete. Useful goods, which become productive, are never produced. So we wonder why our economic growth lags, and why the European countries show a high rate of economic growth.

Our budgeteers then offer to bring back prosperity by such palliatory measures as the 35-hour week, tax cuts, greater budget deficits, more military spending, extensions of credit, more profit incentives, more inflation, more public spending.

Our unemployment has been between 5 and 6 percent despite the rise in the military budget. Other nations of the free world have shown far lower rates of unemployment—between the 1 percent in Germany and the 4.3 percent in Italy. They have also spent less on military hardware (which has been a source of irritation to President Kennedy).

The United States alone has been devoting a very substantial chunk of its resources to military purposes since 1947. These same resources in European countries and Japan are being devoted to productive investment. The U.S. Government finances about 65 percent of all research and development in this country, and by far the larger portion is for military purposes. In Germany, 85 percent of every research dollar is private, and, therefore, goes into the civilian economy. The same is true with Japan. In England, 60 cents of every research dollar is governmental and goes into military purposes, and so her growth rate is low like ours.

In other words, the economic competition from abroad derives from the fact that research money is used to automate, modernize, and replace equipment in order to develop new products. Our civilian economy is heading for disaster, because our scientific personnel, our brains, our energy, and our dollars are going for military purposes. Expenditures on armaments have begun to yield a diminishing economic stimulus to our economy.

The big question is, How can the armament expense be materially reduced so that an era of business growth is achieved and at the same time offer ample protection to our country?

That leads to the second question. How is this ever possible in view of the fact that military spending is embroiled in politics? A chartered jetliner brought the California Democratic congressional delegation to Washington when the Congress convened in order to pull a powerplay and make certain that no contracts were lost. Many Washington pundits thought this was a brazen way for the California politicians to flex their political muscles.

If California is the No. 1 State in congressional power, it is going to be the No. 1 State in defense contracts. It now receives 24 percent of the procurement billions. The whole Midwest—the heartland of the United States—gets only about 12 percent, and most of it for conventional military spending. The argument is offered that California has the brains, and the contracts will follow the brains. But the truth of the matter is that there has been pirating of scientists by States like California, which the Federal Government had set up in the missile business in the first place.

It is the Federal Government that starts the buildup or research center, and once a key installation is established, naturally more contracts and more business flock to it.

The significance of this is that the areas which need redevelopment receive less and less. These areas have about 19 percent of the population, 30 percent of the jobless, produce about 10 percent of the country's goods, and get about 3 percent of the National Government's defense contracts.

The military contracts have produced thousands of nomads roaming the country toward the Pacific coast. The social disturbance that this military contract chasing is causing the country is incredible. Communities are disrupted, Government tax bases are upset, families are divided, children are changed in schools, and delinquency increases. And the hard core areas of unemployment remain.

So the daily nudging of the Defense Department goes on for more contracts for defense areas (like California), otherwise there will be unemployment. States become insatiable. But never is the multi-billion-dollar military procurement program ever threatened. Under such conditions, how can Skybolt production ever be cut off without incurring the wrath of the politicians of the States where the unemployment occurs.

It is brought into sharp focus that our swollen military budget is only partly related to legitimate defense needs. Just look at the incessant sparring between Congressmen and Senators over what State should get how much. We might just be adding to our overkill capacity, first or second strike, at the expense of our economy. What was to be a largess to all is largess to only a few.

It is plainly clear that brutal economic arguments are now being added to the idealistic ones to bring the arms race to a halt.

Dollar Benefits of Youth Conservation Corps Work in National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture to see if estimates could be made of the dollar benefits that would result from the work of a Youth Conservation Corps in our national forests. I found his answer to be rather startling.

A very conservative estimate by the Forest Service indicates that the direct and indirect dollar benefits of a Youth Conservation Corps would be about $7,000 per enrollee as compared to the annual cost per enrollee of $3,895.

I think my colleagues would be interested in reading the Forest Service's full report. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the report along with copies of my correspondence with the Agriculture Department:

APRIL 2, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know I have joined with other of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to authorize a Youth Conservation Corps. While it is my own feeling that the most significant argument for this legislation is the personal benefits for the individual enrollee, I am also quite aware of the great benefits that would result in the work of conserving our natural resources.

I would very much appreciate it if the Forest Service could make estimates of the actual dollar benefits that would result from the work of YCC members in the national forests. If possible, would you also include the delayed and indirect benefits such as eventual timber sales and recreational revenues.

With continued best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington D.C., April 3, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: This acknowledges your letter of April 2 to Secretary Freeman, who has referred it to us for reply.

Attached is a statement which has been prepared showing the potential benefits from a Youth Conservation Corps program. We believe that it will serve the purpose you had in mind in your inquiry to the Secretary.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. SWINGLER,
Acting Chief.

POSSIBLE ESTIMATE OF DOLLAR BENEFITS FROM YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS WORK

There is over 300,000 man-years of development work on the national forests that is available for accomplishment by a Youth Conservation Corps.

The direct financial revenues to the Treasury from the national forests, if all of this work was accomplished, would rise to over $200 million annually by 1972. Payments from national forest revenues for county schools and roads would increase correspondingly. The capital value of the timber, forage, and lands of the national forests would increase by about $2 billion.

The timber stand improvement and reforestation work would contribute materially to a long-term investment resulting in timber production of 21 billion board feet of sawtimber annually by the year 2000, worth $350 million annually in timber sales.

In addition to direct financial income to the United States as a result of national forest development, there will be both substantial secondary benefits and very real intangible benefits. Secondary benefits include such things as numbers of people employed directly on the program work and the harvesting of national forest timber and other products and the value added to those products by manufacture, distribution, and marketing.

In timber alone, it is estimated that for every dollar of national forest stumpage sold, the end products will be worth about $20 by the time they reach the ultimate consumer. The estimated employment directly associated with the utilization of timber harvested from the national forests will amount to about 800,000 man-years annually by 1972. This will be more than twice the current level.

Development of the recreation facilities on national forests would serve the recreationists who will be putting into trade channels by 1972, $1.5 billion for sporting equipment, transportation, licenses, lodging, and other items.

Development and improvement of the small and big game habitat and fishing waters by a Youth Conservation Corps would increase the use of many national forest areas by hunters and fishermen. It is estimated that fishermen and hunters spend about $10 for each man-day visit to national forests. Increase of this use through improvement of the wildlife habitat would put a large share of this man-day expenditure into the local economy.

Of the reservoir of national forest work available to a Youth Conservation Corps program and the resultant total benefits, the following examples indicate possible benefits attributable to the program.

On a national average, recreationists spend about $5.50 per person-trip day. It is estimated that national forest recreation visitors spend about half of this average, or $2.50 per man-day. Every family recreation unit constructed by a Youth Corps on the national forests, at an approximate cost of $1,000 per unit, would return approximately $1,060 annual expenditures by recreationists into the local economy in a year or two. It is estimated that a Youth Corps of 15,000 enrollees could conduct at least 12,000 family recreation units annually, which would return approximately $12 million into the local economy in a year or two.

Millions of acres of young growth timber stands on the national forests or of timber stands partially or completely denuded by fire, inserts, diseases, or other causes will, when culturally treated, return $5,000 or more in 10 years on a $3,000 investment. There are nearly 30 million acres of national forests lands in need of such treatment. A 15,000 Youth Corps could accomplish about 2,000 man-years or $7 million worth of such work annually. This would return about $11.7 million annually in 10 years.

Similar benefits can be indicated in wildlife habitat improvement to increase use of many national forest areas by sportsmen; watershed restoration to stabilize soil, improve streamflows, and enhance water quality; insect and disease control to prevent annual losses in timber of about $94 million annually; and forest road and trail maintenance and construction to increase public use and access to resources.

A very conservative dollar estimate of the direct and indirect benefits of a Youth Corps is a return of about $7,000 per enrollee or $7,000 for a $3,985 annual cost per enrollee.

Warren County, Tenn., Civil War Centennial "Mission to Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, today I was pleased to receive and greet two citizens of McMinnville and Warren County, Tenn., on the steps of the Capitol which marked the completion of a historical and memorable trip to Washington. These gentlemen, Mr. Everett Brock, Jr., and Mr. Arliss Hillis, drove a mule-drawn Civil War cannon from McMinnville, Tenn., to Washington, D.C.—some 622 miles. The trip took 35 days.

This "Mission to Washington" was part of the celebration in McMinnville by the Civil War Centennial Commission and also reflected the spirit of Col. John H. Savage, a former Member of Congress who served four terms in the House of Representatives.

Colonel Savage, a native of McMinnville, Tenn., had an illustrious career of service in the U.S. Army during the Mexican War during which he was elected to Congress. As a Member of Congress he opposed secession and declared it was unconstitutional. He nevertheless took up arms with the South when war was inevitable. A courageous soldier and leader of the 16th Regiment Tennessee Infantry in the Confederate Army, he was wounded at the Battles of Perryville and Stones River. After the Battle of Stones River, even though wounded, he devoted his energies in trying to bring about a peaceful and honorable settlement for both sides of the war.

Colonel Savage tried to come to Washington to urge upon his friends and to urge the President to work towards a settlement of the war but was unable to reach Washington.

Mr. Brock and Mr. Hillis carried to President Kennedy, Speaker McCormack, and to me as their Representative a message in the spirit of Colonel Savage. It points out the futility of war and urges unity of the North and South.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix the letter presented to me and also the biography of Colonel Savage as it appears in the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1961:

MCMINNVILLE-WARREN COUNTY
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL,
MCMINNVILLE, TENN., *March 1, 1963.*

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Representative, Fourth District, Tennessee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EVINS: This is to introduce Mr. Everett Brock, Jr., in the role of Maj. P. H. Coffee, C.S.A., 16th Tennessee Regiment, and his muleskinner, Mr. Arliss Hillis, portraying a Confederate sergeant, who have driven a mule-drawn Civil War cannon from McMinnville, Tenn., to Washington, D.C. (March 1, 1963 to April 4, 1963).

One hundred years have passed since middle Tennessee was a battleground during the great conflict between the States. We in McMinnville and Warren County are commemorating this historic event.

By careful examination of the history of this war and the people who participated in it, we find that many Tennesseans of that time felt that the war was unnecessary, and sought to bring it to a speedy and honorable end.

Among this group was John H. Savage, a McMinnville, Tenn., attorney, serving as a Member of the U.S. Congress. Congressman Savage argued that it was the right of any people to rebel, but he opposed secession on the grounds that it was unconstitutional. However, when Tennessee left the Union to become one of the Confederate States of

America, Congressman Savage left his seat in the Congress to take up arms with the South.

He was elected a colonel by his fellow soldiers and was placed in command of the 16th Tennessee Infantry, serving gallantly through many campaigns. Completely disillusioned by Confederate military leadership, and now thoroughly convinced that the South could not win, he resigned his commission following the Battle of Stones River, in which his brother and a large percentage of the troops under his command were killed, with the hope that he could intercede through his friends in Washington and bring peace without loss of honor or rights to either side.

But, Colonel Savage was never able to reach Washington with his appeal and the great struggle between the States continued.

Now, 100 years later, a mule-drawn Civil War cannon which was used by both the North and the South has been dispatched to Washington, D.C., to focus public attention on the futility of war, and to commemorate the sacrifices by the gallant men of the blue and gray.

It is the desire of the Civil War Centennial Commission of McMinnville, Warren County, Tenn., that the "mission to Washington" will serve to reunite and rededicate all Americans to the common cause of unity and the preservation of peace at home and abroad.

We, the Civil War Centennial Commission of McMinnville, Warren County, Tenn., extend to you a most cordial invitation to attend this commemoration at McMinnville, Tenn., which will continue until May 4, 1963.

Respectfully yours,

SAM CORDELL,
Chairman, Civil War Centennial Commission.

KENNETH CANTRELL,
(As Col. John H. Savage).

[From the Biographical Directory of the American Congress 1774–1961]

JOHN HOUSTON SAVAGE

Savage, John Houston, a Representative from Tennessee; born in McMinnville, Tenn., on October 9, 1815; attended the common schools; served as a private in the Seminole War; studied law; was admitted to the bar and commenced practice in Smithville, Tenn.; colonel of State militia; attorney general of the Fourth Tennessee District 1841-47; presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Polk and Dallas in 1844; major of the 14th U.S. Infantry during the Mexican War and subsequently promoted to lieutenant colonel; elected to the 31st and 32d Congresses (March 4, 1849, to March 3, 1853); declined to be a candidate for reelection; elected to the 34th and 35th Congresses (March, 4, 1855, to March 3, 1859); colonel of the 16th Regiment, Tennessee Infantry, in the Confederate Army during the Civil War and was wounded at Perryville and Murfreesboro; member of the State house of representatives 1877–79, and in 1887; died in McMinnville, Tenn., on April 5, 1904; interment in Riverside Cemetery.

Analysis of 1963 King-Anderson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, believing that a sound approach to caring for our needy aged is essential, I ask that the analysis of the 1963 King-Anderson bill prepared by Paul R. M. Donelan, legislative attorney for the American Medical Association, be included in today's RECORD. Mr. Donelan's analysis was given before the Minnesota State Medical Association in Minneapolis on March 20, 1963, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PAUL R. M. DONELAN, LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

I have been asked to discuss with you the President's Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, or as it is more popularly called, the King-Anderson bill. Unfortunately, time will not permit me to go into all the details of this 75-page bill. I will leave for those who would like it a detailed analysis. Attached to it is a listing of 15 objections to the bill. You can read them at your leisure. I will have to limit myself to the major provisions and some of their ramifications. I would like to present them by first posing a question and then giving the answer. When I have finished my statement, there will be a brief question-and-answer period.

As you know, the bill would authorize the financing of hospitalization, nursing home care, outpatient hospital diagnostic services, and home health services for all persons over 65. Let's take a little closer look at the separate parts of this proposition.

Will all social security beneficiaries be entitled to benefits? No, only those over age 65. Although an individual may receive retirement benefits at age 62 under the social security law, he would not be eligible for benefits under the bill. Nor would the wife of a retired social security beneficiary unless she is age 65. The disabled individual and his dependents who are currently receiving social security benefits are, of course, excluded. I point these out because this is one obvious area for further expansion.

Will the aged individual have to be retired and be receiving social security benefits? No. The so-called work test under which social security benefits are reduced or eliminated will not apply. Thus, the 5 million of our aged who are working, or who are the wives of workers, would be entitled to the benefits.

Initially, that is until 1967, the only requirement which will have to be met is the age 65 requirement. After January 1, 1967, the aged person would have to have three quarters of social security or railroad retirement coverage, whenever acquired, for each year elapsing after January 1, 1965, and the year before he attains age 65. Thus, an individual who becomes 65 in 1969 would need 12 quarters of coverage to be eligible, since 4 years will have elapsed since January 1, 1965.

What benefits would be provided under the bill? Let us take them up one at a time.

First, let's look at the hospitalization benefit. The bill would provide up to 90 days of inpatient hospital services during a benefit period, subject to a deductible of $10 a day for the first 9 days, with a minimum deductible of $20. However, the individual would be given a one-time, irrevocable election of an optional 45 days of hospitalization, not subject to a deductible; or 180 days of hospitalization subject to a deductible equal to 2½ times the average per diem rate for inpatient hospital services as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the customary charges of the hospital, if they are smaller. The bill provides that for the first 2 years the per diem rate would be $37.

For those now 65, the option would have to be exercised by no later than the month of November 1964. For those who become 65 after January 1, 1965, the election would have to be made by the month prior to the month he becomes age 65. Failure to make a timely election would be deemed as an election of the 90-day, $90 deductible plan.

Hospitalization would consist of those services normally provided in a hospital, but could not include medical or surgical services provided by a physician, resident or intern, with certain exceptions. The services of a pathologist, radiologist, a specialist in physical medicine, or an anesthesiologist, if provided in the hospital, would be financed. Medical and surgical services could be provided by residents and interns, but only in a teaching hospital under a program approved by the AMA's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals.

Will the aged individual be able to get these services at any hospital? No. The bill sets out criteria that some hospitals, especially the smaller ones in rural areas, may not be able to meet. Further, the services could be obtained only in hospitals which enter into an agreement with the Secretary to provide them. Tuberculosis hospitals and mental institutions are specifically excluded from providing services.

Now let's look at nursing home benefits.

The bill would authorize up to 180 days of nursing home services during a benefit period, but only for conditions for which the individual was treated in a hospital and, initially, only in a nursing home which is affiliated or controlled by a hospital.

Of the 24,000 nursing homes in this country, less than 500 can meet this affiliation requirement. There are some States in which no nursing homes would qualify. In Minnesota, as of last June, there were 22 qualified nursing homes, with a total of 999 beds, to provide services for the 354,000 aged individuals in the State who would be eligible under the bill.

When this point was brought out during the Senate debate last summer, Senator ANDERSON was visibly shaken. One-half hour before the vote was taken, Senator MUSKIE of Maine offered an amendment to allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make determinations as to other nursing homes which could provide services. This amendment is contained in the present bill.

At any rate, it can easily be seen that the limited nursing home benefits will not be generally available and are window dressing to a large extent.

As you may have noted, I have indicated that the hospitalization and nursing home benefits are limited to a benefit period.

What is a benefit period? This is a rather tricky provision in view of the hospitalization options. A benefit would begin with the first day of hospitalization and end 90 days after the individual was discharged from the hospital or nursing home for the first time. The 90-day period need not be consecutive but must occur within 180 days following the first day of hospitalization. In other words, there would be at least two benefit periods a year. Of course, with the beginning of a new benefit period, the individual would again have to pay the deductibles.

The bill provides that both inpatient hospital services and nursing home services must be subject to a utilization review plan. Under such a plan, a hospital staff committee including at least two physicians would have to review the case of each beneficiary under the bill who is in a hospital or a nursing home for 21 days. These reviews would be made as frequently thereafter as the Secretary of HEW specifies. If, after opportunity for consultation with the attending physician, the physician members of the utilization committee feel that further services are not medically necessary, payment would not be made to the provider after the third day following notice. If the Secretary finds that the utilization plan is not operating with reasonable regularity, he has two alternatives. He can terminate his agreement with the hospital or nursing

home, or he can limit payment to the first 21 days. In either event, the beneficiary would be the innocent victim of administrative action.

Now we come to home health services. The bill would authorize payment for 240 visits in a calendar year by a public or nonprofit, tax-exempt agency to an individual who is under the care of a physician.

Will these services be generally available? No. Organizations which provide these services, such as the Visiting Nurse Association, are generally established on a countywide basis. There are only 900 such organizations in the more than 3,000 counties in the United States.

Finally, the bill would authorize outpatient hospital diagnostic services which would be subject to a deductible of $20 every 30 days. I want to stress that these are diagnostic services, not treatments. The bill excludes any services not authorized to inpatients. Thus, physician services, except the diagnostic services of a pathologist, radiologist or physiatrist, would be excluded.

When would the benefits begin? Inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital diagnostic services, and home health services would be financed beginning January 1, 1965. Skilled nursing facility services would be financed beginning July 1, 1965.

What services would not be financed? As I have already indicated, services by the beneficiary's family physician would not be financed, whether provided in the hospital, in the office, or in the home.

Outpatient clinic services are excluded. These could be provided only to an inpatient in a teaching hospital.

Emergency room treatments are also excluded. Again, the individual would have to be hospitalized in a teaching hospital.

Private duty nursing services are specifically excluded.

Drugs and biologicals used outside a hospital or nursing home are also excluded.

Medical appliances, which can be used while an inpatient or while receiving home health services prescribed by a physician, would have to be purchased by the individual once his treatments ended.

In short, as reported in a study by the Aetna Insurance Co., the bill will cover less than 25 percent of the average medical care costs of the average person over age 65.

How will the program be financed? For the aged not under social security or the railroad retirement programs, appropriations would be made from general revenues.

For those under the railroad retirement program, the railroad retirement tax would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent on the present wage base of $4,800 effective January 1, 1965.

For those under social security, on January 1, 1965, the social security tax rate would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent, and the taxable wage base would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200. Put another way, the worker who earns $5,200 with have his social security taxes increased in 1965 from the current $174 a year to $201.50. His employer would pay a similar amount. The self-employed individual would have his tax increased from $259.20 to $301.60. By 1968, including the already scheduled increases, the worker would be paying a tax of $253.50, and the self-employed individual, $379.60.

Will these taxes be adequate to meet the cost of the program? The administration estimates that the first year cost will be a little over $1 billion. The proposed tax increases are expected to bring in approximately $1.4 billion annually. Part of this sum will be used to pay for a slight increase in the maximum cash benefits for those who pay the greatest tax. The health insurance industry, which makes or loses money on its estimates, indicates that the first year cost of this program will be $2.2 billion. By 1990, the administration estimates that the program will cost $2.3 billion. The insurance industry says that the cost in 1983, some 7 years earlier, will be $5.4 billion.

I will let you judge whose figures are probably more accurate the administration's, which are based on 5,000 personal interviews, or the industry's, which are based on the experience gained from some 13 million claims studied by the New York State Insurance Department.

I want to remind you that these figures do not involve any expansion of the program. They are based on projected increases in the number of social security beneficiaries and expected increases in the cost of the services. What the program would cost if the age limit were dropped to 62 to cover persons already retired under social security; or if the program were expanded to cover widows, the disabled and their dependents who now receive social security benefits; or if adequate services were provided, is anyone's guess. These possibilities should be of interest to your friends and patients, since they will be called on to finance these expansions.

Why is organized medicine so concerned with this bill? Primarily, it is because it fears the bill will lead to controlled medicine and to a deterioration of medical care.

How will this program lead to controlled medicine? It is axiomatic that that which the Government subsidizes, it regulates. Indeed, it must. The Government owes a duty to see that the taxpayers' money is spent properly and with efficiency. The problem arises as to what is proper and what is efficient.

Why will this bill lead to any more control than the Hill-Burton program, which organized medicine supported? The distinction arises from the goals of the two programs. Under the Hill-Burton program, the Government's responsibility is to see that a hospital or other facility is constructed. Once that goal is achieved, the Government's responsibility ends.

Under this bill, services are to be financed by Federal funds. This is a continuing program, and thus the Government's responsibility will continue. The bill sets up criteria to be met by providers of services and contains specific definitions as to what the services shall consist of. In order to determine that proper services are being provided, the Federal Government will have to oversee their provision.

How will this bill lead to the deterioration of medical care? The record shows that when a system of controlled medicine is established, medical progress ceases. One British observer noted that health care in Great Britain has been "frozen at the 1948 level."

Why? Primarily for two reasons.

The first and immediate cause is overutilization. It is a fact of life that, where so-called free programs are established, utilization goes up to an unjustified degree. For example, utilization of hospitals by the aged in North Dakota and in Saskatchewan prior to the establishment of the provincial hospital program were approximately the same. As of last year, utilization in Saskatchewan was almost three times that in North Dakota. Whenever health care is given as a matter of right, utilization goes up.

The second result of controlled medicine affecting the quality of medical care is in my opinion the most important. It is the long-range reduction in the number of practicing physicians. As you know, it takes a long time and a lot of hard work to become a physician. These facts, coupled with competition from other fields of endeavor which promise more immediate rewards, discourage many potential medical students. But the added ingredient of future Government control makes it even more discouraging. I personally know physicians who have discouraged their sons from following in their footsteps for this reason. Other physicians who were active in recruiting college students into medical education have discontinued this practice. Where the number of physicians is reduced, there must be a corresponding reduction in the quality of care.

I would like to spend the next few minutes commenting on two or three of the major arguments advanced in favor of the King-Anderson bill. In his message on "aid for elderly citizens," the President justifies the bill with statements such as "Almost half of those over 65 living alone receive $1,000 or less a year, and three-fourths receive less than $2,000 a year." Mr. Kennedy does not tell us the number of our aged people who are living alone, nor who they are. But I would hazard a guess that a majority of these are individuals who are currently receiving old age assistance payments and medical care which is much more adequate than would be provided under this bill.

The President goes on to say that "About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than $1,000." By the same token, this statement means that about half the spending units headed by a person over 65 have liquid assets in excess of $1,000. As a matter of fact, the report from which the President got his figures shows that 52 percent of our aged included in the study had liquid assets in excess of $1,000. The same report shows that 25 percent of them had liquid assets in excess of $5,000.

Mr. Kennedy continues, "Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their home, of less than $5,000." Let's accept Mr. Kennedy's figure, because it means that three-fifths have a net worth in excess of $5,000. Again, the report from which the figure is taken shows that 63 percent of the spending units headed by a person over 65 have net worths in excess of $5,000. Nineteen percent of them have net worths in excess of $25,000.

The point that I want to make here is that you should not accept figures to justify the bill without giving them some thought as to their ramifications.

Goldwater, Dodd, and Hosmer Called Madmen by Radio Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, indication of the Soviet's attitude on attempts to have U.S. test ban proposals include realistic cheat preventing verification details is found in the following English language broadcasts by Radio Moscow:

March 11, 1963: It would be timely at this point to speak about the American position. The thing is that recently the opponents of a test ban in the United States have significantly increased their pressure on President Kennedy to make him abandon the talks on the subject at Geneva. A few days ago Mr. HOSMER, a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, brazenly claimed that a nuclear test ban would prevent the United States from improving its nuclear rocket weapons. Senator

DODD, one of those wildmen, put it still more bluntly: he emphasized that even if agreement on a nuclear test ban were reached at Geneva, he and those who think alike will do their utmost to torpedo the treaty in Congress.

Well, these are the facts. The U.S.S.R. makes reasonable concessions to promote progress, while the West refuses to make any compromises whatsoever, and its refusal is accentuated by the nuclear blasts in Nevada and by the energetic efforts to enlarge the atomic club and the new plans for arming. The policy that Britain and its partners are pursuing hardly fits in with the aims of the conference at Geneva.

New York, March 22, 1963: A widely publicized, systematic press campaign is in progress in the United States, aimed at torpedoing the talks in Geneva in which the U.N. Disarmament Committee is examining the problem of banning nuclear tests.

The tone of this campaign is set by the "madmen" among the U.S. legislators, the Senators GOLDWATER and DODD, and Congressman HOSMER types, and by atomic scientists such as the father of the hydrogen bomb, Teller.

The madmen openly demand discontinuance of the talks, recall of the U.S. delegation from Geneva, and a further nuclear armaments race. This was recently demanded at a Senate session by Senator GOLDWATER. The madmen motivate their demands by the contention that it is, as they allege, impossible to arrive at an agreement on the banning of nuclear tests with the Soviet Union which would completely exclude the danger of secret violations of such an agreement. Behind the madmen are the war industry monopolies and the Pentagon, which fear as worse than fire any slight hint that peace might reign.

Sensible Americans, realizing where a continuation of the atomic armaments race is leading, are making efforts to uncover this campaign and attract public attention to the danger to mankind with which the striving to continue the nuclear armaments race in the interests of the war industry monopolies and the Pentagon's global strategy is fraught.

A few months ago, said Democratic Senator CLARK in the Senate, President Eisenhower warned the country against the danger of pressure from the war industry complex on the economic and political life of the United States. This warning was fully justified, Senator CLARK continued. The war industry complex in the United States is forcing an increase in the armaments race expenditure. This group had flooded the press with material in favor of continuing nuclear tests. The other point of view is simply not presented to the American public. Commentators, scientists, and Senators want to make us believe that those who strive for a nuclear test ban agreement are striving for something endangering our national security and that no patriotic-minded American should be in favor of an agreement.

The organs of the press which reflect the views of thinking Americans are decisively speaking out with relations about the madmen's campaign and with appeals to really strive for a nuclear test ban agreement. The York, Pa., Gazette & Daily writes in an editorial article that in appealing to us not to believe the Soviet Union, the Tellers, and GOLDWATER are simply wanting to continue nuclear tests.

Mentioning that seismologists, including American ones, are convinced as a result of their research that onsite inspection is unnecessary, as it is now impossible to conceal a nuclear explosion even if it is underground, the Gazette & Daily writes about the madmen: "Evidently they are so obsessed with striving to continue nuclear tests that they have put themselves beyond science, reason, logic, and human feelings, and it seems they would like to place us all on the same level."

Governor Brown Reappoints McConnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that F. Britton McConnell, the distinguished insurance commissioner of the State of California, has achieved an outstanding record of progress as chairman of the executive committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

The increasing size of the insurance business and its consequent importance in the economy of our Nation has necessarily increased the importance of the various State commissioners who administer the State laws governing the business. We in California have been fortunate to have a man of the quality of Mr. McConnell watching over the day-to-day operation of insurance companies in California.

I will supplement my references to Mr. McConnell by an article which appeared in the Insurance Journal of June 11, 1959, on the occasion of the reappointment of McConnell by our good Governor, Pat Brown.

The article follows:

GOVERNOR BROWN REAPPOINTS MCCONNELL

Qualifying as the miracle of political miracles, Governor Brown at Sacramento late Friday of the past week announced the reappointment of F. Britton McConnell to a second 4-year term as insurance commissioner of California. The nomination now goes to the Senate rules committee preparatory to confirmation. No problem is anticipated, as a group of Democratic senatorial leaders have been known to have taken the lead to urge the Governor in recent weeks to reappoint McConnell.

The Democratic Governor's retention of McConnell, a Republican whom former Governor Knight first appointed early in 1955, was made public a few hours after McConnell's departure by Jet 707 from Los Angeles—unaware of the reappointment—to attend the annual meeting of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners in Boston. It is the first time a California commissioner has been reappointed to a second term and to serve under both a Republican and Democratic administration.

He was accompanied by Mrs. McConnell and their son, Drew. Also on board the same flight to attend the NAIC meeting was Edmund W. Cooke, prominent Los Angeles insurance attorney and originally a candidate for the insurance commissionership appointment.

Shortly after the flight was airborn the crew found the nose landing gear of the jet was jammed and would not retract. The aircraft circled Los Angeles for over 3 hours dissipating its fuel load to assure a safe return landing at Los Angeles International Airport. A substitute plane finally took off and the flight was uneventful to Boston, although some 10 hours after the original departure time.

McConnell was greeted upon his arrival at the Boston Statler-Hilton with a telegram from Governor Brown informing him of his reappointment, and a telephone call from the Journal in Los Angeles.

It was a happy commissioner the Journal interviewed in the early morning hours of Saturday. He said he was pleased to be honored with reappointment and delighted with the opportunity to serve a second 4-year term and under Governor Brown. He said he hoped to do the best job of his ability.

California's commissioner brings to the position a wealth of experience in the business of insurance. With a father and grandfather preceding him in the business, Commissioner McConnell boasts a colorful and widely diversified experience: office boy in his father's general and local agency businesses during school vacations; special agent in the workmen's compensation field of California; operation of his father's local agency upon the elder McConnell's death; practice of insurance law; property—liability—life—accident and health company executive, and years of legislative activity at Sacramento.

Commissioner McConnell retired as vice president and general counsel, and member of the board of directors, of the Pacific Employers and its affiliated companies of Los Angeles in 1954 after 13 years in those positions, has been active in the Republican Party in California, served 4 years as a member of the Beverly Hills City Council, which named him mayor for a 1-year term.

Born in New Orleans, La., April 6, 1895, "Brit" McConnell is a descendant of over a century of insurance in his family. His father, William L. McConnell, was originally with the Ferd Marks Insurance Agency in New Orleans, and later a partner in the general agency firm of Vreeland & McConnell, which represented a number of fire companies and the Ocean Accident & Guarantee in Louisiana and Mississippi. Later, the elder McConnell was actively engaged in the business of insurance in California moving to this State in 1910 because of his wife's health.

The choice of Governor Brown for reappointment in addition had a grandfather, Cyrus King Drew, that was engaged in the local agency business at Evansville, Ind., an uncle, also named Cyrus King Drew, who was a prominent insurance editor and publisher in the Mountain States and the west coast, and has a cousin, John P. Breeden, retired vice president in charge of Corroon & Reynolds' operations on the west coast, with headquarters in San Francisco.

McConnell was educated in the grammar schools of New Orleans and upon migration of the family to Los Angeles graduated from Manual Arts High School. He completed his education at Hastings College of Law of the University of California in San Francisco, receiving his LL.B. in 1924.

Prior to the completion of his educational background, McConnell joined the State Workmen's Compensation Fund at San Francisco in 1914, traveling the Sacramento Valley as special agent, which included all phases of the early days of workmen's compensation in California—from rating through auditing, to the handling of claims and appearances before the industrial accident commission. He served in this era prior to World War I with such famous figures in the insurance business as Claude Fellows, late founder of the Associated Indemnity, Dan Burbank, late insurance attorney of California, William Leslie, formerly general manager of the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters, Joe Gallagher, manager of the

State fund, and John Cornwell, Los Angeles manager of the State fund.

His career was interrupted by service in World War I overseas with the machinegun division of the 361st Infantry Regiment of the 91st Division, under Capt. Frank P. Doherty, later promoted to major and now a famous lawyer and Republican leader of Los Angeles. He was injured in the Argonne battle September 28, 1918, hospitalized in France, New York, Camp Kearney, and Letterman Hospital at the Presidio in San Francisco—and honorably discharged in August 1920, carrying the injuries sustained in action to the present day.

Upon his discharge from the Army, he returned to the employ of the State Fund and during that time studied law and admitted to practice in 1924. Shortly after his admission to practice, the death of his father called him to Los Angeles to take over the prominent local agency that had been operated under his father's name, William L. McConnell, in Los Angeles.

He continued the local agency until his practice of law had been established and then disposed of the business. He then established the general practice of law at Los Angeles, specializing in insurance work until 1941, when he turned over his practice to J. L. Kearney, an old friend and associate in the State Fund, to become vice president and general counsel and member of the board of directors of the Pacific Employers.

"Brit" McConnell is prominently known among his colleagues as the elder statesman in the field of workmen's compensation law in California, as well as executive administration on the company side. While in the practice of law, McConnell was also an executive officer and director, and active in the administration of the life and disability business of the Unity Mutual Life & Accident of Los Angeles.

He is recognized as one of the principal authors of the McBride-Grunsky Rate Regulatory Act of California that was enacted following the famous SEUA decision and later the passage of Public Law 15.

The past 4 years, Commissioner McConnell has documented a term of such success that with the exception of a handful of diehards, all in the industry describe him as the greatest in California insurance history. Even those who bitterly opposed his candidacy 4 years ago are now in complete agreement of his exceptional stature as the top commissioner of California.

Further, the past 4 years has noted his prestige on the national scene. From the beginning his leadership in the NAIC has been in constant evidence. As a result, news of his reappointment is reported to have spread a ray of sunshine over the current deliberations of the NAIC in Boston.

All hands in the insurance industry applauded Governor Brown's statesmanlike decision to retain Commissioner McConnell for a second 4-year term, in face of the fact that they are of different political beliefs. It is believed that the Governor recognized the stature of Commissioner McConnell and concluded that his reappointment was best for California, its insurance industry and the insurance-buying public.

Insurance people were jubilant in averring that by this decison Governor Brown's prestige has been enhanced in business circles such as no other Democratic Governor in California's history.

In the brief interim since announcement of the appointment, industry leaders in California were formulating plans for a public salute to the Governor and Commissioner McConnell. Tentative plans call for public events both in Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Week in Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress marks the ninth year in which Mrs. Schwengel and I have been hosts to the students of Iowa colleges who participate in the "Week in Washington" program.

We sponsor this program for political interns in cooperation with the Iowa Center for Education and Politics at the State University of Iowa. Each year we welcome 10 students—5 Democrats and 5 Republicans—who spend a week in the Capital as our guests. They come in pairs and during the week that they are with us, they follow a full schedule which exposes them to as much government and politics at the Federal level as we can cram into 5½ days.

Up until now we have entertained 82 students and 14 political science instructors. It has been a gratifying experience for us, and from the reports we receive, we know that it has contributed to the educations of these young people who have come here to attend sessions of the House and Senate; sit in on committee hearings; attend agency briefings; visit the Supreme Court to hear decisions; look in at the national headquarters of their political party; talk with congressional leaders and get first-hand knowledge of how a congressional office is run.

After each set of students has shared this experience, they write reports which they file with the Iowa Center for Education in Politics. I receive copies of these reports, and the collection through the years speaks eloquently for the value of the program.

During the week of April 25–30, our guests were Philip Miller, Democrat, of Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa; and Clark McNeal, Jr., Republican, of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa.

A copy of Clark McNeal's report has been received and I feel that it should be brought to the attention of my colleagues so that they will know about the reaction of these students to the experience and the program.

This is an eloquent testimony to democracy in action. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the report appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The report follows:

APRIL 1, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: The past week has been one of a mixture of pleasure, interest, and inspiration. It has combined the process of learning with a realization and reverence for the work of our Government and the heritage which is ours as a country. The process by which our knowledge from a book comes to life as an experience is actually the difference between knowing and understanding. It is this concept of understanding which has grown in us through your generous hospitality and personal concern for increased awareness in future citizens. In light of my brief exposure to the Federal Government and its many operations, I should like to offer a few observations that have made indelible impressions upon me.

As I come to the end of a visit with Congressman SCHWENGEL in Washington, I think that the singularly most important gain I can count is the realization of experiencing brifly the world of actual, practical politics. Although many authors try to portray the world and processes of the Supreme Court, no author can re-create an actual presence of the Court in session. Similarly many portray the Russian officials in their writings, but nothing can take the place of actually visiting the Russian Embassy and talking first-hand with a person who has grown to know two cultures and serves as a representative of his own country in our country. No author can re-create the overwhelming reverence one experiences when he stands in the same halls that our forefathers stood when times of crisis inspired some of the greatest thoughts and oratory that has ever been known to man. These experiences can never be gained second-hand. These are the experiences that Congressman SCHWENGEL has made it possible for me to experience that I might gain increased interest in a country that does belong to me, and a country that demands the highest of each citizen.

I have also mentioned that I was permitted to gain an insight into the practical side of politics. There have been so many reports, most of which are usually unfounded, of the corruptness and selfishness of our Congressmen. I think that I have often had such an impression myself as I peered in from the outside. However, I think that it would behoove us all to look at the devotion with which the vast majority of our Congressmen serve their charges. I have seen personally the overloaded schedule which Congressman SCHWENGEL fills effectively. The life of a Congressman is hard work and not the life of ease it is popularly portrayed to be. Also I have seen the tremendously technical work that a Congressman must do. Congressmen must be extremely knowledgable in order to understand and criticize legislation. The business of state is challenging and complicated, it is not a job for pretty boys and amateurs. Yet how many times have voters been forced to choose between the lesser of two evils whose names appear on a ballot? Everyone has always said that a common man could do the business of state—this is a grave mistake—a man can be common as we basically all are; but he must be dedicated, and in being dedicated, the man is no longer common. Finally with regard to the practical side of politics, I have observed that the game of politics itself often impedes the flow of good objective legislation. This is extremely serious. It has been pointed out to me by Congressman SCHWENGEL that there are many difficulties in school administration in the District of Columbia. In such instances as in many others, there is no room for shortsightedness and undue extremism. While one must be attentive to minute detail, a Congressman must be farseeing and ready to act in cases of necessity. It is the marriage of a philosophy to a technology which constitutes effective democratic government; too great an emphasis on either philosophy or technology produces a distortion of the system and endangers its operation. We exist as people and must legislate to facilitate our physical needs, but we must be quick to guard against infringement upon our ideas of freedom and individual liberty.

In closing my evaluation of the "Week in Washington Program" is that of a sound in-

vestment in the future of the United States. The week in Washington shall always remain as one of the unforgettable experiences of my life.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK E. MCNEAL.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure for me to inform our colleagues in the Congress that the winner of the 16th annual voice of democracy national broadcast scriptwriting contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is a young man I am proud to claim as a constituent, Richard John Behrens of Westfield, N.J.

Mr. Behrens' script on the subject, "What Freedom Means to Me," won this student at Holy Trinity High School in Westfield first place in a national competition of considerable prestige. His victory has also won for him a $5,000 college scholarship—an award which, judging from the high quality of his script, he will put to very good use.

Indicative of the importance of this scriptwriting contest, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it is sponsored by the FVW with the cooperation of the National Association of Broadcasters and the State association of broadcasters, and is endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education. The National Association of Secondary-School Principals has placed the contest of its approved list of national contests and activities for 1962–63.

Since Richard Behrens' script is devoted to a subject which is fundamental to everything we are trying to do here in Congress, and because this script is an outstanding example of the developing ideas of young people on the edge of adulthood and responsible citizenship, I feel certain our colleagues will be interested in reading it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include it herewith:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Richard John Behrens)

In the life of our Republic, perhaps no word has been more abused than freedom. This mistreatment is at least partly caused by a faulty interpretation of what freedom really is. Let us then, examine some of the imperatives of the word itself.

Freedom is a concept, not a commodity. It is an intangible idea whose residence is the minds and hearts of enlightened men. Since freedom is an abstraction, when we possess it we are not fully aware of it. Freedom's presence is never as obvious as its absence. Freedom is also relative. By that I mean, the concept of freedom varies from person to person. A prisoner in solitary confinement might believe he possesses freedom if he is let into the yard. A prisoner in the yard might think freedom exists on the other side of the wall. In an oppressed society, people believe that freedom exists in another class with a few more privileges. On and on we go until we reach the ultimate; a society in which all its citizens have complete freedom.

In our own country we have many political freedoms. But it is not a utopian state. Our freedoms are balanced, personal privileges against public freedoms. We may then say that, in our country, the thing we call freedom, is actually a balanced relative abstraction; the public good weighed against the private good.

Not only has the word freedom been misinterpreted, but it has been used by egotistical individuals to their own ends. In spite of these individuals we have produced many documents which express a basic characteristic in human nature; that feeling is man's desire for freedom. This freedom cannot be handed down from generation to generation, it must periodically be renewed and constantly be guarded. But to keep this most valuable of franchises we must fulfill all the corresponding obligations freedom brings with it. We must not treat this privilege lightly, or we will lose it; for besides being a privilege, freedom is a challenge. This ever-present challenge has been met many times in the past with such documents as the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation. And yet, because some men have taken our precious freedom and used it as a haven, and defied the principles it stands for, repeatedly, other men must renew it by fighting, even dying if necessary, so we may continue to display our freedom as an example for the rest of humanity to behold and strive for.

Every day each of us in this country exercises his freedom more often than does the average citizen of a Soviet-bloc nation in a whole year. We say prayers. Every day we thank God for giving us this privilege of freedom. We vote in elections, read honest newspapers, listen to a free radio, go or come as we choose. Yes, we certainly are on display with all our liberties. But we are representatives of another kind, also. We are ambassadors of responsibility. Not only do we have the liberty of free election, but the obligation of being informed and patriotic citizens and voting intelligently in those elections.

Finally, as we look at our many freedoms, we become appreciative, exalted, and assured. Apreciative that we were chosen to receive this gift, exalted that we have been so honored, and assured in the knowledge that it will continue, for freedom is as strong as its folowers, they are its strength. We are ambassadors of reason, responsibility, and righteousness faithfully fulfilling our obligation to this privilege, so we may look forward to many more generations of this balanced relative abstraction we so cherish.

Many of my foregoing remarks are idealistic, and these freedoms do not necessarily exist all at once in one man or one place. But they do represent what they desire as a people and as a culture. Although our freedom hasn't been refined to its utmost, yet our seeking of freedom is dynamic, we're always improving. So that our endeavors, with God's help, will prevail.

Congress Should Restore Allotments for Servicemen's Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to the payment of quarters allowances to enlisted members in the Armed Forces.

My bill seeks to correct a grave injustice that has been done to dependents and the immediate families of servicemen. The injustice, to be sure, was not committed intentionally, but it exists nevertheless and many of these dependents are now suffering the consequences.

On July 10, 1962, Public Law 87–531 was enacted by Congress to amend certain sections of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. These changes went into effect on January 1, 1963. The major change is that under the new law noncommissioned officers in all branches of our Armed Forces, having 4 years of service or more, are no longer required to have a class Q allotment in effect for their dependents. In other words, the law gives the serviceman full authority for the disposition of his pay. If he so desires, he may arrange for continued direct payment to his dependents; if he chooses not to do so, he need not make such arrangements.

Since December 31, 1962, all class Q allotments have been terminated, except for certain enlisted members in the lower grades. The result is that many of the men in service failed to make the necessary arrangements for their dependents to receive the allotments they have been getting in the past. In recent weeks, I have received several complaints from the wives of servicemen who have young children and are dependent on these allotments for their subsistence.

What can such families do? In an information sheet prepared by one of the military services, we are told that the dependent may contact the serviceman's unit commander. If the serviceman, having been counseled, refuses to furnish direct support or initiate a class E allotment, "he renders himself subject to disciplinary action, including reduction to a grade in which a class Q allotment is mandatory and may be initiated without his consent."

This creates a difficult administrative problem for the military services and much unnecessary work. But the worst part of it is that the services can only try to impress the servicemen with the need for providing assistance to their families, they can take certain disciplinary action against men who refuse to do so, but they cannot force them to provide support. This is something that only a civil court can do.

In some communities, I understand, such families are turning for help to local welfare organizations and the Red Cross. Women with small children are becoming desperate in their efforts to make ends meet, after having been deprived of support. Some of these people have told me of their plight in person, others have written to me. I should like to quote from a letter of a woman in my district, who writes:

Previous to January 1, I was receiving $137.10 regularly on the 5th day of each month. I had been receiving a regular allotment check for the past 9 years. Since the new ruling on allotments for dependents of servicemen, which was recently passed, my checks have been discontinued.

I received an American Express check on February 5 in the amount of $100, and at that time I wrote to my husband's commanding officer requesting him to make arrangements for a definite and regular payment. I have not received anything since February 5. I understand it is entirely up to my husband to determine how much I am to receive and that it is his responsibility to see that it is sent to me.

This seems unfair to me because, after all, I do have a small son (age 10) to support, a home to operate, and bills to pay. I must have a definite amount to plan on in order to meet my obligations. I know of several other servicemen's wives who are faced with the same problem. If our husbands do not choose to send us money, we have to worry about how we are to pay our bills.

If this situation becomes widespread, and I fear that it may, it can create great havoc in many families and lead to tragedies where the greatest victims will be the young children. This was not the intention of Congress when the law was enacted last year. Congress was simply trying to raise the quarters allowance for certain members of the Armed Forces and noncommissioned officers were given the freedom to provide voluntarily for their dependents without arbitrary action on the part of the Government. Congress meant well, but human nature being what it is, it did not work out so well for the families of these men. For reasons of their own, many of the men have terminated their assistance with the result that their families, their wives and children, are now suffering great hardship.

In view of the fact that Congress, directly or indirectly, was instrumental in bringing this situation about, I believe that immediate steps should be taken by Congress to rectify the situation. With every day's delay the problem will grow bigger and more difficult. The old system of mandatory allotments should be restored at once before disruption sets in with many families and tragedies ensue.

It is the purpose of my bill to restore the system of mandatory allotments for dependents of military personnel as it existed prior to January 1, 1963. Congress has made a mistake and should recognize it as such and correct it. I appeal to all my colleagues to request this correction before they are deluged with letters from families telling of their hardships. I appeal to the House Armed Services Committee, to whom my bill has been referred, to consider this bill in the nature of emergency legislation and to act on it at once.

Prisoners of the Communist Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, if there is one basic flaw above all others in the administration's foreign policy, it is the reluctance to admit that communism is a worldwide movement, with headquarters in Moscow, that is relentlessly enslaving the peoples of formerly free nations.

The peoples of Eastern Europe whose homelands have been betrayed into the Communist empire, are nothing but chattels, sold into slavery by a Western world which conveniently looked the other way when the Red empire advanced.

Many of those people managed to find freedom in the United States, but their hearts still ache for those they left behind. No wonder they are puzzled by this country's policy of diplomatic silence on the question of liberation for the captive nations of Eastern Europe. No wonder they have been encouraged and gladdened by the action of the Indiana General Assembly which adopted a resolution on Captive Nations Week.

But, Mr. Speaker, the policies of our Government recently have been based upon the proposition that we must reach certain accommodations with the enemy, and this entails, very often, skirting around some of the more delicate issues, such as the restoration of freedom to the enslaved peoples of Europe. Nowhere has that policy been more obvious than in our refusal, so far, to come to the aid of those imprisoned in the Communist satellite of Cuba, now classified as a captive nation.

It is significant, I believe, that the State of Indiana has seen fit to recognize the need to free the once free nations if we are to live up to our belief in freedom for all.

In this regard, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star entitled "When They Were Free."

The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 24, 1963]

WHEN THEY WERE FREE

Adoption of a Captive Nations Week resolution by the Indiana General Assembly has heartened people of this area whose hearts are tied to the unhappy prisoners of the Communist empire.

As far as we know this is the first such resolution to be adopted by a State legislature. It is inspired by and incorporates a resolution adopted by Congress 4 years ago. We are very proud that our legislature has done this.

A letter from the Indiana Committee of Captive Nations tells of their reaction. Here is a sentence from the letter which best expresses it:

"Right now the captive nations people around Indianapolis are so elated over the development, and being anxious to show their thanks for America having taken them in and also wishing to try to awaken the country to the dire threat, are hard at work putting together a musical skit showing folk dancers in native costumes as they enjoyed life when they were free."

The committee's plan suggests that a genuine cultural treat may be in the making.

But what is this dire threat to which the committee would awaken us? In the past week, while the Indiana committee was launching this planning, the national group, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, was making calls on Members of Congress and the Department of State. Its purpose was to present a memorandum expressing the fear that the goal of freedom and independence for the captive nations may be drowned in silence.

The memorandum points to the fact that present United States and Western policy toward the Communist empire is to downgrade the issue of independence and stress revival of normal relationships with existing regimes. This is supposed to be a more realistic approach, aimed at securing gradual change toward more humane and rational conditions in the captive countries.

"Unfortunately," says the memorandum, "in the course of this policy the main goal of freedom and independence for east-central Europe is more and more drowned in silence. Absence of meaningful Western political action to promote freedom in east-central Europe is bound to generate resignation among the captive peoples. And such a resignation would have far-reaching negative consequences to the security of Western Europe and the free world in general. The spirit of resistance of the captive peoples can be maintained by a clear-cut Western commitment to the purpose of a free east-central Europe—in itself a political action productive of far-reaching results."

Liberation of the captive nations without war is the objective of this organization, and it is viewed as a realistic one. But it is realistic only if the Western nations and peoples refuse to accept the status quo of the captivity of these nations, refuse to give the Soviet Union more successes and the prestige of silent approval of its brutal colonialism.

The sentence quoted above from the Indiana committee letter is an expression of gratitude and pleasure. But it ends, perhaps unintentionally, on a note of bitter poignancy—"when they were free."

Yes, the homelands of these people once were free. And they can be free again. Americans can help. We can help by refusing to accept a nostalgically backward look to the time when they were free—by insisting on a forward look to the time when they may be free again. By this insistence alone the Communists will be told that they have not yet made their empire secure. They never can, as long as the will for freedom lives.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the Washington Post regarding the proposed repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and a letter I sent regarding the editorial:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1963]

THE SILVER DOLLAR

We have come a long way since William Jennings Bryan used to orate about the "cross of gold" and demand the acceptance of silver as basic to our monetary system on a ratio of 16-to-1 with gold. Now Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has made a recommendation that, if approved by Congress, will diminish the importance of silver by switching from silver certificates to Federal reserve notes thus freeing 1.3 billion ounces of silver required by law to maintain $1 silver certificates in circulation. The recommendation is eminently sensible. Mr. Dillon points out that the Government's supply of silver for coinage will run out in 1965 unless it can free for use by the Government's mints some of the 1.3 billion ounces now lying useless in vaults. When

the Government's supply runs out, it may have to buy silver in foreign markets, for the domestic production of silver is not sufficient to meet all demands.

Some of the silver producing States have long maintained a sentimental interest in silver dollars, along with a powerful bloc in Congress that prevented any modernization of our silver laws. The silver dollar is about as obsolete as the arguments of the silver bloc, and sentiment is strong for a revision of our laws concerned with silver in its relation to the monetary system. If something is not done, Mr. Dillon suggested even graver threats to silver coinage ahead. If the Government has to diminish its gold reserve still further by purchasing silver abroad, we may be faced with a common European expedient of using other cheaper metals. The silver bloc would hate the thin jingle of aluminum dimes and quarters. To forestall that hazard, let the silver laws be revised.

MARCH 21, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
1515 L Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was a great pleasure for me to return to Washington and have the benefit of the generally fine editorial policy of the Post. However, the traditional aspirations for spring's first day turned to ashes this morning upon reading the editorial entitled, "The Silver Dollar."

I am sure that if more research had been spent on the proposed demonetization of silver, more than half the truth would have appeared in the editorial. Even a few minutes of reflection would have cleared up the confusion of silver dollars with silver certificates. Perhaps some study of the silver situation would have given the author of this unfortunate editorial some arguments, other than the ad hominen references to William Jennings Bryan and the bogeyman silver bloc, for the Treasury bill to replace silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes.

At the risk of being labeled the sole surviving representative of the powerful silver bloc in Congress, I would like to briefly point out some of the rational arguments against the Treasury Department's proposal in H.R. 4413. Silver has traditionally been, in this country, and in almost every other civilized nation, a monetary metal. The present drive to substitute currency that has 100 percent silver backing with notes which will have but 25 percent gold backing is aimed at complete demonetization of gold as well as silver. The recent spectacular rise in the price of silver has given a lever to the proponents of a completely managed currency system. However, I am disappointed that our Treasury's reaction is only one of panic, rather than reason.

Silver production now has but a 12 to 1 ratio with gold. The monetary price of silver at $1.29 per ounce represents an approximate ratio to gold of 27 to 1. Rather than irretrievably retire silver certificates, a more sensible approach would be to place the monetary value of silver in a more realistic relation to gold. I have suggested to the Banking and Currency Committee that a monetary value of $1.38 for silver would be a sound move at this time. This would involve no mechanical problems at all, since the monetary price of the silver in our coins is $1.38.

To replace $2 billion in silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes would cost the American taxpayer more than $50 million per year, since 75 percent of the backing for Federal Reserve notes is in the form of collateral, upon which the United States pays interest. It costs the taxpayer nothing to keep silver certificates in circulation; rather the Treasury has realized an economic profit on them every year since the enactment of the Silver Purchase Act.

The history of silver legislation is clouded with too much emotion. I believe it is time that the Congress approach the problem rationally and that is why I would like to see the Post apply its policy of thoroughness and objectivity to this legislation.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The Cotton Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune of March 19 editorialized on Congressman PAUL FINDLEY'S proposal to resolve the cotton mess. I suggest that my colleagues read this editorial.

It follows:

THE COTTON MESS

Economic absurdities and contradictions show up at every twist and turn in the jerry-built maze of unlikely political devices that make up the farm program. That's why we agree with President Kennedy when, in a masterpiece of understatement, he tells Congress, "The time has come to fashion a sound and enduring national policy for cotton."

Over nearly three decades taxpayers have spent billions of dollars to help cotton farmers by guaranteeing them good prices, subsidizing exports to keep American cotton moving in world markets, buying and storing surpluses, and paying premium prices for cotton products. Since the late 1920's, world cotton production has doubled. Yet, in the same period the U.S. share of these markets has dropped from 56 percent to about 30 percent and is continuing to fall off sharply.

Because domestic cotton prices are guaranteed at much higher levels than those of producers abroad, our textile mills have been priced out of foreign markets and are losing domestic customers to substitute fibers and imported cotton products made by their foreign competitors who can buy our cotton at a discount export price. National cotton acreage is down to the minimum permitted by law. Yet by next August the Government will own a 10 million bale surplus of cotton, valued at about $1.6 billion, the biggest stockpile since 1957. By March 1, 5.6 million bales of the 14.7 million bale 1962 crop was already in Federal price shelters.

And what does Mr. Kennedy propose as a more sound and enduring plan? Why, another subsidy. In addition to the farm and export subsidies now being paid, there is to be a subsidy to enable domestic mills to buy cotton more cheaply and boost consumption by lowering prices of their products to domestic consumers.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican of Illinois, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, offers a plan that appears to have considerably more merit than this extra dosage of patent medicine suggested by the administration. Mr. FINDLEY would get the Government completely out of the cotton business in 3 years by selling the surplus back to the farmers who produced it.

Farmers would be offered the opportunity to buy surplus cotton at prices sufficiently attractive to provide a reasonable profit upon resale. In return, they would agree not to grow any cotton. During the 3-year transitional period required to work off the surplus, price supports would be gradually lowered to world price levels and planting restrictions would be gradually eased.

After 3 years, planting restrictions would be eliminated and price supports set at levels high enough to prevent disaster but low enough to let markets at home and abroad adjust supply and demand.

Contrast this with what the President proposes, which is for taxpayers to continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars annually to keep raw cotton prices high, and then lay out more millions to force prices back down after the cotton leaves the farm. Obviously, Representative FINDLEY'S plan would be immeasurably more sound and enduring if Congress can be persuaded to try it.

Fifth Columns in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent Washington Star article by Mr. Gould Lincoln carried some very interesting highlights of a speech by former Postmaster General James A. Farley. As chairman of the board for the Coca-Cola Export Corp., Mr. Farley has considerable knowledge of the international scene and is particularly conversant with the problems of Latin America. I believe that Mr. Farley's clear statement of Communist methods and goals will be of particular interest to the House and, pursuant to permission granted, I insert the article "Fifth Columns in Latin America" in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FIFTH COLUMNS IN LATIN AMERICA

This country has gone a far piece down the road for peace. It will go farther—even if it has to fight for it, as it has in two World Wars and in the Korean war. Former Postmaster General James A. Farley, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's right-hand man during the latter's first two administrations, speaking in Chicago Friday to the Executives' Club, warned, however, that this is no time to be lulled to inaction by Communist propaganda. He commented that unfortunately "there are well-meaning Americans who unwittingly assist" the Communists in trying to break down the will of the American people to resist. "They argue," said Mr. Farley, "that this is a time of greatest danger, and therefore greatest care must be taken. This is certainly true, but there is a vast difference between taking care and taking to the woods."

Mr. Farley likened the Communist operation since World War II to that of a python throwing its coils around helpless free peoples, first of Central Europe, moving on to Asia and the Middle East, and now to Latin America. And he said: "All the committee reports in the world will not wash away the lines on the map; and the lines on the map, as certainly as the calendar on the wall, indicate this country is under attack. I had no higher formal education but I have had extensive dealings with American statemen for nearly half a century—enough to defy any professor who tries to peddle the nonsense that the Communist occupation and arming of Cuba is not a threat to the security of the United States and therefore to the whole free world. In my opinion, that menace must be removed. To remove it world war III may have to be risked; and for

myself I am prepared to take that risk. But the decision is not mine. That decision rests with the loneliest man in the world—the President of the United States." Admitting that these decisions are "agonizing." Mr Farley urged the American people to assure the President they will back him in any decision he may make.

DOUBTS REDS

Mr. Farley made it clear he takes little stock in the oft-reported desire of Nikita Khrushchev, the Russian premier, for "peaceful coexistence." Communists, he said, are not going to abandon a technique which has proved so successful—the technique of fifth column operations and subversion, and show of force. And getting directly to the Cuban situation, Mr. Farley told his audience: "Before the world, the United States proved that the Kremlin lied when it stated there were no atomic weapons (of long range) in Cuba. Finally, even the Reds had to admit they lied. But if the Reds lied about putting the weapons into Cuba, can any one believe them when they say they have taken them out? Or would you take their word that they will not put them back?" As Mr. Farley commented: "Do you need a committee to tell you what they intend?"

Portugal Deserves Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Clay report on foreign aid urged that every effort should be made to reduce assistance to foreign countries in return for base rights. The report specifically mentioned Portugal, and this mention was in error. The State Department corrected the error in a statement by Lincoln White, the Department press officer, who pointed out that Portugal had never asked nor received compensation for the Azores bases. The Associated Press story was printed in the Washington Post on March 27, 1963, and the Washington Evening Star commented on the correction editorially on March 29, 1963. I believe the store and editorial should be brought to the attention of the Members. Few countries, even allies, do anything for nothing, and Portugal should have full credit for its generosity.

The story and editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 27, 1963]

UNITED STATES DENIES PAYING PORTUGAL FOR BASE

The State Department, taking issue with part of the Clay report on foreign aid, yesterday said the United States does not pay Portugal for U.S. base rights in the Azores.

A foreign aid advisory committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, said in a report issued over the weekend:

"Every effort should be made to reduce assistance to foreign countries in return for these (base) rights, especially Spain and Portugal, which are already more than adequately compensated."

State Department Press Officer Lincoln White said that Portugal has not asked for or received U.S. aid in return for the Azores-base rights granted to the United States since 1951. The United States is currently seeking a renewal of the rights.

White said Marshall plan aid to Portugal ended in 1951, arms help extended to Portugal is due to her membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and surplus-food aid to Portugal is a program carried out by voluntary relief agencies.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1963]

ERROR ON PORTUGAL

Speaking through Press Officer Lincoln White, the State Department has made a timely correction of an error in the Clay Committee's report on foreign aid. The error is the report's statement that Portugal has already been more than adequately compensated for the base rights it has granted the United States in the Azores.

Actually, as Mr. White has explained, the Portuguese have neither asked for nor received any compensation in connection with this important understanding between them and our own country. It is unfortunate that the Clay Committee has suggested otherwise at a time when there are delicate negotiations to renew the rights Lisbon granted years ago without asking a nickel for them.

In the circumstances, the State Department has done well to set the record straight. What must be hoped for is that the Portuguese will understand that the error in the Committee's report was a sort of slip of the pen. Certainly it should have no bearing on current talks to keep America in the Azores for the defense of the free world.

The Case for the Cold War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, a strong argument in favor of recognition of the services rendered by post-Korean veterans is made by Mr. Felix Putterman, the national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. In an article in the February 1963 issue of the organization's publication, Mr. Putterman ably presents the case of the cold war veterans and the need for a GI bill of rights for such veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and urge their serious reflection of this proposal. The article reads as follows:

THE CASE FOR THE COLD WAR VETERANS

The other day the Army awarded the Air Medal, a high honor indeed, to a noncom for giving aid to casualties while in helicopter flight over combat areas in south Vietnam. While this was still another incident in a long series of quiet American bravery in the sullen swampland and jungles of southeast Asia, it serves as a reminder that this is still a part of what is euphemistically called peacetime duty.

Hardly a week goes by without an announcement of casualties and deaths among U.S. servicemen on the hot front of the cold war. Yet as far as recognition and benefits are concerned, there is no distinction made between garrison duty here at home and service abroad on this razoredge exposed nerve of the struggle between freedom and tyranny.

President Kennedy has taken an initial step in asking the Congress for legislative authority to award medals, the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Air Force Cross, and Silver Star, now restricted to heroic service in active combat with an enemy of the United States during wartime. Such legislation is consistent with the President's action of last April when Mr. Kennedy issued an Executive order to establish eligibility for the award of the Purple Heart to cold war casualties.

Many distinctions are drawn by the Government based upon the supposed differences besween hot and cold war duty. Among these are a number that are artificial and arbitrary at best.

Servicemen carrying out the national commitment in Berlin, on the armistice line in Korea, in Laos, and the agony of Vietnam cannot purchase national service life insurance. If they lose a limb, they are not eligible for the special automobile available to World War II and Korean veterans. The benefits of a GI bill are as yet unattainable. Their eligibility for service-connected disability compensation is severely limited by much stricter presumptions of preservice fitness than predecessors of Korea and World War II. After discharge, veterans of Vietnam, Berlin, et cetera, are not eligible for the same pension given war veterans totally and permanently disabled by reason of nonservice-connected cause.

Apparently, the Government's distinction between hot and cold war has not inhibited insurance companies. There have been a number of complaints from parents and widows that policies held on deceased sons and spouses are not being paid because the death occurred on a hazardous mission overseas. An insurance company refused to pay double indemnity for an accidental death to the widow of a warrant officer lost in a transport crash in Laos 2 years ago. A number of dependents have been trapped in this whiplash between the Government's artificial distinction of what comprises wartime duty and the private insurance companies' strict views on accidental death.

Obviously, the situation beggars a sensible, rational, and humane solution. The Congress can take a constructive step in the right direction by adopting the President's proposal on awards. The logical next step would be an adjustment of our entire schedule of benefits to bring in deserving veterans who have been exposed to hazardous duty. The term "hazardous duty" should be interpreted in a limited sense so that the administration could not be accused of creating an all-encompassing Mother Hubbard for every peacetime serviceman. Finally, the GI bill for which Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has been leading a valiant and almost lonesome fight should be moved up high on the agenda of a Congress which may have time on its hands while waiting around a goodly portion of next summer for the tax bill to be reported out into daylight from the inner recesses of the Senate Finance Committee.

Admittedly the GI bill is expensive—not extravagant—but expensive. It is inconceivable that the talents of our most fiscally responsible Members of Congress cannot be used for something positive rather than merely being "agin" every spending proposal. One contribution would be a GI bill or rights, carefully drawn to limit, if necessary, its benefits to those cold war vets enduring the hazards of perilous duty while plugging the leaky dikes of the free world.

What is right is right. At the expense of some of our finest young men, the Government Treasury and private insurance companies have been eating their cake and having it as well.

The Federal Trade Commission's Role in Regulating Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Retailing Conference of the School of Business Administration, University of Massachusetts, at Amherst, Mass., had as its speaker on March 27, Mr. Daniel J. Murphy, director of the Bureau of Deceptive Practices, Federal Trade Commission. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Murphy's address, entitled "The Federal Trade Commission's Role in Regulating Advertising," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S ROLE IN REGULATING ADVERTISING

(By Daniel J. Murphy)

It was indeed a pleasure for me to accept your kind invitation to appear on this program and to discuss with you the Federal Trade Commission and its advertising jurisdiction.

Ever since its organization, nearly a half century ago, the Federal Trade Commission has engaged in a campaign to eliminate deceptive advertising.

Although the Federal Trade Commission Act makes no specific reference to false and misleading advertising, it was clearly intended to deal with this problem as one aspect of the unfair methods of competition against which the law was directed.

Fortified with a congressional broad power to proscribe "unfair methods of competition," the Commission, in its early days, determined that deceptive advertising, because of its ability to injure competition, was an unfair method of competition.

This Commission has the widest jurisdiction of all Federal regulatory bodies over advertising. Other Federal agencies have restricted jurisdiction over advertising—limited to single commodities or particular media. The jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, by contrast, is general—extending to all media, and, with few exceptions, to all commodities.

It is the only governmental agency, fortified by statute, equipped by personnel, and strengthened by years of experience, with adequate procedures and techniques, to perform this most vital responsibility.

Until 1931, one important question remained unresolved—whether the Commission could prohibit false advertising when there was no showing of competitive injury.

This basic question was resolved adversely to the Commission by the Supreme Court in the famous 1931 case, *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raladam*, 283 U.S. 643.

The Court held that the Commission lacked jurisdiction to proceed against false advertising where no substantial competition, present or potential, was shown to have been injured or clearly threatened with substantial injury by the advertising sought to be prohibited.

This decision was a severe setback to the Commission's enforcement against false advertising. Agitation soon developed for congressional action to broaden the Commission's power in order that it might protect the consuming public as well as honest competitors.

These efforts resulted in the passage of the Wheeler-Lea amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1938. The basic prohibition of section 5 now reads: "Unfair methods of competition in commerce, *and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce*, are hereby declared unlawful." (Italic supplied to indicate Wheeler-Lea Amendment.)

Unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices are not defined by statute. As a matter of fact, it would be impossible to frame definitions which would embrace all unfair business practices. There is no limit to human inventiveness in this area. Unfair methods and practices are to be determined by inclusion and exclusion in consideration of the experience and progress of business.

Advertising has had and is having a tremendous growth. In 1962 approximately $12½ billion were spent in advertising. This is an impressive sum—more than double what was spent in 1950.

This advertising appeal is thrust directly at the consumer. This tremendous and powerful force—whether in the form of the spoken word on radio, or the pictorial presentation on television, or the written word of the newspapers, or various other methods of communication—constitutes an absorbing and continuing appeal, many times dramatic and emotional, exhorting and urging the defenseless and many times gullible consumer to buy and use the abundant goods and services produced by our complex economy. Thus, many luxuries of yesterday become the necessities of today.

Just imagine the numbers and kinds of advertisements the average consumer is exposed to. He is subjected in one form or another to millions of advertising techniques during the course of a year. The written word, the spoken word, the pictorial presentation. This tremendous power of advertising suggests a tremendous responsibility of the advertiser to comply with the law.

Business and the advertising fraternities must universally recognize their responsibilities of properly and honestly informing the consumer of the qualities and value of their products, without the use of false and misleading statements and without disparaging observations of competitive products.

As President Kennedy said in his special message to Congress on consumer protection in March of 1962, consumers were then the only important group in the economy who were not effectively organized, and whose views were not often heard in the halls of government. Since then we have seen a quickening interest in consumer problems. The President in July of 1962 appointed the Consumer Advisory Council to provide Federal agencies with advice on broad issues of economic policy, on governmental programs protecting consumer needs, and on needed improvements in flow of consumer research material to the public. Representatives of 22 Federal agencies, including the Federal Trade Commission, have been designated to aid the council and have had frequent meetings with it. These meetings serve to bring the viewpoint of the consumer more closely into the deliberations of the Government agencies, and at the same time give the agencies another outlet toward the consumer through which to make known the types of service which they are prepared to render. Thus the consumer has been advanced to a front position in alerting Government agencies to the problems affecting him.

The present Congress, in protecting the consumers, has already passed new legislation and is presently considering additional legislation. For example, added protection against unsafe or ineffective drugs has been provided.

Senator HART's truth in packaging bill and Senator DOUGLAS' truth in lending bill are receiving active attention in congressional committees, to determine whether consumers buying goods in packages should be provided with more complete information regarding the contents of the packages, and whether persons borrowing money or buying on credit are being sufficiently advised concerning the amount and rate of interest or carrying charges. Thus there is lively interest on the part of all of us not only in full implementation of present consumer legislation, but in ascertaining the need for additional protection.

Consumer organizations and consumer groups which in past years may have felt like neglected stepchildren now find their advice being actively sought and their problems affecting them being considered at the highest levels of government.

The Commission, in assuming its great responsibilities in this area—apart from its formal proceedings—has adopted and employed several informal procedures and techniques in meeting the challenge of false and misleading advertising. It must be realized that the function of the Commission as an administrative agency is not to punish, but to educate, explain, and encourage. We seek voluntary compliance to the maximum extent possible. This is a sound basis for understanding and cooperation between business and government.

Under its consent settlement procedure, the Commission gives notification of its intent to issue a complaint, accompanied by a proposed complaint and order. The party has 10 days in which to decide to accept a consent order, and an executed agreement embodied in the order must be submitted to the Commission within 30 days.

This agreement may contain a statement that it is for settlement purposes and does not constitute an admission of guilt. The Commission may accept the agreement and issue its complaint and decision, including the order agreed upon, or it may reject the agreement and issue its complaint.

Trade practice conference rules represent a cooperative undertaking between the Commission and members of an industry to draw up a code of conduct for the industry and thus obtain industrywide, voluntary compliance with the laws which the Commission administers.

To further deal with problems on an industrywide basis, a few years ago advertising guides were added to the older trade practice rules.

The advertising guides serve a dual purpose of providing guidance for the members of the industry who wish to comply with recognized legal standards and providing the consumer with the means of recognizing and avoiding deceptive sales appeals.

Generally speaking, guides may be issued in one of two forms: (1) Guides which apply to specific practices in a particular industry such as the advertising guides for cigarettes, automobile tires, fallout shelters, shell homes, and shoe labeling; (2) guides which apply to business practices common to many industries such as deceptive pricing, bait advertising, guarantees, and guides for advertising allowances.

More recently we adopted and are now using a procedure for the issuance of advisory opinions. These opinions afford assistance to individual businessmen in informing them of the legality of a proposed course of action. On the basis of facts submitted by an applicant, the Commission will, where practicable, advise him whether the proposed course of action, if pursued, will likely result in action by the Commission. Such advice, of course, is without prejudice to the right of the Commission to reconsider the question and to rescind or revoke the advice, but the information submitted as the basis for the opinion cannot be used against an applicant without prior notice and opportunity to discontinue the course of action pursued in good faith in reliance upon the advisory opinion.

We are now prepared to put into practice a procedure which was announced last year

for the promulgation of trade regulation rules. These rules will "express the experience and judgment of the Commission, based on facts of which it has knowledge derived from studies, reports, investigations, hearings, and other proceedings, or within official notice, concerning the substantive requirements of the statutes which it administers." The procedure for establishing trade regulation rules provides for the publication of proposed rules in the Federal Register, for the giving of notice as to when interested parties may present written data, views, and argument, for holding hearings, and for all other necessary procedural safeguards. Additionally, when the Commission in an adjudication relies upon any such trade regulation rules, the respondent will be given a fair hearing on the legality and propriety of applying the rule to the particular case.

We have discussed in brief the jurisdiction of the Commission and some of its procedures and techniques, used in its continual campaign against false advertising, with its ever-changing themes and variations.

The Commission has made a substantial record of accomplishment in this area. However, it must be appreciated that the job of policing advertising is too big for any single organization whether governmental or private. The Commission needs and expects the whole-hearted and active cooperation of business and the entire advertising industry. The consumer must be protected—the businessman must be protected. All interested parties, therefore, are called upon to cooperate in contributing to the promotion of an economic system that is fair and competitive.

Part 14: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba (January 23, 1963–January 31, 1963)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of our American essayists and poets, James Russell Lowell, said something once that I feel is apropos today in connection with our running controversy with Castro in Cuba, as well as his sponsor-dictators, Mao Tse-tung and Nikita Khrushchev, of Red China and Soviet Russia: "There is no good arguing with the inevitable. The only argument available with an east wind is to put on your greatcoat."

Our approach for quite some time now appeared to be to engage in a series of diplomatic arguments and diplomatic discussions with Castro and his henchmen, just as it seemed to be our accepted method of dealing with Khrushchev and his bodyguards.

In all our diplomatic discussions, it appears that we somehow all came out on the losing side—even when temporarily it looked as though we were winning the argument, in looking back at the Cuban quarantine by our Government. About the only time I can recall with certainty when it was apparent we won an argument with Khrushchev, for instance, has been when we stopped discussing and started taking action in accordance with what we firmly believed to be right. Witness the Berlin airlift, as a prime example, when our access routes into West Berlin were closed after a series of harassments by the Soviets of the allies. The same thing applied after the wall was built between East Berlin and West Berlin and it once again appeared that the Soviets might attempt again to close our points of access and free and open travel by the military between the two segments of the divided city. And our latest example of "putting on our greatcoat" was, of course, the act of setting up our quarantine of Cuba—in spite of the huffing, puffing, and rocket rattling engaged in by Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and Castro.

My chronology today concludes the January portion of events involving Castro, Cuba, and the United States. Very soon I will go into the February events.

We find in the latter part of January that the Soviets were busily transforming Cuba into a veritable armed camp—even without the 40 missiles and 42 I-28's which had been sent back to Russia. Their actions were reported by the New York Times, January 23, and also in public statements made by Senator KENNETH KEATING—the man who stated of the Soviets and Cubans that "they are now 10 times stronger than they were on July 1 of last year," and that his information "confirmed by official Government sources" indicated the Soviets had 20,000 men in Cuba, including soldiers and technicians and the force included combat troops as well.

The President was drawn into this new controversy over the Bay of Pigs invasion when he asserted that no U.S. air cover was ever planned to help the Cuban attackers. He stated instead that the plan—which failed miserably—was a strike by B-26 bombers flown by pilots not based in the United States. He denied that there was a buildup of the military, in the sense of equipment coming in from outside Cuba, but admitted that after withdrawal of 4,500 Soviet technicians since October, there was left 16,000 or 17,000 Russians still in Cuba operating technical equipment, building barracks, and acting as a part of organized military units.

Representative MINSHALL, of Ohio, introduced a resolution which called for a joint House-Senate committee to undertake a full-scale investigation of the Bay of Pigs invasion. He indicated that he felt the controversy transcended both political parties and partisan motivations. Representative MINSHALL also asserted that at this late date, honest accurate reporting of the events leading up to, and including the invasion, could not or would not break security.

A top intelligence briefing took place on the 25th of January at which time several Senators heard reports of the buildup of a powerful military and political machine in Cuba over the previous 6 months. This briefing grew out of Senator KEATING's public report of a military buildup in Cuba and made many believe that without his prodding—such a briefing could not have taken place. A variety of comments made by Senators taking part in the briefings indicate the wide variance in their thinking, or points of view, as far as the potential threat of the military buildup. It also indicated the wide variance in the Democrat Party as far as support of President Kennedy's efforts to play down the threat of such military buildup.

Republican Senator AIKEN felt the buildup was much stronger militarily and politically than it was 6 months before. Democrat Senator SYMINGTON stated the big Soviet military complex in Cuba had been constructed over the last 6 months. But Democrat Humphrey, present at the same briefing, claimed to have heard nothing to indicate there had been a significant Soviet buildup. This had the effect of building the suspicion in the minds of the American public that someone was either stretching the truth, or had a good imagination, or that someone was being either overly partisan or overly protective.

A U.S. intelligence report was circulated a little later which described a Soviet ship, *Simferopol* as being the only one which had put in at a Cuban port with a significant amount of military equipment since last fall's crisis.

This same intelligence report indicated that Russia had supplied a great deal of military equipment to Cuba prior to July of 1962—which included the following: "About 200 tanks; around 1,500 artillery pieces; 35 Mig 15 and 17 jet aircraft; and many conventional antiaircraft guns."

During the July–October influx of weapons and personnel, the report stated that the number of Mig jet fighters had tripled to a total of 106, including 42 of the advanced Mig-21 type. The number of tanks and field pieces doubled. Major new weapons were also sent into Cuba—including surface-to-air missiles deployed among 24 bases—4 coastal defense missile systems, 12 missile-armed coastal-defense boats, and a number of self-propelled mobile field pieces

Russian manpower—according to the intelligence summary—mounted from a pre-July figure of 500 to a total of about 22,000 by late October. But when Premier Khrushchev pulled out his missiles and bombers—as a result of our quarantine—this Soviet strength was supposedly cut down by about 5,000 men. But the Soviets were known to control the new equipment delivered to Cuba.

Our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, admitted that continued presence of heavily armed Soviet combat troops in Cuba was a matter of real concern to the United States. He also admitted remaining Russian forces on the island were a substantial military presence. He reiterated what had been said many times, that "it must be our policy that penetration of this hemisphere by a Communist regime from outside is unacceptable to this hemisphere."

The diplomatic arguments went on—the east wind continued blowing—and the American people began to feel they were indeed being placed in the position of having to "put on your greatcoat."

Our January portion of the chronology ends with statements by Pentagon spokesmen assuring the American public that missile sites were not only broken up, dismantled, not being used for any military purpose, and so forth, but that such missiles, transporters, and missile erectors had been photographed en route to and at port areas, loaded aboard ship, and were aboard ships en route to the U.S.S.R.

But those who urged that we "put on our greatcoats" in the argument being carried on with the east wind, could and would not be convinced that things were as pleasant as the public was being daily assured was the case.

Part 14 of the chronology follows:

PART 14: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT—A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO AND CUBA (JANUARY 23, TO JANUARY 31, 1963)

January 23, 1963: The New York Times news service said that Soviet forces in Cuba are reported working around the clock building and improving "highly sophisticated ground and air defenses."

A Washington-dated dispatch by Tad Szulo said private reports from Havana, confirmed in part by American experts on the Cuban situation, relate that large shipments of weapons and other materials are continuing to arrive in Cuba.

The Times story said: "Soviet encampments are being relocated and strengthened, and Soviet experts are directing Cubans in the construction of underground depots, hangars and runways.

"The construction work is apparently concentrated in the main defense complex between Havana and the San Antonio de los Banos Air Base in Camaguey Province, and in the Sierra Maestra area of Oriente Province.

"Soviet troops exclusively are doing the work and some sites are closed even to Cuban military personnel."

In Washington, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, told a reporter he has information "confirmed by official Government sources" that Soviet weaponry has been pouring into the island.

"They now are 10 times stronger than they were on July 1 last year," Keating said.

"My information is that they (Soviets) have 20,000 men in Cuba, including soldiers and technicians. The force includes combat troops."

January 23, 1963: A planeload of 98 Cuban-Americans, many of them children, landed in Miami. The refugees reported growing food shortages and anti-Castro feeling in Cuba, and stepped-up reprisals against opponents of the Government.

January 23, 1963: The SS *Shirley Lykes* headed out of Havana for Florida tonight, packed with 1,160 refugees from Fidel Castro's Cuban regime, the Red Cross reported.

January 24, 1963: President Kennedy entered the new controversy over the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion with the assertion that no U.S. air cover was ever planned to help the Cuban attackers.

What was planned, and what proved to be a failure, he said, was a strike by B-26 bombers flown by pilots not based in the United States.

The invasion brigade thought that this attack would give it protection on the beach, but Cuban jets "were very effective" and the invasion brigade "was not able to maintain air supremacy on the beach," the President said.

President Kennedy also replied to questions about a reported new buildup of Soviet weapons in Cuba. He said one Soviet ship has arrived in Cuba since the October crisis "which may have arms on it, possibly military cargo."

But he said that there was no military buildup in the sense of equipment coming in from outside Cuba. "There is no evidence that this ship carried any offensive weapons," the President said.

Some 4,500 Soviet technicians have been withdrawn from Cuba since October, he said, and there are 16,000 or 17,000 Russians still there, operating technical equipment and building barracks. Some of the Russians are in organized military units, he said.

"Our scrutiny of Cuba is daily," the President said.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said the buildup consists of tanks, guns, fighter planes, and other weapons but not long-range missiles and bombers.

KEATING said he had learned from refugee sources that Soviet military activity on Cuba is 10 times greater than it was last July 1 before the missile crisis.

In the House, Representative WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Republican, of Ohio, introduced a resolution calling for creation of a Joint House-Senate committee to make a full-scale investigation of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Referring to the Attorney General's comment that no air cover was promised, MINSHALL said "this tremendously important controversy transcends political parties and partisan motivations. At this late date, an honest, accurate report of events leading up to and including the invasion would not break security."

January 25, 1963: Several Senators said, after a top intelligence briefing, that the Soviet Union has built a powerful military and political machine in Cuba over the past 6 months.

The Senate hearing was held to look into charges by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, that the military buildup in Cuba is 10 times greater than it was last July before the missile crisis.

Senator KEATING said he knew of no offensive missiles and bombers going to Cuba. But he said tanks, guns, Mig fighters, and other arms were continuing to pour in.

After the briefing, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, told newsmen that the Russians have built "an enormously powerful military and political base in Cuba—much stronger than it was 6 months ago."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, said "there is a big Soviet military complex in Cuba" that was constructed over the last 6 months.

At the same time, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, said he heard nothing to indicate there had been a significant Soviet buildup.

Senator HUMPHREY said there was plenty of blame for both Democrats and Republicans from the invasion fiasco and little to be gained by opening old sores.

January 25, 1963: New York Attorney James B. Donovan returned to Miami from a conference with Cuban Premier Fidel Castro in Havana and said that he was "most optimistic" that about 25 Americans held prisoner in Cuba would be released soon.

January 26, 1963: An intelligence summary circulating among top U.S. officials reports that a Soviet ship carrying a "significant amount of military cargo" docked in Cuba within the past 2 weeks.

The vessel, identified as the *Simferopol*, is the only one which has put in at a Cuban port with a "significant amount" of military equipment since last fall's crisis, the report says—backing President Kennedy's contention.

The summary states that U.S. intelligence agencies have observed shipping to Cuba closely since last fall.

According to the intelligence study Russia had supplied "a great deal of military equipment to Cuba prior to July 1962, including about 200 tanks, around 1,500 artillery pieces, 35 Mig-15 and Mig-17 jet aircraft and many conventional antiaircraft guns."

As a result of a July-October influx of weapons and personnel, the number of Mig jet fighters tripled to a total of 106, including 42 of the advanced Mig-21 type. The number of tanks and fieldpieces doubled. Also major new weapons were sent into Cuba, including surface-to-air missiles now deployed among 24 bases, 4 coastal defense missile systems, and 12 missile-armed coastal defense boats, as well as a number of self-propelled mobile field pieces.

During the same period, according to the intelligence summary, Russian military manpower in Cuba mounted from a pre-July figure of 500 to a total of about 22,000 by late October. This Soviet military strength was cut down by around 5,000 men when Premier Khrushchev pulled out his missiles and bombers.

"Most of the new equipment delivered to Cuba this summer is in the hands of Soviet personnel," the report states.

January 27, 1963: Secretary of State Dean Rusk said that the continued presence of heavily armed Soviet combat troops in Cuba is a "matter of real concern" to the United States.

Rusk acknowledged that Mig fighters capable of carrying nuclear warheads are being flown by Soviet pilots in Cuba. He described remaining Russian forces on the island as a "substantial * * * military presence."

The best U.S. intelligence guess, he added, is that there are no nuclear warheads in Cuba today. But without onsite inspection, he said, "this is a problem of proving the negative." Rusk spoke on the WRC-TV (NBC) program, "Meet the Press."

Although Rusk gave no hint of U.S. deadlines for Soviet troop removal from Cuba, he said, "it must be our policy that penetration of this hemisphere by a Communist regime from outside is unacceptable to this hemisphere."

January 27, 1963: A Republican and a Democratic Senator expressed concern that more politics than patriotism may become involved in investigations of the Cuban situation.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, cautioned against any partisan inquiries into the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. He suggested that a special bipartisan House-Senate committee be named to study it.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, criticized "rash, partisan, demands for congressional investigations about past Cuban policy." Instead of an inquiry, he called on President Kennedy to propose a "manifesto of freedom" for Cuba when he meets with Central American leaders in Costa Rica next month.

JAVITS, appearing on New York State television stations, observed that there had been demands for "various kinds of investigations." He said there clearly ought to be an inquiry into the abortive 1961 invasion so the Nation can "profit from what occurred." But he said it must not be a partisan affair.

HUMPHREY, addressing a United Auto Workers' conference in New York, said partisan demands for a Cuba investigation could hurt national unity. He also said congressional investigations seldom look to the future and that is what is now needed.

HUMPHREY said that out of the Costa Rica conference March 18-20 should come "an announcement of determination that freedom will replace Castroism in Cuba."

He said the Cuban people have had enough of the ABC's of tyranny—Anarchy, Batista, and Castro. "Let us give them a clear message that we are determined to help them to democracy, enlightened leadership and freedom."

As for congressional investigations, HUMPHREY said Castro's rise was "a tragic story

that will not be remedied by seeking partisan advantage of trying to assess blame on either the Eisenhower or Kennedy administration."

January 28, 1963: Two of the planned air strikes for an invasion of Cuba in 1961 were canceled by President Kennedy, Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican of Kansas, told a meeting of Republican women.

CARLSON stressed, however, that the United States had not promised air cover for the Bay of Pigs invasion.

CARLSON, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the Central Intelligence Agency and Department of Defense originally planned three air strikes. One strike, against Cuban planes on the ground, were carried out but the other two were canceled.

"The United States did not promise air cover," CARLSON told the Kansas Federation for Republican Women, "but * * * three air strikes were planned to destroy all Cuban airpower on the ground.

"The planes to make these strikes were based on an island off Florida. Some of them were piloted by Americans, others by Cubans."

January 28, 1963: The Peruvian Foreign Ministry today announced that documents found on the bodies of Cuban Government officials killed in an air crash near Lima on November 27, 1962, link Cuba "to a conspiracy of continental dimensions."

January 30, 1963: The United States accused Cuba of declaring war against the hemisphere, and urged Latin American nations to redouble their vigilance against Castro-Communist subversion.

This was the substance of a note delivered by DeLesseps S. Morrison, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States. The note was given to Ambassador Juan Bautista de Lavalle of Peru, chairman of a special OAS committee on Cuba.

Referring to a January 16 speech by Fidel Castro, the note said the Cuban Premier's statement "further defining the Cuban Government's position of encouragement and support for armed insurrection in other countries of the hemisphere * * * constitutes a declaration of war against the hemisphere.

January 31, 1963: Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York, told the Senate that the Soviet Union is pressing a new military buildup in Cuba. He called on the Kennedy administration for the facts.

The Defense Department replied by challenging two specific statements by KEATING: (1) That a Soviet ship arrived in Cuba last Friday and "unloaded a cargo of armaments," and (2) that there is "continuing, absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence that the Soviets are maintaining" the missile bases that led to last October's crisis.

In a Senate speech, KEATING said "Cuba is becoming an impregnable fortress just as fast as the Soviets can make it so," and they are building to the point where "it will be impossible to get them out with conventional weapons."

KEATING said the arms shipment reached Cuba the day after President Kennedy told his news conference last Thursday that Cuba is being kept under daily surveillance and that only one ship with possibly military cargo has docked there since October.

A Defense Department spokesman said: "Within a few days of the President's press conference last week two large Soviet ships, Kasimov and Baltica, did arrive in Cuba. There is no evidence that either carried offensive weapons."

As to KEATING's statement that the Soviets are continuing to maintain the missile sites they agreed to dismantle, the Pentagon spokesman said:

"Concrete launch pads were broken up and other parts of the installations were destroyed. There is no evidence that these sites are usable, that they are being used for any military purpose, or that they are being maintained."

The spokesman said also that after the agreement between Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and President Kennedy for removal of offensive weapons it was observed that the missile sites in Cuba were being dismantled.

"Missiles, transporters and missile erectors were photographed en route to and at port areas, being loaded aboard ship, and aboard ships on route to the U.S.S.R.," he said.

RENO J. CONTI,
Foreign Affairs Division.

Lamp of Life Must Dim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the tribute written by Mr. Columbus P. Giragi, of Phoenix, Ariz., to his mother upon her death on March 14. Mr. Giragi is one of Arizona's outstanding journalists and finest citizens, as can be clearly seen by the beauty and understanding of life and people which is expressed in this tribute. I am sure that the "Lamp of Life Must Dim," which appeared in Mr. Giragi's column "Sparks From the Grindstone" in the Arizona Daily Sun of March 19, will be long remembered by all those who have the opportunity to see it.

The article follows:

LAMP OF LIFE MUST DIM

(By Columbus Giragi)

The lamp of life must burn out.

December 28, 1873, on the Isle of Sicily, such a lamp was lighted for Sarah Fiorello.

It went out, as she slept, in Phoenix, Ariz., U.S.A., March 14, 1963, in the land she loved.

Mrs. Sarah Fiorello Giragi has gone to her reward.

May her soul sublimely glow, for all eternity, in the realm of God's love, as she will in the hearts and memories of those she leaves behind.

Her lamp has burned out but no darkness shall dim the light she leaves shining in their book of memory.

A devoted mother, a devout daughter of God, she was ever reliable, in austerity as in abundance.

By nature, at times under stress of necessity, always by ambition, she never shirked her duties.

Years ago, when housewives gathered to visit—or fashion a burial garment for a departed friend, with a white or gold cross on a sleeve or across the bosom—she often did needlework.

On her own gleaming pillowcases, in beautiful thread lettering:

"I slept and dreamt that life was beauty.
"I waked and found that life was duty."

Advanced age, relentless though without illness or pain, took its toll of the mortal body.

Experts, trained in the profession of medicine, and in caring for the ill and the aged, dedicated to protecting and prolonging life bow, reluctantly, to the inevitable.

Helpless, sad, deeply hurt, children stand by, and suffer.

Her tenderness and devotion dwell in minds which wonder why it must be so, why the flickering lamp is beyond their helpfulness.

She gave them life, constant care, fitness for earthly tenure, and love that never faltered, love that knew no bounds.

She was soothing sanctuary when the tempests and tragedies of life raged and struck.

Someone wrote a brief fable about an errant youth becoming enslaved in the clutches of a cruel woman who, in her wickedness, one night demanded he bring her the heart of his mother.

Returning on his evil errand, to the iniquitous disgrace to womankind, trudging through the storm with his mother's bleeding heart in his hands, he stumbled and fell into the gutter.

The heart, lying in the street, asked tenderly:

"Did you hurt yourself, Son?"

There is nothing on this earth deserving of rank about a mother's love.

The angelic sight of a happy child is dwarfed by the light in the eyes of a mother beaming upon that happiness.

It seems only a mother can know the bliss which blooms in that garden of joy.

I have seen my mother enjoying such bliss.

Its extent and fulgency can be only surmised by any boy, by any youth, by any man.

Those are the times never to be forgotten. I will remember.

Unable to adequately assemble the words, I must turn to the famed Avis Turner French:

"I know I shall remember while I am growing old, how much she loved the starlight, the hills, the sunset's gold. The way she had of laughing just over little things. She graced the years with beauty because her soul had wings.

"I know I shall remember the songs she often sang. Her voice was pure as crystal, like bells that softly rang. The way she always kissed me was always sweet to know. She was so dear, my mother, who loved me, long ago."

Eternal happiness, reward for a lifetime devoted to God and helpfulness, is the promise to mankind.

Sometime, somehow, may she again know the happiness when those she loved and served on earth can gather about her "* * * at the river, which flows by the throne of God."

Now she belongs to Him she worshiped, and to loving, consecrated memories.

She taught that the will of God ever be accepted.

All should accept, though it be in the darkness of sorrow, heartache and tears.

Solace is not abundant in this grief, but suffering is dulled by kind fellowmen who tender the thought that the mystery of death "at the end of a perfect day" brings rest "to a tired heart."

Three Lives—Three Deaths—Three Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Judge Samuel Weiss, of Pittsburgh, Pa., my good friend and former Congressman, has forwarded me a remarkable sermon to read.

As I have admired Rabbi Harold Silver for his devotion, intelligence, and humanity, I am offering this New Year's sermon for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an inspiring document:

THREE LIVES—THREE DEATHS—THREE PRAYERS

(By Rabbi Harold Silver)

The older I become, with the passing of each new year in my life, January 1 has less and less meaning. The only new year observance any longer which has any poignant significance for me is the Jewish New Year. More and more I stand in awe of our forefathers who were so wise and realistic in arranging our religious calendar in such a way that the new year begins at the fall season of the year. It makes so much more sense to me to inaugurate a brand new chapter in your book of life at that particular time of the year, rather than in the dead of winter, as we observe it in the general calendar.

The fall is such a logical time to start a new year in our society. Summer and the vacation hours are over, with our minds and bodies refreshed and reinvigorated. A new school year commences for our children. A whole new season of communal activities is launched in the fall revolving around all of the major religious, cultural, and social institutions in our life. Mother Nature begins to yield her rich harvest at this glorious autumal season of the year. All in all, there is an infinitely rich variety of true endings and real beginnings clustering around the Jewish New Year, which makes it a natural and impressive starting point in everybody's life. There is no forced or artificial need to whip up one's mood or spirits, as with January 1, to remind us of the fact that another calendar climax in our lifetime has been reached. I think that is why most people actually resent the New Year's Eve festivities as they grow older. A person cannot help but wonder: What exactly is it he is supposed to be celebrating on December 31? It's the dead of winter. The weather is foul. The Christmas season whirlwind has hit our community with its usual tornado-like exhaustion. The morning of January 1 generally brings us all one monster headache, with bills for the season past, and our income tax forms for the year just ended. Three more months of hard, cold winter stare us in the face. Driving conditions could not be any more treacherous. Winter has the highest incidence of sickness and death. January is probably the worst business month of the year. It is no wonder that so many people seem to want to drown themselves in alcohol on New Year's Eve to forget as much as they can. This certainly is not a particularly propitious, edifying, or inspiring time of the year to turn over a new leaf.

I imagine that each generation feels that only it has experienced the height and depth of great drama, emotion and history in any given year. However, as I reflect upon the year just ended, I wonder to myself what emotions of any other generation can really compare with the excruciating tenseness we all experienced last year as we in this country waited for interminable hours for the breath-clutching return of John Glenn's capsule from the frosted loneliness and dangers of outer space. What can compare with the emotion-charged grimness and fascination of the spine-tingling drama surrounding the calling in of hundreds of Federal marshals, and thousands of Federal troops to the University of Mississippi, in the blood-stained and riot-filled successful attempt to enroll one Negro student at "Ole Miss?" And that unforgettable of unforgettable Tuesdays last October—when literally the fate of our whole civilization hung in dreadful balance over the Cuban situation, as America took the nuclear bit in its national mouth, and the panic button for universal disaster was primed for pushing by the President of the United States.

Whenever anyone is caught up in a seemingly impossible and dreadful situation, the question always arises; how much can a body take before the ultimate collapse? Looking backwards over the last year has convinced me that the capacity of the human animal to absorb shock, excitement, despair and sheer horror, and yet rise above it confidently and constructively, is absolutely unlimited, unfathomable and unbelievable. I have stood over too many hospital beds in my life to believe otherwise. I have talked with too many people in this life who have managed to survive every conceivable human horror to think otherwise. We human beings are truly a remarkable and mysterious creation. Anyone who still doubts the presence of God in human life, after observing the race of man confront crisis after crisis in human affairs—face these crises with unbelievable tenacity, courage, determination, and hope—can anyone still imagine, in his wildest and brooding skepticism, that such awe-inspiring human capacity to survive and to prevail derives only from the 97 cents worth of chemistry in the human body?

As we have all turned another sharp corner in our lives, I choose to reflect upon the year just ended not through the eyes of a political commentator evaluating the torrid and complex historical events of 1962, I leave that task to others. I choose to survey 1962 rather through the death of three unique women. Three remarkable women whose lives in my mind are truly symbolic of so much of what is essentially wrong and right with our generation. There are profound truths and tragedies in the lives of these three women which have a solemn and yet an inspiringly hopeful bearing upon all of our lives, if only we will pause a moment at the beginning of 1963 and give to these lives far more than a passing consideration.

The first death which I know saddened us all immeasurably during 1962 was Eleanor Roosevelt's. There is an old saying in our ancient literature which declares that in every generation there are 36 unique and righteous human beings upon whose spirit the health and welfare of all mankind in that particular generation is dependent. Without question, Eleanor Roosevelt nobly qualifies to be included among this 36. She was one of the most gifted and heart-warming personalities our age has produced. Her death leaves a tremendous emptiness in the world. Part of this void is due to the fact that her passing severs us all from the last link we in our generation have with the Roosevelts. No matter what our politics, the impact of the Roosevelt presidency in the life of our Nation, and in the history of our time, was of such a dynamic nature that many generations will elapse before the unique image of that gigantic public figure will ever pass our way again.

Certainly, no American President was ever blessed with such a mate—such an unexcelled woman who unflaggingly gave more of herself and her own deep inner life to the whole world around her in an unceasing, fruitful, and fulfilling measure. If ever there was a woman who by dint of her shy, retiring nature, temperament and personality was a sure-fire candidate for public obscurity. Eleanor Roosevelt was that woman. If ever there was a wife who by virtue of her mother-in-law's and her husband's completely overpowering public and private personality was to be pigeonholed for "nonentity-hood," that woman was Eleanor Roosevelt. But the inherent greatness and resplendent majesty of her inner being was not to be denied by any of these considerable lifetime handicaps. Her enormous inner worth blessedly burst forth in her later, mature years enveloping a thousand different, meaningful human causes and concerns, enriching all incalculably who were privileged to come into contact with her ennobling presence.

As the sun of her husband's life set forever, the moon of her own brilliant and stirring public personality rose to greater and greater heights of illumination, involvement, responsibility and effort. She was a towering inspiration to all of us. In an age where the impulse to involve oneself beyond the heady commitment to self is notoriously weak and ineffectual, Eleanor Roosevelt, through her tireless, undeviating lifetime commitment to the problems of an all-embracing humanity, goaded, embarrassed and inspired all of us to direct our eyes and hearts more searchingly to those who have lost their way in this world. Her concern for people was universal. The frontier of her human commitment was without limit. Because of this, she rightly earned the laurel of "First Lady of the World." No grave is big enough for her mortal remains. She lies enshrined in all of our hearts. May we all prove worthy of having lived in the same generation with this great lady.

A second woman died last year whose death also saddened us but for entirely different reasons. Here was a woman who, on the surface of her glittering life, seemed to possess everything imaginable most people struggle feverishly to attain—wealth, beauty, fame, and glory. Yet with all of these "attainments," beneath the high-powered glamor, tinsel, and notoriety, there was only heartache, loneliness, three broken and barren marriages, and a brooding, lifetime despair which inevitably led to a lethal overdosage of sleeping pills, and a lifeless body slumped over an empty bed with a cold, dead hand clutched pathetically on the telephone.

I think that what really upset most people about Marilyn Monroe's death was not so much the tragedy as to how her life suddenly ended. For her ending really was not sudden. She began to die years and years before she took those sleeping pills—all those years of her early loveless, bitterly unhappy, and abandoned childhood; the years of frustration with a terribly wrong first marriage of escape; the years of an even greater unhappiness with a second and equally wrong marriage of fame and convenience; the years of degradation, enveloped in a cold, conniving, and sensational motion picture career, where her limited artistic assets were blown up cruelly out of proportion to the real inner needs, demands, and abilities of the woman herself; and, then, the years of a third and equally wrong and despressing marriage for which her flamboyant career had by this time poisoned any real chance she might have had for any normal marital success and fulfillment.

The larger tragedy of Marilyn Monroe's life in my mind is that essentially all she ever wanted from life was what most ordinary women achieve with ease and simplicity—a decent husband to love, a baby, and a normal, happy, married homelife—things, sadly, which far too many women today stupidly and tragically depreciate and take for granted—yearning and daydreaming all the while for the glamor, fame, and excitement, which was Marilyn's, but which she would gladly have given up all in a moment for these other generally unacknowledged and unappreciated family blessings. What so moved many, many people deeply about Marilyn Monroe's suicide was the sober realization that abiding and satisfying happiness in life is not manufactured in the Hollywood of our dreams. The intrinsic values and imperatives of living in 1962, or in any other year, are not to be found on the glittering covers of national magazines, or in the scandal columns many of us devour hungrily each morning over breakfast.

The long-range human cure for most daily discontent and dissatisfaction in our time will never be found in alcohol, in tranquilizers, or on the couches of psychiatrists. The basic cure, in fact, the great challenge of today, is rather in one's recalling forgotten and unappreciated, God-given daily blessings of sound physical and mental health, decent mates, emotionally healthy children, and the unacknowledged fruits of whatever livelihood destiny has chosen for us to pursue. This poor woman's untimely death last year gave us all, of both sexes, a much-needed, new look at ourselves, and the paradise which is lost sight of in our lives only to those who are too blind to see it right in front of their own faces.

The third woman who died during 1962, whose death also touched me deeply, was the old dowager queen mother of Holland who passed away in her late eighties. What moved me especially about Wilhelmina's death was her last will and testament. It was her expressed wish that her state funeral be white instead of black. White, in Wilhelmina's mind, represented a radiant, illuminating hope for a long cherished and joyous reunion with her beloved, Prince-Husband who had predeceased her by many years. White was a visible sign of this happiness of hers in being together again wtih her husband, and of their future life together with their Creator in eternal bliss. The Dutch people, who loved their old queen mother, honored her last wishes faithfully. The horses drawing her funeral hearse were white. Her coffin was white. And the entire route all along the funeral procession was bathed in resplendent white flowers and white banners.

It was not only the whiteness of Wilhelmina's funeral which caught my attention, but rather the shining incandescence of her abiding and inspiring faith in an afterlife with her husband and with God. Few of us today, in our so-called modern and sophisticated era, hold fast to such an enduring and soul-strengthening conviction—a lifetime faith which triumphantly transcends the grave and reaches out into eternity; a faith which is at the very roots of our Judaeo-Christian religious heritage; a faith which sees the handiwork of God in every corner of the universe; a faith which cannot possibly conceive of the absence of this same Divine Presence in the universe beyond; a faith which removes the fear of dying and the eternal mystery of what must be beyond our mere mortality. Would that more of us had Wilhelmina's faith to illumine and to sustain our difficult hours of loneliness, helplessness, and bereavement. Would that more of us in this frantic, crass and uncertain age have the larger wisdom, insight, and openmindedness to reevaluate much of what this queenly woman symbolized in her lifetime—a Victorian lifetime, many of whose values, attitudes, and convictions sadly and tragically have become lost to our generation.

What many of us refer to today as Victorian—what has unfortunately become a term of mockery, humor, and tritism—those old-fashioned, 19th century, Victorian values of private virtue, character, integrity, gentility, decency, and honor—values which Wilhelmina nobly epitomized in her lifetime—how our generation today stands in dire need of these oldtime virtues which, in the last analysis, never really go out of style. Such moral and ethical imperatives form the very bulwark of our lives, of all of our human relationships, and of our whole civilization. All of our fabulous advances in 20th century science, medicine, and technology stand as naught, and pale into insignificance beside these rock-ribbed, timeless basic human ideals, and goals for all humanity in every age. To the degree that all of us have shunned and denigrated these oldtime moral values during the year just ended, we have only succeeded in bringing that much more ethical darkness and spiritual chaos into our lives. To the degree that all of us can and must rededicate our lives in the year ahead to these solid and ageless ethical and religious values of conduct and faith, only then will we be able to light up our lives and personal fortunes immeasurably in the time to come.

Perhaps none of us will ever achieve the breadth and intensity of Wilhelmina's faith. But we can and must strive for and achieve enough of that same essential conviction and confidence to give to all of our lives far more depth, direction, and meaning than they have ever had before.

Eleanor Roosevelt, Marilyn Monroe, Queen Wilhelmina—three lives, three deaths. Before we allow 1962 completely to give up its ghost, let us pause a moment in our looking backwards and ahead to see whether the powerful lessons of these three remarkable lives has given us fruitful food for reflection.

If from Eleanor Roosevelt's life, we are inspired to involve ourselves ever deeper and ever more meaningfully in the on-going needs and demands of people everywhere on earth, then her noble involvement in humanity will become a fixed, guiding, and shining star for us all in the troubled firmament of our time.

If from Marilyn Monroe's tragically unfulfilled and star-crossed days, we can all gain a refreshingly new appreciation and awareness of that which is within the precious circle of our own immediate and lifetime care and commitment, then her untimely passing will prove to be a very compelling and timely reminder to us all of things not beyond our grasp but fulfilling within our daily reach.

And, if from Wilhelmina's triumphant departure from the days of the years of her regal life here on this earth, we can all strive a little bit harder to recapture the spirit and the deeper meaning and relevance of that timeless code of moral and spiritual values by which she lived and died—a shining code for every generation of mankind—we shall, indeed, in the days to come, whether in this year or the next, rediscover for ourselves and for our children the one, true and historically permanent anchor of certainty and guidance in our lives which will assuredly secure all of our hopes, and dreams and souls in this world and the next, three lives, three deaths, three prayers. God grant that in the time to come, we respond to these lives, embrace the meaning of these deaths, and allow these prayers to be realized substantially in our own expanse of time and challenge.

Mass Polio Immunization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, my purpose of obtaining permission to speak today is to salute the Chester and Great Falls, Chester County (S.C.) Junior Chambers of Commerce, which under the leadership of Royce Lashley and Bill Helms, Chester County druggists, have announced that more than 10,000 people, about one-third of the population of my native county, have participated in a mass polio immunization program. I bring this story to the attention of the Nation in order that it might inspire and guide others to a similar effort. These young men deserve every cooperation and congratulation for the lives and health they are certain to save by this program.

I include a story from the State newspaper of Columbia, S.C. of Tuesday, April 2, 1963.

TEN THOUSAND PARTICIPATE IN MASS IMMUNIZATION

(By Mrs. S. W. Klutte)

CHESTER.—Officials have announced that more than 10,000 people, about one-third of the total population of Chester County, participated last Thursday in a mass immunization drive against polio.

Royce Lashley, Chester druggist who spearheaded the drive, said: "We were really pleased with the way people turned out for this program."

The first mass use of the Sabin oral polio vaccine was the project of the year for the Chester Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Seven distributing teams worked Chester County with a permanent station at the Chester National Guard Armory. Two teams in Great Falls reported giving 2,000 doses of the vaccine.

Bill Helms, president of the Jaycees of Great Falls, said about 90 percent of the school children in the county received the first of three doses of the vaccine.

The Jaycees plan a "mopup" day April 3 at the Chester Armory for those people who missed the first immunization. Lashley said over 1,000 doses of the vaccine were left from the original supply and they hoped to distribute those Wednesday.

The next dose of the vaccine will be given on May 3 and the third and final dose is planned for a date in the fall.

Lashley warned that the next two doses must be taken for complete immunization against the disease. He added that the vaccine reportedly produces a lifetime immunization against polio.

Bartlesville Wins All-America Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor was recently bestowed upon a community in Oklahoma's Second Congressional District when the National Municipal League and Look magazine designated the city of Bartlesville as a recipient of the annual All-America City awards.

This is a distinguished honor for which all Oklahoma is proud. Bartlesville is 1 of 11 American cities to be singled out for this outstanding recognition out of the nearly 70 applicants that were considered.

The basic criterion for selecting the award-winning cities is effective citizen action in addition to good local government.

Bartlesville well qualifies in this regard. The community leaders and citi-

zens of Bartlesville have a fierce community pride and they work together on various projects which are greatly beneficial to the city and to the State of Oklahoma.

The junior chamber of commerce is an excellent example of the spirit and enthusiasm with which the citizens of Bartlesville tackle community projects.

The Jaycees spearheaded many projects, among them being a statewide drive that secured 220,000 signatures to a petition for reapportionment of the State legislature, thus forcing a referendum vote.

The April 23 issue of Look magazine, which highlights the All-America City winners, points up other Jaycee-community activities such as the successful 5-month campaign to raise $612,760 for a new 52-acre city park and an adjoining 160-acre 18-hole golf course.

Bartlesville residents enthusiastically supported this drive and all funds needed for the project were collected from local contributors. This same generous response was given to the local community fund and United Health-Service Fund campaigns.

The Bartlesville Jaycees are planning a celebration on April 19 and 20 in honor of the city's recent recognition, and an outstanding program is being formulated.

I had hoped to be on hand personally for the celebration and to congratulate the residents of Bartlesville personally, but will be unable to do so because I will be on active duty as a Naval Reserve officer and will be visiting Guantanamo and fleet and Marine units in the Cuban area at that time.

However, I know I speak for all Oklahomans in extending our sincere congratulations to the city of Bartlesville and to its citizens and leaders whose work and efforts have brought this great honor to our State.

Why Shackle Cuban Freedom Fighters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, patriotic anti-Castro Cubans—in the United States, in Latin America, in their unhappy homeland—must harbor feelings of bewilderment, frustration, and anger after reading the stern statements of our State Department spokesman in regard to Alpha 66 raids on Cuba, and noting the extraordinary measures being taken by our Government to curb these forays.

Cubans who live for the day of their country's liberation may be able to appreciate the undesirability of open encouragement of these harassing tactics, but they must be mystified by this strong condemnation from the Government which once led them to bitter disappointment at the Bay of Pigs.

As long as Alpha 66 is going it alone, why could not our State Department spokesmen content themselves with the simple statement, "We don't know anything about it"?

Bedlam, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent first-page editorial from the Berks County Italo-American, which was previously published in Il Popolo Italiano:

BEDLAM, U.S.A.

If you want to sell newspapers, there's nothing like sex, rape, fear, and hysteria to increase sales. And if you're looking for a convenient scapegoat, parole and probation officials make the likeliest sacrificial lambs. Add a liberal dash of political seasoning and what evolves is a typical example of scare-school sensationalism in the worst tradition of yellow sheet journalism.

So long as the courts of law and cub reporters continue to confuse criminals, and more particularly sex deviates, with rational human beings, so long will criminality and sex offenses continue to shock the moral conscience of society.

Punishment is meaningful to the average man, but it is absolutely useless as a concept when dealing with mental compulsives or mentally deranged individuals. These people do what they do because they are emotionally incapable of doing anything else.

Too often what is defined as sanity and insanity in a court of law dates back to an age that knew little or nothing about mental illness. As a consequence, bank thieves, arsonists, con men, sex offenders, dope pushers, gamblers, and the rest are lumped together like so many tag ends of discarded junk.

A parole official would have to be a super-Solomon to be able to sort out, identify and evaluate the human wreckage with which he is daily confronted, not by the handful but by the hundreds. Obviously, society and its hysterical spokesmen are demanding of its parole officials capabilities and accomplishments which society, itself, does not possess.

Criminality is more than the business of apprehension and conviction. It is primarily the business of trained pyschologists and psychiatrists. Incarceration has no meaning if it is not to be utilized for mental treatment and rehabilitation. And if incarceration for life is to become the rule, then we can look forward to the prospect of walled cities on a universal scale, the like of which civilization has never known.

Nor can criminality be divorced from slums, educational facilities, more and better teachers, spiritual instruction, political corruption, racial prejudice and hatred, parental discipline, a social conscience, love and honest compassion.

There is no simple solution. Money alone will never cure it. The prevention begins in the home, the neighborhood, the school and the church. By the time it reaches court the battle is three-quarters lost.

Criminality demands people who care, not just at election time, but every day of the year. Although inmates were chained and beaten in the snakepits of bedlam, there is no available evidence on record that this deterred others from committing equally heinous crimes against society. Reversion to the animalism of the past is hardly a suitable blueprint for the future.

Defense Lie Detectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Defense Lie Detectors."

This is an excellent editorial, and I wholeheartedly agree with its contents. This is a deplorable situation, and should never have been allowed to happen in

The editorial follows:

DEFENSE LIE DETECTORS

The Defense Establishment and the country will be in a sorry state if it ever reaches a situation in which it is necessary to interrogate officers and subject them to lie detector tests in order to discover the sources of information given to the public.

Officials in whom the President of the United States has put his trust by Federal appointment ought not be required to prove their honesty by a humiliating and undignified submission to this particularly dubious technique of criminal investigation in a cause of such trivial importance. Things will have come to a pretty pass indeed when responsible public men have to prove by a lie detector test that they did not tell the truth to a reporter.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester is to be congratulated for the firmness with which he refused to participate in this dishonorable business. The Department has wisely decided to drop the whole investigation of the sources of the disclosure of a document reporting the excessive zeal of the investigators of a congressional committee. Maj. Gen. W. H. Blanchard, Air Force Inspector General, ought to give his polygraph back to Dick Tracy. These demeaning and degrading tactics are not acceptable in the ordinary administration of a Government department and they ought to be repudiated, not only in this case, but for other cases of the kind. Under Secretary Robert Lovett wisely forbade the use of such procedures without his express authorization in 1950. It is unfortunate that they have been employed again.

Secretary McNamara has deplored the fact that the questions asked in some recent investigations have shaken the country's confidence in the Defense Establishment. Nothing could shake it more than such a demonstration that the Department itself doubts the word of even its highest ranking officials. This is an ugly episode. The public is entitled to the fullest explanation of how and why it happened and to the firmest assurance that it will not happen again.

An Easter-Passover Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following prayer by Rev. Leon K. Molter as it appeared in the March-April 1963 issue of the Empire State Mason:

AN EASTER-PASSOVER PRAYER

(By R.W. and Rev. Leon K. Molter, Grand Chaplain)

O Thou from Whom all things come and have their being, hallow us with thy presence. The drab days of winter are disappearing and the earth seems to rise to life again. We feel our pulses quicken by the freshness of springtime and the winter bondage of selfishness dies and breaks forth to express itself in the nobility of charity to all men. May our souls thrill to the beauty of this holy season with its eternal messages of freedom and the hope of everlasting life and thus, make us more determined to apply that which we have learned to make our lives more meaningful. As we gather throughout this great State and break bread together in our meetings of fellowship; may we ever give evidence of the sincerity of our convictions and make us walk as upright men and Masons, so help us, our God. Amen.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Mrs. Blanche W. Noyes Is Among Six Named To Receive 1963 Federal Woman's Award — Outstanding Achievements Credited to Honorees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, an article by Reporter Sue Cronk in the April 7 issue of the Washington Post discusses the naming of six outstanding women employed by the Government as recipients of the 1963 Federal Woman's Award.

Established in 1960, this award recognizes women in the Federal employ who have contributed to the quality and efficiency of the career service, influenced major programs, and demonstrated personal qualities of leadership, judgment, integrity, and dedication. Heading the panel who selected the six 1963 recipients was News Commentator David Brinkley. Other judges were TV Personality Betty Furness; Katharine E. McBride, president of Bryn Mawr College; and H. Ladd Plumley, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It is a pleasure to note that one of the ladies accorded this high honor is Mrs. Blanche W. Noyes, former Bendix Trophy winner and an air-marking specialist for the Centers and Towers Project Branch, Installation and Materiel Service, Federal Aviation Agency. A cherished friend, Mrs. Noyes is an experienced and capable aviatrix who has logged some 13,000 certified air hours. I have been privileged to fly with her as a passenger on many occasions, and have often joined her as a participant in ceremonies and programs sponsored by segments of the aviation industry in West Virginia.

Mrs. Noyes has been a leader of thought in the field of aviation. The Post article states that—

> She has been directly and personally responsible for the Goevrnment's air-marking program. She has written and revised the technical handbook used by those who design and build air markers, and she has designed the U.S. standard heliport marker and the ground signals used by pilots awaiting rescue, in addition to helping many foreign countries set up their marking programs.

We are grateful to Blanche Noyes for these significant contributions which reflect her unswerving devotion to the public interest.

The 1963 Federal Woman's Award was also presented to the following:

Dr. Eleanor L. Makel, assistant to the director of the medicine and surgery branch, St. Elizabeths Hospital; Miss Bessie Margolin, assistant solicitor in the Department of Labor; Mrs. Katherine Mather, chief of the petrography section, Special Investigations Branch, Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Department of the Army; Miss Verna C. Mohagen, director of personnel management, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Miss Eleanor C. Pressly, head of the vehicles section, Spacecraft Integration and Sounding Rocket Division, Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. President, I am confident that each Member of Congress will wish to join me in conveying these dedicated and distinguished ladies our heartfelt congratulations and gratitude for tasks well done.

The Job To Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the prominent women aviators of our Nation, Jacqueline Cochran, has recently been traveling through the country speaking about the role of women in the space age.

Miss Cochran has many noteworthy achievements in her pioneering efforts to bring women into the world of aviation.

Miss Cochran is now in the forefront of efforts to demonstrate the contributions which can be made by women in the future space endeavors. One of her speeches, entitled "The Job To Be Done," delivered before the Zonta Club of Cleveland in November, is a particularly good example of her thinking on this vital question.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Miss Cochran's speech, as follows:

THE JOB TO BE DONE

(Speech by Miss Jacqueline Cochran, Zonta Club of Cleveland, "Women in the Space Age," November 28, 1962)

The Lovelace Foundation for Medical Research gave the first medical checks to the large group of astronaut candidates. From this group, the original seven astronauts were finally chosen. Dr. Randolph Lovelace spearheaded these medical tests. He has been in aviation medicine and aerospace medicine almost since the beginning. About 3 years ago, he and some of his associates thought it would produce interesting and perhaps instructive medical information to check a group of women pilots. They wanted to find out how a group of women pilots compared with men from the physical and psychological standpoints.

A group of volunteers were asked for by Dr. Lovelace. Jerry Cobb was the first to take the medical tests. Some 20 other women pilots took the tests later.

This unofficial and volunteer medical research project, through publicity, editorial license and wishful thinking became parleyed into the fairly widespread belief that there is an astronaut program for women. There is much misinformation on the subject. I know my facts. I have worked with Dr. Lovelace for years as a guinea pig in various aspects of aviation medicine. My husband is chairman of the Lovelace Foundation. I have talked with top men in various branches of the armed services and with several of the top bosses in NASA. I financially helped most of the 20 women get their tests, to the tune of about $18,000. I know how they rated among themselves in their tests. In my opinion, the misinformation that has been floating around has actually slowed down rather than speeded up the possibility of a space program for women.

There is no astronaut program for women. There has never been such a program for women. No woman in this country has passed the full battery of tests that would make her a candidate for training even if such a program were planned. NASA has never nominated, selected or approved any woman for such role.

No battle of the sexes seems to exist as to whether women should presently be in an astronaut program. Women, as a whole, just don't seem to have any great interest in the subject. Indeed, there seems to be only slight interest among our 12,000 women pilots. This is evidenced by the fact that it took some doing to get 20 to take the preliminary tests. Twenty was the minimum number that Dr. Lovelace thought would make any findings worthwhile. Of course, it is a live subject with the few women pilots who seem raring to go. But even most of the 20 realized that they were merely entering a medical research program.

NASA, in establishing basic qualifications for applicants for training as astronauts made no distinction as to sex. They did say that candidates would have to be experimental jet test pilots and, in addition, would have to have a degree in engineering or one of the sciences. No woman can meet these basic qualifications.

Some women alleged the requirements were discriminatory. If they were, they were equally discriminatory against all nonpilots as well as practically all male pilots.

Precious few pilots can meet the basic qualifications. Only a few enter test-pilot training schools and only a small percentage who enter graduate. Only a few of these who graduate have engineering or scientific degrees.

The screening sieve for selecting astronauts has a small mesh. That's the way it should be. NASA has stated it will need only 50 astronauts during the present decade. It follows that they should be from the very best material available. Our space program is terribly expensive and exceedingly urgent in the national interests. It

should not get mixed up with side issues. The determination whether women should be included at this time in the program of training and use as astronauts should not depend on sex. It should depend on whether such inclusion will speed up, slow down or make more expensive or complicated the schedule of exploratory space flights our country has undertaken. Such a decision can best be made by the agencies directly involved. It should be left to such agencies.

I don't feel discriminated against because of the qualifications just stated even though I want to go into space. I expect to go there in due time, but not at the expense of our national interests.

I know of no reason why women will not go into space just as they were in all phases of aviation from ballooning to fast-powered flight. But women have not yet been checked sufficiently as a group for anyone to say that their bodily structure can stand the same number of G's as men without permanent aftereffects. It was the purpose of the research program to find out about these things. It involved little expense. It intrigued the doctors. I'm sorry it was called off for lack of need. I want to see it back on the tracks.

Any crash program to put an American woman into space ahead of a Russian woman would, I believe, be unsound. I doubt that any agency would take the responsibility for such a program. It has been said that Russian women have been in training as astronauts for more than 2 years. I doubt this but, if so, they already have the ability to beat us to the punch, if it is considered a punch. Even the monkeys needed considerable training and we are beyond the monkey stage. We must expect failures in some space flights. If one happened to a woman in connection with a crash program, the propaganda value would be exceedingly negative.

No woman should be selected as an astronaut trainee unless a group of women are simultaneously selected. This is so that norms can be established rather than individual capacities of one or a very few who might not be representative.

I believe that women will be found fit for space travel. But such proof is presently lacking. It should not be searched for by including women—just because they are women—into the middle of an expensive and highly important astronaut program. There is a better and sounder way.

If a large group of women of various ages and educational backgrounds were given a series of checks and tests relating to space flight, much beneficial data could be obtained in the aerospace-medical field.

Such tests should be considered of a medical research nature.

They should, in my opinion, start off with not less than 200 women. These women do not necessarily need to be pilots. They could come from within the armed services as well as without. They would not have to be collected in one group at one place. Their checks could take place at various aerospace-medical centers operated by the various Government services and agencies around the country. They could be fitted into the various laboratories so as not to impose peakloads. Each medical center should give exactly the same tests under similar conditions so that the findings will have validity. It follows that some aerospace-medical doctor should have general supervision. Each series of tests starting with the first medical exam will involve some attrition by elimination. There will also be some dropouts. That's why I want to see 200 as a start. Such a program might take a year or two to complete. The end product will be a group of women who are qualified to be specially trained for space flight. They could then be inducted into a space training program.

This is one of the things still to be done. I believe it will be worth far more than the comparatively small cost.

But this is not all.

We presently tend to think of space flights as one or two men on a capsule couch. But that is no adequate way to explore the moon or other planets.

The astronaut or astronauts who take the space ship to the moon, land it, take off again and come home are going to be too busy to undertake other scientific tasks.

This is all right for the start. But to do a proper job of exploration and scientific study, there must be technicians and engineers and scientists along. I refer to geologists, astronomers, nuclear physicists, engineers and other technicians. It's time we started getting some of the younger people in these various fields prepared for space flight. I have been advancing this idea during recent months. I am glad to read that others have been considering the same point.

The polar regions were not explored and studied by pilots alone. They had a diversified group of specialists with them. And so it will be in the conquest of space.

Here is a great opportunity for women. Those who pass the first phases of any women's research program should also be trained in special skills having to do with things in space. These women may not be among the first 50 astronauts at the controls but when we explore the moon in an important way, they will be there. This will be because they will have proven they can adapt themselves to the new space environment, but also have perfected special skills to contribute to such exploratory flights.

If I were starting out to seek a career, I would break down the gate in an attempt to get into any such program.

I want to see nonpilot specialists getting prepared for space flight. That includes doctors and scientists. That also includes women who are ready to dedicate themselves and prepare with some special knowledge.

These are some of the things still to be done.

As to women, it can well start with a program of the type I have mentioned.

The Responsibility for Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, David Lawrence's column in the Washington Evening Star, Friday, April 5, contains some pertinent observations which should be read widely.

It is high time that we who believe in sound money, sound economy, and a fair chance for all, begin to speak out.

I ask unanimous consent that the Lawrence article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFICITS—DEFICITS AND GOLD OUTFLOW OF 1958–60 BLAMED ON DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy told newsmen on Wednesday to look back at the period between 1958 and 1960, when the Eisenhower administration was in power, and they would find a high unemployment rate, the largest peacetime deficit and the biggest outflow of gold.

But Mr. Kennedy forgot to mention that the Democratic Party had a majority in both Houses of Congress during that same period. After all, the national legislature has to vote the money that's spent by the Government and also decide on the tax rates. Congress, therefore, is primarily responsible for any deficits. Likewise, the outflow of gold was due then, and is due today, to the large grants and loans for foreign aid. This also is basically the responsibility of Congress.

The Democratic Party has had a majority in the Senate and House ever since 1932, with the exception of the period between 1946 and 1948, and between 1952 and 1954. Thus, for a total of 26 out of the last 30 years, the Democratic Party has been in charge of lawmaking and, especially, the appropriation of public funds.

As for the unemployment rate, which has declined only slightly during the present administration, the responsibility definitely rests on the Democratic Party in Congress. For Congress, year after year, has refused to broaden the antitrust laws to regulate, if not abolish, the labor-union monopolies which today push up the wage rates and force the squeeze in profits that brings unemployment.

The Kennedy administration, moreover, has not made a single recommendation to Congress thus far to deal with the abuses of "collective bargaining" and the violations of the civil rights of those workers who refuse to join a union or wish to cross a picketline and work.

The President's reference to the prevailing unemployment rate and that of the preceding administration was made on the same day that the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, said to a news conference at Rochester, N.Y., that "last year, some 19 million man-hours were lost because of strikes, but in that same year, 900 million man-hours were lost due to unemployment." He declared that the strike picture is comparatively rosy. Mr. Wirtz sought to give the impression that the labor unions are not in the least responsible for the unemployment situation in America and that there is no connection between the unemployment problem and the behavior and policies of union leaders.

The Secretary of Labor didn't mention the fact that every year numerous employers go out of business because, though unable to pay higher wages, they cannot afford costly strikes and consequently must surrender to the wage demands which unions uniformly impose throughout an industry. This means that, while the larger businesses are able to maintain themselves, the marginal companies are forced to the wall and unemployment is the result.

The arbitrary power of trade unions which has been exercised to extort high wage scales, irrespective of whether an employer can afford them, is fundamentally responsible for the high rate of unemployment today. The Democratic Party has avoided this issue for the last 30 years, and it was a Republican Congress which, in 1947, secured the revision of the one-sided Wagner Act passed in 1935. The new law, known as the Taft-Hartley Act, was vetoed by a Democratic President but was passed over his veto by the Republican Congress.

The abuses, however, which have since arisen, even under the Taft-Hartley Act, and which urgently need correction have been largely ignored by the Democratic Congress in the last 8 years. There is no evidence, either, that the labor committees of the House or Senate in a Democratic Congress will ever take up the subject as long as a substantial number of Senators and Repre-

sentatives are elected with the aid of campaign funds furnished by the labor unions in defiance of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Secretary Wirtz seems to think a remedy for unemployment will be found in the further development of the Youth Employment Act and in an extension of the manpower development program, as well as in an enlargement of the vocation, education and area redevelopment projects.

But all this merely means a throwback to the 1930's, when made work by the Government itself under the Works Projects Administration, or the WPA, as it became widely known, was in vogue. It didn't cure unemployment then, and it will not do so now. For there is only one way to create new jobs, and that's by making it possible for private business to earn a profit while it pays fair, but not exorbitant, wages. This can come about when labor-union monopolies are deprived of their power to fix wage costs throughout an industry. The alternative is socialism and state capitalism, which are the forerunners of communism.

The American people every 2 years can express themselves at the polls. Their next opportunity to elect an antiradical Congress, and one that doesn't owe its election to the campaign funds of the labor unions, is in November 1964.

Congressman Clyde Doyle's Message to Mr. Bart Lytton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of our colleagues one of the last letters written by our fellow Congressman, and my fellow Californian, Clyde Doyle. I wish to insert his letter in the RECORD for it conveys the warm, friendly, and genuineness that were so truly the marks of Clyde Doyle. In reading this letter addressed to Mr. Bart Lytton we can only be but reminded that the death of Clyde Doyle spelled sad days not only for California, but for the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, in a real sense, his 16 years of congressional service was a career which served as a continuing source of betterment of our land. Those back in his home district, and for that matter those across the Nation who were fortunate enough to have known Clyde—and all who knew him were his friends—will recognize in this letter the qualities that so well mark the quality of his character: humility, gentleness, and honor.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

Mr. BART LYTTON,
Dinner Chairman, Seventh Annual F.D.R. Dinner, Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR FRIEND BART: I would surely love to be able to have the great joy and inspiration, which it certainly would be to me, to be present on the evening of March 14 when you friends have the seventh annual F.D.R. dinner and honor Gov. Edmund G. Brown for his recent gubernatorial victory, but of course, friend Bart, I cannot make it.

I will have to be right here on the job in the Nation's Capitol, but I do want to express my appreciation to you and all the people of the great 23d District for the support you gave to the reelection of our great Governor.

With best wishes, I remain,
Cordially,

CLYDE DOYLE.

Lincoln's Greatness Not Due to Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have been most disturbed over recent speculation that the greatness of Abraham Lincoln was due to a frightful disease known as Marfan's syndrome. I therefore ask unanimous consent that an article—shortly to be printed in Philadelphia's Blumhaven Digest, which I believe clearly refutes this vilification of Lincoln—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT MARFAN'S SYNDROME AFFLICTION OF LINCOLN

"Did illness make Lincoln great?" So reads a 1963 magazine headline, ironically appearing on February 12, Lincoln's 154th birthday.

The magazine article is based upon the research of a Kentucky internist, who now, after 20 years' study of Lincoln's physical and mental traits, attributes his greatness to an uncommon disease, known as Marfan's syndrome.

In view of the following article about the "Paradox of Lincoln's Rise" and the exalting spiritual qualities of our 16th President that it substantiates, it is in my opinion, sheer vilification to attribute Lincoln's greatness to some frightful disease.

Technically, Marfan's syndrome is defined as a hereditary disease of the body's connective tissues, the bones, muscles, and ligaments, the symptoms occurring together, affecting the eyes, the heart and the skeletal structure. As applied to Lincoln, it is said to have produced the sturdy railsplitter's "long sad face, sunken chest, misshapen ears, loose, spidery arms, immense hands, gangly apearance, uncouth movements, high-pitched, almost girlish voice." Some contradictions in Lincoln's personality, such as his periodic shyness and his inclination to tell stories and jokes, and shortly thereafter sink into a deep depression, seem to impress our medical detective, who asserts that these characteristics are due to the rare disorder, known as Marfan's syndrome. (Marfan was a French pediatrician who identified the ailment in 1896, 31 years after Lincoln's death.)

So now, 98 years after Lincoln's death, we are asked to accept a medical diagnosis that attributes Lincoln's superb intelligence and leadership to a loathsome inherited disease.

Such diagnosis, obviously, was never made. The disease was unknown in 1860, and the patient, though described by a contemporary writer as the "offspring of a happy marriage between a derrick and a windmill," did not submit to a physical checkup and certainly needed no medical attention. For want of more scientific information, our diagnostician now says, he duly read the description recorded by the "tailors and bootmakers" who fitted Mr. Lincoln, and concluded that abnormalities were indicated.

And how can a dedicated Lincoln student, a layman, dispute a physician's verdict that the great emancipator's humanity, understanding and compassion were part of what Lincoln harvested from his ailment?

By the evidence, of course, evidence which happens to flatly contradict Lincoln's medical detractors.

In the Lincoln Memorial Gallery of the Blumhaven Library, there is an original bronze casting of Lincoln's face, made by the sculptor Leonard Volk. It is a beardless face, with no structural details concealed by the growth of hair. This impression of Lincoln's face was made in 1860 before he was nominated for President. It reveals a relatively small head for a man 6 feet 4 inches tall, and there is no discernible deformity or disease visible in that exact replica of Lincoln's face. The ears are not abnormal or misshaped. There is no deviation of the eyes. They are completely balanced and normal.

A top-ranking Philadelphia physician examined that bronze mask recently and declared there is not the slightest deviation of the eyes or a skeletal disorder indicated. This doctor also declines to attribute the early death of Lincoln's children to the inherited illness. There is no evidence to support the speculative diagnosis, he declares.

In addition to the life mask, Blumhaven has a bronze casting of Lincoln's hands. The fist of the right hand is powerful, not spidery. The left hand, gripping a broom handle, is a striking reflection of the man's strength and powerful physical condition. These replicas of iLncoln't face and hands tell us the truth about Lincoln's physical being.

The medical verdict of 1963 will not tarnish the heroic image of Abraham Lincoln, or rob him of the glory in history that is his.

To the medical profession, I respectfully submit Richard Watson Gilder's classic description of Lincoln's bronze life mask. It is worthy of their sober consideration and their contemplation of human fallibility. The Gilder poem:

"This bronze doth keep the very form and mold
Of our great martyr's face. Yes, this is he;
That brow all wisdom, all benignity;
That human, humorous mouth; those cheeks that hold
Like some harsh landscape all the summer's gold;
That spirit fit for sorrow, as the sea
For storms to beat on; the lone agony
Those silent, patient lips too well foretold.
Yes, this is he who ruled a world of men
As might some prophet of the elder day—
Brooding above the tempest and the fray
With deep-eyed thought and more than mortal ken.
A power was his beyond the touch of art
Or armed strength—his pure and mighty heart."

A Shortage of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 domestic problem in the United States today is the high rate of unem-

ployment. One of the main causes of this serious problem is the fact that many of our unemployed lack the basic skills needed to fill existing job vacancies. We are suffering not so much from a shortage of jobs as from a shortage of manpower trained to fill those jobs.

During a recent interview for U.S. News & World Report, Labor Secretary Wirtz said that there are numerous opportunities, especially for young people, "in skilled jobs and in professional jobs such as teaching, medicine, nursing and engineering," as well as in many service occupations.

In order to reduce the steadily rising level of unemployment, we must equip our labor force through training and retraining to fill the skill demands of the jobs that are going begging. Because of the importance of Secretary Wirtz' remarks on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his interview in the April 1 issue of U.S. News & World Report be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

EXCERPT FROM "WHY YOUNG PEOPLE FACE A SHORTAGE OF JOBS"—AN INTERVIEW WITH LABOR SECRETARY WIRTZ

Question. Are there jobs now for all those with skills?

Answer. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act we are training people at the rate of 50,000 to 60,000 a year, and so far we have been able to find work for most of those who finish the training program. If the economy can move up at the rate of 4 percent a year—the present goal—there would soon be full demand for our manpower supply. We are actually coming close to a shortage of skilled manpower in a number of occupations already.

Question. A shortage of workers? In what kinds of jobs?

Answer. This is already true in a good many types of engineering jobs, in teaching jobs, in many professional jobs and in skilled jobs in some trades.

Question. Aren't these jobs for college-trained people?

Answer. Not necessarily. Take the construction industry: Unless we train at a much faster rate than now through the apprenticeship program, there will be a real shortage of skilled workers in the construction industry.

Question. Who controls the apprenticeship program?

Answer. In general, the industry and the unions. There are problems in connection with apprenticeship training which have to be faced squarely.

Question. Has there been an arbitrary limitation of the number who can get apprenticeship training?

Answer. Yes, there has been some of that.

Question. Restraint on Negro training in particular?

Answer. In some unions there has been and still is racial discrimination in apprenticeship programs which cannot be justified or tolerated.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in what fields are jobs for younger people now available?

Answer. In general, the answer is in skilled jobs and in professional jobs such as teaching, medicine, nursing, and engineering. There is a shortage, too, of people just below the professional level, such as assistants to engineers and scientists, and so on.

Question. What about secretarial jobs?

Answer. In a good many cities job opportunities are available in service occupations, ranging all the way from secretarial work to domestic help, both male and female. In most cities it is hard for housewives to get the domestic help they need.

Question. But domestic work is not highly skilled. Why is it so hard to get domestic help at a time when there are so many people unemployed?

Answer. There are two problems here. One: It's a harder administrative job to bring thousands of workers together with thousands of housewives than it is to staff a single factory that employs several thousand workers. Often a housewife just wants somebody for part-time work.

There is also this problem: In this country there is a tradition of looking down on domestic service. To many workers even the most menial job on an assembly line is more attractive, has more status appeal, than a job taking care of somebody's house or yard, or working in a restaurant.

Our Republican Form of Government and Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is unrealistic to think that the countries of Latin America can adopt our form of government, make the success of it that we have, and thus be made over in the image of the United States.

This point was made in a column by Jack Spalding, editor of the Atlanta Journal, who notes that just because our constitutional government works for us it does not follow that it will work for other people in Latin America. For one thing, the people there are accustomed to following strong leaders and take little or no interest in government. As Mr. Spalding writes, this results in a small ruling class and a large group of those ruled.

A principal concern of the United States at this time should be in seeing that the Communists do not infiltrate and take over the ruling class, as was done in Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Spalding's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUATEMALA—SELDOM HAVE SO MANY BEEN RULED BY SO FEW

(By Jack Spalding)

I see by the papers where my old friends in Guatemala have a new military government.

Unless things have changed more than I think, it is going to make little difference in their way of life.

They are going to keep right on working in the coffee, the bananas, and burning off fields for a new corn crop. They are going to keep right on going to market to swap their produce for something they need produced by somebody else. They are going to pay attention to the council of elders or whatever group rules their village as they did before the Spaniards came, and let the crazy mixed-up descendants of the Europeans argue ideology and fight over the right to govern and graft in the capital and other centers of urban culture.

Now Guatemala is one of the world's most beautiful and picturesque countries. But when we preach and worry about its failure to make a success of our form of government, we are being somewhat unreal.

I would not be surprised if we were not being rather unreal in the case of a number of other Latin American countries. Our Government is the product of situations and forces peculiar to us, and what Thomas Jefferson and friends worked out in our case, does not necessarily apply to other places. Guatemala, for instance.

The wave of idealism and liberal thought which produced our Revolution and Constitution swept Latin America somewhat later. And while representative government as evolved by those who gave it to us presupposed a literate populace of freedmen as its base, that base has been lacking in Guatemala and other places.

UNLETTERED

Guatemala is mostly Indian and most of those Indians are rural and quite untouched by the things which bother us here. They are the base of the country, and unless compulsory education and other modern innovations have made great inroads since my last visit, the politics of Guatemala City is of small concern to them.

When I lived there during the late thirties, the country was under the dictatorship of the late Jorge Ubico. And while this dictatorship was restrictive (requiring interior passports, and a fellow never knew when the army was going to search his house for guns or take somebody away in the middle of the night for questioning), there seemed a great indifference to all this on the part of those who should be interested.

Perhaps so many years of misrule had produced an unconquerable cynicism in the people, but nobody seemed to care very much.

So when I read of revolt there or in Honduras, or Nicaragua, I figure it is a squabble among the rulers as to whose time it is to run the show, and that the ruled, as usual, will go plugging along and hoping they will be left alone.

You have there a small ruling class, and a large group of those ruled.

The Communists seized power in Guatemala about 10 years ago, but a counterrevolution of the type which failed at the Bay of Pigs succeeded. In order to counter such attractions as the Communists offered, the new, anti-Red regime stepped up land reform, health services, and education.

But now I read that it was fear of another Communist coup which provoked the deposing of the president and the takeover by the military.

RED THREAT

All this is being watched closely in Washington, Havana, Caracas, Peiping, Moscow, and Rome.

For it is in those countries where so few control so many that a handful of clever men can carry the whole nation into the Red camp or keep it safe for Washington.

The Communists know this better than we do and have been very good at getting their men quietly into key posts. Witness Cuba. Witness the Guatemala of 10 years ago. Witness the signs of ferment and strife in other parts of Latin America today.

Our relations with our Latin American neighbors never have been entirely happy and seldom have our policies met with less success than recently.

In wishing just what we have for Latin America, we may be doing the wrong thing. Just because something is good for us, does it follow that it is going to suit them?

Mr. Jefferson's constitution must have been rewritten in Spanish many, many times. But it has failed in more cases than it has worked.

Right now self-government for some of our southern friends looks like a luxury we can't afford unless we want to risk more Communist takeovers through the use of democratic forms.

Accelerated Public Works Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Members of the House of Representatives will consider the 1963 supplemental appropriation bill.

In my opinion, based upon personal experience, it is essential that Congress appropriate the full $500 million requested by the President of the United States in order to continue the vital accelerated public works program, as authorized during the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, immediately following the 1962 general election my office arranged and participated in a public meeting in each of the seven counties of the Fifth Congressional District to explain the Accelerated Public Works Act. Because of the extremely high percentage of existing unemployment, I knew the accelerated public works program would provide the only method available for our citizens to help themselves. This act made possible urgently needed temporary employment and at the same time made it possible for our local officials to improve local living conditions.

Our citizens have done all within their resources to create new and permanent private employment. Our unemployed, who are denied gainful employment through no fault of their own, are anxious to have an opportunity to work and support their families.

Because of continued increased unemployment, our community, city, and county officials have been forced to reduce essential services due to the fact they have no way to obtain local funds because of their decreased income. However, they have carefully considered the accelerated public works program and following detailed studies they have submitted applications for quite a few fully justified public projects. In each case our local officials have been able to arrange the required local financing because of the benefits provided by this program.

Not only in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia but also throughout the United States our local citizens have demonstrated their initiative and desire to improve their local areas. These public-spirited citizens have applications pending for Federal funds exceeding twice the amount requested. Unless the Congress appropriates the full $500 million as requested, our local citizens, who have worked so hard to do their part, will be discouraged and failure to appropriate these funds will justify the fact that the efforts extended to improve local conditions will have been in vain.

Each of these communities, I might add, have expended funds in properly preparing their applications and because of the provisions of the act as previously authorized by the Congress, they fully expected that carefully chosen improvements would be approved. Without additional Federal funds these communities cannot move forward, simply because they do not have the financial resources. In this connection, I have worked closely with the officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration and other participating Federal agencies in following every application through each step. I have respect for these Federal officials for the completely fair and dedicated manner in which they have been doing a most difficult job. To my personal knowledge these officials have worked long hours, including Saturdays and Sundays, in an effort to process those applications which afford the greatest benefit for each dollar expended by the Federal Government.

Just last month southern West Virginia suffered the most disastrous floods in our history. These Federal officials came to see firsthand the unsurpassed damages. Some of our pending applications are in more urgent need now because of this disaster. I have seen firsthand the effectiveness of the accomplishment so far of the officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration and other agencies.

When it is considered that we have nearly one-third of our counties in the United States adversely affected by persistent and substantial unemployment, no one can successfully challenge the fact that we do have a major internal problem. I am firmly convinced that the accelerated public works program, Federal participation with local governments, is a very important investment in the future of our Nation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully plead with the Members of the House to vote the full $500 million for the continuation of the accelerated public works program. It is my firm conviction that we have an obligation to our citizens in these areas and to our future generations to appropriate these funds in order that our citizens may be able to help themselves and continue to look forward.

F.D.R. Urged Ending Federal Dole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body have on many occasions extolled the virtues of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I must honestly confess that on most of these occasions I could not find myself in agreement with my colleagues. However, in the March 21, 1963, edition of Action in Kentucky I find an editorial which quotes our late President, and I am prepared to join with any and all his disciples who are willing to put into effect the principles enunciated herein:

F.D.R. URGED ENDING FEDERAL DOLE

"The lessons of history, confirmed by the evidence immediately before me, show exclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive of the national fiber.

"To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. It is in violation of the traditions of America. Work must be found for able-bodied but destitute workers. The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief."

You are bound to be surprised when you learn who made the above statement. It was President Franklin D. Roosevelt. But ever since he made it in 1935 the Federal Government has pursued the opposite course by getting deeper and deeper into the "business of relief." Welfare expenditures today are 10 times what they were in 1935.

During the last 11 years, alone, these payments skyrocketed from $4.9 billion annually to $37.3 billion a year. Washington should lose no time in getting the Government out of the relief business by restoring welfare responsibilities to States and communities.

Small Towns Versus Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, last week's U.S. News & World Report contains a detailed account of the Area Redevelopment Administration's forced entrance into the life of the counties and small communities of our Nation. The sad part of the matter is that the ARA not only has the habit of dictating to local authorities and interested citizens, but it is now doing so uninvited and unwanted by the residents of many counties and communities across the Nation.

The following editorial from the April 4 Minnetonka Herald in Minnesota's Third District comments on a typical example of this bureaucratic intrusion by the ARA. Redevelopment efforts by the Federal Government should be limited to those areas of demonstrated need where assistance from Washington is truly desired.

The editorial follows:

[From the Minnetonka (Minn.) Herald, Apr. 4, 1963]

SMALL TOWNS VERSUS WASHINGTON

U.S. News & World Report this week contains an account of an incredible intrusion by the Federal Government into one mid-American community.

It describes how Rice County, Kans., was picked to be the recipient of redevelopment aid by the Area Redevelopment Administration, a Government agency which was set up by Congress in 1961 and is growing as fast as it can find places into which to pour money. Last year it gave away $7 million, this year $45 million, and it is shooting for $121 million next year.

Funny part is, I'll ol' Rice County didn't ask for help, and is, in fact, one of the richest counties in Kansas. It has wheat, salt mines, cattle, and oil. Its residents and businessmen are irked at being called depressed and having the Government create a breadline atmosphere with its offer of food stamps for the needy, and so forth.

Max Moxley, the crusty editor of the local newspaper, the Sterling Bulletin, had this to say editorially:

"Any pouring of Federal funds into a county, whether needed or not, is bound to give us a boost. Then why are we concerned? If Rice County, which ranks well in the top 15 percent of Kansas counties economically, is eligible for aid, certainly all our neighbor counties merit the same consideration. How long will the Federal purse withstand such raids?

"Why are we scared? The guiding light and major domo, sent down to brainwash this old Moesback, stood in front of the old home paper office, and told us flatly: 'More socialism in these areas is inevitable. When this building of yours needs rebuilding, you will not have the money to do it and it will have to be done with Federal funds.' And so it is, the simple verities of American small-town life, the rules, the very moral fiber which has held the wonderfully complex system together, are being shaken to the core.

" 'This whole idea is a very serious threat to home rule.' In two ways: Small towns versus the county seat; and the county as a whole versus Washington.

"We recognize merit in some of the grants for larger facilities that are more directly related to the public welfare—at least those that are bona fide revenue-producing properties or are backed by local tax support.

"We wish to emphasize that in no way do we condemn those who are taking advantage of the boodle. The funds are available—so: gather ye rosebuds while ye may.

"Yours,

"THE VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS."

The editor cited this paragraph from a researcher's report:

"In most rural communities, it is hypothesized, most of the influentials will oppose innovation, change, and development. They are committed to the status quo and its preservation. Therefore, a substantial product of area development will be to devise methods of identifying the support and basis of operation of these influentials and the devising of methods which will cause them to reorient their relationship to the area."

Mr. Moxley concluded that this meant: "These clods out there have no idea what is good for them. We've got to jam it down their throats."

There must be, ultimately, some limitation placed on the largesse dispensed by the Federal Government which is unasked for, uncalled for, unnecessary, and unbacked by hard cash—in other words, borrowed against a deficit.

It is high time that the Podunks of this country come to realize that Washington's green stamps are nothing but Podunk dollars sent back home with more than half their value removed.

It is hard to turn down a gift, but as one stanch Kansan remarked. "The only way to stop these hand-me-downs from Washington is to not take them yourself."

Retraining—Industry and Local Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress will probably be longest remembered for its constructive action in passing the Manpower Training and Development Act, a law passed in the recognition that it is dynamism and not sluggishness that is causing our major economic problem, unemployment. The central feature of the Manpower Act is its provision for retraining those whose skills have become obsolete in the rapidly advancing American economy and giving them new skills marketable in the labor market of our economy.

The Federal Government is not the only agency, nor the most important, which is interested in retraining. Private industry has made some remarkable strides in this field, indeed, its success could well be the guide for future Government actions in retraining. State and local governments have also been active in this area and their work deserves full recognition. Two articles recently have come to my attention which point out the non-Federal work which is being done in retraining. First is an article from the Washington World of March 15 commenting on the apprenticeship programs in industry which gives a chance for industry to train the workers it needs. Second is an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 29 on a program which has been developed in Cook County, Ill., for giving unemployed workers on relief a basic education in the three R's, as a first step to vocational retraining. Both of these deserve fullest attention as examples of how the work of the Federal Government can dovetail into what is already being done in our country.

These articles follow:

[From the Washington World, Mar. 15, 1963]

INDUSTRY TRAINS ITS OWN SKILLED WORKMEN—APPRENTICE PROGRAM FILLS CHANGING JOBS

"Our job is to build people. The people will build the airplanes."

With these words, Robert E. Gross, chief executive officer of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., set the pace for the company's apprenticeship programs. Other companies are jumping on the apprenticeship bandwagon.

There are now more than 150,000 registered apprentices in training in business and industry, reports the Department of Labor.

Apprenticeship provides employers with an effective training plan that permits employees to develop a wide and diverse range of skills. Training programs are designed to afford a qualified person an opportunity to earn while he learns a skilled occupation.

MINIMUM TRAINING SET

Business and labor leaders serving on the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship define apprenticeship as a method of learning a skill through a predetermined schedule or training outline which consists of not less than 4,000 hours, or a minimum of 2 years, of on-the-job training and related theoretical instruction.

An apprentice learning a skill receives on-the-job training, but a person receiving on-the-job training is not necessarily an apprentice, the committee points out.

Not limited to any single business or industry, a sound apprenticeship program stresses quality workmanship.

Apprenticeship is a completely voluntary training program on the part of both business and industry. They are responsible for its administration, operation, and the effect it has on the community and the Nation.

OCCUPATIONS LISTED

Occupations which traditionally are recognized as suitable for apprenticeship include such skilled occupations as plumber, electrician, carpenter, tool and die maker, stationary engineer machinist, and printer. A multitude of lesser known occupations also offer apprenticeship training.

The Department of Labor estimates that this Nation will need 24 percent more skilled workers by 1970. Today there are approximately 8.5 million skilled workers in all industries. Fewer than 60,000 apprentices in registered programs completed their apprenticeships in registered programs in 1960 and 1961.

Expansion in apprentice-employing industries during the current 1960–70 decade has been projected as the following minimums: Construction, up 30 percent or more; trade and services, 25 percent; manufacturing, 15 percent; transportation, utilities, and mining, all 5 percent.

Business and industry need versatile, easily retrainable skilled workers, the Labor Department says. Many highly-skilled workers are often unemployed because they are unable to adapt their talents to the changing needs of industry.

RETRAINING OFTEN VITAL

The day of the specialist is fast losing its status in some industries. When business and industry must adopt technical changes, their employees also must retrain to acquire essential new skills. As the number of apprentices decreases, business and industry become less able to keep pace with current market demands.

Planned training assures: An adequate supply of skilled workers trained in efficient methods of production; lower production costs. Production by skilled workers means reduction in waste; satisfied customers; reduced labor turnover; reduced supervision; advancement of trained, skilled workers to supervisory jobs; and national security—development of the Nation's skilled manpower is as important to national security as the training of men for the Armed Forces.

PROGRAM POPULAR

A study made by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprentices after they complete their training has disclosed that 6 years after completing more than one-fourth had advanced to supervisory positions or had become managers or proprietors of their own businesses, 93 percent had made specific use of the skills learned during their apprenticeship, only 7 percent had gone into completely different types of work, and virtually all were highly enthusiastic about apprenticeship training.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1963]

RETRAINING AND 3 R'S—CHICAGO FINDS FUNDAMENTAL SCHOOLING AIDS MANY JOBLESS

(By Ronald G. Shafer)

CHICAGO.—Like many sixth graders, John Calicott puzzles intently over the questions in an English test he's taking at one of this city's south side schools. Unlike most sixth graders, however, Mr. Calicott is 46 and has a wife and seven children.

A tall, slender Negro, Mr. Calicott is among some 7,600 Chicago relief recipients in a new, fast growing program that shows promise of helping him and many thousands of others in his situation get off swelling relief rolls across the country by giving them the basic "three R's" of reading, writing and arithmetic they missed as children.

The Chicago program, which started just 1 year ago with 225 volunteers, is catching the attention of welfare officials in many other cities. Evidence here so far suggests that such a basic education program may be necessary if extensive and costly job retraining programs now getting into gear with heavy Federal aid are to prove effective on any wide scale in making reliefers self-sufficient citizens.

MANY CAN'T READ ADS

"The bedrock problem is ignorance," asserts Raymond M. Hilliard, director of public aid for Cook County, which includes the city of Chicago and most of its suburbs. Of the county's 50,000 ablebodied adult relief recipients, at least half are what he calls "functionally illiterate." That means, he says, that they "can't read a help-wanted ad or write their name on a job application," almost automatically excluding them from any employment beyond the menial odd-jobs category.

At least partly due to this educational barrier, retraining alone failed to stem the relief roll tide in Chicago. Last May, the rolls, including the aged and members of reliefers' families, reached a record 290,000 names, up from about 209,000 in early 1958 when an ambitious job retraining effort was started.

In March 1962, the county welfare department, with the financial backing of the Chicago school board, launched its back-to-school program for people receiving welfare aid. The students attend two evening classes a week, each 2 hours long. They are taught reading, arithmetic and such other subjects as American history and current events.

"For the moment, we're attempting to upgrade those who attend classes to an eighth grade educational level and then on to more schooling, vocational training or jobs," Mr. Hilliard explains. "Eventually, though, we hope to increase enrollment to 50,000 in grade levels through high school. Getting jobs is our aim and a basic literacy training for those who need it is the first step on the road to employment."

Attendance is compulsory. Relief recipients are told: "You cut classes and we cut your checks." But the compulsory factor has rarely been needed. Even Mr. Hilliard is surprised by the enthusiasm of the students. "Most of them are not only willing, but eager to attend," he says.

Result: While relief rolls nationally continued to expand, reaching 7.8 million on January 31, up 300,000 from a year earlier, the number receiving aid in Chicago edged down over the same period by 10,000 to 273,105—1962 was the first year to show a decline in Chicago since 1956. Precisely how much of the shrinkage was due to the schooling and retraining can't be measured but welfare officials say it played a major role.

Welfare Director Hilliard calls money spent on rehabilitation a sure fire investment in preventing and eventually eliminating dependency. His argument is that "it makes more sense to spend $100,000 a month getting people off relief than to continue spending $16 million monthly just to keep them alive."

The oldest part of the Cook County program is job training. It's carried on in an old, five-story wooden warehouse on Chicago's West Side. About 100 public aid department instructors teach over 20 different vocations, from spray painting to metal drilling, and from glasscutting to running a power sewing machine. The rehabilitation center takes on a number of small jobs to help meet costs. This work includes such jobs as welding battery carriers for an automotive manufacturer and sewing diapers for a diaper service company.

At present, over 13,000 are enrolled at the training center. Last year, the center found jobs for a record 12,383 relief recipients.

Mr. Calicott is a good illustration of how Mr. Hilliard's teach-and-train approach works. He went on relief in 1960 after losing his $80-a-week job unloading freight cars for the Santa Fe Railroad. With little formal education and no special skills, he couldn't find another job. Last November, after going to school for 7 months and taking a 2-week driver training course, he passed a cab driver's examination and landed a job with the Chicago Yellow Cab Co.; he continues his schooling in the night classes. His monthly earnings climbed from $95.79 in November to $238.30 in February and he thinks they'll soon reach the point where he won't need public assistance. Before getting the job, he was receiving $316 a month in relief.

AN UNCAGED BIRD

Teachers at the literacy school point out that besides the employment potentials, the school often helps make persons on relief more conscientious parents, lessening the chance that their children may follow their parents' footsteps onto relief rolls. "No kid of mine will ever drop out of school," vows one 53-year-old student with 13 children.

What do people on relief think about going back to school? Matthew Marshall, a 56-year-old former Mississippi cotton picker who couldn't read or write before attending classes, puts it this way: "I feel like a caged bird that all at once got out." Since starting to school, Mr. Marshall has obtained a part-time job washing and waxing cars.

Cook County has inherited many of its welfare troubles from other States and can't prevent new ones from streaming in. More than half the people on relief in greater Chicago were born or educated in the Deep South and 80 percent are Negroes, one recent survey showed.

So Chicago still has a long way to go before its relief problem is solved, if it ever will be be, but the education program shows bright promise of helping to lighten the load.

The Maine Chicken Barbecue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when all of our States seek greater employment opportunities for their citizens, it has become most important to increase consumer demand in this country and abroad for the countless goods and products produced in the United States.

It seems timely for me to acquaint my colleagues with a most successful sales promotion event in Washington, D.C., which should prove beneficial to several State of Maine food products. I refer specifically to a Maine chicken barbecue sponsored by the Maine State Society on April 3 at the Kenwood Golf and Country Club. Featured on the menu was Maine chicken barbecued on the grounds by experts, Maine potatoes and peas, and topped off by Maine blueberry pie.

This barbecue would have been judged a success by any standards. Three hundred and fifty loyal State of Maine people, temporarily displaced from the Pine Tree State and living in Washington, D.C., turned out to dine on Maine delicacies, listen to the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and meet Maine's lovely cherry blossom princess and "Miss Maine Vacationland," Miss Sarah Allen.

The more intangible benefit from this affair came from acquainting a host of people, including food brokers and food retailers in the Washington area with a few food items produced in Maine of which we are justly proud.

Executives from all the major chainstores attended as well as representatives from several embassies of countries that import Maine agricultural produce.

This most successful affair was the brainchild of the imaginative president of the Maine State Society, Hon. James V. Day, better known in Washington as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission. Cooperating to the fullest extent were the Maine State Department of Agriculture and the Maine Poultry Growers Association.

The resulting good will and extensive publicity could very well open new markets for Maine produce; I commend Commissioner Day and other officers of the Maine State Society.

I have been assured that the famous Maine State Society annual lobster dinner will be put on again this summer, with extra trimmings.

The day of the Yankee peddler may be gone, but there are still ways to get people everywhere to recognize superior products. The formula is still the same, a little initiative and a lot of hard work.

Have We Completely Lost Our Concept of Reason?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article deserves the careful consideration of every Member of this Congress. It also deserves justification from those responsible for this ridiculous situation which is definitely not in the public interest if the facts are as stated and we take them as facts until disproven. The article follows:

MONKEY WRENCH IN THE WORKS—PLUMBERS FOUL UP A SALK RESEARCH PROJECT

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—This is the story of two hospitals, and the Salk Institute of Biological Studies, and a $52 million city sewage system. They all have two things in common—pipes and a plumbers' union demand that the tubing be removed from costly equipment already installed, but not installed by the plumbers.

This would mean removing piping from sensitive laboratory equipment, sterilizers, autopsy tables, whirlpool baths, X-ray developers, and special boilers as well as expensive dishwashing machines.

I write this story as much as an appeal to reason as I do in angry protest. I ran into it in San Diego.

There the Salk research institute is rising on the cliffs above the Pacific in lovely La Jolla. The land was donated to Dr. Salk by the people of San Diego.

Local plumber officials have told the contractors that the union men will install laboratory equipment only if they are also allowed to fabricate all pipe less than 2 inches in diameter.

This creates a crisis. The pipes are an integral part of the complex research equipment. Much of it is delicate. Much is calibrated—scientifically checked out. Furthermore, many of these laboratory items are

the personal property of the scientists who will work in painstaking medical research with Dr. Salk, developer of the antipolio vaccine.

And not too far off is the new San Diego County Hospital. There, too, the plumbers local claimed the right to what they call fabrication on the construction site. They claimed, for example, the right to install the 2-inch tubing on three big surgical sterilizing machines. But these units already had the piping installed at the home plant of the American Sterilizer Co.

Well, said the local's officials, there were alternatives. The pipes could be taken out of the sterilizing equipment and discarded. Then new pipes could be fabricated and installed by the union's members. Or the units could be sent back to the factory. Each weighs 9,000 pounds. There the piping could be removed and the stripped units could be returned to the San Diego Hospital.

The company has said with understandable indignation that if the units are disassembled, it would void all guarantees. It could not send stripped units. The sterilizers must be fully assembled in the plant to be tested.

There are also 125 new stainless steel sinks already installed in the hospital. The union wants them removed so its members can reinstall the already affixed sink-drainboard units

Now, there is no question at all of union labor The drainboards were planted by members of the sheet metal workers' local. This happened in November 1962. But the plumbers still want the sinks taken out so they can replace the drainboards or they won't hook the tubing to the water and drain pipes.

There is another medical institute being built—the Scripps Hospital. This is a mile or so from the Salk site. Since American Sterilizer equipment is scheduled for Scripps, the contractors expect the same difficulties.

There is San Diego's Metropolitan Sewage Treatment Plant. It is part of the city's $52 million system now under construction. The plumbers threatened to picket and shut down the entire project unless they were allowed to dismantel the small pipe on boilers and water softeners. They wanted to reinstall new pipe for the old, by cutting and threading new tubing right on the job site.

The boilers, like the hospital sterilizers, had come from their manufacturer complete with pipes. The contractor went ahead and installed it. The plumbers did not shut down the sewage system.

But a private building in downtown San Diego did not come off so easily. An air-conditioning subcontractor on the new 25-story U.S. National Bank Building there had been forced, under the union clause, to remove 1,500 pieces of copper tubing from the aid-conditioning units. The pieces were discarded. New tubing was brought in. It was bent to needed angles. It was cut and reinstalled in place of tubing originally part of the equipment bought from a Midwest firm.

There have been labor-management conferences. The union has claimed that its overall contract calls for local fabrication, assembling and attaching of all pipe less than 2 inches in diameter. Contractors say that this should mean only pipes used to connect the equipment, such as sterilizers or X-ray developers, with water, drain and steam lines. But the union now insists on the piping attached to the equipment itself.

Of course, there is anger in the community. Of course, this situation exists in other areas. Of course the anger spreads. Of course labor's image blurs. Of course no community or contractors wants to pay double. Dollars are hard to come by.

And where's the principle? Most of the equipment is union made and union affixed anyway.

Is there no successful appeal to reason?

President Calls Upon Country To Observe the 20th Anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising on April 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the President has called upon the people of this country to observe the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising on April 21. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Jewish News of March 29, 1963, which is a fitting tribute to one of the finest examples of human heroism in history.

HONOR TO HEROES OF WARSAW GHETTO

Last August, the President of the United States was authorized, in a resolution adopted by the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, to designate April 21, 1963, as a day on which to observe the courage that was displayed by the heroes in the Warsaw ghetto who defied the Nazis and rose up in revolt against the German bestialities.

In the spirit of this resolution, President Kennedy, in a proclamation issued earlier this month, called upon the people of this country to observe the 20th anniversary of the Warshaw ghetto uprising with appropriate ceremonies on April 21.

Commending the heroism of the Jewish heroes, President Kennedy said, "Though they lacked both military resources and a military tradition, they were able to conduct their struggle against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism, an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world, and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered."

The President's proclamation realistically pointed out that while the result of their uprising "was known by the Jews to be foredoomed," the 70,000 remaining Jews in the Warsaw ghetto—who survived out of a total of 400,000 who were herded into a several-block walled-in area, to be sent from there to extermination camps—"engaged the Nazis in battle." His proclamation stated:

"With deadly efficiency, most of the other inhabitants had been transported by the Nazis to concentration camps and had there been exterminated.

"The surviving Jews, suffering from malnutrition and disease, with pitifully few weapons and virtually no hope of assistance from any source, determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible."

During the coming month, there will be many commemorative events, to mark the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto resistance to nazism. The Polish Government is cooperating in the setting up of a monument in tribute to the ghetto fighters, and non-Jews are sharing with Jews in many lands a sense of admiration for those who defied the Nazis, at the functions at which their heroism will be recalled.

In our own community, the tribute to the Warsaw ghetto fighters will be expressed at another annual commemoration, on April 7. It will be an occasion for evaluating the events that transpired with the rise of Hitlerism, and more especially it will provide an opportunity for our community once again to reaffirm our kinship with oppressed Jews wherever they may reside.

Major in the discussions today relating to the Hitler era is the mooted question of resistance—whether Jews resisted the Nazis sufficiently and how resistance might have offset the enormity of the great tragedy.

Raul Hilberg, in "The Destruction of the European Jews," the most important and competent available documented narrative history of the Hitler period, published by Quadrangle Books, showed how the fear of overwhelming odds against them deterred Jews and non-Jews alike from resisting the Nazis hordes. There were too few rebellions against the Hitlerites, but the limited few stood out for their heroism, and Professor Hilberg's documentation makes this statement in reference to the Warsaw ghetto fighters:

"The largest single clash between Jews and Germans occurred in the ghetto of Warsaw. Let us say at once that for the further development of the destruction process, this armed encounter was without consequence. In Jewish history, however, the battle is literally a revolution, for after 2,000 years of a policy of submission the wheel had been turned and once again Jews were using force."

This is a most interesting commentary and it has special significance by virtue of the questions that were posed by the youth in Israel during the Eichmann trial: "Why didn't Jews fight back?"

That is why most of the literature dealing with the catastrophe now probes into the question of resistance. That is why the Warsaw ghetto episode in our history is so vital and so symbolic of the emergence of a new spirit that defies persecutions and humiliations.

The Jewish Community Council of Detroit has been among the first Jewish communal organizations to initiate commemorations of the Warsaw ghetto heroism. It has become an annual event in this city, and many men and women have come to consider it a sort of pilgrimage to the graves of the victims of nazism to attend the council-sponsored tribute meetings.

This year's commemoration, because it is the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, and because it has now become a worldwide celebration, assumes greater significance than ever before. Once again, our community is in the forefront in observing the event.

Once more, it is to be hoped, such a commemoration is an occasion for rededication to the goal that no one who is in danger from oppression should be left unaided, that all who need help in the battle against tyranny should be supported, that the persecuted and the economically dispossessed should have our assistance.

The Warsaw ghetto commemoration is, therefore, a call to action for a rebirth of libertarianism, for the strengthening of the struggle for freedom, for a recognition of the truth that as long as a single group anywhere remains enslaved the entire world is endangered by slavery. Therefore, the goal is for liberty for all, so that anything even remotely akin to nazism should never again be able to raise its ugly head.

Another Court-Imposed Roadblock to Policing Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in the Long

Beach Independent-Press-Telegram on March 27 discusses a matter of deep concern to the Nation:

COMFORT FOR SUBVERSIVES IN NEW HIGH COURT DECISION

In another close five to four decision on investigations of communistic infiltration, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled this week that Red-hunting legislators cannot dig into the affairs of organizations "not linked clearly with subversive or other illegal or improper activities."

The danger in the decision is immediately apparent. It implies that the investigators must "have the goods" on an organization before they can examine it. Subversive infiltration, which is never done with fanfare—indeed, it is usually a clandestine operation—must proceed to the point where it is well exposed before it can be investigated. The investigation then becomes a matter of merely confirming something that is already well known, and in the meantime undercover subversion will have had a free hand in seeking objectives inimical to the interests of this country.

The majority decision implies a distrust of investigative bodies, suggesting that these units of publicly elected officials without justification of reasonable suspicion would probe into private associations. The decision makes sense only if we are to assume that investigating legislative committees are given to excesses and imprudent acts jeopardizing the rights of private individuals in legitimate associations or those of unquestionably loyal organizations.

One can easily see that this decision will be raised to bar and hamper investigations of any organization except those of openly Communist connections. Justice John M. Harlan, in a dissenting opinion, states the case:

"The net effect of the court's decision is, of course, to insulate from effective legislation the time-proven skills of the Communist Party in subverting and eventually controlling legitimate organizations."

For the majority, Justice Arthur Goldberg declared: "Nothing we say here denies the underlying legislative right to investigate or to legislate with respect to subversive activities by Communists or anybody else."

Thus the majority recognizes the legislators' right to investigate, but in the next paragraph it goes a long way in making it most difficult to do it effectively. They can't investigate until they know and they can't know until they investigate.

It's like telling a police detective he mustn't try to find out if a suspect committed a murder unless he saw him do it.

Experience Counts: Encouraging Trends in the Hiring of Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS Mr. Speaker. In recent years, job discrimination against older workers has posed an increasingly serious social and economic problem in our society. Employers often have set maximum age limits for new employees or have tended to ignore older applicants, in favor of younger ones.

There are signs, however, that employer attitudes may be changing. According to an article in the January 7 Wall Street Journal, discrimination against older workers is decreasing as more and more firms realize that older persons make stable and reliable employees and offer valuable skills.

According to a Bureau of Labor Statistics Report:

Productivity of older factory hands is generally as good as or better than that of younger workers, except in jobs requiring considerable strength or high-speed work on an assembly line.

Throughout the country, department stores, factories, insurance companies, et cetera, are recognizing the value of hiring older workers. These signs are encouraging and I hope that other employers will take note of them and start stepping up their hiring of older persons. I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD.

MANY FIRMS DROP BANS ON HIRING OLDER PEOPLE; SKILLS, STABILITY CITED: MANUFACTURER RECRUITS FORCE OF SALESMEN OVER 45; STUDY INDICATES LOWER TURNOVER

(By William E. Blundell)

When Dallas new Medallion discount department store began hiring its work force last summer, it announced there was no maximum age limit for applicants. As a result, when the store opened in September, the average age of the 200 employees was 52—some 12 years above the average for the typical new store. Among Medallion's employees is a 74-year-old saleswoman in baby furnishings.

The Dallas store's policy spotlights the fact that barriers against older jobseekers are breaking down in some places. An increasing number of employers are concluding that such restrictions—many of which date from the depression practice of giving preference in hiring to younger men with families—don't make much sense now. Middle-aged and elderly workers, employers are finding, often have valuable skills and are more likely to stick with a firm than are restless young workers.

Says Medallion President Charles Goldstone of his store's hiring policy: "We're not doing this to be humane. Our reasons are entirely selfish. We're taking on these people because we expect them to do more for us than younger employees."

A LOOK AT FIVE CITIES

Labor Department studies underscore the wider acceptance of older employees. In 1956 a study of job openings in five U.S. cities showed that 58 percent carried upper age limits; of all the openings, 42 percent stipulated applicants under 45. In 1961 the agency found that only 39 percent of the openings in the same cities carried maximum age limits; openings specifying applicants under 45 accounted for only 26 percent of the total.

None of this means joblessness among older workers doesn't continue to pose a major problem. Men over 45 constitute 26 percent of the labor force but account for more than 30 percent of the long-term—6 months or more—unemployment. Many companies remain reluctant to hire older applicants, especially in the low-skill, hourly-worker categories that are the core of the chronic unemployment problem.

"We like to hire our workers young and let them work themselves up the ladder," says Charles W. Ufford, director of industrial relations for Warner & Swasey Co., Cleveland-based machinery maker. "This policy is good for the younger workers, and it's good for the older worker who started with us. But it's not so good for the older fellow who's outside trying to get in."

Adding urgency to the problem is the rising proportion of older workers in the U.S. labor force. It's estimated that by 1965 the 45-and-over group in the work force will be adding 11 workers for every 2 added to the 25-to-44 group.

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS

This prospect is spurring both private interests and Government bodies to pay more attention to the plight of older workers. Since 1950, 14 States have passed laws aimed at curbing discrimination in hiring because of age, and at least 9 cities have set up programs to place more older wrokers in municipal jobs. The Federal Government already is bound by law to avoid age discrimination in its own hiring, but some agencies, including the Labor Department, have been making a special effort recently to open up more job opportunities in their own ranks to older people.

John Convery, industrial relations consultant for the National Association of Manufacturers, says businessmen are definitely aware of the problems many older people face in trying to earn a livelihood. "Industry is very much concerned with this group, and more and more firms are taking an interest in hiring the mature worker," comments Mr. Convery. While this trend is traceable in part to an aging population, adds Mr. Convery, another factor is that "more concerns are seeing advantages to this employment."

Texas Refinery Corp., Fort Worth, noticed a few years ago that its older salesmen were generally making impressive records. On the other hand, many seemingly capable but inexperienced younger salesmen were doing poorly. The concern, a manufacturer of building maintenance products, began advertising for older salesmen only. Now most of the sales staff is over 45. Vice President Earl Byers, who started as a salesman more than 30 years ago, is 80 years old.

Some companies are even leaning to older persons to fill blue-collar hourly jobs, though employer resistance to hiring older workers in this category remains high. A Bureau of Labor Statistics study concluded that productivity of older factory hands is generally as good as or better than that of younger workers, except in jobs requiring considerable strength or high-speed work on an assembly line.

International Shoe Co.'s Hartford, Ill., tannery goes so far as to hire no one under 45. "We found older workers are of better quality," says R. H. Richards, vice president. "They've got more interest in what they're doing." The tannery employs about 300 workers.

Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn., likes older workers because they stay put. "Older workers are subject to less turnover," maintains Henry Dawes, personnel director. "You don't have nearly the training costs and the recruiting costs that you do with younger people. These are very, very expensive."

Two years ago Connecticut General studied the turnover rate among its female home office employees. It found that of the women hired between the ages of 30 and 40 the previous 10 years, only one in three was still on the job. In the 40-to-50 bracket, half had stayed. Of those hired in the 50-to-65 bracket, not one had left. In another home office study, the company also found older workers were absent less than their younger coworkers.

A common argument against hiring older persons is that they raise outlays for fringe benefits—pension plans, group life insurance, and hospital and surgical insurance. But some employers question the wisdom of age limits based on such factors. "It's penny wise and pound foolish to save money on these things and automatically lose good people because the employer has a policy, unwritten or otherwise, that older folks can't be hired," says Mr. Goldstone, of Medallion.

Some authorities claim many employers have an exaggerated idea of the costs of fringe benefits for older workers. According to one insurance expert, premiums for group life insurance and medical coverage are likely to be higher for a group of 25-year-old workers than for a group of 45-year-olds. Insurance firms base rates on claims experience for different age brackets; while life insurance rates naturally go up with age, the heavy maternity benefits paid many younger workers lift their medical claims above those of workers in their midforties. Even for a group of employees 55 years old, an age when medical bills are beginning to rise again, premium costs run only 20 percent or so above those for a work force of 25-year-old.

Unit Banking on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of Commerce of April 1, 1963:

UNIT BANKING ON TRIAL

Unit banking, which means a single bank without branches, or a multiplicity of such banks, usually small, is almost as old as the country and is to be distinguished from dual banking, which is the system by which Federal and State chartered banks, with or without branches, exist side by side. Unit banking has been increasingly criticized in recent years because, through sheer numbers and political influence, it has been a barrier to bank branching in many States.

In a recent speech in Florida, James J. Saxon, the Comptroller of the Currency, told off the unit bankers in the strongest terms yet used. They sponsored, he said, a formula for stagnation, not progress. And while in Florida, Mr. Saxon singled out that State as one of the worst examples of the policies he was criticizing. By restricting bank branching, he said, Florida has brought a mushroom growth of nonbanking corporations to do what banks were better able to do.

Florida allows no bank branching, so this restriction is being evaded on several fronts. Mr. Saxon says Florida heads the list of States in applications for charters of new national banks. It has developed affiliate, satellite and group banking which, as Mr. Saxon also notes, are the most common devices used to surmount impediments to bank expansion when State laws are too restrictive.

The point is that Florida needs new banking facilities, which can be most efficiently provided by existing institutions and not by a multiplicity of small new banks.

There is no reason, said the Comptroller, why the powerful instrumentality represented by our commercial banks should be held in check while the tasks which they are able to perform with the greatest efficiency are in such large degree left to (nonbank) others.

The Comptroller is obviously growing more militant as he collides more frequently with State bank supervisors, many of whom view him as no friend. Yet, while the Comptroller at times may seem to be overdoing his strictures, there is much truth in what he says.

Incidentally the pirating of the banking business by specialized nonbanking lenders is not peculiar to States in which no branching is allowed. However, severe restrictions upon banking encourage the more rapid growth of nonbanking competitors.

If this were only a quarrel fit to be fought out in Florida alone it would not be worth too much national attention, but the same rigorous restriction upon bank branching exists in States such as Illinois and in, for example, North Dakota, where the Comptroller has got himself into a first-class row by sanctioning a national bank branch. If he does this in some other nonbranching States the prohibitions of the States will soon be infiltrated and will have to be abandoned.

We are quite sure the Comptroller is not attacking unit banking as such, for he is adding to the number of such banks all the time by chartering new ones where a need for them can be shown and he is bound to protect their right to survival and to recognize the position of State-chartered unit banks.

What it is really attacking is the unit banker's philosophy—laissez faire. Don't upset too much the existing system. In this attitude too many unit bankers fail to see that they are opening the doors to less regulated nonbanking competitors who do many functions the banks could do more efficiently and at additional profit.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the whopping $98.8-billion budget—the biggest ever submitted by any administration in war or peace—many of the needs of the American people are being pushed aside.

While the need for more and better schools for our children is vital, we find that education must wait because we are short on funds.

While the need for medical care for the aged is urgent, we find that we cannot provide a health care program unless we raise taxes, social security taxes.

While there exists an ever-increasing need for more housing for the elderly, we find that there are insufficient moneys to properly house our senior citizens.

While there is a need for more adequate benefits for our disabled veterans, we find that our budget cannot stand this additional expenditure.

While there is a desperate need for tax relief for the overburdened wage earners, we find that a tax cut can only be given at the expense of creating a bigger deficit and a larger national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on but the answers are always the same, we cannot afford these needed services. Now, if there were no other avenue open to us, I would agree. But, we can find the money to accomplish many of these objectives if only we used a bit of horsesense.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is a national lottery. By promoting a national lottery, we could raise easily, painlessly and voluntarily over $10 billion a year in new revenue.

Instead of letting all the money that is spent on betting—$50 billion a year—disappear into the hands of the underworld, we can tap this tremendous source of revenue for our own welfare and the public's good.

In a national lottery, Mr. Speaker, we can find not only the answer but the money to take care of many of these needs of our American citizens.

Dr. Rigell: Everybody's Pastor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle on Tuesday, April 2, 1963, regarding Dr. William R. Rigell.

Dr. Rigell passed away on March 26, 1963. He was a great man and a good man—his memory will linger on in the hearts of all east Tennesseans who loved him and whom he loved. Johnson City and East Tennessee State University will always remember his good deeds and his devotion to all who knew him.

The editorial follows:

DR. RIGELL: EVERYBODY'S PASTOR

"I had two pastors—my own and Dr. Rigell."

These nine words, spoken in a muted newsroom not yet recovered from the weight of Dr. W. R. Rigell's death, are as fine and as fitting a tribute as could be given.

For the reporter who uttered them was speaking not only for himself but for Johnson City.

Dr. Rigell was the minister universal. He could move across denominational lines, bridge social and economic chasms, and gently topple barriers of environment or education.

He could reach an individual where he lived and communicate with him man to man and heart to heart.

He had a soft wit, yet it could kick like a mule.

Similarly he had a soft and easy way of preaching, yet it could condemn, convict, and lead men from their follies into paths of abiding Christian service.

No wonder he was "my second pastor" to so many Johnson Citians who did not belong to his church.

No wonder he was, in such a real sense, everybody's minister.

When he arrived in Johnson City from Gadsden, Ala., September 1930, the first thing people noticed about him was his delightful southern drawl. They noticed and experienced much more in the years and decades that followed.

As pastor of Central Baptist Church Dr. Rigell manifested a pulpit skill and an administrative knowhow that gave Central the golden era of its long history. At the same time he made himself such a positive force in the community that he was widely sought and consulted on problems and undertakings far removed from his sphere of responsibility.

It was as a friend of ours said, "I never talked with him about anything without knowing more and feeling better afterward."

Dr. Rigell retired as Central's pastor in 1953, but a man who loved life and people as much as he did, and yearned to serve with as much compelling zeal as he, could not

withdraw to a couch or rocking chair—or even to pleasant puttering with a garden tool or golf club.

He became an associate professor at East Tennessee State, teaching courses in Bible and conducting a counseling service which brought him in touch with thousands of young people in whom he maintained a lively interest and for whom he had an unflagging patience and compassion.

Never, even when illness took its toll, did his concern for people and things about him lapse. To the end, he could and did take the positive view.

As Johnson City loved him, so did he love Johnson City.

Soon after his retirement from the active ministry, he wrote a guest editorial for this newspaper in which he said:

"During our residence in Johnson City we have discovered, of course, much of the mean and sordid life of human beings, and heard a lot about the 'underworld.' On the other hand, we have found nobility in manhood, womanhood and youth. There are moral standards, religious experience and cultural influence which rise above all that is base and boresome. These make Johnson City a wonderful place to live in, and invite one to spend the rest of his days here."

That is just what Dr. Rigell did.

Truly he was a great and good man.

Statement of Beliefs of the New Jersey College Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Young Republicans who are undergraduates at Rutgers University, the State university of New Jersey, are very dedicated and sincere in their standards of citizenship and their desire to preserve and encourage the fundamental beliefs and faiths of our forefathers who founded our Nation. This is a most refreshing atmosphere because I think many thoughtful citizens are beginning to feel more than ever that we should encourage the old time practice of thrift, and that character-making trait of self-denial. We hear frequently such doctrine advocated in speeches but it is another thing to have them put into practice.

The Young Republicans at Rutgers have issued a statement of beliefs about what the citizens of our country should practice and I take great pride in printing it herewith as part of these few remarks:

STATEMENT OF BELIEFS OF THE NEW JERSEY COLLEGE YOUNG REPUBLICANS

The New Jersey College Young Republicans hold the belief that the individual, regardless of his race, creed, or color, is the foundation upon which the United States is to continue to be developed, both publicly and privately.

It is, therefore, our belief:

1. That every citizen must maintain his personal dignity if our Nation is to survive as a republic.

2. That this responsibility demands that the individual exercise and protect his freedoms.

3. That is a breach of freedom when the individual is forced into social programs without his consent.

4. That freedom removed by force demonstrates corruption of American principles and a trend toward totalitarianism.

5. That decentralization of Government powers is essential to the preservation of freedom.

6. That promotion of the individual through the execises of our political and economic freedoms is the basis for policy of the New Jersey College Young Republicans.

Washington Post Urges Careful Consideration of Joint Economic Committee Minority Unemployment Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial discussing the problem of combating unemployment, the Washington Post on April 1 called attention to the recommendations of the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee and advised that they were worth the serious consideration of the Congress.

One of the points of the Post's editorial—and one of the major points of the "Minority Views on the President's Annual Economic Report"—was that we must give greater attention to specific measures to combat unemployment rather than pin too much hope on general fiscal and monetary policies designed to increase aggregate demand.

I think that the position which the Washington Post takes on this problem is of widespread interest, and under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

COMBATING UNEMPLOYMENT

In his first manpower report President Kennedy declared:

"The ideal of full employment, in the large sense that each individual shall be all that he is capable of becoming, and shall contribute fully to the well-being of the Nation even as fully as he shares in that well-being, is at the heart of our democratic belief. If we have never achieved that ideal, neither have we ever for long been content to fall short of it. We have measured ourselves by the persistence of our efforts to meet the standard of full employment and the use of our human resources. As we still fall short of that standard, we are still not satisfied."

Although this eloquent statement ends on a note of hopeful determination, it summarizes a record of past failures which underscores the problems which must be surmounted before the rate of unemployment can be drastically reduced.

A historical perspective on the unemployment problem in the United States can be gained from the series on unemployment as a percentage of the labor forces, beginning in 1900, which appears in "Historical Statistics of the United States," a volume prepared by the Bureau of the Census. The average rate of unemployment for the 63-year period, 1900–62, is 6.9 percent, but that figure is distorted by the great depression in which unemployment reached an all-time high of 24.9 percent in 1933 and remained above 14.5 percent until 1941. A more meaningful appraisal of the unemployment record can be made by considering the number of years in which unemployment was below 4 percent, a level adopted by the Council of Economic Advisers as an interim full-employment goal. Unemployment ranged below 4 percent in only 23 of the 63 years, and if the war years are excluded, the number drops to 15.

It should not be inferred that higher rates of unemployment are historically inevitable. What the long record of unemployment levels does indicate is that the problem is not likely to be solved without a massive effort on the part of Government, private industry, and the labor movement.

For the past 5 years the rate of unemployment has exceeded 5.5 percent, and while this is a far cry from the catastrophic levels of the 1930's, it represents a degree of economic waste and social degradation which should not be tolerated in a democratic society. Much of the current unemployment can be ascribed to the unsatisfactory rate of economic growth, but it would be naive to assume that the persistent problems of unemployment will vanish, if, by enlightened fiscal and monetary policies, the overall rate of economic growth is increased to 4.5 or even 5 percent. There would still be economically depressed areas with industries rendered obsolete by the dizzy pace of technological change; hordes of school dropouts destined for lives of idleness because they lack the requisite technical skills; and those victims of racial discrimination or generations of poverty who are patently lacking in the motivation to seek gainful employment.

The job-retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 mark the beginnings of a long-delayed assault on these problems, but they are only beginnings. Congress should carefully consider the intelligent recommendations set forth by the minority members in the report of the Joint Economic Committee. They include measures which would provide tax relief for individuals enrolled in technical training programs on the post-high-school level and for expenses involved in moving to new jobs; encourage States to permit persons undergoing retraining to receive normal unemployment compensation; disqualify from unemployment compensation benefits those workers who refuse to enroll in retraining programs without good cause.

The hard core of persistent unemployment can be drastically reduced if not eliminated, but the task will never be accomplished by sentimentalists who hold that all the unemployed are innocent victims of society or the sanctimonious souls who are equally convinced that all idleness is voluntary. What is required is a greater understanding of the underlying issues and willingness to experiment with a variety of imaginative programs.

The Man in Government on the Local Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, all too often those public spirited citizens who choose to serve their local, county, or State communities in government

positions represent and serve their fellow citizens without the kind of commendation which they so richly deserve. In fact, more often than not, they receive more abuse than thanks for their day-to-day efforts.

The following editorial from the April 4 North Hennepin Post, of Robbinsdale, Minn., gives a good description of what often happens to a man in government on the local level:

Do you realize the average suburban councilman puts in a full working day each time the council meets and there is not even a coffee break? The next morning he must be at his regular place of employment on time if he wants to continue holding his job. What reward does he reap? Merely the satisfaction of doing something for his community. During his term in office, his telephone at home is constantly ringing, a sympathetic wife wonders if she has married a psychic case and the children, whenever they see their father, begin inquiring, "Who is that man? Does he live around here?"

Court Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Court Order" which appeared in the April 6 issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COURT ORDER

An order and judgment calling for West Kentucky Coal Co. to pay Tampa Electric Co. $2,991,501.19 in damages has been entered in Federal court in Nashville. This raises the question: Is it possible for a party to be penalized for complying with court orders entered in a case filed against it but binding upon it while such orders were in effect and until a court of last resort spoke? Apparently it is.

We know there must be reversals and final judgments, but we deplore the presently unfair and potentially disastrous effect of court rulings which apparently required a judge to award a huge judgment on account of action taken under legal compulsion and in reliance upon the earlier considered judgment of the same court and of the U.S. Court of Appeals.

The complex suit, as we commented the other day, had it origins in a coal supply deal worked out between Tampa Electric and Nashville Coal Co. prior to Nashville Coal's acquisition by West Kentucky in 1955. Counsel for West Kentucky rendered an opinion that the Tampa-Nashville contract was in violation of the antitrust laws, and West Kentucky accordingly notified Tampa that the contract was not subject to performance.

Tampa Electric filed suit against West Kentucky in 1957, and U.S. District Judge William E. Miller in U.S. District Court in Nashville, before whom the case was tried, found against Tampa and held that the contract was illegal under section 3 of the Clayton Antitrust Act.

This judgment by Judge Miller was affirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in 1960. By a divided vote, however, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the decision in 1961 and remanded the case to the district court in Nashville. After 2 further years of litigation, West Kentucky has now been assessed the huge judgment of almost $3 million.

Tampa Electric is a giant public utility which can and does buy coal wherever it chooses, practically on its own terms. It actually has little to gain from Judge Miller's latest decision, since most of whatever monetary tribute might be exacted from West Kentucky would automatically be passed along to Tampa's prosperous industrial customers under an ironclad fuel adjustment clause in Tampa's rate schedule.

As we have said before in this same connection, West Kentucky Coal Co. has been a mainstay of this area for more years than most of us can remember. Thus the Tampa judgment amounts not only to a hardship on our No. 1 employer, but also is a blow to Madisonville and surrounding communities.

Aside from narrow technical questions, which we are not qualified to discuss, it seems to us that broad principles of equity call for a reversal by the higher courts of Judge Miller's $2,991,501.19 decision.

Sites in Washington, D.C., With Facilities for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, annually Washington, D.C., plays host to over 10 million visitors. Of this number, many are handicapped and disabled. A request from a handicapped constituent regarding the facilities available to him at the various sites in Washington, D.C., made it apparent to me that a list of such facilities would be of value. Therefore, I would like to make known to the general public the following list of sites in Washington, D.C., with information concerning the facilities they provide for handicapped sightseers.

Aquarium: Basement of Commerce Building, 14th Street between E and Constitution NW., Sterling 3-9200. Open 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily and Sunday. Wheelchairs for the handicapped are not provided. The entrance of the Commerce Building has a few stairs. A ramp, however, at the rear of the building on Constitution Avenue provides access to the elevator. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Arlington National Cemetery: Jackson 2-3000. The grounds are open daily and Sunday, October through March, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.; April through September, 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. Located here are the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Amphitheater and the Custis-Lee Mansion. There is a change of guard at the Tomb every hour on the hour. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, members of the staff, if contacted in advance, will usher handicapped persons around.

Botanic Gardens: First and Maryland Avenue SW., Capitol 4-3121, extension 6520. Open Sunday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Open Saturday 9 a.m. until 12 noon. One wheelchair is provided for the use of handicapped persons. The building entrance consists of five stairs. There is no ramp. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Bureau of Printing and Engraving: 14th and C Streets SW., Executive 3-6400, extension 7514. Open Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. to 2 p.m., with the exception of holidays. Conducted tours are available. The Bureau provides wheelchairs for visitors because ordinary wheelchairs are too wide for the ramps. A system of ramps makes it possible for handicapped persons to avoid stairs. If desired, wheelchair service from one's automobile to the building can be arranged by calling in advance.

Capitol: Capitol Hill, Capitol 4-3121. Open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Open to those who hold passes to the gallery if Congress is in session until one-half hour after adjournment. Tours are available from 9 a.m. to 3:55 p.m. with groups forming every 15 minutes. The guide service is 25 cents for persons 10 years and older. The Capitol provides many wheelchairs for the handicapped. Several elevators and ramps make the Capitol accessible to the handicapped. Special arrangements for tours may be made by calling in advance.

Corcoran Gallery of Art: 17th Street and New York Avenue NW., Metropolitan 8-3211. Closed Monday, open Tuesday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 2 to 5 p.m. The gallery provides one wheelchair. A ramp entrance is available at the service entrance on E Street and should be arranged for by calling in advance.

Custis-Lee Mansion: Jackson 2-3000, extension 2146. Open daily 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., October through March; 9:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., April through September. Admission is 25 cents per person; persons under 18 years of age may be admitted free. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. The Mansion has several steep steps which might cause difficulties for the handicapped. However, the staff is willing to provide personal assistance and tours for the handicapped if contacted in advance.

Dumbarton Oaks: 1703 32d Street N.W., Adams 2-3101. The gardens are open Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. One wheelchair is provided for the handicapped, although several steps in the garden make sightseeing difficult for the severely handicapped. In the fall 1963, two museums are scheduled to be opened. The entrance of one will have no steps, while the entrance of the other will have approximately three steps.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: 9th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Executive 3-7100. Open Monday through Friday, 9:15 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Tours start every 15 minutes and last approximately 1 hour. Advance reserva-

tions are necessary for large groups. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, there are no stairs at the entrance of the building, and most of the stairs inside of the building can be avoided by using elevators. We are informed by the Bureau that handicapped person should try to avoid the peak tourist seasons. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Folger-Shakespeare Library: 201 East Capitol Street, Lincoln 6-4800. Open Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, there is a ramp at the entrance. It is not necessary to make advance arrangements.

Ford's Theatre—Lincoln Museum: 10th Street between E and F NW., Republic 7-1820, extension 2565. Open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 12:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. The building in which Lincoln died is directly across the street and is open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; Sundays and holidays 12:30 to 5:30 p.m. Admission to each building is 10 cents. Persons 18 years of age and under are admitted free. No arrangements are made for the handicapped. There are five or six short steps at the entrance to the Museum. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Franciscan Monastery: 14th and Quincy Streets NW., Lawrence 6-6800. Tours are conducted from 9 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. daily. No wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped; however, a long ramp extends along the side of the main church. It is not possible for a person in a wheelchair to enter the catacombs. Special plans for a large group should be made by calling in advance.

Jefferson Memorial: South Bank of the Tidal Basin, Republic 7-1820, extension 2145. Open daily and Sunday, 8 a.m. to 12 midnight. Special tours are available and may be arranged by calling in advance. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, the guards will assist handicapped persons if requested to do so.

Library of Congress: First Street and Independence Avenue SE., Sterling 3-0400. The exhibit halls are open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 10 p.m.; Sunday, 11:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. Wheelchairs are available for handicapped persons. The guards will assist in lifting the chair if necessary. A special parking place in front of the building and special tours may be arranged in advance by calling the Stack and Readers' Division.

Lincoln Memorial: West Potomac Park at the foot of 23d Street NW., Republic 7-1820, extension 2573. Open daily and Sunday, 8 a.m. to 12 midnight throughout the year. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. Personal help from the guards is available if requested. Blind persons may take their dogs into the memorial and may touch the pedestal.

Medical Museum, Armed Forces Institute of Pathology: 9th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Republic 7-6700, extension 64768. Open daily and Sunday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. One wheelchair is available. The entrance consists of several stairs, and no ramp is available. Two exhibit halls are located on the second floor and are accessible only by a staircase.

Mount Vernon: Mount Vernon, Va., South 5-2000. Open daily and Sunday, March through September, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; October through February, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Adult admission is 75 cents. The admission for school groups and children, grades 7-12, is 40 cents. Children under 12 years of age and school groups, grades 1-6, are admitted free. A number of wheelchairs are available for the handicapped. It is possible to arrange by calling in advance for a station wagon to meet and pick up handicapped persons at the gate as well as at the boat. The staff at Mount Vernon is able to provide better service for the handicapped persons during the nonpeak tourist seasons.

National Archives: Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Worth 3-1110. Open 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. weekdays; 1 p.m. to 10 p.m. Sundays and holidays. Wheelchairs are not provided for the handicapped. However, a ramp is available at the Seventh Street entrance, and may be used if arrangements are made in advance. Special tours may also be arranged by calling in advance.

National Gallery of Art—Mellon Gallery: Sixth Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Republic 7-4215. Open daily 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. There is a concert every Sunday evening at 8 p.m. in the east garden court starting in September and ending in June. Wheelchairs are provided for handicapped persons. There are no stairs at the entrance on Constitution Avenue. Special tours may be arranged in advance only when a group consists of more than 15 persons.

National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception: Fourth Street and Michigan Avenue NE., Lawrence 6-8300. Open daily 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Sunday masses are held at 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 noon. Free guided tours are available every half hour. One wheelchair is provided for handicapped persons. The entrance to the building has no stairs. Elevators may be used in the building. Special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

National Wax Museum: 500 26th Street NW., at E Street, National 8-2996. Open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. The museum features monuments and personalities in American history. Admission: adults, 75 cents; children 6 through 12, 50 cents; children under 6, free. Wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. There are no stairs at the entrance of the building. During the nonpeak tourist season special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

Naval Observatory: 34th Street and Massachusetts Avenue NW., Decatur 2-9013. Open Monday through Friday for conducted tours at 2 p.m. only. For groups of 10 or more special advance arrangements should be made. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. There are stairs at the entrance of the main building. Much walking, including several inclines, is required between the three buildings visited on the guided tour.

Smithsonian Institution Group: National 8-1810. Arts and Industries Building, Ninth Street and Jefferson Drive SW. Museum of Natural History, 10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW. Smithsonian Building, 10th Street and Jefferson Drive SW. Freer Gallery of Art, 12th Street and Independence Avenue SW. All of the above buildings are open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Wheelchairs are provided at the entrance of each building for handicapped persons. The entrances of many of the buildings have no stairs; however, not all of the buildings have elevators. In the past, special tours for the blind have been arranged and special exhibits prepared. Special arrangements may be made by calling extension 542 or 543.

Supreme Court: First, and Maryland Avenue NE., Executive 3-1640. Open Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 12 noon. Conducted tours are available every 15 minutes except when the Court is in session. No special facilities are provided for handicapped persons. However, if advance reservations are made with the Marshal's Office—extension 281 or 282—the South Drive on Second Street can be used for easy access to the elevator. Special tours may also be arranged by calling the Marshal's Office in advance.

Washington Cathedral: Wisconsin Avenue and Woodley Road NW., Woodley 6-3500. Services are held Sunday, 7:30 a.m., 9 a.m., 11 a.m., and 4 p.m. Conducted tours are available daily, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and on Sunday, after 11 a.m. The cathedral and the Bishop's Garden are open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily and Sunday. The Memorial and Tomb of Woodrow Wilson, the only President buried in Washington, D.C., are located in the cathedral. Wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. Handicapped persons should enter the cathedral at the west entrance because it has no stairs. Special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

Washington Monument: On the Mall at 15th Street, Republic 7-1520, extension 2840. Open daily, March 20 through Labor Day, 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. Open daily, Labor Day to March 20, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The elevator fee is 10 cents for visitors 19 years and older. No wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. However, special priviliges are given the handicapped in use of the elevator. It is possible for persons in wheelchairs to ride the elevator to the observation point at the top of the Monument.

White House: 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., National 8-1414. Open Tuesday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 12 noon; Saturday, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. One wheelchair is provided for the handicapped. The elevator may be used. Special arrangements should be made in advance through one's Senator or Congressman.

Zoological Park: 3000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Columbia 5-0743. The buildings are open during November through April, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; May through October, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The grounds

are open throughout the year from daylight to dark. A limited number of wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. Many ramps have been constructed in order that handicapped persons may avoid stairs. It is possible to secure directions from the Park Police for seeing maximum part of the park with the minimum effort. Special arrangements for the tour should be made by calling in advance. The park has restaurant facilities, and special arrangements for handicapped persons or groups of handicapped may be made by contacting Mr. Leech at Columbia 5-9434 or Columbia 5-3231.

Sightseeing at the Zoological Park is easier for handicapped persons during the summer months as the animals are kept out of doors and it is not necessary to enter the buildings.

From Greenbelt to Greendale in 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the village of Greendale, Wis., under the administration of the Milwaukee County Development Corp., a series of four public service advertisements were sponsored by MCDC in local news media.

These ads provide an interesting and detailed description of the progress which has been made in the years since this Federally owned and operated community was sold into private hands. I am sure my colleagues will be interested in these articles and commend their attention to them.

The articles follow:

GROWTH: FROM GREENBELT TO GREENDALE IN 10 YEARS

Greendale is unique because it was planned that way. It combines the warmth and charm of a country village with the advantages of a metropolitan area, all made possible by the benefits of expert, long-range planning.

Greendale's roots are deep in the historic past. It all started with a modest, practical minded Englishman who had a dream. About the turn of the century Ebenezer Howard proposed his dream of the ideal city, the garden city: "A town designed for healthy living and industry: of a size that makes possible a full measure of social life, but not larger; surrounded by a rural belt." That was Ebenezer Howard's proposal. It is also a candid description of Greendale.

During the middle 1930's Rexford Tugwell led an effort to have the Federal government implement the British concept of the garden city. Along with two other sites, one in Ohio and one in Maryland, Tugwell and his committee chose an area of 3,400 rolling, wooded acres southwest of Milwaukee, an area fashioned to perfection for the setting of his greenbelt village. All construction was carefully planned to blend with the natural surroundings, with such success that today, some 30 years later, Greendale retains its European village air.

In 1938 the community of Greendale became a village with a council-manager form of government. In 1949 Congress authorized the Public Housing Administration to dispose of the greenbelt towns—both the homes rented out by the Government and the undeveloped lands.

In 1952, the shopping center, village hall, and many acres of surrounding land were put up for sale. In order to keep Greendale from becoming a lucrative toy of outside speculators, The Milwaukee Community Development Corporation (a conventional business) was organized by three Milwaukee businessmen with the corporate backing of the Boston Store, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., and Kearney Trecker Corp. In 1953, MCDC purchased all lands and buildings not previously sold to individuals.

Since then, every road, street, residential lot, manufacturing and commercial tract has been developed with an overall general plan as the guide.

Greendale's long-range development plan is possible because almost all the vacant land in the village is under single ownership of local, public-spirited business organizations. This produces a rare and interesting situation whereby the village retains its own authority, identity, and strength, where the people have full voice and representation in all matters, while at the same time, village land (prior to sale to homeowners) is owned by private business, and developed on the basis of a carefully thought out general plan.

Here is how MCDC works: A large area is selected for development based on the overall general plan. The MCDC staff (an architect, a city planner, and a civil engineer) then go to work.

The selected area is then planned so that the area will have a diversified land use, making provision for all the basic needs of a balanced community. Topography, road patterns, utilities, and general lot design are outlined. Also community facilities including parks, church, and school sites are considered in the planning.

The individual tract plans, showing the full development of each tract, within the area, are then submitted to the village planning commission and the village board for approval and for classification of the proper zoning. After approval of the village board, the preplanned tract is put up for sale as a package to a developer (a group of investors), who agree to develop the tract as outlined in the approved plans.

Nature is Greendale's foremost architect. Set on rolling, beautiful Kettle Moraine countryside, it is liberally laced with green, including 90 acres of landscaped parks. Centuries-old trees spread their branches over bright new homes. A stream flows through a wooded park in the heart of the village.

Careful planning has preserved the natural beauty of the setting; but it also has its very practical value. So skillfully have these winding streets been designed for the complete safety of Greendale children that not one car-pedestrian fatality has ever been recorded in the village. It is no accident that homes range in price from $15,000 to $60,000, or that land has been carefully allocated to commercial and light industrial use. It is, rather, part of a comprehensive plan to provide social and economic balance, and to strengthen the tax base.

March 10, 1962, Business Week magazine said: "Milwaukee group picks up where Rexford Tugwell left off in developing Greendale. * * * Nowhere has more new housing been built under private enterprise or the planning been administered more faithfully to the greenbelt ideals than in Greendale."

This spring marks MCDC's 10th anniversary. This is the first in a series of articles telling the story of Greendale, a community that began as an Englishman's dream, was fostered by the Federal experiment of combining village and nature, and has become a reality through the cooperative efforts of those of you who foresaw the many great adventures of living in a garden city.

NATURE AND MAN BUILD TODAY'S EXPANDING GREENDALE

Most people think that all new towns near big cities just grow willy nilly, a crossroads store plus a few houses and billboards make another village. But that's not the way with Greendale.

In 1952, the Milwaukee Community Development Corporation formed to rescue the young Greendale community from fast-buck speculators who ring metropolitan areas with eyesore communities.

Today, the village's attractive homes nestle on curving streets. Green meadows and woodland parks, modern schools, churches and other thoughtfully planned community facilities enrich life for all of Greendale's residents.

In the MCDC plan, 1,037 acres have been set aside for parks, including county and neighborhood parks, gracious assets which assure homeowners that their village will remain a garden city.

Several of the wisely placed parks, Edgerton, Sherwood, Canterbury, have already been transferred by MCDC. Others, including large neighborhood and strategic entrance sites will eventually be added as population grows.

A gentle slope dramatized the design of Greendale High School at 6801 Southway.

Currently, the school can accommodate 800 students. At present 620 attend Greendale High School, including tuition students from the city of Franklin. But the gym, cafeteria, and other expandable areas were planned for an anticipated 1,200.

Buildings of unorthodox design are not unusual in Greendale and are acceptable to the community, too, providing they blend with the surroundings and conform to the overall plan. Such a structure is the hexagonal Highland View elementary school with its classrooms clustered around a central hall. The two-story building on a hillside near a stand of huge, ancient oaks, is planned as a facility for sound and creative teaching.

Two other public elementary schools, Armbruster and Central Elementary, also serve Greendale children. Central Elementary also houses a junior high school for youngsters of the district.

A strikingly modern building serves the Catholic grade schoolers at St. Alphonsus parish. At present, 930 students are enrolled in the school, administered by the School Sisters of St. Francis. Fourteen additional classrooms will be added to St. Alphonsus with construction scheduled to begin this summer. Archdiocesan authorities also plan a Catholic high school.

The Missouri synod of the Lutheran Church has acquired a 33-acre site between South 76th and 82d Streets, Root River Parkway and West Abbott Avenue for the erection of a high school to accommodate 1,000 students in the near future.

Greendale churches have been important in the development of the village as a model community. The five village churches—St. Alphonsus Catholic Church, Greendale Community Congregational Church, St. Luke's Lutheran Church, Our Shepherd Lutheran and St. Hugh of Lincoln's Episcopal Church—have proved a strong support to suburban family life.

In Greendale, a family may have the rare privilege of worshiping in a church located on a site landscaped by the generous hand of nature. In the last 10 years, the three original churches have enlarged to accommodate their ever-increasing numbers of members, two additional churches have been added to serve the growing community on sites made available by MCDC in the planning of adjoining lands. Moreover,

MCDC has reserved sites for two more congregations on its properties. And more sites can be made available as needed.

In 1952, MCDC set aside a tract for future recreational use by an organization of village residents. As part of the plan, the Village Club, restricted to Greendale residents, was started. Now, more than 239 families use the club's comfortable facilities at the foot of Sherwood Road.

In 1960, the Village Club opened an L shaped swimming pool (official junior olympic size) and sufficient for the recreational needs of 500 families.

The Youth Memorial Building on the central school tract was achieved through the hard work and persistence of a dedicated group of residents. A barn on Highway 36 south of Root River Parkway is being rented to the American Youth Hostel Association; the barn on South 76th Street is being considered by the Suburban Players.

Greendale residents of all ages are active in many social and fraternal organizations: Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camera Club, Science Club and many others; church organizations, J.C.C.'s service clubs, Women's Club and home associations.

All of which proves once again that thoughtful men can, by looking ahead, achieve the community that meets all their needs and wants.

BROAD STREET: STORYBOOK STREET OF CHARMING SHOPS

Shopping on picturesque Broad Street is often an adventure to the Greendale newcomer, used to the bustle and crowds of city shopping. The mall, surrounded by convenient shops is a pleasant place to meet old friends and new neighbors who will soon become friends.

Within the last 5 years the shopping center has doubled in size with the addition of a new 15-unit building. The restrained design of the stores is in keeping with other village achitecture and in character with the Greendale personality. Ample parking area is one more feature that prompts milady to forego city traffic and parking problems.

There is vacant land available in the village center for additions to the shopping facilities. The overall village development plan includes space for an additional shopping center at the northeast corner of South 51st Street and College Avenue. These commercial facilities help reinforce the valuation of the village and provide tax revenue.

The nearness of Milwaukee's southside shopping centers, just 4 miles toward Milwaukee on Loomis Road, is another convenience for the Greendale resident. Downtown Milwaukee stores are only 8 miles away.

Greendale, though basically a residential community, is strategically located with easy access to industrial areas. Fully aware of Greendale's industrial possibilities, MCDC in 1957 proposed a plan for an industrial park to the Village Plan Commission.

The proposed Industrial Park tract of 52 acres, set well away from residential lands, had basic characteristics that led to its use as a commercial and light manufacturing district. The sewage treatment plant was located in the area and the village needed additional room for its public works building.

MCDC then exchanged lands with the village and began planning and developing the park, which involved extending utilities and roads to the area. This was financed by MCDC with the cooperation of the village. Eighteen lots averaging an acre in size were platted, including lots for the treatment plant and the public works building.

After five lots were sold and three buildings were completed in the park, a developing firm, Roxboro, Inc., was formed by a group of experienced industrialists. MCDC entered into an agreement with Roxboro Inc. to further develop the park.

In January 1959, the research laboratories of Allis-Chalmers were begun on the 30 acre tract at Grange and South 60th Street. A distinctive building was erected, with setbacks from the road and offstreet parking. Several additions have been made to the original building and ample room is available for expanson of the plant. It is hoped that the Allis-Chalmers research laboratory, together with the Louis Allis Co. laboratory, will prompt other companies to locate similar facilities in Greendale's industrial park.

In addition to the present park, MCDC has proposed additional industrial tracts in its overall development plan and the village plan commission has reviewed the proposed tracts. An area of approximately 27 acres is planned along Highway 36 at the southeast corner of West College Avenue. A second tract of approximately 80 acres is proposed in the triangle of South 76th Street, Highway 36, and south of Root River Parkway.

Development of these additional tracts will require detailed planning and the expansion of the village water system and the metropolitan interceptor sewer.

In addition to hard work and long hours of planning and conferences, the industrial park project has been costly, but the investment made by Roxboro, Inc., the village of Greendale, and MCDC has been worthwhile. The market value of the land comprising the industrial park property in 1957 was $36,000. Its present assessed value is near $550,000. This means an increase in revenue from real estate taxes as well as personal property taxes and income taxes for the village. This added valuation also increases the borrowing power of the village and is an important factor in decreasing the taxes of Greendale property owners.

MORE OF EVERYTHING FOR EVERYONE AT LESS COST

Greendale is a model town and as such it has attracted observers from throughout the world. The village is ably governed by an elected board of trustees with a village manager to administer the departments for maintenance of the village and the protection of its citizens.

Through the leadership of men of foresight, members of the plan commission, zoning board of appeals, building board, youth commission and the elected school board, the village today finds itself in an ideal position to encourage and accommodate growth and further development.

In 1952 the Federal Government sold all existing homes to village residents and in 1953 the vacant land and the shopping center were sold to private enterprise. Greendale's controlled growth was made possible by an adequate zoning ordinance enacted in 1953 and administered by the plan commission and the village board. The Milwaukee Community Development Corporation, Greendale's largest landowner, was then able to plan entire neighborhoods and provide diversified land use.

Never before has Greendale had so much to offer prospective residents. The stabilization of the tax cost, a key step in providing a suitable condition for growth, was accomplished by a number of factors, the overall planning by MCDC and the cooperation of the village government; the variety of residents available to the buyer varying in size from the multifamily to small, medium and large homesites; increased shopping facilities and the invitation extended by Greendale's Industrial Park to light manufacturing. Another important factor was the careful attention given to capital outlay budgeting details by the Greendale schools and municipal government.

Greendale has been the choice of families who recognize the many advantages and community facilities that go with the purchase of a home in the village. Where logical planning made it possible, development has included sewers, water, storm sewers, curb, paved street, planting screens, and sidewalks. Such community services as schools, fire and police protection and others that already existed have prompted families to choose Greendale as their new home.

The Greendale Village Board of Trustees is constantly working to make Greendale a better place in which to live and the village holds a promise for new residents of high living standards under a reasonable, and uniform, rate of taxation. Through its various committees, the village board determines policies and enacts legislation to carry out the numerous activities and services which the residents of the village enjoy. Residents of the village are invited and encouraged to participate in village board meetings where policies are determined.

The village manager is responsible for carrying out the policies as established by the village board.

Greendale residents are proud of their homes and have maintained their properties very well. The community itself is nestled in an area that has been exceptionally blessed by nature. The MCDC plan, we believe, contributed much to the orderly growth of Greendale and the corresponding increase in values on one hand, with declining village taxes on the other.

In 1953 Greendale had the highest tax rate in the county. Yet in spite of a rapid school building program and extension of village services, village tax rates have steadily declined. Greendale's present tax rate is now exceeded by about 70 percent of the property in Milwaukee County. Greendale's tax rate assessed levels has consistently dropped over the years, while the rate of most communities continues to rise.

This month marks MCDC's 10th anniversary and as we look ahead to the future, as we project a little, we look forward to continued growth for Greendale, a planned growth that is healthy and necessary.

The future of Greendale rests, of course, with you, the residents who foresaw all the advantages of living in a modern garden city, a village combining city comforts and conveniences with the unhurried, unruffled pace of a small town.

This community has grown and prospered during the past 10 years and we like to think that we have been responsible in part for that growth and prosperity. On this, our 10th year in Greendale, we salute each and every one of you, our neighbors and friends.

COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF FACTS

In 1953 the population of Greendale was fewer than 3,000. In 1963 the population of Greendale is estimated at about 10,000. In 1954 the average family unit in Greendale was valued at approximately $10,465. In 1963 the estimated value of the average family unit is expected to be $19,110. In 1954 the total market value of all types of properties throughout the village was $6,875,620. In 1962 the total market value of all types of properties throughout the village was $41,347,000.

During its 10 years of business in the village of Greendale, MCDC, as the single owner of all vacant land paid taxes on its property totaling more than $205,000, and spent approximately $300,000 for planning, therefore relieving the village government of planning expenses.

Education and Employment—Chicago's Answer to the High School Dropout Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, high school dropouts continue to be a major source of our long-term unemployment today. An encouraging effort to reverse this situation, however, is coming from the combined efforts of the Chicago Board of Education and Carson Pirie Scott & Co., a Chicago department store, in their promotion of a rehabilitation program for dropouts, called Double E—education and employment.

This program, which is now entering its second year, was not designed to curb the increasing dropout rate, but rather to equip dropouts to meet the ever-increasing skill requirements of new jobs which are being created.

According to an article in the October 13 issue of Business Week:

> The academic end of the (double E) program was work-related rather than an attempt to complete the dropout's formal education. Teachers concentrated on the development of vocational competence and self-expression and on such basics as personal finance, how to read a newspaper, letter writing, and intelligent buying.

This is a vitally important task, and I hope other communities will investigate the Chicago program and its possible application to their own dropout problems.

Because of the timeliness of this article, and the significance of the problem of unskilled high school dropouts, under unanimous consent I insert this article from Business Week magazine in the RECORD:

A BREAK FOR DROPOUTS—BIG STORE HELPS CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION IN PROGRAM THAT FITS YOUNGSTERS FOR REGULAR JOBS AND FILLS SOME GAPS IN EDUCATION THEY MISSED—THE IDEA IS SPREADING

High school dropouts usually are written off as an academic, social, and economic liability.

Instead of swelling the ranks of unskilled unemployed, they are participating in a remarkable rehabilitation program pioneered last year by the Chicago Board of Education and Carson Pirie Scott & Co., a Chicago department store. The program—christened Double E for education and employment—began its second year last month.

"There is nothing paternalistic about Double E," says Carson President C. Virgil Martin. "Today's dropouts are tomorrow's consumers. If they cannot be productive, due to a lack of jobs, their purchasing power is severely curtailed.

PATTERN

Using Carson's experience as a model, such Chicago employers as Illinois Bell Telephone Co., Science Research Associates, the Fair Store (a Montgomery Ward & Co. subsidiary), the Conrad Hilton Hotel, and Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., have provided employment for 1 to 13 dropouts each. Others have expressed interest.

A great deal is at stake in the program, Chicago educators feel. This is not primarily because of any increase in the dropout rate. On the contrary, the 1960–61 figure of 7.7 percent was a 9-year low, an encouraging development in a city where one out of every three students who enter high school fails to graduate. It's because the new jobs being created by industry are getting further out of the dropout's reach.

The department of city planning warns that the 142,000 additional jobs predicted for the Chicago area by 1965 will be largely in fields requiring a high school diploma or its equivalent. The U.S. Labor Department sees a similar pattern nationally.

Awareness of this problem—and the need to involve employers in its solution—led School Superintendent Dr. Benjamin Willis to turn down Frederick W. Englund, administrative vice president at Carson, on recruiting high school graduates for an executive training program last year. Instead, Willis asked, How about hiring dropouts?

FIRST TRIAL

Surprised but game. Carson agreed to hire 35 boys and 24 girls selected by summer school counselors from a cross section of the Chicago dropout population. All were between 16 and 21 and each was judged to have a potential for success. The plan called for them to work 3 days in the store, spend 2 days in classroom activities each week.

Since the school budget made no provision for Double E, Willis got a $50,000 Ford Foundation grant to pay the salaries of four full-time teachers and to provide a $2 daily lunch and carfare allowance for students.

The pilot program got underway with an informal dinner designed to enlist parents support.

"The big problem for these kids is insecurity," a store official explains. "Arousing interest at home is half the battle."

ORIENTATION

Students underwent a 3-week orientation period, then were assigned to available jobs on the basis of interest, aptitudes, and skills. No job was created specially for the occasion—Carson wanted to run as practical a program as possible, Englund says. Jobs included stock and clerical work, sales, display, merchandise checking, gift wrapping, and printing. Wages began at $1 an hour.

"The kids paid their own way quickly," says Jerry Long, Carson's employment manager.

The academic end of the program was work-related rather than an attempt to complete the dropout's formal education. Teachers concentrated on the development of vocational competence and self-expression and on such basics as personal finance, how to read a newspaper, letterwriting, and intelligent buying.

After a year, school and store officials summed up Double E: not perfect but an undoubted success. Thirty-nine of the original group were still at work when the pilot project ended in June. Thirty of these are staying on as regular Carson employees. Average wage of the survivors was $1.25 an hour. One boy earned $1.62.

FACTS OF LIFE

Those students who failed to finish the program benefited anyway, store officials believe.

"Even the briefest encounter with work experience leaves the dropout with a more realistic idea of what society expects of him," one official said.

Not everything about Double E has come up roses. Officials note that 32 of the 108 dropouts cleared for this year's program have not yet been placed; they suspect they could not pass simple employment aptitude tests. They are also troubled by the lack of manufacturing jobs—mainly because manufacturers fear seasonal, union or work-scheduling problems. These can be worked out, officials say.

Double E is only one of three projects for Chicago dropouts. Double T—for training and tryout—provides dropouts with grounding and jobs in such areas as food and hospital service and the needle trades. Double C—for census and counseling—will create permanent records of all Chicago dropouts to enable the Board of Education to keep in touch with them.

The Christian Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1962, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sermon that had been preached by Rev. W. W. Finlator as pastor of the Pullen Memorial Baptist Church, Raleigh, N.C., the sermon being entitled "Christ in Congress", and voicing opposition to the Christian amendment proposal which has been introduced by several Members of Congress.

In answer to the sermon mentioned, Rev. Samuel E. Boyle, of Los Angeles, Calif., a devoted Christian who has spent 21 years in evangelistic work in China and Japan, has delivered his own sermon, entitled "The Christian Amendment," and Reverend Boyle has requested me to have his sermon published in the Appendix of the RECORD. His sermon is a very fine answer to those who would oppose the Christian amendment and I am happy to insert it as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

With reverent and friendly respect for the Christian convictions of a fellow minister of Christ, I beg to differ sharply with the Reverend Mr. Finlator. It seems to me that he grossly distorted the significance of this Christian amendment resolution and that he sets up a great number of "straw men" as scarecrows to frighten us away from the very legislation which, it seems to me, is urgently needed to stay the tide of secularism and atheistic court cases intended to drive from our national life the very last trace of our Christian heritage.

Mr. Finlator said, criticizing the Christian amendment phrase, "This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ * * *": "Shocking, isn't it? * * * Look at the adverb 'devoutly.' Plainly it is illegal

here. Men can and should be devout but not governments. Let's face it. What we have required of our Government, and written into our Constitution, is that it be neither devout nor undevout, religious or antireligious, but that it remain religiously neutral, secular if you please. * * *"

How can a nation be neutral toward God, the Ruler of all nations? How can a nation be neutral toward Jesus Christ, the risen Lord and King of Kings, who is coming to judge all nations? Mr. Finlator has taken the absolutely secular theory of government as his own. He comes near to the false and dangerous platform of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, which has said in one of its annual reports:

"The United States not being a Christian nation and its godless Constitution requiring a secular government, the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism demands:

"(1) Taxation of church properties.

"(2) Elimination of chaplains and sectarian institutions from the public payroll.

"(3) Repeal of laws restricting rights of atheists and those enforcing Christian morals.

"(4) Abolition of oaths in courts and inaugurations.

"(5) Nonissuance of religious proclamations by Chief Executives.

"(6) Erasure of the superstitious inscription "In God We Trust" from our coins and the removal of the church flag from above our national flag on battleships.

"(7) Exclusion of the Bible as a sacred book from public schools.

"(8) Suppression of the bootlegging of religions through dismissal of pupils for religious instruction during class time.

"(9) Secularization of marriage, with divorce granted upon request.

"(10) Repeal of antievolution, antibirth control, and censorship laws."

We cannot know, of course, how far Mr. Finlator would go with the thoroughly secular goals of the AAAA. Perhaps he would object to some of the above 10 proposed reforms in American national life. It seems obvious nevertheless that the fundamental theory of a government's attitude toward religion, all religion, is the same for both Mr. Finlator and the AAAA. How can he avoid a full committal to the AAAA program of de-Christianizing our Republic by removal of all traditions having some relation to the Christian religion? Is that what Mr. Finlator seeks also?

Nearly 60 years ago an editor of The Christian Statesman wrote these prophetic words after a Christian amendment bill had been rejected by the Congress of his day: "It will be found that there can be no middle ground between openly acknowledged Christianity and blank political atheism." We now can see that prophecy fulfilled in many court actions of our own day.

When the Roman Governor Pilate faced Jesus of Nazareth and His enemies, the crafty politician of Rome tried desperately to find a place of neutrality toward Christ. He found none. His cry to the hostile enemies who demanded Jesus' death is almost pathetic, "What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be crucified." There was not, and cannot be, neutrality of governments to Jesus Christ.

Mr. Finlator opposes the Christian amendment introduced in the 87th Congress and again in the 88th Congress. He would oppose any such religious statement of any kind as an amendment to our Constitution. Thus we can scarcely expect Mr. Finlator to discuss the detailed wording of the Christian amendment resolution quoted at the beginning of this article in any fair and impartial manner. He is not openminded. He is a secularist.

If we turn to his criticisms of the wording of this Christian amendment, we find Mr. Finlator voicing the usual objections which come from superficial and prejudiced opinion about the nature and effect of this legislation on our freedom.

(1) There is the cry, "What about the Jew?" Or what about the Hindu, the Moslem, the Buddhist or the athetist; that is, what effect will this legislation putting Christ's name into the fundamental law of our land have on non-Christian or antireligious minorities of the Nation?

Our national method of deciding between conflicting opinions of people is always by the democratic process of majority rule. In political life today, for example, we have two great political parties. When one party wins the administration of the Nation, the rights of the minority are not trampled on. Our Constitution defends the freedom and interests of those who lose, as well as the freedom and rights of the majority. This is the American way.

If the Christian amendment were to be adopted by a majority of both Houses of Congress, and submitted to all the 50 States, of which three-fourths ratified this Christian amendment, many non-Christians would be disappointed or angry because of their dislike of Christianity. This bill would not work, however, on them any loss of freedom or restriction of their citizen's rights. The Christian amendment resolution contains the explicit guarantee of such rights to all. A modified oath is to be provided enabling people of different faiths to protect their consciences if they enter public life or vote for the candidates they choose.

The major issue is this: Are we going to go on dishonoring God and rejecting the authority and rule of Christ the Son, our Mediatorial Ruler and Judge, in order to please those few who oppose this national faith? It is necessary to come humbly as a nation to the Creater—God—and to confess as a nation our deep sin and distress. That is what we must consider. A famous Baptist preacher of England, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, gave to his day and generation this warning:

"For nations there is a weighing time. National sins demand national punishments. The whole history of God's dealings with mankind proves that though a nation may go on in wickedness, it may multiply its oppressions; it may abound in bloodshed, tyranny, and war, but an hour of retribution draweth nigh. There cannot be eternal damnation for nations as nations; the destruction of men at last will be that of individuals, and at the bar of God each man will be tried for himself. The punishment of nations, therefore, is national. The guilt they incur must receive its awful recompense in the present time."

(2) This Christian Amendment legislation does not unite church and State. Mr. Finlater ridicules the second item of the Christion Amendment which clearly reaffirms our tradition of separation of church from the state. He is mistaken in this criticism and not wholly honest. He is not urging here separation of church and state, a Christian principle basen on Jesus' famous words in Matthew 22:21 "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" Mr. Finlator defends the atheistic position toward the state by demanding a separation of all religion from the state. This error of thought is the deadly foe of American freedom and leads right to Communist dictatorship. Where in all the world is separation of all religion from the state so rigorously enforced today as in the several Communist nations? Who rules with iron hand the churches and educates the rising generations to hate and destroy all religions? There is no guarantee of freedom in a secular, atheistic state.

What many people seem incapable of understanding is that the state also has its religious character and duty. The state is separate from the churches. We would resist with all our power the establishment by law of the Roman Catholic Church, or the Methodist Church, or the Baptist, or even of my own little denomination. We would never willingly accept the NCC ecumenical movement's establishment in this country as the special voice of Protestantism at Washington, D.C. Religious diversity and full freedom of faith and propaganda, and unlimited activities of all citizens in any church or no church, are freedoms unchanged by this Christian Amendment.

The Government of this Nation must make its own direct acknowledgment of Christ, however difficult it seems. God requires that our rulers shall rule justly, with mercy, and in the fear of God. The church cannot lawfully interfere with the civil rulers. The civil ruler cannot lawfully interfere with the freedom of the churches. Yet both church and state are obligated by God's word separately and devoutly to recognize and honor the authority and law of the Lord Jesus Christ.

(3) Mr. Finlator makes another criticism which is obviously based on misunderstanding of the Christian amendment's purpose. He says that this Christian acknowledgement in the supreme law of our land would be a hypocritical gesture. This, he says, would be rank self-righteousness and would be wrong in view of the deep moral sins of our people. He does not favor this false label.

We are not trying to smuggle the Christian amendment in by stealth nor to force it on our country by violence. How could we? This is an amendment. It is properly introduced by Members of Congress as a resolution. Like all proposals, this resolution must come before a committee, the whole House of Congress, and then face the voters as it goes to the States for ratification. Mr. Finlator himself rejoices that this difficulty of changing the Constitution by amendments is so formidable that our Christian amendment has scant hope of getting adopted. Then what does he fear? Why does he so violently attack this little, hopeless resolution?

The Christian Amendment is a sensible, frank, openly proposed suggestion to our Congress and our fellow Americans that this Nation shall reconsider the meaning of our Constitution with respect to religion. It is a Christian amendment. It asks our Nation to consider the claims of God's appointed Saviour and Judge of nations, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who comes again to judge the world in power and glory. We in no way apologize for this wonderful Gospel invitation to America.

We believe, too, that passage of this amendment seems remote. It may never come. If America does not accept this, or a similar Christian amendment, to bring our Government and people to a Christian confession of sin, I believe disaster will certainly fall on us as a people and a Nation. We are not trying to put on a Christian label but to bring America to Christ.

Is this not a time to seek together the help of God? How can we face today's dangers in the world and our moral decline at home without seeking a great national revival of repentence and faith in the God of our fathers? This and nothing less will accompany the Nation's adoption of the Christian amendment legislation.

The Christian Amendment cannot be adopted until America repents, as a Nation. It cannot be adopted by an irreligious, anti-Christian people. It must be the fruit of a national revival and a genuine reformation of life and law to honor God. That is one reason so many criticize and oppose this

suggestion. The Christian amendment is intended as an appeal to America to turn from sin to God, and to seek first His kingdom and His righteousness. Then, and only then, can the blessing of God rest on our economy, our social life, our youth, our foreign policy, our war against the Communist aggressor. The time is short.

Those who support the Christian amendment do so not to please men but to honor God, and to bring redemption to this Nation and the world.

Psalm 2: 10–12 is our closing appeal to the Congress and people of the United States: "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear * * *," etc.

Greendale's Milwaukee County Development Corp. Celebrates 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, it was my distinct pleasure to be present in Greendale, Wis., for the 10th anniversary celebration of the Milwaukee County Development Corp. Milwaukee County Development Corp. is a private corporation which was established in 1953 to administer the sales of land from the previously Government-owned and operated village of Greendale, Wis.

The occasion was a fitting one on which to review the progress that has been made in that model community since Greendale was transferred from Federal to private ownership.

As the speaker for the evening, I was most pleased to be introduced by Mr. Louis Quarles who became temporary president of the civic corporation 10 years ago and has served admirably in the post ever since. Mr. Quarles' introductory statement and my remarks of the evening follow:

STATEMENT BY MR. LOUIS QUARLES

Ten years ago it was brought to the attention of some Milwaukee citizens that the U.S. Government was about to sell its holdings in Greendale as a single package. They got together a few people, including persons who expressed an interest in the venture, and they held their first meeting at the Allis-Chalmers clubhouse at West Allis. They formed a corporation, made a bid which was accepted by the Government. I was asked to pinch-hit as president until they could elect a permanent one—I am still pinch-hitting, much to my surprise, but I find it interesting and stimulating.

The invited guests in 1953 included the three clergymen and the members of the village board and school board, it was a relatively small group. Tonight we have the clergy with us again—which is only proper in a residential community—but the number has now grown to five. Thank you for coming tonight.

As the village problems expanded so have the various elements of government grown; so that in addition to the village board members, and members of the school board, we have the former and present members of the plan commission, the zoning board of appeals, the building board, the development commission, the village officials, and also the six candidates for the village board, thus including the officials to be.

I am not going to bother you with history. You are more familiar with developments here than I am, but to borrow a phrase from a former Governor of Wisconsin I'll try briefly "to reminisce a little bit about the future."

I want to thank the candidates for coming and we cannot introduce them because Milwaukee County Development Corp. being a corporation can only talk about issues. But the candidates are vitally important to you and to us because they represent the future. While a 10th anniversary get together is basically historical, we in Milwaukee County Development Corp. always look ahead, and are primarily interested in continued development. Having six candidates for the three trustee positions on the village board represents citizen interest, and without constant interest by good citizens, continued good village government is not possible.

We wish the candidates well, and may the best three men be elected.

And speaking further about development, I am sure you all know that Milwaukee County Development Corp is primarily in business in Greendale—to go out of business We want to finish what we have started and close up the company We will fold our tents like the Arabs and silently steal away.

In planning primarily for long range development of Greendale as contrasted with a quick turnover, it may be that our group was not true to the general concept of the ordinary businessman. We were primarily interested in doing a good job for the future. It has been said: "Why should I do anything for posterity, posterity never did anything for me." We did not and do not subscribe to that point of view.

We would be less than honest with you if we claimed that neither profits nor losses are a consideration in our business, or of interest to our stockholders. When we started in Greendale 10 years ago, we intended to found neither a nonprofit nor a quick-profit institution. Our primary interest was to assure a proper and outstanding development in the community. Incidentally, we intended to fairly reward our shareholders in the long run for the risks which they assumed and their continuing efforts to improve Greendale.

The pace of development over the past 10 years shows that expansion of Greendale has built up considerable momentum during the past few years.

We believe this reflects an awakening of people throughout the Milwaukee area to the many desirable features of life in your community. Recently this momentum has leveled off, in part because of problems whose final solution awaits construction of the metropolitan interceptor sewer. Our experience since 1953 makes us very skeptical about the ability of ourselves—or the community—to turn on or shut off progress at will, and particularly to turn it on. We are concerned about preserving the momentum which has been built up. Since good planning can best be achieved under conditions of steady, organized growth, we are equally concerned that, if the stream of progress is once dammed up, disorganized conditions will surely follow once the dam has been opened.

We hope that Greendale's growth over the next several years can progress in a steady, well organized and well planned manner. We conceive it to be our job to assist, to the best of our ability, in achieving this type of growth. We earnestly solicit the help of all of you in working toward that objective.

And so with those comments about history, and Milwaukee County Development Corp., and with the progress that has been made in the past 10 years—I am sure that you all can well understand there is not likely to be a 20th anniversary dinner given by Milwaukee County Development Corp.—and perhaps not even a 15th anniversary dinner. We are looking forward to the time when our task will be completed.

So much for Milwaukee County Development Corp. and history, which easily brings me to our guest tonight—the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, a man well known to all of you.

We asked him to be our guest to greet the past and present officials of the village of Greendale because we know that during the congressional years before 1952–53 he was very active when legislation was being enacted to determine the policy about the sale of Greendale—he has said he often felt as though he was almost the mayor of Greendale. His interest in the village and its development has been a continuous one up to the present date and I am sure will continue well into the future.

It is my pleasure to present the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. My friends, it is a distinct honor and privilege for me to be here tonight to join in the 10th anniversary banquet of the Milwaukee Community Development Corp. As one who has been vitally interested in this organization, its aims and aspirations, I feel privileged to have this opportunity to express my words of praise and commendation for the work that has been done here.

Through the efforts and cooperation of countless individuals—some of them no longer with us—Greendale has become the thriving community we know today. My efforts on behalf of this village at a time of flux and crisis over 10 years ago have been dwarfed by the accomplishments which you have made over the ensuing years. In a joint effort that bespeaks the best in our American way of life, you, as directors, with the cooperation of the householders and residents of Greendale, have maintained and improved what surely must be singled out as one of the most unusual communities in the United States.

Greendale, as I am sure you know, was one of the Greentown triplets. It was born with its sister towns, Greenbelt, Md., and Greenhills, Ohio, during a crucial decade in our Nation's history; the decade of the Great Depression. The depression was a crucial period chiefly perhaps for the vast social and political changes which were experienced in two key nations of the world. One of those nations was German. The other was our own country.

In Germany the changes took the form of Fascist totalitarianism. In that land hopelessness and despair were galvanized by a madman into one of the most horrible demonstrations of man's inhumanity to man that the world has ever seen.

In our own country the social revolution came about as our forefathers had meant it to—through the free choice of free citizens. In 1932 the people of the United States went to the polls and elected Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be their President. The country gave him a clear mandate to do what he could to cure the sickness which had stricken a once healthy nation. Franklin Roosevelt's answer was the New Deal.

No matter what our political beliefs, no matter what we think of F.D.R. and what he did or didn't do, we must admit that a social revolution was accomplished in this country. It was a sweeping revolution that came about without gunfire and without bloodshed. It was a revolution that, for better or worse, left an indelible imprint on our history and our way of life.

Although it was only 30 short years ago, somehow those New Deal days seem far away now. Perhaps it is because we have experienced so much since then. Even the names of those who engineered the New Deal have a faraway ring: Rexford Tugwell, Harold Ickes, Frances Perkins, Harry Hopkins, Robert Sherwood, Walter Borah, Hiram Johnson, George Norris.

Greendale was a child of the New Deal. It was conceived as one of innumerable projects to combat the great depression. The reasons behind its development were mainly two. First, the construction project gave work to men who otherwise would have been on the relief rolls. During the 2 years it took to build the town, an average of 2,000 men were employed per day.

Second, the homes offered low-cost housing to families with modest incomes. Rents ranged from $19 to $36 a month, averaging $29. Occupancy was restricted to families within the income range of $1,000 to $2,200 a year. In special cases individuals with less than $1,000 were accepted. Consideration also was given to large families with slightly higher incomes.

But to the technocrats who were the driving force behind the creation of this community, Greendale primarily represented planning. Greendale and its sister towns were to be planned as no other American cities had ever been. They were to be models for the future.

Greendale was the brainchild of men who believed that social evils were for the most part the result of unwholesome environment. They believed that if men put their minds to creating a healthy environment, that environment would, in turn, make healthy, happy, good people. Whatever flaws we might find in this philosophy, we cannot deny that planning was a startling concept in those days.

Not that it should have been. Many ancient cultures had consciously set out to build their cities according to a preconceived blueprint. The ancient Egyptians, the Aztec and Mayan cultures planned their cities and towns. There was, in addition, an American precedent. Washington, D.C., was a tract of swamp and forest land along the Potomac River when Charles L'Enfant first saw it and convinced President Washington that it should be the seat of the new government. L'Enfant's genius is still evident there. His planning has given us one of the world's truly beautiful cities.

But most American cities and towns, like Topsy, "jus' growed." Some, like Milwaukee, sprang up where navigable rivers flowed into larger bodies of water. Others, like Hales Corners, grew where main highways crossed. Still others were established as central points for farmers to bring their products and do their trading. A few, like West Allis, arose near industrial firms. How little planning went into the average American community is evident. Houses are piled one on top of another. There is little open space for trees and shrubs and foliage. Commercial enterprises are scattered in and among homes.

There was to be none of that in Greendale. Its planners drew their basic idea from the English garden villages. It is perhaps ironic that the English villages which appealed so much to the planners were not themselves planned. They were established according to social and practical considerations of their time that dictated that the farmers live in villages and go out each day into the surrounding fields.

The farms, gardens and wooded groves which surrounded the English villages became a "green belt" to the planners. This belt of green was to prevent unsightly developments from encroaching on the town.

Thirty years ago, the planners emulating the British concept, looked around for a suitable location for their green town. They selected the 3,400 acre tract of rolling terrain along the Root River Valley in southeastern Wisconsin, 8 miles from downtown Milwaukee. As we know, the choice of this location was a good one.

Then the planners began designing Greendale:

Each of the housing units was to be surrounded by approximately 5,000 square feet of ground providing space for gardens, trees, and shrubs.

The houses were to vary in size but were to be of similar architectural design. In addition to its own yard, each family was to have additional ground in gardens located within easy walking distance of the dwellings.

Streets and sidewalks in Greendale were planned to minimize traffic hazards. The town was to have access to three major roads, yet be situated far enough from them that traffic would go around, not through, the village. Most of the streets were to dead end in order to eliminate through traffic. The underlying principle was to promote safety. After all, the people of Greendale were expected to have families.

Greendale was to own and operate its own electrical distribution system which would be entirely underground. The subsurface wiring system was to assure a more complete continuity of service, free from interruption of storms, and eliminate the unsightliness of poles and overhead wires.

Greendale's business center, operated partly on a cooperative and partly on a privately owned basis, was to have all the services any villager could expect. Each business was to be housed in its own proper place.

Every foot of land within the area of Greendale was to be put gradually to its best possible use. The 74 farms and rural home units which were originally on the land were to be improved. Almost every building was to receive a new roof. Those without electricity were to be electrified.

A community building was to be constructed. It would house the school, but at the same time provide a place for the adult population to meet for games, meetings, and class instruction. Even Greendale's gardeners were to have the aid of a town agricultural guidance director.

Sounds like paradise doesn't it? And actually most of the plans were realized. But here and there the planners seem to have forgotten reality. In the Greendale of the Federal planners, no one's roof would ever leak or plumbing clog or furnace go on the fritz. But more particularly they sometimes seemed to have overlooked the human element.

For example, let me quote directly for a moment from a brochure on Greendale which the Public Housing Authority released about a year after the town had been occupied. A section is devoted to describing the numerous parks and play areas where children could be sent for supervised games and instruction. One sentence reads, and I quote, "Mothers send their children to these small neighborhood playgrounds where they know they will be safe and happy."

Only planners think that every child on a playground is happy. Certainly mothers don't. Or anyone who has ever had anything to do with a playground. Children cry, fight, pout, scream, and get bloody lips and black eyes on playgrounds. But to most planners, a playground is a place where the lion lies down with the lamb.

If I may find one more fault with the planners, it is that they left out of their scheme for Greendale a building which was a central point of the English village which they copied. That, of course, was a church. The Federal Government could not, of course, have financed a church for every denomination. Our Constitution forbids that. Yet the Government has successfully conducted interdenominational chapels on its military installations for years. However, the New Deal planners chose not to emulate this precedent. They were more interested in creating a paradise on earth than in suggesting that there could be one after death.

Yet, lest you think me too hard on the Government planners, let me hasten to add that I think they created a model town here in Greendale. They proved the value of planning to a community. Theirs was a tremendous achievement and a solid contribution to our society.

You will not hear from me any criticisms of Greendale as a "socialist real estate project" or "collectivist-inspired community." We have had enough of that from other quarters. But we would be remiss if we did not question Greendale as it was originally conceived.

Does the Federal Government have any business owning and running a town? Is it good for individual citizens to be dependent upon the Federal Government for their housing, schooling, for their children, recreation facilities and the like? Is individual initiative and freedom to a large extent stifled in this kind of environment?

These are serious questions, but today they are moot ones as far as Greendale is concerned. For with the end of World War II came a new political climate. The New Deal and its revolutionary fervor declined. There was growing disillusionment with Soviet Russia and its socialist experiment. This fact contributed much during the Truman administration of our country's swing back to the middle of the road. With the changes on the political scene came the determination to sell the Federal "Green" towns.

Two were sold to private developers. Greendale was not. We all know the reasons why. It has been a great source of personal pride to me to have helped in the preserving of the character of this community. In Greendale—unlike other Federal housing projects which were sold—the people had full opportunity and first chance to purchase the homes in which they were living, for a reasonable price. At the same time, the plan used in selling Greendale saved the Federal Government over $2 million. The work of the Milwaukee Community Development Corp. cannot be over estimated in this regard.

Under the guidance of this cooperative, free enterprise organization, the work of planning, begun by the Federal Government, was carried on. We can see the results around us. Residential areas have expanded into the once rural portions of Greendale. New homes have been constructed, utilities have been extended, and new roads have been built. Yet, the essential character of Greendale as a model community has been retained.

I am informed that foreign visitors and American community planners still visit Greendale. And well they might—for two reasons.

First, it has a historical significance as one of the first truly planned communities in our country. Methods which were originated for, and demonstrated in, this town have been used ever since. One thinks of the three Levittowns or Lake Park, Ill. These communities and their planners owe much to what had been done here almost 30 years ago. Near Washington, D.C., in Virginia, a new town is even now taking shape out of what was once farmland. It will be called Reston.

I recently saw represenations of what Reston will look like when it is completed and was struck with its resemblance to Greendale.

But more than being a prototype for the planned communities of this Nation, Greendale was a testing place for the underlying concepts of planning. Urban renewal, urban

redevelopment, strict zoning, traffic control—all these concepts which now are so familiar to us—have been inherited, at least in part, from Greendale and its sister cities, and the men that planned them.

But there is a second good reason for modern community planners to visit Greendale. That is to witness the fine accomplishments which have taken place here since 1952.

We all know that Greendale faces problems. The rapid increase in population which the village can expect in the next few years is certain to cause problems. Moreover, if the tax base is to be expanded, some attempt must be made to attract light industrial plants and commercial enterprises. Yet these must, at the same time, conform to the essentially residential character of the village. Yes, this community has continuing problems.

It has had problems before—certainly very serious ones. However, through the cooperative effort of the citizens of Greendale, past difficulties have been successfully resolved. I am confident that the problems of the future will be met and resolved.

The New Deal planners who created Greendale are no longer with us. But their ideas remain. Planning must still be an integral part of the life of this community. Undoubtedly you will continue in the path of village planning and cooperation in the future. And so, we look forward to the 20th anniversary banquet, for we will find Greendale even more flourishing than it is today.

This is your challenge. This is your goal.

Administration Blocks Drive for Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the March 28 issue of the Wall Street Journal contains an analysis of the administration's tax proposal, measuring it against the goal which it seeks to attain. I believe the article properly points out the fallacies inherent in the deficit approach to stimulating economic growth, and in particular the current administation effort to utilize this approach. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 28, 1963]

SPURRING GROWTH: ADMINISTRATION COMPLICATES TASK BUT GOAL IS OBTAINABLE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The more President Kennedy's program of tax reduction plus alleged tax reform is subjected to the light of discussion the less convincing it seems as a remedy for the sluggish growth of the American economy.

There is no basis in past experience for the assumption that a budget deficit will touch off an upsurge in consumer demand. Had this been true, it would be hard to explain the record of three recessions in the last 10 years, plus a growth rate markedly slower than that of the leading European industrial nations and Japan.

There has certainly been no lack of deficit medicine. Deficits have been running at an average of $3.2 billion for the last 10 years, with the Kennedy administration showing the unenviable record of a rising rate of unemployment with a steady increase of red ink in the Federal budget. Moreover, even if it were true that budget deficit was a sure stimulus to a business upturn, the President's proposal is not adequate to achieve this purpose.

Against the proposed reduction in Federal taxes by $2.7 billion in the present year must be set an increase of $2 billion in the social security tax and of some $3 billion in the probable increase of State and local taxes. Moreover, the proposed tax reforms are mostly not reforms at all, in any proper sense of the word, but one-sided attacks on the pocketbooks of people in the upper and middle tax brackets who furnish most of the capital for the new investment that creates new jobs.

HIGHER TAXES FOR MANY

It is fair enough to disallow padded, excessive and unreasonable expense deductions. But where is the justice or equity of making an arbitrary cut in legitimate allowable deductions? Equally obnoxious is the proposal to eliminate the small credit allowed for income from dividends, which has already been taxed once under the corporation income tax. For many taxpayers the probable effect of the Kennedy proposals would be higher, rather than lower payments.

The rather striking absence of popular enthusiasm for the administration tax proposals is based on a growing realization that tax reduction, without a cut of corresponding proportions in Government expenditure, is a snare and a delusion. Despite glib sneers at the conventional wisdom, on the part of academic New Frontiersmen, what a government spends must somehow be paid for, either in taxation or in inflation, which is a peculiarly destructive, dangerous, and uncontrollable form of taxation.

There is a legend in a large New York bank about an exuberant young visitor from Brazil who called on one of the veteran economists of the bank and gave him a long exposition of the marvelous progress which Brazil had achieved, in spite of its high rate of inflation. In conclusion the visitor said: "The laws of economics do not apply to Brazil." To which the economist, who had listened in silence, replied with two words: "They will."

A similar prediction may be made for the United States, if those responsible for its financial stability ignore all lessons of experience.

TARGETS FOR ECONOMY

President Kennedy has often used the argument that tax rates under our steeply graduated income levy tend to discourage new investment. This is true. But the answer to the problem which this statement poses is not to run increasingly heavy deficits, but to adjust Government spending to our resources. Unfortunately the budget which is now up for consideration makes no effort to meet this requirement.

Since the administration has failed in this task, it is the duty of a bipartisan economy group in Congress to make substantial cuts, $5 billion at a minimum, $10 billion at a maximum, in the proposed record budget. There are at least four shining targets for economy, foreign aid, agricultural subsidies, veterans' expenditures not connected with service disability, and the effort to be first with a man on the moon, a project for which no adequate military or scientific justification has ever been offered. Needless to say, the obligation to economize applies to State, as well as to Federal spending.

A genuine, as contrasted with a phony, tax reform would be to shift some of the weight of the Federal tax burden from direct to indirect levies. The United States is alone among leading industrial nations in relying almost exclusively on direct taxation for its national revenue. In Germany and England the distribution between direct and sales or excise taxes is about 50–50; the proportion of indirect taxation in France and Italy is still higher. This predominant reliance on graduated direct taxation, reaching near confiscatory heights on big incomes, hits especially hard at job-creating private investment capital.

EVENING THE SCALES

Besides giving tax cuts that would be real and genuine through reductions in expenditure, the administration and Congress could create a better climate for investment by taking measures to make the scales in collective bargaining less heavily loaded in favor of monopolistic trade unions than they are at present.

The one-sided State laws which provide unemployment relief for strikers should be repealed. (No corresponding subsidy is paid to management.) Trade unions should no longer be permitted to do many things which would expose employers to be prosecuted under the antitrust laws or other legislation. Organized labor should have equality under the law. It should not have an above-the-law status. If some reasonable risk and sacrifice were attached to striking, there would be fewer strikes, many fewer for clearly exorbitant inflationary demands and for frivolous causes.

Abuse of the monopolistic power of the strongly organized trade unions is one of the biggest, most obvious causes of the unemployment over which union leaders shed crocodile tears. Unions can price their members out of jobs, just as a company can price itself out of customers.

The paths to sound economic growth are not invisible, but the U.S. Government has an unusually hard time seeing them.

ASCS Committeemen Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a special group of farmers in our Nation. They are the farmer ASCS committeemen who administer most of the action programs of the Department of Agriculture. The time is appropriate because 1963 is the 25th anniversary of the legislation establishing the present farmer committee system. The 75th Congress passed legislation which the President signed into law—Public Law 430—on February 16, 1938. It was, in part, an amendment to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which directed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish local and State committees. While similar committees functioned from the time the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed in 1933, these others were operating under directives issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than by provision of law.

Under this law the Secretary was directed to establish local administrative areas which cannot cross county lines, with the provision that the participating farmers within such local areas were to elect three farmers to administer the program and represent them. This, then, amounts to an honor for these

three elected farmers, but it also becomes a duty. It is an honor because it shows the esteem in which these men are held in their communities. It is a duty because many demands are made on their time, often when they can ill afford to take the time from operating their individual business, to attend meetings or perform other duties including explaining new programs to farmers and enrolling them in these programs.

We all know that over the years these committees have become increasingly interested and effective in the presentation of the programs to the farmers, as is so well evidenced by the following data on farmer participation in the agricultural conservation program during the past 5 years.

Year	Farms participating	Acres on participating farms	Cropland on participating farms
1958	1,114,459	400,763,000	157,230,000
1959	1,005,738	387,534,000	148,644,000
1960	1,055,872	391,421,000	152,199,000
1961	1,216,962	433,573,000	182,224,000
1962 [1]	1,270,000	440,000,000	185,000,000

[1] Estimated.

Actually, the total number of farmers who have participated in the ACP during this 5-year period is much nearer the 2 million figure, because there is a constant turnover of participants which, in 1962, was approximately 200,000, or 4 times the total increase over the preceding year. Because of the importance of the functions these committeemen perform in the limited time they are given the opportunity to work, it appears that more extensive use should be made of their talents whenever possible, as these men are the backbone of the program. This in no way detracts from the efficient and hard-working staffs maintained in their offices. They work as a team for the benefit of all farmers. One point which is frequently overlooked in the consideration of this program is the fact that it embraces all farmland. From time to time, special programs to treat production and conservation problems on certain types of land are considered and then enacted, but not all land is eligible. Some of these special programs include (a) the conservation reserve of the soil bank program, (b) the Great Plains program, (c) feed grains program, and so forth. Since under the ACP any farmland is eligible—it is this total of all land which we must depend upon for the Nation's food supply in the future—we must do everything possible to see that it is preserved rather than wasted away. Hence, it becomes increasingly important that these men—the community, county, and State ASCS committees—be given the necessary tools, including the opportunity to familiarize all farmers in their locale of the need for the preservation of the soil for future generations, and the necessary finances to enroll all farmers in the program.

For my part, I believe they have done a giantlike job to date with the tools provided for them to work with. They have earned all the acclamation accorded them by their fellow farmers. They deserve to be lauded for their years of dedication to duty. ASCS committeemen, we salute you.

Local Unit Questions Wisdom of PTA Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a ballot recently sent to its local units by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers has caused considerable concern among many of the local units in the Fifth District of Texas. Many members seem to be of the opinion that the loosely worded ballot is more of a propaganda effort on a wide range of political matters not connected with the understood functions of the parent-teachers' association. I think the following resolution, passed by the Lake Highlands Elementary Parent-Teachers' Association in Richardson, Tex., sums up the criticism of this ballot and I include it as a part of these remarks in order to acquaint other units with the feeling of many of the people in the district I have the honor to represent. I am also including the text of the ballot issued by the National PTA.

The material follows:

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That we, the members of the Lake Highlands Elementary Parent-Teacher Association, Richardson, Tex., Independent School District, do hereby express our objection to the ambiguous wording (making a clearcut vote "for" and "against" the various propositions impossible) of the policies of the legislation program, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; we further consider this a highly political ballot for which the national congress cannot speak for its some 12 million members; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our thanks to the Texas Board of Managers for bringing these policies to the attention of the Texas membership by asking each local unit to cast ballots; we further urge that all State presidents make copies of these policies available to their memberships; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Texas State president, Texas district II president, Richardson city council president, and each member of the national board of managers, including all State presidents; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to U.S. Senators RALPH YARBOROUGH and JOHN TOWER, and U.S. Congressman BRUCE ALGER so that they will know that the National Congress of Parents and Teachers does not speak for the membership of this unit.

I, Mrs. Lee R. Royal, hereby certify that I am the duly elected and acting secretary of the said Lake Highlands Elementary Parent-Teacher Association and that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly passed by the members of said Association at a special meeting called and held on March 26, 1963.

Mrs. LEE R. ROYAL,
Secretary as aforesaid.

LOCAL UNIT BALLOT ON LEGISLATION PROGRAM, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS POLICIES

Action of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers on Federal legislation is determined at all times by previously adopted legislation policies. These policies define the fields of legislation that are within the scope of the parent-teacher program and specify certain required qualifications. Priority items, which must conform with these policies, define the action proposed each year. These items are selected from areas of concern to the national congress in which Federal bills are pending or expected.

The policies on the 1961–63 legislation program will prevail until sufficient time has been allowed for study of, and subsequent vote on, the revised policies stated below. Not until a minimum of 31 State congresses have reported their approval will these policies become effective. It is recommended that State congresses provide reasonable time for study before any policy item on the legislation program is presented for approval or disapproval. Every policy item will need to be voted on.

BASIC REQUIREMENTS

1. Maximum local control: All Federal legislation concerned with education and child welfare must include provisions that will insure maximum local control. For ☐; Against ☐.

2. Appropriations: Those Federal offices and agencies responsible for carrying out legislation concerned with education and child welfare must be supported by funds adequate to meet the legislative requirements. For ☐; Against ☐.

3. Channeling of Federal funds: Federal grants for States should be made through the Federal agencies that are most directly concerned with the legislative enactment involved and then administered by the comparable State and local agencies. (For example, Federal funds for education should be channeled through the U.S. Office of Education, through State departments of education, to local school districts, and should be administered with maximum local control). For ☐; Against ☐.

EDUCATION

1. In order that the free public school system be maintained and strengthened, Federal funds for education must be appropriated for publicly controlled, tax-supported schools only, for the purpose of increasing educational opportunity and services among the States, with provisions ensuring maximum local control and encouraging States to give their own best support and to equalize educational opportunities and services within their own boundaries. For ☐; Against ☐.

2. Education beyond high school should be encouraged and financial assistance provided for tax-supported institutions. For ☐; Against ☐.

3. The U.S Office of Education should be established as an independent agency of the Government under the general direction of a Federal board of education. This board should be composed of laymen appointed to long, overlapping terms; it have authority to appoint, and be advisory to, the U.S. Commissioner of Education. For ☐; Against ☐.

CHILD WELFARE

1. Child Labor: The child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be maintained. For ☐; Against ☐.

2. Child Life Research: The programs of child life research that are being carried on by various Federal agencies should be correlated and supported by appropriations. For ☐; Against ☐.

3. Health: Expanded public health services and public health education opportunities should be provided for all children and youth. For ☐; Against ☐.

Maternal and child health services and services for all handicapped children should be continued with the aid of Federal appropriations. For ☐; Against ☐.

4. Juvenile Protection: Federal programs of juvenile protection should be developed:

(a) To assist in the implementation of State laws when environmental factors are involved in the safety and welfare of children and youth. For ☐; Against ☐.

(b) To provide funds for assistance to, and in cooperation with, States in study of causative factors in delinquency. For □; Against □.

(c) To strengthen and improve State and local programs for control, treatment, and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. For □; Against □.

5. Rural and urban services: The basic principles of equalization of education, recreation, and health services for children and youth, with the improvement of these services where needed, should be maintained in rural areas and in densely populated urban areas. Similar legislation should provide for children of migrant families. For □; Against □.

6. School and community services under the U.S. Government: The Federal Government should see that adequate funds are provided for school and community services in the District of Columbia and in oversea areas where the United States maintains armed forces. For □; Against □.

7. Pure foods and drugs: Federal legislation should provide for complete inspection of food, drug, and cosmetic establishments by the Food and Drug Administration. Legislation should require drug manufacturers to have adequate controls to insure the purity and safety of their products. New drugs and medical devices should be proved effective as well as safe before they are placed on the market. Distributors of dangerous habit-forming drugs should be required to keep records on production and sales of such drugs and to make these reports available for inspection. For □; against □.

LIBRARY SERVICES

Public library services should be extended to all people on an equitable basis. For □; Against □.

PEACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

1. National defense: In planning the strategy of the national security program, the role of the schools should be carefully considered, because the security of this country and the peace of the world today require a well-educated civilian population as well as a strong military force. A major part of the national security rests upon the ability to prepare young people for the discharge of their military and civic responsibilities. For □; Against □.

An adequate civilian reserve of manpower available for military service should be developed, and a standing miltiary force sufficient to deter aggressors should be maintained. Every effort should be made to meet the personnel needs of the Armed Forces with the least interruption of high school and post high school education of youtha—t the same time with fair consideration for the needs of out-of-school youth. For □; Against □.

2. International Relations:

(a) The United Nations should be supported as the best available instrument for world peace. Diligent efforts for international cooperation should be made through use of United Nations channels—to improve the economic, social, physical, and spiritual welfare of all children and youth. For □; Against □.

(b) The program of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) should be continued. For □; Against□.

(c) The national congress supports in principle the work of other specialized agencies—such as (1) the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). For □; Against□. (2) The World Health Organization (WHO). For □; Against □. (3) The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). For □; Against □. (4) the Bureau of Technical Assistance Operations (TAO). For □; Against □.

(d) The national congress supports a broad program of cultural and educational exchange between the United States and other countries, and assistance by the Untied States in training of teachers and other professional and technical personnel for other countries. For □; Against □.

POSTAL RATES

The national congress will oppose increases in the special postal rates for the mailing of library books and educational materials, and for second-class mailings by nonprofit organizations. For □; Against □.

The following proposition is not part of the national legislation program:

We are in favor of any further extension of Federal aid to Education. For □; Against □.

An Appeal for Responsible Negro Leadership in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for the improvement of conditions in the District of Columbia rests not only on Congress, its governing body, but on the people within the District as well. Unfortunately, there has been a trend of late to give too great a weight to statements, at times irresponsible, of certain individuals and groups who have proclaimed themselves the spokesmen for the Negro community.

As I have remarked in the past, it is my belief that there is much room for improvement in the living conditions and educational, employment, and social opportunities of the citizens of the District. At the same time, however, the increasing disrespect for the law cannot be tolerated. Past statements by some of the so-called spokesmen for the community at large have failed to contribute to increased citizen cooperation and individual responsibility so vital to such a diverse society as the District of Columbia.

It has been my feeling that these spokesmen have been out of touch with their own constituents—that their views do not reflect the views of the great majority of our citizens, regardless of race. In the Sunday Star of April 7, 1963, this feeling was borne out by a letter written by Bert Cumby, a respected and intelligent leader of the responsible Negro community in Washington, D.C. I would suggest that the spokesmen who wish to blame everything on the Negro, as well as those I have already mentioned who are willing to blame everything on society and the police, should read this letter carefully, both for its content and approach. This letter may well signify a turning point for the better for all of us living in and working in the District.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Apr. 7, 1963]

THE NEGRO AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following views on crime in the Capital and its relation to the Negro community were submitted to the Star in the form of a letter by Bert Cumby, who had a distinguished Army career and is active in church and youth affairs here. As a lieutenant colonel, he was the first Negro instructor in the Army Intelligence School; interrogated prisoners of war during the Korean action and testified before the McClellan committee on POW Exchange Methods. He is a member of St. Stephen and Incarnation Episcopal Church and the National Council of Boy Scouts.)

There seems to be a growing concern within the Negro community over crime in the District, and some self-appointed spokesmen, through statements to the press, create the erroneous impression that they speak for all Negroes here.

This concern is not necessarily over the stated objectives of these persons, but rather over their careless and ill-prepared performances, reflecting certain civic interpretation and thought subsequently and unjustly charged to the Negro community.

Such performances and their impact on the Negro community call for some comment and observations. It is hoped that these observations will be noted with the same spirit in which they are presented, and with the maturity and objectivity befitting a vital segment of the Nation's population that recently celebrated its centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation.

ALARMING CRIME RATE

Every District of Columbia resident who can read a newspaper, listen to radio and view television, knows that crime here has reached alarming proportions, and every segment of the population, including the executive branch of the Federal Government, has expressed concern. The crime picture has been objectively presented to Congress and to the public. It has been supported by hard facts and information, and with cold statistics from the police department, the courts, and from institutions intimately concerned with the problem.

Instead of facing this unpleasant fact and offering practical recommendations for its solution, some seem to think the statistics are rigged and that crime here is normal, whatever that means. But the Negro community is not saying the statistics are rigged and I do not believe the Negro community regards crime in the District as normal. But the implications can be clearly drawn from the performances and statements by some alleged spokesmen for the Negro community.

Recently this writer attended a public meeting in Northwest Washington, at which crime in the District was discussed. When someone asked how it could be curbed, one speaker replied that crime in Washington is not as bad as it might seem. He said New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and St. Louis had more crime than Washington. This may be true. But what does crime in those cities have to do with crime here?

HOME RULE NO SOLUTION

As to how crime can be curbed here, one speaker said get home rule. This writer is not against home rule. He has been a District of Columbia taxpayer for 22 years and has religiously shouldered every individual responsibility of citizenship, including 20 years of honorable military service in several parts of the world. But home rule without numerous other individual and group actions, will not solve crime in Washington any more than it will solve it in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and St. Louis—all blessed with home rule and effective political organizations to support them.

The apparent failure on the part of some persons to face up to reality in this problem is reflected in their protestations. This writer is not against protest. The technique of protest is a constitutional right. But this writer does oppose the conference-type of protest where those protesting present a case as special representatives of the Negro com-

munity, of which I am a member, with erroneous information, poor preparation and without reliable and verified sources.

LEGAL BACKGROUND

The late and erudite Charles Houston who, with the able assistance of the brilliant Dr. James Nabritt of Howard University, laid the solid legal background for most civil rights the Negro enjoys today, once said that the Negro can not afford to plead his case, whether before a court of law or before public opinion, with faulty information. The life and times of this great Negro leader and legal mind, and that of Dr. Nabritt should be must reading for those who seem so eager to represent the Negro community. At this critical period in the historical development of the American Negro, responsible spokesmanship and leadership are absolutely essential to his continued progress, and vital to his survival.

Protests based on faulty information, unrelated facts, and emotionalism, make a painful contribution to the neutralization of Negro leadership everywhere. Documented instances of this kind are many. Several years ago a self-appointed spokesman for the Negroes here protested against police brutality. The Commissioners took the protest under study for possible action. After much publicity, time-consuming conferences and investigation, it was learned that the principal source of the information in the charges was an ex-convict with a long criminal record. Of course, the charges were withdrawn.

RECENT SHOOTING

Recently an alleged purse snatcher was shot by a policeman. Within hours after the incident and without complete facts, a telegram was dispatched to the Commissioners, the police department, a civil rights agency and the press, protesting "murder." The telegram accused the wrong policeman for the action. However, there is no record to indicate that a corrected copy of the telegram was forwarded to the original receivers.

It seems in this instance no thought or serious consideration was given to the record of the alleged offender, the offense, or the helplessness of the victim, a pregnant woman. This action clearly reflected an interest in the offender, and little or no sympathy with the victim. If the community at large interpreted this action as the attitude of the Negro community toward this matter, it is both unfortunate and erroneous.

Perhaps the greatest disservice self-proclaimed Negro spokesmen have inflicted upon the Negro community is the utterly false impression that Negroes are indifferent to crime here. The fact is the Negro community is greatly concerned with crime here, and it has to be when statistics show that 70 or 80 percent of the victims are Negroes. Everything about crime in Washington that is repugnant to the white community is repugnant to the Negro community. It was repugnant when a defenseless woman was attacked while praying in church. It was repugnant when a Catholic priest was murdered by one whom he had helped. It was repugnant to the Negro community when a Jewish shopkeeper was brutally murdered and robbed.

THE GUILTY MUST PAY

It was repugnant when a pregnant mother was attacked while doing her laundry at home. It was repugnant to the Negro community when an aged musician was slain while walking home with groceries. It was repugnant when two men clubbed to death a 40-year-old man in his home. It was repugnant to the Negro community when seven Negro women were criminally assaulted in recent months. And, it is repugnant to the Negro community when these offenders are defended and the victims ignored. If we are to have a society of decency, of the rule of law and not the rule of the jungle, we must not only be against crime, but must demand that offenders pay for all crimes against society.

Persons without qualifications for operating a highly specialized agency such as the police department and other agencies of public safety, have suggested that District police undergo special training in discretion and proper use of their basic weapon. This writer is more concerned about the offender and potential offender, whose rebellion against constitutional authority contributes to his offenses, than about the trained police officer. This writer is more concerned about a weapon in the hands of an offender or potential offender than the weapon in the hands of the policeman.

Nothing reflects the above more dramatically than the fatal shooting of Pvt. Elmer L. Hunter, an intelligent young Negro police officer, by a man with a weapon concealed in an umbrella. This officer was exercising discretion, kindness, and respect for the individual in line of duty. Could this gunman have been under the impression that the policeman would not defend himself because of charges that police are trigger happy?

If there were outcries by the usual spokesmen in this case this writer failed to observe such. Is it that the policeman who shot the alleged purse snatcher was unjustified, and the offender who killed Private Hunter was justified. The useless murder of this Negro policeman was most repugnant to the Negro community, and this writer is proud to say he contributed to his widow's fund.

MEASURES COULD BE TAKEN NOW

Many reasons are advanced for crime here, one being job opportunity. This may have contributed, but to what extent is not known. There have been many suggestions as to how crime could be curbed, including more jobs for youngsters, more policemen and more police dogs on the streets. But implementation of these and other measures for curbing crime here will take time. Other actions can be taken within each segment of the community, and without delay. These actions don't require a Supreme Court decision, approval by congressional committees, or approval by the District Commissioners. They are submitted here in the interest of the Negro community.

No personality in the Negro community has a greater opportunity to serve his people than the Negro minister. He is not only a spiritual leader but a missionary. He enjoys confidence and support and is highly respected in his area. The Negro minister has done much to alert his followers to their need for full citizenship, and stimulating their desire for various aspects of civil rights. The Negro minister could impress upon his followers the necessity for exercising continuous control and discipline over their children.

He could stress that as important as church and school are to the daily lives of children, the home is the real training ground. He could accept the absolute necessity for providing their children with the best educational training and preparation available, they will never take their rightful place in competitive and integrated society. He could emphasize that with citizenshp goes a keen sense of individual conduct and responsibility. He could hammer home the ageless truth, that to demand respect from others one must first respect himself, and that the dignity of the individual starts with the individual.

NEGRO RADIO

Several local radio stations are for all practical purposes, "Negro stations." They are staffed with Negro personnel, their programs are aired to the Negro community, and their advertisers, for the most part, depend upon Negro trade. These outlets could render a vital service in fighting local crime. They could decrease their regular diets of terrifying sounds for a few educational programs.

They could substitute a crime doesn't pay series for programs which serve no useful purpose except to plug advertisers. They could produce programs for children, reflecting the better side of our youth, such as the large number of Negro children in the District High School Symphony which gave a remarkable performance recently at Roosevelt High. They could run a citizenship series, stressing the essential qualities of respectable citizenship. They could do what a highly respectable Negro publication did several years ago: run a series on conduct—good and bad. This does not seem to be suggesting too much of a communication facility that earns its profits from sources that depend largely on Negro business.

COMPLEX PROBLEMS

To those persons whose methods seem to reflect an emotional impulse rather than well-planned thought and action, the area of race relations is complex and delicate. In this area everything is not jet black or pasty white. There are no one-way streets. There is an area between the two shades—call it the gray area, where men of goodwill, of personal integrity and honesty, and of individual responsibility can meet on common ground, work together and produce good for the good of the community in which we live. And until such a relationship is firmly established on all levels, our purposes will be self-defeating and our ultimate goals postponed.

Before critics dismiss these observations as typical name-calling nonsense, the writer wishes to clearly state that as a member of the Negro community, he shares the very same aspiration of every other Negro regarding full citizenship, and he has not in the past and does not now, compromise on any of the fundamentals of this status. These comments are in the interest of responsible leadership—responsible Negro leadership.

BERT CUMBY.

The Employment Crisis Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago American recently commended editorially on a speech of the President in Chicago, pointing to the problem which he dealt with and the words left unsaid in his original text. The importance of the problem, that of the maturing of the wartime baby boom and their entry into the labor market, deserves full attention and I commend the Chicago American's editorial, which follows, for turning the thoughts of its readers to this situation.

KENNEDY'S SOBER WARNING

In delivering his speech here Saturday on the Nation's unemployment problems, President Kennedy considerably toned down the grim warnings contained in his original script; he left out, for instance, any reference to "a decade of chronic troubles and recession" that would follow if jobs can't be provided for the tidal wave of new workers. What he did say, though, was sober enough, and the facts do not need any dressing up to be worrisome.

As Kennedy emphasized, the postwar baby flood is now surging through high school and college and is threatening to engulf the labor market. At the same time, advances

in technology are shrinking job opportunities, particularly for unskilled workers; in the last 6 years, Kennedy said, the Nation's manufacturing output has increased by 20 percent with 800,000 fewer workers on production lines—and the loss has not been offset by the gain in white collar jobs. The economy is losing its ability to absorb new workers just when the ability is most needed.

The problems do not stop with unemployment. Men who can't find jobs will either be forced onto relief, swelling an already huge tax burden, or will turn to other means of survival, including crime. Said Kennedy: "In the last decade, arrests of youths increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers rises 15 times as fast?"

The President restated his package program for attacking these problems, including a $10 billion tax cut and a $12 billion deficit.

The administration would do a lot better at convincing the Nation of the urgency of its program if it would cut down other spending and lift part of the tax burden from business. It is business that provides jobs.

South Dakota Lawyer Conquers Handicap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the April 1963 issue of Kiwanis magazine tells the inspiring story of Mr. Vernon Williams, an Aberdeen, S. Dak. attorney, who triumphed over blindness.

An article by Helen Rezatto, entitled, "Just an Average Lawyer," relates the remarkable achievements of Mr. Williams and his devoted family.

A highly respected attorney, Vernon Williams is also an engaging human being who has won the affection of his community and State.

Believing that the story of his triumph will be an inspiration to all who read it, I ask unanimous consent that the Kiwanis article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST AN AVERAGE LAWYER

(By Helen Rezatto)

At 7 o'clock on a summer morning the alarm rings in a large brick home on shady, pleasant Lincoln Street in Aberdeen, S. Dak. (population 23,000). And a routine day begins for the Vernon Williams family.

Although Attorney Vernon Williams, 45, has one of the largest law practices in his native State, most other aspects of his life are close enough to the norm to be termed "average." He is short, slight, has a twinkling, pixie face, topped with the rambunctious bristles of a youthful crew cut. The personalities of extroverted, loquacious Vernon and his serene, attractive wife Betty complement each other. They and their four children are a typical, middle-class family—almost.

While Vernon has a fast shave and shower, Betty begins breakfast preparations. When he arrives in the kitchen, Betty says, "Honey, would you see what's the matter with the toaster?"

Vernon, a do-it-yourself handyman, gets the tools from the hall closet and soon has the toaster apart, adjusted, and back together again. "There," he exclaims. "I don't know what this helpless family would do without me."

He sets the orange juice glasses on the dining room table, while en route to switch on the morning TV news, and then sits down to breakfast.

Paul, 16, and Sharon, 14, are snoozing late, but Kay, the 18-year-old daughter with a summer job, bounces in to take her place at the table. "Dad," she says with teenage indignation, "You can't wear that tie with a striped suit. It looks awful."

Vernon, a well-trained father of two pretty girls, smiles good naturedly. "Pick out another then—my color sense is lousy."

Benny, 10, up early to savor every delightful vacation moment, announces, "Today I'm going to ride my bike with no hands."

After breakfast, out in the yard, Benny is already on his bike. Holding his arms straight out he careens wildly over the lawn, tipping over at his father's feet. Crestfallen, the boy pleads, "Dad, show me how."

Vernon springs lightly on the bike, "Look, Ma. No hands." he calls out, and balancing perfectly without touching the handlebars, he circles the yard. Then the expert gives his son a fatherly pat. "All a matter of confidence and practice, Benny. Keep trying."

"Come on, showoff," his wife yells from the car. "You'll be late for work."

By now, Mrs. Williams has backed the car into the street. Vernon steps into the back seat. "Thank God for Friday," he says. "I can hardly wait to get to the lake."

At his office the lawyer lights a cigar, and turns on the tape recorder. Cigar smoke billowing around him, he listens with intense concentration to the voice of one of his two secretaries, reading specific negligence verdicts from legal tomes.

Finally, he switches off the machine and buzzes for Pearl. "Get the dope on that old McCluskey negligence case, August 1955—I think." She pulls out a folder and puts it on his desk.

Vernon carefully sorts the papers in the folder, then begins talking into the dictaphone. After he has dictated letters and special memos to his secretaries, he starts typing, cigar in his mouth.

Doors slam. Phones ring. Typewriters click. Dictaphones and tape recorders drone. Clients drop in. Easy camaraderie between employer and employees in a long-standing, working relationship. Just another busy day in an efficient law office.

So it goes through the day. Vernon talks with his clients about drawing up deeds and contracts and bringing suits. A women's club asks him to speak to them about combating juvenile delinquency. A fellow Kiwanian stops in to talk about a forthcoming committee meeting.

The last of the day's appointments over, Vernon dials home. Soon Betty, with Sharon, Benny, and the weekend supplies stowed in the car, picks him up for the 13-mile drive to Lake Mina.

While the Williamses are unloading at the lake cottage, their neighbors, the Burckhards arrive.

Bob Burckhard calls over, "Hey, Vernon, while the girls are slaving over a hot stove, let's go for a ride to cool off. I'll navigate our boat and you can ski.

In their swimming suits, Vernon and the two children appear on the Burckhards' dock. "Come on, Sharon and Benny, I need observers," Bob urges.

Vernon adjusts the skis to his feet, fastens the lifejacket, hands his glasses to Sharon. The boat roars ahead and he takes smoothly from the edge of the dock. The late afternoon sun shines fervently on the placid lake.

First, Vernon follows the wake of the boat, then jumps back and forth over the foam. He signals that he is going to try one ski. Slowly, he lifts his left leg into the air and drops the ski off his foot, trying to balance on the right ski. He wobbles uncertainly. The children giggle as their father falls helter-skelter into the water.

Bob brings the boat around. Benny dives into the water to retrieve the skis. Sharon helps her dad heave himself over the side of the boat. Laughing and dripping, Vernon says, "I don't see why I always fall over on one ski."

Benny clambers back into the boat and says, "Just like riding bikes with no hands—it's all a matter of confidence and practice, Dad. Keep trying."

Later, in the cool evening, the two adult couples play bridge, the men against the women. Betty deals the cards and Vernon takes orders for thirst quenchers. He rummages for ice and drinks in the refrigerator, fixes two glasses of Coke and two of lemonade and then carries all four glasses to the table at the same time.

Playing the hand for three no trump, Vernon pulls off a nine spot finesse through Carroll Burckhard's hand. She complains, "I swear you can see my cards."

He chuckles gleefully and cashes the winning trick to make the contact. "Now, Carroll, you know I wouldn't do that."

Suddenly, the four players are startled by loud, reverberating thunder. Betty says anxiously. "Sounds like a storm's coming. Honey, what about the boats?"

Vernon stands up. "Come on, Bob let's get the boats in."

Bob Burckhard says, "I didn't bring our flashlight. Have you got one?"

Vernon guffaws. "Sorry, old boy, I forget you're a helpless, handicapped person and can't see in the dark. Come on, I'll take your arm and guide you down to the lake."

Arm in arm, the two men step into the darkness.

Carroll turns to Vernon's wife, "Honestly, as long as I've known Vernon, I have to remind myself over and over that he really is blind."

Betty nods slowly and smiles. "I know," she says softly, "I know."

Yes, Attorney Vernon Williams is blind. He has been completely sightless since infancy. Before he could become the versatile man he is today, there were innumerable challenges to meet. There were many special people to help Vernon help himself.

First, there were his parents, Benjamin and Marie Williams, who determined Vernon should be brought up just like his twin sister Virginia and their two older brothers, Clinton and Allan. So Vernon has never attended a school for the blind, has never used a white cane or a guide dog.

Marie Williams learned how to read and write braille, and taught Vernon. Endlessly, she read to him; laboriously, she transposed important parts of his schoolwork into braille dots. And she taught 10-year-old Vernon how to type on both a regular typewriter and a braille writer.

Vernon's parents never said, "You can't do that." They said, "Of course, you can do it; try."

Vernon learned to ride a bike when he was 7. Neighbors watched, horrified, as this adventurous blind boy sped through the tree-filled Williams yard—and sometimes not even using his hands. On the Aberdeen streets he rode with a group of boys who warned him of traffic and turns.

When his guide and twin, Virginia, was sick, he felt enormous pride in walking by himself to school, memorizing every detail along the way. His family encouraged him to compete in a seeing world on its own difficult terms. Sometimes he came out ahead; he won prizes for memorizing the most Bible verses at Sunday school.

There were others who aided this aggressive spirit in its search for independence. Ted Rozendal, the seventh-grade manual-training instructor, convinced the school administrators that a boy with Vernon's manual dexterity could learn to use tools safely and effectively.

This teacher placed his big, patient hands over Vernon's small, eager ones and said, "Here is a soldering iron. Feel of it. I'll show you how it welds metal together—then you're on your own." And those inquisitive fingers learned—with a perceptive teacher standing quietly only inches away while a sightless child handled a burning tool.

There was Merten Hasse, the high school science teacher, who said, "Sure, you can make a radio set. I'll show you." With help, the boy made a radio set and became a licensed ham radio operator.

There was Dr. E. A. Rudolph, an Aberdeen ophthalmologist, who knew the agonizing persistence it took for teenaged Vernon to perform simple actions that were effortless for others. He knew how the boy longed to be freed from his nocturnal prison and how he yearned to live confidently in a strange universe.

But Dr. Rudolph knew his psychology, too. Once, after a disappointing eye examination, Vernon hit the depths of discouragement and shuffled disconsolately out of the doctor's office. Dr. Rudolph followed him and fired a parting shot in front of the patients in the waiting room. "All right, you're just a hopeless blind idiot. So feel sorry for yourself. That's all you ever will do." But they learned, and when Vernon graduated, one professor paid him a compliment he will always cherish: "People will forget you're blind. You'll be just an average lawyer."

Vernon, humiliated and furious, stomped out of his doctor's office, vowing, "I'll show that so-and-so. I'll show everybody what I can do."

After high school, Vernon attended Northern State Teachers College in Aberdeen. At the same time, he operated a post office news stand, saving money to make a dream come true—law school.

While a student at Northern, he met a girl with wonderful vision named Betty. And the things she saw in Vernon enchanted her. She fell in love with a popular boy who won the oratorical contests, who was the best fun, the best dancer, the best looking—the best catch of all. And he, too, fell in love.

Betty waited for Vernon while he went away to law school at the University of South Dakota. There, the National Youth Administration gave Vernon a small allowance for a reader. Long before, he had learned to memorize quickly material read to him.

Often it was rough going; a few professors told Vernon to give up, to go home. It took the law faculty a little time to know Vernon as well as his family, or Betty, or Dr. Rudolph knew him, to realize what this determined youth meant when he said, "I can do it."

Vernon Williams was admitted to the South Dakota bar in 1941; he and Betty were married in 1943. A year later he joined the Kiwanis Club of Aberdeen. Eventually, he had his own practice; then he was elected State's attorney of Brown County for as many terms as the law then allowed.

Today, Vernon Williams has been a successful lawyer for 22 years. Of course, Vernon had some distinct advantages in the courtroom. Take the trial when he was the prosecuting attorney in a routine case: a man accused of driving his truck up to a loading chute and stealing a load of hogs.

Police evidence was introduced: the plaster cast imprints of fresh tire marks at the scene of the crime. But the treads were just like those on many trucks in the Aberdeen area; nothing could be proved, the defense concluded.

Objecting, Vernon rose to his feet. The jury watched, fascinated, as a slight man wearing dark glasses strode swiftly up to the low wooden dividers in the courtroom. Just as a juror gasped, "He's going to run into something and hurt himself," he stepped neatly through the swinging gate—nimbly as a shifty quarterback avoids a tackler.

Vernon faced the jury. He said, "I have carefully checked this plaster cast. I have discovered a tiny cut on one of the treads. I have examined the actual tires on the accused's truck. The minute identifying mark on the left front tire is the same flaw that shows up on the plaster cast."

Vernon held up a magnified photograph: "It's simple as black and white," he said. He turned the picture slowly so that the judge, the jury, the defense could all see. "Now—you can all see it as well as I, can't you?"

The jury laughed and nodded.

The jurors accepted the irrefutable evidence that Vernon had discovered and visualized with his fingers. The defendant was convicted on a directed verdict from the judge.

Vernon has an additional advantage. During his speeches, he can unobtrusively read his notes. He casually puts his hands in his pockets to feel the typed braille cards—the same method he uses to read the meaningful raised dots on playing cards.

The opposing attorney is apt to wonder who's handicapped and who isn't.

Vernon, like many average lawyers, does what he can to serve his community.

In his law office recently, I asked him about his years as a Kiwanian. "I've been a member of the underprivileged child committee," he said, "and chairman of the committee on fund raising. I enjoyed the underprivileged child committee especially, because of our widowed mothers' project." He explained that the club built a three-room house, and that it was the committee's job to find a widowed mother to live in it. They did—a woman with two kids living in a decrepit shack. "We established them in the house, bought clothes for the kids, and sent them off to school," he said. "It was a great experience."

He helps in other ways, too. Not long ago, Walter Hack, superintendent of the newly constructed State school for the blind at Aberdeen, phoned Vernon about equipment for the proposed swimming pool. "Should we have diving boards?" he asked. "Would our youngsters like to dive or would that require a space concept they don't have?"

"Space concept," Vernon roared. "Maybe not like the astronauts. But sure, put in diving boards. And make one high enough for easy flips."

"OK—we'll do that." The superintendent paused a moment. "Say, can you do a flip?"

Vernon didn't hesitate a second. "Well, I've never tried a flip. But I bet I can. And I'll come out and show those little blind kids how, too."

The superintendent of the school for the blind didn't offer to bet Vernon could not do a flip or even a two-and-a-half with a full twist. Somehow, it seemed safest to bet that a normal, athletic fellow like Attorney Vernon Williams can do anything he sets his sights on.

GI Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure when the leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars come to Washington each spring to appear before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and to visit with their Representatives in Congress. This current year the visit seemed even more pleasant. It should be remembered that there are many Members of the 88th Congress who in former years have held office in local posts and on the State or department level.

We had several purposes in mind when asking for this entry. One was to make particular mention of the visit of the commander of the Department of Missouri, Calvin Vogelsang; his senior vice commander, Kenneth Petett; past department commander, Gene Wilder; along with another very well-known past department commander, Ernest D. "Fergy" Ferguson, now national chairman of the VFW's Civil Defense Committee.

Among other happenings, it seems most appropriate that mention be made of an unusual honor which came to the Fourth Congressional District and to Post 1000, VFW, located in our home city of Independence, Mo., when national commander in chief, Byron B. Gentry, announced the appointment of E. E. Bollinger, of Independence, Mo., as national aide-de-camp to the commander in chief.

In making the announcement the commander in chief said:

> It is a great pleasure to appoint Mr. Bollinger. He will serve as a personal representative, and I know he will put forth his best efforts to further the work of our organization.

It should be noted that "Colonel Earl," as he is known in Post 1000, is only the second member of our local post who has ever been accorded this honor at any time during the history of VFW. The late Waller "Bud" Angell was named national aide-de-camp about 10 years ago. The Missouri delegation in Congress congratulates you, Earl Bollinger.

The highlight of the annual visit of State and National officers of VFW to Washington is the annual dinner which honors Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces. This year, several outstanding personalities appeared on the program including Sir Roy Bucher, chairman of the British Legion; Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, Chief, Investigational Drug Branch, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, made famous for her thalidomide investigation. However, in the opinion of most of those present the frosting was put on the cake by the appearance of Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., captain, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, who rose to read the poem writen by our national commander in chief, Byron B. Gentry, of Pasadena, Calif., entitled, "GI Joe."

Mr. Speaker, as Douglas Fairbanks read from the lines of this poem, it was done so eloquently and with such meaning and sincerity that a hush fell over the large assemblage in Sheraton Hotel straining their ears to hear every word describing the men of World War II who were called general issue or just plain GI Joe. We think it is appropriate that this poem be included at this time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to honor all GI Joes as described by this great poem and

to further honor its author who is making an outstanding record as commander in chief of VFW:

GI JOE

(By Byron Gentry)

Born to independent freedom
Of his thinking and his ways;
With no military training
In his school or working days,
He was thrust on moment's notice
Into war he didn't make—
Bitched and joked at situations
Regulations made him take.

What was "honorable profession,
And the art of bearing arms,"
To the Germans and the British,
Was to him ideal for farms,
Snafu was the term he gave it,
But he took it just the same.
Insubordinate by nature,
He remained the way he came.

Thus they called him general issue,
Just plain "GI Joe" for short,
As he shrugged at regulations
And made discipline a sport;
Voiced his caustic observations
Without caring who might hear;
Viewed both officers and noncoms
As a parson looks at beer.

Sergeants moved him to coin phrases
Which defy a writer's use;
While lieutenants were the object
Of his penchant for abuse.
Added to his native talents
And the courage of his race,
Stubborn pride made him a soldier
Whom the Germans feared to face.

When the dawn barrage exploded
Its terrific missile shower,
Every GI cursed the "bastards
Who dared wake him at this hour."
When he learned his lines were severed,
And his radios were jammed,
He accepted isolation
With the comment, "I'll be damned."

At a far advanced command post,
Facing winter-quartered Huns—
Where Intelligence reported
Just two horse-drawn heavy guns,
A GI observed with wisdom
From his country Uncle Seth,
"Christ, the Germans must be working
Those two horses half to death"—

Where a small group manned machineguns
In the midst of German tanks—
Mowed down wave on wave of Germans
From their endless charging ranks,
"Take a breather," called a German
In good English, "We'll be back."
"Not unless you watch that traffic,"
Was a GI's answering crack.

Thus the brat who broke your window,
And the kid who dunked your cat;
Stuffed your paper down the drainpipe;
Or threw snowballs at your hat,
Called upon his love of mischief
When his life was on the block—
Shrugged at hardship and disaster;
Laughed at battle's fearful shock.

Every ounce of him a soldier;
Every inch of him a man—
When he fought your battles for you;
Ate with fingers from a can.
And the courage of his laughter
Dulled the panic of his fear—
When it came his turn for dying,
He stepped up without a tear.

Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald W. Collier, a constituent of mine, and also vice president in charge of research of the Borg-Warner Corp. in Chicago, Ill., recently gave a speech here in Washington before the National Security Industrial Association. His speech, "A Civilian Looks at Government sponsored Research and Development," was a very thoughtful analysis of the affects and problems generated by Government-sponsored research and development in private industry.

I think that his remarks are most apropos particularly at this time when there is such an ever-increasing amount of Government funds being made available for research.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following speech and commend it to my colleagues:

A CIVILIAN LOOKS AT GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

As the final speaker of this session, I have taken the liberty of broadening the subject somewhat to tell you how one civilian looks at Government-sponsored research and development in general. How one's approach to it must necessarily differ from that which he takes in his own company. Some of the problems created when one tries to carry out both kinds of research in the same organization * * * and some of the problems that have been created and which will be intensified if the trend toward a greater percentage of Government support for all research and development continues.

But first, a word about my qualifications to be classed as a civilian as well as the viewpoint I shall take toward Government-sponsored research and development. Borg-Warner Corp. has 47 divisions with a widely varied product line and a highly autonomous operating philosophy. Each division operates as an integrated profit center, responsible for research and development in its own product areas. In addition, the company maintains a corporately financed research center to support the technological activities of the operating divisions and to bring into the corporation new technology not now existing in any of the divisions.

Last year, Borg-Warner did almost $8 million worth of research and development supported by Federal funds, between 25 and 30 percent of total research and development expenditures. However, the individual units varied widely in the portion of their research and development supported by Federal funds: Many divisions did none; the research center less than 5 percent; several divisions more than half; and one division supplying military hardware had 98 percent of its research and development federally financed. Thus there are a variety of hats from which I can choose, but I shall speak today as an industrial research executive who must justify the productivity of his operation to the directors responsible for appropriating most of the funds for its support.

With the great expansion of Government-financed research and development, there now appear to be two distinct concepts held by industrial companies: The first is the traditional one, that research and development is an internal activity directed at helping to achieve overall corporate objectives. The second, and newer, concept is that research and development may be sold just as the company sells its other products and services. In the latter case, the company's attitude obviously is far different than in the former. It may do such research out of patriotic duty, or, because it hopes for an attractive return on its own invested funds, or, it may have developed facilities (in some cases, almost unwittingly) to perform such research which now must continue to be fed new contracts, or the managers of this part of its activity may just be aggressively expansionist in building their own empires. I believe most companies initiate such research businesses hoping there will be some fallout that will either be helpful in present commercial activities, or that it will provide a basis on which to start a new activity. To date, the realization of this hope has been the exception rather than the rule. In fact, now that nonindustrial organizations have become as sophisticated in organizing and managing research as industrial organizations, I wonder whether any of these reasons (even those based on patriotic duty), are on a sound basis.

Companies selling research as a commodity have had—for the most part—only one customer, the Federal Government. Recently, however, the managers of this part of their activity have broadened their marketing base to include other private firms also. Since there is little interaction between this type of research and the rest of the firm, they are not often concerned with the proprietary aspects of the information they generate through this research. Neither are they particularly concerned with building up a continuing and growing pool of technical know-how within the company other than to enhance the company's competitive position in obtaining future research and development contracts. Finally, research and development workers, like hourly production workers, are laid off when business falls off and hired on when it picks up again with the signing of another big contract. Only the scarcity of technically trained workers moderates the degree to which such practices resemble those of the factory, and it is not too surprising that the attitudes of professional people working in such operations tend toward those of labor rather than management. How much research and development such a company does depends primarily on how much in sales of research and development contracts they can generate.

Now, let us return to the company that performs research and development as an aid to achieving its corporate objectives. And before you all rise up, en masse, against me, I hasten to point out that I am including those suppliers of government hardware that perform research work to improve their chances of getting a production contract. However: To fully qualify, the research dollars should be a relatively small fraction of the production dollars envisioned, and as we all know, the trend of military and space expenditures has been to make the "P" smaller and the "R" larger. Let us review, briefly, the reasons why companies find it worthwhile to engage in research and de-

velopment and pay for it themselves. Simply stated, they do it because they find that the return on the money invested is higher than most other ways of employing their funds. Studies by Yale Brozen have shown there is a high correlation between the percentage of sales dollars spent on research and development and the average returns on stockholders' investment. Studies by Booz, Allen & Hamilton have shown that increases in plant capacity in a variety of industries correlate well with the logarithm of research expenditures as a percentage of sales. Studies of 10 chemical companies over a 13-year period showed that for each dollar spent on research, $36 of additional sales were generated in the 4th through the 10th years after the research period.

Earlier studies by Raymond Ewell have shown there is a good correlation between the growth rate of various industries and their research and development costs. His studies also indicated that $1 of research expenditure resulted in at least $25 of added gross national product over the following 25 years. High growth rate industries tend to be high investors in research and development. Stanford Research Institute says it finds that within any one industry the companies with above-average growth are those with above-average company-sponsored expenditures on research and development, again measured as a percentage of sales.

In these days of the growing profit squeeze, another aspect of research and development payoff is of particular pertinence. Correlations made by Stanford Research show that increases in productivity in various industries are proportional to the research and development spending by those industries. The same study shows that the net profit margin of 80 manufacturing companies correlated well with the percentage of sales represented by their company-sponsored research and development expenditures. Research can increase productivity. It also can reduce the capital requirements for producing a product. Finally, a number of companies use, as a criterion for evaluating their research, a return of 100 percent or more per year on research dollars expended. The experience of companies with which I have been associated is not inconsistent with this expectation.

Besides these aggressive reasons for companies to support research and development, there are a number of equally cogent defensive reasons. Competition and obsolescence rates are accelerating at such a pace that it becomes necessary to run faster and faster just to stay even. Stanford Research studies of the life cycle of products as technically unsophisticated as home appliances have shown that the period from the time they were introduced until they reached their peak sales and began to decline, dropped from 34 years for products introduced before 1920 to an average 8 years for those introduced in the postwar period. This experience is typical of practically every product with which I am familiar. In the defense and space area, products are born, grow and die with such rapidity it can almost be said that once you have learned how to produce a product, it's obsolete.

Obsolescence can occur in the traditional way by a normal evolution of the technology on which a product is based or it can come by having its function performed in a superior way by some entirely different, and usually new, technology. This has become increasingly frequent in the postwar period. Devices are being obsoleted by technologies with which existing manufacturers are often completely unfamiliar. High competence in a company's present technical field no longer assures continued success.

Thus, significant levels of new product research are required simply to keep sales from shrinking.

If the payout from industrially oriented research is so favorable and its need for protecting existing businesses so vital, why, then, does not its employment as an industrial tool grow without limitation? There are a number of restrictions which limit the growth rate of company-sponsored research. Many of these restrictions do not exist with respect to federally financed research and development.

The first is concerned with the natural conservatism of those charged with the responsibility of earning a profit for the stockholders, coupled with the long leadtime required for research to pay off. A profitable exploitation of research requires the successful integration of a large number of company functions which must learn how to deal effectively with new concepts, techniques, and products that are disturbing to the comfortable status quo. The cautious manager is loath to channel too much of his profits into such an activity until the results indicate it is indeed paying off. Almost invariably, those companies that have tried to step up research expenditures with a large jump have wasted money and have been disappointed by the results.

Akin to a company's learning curve on how to exploit research is the availability of capital to bring to market the results of research. In the chemical industry from $5 to $15 of new capital is required to exploit a dollar's worth of new product research. Thus, too high a level of research expenditure, particularly in high investment industries, can rapidly exceed the company's financial resources to exploit such research.

The shortage of highly qualified manpower to carry out research and the increasing cost of such manpower, is holding back the growth of research in companies that must support it out of profits. Combined with this is the increasing cost of producing a research result caused by growing Government testing regulations, industry must also test extensively for its own account to be sure the potential new product has sufficient advantages over existing competitive products to justify the investment risk needed to bring it to market.

Finally, in some technical fields there is evidence that the returns from increased research expenditures are shrinking. In the pharmaceutical industry, for instance, research dollars are increasing but it has been several years since a major new drug has been introduced. The petroleum industry has realized that its fuels and lubricants technology has matured to the point where it can no longer justify the levels of research expenditure it has made in the past.

Thus, the industrial research manager must consider many factors before undertaking a proposed piece of research in addition to determining its technical feasibility and whether there is support money available. For the research to be compatible with his company's corporate goals, a few of the things he must evaluate are: Does it fit present marketing channels and manufacturing capabilities? Or, must major investments in new equipment, staff, and techniques be made? How well can the present engineering and technical field staff support the product once developed? What is the nature of present or potential competition and is the possible time scale of development and introduction compatible with the trend of the technology and the needs of his customers? Can sufficient patent protection or proprietary know-how be developed to justify the risk of the investment required to exploit the successful results of the research? And finally: Is the estimated rate of return great enough in relation to the cost of the development and its probability of success * * * to exceed other alternatives that the company has for investing its money?

Assuming that a potential Government R. & D. contract fits into your corporate objectives with a favorable balance of these considerations (and if one of your corporate objectives is to become a producer of hardware for the Government, this situation may well arise) what problems are encountered in trying to integrate such work into a civilian oriented research and development organization? You must first recognize that the technical proposal procedure is a costly one in both time and dollars, and the yield is relatively low in terms of contract awards.

You must then consider the protection of the company's proprietary position. When Government research is undertaken to further the corporate objectives, it necessarily stems from, adds to, and becomes a part of, a body of know-how and patents that is being built up in the areas of the company's specialty. Even in those areas where the Government is the major or only customer and therefore can compel licensing of your company's patents to competitors, one should carefully weigh the competitive advantage of keeping know-how proprietary plus a reasonable royalty against the dollar savings of research costs involved. Contracts with those agencies which take title to patents developed under their support and shop rights to background patents and know-how become very difficult to justify under the criteria being developed.

You should also consider the instability which Government contracts tend to introduce into an organization. The life of a research director is never an easy one when it comes to obtaining support funds but individual company managements tend to be a lot more stable as a source of funds than is the Government. One must take care not to let the level of manpower on Government contracts get beyond the ability of the company to support it from its own funds during slack periods of Government work. This trap presents a Hobson's choice of losing control of the research program by being forced to take on contracts which do not fit the corporate objectives merely for the dollar support they provide, or facing a layoff of the personnel concerned. This latter results in damage to morale in the rest of the organization and the danger of increased turnover of just the personnel the company does not want to lose. One might argue that such periods of contract cutback offer an opportunity to weed out the inevitable deadwood that accumulates in any organization. However, this assumes that deadwood can be eliminated throughout the organization and that the better people on the Government contract work will be transferred into the non-Government part of the company operations. In practice this rarely happens, since apparently it is difficult to create a proper commercial orientation in that part of the staff which has spent its time fulfilling Government objectives unfettered by the realities of the market.

When one commits himself to meet the contractual obligations of Government research and development, he gives up the flexibility that is so important in maintaining a competitive research and development effort these days. Because the time and performance specifications of Government contracts are relatively rigid, the personnel assigned to them are, for the most part, unavailable for transfer into programs that may become a much more attractive means for attaining company objectives. When the contract's work carries a security classification with it, communications are impeded and costs increased by the steps which must be taken to meet the security regulations.

Other problems include increased paperwork and accounting costs to meet the more rigid requirements of Government practices * * * renegotiation, which, if it does not directly reduce the amount of money

you thought would be supplied by the Government, does indirectly in terms of the management time and costs involved in the negotiations.

Finally, one should also be prepared to have company capital tied up because of the frequent slow rate of payment by the Government.

Let us assume that the industrial research director has successfully integrated into his operation those Government contracts which contribute to his corporate objectives, and managed to maintain control of his program and organization. Can he choose to ignore the large and growing research activity being conducted by those organizations which are selling R. & D. services as a product? I think not. Whether he likes it or not they are going to exert a major influence on his ability to carry out his own chosen research program effectively. Much has been said recently about the potential stagnation of our economy as a result of diverting 75 percent of the country's R. & D. effort away from expenditures by industry for civilian purposes. I am happy to see the increasing concern at the national level for such problems, and hope a better balanced research program for the country as a whole will result. A stagnating economy is unhealthy for all of us and it is a particularly difficult one in which to have research and development flourish.

I agree with Dr. Holloman that the only kind of research and development that will stimulate economic growth in the long run is that which increases productivity. This can be process research leading to reductions in manpower for a given level of production, or the development of a new shoe sole material with twice the life of that which exists today. (And in these days of 50-mile hikes, that might be a No. 1 project.) I further agree with him that more of it should be done since it appears that, in percentage of GNP, there is less being done now than 20 years ago.

Part and parcel of the problem of diversion of effort from civilian objectives is the indirect diversion which results from the increasing costs of doing research. The very rapid increases in research and development activity over the last decade have caused the salaries of research and development personnel to more than double. Since the costs of doing research and development are 70 percent accounted for by personnel costs, we are in grave danger of pricing profit-supported research and development out of the market. Research costs in the United States are already dangerously high: Two to four times those of other industrialized communities such as Western Europe and Japan. In the main, only profit-motivated and supported research is directed at increasing industrial productivity. To increase its cost is to divert it from these highly vital ends.

I question whether adding programs of additional research and development expenditures by the Government—even those directed at civilian objectives—is any real solution to this problem, if they simply increase the surplus of dollars chasing too few scientists and engineers. Current projections of demand for the rest of this decade indicate the supply will fall short by about 400,000 scientists and engineers. Adding further demand to the picture will only aggravate the problem. What is needed, in my opinion, is a reassessment of our entire governmental R. & D. program to achieve a better balance between the civilian economy and national military and space objectives and a reduction in total Government R. & D. activity to bring it more in line with the projected supply of competent manpower to carry it out. Running our national scientific manpower budget at a deficit makes even less sense than running the Federal Government by deficit financing.

Finally, just a word on two other problems that the increasing Government expenditures for research and development will raise for our civilian economy: The first is the growing fraction of our research which is subject to the policy of the Government to take title in patents resulting from it. Unchecked, this can lead to the destruction of our patent system, a catalyst for industrial entrepreneurism which is credited with being a major factor in the high standard of living we enjoy. Without some assurance of protection, an industrial concern will be very reluctant to risk stockholders' money on the exploitation of new technology. And without such investments in manpower, equipment, and organization, the results of research cannot be made available to the public and contribute to the growth of our economy. It is then likely that the national need would demand that the vacuum thus created be filled by expansion of the Government into exploitation for civilian purposes of the technology it owned. Such progressive nationalization of our industry is not the direction to go to achieve a vigorous and growing economy.

My second concern is the atrophying of our commercial research and development managerial talents. Government has no profit objectives in the research it does. With so large a fraction of the total research in the country supported by the Government, I believe we are in danger of losing our talent to make the hard, economically sound research decisions so necessary to survive in a competitive world. Are we likely to have research managership degenerate as salesmanship did during the order-taking periods immediately following the two recent wars? Such a development could have serious implications to our national security since in the final analysis we are competing on an economic basis with friend and foe alike throughout the world.

When this civilian looks at Government-sponsored research and development, he becomes alarmed by what he sees. No other equally vital factor in our national economy is so largely dominated by Government, and yet the directions it seems to be taking appear contrary to the best interests of the country. I believe the time has come to reappraise our total research and development effort, with a perspective that looks beyond the next missile system or putting a man on the moon. Without the foundation of a sound economy nothing else can long endure. Let us set our targets more realistically and more selectively. Let us slow down demands that have created this galloping inflation in research costs. Let us rebalance the resulting sound national research and development effort to permit greater relative emphasis on the continuing healthy growth of our economy. In short, gentlemen, let us regain control of this bull whose tail we grasp before it pulls us to our own destruction.

St. Patrick's Day in Jersey City, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Jersey City, N.J., has just completed a year-long people-to-people program with the citizenry of Dublin, Ireland, and so outstanding was the success of the venture, I feel it should be brought to the attention of the members of the House. Much credit is due these who planned this affair.

Although a great many residents of Jersey City, part of which is in my district, are of Irish descent, the celebration of St. Patrick's Day was not a citywide or an officially sponsored affair in past years. This fact bothered many citizens and on March 16, 1962 a group decided to do something that would assure a more fitting local celebration of the feast day of Ireland's patron saint.

It was suggested by Eugene J. Scanlon, who is two generations removed from the Emerald Isle, that the group plan a citywide celebration for 1963 and that they start that night by placing a telephone call to Dublin police headquarters and asking for a police officer named Patrick—any Patrick would do—and invite him to the celebration a year hence.

As chance would have it, Garda Patrick J. Kenny, a red-mustached, 6-foot-2 former boxer and former soldier, father of six and a veteran of 21 years' service in the Irish Civic Guards—and one truly gifted with extraordinary brogue—answered the telephone in Dublin Castle, the city's police headquarters.

The invitation was extended by Mr. Scanlon and promptly accepted by the self-described flabbergasted Garda Kenny.

A year later, on March 17, 1963, Garda Kenny led 20,000 marchers in a St. Patrick's Day parade that was viewed by 250,000.

People of all nationalities joined the line of march to pay tribute to the great saint. It was my pleasure to march alongside the Honorable Thomas Gangemi, mayor of Jersey City, and the Honorable Eugene G. Farrell, editor of the Jersey Journal, who had been appointed by Mayor Gangemi as Jersey City's "ambassador to Ireland" and who had flown to Dublin to escort Garda and Mrs. Kenny to America.

March 17 was declared an official holiday in Jersey City this year.

Before long, due in large measure to the efforts of Mayor Gangemi, Mr. Farrell and other members of the parade committee, a full-scale celebration was being planned. In Eire, too, the stage was being set by such dignitaries as James O'Keefe, Lord Mayor of Dublin; Mayor Patrick Ryan, of Galway City, Garda Kenny's birthplace, and Daniel Costigan, Dublin police commissioner.

Garda Kenny was given extended leave for his trip to America, and when Ambassador Farrell arrived in Dublin he was given a reception befitting a visiting ambassador.

During the 11 months of newspaper promotion on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, an avalanche of mail flowed in both directions as hundreds, possibly thousands, of families renewed acquaintances and new friendships were formed.

Stories of the event were carried by the Associated Press and United Press International, and this brought many letters of commendation to Jersey City officials. Even newspapers in London carried reports of the unique "people-to-people" program. In Ireland, Garda

Kenny, his wife, and their six children became national celebrities almost overnight.

On March 8, the Kennys arrived at New York International Airport where they were greeted by a pipers' band, a color guard and hundreds of residents of Jersey City, including city officials. Five nights later, more than 1,000 citizens of many national backgrounds honored the visitors from Dublin at a testimonial dinner.

The big parade on March 17 will be talked about for a long time in Jersey City. Garda Kenny marched out front in his Civic Guard uniform, the first time in history that a member of his police unit was wearing the uniform with official permission outside Dublin.

Pinned to his left lapel was a gold badge which had been presented to him at the testimonial dinner by Mayor Gangemi bearing the inscription "Honorary Chief of Police, City of Jersey City, New Jersey, U.S.A."

On March 19, Garda Kenny and Mrs. Kenny came to Washington, D.C., where they met many Members of the Congress. I am grateful to the Vice President for the gracious hospitality he extended to our visitors from Dublin and a delegation from Jersey City. It was my privilege to introduce these friends, including Mrs. Scanlan who worked so hard to make this event a success.

Our distinguished Speaker also made time in his busy schedule to extend his warm welcome. He was, as always, exceedingly gracious and once again he evidenced a truly great knowledge of Irish history and revealed many Irish traditions well remembered by those of Irish descent in this country, but unfamiliar to many native Irish.

I am indeed grateful to the Speaker for his kindness.

The Kennys have returned to Ireland. Their visit will be long remembered. The St. Patricks' Day celebration was truly a fine event that fully expressed a fine civic pride and a genuine feeling of brotherhood.

It would be difficult to commend all who worked toward the success of the great event. But special mention should be made of Mrs. Scanlon, Warren Murphy, John Thompson, and John Hunt, all of Jersey City.

The following are two editorials that appeared in the Jersey Journal, commenting on the wonderful affair and the good that it brought on both sides of the Atlantic.

SO LONG, P.J.

Constable and Mrs. Patrick J. Kenny go home tomorrow. All of us brushed by their magic in the past 3 weeks give them back reluctantly to their eagerly waiting six children and the Emerald Isle which owes them a heroes' welcome.

For they leave behind them a wonderfully refreshing spirit which captivated all of us and became a prevailing mood at the most successful, and first municipally sponsored St. Patricks' Day parade in Jersey City's history.

We hope P.J. and his lady return to Dublin with the same feelings about us. Our welcome mat will always be out for P.J., Nancy, and the kids. We bid them "so long" and we hope they come back—soon and often.

THE BIG PARADE

Wasn't that a day, though. For a town which had never had a citywide St. Patrick's Day parade, Jersey City certainly started with a bang. Thousands of marchers and a hundred thousand or more watchers made it the most colorful holiday the city ever has given itself.

It was a happy day all day. Even the sun seemed to be having fun upsetting those forecasters who assured us all the night before that we would be showered with rain and buffeted by winds. There was neither.

It was more than a great day for the Irish, more than a roaring public welcome for Constable P. J. Kenny and Nancy (although they were cheered from end to end of the march) it was more than a parade, more even than a tribute to the great Saint. It encompassed and transcended all those things. It was a kind of spontaneous outcry against talk of abominations, a sort of "Let's show the world Jersey City can do things right." And it did.

It was a wholesome day. It was a day when everyone in the city, for a change, was on the same side. Those who might otherwise be harpooning each other for some political purpose, were slapping each other on the back and saying how fine the parade was. Yet, it can be quite a town when everyone gets on the same side.

It was a day no one wanted to see end from Bishop Stanton, standing for hours on the reviewing platform, to the youngsters waving their green and gold banners.

It was the kind of day that should come again, now that we have seen how it can be done, how the whole town can turn out just for the sheer joy of expressing good will. It was the kind of day that makes one ask: "Why don't we do this more often?"

And why don't we?

City Invited to Landes Reception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Wichita Falls, Tex., said farewell Sunday to one of its most outstanding families. Dr. James H. Landes, minister of the First Baptist Church for the past 18 years, preached his last sermon in Wichita Falls Sunday morning. This week he is assuming new duties as president of Hardin-Simmons University in Abilene, Tex. Dr. and Mrs. Landes and their daughter, Ruth, have been among the most highly respected and deeply loved members of our community. We will miss them but wish them well in their new home.

Following is an article which appeared in the March 31 edition of the Wichita Falls Times about the Landes family, the recognition given them by the community and the wonderful record of their service to our city:

CITY INVITED TO LANDES RECEPTION

Wichitans of many faiths and all walks of life join today in paying tribute and bidding Godspeed to two of the city's best-loved residents, Dr. and Mrs. James H. Landes.

Designated "James H. Landes Day" by official proclamation of Mayor John J. Gavin, Sunday marks the close of an 18-year pastorate of Dr. Landes at First Baptist Church.

He will leave early in the week to assume his duties as new president of Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene.

Climax to Sunday's observance of "Landes Day" will be an appreciation service at 6:50 p.m. in First Baptist, followed by a public reception there at 8 o'clock.

To open the day's tribute all Sunday school classes at First Baptist are striving for an unusually high attendance.

Dr. Landes will deliver his final sermon as pastor of First Baptist Church at the Sunday morning worship service.

In his proclamation honoring Dr. Landes, Mayor Gavin urges that all our people express appreciation for his great Christian example by attending the church of their choice Sunday.

Leadership of Dr. Landes has extended into all facets of community life, and his personal touch has been felt by people of all faiths.

President of the Baptist General Association of Texas for the last 2 years, Dr. Landes is respected as a dynamic preacher of the Gospel and an efficient organizer and administrator throughout the entire Southern Baptist Convention.

He probably is the best known Baptist preacher today in Texas and one of the top leaders of that church throughout the entire South.

Despite his full schedule of activities in Baptist life throughout the city, State, and South, the personable minister has found time to take part in practically all worthwhile community endeavors and also for visits not only to the sick and troubled of his own congregation; but also those among his wide circle of friends in other denominations.

SILVER BEAVER

Dr. Landes in 1961 was presented the Silver Beaver Award by the Boy Scouts of America for distinguished service to boyhood.

He has served twice as president of the Wichita Falls Ministerial Alliance, director of the Knife and Fork Club, chairman of the Executive Board of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, and as a member of the boards of the chamber of commerce, citizens' planning committee, American Red Cross, Boy Scouts, Young Men's Christian Association, Salvation Army, Boys Clubs of America, Community Chest, UESO, civic music, child welfare, mental health and united fund.

He has delivered the annual sermon for the Southern Baptist Association and the Baptist General Convention of Texas and has been featured speaker on the telecast "Frontiers of Faith." In 1961 a sermon he delivered in Wichita Falls was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WIFE AND DAUGHTER

In 1955 the minister attended the Baptist World Alliance in London and toured the Holy Land. He also attended the Baptist World Congress in Copenhagan, Denmark.

For several years he preached at the cowboy camp meeting in the Davis Mountains.

Mrs. Landes has filled an equally busy spot in the community life and has been a leader in many endeavors in addition to carrying out to the fullest her role as a busy minister's wife. Like her husband, she numbers a host of friends in all faiths and all walks of life.

For many years she was a board member of the womens' missionary union State executive board, and has been active in the Young Women's Christian Association, musicians club, and the woman's forum. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

The Landeses have one child, a daughter, Ruth, who is now Mrs. Bill Pitts. She has completed all work except her dissertation for a doctorate from George Peabody College and is at present a college teacher in Nashville, Tenn. Her husband is doing graduate work at Vanderbilt University.

A talented musician, Mrs. Pitts won many honors at Wichita Falls High School and Baylor University.

CHURCH GROWTH

During the 18 years of Dr. Landes' ministry in Wichita Falls, there have been 9,941 members added to First Baptist with 2,675 of them by baptism. Six missions have been established, with three of them already self-supporting.

Sunday school enrollment has increased from 1,852 to 3,432 and training union from 294 to 1,132. The church has nine graded choirs in addition to the sanctuary choir, which last year sang before the Baptist General Convention of Texas.

Budget of the church has grown from $56,000 in 1945 to $395,000 for 1963. Value of church property now stands at $2,436,170.

Test Ban Report Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to take this opportunity to insert at this point a letter to the editor which appeared in today's New York Times. The letter is from the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, a highly respected and responsible member of the Republican Party, who has devoted much of his life to service to the Government of the United States, and who, as a result of his past and current association with the United Nations, is certainly in a position to judge the efforts underway to effect a nuclear test ban treaty.

His letter is set forth herewith:

TEST-BAN REPORT ATTACKED—WADSWORTH DENIES PANEL SPEAKS FOR ALL HOUSE REPUBLICANS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Critics of the protracted efforts to achieve a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Russians have been most outspoken since the chances of agreement seemed to improve in the wake of the Cuban crisis. These critics are to be found in both parties, as are the consistent advocates of a workable treaty. Unfortunately, however, the Republican leadership in the House has left the impression that the GOP as a whole opposes the administration's current test-ban policy.

This impression has been left by Representative CRAIG HOSMER's Republican House Panel on Nuclear Testing, whose reports are signed by the entire GOP leadership. The panel's first report, presumably based on the views of "experts" whose anti-test-ban views were already well known, was released to the press before scientists with a different approach could be heard.

Not surprisingly, the first report concluded that "the present basis for negotiations on detection machinery fails to offer realistic probability of detecting violations." Yet it was not until almost a month later that Government witnesses spelled out the areas of recent progress in underground test detection before the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Anyone seriously interested in the facts could hardly be in a position to judge the detection machinery without hearing from the men most closely associated with making it work.

UNDERGROUND EXPLOSIONS

Now the hearings are over and Mr. HOSMER's panel has issued another report. This time the panel has seized upon one bit of testimony, carefully ignored other statements, and has come to the conclusion that the American-British detection system cannot detect small underground nuclear tests over an area of 2.5 million square miles in the U.S.S.R.

The Hosmer panel's calculations are based on the assumption that secret Soviet tests would be conducted in dry alluvium, a soft earth. But the panel ignored the testimony of Dr. Franklin Long of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who indicated that there are only two small areas of alluvium in the U.S.S.R. One is on the Iranian and Afghan borders, the other about 400 miles from Iran. Both are within detection range of stations outside of the U.S.S.R.

As a Republican and as the former chief negotiator for the Eisenhower administration, which initiated the nuclear test-ban talks, I find the operation of the Hosmer panel one of the most unfortunate domestic developments since I served in Geneva. It is biased in its presentation of the argument and misleading in its pretense of speaking for all House Republicans. I feel sure that the panel does not reflect the views of all Republicans in the House and certainly in the Senate, which must ultimately ratify any treaty which is signed.

BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Some Congressional and press attacks on continued efforts to reach agreement imply that the top officials of the administration and their negotiators are "giving away" our national security, piece by piece. Level-headed Americans know that successful negotiations must be based on a structure of mutual advantages for both sides. A workable nuclear test ban—and further steps toward mutual disarmanent—would improve the security of both major powers as well as all other nations.

If this administration is guilty of anything, it is the failure to educate the public to the comparative risks of continued testing versus a treaty. President Kennedy made a cogent point during his press conference of March 21 when he spoke of the probability that many more nations would have the nuclear weapon by the midseventies. I hope he will continue to voice this warning until it is well understood. When the public is made aware of the choice we face, it can intelligently weigh the risks of new paths of international security.

JAMES J. WADSWORTH.

Tragedy in Our Policy Toward Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last week in the RECORD I predicted that this administration would line up with Castro and Khrushchev against the patriot Cuban exiles. I did this merely by gaging future conduct by past performance of President Kennedy. Sure enough we are now implementing that policy. Instead of proclaiming and prosecuting violation of our hemisphere by Khrushchev and international communism we are aiding and abetting puppet Castro and big boss Khrushchev at the expense of Cuban patriots in and out of Cuba. Where now is hope for the Cubans under communism's terroristic, police state control?

President Kennedy campaigned promising to liberate Cuba from communism. Then he promised Khrushchev and Castro not to even attack Cuba. President Kenunedy declared a quarantine but did not follow through. Mr. Khrushchev declared the heavy arms shipments to Cuba were not offensive weapons. The President parrotted these words then was forced to repudiate his own statements. The President finally admitted Khrushchev was running the show. Last week the President admitted he knew there were 22,000 Russian troops in Cuba last year, yet never confided in our people. On TV last year the President discussed as just learned a missile buildup yet we know now from testimony that the administration knew these facts weeks before.

The Cubans maintain that this country promised air support and help in the abortive invasion and since then we have heard numerous versions including the President's brother's statement that we never promised such aid. What can we believe?

What now happens to the exiled Cubans and those under Khrushchev and Castro's iron heel? What happens to other people in captive nations? Are we forsaking Latin and South America? Have we abandoned any semblance of toughness or dedication to principle, any principle, in our world confrontation of a Communist system dedicated to burying us? Are we yellow? Are we scared? Of course not. Yet our posture of vacillation, doubletalk, repudiation, and weakness may tempt some foolhardy unknowing foreign nation to test us.

Is it possible that our leaders do not know the moral fiber, the toughness, the steadfastness of American people who expect the same of their leaders? The managed news controversy suggests that the President does not know and underestimates the need for and the capacity of the understanding of American people.

The new "neutralism" by David Lawrence is both timely and prophetic. The path to war is the path of weakness not strength. Let us hope the President and his advisers, and congressional leaders get the message.

THE NEW "NEUTRALISM"

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe we ought to apologize for any past expressions implying disagreement with the "neutralism" of various governments in Asia and Africa.

Maybe we should forget all that our spokesmen have said heretofore in support of the right of peoples anywhere to seek by revolution to free themselves from the yoke of autocratic rulers.

Maybe we should explain that it is considered expedient now not to offend Khrushchev, though he strives through international communism to dominate the world.

Maybe all democracies are expected now to remain neutral and to restrain Cubans from returning to their homeland to fight for the freedom of their countrymen.

Maybe we should erase from history books the chapters on the American Revolution wherein our forefathers pledged "our lives our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to gain independence from tyranny.

For what else does it mean when the President of the United States orders exiled Cubans to be arrested and imprisoned if they take any steps while inside this country to

help organize military expeditions of their own people to go back to rescue their fellow citizens?

Mr. Kennedy said to his news conference the other day that such raids are ineffective and could cause international complications for us. There are even hints that the great Government of the United States is afraid to hurt the feelings of Khrushchev and thus give him an excuse either to halt the withdrawal of the remainder of the Soviet Army now stationed in Cuba or even to send in additional forces.

But since when is the policy of the United States based on fear of a tyrant instead of on fundamental principles of international justice?

The President can call the raids ineffective, and they might indeed fail for the time being. But, realistically, they symbolize the spirit of revolution—the sacrifices that patriots are ready to make for their country's freedom.

Why are we being commanded to stay neutral when human liberty is at stake and brave men are willing to die for such a cause? Is this the time for us to appear before all the world as having intervened to protect Castro and the Soviet Army in Cuba?

Why does the President invoke neutrality laws against the expeditions of patriotic Cubans? Didn't the Soviet Government send in an army of 22,000 troops and technicians and erect missile bases aimed at our coastline from an island 90 miles away? What kind of neutrality has Khrushchev observed?

Why do we tear to shreds the historic Monroe Doctrine, which for nearly 140 years has been a cardinal policy of the United States?

President Monroe announced to the world in 1823 that we would not let European powers "extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere" or control any government except in colonies they already possessed. But today we allow the Soviet system to establish and maintain itself in Cuba by the dominance of military force. We set an example for the nations of the world, including the Latin American countries. We tell them, in effect, they must not permit their territory or their resources to be used to aid the revolutionary movement in Cuba.

This is "neutralism" with a vengeance.

This is alinement on the side of the cruel dictators.

This is official indiffirence to the cause of freedom.

What shall we say now to the captive peoples of Eastern Europe? Shall we squelch all the organizations inside countries where refuge is given to "exile governments" and where bands of patriots send word constantly by radio and otherwise to their countrymen that the free world hasn't forgotten them?

The President's action in depriving exiled Cubans of the opportunity to deliver their own people from human bondage has sent a chill of dismay through the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere.

The view is expressed, moreover, inside official Washington that we must not annoy Khrushchev. In other words, supposedly to avoid a big war, we must appease the Hitlers of our day.

But sad experience tells us that this is the very way wars are brought on. Dictators misconstrue pacifism for cowardice. They then take chances and intensify their acts of aggression. As Winston Churchill wrote after World War II:

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance for survival.

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

The new "neutralism" is a most dangerous development in our foreign policy. It could ultimately plunge us into the big war nobody wants.

Tribute to a Great Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, tributes to one of America's greatest leaders continue to appear. I refer, of course, to the tributes to Eleanor Roosevelt who died last November. I ask unanimous consent to have a sensitive, warm article by Katie S. Louchheim, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, which appeared in the March 1963 newsletter of the Department of State, to be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT LADY

(By Katie S. Louchheim)

(Note.—When Mrs. Roosevelt died on November 7, it was a great personal loss to Mrs. Louchheim who had known and admired her for many years.)

The chairman of the United Nations Day celebration had just introduced Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as "the first lady of the free world."

"The audience," said a newspaper account, "gave Mrs. Roosevelt a standing ovation."

Such an outpouring of affection and esteem greeted her wherever she spoke in small and large halls, in all parts of America, and in faraway places around the globe. She was, in a word, revered in her own time.

Her generosity with her time was prodigious. She seldom refused a plea for an appearance. Her remarks, delivered in that simple understated eloquence would reach out to everyone in the room. Her audiences invariably left determined to follow her precepts: "remember that what each one of us does in each community is a sign to other people watching us all over the world; this, they say, is what you mean by Democracy." Then she would add: "This country must accept a Soviet challenge and become a showcase for what can be done by free men for the individual."

Her name headed so many lists. When we needed her—and all of us needed her in so many ways—she was there to inspire and guide and light those "candles in the dark."

She was the first always to go to the trouble spots and the first to insist on practical answers to probing questions. She combined idealism with practicality in a unique American way. Because of her effective concern for her fellow man and woman, she became the pace setter for all of us. We are all her beneficiaries. Because of her leadership, we can truthfully say that our friends throughout the world today regard the American woman's contribution as significant and constructive. Because of her example, we have all attempted to keep the pace she set for us.

Sometimes the pace in its literal sense—just keeping up with her—catching her from plane to speech, or from meeting hall to next appointment was a frighteningly fast one. I can recall many occasions when she left me breathless, pursuing her up the steps of a hotel, on my way to escort her to her waiting car, or to the airport. She was always ahead of me and yet always willing to share her precious moments between engagements. She took the time to hear my explanations when I wanted her help or advice. And she invariably gave both with that gentle firmness that assured a genuine interest, a kindness that was never hurried or curtailed.

I recall very clearly the first time I saw her at close hand. We were working in the women's division of the Democratic headquarters in the 1940 campaign. She came to pay us an "encouraging call." She stopped at every desk to talk. Commenting on the work at hand, she moved on leaving a delighted volunteer behind.

Right after election, President Roosevelt invited all the workers to the White House so he could personally thank us. The invitation, we were certain, came to us at Mrs. Roosevelt's suggestion.

The President received us informally, chatting with each one of us as we shook hands with him. Later Mrs. Roosevelt took us to the East Room to show us the new piano. "The President was not really interested in the quality of the instrument," she told us, smiling, "but in the eagle pedestal—being an ornithologist he wanted to be certain the details were quite correct."

In recent years, I had many occasions to talk with her about the opportunities for women to be of service. She believed in women's contribution and never ceased to seek new ways in which women volunteers could be used, or in which the social injustices to women could be resolved and new doors could be opened to them professionally.

She would remind us, by recounting her own experiences, of the responsibilities all women in public life faced. In her autobiography, describing her participation as the only woman in the delegation to the London meeting to set up the first General Assembly of the U.N., she says:

"I was not very welcome. Moreover, if I failed to be a useful member it would not be considered merely that I as an individual had failed but that all women had failed. There would be little chance for others to serve in the near future."

All of us have heard her express these warning sentiments on many occasions. In a "Person to Person" interview with Edward R. Murrow, she said: "A woman must do well, or she hurts all women."

She more than lived up to her own warning. Whatever she did, she did well, graciously, modestly, and with distinction. And what she did helped all women.

The last time I saw her was at a meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women at which she presided. I had come to tell the Commission about a recent trip to Japan and how on countless occasions in meetings with Japanese women leaders, they had expressed admiration for President Kennedy in creating this body, and great hopes in the accomplishment of its objectives.

Mrs. Roosevelt made a point of asking me whether the young bride in Japan was still "dominated" by her mother-in-law. This situation had troubled her when she had last visited that country. I assured her many of these traditional mores were changing. Feelingly she said: "I hope so."

Afterwards, I told her of an evening in Osaka with a group of Japanese professional women. They sought my advice. Would they be more effective if they took on more aggressive manners, raised their voices in debate, insisted more forcibly and loudly on their rights?

"No, by no means," I replied and went on to say that all of the women in my country who had succeeded in persuading others to their cause had retained their femininity, and their approach had always been reasonable and gentle. As a perfect illustration of my thesis, I had reminded them of Mrs.

Roosevelt. They had nodded approvingly and thanked me for reassuring them. Nothing would please them more than to follow in Mrs. Roosevelt's footsteps.

Mrs. Roosevelt listened and gave me one of those delightfully half-amused smiles. It seemed to say, "If I have helped, if what I have done has inspired others, that was precisely what I intended to do with my life."

East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, within recent months the Atlantic Alliance has had to weather a series of storms. We have found that we and our allies do not always agree on the means to meet the Soviet military threat, nor how to deal with the Russians on the diplomatic level. Now we find ourselves in an economic dispute with our allies over the question of East-West trade. The specific point at issue has been the Russian desire to purchase 40-inch pipe from Western countries. We have refused to sell the Russians this pipe, fearing it will disrupt the Western oil market, and have put pressure on our allies to do the same.

However, our British and German allies do not look on such sales with the same alarm, and their businessmen have been very interested in increasing trade relations with the Soviet Union. This particular issue is only sympotomatic of the broader and more important question of East-West trade and what kind of common policy, if any, shall be worked out among the NATO powers.

Although we are the most powerful member of the Alliance, we must not forget that our allies are independent nations which sometimes have a different conception of their interests than we do. Without exception they depend heavily on foreign trade for their economic survival; for us it is less important, involving only 4 percent of our manufactured goods. The problem of East-West trade is a crucial one not only in the relations between ourselves and our allies, but between the Atlantic Alliance and the Soviet Union.

An editorial in the April 2 Washington Post outlines some of these problems and I commend it to my colleagues. The two points it makes are those to which we must address ourselves if the present drift and disintegration within the alliance are to be stemmed: First, our allies have a vital economic stake in the maintenance of East-West trade; second, trade can be an instrument for the reduction of political tension if intelligently applied.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Should Britain sell pipeline to the Soviet Union? The United States says no, invoking the goal of NATO unity and the specter of building up the enemy. The British, a trading people with heavy unemployment, say yes, downgrading the importance of a Soviet purchase. Here in a nutshell is the problem of East-West trade.

This newspaper has already stated its opinion that the United States has the right to explain its viewpoint to its allies which trade with Russia. It has done so not only to Great Britain but to West Germany, Italy, and Japan. By the same token of fairness, the nations approached have the right to decide the question for themselves. They should not be the butt of American censure or reprisal if, within the limitations prescribed by NATO policy, they choose to trade.

The NATO limitations amount to the lowest common denominator of agreement among the allies. Unilaterally, the United States has put far tighter shackles on itself. If official Washington is unhappy about the gap, and it is, it should keep in mind that it is a member of an alliance, not the "Moscow" of the Western "bloc." American irritation would seem to be the cheap price of participation in a grouping of political equals.

The fact is that East-West trading prospects are far from unlimited. The NATO controls amount to a floor. Soviet realities make a ceiling: Moscow's foreign exchange situation, its commitment to economic self-sufficiency, its short shelf of wares and short shopping list and its ornery trade practices. As for goods in the gray area between the American and NATO controls, such as pipeline, trade stoppage will only encourage Soviet development of a domestic supply. The United States sees pipeline as an iron snake writhing into the Western European oil market. Even if this questionable image turns out to be the proper one, the touted Soviet "oil offensive" will have to be met on other terms.

One does not have to accept the Kremlin's cant in order to believe that trade offers one small possibility of taking the tension from East-West relations and of forming the habit and the pattern of mutually advantageous contact. It is high time that this possibility be explored.

The Late Dr. E. H. Givens, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1963, the Senate of the 58th Legislature of Texas adopted Senate Resolution 315 in memory of Dr. E. H. Givens, of Austin, Tex.

This is a splendid and deserved tribute to Dr. Givens. He and I were close, personal friends over the years. Because of what his life meant to Austin, the State of Texas, and our beloved country, I will insert the senate resolution at this point:

SENATE RESOLUTION 315

Whereas in the passing of Dr. Everett H. Givens on the 6th day of November 1962, the city of Austin lost a dedicated and able civic leader; and

Whereas Dr. Givens devoted most of his life to the betterment of educational standards and economic conditions of members of his race; and

Whereas his intelligent and logical approach to controversial matters made him an effective champion of many causes and earned for him the respect of people in all walks of life; and

Whereas Dr. Givens worked tirelessly for east Austin, giving his wise counsel in fostering better understanding, and his passing is an irreparable loss to thousands of people who for so many years depended on his wisdom and guidance; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of the 58th Legislature of the State of Texas to honor the memory of this most worthy citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That when the senate adjourns today it do so in his memory, and that a page in the permanent journal of the senate be devoted to the recording of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Dr. Givens' widow as an expression of sympathy and as a small token of the respect in which Dr. Everett H. Givens was held by the members of the Senate of Texas.

Buy American Act on Ships Tightened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, because the action taken by the Secretary of Defense in tightening the provisions of the Buy American Act is of great importance to all of us and to our constituents, I am inserting an article from the Baltimore Sun of April 5, outlining the Secretary's administrative order in this regard:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, April 5, 1963]

BUY AMERICAN ACT ON SHIPS TIGHTENED

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—The Defense Department has tightened its Buy American Act provisions in three pending bids for construction of Navy ships, Representative GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland announced today.

The Secretary of Defense has taken administrative action to change the standard for defining American-made goods from 50 to 90 percent of the cost of materials or products involved in ship construction, GARMATZ said.

"The effect of this new standard is to require contractors on ship construction to use materials and products largely of American manufacture," he added.

COMPLAINTS NOTED

"Under the usual procurement rules, a manufactured item qualifies as American-made so long as the cost of foreign-made material does not exceed 50 percent of the total * * *. Many business firms have complained that competitors with cheap labor and materials often have been able to underbid them in Government procurements."

GARMATZ referred to a recent instance where the Navy Bureau of Ships awarded a conversion contract for two AO-22 fleet oilers to Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co., a Northwest firm owned by Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Puget Sound was able to underbid east coast shipbuilding firms by proposing to have midsections of the hulls fabricated in Japan.

Since the cost of foreign-made goods entering into the contract operation would have been 36 percent, somewhat less than the 50 percent ceiling, the Navy decided that Puget Sound was entitled to the award under the Buy American Act and Executive Order 10582 implementing the act.

GARMATZ OPPOSED PLAN

Although GARMATZ bitterly opposed granting the contract to Puget Sound, the Defense Department did so.

GARMATZ, who is the ranking member on the House Merchant Marine Committee, still is considering having the Government Operations Committee investigate the Puget Sound award.

Under the 90 percent formula established as a result of congressional pressure and industry protests, Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co. would not have been eligible.

The industry charged that the Government procurement policy relating to naval vessel construction gave an advantage to firms depending on foreign sources for fabrication of components.

COMPLETE HULLS CONSIDERED

After the Puget Sound award, other firms began to consider foreign fabrication—even to the extent of complete hulls—in bidding on ship construction contracts.

"The 90-percent formula is designed to curb that trend and to check the outflow of gold for payments of procurement abroad," GARMATZ stated.

"Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is to be commended for taking prompt action in this matter," he said.

The Congressman had introduced legislation to amend the Buy American Act to exclude naval vessels from the application of the percentage rule. The effect of the bill, he said, would be to require complete conversion in the United States, a requirement already in the law for commercial vessels in the domestic coastwise trade.

Resolution for an American Ideals Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very illuminating resolution was adopted on April 1, 1963, by the pertinent committees, national officers, and department commanders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The title of that resolution is: "For an American Ideals Corps." The resolution is in keeping with the nationwide programs to advance Americanism and the annual Loyalty Day program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The purpose of the resolution is to bring about the establishment of a Presidential Committee to promote the ideals and values of our free way of life, to offset the negativism which now attaches to so much of our public affairs and to strengthen confidence in our free institutions.

Mr. William Bowles, immediate State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for Ohio played a very significant role in the preparation and passage of this resolution.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION FOR AN AMERICAN IDEALS CORPS

Whereas it appears that there is in the United States today a growing tendency to devaluate, or ignore, the richly patriotic heritage from which were derived our national character and the fundamental freedoms of the American way of life; and

Whereas an increasing variety of disturbing philosophies, of both foreign and domestic origins, strive to downgrade clear thinking, loyal, and dynamic American patriotism; and

Whereas the continued impact upon our citizens of all such divisive influences may impair or destroy our national unity and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, through its commander in chief and its National Committees on Americanism, Loyalty Day, and Community Service, urge the President of the United States to create and activate an official Federal committee identified by such appropriate name as the President's Americanism Corps, or the President's Ambassadors of Loyalty, or the President's Committee for American Ideals; and be it

Resolved, That the President instruct his special body to establish and direct a vigorous nationwide campaign, implemented by volunteer patriotic individuals, organizations, and institutions, to the end that all loyal citizens, in every community of our land, may demonstrate vigorous, positive adherence to historically tested, old-fashioned American ideals and practices; and be it further

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars urges its 1,300,000 members and all other loyal citizens to give their wholehearted support to such a movement as a most effective patriotic countermeasure against any effort to compromise, weaken, or destroy our American way of life.

Gains Tax Regarded as Fair for Timber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent interview of Mr. William Swindells, written by Gerry Pratt, in the Portland, Oreg., Oregonian:

MAKING THE DOLLAR: GAINS TAX REGARDED AS FAIR FOR TIMBER

(By Gerry Pratt)

William Swindells is of the old school of timber industry executives, articulate and blunt. He knows this, refuses to waste time considering the politics of what he believes is right or wrong, and stays out of controversy by avoiding newspaper interviews.

But he was seated now, in the deep leather chair behind his desk in the Pacific Building, speaking for the record. "Providing I get to read it first."

Treasury men, perhaps seeking ways to pad back the money President Kennedy proposes to cut from the Nation's tax bill, have proposed eliminating the capital gains provisions on timber. That was enough to force the Willamette Valley Lumber Co., Santiam Lumber Co., Wood Fibreboard Co., and Western Kraft Co., executive to sit still and get the story of capital gains off his chest. He began with patience. "Starting back, prior to 1943, when if you had a block of timber to sell, there was never any question but what the taxes would be capital gains.

"Then people began cutting their timber to meet the maximum war effort and the excess profits tax, 80 percent, hit them. That didn't leave enough for them to replace their timber."

The result was tax legislation known as 631 the capital gains provision that allows timber operators to claim the profit on their timber at the capital gains tax rate of 25 percent, rather than the straight corporation tax rate of 52 percent.

TAXES TAKE 31 PERCENT

Swindells leaned forward, looking through steel-rimmed glasses for your acceptance of what he was saying, speaking in a voice so big it surprises you: "If you sold your timber outright, you paid a flat 25 percent of the profit in taxes, capital gains taxes," he said patiently, "plus 6 percent to the State * * * which makes 31 percent.

"An extreme example. You have some $10 timber you cut, basing the sale on today's market value of $43 a thousand. So you have approximately $33 profit and you pay approximately one-third of that in taxes.

"But to replace that timber, to get it back into your timber inventory, costs you $43 a thousand, the market value. So you have got to take the one-third you paid in taxes out of your earnings. Under normal, full 52-percent corporation taxes, you would have 52 percent to make up to replace your timber, and the earnings will not support 52 percent."

Swindells' companies have been replacing 50 million feet a year. "Our timber in fee is the same today as it was in 1950," he said. "We have never had enough timber here to be on a sustained-yield basis, so we have had to replace our timber at timber sales."

Without the capital gains provision allowing that extra profit on the company's timber, Swindells said, this could not be continued as a company policy. "At the present retail price of timber, the profit margin is so small, it would not pay to continue operation. The alternative," he added bluntly, "would be to discontinue business."

BYPRODUCTS PROVE LIFESAVER

But capital gains on timber have also left enough money in the timber operators' hands to build the timber inventory needed for complete utilization, the wood fiberboard plant, scheduled for a 60-percent expansion, the kraft plant, taking on an additional $3.8 million paper machine. This is the money, he said, that has kept the industry in business, giving us the raw material base to back up the industrial expansion.

"So some guy says, 'You have been able to build up a pretty nice empire out of that money you have retained,' he said, phrasing the obvious criticism.

"But ask yourself what has this money done for the country," and he began to illustrate.

The Swindells companies employ approximately 3,000, some 80 percent of them in Oregon. "Our particle board plant uses 7,500 units of shavings a month. Western Kraft uses 13,000 units of chips a month and we have every reason to believe that by the end of 1963, we will be able to use our sawdust in a product of vast potential."

Swindells pointed to what this market for waste materials mean to the small private operator. "It gives him a market for his chips and shavings, permits him to practice good utilization. He could not practice good utilization without these plants. Dallas would be a ghost town today without the capital gains provisions."

But more important to this region, he said, are the forestry practices the capital gains provision created in the woods of Oregon and Washington and California.

"You cannot practice good forestry unless you have complete utilization. And you must have the incentive to grow trees in the face of risks like the Columbus Day storm, fires, and maintenance to practice good forestry. * * * These are all calculated risks and then we figure we have this capital gains waiting at the end of the line to pay for it.

"To make an investment like this you cannot think in terms of less than 50 to 90 years. You started out on the basis of capital gains 20 years ago. Now you knock it off. It will create financial uncertainty.

"How can you go ahead on a program that will be uncertain, developing timber you perhaps can't realize a thing on?"

Some Old-Fashioned Treatment for a Modern American Ailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the need to get America moving these days, without a clear indication as to where we should go. We hear a lot about the lack of interest of rank and file Americans in the deliberations of Congress. We hear a lot about the President's personal popularity, and the lack of support for his program. We hear a lot that should lead us to believe Americans are expecting more positive leadership, and a clearer expression of where we are trying to go.

I received today my copy of the Dickinson Press, one of western North Dakota's oldest newspapers. The guest editorial in this issue of April 6, 1963, is written by a small businessman of Dickinson, N. Dak., who I believe is typical of millions of middle- to low-income Americans. I believe the thoughts he has expressed are shared by the vast majority of Americans and I believe all in Congress—and the leaders of this administration—could do well to give most serious heed to the thoughts expressed.

Americans want to be proud of their country, and they are willing to make such sacrifices as are necessary to keep our country strong, and the kind of country of which we have been justly proud in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the thoughts expressed by Mr. Wally Kack will prove of interest to the Members of the House of Representatives and provide food for thought in analyzing our national policy.

Under consent I insert his editorial following my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Dickinson Press (N. Dak.) Apr. 6, 1963]

GUEST EDITORIAL

(By Wally Kack)

I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my great-grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world. For some time now, this has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one. I suppose I would have to admit that I am, among my own neighbors and in my own culture, the typical, average, well-educated, genteel citizen to whom family, mortgage, and security have been the all-important items.

I am now 52, and soon, my wife, daughter, and I will move into our new house. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account at the Liberty National Bank. I am a law-abiding man on the quiet side, and dissension makes me terribly nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone ever.

My wife had me cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I hadn't thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon and oxen when she and great-grandpa were youngsters coming out to settle in Iowa in the great migration. Great-grandma wrote about it as the wild, new land, rich and abundant in mythical proportions.

On the trail she wrote of sickness and hunger, and heat and cold, and dust and thirst, and the deaths and births like beads strung together on a threat of hope—hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn. And when she viewed the new land, she wrote in simple word pictures of the cities and farms and schools, and happiness that would some day bloom in the greatness of the vast new land. She wrote of her tomorrow and my today.

The ink was badly faded, but the message was clear. As I read, I began to think about America and being an American and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to America, to those rich lands and farms, to the cities and the people, to its freedom and its hope.

And, suddenly, I realized that I am a sick American. I mean, really sick. I am sick of panacea and of backing up. I am sick of reaction where there should be initiative. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants. I am sick of Government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its own offices. And I'm sick of being a nice, patient guy about it. I am sick of placidly accepting excuses instead of successes; of being a silent gentleman about it for fear of controversy. I am sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-fingered diplomats and lily-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

I am sick of 40 years of relentless creeping, cancerous, communistic godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering that flag and seeing it trampled in the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances.

I am sick of educators who teach tolerance of subversion and of clergymen who would have me quail at the specter of battle and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do.

In all honesty, the thing of which I am most sick is the man who lets these things come to me: myself.

And by the living God who made me, sirs, I am a sick American who intends to get well, and I hope that everyone who feels as I do will do his bit to recover from the malady which ails him.

What Is Behind President's Support of Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the reporting of news on America's turning against Cuban exile patriots has a horrible nightmarish quality. If only this were just a bad dream. Is it possible the President cannot see that failure to declare the reimposition of the Monroe Doctrine is the source of all our trouble—and that it will get worse?

First. The President says the raids will not weaken Castro—of course, they will but even if not they strengthen the hearts and hopes of freedom-loving people everywhere, especially in Cuba. Enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine would solve this one.

Second. The Cuban patriots raids will make it harder to get Soviet troops out of Cuba, the President opines. The implementation of the Monroe Doctrine would see the United States brooking no dilly-dallying—get the troops out now, or we'll drive them out.

Third. Raids on the Soviet ships are dangerous to the United States. They will bring reprisals possibly on American ships, the President forecasts. The Monroe Doctrine terms would not permit Russian shipments of arms and armaments in this hemisphere, and if they came, you bet it would be dangerous, for Russia. We would sink them.

What is this timid attitude of our leaders? Is the President afraid to stand up to Russia when our safety and protection are at stake? Is the United States sovereignty and safety not transcendent over Khrushchev's feelings?

The news articles from the U. S. News & World Report, when viewed in the light of the terms of the Monroe Doctrine, take on a somber, ominous note, pitilessly showing how weak and fearful is our policy.

A STRONGER CASTRO—WITH U.S. HELP?

Fidel Castro, growing militarily stronger week by week, suddenly finds himself getting protection from an unexpected quarter—the U.S. Government.

The United States, which once helped Cuban exiles attack Castro, now is causing their arrest for such activity.

A crackdown has been ordered by the Kennedy administration against anti-Castro raids mounted or supplied from U.S. territory.

To enforce this crackdown, the U.S. Coast Guard in Florida is being beefed up. On April 3, reinforcements began pouring in—200 more men, 12 more patrol boats, 6 more amphibious airplanes.

The help of Great Britain has been enlisted by the United States in this campaign.

On March 31, a boatload of 17 anti-Castro raiders was seized on Norman Cay, a tiny island in the British-ruled Bahamas, north of Cuba.

It was the British who made the arrests. But, the U.S. State Department admitted, it was the United States that tipped off the British.

At the same time the British were seizing one anti-Castro boat in the Bahamas, American authorities seized another in Miami.

CURBS ON LEADERS

Simultaneously, restrictions were placed on the activities of Cuban exile leaders in Miami. Orders were served on 25 of these leaders not to step outside the limits of Miami's Dade County.

To Cuban exiles, all this appeared to be an American act of betrayal.

As the drive against Cuban exiles grew, cries of protest rose from across the country.

Two years ago, the U.S. armed and trained Cubans for an invasion against Castro. Even after that invasion, the Kennedy administration continued to aid the exiles and assure them that eventually they would be able to oust the Cuban dictator.

Now, suddenly, instead of getting help and assurances, the exiles found themselves facing obstacles and threats of arrest.

To many Americans, the seeming reversal of U.S. policy came as a surprise—and a puzzle.

People asked: Why? What is the Kennedy administration trying to do?

On April 3, at a news conference, President Kennedy gave his explanation.

What the President's words boil down to is this: The United States is trying to avoid trouble with Russia that might raise a new threat of war.

HIT: RUSSIAN SHIPS

Cuban exiles, in recent weeks, had begun a new type of campaign. Instead of striking only at Castro, they began attacking Russian merchant ships that supply Castro.

On March 17, one group of exiles raided the Cuban port of Isabela de Sagua and fired on the Soviet freighter *Lvov*. Afterward, at a news conference in Washington, they boasted that they had also gone ashore at Isabela de Sagua and fought a 45-minute gun battle with Russian soldiers.

Ten days later, on March 27, another group of exiles raced a 22-foot speedboat into the port of Caibarién, on Cuba's northern coast.

Tony Cuesta, military leader of the group—known as Commando L—told U.S. News & World Report this story of that attack:

The raiders sped right for the biggest ship in port—the Soviet freighter *Baku*. They fired machineguns and 20-millimeter cannons at the *Baku* as they approached.

Then the raiders pulled alongside and pasted a 50-pound charge of plastic explosive to the Russian ship. They covered this operation by throwing hand grenades onto the *Baku*'s deck.

As they raced away, toward the open sea, the plastic charge exploded.

Later, from a Cuban broadcast, the raiders learned: Their charge had torn an 18-foot hole in the side of the Soviet ship, and 10,000 sacks of sugar destined for Russia were destroyed by the sea water that rushed into the breach.

IRE IN MOSCOW

The raids drew an angry protest from Moscow. The Russians charged the United States with full responsibility. They said the United States, by tolerating such raids, "is actually bringing about a dangerous situation in the area of the Caribbean Sea and throughout the world."

The danger of the situation was demonstrated on March 28. Two of Castro's Russian-built Mig jet planes fired cannon shots across the bow of an American motor ship, the *Floridian*, in international waters off the coast of Cuba.

On April 2, Castro apologized to the United States, said the shooting was a mistake. But the implication was clear: The Communists would shoot at American ships if exile attacks continued.

On April 3, with the crackdown in force, the U.S. State Department was able to tell Russia that "every step necessary" was being taken to insure that such attacks are not "launched, manned, or equipped from U.S. territory."

Did this mean that all exile attacks on Castro's Cuba and Communist ships are going to cease?

Talk to the exile leaders in Miami and the answer you get is, "No." They concede that the new crackdown will make it more difficult to supply some types of operations. But they insist the raids will go on.

In fact, some say, the raids will increase because the raiding force is growing, with enough men, boats and arms spread through the Caribbean to mount a continuing campaign.

Raiders insist that they do not attack from bases in the United States, but from bases in the Caribbean, outside of America's territorial waters.

Those bases, the raiders say, are small, uninhabited islands—perhaps just a sandspit—where raiders take shelter for a day or so and then move on.

Sometimes, raiders claim, they even use islands that belong to Cuba.

The raiders point out that there are thousands of tiny islands in the Caribbean and that it would be impossible for any country to police them all effectively.

How, then, did the British find that raiding boat—called the *Violynn III*—which they captured in the Bahamas on March 31?

That story was told by Jerry Buchanan, a 24-year-old American adventurer who sailed aboard the boat with 16 Cubans. He said the *Violynn III* was followed by a U.S. Navy plane for nearly 2 days and then, when it put in at Norman Cay to refuel, Bahamian police were waiting—"They knew all about us."

A State Department spokesman admitted the information on which the British acted "was provided to British authorities by the United States."

This illustrates the change in U.S. policy: The owner of the *Violynn III* said the craft had been used before on secret missions to Cuba—sometimes with advance knowledge of U.S. authorities.

It has been the attacks on Russian ships that have stirred the U.S. Government into action against the exiles.

This campaign has been growing, and some exile leaders consider it important. The idea in these attacks is to cut off Castro's supplies by knocking out as many Communist supply ships as possible and scaring off neutral ships.

Said one exile leader, Tony Cuesta:

"Cuba cannot live without supplies from abroad—particularly oil. Therefore, if we can destroy enough shipping to scare most of the rest away, Castro dies of starvation."

WE ARE INVISIBLE

How can the exiles, with only small boats and light guns, hope for much success against Castro's strong coastal defenses?

Mr. Cuesta explained:

"Our advantage is that we are the invisible enemy. We have no bases they can attack. Our main weapon is the small, fast boat. It is hard for radar to spot. Once in the shallow water near shore, we operate at our best—we are the masters. Right now we fight only at night. Later we will operate in daylight, too."

Yet, to many exile leaders, the attacks on ships are less important than the other mission of raiding boats—the infiltration of Cuba from the sea.

Objectives of the infiltrations are to deliver arms to resistance groups inside Cuba, to land guerrilla fighters and saboteurs on Cuban soil, to gather intelligence information, and to take out anti-Castro Cubans who want to escape from Cuba.

Such activities as these, the exiles say, have always been encouraged by U.S. authorities.

In New York, on April 2, it was reported that more than a score of American college students have been using their weekends and vacations to take part in at least 15 such missions to Cuba.

Alexander I. Rorke, Jr., the owner of the *Violynn III*, made the disclosure in an interview on a television broadcast by the American Broadcasting Co. He identified himself as leader of a group of Americans supplying arms to the anti-Castro underground. But he insisted the arms were not shipped into or out of the United States, so that no American laws were violated.

SHACKLES—AND BITTERNESS

In spite of their determination to continue their raids—and their predictions of future success—most anti-Castro Cuban leaders in Miami are bitter about the new shackles placed on them by the country that had previously encouraged them to fight.

One exile leader, Luis Conte Agüero, called the new U.S. policy "an anti-Monroe Doctrine." He said it puts the United States "in the incredible position of protecting the Russians in Cuba."

In Congress, the new crackdown provoked controversy, with opinions divided—some lawmakers defending and others criticizing the administration's policy.

In the debate, one subject kept popping up. That subject was the continued presence of Russian troops in Cuba.

MR. KENNEDY'S HOPE

President Kennedy was asked about this at his April 3 news conference.

The President said it was estimated that there were about 21,000 or 22,000 Russian troops in Cuba last October, at the time of the missile crisis. He said evidence indicated that about 5,000 Russians left Cuba last November and approximately 4,000 left last month.

This would indicate about 12,000 or 13,000 Russian troops remaining in Cuba.

"We hope they are going to be withdrawn," the President said. He did not say what the United States would do if the troops were not withdrawn.

One thing that Mr. Kennedy made clear, however, was this: He thinks the chances of getting Nikita Khrushchev to pull his troops out of Cuba are going to be a lot better if the U.S. Government can stop the Cuban refugees from shooting up Russian ships.

The Unthinkables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, a current issue of National Review contains an article that caught my interest since it points up our seeming strange official attitude toward what amounts to a bandit in our backyard. The article is extremely brief but its impact will certainly be lasting. I commend it to my colleagues for informative reading.

The article follows:

THE UNTHINKABLES—GANGBUSTERS ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Victor Gold)

MARCH 15, 1934.

To All Members, Department of Police, City of Chicago:

Your attention is directed to increased partisan hectoring regarding the Dillinger file. Basic department policy in this area is contained in white paper, January 17, 1934, "Has Dillinger Betrayed His Revolution?" Nevertheless, growing civic unrest, fanned by irate-wing extremists, makes further clarification necessary:

1. The Dillinger gang is under constant surveillance. Its community prestige, according to department surveys, is at an all-time low. Its economic affairs are in serious disarray.

2. Department experts assess Dillinger's total ballistic capability at 7 second-hand Thompson submachineguns, 12 old-model Smith & Wesson .45 caliber pistols, 5 obsolete Colt .32 caliber automatics, and 3 bulletproof vests of doubtful value. In the absence of howitzers and other long-

range cannon—removed last month following department demands that area zoning ordinances be observed—this arsenal is properly classified defensive in nature.

3. Your department has at its disposal approximately 1,200 police officers, 5,000 small arms of the very latest design, 50 Thompson submachineguns just in from the factory and an overwhelming weapons superiority provided by National Guard Reserves. Viewing the Dillinger problem in this perspective, it is little short of ridiculous to assume that city hall is in danger of attack.

PROPER WARNING

4. Of course, it is always possible that city hall could be attacked. Anything is possible. Your department is alert to this possibility, however, and has duly warned Dillinger that such an attack would represent the gravest of threats to community law and order.

5. Department strategy takes into account growing evidence that the gang is no longer monolithic in structure. Underworld intelligence reports confirm that Dillinger and "Baby Face" Nelson, between fusillades at police officers, hardly speak to each other.

6. Contrary to rumors circulating State Street, your department was under no pledge, promise or obligation to furnish roof cover for citizen vigilantes during their recent abortive assault on Dillinger headquarters.

7. Finally, your department remains convinced that the only real answer to the threat of Dillinger and Dillingerism lies in an expanded economic development program for the affected neighborhood. While we acknowledge some difficulty in locating risk capital investors for new projects, there is no satisfactory alternative in a modern civilized age. A police stake-out and full-dress attack, with its concomitant violence and decline in neighborhood property values, is unthinkable.

8. Should the inquiring citizen persist in his hectoring, advise him to take a 50-mile hike to let off steam. If nothing else, it will put him in Peoria police jurisdiction.

Meaningless Objective: Growth Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, economic growth to many Government planners means merely inflated, hollow statistics rather than increased investment and healthy production. Growth statistics such as GNP can be artificially produced and are by themselves meaningless except for use for deceptive political claims.

A sound economy promises us the only real growth—not false gimmicks to bolster up the statistics.

"The Growth Obsession" is from the Wall Street Journal:

THE GROWTH OBSESSION

The speakers at a recent symposium—the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, bankers, businessmen, and academic economists—offered widely different prescriptions to achieve this growth. Some prescribed big tax cuts in various doses. Others plumped for bigger Government spending. Some asked for both together. There were even an old-fashioned few who argued the need for less Government spending.

But with a lone exception, all the speakers were agreed on one thing. What ails us is not enough growth, and growth in large quantities is what the economy must have at any price. Indeed, this was the premise imbedded in the title of this symposium sponsored by the American Bankers Association.

It is in fact a very simple matter to stimulate growth in the economy as it is commonly measured. The gross national product, which was the yardstick used by almost every speaker, can be increased by anything that will increase the turnover of money. Increased Government spending will increase the statistic regardless of what the money is spent for. So will increased private spending; let the people once doubt the future value of their money, and their rush to spend present dollars would shoot the GNP up to the sky.

It's no great trick, either, for this country to increase production statistics. The Government's farm program has increased agricultural production to the point where we don't know what to do with it all. The same could be done with the steel industry if the only point were to make more steel ingots. The unemployment statistic can be made to drop by any one of a number of devices, ranging from make-work to simply putting all the unemployed on the Government payroll.

The ridiculousness of these suggestions is merely a reminder that it is not growth, of and for itself, that we want.

Indeed, one of the ills we now suffer from, as the farm program well illustrates, is that artificial stimulants have been applied to some parts of the economy so that they have grown out of all proportion to the rest of the body or to any need at all, and this wild growth is putting undue strain on the whole body economic.

If we can agree on policies that will give us a sound economy, it is possible that they may not cause much immediate growth; indeed, almost by definition they will not in any segments of the economy which are already overgrown. It is even possible that healthy policies may not result in great future growth, although we doubt it because we don't believe in the gloomy view that ours is a mature economy with all its growth in the past.

But only by searching for sound policies can we possibly hope to achieve any real growth. Approaching the problem as if growth were all there is to talk about, and a thing to be bought at any price, is to mistake the task.

Guatemala Takeover Is a Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very penetrating and thoughtful article appeared in the Washington Daily News on Thursday, April 4, 1963, under the caption "Guatemala Takeover Is a Racket." This article was written by Richard H. Boyce, datelined San Salvador, and followed within a few days after he departed Guatemala where he observed the overthrow of the Ydigoras government by a military coup.

Mr. Boyce has done an outstanding job in exposing the manner in which the military forces in many Latin American countries are tied in with the 2 percenters who own everything and use the combination of these two forces to prevent the blooming of a truly popular and representative government.

I would add only one point which may have escaped the attention of Mr. Boyce. One of the candidates for the presidency in the free elections that were scheduled to be held before the military coup was Col. Jose Luis Cruz-Salazar, a career military officer in Guatemala and former Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States. It is interesting to observe that Colonel Cruz-Salazar was in the United States on February 27, 1963, and appeared before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as a witness on the subject of Castro Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere. It is fair to inquire whether Colonel Cruz-Salazar is in any way involved in the military coup which just took place in Guatemala and the extent to which this coup de etat has improved his chances of succeeding President Ydigoras in an election that could hardly be described as democratic when conducted by the military group now in power. A prudent concern for the future and the rights of the poor peasants of Guatemala—three-fourths of whom are illiterate—who are paying the price for the shocking "protection" provided by the military coup, requires an answer to this question before the U.S. Government takes any action in regard to the mysterious events which have just taken place in Guatemala.

Under previous permission, I include Mr. Boyce's article in the RECORD:

GUATEMALA TAKEOVER IS A RACKET

(By Richard H. Boyce)

SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADORE, April 4.—The military takeover in Guatemala is nothing but a protection racket, Chicago-gangster style of the 1930's.

And it is the poor peasants of Guatemala—three-fourths of them illiterate—who are paying the price of this awful protection.

The army's contention that it was necessary to unseat President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes because he was "complacent" toward communism's threats to the government is hard to swallow.

Senor Ydigoras may have been corrupt as some charged. But he also was one of the most vocal anti-Communist in the hemisphere. He permitted the 1961 Bay of Pigs anti-Castro invaders to train in Guatemala.

He was a legally elected President.

QUESTIONS

Is a totalitarian police state created by army tanks and guns any more democratic than a Communist government? To replace Senor Ydigoras by force is to use the very weapon the Guatemalan Army, under strongman Enrique Peralta, cries loudest against.

For months army elements have been trying to arrange a coup in Guatemala.

As far back as last November, certain army officers went to Senor Peralta, then Defense Minister and, as such, army commander in chief. They sought his support in overthrowing Ydigoras and creating a three-man junta. Senor Peralta would become the next President, these officers assured him. Senior Peralta refused then.

PRESSURE

But pressure on him continued, then mounted as Juan Jose Arevalo vividly came into the picture. Senor Arevalo is a former Guatemala President (1945–50), branded a

Communist, who pledged to return from exile and seek the presidency again.

As bombings and terrorism in the capital increased, some said it was the work of Arevalo supporters. Others charged the bombings were arranged by rightist elements to foment unrest.

When Senor Arevalo skulked into the country secretly last Friday night, the army took matters into its own hands. It staged the coup that upset Senor Ydigoras. Senor Peralta became "chief of state."

THINKING

Some Guatemalans and some American observes in Guatemala think Senor Peralta sincerely means to turn over control to democratically elected officials. Senor Peralta himself says he means to do so "when the country normalizes."

But there are strong indications the "chief of state" is in the grip of a group of powerful younger army officers who dictate actual policy.

And there are also indications the army takeover is not as popular as the army wants the world to believe.

U.S. Accomplishments in the Nuclear Power Field

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, outstanding progress has been achieved by the Nation's nuclear power program in the brief decade following the passage of the Atomic Energy Act in 1954. No nation in the world has matched U.S. leadership in the development of this new source of energy. It is to the fullest credit of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and American industry, that technical progress and practical achievement have brought nuclear power to the threshold of economic reality.

Following upon the very substantial research and development efforts of the AEC toward the realization of economic nuclear power, 125 investor-owned electric utility companies are today participating in 1 or more of 25 nuclear power projects in the United States. These projects include—

Eight stations in operation with capacities ranging from 4,000 to 275,000 kilowatts, and totaling some 750,000 kilowatts.

Six stations under design or construction with capacities ranging from 17,000 to 325,000 kilowatts, and totaling some 550,000 kilowatts.

Four stations under preliminary planning or contract negotiation with capacities ranging from 395,000 to 1,000,000 kilowatts, and totaling some 2,300,000 kilowatts.

Seven utility group projects involve studies and research and development.

These projects are summarized in table I and participating utilities listed are discussed in table II. Details respecting the projects are as follows:

First. Santa Susana plant consists of the AEC's sodium reactor experiment, and the Southern California Edison Co.'s experimental station. The reactor plant was designed, constructed, and is being operated for the AEC by Atomics International, a division of North American Aviation. The conventional portion is being operated by the Southern California Edison Co., at its own expense.

Reactor plant design started July 1, 1954, and the entire station went on the line July 12, 1957. The facilities were installed to serve experimental needs and were an important preliminary to the construction of the Hallam nuclear power facility. Experimental data continue to be developed, and Atomics International has a program which may last several years.

During the past year the bulk of the effort was directed toward experimental work. In connection with this, the installation generated steam for a total of 2,617 hours and produced 2,264,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity over a period of 1,439 hours.

Second. The Vallecitos atomic powerplant celebrated its fifth anniversary of start of power operations last October. During these 5 years of developmental work this joint project of Pacific Gas & Electric and General Electric produced some 292 million thermal kilowatt-hours of power and supplied over 40 million kilowatt-hours of electricity. In addition the plant has been used to train many reactor operators and has attracted over 31,000 visitors.

The plant's boiling water reactor was used in 1962 and will continue to be used in 1963 for AEC and General Electric sponsored development programs on high power density nuclear fuels, longer nuclear fuel life, and maritime reactor fuel studies. System stability studies were completed in 1962. In addition, a superheat loop in the reactor was expanded in 1962 to boost superheat fuel irradiation capability from one element to nine elements. The superheat loop is a part of the AEC's nuclear superheat development program.

The reactor was shut down in September due to a steam leak caused by a small crack in the recirculation piping. High thermal and mechanical stresses were identified as the forces responsible for the cracking. New piping was installed and corrective action taken to prevent reoccurrence.

Third. Shippingport atomic power station, the country's first large-scale nuclear power station, was constructed as part of the AEC's reactor development program. Duquesne Light Co. owns the conventional portion of the plant, contributed to the nuclear portion of the plant and operates the entire plant for the AEC. Shippingport was designed to function both as a test facility and as a power producer. Construction was initiated in September 1954—and completed the latter part of 1957. Criticality was achieved on December 2, 1957. Since then numerous tests have been made while the unit has also been operated as part of the Duquesne system.

In April 1962 a supplemental agreement was concluded between Duquesne and the AEC, which provides for continued operation of Shippingport by Duquesne Light beyond the expiration date of the present contract. The revised agreement will provide for operation during the burnup of core I, seed 4, the removal of core I and installation of core II, and for a period of 5 years beyond completion of the installation of the second core. Installation of this second core is scheduled for early 1964 and will increase the net capability of the plant from 60,000 to 90,000 kilowatts net. In addition, this new agreement provides for an adjustment in costs so that Duquesne Light's future expenses associated with Shippingport will be equal to those which Duquesne would incur in generating the equivalent electrical output of Shippingport by conventional means.

Initial construction of the heat dissipation system was completed in October. Operational testing was performed but terminated due to major control problems. The heat dissipation system, a part of the core II modification program, will operate in parallel with the turbine generator plant. This system was installed to dissipate the excess energy because core II is designed to produce 150,000 kilowatts and the generator has only a 100,000-kilowatt capacity.

Fourth. Dresden nuclear power station was designed and built by the General Electric Co. for a firm price of $45 million. Of the contract price, $15 million was paid as a research and development expenditure by Commonwealth Edison Co. and the other members of the Nuclear Power Group, Inc. The remaining $30 million plus the cost of the site and company overheads was capitalized by Commonwealth Edison Co. First criticality was achieved on October 15, 1959; first electricity was produced on April 15, 1960. The plant went into commercial operation on August 1, 1960.

From January 1, 1962, until it was shut down for the first refueling on November 7, 1962, Dresden operated 93.3 percent of the time with an overall capacity factor of 86 percent. The unit was shut down to remove and replace 192 fuel elements out of the 464 in the reactor and to make certain alterations and inspections.

Inspection showed the cause of sticking of one rod was gauling between a chromium-plated sleeve and the index tube. Inspections of five other control drives showed only minor wear. Inspection of the lower case boron carbide control blades showed them to be in perfect condition. The grid support plate showed no new or enlarged cracks in areas previously inspected and only one in the area not previously inspected. Inspection of fuel assemblies showed a few failures among experimental elements. These will not be returned to the core.

Permission was received from the AEC to increase reactor power from 630,000 kilowatts—thermal—to 700,000 kilowatts—thermal—in September. A net station capability of 202,000 kilowatts was demonstrated at a reactor output of 675,000 kilowatts—thermal—prior to shutdown.

Negotiating a fuel reprocessing contract with Nuclear Fuel Services and the related agreements with the AEC have been pushed vigorously throughout the past year. It appears now that these matters would be settled in the near future. Without the incentive of the $30 plutonium price, Dresden probably will be operated as incremental operating costs dictate, the same as the conventional plants. This should result in an annual capacity factor of about 65 percent for the next few years.

Fifth. Yankee Atomic Electric Co.'s nuclear powerplant at Rowe, Mass., uses a pressurized water reactor. Construction was completed in July 1960; initial criticality was attained in August; and power operation began in November of that year. The plant was placed in commercial operation July 1, 1961, at an authorized power level of 150,000 kilowatts gross electrical output. The reactor was shut down for refueling on May 18, 1962, core I having produced 1.33 billion kilowatt-hours by that date. Operation was resumed with core II on September 21, 1962. On October 11, 1962, Yankee's facility license was amended to permit operation at 540,000 kilowatts—thermal—which corresponds to approximately 170,000 kilowatts gross electrical output. The new power level was reached on October 17 and operation at or near this level continued for the remainder of the year. Gross generation during this period amounted to 370,951,000 kilowatt-hours.

The project was undertaken as part of the power reactor demonstration program and was estimated to cost $50 million. Arrangements had been made to finance up to $57 million including cost of the initial core, working capital, and preliminary operation. As of July 1, 1961, when the plant was placed in commercial operation, the total cost of the project was $43.7 million, of which $39 million represented the cost of the plant and the balance, working capital, core fabrication costs, and organization expense. In addition, the AEC contributed $5 million in the form of research and development work pertaining to the nuclear design of the plant.

Sixth. The Saxton nuclear power plant attained initial criticality on April 13, 1962. This 5,000-kilowatt plant is owned and operated by Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp., a company formed by the domestic operating subsidiaries of the General Public Utilities Corp. The unit will be operated in a 7½-year research and development program. The program will include 5 years of operation with primary emphasis on exploring the possibilities of increasing nuclear fuel-use efficiencies and economies and lowering future capital costs.

Following attainment of criticality, zero power experiments were conducted in order to provide a reference for accurate interpretation and evaluation of future research and development experiments.

Power was generated for the first time on November 16 for a period of approximately 3 hours. The reactor was then shut down for a period of approximately 3 weeks to make a number of previously scheduled minor modifications and repairs. Electric power was generated again on December 16 and the reactor was operated for several days at 75 percent of full power starting December 26.

The AEC issued an amendment to the Saxton operating license providing for phase 1 of the Saxton research and development program. This will cover a period of approximately 1 year and include operating the reactor with chemical shim control up to 23,500 kilowatts—thermal—and operation with special test subassemblies in the core at power densities up to 16 kilowatt-feet of fuel rod.

Seventh. The Indian Point nuclear power plant was built and financed by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. This 275,000-kilowatt pressurized water plant attained criticality in August 1962 and began commercial operation in the following month. Since the early part of this year the plant has operated at rated capacity. The nuclear reactor provides 163,000 kilowatts of the capacity and an oil-fired superheater 112,000 kilowatts.

Eighth. The Big Rock Point nuclear plant achieved criticality on September 27, 1962, 28 months after Consumers Power Co. was issued a construction permit for this facility. The first generation of electric power was achieved on December 8, 1962. Since December 8 the plant has been engaged in a stepwise approach to full power. Full rated power of 50,000 kilowatts electrical gross output for the first core and a sustained full power run are scheduled for the month of March. This program is necessary to verify plant capability and to establish normal operating conditions as a reference base for research and development activities. With the completion of these performance tests the plant built and owned solely by Consumers Power Co., will be dedicated to the conduct of a 4½-year research and development program under the auspices of the AEC. The program will include irradiation of developmental fuels; stability, transient and physics testing; and operation of a process computer system. The program also includes increasing plant capability to 75,000 kilowatts and providing data useful to the design and operation of large, economic boiling water reactors.

Construction cost of the completed plant was well within the original estimate for the project. The success of the operation training program is evidenced by the fact that the plant staff took full responsibility for and provided the manpower necessary for all plant operations to date with consulting assistance available from General Electric Co. The success of plant operations and favorable response to Consumers Power Co.'s public information program resulted in the Big Rock Point nuclear plant being recognized by the press as among the top 10 news items in Michigan during 1962. The public information center at the plant has handled over 150,000 visitors.

Ninth. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. commenced construction of Unit No. 3 at Humboldt Bay power plant on November 11, 1960. This project is being financed entirely with investor funds, including research and development. Bechtel Corp. designed and constructed the unit on a rgular commercial basis. General Electric Co. supplied the nuclear and electrical equipment. The total cost of the unit is estimated to be $21.4 million. The design incorporates pressure suppression containment, which is believed to be a significant advance in the art. With it, in the event of an operating accident, escaping steam from the primary system would be quenched in a water pool, thereby reducing pressure rise after the accident.

The construction permit incorporating this feature was granted by the AEC on November 9, 1960. The public hearing for the provisional operating license was held July 19, 1962, and the license was issued on August 28. As of January 1, 1963, construction was essentially complete. The first load of fuel was delivered on September 25 and fuel delivery was completed December 29. Initial fuel loading began February 15, 1963.

Tenth. The Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, formed in 1956, have built a heavy-water moderated and cooled, pressurize-tube reactor nuclear steam generator under the third round of the AEC power demonstration program.

During 1962 the Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates completed installation of all major equipment in its plant at Parr, S.C. An AEC provisional operating license was issued on November 27, 1962. During hot fitup tests conducted in late November, minor mechanical difficulties were experienced which have delayed criticality. It is now anticipated that initial criticality will occur in midspring 1963.

Under the contract the Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates has with the Commission, the AEC supports the cost of the research and development program. The Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates bears the cost of administering the program and furnishes the reactor.

Eleventh. The Enrico Fermi atomic power plant is sponsored by the Power Reactor Development Co., a nonprofit organization, and the Detroit Edison Co. Atomic Power Development Associates, Inc., is performing research and development and furnished the reactor design. In addition, Atomic Power Development Associates, Inc., is assisting in the nuclear testing of the reactor.

Construction essentially is completed, but nonnuclear testing in 1961 revealed two areas where extensive repairs and modification were necessary. The work required was nearly completed before the year end, and in early 1963 various components were being reassembled and checked out for actual operation. It was estimated that from 2 to 4 months would be required before the reactor would be ready for fueling.

In December 12, 1962, during preoperational testing, a leak developed in the tubing of No. 1 steam generator and a sodium-water reaction occurred. All safety devices worked as intended and the resultant gases were discharged

through a rupture disc to vent pipes above the steam generator building roof.

Inspection with the tube bundle in place revealed what seems to be comparatively small leaks in six tubes. An appropriate program to determine the cause of the failure and proper corrective measures is underway. This failure is not expected to cause a delay in the fueling program.

Twelfth. Construction essentially is completed on the Pathfinder atomic power plant, rated 66,000 kilowatts with a boiling water reactor and an internal nuclear superheater. The plant, located about 5 miles from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was designed and built for Northern States Power Co. by the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. with architect-engineering services by Pioneer Service & Engineering Co. The Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates, a group of 10 midwestern utilities, has furnished $3.65 million toward research and development costs and AEC assistance for research and development totals $10.3 million including a $1.8 million waiver of fuel-use charges. Northern States Power, as owner and operator, will be investing about $19 million in the plant.

Due to delays in fabrication of the fuel, plant startup is now scheduled for third quarter 1963. The startup program involves about 1 year in a step-by-step approach to full power so that commercial operation cannot be realized before late 1964. Preoperational testing of the plant is well underway and training for operating personnel is continuing. Northern States Power, as license applicant, and Allis-Chalmers, as plant designer, are actively engaged with the AEC in plant licensing matters.

Thirteenth. The Peach Bottom nuclear powerplant is being built by Philadelphia Electric Co. in cooperation with the nonprofit High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc. (a 53-company association). These companies are building a prototype high-temperature, helium-cooled, graphite-moderated nuclear powerplant in response to an AEC invitation.

The plant is being constructed on a fixed-price contract for $24.5 million. In addition, AEC will contribute toward research and development performed by General Dynamics an amount not to exceed $14.5 million, including $2 million in postconstruction research and development. AEC also will waive up to $2.5 million in fuel-use charges during research and the first 5 years of operation.

A construction license for Peach Bottom was issued by the AEC in February 1962 and site clearance was begun immediately. All major plant components have been ordered and physical construction of the plant was approximately 28 percent complete by the end of 1962. The plant is scheduled for completion in the middle of 1964. Preconstruction research and development essentially is complete. The program for postconstruction research and development is in preparation.

Fourteenth. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. on November 28, 1962, received from the California Public Utilities Commission a certificate of public convenience and necessity for unit No. 1 at Bodega Bay Atomic Park. The petition for a rehearing before the Commission was denied on January 2, 1963. On December 28, 1962, the company filed an application with the AEC for a license to construct and operate a nuclear reactor as a part of unit No. 1.

The unit will consist of a nuclear-fueled boiling water reactor and a tandem compound turbine generator, with a nominal rating of 325,000 kilowatts. It will be located on Bodega Head on the Pacific coast, approximately 50 miles northwest of San Francisco, on a 225-acre site. The reactor will be of the single-cycle, forced-circulation type with internal steam separation. Fuel will be slightly enriched uranium dioxide in stainless steel tubing. Pressure suppression containment, first developed for the company's Humboldt Bay nuclear unit, will also be employed at Bodega Bay.

Fifteenth. Southern California Edison Co. and San Diego Gas & Electric Co. project: Southern California Edison Co. has executed a contract with Westinghouse Electric Corp. and Bechtel Corp. for the engineering and construction of its proposed 395,000-kilowatt—gross—nuclear powerplant, to be located in the northwest corner of Camp Pendleton, Calif. San Diego Gas & Electric Co. will acquire a 20-percent interest in the plant.

Site grading and excavation is scheduled to commence on October 1, 1963, and construction of the plant proper is scheduled to commence on April 1, 1964. This schedule is dependent upon acquisition of the plant site and the issuance of all necessary regulatory approvals in advance of these dates. An application for a construction permit and for an operating license for the plant has been filed with the AEC.

Good progress has been made with respect to the significant features of a contract between Edison, San Diego, and the AEC, under which the two companies will undertake to procure and operate the plant in accordance with, and as a part of, the AEC's power demonstration program.

The Secretary of the Navy has stated that the Department of the Navy has no objection to the location of the plant in the northwest corner of Camp Pendleton. Legislation has been introduced in Congress which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements to Edison and San Diego for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the plant, and for offsite transmission and communication lines, access road, spur track, and other appurtenances to the plant.

Sixteenth. The Connecticut Yankee Atomic Co., formed by the 12 major New England investor-owned electric utility companies, plans to construct a 500,000-kilowatt atomic powerplant at Haddam Neck, Conn. The plant will use a pressurized water reactor. Its cost is estimated to be between $70 and $80 million. Completion date is tentatively set for 1967. Research and development assistance will be sought from the AEC.

The decision to go forward with plans for a large nuclear plant of this type is based on the results of a study which showed that atomic power cost is competitive now with fossil fuel costs in New England and gives every promise of producing lower costs in the future.

Seventeenth. A large-scale nuclear powerplant is expected to be built by the New England Electric System. While the original plan was for a plant of the order of 300,000 to 350,000 kilowatts, present thinking is directed toward a plant of 500,000 kilowatts or larger. The recent organization of Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co., in which New England Electric System is a substantial participant, and its plans for construction of a nuclear plant of approximately 500,000 kilowatts for completion in 1967 has influenced the time schedule for the proposed New England Electric System plant so that a completion date in 1968 or in 1969 is now envisioned.

This plant must, of course, take its place in the orderly development of the future power-supply program for the system. It is conceived as a production plant, not an experiment or prototype. In view of the proposed completion date, the system has as yet no necessity to freeze on the reactor's precise type or design, and can continue to analyze and take into account continuing developments in reactor operations and design.

Eighteenth. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., has applied to the AEC for a construction permit to build a 1,000,000-kilowatt nuclear powerplant at Ravenswood, Queens, N.Y. The proposed plant will have a pressurized reactor and oil-fired superheater. The combination design is expected to produce electricity at a cost competitive with a plant using conventional fuel entirely. Preliminary estimates indicate construction costs of $175 million. The plant will be built entirely with funds raised by Con Edison. No Government moneys would be involved. Plans call for completion of the plant by 1970.

These projects aggregate some 3,600,000 kilowatts of capacity and will involve estimated utility company expenditures of almost $1 billion. Expenditures through 1964 are tabulated in table III. Furthermore, it is to be expected that additional stations and further substantial expenditures by utility companies will follow in time involving units not only in the 500,000-kilowatt category and larger but also in the smaller ranges of say, 150,000 to 200,000 kilowatts, as well. In line with this is the recent announcement of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that it will depend on the atom more and more as time passes. If its Humboldt Bay atomic plant and its proposed Bodega Bay atomic park plan are as economically successful as Pacific Gas & Electric Co. confidently expects, many of its new big generating units will be nuclear. This could involve about 10 million kilowatts in the period 1970 through 1980.

While the majority of the reactor projects in which electric utility companies are participating make use of the presently most competitive types, there are a significant number which are designed to push existing technology to the utmost limits. Thus, there are found ad-

vanced projects involving not only converter and breeder reactors but also sodium technology, high temperature and gas-cooled systems, uranium-thorium complexes, and pressure-tube designs. In addition, the utility group study projects include advanced development concepts.

It was recognized from the outset that most of the stations being built would not produce economic power. However, these systems had favorable promise for the future, and justified the construction and operation of plants to identify the problems involved and so to accelerate the development of applicable technology. It is reasonable to expect that they will contribute markedly to our national reactor development program.

Another significant contribution by the electric utility industry has been the evaluation and clarification of nuclear power economics. The operation of power stations by power companies on power networks had made it possible to study directly and practically the cost of nuclear power. As a result, it is becoming increasingly possible to judge nuclear reactor designs in terms of true economic values. In this connection, the investment and participation of the equipment manufacturers has played a notable role and has contributed to the competitive environment which exists today for proven reactor systems.

It is significant to note that the growing competition of nuclear power is having an impact on the conventional power industry as well. As Congressman Holifield, Dr. Pittman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Federal Power Commission Chairman Swidler have pointed out, the competition of nuclear power has been a factor in the downward cost trends of fossil fuels in certain areas of the country. In short, nuclear power has already become a competitive element in the electric power producing market and, in this sense, electric power consumers already are enjoying fruits of nuclear power developments.

A further substantial contribution by electric utility companies to our Nation's effort is being made through the training of personnel. Electric utility companies have recognized the need for technical competence in this new field and have pressed the training of their engineers, scientists and operators in nuclear technology and related disciplines. In this manner, they have added substantially to the pool of human resources needed to support the Nation's growing program in the use of nuclear energy.

The electric utility companies' accomplishments, contributions and active participation in the nuclear power field have done much to complement and justify the efforts of the AEC. A strong feeling of confidence is emerging in the industry concerning the reliability and economic viability of nuclear power systems. This feeling of confidence undoubtedly will continue to grow as new stations are added to the power systems. There is little question but that the past decade's effort has brought nuclear power to a level of economic competitiveness in the high fuel cost areas of the country. It is safe to say that, by 1970, few electric utility companies anywhere in the United States will add substantial new capacity to their systems without considering the possibilities of nuclear power.

TABLE I.—*Electric utility company participation in nuclear power development*

PLANTS IN OPERATION

Name of participating utility and plant [1]	Location of plant	Reactor type	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Construction cost [2]	Research and development cost [3]	Critical	Commercial operation	Generation in 1962 (kilowatt-hours)	Total generation (kilowatt-hours)
(1) Southern California Edison Co.[4] (Santa Susana)	Santa Susana, Calif.	Sodium graphite.	[5] 7,500	[6] $1,340,000	----------	April 1957	July 1957	2,310,000	18,438,000
(2) Pacific Gas & Electric Co.[8] (Vallecitos)	Pleasanton, Calif.	Boiling water	[5] 5,000	[6] 572,000	----------	August 1957	October 1957	8,264,000	40,117,000
(3) Duquesne Light Co.[7] (Shippingport).	Shippingport, Pa.	Pressurized water.	[5] [9] 60,000	22,500,000	([10])	December 1957	December 1957	[9] 315,963,900	[9] 1,152,590,200
(4) Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden).	Morris, Ill	Boiling water	[9] 200,000	34,200,000	$15,000,000	April 1960	October 1960	1,192,735,900	[9] 1,974,916,360
(5) Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee).	Rowe, Mass	Pressurized water.	[5] 170,000	39,000,000	1,000,000	August 1960	July 1961	[5] 740,124,700	[5] 1,701,472,000
(6) Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp. (Saxton).	Saxton, Pa	Closed cycle water (PWR)	[5] 4,000	[11] 6,932,428	[12] 286,392	April 1962	([13])	228,000	228,000
(7) Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).	Buchanan, N.Y.	Pressurized water.	[14] [5] 275,000	126,000,000	11,000,000	August 1962	September 1962	60,672,385	60,672,385
(8) Consumers Power Co. (Big Rock Point).	Charlevoix, Mich.	Boiling water	[15] [5] 50,000	26,310,000	([16])	September 1962	([17])	[9] 28,900	[9] 28,900

PLANTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR DESIGN

Name of participating utility and plant [1]	Location of plant	Reactor type	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Estimated construction cost [2]	Estimated research and development cost [3]	Scheduled for commercial operation
(9) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Humboldt Bay)	Eureka, Calif	Boiling water	[5] 60,000	$21,400,000	----------	Early 1963.
(10) Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc. (Parr).	Parr, S.C	Pressure tube, heavy water	[9] 17,000	[18] 18,540,000	([19])	([20]).
(11) PRDC-Detroit Edison Co. (Fermi)	Lagoona Beach, Mich	Fast breeder	[21] [5] 60,000	68,829,000	31,305,000	([22]).
(12) Northern States Power Co.-Central Utilities Atomic Power Association (Pathfinder).	Sioux Falls, S. Dak	Boiling water [23]	[5] 66,000	19,000,000	4,000,000	Late 1964.
(13) Philadelphia Electric Co.-HTRDA (Peach Bottom).	York County, Pa	High temperature, gas cooled	[9] 40,000	[24] 8,000,000	16,500,000	1964.
(14) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Bodega Bay)	Bodega Bay, Calif	Boiling water	[5] 325,000	58,826,000	----------	1966.

PLANTS UNDER CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS OR IN PLANNING

(15) Southern California Edison Co.-San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	Camp Pendleton, Calif	Pressurized water	[5] 395,000	$80,000,000	----------	December 1966.
(16) Connecticut Yankee Atomic Co	Haddam, Conn	do	[5] 500,000	80,000,000	----------	September 1967.
(17) New England Electric System	Massachusetts	Not selected	[25] 500,000	70,000,000 to 80,000,000	----------	1968–69.
(18) Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Ravenswood).	New York, N.Y	Pressurized water	1,000,000	175,000,000	----------	About 1970.

[1] Utility member companies of groups are shown in appendix II.
[2] Plant costs exclusive of switchyard and step-up transformers, but including interest during construction. Any exceptions for specific plants are noted.
[3] Made by sponsoring utility or other participating utilities does not include contributions made by the AEC.
[4] Nuclear portion of plant designed, constructed, and operated for the AEC by Atomics International. Southern California Edison Co. built and operates conventional portion of plant.
[5] Gross.
[6] Pacific Gas & Electric Co. built and operates conventional portion of plant. General Electric Co. built and operates nuclear portion.
[7] AEC owns nuclear portion of plant. Duquesne Light Co. contributed to nuclear portion, owns conventional portion of plant and operates entire plant.
[8] Turbine rated 100,000 kilowatts. Plant to be modified to have increased capacity with new core.
[9] Net.
[10] In addition to expenditures for conventional portion of plant and the site, Duquesne Light Co. contributed $5,000,000 toward cost of reactor.
[11] Fixed price for reactor and auxiliary equipment, fuel and associated costs for 5-year research and development program, plus expenditures for training, licensing, insurance and other miscellaneous costs during construction.
[12] Administrative, operation maintenance cost of research and development program till end of 1962. Does not include manufacturer's research and development costs.
[13] Research and development project.
[14] Nuclear 163,000 kilowatts; oil-fired superheater 112,000 kilowatts.
[15] Ultimate capacity of plant 75,000 kilowatts (gross).
[16] The construction of the Big Rock Point nuclear plant required capital expenditures of approximately $12,000,000 more than would have been required for the same amount of conventional plant capacity. This amount is considered to be a research and development expenditure and as such is to be amortized off over a 10-year period. The cost of ownership of the remaining plant investment made available for research and development activities is also a logical research and development expense. For the coming 4½-year period this will amount to an additional $8,000,000.
[17] Plant now engaged in initial phase of a 4½-year AEC sponsored research and development program aimed at increased power densities, longer fuel life, and lower fuel fabrication costs.
[18] Does not include $1,650,000 administrative, employee training, and startup costs.
[19] Not available.
[20] Fuel loading scheduled early spring 1963, criticality midspring 1963.
[21] 100,000 kilowatts after fuel development program.
[22] Low power testing, April 1963. Commercial operation indefinite, probably early 1964.
[23] Internal nuclear superheater.
[24] In addition to this expenditure and its portion of the HTRDA research and development program, the Philadelphia Electric Co. will expend an estimated $4 240,000 for land, interest during construction, etc.
[25] Or more.

TABLE II

NAMES OF ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANIES PARTICIPATING IN NUCLEAR POWER STUDY, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, OPERATING AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Projects in operation

1. Southern California Edison Co. (Santa Susana).

2. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Vallecitos).

3. Duquesne Light Co. (Shippingport).

4. Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden). Nuclear power group; American Electric Power Service Corp., Central Illinois Light Co., Commonwealth Edison Co., Illinois Power Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Union Electric Co.

5. Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee): Boston Edison Co., Central Maine Power Co., Central Vermont Public Service Corp., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Eastern Utilities Associates, Hartford Electric Light Co., New England Electric System, New England Gas & Electric Associates, Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, Western Massachusetts Electric Co.

6. Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp. (Saxton): Pennsylvania Electric Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co.

7. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).

8. Consumers Power Co. (Big Rock Point).

Projects under construction or design

9. Pacific Gas & Electric (Humboldt Bay).

10. Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc. (Parr): Carolina Power & Light Co., Duke Power Co., South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Virginia Electric & Power Co.

11. The Detroit Edison Co. (Enrico Ferm). Power Reactor Development Co.: Alabama Power Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Mississippi Power Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

12. Northern States Power Co. (Pathfinder). Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates: Interstate Power Co., Iowa Power & Light Co., Iowa Southern Utilities Co., Madison Gas & Electric Co., Northern States Power Co., Northwestern Public Service Co., Otter Tail Power Co., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., Western Power & Gas Co., Wisconsin Public Service Corp.

13. Philadelphia Electric Co. (Peach Bottom). High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc.: Alabama Power Co., Arizona Public Service Co., Arkansas Power & Light Co., Atlantic City Electric Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., California Electric Power Co., Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co., Central Illinois Light Co., Central Illinois Public Service Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Central Power & Light Co., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Gulf Power Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., Idaho Power Co., Illinois Power Co., Iowa Public Service Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Kentucky Utilities Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., Montana Power Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Portland General Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., San Diego Gas & Electric Co., Sierra Pacific Power Co., Southern California Edison Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., United Illuminating Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

14. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Bodega Bay).

Projects in planning or contract negotiations

15. Southern California Edison Co.–San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

16. Connecticut Yankee Atomic Co.: Boston Edison Co., Cambridge Electric Light Co., Central Maine Power Co., Central Vermont Public Service, the Connecticut Light & Power Co., the Hartford Electric Light Co., Montaup Electric Co., New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co., New England Electric System, Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, the United Illuminating Co., Western Massachusetts Electric Co.

17. New England Electric System.

18. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Ravenswood).

Study, research, and development groups

19. Empire State Atomic Development Associates, Inc.: Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Long Island Lighting Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.

20. Texas Atomic Energy Research Foundation: Central Power & Light Co., Community Public Service Co., Dallas Power & Light Co., El Paso Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Houston Lighting & Power Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., Southwestern Public Service Co., Texas Electric Service Co., Texas Power & Light Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

21. Southwest Atomic Energy Associates: Arkansas Power & Light Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Empire District Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Kansas Gas & Electric Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Southwestern Electric Power Co., Western Light & Telephone Co., Inc.

22. Atomic Power Development Associates: Alabama Power Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., General Public Utilities Corp., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Hartford Electric Light Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Mississippi Power Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pennsylvania Electric Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Southern Services, Inc., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Wisconsin Power & Light Co.

23. East Central Nuclear Group; Appalachian Power Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Dayton Power & Light Co., Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Monongahela Power Co., Ohio Edison Co., Ohio Power Co., Pennsylvania Power Co., Potomac Edison Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., West Penn Power Co.

24. Florida West Coast Nuclear Group: Florida Power Corp., Florida Power & Light Co., Tampa Electric Co.

25. Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group: Arizona Public Service Co., California Electric Power Co., Iowa Public Service Co., Nevada Power Co., Portland General Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Rochester Gas & Electric Co., Southern California Edison Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co.

TABLE III.—*Estimate of expenditures by electric utility companies for nuclear power projects* [1]

	1958 and earlier	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Expenditures for plants [2]	$123,324,000	$98,451,000	$103,058,000	$84,054,000	$45,452,000	$39,211,000	$31,999,000
Other expenditures [3]	11,485,000	3,307,000	3,048,000	6,004,000	6,133,000	6,806,000	6,738,300
Total by years	134,809,000	101,758,000	106,106,000	90,058,000	51,585,000	46,017,000	38,737,000
Cumulative	134,809,000	236,567,000	342,673,000	432,731,000	484,316,000	530,333,000	569,070,000

[1] Based on information obtained from the major nuclear power groups and previous previous surveys made by Edison Electric Institute.

[2] Estimate of expenditures by electric utility organizations for the following plants in operation, under construction or in contract negotiations including accompanying research and development work, but exclusive of operating cost: Dresden, Yankee, Shippingport, Santa Susana, Vallecitos, Saxton, Indian Point, Big Rock Point, Humboldt Bay, Parr, Enrico Fermi, Pathfinder, Peach Bottom, Bodega Bay, Southern California Edison-San Diego Gas & Electric Co. project, and, Connecticut Yankee.

[3] Includes expenditures by individual companies and groups of companies for nuclear power study, research, and development. These figures do not include expenditures associated with any of the projects listed in footnote 2 above. Included in this category are the following groups: Empire State Atomic Development Associates, Texas Atomic Energy Research Associates, Southwest Atomic Energy Associates, Nuclear Power Group, Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group, Atomic Power Engineering Group (up to 1959), Pacific Northwest Power Co. Group, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. project (up to time of cancellation), Pioneer Service & Engineering Group (up to 1957), ECNG-FWCNG project (up to time of cancellation), East Central Nuclear Group, and Florida West Coast Nuclear Group.

Senator Tower Explains the ABC's of Conservatism to a Liberal Texas Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the April 6, 1963, issue of Human Events includes an excellent article entitled "Senator Tower Explains the ABC's of Conservatism to a Liberal Texas Editor."

The Senator's letter to the editor of the Texas Observer does a great deal to place the issue of liberalism versus conservatism in proper perspective:

SENATOR TOWER EXPLAINS THE ABC'S OF CONSERVATISM TO A LIBERAL TEXAS EDITOR

Mr. RONNIE DUGGER,
The Texas Observer,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR RONNIE: I am flattered that the Texas Observer has asked me to do something on my fundamental beliefs. In your note to me, asking me to do this piece, you observed that "* * * our readers have so little, substantially, in common with you." However, I am always glad to speak or write under critical, as well as favorable circumstances.

Too, I remember a line from Rudyard Kipling: "They cannot know England who only England know." Perhaps some exposure to an honestly expressed conservative viewpoint may cause some of my liberal friends to take better stock of their own positions.

At the outset, I should note that, too often, the doctrinaire liberal or the doctrinaire conservative tends to state his case in a manner that would convey the impression that he is God, dictating the Ten Commandments to Moses. I'm as guilty of this as anyone.

So, perhaps I should start with a little disarming humility and say that that I am aware that I have no monopoly on truth and, although political philosophies are things to which insincere men may, from time to time, repair for the sake of political expediency, I will concede the intellectual honesty of those who might be properly regarded as the real opinion leaders of the liberal movement.

LIBERALS POSSESSED OF A MASSIVE CONCEIT

However, it occurs to me that they are possessed of a massive conceit. As the attitude toward people low on the socioeconomic scale on the part of the old Tory Democrats of the last century may have been condescendingly philanthropic, so, too, the attitude of the American 20th century so-called liberal is one that sometimes appears to border on contempt for the ability of people in a society to regulate themselves.

Liberal intellectuals cling to the ancient notion that there must be a ruling elite which uses the coercive authority of the state as a means of ordering the lives and destinies of men, through complete planning of the political, economic and social processes.

As I see it, the function of Government is to preserve order in society—not to order society.

It is no more accurate to caricature the conservative as a bloated, greedy, avaricious moneybags, bent on the preservation of privilege and the exploitation of the poor, than it is to caricature the liberal as a bewhiskered, red-eyed, bomb-throwing anarchist.

Assuming that the liberal and the conservative have mutually compatible goals: to wit, the elevation of the whole condition of mankind, the enhancement of the individual dignity of man, consistent with our Judeo-Christian system of ethics, morality and humanity, the difference lies in the approach, the conservative being libertarian, the liberal, essentially egalitarian.

GOVERNMENT PLANNING GUESSWORK AT BEST

In the eyes of the conservative, the liberal approach, too often, becomes an end unto itself and is, therefore, destructive of the goal. The achievement of complete "equality," and its maintenance, it seems to me, would necessarily require substantial sacrifice of individual liberty and freedom of choice.

It appears to me the liberals are bent on the establishment of a system which would marshal the wealth and resources of the land and redistribute them in the form of welfare benefits and public works. While some liberals may not consciously seek the establishment of a Socialist state in America, I believe that many of the programs they advocate establish a trend in that direction.

In seeking the establishment of a planned economy, the liberal apparently fails to take into consideration the fact that capitalism, or the market-regulated economy, has proved to be the most productive system and has afforded the highest standard of living.

Government planning, as one wise man has observed, is not a mature way to organize an economy. It is unproven; it is educated guesswork at best. Carried to its ultimate, it is necessarily tyrannical in character in that it essentially determines what will be produced and consumed, at what jobs people will work and what compensations they will receive.

A market-regulated economy preserves the democracy of the marketplace in which people, by the manner in which they spend their dollars, in effect determine what goods and services will be produced.

A system in which taxes become confiscatory, in which there is extensive government competition with business, or at its worst, one in which the means of production, distribution, and exchange are nationalized, not only denies a certain amount of freedom of choice, it destroys incentive.

I am aware that conservatives are very often accused of placing property rights before human rights. I deny the allegation and defy the alleger. I consider that the right to own and exploit property for private subsistence, or gain, is an essential human right. It prevents the citizenry from being reduced to a status of complete dependency on the government.

I submit, further, that the honest and consistent conservative has equally high regard for other rights which those of us living in an Anglo-Saxon society have grown to expect, such as freedom of speech, press, assembly and worship. We believe in elaborate safeguards for the accused and equality in the eyes of the law.

On that last point, was it Anatole France who cynically said, "The law in its majestic equality prohibits the rich man from begging alms and sleeping under bridges, as well as the poor man?" I don't believe this comment could characterize our legal and political system, as the conservative thinks it should be. We do not seek to foster or preserve privilege.

INTENSE TAXATION PENALIZES SUCCESS

Consistent with our notion that government should preserve order in society and should foster a climate of freedom and growth, we approve such measures as antitrust laws and other legislation designed to protect the general citizenry against the unscrupulous and the greedy—laws that create a climate of opportunity for all the people, regardless of station or origin. In short, we seek a society in which all men can aspire to be successful and have some reasonable chance of realizing that aspiration.

We, therefore, resent a system of taxation and expenditure that penalizes success and encourages indolence, a regulatory system that will prevent one segment of the society from abusing its economic power—but, at the same time, allow, indeed, even encourage another segment to abuse its power with impunity.

Conservatives cling to the idea that ours is, historically has been, and ought to be a classless society—one in which people move freely and without prejudice up and down the socioeconomic ladder. We are righteously, rightfully indignant at those who foment class war for political purposes.

It should be obvious to any but the most ignorant that the best interests of the working man are closely identified with the best interests of the proprietors and managers.

Certainly, there are legitimate differences between labor and management on hours, wages, and working conditions. But generally, where a favorable climate for business exists, where business prospers, the working man prospers also.

MUST THERE ALWAYS BE ALTERNATIVES?

Too often, the cry is raised that we are "aginners"; we are nonprogressive because we oppose programs and proposals which are propounded by the administration. "What are you for?" we are asked.

We are for individual liberty and freedom of choice. We are for a market-regulated economy. We are for the responsibilities of government devolving on those organisms of government that are closest to the people. We therefore oppose that which is destructive of what we are for.

Being in the minority, it is our duty to oppose that which we consider to be conducive to the establishment of dangerous trends. When, and if, we succeed to a majority position, then we will propound our own programs—then it will be the liberals who have to hazard the accusations of obstructivism and negativism.

It is often suggested that we have no alternatives to the proposals of this administration. Why should we oppose bad proposals with programs and proposals that are less bad? Must there always be alternatives?

Well, Ronnie, that about wraps it up. I've probably left out a great deal that I should have said; but I hope this will give your readers some insight into the conservative mentality. We are not without humane feelings; we love our children; we support humanitarian causes; we give as generously of our time and energies to the betterment of our communities as the liberals do—perhaps more so.

We do not deny that responsibilities for the care of the indigent, the education of our children, and the elevation of the whole state of our society, exist. We simply believe that they should devolve on the individual, the family, the community, the local or State government to the maximum degree possible.

Many thanks to you and the Texas Observer for giving me this forum. It is a tribute to your desire to be fairminded.

Very truly yours,

JOHN G. TOWER.

Junior ROTC a Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial written by Jim Welch in the Capitol Journal, Salem, Oreg., on the junior ROTC program:

JUNIOR ROTC A WASTE

We are sorry that the Defense Department has thrown in the towel in its effort to get Congress to abolish the high school Reserve Officers Training Corps.

This sop to congressional pressure was designed to win influential friends for a more important measure, the overhaul of the college ROTC program. And we'll grant that changes there are more important than the abolishment of the relatively small high school program.

Still, we are sorry that the taxpayers will continue to provide most of the money for this military training in 255 schools. For it's expensive to provide servicemen as instructors, to say nothing of uniforms and equipment. And unlike the college program, it accomplishes very little of benefit to the armed services.

After Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara decided to retreat on this relatively minor matter, Assistant Secretary Norman S. Paul testified Wednesday before a House Armed Services subcommittee. He said the Pentagon is interested in a program "that will develop discipline, leadership, and physical conditioning of the high school student," and supports whatever Congress wants to do in continuing or even expanding the program. But he warned of possibly excessive costs, and suggested a thorough study.

We disagree with Paul's assertion that the Defense Department should be concerned with the development of "discipline, leadership, and physical conditioning," of high school students. We believe the Pentagon should concern itself with training soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and that this can be done most effectively and economically in service schools, rather than in high schools. Let's leave discipline and leadership to parents and teachers, and physical conditioning to the high school physical education program.

We believe high school military training is expensive and wasteful and has no place in the crowded curriculum.

Commentary From a University Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some writers and speakers have amused themselves and their readers by poking fun at certain budget items for research. While the titles of these research projects may not make sense to the uninformed, Carl W. Larsen, director of public relations at the University of Chicago and formerly head of public information at the Argonne National Laboratory, has interpreted them in terms of their place in research affecting the public health. I am sure my colleagues will find of interest and enlightenment, as have I, in the following article by Mr. Larsen in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 17, 1963.

A COMMENTARY FROM A UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

(Editor, Chicago Sun-Times)

THE ORAL HEALTH OF ICELANDIC PEOPLES

By the age of 50 most of our population loses teeth because of periodontal disease. By age 65, almost all the population has suffered from this disease. It is painful, annoying, disabling and expensive. By studying the incidence of the disease in its different manifestations in different peoples, with different foods, different climate and different customs, we may be in a position to make a sizable contribution to the health and pocketbook of the average American.

A study of the oral health of Icelandic people was taken by a University of Alabama team under the supervision of Dr. Joseph F. Volker, dean of the school of dentistry and vice president in charge of health affairs. Dr. Volker is both a Ph. D. and a D.D.S., and before heading the Alabama program was dean of the College of Dentistry at Tufts University.

He and his coinvestigators are recognized as outstanding scholars and research scientists, and have been deemed well qualified to handle this project. The facilities to carry out the work are recognized as excellent both in Iceland and in Alabama. This study takes advantage of the opportunity to correlate many factors—climate, industry, population, drinking water, age, organization—and the relationship of these to the serious problems of tooth decay and oral disease. We can learn from these studies some of the mechanisms involved in cultural change, related to oral problems and possibly how to protect our teeth.

The survey has already produced some significant reports presented at the meeting of the International Association for Dental Research, March, 1962, and printed in Public Health Reports 77:594, 1962. The investigators found a higher prevalence of tooth decay and gingivitis in children in Iceland than in those of other nations. The contrast with Alaska was marked. The high rate of gingivitis in children was particularly surprising since periodontal disease in youngsters has not heretofore been considered a significant area of study. If we can determine why the gums of small children in Iceland show disease when the supporting structures of the teeth of those in other countries do not, we may have a most important clue to the dental problem of our own older age groups.

INVESTIGATION OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN ECHOES

It is recognized that orientation and location of objects is the greatest detriment to useful life among the blind. The ability of bats to navigate, avoid obstacles, and apparently detect the form and shape of objects, is well developed. A group of investigators from Arizona has designed a program to duplicate or simulate the physical apparatus used by bats in these processes. The results of this research might provide some insight into the way that sensory systems provide mental imagery concerned with object locations, visualization, and orientation. If the device to simulate the bat echo system of location is successful, it could be adapted to give the blind greater mobility.

Other important practical uses of information gained from this kind of research relate to civilian and military sonar-type devices—in mining and submarine activity for instance.

STUDIES IN SILENT THINKING

The research on silent thinking is being conducted by Dr. Irving Maltzman at the University of California and is designed to gain insight into the thought processes of mentally disturbed persons, particularly schizophrenics. Mutism is a part of the pathology of schizophrenia; hence, one of the great problems in the study and treatment of mental illness is the inability to communicate with the patient because he is unwilling or unable to say what he thinks or feels.

Dr. Maltzman has devised a method for circumventing this problem—a method which, in the words of scientific reviewers of the application, is "experimentally ingenious." He is using several physiological measures that can indicate the patient's reactions to words or ideas without his having to respond verbally to the ideas, and it is in this sense that he is studying "silent thinking". In this way the investigator hopes to find out some of the ways in which the thinking of mentally disturbed persons differs from that of normal people. If we can obtain this information, we can hope, eventually, to devise better methods of treatment of the mentally ill.

RED TUNA AND YELLOW FAT DISEASES IN THE CAT

This grant is concerned with reducing high cholesterol blood levels in the human body. Possible agents for accomplishing this reduction include certain fatty acids found in fish oils. Large amounts of these highly unsaturated fatty acids are contained in marine fish oils. However, a toxic effect from these acids in red tuna has been recognized in the cat.

Yellow fat disease in the cat appears to stem from the toxicity of the unsaturated fatty acid of the tuna. It is possible that the use of antioxidants (substances which hinder oxidation) will overcome the toxic effects, permitting the fatty acid to be tested for its ability to lower cholesterol. Under the grant program, several oxidants will be tested in an attempt to treat or prevent yellow fat disease in experimental animals before any recommendation whatsoever is made in prescribing fatty acids for the human.

A STEREOTACTIC ATLAS OF THE BEAGLE BRAIN

In recent years an exact knowledge of the brain, and specifically of the location of functions within the brain, has assumed very great importance. Such knowledge is essential to facilitate the surgical treatment of such neurological disorders as Parkinson's disease and other forms of involuntary movement. In the past, surgical procedures have also been utilized in the treatment of mental illness.

Obviously, the use of such procedures on the human patient must be preceded by animal experiments. The dog is the most suitable available animal for this type of study. However, because of the variety of breeds of dogs which are used for this research and also because there is tremendous variation in the size, shape, and configuration of the brain of various species of dogs, it has been extremely difficult to develop standardized procedures for the study of the brain. It has been especially difficult to develop a method whereby lesions can be placed with accuracy in deeper parts of the brain without the destruction of large overlying areas. The beagle is a readily available species of dog, and because of many years of inbreeding, the structure and function of the brain can be relied upon.

The stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain consists of a complicated system of cross sectional diagrams which indicates with accuracy the relationship of each structure within the brain to the surface landmarks overlying it. Such an atlas is essential to any investigator who wishes to know, with accuracy, the location of a probe, or other instrument which is inserted into the substance of the brain.

The sums of money involved in the National Institutes of Health grants are relatively small compared with research grants for defense-oriented subjects. One rarely reads any editorial questioning of the validity of the defense grants, however. In this context, your editorial of February 7 brings to mind an editorial which appeared in another important American newspaper, the Washington Post, on October 29, 1951, under the title "Research Grants." This editorial said:

"A few Members of Congress and certain elements of the local press have had a good deal of fun lately at the expense of the Public Health Service's National Institute of Mental Health. It seems that funds amounting to about $750,000 were recently given out for some 58 basic and applied research studies, some of which didn't seem to make sense to the critics. We suggest to the Congressmen and to our colleagues alike that it may be very dangerous to ridicule what they do not understand. And as an object lesson in point, we offer an excerpt from a Washington Post editorial—a long, fulminating, powerful editorial—of November 2, 1900:

"'Of all the silly and nonsensical rigamarole about yellow fever that has yet found its way into print, and there has been enough of it to load a fleet, the silliest beyond compare is to be found in the arguments and theories engendered by the mosquito hypothesis.'

"The editorial demolished the mosquito hypothesis which was being investigated at the time by a Maj. Walter Reed. On February 6, 1901, however, this same Major Reed was able to announce conclusive proof that mosquitoes were yellow fever carriers. It would be hard to estimate the number of human lives saved by allowing him to go ahead with his 'silly and nonsensical rigamarole.'

"Mental illness is dangerously widespread in America, and the need for searching study of its causes is very great. It is easy—but not always sensible—to laugh at some of the theories of psychologists and psychiatrists. Not many of us are well equipped, however, to dismiss them as absurd. The Mental Health Institute's grants are carefully sifted by qualified scientists and laymen who have no connection with the Government. Perhaps it would be best, and safest, to leave the determination to them."

There may be valid reasons for a debate over some National Institutes of Health policies and procedures, but this dialog should be carried on in an informed and sophisticated manner rather than one which would poke glib fun at titles of grants for research on which the author knows no more than the title. It takes time, however, to learn about such complex matters, and editorial writers often are prone to make one-factor analyses of multifactor problems and events. I wish life were that simple.

Some of these project titles may sound odd to laymen, but they are not really intended for the lay public. The titles are devised by the scientists themselves, I am told, and are designed simply to inform other specialists what the research project is about.

The Midwest at present is undergoing an agonizing appraisal of how, when and where it can get additional support for research and development commitments from both private industry and government. Certainly, town must make a better effort to understand what gown is trying to accomplish, especially when it has much to do with the future health of the men and women in town.

I am not suggesting that editorial writers abandon fair and informed comments about research activities at universities or in hospitals or other academic institutions. There is a great need for considerably more intelligent and informed discussion about such activities. However, before such comment is made, it seems to me there is a responsibility that editorial writers fill their intelligence gaps in this increasingly important area of knowledge.

Sincerely,

CARL W. LARSEN.

Accelerated Public Works Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be of considerable benefit to all concerned with the supplemental appropriation for the accelerated public works program to have a concise summary—in outline form—of the accomplishments of the program to date. I hope that my colleagues will give their most thoughful attention to these figures, and that they will see them not in terms of the adding machine, but in terms of the crying human need which they so graphically convey. I sincerely request that this distinguished Chamber will have the courage and the compassion to fulfill its self-imposed obligation to extend and to continue this most vital program. The summary follows:

STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

I. ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF APW PROGRAM TO DATE

A. Allocation of funds as of cutoff date, January 24, 1963: $394 million allocated. (Retained in contingency reserve: $3.7 million.)

B. Total projects approved as of January 24, 1963: 3,756 projects approved.

C. Effect of accelerated public works on unemployment:

1. Actual on-site employment generated since October 13, 1962: 50,000 jobs of 1 year's duration.

2. Estimate of off-site employment stimulated: for every man put to work by accelerated public works funds, at least one other person had a job in a related industry: 50,000 additional jobs.

3. Total employment created: 100,000 jobs in all.

D. Distribution of projects and funds:

1. State and local: 1,582 projects; $289,935,000; 72 percent of funds.

2. Federal programs: 2,174 projects; $104,065,000; 28 percent of funds.

E. Distribution of funds by States:

Alabama	$7,918
Alaska	4,054
Arizona	5,000
Arkansas	5,144
California	11,101
Colorado	2,366
Connecticut	3,963
Delaware	93
Florida	5,899
Georgia	4,897
Hawaii	546
Idaho	3,180
Illinois	7,878
Indiana	3,838
Iowa	385
Kansas	162
Kentucky	13,275
Louisiana	12,472
Maine	1,655
Maryland	957
Massachusetts	5,837
Michigan	23,811
Minnesota	6,378
Mississippi	6,930
Missouri	4,831
Montana	3,177
Nebraska	1,231
Nevada	332
New Hampshire	1,037
New Jersey	15,479
New Mexico	7,017
New York	10,625
North Carolina	7,681
North Dakota	497
Ohio	8,683
Oklahoma	7,042
Oregon	6,250
Pennsylvania	25,315
Rhode Island	6,204
South Carolina	4,391
South Dakota	1,139
Tennessee	9,187
Texas	5,310
Utah	2,710
Vermont	391
Virginia	1,211
Washington	6,821
West Virginia	11,200
Wisconsin	3,237

Wyoming	$727
Guam	105
Puerto Rico	6,333
Virgin Islands	326

F. State-by-State distribution of funds according to amount of grant:

[In thousands]

1. Pennsylvania	$25,315
2. Michigan	23,811
3. New Jersey	15,479
4. Kentucky	13,275
5. Louisiana	12,472
6. West Virginia	11,200
7. California	11,101
8. New York	10,625
9. Tennessee	9,187
10. Ohio	8,683
11. Alabama	7,918
12. Illinois	7,878
13. North Carolina	7,681
14. Oklahoma	7,024
15. New Mexico	7,017
16. Mississippi	6,930
17. Puerto Rico	6,821
18. Minnesota	6,378
19. Washington	6,333
20. Oregon	6,250
21. Rhode Island	6,204
22. Florida	5,899
23. Massachusetts	5,837
24. Texas	5,310
25. Arkansas	5,144
26. Arizona	5,000
27. Georgia	4,897
28. Missouri	4,831
29. South Carolina	4,391
30. Alaska	4,054
31. Connecticut	3,963
32. Indiana	3,838
33. Wisconsin	3,237
34. Idaho	3,180
35. Montana	3,177
36. Utah	2,710
37. Colorado	2,366
38. Maine	1,655
39. Nebraska	1,231
40. Virginia	1,211
41. South Dakota	1,139
42. New Hampshire	1,037
43. Maryland	957
44. Wyoming	727
45. Hawaii	546
46. North Dakota	497
47. Vermont	391
48. Iowa	385
49. Nevada	322
50. Virgin Islands	326
51. Kansas	162
52. Guam	105
53. Delaware	93

II. BACKLOG OF ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

A. Projects submitted and waiting to be approved: 5,678 projects.

B. Funds required for this backlog: $1,285,735,000. (Approximately $1.3 billion.)

C. Since December 1962, projects have been submitted at the rate of: $450 million per month.

III. EFFECTS OF $450 MILLION ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

A. On-site employment to be created: 55,000 jobs.

B. Off-site employment to be generated: 55,000 jobs.

C. Total employment to be generated through $850 million accelerated public works funds: 210,000 jobs of 1 year's duration.

D. Would put back to work (approximately): 10 percent of unemployed in distressed areas.

Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area in Which To Lose More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on page A1777 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 28, 1963, I inserted a copy of a letter written to the Secretary of the Interior by Mr. T. E. Roach, president of the Idaho Power Co. Mr. Roach's letter quite properly protested the proposal being entertained by the Secretary of the Interior to extend the Bonneville Power Administration electric power marketing area into southern Idaho, where the electric needs of the area are being well supplied at reasonable rates by Mr. Roach's company.

Mr. Roach's letter to Secretary Udall called attention to the fact that the economic condition in Bonneville's present power marketing left much to be desired, in comparison with the area in southern Idaho served by the Idaho Power Co. and other tax paying electric utility companies.

The fact that Bonneville is now operating at a loss in excess of $15 million annually and has predicted it will have a shortage of 1,300,000 kilowatts of firm power by 1970, should in itself preclude any thought of spending up to $100 million of the taxpayers' money to extend its system into an area now being served at reasonable rates well below the national average.

Mr. Roach's letter to Secretary Udall referred to critical editorials of newspapers published in the Idaho area proposed to be invaded by Bonneville. The following editorial is the first of a series which are indicative of southern Idaho's desire to have none of the subsidized Federal power which failed to bring the heralded economic utopia to the Bonneville area. I urge my colleagues to read each of the series as I present them day by day.

BPA POLITICAL CLAPTRAP

Of all the political claptrap which is being foisted on Idaho voters this fall, nothing ranks higher in plain asinity than the proposal to include southern Idaho in the area served by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The bait is economics: The rosy-hued promise that's all southern Idaho needs to stimulate its economy; to get up and go places.

We need BPA power just about as much as we need two railroads which would, inevitably, be at each other's throat and result in bankrupting both of them. Of course, BPA wouldn't go broke; the taxpayers are already subsidizing BPA to the tune of about $15 million a year.

If there were any sense whatever to the idea that BPA is all southern Idaho needs for rapid economic progress and development, what's the matter with northern Idaho? North Idaho has been in the area served by BPA for years and if Idaho has an economic sore spot, it's that part of the State.

Southern Idaho has been doing all right. We'll keep right on doing all right if only Uncle Sam can be induced to leave us alone.

A Timely Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a modern fable with a strong point to make appeared on March 31. The newsletter of our able colleague from Texas, Hon. JIM WRIGHT, offers a subtle, but most effective, explanation of one of the most controversial transactions of modern times.

I heartily commend this document to my colleagues as enjoyable, enlightening, and eloquent literature.

The article follows:

A TIMELY FABLE

Once upon a time, in a fair and bountiful land where many animals lived, there stood a curious five-sided house. It nestled alongside a broad river in a big and majestic city.

In this house lived a mule, a goat, and a falcon. To them the other animals of the land had entrusted the job of protecting their country from an angry red bear which snorted the kind of fire from which the sun is made and, on occasion, thumped his shoe upon the table.

The mule, the goat, and the falcon all were anxious to protect the land, but among themselves they were very quarrelsome. Each had his own idea on how to defeat the red bear in case he should attack.

"I shall meet him on the land, and with my great mobility and firepower, I shall kick him to death," brayed the mule, flecking a bit of lint from his forest green suit.

"Tut, tut, there will be no need of that" sneered the goat, who was resplendent in his dark blue suit with gold stripes. "My specialty is the sea, and if the bear ever threatens our shores, I shall butt him right out of the water."

"Nonsense," jeered the falcon, proudly displaying the silver wings on his light blue suit. "If the bear should attack, I shall fly to his homeland, peck out his eyes and destroy his ability to fight."

So it went for many years, with the three animals incessantly bickering among themselves.

Nowhere did these arguments cause more concern than on a gentle hill which lay just across the river. Here lived a great herd of donkeys and elephants. Even though they themselves were not immune from petty jealousies, they realized there was a desperate need to eliminate the tumult within the great five-sided house. After the donkeys had done much braying and the elephants had done much trumpeting, they decided that another animal should be chosen to take complete charge of the occupants of the five-sided house.

Now it happened that in a large white house not far from the hill there lived an eagle. It was decided to let the eagle choose the animal to be in charge of the five-sided house, provided, of course, that the donkeys and the elephants approved of the eagle's choice.

Many years passed, and several different eagles moved in and out of the large white house. Each eagle chose an animal to live in the five-sided house. Alas, however, the mule, the goat, and the falcon never really stopped their bickering. They seemed to resent every animal that was put in charge of them, and each continued to go pretty much his own way.

Finally one day a new eagle moved into the large white house. This eagle had some very definite ideas about the animal that should be put in charge of the five-sided house. He wanted a wise, but young, owl.

It so happened that just such an owl lived in a busy city to the west. This owl made a living by providing engines to be used in crossing narrow inlets on the shore of a large lake, the Fjord Motor Co., some animals called it.

The owl consented to take charge of the five-sided house, and the animals on the hill generally approved.

"He's very wise," nodded the donkeys.

"And he can bring to the house the valuable cost-cutting lessons he learned in private enterprise," trumpeted the elephants.

Soon after moving into the five-sided house the owl discovered that the goat and the falcon were planning to buy new swords. Separate kinds, of course.

"Why can't you both buy the same type of sword and save money?" the owl asked.

"That's quite impossible," said the goat with a patronizing smile. "Yes, quite," agreed the falcon. When the owl asked why, the goat tried to explain.

"You see, my sword is to be used at sea," he said. "I have always bought a sword shaped sort of like a 'T'."

"And my sword," put in the falcon, "is to be used for the air and must have something of an 'F' shape."

The wise young owl pulled a slide rule out from under his wing and appeared quite thoughtful. "Perhaps an 'X' shaped sword might serve you both," he observed. "We could call it the TFX, and it would save a billion dollars."

Panic gripped the goat and the falcon.

"It won't work," cried one.

"It's never been done before," shrieked the other.

The owl consulted his slide rule again. "Nevertheless I think we should try it. Even though the TFX might not exactly suit your individual preferences, I will promise you that it will provide a far better sword than either of you now has."

Crestfallen and bitter, the goat and the falcon left the owl.

"Whatever shall we do?" cried the goat.

"We shall march straight to the Hill and complain to our powerful friends," said the falcon. "One of the donkeys is a particularly close friend of mine."

The goat appeared puzzled. "But aren't the elephants and the donkeys on the Hill also very close friends of the owl?" he asked.

"They have been," the falcon gloated. "But they may change their minds if we tell them that the owl is robbing us of an effective means of protecting the country, and that it would be cheaper and better to build two different swords."

"But is that true?" demanded the goat.

"Sure it is," smirked the falcon, winking and nudging the goat in the ribs. "Sure it is."

Moral: As long as we're going to have an owl, we ought to believe in him because he seems to be the only one who gives a hoot.

The Need for a Central Soil and Water Conservation Research Facility in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues once again to the proposal for soil and water research laboratory in Pendleton, Oreg.

Mr. Floyd Root, chairman of the Oregon Wheat Commission, is one of the most qualified exponents of the laboratory. He knows that the progress of my State, the West, and the whole country, depends in large measure on the care we take to preserve and improve our soil and water resources. We cannot hope to do this without research.

Mr. Root's statement for the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee is one of the best summaries of the case for the Pendleton Research Laboratory I have seen. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE NEED FOR A CENTRAL SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION RESEARCH FACILITY IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

(By Floyd Root)

In 1958, in response to a request of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture appointed a committee which prepared the most comprehensive study ever made in the field of soil and water conservation research. The findings of the committee were published as Senate Document No. 59—86th Congress. The report documented the need for over $20 million of additional funds for research scientists and engineers, scientific equipment and facilities, and operating expenses to carry on additional research in urgently needed soil and water research.

In the intervening years since the study was made, limited progress has been made in the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report. To date, approximately 20 of the 46 facility or program items have been either partially or fully implemented entailing only about 20 percent of the recommended funding. This fact appears to be inconsistent with the intent of the 86th Congress and President Kennedy's announced concern with the conservation of two of our greatest natural resources—soil and water.

The intelligent management and development of these resources will be a major factor in our future economic growth. Both basic and applied research is needed for the solution of problems of soil and water conservation.

The need for a central soil and water research laboratory in the Pacific Northwest wheat area as recommended in Senate Document No. 59 is critical. The Pacific Northwest and the Columbia Plateau in particular present a special problem in water runoff and soil erosion not generally found in other areas of the United States.

Here is what happens:

1. Snow falls on frozen ground. As the weather turns warm, the snow melts and gradually begins to cut small rills in the cultivated fields. The soil is frozen and cannot absorb the water from the melted snow. Fifty percent of the annual precipitation of 8 to 20 inches occurs during the winter months when the ground may be frozen.

2. Warming weather is often accompanied by high intensity rains. The soil is still frozen so the volume of water and topsoil runoff increases. Soil losses may run as high as 150 tons or an average of 1 inch of top soil per acre on a 32-percent slope. Farming on slopes of 50 percent is not uncommon in the region.

3. Large gullies several feet deep are sometimes formed in a 24-hour runoff period.

4. The muddy water travels to the sea, often talking out bridges, flooding towns and cities.

Why the problem is critical:

Erosion is no longer solely an agricultural problem. Although we deplore the loss of highly productive agricultural land, the effect on the general economy and well being of the people of the United States is also of concern:

1. The inevitable result of eroded land is decreased productivity, leading to higher per unit costs and higher food prices to consumers.

2. Silt pollution of streams contaminates reservoirs and endangers city water supplies.

3. Deposits of silt in basins behind dams decreases irrigation storage capacity, flood control capacity, electric power generation and recreation value.

This is what can be done to help solve the problem:

Senate Document No. 59 (p. 160) recommends construction funds of $425,000 to provide office, laboratory, and related capitol construction at Pendleton, Oreg. Proposed operating funds of $285,000 annually were indicated to "develop information needed for effective field practices to conserve moisture, prevent erosion, and maintain good tilth on the Ritzville and Walla Walla soils in the Pacific Northwest."

Provision of this facility and operating funds would permit a staff of scientists and technicians to effectively work on the pressing problems of the area. For example, improved mechanical and management systems could be developed to—

1. Increase infiltration and storage of water on the land. Holding moisture where it falls for later use is the ultimate in soil and water conservation in dryland areas.

2. Augment ground water recharge.

3. Provide water spreading on range land.

4. Ascertain the value and practicality of small catchment basins on cultivated land.

New knowledge in the above aspects of soil and water conservation when applied to the land will—

1. Reduce runoff losses and resultant soil erosion.

2. Lessen sedimentation in reservoirs used for municipal water supplies, recreation, and storage of irrigation water.

3. Decrease costly silting of rivers and harbors.

4. Conserve surplus waters during spring runoff for efficient and economic utilization later in the season.

How the research would be carried out:

As recommended in Senate Document No. 59, the Central Laboratory would be located at Pendleton, Oreg. The work would be carried out in cooperation with various local, State, and Federal agencies. Parts of the work would be conducted at existing experiment stations away from Pendleton such as at Moro, Oreg., and Lind, Wash., and on farmer's fields or other experimental sites throughout the region in order to develop practices which are applicable to the varied climatic, soil and topographic conditions encountered.

In summary, research facilities and programs are urgently needed at Pendleton to develop methods and techniques to keep the limited and poorly distributed precipitation

on aproximately 11 million acres of land which will help reduce or spread peak runoff and resultant damaging floods, and improve sustained water yields from upstream watersheds.

In 1960 the Senate Committee on Appropriations placed the Pendleton facility No. 22 on the list of 45 priority items. It is now very near the top (second or third of the remaining facilities). We strongly urge the Congress to continue the policy of implementing a few of the top priority projects each year.

The Pendleton facility has been endorsed by several organizations such as—

1. The Associations of Soil Conservation Districts in the states of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.
2. The Wheat Growers Associations in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.
3. The Area and National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.
4. The National Association of Wheat Growers.

We all appreciate the efforts that have been made in the past toward implementing Senate Document No. 59. We look forward to continued progress.

A Free World Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Franciscan Message, a monthly magazine published by the Franciscan Fathers of Pulaski, Wis., carried an article in its April 1963 issue dealing with the subject of our discriminatory immigration laws. Recently I joined many other Members of Congress in introducing legislation to amend our immigration laws and this article effectively presents the argument in favor of fair adjustment of these laws. I insert the article in the RECORD, directing the attention of the Members to its vivid description of the history of immigration to this country:

A FREE WORLD FAILURE

(By Alice Ogle)

The Congress of the United States has given Americans a black eye all over the world.

While it involves itself in major battles, other important issues often get lost. The need to change the archaic and discriminatory provisions of our immigration laws is one such neglected issue.

It's not enough to say, "I don't know anything about such laws." Dominican Jerome Hamer calls noninformation a sin and says that a willingness to be informed is part of the lay apostolate, that such a willingness can bind together the total dimensions of all the problems of the world that are becoming more and more unified. It implies, thus, an international perspective that is based upon the desire for true understanding."

The example of Father Dominique Pire, the Belgian Dominican priest who, since 1949, has made hard-core refugee cases his life's work, should make it impossible for Catholics to plead ignorance of what steps must be taken in the name of justice. His map of relief enterprises is labeled L'Europe du Coeur, Europe of the Heart. It's a label that should spread to our country; particularly to our country, for not one of us can say he hasn't immigrant or refugee roots.

When anyone shows lack of enthusiasm for newcomers to the United States, my husband talks about his grandparents: "They came from Ireland where they had no freedom of religion or education and not even freedom from hunger, and they settled along the mud flats of the Mississippi River near St. Paul, Minn. There they lived in shacks; they were squatters.

"John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul, and Jim Hill, head of a railroad, made it possible for them to leave the religious and economic pressures of the Ireland of that time. Grandfather got a job working on the railroad. This family soon had plenty to eat and could go to school and to mass with complete freedom.

"Then Italians and Poles began arriving from Europe to settle alongside the Irish in their shanties, and some of the latter protested this invasion. My grandfather would shake his head and say 'How quickly we forget that we all are refugees and descendants of refugees. It is not difficult sometimes to despise the human race.' "

Into this country has poured confusion of bloods, omegas of peoples, moods of continents, melting pots of seas, flavors of tongues, yesterdays of martyrs—and the tomorrows. It is easy to forget that it isn't one nationality or race that made America great, but the niagaras of little peoples from everywhere, the white gulf streams of Europe, the black tidal waves of Africa, the yellow neaptides of Asia.

A La Guardia shaped the cosmos of Manhattan. A Brandeis opened many eyes to our Constitution. Madam Kai-shek came here and interpreted the Orient. A man named Zvak built St. Paul's Cathedral in a forest of skyscrapers. And Marian Anderson bewitches continents with the talisman of her art. To forget that this land is an immense forest with loin roots in a hundred lands is to be an especially distasteful kind of isolationist.

In the early 1600's, a few colonists came to America and touched off a tidal wave of migration that became the greatest mass movement of people in history. English pioneers set up colonies of little more than 100 persons at Plymouth and Jamestown. A little band of Dutch settled New Amsterdam. A few French set up outposts along the Mississippi River to settle later in Louisiana. A few Swedes settled at Fort Christina, Del., and groups of Spaniards established colonies in the Southwest and Florida. And each colony set up its own standards for the selection of immigrants. Policies varied during this early period.

There were no Federal laws governing admission of aliens, however, until 1798 when the Alien Act was passed. It empowered the President to order any alien deemed dangerous to this country to depart from the United States—but the law expired after 2 years.

In 1882 the first general immigration statute was enacted, an act that provided for a head tax of 50 cents and barred admission into the country of persons likely to become public charges, convicts, and mental incompetents. Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, marking the beginning of anti-Chinese legislation. There were 200,000 Chinese in the country when the Exclusion Act was passed. They had come because of a famine in the Canton region of China to find employment in California mining camps.

Statistics are dull, but in order to get the true picture of the melting pot that is America it is necessary to know at least some of the history of immigration.

Between 1881 and 1920, 23½ million aliens were admitted for permanent residence. Nearly 90 percent came from Europe.

The peak of immigration, reached during the years 1905 to 1914, amounted to over 10 million immigrants, arriving in waves of a million or more in most of these years. Then came World War I, and travel difficulties accounted for a decline in immigration during the war years. After 1919, however, it increased again—but with a shift in the origins of immigrants.

Whereas 80 percent of the European immigrants had been coming from western and northern Europe, now there began a large movement to the United States from southern and eastern Europe. Millions came from Italy and Austria-Hungary and from Russia. They came because of famine or religious or political oppression, just as the Irish, English, and Germans had come earlier—and many of whom now resented invasion of people not of their origins.

Changes in our immigration laws were made to admit certain aliens as nonquota immigrants, people from Canada, Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and other South American nations. The laws included husbands, wives, and children. There was then no separation of families.

In 1943 Chinese immigrants were declared eligible for naturalization; and in 1945, the War Brides Act was passed, making it possible for nearly 115,000 brides and 4,669 children to come into this country under this act. And then a new kind of immigrant was born: the displaced person.

The highly humane displaced Persons Act was passed by Congress in June 1948, allowing over 400,000 visas for DP's. Then a Federal agency, the Displaced Persons Commission, was established to administer this law.

For a time, refugees from slave nations came by the thousands, sometimes to be greeted with great enthusiasm by Americans on their arrival, for there was a kind of free-world spirit for awhile. But in 1952, the controversial McCarran-Walter Act became law, one designed to repeal all existing immigration and nationality laws and revise and codify all such laws.

Total annual immigration quotas remained substantially the same as before. However, the first 50 percent (first preference) of the quota was reserved to certain highly skilled or educated persons whose immigration would benefit the United States considerably. Second preference was given to alien parents of U.S. citizens, and to spouses or children of some aliens (how the selection is made has never been clear to the ordinary citizen) who had been admitted as immigrants. Some close relatives of U.S. citizens were given fourth preference under the act, and remaining quota numbers for each country were given to persons not eligible to apply under any previous provision.

That's the way the law reads. The fact that it splits families and refuses entry very often to persons who have waited a miserably long time led Eugene Lyons, a Reader's Digest editor, to call the law "the half-open door." It has caused U.S. bishops to ask, "Are we doing all we can to help the refugee and displaced person? Are our laws sufficiently compassionate? Are we sufficiently sensitive to problems such as reuniting families or providing homes for orphan children of other lands?" Dwight D. Eisenhower once called the McCarran-Walter Act niggardly.

No one can forget how the problem was met in 1956, when nearly 200,000 Hungarians fled their homeland after an unsuccessful revolt against Communist oppression—and touched the hearts of free men everywhere. What followed then showed that an aroused world opinion can achieve miracles. Red tape was slashed; immigration laws were relaxed. Within a few months, 35 countries had given permanent asylum to more than

140,000 escapees from Hungary. Within 1 year, only about 20,000 still remained unsettled. The problem had been diminished to manageable size. In short compassion and generosity for once prevailed over pettifogging caution.

Meanwhile, there was a sad byproduct of this preoccupation with Hungarians: an all but total eclipse of interest in earlier refugees from other Iron Curtain countries occurred. Men and women who had grown old and sick waiting in refugee camps for a chance to emigrate heard in bewilderment about the way Hungarians were whisked off to new homes. "Why?" they asked. "Why not us too?" Haven't we also given up everything for freedom?"

Actually, the Hungarian operation proved that the refugee problem can be solved. "It needs only to be tackled on the same international scale and in the same generous spirit," says Lyons. This senior editor of Reader's Digest is an expert on communism; and it was from his interest in the evils of Red despotism that his concern for people who struggle to escape it derived. He says that "senseless restrictions and bureaucratic flypaper account for a large proportion of unsettled thousands in other lands. Screening to weed out the undeserving and subversive is unavoidable, of course. But, unhappily, the rules and procedures are not uniform, and the refugee has little notion of his rights. Scared and anxious, he may lie or make mistakes in answering questions, then find himself helplessly—and sometimes lastingly—bound in redtape."

He has vast praise for such organizations as the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, whose task it is to find transport for all types of emigrants, as well as the U.S. escapee program under the State Department. The U.S. escapee program has interpreted its mandate liberally to make the outstanding contribution in both political and human terms. It does not itself engage in welfare activities but channels its aid through private organizations such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and other benevolent groups."

In a Rumanian novel about DP's, "The 25th Hour," by C. V. Gheorghiu, one of the book's characters says, "When we shall no longer be mere numbers, categories and statistics, but men, unique and irreplaceable in our individuality, then only will our humanity be restored." This is the soul of the refugee challenge.

There would be no America without immigrants, many of them escapees from oppression of earlier times. The story of what they accomplished is one of the most amazing and inspiring stories ever written. They came and hewed forests, drained swamps, prepared soil for cultivation. They leveled roadbeds, laid ties and drove spikes into narrow bands of steel to link the new West with the developing industries in the East.

They bored into the bowels of the earth and they swayed dangerously on tall steel girders to create immense factories and huge cliff dwellings. Voices of every land merged with the roar of flying shuttles, whirling cogs and clanging levers. They swarmed the docks to unload ships and toiled in freight yards to help move the products of millions of their own countrymen. They sold these products over store counters in countless stores and shops. Women, and even young children, from across the seas have served long hours in sweatshops or in piecework in dimly lit tenements. Without these people, there would be no American prosperity—and no America.

Dr. Thomas Dooley told Americans over and over again that "there are few employed Americans whose lot is not incomparably better than that of the overwhelming majority of workers in the rest of the world. When we realize that a great portion of the world's population goes to bed hungry each night and preventable disease is endemic in whole countries, we know our sacrifices are relatively minor."

They are nearly too small to consider when seen against the problems of men, women, and children who live in minimal decency while waiting endlessly for permission to achieve refugee status. Desperate fugitives from communism dream of freedom, a dream that too often finally dissolves in the nightmare of a smelly overcrowded compound of misery. Father Pire's experiences have made the world aware of this injustice, a world that seems to be largely uncaring.

There are words, uttered centuries ago, that should awaken consciences even in the chambers of the U.S. Congress where laws are made or changed:

"I was thirsty and you gave Me to drink;

"I was a stranger and you took Me in; naked and you covered Me; sick and you visited Me;

"I was in prison and you came to Me.

"Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of My brethren, you did it for Me" (Matthew 25: 35–40).

The 65th Anniversary of the Blowing Up of the Battleship "Maine" and of the War With Spain

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the annual occasion on which I reach out with the hope, and somehow the faith, that I am talking to history.

No greater disservice ever has been done the image of our country in our own eyes, as well as the eyes of the world, as that rendered by some modern writers in their treatment of the War with Spain, which was triggered by the blowing up of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Savana 65 years ago on Friday last.

They misinterpret the motivations and the events of a earlier period of old-fashioned American patriotism and a war of pure idealism. I have no personal quarrel with them, any more than I have with fine and beautiful ladies who conform to changing dress vogues even when the current styles in their individual cases might not enhance their own types of beauty.

In 1898 most American women were their own dressmakers. They had neither the money nor the desire to buy store clothes. In most cases they had a feminine pride in designing and sewing together their own gowns, and most mothers made the dresses of their children and with the sons down to their first short trousers on their graduation from kilts.

No one in his right mind would look to a well-dressed American woman of 1963, and most American women do have taste, to pass judgment on the styles and dress of 1898. How, then, can one accept the interpretation of the spirit of 1898, when America moved forward in a war of unselfish idealism to meet its rendezvous with destiny, by historians born years after the event?

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. Speaker, I have said that in my remarks today, as well as the remarks I have made every year in this historic Chamber since first I was elected to the Congress, I have the hope, and somehow the faith, that I am speaking to history. I am thinking of the researchers who will come, long after all of us have played our parts and are gone, to the Library of Congress and will browse over the printed volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am thinking of the time, far away perhaps, when in the perspective and evaluation of history the 50-year period beginning with the War with Spain, then a period of peace and muscle flexing, and World War I, then another period of peace and preparation, and World War II, all this as the 50-year war that ushered in the golden centuries of American world leadership.

WAR OF PURE IDEALISM

I want to set the record straight for these researchers. The commencement of this cycle of half a century that changed the world more drastically than any material cycle of events in history was the War with Spain. It was a war of pure idealism. It was the only war in history fought entirely, as far as the United States was concerned, by volunteers. It was fought on land and sea in the Pacific and the Atlantic. On land it was fought by green troops, inadequately equipped, with food unfit for human consumption and practically no medicine. Against these staggering odds, the war on land and sea in the Pacific and the Atlantic was fought and won in 7½ months.

No war in the history of the world in comparable time accomplished so much for freedom and mankind. It started a chain of dynamic events that changed the political face of the universe and carried every human being in the world forward in his eternal quest for a higher plateau of human contentment and dignity.

It was a war of idealism. The "Spirit of 1898" was an expression of old-fashioned American patriotism, of faith in God and country. It was a rededication of all the American people, in cities and hamlets and on the farms, to the pledge of the signers of the Declaration of Independence of their "lives and fortunes and sacred honor." It was proclaimed and waged and terminated in the finest spirit of self-abnegation ever shown in all recorded history.

VANQUISHED SPAIN HELPED TO ITS FEET

What nation in all history has accorded to a crushed and beaten foe, stripped forever of its once-proud world power, its day of glory ended and poverty at home eating at its vitals, the compassion that the United States showed to Spain? Instead of demanding war indemnity to cover the cost of the war that we had won, the United States actually helped the vanquished Spain to get back on its feet to care for its own impoverished people.

To the peoples of Puerto Rico, liberated from the enslavement of colonialism, the United States gave vast sums of money, by the standards of that period, to tide them over a devastating famine.

To the brave soldiers of Cuba, who long had waged a war for liberation against overwhelming odds until American soldiers joined them as comrades in freedom's fight, the United States gave liberal payments in money with which to buy the tools of agriculture to rebuild the shattered economy of their beloved country. The United States gave to Cuba, freely, unconditionally, and with our blessing and good wishes, the independence as a sovereign nation that long had been the dream of every Cuban heart.

To the Philippines we sent the cream of our youth to serve in all the remote corners of the island as schoolteachers laying the stout foundations in education of popular government as they had been laid in our own country. No other nation in all the recorded history of mankind, left by a war that it had won in possession of such rich territories, wrested from the enemy, abstained as did the United States from taking 1 acre for itself or 1 cent of tribute and instead poured out its wealth in money, sweat, toil, and sacrifice for human betterment in a spirit of pure idealism.

LAW OF POLITICAL GRAVITATION

The women of 1898 were not ashamed of the homemade dresses they wore. The men of 1898 were not ashamed of their simple honest faith in their country, their idealism, and their indoctrination with good old-fashioned patriotism.

No generation can be reconstructed on the customs, the conditions and the mores of a later generation. The historians who find permanent place in the world's literature first have reached maturity in a realization of this eternal truth.

The law of gravitation has a political as well as physical impact. It is manifest in the rise and fall of empires, of dynasties, of world powers if we read the histories of those departed eras with the guiding thought to our interpretation that all life is change and the flower of spring has the destiny ahead of development into the fruit or vegetable of the late summer or the autumn. In no lesser measurement young nations, the products of ever-changing conditions, are drawn on to their destinies by the pull of the law of a political gravitation that as yet we have not charted and recognize only in its dim outlines.

On my study missions to Africa I sense in the faces and the voices, not only of those of education and training in leadership, but of the unlettered masses as well, clear evidence of a pull of political gravitation somewhat comparable, I fancy, to that experienced by our early Americans.

In 1898 the term "manifest destiny" was still in popular usage. In this generation it is a term in disfavor. In 1963, when we have become the most powerful nation of the free world, we speak properly of "world responsibility." We are what we are, and ours is a position of grave responsibility. Our use of words and phraseology must be realistic and exact.

IN 1898 WE WERE WHAT WE WERE TO BE

In 1898 we were, in the minds of our people, what we were to be. We were as the blossoming buds of spring that were to be the fruit and the vegetables of late summer and autum.

A new era was opening. There was to be a half century of alternate war and peace from which the United States was to emerge with the awesome challenge of leading in the task of rebuilding a world of freedom, and understanding and human dignity.

To say that the Americans of 1898 were conscious of events to happen, and that their thinking and their actions were charted by the blueprints of the future, would be sheer recklessness. I mean no such implication.

I do respectfully maintain, however, that among them was a strong compelling sense of what our country was to be, that they gave expression to this innate sense when they used such terms as "manifest destiny," and when they went to war with Spain, still at the time of declaration of war regarded as one of the great world powers.

It was the pull of the law of gravitation, as potent, as eternal, in its political as in physical manifestations.

In an humble effort to recapture for our Nation the spirit of 1898 and to quiet the confusion that has come from the attempt to reconstruct the era on the manners, customs, and mores of 1963, I shall now address myself to what are the most commonly circulated libels on the war with Spain.

LIBEL NO. 1

It was the unwanted war. That is libel No. 1. The fact is that war was declared by the Congress, without a dissenting vote, and not a single Member of the Congress was defeated at the next election because of that vote.

On April 25, 1898, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 10086 by voice and the Senate passed the resolution by unanimity. H.R. 10086 declared that "war exists between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain, and the same is hereby declared to exist, and that war has existed since the 21st day of April A.D. 1898, including said day, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain." It directed and empowered the President of the United States "to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into active service of the United States the militia of the several States to such extent as may be necessary to carry this action into effect."

I would be the first to admit that all wars have been unwanted, in the sense that mothers and fathers in all generations, I am sure, would have preferred the paths of peace for their children. With the benefit of hindsight, possibly many wars could have been avoided. There are so many "ifs" in history.

But, to single out the Spanish-American War, the most idealistic and unselfish armed conflict in our national history, as the unwanted war, as though all others were the legitimate and welcomed children of our national historical family and it alone was the unnatural and unwanted child, is the most unjustifiable of libels.

MCKINLEY AND LINCOLN

Many wars might have been averted if there had been the advantage of hindsight, and in our eternal quest for a permanent peace, a goal I have the faith some day will be reached, I think a useful purpose is served in reviewing the circumstances that preceeded the reaching of the point of no return in the armed conflicts of the past. What I object to is the singling out of our war with Spain.

President McKinley was a man of peace, more interested and better versed in the tariffs governing the trade of the world than in the international tensions that menace international amity. It is, however, unfair to his memory to suggest that he was pulled into the war with Spain against his own judgment and convictions by a tide of emotions and of pressures.

President Abraham Lincoln was a man of peace, and until the last moment before the point of no return, he had hoped that the terrible years of civil war to follow would be averted.

National judgments that lead a representative democracy to the grim tragedy of war come from an interpretation by the executive and the Congress of the will of the people. They represent in the final analysis the meeting of many minds of varying approaches and tests of evaluation.

Much is made in a recent scholarly work on the war with Spain of the belief in the mind of our minister to Spain at the time that Spain was on the verge of departing from Cuba, was even willing to give the island over to annexation by the United States.

Chamberlain, when he returned to England, was filled with the peaceful intentions of Hitler. Human nature, frail and imperfect as it is, can fail both in excessive caution and excessive lack of caution.

ON AUGUST 1, 1898, THE WAR WAS OVER

What should be noted in the recital of Spain's reported willingness to quit its colonial hold on Cuba, without a fight or a murmur, is that the alleged date of the turnover was set at August 1, 1898. I was at Santiago de Cuba on July 17, 1898. I had been there since shortly after mid-June of 1898. On July 17, 1898—the date of the armistic—the fighting was over, the war had been won, and Cuba indeed was free. This was 2 weeks earlier than August 1, 1898. It is quite possible, even probable, that as early as July 1, 1898, when the Spanish fleet at Santiago was sunk and the Spanish army crushed, that Spain was willing to release its hold on Cuba. The war already had been won by the United States.

LIBEL NO. 2

It was Hearst's war. That is libel No. 2. It is pure nonsense. Hearst was a colorful young newspaper publisher of the period, and his newspapers did print dramatic and colorful reports of conditions in Cuba and, after the sinking of the *Maine*, of the angry indignation of the American people in the cities, the hamlets, on the farms, everywhere.

American newspapers, including the highly respected New York Times, gave full coverage to the events leading up to World War I and World War II. I have never heard anyone say that World War I and World War II were brought on by the newspapers.

I was 15 when war was declared, still 15 when I left the sophomore class in high school to enlist. I became 16 a few days thereafter. Young as I was, I was in a much better spot to know the temper of the American people at that time than those who were born years later.

Seven of my high school classmates joined with me in volunteering as soldiers, and we landed in Cuba together after only a few weeks training to fight for what we, our parents at home and the American people as a whole, thought was a noble war of liberation.

When our company entrained at Benton Harbor in Michigan as we left for the fighting front it seemed to me that everybody had turned out to see us off. There were the same crowds at all the stops. When we returned from Cuba after the campaign the crowds were even larger, if that were possible.

I do not think that a boy of 16 is likely to misjudge the emotion and the sentiment that are unveiled in his presence. When I read that someone, attempting to reconstruct the spirit of 1898 half a century later, charges that the War with Spain was brought on by a newspaper I think back to those faces, those cheers, and those prayers of American men and women, in towns and in country places.

Most of them had never seen a New York newspaper. In 1898 no newspaper had a circulation of any considerable size. The Benton Harbor News-Palladium covered the community where I was attending high school. Perhaps 30 or 40 copies of the Tribune and other Chicago newspapers came in; none from New York. Newspapers with circulations reaching a million and more came many years later. There were one or two periodicals, with subscription rates as low as 10 cents a year, with great national circulations, but they did not go in for news.

To charge that the generation of 1898 was duped by journalistic warmongers is an indictment of that generation; of which I and my parents were parts, that I resent.

LIBEL NO. 3—CLOSE TO TREASON

It was a war of imperialism. This is libel No. 3 and one that comes close to treason. It is based upon the thin reasoning that at a later period when the disposition of the Philippines figured in an American political campaign and the cry of imperialism was raised against a relatively small minority of the American people who favored hanging onto the Philippines.

But to say that at the time of the sinking of the *Maine* 65 years ago last Friday, or at the time of the declaration of war on April 25, 1898, lust for power or territory or any selfish gain of any nature whatsoever was a factor, even of the most minor sort, in the making of our national judgment is to participate in a totally unjustified downgrading of our country that merits the condemnation of all thoughtful and patriotic Americans.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE "MAINE'S" HEOROIC DEAD

A war that brought so much to the world, that ushered in events that changed the life of every human being, that cost the United States so much in money and in men, and for the waging and winning of which the United States neither asked nor received one cent or one acre, was one of the great epochal adventures in pure unselfish idealism in the long story of mankind. It reflects the true image of Uncle Sam.

Future generations can honor the memory of the 266 American heroes who died with the *Maine* 65 years ago in no better way than by protecting and preserving that image.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in defense of the generation of my boyhood. It was a generation of good and noble people. It was a generation of simple living and honest thinking men and women. It was a generation of idealists, in the finest expression of that idealism that gives purpose and direction to human ends.

I am grateful to the younger Members of this historic body most of them veterans of World War I or of World War II, many with outstanding combat records of which they never speak. From the bottom of my heart I thank them for their gracious understanding and even kindly treatment of the last veteran of the war with Spain in the Congress of the United States.

As long as Providence and the support of my constituents permit me to remain in the Congress I shall continue annually on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* to do all within my humble power to set the record straight on the war with Spain for succeeding generations.

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at Democratic State Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, the great mayor of the great city of New York on March 28, 1963, the occasion being the Democratic State dinner held at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Hartford, Conn.

I insert this because of the cogent remarks of our mayor dealing with some of the current problems of legislation facing the responsible authorities in this country:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT DEMOCRATIC STATE DINNER, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, HARTFORD, CONN., MARCH 28, 1963

I feel at home here. I certainly ought to. I live and work not too far from here, and I know that some of you, at least, go to work in the same city where I do mine.

I want you to know that I have had the commuters here in mind during these tough weeks of mediating the newspaper strike. I wanted the commuters to have their regular morning and evening reading matters for that train ride on the New Haven. That ride is tough enough, they tell me; but without the Times, the News, the Mirror, or the Herald-Tribune in the morning, and the Post or the Journal or the World-Telegram in the evening, time must have really hung heavy for many of them.

We, in New York City, have made some interesting discoveries during these weeks. We have discovered, among other publications, the Hartford Courant and the New Haven Register. That didn't help the Democratic Party of New York much, either. Some New Yorkers have even discovered that books as well as newspapers can be read on the subways. More seriously, New York City has discovered how important the metropolitan press really is to the city's economy and cultural life, too.

Perhaps even more important is the fact that the absence of the great newspapers of our city has deprived many of our citizens and yours, too, of a sense of contact and involvement in the affairs of our country and the world.

I said a moment ago that I felt quite at home here in Connecticut. That dates back. I went through college and law school not far from here—in New Haven, that is. And I married a Connecticut girl whose family still lives here. Today I feel almost as much at home in Connecticut as I do in the Bronx—or even in Brooklyn.

Now let me say that we of New York City are not only close to Connecticut geographically, but also politically. We are for the same things and against the same things.

There are some differences. While we have more people, you have more Senators—at least more Democratic Senators. And at this time, I want to express my personal tribute and that of the Democrats of New York City to those two men of stature and eminence who proudly and capably represent the State of Connecticut in the U.S. Senate—TOM DODD and ABE RIBICOFF.

I know of no State which can boast a finer brace of Democrats and Americans—both of whom indicate clearly that their contribution to American government is only in its beginnings.

But Connecticut's impact upon the affairs of the Nation is not reserved just to those two men. They are only half the big four of Connecticut's Democratic Party leadership.

Your Governor, your first citizen, combines statesmanship with commonsense and political know-how with ways of good government. New York City salues you, Governor John Dempsey.

You have also produced the Nation's finest organization leader—a political genius, if ever there was one—a very good friend—a truly dedicated Democrat, who is known more for his deeds than his words, National Chairman John Bailey.

One of the greatest tributes to John Bailey, and to the Democratic Party of this State, and finally to Connecticut, herself, is the very richness and variety of this State's contribution to the leadership of America during these years of trial and decision. I am thinking of men like the late, great Brian McMahon, and among those currently on the scene, Chester Bowles and Bill Benton.

There are also your fine Democratic mayors, whom I know intimately from working with them, some of them over many years. Typical of your mayors is my brilliant colleague, a man of national stature, my good friend Dick Lee, of New Haven, who succeeded me as President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

There are also your fine Congressmen, and your State legislators and other State offi-

cials. We, in New York, take our hats off to the Democratic Party of this State, which has made all this possible.

As I said, we New York Democrats and you Connecticut Democrats have much in common. We are fighters—among ourselves, when we aren't fighting Republicans.

This year, with no statewide election scheduled, we are keeping in trim the usual way. But next year, I know that we will all be on target together, and that target will be the Republican candidate for President. And my guess is that we can already guess pretty accurately who that candidate is going to be—the Republican candidate, I mean. He is the Governor of a State no far from here—in fact, I pay my State taxes and my license fees to him.

I have heard it said that the Republican Party nationally is not in very good shape, relatively speaking. This is relatively true.

The simple reason for this is that the Democratic administration, under the vigorous, driving and imaginative leadership of President John F. Kennedy, is truly reflecting the will and desire of the American people for action and forward movement.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, is, in my judgment, a truly bankrupt party. It is bankrupt in ideas. It is bankrupt in ideals. It is bankrupt in both principles and programs.

The Republican Party is against—it is against everything. It is against progress. It is against doing anything positive or constructive to solve the problems of the Nation.

It is against medicare, for the aged. It is against the youth opportunities bill, for the young.

The Republicans are against trade expansion. They are also against foreign aid—and, of course, against the United Nations.

They are for invading Cuba, but they are also for massive cuts in our military budget.

We have a Republican Senator from our State—I am sorry to say—who is ready, willing and anxious to fight a small war in the Caribbean. He has his own intelligence service as well as his own weekly radio program. I would say that he is better at the latter than he is with the former. I just cite him because he is a Republican case in point.

Of course, I am a Democrat and the mayor of New York City, and I am satisfied to let President John F. Kennedy and Secretary Rusk, run the foreign policy of the United States.

I suppose I am a little strange that way.

But I am concerned, and very deeply concerned, over some of those problems of our country with whose manifestations I must deal, as mayor, from day to day—problems which urgently call for action—for Federal and State action—for concerted and cooperative action at all levels of government, to meet the gathering crisis. I say crisis. I do not use the word lightly. I mean the situation being brought about by the mass migration of Americans from farms and rural areas into our urban areas. This movement has occurred and is occuring all over the country, but especially from the South, and in the case of New York, from Puerto Rico. I hasten to emphasize, however, that this isn't simply a New York phenomenon; it is a national phenomenon—the phenomenon called urbanization.

In the so-called metropolitan area of New York City, there now live 15 million people. Twenty years from now that number will be 25 million. Only 10 years from now 80 percent of the people of the United States will be living in cities. Most of Connecticut will be either urban or suburban.

As I need not tell anybody here, the problems of urban living and urban government are growing at lightning speed. The costs of Government are leaping upward with giant steps.

We need to find some way or ways of making increased headway in regard to mass transportation, to air pollution, and water pollution * * * to the growing problems of traffic, of security against crime and fire, of juvenile delinquency. At the same time, we must find ways and means of reducing the cost, of introducing new efficiencies and greater measures of cooperation. This is a must if the cost of local government is to be kept within manageable proportions.

To take the first steps toward the solution of these problems, President Kennedy last year proposed the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, whose chief operating concern would be community planning, urban renewal, and housing.

This critically important undertaking was extensively debated, extensively fought over, and then defeated. Who defeated it? Of course, the Republicans. The proposal was defeated in the House. The Republicans cast 166 votes that day, of which 153 were cast against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, and against the interests of all the millions of people who live in the cities and in urban areas.

Only 10 percent of the people of this country live on farms today. Yet we have a Department of Agriculture whose annual budget is the largest of any Department in the Federal Government, other than the Defense Department. I do not begrudge the farmers the guidance, and support which the Federal Government gives them. But I do deeply resent the fact that Republicans representing rural constituencies joined with Republicans representing city people to vote down the proposition that the cities, too, have a right to be represented at the Cabinet table in Washington.

The Republicans must be brought to account for this.

I would say the same thing about the proposal for Federal aid to mass transportation. That legislation is now pending on the Senate floor, having been reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

The same is true of the youth opportunities bill which is likewise pending before the Senate. This legislation has great possibilities for the war against juvenile delinquency.

This bill—the youth opportunities bill—marks out a crucial sector of the new frontier—a sector on which we are, in fact, falling back on and on which attack and forward movement are critically necessary.

I refer to the vast increase in unemployment among the young and especially the young who lack vocational skills.

The young make up one-third of the unemployed of the Nation. Of the more than one-half million unemployed in New York State at the end of last month, more than 50 percent were classed as either unskilled or semiskilled.

It is our projection for New York City that during the next 10 years while there will be a 20-percent increase in job opportunities for skilled workers, there will be a 19-percent decrease in jobs for the unskilled.

Most tragic of all is the prospect for the young who are members of minority groups. Crushed between unemployment and lack of skills on the one hand, and discrimination on the other, many of them are inevitably drawn into the dark corridors of crime—unless they can be rescued.

Action must be taken by Government through such measures as the youth opportunity bill to enlarge the prospects for rescue and to break this vicious cycle.

For all these measures, we Democrats must mobilize all-out support. We who believe in action and in progress must act. The Republicans must be on notice that, if they do not enact all the Federal legislation to which I have referred, we are going to make the issues, and we are going to make them throughout the country.

On these and similar issues, we will surely win next year not only the Presidency—because that is scarcely in doubt—but throughout the land, with such a congressional sweep as this country has never known.

I only hope that we in New York City and State will do as well as you did last year in this State and as you will do again, I am sure, in 1964.

U.S. Taxpayers Finance Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid is distasteful to our citizens because it has failed in its objectives, while simultaneously impoverishing future generations of our citizens who must pay the money we borrowed to give away.

Interestingly enough the President demonstrates once again why the program has failed and his apparent utter lack of knowing why it fails. The people know.

It is this: the U.S. Government cannot preserve human freedom and the importance of the individual by subsidizing socialism. The President wants to give $700 million to India's leaders for India Government construction and operation of steel production, a basic component part of socialism.

Here we see the hard-earned money of U.S. citizens go in a capitalistic society being given by the President to that system which is in mortal combat with us, and whose leaders intend to bury us.

Here we are subsidizing socialism at the expense of capitalism; here we are aiding a neutral, not a friend; here we are borrowing to give away.

And our Executive leader is the chief proponent. But the people are not behind the President. Apparently, he does not know it.

Interestingly enough the President cracked down on the steel industry in this country. Then the President saw eye to eye with Mr. Wilson who plans to renationalize Britain's steel industry. Now the President wants to give India a Government operated steel mill. What is the next step, Mr. President?

Our steel mills have difficulty competing now at home and abroad. The increased cost of doing business because of Federal law and taxes will be furthered to pay for giving away steel mills, which then compete.

What happens when our steel mills cannot operate at a profit? Labor demands of higher wages are Government protected. Higher prices by steel to make profit and stay in business are prevented by the President. "What are your next moves, Mr. President?" should be asked.

If the President has not looked that far someone must tell him we cannot give our money away and stay in business. Or does the President plan to take over steel, like those leaders with whom he is conferring, in Britain and India.

The following article on foreign aid and gift of steel is interesting reading:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 15, 1963]

KEY TEST OF U.S. AID—SOCIALIZED STEEL FOR INDIA

(Should American taxpayers put up the millions to finance and build another Government-owned steel mill for India? This is the core of a debate over the biggest U.S. foreign aid project ever proposed for an underdeveloped country. India needs the steel. But its private industry is being held back while Nehru concentrates on his socialized mills.)

NEW DELHI.—A basic test of U.S. policy as it affects foreign aid is soon to be made. This test concerns construction of a Government owned and operated steel mill that will cost $700 million, most of it put up by American taxpayers.

In Washington, a report on foreign aid has just been made by a special White House committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay. This report opposed use of dollars of American aid to finance construction for socialized industries that compete with private industry in a country.

A steel mill, if given to India, will be the largest single U.S. aid project for any underdeveloped country.

There is a private steel industry in India. Its costs are lower than those of the Government industry. It wants very much to expand. The Government is denying this right and is siphoning off profits of the private industry to help subsidize the inefficient Government-operated plants. A tariff board had recommended that the private companies be allowed to keep more of their own profits to finance expansion, but this recommendation was overruled.

DECISION TIME

Now Americans must decide what they want to do. J. Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard economist, who is Ambassador, is strongly in favor of U.S. aid to build the Indian Government another steel mill.

India's steel industry, Government and private, has a capacity at present of 6 million tons. There is general agreement that a shortage of steel exists and that there is need for added capacity. India has vast resources of coal, iron ore, and limestone, well located. The potential for production of low-cost steel is there. The need is for better transportation, more power, and coking coal, more steel mill capacity.

Russia, West Germany, and Great Britain al lhave built Government-owned steel mills for the Indians.

THE RUSSIAN JOB

The first Government mill to be completed was financed by the Russians. It was built by Russians and is operated by Russians. American engineers describe the mill as extremely simple in design, but it does produce steel. Their description expresses the view that the mill is built by peasants for peasants.

Russians have kept control of this whole operation, with the Indian general manager no more than a figurehead.

INDIAN BUNGLING

The German experience, by comparison, has been a nightmare.

West German companies provided the plant and helped build it. Indians, however, have had a part in the whole project. Trouble developed and a special commission of German technicians was appointed to find what was wrong.

The commission found: Indian personnel with adequate training was extremely scarce. Rolling stock had gotten into catastrophic shape. There were almost no spare parts. Absenteeism had risen to 25 percent. Hindustan Steel, Ltd., the Government company running the plant, had 3,600 headquarters personnel, and a minor decision required from 24 to 36 months. About 30 percent of Indians trained in Germany were given jobs for which they were not trained. Many of the trained personnel, as a result, moved to other jobs.

The report said that the advice of German experts was ignored, and Indians accept this report as accurate.

British experience at India's third Government steel mill is only a little better. A politician from Madras State with an excellent reputation in Western circles has now been put in charge of the German and British-built mills. He has given more authority to German and British personnel.

SOCIALISTIC PATTERN

Now the question is whether American taxpayers should invest a large number of foreign aid dollars in an American plant for the Indians. If built, it will be Government owned, because the Nehru Government has decided that India's steel industry is too important to be in private hands. It fits into what is described as the socialistic pattern of society.

If an American steel plant is built it will require as many as 400 American technicans. Both the Germans and British are convinced—after their own experience—that Americans must control the project during its building and perhaps for 5 or 10 years afterward.

No one in New Delhi is quite sure how far the Indians are prepared to go to met American demands for airtight management, if those demands are made. If such demands are not made, then it is recognized that the project probably would head for trouble.

OFFICIALS AT ODDS

It is an open secret here in New Delhi that some U.S. foreign-aid officials are bitter over the way Ambassador Galbraith has handled this whole project. His attitude for months has been that all that remained was to work out details. Fowler Hamilton, until recently Administrator of foreign aid in Washington, is understood to have felt Ambassador Galbraith was surrendering the U.S. negotiating position before the deal was set.

Indians will be upset if Americans do not go ahead to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. However, General Clay's committee has come out against financing socialistic enterprises in competition with existing privately operated industries. Congress may have to decide.

India has two privately owned steel companies. One is the Tata Iron and Steel Co., the other the Indian Iron and Steel Co. The Tata Co. expanded its capacity by 500,000 tons during the second 5-year plan, with the help of a World Bank loan.

Since then, however, Tata's application for an alloy rolling mill, badly needed by the Indian economy, has been refused. Also, the private steelmakers, who operate at costs around 15 percent below costs of the Government mills, have not been allowed to keep a bargain made with the World Bank to accumulate profits for expansion.

IF UNITED STATES BACKS OFF

Private steel companies have the trained personnel, experience and means to expand to meet India's steel needs. Government stands in their way. The question is whether American taxpayers now will build new steel facilities to take the place of those that could be financed privately.

Indian officials already are wheeling out the whipsaw argument. They say that if Americans do not go ahead with the project, then the Russians will.

John Ford, Congressional Editor for the Navy Times, Speaks Out Before the American Legion on Centralization of Pentagon Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, among the well informed and more articulate writers covering the military beat in Washington is John Ford, the congressional editor of the Navy Times. For years John Ford's writings have brightened the day. His grasp of the military picture is one of the strongest in Washington. When John Ford writes a piece it is well worth reading because it is backed up with knowledge in depth of his subject and a knack for getting his ideas over and communicating in the fullest with his readers.

The subject of centralization of power in the Pentagon has been discussed at great length on the floor of this House. Many words have been written about it, unfortunately too many words by people who do not have the knowledge or information to intelligently discuss the subject. On March 12 of this year John Ford brought the subject into sharp and clear focus before the American Legion Security Commission. His speech was recently brought to my attention and I hasten to share it with you. John Ford's speech bears testimony that not only Members of Congress and those in uniform are concerned about the situation in the Pentagon where 30 years of living supersedes 30 years of experience in the country's uniform when it comes to decisionmaking.

Here is Mr. Ford's address:

CENTRALIZING AND THE DECISIONMAKING PROGRESS

I understand you are going to tour that labyrinthian maze called the Pentagon tomorrow and before you go I would like to talk to you briefly about some of the things happening there—and to those of you who will be lost in those endless corridors, never to return, I'd like to say goodbye.

I have heard rumors that your chairman is going to make you walk to the Pentagon tomorrow in line with the current hiking craze. I don't know how true that may be. But I do want to talk to you seriously about some of the things that are happening in the Pentagon—or as we call it here in Washington, Disneyland East.

My subject—centralization and the decisionmaking process—is one that is easy to oversimplify but sometimes hard to present in simple terms. Since World War II there has been a steady drive to unify our national defense activities and to centralize the decision-making involving these activities.

It is easy to accept the oversimplification of the centralization forces that centralization improves efficiency and saves money. I submit to you that the reason the centralization forces are winning—and make no mistake about it, they are winning—is that

the American people have accepted this oversimplification. To an amazing degree centralization is equated in the public's mind with economy and efficiency and the separate services with duplication and waste.

A symptom of this acceptance is the glowering terms in which the press generally greets centralization moves. For example, take the following from a February 15, 1963 article in Time mazagine on Defense Secretary McNamara:

"McNamara has presided over a fundamental reorganization of the Armed Forces to increase efficiency and save money. Where top Pentagon officials formerly had to wade through as many as 11 separate—and often conflicting—intelligence reports from the services daily, they now get a single, four-page summary from the unified Defense Intelligence Agency. Millions of dollars have been saved on items ranging from belt buckles to bloomers by creation of a single Defense Supply Agency."

Note the assumption that the intelligence change is per se an improvement—presumably because reading has been cut to four pages and conflicting views eliminated. No thought is given to whether top officials are getting all of the information they need or to the political implications.

The claimed savings by the Defense Supply Agency are repeated in any number of newspaper articles and editorials. And we are constantly greeted by delightful stories of how thousands of dollars are being saved by standardizing items of female lingerie. But, while there is a supply of headlines for Woman's Wear Daily, it is interesting to note that a House subcommittee could find no specific examples of monetary saving by the new agency other than the drawing down of inventories. DSA officials repeatedly refused to claim any savings and disavowed any of the dollar figures of savings usually found in news stories. DSA chief Lt. Gen. Andrew McNamara again and again refused to predict how much, if any, money his agency could be expected to save.

Now in discussing overcentralization I'm not going to give you the answers to the problem. But I would like to leave you with some questions. I would like to hope that you would look into the matter further and form your own judgment on it.

And I think if we are going to understand the problem, we must release our thinking from the conventional mold. We must remember that the principal function of a Department of Defense is not to save money. We must get over the idea that reorganization is a panacea for all ills. The poor U.S. Army has been reorganized so often it is hard to see how it gets anything done. We have to get over the idea that when mistakes are made it means something has to be changed. There is just as much redtape, just as much delay in the topheavy Defense superstructure today as when the separate services were running things. It is just as hard to get things done. You know Defense has a 5-year package program for just about everything nowadays. And Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric recently said that they cannot change a line of it without McNamara's personal OK.

We have to get over the oversimplification in slogans like "interservice rivalry." It is equally correct to say that the services have been in healthy competition which produced technical excellence in a highly competitive field, just as competition in our free enterprise system has produced a higher standard of living.

Things often look different than they really are to people who do not understand them. It is not enough to judge by the surface impression.

It is true that we have duplication and waste in our defense efforts. And it is true that you will always have it in anything as big, as complex, and as costly as the Defense Establishment. You have it in anything that big, public or private. It is true that we spend millions developing weapons systems which turn out not to be worth it and which have to be abandoned. Something of the same thing happens in private industry. We have our Skybolt but you've got the Edsel. The Bomarc didn't live up to its advanced billing; how many of you bought a Tucker automobile?

Rather I think we should look at the effect of centralization in terms of combat effectiveness, long-range political implications, and the development of future combat leaders—a development as important as that of any weapons system.

How has it related to our combat effectiveness? Has it improved our defense in this area?

This is an area where it is difficult to judge. Most laymen, and particularly this one, lack the competency to judge the results. But we do know our Senators and Representatives have been disquieted about developments.

In the first 18 months of the McNamara ascendency no new major weapons systems were started.

No program has yet been formulated for military use of space. The Skybolt has been scrapped. The RS-70 moves at a snail's pace. B-58 production has ended. The manned bomber is being phased out and Congressmen are concerned that we are lessening our ability to respond to conventional war situations.

Nike-Zeus has been held back and the anti-missile-missile program gives little reason for comfort.

The so-called TFX tactical flight has been delayed 2 years by Defense insistence on a single, all-purpose aircraft that both the Navy and Air Force can use—and in the end I understand two versions of the plane will be developed anyhow. The present hassle over the TFX contract shows that centralization certainly hasn't gotten politics out of the procurement business.

What about the political implications of centralization?

Concentrating more and more power at the top of the huge defense hierarchy puts control over the military-industrial complex in the hands of a few men. The temptation to use this power for partisan political advantage is very strong. You will remember General Eisenhower warned us against the threat of this military-industrial complex in one of his final acts as President.

A single intelligence unit makes it a lot easier to manipulate intelligence estimates for political purposes, domestic and foreign. There are some who have expressed the fear that intelligence reports in the Cuban crisis were influenced by preconceived policies.

We are all familiar with the recent phenomenon of managed news, which has dangerous implications for our historic freedoms. Now there have been attempts to control the flow of information to Congress.

A recent Army order requires field commanders to supply daily reports on visits by Congressmen or their staffs with résumés of any interviews. The order said requests for copies of the résumés by congressional committees must be brought to the attention of the Pentagon and will be acted upon only by headquarters.

When he first hears of an impending visit by a Congressman or staff member, the field commander is to submit an initial priority report by electrical means.

In other words, they are going to try to monitor what is said to Congressmen in the same way they try to monitor what is said to newspapermen. And, of course, senior field commanders are not to be trusted to talk to Members of Congress on their own.

Finally, what of the effect of centralization on the development of future combat leaders?

The most unpleasant and perhaps most dangerous aspect of the overcentralization now taking place is the treatment of military officers.

Major weapons decisions are being made by Pentagon civilians sometimes without the advice of senior military leaders and often against the advice of these military men.

Decisions are being made by planners with little regard for the operations people who have to carry the orders out. The voice of military experience, the knowledge learned on the battlefield, is being ignored in favor of the computer. Sometimes the treatment of the services is almost insulting. There came to my attention just last week an order to the military departments to supply facts on the use of military transport aircraft. The directive pointedly said "Recommendations from the services are not desired."

In other words, we need the information you have—but we're not interested in your ideas.

And we see such spectacles as what happened 2 weeks ago before a House subcommittee considering a military pay bill. A Defense study group worked for a year to bring forth a pay bill—a very inadequate bill that Congress has had to change substantially—and then gave the services a very short period in which to study it and make comments. The result was that the personnel chiefs of the services paraded before the committee and one by one criticized as inadequate the bill that had been written for their services.

Voices are beginning to be heard in the land protesting the trend of overcentralization.

A House Armed Services Subcommittee looked into the independent agencies last year and had this to say concerning the effect of centralization on the development of future military leaders:

"We can reach no other conclusion than that there has been a vastly increased centralization of decisionmaking, directly or indirectly, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and a resultant diminuation of the responsibilities of the military departments and the separate services. The subcommittee is convinced of the growth of a system which moves decisionmaking higher and higher on the scale of centralized authority and into the hands of a few people. * * * With all decisions being made at the Department of Defense level, lower echelons will develop a no-decision or indecisive philosophy. Individuals who once made decisions will be gone and will be replaced by individuals who, having been raised under the new system, will never have been required to make decisions."

One can't help but wonder how these no-decision officers will perform in future combat situations, with no computer nearby.

The House Appropriations Committee has also expressed "increasing concern" with the "trends in management, organization and procedures toward more and more centralization of authority for decisionmaking on minute details."

The House Armed Services Subcommittee found questionable legal basis for the establishment of some independent Defense agencies but its only recommendation was to legalize them and study the matter further in the future. About all it did was regroup for a new fight. It was something of a Dunkirk for the anticentralization forces.

But the major spring offensive was launched recently by Hanson Baldwin, the military editor of the New York Times, in an article entitled "McNamara's Monarchy." In a blistering attack on "the kind of unification being practiced today," he said the current trends are: "dangerous to the Nation's system of political checks and balances, dangerous to the continued development of sound military advice and effective

military leadership and dangerous to managerial and administrative efficiency."

There is danger, Mr. Baldwin said, of developing: "future generations of officers who will be yes-men and conformists, wizards of the new technique of operational analysis and computer calculation but without the moral courage or leadership qualifications required by the battlefield."

Yes, voices are beginning to be heard in the land against the dangers of overcentralization and perhaps when you have studied the matter further one of the voices will be yours.

Project Applications Pending Under Accelerated Public Works Program and Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of community facility projects, hospital construction projects, and waste treatment projects—by States, communities and areas:

LIST OF PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY HHFA, CFA

(Area type, locality, and brief description of project)

ALABAMA

A—Altoona, Etowah County; sanitation, additions.

A—Glencoe, Etowah County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Warrior City, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.

A—Guntersville, Marshall County; parks, additions.

A—Guntersville, Marshall County; water system, additions.

A—Parrish, Walker County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Clanton, Chilton County; other water, additions.

B—Choctaw, Choctaw County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Luverne, Crenshaw County, city streets, improvement.

B—Cullam County, Review Board; courthouses, new.

B—Collinsville, De Kalb County; disposal facility, new.

B—Moundville, Hale County; water system, additions.

B—Stevenson, Jackson County; gas system, new.

B—Kennedy Waterworks Board, Lama; water system, new.

B—Notasolga, Lee County; water system, additions.

B—Notasolga, Macon County; water systems, additions.

B—Tuskegee, Macon County Board of Review; protect buildings, new.

B—Linden, Marengo County; clinics, new.

B—Demopolis, Marengo County; hangars, new.

B—Hamilton Waterworks Board; Marshall; water system, improvement.

B—Grant Waterworks Board, Marshall; water system, new.

B—Wilsonville, Shelby County; sanitation, new.

B—Chatom, Washington County; courthouses, new.

S—Georgiana, Butler County; municipal buildings, new.

SB—Greenville, Butler County; city streets, improvement.

S—Jacksonville, Calhoun County; city streets, improvement.

S—Anniston, Calhoun County Commissioners; courthouses, additions.

S—Anniston, Calhoun County; water system, additions.

S—Oxford, Calhoun County; city streets, improvement.

S—Rainsville Public Building Authority; protect buildings, new.

S—Crossville, De Kalb County; protect buildings, new.

S—Gadsden, Etowah County Board of Review; courthouses, additions.

S—Fayette, Commissioners Court of Fayette; courthouses, repairs and improvements.

S—Eutaw City, Green County; swimming facilities, new.

S—Hueytown, Jefferson County; sanitation, additions.

S—Scottsboro, Jackson County, parks, additions.

S—Birmingham, Jefferson County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Jefferson, Jefferson County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Graysville, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.

S—Irondale City, Jefferson County; water system, improvement.

S—Fairfield City, Jefferson County, city streets, improvement.

S—Midfield, Jefferson County, drainage, additions.

S—Bessemer, Jefferson County, water system, additions.

S—Birmingham Water Works Board, Jefferson County; water system, additions.

S—Leeds Water Works Board, Jefferson County; water system, additions.

S—Hamilton, Marion County; hangars, new.

S—Marion, Perry County; sanitation, additions.

S—Carbon Hill City, Walker County; water system, additions.

ALASKA

B—Ketchikan; harbor facilities, new.

B—Metlakatla Indian Commission; annet, highways, new.

B—Wrangell, Petersburg; water system, new.

B—Sitka; municipal buildings, repair and improve.

B—Yakutat, Lynn Canal, Icy Strait; sanitation, new.

B—Cordova, McCarthy; harbor facilities, new.

B—Cordova, McCarthy; highways, improvement.

B—Cordova, McCarthy; harbor facilities, new.

B—Cordova, McCarthy; municipal buildings, new.

B—Seward; water system, new.

B—Seward; municipal buildings, new.

B—Seward; highways, new.

B—Seward; harbor facilities, new.

B—Kenai, Cook Inlet; sanitation, new.

B—Kodiak; highways, new.

B—Kodiak; sanitation, new.

B—Kodiak; municipal buildings, new.

B—Dillingham Public Utilities District 1; water system, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; gas storage, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; gas storage, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; gas storage, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; municipal buildings, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; sanitation, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; sanitation, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; harbor facilities, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; sanitation, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; municipal buildings, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; highways, new.

B—City of Fairbanks; sanitation, new.

B—Fairbanks; sanitation, new.

B—Fairbanks; water system, new.

B—Hamilton Acres Public Utilities District; sanitation, new.

B—North Pole, Fairbanks; sanitation, new.

B—Nome; water system, new.

ARIZONA

B—Show Low, Navajo County; water system, improvement.

B—Show Low, Navajo County; water system, improvement.

B—Parker, Yuma County; water system, new.

ARKANSAS

A—Hampton, Calhoun County; waste treatment, new.

A—Dumas, Desha County; water system, improvement.

B—Street improvement districts 14, 13; roads, new.

B—Alpena, Boone County; water system, new.

B—Lake Village, Chicot County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Water improvement district 1, Amity—CL; water system, improvement.

B—Pollard, Clay County; water system, new.

B—Success, Clay County; water system, new.

B—McDougal, Clay County; water system, new.

B—Greenway, Clay County; water system, new.

B—Plumerville, Conway County; sanitation, new.

B—Highway 71 water improvement district, A; sanitation, new.

B—Kibler Road and water improvement district; sanitation, new.

B—Dyer, Crawford County; sanitation, new.

B—Alma, Crawford County; water system, new.

B—West Memphis, Crittenden County; sanitation, new.

B—West Memphis, Crittenden County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Earle, Crittenden County; water system, improvement.

B—Cherry Valley, Cross County; water system, new.

B—Reed, Desha County; sanitation, new.

B—Tillar, Drew County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Wilmar, Drew County; water system, improvement.

B—Winchester, Drew County; water system, improvement.

B—Ozark, Franklin County; water system, new.

B—Ozark, Franklin County; roads, new.

B—Sheridan, Grant County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Leola, Grant County; water system, new.

B—Calico Rock, Izard County; sanitaiton, new.

B—Oxford, Izard County; water system, new.

B—Clarksville, Johnson County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Black Rock, Lawrence County; water system, new.

B—Board of Commissioners, Marianna-Lee Counties; water system, new.

B—Marianna-Lee Counties; sanitation, improvement.

B—Star City, Lincoln County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Gould, Lincoln County; water system, improvement.

B—Star City, Lincoln County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Paris-Logan Counties; sanitation, new.

B—Flippin-Marion Counties; sanitation, new.

B—Clarendon, Monroe County; water system, improvement.
B—Brinkley, Monroe County; water system, improvement.
B—Brinkley, Monroe County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Perry, Perry County; water system, new.
B—Bigelow, Perry County; water system, new.
B—Board of Commissioners, Helena-Phillip; water system, new.
B—Helena Highway and Water Line Improvement District; water system, new.
B—Board of Commissioners, West Helena Water District; water system, new.
B—Barton, Lexa Suburban Improvement District: sanitation, new.
B—Helena Improvement District—Phillips; sanitation, new.
B—Elaine, Phillips County; roads, improvement.
B—Weiner, Poinsett County; gas system, new.
B—Harrisburg, Poinsett County; gas system, new.
B—Harrisburg—Poinsett County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Fisher, Poinsett County; water system, new.
B—Wickles, Polk County; sanitation, new.
B—Russellville, Pope County; sanitation, new.
B—Hazen, Prairie County; sanitation, new.
B—Devalls Bluff, Prairie County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Ulm, Prairie County; water system, new.
B—Benton, Saline County; water system, new.
B—De Queen, Sevier County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Sharp County Medical Center, Inc., Hardy; clinics, new.
B—Hardy, Sharp County; water system, improvement.
B—Ash Flat, Sharp County; water system, new.
B—Mountain View, Stone County; water system, improvement.
B—Searcy, White County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Patterson, Woodruff County; water system, new.
B—McCrory, Woodruff County; water system, additions.
B—McCrory, Woodruff County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Belleville, Yell County; water system, new.
S—Waldo, Columbia County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Van Buren, Crawford County; water system, improvement.
S—Board of water commissioners, Wynne, Cross County; water system, improvement.
S—Wynne, Cross County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Conway, Faulkner County; water system, improvement.
S—Paraguold, Greene County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Paragould, Greene County; sanitation, new.
S—Paragould, Greene County; roads, new.
S—Malvern board of commissioners, Hot Spring County, water system, improvement.
S—Texarkana, Miller County; roads, new.
S—Texarkana, Miller County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Drainage District 16, Blytheville; water system, new.
S—Drainage District 17, Blytheville; sanitation, new.
S—Osceola Drainage District 12, Mississippi; sanitation, new.
S—Osceola Drainage District 9, Mississippi; sanitation, new.
S—Perryville, Perry County; sanitation, new
S—Helena, Phillips County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Glenwood, Pike County; water system, improvement.
S—Mena, Polk County; water system, improvement.
S—Fredonia, Prairie County; water system, new.
S—De Valls Bluff, Prairie County; courthouses, repairs and improvements.
S—Des Arc, Prairie County; courthouses, repairs and improvements.
S—Des Arc, Prairie County; correction institution, repairs and improvements.
S—Forrest City, St. Francis County; municipal buildings, repairs and improvements.
S—Benton, Saline County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Dardanelle, Yell County; sanitation, new.

CALIFORNIA

A—Millview Water District, Ukiah, Mendocino County; water system, improvement.
A—Keyes, Stanislaus County; sanitation, new.
A—Turlock, Stanislaus County; office buildings, new.
A—Westport Fire Protection District; community buildings, new.
A—Modesto, Stanislaus County; parks, new.
A—Modesto, Stanislaus County; parks, new.
B—Yreka, Siskiyou County; community buildings, new.
B—Crescent, Del Norte County; sanitation, additions.
B—Crescent, Del Norte County; water system, additions.
B—East Quincy Service District, Plumas County; water system, new.
B—Quincy, Plumas County; office buildings, new.
B—Hollister, San Benito County; sanitation, additions.
B—Sunnyslope Water District, San Bernardino; water system, improvement.
B—Dorris, Siskiyou County; sanitation, new.
B—Yreka, Siskiyou County; community buildings, additions.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; city streets, improvement.
S—Malaga Water District, Fresno County; water system, new.
S—Riverdale, Fresno County; sanitation, additions.
S—Huron, Fresno County; community buildings, new.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; parks, new.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; parks, new.
S—Huron, Fresno County; city streets, improvement.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; parks, new.
S—Clovis, Fresno County; water system, improvement.
S—Calwa Water District, Fresno County; water system, improvement.
S—Firebaugh, Fresno County; sanitation, new.
S—Reedley, Fresno County; water system, improvement.
S—Mendota, Fresno County; water system, improvement.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; parks, additions.
S—Orange Cove, Fresno County; roads, new.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; city streets, improvement.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; auditoriums, new.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; auditoriums, new.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; auditoriums, new.
S—Fresno, Fresno County; auditoriums, new.
S—Fresno, Frenso County; auditoriums, new.
S—Selma, Fresno County; sanitation, new.
S—Orange Cove, Fresno County; water system, new.
S—Blue Lake, Humboldt County; sanitation, improvement.
S—King Salmon, Humboldt County; waste treatment, new.
S—Cutten, Humboldt County; sanitation, new.
S—Cutten, Humboldt County; sanitation, new.
S—Cutten, Humboldt County; sanitation, new.
S—Eureka, Humboldt County; community buildings, new.
S—Blue Lake, Humboldt County; water system, new.
S—Rohnerville, Campton Heights; disposal facilities, new.
S—Redway Sanitation District, Humboldt Countuy; disposal facilities, new.
S—Eureka, Humboldt County; auditoriums, new.
S—Elsinore Valley Municipal, Water District; water system, new.
S—Leucadia Water District, San Diego; sanitation, additions.
S—La Mesa Water District, Spring Valley; water system, new.
S—Fallbrook Public Utilities District; water storage, new.
S—Escondido, San Diego County; water system, improvement.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; air terminals, new.
S—Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District; water resources, new.
S—National City, San Diego County; City Streets, new.
S—National City, San Diego County; City Streets, new.
S—Oceanside, San Diego County; water resources, new.
S—Encinitas Olivenhain Municipal Water District; water system, improvement.
S—Coronado, San Diego County; city streets, new.
S—Coronado, San Diego County; city streets, new.
S—Valley Center, San Diego County; water system, new.
S—Rancho Sante Fe, San Diego County; water system, new.
S—Rancho Santa Fe, San Diego County; water resources, new.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; sanitation, new.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; city streets, improvement.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; city streets, improvement.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; city streets, improvement.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; office buildings, additions.
S—San Diego, San Diego County; bridges, new.
S—Vista, San Diego County; sanitation, new.
S—Vista, San Diego County; sanitation, new.
S—El Cajon, San Diego County; protect buildings, new.
S—El Cajon, San Diego County; city streets, new.
S—Del Mar, San Diego County; water system, new.
S—Carlsbad, San Diego County; sanitation, new.
S—Carlsbad, San Diego County; water system, improvement.
S—Santee Water District, San Diego, County; sanitation, new.
S—Santee Water District, San Diego County; water system, new.
S—Santee Water District, San Diego County; sanitation, new.
S—Lakeside Municipal Water District, San Diego; water system, new.

S—Vista Irrigation District, San Diego County; water resources, improvements.

S—El Cajon, San Diego County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Lakeside Irrigation District, San Diego County; water system, improvement.

S—San Diego County; Water Authority, water system, new.

S—San Diego, San Diego County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Ripon, San Joaquin County; drainage, additions.

S—Escalon, San Joaquin County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Manteca, San Joaquin County; sanitation, new.

S—Stockton, San Joaquin County; auditoriums, new.

COLORADO

A—Georgetown, Clear Creek County, sanitation, additions.

A—Georgetown, Clear Creek County; watter system, improvement.

B—San Luis, Costilla County; Health; Harbor facilities, new.

B—Gregory Water & Sanitation District; sanitation, additions.

B—Walsenburg, Huerfano County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Walsenburg, Huerfano County; water system, improvement.

B—Golden, Jefferson County; Parks, new.

B—Trinidad, Las Animas County; water system, improvement.

B—Aguilar, Las Animas County; water system, improvement.

B—Trinidad, Las Animas County; Electric system, new.

B—Woodland Park, Teller County; water resources, new.

S—Alamosa, Alamosa County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Pueblo, Pueblo County; city streets, new.

S—Pueblo, Pueblo County; swimming facilities, new.

S—Boone Sanitation District, Pueblo County; sanitation, additions.

S—Pueblo, Pueblo County; protect buildings, new.

CONNECTICUT

A—Bristol, Hartford County; city streets, improvement.

A—Bristol, Hartford County; sanitation, new.

A—Bristol, Hartford County; protect buildings, new.

A—Bristol, Hartford County; auditoriums, new.

A—Derby, New Haven County; community buildings, new.

A—Ansonia, New Haven County; 522 city streets, improvement.

A—Sewer Authority of Seymour, New Haven County; sanitation, new.

S—Bridgeport, Fairfield County; sanitation, new.

S—Bridgeport, Fairfield County; swimming facilities, new.

S—Fairfield, Fairfield County; sanitation, new.

S—Fairfield, Fairfield County; swimming facilities, additions.

S—Stratford, Fairfield County; harbor facilities, additions.

S—Stratford, Fairfield County; sanitation, new.

S—Stratford, Fairfield County; sanitation, new.

S—Stratford, Fairfield County; roads, new.

S—Stratford, Fairfield County sanitation, new.

S—Trumbull, Fairfield County; bridges, improvement.

S—New Britain, Hartford County; parks, new.

S—Southington, Hartford County; bridges, new.

S—New Britain, Hartford.

S—New Britain, Hartford, sanitation, new.

S—Litchfield, Litchfield County, garage, new.

S—Litchfield, Litchfield County, bridges, new.

S—Harwinton, Litchfield County; garage, new.

S—Watertown, Litchfield; water system, new.

S—Watertown, Litchfield, sanitation, new.

S—Watertown, Litchfield, city streets, improvement.

S—Oakville Fire District, Watertown, sanitation, improvement.

S—Oakville Fire District, Watertown, sanitation, improvement.

S—Thomaston, Litchfield; garage, new.

S—Portland, Middlesex County; water, water system, new.

S—Middletown, Middlesex County; water resources, improvements.

S—Waterbury, New Haven County; parks, new.

S—Meriden, New Haven County; sanitation, new.

S—Meriden, New Haven County; water system, news.

S—Meriden, New Haven County; roads, improvement.

S—Meriden, New Haven County; sanitation, new.

S—Meriden, New Haven County; water system, new.

S—Meriden, New Haven County; parks, new.

S—Milford, New Haven County; sanitation, new.

S—Beacon Falls, New Haven County; protect buildings, new.

S—Walcott, New Haven County; garage, new.

S—Hebron, Tolland County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Willimantic, Windham County; sanitation, new.

S—Camden, Wyoming Authority, Kent County; sanitation, new.

S—Dover, Kent County; sanitation, new.

FLORIDA

S—Pompano Beach, Broward County; protection buildings, new.

S—Pompano Beach, Broward County; playground, additions.

S—Central Broward Drainage Districts, Davie; drainage, improvement.

S—Oakland Park, Broward County; parks, new.

S—Fort Lauderdale, Broward County; industrial buildings, new.

S—Fort Lauderdale, Broward County; sanitation, new.

S—Fort Lauderdale, Broward County; bridges, new.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; swimming facilities, new.

Hollywood—Broward County; city streets, improvement.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; water resources, new.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; drainage, new.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; harbor facilities, improvement.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; water system, additions.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Fort Lauderdale, Broward County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Fort Lauderdale, Broward County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Fort Lauderdale, Broward County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Margate, Broward County; conservation measures, new.

S—Margate, Broward County; roads, new.

S—Margate, Broward County; bridges, new.

Margate, Broward County; drainage, new.

S—Fort Lauderdale, Broward County; parks, new.

S—Margate, Broward County; bridges, new.

S—Wilton Manors, Broward County; swimming facilities, new.

S—Hollywood, Broward County; water system, additions.

S—Lauderdale by the Sea, Broward County; city streets, improvement.

S—Lauderdale by the Sea, Broward County; community buildings, additions.

S—Altha, Calhoun County; gas system, new.

S—Miami, Dade County.

S—Miami, Dade County; drainage, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; sanitation; improvement.

S—Miami, Dade County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Miami, Dade County; city streets, improvement.

S—Miami, Dade County; protection buildings, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; drainage, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Miami, Dade County; protection buildings, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; parks, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; city streets, improvement.

S—Miami, Dade County; athletic buildings, new.

S—North Miami, Dade County; protection buildings, new.

S—North Miami, Dade County; municipal buildings, new.

S—North Miami, Dade County; drainage, new.

S—North Miami, Dade County; protection buildings, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; water system, additions.

S—Miami, Dade County; water system, additions.

S—Miami, Dade County; water system, additions.

S—Miami, Dade County; water system, additions.

S—Miami, Dade County; water system, additions.

S—Miami, Dade County; water resources, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; garage, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; garage, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; office buildings, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; office buildings, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; exhibit buildings, new.

S—West Miami, Dade County; city streets, improvement.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; water system, additions.

S—North Miami Beach, Dade County; libraries, new.

S—Surfside, Dade County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; city streets, additions.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; drainage, new.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; sanitation, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; sanitation, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; sanitation, new.

S—Miami, Dade County; disposal facilities, additions.

S—Miami Department of Water and Sewage; disposal facilities, additions.

S—Miami Department of Water and Sewage; water system, improvement.

S—Florida City, Dade County; clinics, new.

S—Florida City, Dade County; waste treatment, new.

S—Coral Gables, Dade County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Coral Gables, Dade County; city streets, improvement.

S—Coral Gables, Dade County; libraries, new.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Miami Beach, Dade County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Bonifay, Commissioners of Holmes County; office buildings, new.

S—Zephyr Hills, Pasco County; sanitation, new.

SB—Live Oak County Commissioners; water system, additions.

A—Blountstown, Calhoun County; water system, improvement.

A—Branford, Suwanee County; clinics, new.

B—Blountstown, Calhoun County; waste treatment, additions.

B—Apalachicola City, Franklin County; community buildings, new.

B—Apalachicola, Franklin County; community buildings, new.

B—Grand Ridge, Jackson County; water system, new.

B—Port Richey, Pasco County; water system, new.

B—Port Richey, Pasco County; water system, improvement.

GEORGIA

A—Temple, Carroll County; gas system, new.

A—Temple, Carroll County; water system, improvement.

B—Nahunta, Brantley County; disposal facilities, new.

B—Girard, Burke County; water system, improvement.

B—Cordele, Crisp County; gas system additions.

B—Vienna Roads and Revier Commission, Dooly County; correct installation, additions.

B—Albany Roads and Revier Commission, Douglas County; other water, new.

B—Albany, Dougherty County; water system, additions.

B—Royston, Franklin County; water system, additions.

B—Calhoun, Gordon County; water system, improvement.

B—Clarkesville, Habersham County; community buildings, new.

B—State Penal and Rehabilitation Authority, Hall County; correct installation, new.

B—Hartwell, Hart County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Royston, Hart County; water system, additions.

B—Louisville, Jefferson County; water system, improvement.

B—Rentz, Laurens County; water system, additions.

B—Dublin, Laurens County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Dudley, Laurens County; water system, improvement.

B—Royston, Madison County; water system, additions.

B—Mount Vernon, Montgomery County; disposal facilities, new.

B—Shellman, Randolph County; sanitation, new.

B—Cuthbert, Randolph County; water system, additions.

B—Hiltonia, Screven County; water system, new.

B—Roads and Revier Commission, Sylvania, Schley County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Martin, Stephens County; water system, new.

B—Dawson, Terrell County; city streets, improvement.

B—Roads and Revier Commission, Lyons, Toombs County; correct installation, new.

B—Hiawassee, Towns County; parks, new.

B—Roads and Revier Commission, Jeffersonville; courthouses, new.

B—Social Circle, Walton County; water system, additions.

B—Roads and Revier Commission, Jesup, Wayne County; courthouses, new.

B—Glenwood, Wheeler County; sanitation, new.

B—Cleveland, White County; courthouses, new.

B—Poulan, Worth County; water system, additions.

S—Pearson, Atkinson County; sanitation, additions.

S—Banks County, Homer, Banks County; gas system, new.

S—Moultrie, Colquitt County; protect buildings, new.

S—Roads and Review Commission Toccoa, Stewart County; community buildings, new.

HAWAII

S—Toccoa City, Stephens County; gas system, improvement.

B—Hilo, Hawaii County; water system, new.

IDAHO

B—Plummer, Benewah County; sanitation, new.

B—West Bonner Sewer District 1 of Pries; sanitation, new.

B—Riverside Independent Water District Orcfi; water system, new.

B—Grangeville, Idaho County; water system, new.

B—White Bird, Idaho County; water system, new.

B—Cottonwood, Idaho County; water system, new.

B—Cottonwood, Idaho County; roads, new.

B—Grangeville, Idaho County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Spirit Lake, Kootenai County; water system, new.

B—Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapw; municipal buildings, new.

ILLINOIS

A—Cairo, Alexander County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Cairo, Alexander County; sanitation new.

A—Tamms, Alexander County; sanitation, new.

A—Keyesport, Bond County; water system, new.

A—Greenville, Bond County, sanitation, new.

A—Panama, Bond County; water system, new.

A—Keyesport, sanitation district, Bond County; sanitation, new.

A—Stonington, Christian County; sanitation, new.

A—Breese, Clinton County; drainage, new.

A—Carlyle, Clinton County; water system, improvement.

A—Carlyle, Clinton County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Carlyle, Clinton County; city streets, additions.

A—Carlyle, Clinton County; drainage, new.

A—Carlyle, Clinton County; disposal facility, new.

A—Carlyle, Clinton County; water system, additions.

A—Keyesport, Clinton County; water system, new.

A—Bartelso Village, Clinton County; waste treatment, new.

A—Breese, Clinton County; city streets, improvement.

A—Albers, Clinton County; waste treatment, new.

A—Bartelso, Clinton County; sanitation, new.

A—Keyesport, sanitation district, Clinton County; sanitation, new.

A—Mattoon, Coles County; water system, improvement.

A—Humboldt, Coles County; water system, new.

A—Jewett, Cumberland County; water system, new.

A—Grayville, Edwards County; other water, improvement.

A—Benton City, Franklin County; sanitation, new.

A—Benton, Franklin County; sanitation, new.

A—Buckner, Franklin County; water system, new.

A—Frankfort, commission, park district; parks, new.

A—Liverpool drain, Levee district; sanitation, new.

A—Omaha, Gallatin County; water system, new.

A—Old Shawneetown, Gallatin County; water system, new.

A—Shawneetown, Gallatin County; sanitation, new.

A—Broughton, Hamilton County; water system, new.

A—Elizabethtown, Hardin County; water system, new.

A—Ava, Jackson County; sanitation, new.

A—Carbondale, Jackson County; water system, new.

A—South Highway Water District, Jackson County; water system, additions.

A—De Sota, Jackson County; waste treatment, new.

A—Murle Water District, Jackson County; water system, additions.

A—Grand Tower, Jackson County; disposal facilities, new.

A—Crab Orchard Water District, Jackson County; sanitation, new.

A—Campbell Hill, Jackson County; sanitation, new.

A—Bluford, Jefferson County; water system, new.

A—Mount Vernon, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.

A—Wataga, Knox County; water system, additions.

A—Bunkerhill, Macoupin County; disposal facilities, new.

A—Carlinville, Macoupin County; sanitation, new.

A—Gillespie, Macoupin County; sanitation, additions.

A—Palmyra Codesto Water Commission; water system, new.

A—White City, Macoupin County; water system, new.

A—Benld, Macoupin County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Wilsonville, Macoupin County; sanitation, new.

A—Salem, Marion County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Alma, Marion County; water system, new.

A—Kinmundy, Marion County; disposal facilities, new.

A—Salem, Marion County; gas system, new.

A—Salem, Marion County; sanitation, additions.

A—Brookpart, Massac County; sanitation, new.

A—Witt, Montgomery County; waste treatment, new.

A—Farmersville, Montgomery County; waste treatment, new.

A—Taylor Springs, Montgomery County; waste treatment, new.

A—Coffeen, Montgomery County; disposal facilities, new.
A—Litchfield, Montgomery County; city streets, improvement.
A—Panama, Montgomery County; water system, new.
A—Farmersville, Montgomery County; sanitation, new.
A—De Quoin, Perry County; city streets, improvement.
A—Pinckneyville, Perry County, municipal buildings, new.
A—Du Quoin, Perry County; water system, improvement.
A—Golconda, Pope County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Mound City, Pulaski County; sanitation, new.
A—Mounds, Pulaski County; sanitation, new.
A—Karnak, Pulaski County; sanitation, new.
A—Olmsted, Pulaski Couty, municipal buildings, new.
A—Harrisburg, Saline County; water system, improvement.
A—Stonefort, Saline County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Cobden, Union County; water system, new.
A—Anna, Union County; water system, new.
A—Fairfield, Wayne County; sanitation, additions.
A—Sims, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Wayne City, Wayne County; water system, additions.
A—Fairfield Public Library, Wayne County; community buildings, new.
A—Carmi, White County; water system, new.
A—Mill Shoals, White County; water system, new.
A—Norris City Sanitation District, White County; sanitation, new.
A—Grayville, White County; other water, improvement.
A—Grayville, White County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Marion, Williamson County; water system, new.
A—Energy, Williamson County; sanitation, new.
A—Herrin Park, Williamson County; parks, new.
A—Pittsburg, Williamson County; water system, new.
A—Herrin, Williamson County; water system, improvement.
A—Creal Springs, Williamson County; sanitation, new.
A—Stonefort, Williamson County, municipal buildings, new.
A—Herrin, Williamson County; sanitation, new.
B—Brussels, Calhoun County, water system, new.
B—Hardin, Calhoun County; roads, new.
B—Albion, Edwards County; waste treatment, new.
B—Jerseyville, Jersey County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Henry, Marshall County; waste treatment, new.
B—Lacon, Marshall County; sanitation, new.
B—Sherrard, Mercer County, sanitation, improvement.
B—Aledo, Mercer County; sanitation, additions.
B—New Boston, Mercer County; sanitation, new.
B—Joy, Mercer County; sanitation, new.
B—Windsor, Mercer County; disposal facilities, new.
B—Keithsburg, Mercer County; sanitation, new.
B—Sherrard, Mercer County; water system, new.
B—Sullivan, Moultrie County; community buildings, new.
B—Arthur, Moultrie County; sanitation, new.
B—Sparta, Randolph County, city streets, improvement.
B—Chester, Randolph County, sanitation, additions.
B—Tilden, Randolph County, sanitation, new.
B—Prairie du Rocher, Randolph County; disposal facilities, new.
B—Windsor, Shelby County; sanitation, new.
S—Thomson, Carroll County; sanitation, new.
S—Shannon, Carroll County; city streets, improvement.
S—Avon, Fulton County; disposal facilities, new.
S—Smithfield, Fulton County; water system, new.
S—Canton, Fulton County; sanitation, new.
S—Farmington, Fulton County; roads, new.
S—Galesburg, Knox County; water system, additions.
S—Henderson, Knox County; water storage, new.
S—Oneida, Knox County; sanitation, new.
S—Galesburg, Knox County; sanitation, new.
S—Mount Zion, Macon County; water system, improvement.
S—Niantic, Macon County; water system, new.
S—Blue Mound, Macon County; sanitation, new.
S—Warrensburg, Macon County; sanitation, new.
S—Forsyth, Macon County; water system, new.
S—Danville, Vermilion County; sanitation, new.
S—Vance Township, Vermilion County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Monmouth, Warren County; drainage, new.

INDIANA

A—New Castle, Henry County; water system, new.
A—Evansville, Vandeburgh County; auditoriums, new.
B—Charlestown, Clark County; gas system, new.
B—Charlestown, Clark County; sanitation, new.
B—Charlestown, Clark County; water system, new.
B—Moores Hill, Dearborn County; sanitation, new.
B—Aurora, Dearborn County; water system, new.
B—Jasonville, Greene County; water system, improvement.
B—Bloomfield, Greene County; sanitation, new.
B—Switz, Greene County; water system, new.
B—Corydon, Harrison County; sanitation, new.
B—Loogootee, Martin County; water system, new.
B—Shoals, Martin County; sanitation, new.
B—Ellettsville, Monroe County; water system, new.
B—Paoli, Orange County; water system, improvement.
B—Troy, Perry County; sanitation, new.
B—Winslow, Pike County; water system, improvement.
B—Spurgeon, Pike County; water system, new.
B—Grandview, Spencer County; water system, new.
B—Rockport, Spencer County; roads, improvement.
B—Rockport, Spencer County; parks, new.
B—Carlisle, Sullivan County; sanitation, new.
B—Patriot, Switzerland County; water system, new.
B—Perkin, Washington County; water system, new.
B—New Perkin, Washington County; sanitation, new.
S—Muncie, Delaware County; sanitation, new.
S—Albany, Delaware County; sanitation, new.
S—Gaston, Delaware County; sanitation, new.
S—Oldenburg, Franklin County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Laurel, Franklin County; sanitation, new.
S—Vincennes, Knox County; sanitation, new.
S—Monroe City, Knox County; water system, new.
S—Decker, Knox County; water system, new.

IOWA

B—Centerville, Appanoose County; sanitation, new.
B—Cincinnati, Appanoose County; sanitation, new.
B—Centerville, Appanoose County; city streets, new.
B—Albia Municipal Water Works, Monro County; water system, improvement.

KANSAS

A—Galena, Cherokee County; sanitation, additions.
A—Garden Sanitary District No. 1, Cherokee County; sanitation, new.
A—Arama, Crawford County; sanitation, new.
A—McCune, Crawford County; sanitation, new.
A—Pittsburg, Crawford County; water system, new.
A—Cherokee, Crawford County; sanitation, new.
S—Mulberry, Crawford County; water system, additions.
S—Parsons, Labette County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.
S—Parsons, Labette County; city streets, new.
S—Cherryvale, Montgomery County; water system, new.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; water system, improvement.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; libraries, additions.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; bridges; new.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; bridges; new.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; electric system, new.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; sanitation, additions.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; water system, additions.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; sanitation, additions.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; protect buildings, additions.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; sanitation, additions.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; community buildings, new.
S—Coffeyville, Montgomery County; sanitation, new.

KENTUCKY

A—Columbia, Adair County; sanitation, new.
A—Lacenter, Ballard County; roads, improvement.
A—Pineville, Bell County; sanitation, new.
A—Middlesboro, Bell County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Middlesboro, Bell County; city streets, improvement.
A—Burlington, Boone County; water system, new.
A—Jackson, Breathitt County; water system, new.
A—Jackson, Breathitt County; sanitation, new.
A—Hazel, Calloway County; sanitation, new.
A—Carter County, Carter County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.
A—Grayson, Carter County; sanitation, new.
A—Water and Sanitation Commission, Hopkinsville, Christian County; water system, new.
A—Hopkinsville, Christian County; bridges, new.
A—Hopkinsville, Christian County; protect buildings, new.
A—Hopkinsville, Christian County; playground, new.
A—Hopkinsville, Christian County; water system, new.
A—Hopkinsville, Christian County; sanitation, new.
A—Pembroke, Christian County; sanitation, new.
A—Crofton, Christian County; water system, new.
A—Manchester, Clay County; water system, new.
A—Manchester, Clay County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Irvine, Estill County; water system, new.
A—Prestonburg, Floyd County; libraries, new.
A—Martin, Floyd County; sanitation, new.
A—Mayfield, Graves County; water system, new.
A—Wingo, Graves County; sanitation, new.
A—Fancy Farm, Graves County; water system, new.
A—Lowes, Graves County; water system, new.
A—Leitchfield, Grayson County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Russell, Greenup County; water system, new.
A—Greenup, Greenup County; sanitation, new.
A—Elizabethtown, Hardin County; roads, improvement.
A—Loyall, Harlan County; sanitation, new.
A—Cumberland, Harlan County; roads, improvement.
A—Harlan, Harlan County; sanitation, new.
A—Dawson Springs, Hopkins County; water system, improvement.
A—Hindman, Knott County; water system, new.
A—Corbin, Knox County; playground, new.
A—Barbourville, Knox County, municipal buildings, new.
A—Upton, Hardin and Larue Counties; water system, new.
A—Hodengville, Larue County; courthouses, new.
A—London, Laurel County; protect buildings, new.
A—Laurel County Water District, Corbin; water system, new.
A—Louisa, Lawrence County; courthouses, repair, improve.
A—Whitesburg, Letcher County; courthouses, new.
A—Neon, Letcher County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Whitesburg, Letcher County; water system, new.
A—Jenkins, Letcher County; sanitation, new.
A—Paducah Water Works, McCracken County; water system, new.
A—Paducah, McCracken County; sanitation, new.
A—Paducah, McCracken County; water system, new.
A—Paducah, McCracken County; auditoriums, new.
A—Paducah, McCracken County; water system, new.
A—Richmond, Madison County; sanitation, new.
A—North Marshall, Marshall County; water system, new.
A—Brandenburg, Meade County; water system, new.
A—North Mercer Water District, Saluisa County; water system, new.
A—Darkesboro, Muhlenberg County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Bloomfield, Nelson County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Fordsville, Ohio County; water system, new.
A—Falmouth, Pendleton County; sanitation, new.
A—Hazard, Perry County; playground, new.
A—Hazard, Perry County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Hazard, Perry County; courthouses, new.
A—Pikeville, Pike County; water system, new.
A—Morehead, Rowan County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Elkton, Todd County; water system, new.
A—Gadiz, Trigg County; sanitation, new.
A—Gerulean Springs Water District; water system, new.
A—Bedford, Trimble County; sanitation, new.
A—Slaughters, Webster County; water system, new.
A—Sebree Webster County; sanitation, new.
A—Corbin, Whitley County; playground, new.
A—Corbin, Whitley County; water system, improvement.
AS—Olive Hill, Carter County; sanitation, new.
AS—Lone Oak Water District, McCracken County; water system, improvement.
B—Columbia, Adair County; community buildings, new.
B—Scottsville, Allen County; protect buildings, new.
B—Barren Co., Barren County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; water system, new.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; sanitation, new.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; sanitation, new.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; sanitation, new.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; sanitation, new.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; highways, new.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; community buildings, new.
B—Glasgow, Airport, Barren County; hangars, new.
B—Glasgow, Barren County; sanitation, new.
B—Sharpsburg Water District, Bath County; water system, new.
B—Shepherdsville, Bullitt County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Morgantown, Butler County; other water, new.
B—Arlington, Carlisle County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Albany, Clinton County; sanitation, new.
B—Albany, Albany and Clinton Counties; water system, improvement.
B—Burkesville, Cumberland County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Horse Cave, Hart County; sanitation, new.
B—McKee, Jackson County; sanitation, new.
B—Beattyville, Lee County; sanitation, new.
B—Vanceburg, Lewis County; sanitation, new.
B—Stanford, Lincoln County; sanitation, new.
B—Lake, Livingston County; water system, new.
B—Gilbertsville, Marshall County; water system, new.
B—Edmonton, Metcalfe County; water system, new.
B—Greenville, Muhlenberg County; water system, improvement.
B—West Scott County Water District, Bloom; water system, new.
B—Bardstown, Nelson County; water system, new.
B—New Haven, Nelson County; sanitation, new.
B—Nicholas County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Centertown, Ohio County; water system, new.
B—Pendleton County; gas storage, new.
B—Elkhorn, Pike County; sanitation, new.
B—Pulaski County Water District, Scienc; water system, new.
B—Burnside, Pulaski County; sanitation, new.
B—Jamestown, Russell County; water system, new.
B—Georgetown, Scott County; playground, new.
B—East Shelby Water District, Bagdad County; water system, new.
B—Guthrie, Todd County; water system, improvement.
B—North Side Bowling Green Water District; water system, new.
B—Bowling Green, Warren County; hangars, improvement.
B—Williamsburg, Whitley County; water system, new.
B—Campton, Wolfe County.
BS—Elkton, Todd County; sanitation, new.
S—Bell County; courthouses, new.
S—Florence, Boone County; community buildings, new.
S—Florence, Boone County; drainage, new.
S—Catlettsburg, Boyd County; sanitation, new.
S—Ashland, Boyd County; city streets, improvement.
S—Ashland, Boyd County; water resources, new.
S—Ashland, Boyd County; water system, new.
S—Jackson, Breathitt County; sanitation, new.
S—Lebanon Junction, Bullit County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Morgantown, Butler County, sanitation, new.
S—Morgantown, Butler County; correctional institution, new.
S—Murray, Calloway County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Murray, Calloway County; courthouses, repair and improvement.
S—Bardwell, Carlisle County; water system, new.
S—Bardwell, Carlisle County; roads, improvement.
S—Chent, Carroll County; water system, new.
S—Winchester, Clark County; sanitation, new.
S—Marion, Crittendon County; city streets, improvement.
S—Sandy Hook, Elliott County; correct installation, new.
S—Department of Fish and Wildlife, Franklin County; water system, improvement.
S—Symsonia Water District, Graves County; water system, new.
S—Benham, Harlan County; sanitation, new.

S—Russellville, Logan County; water system, improvement.
S—Paducah, McCracken County; auditoriums, new.
S—Paducah, McCracken County; water system, new.
S—Paducah, McCracken County; water system, new.
S—The Lebanon Works, Marion County; water system, additions.
S—Hardin Water District, Radcliff, Marion County; water system, new.
S—Carlisle, Nicholas County; sanitation, new.
S—Heartford, Ohio County; water system, improvement.
S—Tri-Village Water District, Owen County; water system, new.
S—Owenton, Owen County; sanitation, new.
S—Stanton, Powell County; sanitation, new.
S—Sturgis, Union County; water system, improvement.
S—Dixon, Webster County; water system, new.
SA—Estill County Water District No. 1; water system, new.
SA—Caneyville, Grayson County; water system, new.
SA—Hanson, Hopkins County; water system, new.
SA—Barbourville, Knox County; gas storage, new.
SB—Clover Port, Breckenridge County; sanitation, new.
A—Natchitoches, Natchitoches Parish; harbor facilities, new.
A—Natchitoches, Natchitoches Parish; roads, improvements.
A—Natchitoches, Natchitoches Parish; sanitation, improvement.
A—Alexandria, Rapides Parish; gas storage, new.
A—Alexandria, Rapides Parish; sanitation, new.
A—Melville, St. Landry Parish; sanitation, new.
A—Eunice, St. Landry Parish; gas storage, new.
A—Eunice, St. Landry Parish; sanitation, new.
A—Leonville, St. Landry Parish; water system, new.
A—Hammond, Tangipahoa Parish; water system, improvement.
A—Roseland, Tangipahoa Parish; sanitation, new.
A—Amite City, Tangipahoa Parish; city streets, improvement.
B—Crowley, Acadia Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Church Point, Acadia Parish; water system, new.
B—Estherwood, Acadia Parish; water system, new.
B—Mermentau, Acadia Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Oberlin, Allen Parish; water system, new.
B—Marksville, Avoyelles Parish; roads, improvement.
B—Evergreen, Avoyelles Parish; water system, new.
B—Marksville, Avoyelles Parish; community buildings, repair and improvement.
B—Westlake, Calcasieu Parish; water system, new.
B—Westlake, Calcasieu Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Vinton, Calcasieu Parish; harbor facilities, new.
B—Cameron, Cameron Parish; parks, new.
B—Cameron, Cameron Parish; roads, new.
B—Sicily Island, Catahoula Parish; water system, new.
B—Vidalia, Concordia Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Ridgecrest, Concordia Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Ville Platte, Evangeline Parish; roads, new.
B—Ville Platte, Evangeline Parish; parks, new.
B—Mamou, Evangeline Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Georgetown, Grant Parish; water system, new.
B—Jennings, Jefferson Davis Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Jennings, Jefferson Davis Parish; sanitation, improvement.
B—Lafayette, Lafayette Parish; water system, new.
B—Lafayette Parish; community buildings, new.
B—Lafayette, Lafayette Parish; roads, new.
B—Lafayette, Lafayette Parish; roads, new.
B—Youngsville, Lafayette Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Broussard, Lafayette Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Broussard, Lafayette Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Dubach, Lincoln Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Walker, Livingston Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Denham Springs, Livingston; sanitation, improvement.
B—Campti, Natchitoches Parish; water system, new.
B—Alexandria, Rapides Parish; water system, new.
B—Pineville and Rapides Drain District; water system, new.
B—Pineville, Rapides Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Pineville, Rapides Parsh; parks, new.
B—Pineville, Rapides Parish; roads, improvement.
B—Pineville, Rapides Parish; roads, improvement.
B—Coushatta, Red River Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Coushatta, Red River Parish; sanitation, improvement.
B—Many, Sabine Parish; water system, improvement.
B—St. John, the Baptist Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Sewerage District 1, St. John the Baptist Parish; sanitation, new.
B—St. John the Baptist Parish; sanitation, new.
B—Breaux Bridge, St. Martin Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Breaux Bridge, St. Martin Parish; roads, new.
B—Water District 1, St. Martin Parish; water system, new.
B—St. Martinsville, St. Martin Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Newellton, Tensas Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Abbeville, Vermillion Police Jury; courthouses, new.
B—Abbeville, Vermillion Parish; roads, improvement.
B—Kaplan, Vermillion Parish; gas storage, improvement.
B—Kaplan, Vermillion Parish; water system, improvement.
B—Kaplan, Vermillion Parish; sanitation, improvement.
B—Abbeville, Vermillion Parish; city streets, improvement.
B—Leesville Police Jury, Verno; courthouses, new.
B—Lake Providence Port Commission; harbor facilities, new.
S—Sulphur, Calcasieu Parish; water system, improvement.
S—Vinton, Calcasieu Parish; roads, new.
S—Vinton, Calcasieu Parish; roads, improvement.
S—Vinton, Calcasieu Parish; Community buildings, new.
S—Vinton Harbor and Terminal District; harbor facilities, new.
S—Lake Charles Drainage District; roads, new.
S—Dry Prong, Grant Parish; water system, new.
S—Kenner Sewer District No. 1, Jefferson Parish; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer District No. 9, Jefferson Parish; sanitation, new.
S—Bank Consolidated Sewer District, Jefferson Parish; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer District 8, Jefferson Paris; sanitation, new.
S—Westwego, Jefferson Parish; sanitation, new.
S—Road District 1, Jefferson Parish; roads, new.
S—Road District 1, Jefferson Parish, roads, new.
S—Road District 1, Jefferson Parish, roads, new.
S—Road District 1, Jefferson Parish, roads, new.
S—Greater LaFourche Port Commission; water resources, new.
S—Golden Meadow, LaFourche Parish; city streets, new.
S—Board of Commisioners, Orleans Levee District.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee District, water resources, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee district.
S—Board of Commisisoners, Orleans Levee District.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee District; water resources, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee District; water resources, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee District; water resources, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee District; airports, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee District; community buildings, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Orleans Levee District; water resources, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Port of New Orleans; community buildings, new.
S—Board of Commissioners, Port of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; water system, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board of New Orleans; sanitation, new.
S—New Orleans, Orleans Parish; community buildings, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board, New Orleans; community buildings, new.
S—Sewer and Water Board, New Orleans; water system, improvement.
S—New Orleans, Orleans Parish.
S—New Orleans, Orleans Parish; roads, new.
S—New Orleans Sewer and Water Board.
S—New Orleans Sewer and Water Board; sanitation, new.
S—New Orleans Sewer and Water Board.
S—New Orleans Sewer and Water Board; sanitation, new.
S—New Orleans Sewer Water Board; sanitation, improvement.
S—Alexander, Fire Protection District 3; harbor facilities, new.
S—Alexandria, Rapides Parish; courthouses, new.
S—Alexandria, Rapides Parish; roads, improvement.

S—Lecompte, Rapides Parish; sanitation new.

S—Alexandria, Rapides Parish; city streets, new.

S—Alexandria, Rapides Parish; city streets, new.

S—Waterworks District 2; water system, new.

S—Waterproof, Tensas Parish; sanitation, new.

S—St. Joseph, Tensas Parish; roads, improvement.

MAINE

A—Saco City, York County; sanitation, new.

A—Kennebunk, York County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Old Orchard Beach, York County; sanitation, new.

B—Limestone, Aroostook County; water system, improvement.

B—Madawaska, Aroostook County, sanitation, new.

B—Madawaska, Aroostook County, water system, new.

B—Madawaska, Aroostook County, waste treatment, new.

B—Wiscasset, Lincoln County; water system, new.

S—Lewiston, Androscoggin County; waste treatment, new.

S—Auburn Water District, Androscoggin County; water system, new.

MARYLAND

A—Cambridge, Dorchester County; sanitation, new.

A—Cambridge, Dorchester County; water system, new.

A—Funkstown, Washington County; sanitation, new.

B—Perryville Town Commission, Cecil County; sanitation, new.

S—Cumberland, Allegany County; sanitation, new.

S—Cumberland, Allegany County, sanitation, new.

S—Cumberland, Allegany County; water system, new.

MASSACHUSETTS

A—New Bedford, Bristol County; disposal facilities, new.

A—Swansea Water District, Bristol County; water system, new.

A—Fall River, Bristol County; water system, improvement.

A—Ipswich, Essex County; waste treatment, new.

A—Ipwsich, Essex Coutny; water system, improvement.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; sanitation, new.

A—Lowell City, Middlesex County; garage, new.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; bridges, improvement.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; parks, new.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; auditoriums, repair and improvement.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; community buildings, new.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; parks, new.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; protect buildings, new.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; auditoriums, new.

A—Lowell, Middlesex County; city streets, improvement.

A—Franklin, Norfolk County; water system, new.

A—Plainville, Norfolk County; water system, new.

B—Gloucester, Essex County; sanitation, new.

S—Easton, Bristol County; water supply, additions.

S—Andover, Essex County; water system, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; swimming facilities, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; water system, new.

S—Holyoke, Hampden County; water system, new.

S—Holyoke, Hampden County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.

S—Wilbraham, Hampden County; water system, new.

S—Wilbraham, Hampden County; city streets, improvement.

S—East Longmeadow, Hampden County; water system, new.

S—Water and Sewer Commission, Longmeadow; water storage, improvement.

S—Westfield, Hampden County; sanitation, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; garage, new.

S—Water Commission of Springfield, Hampden County; water system, new.

S—Holyoke, Hampden County; garage, new.

S—Holyoke, Hampton County; gas system, new.

S—Park Recreation Commission; West Springfield; parks, new.

S—Chicopee, Hampden County; electric system, new.

S—Ludlow, Hampden County; sanitation, additions.

S—Palmer, Hampden County; Municipal buildings, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; city streets, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; city streets, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; city streets, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; city streets, new.

S—Springfield, Hampden County; city streets, new.

S—Fire district No. 1, Hadley, Hampshire County; sanitation, new.

S—South Hadley, Hampshire County; city streets, improvement.

S—Easthampden, Hampshire County; roads, improvement.

S—Stoughton, Norfolk County; sanitation, new.

S—Brockton, Plymouth County; water system, new.

S—Warren, Worcester County; sanitation, new.

S—Milford, Worcester County; libraries, new.

S—Hopedale, Worcester County; bridges, new.

MICHIGAN

A—Bangor Township, Bay County; water system, improvement.

A—Bay City, Bay County; water system, improvement.

A—Bay County; water system, new.

A—Hampton Township, Bay County; water system, new.

A—Gladstone, Delta County; sanitation, new.

A—Gladstone, Delta County; water system, improvement.

A—Escanaba, Delta County; water system, new.

A—Escanaba, Delta County; sanitation, new.

A—Delta County; correct installation, new.

A—Escanaba, Delta County; parks, new.

A—Petoskey, Emmett County; highways, new.

A—Traverse, Grand Traverse County; water system, new.

A—Grand Traverse County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Hillsdale, Hillsdale County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Hillsdale, Hillsdale County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Hillsdale, Hillsdale County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Suttons Bay Village, Leelanau County; sanitation, new.

A—Morenci, Lenawee County; sanitation, new.

A—Madison Township, Lenawee County; sanitation, new.

A—Tecumseh, Lenawee County; sanitation, new.

A—Tecumseh, Lenawee County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Deerfield, Lenawee County; water system, new.

A—Ridgeway Township, Lenawee County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Detroit, Macomb County; water system, new.

A—Macomb Township, Macomb County; water system; new.

A—Center Line, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—Intracounty Drainage Board, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—Intracounty Drainage Building, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—Intra County Drainage Board, Macomb, County; sanitation, new.

A—Intra County Drainage Board, Macomb, County; sanitation, new.

A—Intra County Drainage Board, Macomb, County; sanitation, new.

A—St. Clair Shores, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—St. Clair Shores, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—St. Clair Shores, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—St. Clair Shores, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—St. Clair Shores, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—Roseville, Macomb County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Romeo Village, Macomb County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Mount Clemens, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—Warren, Macomb County; highways, improvement.

A—Warren, Macomb County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Warren, Macomb County; sanitation, new.

A—Clinton Township, Macomb County; water system, new.

A—Sterling Township, Macomb County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Sterling Township, Macomb County; water system, new.

A—Van Buren Township, Wayne County; water system, new.

A—Canton Township, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—Center Line, Macomb County; highways, improvement.

A—Utica, Macomb County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Fraser, Macomb County; harbor facilities, new.

A—Republic Township, Marquette County; water system, new.

A—Republic Township, Marquette County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Marguette, Marquette County; gas storage, new.

A—Menominee County Road Commission; sanitation, new.

A—Carleton, Monroe County; sanitation, new.

A—Oakland, Oakland County; sanitation, new.

A—Oakland, Oakland County; sanitation, new.

A—Oakland, Oakland County; highways, new.

A—Berkley, Oakland County; sanitation, new.

A—Hazel Park, Oakland County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Hazel Park, Oakland County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Hazel Park, Oakland County; water system, improvement.

A—Hazel Park, Oakland County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Troy, Oakland County; sanitation, new.
A—Oak Park, Oakland County; water system, new.
A—Oak Park, Oakland County; sanitation, new.
A—Sylvan Lake, Oakland County; water system, new.
A—Southeast Oakland County Water Authority; water system, new.
A—Keego Harbor, Oakland County; water system, new.
A—Oakland County Road Commission; harbor facility, new.
A—Pontiac, Oakland County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Pontiac, Oakland County; parks, new.
A—South Lyon, Oakland County; sanitation, new.
A—Waterford Township, Oakland County; water system, improvement.
A—Troy, Oakland County; water system, new.
A—Orion Township, Oakland County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Lathrup Village, Oakland County; water system, improvement.
A—Waterford Township, Oakland County; harbor facility, new.
A—Berkley, Oakland County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Ferndale, Oakland County; municipal buildings, new.
A—St. Clair County; highways, improvement.
A—Marine, St. Clair County; highways, new.
A—St. Clair, St. Clair County; water system, improvement.
A—Memphis, St. Clair County; waste treatment, new.
A—Port Huron, St. Clair County; water system, new.
A—St. Clair County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Manistique, Schoolcraft County; water system, new.
A—Cass City Village, Tuscola County; water system, new.
A—Wayne, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Wayne, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Wayne, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Dearborn, Wayne County; parks, new.
A—Garden City, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Garden City, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Garden City, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Garden City, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Garden City, Wayne County; highways, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; gas storage, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; gas storage, improvement.
A—Grosse Pointe Farms, Wayne County; municipal buildings, repair and improve.
A—Grosse Pointe Farms, Wayne County; municipal buildings, repair and improve.
A—Grosse Pointe Farms, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Plymouth Township, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Plymouth Township, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Plymouth Township, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Sexton-Kilfoil, Wayne County.
A—Sexton-Kilfoil, Wayne County.
A—Sexton-Kilfoil, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Dearborn, Wayne County; parks, new.
A—Dearborn Township, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Dearborn, Wayne County; harbor facilities, new.
A—Dearborn, Wayne County; harbor facilities, new.
A—Romulus Township, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Highland Park, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Highland Park, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Highland Park, Grosse Point; municipal buildings, repairs and improvements.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Grosse Pointe Park, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; industrial buildings, new.
A—Riverview, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Harper Woods, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Romulus Township, Wayne County; highways, new.
A—Romulus Township, Wayne County; highways, new.
A—Allen Park, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Highland Park, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Redford Township, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Redford Township, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—River Rouge, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—River Rouge, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Wyandotte, Wayne County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Wayne County Road Commissioner.
A—Wayne County Road Commissioner.
A—Wayne County Road Commissioner, sanitation, new.
A—Southgate, Wyandotte Road, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Gilbralter, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Lincoln Park, Wayne County; parks, new.
A—Wayne County Road Commission.
A—Wayne County Road Commission.
A—Wayne County Road Commission; water system, new.
A—Wayne County Road Commission.
A—Wayne County Road Commission.
A—Wayne County Road Commission; water system, new.
A—Trenton, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Ecorse Building Authority, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County! highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.

A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Detroit, Wayne County; highways, improvement.
A—Livonia, Wayne County, highways, improvement.
A—Livonia, Wayne County, highways, improvement.
A—Livonia, Wayne County; sanitation, new.
A—Grosse Pointe, Wayne County, municipal buildings, new.
A—Lincoln Park, Wayne County; water system, improvement.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Taylor Township, Wayne County; water system, new.
A—Lincoln Park, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Alger-Munising, Alger County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Munsing, Alger County; highways, improvement.
B—Munsing, Alger County; highways, new.
B—Alpena, Alpena County; municipal buildings, repair improvement.
B—Elk Rapids, Antrim County; parks, new.
B—Standish, Arenac County; sanitation, new.
B—Au Gres, Arenac County; water system, new.
B—Standish, Arenac County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Sterling, Arenac County; sanitation, new.
B—Arenac County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Baraga County, road commission; municipal buildings, new.
B—Lanse Township, Baraga County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Lanse Village, Baraga County; water system, improvement.
B—Lanse Township, Baraga County; water system, new.
B—East Jordan, Charlevoix County; sanitation, new.
B—Cheboygan, Cheboygan County; water system, new.
B—Road Commission, Chippewa County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Rudyard Township, Chippewa County; sanitation, new.
B—Clare, Clare County; water system, new.
B—Grayling, Crawford County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Grayling, Crawford County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Crawford County; Library Board; municipal buildings, new.
B—Iron Mountain, Dickinson County; sanitation, new.
B—Iron Mountain, Dickinson County; water system, new.
B—Kingsford, Dickinson County; water system, new.
B—Dickinson, Dickinson County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Harbor Springs, Emmet County; sanitation, new.
B—Emmet County, municipal buildings, new.
B—Emmett County, municipal buildings, new.
B—Flint, Genesee County; water system, new.
B—Ironwood, Gogebic County; sanitation, new.
B—Ironwood, Gogebic County; water system, improvement.
B—Gogebic County; Building Authority, municipal buildings, new.
B—Watersmeet Township, Gogebic County; water system, new.
B—Bessemer, Gogebic County; sanitation, new.
B—Marenisco Township, Gogebic County; water system, new.
B—Alma, Gratiot County; sanitation, new.
B—Alma, Gratiot County; water system, new.
B—Houghton Village, Houghton County; sanitation, new.
B—Hancock, Houghton County; sanitation, new.
B—Portage Lake, Houghton County; waste treatment, new.
B—Houghton County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Hancock, Houghton County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Portage Township, Houghton County; water system, new.
B—Harbor Beach, Huron County; parks, new.
B—Caseville Township, Huron County; parks, new.
B—Ubly, Huron County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Iron County Road Commission; municipal buildings, new.
B—Iron County Road Commission, River Township; highways, new.
B—Baldwin, Lake County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Baldwin Village, Lake County; water system, new.
B—Lapeer County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Brighton, Livingston County; sanitation, new.
B—Howell, Livingston County; sanitation, new.
B—Fowlerville, Livingston County; sanitation, new.
B—Pentland Township, Luce County; water system, new.
B—Newberry, Luce County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Newberry, Luce County; sanitation, new.
B—St. Ignace, Mackinac County; parks, new.
B—Clark Township, Mackinac County; parks, new.
B—St. Ignace Township, Mackinac County; water system, new.
B—Mackinac County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Portage Township, Mackinac County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.
B—Mackinac County Road Commission; highways, new.
B—Arcadia Township, Manistee County; parks, new.
B—Manistee, Manistee County; water system, new.
B—Filer Township, Manistee County; water system, improvement.
B—Onekama, Manistee County; sanitation, new.
B—Menominee, Menominee County; sanitation, new.
B—Menominee, Menominee County; parks, improvement.
B—Lake, Missaukee County; sanitation, new.
B—Pentwater, Oceana County; sanitation, new.
B—Hart, Oceana County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Shelby Village, Oceana County; sanitation, new.
B—Shelby Village, Oceana County; clinics, new.
B—Ontonagon, Ontonagon County; sanitation, new.
B—Ontonagon County Road Commission; municipal buildings, new.
B—Ontonagon County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Ontonagon, Ontonagon County; water system, new.
B—Rogers, Presque Isle County; parks, new.
B—Roscommon County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Roscommon, Roscommon County; sanitation, new.
B—Brown, Sanilac County; sanitation, new.
B—Kingston, Tuscola County; water system, new.
B—Lawrence, Van Buren County; water system, new.
B—Mattawan, Van Buren County; water system, improvement.
B—Manton, Wexford County; water system, improvement.
S—Battle Creek, Calhoun County; sanitation, new.
S—Parma, Jackson County; sanitation, new.
S—Norton Township, Muskegon County; water system, new.

MINNESOTA

A—Hill City Village, Aitkin County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Cass Lake, Cass County; community buildings, repair/improvement.
A—Nisswa, Crow Wing County; community buildings, new.
A—Grand Rapids, Itasca County; community buildings, new.
A—Grand Rapids Village, Itasca County; water system, additions.
A—Grand Rapids, Itasco County; sanitation, new.
A—Grand Rapids, Itasca County; highways, improvement.
A—Coleraine, Itasca County; roads, new.
A—Deer River, Itasca County; roads, improvement.
A—Iron Range, Itasca County; community buildings, new.
A—Keewatin, Itasca County; city streets, improvement.
A—Arbo Township, Itasca County; community buildings, new.
A—Cook, St. Louis County; waste treatment, new.
A—Orr Village, St. Louis County; protect buildings, new.
A—Proctor and Duluth, St. Louis County; sanitation, new.
A—Proctor, St. Louis County; sanitation, improvement.
A—McKinley Village, St. Louis County; protect buildings, new.
A—Proctor Village, St. Louis County; garage, new.
A—Eveleth City, St. Louis County; water system, improvement.
A—Eveleth City, St. Louis County; city streets, improvement.
A—Floodwood, St. Louis County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Mountain Iron, St. Louis County; gas storage, new.
A—Duluth, St. Louis County; water system, new.
A—Nichols, St. Louis County; sanitation, new.
A—Mountain Iron, St. Louis County; sanitation, new.
A—Mountain Iron, St. Louis County; roads, new.

A—Stuntz, St. Louis County; city streets, new.
A—Virginia, St. Louis County; roads, new.
A—Iron Junction, St. Louis County; water system, improvement.
A—Winton, St. Louis County; water system, new.
A—Cloquet, St. Louis County; water system, new.
A—Duluth, St. Louis County; parks, new.
A—Duluth, St. Louis County; community buildings, repair/improvement.
A—Hoyt Lakes, St. Louis County; parks, improvement.
A—Duluth, St. Louis County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Bemidji, Beltrami County; protect buildings, new.
B—Bemidji, Beltrami County; water system, new.
B—Bemidji, Beltrami County; sanitation, new.
B—Kelliher Village, Beltrami County; parks, new.
B—Blackduck, Beltrami County; sanitation, new.
B—Carlton Village, Carlton County; sanitation, new.
B—Wrenshalla, Carlton County; sanitation, new.
B—Carlton, Carlton County; sanitation, new.
B—Thomson, Carlton County; sanitation, new.
B—Carlton County; community buildings, repair/improvement.
B—Kettle River, Carlton County; roads, new.
B—Kettle River, Carlton County; sanitation, new.
B—Cromwell, Carlton County; community buildings, new.
B—Cromwell, Carlton County; water system, new.
B—Grand Marais, Cook County; roads, improvement.
B—Evansville, Douglas County; sanitation, new.
B—Akeley Village, Hubbard County; water system, new.
B—Park Rapids, Hubbard County; community buildings, new.
B—Mora, Kanabee County, water system, new.
B—Kanabec County, community buildings, new.
B—Mora, Kanabec County; parks, new.
B—Koochiching County nursing home; convalescent homes, new.
B—International Falls, Koochiching County; city streets, improvement.
B—Big Falls, Koochiching County; sanitation, new.
B—International Falls, Koochiching County; sanitation, new.
B—International Falls, Koochiching County; community buildings, repair/improvement.
B—Two Harbors, Lake County; sanitation, new.
B—Bandette, Lake of the Woods County; sanitation, new.
B—Williams, Lake of the Woods County; water system, new.
B—Thief River Falls, Pennington County; sanitation, new.
B—Thief River Falls, Pennington County; storage, new.
B—Thief River Falls, Pennington County; community buildings, repair and improvement.
B—Pine City, Pine County; water system, new.
B—Willow River, Pine County; sanitation, new.
B—Pine County; harbor facilities, new.
B—Roseau Village, Roseau County; community buildings, new.
B—Greenbush, Roseau County; sanitation, new.
B—Roseau County; community buildings, new.
B—Duluth, St. Louis County; community buildings, new.
S—Stephen, Marshall County; roads, new.

MISSISSIPPI

B—Shelby, Bolivar County; city streets, improvement.
B—Mound Bayou, Bolivar County; water system, new.
B—Okolona, Chickasaw County; water system, additions.
B—Quitman City, Clarke County; city streets, improvement.
B—Collins, Covington County; water system, new.
B—Seminary, Covington County; water system, new.
B—Collins, Covington County; gas system, additions.
B—Pickens, Holmes County; sanitation, additions.
B—Fayette, Jefferson County; correctional institution, new.
B—Prentiss, Jefferson Davis County; sanitation, new.
B—New Hebron, Lawrence County; sanitation, new.
B—Tupelo, Lee County; drainage, additions.
B—Madison, Madison County; water system, additions.
B—Potts Camp, Marshall County; water system, additions.
B—New Augusta, Perry County; gas system, new.
B—Summit, Pike County; sanitation, new.
B—Ruleville, Sunflower County; city streets, improvement.
B—Senatobia, Tate County; city streets, improvement.
B—Walthall County Board of Supervisors; correctional institution, new.
B—Leland, Washington County; city streets, improvement.
B—Greenville, Washington County; highways, new.
B—Noxapater, Winston County; gas system, new.
B—Coffeeville, Yalobusha County; sanitation, additions.
B—Bentonia, Yazoo County; sanitation, additions.
S—Houston, Chickasaw County; city streets, improvement.
S—Hernando, De Soto County; water system, new.
S—Laurel City, Jones County; city streets, improvement.
S—Laurel, Jones County; sanitation, new.
S—Lena, Leake County; water system, new.
S—Greenwood, Leflore County; sanitation, additions.
S—Board of Aldermen Vicksburg, Warren County; sanitation, additions.
S—Vicksburg, Warren County; water system, new.
S—Greenville, Washington County; sanitation, additions.
S—Hollandale, Washington County; sanitation, additions.
SB—Greenville, Washington County; city streets, improvement.
SB—Board of Supervisors, Louisville, Winston County; warehouses, improvement.

MISSOURI

A—Washington, Franklin County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Washington, Franklin County; sanitation, new.
A—Union, Franklin County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Ironton, Iron County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Pilot Knob, Iron County; water system, additions.
A—Ironton, Iron County; courthouses, additions.
A—Flat River, St. Francois County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Desloge, St. Francois County; sanitation, additions.
A—Esther, St. Francois County; sanitation, new.
A—Potosi, Washington County; city streets, improvement.
B—Ellsinore, Carter County; water system, new.
B—Grandin, Carter County; water system, new.
B—State Park Board, Jefferson City; parks, new.
B—Ava County Court, Douglas County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Trenton, Grundy County; bridges, new.
B—State of Missouri, Hermitage, Hickory courthouses, new.
B—Wellington, Lafayette County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Wellington, Napoleon Special; roads, improvement.
B—Odessa, Lafayette County; water system, improvement.
B—Corder, Lafayette County; sanitation, new.
B—Bates City, Lafayette County; water system, improvement.
B—Concordia, Lafayette County; roads, new.
B—Waverly, Lafayette County; water syster, new.
B—Odessa, Lafayette County; water system, additions.
B—Mayview, Lafayette County; sanitation, new.
B—Mercer, Mercer County; water system, new.
B—Thayer, Oregon County; water system, new.
B—Alton, Oregon County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Gainesville, Ozark County; sanitation, new.
B—Hayti, Pemiscot County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Ellington, Reynolds County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Naylor, Ripley County; water system, new.
B—Doniphan, Ripley County; disposal facilities, new.
B—Eminence, Shannon County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Houston, Texas County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Cabool, Texas County; water supply, new.
B—Mountain Grove, Wright County; swimming facilities, new.
B—Hartville, Wright County; courthouses, new.
S—Jackson, Cape Girardeau County; sanitation, additions.
S—Liberty, Clay County; sanitation, new.
S—Liberty, Clay County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Liberty, Clay County; roads, new.
S—Gladstone, Clay County; water system, new.
S—Gladstone, Clay County; sanitation, new.
S—Jefferson, Cole County; sanitation, additions.
S—Pacific, Franklin County; water supply, new.
S—Lake Lotawana, Jackson County; sanitation, new.
S—Lake Lotawana, Jackson County; sanitation, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.

S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; sanitation, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; auditoriums, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; airports, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; airports, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City—Jackson County; auditoriums, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; roads, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County, water system, new.
S—Lees Summit, Jackson County; roads, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; roads, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; water system, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; water system, new.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County.
S—Kansas City, Jackson County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Higginsville, Lafayette County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Southwest City, McDonald County; water system, additions.
S—Noel, McDonald County; sanitation, new.
S—Anderson, McDonald County; gas system, new.
S—Goodman, McDonald County; gas system, nw.
S—Southwest, McDonald County; gas system, new.
S—Hannibal, Marion-Ralls County; city streets, new.
S—Lawson, Ray County; water system, new.
S—Elvins, St. Francois County; sanitation, new.

MONTANA

A—Columbia Falls, Flathead County; water system, new.
A—Columbia Falls, Flathead County; sanitation, new.
A—Libby, Lincoln County, municipal buildings, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
A—Butte, Silver Bow County; roads, new.
B—Bridger, Carbon County; roads, new.
B—Roberts, Carbon County; water system, new.
B—Polson city, Lake County; sanitation, new.
B—Ronan, Lake County; sanitation, new.
S—Roundup, Musselshell County; sanitation, new.
S—Culbertson, Roosevelt County; water system, new.
S—Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of; municipal buildings, new.
S—Froid, Roosevelt County; sanitation, new.
S—Wolf Point, Roosevelt County; parks, new.

NEBRASKA

B—Kearney city, Buffalo County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Gibbon village, Buffalo County; sanitation, new.
B—Ravenna, Buffalo County; Parks, improvement.
B—Arnold village, Custer County; parks, new.
B—Sargent, Custer County; city streets, improvement.
B—St. Paul city, Howard County; sanitation, new.
B—Farwell village, Howard County, sanitation, new.
B—Taylor village, Loup County; sanitation, new.
B—Fullerton, Nance County; sanitation, new.
B—Nance County; harbor facility, new.
B—Fullerton, Nance County; community buildings, new.
B—Litchfield village, Sherman County; sanitation, new.

NEVADA

B—Caliente, Lincoln County; roads, new.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

B—Littleton, Grafton County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Atlantic City, Atlantic County; city streets, new.
A—Atlantic City, Atlantic County; city streets, new.
A—Pleasantville, Atlantic County; sanitation, new.
A—Atlantic City, Atlantic County; roads, improvement.
A—Atlantic City, Atlantic County; roads, improvement.
A—Atlantic City, Atlantic County; roads, improvement.
A—Atlantic City, Atlantic County; roads, improvement.
A—Somers Point Sewage Authority, Atlantic County; sanitation, new.
A—Atlantic City Atlantic County; water system, new.
A—Ventnor City, Atlantic County; city streets, improvement.
A—Wildwood, Cape May Co., roads, new.
A—Middle Township Water District No. 1, water system, new.
A—Cape May, Cape May County; highways, new.
A—Cape May, Cape May County; garage, new.
A—Cape May, Cape May County; protect buildings, new.
A—Long Beach Township, Ocean County, roads, new.
A—Driebelle Borough, Monmouth County, water system, new.
A—Asbury Park, Monmouth County; protect buildings, repair/improvement.
A—Asbury Park, Monmouth County; protect buildings, repair/impr.
A—Spring Lake Heights Borough, Monmouth County; water system, new.
A—Little Silver Borough, Monmouth County; sanitation, new.
A—Wall Township, Monmouth County; sanitation, new.
A—Borough of Farmingdale, Monmouth County; water system, new.
A—Asbury Park, Monmouth County; libraries, improvement.
A—Belmar Borough, Monmouth County; water resources, additions.
A—The Borough of Spring Lake, Monmouth County; harbor facilities, improvement.
A—Colts Neck Township, Monmouth County; community buildings, new.
A—Manasquah Borough, Monmouth County; garage, new.
A—Middletown Township, Monmouth County; city streets, improvement.
A—Long Branch, Monmouth County; city streets, new.
A—Long Branch, Monmouth County; city streets, new.
A—Long Branch, Monmouth County; bridges, new.
A—Long Branch, Monmouth County; roads, new.
A—Middletown Township, Monmouth County; sanitation, new.
A—Middletown Township, Monmouth County; city streets, new.
A—Middleton Township, Monmouth County; community buildings, repair and improve.
A—Borough of Sea Girt, Monmouth County; water system, new.
A—Borough of Harvey Cedars, Ocean County; harbor facilities, improvement.
A—Dover Sewer Authority, Ocean County; sanitation, new.
A—Borough of Island Heights, Ocean County; sanitation, new.
A—Beach Haven Borough, Ocean County; municipal buildings, repair and improve.
A—Point Pleasant, Beach Borough, Ocean County; water system, new.
A—Point Pleasant, Beach Borough, Ocean County; sanitation, new.
A—Point Pleasant, Beach Borough, Ocean County; sanitation, new.
A—Point Pleasant, Beach Borough, Ocean County; sanitation, new.
A—Point Pleasant, Beach Borough, Ocean County; harbor facilities, new.
A—Point Pleasant, Beach Borough, Ocean County; city streets, improvement.
A—Point Pleasant, Beach Borough, Ocean County; harbor facilities, new.
A—South Toms River Borough, Ocean County; community buildings, new.
A—Jackson Township, Ocean County; protect buildings, new.
A—Toms River, Dover Township, Ocean County; community buildings, new.
A—Borough of Mt. Pleasant Beach; municipal buildings, repair and improve.
A—Borough of Mt. Pleasant Beach; community buildings, new.
A—Toms River, Ocean County Authority; water resources, new.
A—Ocean Gate Borough, Ocean County; parks, new.
A—Ocean Gate Borough, Ocean County; water system, new.
A—Lavallette Borough, Ocean County; bridges, new.
A—Tuckerton Municipal Utilities Authority; sanitation, new.
A—Paterson, Passaic County; community buildings, new.
A—Paterson, Passaic County; parks, new.
A—Paterson, Passaic County; parks, new.
A—Northern Jersey Water Commission; water system, new.
A—Passaic Valley Water Commission; water system, new.
A—Patterson, Paissaic County; sanitation, new.
B—Seaside Heights, Ocean County; roads, new.
S—Bordentown, Burlington County; sanitation, new.
S—Evesham Township, Burlington County; water system, new.
S—Bordentown, Burlington County; courthouses, repair, improve.
S—Mount Holly Township, Burlington; sanitation, new.
S—Burlington Township, Burlington; sanitation, new.
S—Levittown Township, Burlington; sanitation, new.
S—Riverside Township, Burlington; sanitation, new.
S—Evesham Township, Burlington County; roads, new.
S—Bordentown, Burlington County; city streets, new.
S—Cinnamins Township, Burlington County; community buildings, repair, improve.

S—Camden, Camden County; waste treatment, new.

S—Camden, Camden County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Lawnside, Camden County; sanitation, new.

S—Camden, Camden County; water system, new.

S—Gloucester Township Sewage Authority; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Bellmawr, Camden County; sanitation, new.

S—Haddon Township, Camden County; libraries, improvement.

S—Mount Ephriam Borough, Camden County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Haddonfield, Camden County; sanitation, improvement.

S—East Orange, Essex County; garage, new.

S—Newark, Essex County.

S—Newark, Essex County.

S—Newark, Essex County; facilities, new.

S—Newark, Essex County.

S—Newark, Essex County.

S—Newark, Essex County, warehouses, new.

S—Newark, Essex County.

S—Newark, Essex County.

S—Newark, Essex County; roads, new.

S—Newark, Essex County, Park Commission.

S—Newark, Essex County, Park Commission.

S—Newark, Essex County, Park Commission; parks, new.

S—West Orange, Essex County; athletic buildings, improvement.

S—Livingston Township, Essex County; community buildings, new.

S—Livingston Township, Essex County; sanitation, new.

S—National Park Utility Authority, Gloucester County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Paulsboro, Gloucester County; water system, new.

S—Jersey City, Hudson County; community buildings, new.

S—Bayonne, Hudson County; sanitation, new.

S—New Jersey Public Market Commission, Jersey.

S—New Jersey Public Market Commission, Jersey; community buildings, new.

S—Bayonne, Hudson County; water system, new.

S—Borough, Hoboken, Hudson County; other recreation facility, new.

S—Hoboken Borough, Hudson County; city streets, new.

S—Hoboken Borough, Hudson County; sanitation, new.

S—Hoboken Borough, Hudson County; city streets, improvement.

S—Hoboken Borough, Hudson County; sanitation, new.

S—Hoboken Borough, Hudson County; city streets, improvement.

S—Hoboken Borough, Hudson County; sanitation, new.

S—Amboy, Middlesex County; libraries, new.

S—Borough of Carteret, Middlesex County; protect buildings, new.

S—Borough of Carteret, Middlesex County; garage, new.

S—Piscataway Township, Middlesex County; roads, new.

S—Milltown Borough, Middlesex County; community buildings, new.

S—Madison Township, Laurence Harbor; sanitation, new.

S—Piscataway Township, Middlesex County; sanitation, new.

S—Board of Education, Borough of Carteret; other recreation facilities, improvement.

S—New Brunswick, Middlesex County; community buildings, repair/improvement.

S—Edison Township, Middlesex County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough South Plainfield, Middlesex County; garage, new.

S—Perth Amboy, Middlesex County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Metuchen, Middlesex County; city streets, improvement.

S—Borough of South Plainfield, Middlesex County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Jamesburg, Middlesex County; community buildings, new.

S—Hanover Township, Morris County; sanitation, new.

S—Boonton, Morris County; community buildings, new.

S—Chester Borough, Morris County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Watchung, Somerset County; sanitation, new.

S—Borough of Manville, Somerset County; water system, new.

S—Montgomery Township, Somerset County; community buildings, new.

S—Scotch Plains Township, Union County; sanitation, new.

S—Rahway, Union County; garage, new.

NEW MEXICO

A—Silver City, Grant County; parks, new.

B—Aragon Mutual Water Sewer Works; water system, new.

B—Cimarron, Colfax County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Raton, Colfax County; water system, new.

B—Springer, Colfax County; roads, additions.

B—Central, Grant County; water system, improvement.

B—Santa Rosa, Guadalupe County; roads, new.

B—Santa Rosa, Guadalupe County; water resources, new.

B—Gallup, McKinley County; harbor facilities, new.

B—Gallup, McKinley County; auditoriums, new.

B—Gallup, McKinley County; water system, new.

B—Gallup, McKinley County; roads, additions.

B—Wagon Mound, Mora County; sanitation, new.

B—Chama, Rio Arriba County; water system, new.

B—Espanola, Rio Arriba County; water system, improvement.

B—Espanola, Rio Arriba County; roads, improvement.

B—Espanola, Rio Arriba County; roads, new.

B—Bernalillo, Sandoval County; sanitation, new.

B—Bernalillo, Sandoval County; roads, new.

B—Farmington, Sau Juan County; water system, new.

B—Las Vegas, San Miguel County; sanitation, new.

B—Las Vegas, San Miguel County; auditoriums, new.

B—Santa Fe, Santa Fe County; auditoriums, new.

B—Santa Fe, Santa Fe County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Espanola, Santa Fe County; water system, improvement.

B—Espanola, Santa Fe County; roads, improvement.

B—Taos, Taos County; water system, improvement.

B—Penasco Water Associates, Taos County; water system, new.

B—Willard, Torrance County; water system, new.

B—Estancia, Torrance County; water system, new.

B—Moriarty, Torrance County; water system, new.

B—Mountainair, Torrance County; roads, new.

B—Estancia, Torrance County; roads, improvement.

B—Los Lunas, Valencia County; water system, improvement.

B—Belen, Valencia County; water system, improvement.

B—Los Lunas, Valencia County; roads, new.

B—Los Lunas, Valencia County; swimming facilities, new.

B—Grants, Valencia County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Grants, Valencia County; water system, improvement.

B—Grants, Valencia County; roads, improvement.

B—Milan, Valencia County; water system, improvement.

B—Gallup, McKinley County; water resources, new.

S—Board of Commission Reserve, Catron; parks, new.

S—Catron County Commission Reserve, Catron; municipal buildings, new.

S—Silver City, Grant County; airports, new.

S—Mora County Board of Commission, Mora; municipal buildings, repair, improvement.

S—Belen, Valencia County Fair Association; exhibit buildings, new.

NEW YORK

A—Auburn, Cayuga County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Fleming, Cayuga County; water system, new.

A—Weedsport, Cayuga County; sanitation, new.

A—Cayuga, Cayuga County; sanitation, new.

A—Dunkirk City, Chautauqua County; water system, new.

A—Rouses Point, Clinton County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; water system, new.

A—Champlain Village, Clinton County; water system, new.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; sanitation, new.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; municipal buildings, repair/improvement.

A—Dannemora, Clinton County; protect buildings, new.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; sanitation, improvement.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; sanitation, new.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; water system, new.

A—Plattsburgh, Clinton County; water system, new.

AB—Keeseville, Clinton County; sanitation, new.

A—West Seneca, Erie County; municipal buildings, new.

AB—Keeseville, Essex County; sanitation, new.

A—Saranac Lake, Franklin County; protect buildings, repair/improvement.

A—Gloversville City, Fulton County; sanitation, new.

A—Watertown, Jefferson County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Watertown, Jefferson County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Oneonta, Otsego County; sanitation, new.

A—Oneonta, Otsego County; city streets, improvements.

A—Waddington, St. Lawrence County; sanitation, new.

A—Norfolk, St. Lawrence County; sanitation, new.

A—Waddington, St. Lawrence County; sanitation, new.

A—Norfolk, St. Lawrence County; sanitation, new.

A—Waddington, St. Lawrence County, water system, new.

A—Waddington, St. Lawrence County; city streets, new.

A—Ogdensberg, St. Lawrence County; sanitation, new.
A—Stockholm-Winthrop St. Lawrence County; sanitation, new.
A—Massena, St. Lawrence County; sanitation, new.
A—Morristown, St. Lawrence County; garage, new.
A—Schenectady, Schenectady County; sanitation, new.
A—Schenectady, Schenectady County; water system, new.
A—Schenectady, Schenectady County; city streets, improvement.
S—Wellsville, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.
S—Wellsville Water District, Allegheny County; water system, new.
S—Little Valley, Cattaragus County; correctional institution, new.
S—Conquest, Cayuga County; community buildings, new.
S—Elmira, Chemung County; protect buildings, new.
S—Sewer District 2, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Cheektowaga storm drainage district; sanitation, new.
S—West Seneca, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Sloan-Buffalo, Erie County.
S—Sloan-Buffalo, Erie County; protect buildings, new.
S—Amherst-Williamsville, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Amherst-Williamsville, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Buffalo, Erie County.
S—Buffalo, Erie County; community buildings, additions.
S—Amherst-Williamsville, Erie County; parks, new.
S—Tonawanda, Erie County; community buildings, new.
S—Amherst, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Tonawanda, Erie County; roads, new.
S—Tonawanda, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Tonawanda, Erie County; road, new.
S—Amherst, Erie County; roads, new.
S—Marilla, Erie County; city streets, new.
S—West Seneca, Erie County; playground, new.
S—Hamburg, Erie County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Lancaster, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Lancaster, Erie County; libraries, new.
S—Lancaster, Erie County; water resources, new.
S—Buffalo Sewer Authority, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Erie County Water Authority, Buffalo.
S—Erie County Water Authority, Buffalo; water system, new.
S—Hamburg, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Depew, Erie County; protect buildings, new.
S—Amherst, Williamsville-Erie County; municipal buildings, new.
S—East Aurora, Erie County; water resources, new.
S—East Aurora, Erie County; city streets, improvement.
S—Buffalo, Erie County.
S—Buffalo, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Buffalo, Erie County.
S—Buffalo, Erie County; city streets, improvement.
S—Buffalo, Erie County.
S—Buffalo, Erie County; bridges, improvement.
S—Blasdell, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Elma, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Elma, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Grand Island, Erie County; city streets, new.
S—Cheektowago, Erie County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Grand Island, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Buffalo, Erie County.
S—Buffalo, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Buffalo, Erie County.
S—Buffalo, Erie County; community buildings, new.
S—Sloan, Erie County.
S—Sloan, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Lancaster, Erie County; city streets, improvement.
S—Lancaster, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Lancaster, Erie County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Hamburg, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Hamburg, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Boston, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Eden, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Blasdell, Erie County; city streets, improvement.
S—Hamburg, Erie County; water system, new.
S—Hamburg, Erie County; sanitation, new.
S—Leroy, Genesee County; water system, new.
S—Clayton, Jefferson County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Watertown, Jefferson County; water storage, new.
S—Watertown, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.
S—Lewiston, Niagara County; water system, new.
S—Niagara County Water District, Lockport, Niagara County; water system, new.
S—Water District 3 Lockport, Niagara County; water system, improvement.
S—Royalton Gasport, Niagara County; water system, new.
S—North Tonawanda, Niagara County; bridges, new.
S—Lockport, Niagara County; water system, new.
S—Niagara Falls, Niagara County; auditoriums, new.
S—Wheatfield, Niagara County; water system, new.
S—Lewiston, Niagara County; sanitation, new.
S—Clyton Springs, Ontario County; water system, new.
S—Victor, Ontario County, water system, new.
S—Gorham, Ontario County; water system, new.
S—Rushville, Ontario County; water system, new.
S—Phelps, Ontario County; sanitation, new.
S—Geneva, Ontario County; water system, new.
S—Wallkill, Orange County; sanitation, new.
S—Walden Village, Orange County; water system, new.
S—Walden Village, Orange County; city streets, new.
S—Highlands, Orange County; sanitation, new.
S—Goshen, Orange County; munitions buildings, new.
S—Crawford, Orange County; munitions buildings, new.
S—Montgomery, Orange County; sanitation, new.
S—New Windsor, Orange County; sanitation, new.
S—New Windsor, Orange County; sanitation, new.
S—New Windsor, Orange County; sanitation, new.
S—Newburgh, Orange County; sanitation, new.
S—Middletown, Orange County; water system, new.
S—Bolton, Warren County; garage, new.
S—Fort Ann, Washington County; water system, new.
S—Hudson Falls, Washington County; water system, new.
S—Rushville, Yates County; water system, new.

NORTH CAROLINA

A—Hope Mills, Cumberland County; water system, additions.
A—Creedmoor, Granville County; water system, improvement.
A—Raeford, Hoke County; water system, additions.
A—Kingston, Lenoir County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Kingston, Lenoir County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Kingston, Lenoir County; water system, improvement.
AS—Grifton, Lenoir County; water system, new.
A—Hamlet, Richmond County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Henderson, Vance County; sanitation, new.
A—Henderson, Vance County; water system, new.
A—Wilson, Wilson County; water system, improvement.
B—Wadesboro, Anson County; water system, new.
B—West Jefferson, Ashe County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Lewiston, Bertie County; water system, new.
B—Aulander, Bertie County; community buildings, new.
B—Bladen County; community buildings, new.
B—Morehead, Carteret County; sanitation, new.
B—Murphy, Cherokee County; water system, additions.
B—Edenton, Chowan County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Edenton, Chowan County; community buildings, new.
B—Edenton, Chowan County; city streets, improvement.
B—Robbinsville, Graham County; water system, improvement.
B—Highlands, Macon County; water system, new.
B—Spruce Pin, Mitchell County; water system, improvement.
B—Roxboro, Person County; protect buildings, new.
B—Roseboro, Sampson County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Bryson, Swain County; water system, new.
B—Norlina, Warren County; sanitation, new.
S—Camden, Camden County; community buildings, repair/improvement.
S—Durham, Durham County; city streets, improvement.
S—Durham, Durham County; city streets, improvement.
S—Durham, Durham County; water system, new.
S—Durham, Durham County; protect buildings, new.
S—Board of Commissioner, Louisburg-Franklin County; community buildings, new.
S—Youngsville, Franklin County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Board of Commissioners, Hendersonville County; water system, new.
S—Elizabeth, Pasquotank County; sanitation, improvement.
SB—Roxboro, Person County; community buildings, new.
S—Pethel, Pitt County; water system, additions.
S—Greenville, Pitt County; sanitation, new.
S—Greenville, Pitt County; protect buildings, new.
S—Greenville City, Pitt County; city streets, imp[illegible]ent.

S—Greenville, Pitt County; correctional institution, repair and improvement.

S—Farmville, Pitt County; water system, improvement.

S—Winterville, Pitt County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Farmville, Pitt County; city streets, improvement.

OHIO

A—Winchester, Adams County; sanitation, new.

A—Ashtabula, Ashtabula County; roads, improvement.

A—Conneaut, Ashtabula County; water system, new.

A—Geneva, Ashtabula County; roads, new.

A—Jacksonville, Athens County; waste treatment, new.

A—Brookside, Belmont County; sanitation, new.

A—Shadyside, Belmont County; water system, improvement.

A—Belmont County; sanitation, new.

A—Belmont County; water system, new.

A—Aberdeen, Brown County; water system, new.

A—Amelia, Clermont County; sanitation, new.

A—Milford, Clermont County, water system, new.

A—Gallipolis, Gallia County; sanitation, new.

A—Gallipolis, Gallia County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Byesville, Guernsey County; water system, new.

A—Logan, Hocking County; sanitation, new.

A—Wellston, Jackson County; water system, improvement.

A—Wellston, Jackson County; roads, improvement.

A—Jackson, Jackson County; waste treatment, new.

A—Jackson, Jackson County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Jackson, Jackson County; roads, improvement.

A—Coal Grove, Lawrence County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Logan, Hocking County; waste treatment, new.

A—Pomerby, Meigs County; sanitation, new.

A—Beallsville, Monroe County; sanitation, new.

A—Clarksburg, Ross County; sanitation, new.

A—Chillicothe, Ross County, sanitation, new.

A—Portsmouth, Scioto County, sanitation, new.

B—Matamoras, Washington County; disposal facilities, new.

S—Middleton, Butler County; sanitation, new.

S—Middleton, Butler County; water system, new.

S—Middleton, Butler County; water system, improvement.

S—Eastern Vmen. Township, Butler County; water system, new.

S—Wayne Township, Butler County; water system, new.

S—Fairfield, Butler County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Hamilton, Butler County; sanitation, new.

S—Hamilton, Butler County; sanitation, new.

S—Hamilton, Butler County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Hamilton, Butler County; gas system, new.

S—Hamilton, Butler County; gas system, improvement.

S—Fairfield, Butler County; water system, new.

S—Trenton, Bulter County; sanitation, new.

S—Minerva Village, Carroll County; roads, improvement.

S—Minerva, Carroll County; sanitation, new.

S—Union Township, Hamilton County; water system, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; sanitation, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; sanitation, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; sanitation, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; sanitation, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; sanitation, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; waste treatment, new.

S—Sheffield Village, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Avon Lake, Lorain County; sanitation, new.

S—Elyria, Lorain County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Elyria, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Lorain, Lorain County; water system, new.

S—Holland, Lucas County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Adams and Springfield Townships, Lucas County; sanitation, new.

S—Waterville, Lucas County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Toledo, Lucas County; sanitation, new.

S—Toledo, Lucas County; airports, new.

S—Toledo, Lucas County; airports, new.

S—Toledo, Lucas County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; roads, improvement.

S—Lowellville, Mahoning County; roads, new.

S—Lowellville, Mahoning County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; roads, improvement.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; roads, improvement.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; city streets, improvement.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; auditoriums, new.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; parks, new.

S—Struthers, Mahoning County; parks, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; sanitation, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; roads, improvement.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; sanitation, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; roads, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; sanitation, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; sanitation, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; sanitation, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Vienna Township, Mahoning County; auditoriums, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; garage, new.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; municipal buildings, repair/improvement.

S—Vienna Township, Mahoning County; water system, new.

S—Campbell, Mahoning County; water supply, new.

S—Campbell, Mahoning County; sanitation, new.

S—Campbell, Mahoning County; water system, new.

S—Campbell, Mahoning County; city streets, improvement.

S—Campbell, Mahoning County; water system, new.

S—Campbell, Mahoning County; sanitation, improvement.

S—Campbell, Mahoning County; city streets, improvement.

S—Youngstown, Mahoning County; auditoriums, new.

S—Coitsville Township, Mahoning County; auditoriums, new.

S—Youngstown Township, Mahoning County; parks, new.

S—Canfield, Mahoning County; municipal buildings, repair/improvement.

S—Austintown Township, Mahoning County; libraries, new.

S—Poland, Mahoning County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Zanesville, Muskingum County; water system, new.

S—Zanesville, Muskingum County; water system, new.

S—Zanesville, Muskingum County; sanitation, new.

S—Zanesville, Muskingum County; municipal buildings, repair/improvement.

S—Zanesville, Muskingum County; sanitation, new.

S—Zanesville, Muskingum County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Massillon, Stark County; sanitation, new.

S—Alliance, Stark County; sanitation, new.

S—Alliance, Stark County; sanitation, new.

S—Massillon, Stark County; municipal buildings, new.

S—Magnolia Village, Stark County; waste treatment, new.

S—Alliance, Stark County; sanitation, new.

S—Minerva Village, Stark County; roads, improvement.

S—Canton, Stark County; water system, new.

S—Canton, Stark County; roads, new.

S—Canton, Stark County; roads, improvement.

S—Canton, Stark County; sanitation, new.

S—Canton, Stark County; sanitation, new.

S—Canton, Stark County; roads, new.

S—Minerva, Stark County; sanitation, new.

S—East Canton, Stark County; water system, new.

S—Niles, Trumbull County; water system, new.

S—Mineral Ridge, Trumbull County; water system, new.

S—Hubbard, Trumbull County; auditoriums, new.

S—Hubbard, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.

S—Hubbard, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.

S—Hubbard, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.

S—Hubbard, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.

S—Hubbard, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.

S—Hubbard, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.

S—Warren, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.

S—Warren, Trumbull County; roads, improvement.

S—Warren and Trumbull Counties; roads, new.

S—Warren, Trumbull County; drainage, new.
S—Warren, Trumbull County; roads, improvement.
S—Girard, Trumbull County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Girard, Trumbull County; auditoriums, new.
S—Niles, Trumbull County; sanitation, new.
S—Cortland, Trumbull County; municipal buildings, new.

OKLAHOMA

A—Fort Gibson Utilities Authority, Muskogee County; water system, improvement.
A—Tryon Utilities Authority, Lincoln; water system, new.
A—Tryon Utilities Authority; Lincoln County; water system, new.
A—Muskogee, Muskogee County; city streets, new.
A—Warner Sewer Trust; Muskogee; sanitation, new.
A—Porum Public Works Authority; Muskogee County; sanitation, new.
A—Haskell, Muskogee County; water system, new.
A—Okmulgee, Okmulgee County; sanitation, improvement.
A—Dewar, Okmulgee County; sanitation, new.
A—McAlester, Pittsburg County; sanitation, new.
A—McAlester, Pittsburg County; roads, new.
A—Haileyville Public Works Authority; sanitation, new.
A—Pittsburg County Public Works Authority; water system, new.
A—Canadian, Pittsburg County; water system, new.
A—Crowder, Pittsburg County; water system, new.
A—Pittsburg, Pittsburg County; water systime, improvement.
A—Porter Public Works Authority, Wagonner County; sanitation, new.
B—Tahlequah, Cherokee County; water system, improvement.
B—Hugo, Choctaw County; protect buildings, repair and improvement.
B—Chickasha, Grady County; community buildings, new.
B—Verden, Grady County; water system, new.
B—Mangum Utilities Authority, Greer County; sanitation, additions.
B—Dustin Public Works Authority, Hughes County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Hughes County Commission; protect buildings, new.
B—Ravia, Johnston County; water system, new.
B—Tishomingo, Johnston County Commission; protect buildings, new.
B—Red Oak Public Works Authority, Latimer County; sanitation, new.
B—Heavener Public Works Authority; Le Flore County; water system, improvement.
B—Panama Public Works Authority, Le Flore County; sanitation, new.
B—Spiro Municipal Improvement Authority, Le Flore County; water system, improvement.
B—Talihina Public Works Authority, Le Flore County; water system, new.
B—Chandler, Lincoln County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Chandler, Lincoln County; playground, new.
B—Idabel Public Works Authority, MCCU; water system, new.
B—Idabel, McCurtain County; community buildings, new.
B—Checotah, McIntosh County; water system, new.
B—Eufaula, McIntosh County; water system, new.
B—Pryor Creek, Mayes County; gas storage, improvement.
B—Pryor Creek, Mayes County; water system, improvement.
B—Paden Utility Authority, Okfuskee County; water system, new.
B—Northeast Oklahoma Gas Authority; gas storage, new.
B—Morris Municipal Improvement Authority, Okmulgee County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Ada, Pontotoc County; roads, new.
B—Ada, Pontotoc County; roads, new.
B—Tecumseh Utility Authority, Pottawatomie County; water system, improvement.
B—Claremore, Rogers County; community buildings, new.
B—Roland, Sequoyah County; water system, new.
B—Gans, Sequoyah County; water system, new.
B—Collinsville, Tulsa County; water system, improvement.
B—Wagoner County Development Authority; water system, new.
B—Wagoner, Wagoner County; municipal buildings, repair and improvement.
S—Clinton, Custer County; city streets, improvement.
S—Granite, Greer County; playground, new.
S—Mill Creek, Johnston County; water system, new.
S—Purcell, McClain County; community buildings, new.
S—East Central Oklahoma Gas Authority; gas storage, new.
S—Ada, Pontotoc County; roads, new.
S—Shawnee, Pottawatomie County; roads, new.
S—Claremore Public Works Authority; water system, improvement.
S—Sasakwa, Seminole County; water system, new.
S—Wewoka, Seminole County; water system, improvement.
S—Muldrow, Sequoyah County; water system, new.
S—Muldrow, Sequoyah County; sanitation, new.
S—East Central Oklahoma Gas Authority; gas storage, new.

OREGON

A—Halsey, Linn County; sanitation, new.
B—Gearhart City, Clatsop County; water system, new.
B—Warrenton, Clatsop County; water system, new.
B—Seaside, Clatsop County; sanitation, new.
B—Seaside, Clatsop County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Seaside, Clatsop County; water system, new.
B—Seaside, Clatsop County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Cave Junction, Josephine County, sanitation, new.
B—Grants Pass Irrigation District, Josephine County; sanitation, new.
B—Newport, Lincoln County; sanitation, new.
B—Newport, Lincoln County; water system, new.
B—Nelscott Sanitation District, Lincoln County; sanitation, new.
B—Newport, Lincoln County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Oceanlake, Lincoln County; parks, new.
B—Depoe Bay Rural Fire Protection District; protect buildings, new.
B—Taft-Nelscott-Delake Water District; water system, new.
B—Mosier Irrigation District, Wasco County; water system, new.
B—Dallas City; water system, new.
B—Maupin, Wasco County; sanitation, new.
B—Dufur, Wasco County; sanitation, new.
B—McMinnville, Yamhill County; water system, new.
B—Lafayette, Yamhill County; sanitation, new.
B—McMinnville City, Yamhill County; sanitation, new.
B—McMinnville City, Yamhill County; sanitation, new.
B—Amity Rural Fire Protection District; protect buildings, new.
B—Newberg, Yamhill County; roads, new.
B—Sheridan, Yamhill County; water system, new.
S—Empire, Coos County; sanitation, new.
S—Coos Bay, Coos County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Coquille, Coos County; sanitation, new.
S—Powers, Coos County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Myrtle Point, Coos County; roads, new.
S—Gold Beach, Curry County; sanitation, new.
S—Roseburg, Douglas County; sanitation, improvement.
S.—Riddle, Douglas County; sanitation, new.
S—Sutherlin, Douglas County; sanitation, new.
S—Oakland, Douglas County; sanitation, new.
S—Brownsville, Linn County; sanitation, new.
S—Albany, Linn County; sanitation, new.
S—Vale-Malheur, Malheur County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Nyssa, Malheur County; water system, new.
S—Ontario, Malheur County; water system, new.
S—Salem, Marion County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Salem, Marion County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Salem, Marion County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Salem, Marion County; water system, new.
S—Falls City, Polk County; water system, new.
S—Dallas, Polk County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Dallas, Polk County; gas storage, new.
S—Dallas, Polk County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Dallas, Polk County; roads, new.
S—Dallas, Polk County; sanitation, new.

PENNSYLVANIA

A—O'Hara Township, Fox Ridge, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; city streets, new.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; bridges, new.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; drainage, new.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; playground, new.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; parks, new.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.
A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; parks, new.

A—Crescent S. Heights, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Etna, Allegheny County; water resources, new.

A—Borough of Etna, Allegheny County; city streets, new,

A—Borough of Etna, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Ohio Township, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Dormont, Pittsburgh County; other recreation facilities, new.

A—Borough of Dormont, Pittsburgh County; drainage, new.

A—Moon Township, Allegheny County; water system, additions.

A—Moon Township, Allegheny County; water system, new.

A—Snowden Township, Allegheny County; drainage, new.

A—Snowden Township, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Snowden Township, Sewer Authority, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of W. Mifflin, Allegheny County; parks, new.

A—Borough of Baldwin, Allegheny County; parks, new.

A—Borough of Baldwin, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of McKees Rocks, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Hampton Township, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Braddock Hills, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Oakdale, Western Allegheny County; water system, new.

A—Duquesne City Sanitary Authority, sanitation, new.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; parks, new.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; parks, new.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Monroeville Water Authority, Allegheny County; water system, new.

A—Borough of Franklin Park, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Brackenridge, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Buena Vista Elizabeth Township; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Versailles, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; parks, additions.

A—Forward Township, Monongahela County; water system, new.

A—Borough of Ingram, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—McCandless Township, Allegheny County; garage, new.

A—Munhall Borough, Allegheny County; protect buildings, new.

A—Munhall Borough, Allegheny County; highways, new.

A—Lincoln Borough, Allegheny County; water system, new.

A—Borough of Chalfant, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Glenshaw Shaler Township, Allegheny County; swimming facilities, new.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; water system, new.

A—Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania Joint Authority; garage, new.

A—Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania Joint Authority; parks, new.

A—Versailles Township Sanitation Authority; sanitation, new.

A—White Oak Borough Authority, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Pittsburgh Fox Chapel Authority; water system, additions.

A—Pittsburgh Borough of Aspinwall; water storage, new.

A—Pittsburgh Borough of Aspinwall; water storage, new.

A—Pittsburgh Borough of Aspinwall; electric system, new.

A—Pittsburgh Borough of Aspinwall; playground, new.

A—Pittsburgh Borough of Aspinwall; garages, new.

A—Pittsburgh Borough of Aspinwall; city streets, new.

A—Bridgeville Municipal Authority; city streets, new.

A—Pittsburgh Forest Hills Borough; city streets, new.

A—Braddock Hills Borough, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Homestead, Allegheny County; city streets, additions.

A—Borough of Green Tree, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Edgewood, Allegheny County; city streets, improvement.

A—Duquesne, Allegheny County; drainage, new.

A—Duquesne, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Turtle Creek, Allegheny County; bridges, new.

A—Pleasant Hills Borough, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Township of Deer, Allegheny County; municipals buildings, new.

A—Township of Harmar, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—The Borough of East McKeesport, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Municipal Authority of Borough of Edgewood; water system, new.

A—Borough of Crafton, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—The Elizabeth Township Authority, Allegheny County; garages, new.

A—Township of Moon, Allegheny County; protect buildings, new.

A—The Borough of Blawnox, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Stowe Township, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Franklin Municipal Authority Township, Allegheny County; sanitation, new.

A—Pittsburgh Mount Lebanon Township; city streets, new.

A—Pittsburgh Mount Lebanon Township; parks, new.

A—The McCandless Township Sanitation Authority; sanitation, new.

A—The Borough of Sharpsburg, Allegheny County; protect buildings, new.

A—North Versailles Township, Allegheny County; city streets, improvement.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

A—Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; city streets, new.

A—Indian Township, Allegheny County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Churchill, Allegheny County; highways, additions.

A—Borough of Churchill, Allegheny County; conservation measures, new.

A—Collier Township, Allegheny County; water system, new.

A—Borough of Liberty, Allegheny County; city streets, improvement.

A—Fox Chapel Authority, Allegheny County; water storage, new.

A—Ford City Manor Township; water system, additions.

A—Borough of Kittanning, Armstrong County; parks, new.

A—Borough of Ford City, Armstrong County; sanitation, new.

A—Crescent South Heights, Beaver County, sanitation, new.

A—Hopewell Township Authority, Beaver County; sanitation, new.

A—Center Township, Monaca, Beaver County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Midland, Beaver County; other water, new.

A—Borough of Baden, Beaver County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Conway, Beaver County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Monaca, Beaver County; water system, additions.

A—Borough of Eastvale, Beaver County; city streets, new.

A—Chippewa Township, Beaver County; sanitation, new.

A—Ambridge, Harmony Township, Beaver County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Monaca, Beaver County; drainage, new.

A—Ohio Township Municipal Authority, Beaver County; water system, new.

A—Municipal Authority, Beaver Falls Township; sanitation, new.

A—Municipal Authority, Township of North Swickley; water system, new.

A—Beaver Falls Municipal Authority, Beaver County; water system, new.

A—Beaver, Beaver County; bridges, additions.

A—Borough of Ambridge, Beaver County; city streets, additions.

A—Borough of Eastvale, Beaver County; drainage, new.

A—White Township, Beaver County; roads, new.

A—Duncansville Municipal Authority, Blair County; sanitation, new.

A—Antis Township, Supervisors, Balir County; water storage, new.

A—Antis Township, SUP. VR., Blair County; garages, new.

A—Antis Township, SUP. VR., Blair County; water storage, new.

A—Altoona City Authority, Blair County; drainage, new.

A—Athens-Sayre Joint Authority; sanitation, new.

A—N.W. Sanitary Sewer Systems Authority; sanitation, new.

A—Cranberry Township, Butler County; water system, new.

A—The Municipal Authority of the Borough of; water resources, new.

A—Lower Yoder, Johnstown, Cambria County; sanitation, new.

A—Upper Yoder Township Water Authority; water system, new.

A—Johnstown Conemaugh Valley, Mercer County, sanitation, new.

A—Johnstown, Cambria county; sanitation, new.

A—Nanty Glo. Borough, Cambria County; sanitation, new.

A—Johnstown, Cambria County; city streets, additions.

A—Borough of Westmont, Cambria County; sanitation, new.

A—Richland Township Supervisors, Cambria County, city streets, new.

A—Borough of Edensburg, Cambria County; parking lots, new.

A—West Taylor Township, Cambria County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Sankertown, Cambria County, city streets, new.

A—West Taylor Township, Cambria County; water system, new.

A—Edensburg, Cambria County Commissioners; correctional institution, new.

A—Johnstown Municipal Authority, Cambria County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Gallitzin, Cambria County; water system, new.

A—Borough of Cresson, Cambria County, sanitation, new.

A—Westmont Borough, Cambria County; city streets, improvement.

A—Jim Thorpe Municipal Authority, Carbon County; sanitation, new.

A—Woodland, Bigler Area Authority; water system, new.

A—West Mead Township, Crawford County; sanitation, new.

A—Vernon Township Sanitary Authority, Crawford County; sanitation, new.

A—County Borough of Ridgway, Elk County; water storage, new.

A—Borough of Waterford, Erie County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Northeast, Erie County; other water, new.

A—Harbor Creek Township, municipal authority; water system, new.

A—Lake City, Fairview Township, Erie County; garage, new.

A—Uniontown, Fayette County; correctional institution, new.

A—Board of Supervisers of North Union Township; sanitation, additions.

A—Uniontown City, Fayette County; protect buildings, new.

A—Township of South Union, Fayette County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Township of South Union, Fayette County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of South Connellsville, Fayette County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Authority of Charleroi, Washington County; water system, additions.

A—Uniontown, Fayette County; playground, additions.

A—Uniontown, Fayette County; parks, new.

A—German Township, Fayette County; roads, new.

A—White Township, municipal authority, Indiana County; sanitation, new.

A—Indiana County; courthouses, new.

A—Municipal authority, Borough of Reynoldsville; water resources, new.

A—Scranton, Lackawanna County, municipal buildings, new.

A—Scranton, Lackawanna County; city streets, new.

A—Scranton, Lackawanna County; sanitation, additions.

A—Scranton, Lackawanna County; correctional institution, repair and improvement.

A—Scranton Institutional District, Lackawanna County; convalescent homes, new.

A—Scranton Institutional District, Lackawanna County, water system, new.

A—Scranton Institutional District, Lackawanna County; convalescent homes, additions.

A—Scranton, Lackawanna County; libraries, new.

A—Borough of Archbald, Lackawanna County; city streets, new.

A—Scranton, Lackawanna County; protect buildings, new.

A—New Castle, Lawrence County; city streets, improvement.

A—New Castle, Lawrence County; swimming facilities, new.

A—New Castle, Lawrence County; parks, new.

A—New Castle, Lawrence County; city streets, new.

A—New Wilmington Borough, Lawrence County; water resources, new.

A—Shenango Township Park, Lawrence County; parks, new.

A—Borough of Ellwood City, Lawrence County; drainage, new.

A—Nanticoke, Luzerne County; city streets, new.

A—Nanticoke, Luzerne County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of West Hazleton, Luzerne County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Swoyersville, Luzerne County; city streets, new.

A—Kingston Township, Luzerne County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Freeland, Luzerne County; city streets, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre—Luzerne County, libraries, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; sanitation, new.

A—Freeland Foster Township; Luzerne County; city streets, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; garage, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; water resources, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; bridges, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; bridges, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; drainage, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; roads, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; roads, new.

A—Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County; roads, new.

A—Council of Borough of Ashley, Luzerne County; garage, new.

A—Borough of Ashley, Luzerne County; drainage, new.

A—Plains Township, Luzerne County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Dupont, Luzerne County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Lehman Township, Luzerne County; roads, new.

A—Borough of Shickshinny, Luzerne County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Shickshinny, Luzerne; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Shickshinny, Luzerne; city streets, new.

A—Williamsport, Lycoming County; sanitation, new.

A—Williamsport, Lycoming County; swimming facilities, new.

A—Farrell Redevelopment Authority, Mercer County; drainage, new.

A—Borough of Wheatland, Mercer County; water supply, new.

A—Borough of Sharpsville, Mercer County; sanitation, new.

A—Hickory Township, Mercer County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Grove City, Mercer County; water resources, new.

A—Pymatuning Township Supervisers, municipal buildings, new.

A—Sandy Lake Borough, Mercer County; sanitation, new.

A—Borough of Stoneboro, Mercer County; sanitation, new.

A—Pymatuning Township, Greenville County; roads, new.

A—Newton Hamilton Borough Authority, water system, new.

A—Borough of Burnham, Mifflin County; city streets, new.

A—Danville Municipal Authority, Montour County; water system, new.

A—Ralpho Township, Elysburg, Northumberland County; water system, new.

A—Watsontown Borough, Northumberland County; drainage, new.

A—The Township of Coal, Northumberland County; sanitation, new.

A—Municipal Authority, Sunbury, Northumberland County; water system, additions.

A—Milton Borough, Northumberland County; sanitation, new.

A—Uniontown, North Fayette County; municipal water system, new.

A—Schuylkill Haven Borough, Schuylkill County; other water, new.

A—Borough of Schuylkill Haven, Schuylkill County; libraries, new.

A—Cressona Borough Authority, Schuylkill County; sanitation, new.

A—Hummels Wharf Authority, Snyder County; water system, new.

A—Borough of Selinsgrove, Snyder County; drainage, new.

A—Meyersdale, Somerset County; water system, new.

A—Borough of Somerset, Somerset County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Somerset, Somerset County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Somerset, Somerset County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Meyersdale, Somerset County; sanitation, new.

A—Jefferson Township Supervisers, Somerset County; roads, new.

A—Berlin Borough, Somerset County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Somerset, Somerset County; bridges, new.

A—Somerset, Somerset County; courthouses, new.

A—Rockwood Borough Municipal Authority; sanitation, new.

A—Lewisburg, Union County; city streets, new.

A—Lewisburg, Union County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Washington City, Washington County; libraries, new.

A—Borough of Roscoe, Washington County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Ellsworth, Washington County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Borough of Donora, Washington County; city streets, new.

A—Borough of Donora, Washington County; city streets, improvement.

A—Monessen, Westmoreland County; city streets, new.

A—Monessen, Westmoreland County; parks, new.

A—Monessen, Westmoreland County; community buildings, new.

A—New Kensington, Westmoreland County; city streets, new.

A—New Kensington, Westmoreland County; drainage, additions.

A—Municipal Authority Borough of Smithton; other water, new.

A—Herminie, Township of Sewickley; water systems, additions.

A—Borough of Scottdale, Westmoreland County; city streets, new.

A—Monessen, Westmoreland County; city streets, new.

A—West Leechburg Borough, Westmoreland County; protect buildings, new.

B—Foxburg Area Authority, Clarion County; sanitation, additions.

B—Sligo Borough Authority, Clarion County; water system, new.

B—Hawthorn Area Water Authority, Clarion County; water system, new.

B—Castanea Township, Clinton County; sanitation, new.

B—Lock Haven City Authority, Clinton County; water resources, new.

B—Waynesboro West Franklin Sewerage Authority, Clinton County; sanitation, new.

B—Morgan Township Supervisors, Greene County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Borough of Mount Union, Huntingdon County; sanitation, additions.

B—Borough of Brockway, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.

B—Williamsport Authority, Lycoming County; sanitation, new.

B—Muncy Creek Township, Lycoming County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Williamsport, Lycoming County; drainage, new.

B—Williamsport, Lycoming County; city streets, new.

B—Borough of Jersey Shore, Lycoming County; protect buildings, new.

B—Foster Township authority, McKean County; sanitation, new.

B—Kane Wetmore Township, McKean County; drainage, new.
B—Bradford, McKean County; bridges, new.
B—Sharon, Mercer County; city streets, new.
B—Borough of Stroudsburg, Monroe County; parks, additions.
B—Middlerstown Borough, Perry County; sanitation, new.
B—Duncannon Borough Municipal Authority; sanitation, new.
B—Liverpool Municipal Authority, Perry County; water system, new.
B—Liverpool Municipal Authority, Perry County sanitation, new.
B—Elkland Borough Council, Tioga County; sanitation, new.
B—Cornplanter Township Board of Supervisors; sanitation, new.
B—Franklin, Venango County; conventional homes, repair improvement.
B—Borough of Emlenton, Venango County; swimming facility, new.
B—Pleasant Township, Warren County; sanitation, new.
B—Sheffield Township, Warren County; sanitation, additions.
B—The Borough of Hawley, Wayne County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Conewago Township Board of Supervisors; sanitation, new.
S—Cumberland Township Gettysburgh; sanitation, new.
S—Adams County Public Library, Gettysburg; libraries, new.
S—Borough of Kennett Square c/o Borough; water system, new.
S—Doylestown, Bucks County Authority; sanitation, new.
S—Middletown Township, Bucks County; city streets, new.
S—Bensalem Township Authority, Bucks County; sanitation, new.
S—Borough of Perkasie, Bucks County; drainage, new.
S—Perkasie Borough Authority, Bucks County; water system, additions.
S—Borough of Phoenixville, Chester County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Atglen Borough Sewer Authority; sanitation, new.
S—Newtown Township Sewer Authority, Delaware County; sanitation, new.
S—Media, Delaware County Courthouse; protect buildings, new.
S—Media, Delaware County Courthouse; bridges, new.
S—Bromell Marple Township, Delaware; sanitation, new.
S—Borough of Norwood, Delaware County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Township of Springfield, Delaware County, drainage, new.
S—Upper Darby Township, Delaware County, sanitation, new.
S—Upper Darby Township, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Upper Darby Township, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Upper Darby Township, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Chester, Delaware County; city streets, improvement.
S—Chester, Delaware County; city streets, improvement.
S—Chester, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Chester, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Chester, Delaware County; water resources, new.
S—Tinicum Township, Essington, Delaware; swimming facilities, new.
S—Borough of Foricroft, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Radnor Township Municipal Authority, Delaware County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Chester Township, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Norwood Borough, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Borough of Prospect Park, Delaware County; drainage, new.
S—Connellsville, Fayette County; city streets, new.
S—Upper Merion Township Board of Supervisors; city streets, new.
S—Norristown Board of Commissioners, Montgomery County; courthouses, additions.
S—Norristown Board of Commissioners, Montgomery County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Norristown, Montgomery County; courthouses, new.
S—Borough of Schwenksville, Montgomery County, sanitation, new.
S—Municipal Authority for Upper Moreland; municipal buildings, new.
S—Oaks Upper Providence Township; sanitation, new.
S—Port of North Wales, Montgomery County; garages, new.
S—Upper Merion Township Authority, Montgomery County; sanitation, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; other water, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; playground, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; subway station, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; subway station, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; subway station, additions.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; water system, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; water system, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; harbor facilities, additions.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; other water, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; other water, new.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.
S—Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; waste treatment, new.
Total: 339 localities.

RHODE ISLAND

A—Warwick, Kent County; libraries, new.
A—East Greenwich, Kent County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Warwick, Kent County; water system, new.
A—Woonsocket, Providence County; water system, new.
A—Pawtucket, Providence County; waste treatment, new.
A—Cumberland, Providence County; water system, new.
A—Board of Water Commissioners, Lincoln; sanitation, new.
A—Narragansett, Washington County; sanitation, new.
Total: eight localities.

SOUTH CAROLINA

A—Denmark, Bamberg County; water system, new.
A—Myrtle Beach, Horry County; sanitation, new.
A—North Orangeburg, Orangeburg County; municipal buildings, new.
A—South Carolina Aeronautical Commission, Columbia County; airports, new.
B—Aiken, Aiken County; parks, new.
B—Jackson Public Works Commission, Aiken; water system, new.
B—Williston, Barnwell County; sanitation, new.
B—Beaufort County Water Authority; water system, new.
B—Forest Beach Public Service Department, Hilton; water system, new.
B. St. Matthews, Calhoun County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Pageland, Chesterfield County; water system, new.
B—Manning, Clarendon County; sanitation, new.
B—Summerton, Clarendon County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Walterboro, Colleton County; sanitation, new.
B—Lodge, Colleton County; water system, new.
B—Darlington, Darlington County; municipal buildings, new.
B—St. George, Dorchester County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Hardee, Jasper County; sanitation, new.
B—McCormick, McCormick County; municipal buildings, new.
B—McCormick, McCormick County; water system, new.
B—Rowesville, Orangeburg; water system, new.
Total: 21 localities.

SOUTH DAKOTA

B—Pine Ridge Reservation, Bennett County; parks, new.
B—Pine Ridge, Shannon County; parks, new.
B—Pine Ridge Reservation, Shannon County; parks.
B—Pine Ridge Reservation, Washabaugh; parks, new.
Total: three localities.

TENNESSEE

A—Harrogate Arthur Shawnee; water system, new.
A—Jellico, Campbell County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Nashville Mental Health Department; clinics, new.
A—Decaturville, Decatur County; sanitation, new.
A—Jamestown, Fentress County; sanitation, new.

A—Rutledge, Grainger; sanitation, new.
A—Hamilton County; bridges, new.
A—White Pine, Jefferson; sanitation, new.
A—Wartburg Plateau Utility District; water system, new.
A—Dayton, Rhea County; water systems, new.
A—Kingston, Roane County; parks, new.
A—Oneida, Scott County; municipal buildings, new.
AS—Oneida, Scott County; roads, improvement.
B—Pikeville, Bledsoe County; sanitation, new.
B—Celine, Clay County; water systems, new.
B—Parsons, Decatur; sanitation, new.
B—Dickson, Dickson County; water system, new.
B—Turnbull Utility District, Dickson; water systems, new.
B—Somerville, Fayette County; sanitation, new.
B—Moscow, Fayette County; sanitation, new.
B—Rossville, Fayette County; sanitation, new.
B—Blaine Utility District No. 1, Grainger; water system, new.
B—Monteagle, Grundy County; roads, improvement.
B—Sneedville, Hancock County; water system, new.
B—Sneedville, Hancock County; city streets, new.
B—Whiteville, Hardeman County; water system, improvement.
B—Savannah, Hardin County; roads, new.
B—Brownsville, Haywood County; water system, improvement.
B—Bethel Springs, Haywood County; water system, improvement.
B—Bethel Springs, Haywood County; water system, new.
B—Erin Sam Houston Utility District; gas system, new.
B—Tennessee Ridge, Houston County; water system, new.
B—Erin Municipal Corporation, Houston County; auditoriums, repair and improvements.
B—McEwen, Humphreys County; sanitation, new.
B—Jefferson, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.
B—Corryton Utility District No. 1, Knox County; water system, new.
B—Selmer, McNairy County; sanitation, new.
B—Red Boiling Springs, Macon County; clinics, new.
B—Oliver Springs Cumberland Utility District; sanitation, new.
B—Livingston, Overton County; courthouses, repair and improvements.
B—Linden, Perry County; water system, new.
B—Cookeville, Putnam County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Algood, Putnam County; sanitation, new.
B—Oliver Springs Cumberland Utility District; sanitation, new.
B—Kingston, Roane County; protect buildings, new.
B—Greenbrier, Robertson County; sanitation, new.
B—Huntsville, Scott County; courthouses, repair and improvements.
B—Pigeon Forge Utility District, Sevier County; water system, new.
B—Pigeon Forge, Sevier County; sanitation, new.
B—Erwin, Unicoi County Utility District; gas system, new.
B—Luttrell Utility District No. 1, Union County; water system, new.
B—Maynardville, Union County; water system, new.
B—Spencer, Van Buren County; water system, new.
B—Sparta, White County; water system, new.
S—Prospect, McDonald Utility District; sanitation, new.
S—Elizabethton, Carter County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Board of Electric Light and Water, Hamblen County; auditoriums, new.
S—Morristown, Hamblen County; auditoriums, new.
S—Russellville Utility District, Hamblen County; water system, new.
S—Hamblen County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Hamblen County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; sanitation, new.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; auditoriums, repairs and improvements.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; convalescent homes, new.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; bridges, new.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; protect buildings, new.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; sanitation, new.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; biological gardens, new.
S—Chattanooga, Hamilton County; sanitation, new.
S—Signal Mountain, Hamilton County; water system, improvement.
S—Red Bank-White Oak, Hamilton County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Sneedville Courthouse, Hancock County; courthouses, repairs and improvements. rectional institution, repairs and improvements.
S—Loudon, Loudon County; sanitation, new.
S—Lenior City, Loudon County; sanitation, new.
S—Athens, McMinn County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Sweetwater, Monroe County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Fort Loudoun Utilities Distribution; Monroe County; water system, new.
S—Union City, Obion County; sanitation, new.
S—Union City, Obion County; water system, new.
S—Maynardville, Union County, courthouses, new.
S—Johnson, Washington County; water system, new.
SA—Dayton, Rhea County; municipal buildings, new.
SB—Jasper, Marion County; correctional institution, repairs and improvement.
Total: 85 localities.

TEXAS

A—Pinehurst, Orange County; sanitation, new.
A—Laredo, Webb County; community buildings, new.
A—Laredo, Webb County; water system, improvement.
B—Frankston, Anderson County; water system, improvement.
B—Diboll, Angelina County; community buildings, new.
B—Biboll, Angelina County; highways, new.
B—New Boston, Bowie County; highways, new.
B—Wake Village, Bowie County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Texarkana Water and Sewerage System; water system, improvement.
B—Douglassville, Cass County; water system, new.
B—Hughes Springs, Cass County; water system, new.
B—Alto, Cherokee County; gas storage, new.
B—Wells City, Cherokee County; sanitation, new.
B—Wells, Cherokee County; gas storage, new.
B—Jacksonville, Cherokee County; community buildings, repair and improvement.
B—Rusk, Cherokee County; parks, new.
B—Wellington, Collingsworth County; community buildings, new.
B—Marshall, Harrison County; highways, improvement.
B—Malakoff, Henderson County; water system, improvement.
B—Athens, Henderson County; community buildings, repair and improvement.
B—Jasper City, Jasper County; water system, improvement.
B—Deport, Lamar County; water system, improvement.
B—Brady, McCulloch County; highways, improvement.
B—Grady, McCulloch County; community buildings, new.
B—Jefferson Water and Sanitation District; sanitation, new.
B—Nacogdoches, Nacogdoches County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Newton, Newton County; water system, improvement.
B—Newton, Newton County; community buildings, new.
B—Clarksville, Red River County; highways, new.
B—Franklin, Robertson County; water system, improvement.
B—Hearne, Robertson County; water system, new.
B—Hemphill, Sabine County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Pineland, Sabine County; community buildings, new.
B—San Patricio Municipal Water District; water system, new.
B—Gregory, San Patricio County; water system, improvement.
B—Center, Shelby County; highways, new.
B—Mount Pleasant, Titus County; sanitation, improvement.
B—Alba, Wood County; sanitation, new.
S—Galveston, Galveston County; highways, improvement.
S—Galveston, Galveston County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Texas City, Galveston County; highways, new.
S—Galveston County; water system, improvement.
S—Jasper, Jasper County; community buildings, new.
S—Port Arthur, Jefferson County; water system, new.
S—Port Arthur, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.
S—Groves, Jefferson County; sanitation, new.
S—Groves, Jefferson County sanitation, new.
S—Jefferson County, Drainage District; sanitation, new.
S—Groves, Jefferson County; water system, new.
S—Beaumont, Jefferson County; community buildings, new.
S—Beaumont, Jefferson County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Nederland City, Jefferson County; water system, improvement.
S—Nederland City, Jefferson County; highways, improvement.
S—Nederland City, Jefferson County; highways, improvement.
S—Beaumont, Jefferson County; highways, new.
S—Griffing Park, Jefferson County; highways, improvement.
S—Griffing Park, Jefferson County; sanitation, improvement.
S—Griffing Park, Jefferson County; water system, improvement.
S—Port of Beaumont Navigation District; highways, improvement.
S—Orange, Orange County; water system, new.

S—Vidor City, Orange County; community buildings, new.
S—Commission Court, Orange County; highways, new.
S—Commission Court, Orange County; highways, new.
S—Commission Court, Orange County; highways, new.
S—Commission Court, Orange County; highways, new.
S—Portland, San Patricio County; water system, new.
S—Sinton, San Patricio County; water system. improvement.
S—Del Rio, Val Verde County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Laredo Del Mar County District; water system, improvement.
S—Crystal City, Zavala County; community buildings, new.
S—Crystal, Zavala County; community buildings, repair and improve.
S—Crystal City, Zavala County; water system, new.
Total: 72 localities.

UTAH

B—Milford, Beaver County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Minersville, Beaver County; water system, new.
B—Minersville, Beaver County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Wellington, Carbon County; water system, new.
B—Wellington, Carbon County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Mount Pleasant City Corporation, Carbon County; sanitation, new.
B—Ferron, Emery County; water system, new.
B—Castle Dale City, Emery County; water system, new.
B—Emery, Emery County; water system, new.
B—Panguitch City, Garfield County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Panguitch City, Garfield County; water system, improvement.
B—Tropic Town, Garfield County; roads, new.
B—Panguitch, Garfield County; parks, new.
B—Mona Town, Juab County; water system, new.
B—Levan, Juab County; water system, improvement.
B—Blanding, San Juan County; water system, improvement.
B—Monticello, San Juan County; water system, new.
B—Ephraim City Corporation, Sanpete County; sanitation, new.
B—Gunnison City Corporation, Sanpete County; water system, new.
B—Mount Pleasant City Corporation, Sanpete County; water system, improvement.
B—Kamas, Summit County; sanitation, new.
B—Francis, Summit County; water system, new.
B—Coalville City Municipal Corporation, Summit County, sanitation, new.
B—Oakley, Summit County; water system, new.
B—Ute Indian Tribe of Fort Duchesne; water system, new.
B—Midway Town Corporation, Wasatch County; water system, new.
S—Duchesne, Duchesne County; water system, new.
S—Provo City Corporation, Utah County; parks, new.
S—Provo City Corporation, Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—American Fork City Corporation, Utah County; roads, new.
S—American Fork City Corporation, Utah County; water system, new.
S—Orem City Corp., Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—Orem City Corp., Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—Orem Metropolitan Water District, Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—Spanish Fork City Corp, Utah County; municipal buildings, new.
S—American Fork City, Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—Alpine City, Utah County; water system, new.
S—Lehi City Corp., Utah County; water system, new.
S—Lehi City Corp., Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—Salem City Corp., Utah County; sanitation.
S—Pleasant Grove City, Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—Pleasant Grove City, Utah County; roads, new.
S—Pleasant Grove City, Utah County; water system, new.
S—Provo City Corp., Utah County; water system, new.
S—Payson City Corp., Utah County; sanitation, new.
S—Spanish Fork City Corp., Utah County; roads, new.
S—Lindon City, Utah County; water system, new.
S—Springville, Utah County; water sytem, new.
S—Springville, Utah County; gas system, new.
S—Santaquin City Corp., Utah County; water system, improvement.
S—Pleasant Grove City Corp., Utah County; harbor facilities, new.
S—Laverkin, Washington County; water system, improvement.
S—St. George, Washington County; municipal buildings, new.
S—Santa Clara, Washington County; water system, new.
B—St. Johnsbury, Caledonia County; garage, new.

VIRGINIA

A—Pennington Gap, Lee County; water supply, new.
A—Jonesville, Lee County; water system, new.
A—Big Stone Gap, Wise County; water system, new.
A—Norton, Wise County, sanitation, new.
A—Wise, Wise County; sanitation, new.
A—Coeburn, Wise County; sanitation, new.
A—Coeburn, Wise County; water system, new.
A—Wise, Wise County; water resources, new.
A—Wise, Wise County; fish and wildlife, new.
B—Grundy, Buchanan County; parking lots, new.
B—Montross, Westmoreland County; correction institution, repair/improvement.

WASHINGTON

A—Wenatchee Public Utilities District; water resources, new.
A—Chelan, Chelan County; garage, new.
A—Wentachee, Chelan County; city streets, improvement.
A—Chelan, Chelan County; athletic buildings, new.
A—Douglas Sewage District 1, Douglas County; disposal facilties, new.
A—Waterville, Douglas County; office buildings, additions.
A—Westport, Grays Harbor County; sanitation, new.
A—McCleary, Grays Harbor County; water system; additions.
A—Aberdeen, Grays Harbor County; roads, new.
A—Port Townsend, Jefferson County; office buildings, additions.
A—Port Townsend, Jefferson County; bridges, new.
A—Port Townsend, Jefferson County; bridges, new.
A—Toledo, Lewis County; disposal facilities, new.
A—Centralia Municipal Coporation, Lewis County; lighting, improvement.
A—Centralia, Lewis County; water system, new.
A—Winlock, Lewis County; sanitation, new.
A—Winlock, Lewis County; sanitation, new.
A—Chehalis, Lewis County; city streets, improvement.
A—Chehalis, Lewis County; bridges, new.
A—Chehalis, Lewis County; bridges new.
A—Centralia, Lewis County; sanitation, new.
A—Morton, Lewis County; water system, additions.
A—Morton, Lewis County; city streets, improvement.
A—Chehalis, Lewis County; other water, new.
A—Vader, Lewis County; water system, additions.
A—Mabton, Yakima County; municipal buildings, new.
A—Sodro-Woolley, Skagit County, drainage, new.
A—Mt. Vernon, Skagit County; protect buildings, new.
A—Burlington Sewage District 1, Skagit County; sanitation, additions.
Laconner Swinomish Indian Tribal Community Buildings, new.
A—Zillah, Yakima County; water supply, additions.
A—Selah, Yakima County; water supply, additions.
A—Toppenish Yakima Tribal Council; parks, new.
B—Port Angeles Public Utilities District; water supply, additions.
B—Port Angeles, Clallam County; courthouses, additions.
B—Republic, Ferry County; garage, new.
B—Brewster, Okanogan County; protect buildings, new.
B—Brewster, Okanogan County; water system, improvement.
B—Okanogan, Okanogan County; sanitation, additions.
B—Omak, Okanogan County; other water, new.
B—Omak, Okanogan County; city streets, improvement.
B—South Bend, Pacific County; water resources, improvement.
B—Raymond City, Pacific County; sanitation, new.
B—Betaline, Pend Oreille County; disposal facilities, new.
B—Cusick, Pend Oreille County; water system, improvement.
B—Ione Chippewa Water District, Pend Oreille County; water system, new.
S—Spokane, Spokane County; airports, new.
S—Cheney, Spokane County; swimming facilities, new.
S—Ferndale, Whatcom County; city streets, improvement.
S—Point Robert Water District 4; water system, additions.
S—Lynden, Whatcom County; sanitation, new.
S—Shelton, Mason County; sanitation, additions.

WEST VIRGINIA

A—Court of Raleigh, Beckley County; parks, additions.
A—Huntington, Cabell County; courthouses, new.
A—Huntington, Cabell County; sanitation, new.
A—Huntington, Cabell County; sanitation, new.
A—Huntington, Cabell County; sanitation, new.
A—Huntington, Cabell County; sanitation, new.

A—Huntington, Cabell County; sanitation, new.

A—Huntington, Cabell County; sanitation, new.

A—Pea Ridge Public Service District, Cabell County; sanitation, new.

A—Oak Hill, Fayette County; city streets, new.

A—Mount Hope, Fayette County; athletic buildings, new.

A—Fayetteville, Fayette County; city streets, new.

A—Smithers, Fayette County; city streets, new.

A—Lewisburg, County Court of Greenbrier; courthouses, new.

A—Lewisburg, Greenbrier County; other water, new.

A—White Sulphur Springs, Greenbrier County; city streets, improvement.

A—Clarksburg, Harrison County; city streets, improvement.

A—Hepzibah Public Service District, Harrison County; water system, new.

A—Stonewood, Harrison County; sanitation, new.

A—Nutter Fort, Harrison County; sanitation, new.

A—Hepzibah Public Service Water District, Harrison County; sanitation, new.

A—Ripley Board of Education, Jackson County; swimming facilities, new.

A—Charleston, Kanawha County; disposal facilities, new.

A—St. Albans, Kanawha County; sanitation, new.

A—St. Albans, Kanawha County; city streets, improvement.

A—Glasgow, Kanawha County; community buildings, new.

A—Chesapeake, Kanawha County; city streets, new.

A—Chesapeake, Kanawha County; sanitation, new.

A—Dunbar, Kanawha County; city streets, new.

A—Glasgow, Kanawha County; water system, new.

A—Cedar Grove, Kanawha County; city streets, new.

A—Glasgow, Kanawha County; water resources, new.

A—Keystone, McDowell County; water system, new.

A—Welch, C. McDowell County; municipal buildings, repair, improve.

A—Mannington, Marion County; water system, new.

A—Fairmont, Marion County; roads, new.

A—Moundsville, Marshall County; drainage, additions.

A—Moundsville Public Sanitary District No. 2, Marshall County; water system, new.

A—Point Pleasant, Mason County; city streets, improvement.

A—Point Pleasant, Mason County; community buildings, new.

A—Bluefield, Green Valley, sanitation, new.

A—Bluewell Public Sanitary District, Mercer County; other water, new.

A—Green Valley, Glenwood Public Sanitary District; water system, new.

A—Lilly Grove Public Sanitary District, Mercer County; sanitation, new.

A—Princeton, Mercer County; libraries, new.

A—Princeton, Mercer County; city streets, new.

A—Athens, Mercer County; city streets, improvement.

A—Princeton Sanitary Board, Mercer County; sanitation, new.

A—Williamson, county court of; courthouses, new.

A—Chattaroy Public Sanitary District, Mingo County; water system, new.

A—Chattaroy Public Sanitary District, Mingo County; waste treatment, additions.

A—Williamson, Mingo County; city streets, new.

A—Morgantown Paw Paw District 19; other water, new.

A—Morgantown, Monongalia County; libraries, new.

A—Wheeling Park Commission, Ohio County; parks, additions.

A—Wheeling, Ohio County; municipal buildings, new.

A—Bethlehem, Ohio County; sanitation, new.

A—Mabscott, Raleigh County; city streets, improvement.

A—Mabscott, Raleigh County; community buildings, new.

A—Beckley, Raleigh County Armory; cultural buildings, new.

A—Beckley, Raleigh County Armory; cultural buildings, new.

A—Grafton, Taylor County; sanitation, new.

A—Paden City, Tyler County; drainage, new.

A—Paden City, Tyler County; water system, improvement.

A—Paden City, Tyler County; roads, improvement.

A—Spring Valley Public Service District, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—Fort Gay, Wayne County; water system, additions.

A—Huntington, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—Huntington, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—Huntington, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—Huntington, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—Huntington, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—Huntington, Wayne County; sanitation, new.

A—New Martinsville, Wetzel County; city streets, new.

A—New Martinsville, Wetzel County; parks, additions.

A—Paden City, Wetzel County; water system improvement.

A—Paden City, Wetzel County; roads, improvement.

A—Parkersburg, Wood County; water resources, new.

A—Vienna, Wood County; city streets, new.

B—Court Hamlin, Lincoln County; courthouses, new.

B—Lincoln Public Service District, Alum Creek, Lincoln County; other water, new.

B—West Hamlin, Lincoln County; sanitation, new.

B—West Hamlin, Lincoln County; water system, new.

B—Pleasant View Public Service District, Lincoln County; sanitation, new.

B—Summersville, Nicholas County; municipal buildings, new.

B—St. Marys, Court of Pleasant County; heating system, new.

B—County Court, Roane County; courthouses, new.

B—Hinton, Summers County; protect buildings, new.

B—Buckhannon, Upshur County; city streets, improvement.

B—Addison Webster Springs, Webster County; city streets, improvement.

B—Addison, Webster County; city streets, improvement.

S—Martinsburg, Berkeley County; city streets, new.

WISCONSIN

A—Poplar, Douglas County; community buildings, new.

A—Maple Township, Douglas County; community buildings, new.

A—Superior, Douglas County; community buildings, new.

A—Superior, Douglas County; roads, new.

A—Superior, Douglas County; roads, new.

A—Superior, Douglas County; roads, new.

A—Lacrosse, Lacrosse County; correctional institution, new.

A—Bangor Village, Lacrosse County; libraries, new.

A—Lacrosse, Lacrosse County; water system, additions.

A—Lacrosse, Lacrosse County; drainage, new.

A—Shelby Sanitary District No. 1, Lacrosse, sanitation, new.

A—West Salem, Lacrosse County; water system, new.

A—Onalaska, Lacrosse County; sanitation, new.

A—Campbell, Lacrosse County; sanitation, new.

B—Ashland, Ashland County; water system, new.

B—Ashland, Ashland County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Ashland, Ashland County; sanitation, improvement.

B—Ashland, Ashland County; roads, new.

B—Ashland, Ashland County; harbor facilities, new.

B—La Pointe, Ashland County; harbor facilities, additions.

B—Drummond, Bayfield County; garage, new.

B—Namakagon Township, Bayfield County; community buildings, new.

B—Tripp, Iron River, Bayfield County; garage, new.

B—Washburn, Bayfield County; office buildings, additions.

B—Cable, Bayfield County; harbor facilities, new.

B—Washburn, Bayfield County; community buildings, new.

B—Webster, Burnett County; community buildings, new.

B—Burnett County; municipal buildings, news.

B—Grantsburg, Burnett County; community buildings, new.

B—Burnett County; community buildings, repairs, improvements.

B—Sturgeon Bay, Door County; harbor facilities, new.

B—Sturgeon Bay, Door County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Hurley, Iron County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Necedah Village, Juneau County; sanitation, new.

B—Camp Douglas, Juneau County; water system, new.

B—Union Center, Juneau County; sanitation, new.

B—Langlade County; harbor facilities, new.

B—Elcho, Langlade County; community buildings, new.

B—Antigo, Langlade County; roads, new.

B—Antigo, Langlade County; roads, improvement.

B—Merrill, Lincoln County; water system, improvement.

B—Merrill, Lincoln County; roads, improvement.

B—Wausaukee, Marinette County; sanitation, new.

B—Wausaukee, Marinette County; water system, new.

B—Marinette, Marinette County; protect buildings, new.

B—Marinette County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Cassian, Oneida County; roads, improvement.

B—Minoqua, Oneida County; city streets, improvement.

B—Minoqua, Oneida County; municipal buildings, new.

B—Minoqua, Oneida County; parks, new.

B—Minoqua, Oneida County; roads, improvement.

B—Stevens Point, Portage County; sanitation, new.

B—Rosholt, Portage County; sanitation, new.

B—Junction, Portage County; water system, new.

B—Phillips, Price County; municipal buildings new.

B—Worcester, Price County; harbor facilities, new.
B—Worcester, Price County; roads, improvement.
B—Prentice, Price County; sanitation, new.
B—Knox, Price County; community buildings, additions.
B—Knox, Price County; bridges, new.
B—Hayward, Sawyer County; sanitation, new.
B—Winter, Sawyer County; water resources, new.
B—Winter Sanitary District 1, Sawyer County; sanitation, new.
B—Meadowbrook, Sawyer County; roads, improvement.
B—Radisson, Sawyer County; water system, new.
B—Pershing, Taylor County; roads, improvement.
B—Holway Township, Taylor County; roads, new.
B—St. Germain, Vilas County; roads, new.
B—Arbor Vitae, Vilas County; community buildings, new.
B—St. Germain, Vilas County; community buildings, new.
B—Phelps, Vilas County; municipal buildings, new.
B—Minong, Washburn County; sanitation, new.
B—Minong, Washburn County; water system, new.
B—Shell Lake, Washburn County; protect buildings, additions.
B—Washburn, Washburn County; water system, new.
B—Birchwood, Washburn County; sanitation, new.

WYOMING

B—Lovell, Big Horn County; roads, new.
B—Deaver, Big Horn County; water system, new.
B—Labarge Sanitary Improvement District; sanitation, new.
S—Basin, Big Horn County; parks, new.

PUERTO RICO

A—Prasa, Guanica; water system, new.
A—Prasa, Mayaguez; water system, new.
A—Prasa, Cidra; water system, new.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Arecibo; city streets, improvement.
A—Prasa, Loiza; sanitation, improvement.
A—Prpa, San Juan; community buildings, new.
A—Prpa, San Juan; harbor facility, new.
A—Prpa, San Juan; community buildings, new.
A—Prasa, San Juan; sanitation, improvement.
A—Municipality of Guayama; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Guayama; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Carolina; electric system, new.
A—Municipality of Ciales; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Gales; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Gales; bridges, new.
A—Municipality of Gales; bridges, new.
A—Municipality of Carolina; electric system, new.
A—Municipality of Gales; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Loiza; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Aquas Buenas; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Juncos; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Camuy; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Guanica; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Juan; conservation measures, new.
A—Municipality of Barceloneta, roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Carolina; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Arecibo; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Cidra; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Gurabo; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Aquadilla; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Ponce; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Hatillo; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Carolina; sanitation, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; parks, new.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; electric system, additions.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Bayamon; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Humacao; sanitation, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; bridges, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; sanitation, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; city streets,
A—Municipality of Ponce; city streets, new.
new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; bridges, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; bridges, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Ponce; city streets, new.
A—Municipality of Carolina; athletic buildings, new.
A—Municipality of Carolina; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Carolina; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Yauco; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Lorenzo; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of San Lorenzo; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Patillas; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Patillas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Patillas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Patillas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Juncos; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Patillas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Patillas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Patillas; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Patillas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Caguas; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Cidra; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Morovis; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Manati; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Guayama; roads, improvement.
A—Municipality of Guayama; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Maunabo; sanitation, new.
A—Municipality of Barceloneta; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Barceloneta; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Arroyo; bridges, new.
A—Municipality of Arroyo; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Gurabo; roads, new.
A—Municipality of Mayaquez; roads, additions.
A—Municipality of Mayaquez; cemeteries, new.
A—Municipality of Mayaquez; city streets, improvement.
A—Municipality of Mayaquez; water resources, new.
A—Municipality of Mayaquez; bridges, new.
A—Municipality of Mayaquez; sanitation, new.
A—Puerto Rican Water Reservoir Authority, Juncos; sanitation, new.
A—Puerto Rican Urban Renewal and Housing Corp., Ponce; electric system, new.
A—Municipality of San Juan; city streets, new.
A—Prasa Hatillo; water system, improvement.
A—Municipality of Ponce; city streets, new.
A—Puerto Rican Urban Renewal and Housing Corp., Guayanill; sanitation, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Ponce; industrial buildings, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Guayn; industrial buildings, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Loiza; industrial buildings, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Guani; industrial buildings, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Aguas Buenas; industrial buildings, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Guani; industrial buildings, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Mayag; industrial buildings, new.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Carol; industrial buildings, new.
A—Prasa Aquas Buenas; water system, additions.
A—Prasa Barceloneta; water system, new.
A—Puerto Rico UR & Housing Corp., Aquada; bridges, new.
A—Puerto Rico UR & Housing, Patillas; sanitation, new.
A—Puerto Rico UR & Housing, Guayanilla; sanitation, new.
A—Mun. of Hayaguez; roads, improvement.

A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development, Loiza; sanitation, improvement.
A—Puerto Rico Industrial Development, Caguas; water system, additions.
A—Mun. of Morovis; roads, new.
A—Prasa Ponce; office buildings, additions.
A—Prasa Catano; city streets, new.
A—Mun. of Yauco; roads, additions.
A—Mun. of Cuguas; sanitation, new.
A—Mun. of Hatillo; roads, improvement.
A—Prasa Carolina; water system, new.
A—Mun. of Guaynabo; roads, new.
A—Prasas Guayanilla; water system, new.
A—Prasa, Ciales; water system, new.
A—Mun. of Hatillo; drainage, new.
A—Mun. of Hatillo; garage, new.
A—Mun. of Juncos; drainage, new.
A—Mun. of San Lorenzo, sanitation, new.
AB—Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority; electric system, new.
AB—Puerto Rico Resources Authority, Guayanill; electric system, new.
B—Prasa, Vega Alta; water system, new.
B—Municipality of Orocovis; sanitation, improvement.
B—Municipality of Yabucoa; electric system, new.
B—Municipality of Humacao; city streets, additions.
B—Municipality of Naranjito; electric system, new.
B—Municipality of Ceiba; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Humacao; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Orocovis; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Barranguitas; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Las Piedras; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Trujillo Alto; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Quebradillas; community buildings, new.
B—Municipality of Ponce; harbor facility, improvement.
B—Municipality of Yabucoa; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Yabucoa; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Yabucoa; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; auditoriums, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; municipal buildings, repairs and improvement.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; other recreation facilities, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; roads, new.
B—Municipalities of Vega Baja; industrial buildings, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; garage, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; libraries, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; community buildings, additions.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; cemeteries, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; correctional institution, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; electric system, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; harbor facilities, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Baja; water system, new.
B—Municipality of Comerio; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Quebradillas; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Orocovis; electric system, new.
B—Municipality of Orocovis; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Orocovis; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Orocovis; bridges, new.
B—Municipality of Maunabo; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Luquillo; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Humacao; industrial buildings, new.
B—Municipality of Humacao; sanitation, new.
B—Municipality of Humacao; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Humacao; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Fajardo; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Corozal; roads, improvement.
B—Municipality of Barranquitas; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Quebradillas; roads, new.
Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Comerio; industrial buildings, new.
Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Comerio, industrial buildings, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Nagua; industrial buildings, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Las Pied; industrial buildings, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Humacao; industrial buildings, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Toa Alta; industrial buildings, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Trujillo Alta; industrial buildings, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Fajardo; industrial buildings, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., Toa Alta; sanitation, new.
B—Prasa Quebradillas; water system, improvement.
B—Prasa Corozal, water system, additions.
B—Puerto Rican Urban Renewal and Housing Corp., Quebradillas, sanitation, new.
B—Puerto Rico Urban Renewal and Housing, Toa Baja; sanitation, new.
B—Puerto Rico Urban Renewal and Housing, Comerio; sanitation, new.
B—Puerto Rico Urban Renewal and Housing; Comer; sanitation, new.
B—Puerto Rico Industrial Development, Vega Alta; sanitation, additions.
B—Municipality of Yabucoa; electric system, additions.
B—Municipality of Yabucoa; electric system, new.
B—Municipality of Yabucoa; electric system, new.
B—Municipality of Comerio; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Comerio; water system, additions.
B—Municipality of Naguabo; sanitation, new.
B—Municipality of Nabuabo; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Naguabo; water system, additions.
B—Municipality of Las Piedras; city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Vega Alta; athletic buildings, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Alta; electric system, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Alta; parks, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Alta; city streets, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Alta; libraries, new.
B—Municipality of Vega Alta; city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Trujillo Alto; parks, new.
B—Municipality of Trujillo Alto; water system, additions.
B—Municipality of Trujillo Alto; water system, additions.
B—Municipality of Trujillo Alto; roads, new.
B—Municipality of Trujillo Alto; water system, additions.
B—Municipality of Toa Alta; city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Toa Alta; sanitation, new.
B—Municipality of Las Piedras; sanitation, new.
B—Municipality of Toa Baja; city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Toa Baja; city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Toa Baja; city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Toa Baja, city streets, improvement.
B—Municipality of Toa Baja, city streets, new.
A—Charlotte Amalia, St. Thomas, sanitation, improvement.
A—Charlotte Amalia—St. Thomas, water system, new.
B—Christiansed, St. Croix, water system, new.
B—St. John, roads, new.

LIST OF PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, DIVISION OF INDIAN HEALTH

(Area type, locality, and brief description of project)

ALASKA

5b—Kotzebue (election district 23); community water and sewerage.
5b—Seward Peninsula (3) (election district 11); communal water and individual waste.
5b—Norton Sound (4) (election district 23); communal water and individual waste.
5b—Hoonah (election district 6); community water and sewerage.
5b—Holikachuk (election district 17); communal water and individual waste.
5b—St. Mary's (Andreafski) (election district 23); communal water and individual waste.
5b—Kwethluk (election district 16); communal water and individual waste.
5b—Klukwan (election district 6); community water and sewerage.
5b—Anaktuvuk (election district 21); communal water and individual waste.
5b—Tanana (election district 18); communal water and individual waste.
5b—Diomede (election district 23); communal water and individual waste.
5b—Goodnews (election district 16); communal water and individual waste.

ARIZONA

IR—Fort Apache Reservoir, Canyon Day; community water and waste; individual water and waste.
IR—Gila River (Pima) Reservoir, Stotonic; community water and individual waste.
IR—San Carlos Reservoir, Seven Mile Wash; community water and individual waste.
5b—Rualapai Reservoir, Peach Springs; community water and sewerage, individual waste.
IR—Papago Reservoir, five villages; community water and individual waste.
IR—Salt River Reservoir, Pima-Maricopa; community water and waste.
IR—Gila River (Pima) Reservoir, St. Johns; community water and individual waste.
IR—Hopi Reservoir, New Oraibi; community water and sewerage.
IR—Gila River (Pima) Reservoir, San Tan; community water and individual waste.
IR—Papago Reservoir, five communities; community water and individual waste.
IR—Gila River (Pima) Reservoir, Maricopa; community water and individual waste.
IR—San Carlos Reservoir, Gibson Wash; community water and individual waste.
IR—Fort Apache Reservoir, McNary; community water and sewerage.
IR—Navajo Reservoir, Teecnospos; community water and waste.
IR—Navajo Reservoir, Pinon; community water and waste.

ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

IR—Navajo Reservoir, Ariz. (80 percent), New Mexico (20 percent); individual home water storage and waste disposal.

IR—Navajo Reservoir, Ariz. (four communities) and New Mexico (four communities); rural water distribution systems.

IR—Navajo Reservoir, Ariz. (seven communities) and New Mexico (three communities); rural water distribution systems.

MINNESOTA

IR—Red Lake Reservoir, Little Rock area; individual water and waste.

MONTANA

IR—Fort Peck Reservoir, Wolf Point; community water and sewerage.

IR—Fort Belknap Reservoir, Milk River Valley; community water and individual waste.

IR—Fort Belknap Reservoir, Beaver Creek; individual water and waste.

IR—Northern Cheyenne Reservoir, Lame Deer; community water and individual waste.

IR—Blackfeet Reservoir, Babb, St. Mary; individual water and waste.

IR—Flathead Reservoir, Polson area; individual water and waste.

IR—Flathead Reservoir, Ronan area; individual water and waste.

NEW MEXICO

5b—San Ildefonso Reservation, San Ildefonso; community water and sewage.

5b—Nambe Reservation, Nambe Pueblo; community water and sewerage.

5b—Pojoaque Reservation, Pojoaque Pueblo; community water and sewerage.

IR—Laguna Reservation, Panguate; community water and sewerage.

IR—Laguna Reservation, Seama; community water and sewerage.

IR—Acoma Reservation, McCartys; community water and sewerage.

IR—Mescalero Apache Reservation, rural areas; individual water and waste.

IR—Laguna Reservation, Encinal; community water and sewerage.

5b—San Felipe Reservation, San Felipe Pueblo; community water and sewerage.

5b—Santa Ana Reservation, Santa Ana Pueblo; community water and sewerage.

5b—San Juan Reservation, San Juan Pueblo; community water and sewerage.

IR—Navajo Reservation, Shiprock; community sewerage (low-cost housing project).

IR—Navajo Reservation, Crystal; community water and sewerage.

NORTH CAROLINA

IR—Cherokee Reservation, Big Cove and Cherokee; individual water and waste.

IR—Cherokee Reservation, Birdtown; individual water and waste.

NORTH DAKOTA

IR—Fort Totten Reservation, Crow Hill District; individual water and waste.

OKLAHOMA

5b—McIntosh County, Hanna District; individual water and waste.

5b—Delaware County, Eucha District; individual water and waste.

5b—Adair County (district to be selected); individual water and waste.

5b—McCurtain County (district to be selected); individual water and waste.

5b—Cherokee County (district to be selected); individual water and waste.

5b—Delaware County (district to be selected); individual water and waste.

OREGON

IR—Warm Springs Reservation, rural areas; individual water and waste.

IR—Warm Springs Reservation, Simnasho; community water and sewerage.

IR—Warm Springs Reservation, Greenville; community sewerage.

SOUTH DAKOTA

IR—Standing Rock Reservation, Kenel; community water and sewerage.

IR—Sisseton Reservation, Long Hollow and Enemy Swim; individual water and waste.

IR—Pine Ridge Reservation, Crazy Horse; individual water and waste.

IR—Rosebud Reservation, Upper Cut Meat; individual water and waste.

IR—Rosebud Reservation, Horse Creek and Swift Bear; individual water and waste.

IR—Pine Ridge Reservation, American Horse; individual water and waste.

IR—Pine Ridge Reservation, Rocky Ford; individual water and waste.

IR—Sisseton Reservation, Lake District; individual water and waste.

WASHINGTON

IR—Colville Reservoir, Okamogan Valley, Katar and Disantel; individual water and waste.

IR—Yakima Reservoir, Toppenish District; individual water and waste.

5b—Quinault Reservoir, Queets; community water and individual waste.

IR—Colville Reservoir, Coulee Dam and Nespelem; individual water and waste.

WISCONSIN

IR—St. Croix Reservoir, Danbury and Big Round Lake; individual water and waste.

5b—Mole Lake Reservoir, Mole Lake Area; individual water and waste.

IR—Lac Courte Oreilles Reservoir, New Post; community water and sewerage; individual water and waste.

LIST OF PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, DIVISION OF HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL FACILITIES

(Area type, locality, and brief description of project)

ALABAMA

5(b)—Shelby (Shelby County), Alabaster, Shelby County Nursing Home; new 40-bed nursing home.

LS—Birmingham (Jefferson County), Birmingham, Holy Family Hospital; addition and alterations.

LS—Birmingham (Jefferson County), Birmingham, University Hospital; alterations and addition to dietary department.

LS—Birmingham (Jefferson County), Birmingham, University Hospital; clinical services building remodeling.

5(b)—Wilcox (Wilcox County), Camden, Wilcox Memorial Hospital; 12-bed addition.

5(b)—Bibb (Bibb County), Centreville, Bibb County Nursing Home; new 30-bed nursing home.

5(a)—Jasper (Walker County), Jasper, People's Hospital; addition of 66 beds and remodeling.

5(a)—Jasper (Walker County), Jasper, Jasper Community Hospital; eight-bed addition.

5(b)—Russell (Russell County), Phenix City, Phenix City Nursing Home; new 33-bed nursing home.

5(b)—Bullock (Bullock County), Union Springs, Bullock County Nursing Home; new 30-bed nursing home.

5(b)—Conecuh (Conecuh County), Evergreen, Conecuh County Hospital; addition of 11 beds to hospital.

ALASKA

5(b)—Fairbanks (election district 19), Fairbanks, St. Joseph's Hospital; addition of new kitchen and laundry.

5(b)—Kenai-Cook Inlet (election district 12), Kenai, Central Kenai Peninsula Hospital, new general hospital of 20 beds.

5(b)—Seward (election district 11), Seward, Seward General Hospital, addition of elevator to existing hospital.

ARKANSAS

5(b)—Independence (Independence County), Batesville, Independence County Nursing Home; new nursing home.

5(b)—Cleburne (Cleburne County), Heber Springs, Cleburne County Hospital, new hospital.

5(b)—Faulkner (Faulkner County), Conway, Arkansas Children's Colony; rehabilitation center addition.

5(b)—Faulkner (Faulkner County), Conway, Arkansas Children's Colony, nursing home addition.

5(b)—Desha (Desha County), Dumas, Desha County Hospital; addition to hospital.

5(b)—Desha (Desha County), Dumas, Desha County Hospital, addition to nursing home.

5(b)—Desha (Desha County), McGehee, McGehee City Hospital, new hospital.

5(b)—Crawford (Crawford County), Van Buren, Crawford County Hospital; addition.

CALIFORNIA

LS—Eureka (Humboldt County), Eureka, Eureka General Hospital; addition.

LS—Fresno (Fresno County), Fresno, Fresno Community Hospital; remodeling and expansion of services.

5(b)—Plumas (Plumas County), Quincy, Plumas County Geriatric Hospital; remodeling of nursing home and public health center.

LS—San Diego (San Diego County), San Diego, Mercy Hospital; replacement of hospital.

5(a)—Shasta (Shasta County), Redding, Mercy Hospital; addition of general beds and remodeling of services.

5(a)—Shasta (Shasta County), Redding, Shasta County Hospital; 14 psychiatric bed addition.

COLORADO

5(b)—Alamoso (Alamoso County), Alamoso, Alamoso Community Hospital; 28-bed addition to general hospital plus services.

FLORIDA

LS—Miami (Dade Co.), Coral Gables, Doctors' Hospital; addition.

LS—Miami (Dade Co.), Coral Gables, Coral Gables General Hospital; 55-bed addition.

LS—Miami (Dade Co.), Miami, Cedars of Lebanon Hospital; expansion of service areas.

LS—Miami (Dade Co.), Miami, Jackson Memorial Hospital; 252-bed addition.

LS—Miami (Dade Co.), Miami Beach, Miami Heart Institute; service addition.

LS—Miami (Dade Co.), North Miami, North Miami General Hospital; addition.

ILLINOIS

5(a)—Mattoon (Coles Co.), Mattoon, Memorial Hospital Nursing Care, Unit; new nursing home, 51 beds.

5(a)—Centralia (Marion Co.), Centralia, Warren Murray Childrens Center; addition.

5(b)—Marshall (Marshall Co.), Lacon, St. Joseph Nursing Home; new 50-bed nursing home.

5(b)—Richland (Richland Co.), Olney, Richland Memorial Hospital; addition and remodeling.

5(b)—Monroe (Monroe County), Bloomington, Bloomington Hospital; addition and remodeling.

5(b)—Jennings (Jennings County), Butlerville, Muscatatuck State School; addition and remodeling.

LS—Connersville (Fayette County), Connersville, Fayette Memorial Hospital; addition and remodeling.

5(b)—Harrison (Harrison County), Corydon, Harrison County Hospital; addition and remodeling.

KANSAS

LS—Independence-Parsons (Labette County), Parsons, Parsons State Hospital and Training Center; addition to rehabilitation services.

KENTUCKY

5(b)—Pendleton (Pendleton County), Falmouth, Pendleton County Hospital; new hospital.

LS—Owensboro (Daviess County), Owensboro, Owensboro Daviess County Hospital; addition and remodeling.

5(b)—Monroe (Monroe County), Thompkinsville, Monroe County War Memorial Hospital; addition and remodeling.

LS—Winchester (Clark County), Winchester, Clark County Hospital; new hospital.

LOUISIANA

5(b)—Livingston (Livingston County), Albany, Retarded Children's Hospital; new 300-bed hospital.

LS—Alexandria (Rapides County), Alexandria, St. Francis Cabrini Hospital; adding air conditioning and remodeling.

LS—Calcasieu (Calcasieu County), Lake Charles, St. Patrick's Hospital; new hospital.

LS—New Orleans (Orleans County), New Orleans, Children's Hospital; addition to general hospital.

5(b)—West Carroll (West Carroll County), Oak Grove, West Carroll Parish Hospital; 25-bed general hospital.

MAINE

5(b)—Hancock (Hancock County), Bar Harbor, Mount Desert Hospital; remodeling.

5(a)—Biddeford-Sanford (York County), Biddeford, Webber Hospital; addition.

LS—Lewiston-Auburn (Androscoggin County), Lewiston, Central Maine General Hospital; replacement and addition.

LS—Lewiston-Auburn (Androscoggin County), Lewiston, St. Mary's Hospital; addition.

MARYLAND

5(a)—Cumberland (Allegany County), Cumberland, Cumberland Memorial Hospital; additions and alterations.

5(a)—Essex (Essex Co.), Amesbury, Amesbury Hospital; addition of 18 beds.

5(a)—Fall River (Bristol Co.), Fall River, Cerebral Palsy Rehabilitation Center; new.

5(a)—Fall River (Bristol Co.), Fall River, Truesdale Hospital; alterations.

5(a)—Fall River (Bristol Co.), Fall River, Union Hospital; addition and alterations.

LS—Springfield-Chicopee, Holyoke (Hampden Co.), Holyoke, Holyoke Hospital; addition of 65 beds.

5(a)—Essex (Essex Co.), Ipswich, Stephen Caldwell Nursing Home; addition of 15 beds.

LS—Lawrence-Haverhill (Essex Co.), Lawrence, Lawrence General Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Lowell (Middlesex Co.), Lowell, St. Joseph's Hospital; addition and alterations.

5(a)—Newburyport (Essex Co.), Newburyport, Anna Jaques Hospital; addition.

LS—Northampton (Hampshire Co.), Northampton, Cooley-Dickinson Hospital, addition and alterations.

5(a)—North Attleboro (Bristol Co.), North Attleboro, Maddona Manor; addition.

LS—Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke (Hampden Co.), Springfield, Springfield Jewish Home for the Aged; new, 125 beds.

LS—Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke (Hampden Co.), Springfield, Wesson Memorial Hospital; addition of 100 beds.

MICHIGAN

5(a)—Detroit (Wayne County), Detroit Receiving Hospital; remodeling.

5(a)—Detroit (Wayne County), Herman Kiefer Hospital; remodeling of 200-bed mental hospital.

5(a)—Detroit (Wayne County), St. Joseph Hospital; interns quarters.

5(a)—Detroit (Oakland County), Farmington Bottsford Hospital; new 45-bed general hospital.

5(a) Detroit (Oakland County), Bottsford Hospital; new 45-bed general hospital.

5(b)—Benzie (Benzie County), Frankfort, Benzie County medical care facility; new 40-bed nursing home.

5(a)—Detroit (Wayne County), Garden City, Garden City Osteopathic Hospital; addition of 95 beds.

5(a)—Detroit (Wayne County), Florence Crittenton Hospital; remodeling of 190-bed hospital.

5(a)—Escanaba (Schoolcraft County), Manistique Schoolcraft Memorial Hospital; addition and remodeling of services.

5(b)—Luce (Luce County), Newberry, Tequanamon Hospital; new 38-bed general hospital.

5(a)—Detroit (Oakland County), Pontiac, St. Joseph Mercy Hospital; addition of 100 beds and remodeling.

5(a)—Detroit (Oakland County), Rochester, Florence Crittenden Hospital; new 150-bed hospital.

5(b)—Arenac (Arenac County), Rochester, Standish Hospital; new 36-bed general hospital.

5(a)—Detroit (Wayne County), Woman's Hospital; remodeling.

MINNESOTA

5(b)—Carleton (Carleton County), Cloquet, Community Memorial Hospital; addition of 30 nursing home beds and remodeling.

5(a)—Hibbing-Virginia (St. Louis County), Cook, Cook Community Nursing Home; new nursing home.

5(a)—Duluth-Superior (St. Louis County), Duluth, St. Luke's Hospital; replacement of 168 obsolete beds, expansion of X-ray and laboratory.

5(b)—Cook (Cook County), Grand Marias, North Shore Hospital; addition of 24-bed nursing home.

5(a)—Brainerd-Grand Rapids (Itasca County), Grand Rapids, Itasca County Memorial Hospital; addition of 14 general beds and expansion of services.

5(b)—Pennington (Pennington County), Thief River Falls, Oakland Park Nursing Home; remodeling and alteration of services.

5(a)—Hibbing-Virginia (St. Louis County), Virginia, Iron Range Rehabilitation Center; addition of services.

MISSISSIPPI

5(b)—Hancock (Hancock County), Bay St. Louis, Hancock County Hospital; 26-bed addition and expansion of services.

5(b)—Humphreys (Humphreys County), Belzoni, Humphreys County Hospital; replace inflammable ceilings in corridors.

5(b)—Lincoln (Lincoln County), Brookhaven, Lincoln County Hospital; addition of 47 beds.

5(b)—Marion (Marion County), Columbia, Marion County Hospital; 16-bed addition and expansion of service area.

5(b)—Jefferson (Jefferson County), Fayette, Jefferson County Hospital; new 30-bed hospital.

5(b)—Holmes (Holmes County), Lexington, Holmes County Hospital; 18-bed addition and expansion of service areas.

5(b)—Pontotoc (Pontotoc County), Pontotoc, Pontotoc Community Hospital; add 10 beds and improve central service.

5(b)—Sunflower (Sunflower County), Ruleville, North Sunflower County Hospital; addition of 24 beds.

5(b)—Warren (Warren County), Vicksburg, Vicksburg Hospital; 15-bed addition and modernization.

MISSOURI

LS—Jefferson City (Cole County), Jefferson City, St. Mary's Hospital; 30-bed general and 30-bed chronic addition and remodeling.

5(a)—Butte (Silver Bow County), St. James Community Hospital; 45-bed addition to general hospital plus expansion of services.

5(a)—Kalispell (Lincoln County), Eureka, Eureka Community Hospital; new hospital, 9 general beds and 28 nursing beds.

5(a)—Kalispell (Flathead County), Kalispell General Hospital; expansion of X-ray facilities and other services.

5(b)—Carbon (Carbon County), Red Lodge, Carbon County Memorial Hospital; addition of 16 nursing home beds to general hospital.

5(b)—Musselshell (Musselshell County), Roundup, Roundup Memorial Hospital; addition of 15 nursing beds, remodeling of kitchen, heating plant, and oxygen system.

NEBRASKA

5(b)—Garfield (Garfield County), Burwell, Burwell Nursing Home; new 40-bed nursing home.

5(b)—Buffalo (Buffalo County), Kearney, Good Samaritan Hospital; new hospital.

5(b)—Buffalo (Buffalo County), Kearney, Mount Carmel Nursing Home; new nursing home.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

5(b)—Grafton (Grafton County), Hanover, Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital; addition.

5(b)—Grafton (Grafton County), Haverhill, Grafton County Infirmary; expansion.

NEW JERSEY

LSA—Philadelphia (Burlington County), Mount Holly, Burlington County Hospital; addition and alterations, extension of services.

LS—Newark (Essex County), American Legion Tri-County Memorial Hospital; replacement of hospital.

LS—Newark (Essex County, Newark Beth Israel Hospital; alteration and addition.

5(a)—Atlantic City (Atlantic County), Northfield, Atlantic City Hospital; remodeling.

5(a)—Lakewoods-Toms River (Ocean County), Toms River, Community Memorial Hospital; alterations.

5(a)—Atlantic City (Atlantic County), Somers Point, Shore Memorial Hospital; addition and alterations.

LS—Philadelphia (Camden County), Stratford, Valley General Hospital; replacement of existing hospital.

NEW MEXICO

5(b)—Rio Arriba (Rio Arriba County), Espanola, Espanola Hospital; expansion of X-ray and laboratory facilities.

5(b)—San Juan (San Juan County), Farmington, San Juan County Hospital; addition and remodeling.

5(b)—San Miguel (San Miguel County), Las Vegas, New Mexico State Hospital; addition.

NEW YORK

5(b)—Auburn (Cayuga County), Auburn Memorial Hospital; addition.

5(b)—Auburn (Cayuga County), Mercy Hospital; addition.

LS—Buffalo (Erie County), Buffalo Columbus Hospital; additions and alterations.

LS—Buffalo (Erie County), Sisters of Charity Hospital; addition.

LS—Buffalo (Erie County), Mercy Hospital; addition.

LS—Geneve-Canandaigua (Ontario County), Canandaigua, F. Thompson Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Waterton (Jefferson County), Carthage, Carthage Hospital; new hospital.

LS—Geneva-Canandaigua (Ontario County), Clifton Springs, Clifton Springs Hospital and Clinic; addition.

LS—Elmira (Chemung County), Ornot-Ogden; addition.

LS—Geneva-Canandaigua (Ontario County), Geneva, Geneva General Hospital; addition.

LS—Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon (Orange County), Goshen, Goshen Hospital; replacement.

LS—Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon (Orange County), Goshen, Orange County Infirmary; addition.

5(a)—Gloversville (Fulton County), Johnstown, Fulton County Infirmary; new nursing home.

LS—Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon (Orange County), Middletown, St. Theresa's Home; new nursing home.

LS—Buffalo (Niagara County), Niagara Falls, St. Mary's Hospital; addition.

LS—Geneva-Canandaigua (Yates County), Penn Yan, Soldiers and Sailors Memorial; addition.

5(a)—Plattsburgh (Clinton County), Ogdensburg Diocese Nursing Home; new nursing home.

5(a)—Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone (St. Lawrence County), Potsdam, Potsdam Hospital; addition.

5(b)—Essex (Essex County), Ray Brook, Lake Placid-Saranac Lake Hospital; new hospital to replace two existing hospitals.

5(a)—Schenectady (Schenectady County), Ellis Hospital; 99-bed addition.

5(a)—Ogdensburg - Massena - Malone (Franklin County), Tupper Lake, Mercy Hospital; addition.

NORTH CAROLINA

5(b)—Watauga (Watauga County), Boone, Watauga; new 100-bed general hospital.

5(b)—Avery (Avery County), Banner Elk, Charles A. Cannon, Jr., Memorial Hospital; new laundry.

LS—Durham (Durham County), Duke University Hospital; replacement of storage facilities.

5(a)—Henderson-Oxford (Vance County), Henderson, Maria Parham Hospital; new hospital to replace unsuitable structure.

5(b)—Ashe (Ashe County), Jefferson, Ashe County Memorial Hospital, addition and remodeling.

5(b)—Alleghany (Alleghany County), Sparta, Alleghany County Memorial oHspital; addition and alterations.

OHIO

5(a)—Ashtabula-Conneaut (Ashtabula Co.), Conneaut, Brown Memorial Hospital; addition to diagnostic and treatment unit.

5a Point Pleasant-Gallipolis (Gallia Co.), Gallipolis, Holzer Hospital; installation of cobalt unit.

LS—Hamilton-Middletown (Butler Co.) Hamilton, Eugene Hughes Memorial Hospital; addition of air conditioning unit to existing hospital.

LS—Hamilton-Middletown (Butler Co.) Hamilton, Mercy Hospital; expansion and remodeling of laboratory, instalaltion of air conditioning.

LS—East Liverpool-Salem (Columbiana Co.), Lisbon, Columbiana County Nursing Home; new 25-bed nursing home.

5(a)—Belmont (Belmont Co.), Martins Ferry Hospital; addition of 70 beds.

LS—Stark (Stark Co.), Massilon, Massillon City Hospital; addition of 52 beds.

5(a)—Portsmouth (Scioto Co.), Portsmouth, Southern Hills Hospital; addition of 27-bed wing and modernization of existing facility.

LS—Toledo (Lucas Co.), St. Vincent Hospital; new maintenance building and new service units.

LS—Zanesville (Muskingum Co.), Children's Society and Bethesda Hospital; new rehabilitation center.

5(b)—Choctaw (Choctaw County), Hugo, Choctaw County Health Center; new public health center and branch of State laboratory.

5(b)—McCurtain (McCurtain County), Idabel, McCurtain County Health Center; new public health center.

5(b)—Sequoyah (Sequoyah County), Sallisaw, Sequoyah County Memorial Hospital; new 28-bed general hospital.

5(b)—Haskell (Haskell County), Stigler Haskell County Memorial Hospital, addition of 14-bed chronic disease wing.

OREGON

5(b)—Yamhill (Yamhill County), Newberg, Newberg Community Hospital; addition of nursing home to hospital.

LS—Klamath Falls (Klamath County), Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital; new 131-bed general hospital.

5(b)—Yamhill (Yamhill County), Newberg, Newberg Community Hospital; addition of nursing home to hospital.

LS—North Bend-Coos Bay (Coos County), North Bend Mercy Home; addition of 80 nursing home beds to existing nursing home.

LS—Ontario (Malheur County), Holy Rosary Hospital; addition to general hospital.

LS—Salem (Marion County), Salem Memorial Hospital; addition to hospital.

PENNSYLVANIA

LS—Philadelphia (Montgomery County), Abington, Abington Memorial Hospital; addition.

5(b)—McKean (McKean County), Bradford, Bradford Hospital; new elevator.

5(a)—Uniontown-Connellsville (Fayette County), Brownsville, Brownsville Hospital; new hospital.

5(a)—Scranton (Lackawanna County), Carbondale, St. Joseph's Hospital; ancillary services.

LS—Philadelphia (Delaware County), Chester, Crozier Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Clearfield (Clearfield County), Clearfield Nursing Home; addition.

LS—Philadelphia (Delaware County), Chester, Chester Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Clearfield (Clearfield County), Clearfield Hospital; addition and replacement.

LS—Philadelphia (Bucks County), Doylestown, Doylestown Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Clearfield-Dubois (Clearfield County), Dubois, Dubois Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Sharon-Farrell (Mercer County), Greenville, Greenville Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Allegheny County), Homestead, Homestead Hospital; new.

5(a)—Indiana (Indiana County), Indiana Hospital; alterations.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Westmoreland County), Jeanette, Jeanette Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Kittanning-Ford City (Armstrong County), Kittanning, Armsdale Home and Hospital; new nursing home.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Westmoreland County), New Kensington, Citizens General Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Washington County), North Charleroi, Charleroi-Monessen Hospital; alterations.

LS—Philadelphia (Philadelphia County), Germantown Dispensary and Hospital; addition.

LS—Philadelphia (Philadelphia County), Jefferson Medical Center; remodeling.

LS—Philadelphia (Philadelphia County), Metropolitan Hospital; addition.

LS—Philadelphia (Philadelphia County), Misericordia Hospital; expansion.

LS—Philadelphia (Philadelphia County), Penn Hospital; parking garage.

LS—Philadelphia (Philadelphia County), Skin and Cancer Hospital; new hospital.

LS—Philadelphia (Philadelphia County), Womans Hospital of Philadelphia; alterations and additions.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Allegheny County), Montefiore Hospital; completion of shell floors.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Allegheny County), North Hills Passavant Hospital; addition.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Allegheny County), University of Pittsburgh Hospital; completion of hospital shell floors.

5(a)—Pittsburgh (Allegheny County), Villa De Marillac; replacement.

5(b)—Clinton (Clinton County), Renova, Renova Hospital; addition.

5(b)—Williamsport (Lycoming County), Lysock View Hospital and Home; addition.

5(b)—Williamsport (Lycoming County), Williamsport Hospital; alterations and modernization.

RHODE ISLAND

5(a)—Providence-Pawtucket (Newport County), Cranston, Rhode Island Medical Center; diagnostic and treatment center.

5(a)—Providence-Pawtucket (Newport County), Cranston, Rhode Island Medical Center; elevator.

5(a)—Providence-Pawtucket (Providence County), Cranston, Rhode Island Medical Center; storage facilities.

5(a)—Providence-Pawtucket (Providence County), Pawtucket, Memorial Hospital; replacement.

5(a)—Providence-Pawtucket (Providence County), Providence, Rhode Island Hospital; remodeling.

5(a)—Providence-Pawtucket (Providence County), Woonsocket, Mercy Hospital, new hospital.

SOUTH CAROLINA

LS—Gaffney (Cherokee County), Cherokee County Memorial Hospital; new and expanded service facilities.

TENNESSEE

LS—Cleveland (Bradley County), Bradley County Hospital; expansion of service areas.

LS—Chattanooga (Hamilton County), Baroness Erlanger Hospital; remodeling to provide 28-bed intensive care unit and 18-bed recovery room.

5(b)—Overton (Overton County), Livingston, Lady Ann Memorial Hospital; addition.

TEXAS

5(b)—Nacogdoches (Nacogdoches County) City Memorial Hospital; addition and remodeling.

5(b)—Nacogdoches (Smith County), Tyler, Mother Frances Hospital; addition, 134 general beds and 19 mental beds.

UTAH

5(b)—Emery (Emery County), Huntington, Emery County Nursing Home; new nursing home.

LS—Provo-Orem (Utah County), Provo, Eldred Sunset Manor; addition to chronic disease hospital.

LS—Provo-Orem (Utah County), Provo, Utah Valley Hospital; remodeling of 240-bed general hospital.

WASHINGTON

LS—Bellingham (Whatcom County), St. Joseph's Hospital; new 70-bed hospital to replace unsuitable hospital.

5(b)—Jefferson (Jefferson County), Port Townsend, St. John's Hospital; new hospital, diagnostic center, and nursing home.

5(a)—Yakima (Yakima County), Sunnyside, Valley Memorial Hospital; addition to hospital for expansion of services.

5(a)—Wenatchee (Chelan County), Central Deaconess Hospital; addition of 13 beds to general hospital.

5(a)—Wenatchee (Chelan County), St. Anthony's Hospital; new hospital of 46 beds to replace unsuitable structure.

5(a)—Yakima (Yakima County), Yakima Valley Memorial Hospital; remodeling of all major services.

WEST VIRGINIA

5(a)—Beckley (Raleigh County), East Beckley Nursing Home; new nursing home.

5(a)—Charleston (Kanawha County), Charleston Memorial Hospital; chronic disease and diagnostic and treatment addition.

5(b)—Clay (Clay County), Clay County Health Center; new health center.

5(b)—Randolph (Randolph County), Elkins, Memorial General Hospital; replacement of general hospital.

5(a)—Fairmount (Marion County), Fairmount General Hospital; addition to general hospital.

5(b)—Summers (Summers County), Hinton, Summers County Hospital; new 50-bed hospital.

5(a)—Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs (Greenbrier County), Lewisburg, Greenbrier, County Health Center; new health center.

5(a)—Oak Hill-Montgomery (Fayette County), Montgomery, Laird Memorial Hospital; addition to general hospital.

5(b)—Lewis (Lewis County), Weston, Stonewall Jackson Memorial Hospital; new general hospital.

5(a)—Wheeling (Ohio County), Ohio Valley General Hospital; residents and interns quarters.

WISCONSIN

5(b)—Langlade (Langlade County), Antigo, Langlade County Memorial Hospital; addition and conversion.

5(a)—La Crosse (La Crosse County), Grandview Hospital; modernization and alteration.

5(a)—La Crosse (La Crosse County), La Crosse Lutheran Hospital, addition and alteration.

5(b)—Marinette (Marinette County), Marinette General Hospital; addition of 40 beds.

5(b)—Vilas (Vilas County), Phelps, Northwoods Hospital; 20-bed nursing home addition.

5(b)—Price (Price County), Phillips, Southern Price County Nursing Home; new 40-bed nursing home.

5(b)—Washburn (Washburn County), Spooner, Community Memorial Hospital; addition.

5(b)—Portage (Portage County), Stevens Point, Portage County Infirmary; 50-bed addition.

GUAM

5(b)—Guam (Guam), Agana, Guam Memorial Hospital; new 200-bed hospital, health center, nursing home and TB unit. To replace hospital damaged by typhoon.

PUERTO RICO

5(a)—Aguadilla (Aguadilla) Aguadilla District Hospital; new nursing home.

5(b)—Aibonito (Aibonito) Menonita Hospital; expansion.

5(a)—Arecibo (Arecibo) Arecibo District Hospital; new nursing home.

5(b)—Corozal (Corozal), Corozal Health Center; new general health center.

5(b)—Fajardo (Fajardo), Fajardo District Hospital; new nursing home.

5(a)—Guayama (Guayama), Clinica Santa Rosa, Inc.; new general hospital.

5(b)—Humaco (Humaco), Ryder Memorial Hospital; general expansion and remodeling.

5(b)—Las Piedras (Las Piedras), Las Piedras Health Center; remodeling.

5(a)—Ponce (Ponce), Dr. Pilas Hospital; new general hospital.

5(a)—Ponce (Ponce) Santa Asilo De Damas Hospital; new construction.

5(a)—Ponce (Ponce) St. Lukes Episcopal Hospital; addition and expansion of services.

LS—San Juan (San Juan), Rio Piedras, Sociedad Espanola Auxilia Muto; general expansion and remodeling.

LS—San Juan (San Juan), Doctors' Hospital; general expansion and remodeling.

LS—San Juan (San Juan), Hospital Evangelico; new general hospital.

LS—San Juan (San Juan), Santurce, Presbyterian; remodeling and expansion.

5(b)—Trujillo Alto (Trujillo Alto), Trujillo Alto Health Center; remodeling and addition of four beds.

5(b)—Adjuntas (Adjuntas), Puerto Rico, Adjuntas Health Center; general remodeling.

5(a)—Arecibo (Arecibo), Puerto Rico, Dorado Health Center; general remodeling.

5(b)—Rio Grande (Rio Grande), Puerto Rico, Rio Grande Health Center; general remodeling.

5(a)—Ponce (Ponce), Puerto Rico, Juana Diaz Health Center; new health center.

5(b)—Villabba (Villabba), Puerto Rico, Villabba Health Center; general remodeling.

LIST OF PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, WASTE TREATMENT WORKS

(Area type, locality, and brief description of project)

ALABAMA

5(a)—Gadsden (Etowah County), sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Jasper (Walker County), Carbon Hill; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Jasper; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

5(b)—Conecuh, Evergreen; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Coosa, Goodwater; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. De Kalb, Collinsville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Fort Payne; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Hale, Moundsville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Greensboro; interceptor sewers. Jefferson, Fultondale; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Graysville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lamar, Vernon; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Macon, Tuskeegee; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Marion, Guin; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Hamilton; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Marshall, Arab; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Perry, Marion; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Russell, Phenix City; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Shelby, Wilsonville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Sumter, Livingston; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Talladega, Sklacoga; sewage treatment plant addition. Talladega, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Winston, Haleyville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Labor—Anniston (Calhoun County), Weaver; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Birmingham, Jefferson County; sewage treatment plant. Jefferson County; sewage treatment plant and outfall.

ALASKA

5(b)—Bristol Bay: Dillingham, sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer. Fairbanks: Fairbanks, interceptor sewer; Hamilton Acres, sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer. Kenai, Cook Inlet: Kenai, sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer; Seldovia, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer. Nome: sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer. Palmer-Wasilla-Talkeetna: Palmer, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer. Southeast Alaska (Indian area): Yakutat, sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer. Yukon-Koyukuk: Nenana, sewage treatment plant.

ARKANSAS

5(b)—Lawrence: Black Rock, stabilization pond and interceptor sewers. Madison: Huntsville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewers. Sevier: Horatio, stabilization pond and interceptor sewers. Woodruff: Cotton Plant, stabilization pond. Yell: Dardanelle, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewers.

Labor—Brinkley (Monroe County): Clarendon, sewage treatment plant; Des Arc (Prairie County), DeValls Bluff, stabilization pond and interceptor sewers; Hazen, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewers. Murfreesboro (Pike County): Glenwood, stabilization pond and interceptor sewers. Texarkana, Tex., area: Miller County, Ark., Texarkana, interceptor sewer and outfall. Trumann (Poinsett County), Harrisburg, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewers.

CALIFORNIA

5(a)—Modesto (Stanislaus County): Patterson, sewage treatment plant.

5(b)—San Benito (San Benito County): Tres Pinos, stabilization pond and outfall sewer. Siskiyou (Siskiyou County): Dorris, sewage treatment plant.

Labor Eureka (Humboldt County): Phonerville, sewage treatment plant and intercepter sewer; Redway, sewage treatment plant and intercepter sewer. Fresno (Fresno County); Selma, interceptor sewer. Stockton (San Joaquin County): Keyes, sewage treatment plant; Tracy, sewage treatment plant additions; Stockton, sewage treatment plant additions.

COLORADO

5(b)—Alamosa: Alamosa, sewage treatment plant additions. Costilla: San Luis, stabilization pond and outfall sewer. Clear Creek: Georgetown, stabilization pond and outfall sewer. Gilpin: Gregory Gulch sanitation district, sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer. Huerfano: Walsenburg, sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer.

Labor Pueblo: Boone, stabilization pond and outfall sewer.

CONNECTICUT

5(a)—Ansonia (New Haven County): Ansonia, sewage treatment plant; Derby, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewers; Seymour, sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewers.

Labor Middletown (Middlesex County): Conn Valley Hospital, sewage treatment plant addition; Middletown, interceptor sewers and force main. Norwich (New London County): Norwich, interceptor sewers. Torrington (Litchfield County): Winchester, sewage treatment plant additions. Waterbury (Litchfield County): Watertown fire district, interceptor sewer and force main.

DELAWARE

Labor Sussex (Sussex County): Bridgeville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Greenwood, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Laurel, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Millsboro, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Selbyville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

FLORIDA

5(b)—Pasco: N. Port Richey, sewage treatment works; Zephyrhills, sewage treatment works. Labor, Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood: (Broward County), Hollywood, sewage treatment works; Miramar, sewage treatment works. Miami (Dade County), Blounts Town; sewage treatment works. Dade County, sewage treatment works.

GEORGIA

5(a)—Carrollton (Carroll County): Carrollton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Bowdon, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

5(b)—Burke, Sardis, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Crisp, Cordele, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Dooly, Unadilla, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Franklin, Royston, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Habersham, Demorest, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Johnson, Wrightsville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor: Jones, Gray, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Laurens, Dudley, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Randolph, Cuthbert, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Screven, Sylvania, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Hattnall, Greenville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Tooms, Lyons, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Union, Blairsville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Walton, Logansville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Warren, Warrenton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Washington, Tennile, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Worth, Poulan, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Sylvester, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

HAWAII

5(b)—Hawaii: Hawaii County, sewage treatment works.

IDAHO

5(b)—Boundary: Bonner's Ferry, stabilization pond and outfall sewer. Kootemai: Couer d'Alene River Sanitation District, stabilization pond and interceptor. Nez Perce: stabilization pond and outfall sewer.

ILLINOIS

5(a)—Cairo-Metropolis: Alexander County: Karmak, sewage treatment works; Tamma, sewage treatment works; Thebes, sewage treatment works. Pulaski County: Mound City, sewage treatment works. Massaac County: Brookport, sewage treatment works; Centralia. Clinton County: Albers, sewage treatment works; Trenton, sewage treatment works. Marion County: Iuka, sewage treatment works; Kimmundy, sewage treatment

works: Harrisburg. Gallatin County: Shawneetown, sewage treatment works. Saline County: Eldorado, sewage treatment works. Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Franklin County: Christopher, sewage treatment works. Thompsonville, sewage treatment works. West Frankfort, sewage treatment works. Jaskson County: Ava, sewage treatment works; Campbell Hill, sewage treatment works; Dowell, sewage treatment works; Grand Tower, sewage treatment works. Johnson County: Buncombe, sewage treatment works; Cypress, sewage treatment works; Goreville, sewage treatment works.

5(a)—Perry County: Cutler, sewage treatment works; Pinckneyville, sewage treatment works; Tamaroa, sewage treatment works; Willisville, sewage treatment works. Williamson County: Creal Springs, sewage treatment works; Energy, sewage treatment works. Litchfield. Bond County: Keyesport, sewage treatment works; Pocahontas, sewage treatment works. Christian County: Assumption, sewage treatment works; Edinburg, sewage treatment works; Stonington, sewage treatment works. Macoupin County: Gillespie, sewage treatment works; Wilsonville, sewage treatment works. Montgomery County: Coffeen, sewage treatment works; Schram City, sewage treatment works. Mount Vernon. Jefferson County: Bluford, sewage treatment works; Summersville SD, sewage treatment works.

5(b)—Carroll. Lanark, sewage treatment works. Marshall: Lacon, sewage treatment works; Wenonah, sewage treatment works. Mercer: Joy, sewage treatment works; Keithsburg, sewage treatment works; Viola, sewage treatment works. Moultrie: Arthur, sewage treatment works. Randolph: Baldwin, sewage treatment works; Ellis Grove, sewage treatment works; Prairie du Rocher, sewage treatment works; Red Bud, sewage treatment works; Tilden, sewage treatment works. Richland: Olney, sewage treatment works. Shelby: Findlay, sewage treatment works; Moweaqua, sewage treatment works; Tower Hills, sewage treatment works.

Labor—Canton (Fulton County): Astoria, sewage treatment works; Canton, sewage treatment works.

Labor—Cuba: Sewage treatment works; London Mills, sewage treatment works; St. David, sewage treatment works. Danville (Vermillion County): Danville Southern District, sewage treatment works; Rankin, sewage treatment works. Decatur: Blue Mound, sewage treatment works; Warrensburg, sewage treatment works. Galesburg: East Galesburg, sewage treatment works; Maquon, sewage treatment works.

INDIANA

5(a)—Evansville (Vanderburgh): Evansville, interceptor sewers.

5(b)—Clark County: Charleston, sewage treatment plant improvements. Clay County: Brazil, sewage treatment plant improvements. Crawford County: English, sewage treatment plant. Dearborn County: Dillsboro, sewage treatment plant; Moores Hill, interceptor sewers and sewage treatment plant. Green County: Bloomfield, interceptor sewers and waste stabilization pond; Jasonville, sewage treatment plant improvements; Linton, sewage treatment plant improvements; Lyons, sewage treatment plant; Switz City, sewage treatment plant. Lawrence County: Mitchel, sewage treatment plant improvements. Martin County: Shoals, sewage treatment plant. Monroe County: Bloomington, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Ripley County: Milan, sewage treatment plant improvements. Sullivan County: Carlisle, sewage treatment plant; Dugger, sewage treatment plant. Vermillion County: Clinton, sewage treatment plant improvements. Washington County: Campbellsburg, waste stabilization ponds; New Pekin, waste stabilization ponds.

Labor—Connorsville (Franklin): Laurel, sewage treatment plant; Oldenburg, interceptor sewers and sewage treatment plant improvement. Michigan City-La Porte (La Porte): Michigan City, sewage treatment plant improvement. Muncie (Delaware): Albany, sewage treatment plant; Eaton, interceptors and sewage treatment plant; Gaston, interceptors and sewage treatment plant; Muncie, interceptor sewers. South Bend (St. Joseph): Mishawake, sewage treatment plant improvement; South Bend, sewage treatment plant improvement. Terre Haute (Vigo): Terre Haute, interceptor sewers. Vincennes (Knox): Decker, sewage treatment plant; Monroe City, sewage treatment plant; Vincennes, interceptor sewers.

IOWA

5(b)—Monroe County: Lovilla, sewage treatment plant. Appanoose: Moravia, sewage treatment plant; Moulton, sewage treatment plant.

KANSAS

5(b)—Cherokee: Galena, stabilization pond and outfall, Riverton, stabilization pond and outfall. Crawford: Walnut, stabilization pond and outfall. Rice: Alden, stabilization pond and outfall.

Labor—Montgomery: Coffeyville, lift station and force main.

KENTUCKY

5(a)—Boyd (Boyd): Bellefonte, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Corbin: Clay, Manchester, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Laurel: London, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Whitley: Corbin, interceptor sewer. Danville: Boyle. Junction City, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lincoln: Crab Orchard, Stanford, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Mercer: Burgin, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Elizabethtown: Grayson, Clarkson, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Hardin: Elizabethtown, interceptor sewer. Hazard: Breathitt, Jackson, sewage treatment plant. Letcher: Fleming-Neon, Jenkins, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Hopkinsville: Christian, Crofton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Hopkinsville, sewage treatment plant. Pembroke, sewage treatment plant. and interceptor. Todd: Guthrie, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Madisonville: Hopkins, Earlington, interceptor sewer. Madisonville, interceptor sewer. Mortons Gap, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Muhlenberg: Drakesboro, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Greenville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Webster: Clay, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Providence, sewage treatment plant. Sebree, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Middlesboro-Harlan: Bell, Middlesboro, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Pineville, sewage treatment plant. Harlan: Benham, interceptor sewer. Closplint, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Cumberland, interceptor sewer. Evarts, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Harlan, interceptor sewer.

5(a)—Leslie: Hyden, sewage treatment plant. Morehead-Grayson: Carter, Grayson, sewage treatment plant; Olive Hill, sewage treatment plant and interceptor, Greenup: Fullerton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Raceland, sewage treatment plant; Russell, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; South Shore, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Worthington, sewage treatment plant; Wurtland, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Wurtland Water Commission, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Paducah: Graves, Mayfield, interceptor sewers. Marshall: Calvert City, sewage treatment plant; Lake City Sewer District; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. McCracken: Sanitary District No. 3, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Paintsville-Prestonburg: Floyd, Martin, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Wayland, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Knott: Hindman, sewage treatment plant. Magoffin: Saylersville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Pikesville-Williamson (Pike): Elkhorn City, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Richmond: Jackson, McKee, sewage treatment plant; Madison: Richmond, interceptor sewer. Rockcastle: Brodhead, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

5(b)—Adair: Columbia, interceptor sewers. Breckinridge: Irvington, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Butler: Morgantown, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Calloway: Murray, sewage treatment plant. Clinton: Albany, sewage treatment plant. Crittenden: Marion, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Cumberland: Burkesville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Edmonson: Brownsville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

5(b) Fulton: Hickman, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lee: Beattyville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lewis: Vanceburg, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lyon: Eddyville, interceptor sewers. McCreary: Stearns, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Whitley City, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Metcalfe: Edmonton, interceptor sewers. Monroe: Thompskinsville, sewage treatment plant. Nelson: Bloomfield, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. New Haven, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Oldham: State Property and Buildings Commission, sewage treatment plant. Owsley: Booneville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Pendleton: Butler, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Falmouth, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Powell: Clay City, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Pulaski: Burnside, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Somerset, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Russell: Jamestown, sewage treatment plant. Russell Springs, sewage treatment plant. Shelby: Shelbyville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Wolfe: Campton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Labor—Bedford (Trimble): Bedford, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Carlisle (Nicholas): Carlisle, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Carrollton: Carroll, Carrollton, interceptor sewers. Henry: New Castle, sewage treatment plant. Florence (Boone): Walton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Frankfort (Franklin): Frankfort, interceptor sewers. Lebanon (Marion): Lebanon, sewage treatment plant. Morganfield (Union): Morganfield, sewage treatment plant; Sturgis, sewage treatment plant; Uniontown, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Labor—Nicholasville (Jessamine), Nicholasville; sewage treatment plant. Wilmore; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Owensboro, Daviess; interceptor sewers. Hancock, Hawesville; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Lewisport; sewage treatment plant. McLean, Calhoun; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Livermore; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Ohio, Beaver Dam; sewage treatment plant. Hartford; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Owenton (Owen), Owenton; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Paris (Bourbon), Millersburg; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Paris; interceptor sewers. Shepherdsville (Bullitt). Mount Washington; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Shepherdsville; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Springfield (Washington), Springfield; sewage treatment plant. Warsaw (Gallatin), Warsaw; sewage treatment plant. Williamstown (Grant), Dry Ridge; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Williamstown; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Winchester (Clark), Winchester; sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

LOUISIANA

5(b)—Allen, Kinder; stabilization pond and interceptors. Avonyelles, Bunkie; altera-

tions and additions to existing sewer system. Concordia, Vidalia; stabilization pond and interceptors. Lafayette, Broussard; sanitary sewerage system. St. John the Baptist, Garyville; stabilization pond and interceptors. La Place; sewage treatment plant, stabilization pond, interceptor sewers. Reserve; stabilization pond and interceptors. St. Landry, Opelousas; sewage treatment plant. Vermillion, Kaplan; interceptor sewers.

Labor—New Orleans (Jefferson), Jefferson Parish No. 3; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Jefferson Parish No. 4; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Jefferson Parish No. 8; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Westwego; sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

MAINE

5(a)—Biddeford-Sanford (York), Kennebunkport; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Old Orchard Beach; interceptor sewers. Saco; sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

5(b)—Hancock, Bar Harbor; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Knox: Rockland; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Lincoln: Damariscotta, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Wiscasset, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

MARYLAND

5(a)—Cambridge (Dorchester), Secretary; sewage treatment plant and appurtenances. Cumberland (Alleghany): Bedford Sanitary District, interceptor sewers; Bowling Green, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Cresaptown, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Frostburg, interceptor sewers. Hagerstown (Washington), Funkstown; sewage treatment plant and appurtenances; Halfway, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances.

5(b)—Cecil, Northeast; sewage treatment plant and appurtenances; Rising Sun, sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Garrett: Grantsville, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances. Somerset: Crisfield, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances.

MASSACHUSETTS

5(a)—Lowell (Middlesex), Billerica; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. New Bedford (Bristol): Dartmouth, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Fairhaven, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Newburyport (Essex), Ipswich, sewage treatment plant.

5(a)—North Adams, Berkshire, Adams; sewage treatment plant. Williamston; interceptor sewers. Franklin, Monroe; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Providence-Pawtucket, Bristol, Attleboro; pumping station and force main. Norfolk, Franklin; pumping station and force main.

5(b)—Plymouth, Plymouth; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Brockton (Plymouth), Bridgewater; sewage treatment plant. Whitman; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Milford, Norfolk, Millis; sewage treatment plant. Worcester, Milford; interceptor sewer. Northampton, Hampshire, Easthampton; interceptor sewers. Hadley; sewage treatment plant and outfall sewer. Worcester, Warren; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Hamden, Chicopee; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Holyoke; sewage treatment plant. Ludlow; interceptor sewers. Westfield; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. West Springfield; interceptor sewers.

MICHIGAN

5(a)—Adrian (Lenawee), Madison Township; sewage treatment works. Morenci; sewage treatment works. Detroit, Macomb, Mount Clemons; sewage treatment plant additions. Oakland, Lake Orion; sewage treatment plant. Oakland County Department of Public Works; interceptor sewer. Oakland County Department of Public Works; interceptor sewer. Wixom; sewage treatment plant. Wayne, Detroit; sewage treatment plant additions. Detroit; interceptor sewers.

5(a)—Marquette (Marquette), Ishpeming; sewage treatment works. Monroe (Monroe), Carleton; sewage treatment plant. Port Huron (St. Clair), Algonac; sewage treatment plant. Memphis; sewage treatment plant. Traverse City (Leelanau), Sutton's Bay; sewage treatment works.

5(b)—Arenac, Sterling; sewage treatment works. Chippewa, Rudyard; sewage treatment works. Dickinson, Norway; sewage treatment plant. Sagula; sewage treatment plant. Houghton, Hancock; interceptor sewer. Houghton; interceptor sewer. Houghton and Hancock; sewage treatment plant. Iron, Iron River; sewer extension. Lake, Baldwin; sewage treatment plant. Livingstown, Fowlerville; sewage treatment works. Luce, Newberry; sewage treatment works. Manistee, Onekama, sewage treatment plant. Missaukee, Lake City; sewage treatment works. Oceana, Pentwater; sewage treatment works. Shelby; sewage treatment plant. Osceola, Marion; sewage treatment plant. Sanilac, Brown City; sewage treatment works. Lexington; sewage treatment plant. Van Buren, Mattawan; sewage treatment works. Wexford, Mesick; sewage treatment plant.

Labor—Battle Creek (Calhoun), Tekonsha; sewage treatment plant. Jackson (Jackson), Parm; sewage treatment plant.

MINNESOTA

5(a)—Brainerd-Grand Rapids, Cass, Hackansac; sewage treatment plant. Itasca, Big Fork; stabilization pond. Warba, stabilization pond. Hibbing-Virginia (St. Louis), Bievabik; sewage treatment plant additions. Esko Corner; sewage treatment plant. Orr; intercepter improvements.

5(b)—Carlton County, Thompson; sewage treatment plant. Douglas County, Evansville; sewage treatment plant. Hubbard County, Akeley; stabilization pond and outfall. Pine County, Askov; sewage treatment plant. Roseau County, Greenbush; stabilization pond.

MISSISSIPPI

5(b)—Attala County, Kosciusko; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Bolivar County, Mound Bayou; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Shaw; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Calhoun County, Vardaman; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Choctaw County, Eupora; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Copiah County, Wesson; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Covington County, Collins; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Seminary; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Hancock County, Bay St. Lewis; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Holmes County, Lexington; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Pickens; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Humphrey, Isola; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Jefferson Davis County, Prentiss; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Jones County, Laurel; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Kemper County, DeKalb; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lafayette County, Oxford; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lawrence County, New Hebron; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

5(b)—Leflore County, Greenwood; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Madison County, Canton; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Madison; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Marshall County, Potts Camp; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Pike County, Osyka; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Pile County, Summit; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Simpson County, Magee; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Mendenhall; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Smith County, Taylorsville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Sunflower County, Indianola; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Wayne County, Shubuta; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Webster County, Mathiston; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Yalobusha; Coffeeville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Water Valley; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Yazoo County, Bentonia; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

MISSOURI

5(a)—Flat River (St. Francois County), Flat River; stabilization pond and outfall.

5(b)—Lafayette County, Mayview; stabilization pond and outfall. Wellington; stabilization pond and outfall. Oregon County, Alton; stabilization pond and outfall. Ozark County, Gainesville; stabilization pond. Pemmiscot County, Hayti; stabilization pond. Reynolds County, Ellington; stabilization pond and outfall. Stone County, Galena; stabilization pond and outfall.

Labor—Jefferson City (Cole County) Jefferson City; interceptor sewer and sewage treatment plant. Richmond (Ray County), Lawson; stabilization pond and outfall.

MONTANA

5(a)—Kalispell (Lincoln), Libby; stabilization pond and outfall.

5(b)—Fort Peck (Roosevelt), Froid; stabilization pond and outfall. Poplar; stabilization pond and outfall. Lake County, Ronan; stabilization ponds, interceptor, and outfall. Ravalli County, Darby; stabilization pond and outfall. Sanders County, Thompson Falls; stabilization pond and outfall.

NEBRASKA

5(b)—Buffalo County, Amherst; stabilization pond and interceptor. Metler; stabilization pond and interceptor; Pleasanton; stabilization pond and interceptor. Custer County, Arnold; sewage treatment plant improvements. Mason City; stabilization pond and interceptor. Merna; stabilization pond and interceptor. Dawson County, Gothenburg; stabilization pond and interceptor. Sumner; stabilization pond and interceptor. Howard County, Dannebrog; stabilization pond and interceptor. Elba; stabilization pond and interceptor. St. Paul; stabilization pond and interceptor. Wheeler County, Erickson; stabilization pond and interceptor.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

5(b)—Grafton County, Bristol; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Littleton; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Plymouth; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

NEW JERSEY

5(a)—Atlantic City (Atlantic), Buena; sewage treatment plant. Mays Landing; sewage treatment plant. Weymouth; sewage treatment plant. Lakewood-Toms River (Ocean), Berkeley Township; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Dover; sewage treatment plant and outfall. Lakehurst; sewage treatment plant additions. Plumsted; sewage treatment plant. Point Pleasant; sewage treatment plant additions. Long Branch (Monmouth), Allentown; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Keansburg; sewage treatment plant additions. Long Branch; sewage treatment plant additions. Neptune Township; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Ocean; sewage treatment plant. Roosevelt; sewage treatment plant additions. Wall; sewage treatment plant. Ocean City-Wildwood-Cape May, (Cape May), Sea Isle City; sewage treatment plant additions. West Wildwood; pumping station and force main. Paterson-Passaic (Passaic), North Haledon; sewage treatment plant. Pompton Lakes; sewage treatment plant additions. Wayne (Lower Preakness); interceptor sewer. Wayne (Mount View); interceptor sewer. Wayne

(Sheffield); interceptor sewer. West Milford; sewage treatment plant.

Labor—Jersey City (Hudson), Jersey City; sewage treatment plant additions. North Bergen; interceptor sewer. Secaucus; interceptor sewer. New Brunswick-Perth Amboy, Middlesex, Madison; interceptor sewer. South Plainfield; interceptor sewer. Spotswood; interceptor sewer. Woodbridge; interceptor sewers. Somerset, Bridgewater (North Branch); interceptor sewers. Bridgewater (Peters Branch); interceptor sewers. Green Brook; interceptor sewers. Manville; sewage treatment plant additions. Philadelphia, Burlington, Cinnaminson; sewage treatment plant additions. Florence; interceptor sewer. Medford; sewage treatment plant. Moorestown; sewage treatment plant additions. Palmyra; sewage treatment plant additions. Camden, Berlin Borough; sewage treatment plant. Borrington; sewage treatment plant additions. Cherry Hill (Ashland); pumping station and force main. Cherry Hill (3 Oak Orchard); pumping station and force main.

Lindenwold; sewage treatment plant. Pennsauken SA; sewage treatment plant additions. Pine Hill; sewage treatment plant. Gloucester, Deptford; sewage treatment plant additions. Deptford; sewage treatment plant additions. West Deptford; sewage treatment plant. Woodbury; sewage treatment plant additions.

NEW MEXICO

5(b)—Catron County, Quemado; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Colfax County, Cimarron; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Raton; sewage treatment plant additions. McKinley County, Gallup; sewage treatment plant additions. Rio Arriba County, Espanola; sewage treatment plant, interceptors and outfall. Sandoval County, Bernalillo; stabilization pond and interceptor. Valencia County, Seboyeta; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

NEW YORK

5(a)—Auburn (Cayuga), Weedsport; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Gloversville (Fulton), Gloversville; interceptors. Jamestown-Dunkirk (Chataugua), Chautauga; sewage treatment plant additions. Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone (St. Lawrence), Heuvelton; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Norfolk; sewage treatment plant. Ogdensburg; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Schenectady (Schenectady), Niskayuna; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Schenectady; interceptor sewers. Watertown (Jefferson), Watertown; sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

5(b)—Essex County, Port Henry; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. West Port; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Greene County, Catskill; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Schoharie County, Sharon Springs; sewage treatment plant additions.

Labor—Batavia (Genessee), Batavia; sewage treatment plant. Buffalo (Erie), Akron; sewage treatment plant, new and additions. Amherst; interceptor sewers. Blasdell; sewage treatment plant additions. Cheektowaga; sewage treatment plant, additions. Erie County, Evans-Angola; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Elmira (Chemung), Chemung; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Glen Falls-Hudson Falls (Warren), Lake George; sewage treatment plant additions. Newburg-Middlestown-Beacon (Orange), Montgomery; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Wallkill; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Wellsville (Allegany), Bolivar; sewage treatment plant additions. Cuba; sewage treatment plant.

NORTH CAROLINA

5(a)—Fayetteville (Cumberland County), Fayetteville; interceptor sewers. Henderson-Oxford, Franklin County, Bunn; sewage treatment plant. Franklinton; interceptor sewers. Youngsville; interceptor sewers. Granville County, Creedmoor; stabilization pond. Lumberton (Robeson County), Fairmont; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lumberton; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Maxton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor. St. Pauls; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Wilson (Wilson County), Elm City; stabilization pond.

5(b)—Ashe, West Jefferson; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Avery, Newland; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Bertie, Colerain; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Bladen, Bladenboro; sewage treatment plant additions. Carteret, Beaufort; sewage treatment plant and interceptor: Morehead City; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Newport; sewage treatment plant. Cherokee, Andrews; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Murphy; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Clay, Hayesville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

5(b)—Columbus, Brunswick; sewage treatment plant. Chadbourn; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Fair Bluff; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Lake Waccamaw; stabilization pond. Whitesville; sewage treatment plant additions. Greene, Hookerton; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Snowhill; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Halifax, Enfield; sewage treatment plant. Roanoke Rapids; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Scotland Neck; sewage treatment plant addition. Lincoln, Lincolnton; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Macon, Franklin; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Highlands; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Madison, Hot Springs; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Marshall; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Mitchell, Bakersville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Spruce Pine; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Northampton, Gaston; sewage treatment plant. Person, Roxboro; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Roxboro; interceptor sewer. Pitt, Farmville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Winterville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Sampson, Roesboro; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Swain, Bryson City; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Tyrrell, Columbia; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Warren, Warrenton; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Washington, Plymouth; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Labor—Elizabeth City, Pasquotank County, Elizabeth City; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Perquimans County, Hertford; sewage treatment plan and interceptor. Manteo, Dare County, Manteo; sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

OHIO

5(a)—Batavia-Georgetown-West Union, Adams County, Winchester; sewage treatment works. Brown County, Aberdeen; sewage treatment works. Clermont County, Amelia; sewage treatment works. Loveland; sewage treatment works. Cambridge (Guernsey County), Quaker City; sewage treatment plant additions. Kent-Ravena (Portage County), Kent; sewage treatment works. Portsmouth (Ross County), Clarksburg; sewage treatment works. Kingston; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. New Martinsville, W. Va., Monroe County, Ohio, Woodsfield; sewage treatment plant additions. Point Pleasant, Gallipolis, W. Va., Meigs County, Ohio, Pomery; sewage treatment plant and interceptors. Wheeling, W. Va., Belmont County, Ohio, Belmont County Sewage Authority; sewage treatment works. Belmont County; sewage treatment works.

5(b)—Morgan, Malta; sewage treatment works. McConnelsville; sewage treatment works. Perry, Somerset; sewage treatment works. Washington, Belpre; sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Labor—East Liverpool-Salem (Columbiana County), Columbiana; sewage treatment works. Hamilton-Middlestown (Butler County), Trenton; sewage treatment works. Youngstown-Warren (Trumbull County), Warren; sewage treatment works.

OKLAHOMA

5(a)—McAlester (Pittsburg County), Haileyville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Krebs; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. McAlester; sewage treatment plant additions. Muskogee (Muskogee County), Fort Gibson; sewage treatment plant and interceptor. Warner; stabilization pond.

5(b)—Delaware: Colcord, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Grady: Verden, sewage treatment plant.

Haskell: Stigler, sewage treatment plant additions.

Hughes: Holdenville, sewage treatment plant additions.

Latimer: Red Oak, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Lincoln: Tryon, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Mayes: Pryor Creek, sewage treatment plant additions.

McCurtain: Idabel, sewage treatment plant additions.

Okfuskee: Paden, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Pontotoc: Ada, interceptor sewer.

Sequoyah: Muldrow, stabilization pond and interceptor; Roland S.I.D. No. 1, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Wagoner: Porter, stabilization pond and interceptor.

OREGON

5(b)—Wasco: Dufur, sewage treatment plant and outfall; Maupin, sewage treatment plant.

Labor—Albany (Linn County): Brownville, stabilization pond and interceptor; Halsey, stabilization pond and interceptor.

North Bend-Coos Bay (Coos County): Eastside, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Empire, sewage treatment plant.

Roseburg (Douglas County): Oakland, sewage treatment plant.

Salem (Marion County): Salem, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Woodburn, sewage treatment plant additions.

Polk County: Dallas, sewage treatment additions.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS—PENNSYLVANIA

5(a)—Altoona (Blair County): Duncanville; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Clearfield-Dubois (Jefferson County): Brockway, sewage treatment plant.

Erie (Erie County): Albion, sewage treatment plant.

Johnstown (Cambria County): Cresson, sewage treatment plant; Patton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Stony Creek Township, pump station.

Somerset County: Berlin, interceptor sewer; Confluence, sewage treatment plant.

Kittanning-Ford City (Armstrong County): Applewood, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Parker City, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Meadville (Crawford County): Cambridge Springs, sewage treatment plant; Meadeville, sewage treatment plant additions; Saegertown, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Springboro; sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

New Castle (Lawrence County): New Castle, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Union Township, interceptor sewer.

Pittsburgh, (Allegheny County): Allegheny County, interceptor; Robinson Township, sewage treatment plant; West Mifflin, interceptor sewer.

Beaver County: Chippewa Township, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Washington County: Claysville, sewage treatment plant; Donlevy, sewage treatment plant; Monessen, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Monongahela, sewage treatment plant; Mount Pleasant, sewage treatment plant; New Eagle, sewage treatment plant; Rostraver Township, sewage treatment plant; Smithton, sewage treatment plant; West Newton, sewage treatment plant; Youngwood, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Pottsville-Lehighton, Carbon County: Jim Thorpe, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Schuylkill County: Blythe Township, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Cressona, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Orwigsburg, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Pine Grove, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; St. Clair, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Tamaqua, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

St. Marys (Elk County): Johnsonburg, sewage treatment plant.

Sayre-Athens-Towanda (Bradford County): Athens-Sayre, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; New Canton, sewage treatment plant; troy, sewage treatment plant additions; Wyalusing, sewage treatment plant.

Scranton (Lackawanna County): Clarks Green, interceptor sewer; Scranton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Sharon-Farrell (Mercer County): Hempfield, interceptor sewer.

Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Columbia County: Millville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Montour County: Danville, sewage treatment plant additions.

Uniontown-Connellsville (Fayette County): Brownsville, sewage treatment plant; Dawson, sewage treatment plant; Fayette, sewage treatment plant; Point Marion, sewage treatment plant; Vanderbilt, sewage treatment plant; Washington Township, sewage treatment plant.

Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton (Luzerne County): Avoca, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; DuPont, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Duryda, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Exerter, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Forty Fort, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Freeland, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Hanover Township, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Jenkins, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Kingstom, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Nanticoke, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Pittston, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Plaines Township, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Plymouth, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Shickshinney, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; West Pittston, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Wilkes-Barre, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Wyoming, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

5(b)—Bedford: Bedford Township, sewage treatment plant; Hyndman, sewage treatment plant; Saxton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Clarion: Clarion, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; East Brady, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Forest: Tionesta, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Greene: Greensboro, sewage treatment plant.

Huntingdon: Alexandria, sewage treatment plant; Mount Union, sewage treatment plant; Orbisonia, sewage treatment plant; Shirley Township, sewage treatment plant.

Lycoming: Hughesville, sewage treatment plant; Montgomery, sewage treatment plant.

McKean: Eldred, sewage treatment plant; Kane, sewage treatment plant; Smethport, sewage treatment plant; Wetmore Township, sewage treatment plant.

Perry: Bloomfield, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Duncannon, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Liverpool, sewage treatment plant.

Potter: Coudersport, sewage treatment plant; Shinglehouse, sewage treatment plant.

Susquehanna: Hallstead, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Tioga: Mansfield, sewage treatment plant.

Venango: Complanter, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Warren: Tidionte, sewage treatment plant; Youngsville, sewage treatment plant additions.

Labor—Gettysburg (Adams County): Bonneauville, sewage treatment plant; Cumberland Township, sewage treatment plant; Fairfield, sewage treatment plant.

Philadelphia: Bucks County, Bucks County, interceptor sewer; Bucks County, interceptor sewer.

Chester County: Atglen, sewage treatment plant.

Delaware County: Marcus Hook, interceptor sewer; Tinicum, sewage treatment plant additions.

Montgomery County: Bridgeport, sewage treatment plant and pump station additions; Schwenksville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Telford; sewage treatment plant; Upper Providence Township, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Philadelphia County: Philadelphia, sewage treatment plant additions; Philadelphia, sewage treatment plant additions.

RHODE ISLAND

5(a)—Providence-Pawtucket, Kent County: West Warwick, sewage treatment plant additions and interceptor.

Providence County: Burrillville, sewage treatment plant additions; Cranston, sewage treatment plant; East Providence, interceptor sewers.

Washington County, Narragansett, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

SOUTH CAROLINA

5(a)—Conway (Horry County): Loris, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Myrtle Beach, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

5(b)—Aiken: Wagner, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Allendale: Fairfax, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Beaufort: Chesterfield, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Forest Beach, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Calhoun: St. Matthews, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Clarendon: Manning, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Darlington: Hartsville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Lamar, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Hampton: Estill, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Varnville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Jasper: Hardeeville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Kershaw: Kershaw, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Lee: Bishopville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Marlboro: McColl, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Williamsburg: Hemingway, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Kingstree, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

SOUTH DAKOTA

5(b)—Bennell: Marten, stabilization pond.

Corson: Wakpala, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Dewey: Timber Lake, stabilization pond.

Gregory: Gregory, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Stanley: Fort Pierre, sewage treatment plant.

Todd: Mission, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Tripp: Winner, stabilization pond and interceptor.

TENNESSEE

5(a)—LaFollette-Jellico-Tazewell (Claiborne): Tazewell, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

5(b)—Benton: Big Sandy, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Bledsoe: Pikeville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Clay: Celina, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

DeKalb: Alexandria, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Dickson: Dickson, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

White Bluff, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Fayette: Moscow, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Rossville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Somerville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Somerville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Fentress: Jamestown, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Grainger: Rutledge, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Grundy: Tracey City, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Hardenman: Whiteville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Hickman: Centerville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Houston: Tennessee Ridge, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Humphreys: McEwen, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Jackson: Gainsboro, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Jefferson: White Pine, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

5(b)—Marion: South Pitsburgh, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Putnam: Algood, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Cookville, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Monterey, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Robertson: Green Brier, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Sevier: Pigeon Forge, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Unicol: Erwin, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Labor—Chattanooga (Hamilton): Chattanooga, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Johnosn City (Carter): sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Johnson City (Carter): Elizabethtown, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Lenoir (Loudon): Lenoir City, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Loudon, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Morristown (Hamblen): Morristown, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

Union City (Obion): Obion, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Union City, sewage treatment plant and interceptors.

TEXAS

5(b)—Bowie: Wake Village, sewage treatment plant additions.

Cherokee: Jacksonville, sewage lift station and outfall; Wells, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Marion: Jefferson, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Wood: Alba, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Labor—Beaumont-Port Arthur, Jefferson County: Port Arthur, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Orange County: Pinehurst, sewage treatment plant.

Galveston (Galveston County): Texas City, sewage treatment plant additions and interceptor.

UTAH

5(b)—Beaver: Beaver City, sewage treatment plant and outfall; Milford, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Carbon: Price River Water Improvement District, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Emery: Green River, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Sanpete: Ephraim, sewage treatment plant and outfall; Gunnison, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Summit: Coalville, sewage treatment plant and outfall; Kamas, sewage treatment plant and outfall; Park City, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Labor—Provo-Orem (Utah County): American Fork, outfall sewer; Payson, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Roosevelt (Duchesne County): Duchesne, sewage treatment plant and outfall; Roosevelt, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

St. George (Washington County): St. George, sewage treatment plant and outfall.

VERMONT

5(b)—Caledonia: Hardwick, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Essex: Island Pond, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Orleans: Newport, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

VIRGINIA

5(a)—Big Stone Gap-Appalachia: Lee County, Pennington Gap, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Wise County: Norton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; St. Paul, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances; Wise, stabilization pond.

5(b)—Buchanan: Grundy, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances.

Grayson: Independence, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Russell: Cleveland, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances; Honaker, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances.

Scott: Gate City, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances; Weber City, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances

WASHINGTON

5(a)—Aberdeen (Grays Harbor County): Westhaven, sewage treatment plant.

Anacortes (Skagit County): Concrete, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Centralia (Lewis County): Centralia, pump station and force main; Toledo, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Wenatchee (Douglas County), Douglas County; sewage treatment plant.

Yakima (Yakima County), Union Gap; sewage treatment plant additions.

Yakima; sewage treatment plant additions.

5(b)—Clallam: Seguiam; sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Pacific: Ilwaco; sewage treatment plant and outfall.

Pend Oreille: Cusick, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Metaline, sewage treatment plant.

Labor—Belingham (Whatcom County): Lynden, sewage treatment plant.

Shelton (Mason County): Shelton, interceptor sewer.

WEST VIRGINIA

5(a)—Beckley (Raleigh County): Crab Orchard-McArthur, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; North Beckley, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Rhodell, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Shady Springs, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Bluefield (Mercer County): Athens, sewage treatment plant; Bluefield, sewage treatment plan and appurtenances; Bramwell, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Green Valley-Glenwood P.S.D., stabilization pond and interceptor; Lilly Grove P.S.D., stabilization pond and interceptor; Matoaka, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Midway P.S.D., stabilization pond and interceptor.

Charleston (Kanawha County): Belle, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Charleston, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Chesapeake, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Clendenin, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Marmet, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Clarksburg (Doddridge County): West Union, sewage treatment plant.

Harrison County: Bridgeport, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Clarksburg, sewage treatment plant; Nutter Fort, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Shinnston, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Taylor County: Grafton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Hepzibah, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Fairmont (Marion County): Fairmont, stabilization pond and interceptor; Fairview, stabilization pond and interceptor; Grant, stabilization pond and interceptor; Mannington, stabilization pond and interceptor.

Huntington-Ashland (Cabell County): Huntington, interceptor sewers; Milton, stabilization pond; Pea Ridge P.S.D., sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Wayne County: Fort Gay, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Wayne, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances.

Logan, (Boone County): Danville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Lincoln County: Hamlin, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Pleasant View P.S.D., sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Logan County: Chapmanville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Logan, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Man, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Mineral (Mineral County): Ridgeley, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Mingo (Mingo County): Chattaroy P.S.D., sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Delbarton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Kermit, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Matewan, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Morgantown (Monongalia County): Granville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Morgantown, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Star City, interceptor sewers; Westover, interceptor sewers.

New Martinsville (Tyler County): Middlebourne, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Oak Hill-Montgomery (Fayette County): Fayetteville, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Smithers, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Parkersburg (Pleasants County): Belmont, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; St. Mary, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Ritchie County: Pennsboro, sewage treatment plant.

5(a)—Wirt County: Elizabeth, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Wood County: Parkersburg, interceptor sewer; Williamstown, sewage treatment plant and appurtenances.

Point Pleasant-Gallipolis (Mason County): Henderson, sewage treatment plant and interceptors; Mason, stabilization pond and interceptors.

Putnam County: Poca, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Winfield, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs (Greenbrier County): Alderson, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; East Rainelle, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Lewisburg, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Rainelle, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Ronceverte, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Monroe County: Union, sewage treatment plant.

Welch (McDowell County): Iaeger, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Keystone, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Kimball, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Northfork, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; War, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Welch, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Wheeling (Marshall County): Cameron, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Ohio County: Triadelphia, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Wheeling, interceptor sewers.

5(b)—Barbour: Belington, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Braxton: Gassaway, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Sutton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Clay: Clay, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Grant: Petersburg, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Morgan: Berkley Springs, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Paw Paw, sewage treatment plant.

Nicholas: Richwood, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Pendleton: Franklin, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Pocahontas: Marlinton, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Preston: Kingwood, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Reedsville, sewage treatment plant.

Tucker: Davis, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Parsons, stabilization pond and interceptor; Thomas, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Webster: Webster Springs, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Wyoming: Oceana, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Labor—Martinsburg (Berkeley County): Martinsburg, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

Jefferson County: Charles Town, sewage treatment plant; Ranson, interceptor sewer; Shepherdstown, sewage treatment plant and interceptor.

WISCONSIN

5(a)—LaCrosse (LaCrosse): Campbell, sewage treatment works.

5(b)—Ashland: Glidden, sewage treatment works.

Forrest: Crandon, sewage treatment works; Wabeno, sewage treatment works:

Iron: Hurley, sewage treatment works; Upson, sewage treatment works.

Juneau: Union Center, sewage treatment works.

Portage: Rosholt, sewage treatment works; Stevens Point, sewage treatment works and additions.

Price: Ogema, sewage treatment works.

Rusk: Bruce, sewage treatment works.

Sawyer: Raddisson, sewage treatment works.

Taylor: Rib Lake; sewage treatment works.

Vilas: Land O'Lakes; sewage treatment works.

Washburn: Birchwood, sewage treatment works.

5(b)—Big Horn: Deaver, stabilization pond and outfall.

PUERTO RICO

5(a)—Caguas: Caguas, sewage treatment plant and interceptor; Caguas, interceptor sewers.

San Juan: Hyde Park, interceptor sewers.

Appendix

Significant New Support for District of Columbia Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, neither the Congress nor the Federal executive departments have the time or the wisdom to try to solve the local problems of the Nation's cities and towns. Washington is the Nation's Capital and some aspects of its government are properly of special concern to the Congress. But Washington is the hometown of 800,000 American citizens who have many civic problems having no connection with the city's role as national capital. Those local problems—schools, law enforcement, zoning in residential areas, and so forth—will never be solved until the responsible citizens of this community are given the chance to govern themselves.

I have supported home rule in the past; I will continue to work for this important goal. This objective is not a partisan one: 1960 platforms for both Democratic and Republican national conventions pledged support for home rule. I hope that the leaders of both parties in the 88th Congress will find ways to redeem their platform promises and eliminate the biggest remaining outpost of "colonialism" in the Western Hemisphere.

In recent days, I have been heartened by a significant change in position of the respected and influential Washington Star. Long opposed to home rule, the Star in an editorial of April 7 promised support for this legislation if a permanent Federal contribution formula is written into the law. The Star's condition of support is a reasonable one which I believe is accepted by both Democratic and Republican sponsors of home rule legislation. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the Star's editorial, and a related New York Times editorial of April 8:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 7, 1963]

HOME RULE HITCH

The Star's opposition in the past to most home rule bills for the District has sprung from a real concern that their enactment would serve to discourage, rather than encourage, the payment of an equitable share of the expenses of the city by the Federal Government. Now the President once again has sent Congress a home rule bill which, if adopted as proposed, would seem to meet that objection.

This latest bill, which differs only slightly from the administration version proposed a year ago, contains a specific and generally fair formula for measuring the size of the annual Federal payment. The essential feature of the formula, however, as far as home rule is concerned, provides that these funds, mathematically determined each year by the formula, would be advanced automatically to the District of Columbia from the U.S. Treasury, without further action by Congress. If Congress will commit itself to meet its fiscal obligation to the District through this or some other equally acceptable provision as a part of the home rule bill, we would support the measure. Without the inclusion and final enactment of such a binding commitment, however, we would persist in our opposition to home rule.

Congress has defaulted year after year on the insufficient Federal payment amounts which it has authorized by law. And it makes even these inadequate funds available only after the desperate urgency of the need has been painfully proved and proved again during committee hearings and congressional debate in connection with the annual District budget.

Our basic concern about any new home rule bill is that Congress will not permit the District authorities to make their own budgetary decisions and then support them to the extent of the Federal fiscal assistance which would result from application of the proposed formula. Without this commitment and this support, home rule could be more than a snare and a delusion. It could be a disaster for this city.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1963]

VOTELESS CITIZENS

The newly adopted 23d amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not do much by way of giving sovereign power to the 800,000 people who live in the District of Columbia. "It does give them power for the first time to vote in a presidential election, but not to choose their own local government, to make their own local laws, to shape their own local budgets or to impose their own local taxes.

President Kennedy has again urged Congress to remedy this state of affairs through the adoption of a District Charter Act. With this in view he has submitted a bill, the purpose of which "is to reaffirm, at the seat of our National Government, our basic American belief that government should be responsible to the governed."

Let us face the fact frankly: The greatest single obstacle to the adoption of this bill is the increasingly large Negro population of the District of Columbia and the consequent reluctance of many Members of Congress to grant home rule lest the whites be outvoted at the polls. This is not a line of reasoning that does credit to those who follow it. It is, on the contrary, a narrow, bigoted and, in the long run, self-defeating line, and it is particularly shameful that it should be permitted to void the right of self-government in that one area which, above all others, should be a shining example of democratic principle.

Provocative Questions Concerning Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the New York Times of April 7 contained an editorial that raises a number of provocative questions concerning our space program.

Those of us who serve on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee have a particular responsibility to make sure that, as the Times put it, we are putting first things first and that we are getting our money's worth. Of particular interest to me is the question of duplication of facilities. The complex of NASA installations and laboratories has been growing at a staggering rate.

Is each new facility really necessary? This is the question we must ask and to which we must find the "hard" answer. Is, for example, a separate new electronics research center, such as NASA has proposed for the Boston area, truly essential? This is a question which I raised publicly some time ago and which I believe our committee will want to explore thoroughly when the authorization bill comes before us.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix the text of the Times editorial and of a recent statement concerning my inquiry to Air Force Secretary Zuckert with regard to alleged duplication of facilities by NASA.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

CONFUSION IN SPACE

The latest Soviet space achievement, another lunar exploration, emphasizes the need for a searching look at the U.S. space program, its organization, its management, its goals.

From the beginning, our program has been hampered by a dichotomy of organization and effort. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was supposed to concentrate on developing the peaceful uses of space; the military were to work hand in hand with it. In practice NASA has preempted the man-in-space program, and in many areas in which the military should be concerned has exhibited a propensity for empire building and politics; laboratories and installations which duplicate some already existing in the Armed Forces have been bestowed, with prodigal hand, upon various deserving sections of the country.

Specific instances of this kind of duplication have been cited in recent weeks. Some congressional eyebrows were raised recently when an expensive electronics research center was proposed for the Boston area, home bailiwick of the youthful new Senator from Massachusetts. Now the Air Force in a memorandum has suggested that some $77,671,000 of projected NASA construction costs represent unnecessary duplication of existing facilities. NASA, for instance, proposes to build at Moffett Field, Calif., a life sciences research facility at a cost of $4,880,000. This despite the fact the Air Force has long maintained superb bioastronautics laboratories, which NASA has declined to use.

There are two key questions which should be answered: The first is: Are we putting first things first? And the second is: Are we getting our money's worth?

We agree with Dr. Edward Welsh, executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, that Russia will not hesitate to use space for military purposes, and that, as Dr. Welsh put it, the "ability to defend ourselves in space against threats from space (an antisatellite capability, for instance) is as essential as preparedness in any of the other defense dimensions." Yet the military development of space applications clearly has been subordinated to NASA programs and goals.

This subordination of security goals and the organizational split in our space program, with the unnecessary duplication it has entailed, create doubt that all the money appropriated for space is being utilized wisely. The President himself, in defending his space program at his news conference, cast doubt on whether all the funds were well spent. Congress should make a detailed study of the entire program, and particularly of its organization, its management, and its goals.

INQUIRY OF SECRETARY ZUCKERT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, disclosed that he has telegraphed Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert requesting an expeditious report on a news story concerning an Air Force memorandum complaining that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration seeks "millions of dollars for facilities which would duplicate Air Force facilities."

The news story quoted NASA Deputy Administrator Hugh Dryden as saying he had been told an Air Force memorandum had been prepared charging that NASA is asking for construction of $77,671,000 in facilities, which the Air Force asserts would duplicate Air Force facilities.

Early in February, Senator CASE in a speech before the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce said:

"A new proposal of the administration, which deserves very close scrutiny in this connection, is the proposal in the new budget to establish a basic electronic research center in the Greater Boston area, with a starting cost of $6½ million and with a projected payroll of about 2,000 persons. The eventual cost of the facility is estimated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at about $50 million.

"As a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I shall insist on the fullest possible airing of the need for construction of this Government facility in the face of the tremendous electronic know-how and competence in private firms concentrated in several States. And, second, if the need for a Government basic electronics research center is demonstrated, why should not the facilities of the already existing Air Force Flight System Development Center located in the same area be used?"

Last month the New Jersey Council for Research and Development, a statewide organization of business, industry, labor, education, and government promoting the growth of research and development in New Jersey, wrote Senator CASE that New Jersey was an ideal location for the proposed electronics research center and pointed out that in recent months several hundred engineers have been laid off in the Camden and Moorestown area. Senator CASE responded that if the need for such a facility is proven, all areas of the country should be considered, including New Jersey. He added that he agreed with the council that the scientific and educational qualifications of New Jersey are outstanding.

Detroit Association for Study of Negro Life and History Opens $50,000 Drive To Buy African Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the American expanding interest in the arts is, among other things, a promise for our deeper understanding of peoples and nations. I think very exciting in this trend is the fact that the Detroit Association for the Study of Negro Life and History opened February 10, this year, a $50,000 drive to establish an African art room at the Detroit Institute of Arts. The enthusiastic response which the association, in undertaking the effort, received from African ambassadors in this country foretells that the benefits will be mutual between peoples and nations.

I would like to include in the RECORD a Detroit News report, February 11, 1963, concerning this project.

The article follows:

OPEN $50,000 DRIVE TO BUY AFRICAN ART

(By Joy Hakanson)

A near capacity crowd gathered at the Detroit Institute of Arts lecture hall yesterday to kick off a fundraising drive for an African art room at the museum.

The $50,000 goal set be the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History would buy new examples of African art to add to 24 already owned by the museum.

Yesterday's most dramatic announcement was the promise of art from new nations in Africa. Those already committed to the program are the Republic of Mali, Sierra Leone, the United Arab Republic, Ghana, the Congo, Republic of the Congo, Central African Republic, Malagasy Republic, Liberia and Tanganyika.

DISPLAYED IN WING

Museum Director Willis F. Woods said the art would be displayed in the museum's new $3,700,000 wing, expected to be completed in 2 years.

Addressing yesterday's audience, in the 1,500-seat lecture hall, Mayor Cavanagh said the fund drive spearheaded by the association "opens clearer channels of communications between peoples.

"I can think of no better expression of man's regard for fellow man than art," the mayor said.

The first pledge of $1,000 for the new room was made by Dr. Alfred E. Thomas, Detroit art collector and patron. Financial support was also pledged by Charles C. Diggs and his son, Congressman CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

Dr. Thomas said: "We intend to turn moneys raised over to the museum's founders society, so that the museum staff can purchase are objects they think proper for the gallery."

BEAMED BY "VOICE"

Another speaker was Dr. Broadus Butler, assistant to Wayne State University's dean of the liberal arts college, who said that "this is the first step in bringing Africa's treasures home to Detroit. We hope our whole dream will be realized by September 8."

The program, including the key address by Lawrence A. Fleischman, president of the Detroit Arts Commission, was taped by the Voice of America for a 15-minute radio program that will be heard in Africa.

The idea for an African gallery at the institute originated last September with Marc Crawford, a freelance writer.

"African art has played a great part in contemporary painting," he said. "Artists such as Picasso have been tremendously influenced by it.

"Yet, this city had no place where scholars could study the arts of Africa or where children could become acquainted with their African heritage. It seemed to be that assembling a collection could be a joint community and Pan-African effort for the enrichment of both continents."

In contacting African Ambassadors, Crawford received replies such as this:

"It is obvious that this good initiative must be sponsored and encouraged for the better understanding between people," came from Malagasy.

Yesterday's meeting officially opened Negro History Week in Detroit, which this year has the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation as a theme.

Woods congratulated the association for its "wonderful demonstration of community faith" in participating in plans for the African gallery.

While none of the gifts from Africa have arrived yet, Woods scheduled an African art exhibit at the museum for next September when the fundraising drive is over.

The Kennedys and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Kennedys Versus the Press," written by Mr. Walter Winchell for King Features Syndicate and published on March 21, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDYS VERSUS THE PRESS

Falsehoods are the weapons of leaders who believe that history deals in illusions and not in facts. A striking case in point has been offered by the Kennedys: Last January Bobby Kennedy vigorously denied that any Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion. JFK pledged "to make sure that there are no Americans involved in actions inside Cuba." Several weeks ago Senator DIRKSEN disclosed that four Americans were

killed in that battle. After some stalling the administration reluctantly confirmed the story. The power of democracy is based on an informed citizenry. Without information, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of assembly have no reality. The truth is that without the free flow of information you invite the nightmare reality of tyranny.

A free newspaper not only reflects the daily experience of the world—it is also a daily education for newspapermen as well as readers. Without that education the people are deprived of sound judgment. And without such judgment they are incapable of making decisions. Decisions ranging from casting a ballot to expanding a business * * * The very serious charges leveled against the administration by Arthur Krock in Fortune magazine merely confirm this reporter's warnings. Mr. Krock writes in part: "A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been enforced more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war."

This reporter has stated before that when an American is in doubt as to whether his rights under the Constitution are being impaired, his conscience leaves him no choice. He must fight or protest. The administration's manipulation of the news and its ugly contention that "the results justify the methods we used" are marred by two defects, both constitutional. Firstly John F. Kennedy hasn't the right to receive such powers. Secondly his administration has no right to impose those powers on any citizen. All the gentlemen involved swore to uphold the Constitution and that wonderful document was designed to stop any form of despotism.

I say the administration's attempt to transform the American press into a propaganda weapon is as iniquitous as it is perilous. I say that the procedure by which this is being accomplished is contrary to the traditions of this democracy. And unchallenged, the liberties of the American people will be destroyed by default. All too often J.F.K. has acted as if he were elected publisher of the American press. His attitude also happens to be contrary to Jefferson's. In 1823 Jefferson wrote to Lafayette: "The only security of all is in a free press."

Thomas Jefferson's dedication to the people's right to know inspired the first amendment. Now we are being told that the Government should determine what the people should know and not know. We seriously doubt whether the American people will allow the Kennedy brothers to delete Thomas Jefferson from the Constitution. Some members of the administration have argued that it is essential to protect military secrets. No sane American denies that. But the truth is that despots have always sought to suppress news in the name of military secrecy. Of course, no American newspaperman would publish classified military information. At the very least, American journalists are as intelligent and patriotic as Washington bureaucrats.

The following fact should be stressed: World War II censorship was voluntary, and there were no known violations that endangered national security.

The wisdom of the Bill of Rights gives the citizen the right to be heard, to criticizes, and to reject. Political hacks often function in smoke-filled rooms, but the Constitution lives by the light of day, and that light must never be dissipated by the darkness of any international crisis. We are told that modern warfare requires the manipulation of the news, but we are given no assurance that our democratic system of checks and balances will continue to control it. Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton would no more have created such a military-political machine such as that now being formed than they would have loosed a wild horse in a holiday parade.

It is important to note that the administration's censorship has also extended to Congress. The historic fact is that Congress has the constitutionally guaranteed right to know anything about the Republic. Unless Congress has the facts it cannot pass intelligent laws. Yet the administration has ordered the Department of Defense to present to Congress and the people only those facts it wishes Congress and the people to hear. The stunning fact is that the administration has made it clear it intends to shut down all sources of Government information any time it decides there is an international crisis. Since we live in a time of constant global crisis, it is sickening to think of the implications.

The President's power is all pervasive almost beyond the belief of the average citizen. There is hardly a single function of our national existence that is not touched by White House decisions. But the Bill of Rights made it clear that the press is not an extension of any politician's power. On the contrary, the press must serve as a watchdog against the abuse of power by politicians. There was no back door to Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in 1776, and there is no place for trapdoors in the ramparts of our national defense today.

The Germans and the Italians once voted away their liberties, and the jagged wrecks of their public buildings eventually became monuments to that sorry day of their respective histories.

Over the years the free press has continually fought invaders. Lies and the arbitrary power of officials have been its foes. The challenge represented by such enemies is both formidable and perilous, and the soldiers engaged in the struggle are ordinary extraordinary newspapermen. For a newspaperman to report the truth is a public duty. For this Government to withhold the truth is a crime.

If the American press ever becomes a weapon in the hands of Government officials, then it will be a weapon aimed at the heads and hearts of the American people.

Good Friend of Federal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the work of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is generally not the type which is reflected in front page newspaper headlines.

Nevertheless, since its organization in the 83d Congress, it has pursued a continuing and most effective program of promoting efficient utilization of Federal civilian personnel and advancing generally the Federal career civil service.

The subcommittee has compiled an impressive record of accomplishments that has resulted in a vastly improved Federal personnel system and a savings of substantial amounts in taxpayers' dollars.

Having served as ranking majority member on this subcommitte during the 87th Congress, I was particularly gratified at the very fine editorial comment on the activities of the subcommittee which appeared in the April 3, 1963, edition of the Evening Star.

Entitled "For the Workers," the editorial points out that Federal employees have a good friend going for them in the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee and it has some nice things to say about the subcommittee's new chairman, our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Mr. HENDERSON.

I certainly commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I think they will agree with me that the subcommittee is proving to be a good friend not only to Federal employees but a good friend also to the taxpayers of this country.

The editorial follows:

FOR THE WORKERS

Federal employees have a good friend going for them in the House Civil Service Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, and it should be good news that Representative HENDERSON of North Carolina, the new chairman, has promised a hard look at hiring and wage policies.

Only through such methods, diligently pursued, can Government workers hope for relief from nagging injustices and inconsistencies which continuously are cropping up. For example, the subcommittee hopes to devise a more equitable wage board system for dealing with per diem, or blue-collar workers. Too often at present, a wage board for one department approves a job classification scale lower than that of another department for the same kind of work. What is needed is a unified system to avoid such inequities.

Then there is the ever-vexing question raised by contracting for non-Government technical personnel on a job-by-job basis. To what extent does this practice retard the advancement of career employees, or cause dissatisfaction because of wage disparities? Also deserving close study is whether the use of military personnel in civilian jobs is in the best interest, particularly the use of retired military officers.

All these matters and others the subcommittee has pledged to give its closest attention, with the blessing of Civil Service Commiteee Chairman Murray, during the next few weeks. The subcommittee already has made a good record in keeping the Government agencies on their toes, and its excellent investigative staff may be counted on to do a constructive job this time.

Have You Seen Wind Cave?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Saturday, April 6, Editor Lloyd Wendt, of the Chicago American, made a suggestion on his editorial page which should receive the most careful consideration on the highest levels at the Pentagon.

Mr. Wendt's editorial suggests that Wind Cave in South Dakota's Black

Hills be chosen for the site of the Strategic Air Command headquarters if it is moved from Omaha, Nebr. If adopted, the suggestion could save the Department countless millions of dollars. Wind Cave is a natural. I hope the suggestion will receive the careful attention it deserves.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE YOU SEEN WIND CAVE?

On the theory that the present underground headquarters of the Strategic Air Command at Omaha are "not sufficiently secure," Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is proposing that another one be dug. His plan provides that this one shall be able to absorb a direct hit from Russia's biggest nuclear bomb and stay in business.

McNamara said three sites for the new headquarters were being considered. One is the present Omaha headquarters, which could be remodeled, one is in the Colorado mountains, and a third, which many Chicagoans have visited, is in the Black Hills of South Dakota. It is Wind Cave.

McNamara says one requirement is that the new underground headquarters have plenty of space, and Wind Cave has. It consists of a series of limestone caverns underlying a 28,000-acre area which has been made a national park. It has miles of corridors and chambers, and it gets its name from the fact that a current of air flows into it when the barometer falls and out again when the barometer rises.

If the cave is chosen by the Defense Department, it will become the command post and communications center of the Strategic Air Command.

It will have direct wires to the White House, the Pentagon, air fields all around the world, and a number of subsidiary underground command posts in this country. It will become a center of the world's anxious attention, one of two places (the other is somewhere in Russia) where atomic war might start if—perish the thought—it ever starts.

Harry Fowler Retires From Bureau of Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of Oklahoma's very distinguished citizens and leaders, Harry C. Fowler, of Bartlesville, will retire this month as the research director of the Bartlesville Petroleum Research Center.

Mr. Fowler's retirement, effective on April 26, culminates 40 years of outstanding service with the Bureau of Mines of the U.S. Department of Interior.

Since first joining the Bureau in Bartlesville in 1923, Harry Fowler has served well in many areas of the Bureau's operations. His great abilities, both as an administrator and as an engineer, are well recognized by his colleagues.

During his tenure with the Bureau, Mr. Fowler has served as the assistant chief petroleum engineer in Washington, Acting Chief of the Petroleum and Natural Gas Division, and for the past 15 years he has been a designated representative of the Director of Mines on the Secondary Recovery and Pressure Maintenance Committee of the Oil Compact Committee.

His services received recognition by the Department of Interior in 1952 when he was presented the Department's Distinguished Service Award and Gold Medal.

Harry Fowler was one of the early pioneers of the Bartlesville Research Center and his inspiring leadership has been instrumental in the Center's great development and expansion.

Harry Fowler assumed duties as research director of the center in 1945. The intervening 18 years under his leadership have been marked by significant progress.

The Federal Government has more than tripled the amount of funds for the center's activities. However, more significant is the great increase in the center's research capabilities. This increase is beyond measure, and this is an advance that benefits every member of our society.

Harry Fowler is a dedicated and progressive engineer, an inspiring and tireless administrator, a responsible citizen and community leader, and a great American. I know I speak for his legion of friends in expressing our appreciation to him and in wishing him many happy and fulfilling retirement years.

On April 8, 1963, the Bartlesville Examiner Enterprise, one of Oklahoma's outstanding daily newspapers, printed the following well-deserved tribute to Mr. Fowler:

[From Bartlesville (Okla.) Examiner-Enterprise, Apr. 8, 1963]

H. C. FOWLER LEAVES MARK OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Harry C. Fowler, research director of the Bartlesville Petroleum Research Center, will step down from this position April 26 when his retirement becomes effective.

His retirement will close 40 years of service with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

The successor to the research director position has not been announced yet.

Fowler, one of the early day pioneers of the research center has been instrumental in many of the changes at the center since he assumed duties as research director in 1945.

The center itself has grown considerably during Fowler's tenure here, as it has climbed steadily in Federal funds from $500,000 in 1945 to the present $1,800,000.

During his 18-year span as research director, complexed and advanced facilities and equipment have been added to help accomplish the center's objectives. More complexed requirement standards for engineers have taken place also.

The objectives of the center include the development of new and old petroleum-production methods, and provision of a basis for better utilization of petroleum industry products, actual and potential.

"In the old days," Fowler recalled, "we used pipes and tools to work out the problems but today's engineers have more advanced and scientific equipment to master their problems.

"Present-day engineers must be more interdisciplinary in their approach to technical problems than they were 20 years ago," Fowler explained. "They must be fully educated in all phases of mathematics and sciences."

Fowler's 170-man personnel staff members strive to select their problems more carefully to meet the needs of the space age.

Fowler received his A.B. degree in civil engineering at Stanford University in 1915, and joined the Bureau of Mines here in 1923 as a safety engineer.

The Bartlesville Petroleum Research Center, known then as the Petroleum Experiment Station, was housed in two small brick buildings where the south wing of the present structure is located.

Five years later, he was called to Washington to serve as the assistant chief petroleum engineer.

Fowler served from October 1928 until July 1933 as the Acting Chief of the Petroleum and Natural Gas Division.

When the petroleum and helium work of the Bureau was consolidated, Fowler continued as the Assistant Chief of the Division. In 1945 he returned to Bartlesville to direct the activities of the Bureau's Petroleum Research Center.

Fowler is the author and coauthor of many articles pertaining to the technical developments in petroleum and natural-gas production, particularly since they relate to activities of the Bureau of Mines in these fields, and to petroleum conservation.

He is coauthor with C. E. Beecher, a former schoolmate and colelague, of a chapter in the volume, "History of Petroleum Engineering," dealing with production techniques and control which was published recently by the American Petroleum Institute.

Fowler has proved to be an outstanding engineer and administrator, factors which were recognized in 1952 when he was awarded the Department of the Interior's Distinguished Service Award and Gold Medal.

He has served as a designated representative of the Director of Bureau of Mines on the Secondary Recovery and Pressure Maintenance Committee of the Interstate Oil Compact Committee since it was constituted more than 15 years ago.

He is a member of the Bartlesville Chamebr of Commerce, the Bartlesville Engineers Club, and the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

"The men and women who work together here are the heart and soul of the research center," Fowler was once quoted as saying.

This, in a small way, is a tribute to Fowler and the personnel of the research center.

Saints Cyril and Methodius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on April 5 and 6 of this year, the Slovak League of America held a conference of American Slovaks in Washington, D.C., at the Hotel Washington. The Slovak League is the recognized representative of the Slovak people in America. It comprises five fraternal organizations and has as its affiliates numerous Slovak newspapers

and the Slovak Newspapers Journalists' Association. I am certain that most of the Members of this body are acquainted with the outstanding work of the league. I congratulate the league for its excellent past record and express my best wishes for a successful conference.

One of the purposes of the conference was to celebrate the 1,100th anniversary of the coming of St. Cyril and St. Methodius to Slovakia, the ancient homeland of the Slovak people. In this connection, I ask for unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by A. V. Pier, O.S.B., which deals with the history of the two Saints.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAINTS CYRIL AND METHODIUS

(By A. V. Pier, O.S.B.)

This year marks 1,000 years since the arrival of two brother missionaries, Constantine (changed to Cyril when he became a monk in Rome shortly before his death) and Methodius, who were sent from Constantinople by Byzantine Emperor Michael III to the kingdom of Moravia at the request of the Slovak ruler, King Rastislav, in 863.

Although the Slovaks and their Slavic kinsmen in various parts of the central European realm had been evangelized to some extent by missionaries from Bavaria, nevertheless it was the work of these brother apostles that finally won the Slovaks and other Danubian Slavic peoples to the Christian faith.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Slovanic rite and liturgy, which they introduced to our Slovak ancestors with the approval of the Holy See, gave way to the Latin rite in Slovakia, the Cyrillo-Methodian heritage has survived in a twofold manner: (1) The loyalty of the Slovaks to the Holy See has never been broken down through the passage of 11 centuries; (2) the glagolitic script put the ancient Slovak language into written form for the first time in history so that this became the keystone of the Slovak nation's literary language. It was invented by St. Cyril.

Constantine (Cyril) lost no time in translating the New Testament, as well as other parts of sacred Scripture, and sacred hymns and prayers into the language of the people. This stroke of genius was destined to bear immediate fruit. A rapid conversion of the people followed the preaching of the word of God in the vernacular.

Not long after their coming to Moravia, both brothers were summoned to Rome where the Holy Father gave them his blessing and approval of their apostolic work. Constantine, who was ailing entered a monastery where he died while in Rome. Here he had received the name, Cyril, by which he is generally known. His brother, Methodius, was consecrated and named archbishop of a newly instituted Slavonic province in the kingdom of Moravia. After many years of work, which was marked by difficulties, dangers and sufferings, the saintly prelate died in the ancient homeland of our Slovak ancestors.

Saints Cyril and Methodius, the patron saints of the Slovaks, are honored by all Slavic nations because their influence was felt far beyond the borders of their actual mission countries (first, Bulgaria and then the kingdom of Moravia). Moreover, their disciples carried the cross to the rest of the pagan Slavs beyond the Danube.

The Slovak nation, because of the historical fact that the central headquarters of Saints Cyril and Methodius was located in the heart of its country on the Danube, has a greater claim to honor them as apostles to Slovakia (which was the heart of the kingdom of Great Moravia at the time of their coming to central Europe in the second half of the ninth century) than other Slavic nations. Nonetheless, the Slovaks are happy to welcome all Slavic nations to join them in celebrating the 11th centennial of this great event in 1963.

We are indeed fortunate to have at our disposal historical chronicles upon which we can base our information about two of the most remarkable saints in the history of the church. In many cases, one must rely on legendary accounts of real people who lived so long ago, but in this case, we have the activities of Saints Cyril and Methodius faithfully recorded in both ecclesiastical and secular documents. Nothing, therefore, remains in doubt as to their undertakings, their failures and disappointments, and their great achievements that ultimately overshadowed their momentary setbacks after the amazing conversion of the Slovaks, and their kinsmen on the Danube, in the years of their missionary endeavors.

Slovaks are especially proud to acknowledge publicly their gratitude to the brother apostles who converted their ancestors 1,100 years ago, and they are, therefore, happy to contribute to the new Slovak mission institute in Rome that bears their illustrious names, names that have not only gone down in history but into eternity.

The Saints Cyril and Methodius Mission Institute in Rome is a fitting tribute to the memory of the great missionaries who came to Slovakia from Constantinople and brought the message of salvation to our forefathers in 863, in a language they could understand. In the near future, new missionaries with the self-same apostolic zeal will go to Slovakia again in order to rekindle the fire of Christian faith in the hearts of those who will not be able to keep it aglow because of the cold fury of zealots of a new paganism and atheism that swarm like clouds of red locusts over the land.

The cross, symbol of hope, salvation, and love, will once again be restored to its rightful place in Slovakia over which the Prague and Moscow hammer and sickle, twin symbols of despair, destruction, and hatred, now casts the shadow of death in our day.

Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Richmond News Leader's lead editorial of April 3 reminds us that bravery and heroism were once highly esteemed qualities in the American tradition. Pointing a finger of shame at the President for his attempted restriction of activities by Cuban exiles to weaken and eventually overthrow the bearded dictator who has imposed Communist domination on their homeland, the News Leader asks the significant question: "In heaven's name, whom are we fighting—our friends, or our enemies?"

I ask that this editorial be included in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Apr. 3, 1963]

SHAME

The most melancholy manifestation of the administration's no-win policy is to be seen in the maddening restrictions newly clamped upon the anti-Castro raiders. In heaven's name, whom are we fighting, our friends, or our enemies? What new heights of hypocrisy and timidity is Mr. Kennedy reaching for now?

In cracking down on these heroic men, our Government has announced that the United States does not propose "to see our own laws violated with impunity, or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals."

It makes you a little sick at the stomach. At the time of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, our own Government violated every neutrality act on the statute books, and a dozen other laws besides. As recently as last October when the President's spine was stiffer, our own Government engaged in activities that might well have provoked full-scale armed reprisal. To this day, we are engaged in Vietnam in a military action filled with risk of a broadened war.

What is to be gained by hobbling the raiders? It is said that their continued hit-and-run attacks will provide a justification to the Russians for keeping troops in Cuba. This is the only line of reasoning that makes any sense, and it doesn't make much sense. If the Russians want to keep their troops in Cuba, they can trump up a justification on their own. And when did the Russians justify their course of conduct anyhow?

A second argument is that these sporadic raids will provoke attacks on American shipping in the Caribbean. All right. Suppose they do. The U.S. Navy is not helpless to protect ships flying the American flag. There is a French proverb to the effect that you can't make an omelet without breaking some eggs. We ought not to imagine that effective pressure can be kept on Castro without risking some loss of life and property.

Against these pusillanimous and legalistic arguments, every consideration of patriotism and every factor of morale have been discounted. It is said that the raiders accomplish nothing significant: They sink a freighter, they blow up a dock, they drop leaflets, they land a few rifles. These achievements are counted as nothing at all.

We count such activities for a very great deal. "Exiles feed on hope," says Creon in "Antigone." These brave conspiracies, these heady raids along the Cuban coast, are visible symbols of the fire of counterrevolution. They are feats of derring-do from which legends are made. To thousands of Cubans longing for freedom from Castro's Communist rule, the raiders bring a message that sustains: Have courage. You are not forgotten.

Mr. Kennedy would snuff out this spark of resistance; he would jam the message. He will not countenance a Cuban Government in exile; he will not tolerate attacks on Castro's Cuba. The British are brought into this disgraceful affair, in order to round up a band of 17 raiders in the Bahamas; the presumption is strong that our own Central Intelligence Agency exposed their hideout. Henceforth the Cuban commandos must fight two foes, the Communist enemy in front, the American friend behind.

Bravery. Personal heroism. A certain impudence. A sense of glory. These are qualities once highly esteemed in the American tradition. Why must they now be suffocated in a fog of diplomacy and a blanket of neutrality law? Shame, Mr. Kennedy. We cry shame.

Reform of Congressional Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, those of us who have been pressing for modernization of the congressional organization and procedures were greatly encouraged by a forthright article on congressional reform by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. The article appeared in the New York Times Magazine on April 7.

In his usual vigorous fashion, the senior Senator from Minnesota, who is also the majority whip, made an impressive case for action to improve the functioning of Congress.

His interest will be, I am sure, most helpful in securing hearings on the measures to this end which have already been introduced, including my own bill in which Senator CLARK joined. Senator CLARK and I have already written to the Rules Committee urging that hearings be held, and we welcome the support and interest of the Senator from Minnesota.

I am confident that if hearings are held, the case for action looking toward improvement in specific problem areas will be demonstrated beyond question. That the need for reform is widely recognized is indicated by the response to a recent poll I made of teachers and practitioners of political science.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Senator HUMPHREY be printed in the Appendix, together with a news article also from the New York Times of April 7 which summarizes the comments to which I refer.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

CONGRESS SCORED ON ARCHAIC RULES—SENATOR CASE'S POLL SHOWS SUPPORT FOR REVISIONS

(By Cabell Phillips)

WASHINGTON.—If Congress is to restore its prestige and effectiveness it had better give prompt attention to its archaic methods of doing business, a cross section of the Nation's political scientists believes.

This nearly unanimous opinion emerges from a nationwide poll of more than 200 teachers and practitioners of political science. The poll was recently completed by Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, who requested comment on a bill he had introduced calling for a special commission to study and make recommendations on congressional reorganization.

One important consensus from the comments is that Congress, as an institution, is losing status in the public mind as an effective arm of Government in comparison with the executive and the judiciary.

While both the Presidency and the courts have geared their thinking and their operations in consonance with the needs of modern times, many believe, Congress, as one respondent put it, gives the impression of "limping along in the harness of the horse and buggy age."

This rather prevalent viewpoint was expressed as follows by Prof. Edgar W. Waugh of Eastern Michigan University:

"Measured by the individual capacities of its Members (this) Congress compares very favorably with any of its predecessors, but when measured by its collective capacity to get things done, it looks much worse. Each House has become, so to speak, a prisoner to procedures which are patently out of step with the swift tempo of the nuclear space age. This needs to be corrected, and swiftly."

Professor Waugh added that it had become essential "to bring the executive and legislative branches into a closer and more cooperative relationship without damage to the balance on which our Government is founded, and without impairing the values provided by a loyal opposition."

The Case bill, one of several introduced this year for congressional reform, centers on a study commission composed of both Members of Congress and experts from other fields of public life. The bill defines 12 problem areas on which the commission would concentrate.

These problem areas cover such subjects as the scheduling of congressional business, staffing and procedure of committees, rules of floor procedure, conflicts of interest of the members, travel and other spending allowances, financing of congressional election campaigns and "the strengthening of the congressional power of the purse."

The bill has been referred to the Rules Committee but no hearings have been scheduled.

The last substantial reform of congressional procedures occurred under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Its principal achievement was a drastic reduction in the number of standing committees, and provisions for professional staffing of some of those committees. However, rules that contribute most to the cumbersomeness of congressional procedures, the right of committees to bottle up unwanted legislation, the seniority rule in the choice of chairmen, unlimited debate in the Senate, have not been altered in a century.

Virtually all the political scientists replying to Senator CASE's inquiry applauded his idea for a broadly based study of reforms. Their viewpoints about what is wrong with Congress and what needs to be done about it fell into several broad categories.

A large group felt that Congress will continue to lose stature in the public eye until it modernizes its procedures. Addressing himself to this point, Prof. John W. Baker, chairman of the department of political science at the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, wrote:

"I consider Congress to be the vital center of our representative democracy, and yet I find it very difficult to convince students of this fact. They have seen too many cartoons of Senator Snort and his ilk. Congress has been the butt of too many derogatory jokes. They have heard too much pool reporting of congressional activities. They have also read too much responsible reporting which has pointed out the weaknesses of Congress as it is functioning at present."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

TO MOVE CONGRESS OUT OF ITS RUTS: AMERICANS KNOW THAT THAT BODY COULD DO A BETTER JOB THAN IT DOES; A SENATOR OFFERS HIS VIEW OF WHAT IS WRONG AND HOW LEGISLATORS COULD BE MADE MORE EFFECTIVE

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

(HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the senior Senator from Minnesota, serves on four committees, including one on reorganization of Government.)

WASHINGTON.—Sixteen years ago, the United States held a monopoly of atomic weapons. Jet aircraft were barely operational. The space age could be found only in science fiction magazines. Television was an 8-inch infant in electronics laboratories. The Nation's elementary schools had classrooms to spare. The cold war could be seen on the horizon only by a handful of political wise men. Europe was near economic collapse, Africa was still a continent of colonies and Chiang Kai-shek still ruled the Chinese mainland. Cuba, to most Americans, was a plush and pleasant vacation spot. Fidel Castro was a teenager.

It was 16 years ago when the U.S. Congress last turned to the tedious task of self-criticism and produced a major legislative reform. Since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Congress has changed little. The structure is the same. The committee lineups are almost identical. The traditions are preserved. And the basic attitudes of Congress toward its own prerogatives and centers of power are still tuned to 1946 or the more distant past.

But the needs of the Nation and the demands on Congress have multiplied.

Since 1946 the Nation's population has increased 33 percent, its Government has grown to include many more services and duties, its problems are infinitely more complex, and its involvement in world affairs is no longer fractional and irregular but rather total and constant.

The essential problem of Congress today is simply that there is more to do but only the same number of men to do it. The Members of Congress have to find enough time to fulfill their thousands of obligations and to develop a congressional system in which they can use their time most effectively.

The most pressing day-to-day demands for the time of Senators and Congressmen are not directly linked to legislative tasks. They come from constituents. And the constituency of a Member of Congress is not limited to his home State or district. He gives priority attention to the people back home, but as a U.S. Senator or Representative, his constituency is the whole Nation.

The image of a Member of Congress engaged in debate of issues or in study and reflection on the problems of the Nation and freedom is accurate for only a fraction of his time. At any point in his workday, the Congressman is more likely to be talking about a housing development with municipal officials, or phoning an executive agency for an answer to a constituent complaint, or dictating a letter to a citizen who wants some information for his son's term paper for a school civics class.

Speedy air travel, the low cost of telegrams, or long-distance telephone calls and campaigns to encourage citizens to "write your Congressman" have turned most congressional offices into operations resembling a complex of train station, post office, airline terminal, and communications center. My own experience may or may not be typical, but it is significant of the increased personal workload for Members of Congress.

In 1949, I moved into an office of four rooms. My staff and I had the use of two telephone lines. An average of 50 letters a day were received. Thirty telephone calls a day were considered heavy. A personal visit to the office by a constituent on any day was a special event.

In 1962, my office had doubled to eight rooms. Now, 12 telephone lines funnel an average of 500 calls into the office each day, and I keep two private lines just to be sure I will be able to get through the crowded switchboard to reach my staff. One hundred and twenty personal visitors, not counting large groups of students or tourists, come into the office each day, about half of them constituents from my home State.

How does the Member of Congress handle this workload? He has a staff to help, and he and his assistants work long hours at a fast pace. Any citizen who doubts that he is getting an honest day of work for the salary he pays his Congressman need only walk by the Senate or House office buildings late at night or on weekends. Most of the lights are burning through the evening hours, and many still shine after midnight on any night of the week.

Congressmen do not complain about the demands on their time for service to constituents. They perform that service because it is their job, because it is vital for their political survival, and because they know that the individual citizen with a need, complaint or idea cannot even hope to dent the surface of big government unless he works through his elected representative.

But Members of Congress do complain often that they have little time to perform their duties as legislators. This is perhaps the central, general problem and defect of Congress today: The inability of Congressmen to find the time to inform themselves of the issues they face, to give their best talents to committee assignments, and to legislate responsibly.

The day is long gone when a Member of Congress could be satisfied with mastery over two or three limited, precise subjects and follow a policy of voting the party line on other issues. Today, the Senator or Congressman is expected to be thoroughly informed on hundreds of different subjects and issues, from agricultural economics in Minnesota to the administration of foreign aid in Bolivia, from Federal housing needs in New York to Soviet strategy in the Middle East, from a flood control project in California to the merits of a man-on-the-moon spaceship project.

The complexities and variety of issues which Members of Congress must master will continue to increase in an age of nuclear power, scientific advances, fast-changing social patterns, and international involvement and leadership by the United States.

The pattern is already evident: At the time of the last Legislative Reorganization Act, the 79th Congress (1945 and 1946) initiated 12,656 bills or resolutions. The 87th Congress (1961 and 1962) initiated 20,316 bills or resolutions, a 60-percent increase in the congressional workload.

Most of these measures were relatively routine, but each took some time from Congress in general and individual Members in particular.

There has been a comparable increase in the flow of major, controversial, and thus time-consuming legislative proposals. Traditionally, the average congressional session has seriously considered and attempted to hammer out one major new program or reform in a single year. The second session of the 87th Congress last year made a serious effort on many major legislative programs, including the trade bill, tax reform, social security financing of health insurance, authorization to purchase United Nations bonds, and the Communications Satellite Act.

A realistic accounting by the White House concluded that the 87th Congress approved, and the President signed into law, 73 major legislative proposals. The 83d Congress, representing the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, approved 29 major legislative proposals. The 87th Congress of 1961 and 1962 approved a total of more than 1,000 public bills. The 83d Congress of 1953 and 1954 approved about half that number.

These figures are not mentioned to play a sort of partisan numbers game, but rather to emphasize the increased legislative workload of Congress and its Members.

The result of that heavy workload, in 1962, was one of the longest peacetime sessions of Congress in history. Congress met continually from early January to mid-October. In the final month, a few old-timers on Capitol Hill grew frustrated enough to look back fondly on the year 1923, when Warren Harding was President and the Congress convened in March just long enough to recess until December.

But even 9- or 10-month congressional sessions do not solve the problem of the individual Senator or Congressman who must find the time to inform himself about the legislative issues he faces.

Most Members of Congress are dedicated and conscientious legislators and public servants, aware of the power they hold over the dollars and destiny of the American people and so many others throughout the world. If they are given extra time, or rather freed from unnecessarily time consuming duties, they will spend most of it tackling the huge task of informing themselves.

Several steps can be taken to give them that extra time. These are not the final answers to the time problem of Members of Congress, but they would help.

First, more joint meetings of congressional committees. A legislative question involving disarmament and arms control, for example, normally requires consideration by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Joint meetings would save the time of Members serving on more than one of these committees.

Second, more standing joint commitees including Members of both the House and the Senate. Such committees would save time, particularly toward the end of each congressional session, by paving the way to speedier conference agreements between the Senate and the House on controversial issues.

Third, more efficient scheduling of the workdays of Congress. Certain days could be scheduled specifically for floor debate and action by the full House or Senate. Other days could be restricted exclusively for hearings and action by the congressional committees.

In the early months of the session, the full House or Senate would meet only a few days each week. As committees completed their action in the later months of the session, the Senate and House would meet more often. This pattern would save time for Members, and end the absurd necessity of Members literally running from committee room to Senate or House Chamber when issues in which they are involved are up for action at different places at the same time.

Fourth, modification of the morning hour in the Senate, in which Members read miscellaneous speeches of marginal or undated importance and insert various articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Instead, Members would be permitted to send their morning hour speeches and articles to the clerk for insertion in the RECORD, without taking their own time and the time of other Senators to read them word for word.

Fifth, a requirement in the Senate that Members restrict their remarks to the issue formally listed as the business of the Senate. In a debate over agricultural programs, for example, a Senator would not be able to spend an hour discussing a totally unrelated subject. This rule of germaneness now applies only to debate in the House of Representatives.

Sixth, a summer recess of Congress of at least 3 weeks. This would take time away from legislative duties, but ultimately, I am convinced, would save time. The immediate value would be the opportunity for Members of Congress to spend some time with families and constituents in a period (June or July) when schools are closed and citizens are not tied at home because of weather.

The indirect value would be the change of pace and rest such a recess would give to each Member. He would return for the final busy weeks of the session refreshed for more efficient performance of his legislative duties. Congressmen are human beings; they get tired and their nerves can become frayed from long months of pressure and hard work. A summer recess would probably reduce the inevitable tensions and bickering so common in the final weeks of congressional sessions.

Seventh, modification and adoption of the British question period, in which administration leaders would report on and answer questions of general importance before the full Senate and House. This would save time, help to keep Members of Congress better informed on administration programs and policy and sustain the necessary frequent contact between the executive and legislative branches of Government.

This final suggestion, and some of the others, would have a valuable side effect; it would save the time of high administration leaders who have their own crucial problems of too many duties for too few hours.

It is not unusual for the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and other Cabinet officers to give basically the same testimony and answer basically the same questions for several different congressional committees. The Secretary of State, for example, might be called early in the session to outline the foreign aid program, including military aid, to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. He will then repeat the same testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and again to the House Armed Services Committee.

The result, I believe, is an excessive demand on the time of these officials. Secretary of State Dean Rusk made 54 personal appearances before congressional committees during the 87th Congress, 29 in 1961 and 25 in 1962. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara spent a total of 203 hours before congressional committees during the 87th Congress, 88.74 in 1961 and 114.25 in 1962.

Standing joint committees, more joint meetings of committees, and a question period for the full House or Senate would save the time of Congressmen and these high officials, and serve to inform all Members of Congress more thoroughly.

Another congressional defect which tends to waste time, and to cause confusion and occasional conflict between Members, rests with the lineup of Senate and House committees. New problems and programs created by a world transformed by nuclear power and the space age are being handled by a congressional committee system which has changed little in 50 years.

There were 2 weeks of confusion following introduction of my bill in 1961 to establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This measure was first assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee, then switched to the Government Operations Committee, then back to the Foreign Relation Committee. At one point, it almost went to the Armed Services Committee. (The bill finally remained with Foreign Relations, was approved, and signed into law.)

The Communications Satellite Act bounced from committee to committee before it was finally processed and sent to the floor last year. At one time or another, this bill involved the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Government Operations Committee, the Space and Astronautics Committee, and, of course, the Appropriations Committee.

Is a more up-to-date committee lineup, responsive to modern problems and modern opportunities, needed? I believe it is, and that a thorough review of the present committee and subcommittee lineups and jurisdictions is necessary.

That review would be one of the prime responsibilities of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which would be established by a resolution sponsored by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and 31 other Senators representing both parties. A companion measure in the House agrees that this committee of seven Senators and seven Representatives should conduct a complete review, the first since 1946, of Congress and produce recommendations for its improvement.

I expect this Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to be established. Its work will be one of the most significant efforts of the 88th Congress. And its task will be difficult, because there is little popular interest or direct political advantage in the tedious effort for procedural reform within Congress.

But the American people want good government, and sense that the legislative branch has not been performing its functions with the order and effectiveness the Nation deserves. The waning weeks of the 87th Congress included fights over such petty issues as what room the Appropriations Conference Committee should meet in, and long delays over minor details of legislation.

Displays of bickering and pettiness tend to obscure the real record of achievement written by recent Congresses and to diminish the respect and confidence of the people in their own representative government. Perhaps the greatest need in Congress today is not so much for studies, procedural changes, and committee modernization. It may rather be a more thoroughly responsive attitude by Members of Congress, who need to realize that the rules and traditions of Capitol Hill are not sacred, and that the national interest and public service are more important than individual or committee powers and prerogatives.

A Study on Labor Relations Conducted by the University of Santa Clara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the University of Santa Clara, located in Santa Clara, Calif., recently issued a study on labor negotiations which seems to me to be timely and worthy of serious consideration at a time when labor relations are playing such an important part in our economy.

The study report letter follows:

ECONOMIC LETTER FROM DR. LAWRENCE C. LOCKLEY

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,
THE UNIVERSITY OF SANTA CLARA,
Santa Clara, Calif., April 1963.

As it seemed in advance, this is a year of critically important labor negotiations. With labor unions varying from small to large, and from wise to foolish, it is difficult to make sweeping statements about union tactics. Only a few generalizations can be made: First, labor unions have not been growing in membership to match the growth of the labor force. The old style union point of view is a diminishing point of view. Workers no longer feel that their only source of strength is the union. More and more, they feel that they owe many of thir benefits to the Federal Government. Younger workers find it difficult to see the need for unswerving loyalty to and support for their unions. Not only has the Federal Government become a sort of unintentional competitor to the unions for worker loyalty, but the unions themselves have become bigger and more highly institutionalized. The larger organizations probably have lost the feeling of an association or a club, and have become impersonal.

There is another factor of equal importance. Union officials live in a competitive world. They compete for the offices they hold. If they do not resort to fraud and intimidation, their tenure of office is always dependent on the satisfaction of the members they lead. They are also faced with a comparison of the performance of the heads of other—and sometimes, rival—unions. How much they know about economic forces cannot be guessed at by outsiders; some of them are probably sophisticated, whereas some of them are unaware of the economic implications of union tactics. None of them is unaware of the political implications of union tactics, however.

Whether for these or for other reasons, there is a tendency for union demands to focus on the immediate present, and apparently to pay little attention to the long-run effects. One of the serious consequences that I see in this year's union demands is a serious threat to the small business firms. Unions are trying to force the hiring of an extra shift of workers by making overtime work extremely expensive. Yet many small firms which hire three or four or six or seven or eight union workers cannot afford to put on a second shift. From time to time, a little overtime work gives them the elasticity they need. But for the most part, many of them could not afford to hire even an extra worker.

Another point comes up in consideration of job security: the point of severance pay. The printing trades in San Jose right now are asking for the building up of severance pay to the limit of a year's wage per man. This request would require each firm dealing with the members of these unions to build up a severance pay fund—an achievement few firms could accomplish in the competitive world in which they did business. But the absence of such a fund would leave a contingent labor lien against the company, thus impairing its credit, and making any real business growth extremely difficult.

Individual instances are many. The basic principle is that unions have still not learned that prosperity rests on production and productivity increases. Labor gets more when more is produced. And the more produced, the more labor gets. Typically unions appear to feel that there is a limited amount of production and a limited amount of work, and to feel that their success is measured by the amount of this supposedly limited volume of work they get. As long as they continue to hold this view, they will handicap the growth of production and contribute toward the slowing of our entire economy.

Unions have performed a great service to labor, and almost as great a service to management and to capital. During the latter part of the 19th century, say from 1880 and on to the day of Henry Ford's $5 a day wage (in those days an amount adequate to buy a reasonable standard of living), the share of the social dividend drifting down to labor was small in terms of the needs of a working class family. If work was steady, workers were able to make do. But when there were frequent layoffs, the lot of the worker was meager. Such men as John R. Commons, Carl Sandburg, Jack London, and Henry George took minority positions largely because of their sympathy for the worker, rather than their conviction of a better method of social organization. They and a good many others stood against business, profits, and wealth primarily because they felt that the working class was unduly depressed.

Since that day, the workers of the United States have fared better and better. Hours of work have dropped to a theoretical 40 a week—though many workers add to their basic wage by frequent overtime assignments at higher hourly rates. Working conditions have improved. The heavier work is now done by mechanical power. Few laborers swing a pick or lift a No. 2 to put a ditch in, but instead a smaller number ride on ditch digging machines. And the wages of labor have risen steadily since the beginning of the century. This rise in wages has been not only in money wages, but in real income as well. Workers are getting more and more of the social dividend.

This general betterment can more realistically be attributed to union pressure than to the wisdom of management. And union effort was greatly strengthened by the assistance of the Federal Government. When management had the upper hand, management held wages down and made little effort to improve working conditions. At present, with the continued support of Government, the larger unions have a power about on a par with that of management. As I write this, there seems some doubt concerning the railway brotherhoods' attitude toward the current decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. There is talk of a strike against layoffs of men whose jobs have become obsolete.

Just as it might be expected that coal miners, seeing the certain ending of coal mining in the strip-mining areas, would hunt for other work in other localities, it might also be expected that members of the railway brotherhoods would, as they saw the economic standing room of the railroads begin to diminish, start trying to find other kinds of work. Even if the workers were not in a position to appraise overall and long-range trends, officers of the brotherhoods have been. We have not yet answered the question of whether society should continue to provide working conditions and wages for industries or companies which have become economically obsolete. To an economist, the question is one which could hardly be answered in the affirmative. Yet those workers who have reached their middle years, never having considered the possibility of change, would probably answer "yes."

Over the years since the passage of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, we have been engaged in the attempt to improve on a price-regulated labor market. By dint of a succession of laws and administrative and commission decisions, we have attempted to introduce economic relationships which would not have developed under a completely free enterprise economy. We are now finding that a little regulation requires a lot of regulation, and in the end, may not produce a viable set of relationships. Certainly, the workers of the United States cannot be supported by the rich because there are few rich, and their incomes would hardly be a drop in the bucket. If our society is to be divided into classes, the classes must be three: workers, annuitants, and the indigent. None of us lives on money—we all live on real wages, and real wages are the result of production. If we want to be ahead of where we are, we must look to increased production.

WHAT ABOUT COMPULSORY ARBITRATION?

A steady increase in comments on the need for compulsory arbitration suggests

that the present use of the strike by unions must be arousing public resentment. Compulsory arbitration is advanced as an alternate to the strike when labor and management cannot agree on the issues involved in collective bargaining. Certainly, the newspaper strikes in New York City and in Cleveland are aggravated examples of what the public would like to avoid. Were we to have a strike which would tie up the railroads for any prolonged period, we'd find economic costs of severe proportions. No one wins a strike nowadays. And if major strikes are to continue to take place, some form of public coercion may be needed.

But arbitration? Let's look at that possibility. I myself am a member of the panels of arbitrators for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and for the American Arbitration Association. I have done enough arbitration work to know what the process is like. An arbitrator is expected to compose a difference of opinion between two disputants. In general, he should be asked to compose a difference of opinion only in an area in which he is reasonably competent. If a dispute arises concerning the origin of an old violin, we do not expect any passerby to be able to arbitrate the dispute. Nor if there is a difference of opinion concerning a medical diagnosis, we are not going to expect a nonmedically qualified arbitrator to be adequate, no matter how impartial he may be, nor no matter how much good will he may have for both participants in the argument.

In industrial relations, arbitration around the meaning of a collective bargaining agreement is relatively easy. If a grievance arises over a promotion, an impartial arbitrator must only attempt to understand what union and management meant by the wording in the agreement both signed, listen to the evidence presented before him, and attempt to decide whether the grievance is just within the terms of the bargaining agreement. There is no room for the arbitrator to exercise his own value judgments or prejudices. A professor or an attorney can arbitrate here.

But if we appoint an arbitrator to decide whether a company may institute a price increase, or whether a trade practice long accepted by management and labor shall be suddenly terminated, or whether wages may be increased, we are going beyond the idea of arbitration. The impartial man of good will is asked, in such cases, regardless of whether he has any special competence, to make a decision requiring considerable special knowledge—possibly requiring greater competence than any one may have. He may come to making such decisions on the basis of his own system of value judgments or on the basis of his own whim or caprice.

Suppose we pass legislation requiring compulsory arbitration for disputes which cannot be settled without a prolonged strike. Suppose the issue of superfluous workers (the term "featherbedding" suggests a point of view) on the railroads comes to be the cause of a dispute which cannot be settled by the railroads and the brotherhoods. There is no universally accepted principle by which the basic issue can be resolved. Fundamentally, we have two conflicting philosophies: (1) That management should not have to pay for work that is not essential, or that is not constructive; (2) that workers have a right to their jobs, and should be discharged only for due and just cause. Because there is no abstract principle of justice which is both universally accepted and applicable, an arbitrator will be influenced in his judgment by which of these two conflicting philosophies is the more compatible to him.

Essentially it is the duty of management and labor to work out their settlements without serious conflict with the public interest. This duty cannot easily be shifted by compulsory arbitration or by any other method of superficial peacemaking. Arbitration may interpret, but it must not try to take the place of collective bargaining.

If strikes are going to interfere seriously with the public interest, then we must reconsider our entire portfolio of labor legislation. The functions of labor organizations have changed over the years. The scope and authority of management has changed. Our labor legislation was written at a time when labor organizations needed help, and management needed restraint. Year by year these two conditions seem to be changing.

THE TAX CUT AND TAX REFORM

As we might have expected, our tax legislation appears to have become partisan and political, and to have moved out of the sphere of economic analysis. Had the Congress, when it assembled, agreed on a substantial tax cut, and agreed that it should be immediately applicable, there would have been a shock value which would probably have brought about a marked spurt in retail trade. But the idea of a tax cut as an immediate palliative has now given way to a balancing of the desirability of a more leisurely tax cut, and of a measure of tax reform.

Certainly we need tax reform. Our present Federal income tax structure is the work of no legislator or no Congress, but is something like the moraine of a score of Congresses. It is a patch-upon-patchwork of compromises and appeasements of special interests and pressure groups. Underlying it is a punitive motive harking back to the mood of the Populists and William Jennings Bryan.

The first requirement of a tax system is that it should raise as much money as is necessary to conduct the affairs of the Government. The second requirement is that it should not hamper industrial activity, but rather, make it possible to maintain a steady and desirable rate of economic growth. The undue reliance on a progressive income tax in a nation in which incomes have had some degree of leveling already suggests that the progressive steps of the tax rates are punitive but not rewarding to the tax collector.

Altogether too much of our business activity is conditioned on the attempt to minimize the tax bite. When progressive taxes make high incomes and large rates of profit relatively fruitless, I suppose it is inevitable that lawful tax minimization becomes an obsession of businessmen. And I suspect the decisions made for this purpose are not the ones which might increase our rate of economic growth to the maximum.

The constant stress on tax relief solely at the lower end of the income distribution suggests a strange forgetfulness of the importance of business activity. Many of the professional liberals assume that business will be carried on under all conditions of profit or deficit. Actually, business activity, as a form of private enterprise, can be carried on only as long as the revenues brought in by the sale of the goods or services produced will pay for the continued application of the factors of production. Land, labor, all capital goods (including not only machines and equipment used within the plant or factory, but also transportation and materials handling equipment used to complete the delivery of the goods or services to the point of consumption, management services, and working capital and credit to arrange for the flow of raw materials, the holding of inventories as needed to assure even flows of production and marketing, must be provided by the revenue. Particularly in a long-term rising price level, it is difficult to obtain funds for replenishment of assets which wear out. Machine tools, trucks, freight cars, and a wide range of similar items can legally be depreciated only on the basis of original cost. A railroad which finally has to replace a freight car—in service for possibly 20 or 25 years, may have saved up from its depreciation allowance the full original purchase price, only to find that an equivalent car cost about three times what the car to be replaced cost. More and more we find that what we used to consider profits, the sums left over for the owners of the business, are necessary to supply a continual reinvestment fund. Owners have, over the last 25 or 35 years, received a decreasing percentage of the output of the firms they own. The entire volume of dividends and interest distributed to owners is a too small amount to pay for many of the demands now being made for wage adjustments. Over this same period of years, the share of the output of business going to nonmanagerial and nonsupervisory workers has been steadily increasing.

The profits of business are widely misunderstood. Most of the food firms do business on net profits of from one-half of 1 percent of sales to up to 2 percent of sales. Only a small part of American business earns as profits as much as 5 percent of sales, before taxes.

When the liberals mount an attack on business asking that business accept larger financial responsibilities and accept larger costs, and hold prices at the same level, they should remember that they are asking business to do so when business lacks the funds to accept such responsibilities.

And if major increases in wages and other costs are to be made from other than the revenues of business, then they must be made from the revenues of government which we expect will be derived directly or indirectly from the revenues of business. As rich as our economy is, it is not permanently able to support consequential payments not made possible by the revenues of business. And if we try to pay for expenditures that are not so supported, we start the economic equivalent of the forest fire: inflation.

Somehow, we must learn to live without killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

From Baltazar Gracian's "Art of Success" (translation by Lockley): "Do not love or hate forever. Confide in today's friends as though you know that they would be tomorrow's enemies, and enemies of the worst kind. This reversal often happens in reality, so let your caution guard against it. You do not have to give arms to deserters from friendship—that they may fight you better. On the other hand, when enemies leave the door open for reconciliation, the reconciliation is the more secure, particularly if it has come through gallantry. Today's worry is often yesterday's vengeance, and the evil that we have done serves to cloud our present contempt."

Col. Charles H. Mackoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, March 21 marked the retirement of Col. Charles H. Mackoff, commandant of the Spokane, Wash., 6241st Army Reserve School. Colonel Mackoff completed 33 years of military service, and during that time, compiled a most distinguished record. We who serve in the Congress give consideration to the spending of billions of dollars for military equipment. But

time has proven that it still takes well trained, dedicated men such as Colonel Mackoff to provide the know-how to make these weapons truly effective as a deterrent to armed conflict.

The members of the Spokane chapter of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States think so highly of Colonel Mackoff that they urged the national headquarters of their association to issue a citation to him in honor of the completion of his military service. The national headquarters responded to this request by issuing this citation.

The following is a brief biography of Colonel Mackoff, and I am confident my colleagues will join me in saying to this distinguished American thanks for a job well done.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF COL. CHARLES H. MACKOFF

Colonel Mackoff entered military service as an enlisted man with the 161st Infantry Regiment, Washington Army National Guard, in February 1929. He remained active until the start of World War II when he was inducted into Federal service with the 161st Infantry as a first lieutenant in September 1940. After graduating from the infantry school battalion, company and staff officers course in 1941 he saw service in Guadalcanal where he was awarded the Bronze Star (combat). He graduated from the Command and General Staff College Infantry Course No. 19 in August 1944, and served as an instructor at the U.S.C. & G.S. College from August 1944 to December 1945. He was separated in December 1945 in the grade of colonel.

Colonel Mackoff resumed his Reserve activities in 1947 and served as an instructor in the C. & G.S.C. SAC course from April 1949 to September 1951. On October 1, 1951, he became the first commandant of the newly established Spokane Army Reserve School which assignment he has held continuously since that date.

Under Colonel Mackoff's leadership the Spokane USAR school has attained 15 superior general inspection ratings during the 11-year period. The school headquarters under his command conducted annual active duty training for the transportation school for 5 years and the infantry and artillery schools for 6 years. Colonel Mackoff's civic activities include the 1958 presidency of the Spokane chapter, ROA. In 1957 he served as commander of the Spokane chapter, Military Order of the World Wars.

Under Colonel Mackoff's leadership the 6241st USAR school won the first certificate awarded by national headquarters to a USAR school for 100 percent ROA membership of both the staff and faculty and the student detachment in March 1956.

Opportunities in Biomedical Engineering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was recently privileged to address a conference sponsored by Northwestern University Bio-Medical Engineering Research Center in Chicago, Ill. Northwestern University has participated in a program of the National Institutes of Health relating to the cooperation between medicine, biology, and engineering. The bio-medical engineering research center is the first project of its kind in the Nation. It brings together in harmony and teamwork the disciplines of medicine, biology, and engineering as a new development in the healing arts.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPORTUNITIES IN BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING FOR CHICAGO AREA INDUSTRY

AN OPENING ABSTRACT

As this audience is aware, for a number of years, I have been recommending improved abstracting of scientific information.

Let's start right off, therefore, with an "abstract" of the principal points which will be submitted to you this evening. They are:

No. 1. We are at just the dawn of a dramatic era of biomedical engineering.

Aerospace medicine, alone, has hardly begun to yield its fantastic potential for us earthbound civilians.

No. 2. In this era, to move ahead, as rapidly as posible, will require:

Advancement of the state-of-the-art in many individual disciplines.

The teamwork of all interested disciplines.

Here, I refer to the individual and combined efforts of medical science, the physical and engineering sciences, agencies of the U.S. Government, the universities of our land, particularly their colleges of engineering, schools of medicine, and teaching hospitals, private American industry, and professional and trade organizations.

Each has an expanded role to play. Each must function at its highest level of efficiency.

I shall concentrate as I know you would wish, on what the Federal Government should be doing with you and on what you can do in conjunction with it.

No. 3. The path ahead—rewarding as it is and will ultimately be—will not be easy, scientifically, technically, or, indeed, financially. Optimism is necessary, but so is realism as to the practical obstacles ahead.

Now, let's turn to each of these phases in turn.

THE VAST OPPORTUNITIES

I have had 5 years of contacts and correspondence with biomedical engineers in the United States and throughout the world. What they have said and written confirms in my judgment this fact: Biomedical engineering offers some of the most profound opportunities for human service to be found anywhere in health science.

Biomedical engineering offers, too, some of the most inspiring opportunities for the American economic system to demonstrate further:

Its sense of public service.

Its creativity and efficiency.

Its awareness that there is profit to be made in leading the world in meeting tomorrow's needs with tomorrow's answers.

American industry is moving rapidly ahead into the automation era. Industry knows that systems engineering is the key to that era. And, systems engineering will be the crux of tomorrow's health services, tomorrow's hospitals, tomorrow's laboratory research into organ systems.

Biomedical engineering, moreover, offers particular opportunities for us of the Midwest and the upper Midwest, provided we aggressively grasp these opportunities.

For a layman who still marvels at the miracle of flight, what is being done in electronics today seems incredible: Miniaturized instrumentation—radio "pills" devised many years ago to relay information from inside the human body—successful cardiac pacemakers—heart-lung bypass machines—the almost unbelievable range of existent uses of ultrasound and infrared among other elements of the electromagnetic spectrum.

And more marvels, further applications are on the way:

The development of physiological monitoring systems, particularly for intensive post-operative patient care in the Nation's hospitals.

The development of electronic instrumentation which may one day enable the blind to "see," the deaf to "hear," as already the mute are being enabled to "speak."

The development and refinement of additional artificial internal and external organs, to replace diseased or amputated organs.

The simulation of biological phenomena by analog computers, leading to increased understanding of the nature of living processes.

Specifically, the development of bold new systems concepts for understanding of that most fantastic of all instruments—the human brain—how it learns, how it remembers, how it thinks, how it sleeps.

The use of digital computers for the mass input, "massaging," evaluation, output of biomedical data of unheard of complexity—about a single individual or a million or 10 million individuals.

And other applications, too numerous to even highlight.

TEAMWORK NECESSARY

Yesterday's achievements of this type have taken sweat and some tears; and so will tomorrow's.

Never before have individual scientific disciplines been called upon to develop faster and to collaborate more closely with other disciplines.

The Ph. D. and the M.D., the biophysicist and the biochemist, the electrical engineer and the neurosurgeon—these and a vast number of other types of teams will be communicating with one another, working with one another as never before.

Traditional compartments between disciplines have now been shattered by interdisciplinary breakthroughs.

Telemetering developments, alone, from orbiting space satellites and man-to-the-moon rockets have altered and will revolutionize old sciences and engineering.

THE TASKS OF MANY ORGANIZATIONS

It behooves every discipline, every organization, every industry, to appraise its past, present, and future role.

Medical science, in particular, will have to revise both its undergraduate and postgraduate medical education.

The physical sciences and engineering will have to improve their curriculums. And they, like the life sciences, will have to increase the numbers of their future specialists, as well as their generalists.

Business, trade, professional, and other not-for-profit organizations must reexamine their present services in terms of tomorrow's needs.

Fortunately, there is abundant indication that this is being done, particularly by professional groups.

I need only cite the forward-looking plans of, to cite but three groups: the Engineering Joint Council Research Committee; the Institute of Radio Engineers and its long-established Professional Group on Medical Electronics; and the work by the International Federation of Medical Electronics, among others in this category, and the work of the Foundation for Medical Technology in other not-for-profit areas.

In all of this concurrent effort, the Federal Government has special obligations.

FOUR TASKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

No one need be reminded in detail that your Government is spending in the order of $14.7 billion a year for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

The overwhelming proportion of that total ($7.4 billion) is, of course, for military objectives, with civilian space, nuclear energy, and medical activities the three largest components thereafter.

Let me submit four tasks of the Federal agencies, as I see them, in this area:

1. To act in concert with one another so as to expedite the progress of biomedical engineering.

We need more interagency planning on biomedical engineering, and more interagency funding of projects of common interests, more interagency consistency in fellowship and other education programs.

NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Federal Aviation Agency are only beginning to realize common programing.

NO EASY AUTOMATIC "SPIN OFF" FROM SPACE SCIENCE

2. The Federal agencies must act further to help convert military and space science and technology into civilian technology. There was a day when some folks assumed a "spin off" of civilian byproducts would occur automatically.

Fortunately, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is now more realistic. It is aware that miracles of adaptation of space devices to users—here on earth—are not going to occur by themselves. An aggressive, grassroots effort to assist universities and private industry in civilian-type application is essential.

President Kennedy has, as you know, soundly proposed a Federal Engineering Extension Service. Such a Service would enable the great colleges of engineering of our land to serve as local packagers of information so as to meet the special needs of local industry. Engineering colleges should then, in effect, parallel the magnificent job which has been done down through the years, by colleges of agricultures. By means of the vast county agent system, the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges have revolutionized American farming and made its productivity the envy of the world. Similarly, any company in the Chicago area, or in any other area, should be able to get the benefit of the counsel of its engineering schools. They, in turn, should be able to draw upon the sum total of federally sponsored information, and, to the extent feasible (without impairing proprietary rights) of privately sponsored information.

3. Information and communication are, in my judgment, the key.

There is no single greater task, as I see it, than for each Federal agency to put its information and communication house in order and for all Federal agencies to put their mutual Federal information house in order.

In this way, you in Evanston and your counterparts anywhere in the 50 States should be able to learn promptly, easily, about anything and everything (not classified for military reasons) which you have paid as taxpayers.

Right now, there may be as many as 150,000 federally supported research and development tasks underway. Perhaps one-sixth of them are in electronics alone. You're paying the bill for these projects. You personally should be able to tap into the vast bank of information about nonclassified projects, present and past.

In my view, a scientist or an engineer (whether at Northwestern University or any private company) should be able, by telephone, by letter, by telegram, by visit, to draw upon an automated network of federally sponsored information resources in every region of our country.

In the same manner, when you and I make a telephone call from Chicago or Evanston (or anywhere else in the United States), we tap into a system of local, regional, national, and international switchboards. Most of the switching of our signals, from our house, office, or laboratory, to a person 1 mile or 3,000 miles away, is done automatically and in a matter of seconds or minutes.

The day should not be long distant when, in a similar manner, any individual can receive swiftly signals from the scientific repositories of the earth. He may want to receive these signals by ear, or by sight; e.g. through a print-out from the world's "pool" of library and other information centers, or to have the information magnified from microfilm or microform, displayed visually on a TV-like console at his desk.

If that sounds "Buck Rogerish," I can assure you that the makings of this system are actually already in existence—in bits and pieces.

DON'T BE BASHFUL ABOUT YOUR INFORMATION NEEDS

You of the world of university and industary have a right to expect that your Government will serve you.

Do not hesitate to acquaint Federal agencies with your specific information needs. Tell them what you want and the way you want it. Don't be bashful.

I have found that, for too long, even our leading private citizens and companies have tended to resign themselves to poor Federal information service. The information that they wanted came in too slowly, or they were flooded with irrelevant information which was totally useless in terms of their particular request.

Sometimes the poor service was relatively unavoidable because Federal service was underfinanced and undermanned. But now there is no excuse for any agency's failing to provide taxpayers with information which you need and want and which is useful to our free enterprise system and to the service of human health.

Last September the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, held a 5-hour hearing, at which representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and of every single major science agency in the U.S. Government testified.

Perhaps the most remarkable and enlightening testimony was that given by the able Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric.

Mr. Gilpatric readily conceded that the Defense Department has not begun to perform the information service which our subcommittee has long urged upon it.

He promised to improve the management of Defense information. He has been true to his word. In the last 5 months, there has been a whirlwind series of actions within the Defense Department and within what has heretofore been known as the Armed Services Technical Information Agency in particular. My hope is that out of these actions and out of the new Defense Documentation Center will come the first systematic management and dissemination of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Advance Research Agency information.

Following our hearing, there has been vigorous followthrough from the President's Office of Science and Technology. Two landmark reports have just emerged from the President's Science Advisory Committee—one from its Panel on Information, one from its Panel of Life Sciences. Both reports provide valuable impetus to biomedical information advances.

OUR REGIONAL OPPORTUNITY

We have considered national efforts and studies. Now, what of the needs of the Midwest?

Here is a fourth phase of Federal obligation, but it is also a phase involving our own responsibility.

You are probably familiar with the fact that for some time now, I have been taking steps to help correct what I regard as a very disturbing imbalance in the geographic distribution of Federal contracts for research and development.

The Midwest and the upper Midwest have been getting the "short end of the stick" not deliberately, but because of a combination of nondeliberate, nonplanned developments. Government decision after government decision—apparently unrelated—have created a condition in which nearly half of all the defense procurement is on the west coast, and another fifth on the east coast.

These areas have earned much of this support, in part through their superb graduate centers in research and technology. They were in early, and they are reaping the fruits of early labors.

But they have no monopoly or near-monopoly in industrial or university skill—far from it.

It is not just a matter of regional pride when I point to the magnificent untapped talents and know-how in our own region. It is in the natural interest to orchestrate the human resources of the Midwest with those of the west and east coasts.

We of the Midwest have some of the greatest medical resources in the world. We have some of the finest engineering and industrial resources.

The harmonious marriage of midwest engineering, industry, and medical resources is essential.

The talent and know-how of all three must be refined, polished, sharpened and matched to tomorrow's Federal and private requirements.

UPGRADING SKILL THROUGH EDUCATION

Everyone in this audience must be on the alert to learn what our citizens and what Uncle Sam will need and want, and to upgrade our ability to fulfill those needs and wants.

Excellence in education—undergraduate and postgraduate—is the indispensable foundation for upgrading our regional skills.

And that is, of course, precisely what Northwestern University's magnificent biomedical engineering research center will offer.

The world will "beat a path" to Northwestern's "door," because Northwestern is determined to "beat a path" to frontiers of man's knowledge.

Meanwhile, I welcome the recent establishment in Bloomington, Ind., of the Aerospace Research Application Center, partially supported by NASA, but having strong private support, as well, I note, too, that Midwest Research Institute at Kansas City in a recent pilot project found around 50 commercial applications for space technology. But this is only the beginning of what we of the Midwest must do to identify opportunities and equip ourselves to fulfill them.

ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES AHEAD

And, now, a word of caution. I have mentioned the potential profits from this vast new field.

Make no mistake. There are potential losses, as well, in endeavoring to serve both the Federal and the private market.

The files of our subcommittee contain letters from many electronic and other companies, telling of their difficulties in selling more than a few prototype models of their most advanced instrumentation.

The American M.D. and the American hospital are not the easiest customers to sell;

nor should they be. Where human life is involved, every effort has to be made to minimize avoidable risk when new techniques or instruments are proposed. Inevitably, modern science will prove cautious about installing new devices until there has been careful basic and applied research and adequate clinical trial. This takes time, money, skill, and standards.

We must always carefully balance our zeal for the new with respect for the old. We must always respect the right of the M.D. to demand the most solid scientific proof of the safety and efficiency of new instrumentation.

There are over 6,500 hospitals in our Nation. Potentially, they offer a great economic market, but in actuality, the hospitals of our country have some of the severest financial problems of any community institutions. Selling new instrumentation to them in large quantities has proven an enormously difficult task for even the largest, best established electronic and other companies.

And so, although I am happy to speak of the promise ahead, I do also want to sound this note of realism.

Industry will need its most careful marketing surveys, maximum engineering efficiency, and great patience and perseverance, if it is to serve this unusual and difficult market.

But always remember, it is a market worth serving.

The Federal Government can and should help you, insofar as possible.

But each of you must also shoulder your own burdens.

CONCLUSION

An old Chinese proverb reads that "If every man would sweep in front of his own doorstep, the world would soon be clean." Yes, we are all enlisted in the struggle to cleanse the world of disease and disability. The world indeed, stands on the threshhold of a new day in diagnostic, preventive, curative, and restorative medicine.

I know that this great intellectual community of the Chicago area has a tremendous part to play in the fashioning of that new day.

Johannesen Triumphs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Grant Johannesen, a distinguished citizen and artist from Salt Lake City, Utah, has recently made a major contribution in communicating the spirit of good will and achievement of the American people to the people of Communist Russia.

The following account of Mr. Johannesen's concert at the Tchaikovsky Conservatory in Moscow is testimony of his distinguished artistry. It is heartwarming evidence that communication to people is possible despite the inhibitions established by an adverse government:

JOHANNESEN TRIUMPHS—ANOTHER U.S. PIANIST WOWS THEM IN MOSCOW

(By David Miller)

Moscow.—A wildly cheering audience refused to let American pianist Grant Johannesen leave the Tchaikovsky Conservatory last night in one of the greatest triumphs ever scored by a visiting artist.

Mr. Johannesen, a 40-year-old native of Salt Lake City, played encores lasting nearly 45 minutes before the house lights were turned off and workmen rolled the piano from the stage.

MOSCOW LOVES YOU

Even then the audience demanded more. Only gradually did they disperse. Backstage, a woman said in broken English:

"The Moscow public loves you. Come to Moscow again, and if you see Van Cliburn please remember me to him."

In 1958, 23-year-old Van Cliburn, little known outside music circles, was skyrocketed into international fame when he won top honors at the Tchaikovsky International Festival in Moscow and received a congratulatory bear hug from Premier Khrushchev.

Mr. Johanneson, described by Moscow critics as "incredible," said he was overwhelmed by the audience's response.

"What a wonderful public you have," he said backstage. "I didn't expect such a warm reaction. It exceeded everything I expected."

Opening a 3-week tour of the Soviet Union, Mr. Johannesen stunned the audience with Virgil Thomson's "Ragtime," after a program that included Mozart, Beethoven, Franck, Schuman and Prokofiev.

He was called back for four curtain calls after the first end of the program and three times after the second half, he responded with six encores.

Mr. Johannesen, who made his debut in New York in 1944, has played with virtually every major American orchestra, including the New York Philharmonic, the Boston Symphony, the Cleveland Orchestra, and the Philadelphia Orchestra. He has traveled and performed widely in Europe, but last night's performance marked his first in the Soviet Union.

Grave Injustice Done Girl Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, 1963, in the Manchester Union Leader appeared an editorial signed by Publisher William Loeb referring to a syndicated column written under the title of "Count Marco" and published originally by the San Francisco Chronicle. This column was republished by the Boston Herald on March 14, 1963.

The Count Marco column is subject to serious criticism for its insinuations and unfair allegations about the Girl Scouts of America. The scouting movement in America with both boys and girls is, with our churches, one of the greatest known deterrents to juvenile delinquency. For a columnist to belittle and deride the efforts of the Girl Scouts is most unfair and objectionable.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a great injustice has been done to the Girl Scouts of America and wish to include in my remarks the full text of the editorial as published by the Manchester Union Leader:

GRAVE INJUSTICE DONE GIRL SCOUTS

It seems the calendar which, this year, the Girl Scouts are selling from door to door—in order to raise money for this fine organization—is claimed to be inaccurate because Easter is supposedly set for April 21 instead of April 14.

Actually, looking at the Girl Scouts calendar, we think it is not inaccurate, since it has the word "Easter" definitely within the bracket with the figure "14," and Palm Sunday within the figure "7."

At any rate, this very small matter brought down on the heads of the Girl Scouts one of the most vicious attacks imaginable. This was written under the title "Count Marco," a columnist syndicated by the very brittle and sophisticated San Francisco Chronicle. This column was republished by the Boston Herald on Thursday, March 14. To give you a little idea of how vicious this attack was we will quote just a few parts of this column.

"For the moment the little things in basic green with badges have given up peddling cookies on street corners and are now out on a door-to-door kick peddling calendars that don't even know what day it is. * * *

"I imagine that for this little 50-cent sleight-of-hand shuffle the Girl Scouts get the P. T. Barnum Merit Badge for learning a valuable lesson, 'There's a sucker born every minute.'"

Again the column says: "I leafed through my copy of the Girl Scouts Handbook, looking in the index for 'Honor.' I note that there is a big jump from 'Homemaking' to 'Horsewoman' with no 'Honor' in between."

At another point the columnist says: "Ah, from such little swindles big swindles grow, and from little G-girls it's not too far to jump to big B-girls." (Standing, of course, for bar-girls of uncertain virtue.)

Such an attack made on the Girl Scouts is outrageous. For any newspaper to syndicate such a column, and then for any other newspaper to reprint it, is, of course, the height of journalistic irresponsibility.

It seems that quite a few people wrote to the Boston Herald complaining about this.

The Herald answered by way of an editorial in which it very piously stated: "Since Count Marco has a national following, what he says is news, and he appears in the Herald for that reason. We do not undertake to censor him any more than we would censor the offbeat comments of some public figure like Cassius Clay."

Such hypocrisy.

The Herald doesn't seem to have any trouble leaving out important columns with which it disagrees. Recently a Holmes Alexander column dealing with Arthur Krock's comments on "news management" was nowhere to be found by this writer anywhere in the Herald, although Holmes Alexander appears almost daily in the Herald. In the same way, it could have dropped the Marco column if it didn't approve of the sentiments therein.

The whole business looks like another attack by those oh-so-sophisticated people who don't believe in the simple virtues taught to the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts.

This newspaper wishes the Girl Scouts every success. They have been maligned and attacked unfairly and unjustly and, as a matter of fact, indecently.

Any newspaper which uses a phrase in relation to Girl Scouts as follows—"from little G-girls it's not too far a jump to big B-girls"—should have its publisher's mouth washed out with good strong laundry soap.

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher.

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 14, 1963]

FUTURE LITTLE FRAUDS

Easter is going to be a little late next year—that is if the little misguided girl guides in some cities have anything to do with it. For the moment the little things in basic green with badges have given up peddling cookies on street corners and are now out on a door-to-door kick peddling calendars that don't even know what day it is.

I imagine that for this little 50-cent sleight-of-hand shuffle the Girl Scouts get the P. T. Barnum Merit Badge for learning a valuable lesson, "There's a sucker born every minute."

According to a press release, "Brownie, Intermediate, and Senior Girl Scouts will sell the 1963 Girl Scout calendars door to door in their neighborhoods.

Under the heading, "Slight Error," it says, "Easter will be a week later this year according to the calendar. Inadvertently Easter Sunday and the other related days were all printed a week late in the new calendar. Each calendar will contain an insert noting the correct dates."

I leafed through my copy of the Girl Scouts Handbook, looking in the index for "honor." I note that there is a big jump from "homemaking" to "horsewoman," with no "honor" in between.

Here is an organization purporting to teach young girls that perfection is something to be sought after. Yet this same organization sends these poor young things out to unload something that is far from perfect. It's tantamount to selling matches without sulfur and, when asked how they can be lighted, slipping a correction note to the buyer that reads, "Rub two of them together."

Ah, from such little swindles big swindles grow, and from little G-girls it's not too far a jump to big B-girls.

Never permit your daughters to sell door to door. They learn nothing of value except perhaps to see how awful some American women look during the day.

If an organization is so poor that it must unload shoddy merchandise through the hands of your offspring, it is not the kind of organization to which they should belong.

Better they should be in the kitchen, learning to bake bread and cookies—for home consumption, not door-to-door sale.

British Paper Criticizes United States—Panama Policy Rapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it often occurs in matters of foreign policy that people in distant countries, fully alert to their own interests, see a certain issue more clearly than the nations directly concerned with it.

This applies particularly to maritime states, whose vessels transit the Panama Canal, notably Great Britain, one of the signatories of the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, which recognized the exclusive right of the United States to construct and manage a ship canal across the American isthmus.

A recent article in the Times of London, quoted in the Miami Herald of March 14, 1963, emphasizes that the United States lacks a firm policy in dealing with Panama and deplores the continuing series of concessions by our country as the only response to increasing Panamanian clamor.

The news story follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 14, 1963]

BRITISH PAPER CRITICIZES UNITED STATES—PANAMA POLICY RAPPED

LONDON.—The Times of London said the United States apparently lacks a firm policy in its dealings with Panama over the Canal Zone.

The Times said Panama needed help in improving its underdeveloped economy, but added that it is doubtful if any of the concessions currently being demanded "would be of any benefit to the economy, let alone the poverty-stricken campesinos.

policy and this apparently the United States lacks in its dealings with Panama. A firmer policy, defining in more precise terms exactly what the United States is prepared to grant * * * would command more respect * * * than a continuing series of concessions granted only in response to growing Panamanian clamor," the article concluded.

Statement of SBA Administrator Horne on President's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, has recently presented testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on the effect of the President's proposed tax program on the small business segment of our economy.

Mr. Horne's statement is one of the clearest and most persuasive statements in support of the President's tax proposals which I have seen.

Mr. Horne points out that the small business community has a very special stake in the proposed tax reduction and revision program. Part of this stems from the fact that small firms have typically been unable to obtain adequate equity financing. They, therefore, must use other sources for financing. The importance of tax reduction, which would result in increasing funds available for small business reinvestment purposes cannot be overstated, the Administrator testified.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include Administrator Horne's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN E. HORNE, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

I welcome this opportunity to submit to the committee the views of the Small Business Administration on the President's tax program. I strongly urge that this program be adopted.

The 4.5 million concerns comprising the small business sector of the economy constitute 95 percent of all American business firms. Quite obviously, they, and the 30 million people for whom they provide gainful occupation, have a vital interest in the President's tax recommendations.

I have devoted much of the past 15 years in both the executive and legislative branches to dealing with problems of the smaller firm. During that time I have been concerned with the inhibiting effect of our tax system upon the welfare and growth of small business. I am aware that during these years, Members of Congress of both parties have advocated certain of the proposals now incorporated in the President's program.

As Administrator of the Federal agency which Congress has directed to "aid, counsel, assist and protect * * * the interests of small business," I am gratified that the President's tax message contains proposals addressed to the "special tax problems of small business."

This concern with the smaller firm's tax problems, while especially notable in the proposed tax reductions, is apparent throughout the program. Even revenue producing proposals, which at first impression seem to affect small concerns adversely, frequently contain provisions to limit the impact on such firms. Indeed, a number of the proposed revisions would work to the direct benefit of the small concern.

In his message, the President noted that his tax recommendations would "give particular encouragement to small business." This is not to say that only small concerns would benefit under the President's program. For small business operates within the framework of our economy—not independently of it. Small concerns, like firms of all sizes, can only prosper and grow in a climate conducive to economic opportunity. A national tax policy that helps provide such a climate will serve the needs of small as well as large enterprises.

But national tax policies, to be meaningful for small business, must take account of the inherent differences between small and large business. These differences have been acknowledged by the Congress in other areas of business activity. Indeed, competitive disadvantages and the difficulties of small firms in obtaining adequate financing and procurement opportunities gave rise to creation by the Congress of the Small Business Administration. The full recognition of these differences in every area of the proposed program gives added validity to the President's tax proposals.

Since detailed explanations of these proposals have already been presented to the Committee, I shall confine my remarks to those parts of the President's proposals that are of special interest to the smaller firm. Before doing so, I should like to discuss the current economic setting and its relation to the President's program—also with special emphasis on small business.

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY AND SMALL BUSINESS

Our industries are today turning out more goods than ever before. Employment is at a high level. In the past 2 years, personal income and consumer after-tax income have risen—and with virtually no erosion in the value of the dollar.

The small business community has benefited from these improved economic conditions. New incorporations—largely small business—have increased. Business failures, after a sharp rise in 1961, were substantially lower in 1962. Retail sales recently reached an all time high, a record of considerable significance of the nation's 2 million small retailers.

The present state of the economy is good—but not good enough. In several major respects, our progress has been neither

as rapid nor as substantial as we would have wished. Thus, the nation's production of goods and services still falls short of its potential. And unemployment remains intolerably high.

Just as small business has shared in the progress of the last 2 years, so too does small business bear the deadening weight of an economy operating below full potential. The large, diversified firm can shift its emphasis to a less affected market. Economies of scale and of automation can frequently enable a large producer to mitigate the effects of a profits squeeze. But the small firm rarely has this type of flexibility.

The continued growth and vitality of our small business community lies in sparking the unrealized potential of our economy. In my judgment, this is the greatest challenge of the 1960's and 1970's.

There is one step which, in my opinion, offers the best hope for fuller utilization of our human and material resources—early and substantial reduction in Federal income tax rates, coupled with revision in the Federal income tax structure.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM AND SMALL BUSINESS

There is general agreement that our tax system must be modernized to enable us to end the sluggish performance of our economy and to spur it toward its true potential. Through tax cuts on personal incomes, additional purchasing power will be released, providing the demand necessary to call forth higher levels of production. Opportunities for profitable output and sales by small business will be increased. Simultaneously, corporate tax cuts and tax reductions on incomes of unincorporated businesses will offer fresh incentives for investment and expansion. As existing business activity is accelerated and expanded, and as the formation of new businesses is encouraged by new and increasing markets, our growing labor force will become more fully absorbed.

The small business community has a very special stake in a program of tax reduction and revision.

Unlike their larger competitors, small firms have typically been unable to obtain sufficient equity financing. To finance their operations, they have been forced to rely on internally generated funds—which are usually inadequate—or to rely too heavily on burdensome forms of credit. As a result, they have often been unable to purchase the facilities and equipment necessary to modernize and expand.

These are matters uniquely within the cognizance of the Small Business Administration. Our lending programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act were created because of the inaccessibility to small firms of the sources of financing available to large firms.

But there are obvious limits to what SBA can do in these areas. Without adequate internally generated funds, small businesses are severely handicapped in their growth potential. It is, after all, the promise of such funds which attracts outside financing.

The importance of tax reduction, which would result in increasing these funds, therefore, cannot be overstated. In addition, through their strengthened ability to demonstrate financial soundness, small firms would become more attractive both as borrowers and as potential investments.

The hope of prompt and sustained prosperity for small business would be greatly enhanced by enactment of the President's tax program.

And now, to a brief examination of proposals in the President's program having particular applicability to small business:

REDUCTION IN TAX RATES

Corporations: Under the President's proposals, almost half a million small firms would have their tax bills immediately reduced by 27 percent. This would occur through a reduction from 30 to 22 percent in the corporate normal tax rate, levied on the first $25,000 of taxable income. The President has noted with respect to this proposal that "Small businessmen * * * will * * * receive greater reductions in their corporate taxes than their larger competitors."

For corporations which, while somewhat larger, are nevertheless small in comparison to the industrial giants, the benefits would also be impressive. For corporations with taxable incomes of $50,000 or $100,000, the tax reduction in the first year would amount to 9.8 percent and 4.3 percent, respectively, with proportionate reductions for corporations with incomes between these levels.

These corporations would also benefit further from the 1964 and 1965 reductions in the corporate surtax rate to 50 percent and 47 percent, respectively. When the reductions are fully effective in 1965, they would amount to a 15.9 percent tax reduction for the corporation with $50,000 annual taxable income and a 12.4 percent tax reduction for the corporation with $100,000 annual taxable income.

The reversal of corporate normal and surtax rates designed to assist small business would, however, unless limited to small concerns, confer benefits on larger firms operating through separately incorporated companies. As Secretary Dillon testified before the committee:

"The fact that there are valid business reasons for many of these multiple corporate structures does not justify treating each corporate unit in the group as if it were an independently controlled small business. Under existing law, in the case of these multiple corporate structures an incentive for small business is converted into a large bonus for middle and big business."

Revision of the surtax exemption provisions is therefore a necessary concomitant of the reduction in the normal tax rate.

In order not to nullify the benefits of the proposal for truly independently owned and operated small businesses, the President has recommended that related corporations having 80 percent common ownership and control be limited to a single surtax exemption. This denial of multiple surtax benefits would be made gradually effective over a 5-year transition period. This change would affect only businesses which operate under a multicorporate framework and which have combined annual income exceeding $25,000. The fact is that the incorporated small business normally operates as a single corporation.

Clearly, the benefits to small business which would result from the normal tax rate reduction far outweigh the effect of limitation to a single surtax exemption upon those few small businesses who may have a multicorporate organization and an aggregate income of more than $25,000. Moreover, any effect upon particular concerns would be mitigated by the general reductions in corporate tax rates, as well as by the gradual transition period.

It may be noted that the size standards for assistance provided under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act also contain limitations to insure that the benefits intended for truly independently owned and operated small concerns are not extended to businesses which are actually parts of a large enterprise. This principle, long accepted and approved by the Congress, is the same as that embodied in the proposed restrictions on surtax exemptions for multiple corporations under common control.

Undoubtedly, in addition to the substantial revenue loss to the Federal Government, the proliferation of affiliated corporations benefiting from an excessively large number of multiple surtax exemptions has contributed to a weakening of the competitive position of small business. To that extent, putting an end to this practice will assist the many small businessmen who are now struggling to keep pace with larger competitors, operating through several corporations at least partially to take advantage of existing law.

Unincorporated firms: A major feature of the President's tax program is its proposed reduction in individual tax rates which are applicable to some 4 million small unincorporated businesses. Tax liabilities on all individual incomes would be decreased by $11 billion over a 3-year period through a reduction in rates from their present levels of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent, with appropriate reductions covering every bracket.

The program would also allow income averaging relief to individuals operating unincorporated businesses with unusual amounts of income bunched in a single year. In general, the averaging would apply to individuals whose income in the fifth year of a 5-year period exceeds their average income in the 4 preceding years by at least one-third. The amount subject to averaging (that portion above the 133 percent) would have to total at least $3,000, however.

Many small firms will undoubtedly be able to take advantage of this new provision. A random sampling of applicants for SBA loans indicates that small unincorporated businesses in a variety of trades and industries may have widely fluctuating incomes. The liberal averaging provisions could be very helpful to such concerns, by mitigating the application of graduated rates on an unusually high level of income occurring in a single year.

With respect to another recommendation in the individual tax area, the 5 percent (of adjusted gross income) floor on deductions, it is clear that unincorporated small firms would not be affected as much, since the floor would apply only to personal, nonbusiness deductions. Business expenses would still be fully deductible without regard to the 5 percent limitation.

The net effect of these reductions and allied provisions would be of substantial benefit to small business and should directly increase after-tax earnings available to small concerns. This will better enable these concerns to retain the funds necessary for continued operation and growth.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Another proposal of importance to the small business community would allow, as a current expense deduction, expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research or development activities. Under present law, the cost of such machinery and equipment must be capitalized and deducted over its useful life through depreciation allowances. Under the President's proposal a taxpayer would be allowed, as a current expense deduction in any year, expenditures for such machinery and equipment acquired in that year. This approach would be applicable to unincorporated as well as incorporated businesses. Moreover, the proposal contains special rules to make it easier for small firms with limited research and development budgets to obtain the deduction.

A number of, but not enough, small concerns are engaged or interested in research and development work. This proposal could be of substantial aid to them in financing the machinery and equipment for such work. Thus the tax advantage of being able to charge the entire cost against current taxable income could be crucial in enabling small firms to acquire such equipment.

Perhaps of even greater significance are the many firms which engage, or would like to engage, in research and development—not on contract to other firms or to the Government, but rather to remain competitive in their own industries. "Expensing" of research and development equipment, plus ad-

ditional funds resulting from the President's tax program, could provide the means for more small firms to engage in research and development activities to their eventual competitive advantage.

OTHER PROPOSALS AFFECTING SMALL BUSINESS

Capital gains: The President has recommended that the percentage of long-term capital gains included in taxable income of individuals be reduced from the present 50 percent of the gain to 30 percent. In combination with the proposed individual income tax rate schedule, this will result in capital gains tax rates ranging from 4.2 percent to a maximum of 19.5 percent, compared with an existing range of 10 to 25 percent. This rate reduction is expected to encourage increased investment by individuals.

The present 25 percent tax on corporate capital gains would be lowered to 22 percent. Thus, for corporations with annual taxable income of $25,000 or less, the tax rate would be identical on ordinary income and on the taxable long-term capital gains.

The proposed increase to 1 year in the holding period for long-term capital gains is expected to lessen the present importance of tax considerations as a factor in investment. Small business investments typically require at least a year to mature. Limiting long-term capital gains to bona fide investors, rather than short-term speculators, could result in such investors devoting more funds to investment in small firms.

Gains accrued on capital assets on transfer at death: Coupled with rate reductions and other reforms in the capital gains area designed to aid in increasing the flow of investment funds, the President has recommended taxation at long-term capital gains rates of net gains accrued on capital assets at the time of transfer at death. Present law permits the exemption from income tax of capital gains accrued when appreciated assets are transferred at death.

Understandably, many owners and operators of small business firms are concerned with this or any other proposal which they believe would impose a higher rate structure on businesses, or interests in business, left to their heirs. However, I want to emphasize the provisions in the present recommendation that would cushion the impact of any tax on gains on capital assets at the time of transfer at death—or which would exclude a portion of such assets from taxation.

There are provisions for 5-year averaging of the gain; for installment payment of additional taxes over a period of up to 10 years; for an exemption of gain up to $15,000 (which Treasury expects to permanently exempt relatively small estates from the impact of the proposal); and for a marital exclusion such as is now contained in the Federal estate tax laws. In addition, under the President's program, the lower capital gains and income tax rates would also be applicable. Finally, the amount of any such tax would reduce the estate for Federal estate tax purposes.

To illustrate the relatively minor impact which this proposal would have upon most small businesses, let us examine the hypothetical case of the married owner of a successful small concern, whose gross estate at death included assets which had appreciated in value by $124,000. Giving effect to the marital exclusion, subtracting the $15,000 blanket exemption, and assuming that $12,000 is attributable to increases in value of his household effects and modest charitable bequests, we find that all but $35,000 of the gain is exempt from taxation. Under the President's proposals, only 30 percent of the capital gain, or $10,500, would be subject to tax.

Even if we assume an average annual income of $50,000 in the years prior to death, the total tax—when averaged out to avoid the impact of "lumping" in a single year—would be $4,935. The average annual payments, when spread over the 10-year period provided for by the President's proposals, would be about $500.

The $4,935 capital gains tax would also be a deduction for estate tax purposes. In the estate tax bracket in which such an individual would probably fall, this payment would serve to reduce estate taxes payable by $1,480. Thus, the net cost of the capital gains tax proposal would be only $3,455, and this could be paid over a 10-year period.

I have intentionally focused upon an individual of substantial income, who leaves an estate of more than moderate size, and whose business has experienced considerable growth. When we consider that the great bulk of the small businessmen are not so fortunate, it becomes apparent that there are few indeed who will be greatly affected by these proposals.

The Treasury Department estimates that the proposal would affect less than 3 percent of those who die each year and, moreover, that only 10 percent of the impact would fall upon individuals with adjusted gross income of $20,000 or less. For all of these reasons, it appears unlikely that this proposal would have significant impact upon the financial position of small concerns.

Employee stock options: Another proposal would eliminate the present favorable capital gains treatment accorded stock options. Upon the exercise of newly granted stock options, the spread between the option price and the value of the stock at the date the option is exercised would be taxed at ordinary income tax rates.

Since small firms have not made wide use of stock options, this proposed tax treatment of stock options would lessen the advantages of large companies over small business in management recruitment or retention. To this extent, the proposal should benefit small concerns. Moreover, the overall effect of the President's program of tax reduction offers something more positive in this area. The drain of management personnel from small business could be checked by the increased ability of the small firm to offer attractive compensation as well as by the enhanced growth potential of the smaller firm.

Carryover of capital losses: Under the President's proposal, individuals would be permitted an indefinite carryover of capital losses incurred in any one year. Present law permits unused capital losses to be carried over for only 5 years. Capital losses of individuals may be charged in any year only against capital gains and $1,000 of ordinary income. This proposal would enable small unincorporated firms and investors in small corporations to obtain the full tax benefits of using a capital loss as an offset to income, even though they may not be sufficiently diversified to offset completely a large loss within 5 years.

Generally, this proposal is expected to "improve investment odds for the risk taker and increase the effective supply of investment funds for growth." Like the averaging provision, it should prove helpful to small concerns and small business investors.

CONCLUSION

The increased financial strength which will accrue to small concerns from the President's tax program will benefit them in many ways. Since small firms generally operate on narrower profit margins than their larger competitors, and, as I have noted above, have difficulty in obtaining additional capital, they have often been unable to purchase the facilities and equipment necessary to modernize or expand. Benefits accruing from the proposed program, when coupled with the investment credit provided in the Revenue Act of 1962 and the administration's liberalized depreciation guidelines, should significantly aid small firms in financing such necessary equipment and facilities, and in increasing their work forces.

Business opportunities which previously appeared out of reach because of lack of funds, may be more feasible projects for small business consideration. The enhanced attractiveness of small business prospects and their increased financial strength should make external equity and debt financing easier, should aid in the acquisition and retention of capable management personnel, and should help combat the trend toward absorption of small firms into larger companies.

The revenue producing revisions are a most important aspect of the overall program. Without this revenue, the salutary rate reductions proposed by the President might well be jeopardized.

In addition to the stimulus to the economy which small business would share with all elements of the Nation, the increased incentive to greater initiative, effort and risk-taking should encourage additional capital investment in small concerns by small business investment companies and other investors.

In such a climate, small business can prosper. And as Secretary Dillon has said, reflecting the policy of the Congress in the Small Business Act, "Small businesses, their strength and vitality, are the very keystone of our competitive economy and its potential for growth."

I sincerely hope that the President's tax program will be given favorable consideration by the committee.

The Equal Rights for Women Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the text of a resolution adopted March 29 by the Fairfield County Republican Women's Association in support of the equal rights for women amendment which many Members, including myself, have introduced:

RESOLUTION

Whereas since 1940 the Republican Party platform has favored submission to Congress of an amendment to the Constitution providing equal rights for men and women; and

Whereas our Representative, the Honorable ABNER W. SIBAL, has submitted to the 88th Congress House Joint Resolution 103, identical to Senate Joint Resolution 45, which reads as follows:

"Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

" 'SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect one year after the date of ratification.' "

Resolved, That the executive board of the Fairfield County Republican Women's Association declare its support of this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved, That the Honorable ABNER W. SIBAL may, at his discretion, cause this resolution to be inscribed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an appearance made before the Health and Safety Subcommittee last week by the Governor of my State of Tennessee, the Honorable Frank G. Clement.

On the occasion of Governor Clement's appearance, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS, remarked that he was the only one of the 50 Governors who had testified before the subcommittee on this important subject.

Governor Clement is a pioneer in mental health, and during his previous administrations great progress has been made in this field in Tennessee.

Because of this and because important legislation on this subject has been introduced in the House, I would like to direct attention to the following portions of Governor Clement's testimony:

EXCERPTS OF GOVERNOR CLEMENT'S TESTIMONY

To begin with, like Tennessee, most States have awakened to the fact that they have been sadly neglecting their mentally ill and their mentally retarded. They have taken stock of their situation and have found that they were the proud possessors of several sets of more or less ancient buildings, which by a stretch of the imagination were called hospitals. I think they could be more appropriately called institutions.

Almost without exception these buildings were in a state of disrepair through lack of maintenance, and by the time I came into office at least many more people were housed in them than they were designed for. Professional treatment personnel were so woefully outnumbered by their patients that there was practically no chance for any patient to receive individual care. And this was the base line that most States started from—not 100 years ago but in the past 10 to 20 years.

Gentlemen, if I don't make any other point to you today, I would like to bring out into the open the fact that it is only in the last 10 to 20 years in my opinion as a three-term Governor of Tennessee that we have brought this subject of mental health out of the shadows and into the sunlight.

During this recent period, I have no doubt that more money has been spent on public mental health programs by the various States than was spent in America in the preceding 100-year period, and yet there is still the problem of overcrowding and lack of adequate professional staff. These problems confronted me when I first took office as a young man of 32 as Governor of Tennessee, and that was in the year of 1953, and while great progress has been made, some of them were there waiting to meet me when I took office again in January of this year.

Now our program has improved tremendously in Tennessee during these past 10 years. We have created a separate department of mental health which has been headed continuously by a qualified psychiatrist. We have added intensive treatment buildings to our old hospitals. We have built three entirely new hospitals. We have started 12 new community mental health clinics and other experimental projects. This is not a unique record.

I wouldn't sit here and try to make you think today that I am the only Governor who has done anything about mental health. In their own way other States, perhaps your State, have responded to the problem with equal determination. Each one has experimented with ways to improve on the old models, the old models for care which were inherited from the past. And yet, gentlemen, no State can say that it has achieved a satisfactory way of dealing with this mental health problem.

Perhaps 10 years is not a fair test, but it is the only test that I personally can apply. After all, we are attempting to correct accumulated ills of many decades. In any case it cannot be said that the States have waited to act until they were assured of Federal aid.

The States have been acting, and I can say to you that Tennessee acted without regard to whether the Federal Government did or did not do something about it. The bills under consideration today acknowledge this and provide impetus for still further action.

Thank you.

Channel for Astronomy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Illinois, and the University of Illinois have put up one of the largest, if not the largest, radio telescopes in the world south of Danville, Ill., about 35 miles from the University of Illinois.

Channel 37 has been set aside by countries all over the world for astronomy and science. Even countries behind the iron curtain have set aside the band which now includes channel 37 for science only.

This is the only channel that has been requested for purely scientific use. This channel ought to be set aside for science. The attached editorial from the Sunday, April 7 edition of the Washington Post sets out the reasons why channel 37 should be for science and science only. We are going into the age of the future which will involve problems millions of miles from home. Radio astronomy is a relatively new science. Even small disturbances carry great weight in this field. It is to the future that we are looking if we are to get a clear radio wave. Channel 37 ought to be set aside for science in order that it may do a good job.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Washington Post of April 7 is appended in full as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1963]

CHANNEL FOR ASTRONOMY

The problem of allocating television channels is like dividing a pie at a Boy Scout jamboree. There are simply not enough slices to go around. One can sympathize with the Federal Communications Commission as it weighs the conflicting claims of private and public interests in doling out the precious channels in the ultrahigh frequency range. Not only are there local applicants for UHF stations but the Coast Guard, the police and developers of mobile telephones also have worthy designs on a limited resource.

Still, there does seem, weight in the contention of the radio astronomers that one channel should be set aside exclusively for exploring the heavens. The airwaves belong to the public, and the pursuit of knowledge in the space age ranks high as a public interest. Scientists are thinking more of the future than of the present in arguing that one clear radio wave might prove of incomparable value in solving the secrets of outer space.

Squeezed in the middle, the FCC is proposing a compromise, that channel 37, which the astronomers want, should be allocated on a limited basis to stations that would sign off at night. A 600-mile area would be ruled off limits to broadcasters in order to protect the University of Illinois radio telescope. But the trouble with the compromise is that it would wipe out the opportunity for keeping one channel completely clear, and as the late show is followed by music 'til dawn, one encroachment would surely invite another.

The FCC ought to consider carefully whether the needs of science should not be given priority in this case. It would be sad if, for the want of a truly clear channel, the life of an astronaut should be lost. One channel out of 70 for studying the universe does not seem an excessive demand.

Statement of 10 New England Cooperatives Regarding National Dairy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, presently there are several pieces of dairy legislation before the Congress, most of these concerned, in some way or another, with control of milk production.

Today there is evidence which reveals that national milk production is tapering off and tending away from a super surplus supply situation, and against the background of such developments 10 New England cooperatives met, on March 21, 1963, to formulate opinions on national legislation.

Because these cooperatives are highly representative of dairymen in northern New England, I feel their findings are highly deserving of recognition. I, therefore, submit to the RECORD the following statement endorsed by these 10 New England dairy cooperatives:

STATEMENT OF 10 NEW ENGLAND COOPERATIVES REGARDING NATIONAL DAIRY LEGISLATION

In a meeting held at Montpelier, Vt., on March 21, 1963, the undersigned cooperatives met and discussed in full the bills before the Congress of the United States that pertain directly to the dairy industry. After a full discussion it was decided that the cooperative representatives would return to their own cooperatives and determine the desires of their own cooperatives and then meet again to discuss what action seemed desirable.

At the meeting today (April 2, 1963), the undersigned cooperatives have endorsed the following statement:

I. PRICE STABILIZATION

We believe that the recent trend of reduced national milk production is more than a short-lived, sporadic, downward adjustments, and we expect this trend to continue. The price support programs for milk and butterfat with a minimum of 75 percent of parity can effectively stabilize the price of these products to farmers and can be relied upon to maintain a close working balance between the supply of milk available and the demand for it.

We the undersigned New England cooperatives support the price stabilization principles of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to include the continued use of the price support program for milk and butterfat and the products thereof, plus an adequate program of surplus disposal.

We the undersigned New England cooperatives also reject any course of action that is not in accordance with the price stabilization principles of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

II. FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDERS

The Federal milk order program and the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, has done much to stabilize the fluid milk markets in New England and thereby enhance the income of the dairy farmers. Therefore, we the undersigned New England cooperatives pledge our cooperation in safeguarding the classified price system, and improving the effectiveness of the program for dairy farmers.

Bellows Falls Cooperative Creamery, Inc., Bellows Falls, Vt.; Cabot Farmers Cooperative Creamery Cp., Inc., Cabot, Vt.; Grand Isle County Cooperative Creamery Association, Grand Isle, Vt.; Granite City Cooperative Creamery Association, Barre, Vt.; New England Milk Producers' Association, 68 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.; Northern Farms Cooperative, Inc., Montpelier, Vt.; Richmond Cooperative Association, Inc., Richmond, Vt.; St. Albans Cooperative Creamery, Inc., St. Albans, Vt.; United Farmers of New England, Inc., 142 Cambridge Street, Boston, Mass.; White River Valley Dairies, Inc., Randolph, Vt.

Big Taxes Take Money Which Could Make Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun recently published an editorial illuminating the difference between Socialist thinking and the American free-enterprise system. I would like to have the editorial included in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

BIG TAXES TAKE MONEY WHICH COULD MAKE JOBS

One fundamental difference between the American free enterprise system and socialism should be recognized more fully.

In the American ideal, the individual is free to accomplish what his intellect, ingenuity, determination, and energy will allow.

In socialism, whether Keynesian, Marxist, or what type, Government does it all except the work.

The two systems cannot exist long in the same country. The reasons are easily seen.

Socialism, for example, takes so much of the Nation's income that the individual is kept broke. Or to put it another way, socialism takes all, returning to the individual enough to meet such needs as socialism's masters deem proper.

The American free enterprise system can exist only so long as the individual (whether singly or collectively) can strive for returns commensurate with the effort he expends and the risks he takes.

To expand his undertakings, the individual must be able to use the fruits of his efforts for his own purposes, not have to turn them over to Government.

It is necessary to think about this difference, because there is in progress a move to increase Government's spending at a time when (Government economists insist) there is need for a forward surge in the Nation's economy.

The excuse given for Government getting deeper into the Nation's life is that there is unemployment.

When has it been otherwise in this or any other nation except where people are slaves, like in the Soviet Union and Red China?

Employment, again Government figures, continues at over 68 million persons. Gross national product is setting records month after month.

Potentially the American people have more money than ever before in the world's history. They would have if Government let them keep it.

If greater expansion of our economy is needed, it would come about naturally, if the people (including business and industry) were allowed to spend their own money instead of having Government spend it for them.

That is what those who believe in the American free enterprise system want. That is why so many Americans are calling for a major cut in taxes, a complete revision of the Federal tax system.

But taxes can be reduced (that is, more money can be left in the pockets of those who earn it) only when the Federal Government quits spending so much of the Nation's income.

To insist that lowered Government spending would damage the economy is to preach the Socialist doctrine that Government knows best, can do it best, should see that all its children are getting what Government thinks they should have, and that everbody works the way Government believes they should.

Let it stand for the record that those who consider themselves the allwise, allknowing, allpowerful Government are the products of the American free enterprise system. They obtained their money, their position and their authority because they took advantage of what someone else had done in the American way.

Let us also remember that never in recorded history has a nation reached such heights of knowledge, power and wealth as has the United States of America, the only nation on record with our ideal of government.

The greatest contribution President Kennedy can make to this Nation's well-being is to drive the Socialist thinkers out of positions of authority, and to devote the country's resources and might solely to the preservation of America in the form provided by the Constitution.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEWARK, N.J.,
April 2, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Belatedly am taking this means of expressing sincere thanks for your efforts on behalf of the captive nations by introducing a bill in the House that would lead to formation of a committee that would be of assistance to the above mentioned group.

Very truly yours,

FRANK VASKAS.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Flood resolution, House Resolution 14, is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. I urge you to submit it to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

NYKOLA SPANCZAK.

HOLY CROSS UKRAINIAN
AUTOCEPHALOUS ORTHODOX
CHURCH IN EXILE,
Utica, N.Y., March 30, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: In the name of our church organization we urge you to submit as soon as possible the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14) to vote by your committee and ask you kindly to give it your favorable consideration. The Committee on Captive Nations is important both for our Government and the American people.

While Communist Moscow has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation from captive nations in Asia and in Africa, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Moscovite which constitute a big weakness of the Moscow totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of very vital importance to our honorable Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We urge you, Dear Congressman H. W. SMITH, to give your full support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee's, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,

Rt. Rev. ORESTES IWANIUK,
Pastor.

SERGE JAMSINK,
President of the Congregation.
BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
April 1, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed please find copy of telegram I sent to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH regarding the Committee on Captive Nations.

You may recall we met at a luncheon at which you addressed the Ukranian Congress Committee of American delegates last October in New York City—I was the blonde from Olyphant, Pa. You also know my husband, Walter Dushnyck, editor of the Ukrainian Bulletin and the Ukrainian Quarterly.

Thank you, Congressman FLOOD, for all your efforts in behalf of the captive nations and the enslaved Ukrainians.

God bless you.

Sincerely,

MARY DUSHNYCK.

APRIL 1, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you to submit Flood Resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your Rules Committee. Special Committee on Captive Nations in House of Representatives essential for obtaining factual information on captive nations for use of our Government in foreign policy matters. Please give your support to Flood resolution.

MRS. MARY DUSHNYCK,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

NATIONAL PAN-EPIROTIC SOCIETY,
St. Louis Mo., March 30, 1963.

Hon. DAN FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the members of our organization I wish to congratulate you on your initiative in forming a committee on the enslaved nations. Through this act you have embraced the hopes and aspirations of millions of people in their struggle for freedom. This shows your compassion and understanding of people who have lost their liberty and who suffer under the Communist yoke.

We will be happy to assist this committee in its work in any way possible.

Would you kindly send us the names of the members of this dedicated committee? Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ELIAS TSIOPOS,
Chairman.

Panama Canal Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years no one in the Congress has made a more vigorous effort to defend the just rights of the United States in its sovereign jurisdiction over the Canal Zone than my able and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

It was thus highly gratifying, when reading a recent editorial in the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, to note that his notable contributions have been recognized by that influential paper.

The editorial follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Mar. 25, 1963]

PANAMA CANAL ISSUE

While we applaud President Kennedy's stated intention to block further Communist expansion in this hemisphere, we regret that the meeting of Central American Presidents did not produce a strong proclamation on the importance of the Panama Canal.

The Canal Zone is the most important spot in this hemisphere. It is of vital concern to the United States and to all the Americas. Yet the right of the United States to maintain control over it has not been defended with vigor in recent years.

The country should pay heed to statements by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. More than any man in Congress, Mr. FLOOD has stressed the importance of upholding American authority in the Canal Zone.

A few days ago, Representative FLOOD said "the time is certainly overripe for a forthright and openly proclaimed reaffirmation of our treaty rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal." He expressed the hope that the President will meet any proposals which may further impair our treaty rights concerning the canal "with a rocklike stand for our own interests."

In 1960, President Eisenhower unwisely permitted the Panamanian flag to be flown over Canal Zone territory. This was considered a minor concession to the pride of the Republic of Panama. Instead of easing hard feelings, the surrender of a principle led to fresh demands by the Panamanians.

"Such formal displays of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone," said Representative FLOOD, "are not harmless gestures but symbols of weakness."

Strong forces are pushing for the internationalization of the Panama Canal. This would mean, of course, that the United States no longer would control one of the keys to its national defense.

The United States must not wait until pressures have built up for liquidation of U.S. sovereign control over the Panama Canal. Now is the time for the President and the Congress to reassert the United States' unqualified jurisdiction over the most strategic spot in the Western Hemisphere.

Foreign Students at the University of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, the increasing flow of American students abroad, and the flow of foreign students to the United States, clearly indicate the growing recognition of the importance of international education. It is interesting to note that the number of foreign students on U.S. college campuses has increased from a total of 26,433 in 1950 to 58,086 last year.

This increase in the number of students who have come to the United States during the past 12 years by nearly 120 percent has challenged American higher education to provide the accommodations necessary to meet the special needs of these students. It is obvious that the impressions made on these student during their terms of study will in no small measure determine their future attitudes and the attitudes of their countries toward the United States. For this reason, I think it is important that we prepared to meet this challenge and make certain that these students feel welcome on our campuses.

In this connection, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article which appeared to the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, describing the role the University of Hawaii is playing in meeting this challenge.

The article follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Apr. 2, 1963]

BIG INCREASE NOTED IN FOREIGN STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

(By Hildegaard Verpolegen)

The number of foreign students at the University of Hawaii has increased by more than 17 times in the past 11 years.

The increase is due only partially to the East-West Center. Even without counting Center students the foreign students on campus increased by almost 10 times in the past 11 years.

In the spring of 1952, there were 37 foreign students on campus. Today, there are 644 including 277 East-West Center grantees on campus from Asia and the Pacific area.

According to the most recent national statistics, the ratio of foreign U.S. students

at the University of Hawaii make it one of the leaders among State universities.

In 1962, foreign students at the University of Hawaii made up 4.6 percent of the total enrollment as compared to 3.7 at the University of Illinois; 3.5 at the University of Wisconsin; 2.4 at Indiana University; and 4.1 at the University of Southern California and Oklahoma State University.

FACTORS

Three factors are responsible for the great increase here, according to A. Lee Zeigler, foreign student adviser.

1. A general explosion or great increase of foreign students in the United States in recent years, with a 10-percent increase last year.
2. The University of Hawaii itself.
3. The East-West Center.

Among the attractions at the University of Hawaii are academic programs, Zeigler said, listing tropical agriculture, agricultural economics, hotel management and tourism, and teaching English as a second language, as just a few examples.

"Geography is important, also," he said.

"Hawaii has a reputation for easy adjustment, both climatically and socially.

"This is the closest U.S. institution to many countries.

"Many students have family connections here.

"Despite a high cost of living, the University of Hawaii has low academic costs," Zeigler continued.

"The University of Hawaii has a fairly generous admissions policy. There aren't any quotas here which hold down the number of foreign students."

The present foreign students range from entering freshmen to those studying for doctor of philosophy degrees.

They come from 51 different countries and territories and all have some contact with the foreign student office.

Once the foreign student arrives on campus, there is a 2-week orientation program and help with registration. The office helps with tutors, arranges counseling for all foreign students and gives academic assistance to undergraduates.

SOME OF WORK

Much of the work done by the office deals with student-community relations.

If a school or club wants a foreign student as a speaker or if a family wants to entertain a student, the office makes the arrangements.

The office also helps with presentation of cultural programs and international nights staged by the foreign students.

"We also arrange classes," Zeigler said.

Foreign students, like many U.S. students, have financial problems, Zeigler pointed out.

A foreign student assistance fund has been established and is administered by Zeigler's office.

"We also give information on scholarships and grants-in-aid," Zeigler said.

The present foreign student scholarships include 277 from the East-West Center, 13 from the U.S. Army, 12 from the trust territory, 6 from AID, and 8 from Rockefeller Foundation.

The remaining students have other scholarships or are financing their own studies.

One of the most recent organizations in connection with the foreign students is a group called International Neighbors.

The club is made up of wives of foreign students, faculty members, and other interested women.

Blockade: Old Thoughts on a New Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the tremendous volume of publicity growing out of the Cuban crisis of October 1962 surprisingly little of authoritative value on the history and law of blockade has been published. Thus, it was refreshing to read in the March 1963 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, an informative article on those subjects by Rear Adm. John D. Hayes, U.S. Navy, (retired).

In this article, Admiral Hayes develops how the maritime supremacy of the United States can be applied in dealing with the situation in the Caribbean. As such, the article, which is commended for reading by all concerned with the formulation of our naval policy, in connection with my address, "Monroe Doctrine versus Khrushchev Doctrine?" in the RECORD of April 12, 1963.

The indicated article follows:

BLOCKADE: OLD THOUGHTS ON NEW IDEAS

(By Rear Adm. John D. Hayes, retired)

Blockade, after being considered a naval and diplomatic anachronism for a decade and a half, has today suddenly become popular again. In its mildest form, it was a startling success in easing the critical situation in Cuba last October and now it is being offered as the panacea that can solve all our troubles there. While the missiles were pointed at their throats, Americans could only think of Cuba as being 90 miles away. When they saw the missiles returning by ship to the Soviet Union, they discovered that Cuba is an island where everything except diplomats must come and go by sea. Some Americans might have gone so far as to look at a good map or chart to find that Cuba should be an easy area to blockade, far easier than our South Atlantic coast which was successfully blockaded during the American Civil War.

What is blockade? Americans should be careful not to use this word loosely. President Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward did not know exactly what it meant in April 1861. They thought it an easy way to force the seceding States back into the Union. Instead they learned that they had transferred what they considered an internal problem into the realm of foreign affairs; had granted the insurgents or rebels the status of belligerents and had committed their Navy to a tremendous 4-year task. It may have been to avoid a similar trap that President Kennedy last October used the word quarantine as a label for what was obviously a blockade and aggressive weapons for what was absolute contraband.

Blockade is the stopping of water communications with a base, port or section of the coast of an enemy by a naval force stationed off it. It is the weapon of a superior naval power and is therefore analogous to a siege on land. Blockades may be of two kinds, one directed primarily against the enemy's naval force to prevent it from challenging control of the sea. Such was the British blockade of the German fleet in World War I. The other is directed against the enemy's overseas commerce to prevent that commerce from supporting their war effort. A commercial blockade interdicts neutral as well as enemy shipping, but to be recognized in international law, sufficient naval force must be employed to intercept and capture vessels attempting egress and ingress. enemy's oversea commerce to prevent that are intercepted trying to run an effective blockade are subject to capture and condemnation.

There have been three major commercial blockades in naval history: (1) The blockade of France by Great Britain in the last years of the Napoleonic Wars; (2) the Northern blockade of the South, 1861–65; (3) the British blockade of Germany in World War I. All have lessons for the situation today.

THE BLOCKADES OF THE NAPOLEONIC WARS

After the battle of Trafalgar, October 21, 1805, Great Britain became supreme upon the seas. Napoleon, locked within the continent of Europe, issued his Berlin Decree in November 1806, forbidding all European nations to trade with Great Britain. Its closing words were: "This decree shall be considered as the fundamental law of the empire, until after England has acknowledged that the rights of war are the same on land and on sea; that war cannot be extended to any private property whatever nor to persons who are not military; and until the rights of blockade be restrained to fortified places, actually invested by competent forces."

Had Great Britain accepted this she would have been relinquishing most of the maritime advantages that control of the sea gave her. Instead, she retaliated with her Orders in Council of January 1807 which forbade all trade involving neutrals with the ports of France. In this struggle between giants the United States held a somewhat favorable position not unlike certain weak states today. Yankee ships had been doing well. Jefferson and Madison favored revolutionary France over Great Britain, which was endeavoring to maintain the existing order of things. Not all Americans agreed, especially after the effects of the British blockade began to be felt. Jefferson's Embargo and the War of 1812, "Mr. Madison's War," were unpopular. John Randolph expressed the view: "The only possible barrier between France and universal domination before which America as well as Europe must fall, is the British Navy."

THE CIVIL WAR BLOCKADE

In the half century following the Napoleonic Wars, efforts were made to bring some order into the conduct of war against trade at sea. France and Great Britan in the Crimean conflict against Russia, 1854–1856, pledged themselves not to use privateers or to capture goods of the enemy in neutral ships nor neutral goods in enemy ships. They reserved the right, however, of capture of neutrals running the blockade or carrying contraband. They themselves were able to purchase large quantities of powder from the E. I. du Pont Co. while the Russians were denied this source of supply. After that war, the three contestants promulgated the Declaration of Paris of 1856 which was a set of rules for the conduct of war against trade at sea. The United States at the time would not become a party to this declaration because it failed to provide for exemption of all private property at sea. Five

years later at the outbreak of the Civil War the North was more than happy to do so.

At the risk of stirring emotions, it is necessary to compare the maritime situation in 1861 with 1963. The South was virtually an island since her land boundaries were undeveloped frontiers. Her's was a one-crop economy. She had no navy but she counted heavily on help from powerful European maritime states who needed her cotton. No formal war was declared because Lincoln and Seward kept insisting that the Confederate States were a group of insurgents and that the United States was not engaged in war but in putting down rebellion.

Nevertheless a blockade had been established and vessels were being condemned in prize courts for violating it. The first cases appealed to the Supreme Court were decided early in 1863. One case was that of a Mexican vessel taken on the gulf coast and condemned as a prize. The counsel for her owners held that insurrection was not war according to our Constitution and that war would have to be declared by Congress before a blockade could be established.

The case for the captors was argued by Richard Henry Dana, Jr., best known for his book, "Two Years Before the Mast." Dana legally saved the Civil War blockade. He did this by arguing that it was war in essence that determined jure belli and not the declaration of war.

"War," pleaded Dana, "is simply the exercise of force by bodies politic, or bodies assuming to be bodies politic, against each other for purpose of coercion. * * * The sea is res omnium. It is the common field of war as well as commerce. * * * War is a state of things and not an act of the legislative will. * * * Civil wars [like cold wars] change their state from day to day and place to place."

The Supreme Court affirmed the lower court in a 5-to-4 decision. Justice Robert W. Grier, who admitted being impressed by Dana's pleading, pointed out in his majority opinion many characteristics of the Civil War situation that have parallels in the cold war. "The President was bound to meet war in the shape it presented itself without waiting for Congress to baptize it with a name * * * the President has a right, jure belli, to institute a blockade of ports of States in rebellion which neutrals are bound to obey. * * * The laws of war recognize the rights of a belligerent to cut these sinews of power of the enemy by capturing his property on the high seas. It is the illegal traffic that stamps it 'enemy property'."

MARITIME BELLIGERENCY IN A COLD WAR

Americans, it is believed, are not thinking of blockade in its real sense when they apply the word to Cuba at the present time. What they want is interdiction of the transfer overseas of weapons of the cold war—nuclear missiles, aircraft, troops, agents and other Communist methods of disturbing the delicate balance of peace in the world today. These and the means to support them are what should be considered contraband in the new cold war interpretation of international law. Contraband is the international law term for private goods, enemy or neutral, that may be put to military use in war. A belligerent may capture such goods if he is able to intercept them on the way to the enemy. In the nature of things, he can do this only at sea.

To prevent Communist infiltration of the sea federation of the free world, the United States need only assume the rights of a maritime belligerent. The precedent to do this without formal declaration of war has already been established by our unilateral action during the Civil War. Such belligerent rights would include determining what constitutes contraband in a cold war with the methods of insuring that such contraband is not exported beyond the littoral of the European land mass. To accomplish this, the United States as a maritime belligerent would have the age-old right of visit and search for such contraband. It will have to be done in some new form. For this there is an excellent precedent and some very good lessons in the British blockade of Germany in World War I. At present we are finding that photo-intelligence is a poor substitute for onsite inspection, the true means of insuring against an arms buildup in Cuba. This can only be accomplished by occupation, but the maritime equivalent of onsite inspection, a modern form of visit and search, will serve as well.

THE APPLICATION OF MARITIME BELLIGERENT RIGHTS IN WORLD WAR I

The situation in Europe in the early years of the 20th century were not unlike that in the world today, armed nations expressing, and some honestly searching for, means of obtaining a lasting peace or at least reducing the effects of war. One form manifested itself in a strong sentiment to exempt private property at sea from capture during war. To this end the Declaration of London in 1909 divided such property into three categories for purposes of international law: (1) absolute contraband which included military goods; (2) conditional contraband which included goods that could be converted to war purposes; and (3) free goods which could not be declared contraband. The list of free goods included such items as raw cotton, fertilizer and metallic ores. The Declaration of London also attempted to define with more exactness the rules for effective blockade and the conduct of visit and search at sea.

The basic flaw in the Declaration of London was that it failed to take into account the changes taking place in the conduct of war. Naval weapons such as the submarine, airplane, torpedo and mine, had made the old type of close blockade as well as visit and search at sea impossible. Under the modern concept of the nation in arms all commodities had some military value. Finally, there were on the land border of Germany nations that would probably remain neutral in a war between great powers and whose trade with Germany in war could not be interdicted by any naval force.

When World War I came, new methods had to be devised by the major maritime power, Great Britain, to cut off seaborne trade to the Central Powers, especially Germany, and to prevent the means of war in the form of goods from reaching her from overseas. This was finally done by a system of trade controls without precedent in naval history and which were to give new meaning to the word "blockade." In this new form, economic pressure was brought to bear not so much by naval ships directly as by a system of trade restriction that control of the sea made possible.

This trade restriction, or blockade in its new form, gradually evolved during the years 1915 and 1916, within five general categories: (1) inspection; (2) rationing; (3) written clearances; (4) black lists; and (5) bunker control.

1. Inspection in port replaced the visit and search at sea of former days for the dangers of modern weapons and the size and complexity of the cargoes made unfeasible the old methods of inspection. Suspected vessels, instead, were directed into port for examination. By World War II this principle of diversion was accepted into international law. During World War I, the ports of Kirkwall in the Orkneys and the Downs in the English Channel were used for that purpose. Key West and Guantanamo are well situated for such a purpose today.

2. Rationing was a method by which the continental neutrals bordering on Geormany were allowed supplies only sufficient for their own use. Rationing was based on an elaborate statistical system and was given legal blessing after a British prize court condemned a steamer for carrying an amount of lard to Denmark far in excess of what the country normally imported. U.S. economists should know the amount of petroleum normally imported to Cuba before the Communist takeover and it should also be possible to compute approximately by tanker capacities the amounts going in today. Free world petroleum imports into Cuba could then be restricted to the amount normally necessary for the Cuban economy.

3. Written clearances in the form of letters of assurance or "navicerts" were given to neutral ships sailing to Europe from neutral ports. These navicerts certified to the contents of the cargo which would speed the ship's examination. Neutral shipping companies with the exeeption of those of Sweden cooperated.

4. Black lists were publications that included the names of firms known to be trading with the Central Powers through allied intelligence and postal and telegraph surveillance. Neutral ships were forbidden to transfer their goods.

5. Bunker control or the issue of British coal to neutral vessels was the economic club which made all other restrictions possible. Great Britain at the time was the major supplier of coal to Europe and also controlled most of the coaling stations throughout the world.

The use of navicerts, black lists and bunker control as means of preventing cold war contraband from reaching Cuba today is obvious.

Mention of one additional rule of international law concerning visit and search should not be omitted. Article 16 of the Declaration of Paris exempted neutral vessels under convoy of its own men-of-war from visit and search. The commander of the convoy, however, was required to give the commander of the belligerent vessel all the information on the character of the ships and their cargo which visit and search might reveal. The Decleration of London was never ratified by the United States but the contents of this article were included in "Instructions for the Navy of the United States Governing Maritime Warfare" (June, 1917).

The blockade of Germany was essentially a form of economic warfare but it was based on control of most of the navigable waters of the world, a control which the British Navy had exercised for a century. However, where the arms of the British Navy could not reach, economic warfare broke down as was the case with Sweden on the Baltic and with Rumania on the Black Sea. Today, U.S. naval power, strong as it is, cannot reach these seas. But it should be able to control the Caribbean.

PACIFIC BLOCKADE

The foregoing recommendations for handling the Cuban situation were based on a cold war interpretation of international law. There also exists a precedent for basing it on a peacetime interpretation. In fact, when the word "blockade" is used with reference to Cuba, what is usually meant is not the wartime blockade that is outlined in the Declarations of Paris and London but a 19th century form of police action known as pacific blockade. A pacific blockade is inaugurated when a state that considers itself aggrieved institutes a blockade of the ports of the aggrieving state without at the same time putting the relations between the two on a war basis.[1]

[1] T. J. Lawrence, "The Principles of International Law" (London, 1915), 339.

Pacific blockade was the 19th century form of cold war, employed against troublesome nations liable to disturb the peace of Europe. It was employed by England and France in 1824 to prevent Turkey from invading Greece and in 1886 to prevent Greece from invading Turkey. France and England employed a form of pacific blockade against Argentina in 1837 and France employed it against Mexico in 1938, against China in Formosa in 1884 and against Siam in 1893.

This new practice was haphazard at first but as it hardened into an international habit, a divergence appeared between the views of France and Great Britain. France, with a small merchant marine, held that pacific blockade should apply to vessels of all nations and should include the power of condemnation. The British understandably held that pacific blockade granted no powers to interfere with the commerce of nations not involved, and that the action against offenders was limited to detention. The milder view prevailed and was given sanction in 1887 when the Institute of International Law at Heidelberg, Germany, resolved that pacific blockade was legal but only against ships of the offending nations which could be detained without compensation.

Pacific blockade was a European concept to which the United States never subscribed. In 1902–03, Great Britain and Germany blockaded Venezuela to compel settlement of financial claims. Germany wanted to resort to pacific blockade but the United States stood against this and the two European nations therefore established a state of war with a notice of a warlike blockade but with no declaration or other military action. During the Cuban crisis in October 1962, according to at least one press acoount, pacific blockade was considered but was rejected because of the U.S. stand in 1902 and possibly out of fear of reaction from other Latin American states.

OUR NEGLECTED MARITIME SUPREMACY

There are many precedents in international law which can be employed to fit the situation that faces the United States with respect to Cuba. They would be easier to apply today if more attention had been given after World War II to exploiting the capabilities of our maritime supremacy. Instead we chose to exploit our supposed possession of the secrets of nuclear energy. Had the free world, under the leadership of the United States, asserted its rights to police the lines of the Great Sea Federation that evolved from World War II, the situations in Korea, Suez, Congo, and Cuba would, no doubt, have been far different. Americans, however, are a continental people and their naval profession has produced no Neo-Mahans to instruct them in the age-old potentialities for good that was inherent in their new maritime supremacy. Instead they were told by their political scientists, statesmen, and military people that their's was a "unique age" to which the lessons of history could not apply. So, like other generations of Americans before them, they stumbled and learned only after they picked themselves up.

Precarious Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the weekly Marquette (Kans.) Tribune which expresses in clear and concise terms the growing concern at the grassroots level over the Federal Government's fiscal policies. I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the House who share this concern.

[From the Marquette (Kans.) Tribute]

PRECARIOUS PROSPERITY

How exclusive is prosperity? Is this era of high wages, high prices and a full horn of plenty the reward for the efforts of our labors or the unstable prop over a chasm of future financial trouble?

It is difficult to say to the unthinking citizen, your new television set, your new home, your new car, or your new tractor does not represent prosperous times. To the shopkeeper it is difficult to say there is no significance to prosperity in your increased sales volume. To the worker he has only to look at his pay envelope to discount any omen of ill times.

How much of this prosperity is paid for and how much do we owe is the only true measure of our financial security.

It is time the American people realize the national debt is their debt. It is time the American people realize the folly of big government is their folly. It is time we all realize that extravagance, waste, bureaucracy, and expensive socialistic experiments are causing our national debt—a debt which if allowed to continue to grow can only lead to national bankruptcy which is tantamount to individual bankruptcy.

The basic fact is, our economy is resting on quicksand caused by Government waste, bureaucracy and corruption. Government expenses are too high—public ideals are too low.

Farley Echoes Words From Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who served with such distinction as Postmaster General, has enjoyed over his entire adult life an outstanding reputation for public service. Today his counsel is sought and his judgment respected. He expresses himself as he thinks in his heart. Recently, David Lawrence in one of his syndicated columns referred to a conclusion made by Mr. Farley on the Cuban situation. It was published in the Nashville, Tenn., Banner, a newspaper of wide circulation and usefulness. Because of its real contribution to provocative thinking, I include, under unanimous consent, this portion of the David Lawrence article which quotes Mr. Farley on this subject:

FARLEY ECHOES WORDS FROM PAST

In his column today, David Lawrence develops the thesis that Congress looks at Cuba more realistically and certainly more resolutely than either the President or the State Department.

This should mean that given the opportunity Congress likely would take more stringent measures in dealing with the Communist menace in this hemisphere—at the very least establish a policy more consistent than that which has been followed since Castro came into power.

James A. Farley, former Democratic Party chairman and Postmaster General under Franklin Roosevelt, has reached the conclusion that present policy in regard to Cuba is sadly lacking in firmness of approach.

A person whose first concern always has been his Nation above partisan politics, the frank Mr. Farley said recently in a Chicago speech:

"I expect to be called an alarmist and even a warmonger. My answer is to point to the map. Each time that we seek to disengage them (the Reds) they confront us nearer home. Today they are on our front doorstep. In my opinion the menace must be removed. To remove it, world war III may have to be risked—and, for myself, I am prepared to take that risk. But the decision is not mine. It rests with the President of the United States."

Being a realist, Mr. Farley fully realizes the Nation would be taking a calculated risk by following a more resolute policy on Cuba rather than blowing hot and cold. The liberal elements within his own party cried loud and long over a similar remark made by the late John Foster Dulles. The then Secretary of State said, in effect, that an aggressive foreign policy might take the Nation to the brink of war. This became known, derisively in some quarters, as "brinkmanship."

Firmness in dealing with our cold war enemies whether it is over Berlin, Cuba, or other infected areas in the hemisphere will entail brinkmanship as expressed by both Farley and Dulles; to pursue a policy of softness where risk is ruled out is brinkmanship in the worse sense.

Lamp of Life Must Dim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, a man's love for his mother is the most tender of sentiments expressed in our cold, hurly-burly, rushed society of today. I am most impressed by the devotion and feeling that Mr. Giragi's words emphasize in this column on the death of his mother:

LAMP OF LIFE MUST DIM

(By Columbus Giragi)

The lamp of life must burn out.

December 28, 1873, on the isle of Sicily, such a lamp was lighted for Sarah Fiorello.

It went out, as she slept, in Phoenix, Ariz., March 14, 1963, in the land she loved.

Mrs. Sarah Fiorello Giragi has gone to her reward.

May her soul sublimely glow, for all eternity, in the realm of God's love, as she will in the hearts and memories of those she leaves behind.

Her lamp has burned out but no darkness shall dim the light she leaves shining in their book of memory.

A devoted mother, a devout daughter of God, she was ever reliable, in austerity as in abundance.

By nature, at times under stress of necessity, always by ambition, she never shirked her duties.

Years ago, when housewives gathered to visit—or fashion a burial garment for a departed friend, with a white or gold cross on a sleeve or across the bosom—she often did needlework.

On her own gleaming pillowcases, in beautiful thread lettering:

"I slept and dreamt that life was beauty.
"I waked and found that life was duty."

Advanced age, relentless though without illness or pain, took its toll of the mortal body.

Experts, trained in the profession of medicine, and in caring for the ill and the aged, dedicated to protecting and prolonging life bow, reluctantly, to the inevitable.

Helpless, sad, deeply hurt, children stand by, and suffer.

Her tenderness and devotion dwell in minds which wonder why it must be so, why the flickering lamp is beyond their helpfulness.

She gave them life, constant care, fitness for earthy tenure, and love that never faltered, love that knew no bounds.

She was soothing sanctuary when the tempests and tragedies of life raged and struck.

Someone wrote a brief fable about an errant youth becoming enslaved in the clutches of a cruel woman who, in her wickedness, one night demanded he bring her the heart of his mother.

Returning on his evil errand, to the iniquitous disgrace to womankind, trudging through the storm with his mother's bleeding heart in his hands, he stumbled and fell into the gutter.

The heart, lying in the street, asked tenderly:

"Did you hurt yourself, son?"

There is nothing on this earth deserving of rank above a mother's love.

The angelic sight of a happy child is dwarfed by the light in the eyes of a mother beaming upon that happiness.

It seems only a mother can know the bliss which blooms in that Garden of Joy.

I have seen my mother enjoying such bliss.

Its extent and fulgency can be only surmised by any boy, by any youth, by any man.

Those are the times never to be forgotten. I will remember.

Unable to adequately assemble the words, I must turn to the famed Avis Turner French:

"I know I shall remember while I am growing old, how much she loved the starlight, the hills, the sunset's gold. The way she had of laughing just over little things. She graced the years with beauty because her soul had wings.

"I know I shall remember the songs she often sang. Her voice was pure as crystal, like bells that softly rang. The way she always kissed me was always sweet to know. She was so dear, my mother, who loved me, long ago."

Eternal happiness, reward for a lifetime devoted to God and helpfulness, is the promise to mankind.

Sometime, somehow, may she again know the happiness when those she loved and served on earth can gather about her "at the river, which flows by the throne of God."

Now she belongs to Him she worshipped, and to loving, consecrated memories.

She taught that the will of God ever be accepted.

All should accept, though it be in the darknes of sorow, heartache, and tears.

Solace is not abundant in this grief, but suffering is dulled by kind fellowmen who tender the thought that the mystery of death "at the end of a perfect day" brings rest "to a tired heart."

Official Organ of Communist Party, U.S.A., Reports Test Ban Petitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, concurcurrently with the Disarmament Agency's cloak and dagger propaganda campaign using various scientific and other public names to parrot its test ban line, The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A., reports with satisfaction various test ban petition signing bees which are progress. Between the two groups, presumably the American people are supposed to become sufficiently brainwashed to accept at face value any treaty terms conjured up by in the Agency's dream factory. My own experience with evaluating them for fatal flaws and producing pertinent facts thereunto pertaining indicates one of the rewards is subjecting one's self to the neo-McCarthyism of the leftwing and its allies. The Worker's article printed April 7 is recommended reading for legislators who may be the target of the petitions it mentions.

It is as follows:

[From the Worker, Apr. 7, 1963]

NATIONAL PETITION DRIVE URGES UNITED STATES CONTINUE SEEKING TEST BAN PACT

A petition campaign urging President Kennedy and his administration to "persist in their effort to negotiate an effective test ban treaty with the Soviet Union" is underway throughout the country.

The petition has been signed by 29 noted Americans including Norman Cousins, Benjamin Spock, Dore Schary, Norman Thomas, Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Robert Ryan.

It is called Citizens' Appeal for a Test Ban, and states that a test ban agreement is "in the national interest of the United States as well as to the benefit of all humanity."

The petition holds that no agreement is risk proof, but adds:

"Continued unlimited testing and an unrestricted arms race are greater risks than a treaty with assurances of the kind being sought by our negotiators."

The petition lists four benefits of a test ban treaty:

It would lessen the dangers of the arms race;

It would inhibit the spread of nuclear power to other countries;

It would aid in further negotiations toward disarmament;

It would eliminate the danger of fallout.

The petition concludes:

"We pledge our efforts to unite our friends, neighbors, and elected representatives in support of the signing and ratification of a treaty ending all nuclear weapons tests."

The signed petitions will be taken to Washington in a mass mother's lobby on Tuesday, May 7.

The lobby, being spearheaded, will visit Senators to influence them into ratifying a test ban treaty when such a treaty is brought to Congress.

A delegation will also try to see President Kennedy.

Copies of the petition may be obtained from the American Friends Service Committee, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and Women Strike for Peace.

CHICAGO ACTION

CHICAGO.—Thirty-five Chicago area leaders have formed a Committee for a Test Band Treaty and have begun a campaign to win support for a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests now.

A statement by the committee, located at 431 South Dearborn Street, Room 303, stresses its belief that the problem is essentially political rather than technical.

"The Soviet Union and the United States," it says, "have both made substantial compromises from earlier positions, and there is strong evidence that both wish to conclude a treaty.

"Yet many Senators and newspaper editorial writers are against almost any kind of a test band treaty. A recent poll of the Senate shows that only half of the Senators are in favor of such a treaty. Two-thirds of the Senate will be needed for ratification, once it is signed by the administration. The President might not even sign the treaty he wants, because he fears the Senate may not ratify it.

"Much of the opposition to the treaty is based on fear combined with ignorance of the technical facts. Some comes from those who want neither any slowup in the arms race nor any negotiations with the Communists, whether it appears to be in our interests or not. Still others oppose a treaty for politically partisan reasons, hoping to capitalize on public sentiment."

The statement stresses the importance of a treaty in creating a climate for peace, expressing fear that delay may make it impossible to get a treaty until after the next presidential elections because of political considerations.

Among the actions it calls for are wires to President Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and William C. Foster, supporting their efforts for a treaty; wires and letters to Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, EVERETT DIRKSEN, GAYLORD NELSON, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT; petitions of friends and neighbors and resolutions from clubs, organizations, and churches. It offers speakers and literature, and it appeals for funds.

Sponsors of the committee, with organizations listed for identification only, are:

Ruth Adams, Council for a Livable World; Hayes Beall, The Cooperative League of USA; Irving Birnbaum, American Veterans Committee; Bishop Charles W. Brashares, Chicago Area Methodist Church; William O. Brown, Milwaukee Turn Toward Peace.

Also, Rev. Dr. Edgard H. S. Chandler, Church Federation of Greater Chicago; Elmer Gertz, Council of Greater Chicago, American Jewish Congress; Adele Goldstein, Chicago Women for Peace; Chester Graham Madison Peace Center; Father Gerard G. Grant, S.J., United World Federalist.

Also, Carol Halstead, Peace and World Affairs Center of Evanston; Hilton E. Hanna, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO); Charles Hayes, District 1, United Packinghouse Workers (AFL–CIO); David Kelly, Student Peace Union; Maurice Klinger, Council of Greater Chicago, American Jewish Congress.

Also, Lawrence A. Landry, Chicago Area Friends of Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee; Rabbi Ernst M. Lorge, Chicago Board of Rabbis; Frank McCallister, Chicago Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; George R. McCoy, Friends Committee on Legislation; Richard Merbaum, New University Thought; Jay Miller, American Friends Serv-

ice Committee; Rev. Richard N. Miller, Church of the Brethren.

Also, Rosalie Oberman, Chicago Women's Division, American Women's Division, American Jewish Congress; Robert Palter, Hyde Park Peace Center; Richard S. Preston, Chicago Chapter, American Federation of Scientists; Wilfred Reynolds, Peace and Social Concerns Committee, Chicago Area Friends Meetings (Quakers).

Also, Mary Sandbach, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Herman P. Schuchman, National Association of Social Workers; Hugh Schwatzberg, Independent Voters of Illinois (ADA); Sarah Shoreman, North Shore Women for Peace; George Sisler, Church Federation of Greater Chicago; Rev. Ellsworth Smith, Midwest Unitarian, Universalist Conference; Dallas W. Smythe, Champaign-Urban Turn Toward Peace; Henry Wineberg, Voters for Peace; Margaret Woodruff, United Church Women of Greater Chicago.

Gambling in Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a large portion of this Nation's manpower is unemployed, a good many industries operate on marginal profits, prices of numerous goods and services are excessive, our gross national product climbs has not lived up to our expectations, our balance of payments continues to be unfavorable. Clearly, the economy, while not in the midst of a recession, is underachieving, it is not living up to its potential.

The administration, the Congress, the business community, the workingman, the consumer, the taxpayer, all are concerned, all are looking for ways and means to stimulate a lagging economy. The proposed solution receiving the most attention has been the administration's tax reduction reform plan.

They argue that tax reduction would solve all our problems, it would increase demand causing business investment and expansion, greater profits, new jobs, lower prices. Nowhere in the argument, however, is there any realistic discussion of why taxes are currently too high.

Our tax rate is burdensome because Government spending is excessive. The cost of Government is and has been a brake on our economy. The cost of Government is inflationary, it is a part of the cost of doing business. If we are to really stimulate the economy, we must cut unnecessary Federal spending. Cutting taxes while accelerating excessive spending can only result in inflation.

"Gambling in Deficits," an article appearing in the 119th Annual Report 1962 of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., presents a realistic, perceptive, and thoughtful analysis of our economic plight. I urge every Member of Congress to read it.

The article follows:

GAMBLING IN DEFICITS

This section of our 1958 annual report closed with the words "inflation must be stopped, for what is at stake from now on is jobs and the dollar itself as the symbol of America's economic and moral strength."

We are told that inflation has been stopped and that therefore Federal deficits are not dangerous. As proof, the comparative stability of various price indexes is cited. It is also argued that there can't be inflation so long as our productive capacity far exceeds demand.

But perhaps inflation hasn't been stopped. May it not be possible, as is often the case, that overall statistics and generalized statements conceal serious distortions within our economic structure?

During the past several years, for example, there has been a continuous inflation in two of the largest elements of the cost of producing and distributing goods and services; namely, the cost of labor and the cost of Government. At the same time there has been a continuing and disturbing deflation of profit margins. Rising costs and falling profits put relentless pressure on management to replace men with machines in the hope of lowering costs and remaining competitive both at home and abroad. Here surely is at least a partial explanation of the rising joblessness which has now become a matter of national concern.

Washington is quite aware of these simultaneous inflationary and deflationary trends. The remedies it has suggested, however, have tended to be more verbal than concrete. It has talked about "guidelines" for wage negotiations. Whenever the Government has intervened in a labor dispute, the guidelines have more often been breached than honored, notably in the recently paralyzing shipping strike.

Couched in soothing words about balancing the budget in some distant year, reductions and reforms of Federal taxes have been proposed to help profits and boost demand. Not one sentence is devoted officially to the true villain that built our crippling tax structure; namely, the cost of Government. On the contrary, new and rehashed spending programs that would ultimately cost unmeasured and unmeasurable billions have already been presented to this session of Congress. Does anybody seriously believe that a tax cut will so revive consumer demand and profits that the tax revenue at the proposed rates will wipe out the present deficit, plus the added deficit from tax reduction? And would the supposed benefits of the cut cover the costs of the recommended expansion of the welfare state as well?

Even if this tax reduction were based on more than a theory and affected only our domestic economy, there would be great risks involved in enlarging an already enormous Federal deficit. These risks, however, are made far greater because we are also running a sizable deficit in our intentional balance of payments. Such a deficit could continue for many years without threatening our gold supply if there were foreign confidence in the way we handle our fiscal, monetary and labor affairs, and hence complete confidence in the dollar. In the absence of such confidence we must expect continued losses of gold—let us hope not in critical amounts.

Here again, we are given reassuring words, but the fundamentals are not tackled. We continue generous foreign aid, particularly to the uncommitted and underdeveloped nations—yet in most cases such aid has been more than offset by the deterioration of the prices of, and markets for, their exportable raw commodities. One cannot help wondering if we are fighting the battle for foreign allegiance with economic weapons that are not only very clostly but ineffective as well.

Partisanship should play no part in the great debate that is inevitable concerning this tax proposal and our planned gamble in huge deficits. The seriousness of the dollar's position and the plight of the jobless require more than a pleasant lowering of taxes concentrated in favor of those representing the largest number of votes. What is needed is an agonizing reappraisal of our labor policy and laws, of Government spending and of the international balance of payments. When progress has been made in these areas, we can and should tackle the problem of how we can most wisely tax ourselves to pay for the kind of government we really want.

Improvement in Train Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I addressed the House and complained about the type of service being rendered by the Pennsylvania Railroad to passengers between New York and Washington. I called to the attention of the House the overcrowding of passenger trains, the antique equipment being used and the dangerous conditions being permitted by the railroad. While I know that my comments did not bring about the results that I am about to mention, I nevertheless felt constrained to bring to the attention of the House the effort on the part of the Pennsylvania Railroad to improve the service for passengers particularly between New York and Washington, announced in a release from the Pennsylvania Railroad under date of April 3 and in an article in the Washington Post under date of Saturday, April 6, 1963. John B. Dorrance, general manager of passenger sales of the Pennsylvania Railroad, announced that 50 modern stainless steel coaches with completely new interiors will be added to the fleet of Pennsylvania Railroad day-and-night trains between New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington starting in September. It is also my understanding that additional dining cars, mail cars, and express cars are scheduled for rehabilitation during the coming year. Mr. Dorrance has announced that the additional coaches will more than double the number of modern cars in the New York-Washington service. This is indeed good news for the traveling public and is an indication that the railroad is sincerely interested in improving the passenger service for the citizens of this country. I have stated on several occasions that I was convinced that the railroad was trying to drive passengers away and was attempting to discontinue passenger service. This type of action on the part of the railroad is a clear indication that the railroad does intend to continue passenger service and is seri-

ously interested in improving it. Even the railroad will admit it has had inadequate and unsatisfactory accommodations for passengers between New York and Washington. Its desire and positive efforts to correct these conditions certainly deserve notice and commendation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Pennsylvania Railroad, Mr. Dorrance, and the other officials responsible for this change in policy. I am satisfied that a continuation of this progressive policy will go a long way in restoring the confidence of the traveling public in the railroad and thus reduce appreciably the losses now being sustained by the railroad in their passenger service.

I would also like to report to the Congress that as a result of my comments I was privileged to meet representatives of the railroad, headed by Mr. Bart Viviano, assistant vice president. I have been assured by Mr. Viviano and by other representatives of the railroad that every effort will be made to eliminate overcrowding and that a sincere effort on the part of the railroad is being made to improve service. The recent action of the railroad would seem to confirm Mr. Viviano's assurances.

I believe, Mr. Spreaker, fair play dictates that having openly criticized the Pennsylvania Railroad, I now bring to the attention of this Congress the efforts on the part of the railroad to remedy the situation which prompted my criticism.

Laxities, Illegalities, Flagrant Abuses in U.S. Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General of the United States, in his reports to the Congress, has disclosed innumerable instances where business firms in concert with, or independent of, Government procurement officials, have extorted countless millions of dollars out of U.S. taxpayers.

Our Government procurement programs are riddled with flagrant violations of law. There exists a combination of utter incompetency, negligence, and civil and criminal conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, the following are three briefs extracted from the reports of the Comptroller General issued on March 29, 1963.

HAZELTINE CORP. UNJUSTILY ENRICHED BY $428,800

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. designed and developed the Navy's WF-2 attack early warning airplane. In November 1958, and January 1959, Grumman subcontracted with Hazeltine Corp. for the production of spare parts and modification kits for the WF-2's airborne radar system. The contract was issued under the provisions of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract which had been awarded to Grumman for the production of the WF-2 aircraft by the Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy.

In his report to the Congress, the Comptroller General disclosed that the purchase orders issued to Hazeltine by Grumman under this contract, totaled more than $3,050,000.

The GAO found that the prices negotiated for these purchase orders were $428,800 greater than needed to cover the costs Hazeltine could reasonably expect to incur. Even though the purchase order awards were under the surveillance of the Navy, the Comptroller General found no evidence whatever to indicate that the Navy questioned the prices agreed upon by Grumman and Hazeltine. As a consequence, the padded prices agreed upon by Grumman and Hazeltine were passed on to the Government under Grumman's cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract with the Navy.

The GAO pointed out that had the Navy or Grumman obtained and studied Hazeltine's most recently experienced costs or vendors quotations before the formal purchase orders were awarded, the overstated charges to the Government of $428,800 could have been avoided.

The Comptroller General cited a number of specific instances wherein a study of Hazeltine's cost data would have permitted the Government to avoid these excessive costs:

(1) Hazeltine's proposal included estimated material costs of $1,511.10 for each of 29 radar receivers. At the time Hazeltine prepared its proposal, it had cost information which indicated that it had incurred material costs of only $1,071.66 a unit for producing the exact same radar receiver under a previous purchase order.

(2) Prior to preparing its price proposal, Hazeltine obtained a price quotation of $1,926 for each of 18 computer assemblies. However, in pricing out the 18 computer assemblies in its proposal, Hazeltine included an estimated cost of $2,145 for each unit.

GAO's review disclosed that Hazeltine's proposal to Grumman included cost allowance of over $14,100 for items which had not even been ordered and for costs which would not be incurred.

It was also discovered that Hazeltine's price proposal included an estimated cost of $7,800 for certain components of the frequency modification kits, none of which were either ordered by, or delivered to, Grumman.

The Comptroller General, during the course of his review, found that "Hazeltine's comments to the GAO were directly contradictory to Hazeltine's representations to Grumman."

Mr. Speaker, under Grumman's cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract with the Navy, it undertook the responsibility of awarding subcontracts at reasonable prices. It is evident that Grumman, by failing to adequately review Hazeltine's price proposal, did not properly discharge these responsibilities.

Neither is it reasonable for Hazeltine to retain the $428,800 it acquired through failure to disclose and by cost padding.

The Department of the Navy, having failed to adequately review its procurement procedures on this contract, must take such action as is necessary to obtain full recovery of Hazeltine's unjust enrichment.

AIR FORCE NEGLIGENCE IN BOEING-WESTINGHOUSE CONTRACT

On April 10, 1959, the Air Force Air Materiel Command awarded a contract to the Boeing Company for the production of Bomarc interceptor missiles, weapon support equipment, and related spare parts.

The incentive type of contract used in this procurement provides for the contractor and the Air Force to agree, prior to production, on an estimate of costs to be incurred. This is the initial target cost, and an initial target profit is determined by applying an agreed percentage to such costs. Any overstatement of target costs proportionately increases the contractors target profit.

The Comptroller General, in his review of this contract, disclosed that the Government will incur unnecessary costs of about $404,500 in the form of unwarranted profits because:

(1) Westinghouse, to which Boeing had subcontracted a portion of the contract work, quoted prices to Boeing that were based on cost estimates that were higher than those justified by its most recent experience;

(2) Boeing, without adequately reviewing this price, included it in its proposed initial prime contract target price; and

(3) The Air Force not only accepted Boeing's proposed price for the subcontracted items without adequate review, but also allowed target and incentive profits to be based on this price although the subcontract price was only tentative and was subject to redetermination.

The GAO clearly pointed out that, at the time of negotiations on the prime contract, later and more reliable cost data were available to the prime contractor—Boeing—which showed that actual costs experienced under prior purchase orders were substantially lower than the amounts proposed by the subcontractor. Boeing should most certainly have considered this in negotiations with the Air Force.

The following examples by the Comptroller General indicate the extent to which Westinghouse padded their materiel costs:

(a) GAO's computation, based on previous purchase orders for identical equipment, showed that unit materiel costs for antenna subassemblies should have been $5,976 rather than the $10,948 proposed by Westinghouse.

(b) GAO's computations showed that the unit materiel costs for receiver/transmitter subassemblies should have been $3,232 rather than the $9,196 proposed by Westinghouse.

(c) GAO's computations showed that the unit materiel costs for control unit subassemblies should have been $2,085 rather than the $5,042 proposed by Westinghouse.

Mr. Speaker, Boeing failed to evaluate the reasonableness of the bases on which the materiel estimates were established or to relate the proposed materiel prices to known materiel cost data available at Westinghouse.

The Air Force negligently accepted these prices without change.

Mr. Speaker, the profiteering of the civilian contractors in this case could not have been possible had the Air Force

carried out its responsibility to review the detailed support of Boeing's cost proposal, and to review Boeing's procedures for satisfying itself that the subcontract costs in its proposal were based on the latest available cost data.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY WASTES $1.2 MILLION IN FIRE EXTINGUISHER PROCUREMENT

Mr. Speaker, in his report to the Congress on March 29, the Comptroller General disclosed that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers incurred unnecessary costs of more than $1.2 million in the procurement of new, higher priced, portable fire extinguishers.

The Comptroller General charged that the Army authorized wide usage of these new high-cost fire extinguishers without properly evaluating the benefits to be obtained in relation to the increased costs involved. As a result, large numbers of the new type extinguisher were procured and issued for use even though a subsequent study indicated that substantially less expensive extinguishers would have been adequate.

This new type of extinguisher was adopted by the Army in May 1959, for use in fighting liquid-fuel and electrical fires. A Corps of Engineers report on the new extinguisher stated that its estimated cost was the same as the cost of the item replaced.

Mr. Speaker, it is a proven fact that the average procurement cost of the new extinguisher was $20.19 compared with a cost of $13 for extinguishers identical to those already in use.

By October 1959, the Corps of Engineers had decided to replace 16 other fire extinguisher models with the new type of extinguisher without evaluating the benefits to be obtained in relation to the relatively high cost of the new extinguisher.

Mr. Speaker, had the Corps of Engineers continued to use the completely adequate current models, their procurement costs for the 102,678 extinguishers in question would have been $849,147. The Army chose, however, to purchase the new extinguishers at a cost of $2,073,295, which represented wholly unnecessary excess costs to the Government of $1,224,148.

The Comptroller General pointed out that a fundamental management failure occurred in this procurement, in that a program was adopted and allowed to proceed without followup evaluations to assure that the costs involved were warranted in relation to the actual benefits obtained. A timely comparison of planned costs with the actual costs being incurred would have shown at a much earlier date the need for a critical review of the program. Had this review been made, a substantial part of the excess cost could have been avoided.

Mr. Speaker, the collusion and connivance between U.S. procurement officials and business firms has reached alarming proportions.

The Comptroller General's reports themselves cannot cure this evil. There must be a fixing of responsibility and accountability; appropriate disciplinary action by all departments; and a strict enforcement of the applicable civil and criminal laws.

All the criminal laws written will not deter crime or protect the public interest without effective enforcement agencies, procedures, and actions. These abuses can only be deterred by making examples of the offenders.

The repeated shocking losses and wastages in our military procurement clearly indicate that the present corrective measures being taken by our responsible officials are inadequate and ineffective.

Early Showdown in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my address to the House on April 12, 1962, "Monroe Doctrine versus Khrushchev Doctrine," I outlined a plan of action to meet the crisis in the Caribbean. The principal point in this program was a showdown in Cuba, with the liberation of its people from alien dictatorship and restoration of constitutional government.

Since that time, the spread of revolutionary movements in the Caribbean region has accelerated to the extent that the Presidents of Central American countries, Panama, and the United States met at San Jose, Costa Rica, for consultation on means for meeting the threat.

Thus it is heartening to read a thoughtful article by David Lawrence in March 26, 1963, issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., calling for an early showdown on Cuba.

The article follows:

FOR AN EARLY SHOWDOWN ON CUBA—U.S. ACTION TO END SOVIET FOOTHOLD IN THIS HEMISPHERE CALLED NECESSARY

(By David Lawrence)

Will the United States permit a complete Communist takeover of Central and South America similar to what has already happened in Cuba?

One by one, the Latin American countries are currently being subjected to the most intensive penetration by the Soviet Government. What is the answer?

It will be of no avail to blame a preceding administration. There is an unfortunate tendency in Washington nowadays to condone evil by enumerating mistakes of the past, as if these furnish an alibi for present errors or neglect of duty.

The problem is really nonpolitical. It is every day becoming more difficult to handle. Billions of dollars are being taken away from the taxpayers of the United States annually to support so-called foreign-aid programs on all continents. Almost everyone familiar with the situation agrees that financial aid of some kind from the United States is essential to thwart the Communist intrusions in the internal affairs of various countries to the south of us. When the United States lends or gives money to another country, however, the Washington Government cannot exercise complete control over what happens to such funds.

The spread of communism in Latin America is due largely to economic conditions that have long prevailed there. Poverty and a low standard of living provide fertile areas for Communist infiltration. Weak governments, influenced by selfish leaders, have retarded progress. Even in a country as friendly to the United States as Brazil has been for the last 150 years or more, there is today a threat of a Communist takeover. Guatemala is also in peril. Argentina and Chile have had their Communist troubles, too. It certainly is time for a much more forceful policy toward Communist sabotage and subversion than the United States has thus far been willing to adopt.

Foreign policy in this field, both under the present and preceding administrations here, has been based on a belief that the Organization of American States can be made to function as a kind of supervisory police body which would employ armed forces in a collective manner. But almost every one of the Latin American countries faces such a serious threat from within that it is doubtful whether any firm policy which really comes to grips with the Communist problem will ever materialize through the OAS. The United States bears the major responsibility, and must go it alone when it becomes necessary. That time has arrived.

It will be argued, of course, that public opinion in Latin America is opposed to any armed intervention by this country, and that the Communists will capitalize on such a step. But although the Latin countries were at first dismayed by the attempted invasion at the Bay of Pigs, many of the leaders of various governments to the south of us now have seen the light and want Cuba freed from the Communist yoke by any means possible.

The United States inevitably has to take the risk of offending the Kremlin, and can adopt the very contention that nations have put forward in the past—respect for international rights. To protect American property by force, if necessary, is a right granted under international law. It involves a decision that has to be made sooner or later. Under the Monroe Doctrine, the United States has maintained that no European power shall be permitted to establish a base or its "system" in this hemisphere. Historical precedent under international law therefore would justify a move to rid Cuba of Communist troops, technicians and subversive organizations as well.

What the United States does or fails to do in Cuba is directly related to the future freedom of all the Latin American peoples. The cry will be raised that intervention could bring on World War III. But a Communist takeover of Latin America, including Mexico, would mean a world war just the same. So it's a question of not what shall be done, but when. All signs today point to a Communist conquest of the Latin countries of this hemisphere if the United States continues to wait for the weak Organization of American States to act, or mistakenly delays action until the Communists have built another wall around all of Latin America just as they have around West Berlin.

Cuba is the natural place for an early showdown with communism in this hemisphere.

Special Captive Nations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to comend our colleagues Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD and Congressman

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI and the many other Members who are dedicated to the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

I support House Resolution 14 which would establish the special committee. This action is clearly in the interests of the United States and will help to fulfill our real responsibility to those persons living under the domination of foreign powers.

There is one additional point that needs to be made and to which I want to give special attention today. It is now evident that Cuba is a captive nation in every sense of the word. We should now add Cuba to the group of nations whose people no longer have the opportunity to determine their own form of government or to participate in the day-to-day procedures of their governing authorities.

As free citizens we in this country must come to recognize that the captive nations as a group constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom.

The international Communist organization has consistently shown that it fears a growing world knowledge of and interest in the captive nations. Advancement of this kind of factual understanding serves to explode the myths of Soviet unity and exposes the true meaning of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout those areas controlled by communism.

We need to do everything we can to bring the facts to all the world. I am proud to give my support to House Resolution 14 and I urge my colleagues to do the same and I respectfully urge on the President of the United States to affirm his support.

The Nurse Everyone Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an excellent pamphlet entitled "The Nurse Everyone Needs," which was published by Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 22 East 38th Street, New York City, in cooperation with the National Association for Practical Nurse Education and Service, Inc., of New York City. The author is Mrs. Marguerite Clark, nationally known medical and science writer who was for 20 years the medicine editor of Newsweek magazine.

Without inserting into the RECORD the entire pamphlet, I am, with the permission of the Speaker of the House, inserting in the RECORD the highlights of the pamphlet. Members of the House will find interesting the facts and figures and information about the training of practical nurses in the United States today.

The material follows:

THE NURSE EVERYONE NEEDS

Of the nurses in the United States today, about 220,000 bear the label "practical." The licensed practical nurse is in demand in hospitals, nursing homes, private homes, public health agencies, visiting nurse agencies, Federal services, doctors' offices, school infirmaries, summer camps, and in industry.

The public image of the early practical nurse as a carpet-slippered Mother Hubbard-clad, "Sairy Gamp" woman-of-all-work, undoubtedly was true in isolated cases. But it is definitely not true of the modern brisk uniformed LPN of today. At that, recognition has not been easy. It has come through the well-planned, energetic, organized effort of State and national nursing organizations.

The practical nurse got her first real chance during the Second World War with its increased demands for well-trained nurses. But even before the war a quiet campaign for formal PN training was underway.

In 1940, at a professional nursing convention in Philadelphia, Hilda Torrop and her associates founded the National Association for Practical Nurse Education and Service, Inc., as a national nonprofit organization to help fill the need for more nurses and to establish better standards for PN education. At that time there were only about 150 practical nursing schools in the United States. Most of them were poorly organized and directed. Standards were low, and few States had licensing laws. Under the vigorous direction of Miss Torrop and other pioneers in nursing administration, practical nursing programs were extended and better training schools were established.

The real break came when practical nursing attracted the interest of the U.S. Office of Education. Vocational schools for PN's were enlarged, new ones started, and a Practical Nursing Education Service was established in the Office of Education, with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In 1956, Public Law No. 911, passed by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower, directed improvement and expansion of the practical nursing program and appropriated $25 million for the work.

Today, there are more than 700 State-approved schools. Every State has a law that governs the licensed practical nurse. Four types of schools offer training facilities: (1) vocational public schools (as part of the vocational or adult educational program); (2) junior colleges, private schools, or universities; (3) hospitals; and (4) private agencies.

There are no approved correspondence courses in practical nursing. Such graduates are not eligible for State licenses because courses by mail cannot include clinical or actual nursing experience with patients, which the students must have.

To make sure that the practical nursing student received proper training in the basic nursing skills needed for daily care of patients, the original LPN training program was divided into two sections:

1. Sixty-four hours of classroom instruction, including how the body is built and works, conditions of illness, mother and baby care, nutrition and special diets.

2. Two hundred and forty fours of clinical care in a convenient hospital where the student puts into practice the things she has learned in the classroom.

Today, the LPN standard training has changed somewhat. The once sharp line drawn between the preclinical classroom period and the clinical period at the patient's bedside in a hospital, has been softened. More and more, the LPN is learning her profession by doing, all through her schooling.

Typical of this modern, efficient LPN education, is that offered at the Hospital for Special Surgery School of Practical Nursing, started in 1955, in the 170-bed orthopedic and rheumatic disease hospital on East 70th Street in New York City.

"Ours is an integrated course of study," said Miss Dean Smith, director of nursing education at the hospital. "We combine clinical and practical training in one overall experience that will make quite clear to the student exactly what she is being taught and why. * * * Our purpose is to produce the best bedside nurses we can."

The student to be must decide on the kind of school she wishes to attend—vocational, junior college or university, or hospital.

The acceptable age range is wide, from 17 or 18 to 45 or sometimes 50, for both men and women. Male applicants, unfortunately, are scarce despite the fact that men make good LPN's. They are needed, and there are many jobs open for them.

While no special subjects are required for admission, applicants under 35 years of age must have completed 2 years of high school. Some States require high school graduation. Proof of graduation from the eighth grade is accepted for women over 35.

Salaries depend on the part of the country in which the LPN works and on the location, hospital, nursing home, public health agency, or industry. On the staff of a large city hospital, the LPN starts with a salary of $2,500 to $3,000 a year, or even higher. Private duty LPN's earn $10 to $14 for 8 hours. In Government hospitals and health agencies, the pay is higher. Federal civil service appointments in these agencies paid $3,760 in 1961.

"What the practical nurse needs most of all is a stabilization of her role, so she will know exactly where she stands," said Eleanor Gaffney, president of the National Association for Practical Nurse Education and Service, Inc. "Just now, in the hospitals in any one city, we may find policies and varying levels of acceptance of what a practical nurse may do, can do, and should do. This variation exists in spite of the fact that present training programs prepare the practical nurse in the basic sciences, the nursing arts, rehabilitation techniques, pharmacology, and administration of medicine. The true role of the LPN (licensed practical nurse) must be faced squarely and honestly. It is for bedside nursing that she is being trained; it is her greatest job satisfaction, and it is there she is most needed."

Some 25,000 practical nurses will graduate this year, but it is estimated that the current need is for 200,000 every year. With some 27 million patients requiring but not getting longtime nursing care, this need is critical.

"All over the country, there are those in pain, desperate for help, children, old people, mentally ill, crippled, convalescent, victims of accidents and chronically ill, sending out cries for nursing care," said Hilda Torrop.

"At the same time, we have a large and tragic number of unemployed; we have hundreds of thousands of high school graduates looking for jobs, and yet we have a desperate national shortage of nurses. How can you reconcile these opposing factors?"

"The speediest way to eliminate this shortage," said Miss Torrop, "is to get more practical nurses into the field.

"Thousands of young women just out of high school seeking careers, the mature men and women who must find work, these people are magnificent potentials for the vocation of LPN. Just think, 1 year's training, and you have a job for life, one you can

pack in your suitcase and take wherever you want to go.

"The PNs begin and finish their nursing training with the intention of becoming full-time workers," said Miss Torrop. "The turnover is usually less in this group than in any other. PN graduates remain in their work far longer since the women attracted to the program have a need to earn a living.

"Finally, a job is ready for every graduate of a State-approved practical nursing school on the day she gets her certificate. There are no waiting lines."

Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor in a recent compilation on area labor market trends listed 26 areas of "substantial and persistent unemployment" in the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. All of these 26 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment in these 3 States are within the power marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration.

If the subsidized Federal power now being marketed by Bonneville at an annual loss of $15 million has not brought full employment and prosperity to the area wherein they now operate, one can understand the reluctance of southern Idahoans to have Bonneville extend its marketing area in their direction.

The following editorial from an Idaho newspaper points out why "BPA—Not For Idaho":

[From the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post Register, Oct. 21, 1962]

BPA—NOT FOR IDAHO

In an Idaho political campaign distinguished of late by dramatic irrelevancies, Secretary of Interior Udall at least performed a service in his east Idaho visit this week in putting a major issue in profile.

Should or should we not bring Bonneville Power Administration power into southern Idaho?

It at least put such profundities as whether the Twin Falls High School band should welcome Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON in the background.

Secretary Udall says we definitely should. His contention mostly revolves around the potential of cheap power in stimulating the economy and attracting new industry.

However, Idahoans should think through this proposal most thoroughly because instead of opening new thresholds of industrial development it would undoubtedly slam the door on the real course of Idaho progress—water development.

The low offered rate of BPA power, disguising the costs behind it, which taxpayers must bear, would simply put reclamation out of business. Private or Federal projects like the Palisades Dam, Burns Creek or Teton Dam, simply could not compete with BPA power. And we will have to recognize more and more that power is the indispensable handmaiden of irrigation, flood control, and recreation development. As a consequence, Idaho would be denied these multiple-purpose projects, the right to store water where it can best be stored, in the upper watersheds.

It must also be remembered that BPA power would have a limited market for all of this expensively wrought power. It can only be sold to REA's, municipalities and other public power platforms. How many are there of these in southern Idaho? What portion of the market does it represent? And yet we would build transmission lines at $25,000 per mile across the length of Idaho for this misplaced objective. Cheap power?

BPA, of course, has been losing impressive amounts of money because it has been unable to sell its secondary or dump power. New dams being projected on the Columbia plus the California intertie program may be the combination for saving BPA—but not Idaho.

What we need is more taxable industries, as Secretary Udall indicated in his east Idaho presentation, but not the way Mr. Udall prescribes.

The real path to industrial development in Idaho lies in a revision of the tax structure which at best is disillusioning to industrial prospectors, in developing our river the traditional way, and in captializing on every natural resource that we can.

Secretary Udall says the decision on whether BPA power should be expanded into Idaho rests solely with him. Fortunately, the decision on appropriations for the staggeringly expensive transmission lines rest with Congress.

National Draft Goldwater Committee Formed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday Morning, April 8, 1963, the National Draft Goldwater Committee announced its formation and plans for the ensuing presidential campaign. I believe that their statement of purpose is consistent with the highest ideals of our Republic and the political processes therein and I would like to include their statement in these remarks.

It is noteworthy to call attention to one particular quote from the statement which was made by Peter O'Donnell, national chairman. He told the press conference:

We must not give up the advantages to be derived from a contest simply because cries of unity are being made.

This statement indicates an understanding of the political process which is absent in the comments of those who fear contest or controversy. In a truly competitive race for the Presidency, the Republican Party will be strengthened and not weakened. Of course, it is the hope of the conservative majority in the Republican Party that they will come out of the 1964 Republican National Convention with the nomination of a conservative rather than a liberal candidate. From my point of view, I see nothing wrong with the majority wanting to see to it that a candidate who represents the majority thinking is their standard bearer.

The statement by the newly formed committee is as follows:

NATIONAL DRAFT GOLDWATER COMMITTEE FORMED

The National Draft Goldwater Committee has been formed to mobilize the tremendous, spontaneous enthusiasm for Senator GOLDWATER that is sweeping the country. Americans everywhere, by the tens of thousands, are anxious to take an active, personal part in assuring his nomination and election.

A Washington headquarters will be opened in the near future. In the meantime, your correspondence is invited and your contributions are urgently needed and we ask you to mail them to the National Draft Goldwater Committee, P.O. Box 1964, Washington 25, D.C.

Officers of the organization will be: Chairman, Peter O'Donnell, Jr., Republican State chairman of Texas; cochairman, Mrs. Ione F. Harrington, Republican national committeewoman for Indiana; Secretary, Mrs. Judy Fernald of Upper Montclair, N.J., immediate past cochairman, Young Republican National Federation; Treasurer, J. William Middendorf of Greenwich, Conn., New York stock broker and member of the Connecticut Republican Finance Committee.

The names of other people associated with the committee will be announced at a later date.

The purpose of our national office will be to coordinate this citizen's movement which is springing up all over the country and to encourage and channel the efforts of all volunteers who want to help Senator GOLDWATER. Working with the GOLDWATER State chairmen in each of the 50 States, we will service local Draft Goldwater Clubs with campaign material and make suggestions from time to time for effective grassroots activity.

We want to make clear that we have not consulted Senator GOLDWATER about forming this committee. We take him at his word when he says that his present intention is to run for reelection to the Senate next year. But we are confident that when Senator GOLDWATER has seen tangible expressions of support—petitions, wires, letters, and contributions from men and women all over this country, he will respond to that call to duty in the same selfless spirit which led him to serve our country so ably in the Air Force and the U.S. Senate.

Senator GOLDWATER offers the Republican Party a marvelous opportunity. In GOLDWATER, the Republicans can nominate a man who can be elected President in 1964. In addition, he will help in the election of numerous Congressmen who will enable the Republican Party to gain control of the House of Representatives.

To take the proper course of action, we need to think anew and act anew as befits a new situation. Heretofore in national politics, the Southern States have provided the Democrats a built-in advantage by giving their electoral votes to the Democratic nominee, whomever he may be. Today, the situation is changed. Now we have a candidate to run on the Republican ticket who can convert a past weakness of the Republican Party into a great strength by sweeping these Southern States, but this is only possible with the candidacy of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. In addition, he will carry most of the border States and the dependable Republican States of the Midwest, Rocky Mountains, eastern central area, and northern New England. The key to Republican success lies in converting a weakness into a strength and becoming a truly national party.

It is to be expected that a contest will develop for the Republican Presidential nomination. This is a good thing because this contest will strengthen the Republican Party in several ways.

First, it will attract national attention to our candidates over an extended period of time, up to and through the national convention.

Second, it will publicize the Republican position on the important issues of the day.

Third, it will attract more people into our Republican primaries and conventions.

The Republican Party suffered from the lack of contest in 1960, while the Democratic Party was strengthened by the contest for the nomination. We must not give up the advantages to be derived from a contest simply because cries of unity are being made.

We think the American people want a clear-cut choice between the New Frontier of the Kennedy's and Republican principles of free enterprise, fiscal responsibility, sound government, and a firm foreign policy, so well exemplified by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. The opportunity for providing that choice is now open to the American people by the nomination and election of Senator GOLDWATER. Americans for GOLDWATER, let us hear from you.

Salinger Uses Trial Trick To Strike Back at Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Lauderdale News has published a particularly noteworthy editorial on New Frontier news management practices, focusing attention on the tactics of White House Press Secretary Salinger and rebutting administration denials of efforts to manage news with some contradictory official pronouncements that have not yet been explained.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by William A. Mullen:

SALINGER USES TRIAL TRICK TO STRIKE BACK AT PRESS

Some of the more successful criminal lawyers will agree that one of the best ways to win a case is to try everybody but the defendant. We have observed this on more than one occasion, as witnesses were subjected to acrimony, and innuendo was employed to suggest that the prosecutor has political ambitions.

The neat trick involved is to divert attention from the accused and direct it at the accusers to win sympathy and to confound the jury.

Now it appears that the Presidential Press Secretary, Pierre Salinger, has taken a page from the primer on courtroom antics and that he is endeavoring to control, or manage, the direction of this controversial and extremely important issue by pointing an accusing finger at the accusers.

No one can accuse Salinger of being timid in the matter, for he chose no less an occasion than speaking before the Women's National Press Club luncheon at Washington, Friday afternoon to press his counteroffensive.

The gist of his point was that the administration does not manage the news, but that some newspaper editors do by publishing untrue or slanted stories. By raising doubt over certain editors without naming them specifically, thus avoiding potential libel, Salinger leaves the impression that all newspapers are not to be trusted, since no one is quite certain about those he had in mind.

He qualified any concession as to the objectivity of the news wire services by saying the news "is being managed fairly by the news organizations," but adding that these have had many lapses recently. The choice of his verb, managed, is quite adroit, since it's not certain whether he meant they are handling the news fairly, or controlling it fairly.

Salinger also referred to the Billie Sol Estes case as an example of press news management and the emphasis given of Democratic association with the scandal over any Republican share of the blame. He did not identify the paper. But it was the New York Herald Tribune, whose White House subscription was cancelled by the President as a result of the incident.

As far as we can determine, Salinger made no mention at the luncheon that the administration minimized, or sought to minimize, the Estes scandal at the outset. Moreover, as we recall it, the affair, made possible by the complexity and enormity of Federal management of agriculture in the first place, was not revealed by Government officials.

We also recall that an Agriculture Department secretary, attempting to protect highly important files of her boss, wound up being committed as a disturbed mental patient.

Moreover, Salinger's pointing a finger at the press is not new. About a month or so ago, he stated that managing editors manage the news every day by deciding the content of newspaper editions. A choice must be made, because the volume of news is many times greater than available space and selectivity must be exercised.

We do not rise to the defense of the newspaper industry en toto because there are some offenders in its midst. But it is not all bad, as Government is not all bad.

If there is an impression created in Washington that Government censors take reporters by the ear and manage the news, that is dead wrong and surely beneath the abilities of politicians who manage to rise to the Capital scene.

There is no need for such crudeness. News management on the part of official Washington is deceivingly simple. Since it is the source of the greatest volume of news in the world, it can control that news by two simple expedients:

First, generate so much news that the facilities for handling it and for publishing it are overtaxed. Such preoccupation restricts foraging into other areas of the news realm. Thus, conduct and policy in the areas often escape full attention because of this attrition, manage to remain outside scrutiny unless or until they boil to the surface and draw attention by the nature of their own affairs.

Secondly, the President is the world's greatest individual source of news and object of news interest. What he does and says, or what he does not do or say, generates news. As the President controls his role in these actions, he also controls the nature of the news resulting therefrom.

To cite a most recent example: At his press conference Wednesday, the President discussed his conference with Central American Presidents at Costa Rica and was asked if the conference had sought stronger sanctions against Cuba than the United States wanted.

He said that was untrue, which it no doubt was. However, the public may have forgotten that in the previous week and on the eve of the conference, the United States made it known that it would not accept stronger measures against Castro at the conference.

That served notice on the Central American Presidents and presumably narrowed the discussions to less volatile censure of Cuba and more emphasis on American foreign aid to the isthmus nations. If the preopening statement had not been issued, the conference may have taken a different tack. Who knows?

We presume the press secretary has an explanation for this and for the statement no Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs operations, yet names of four pilots eventually came out; the October 15 Washington press briefing that Cuba had only defensive weapons and the October 16 confirmation of missiles on the island; the President's warning there would be a recession if taxes are not cut, then his statement there would be no recession this year.

Add to these the favorable unemployment figures released just before election, and the corrected figures announced afterward. And let's not forget that it was Arthur Sylvester, Deputy Defense Secretary for Public Information, who claimed Government had the right to manage the news and to lie.

Chairman Evins Addresses Independent Dairies—Urges Support for President's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today the Nation's Capital has as its guests the members of an outstanding small business organization, the National Independent Dairies Association.

This group is holding its sixth annual convention here in Washington, and at a luncheon yesterday, its members were privileged to hear an address by the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, our distinguished colleague, Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee.

During the course of his remarks, Chairman EVINS detailed some of the important advantages to be gained by small business if the President's tax proposals can be adopted. He urged the members of the National Independent Dairies Association, as well as all other independent small businessmen, to support these proposals.

Chairman EVINS described the President's tax proposals as one of the greatest single actions that can be taken at this time to provide immediate assistance to small business.

I am sure that the statement of Chairman EVINS will be of interest to all of the Members of the House, and I am, therefore, asking that it be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT DAIRIES' ASSOCIATION, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, APRIL 8, 1963

I

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Independent Dairies' Association, and

friends, certainly I am pleased and delighted at the opportunity to meet with you today.

I appreciate the kind remarks of my good friend, Lynn Paulson. They are flattering, but I assure you undeserved.

Let me return the compliment by paying a tribute not only to Lynn but also to our friends here in the audience who are members of this great organization.

II. COMPLIMENTS COUNSEL AND ASSOCIATION

I want to tell you that your general counsel, Lynn Paulson, is one of the most dynamic and effective trade association representatives in Washington. His contacts with Members of Congress are effective. He gets the job done and he is always doing a good job in your behalf. He is an old timer around these parts—and I might add with a New Frontiersman's outlook.

The members of your association have achieved virtual perfection, as you provide a grateful citizenry with the cleanest, most nutritious, and most wholesome product to be found anywhere in the world, milk.

You are engaged in a business where the profits are too low and the risks too high.

You are in a business where you must meet the competitive power of some of the largest economic giants in the entire United States.

We all appreciate the importance of small business to our economy and I believe our small independent dairies represent one of the finest segments of all small business enterprises. You are doubly important.

You are not only a group of small businessmen who have fought courageously and relentlessly to keep your industry from becoming monopolized by a few big companies but you are also the purveyors of a commodity that is literally vital to our people.

On one thing all persons agree, That of all foods known there is none more important to the health of the individual than milk.

It is the sustaining food of infants, growing children, youths, young men, full-grown adults, and the aged.

The products of your industry nourish not only the sick and disabled but also the toughest and healthiest and huskiest of athletes. I don't exactly know into which one of these categories I belong; but, one thing I do know, we at our house buy our milk only from the small independent dairies.

I am sure that there must be a high degree of satisfaction to the people in your industry to know and to realize that you are engaged in such a beneficial type of enterprise, and that your contribution to the welfare of your community is immense. It is indeed unmatched by nearly any other type of commercial activity.

So, you have these rewards. On the other hand, we know that the members of your industry also have your problems.

Barriers and obstacles have been placed all too frequently along the competitive trail which you must travel.

I refer particularly to the character of the competitive forces and practices with which you have been compelled to compete and to contend—price discriminations, boycotts, loss-leader sales, corporate mergers, conspiracies, and other forms of unfair competition.

Abe Fortas, a well-known antitrust attorney, tells the story about a small independent dairyman fighting a giant in your industry in an FTC proceeding involving the Robinson-Patman Act. A small dairyman was being cross-examined. This independent testified that the respondent had not made available to him advertising allowances which were offered to his large competitors. The attorney asked the dairyman, "And have you suffered as a result?" With a sad look on his face, the little dairyman summed up the situation in these words, "Mr. Lawyer, how would I know? I suffer so much."

Lynn Paulson has acquainted me and the members of our Small Business Committee, from time to time, with the problems and sufferings of your industry and he has indicated that they have been plentiful.

I believe the worst of the storm, however, is over and that you can now look forward to a less turbulent era of competitive coexistence.

III. ANTITRUST LAWS—AGENCIES FOLLOW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) *Subcommittee established*

As you gentlemen well know, the House Small Business Committee, during prior sessions of Congress, established a special subcommittee concerned exclusively with the problems of the dairy industry.

The committee investigations and hearings were conducted in Washington and throughout the country in the interest of fair competition and of maintaining the competitive position of members of the Independent Dairies Association.

The chairman of this subcommittee was our distinguished colleague, Congressman TOM STEED of Oklahoma. We of our committee feel that as a result of his work we have helped to bring about a better climate and helpful developments for your industry.

(b) *FTC actions*

The Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice are following through on the recommendations of our committee. For instance, following the Small Business Committee hearings in Dallas in 1957, formal complaints were issued by the Federal Trade Commission against two giant members dominant in the dairy industry.

About 1 month after the committee hearings in Denver in 1959, the Commission issued a formal complaint against one of the dominant members of the industry doing business in that area.

The company allegedly was competing unfairly by discriminating in price.

(c) *Supreme Court action*

Less than 2 months ago the Supreme Court made it clear that the sale of milk below cost by a national dairy chain when made with the intent to injure competition, was illegal and in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

This recent and far-reaching decision, incidentally has breathed new life into this particular statute, and it portends other and further vigorous action to preserve our free enterprise system and promote competition, by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

(d) *Loss-leader selling*

Another matter of concern to your industry and your association is loss-leader selling. I have in mind the practice of using milk as a loss leader.

I believe this is one type of merchandising that we could do without.

It is harmful to small business. The Supreme Court has told us that it is deceptive to consumers, commenting that "it plays on the gullibility of customers by leading them to expect what generally is not true; namely, that a store which offers such an amazing bargain is full of other such bargains."

As you know, the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits the sale of goods at unreasonably low prices or below cost when it is done with the intent to injure a competitor. This is a criminal statute which the Supreme Court just recently told us is entirely constitutional and enforcible. The Antitrust Division, therefore, as a result of this decision, is now in a position to deal more effectively with the loss leader problem than previously.

The Supreme Court's decision seems to point the way for more relief for your industry in the future from the very harmful practice of loss leader selling.

The Department of Justice has recently announced that a grand jury had indicted a large chain grocery store and a large dairy organization for conspiring in a price-fixing agreement in violation of the antitrust laws.

I want to add that the evidence in these cases was first developed during the course of hearings by the House Small Business Committee. So we feel our committee has been most helpful.

I know you gentlemen are aware also of the recent decisions of the Federal Trade Commission against one of your giant dairy competitors requiring this company to divest itself of some of the smaller dairies it had acquired.

In addition, this company was told that it may not purchase or acquire any other dairy within the next 10 years.

A similar order against another chain dairy organization was also entered several months ago and a number of similar cases, I am advised, are presently pending before the Commission.

All of these actions, I believe, indicate a renewed vigor to enforce the antitrust laws, prevent unfair competition, with which your companies have been faced in the past, and they portend a climate of fair competition and better opportunity for the future.

(e) *Committee action*

The day-by-day work of the House Small Business Committee serves to promote this climate of fair competition for our small and independent business establishments and to preserve our free enterprise system and the balance of opportunity for all in our country.

(f) *Merger cases*

It is difficult to talk about any aspect of our antitrust laws without thinking of the high degree of concentration and mergers existing in our economy.

One aspect of the corporate merger problem reminds us that normally one of the fruits of owning your own business is the realization and perhaps the hope that after you have operated your business for 25 or 30 years and you are ready to retire, that you could sell your business and receive in one big lump sum sufficient money to insure a comfortable means of living for you and your family during your retirement period.

There is this law, however, section 7 of the Clayton Act, that tends to deprive an independent businessman of this privilege of selling his business just to anyone he might choose.

This law says, in effect, that a company may not buy your business if a lessening of competition is apt to result.

Generally this means that you cannot sell your business to any of the large chain dairy organizations.

I would like to suggest, therefore, if you are entertaining the idea of selling your business, that you look to another small business concern as a prospective buyer.

Present indications are that the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice are not going to permit giant members of your industry to increase their capacity by purchasing independent dairies and thereby lessening competition.

(g) *Failing company doctrine*

Occasionally you hear talk about the so-called failing company doctrine, wherein a big corporation is permitted to buy another concern provided the company is in a failing or bankrupt condition.

Now I feel that I must warn you that this apparent exception in the antimerger statute is a bit deceptive.

This doctrine was applied once in a case by the Supreme Court, but this was more than 30 years ago.

During the years that have elapsed since that decision, the problem of corporate acquisition and mergers has become acute. Conditions have changed.

Two months ago the Federal Trade Commission in a report told us that corporate mergers increased in 1962 over 1961.

This fact, coupled with the present climate, indicates that in the future greater effort will be made to enforce these laws and the courts urged to interpret them more strictly.

I wanted to supplement the advice and counsel given to you by your own able General Counsel, Lynn Paulson, by expressing the belief that the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice may well interpret, in the future, this so-called failing company doctrine very conservatively and very strictly, with the result that the dominant members in the dairy industry are not going to be permitted to buy up small dairy companies unless they are hopelessly insolvent and determined efforts have been made to find other buyers.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

And now may I turn to another matter.

Earlier this year when I announced the designation of subcommittees and outlined the program of work and activities of the House Small Business Committee for the 88th Congress, I made a statement that it was my plan initially to designate only four subcommittees—in addition to the work of the full committee—I made further announcement that, from time to time, as particular problems arose and developed, that I would consider the designation of an additional subcommittee on special small business problems to hold hearings and look into matters singular to particular industries as they might develop.

This continues to be my plan for the work of our committee.

The four subcommittees which I have announced to date include: No. 1, Foundations: Their Impact on Small Business—Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman.

This subcommittee will continue to be concerned with the growth of tax-exempt foundations and whether or not these foundations, operating under a charter of Congress, are being used for and serving a charitable purpose or whether such foundations are being used as a device, scheme, or gimmick to avoid taxes and to compete unfairly against small business.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman; Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee; Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, Republican, of Kansas; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; and Representative RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana.

No. 2, Small Business and Government Procurement—Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, chairman.

With the tremendous amount of Federal procurement, both military and civilian, it vitally essential that small business receive a just and fair and equitable portion of Government contracts and subcontracts. This subcommittee will be concerned with endeavoring to increase the numbers of contracts and the dollar amounts of contract awards of not only defense contracts and civilian procurement but also an increasing amount of awards in the field of research and development.

During the fiscal year of 1962, research and development awards granted to small business by the Department of Defense increased from 2.9 percent for the preceding year to 3.5 percent. However, during the first 6 months of the present fiscal year—that is, from July through December 1962—this percentage declined to 2.7. We hope this declining trend can be reversed.

Since many of these research and development awards lead to the discovery of new processes, new products, many of which become patented, it is especially important that small business be permitted to share fully in this activity.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, chairman; Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Representative H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; and Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York.

No. 3, Taxation—Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, chairman.

This subcommittee will be concerned with helping to write tax legislation and to develop tax policy favorable to small business. President Kennedy has recommended substantial changes in our tax laws. Many of the President's proposals are designed specifically to assist small business.

It is evident that if the President's proposals are enacted into law, American small business will be the principal benefactors.

For instance, corporate income tax rates for small business concerns will drop from 30 to 22 percent, effective January 1.

If your company is not incorporated you could still profit because individual income tax rates would be reduced under the President's proposed legislation now pending in the Congress from 20 percent down to 14 percent.

Should a small independent company earn unusually high profits in any one year, the tax on these higher profits could be paid as if they were earned over a 5-year period.

The new bill proposes that tax treatment of capital gains be altered in such a manner as to benefit especially small business taxpayers.

I believe the President's tax proposal for small business constituted one of the greatest single actions that can be taken to assist small business immediately, and I believe that you gentlemen will want to work with and cooperate with Congressman STEED, the chairman of this subcommittee, as you did in the past on the milk hearings and milk investigations affecting your industry.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative TOM STEED, Democrat of Oklahoma, chairman; Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat of New York; Representative ARCH A. MOORE, Jr., Republican of West Virginia; Representative JOHN DINGELL, Democrat of Michigan; and Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican of New York.

No. 4, Distribution Problems Affecting Small Business—Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, chairman.

This subcommittee will be concerned with marketing and distribution problems and particularly the difficult problem concerning dual distribution whereby a manufacturer sells direct to its own outlets and also to competing independent merchants.

Representative ROOSEVELT and his subcommittee plan to hold a series of hearings, beginning the latter part of this month, covering dual distribution practices in several different industries, such as petroleum, steel, glass, paint, shoes, and perhaps some others as well.

I noticed in your own industry bulletin, following the announcement of our subcommittees and scheduled program, Lynn Paulson advised you that our House Small Business Committee had not for the 88th Congress designated a subcommittee dealing with the problems in the dairy industry.

I have mentioned earlier that it was my feeling that much had been accomplished in this area in previous sessions and that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice are following the recommendations and reports of our committee for action in behalf of your industry.

I also stated, and I am happy to repeat, that I shall be pleased to give consideration to the naming and designation of a special subcommittee for any new or particular problems that may arise in your industry, the dairy industry, should we feel that the facts and circumstances warrant such action.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, chairman; Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Representative ARCH A. MOORE, Jr., Republican, of West Virginia; Representative JOHN C. KLUCYNSKI, Democrat, of Illinois; and Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, Republican, of Kansas.

V. IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS—CONCLUSION

In creating the House Select Committee on Small Business in 1941 at the outbreak of World War II, during the 77th Congress, the Congress made clear its determination to keep itself informed as to whether or not the needs of small business receive adequate consideration.

In passing the Small Business Act of 1958, the Congress demonstrated its continuing interest in small business. In that law the Congress proclaimed:

"It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government (including but not limited to contracts for maintenance, repair, and construction) be placed with small business enterprises, to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation."

This is the declared policy of our country.

Today, 95 percent of all American business enterprises are small business.

Some of these small businesses grow into industrial giants.

Some are family, one-man firms. They live for a while and fade or leave the scene of commercial activity.

Still others operate at about the same level of activity over a number of years, even generations.

Collectively, these small independent businesses constitute a broad-based economy unparalleled in the world.

They provide stability.

They bring new vigor, new ideas to our entire economy.

Because I feel so strongly that small business is vital to the strength and future of our country, I was highly honored by the action of the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Speaker McCORMACK, when at the opening of the 88th Congress, he asked that I serve as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business.

After sober contemplation of the responsibilities entailed, which would be in addition to my already considerable duties as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I consented to fill the post.

This committee over the years has served to preserve our free competitive enterprise system and to help small business not only to exist but to succeed, this during a period of war when small business was mobilized to make a significant contribution to the war effort.

Since that time, the committee has been reestablished by each succeeding Congress.

During the intervening 2 years, the committee has on many occasions proven to be a powerful force on behalf of the American small business community.

During the 88th Congress and for whatever time I may be privileged to serve as chairman of this committee, it is my hope

that we may continue this tradition of aiding small business while also adding new responses to the constantly evolving problems confronting our Nation's small enterprises.

Small business does not exist in a vacuum. Like other segments of our society it is subject to the forces of which it is a part.

Because our Committee works hard to assist small business in matters of financing, securing Government contracts, prevention of absorption of small business by corporate consolidation and mergers, and the promotion of tax and trade policies favorable to small business, we have infrequently been charged by critics who regard these programs as coddling or favoring small business.

They have asked why should the Congress—the supreme legislative body of our Nation, sworn to act in the entire public interest rather than for any particular industry or group—act to help the small businessman.

The answer is because it is impossible to help any segment of our economy without helping all of it.

A thriving small business community contributes to the prosperity of our total national economy.

Equality of opportunity must be present everywhere or soon it will be present nowhere.

Furthermore, there is an even more basic reason for this consideration.

Small independent business of this Nation has a very special function to fulfill.

Small business is creative, dynamic, and flexible. These are the qualities that cause and encourage our economy to thrive and to prosper.

Small businessmen have helped to make our free enterprise system and to help make America great.

We want to preserve and to perpetuate this system and conditions that have made America great.

One of the bywords of this Republic from its earliest days has been e pluribus unum, from many—one, one composite Nation—stronger because it is composed of many diverse parts.

This then is the greatest strength of our country—that we have room for all.

Just as we need the output of our industrial giants, so we must preserve the diversity, the adaptability, the vitality and the creativity of our smaller, independent businesses.

All of us, working together, in a free America, with opportunities open to all, are an unbeatable team in war or peace.

Kennedy Hopeful It's Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this House an excellent article which was written by the syndicated columnist, Andrew Tully, entitled "Kennedy Hopeful It's Rockefeller." It has been obvious for many years that the Democratic strategy is to secure the nomination of a liberal Republican so there will be no true campaign, in the real sense of the word, and no airing of the dirty linen here in Washington. To this end, the liberal press and the various liberal satellites throughout the country repeat over and over the line that a conservative cannot win the Presidency. I suggest that the opposite is the case.

Mr. Tully analyzes the situation and makes a cogent statement regarding the preferences of the current White House incumbent. Naturally, Mr. Kennedy would not want to face a man such as BARRY GOLDWATER who would forthrightly point out the sins of omission and commission of this current administration. It would be much better from the President's standpoint if someone like Governor Rockefeller were the Republican nominee and the 1964 campaign would then be little more than quibbling over the details of socializing the country.

I commend this article to the Members of the House.

KENNEDY HOPEFUL IT'S ROCKEFELLER

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—It may seem a curious thing, but President Kennedy is hoping the Republican nominee for President next year will be the man most experts believe has the best chance to beat him: Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York.

Kennedy's appraisal of the situation, according to insiders, can be put in a nutshell: He thinks it will be much easier going against a so-called liberal such as Rockefeller than against either a conservative or a man who at least can put on a convincing show of being one. Rockefeller is seen as a candidate who is likely to be accused of "me-too-ism," a man who will be unable to create clearcut issues.

Rockefeller lately has assumed a more conservative posture, having nothing to worry about in liberal New York State until 1966. In the Cuban situation, he has been tougher on Kennedy than even Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and has had the expert help of his pal and political debtor, Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, who is a kind of Washington advance man for Rockefeller.

LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE

It is clear at this point that Rockefeller will try to unseat Kennedy from the vantage point of an authentic conservative with discreet liberal appurtenances. He must, if he is going to win any measure of support from the Taft wing of the Republican Party.

But the White House thinks he will fail. In the first place, Rockefeller's strength is in the North, with its liberal majorities. He cannot afford to lean so far to the right that he loses this huge bloc of votes. And though any candidate must come out foursquare for civil rights, this does not always work for the GOP nominee, as Richard Nixon discovered when the Negro vote carried Kennedy into the White House.

Moreover, Kennedy insiders feel Rockefeller will have a hard time winning over the GOP conservatives. Their claim has always been that GOP nominees in the past have looked too much like the Democratic nominee with the result that the voter, with no clear choice, has gone to the Democrats. Only Eisenhower has been an exception in recent years and he was just that—an exception.

REELECTION AIM

GOP conservatives want one of their men as the 1964 nominee. They would give their right arm if it could be GOLDWATER, but GOLDWATER has said he'll run for reelection to the Senate, and at this stage there is no reason to disbelieve him. And, of course, GOLDWATER may be too conservative to win—and he has the added disadvantage, in the view of some, of being part Jewish. This is a shame, but a fact of political life.

Depending on their records from here in Governors Romney of Michigan and Scranton, of Pennsylvania, could emerge as bona fide conservatives, if somewhat paler than GOLDWATER, by the time the GOP convention is convened. It is a good bet that either would be more attractive to the old-line Republican conservatives than the somewhat flamboyant Rockefeller. At least they would not have been around long enough to build up any major doubts about their conservatism, as Rockefeller has been and has done.

IKE A BIG FACTOR

Most importantly, perhaps, is that the White House counts Eisenhower among the conservatives, and Ike has given notice he is going to be very much involved in politics in his role as elder statesman of the party. By and large, the conservatives retain a sneaking admiration for Ike, and they will not ignore his counsel.

That brings it back again to Rockefeller. Rockefeller is not one of Ike's favorite politicians. The Governor was sharply critical of the Eisenhower administration on several occasions and Ike is thin-skinned when it comes to a member of his own party daring to criticize him. Specifically, Eisenhower has not forgiven Rockefeller for the swipes he took at the White House policies before and after the treaty of Park Avenue, in which Rockefeller swung his support to Nixon in return for concessions rendered.

Eisenhower, of course, will support any Republican candidate against "that young man" next year. But he would much prefer his support be given to somebody like Romney or Scranton. Around 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue the preference is for a half-hearted Eisenhower in 1964.

Socialist From Britain Says He and President See Eye to Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a recent news account of the meeting between President Kennedy and Harold Wilson, new Labor Party leader, an avowed Socialist, has a rather interesting comparative reference.

Mr. Wilson, professing to be a Socialist, outlined some of his plans, including the renationalizing of the steel industry, then flatly stated that he and President Kennedy see eye to eye on a number of issues.

While I have never labeled our President a Socialist, an analysis of his legislative recommendations do seem to follow the path a Socialist must follow to socialize this country, and would explain the President's many anticapitalistic actions.

Perhaps Mr. Wilson knows more than U.S. citizens are being told in our managed news environment as to the President's plans and is being prophetic for the future in both Great Britain and the United States.

The article follows:

IF WILSON WINS: SOCIALIST PLANS FOR BRITAIN

What would a Socialist election victory in Britain mean to United States-British rela-

tions? Little change, in the view of Harold Wilson, new Labor Party leader.

Mr. Wilson is the man who would head a new Socialist Government in Britain. He visited Washington in early April, talked with President Kennedy and other top officials. He gave his views to interviewers on the NBC television program "Meet the Press"—taped for showing after his departure:

"Britain needs the United States, the United States needs Britain. But so far as our foreign and defense policy is concerned, * * * the Western alliance is the center of our party.

"On the questions that I discussed this past week with the leaders of the administration, we see eye to eye on a great number of issues, particularly on developing the Atlantic partnership, and I think also on the whole question of developing underdeveloped areas of the world."

Mr. Wilson said that his views and those of his party on world affairs and defense matters are "pretty close, I think, to the Democratic administration. There are certain differences. * * * We support entry of Red China into the U.N."

On Britain's domestic affairs, Mr. Wilson made his policies clear:

"I am a Socialist," he said. "We intend to renationalize the steel industry * * * and also to mobilize new industries, both privately and publicly owned, so we can make a bigger contribution in the world."

The Springfield Armory, Selected by President George Washington as National Armory, Designated as National Historical Landmark by National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week, on April 2, the Springfield Armory in my home city of Springfield, Mass., was officially designated as a registered national historical landmark by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior, under provisions of the Historic Sites Act passed by Congress in 1935. An armory in Springfield produced weapons for Gen. George Washington's Continental Army during the Revolutionary War. Shortly after President Washington's inauguration in 1789, the first Chief Executive and father of our country visited Springfield and subsequently recommended the establishment of a national armory there. Since that time the Springfield Armory has contributed to America's national defense and arsenal of small weapons.

Unfortunately, I could not go to Springfield for this dedication, because the appropriations subcommittee on which I sit was holding hearings, but I did send the following telegram for the occasion:

APRIL 1, 1963.

COL. C. L. P. MEDINNIS,
Commanding Officer, Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.:

Regret cannot join with you personally on this momentous occasion as the Springfield Armory is officially designated as registered national historical landmark, but congressional duties necessitate my remaining in Washington. Ever since President Washington selected and Third Congress approved Springfield as site of national armory, the community and arsenal have grown together in importance, have made innumerable contributions to national security in wartime and to national culture in peacetime. We in Greater Springfield can justly be proud of the Springfield Armory, its history, its tradition, its weapons development in the past and its most recent contribution, the M-14 Springfield rifle. The fact that the M-14 Springfield remains as the Army's standard rifle is testimony to the skills and hard work of the craftsmen and researchers at this arsenal. The armory has had a glorious history and it will also have a useful future as the Army's small weapons research and development center of the Nation. Let it be said on this historic occasion that I am a firm believer in the Nation's arsenal system which has sparked the arming of this Nation in every crisis of its history and has contributed such outstanding weapons as the M-1 Garand and the M-14 Springfield rifle to the national arsenal. However, we must not rest on our laurels. Now is the time for a renewed effort in research and development at Springfield to produce new generations of small weapons so vital to the Nation's defense even in the space age.

EDWARD P. BOLAND
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD newspaper stories telling of the dedication, taken from the Springfield Daily News of April 1, another on April 2, another in the Springfield Union on April 3, an editorial in the Springfield Daily News on April 3, and the address by Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, commanding officer of the Springfield Armory.

The articles follow:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 1, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE BOLAND IN DEFENSE OF THE M14—URGES RENEWED EFFORT IN SMALL ARMS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Springfield, today, on the eve of the official designation of the venerable Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark, spoke out in defense of the arsenal system and particularly its latest product, the M-14 Springfield rifle.

The local representative sees the recently much criticized M-14 Springfield as a fit contributor to a long tradition of military small arms development here.

At the same time, the Congressman, who wrote to Col C. L. P. Medinnis, commanding officer of the gun plant, to say he would be unable to attend the ceremonies, urged that there be a renewed effort in research and development to produce a "new generation of small weapons vital to the Nation's defense, even in the space age."

After expressing his regrets at being unable to attend the landmark plaque ceremony at the armory, Representative BOLAND wrote:

INNUMERABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

"Ever since President Washington selected and the third Congress approved Springfield as the site of the national armory, the community and the arsenal have grown together in importance and have made innumerable contributions to the national security in wartime and to the national culture in peacetime.

"We in Greater Springfield can justly be proud of the Springfield armory, its history, its tradition, its past weapons development and its most recent contribution—the M14 Springfield rifle.

"The fact that the M14 Springfield remains as the Army's standard rifle is testimony to the skills and hard work of the craftsmen and researchers at this arsenal.

"The Springfield armory has had a glorious history and it will also have a useful future as the Army's small weapons research and development center of the Nation.

"Let it be said on this historic occasion that I am a firm believer in the Nation's arsenal system which has sparked the arming of this Nation in every crisis of its history, and has contributed such reliable weapons as the M1 Garand and the M14 Springfield rifle to the Nation's arensal.

MUST NOT REST

"However, we must not rest on our laurels. Now is the time for a renewed effort in research and development at Springfield to produce new generations of small weapons so vital to the Nation's defense even in the space age."

The 10 a.m. dedication event will take place in front of the main administration building, Armory Square, where a permanent bronze marker will be unveiled.

Dr. Murray N. Nelligan of the Department of the Interior will present the plaque and certificate.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 2, 1963]

ARMORY IS ESTABLISHED AS NATIONAL LANDMARK—GUN PLANT ON HILL JOINS MOUNT VERNON AND TICONDEROGA AS HISTORICAL U.S. SITE

Pleasant weather today was a fitting background as the 169-year-old Springfield Armory took its place as a national historic landmark along with Valley Forge and Mount Vernon and other revered places in the Nation.

While some 2,000 gathered in a large semicircle around the flag-bedecked armory administration building, Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, commanding officer of the armory, accepted a Department of the Interior certificate, and a few minutes later John C. Garand, inventor of the M-1, one of the "guns of glory" of the arsenal, unveiled a plaque.

The Interior Department official, Dr. Murray Nelligan, remarked that the ancient gun plant, established by Gen. George Washington, had a right to stick out its much respected military chest since it is to be one of only 350 locations in the Nation deemed important enough in American history to be selected as a landmark.

"The armory takes its place now with Mount Vernon, with Fort Ticonderoga, with Old North Church, and the USS *Constitution*," commented Dr. Nelligan, "certainly a coveted honor which the people and city of Springfield can share."

Introduction of the brief dedication program was made by Colonel Medinnis, who also conducted a tour of the historic spots within the arsenal, ending with a visit to the Benton Small Arms Museum and a luncheon at the officers club for special guests.

After the reading of congratulatory telegrams and letters from Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Representative Edward P. Boland, and Maj. Gen. Nelson M. Lynde, Jr., commanding officer of Army Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill., Colonel Medinnis spoke on the history of the gun plant, its contribution to the Nation's military growth, and its close relation with the city of Springfield over more than a century and a half.

STARTED IN 1777

The armory began with the establishment of a laboratory and depot in rented buildings in 1777, Colonel Medinnis said, Springfield was chosen as the site of a national

armory primarily because of the presence of a considerable number of skilled gunsmiths, blacksmiths, and craftsmen.

General Washington, he said, visited the city shortly after his inauguration in 1789 and, convinced of its potentialities, recommended the establishment of an armory, which was agreed by the 3rd Congress.

"Today this installation," said the commanding officer "is the only manufacturing arsenal which can call itself an armory. The Springfield Armory was so designated from the very beginning and, because of long historical association, the term has remained unchanged."

He then traced the development of small arms, and made note of the presence on the platform with him of Mr. Garand, who was the first designer of a semiautomatic rifle, first issued in 1937.

WAR PRODUCTION

In 1795, he noted, there were 40 people employed and 245 muskets produced at the Armory; in 1864, 276,000 rifles were produced and during World War II, more than 4 million Garands were produced by a peak work force of 14,000.

Springfield Armory is today a member arsenal of the Army Weapons Command with headquarters at Rock Island, and furnishes modern weapons to all elements of the Armed Forces. Commenting on the famous names of those who commanded or worked in the armory, the commanding officer said that the Benton Museum, one of the stops on the tour of the grounds, contains historical mementos of not only the armory but also the saga of American military greatness.

The tour included the main administration building, erected in 1817; the high point of Shay's Rebellion in 1786; the original guard house, erected in 1880, now referred to as "honeymoon house" for newly assigned lieutenants, and the officers club, the oldest building or post erected in 1808.

The main arsenal, officers' row, and watershops area were also visited before the museum and the luncheon program which ended the official phase of the observance.

Visitors included Col. John W. Carroll, commander of Westover Air Force Base; Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Joint Civic Agencies President Bernard H. McMahon, and other community and military leaders.

The plaque placed on the facade of the administration building reads:

"Springfield Armory has been designated a registered National Historic Landmark. Under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1955, this site possesses exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service."

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Apr. 3, 1963]

U.S. LANDMARK TITLE ACHIEVED—ARMORY NAMED HISTORIC SITE AT CEREMONY

The Springfield Armory was formally designated as a national historic landmark at a ceremony at the armory grounds attended by about 2,000 persons Tuesday.

Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, armory commanding officer, accepted a Department of Interior certificate and John C. Garand, inventor of the M1 rifle, unveiled a plaque.

FACILITIES TOURED

Colonel Medinnis recited a history of the armory and conducted special guests on a tour of armory facilities.

The plaque designating the armory as a national historic landmark notes, "This site possesses exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States."

The armory joins Valley Forge and Mount Vernon and some 350 other sites as national landmarks.

Congratulatory telegrams included one from Senator SALTONSTALL, receiving during the afternoon. It said:

"Sorry I could not be with you this morning. Since Revolutionary days, the armory has been a vital part of the Springfield economy and has played an important role in our Defense Establishment. This is an important day for the armory and a reminder of the role which is played in the history of our country and its continuing significance to Springfield."

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 3, 1963.]

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK

Connecticut Valley residents hardly need to be reminded that the U.S. Armory at Springfield is a national historic landmark, but that designation given to the armory yesterday by the Department of the Interior may be a helpful guide to citizens in other parts of the country.

There were some positive reasons for locating the armory at Springfield. Even in colonial times, there were gunsmiths, blacksmiths and other skilled craftsmen in Springfield. There were also some negative reasons. Any site below the Enfield Rapids could be attacked by enemy gunboats, but a location above the navigability limits of the Connecticut River would be safe. West Springfield was then larger than Springfield, and the former used its political influence to keep the armory out of West Springfield, and thus to keep the west side girls out of the ogling range of the armory soldiers.

The armory, with its wartime expansions and its postwar layoffs which flooded the labor market with skilled craftsmen, was largely responsible for Springfield's industrial development. However, the armory's role is not only historic, it is present. The armory is not only the Nation's oldest manufacturing arsenal; it is also today the U.S. Army's principal research and development center and pilot manufactory for small arms.

The Springfield Armory is a national historic landmark, but it is also a vital part of the National Defense Establishment, and of the region's industrial complex. The armory is 169 years old, but it must help the country prepare for the common defense until that day when the potetic prayer of one of the armory's most famous visitors is answered, and the "huge organ" of "burnished arms" gently whispers "peace."

SPRINGFIELD ARMORY BEING NAMED NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK

(Speech by Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, April 2, 1963)

Congressman BOLAND, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, as commanding officer of the Springfield Armory it affords me the greatest pleasure to welcome you this morning to this uniquely historic post for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially designating the Springfield Armory as a registered national historical landmark.

Under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act passed by the Congress of the United States in 1935, the Secretary of the Interior was directed to make a survey of the historic sites of the United States "for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States."

A program for the registry of such landmarks was initiated by the National Park Service some years ago and on December 4, 1961, my office was notified that the Springfield Armory had been designated as such a site.

We are here today for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially marking this designation.

As you are all aware, the Springfield Armory traces its history back to the year 1777 when a laboratory and depot were established in rented buildings in what is now the downtown district of the city of Springfield.

Following the Revolutionary War, all manufacture and repair work was stopped but Springfield was retained as a storage depot for the New England area. President George Washington visited this city shortly after his inauguration in 1789 and, convinced of its potentialities, recommended the establishment of a national armory here. His approval of the local area was adopted as a law by the Third Congress.

Springfield was chosen as the site of a national armory primarily because of the presence of a considerable number of skilled gunsmiths, blacksmiths and craftsmen. The availability of such a great number of artisans prompted Gen. Henry Knox, the then Gen. George Washington's most experienced artillery officer, to recommend Springfield for its march toward history.

Since then, the Springfield Armory and the community of Springfield have been mutually interdependent. The armory attracted additional arms industries to the area, and the supply of competent gunsmiths, in turn, has continued to be an important factor in enabling this post to continue its activity.

The designation of this installation as a registered national historical landmark is a source of considerable pride to all of us in this area. We at the Springfield armory are particularly proud of this recognition for it constitutes a tribute to the leadership and the personnel of past and present years who have had such a great part in shaping the great traditions of this installation.

The names of Superintendents David Ames and Benjamin Prescott, the first leaders of the armory, immediately come to mind since they were the first to formulate the plans which led to the basic foundations of the arsenal system. Then, too, the name of Lt. Col. Roswell Lee, the first of the military commanders here whose name has been perpetuated in the local chapter of the Masons; Maj. J. W. Ripley; Capt. George Dwight; Capt. Alexander B. Dyer; Maj. J. G. Benton for whom the city's Benton Park and this installation's small arms museum have been named—all these are names which have contributed to the history not only of the Springfield Armory but also to the city of Springfield. All these men were particularly outstanding in their work effort and also active in the affairs of the city during or after their service at this installation. Their names have been indelibly recorded, at attested by various parks, streets, and other landmarks bearing their names.

There are still other names of men from the Springfield Armory who have contributed to the march of history.

They are men like Thomas Blanchard who designed a machine for turning gunstocks. This very machine, which is to be seen in the Armory Benton Small Arms Museum, was the forerunner of all modern lathe machines.

There is also the name William R. "Billy" Bull, who as an armory employee, used his marksman's eye to such excellent advantage that he traveled to England and outshot all rifle marksmanship competitors to gain the world title.

Names such as Erskine Allen, James Cranston, and Lucian Bruce were connected with early developments of small arms; while John E. Murphy and Daniel J. Manning were principally responsible for developing the Model 1903 Springfield Rifle, one of the "guns of glory" which saw service from the Walls of China in the Boxer Rebellion to the beginning of World War II.

Still with us today and already a legend for his work in our field is the name of John C. Garand, the inventor of the M1 rifle which

bears his name. He is unique in the fact that his brainchild was he first successful semiautomatic rifle and that much of the machinery he designed for the manufacture of M1 rifle components is still admired and copied by machine-tool and small arms industries. Springfield Armory is honored in claiming him as one of its family.

There is still another side to the Springfield Armory story and this concerns primarily the city of Springfield.

Any historic research into the annals of Springfield would necessarily show the great part this post has played in its history and development. No better illustration of how this is recognized can be cited than the inclusion of the view of the main arsenal here in the seal of the city, which was adopted when Springfield became a city in 1852. The complete seal pictures the town at the time. In the upper part of the seal may be seen the main arsenal just as it appeared then and has existed to this day. Many of you undoubtedly remember the poem "Arsenal at Springfield" written by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

This attention was certainly warranted since the armory's role as an influential social institution in the community is clearly evident when it is realized that most religious denominations established in Springfield were a direct outgrowth of the armory work community.

All denominations, Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, Catholics to number a few, came to life as a result of religious creeds of armory employees. Most of them met as combined churchmen for the first time in either the U.S. chapel—a room in the second floor of the present administration building—or military hall here on post.

Two of the offspring of these early religious groups can be seen today in the Universalist Church and St. Michaels Cathedral.

In addition to the prestige the armory has brought to the city because of its manufacturing activities it is interesting to note that the city and the armory gained prominence from the great national horse show held in Federal Square at this installation in 1856. This was the first show of its kind in the United States and attracted persons from all over this country and Canada.

New England and particularly the Connecticut Valley benefited from the founding of the armory for it was here at this installation that a beginning was made in the development of the fine-crafts industry for which this part of the country is so famous. Furthermore, the armory gained distinction throughout the industrial world by being a pioneer in the development and manufacture of interchangeable parts in connection with rifle production, a feature later adopted by industry as essential for all mass production of fabricated articles.

Honored guests, please forgive all of us at the Springfield Armory, if we appear to be blowing our own horn at this time. The fact of the matter is that we are proud to have our tradition, our background, our accomplishments brought to the attention of the Nation. The pride we have shared in our establishment we are now happy to share with the Nation since it is for this Nation that this Springfield Armory has existed at all.

The registering of the Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark gives due recognition to the important role of this Federal arsenal and this site in the cultural history of the United States.

I would, at this time, like to give full attention to the role played by the U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, for this opportunity in bringing to the attention of the Nation the national significance of this installation. The Department of Interior now becomes a full partner in this event of today.

It is with a deep sense of personal pride, accomplishment and satisfaction that I accept this plaque and certificate in behalf of all Springfield Armory personnel, both past, present and future.

This marker is received in trust for all to commemorate the location of the Springfield Armory in the historic annals of this Nation.

It is our hope that future generations will remember full well the significance of this event.

This plaque and certificate support this objective.

This concludes our presentation ceremony. I want to thank you all for witnessing the event. It is my earnest hope that all of us will remember this dedication in our future thoughts and deeds.

SPRINGFIELD ARMORY NAMED AS NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK ON APRIL 2, 1963

The date of April 2, 1963, will be of double-barreled significance to the Springfield Armory, according to Commanding Officer Col. C. L. P. Medinnis.

On that date, the local U.S. Army Weapons Command installation will mark not only its 169th anniversary but also its commemoration as a national historic landmark. The event will be witnessed by key military, congressional, civic, and historical groups of this area.

Naming of the Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark developed as a portion of the registry program instituted by the Department of Interior, National Park Service. The registry is a method by which the Federal Government recognizes sites classified as of exceptional value irrespective of ownership. Such sites are not of the national park system. The registry, in effect, identifies important segments of American heritage and brings them to the attention of the American people.

The event will be highlighted on April 2 with a half-hour dedication ceremony beginning at 10 a.m., immediately in front of the Main Administration Building, Armory Square, where a permanent bronze marker will be unveiled.

Dr. Murray H. Nelligan, of the Department of Interior, Philadelphia, Pa., will present this installation with its plaque and certificate. Other invited guests include Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts, U.S. Army Weapons Command, civic officials from Holyoke, Chicopee, Westfield, and Springfield; the Springfield Joint Civic Agencies; regional historical groups; and representatives of military units within the Greater Springfield area; key Springfield Armory personnel and representatives of the installation labor groups.

Employees of the Springfield Armory will also be given an opportunity to observe the dedication ceremony.

Specially invited guests of Colonel Medinnis will then be taken on a tour of the major historic sites within the installation. The tour itinerary will include halts at the main arsenal, the west and middle arsenals, the site of Shay's Rebellion, and the dam at Watershops Pond. The final stop of the tour will be the Benton Small Arms Museum at the armory.

The Department of Interior summed up its reasons for choosing the Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark in four data-packed paragraphs which have now become part of the official record. The four paragraphs follow:

"The Springfield Armory, dating from 1794, is the U.S. Government's oldest manufacturing arsenal. Since the dates of its establishment, the armory's ordnance products have figured in every American war, and its name has become synonymous with some of the finest of the world's military arms. The armory is significant also as the site of the defeat of the most dangerous threat posed by Shay's uprising in 1786–87, when the rebellious farmers of Massachusetts were thwarted in their attempt to seize the arms and supplies stored at the Springfield depot.

"The availability of skilled gunsmiths, blacksmiths, and other artisans had made Springfield a firearms manufacturing center prior to the Revolution and for this reason Gen. Henry Knox was prompted in 1777 to propose the town as a laboratory, a manufacturing and repair depot for military arms in the war with Britain. In 1789, the newly elected President George Washington inspected the Springfield site and subsequently recommended it as the location of a national armory.

"The Springfield Armory was the site of the abortive attack by Capt. Daniel Shays and his followers in the Massachusetts uprising of 1786–87 known as Shays' Rebellion. For several months prior to the attack, debt ridden and disgruntled farmers had roamed Massichusetts, preventing county courts from sitting and rendering judgment for debt. In late 1786, Shays and his followers gathered for an assault on the supply depot at Springfield where a quantity of arms, ammunition and supplies were stored. They attacked on January 25, 1787, but were repulsed by the defending garrison. The revolt continued for a few weeks more but the farmers never again made so dangerous a threat.

"Springfield Armory today is the U.S. Army's principal research and development center and pilot manufactory for small arms. A museum in the armory has exhibits not only telling the history of the armory but also interpreting in vivid fashion the story of America's military growth and power. A boulder adjacent to the armory grounds on State Street marks the site of Shays' attack in January 1787. The armory is located at Armory and Federal Squares, Springfield, Mass."

Pentagon's Surpluses Hit Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the largest peacetime budget in our Nation's history, and as we attempt to hold down all unnecessary expenses to a minimum, we might focus our attention on military expenses which this year total $55 billion, and, if we include space and veterans' appropriations, will consume $65 billion—or 60 percent of the total budget. With the peacetime military budget at an alltime high, it is shocking to learn that the Department of Defense now has some $8 billion worth of items not needed for peacetime use or for any potential mobilization plan.

Beyond that there is another $4 billion in items for which no one can find any use; and a total value of equipment in excess of needs reaching the astounding figure of $16 billion. This military waste is intolerable at a time when needed public services are being challenged or withheld for lack of funds. The $16 billion in items for which the Department of Defense can find no use is enough to pay for our space budget, our agriculture subsidies and our health, labor, and welfare requirements.

In order to draw this situation to the attention of Congress, I insert in the

RECORD the following story from the Washington Post of Sunday, April 7, 1963:

PENTAGON'S SURPLUSES HIT BILLIONS

(By James McCartney)

The Department of Defense today has literally billions of dollars worth of equipment in excess of the Nation's needs.

It has about $8 billion alone in items of so-called long supply—meaning items not needed either for peacetime use or in any one of a wide variety of potential mobilization plans.

But the $8 billion is only a beginning.

The Department has another $4 billion in items that no one at the moment can find any use for. These include everything from electronic gear and aircraft spare parts to GI bunkbeds.

They are currently being screened to see whether anybody wants them, or can find a way to use them, before they are declared surplus.

ABOUT ONE-FOURTH SALVAGEABLE

If past patterns work out, about $1 billion of the $4 billion will be salvageable.

In addition to these two categories, however, there are billions of dollars worth of items that have already been declared surplus and are still owned by the Government.

Pentagon officials in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Supply were not able to provide a figure for the present value of surplus stocks.

But they pointed out that in recent years the rate of surplus stock disposals in a single year has ranged from about $4 billion to slightly over $8 billion.

Then, too, there is another category of items in excess of needs for which officials have no ready dollar value estimate.

These are what are called "obsolete major end items"—which means large items like ships or airplanes or tanks that have become obsolete.

WELL OVER $16 BILLION

According to Col. Harold Reichenberg, a staff officer for supply programs, there is no easy way to find a figure for obsolete major end items now in stock.

Thus it is impossible to furnish an accurate estimate of the total value of equipment on hand in excess of needs. But a minimum figure would run well over $16 billion.

The largest category is clearly the $8 billion worth of items in long supply.

Much of this is stocks of ammunition or weapons built up during World War II and the Korean war and still considered handy to have around, just in case.

It's cheaper to keep much of this material than to dispose of it.

The $4 billion worth of items undergoing screening, like surplus and obsolete items, are largely a result of changing weapons technology.

Every time the Nation phases out of one kind of weapon, like an airplane or a missile, the replacement parts and supporting gear for the weapon are likely to be of little value.

USES FOUND SOMETIMES

Sometimes uses can be found for component parts, like generators or vacuum tubes, gasoline tanks or radios.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has been trying hard to increase the amount of parts that can be reutilized, and has had some success.

McNamara believes that one of the most promising ways to reduce huge excess inventories is to try to keep the number of different weapons systems down.

If two models of an item are produced when one would do the job, he told Congress recently, the costs of production and of providing spare parts and support equipment all increase.

Labor Movement Pledges Strong Support for the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening features of modern industrial life in America today is the recognition of the increasing public spirited role played by the working men and women of our Nation and the organized labor movement. An enlightened public opinion is one of the strongest bulwarks of our freedom. As we wage desperate battles against constant threats to our national security and the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion, the support of that group of people recognized as the backbone of our Nation is indeed encouraging.

Recently in Bal Harbour, Fla., the AFL–CIO executive council passed the following resolution on Cuba, which I wish to include in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON CUBA, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 25, 1963

The situation in Cuba continues to represent a most serious threat and the gravest danger to the unity and stability of the inter-American system and its institutions as well as a threat to the welfare of the people of the Western Hemisphere, especially the workers and peasants.

Our executive council at its May 4, 1960 meeting, issued a statement in which it detailed the successive steps which led to the establishment of a totalitarian police state including complete suppression of trade union freedom, political opposition, freedom of the press and other democratic rights. The council concluded that the disruptive activities of the Cuban regime "have all the earmarks of a well-planned strategy designed to make Cuba an advanced outpost of the Soviet Union drive to infiltrate the New World."

In a statement adopted February 28, 1961, the executive council observed: "It is now clear to all that Cuba has become a Soviet satellite and that it is being openly and boastfully used as a staging area for the internal subversion and ultimate control of Latin America."

At our fourth constitutional convention in December 1961, our membership condemned the Communist tyranny forced upon the Cuban people and their tragic impoverishment through the Cuban regimes development of "a huge military machine for armed aggression against the free nations of Latin America." Our resolution noted with pride that "the free labor movement in Latin America was first to discover the falsity of the Castro propaganda, the subservience of its regime to Soviet Communist dictation, and the subjugation of the Cuban workers and peasants to totalitarian enslavement."

By the following month the Organization of American States (OAS) had declared that the Cuban regime and its Communist form of government was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the inter-American system. Stiffening opposition to the Cuban regime, recognition that the Cuban revolution had been betrayed and realization of Cuba's role in attempting to subvert the legally constituted governments of Latin America also prompted the OAS to form a security committee to combat Cuba's mounting program to foment hemispheric rebellion.

Now that the Cuban Communist regime has become an acknowledged satellite of Soviet Russia and has transformed Cuba into an armed fortress with Russian troops and armaments, the situation is not only incompatible but completely intolerable.

The prophetic nature of past AFL–CIO statements on Cuba has been accentuated by subsequent developments in Cuba. The results have repeated the Communist pattern; increasing shortages of food, medicines, shoes and other essentials; decreasing standards of living; mounting denials of personal freedom; and, no fulfillment of the many lavish revolutionary promises.

Freely elected trade union leaders have been liquidated and replaced by Communists and supporters of the Castro regime; Soviet-styled "Socialist emulation" campaigns to speed up production have been introduced; work norms have been established with severe penalties for those who fail to meet state-established quotas; wages and holidays are controlled by the government; penalties are imposed for absence from work and, official permission is required in order for a worker to move from one job to another. The Cuban Workers Confederation directs the 25 national federations, but it is completely responsible to the Cuban regime and represents the State, not the workers. In short, in the field of unions and labor, as in other facets of Cuban life, hard-earned democratic rights have been abolished.

The full extent of Cuban subservience to communism was revealed in President Kennedy's exposure of the presence of Soviet ballistic missile sites and armament in Cuba and the subsequent negotiations which led to their removal. Frustrated in their attempts to establish an offensive missile base in the Western Hemisphere, the Communist leaders have renewed their efforts to export rebellion and foment terrorism and insurrection throughout Latin America. The continued presence of troops and Cuba's huge Communist-equipped military establishment stress the continued threat to freedom Cuba represents.

We, therefore, restate our encouragement and support of effective, collective measures to protect the territorial integrity and national independence of all the nations in the Western Hemisphere; to repel Cuban and Communist attempts to infiltrate, subvert, and dominate the New World; and, to eliminate the spawning grounds of communism through the Alliance for Progress and similar programs. We repeat our pledge of unreserved support for all effective measures the Government of the United States and of the member governments of the OAS deem necessary to achieve these goals.

We support President Kennedy's statement in Miami last December 29, "That it is the strongest wish of the people of this country, as well as the people of this hemisphere that Cuba shall one day be free again." We salute the enslaved workers and others inside Cuba who continue to fight for freedom and the thousands of freedom loving Cubans who have been forced to flee from their homeland and who also continue to fight for freedom. In expressing our solidarity with the Cuban people, we call upon our Government and the people of the United States to support with all means at their disposal the heroic efforts of the Cuban people to regain their liberty by freeing themselves from a Communist dictatorship. We urge vigorous efforts to extend the fundamental principles of the Alliance for Progress—the right of free elections and the free exercise of basic human freedoms: effective agrarian reform and the right of every campesino to own the land he tills; the effort of every free nation to pursue programs of economic and social progress; and the right of every people freely

to transform the economic and political institutions of society so that they may serve the welfare of all, not only to the people of Cuba, but also to all nations of the hemisphere.

Federal Aid Is Threat to Stable Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the illogic of Federal aid can be seen in the arguments over the mass transit bill. The heavier the Federal tax burden and encroachment on the local communities the more the need for Federal aid to the communities. This full circle accelerating fast enough will imbalance the strongest economy. And that is just what we are doing at a dizzy pace. The Wall Street Journal's interpretation is sensible and refreshing. I commend it to my colleagues, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

STRICTLY ON MERIT

Some interesting arguments are being advanced in behalf of the administration's massive mass transit bill, which now awaits action by the House.

Before the Senate finally approved the measure, Senator RIBICOFF made an appeal to his fellow legislators from largely rural States. Some of them, it seems, hadn't been persuaded that their constituents ought to subsidize transit programs for a few metropolitan areas that should be able to foot the bill themselves. The Senator, going straight to the point, said that "if votes are withheld by States that have little or no present need for Federal funds for commuters, where do these States expect to find support for their own urgent needs?"

That surely is direct enough: Pitting the country boys against the city boys gets right to the merits of the issue. And here's an even more instructive exercise in logic:

A spokesman for the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia argued during hearings on the same bill that since States and local communities haven't the financial resources to improve mass transit facilities, the Government ought to do the job. (It is only right to note, in passing, that without any apparent difficulty Philadelphia has just raised, for various purposes, $37.2 million in the bond market.)

The reason advanced by the chamber for State and local financial woes was "the constant and heavy encroachment of the Federal Government" upon available tax revenues.

"As this situation is the Federal Government's doing," the argument concluded, "it is a Federal responsibility to solve the problem."

Now what this theory really means is that the more the Government encroaches on State and local revenues, the greater is the Federal obligation to shunt more and more money back to the straitened localities. As those amounts increase, the Government will have to encroach yet more heavily on local resources. Nobody ever seems to ask just where that dizzying process is supposed to stop spinning.

Anyway, it is certainly reassuring for the taxpayer to realize how well reasoned are the arguments over great issues before the country, and how logically those issues are decided.

Theodore Kiendl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of my first venture for public office, I was very fortunate and indeed very proud, to have as my friend and campaign chairman, Mr. Theodore "Ted" Kiendl of Yonkers, N.Y. My association with this warm, generous, talented, but modest man has been always an extremely rich and rewarding one. Mr. Kiendl is a gentleman in every sense that word conveys. One of nine children, Ted Kiendl by virtue of hard work, love of the law, and an abiding faith in the right has earned the respect of his fellow citizens as next door neighbor, as lawyer, and as public servant. On March 9, 1963, the Yonkers Herald Statesman reviewed the career of his manifold accomplishments in anticipation of his completion of 50 years of service to his beloved profession. Mr. Speaker, very proudly I ask that this article appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, Mar. 9, 1963]

A MAN WHO KNEW WHAT HE WANTED: 50 YEARS OF LAW, AND STILL NO REGRETS

(By Nina Jones)

Hour after dragging hour, glowering witnesses monotonously repeated, "I refuse to answer on the grounds—."

The scene was the courtroom of the State crime commission in charge of the 1952–53 waterfront investigation when witnesses, 90 percent of them gangsters, were subpenaed in droves.

Theodore Kiendl of Yonkers, special counsel to the commission, was trying to cross-examine witness No. 50 who sat insolently with closed eyes. For Attorney Kiendl it was finally just too much and too many:

"Mr. Blank," he smoothly slid in between the routine questions, "Are you asleep?"

"I refuse to answer on grounds—."

Reminded recently of this fragment of lore about him, Mr. Kiendl was amused. Next October, he will have spent 50 finely relished years in active practice of the law. Interviewed in his 44th floor offices at 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, he was asked why he didn't write a book about some of his several famous law cases.

A handsome man with thick snow-white hair and dark brows, he was sitting silhouetted by a spectacular view of New York Harbor. He was deliberate in taking a space of time to fold his hands on his old walnut desk, an anachronism in the gleaming glass eyrie of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland and Kiendl.

"Do you know," he finally countered, "that my friend Louis Nizer told me he has sold 350,000 copies of his? Well, I have written a book, but it is never going to be a best seller. I wrote it to give to my sons on my 50th birthday.

"It said a lot of things I wanted them to hear from me and to know about me. Then I had a few copies printed and bound—very impressively, you know, because I wanted to use every device to help make my advice seem impressive. That's the only book I will never write."

That resolution makes waste because Mr. Kiendl is of a time and of a breed not to be repeated.

He was born in Brooklyn in 1890, one of nine children. His father was a lawyer whose offices were across the street from the family residence.

"He came home for lunch. That meant 12 people (my grandmother lived with us) at table three times a day. There was constant conversation about the law. I never wanted to be anything else. I have never regretted my choice.

"I grew up with three ambitions: To be on the board of education (he was, in Yonkers); to be a director of a local bank (he was asked, but had to refuse); and to be a church elder (he is, the Reformed Church of Bronxville).

"I love all kinds of law cases, and have had every kind there is—admiralty, equity, juried, nonjuried—except patent and I argued a patent appeal once."

His most recent case, newsworthy as many have been; was his defense of a New York Supreme Court justice. Mr. Kiendl was in the news locally last May, when he sat on the hearings on the Playland concession.

As a bona fide prominent resident of the county, Mr. Kiendl is equipped with at least one story about the nearly legendary William L. Ward, GOP leader: "Judge Lee Parsons Davis came to tell me Mr. Ward had decided I should run for district attorney; then in 2 years, run for the supreme court. I was only 39, and it was a great temptation. But I declined. I have never been sorry. I knew"—again that characteristic Kiendl dry self-depreciation—"better than anyone else what a terrible judge I would be."

Perhaps it is his profession that has given Mr. Kiendl his disciplined personal modesty. But a pleased gleam comes into his eyes if he is nudged to delve into his Columbia University (class of 1910) athletic career.

He held a record for being a team captain that probably never has been equaled. He was captain of baseball, football, basketball, and track teams; held the captainship of a championship freshman basketball team and the captainship, for 2 years running, of the all-eastern college basketball team.

"When Lou Gehrig came to Columbia he occupied the same position I had—first base. I had a better batting average than he did," and there is dignified glee in the Kiendl eyes.

Pending now is his nomination to the Hall of Fame.

"But I don't deserve it and won't get it—or anyway, not until I'm dead."

Being a lawyer keeps one for years looking steadily at mortality, and Mr. Kiendl frequently alludes to it now in terms of himself.

But his quick mind and his relish in work and in many interests (he's given up golf, but is a discriminating gardener, an enthusiastic philatelist) is so completely reassuring one is impelled to take issue when he points out the nameplates on his firm's historic resk—"Francis Lynde Stetson, 1877–1920," and "John W. Davis, 1921–55"—and says, "I can't possibly hope to beat those records."

Professor's Opinion Isn't Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, along with many other citizens of Michigan, I have been deeply disturbed by the action of the Secretary of Health, Edu-

cation, and Welfare in advising Governor Romney that Federal funds for aid to dependent children of the unemployed will be withheld because he disapproves the Michigan plan as passed by the State legislature and signed by the Governor.

As another indication of the invasion of Federal control over State and local government, this is an alarming situation. The present controversy centers about the right of the State of Michigan to define who is unemployed for eligibility for benefits under the program. The Governor contends, with excellent reason, that the Federal law provides it is the responsibility of each State participating in the program to determine who is eligible and that the Michigan law does conform to Federal requirements.

It has been alleged that Secretary Celebrezze is deliberately trying to make an issue of his to embarrass the Governor for political reasons. Whether this is true or not, it is frightening to contemplate that the rapid trend toward centralization of government makes such a situation possible. The question many are asking is, Does the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have the right to dictate in detail to all the States exactly to whom and when public welfare may be given?

As public reaction to this latest encroachment of Federal will over local desire, I want to call attention to the following editorials from the Detroit News of March 21 and the Detroit Free Press of March 22:

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 21, 1963]

PROFESSOR'S OPINION ISN'T LAW

Bureaucrats, even when they are professors, frequently make poor lawyers, as witness the current rhubarb over the new State legislation which qualifies needy children of unemployed for Federal-State aid.

The program, known as aid to dependent children of the unemployed has had a tough time coming into being, but the legislature finally passed it and sent it to the Governor.

The bill had been approved by the regional office of the department of health, education, and welfare, but at the very last moment Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen, the department's assistant secretary for legislation, issued a curbstone opinion that the Michigan act was discriminatory and therefore ineligible for Federal funds.

His opinion came via telephone to a State senator and later in newspaper interviews. A telegram signed by another Federal official was finally received by a Michigan welfare administrator.

And finally, HEW Secretary Celebrezze, apparently acting on the opinion originating with Cohen, put in his oar. Celebrezze informed Governor Romney he believes the program is unacceptable, though nowhere stating Michigan won't get the Federal money if the Governor signs the measure.

Discriminatory, as used by Cohen, is a dirty word. The bill does define and thus limit those eligible, just as does every other piece of welfare legislation, local, State, or Federal, of which we are aware.

Not all veterans can qualify for all Federal aid to veterans; all employed are not covered by the social security program; all unemployed are not eligible for unemployment compensation; all those over 65 would not be covered by the medical aid program of the Kennedy administration, which has the support of Professor Cohen's department and probably of Professor Cohen.

Whether certain of the unemployed should have been disqualified in the Michigan legislation can be argued until the cows come home, but the legality of the act is unquestionable if the wording of the Federal law means what it says.

The pertinent section says that the term "dependent children" shall include "a needy child under the age of 18 who has been denied parental support or care by reason of the unemployment (as defined by the State) of a parent."

The legislature defined "unemployment" and in doing so disqualified some children—children who will continue to receive welfare support under existing State and local programs but not under the new Federal-State program.

Professor Cohen obviously would not disqualify the children if he were writing the law. It was, however, written by the legislature and the Federal law permits the definitions it saw fit to include. He would therefore deny the program to all needy children in the State because he has an opinion that the legislature has discriminated against some.

This is bad law and worse welfare. Aid to dependent children of the unemployed has been plagued by bottleneckers and hamstringers from first conception and now presumably it will be the duty of lawyers and the courts to bring it into effect.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN RULING GIVES OFF AN ODOR OF POLITICS

The newest example of legislation by bureaucracy instead of by laws comes from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze, a nice ex-mayor of Cleveland, has decided that the bill to qualify Michigan for aid to dependent children of the unemployed workers doesn't do the job. The bill is discriminatory, he thinks, because it limits those eligible for Federal help.

Regardless of what Celebrezze says, we suspect that his opinion is political rather than judicial. The law is clear enough. The trouble is that Celebrezze is a Democrat, and his assistant secretary, Wilbur Cohen, who first proclaimed that the Michigan bill wasn't good enough, is a Democrat from Ann Arbor.

The Federal statute says: "Effective May 1, 1961, and ending at the close of June 30, 1967, the term 'dependent child' shall * * * include a needy child under the age of 18 who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the unemployment (as defined by the State) of a parent."

The Handbook of Public Assistance Administration, a publication of the HEW to guide its hired hands, says:

"The definition of the term 'unemployment' is the responsibility of the State. The State may define the conditions that constitute unemployment of the parent as broadly or as restrictively as is consistent with the conditions existing in the State and within the limits of maintaining a reasonable relationship between such definition and the purpose of the new legislation."

No one could in good conscience argue that the new Michigan bill is unreasonable. It would cover some 10,000 needy, and would save the communities of the State approximately $9 million. The savings to Wayne County alone would come to $2 million.

If there is a dispute between the Federal Government and the State of Michigan, it's sociological, not legal. Celebrezze claims the Michigan bill is arbitrary, in that not everyone is covered.

But so is social security, of which the Federal aid to dependent children and unemployment statute is an offspring. Not everyone qualifies for social security, regardless of whether he has worked.

So, too, is unemployment compensation. The qualifications are restricted to certain types of workers in certain industries of certain sizes.

The Michigan bill is no more restrictive or arbitrary than these, and certainly not as restrictive as approved legislation in some other States.

Governor Romney, in a fighting mood, is prepared to take his case to Washington. We hope he does. We'd like to see him make a strong fight for the principle that the law means what it says it means, rather than what some bureaucrat would like it to mean.

In this case the law is clear enough. It is the bureaucrat who is fuzzy and arbitrary.

Why Dr. Sams Can't Deliver Babies in Bellaire, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, across the river from Pittsburgh is the Bellaire Medical Clinic which is rendering splendid medical service to the people of Bellaire, Ohio. I request unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the National Observer of March 18, 1963, which describes in fair and objective detail the problems of this clinic. I hope it will provide food for thought among all those who are concerned with our health problems and with ways and means of meeting them.

The article follows:

[From the National Observer, Mar. 18, 1963]

DR. SAMS: WHY HE CAN'T DELIVER BABIES IN BELLAIRE—A DOCTOR'S FEUD IN OHIO TOWN UNDERLIES SOME MAJOR NATIONAL ISSUES

BELLAIRE, OHIO.—A feud among doctors in this Ohio River factory town dramatizes on a small stage a national medical issue—how is medicine to be controlled, practiced, and paid for?

What is happening in Bellaire has happened before, with variations, and will happen again. A group of "outside" doctors set up a clinic in 1952 supported in large part by the welfare and retirement fund of the United Mine Workers of America (UAW). The welfare fund liked their work, and over the years has shifted more and more of its business to the clinic and away from Bellaire's established doctors.

Bellaire shows one way—not the only way, by any means—in which the lone "family doctor" is reacting to group-practice doctors armed with pooled medical knowledge.

As the Bellaire Clinic has grown (today it has nine full-time and four part-time doctors), so has the apprehension of some of the oldest doctors grown. Some of them see a plot by "union doctors" to take over Bellaire's only hospital. The trustees at City Hospital have been slow to admit clinic doctors to staff privileges. The Belmont County Medical Society hasn't admitted a new clinic doctor since 1954. The clinic's newest doctor, who is Belmont County's only certified obstetrician-gynecologist, has been waiting for a year to get staff privileges so he can deliver babies at the hospital.

CLINIC BACKERS ARE RILED

Last month a group of clinic backers here exploded at what they called "a 10-year history of harassment, discrimination, and obstruction of the Bellaire medical group by organized medicine."

They declared that the hospital trustees "have permitted themselves to be used as a weapon against the medical group by the Belmont County Medical Society, an affiliate of the American Medical Association."

Thus the clinic people brought into the open a struggle that has smoldered almost since the clinic's beginning in 1952. At stake, they argue, is the right of people in and around Bellaire to choose between the relatively new prepaid group practice plan of the clinic and the traditional fee-for-service system of the established doctors.

Although no older doctor here will admit he's losing business, the economic issue bulks large in the Bellaire medical conflict. But the case of Bellaire goes to the heart of many other issues in modern medicine. "Third party" medicine is one such issue, whether the third party be a private insurance company, a union, an employer, or the Federal Government. Many doctors fear they will lose control of their profession to some third party that pays for medical care and consequently wants to supervise it.

A DOCTOR'S DECLARATION

Defenders of the established medical order in Bellaire show no signs of backing down in the face of the clinic's attack. John Cinque, Jr., chairman of the trustees of City Hospital, declared: "I think this matter's got to be resolved with these people once and for all."

Dr. R. H. McCommon, president of the Belmont County Medical Society, explained it takes a two-thirds vote of approval by society members for a doctor to be admitted to the society. "If they're not liked and not wanted in, they just don't get the votes," he said.

Clinic backers think there's more to it than that. Their attorney has asked the Justice Department to look into the case for possible violations of antitrust laws, and Justice Department agents have been in Bellaire recently. They were here before, in the early 1950's, when Mr. Cinque suspected one of the clinic doctors of being a Communist. The man was cleared, Mr. Cinque said.

Bellaire is an aging, 12,000-population town of coalminers, steelworkers, glassworkers, and trades people squeezed into the Ohio side of the Ohio River valley 5 miles below Wheeling, W. Va. The miners work the shaft and strip mines in the county around Bellaire and neighboring towns. Especially in winter, it's a drab place. Perhaps the most impressive thing about Bellaire is its more than 100-bed City Hospital, which is owned not by the city of Bellaire but by several thousand citizens who donated funds to build and expand it. A few blocks from the hillside hospital stands a big, century-old mansion that houses the busy young Bellaire clinic.

LEASES THE CLINIC FACILITIES

The clinic is owned by the Medical Foundation of Bellaire, a lay citizens' group which leases the clinic facilities (including two satellite clinics at outlying Harrisville and Powhatan Point) to the doctors' Bellaire Medical Group.

The full-time clinic doctors include five general practitioners, a pediatrician, an internist, a surgeon, and an obstetrician-gynecologist. An otolaryngologist (ear-nose-throat specialist), a dermatologist (skin specialist), and a psychiatrist work 1 day a week for the clinic. A radiologist (X-ray specialist) works 4 days a week. The doctors are paid salaries ranging from $14,000 to $30,000 a year, depending on education and experience.

Who are these medical insurgents, and why are they here? One of them is crew-cut, pipe-smoking Dr. Milton Levine, an internist who was born in New Jersey 43 years ago, and got his M.D. from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. His wife Dr. Charlotte Levine, is a general practitioner in the clinic.

"It's easy for any doctor to go into practice if he simply wants to make a living," Dr. Milton Levine said. "But I want more from my medicine than that. I want to be able to practice it the way I was trained to practice it. I can do that in one of two settings—in a university or in a group where I have people of like mind, that is, people who want to practice university medicine."

Bespectacled, athletic-looking Dr. Daniel J. Birmingham, the group's surgeon, is 40. Dr. Birmingham explained that a surgeon's business all comes in the form of referrals from other physicians. In "sold" surgical practice, "there are subtle financial pressures that are not present in this type of (group) setup. I am completely free of any financial influence as to whether a patient should have an operation or not. I can go to sleep at night knowing I haven't done anything that's not medically indicated."

Dr. Jack L. Paradise, 37-year-old pediatrician, is medical director of the group. A layman, George Goldstein, is secretary of the medical foundation and administrator of the clinic.

Doctors opposed to the clinic claim its physicians "work for" the United Mine Workers. Not so, says Mr. Goldstein. True, the UMW welfare and retirement fund, dissatisfied with existing medical services, encouraged formation in the Bellaire clinic and of other clinics in coal-mining areas. The clinic has a "close working relationship" with the fund, which is administered separately from the union, Mr. Goldstein says. But the clinic is independent of the fund and does 40 percent of its business with non-fund patients, he adds. These patients are on the traditional fee-for-service basis.

CONTENTION OF THE FUND

The welfare fund began operations in 1948, providing nearly every kind of medical service for miners and their families. It quickly ran out of money. When it resumed business in 1950, home and office calls to general practioners were no longer covered, nor were drugs and dentistry. During the 1950's many doctors originally on fund-approved lists were lopped off. Some hospitals were dropped. Emphasis was shifted to specialist care as a means of avoiding hospitalization. The fund recognized only those specialists certified by the various medical specialty boards and colleges.

"We have found some hospitals just don't provide the kind of services that we are paying for or that they are charging for," a fund spokesman said at the fund's Washington, D.C., headquarters.

In east Kentucky, West Virginia, and southwestern Virginia, the fund went so far as to build and operate its own hospitals, 10 of them. Now, with the number of employed miners dropping sharply in some areas, the fund has said it will have to close four east Kentucky hospitals unless some other agency will take them over.

The fund claims to take care of about 1 million people in 30 States. Its 10 area medical officers, doctors themselves, have the job of riding herd on local medical practices to hold down unnecessary surgery and hospitalization on fund beneficiaries. "We're still doing business with 7,000 physicians, and that isn't a bad number," said the fund spokesman.

Around Bellaire, miners can get from the clinic, at additional cost, coverage that the welfare fund does not provide, such as general practioners' fees. This costs a working miner with dependents $5 a month. "By a small monthly payroll deduction," says a clinic promotional pamphlet, "you can budget your medical costs."

Prepaid group health plans are firmly established around New York City, in Washington, D.C., and along the west coast. But they've been slower to take hold in the Midwest. Across the river in West Virginia, the State legislature adjourned last month, without passing a bill to authorize such health plans. The State medical association fought the bill.

Officially, the American Medical Association is in favor of group practice and prepayment of medical expenses. But an official of the Group Health Association of America commented in Washington, "Some of their hearts are not in it." Some physicians don't like the idea of a patient being tied, by prepayment, to a particular group of doctors, he explained.

In Bellaire, 6 of the 13 clinic doctors have been admitted to the voting staff of City Hospital, but 6 of the other 7 are on nonvoting status. Some had long waits for nonvoting status, which permits them to practice in the hospital but not to participate in determining hospital medical policies. After the original four clinic physicians were admitted to the county medical society, the society never admitted another one to membership. Consequently, the newer doctors are not members of the Ohio State Medical Association or the American Medical Association. This does not prevent them from practicing, but it deprives them of prestige and certain professional advantages such as access to publications and meetings.

ONLY TWO DELIVERIES

Perhaps the most bewildered man in the whole controversy is Dr. James Edward Sams, the board-certified obstetrician-gynecologist who came to the clinic a year ago and has delivered only two babies since then because he can't get any hospital privileges.

Dr. Sams is the man on whom the clinic has chosen to base its all-out fight. He's a mild-mannered, 49-year-old southerner who retired from the Army as a colonel last year after 22 years as an Army doctor.

In his soft Mississippi drawl, Dr. Sams explained why he decided to join the clinic: "I had never done private practice. This was the nearest type of practice to what I had been doing. I liked the idea of doing group practice without having to dun my patients and talk finances, because I've never done any of it, and I wouldn't know how to go about it."

No one has questioned his qualifications, but his repeated applications for admission to the hospital staff have been rejected. "When it reached this impasse it was a shock to me," Dr. Sams said. "I had expected to be welcomed."

He added that "doctors ought not to be bickering in public. But we've reached the point where there's nothing else to do."

Mr. Cinque (pronounced Chin-kway), the chairman of the hospital trustees, is an attorney and has been a Bellaire resident for 50 of his 58 years. Solidly built, with close-cropped gray hair, bristling with nervous energy, he makes quick replies to the clinic doctors' complaints.

"We have ample doctors, ample OB men," he snaps. Two Wheeling obstetricians are available for emergency calls, he says, and Dr. Sams lives in Wheeling himself.

THE HOSPITAL'S RULE

Regarding the delays in admitting clinic doctors to the staff, Mr. Clinque says: "These guys come in here, it must be a training ground for them. They're here 6 months to a year and they're gone. So we established a rule they've got to show they're going to stay here."

Mr. Goldstein says the clinic seeks permanent doctors and usually gets them.

Mr. Cinque denies there is any collusion between the medical society and the hospital trustees. "I have never been pressured by any of the older doctors in any way, shape, or form," he says.

There were no certified specialists in Belmont County before the clinic opened (although there were some in Wheeling), and Mr. Cinque has a low opinion of specialists generally. "They can't perform anything but their specialty," he says. "I don't want specialists for myself personally. I'll take the general practitioner any day. If he wants help (from a specialist) fine."

Board certification of specialists "means nothing to us, and should mean nothing to anyone," Mr. Cinque said. "There are two physicians and surgeons in this institution that could be members of three different colleges (of specialists) if they were willing to take the time to get certified."

Mr. Cinque calls the UMW welfare fund a "horrible waste," and adds: "We don't want to deal with the welfare fund. We don't want to deal with people who are autocratic. The miners' welfare fund isn't going to tell me what I can do in my hospital." The hospital does, however, take welfare fund patients.

Thus Bellaire's medical future is being fought out. The community as a whole seems unperturbed. But whatever the deeper implications of the issues, the feeling seems to be that Dr. Sams should be permitted to deliver babies in City Hospital.

Truth in Packaging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of real satisfaction to me that my hometown paper, the Watertown (Wis.) Daily Times, has commented strongly in an editorial of April 2, 1963, on the need for truth-in-packaging legislation. I, along with many others in both the House and the Senate, have introduced a truth-in-packaging bill, and chances for passage of the bill seem bright. Public awareness of the bill, and the benefits it would provide to consumers throughout the Nation, is a necessary prerequisite to the success of this legislation. It is responsible journalism, such as the Watertown Daily Times has shown in the editorial reprinted below, that will arouse the support of the people for the truth-in-packaging bill.

The editorial follows:

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

The bogeyman of big government is being used in an attempt to frighten the public away from truth-in-packaging legislation. People are being told that a law such as that now being considered in Congress would be just one more way of giving the Washington bureaucracy control over the lives of Americans. It also is being said that control over packaging would be a blow to free enterprise.

It would be nothing of the sort, unless by free enterprise is meant the sort of "let the buyer beware" enterprise that Americans have long since decided not to tolerate. The truth-in-packaging legislation is intended to do just what the name suggests—to make processors and manufacturers of consumer goods sell their products in honest packages which tell the consumer exactly what, and how much, is inside.

This would obviously involve an extension of Government control. But a more sensible way of looking at this aspect of the matter is that the truth-in-packaging law would enable the consumer, through Government, to do something that he cannot do on his own. The present hodgepodge of packaging, confusing at best and at worst thoroughly deceptive, cannot be improved unless reasonable standards are established and enforced.

Processors insist that an industry code would do the trick without a law. Past experience gives little reason to suppose that an industry code would give the consumer the sort of protection he ought to have. Many firms voluntarily provide high quality, full measure, and honest labeling, but some do not. It is the latter that make the truth-in-packaging legislation necessary for consumer protection.

Support President Kennedy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard of rocking-chair military strategists and world affairs experts—in bygone days these were favorite phrases of silver-tongued orators. Today, we hear less of these sonorous sounds but, alas, we have many more examples of such postures before us. Many people in public life, whose responsibilities of office demand the greatest objectivity, seem to have engaged in all manner of shouts and cries for "more action" or "less action" in hit-and-miss fashion when the seriousness of the situation surrounding us demands the utmost in dedication and constructive effort.

How gratifying, then, to come across a statement recently issued at Bal Harbour, Fla., by the AFL–CIO Executive Council urging support of our President.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I share this important statement with my colleagues by placing it in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON CUBA

Every American is deeply concerned over the Kremlin's transformation of Cuba into a heavily armed base for Communist subversion and sabotage. The American people are as one in the condemnation of the Communist yoke forced on the Cuban nation. We are all agreed that, in the interest of world peace and freedom, Cuba must be returned to the Cuban people so that they can build their homeland into a healthy democracy.

It is understandable that there may be differences of opinion in our country regarding our Government's policies for achieving these objectives. The exchange or even clash of opinions over important policies is an integral part of the democratic process. American labor would vigorously oppose any effort to silence criticism. However, the executive council of the AFL–CIO views with considerable concern the intense partisanship which has been injected into the debate over Cuba by some opponents of the administration.

As the Chief Executive of the Nation and as the Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces, the President of the United States is the principal architect and executor of our country's foreign policy. Given the seriousness of the worldwide Soviet imperialist threat and the multiplying dangers of Communist subversion, especially in Latin America, the responsibilities of the President in meeting the Cuban problem are particularly heavy. In this critical situation, destructive criticism—like broadcasting suspicions about unfounded deals with Moscow—can only add to the enormous difficulties confronting the President in his efforts to preserve the security and freedom of our country by peaceful means, if at all possible, and by all means, if necessary. Former President Eisenhower served the Nation well when he recently stressed the overriding importance of bipartisanship in the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy.

Only blind political partisanship can disparage the great significance and beneficial results of President Kennedy's courageous and decisive action in forcing the Soviet Union to dismantle and withdraw its emplaced rockets from Cuba. Such partisanship can only hurt the international prestige of our country and the effectiveness of our Government's efforts to eliminate entirely the Soviet exploitation of Cuba as a base for Communist subversion and Muscovite provocations in the New World.

Such short-sighted political partisanship tends to spread confusion and distrust among the people. Anxious to prevent the sapping of public confidence in the administration, officials occupying even very sensitive Government posts have been drawn into disclosing vital security information. When the debate takes such a costly turn, the best interests of our Nation are not helped but hampered. All of this tends to divide the American people where there is no cause for division and when there is every reason for unity.

Furthermore, those who play with the Cuban problem, as if it were a poltical football, undermine the unity of freedom-loving Cubans everywhere and weaken their confidence in the determination and capacity of the United States to help them regain their national independence and to build a healthy democracy.

Since last October, when Khrushchev was forced to back down in the face of superior American strength, our Government has engaged in effective aerial surveillance of Cuba. President Kennedy's unrelenting pressure on the Kremlin to withdraw its troops from Cuba has begun to show results. The Organization of American States (OAS) is demonstrating greater vigilance and effectiveness in meeting the dangerous sabotage campaign launched from Cuba under Soviet direction. The economic measures taken by our Government against Castro are dealing his dictatorship telling blows.

Senators, Congressmen, Governors, and Government officials—like all other patriotic citizens—can serve our country best by proposing constructive measures for the complete elimination of the threat of Communist subversion and Soviet provocations based in Castro Cuba. Toward this end, the AFL–CIO Executive Council reiterates the specific proposals it made at its meeting of November 13, 1962. We quote in part:

"Our Government can count on the wholehearted and active support of the AFL–CIO in—

"Accelerating its efforts to insure American military superiority.

"Continuing aerial surveillance of Cuba until such time as U.N. inspection or, as President Kennedy has proposed, any other 'Equally satisfactory means of international verification is effected.'

"Making clear and emphasizing through radio and other channels, our friendship for the people of Cuba, our determination to see them free of all foreign domination and

exploitation, our readiness to help them overcome their present miserable economic conditions and enjoy the benefits of the Alliance for Progress program, once they establish a government of their own choice through free elections."

We earnestly plead for an end to all partisanship. We urge the unification of the entire Nation under the courageous and capable leadership of President Kennedy.

Legislative Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received House Joint Memorial No. 1 from the Legislature of the State of Washington, and also a letter from the secretary of state which states:

As you undoubtedly know, one of the thorny problems which seems impossible to resolve by the legislature, in its extraordinary session, is the problem of reapportionment. As a matter of fact, at the time of writing this letter it seems most probable that the legislature will give up in despair and report to the Federal District Court that a reapportionment cannot be agreed upon.

The attached certified copy of House Joint Memorial 1 reflects the thinking of the current legislature, in that it proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the judicial power of the United States relating to reapportionment, and it is at the direction of the legislature that I am sending you this memorial.

Since I am sure this is a subject of more than passing interest to other Members of Congress, I trust they will take time to read this memorial forwarded by the Legislature of the State of Washington, the text of which follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully petition that the Congress of the United States call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in which the people have the right of initiative in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature in a State in which the people have the right of initiative.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

Be it further resolved, That, if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this memorial prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Passed the house March 28, 1963.

WILLIAM S. DAY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 30, 1963.

JOHN A. CHERBERG,
President of the Senate.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, nobody has written with more urgency or clearer perception of the administration's inadequacies in the Cuban situation than columnist David Lawrence.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD three of Mr. Lawrence's recent columns on this subject:

POLICY ON CUBA ENCOURAGES REDS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By David Lawrence)

Will the United States permit a complete Communist takeover of Central and South America similar to what has already happened in Cuba?

One by one, the Latin-American countries are currently being subjected to the most intensive penetration by the Soviet Government. What is the answer?

It will be of no avail to blame a preceding administration. There is an unfortunate tendency in Washington nowadays to condone evil by enumerating mistakes of the past as if these furnish an alibi for present errors or neglect of duty.

The problem is really nonpolitical. It is every day becoming more difficult to handle. Billions of dollars are being taken away from the taxpayers of the United States annually to support so-called foreign aid programs on all continents. Almost everyone familiar with the situation agrees that financial aid of some kind from the United States is essential to thwart the Communist intrusions in the internal affairs of various countries to the south of us. When the United States lends or gives money to another country, however, the Washington Government cannot exercise complete control over what happens to such funds.

Also, the Communists train stooges in Moscow and send them back to their native lands to convert their fellow countrymen or to engage in an obstructionist-type of political activity that checkmates progress even when American money for worthy objects is made available.

The fundamental weakness in the situation today is the failure of the U.S. Government to adopt a resolute policy toward the Communist invasion of this hemisphere. The inclination here has been to avoid a showdown on the vague ground that commitments in other parts of the world may be endangered. But many times in world history, procrastination and timidity have resulted in bringing on the very conflict that a policy of forbearance was aimed to avoid.

The spread of communism in Latin America is due largely to economic conditions that have long prevailed there. Poverty and a low standard of living provide fertile areas for Communist infiltration. Weak governments, influenced by selfish leaders, have retarded progress. Even in a country as friendly to the United States as Brazil has been for the past 150 years or more, there is today a threat of a Communist takeover. Guatemala is also in peril. Argentina and Chile have had their Communist troubles, too. It certainly is time for a much more forceful policy toward Communist sabotage and subversion than the United States has thus far been willing to adopt.

Foreign policy in this field, both under the present and preceding administrations here, has been based on a belief that the Organization of American States can be made to function as a kind of supervisory police body which would employ armed forces in a collective manner. But almost every one of the Latin American countries faces such a serious threat from within that it is doubtful whether any firm policy which really comes to grips with the Communist problem will ever materialize through the OAS. The United States bears the major responsibility, and must go it alone when it becomes necessary. That time has arrived.

It will be argued, of course, that public opinion in Latin America is opposed to any armed intervention by this country, and the Communists will capitalize on such a step. But although the Latin countries were at first dismayed by the attempted invasion at the Bay of Pigs, many of the leaders of various governments to the south of us now have seen the light and went Cuba freed from the Communist yoke by any means possible.

The United States inevitably has to take the risk of offending the Kremlin, and can adopt the very contention that nations have put forward in the past—respect for international rights. To protect American property by force, if necessary, is a right granted under international law. It involves a decision that has to be made sooner or later. Under the Monroe Doctrine, the United States has maintained that no European power shall be permitted to establish a base or its system in this hemisphere. Historical precedent under international law therefore would justify a move to rid Cuba of Communist troops, technicians, and subversive organizations as well.

What the United States does or fails to do in Cuba is directly related to the future freedom of all the Latin-American peoples. The cry will be raised that intervention could bring on world war III. But a Communist takeover of Latin America, including Mexico, would mean a world war just the same. So it's a question of not what shall be done, but when. All signs today point to a Communist conquest of the Latin countries of this hemisphere if the United States continues to wait for the weak Organization of American States to act, or mistakenly delays action until the Communists have built another wall around all of Latin America just as they have around West Berlin.

Cuba is the natural place for an early showdown with communism in this hemisphere.

PARADOX IN CUBA POLICY LOOKS TIMID TO LATINS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Thousands of Soviet troops are apparently going to remain in Cuba indefinitely, and the U.S. Government evidently isn't going to do anything about it but write notes. While the number of "withdrawals" is announced, no official information is forthcoming as to the number of replacements.

For all the members of the Soviet Army in Cuba wear civilian clothes.

There seems, moreover, to be a tacit and unwritten agreement that not only will there no invasion of Cuba by this country but that the Soviet Army on the island and Castro troops will be protected by the United States against all outside attacks or invasions.

This paradox is occurring while tens of millions of dollars are spent annually to create abroad an "image" of the United States that will command respect and support as against Communist imperialism. Billions are about to be spent, also, in Latin America by our Government in the battle against communism. Psychological warfare is today almost as important, if not more so, than diplomacy used to be.

But what kind of image is the United States creating in Latin America? And who is creating that image? It is not the official information agency, with its managed broadcasts, but the White House and State Department, which can by their acts and pronouncements produce unfavorable impressions on the peoples of other countries.

The President has just directed that the Cuban exiles be prevented from liberating their fellow citizens by any acts initiated inside this country. This is a role of neutralism in the Western Hemisphere in place of the Monroe Doctrine. The explanation given by President Kennedy is that otherwise there might possibly be serious complications for the United States in Europe. This view, however, has already been interpreted in Latin America as a policy of timidity and fear. It is regarded as an abandonment of Cuba to Castro—as a means of strengthening him. The administration here may protest that this is farthest from its thoughts, but the policy may have that effect just the same.

EXILES CONFUSED

The people of Latin America know the difference between resoluteness and irresoluteness. If it is a violation of the neutrality laws of the United States, for instance, to allow expeditions to take the big risks that exiled Cubans wish to take to carry on forays along the coast of Cuba, then, it is asked, why does the U.S. Government keep on making unneutral statements that tell those same Cuban exiles to look forward to revolution as a means of liberation? Such declarations were repeated several times by the administration in recent months. This had a profound effect on the anti-Castro Cubans. They came to believe that the U.S. Government is behind them. But what do they see now? The Washington administration not only orders the Cubans seized if they try to launch any military raids from this country, but it has persuaded the British Government also to seize raiders.

Will the Latin American governments now feel morally bound to adopt the same course that Washington has urged on Great Britain? Will the Latin American governments be requested by the United States to prevent the use of their territory as a base of operations for the Cuban exiles?

The psychological effect of the latest turn in the Kennedy-Rusk policies can only be damaging and discouraging to the people inside Latin America who have no illusions about the problem of Communist infiltration or Castro's deliberate attempts to subvert many countries in this hemisphere in aid of Communist objectives.

While the raids launched against Cuba would themselves be mere pinpricks or ineffective, as President Kennedy sees it, it is out of such valiant and sacrificial expeditions that the spirit of revolution is stimulated and the morale of the insurgents is heightened. They have, moreover, a decided impact inside a country where a dictatorship is in power.

VAGUE FEARS

The image of weakness which the U.S. Government is creating for itself abroad with respect to Cuba is in large part due to the openly but vaguely expressed fear of international complications. This seems to accompany almost every move of American foreign policy nowadays where Cuba is concerned. The failure of the Soviet Government to withdraw all its troops from Cuba, after 5 months of note writing between Moscow and Washington, is being treated here with faint words of remonstrance. The fact that a European power has violated the Monroe Doctrine and maintains any troops or weapons on Cuban soil has been dealt with gently by the Washington Government.

To those who constantly talk of escalation and the dangers of nuclear war, all this may seem expedient. But it is precisely the kind of appeasement that has led to war in the past. Indeed, the administration's policy is not only presenting in Latin America an image of fear of Castro and the Soviets on the part of the United States, but it could have the dangerous effect of making the people of Western Europe, as well as the captive peoples of Eastern Europe, also believe that, when the chips are down, the United States will not pursue firm policies against Soviet aggression anywhere.

Communication—A Statement on the Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the long and arduous negotiations toward a treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons has now reached a critical stage. We are at the point where a workable treaty is in sight; the outstanding difference between ourselves and the Russians is now over the relatively minor question of the number of onsite inspections.

The burden of the problem is now being shifted from the scientists to the legislators. For this reason it is vital that we understand the factors involved in a test-ban treaty, and that the fog of misunderstanding—whether deliberate or accidental—be dispersed. To help clarify the issues I should like to insert in the RECORD this communication to the Washington Post, from nine distinguished American scientists, published in the Post on April 9, 1963.

I would particularly like to draw attention to the following points which they make: First, the United States and the Soviet Union are able to destroy one another regardless of how much their nuclear arsenals are expanded; second, the Soviet Union has more to gain from unrestricted nuclear testing than we do because they are further behind in nuclear technology; third, our own experts have stated that underground testing is of little military value; and fourth, adequate safeguards now exist for a workable test ban treaty which would end atomic fallout and help slow down the arms race.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1963]

A COMMUNICATION: STATEMENT ON THE TEST-BAN TREATY

In view of recent controversy concerning the desirability of concluding a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, we wish to make the following statement in support of the efforts of the U.S. Government to conclude such a treaty as soon as it can be negotiated.

Our primary reason for support lies in the fact that a test-ban treaty is in the best interests of the United States and of world peace. A treaty would reduce the speed of the present arms race, inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers, reduce the likelihood of nuclear war, and prevent the extension of the hazards of fallout. We therefore commend the President of the United States for his sincere attempt to reach a workable agreement with the Soviet Union on a test ban, and urge that Members of the U.S. Congress and of the general public consider the question of the test-ban treaty in the light of scientific fact and rational argument rather than in terms of partisan politics.

Unfortunately, public debate on the issue has been confused in recent weeks by some Members of Congress and by public figures who have attacked the test-ban treaty by spreading a completely false view of the test-ban situation. They also would appear to be operating on the fallacious assumption that American security can best be maintained by unlimited development of our nuclear weapons capability no matter what the other nations may be free to do in this regard. The attackers have failed to recognize the clear fact that once the overkill capabilities of the Soviet Union and the United States have reached their present level—and hardened missile bases are in place, making a successful disarming attack impossible for either side—an increase in nuclear capacity by one side or the other does not upset the balance of deterrence.

DETERRENCE REMAINS

Even though we probably possess between three to eight times as much intercontinental nuclear weapons capability as the Soviet Union, we would still have little chance of escaping an incredibly destructive retaliation were we to strike first with our strategic force. Since the smaller Soviet force is enough to deter us from a nuclear attack on the Soviets, a considerable change in force levels would still leave us with more than sufficient force to deter the Soviets from making a nuclear attack on us.

The opponents of the test ban treaty also base their argument on the fallacious assumption that any attempt on our part to negotiate with the Soviet Union means that we are taking a soft political line and making dangerous concessions. The treaty opponents therefore consider any lowering of the number of on-site inspections by the United States simply as a sign of weakness and of yielding to the advantage of the Soviet Union, rather than as realistic negotiation to improve national security. In fact, during the period since the test ban discussions began in 1958, detection techniques have been rapidly improving and may be expected to improve still further. It is now possible to detect many of the explosions within a given country by stations outside that country, and the number of on-site inspections required for checking the identification of earthquakes versus explosions has been greatly reduced. Research has also shown that there are many fewer earthquakes in the Soviet Union than was formerly thought, thus making a reduction

in the possibility of their being confused with nuclear tests.

The strategy of the opponents of a treaty is to exaggerate the risks of clandestine testing and to minimize the risks of a continuing nuclear arms race. Among the most flagrant violations of fact which they have publicized in these matters are the recent statements by Dr. Edward Teller that a test ban agreement "would be virtually unpoliced" and "would not interfere with Russian progress," and Senator DODD's claim that the test ban policy of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

MISSTATEMENT CHARGED

In making this claim, Senator DODD is completely misstating the facts as set forth by responsible Department of Defense officials. If the Soviets learned more than we did in the 1961–62 testing and narrowed the gap between us, it was because they had more to learn. There is every reason to believe that they would have narrowed the gap even more rapidly had there not been a moratorium and had there been continuous testing on both sides after 1958. Conversely, if we had been able to conclude a test ban treaty in 1959, the Russian tests of 1961–62 would not have taken place and we would still have our great superiority of nuclear weapons technology. By no stretch of the imagination could these tests have been carried out secretly underground.

The direct advantages to the United States of a test ban treaty are these:

1. Dependable assurance that no atmospheric testing, which is the really important kind, is taking place.

2. Reasonable assurance that underground testing of small nuclear weapons is not taking place.

What assurance do we have that in the event of a test ban treaty the Soviet Union would not conduct secret underground tests?

Even though a single small test might be concealed by being confused with an earthquake if the test were conducted in a region of frequent earthquake occurrences, any significant series of tests would be almost impossible to conceal.

RISK IS EMPHASIZED

It is extremely unlikely that the Soviet Union would be willing to risk the breakdown of the treaty for the marginal gain they might achieve by testing explosions small enough to escape detection. It is important to recall that American nuclear weapons experts insisted that underground testing was of little value for military purposes when, in 1961, our testing was temporarily limited to underground explosions. We have additional assurance in the fact that the Soviet Union has agreed to three on-site inspections should suspicious indications of underground testing be discovered by the detection system of the United States and the United Kingdom, and is willing to permit a number of automatic seismic stations on Soviet territory.

The Soviets surprised us by starting big atmospheric tests in 1961 when we thought at that time they would continue negotiations for a test ban treaty. The opponents of a present treaty now claim that this means the Soviets broke a test ban agreement in 1961. On this basis they warn against entering another agreement. It is too often forgotten that there was no test ban agreement (much less a treaty) in 1961, and that President Eisenhower, on December 29, 1959, terminated the 1-year informal moratorium by announcing, "The voluntary moratorium on testing will expire on December 31." Even though the Soviets and most other nations have broken treaties, a test ban treaty would be very different from a mere cessation of tests, particularly if adhered to by an increasing number of nations, because it would be in the interest of the United States and the Soviet Union to abide by it. To be on the safe side, our developments and preparations would continue as far as possible without testing, and there should be no doubt that American testing would be resumed if the Soviets should break the treaty by again resuming tests in the atmosphere.

Even if the treaty should be abrogated after a time or should fail to develop into a world test ban because of the recalcitrance of France or China, it would not have interfered with our nuclear development appreciably more than the Soviet's. The treaty would emphasize above all the common interest of the United States and the Soviet Union in trying to avoid nuclear war.

In summary, the test-ban treaty, as proposed, will stop atmospheric testing as long as the treaty is in effect. It will leave some uncertainty about very small tests (one ten-thousandth the size of the H-bomb) but could reasonably be expected to deter the Soviets from even small-scale cheating (a) because it would teach them relatively little, (b) because of the serious risk of being caught and (c) because there are good reasons for the Soviets to want the treaty to function.

Careful studies by the foremost experts in the United States and by the President's advisers on national security, including those in the Defense Department, have furnished the conclusion that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test-ban treaty is considerably more than the risk that such a treaty might be violated by secret testing. We support the President in this conclusion and believe that once the Members of Congress and the people of the United States are aware of the realities of our present situation and of the facts of the test-ban case, that they too will support the President in his effort to find answers to the greatest question before the world today—the question of survival.

Dr. Bernard Feld, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. David Inglis, Argonne National Laboratories, Argonne, Ill.; Dr. James Watson, Department of Biology, Harvard University; Dr. Bruno Rossi, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, MIT; Dr. Donald Glaser, Department of Physics, University of California; Dr. Hans Bethe, Department of Physics, Cornell University; Dr. Freeman Dyson, Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton University; Dr. Francis Low, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. K. T. Bainbridge, Department of Physics, Harvard University.

Washington Star Calls Wild Animal Conservation an Evident Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 107 is needed to provide a new impetus to efforts to save imperiled wild animals throughout the world.

The severity of the threat to our animal resources is not widely recognized. Neither do we pay sufficient attention to the human, ethical, and economic values that will be lost if we do not act to save the world's animals.

The Washington Star has recently commented on my proposal and pointed out that a look at the facts makes the need for action evident to anyone. I call the attention of the House to the Star's editorial, which follows:

WILDLIFE IN TROUBLE

Nearly four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, devoted strictly to wild animals and birds, may strike some as a rather extravagant use of space. Not so Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, and his reason becomes evident at the very outset of his well-organized remarks:

"Man has already ignobly succeeded in exterminating about 200 species of birds and animals, among them beautiful, useful and once plentiful creatures. * * * Now we recklessly threaten nearly 250 species with the same fate. These almost condemned creature include some of the most spectacular and successful animals evolved during millions of years. Yet if we continue our present course, they may be gone forever in a decade or less."

If Mr. REUSS' information is accurate (and he quotes competent authorities) this does not leave much time to insure the survival of such species as the American bald eagle (our national emblem), the California condor, polar bear, woodland caribou, trumpeter swan, giant tortoise, Arabian oryx, Ceylon elephant, Kashmir stag, wild chinchilla, Angolan giraffe and the rhinoceros, elephant and antelope of Africa, to name but a few.

To prevent the total destruction of these once-abundant birds and beasts, man must do a complete turnabout. Up to now he has wantonly killed them for sport, for fads and fancies to please his vanity (ivory, pelts, feathers, leopardskin coats and the like) and for profit by poachers, at least one of whom has made as much as $50,000 a year.

Aside for those which every nature lover and circus fan can understand, Mr. REUSS enumerates vital reasons for putting the brakes on animal annihilation. One is the need for continued scientific study of wildlife, but more pratical is the economic factor. By proper management, the fowl and fauna can become an important part of the development of many new African countries, providing under right conditions food, hides and lucrative tourist attractions.

Thus far a few organizations such as the World Wildlife Fund, have engaged in an uneven fight for preservation. Mr. REUSS has found that a realistic worldwide conservation program would cost at least $3 million a year. For a start in that direction, he has asked Congress to authorize an international conference to set up the machinery. Principally, there would be an effort to ban or curtail imports on commodities derived from wild animals, to set up conservation schools and departments, and to give monetary aid to countries where wildlife abounds. The need for such a program should be evident to anyone who reads Mr. REUSS' treatise.

Leading Scientists Support Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the administration's proposals for a test ban treaty have generated a heated controversy in both governmental and private sectors of our

Nation. Much of this debate has stemmed from the lack of public understanding of the comparative risks between a test ban treaty and a continued unrestrained arms race. There is no more important issue facing this Nation, and indeed mankind, than disarmament under effective international control. The conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty would be an important step in that direction. Public information regarding the test ban proposals and their vast implications for future world peace is a basic necessity. Because of the importance of public education on this issue, I was delighted to see in the Washington Post this morning a letter from several of our Nation's most distinguished scientists, including a number of Nobel Prize winners. In this communication the distinguished men of science have cleared the air of many of the confusions and invalid assumptions which have been thrown up around the test ban issue by many of the opponents of the administration's proposals. The scientists outline the cogent reasons why the President's proposals are in the interest of our national security and why it is important to the future of this Nation that a test ban treaty be concluded. I highly recommend the following letter to all my colleagues and to every American.

The article follows;

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1963]

A COMMUNICATION: STATEMENT ON THE TEST BAN TREATY

In view of recent controversy concerning the desirability of concluding a nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union, we wish to make the following statement in support of the efforts of the U.S. Government to conclude such a treaty as soon as it can be negotiated.

Our primary reason for support lies in the fact that a test ban treaty is in the best interests of the United States and of world peace. A treaty would reduce the speed of the present arms race, inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers, reduce the likelihood of nuclear war, and prevent the extension of the hazards of fallout. We therefore commend the President of the United States for his sincere attempt to reach a workable agreement with the Soviet Union on a test ban, and urge that Members of the U.S. Congress and of the general public consider the question of the test ban treaty in the light of scientific fact and rational argument rather than in terms of partisan politics.

Unfortunately, public debate on the issue has been confused in recent weeks by some Members of Congress and by public figures who have attacked the test ban treaty by spreading a completely false view of the test ban situation. They also would appear to be operating on the fallacious assumption that American security can best be maintained by unlimited development of our nuclear weapons capability no matter what the other nations may be free to do in this regard. The attackers have failed to recognize the clear fact that once the overkill capabilities of the Soviet Union and the United States have reached their present level—and hardened missile bases are in place, making a successful disarming attack impossible for either side—an increase in nuclear capacity by one side or the other does not upset the balance of deterrence.

DETERRENCE REMAINS

Even though we probably possess between three to eight times as much intercontinental nuclear weapons capability as the Soviet Union, we would still have little chance of escaping an incredibly destructive retaliation were we to strike first with our strategic force. Since the smaller Soviet force is enough to deter us from a nuclear attack on the Soviets, a considerable change in force levels would still leave us with more than sufficient force to deter the Soviets from making a nuclear attack on us.

The opponents of the test ban treaty also base their argument on the fallacious assumption that any attempt on our part to negotiate with the Soviet Union means that we are taking a soft political line and making dangerous concessions. The treaty opponents therefore consider any lowering of the number of on-site inspections by the United States simply as a sign of weakness and of yielding to the advantage of the Soviet Union, rather than as realistic negotiation to improve national security. In fact, during the period since the test ban discussion began in 1958, detection techniques have been rapidly improving and may be expected to improve still further. It is now possible to detect many of the explosions within a given country by stations outside that country, and the number of on-site inspections required for checking the identification of earthquakes versus explosions has been greatly reduced. Research has also shown that there are many fewer earthquakes in the Soviet Union than was formerly thought, thus making a reduction in the possibility of their being confused with nuclear tests.

The strategy of the opponents of a treaty is to exaggerate the risks of clandestine testing and to minimize the risks of a continuing nuclear arms race. Among the most flagrant violations of fact which they have publicized in these matters are the recent statements by Dr. Edward Teller that a test ban agreement "would be virtually unpoliced" and "would not interfere with Russian progress," and Senator DODD's claim that the test ban policy of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

MISSTATEMENT CHARGED

In making this claim, Senator DODD is completely misstating the facts as set forth by responsible Department of Defense officials. If the Soviets learned more than we did in the 1961–62 testing and narrowed the gap between us, it was because they had more to learn. There is every reason to believe that they would have narrowed the gap even more rapidly had there not been a moratorium and had there been continuous testing on both sides after 1958. Conversely, if we had been able to conclude a test ban treaty in 1959, the Russian tests of 1961–62 would not have taken place and we would still have our great superiority of nuclear weapons technology. By no stretch of the imagination could these tests have been carried out secretly underground.

The direct advantages to the United States of a test ban treaty are these:

1. Dependable assurance that no atmospheric testing, which is the really important kind, is taking place.

2. Reasonable assurance that underground testing of small nuclear weapons is not taking place.

What assurance do we have that in the event of a test ban treaty the Soviet Union would not conduct secret underground tests?

Even though a single small test might be concealed by being confused with an earthquake if the test were conducted in a region of frequent earthquake occurrences, any significant series of tests would be almost impossible to conceal.

RISK IS EMPHASIZED

It is extremely unlikely that the Soviet Union would be willing to risk the breakdown of the treaty for the marginal gain they might achieve by testing explosions small enough to escape detection. It is important to recall that American nuclear weapons experts insisted that underground testing was of little value for military purposes when, in 1961, our testing was temporarily limited to underground explosions. We have additional assurance in the fact that the Soviet Union has agreed to three onsite inspections should suspicious indications of underground testing be discovered by the detection system of the United States and the United Kingdom, and is willing to permit a number of automatic seismic stations on Soviet territory.

The Soviets surprised us by starting big atmospheric tests in 1961 when we thought at that time they would continue negotiations for a test ban treaty. The opponents of a present treaty now claim that this means the Soviets broke a test ban agreement in 1961. On this basis, they warn against entering another agreement. It is too often forgotten that there was no test ban agreement (much less a treaty) in 1961, and that President Eisenhower on December 29, 1959, terminated the 1-year informal moratorium by announcing, "The voluntary moratorium on testing will expire on December 31." Even though the Soviets and most other nations have broken treaties, a test ban treaty would be very different from a mere cessation of tests, particularly if adhered to by an increasing number of nations, because it would be in the interest of the United States and the Soviet Union to abide by it. To be on the safe side, our developments and preparations would continue as far as possible without testing, and there should be no doubt that American testing would be resumed if the Soviets should break the treaty by again resuming tests in the atmosphere.

Even if the treaty should be abrogated after a time or should fail to develop into a world test ban because of the recalcitrance of France or China, it would not have interfered with our nuclear development appreciably more than the Soviets. The treaty would emphasize above all the common interest of the United States and the Soviet Union in trying to avoid nuclear war.

In summary, the test-ban treaty, as proposed, will stop atmospheric testing as long as the treaty is in effect. It will leave some uncertainty about very small tests (one ten-thousandth the size of the H-bomb) but could reasonably be expected to deter the Soviets from even small-scale cheating (a) because it would teach them relatively little, (b) because of the serious risk of being caught, and (c) because there are good reasons for the Soviets to want the treaty to function.

Careful studies by the foremost experts in the United States and by the President's advisers on national security, including those in the Defense Department, have furnished the conclusion the arms race without a test-ban treaty is considerably more than the risk that such a treaty might be violated by secret testing. We support the President in this conclusion and believe that once the Members of Congress and the people of the United States are aware of the realities of our present situation and of the facts of the test-ban case, that they too will support the President in his effort to find answers to the greatest question before the world today—the question of survival.

Dr. Bernard Feld, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. David Inglis, Argonne National Laboratories, Argonne, Ill.; Dr. James Watson, Department of Biology, Harvard University; Dr. Bruno Rossi, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, MIT; Dr. Donald Glaser, Department of Physics, University of California; Dr. Hans Bethe, Department of Physics, Cornell University; Dr. Freeman Dyson, Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton University; Dr. Francis Low, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. K. T. Bainbridge, Department of Physics, Harvard University.

Hit-and-Run Raids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roscoe Drummond has raised the point: "Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does." This is probably an understatement even at that.

Recalling the President's pronouncements of sympathy with the exiled Cubans and his later attempts to block actions by them, whatever their limited success, to regain their homeland, Mr. Drummond notes significantly:

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the full text of Mr. Drummond's column, entitled "Hit-and-Run Raids":

HIT-AND-RUN RAIDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably President Kennedy seeks the goal of a "free Cuba." He told the released Cuban invasion-prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident that their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugees' harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in the way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pinpricks. So were Castro's first hit-and-run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any "prudent" man could have told the latent and fermenting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and handmade grenades.

But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil."

It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba.

The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that findings things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Mr. Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we should "do more" to help the Cuban resisters "both inside and outside Cuba." Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba.

If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong, then, at the very least, it should be suggesting to them and helping them to do it right.

A $1,000 Reward Offered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, here is a good chance for someone among our foreign aid spenders to make himself $1,000 in cold cash, provided he can put his finger on the very words in our Federal Constitution specifically authorizing this gigantic, backbreaking, nation-ruining, inflationary, ineffective foreign aid adventure that has already cost our country $100 billion since its inception. I now make this cash offer to President Kennedy, Chief Justice Warren, Secretary of State Rusk, or any Member of Congress who will point out to me the constitutional words giving this kind of legal authority to any officials whatever in our government of the people.

I have always voted against every single dime of this unconstitutional outpouring of the resources of our people. And so I now challenge all those who have so faithfully supported it from year to year to show me, though I do not hail from Missouri, whereby they have derived their just power from the consent of the governed so as to have enabled them to take a total of $555 from each man, woman, and child in America, over the years, and broadcast that bounty throughout the world, frequently among communistic countries.

BUT DEAN RUSK SAYS

The latest statement from Secretary Rusk about this piece of outlawry says that any failure to keep up this foreign aid program right now might cause us to lose Vietnam. Now when did we ever have Vietnam? Where is the official sanction for making Vietnam a state or territory of the United States? And if we do lose that which we do not have, how could it possibly matter? Are those jungles in southeast Asia really necessary to our survival? Do they furnish additional war potential to the Kremlin? Do they have atomic powered submarines or long-range missiles? Is Vietnam such a suitable locale in which the sons of American parents may die that we must continue to pour our blood and money into that distant territory thousands of miles from our shores? Frankly, we all know the Vietnamese would not recognize any democracy, or care about it, if they should meet it out on the sweet highway to paradise.

We may indeed lose Vietnam. But truthfully we have already lost Vietnam. And yet we know we never did have it in the first place, if we just tell the simple truth about the whole matter.

WHAT A JOKE

You may recall that recently someone in our Government accused the ruling authority down in Brazil of being soft on communism, or words to that effect. And immediately the Brazilians jumped up and said, "If you are going to insult us in that manner, we will just stop taking all your foreign aid." And then we calmed down considerably and said, "Now do not get ruffled, just be good boys and keep on taking our aid and another shipment will soon be on the way." What a joke when you have to apologize for telling the blunt truth and when you even have to beg some foreign nation to take your handouts.

And then also what a joke it is whenever some little, struggling county or city down in Kentucky, Tennessee, or Georgia could not come to Washington on its hands and knees and get enough money to build a small bridge or a dam from these very "Constitution disregarding" authorities who would yet hasten to pour out millions of your cash dollars before sunrise tomorrow to help keep India "neutral." Why not let India be unneutral? She will eventually learn all about communism regardless of our pattern of behavior. In fact, she has already learned, even before the recent idles of March, has she not?

Mr. Speaker, I will never be very much of a governmental economizer here in Congress until and unless we see fit to prefer an American bridge or a Kentucky dam over and above the building of an airfield over yonder in Afghanistan.

And did you know—yes, of course, you must know—that we have given several billions of dollars to foreign powers to help reduce their national debts and balance their budgets? And yet in order to do this we had to increase our own national debt and unbalance our own budget. Ours is the largest national debt on earth. It is even larger than the combined debt of all those receiving our

foreign aid. But we just go blithely and bounteously along on our merry way toward national and fiscal destruction. Will I vote this week to add on the increased $500 million for accelerated public works? Of course, I will. My simple motto declares, "Millions for the near east we call eastern Kentucky and not one additional dime for the near east we might call East Germany." Maybe you really did not know we had already spent several millions on communist East Germany. But it is true. Just look at the dismal record and you will see SILER has not infringed on the Ninth Commandment against false witnessing.

Mr. Speaker, you well know that Rome lasted only as long as there were real Romans interested in Rome. Now it is equally true, I believe, that America will only last as long as there are real Americans interested in America.

Well, I will be hanging around with my checkbook ready to give $1,000 to anyone who will show me some rhetoric in the Federal Constitution about like these words: "And shall have power to make appropriations for the use and benefit of other foreign nations." My address here in Washington is 209 House Office Building and I will be ready, willing, and able if you will only "point out them words."

Foster Sons of Kansas Do Well in Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 President Kennedy nominated two of the Army's most distinguished officers for promotion and appointment to yet higher rank. Lt. Gen. Theodore W. (Ted) Parker is to receive a fourth star and become Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe. Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson is to receive the third star of a lieutenant general and replace General Parker as the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations. It is interesting to note, and perhaps more than a coincidence, that these two outstanding officers served in the State of Kansas prior to coming to Washington for their present assignments. General Parker was the commanding general of the 1st Division at Fort Riley and General Johnson was the commandant of the Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth.

As is well known, the Sunflower State has given the country many famous soldiers, including Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. It is a pleasure to note that in addition to doing more than its share in providing the Nation's military leaders, Kansas also now serves as a grooming ground for rising military officers so unfortunate as to have been born in a State other than Kansas.

For the information of my colleagues, I am appending a brief synopsis of the military careers of these two fine officers. Their many friends in Kansas join me in extending congratulations upon their promotion and all good wishes for success in their new assignments.

SYNOPSIS OF CAREER OF LT. GEN. THEODORE W. PARKER

Lt. Gen. Theodore W. Parker's military service reflects a wide range of assignments as an artilleryman and staff officer, and with particular experience in the field of international politico-military affairs. Culminating considerable command duty at artillery battery and battalion level, he was a commanding general of division and corps artillery in combat in Korea, and Army artillery officer there. Later he commanded an antiaircraft artillery brigade and region in the United States. His service in the politico-military field includes 3 years on the War Department general staff, a year in the executive offices of the President and over 3 years in Paris with the North Atlantic Council, the major part of it as the standing group's representative to the council.

Theodore William Parker was born in Minneapolis, Minn., January 31, 1909, and graduated from North High School there in 1925. He graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1931. He married Nina Mae Hill of Minneapolis on July 20, 1935, at Fort Snelling, Minn. They have three daughters, the eldest of whom is married to Ensign Frank O'Beirne, Jr., U.S. Navy.

General Parker is a graduate of the battery and advanced officers' courses at Fort Sill, Okla., the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and the National War College, Washington, D.C. From 1935 to 1939 he served as an instructor at West Point in the department of natural and experimental philosophy.

During World War II, he went to Iceland with the first Army contingent to go overseas, and spent some 2 years there. He returned to the United States to train an artillery battalion, then served as G-3 (operations officer) of the 9th U.S. Army throughout its campaigns in the European Theater of Operations.

He spent a year (1949–50) as assistant secretary of the Army General Staff in Washington and 2 years (1950–52) as chief of staff of the 10th Infantry Division (training) at Fort Riley, Kans.

He was promoted brigadier general in 1952 and major general in 1956.

General Parker's citations and decorations include: Legion of Merit (with Oak Leaf Cluster), Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal, Order of the British Empire (United Kingdom), and Ulchi Distinguished Service Medal with Gold Star (Republic of South Korea).

SYNOPSIS OF CAREER OF MAJ. GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON

Harold K. Johnson was born in Bowesmont, N. Dak., on February 22, 1912. He was graduated from high school in Grafton, N. Dak. in 1929, and from the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., in 1933 as a second lieutenant of infantry.

General Johnson's service includes a tour of duty with the Third (Old Guard) Infantry Regiment at Fort Snelling, Minn.; the 28th Infantry at Fort Niagara, N.Y.; and the 57th Infantry, Philippine Scouts, Port McKinly, Philippine Islands. He was in the 57th Infantry (Philippine Scouts). Upon the fall of Bataan in April 1942, he participated in the death march from Bataan, and later was imprisoned by the Japanese at Camp O'Donnell, Tarlac, Philippine Islands; Camp Cabanatuan, Philippine Islands; Bilibid Prison, Manila, Philippine Islands.

He was moved to Japan in the winter of 1944–45 after the Americans had landed on Leyte. The ships on which he was moved were twice subjected to friendly air attack and damaged to the extent that they could not proceed. He was moved from Japan to Korea in April 1945 where he was liberated by the Seventh Division when they made their occupational landing at Inchon on September 8, 1945.

Upon his return to the United States he attended the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and served for 2 years on the faculty. He attended the Armed Forces Staff College at Norfolk, Va., from whence he was assigned to the Seventh Infantry Regiment stationed at Port Devens, Mass.

He took the first provisional infantry battalion to Korea in August 1950, where he joined the First Cavalry Division in the defense of the Pusan Perimeter, later participating in the pursuit to the north, the encounter with the Chinese in late 1950 and subsequent withdrawal to South Korea. During this period he commanded both the Fifth and Eighth Cavalry Regiments of the First Cavalry Division.

In February 1951, he joined I Corps in Korea where he served until October 1951 as assistant chief of staff, G3, operations.

Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to the office of the chief, Army Field Forces at Fort Monroe, Va. He attended the National War College, graduating with the class of 1953. He then was assigned to the office of the assistant chief of staff, G3, operations, where he served as chief, joint war plans branch; assistant to the chief of plans division, G3; and as executive officer, G3, until his departure for Fort Carson, Colo. in January 1956 to serve as assistant division commander, Eighth Infantry Division. The division gyroscoped to Germany in the late summer and fall of 1956. After serving 20 months as assistant division commander, Eighth Division, he was assigned to Seventh Army Headquarters in Stuttgart-Vaihingen as chief of staff. Then in April 1959, he was moved to Headquarters U.S. Army Europe as assistant chief of staff, G3. General Johnson has been awarded the Combat Infantryman's Badge with Star, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Legion of Merit with three Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Bronze Star Medal.

Col. William H. McIntyre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear of the death on March 1 of a distinguished citizen of New York, Col. William H. McIntyre.

Colonel McIntyre was born on March 3, 1888, in the McIntyre Homestead at 86th Street and Bloomingdale Road located in the 20th Congressional District which I am honored to represent. He had an illustrious military, civic and political career. Among other decorations, he held the Croix de Guerre. He was president of the 22d Regiment Defendam Association; past commander, 69th Regiment Veterans; president of the National Guard-Naval Militia; a founder of the American Legion and

national vice president of the Society of American Legion Founders; a national officer in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion and Catholic War Veterans.

On January 28, 1956, Colonel McIntyre was honored with a citation by the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Command, Inc., for his tireless devotion to those heroic Americans who lost their lives in World War II and Korea. On March 7, 1956, Congressman Irwin Davidson, who then represented the 20th District, paid tribute to Colonel McIntyre and introduced the resolution of the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Command, Inc. into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will want to joint me in extending deepest sympathy to the family of Colonel McIntyre.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an obituary of Colonel McIntrye which was published in the New York Daily Report on March 4, 1963.

The article follows:

RITES SLATED TODAY FOR COLONEL MCINTYRE

A messa-cantata for Col. William H. McIntyre, a founder of the American Legion and a past president of the Society of American Legion Founders, will be held at 10 a.m., today in St. Paul the Apostle Church, 60th Street and Columbus Avenue. Colonel McIntyre died of a heart attack Friday in his home, 316 79th Street. Burial will be in Calvary Cemetery, Queens.

Colonel McIntyre met every ship, train and plane arriving in New York bearing bodies of American men killed in either World War II or the Korean conflict.

From 1947 to 1956, he participated in 605 such memorial ceremonies, having met 86 ships and 519 trains which brought back more than 150,000 American war dead.

"Bill" McIntyre, a World War I veteran, attended the famous Paris caucus in 1919 which laid the foundation for the Legion.

He made three trips back to Europe to visit American military cemeteries—in 1927, 1947, and 1954. He wrote approximately 10,000 letters to next of kin of American fighting men who died for their country.

A few years ago, Colonel McIntyre was the subject of an unusual tribute in the House of Representatives, when Representative Irwin D. Davidson, Democrat-Liberal, of New York, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a citation honoring the colonel.

A New York County Republican committeeman for many years, he was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress against Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., in the old West Side 20th District in 1949.

Colonel McIntyre held the Croix de Guerre and many other decorations. Besides the Legion, he belonged to the Franco-American Society, the Order of Lafayette, and the Catholic War Veterans. He was a member of Metropolitan Post 385.

Colonel McIntyre was for 55 years a claims supervisor for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Born in New York, March 3, 1888, death claimed him just 2 days before his 75th birthday. Surviving are a daughter, Claire, with whom he lived; a son, William J., of Matawa, Ontario, and three sisters, Mrs. James (Violetta) Cramer of St. Petersburg, Fla.; Mrs. Eugene (Cornelia) A. De Rosier of New York, and Mrs. Robert (Julianne) Grandchamp of New Paltz, N.Y. His wife, the former Marie Louise Meade, died in 1958.

Sister Mary Philippa, S.M.: A Tribute From Her Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and to the attention of our colleagues an article entitled "Sister Mary Philippa, S.M.: A Tribute From Her Staff."

To those Members of Congress who knew her, I know they will recognize this eloquent tribute as a true and accurate account of her life and work. It was my privilege and honor to have known her. It was her mind and heart and determination that was a large factor in building St. Mary's Hospital to become one of the leading institutions in the Nation. Her example and work will serve as a guidebook for her successors for many years to come.

In my mind, one sentence from the appended article, summarizes best her work at the hospital. It reads:

She had a feeling of St. Mary's as a living thing, as a part of continuing history; and nothing which might enhance its good name, or preserve its past, was too much trouble for her to undertake.

The article follows:

SISTER MARY PHILIPPA, S.M.: A TRIBUTE FROM HER STAFF

Her years in the hospital, happily an unbroken continuum, were filled with change and accomplishment. Many will remember her for the physical additions to the hospital, such as the new south wing or the McAuley Institute. But the true proportion of the changes she wrought can never be measured in bricks and mortar. Her great personal contribution was in "bending" the hospital's role from that of a private community hospital to that of a comprehensive medical center. She saw early that service alone was not sufficient to maintain the hospital's fine reputation in the city, and as promptly espoused the additional obligations, and the financial burdens, of teaching and research. Ready support was given to the development of improved nursing education, culminating in the establishment of a school of nursing in affiliation with the University of San Francisco. She lent every possible support to the acceleration of the teaching program for house officers, and was one of the first administrators in the country to appoint a full-time director of medical education. Finally, she saw clearly the need to interest the house staff in research methods, and gave full support to any physician on the staff who had a bent toward research. Thanks to her wisdom the composition of the staff has been quietly altered to conform with the hospital's newer role, as a medical center providing service, education, and research. Of her many accomplishments, perhaps this happy marriage will endure the longest, will be a true monument more lasting than brass.

But there was more to this remarkable woman than accomplishment. There was a manifest warmth and caritas despite her every effort to hide them behind the camouflage of authority. Little did the newsman who wrote her obituary realize how close he had come to the inner person when he described her "as a woman who had dedicated her life to mercy." Her mercy was indeed soft "as the gentle rain from heaven," self-effacing, given with ease and a wide understanding of human needs. But the true measure of her humility could be seen in her brusque, embarrassed rejection of any acknowledgment by the recipient of her generosity. How many of us, as impoverished interns, could ever forget our feelings of warm gratitude as she aided our first, faltering steps into fatherhood with the bundle of baby needs and the canceled hospital bill.

Perhaps Sister Mary Philippa Fayne will be best remembered by the awe she inspired in nearly everyone she met. In a world which easily tolerated compromise and mediocrity, she rejected any facile solution to human problems within the hospital family. She never trimmed her high principles to suit the changing needs of her staff, exhibiting at all times an unvarying, constant incorruptibility. She never left you in any doubt where you stood in her estimation. More than anyone else in the hospital she had a feeling of St. Mary's as a living thing, as a part of continuing history; and nothing which might enhance its good name, or preserve its past, was too much trouble for her to undertake.

In her last letter to her medical staff, she expressed so aptly the bond that united her and her professional staff to this living thing. In gratitude for their loyalty. She wrote: "From the interest and loyalty of such friends, we derive the added impetus which, with God's help, will enable us to see the fulfillment of our plans for expansion." Although she was called before her plans were fully realized, there is little danger that those of us who were privileged to know this remarkable person will retreat from the challenge she has handed down. And when her goals are finally achieved, and the medical complex she dreamed of is realized, then indeed will she attain the final tribute for the part she played in the story of "St. Mary's: Monumentum Aere Perennius."

President Should Level With the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the contradictory, vacillating, sometimes secret actions of our Government are bearing fruit. That fruit is bitter and sickening. Evidences are seen on all sides in Cuba, communism, and the Monroe Doctrine violation.

One day we promise help, then at the crucial moment we renege. Then we say we never promised aid. We blockade, but it was not a blockade. We say arms buildup is defensive, not offensive. Then agree it is offensive. By this time it is too late. We demand removal of the offensive weapons, but do not inspect to see that it is done. We declare when forced to explain that the Russians in Cuba are technicians. Then, again challenged by the people, admit they are soldiers, just a few. Then it becomes 22,000 soldiers. We train Cubans to retake their homeland. Then repudiate their efforts, to side with Castro and Khrushchev in military support. And

every step of the way the American people are kept uninformed, misinformed and are told only when public pressure becomes irresistible, and then only so much as necessary to quiet public demands. Then a top administration official proclaims the right of the Government to lie. Meanwhile, military leaders are muzzled and downgraded.

What is this new posture of the United States, Mr. President? It is time we leveled with the people. You know, most of us Congressmen and constituents alike think our Government is still of, by, and for the people. So how about taking us into your confidence. After all, we all will suffer any unfortunate consequences of bad policy decisions.

The following article from the Washington Post points up the confusion which the administration is fostering:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 8, 1963]

NEUTRALITY ACT STRAINED: EXILE-RAIDER BAN BAFFLES CUBANS AND COMPOUNDS IRONY FOR THE FBI

(By David Kraslow)

The Federal Bureau of Investigation must find the crackdown on Cuban exile raiding activity a bit ironic.

The story behind that thought has yet to be told and much of it probably never will be known. Involved were secret discussions (arguments might be a better word in some instances) at the highest levels of Government. It is doubtful that a complete record—if indeed any record—has been preserved for posterity.

In the last months of the Eisenhower administration—during the summer of 1960—the United States began to recruit and train Cuban exiles for action against the Fidel Castro regime. The concept was rather vague. It did not harden, in fact, until after President Kennedy took office in January 1961.

The task fell to the Central Intelligence Agency. It financed Cuban exile groups. It supported basic training camps in the United States. It did more.

SHOOTING INCIDENT

Americans who lived near one such camp in a rural area south of Miami could hear drill orders barked over a loudspeaker. They reported seeing young Cubans in marching formation.

There was a shooting incident during that summer of 1960. Some American youths seeking a little fun tossed firecrackers into the camp. Thinking they were being attacked by Castro supporters, the Cubans came running with carbines blazing. One of the American youths was wounded.

Federal officials quietly urged local authorities to let the incident slide by.

The FBI was not happy. It has major responsibility for enforcement of the Neutrality Act, which makes it a crime for anyone to aid, prepare, or participate in a military expendition from the United States against a foreign state with which this country is at peace.

The FBI knew what was going on. It knew that the Neutrality Act was being flagrantly violated. It knew the violations had the blessing of the CIA. FBI agents gathered their information and made their reports to Washington.

MATTER OF CONCERN

The CIA-sponsored activity on U.S. soil became a concern of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Attorney General William Rogers. How could persons doing the bidding of an arm of the U.S. Government be prosecuted for violating a U.S. law? And what were the long-range implications—both for agents sworn to uphold the law and for a free society as a whole—of an official policy of selective enforcement of the law?

Whatever the justification, these were the facts, and the facts added up to a serious moral dilemma for Hoover and Rogers.

(When Fulgencio Batista was in power and Castro fought him from outside Cuba and later from the Sierra Maestra, there were numerous Neutrality Act prosecutions of Cuban nationals in the United States. Both Batista and Castro supporters were arrested.)

FBI agents may well have been sympathetic with what the Government was doing with one hand, but they also knew that the other hand was compromising the principle of impartial enforcement of the law.

OTHERS PUNISHED

They knew that other Cubans had been punished in American courts for violating the same law.

Hoover and Rogers made their thoughts known at Cabinet-level and White House discussions. The argument was made that if what the CIA was doing had to be done, then find a location outside the country where the Neutrality Act would not apply.

These discussions in the summer of 1960 were an important factor behind the shift of Cuban exile training to Central America.

Now, for what may very well be excellent reasons, the Government is getting tough with Cubans for violating a law in 1963 that they were invited to violate in 1960. If some Cubans are baffled, that is understandable.

And if Federal law enforcement officers can just about taste the irony, that, too, is understandable.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Old Salt Creek Makes Brisk Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am sure that every oilman is familiar with the Salt Creek oilfield. This historic field, established in 1908, put Wyoming on the map as an oil producer. The oil from this field during initial years of heavy production made it the largest single producing field in the world.

Now time has a habit of ending the glory of an oilfield and for some time production at Salt Creek, as in many other historic fields, fell rapidly. But the picture has changed. The Pan American Petroleum Corp. and its contract operator at Salt Creek, the Midwest Oil Co., have produced a comeback at Salt Creek through waterflood recovery operations.

The story of how this was accomplished appears in the February issue of Horizons, Pan American's magazine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD SALT CREEK MAKES BRISK COMEBACK

Historic old Salt Creek, one of the most famous fields in the annals of the petroleum industry, has come back to life. On the decline for many years, the dozing giant has awakened, pumping forth millions of additional barrels of oil from beneath its 30-square-mile surface.

Established in 1908, the central Wyoming oilfield increased oil production steadily year by year and was for a time the world's largest producer. In 1923 it poured out an average of about 97,000 barrels of oil a day. This accounted for some 5 percent of all the oil produced in the United States that year. Production skidded steadily from this peak. By 1933 it stood at 20,000 barrels per day and by 1954 it had slipped to about half this total.

In 1955 the ex-king of the oilfields, its flush days long past, received a superstimulant. Waterflood operations began. Since then production has soared once more. During 1962 the field was back up to nearly 7 million barrels a year, almost the same rate it had enjoyed in 1933, 29 years before. Pan Am is the contract operator at Salt Creek for Midwest Oil Co., the unit operator.

Waterflooding is a type of secondary recovery. Water is injected into the oil sand to flush more oil into the producing wells. This highly successful engineering technique greatly increases the ultimate recovery of oil.

Salt Creek contains 12 separate oil-bearing reservoirs. One of these formations—the First Wall Creek—has accounted for virtually all of the field's increased production. The First Wall Creek would be producing less than 400 barrels per day, based on a normal decline, if the formation had not been flooded. Instead, it's yielding over 10,000 barrels per day—about half of Salt Creek's total production.

Hand in hand with higher production, Salt Creek is taking on a streamlined look these days. The rejuvenation has accounted for the presence of much modern equipment: pumps, tubing, flowlines, pumping units, treating equipment, and lease automatic custody transfer installations. Fifteen LACT units now handle all production from the field proper.

Modern engineering and scientific know-how are paying off as this fabulous old oil patch makes its impressive comeback.

Salt Creek's waterflood operation is truly unique. The field's four supply wells flow 240,000 barrels of water a day into a number of water-injection wells located strategically throughout the First and Second Wall Creek reservoirs. Because the water wells flow, there is no need for costly water-injection pumps. Likewise, there is no need for filters or treating equipment.

The first of Salt Creek's water wells came into being 35 years ago when an oil test flowed water from the Madison, which is known to be a water-bearing formation throughout the Powder River Basin. The well, however, was completed as a Tensleep producer and continues to produce in the Tensleep formation even to this day. The four wells now supplying the waterflood have all been drilled in recent years specifically for that purpose. Water comes out of the supply wells at about 184 degrees. The Big Horn Mountains, located about 55 miles northwest of the field, provided the source of the water in the geological past. Today, the elevated Madison outcrop in these mountains supplies the very desirable high pressure that is available at the earth's surface in the Salt Creek field.

Now 55 years old, this world-famous oilfield has acquired a second wind and is showing its new-found vitality with greatly increased production. Men able to think, and ready to apply today's technology have revived one of the Nation's oldest fields—bringing about a new era in Salt Creek's long story of progress.

Controls Reap Poor Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call to the attention of the House the following column by John Chamberlain, entitled "Controls Reap Poor Crop."

As Mr. Chamberlain points out, under present Government policies, the gap between the poor farmer who cannot afford chemicals and the rich farmer who can afford the application of advanced yield-increasing techniques to his farm operation continues to widen, with the result that displaced farmers and farmworkers are contributing daily to the unemployed ranks in the cities

And with respect to the continuing burden of Government-stored farm surplus, paid for by the taxpayers, it seems to me it must by this time be painfully evident to most Americans that there is something drastically wrong with a policy which sends more of the taxpayers' money, in the form of subsidy checks for retirement of acreage, to farmers who are at the same time raising more on the land they retain for production, spiraling the already serious quantities of farm suplus. Is there no end in sight to this Parkinson's folly in American agriculture?

The article follows:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Apr. 1, 1963]

CONTROLS REAP POOR CROP

(By John Chamberlain)

President Kennedy recently mentioned the agricultural revolution as one of the prime causes of the worsening unemployment situation. He is, of course, right. But the crop management that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman advocates only serves to aggravate a problem of farm labor displacement that has been with us ever since McCormick invented the reaper.

The effort to manage crops by controlling the planting acreage or by rewarding the farmer by guaranteeing him a fixed sum of money for a given number of bushels, some of which remain in Government storage bins, may temporarily solve the problem of the agricultural price level. But the farmer, still trying to make his individual business as profitable as he may, responds to the planting limitations by trying to harvest his per acre yield with the least expenditure of cash and labor hours. The pressure from Washington to limit the amount of corn or wheat coming to market brings an almost fiendish cleverness into play in this matter of getting rid of expensive farmhands and in obtaining bigger yields from reduced acreage.

I keep up with these things at the cost of scaring myself half to death every month when my copy of the Farm Journal arrives. This month there are two spinetinglers in the Journal that President Kennedy, if he wishes to sleep well, had better not take to bed with him.

One article tells the farmer how to pick the right chemical to use on his particular soil as a preemergence weeder. The second article, one on "Corn Without Plowing," explains how a single dose of weedkilling chemicals applied to a cornfield in the spring does away with the need to plow and to harrow and to cultivate. You simply throw the preemergence weeder on plain, ordinary sod, then you plant the corn, and then, come autumn, you harvest a 100-bushel-per-acre yield. It's all done in three motions, and there's no work in the hot months.

VIRTUES PROVED

A Department of Agriculture scientist, Warren C. Shaw, explains the resulting displacement of farm manpower blithely. "All we do," he says, "is substitute chemical energy for mechanical energy." According to

Ohio experiment station scientists, the labor-displacing virtues of preemergence weeders have already been proved in rather extensive practice.

"We've averaged 107 bushels where we planted in killed but undisturbed sod on silt loam soil—the same as corn made on sod where we plowed and disked," says Ohio experimenter G. B. Triplett, Jr., "and no-tillage corn planted in old cornstalks on silt loam soil yielded 100 bushels—3 bushels more than where we plowed under the old stalks."

Thus the backbreaking tyranny of hacking at clods disappears from the American farm. But also: exit the farm laborer.

The preemergence weeder chemicals go by such designations as 2,4-D, which strangles broadleaf weeds at birth, and atrazine, which kills sod and grassy weeds. Other weed killers are dalopon and linuron. No doubt the partisans of organic farming will soon be telling us that 2,4-D and atrazine and dalopon are murderous to earthworms, destructive of a proper balance of corn vitamins and ruinous to the structure of humus. But this, even if true, will not keep the average farmer from using them. Chemicals, on the farm, are here to stay.

GAP WIDENS

The use of preemergence weeders is merely one manifestation of a phenomenon that must, eventually, force the Government to choose between totalitarian controls for agriculture and a phased return to the free market. Partial crop management pushes the cleverer and the richer farmer into devising all sorts of ways of getting more for less expenditure of effort from a controlled acreage. Meanwhile the gap between the poor farmer and the rich and resourceful farmer widens. The poor farmer sells out to the rich farmer who can afford chemicals. And the number of exfarmers seeking employment in the city mounts.

The Red Purpose Never Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with an excellent editorial published in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on April 4, 1963. The editorial is entitled "The Red Purpose Never Changes" and is concerned with the recent visit to this country of so-called church leaders. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Apr. 4, 1963]

THE RED PURPOSE NEVER CHANGES

Now that the Soviet churchmen, who caused a controversy out of proportion to their importance, have come and gone, the purposes and effects of their visit perhaps can be evaluated in better perspective than at the time.

The ministers, representing several faith, came to the United States at the invitation of the National Council of Churches. Then, as it often has in the past, it acted more out of zeal for what it calls Christian unity throughout the world than with good judgment.

The leaders of the council perhaps had been persuaded that there was some religious liberty left in Russia, or that a measure of freedom of worship had been restored.

That was their first mistake; the second was in extending the invitation; and the State Department was mistaken in issuing the travel visas. All concerned should have known or been able to find out that the churchmen would not have been allowed to leave Russia without a secret police guard of some sort to keep watch on them or without the Kremlin's being sure they would spread more Red propaganda than religious doctrine.

It is noteworthy that about as many people attended protest meetings, organized by fairly recently formed anti-Communist groups voicing their objections to the visitors, as were heard by the visitors themselves.

Nationwide publicity was given to the testimony of a naturalized Russian-American who talked his way into the confidence of leaders of a meeting held for the visitors in Austin, Tex., served as an interpreter for part of the session and followed the group to other places.

This man said he also won the confidence of one of the Russians and that he was told that the religious group was a front for Soviet propaganda, that the members were really Red agents and that one of their number was an agent of the Soviet secret police.

His word, of course, was denied by the man to whom he said he talked for many hours.

Which of the two was telling the truth, and we are inclined to believe the Soviet-American although it's rather hard to imagine the other man's placing his life or liberty in such jeopardy unless he deliberately sought a form of martyrdom, matters little.

The point is that no one should have been greatly surprised by the claims that the Russian churchmen were allowed to come to this country for the detriment of its people rather than to seek to make common cause in the improvement of understanding between peoples and the furtherance of the Christian faith.

The American people should know, for they have been told long enough and often enough that, failing to destroy the church when they took over, the Communists proceeded to infiltrate and perhaps almost completely take it over and make it an instrument of their policy.

The Russian churchmen said repeatedly that freedom of worship was allowed, and they may have said it with a measure of sincerity and a slight bit of truth, for such things are relative. To a large extent, the church was a tool of the czars, but there were in Russia then sincere ministers and faithful Christians. And we believe there are such there now. Some of them may have to pay lipservice to the regime as the price of even a partial ministry and the bare form of public worship.

But the early Christians existed in catacombs under the persecution of Rome and they propagated their faith by strengthening it among themselves and communicating it to others. We believe the story of Paul Voronaeff that he was told that, despite restrictions and persecution, there exists in the Communist world a Christian underground.

The militant latecomers to the cause of anticommunism to the contrary, the Communist subversion of the church, is a story which should be well known to readers of the News.

We recently came across a collection of a series of articles written by the publisher of the News 30 years ago during and after a visit to the Soviet Union, not long after the United States officially recognized the Reds and established diplomatic relations.

This series told of what the Communists had done to the church and how they were using it for their own purposes. The author wrote of many other facets of the Red regime and its aims, and declared that they would not change. The whole series has a prophetic quality that is as timely as the news of the day.

The News was reporting the facts on communism and was stanchly anti-Communist before some of its present-day critics were born. And it warned, through news reports and editorials, that World War II had given Communist imperialism a fresh start before they discovered that anticommunism is a salable product.

APW Funds: Philadelphia

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, in my March newsletter to my constituents I set forth a list of Philadelphia projects under the accelerated public works program. I received a report from the office of the Administrator for public works acceleration on an up-to-date list of all projects cleared by the Area Redevelopment Administration and announced by the participating agencies as of March 1, 1963. They total $5,153,000 in accelerated public works funds and will provide an estimated 7,569 man-months or 630 man-years of onsite employment. If Congress approves President Kennedy's request for a supplemental appropriation of $500 million, it may be anticipated that additional projects will be approved for Philadelphia.

The funds approved for Philadelphia include a direct Federal project now in progress at Independence National Park; a new maternity building for the Albert Einstein Medical Center, a project under the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; a number of projects under the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency such as the Center Building for the Trade and Convention Center; a project involving the Fox Chase Pumping Station and the Torresdale Pumping Station; stream drainage at the North Philadelphia Airport; an intercepting sewer at Byberry Creek, and other projects which benefit other sections of Philadelphia.

The Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962—Public Law 87-658—authorized $900 million for construction of needed community facilities such as hospitals, streets, water and sewage systems, public buildings, and so forth. Prior to adjournment last October, $400 million was appropriated under the act to begin work on these projects and to provide jobs in

areas of substantial unemployment, including Philadelphia. Thus far the program has been highly successful.

I feel that the Members should support President Kennedy's request for the remainder of the funds authorized by the 87th Congress for such a worthwhile program.

What Is a Hillbilly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, according to the poet Shakespeare, a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. But a colorful word, to retain its true flavor, must guard its original meaning. I would like to bring one of our West Virginia folk terms, "hillbilly," to the public attention.

To our mountain people this word, "hillbilly," bespeaks a special kind of pride and dignity. One has to know the rugged countryside from which the word sprang in order to appreciate its subtle meanings. For the public enlightenment, I offer here an article on this subject entitled "What Is a Hillbilly?" written by F. Franklin Comstock.

Mr. Comstock publishes a newspaper in my State known as the West Virginia Hillbilly, and he speaks with the inborn pride of our mountain people. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A HILLBILLY?

(By J. Franklin Comstock)

A hillbilly is someone who can't look out his window without seeing the big hills, and feeling small and big at the same time because of them.

He's somebody with a heritage of independence his hillfolk family gave him, because—cut off from other people by the mountains—they had to make it by themselves. Someone stubborn and tenacious because he's learned that while faith can move a mountain, it might take a little time.

He's friendly, because mountains teach that there are more important things to fight than people—and that if your closest friends are both sides of a mountain distant, they're better held onto than fought with. And he's industrious. Even living lazy in mountain country can work a man pretty hard.

He's somebody who knows that only God can make a tree—and figures that if He troubled to make a whole State of forested mountains, that State must be specially blessed.

A West Virginia hillbilly is a man with wealth underfoot, wealth towering over his head, and only the beauty all around him coming easy. He has his troubles—but plenty of toughness and faith to stick it out, sometimes looking poorer than he feels, until it's time.

Now it's time.

I've been told I should change the name of my paper, the Hillbilly. Somebody quoted me Webster's definition of that awful word. Well, I'm a hillbilly, and I told him, let Webster change his definition. The only kind of person I know, in West Virginia, who apologizes now for being a hillbilly, is the fellow who isn't sure but what he is one, in Webster's sense.

We're losing some people from our hills to the flatlands of other States. All right, this may be the way of our country. The good ones want to come back, and will, better experienced and trained than ever. We've lost and gained people for years, and gained on every trade.

And have you noticed, those who come here are as proud as the most deep rooted of us to be known as hillbillies? I had a poll about changing the name of the hillbilly. Including native and new West Virginians, schoolteachers, doctors, lawyers, technical men, the vote was 30 to 1 to retain the name. People like this are changing the old definitions so fast that those who bristle at the word are dwindling in number. And that's good.

This State has got some doing to get done. And how well we do it depends on our opinion of ourselves. No one is going to respect the hillbilly more than we do.

Stubborn hillbillies tended and tamed these mountains, with patience and faith, waiting for the time.

Now is the time.

Now, we're getting the roads. We've got the technology to reap the rewards of our waiting. We're developing our tourist attractions, our cultural potentials, magnets to bring people to us to find out about the hillbilly of today, to prove Webster old fashioned.

Why not give that stubborn, tenacious, independent hillbilly—the real backbone of all of us—credit for what he laid the foundation of? Let's hope we have the guts to live up to him, facing the wonderful, favorable odds his grit preserved for us. Take away his name and you take away the credit from him.

Somebody asked George Washington what he'd do if it looked as if he were losing the war. He said, "Give me but a banner to plant upon the mountains of West Augusta"—their name for this area in Washington's day—"and I will gather around me the men who will lift our bleeding country from the dust and set her free."

He knew his hillbillies.

Effect of Proposed Change in Capital Gains Treatment of Timberland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the lumber industry has been plagued with serious problems for many years. Instead of seeing these problems attacked by the Federal Government with promised vigor, those who operate this great industry and see it give sustenance to great portions of our Nation feel that the administration's proposal to change the capital gains treatment of timberland would add a further hardship. They feel that conservation efforts would be discouraged and a great timber cutting spree would begin, followed by a recession in the lumber areas. The following statement on this subject, by one of the men who have devoted their lives to this business, should be of interest to all the Members of Congress:

EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGE IN CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT OF TIMBERLAND

I am Earl H. Maize, Jr., president of Firco, Inc., a small lumber company located at Willits, Calif.

We operate a mill and several thousand acres of timberlands in Mendocino County, Calif., and have been endeavoring to purchase additional lands to operate on a sustained yield.

Our method of operation, over the past years, has been selective cutting of the more mature trees, leaving the thrifty trees for additional growth and for natural restocking. Needless to say, this method of logging is substantially more expensive than complete logging, as the yield per acre is substantially less on the first and subsequent logging operations.

In our area, we are operating on a 60- to 80-year growth cycle, with planned operations in each area every 10 years. However, if we lose the advantage of capital gains in regard to section 631 (a) and (b), it becomes economically unfeasible for us to invest additional funds in timber growing lands and our method of operation on our present lands will have to be changed for a more extensive harvest.

The real estate taxes, fire protection, and insect protection costs are increasing every year. With the vacillating position now taken by the administration, there is no reason for a small company, such as ours, to plan operations on an economical basis over any long period of time.

Needless to say, the prices of timber have increased very substantially over the last few years. However, as a small operator, we are ever in the market of supplementing our raw material supply. Nevertheless, when we cut our own low cost timber and purchase high priced timber, we have not changed our position in regard to the amount of timber that we own. However, we have a booked gain according to the present law and have to pay a capital gains tax. If we are no longer allowed capital gains on this so-called book profit, it will be prohibitive for us to try to maintain any semblance of a long-term operation.

With the repeal of section 631 (a) and (b), we will have to go to the position of cut out and get out.

Mark American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for nearly 10 years Mr. John J. Shaughnessy, of Brooklyn, N.Y., has carried on a campaign to have imprinted on the external container of exported American goods the inscription or phrase "United States of America."

Because of obstacles which have been constantly placed in the way of his efforts to advertise America he has written a letter to the President of the United States which has been reprinted in the Manchester Union Leader on March 14, 1963. I commend this for the reading of my colleagues so that they may better

understand the opposition which is sometimes placed before those who would like to promote and advertise this wonderful country of ours.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

To the Editors:

Nearly 10 years ago, in 1953, the Congress of the United States of America by unanimous consent in both Houses adopted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) calling upon the entire national business community engaged in international trade to affix on every external container of American goods exported the inscription or phrase "United States of America" in "legible, indelible print of a suitable size" to show American origin. In short, the lettering was to be as large and the format as permanent as the nature of the containers permitted.

This congressional action was approved despite the mutually contrived opposition from spokesmen from the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, and Commerce, and, while permissive to private industry, you must agree had the force of law upon administrators in all Government entities.

However, since the passage of the measure in 1953 and continuing in your administration, the anonymous "they" among unelected officials in that bureaucratic jungle of Washington, D.C., have played a grimly fascinating game of defying and thwarting the will of the Congress and the President.

In 1954, as a Federal career civil service employe with permanent status and the author of the congressional "Mark American" measure, I was told to desist in inviting attention to Members of the Congress that their unanimously declared policy to "Mark American" was being sabotaged by some administrators in the executive branch. The alternative was to be the loss of my position, since it was said, "I was embarrassing someone at top level." Naturally, I was obliged to refuse, as agreement would mean violating my oath of office.

Ten months later, September 1955, because I still refused to remain silent a devious civil service maneuver was employed whereby my personnel space was eliminated for economy. This was the only device that could be used, as I had the highest efficiency evaluation for 15 years; seniority in employment, and, supposedly, as a former combat infantryman, the protection of the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act.

All this was to no avail. The ghostly "they" in the Pentagon evidently believed that the Communist method of economic distress was the most effective way to silence and destroy me and their determination is evidenced in the fact that since my separation from Government service more than 7 years ago every door to reinstatement has been locked and thrice barred.

They were mistaken. I'll fight till I die.

Your special counsel, Hon. Theodore Sorensen, was furnished all the facts countervailing the reasons set forth by Pentagon officials for the elimination of my civil service position and subsequent separation in a detailed brief prepared by a very able lawyer and Naval Reserve officer after long and careful study. I urge you to read this brief, captioned "Refutation," in which the naval officer points out that he had seen convincing proof that 3 days after my last day of service, Army officials, responsible for the elimination of my position, advertised for personnel to fill the position category they had abolished for economy when occupied by me. Pentagon officials, at top level, denied this but when confronted with photostatic evidence they "ate dirt" and made no attempt to counter, cover or fog up, with any sort of denial.

I assure you the same thing will happen if you take a personal interest in this entire unusual and mystifying matter and order an objective examination into the miserable actions of those responsible.

As to the implementation of the "Mark American" measure by your subordinates. On November 12, 1962, following a survey of cargo laid down for oversea shipment in the port of New York, I addressed a letter to you and your special counsel, Mr. Sorensen, advising that on the basis of my observation, the Pentagon and the foreign aid agency under the jurisdiction of the State Department—admittedly the largest shippers of American goods abroad—were still not adhering to the "Mark American" resolution of 1953, but on the contrary, were now jointly using on some cargo a worthless paper label with a format originally designed by Mr. Paul Hoffman and later supplemented by Mr. Harold Stassen which, in the considered judgment of our national marking experts and specialists, is a setup for Soviet distortion for propaganda misrepresentation. In fact, as I told you, the experts said, "It is a slick way to dupe the American people" and knowledgeable persons agree with what I told Mr. Stassen in 1953 that "It must have been conceived in Moscow."

There was no reply or even acknowledgment to the aforementioned letter, so I wrote to Mr. Sorensen on December 13, 1962, and again on January 7, 1963. The last letter, addressed to Mr. Sorensen, was directed to your special assistant, Hon. Richard Donahue, at the suggestion of a Democratic Congressman from New York. Although the postmaster in Washington, D.C., advises that all three communications were delivered to the White House, there is still no reply or acknowledgment to this writing.

Now, I have excellent reason to believe you favor the "Mark American" program. During a visit to the White House on August 8, 1961, your assistant press secretary, Hon. Andrew T. Hatcher, assured me that you did. "I think your idea (to "Mark American") has merit" you said in a letter to me even before it was considered and unanimously approved by the Congress. Mr. Sorensen has copies of our correspondence. And, as I pointed out to you nearly 10 years ago "it can be accomplished without cost" by the simple expedient of Government procurement officials making a request as part of the standard marking requirements that the phrase "United States of America" be included in large-sized lettering on every package and container unit, intermediate and external, as well as on bare items, whenever possible, to show national origin. This, of course, can also be done by private industry, without cost, in accordance with longtime commercial practice. This is precisely what I suggested to you nearly 10 years ago, as my correspondence will show, and also what the Germans have done with outstanding success since the days of the old German Empire. It created for them as it will for us * * * "a posture compelling American workers to fashion goods with 'nothing but the best' zeal instead of an 'it's good enough' lackadaisically."

Surely you will agree that the advent of the Common Market in Europe; the possibility of a United States of Europe, but currently the increasing influx of foreign-made goods into the United States of America and especially from Soviet dominated countries, should alert all American merchants that the only defense mechanism they have, and the only protection the American consumer has, is to be able to identify origin.

Since we have a law compelling foreign importers to identify goods shipped here with the full name of their country—spelled out—why then can't American merchants and governmental entities do likewise and show American origin with the proper and legal name of our country, "United States of America" on every item and every container unit—intermediate and master—for foreign or domestic use or consumption?

We have nothing to be ashamed of in this line of human endeavor because the material which emanates here is the best obtainable anywhere on earth.

My longtime efforts for "Mark American" have been purely altruistic. I never had anything to gain personally nor any other motive except to enhance the prestige and thereby promote the welfare of my country and yours. I never asked what my country could do for me, but rather I tried to serve it and am still willing to do so despite the punishment inflicted upon me. I am not vindictive. My shoulders were always broad enough to carry my cross. To paraphrase the Irish poet and patriot, John Boyle O'Reilly, "The fates were unkind and so it fell my lot to pass under the chastening hand of adversity. But the dark and slow-dragging years of discouragement and disillusion have helped to temper and steel my soul. I take comfort in the thought that I remained ever faithful to the solemn promise I called upon the great God that made me to witness in my oath of office that I would protect and defend the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

JOHN J. SHAUGHNESSY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

The Controversial Oppenheimer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, they are at it again. The wayward chicks of the New Deal are being gathered together under the spreading wings of the New Frontier "mother hen." Robert Oppenheimer is the latest to be brought under the protecting feathers in the New Frontier nest.

I have received telegrams and letters of protest. The first telegram arrived the morning after the Oppenheimer announcement was made. It said:

By what right does the AEC give Oppenheimer $50,000 of the taxpayers' money?

Not being able to answer this question myself, I submitted it to the White House for an answer.

A letter came to my desk yesterday which is most interesting and which I believe justifies insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

The awarding of the $50,000 Enrico Fermi award to atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer is an interesting study in the administration's attempt to bring back into Government a man who in the past indicated he was exempt from Government security regulations.

That's basically the reason given for the award to Oppenheimer. It's sort of postmortem appreciation for his role in helping develop the atomic bomb. Many taxpayers are going to consider it repugnant that their money is going to be given to a man who cannot get security clearance to work for the

Government, and who opposed development of the hydrogen bomb.

Oppenheimer undoubtedly made a great contribution to American science. Unfortunately, he chose to consort with known Soviet agents, so the exclusiveness of American use of his great scientific knowledge came under question. He insisted when questioned, that scientists didn't have to abide by security regulations. The U.S. Government felt differently and decided that he was a security risk. At no time was he accused of being disloyal * * * it was merely pointed out that he was apparently unable to comprehend the seriousness of dealing with Communists at the same time he was working in vital U.S. defense items.

The administration started its rehabilitation of Oppenheimer last year by inviting him to a White House dinner for Nobel prize winners, although he had never won a Nobel prize. Now the Fermi award is announced. The New York Times flatly states that this is a sort of trial balloon, that reaction will be watched closely.

In its customarily clever way, the White House has left itself an out. No date for the presentation ceremony has been set. Thus, if public rejection is encountered, there simply won't be a ceremony.

The Oppenheimer case is controversial. Many believe that a man capable of solving complex mathematical formulas should be mentally capable of telling a Soviet agent from a armless acquaintance. Some believe that his faults should be overlooked because he played a major role in the A-bomb development.

There may be but little stir over the Fermi award. But, if the next step in rehabilitating Oppenheimer is restoration of his security clearance, the administration will undoubtedly find it has stirred up a hornet's nest. Many Congressmen of both parties believe that genius does not make its possessor immune from security laws of the Nation.

Peace Corps Man Escaped Hanging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the New York Times of April 7, 1963, carried the story of a Peace Corps volunteer, Fritz L. Klattenhoff, of Le Center, Wash., who was held captive by Sarawak rebels during the recent uprising in that nation.

It is indicative of the work of the Peace Corps that not only was Klattenhoff a pillar of strength and an inspiration for his fellow captives, but he was working so far from civilization that his captors had never heard of the United States of America.

His story is another illustration of the worth of the Peace Corps, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

PEACE CORPS MAN ESCAPED HANGING—YOUTH, 19, HELD HOSTAGE 4 DAYS BY SARAWAK REBELS

(By Hendrick Smith)

WASHINGTON, April 6.—One sultry morning last December a Peace Corps volunteer walking down a dirt road near a jungle village in southeast Asia was halted by the command: "Stop. Stop or you die."

A shotgun was jammed into his stomach. The volunteer, just 6 months out of high school, was taken hostage by armed peasants during the unsuccessful rebellion in British-ruled Sarawak and neighboring Brunei.

Thus began the Peace Corps' most harrowing episode to date. It has just come to light through sources with access to detailed interviews with the volunteer, 19-year-old Fritz L. Klattenhoff of Le Center, Wash.

Not daring to sleep for fear he would be shot at any moment, the volunteer was imprisoned for 3 days with other hostages at Limbang, Sarawak.

"I'd rather be shot looking at the gun than sound asleep," he said later.

On the fourth day the rebels decided to hang all the hostages—nine Europeans, three Malays and the American volunteer. In the order of execution, the American was to be eighth.

COMMANDOS TO THE RESCUE

Just hours before the scheduled hangings, British commandos recaptured Limbang in a wild battle and freed the hostages. Nine commandos were killed in the fight. Fritz was grazed by gunfire.

Fritz is a husky 200-pounder, standing 6 feet 1 inch. He is easygoing, has sandy hair and a smiling, freckled face. As he related his story, it was obvious that the ordeal had shaken him.

Nevertheless, other hostages said that during their captivity, Fritz had been a tower of strength, mapping strategy for their defense, carrying the wounded, bucking up everyone's spirits.

Fritz was brought up on a dairy farm. He went to Sarawak last August to teach English at a local school and to work at an agricultural station.

He lived alone in a 2-room hut about a mile from Limbang, an isolated village of about 1,000 in northern Borneo. Each month he would go to Brunei, 10 miles to the north, to get his food and supplies.

The tropical rain forest makes overland travel by road impossible in that region. Lazy rivers, looping across the coastal plain like shoelaces, are the main travel arteries. The climate is hot and muggy. The land, drenched with about 120 inches of rainfall a year, is lush, green, and fertile.

Many of the people have never heard of the United States. Fritz was generally believed to be European. When he told a man he was from America, the man wanted to know: "How close is that to London?"

Three months after Fritz's arrival, Limbang was embroiled in revolt.

"On Saturday morning (December 8), I heard shooting at 2 o'clock," he said. "I assumed it was a Chinese wedding, and I lay there—oh, must have been 10 or 15 minutes. I thought, those crazy fools, so late at night. I went back to sleep. It was 2:30 when I woke up again. Then I heard a Bren gun and a machinegun."

FRIENDLY WARNING GIVEN

Several hours later a friendly Malay told Fritz that rebels had captured the town, and warned him to stay in hiding.

On Sunday another acquaintance, a Chinese-Malay who had joined the rebellion, came to Fritz's house to tell him he would not be harmed. Fritz set out to feed his animals.

"I was chatting with a Chinese friend," he said, "when all of a sudden, down the road, I heard: 'Stop. Stop or you die.'

"I told the Chinese chap to get out of here and he took off on his bicycle. I stopped and about half a dozen people who were on foot came running up to me with shotguns with the man who'd previously told me I'd be all right.

Down the road from I don't know where—no doubt they were watching the agricultural station, watching me—came two Landrovers (British jeeps) and a lorry (truck) full of rebels, about 40 of them altogether, armed with shotguns.

"The Chinese-Malay stuck a shotgun in my belly and kept pushing me back. Finally, I was shoved into the Landrover. I was taken to the police station and I talked to the (rebel) commander.

"I showed him my Peace Corps identity card and I told him I was an American and that if he bothered me, America would cause big trouble. I don't think he knew what America was."

Fritz was put in an 8- by 4-foot cell. Three Roman Catholic priests, two Irish and one Dutch, and an official of the public works department were in adjacent cells. The prisoners were fed by local people and not maltreated, but they feared that a shot might touch off the ammunition dump outside their prison, or that their captors might shoot them.

On Tuesday night the hostages were moved to an evacuated one-story brick hospital about 500 yards from the jail. Three other hostages, including the British resident officer and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Morris, were also imprisoned there. The hostages were in two rooms, their guards outside.

At dawn Wednesday, two British minesweepers carrying units of the 42d Commandos of the British Royal Marines, came up the Limbang River for an all-out assault on the town.

"As the first shots were fired, everybody seemed to go under the deck—under the beds—except the two fathers, who were praying in bed for all of us," Fritz recalled.

"It lasted for 2 to 2½ hours. The shells were coming back and forth through the windows. The rebels were trying to shoot in and get us, but they were such short people and the windows being on a higher level, their shots were going straight up."

When the British took the town, Fritz and some other hostages were removed to a safe area in Brunei on Thursday.

The natives greeted him warmly on his return.

"Everybody was so happy to see me, and see me alive, that they threw their arms around me and just cried," the volunteer said.

Fritz spent Christmas in Kuching, the capital of Sarawak, with other Peace Corps volunteers. Then he asked to be sent back to Limbang.

"Not for my own sake, for the sake of the Peace Corps," he said. "What are these local people there going to think if a little thing—well, not a little thing—but if a thing like this happens and the Peace Corps is taken out?"

Fire Protection for the Cleveland, Angeles, Los Padres, and San Bernardino Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during this year in San Diego County as well as in all of southern California, we have experienced an exceptionally violent drought that further multiplies the immediate necessity for full implementation of fire protection plans for

our nationally known multiple purpose Cleveland National Forest as well as Angeles, Los Padres, and San Bernardino Forests.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement of the Citizens Forestry Study Group of San Diego County in support of a current request for increased appropriations for such fire protection for the fiscal year 1963–64 and the continuation of a 10-year program aimed at securing adequate fire protection:

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS' FORESTRY STUDY GROUP OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY IN SUPPORT OF A REQUEST FOR INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR FIRE PROTECTION FOR THE CLEVELAND, ANGELES, LOS PADRES, AND SAN BERNARDINO FORESTS AND THEIR PROTECTION

Gentlemen, the Citizens' Foresty Study Group of San Diego County herein presents its ninth annual request to Congress to appropriate funds to permit full implementation of the fire protection plans presented in 1954 by the four national forests of southern California. This request has been endorsed each year by the Watershed Fire Council of Southern California. In October 1957, a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommended appropriation of these funds.

The Citizens' Foresty Study Group of San Diego County came into being in 1951. The group has obtained an annual appropriation of $15,000 from the San Diego Board of Supervisors for fire-control work on the Cleveland National Forest and in the county rural areas. In addition, in fiscal year 1962 the group obtained 47,300 man-days of county honor camp and State conservation camp inmate labor for fire prevention work. This local contribution to fire protection program is conservatively valued at $393,400.

The Cleveland National Forest covers approximately one-seventh of San Diego County. The value of these lands which are managed under the multiple-use principle for all of the people of the United States is beyond estimation.

The Citizens' Foresty Study Group of San Diego County continues to request Congress to appropriate the full $2,375,000 to permit full implementation of the 1954 fire protection plan for the four southern California national forests.

In confirmation of the urgent need for this appropriation a special subcommittee of the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by then Congressman Clair Engle, meeting in Los Angeles on October 8 and 9, 1957, recommended the administration consider the advantages of a plan to earmark approximately $2,375,000 to the four national forests of southern California in addition to the annual appropriation for national forest fire prevention and presuppression.

As a result of personal appearances in Washington, D.C., by watershed fire council members and constituent group representatives, Congress has made annual supplementary appropriations. The funds, which have been made available in addition to the regular budget, for the four national forests in southern California have been—

Fiscal year:	*Appropriated*
1955	$250,000
1956	675,000
1957	900,000
1958	900,000
1959	1,150,000
1960	1,150,000
1961	1,450,000
1962	1,750,000
1963	1,750,000

The Cleveland National Forest's share of these funds has enabled them to provide much better and additional fire prevention and protection. The most significant improvement is the increase in yearlong personnel from 7 in 1954 to 34 in 1962. The yearlong professional firemen provide increased and better fire protection to this valuable public forest land.

At the present time while much of the United States is having one of the most severe winters of this century, San Diego County is suffering from the worst drought in 111 years of weather history. Only 0.35 inch of rain has fallen in San Diego through February 7, 1963. As a result of this extreme drought, all forest fuels are critically dry during what is normally the middle of the rainy season. With the coming of summer we can expect numerous fires. Only with well trained manpower, modern ground equipment and help from aircraft will the forest managers be able to keep these fires from devastating thousands of acres.

The Citizens' Forestry Study Group of San Diego County respectfully urges your committee to report favorably on the full appropriation of $2,375,000. This appropriation, which has been recommended by both citizens and legislators, can be the most important factor in averting a disastrous fire season in southern California. This relatively small amount of money will result in a savings of many thousands of dollars of fire suppression costs, damages, and even savings of human lives.

Respectfully submitted.

HOWARD KEDDIE,
EARL ROBERTS,
Cochairman.
JACK LYONS,
Secretary.

SOS: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in January of last year the bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, authorized in the 85th Congress, issued its comprehensive report entitled "Outdoor Recreation for America." Most of us are aware of the outstanding job done by the Commission and its staff in preparing this report.

The Commission was headed by Chairman Laurance S. Rockefeller and included as members several of our distinguished colleagues in this and the other body. All Americans have reason to be thankful to the Commission for its thorough and excellent analysis of what must be done to insure recreation opportunities for our citizens.

As the letter of transmittal for the report points out:

The report surveys our country's outdoor recreation resources, measures present and likely demands upon them over the next 40 years and recommends actions to insure their availability to all Americans of present and future generations.

As the junior Senator from a State which possesses an abundance of outdoor recreation resources, I congratulate the Commission for its outstanding contribution to the discussion of recreation needs of our citizens.

I have studied the ORRRC report carefully and find myself in complete agreement with respect to many of the recommendations it contains. Several of the important proposals before this Congress follow the recommendations of the report. One of its recommendations—one with which I am immediately concerned—has to do with routing of highways and the effect on recreation resources.

Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to recommendation 8–13 regarding highways on page 136 of the ORRRC report. It states:

Federal and State Governments should give explicit recognition to recreation values in the planning and design of highways.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the ORRRC report statement supporting this recommendation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHWAYS

Recommendation 8–13: Federal and State governments should give explicit recognition to recreation values in the planning and design of highways.

Mobility is a key factor affecting outdoor recreation. Routing, design, extent, and capacity of highways exert profound influences on the kind and location of pressures brought to bear on recreation resources.

Through a number of programs, the Federal Government is concerned with the construction of every major road in the Nation. These programs, which collectively involve large sums of Federal money each year, strongly influence the availability of recreation opportunities. Yet with the single exception of the billboard provision of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, there is no formal consideration of outdoor recreation values in any Federal legislation concerned with financing and constructing the Nation's roads.

Highway policies thus far have been directed primarily toward the accommodation of greater speeds and larger volumes of traffic. While the design and location of roads for efficient and safe transportation is clearly of high priority, other considerations merit recognition. Travel to reach outdoor recreation facilities is a major use of many of our highways. Roads and highways are multiple-use structures serving a variety of public purposes, and outdoor recreation is an important one of these purposes. Wherever feasible, provision should be made for such compatible recreation opportunities as hiking, bicycling, and picnicking. In some cases, highway fills can serve as dams to impound water for recreation purposes.

New highway design should take esthetic considerations into account. Wherever possible, highways constructed along any body of water should be so designed as not to impair recreation values. Additional measures should be adopted to prohibit objectionable developments from marring roadside scenery.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has pointed out that, with one exception, there is no formal consideration of outdoor recreation values in any Federal legislation concerned with financing and constructing the Nation's roads. This is in spite of the fact that the Federal Government is involved in one way or another in construction of nearly every major highway in this country.

Mr. President, the recommendation of the ORRRC report substantiates what

many people have been saying for years, that highway construction is damaging some of this country's finest recreation resources. With this problem in mind, I introduced S. 2767 in the 87th Congress. The bill died in the Committee on Public Works with the adjournment of the Congress last fall.

Early in the current session of Congress I introduced, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and myself, an identical bill which has been designated S. 468 and referred to the Committee on Public Works. Since S. 468 was first introduced, two more of our colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], have joined in cosponsoring the bill.

S. 468, known as the S O S—save our streams—bill, proposes amendment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act to require approval of the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with appropriate State agencies, of plans and specification for Federal-aid highway construction. The bill is designed to help protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources from damage due to such highway construction.

Mr. President, adoption of S. 468 would represent a big step in the direction recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The bill would give "explicit recognition to recreation values in the planning and design of highways," as recommended in the ORRRC report.

I have taken the floor many times in the last 2 years in support of this bill. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has carried literally dozens of articles, editorials, statements, letters, and other supporting materials from all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to study this problem as it relates to their own States. When they have thoroughly considered the arguments for and aganist S. 468, I am sure they will decide, as I have, that legislation is desperately needed in this area to help protect what remains of our once abundant fish, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Sophomore Class at Georgetown University Holds Congressional Reception—West Virginians Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Sunday afternoon, April 7, Senators and Representatives were guests of the East Campus Class of 1965, Georgetown University, at a congressional reception. Seventy-two Members of Congress attended this worthwhile function which was organized for the purpose of providing students an opportunity to meet their Members of the Congress, and to discuss with them matters of national and international concern.

From 2 to 5 p.m., interested students and legislators mingled in the informal, conversational atmosphere of Georgetown University's Hall of Nations and Walsh Courtyard. It was my privilege on this occasion to meet several students from West Virginia, and to confer with them on aspects of public issues including those which relate to the Mountain State. Present were: Miss Judy Crowder, student in the institute of languages, and formerly of Charleston, W. Va.; Dan Hedges, enrolled in the college of arts and sciences, from Spencer, W. Va.; and John Egan McAteer, a graduate student from Fairmont, W. Va.

Mr. President, the organization and execution of plans for an event of this magnitude require immense effort, careful preparation, and a strong consensus of interest among the entire class. We commend the members of the class for their energy and interest in this positive project. Special recognition is due class president, Michael Lenaghan, and reception committee leaders, Arthur F. Shilonski, J. Thomas Dugan, and Gerard J. O'Grady for their contributions to the success of the gathering.

I am confident that this significant conference is an accurate indication that Georgetown University is continuing to live up to its rich heritage of service to God and country.

I request that the fact sheet describing the event sponsored by the class of 1965, East Campus, Georgetown University be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECEPTION SPONSORED BY THE CLASS OF 1965, EAST CAMPUS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Event: Reception for the Members of the 88th Congress sponsored by the east campus class of 1965, Georgetown University.

Purpose: (1) To permit students to become personally acquainted with their Senators and Representatives; (2) to allow the students to inquire into the various positions held by various Congressmen at a given time; (3) to allow students to learn first hand the problems and issues confronting our Government today.

Date: Sunday, April 7, 1963.

Arrival time: 2 to 3 p.m.

Reception time: 2 to 5 p.m.

Arrival place: (1) Healy Building, entrance at 37th and O Streets NW., Washington, D.C.; (2) student constituent host meets Senator or Representative and escorts him to meeting place.

Meeting place: Hall of Nations and Walsh Courtyard (in case of rain, the New South Dining Hall).

Physical setup: (1) Conversation groups; (2) informal atmosphere; (3) light refreshments will be served.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA,
Worcester, Mass., March 25, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD: Thank you very much for your efforts in introducing a bill for the formation of a Committee on Captive Nations. Such a committee would surely give our American Lithuanian citizens hope that the United States is trying to help by making the Lithuanian case heard before the world. These people would support such a bill 100 percent.

Sincerely,

JOHN ANDRUSKI,
Chairman of Lithuanian Affairs.

MARCH 31, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to inform you that I sent a letter today to Hon. A. W. SIBAL, Congressman, Fourth District, Connecticut, in which I extended my heartiest congratulations to him for his speech calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

In my opinion this committee will serve the best interest of the United States and the cause of freedom and will help the captive Nations, among them the country of my ancestors, Ukraine, to regain liberty, equality and human dignity.

Sincerely,

AUGUSTIN STEFAN.

STAMFORD, CONN.

MARCH 23, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of our organization we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res.

14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberalization in Africa and Asia, we as a Nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———,

Head of Willimantic Branch of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

LEGION OF ESTONIAN LIBERATION, INC., CLEVELAND BRANCH,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 24, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: The House Resolution 14 as introduced by you and calling for the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee can be welcomed and deserves speedy action in the Rules Committee as well as passage in the House.

Soviet communism has been the greatest menace in the world for several decades. More and more Americans are concerned with this threat and realize that Soviet communism has only one goal: the complete and total domination of all nations by the Soviet dictatorship. Millions of Amricans are as deeply concerned and anxious to see freedom established among the nations enslaved by Communist dictatorship. The establishment of the Captive Nations Committee will strengthen hopes of people behind the Iron Curtain and provide the Government of the United States a forum for the study of Communist tactics and existing conditions in the occupied countries.

We support the establishment of this committee and would like to see early passage of your resolution. Kindly send us a few copies of subject resolution.

Respectfully yours,

ANDREAS TRAKS, *President.*
ARNOLD KREVES, *Secretary.*

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *March 27, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, and of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

Please, give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL DWORIAN.
STELLA DWORIAN.

My Country, Right or Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Durham, N.C., Morning Herald entitled "My Country, Right or Wrong" and a column by Bruce Jolly entitled, "JOHNSON: People Over Party" from the Greensboro, N.C., Record be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These two articles point up the high respect the people of North Carolina have for Vice President JOHNSON and indicate the wide approval his recent speech at our Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner was given throughout the State.

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Apr. 2, 1963]

MY COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG

The key theme of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON's speech at Saturday's Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner was the priority of the Nation. It was a good emphasis to make at a partisan gathering. The Vice President used it from two aspects, first, to remind Democrats that they are Americans first, and secondly, to point out that partisanship merely for the sake of partisanship can be inimical to the national interest and dangerous rather than constructive.

One target of Mr. JOHNSON's thesis is the use of the Cuban crisis as a partisan issue. What he did not say, of course, was that the poor handling of public information about Cuba constituted an invitation to the opposition to debate the issue, and debate encourages partisan treatment.

A crisis involving national security, however, calls for unified support of the Government. There is still validity for the old toast: "My country. May she always be in the right. But my country, right or wrong." When the Kennedy administration did face up to the reality of danger in Cuba and took action, the Nation rallied behind it. The subsequent election returns indicate the futility of making the Cuban crisis a partisan issue.

To ask national unity behind a Democratic administration in a crisis is not asking for a cooperation the Democrats did not give a Republican administration in the crises it faced. The Vice President recalled his own support, as Democratic leader in the Senate, of the Eisenhower administration in the critical issues of foreign relations which confronted it. And it will be remembered that there were Democrats who criticized him for supporting a Republican administration when he could have made its handling of crises the basis of opposition.

In the face of trends to divisiveness, Vice President JOHNSON's stress on unity is a needed reminder. Although his emphasis was on the unity of Americans, he also took the opportunity to urge unity within the Democratic Party and to attack those who would encourage division. This aspect, too, was welcome and needed.

To return to the Johnson emphasis on the importance of support of the Government in crises, it it not asking support only on principle. In the case of Cuba, United States policy is getting results. Support in this respect is justified on the basis of its effectiveness.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Record, Apr. 2, 1963]

JOHNSON: PEOPLE OVER PARTY

(By Bruce Jolly)

WASHINGTON.—Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON last week showed once again that political partisanship and statesmanship can coexist.

Speaking at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Raleigh, the man who was nurtured politically in the Democratic Party and who sincerely cannot understand why anyone would want to be anything other than a Democrat, had this to say:

"The test of our parties, the test of our own partisanship, is not the public show we stage politically but the accomplishments we make together in serving the people's needs."

Vice President JOHNSON believes firmly that the progress the Nation has made since World War I has come under Democratic leadership, while the Republicans, during their terms in power, have attempted to retain the status quo.

DESERVES SUPPORT

But he is also convinced that the man who assumes the responsibilities of the Presidency is deserving of bipartisan support and as Senate majority leader while President Eisenhower was in the White House he carried out that conviction to a point that he was criticized at times by members of his own party.

The man who came to Washington as a congressional secretary during the early stages of the F.D.R. era, and who has lived and breathed Democratic Party politics since, can and does cite chapter and verse of the many accomplishments as he sees them to this day.

But this same man, called to Raleigh as probably the one party leader best able to aid the State party in battling the upsurge of Republicanism in North Carolina, chose not to be partisan in his prepared text of the speech he gave. In part, he said:

"I realize that it is expected that I should use this occasion to make claims of partisan success. But that is neither the spirit nor the purpose of my remarks tonight.

"The problems confronting your national leadership at this time are not partisan problems. There is not a Democratic side or a Republican side to the threat of Cuba, to the hopes for world peace, or to the urgent necessity of domestic tax reform and economic growth. There is only an American side.

DIFFERENT THINGS

"We need to remember that party does not come first. At this particular moment in our Nation's history—and in our destiny as leaders of the free world, we must not allow ourselves to be persuaded that partisanship is patriotism."

The Vice President said all that matters—is what our Government actually is, not what the political parties appear to be.

If it was a strange note for a political gathering where partisanship was expected, it is not an unusual note for LYNDON JOHNSON. Nor does the fact that he came forth with a stemwinding political speech after he got through his prepared text detract in any sense from what he had to say before the television cameras, and in the prepared speech that the newspapers got in advance.

If the two LYNDON JOHNSONS that the partisan gathering saw in Raleigh, appear incongruous, it is only because the Vice President in a sense is a paradox. He is the admittedly partisan politician who can and does rise above partisan politics time and again in search of what he sees as the greatest good for all the people.

The National Farmers Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, during the past few years the National Farmers Organization has been the subject of considerable discussion pro and con. It is a comparatively new organization which seeks to raise farm income through a carefully organized action on the part of farm producers.

During my recent senatorial campaign, when asked for my opinion on the NFO, I replied that I was sympathetic with the objectives and philosophy of this organization. I also said that they were not a radical group but were bona fide farm producers who have an understandable desire to do something about the unfortunate position of agriculture today. I expressed the view that the NFO is performing a most valuable function in focusing the attention of the country on the plight of hundreds of thousands of our farm families.

After I had publicly expressed these views, I was very severely criticized by a number of sources. Many people wrote or telephoned their disapproval, in some cases informing me that they had intended to vote for me but could not do so in view of the views I had expressed in sympathy to the NFO.

Mr. President, I have no regrets for my past expressions relative to the NFO and I continue to feel that this organization performs a most valuable service. I do not consider myself an expert on agricultural organization, and I have never tried to pass judgment on the question of whether or not the methods used by the NFO will accomplish the purposes that the organization has in mind. Only time can answer that question. But I do believe that the serious minded and able men who lead the NFO, both in my State, and across the Midwest, deserve the considered attention of all of us who are trying to find a solution to the unfair income situation which now confronts the American farmer.

Recently, a letter written by Mr. John Oster, of Ethan, S. Dak., appeared in the April 6 issue of the Mitchell, S. Dak., Daily Republic. I think it states the NFO case very well, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEARN ABOUT NFO

To the EDITOR:

In the past few weeks there have been several NFO organizational meetings held in Davison and surrounding counties. We have had good attendance at these meetings but none of them have had near the attendance that they should.

In the past few weeks I have talked to a lot of farmers and have found that when they learn the truth about this organization its policies and understand it they are eager to join it.

Almost every farmer agrees that we do have a serious problem in agriculture, but what are we going to do about it. Some say NFO is not the answer, but these individuals have not gone to the trouble to attend a meeting, but rather have gathered their information from hearsay propaganda and misunderstanding.

I sincerely feel that every farmer owes it to himself, his family, community, and his country, to attend at least one or more of these meetings and learn what this program has to offer. An organization that is growing as fast as NFO is not to be laughed at or talked about in small groups of uninformed people, where the facts about the organization get farther and farther from the truth.

Propaganda has been spread by groups and individuals who have fear of the farmer organizing and these groups and individuals spend a lot of money to keep the farmers divided because they know as we in NFO know that in unity there is strength.

I have yet to talk to a farmer who is satisfied with the present-day prices he receives for his production in comparison to the prices he has to pay for equipment, repairs, and many other items he needs in the operation of a farm.

We are the only business in the country that buys retail, sells wholesale, pays the freight both ways and still expect to make a living let alone a profit.

We are the only business in the country that has a product to sell and must take it to the market and say what will you give me. Everything we buy has a price tag on it and the American way is that a manufacturer of an item usually puts the price on it but in agriculture it is a complete reverse.

I think it is high time that we not only as Americans but as American farmers stand up and be counted.

JOHN OSTER.

ETHAN, S. DAK.

Tax Cut and Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, let us face it. J.F.K.'s program for tax cut and deficit spending to avoid a business slump is nothing less than an admission of bankruptcy.

After 2 years in the White House he says that we can no longer pay our way and keep the economy rolling. Since the taxing end of the tax-and-spend philosophy has become politically unpopular, his plan obviously is to write off the debt through inflation—just about 10 percent the first year.

Here we are in peacetime, a creditor nation, with gross national product at its historical peak, with more people employed at higher wages than ever before anywhere, and now he tells us that we can no longer pay our way, and he wants to start the printing presses.

If the country is not insolvent, then where is the bankruptcy, except in the minds of the inexperienced idea men in the White House?

Seventeenth District Peace Corps Volunteer Honored by People of Magarao, the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud of my congressional district and the fine people I represent. I was, therefore, especially pleased to learn that one of my younger constituents, Barbara A. Bassett, was one of four Peace Corps volunteers honored by the municipal government and people of Magarao, the Philippines, for her services rendered as a volunteer.

At this time I would like to insert a copy of the resolution passed by the municipal council expressing their appreciation and I would also like to publicly commend Barbara and the other Peace Corps members for the fine work they are doing to improve the understanding and relations between our country and these foreign lands:

RESOLUTION 8

A resolution of appreciation by the municipal government of Magarao in behalf of its constituents to the invaluable services rendered by the U.S. Peace Corps volunteers; namely, Mesdames Barbara Bassett, Karen Cole, Pat Nash, with special acknowledgment to Madam Brenda Brown

Whereas the people of Magarao, through its duly constituted authorities, owe lasting debts of gratitude to the U.S. Peace Corps volunteers assigned in this municipality for rendering invaluable assistance in reawakening the interest and enthusiasm on literature and other media of acquiring sufficient information and knowledge about man, his neighbors and the whole world in which he lives;

Whereas in their sincere desire to enlist the cooperation of the community in their educational program, they had shown admirable traits and dedication to service which propelled the latent civic minds to embrace their guidance;

Whereas believing that during summer days, plenty of children both of school and non-school-age spend their vacation listlessly, these dedicated volunteers organized a free summer day camp which terminated successfully with bright hopes and promise;

Whereas convinced that the community needs a suitable place to secure good reading materials to enrich their literacy growth, these Peace Corps volunteers through the initiative and guidance of Miss Brenda Brown, solicited books and literature from friends and countless civic organizations in the United States to establish a community library;

Whereas we cannot overlook nor over emphasize the solicitous efforts which Miss Brenda Brown's mother in the United States has done to make the library project a worthwhile reality by collecting 4,000 volumes of books;

Whereas the exalted civic spirit which Mrs. Elizabeth Durham (mother of Miss Brown) of 3417 Springdale Avenue, to the invaluable benefits of our people deserves the highest degree of gratitude;

Whereas considering the above stated facts, the municipal council wishes to express to the U.S. Peace Corps volunteers, namely, Mesdames Barbara Bassett, Karen

Cole, Pat Nash, and Brenda Brown, their deepest appreciation, gratitude, and acknowledgement for their invaluable services: Now, therefore, on motion by Councilor Gregorio Follosco, properly seconded by Vice Mayor Francisco Binondo: Be it

Resolved, as it is hereby resolved, That the highly meritorious accomplishment of the Peace Corps volunteers has earned for them and their country the respect and admiration of those whom they have served and associated with, and has brought honor, glory, and prestige, not only to themselves but also to the United States of America. Likewise, it is equally elating on our part to extend the same thought of acknowledgement to the countless donors that immensely contributed to the task of realizing the Peace Corps volunteers community projects of living reality;

Resolved further, That on behalf of the municipal council and the people of Magarao, we wish to express to them our profoundest and sincerest best wishes in their chosen endeavors with the assurance that what they left as lofty legacies of their praiseworthy efforts shall remain permanent muniments in our community;

Resolved finally, That copies of this resolution be furnished to Mesdames Barbara Bassett, Karen Cole, Pat Nash, and Brenda Brown, Peace Corps volunteers, Mrs. Elizabeth Durham, Miss Brown's mother, Mr. Charles Dey, regional staff member, Peace Corps, Dr. Laurence Fuchs, director, Peace Corps Philippine project, Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director, Peace Corps, United States of America, His Excellency John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, and to all donors for their information and record.

Unanimously carried.

I hereby certify to the correctness of the above-quoted resolution.

EVERISTO E. SAMANTE,
Municipal Secretary.

Attest:

SIMEON BARRAMEDA,
Municipal Mayor.

Operation Amigo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in San Diego, Calif., Point Loma High School has completed a most successful and exciting international project termed "Operation Amigo." Twenty-five Mexican students and a chaperone were flown in from Mexico City to San Diego at the expense of the Copley Press. The Copley Press also financed bus trips around the city to various points of interest and on to Disneyland.

Twenty-six parents took Amigos in their homes for 16 days. Many organizations around our city hosted events for these wonderful boys and girls, ages 15 to 18; U.S. Naval Amphibious Base, the U.S. Marine Recruit Depot, the Mission Yacht Club, General Dynamics/Astronautics—manufacturers of the Atlas Missile—Scripps Institute of Oceanography, the San Diego Zoo, the Star of India—the last iron sailing vessel afloat on the west coast—and other public and private schools.

My reason for inserting a report of this project in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerns the subtle values, the happenings that one could not read in the paper. For example, one of the girls has a sister attending the University of Moscow on a complete scholarship—portal to portal; two more are declared atheists—first step toward communism; the Mexican students had a picture of Americans as doing things only for the material benefits and they felt that American schools taught only frills and were for fun.

Under leave to extend my remarks, include as a portion of my remarks the following report:

OPERATION AMIGO

MARCH 26, 1963.

To: Dr. Ralph Dallard
From: Donald W. Giddings
Subject: Evaluation of Operation Amigo

May I express the appreciation of the faculty, students and parents to you and the board of education for allowing us to share in this thrilling project. May I also state that Point Loma High realized that this was not a one-school affair; we considered ourselves to be representing the San Diego Unified School District.

The visiting students and their chaperone, Mrs. Comacho de Campo, visited Clairemont High, San Diego High, Collier Junior High, Dana Junior High, Loma Portal Elementary and Silvergate Elementary Schools of our district. University of San Diego, University High School, and Warren Walker School were visited also. More important, the students, in addition to being with families of varying business occupations, also lived with a judge in the municipal court, principals of secondary schools (Clairemont and Memorial), and teachers in Point Loma High School.

The visit of the Amigos is likened to a drop of a pebble into a pool of water; the 26 visitors will spread their impressions of San Diego and the United States to 26 times that number of persons.

Before listing the values of the program, may I stress the importance of Mr. Hugh Dale to the success of the program. Mr. Dale, an 11th grade counselor, intergrade counselor and teacher of Spanish and French, was the coordinator for Point Loma High School. His unselfish giving of himself; his diplomacy and tact when dealing with many persons; his calm under stress and strain of schedule problems; his strength when bombarded by invitations for the Amigos from well-meaning persons and organizations, and his ability to include most of our faculty in one way or another, were most important to the success of the program.

I would like to list some of the benefits of Operation Amigo. Your attention is called to the fact that many of the benefits from this type of project are subtle and occur incidentally.

1. Our aural-lingual method of teaching foreign language proved its value in contrast to the traditional read, repeat, write method. Our second-fifth year students were able to converse immediately with the Amigos.

2. The widespread intermingling of families and individuals was quite important; this not only gave host families an opportunity to relax, but also the host students had an opportunity to catch up on schoolwork.

3. The obvious respect the Amigos developed for our educational philosophy; they had a preconceived idea that our students engaged in frill courses. The proof of the pudding was when the students who are presently enrolled in freshman classes at the University of Mexico thanked our faculty members for helping them keep up while away from school.

4. Mrs. Campo was greatly impressed with the fluency of our language teachers. The emphasis our teachers place on conducting classroom instruction in the foreign language resulted in fluency of interchange that amazed her. A number of non-Spanish language teachers also complimented our visitors by speaking with them in Spanish. Needless to say, my pride in our faculty is even greater than it was.

5. Classroom discussions which were skillfully managed by faculty members who had Amigos as members of their classes or as guests, offered an opportunity for an exchange of cultural, political and educational philosophies.

6. The unselfish participation of parents, students and faculty in Operation Amigo was most gratifying. Innumerable persons have told me that nothing ever excited a community and gave it a oneness as did the spirit of this program.

7. The opportunity to visit with these fine young Latin Americans has convinced me that the Communist threat is certainly a serious one. Two or three of these youngsters were atheists (first step) and one of the Amigos' sister is attending the University of Moscow as a guest of the Russian Government. I might add that my attention was concentrated on these students during the last few days, and especially at the farewell, and it is sincerely my feeling that these particular youngsters indicated by their attitudes that they had been profoundly affected by their visit with norteamericanos.

8. The Copley Press is to be commended for the tremendous good will brought about by this project. Mr. Chipp, the gentleman who supervised the program for the newspapers, was considerate, understanding and most circumspect. The reporters were never resented by members of the faculty because the men were aware of our educational obligations and went out of their way to cooperate. Mr. Matson, of the photography (movie) unit, seemed to have his men everywhere, but never seemed to be in the way. At no time were any of the Copley Press people insistent to the point of disturbing the school routine.

9. We know that the attitude of the Latin Americans toward us has been modified; we feel we have made 26 lifelong friends. We know that the norteamericano attitude toward our neighbors to the south has been modified. The insistence of the Amigos that our students visit them and the definite offering of homes for their stay is most gratifying and sincere.

A final note: the many, many persons in our community who volunteered to participate in the Amigo programs and who offered their facilities for use shall always be remembered. These people helped to dispel the concept of the Latin Americans that North Americans do only those things which bring material rewards. The statement made by an Amigo to Mrs. Campo, "The people are doing these things because they like us and want to be friendly," revealed a change in attitude toward North Americans.

Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in our consideration today of the bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, section 4 of

the act of July 6, 1939, and the act of July 31, 1946, a lot has been said about our balance-of-payments problem in this country.

This is a rather vague subject to a lot of people, and it would be helpful if the question could be more thoroughly clarified.

The National Observer of March 18, 1963, contained a column entitled "Dollars and Gold: The Factors in Balance of Payments." I found this column to be a clear and informative statement of several aspects of our balance-of-payments problem in the United States, and would like to recommend it to the House of Representatives and to the public as a concise, point-by-point explanation of the economic problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the National Observer, Mar. 18, 1963]

DOLLARS AND GOLD: THE FACTORS IN BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The term "balance of payments" comes up in discussions on tax cuts, foreign aid, U.S. trade with the Common Market, military defense, and many other matters. Here, in question and answer form, is an explanation of the balance-of-payments problem and why American economists are worried about it.

Question. What is mean by balance of payments?

Answer. It is an accounting of a country's financial dealings with the rest of the world during a specified period, usually a year. It shows the relationship between the total outflow of payments made to other countries and the total receipts from other countries.

Question. What do payments by the United States consist of?

Answer. They include the money other countries get through selling their goods in American markets, Government loans and grants to foreign countries, military spending overseas, spending by American tourists abroad, and other sources.

Question. What do receipts consist of?

Answer. Receipts include money received for American goods sold abroad, income received from American investments overseas, expenditures of foreign tourists in the United States, and repayment of loans by foreign businessmen or foreign governments.

Question. How does the United States now stand on its balance of payments?

Answer. The United States has been running a deficit in its balance of payments (that is, payments exceed receipts) every year since 1951, except 1957. The deficit last year was $2.2 billion.

Question. How did this compare with previous years?

Answer. It was slightly better than in 1961, when the deficit was $2.4 billion. From 1958–60, the yearly deficit was higher, totaling $11.3 billion during those 3 years.

Question. Why does the United States have such a large deficit?

Answer. In recent years, the deficit has been caused by heavy military spending overseas, foreign aid programs, oversea investments by American businessmen, and short-term capital investments abroad. In international trade, the United States annually exports more goods than it imports. In 1962, exports exceeded imports by $4.4 billion. But the other expenditures brought about the deficit.

Question. What is short-term capital?

Answer. Short-term capital called hot money, is capital exported for quick profit in response to such enticements as fast rising stock markets or high interest rates. If a stock market boom tapers off or the interest rates fall, the short-term capital may return to the United States or to wherever investment opportunities look the most glamorous.

Question. What happens to American dollars when the United States has an adverse balance of payments?

Answer. When the United States is running a deficit in its balance of payments, more dollars have left the country than come into it. Foreign countries, particularly their central banks, can either hold the dollars or convert them into gold at the U.S. Treasury.

Question. What's a dollar worth in gold?

Answer. The Treasury buys and sells gold at the rate of $35 an ounce. By law, however, Americans cannot keep gold except for specified uses.

Question. What have foreign banks been doing with the dollars they accumulate because of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit?

Answer. Since 1958, foreign banks have been converting much of their dollars stores into gold.

Question. Why have these banks been taking gold?

Answer. Fear of inflation is one reason. Inflation in the United States would lower the purchasing power of dollars held by the foreign banks. Gold is considered the ultimate means of settling transactions.

Question. But isn't the dollar as good as gold?

Answer. Not quite. Like all paper currencies, it is vulnerable to inflation. Still, it's considered one of the strongest currencies in the world and is often used as a substitute for gold in international transactions.

Question. Is the United States losing much of its gold?

Answer. Yes. In 1946, the U.S. gold stock was $24.6 billion. Today it's down to $15.9 billion. If all foreign banks demanded gold for their dollars, the United States wouldn't have enough gold to exchange for their dollars.

Question. Is the steady drainage of American gold a serious problem?

Answer. Yes, if it continues until all our gold is gone. With the dollar no longer supported by gold, confidence in the stability and value of the dollar might decline, both in this country and abroad. Fearing a decline in the real value of a dollar, producers of goods and services—both at home and abroad—might demand more dollars to make up for the loss. Higher prices, higher wages, and possibly runaway inflation, would result.

Question. Are foreign banks likely to trade all their dollars for gold?

Answer. Probably not, since the complications that would result would harm the economies of their countries. But if a run on American gold starts, such as the runs on banks during depression times, the foreign banks might decide the lesser of two evils would be to convert their dollar holdings into gold.

An Appeal to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include as a portion of my remarks the following article which appeared in the March 18 issue of Missiles and Rockets magazine:

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

"We are in a strategic space race with the Russians and we have been losing. The first manmade satellite to orbit the earth was named Sputnik. The first living creature in space was Laika. The first rocket to the moon carried a Red flag. The first photograph of the far side of the moon was made with a Soviet camera.

"Control of space will be decided in the next decade. If the Soviets control space they can control earth, as in past centuries the Nation that controlled the seas dominated the continents. This does not mean that the United States desires more rights in space than any other nation. But we cannot run second in this vital race. To insure peace and freedom, we must be first.

"The target dates for a manned space platform, U.S. citizen on the moon, nuclear power for space exploration, and a true manned spaceship should be elastic. All these things and more we should accomplish as swiftly as possible. This is the new age of exploration; space is our great New Frontier."

The words above were not written by the editor of Missiles and Rockets. They were written by President of the United States John F. Kennedy. They appeared in an article wrote for hte October 10, 1960, issue of Missiles and Rockets, less than a month before his election.

We appeal to the President to carefully consider once again what he said at that time:

"If the Soviets control space, they can control earth."

Mr. Kennedy's article was written in response to a nine-point proposal by this magazine for an effective national defense and space policy. These points included recognition that "space for peaceful purposes" is possible only if "freedom of space" is insured by giving the U.S. military a predominant role in developing and carrying out the projects necessary to guarantee freedom of space.

This is what Mr. Kennedy said in his response:

"The space and defense proposals of missiles and rockets parallel, although in somewhat more detail, those of the Democratic Party platform. They are in line with my own thinking; our goals are identical."

We must ask, Mr. President, what has happened to your thinking? Why are our goals, in a little more than 2 years, now so far apart?

In agreeing to our proposal for an effective U.S. military space program, you called it "an umbrella under which we can explore and develop space for the benefit of all mankind."

There is no such umbrella, Mr. President, and the events of the past 2 months have made it exceedingly clear that there is no prospect of one.

The course upon which you are embarked is endangering the future security of the United States as no other President has done. We do not make this charge lightly. There are serious reasons for making it at this time.

Foremost is the fact that the Russians themselves have taken your words of October 1960 at their face value. Marshal Vasiliy Danilovich Sokolovskiy, First Deputy Minister of the Soviet Armed Forces, recently has published what an Air Force official calls the first comprehensive treatment of Soviet doctrine and strategy since 1926, a book entitled "Military Strategy."

In that book, Marshal Sokolovskiy cites your statement of October 1960 in Missiles and Rockets that the country which controls space can control the earth. He says the

Soviet Union cannot disregard what he calls U.S. plans to use space exploration for military purposes.

Sokolovskiy states that the Soviet Union cannot allow the United States to become superior in this field in any way. He says the Soviet Union must oppose the United States with "more effective means and methods by the use of space for defensive purposes."

The implication is plain that the Soviet Union is embarked on a military space program.

What, meanwhile, is the status of the U.S. military space program which the Russians are using as an excuse for embarking on military space projects of their own?

The exclusive reports in this magazine that the Dyna-Soar (X-20) project was to be given the ax now has been confirmed. No less an authority than your Secretary of Defense made that clear in his statement to Congress on Dyna-Soar: "It will cost to complete, in total, including funds spent to date, something in the order of $800 million to $1 billion. The question is, do we meet a rather ill-defined military requirement by proceeding down that track, or do we meet it better by modifying Gemini in some joint project with NASA? * * * I think we can cut back very substantially while better meeting both of our requirements, and that is our objective."

The Rover program for development of a nuclear rocket for space, which you said in October 1960, should be accomplished as swiftly as possible, has slipped 14 to 16 months behind schedule.

The Midas program, for development of an early-warning satellite system, has been cut back to a study effort.

Saint, the program to develop a capability for inspecting possibly hostile satellites, has been cut back in favor of a more distant goal.

Blue Gemini, the Air Force program for developing its own space flight capabilities, has been abandoned in favor of the joint project with NASA.

Where, Mr. President, is the effective and predominant military space program which you agreed is so vital to our national security? It does not exist—and current developments are pushing any prospect of its implementation into the far distant future.

We charge you with neglect of our national security in your own words, Mr. President: "If the Soviet control space, they can control earth."

A Proper Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the millions of words that have been spoken about the Cuban problem attest to the complexity of that problem. One of the latest aspects of this problem is that of refugee attacks on Russian shipping and Cuban shore installations.

It is imperative that we remember, in considering that problem, that this country has commitments all over the globe and the responsibility of pursuing a policy that will insure long range success. On the other hand the Cuban refugees have but one concern—to return to Cuba. It is understandable that they will do almost anything to attain that end but it should be equally understandable that we cannot permit them to change the course of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, the problem of refugee attacks on shipping was very intelligently discussed in an editorial in the April 2 edition of the Casper Tribune and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPER ACTION

The Washington Government's crackdown on hit-and-run raids on Cuba has brought sharp criticism, and in some cases defiance, from Cuban exiles in this country, perhaps not wholly without cause.

The administration has been reckless in what amount to promises that Castroism will be overthrown and freedom restored to Cuba. The exiles ask how freedom can be regained unless they are allowed to fight for it.

But it seems to us the administration has no choice to ending commando raids staged in this country, and that it properly can ask the British to do the same so far as concerns British territory.

The Cubans came to the United States as refugees seeking asylum, which was granted freely and at considerable cost to Florida, because most of them are without means. For them to use U.S. territory to prepare military actions against Cuba is an abuse of privilege, and to all practical purposes alines the United States with this military effort.

Actually the hit-and-run raids are merely acts of harassment, and more often than not directed to indiscriminate destruction.

The shelling, on two occasions, of Soviet commercial vessels serves no military purpose, and might lead to a tightening of the Soviet hold on the Castro regime and the island, when the purpose of the United States is to secure complete withdrawal of Soviet troops.

In its propaganda harangue, Moscow points a finger at the United States as an imperialist aggressor bent on taking over Cuba. If any action of Washington tends to give color to charges of interventionist intention, it will bring quick repercussions from the Soviet Union that might lead up to acts of war.

In such case, events could move swiftly.

It is easy to sympathize with the plight of Cuba, and it is desirable that a means be found whereby the Cuban people can win back their freedom. But the means must have the virtue of practicality.

By all accounts, there is no great restiveness among the Cuban people themselves, a prime requirement for successful revolution.

An Answer to an Invitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I received the following note and enclosure from a good friend and constituent of mine.

The "answer to an invitation" is so well written, and expresses the thoughts of so many of the people of my district, that I felt it merited a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

CHESTER, N.Y.,
April 8, 1963.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I thought that you might be interested in my reply to an invitation to visit behind the Iron Curtain with an official government blessing.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR E. PROSSER.

APRIL 6, 1963.

Mr. RICHARD AMMON,
Mr. HARLO P. BEALS,
Goodwill People-to-People Travel Program.

GENTLEMEN: I want to thank you for your letters of recent date. I am very much pleased that you thought of me when considering selection of people who might be an asset to this mission. I have the $1,497; I have spent 38 years producing eggs; I am semiretired so I have the time; I have attended four world poultry congresses showing that I enjoy travel. But I must decline.

My main reason for declining is that I do not share Harlo Beals' feeling that farming the U.S. way is an example of freedom of democracy. There was a time that this was so but I am sure Karl Marx is resting a lot more comfortably in his grave than Thomas Jefferson is as they review which direction the United States is heading. You gentlemen are familiar with the billions of tax dollars which have been and are still being poured into worthless farm programs so I will not bore you with the details. I have not forgotten that you, Dick, with GLF aid, helped me in the presentation of a paper on this subject that I read to the Senate Agriculture Committee on May 24, 1961, and I am truly grateful for that help. I believe that I would not be capable of helping to improve relations and understanding between people" which you mention in your letter. In fact, I would be very much embarrassed if any person in Hungary asked where we were when the Soviets slaughtered these free people. I can hardly believe that the funloving Hungarians whom the travel folder says we will see at play will be the true representatives of these murdered patriots. I also doubt that the Government officials' briefing at the airport prior to flight would make me a proponent of its socialistic policies. The liberals have been trying to indoctrinate me for years with no success.

I think this mission has possibilities: it should be headed by Orville Freeman and made up of some of my brother poultrymen who subscribe to his socialistic ideas. They could see the finished product of their philosophy. Of course they would see only the showcases and not the slave camps of Siberia. Possibly then they might realize that the only difference between socialism and communism is the firing squad.

I just learned as I finished this letter that my son, Robert, is going to make the trip. He also is a conservative. It may help bolster his convictions if they show real conditions and not just show cases for tourists.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR E. PROSSER.

Need for Less Profile and More Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of Congress, what

the United States needs from the White House is less profile and more courage.

One trouble with the profile is that it is looking, not forward to the challenge of the hour but off to one side or the other to see whether or not Khrushchev or any other latter-day dictators are smiling or frowning. We dare not offend them, you know.

This need for courage has been a continuing one during the past 2 years, one that has, with the President's latest policy on Cuba, grown to alarming proportions. David Lawrence, writing in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, describes this policy as the new "Neutralism." And only yesterday Drew Pearson wrote:

The policy includes not only a sharp warning to Cuban exile leaders that they will be prosecuted if they try any more hit-and-run raids, but also tacit acquiescence to some Russian troops remaining in Cuba. * * * Behind all this is an undeclared Government decision not to upset the status quo in Cuba.

Today's papers are carrying the news that José Miro Cardona, Cuban exile leader, has resigned as president of the Cuban Revolutionary Council in protest against this new policy on Cuba. I do not think any of us can know the extent of bewilderment and discouragement the Cuban exiles feel as a very real effect of the policy.

To see the United States in the role of a neutralist nation, as Mr. Lawrence has described it, has jolted me. His column, "The New 'Neutralism,'" follows; please read it.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 15, 1963]

THE NEW "NEUTRALISM"

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe we ought to apologize for any past expressions implying disagreement with the "neutralism" of various governments in Asia and Africa.

Maybe we should forget all that our spokesmen have said heretofore in support of the right of peoples anywhere to seek by revolution to free themselves from the yoke of autocratic rulers.

Maybe we should explain that it is considered expedient now not to offend Khrushchev, though he strives through international communism to dominate the world.

Maybe all democracies are expected now to remain neutral and to restrain Cubans from returning to their homeland to fight for the freedom of their countrymen.

Maybe we should erase from history books the chapters on the American Revolution wherein our forefathers pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to gain independence from tyranny.

For what else does it mean when the President of the United States orders exiled Cubans to be arrested and imprisoned if they take any steps while inside this country to help organize military expeditions of their own people to go back to rescue their fellow citizens?

Mr. Kennedy said to his news conference the other day that such raids are "ineffective" and could cause international complications for us. There are even hints that the great Government of the United States is afraid to hurt the feelings of Khrushchev and thus give him an excuse either to halt the withdrawal of the remainder of the Soviet Army now stationed in Cuba or even to send in additional forces.

But since when is the policy of the United States based on fear of a tyrant instead of on fundamental principles of international justice?

The President can call the raids "ineffective" and they might indeed fail for the time being. But, realistically, they symbolize the spirit of revolution—the sacrifices that patriots are ready to make for their country's freedom.

Why are we being commanded to stay neutral when human liberty is at stake and brave men are willing to die for such a cause? Is this the time for us to appear before all the world as having intervened to protect Castro and the Soviet army in Cuba?

Why does the President invoke neutrality laws against the expeditions of patriotic Cubans? Didn't the Soviet Government send in an army of 22,000 troops and technicians and erect missile bases aimed at our coastlind from an island 90 miles away? What kind of neutrality has Khrushchev observed?

Why do we tear to shreds the historic Monroe Doctrine, which for nearly 140 years has been a cardinal policy of the United States?

President Monroe announced to the world in 1823 that we would not let European powers "extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere" or control any government except in colonies they already possessed. But today we allow the Soviet system to establish and maintain itself in Cuba by the dominance of military force. We set an example for the nations of the world, including the Latin American countries. We tell them, in effect, they must not permit their territory or their resources to be used to aid the revolutionary movement in Cuba.

This is "neutralism" with a vengeance.

This is alinement on the side of the cruel dictators.

This is official indifference to the cause of freedom.

What shall we say now to the captive peoples of Eastern Europe? Shall we squelch all the organizations inside countries where refuge is given to exile governments and where bands of patriots send word constantly by radio and otherwise to their countrymen that the free world hasn't forgotten them?

The President's action in depriving exiled Cubans of the opportunity to deliver their own people from human bondage has sent a chill of dismay through the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere.

The view is expressed, moreover, inside official Washington that we must not annoy Khrushchev. In other words, supposedly to avoid a big war, we must appease the Hitlers of our day.

But sad experience tells us that this is the very way wars are brought on. Dictators misconstrue pacifism for cowardice. They then take chances and intensify their acts of aggression. As Winston Churchill wrote after World War II:

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance for survival.

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

The new "neutralism" is a most dangerous development in our foreign policy. It could ultimately plunge us into the big war nobody wants.

Drying Up the Sea of Red Ink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following editorial from the National Association of Investment Clubs Bulletin, as reprinted in the Manchester Union Leader on March 29:

DRYING UP THE SEA OF RED INK

Tax reductions and reforms are very much in the public eye. Tax reductions are strongly supported by practical people while the reforms seem to be the darlings of the Socialist thinkers.

Eventually a tax law will emerge. It will not be the answer, however, to the ailments of the United States. Our body politic is adrift on a red ink sea. This manmade sea is growing into its fourth decade of life.

The probabilities are that budget deficits will result in a showdown for the United States before the 1970's are reached. The disciplined economies of the European Common Market and Japan have attained power on the basis of fiscal soundness. They will be considerate only to a point.

France had to embrace Strong Man de Gaulle to rescue the nation from its politicians. France also, a few years ago, was adrift on red ink.

With the rise of De Gaulle and the failure of government ownership in England, true liberals are beginning to question and disentangle themselves from Socialist concepts and programs. They recognize that budget deficits can mean only economic chaos in the long run. They know that budget deficits, hopeless inflations, are the principal instruments for socialist parties of all varieties to gain more power. A liberal does not like political dictatorship, which usually is necessary to make socialism work even moderately well.

The liberal-Socialist split has been cropping out all over the world and has penetrated as far as State governments in the United States. This split offers an opportunity to do something about eliminating budget deficits and restoring the economic self-discipline that will again bring the United States to full economic vigor.

Is it not time to reform the politicians, as they have reformed us, and return to responsible government? Business and labor have each gone through reform periods.

The 22d amendment to the Constitution, which limts the term of President to two, could be implemented by an amendment denying for one term the right of any elected Federal official to run for reelection if the Government of the United States operated at a cumulative deficit in the administrative budget during his years in office. This standard would not apply to terms of office in which the Nation was engaged in a declared war.

For example, a Congressman could run for office only if a cumulative surplus in the administrative budget had been realized for the 2 years ending June 30 prior to the November election. The President and Vice President could run only if there is a surplus for the 4 years of their terms. The Senators, on the other hand, would earn reelection privileges by showing a surplus over the 6-year period of their terms.

Constitutional amendments are slow to enact. It is safe to say that there would be a miraculous transformation among elected Federal officials, if they were faced with the prospect of this amendment becoming effective in 5 years.

Their own political survival would depend upon sound practices in the field of foreign aid, military expenditure, balance of payments, the soundness of the U.S. money, and the general health of the population and the business community. Suddenly the General Accounting Office would be looking for waste in Government. Just as quickly, every pressure group would suffer loss of power because Congressman John Doe would measure special interest requests against his own eligibility to run for reelection.

Impractical you say? Admittedly, it would be difficult to inaugurate such an amendment through the channel of Congress.

But remember, States can begin constitutional amendments also. This is the one way the States can reestablish their independence of the Federal Government. If the amendment started in the great self-reliant State of Texas, the industrial States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, States on the firing line of foreign economic competition, might fall in line. Other States depending on manufacturing and foreign trade for employment and payrolls would follow.

The drifting body politic is in need of reform. The sooner the better, if we want to move ahead again.

Congested Court Calendars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial penned by Albert S. Callan, Jr., of the Chatham Courier, in the April 4 issue of that fine publication. In exploring the seemingly endless stream of Federal suits in the courts today, with badly congested court calendars, the editor provides those of us caught up in the throes of big government with an important issue to reflect upon. Where does all of this lead? When will it stop? What are the consequences? Actually the courts are but one example of this problem; however, I believe that it is sagacious and timely, and feel that every Member should consider the implications of the Federal State and its advent.

The comments are as follows:

[From the Chatham (N.Y.) Courier, Apr. 4, 1963]

WHERE THERE'S SMOKE

Once more the Federal Government has brought suit against a corporation for unfair trade practices with General Motors in the role of defendant and again the courts have dismissed the action.

The U.S. Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission have initiated such a multiplicity of similar suits that suspicion is aroused they result from an animus toward business. This, of course, is categorically denied by the Federal agencies.

Yet, we ask, who is to blame in these cases? Our American business enterprises are tangled in a web of laws, so vague as to intent, so subject to change at congressional whim or Government pressure, that the resulting confusion is more than a layman can grasp.

Prosecutions based on these laws bear a strong family resemblance to inquisitions of the Middle Ages. The public is often led to judge corporations guilty before the verdict is in, and in most cases litigations are so lengthy we forget to watch the outcome.

If there is no animosity on the part of certain governmental departments toward business, then there must be another reason for this sudden zeal to ferret out unfair trade practices.

The more activities these departments can show, the larger appropriations they can get from Congress. In the long run, therefore, it is not the corporation that suffers the most, but the taxpayer who foots the bill for these lengthy probes.

To end these endless series of costly court actions, the Government should institute clarification and stabilization of laws pertaining to trade, for what was perfectly legal yesterday, is the crime of today and an invitation to prosecute without sufficient reason for the sake of self-aggrandizement and political notice.

Sherman Phelps Platt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Kingsport Times on Wednesday, April 3, 1963, regarding Mr. Sherman Phelps Platt.

My good friend, Sherman Phelps Platt, recently passed away. To have enjoyed his friendship was one of the greatest privileges of my life. He was a great man and one of the founding citizens of Kingsport, Tenn. He loved his city and had a genuine desire to serve it.

His memory will linger on in the hearts of the people, and Kingsport is a better place in which to live as a result of his devotion to the better things in life.

The editorial follows:

[From the Kingsport (Tenn.) Times, Apr. 3, 1963]

SHERMAN PHELPS PLATT

Once more we have to take the news of the passing of another founding citizen of Kingsport. Sherman Phelps Platt, long associated with the old Kingsport Improvement Co., and the man who was close to the late J. Fred Johnson, the "father of Kingsport," has finished his race.

"Phelps," as we came to know him, came to Kingsport as a young man and became what amounted to confidential secretary to Mr. Johnson, although as far as we know he never held that title officially. We do know that he was in the confidence of J. Fred Johnson as few men were and had a quiet hand in carrying out many of the early plans and negotiations with industrial organizations which became the foundation stones in the economic building of Kingsport.

This was in the early days when the Kingsport Improvement Co. was the unofficial, but very efficient, chamber of commerce and J. Fred Johnson was its executive director. This was the work to which Phelps Platt gave his time and talents.

Platt, although he served as the fifth president of the Kingsport Kiwanis Club and served as chairman of the local draft board during the war, was never what is known as a front man. He preferred to work behind the scenes and was far more at home in the conference room than he was on the public platform. On community projects like the community chest and the hospital drive and similar projects his was the advisory voice rather than the voice giving orders. As a matter of fact we cannot remember ever using his picture in the paper. He wanted no part of publicity.

When in the course of the city's growth, the Kingsport Improvement Co. turned over the promotional work to a regular chamber of commerce, Platt stepped aside for others and devoted himself to private business. He was for years engaged in the insurance business as well as having an interest in other local organizations.

It suddenly strikes us how often, in the sad duty of commenting on the passing of the old leaders of Kingsport, we have had to say that the man was a self-effacing person who preferred to work quietly without thought of whether his work was known much less credit given to him. It has been perhaps the keynote to the successful growth of this city that the work of leadership was carried on by men who had no axe to grind and who worked from a genuine love of the city and a genuine desire to serve it.

We have to repeat again this sentiment in connection with Sherman Phelps Platt. He was such a man who loved his city and asked nothing better than to serve it most of his adult life.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the San Diego Union of April 1, 1963, and the New York Daily News of April 2, 1963, with reference to a recent address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.:

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 1, 1963]

FARLEY FACES FACTS

James A. Farley, Democratic national chairman under Franklin D. Roosevelt and one of John F. Kennedy's stanch supporters for the Presidency, recently expressed his opinions about Cuba and communism in a Chicago speech.

"Unlike some of our statesmen," he said, "I do not think the Communist danger is subsiding; I am sure it is mounting. I expect to be called an alarmist and possibly a warmonger. My answer is to point to the map.

"The map proves that we are not moving toward war with the Communists; they are moving toward war with us. Each time we seek to disengage with them, they confront us nearer home. * * * Cuba is a menace that must be removed."

The former Postmaster General's declarations are at sharp variance with President Kennedy's efforts to minimize the Red threat in Cuba. They are also unusually interesting because Mr. Farley is highly influential among the mass of Democratic voters in the

North. These are the middle-of-the-road, traditional Democrats, who long have shown annoyance with liberal and radical leadership in their party.

Mr. Farley is both a skilled politician and an astute observer of world affairs. His realistic analysis of the Red powderkeg in Cuba can draw only applause from Republicans and Democrats alike.

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 2, 1963]

GUEST EDITORIAL

By James A. Farley (the kind of Democrat you can admire), in a recent Chicago speech:

"It seems to me that any American's answer to the villainous Red propaganda is just this simple: You commissars may have the weapon which will blow me to kingdom come, but the weapon has not yet been invented which can put a yoke on my neck. * * * I assume Patrick Henry meant it when he said, 'Give me liberty or give me death.' * * * In blunt terms, to stand as an American you must be prepared to fall as one. * * * King George III did not believe that Americans would fight; the Kaiser thought we were a cowardly and unmilitary people; Hitler thought Americans would never wake up—and it is a great pity that Mr. Khrushchev doesn't read more history."

Company Strikes Back at Senator's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last month the senior Senator from Delaware made charges on the Senate floor involving Farmers Investment Co. of Arizona.

R. Keith Walden, president of Farmers Investment Co., has since written the Senator declaring:

Perhaps the erroneous aspect of your comment that this company has found a "remarkably easy way to make money fast in the New Frontier" can be excused by your failure to ascertain the facts.

The Pinal County Enterprise of April 4, 1963, carries a story on the original charges and Mr. Walden's refutation. So that my colleagues hay have both sides of the issue I submit the following text of the Enterprise story:

COMPANY STRIKES BACK AT SENATOR'S CHARGES

R. Keith Walden, president of Farmers Investment Co., which last month was castigated in the U.S. Senate by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware, struck back last week in a five-page letter to the Senator.

The letter was prompted by Senator WILLIAMS' remarks on the Senate floor that Farmers Investment Co., in Maricopa and Pinal County operations, "made an easy profit of over $26,500 on land which it was renting from the State of Arizona for less than $2,500." This was under the grain diversion program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Walden, in his letter, told Senator WILLIAMS that "the reporting and wide circulation of your statements have been derogatory to the image of this company in the communities in which we operate and in this State as a whole."

He then proceeded to point out to the Senator the factual circumstances surrounding Government payments to Farmers Investment for taking land out of production.

Senator WILLIAMS, a crusader against the Kennedy-Freeman feed grains program, in a speech before the Senate March 14 said: "I call attention to the remarkably easy way it (Farmers Investment Co.) found to make money fast on the New Frontier."

"This company rented 582.3 acres from the State of Arizona—Maricopa County—at an average cost of $3 per acre, or less than $1,800. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the ASC State committee, then contracted to pay the company $37.90 per acre, or a total of $22,069.17 not to cultivate the same acreage," the Senator reported.

"This represented a net profit of over $20,000 merely to act as an agent between the State of Arizona and the Federal Government," was Senator WILLIAMS' words as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He then went on to outline figures for three tracts of land in Pinal County which the company leases from the State. He said the total rent was around $700 and Farmers Investment collected a total of $6,913.54 from the Federal Government not to cultivate the same acreage.

"On the two transactions the Farmers Investment Co. made an easy profit of over $26,500 on land which it was renting from the State of Arizona for less than $2,500," was the Senator's conclusions.

In answer to this, Walden said that "the implication here is * * * that no cost other than the payment by us of a rental of $2,500 was necessary to place ourselves in a position to participate in the Federal grain diversion program."

He then explained that Farmers Investment rented this land from the State since 1950 in Pinal County and since 1954 in Maricopa County.

"The land which we lease from the State in Maricopa County encompasses 8,200 acres. Prior to its development by this company, it was unimproved, desert, grazing land, on which the State received a rental of 4 cents per acre per year. At our own expense, we placed $183 per acre of fixed improvements on the land," Walden pointed out.

"In addition, it was necessary for us to invest more than $100 per acre in farm tools and machinery for each tillable acre," he continued. "The average cost of growing and harvesting the crops which we produced on all of our farm acreage in 1961 was $173.42 per acre. The total of these figures was $456 per acre."

Walden also pointed out that improvement of this State land increased income to the State from 4 cents per acre per year to a figure which varies from a minimum of $3 per acre to $18 per acre per year, "depending on the crop grown, the soil classification and the cost of irrigation water."

"Perhaps the erroneous aspect of your comment that this company has found a 'remarkably easy way to make money fast in the New Frontier' can be excused by your failure to ascertain the facts," Walden continued. "Perhaps your statement that 'this represented a net profit of over $20,000 merely to act as an agent between the State of Arizona and the Federal Government' can also be excused on the basis of your being unfamiliar with the tremendous investment in improvements which all farmers are required to place on State land subjugated in Arizona."

Then Walden gave the Senator a factual analysis of the company's grain diversion, grain production and grain consumption operations during the 1961 year.

The president of Farmers Investment pointed out to the Senator that participation in the grain diversion program in connection with their cattle feeding program actually saved the taxpayers $10,409.31 in 1961. And he quoted figures from the annual audit of the company to back up his statements.

The quotes from Walden's letter:

"In 1961, fixed, administrative, overhead costs, whether we planted a crop or not, amounted to $4.95 per acre on grain crops, before land taxes or land rental paid to the State. The average land rental paid to the State on land either planted to grain crops or placed in the diversion program amounted to an additional $3.32 per acre.

"Hence, the total per acre fixed costs which we had on acreage placed in the grain diversion program amounted to $8.27 per acre. Our net profit on acreage planted to grain in Pinal and Maricopa Counties amounted to $30.95 per acre before deducting fixed costs. Subtracting this figure from the diversion payment received, the result is $16.14 per acre. Since the total acreage diverted was 1,998.2 our profit was $32,250.95 more than had we not participated in the diversion program.

"In 1961, we paid $648,885.15 for 15,011.95 tons of grain. In addition to our own production, purchases were made from either existing Government-owned surplus stocks or oher farmers. Insurance and storage rates which the Government pays on grain storage in Arizona amount to $4.80 per ton per year. Our purchases of grain saved the taxpayer of the United States $72,057.36 on storage costs alone."

Using 5 percent as the rate of interest the Government pays on money tied up in feed grain inventories, Walden carried the saving to taxpayers even further. He stated the saving in interest due to the grain purchased in 1961 would amount to an additional $32,444.25 for 1 year.

"Our grain purchases in 1961, therefore, saved the taxpayer something in the order of $104,501.61, less the diversion payment which we received, in the amount of $94,092.30. The net saving to the Government under these peculiar circumstances amounted to $10,409.31," Walden wrote.

He termed it a patriotic decision to cooperate with the Government program in 1961, 1962, and again in 1963. But, principally due to the criticism which the company feels has been "unjustly leveled at us from the U.S. Senate for 2 years and also because, by implication, it also places other large farmers in an unfair position, we are somewhat inclined to change our plans for 1964," the letter stated.

In conclusion, Walden told Senator WILLIAMS that "I hope these facts will be helpful in your effort to rectify some of the maladies which we all recognize exists in the farm program."

The Price They Paid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the concise composition authored by Dr. Bob Wells, entitled "The Price They Paid," which was recently broadcast over the American Freedom Network, an independent, nonprofit, nonpolitical informational public affairs broadcasting service, Post Office Box 626, Bonita, Calif. I, therefore, include it as a portion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE PRICE THEY PAID

Have you ever wondered what happened to those men who signed the Declaration of Independence?

Five signers were captured by the British as traitors, and tortured before they died. Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost their sons in the Revolutionary Army, another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds or the hardships of the Revolutionary War.

What kind of men were they? Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were merchants, nine were farmers and large plantation owners, men of means, well educated. But they signed the Declaration of Independence knowing full well that the penalty would be death if they were captured.

They signed and they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Carter Braxton of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader, saw his ships swept from the seas by the British Navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts, and died in rags.

Thomas McKeam was so hounded by the British that he was forced to move his family almost constantly. He served in the Congress without pay, and his family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him, and poverty was his reward.

Vandals or soldiers, or both, looted the properties of Ellery, Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge, and Middleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr., noted that the British General Cornwallis had taken over the Nelson home for his headquarters. The owner quietly urged Gen. George Washington to open fire, which was done. The home was destroyed, and Nelson died bankrupt.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife, and she died within a few months.

John Hart was driven from his wife's bedside as she was dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His fields and grist mill were laid waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves, returning home after the war to find his wife dead, his children vanished. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and a broken heart.

Norris and Livingston suffered similar fates.

Such were the stories and sacrifices of the American Revolution. These were not wild-eyed, rabblerousing ruffians. They were soft-spoken men of means and education. They had security, but they valued liberty more. Standing tall, straight, and unwavering, they pledged: "For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of the divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

They gave us an independent America. Can we keep it?

Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the April 3, 1963, edition of the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C.:

WELL DONE

There are times when everyone can applaud an unprecedented act.

That was the case when Congress, for the first time in our history, voted to proclaim a foreigner an honorary citizen of the United States.

The foreigner is Sir Winston Churchill. And he is, in the full sense, the first citizen of the free world. The history which he did so much to write—in deed and in words—is his enduring monument. His was the voice, indomitable in the face of appalling defeats and disasters, which rallied peoples and nations and led, at long last, to victory.

And there is something vital that the statesmen of the present day, here and abroad, can learn from Sir Winston. There was no drift when his hand was at the helm. There was no irresolution. Risks—great risks—were taken with full knowledge of what might happen, and with full resolve to see the dangers through to the end, whatever that end might be. The Western World of the present needs more, much more, of that spirit, courage, and dedication.

Make Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of March 16, 1963. The editorial points out that the old remedies of the 1930's which have been exhumed by the New Frontier, are no more effective today in solving unemployment than they were then.

Text of the editorial is as follows:

MAKE WORK

Frances Perkins, who was Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of Labor, went back to Washington recently to help celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Labor Department and to reminisce about unemployment during the depression.

In her comments while at the Capital, Miss Perkins gave little help to the Kennedy administration in its efforts to depict present unemployment levels as a grave crisis. Back in the thirties, said Miss Perkins, 17 million persons were out of work in a labor force two-thirds the size of the one we have today. Today about 5 million are officially declared to be out of work, and they include many part-time workers and others who are not family breadwinners.

Miss Perkins might have added that none of the New Deal's programs for putting people to work was permanently successful, and that the unemployment problem remained critical until World War II.

Nevertheless, the Kennedy administration is following the make-work pattern of the Roosevelt administration in an attempt to solve today's unemployment problem, and with about the same degree of success.

For example, Congress last year approved the so-called development program for relief of chronic unemployment areas, and the report on the first year's operations is now in.

It shows 2,900 projects have been approved, with more than $485 million allocated. The figures show it will take 49,000 man-years to complete the projects or about $10,000 per project.

The workers won't get $10,000 each, of course. Much of the money will go for materials, administration and overhead. But the cost to the taxpayers will be $10,000 for each of the 49,000 jobs created. Officials say optimistically that they hope to cut this figure to $8,500 per job.

But if the unemployment problem were to be solved by such expensive make work, the total cost would run to something like $40 billion, and even the most radical New Frontiersman doesn't care to contemplate such a figure as that.

President Kennedy says he want to create productive jobs that will add to individual and national prosperity. He made that point in his unemployment message to Congress this week. All his countrymen, we think, are with the President on that.

But make work and subsidies won't create permanent jobs.

Retraining programs may have some limited value. The efforts to keep young people in school through the 12th grade is praiseworthy, but will not solve the problem of fitting reluctant students and slow learners into an increasingly automated world. By the same token, a Youth Conservation Corps, on the order of the CCC of Frances Perkins' day, is at best a means of taking young people off the unemployment rolls temporarily.

For all the pulling and prodding and spending of the taxpayers' money, the Government is not likely to help ease unemployment until it pursues policies which will stimulate the enterprise economy and thus create productive employment.

And this means hands off rather than hands on the economic machinery.

America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a timely, well-reasoned plea to the American people to awaken to the potential of our natural resources or face shortages of our most elemental needs, is in an editorial in the Washington Post of April 8, 1963.

The editorial very sensibly points out that we are given just so much land and so much water. Waste of either courts disaster for a doubled population within 37 years.

The editorial, titled "America's Future," demands and deserves wide reading and thought by all of us, in and out of the Congress. Under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

AMERICA'S FUTURE

The gist of the latest survey of natural resources seems to be that the people who inhabit this land are headed for trouble unless they adopt conservation measures and at the same time improve their technology. There are, to be sure, many encouraging aspects of the study, which is entitled "Resources in America's Future." Its authors tell us that no "across-the-board shortages of natural resources" are in sight during the remainder of the 20th century. But 37 years is a very short period when thinking of the future of a great country.

Probably the most optimistic note in the study is its emphasis on the extent to which technological progress can overcome the threat of scarcity. Along with our enormous increase in population and the greater productivity of each individual, comes increased know-how in utilizing our resources. The U.S. population is expected to double by the year 2000 and the value of goods and serv-

ices produced will probably be multiplied by four. This could mean acute shortages unless technology in utilizing resources keeps pace with the advancing demands.

The experts see substantial possibilities in using lower grades of raw material, in substituting plentiful materials for scarce ones, in getting more use out of given amounts, in importing some things from other countries, and in making multiple use of land and water resources.

Some of the most serious problems arise in connection with land and water—resources which are not readily expansible. The experts see a doubling of urban land requirements by 2000, reaching a total of 45 million acres. For recreation the need is placed at 130 million acres, three times the 1960 figure. All the demands for land by 2000 add up to 50 million more acres than the total area of the 48 contiguous States, and of course much of this area is unusable desert. Obviously, therefore, multiple use of land will be necessary, and this problem will become the more acute with each passing decade.

The demand for water has been growing faster than population. The municipal use of water is expected to double by 2000 and industrial use of water to quadruple. In the West, the experts conclude, the problem will have to be met by the construction of new dams and reservoirs, long-distance transportation of water, desalinization and perhaps a curtailment of irrigation to make water available for new industry. In the East, the study concludes, the two greatest needs are increased storage capacity and more thorough treatment of waste water to relieve the streams of their pollution.

Another cautionary note seems to demand special attention. To supply the timber needs of the year 2000 under present practices would require an additional 300 million acres of commercial forest land. Since the land will not be available, the need will have to be met by improved management of existing forest lands, importation of lumber and the use of substitutes. Even so, the net effect is to emphasize the great importance of our forests.

America's future is rosy indeed, when compared with that of many other lands, but only economical use and wise conservation of our resources and a steady advance of technology can keep the outlook bright for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

Cut Foreign Aid?—Maybe Reds Wouldn't Like It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Tampa Tribune, which is published daily at Tampa, Fla.

The Tampa Tribune is one of the outstanding newspapers in our Nation and it usually follows a course of moderation. However, its editorial staff, as many other Americans, has come to the realization that the foreign aid program will not do and has not done the job that its proponents have claimed it could do.

The editorial, "Cut Foreign Aid? Maybe Reds Wouldn't Like It," follows:

CUT FOREIGN AID?—MAYBE REDS WOULDN'T LIKE IT

Secretary of State Rusk hasn't helpd the cause of foreign aid by his blundering statement to a congressional committee that those who would sharply cut aid funds are cooperating with Communist strategy.

But maybe he has, unwittingly, helped the cause of fiscal stability.

Congressional resentment against Rusk's implication that to cut the Kennedy aid program is to help communism very likely will stiffen opposition to the President's request for $4.5 billion for the fiscal year starting July 1.

It may very well force a reduction below the $3.9 billion appropriated for the present year. It should.

American dollars now flow out to 95 countries around the globe; amounts given in economic and military aid since the end of World War II range from $9½ billion for France to $100,000 for Zanzibar. The total of all aid will reach $100 billion this year.

There can be no disputing the fact that much of the money has been well spent. The Marshall plan probably saved war-stricken Western Europe from falling under Communist domination, and most certainly supplied the vitamins for its present economic health. Aid to Turkey, South Korea, and Nationalist China has helped contain Communist expansion and the same result is hoped for in India. The assistance given the Dominican Republic has so far enabled the little sugarcane republic to emerge from the chaos of an overthrown tyranny and take wobbly steps along the pathway of democracy. There are other examples of tangible results.

But there can't be much argument, either, that a shocking lot of the foreign aid has been and is being wasted. It has gone to prop up corrupt dictatorships, feed needless armies, and fatten the Swiss bank accounts of greedy politicians. As the Clay Committee report recently pointed out, the program is "attempting to do too much for too many"—and requiring too little in return.

Secretary Rusk's statement is an indication of what's wrong with the foreign aid program.

Washington policymakers have come to regard foreign aid, like farm subsidies, as holy writ. It is a political commandment that the farmer must be subsidized; so, too, the underdeveloped country, whatever its capability for self-help. Anyone who would tamper with this sacred tradition is guilty of inhumanity and very possibly pro-Communist sympathies as well.

If the United States were debt free and running annual budget surpluses, it could afford this concept of foreign aid. But it's not and it can't.

This country has a debt (as of yesterday) of $303 billion, a $7 billion increase since last year. It probably will finish the present fiscal year about $8 billion deeper in the red. It is losing gold reserves at the rate of $2 billion a year, and only the forbearance of foreign holders of dollars-credits enables us to maintain the dollar's stability in the world market.

In these circumstances, it is purest profligacy to talk of increasing foreign aid. Commonsense demands, instead, a selective but substantial reduction. President Kennedy conceded the need for review when, after the Clay report, he voluntarily cut his original proposal by $400 million. Congress can do better. It ought to aim at a maximum of $3 billion for next year's program, instead of the $4.5 billion sought by the President.

Contrary to Secretary Rusk's view, we don't think such a cut would be cause for celebration in the Kremlin. Nikita Khrushchev and his fellows, we suspect, would much prefer to see the United States follow Washington's political commandment to its inevitable end—which is bankruptcy.

Railroading No Featherbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix an excellent letter written by Maurice K. Robinson, of Turners Falls, Mass., a freight conductor on the railroad. He describes in precise detail some of the disadvantages of working on the railroad and sets a number of matters in proper perspective. I think that his letter deserves wide reading:

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette, Apr. 2, 1963]

RAILROADING NO FEATHERBED

To the EDITOR OF THE RECORDER-GAZETTE:

It was refreshing to read your featherbed editorial of a few days back and confront myself with the unvarnished truth. It is always heartwarming to read an opinion by a modern-day Horace Greeley, when one realizes the research he must put in to know exactly what he is talking about.

I am a freight conductor on the railroad. For the past 2 months I have practically lived outdoors, climbing up and over boxcars, wading through knee- and hip-deep snow in subzero temperatures, and working nearly 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. I have ridden a railroad snowplow and had it jump the track. I have been riding the caboose and had the engine jump the track. I have been a week trying to get to my other terminal but couldn't because of the weather. Yet when I do get a breather I like to read your editorial about my short workweek.

It pleases me no end when I see by your editorial that some of the railroads' ills are caused by overage employees. Of course you must have investigated and found out that railroad conductors and trainmen are compelled to retire at age 65. So perhaps you advocate compulsory retirement at age 60, 55, or 50. Is that what you have at the Recorder-Gazette?

I'm glad you put in that part about unneeded employees. The railroad I work for is way ahead of you on that one. They removed the middle brakeman on their through freights several years ago. Now the conductor in many instances rides part of the trip on the engine, instead of the caboose which is his office, and performs the duties formerly done by the second brakeman on the engine. Did I say through freight? No such animal now. All freights make anywhere from six to a dozen stops to do work.

Another thing I'm glad you brought up was the mileage formulas. Our through freight have to work over 10 hours a day before overtime starts or a theoretical 70 hours a week. So I'm a hundred percent for revising this antiquated structure.

Of course, even a newspaper of your caliber couldn't think of everything to put in your featherbed editorial. You forget to mention that conductors and trainmen have no sick leave, that passenger trainmen never receive time and a half, that we have no company-paid insurance plan, that we get nothing extra for working nights, or Sundays, and road conductors and brakemen receive no extra compensation for working holidays. That we pay for our own railroad watches.

Do you know that of the 30 approximate road conductors and trainmen working on the division I work on, only 5 are home in their own beds every night? Do you know

of the others that spend every other day away from home, they pay their own expenses and are not reimbursed by the railroad? In my own case I am usually home only 8 hours every 2 days to see my family and then they're usually in bed.

Oh yes; one last thing. Do you remember what a section man looks like? A few years ago they were thicker than fleas but like the horse and buggy they were expendable, and now in many instances it's the featherbedding conductor and brakeman who shovel the snow and chip the ice from buried switches.

But, nevertheless, it's nice to read informative, well-investigated editorials like yours that utter the unvarnished truth.

Perhaps now people won't be so quick to throw stones at my wife and children just because they're related to a featherbedder.

MAURICE K. ROBINSON.

Public Opinion Poll of the Honorable Harold R. Collier, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take the privilege of reporting to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the results of a very extensive public opinion poll recently completed in the 10th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor of representing.

My questionnaires were mailed to 68,000 homes throughout the 29 towns, cities, and villages, in the seven townships in Illinois' 10th District covering the west suburban and north suburban areas of Cook County. The poll was conducted by mail and drew a record-breaking response notwithstanding the fact that the participants had to provide the postage to return their completed questionnaires to my Washington office. A total of 18,853 were returned for a 27.7-percent response. This substantially exceeded the highest previous response to questionnaires which I mailed in the 85th, 86th, and 87th sessions of Congress.

I call particular attention to the fact that 83 percent of the residents of my district favor a tax cut only along with a cut in Federal spending.

This is particularly significant because I think it reflects a nationwide concern on the part of the majority of the American people with consistent budget deficits. I also direct the attention of my colleagues to the fact that 73 percent of the respondents favor sharp reductions in the foreign aid program while 17 percent oppose such cuts and 10 percent indicate that they had no opinion on this issue. Eighty-eight percent of those responding oppose any aid to nations with Communist governments while but 3 percent registered approval of this practice.

The results of this questionnaire follow:

[Total returns, 18,853]

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Proposed tax cut:			
(a) Favor only along with cut in Federal spending?	83	10	7
(b) Favor regardless of budget deficit?	18	61	21
2. Federal aid to education:			
(a) To public schools only?	42	47	11
(b) Both public and private schools?	29	59	12
(c) Federal college loan program?	54	33	13
3. Foreign aid program:			
(a) Maintain at present levels?	20	63	17
(b) Reduced sharply?	73	17	10
(c) Aid to nations with Communist governments?	3	88	9
4. Medical care for aged:			
(a) Under the social security program?	35	56	9
(b) Tax allowance for private insurance?	61	23	16
5. Domestic Peace Corps: (a) For its establishment?	39	55	6
6. Department of Urban Affairs and Housing: (a) For its establishment?	24	68	8
7. Military draft:			
(a) Maintain at present 24 months?	52	28	20
(b) Reduced to 18 months?	41	34	26
8. Military pay increased: (a) For proposed 15 percent increase?	51	42	7

The Common Market Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, General de Gaulle's veto of British entry into the European Common Market came as a shock and blow to other European nations and to the United States. Many assessments have been made of this action which was in some respects as much aimed at the elimination of U.S. influence in Europe as it was at the British.

One very interesting and perceptive account appeared in the March 9 issue of America by Mr. Christopher Emmet, a distinguished student of European affairs. Mr. Emmet argues, in my judgment rightly, that for the moment at least the greatest economic danger stemming from British rejection lies in the possible adoption of a protectionist Common Market tariff policy. Politically, he sees the real threat in a possible rejection of Atlantic unity and a revived interest in the possibility of a purely European deal with the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, these are very real dangers and I ask unanimous consent to have pointed in the Appendix of the RECORD this stimulating article entitled "The Common Market Crisis."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From America, Mar. 9, 1963]

THE COMMON MARKET CRISIS: BRITAIN'S IMMEDIATE ENTRY IS NOT THE MOST CRITICAL ISSUE AT THE PRESENT MOMENT

(By Christopher Emmet)

(Mr. Emmet, for years a close student of European affairs, is a frequent contributor to this review. His article will be read with respect in French and German Government circles.)

There is no doubt about the gravity of the crisis unleashed by General de Gaulle's veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market. However, it is important to distinguish between different elements in this crisis which have become confused in the general excitement. One is the present failure of Britain to gain entrance into the Common Market. The other and more far-reaching issue is the reason De Gaulle gave for rejecting the British, and the timing of that rejection.

Britain's failure to get into the Common Market now is the occasion rather than the cause of the crisis. Her application is still on the agenda. Her membership is still favored by the rest of the six except France, if Britain meets their conditions. Even General de Gaulle has left the door open for full or associate membership in the future.

Therefore, regrettable as the present unfavorable decision on British entry may be, the only danger, at least on the economic level, would come from an aggressive tariff policy by Common Market countries against other members of the Atlantic Community; and such a policy is unlikely. General de Gaulle does not have the power to impose such a tariff policy on the Common Market even if he wished; and he has made it clear that he does not. He realizes that any attempt by one member to dictate economic policy would destroy the market, from which the French economy has gained so much.

Wilhelm Roepke and Gunnar Myrdal, two world-famous economic authorities belonging to widely different schools of thought, believe Britain's nonadmission to the market will in the end even benefit the economies of all concerned.

Turning to the political level, there are both advantages and disadvantages to Britain's early entry. It is well to remember that until a year ago Britain was not expected to join. Indeed, on the very eve of the Brussels breakdown there was grave doubt as to whether the majority of the British people were willing to join. The election of Harold Wilson as leader of the Labor Party has increased this doubt. A delay in Britain's entry may give the Common Market more time to consolidate its economic and political unity and better enable it to cope with the problems of including less homogeneous members, like Britain and the Scandinavian countries, without losing its momentum.

For these reasons, many friends of European integration and many stanch supporters of NATO who disagree with De Gaulle on other matters looked upon British entry now with some misgivings. Their doubts were shared by many persons high in the American Government, at least until very recently. They feared it might end hopes for the degree of political integration which has been the European postwar dream, a dream which the British could not be expected to share fully.

True, General De Gaulle does not share this dream either; but he will not live or rule forever. To suddenly enlarge the European union by the admission of Britain and

other countries with different backgrounds might end the dream for a United States of Europe; while to go along temporarily with De Gaulle's kind of integration would only postpone it. And after De Gaulle there would be much less danger of an anti-American or third force philosophy in a United Europe. Thus, there is something to be said for maintaining the present political membership of the Common Market while waiting De Gaulle out. There are counterarguments in favor of British entry now, which will not be repeated here because they have been widely publicized.

But however one may feel about Britain's membership, and deeply as we may regret the way she was treated, the important thing now is to restore perspective and not to regard the veto at Brussels as a fatal disaster. Under the shock of disappointment and sensational news reports, people have been talking as if the Common Market itself will be a threat unless Britain gets in immediately. Everyone forgets that, until a few weeks ago, the Common Market and Franco-German reconciliation were rightly regarded as the greatest gains for freedom in the postwar world.

General de Gaulle provoked this reaction, and the mass communications mediums in all NATO countries have exacerbated it. Controversies between allies always have special morbid news value; and the time and space limitations of press and television lead to oversimplification. The press is right in regarding this as a crisis, but wrong in identifying this crisis with the rejection of Britain at Brussels.

The reasons De Gaulle gave are the real causes of the crisis. He charged that Britain in the Market would become a Trojan horse for the involvement of the United States and the whole Atlantic community in the affairs of Europe. But this is the very thing European supporters of NATO hope for, a developing Atlantic unity which alone can insure the survival and growth of the free world. Thus, the general laid down a challenge to all who believe in the need for an increasingly united front against Communist aggression.

The timing of De Gaulle's challenge—it came just before the long-planned signing of the Franco-German alliance—was clearly an attempt to commit his German allies, at least indirectly, to the rejection of Britain and to the reasons he gave for that rejection. De Gaulle presented the Germans and the rest of the Six with a fait accompli, counting on the fact that none of them would risk destroying the Common Market and Franco-German reconciliation.

The general is a notoriously tough bargainer; his timing and tactics in rejecting the British provide a perfect example. If President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill were often unable to get his cooperation, even when he was a guest in Britain commanding little more than a corporal's guard, we cannot blame President Kennedy and Chancellor Adenauer for having failed to persuade him to date. But the task is not hopeless, as was proved by Algeria: the general was wrong there at first also. The NATO nations possess the bargaining power to change his mind in the present case, if they remain united.

At the moment, the key is in the hands of the Germans, for De Gaulle's grand design for Europe as a third force under his leadership hinges on the Franco-German alliance. The problem now is how to keep the gains of both the Market and the Franco-German alliance while checking the general's other aims. The majority of Germans support NATO and reconciliation with France with equal fervor. They must now convince De Gaulle that they refuse to choose between the two, or give the French alliance priority over the alliance with the United States. Otherwise, German ratification will be misinterpreted as a surrender to De Gaulle's aims and as a blow to NATO.

A strong line by the chancellor and other leaders of his government and party is required, not only to convince the general, but to convince Germany's other allies, and to unite the German people. De Gaulle's refusal to grant even the chancellor's modest plea to suspend negotiations with the British for a few weeks before a final breakoff has increased the fears that De Gaulle will now be able to dominate Germany and the rest of the Common Market. It is this fear which has led to efforts by the British and some others to stir up mistrust of the Franco-German alliance. Some would even attempt to break up the Common Market unless De Gaulle agrees to admit the British now.

If the German Government fails to show its will and ability to resist De Gaulle's pressure, divisive forces will be unleased within every member of the Common Market and the Atlantic Community.

The false identification of the United States with Britain, for which De Gaulle was solely and deliberately responsible, is the most confusing aspect of this situation. This is the more ironic because, as we have seen, it is De Gaulle who is trying to throw Washington into London's arms or vice versa, and turn them both away from Bonn and Europe.

It should be publicly pointed out that the policy of the Common Market countries has been closer to the American view than has been the British policy on Berlin and some other NATO issues. The Skybolt affair, which De Gaulle cites as proof of U.S. favoritism toward Britain, shows the exact opposite of favoritism. Kennedy not only withdrew the Skybolt, much to British chagrin but made the same Polaris offer to France.

De Gaulle would like Europeans to forget that it was America which threw all its influence behind the cause of European unification, after laying the basis for it in the Marshall plan; while, after Churchill's great postwar speeches, the British opposed unification until a year ago. America pursued this course even though it was obvious that an increasingly integrated Europe would be a potential rival for the United States in both the economic and political fields, and end our supremacy in the free world. It was, in fact, General de Gaulle himself who blocked the first great effort for European union, when he threw all his influence against French ratification of the treaty for a European Defense Community, in 1954.

As regards the effect of the Common Market crisis on the United States, the present identification of the cause of NATO with the British, and the weakening of U.S. confidence in the more militantly anti-Communist leaders and parties who support the Europe of the Six, tend to strengthen the hands of those everywhere who favor the softer approach on Berlin, Cuba, atom test inspection and East-West trade, with which the British are now usually identified.

The influence in Britain of Harold Wilson, who may be the next Prime Minister, and who has just proposed that the West recognize the Ulbricht regime in order to preserve access to Berlin, is bound to move British foreign policy further in this direction. This is especially true because most of the powerful mass circulation British press leans in the same direction. Wilson would hardly say this at this time unless he believed it a popular line to take.

Still worse, these developments help economy minded U.S. conservatives who oppose foreign aid. These people already have the excuse of the dollar deficit and the large budget deficit to back their demands for destructive cuts. Added to their claim that foreign aid money is being wasted in the underdeveloped countries, they can now cite the Common Market support of De Gaulle as a classic example of ingratitude, since American aid laid the foundation for the Common Market's prosperity through the Marshall plan. And all this comes at a time when the dollar deficit has forced the United Statets to adopt a tougher financial policy toward our NATO allies, and just when it is most necessary to increase popularity and support for NATO.

It is widely speculated here that De Gaulle is willing to separate America from Europe, at the risk of weakening NATO, because he considers NATO no longer necessary for Europe's protection. Two explanations are given for his attitude: his reliance on the Sino-Soviet split to end the Soviet threat to Europe; and his reported hope of making a European deal with the Soviets. The British, in turn, can use their rejection by the Common Market as an excuse for urging more British trade with, and appeasement of, the Soviet Union; and they will urge America to adopt that policy as well. The U.S. dollar deficit strengthens the force of that argument. Thus, there will be pressure for a competition in appeasement, if things are allowed to go on in the present direction.

If the real cause of the present crisis is not Britain's failure to get into the Market now, it follows that the current pressure to force Britain in soon is not the real cure. The fight with De Gaulle must be made on the issues of NATO, nuclear arms, Atlantic unity, and the Common Market's tariff to the outside world, issues on which he is totally wrong from the point of view of most good Europeans. The battle should not be waged on the issue of immediate British entry, on which he may be at least partially right.

The key question, which only the Germans can answer, concerns the effects of the Franco-German alliance on all the issues discussed here. Once the treaty is ratified, the Germans will lose much of their bargaining power. Hence, they should reach some understanding with De Gaulle before the treaty is finally ratified. (The process of submitting a treaty to various committees in the Bundestag will permit time for such a clarification.)

If the Germans thus show that the Franco-German alliance is a two-way street by which they influence De Gaulle as well as vice versa, and if they can demonstrate that the temporary rejection of Britain involves no danger of a trade war, confidence will be restored and the worst part of the crisis resolved.

Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually; Wants Larger Area To Lose More In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting the third of a series of newspaper editorials from southern Idaho which are highly critical of the proposal to extend the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. It seems that, with few exceptions, the people of southern Idaho would rather hold on to the economic progress which has been achieved in cooperation with the private electric utility that has provided them with ample power at reasonable rates well below the national average. Taxes paid by this utility provide the funds for a large part of local and State services needed by the people of Idaho. I can readily understand why they would question the wisdom of

bringing in Bonneville subsidized Federal power, when such Federal power has not been the economic panacea its promoters would have us believe.

There are two major Federal electric power areas in the United States—Bonneville and TVA. In Idaho, Oregon, and Washington there are 26 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment reported by the U.S. Department of Labor in February 1963. And as you might surmise, every one of these 26 areas are in the Bonneville Power marketing area. In Tennessee there are 22 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment reported. Again, as you might surmise, all of these areas are within the TVA power marketing area.

With such records of questionable economic development in these two Federal power areas, one can understand why southern Idaho does not want to be socialized but would rather carry on in the American private enterprise way.

The following editorial from the North Side News of Jerome, Idaho, shows why free enterprise is in jeopardy:

[From the Jerome (Idaho) North Side News, May 10, 1962]

FREE ENTERPRISE IN JEOPARDY

Possible marketing extension of the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to southern Idaho is another attempt by the Federal Government to waste public funds for increased Government ownership of the power industry.

Tax money is required to develop tax-exempt power facilities which eliminate or prevent the building of taxpayer investor-owned electrical units.

It is frightening to see millions of dollars asked each year to build a tax-destroying Federal monopoly when Federal expenses are running way ahead of income, and when demands are made to increase the Federal debt.

But far worse than the taxes and the debt that Government in business involves are the lost liberties and individual opportunities that follow when a centralized Government turns toward socialization of enterprise.

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall's directive to BPA to study extension of its marketing area to southern Idaho will have a serious effect on the economy of the area because the position of private power will be jeopardized.

With a clearness of logic, James Annest, who is a candidate for nomination for second district Congressman on the Republican ticket, has charged that BPA lost $13 million last year and that Federal power supporters are proposing that Idaho taxpayers underwrite an even greater loss in years to come.

What supporters of Federal control would like us to believe is that we are threatened with a severe electrical shortage, that the security and prosperity of the Nation and Idaho are at stake, and that only Government spending can save us all from disaster.

Business Speaks to the Government About Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

BUSINESS SPEAKS TO THE GOVERNMENT ABOUT ADVERTISING—TALK PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE ADVERTISING FEDERATION OF AMERICA AND ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION OF THE WEST FIFTH ANNUAL MID-WINTER CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 5–6, 1963

(By Peter G. Peterson)

For the last few years, Madison Avenue has been America's most popular villain. The "Wolves of Wall Street," as they were vividly described in the twenties, are probably greatly relieved to give up their preeminent position.

One of the most popular formulas for writing a bestseller in recent years has been to create a picture of Madison Avenue as the sinister locale of much of the evil that besets us. The small brigade of striped-tie executives on Madison Avenue is charged with manipulating the American people and degrading their tastes, almost at will, so that the people covet products they should not have. Further, the Madison Avenuers are said to be responsible for shoddy merchandise that wears out quickly, if it works at all.

They are the people who waste the country's resources on silly, frivolous products when these resources should be devoted to more solemn, necessary, and desirable public sector outlays.

I am not here to defend Madison Avenue. It probably has the largest per capita rate of articulate spokesmen of any industry. It has its excesses. Unlike many other professional groups, however, it seems painfully aware of most of them.

I am here, however, to suggest that the attack on advertising has a sub rosa quality that is not worthy of the great issues it raises. I am here to suggest that the target of these criticisms should be considerably broadened to include other segments who are as deeply involved or implicated.

Let us take the businessman. It is he who designs and makes the products being criticized. It is he who decides how to market these products, including how to advertise them. It is he who pays the advertising bills, and thus bears the ultimate authority and responsibility to say "no" if he does not approve of the way his product is presented to the consuming public.

Let us also include the consumer. If he is to be protected against outside forces, it is well that he be confronted directly with what he is being protected against and what the methods and costs of protecting him are likely to involve. If it is his tastes that are being criticized, then let us say so directly.

If there are real villians in this plot, they are likely to be either the businessman, or the consumer, or both. Madison Avenue is but an accomplice.

For, as George Stigler of the University of Chicago recently observed, "Denouncing people who serve public tastes is like blaming the waiters in restaurants for obesity."

I would like to suggest that the time may have come for the country to have another of its public debates on some of the real questions that lie behind the attack on Madison Avenue. In raising some of these questions, it might be well to focus not on the groups who have a special interest in the marketing of more products at a higher profit (the manufacturers, distributors, retailers, advertising agencies, etc.), but on the consumer and the society as a whole. It is the consumer the economy is set up to serve, and the preservation of the economic system is important only if it serves him.

One of these basic questions, then, it seems to me, has to do with the freedom of the consumer to make choices in the market place among the widest possible number of alternatives, and whether he has the wisdom to make these choices.

Whenever we limit these choices, whether by a tax on advertising, restricting the kind of distribution that is acceptable, by laws requiring certain margins or discounts or prices, or in a hundred other ways, I think we should do this only after we have resolved a number of basic questions.

For example, do we believe the consumer is able to make responsible buying decisions, provided he is not coerced, conspired against, or subjected to fraud? If not, how do we protect the consumer without limiting the choices he has?

Does this also mean we have serious questions about his ability to make far more complex political decisions? History tells us that economic freedom and political freedom are intimately intertwined.

I am only trying to suggest that at any given time some segments of a free marketplace are not in reality an argument against freedom itself.

It would seem wise to question also whether some of the attacks on Madison Avenue and advertising aren't in effect, an oblique attack on some of our national goals.

For example, we widely assume that a crucial national goal is a growth in our gross national product and a rising standard of living.

This would obviously sugggest more consumption by consumers, not less. It will mean that consumers will buy more products that by today's standards are less "important," less "necessary," more "marginal."

This growth in consumption of so-called luxury products will come at a time when a major segment of the world has not even the barest essentials.

It will come at a time when sincere, social critics within our own country will see needs of our own people that seem more basic than the frills and gadgets and services we will be buying.

I feel much of the criticism of Madison Avenue reflects some far deeper concerns about public tastes and morals, and how we reconcile the good life from the moral standpoint with the full life from the economic standpoint. Can we have more material goods without becoming overly materialistic?

Still another set of basic questions has to do with whether and how our economy can support our public needs and also our private desires. Is it true that the added consumption of products and services by consumers makes possible the tax base with which we finance our public needs? Is it true we can have both foreign aid and fur coats, both defense and deep-freezes, both schools and sports cars?

These are some of the questions that may explain the ferocity of the attack on Madison Avenue. Perhaps in our frustration with questions like these we need to find an outlet, or a scapegoat.

A more appropriate outlet might be an intensive national debate on consumption in our economy and the relationship of our personal goals to our country's goals.

These are questions that concern every citizen.

Now, I would like to turn to marketing and advertising as seen through the eyes of a businessman—advertising, not as a moral or esthetic force, but as a way of selling more products and making more profits for my company.

One would not suspect this by reading some of the bestsellers of recent years, but if I may paraphrase Lord Byron "Advertising is not a thing apart and it is certainly not a businessman's whole existence." As businessmen, we view advertising as simply one tool for helping sell products.

We can decide not to advertise at all, or much less, and spend more on personal selling to the dealer, give the retailer a bigger margin, or any mix that one can imagine that sells the product to the consumer.

It is a curious paradox that while the social critic ascribes a kind of omnipotence to advertising, most business executives have a very different concern.

They are much more likely to ask: Are we spending too much on advertising? It is really effective?

The businessman's own experience tells him advertising is far from omnipotent.

While the Edsel car is the most dramatic example, there are hundreds of Edsels in the marketing morgues of many of America's corporations—products that wouldn't be bought by the consumer in spite of heavy advertising expenditures. The failures of new products even in some of the best and biggest of companies, certainly outnumber the successes.

The businessman worries about his growing advertising budgets for still another reason. For all the work and studies that have been made in the so-called scientific measurement of advertising, I believe it is fair to say that we can assess only a small part of the dollars-and-cents effect of advertising.

As an amusing footnote—which I think brings out the essential contradictions and frustrations in the advertising business—I'd like to mention a cartoon I saw in a recent issue of the Saturday Review.

The president of the advertising agency is standing at the head of a conference table saying to his plans board "What we need is a brand new idea that has been thoroughly tested."

The measurement of marketing efforts is no less difficult than the measurement of a political campaign. The situation the businessman faces is similar to the one many of you have faced as you decided how to allocate your campaign funds.

Aside from a superb product, how much of your success do you attribute to your door-to-door efforts, going to picnics, the additional votes per hotdog, or ethnic dish eaten, what about those bumper stickers, and so forth?

Likewise, the businessman's chief concern about his growing advertising budget is whether he is getting his money's worth.

The social critics would lead us to believe that advertising is an absolutely indispensable and all powerful weapon that can manipulate the consumer at will.

It is a melancholy fact that the businessman knows better.

A second concern has to do with "truth" in advertising. Let me say at once that as far as hard-core facts go, we must absolutely be faithful to them. Lying about the facts of a product is not only the surest way to court commercial disaster, but it is a kind of treason to the American system—for the long-term effects of such calculated misstatements is to breed an abiding cynicism in the public.

But we must also make a necessary distinction between downright lies and the kind of exaggeration that is perhaps all too natural, normal, and human. A man who makes a product cannot help thinking his product is the finest thing since Cheops built the pyramids.

Allow me to draw another familiar analogy. In courtship, we know, both the man and the woman turn their "best profile" as it were, to the other. They may not, and should not, lie to each other about their past and their prowess, but the very act of courtship makes them put the most favorable light upon themselves.

Now, advertising is a commercial form of courtship. It is a wooing of the consumer—and in the press of wooing, the advertiser tends to do exactly what lovers do—that is, put his product in the most favorable light, however minute, and using a kind of verbal "cosmetic" to highlight the good points and play down the less favorable ones.

It is in this dim area between fact and fiction, this murky region of commingled light and shadow, that some advertising resides and many businessmen are not too happy with it. But the danger in trying to control this broad area is that nobody knows where poetic license should end and policing begin. Unfortunately, we are dealing here with imponderables.

When governments try to supervise and control these imponderables, we find that the creative vitality of a culture soon withers and dies. No sin that advertising may commit could be as great as its repression by government forces—for if advertising can be forced into a bureaucratic straitjacket, where does this end?

Here again, be it understood, I am not suggesting that the Government does not have a right and a duty to inhibit the hard-core falsehood, the base misrepresentation, the hit-and-run lie perpetrated by the fly-by-night company. But beyond this obvious exercise of authority against fraud, we must tread very gingerly indeed.

In the long run, I am convinced, the only formula that will raise the standards of advertising is the raising of the level of American culture generally. As the public acquires more taste, more discrimination, more genuinely civilized attitudes, advertising will necessarily respond to the heightening of our national sensitivity. If our educational processes, our entertainment values, our communications media, continue their present rise—and no one can doubt that they have risen appreciably over the last dozen years—the consuming public of the near future will also mold advertising patterns as much as being molded by them.

This process is already much in evidence. Since 1940, for example, although total consumer expenditures have risen sharply, a breakdown of categories clearly indicates that the American public has considerably shifted his spectrum of values.

For rough illustrative purposes, we can divide such expenditures into two broad groups—moneys spent for self-indulgence, and moneys spent for self-improvement. If we studied the statistics of spending over the last two decades, we would find that while most social critics decry our self-indulgence in the trivial, the ephemeral, and the gimmicky, it is actually in the area of self-improvement that the greatest gains have been made. While spending for alcohol, spectator sports, clothing, and restaurants has increased only slightly, spending for public and private education, for musical instruments and classical records, for religious and welfare activity, foreign travel has risen to unprecedented heights.

My confidence in the brains and backbone of the consumer grows daily.

In the light of these trends and tendencies, it behooves us to be extremely careful and skeptical about any legislation that proposes to restrict the free choice of consumers.

Business must not ask for security for itself and deny it to others. As William Allen White said many years ago: "Liberty is the one thing that cannot be held unless we extend it to others." If we are against legislation that would inhibit business, we can't honestly ask for legislation that would inhibit the free choice of the consumer.

As I have read various legislative proposals over the past several years, I find myself asking this question: Are these proposals designed to protect the consumer in the only sense he can really be protected—by providing him a wide diversity, by providing him free choice, free from collusion, free from fraud * * * or are these proposals designed to protect someone else; protect the status quo perhaps at the expense of freedom of entry by other forms of distribution?

To paraphrase Mr. White, assuring one man's security in the marketplace is often at the expense of someone else's liberty.

As in so many things, yesterday's radical marketers are often today's successful innovators. The discount house has achieved an eminent position because it filled a need existing channels of distribution were not filling. At the same time, many specialty stores are thriving because they too are answering the needs of other consumers. Retail private labels are now reported to account for something over 20 percent of total grocery sales. In other industries, door-to-door selling has now offered some consumers an alternative they were apparently waiting for.

Subject to restraint against conspiracy and fraud, I urge we give manufacturers and retailers alike the freedom to sell their products as they see fit.

Permit me to conclude with one more analogy. An old-fashioned phrase is the "body politic." It is a very real metaphor, because the body of society is very like the body of an individual. And whether we are considering an ailment, or a set of symptoms in a person, we do not engage in radical surgery until all other means fail. First, we try to decide if the ailment is self-limiting as many diseases are. We also try to determine if a worrisome growth is benign or malignant. It is often simple to do this in the individual body by taking a biopsy. But it is much harder and more hazardous in the body politic.

It is also a lamentable fact that the cure is sometimes worse than the disease.

I would hope that before we adopted any legislative surgery, we would assure ourselves we are using the latest diagnostic techniques, that we are giving a complete physical examination, that the symptoms were truly prevalent, that the growth was truly malignant, for it is you, as legislators, who are the general practitioners charged with preserving the health of the body politic.

As you gentlemen know much better than I, new regulatory agencies seem to have a life cycle of their own.

The process seems an irreversible one. They grow in costs, they change in function, becoming increasingly detached from the legislative, and the problems being attacked may or may not have been visualized in the original legislation. There is probably in this room today more than one father of a regulatory agency conceived in earlier years who has some difficulty recognizing his offspring.

Most critics of advertising make the mistake of assuming that it is a monologue, when in reality it is a dialogue. The advertiser talks to the public, but the public talks back in its own slow, inarticulate, but effective way.

We must do everything possible to encourage this dialogue, to keep the lines of communication free and open—so that the consumer and manufacturer can hear each other talking.

To maintain a healthy tension in this dialogue is the task of all of us businessmen, advertising executives, educators, public officials, and consumers. That is probably the main reason we are here today.

City Reduces Water, Garbage, and Irrigation Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the up and coming little cities of my State of Idaho is Gooding, located in the rich agricultural area north of the Snake River.

At a time when most municipalities are exploiting every possibility for new rev-

enues, Gooding's City Council has voted unanimously to reduce fees for several services, but without a reduction in the services themselves.

In recognition of this accomplishment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the Gooding (Idaho) Leader of Thursday, April 4, 1963, explaining the council's action.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY REDUCES WATER, GARBAGE AND IRRIGATION CHARGES—CONSIDERABLE SAVINGS GIVEN RESIDENTS; CITY SERVICES WILL NOT BE CURTAILED

In the present day when cities such as Gooding are looking for additional revenue, Gooding city councilmen at their regular semimonthly meeting held Monday evening, voted unanimously to reduce culinary water, garbage and irrigation charge for 1963. Irrigation water charges for lots and acreages were reduced 16⅔ percent and the annual construction charge of 75 cents on business lots was dropped. The charge was eliminated because 1962 was the year for last payment of construction charges by the American Falls Reservoir District No. 2 on business lots.

The city culinary water rate was reduced from $1.75 minimum charge for the first 1,000 gallons to $1.50 minimum for the first 1,200 gallons.

Garbage collection charges were reduced 20 percent for both residential and business property. Future charges for residences will be 80 cents per month instead of $1. Business property will be $1.60 instead of $2. These reductions will take effect on May 1 billing.

Mayor Leo Rice reported there are several reasons why the city took unprecedented action in reducing rates. The new city water well is completely paid for. There are no major projects to be undertaken by the city in the foreseeable future. Mayor Rice stated Tuesday that the city will do more street work this year than last, and there will be no curtailment in city services. In addition the city has ordered new office equipment.

Groundbreaking for Indian Pavilion, New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair of 1964–65, at the groundbreaking for the Indian pavilion, at Flushing Meadow on April 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR OF 1964–65

I am one of those ancients who in early youth saw the Indian Raj through a romantic veil. My generation was brought up on Kipling and the Barracks Room Ballads. In the words of our own divine Daniel Webster, we beat time to the morning drum, which followed the rising sun, kept company with the hours, and circled the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England.

We sang the Kashmiri song about the pale hands beside the Shalimar, heard the echoes of voices in the bazaars and swallowed tales of monsoons, rains, and racial tensions, nabobs, howdahs, viceroys, sahibs, rajahs, rubies, curries, and whatnot. We were puzzled however by the ominous note of the Recessional at the Diamond Jubilee, after accepting the Suez Canal as the lifeline of Empire.

We have lived to see the veil of romance rent, an ancient civilization revived, independence established, and a new nation like our own conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, rise and command the attention of the world. We have come to realize that there is more than a passing resemblance between Abraham Lincoln and Mahatma Gandhi.

In projecting the image of India, you will find that Flushing Meadow is a better medium than Hollywood. We welcome you to the Olympics of Progress at the World's Fair. We assume that you will invite your most ingenious administrators, architects, and artists to fashion your exhibits, those who can best revive the past, mirror the present, invoke the shape of the future, and reconcile and integrate the claims of religion, tradition, beauty, utility, industry, and democracy.

We ask that you, Madam Gandhi, convey to your distinguished father the respect and admiration of our people for his part in bringing the East and West together and in furthering the cause of international peace through friendship and understanding.

GOP Solons Fettered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, studies have been made to determine the status of the minority as far as staff work in House committees is concerned. This study has shown a decided lack in the quantity of staffing which is available to the minority. On April 7, 1963, my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER wrote a column entitled "GOP Solons Fettered" which sets forth the complete case for adequate minority staffing in a succinct, well-ordered manner.

The article follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, Apr. 7, 1963]

WHAT I BELIEVE: GOP SOLONS FETTERED

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Why doesn't the Republican minority in Congress exercise more weight in Government policymaking?

There are many reasons, such as the size of the majority, the role played by powerful Democratic committee chairman and the influence exerted by a Democratic President.

But another reason, one which doesn't get nearly enough attention, is the fact of inadequate minority staffs in the House and Senate.

Just as generals must, so Senators and Representatives depend heavily upon staffs to do the real digging and much of the work, pulling together the background on which a policy decision can be made. What witnesses will a committee hear? What is the status of similar legislation? What are the needs for proposed legislation, and so on? All this is the work of committee staffs.

Today, of course, the majority party, which is the Democratic Party, expects a substantial share of the staff to be appointed by them and to be working for them.

On committee after committee, however, the minority party has not been able to appoint any staff members at all. On most, there is at least a disparity of staff appointments far beyond the disparity in party representation.

Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and proper committee staffing was denied to the Democrats.

The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch.

This cannot be done without spadework on behalf of the minority position on the myriad questions coming before the House and Senate. Legislating is amazingly complex, reaching into every possible phase of American life. Some subjects could occupy the entire time of intelligent legislators to the exclusion of everything else.

What it boils down to, is help for busy Senators and Congressmen. Unless provided on a larger scale for minority Members of Congress, the case for the opposition in American political life will continue to suffer.

Unfortunately, too much importance is given to advancing the administration's program today. Just because a President sends a message to Congress and follows it up with specific legislation doesn't automatically assure that this is the best thing that could be enacted for the people.

Very often, just the opposite is the case. Sometimes it is the people's definite advantage to have Presidential requests opposed and defeated by their representatives in Congress. And because of this, the minority effort is extremely important. It definitely should be supported by the best staff work available.

Rev. Irwin R. Lindemuth, Pittsburgh Pastor and Poet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and Sun Telegraph, May 7, 1960]

CARRICK MINISTER OVERCAME HEAVY ODDS: TOOK HARD ROAD TO PULPIT—LONG STRUGGLE MARKED HIS WAY TO PASTORATE

(By William M. Rimmel)

The pulpit of America's churches are filled with ministers who had to struggle against almost insurmountable odds before they were ordained.

Such a man is Rev. Irwin R. Lindemuth, pastor of the Birmingham Congregational Church, Carrick Avenue, Carrick.

From that day back in 1937 when he entered Pennsylvania State University on a year's scholarship to study mechanical engineering until he assumed his present pastorate it has been one continuous struggle.

BUSINESS FAILED

A month after he entered college his father's business in Mt. Carmel, Pa., failed. He found a spare-time job as a door-to-door salesman, living on bologna sandwiches. Relatives added to his meager earnings and he struggled on.

When his health was impaired by a combination of worry and diet, he decided to give up the struggle and find a job. His schoolteacher back in Mt. Carmel, who started him on his college career, suggested that he take a civil service examination. He might find a job and by saving he could resume his education. A month later he was working in the State Unemployment Office in Harrisburg.

Two years later he passed another civil service test and was appointed an inspector in the U.S. Ordnance Department and assigned to the Pittsburgh area.

When he was sent to Youngwood he learned that an apartment went with the job. So he called the girl he met in high school and proposed marriage.

In February 1943 he enlisted as an aviation cadet. After basic training he was shipped to an air school in Texas. A hurricane struck the field a short time before he was due to graduate. Fearing that the planes would be torn from the ground moorings, officers assigned the cadets to hang onto the wings of the planes during the height of the gale.

HELD ON TO PLANE

The mooring lines broke and Mr. Lindemuth's plane and a dozen others were carried skyward. The other cadets dropped off. But Lindemuth held on and when his plane was snapped he was hurled to the earth. When his classmates graduated he was in the hospital at Temple, Tex., with a broken back.

It was during his year in the hospital that he decided to enter the chaplaincy. But since he couldn't play an organ or typewrite, he wound up as a radio mechanic on one of the B-29's stationed in the Marianna Islands.

Between his tours of duty he volunteered to assist the chaplain. He helped transform an old prefab hut into a chapel and was putting the finishing touches on the road leading to the church on Christmas Eve when he was injured and wound up in the hospital for the second time.

When he was discharged at the end of the war he had already started preparation for studying for the ministry. And in 1946 he was accepted at a seminary in Bangor, Maine. With the help of relatives he rebuilt an old truck to haul his wife, baby, and furniture to the living quarters provided by the seminary.

To add to his Government GI allotment, Mr. Lindemuth washed dishes and his wife assisted in making salads at the seminary. On weekends he preached to a congregation of 20 in a small church in Lincoln Center, Maine. And in the summer he labored on neighboring farms.

DIRECTOR AT CAMP

By the time he graduated his family had increased to three and he moved to Fountain Springs, Pa., where he was ordained and assigned to a church. He came to Congregational Church in 1954 as assistant pastor and assumed the pastorate 3 years ago when the pastor, Rev. R. O. Eisele, retired.

He is camp director at Hartman Center, pastor advisor to the Pilgrim Fellowship, trustee of Congregational Homes for the Aged, and a member of the Industrial Management Club.

THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR

Our Father: Thou shalt love thy neighbor—
Divine words, these,
Calling now to conscience, confidence, and care.
Our souls, our minds, though filled with memories
Of waste and war, now bow in prayer.

Above the far-off sounds of hate,
The fearful threats of those who fear,
The meek and holy still await
The love that seems so near.

Thou shalt love thy neighbor—centuries heard
Man's routine reading of the scrolls.
Long before our Lord's voice stirred,
Men of God appealed to souls.

But love was needed, more than words:
Someone had to love as He;
And so today mere threatening words
Can never change the love to be.

Grant us reverence, grant remembrance
Of all those whose love still lives,
May our love be strong defense,
Ours the strength love always gives.

Grant that we may love our neighbor;
Grant that we may love Thy son;
Grant that we deserve Thy favor,
And Thy love and ours be one.
Amen.

The prayer-poem "Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbor," was written for use by the congregation in church on Memorial Day Sunday—Sunday, May 27, 1962.

Pastor Lindemuth preached on "Love Thy Neighbor," and preceded his sermon with the following prayer:

Our Father: Today our hearts breathe out a prayer for all those who died trying to win wars.

But we pray more so for those who died trying to win peace.

May our devotion to them never cease.

May our allegiance to their cause ever increase.

The stench of the Eichmann war trial still troubled our souls: How one could hate the Jews, of whom Christ was born. And how Hitler and Eichmann, once German Christians and church attenders, could so pervert Christ's teachings and Christianity. Where had the church failed?

Pastor Lindemuth personally remembered friends killed in World War II, especially the invasion cemetery on the island of Tinian in the Pacific, where white crosses of Christ and the white stars of David stood row on row. He remembered also an uncle for whom he was named, killed in World War I, and family gatherings at the cemetery in Mount Carmel each Memorial Day.

TODAY MEN TALK FREELY OF FREEDOM

The following invocation prayer was composed for unison reading in church services Sunday, February 14, 1960, following the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth. Pastor Lindemuth, long an admirer of the true Christianity of Lincoln, felt the need for rebirth of a nation under God and redefinition of freedom.

Our Father: Today men talk freely of freedom
Yet deny it to many not free,
Believe in the precepts of freedom
Yet cannot soul-slavery see,
Live in a world of great promise
Yet promise so little so well
That correcting criteria of conscience
Always with freedom must dwell.

Mr. Lincoln was sorrowed by slavery
Because he believed in Thy will.
Yet others rose up in anger;
For slavery, brothers would kill.
Condemned was the spirit of conscience;
Crucified was the spirit of Christ.
Yet Christians called themselves Christians,
As though Christ with Caiaphas made tryst.

Souls still are living in bondage.
A Moses is needed to lead;
A Nehemiah, to build new Jerusalems;
A Christ, to conquer men's greed.
God help me if I help not my brother,
Whatever his status may be.
God help us to love one another.
Only then can we truly be free. Amen.

Rev. IRVIN R. LINDEMUTH,
Minister.

A DECLARATION OF DIVINE DEPENDENCE

Our Father: Today we make a declaration of divine dependence.
In a world where so many want to be free,
We know blessed freedom comes only through Thee.
Servitude, slavery is born of man's sin:
Here is where most of man's evils begin.
So sin is our foe, not other men;
We need to depend more upon Thee again.

Our forefathers depended upon guidance from Thee:
Abraham founded a nation by faith;
Isaac, Jacob were guided by grace;
Moses plodded a wilderness way
Guided, and guiding, by Thee day by day.
Prophets corrected when sin sat on throne,
Warning that suffering alone would atone.

Our Lord and Saviour declared divine dependence:
"Blessed are they," he said of the meek;
"Blessed are they who righteousness seek."
He taught a commandment to love one another,
Not a plea, but command, to make each man a brother.
Only the truth—this truth—made men free;
Freedom never meant denial of Thee.

Our nation was founded on declared divine dependence:
Certain truths were declared to all as self-evident,
Not man-made, temporal, but eternal and heaven-sent.
Men, endowed by Creator with inalienable right,
Defended, depended upon that which was right.
So guided, so guarded, we too must defend
The Way of life upon which we too depend.

The poem-prayer "A Declaration of Divine Dependence," was composed by Pastor Irvin R. Lindemuth for use in the Birmingham Congregational Church, 25 Carrick Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Sunday, July 1, 1962.

The poem, of course, refers to the real roots of American freedom, American freedom did not begin with the Declaration of Independence; it began long before when men made their "declarations of divine dependence." Freedom is the fruit of faith; faith is the root of freedom. Freedom is not a political matter; freedom is basically a religious experience. Epictetus, a Greek slave born about 60 years before Christ, said: "No man is free who is not master of himself." In order to have freedom, man must establish right relationships with God, and must be aware of his own limitations. "As I would not be a slave, neither would I be a master," said Abraham Lincoln. Jesus said to those Jews who believed in him (John 8: 31-36): "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." They answered him, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to

any man; how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?" Jesus answered them, "Verily, verily I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house forever: but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

Pastor Lindemuth prayed the following prayer before his sermon: "Our Father: this past week has reminded us all of our freedom as a Nation, as a church, as individuals. We remember that most of us were born free. But we so often forget that our freedom was bought with a great price. We enjoy so much the fruits of freedom that we often forget the roots. Help us to so cultivate our consciences, our concern, our Christianity, our church and our country, that all freedom becomes deeper rooted in faith, and all faith finds greater fruition in freedom. Amen."

O THOU WHO ALONE RULES

O Thou who alone rules the vast circling heavens,
Above and beyond meager measure of man,
And ruler of earth, encompassing Presence,
Ruler of all since creation began:
Forgive us if we, in impudency,
Forget we too are subject to Thee.

Man makes in his image new weapons of might
To demand and command of inhabitants of earth
Homage and obedience, subjection and fright,
Without sharing or caring for rights of all birth.
But idols are shattered. Man's own fears increase.
Armies are scattered, and bring man no peace.

O Thou who art always the ruler, alone,
Infinite, boundless, beyond whim of man:
We would, this hour, for man's sins atone;
We would, this day, seek for some better plan,
Knowing, if Thy will and our wills be one,
Thy will will be done, and Thy kingdom will come.

Grant us this hour new courage, new strength,
New wisdom to see as in ages gone past,
Thy much greater wisdom wins victory at length,
Only right is might, and only love will last.
O Thou who alone rules, abide with us still,
That we might be ruled by Thy much wiser will.
Amen.

The above was presented as an invocation prayer in church services July 8, 1962, at a time when nuclear testing was being carried out, space flights were continuing, there was trouble in Berlin and Cuba and many places in the world. The pastor saw a need for new courage, new strength, new wisdom in the light of a much greater wisdom.

WHEN WE HEAR OF WAR AND RUMORS OF WAR

The following invocation prayer was written for use in church services on Sunday, October 28, 1962, following President Kennedy's announcement of the Cuban crisis. The Saturday evening preceding the announcement, Pastor Lindemuth sat at a Veterans of Foreign Wars banquet (Brentwood Post), and the threat of another war weighed heavily on his mind.

Our Father: When we hear of war and rumors of war,
Strengthen us by Thy grace.
Our prayer is always for proper perspectives for peace.
We share the prayers of Thy people, wherever they are.
War is not new. We remember the past,
Pages of history burning with hate.
We wait, and remember One Man who feared not His fate.
History became His story, redeeming at last.
"When ye hear of wars and rumours of war,
Be ye not troubled * * *."
His soft-spoken words are sharper today than all two-edged swords.
We are troubled by rumors no more.
Help us to hear Christ again and again,
To seek for Him, speak for Him.
This troubled day, we hear the Saviour of men and we pray,
For a kingdom on earth of good will among men.
Amen.

Sound Attitude Toward Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine letter about prayer in schools, written by George W. Shumsky, of Flushing, N.Y.

It is through these principles, held by Mr. Shumsky and so well expressed in his letter, that we have grown into such a great Nation.

The letter follows:

GOD'S PLACE IN SCHOOL

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

It is time that we of the Jewish faith who believe in God stop letting rabbi after rabbi, and others, make statements for us that far too many of us do not agree with.

I am a member of a reform congregation and attend services frequently. In my own way I have prayed to God for help and guidance and I try to instill this into my children. I am not a fanatic. But I believe in a Deity within the Hebrew framework, as I feel most American Jews do.

So I can see no harm in the reading of a nonsectarian portion of the Bible in the school systems of America. In fact, I believe Bible reading should be continued and that all persons who believe in God (and I did not say religion) should encourage it.

This country and the Jewish people were founded under the belief in God. The Jewish people have been carrying the Word of God for thousands of years from country to country. Great religions have been founded on this Word of God. No one has to accept another's religion. But everyone who believes in religion does accept the fact of God.

America's Founding Fathers did say that religion and the state should be separate. But they did not deny the existence of God. And reading of the Word of God is not the teaching of any particular religion.

The rabbis, the Unitarian groups and other religious organizations would do better to see that Bible reading in schools does not favor any particular religion rather than to see that there is no more mention of God in our schools.

Ever since the depression and World War II we have seen moral principles, parental responsibility and juvenile behavior decaying. All the religions seem to have larger memberships. But the belief in God seems to be dwindling.

This is also the pattern of the Communists. They say there is no God and they acknowledge that reading the Bible can contaminate them because it might lead them to believe in God.

I am against religion being taught in our elementary schools, and I do not believe that our Government should give financial aid to any institution under high school level whose function is to teach religion, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant or any other.

But I am not against the belief in God being taught by the reading of nonsectarian passages from the Bible.

GEORGE W. SHUMSKY.

Federal Power Commission's Speedup in Rate Determinations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long, hard winter in Georgia. Record low temperatures plagued our State. And with record low temperatures, fuel bills go up. It is good to know that the Federal Power Commission is taking steps to expedite rate determinations. Undue delay is unfair to all concerned. It is unfair to the consumer, and it is unfair to the local distributor who is burdened with making the refunds.

The Atlanta Constitution has commended the Federal Power Commission for its speedup in rate determinations.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following letter from Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and a subsequent editorial from the Atlanta Constitution.

The letter and editorial follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 8, 1963.*

DEAR SIR: I read with interest your editorial of March 30, deploring the procedures under the Natural Gas Act which permit natural gas pipeline companies to collect rate increases for long periods of time subject to refund before a final decision is made on whether the rates are justified.

Your editorial was written in reference to a Federal Power Commission order requiring Southern Natural Gas Co. to refund to its customers $10 million of excess charges which it had collected subject to refund.

You have put your finger on one of the major problems which confronted the Commission when I became Chairman on September 1, 1961, and it is one on which the Commission has taken decisive action. Eighteen months ago the backlog of pipeline rate cases before the Commission had reached the staggering total of over a billion dollars and many companies had filed two or three successive rate increases which they were collecting subject to refund, none of which had been decided. The Commission in the past year and a half has disposed of 85 major pipeline rate cases by ordering the pipelines to refund $360 million and reducing their rates for the future by about $65 million annually.

The Commission has also taken action, to the extent possible under existing law, to insure that another such backlog does not accumulate. We have adopted new rules requiring pipelines to file complete backup information with rate increase requests, thus eliminating lengthy field investigations to obtain the necessary information to determine whether the increase is justified. With our new procedures we expect to reduce greatly the time required to decide these cases.

We also have recommended to the Congress that legislation be enacted authorizing the Commission, in its discretion, to extend the time of suspension of a proposed rate increase for an additional 3 months beyond the present statutory 5-month suspension period. As you point out, the Natural Gas Act now provides that a company may make a rate increase effective, subject to refund, if the Commission has not taken final action after the 5-month suspension period. Under our new rules, we believe the 8-month period is a realistic goal to complete action before rate increases go into effect automatically.

The two Southern Natural Gas Co. rate cases referred to in your editorial were filed long before our new procedures were adopted and the delay was also due in part to the death of the presiding examiner who conducted the hearings. This made it necessary for the Commission to prepare its opinion without benefit of the examiner's recommendations.

I am confident that with our new procedures and our determination to push pipeline rate cases to a prompt conclusion, we are now in position to protect consumers against paying unjustified rate increases for prolonged periods.

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

[From the Atlantic Constitution, Apr. 8, 1963]

NEVER AGAIN SHOULD FPC PERMIT LOGJAM

We are pleased to note that the Federal Power Commission is making progress under existing law to end the huge backlog of pipeline rate cases. In a letter on this page today, FPC Chairman Joseph C. Swidler assures us that the Commission "has taken decisive action" to end the logjam and prevent its reoccurrence.

Mr. Swidler tells us that when he assumed the chairmanship 18 months ago the backlog had reached "the staggering total of more than a billion dollars." In the past year the Commission has ordered refunds of $360 million.

The chairman says the Commission had recommended to Congress that the present 5-month suspension period before a proposed rate increase is put into effect automatically by pipeline distributors be extended to 8 months. He feels the commission could decide all rate cases if given that much time. By all means, it should.

Congress should grant this extension of time if that's what is needed. The Commission itself should be held to some time limit but in no event should the public ever again be soaked for a billion dollars in rate increases while awaiting a ruling on their justification.

Bankers and the Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the coming wheat referendum is of profound concern to all of us. In the April issue of the magazine the Independent Banker, Mr. V. E. Rossiter, Sr., the president of the Bank of Hartington, Nebr., strongly supports the referendum. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Mr. Rossiter's article be included at this point in my remarks.

The article follows:

BANKERS AND THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

(By V. E. Rossiter, Sr., member IBA Agriculture Committee, president, Bank of Hartington, Nebr.)

When an overwhelming majority of the major farm organizations announced recently that they would support the 1963 wheat referendum and 1964 wheat program, the event had special significance for the Independent Bankers Association.

The IBA, through its agriculture committee, has been promoting coordination of effort among farm-oriented groups in finding solutions to the farm problem. Concord among these groups on the wheat program represents the type of cooperation needed to actuate corrective measures in the agricultural segment of the economy.

The IBA's agriculture committee is joining with these organizations in endorsing the wheat program and recommends that the IBA give unequivocal support to it.

BACKGROUND ON ENDORSEMENT

This endorsement is an outgrowth of a series of events that began with a meeting of IBA officers and the agriculture committee last August in Minneapolis, Minn.

After a year and a half of intensive study of the farm problem, the committee was ready to launch a program of action. We decided at the Minneapolis meeting that the IBA might work more effectively within the general framework of existing farm organizations and commodity groups.

These organizations, we reasoned, are thoroughly seasoned in the campaign for rural economic rehabilitation, they are already working for a relatively high income level in the rural areas and related industries.

We also felt that unless we first consulted with other interested groups, an abrupt injection of banker opinion into the confused farm picture might be regarded as an unwelcome intrusion.

This precaution may appear ridiculous to most bankers, and to rural bankers in particular, because it is natural to assume that every well-informed person is aware of banker interest and concern.

But the IBA did not take this assumption for granted, and we were soon to learn that we had acted wisely.

CONFERENCES STARTED

Agriculture Committee Chairman Pat DuBois initiated a series of conferences that has resulted in an exhaustive exchange of information among farm organizations, farm-oriented church groups, the State commissioners of agriculture, commodity groups and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The first conference, staged in Washington, D.C., October 3 and 4, 1962, attracted representatives of all groups invited. There was a great deal of curiosity among participants about what had motivated bankers to sponsor the conference.

Our objective was to convince the professionals in the field of agricultural policy that we bankers were not only familiar with the farm problem but that we had developed information that even they didn't know about.

We wanted to prove that bankers not only have a right to inject themselves into the agricultural picture, but that it is essential that they do so without delay.

SHARE SAME GOAL

It was the Agriculture Committee's belief that the great majority of farm organizations and farm-oriented church groups share the long-range goal of substantially improved farm income.

We also felt that there was only modest disagreement among these groups in regard to the manner in which the goal should be reached, that the key to mutual agreement was coordination rather than compromise.

Since the substantial improvement of farm income is also the avowed objective of the Independent Bankers Association, discussion at the Washington meeting centered largely around this subject.

We concluded that little would be gained by inviting individuals or groups which, by their words or actions, have demonstrated opposition to this goal and seem to oppose the views of the organizations that we did invite.

This exclusion is only a temporary policy, however, and ultimately the IBA agriculture committee will explore all views and opinions as closely as possible.

Attending the initial conference were the National Grange, National Farmers Union, National Farmers Organization, National Council of Churches, Church in Town and Country, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Association of State Directors of Agriculture and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

BROADER OUTLOOK

We bankers were soon to learn the benefit of having representatives of church groups present, for they made us recognize that we had been a bit too singleminded in our point of view. While we had been focusing just on the economic considerations, the meeting introduced us to the broader picture of troublesome sociological, cultural, and spiritual implications of the rural economic problem.

The exodus of farm and rural town families from the rural areas results in an influx of maladjusted and often unskilled rural people into the metropolitan areas. This has created a problem of overchurched and overschooled areas in rural America, where diminished population no longer supports adequate church facilities and accredited schools.

At the same time, just the opposite problems are being created in the cities, along with chronic social ills.

By midafternoon of the first full day of the Washington conference, we found ourselves in complete agreement on two of the most basic factors relating to the farm problem.

First, we agreed that the No. 1 problem in agriculture is the decline in farm income in relation to national income. Second, we agreed that the problem of agricultural surpluses has been greatly exaggerated and has been used to cloud the real issue and to demean the farmer and discredit his industry.

We also agreed that organized banking could make a valuable contribution to correction of the farm problem by promulgating the results of its research efforts.

But perhaps the most significant aspect of the conference was the favorable reaction of participants, many of whom had been thoroughly skeptical at the meeting's outset. Everyone appeared delighted, and perhaps a little surprised, that there had been so few differences of opinion among the church people, top farm leaders, State and Federal Government officials and bankers present.

SUSPICIONS DISPELLED

For example, L. Y. Ballentine, North Carolina commissioner of agriculture and president of the National Association of State Commissioners of Agriculture, said he had attended the conference "more out of a sense of duty" than "honest expectation that any good would come from it."

"But," he said, "I find myself both pleased and surprised because this meeting is like a ray of sunshine breaking through on a dark and cloudy day" for agriculture.

One of the topics discussed at the close of the meeting was the sense of mutual suspicion that had pervaded participants when the conference opened and which had been dispelled after a single day. Others commented that the IBA had been unexpectedly

candid in its presentations and that they would leave the conference with a new perspective of the banker.

The representative of a leading farm organization said that in his 10 years in Washington, he had attended hundreds of similar meetings. He added:

"I must confess that this one is outstanding in my experience, because it is the first such meeting in all these 10 years in which a banker participated who was in sympathy with the farmers."

His commentary on banker indifference was regarded good naturedly by all of us, but it provoked similar comments on the apparent lack of banker interest in the farm situation.

BANKER COUNTERS

Then one of our outspoken IBA agriculture committee members finally said:

"Where would anyone get the idea that rural bankers haven't always been, and indeed aren't now, sincerely concerned about the circumstances prevailing in agriculture and the consequent loss of market for manufactured goods and the social and cultural and spiritual problems that it has created? We have always been concerned. I don't understand how anyone can get the idea that we are not concerned."

But the question had already been adequately answered, and we all knew it.

As bankers we haven't been in evidence individually or collectively when we might have helped with counsel or even active participation in solving the problems besetting agriculture. We've been concerned, but we haven't actively expressed our concern.

Our neglect was glaringly evident to the farm organization official who said he couldn't recall ever having attended a meeting in which a banker was present who was sympathetic to the farmers.

While we may feel personal guilt for this indictment, the IBA can, at the same time, feel proud. The farm official made his comment in high praise of the IBA's efforts to actively assist in the improvement of the income situation of the farmer and rural America.

Following the Washington meeting, similar conferences were sponsored by the IBA in Des Moines, Iowa, and Des Plaines, Ill.

IBA agriculture committee members have also participated in privileged closed door sessions of various farm organizations and church-sponsored conferences.

AGREEMENT ON REFERENDUM

It was the ambition of the IBA committee to foster agreement among a large number of farm organizations and commodity groups on a short-range farm program which would result in an immediate and substantial increase in farm income.

We wanted to act as a catalyst in promoting short-term agreement without interfering with the long-range objectives for more permanent programs which each major organization jealously supports as its own.

Our primary interest was to impress these people with the seriousness of the immediate problem and to deemphasize, for the moment, programs which may take months or even years to accomplish and which would come too late to ward off an impending depression.

Then, to our delight and to a degree our embarrassment, we discovered that while we and others were wishing and talking, an overwhelming majority of the farm organizations had come to an agreement through their own initiative.

The agreement was on the wheat referendum, slated for May or June, which would implement the 1964 wheat program authorized by Congress.

Supporting the wheat referendum are the National Grange, National Farmers Union, Missouri Farmers Organization, National Farmers Organization, National Association of Wheat Growers, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.[1]

Apparently, the only farm organization opposing the referendum and the 1964 wheat program is the Farm Bureau. Its opposition probably does more to illustrate the black-and-white aspects of different farm philosophies than anything has in recent years. The conflict indicates that it is necessary not only for farmers but for all interested groups and individuals to take an active part in planning the future of agriculture.

While details of the referendum have not yet been fully determined, there are certain features of it that are reasonably clear now and are of interest to bankers and rural merchants.

RESULTS IF PASSED

If a two-thirds majority, plus 1 of the 1,800,000 wheatgrowers in the Nation eligible to vote favor the wheat referendum, the following results can be expected:

Farmers will receive $2 per bushel, or more, for nearly all of their wheat marketings in 1964.

Wheat prices will be stable and predictable. Consumer prices, as they reflect the cost of wheat, will be the same as in 1962.

The farm value of wheat production, including diversion payments, will be at the high 1961–62 level, and overall more than $2.3 billion. Relative to other sectors of agriculture, the wheat farmers will continue to have a very favorable income.

World markets will be unaffected if the U.S. price level remains at $2 per bushel. France has a price of $2.40; Germany, $3.15 per bushel and 33 other foreign countries have a higher price on wheat than the United States.

Wheat surpluses will be reduced an estimated 150 millon bushers if there is a normal crop and storage costs will decline.

ALTERNATIVE MEASURES

Alternative measures are provided by the Agricultural Act of 1962 in the event that the wheat referendum is defeated. If failure occurs, the results will probably be as follows:

Farmers will receive about $1 per bushel, on the average, for their wheat.

In spite of possible sharply increased acreages, farm income will be reduced considerably. Gross income from wheat will be $700 million less than if the referendum carries.

Gross income available for paying production costs, depreciation, and the like will be reduced by a like amount. Net income available for spending on consumer goods, family living, tractors, machinery, cars, household furnishings, et cetra, will be reduced by a far greater percentage, and in many cases wiped out completely.

Bank deposits will decline, loans will fail to liquidate and carryover credit will be burdensome in the banks and on main street in the rural areas where wheat is produced.

The resulting loss will never be recovered, it will be lost forever. Furthermore, with an abundance of $1 per bushel wheat, the feed grain prices will be completely demoralized and this will lead directly to lower livestock prices with serious consequences reaching into every area of the livestock-poultry-grain farm segments.

These are the facts as seen by the IBA agriculture committee through its interpretation of the Agricultural Act of 1962.

The belief that Congress quickly will come to the rescue of the wheatgrowers if the referendum fails is irresponsible speculation. It is very unlikely to occur in view of statements to the contrary by the President and the chairman of both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees.[2]

WHEATGROWERS PROGRAM

In addition to the facts which it had obtained, the IBA agriculture committee was influenced in taking a stand on the wheat referendum by another compelling factor.

We were impressed by the fact that the proposals embodied in the 1964 wheat program were not originated by the administration. They are ideas that knowledgeable wheatgrowers and their organizations and associations have dreamed about for 40 years. Similar programs were advocated by wheatgrowers in the 1920's.

The 1964 wheat program, which will be voted upon in the wheat referendum, is for 1 year. Strangely, although the various State, regional and National wheatgrowers' associations and organizations all favor this legislation, few will contend that it is a perfect answer to the wheatgrowers' problems. On the other hand, few will deny that it is basically a sound bill. It is the kind of legislation all the wheatgrowers' groups want and that can be readily improved upon if it functions as anticipated.

The problem involved in the referendum is that up to now only the 600,000 farmers who grow wheat in commercial quantities in about 20 States have been eligible to vote in previous wheat referendums. Now, by including the so-called 15-acre allotment growers, an additional 1,200,000 small growers may become eligible to vote if they wish to do so.

The bulk of these farmers are located in 41 States, each of which enjoys an annual gross return from the sale of wheat ranging from almost one-half million dollars in West Virginia to more than $200 million in Kansas and a total of $2.3 billion in all of the States of the Union.

This makes the problem of disseminating accurate information more difficult, and the opportunity to disseminate misinformation somewhat easier.

Considering all of these factors, the Agriculture Committee of the Independent Bankers Association respectfully recommends that the IBA support the 1963 wheat referendum and the 1964 wheat program in every way that it is possible to do so both individually and collectively.

And may it never again be said, even good naturedly, that bankers have no interest in agriculture because they are not visibly active in agricultural considerations.

---

[1] Acting on the coordinating committees and the operating committees at the national level, organized for the purpose of presenting the basic facts not only to the wheatgrowers of the Nation, but to the general public as well, are M. W. Thatcher, president, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives; Hershel D. Newsom, master, National Grange; Glen J. Talbott, vice president, National Farmers Union; Fred Heinkel, president, Missouri Farmers Organization; Oren Lee Staley, president, National Farmers Organization; Glen Bayne, president, National Association of Wheat Growers; Gordon Roth, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association; James B. Dyess, executive vice president, National Association of Wheat Growers; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; and Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Opposing the efforts of these farm organizations is Charles Shuman, president, Farm Bureau.

[2] Excellent and detailed information on the mechanics of the Agricultural Act of 1962, as it applies to wheat, is available at any ASCS county office, or may be obtained directly from the USDA, Washington 25, D.C. If you write, request "Wheat Facts," Publication PA551, January 1963, and "Wheat, the Program for 1964, An Economic Analysis," January, 1963.

Supply Economy in the Defense Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress faced with ever-increasing requests for defense spending, are greatly concerned over defense procurement policies and practices.

It was with considerable pleasure that we noted the creation of the Defense Supply Agency last year by the Secretary of Defense. He has instituted practices which will save American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Perry M. Shoemaker, testifying before the Joint Economic Committee in behalf of the committee of Hoover Commission task force members, comments on the Defense Supply Agency, and the impact of procurement and related activities on the American economy.

Mr. Shoemaker has included in his testimony, a letter from former President Herbert Hoover, in which Mr. Hoover notes the importance of these developments within the Defense Department. Also included is a letter from Mr. Charles Hook, chairman of the committee of task force members.

Mr. Hook notes in his letter the great effect of the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 which provided the legislative framework for the action of the Secretary of Defense in creating the central purchasing agency.

The Members of this House are aware of the great importance of this amendment, and the efforts of the Speaker in accomplishing this much needed reform.

Mr. Hook and the others who have led the fight outside the Congress for the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations have rendered great service to this country and deserve our thanks and admiration.

As a sponsor of Hoover Commission recommendations in the House, and one greatly interested in all programs aimed at bringing about more businesslike practices in Government, and knowing of the interest of so many Members in these matters, I ask that Mr. Shoemaker's remarks, along with the letters from the former President and Mr. Hook be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The material follows:

TESTIMONY OF PERRY M. SHOEMAKER FOR THE COMMITTEE OF HOOVER COMMISSION TASK FORCE MEMBERS BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF PROCUREMENT AND RELATED ACTIVITIES ON THE ECONOMY, APRIL 1, 1963

Our committee of Hoover Commission task force members appreciates your invitation to give testimony at these hearings, and it is in my capacity as vice chairman that I appear before you today.

Based on Chairman DOUGLAS' letter of March 12, 1963, it is my understanding that these are followup hearings on those of January 1960 and are intended as a review of accomplishments, current obstacles to progress and a consideration of possible programs that may further reduce unnecessary impacts on the economy.

Therefore, before proceeding with our testimony, I should like, with your permission, to read two letters. One is a letter addressed to me by the Honorable Herbert Hoover; the other is a copy of the letter Mr. Charles R. Hook, chairman of our committee, addressed to Senator DOUGLAS as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 19, 1963.*

Mr. PERRY M. SHOEMAKER,
Jersey Central Lines,
Jersey Central Terminal,
Jersey City, N.J.

DEAR MR. SHOEMAKER: As you know, Secretary of Defense McNamara has reviewed some of the Hoover Commission's recommendations on reduction of expenses and greater efficiency and has adopted a substantial amount of them. His action is a great compliment to the Commission and to the Committee of task force chairmen which has so devotedly followed it.

I am now informed that the Joint Economic Committee has scheduled further hearings late this month on the impact of defense supply and related activities on the national economy.

The initial hearings of the Joint Economic Committee in January of 1960 were of material help in supporting and encouraging the substantial improvement in defense supply management which has since taken place.

The current hearings can be an important element of support to the action of the Department of Defense. Beyond this, the current hearings are important in urging other agencies of Government to cooperate in further actions of economy so vital to our economy as a whole.

An important segment of the studies and the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission was the whole subject of Government competition with private taxpaying enterprises. In your testimony, I hope that you will call the attention of the Joint Economic Committee to the potentialities in this field.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

NAPLES, FLA., *March 22, 1963.*

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: I am pleased to learn from your letter of March 12, 1963, that followup hearings have been scheduled on "The Impact of Defense Procurement and Related Activities on the Economy."

The hearings held by your committee on this subject in 1960 brought into clear focus the continuing urgent need for the consolidation of the common use supply and service activities in the Department of Defense into a separate agency operating at the Office of the Secretary of Defense level. As you know, this was recommended by the Hoover Commission and its committee on Business Organization of the Department of Defense, of which I was privileged to serve as chairman. Without doubt, it was the Hoover Commission recommendation with the greatest saving potential.

Those hearings also definitely reestablished and reemphasized, as Speaker MCCORMACK has often stated so well, that the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 "removed any possible doubt as to the authority of the Secretary of Defense to integrate supply and service functions when it would be in the best interest of the Government" and "vests the Secretary of Defense with clear authority to deal positively in obtaining economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in these areas which use some 60 percent of the annual military budget."

In his establishment of the Defense Supply Agency, Secretary of Defense McNamara has, as your report so strongly urged, used the broad authority of the McCormack-Curtis amendment to consolidate the common use supply and service activities in the Department of Defense into a single agency operating at the Office of the Secretary of Defense level. In this he deserves great credit and strong support.

I am confident that had it not been for Secretary McNamara's cost reduction program, of which the Defense Supply Agency is a vital part, and the steps he has already taken, the Defense budget would have been far higher than $52 billion for the fiscal year 1964.

The Hoover Commission Report on Business Organization of the Department of Defense was one within which reorganization and the application of sound principles of business management were closely intertwined. I am, therefore, delighted to note the remarks of Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee that "through the superb business management that is going on in the Department of Defense, there will be and there should be large savings."

Very cordially yours,

CHARLES R. HOOK,
Chairman.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, Gen. Robert E. Wood and I were privileged to represent this committee at your initial hearings in January 1960 on the Impact of Defense Procurement and Related Activities on the Nation's Economy. At that time our testimony was primarily directed to the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission calling for integrating the common supply and service activities of the military as a means of reducing expenditures, increasing efficiency, and thus lessening unnecessary impacts on the economy.

Prior to those hearings, some progress had been made by the Department of Defense in line with these recommendations of the Hoover Commission, but, as we then testified, it had been frustratingly slow and failed to effect real integration and further, that the authority of the Secretary of Defense to effect such integration was not being fully utilized. This, despite the fact that it had long been expressed as the intent of Congress and such authority, along with intent that it be fully utilized, actually written into law as early as the O'Mahoney-Douglas amendment of 1952 and then more specifically in the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

Clearly, the intent of Congress in this regard is nothing new. Ever since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947, there have been recurring and positive expressions by congressional committees that there should be integration of the military supply systems designed to meet without duplication the needs of the military departments.

This has been true not only of legislative committees but also the Appropriations Committee of both the House and the Senate. For example, the House Appropriations Committee cut procurement appropriations in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1961 by 3 percent. In its report accompanying the bill, under title III, procurement and supply management, the committee states: "Time and time again congressional committees and the General Accounting Office point out to the Department of Defense procedural errors and make recommendations for improvements in procurement and supply practices and activities."

Later, in the same section, the report said: "In recognition of the admitted waste of which all the foregoing cases are but

representative samples, and in an effort to compel prompt remedial action, the committee recommends reduction of each procurement appropriation by 3 percent, a total decrease of $400,473,000."

The Senate Appropriations Committee report of the same year had the following to say with reference to procurement and supply management:

"The committee notes with grave concern the numerous and admitted examples of waste and duplication in Defense procurement which have been reported to this and other congressional committees. The audit reports of the General Accounting Office show that these are not isolated examples; rather they underscore the urgency of integrating the supply systems and service activities of the military departments as repeatedly expressed as the intent of Congress. Such integration is provided for in the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 Defense Appropriation Act and the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

"While some progress has been made in this direction, it has been far from satisfactory. The committee calls upon the Department of Defense to take immediate and vigorous steps to integrate its procurement, supply, and service activities in order to provide maximum utilization of the defense dollar."

The 3-percent procurement appropriation cut was approved and thus, for the first time, the Congress reduced procurement appropriations in a Defense budget for the stated purpose of compelling the Department of Defense to bring about economies in procurement and supply management.

Your own report issued subsequent to the hearings of January 1960 strongly urged the Secretary of Defense to use his broad authority especially under the O'Mahoney-Douglas and McCormack-Curtis amendments to consolidate the many common supply activities in the Department of Defense into a common agency operating at the Office of the Secretary of Defense level.

Now at long last the recommendations of your committee and of the Hoover Commission have been implemented by Secretary of Defense McNamara through his creation of a single Defense Supply Agency and other steps in his broad cost reduction program. As former President Truman said, in speaking of the Defense Supply Agency, "It is high time we got it."

While these programs have only been underway a little over 1 year, savings actually reflected in the Defense budget for fiscal 1964 amount to approximately $750 million. In addition, Secretary McNamara in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee stated: "Our goal for end fiscal 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to over $3.4 billion each year." No less an authority than Chairman CARL VINSON of that committee said: "And I think he is going to do it."

At the same time and of equal, if not greater importance is the assurance of greater efficiency and a military supply system that provides for central screening of requirements, responsible as well as responsive inventory control along with simplified procurement practices without duplication in personnel or facilities.

In this connection, we have been pleased to note Secretary McNamara's statement that the General Services Administration buys about $770 million worth of common use items per year for the Department of Defense and that he has directed that the services of GSA be used wherever that agency can do the job more efficiently than Defense can.

All of which represents monumental progress in an area wherein is spent 60 percent of the Defense budget, and Secretary McNamara deserves the thanks and support of every one of us.

With the chairman's permission, I think it would be appropriate at this point to have Mr. Upman give the committee a message from Mr. Maurice Stans, former Director of the Budget, one that he authorized when he knew he would be out of the country and therefore unable to accept your invitation to appear at these hearings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the committee's consideration of possible programs that may further reduce unnecessary impacts on the economy.

First, while the single Defense Supply Agency under General McNamara now manages slightly under 1 million items of supply, there remain numerous others that should be brought under the single management of DSA. As a basis for this statement, there is, among others, the report of the Armed Forces supply support center of September 1959 which showed that, of the approximately 3.4 million items in the military supply systems, at least 2,300,000 were common type items.

Insofar as common services are concerned, only a few of these have been brought under integrated management. They include communications, intelligence activities and, in part, transportation. Many others, such as hospitals, medical services, financial management, disbursing, legal, construction, real property management, and engineering, just to mention a few, are readily subject to integrated management.

Second, elimination of the commercial industrial type operations of the Government would greatly reduce unnecessary impacts on the economy. Insofar as the Department of Defense is concerned, these activities are closely interwoven in the supply operations.

However, my remarks are directed not only to such activities of the military or any other single agency of Government, but, in the broader sense, to Government competition per se.

As Mr. Hoover points out in his letter, an important segment of the studies and recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission dealt with the subject of Government competition with private taxpaying enterprises. In fact, the law establishing the second commission specifically charged it with the responsibility of recommending methods for eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise.

You, as members of the Joint Economic Committee, have often heard recently the statement that taxes must be reduced so as to spur the private economy to greater production. What better way of stimulating the private economy to greater production than by getting the Government out of competition with private taxpaying enterprises? The benefits would be threefold in that it would reduce the cost of government, broaden the tax base, and stimulate the private economy to greater production.

Secretary McNamara's recent statement before the House Armed Services Committee re terminating unnecessary operations is a concrete example of the threefold benefits:

"To date, we have announced plans to close or reduce in scope 313 activities, of which 71 are located overseas and 242 in the United States. These actions, when completed, will release nearly 264,000 acres of land for non-Defense use. The original acquisition cost of the land and the improvements was $1.9 billion. Three important benefits result from these actions:

"(i) There is a reduction in annual operation and maintenance costs. Savings reflected in the fiscal year 1964 budget for actions already announced are $106 million.

"(ii) Military personnel are released for other tasks. Through fiscal year 1964, over 11,000 military personnel will have been released for other essential assignments by base closure or reduction actions already announced. The military pay and allowance costs of these personnel are estimated at $57 million. Thousands of additional military personnel will be released by similar actions for assignment to other tasks during the next 3 years.

"(iii) The facilities released are turned to productive uses. The Treasury benefits directly from the proceeds of sale. When private interests acquire the property, a tax revenue benefit accrues to local communities and States. When other Government agencies claim and use the property, it becomes unnecessary for them to request funds for new property acquisitions.

"Actions anticipated through the end of fiscal year 1963 should produce an annual saving of $292 million when completed. Our goal is to initiate actions by end fiscal year 1965 which will increase the annual rate of savings to $442 million."

I believe this statement of Secretary McNamara underscores the fact that there are great potentialities in the field of Government competition.

In view of an annual budget in excess of $98 billion, a current deficit already approaching $9 billion and a national debt in excess of $300 billion, can we afford less than maximum economy and efficiency in the conduct of the essential functions of Government? On the other hand, can we allow the Government to continue activities which are competitive with private enterprise?

Therefore, we strongly endorse the Secretary of Defense's cost reduction program, of which the Defense Supply Agency is a pivotal part. Further, we urge a forceful program to eliminate, in all agencies and departments of Government, those nonessential activities which are in competition with private enterprise.

In closing, may I commend the committee for its continuing recognition of the importance of these Government activities and their impact on the economy.

I would urge that it continue its objective surveillances of military supply management and that, so long as the Defense Supply Agency by its performance merits support and approbation, this committee give the encouragement which the results thus far so conclusively merit. And of even greater importance, this committee should continue to unequivocally support the integrity of the legislation of 1952 and 1958 which is so vital to the Secretary's right to manage.

I deeply appreciate the privilege of again appearing before this committee and taking the opportunity to discuss these important matters.

Professor De Grazia Backs Proposal for an American Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the adaptation of the Scandinavian Ombudsman to the American political system as an agent of Congress to assure that citizens will get their due in dealings with the vast Federal Government.

Alfred de Grazia, distinguished professor of government at New York University, has endorsed this idea and contributed another, the possible use of the Roman tribunate.

I include his comments in the RECORD to further inform the Members on meas-

ures that can be taken to strengthen the rights of citizens and the effectiveness of our Government.

My remarks on the use of the Ombudsman in America are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *April 3, 1963.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I have read with interest your address on the subject of the ombudsman. I would like to congratulate you upon your efforts to work out imaginative solutions to the pressing problems of legislative oversight of the executive branch. Recently, I discussed with Congressman MEADER of Michigan the need for an intensive investigation of the weaknesses and possible strengths of the Congress in relation to the Executive.

Even while I agree with your suggested new institution I wonder whether the Congress might not consider the Roman tribunate as an even more powerful and effective model. That is, if we might have within every agency of the Federal Government a tribune who was an officer responsible to the Congress, who would have as his principal function the presentation of an annual report deliberately charged with reducing officers, expenditures, and functions, we might have a much more powerful congressional instrument. We have no systematic way of planning the reduction of Government but only systematic ways, largely concentrated in the executive branch, of expanding Government. We are full of grand intentions about devolving Government into decentralized and voluntary and nongovernmental groups and persons, but we have not acted effectively to do so.

I believe that this idea forms part of your own plan, and both would find their place in a larger scheme to strength the Legislature.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED DE GRAZIA,
Professor of Government.

Another Old Newspaper Colleague Has Written a Book: Charles L. (Pie) Dufour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the ambition of every newspaperman is to write a book. Perhaps I am the exception, but I readily admit I am surrounded by colleagues who do write books—and write them well.

Only recently I directed your attention to "The Huey Long Murder Case" by Hermann B. Deutsch, and now comes Mr. Deutsch's officemate, Charles L. "Pie" Dufour with another sparkling tome.

"Pie" Dufour's column in the New Orleans States-Item is one of the most widely read columns in the area and not without cause. Mr. Dufour's wide range of knowledge makes him the poor man's short cut to an education.

He is just as much at home writing about a sports event as he is discussing the merits of the opera which was sung the night before. He stands at the top of the list when the roll is called on Civil War authorities.

I shall not attempt to discuss his book. I have left that in more capable hands, William O. Billiter, Jr., who has reviewed many books for the Times-Picayune of New Orleans.

Here it is:

NINE MEN IN GRAY, BY CHARLES L. DUFOUR

(A review by William O. Billiter, Jr.)

Winston Churchill called it "the last war between gentlemen" and in this new book by author-historian Charles L. Dufour nine seltiom-heralded cavaliers of the lost cause emerge with all the vitality and dignity with which they fought.

Here, then, are nine men whom Mr. Dufour has pulled from the shadows of history and placed in the proper perspective of their times. Their stories are dynamic and exciting, and Mr. Dufour has again demonstrated his ability to translate history in humanistic terms.

Gen. Dick Taylor, son of President Zachary Taylor and brother-in-law of Confederate President Jefferson Davis, was an early target of charges of nepotism. But Dick Taylor fought valiantly in Virginia and Louisiana, and proved his stars were well earned.

Gen. Turner Ashby, a gallant member of the Virginia gentry, was a near legend when he was killed defending his home State. A Federal officer noted: "When we found the brave Ashby was slain, there was no rejoicing in our camps."

A son of Ireland who rose from private to general in the Confederate Army, Gen. Patrick Ronayne Cleburne also was slain in combat. Said his commanding officer: "When his division defended, no odds broke its lines; where it attacked, no numbers resisted its onslaught, save only once, and there is the grave of Cleburne."

Lt. Charles W. "Savez" Read, C.S.N., was a Confederate corsair and the terror of the Atlantic seaboard. His saga was described as "such an adventurous career that anyone reading an account of it would be justified in thinking that he was a creature of the imagination who had stepped bodily out of the pages of one of Dumas' novels."

Deceptive in his mild-mannered appearance, Col. Willie Pegram was one of the most dashing artillerymen in the Civil War. Having escaped death through many bloody skirmishes, Pegram died painfully in the waning days of the war.

Col. Lucius B. Northrop was the Commissary General for the Confederacy throughout the bulk of the war. An irascible, albeit colorful man, Northrop "professed a contempt for practically everything except his family, his farm, and Jefferson Davis."

Gen. Billy Mahone was a valiant division commander who fought heroic rearguard operations on the retreat to Appomattox. Braver than he was tall, a soldier described him as being "every inch a soldier, though there were not many inches of him."

Swiss-born Henry Hotze was a brilliant propagandist for the Confederacy in England. Says Author Dufour: "If Henry Hotze had been born a hundred years later, he could have been one of Madison Avenue's bright young men in gray flannel suits."

Gen. Edward Porter Alexander was a skilled artillerist who fought magnificently for the Confederacy, yet who lived to write stirring praise for the Union which had been preserved.

Mr. Dufour's previous Civil War books, "Gentle Tiger: The Gallant Life of Roberdeau Wheat," and "The Night the War Was Lost," have been widely acclaimed for their factual documentation and research, combined with smooth, zestful narration.

"Nine Men in Gray" shows the same skill. Especially well handled are the battle scenes, which ring with life and Homeric tragedy.

Mr. Dufour, long respected in Louisiana as a foremost historian, is now emerging on the national level as one of the handful of important Civil War chroniclers. "Nine Men in Gray" adds justifiably to Mr. Dufour's stature.

The Law and the Person

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon:

THE LAW AND THE PERSON

(Sermon dfelivered by Bishop John Wright of the diocese of Pittsburgh, Pa., at annual red Mass, St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, N.Y., Sunday, September 30, 1962)

"Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me" (Matt. 25: 40).

If any one sentence may be singled out as having most influenced the cultural, social, and legal traditions which add up to what we call democracy, that single sentence is the one from the lips of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, which I have just announced as my text.

It is not in the wisdom of Greek philosophy nor in the logic of Roman law that we must look if we seek a single proposition which has provided the motivation of democracy's most heroic social action and which has transformed the concepts, moral and legal, which dominate the decent, humane society. No philosophical thesis of Plato or Aristotle; certainly no legal maxim or principle of the Roman praetors, any more than of the English chancellors, has had the revolutionary effect that this single sentence of Jesus Christ has had in placing Western law at the service of the person and individual personality, however humble its possessor, at the center of democratic, social and legal theory.

If democracy represents a social and political effort to serve the individual person and to make the perfection of human personality, wherever it exists, the norm of the good society, we owe it to the divine standard of good and evil, of worth and wisdom in the ethical order, enunciated by Christ, recorded by Saint Matthew, meditated, preached and painfully put into practice, however imperfectly, by centuries of Christians who took seriously the teaching of Jesus Christ: Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me.

The least of the brethren at the height of Athenian democracy was not yet a citizen. He was, in fact, a slave. Society was geared not to the perfection of the least of the brethren, but to the service of the citizen and the advantage of the mentally brightest, the physically strongest and, in each case, the most astute and aggressive. In Roman civilization the norm of all sound social theory was summed up in four words: salus populi, suprema lex, a proposition which, as it was in fact understood, meant: the highest norm of law is the security of the state. As for the least of the brethren, he was also a slave or, what was worse, an alien; there was scant discussion of his service and none whatever of his rights.

The concept of service of personality in even the least of the brethren derives from a Hebrew ideal, not a Greek thesis nor a Roman principle; it is canonized in the Christian idea that the moral worth of individual action or of social planning is to be discerned in its effect on the person of the least of the brethren.

If now, and here, by processes which are usually slow and frequently painful-the individual person, without reference to race, family, color, creed, political persuasion or measure of talent, is even theoretically declared to be the object of the law's concern and of the State's solicitude; if the security of his rights and the service of his personality are, even in theory, the test of the decent society, we owe it not to the sophistication of Greek philosophy nor to the efficiency of Roman law but to the compassion of the Christian social morality summed up in the words which, it cannot be too often repeated, have so profoundly influenced the direction of democratic law toward the protection of personality in the least of the brethren.

Nowhere, we like to think, has the influence of Christ's norm of morality borne greater fruit than in our social and legal tradition. The men who wrote our basic American law were powerfully influenced by the general moral teaching of Jesus Christ. But they specifically recognized that all society, religious and civil alike, and all legal traditions, both those of authority and those of liberty, exist for the perfection of human personality in the least of the brethren. They would have understood the magnificent political and social implications of the doctrine which the late Pius XI so briefly summarized when he said, "It is according to the dictates of reason that ultimately all things should be ordained to man as a person, that through his mediation they may find their way back to the Creator." It is in this wise that we apply to the human person the words of the Apostle Paul, "For all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas; or the world, or life, or death; or things present or things to come, all are yours, and you are Christ's and Christ is God's."

Our traditional American legal philosophy, prior to the rise of secularism as a pressure on our courts, sought to respect this concept of the centrality of human personality, with the result that even before a child was born our State protected his human rights, his right to life, his right to be born, even, in accordance with a famous decision of a century ago, his right to inherit though he might be born after his father had died. Indeed, the rights of the unborn child were sacred to our courts under a double title: they are the rights of a human but also of a human incapable of pleading his own rights and therefore with a greater claim, not a lesser, on the protection of the State as our fathers understood it.

The traditional legal insistence on the right of a child to be born has demanded in our medical and moral tradition occasional acts of heroism which many profess to find superhuman. But our forefathers in America considered heroism to be a duty where there is a question of the inviolable rights of human personality.

A child, in the thinking of our tradition, is not born immediately into civil society. Logically, at least, he enters that society, as our forefathers understood it, through the medium of his parents, or, more precisely, through his family.

In the American tradition of law the family is the elementary social unit. For our forefathers democracy meant a plurality of families cooperating by consent for the collective protection and promotion of those God-given natural rights which the family by itself might be powerless to secure for the individual person. Democracy meant, even more, the sovereignty of the family in its own essential work of the rearing of children. The development of the child's faculties, the formation and refinement of his character, his initiation to the requirements and the disciplines of existence in society, all these are, in our tradition, the work of the normal parent and no agency should be encouraged to supplant the normal parent, our fathers considered, in these works.

The consequent amount of legislation in America designed to protect the right of the parent over the child is impressively large. Our forefathers followed Blackstone in his suggestion that the positive precepts of the law should correspond accurately to a natural necessity decreed by divine providence which has provided for the welfare of children, as never could the State or any other agency, by implanting in the breast of the normal parent an insuperable affection, more imperious than any written law, which not even the wickedness, ingratitude, or rebellion of children can totally suppress or extinguish.

And so our legal theory has always recognized that the normal family is, in its own way, sovereign because it is so close to the purpose of society, the perfection of personality. Only the abnormal inadequacy of a particular family places its members within the competency of our courts. Even then, whenever possible, it is the tradition of our courts to do all that artifice can possibly do to supply the defects of nature by providing the homeless child with the nearest possible approach to family life and family rearing.

In our tradition it is recognized that the strength of the State, the good of the child, and the rights we call democratic are best served when the family is protected in its liberty to choose the schools in which the personality of its children may be brought to perfection. So the law traditionally sought to protect and promote that right; so, too, the graduate from our schools found himself protected on every hand by the legislation which our forefathers wrote to guarantee his right to choose his own work, to contract at will for payment, to acquire property, and otherwise to enjoy the fruits of his toil. If these personal rights be struck down or arbitrarily interfered with, there is a substantial impairment of liberty in its long-established constitutional sense and the least of the brethren is likely to be the victim of the strongest or the most cunning.

Behind our legal tradition is the testimony of human reason in its highest moments: the wisdom of Greece, the law of Rome, and the hopes of Israel. But behind it, above all, is the revelation made by Christ and the traditions preserved by christendom, the revelation which included the sublime yet simple principle that forms our text today. Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me.

The person and the rights of the least of the brethren are always and everywhere precarious. At the moment they are endangered in different ways in different parts of the world. As Commonweal magazine pointed out last week, certain institutions even in our own land do not always share the Christian understanding of inviolable human rights; they fail to appreciate, for example, the lofty standard of the integrity of the mere human body which the church insists upon precisely because of the relationship of even the physical body to spiritual personality. They sometimes suppose that the state or the individual himself has rights to incapacitate man's procreative powers, without reference to the relationship of these powers to personality and to rights which only God can give or cancel.

In some parts of the world the plight of human personality results from all denial of its claims by Communist totalitarianism, the antihuman impersonal pretensions of Marxist collectivism. The least of the brethren surely has no claims in the name of God under an atheist state; he has no claim in the name of his own personality in a collectivist society for which all personality resides in the state. In other parts of the world fascism negates personality in the name of the omnipotent and omnicompetent state. Elsewhere racism, as recently in nazism, annihilates personality and despises its rights in the name of blood or class or color. In the eugenic state the rights of personality are jeopardized or ignored in the name of bodily or mental health and the protection of that physical well-being which is more precious to the eugenicist than is spiritual salvation or moral integrity. In a highly technological society the cold efficiency of automation jeopardizes regard for human personality and the rights of workers. Civilization is in grave danger when machinery is more glamorous than persons, just as it is in danger when considerations of class, politics, race, physical efficiency, or health outweigh the claims of human personality and enjoy the favor of the law more than do persons, born or unborn, strong or weak, high placed or the least of the brethren.

One or another form of paganism has displaced religious idealism which gave birth and direction to our democracy whenever the law becomes insensible or indifferent to the rights of the least of the brethren, with the result that only the white, or only the native, or only the true believers, or only the prosperous, or only the physically perfect, or only the safely born, or only those with all their fingers or all their wits are secure in their natural rights. When only the healthy have a right to be born; when only the efficient have a right to survive; when only those in certain racial groups or certain schools or certain political parties or certain privileged positions enjoy the favor of the law and the advantages or tax benefits of the organized community, then that community has ceased to be a democracy and no longer derives its inspiration from the sublime teaching that gives divine and eternal significance to all our human and temporal efforts to be decent. Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me.

God grant that the security of the least of the brethren, of all our groups, in all our schools, among all our kinds and conditions of men, will be guaranteed by laws, by lawyers, and by lawmakers inspired by the historic religious principle that once so profoundly influenced the development of political democracy.

A Report on Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful speech by Mr. C. A. Cannon, one of the Nation's leading cotton textile manufacturers and chairman of the Cotton Policy Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. This speech was delivered in the form of a report to the institute during its annual convention at Hollywood Beach, Fla., on March 22. I think it is of such a character as to provoke discussion, and

understanding, of one of the most serious economic problems confronting our country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT ON COTTON

(A report to the annual meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute by C. A. Cannon, chairman, cotton policy committee, president, Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C., at Hollywood Beach, Fla., March 22, 1963)

In September 1962, the Tariff Commission, by a vote of 3 to 2, with the chairman casting the deciding vote, rejected the Department of Agriculture's request for an offset import fee on the cotton content of imported textile products. On that same day the President stated publicly that the inequity of the two-price system remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry and that he was requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a legislative program to eliminate the inequity. He stated further that he was requesting all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end.

The board of directors of this organization, meeting early in October, endorsed the President's request in a resolution calling for "a return to a one-price system for American cotton, whether sold at home or abroad, as early as possible."

The cotton policy committee was charged with the responsibility of cooperating with the President, with the Congress, and with all segments of the raw cotton industry in the interest of achieving a one-price system.

I appreciate the opportunity to report to you today, in behalf of your cotton policy committee, on our efforts to date.

When our board of directors adopted its position in October, it did so with the clear understanding that the only possible way to achieve a one-price system in the forseeable future is through some type of equilization payments program, one that would maintain a price to domestic growers substantially in excess of the world market, yet make cotton available to domestic users at the same price it is offered to foreign mills.

It was with reluctance that we took this position, but there was no choice. It was either support a payments approach, or resolve to live with the ruinous present system. However, let me make it very clear right now in the beginning of my reamrks that our decision was made easier by the fact that we were and are recommending payments in kind, that is, payments in cotton rather than in cash from the Federal treasury. The truth is that our Government now owns or has loans outstanding on more than 10 million bales of cotton. On August 1, it will own outright more than 8 million bales. In my opinion, the Government will never realize anything more than the world price for this cotton; in fact, much of it will be disposed of under export programs that won't return anything to the Treasury.

Thus our position is that in the final analysis the Government will actually do better by making cotton available to us at the world price because their stocks will be reduced, carrying charges will be lowered, cash money for the cotton will be returned to the Treasury and, most important of all, the cotton economy of the country will start booming.

The Government and the trade are experienced in handling payment in kind programs. The export subsidy program operates on a similar basis. So we are not talking about something that is impossible of achievement.

I shall not attempt to relate all the conferences, meetings, contacts with other parts of the cotton industry, telephone calls and correspondence that have occurred during the past 5 months. Suffice to say enormous time and effort have been put forth by our committee, our friends in Congress, our staff, the cotton council and other friends in the industry. As a result, there has been a series of hearings by the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, headed by Mr. GATHINGS of Arkansas, and by the full Agriculture Committee, headed by our distinguished guest, Mr. COOLEY.

In January a personal visit by members of the House Agriculture Committee to the textile mill areas provided a firsthand look at the cotton problem.

I want to publicly salute and thank Mr. COOLEY, Mr. GATHINGS and their associates for taking 2 days out of a very busy schedule to observe firsthand the competitive marketing problems faced by cotton under the two-price system.

In January, as a result of all the intensive activity on the subject, two major legislative proposals were introduced.

H.R. 2000, the Cooley bill, provided for a one-price cotton system in clear and forthright language.

H.R. 2495 was offered by Congressman GATHINGS. It proposed discretionary authority to eliminate the two-price cotton system and a choice program to provide additional cotton acreage beyond the 16 million acres now set for the 1963 crop.

For a while, it appeared that the Cooley bill would move rapidly through the House committee machinery, with broad support from throughout the cotton industry. But, unfortunately, it soon became clear that the administration felt something less than a one-price cotton system would eliminate the inequity to the domestic industry.

As a result of administration insistence on this point, coupled with a controversy among some of the cotton producer groups on an acreage provision, the legislation was referred to the full House Agriculture Committee back to the Cotton Subcommittee.

Mr. COOLEY and his colleagues on the committee continue to be intensely interested in the problem, however, and are still seeking a way to carry out President Kennedy's wishes as expressed in his farm message to the Congress.

On January 31 the President told the Congress, "Our cotton industry, both producers and mills, is confronted with many problems which it alone cannot resolve."

"The time has come," the President said, "for us to fashion a sound and enduring national policy for cotton, to enable it to make its maximum contribution to our Nation's growth at a minimum of governmental expense."

The President told the Congress a new law should be enacted which will—and these are the President's words, mind you—a law which will "eliminate the disadvantage which the present two-price system for cotton imposes on the U.S. textile industry."

Last week our cotton policy committee, along with ATMI officers and staff, met in Washington once again for a series of conferences at the White House, at the Department of Agriculture, and on Capitol Hill.

We can report that the cotton policy subject is still very much alive. And we can report also that the industry no longer is the sole owner of the cotton problem. It has now become a national problem, the administration's problem, and a solution, in the form of legislation, is being sought eagerly by many, many forces. Our goal now is to find a reasonable and workable approach upon which agreement can be reached.

It goes without saying that we have been deeply disappointed over developments of the past few weeks that have resulted in a setback of legislation to give us a one-price system. Our disappointment is magnified by knowledge that the administration is resisting a clean-cut approach to the objective, the Cooley bill, and supporting instead a proposal that would allow the Secretary of Agriculture discretion in determining a spread between the domestic and export price. Under Secretary of Agriculture Murphy, testifying for the Department, indicated that something less than 8½ cents a pound was the amount necessary to remove the inequity of the two-price system, as contrasted with an 8½-cent export subsidy.

Having decided, apparently, that it does not want American mills, employing American workers, to buy American cotton at the same price it is sold to Japan, Hong Kong, France, or Timbuktoo, the Department has stated its reason as being that there are freight and handling charge advantages enjoyed by the domestic industry that the foreigners do not have. This, then, becomes the basis for their discrimination against the American market.

The industry, without subscribing for one moment to the validity of these diversionary arguments, has nonetheless sincerely and forthrightly rebutted them all. We have engaged in endless hours of fruitless discussion on the subject. But we have in the past, do now, and will in the future stand without compromise on the basic premise that an American mill is entitled to buy American cotton at the same price it is sold for export.

Because we have maintained a firm position, and not compromised on this issue that is so vital to the whole future of the American cotton industry, there are those in the Government and elsewhere who are accusing us of being obstructionists. They are saying, "Why won't the textile industry accept a reasonable and fair compromise of something less than 8½ cents?" or "Why is the industry so greedy and stubborn and selfish as to put it on an all-or-nothing basis?"

These reactions are not unexpected. I propose to try to answer them with the hope that in the minds of reasonable and intelligent people these questions may be put to rest. Here is why, on instructions of ATMI's board and executive committee, we are standing firm for a one-price system.

1. It is fair and equitable. No one has yet advanced a single argument to support the proposition that two-price cotton benefits either the domestic industry or the total economy. I don't care how you wrap the proposition, or the words you select to describe it, it is basically wrong, economically as well as morally, for the U.S. Government to sell American-grown cotton to the Japanese at $42.50 a bale less than American textile mills must pay for that same product.

2. When President Kennedy announced his intention to "remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system," every informed cotton man in the world construed the inequity as being the level of the export subsidy, nothing more and nothing less. Prior to the advent of the export subsidy program, we bought American cotton competitively with foreign mills. There was no inequity in the purchase of the American product. The inequity was created when the export subsidy became effective. Thus, it is crystal clear that the level of the inequity is the level of the subsidy. It can't be anything else.

3. A piecemeal approach will not do the job. It will not generate the necessary levels of increased cotton consumption; it will not materially offset the burdensome portion of imports now entering our markets specifically because of the unfair cotton pricing system; it will not justify the acreage expansion so essential to efficient and profitable cotton farming; we cannot honestly say to the Congress, to the rest of the cotton industry or to the American public that a half measure will achieve any meaningful results, or that it will justify the cost. In short, it will not restore the confidence so essential to dynamic, expanding industry.

4. Contrary to the opinion of most people outside our industry, a reduction in the price of cotton does not automatically mean increased profits for our mills. Contrarily, a reduction in price means an equivalent per pound loss on all our goods in process and in inventory. Conservatively speaking, a 5-cent reduction would create immediate losses for us in the neighborhood of $75 million; an 8½-cent reduction something like $125 million. We have faced up to this fact. We are willing to take a $125 million loss in the interest of reversing the devastating trend now in motion throughout the whole cotton economy. We believe it would be a good investment in the future, for us, for the farmers, for everyone concerned. On the other hand, we are unwilling to take a $75 million loss for another half measure that will not do the job for us, for the farmers or for the cotton economy as a whole. No one should expect us to do so.

Our returns from the complete elimination of the two-price cotton system will come not from savings on lower cotton costs, our competition will see that goods prices reflect the lower costs. Rather, our returns will come from increased consumption, market development and expansion and all the other factors related to a dynamic, vigorous industry, filled with confidence in the future.

5. The textile industry never has and does not now seek a Government subsidy of any sort for itself. We don't want it. We don't like the idea of any program involving payments from the Government. We reluctantly support an equalization payments approach only as the very last recourse to preserve farm income and, at the same time, make American cotton available to us at the same price it is sold abroad.

Such payments can be justified only because there appears to be no other way to eliminate the two-price system. But a discretionary, piecemeal approach will be viewed and labeled simply as a handout or a subsidy to the domestic textile industry. If we accept it, we will place ourselves in position to be so labeled.

In good conscience, we can go to our friends in the Congress and ask them to support a payments program to completely eliminate the two-price system. They know that we have exhausted every recourse available to us; that our industry has borne this devastating burden for 7 long years without relief, and that the whole American raw cotton industry has reached a point where emergency action of some sort must be taken.

But we are in an impossible position to go to our friends in the Congress and ask them to support a half measure that we know will not do the job, one that can only be looked upon as a handout to keep us quiet for a while.

6. The idea of penalizing the domestic industry because of some statistical will-o'-the-wisp freight rate differential becomes absurd in light of the fact that while domestic mills are restricted by law to the purchase of American cotton at the Government supported price, foreign mills buy a very major portion of this cotton outside the United States at prices substantially below the present 8½ cents differential.

Foreign cotton-producing countries are not equipped to store and hold cotton. They do not have a CCC. They must sell when their cotton crop is ready for market, and they always sell below the U.S. price because our country always has stocks to offer. So the disadvantage to us isn't just 8½ cents; it is probably nearer 9½ or 10 cents. Add to this the advantage they have in wages and other costs, and the idea of a piddling freight rate consideration becomes ridiculous.

Finally, the entire American raw cotton industry, as well as the Government, is confronted with one of the most serious emergencies in history. Cotton consumption in the United States is declining at an unbelievable rate; export sales of cotton and cotton textiles are steadily falling; import pressures continue to mount, competing fibers and other products are rapidly taking over cotton's markets; cotton acreage has been reduced this year from 18 to 16 million acres, with the outlook for further reduction in the future; the Government has cotton colic—its owned stocks have increased from 1½ milion bales in 1961 to an anticipated 8½ million bales plus on August 1 this year; carrying charges on this cotton will increase from approximately $17 million in 1961 to $70 million this year; the Commodity Credit Corporation's cotton holdings amounted to less than $300 million in 1961 and are now at the level of approximately $1.7 billion. They have just obtained a deficiency appropriation of $508 million to tide them over.

Everything considered, confidence in cotton and its future is at an all-time low.

There is a desperate need, both from the standpoint of the American cotton industry and the Government, for a return of confidence. This essential confidence cannot and will not be returned so long as the basic inequity of the two-price cotton system remains with us. It will not be returned so long as the Secretary of Agriculture or anyone else has the power to juggle the domestic price as against the export price.

In conclusion, let me say that your committee has followed to the letter the charge given it by the board of directors. We have not deviated from it and do not intend to do so. Our objective, purely and simply, is a one-price system, a system under which American mills can purchase American cotton at the same price our competitors do and continue to provide jobs for around 900,000 Americans and enable their families to enjoy the high standard of living we have achieved. Right is on our side and we will win, not for our sakes alone, but for the sake of the whole cotton industry and our Nation.

Canal Zone Sovereignty Suit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on April 9, I gave some of the background of a pending suit in the U.S. district court for the Canal Zone that concerns the sovereignty of the United States over the zone and the Panama Canal. As such, this suit may prove historic.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be adequately informed about the arguments presented before the court by the counsels for the parties to the suit, I quote the following news stories from Isthmian newspapers as part of my remarks:

[From the Star and Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, Apr. 6, 1963]

U.S. FLAG LAW MAIN ISSUE IN SUIT—CROWE—NO RULING YET ON MOTION FOR DISMISSAL

Judge Guthrie F. Crowe yesterday narrowed down the issue over the joint display of the Panama and United States flags in the Canal Zone to whether the U.S. flag law has been violated. He said the final decision will depend on his finding (1) if plaintiff Gerald A. Doyle has the right to sue and (2) if defendant Gov. Robert J. Fleming's action falls in the category of executive discretion.

That finding will come after June 19, the date set by the court for the filing of final briefs on a defense motion for dismissal of the suit. Secretary of the Army Cyrus R. Vance is a codefendant with Governor Fleming.

If the court finds for the plaintiff, it will mean that the suit will come to trial at a date to be fixed subsequently. If the court finds against the plaintiff, it will mean the end of the controversy—at least in the local court.

The court made no ruling yesterday on the motion after listening during 7 hours to arguments by District Attorney R. K. Hazard, counsel for the defense, and Attorneys William S. Tyson and E. J. Berger, representing the plaintiff.

But Judge Crowe indicated his line of thinking—as of now—on the various issues raised in the suit and expressed it as a guideline on which counsel should base their final briefs. He said:

1. The service of summons made by plaintiff on Secretary Vance by certified mail is improper because the Canal Zone District Court is not a U.S. district court or a judicial district within the meaning of the statute that permits service on officers of the United States by certified mail.

2. The proposed use of Panamanian stamps in the Canal Zone falls well within the purview of the Governor of the Canal Zone, who is empowered by law to determine the postage to be used in the zone.

3. The recognition of exequaturs issued to foreign consuls is pretty largely a question of foreign policy, which lies within the province of the Department of State. It is a matter of executive discretion.

But on the all-important question of the flag display, Judge Crowe indicated that, at this stage, he was accepting the plaintiff's contention that the issue involves whether the law enacted by the U.S. Congress directing the manner in which the U.S. flag is to be flown has been violated.

The situation, he added, now calls for determining whether Doyle has a right to sue, and if so, whether the Governor's action in directing the present display of the flags was clothed with executive discretion.

He pointed out that the question of executive discretion has a great deal to do with whether the courts intervene because of the well-established doctrine of the separation of powers.

The day's arguments were highlighted by a defense denunciation of Governor Fleming. Attorney Tyson referred to Fleming at various points along his address as a "little dictator," as displaying a "sugar daddy" attitude for giving away a billion dollars' worth of property that does not belong to him, and as a "knight in synthetic armor" apparently bent on removing a sacred emblem and symbol of U.S. sovereignty.

Tyson said that he intends to present evidence that—contrary to the defense arguments that Fleming acted under presidential authority—the Governor, upon reading in the press the Washington announcements of the agreement reached between Presidents J. F. Kennedy and R. F. Chiari for the display of the Panamanian flag at new sites in the Canal Zone, had sent a memorandum to his executive assistant directing him to devise a plan whereby the U.S. flag could be flown with the Panamanian flag.

Time and again Tyson raised the point that as long as counsel for the defense cannot produce a presidential proclamation specifically providing for the joint display of the flags, the Governor's action in the Canal Zone constituted an illegal act.

The defense maintained that Fleming, as a representative appointed by the President of the United States to review certain treaty matters with Panamanian officials, was carrying out the policy authorized by the President of the United States and that this

must be presumed unless specifically repudiated by the President.

When Hazard raised the point that the court, as a practical proposition, had to take into regard the effects of a decision contrary to presidential action, Judge Crowe replied that the court was not being asked to determine a contest between the United States and Panama, but to decide whether the action taken was within the law.

In his 4-hour argument. Hazard developed the two grounds on which the defense has moved for dismissal of the suit: First, that plaintiff lacks legal standing to sue; and second, that the issue raised involves a political question and therefore is not a justifiable controversy within the jurisdiction of the court.

He challenged the plaintiff's contention that because Doyle pays for an automobile license plate, pays rent and utilities to the Canal Zone Government and makes purchases in the commissaries he has a pecuniary interest in the matter on the allegation that part of the moneys he contributes are being spent on the display of the Panamanian flag. As to other allegations—such as that the display of the flag threatens Doyle's job and the security of his home—Hazard dismissed them as speculative. Others, among them the contention that Doyle's right of privacy is invaded by the sight of a foreign flag, he termed unsupported.

Hazard maintained that in order to show standing to sue, plaintiff had to prove personal and particular injury to him from the acts complained of.

The defense based its contention that the case involves a political question on press releases issued by the White House and the State Department. These announcements covered the talks between Presidents Kennedy and Chiari last June and their agreement to appoint representatives to discuss the display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone and other issues.

Hazard also cited the White House announcement of September 17, 1960, under which the then President Dwight D. Eisenhower directed the raising of the first Panamanian flag at Shaler Triangle as visual evidence of Panama's titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Hazard pointed out that the real aim of the suit was not only to have the display of the Panamanian flag ruled illegal, but to enjoin the Governor to take that flag down and keep it down to prevent an alleged cession of sovereignty—a question clearly dealing with foreign relations.

As to the alleged violation of the statute which forbids any foreign flag from being displayed in a position of equal or superior prominence to that of the U.S. flag, Hazard maintained that the statute itself is ambiguous and its language suggested certain exceptions. At any rate, he argued, the U.S. flag is being displayed to the right of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone, and the circumstance complies with the language of the statute.

The court commented at this point that the language of the United States Code with reference to the manner of displaying the U.S. flag is clear and that the statute requires that any change in those provisions be made by Presidential proclamation. None of the documents shown by the defense, Judge Crowe pointed out, purports to be a proclamation. The statute applies in the Canal Zone, as a possession, the court added, and the question is one of whether a law enacted by Congress has been violated.

Attorney Berger opened the plaintiff's argument. He dealt with the flag question only. Counsel said under the U.S. flag law a foreign flag cannot be displayed in U.S. territory in a position of equal or superior prominence to that of the U.S. flag. Hence, he said, the display of the Panamanian flag jointly with the U.S. flag in positions of equal prominence at Shaler Triangle, Balboa Heights, and the Terminal Building in Cristobal is illegal. As to the day-and-night display of the U.S. flag at the Balboa Bridge, Berger assailed it as contrary to custom.

Berger maintained that the matter does not involve the removal of the Panamanian flag from the Canal Zone, but the correct display of the U.S. flag.

Tyson, who spoke for almost 2 hours, charged at the start of his address that Doyle ostracized, socially and in his work as Chief of the Architectural Branch of the Engineering Division, for having brought the suit against the Governor.

He argued that Doyle, as a taxpayer, has a pecuniary interest in the expenditure of funds for the display of a foreign flag in the Canal Zone and said plaintiff was prepared to show the allocation or disbursement of Canal Zone Government funds to prove the allegation that Doyle is required to contribute to the expenditure of funds for an illegal objective.

Tyson also cited Doyle's natural rights as a citizen, including the protection of his privacy, which stem from the Constitution.

The court interrupted to point out that, under judicial precedent, not all the constitutional phases may be available to U.S. citizens here because the Canal Zone is outside the U.S. continental limits.

Tyson maintained, nevertheless, that the compulsion to see a foreign flag alongside his own was a deprivation of Doyle's constitutional rights which requires the relief sought—enjoining the Governor from continuing the joint display of the flags as at present.

Counsel closed his argument reading from a U.S. Senate report on the significance of the U.S. flag to its citizens.

In his final remarks, Judge Crowe pointed out that both sides had relied strictly on Federal precedents to support their contentions. He said the Canal Zone Code is a complete compilation of laws for the Canal Zone, based mainly on California laws, and that applicable State decisions carried as much weight as Federal precedents. He told attorneys to include State decisions in their final briefs.

Practically all of the seating space in the courtroom was filled by spectators during the court session.

[From the Panama American, Panama, Republic of Panama, Apr. 6, 1963]

NO DECISION BEFORE JUNE 19—DOYLE'S, FLEMING'S LEGAL STATUS FORM MAJOR ISSUES

Whether Gerald A. Doyle, Jr., has the legal standing to sue Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., and U.S. Army Secretary Cyrus A. Vance is expected to form a major point in Judge Guthrie F. Crowe's findings when he rules on the flag suit issue in June.

The judge issued a line of thinking in the district court case yesterday which reduced the issue to the question of Doyle's standing and whether Fleming's part in the raising of Panama's flag in the Canal Zone falls into the category of executive discretion.

A packed courtroom heard Crowe tell the parties, after 7 hours of argument on the flag issue, that his decision will be withheld until after June 19, the date set to allow time for the filing of additional briefs by both sides.

Rowland K. Hazard, Fleming and Vance's attorney, took Doyle's attorneys completely by surprise by filing a State Department brief contesting Doyle's suit only minutes before the hearing of arguments started.

The brief brought protests of unfair procedure from William S. Tyson, Doyle's attorney, who later in the day attacked Hazard's arguments as completely erroneous and termed Fleming's actions as those of a "little dictator" and illegal.

Crowe called the case one of great importance and announced that, as he had stated at the beginning, "I will not give a decision on the issues raised today until both parties have had the chance to file supplemental briefs. You will be given ample time to prepare additional arguments to cover the questions raised today."

The District Court judge said, however, that he was "impressed" by a motion to quash service on Vance put forward by Hazard and indicated that his line of thinking, as of now, found a "strong" case for the defendants on the proposed sale of Panamanian stamps in the Canal Zone and the issuing of exequators for the zone to foreign consuls by Panama.

Tyson argued that the flying of the Panamanian flag alongside the banner of the United States was illegal and that Hazard's assertions to the contrary were made by a "confused" man.

Although the court made no ruling, Crowe said that, at this stage, he was accepting argument by the plaintiff that the crux of the issue involved whether the law enacted by the U.S. Congress on the way in which the flag is to be flown had been violated.

Fleming's actions were attacked in Tyson's arguments and the Governor as the "little dictator who sips cocktails late in the afternoon."

Tyson told the court that he had proof and intended to show that defense arguments that the Governor had followed Presidential authority in the flag issue were following an erroneous line because the raising of the Panamanian flag in the zone "is illegal until the President of the United States issues a proclamation." Tyson claimed that this had not been done.

Doyle's attorney said he was going to show that on June 13, 1962, after reading press releases announcing agreements between Panama and the United States to raise the standard of Panama—in the zone, "the Governor sent a memorandum to the man who was, and, I believe, still is, his executive assistant, stating 'I see by the newspapers that we may be flying more Panamanian flags and I want you to devise a plan to facilitate this.' "

Tyson claimed that rather than following any Presidential directives, the Governor "assumed authority by reading press releases and issued a directive to go ahead and do it. Up until this moment no proclamation has been issued and unless the President issues one it is illegal."

Crowe indicated that if it is found that Doyle has the standing to sue, then it must be established whether Fleming's action in directing the display of Panama's flag in the zone came under the boundaries of executive discretion. Crowe said that executive discretion played a big part in determining whether the courts intervene because of the well-established doctrine of the separation of powers.

Both parties used Federal cases as precedents in setting forth their arguments. Various points of attack and defense were highlighted by reading from Federal cases involving aspects of the issue.

Judge Crowe, at the conclusion of the arguments, pointed out the reliance on the Federal cases and said that the Canal Zone Code is a complete set of laws for the zone, based mainly on the California Code, and that applicable State decisions carried as much weight as Federal precedents.

He asked that the attorneys include State decisions in their final briefs which are to be filed before June 19. The June date was set by Crowe who told the court that he would be absent from the isthmus in May.

The question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone was raised repeatedly during the arguments and the term "titular sovereignty" used by Hazard was attacked by Tyson who asked the court "Is it correct that my learned

brother has denied U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone? The problem is—are they surrendering sovereignty or not. They make no acknowledgement of sovereignty and refuse to answer when asked in court."

Tyson said that the United States has "perfect title in the Canal Zone both by treaty and decision of the Supreme Court."

[From the Panama Sunday American, Republic of Panama, Apr. 7, 1963]

CROWDED COURT SHOWS KEEN INTEREST IN LEGALITIES OF DOYLE'S FLAG CASE

At the outset, Judge Crowe told the parties that no decision would be handed down Friday. That decision, speculated on by Zonians and Panamanians alike since the filing of the suit last year, will be made sometime after June 19—the date given by Crowe for an end to the filing of briefs.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk appended his signature to a certified copy of a White House press release announcing the erection of Panama's flag in the Canal Zone and attached it to a defense brief which brought controversy with its filing only minutes before the hearing started Friday.

"Unfair procedure" was Tyson's comment on the brief—a 12-page document contesting a memorandum filed a week before the hearing. Doyle's memorandum sought to quash a defendants' motion urging dismissal of the case.

Crowe said "surprise" would not be allowed to enter into the case. It is believed that because of the unexpected brief and Crowe's desire to thoroughly scan the issue the additional time was given.

The district court judge did, however, give some indications of his reaction to the points presented. He said his final decision will depend on his findings on at least two issues:

Whether Doyle has the right to sue Fleming and does the defendant's action in directing the erection of the Panamanian standard in the zone fall in the category of executive discretion?

Should Crowe find in favor of Doyle, the suit will be tried on a date to be fixed in June. Should Doyle's suit be denied then the architect could only have the New Orleans appeals court as recourse. The case would be over here.

The court's decision has yet to come but Crowe did issue a "line of thinking" as a guide to the counsels:

Crowe said he was, for the present, accepting the contention by Doyle and his attorneys that the flag issue involves whether the law enacted by the U.S. Congress directing the manner in which the U.S. flag is to be flown has been violated.

But the judge found a number of "strong points for the defendants on the issues involving service on Vance, the sale of Panamanian stamps in the Canal Zone and the proposed recognition in the zone of exequaturs of foreign consuls.

Hazard's move to quash service on Vance and have the case dismissed was based on the argument that Fleming, as a representative appointed by the President of the United States to review certain treaty matters with the Government of Panama, was carrying out Presidential authority.

Tyson unleashed an attack on Hazard's contention that Fleming was following orders, praising the attorney as a "fine gentleman but his argument is completely erroneous."

Doyle's attorney said he had proof showing Fleming had moved on the flag issue without authority and had "assumed authority and issued a directive to go ahead and do it.

"Because of his action against the little dictator, this man who sips cocktails late in the afternoon, my client is not called to conferences any more. Instead his assistant is called. Doyle has been made socially unacceptable by the brass," Tyson said.

"If they knew what was happening all the senior citizens who helped to build the Panama Canal would turn over three or four times in their graves," Tyson said. "They have no one here to protect their interests. They have no spokesman. They are isolated. If they did have these things the Governor would not be engaging in any of his shenanigans right now."

Tyson also hit out at the "erosion of sovereignty" in the Canal Zone during his 3-hour address to the court.

"I don't know the Governor but I do know he's very generous," Tyson commented. "He's generous with giving property to foreigners. He's ready to give all—including about a billion dollars worth of property that doesn't belong to him."

Doyle's attorney said he holds a lot of respect for the people of Panama and "I'd do anything I could to aid the interests of the Panamanian people, their homes, their children."

"But you don't buy friendship. You don't necessarily buy it by giving all the time," Tyson said, claiming that the problem involved was an internal one and not a question with Panama.

Replying to Tyson's remarks on the sovereignty of the Canal Zone, Crowe said "Some say it's titular sovereignty, some say it's complete sovereignty and some say it's none at all."

Tyson stated the defense had not indicated whether they denied the United States held sovereignty over the zone or not. "They make no acknowledgment of sovereignty and refuse to answer when asked in court." The attorney said the United States has perfect title in the Canal Zone by treaty and as acknowledged by the Supreme Court.

In another reference to Balboa Heights Tyson remarked "I've read about the sacred cows but this knight in synthetic armor is filling something sacred all right the most sacred, the flag." The remark followed a reference to the destruction of the flagpole outside the Governor's residence.

No decisions were made. Crowe has announced the additional time for more briefs and it is expected that both counsels will attempt to strengthen points brought out in the hearing.

The 5,000 zonians and the people of Panama will get the answer to the issue, one way or another, on June 19.

Is "Profit" a Bad Word?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times of Sunday, April 7, carried a powerful editorial describing the role of profit in our Nation. This editorial, "Is 'Profit' a Bad Word?" is a penetrating defense of the role of profit in our economy and I place it in the RECORD at this point feeling that the philosophy and the effectiveness of this editorial merit widespread attention.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

IS "PROFIT" A BAD WORD?

Words, like men, take on different shades in varying lights. What is to one a common and vigorous word is to another an expression of opprobrium.

Such a word is "profit." Those who buy in the marketplace say prices often are too high because profits are excessive. Those who sell in the market say profits are too low because Government takes too much in taxes. Those who labor to make the goods say wages are too low in proportion to profits. Those who invest their funds in business say the cost of labor is too high to allow a good profit.

What does this variable word mean? Literally, a profit is what is left over from the receipts of a business after the cost of doing business has been paid. This cost includes many things: wages, salaries, employee benefits, supplies and materials, taxes on every level, rent—many items.

Profit is not guaranteed. Approximately 30 to 34 percent of the companies in business lose money in any given year.

Who benefits by profit?

The owners of the company who invested risk capital get the first benefit, either in the form of increased dividends or an increase in the value of stock. Most companies distribute only a part of their profit in the form of dividends; some share part of the profits with employees; the remainder goes into expansion, equipment, it is used to make the company produce more products, profits, and jobs.

The employees gain their share of the profits also. Profits make for secure employment, a negotiable asset. Profits make for increased wages and benefits. Profits incubate expansion and possible promotion. Without profit there would be no company, and no jobs.

A company is both a buyer and a seller. A profit enables a company to buy more. One profit creates many profits in other lines of business. Profit means growth and growth is essential. Our population grows at the rate of about 7,000 persons a day. An expanding economy is a vital necessity if we are to live.

Profit also means benefits. The Chase Manhattan Bank points out that in 1908 an average worker in a tire plant was paid 40 cents an hour and produced a tire costing $53. The tire would last for 5,000 miles. Today the average worker in a tire plant is paid $3.14 an hour and produces tires that cost $22 and run for 29,000 miles. The rate of pay has increased eight times. The value received for $53 has increased 14 times. This all happened because capital—profits—were spent on methods and machines to improve production.

Without profits this country would stop running. Profit is what makes a free society move. Take profit away and the free society ceases being free and becomes a captive society. Freedom ends when any force puts an end to the profit motive and the free enterprise system.

The Government today taxes more than 50 percent of the profits earned by business. There is, happily, a growing realization in Washington that this goose that lays the golden eggs should not be killed and out of this realization is growing a program to relieve business of some of this heavy tax burden.

This is encouraging, but it is not enough. The jungle of regulations that now clogs business, some of them conflicting, some contradictory, all of them drearily confusing, this jungle must also be cleared away so that our business community can operate in a manner consistent with the historical vigor of free enterprise.

It is a truism that when Government constricts and constrains business to the point where it can no longer operate in an atmosphere of freedom, that when business becomes, in effect, another arm of Government, then the rights of freemen, in or out of business, begin to dwindle and die.

Words mean many things to many men. There are those in our country today who find the very word "profit" distasteful. They would remove all profit, and the meaning of the word, from business.

Profit is a simple word. It is a necessary part of our life. When Government spends more than it takes in it must, of necessity, place excessive taxes on business profits. If these taxes become too burdensome then profits will disappear.

Once that happens yet another word will cease to have meaning, freedom.

The Wilderness Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, in recent months in many areas there has been more heat than light generated in connection with legislation for the preservation of wilderness areas. It is therefore a great pleasure for me to call to the attention of the House an article from last Sunday's Denver Post which has as its primary purpose to shed light on the current dispute, and particularly the position of the chairman of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

In recommending the reading of this article I note for the record that it appeared on April 7, 1963, prior to the passage of the wilderness bill by the other body and, of course, the article does not have last-minute amendments. But these amendments were not significant and the essential outlines remain the same.

One aspect of this article is very significant. It is something that has been overlooked in much that has been written about the position of wilderness legislation in the House. WAYNE ASPINALL was bound by a vote of his committee in the 87th Congress and he had the overwhelming support of the Interior Committee membership for the substitute bill that he sponsored and that the committee approved.

And I would also like to underline another factor. The House Interior Committee is not going to turn over millions of acres of public lands to those who would destroy or impair the values of these lands. The committee acted, and I hope will continue to act, for the best interests of all of the people. The underlying major principle involved is the responsibility assigned to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States and the division of powers between the executive and legislative branches. I think we are on solid ground in our position.

I urge all Members to read this illuminating article which I incorporate with my remarks at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Denver Post, Apr. 7, 1963]

CALL OF THE WILD MUFFLED IN CONGRESS

(By Bert Hanna)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Colorado's WAYNE ASPINALL in an exclusive interview set forth some some of his viewpoints on current wilderness legislation.)

"A book of verses underneath the bough,
A jug of wine, a loaf of bread—and thou
Beside me singing in the wilderness—
Oh, wilderness were paradise enow."

The sentiments of Omar Khayyam symptomize the longings of nature lovers for preservation of wilderness areas in their natural state—one of the big continuing controversies before Congress—but it is doubtful if their dreams will reach fruition this year. What the old tentmaker had to say about wilderness, expressed in different ways by ardent conservationist groups, falls on deaf ears of key congressional leaders resisting wilderness legislation in present form.

The fight to water down wilderness legislation, which has ardent conservationists up in arms all over the Nation, has placed a veteran, influential Congressman, Democrat WAYNE N. ASPINALL of Colorado's Fourth District, in the most difficult role of his career.

There probably are few lawmakers in Washington who have had more brickbats thrown at them than ASPINALL, rugged, leathery-faced chairman of the House Interior Committee. He has been scourged by editorial writers, savagely cut up in magazine articles, and charged with selfish, special-interest obstructions for holding the line against what he considers extreme wilderness preservation.

He has broken with the Kennedy administration over this issue. He has incurred the wrath of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, author of the wilderness bill which passed the Senate in 1961 only to be scuttled by ASPINALL'S House committee last year.

Wilderness preservation groups in every area of the country have adopted resolutions indicting ASPINALL for his position. Conservation organizations and wildlife groups have lobbied furiously in Washington to thwart or sidetrack his power and influence on the issue.

Buffeted by such storms and pressures, some Congressmen in similar positions might be expected to retreat. But ASPINALL remains adamant. He told a Denver Post reporter in Washington recently, "Despite the fact that I have been crucified as the butcher of the wilderness bill, I intend to stand firm in my position, 'til hell freezes over."

"There has been entirely too much maudlin sentimentality and distortion by misguided zealots on this issue. I insist that my position is not inimical to a reasonable wilderness preservation system, but I could explain until doomsday and never get my point across to my critics.

"What I am standing for is the constitutional and fundamental right of a congressional check and balance in establishment of a wilderness system so that we do not go overboard and wreck our western resource development.

"I stand for clearcut guidelines on congressional and executive policies and prerogatives in the management of our public lands.

"And I do not stand alone."

ASPINALL then quietly pointed out he espouses the official policy of Colorado as laid down by the Colorado Water Conservation Board and affirmed by the Governor's office, the Colorado Water Congress, western mining men, ranchers and stockmen, such groups as the National Reclamation Association, the majority of his own constituents in western Colorado, and a great many supporters in the Congress from other public land States.

That is why he considers a recent article in Harper's magazine slicing him up for his position as unfair and onesided.

The article by Paul Brooks, editor in chief of Houghton-Miffin, a publishing firm, is entitled "Congressman ASPINALL versus the People of the United States."

It purports to detail "how one stubborn man, entrenched in a powerful committee chairmanship, can defy the will of Congress and jeopardize a national asset of incalculable value."

After passing the Senate by a vote of 78 to 8, the Senate bill "under ASPINALL'S direction was hogtied and butchered in committee and not even the spareribs go to the floor of the House," Brooks wrote.

"We can afford to save some of our heritage for our children and grandchildren.

"We can afford to put some of wild America into a trust fund for the future whose income we may enjoy while the principal remains intact.

"The securities * * * are as well diversified as those found in any good portfolio: the call of a loon, the splendor of a virgin forest, the blue of lupin on a mountain meadow, the wake of a beaver on a pond at sunset, the smell of a forest trail after rain."

Brooks described ASPINALL as a master of delay, as illustrated by his long postponement of action by his committee and eventual sidetracking of the Senate-passed bill in favor of one he drafted himself.

And when House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK declined to bring the new bill to the floor under suspension of the rules, thereby permitting no amendments from the floor, Brooks wrote, "ASPINALL'S answer was simple. He went home to Colorado.

"During the 3 remaining weeks before Congress adjourned, no one succeeded in getting any action and the bill was dead."

Brooks does give ASPINALL an accolade for his legislative ability and influence: "He is determined to block passage of the wilderness bill and to substitute his own personal plan for disposition of our public lands.

"If you think that he can't get away with it, if you believe that a single Congressman can't defy both his colleagues and the public at large, you underestimate Mr. ASPINALL."

Amid all the sound and fury, the 66-year-old Congressman avers, nobody has really bothered to analyze what he advocates.

Let's look at the basic points of difference between the original Senate wilderness bill, expected to be approved again soon in substantially the same form by the upper House, and the legislation advocated by ASPINALL last year.

Under the Anderson bill, as already approved by the Senate Interior Committee which is headed by the New Mexico Senator, more than 14.6 million acres of wilderness areas in national forests would be incorporated into a wilderness system immediately.

The Aspinall bill would cut the immediate statutory designation of wilderness areas to less than half that provided by the Senate bill, to about 6.8 million acres of wilderness, wild and canoe areas.

The Senate bill, which contemplates a wilderness system of 61 million acres eventually, would incorporate 83 wilderness areas into the system, with those designated as primitive subject to a 10-year review and modification or elimination.

The Aspinall measure would originally designate 45 areas as wilderness. The primitive areas would be reviewed during a 10-year period but their designation as wilderness would require affirmative action by Congress.

Therein lies the really basic point of difference.

The Senate measure allows a congressional veto over additions to the system by Federal agencies. The House bill would require an act of Congress to add lands to the system in excess of 5,000 acres.

The Senate bill would permit limited minerals prospecting in the system if not incompatible with the wilderness characteristic. The House Interior Committee version would permit mining in wilderness areas for 10 years after establishment of the system, and reopen the lands to prospecting every 25 years.

The Senate bill contains definite restrictions on commercial uses and road developments in wilderness areas. The House committee version would permit limited commercial use. Any livestock grazing now permitted would be continued.

The Senate measure provides that additions of lands to wilderness classification would be subject to a 10-year review by the Secretary of the Interior, with hearings held only if demand exists. Presidential recommendations would become effective after adjournment of Congress unless a resolution of opposition has been adopted by either House of Congress.

The Aspinall proposal would require the Interior Secretary to review wilderness incorporations over a 10-year period, hold local hearings and obtain the views of the Governor, county officials, and Federal agencies with jurisdiction over matters affected.

In addition, the House committee bill declares as a matter of policy that all public lands of the United States are to be managed generally in accordance with the principal of multiple use unless otherwise authorized by law.

These substantial dilutions of the original Wilderness Act, particularly the provision for affirmative action by Congress and the multiple use policy, have led wilderness advocates to the conclusion that ASPINALL is really after a nonwilderness bill which might even menace small areas that are now in wilderness.

The embattled Congressman insists that is not true.

He grants that his proposal would extend present mining operations in wilderness areas for a limited time but said present law would extend mining indefinitely.

"I have tried to achieve a reasonable compromise between two extremes," he says. "On one side are the extreme purist conservationists who want to lock up our resources and create sanctuaries where even man is a trespasser.

"On the other are those who exploit and despoil.

"We (in the House committee) are trying to set aside some 7 million acres in a wilderness state in accordance with what has already been done by administrative action. And these areas would continue to be administered just as they are at present.

"The Senate bill wouldn't be so bad if it had not trespassed on the principle of Government in this country and permitted the executive branch to take over all rights from Congress."

And that is the essence of the Aspinall case on wilderness. He holds doggedly to the view that the administration must recognize that only Congress has the power to set aside public domain and to specify the use of land.

To that end, he wrote President Kennedy at the start of this session suggesting a thorough joint review of all land laws, saying that when the question of congressional-executive relationships has been settled "through enactment of legislation setting up a pattern of future guidelines we can then immediately turn our attention to wilderness preservation."

The President replied, "We are fully mindful and sincerely respect the constitutional prerogative of the Congress to make rules for the management and disposal of public lands," but added that standards of the past are not adequate to problems of the present.

Despite the fact that ASPINALL has been pictured as a one-man holdout against wilderness legislation, he has powerful supporters in his own committee, which backed him 10 to 2 last fall. He has many other allies in Congress.

U.S. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, for example, waged another bitter battle for affirmative congressional action for wilderness designation in the recent Senate hearings.

He contended that it is perilous for the country to permit all wilderness designation to become subject to a Presidential recommendation unless either House of Congress approves a resolution of opposition.

"Such a procedure runs contrary to established practice and represents an abdication of congressional responsibility," said ALLOTT.

The same view was recently expressed by U.S. Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado, a member of ASPINALL's committee, who asked: "Who is WAYNE supposed to represent if he doesn't represent the interests in his own district on the wilderness bill?"

Adding it all up, it looks like a wilderness bill to satisfy both sides will be a long time in evolvement.

And the man who seems to hold the most aces in the deck is the rugged, pokerfaced gentleman from Colorado.

Grassroots Opinion on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have often stated that there is more commonsense in any precinct back in my district in Ohio than can be found in the entire city of Washington. I have never felt that this was a facetious remark. Away from the bureaucratic hypnosis of those who are feathering their own nests, the great body of American citizens has a much better understanding of what we are doing here than most of us would like to admit.

I found the following letter to the editor in the March 29, 1963, edition of the Ashland Times-Gazette of Ashland, Ohio. It was written by Mr. Lyle R. Shull and certainly demonstrates a clarity of thought. It makes very interesting reading.

The article is as follows:

OPPOSES FEDERAL AID

To the EDITOR:

In reply to Dr. Schaefer's recent request for an expression of opinion on the question of whether we should accept Federal aid for our schools, I should like to present the following opinion:

I'm sure our forefathers recognized the need for educating as many people as possible, and yet they didn't establish a Federal education system. Instead they added the 10th amendment to keep the Government from usurping power or entering into new activities other than those necessary to secure our rights. The 10th amendment states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." They wanted all Government activities kept as close as possible to the people.

It is difficult to see how we can read into the simple language of the Constitution a responsibility for education on the part of the Federal Government. The delegation of educational duties to the Federal Government is clearly lacking, yet we are constantly told by Federal aid proponents that it must assume responsibility in this field.

If we ignore the Constitution on this point, how can we defend it against the continuous raids by other special interest groups?

We have seen what Hitler did with German education, and what the Communists are doing in their education by way of indoctrination. Do we want that in America?

Our mistake is in thinking that we can get Federal money without Federal control; yet, the fact is that the courts have clearly established the basic formula for all Federal aid—Federal aid equals Federal control.

Proponents of Federal aid point to past and present Federal programs as examples of no Federal control even though controls of various kinds are clearly present in all programs of Federal aid. What they really mean is that past and present programs do not have controls which are considered to be harmful controls. I could cite examples of how Federal Government pressure is brought to bear in areas where Federal aid is given, by the threat of withholding funds, etc.

Many proponents of Federal aid to education agree that there is a danger of Federal control and that such control would be bad, but they come back with the question, "What else can we do? We've got to get the money from somewhere."

The conclusion that more money is the answer to the problem is based on a superficial premise. Give, for instance, a superior teacher, an average teacher, and a poor teacher each $2,000 per year raise in pay, and see what results you get. You will very likely still have a superior teacher, an average teacher, and a poor teacher.

To Americans, the first solution to most problems is money. Since the source of dollars is now conceived by most Americans to be the Federal Government, many look to it for help.

The Federal Government, however, does not have an inexhaustible supply of money. It has to get its money either directly, from the people by taxation, or indirectly, by printing more money, which is inflation. If the money comes from the people, why bring Washington into the picture? Proponents to Federal aid have an answer to this also. They say it is necessary to equalize educational opportunity throughout the Nation. This sounds like a wonderful and highly moral motive, but let's look at it for what it really is. Their goal: to trim off the high spots and push them down to the level of everyone else is socialism, pure and simple.

Most educators and lay citizens who support Federal aid legislation think the bills in Congress would have equalized educational opportunity in the United States. This is far from being the case, however, and without going into all the ramifications of present legislation, I think we could best describe it as being a wealth redistribution program.

The U.S. Office of Education reports that only 237 school districts out of 40,000 have reached their bonding limits and are unable to finance their needs. Surely it is not necessary to pour millions into the 39,763 school districts who have not yet exhausted their own resources in order to aid the 237 school districts who have exhausted their resources.

Let us be careful about suggesting where we get the funds to do the job. We should not fall into the trap of believing the Federal Government can produce more dollars than the States can. If the States cannot afford more taxes for such an important service such as education, perhaps it is because we have given unlimited taxing power to the Federal Government.

The answer then, might be to bring the taxing power back to the States where the people can say more directly what is most important to them.

LYLE R. SHULL.

ASHLAND, OHIO.

Chicago Ain't Ready for Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Chicago is a large and powerful city in the heartland of our great country. There is no doubt that through its enormous resources and its large newspapers it exerts a tremendous influence upon the economic, political, and cultural life of our Nation, especially the heartland commonly referred to as the Midwest.

Recently an interesting article appeared in the Reporter magazine, March 28 issue, describing Chicago. This article throws a great deal of light upon some of the issues which puzzle all foreigners and not a few Americans. I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reporter Magazine, Mar. 28, 1963]

CHICAGO AIN'T READY FOR REFORM

(By Hal Bruno)

For a city that is self-consciously striving to live down its gangster days, Chicago's aldermanic election last month was a long step backward. Marked by a naked display of the syndicate's political muscle and the professional looking murder of a west side alderman, it was a violent reminder that, under the veneer of reform and respectability, Chicago is still a city where gang type killings occur with regularity and where politics on the ward level can be dirty and dangerous.

Chicago hasn't had an election quite like this one in almost 10 comparatively peaceful years. Politically speaking, the turmoil did not involve Republicans versus Democrats, nor did it involve the Democratic Party as a whole. Instead, it came from intramural ward shenanigans, revealing that within the supposedly monolithic Democratic organization there are islands of autonomy, areas where neighborhood politicians run things as they see fit. The L-shaped first ward, just south and west of the loop, is such an area. In the old days, Alderman J. J. (Bathhouse John) Coughlin and Michael (Hinky Dink) Kenna ran the district as a barony for themselves and the Capone mob. Thirty years later, when many parts of Chicago are as clean as a big city neighborhood can be, the first ward remains in the hands of their heirs.

The first ward includes the downtown hotels and department stores, a small skid row, Chinatown with its pagoda roofs, decaying tenements for Negroes and Mexicans, new highrise housing projects, vast stretches of rubble-strewn prairie cleared for more developments, railroad yards and warehouses, and an old Italian-Greek settlement around Jane Addams' Hull House soon to be cleared for a Chicago campus of the University of Illinois.

The idea of a college campus in the first ward would have tickled Hinky Dink and Bathhouse John. In their day the ward was best known for its levee, a colony of some 200 brothels. Capone established his first headquarters in the Four Deuces on South Wabash Avenue. On election day, voters were paid off in Hinky Dink's saloon at the rate of 50 cents and a schooner of beer for each time they voted. The levee has disappeared, Capone, Hinky Dink, and Bathhouse John are gone, but the gangsters have held onto the first ward as one of their bases for political power in the city council and State legislature. For many years the alderman had been John D'Arco, a Democrat and a member in good standing of the notorious west side bloc. This is a group of Democratic and Republican politicians who effectively block any anticrime legislation that might inconvenience the syndicate. When it comes to politics, the mob is strictly nonpartisan.

Unexpectedly, a couple of months before the election, Alderman D'Arco announced his retirement because of ill health. The new Democratic candidate would be State Senator Anthony J. DeTolve, another member of the west side bloc and a nephew-in-law of Sam (Mooney) Giancana, successor to Tony Accardo as boss of the syndicate. As usual, the first ward Republicans put up a token aldermanic candidate. He was Thomas J. Curran, who pleaded illness and studiously refrained from any active campaigning. For this type of cooperation, the first ward GOP traditionally is rewarded with a seat in the legislature and some patronage jobs.

HOW DO YOU SPELL FIO RITO?

DeTolve was certain to win without even trying, but he made the mistake of refusing to be interviewed by newspapermen and civic groups. He explained that he was just too busy, which prompted Chicago's American to label him "Anthony J. (Busy Busy) DeTolve," making him the butt of this year's campaign. He still would have won, but 4 nights before the election the ward's Democratic precinct captains were summoned to a meeting in a Loop hotel. DeTolve announced he was quitting the race and their new candidate was Michael J. Fio Rito, a 53-year-old lawyer and decorated war veteran who had grown up in the ward but was a political unknown.

The stunned precinct captains—pronounced "presint" in Chicagoese—were told that DeTolve didn't want to "embarrass" them. The popular theory is that DeTolve had brought too much attention to ward affairs, causing the publicity shy syndicate to recommend that he forget about being an alderman and remain a State senator. Commenting on DeTolve's resignation and Fio Rito's substitution, the Chicago Daily News concluded: "If we knew root and all of this, we'd know the answer to all the questions about the mysterious half-world of Chicago."

Fio Rito's unexpected candidacy brought more attention and posed some real problems. For one thing, he lived in suburban Wilmette and wasn't even a resident of Chicago or the ward, which supposedly made him ineligible to vote or to be an alderman. But the candidate revealed that he had established a legal residence more than a year before at an uncle's home on the northwest side, which satisfied the requirements of a year's residence in the city, and had moved into the Conrad Hilton Hotel the previous month, which gave him the necessary 30 days in the ward. The Republicans—except, of course, those in the first ward, who were not planning to win this election anyhow—did not accept Fio Rito's explanations; Sheriff Richard B. Ogilvie, the only top GOP officeholder of any consequence, discovered obvious alterations on the hotel's affidavit of permanent residents who are eligible to vote. The names of Fio Rito and his wife had been added at the end, out of alphabetical order and with a different typewriter from the one used for the other 57 names on the list. Ogilvie started a fruitless search for that typewriter. Though an election clerk admitted making a "human error" by signing the Fio Rito's registration records after the legal deadline, the head of the Democratic controlled election board insisted he was powerless to act. He said it was up to the city council, as a legislative body, to decide whether Fio Rito should be seated, if and when he won the election.

The idea of Chicago's city council refusing to seat a Democratic alderman is preposterous, so the only remaining problem was for the first ward precinct captains to instruct their voters on how to write in Fio Rito's name, since it was too late to change the voting machines and paper ballots. For the next 3 days and nights, the "magnanimous foot soldiers," as De Tolve called the captains, trooped across the ward, explaining in Spanish, Italian, Greek, Chinese—and even English—how to write "Michael Fio Rito," or something close to it.

Then more opposition sprang up from another last-minute candidate, Mrs. Florence Scala, a peppery little housewife who had led the losing fight against locating the University of Illinois in the Hull House neighborhood. Republican Sheriff Ogilvie expressed his frustration by sending his political workers into the first ward to help Mrs. Scala's write-in campaign.

On a hazy election day, February 28, with temperatures averaging a damp and penetrating 10°, some 786,000 Chicago voters—slightly more than 45 percent of those eligible—were "delivered" at the polls. Down in the first ward, the pollwatchers almost outnumbered the voters in some precincts. Despite these precautions, there was a flash of the old Hinky Dink touch: an amazing number of voters asked for pink affidavit forms to declare themselves illiterate. This meant that a Republican and a Democratic judge could step into the booth and "assist" in casting their ballot. The Democrats had nothing to fear from the first ward's Republicans, and Mrs. Scala's supporters hadn't time to register as judges. So each self-declared illiterate was, in fact, a write-in vote for Fio Rito.

To no one's surprise, the final count was 9,424 for Fio Rito; 1,316 for Curran, the passive Republican; 1,050 for Mrs. Scala; and 402 votes by people who didn't know that De Tolve had retired. A lone Republican alderman attempted to challenge Fio Rito's seating in the council, and Sheriff Ogilvie has called for a grand jury investigation of the whole thing, but not much is expected to come from these protests. In a letter to the Cook County State's attorney (a Democrat), Ogilvie bitterly charged: "There is no more flagrant example of crime syndicate interference with the free election processes than exists in the first ward, and this goes for both parties."

RACE REVIVAL

A few miles south, in the fifth ward, the regular Democratic organization was cast in the role of a force for liberalism and good government. Independent Alderman Leon M. Despres, who frequently opposes Mayor Richard J. Daley's program in the city council, had full support of the ward's Democratic organization in his bid for a third term. The reason is that Despres is a proven votegetter in a South Side district that includes the liberal and racially mixed Hyde Park neighborhood, the University of Chicago, and the Negro slums of Woodlawn. The area long has had a tradition of electing "rebels"; among its previous aldermen were former Eisenhower aid Robert E. Merriam and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Despres' opponent was Chauncey Eskridge, a lawyer who campaigned on the premise that the ward's Negro majority should be represented by a Negro alderman. The campaign took on the aspects of a revival meeting, complete with rock-n'-roll bands, parades, rallies, and plenty of outside interference. Most of it came from Negro aldermen in surrounding wards under the control of Chicago's Negro political boss, Congressman WILLIAM DAWSON. The Dawson faction had long resented the fifth ward's independence,

and with safe contests in their own wards they were able to send their precinct workers into the fifth to help Eskridge. Despres counterattacked by running on his impressive record as a leader in the fight for fair housing practices and for an end to school segregation in the Negro ghetto, and also on the novel idea that an alderman should be chosen on the basis of ability rather than race.

The fifth ward voters rejected Eskridge's racebaiting campaign and reelected Despres by a huge margin, 15,828 to 2,479. It was a compliment to voter intelligence and another demonstration of how precinct captains get out the vote. Without the support of the fifth ward regular Democratic organization, even Leon Despres could have been a loser.

Throughout the city, the more than 4,000 Democratic precinct captains earned their city payroll jobs by delivering huge majorities for most of the organization candidates. For Chicago's jobless Republicans it was a painfully familiar story and another defeat at the hands of Mayor Daley's powerful Democratic machine. The colorless GOP won only 4 of the 50 city council seats. In six wards there will be a runoff on April 2 because a multitude of candidates prevented anyone getting a majority. The remaining 40 seats went to 39 Democrats and to Independent Despres. So there will be no change in the rubberstamp performance of Chicago's city council, which has surrendered much of its power to a strong mayor.

In the primary, Mayor Daley was unopposed for nomination to a third 4-year term; but he still pulled some 395,000 votes. His Republican opponent, former State's Attorney Benjamin S. Adamowski, got only 87,000 votes against lightweight opposition that included the eccentric candidate Lar (America First) Daly, making his 20th unsuccessful try for elective office. The difference in the Republican and Democratic primary turnout is an indication of what to expect when Daley and Adamowski face each other in the April 2 election.

SAME OLD CHICAGO

Chicago was about to settle back for a fairly routine mayoralty campaign when, 2 days after the aldermanic election, the body of Alderman Benjamin S. Lewis, a Negro, was found in his new 24th ward headquarters. Lewis was lying face down behind a desk, his arms outstretched and handcuffed, with three holes from a 32-caliber automatic neatly placed in the back of his head. His murder had all the trademarks of a professional job by a syndicate "hit man."

The 53-year-old Negro alderman had been considered by many to be future congressional material and was the absolute political boss of the 24th ward, a 99-percent Negro neighborhood. A Democrat with an independent bent, Lewis had not joined the other Negro aldermen in the attempt to invade the fifth ward. In fact, he often had opposed the Negro political leadership and had ambitions to become the Dawson of the West Side. Lewis had breezed to a 12-to-1 victory for his third term in the city council. Once the stronghold of Chicago's Jewish politicians, the 24th ward had turned into a Negro slum in the 1950's. Lewis, starting as a lowly precinct captian, led the quiet struggle to transfer the power to a Negro political organization. The absentee white politicians, who moved out when the Negroes first moved in, gradually relinquished their organization and patronage to Lewis, including the ward's lucrative insurance and real estate business.

Though police everywhere, and in Chicago in particular, have an almost zero batting average for solving gang murders, investigators plunged into the 24th ward's morass of vice, narcotics, and gambling for evidence of a motive. They are searching Lewis's personal life, political problems, and insurance and real estate dealings. Thus far, it is murder by persons unknown for reasons unknown.

It has been a decade since an important Chicago politician was assassinated so brazenly. In 1953, Republican State Representative Clem Graver, an associate of the West Side bloc, was kidnaped in front of his home and never seen again. The previous year, Republican Charles Gross was gunned down on a west side street after refusing to heed a syndicate warning to bow out of the 31st ward political picture. The murder of Gross, who ran a soft-drink business and dabbled in handbook operations, touched off a crime and politics investigation that failed to produce any indictments but washed everyone's dirty linen in public.

The slaying of Alderman Lewis produced a surprisingly slight shock in a city that thought it had gained a measure of respectability since the still unsolved Gross murder and Graver kidnaping. Civic boosters say is is not significant—that it is an isolated tragedy that could happen anywhere once in 10 years. Critics answer that the political nonviolence and peace of the past decade was only a lucky break, caused mainly by the politicians' staying in line. Whatever the reason behind the Lewis murder and the switch of candidates in the syndicate's first ward, this election has been a throwback, recalling for many the words of an alderman who once boasted: "Chicago ain't ready for reform."

President Kennedy and Our Shameful Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, especially with respect to Cuba, is about as great an appeaser as was Prime Minister Chamberlain of Great Britain during the period of Hitler's rise.

Three excellent articles, two by Henry J. Taylor, which appeared in the New York World Telegram on April 5 and 8, respectively, and the third by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in Sunday's New York Herald Tribune, specify these dangerous avenues of appeasement. The articles follow:

[From the New York World Telegram, Apr. 5, 1963]

CUBA: A DEBACLE IN THINKING

(By Henry J. Taylor)

British General Ritchie later relieved by Montgomery, was defeated by Marshal Rommel in the desert battle at Knightsbridge, leading to the fateful fall of Tobruk.

Ritchie's headquarters were camouflaged in great disarray behind a mesa in the Libyan sands. I traveled there to see him with doughty U.S. General Scott. Ritchie, crouching over the maps, showed Scott his field position.

"What should I do?" he asked.

"Well, General," Scott replied, "I don't know what you should do. But I know this. You're going to have to do something different from what you're doing now, because you're getting the hell beat out of you."

So it is with our policy toward Castro, built along the lines of a leaky beanbag.

Who would have dreamed that mighty America could have come full circle? In one's wildest imagination could anyone conceive a foreign policy that could arrive at such a dismal, defunct and dangerous end?

Here we said, as the minimum demand of the American people, that "a Communist state will not be tolerated in the Western Hemisphere," that "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere," that the Castro cancer would defeat our security throughout Latin America and even pledging to the ransomed freedom fighters that their bloodied pennant will be returned to them in a freed Cuba.

And what happens? We end up protecting, guaranteeing and solidifying Red Castro and the Soviet lodgement there with all the power of our great Air Force and the U.S. Navy.

If we have a foreign policy—or, rather, if what we have can be called a policy—you might as well call humpty dumpty the Rock of Gibraltar.

This is not a policy; it is a debacle in thinking. The results are cumulative, like cancer is cumulative, finally spreading beyond correction. And who can deny the frightful cost of historic errors which quickly become impossible of correction?

That's the really lethal damage in our wrongheaded thinkers' manipulation of the news. By employing an acute sense of timing, such distractions as the President's appearance before the ransomed freedom fighters in Miami, the grim failures can be and are compounded one after the other along a retreat road never made clear to the American people.

With each one, as in the case of the Bay of Pigs and then our October 22 Munich, the choice of corrections narrows. It becomes limited to a choice of bad choices among worse choices.

Thus, mile by sandy mile, President Kennedy has negotiated our position downhill.

Step by step, as the resulting situation has closed in (which is the purpose of the enemy), our Government is forced into the inevitable alibi: that to do something different from what it next proposes would be worse than what it now must do.

Then that bad choice is called wisdom. Accordingly, we end up what we're doing now. Knightsbridge to Tobruk to where?

A humpty dumpty policy is not good enough for the world's leading power nor will it allow us to remain that. There are always barbarians outside the walls.

No leading nation, no matter how productive or apparently powerful, can live through our incredible behavior in a decisive area like Cuba without correction. Either we correct our fantastic blunders, as Montgomery corrected Ritchie's—some way, somehow—or Rommel in the form of the U.S.S.R. will correct them for us.

Politicians skin our ears with baroque oratory, cliche piled on cliche, announcing that the United States must meet its world responsibilities. Yet the first responsibility of a government is to supply security to its own citizens by correcting its own failures.

We talk of healing the world when we are not securely governing ourselves. We're giants when pronouncing of the universe and pygmies in our own performance.

In tragic truth, Castro's Russian masters have outthought us, outmaneuvered us and cast us out of control of the situation besides. How else—how else—could we now find ourselves forced to order a wrongway blockade against fighters for freedom instead of against Castro?

[From the New York World Telegram, Apr. 8, 1963]

A SHAMEFUL HOUR IN U.S. HISTORY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

We might as well turn our Cuban policy over to Alice in Wonderland and be done with it. Has Lewis Carroll been in charge all along?

"Curiouser and curiouser," cried Alice. Well, it is.

Humpty-Dumpty fell off the wall. That's us at the Bay of Pigs, and again in our October 22 Munich. All the king's horses and all the king's men marched up the hill and marched down again.

The President, in a fantastic action still unexplained, lifted his Cuban blockade in less than 30 days. And now in our Humpty-Dumpty policy we have ordered a blockade against freedom fighters instead of against a Soviet lodgement 90 miles from our shores. Could anyone this side of Lewis Carroll dream up a policy that ended up placing the United States in such a position?

Down came the policy baby, cradle and all. Surely, that's what happened to our leadership throughout Latin America with echoes of the bounce-bounce in Canada, France, Great Britain, and throughout the NATO alliance.

"I can't remember things," said Alice in Wonderland to the caterpillar, "and I don't keep the same size for 10 minutes together."

How long does the New Frontier's interest in the freedom of the tyrannized Cuban people remain the same size?

And does the New Frontier remember that "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere?" Kennedy has been negotiating about it ever since.

"Your red majesty shouldn't purr so loud," Alice can be quoted. "You woke me out of, oh, such a nice dream."

"Wake up," said her sister.

"Mind the volcano," said the queen. (Was Senator KEATING coaching Lewis Carroll from the wings?)

"What volcano?" said the king.

"I know what you're thinking about," insisted Tweedledum, "but it isn't so, no how."

"Ditto, ditto," cried Tweedledee. (The purpose of the manipulated news policy is to speak with one voice.)

"Collar that dormouse," they all shouted. "Off with his whiskers."

But the whole court was in confusion and by the time they had settled down again the whiskered dormouse had eluded them.

Alice grew smaller as she ate the wrong side of the mushroom. (What happens to us when we trust Khrushchev's promise? At Geneva, in Cuba, anywhere?)

Carroll has Alice much concerned about mirrors and her image. He wrote, of course, one whole book about the looking glass.

Moreover, Alice has to run faster and faster all the time just to stay in the same place.

If that isn't the manipulated news performance, what is? And the intent is to make it possible for our public, like the White Queen, "to believe six impossible things before breakfast."

Alice has said: "I don't know what you mean by 'glory.'"

Humpty-Dumpty replied: "Of course you don't—till I tell you. When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

But the tragic parallel with Alice in Wonderland must end there. The result is ominous.

With the repudiation of our most solemn pledges through our abandonment of Cuba, can we honestly say—in the New Frontier's eloquent cliche—that America is "in a worldwide battle for the minds and hearts of men?"

It is a moral fraud, and so recognized abroad, for our officials ever to mouth these words in the light of our Cuban performance.

Throughout all times men have tried to be free. For this the bravest and best men on earth have fought and died.

The heroes of freedom—there are many, many Cubans who qualify—have always and everywhere been the future soul builders and the greatest idols in the world.

We desert their struggle only if we admit to our own moral degradation. And what is morally wrong can never be politically right.

The problem is nonpartisan; the effect is complete. However we arrived where we are makes no difference. We are in the midst of a shameful, shameful hour in the history of the United States.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 7, 1963]

SUPPORTING CUBAN RAIDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The more the administration explains its command to the anti-Castro Cubans to stop their attacks on Castro-Soviet forces, the more it seems to be a hasty response which had not been thought through.

President Kennedy is as eager as others to see a free Cuba and to get Soviet troops out of the hemisphere. Obviously he very earnestly believes—or at least instinctively feels—that intervening to prevent the anti-Castro, anti-Soviet Cuban raids is the best way to do both.

But is it? At the very least we ought to take a good questioning look at the arguments the administration advances to justify its policy and to weigh the case on the other side. There are four main contentions the President and others make for trying to erect a wall between the attackers and the Soviet ships and troops.

Argument 1: That the anti-Castro Cuban attacks on Soviet-manned installations will make it harder for us to persuade Khrushchev to withdraw the Soviet troops.

Counterargument: Asserted but unproved. It can just as reasonably be argued that if we insure the Soviets against any hazards for their troops in Cuba, there is absolutely no incentive for Khrushchev to withdraw them. Furthermore, at his last press conference Mr. Kennedy announced that 4,000 Soviet troops were removed in March, the first withdrawals since last November. The raids were in March. The withdrawals were in March. Where is there any basis for the argument that the raids prevent the withdrawals?

Argument 2: That the anti-Castro raids should be stopped because they involve risks for the United States.

Counterargument: True, there are risks. Castro might go berserk and attack the United States instead of the anti-Castro Cubans. Soviet forces might get involved. But we aren't going to help insure the freedom of nations and people who want their freedom without some risks. We are taking greater risks in Vietnam today where the stakes are less than in Cuba.

The nation which has taken provocative action and the greatest risk is the Soviet Union. It did so by turning Cuba into a Russian military base. Is it really in the interests of the United States to provide the Soviet Union with a U.S. protected sanctuary for its troops in Cuba? Should we guarantee the Kremlin against its own risk-taking?

Argument three: That we must not let the "reckless" Cuban refugees dictate U.S. foreign policy.

Counterargument: Right. But isn't there a corollary? If we are going to leave the overthrow of Castro to the Cubans, how can we assert the right to tell them how not to do it?

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, raised this question on the floor of the Senate last week: "Is there not something to be said for those people who are willing to risk their lives to strike a blow for freedom—the kind of freedom we would like to see restored in Cuba?"

Senator WAYNE MORSE replied: "Not a thing"—primarily on the ground that U.S. foreign policy must not be "run by Cuban exiles." But since spokesmen for the administration have said there is no evidence the raids have taken off from American shores, isn't it the United States which is trying to run anti-Castro Cuban policy, not the anti-Castro Cubans who are trying to run U.S. policy?

Argument four: That the hit-and-run raids don't weaken Castro, might help him.

Counterargument: The anti-Castro Cubans are not just attacking Castro. They are attacking a foreign power—Russia, which has put its troops into Cuba to fasten the Communist tyranny on the Cubans. Why should we protect the Soviet troops from the consequences of their presence in Cuba?

How do we know these raids have no future? Castro started by doing less.

The Imperative Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater problem facing the Nation and the world today than the prospect of unlimited nuclear proliferation. The continuing arms race already presents a grim and foreboding picture, and as the nuclear club expands the balance of terror becomes ever more precarious.

President Kennedy, in his March 21, 1963, press conference, said:

> Personally I am haunted by the feeling that by 1970, unless we are successful, there may be 10 nuclear powers instead of 4, and by 1975, 15 or 20. With all the history of war, and the human race's history has been a good deal more war than peace, with nuclear weapons distributed all through the world, and available, and the strong reluctance of any people to accept defeat, I see the possibility in the 1970's of the President of the United States having to face a world in which 15 or 20 or 25 nations may have these weapons. I regard that as the greatest possible danger and hazard.

The road to an effective treaty banning nuclear testing and to a meaningful program of arms control and reduction is without question difficult. We are confronted with opponents who are all too often intransigent. But I believe that we must persevere in our efforts to secure such a treaty.

As a disinguished group of American scientists reported in an open letter appearing in this morning's Washington Post:

> Careful studies by the formost experts in the United States and by the President's advisers on national security, including those in the Defense Department, have furnished the conclusion that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test ban treaty is considerably more than the risk that such a treaty might be violated by secret testing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this very thoughtful letter and the excellent article by Mr. Max Freedman, which appeared recently in the Washington Post, deserve our attention, and I commend them to our colleagues for their consideration.

The letter and article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1963]

A COMMUNICATION: STATEMENT ON THE TEST-BAN TREATY

In view of recent controversy concerning the desirability of concluding a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, we wish to make the following statement in support of the efforts of the U.S. Government to conclude such a treaty as soon as it can be negotiated.

Our primary reason for support lies in the fact that a test-ban treaty is in the best interests of the United States and of world peace. A treaty would reduce the speed of the present arms race, inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers, reduce the likelihood of nuclear war, and prevent the extension of the hazards of fallout. We therefore commend the President of the United States for his sincere attempt to reach a workable agreement with the Soviet Union on a test ban, and urge that Members of the U.S. Congress and of the general public consider the question of the test-ban treaty in the light of scientific fact and rational argument rather than in terms of partisan politics.

Unfortunately, public debate on the issue has been confused in recent weeks by some Members of Congress and by public figures who have attacked the test-ban treaty by spreading a completely false view of the test-ban situation. They also would appear to be operating on the fallacious assumption that American security can best be maintained by unlimited development of our nuclear weapons capability no matter what the other nations may be free to do in this regard. The attackers have failed to recognize the clear fact that once the overkill capabilities of the Soviet Union and the United States have reached their present level, and hardened missile bases are in place, making a successful disarming attack impossible for either side, an increase in nuclear capacity by one side or the other does not upset the balance of deterrence.

DETERRENCE REMAINS

Even though we probably possess between three to eight times as much intercontinental nuclear weapons capability as the Soviet Union, we would still have little chance of escaping an incredibly destructive retaliation were we to strike first with our strategic force. Since the smaller Soviet force is enough to deter us from a nuclear attack on the Soviets, a considerable change in force levels would still leave us with more than sufficient force to deter the Soviets from making a nuclear attack on us.

The opponents of the test ban treaty also base their argument on the fallacious assumption that any attempt on our part to negotiate with the Soviet Union means that we are taking a soft political line and making dangerous concessions. The treaty opponents therefore consider any lowering of the number of onsite inspections by the United States simply as a sign of weakness and of yielding to the advantage of the Soviet Union, rather than as realistic negotiation to improve national security. In fact, during the period since the testban discussions began in 1958, detection techniques have been rapidly improving and may be expected to improve still further. It is now possible to detect many of the explosions within a given country by stations outside that country, and the number of onsite inspections required for checking the identification of earthquakes versus explosions has been greatly reduced. Research has also shown that there are many fewer earthquakes in the Soviet Union than was formerly thought, thus making a reduction in the possibility of their being confused with nuclear tests.

The strategy of the opponents of a treaty is to exaggerate the risks of clandestine testing and to minimize the risks of a continuing nuclear arms race. Among the most flagrant violations of fact which they have publicized in these matters are the recent statements by Dr. Edward Teller that a test ban agreement "would be virtually unpoliced" and "would not interfere with Russian progress," and Senator DODD's claim that the test ban policy of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

MISSTATEMENT CHARGED

In making this claim, Senator DODD is completely misstating the facts as set forth by responsible Department of Defense officials. If the Soviets learned more than we did in the 1961–62 testing and narrowed the gap between us, it was because they had more to learn. There is every reason to believe that they would have narrowed the gap even more rapidly had there not been a moratorium and had there been continuous testing on both sides after 1958. Conversely, if we had been able to conclude a test ban treaty in 1959, the Russian tests of 1961–62 would not have taken place and we would still have our great superiority of nuclear weapons technology. By no stretch of the imagination could these tests have been carried out secretly underground.

The direct advantages to the United States of a test ban treaty are these:

1. Dependable assurance that no atmospheric testing, which is the really important kind, is taking place.

2. Reasonable assurance that underground testing of small nuclear weapons is not taking place.

What assurance do we have that in the event of a test ban treaty the Soviet Union would not conduct secret underground tests?

Even though a single small test might be concealed by being confused with an earthquake if the test were conducted in a region of frequent earthquake occurrences, any significance series of tests would be almost impossible to conceal.

RISK IS EMPHASIZED

It is extremely unlikely that the Soviet Union would be willing to risk the breakdown of the treaty for the marginal gain they might achieve by testing explosions small enough to escape detection. It is important to recall that American nuclear weapons experts insisted that underground testing was of little value for military purposes when, in 1961, our testing was temporarily limited to underground explosions. We have additional assurance in the fact that the Soviet Union has agreed to three onsite inspections should suspicious indications of underground testing be discovered by the detection system of the United States and the United Kingdom, and is willing to permit a number of automatic seismic stations on Soviet territory.

The Soviets surprised us by starting big atmospheric tests in 1961 when we thought at that time they would continue negotiations for a test-ban treaty. The opponents of a present treaty now claim that this means the Soviets broke a test ban agreement in 1961. On this basis they warn against entering another agreement. It is too often forgotten that there was no test ban agreement (much less a treaty) in 1961; and that President Eisenhower on December 29, 1959, terminated the 1-year informal moratorium by announcing, "The voluntary moratorium on testing will expire on December 31." Even though the Soviets and most other nations have broken treaties, a test ban treaty would be very different from a mere cessation of tests, particularly if adhered to by an increasing number of nations, because it would be in the interest of the United States and the Soviet Union to abide by it. To be on the safe side, our developments and preparations would continue as far as possible without testing, and there should be no doubt that American testing would be resumed if the Soviets should break the treaty by again resuming tests in the atmosphere.

Even if the treaty should be abrogated after a time or should fail to develop into a world test ban because of the recalcitrance of France or China, it would not have interfered with our nuclear development appreciably more than the Soviet. The treaty would emphasize above all the common interest of the United States and the Soviet Union in trying to avoid nuclear war.

In summary, the test ban treaty, as proposed, will stop atmospheric testing as long as the treaty is in effect. It will leave some uncertainty about very small tests (one ten-thousandth the size of the H-bomb) but could reasonably be expected to deter the Soviets from even small-scale cheating (a) because it would teach them relatively little, (b) because of the serious risk of being caught and (c) because there are good reasons for the Soviets to want the treaty to function.

Careful studies by the foremost experts in the United States and by the President's advisers on national security, including those in the Defense Department, have furnished the conclusion that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test-ban treaty is considerably more than the risk that such a treaty might be violated by secret testing. We support the President in this conclusion and believe that once the Members of Congress and the people of the United States are aware of the realities of our present situation and of the facts of the test-ban case, that they too will support the President in his effort to find answers to the greatest question before the world today, the question of survival.

Dr. Bernard Feld, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. David Inglis, Argonne National Laboratories, Argonne, Ill.; Dr. James Watson, Department of Biology, Harvard University; Dr. Bruno Rossi, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, MIT; Dr. Donald Glaser, Department of Physics, University of California; Dr. Hans Bethe, Department of Physics, Cornell University; Dr. Freeman Dyson, Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton University; Dr. Francis Low, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. K. T. Bainbridge, Department of Physics, Harvard University.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1963]

IN PERSPECTIVE: HUMPHREY AND DISARMAMENT

(By Max Freedman)

Without Senator HUMPHREY the debate on disarmament would proceed against hopeless odds. He has been President Kennedy's chief supporter in Congress for a prudent and responsible treaty. When Mr. Eisenhower was President he gave the same kind of courageous support to a Republican administration. It is not the least of his merits that he believes that disarmament, like defense policy, should be above mere partisan skirmishing. In view of this record he is entitled to a thoughtful hearing when he makes a major statement on the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

Yet this careful examination of his proposals is precisely what has been lacking. It almost seems as if the cynical principle is being followed of ignoring Senator HUMPHREY's points because one cannot answer them. Some time ago he delivered an elaborately documented analysis of the disarmament deadlock but his address met with little response in the Senate and with only scattered attention in the country. This surely is shabby treatment for a Senator who is carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty.

It may therefore be some contribution to the public debate if one summarizes the main points which Senator HUMPHREY is now making.

He points out that in 1958 it was the belief of both Russian and American scientists that there would have to be an international inspection system with about 180 control posts, of which 19 would be in the Soviet Union. It would have taken between 4 to 6 years to install this system; scores of international technicians would have been included in the project; the system would have cost $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain. Today no such system needs to be established at all.

The United States, like Russia, can now identify nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. If Russia would agree to a treaty outlawing such tests, the risks of successful evasion or cheating would form no problem. The real concern is with tests conducted underground where they may be harder to detect or may be confused with earthquakes.

Senator HUMPHREY reports that in the past 5 years the United States has greatly improved its ability to identify earthquakes in Russia. It is a generous figure to suggest that these unidentified occurrences in any one year will be "only a few dozen at most." Under the British-American treaty each of these mysterious events would be subject to inspection. From a scientific or technical standpoint, the problem of security is wholly manageable. Russia would soon learn this fact if it were willing to give the proposed treaty a fair trial.

Senator HUMPHREY asked the Kennedy administration to make available the results of studies of underground events in Russia from 1958 through 1962. He has quoted "a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence" as saying that the United States has the present ability to monitor a test ban agreement with full safeguards for American security.

Under these new arrangements it would be necessary to supplement these monitoring devices by inspections inside Russia carried out by inspectors who could be accompanied by Soviet observers. The inspected area would be small and would be located by using the records of at least four detection stations. There would be no more than seven inspections each year. The treaty would lapse and the United States would be free to resume its tests if Russia refused to agree to any suggested inspection or was caught in a secret test.

Since the 1960 campaign Mr. Kennedy has shown much more eagerness than the general public to reach a disarmament agreement with Russia, above all on a test ban treaty. The public has tended to view the Geneva talks with resigned apathy as a meaningless charade. Yet all the time hard-working and often misunderstood officials have been closing the gap between the Russian and American positions, while always striving for a treaty that would be endorsed by two-thirds of the Senate. It is high time that we realize that American public indifference is very helpful to Russia in resisting a treaty. For Russia can twist and equivocate at Geneva without being called to account by a bored American press.

The Crisis of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on the voter registration drive in Leflore County, Miss., which appeared in the New York Times on April 6, 1963. This article describes the violence, threats and intimidation which have marked the fight for constitutional rights in Greenwood, Miss.

I have long been concerned over the stiuation in Leflore County. Last August the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee started its campaign in Leflore County to have Negroes register to vote. This campaign has met with extreme hostility which, as the New York Times article points out, has broken out in violence. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is dedicated to the fundamental principles of our democracy. These students deserve our highest admiration, for they are truly fighting in the frontline of liberty.

Afer the campaign to register Negroes began, the Leflore County officials announced that they would not distribute U.S. agricultural surpluses. Since over 90 percent of the surplus food which the county receives free from the Federal Government is distributed to Negroes, this was an obvious move to retaliate against the registration campaign. When this was brought to my attention, I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to take appropriate action. After the Department of Agriculture announced that it would distribute the food if necessary, the county officials finally gave in and began to distribute the food.

The New York Times article also relates the many instances of violence against those who have participated with great courage in the registration drive. As soon as it was clear that violence was being used to stop the registration drive, I urged the Department of Justice to intervene. I am happy that the Department of Justice has filed a suit in Greenwood, Miss.

Mississippi State Representative Karl Wiesenburg of Jackson County, Miss., in an article for the Pascagoula (Miss.) Chronicle stated the problem well when he said:

States rights must be coexistent with State responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, in order to further the understanding of the crisis of democracy in Mississippi I commend the following article to all my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1963]

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY IS TURNED INTO MAJOR BATTLEGROUND OF NEGROES' CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHT—TENSION BUILDS UP AFTER GUN ATTACK; VOTER-REGISTRATION DRIVE IS INTENSIFIED AFTER LEADER IS WOUNDED BY VOLLEY

(By Claude Sitton)

GREENWOOD, MISS., April 5.—The night of February 28 was mild with a hint of early spring as the black sedan rolled westward along U.S. Route 82 across the Mississippi Delta.

One of its three Negro occupants recalled later that as a string of traffic faded to the rear near Itta Bena, a car that had trailed them from Greenwood pulled alongside. Two white men sat in front, one in back.

Bursts of gunfire rang out. Thirteen .45-caliber bullets stitched a ragged seam of fingersized holes along the sedan's left side and one copper-jacketed slug burned into the drivers shoulder to within an inch of his spine.

The wounded man, James Travis of Jackson, Miss., recovered. He has since returned here to his voter registration work as a field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

THREE WHITES ARRESTED

Five days after the shooting Sheriff John Ed Cothron of Leflore County arrested three Greenwood whites, who were charged with felonious assault. Two are well-known citizens—William H. Greenlee, a petroleum products wholesaler, and Wesley Kersey, service manager for an industrial company. The third is a juvenile.

This shooting incident, the first of several, set off a string of events that has turned Leflore County into a major battleground in the Southern civil rights struggle.

Mr. Travis' companions in the car were Robert P. Moses, a field secretary of the student committee and director of the Council of Federated Organizations, and Randolph Blackwell, field director of the voter education project.

The council, known as Cofo, is a coalition of Negro organizations that began a concerted voter registration drive in the Delta last summer. The voter education project, established last year by the southern regional council, has provided funds for Cofo's work.

The attack on the three men set off an angry flurry of activity in the project's headquarters at 5 Forsyth Street in Atlanta.

BIG CAMPAIGN PLANNED

Wiley A. Branton, director of the project, announced a saturation campaign to register Leflore's Negroes, who make up about 64 percent of the county's population of 47,142.

"The State of Mississippi," he asserted, "has repeatedy thrown down a gauntlet at the feet of would-be Negro voters, not only by the discriminatory practices of the registrar, but also by the economic pressures, threats, coercions, physical violence and death to Negroes seeking the right to vote," he said.

"The time has come for us to pick up the gauntlet. Leflore County has elected itself as the testing ground for democracy and we are accordingly meeting the challenge there."

Leflore County lies on the eastern bulge of the Delta, a football-shaped expanse of fertile fields, pasture lands and swampy stands of hardwood. This alluvial plain, bounded roughly by the rolling loops of the Mississippi and Yazoo Rivers, stretches flat as a table for 200 miles between Memphis and Vicksburg.

The tree-screened beauty of its Greek-revival mansions contrasts with the weather-beaten squalor of the shacks of clapboard and tarpaper that stand amid the long brown furrows that lie waiting for the cotton and soybean seed.

In recent years, increasingly efficient machines and chemicals have revolutionized agriculture here.

NEED FOR LABOR CUT

But mechanization has slashed the need for labor by more than half. Many Negroes have moved away but many still remain.

Greenwood is the State headquarters for the Citizens' Council, a militantly segregationist organization founded in 1954 in adjoining Sunflower County.

The John Birch Society followed the council to Greenwood.

Many whites consider the voter registration campaign a Communist plot. Mayor Charles E. Sampson, a loyal member of the Citizens' Council, echoed their sentiments last week when he said that "the only purpose of these agitators is to follow the Communist line of fomenting racial violence."

There are a number of whites who disagree with this attitude and who contend that some compromise must be made with the demands of the Negroes. But they are afraid to speak out publicly.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee began a registration campaign last August in Leflore County. This committee, which grew out of the 1960 sit-in demonstrations against lunch counter segregation, has headquarters in Atlanta.

Two young Delta Negroes were designated as field secretaries for the project—Willie B. Peacock, of Charleston, Miss., and Samuel T. Block, of Cleveland, Miss.

A tall, gaunt youth of 25, Mr. Block became the chief target of white animosity in the campaign's early stages. He initially called attention to himself by asserting that he had been beaten by whites at a local automobile parts business. This drew the first in a long string of denials from whites, who said that they had seen no bruises on him.

The Leflore voter drive met little success last year, according to Mr. Moses. The 28-year-old Negro, who holds a masters degree in philosophy, left his job as a mathematics teacher at the Horace Mann School in New York in July 1961, to come to Mississippi as a field secretary for the student committee.

FEW ABLE TO QUALIFY

His explanation for the poor showing is the same one repeated privately by white officials; under present State voting regulations, few if any Negroes can pass the test.

Most whites of voting age were registered when the more stringent regulations went into effect.

Mrs. Martha T. Lamb, Leflore County circuit court clerk and registrar, said she did not know how many Negroes were registered because records were not kept by race. She and six other Mississippi registrars are defendants in a broad-scale legal attack on the voting laws that is now before a Federal court.

The Justice Department, which brought the suit, states in its complaint that there are 10,274 whites and 13,567 Negroes of voting age in Leflore County. Approximately 95.5 percent of the whites and 1.9 percent of the Negroes are registered.

The suit contends that white political supremacy is maintained by regulations that include the following:

Registrants must be able to read, write, and interpret any section of the Mississippi Constitution to the registrar's satisfaction;

Registrants must be of good moral character, as determined by the registrar; and

Names of applicants and their addresses must be published for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the county.

SAYS IT APPLIES TO ALL

"It applies equally to all, white and black alike," said a member of the county board of supervisors with a grin in defending publication of the names.

Despite their dismal prospects, Negroes began applying for registration in increasing numbers in February.

The key factor in the increased applications for registration, according to Mr. Moses and a number of white observers, was the growing hunger among the field hands and the refusal of the county to relieve it by distributing surplus food provided by the Federal Government.

Until last fall, Leflore gave the food to public welfare recipients all year long. It expanded the program during the winter months to include all needy persons.

The county spent only $38,000 of its $2,095,874 budget for the 1961–62 fiscal year to store and distribute the food to 27,000 persons, about 90 percent of whom were Negroes.

MALNUTRITION REPORTED

But the board of supervisors voted to drop the program for nonwelfare recipients last fall. They explained recently that it had cost more than the county could afford and was not needed because of a bumper crop.

Four Justice Department lawyers who toured the county earlier this month reported that they had found widespread evidence of malnutrition.

Among the cases they describe was that of a mother who could offer her children only a breakfast of fried hoecake and sirup made from water and sugar. Another family had had no breakfast at 10 o'clock and said their dinner the night before had been pinto beans and blackeyed peas.

Other families said they had one big meal a week—chicken for Sunday morning breakfast.

A 34-year-old widow with nine children, ages 1 to 13, had only one bed and a bottomless chair in her shanty home. She said the plantation manager had given her $3 a week "furnish money" to be repaid from her earnings and those of her children. She was asked what she did after the cotton chopping and picking seasons.

"Ain't nothing to do but just wait on the calendar," she replied.

A night visit by two newsmen to a plantation cabin found a 57-year-old Negro hand, his wife and 11 of their 13 children crowded before an old television set in 1 of the 4 rooms.

The crisp stage setting of the Mikado; which they were watching, contrasted with the few pieces of sagging furniture, the split and peeling paper on the walls, the pine floor studded with patches of ancient linoleum and a two-eyed wood stove resting on an automobile wheel rim.

HAS $10 LEFT OVER

The man, a carpenter and mechanic's helper in the plantation's repair shop, said he made 40 cents an hour or about $20 a week. He receives $10 after payments on a Christmas loan and medical bills are deducted.

The family had just finished a supper of cornbread and fried potatoes. There was no milk for the children.

He was asked what he would choose if granted one wish.

"Rights," he replied. "Freedom, free to speak, free to have a voice, to speak, not be condemned or nothing like that. You know we don't have no voice out here."

As a result of the Justice Department's investigation, the Department of Agriculture told the county that the Federal Government would pay the cost of distributing the surplus food. If the county still refused, the department said, the Government would step in and do the job.

The board of supervisors agreed reluctantly to resume the program with the Government paying the cost. And this week hundreds of Negroes flocked to a warehouse here to receive the food.

HUNGER HELPS DRIVE

Hunger and the urging of the voter registration workers brought more and more Negroes to the county courthouse on the Yazoo's south bank to register. Committee officials obtained a three-room office in a ramshackle building on McLaurin Street and the harassment resumed.

The campaign workers reported another violent episode the night of March 6. Mr. Block said a station wagon had pulled alongside a car in which he and three others were sitting. A shotgun roared once.

The charge of buckshot was fired at such close range that it failed to disperse as it smashed one front window of the car and then the other before gouging into the wall of a home, the Negroes said.

City officials, in a statement, suggested that the incident was a hoax.

"Either by good luck or prearrangement, none of the occupants of the car was injured by the gunfire," he said.

No explanation was offered for the fact that three occupants had been cut by flying glass.

FIRE ON THEATER CROWD

The next night, Mr. Moses reported, a sedan carrying four whites drew up in front of a Negro theater. One pulled out a pistol and fired toward a group waiting on the sidewalk. No one was hit.

Last week brought more violence and the Federal intervention that the city had sought to avoid. Nightriders fired two blasts of buckshot into a voter worker's home Monday.

"Again, through good fortune or advanced planning, no one was hurt," Mayor Sampson and the city commissioners said in a statement.

The next morning, about 100 Negroes marched to the City Hall to protest the incident and to demand protection. At the mayor's orders, the police dispersed them with a German shepherd dog. The dog attacked two voter registration workers.

In all, nine of the workers, including the top leaders, were arrested. Eight of them were later given the maximum penalty for disorderly conduct—4 months in prison and a $200 fine.

MINISTER BITTEN BY DOG

Rev. D. L. Tucker, a minister active in the drive, was bitten Wednesday by the police dog as officers scattered a group of Negroes marching homeward after having applied for registration. He was scrambling to get away from the dog when bitten.

Dick Gregory, the comedian, arrived in Greenwood last Monday. Although he taunted the police as he led groups of Negroes in attempts to walk to the courthouse throughout the week, he was not arrested.

Meanwhile, the Justice Department had filed a request for a Federal court order against city and county officials before District Judge Claude F. Clayton, Jr. It sought to force them to take the following actions:

Release the eight registration workers from prison;

Refrain from further interference with the campaign; and

Permit Negroes to exercise their constitutional rights to assemble for peaceable protests and to protect them from whites who might molest them.

FIRST SUCH INTERVENTION

The action marked the first time in the civil rights struggle that the Department had interceded to preserve the right of peaceful protest.

However the Department and the city agreed yesterday that Justice Department attorneys would delay their attempt to obtain the injunctions and the city would stay execution of the sentences against the eight registration workers.

The Department reportedly was concerned over the threat of violence in Greenwood and the possibility that mass demonstrations might lead to a riot.

There is considerable evidence that an explosion has been averted here so far only because leaders of the citizens' council have restrained the more emotional whites. The council's members here include the city's business and professional leaders.

The Department's action disappointed sponsors of the voter registration drive.

WILL KEEP UP CAMPAIGN

Campaign leaders issued a statement yesterday pledging continued attempts by prospective voter applicants to walk in groups to the courthouse.

However, a temporary truce in the crisis was reached today between voter-campaign leaders and city officials. The latter agreed that while racial tensions made it necessary they would provide bus transportation between the drive's headquarters and the courthouse.

After tensions subside, according to Police Commissioner B. A. Hammond, the city will permit groups of no more than 20 or so to walk to the courthouse together so long as there is no threat of disorder.

Despite the violence, harassment, and intimidation, the campaign has picked up momentum. Hundreds of persons packed the mass meetings in the city's Negro churches to cheer top leaders in the civil rights movement.

If local whites could hear the statements being made they might question the accuracy of the Commonwealth's recent observation that "nothing will be changed after democracy has been tested here."

"The white folks are scared," asserted the Rev. James Bevel at one such session. "That's why they turned the dog loose."

BLAME MANY FACTORS

Leflore County's whites have blamed the voter registration workers, the Kennedy administration and the Communists, in about that order, for the racial crisis.

"It's outsiders that's causing it," said Mayor Sampson recently. "We give them everything. We're building them a new swimming pool. We work very close with the nigger civic league. They're very satisfied."

However, some whites conceded readily in private that it would take more than a new swimming pool to resolve the controversy. Sooner or later, they said, the county will be forced to administer reasonable voting tests and to place all qualified persons on the rolls.

Whose Side Are We on in Cuban Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, John Chamberlain has written an illuminating comparison of Fidel Castro and a true hero in Cuban history, Jose Marti, and from this relative estimate is prompted to ask of the present administration, "Who's side are we on?" when we denounce the efforts of some courageous Cuban patriots who are trying bravely to regain their homeland.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following complete text of Mr. Chamberlain's column as it appeared in the Charleston Daily Mail on March 27.

The article follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Mar. 27, 1963]

WHOSE SIDE ARE WE ON IN THE CUBAN CONTROVERSY?

(By John Chamberlain)

It was an old, musty, dogeared volume, the sort of thing you pick up on the remainder shelves of secondhand book shops for a nickel. It's title, a longwinded one, was "The War in Cuba, Being a Full Account of Her Great Struggle For Freedom, Containing a Complete Record of Spanish Tyranny and Oppression; Scenes of Violence and Bloodshed; Frequent Uprisings of a Gallant and Long Suffering People." The date of publication was 1896, 2 years before the Spanish-American War.

I brought it home from Miami, and have been trying, at odd moments, to penetrate the dense jungle of its florid 19th century prose. What keeps you going through the worst of the purple passages is the odd sincerity that dwells just below the surface of the cliche-ridden text. Jose Marti, the Cuban patriot, is decked out in all sorts of angelic colors—but, discounting the tropical flowers of oratory (the work of Gonzalo de Quesada, the Cuban republicans' representative in Washington during the 1890's), he comes through as a warm, sentient human being, idealist and realist in one.

I had never known much about Marti before. Like the young Fidel Castro who staged an impossible attack on a Batista strongpoint for its symbolic value, knowing that it must fail, Marti took his chances at the age of 16 when he claimed the authorship of an anti-Spanish article which he had not himself written. But Marti's motivation was different from Castro's; he performed his Quixotic act to save a friend. He was jailed, then exiled to Spain, from which he escaped. For 25 years thereafter Marti worked for a free Cuba supporting guerrilla activity from New York City. It was Marti who created the Cuban Home Rule Party, who arranged for arms shipments to the insurgents, and who took the field eventually as a Cuban rebel general despite the fact that he had had no experience in soldiering.

Gonzalo de Quesada describes the death and martyrdom of Marti on the soil of Cuba in words that sound like an excerpt from an old melodrama: "Under the palms, on a white steed * * * he fell. There, where our only majestic river, the Cauto, opens its arms, where from the rising grounds, the valleys, like a motherly bosom, invite the eternal rest, canopied by a gray firmament, there, where the world seems to dilate, Jose Marti battled for the last time against Spanish tyranny * * * he charges; his spirited horse carries him ahead of his men; it is his first engagement, it is his last victory; he rolls from his horse, fallen, wounded; his breast is riddled with bullets; the murderous lead entering under his chin has disfigured the firm mouth; the heavy mustache is burnt; his golden tongue is forever silent."

Reading de Quesada's perfervid words, you squirm. But you can't quite laugh, for the veneration so flamboyantly expressed still carries a ring of truth after 67 years.

If Marti had lived to become the first President of a free Cuban Republic, he would have scorned to go back on his word. Castro promised the Cubans that the Constitution of 1940 would be restored after the defeat of Batista; he promised a free press; he promised free scope for any and all businessmen who had not collaborated with the Batista government. Every single promise has been betrayed. Marti would have scorned to put a single Cuban under the yoke of an alien Old World power. Castro has delivered all the Cubans in Cuba to Moscow.

Reading the old dogeared book of 1896, I kept thinking about an article I wrote back in the 1930's, about Venezuela, when that South American country was trying to pick up the pieces after the death of the tyrant Juan Vicente Gomez, who had ruled it from 1908 to 1935. Gomez was a caudillo, a petty general, who pretended to have the good of his country at heart. Called "el bagre," the catfish, and "el brujo," the witch doctor, Gomez was feared by everybody—and he ended by being loved by nobody.

Castro pretends to wear the mantle of Marti. But underneath the "buche y pluma," or wind and feathers, he is the contemporary version of Gomez. When Marti was carrying on his struggle against "Butcher" Weyler, the Spanish general sent from Madrid to hold Cuba in thrall, the United States accorded him the rights of a belligerent. But our State Department denounces the modern disciples of Marti, the Cubans who are banded together in Alpha 66, for hitting some Russians while raiding the Cuban coast. Is the State Department on the side of the shade of Jose Marti? Or does it prefer the shade of "Catfish" Gomez?

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

How Not To Teach Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article by James D. Koerner entitled "How Not To Teach Teachers" has appeared in this month's edition of the Atlantic Monthly. It is very illuminating and I would like to commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

HOW NOT TO TEACH TEACHERS

(By James D. Koerner)

(James D. Koerner received his Ph. D. in American studies at Washington University in 1952, has taught at Kansas State University and at MIT, and is currently serving as president of the Council for Basic Education. He has recently completed a 2-year study of teacher education, the results of which will be published by Houghton Mifflin this spring in a book entitled "The Miseducation of American Teachers.")

Unlike most educational controversies, the training of teachers for the public schools is a subject that generates continuous heat. A kind of rhythm characterizes other issues—why Johnny can't read, or college freshmen can't write, why IQ tests are unreliable, or whether schools should be palaces; such controversies wax and wane. But the problem of how best to prepare teachers, being central to everything else in education, is a war without end. The traditional combatants, professors of academic subjects versus professors of education, have held a series of disarmament conferences in the last few years which, while not producing any substantive results, have eased the tension a bit. Still, the basic quarrel abides, and the cannonading continues from both sides, often rather wide of the right targets.

During the past 2 years, I have visited, for periods of from a day to a week, 63 institutions that train teachers—universities, multipurpose colleges, liberal arts colleges, and teachers colleges, in all sections of the country and representing all types of programs now in operation. I have looked especially at the preparatory programs for teachers of academic subjects, both the liberal arts and the professional part, and I have examined the graduate programs leading to the numerous masters' and doctors' degrees in education. I have visited about 200 classes in both academic and professional subjects; have talked with many hundreds of administrators, students, and members of the faculty; have read through a small library of books, reports, monographs, pamphlets, and periodicals; have examined several thousand transcripts of credit for graduates of education programs; have attended innumerable educational meetings, conferences, seminars, and conventions; and in sundry other ways have acquainted myself with the massive industry of professional education.

It has been, I regret to say, a cheerless experience. When all the complexity of the field is recognized and all the necessary qualifications made, the simple fact remains that the education of American teachers, school administrators, and other professionals is more often a failure than a success. This is so because neither the liberal arts nor the professional component of these training programs comes even close to its theoretical goal.

In the first place, the field of professional education, which controls the training programs for teachers and administrators, has become an unwieldy, slow witted, bureaucratic colossus, standing on a slippery foundation built on sand. It is the most poorly defined, formless field in higher education. It is the most derivative, taking its substance from the academic fields of psychology, history, philosophy, and the social sciences, all of which it has digested badly while adding little that is uniquely its own. Because it has failed to bring a unifying theory into this multifariousness, its training programs continue to be constructed on tenuous and untested hypotheses, or on whatever is expedient in a given instance.

Although education does not yet know how much or what kind of professional preparation is needed by teachers and administrators, it has constructed a plenitude of mandatory training programs on the assumption that it does. These programs, despite a long history of inadequacy, remain frozen into law in State certification requirements. More important, those who run teacher-training programs have become frozen in their own thinking and are now far too busy managing an established business with a rapid growth rate to have much time or inclination for the examination of first principles.

Education has been corrupted by money and power. It is a big business. It turns out a quarter of all the undergraduate degrees awarded by American institutions, and in 1963 will graduate about 150,000 persons eligible to teach in public schools, a good many of whom will not teach, and a good many more of whom will not teach long. It awards half of all masters' degrees, and more doctors' degrees, by a sizable margin, than any other single academic field. To man this giant machine, the field has well over 20,000 full-time faculty, making it second in size only to the field of English. Outside the institutions themselves, there is a constellation of large professional and service organizations that is an integral part of the education machine. All this has happened in an astonishingly short time, and success has seduced the field into arrogance and administrative busywork and away from basic concerns.

Thus, one of the reasons that the education of American teachers is fundamentally a failure is that professional education, which constructs and controls the training programs, has extremely poor credentials as an academic discipline. The fact that it has won recognition as such a discipline, which it has done through the abdication of responsibility by the liberal arts departments, is not a qualification; it merely makes possible the building of more academic empires on sandy foundations.

This general disability, as well as the specific ills that education is heir to, is mostly traceable, as it would be in any other field, to the faculty. It is an indecorous thing to say and is obviously offensive to educationists, but it is the truth, and it should be said: the intellectual caliber of the education faculty is the fundamental limitation of the field. Because no educational program can transcend the quality of its faculty, any long-range improvement in teacher training will have to wait upon improvement in those who staff schools and departments of education. Although a good many men of excellent ability are to be found in education, particularly among the younger faculty, their number is minute in relation to the whole.

Yet the preparatory programs for public school teachers are chiefly under the de facto supervision of the education faculty. It is here that admission to the training programs is controlled, here that the programs themselves are constructed, here that the future teacher accumulates courses in education and pedagogy, here that he develops whatever professional outlook he has, here that, hopefully, he learns what to do with what, hopefully, he has acquired from his academic courses. Cardinal Newman, who wrote one of the great treatises on liberal education, saw only one reason for courses: "The general principles of any study you may learn by books at home; but the detail, the color, the tone, the air, the life which makes it live in us, you must catch all these from those in whom it already lives." It does not live in the greatest part of the present education faculty; in this unfortunate fact lies education's greatest problem.

Weak students gravitate to weak faculties. Education students, along with students in agriculture and business administration, fill the lower ranks of the academic ladder. Every major study of the subject, beginning with a classic one in the State of Pennsylvania in 1928–32 and coming down to very recent ones, has arrived at the same conclusion: education students show up badly, both in achievement and native ability, when compared with students in other fields, a fact that has been known informally throughout higher education for half a century. Teaching attracts poor students for a combination of academic, social, and economic reasons, but the bland acceptance of this condition by the education faculty, its failure to weed out the incompetent and to raise its standards of admission and performance create a circular problem: a weak faculty maintains low standards that attract weak students; together they deter better faculty from entering the field and raising standards that would attract better students into better programs. "All other reforms," as John Dewey once observe, "are conditioned upon reform in the quality and character of those who engage in the teaching profession."

Some headway is being made. A great many teacher-training programs that used to take anyone who appeared at the door have raised admission standards in recent years. A grade average of C or shade better is becoming a common requirement in these programs. This is helpful, though it may not in itself mean much. Grade averages are most significant when one knows what the quality of the instruction is, what the grading practices are, and what groups are given student is competing against. A C average is not an impressive requirement, especially in teachers colleges and State colleges, if one is trying to educate educators, nor is it commensurate with grade averages for entrance to professional programs in other fields. Still, the grade requirement

is on the rise and in time should make some difference in the quality of teacher turned out.

No headway is being made, so far as I can see, on admissions standards at the all-important graduate level. With the exception of students enrolled in the so-called master of arts in teaching programs, who are usually capable persons, candidates for the master's and doctor's degrees are rarely screened in education as they are in other fields. Ironically, it is often easier for one to be admitted to graduate study in education than to undergraduate programs in the same institution. A bachelor's degree which might be 20 years old and from a third-rate institution is often adequate for admission, especially to those advanced degree programs that are wholly under the control of the education division. Whatever reasons there may have been historically for taking low-caliber people in the training programs for teachers, there has never been and certainly is not now any reason for taking them in the graduate programs. The ramifying influence of low standards in graduate education is painfully clear: the masters and doctors turned out become administrators who hire teachers, construct curricula, and set standards in public schools; they also staff professional associations, accrediting agencies, and become professors of education.

The education courses themselves deserve their ill repute. Most of them are indeed puerile, repetitious, dull, and ambiguous, incontestably. Two factors make them this way: the limitations of the instructor, and the limitations of subject matter that has been remorselessly fragmented, subdivided, and inflated, and that in many instances was not adequate in its uninflated state. That some teachers and courses in education can be found to equal the best in the academic areas is a happy fact. A course in the history of education, taught by, say, Lawrence Cremin of Columbia Teachers College, or a course in the psychological theories of how young people learn things, taught by Ernest Hilgard of Stanford, or one in the methods of teaching high school English, taught by Edward Gordon of Yale—such courses could be as valuable as any on the campus. But the mere effort needed to identify the intellectual leaders or the outstanding teachers in professional education today testifies to their scarcity.

The principal subjects of the professional curriculum—teaching methods, practice teaching, and the educational aspects of history, philosophy, and psychology—are almost never taught and the textbooks almost never written by persons who are themselves trained historians, philosophers, psychologists, or proven experts in teaching. Hence, there is nothing more obvious in the typical education class, apart from the remarkable docility of the students, than the lack of real depth and scholarship on the part of the instructor. Frequently, a strong strain of anti-intellectualism is discernible. Frequently, utilitarianism takes the place of intellectualism, the "tenderminded" approach, as William James called it, takes the place of the "toughminded," the ritualistic takes the place of the realistic, the uncritical acceptance of shibboleths takes the place of the critical analysis of ideas. There is a universal devotion to the discussion method, which most often signifies, as it does in public schools, an aimless, generalized bull session. Great use is also made of group dynamics, field trips, panel discussions, student-directed projects, and an infinite variety of movies and other visual aids; these devices no doubt have their uses, one of which seems to be to kill time.

The best students are repelled by all this, the average ones are bored, the poor are pleased. With the exception of practice teaching, which is not really a course, the professional curriculum for teachers is perhaps 50 to 75 percent water. At the graduate level, the dilution is often much higher.

Apart from the question of quality, the quantity of education courses required or permitted in teacher training also deserves the harsh things that are usually said about it. This is one of the oldest issues between the academician, who has traditionally inveighed against what he regarded as an excessive number of education courses, and the educationist, who has usually claimed that the number of courses is quite modest and reasonable. Nobody, so far as I could discover in surveying results of educational research, had tried to collect information on the subject from the only reliable source that exists, the transcripts of credit for graduates of the various education programs. I therefore gathered a representative sample of such transcripts from 32 institutions and made numerous calculations from them.

The transcripts indicate, among many other things, that the preparing institutions go far beyond State certification requirements in education courses. Elementary school teachers get an average of 49 semester hours in education, while the average requirement for State licensure is 24. Secondary school teachers get about 27 semester hours, while the average State requirement is 18. Elementary school teachers, that is, spend about 40 percent of their 4 years of college taking education courses in such subjects as educational psychology (usually three or four courses under different names but covering about the same material), audio-visual aids, personal and community hygiene, and elementary school curriculum; they also take a seemingly endless series of discrete courses in how to teach each subject of the elementary school at each level of the elementary school. Secondary teachers spend nearly 25 percent of their time taking education courses. These are national averages. If one looks only at the liberal arts colleges, the average goes sharply down in education and up in academic courses; if one looks at schools that are present or erstwhile teachers colleges, which prepare very large numbers of teachers, the averages go sharply up in education and down in academic courses. These figures, of course, do not cover the graduate programs in education, in many of which not a single academic course is taken, and where the time is spent in courses so trivial that they must be seen to be believed.

I submit that this much undergraduate time devoted to education, especially in view of the redundant and intellectually thin nature of the courses and the consistently negative reaction of students to them, is indefensible. And it clearly cannot help but deter the very people most needed in teaching; a really bright student will not suffer such a diet. If educationists are serious about improving teacher training and the quality of students, one of the most effective steps they could take would be to reduce course offerings and requirements by perhaps 50 percent, while insisting that the remainder be taught with some distinction.

The remedies for the faults of professional education are implicit in the discussion. If admission standards are low, they should be raised; if course work is sterile, it needs revitalization; if the faculty is weak, new graduate programs and new faculty hiring policies are indicatd. The real question is not what needs doing, but how to get what needs doing done. The forces for change in teacher education are now greater than they have been for a long time. There are more "young Turks" around, more support for new programs from foundations and college administrations, more interest on the part of academic folk, and more pressure for reform from the public than ever before. But to all these forces there are others that are opposite and often more than equal.

Th greatest obstacle to reform is the field of education itself. This is natural. Teacher training is a major industry, the income from which supports not only schools and departments and professors of education but often other branches of the university as well, even entire institutions. Sometimes the income is fairly good, permitting high salaries and fast promotions for the education faculty. Like any vast bureaucracy, education is by nature pretty much dedicated to the status quo and has developed a centripetal circle of power to perpetuate it. At the center are the institutions themselves, while orbiting around them are accrediting associations, the State departments of education, and the administrator dominated State and national agencies like the NEA. Such a concentration of power naturally looks with a cold eye on suggestions for change, especially those coming from outside. It has a built-in radar that sounds the warning at the approach of any proposal that threatens to diminish the establishment, or that might jeopardize jobs or status.

Thus, the field has a history of opposition, more or less automatic, to most proposals for reform that have been made over the last half century. It held the line for decades against increasing the liberal content of its programs at the expense of the pedagogical; it fought like a tiger to maintain in statu quo State certification requirements, that monument to administrative rigidity; it met criticism with fury, denunciation, and diversionary attack. There has always been, for example, enormous opposition to any proposal that would license teachers in a way that would make the most sense to a great many people, through a system of qualifying examinations. Under such a system, people could be qualified to teach when they could demonstrate their ability to do so, which would mean giving them better examinations in subject matter than are yet available, and possibly some sort of probationary internship. It would mean that the main criterion for entrance to teaching would shift from the mechanical counting up of credits and courses, often of dubious pedigree, to performance. In the nature of things, most teachers, whatever system prevails, will continue to come through organized programs in colleges, but they would be required under an examination system to prove their grasp of the subjects they propose to teach as well as their capacity to teach them. The doors to teaching would thus be open to anyone. Einstein might be able to teach third grade arithmetic, after all; able immigrants might be admitted to the classroom to teach their native languages; and the services of many kinds of persons of genuine intellectual accomplishment might be made available to the public schools. An examinations system, whether administered at the State, regional, or national level, would also be a valuable check against the quality of individual institutions, certainly far better than the ineffectual accreditation programs now in operation.

Professional education, except in isolated instances, presents a monolithic opposition to such a scheme and goes to picturesque lengths to find reasons why mandatory qualifying examinations will not work. The educationists' real objection, however, is to the reduced status of professional education, of course work, and of graduation from organized programs that inheres in the plan. Also, the concept of professionalism, which has preoccupied the field of education for so many years, is violated. Qualifying examinations seem to say that public school teaching is not really a profession (which it probably is not) and that people can perform well in it without professional pre-

paration (which they obviously can). I do not believe that any system of qualifying examinations, beyond the perfunctory ones that now exist in a few places, has any chance of adoption. The conditions of life in the world of professional education preclude it, as they preclude other reforms that are urgently needed.

That being true, what are some of the practical, concrete reforms that could be made now within the existing establishment?

1. The time devoted in teaching-training programs to education courses should be restricted to State requirements, which allow ample time for pedagogical work of any consequence.

2. At least two thirds of the work for all graduate degrees in education (the master of arts in teaching degree expected, where it might be about half) should be in the liberal arts area, and students in these programs should be required to measure up to the customary graduate standards.

3. The regular 4-year undergraduate program should remain the standard preparation for new teachers. The master of arts in teaching programs should by all means be continued and encouraged for liberal arts graduates without previous work in education; but the accelerating movement toward making 5 years of preparation mandatory for all new teachers is ill advised. It merely takes the pressure off the undergraduate programs to improve themselves, and it inflicts an enormous and unnecessary burden on an already overtaxed system of graduate education. Four years are ample, provided they are wisely used.

4. The remaining teachers colleges in the United States should be shut down or converted to general purpose institutions, and those that have already been converted in name should move much faster toward conversion in fact. Removal of the word "teachers" or "education" from the name of the school, even when done by the State legislature, does not make the school a liberal arts institution. Most of the colleges that have made such changes still have the same faculty teaching the same kind of students in the same kind of programs as they formerly had.

5. Undergraduate majors in education should be eliminated, and all teachers, including elementary teachers and special school personnel, should be required to major in an academic subject. A reasonable reduction in education courses would make this possible, while the time devoted to the student's general education would remain about what it now is.

6. Education courses that are derived directly from academic disciplines, such as those in educational psychology and in the history and philosophy of education, should be taught only by persons fully qualified to teach in the appropriate academic departments of the same institution. This commonsense recommendation would mean that 90 percent of the people now teaching these courses would cease to teach them, and so is a bit utopian, but it is a goal toward which education ought to be moving with all deliberate speed.

7. If competent faculty cannot be secured to teach methods courses, and most such courses are incompetently taught now, formal courses in the subject should be eliminated.

8. Persons whose graduate training has been in education and who have no recognized qualifications in an academic field should not be allowed to teach academic courses, as they now frequently do in teachers colleges and many smaller institutions.

Unfortunately, the political realities of the education field dictate a future built upon the past, which means that modest, short-term gains, a kind of mild meliorism, will probably be the pattern of the future. The key question is whether improvement of this sort can keep up with the problems of exploding enrollments, the advancement of knowledge itself, and the other educational exigencies of the Nation. In any event, continued improvement in teacher education, slow or fast, will come only in response to unrelenting pressure from the public, the scholarly, and scientific community, and the small minority of educationists who know better than anyone else what is wrong and who want to change it.

Victory in the Cold War—What Is It, and How Can We Gain It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Karl R. Bendetsen, former Assistant Secretary of the Army and for a short time Acting Secretary of the Army, delivered an address before the Cincinnati Council on World Affairs entitled "Victory in the Cold War."

Colonel Bendetsen has enoyed a varied career in the service of the Federal Government and the conclusions in this address are drawn from his wealth of experience.

The address follows:

VICTORY IN THE COLD WAR—WHAT IS IT, AND HOW CAN WE GAIN IT?

It is my privilege, on behalf of the Cincinati Council on World Affairs, to extend to each of you a cordial welcome to this, our ninth annual conference. As citizens of Greater Cincinnati and of the community of regions adjoining it, we have earned the right to share a feeling of just pride in these annual conferences. They have become known and respected across the land. They have rightfully commanded the attention of our fellow citizens everywhere, and, rightfully, too, each has occupied a unique place among the important events on our calendars.

The theme of this year's conference is "Victory in the Cold War." What is it, and how can we achieve it? The cold war is indeed a war. None like it has ever been waged. Tragically, there are many among us who do not recognize it as a war. If such people prevail in our Nation, we will lose all we hold dear. This would be an irretrievable loss—conclusive, final, tragic—and wholly unnecessary. The more tragic, because we can win—if we will—conclusively, finally, and absolutely. Regardless of how it is viewed, however, it is the most prevading influence in our daily lives. It is being waged across and around the world and within our Nation ceaselessly, unremittingly every moment of the day and night. No phase of life is exempted from its impact. It molds or destroys hope, forges uneasy sleep and heavy dreams. It dwells among us and all around us and at the same time it seems to dwell on the border of reality. Perhaps it dwells somewhere in the space between reality and unreality.

The cold war is concerned with the condition of life. It has been said that life without a measure of quality is worthless. Our forbears lived by this philosophy. They are the men from whom we inherited this broad land, who founded our system of government, the finest system in recorded history.

Our forebears founded a system of government designed to advance freedom to protect the dignity of man. To call forth his noblest faculties. It is this freedom the Soviet Communists would destroy. They would subvert all other men to their absolute rule, to a condition of slavery, to the status of instruments of the state. For they are the state.

It is for us today to engage in a dialog to search out the answer to the question whether our value system of freedom is worth dying for. If our answer is that the values of life in freedom under God are not worth dying for, because life is too precious to risk resisting the Communists, then certainly we will have fallen into a great and tragic disorder of mind.

Communism has advanced itself upon this disorder among the minds of men—this disorder of perspective—this total loss of a sense of values. These arch conspirators have never advanced in power anywhere in the world by the merit and strength of their ideas—only by force, fraud, deception and with the fostered and nurtured disorder of fear and the destruction of our attachment to principles.

Sacrifice, courage, and the risking of lives is not new either in the gaining or the preservation of freedom. Voices from the tombs of departed republics tell us that liberty is preserved only by taking risks and by sleepless vigilance. Unfortunately there are those of us who cease to believe this, and unwittingly it is they who are the most deadly foes of our freedom. What manner of man is it that prefers slavery to freedom? Who thinks that the questionable security of slavery is better than the risks of freedom?

When man brings himself to believe that he has no responsibility to the on-going generation, that his only responsibility is to himself alone and that his responsibility consists solely of making any and all concessions, no matter what, simply to preserve his own physical life a bit longer, no matter how abject his poverty of mind, spirit and body becomes, he has then reached a deplorable condition of mind, with a total absence of any philosophy of life.

Anyone who now enjoys freedom, and that is all of us here today, enjoys it only in consequence of the sufferings and the sacrifices of multitudes who died before. Each of us has a moral obligation to secure with our lives the blessings which others before us secured for us with theirs. Our moral obligation is to those who follow us, rather than to ourselves alone. Do we fully understand what is at stake in the cold war?

You may inquire, is it a war? This is an appropriate inquiry, for there are those who have said that this is a war in which our objective should not be victory. How can this be? How could anyone seriously contend that if we are in a war that the objective of our strategy and tactics should not be victory—nothing less.

The question is deadly serious. Upon your understanding and your answer will depend our own destiny and the destiny of our children. We are at the crossroads. Victory can be ours if we will risk it.

I have no doubt whatsoever but that the great majority of Americans want to win the cold war. They are anxious that our leadership be firm and resolute; act only in our long-range interests; take risks to force the Soviet conspirators to back down, to yield, to exhaust them. They would desire to rally behind the slogan, "Better Be Brave Than Alive." I am convinced too that a vast majority of our citizens want our Federal officials, our leadership, to adopt and pursue offensive strategy and tactics designed to win.

But there are those among us who feel differently. Some of them are in positions of influence. They are sincere enough but

they do not see clearly what is at stake. And the answer to the question of what to do is for them much different than it is for the majority of us.

It is an answer which for them is shrouded by the fearsome mushroom cloud—the cloud of the atom bomb which fills the hearts of some men with fear and perhaps distorts their perspectives. These men say we must not pursue victory in the cold war because say they that all is changed by the mushroom cloud that life no longer has any meaning beyond the end of the current span—that freedom is not worth dying for. They say the central issue is no longer the question of whether you and I would be willing to sacrifice life to assure the future of those who would survive us. They say the central issue is no longer the question of whether you and I would be willing to die in order to preserve freedom for our posterity. They say that to pursue victory in the cold war would mean hot war, and that this is the conflict we cannot face because it would mark not the end of some things or some lives to preserve others, but the end of all things. Say they, values die with the people who held them. And so they say that the antagonists in our modern conflict, the cold war, are not the Communist rulers and Western civilization, but humanity versus nuclear destruction, and that those who fight the Communist rulers fight the wrong war against the wrong enemy. Say they, the only real enemy, the only real war, is humanity against the bomb.

Their perspectives are indeed sincerely but unfortunately distorted. During the religious wars in Europe all the people of the city of Magdeburg were eliminated in a mass extermination—40,000. There was a Hiroshima centuries ago. Extermination brought about with swords and crude muskets, knives, and lances. Was that extermination, irresponsibility of the weapons, or did it stem from a disorder within man himself? Who were the adversaries at Magdeburg? Men versus weapons? Hardly.

No, our adversaries are not atom bombs. These did not create the arch conspiracy of pitiless power-mad men who would destroy our values. Whether these men have knives or muskets, lance or cannon, the weapons of the jungle or the atom bomb—our burden is the same. We must displace them from power or they will destroy for us the values that make life worth living.

Our dialog today then begins with the question of survival of freedom and extends to values beyond our own survival. Wars that no one can win are sometimes discussed. But the kind of war that can be won is the one for us to consider today. Nothing can be swept under the carpet simply because it is unattractive lest we compound our own peril. The only things that were ever swept under history's carpet were the fragments of those civilizations which, instead of facing up to their responsibilities, reacted by closing their minds and bringing upon them their own destruction.

What then is the cold war? To understand and to win it requires a clear view of our adversaries. Our adversaries are called Communists. This in it self is something of a false label. They are, in each nation they rule, a relatively small group of ruthless, cruel, avaricious, unspeakable men who are Marxist-Leninists. They are a clique of power-mad, insatiable men, the inheritors of a conspiracy of 17 men led by Lenin who in 1917 by force, stealth, deception, assassination and the active help of the then Imperial German Government perpetrated the most fraudulent hoax in history. They overthrew Kerensky who had deposed the Czar, seizing power from a popular government by force of arms in unbelievable bloodshed. We, in that day and time, stood by and allowed them to do it. They then had the help of Imperial Germany because she wanted Russia, even Kerensky's Russia, out of World War I. She had no idea of the consequences. Their inheritors have had our unintended but real help almost ever since.

These Marxist-Leninist dictators advance by all means and by all weapons to their objective of world domination.

The objective of the Communist ruling class is to advance to unlimited power over the entire world. We must understand that the cold war is total war. It is neither a propaganda exercise nor an economic competition.

The objective especially includes obliteration of free enterprise, church and freedom. In the words of Lenin, "There is no middle road, nor can there possibly be." In his January 6, 1961, speech before the 22d Party Congress, Khrushchev would have communism win everywhere. If their plans and efforts toward the destruction our Government and way of life are not war, what are they? Their aim of necessity shapes ours and under these conditions how can the free world's objective be other than total victory and survival. A state of war has been thrust upon us and as in any war situation the procedural imperative is that one side win and the other lose.

As one of the first things in clarifying and thinking through our concept of victory, we must have clearly in mind the identity of the enemy. We are not arrayed against Russia, China, or Poland, but rather it is the Communist elite, the Communist ruling class. The peoples of Russia, of Hungary, and of the other enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain are our natural allies. They yearn for freedom. Our cause is not against the great mass of people in all the countries now under the rule of the Communist despots. Communism is an atheistic philosophy of world dominance with unlimited privilege and power for its rulers and human automation in a dominion of darkness for the ruled.

The Communist tyrants have installed themselves as a power apparatus in all cases by fraud, deceit, murder, arson, subversion, assassination and force. There is not a single case in the long and sorrowful record of human enslavement since 1917 at the hands of these miserable conspirators in which they have fought and won a battle for the minds of men as they would like to have us believe. These craven, cruel despots have deceived vast numbers of people into thinking that those under their domination have been won in heart and mind. This is a complete and total illusion.

A few of their methods include deception; insidious propaganda; crypto-Communist organizations; infiltration of all types and kinds into our venerable institutions and governmental bodies by professionals who disguise themselves; activist cells; popular fronts joining with and later gaining control of non-Communist true political parties; so-called cultural exchanges; organized visits of people invited to Communist countries to inculcate the minds of the visitors with erroneous and distorted ideas about the so-called Communist system; by shameless attacks on anti-Communists; and the operation of special schools to teach the art of mind manipulation, deception, spying, sabotage, intrigue, guerrilla warfare, insurrection, and riots. They work around the clock ceaselessly with lies, slander, falsehoods, deception through every conceivable channel applying every conceivable pressure and for the most part act through organizations, dupes, and Communist fellow travelers.

The U.S. policy of containment is being gradually replaced by the Soviet Communist devised delusion of peaceful coexistence. This is Marxist-Leninist jargon. What do they mean by this? As in all other Communist phrases it is one calculated to deceive. They do not mean what many Americans have allowed themselves to think. As defined by the 81 Communist Parties in Moscow on December 5, 1960, and as explained by Khrushchev in his January 6, 1961, speech before the 22d party congress, peaceful coexistence does not imply renunciation of the objective of world domination which is to be pursued by all known means including so-called justifiable revolutions and wars of liberation. It does not mean that they intend we would continue to exist in freedom as we know it. There is nothing peaceful about peaceful coexistence other than that primary emphasis is not placed on war as was the case under Stalin and presently under Mao. The arch conspirators do not want their power base destroyed. They would never risk their own destruction. This coexistence means that they exist on their own terms and that we exist too, but only on their terms. As Khrushchev put it when in the United States in 1959, "Peaceful coexistence depends on whether or not you resist."

They use the conference table only as a weapon of offense and it is foolhardy to assume that there can be negotiated with the Communist dictatorship a truce on their aggressive conspiracy until matters in dispute can be settled. Termination of the cold war through agreement is impossible, a childish illusion. An agreed technological slowdown or limitation of arms, or a mutually controlled disarmament would be disaster for us—a baited trap.

Why do they stop short of using nuclear weapons—they have them? They go to unlimited extremes to create the illusion in our minds that they would now use them against us if we were to provoke them. For example, they would have us believe that if we reduced the Communist subversive-offensive base in Cuba, they would retaliate against us with nuclear force. Don't you believe it. They would not use them now—not while we have the superior nuclear force. We still have it—overwhelmingly contrary to the propaganda that alleges there is a nuclear stalemate.

The Communist rulers fear a nuclear war only for so long as we have the superior force we still maintain. Such a war they would lose. They have no humanitarian reluctance to fight any kind of a war they can win. We must keep the overwhelming advantage. One of the most important points of reference for the shaping of our own course is the certain knowledge that they would never resort to actions which would mean their own physical destruction and so if they believe we would use our superior force they would back down. Backing down to them would only be an episode, merely delaying what they regard as the inevitability of their success. Many people do not understand this. Many of our officials do not understand this. Unless with unity and steadfast purpose we do understand this we will lose the cold war. We cannot gain victory passively. Wars are won by action and this one against the Communist elite ruling class requires shrewd, discerning and bold action. The great Communist advance thus far toward their objective springs from superior determination, not at the present from superiority in technology, society, culture or weapons. Their economic strength is inferior, we can exhaust them.

We must understand that Marxist-Leninists never actually negotiate to resolve differences and they never make true concessions. Their purpose is not to bargain but to gain an advantage no matter how small. They use the conference table as a weapon of offense and maneuver for victory only—only for the creation of circumstances favorable to ultimate victory. It is imperative that these cardinal truths be known by all Americans—citizens, officials and, particularly, by Americans who sit down at the

conference table. Endeavoring to deter Communists from their ultimate goal by persuasion or accommodation is fanciful. No agreement with them which is not self-executing can be relied upon. To obtain a test ban treaty except upon terms which give us unlimited, absolute, effective inspection would be utterly worthless and fatally dangerous in the long term. The world opinion we court in seeking a test ban on lesser terms will avail us nothing.

While there is real doubt whether any meaningful world opinion exists, we have compromised our own self-interest as well as time-honored principles in vain attempts to appease and to accommodate it, particularly and tragically when it was assumed to be the opinion of the so-called neutral nations. If such a body of opinion exists at all, it is more likely that we could incline toward us by forthright action in our own self-interest than ever we could by appeasement or accommodation. In any case, it is imperative that we act always in our long-term self-interest without regard to so-called world opinion.

Wishful theories such as evolution, convergence, containment, and coexistence surrender initiative to the Communists and permit the enemy to select the battlefields. They renounce victory as an objective. They make a virtue of inaction and damn courage as a vice. They compel us to react rather than act. They sap our will and foster complacency. Probably herein lies the explanation of why we have been avoiding calculated employment of our national power and capabilities except in grave emergencies. And having used our national power momentarily, as in the case of Cuba last October, wholly fail to follow up and wind up worse off than before—as we have in the case of Cuba. The Communists have turned the October missile episode into a resounding victory. They now have a power base in the Western Hemisphere—a subversive-offensive base from which with or without Soviet troops surely they will complete the conquest of Latin America unless we prevent them by having the courage to force them out—force them out without delay. If this involves risks, we must take such risk. They will not bring on their own destruction.

Sober appraisal brings to mind that these enemies of freedom, with our acquiescence and in some cases our help, now have in their cruel and despotic domain the entire eastern half of Europe, the Baltic States, Outer Mongolia, China, North Korea, and Tibet. Without using a single Russian or Chicom soldier in action they rule North Vietnam and have arranged with our agreement to rule Laos at their pleasure. They have sympathetic and helpful so-called neutrals in various shades of red hue in vast areas of the Near East and Africa and they permeate Indonesia.

As other nations see us we make it hard for anti-Communists to resist. Taking out the missiles in Cuba did not help the anti-Communists of Latin America a bit. It did not remove the actual danger to us or to Latin America. The Communists never intended to use the missiles except as a bargaining lever to make their subversive base permanent by our tacit consent. Up to now they have succeeded admirably. To say that Cuba is not an offensive military threat either misleads or misses the whole point.

Let us consider somewhat more fully how other nations see us. Perhaps it may help us understand why some nations do not trust us.

The Dutch have been our allies. Sukarno has been neutral in favor of the Soviets. We actively supported the realization of Sukarno's aggression against the Dutch in Papua.

We repudiated a pro-Western government in Laos and forced it to accept a coalition, which includes Communists. We pressured this government by withdrawing foreign aid funds from it. This would seem to me to be inconceivable in the face of the fact that the mountains and passes of north Laos are the keys to the subversion and conquest of all southeast Asia. It takes hardly more than a glance at a relief map to appreciate this. Such action takes the heart out of anti-Communist resistance in the region and represents a total misunderstanding of the war we are in and where it should be fought in southeast Asia. We should be holding stoutly at the passes to prevent infiltration rather than to cope with a flood on the open delta.

The proposition that we should avoid unilateral action is completely invalid and impractical. Since when has it become necessary for the most powerful nation in the world to deny itself the right to take unilateral action in enlightened self-interest to uphold right, principle, justice, and honor? Here again the Cuban affair requires that this illogical restraint on our action be discarded.

We must announce that we will strike first with such force and weapons as we think appropriate if we regard the danger great enough. No war has ever been won by defensive strategy and tactics. None ever will be. We must have an inclusive, offensive strategy with well developed situational tactics. The Communists will certainly avoid conventional or nuclear warfare until they are confident of winning. We should not hesitate to fight small wars when it is to our clear advantage as it might be in Cuba.

It is not clear thinking to rely upon the United Nations. Even before the recent influx of neutral states, that body was hamstrung by procedures and the Soviet vetoes. A realistic appreciation of its limitations is necessary. What may be needed is an organization of non-Communist nations to supersede entirely the United Nations.

The Monroe Doctrine must be reinstituted. The Communist offensive power base, Cuba, for subversion of the Western Hemisphere must be reduced. If we take measures to reduce her by one means or another the Communist rulers will not retaliate with nuclear weapons. They do not dare to do so for if they did they know they would be destroyed. They seek not their own self-destruction, but world domination.

Our plans for victory and offensive strategy must embrace, among other things, a strong economy, an assured safe margin of military supremacy, economic warfare on all fronts, enlightened self-interest aid to and trade and intercourse with other nations, spreading the truth about Communist colonialism, ideological, psychological and political warfare, quarantines and naval blockades, guerrilla warfare, support for honest wars of liberation, and working with the Russian peoples and those of other captive countries, all to the end that we may rekindle the hope, the purpose and the action of men for the victory of Freedom and its transcendent values which reach beyond our brief stay on this earth, beyond the grave and to eternity.

We must realize that it is we who have the capacity to exhaust the main power base of our enemy, utterly to break the control of the archconspirators of the Kremlin and their cohorts by forcing them to place an ever-increasing amount of their economy into nonproductive armaments. We must never relax the arms pressure until the Soviet power collapses through failure to provide the people they have enslaved with the bare necessities of life.

In closing may I leave with you these abbreviated conclusions, offered in the context of all that has just been said:

First. We must and we can win the cold war through a major shift in strategy and tactics, although the time within which to shift is not on our side. It is running against us.

Second. It is necessary that we fully understand the cold war. The cold war is total war—a total war of deadly conflict in all its forms—with no quarter.

Third. We must plan to win it unconditionally, executing our strategy and tactics to this end with resolute and superior determination.

Fourth. We must at once declare convincingly that we will never hesitate to strike the first blow with such weapons and power as we consider certain to win whenever the danger to us appears to be sufficient.

Fifth. We must know who the enemy is.

Sixth. We must learn to recognize in all its forms Communist strategy and tactics.

Seventh. We must do all that is necessary to assure that we maintain abolute nuclear and other military superiority in all its forms, with overwhelming second strike kill capacity. We must avoid doing anything internally or externally to impair this.

Eighth. We must know that any agreement or accommodation with the Communist rulers is to their advantage—not ours.

Ninth. We must be willing to use our great national power in all its forms to win and to depose the Communist rulers everywhere.

Tenth. As citizens we must effectively insist that our Government act accordingly.

These, then, are some of the ingredients of victory in the cold war—a war we can win if we choose. You may today help make the choice.

Redevelopment Woe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks the members of the Banking and Currency Committee have been listening to testimony regarding amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. These hearings have now been completed and it is expected that this bill will undoubtedly be considered by the House after the Easter recess. I enclose herewith an article entitled "U.S. Agency That Aids Jobless Areas Draws Fire From Businesses," which appeared in the Thursday, April 11, 1963, edition of the Wall Street Journal, and recommended for reading by those persons interested in this act.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, April 11, 1963]

REDEVELOPMENT WOE: U.S. AGENCY THAT AIDS JOBLESS AREAS DRAWS FIRE FROM BUSINESSES; MARYLAND POULTRY FEED FIRMS COMPLAIN LOAN WOULD GIVE NEW COMPANY UNFAIR EDGE; UNHAPPINESS IN HAPPY CAMP

(By Donald A. Moffitt)

At Happy Camp, a small lumbering town on the Klamath River in northern California, the reopening of a plywood veneer mill last year after a 3-month closedown provoked some unhappy protests.

The objections came from competing millowners, who had been relieved to have one

less competitor sharing a business in which fierce competition had driven prices down 14 percent in 2 years. However, their displeasure was not so much aimed at Josephine Plywood Co., the firm which purchased and reopened the mill, as at a Federal agency which loaned the new owners $325,000, or 65 percent of the purchase price, at 4 percent interest. The other millowners charged that the Federal aid helped a competitor at their expense; the Government replies that its primary interest was in restoring 40 jobs that had been lost when the mill closed.

The agency under fire at Happy Camp is the Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA), a Commerce Department branch created and granted a 4-year life by Congress in May 1961. Conceived as a major weapon of New Frontier economic policy, ARA's primary mission is to channel Federal funds, in the form of loans and grants, into public and private ventures that would create jobs in chronically depressed areas.

AGENCY SCOURS DEPRESSED AREAS

The new agency approached the task with enthusiasm. It has classified 996 areas in the United States and its possessions, inhabited by some 20 percent of the total population, as depressed. And its representatives have actively scoured the areas to find businessmen, industrial commissions, chambers of commerce and State and local officials willing to undertake projects with Federal aid.

So far, ARA has approved loans and grants totaling $84.8 million. It estimates that when all the projects now approved are completed, it will have created 35,000 new jobs directly and a further 20,000 in service and other industries that serve the additional employees.

But the ARA has not always been able to dispense its aid without stirring up controversy. Some businessmen have objected to having their towns tagged as depressed. A group in Walker County, Tex., got the county removed from the depressed list when it complained a State survey that put per capita income at an apparent subsistence level had included 3,000 prisoners in the State penitentiary. A similar controversy swirls around a proposed ARA pilot project in Rice County, Kans., where ARA opponents contend the jobless level is one of the lowest in the State, under 3 percent.

Some of the most violent complaints, however, have come from businessmen such as those at Happy Camp who claim aid to one company in an industry is unfair to competitors. Under the law, to encourage a company to build a facility that will employ workers in a depressed area, the ARA can lend the company up to 65 percent of the project's cost at 4 percent interest with a repayment period of up to 40 years. It also can help companies indirectly by granting cities funds for facilities that will attract industry. And it can bear the cost of training on retraining workers to man new plants.

TROUBLES IN MARYLAND

A proposed project is under fire in Maryland. A new company formed by a group of businessmen in Dorchester County, called Delmarva Soya Processors, Inc., has applied for an ARA loan to build a $2 million plant to process soybeans into poultry feed. The plant would be in the heart of the Delmarva Peninsula, made up of parts of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, which accounted for nearly 30 percent of U.S. poultry production just after World War II. Delmarva's share of the poultry business has slipped to less than 10 percent as Georgia, Alabama, and other States with cheaper access to feed have captured a rising portion of the business.

Since Delmarva's share of the poultry business has shown little inclination toward growth, other feed companies in the area claim a new plant would cost more jobs than it would create. More than 20 grain and soybean dealers in the area have petitioned the ARA to disapprove the loan to Delmarva Soya Processors. They contend that more than 25 full-time grain dealers and their helpers would be thrown out of work, while the new plant would employ only 22 workers.

"This ARA is supposed to be creating new jobs, but they're just about ready to take mine away," complains Robert Whiteley, a soybean dealer in Williamsburg, Md., 12 miles from the site of the proposed new plant. He and other dealers complain that the new plant will be bidding against them for soybeans, which they claim are only grown in sufficient quantity in the area to fill present demand. Dealers who can't meet higher bids will likely lose their sources of supply, the group contends.

Says Henry Thomas, a soybean dealer at Cambridge, Md., "We could hardly complain if this were a privately financed operation but it just isn't fair to use our tax money to build a plant to drive us out of business."

FEARS OF A COMPETITOR

Franklin Purdue, who operates a soybean processing plant in Salisbury, Md., says he borrowed $1.5 million to start up his plant 3 years ago. The loan was for 5 years at 6-percent interest. "I don't suppose there's much point in taking a risk like that when somebody else comes along and gets money on a 20-year, 4-percent loan; why they could drive me right out of business while I'm pinching pennies to pay off my mortgage in 5 years," he declares.

William L. Batt, ARA Administrator, concedes that the grain dealers make "quite a convincing case," but he contends the plant would actually create 45 full-time jobs and "on balance, the economy would gain more than it would lose" by building the new plant. Otis G. Esham, president of Delmarva Soya Processors, says the other dealers are just afraid of competition. "Some babies cry if they don't get all the candy," he declares. Other promoters of the project claim it will make Delmarva more competitive with other broiler areas.

Referring primarily to California's Happy Camp case, Harold W. Williams, assistant ARA Administrator, says the agency is concerned chiefly with saving and creating jobs; "we dont necessarily consider competition or price declines bad things," he says.

The complaints, however, have given some ammunition to ARA's critics in Congress, many of whom are conservatives who fought bitterly to block formation of the agency. Representative BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, has been attacking ARA for a $418,000 loan to Tomahawk Paper Co. in Tomahawk, Wis., to help finance a new plant to make towels, tissue, and napkins. Mr. BYRNES says existing mills in the State are operating at 85 percent of capacity and "the net effect of using Federal funds to add more capacity is either to waste money on an unsuccessful enterprise or take business away from existing tissue mills."

An attempt was made to set up ARA so it could draw money for its loans and grants directly from the Treasury. Its withdrawals were to be limited largely by ceilings on how much it could put out. But a last minute amendment pushed through by conservatives forced the agency to come to Congress each year for an appropriation. It is asking an appropriation of $190 million for the 1964 fiscal year, a boost of 65 percent over the current year. The agency also wants the ceiling on the amount it can have out in loans raised to $650 million from $30 million and the limit on grants boosted to $175 million from $75 million.

An aid to Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who was one of the sponsors of legislation creating ARA, predicts the agency's spending requests will face surprisingly light opposition in Congress this spring. But critics say there are some weak points in the agency's argument that it needs more money. For one thing, they contend the agency has had difficulty finding outlets for the appropriations it already has received.

ARA's appropriation for fiscal 1962, which it didn't receive until September 30, 1961, was $122.5 million; for fiscal 1963, the appropriation was $115 million. The $84.8 million in projects the agency has authorized so far represents only about 36 percent of these combined sums.

The ARA concedes that it had some initial difficulties in stirring up local interest in projects but now claims to have applications for $300 million in projects. Mr. Batt told the House Banking and Currency Committee a few days ago that one drawback was the requirement that a local development corporation be formed to kick in at least 10 percent of the cost of a project, which is to be repaid after the ARA loan is retired. "Many promising projects have been delayed or never started because of the inability of the community to meet the 10 percent requirement," Mr. Batt said. To encourage local participation, ARA is asking that community loans be retired concurrently that the ARA loan so that local development groups will get their money back sooner than at present.

Commerce Secretary Hodges testified that "when the projects finally started to come in, we found that they could not be processed as quickly as we wanted * * * the more soundly secured projects were financed through conventional channels or through the Small Business Administration. The more difficult projects—the ones which had to be financed through ARA or not at all—required closer and more time-consuming study."

Despite such study, the ARA also has been questioned about the potential effectiveness of some of its loans and grants in creating jobs. For example, it granted $75,200 to Mineral County, Nev., to improve the Hawthorne airport by adding runway lights and resurfacing runways. An important part of the airport's business is derived from visitors to Hawthorne's gambling casino. An ARA spokesman says the project is justified, however, because "Hawthorne is looking for new industry, after all, and good airport facilities are one of the things industry is looking for."

ARA loans have followed no particular pattern but the agency has sometimes hit upon resort-type facilities for putting people to work in areas where other jobs have disappeared. The 200-odd ARA projects include a $195,000 loan for a 24-mile tourist railway at Marquette, Mich., a $320,000 loan for a ski resort in Sandpoint, Idaho, and a $10.3 million resort area which the State of Oklahoma is building on the shores of Lake Eufaula, in an area pockmarked by abandoned lead-zinc mines. Among the features of the Lake Eufaula project are golf courses, yacht docks, and four homes which resort managers will rent for $100 a month. It is expected to employ about 500 workers, the agency says.

Other outlays include a $455,000 loan to Boyer Brothers, Inc., a candy producer in Altoona, Pa., to help finance a plant expansion, and a $1.9 million loan to Ponchartrain Hotel Co. in Detroit, which is building a 432-room motel adjacent to the city's big exposition hall. Ponchartrain also is getting $3,840,000 from Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States and $674,650 from Detroit Metropolitan Industrial Development Co. The company itself is putting up $337,325.

Re H.R. 5389, a Bill To Substitute Fiat, Nonconvertible Federal Reserve Notes for All $1 and $2 U.S. Currency Redeemable in Silver Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on April 10, I addressed the House in opposition to the passage of H.R. 5389.

The time allowed me expired before the conclusion of my criticism of this bill.

Although I was given permission to extend and revise my remarks at that point in the RECORD, the remaining portion of my statement was not added to the remarks that I made on the floor. The remaining portion of my statement, pointing out the irreparable damage that this action would cause follows:

This bill will result in a further run on, and a drain upon our subsidiary silver, 50-cent, 25-cent, and 10-cent pieces, where the silver content is 0.72 ounce per $1 of coins. It will become profitable to hoard or melt down silver coins—subsidiary—at $1.38 per ounce.

The best and most effective way to meet this problem is to balance our budget, retain our silver currency monetary system, and make silver currency freely available to the general public.

Our present silver redemption monetary policy reinforces our gold reserves.

The replacement of silver dollars by Federal Reserve notes would further dilute the monetary system. It would further weaken the faith and credit of our Nation, both domestically and internationally.

As of March 27, 1963, the Treasury's stock of gold was $15.88 billion.

The Federal Reserve currency outstanding was $29.89 billion.

The Federal Reserve deposits were $17.63 billion.

The Federal Reserve liabilities, requiring a 25-percent gold reserve were $47.52 billion.

The 25-percent gold reserve requirement was $11.88 billion.

The Treasury gold assets were $15.88 billion.

The U.S. gold available for meeting foreign-held dollars and short-term obligations was $4 billion.

The present bill would add $500 million to the required gold reserves by the substitution of $2 billion Federal Reserve notes for silver certificates. This would reduce U.S. gold available to meet foreign holdings to $3.5 billion.

The U.S. Government has borrowed $800 million of gold from the International Monetary Fund which should be deducted from our holdings. This leaves a net gold stock available to meet foreign holdings to $2.7 billion.

Our short-term banking liabilities to foreigners on March 30, 1964, was $24.9 billion.

Our short-term claims on foreigners as of March 30, 1964, was $4.9 billion.

Our net short-term liabilities to foreigners, payable in gold on demand was $20 billion.

The ratio of our liabilities to our free gold—$20 billion to $2.7 billion—is about $7 in liabilities to $1 in available gold. The United States could only pay off 14 cents for each dollar of our gold liabilities to foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill will exert great pressures for the complete abandonment of our 25-percent gold reserve presently supporting $30 billion of Federal Reserve currency and $17 billion of Federal Reserve deposits.

This bill is a mere prelude to the repeal of the 25-percent gold reserve requirement for our currency. It is another major step toward devaluation, repudiation, and international bankruptcy.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION

There are a number of possible alternative solutions that would insure the retention of our silver redeemable currency and, at the same time, assure the Treasury of an adequate silver supply to meet coinage and silver reserve requirements.

The possible alternatives are—

First. Continue the minting of $1 silver coins with a reduction of silver content from 0.77 ounce to 0.72 ounce.

Second. Retain our $1 and $2 U.S. silver certificates redeemable in silver dollars with a content of 0.72 ounce of silver.

These two steps would equalize at $1.38 instead of at $1.29 per ounce the redemption monetary value of our silver certificates and dollars with that of our subsidiary silver coins of 10, 25, and 50 cents.

Third. Substitute U.S. Treasury notes for U.S. Treasury silver certificates and require a 60-percent reserve instead of a 100-percent reserve for silver notes.

This action would free 40 percent of our $1.6 billion ounces of silver and make it available for either normal or emergency needs.

The 60-percent reserve would be substantially higher than our 25-percent gold reserve for Federal Reserve notes and 45 percent for U.S. Treasury notes.

Fourth. Authorize the U.S. Treasury to protect our silver supply by the purchase or sale of free silver at a predetermined price between $1.29 and $1.38 per ounce.

Permit me to amplify my statement to the effect that we do have a sufficiency of silver to meet our coinage and currency requirements.

The April 3, 1963, Treasury statement states that we have on hand—

First. 1.633 billion ounces of silver on hand, valued at $1.29 per ounce, carried on the books at $2.111 billion.

Second. Against this silver, there are outstanding silver certificates, in face amount of $2.131 billion.

We have a 100 percent backing for our $1, $2, $5, and $10 silver certificates.

Third. We have $81 million of silver dollar coins.

Fourth. We have 37 million ounces of bullion, valued at $31 million.

Fifth. We have 64.7 million ounces stockpiled with the Atomic Energy Commission, having no present nor prospective use, valued at $85 million.

Sixth. About $300 million of silver will be freed and become available through the withdrawal and the substitution of Federal Reserve notes for $5 and $10 silver certificates.

The alleged purpose of this bill is to free silver, held as a reserve for U.S. silver currency, for coinage purposes.

Our coinage and currency requirements today, are sufficient to last for at least 3 to 4 years. This does not include the additional purchase of U.S. production of about $30 to $40 million of silver per year.

This bill would cause irreparable damage to our monetary system. It would invite a disastrous run on our gold supply by foreign holders. This bill should be returned to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Person-to-Person Diplomats Receive Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in these days of continuing international tensions and also, I sadly note, domestic strife, it is refreshing to take cognizance of a recent award bestowed upon the York-Arles Twinning Committee for the best overall program as recognized by Reader's Digest in the national sister city contest. This contest was sponsored in connection with the American Municipal Association and the civic committee of former President Eisenhower's people-to-people program.

The following editorial from the York (Pa.) Dispatch points up the outstanding achievements of this group and the success of person-to-person diplomats:

MORE THAN A DREAM

There is no doubt that the York-Arles Twinning Committee has more than justified its existence. It has made its point: That international goodwill, understanding and peace are matters for the man-in-the-street, and are not alone those for official diplomacy.

York should feel grateful for the laborious, volunteer and persevering work of the committee, for it brought international recognition to this community only this week in Washington. The committee's twinning program with Arles, France, was singled out as the most outstanding in its class in worldwide competition.

Perhaps some folks reacted to this event with a simple, "That's nice." They are the ones who obviously do not fully realize what has been invested in the program, entirely on a voluntary basis, and what benefits it is paying in spreading and strengthening the people-to-people concept. The York committee, in reaching the pinnacle, rose from the status of the pioneer to the stature of the model for a growing list of cities which are adopting similar projects keyed to closer relationship and keener understanding among all people.

The success of York-Arles twinning, we believe, can be attributed to a simple form-

ula: Dedication to a purpose. This was illustrated last July when many area homes were thrown open to a delegation of visitors from York's sister city in France. To some it was the realization of a dream, but to the committee it was the attainment of an objective; the putting into practice that personal touch which leads to understanding, comfort, friendship and mutual admiration.

Now, with York bearing the label of "best" in its twinning endeavors, the York committee is not lessening the tempo of its program. Rather, it is intensifying its efforts by returning the visit of Arles this summer. The York committee has arranged a flying trip in July to Arles, a trip which will certainly further cement the people-to-people philosophy and serve to point up this community again as an example in the twinning movement.

It has been said that the York folks on this trip will not go as tourists. They will go as York and American ambassadors and friends.

This is as it should be. And we believe the Arlesiens will want it that way.

Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing Americans are noted for it is finishing what they start. See a thing through. And that is what we are being called upon to do today. Finish the job.

This appropriation is authorized. Now let us vote it. It is greatly needed. Unemployment has decreased somewhat this last month. We all hope it continues. But it is not going to disappear overnight. We saw last year what needed to be done and we had the nerve then to vote a program to do it. Let us finish that program by voting the remaining funds authorized. Besides a stimulation for the economy and a help for the unemployed, it will help satisfy our national needs for construction of essential public facilities. Further, we owe it to the communities that have been led to expect the appropriation, and that have gone ahead in almost assured anticipation of our appropriation. Many, perhaps most, of the applicants were ready or almost so for participation in the first appropriation. But that money could go just so far, and some had to wait or give up their projects.

For example—just to take one instance—in the Hill-Burton hospital construction program administered by the U.S. Public Health Service—one of the grant-in-aid programs participating in this program—there is a reported backlog of 264 projects costing $259,262,300 and requesting $127,297,427 in accelerated public works assistance. We cannot help all these applicants, but we can help some. If we appropriate this money, as we should, some $56 million would be allocated to the Hill-Burton program for construction of these projects.

Beyond this, there is the permanent employment that follows from operation of every medical facility.

We expect others to honor their obligations to us; let us honor our obligations to the country. Vote the remainder of the accelerated public works authorization and stimulate the chain effect of increased employment and construction of needed public works. Do not let the communities look in vain to us for help. Do not let us slam the doors in their faces. Let us complete what we started and put people to work today.

Hard-Working Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the first New York Times Sunday magazine published following settlement of the lengthy strike contained an excellent profile of the brilliant Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy. The author was the able reporter, Anthony Lewis, of the Times' Washington bureau. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and include it as a part of my remarks as follows:

WHAT DRIVES BOBBY KENNEDY—AN APPRAISAL OF THE QUALITIES THAT HAVE PUT HIM, AT 37, AT THE CENTER OF POWER

(By Anthony Lewis)

(Anthony Lewis, of the New York Times Washington staff, follows the affairs of the Justice Department and U.S. Supreme Court.)

WASHINGTON.—Certainly there has never been an Attorney General like him. In the last 15 months, in addition to presiding over the regular business of the Justice Department, Robert Kennedy has debated with Japanese Communists, helped to settle the Dutch-Indonesia dispute over west New Guinea, played a vital role in the great tests of his brother's Presidency over steel prices, the University of Mississippi, and Soviet missiles in Cuba, made a flying trip to Brazil to discuss her economic crisis with President Joao Goulart, took a critical part behind the scenes in the Cuban prisoner ransom and, most recently, directed the administration's planning on youth employment and delinquency, culminating in the proposal for a Domestic Peace Corps.

His varied and pervasive role in Government has made him, inevitably, a center of controversy. There are businessmen, labor leaders and politicians who mouth the words "Bobby Kennedy" as an oath. There are also admirers, including many who feared his becoming Attorney General but now praise his performance.

He is, at all events, one of the most influential figures in Washington—and one of the least understood.

The public probably takes its image of Robert Francis Kennedy from the swimming pool stories, which make him seem a bubbling extrovert, fond of gay parties and the sophisticated life. A very Republican lady who had that picture in mind met him recently at a dinner party. She heard him fumble his way through a toast, watched him avoid the dance floor and then said to her husband with astonishment: "Why, he's shy."

He is, in fact, an introspective person who suffers the social whirl but does not swim in it. His wife, Ethel, is the bubbly one whose enthusiasm lights up parties. Often in the midst of revelers he can be seen with a preoccupied expression, as if some thought of duty had crossed his mind. He has no love for small talk, or for the artistic pleasures of the White House Kennedys. New York would not call him a cultivated man. He is too simple.

All public figures are supposed to love children, but he really does. If a friend stops by with a child at Hickory Hill, the Kennedys' home in McLean, Va., the Attorney General is likely to sweep the child up on a horse and ride off. When he had a few minutes off from a grinding schedule in Japan, he played ball with some 5-year-olds from a kindergarten next door to the American Embassy. He looked happier than he had for days, until a television cameraman appeared; then he walked off.

He has the Kennedy family's feeling about physical courage and, in perhaps especially acute form, its compulsion to win. One icy day a few months ago, with a drizzle coming down, he shamed six reluctant old college football teammates out onto a muddy field to take on brother Teddy and his friends in touch football. They played on, relentlessly, until the Robert Kennedy team pulled ahead.

The widespread fears of Robert Kennedy among liberals when he became Attorney General were based in good part on the suspicion that he was focused too much on winning. The feeling was that he was too single minded, too intolerant of different views, too impatient with human imperfection.

This criticism reflected what had been said of him since he arrived in Washington, as an investigating counsel for Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in 1953. An experienced observer then called him "an impatient kid." Later, as counsel to the Senate Rackets Committee, he was charged by some with too much zealotry in opposing labor corruption and too little respect for procedural niceties.

In the Stevenson campaign of 1956 he rode along in the campaign plane, but he was silent and separate, hardly saying a word to anyone. Recently someone reminded him of that period, and he remarked, "I was learning what not to do." It sounded, the way he said that, as if he had spent his time in 1956 painstakingly noting the numerous Stevenson miscues.

As late as the 1960 campaign, a veteran Democratic poll found him inflexible—too demanding for perfection in his image, insufficiently understanding of other men's ideas, or their failings.

None of that would be too surprising in a rich young man—one who, unlike his older brother, had never faced a supreme test of body and spirit. And when he became Attorney General, that was a widespread impression of Robert Kennedy; calculating, narrow, intolerant.

It is questionable whether he ever really was all of that. His friends deny it. But in any case the public image has quite plainly failed to keep up with the man. He has changed.

He says himself that two experiences before the start of this administration had a

particular impact on his thinking—the work on the rackets committee and his brother's primary campaign in West Virginia in 1960.

On the committee he saw the "helplessness of people, their inability to help themselves." His stomach turned at the exploitation of such low-paid workers as carwashers by union leaders.

West Virginia "was an important experience for both my brother and myself—how desperate the people were in their poverty, but they still had their pride."

The point seems to be, though he does not say it, that in those two experiences he learned something about the random cruelty of life, about the helplessness of even good men in the grip of larger forces.

His education has been intensified in the last 2 years. He has really been holding down two jobs in the administration: Attorney General, and Presidential adviser-at-large and trouble shooter.

It was in the second role, of course, that he made his trip around the world last year. The trip was as much for learning as for doing. It taught him, among other things, the place of the irrational—of emotion—in world politics. When one sees an entire people mesmerized by an issue of no practical benefit to them, as the Indonesians were by West New Guinea or the Japanese by Okinawa, one realizes that more human beings live by slogans than by Amercia's kind of pragmatic politics.

Before that trip Robert Kennedy was often highly critical of the Foreign Service; with all that was wrong in the world, it must have failed. He came back much more understanding of its problems.

He came back, too, acutely aware of the connection between social reform in the United States and our posture abroad. He had seen the hunger of Asia for racial and economic justice. Over and over, he had found himself citing the steps taken within the United States to end poverty and racial discrimination. On the way home he said to a newspaperman:

"What would BARRY GOLDWATER say to those people?"

Two things distinguish Robert Kennedy from the ordinary Presidential aid: the diversity of subjects on which he is consulted and the intimacy of his relationship.

The President consults him on major appointments and domestic political decisions. And he has played a vital role in the life-and-death issues of foreign and security policy in this administration. During the Cuban missile crisis, when the choice lay between a sudden strike on the Soviet bases and a blockade, it was the Attorney General who made the most eloquent and persuasive argument to the war council against the strike—what one participant called "a Fourth of July speech"—saying that America would never be the same if it made a Pearl Harbor-like attack.

The intimacy of the two brothers is hard to describe. An old friend of both says simply: "You talk to your brother as you talk to no one else." Another man high in the administration's foreign policy councils puts it: "He has the President's confidence as no other human being does."

Their adult relationship began when John Kennedy's campaign manager had a breakdown during his run for the Senate in 1952. Robert, who was in Washington with the Justice Department, went back to Massachusetts and took over. There was no formal request; in his words, "We don't have that." His brother needed him, so he went.

The relationship now is necessarily on two levels. On Justice Department matters and others where he has formal responsibility, such as the planning for a domestic Peace Corps, Robert reports formally, through channels.

But then there are the conversations on Cuba, or the Central Intelligence Agency, or the future of the Democratic Party in New York. To outsiders the talk would seem cryptic, because the communion is so perfect. In a sentence, in an elliptical phrase, views are communicated.

The Attorney General's role in foreign and national security affairs is commonly dated from the Bay of Pigs fiasco 2 years ago. He was appointed afterward to help find out what had gone wrong. But in another way the episode illustrates what he does for his brother.

According to those who were in on it, one reason for the disaster was the failure of the President and his personal advisers to cross-examine the planners of the Cuban invasion. It was just after the new administration had taken over. One man explains:

"There was too much deference to the experts we'd all been reading about in the magazines. It taught the President the necessity of questioning assumptions."

Asking questions has been Robert Kennedy's particular job since then. He performs this role in behalf of the President, and for several reasons he can do it better than the President himself or his principal Cabinet advisers on foreign and security affairs.

The presence of the President somehow inhibits candid conversation. This was illustrated during the Cuban crisis, when the President deliberately stayed away from some war council meetings to encourage freedom of discussion. The President's brother does not have the same effect.

And a President has to respect the table of organization. He cannot go past the Secretary of State, for example, and ask the head of the department's Congo desk what he really thinks of the situation. The President's brother can be, and is, a lot more free-wheeling.

Then, too, a department head with formal responsibilities for foreign or national security policy speaks as the end product of a lengthy process. He is, so to speak, bound to his department's position paper. But the President's brother is not so bound; he can question any assumption.

His relationship with the President has fascinated the public so much that his performance within the confines of the Attorney General's duties may be overlooked. Most noteworthy, in view of the department's closest and most critical observers, has been his choice of principal assistants. With few exceptions, they are scholars, lawyers of the first rank, as illustrious a group as the department has had for many years.

His first appointee, and one who played a major part in choosing the others, was Byron R. White, now on the Supreme Court. Mr. White's successor as Deputy Attorney General (and like him a onetime Rhodes Scholar) is Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, a former professor of international law. Two Washington practitioners of the highest reputation, Burke Marshall and Louis F. Oberdorfer, head the civil rights and tax divisions, respectively. Another ex-professor, Archibald Cox, is Solicitor General.

These are very different men from those Robert Kennedy knew as investigating committee counsel and campaign manager. They are hard boiled, but they are unmistakably eggheads. He has unquestionably learned from them. And they have had from him the informed support needed for any ambitious program.

Civil rights, for example, Mr. Marshall, with his superior's backing, has brought the program to life. New imagination and tenacity are evident in the struggle for Negro rights.

The Attorney General concedes that he came to the job with no emotional commitment on civil rights: "I wasn't lying awake nights thinking about the Negro in this country." But he has learned, and changed, as Attorney General.

"There are injustices," he says, "and they are flagrant. And I have the power and responsibility to do something about them. So I intend to do it. It's quite simple."

He does not say—as a restrained and pragmatic man he still resists saying—that his emotions have been stirred. But one suspects that there is now a commitment of the spirit on the race question.

On a broader front, he is clearly more of a liberal in social and economic terms today than he was a few years ago. But he still resists the label. Something in his past makes him think of liberals as "people who talk too much."

The suspicion remains mutual to a significant degree. Robert Kennedy has not turned out to be the ogre that many liberals feared when he became Attorney General. But there are specific liberal criticisms of his performances, and some more general worries.

The specifics include his failure to oppose a tightening of the Smith Act which passed Congress last year, and what some liberals regard as too weak a fight against congressional reimposition of postal censorship on Communist propaganda. It should be said that there is no longer any significant fear of him as a McCarthy-like Red hunter; there would be none if his private remarks about anti-Communist zealots were known.

Liberal critics seem to be more worried now about a zealot's crusade against crime. The package of antiracketeering legislation that passed the last Congress gave concern. The wiretapping bill that did not pass was also attacked, and an unsuccessful proposal to prohibit intimidation of Federal agents or witnesses was said by one liberal Congressman to be so broad as "to make it a crime to whistle at an FBI man."

Implicit in this criticism is the fear that the Attorney General is seeking too much power for himself. That is a charge that has been made with increasing frequency by Republicans on the floor of Congress. It is, in fact, the point at which liberal and conservative fears of Robert Kennedy coalesce.

The episode that evoked the biggest outcry from the right was the early-morning FBI call on newspapermen during the steel price crisis. There seems no question but that this has stuck in the public mind as an example of ruthlessness.

There have been critics, too, who have called Robert Kennedy too much of a partisan to be the country's chief law-enforcement official. And his wide-range role in Government outside the Justice Department has been severely questioned as a putative embarrassment to orderly government.

His defenders scoff at the picture of him as power and, ruthless, or partisan.

The FBI episode, in fact, seems to have been simply a bureaucratic mixup. It was in the afternoon that the Attorney General asked for an investigation. For reasons it has not explained, the FBI waited until after midnight to call on the reporters.

As for partisanship, it is difficult to call an Attorney General political when he indicts two Congressmen of his own party 3 weeks before election day. Robert Kennedy did that, and cost the Democrats an almost sure seat in the House.

A White House aid who has wrestled with him over judicial appointments calls him the least partisan man in Government. In arguments, this man says, "he gives you that corny patriotism and stuff. But he means it."

One gets something of the same reaction when one tries to find evidence of resentment among the regular foreign-policy officials at the Attorney General's activities. There just seems to be very little grumbling.

It was Secretary of State Rusk who asked him to deal with Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin during the Cuban crisis. If the expected jealousy is absent, the reason may be that given by one official: "It is so clear that his interest is not personal aggrandisement; it is in making the operation work."

A similar theme is sounded by one of his Justice Department assistants, a man of independence and high reputation at the bar. He says: "I have never seen this Attorney General do anything for a selfish reason, to win public approval or avoid criticism. What he does he does because he thinks it is right."

Any dispassionate observer would have to credit him with fantastic energy in performing his multiple role in Government, and with intelligence as an administrator of the Justice Department. (He has made the career lawyers in the department bloom by encouraging initiative and by recognizing exceptional performance with a personal visit or phone call.)

On the debit side there is an abruptness, an occasional peremptory tone that may conceal a lingering insecurity or lack of experience. He is only 37 years old; mellowness may require more maturity, even in one who has lived—and learned—in a hurry.

The question is premature, but one is bound to ask where Robert Kennedy is going from here.

He will not stay at the Justice Department indefinitely. When he feels some of his programs have made tangible progress, especially the new campaign against organized crime, he will move on.

It is difficult to imagine his leaving the Government as long as his brother is President. If he follows the interest he has demonstrated in the past 2 years, he will turn to a job in the field of national security.

And after his brother's Presidency? Robert Kennedy does not think that far ahead, especially about himself. But few men at the center of power voluntarily renounce that position, and for a Kennedy there is a special challenge. That is to go to the people in one's own behalf—to run for office.

There are weighty reasons opposed. His shyness, for one. And like all political managers, he has taken the burden of much criticism so that his candidate could remain above the battle. But in the end he may regard running for office as the ultimate test. If so, Robert Kennedy will run.

Youth of Idaho Congratulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to tell my colleagues in the House and the people of America of the great amount of pride that I have in some young people in my congressional district.

Some junior high school students at Burley, Idaho, have formed a Students for a Better America Club. They have written to me requesting my ideas on how they can best promote patriotism and the appreciation of our great Nation. Mr. Speaker, they enclosed with their letter to me a little card that sets forth the code for citizenship of their club. It is one that I am very proud to endorse. I am grateful to have young citizens with these goals and ideals among my constituents.

Today when young people of junior high school age are too often lured away by the temptations of alcohol, cigarettes, dope, and pornographic literature, I am especially delighted to have in my district these young people who are setting their sights on a better America. They constitute the Boy Scout leaders, the school board members, the teachers, the scientists, the businessmen, the city councilmen, the county commissioners and yes, even the national leaders of tomorrow. I offer them my sincere congratulations on the formation of their club and wish them much success on the accomplishments of their goals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the code for citizenship of the Burley, Idaho, Students for a Better America Club.

The article follows:

CODE FOR CITIZENSHIP

1. As a citizen of the United States I will uphold its Constitution and use the rights and liberties that are mine.
2. I will give our flag the respect due it for those who fought so hard to keep it flying.
3. I will keep the laws of the land so that we may help maintain unity and faith in each other.
4. I will respect the opinions and ideas of other people.
5. I will uphold that which I know to be right in the face of all opposition.
6. I will set high goals and work conscientiously toward them in order to be of use to my fellow beings.
7. I will be an example unto others of virtue, honesty, loyalty, and all things good, true, and right.
8. I will support those having authority and help them in their callings.
9. I will put my trust in God.
10. I will not think of what my country can do for me, but what I can do to repay those who worked so hard for the things I have to enjoy.

Refreshing Remarks by Arthur Hoppe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, as we embark on our Easter recess and take varied and sundry routes out of the Nation's Capital, I wish to leave with the readers of the RECORD some cheerful and refreshing remarks by Arthur Hoppe, columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle.

Those who follow him avidly will recognize the same amusing style in his approach to some of the prominent topics of the day as evidenced in the following articles:

A PROVEN SYSTEM OF BIRTH CONTROL

(By Arthur Hoppe)

EN ROUTE TO SOUTH AMERICA

The reason I am en route to South America is because I saw where Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy have separate bedrooms in their new Virginia weekend retreat. I think this will solve the population explosion.

I'm not, heaven forbid, prying into our President's personal affairs. I only wish to salute him for helping popularize the only proven-safe, easily understood, guaranteed-effective method of planned parenthood. It's what we experts in the field refer to as geographical birth control.

Actually, up to now, it's been a matter of economics. The richer you get, the farther away from your wife you get. The poor, as you know, sleep in double beds. The middle class in twins. While the rich enjoy separate bedrooms, separate cabanas and separate vacations. This explains why we have so many poor people in the world. And so few rich.

So hats off to Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy, I say, for pointing the way through geographical birth control.

For the population explosion, let's face facts, boils down to a question of opportunity. Statistics bear this out irrefutably.

The poor, who sleep in double beds, average a shocking 7.2 children per household. Now a few sociologists hold this due to the lack of outdoorsy leisure-time activities. Such as water polo and quoits. But the double bed's essential responsibility cannot be ignored.

Take the middle class in its twin beds. A far more admirable average of only 2.4 children per household. More quoit players, you say? Perhaps. But the prime factor is that opportunity has been withdrawn a good yard. Or, as Rotarian speakers invariably put it, "seizing opportunity requires get-up-and-go."

But to date the problem has been solved satisfactorily only by the rich. I doubt any more effective method will ever be devised than having to get up on a cold night, fumble in the closet for one's bathrobe and slippers, stumble down a drafty hall and knock three times on a closed door. Only to find she's off someplace on a separate vacation. The very thought quells the spirit of romance.

And thus it is no surprise. The idle rich, as we call them, average a distinguished 1.2 children. (Excluding the Kennedys who are devoted to 50-mile hikes.) A goal for us all to shoot at.

So if the Government wishes to enter the field of birth control, logic dictates it promote the only perfect method. And let our battle cry then be: "Separate Bedrooms for the Poor!" With perhaps a few quoits thrown in.

Meanwhile, it is up to us as individuals. Join the Geographical birth control league today. Do your part to save the world by stamping out togetherness.

So you can see why I'm off alone to South America. It just shows how far I'll go for a great idea. And this is unarguably a great idea. At last we have a method anybody can understand. Anybody, I might caution, but your wife.

HELP THE DESTITUTE—TAKE 'EM TO LUNCH

(By Arthur Hoppe)

EN ROUTE TO SOUTH AMERICA

I was just joshing. I'm not really going to South America to promote geographical birth control. I'm really going to South America to reexamine our foreign aid program. Everybody's been doing it—for years.

Only lately we're getting very hardheaded about foreign aid. "We gotta be hardheaded," says Congressman OTTO PASSMAN, who wishes to trim foreign aid funds—with a meat ax. And he says some of these countries we give money to are untrustworthy.

Further more, he's right. We slip a zillion dollars to South Concertina. And the next thing you know South Concertina is voting against us in the U.N. and expro-

priating our bananas. It's the height of political dishonesty: these countries just won't stay bought.

But I've got a plan: We knock off slipping these countries cold cash to make them do what we want. Instead, what we do is send them bottles of whisky for Christmas. And maybe suitably inscribed cuff links. Because that's the American way.

You know how it is. If you wish to win the warm, enduring friendship of the cop on the beat or the free press or a client you hate, do you send him a $10 bill? Nonsense. That would be unethical. You send him a $10 bottle. If he's an important client, you also buy him a $25 dinner. And if he's very important you may wish to supply him with one of those young ladies of the evening. Who are excellent at creating good will.

So my bottle diplomacy program would be far more ethical. Which would make us all feel better. I'm sure. More important, it would be far more inexpensive. Which would make Mr. PASSMAN feel better. I'm sure. Statistics show the $100 billion cash money we've spent on foreign aid would be enough to bribe every single foreigner in the world with a $10 bottle three time over. And all we really want to bribe are the foreign officials. Oh, we'll be way ahead.

I'd suggest a strict set of standards be established. To prevent corruption. A foreign legislator, for example, would rate a bottle. An elected official should get a bottle and cuff links. While an El Presidenta rates at least a weekly free lunch, a case of the best on his birthday, and seven fashion models.

Along with each gift, of course, goes a note. Like: "Hi there, Amigo. Haven't seen much of you lately. How's the Missus, if any? And by the by, which way are you planning to vote on that bill nationalizing the local branch of our friendly garter belt industry? Sure hope you think about it. Twice. Your Pal, Uncle Sam."

Yes, sir, as long as we think of our foreign aid program as a bribe to make people do what we want politically, I say bottle diplomacy is the only hardheaded, practicle approach. Because in bribery, it's the personal touch that counts.

The alternative, obviously, is the softheaded approach. This holds we should simply give what money we can afford to those who need it. Not so much for their good as for our own. But we could never get the likes of Mr. PASSMAN to vote for that. Of course, we might send him a bottle.

THE NATIVES ARE GETTING RESTFUL

(By Arthur Hoppe)

MACUTO, VENEZUELA—There you are, loafing around the house. And here I am in the thick of things, fighting communism. Just like Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon, as you may recall, came down here as Vice President to fight communism and cement the bonds of Venezuelan-American friendship. And Mr. Eisenhower had to call out the Marines.

So, with Mr. Nixon's example in mind, it was with some inner queasiness that I stepped off the VIASA jet airliner—better equipped though I was in my football helmet and drip-dry suit. Somebody cleared his throat. "Hit the deck," I cried. And then seven of them rushed me.

Three just wanted to shake hands. A fourth gave me a bottle of Venezuelan rum. Another presented me with a souvenir corkscrew and a bottle opener. And the last handed me a punch. In a tall glass with a cherry in it.

But you know why they love me? It's because they recognize a dedicated Communist-fighter when they see one. And that's exactly what I am.

It's economics. You see, President Betancourt, who is a good guy, has got a couple of mountains full of iron plus oil all over the place. But he's got to "broaden Venezuela's economic base" (whatever that means) to eliminate poverty and defeat the Communists. So he's opening classy hotels around the country to attract tourist dollars. Which are the best kind.

Therefore, if you have any old tourist dollars lying around the house, it is your bounden patriotic duty to come down here into the front lines and fight communism. Personally, I am entrenched at the Macuto-Sheraton Hotel and I can honestly say I have never seen a better place to fight communism.

Built under the old regime of Dictator Marcus Perez Jiminez (a bad guy), the hotel has been standing vacant for the past 5 years and is just now opening under lease to the Sheraton people. It's got 17 kinds of Italian marble and cost a reported $40 million to build. Or better than $100,000 per guest room. With lanai. But the rooms rent for $10 a day. So being a dedicated Communist-fighter is not only patriotic. It's relatively cheap. And you can't beat that.

Of course, fighting communism is not without its hardships. There are grave decisions. Should we sit on the lanai looking up at the towering green Andes? Or in the patio looking out over the blue Caribbean? And which of the two huge pools should we dip into? Or the crystal waters lapping the private beach? Ah, me. And what kind of wine, do you feel, goes best with the filet de bouef? Should we golf this afternoon? Or go deep-sea fishing? Is there time before cocktails to * * *?

Hold it. A gentleman just walked into my $100,000 room carrying a bottle of Scotch, two bottles of mineral water, a fresh pineapple and a bucket of ice. I don't know about Mr. Betancourt, but I think I'm winning.

And now, if you'll excuse a dedicated old Communist-fighter who is trying to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Nixon, I think I'll go out on the lanai and get stoned.

LET'S OVERTHROW LATIN POLITICS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—Guatemala is overthrown, Argentina is teetering and I am tottering. The reason I'm tottering is I've lots of information for you on the Venezuelan political situation and it staggers the mind.

As you know from reading the papers, Venezeula is seething with unrest, racked by violence, thick with Communists and nobody's life is safe a minute. Revolution, say the experts, could sweep the country before you get to the next sentence. It hasn't? Well I'm not surprised. It all depends on which expert you talk to.

Take the Presidente, Mr. Betancourt. Everybody used to say Mr. Betancourt was really a Communist. That was before the Communists began heaving bombs at him. Now everybody says he's really an anti-Communist. Which makes sense. Everybody, that is, except the leftwing which says he is a Fascist tool of the American oil interests. And the rightwing, which says it's a plot, as usual, and he's really still a Communist. Who, I guess, just likes to have bombs heaved at him. Anyway, I think he's nice.

So let us turn to an easy yes-or-no type question: Is there a Communist Party in Venezuela? No, there are three. One is against Moscow. One is against Peking. And the third is against the other two. There are also six other parties who are against the Communists and each other. At least there were six yesterday. But they tend to get against themselves and they multiply like rabbits, or, more accurately, amoebas.

Of course, there is also the FALN or armed forces of national liberation, which doesn't come right in English. The FALN, as you know, is a group of 10,000 young, hard-core, Moscow-trained, Castro-equipped terrorists who steal ships, paintings, and kill everybody in sight. Either that, or it's a bunch of 50 neurotic juvenile delinquents who like to play pranks. Depending on which expert you talk to.

The other day, if it helps, the FALN had a pitched battle with the army. No less than 10,000 rounds of ammunition were fired, said awed eyewitnesses. Nobody was hurt, said awed eyewitnesses. How come, I asked a leftwinger.

"If they hurt people," he said, "it will give them a bad reputation." And why, I later asked a group of the university students, didn't they join the FALN? "Them," snorted one, "they're all either too short or they hate their mothers."

So you can see why I'm tottering. Besides, from here I was thinking of wandering up to Washington. And somebody's bound to say: "Venezuela is the key to the whole South American situation. (That being what they always say in Washington.) How does it really look down there?"

Well, all I can say is "the mountains are towering, the countryside is lush, the cities are beautiful, the people are friendly and funny, and the water's fine." Oh, I tell you, I'll be drummed out of the National Press Club before I can hang up my hat.

So I might as well totter back to the pool at the Macuto-Sheraton Hotel, stagger out on the diving board and overthrow myself. It's good training for becoming an expert on Latin American politics. I mean it's over my head.

EXCLUSIVE: HOW CUBA LOOKS TODAY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

MACUTO, VENEZUELA.—I waited to bring you my exclusive eyewitness report on "How Cuba Looks Today" until I could clear it with the CIA. My country first, I always say. But I am now ready to give you a precise, accurate, unbiased, overall picture of exactly how Cuba looks today.

It's mostly green, with some patches of brown. And it's far longer than it is wide.

The reason I'm able to bring you this precise, accurate, unbiased, overall picture is that Cuba lies smack dab between New Orleans and Venezuela down here in the upper right-hand corner of South America. And VIASA, the excellent Venezuelan airline, saves $132.20 in kerosene for its big 880 jets if it doesn't have to spend an extra 20 minutes detouring around Cuba.

"Most days Castro gives us permission to fly over," says Mr. Joe R. Pardo, a VIASA executive. "But some days he says 'No.' Then we got to go around."

While Mr. Pardo said he didn't know why Mr. Castro sometimes refused permission, I assume it's for aerial safety. I mean there are so many American reconnaissance planes flying over Cuba these days, an airline might interfere with the flight patterns.

Whatever, Mr. Castro was in a good mood the day we flew down and thus I'm able to bring you another exclusive eyewitness report—from 30,000 feet—which I'm sure you've been waiting for. Because eyewitness reports on Cuba are very big in journalistic circles these days. And one thing for certain:

I've got the big picture.

First of all, Cuba, despite numerous articles to the contrary, looks in very good condition, generally speaking. For example, I personally didn't see a single bullet hole in it. Although, of course, they may be there.

Now, as to the reports of Russian missiles, I am unable either to confirm or deny. True, I didn't actually see any Russian missiles. But they may well have been hidden in caves, or under banana leaves. Although I'm

pretty sure I saw a banana plantation, I didn't see any caves. This could be significant.

However, I can accurately report that the whole time I observed the Cuban scene, I didn't see a single breadline. And while I can't say the Cuban people look happy and full, I can't say they look unhappy and skinny either.

On the other hand, there is obviously a desperate shortage of medicines under the Castro regime. Not one single aspirin could be spotted in the whole island. Not even a Dristan tablet. Oh, the suffering that must be going on. From colds, sinus trouble, and hay fever, if nothing else.

And now for the crucial question you undoubtedly have been dying to ask, "Do the Cubans hate Castro?" From my vantage point I would have to say, yes and no. Yes, many Cuban people hate Mr. Castro. And, no, many Cuban people don't. But there is definitely an undercurrent. It lies just off the southwestern tip of the island and I have an exclusive photograph of it to prove it—if it comes out. Just think, it'll be the first Cuban undercurrent ever photographed.

And now, if you'll excuse me, I have to go rush my eyewitness report off to the CIA and the press. Oh, I'll be rich. Of course, you're probably saying, "Pooh, an eyewitness report from 5 miles up isn't worth anything."

Nonsense. First of all, that's 85 miles closer than most eyewitness reports on Cuba these days. And secondly, I've been studying the market for eyewitness reports on Cuba. And believe me, we'll buy anything.

Let's Implement the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am finding that Americans today are more concerned than ever before about the administration's apparent disregard of our time-honored Monroe Doctrine. They are concerned, in fact they are alarmed, at the lily-livered diplomats and the pink-fingered politicians who tell us our enemy is not our enemy and that we must learn to coexist with Communist murderers and tyrants.

I am pleased at the work and positive action of the Committee for the Monroe Doctrine and the dedicated efforts of their chairman, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker. I am glad to include his appeal to this Congress and to the American people asking them to protect the honor and security of our Nation by implementing the Monroe Doctrine.

The article follows:

AN APPEAL TO THE CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES: PROTECT THE HONOR AND SECURITY OF THE NATION BY IMPLEMENTING THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(A statement by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, April 7, 1963)

The Kennedy administration has committed the final betrayal of Cuban hopes for freedom by its order to block the activities of exiled Cuban freedom fighters to liberate their nation from communism. By the same token, President Kennedy is underwriting continued Soviet control over Cuba with the armed might of the United States. Thus, a massive and fatal historic contradiction is perpetrated by the young men who control the executive branch of our Government, a contradiction which, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, places the security of the Nation in immediate jeopardy.

In spite of Communist promises to withdraw Russian troops from Cuba by March 15, only 3,000 have so far been withdrawn. Secretary of State Dean Rusk said on March 12 "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere." Yet, Soviet troops remain in Cuba.

What does the administration do? Does it mobilize the military forces of the United States to back up the demand that Soviet troops be withdrawn immediately? No. It mobilizes the military forces of the United States to block the efforts of those Cuban patriots who are attempting to wrest their homeland from Castro and the Soviet troops. The administration has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's Navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

It is conceivable that a President of the United States might see fit to temporarily suspend the Monroe Doctrine for immediate strategic reasons. However, for a President of the United States to utilize his functions as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to actively aid in the destruction of the Monroe Doctrine by utilizing his power to protect foreign troops in this hemisphere is inconceivable. And yet it is happening.

Present U.S. policy in Cuba is doomed to defeat. This policy of refusing to aid in the overthrow of Communist regimes which, by their nature, are declared enemies of the United States and of free men everywhere is now being applied throughout the world. It has sapped the morale and will to fight of anti-Communist forces everywhere. It has tarnished the honor of the United States and turned our brave talk of freedom and liberation into empty and hypocritical mouthings. This policy is based on cowardice and fear rather than on the traditional American heritage of supporting freedom throughout the world, a heritage which has been paid for dearly with the blood of our young men in two World Wars and Korea. To dismiss the sacrifices of our dead and our maimed for life who are still with us, and of those young Americans who give their lives today in Vietnam and other areas of the world under Communist attack, dishonors the entire Nation.

In times of historic concern and national jeopardy, when the administration has been frightened into inactivity the Congress of the United States must take appropriate action. And if the Congress of the United States is unable to function, then the people of the United States, exercising their constitutional prerogatives, must take the lead.

The Nation is in jeopardy.

In our own hemisphere, the Monroe Doctrine, strictly and immediately enforced, is the only policy which stands between freedom and ultimate Communist takeover of all of Latin America.

The Committee for the Monroe Doctrine calls on the Congress of the United States to immediately resolve that the Monroe Doctrine continues to be a basic plank of American foreign policy.

Further, we call on the Congress of the United States to utilize all of its powers to see that the Monroe Doctrine is implemented and that communism is removed from Cuba forthwith.

We call on the people of the United States to inform their representatives in Washington of their sentiments on this issue and to let their will be known.

The honor and security of the Nation are at stake.

Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually: Wants Larger Area To Lose More in

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth of a series of editorials from newspapers in southern Idaho that are critical of the proposal to extend the Bonneville Power Administration power marketing area into southern Idaho.

With Bonneville now losing $15 million annually, it is difficult to understand why its socialistic promoters want to spend up to $100 million of the taxpayers' money on unjustified transmission lines to bring subsidized Federal electric power to an area that is now being amply served by taxpaying electric utilities at reasonable rates well below the national average.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, there are 26 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, all of which are located within the Bonneville power marketing area. It appears that southern Idaho would rather do without the questionable blessings of the subsidized Federal power from Bonneville, so that they can continue to receive the taxes from the private utilities now serving them so well.

The following editorial from the Eastern Idaho Farmer of Idaho, Idaho Falls, Idaho, uses "The Story of Cascade Locks" to express their opinion as to why they think Bonneville power is not the economic blessing its socialistic promoters would have them believe.

As the House of Representatives is planning an Easter recess, the balance of this series of editorials will be resumed after the House returns.

The editorial follows:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, Sept. 20, 1962]

THE STORY OF CASCADE LOCKS

If there's any city, village or community in the entire Northwest which should benefit from Bonneville power, it's Cascade Locks in Oregon.

Cascade Locks is snuggled up close to the Bonneville Dam, first of the Federal power generating installations on the Columbia River. Cascade Locks has everything. It is at tidewater. The Bonneville Dam provides power for its municipal system. It is served by railroads on both sides of the Columbia River and two trunk highways. It has a beautiful setting, mild climate, plenty of water, and industrial sites without end.

Cascade Locks was there when the Bonneville Dam was built, back in the early days of the New Deal. It's still there. By every yardstick, Cascade Locks should have felt the beneficient influence of Bonneville Power Administration's ministrations: it should be a thriving and growing metropolis.

What's actually happened during those years? The answer is simple, even if the reasons are obscure. In 1950, Cascade Locks had a population of 733 people. The 1960 census credited Cascade Locks with a popu-

lation of 660; a loss in 10 years of about 10 percent.

Anyone who thinks that Bonneville power is a guarantee of growth, progress, and prosperity in itself should take a close look at Cascade Locks. We'll swap Bonneville power for human ingenuity and the will to get things done every time.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducted its Voice of Democracy contest in which State winners told of their reasons why they believed in democracy and what it means to be an American.

The winner for the State of Michigan was Miss Dianne Miller, of Detroit. I recently obtained a copy of her statement, and I found her words so moving, so aware of our heritage and blessings here in this Nation, that I thought it important for my colleagues to take note of them.

I think the Veterans of Foreign Wars deserve the highest praise for its sponsorship of this contest which awakens in a great many young people an awareness of what has gone before them to insure for their futures the most precious of possessions—freedom.

The article follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Graves, rows upon rows of graves. And then, that unforgettable grave, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. This is the sight seen by all those who visit the Arlington Cemetery, near our Nation's Capital.

In the spring of 1961 our family was vacationing in Washington D.C., viewing the normal tourist attractions which our Capital offers, the stately White House, the majestic Capitol Building, the graceful lines of the Washington Monument, and the dignified stature of the Lincoln Memorial. Time passed quickly on this vacation until there was only one afternoon left before we were to return home. A family council was held on how to spend these last few hours most profitably. The vote after much discussion: the Arlington National Cemetery.

And so it was that I found myself standing in reverence in front of this consecrated monument, the Tomb of the Unknowns, and reading the inscription, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God." Herein lay three of our Nation's defenders who had died for the cause of freedom.

I found myself wondering what sort of people these unknown soldiers were. Were they young boys, fresh from school with high hopes and strong ideals, with parents, younger brothers and sisters and sweethearts, anxiously waiting for their return? Were they young fathers, struggling for the future of a wife and children, or were they middle-aged men, older soldiers, who had left families, given up professions to answer the call? Were their names Smith, O'Brian, Martinez or Kowalski? Were they Caucasian, Negro, Oriental or Indian? As I stood there, I think I knew for the first time what an American is.

These unknown soldiers represented to me all the hundreds of thousands of people, regardless of race, creed, or color, who have been willing to fight for the most precious thing a man can possess, his freedom. These Americans gave up all their hopes and dreams for the freedom of home and country, and more, they gave their lives. Until this moment, I had never known how very expensive this precious possession, freedom, could be.

As I stood there, I felt my throat tighten and the tears welling within my eyes, and I made a silent vow that I would never again take for granted all the special privileges I have enjoyed by right of having been born in America. My ancestors paid for my freedom with their sweat and their blood. Suddenly I was filled with deep pride for my Nation and her people. I was proud of my country, proud of my heritage, proud to be an American.

When I left the cemetery that day, it seemed as though the word "freedom," took on a different meaning, or prhaps I had developed a new awareness. I knew that Americans could and would fight again, if necessary, to preserve and insure liberty. This awareness has given me an added confidence in America. I know I can live without fear of family or friends being unjustly punished, I can say what I feel without being arrested. I can read what I want and form my own opinions. In a few years I shall be able to help select the men I think are best qualified to represent the people. I shall be free to choose the profession which interests me and to a great extent, control my destiny. In this day of the space age, these are privileges which are allowed only to an industrious, hearty, loyal group of people who appreciate independence and are willing to pay any price to keep it. My fervent prayer is that my Nation will always consist of the same type of people who have fought for freedom in our past. And, as Abraham Lincoln so aptly stated, "that these dead shall not have died in vain, and that the government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Third Annual Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to call to the attention of other Members of the House the final results of the third annual questionnaire conducted in Michigan's Eighth Congressional District. I only regret that I am unable to also list the many additional notes and comments by many of the 6,000 persons who participated in the voting. These additional notes were most interesting and poignant. Exactly 5,794 replies were tabulated by Data Processing Services, an increase of over 500 from last year's return. The questionnaire was published in 18 weekly newspapers and in the 4 dailies that cover the Eighth District. In addition, it was mailed to approximately 30,000 persons in my district. I am still receiving returns today. I am most grateful for the wonderful cooperation of all news media in publicizing the questionnaire, and for the interest in their Government shown by the citizens who took time to make their views known.

The questionnaire results are as follows:

1. Do you favor placing medicare for the aged under social security and raising social security taxes in a sufficient amount to cover cost?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	311	456	8	775
Percent	40.1	58.8	1.0	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	250	724	12	986
Percent	25.4	73.4	1.2	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	113	660	18	791
Percent	14.3	83.4	2.3	100.0
Professional:				
Number	105	501	12	618
Percent	17.0	81.1	1.9	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	139	606	14	759
Percent	18.3	79.8	1.8	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	99	438	17	554
Percent	17.9	79.1	3.1	100.0
Retired:				
Number	263	483	29	775
Percent	33.9	62.3	3.7	100.0
Other:				
Number	54	148	1	203
Percent	26.6	72.9	.5	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	104	223	6	333
Percent	31.2	67.0	1.8	100.0
Total:				
Number	1,438	4,239	117	5,794
Percent	24.0	73.2	2.0	100.0

2. Do you favor a tax cut aimed at stimulating the economy even though it results in our going deeper in debt?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employees:				
Number	198	550	27	775
Percent	25.5	71.0	3.5	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	162	805	19	986
Percent	16.4	81.6	1.9	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	104	664	23	791
Percent	13.1	83.9	2.9	100.0
Professional:				
Number	85	510	23	618
Percent	13.8	82.5	3.7	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	99	647	13	759
Percent	13.0	85.2	1.7	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	74	461	19	554
Percent	13.4	83.2	3.4	100.0
Retired:				
Number	110	641	24	775
Percent	14.2	82.7	3.1	100.0
Other:				
Number	41	158	4	203
Percent	20.2	77.8	2.0	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	49	276	8	333
Percent	14.7	82.9	2.4	100.0
Total:				
Number	922	4,712	160	5,794
Percent	15.9	81.3	2.8	100.0

3. Do you favor formation of a Domestic Peace Corps to work on local community problems?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	283	446	46	775
Percent	36.5	57.5	5.9	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	284	657	45	986
Percent	28.8	66.6	4.6	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	170	559	62	791
Percent	21.5	70.7	7.8	100.0
Professional:				
Number	209	377	32	618
Percent	33.8	61.0	5.2	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	176	496	87	759
Percent	23.2	65.3	11.5	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	158	349	47	554
Percent	28.5	63.0	8.5	100.0
Retired:				
Number	238	457	80	775
Percent	30.7	59.0	10.3	100.0

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Other:				
Number	73	112	18	203
Percent	36.0	55.2	8.9	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	96	212	25	333
Percent	28.8	63.7	7.5	100.0
Total:				
Number	1,687	3,665	442	5,794
Percent	29.1	63.3	7.6	100.0

4. Do you favor Federal grants to subsidize city buslines in financial need?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	128	609	38	775
Percent	16.5	78.6	4.9	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	93	842	51	986
Percent	9.4	85.4	5.2	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	58	706	27	791
Percent	7.3	89.3	3.4	100.0
Professional:				
Number	65	517	36	618
Percent	10.5	83.7	5.8	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	61	647	51	759
Percent	8.0	85.2	6.7	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	81	409	64	554
Percent	14.6	73.8	11.6	100.0
Retired:				
Number	153	560	62	775
Percent	19.7	72.3	8.0	100.0
Other:				
Number	25	164	14	203
Percent	12.3	80.8	6.9	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	50	267	16	333
Percent	15.0	80.2	4.8	100.0
Total:				
Number	714	4,721	359	5,794
Percent	12.3	81.5	6.2	100.0

5. Do you favor continuing our foreign aid?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	270	421	84	775
Percent	34.8	54.3	10.8	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	387	454	145	986
Percent	39.2	46.0	14.7	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	243	428	120	791
Percent	30.7	54.1	15.2	100.0
Professional:				
Numb lr	252	255	111	618
Percent	40.8	41.3	18.0	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	222	396	141	759
Percent	29.2	52.2	18.6	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	187	260	107	554
Percent	33.8	46.9	19.3	100.0
Retired:				
Number	190	453	132	775
Percent	24.5	58.5	17.0	100.0
Other:				
Number	80	94	29	203
Percent	39.4	46.3	14.3	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	91	182	60	333
Percent	27.3	54.7	18.0	100.0
Total:				
Number	1,922	2,943	929	5,794
Percent	33.2	50.8	16.0	100.0

6. Do you favor administration's general handling of the Cuban situation?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	342	361	72	775
Percent	44.1	46.6	9.3	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	299	592	95	986
Percent	30.3	60.0	9.6	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	183	528	80	791
Percent	23.1	66.8	10.1	100.0
Professional:				
Number	164	397	57	618
Percent	26.5	64.2	9.2	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	273	380	106	759
Percent	36.0	50.1	14.0	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	149	328	77	554
Percent	26.9	59.2	13.9	100.0
Retired:				
Number	229	437	109	775
Percent	29.5	56.4	14.1	100.0
Other:				
Number	64	122	17	203
Percent	31.5	60.1	8.4	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	105	175	53	333
Percent	31.5	52.6	15.9	100.0
Total:				
Number	1,808	3,320	666	5,794
Percent	31.2	57.3	11.5	100.0

7. Do you favor new Federal legislation to deal with strikes affecting our national welfare?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	585	166	24	775
Percent	75.5	21.4	3.1	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	836	115	35	986
Percent	84.8	11.7	3.5	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	708	60	23	791
Percent	89.5	7.6	2.9	100.0
Professional:				
Number	538	60	20	618
Percent	87.1	9.7	3.2	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	675	62	22	759
Percent	88.9	8.2	2.9	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	454	59	41	554
Percent	81.9	10.6	7.4	100.0
Retired:				
Number	700	46	29	775
Percent	90.3	5.9	3.7	100.0
Other:				
Number	164	30	9	203
Percent	80.8	14.8	4.4	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	279	43	11	333
Percent	83.8	12.9	3.3	100.0
Total:				
Number	4,939	641	214	5,794
Percent	85.2	11.1	3.7	100.0

Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper article by a free lance writer in my congressional district depicts his conception of the benefits to conservation in public lands of provisions of the Youth Conservation Corps. Particularly, the author, George Childs, of Devils Elbow, Mo., points out an extra product which he submits will be reaped from the proposed Youth Conservation Corps establishment; namely, the improvement and expansion in Missouri of recreational opportunities which are becoming increasingly in demand with our increasing population.

The following article appeared in the Fort Gateway Guide on February 19, 1963:

DAM CONSTRUCTION WOULD ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

(By George Childs)

In this age of rapid changes, that which is new today becomes almost commonplace tomorrow. One of the marvels of our time is the computing machine, which, combined with new methods of gathering data and statistics, it makes possible to project present day trends to any designated future date, and by so doing forecast what a given situation will be at that time.

Because of this it is possible to closely forecast population figures 5, 10, or 20 years hence. Likewise it is possible to show the growth of unemployment. These projections indicate unemployment is to increase rapidly in this decade of 1960 to 1970.

The February 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report, which has gained a nationwide reputation in this field of forecasting and projection, states that at present 11 out of each 100 of our young men are unemployed and unable to secure work. They estimate this unemployed work group will increase to more than 6 million in this decade. Even under stimulated economy it would be next to impossible to absorb such a number in industry.

This will occur between now and 1970, not at some distant future date; it is expected to become critical by 1965.

Our President has before Congress a makework plan to alleviate this unemployment situation until a permanent solution is found. Under his plan, these young men would be employed in improving our national resources. If this is strictly adhered to, it could be well worthwhile, as in addition to relief in unemployment it would tend to reduce the serious problem of crime so prevalent in this age group, much of which springs from enforced idleness. This proposal deserves the support of our legislators.

There are many places in our country where such work can be carried on with complete economic soundness. Such places as our national parks and forests, along inland waterways and lakes, access roads, impounding of water by building dams to form additional lakes, all have need of maintenance work, that adds to their usefulness and attracts tourists.

As an illustration, consider the many thousands of man hours required to clear the land that will be flooded by the so-called Arlington-Richland dams; this is a type of work these young men are well qualified to perform. This is but one of many such projects throughout our country and when

multiplied sufficiently could furnish gainful and healthful employment to all idle youths.

True, this type of work would not be permanent in its entirety, although many jobs of a lasting nature would result. Its real value lies in the relief it provides during the interim of finding a solution to the problem of employment of a group, 18 to 25 years of age, where most of the trouble rests. The irony of unemployment in this group being we lose the value of these young and vigorous men who are best able to work effectively.

Many informed people think the only sure remedy to this problem lies in a shorter work week making work available to more people by dividing of labor. This requires time for careful study and planning, as well as time to bring it about, for in the correct solution of this problem rests our future welfare.

If shorter working hours or fewer working days per week or month evolve as the best way to solve this problem, workers will have more leisure time and will seek places for recreation and enjoyment for themselves and families.

In forming large bodies by impoundment of our rivers we not only gain the usual benefits that accrue from such improvement but at this time it will serve the dual purpose of furnishing employment and also provide recreational opportunities that will be in demand.

There is an ever-increasing interest in water sports, and a remarkable building up of this area will follow the creation of the large lakes formed by building the Arlington-Richland dams. It is difficult to overestimate the increase in values such an improvement will bring, together with a much needed type of training it provides and the recreational opportunities so badly needed at Fort Leonard Wood.

This development has been talked of long enough. It is 25 years since this construction was authorized by Congress. It is time we gave heed to our needs at home and devote more effort to the welfare of our own people.

To procrastinate further will bring us face to face with a most serious condition in our labor situation not in the far distant future. It will be upon us within the next 2 or 3 years. The time for action is now.

Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, the availability of nuclear weapons to an enemy power interposes a continuing threat to our national security. There has already been a Cuban crisis. There will be other Cubas. The proliferation of nuclear weapons imposes an increase in this threat. One of the keystones of an effective defense system on our homefront is the development of a system of shelters equipped and stocked to protect our people from the fallout effects of a nuclear attack. Since August 1961 this has been an important part of our defense thinking. The first and most important step in this program has been to take an inventory of existing radiation shielding throughout our Nation so that we will know what we now have and what we should provide for.

The national fallout shelter survey was initiated in December 1961. Stocking of identified shelter spaces meeting minimum Federal criteria for fallout protection is now going on.

Some concept of the magnitude of the program is gained when we consider that it involved the work of over 10,000 employees of private architect and engineering firms, the efforts of 5,000 county and municipal governments, the cooperation of over 100,000 building owners, the services of over 2,600 manufacturers and shippers, and the use of 81 Federal warehouses for the stocking of shelter supplies. The survey reached into every town and hamlet. As originally projected the expected gross yield of the survey was 50 million shelter spaces; however, the survey identified shelter space for 104 million Americans—more than double the amount of space which was anticipated. It is estimated about 70 percent of these can be brought into use as working shelter systems.

Ninety-three million dollars was originally allocated for the purposes of this survey. Through the adoption of sound and modern business procedures and engineering techniques the actual cost of the survey was reduced to less than $68 million. The balance of the money originally provided for survey work was applied to the procurement, warehousing, and transportation of shelter stocks and provisions for approximately 47 million of these spaces.

The total cost of the program has been estimated at $238 million, of which the $68 million is the cost of survey and marking the shelters and $170 million, the cost of provisioning them. One hundred and seventy-six million dollars, or approximately 75 percent of the total cost of the program has been met out of fiscal year 1962 and fiscal year 1963 appropriations. The supplemental request for $61.9 million, which we are considering today, is to complete the initial effort and to maintain the data on a current basis.

Another purpose for which these funds are needed is to complete the marking of identified shelter space. A final purpose is to provision shelter space for an additional 23 million people at a cost of approximately $58.9 million. Current and previous year appropriations have provided provisioning needs for 47 million shelter spaces.

These funds are urgently needed now. If they are not forthcoming the continuity and efficiency of survey operations would be seriously impaired. Both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks which have the responsibility for supervising the survey contracts with private architect and engineering firms conducting the survey must know now if operations are to continue in order to plan for keeping their trained professional personnel for this purpose. Current producers and suppliers of shelter stocks must be able to continue production and if production lines are shut down because of the unavailability of funds, additional Government costs to resume production would be incurred which could otherwise be used to stock additional shelter spaces. If no supplemental funds are made available at this time, the joint effort of the Federal Government and hard-won volunteer local government and private building owner participation in this program would be brought to a premature and confusing halt. Public support would be undermined by our procrastination and indecision and the hard-won local participation in this joint undertaking would be seriously crippled. The net results would be the unavailability for use of many potential shelter spaces, creating shelter voids in areas where none need exist and resulting in an unnecessary risk which seems inexcusable to the public in any new national crisis.

In conclusion, I would like to remind you that this vital program has been conducted by responsible people. This is evidenced by their performances in the past 18 months. When one considers that the allocated $93 million easily could have been spent to accomplish only one-half of what has been accomplished, and that their competent management of the program has saved the Government $25 million which has been used for other purposes for which appropriations would have been necessary, I think they should be accorded some recognition for their spending of these public tax dollars in a prudent manner.

I regret terribly the action of the House deleting $3 million from the budget request of Civil Defense budgeted for a fallout shelter survey program.

It is my hope that when the Senate considers this legislation that it will restore, in full, all of the funds which we have deleted for this very necessary program. And I hope when this appropriation bill goes to Conference Committee, this House will reconsider its action and will agree to a restoration of the deleted funds. It would be a small sum to pay as a premium for low-cost insurance providing for the safety of the American people.

A Tower of Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 17, 1963, the State of Kansas lost an outstanding public servant in the death of State Senator August W. Lauterbach, Colby, Kans. Senator Lauterbach was a tireless worker, a devoted public servant, an aggressive banker and businessman, and a devoted father to his son, August, Jr., and his two daughters, Martha and Mary.

Here was a true conservative who looked beyond the moment in pondering

the fate of legislative measures coming before the Kansas Senate ways and means committee, of which he was chairman. His death is a loss to the entire State and, more particularly, northwest Kansas. Those who have known and worked with their friend, "Gus," will do honor to his memory if they live and abide by his basic concepts of government, business, and the living of a full life.

I am inserting herewith editorials which appeared in some of the Kansas papers so that all interested persons may know of the impact one man may have in his State if he is honest, sincere, dedicated, and, above all, willing to stand up and fight.

[From the Hays Daily News, Mar. 18, 1963]

A LOSS TO KANSAS

The people of Kansas lost a true champion in the death of Senator August Lauterbach of Colby last night in the Topeka Hotel where he was living during the present session of the legislature. August was one of those rare individuals who in his political life put commonsense above personal enhancement, called his shots regardless of party wishes, and to the best of his ability tried to bring rhyme and reason into the matter of State finances.

His views were most certainly not always the popular ones, but nevertheless good judgment and sound reasoning were consistently in his corner.

He was called by his colleagues the "fiscal conscience of the State."

As chairman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee he used every weapon at his command to hold spending in line to lessen the need for future tax hardship on the people of the State. Though the battle must have seemed futile and surely frustrating, at no time did he give an inch once he had reached a conclusion.

Lauterbach fought gallantly and in good conscience to deny the entrance of Wichita University into the State supported school system, both in the last and this session of the legislature. We dare say it was a great disappointment when the majority of his fellow senators succumbed to political pressures and voted affirmatively to place the school on the State tax rolls.

Like all in public life who carry the ball for sane and sensible fiscal policies he met rebuffs, but none can say he didn't "give to the last ounce" regardless of the odds.

When he knew he was right, he was an immovable Rock of Gibraltar.

We'll miss August Lauterbach, and so will Kansas.

[From The Topeka Daily Capital, Mar. 19, 1963]

KANSAS LOSES VALUED SON

The death of State Senator August W. Lauterbach, of Colby, takes from the legislature one of its most competent members.

Gus Lauterbach kept a sharp eye on State fiscal affairs. As chairman of the senate ways and means committee, he was a man with deep belief in fiscal integrity and his fellow lawmakers were well aware of it. If there was a piece of important financial legislation to be considered, those advocating it would first ask themselves, "What's Gus Lauterbach going to think about this?"

Senator Lauterbach's ability in finance stemmed from his successful operation of his Colby bank, an institution which he modernized well before other older and larger institutions changed their fixtures and decorative schemes. His fellow bankers recognized him by electing him president of the Kansas Bankers Association and he was a welcome addition to the board of the Eisenhower Foundation at Abilene. He was also a trustee of the Midwest Research Institute in Kansas City and had received the Silver Beaver Boy Scout Award given to adults for serving the Scouting program.

Children found a friend in the outgoing personality of the Colby senator. He was a director in the Kansas Children's Service League in Topeka and never said "No" to any request to help the Scouting program.

But Gus Lauterbach looked beyond the early years of children and tried to do everything in his power to focus attention on their higher education as they grew to college age. He would say that if Kansas was going to spend more money, it ought to go for education. "A boy's opportunity these days lies in education. He can't go back to the farm," Senator Lauterbach observed.

A self-styled conservative and proud to be one, Senator Lauterbach made friends of those who did not agree with him politically. He had a great sense of humor, as evidenced by his humorous acceptance speech as the new president of the Kansas Day Club last January, and he was a man easy to know.

A widower, Senator Lauterbach was close to his son and two daughters. The younger daughter attends his own alma mater, the University of Kansas.

Many competent and dedicated men have come to the legislature and Senator Lauterbach stood in the front rank of this group. Men like him are not easily replaced.

[From the Salina Journal, Mar. 20, 1963]

OF THE KANSAS IMAGE

In many ways August W. Lauterbach was the epitome of the Kansas we would like this State to be. He was not a typical Kansan; he was so much more.

He died at Topeka Sunday because he worked too hard for his State and worried too much about its course.

It is impossible to catalog all his interests. As president of the Farmers and Merchants State Bank at Colby, itself a showplace, he was a leader in the economic development of northwest Kansas.

He spent costly hours of his time working for the Boy Scouts, the Eisenhower Foundation, a long list of civic endeavors.

He was devoted far more than the ordinary alumnus to his alma mater, the University of Kansas.

And he spent himself in the State senate where he was the chairman of the powerful ways and means committee.

If he was in politics it was to serve and because he understood what is necessary for government by the people. He was precisely the kind of citizen-leader the founders of this Republic, whether a Jefferson or a Madison, had in mind.

He was a genuine conservative, eager to spend for education which he valued highly, eager to preserve and encourage the advancement of Kansas, but also eager to keep the bills paid and the bookkeeping honest. Because he spoke his mind about such matters, he was not particularly popular at the statehouse, but respected.

Of course he was human, with foibles and frailties, those of a man of high tension, of a man too discerning to be happy with fools. Yet he was charming, a wit, soundly educated, traveled, cultured, an entertaining companion.

Such was August Lauterbach and as I said, the kind of Kansan we fondly hope exemplifies the Kansas image. Only Gus was real.

[From the Oberlin (Kans.) Herald, Mar. 21, 1963]

A REAL LOSS TO KANSAS

In the death of Senator August W. Lauterbach, Colby, Kans., and Kansans suffered the loss of one of their finest citizens. His influence for good, sound State government, as chairman of the senate ways and means committee, was a recognized asset to the people of Kansas.

It is quite probable that the sudden and unexpected death of Senator Lauterbach was expedited by his dedicated public service. As chairman of the powerful ways and means (finance) committee of the State senate, his efforts to maintain sound economy, with progressive methods, were unceasing, yet frustrating. He opposed with great determination any effort to lead the State into deficit financing, and insisted that any new or expanded program in Kansas should be scrutinized with care, and when initiated, revenue should be provided therefor.

That is the manner in which he always operated his own business, and he believed that any branch of government should be conducted on the same basis.

His influence for good was not restricted to the Kansas Legislature. He had been officially associated with and was a stanch supporter of the Boy Scouts of America, the Kansas Bankers Association, the Presbyterian Church and many other organizations having to do with the molding of lives of Kansas citizens.

"Gus" might well have extended his tenure with us had he been less interested in the welfare of Kansas and Kansas people, and retired from some of his strenuous duties after suffering a coronary attack in 1961. But that would have been a retreat from the active and useful life to which he was accustomed, a cessation of the inherent impulse to help others, and to make Kansas a better State in which to live and promulgate good citizenship. To him that would have been too much of a sacrifice.

Yes, the passing of "Gus" Lauterbach is a real loss to Kansas.

Anbody for Joining McNamara's Band?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the heavy burdens that comes with public service is the severe and unrelentless criticism which a person must be prepared to take when a call is accepted to serve our country in any official capacity.

The bigger the job—the bigger the blasts which regularly find their way into the Nation's headlines. When Robert McNamara responded to President Kennedy's request that he serve as Secretary of Defense, I am sure he knew full well the challenge he was undertaking.

And if he did not, the past few weeks of close scrutiny—both of a personal and public nature—he has undergone would remove any doubt that his job is and will continue to be one of the most difficult in Washington.

Just as his firmness in administering the Department has won for him many tongue lashings, it has also rallied many people in this country to his side who do not hesitate to predict that when a final assessment of his work is made at a future date he will be regarded as one of the most effective Secretaries of Defense ever to serve the United States.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial written by Mr. Drury Brown, the publisher and editor of the Blackfoot News, Blackfoot, Idaho, who is not hesitant to declare himself a member of "McNamara's band."

The editorial follows:

ANYBODY FOR JOINING MCNAMARA'S BAND?

Quite a man is this Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

A Methodist Irishman in the Cabinet of a Catholic Irishman who is President of the United States, he has through sheer ability and performance come to be recognized as the strong man of the Cabinet. His colleagues admire his brains and his toughness; the fact that he has behaved in a nonpartisan manner (he is a registered Republican); and that as president of the Ford Motor Co. he had proved his business ability. Furthermore he has shown that he is willing in the course of his duty to make tough decisions and then stick with them and defend them against the hottest attack that can be brought to bear on him.

So impressive has been his record that up until a few weeks ago some influential members of the Republican Party had put their mark of approval on him as the candidate to lead the GOP out of the wilderness in 1968. (This makes sense in view of the tendency of the GOP to pin its hopes for national victory to a hero rather than to issues).

Secretary McNamara at the present time is as deeply in hot water as it is possible for a man to be. Somehow we are sure he will swim out of it.

He has challenged and is boldly taking on the top Pentagon brass; a group of furious Senators and Congressmen; and powerful influences in the world of big business in which he was once an important figure.

When the people of the United States understand what the issues are, we can be sure they will support him.

The dispute centers around the design of a revolutionary airplane for the military services of the United States. The TFX (tactical fighter experimental) supersonic aircraft exists so far only in blueprints and wind tunnel models, but it will have the ability to jackknife its wings; take off and alight at slow speeds, but fly with twice the speed of sound.

In approaching this plane Secretary McNamara was determined to get one that could be used by both the Air Force and Navy, which if successful would save the U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars. This stirred up the first hornet's nest, for rival services were preparing to build rival tactical fighters.

He told them to build a common type plane. They said they couldn't do it. McNamara in effect said do it anyhow. Grumbling, the services took plans to various builders for creation of models.

When all were shaken down with only two remaining, the antagonists were Convair of General Dynamics, Fort Worth, Tex., and Boeing of Seattle.

Secretary McNamara together with his civilian leaders in the Pentagon, the Deputy Secretaries of Defense, the Navy and the Air Force, selected the design of General Dynamics. In doing so he admitted the Boeing cost estimates were perhaps as much as $400 million below the successful bidders.

With a $6 billion contract at stake all hell broke loose.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, immediately demanded an investigation to see if Seattle were being discriminated against. High Air Force officers backed the Boeing model. Reserve Air Force Officer BARRY GOLDWATER denounced the "Pentagon civilians."

Perhaps Secretary McNamara was to blame for not having anticipated the size of the storm. But once aroused he went on the counterattack.

Sure, he said, the Boeing bid was lower, but Boeing simply didn't meet the requirements of the bid. What they proposed were two separate models, one for the Air Force, one for the Navy. That was the central and crucial fact.

Sure, he had knocked heads together in the Pentagon, but he considered that was part of his job.

When Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric was bold enough to suggest while in the lion's den of Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN'S Permanent Investigation Subcommittee that the uproar was brought about by Senators who hated to lose a plum for their State, the din was terrific.

Of course Gilpatrick was right, but you don't tell Senators things like that. The fiction must be maintained that they are statesmen who never stoop to grabbing a contract for a client in their State. Senatorial dignity must be preserved. But Secretary McNamara backed his civilian lieutenant.

And all the while that other Irishman in the White House was grinning and backing his Secretary of Defense to the hilt.

Quite a man, this McNamara. When the common citizen and taxpayer of the United States comes to understand the sort of defender they have in the Defense Department a lot of them will be wanting to join McNamara's band.

More Comments by Arthur Hoppe of the San Francisco Chronicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I find that I cannot take off for some several days as Congress begins its Easter recess without adding a few more comments by Arthur Hoppe, San Francisco Chronicle, for the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His articles for March 26, 27, 29, and 31 follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 26, 1963]

A FAREWELL TO COWS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We drove up to a lake in the mountains. With us in the big, new car were a grandmother and a little girl. We made it in 3 hours and 47 minutes, the speedometer quivering near 70 at we swished through the fat, spring-green foothills in upholstered comfort.

The grandmother, a slender, gentlewoman, told the little girl how she used to come to the lake each summer in a horse and jouncing wagon a half century ago. And how the ruts were hub deep and how the journey took 2 days. We all shook our heads in sympathy. "Two days," said the little girl.

And the grandmother told her how they used to camp all summer by the lake, sleeping on the ground. No plumbing nor refrigeration, a cow supplying their milk. "Really?" said the little girl, "Right from a cow?"

And the grandmother tried to point out the cows grazing on the fat spring-green hills as we passed. But it was hard because the car was going so fast. "I can't tell cows from horses," said the little girl, frowning. And then she pointed at the chromium heater controls, "Push the button, please," she said, "I'm cold."

As the warmth flowed obediently through the car I got to thinking what a scientist said the other day about cows. He called them "inefficient machines for the production of meat and milk." And he said soon we would be able to produce more efficient meat and milk with pushbuttons.

I suppose it's inevitable. For we live in a time of choice: Cows or pushbuttons. And we have chosen. Yet I'll miss the cows and the fat, spring-green hills they graze on. And in thinking of this I grew sorry for the little girl, having to live in a world without cows. A sterile, artificial, cowless world.

And yet, I also felt sorry for the grandmother. Two days to reach the mountain lake. No plumbing nor refrigeration. How much easier our machines make our lives, I thought. And then I realized the little girl, when she grew up in her superbly efficient world, would inevitably feel sorry for me. Just as her children's children would some day feel sorry for her.

For we all, I think, feel sympathy for those who haven't the machines we have. We feel sorry today for the backward peon and the primitive peasant. And we do our best to bring them plumbing and refrigeration and big, new cars.

I suppose we must try to give them more machines, if only for the sake of our own guilt. Yet I'm not sure it's very important. For even if we succeed, the little girl and her children's children will feel sorry for their primitiveness. And for ours.

The big, new car reached the mountain lake. It was the same as it had been for eons. Blue water, green pines, grey granite. And we stood for a moment, quietly looking at it, the grandmother, the little girl and I. The past, the present and the future. All glad to be alive. All equally glad to be alive.

And that, I thought, is perhaps the heart of the matter. For though we strive to bring all mankind into a pushbutton future, I doubt its citizens will be any more glad to be alive than are we. Nor any less.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 27, 1963]

THE FATHER OF OUR CONSPIRACY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Ah, 'tis spring. The sap is flowing in what orators call "The Sturdy Tree of Our Democracy." Mr. Robert Welch, taproot of the Birch Society, has blossomed forth with a revised edition of his great historical work, "The Politician." All because of democracy and fair play.

In the first edition, as you may recall, Mr. Welch said Mr. Eisenhower was "a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy." But in the revised edition he strikes this passage out.

Actually, he admits manfully, this dogmatic conclusion was perhaps a trifle unfair. And he now wishes democratically to leave the reader "entirely free to draw his own conclusions." Between one of two dogmatic conclusions: Mr. Eisenhower is (a) "a Communist." Or (b) "a mere stooge" of the Communists. Probably his brother. And what could be fairer than that?

Which is all very odd because I've just been hard at work revising my own great historical work: "George Washington—Dedicated, Conscious Tool of George III."

As collectors will remember, I proved beyond any doubt in the first edition that Washington was dedicated. I also documented conclusively (from papers in the Bettman Archives) that he was conscious. And who, on reviewing the indisputable evidence, could question the lifelong card-

carrying membership of this native-born alien in the Mount Vernon Hunt Club, a well-known secret Tory cell?

"Let's," as I put it so well, "look at the record. Who owns Bermuda today? And Jamaica? Not to mention vast Canada which is less than 90 miles from our shores. Indeed, irrefutable statistics show that during this supposed patriot's administration, no less than 3.8 million square miles of sacred North American soil fell forever into the clutches of the George III octopus empire.

"Who, let us ask ourselves squarely, has been named repeatedly by witnesses as a long-time associate of Benedict Arnold? Who, by actual example, advocated sabotaging our great American cherry-growing industry? And who initiated the practice of throwing American money across the water? A practice which has cost $98 billion in the past 15 years alone.

"There can be only one conclusion: Washington got his orders direct from Buckingham Palace. Let him deny it. If he dares."

And though Mr. Washington has never denied my charge, I wish, in a spirit of democracy and fair play, to strike that last passage. And substitute:

"Or was the mastermind behind him the sinister, shadowy figure of his brother, Milton Washington. A very shadowy figure, indeed. Or perhaps even that of his famous cousin, Irving. Better known in the glossaries as Irving (Comma) Washington. A known Hannoverian. Every reader is entirely free to draw any conclusion he wants. Any of these three. Because that's the American way."

Well, it just shows that Mr. Welch and I basically believe in freedom of choice. Which is the heart of democracy. It's just that the choices Mr. Welch offers are a bit limited.

Even so, despite what most everybody says, I'm honestly glad Mr. Welch and his Birch Society are still flourishing. Because democracy really is kind of like a tree—roots, branches and ever-renewing blossoms. But how healthy is the tree of democracy, I ask you in all seriousness, unless it can produce a few nuts?

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 29, 1963]

NIK KHRUSHCHEV, NEW SEXPOT?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Mr. Khrushchev's been awfully busy lately building his image. Telling Soviet folks to eat post toasties and popcorn. And advising the rural voters in fatherly fashion to knock off piling manure in little piles. Because, he says, it lasts longer in one big pile. And that's real image building.

But is he taking the proper tack? After all, Communist apologists to the contrary, Russia is at least 20 years behind us. In public relations.

So as a goodwill gesture, I asked my friend Mr. Harry V. Plate, the noted image building technologist, to draw up a more wideawake American-type PR program for Mr. Khrushchev. And after 2 months analysis, Mr. Plate finally dropped by with his report.

"First of all," says Mr. Plate, "Khrushchev's got to make a U.S. tour." In order to promote world peace? "No," says Mr. Plate, "in order to punch Frank Sinatra in the nose."

Punch Mr. Sinatra? "Right," says Mr. Plate. "It's banner lines for 3 days. Nikita says Frankie insulted Mrs. K. Frankie denies it. Mrs. K. says she'll stand by husband. Forever. And then, of course, Nikita's got to divorce Mrs. K."

He's got to? "He's got to," says Mr. Plate, "once the reports get out linking him with Liz Taylor. Besides, Mrs. K.'s no asset, believe me. Does she collect old furniture? No. Does she chase foxes? Not so's you'd notice. Can she water ski? Unlikely. And as for promoting 'The Mrs. K. Look,' I'd as lief try to promote National Abortionist Week."

Does Mr. Khrushchev remarry? "Several times. Zsa-Zsa says he's cuddly. Sophia says he's got naked eyes. And Brigitte declares she'd love to run her fingers through his hair if he had any. Overnight, he's a new sex symbol. Footprints in Grauman's concrete. Maybe even we get him insulted by Toots Shor."

And he joins organizations? "Hundreds," says Mr. Plate. "The do-good ones: Boy Scout Council, PTA, Anti-Litter Campaign." And the Big Brothers? "You out of your mind?" says Mr. Plate.

But what about his politics. Won't that be sticky? "Not a whit," says Mr. Plate. "He comes on strong against unemployment and steel executives. And in favor of peace and solving the farm problem. And then he announces crawling 75 miles on your stomach is good for you."

Great. If it weren't for his lack of religion. "Oh," says Mr. Plate, "we reveal he is secretly a Southern Baptist."

But can a Southern Baptist occupy the Kremlin? "The Kremlin," says Mr. Plate. "With a socko PR program like this, we'll put him in the White House."

Well, I don't know. I realize that in this field we Americans have reached a pinnacle. But maybe Mr. Khrushchev might just as well go on talking about how best to pile manure. I'm not sure it matters either way.

Because, say what you will, no matter how high you pile it, it's still public relations.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 31, 1963]

RESPECT LIFE OR WE'LL KILL YOU

(By Arthur Hoppe)

One of the most burning moral issues of our time is capital punishment. And after carefully weighing the arguments on both sides, I'd like to say a few words about the death penalty: It isn't enough.

The purpose of the death penalty, everybody agrees, is to show killers that killing people is bad. Which we do by killing them. And that sure shows them. But is this example effective on potential killers? Not very. Because no matter how many people we kill to show people that killing people is bad, people still go on killing people.

Obviously then, the death penalty alone isn't a strong enough deterrent. And after much thought, I have formed the Bring Back the Rack Committee, a do-good organization.

Our platform calls for abolishing the ineffective gas chamber and installing up-to-date medieval racks in every death cell. Along with lashes, flails, thumb screws, and iron maidens. With proper know-how, an execution might well last several weeks.

Equally important, of course, is to reverse our present incomprehensible policy prohibiting photographs of the execution itself. What good is a deterrent like killing people if the public doesn't know exactly how we do it? That's the whole purpose of capital punishment.

So our committee is suggesting that once the new devices are installed, a daily report on the progress of each execution be made to the public via television. Perhaps we might look in each evening after the Popeye show. In order to reach potential killers in the most impressionable age group, radio listeners, of course, would have to be satisfied with merely the condemned man's screams.

There can be no question that all this would deter far more killers than the quick, painless gas chamber. And we of the committee foresee vast potentials in deterring other evils. If killing is bad, so is stealing. And so, unarguably, is double parking. Several well-televised executions by the Chinese water torture method for jaywalkers, for example, and our crime rate would unquestionably drop overnight. Not to mention our traffic problems.

The only possible opposition will come from a few bleeding hearts (the Christians, for instance) who will emotionally contend that torture is bad. And the Government shouldn't torture people.

Nonsense. Killing is bad. Yet we approve of our Government killing people in order to make an example for the rest of us. And, under this theory, it stands to reason our Government could make a far better example by torturing people to death. And we do so want our Government to set a good example. Don't we?

Passover: The Feast of Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record on April 8, 1963. This editorial bears a timely and significant message, typical of the articles which appear daily in a newspaper which lives up to its motto, "an independent community newspaper," as it serves the needs, spiritual, moral and material, of its community.

The editorial follows:

PASSOVER—THE FEAST OF LIBERATION

Passover, the 8-day festival, which commences this evening at sundown, is of prime significance to persons of all faiths. Its theme, tyranny, slavery, and freedom has moral implications for Christians, as well as Jews alike, particularly in this divided world in which we live, with the God-worshiping forces of the West opposing the atheist people of the Communist world.

The manner in which the ancient Israelites never despaired and their undying courage and determination as they refused to surrender completely to their cruel Egyptian taskmasters, provide an inspiring lesson for persons of all faiths. Similar strength and endurance in their own desires will be rewarded with ultimate liberation from the yoke of communism.

The Pharaoh of the Passover story symbolizes not one Egyptian King, but the countless down through the ages who have met a deserved fate as they strove to enslave millions of persons, slaughter those who did resist in an effort to retain their cherished freedom, rule the world and themselves challenge God's divine position as the King of the universe.

The miraculous determination in which the Hebrews were able to escape to the Red Sea, is a reminder to all that similar miracles will again take place as the Berlin wall and the Bamboo and Iron Curtains must someday crumble before the force and drive of the millions of freedom-loving people in those countries. Their liberation will mark the return of the Messiah, bringing peace, freedom, happiness, and prosperity for the people throughout the world.

On the eve of the Passover, the festival of liberation, we of the Chelsea Record join in

extending to our Jewish friends and neighbors our heartfelt wishes for a happy Passover, one that will bring with it peace and freedom for all mankind.

An All-Nuclear Navy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the Navy that henceforth all naval vessels of frigate size and above will be built with nuclear power is most interesting. This switch in policy must certainly be based on sound study and careful consideration. The Fore River shipyard in Quincy, Mass., has made a tremendous contribution in this field. Bethlehem officials and employees have a right to be proud. Once again they have demonstrated the importance of maintaining shipyards that have the technical know-how in this advanced scientific age. I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress an editorial that appeared in the Boston Globe entitled "An All-Nuclear Navy." It is well written and points up the accomplishments of the Fore River shipyard.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 10, 1963]

AN ALL-NUCLEAR NAVY?

America's economic geography requires free use of the seas for prosperity in peace and survival in war. The fact is beyond dispute.

Economic health of the Nation demands the availability of 77 strategic raw materials. Our own resources provide only 11.

Oceans are the arteries for nourishment and life. Slow, plodding vessels which link the United States with remote ports of the world carry 99 percent of all the goods that move in our oversea commerce.

In this context one can understand the vital role of the U.S. Navy and its prevailing concern for maintenance of wartime freedom of the seas in the face of enemy capabilities on, below and above the oceans.

Objectives, however, are often more visible than the methods for achieving them. This is true in Washington where the Navy's ardor for nuclear power has until now been considerably subdued by construction costs of atom-age surface warships.

Admiral Rickover, the Atomic Energy Commission and congressional leaders have long pressed the view that all new capital ships should have the advantage of nuclear power. No one could minimize the value of self-sufficiency, high speed, endurance, extended range, expanded shipboard space achieved through nuclear propulsion.

But those responsible for stretching the Navy's allotted dollars and to decide whether, in terms of wartime responsibilities, three conventional ships would provide more fighting power than two nuclear ships costing the same amount.

Navy Secretary Fred Korth and Adm. George A. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, found that the price of nuclear power was 50 percent higher than the conventional variety. They favored production of a larger quantity of warships with the old style power, except for submarines.

Now, however, they have suddenly switched policy. They and their Pentagon advisers propose that henceforth all naval vessels of frigate size and above be built with nuclear power.

Basis for the major reversal urged on the Secretary of Defense is the operating success of the carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach* and the frigate *Bainbridge*, all nuclear powered and prototypes of their class. They have demonstrated on the high seas that longer cruising time and reduced support requirements compensate for the added costs of construction.

These have been the yardstick to measure reality rather than theory, proving the extent to which elaborate overseas bases, long supply lines and support by auxiliary ships could be reduced.

Secretary Korth's announcement that Admiral Rickover will continue to serve in the nuclear program after the compulsory retirement age of 64 accents the new nuclear look. It reflects the Navy's new conviction that adoption of nuclear power must be immediate, safe and economically efficient.

By their about-face and complete shift of attitude, Korth and Anderson have illustrated a healthy respect for facts. Their flexibility is an example to other military planners who at times reveal a reluctance to yield from their fixed opinion, a dangerous dogmatism.

And, incidentally, the shipbuilders of Fore River have reason for pride. U.S.S. *Bainbridge* and U.S.S. *Long Beach*—two of the three warships which seem to show the advisability of an all-nuclear Navy of the future, are products of the Bethlehem shipyard.

Belittling Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in the flurry of news releases and public statements which issue each day from various Government officials, it is not unusual that attendant facts connected with the utterances are obscured or completely omitted.

Such was the case recently when Anthony J. Celebrezze, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pointed an accusing finger at those responsible for improving our education system. Completely overlooked in his statement were such commendable advances as those which have been made in my own State of Maryland, and consequently I was especially pleased to see that the Baltimore Sun in an editorial on April 10, 1963, called Mr. Celebrezze to task for not giving credit where credit is due.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELITTLING APPROACH

Less than a year ago Anthony J. Celebrezze was mayor of Cleveland with a reputation as a conservative spender. Since then he has gone to Washington as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and adopted the bureaucratic custom of berating taxpayers. We are resting on our oars in public education, says Mr. Celebrezze, adding: "I hope it will not require a Russian on the moon to arouse the American people to concerted action."

This type of talk becomes extremely tiresome. Here in Maryland, for one example, the Tawes administration and the general assembly have just completed a legislative program that includes the conversion and expansion of teachers colleges to serve as liberal arts institutions, the establishment of a student loan program, authorization for branches of the University of Maryland, loan funds for several private colleges and additional support for the public junior colleges. In addition, the State has appropriated more than $100 million to aid local public school systems, a sum that represents a big chunk of the total State budget.

Here in Baltimore, the city in the current year is devoting $64 million to its public school system, which is about a third of its general fund revenue. In Baltimore County, which has less outside help, the general fund appropriation for schools runs over $41 million, which represents 59 percent of local tax revenue.

Nobody is resting on any oars. Nobody is withholding support for education until a Russian lands on the moon. There is, of course, more to be done for education. Taxpayers have to be conditioned to the fact. It would be a pleasant change, though, if the Celebrezzes both on the national and local levels would approach them with a pat on the back instead of that eternally pointed finger of shame.

Minnesota 4-H Radio Speaking Contest Won by Loretta Seppanen, of Alexandria—Maurice Johnson, of Backus, Reserve Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, each year there is held in Minnesota a State 4-H radio speaking contest. The contest finals this year were held March 4 and 5 in St. Paul. Miss Loretta Seppanen, of Alexandria, was selected as the State champion and Maurice A. Johnson, of Backus, was selected as reserve champion.

A total of 1,282 4-H members throughout Minnesota wrote talks for this contest and delivered them in county competition. This is the greatest number of participants in any year during the 21-year history of State 4-H Club cooperation with the Jewish Community Relations Council of Minnesota in the sponsorship of the contest.

Mr. President, the members of Minnesota's 4-H Clubs are among our State's finest young citizens. Their pledge is a model for us all:

My head to clear thinking. My heart to great loyalty. My hands to larger service. My health to better living. For my club, my community, and my country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these outstanding talks given by Minnesota 4-H radio speaking cham-

pion Loretta Seppanen and reserve champion Maurice A. Johnson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SHOULD 4-H PREPARE ME FOR RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP?

(By Loretta Seppanen)

Atticus, the southern lawyer in Harper Lee's novel, "To Kill a Mockingbird," knows that Tom Robinson's rights should be defended. After all, Tom is a citizen and should not be unjustly accused of a crime simply because his skin is black. The townspeople are not likely to concur with Atticus' opinion, and perplexities may overcome Harper Lee's hero if he follows his conclusion with action. Yet, Atticus overcame his obstacles and very skillfully defended the ill-treated Negro. This, I believe, is the course any responsible citizen would have taken—think clearly to come to a conclusion and act upon it.

Thus, it is my purpose to carefully consider two questions. How 4-H should prepare me to think clearly? And how 4-H should prepare me to take action upon my judgments?

For a responsible citizen thinking clearly involves a number of things, the first of which, in my mind, is thinking of others. Without such consideration, a Government like ours could never exist. The cooperative spirit of 4-H work soon brings its members to think of others.

Planning programs, recreation, parties or special meetings calls for thoughtfulness in order to have complete success. Since during a 4-H career a member is called on several times to prepare such programs he develops consideration for others. Also, since 4-H runs on a democratic basis, most members have a chance to hold an office. One of the first qualities noticed in a good officer is consideration for others. Certainly, 4-H can help me gain one of the first prerequisites of clear thinking, thinking of others.

Another part of clear thinking is practicality. An impractical citizen can design very spectacular plans, but impractical plans are of little value. For example, in the story of "The Ugly American" a group of diplomats had a very striking plan to spur the economy of a small Asian country. Their plan was to build transportation systems for the inhabitants' produce. But one of their comrades thought more clearly using his practicality to realize that the backward country needed the produce first, thus suggesting teaching the breeding and caring of chickens to the people. This plan was not as spectacular as the other but it was far more sensible. So surely practicality is important in clear thinging, but how can 4-H develop practicality? Mainly because praticality can be learned through experience and 4-H project work can be the best. What could be more practical than learning how to budget one's clothing dollar or learning of the savings of raising fruit. These are only two examples of the practicality expressed in every phase of 4-H project work. Yes, 4-H does develop practicality, one of the basics for clear thinking and for responsible citizenship.

Yet, thinking clearly is relatively simple compared to the second task—acting upon decisions. Remember Atticus in the beginning of my speech? The decision he made is one many of us may have come to, but taking action was unthinkable in his town. Atticus faced a number of barriers in dealing with the situation.

It is my strong conviction that 4-H club work can really help to overcome these impediments. As I speak here tonight, I face numerous obstacles which can be paralleled to those I may face in responsible citizenship. I have come to some conclusions and now must act upon these in the form of a speech.

But, perhaps my conclusions are unpopular or some one who thinks this speech is silly starts to ridicule me or even boos me out of the studio. I may have come with the feeling of certain failure and backed out at the last minute. These and many other fears stand before me. The risk I may run in taking a course of action might be even greater such as loss of friends, home comfort, or even life. How to overcome this? I know of only one way, standing before the barriers so many times they disappear; 4-H work can do this superbly. Starting from local club demonstrations up to speaking on behalf of 4-H at large national conventions, 4-H club work provides the necessary obstacle-moving tools.

Every time a 4-H member plays his trumpet, seconds a motion, participates in demonstrations or speaks at a radio speaking contest, he is tearing down great barriers leaving a responsible citizen who can act upon his decisions.

"I pledge my heart to clear thinking," are these words familiar to you? I hope they are for they are the first words to the 4-H pledge and the first step to responsible citizenship. My speaking here tonight through a 4-H program is the second, taking a course of action, 4-H enables me to take these vital steps toward responsible citizenship.

ADDRESS BY MAURICE A. JOHNSON, RESERVE STATE CHAMPION, 1963

We, the United States, are faced with an enormous problem, today. Is it the Russians, or Chinese, or the atom bomb? No. It is the problem that divided the Roman Empire, smashed the mighty Roman Legions, and crumbled the very foundations of ancient Rome. It is the problem of the irresponsible citizen. We can measure the full size of our problem by noting the percentage of our citizens that do not turn out to vote. According to the voting statistics, we see that 40 percent of our citizens do not wish to shoulder the responsibility of our democracy. There are some of these that have legitimate excuses for not voting—but many do not.

The picture need not be so dismal, however, since there are organizations today dedicated to producing responsible citizens for the future. Among the greatest of these is 4-H.

In elaborating on how 4-H should prepare me for responsible citizenship, I would like to take note of the word should, meaning ought to, but not necessarily will. Why do I take note of this word? Because citizenship is the giving of oneself for the good of all—and only you can give yourself.

I have referred to you. Why? Because I want each of you, as I tell of my 4-H experiences, to take my words to your hearts and apply them, as directly as possible, to yourself. I have stated that responsible citizenship is dependent upon the individual. In doing this, I have brought the problem to its proper dimension, the single person.

A responsible citizen is a citizen who makes use of his freedoms, as well as faces the responsibilities thus incurred.

The basic freedoms I wish to dwell on are: Religious freedom, pursuit of happiness, and freedom of speech. The fundamental responsibility of a citizen is the knowledge and understanding of how to use our government.

The first freedom I mentioned was the freedom of religion. Although religion is not directly connected with 4-H, neither can it be distinctly separated from 4-H. In our local club, for example, we have a rare heterogeneous grouping of religions, but we have found that all of these religions have in common, with 4-H, the mutual desire to further the development of our heads to clearer thinking, our hearts to greater loyalty, our hands to larger service, and our health to better living. In the development of these four H's, we are together united in a common purpose. Religious tolerance and respect of each other's faith is the lubricant of our club's mechanism. Our 4-H Club has had the privilege of piloting our community toward a greater appreciation of true religious freedom.

Pursuit of happiness seems a rather selfish freedom at first, doesn't it? But when one analyzes it, he turns out with a very different result from his first conclusion. My personal pursuit of happiness is important because with this freedom I can contribute successfully to the economics of my community, as well as of my State and Nation. Four-H has a terrific selection of projects, one to fill my every need and want. Through these projects youths of America, like me, can find careers without an expensive waste of time and money that the trial and error system incurs. These projects give us a sample of an untold number of careers and allow us to find what we are best suited for, as well as what we like best. In this way 4-H has helped many a young man and woman, as it is helping me, to find our profession swiftly, making it possible for us to start contributing sooner, and more effectively, to the welfare of our community, State, and Nation. It has saved many from the hard knocks of fate—from dissatisfaction, unrest, and unhappiness that produce disgruntled citizens.

In a democracy, if one disagrees with our views, we don't kill him, but convince him. The art of persuasion is speech, the most important attribute of a responsible citizen and one that can be developed. It is speech, written or oral, that decides our fate, not the atom bomb. Our leaders converse and exchange notes with leaders of other countries. These produce more victories and defeats than war ever can. It is speech that decides who is going to represent us in the community, as well as in the Nation. Speech even decides how we will get along with our neighbor. Speech also decides whether we are leaders of our people. Speech is indeed important. This is why 4-H has public speaking contests, such as the one we are participating in today, also it is the reason for the 4-H demonstration program. Through previously mentioned channels, 4-H encourages the development of a person's speaking ability. It has taught me to overcome shyness and nervousness, and to say what I believe. Yes, 4-H through speech is deciding our future fate.

The responsibility incurred upon a citizen of the United States at birth is the understanding of our representative form of government; 4-H has taught me the basic fundamentals of our government. The 4-H Club has a teach-by-use system. I, as a new member, was endowed with a right I knew nothing about. This was the right to vote. Along with the right to vote, I received the right to speak, and contribute to the club's program through projects and demonstrations. I learned when to speak, and when not to speak, a very important fundamental. I learned there were others besides my own peers—there were people over me whose place I hoped some day to fill. After several years in 4-H, I bcame a club officer. I became president of our club. As an officer, I learned to share, teach, and lead. I took a more active part in the club's program. I learned to guids an organization, politically, as well as financially.

In summary, I have stated that 4-H is preparing young people for responsible citizenship, by teaching them the fundamental basic freedoms and responsibilities of a democratic government. Four-H is supporting

religious fredom through group cooperation and activities, pursuit of happiness through its projects, and freedom of speech through its public speaking contests and demonstrations. Four-H is teaching civic responsibilities through the club's teach-by-use system.

As 4-H continues to grow in me, and I in 4-H, I believe that by the time I reach voting age, it will have made me a good responsible citizen.

America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Resources for the Future, a private study organization here in Washington, recently completed a 5-year analysis of America's natural resources and concluded that there is a need for effective conservation measures and improvements to technology if we are to ward off resource difficulties.

The study called special attention to multiple water problems especially in the West where shortage is of the greatest concern. As for the East, pollution and increased storage capacity are the chief concerns.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial on the Resources for the Future report which appeared in the Washington Post, April 8, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 8, 1963]

AMERICA'S FUTURE

The gist of the latest survey of natural resources seems to be that the people who inhabit this land are headed for trouble unless they adopt conservation measures and at the same time improve their technology. There are, to be sure, many encouraging aspects of the study, which is entitled "Resources in America's Future." Its authors tell us that no across-the-board shortages of natural resources are in sight during the remainder of the 20th century. But 37 years is a very short period when thinking of the future of a great country.

Probably the most optimistic note in the study is its emphasis on the extent to which technological progress can overcome the threat of scarcity. Along with our enormous increase in population and the greater productivity of each individual, comes increased know-how in utilizing our resources. The U.S. population is expected to double by the year 2000 and the value of goods and services produced will probably be multiplied by four. This could mean acute shortages unless technology in utilizing resources keeps pace with the advancing demands.

The experts see substantial possibilities in using lower grades of raw material, in substituting plentiful materials for scarce ones, in getting more use out of given amounts, in importing some things from other countries, and in making multiple use of land and water resources.

Some of the most serious problems arise in connection with land and water resources which are not readily expansible. The experts see a doubling of urban land requirements by 2000, reaching a total of 45 million acres. For recreation the need is placed at 130 million acres, three times the 1960 figure. All the demands for land by 2000 add up to 50 million more acres than the total area of the 48 contiguous States, and of course much of this area is unusable desert. Obviously, therefore, multiple use of land will be necessary, and this problem will become the more acute with each passing decade.

The demand for water has been growing faster than population. The municipal use of water is expected to double by 2000 and industrial use of water to quadruple. In the West, the experts conclude, the problem will have to be met by the construction of new dams and reservoirs, long-distance transportation of water, desalinization and perhaps a curtailment of irrigation to make water available for new industry. In the East, the study concludes, the two greatest needs are increased storage capacity and more thorough treatment of waste water to relieve the streams of their pollution.

Another cautionary note seems to demand special attention. To supply the timber needs of the year 2000 under present practices would require an additional 300 million acres of commercial forest land. Since the land will not be available, the need will have to be met by improved management of existing forest lands, importation of lumber and the use of substitutes. Even so, the net effect is to emphasize the great importance of our forests.

America's future is rosy indeed, when compared with that of many other lands, but only economical use and wise conservation of our resources and a steady advance of technology can keep the outlook bright for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

The Liberty Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Liberty Amendment's Wishful Thinking," which was printed in the Arizona Daily Star at Tucson, Ariz., on Tuesday, April 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

LIBERTY AMENDMENT'S WISHFUL THINKING

Those who can remember back to the days when the 18th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was adopted, can see in the campaign for the proposed liberty amendment, which would abolish the income tax, a similar kind of method and purpose.

Just as the 18th amendment sought to compel Congress to abolish the sales and drinking of intoxicating liquor, so does the liberty amendment seek to abolish the income tax by compelling Congress to do it. Each proposition sought support from State legislatures; each sought to win its objective by seeking the supreme sanction of a constitutional amendment. In each case a relatively tiny minority of dedicated people sought to impose their will.

Some of the literature that the liberty amendment folk publish indicates that, just as the 18th amendment sought to do something that proved to be impossible, so do they. The table published below is taken directly from the magazine American Progress, published by the liberty amendment promoters.

Comparative budgets by departments

[In millions of dollars]

	1948 budget	1962 budget	Liberty budget
Expenditures			
Agriculture	655	5,101	166
Natural Resources	728	2,138	38
Commerce and Housing	1,604	3,371	769
Labor and Welfare	1,507	4,759	468
National Defense	13,420	47,392	22,924
International	5,205	2,711	186
Veterans' Benefits	7,586	5,296	4,913
General Government	1,457	2,071	1,274
Interest	5,984	8,593	6,427
Miscellaneous	(442)	(557)	(557)
Total expenditures	37,704	80,865	36,598
Tax receipts:			
Personal income	23,937	45,500	0
Corporate	11,598	20,900	25,080
Excise	8,438	9,725	11,670
Employment	2,731	0	0
Estate and gift	1,025	1,953	0
Customs	481	1,115	1,115
Miscellaneous	4,342	3,807	3,807
Adjustments	(5,257)	(667)	(667)
Total receipts	47,295	82,333	41,005
Total expenditures	37,704	80,865	36,598
Budget surplus	9,591	1,468	4,407

The significant feature of this proposed summary of the budget that would follow the adoption of the liberty amendment, is some of its crass assumptions. Take note that under the list of expenditures of the ideal budget, expenditures would be reduced by more than one-half, from $80 billion to $36 billion. Of that total reduction, national defense would be reduced from $47 billion to $23 billion, or more than one-half. Agriculture would be cut from $5 billion to a trivial $166 million, along with drastic reductions in other departments.

All of this would be done on the basis that, since Congress would not have the income from the personal income tax, it would be compelled to make the reductions. The list of the proposed tax receipts reflects this. Thus the promoters of the amendment assume that Congress would have no alternative. It would have to stop spending, just the way the backers of the 18th amendment assumed that people would have to stop drinking, because the law said so.

It takes only a little thinking to wonder how the United States could stand up to the Communist menace with the defense budget cut in half. Congress would have to seek funds elsewhere in the form of vastly increased excise and sales taxes. It would take at least a 10-percent tax on every kind of transaction to bring in the needed revenue.

Of course, it is that very gimmick that would please the main backers of the amendment. By abolishing the personal income tax, it would reduce their total tax bill tremendously. However, the average citizen would have his tax considerably increased. Or Congress could enact what is called a capital levy, which desperation could make necessary. It could do it year in and year out, so that those who think they would have their heavy taxes of the present reduced, would find themselves mistaken.

Those who think that the adoption of a constitutional amendment would prevent the people from doing something an overwhelming majority want to do, are indulging in the wishful thinking of a pipe dream.

Title V Has Helped North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the National Defense Education Act has been responsible for improving counseling and guidance programs in the Nation's public schools by providing funds for the training of counselors and for the establishment of guidance programs in all of our schools.

I am pleased that the President has recommended an expansion of these programs to the seventh and eighth grades and that his recommendation has been incorporated into Senate bill 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

Because my State of North Dakota has so many small schools, we have had a particular problem in establishing counseling programs. Largely because of assistance under the National Defense Education Act, North Dakota has made real strides toward establishing organized guidance programs in its schools. Paul F. Munger, director of counselor education at the University of North Dakota, and James D. Mathisen, director of guidance for the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, have written an excellent article explaining how title V of the National Defense Education Act has helped North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDANCE IN PRACTICE

Title V of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 has had considerable influence on the development of guidance programs in the public schools of North Dakota. Most of the guidance programs in the State are staffed by relatively well-trained counselors rather than by persons who are appointed to positions as counselors with varying amounts of relevant training.

The National Defense Education Act has made possible the professional education of counselors who would not have had the financial resources to secure such training. Through the act professional guidance workers have been able to indicate to the State that guidance programs and trained counselors are available for even relatively small schools. They have been able to show that small schools can afford them and that guidance programs can be a part of the structure of the small school.

When the National Defense Education Act was enacted, an advisory committee consisting of the director of guidance services for the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, two counselor educators, two school counselors, and two school administrators met to decide on the efforts that should be taken which would promote guidance in North Dakota. Several meetings of this group were held and it was eventually decided to utilize the limited funds by sponsoring only 15 guidance units which would serve as models for the schools of the State. This was the alternative to allotting funds to all of the public schools in the State on a per-pupil basis. These 15 units were all set up on a basis of matching funds from the local school district and from the National Defense Education Act funds allotted to the State department of public instruction.

North Dakota's schools are for the most part very small, consequently finding schools in which a suitable student-counselor ratio was feasible was a difficult problem. Several small schools indicated interest in the program, but many of these had only 125 to 200 students in grades 7 to 12. It was decided that two such school districts could employ one full-time counselor between them. This was preferable to employing a person whose duties were divided between teaching and counseling. As a result six multiple school counseling units were set up in addition to nine single school units.

In the school year 1960–61, 21 title V–A counseling units were in operation. In 1961–62, 33 title V–A counseling units were in operation. More schools are seeking counselors. Of the original 15 units 9 are still in existence as separate units. Two have split up into separate units which have their own counselors.

Prior to 1959, there were approximately six schools in North Dakota that had organized guidance programs. In the school year 1961–62, 37 schools have guidance programs staffed by qualified personnel. This change has been partly due to the National Defense Education Act. Under title V–B, the National Defense Education Act has aided in providing trained staff through the support of institutes at both of the North Dakota universities.

An institute was sponsored at the University of North Dakota in the summer of 1959 in which 32 participants were given training. Ten of the participants were placed as counselors in North Dakota, many of the remainder were placed in counselor positions in other States.

In the summer of 1960, 25 participants were enrolled in the 6-week institute at the North Dakota State University. Eight of these were later employed as counselors in North Dakota schools.

A one-semester institute in 1961 enrolled 25 students of whom 18 were from North Dakota. All of these except two are employed as counselors. Six are employed as counselors in North Dakota. Six of the students in the 1961–62 institute are from North Dakota schools.

Of the 40 counselors now employed in public and parochial schools, 23 have received training in various institutes.

From the above it is apparent that much of the growth of guidance services in the schools of North Dakota has been aided by the National Defense Education Act. It is reasonable to state that much that has been accomplished by these counselors in the guidance programs of these schools is due to the support given through this act.

The authors are able to report the results of a survey conducted by the State department of public instruction near the end of the school year 1960–61 of the plan A guidance units. The quantity and distribution of work done by the counselors in these schools is impressive.

In 1960–61 approximately 21,000 interviews were held with students and parents by these counselors. Fifteen percent of the students who were interviewed were seen over a relatively long period of time. Contacts with students concerned educational planning and problems in the majority of cases (59 percent). Interviews with students concerning personal and social problems were next in number (22 percent) and interviews concerned with vocational problems and planning were least significant (19 percent).

Approximately 1,600 of these interviews were held with parents. Such interviews consisted primarily of helping parents understand their children's education, vocational, personal, and social plans. In some instances the counselors helped the parents understand themselves in relation to their children. All of the interviews with parents occurred in the schools rather than in the home or some other place outside of the school.

It is interesting that in 1960–61 over 700 interviews were held with former students. Dropouts and graduates frequently returned to the school for consultation with the counselor. Sometimes they would return to chat with their friend, the counselor, other times they would return for help with planning.

A noteworthy observation is the sources for initial referral to these counselors. Approximately half (49 percent) of the students sought the counselor's help of their own volition. Roughly one-fourth (28 percent) of the students were called in for an interview; 12 percent were referred by teachers, 7 percent were referred by administrators, and 4 percent were advised by the parents to see the counselor. It is interesting that so large a number of students were self-referrals. The authors believe that this proportion is unique and that it indicates an image of a counselor by students which may not often be found in other States.

In addition to the individual contacts with parents and students, over 1,700 individual conferences were held with teachers, usually about individual students.

Another interesting statistic concerns referral by counselors to outside agencies. North Dakota is limited in the number of mental health centers, family service centers, and so forth, available to counselors as referral for service facilities. But despite this fact, 173 referrals of this type were made.

An activity in which the counselor usually is involved is testing, and the National Defense Education Act has had an unusual effect here. Prior to the advent of the National Defense Education Act State plan, tests were being administered in many schools, but often with no real reason for giving them. The State plan gave a definite purpose for tests and provided unification throughout the State as well as purpose for giving them.

The State plan had the effect of decreasing the number of tests given in each school rather than increasing the number. Duplication of types of tests was eliminated.

In summary, the National Defense Education Act has enhanced guidance in the schools of North Dakota by helping to provide funds for the training of counselors, and the establishment of guidance programs in the schools of North Dakota. These programs have served as models to the other schools of North Dakota for the establishment of their own guidance programs.

Responsibility or Rigid Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, our wheat farmers will be called upon to cast their ballots for or against a program which has sobering consequences for them and the national economy.

The campaign prior to the referendum has been marked by propaganda barrages from Washington urging acceptance of the program with all manner of persuasion including threats and decep-

tion. It is time that the other side of the case be presented and I wish to commend the following article by Columnist Richard Wilson appearing in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on April 10. Its thoughful discussion of this issue makes sober reading, indeed.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 10, 1963]

RESPONSIBILITY OR RIGID CONTROL—WHEAT FARMERS VIEWED AS HARNESSING THEMSELVES IF THEY ACCEPT PLAN

(By Richard Wilson)

Thirty years ago this month the New Deal was beginning the most audacious adventure in economic control ever undertaken in this country before or since.

Now it is $48 billion and six Secretaries of Agriculture later. The farm problem of 30 years ago is in some respects worse than ever. Human misery is no longer involved, but not even a close approach has been made to an economically sound and permanently workable solution. Political problems have been eased. Farmers as a class are fewer, smarter, and better off.

After the passage of all this time and the spending of a vast treasure to increase farmers' incomes, the great farm technocracy is facing a key decision. This decision is whether or not to take the final plunge into the strictest form of control and regimentation of private enterprise ever seriously proposed in this country.

The issue rises because the loose and circumscribed control systems of the past 30 years, in all their myriad forms, have not worked satisfactorily. On the whole, surpluses have continued to mount until it costs nearly a billion dollars a year merely to carry them. Every agricultural program devised has fallen afoul of technological progress.

Farmers can produce food faster than Government officials can think up schemes to hold them back. This has been the great technological revolution of our time. There are half as many farmers today as in 1930. They can supply food and fiber to at least twice as many people as the farmers could in 1930.

The issue turns on a new control system for the production and marketing of wheat. About half the farmers in the Nation grow wheat. They have operated under a control system involving limitation of acreage and marketing and fixed prices. But never have the producers of wheat, or any other commodity, submitted to the strict controls of planting and marketing which would virtually convert their farms into state enterprises.

Now, under law, such a program of controlled acreage and controlled marketing is to be submitted to the producers of wheat in a referendum on May 21. Under this program Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman would hear every grain of wheat that falls. Bushel by bushel, wheat would flow into its various uses by Government permit and certification and at Government prices. Farmers would be harnessed in a system providing fines up to $5,000 for violating regulations and jail sentences up to 10 years for fraud.

A wheat farmer could oppose this program with all his heart and mind, and go out of business if his convictions were strong enough. The Government pays him nothing for an independent conscience. If two of his three neighbors want the program, and he does not, he is sacrificed to the general interest; he conducts his business their way or not at all. The new wheat program will be mandatory on all if it is approved by a two-thirds majority.

It is widely believed that if wheat farmers approve the new program the way will be opened for a similar State enterprise system for the producers of corn, feed grains, livestock, and in the end all forms of agricultural control will take this pattern.

Many years of observing the development of farm programs leads clearly to the conclusion that this is, in fact, the case, and that a relatively small group of wheat growers will make the national decision of the greatest importance to all farmers. In the great farm organizations and in the Government it is sensed that this is the critical hour of decision.

Farmers now are faced by the facts of stringent Government control, and they must ask themselves if this is really what they want. If wheat farmers say no on May 21, they can change the whole course of the Freeman-Kennedy farm program. They can, in fact, blow it out of the water.

This choice is made by a semblance, some think it a travesty, of democracy. In a previous referendum only 235,000 farmers voted, perhaps no more than one-sixth of the total farms on which acreage allotments existed. By every means that is legal the vast agricultural bureaucracy is trying to sway the vote in favor of the state enterprise system.

The absurd claim is made by Secretary Freeman that farmers are choosing between $2 per bushel and $1 per bushel wheat. This is not even statistically correct. Mr. Freeman is trying to persuade farmers that Congress and President Kennedy will leave them in the lurch if they turn down the new control program, and there will be nothing but an old control program that will cut their income in half. This is so unrealistic that few farmers will be fooled.

Farmers won't be left in the lurch. They are given a chance now to escape a new regimentation that they will come to hate even more than some of them detest their present restrictions. If the wheat farmers say no, Congress will come immediately to grips with this problem again, and there is no lack of effective programs which could be enacted.

The choice is not between $2 and $1 wheat. It is a choice of freedom and responsibility or the intensification of control systems which haven't yet been able to do the job.

Realistic Idealism: A Philosophy for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a most noteworthy and statesmanlike address was recently delivered by a former Member of this great body and now Governor of Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns, before the Oahu Youth Council Model United Nations Assembly in Honolulu. Because I believe Mr. Burns offers a sound, forward-looking philosophy not only for the youth of our Nation, but for us grownups as well, I ask unanimous consent for insertion in the RECORD of his speech in its entirety.

His speech follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. JOHN A. BURNS, BEFORE OAHU YOUTH COUNCIL, MODEL UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY, MARCH 9, 1963, ELKS CLUB, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the Model United Nations Assembly, guests, I am happy that you have invited me to speak before this assembly of delegates to a Model United Nations. I know of your many weeks of study and preparation for this gathering; and I can surmise the splendid efforts of the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, the instructors in the high schools and university, the interested university students and many others who have done the arranging, publicizing and directing necessary to bring such a highly integrated program as this into being.

To me, there is a very special uniqueness in this assembly. Both the planners and the participants manifest at once faith in the United Nations ideal: "to practice tolerance and to live together in peace * * * to insure that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest * * * to employ international machinery for the economic and social advancement of all peoples."

Yours is a faith determined enough to invest time and effort toward the realization of that goal. But there is more: For the participants, this assembly represents your bent, your talents, your will to achieve the United Nations ideal; for the planners, it represents a faith in youth, it reflects a confidence in the prospect that you students will attain that ideal.

I find these qualities admirable.

I wish today to speak to you about this idealism, and to share with you my thoughts and hopes as to how this may be channeled, for the good of our State, our country, and our world. I believe it is absolutely essential that every encouragement and development be given these ideals.

What is needed is a realistic idealism, an approach that is not strictly pragmatic but which is heavily leavened with the virtues in both philosophies. By this, I do not mean an eclectic approach that includes too much of the best of everything and thus falls down of its own weight. I speak of a guiding principle which includes a realism which accurately gages the times and is in step with the world of sensory data; and an idealism which resists the delusions that becloud the real issues of the times and stands firm with faith in the efficacy of a concept.

This is a difficut role to assume, for it conflicts intrinsically with the pressures of immediate adjustment to the current scene and steadfast certainty of what must become. Thus, in discussing the problem of national security, some will hold that we must rely solely on modern weapons technology, while others would have us disarm unilaterally as a first step toward world peace. To place ourselves at the mercy of those with much to gain from the destruction of our way of life is as foolish as to indulge in a spiraling arms race with its dares and counterdares, and the prospect of a hollow victory shrouded in wholesale death and destruction.

Realistic idealism looks for other alternatives to the dilemma we must resolve.

Here then, is the value and urgency of your meeting today: to study the pressing problems of the world community to find, while there is still time, alternatives to international suicide. For us, this is a realistic idealism.

I believe that after you have completed your formal education and begin to look for a place in adult society, there will be ample opportunity for you to exercise realistic idealism. Immense as have been our Nation's past endeavors in establishing foundations for lasting peace, our future efforts will be greater. The aspirations of the underprivileged nations for the fruits of our technological advances will not be thwarted.

It is not improbable that a number of you with proper educational background and singleness of purpose may someday work with one of the existing international organizations such as the many permanent

secretariats of the United Nations—UNESCO in Paris: the World Health Organization in Geneva; the Food and Agricultural Organization in Rome; the International Bank; or the U.N. Headquarters in New York. And in all likelihood, these centers will have their counterparts in the nations of the Pacific basin. The scope of U.N. organization are as broad as human needs and provide outlets for the creativity of many types of persons.

I was pleased to learn, for instance, of the U.N. scholarships available this summer, scholarships for seminars in international civil service. For the first time, the United Nations and the east-west center have joined in providing funds for sending nine delegates from Hawaii to a U.N. conference in San Jose, Calif. This is indicative of the growing interest in directing young people into these types of careers.

The Peace Corps offers direct entry and experience for properly trained individuals. It is significant that what started as an idea, an election campaign proposal, really has grown in respect both at home and abroad. Our Peace Corps volunteers reflect the type of idealism I mentioned earlier. Their work, supported as it is by the Federal Government, represents the harmonious blend with realism that is possible when both ingredients are properly balanced.

Who can measure the contributions being made by the Peace Corps workers? Small in themselves, their effects may be great in total impact and importance. Over the next 10 years the course of national and even world events may be significantly affected by an innoculation program in Borneo, a community water system in the Philippines, or a village marketing system in Africa. Immeasurable, too, is the effect of people-to-people communication that carries across the spirit and potential of our free society.

But there is another aspect of this program that should be considered, especially by you who are now considering choices in careers. The Peace Corps, in all likelihood, will be a cadre for some of the finest diplomats the United States has ever produced. There is no better training and testing ground for realistic idealism than to match one's will against the stubborn inertia encountered in efforts to improve men's lives in other lands. Even 20 years from now, the full report on the Peace Corps will not be complete.

There are other areas, too. Practically every agency and department of our Federal Government in involved in some way in foreign affairs. For instance, under Public Law 480, the Department of Agriculture has programs that reach around the world. The Alliance for Progress cuts across all departments in coordinating its program. Such programs will continue and will increase, for they reflect our Nation's growing awareness of our position in and responsibility to the rest of the world.

Thus far, I have mentioned programs administered on a Federal level, broad and encompassing as Federal plans must be to cope with far-reaching problems. But when used alone these programs have their limitations. They smack of national interest, of impersonality. However great our private citizens' sacrifice to provide the tax dollar at home, and howevermuch we are concerned that our dollar makes a genuine contribution to world peace, none of this is apparent when the farm machinery is unloaded on a pier in Pakistan.

What is needed is a people-to-people program. We must find practical ways to communicate and to personalize our interest, to truly demonstrate the intensity of our concern for the welfare of our less fortunate neighbors. The problem was well stated by Dr. Charles Malick, former president of the U.N. General Assembly, when he said: "The problem is to extend backward nations fellowship without encroaching on their freedom and independence."

To provide help and at the same time respect the integrity of the recipient is a challenge that can only be met through realistic idealism.

As one step along this road, I propose a people-to-people program in which Hawaii might become directly involved. The Peace Corps is a step in that direction: It is a pattern of things to come. Suppose the State of Hawaii, or a particular ethnic group in Hawaii, set out to investigate a worthy project for development in a foreign country?

Perhaps it would be village development, or the starting of small businesses to be taken over later by local people, or an agricultural development project.

Such a program could start on a modest scale, but it would have tremendous impact, for it would be invested with genuine person-to-person appeal. It is not at all inconceivable that, once underway, our project might merit matching funds from agencies for international development. Our entire foreign aid program is being jeopardized by the lack of the very element this project could offer.

Actually, the State of California has already undertaken such a project on its own. President Kennedy has called it a "preliminary effort," and Theodore Moscoso, the administrator for the Alliance for Progress, praised it as "a new dimension of widespread popular participation in America's oversea program."

Young people like yourselves will sometime no doubt have opportunity to initiate and participate in such projects.

I see such programs as working closely with the development of a foreign trade center complex for Hawaii. A part of this complex would be a trade zone, an area where products from all parts of the world could be brought to Hawaiian soil, stored duty free, until they are ready for marketing in this country.

Another portion would be a merchandise mart, a place where manufacturers from all over the world could exhibit their products, a merchandising center for the entire Pacific basin, and a drawing point for tourists and businessmen alike.

A third portion of the complex would be an international house, in which would be housed libraries, translators, hotel and conference rooms: All the facilities necessary for businessmen from all over the world to meet, discuss needs, and conduct business.

Having in our vicinity such a center for establishing contacts and making friends would be a tremendous boon to local business.

But of more direct interest to you, the entire complex would open a variety of jobs for our people, jobs in new businesses, in servicing the complex, representatives for foreign industries, trade missions, promotional groups, study missions.

These, in turn, will directly affect the educational needs and trends in our secondary schools, our trade schools, our colleges.

So important and so inter-related are all these proposals for the future well-being of such students as yourselves that I believe Hawaii might well institute a Department of the Pacific. A State agency to promote and coordinate all agencies and projects relating to this major goal, the entrance of Hawaii into the very hub of Pacific trade.

You are aware of the dramatic changes taking place in the Pacific basin; much more will follow. The aggressive ambitions of Communist China. Her need for the manufactured surpluses of Japan, the concern of the United States in the implications of such trade alliances, the likelihood still of Great Britain's entry into the European Common Market, obliging Australia and New Zealand to find new markets, the needs of emerging national groups in southeast Asia for manufactured goods in exchange for their raw materials, all these suggest a coming "Era of the Pacific."

Our role in this development must be that of leadership.

All these international endeavors, whether the United Nations, our own National Government, our own people-to-people programs, or our own trade center complex are areas toward which you may direct your ambitions, confident, I believe, that there will be a place for you.

At a time when the Western World seeks to remove the stigma of blame for past abuses of colonialism, our Nation must look increasingly to Hawaii to most effectively express the ideals of peace and brotherhood. Here is warmth, loyalty, an acceptance of racial and cultural differences, and in our veins flow the blood of half a dozen Pacific peoples.

Many of you may find employment elsewhere, perhaps in international service. Many of you will remain in Hawaii to become the teachers, the informed citizenry, the community leaders 10 to 15 years from now.

For all these reasons, I have welcomed this opportunity to urge you to cultivate your realistic idealism.

Best wishes for a successful model United Nations.

Equal Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, during recent years, there has been considerable discussion concerning the equal time regulations affecting the appearances of political candidates on radio and television programs.

Recently an interesting case connected with this point was brought to my attention. It concerns Miss Brenda C. Satterfield, a candidate for the Baltimore City Council, who is also an employee of WCBM radio station in that city. Miss Satterfield issued a background statement and wrote a letter to describe her dilemma. Both of these are self explanatory, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND STATEMENT

I am a candidate for city council, fourth district (there are six districts) in Baltimore. I am employed by WCBM Radio in programing and public service and, on occasion, go on air as a news staff aide . My regular on-air work includes moderating a 45-minute broadcast Saturday mornings (family forum) featuring outstanding nonpolitical public figures in Maryland. My part is not to expound personal philosophy or political but to keep the ball rolling and to relay listeners' questions and reactions.

Upon filing for office, I voluntarily went off the air so WCBM would not have to offer equal time to 139 councilmanic candidates and because I had no clear-cut understanding of requirements under FCC rule 315. The primary reduced candidacies to 38 (7 in my own district) but the problem remains the same. I have not returned to the microphone. I consider this an unnecessary hardship, entailing loss of overtime pay and the professional necessity of regular use of name and presence. During the hearings by the

Communications Subcommittee (Representative WALTER ROGERS, chairman) of the House Commerce Committee (Representative OREN HARRIS, chairman), there was some prospect that the equal time restrictions might be either repealed or suspended. It now is evident that local contests will not be freed, surely not in time for a May 1963 election. Consequently, I am making an appeal for fair play by my fellow candidates and opponents, asking them to allow this exception.

WCBM has consistently allotted free time and sought appearances for the discussion of political issues. Its capsule comment has, for several years, presented issues and candidates on an equal time basis 5 nights weekly, 52 weeks a year. In a supplementary series (council contest), all current councilmanic candidates are asked to air their aims.

Seeking elective office, some candidates expect to make sacrifices, a few even resign office. Some others of us cannot afford the loss of regular income and position on the chance of election, particularly as a minority party candidate. It hardly seems equal to pit an incumbent (with the advantages of office plus income) against challengers less endowed financially who have no alternate careers.

I merely ask exception to regulation that is punitive to broadcasters, a people who certainly should be encouraged to participate in government and further the democratic ideal.

LETTER BY BRENDA C. SATTERFIELD

FELLOW CANDIDATE: Because you are a candidate for city council, you are quite aware of sacrifices we all make in seeking public office.

You know I am employed by WCBM radio in programing and public service. Part of my job includes moderating a 45-minute family forum broadcast; I am also an occasional on-air news reporter.

Under the Federal Communications Act, when a station grants free time to one candidate it must offer equal time to all who seek the same office. This seems like fair play until a broadcaster becomes a candidate. It is obviously impossible to grant equal time to all for my regular work.

I feel sure you do not want to take advantage of another candidate. If you will waive as indicated below, this undue and singular hardship can be lifted.

A postcard is enclosed. Please sign it and indicate whether you do, or do not, agree to let me continue my regular work. If all council candidates agree, I can assure you that my broadcasts will be nonpolitical; your name and your courtesy will be mentioned in at least three broadcasts during the campaign; WCBM will adhere to its fair play doctrine in every other phase of the campaign.

If there is any question in mind, please don't hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,

BRENDA C. SATTERFIELD.

Scientists Are Not Experts on Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it has become the practice of some members of the scientific professions to parade their Ph. D.'s and prizes in particular fields of competency before the public, then blandly sound off on almost any other subject whether or not they know a bit more about it than anybody else. Unfortunately a lot of people are taken in by it, thus these opinions which deserve no more weight than ordinary bull-session observations between ordinary citizens get a very undeserved credence. Such exhibitions of arrogant narcissism are creating much confusion and removing public discussion of the vitally important problem of test-ban negotiations far from the realm of reality.

Professor So-and-So of the biology department of such-and-such university would not dream of sonorously telling his fellow citizens authoritatively just exactly how to fix a television set. Yet the same Professor So-and-So, just because he has become emotionally involved in the subject of a test ban, has no qualms whatsoever about signing his name to a long statement dealing with the innermost intricacies of writing an effective test ban treaty which stops nuclear weapons developments by both sides equally. This despite the fact that he knows little, if anything, about those intricacies. This further despite the fact that if what he signed is in error and what it suggests is acted upon, it could bring a rain of nuclear bombs on the United States rather than keeping them away.

Some light was shed this morning in the New York Times letters to the editor column on this distressing inclination of some scientists to pose as omnipotent by the following communication from a very able and respected scientist who has put his name to a subject on which he is in fact authoritative:

SCIENTISTS AS SEERS: LIMITS SET ON ABILITY TO MAKE FORECASTS ON STRATEGIC ISSUES

(The writer of the following letter, member of the Research Council of the Rand Corp. and professor at the University of California at Los Angeles, was scientific adviser to the American delegation at the Geneva Conference on Surprise Attack (1958).)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of March 30 (western edition) agrees with my "Scientists, Seers and Strategy" in the current foreign affairs in holding that physical scientists and engineers have no magical foresight on strategic issues. But it does not accurately state my argument and hardly recognizes the dangers of the myth punctured. Moreover, the "body of evidence" you cite illustrates the power of that myth.

My article doesn't deny that some scientists have sometimes been right; nor that "politicians and generals" have frequently been wrong. Only that "it would be hard to show that scientists on the whole have been more realistic or prescient." I do not "indict the public activities of scientists"; just the claims of clairvoyance.

The cardinal choices C. P. Snow refers to as a domain of physical science and engineering involve many factual considerations besides the technologies. The notion that, simply by their status as scientists rather than by empirical work on all the major factors affecting such decisions, scientists deserve a special authority is silly and dangerous. We need the methods of science, not merely the authority.

Even more dangerous is Snow's view that only they can "have a firsthand knowledge of what those choices depend upon." Snow believes that scientists have "the future in their bones," and unfortunately a good many others, less extreme than Snow, agree.

RECORD FOR PREDICTIONS

Your editorial perpetuates this folklore. The telling instance it assumes I ignore is the record scientists made in predicting the date of Soviet acquisition of nuclear weapons. This is the standard example often cited by scientists themselves. It is indeed a telling instance, but what does it tell? Nostradamus, too, made many successful predictions. And many predictions that turned out poorly.

After the first Russian nuclear tests, articles appeared, for example, in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist, comparing scientists' predictions of this event with those of the wartime administrators. Quotations showed that in 1945-46 a good many scientists said the Russians would get a bomb in about 4 years. General Groves, Vannevar Bush, and Conant were cited as examples of the interior prescience of wartime administrators.

The first thing odd is the treatment of Bush and Conant. On Snow's definition, to say nothing of more rigorous ones, they rate, and rather high, as scientists. Snow wants some scientists on top rather than on tap precisely because they have the future in their bones. It would be most unfortunate, then, if as soon as they got on top they lost their power of prophecy, as is implied for Bush and Conant.

The successful prophecies cited cluster in 1945–46. In these years the scientists were urging the Baruch-Acheson-Lilienthal plan as the only alternative to the imminent spread of nuclear weapons. After 1946, when the Russians turned the plan down, many scientists, including some quoted for their successful prophecy, reversed their views and, in 1948 and 1949, predicted it would be many years before the Russians got the bomb. Meanwhile the explosion was getting closer.

In fact, Bush and Conant recorded good as well as bad predictions as to the date of the Russian bomb. They guessed right, in September, 1944, sooner than the others quoted.

Even the good 1945–46 predictions, examined more closely, appear less prophetic. For example, one Nobel laureate expected six countries to enter the nuclear club in as few as 5 years. Another expected Russia to be fourth, after Canada and England.

SEQUENCE OF DECISIONS

Forecasts of the progress of a military atomic energy program are not simply matters of technology. They try to forsee a complex sequence of national decisions. Each sequence is affected by the decisions of other countries, by domestic costs, and by national estimates of military and political worth.

Scientists often treat nuclear diffusion as mechanically as the diffusion of a gas. Three years ago Snow assured the American Association of Atomic Scientists that "all physical scientists know that for a dozen or more States it will only take perhaps 6 years, perhaps less," to acquire fission and fusion bombs.

In 1963 only the most ill-informed would wager that there will be a dozen new entrants to the nuclear club by the end of 1966. Such heady and wrongheaded self-confidence is an extreme manifestation of the myth.

In brief, your example simply illustrates a major point of "Scientists, Seers, and Strategy." "No one has had the gift of reliable foresight in these cardinal choices." On these matters "answers are won precariously and intermittently in the course of hard empirical inquiry into the major factors affecting choice."

ALBERT WOHLSTETTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 10, 1963.*

Miami Benefactor Is Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, April 1, 1963, was a sad day for Miami, Fla. Daniel J. Mahoney, one of the vigorous and colorful figures in Greater Miami's history, died in New York at the age of 75.

In Dade County, "Uncle Dan" Mahoney will be long remembered for his innumerable civic activities and key role in furthering Miami's destiny.

As a tribute to him and token of respect for his sorrowing family, I wish to place in the RECORD a testimonial by Ralph Renick, WTVJ vice president in charge of news and broadcast over WTVJ channel 4, Miami, Fla., on Monday, April 1:

MIAMI SORROWED BY DAN MAHONEY'S PASSING

Youthful Miami has had but a short span of time to establish a heritage of names of those people who have given as well as received from this community, who have been a part of its growth, who have played key roles in steering the city's course, who have had a vital interest in the area's welfare.

But such a person was Daniel J. Mahoney who died today in New York at the age of 75. "Uncle Dan" as he was known to his friends and associates came to Miami in 1923; sent here by Gov. James Cox to be associated with the Miami News which Cox had purchased.

Mahoney served as an Army lieutenant in World War I duty in France, emerging as a captain. In 1918, he married Governor Cox's daughter who died in 1921. He was married twice again following his first wife's death.

In 1935, Mahoney was named vice president and general manager of the News, and publisher in 1951. He was a man who delegated authority telling his staff members, "I'm with you right or wrong—but always try to be right."

"Uncle Dan" was a mover. He never tried to hide his effort to influence the course of politics—he fought organized crime, served as head of the community chest, president of the Orange Bowl committee, and was chairman of the University of Miami board of trustees.

In recent years, his vigorous activity was curtailed as his robust health began to fail. The end came today on the operating table while lung surgery was being performed.

Dan Mahoney was a part of those fabulous years that put Miami on the map. He was one of those who led the way and who moved in directions he thought proper.

Miami's heritage and culture is richer because of him.

His name deserves a prominent place on Miami's permanent honor roll of those who believed in and worked for this community.

Further testimonial to the great contributions made to Miami's progress by Dan Mahoney appeared in the news columns of the Miami News of Thursday, April 4, following:

FINAL RITES AT UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI HONOR D. J. MAHONEY

(By William Tucker)

More than 300 of his friends and admirers paid final tribute to Daniel J. Mahoney today in the library auditorium at the University of Miami which he loved so well.

A great bank of flowers stood at the head of the auditorium, topped by a cluster of red roses sent by President Kennedy. The centerpiece was a white cross of flowers sent by Anthony Abraham.

The family of the publisher of the Miami News, who died in a New York hospital Monday, had requested that instead of flowers, donations be made to the newly established Mahoney Memorial Fund at the university. But many of his friends sent both flowers and contributions.

Dr. Henry King Stanford, president of the university, made the memorial address, praising Mahoney for bestowing on the college a "loyalty and affection that nothing else outside of his family and newspaper received."

"The evidence is all around us of the fruits of his labors for the university he loved so well," Dr. Stanford said.

"Everything good for the community had his support, his boundless energy and his infectious good humor."

Scores of outstanding leaders of Greater Miami attended the final services for the publisher. Private burial services followed in a mausoleum at Woodlawn Park Cemetery.

Among the many figures present from Mahoney's colorful past was heavyweight champion Gene Tunney, who once knocked the publisher off his feet in a sparring session after Mahoney stung him with a punch.

A University of Miami mixed choir, in green surplices and white collars, provided the music and closed with a ringing recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

The final benediction was made by Lt. Col. Frank Titus, an American Legion chaplain representing the Armed Forces for which Mahoney fought so valiantly as a captain of infantry in World War I.

Cards on the flowers indicated Mahoney's wide circle of friends and organizations.

There were lilies from the board of directors of the LaGorce Country Club, of which Mahoney was a cofounder. Another cluster of lilies was sent by the officers and directors of the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Mahoney's widow sat in the front row flanked by his two sons, Daniel, Jr., and Michael, and their wives. Across from them sat the pallbearers.

Active pallbearers were Jack Tarver, president of Atlanta Newspapers Inc.; J. Luckett Yawn, general manager of the Miami News; William C. Baggs, editor of the News; Julian Eberle, production manager of the Cox Newspapers; Ray Sadler, general counsel for Cox Newspapers, and Robert Snyder, of Dayton, Ohio.

Honorary pallbears were Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, of New York City, Bernard F. Gimbel, of Palm Beach, Tunney, A. J. Henderson, Col. Arnold Hanger, Oscar Dooly, George Whitten, Albert Dubbin, John C. Clark, of Binghampton, N.Y., Judge Emett Choate, Jay Gould, of New York City, Hugh Emerson, Shelby Langston, Guy D. Austin, Wallace Gilroy, of Golden Beach, Hank Meyer, Henry Sinclair, and McGregor Smith.

The School-Community Improvement Program in San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a most significant and interesting educational program which is taking place in the city of San Francisco, Calif. It is reported in a recent issue of the San Francisco public school bulletin.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House have heard much about and are all concerned, I am sure, with the many problems of education. Particularly, we have heard of the culturally deprived child. This is the child growing up in a changing neighborhood in one of our urban areas, and served poorly in educational and cultural opportunities. It is from such groups that we have some reason to believe come recruits of gangs, or at least lest constructive associations than we could hope for them. Likewise, we hear much about the shortage of teachers in this area, inadequately trained teachers, shortage of space, facilities, time, and more. Sometimes we have been so long in hearing about problems and so short in hearing about solving them, or even meeting them, that it is depressing.

It is most heartening, therefore, to get news of something significant and constructive that is being done, and which moreover, is working well. This project in San Francisco bids well, also, to provide some experience and techniques which may have considerable extension in applicability beyonds its borders.

Mr. Speaker, what has been launched in San Francisco is a school-community improvement program. With money from the Ford Foundation, a lot of volunteer help from college students who are training to be teachers, generous cooperation from churches and other community agencies and neighborhood houses, and the schools, a creative, vital program has taken shape.

It seems to me that this is an exciting thing which is taking place. The Ford Foundation should be commended for its financial support. The agency personnel, the volunteers, the school officials, and the overall director, Mr. George E. Schell, ought to be congratulated and encouraged. This is the best tradition of the American spirit in meeting problems; a spontaneous affection, ingenuity for practical improvision, and shirt sleeves working have combined to do something, not just talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, it is certain that fresh ideas will come out of this and data that will be published in due course. Much will be learned here, that with appropriate local modifications, can be used elsewhere.

I recommend to the Members of the House of Representatives that they take note of this project and keep abreast of its developments. Further details of the program, the names and kinds of participating agencies are contained in the San Francisco school bulletin which I have previously mentioned and which I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House at this time.

The article follows:

STUDY CENTER PROGRAM GROWS

One of the outstanding products of the Ford Foundation backed school-community improvement (commonly known as SCIP) has been the development of the study center program under the leadership of Mr. George E. Schell, school-community counselor.

The program started in 1961 with five centers in the western addition. Today there are 16 study centers in operation around the city with a weekly attendance of over 700 students and 100 volunteers (mostly teacher trainees) from San Francisco State College, University of San Francisco, San Francisco College for Women and City College of San Francisco.

Early in 1961 it became evident that many of the students in the western addition lacked the physical environment for the development of good study skills. It was felt that more than a study hall was needed and the concept of a study center was developed. A study center was not only a place to study, but was a place to get individual help in academic areas, a place to improve reading, explore vocations, and most important, it was another place where people cared.

School buildings were not used for study centers as homework is a parent-child function and study centers act as parent surrogates. Another reason for locating centers in the community, according to Mr. Schell, is to indicate that people (other than educators) are interested in education. In addition, it gives many volunteers a new experience in working with deprived children. This is especially useful to the volunteers who will eventually teach the culturally deprived child.

The majority of volunteers have come from the teacher-training program for several reasons. First of all these people are near the end of their training and will be qualified teachers within 6 months to a year. Being in the teacher-training program greatly alleviates the need for screening by agency people. As these students will be teachers of our youth this gives them experience with youngsters centered around schoolwork. In addition, it gives valuable experience and insight into the educational problems of the culturally deprived. Orientation programs have been held to help volunteers understand the needs and background of the youngsters who come to study centers.

From the very beginning the study-center program has created considerable enthusiasm and a spirit of cooperation between SCIP, schools, group work agencies, churches and college personnel. Basic plans were formulated in various group meetings; however, the way the center would function was left to the directors of each center. The lack of strict rules regarding the operation of a study center has been one of the strengths of the program. Such flexibility has resulted in each study center assuming a personality of its own, and the total program has benefited from the creativity of the directors and their staff.

Reference libraries are being built up in all the study centers from donations and special grants of money. In addition, the children in the centers are being provided cultural enrichment experiences by attending plays and symphony events.

A list of study halls and location appears below:

American First Baptist Church, Dr. Howard Day, Un. 3-3382, Octavia and Market Streets, Tuesdays and Thursdays, 4-6 p.m. Elementary and junior high students.

Booker T. Washington Community Center, Mr. Harold Ware or Miss Toshi Koba, Wa. 1-4758, 800 Presidio Avenue (Presidio and Sutter), Wednesdays, 730-9:30 p.m. Elementary, junior and senior high students.

Buchanan Y.M.C.A., Mr. Harry Payne, We. 1-8720, 1530 Buchanan (Buchanan and Geary), Thursdays, 7-9:30 p.m. Elementary, junior and senior high students.

Hamilton Methodist Church, Rev. Rex Bevins, Lo. 6-2416, 1525 Waller Street, Tuesdays and Thursdays, 3:30-4:30 p.m. Elementary students, Tuesdays, 7-9 p.m. Senior high students, Thursdays, 7-9 p.m. Junior high students.

Howard Presbyterian Church, Rev. Thomas Dietrich, He. 1-8881 or Kl. 2-1640, Oak and Baker Streets, Tuesdays and Thursdays, 3:30-4:30 p.m. Elementary students, Wednesdays, 6:30-8:30 p.m. Junior and senior high students.

1830 Y.W.C.A., Mrs. Nancy Burenstine or Miss Rose Richards, Wa. 1-3814, 1830 Sutter Street (Buchanan and Sutter), Thursdays, 4-6 p.m. Junior and senior high girls, Wednesdays, 3:30-5 p.m. Elementary school girls.

Calvary Presbyterian Church, Rev. Robert Nicholson, Fl. 6-4263, Jackson and Fillmore, junior and senior high students membership closed.

Canon Kip, Mrs. Tony Lagone, Un. 1-6801, 8th and Natoma Streets, Wednesdays, 6:30-8:30 p.m. elementary, junior and senior high students.

St. John's Episcopal Church, Rev. Edward Berey, He. 1-5317, 120 Julian Avenue (near 15th Street), Tuesdays and Thursdays, 7-8:30 p.m. junior and senior high students.

Mission Methodist Parish—Hospitality House, Rev. William Miller, Mi. 7-8393, 6138 21st Street (21st and Capp), Wednesdays, 7-8:30 p.m., junior and senior high students.

Potrero Hill Neighborhood House, Mr. Ed Weaver, Mi. 7-9332, 953 DeHaro (DeHaro and 22d Streets), Mondays, 3:30-4:30 p.m. elementary students.

Olivet Presbyterian Church, Rev. William Cox, Mi. 7-1315, 19th and Missouri Streets, Thursday, 7-9 p.m., junior and senior high students.

Milton Meyer Recreation Center, Mr. Joe Bailey, Va. 6-4660, 195 Kiska Road, Tuesdays and Wednesdays, 7-9 p.m., elementary, junior, and senior high students.

Ridge Point Methodist Church, Mr. Joe Bailey, Va. 6-4660, 181 Hilltop Road, Mondays and Tuesdays, 7:30-9:30 p.m., elementary, junior, and senior high students.

Bayview Neighborhood Community Center, Mr. Joe Bailey, Va. 6-4660, 1201 Mendell Street, Mondays and Tuesdays, 7-9:30 p.m., elementary, junior, and senior high students.

Pilgrim Congregational Church, Rev. John Washington, Ju. 6-3124 or Ju. 6-0152, 400 Randolph Street (Randolph and Ramsell), Tuesdays, 7-9 p.m., junior high students, Wednesdays, 3:30-4:30 p.m., elementary students.

The Case of Gas Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a very fine article appeared in the April 9 issue of National Review on "The Case of Gas Warfare," which was written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan. There is great misconception about the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and this is unfortunate. I believe that Mr. Harrigan's article deserves careful reading by the Congress. Mr. Harrigan is associate editor of the News & Courier in Charleston, S.C.

The article follows:

THE CASE FOR GAS WARFARE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

After years of almost total lack of interest, the United States has taken up guerrilla warfare training as though it were something new under the sun. As a result, think shops at the Rand Corp., Institute of Defense Analyses, and elsewhere have been cranking out guerrilla warfare studies. Mao Tse-tung's writings on the subject are in paperback edition. A special manual on tactics for guerrilla operations has been made available to marines. Sudden interest in the subject stems from the fact that Americans are being shot at and killed in South Vietnam. Americans have little difficulty acquiring the savvy necessary for guerrilla warfare. But this begs the question of whether guerrilla warfare is the best way for the United States to conduct military operations.

Guerrilla warfare is cheap in everything but human life. In that, it is very, very expensive. China and the southeast Asian lands can afford to expend manpower in battle at a tremendous rate. It is no difficult matter for Red China, for example, to find more coolies to carry a burp gun and a small bag of rice.

But the United States cannot afford such expenditure of lives. The American citizen-soldier is too valuable to sacrifice. But when we engage in guerrilla-war-type operations, as in South Vietnam, we are fighting on the enemy's terms and in a way that eases his problems. We are not using what is our real strength: the production of weapons that can effectively counter a very numerous foe.

The best way for the United States to achieve its military aims in southeast Asia would be to rely on chemical warfare. The United States will never have enough counterinsurgency troops to comb every rice paddy in the battle zones of South Vietnam. We cannot send armored personnel carriers down every irrigation canal. Not enough helicopters can be produced and manned to track down every band of guerrillas hiding in wooded areas. But it is possible to "sanitize" an area with chemical weapons, with gases and sprays that destroy vegetation, animal life and crops. We can create a no man's land across which the guerrillas cannot move. We can clean up an area so that the enemy won't dare attempt to operate in it. The most important use of chemicals is to deny terrain to an enemy unless he is willing to take a tremendous number of casualties. A single helicopter equipped with a gas dispenser, could flush out an entire band of guerrillas in a few minutes of work. Gas also is effective on rough terrain where guerrillas hide in caves and tall grass and where counterguerrillas cannot go except at high cost in human life.

ANSWER TO GUERRILLA TACTICS

Because the United States has control of the air over southeast Asia, it is in a position to make maximum use of gas warfare. Either fixed wing or helicopter aircraft can dispense the gas. In addition, gas can be delivered by special gas shells, as was the practice in World War I. Indeed it is not extreme to suggest that gas and other chemical instrumentalities may be the answer to guerrilla war operations everywhere in the world, whether they be partisan struggles in city streets or insurgency operations in mountainous areas. Drenching a countryside with gas can set up an effective barrier or root guerrillas out of their strongholds.

Why hasn't the use of gas in South Vietnam been considered by the United States? The answer is that the country has refused to give thought to this branch of modern weaponry because public opinion is clouded and confused with regard to the issue of gas warfare. The United States has invested billions of dollars in hydrogen bombs that could blow up entire cities but gas, a far less lethal weapon, must not even be considered, say the opponents of chemical warfare.

Toxic chemical warfare has not been used since World War I, and several generations have grown up uninformed on its capabilities but in the widespread belief left over from the First World War that its use is cruel and unethical. The myth

of immorality is the principal barrier to effective use of a weapon that could implement the defense of freedom in many parts of the world. The public should be brought to a realization that chemical warfare agents are not the cruel weapons of total destruction that they have been termed. Indeed, until the United States is prepared to use these weapons, there will be a gap in American military defenses against the Communist enemy. We will be fighting with one hand tied behind our back, especially in the zones where guerrillas have an edge on Western forces.

In considering gas warfare, the U.S. public needs to know some vital facts: that gases and other chemicals do not destroy property, for example. Thus a land need not be impoverished by chemical warfare as it is by war with conventional weapons. Gases now available can cause destruction of the will to resist or induce temporary mental derangements; many of these gases do not kill or result in permanent injury. These gases are termed psychochemicals and are nonlethal incapacitating agents.

Whereas today's counterinsurgency operations involve killing with bayonets, knives, and similar weapons, conflict with gases is relatively bloodless. And a nation that has no qualms about training counterguerrillas in the art of knifing guerrillas in nighttime operations certainly should have no objection to gas warfare, especially with gases that are nonlethal.

Brig. Gen. J. H. Rothschild, U.S. Army retired, has correctly stated that this "neglect of nonlethal chemicals is nothing short of tragic. Man is now confronted with the possibility that he can, in some important measure, eliminate death from warfare." Of course, the use of gases should not be predicated on their usefulness in avoiding bloodshed. That simply points up the senselessness of the myth of chemical warfare's immorality. The real argument for using gas warfare is that it gives us a better chance of winning battles in which our forces are engaged. We need all types of gases, lethal as well as nonlethal.

The tactical use of gas would be for sealing off a region in a country threatened by Communist guerrillas. Periodic drenching with gas would be undertaken for the purpose of establishing a protective zone of land—much as minefields are used. By contaminating an area, the defenders could force the enemy to keep his distance. And unless the enemy had air superiority or superior artillery forces, he could not retaliate against the defenders who were enjoying the protection of a gas barrier.

Unless the United States is prepared to make use of its industrial and technical know-how, as in the case of chemical warfare, it will continue to fight at a disadvantage.

The World's Business Is Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, March 13, 1963 was the golden anniversary of the College of Business Administration of Boston University. At the exercises marking the event, Mr. Paul Hoffman, managing director of the United Nations Special Fund, delivered the Founders' Day address on the subject of "The World's Business Is Your Business." We are all well aware of the great talent and ability possessed by Mr. Hoffman. Because I feel that his remarks are so pertinent to present-day international development problems with which we are so deeply concerned, I am more than happy to be able to take this opportunity to bring the thoughts which he has expressed to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The address follows:

THE WORLD'S BUSINESS IS YOUR BUSINESS

You have honored me highly by inviting me to participate in this convocation celebrating the golden anniversary of the college of business administration of this great university. I am particularly appreciative because since becoming first a U.S. Government official and then an international civil servant, some of my friends have forgotten that I am first and last a businessman. May I add that, having observed economic and social systems the world over, I am more deeply convinced than ever that this free and open society of ours, of which our people's capitalism is an essential element, offers its citizens a larger opportunity to make a better living and to grow and develop intellectually and spiritually than any other system on the face of the earth.

The 50 years which have elapsed since the first student crossed the threshold of this college of business administration have been designated as the period of the big change. Frederick Lewis Allen wrote a fascinating book with that title. And what a big change—what a huge change—has taken place. Empires have been shattered and more than 50 new nations have been born. The world's population has jumped from 1.6 billion to more than 3 billion. We have experienced a revolution in communications, with radio and television, and now Telstar. And the world has taken to wheels. There were 1.3 million motorcars on the world's highways in 1913, today 110 million. The most sensational advance in the field of transportation has been in air transport. In 1913 it took 50 days of hard traveling to circle the globe, today 25 hours does it.

There has been, unfortunately perhaps, a phenomenal development in weapons of destruction. The United States and the U.S.S.R. have now enough firepower to annihilate 100 million people in the space of 1 hour and to make large areas of the earth uninhabitable. Our situation in 1913 was much more comfortable. I recall that in 1917, when I was in officer training camp at Fort Lewis, Wash., a Seattle newspaper published a story of a new German gun, the Big Bertha, which was said to have a range of 70 miles. This story was labeled as fantastic nonsense by the captain of our training battery who proved, to my complete satisfaction at least, that it was impossible and would always be impossible for a missile to be fired such a great distance. Today the intercontinental missiles have a range of 5,000 miles and it is expected this will be doubled soon.

The most spectacular progress in all fields has, of course, been in the exploration of space. In 1913 not even the most imaginative of science fiction writers ever suggested that astronauts would be circling the globe by 1960; and who could have dreamed in those days that the United States would be under way with a $9 billion program to put a man on the moon by 1970?

The changes in business practices and business thinking which have taken place in the past half century do not seem spectacular and are not of the kind that make headlines. They are, nevertheless, revolutionary. Further, they affect the lives of all our people. There have been revolutionary changes in manufacturing, marketing, and management practices and in business attitudes.

I am not going to discuss the new techniques in manufacturing, marketing, and management because developments have come too rapidly since I ceased being an active business executive in 1948. In that year we were only dimly aware of the full impact of automation, of the manifold business uses of computers and of the potentialities of subliminal impressions. Clearly, any comment I offered would be very much dated. What I would like to talk about is the change in business attitudes.

It is difficult to realize that the concept of conservation and the development of resources began to take hold in the United States only about 50 years ago. Up to that time we were exploiting our rivers and forests and mining our lands. What was true of physical resources was also true of human resources. The National Safety Council, with its program for the protection of workers against accidents, for the safeguarding of their health, got underway the same year as your business college. But the notion that it was good business for companies to provide training and educational courses for their employees gained acceptance much later.

Nothing could be more striking than the change in attitude on the part of the world of business toward the world outside business. In 1913 most businessmen, particularly big businessmen, felt that Government was the servant of business. Even in the 1920's, President Coolidge was acting as a spokesman for the business community when he said, "The business of America is business." And in the 1930's the billboards of the country blazoned the message "What's good for business is good for you." Today business accepts without question a very different concept; namely, that what's good for America, all of America, is good for business.

There is another striking change and that is the attitude of businessmen toward education. When this college of business administration was inaugurated, there were only two other institutions training men for business careers. Most businessmen, particularly self-made businessmen, looked with suspicion upon anyone whose education had gone much beyond the primary school. I remember that one leading manufacturer in Chicago would not accept an application for employment from anyone who had gone beyond the second year in high school. His oft-repeated statement was that too much learning unfits a man for business. Today, business management is looked upon as a profession and a man who does not train for his career in business is at a great disadvantage. He has little chance of holding his own in this vital and complex sphere.

Despite the fact that this half century has been the period of big change there are some things that remain unchanged. When I was starting my business career I received two pieces of advice that I think are as good today as they were then. One came from a wise friend of mine whose counsel I sought when I left college. He said, "Get into a growing business in a growing town and then if you don't do well there is no hope for you." I took his advice, went into the automobile business in Los Angeles, and found it impossible not to do fairly well.

The second piece of advice came from one of America's wisest businessmen, John M. Studebaker. I had written a theme on how to sell a Studebaker motor car which won for me first prize in a national contest. The Studebakers were a thrifty people, not given to lavishness. The first prize consisted of a personal interview with J. M. Studebaker himself. As I was ushered into his office he was busily engaged in opening his morning mail. The letters he put in one pile. After slitting the envelopes so that they opened flat, he put them in another pile.

His first remark was: "The boys downstairs buy scratch pads. I don't. It is a waste of money. I use the backs of the envelopes." Then he said: "These letters are the complaints. Every morning I insist that all complaints about our product come to me personally. The best way to maintain quality, even in big business, is to handle the complaints yourself." Then he looked up and said: "Young man, you are just starting in business. I have some advice to offer you. We have done fairly well in this business and I will tell you why. We have always given our customers a little more than we promised. That is the way to hold them." Then after a moment's hesitation he added: "But don't give them too much more, son, or you will go broke."

And now I want to turn from the past to the future and offer you my own bit of advice. The future, in my opinion, belongs to those of you who can keep abreast of change and take full advantage of the great opportunities it offers. This is not going to be easy in the next 50 years because not only are more big changes coming but they are going to come much faster with every passing decade. Mr. William Benton, publisher of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, has calculated that it took man roughly 500,000 years to arrive at the agricultural revolution; it took him another 25,000 years to achieve the industrial revolution; another 200 years to reach the atomic age; and only 15 years to launch the space age.

Without in any way discounting the impact that space exploration may have on life on this planet in the next 50 years, I am certain that if the potentialities of that period are to be realized, it is vital that nations become better neighbors and that they get on with that task fast. Furthermore, much of the impetus needed to bring this about must be economic, must come from business. Let me illustrate what I mean.

At the end of World War II the parliamentarians of Europe were busy on two fronts, first they were meeting in the Council of Europe to discuss the political union of Europe and then they were meeting in their own parliaments at home to discuss new and ingenious restrictive trade barriers which, of course, tended to separate one country from another. The efforts to unite Europe by political means failed. So did the effort to build a common defense; but Jean Monnet, working quietly with the assistance of the Marshall plan, did bring into being first, the Coal and Steel Community and then the Common Market. Six of Europe's countries are now united economically and the trend is in the direction of political union. Further, despite a temporary setback, the day is not far distant when all Europe, including Great Britain, will be united in a common market. At the present time, the political differences between France and Great Britain are keeping Great Britain out of the Common Market, but I predict that political differences will give way to economic pressures. Economic union has proved so good for all the people and for business that it is only a matter of time before all the European nations will become better neighbors.

Concurrently with the growing neighborliness of the Atlantic Community there is a desperate need for the richer countries to become better neighbors of the poorer countries.

As we look out on the world today we see in limited areas affluence and complacency and in much larger areas, poverty and seething unrest. It is my deeply rooted view that, only if those who are affluent cease to be complacent and give thought to those who live in poverty can we hope for a comfortable and prosperous world. The most important reality of modern life is the fact that the international interest has become the national interest.

The United States today finds itself in a paradoxical situation. It has the highest income per person of any country in the world. It also has dangerously high unemployment, the latest figures showing this to be over 6 percent. This problem of unemployment, which is due in part to the incredible advances in science and technology, can be met only through accelerating the pace of the country's economic growth.

Much of our economic growth must come through an expansion of our domestic market but the great new economic frontier lies in the 100 countries and territories associated with the United Nations, in which more than 1,300 million people are living.

The people of these countries are in active, sometimes explosive, revolt against the conditions under which they have been living. They are determined no longer to accept poverty, illiteracy, chronic ill health, and despair as their way of life.

And now for another paradox. Science and technology are in no small way responsible for this seething unrest with which we are faced in these 100 countries. It was the result of advanced technology in the way of radio and other improved means of communication which brought to these people knowledge that farmers and workers, people just like themselves, in North America and Europe owned houses, wore good clothes, and enjoyed good health. It was this knowledge that started hundreds of millions of mothers asking the question, Why should my children be hungry, be ill clothed, not have a chance to learn to read and write, and not have good medical care?

Yes, science and technology must accept responsibility for this sudden uprising of the peoples of the less developed countries which has aptly been called the revolution of rising expectations. But at the same time it is science and technology which offer hope that we can meet the rising expectations now filling the hearts of half the world's people.

Before giving specific details as to how science and technology can help to assist the growth of the poorer countries, let us pause for a moment and see how the U.S. economy would be benefited by such a development.

If per capita incomes in these underdeveloped countries were lifted in the 1960's, steadily year by year, by only 2.5 percent, exports to them from the industrially advanced world, which totaled $164 billion for the 10 years 1950–60, should reach $350 billion for 1960–70. For the United States, assuming it retains its current share of the international trade flow, such an increase would mean, by 1970, an estimated additional $8.5 billion per year in exports.

An equivalent of more than 4.5 million jobs in the United States now depend on foreign trade. Of these, more than 1,750,000 jobs depend on U.S. exports to the underdeveloped areas of the world. By 1970 this number could well be increased by 1 million, for a total of 2,750,000 full-time jobs.

We in the Special Fund, of which I have the honor to be the managing director, are quite confident that this modest increase in the per capita incomes in the less developed countries can be achieved because of the evidence we have already had of the contributions of science and technology.

One of our responsibilities is that of assisting countries in finding out what physical resources they have. I could give many examples of how science and technology have helped us in meeting this responsibility. One is that of aerial surveys where contemporary methods, steadily being improved, can already compress into one decade soil, mineral, water, and transport investigations that, by methods that were standard a generation ago, would have taken a century. This is but one of the marvels of our age. Another exciting new instrument for discovery is the peaceful atom. Among the many applications of radioactive isotopes, medical diagnosis has been greatly aided, new accuracy is being brought to ground investigation, and answers are being obtained to imponderables of plant breeding and fertilization, of animal husbandry, and of insect control.

Nor is this the end. Electronic computers are being used for building mathematical models of river beds, showing where dams should be built, flood control barriers introduced, irrigation works installed. Computers are also proving their value in a host of other directions, not least in development planning. All this at less cost, with greater speed and higher efficiency than the older methods.

These incredible new tools are adding to the proof coming to the United Nations each day that the low-income countries are richly endowed with the physical resources required for their prosperity and sustained economic growth.

An additional responsibility of the special fund is that of assisting the less developed countries in a better utilization of their human resources.

Potentially, these low income countries are rich in human abilities. Of the 300 million people living in the less developed countries for which the United Nations has some responsibility, almost half cannot read or write. Not over 10 percent of children from 14 to 18 are in secondary schools and only the thinnest layer are undergoing technical training or taking university work. Today everyone recognizes the intimate relationship that exists between the economic development of a country and the education of its people. Only by giving the highest priority to the development of education at all levels, with particular emphasis on the training of people to make effective use of their natural resources, can there be an adequate response to the revolution of rising expectations. Only through education can the benefits of the revolution of science and technology be realized. Making effective use of human resources is an entirely different task from that of speeding the discovery of physical resources. It is an area where there is need, desperate need, for innovation and change. I question whether this need can be met without fundamental change in teaching methods. Of one thing I am certain. We would be most appreciative for assistance from this college of business administration in learning of ways in which knowledge of modern management methods can be imparted to the peoples of the developing countries. Perhaps we are in even greater need of assistance in instilling a spirit of entrepreneurship in people who have always thought of business simply as a trading operation where you bought cheap and sold dear. It may surprise you to know that in many languages there is no synonym for businessman. The nearest word is merchant.

Certain results flowing from the fund's activities may be of particular interest to this audience. The first survey completed was one on the needs and resources of Argentina for electric energy. It was a low-cost survey involving something over $300,000. It demonstrated clearly that Argentina required over $700 million worth of new facilities to be constructed over a 10-year period and that there was such a crying need for electric energy that this investment could be serviced and amortized without difficulty. More than $300 million of this amount has already been subscribed, a substantial part from private sources.

An aerial survey of mineral resources in northern Chile which we are just completing has produced exciting results. Over $300 million worth of minerals have been discovered and as a consequence many private-

money companies are interested in obtaining concessions from the Government. There is a great advantage in attracting private investment because with the investment usually goes managerial know-how. Further, most American concerns are pursuing an enlightened policy in enterprises for the development of physical resources in other countries. They are both bringing in capital investment and training counterpart personnel so that in time most of their employees will be nationals.

If time permitted I could go on with example after example of surveys which would demonstrate that it is not lack of physical resources which is responsible for the poverty in many parts of the world, but rather ineffective use of those resources. I could tell you of institutes of various types, ranging from those in the field of vocational training to the highest technical university. Altogether, the governing council of the special fund has approved to date 286 projects located in 96 countries and calling for total expenditures of $590 million. Of this $590 million, I should quickly say that $340 million is being supplied by the countries themselves. We have learned that we can only help countries whose people are determined to help themselves.

Let me summarize what I have been trying to tell you. First, that the big change of the past 50 years is a mere prelude to the bigger changes that lie ahead; second, that the national interest of all countries, particularly the industrialized countries, is served best by looking outward to a world that is shrinking at a fantastic speed but in which business opportunities are expanding even more rapidly; and third, that there are not only profound moral reasons for the richer countries helping the poorer countries but there are also good business reasons.

In closing, may I wish you Godspeed and remind you that the world is yours if you move with intelligence and move quickly.

Without a Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the April 8 issue of the Parsons (Kans.) Sun and written by the editor, Clyde M. Reed. It says much in a few words:

WITHOUT A RECORD

President Kennedy is openly scornful of a budget-cutting proposal of his immediate predecessor, with no surprise attached at all.

Mr. Kennedy is a Democrat, Mr. Eisenhower a Republican. Mr. Kennedy is a young man determined to perform better than an elder statesman who served before him. Their respective philosophies, elusive as both prove to be at times, are many political miles apart.

The Eisenhower record, said the President sniffingly at his latest press conference, is not one "we plan to duplicate if we can help it."

That's good political talk. The partisans on either side can find much to munch upon.

Still Mr. Kennedy is faced with a problem he is not able to master. He has not made a record of his own.

The course of the incumbent administration has been one of complete indecisiveness, varying from firmness at times to complete vacillation on most other occasions without a political doctrine to which a majority or even a sizable minority can tie.

Mr. Kennedy has proposed the wrong remedies for the wrong era. He has retreated when the political strategy called for advance. He has used the approach of the Boston precincts when political statesmanship was the need of the day. He promised change and has delivered stillborn programs.

Time still is on his side. But it won't wait forever.

Sir Winston Churchill: Honorary U.S. Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on Tuesday signed a proclamation declaring one of the greatest Englishmen of history, Sir Winston Churchill, to be an honorary citizen of the United States. As a Member of the 88th Congress, I was proud to cast my vote in favor of this honor bestowed upon Great Britain's wartime Prime Minister. His magnificent contributions to the cause of freemen assure him a place in history as one of the truly great leaders of all ages.

Under unanimous consent I wish to have Sir Winston's message to President Kennedy, the President's remarks at the ceremony, and the Presidential proclamation printed with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

CHURCHILL'S MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, I have been informed by Mr. David Bruce that it is your intention to sign a bill conferring upon me honorary citizenship of the United States.

I have received many kindnesses from the United States of America, but the honor which you now accord me is without parallel. I accept it with deep gratitude and affection.

I am also most sensible of the warm-hearted action of the individual States who accorded me the great compliment of their own honorary citizenships as a prelude to this act of Congress.

It is a remarkable comment on our affairs that the former Prime Minister of a great sovereign state should thus be received as an honorary citizen of another. I say "great sovereign state" with design and emphasis, for I reject the view that Britain and the Commonwealth should now be relegated to a tame and minor role in the world. Our past is the key to our future, which I firmly trust and believe will be no less fertile and glorious. Let no man underrate our energies, our potentialities, and our abiding power for good.

I am, as you know, half American by blood, and the story of my association with that mighty and benevolent Nation goes back nearly 90 years to the day of my father's marriage. In this century of storm and tragedy I contemplate with high satisfaction the constant factor of the interwoven and upward progress of our peoples. Our comradeship and our brotherhood in war were unexampled. We stood together, and because of that fact the free world now stands. Nor has our partnership any exclusive nature: the Atlantic community is a dream that can well be fulfilled to the detriment of none and to the enduring benefit and honor of the great democracies.

Mr. President, your action illuminates the theme of unity of the English-speaking peoples, to which I have devoted a large part of my life. I would ask you to accept yourself, and to convey to both Houses of Congress, and through them to the American people, my solemn and heartfelt thanks for this unique distinction, which will always be proudly remembered by my descendants.

KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT THE CEREMONY

We meet to honor a man whose honor requires no meeting—for he is the most honored and honorable man to walk the stage of human history in the time in which we live.

Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty.

Facing firmly toward the future, he has never forgotten the past.

Serving six monarchs of his native Great Britain, he has served all men's freedom and dignity.

In the dark days and darker nights when Britain stood alone—and most men save Englishmen despaired of England's life—he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen.

Given unlimited powers by his citizens, he was ever vigilant to protect their rights.

Indifferent himself to danger, he wept over the sorrows of others.

A child of the House of Commons, he became in time its father.

Accustomed to the hardships of battle, he has no distaste for pleasure.

Now his stately Ship of Life, having weathered the severest storms of a troubled century, is anchored in tranquil waters, proof that courage and faith and the zest for freedom are truly indestructible. The record of his triumphant passage will inspire free hearts for all time.

By adding his name to our rolls, we mean to honor him—but his acceptance honors us far more. For no statement or proclamation can enrich his name—the name Sir Winston Churchill is already legend.

KENNEDY PROCLAMATION

Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a son of America though a subject of Britain, has been throughout his life a firm and steadfast friend of the American people and the American Nation; and

Whereas he has freely offered his hand and his faith in days of adversity as well as triumph; and

Whereas his bravery, charity and valor, both in war and in peace, have been a flame of inspiration in freedom's darkest hour; and

Whereas his life has shown that no adversary can overcome, and no fear can deter, free men in the defense of their freedom; and

Whereas he has expressed with unsurpassed power and splendor the aspirations of peoples everywhere for dignity and freedom; and

Whereas he has by his art as an historian and his judgment as a statesman made the past the servant of the future;

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, under the authority contained in an act of the 88th Congress, do hereby declare Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 9th day of April in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

Bungling Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, developments in Cuba and other parts of the world have left many people in this country confused, bewildered, and aroused. There seems to be a general feeling that the administration is not leveling with them on the Cuban situation. In spite of all the attempts to censor and control news, the American people do want to know more about the foreign policies of the Kennedy administration and why our prestige seems to be sinking lower and lower each month.

As proof of the fact that there are people here in the United States who are further ahead in their thinking than the administration and the State Department, I submit correspondence, which a constituent of mine, Mr. Roland G. Eaton, Troy, N.Y., recently had with the State Department, relating to the bungling foreign policy of this administration. Before it is too late and this country is destroyed through the policy planners in the State Department, I believe that Congress should get on with the business of a thorough investigation of the State Department, its policies, and its personnel.

The correspondence follows:

TROY, N.Y.,
February 3, 1963.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a private citizen and a former officer in the U.S. Naval Intelligence Service, I am very concerned about the wishy-washy lack of force and direction of the foreign policy of the United States under the present administration.

I have received the hogwash put out by the Office of Public Services Bureau of Public Affairs Release A-163.

It begins to appear that our no-win foreign policy is dictated by the United Nations and U Thant.

I am one of thousands of patriotic Americans who believe that the United States should withdraw from the United Nations. I realize that patriotism and nationalism are dirty words to the one world Fabian Socialist minority who have apparently done an excellent job in intrenching themselves in the State Department and in the present administration.

Since the State Department places so much store upon the rulings of the International Court of Justice, why is it not consistent in its policy by insisting that Soviet Russia pay its proportionate share of certain expenses of the United Nations, or else have them thrown out.

I very frankly do not like the United Nations policy and to think that newly formed Afro-Asian nations of semibarbaric nature have equal vote with the United States is utterly ridiculous. Anyone with commonsense knows that the majority of them would fare better under colonialism, another dirty word in the Socialist's vocabulary.

It is all very well to have utopian ideals, but the hard facts are that our foreign policy has estranged us from the Netherlands, France, Belgium, Great Britain, Portugal, and Spain who should all be our allies.

I think siding with Sukarno and Indonesia against Holland was utterly ridiculous. I think siding with Adoula against Tshombe was a piece of damn foolishness.

Confucius said that one who makes a mistake and then repeats the same mistake is a fool. In our relations with the Soviet Russians everyone in the State Department appears to be damn fool, particularly regarding Cuba.

Any simple-minded oaf knows that Soviet Russian communism is bent on worldwide domination, and that even though a written signed agreement were reached with them on any matter that if it suited their purpose the agreement would only be a scrap of paper.

Since you continue to retain such personnel as Weiland (Montenegro) and Rubottom it is questionable in my mind if the actions of the State Department are only the acts of fools. Perhaps they are the predetermined planned acts of those who have no loyalty and no patriotism to the United States of America.

It is now pretty well established that the Russians are better entrenched and have more offensive weapons in Cuba than they had in October, to say nothing of the thousands of trained Chinese and Russian crack troops that are still on that island.

We don't need another Pearl Harbor and unnecessary slaughter of Americans to arouse the American people. We want people at the helm in our country and in the State Department with the guts to run the Chinese, Russians, and Castro out of Cuba. Such action would restore some faith and confidence not only to the citizens in this country but to those in South and Central America as well. If you had rattlesnakes in your backyard, you wouldn't wait to see if they would poison your animals and get in the house, you would rid yourself of them.

Please don't waste the taxpayer's money including mine sending me mimeographed gobbledygook from the Office of Public Services.

Let's have some affirmative action and less double talk about Cuba. It is high time that the State Department was composed entirely of personnel who have the philosophy: "My country may she always be right, but my country first, right or wrong." I am not willingly paying taxes to be used to promote worldwide socialism nor to support the nations that were well off under colonialism.

I am glad to get this off my chest and I assure you that there are thousands who feel the same way.

Very sincerely yours,

ROLAND G. EATON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963.

Mr. ROLAND G. EATON,
Troy, N.Y.

DEAR MR. EATON: Your recent communication to the Secretary of State has been received. We appreciate your interest in writing.

The U.S. Government has never endorsed the world government concept. President Kennedy expressed American policy in his state of the Union message of January 11, 1962:

"These various elements in our foreign policy lead, as I have said, to a single goal—the goal of a peaceful world of free and independent states. This is our guide for the present and our vision for the future—a free community of nations, independent but interdependent, uniting north and south, east and west, in one great family of man, outgrowing and transcending the hates and fears that rend our age.

"We will not reach that goal today, or tomorrow. We may not reach it in our own lifetime. But the quest is the greatest adventure of our century. We sometimes chafe at the burden of our obligations, the complexity of our decisions, the agony of our choices. But there is no comfort or security for us in evasion, no solution in abdication, no relief in irresponsibility."

President Kennedy has said, "I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect instrument because they dislike our imperfect world." President Eisenhower, reporting to Congress in 1959 on our participation in the United Nations (U.N.), said: "Given our sustained and vigorous support, it will continue to advance the interests of the American people and of free nations everywhere."

There are many good reasons for supporting the U.N. including these overriding ones:

First. The U.N. has successfully maintained or helped maintain peace in many parts of the world. The history of its peacekeeping operations ranges from Iran immediately after World War II through the Arab-Israel war to the present Congo operation which has prevented Communist infiltration into the heart of Africa and has avoided the danger of an armed clash between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Second. United Nations policy in the Congo, the Middle East, and elsewhere directly coincides with United States policy. This situation has obtained frequently whereas the record shows that seldom if ever on major issues has U.N. policy paralleled Soviet policy, much less followed it.

The facts do not support the contention sometimes made that the Soviet bloc now dominates the U.N. There is dramatic evidence to the contrary in the actions of the 16th U.N. General Assembly. The election of a single Secretary General with full powers, and the complete rejection of Premier Khrushchev's troika proposal, proved that the U.N. was too tough for Soviet wrecking tactics. The General Assembly also opposed the Communist bloc on the 50-megaton bomb. Meanwhile, it has approved such major U.S. proposals as internationally inspected disarmament, a food for peace program, peaceful uses of outer space and a U.N. decade of development. Moreover, the General Assembly has consistently opposed Communist China's admission to the U.N.; the vote in favor of the view held by the United States in 1961 was larger than it had been for years, and the vote in 1962 was still larger.

It is well known that the Soviets tried to block the U.N. peacekeeping operation in the Congo. Their failure to do so and their annoyance at the apparent success of the operation were expressed in their refusal to pay their share of the costs and in their violent attacks on the independence of the office of the Secretary General.

Third. The U.N. is the anchor for a large number of international organizations that are helping to create the kind of conditions the United States would like to see in the world.

These organizations deal with such basic problems as economic development, monetary and trade policies, child welfare, disease and epidemics, meteorology and telecommunications, labor standards, and the resettlement of refugees. These matters are important to the United States with our vast international economic interests and our desire to see other nations handle their problems through free institutions rather than through coercion and communism. Most of these useful organizations are close-

ly linked with the U.N. and would be ineffective if the parent body were crippled.

The withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations would render the organization almost completely ineffectual in the pursuit of its objectives. The younger and less powerful nations who now look to the U.N. for collective security against aggression would be cut off. The resultant sharp increase in world instability would provide a situation made to order for Communist agitation and subversion. It is very difficult to see how the United States and the rest of the free world could gain by this. As you know, such conditions are an objective of Communist policy.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. KARNACKI,
Office of Public Services
(For the Secretary of State).

TROY, N.Y., *March 26, 1963.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention of Mr. Edward A. Karnacki, Office of Public Services).

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your three-page communication of March 12, 1963.

I am appreciative of your fine effort to convert me to accepting a type of foreign policy which is utopian, idealistic, and absolutely infeasible.

The U.S. foreign policy is chimerical, completely lacking in direction, contradictory, repeatedly naive, and seemingly incapable of learning from past errors.

The three overriding reasons given in your communication for supporting the U.N. are examples which fail to impress me, and which in fact only bear out my contention that our country would be infinitely better off out of that ill-fated Organization.

First. "The U.N. has successfully maintained or helped maintain peace in many parts of the world," could be countered by merely mentioning Goa, the rape of Katanga, the loss of North Korea, the current Indonesia-British Malaya situation, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, Yemen, Hungary, and so forth.

Second. "U.N. policy in the Congo, the Middle East, and elsewhere directly coincides with U.S. policy." Rather I would state the U.N. has directed U.S. policy, and has effectively alienated us from allies who deserve our support; namely, Portugal, Spain, France, Great Britain, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Our positions taken in regard to the Suez Canal, Indochina, Dutch East Indies, Angola, and so forth, have certainly created more problems than were solved.

Third. "The U.N. is the anchor for a large number of international organizations that are helping to create the kind of conditions the United States would like to see in the world." Who in the United States? The majority of our citizens are not international socialists.

(1) In view of the fact that Soviet Russia and its satellites belong to the U.N. club, do not pay their dues and assessments except in coin negotiable only within the borders of their domination; (2) and because the United States pays a minimum of 32 percent and up to 40 percent of all dues, costs, and assessments, plus; (3) and because the U.N. and not the United States of America gets credit for all the handouts described in the next to last paragraph of page 3 of your communication; (4) and because the U.N. has kept Almighty God out of its organization it would seem advisable, sensible, desirable, and really wise to disband the U.N. and form an organization of anti-Communist nations giving the support and handouts in the form of loans to those nations who are sufficiently forthright as to be for us and not neutral. I would remind you that our Lord and Saviour himself stated: "He that is not for me is against me." This new organization should recognize the existence of Almighty God and thus not suffer the lack of divine guidance that is a major lack in the U.N.

With a new organization the anti-Communist nations would be strengthened. Those who remained out and neutral would be entirely dependent upon the resources and charity of the Red bloc. There would be no vetoes to constructive action. We would have improved collective security against aggression. We would put a greater economic strain upon the Communist nations. We could have direction to our foreign policy and we could move forward with vigor.

Let us not waste time and money debating and trying to arrive at agreements with an enemy bent upon our destruction and to whom a signed treaty is merely a scrap of paper.

How does the United States benefit by having $3 million given by Mr. Hoffman's UNESCO to Cuba for agricultural research and development? How does the United States benefit by the Attorney General making gifts to African chieftains of airplanes for their personal use? How does the United States benefit by the Emperor of Ethiopia being presented with an air-conditioned ship with the crew trained at our expense?

I have received an appeal for funds from the White Fathers to help build a school. They had an established school going in the Congo, but UNESCO came along and built immediately adjacent cutting down on their attendance and forcing them to relocate. In view of the scarcity of educational facilities in that country UNESCO could have built in a dozen other areas where school facilities are lacking. For example, where these dedicated priests are now going to build but instead UNESCO put an existing school out of business because they are an atheistic organization. The White Fathers headquarters are in Washington, D.C., if you want verification.

I am only one of millions of U.S. citizens adamant in my opposition to our continued support of the United Nations. I advocate ditching our no win policy. If the choice is atheistic communism or death, I'll take the latter but not by appeasement methods please.

Enclosed you will find an article from Human Events, "A Man Named U Thant." Also, enclosed you will find clippings from the Mississippi department of the American Legion newspaper.

May Almighty God help the United States with the appeasing, concession granting, drifting, foolhardy lack of directions of its present foreign policy. I sincerely hope that it is not deliberate subversion, but you do have some really queer thinking people in your department whose views do not coincide with the majority of the citizens of our country. The odds against such repeated stupidity seem improbable. You have had and retained in your department many questionable security risks to my personal knowledge. I resent being taxed to promulgate policies which are contrary to the best interests of the American way of life.

Very truly yours,

ROLAND G. EATON.

Need for Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the President's tax proposal will be the most intensively considered legislation to come before this Congress. The Ways and Means Committee has just finished 6 weeks of public hearings. We have now started executive sessions to discuss the details of the proposal and to begin the actual drafting of this complicated legislation.

It is vitally important that the Congress does not lose sight of the overriding importance of a tax cut for our Nation's economy in the whirl of discussion over all the technical details of this proposal. An editorial in the Dayton (Ohio) News for March 16 makes this point with special effectiveness. I commend it to my colleagues.

TAX GREED

According to Aesop, a lion and a tiger quarreled over the carcass of a fawn. Taking advantage of their mutual exhaustion, a fox moved in and grabbed the prey. Neither beast had the strength left to stop him.

You have to wonder whether the "fox" of recession will steal from labor and business the fruits of the tax cut over which they are quarreling.

Business wants to concentrate the slashes in the upper brackets. Its aim is to free funds for capital investment. Labor wants the whole of the cut reserved for the lowest brackets. Its object is to free funds for heavier consumer spending.

Actually, the economy needs both stimuli. A sensible tax bill will carry discriminating cuts across the board. This is the principle of President Kennedy's proposal, although it would be harder to say whether he has hit upon the ideal apportionment. If business and labor fight too hard over the spoils, the whole program may bog down in Congress. Then if a recession moves in, there'll be plenty to pay at both ends of the economic spectrum.

Physical Fitness and Podiatry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, walking has received much emphasis as part of physical fitness. The Nation's press and other media have given due play to this in stories of 50-mile hikes and the like. But to further this concept and help develop physical fitness programs for our citizenry, may I suggest Americans first look to their feet. The American Foot Health Foundation, a related organization of the American Podiatry Association, focuses on the Nation's foot problems annually by sponsoring Foot Health Week. The dates this year are May 10–17.

Dr. Benjamin C. Mullens, president of the American Podiatry Association, has assembled some thoughts on foot health as part of total health in a statement he has issued for Annual Foot Health Week. I am pleased to include, under unanimous consent, Dr. Mullen's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Neglect of foot health has become the vast wasteland in the medical professions. While the moral concept of all medical specialties is prevention of disease, suffering and debility, some 60 percent of our school children

have foot troubles, 10 to 15 percent requiring professional care.

Care of the feet in prime years makes a healthier and more productive individual upon reaching maturity, and helps prevent foot and other health problems later in life. Foot fatigue costs American business and industry millions of dollars yearly in plant accidents, absenteeism, and lowered employee morale—all reducing productivity.

Four out of five senior citizens suffer foot problems. According to heart specialists, one of the best preventatives for the Nation's No. 1 killer, is normal and frequent use of the feet and legs. But how can our "geriatrics" be motivated to walk if their feet hurt?

Podiatry was conceived and nurtured by leaders of the medical profession more than half a century ago. The aim and purpose of podiatry's sponsors of that day were to insure adequate scientific foot care by trained specialists in this field.

Foot Health Week, May 10–17, affords the American Podiatry Association an opportunity to fulfill its public responsibility—stimulating a wider interest in foot health through public education and information and thus playing our full part in advancing the total health of the American people.

Kennedy Appeasement Hands Communists Another Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, remember last year how loudly President Kennedy proclaimed the great victory in Laos when we gave in to the Communist demands for a coalition rule and quickly forced pro-western Laotians to accept the defeat? Now we are reaping the full reward, another Communist betrayal, another broken agreement, another country lost to ever-widening Soviet sphere of influence and control.

The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune recites the results of peaceful coexistence in Laos:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE IN LAOS

Once more the little southeast Asian jungle kingdom of Laos is ablaze. As in the bloody civil war which ended less than 9 months ago, it is the Communist Pathet Lao which has attacked, shattering the shaky three-headed coalition government. Only this time, instead of fighting the pro-Western group, the Reds have turned on their erstwhile civil war pals, the self-styled neutralists of Gen. Kong Le.

Last year President Kennedy, who once promised that southeast Asia would never be allowed to slide down the Communist drain, joyously hailed the Geneva accord which ended the civil war and created a wobbly coalition government.

Now on the Plain of Jars, the junior partner of that coalition is smashing the hopes of its author, W. Averell Harriman, who, as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, dumped Laos' pro-Western Government in favor of the Russian troika, the uneasy coalition that few expected would work.

In Laos, the Reds took somewhat longer to make their move for full power than Communists usually do. Conservatives in Laos had predicted that the Pathet Lao would never be satisfied with the role of a junior partner, and President Macapagal of the Philippines warned that the weak Lao troika would merely serve as a gateway for a Communist takeover.

Since World War II, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, and the other Red satellites stand as lurid examples of what happens when the Communists are allowed to enter any "coalition." The same fate also awaited Nationalist China in the plan of Gen. George C. Marshall to bring the Communist Chinese into Chiang Kai-shek's government.

Now it is the turn of Laos to prove again that any nation forced to admit Communists into its government is inviting its overthrow.

Man of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, summer employment in Washington has been the long sought goal of many thousands of college students who have, in the past, come to the Nation's Capital to fill temporary vacancies in the executive branch. This has been mutually beneficial for students and Government offices alike. From impressions gained in a firsthand acquaintance with Federal processes, interests are created which assure our career civil service of talented young men and women as future administrators. This year, however, something new has been added with the intrusion of the White House to make a political pork barrel of this program.

The charges and denials of political patronage on a massive scale have been confusing. However, the National College Democrat, the official publication of the National Federation of College Young Democrats, unmasked this tawdry project when it announced that "responsibility for summer jobs has been transferred to the White House." Political screening is then candidly explained.

Anyone with a sense of fairness is repelled by these tactics and we can congratulate the Civil Service Commission for speaking out against this practice. As a practical fact, the Commission is very tardy in taking action, since the filling of vacancies for this summer is largely completed. Perhaps it was incredulous that this kind of courthouse patronage was seriously undertaken by the overzealous White House staff, apparently with the President's concurrence.

In any case, the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, April 10, makes comments that need to be called to the attention of the Congress and the Nation:

MAN OF COURAGE

A special medal of some sort should be struck off to commemorate the intestinal fortitude of Civil Service Commission Chairman Macy in killing a cheap little patronage scheme cooked up by some of the Democratic politicians in the White House.

This was a plan to require that all summer Government jobs for students be cleared through the White House. In other words, grab the kids while they're still young and introduce them to the practical side of politics. And, possibly, there might be a few breaks in the process for Democratic parents.

This shabby business now has been scotched. The Civil Service Commission has served notice that the project "is illegal and will not be tolerated." As one CSC official put it, "We couldn't allow the situation to continue. The reputation and integrity of the Government's civil service merit system were at stake."

This certainly was true, and, in our opinion, the reputation and the integrity of the Kennedy administration also were at stake. For this reason, we take with a grain of salt the suggestion in the news reports that the CSC action was not cleared with the White House. President Kennedy may not have initiated the action, but he surely didn't oppose it. For aside from the pettiness of the whole thing, he would recognize that the political reaction inevitably would be adverse.

In saying this, however, we detract nothing from Mr. Macy and his CSC colleagues. They have done a good day's work.

Address by Richard Cardinal Cushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Boston College it is with great pride and deep humility that I am at this time privileged to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD of the Congress of the United States the text of the sermon offered by His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, the beloved archbishop of Boston, on the occasion of the Boston College centennial mass at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross on March 30, 1963:

TEXT OF THE SERMON BY RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING

The history of Boston College reveals that it progress has been the result of courageous determination to meet seemingly insurmountable obstacles. Comparing this great university of today with the humble beginnings of a century ago, we marvel that the modest structure on James Street, in the south end of Boston, could ever develop into the towering magnificence of University Heights. Even those who do not know the inspiration out of which Boston College has emerged, will recognize that human efforts alone cannot explain the material expansion and academic progress of 100 years. An institution which took its start in the midst of what was an unsympathetic environment, and set out to provide little more than the early training necessary for those who would dedicate their lives to the service of God, has become in our day one of the great institutions of learning in this country.

The complete story has been competently recorded for a long time. It will be recalled again and again during the course of this centennial observance. It will be enough for me to look back ahalf a century to the the year 1913 when I was graduated from Boston College High School and to recall

that the Archdiocese of Boston can never forgot the important part that Boston College has played in the growth of this sector of the universal church. It requires no historical research for me to state plainly that without Boston College, and the efforts that the Society of Jesus has channeled into its growth, the influences and strength of the church in our midst would be massively diminished. Prelates, priests, and religious by the hundreds are indebted to the old and the new Boston College for the opportunity of preparing themselves for the religious life. Men and women by the thousands who today, as in the past, constitute outstanding lay members of the church militant and witnesses of Christ, proudly and gratefully salute their alma mater during this centennial for their spiritual as well as intellectual formation.

It is highly important, therefore, that the present archbishop of Boston should speak of Boston College in terms of the relationship with the church, as well as within the embrace of one of the greatest centers of learning of the United States. Others, better equipped than I, can direct their attention to her accomplishments in scholarship and culture and her contributions to the work of education and learning over 10 decades.

Without a confidence in God that never wavered, without the generosity of her alumni and friends, without the dedication of her professors, Boston College would have been destined to remain on a less elevated level of educational achievement. Without the inspired efforts of dedicated Jesuits during the past century, the human power that divine providence uses as its instrument, progress would have yielded to the frustrating reality of material insufficiency, and the discouraging opposition of those who could see no promise in the future of this ambitious venture.

But the fears and misgivings, the doubts and the hesitancy of earlier years have long disappeared and Boston College has consistently gained ever new recognition in the fellowship of those institutions that started earlier or later, accumulated great resources and reached educational prominence in different directions. Proud as we are today that the college has overcome the obstacles of the past, we must never forget the years of struggle and sacrifice that went into its development. We must never dissociate its present greatness from the early hopes in which it was conceived and the faith of Christian men through which it has been brought to this hour.

At this time when the college was making its humble beginnings many men wondered if religion itself was destined to endure for very long. The previous century, which had witnessed the birth of this Republic, had also been a time when the ancient ways had been shattered in many lands and the new social and political institutions which appeared were unstable and often supported by violence and oppression. While the 19th century appeared to be more calm, vigorous new winds of thought, nearly all unfriendly to religion, began to capture the minds and imaginations of learned men on all sides. It was in this forbidding climate that a sturdy band of Jesuit priests set out to bring to success the idea of a Catholic university in Boston.

I think it important to recall that many intellectual leaders of that day would have thought it folly to seek to combine religion and learning, to study in any fruitful relationship the science of human knowledge and the science of divine things. Actually, it was not a time when men despised religion—that was to come later—it was rather a time when men doubted its relevance to human endeavor and believed it to be the inevitable victim of human progress.

Not so the Jesuit fathers who had already for three centuries been educators of international renown. They were not strangers to the new knowledge, nor were they obscurantists seeking to restore the glory of an earlier time. Scientists, philosophers, men of letters and men of learning—they knew how to seek each new truth without in the process abandoning truths already known. They knew how to move forward in each generation without losing the gains made by their fathers in an earlier generation.

Perhaps in this sense more than any other we can say that Boston College in its youthful years set itself against the prevailing intellectual currents of its time and in this measure also was separated from so much that was calling itself contemporary. A hundred years has shown that most of what seemed to be new was only fashion and fad, and the decision to be faithful to an older wisdom paid its munificent rewards in education and excellence. Moreover, it provided foundations of stability on which a continual growth could be cultivated without danger to either faith or learning.

Sometimes I think the test of true success can be found in the words of our critics, for we are often revealed there with a clarity we cannot create for ourselves. My experience has been that Boston College, and Jesuit schools generally, are criticized from two directions. In the first place, they are told that they live too much in the past, that the 400 years of Jesuit educational experience is a weight that holds them back from present progress and makes them reluctant to accept change in a changing world. The second criticism, as you may have foreseen, is precisely the opposite. Men say that the Jesuit schools have changed too fast, they have been too quick to copy the ways of others, and too eager to put aside the claims of their own long and tested experience. When the critics thus divide, I think it no mistake to conclude that those criticized are likely to be very close to the "golden mean" which is in fact the object of their striving.

Is this not truly the aim of the Catholic college and university? To hold fast to those truths delivered to the saints, to protect against all assault the sacred revelations of God, and, with these truths firmly committed, to seek without fear and without reserve all truth which the mind of man can know and his diligence discover.

There are those who feel that the religiously commited person has in some manner abandoned his right to be a scholar, made himself unworthy of the academic community and in a sense betrayed the company of learned men in what he claims membership. Nothing could be more mistaken than this.

The Christian scholar finds his faith giving new meaning to his researches by adding to them a new dimension. He finds that it gives himself as a person new inspiration in the pursuit of truth and the advance of learning. Far from being an obstacle in his way, it is a light by which he moves in new directions, it is the eternal truths in which all the truths of his seeking find their ultimate explanation.

Too often we must acknowledge that we ourselves through weakness and timidity have failed to recognize that faith and freedom are twin gifts of God which he expects us to use for His glory. The scholar in a special way must be the confident Christian whose faith can move mountains and whose freedom can change the face of the earth. It was our Lord himself, we must remember, who upbraided the timid, calling them "hearts of little faith," and suggesting by contrast that a strong faith and a bold Christian heart will be the true shield of an apostle in His church. The same God, who is His merciful grace gives us faith, is the Creator who in His holy design has given us freedom. He did not intend these gifts to be in conflict but in harmony, and it is in truth that they meet and it is in truth that they are fulfilled.

Since the highest of the virtues is wisdom, surely one of the noblest of callings is that of the scholar who seeks wisdom as his life's work. So, too, one of the proudest of man's monuments must be the university where men gather for this exalted purpose. But we must be warned that "the corruption of the best is the worst" and those who pervert to lesser purposes the greatness of this calling are the ultimate subversives who make truth itself their victim.

Boston College, in its 100th year, can listen to these words with its head erect and its eyes clear for it has been faithful to these Catholic traditions in which the learning of the Western World was born. I know that a hundred years is only a short time in the long life of man—that it is only a short time in the history of our civilization—but we must recall here on this day that it is more than half the years in the life of this Republic. Boston College is a Catholic university and it is an American university, and when I say it has been faithful to its Catholic past, I am saying at the same time that it has been faithful to the highest ideals of our country and its people. Learning, to be sure, knows no national boundaries; it is the patrimony of man wherever he lives and whatever his history. But a land that is without learning is a land impoverished, however impressive may be its other resources. The richest asset of any nation is its people and the university that shapes the minds and souls of men in mental and moral excellence, makes the weak strong and the strong, stronger. When we say that the church is grateful for a hundred years of service to the cause of truth, we must add that America, too, is grateful for a hundred years of service in the cause of freedom.

There is a temptation to look ahead as we bring to a close our thoughts on this historic day. But mine is not the role of the prophet. As the frontiers of knowledge have been penetrated in the last 100 years, opening up areas beyond the dreams of men, so in the next century we cannot even guess what new boundaries will be set. In this bold venture of the human mind, however, I urge Boston College to continue its present pursuit of excellence in the great traditions of the Christian scholar. Hold fast to those essential truths which God has revealed to man in His church, and thus armed with the sword of the spirit, be second to none in your pursuit of excellence in the vast and challenging empires of the human mind.

World Trade Club, San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1963, the World Trade Club of San Francisco will celebrate the third anniversary of the opening of its headquarters in the World Trade Center at the Ferry Building in San Francisco.

Dedicated to the promotion, encouragement, and expansion of international trade and world travel, as an adjunct and integral part of the San Francisco World Trade Center, the World Trade

Club has grown in the past 3 years to a present membership of 1,380 firms and individuals who are associated either directly or indirectly with the field of international trade and world travel. During this period the club has gained international stature as a meeting place for the various organizations directly concerned with the basic purposes of the club, such as the San Francisco Area World Trade Association, the San Francisco Consular Corps, the Pan American Society, the Export Managers' Association, the Marine Exchange, the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce Marine Committee, and others, and has also gained renown for its receptions and dinners honoring foreign trade delegations and other government representatives, both foreign and domestic, and has sponsored such special receptions and celebrations as Australia Day, New Zealand Day, India Day, and Philippine Day. One interesting recent event was the staging by the World Trade Club of a reception for the Commonwealth consuls general under joint sponsorship with International Business Week of Stanford University.

It is a matter of particular interest that the bylaws of the World Trade Club provide for the issuance of special memberships on an honorary basis to the heads of all foreign diplomatic corps located in the bay area, with the result that the other members of the club interested in world trade and travel may have direct and continuous contact with all of the representatives of the foreign countries around the world who necessarily have a similar interest.

The World Trade Club has been extremely fortunate in having for its president during the past 3 years George Killion, president of the American President Lines and a member of the National Export Expansion Council of the U.S. Department of Commerce. At the annual meeting of the board of directors of the club held on March 4, 1963, Mr. Killion was unanimously reelected as president of the club for the ensuing year, in recognition of the invaluable services he has rendered to the club and to the foreign trade community centered in San Francisco. J. Monroe Sullivan, the secretary of the World Trade Club, is executive director of the San Francisco World Trade Center Authority, a State agency, and is a member of the San Francisco Regional Export Expansion Council of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Among the well-known individuals presently serving on the board of directors of the World Trade Club are Cyril Magnin, president of the San Francisco Port Authority, Adolph P. Schuman, chairman of the San Francisco World Trade Center Authority and an international figure in import and export trade, Albert L. Reeves, senior vice president of Utah Construction & Mining Co., and William A. Pomeroy, identified with J. H. Pomeroy & Co., both firms being favorably known and identified in the international contractor field, and Otto N. Miller, president of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Market Must Determine Price in a Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a year ago President Kennedy dealt a telling blow to freedom and the private enterprise system in his bullying the steel industry to prevent a price increase. History may record the President's vicious attack on a basic industry as one of the crucial steps in the destruction of capitalism in the United States. No government has a moral right to intervene in establishing prices in a free society.

Last year's intemperate action by the President is recalled by the current announcement by the Wheeling Steel Corp. of an increase in the price of steel. The company has every right to make this decision and the wisdom of it will be determined by the market, not by Government edict or dictatorial tantrums.

This subject is ably discussed in the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

THE STEEL PRICE HIKE

The first anniversary of Mr. Kennedy's crackdown on the steel industry for seeking to raise prices $6 a ton produced ironic developments. Wheeling Steel Corp., the Nation's 11th largest producer, was standing yesterday on the announcement that its prices on several major products had been raised an average of $6 a ton.

The Wheeling increase followed pronouncements by two major steelmakers. Roger M. Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp, who was in the principal victim of Mr. Kennedy's wrath a year ago, contended in a speech at Des Moines that the President had no right to interfere with business decisions.

Mr. Blough's position was substantially that taken by William A. Steele, president and chairman of Wheeling. Labor costs were up 20 percent since 1958 and the costs of materials and services had also increased, with no increase in prices in that period.

On the other hand, Arthur B. Homer, chairman of Bethlehem Steel, said at the annual meeting of stockholders that he had considerable doubt whether the market would support a price increase at this time.

No industry spokesman referred to the possibility that the price increase might encourage the United Steelworkers Union to reopen the issue of wages and fringe benefits, as it is permitted to do after May 1.

Naturally, there was considerable interest in the attitude Mr. Kennedy would take. A year ago he had a tantrum and denounced steel manufacturers as "irresponsible" men who had shown "utter contempt" for the Nation's welfare. The Department of Justice went into action, showers of subpenas descended, Federal grand juries and congressional committees began investigating, and FBI agents routed newspaper reporters out of bed trying to get evidence of something.

Very shortly the steel companies which had tried to increase prices buckled under the pressure and rescinded the increase.

It is little wonder that Mr. Blough at Des Moines reflected a belief that Government should stay out of business decisions.

"I believe," he said, "that no one in Government—no matter how highly placed—should interfere with the lawful business decisions of our people." He described himself as "a specimen who was virtually torn limb from limb as the result of an unfortunate but well intentioned attempt to have his company try for economic recovery."

Mr. Blough's reaction is easily understood, but his thesis would have been incomplete had he not emphasized that Mr. Kennedy's intervention was not only improper but unnecessary. There is no need for executive price fixing as long as the free market is functioning in what is supposed to be a free enterprise country.

"Whether the price increase might have 'stuck' in the absence of the 'circumstances' imposed by the Government no one can say," Mr. Blough said. "Had they stuck at the time, it seems probable that, in the case of some products and areas, the competitive forces of the market would later have compelled a reduction from the newly established higher levels; but there is little doubt that the general level of steel prices would currently be higher than it is."

That is United States Steel had no more real control over prices than Mr. Kennedy had a right to think he had. The market would govern, and if the price was not right, the market would have reported that verdict and the price would have slipped back without any Presidential dictate. But that United States Steel, Wheeling, or any other supplier has the right to test prices in the marketplace is a proposition which can be questioned by no one who believes the United States has a free economy.

Jules Witcover Receives Sigma Delta Chi Distinguished Service in Journalism Award for Washington Correspondence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a good feeling to know that a person with whom you have had some degree of contact, whose star is rising in his chosen profession, and whose work always reflects his superior abilities, has gained the highest recognition and acclaim of his contemporaries.

Jules Witcover, of Advance News Service, the national news-gathering organization of the Newhouse newspaper group, is just such a person and it was with considerable pleasure that I learned that Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalistic society, today announced that he is to be the recipient of its Distinguished Service in Journalism Award for Washington correspondence in 1962.

I was in frequent contact with Jules for many years when he exercised his skills here on Capitol Hill and, among his many other duties, followed by activities for the Syracuse Herald-Journal. The accuracy and objectivity of his reporting have always been of the highest order. Armed with keen preception, wit, and obvious writing talent, I know of no man in his profession who has more

aptly fulfilled his important responsibilities to his readers than has Jules Witcover. It is only fitting that he should receive one of the very highest forms of recognition extended the members of that profession.

I know that all of my colleagues who know Jules' work join me in extending congratulations and in expressing confidence that his efforts will continue to receive high acclaim.

Following is an account of the award taken from the Advanced News Service national wire:

Jules Witcover, of Advance News Service—the national newsgathering organization of the Newhouse newspaper group—today was named winner of the Sigma Delta Chi Distinguished Service in Journalism Award for Washington correspondence in 1962.

Mr. Witcover was recognized by the professional journalistic society for his outstanding work in reporting and writing a detailed 10-part series on the changing role of the American Medical Association.

Awards by Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalistic society, are among the oldest and most noted in journalism, having been made annually since 1932.

Mr. Witcover's work was cited as excellent objective reporting from Washington, where one newspaperman's correspondence is chosen annually for the Sigma Delta Chi award.

The Witcover award was 1 of 4 given to newspaper writers among 15 communications categories recognized by the Society. Almost 1,000 nominations were made for the 1962 awards.

The citation for Witcover announced by Russell E. Hurst, executive officer of Sigma Delta Chi, said:

"Jules Witcover's in-depth reporting of the changing role of the American Medical Association and its emergence as a major protagonist in the politico-economic field is excellent objective reporting.

"The AMA, by its very existence and the nature of its being, touches in one way or another almost every person in this nation. Mr. Witcover's series pinpoints a subtle change in the policy of the organization which probably has been little realized by the general public.

"His articles are in the best tradition of journalism and are a major contribution to continued objectivity and enterprise."

Mr. Witcover's prize-winning series was based on almost 40 interviews conducted in Chicago, where the AMA is headquartered, and in Washington.

His impartial stories assayed the role in U.S. life today of the medical association, which is highly regarded for its contributions to medical science but which has in recent years moved increasingly into the political arena and into public controversy.

The Witcover series was widely printed over the United States.

Mr. Witcover, 35, is a 13-year newspaper veteran who has spent the past 9 years as a Washington correspondent covering political, legislative, defense and other stories.

He was graduated from Columbia College in 1949 and from the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism in 1951. A native of Union City, N.J., he attended Union City public schools and served in the Navy in 1945 and 1946.

In 1958, he took leave from his Washington assignment to study and work in Europe as a Reid Foundation fellow. Mr. Witcover formerly worked as a staff reporter for the Newark Star-Ledger and has long represented the Syracuse Herald-Journal in Washington.

Mr. Witcover will attend a Sigma Delta Chi awards banquet in Dallas, Tex., May 11 to receive a bronze medallion and plaque which will be presented him.

Censorship by Subordinates Blocks Presidential Access to Nuclear Test-Ban Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, time and again we read news accounts of the President having decided this, that or the other matter of significant importance to the United States of America. The Constitution places upon him the obligation and duty to make such decisions. Yet there is a continuing stream of evidence that the President does not in fact make such decisions in the sense that he is properly advised of all the facts involved, opinions on them which may be contradictory and alternative courses of action which may be available. Rather there is evidence that these decisions actually are made by anonymous and semianonymous subordinates by the simple process of censoring from the Presidential awareness all but those facts, opinions and alternatives so as to cause the ultimate decisionmaker to decide as these subordinates desire. There is also evidence the President may be bypassed completely. This appears to have been the situation with the State Department's stiff note to Canada concerning antimissile nuclear warheads which caused the Diefenbaker regime to tumble. It is said to have been based on a communication from White House Adviser McGeorge Bundy which the State Department regarded as expressing President Kennedy's order that the note be drafted and delivered to the Canadians. The President is reported to have been as surprised as Mr. Diefenbaker over the incident.

This is a far cry from a responsible and responsive U.S. system of government which civic books describe to our children.

The following article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., printed in the Galesburg, Ill., Register-Mail on April 3 relates a very specific example of censorship by subordinates to which I can personally attest:

WARNING ON TEST FLAW FAILS TO REACH J.F.K.

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Two weeks ago Congressman CRAIG HOSMER dispatched to President Kennedy a letter of vital importance.

Hosmer is ranking Republican on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and one of the country's best experts on nuclear testing and disarmament. He laid his cards on the table in the very first paragraph of his March 18 letter:

"I sincerely hope this letter may reach you because it contains information relating to the national security which I feel you may not otherwise receive."

The President did not, however, receive that letter. It was intercepted by an anonymous aid and the Congressman received a standard, thank you form letter for his troubles.

Here is what HOSMER told the President:

"Your Disarmament Agency officials recently outlined to the Joint Committee many of the provisions of a revised test-ban treaty under preparation which they state will soon be offered to the Soviets. This proposal contains a loophole through which the Soviets can move clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent, Communist world domination."

HOSMER told the President that Government witnesses had testified that the verification system to be proposed is inadequate to detect and identify underground test cheating at yields equivalent to 3 kilotons and below if tested in alluvium formations 620 miles within the Soviet Union.

According to HOSMER's calculations, this gives Russian scientists at least 2.5 million square miles in which to test to their heart's content.

Under terms of the U.S. draft treaty, the United States would forego wholly any and all weapons development; and as a practical matter, simply trust the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests and secretly develop nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

Listed below are the significant weapons which Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, Director of Military Applications for the Atomic Energy Commission, told the Joint Committee could be clandestinely tested and developed in this undetectable area:

1. Relatively low yield weapons of the tactical type.

2. High-yield tactical weapons that could be developed by extrapolation from explosions as small as 1 kiloton, without the necessity for proof testing.

3. At least one-half of all strategic weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military, all without the need for proof testing.

As an indication of where weapons development interest lies, General Betts revealed that 50 per cent of all U.S. underground testing in Nevada is carried out in this low, undetecable, below 3-kiloton range.

Actually tests much larger than 3 kilotons can be carried out clandestinely under terms of the proposed U.S. treaty. Simply by muffling their explosions in underground cavities, the Russians could reduce 30-kiloton explosions below the 3-kiloton threshhold of nondetectability.

In his letter to President Kennedy, Congressman HOSMER wrote:

"So again, I urge you to talk directly with General Betts. * * * I am certain that what he will tell you will substantiate the proposition that an effective test-ban treaty—one which will in fact cause the Soviets to stop nuclear weapons development if we do—will require manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union as well as on free world soil.

"Again, in closing, I reiterate the danger of missing the chance for an effective, risk-reducing treaty by the proposal of an effective, risk-increasing treaty."

But the President, sad to say, has not seen the letter.

African Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 this Congress designated April 15 as African Freedom Day. The emergence of the African Continent is one of the most spectacular and dramatic stories of our time. My very keen interest in this "continent God has held in reserve" goes back many years. During my service as delegate to the Eighth Gen-

eral Assembly of the U.N. my interest was greatly increased as we on the Fourth Committee debated the problems of the mandated and colonial areas.

In 1955 I undertook the first special study mission to Africa, south and east of the Sahara, on behalf of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Those 3½ months of study and travel were most illuminating and beneficial. The African has come a long way and like all humanity has a long way to go. I cannot agree with all practices carried on in the name of democracy on the continent, just as many Africans would take exception to certain aspects of the American scene. But now is not the time to be discouraged, indeed, there is every good reason to be hopeful.

The Communists had hoped to take over Africa. Now they are not so sure. The Washington Post on April 6, 1963, carried an article entitled, "Soviet Reported Trying for African Comeback." As the intervening years have served to strengthen my first impressions rather than to change them, may I again cite what I set down in my report of the Special Study Mission to Africa 8 years ago.

The United States, in its position of leadership in the free world, cannot sidestep its responsibility in the unfoldment of Africa. We must take a deep interest in the social, economic, and political changes taking place in that great continent since they affect our own national goals.

I know that always there will be a great bond of interest and affection between the people of the United States who from colonialism became a great power and the people of Africa who so recently assumed the mantle of independence. We all rejoice in Africa's independence and pray that with the grace of God freemen will temper their freedom with responsibility and dignity.

Resolutions of the National Wildlife Federation's 27th Annual Convention Held in Detroit, Mich., March 1–3, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Resolutions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15 of the National Wildlife Federation's 27th Annual Convention held in Detroit, Mich., March 1–3, 1963.

These are the expressions of the largest conservation organization in the United States and in the world and deal with some of the most pressing problems we face in the field of natural resources:

RESOLUTION 3—YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Whereas the number of young Americans who reach the age of employment is increasing each year; and

Whereas large numbers of these young people cannot secure gainful employment because of a lack of skills or work experience; and

Whereas many unemployed young people drift into juvenile delinquency and crime, thus creating additional problems for governmental agencies and welfare groups; and

Whereas Federal and State resource agencies have many worthwhile conservation projects on parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and lakes and streams which need accomplishment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby expresses its approval of the principle of the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps for the purpose of providing beneficial employment and training for young men while, at the same time, accomplishing urgently needed Federal and State projects in the resources conservation field.

RESOLUTION 5—MULTIPLE USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Whereas the principle of multiple use management has been prescribed as a policy for national forests by the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas members of the public utilize national forests heavily for recreational pursuits, among the purposes specifically prescribed in the multiple use policy; and

Whereas some segments of the timber industry are embarked upon programs calculated to shift materially the existing management of national forests to favor their uses and interests, to the detriment of the public interest in watershed protection and recreation; and

Whereas the granting of preferential treatment to any special interest group distorts and is inconsistent with resource management aimed to achieve maximum benefit to the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby expresses confidence that the U.S. Forest Service has in its employ technicians fully competent to develop and manage the forest, soil, grass, watershed and wildlife habitat resources, and affirms its opposition to practices which tend to give special interests preferential treatment at the expense of other of the multiple uses.

RESOLUTION 6—INTERNATIONAL WATER POLLUTION

Whereas the city of Mexicali, Mexico, discharges large quantities of domestic and industrial wastes into the New River at Calexico, Calif.; and

Whereas the New River pollution originating in Mexico creates dangers to the public health and damages public recreational and aesthetic values in a significant area of the United States, including the Salton Sea which supports an important fishery; and

Whereas communities in the Imperial Valley of California have constructed, or scheduled for construction, treatment facilities for wastes originating in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby urgently requests that the Government of the United States use all of its good offices to make proper representations to the Republic of Mexico and its political subdivisions which will result in a permanent solution to this international pollution problem.

RESOLUTION 7—PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STREAMS

Whereas the competition for water for such purposes as municipal and industrial supplies, irrigation, power generation, navigation and water quality control is such that each year fewer and fewer streams remain in their natural, undeveloped state; and

Whereas the anadromous fish runs dwindle as man-made obstructions seal off routes to their fresh water spawning locations and high dams, in particular, cause fish passage problems which are as yet unsolved; and

Whereas flowing water is necessary for many types of fish which are important to recreational needs of millions of Americans; and

Whereas myriads of yet unborn citizens will undoubtedly want to view a natural stream: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby supports the principle that each State or region should ascertain which streams or other waters, or portions thereof, shall remain in a free-flowing condition without development or exploitation under governmental authority or license.

RESOLUTION 8—WILDLIFE IN "PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL FORESTS"

Whereas the recreational use of national forests, particularly for hunting and fishing, continues to grow in keeping with the greater population of the Nation and increased leisure; and

Whereas many national forests presently are in urgent need of recreational facilities, including but not limited to campground and sanitation facilities and wildlife habitat development; and

Whereas funds were provided for campground and sanitation facilities under Operation Outdoors, part I; and

Whereas wildlife is an integral part of the recreational opportunity offered by National Forests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled Mar. 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby asserts its belief in the urgency that full implementation of fish and wildlife projects, including critical habitat improvement work, needs to be accomplished as outlined in Program for the National Forests."

RESOLUTION 9—RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ON NATIONAL LAND RESERVE

Whereas the demand for use of the national land reserve for recreational purposes, including enjoyment of fish and wildlife, continues to grow as a result of an increased population enjoying additional leisure time; and

Whereas national land reserve properties offer many recreational sites relatively near large population centers; and

Whereas there is an urgent public need for the provision of recreational facilities, including but not limited to campgrounds, sanitation facilities, high standard access roads, and wildlife habitat improvement; and

Whereas funds provided for recreational development have been totally inadequate; and

Whereas only full implementation of a recreation development program can restore, protect, and maintain valuable and critical habitat, and provide those recreational facilities needed for the public's enjoyment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., does hereby express its conviction that the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, should be provided with appropriations adequate for the development, improvement, and maintenance of critical wildlife habitat, and for the construction, development, and maintenance of needed public recreational facilities on the national land reserve.

RESOLUTION 10—ACCESS ROADS ON PUBLIC LANDS

Whereas large areas of public lands presently are inaccessible for public use due to

the lack either of development or maintenance of access roads or of easements over intervening public properties; and

Whereas many of these areas support large concentrations of wildlife which should be managed properly in order to maintain healthy and vigorous animals without damage to their habitat; and

Whereas the construction of access roads to and over these public lands would serve many purposes for the using public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby asserts its belief in the need for the appropriation of funds adequate for the construction and maintenance of access roads and acquisition of easements or rights-of-way over private properties to major blocks of Federal land.

RESOLUTION 11—MANAGEMENT OF WATERFOWL IN NORTHEAST REGION

Whereas many acres of important migratory waterfowl management areas exist in the northeast region of the United States; and

Whereas present data indicate there are significant numbers of migratory waterfowl that winter in the northeast region; and do not migrate considerably south of New England; and

Whereas some species of migratory waterfowl are underharvested under present wildlife management regulations; and

Whereas species management may not be practical on a flyway basis. It is recommended that a species management be permitted on a regional basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby urgently requests that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of the Interior, and appropriate State wildlife agencies give consideration to species management of the migratory waterfowl in the northeast region, which will permit its greater utilization.

RESOLUTION 12—PRESERVATION OF SHORELINE AREAS

Whereas the immediate preservation of suitable shoreline areas is viewed as necessary for a program of varied public outdoor recreational opportunities; and

Whereas the acquisition of such suitable shoreline areas can be assured only through coordinated and cooperative long-range planning; and

Whereas to be most beneficial such areas should be situated near large population centers and thus are the subject of many competing demands; and

Whereas the need for shoreline preservation is acute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual convention assembled March 3, 1963, at Detroit, Mich., hereby urges the U.S. Department of the Interior to assume a vigorous leadership in the preservation of shoreline recreation areas for public use and that immediate attention be directed to establishment, either by the Federal Government solely or in cooperation with appropriate State agencies, of these proposed areas: Fire Island on the south shore of Long Island, N.Y.; Assateague Island, Md. and Va.; the extension of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, N.C.; Channel Islands, Calif.; the Oregon Dunes, Oreg.; Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich.; and Pictured Rocks, Mich.

RESOLUTION 15—CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

Whereas the National Wildlife Federation is dedicated to the conservation of our natural resources; and

Whereas, the very air that surrounds us is one of the most important of these natural resources and is necessary to all plant, animal, and human life; and

Whereas the problems of air pollution are nationwide and have been recently highlighted by a National Conference on Air Air Pollution; and

Whereas these air pollution problems will become of increasing importance in the years to come; and

Whereas the National Wildlife Federation is the recognized leader in the field of resource conservation: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation continue to assert its leadership in the Nation by recognizing the importance of air as a natural resource and enlarge the scope of its activities to educate the public as to this importance and the detrimental effects of air pollution; and be it further

Resolved, to emphasize the importance of this resource and these new activities in this direction, that the board of directors investigate the possibility of amending the conservation pledge to include air as a resource to be protected. Should this amendment not be possible, it is recommended that consideration be given to the adoption of a new pledge that would include air as an area of concern.

Shedding Light on Drug Research—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the fine industries of my district is the Hess & Clark Co. of Ashland, Ohio. A division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., this company has pioneered in the research and development of drugs for livestock, poultry, and animals.

Through the past 2 years, I have corresponded at length with professional men at Hess & Clark regarding some of the problems of their industry vis-a-vis Government controls and directives. Needless to say, I have learned a great amount by drawing on the experience of men like Paul D. Harwood, vice president in charge of research, and William M. Dillard, director of field research.

In the thought that other Members of the House might use the same experience, I am introducing into the RECORD a series of letters on the general subject of drug research and I commend them to all of the Members of this body. The first letter is as follows:

HESS & CLARK,
Ashland, Ohio, April 8, 1963.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Representative to Congress,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: A recent issue of the technical journal, Science (139: 1180), contains an article of tremendous importance to everyone. Dr. Walter Modell discusses the "Hazards of New Drugs" stating at the start that the scientific approach is necessary for the safest and most effective use of new drugs. Unlike many scientists, Dr. Modell discusses fully the ethical and moral aspects of new drug development, reaching the final conclusion that never before has our ecologic balance been so dependent on drugs; never before in its history has medicine had so many useful, effective drugs on hand; and never before has there been such promise of even better ones to come. Quite wisely Dr. Walter Modell M.D. limited his discussion and his illustrative examples to human medicine, but parallel situations may be described from veterinary medicine where the numerous ecological factors are more apparent, if not more significant.

One of us has worked in experimental therapeutics for more than 30 years and most of that time with domestic animals. We have been able to observe the frank hositility to therapeutic investigations that developed in the 1930's and drove many scientists into basic research—a frightened state of mind that reminded Hans Zinsser (rats, lice, and history) of captive monkeys in a cage playing with their genitalia. So today we see articles such as one written by Herbert G. Lawson (Wall Street Journal, Mar. 26, 1963) indicating that no new therapeutic breakthroughs can be expected because recent investigations have exhausted our available basic knowledge. This is not true. We know of many drugs under study in several laboratories that show excellent promise of efficacy in the treatment of virus diseases and of cancer. As Modell has stated never before—even in the recent past—has there been such high promise of better drugs to come, of significant breakthroughs. Scientists with decades of experience in the field are forcibly reminded of the therapeutic nihilism of the 1930's that slowed and delayed research. Development of therapies such as Fleming's discovery of penicillin were delayed. An unknown number of projects which failed to break through the antiscience of the times may have been destroyed. We are hoping the present storm of nihilism will collapse in the near future as that of the thirties collapsed in 1938—allowing penicillin to escape. Our present purpose is to present a number of instances where pressures from outside science have delayed and confused scientific developments badly needed in the production of food animals.

1. Congress passed the Humane Slaughter Act several years ago forcing a few types of slaughter upon our meat industry. The equipment needed is sufficiently cumbersome to force more extensive preslaughter handling. For food animals this means extended periods of fright and stress and far more cruelty than the act is able to remedy. Individuals unfamiliar with the many factors affecting humane treatment of animals behaved with the best of intentions but unethically since through lack of knowledge their proposed remedies prove detrimental, i.e. cruel in use.

2. The raising of sheep is peculiarly adapted to our Great Basin area and surrounding mountains. Unfortunately in some portions of this area lambs die regularly from white muscle disease and the industry is uneconomic. Several years ago brillant research by agricultural scientists of the region proved white muscle disease was nutritional in origin, being caused by deficient supplies of the trace element, selenium. Enforcement officers of the Federal Government, we avoid names because administrators do not tolerate the scientific custom of stating the facts, determined that the tremendously small amounts of inorganic selenium needed could not be used under law. North America is unique in having toxic concentrations of selenium in the soil as well as areas that lack the element. We are told that the problem is conquered in part by use of feedstuffs containing toxic levels of selenium. Since livestock men cannot obtain selenium analyses of these foodstuffs, they make certain that enough is employed, and levels of selenium in organic combination may exceed by twentyfold the amounts of sodium selenite that need be added. Rule 1 of any therapeutic situation, namely, ask for informa-

tion from experienced individuals, is ignored because of unscientific interpretation of a legal phrase.

3. Early this year Hess & Clark received the first approved label for a therapeutic agent to be used as a feed additive. A large feed manufacturer began tests under their conditions of use to ascertain that the agent is broadly useful in poultry husbandry. The drug is highly active for the prevention of Escherichia coli infections of the airsacs, a condition that occurs frequently in large flocks, and in large flocks only. Several broiler flocks were 4 to 5 weeks of age when a Federal regulation issued stating that no drug could be used experimentally in food animals unless all animals were destroyed and a record kept to prove destruction. The officials of the feed company were much concerned because the scores of thousands of broilers represented a very large investment in human effort and the Federal officials regularly boast that cost is no factor. Frightened into error the feed company withdrew the drug from all flocks in the dead of winter. Severe weather stress, the sudden withdrawal of therapeutic defenses resulted in a severe break in airsac infections. In time these broilers were slaughtered, a high percentage were condemned by the Federal officers and the financial losses were heavy. More important from an ethical point of view, the majority of the birds were sold as edible, although E. coli is frequently pathogenic for man. Such are the workings of modern legal interpretations.

4. The errors continue in a manner both ludicrous and tragic. Nihydrazone, the drug involved, is one of very few effective therapeutic agents that are completely metabolized by living tissues. Slaughter an animal while eating feed medicated with these drugs, and the medicament will be completely metabolized or burned up by the time the carcass is chilled. The chief metabolic end product is carbon dioxide. E. coli is a common disease agent for both man and animals. Recognizing their error, the feed company wishes to repeat the experiment prematurely and disastrously terminated. Unfortunately, the regulations now state: (1) Nihydrazone is a new drug and cannot be sold to anyone not possessing an effective food additive order, (2) since nihydrazone is covered by an approved label no investigational drug permit can be obtained, and (3) samples or quantities of a drug cannot be shipped to anyone for experimental purposes unless he possesses an investigational drug permit. Lawyers tell me that no legal way exists by which we may furnish nihydrazone to this feed company and to many others. The negatives have completely barred research "under conditions of use" which are so fully and specifically spelled out in the Food Additives Amendment of 1958. Meanwhile broilers are being raised, are suffering outbreaks or air-sac infection, are being condemned by Federal officials, or are going to market with E. coli infections not yet detectable at inspection. As Dr. Modell pointed out the more important ethical problem is the failure to use a new drug since these agents are absolutely necessary in our ecology; we may include the ecology of our domestic animals.

5. Yesterday, we were in the office of a veterinarian employed by an eastern chemical house, when he received a long-distance phone call. Mr. John Doe stated he was calling because the Missouri representative of the company requested it. Doe had received a masters degree in animal husbandry from the university and became manager of a large farm that specialized in swine. The enterprise was losing money when Doe took charge because of the high incidence of disease, mostly scours caused by E. coli and Salmonella. Sanitation was above reproach, and Doe introduced a feed additive called furazolidone, adapting the label directions very slightly to fit local necessities. During the past year Doe had marketed at a profit between 8,000 and 9,000 pigs and at the moment had more than 4,000 head on feed. He had maintained accurate records throughout and offered all data to the veterinarian. Because these diseases are ecological only data collected under use conditions are reliable, but the veterinarian replied, "I cant hear you and don't repeat it. I want to talk to our agent at once." To the company representative he said, "Our drug is proved safe by several years of use, but the FDA has demanded that we obtain a food additive order. This has been very difficult because the regulations are toughest for the safest drugs. We have in Washington right now a couple of large volumes representing a food additive petition. If it is allowed as indicated, our drug becomes a new drug and we must submit to Washington every 6 months full reports of any experiment done with it. Unless the label directions are followed precisely any experience is legally speaking an experiment. Very recently a new regulation appeared ordering destruction of all food animals used experimentally unless we obtain a written exemption. We have not had time to obtain an exemption and we are not prepared to buy and burn 4,000 hogs. My budget is not that large, and I am not prepared to spend several years in jail even for truthful information. I cannot receive any data unless the label is followed exactly.

Many other examples of the detrimental effects of laws, rules and regulations affecting all animals from fish to cattle and man himself might be cited. Everyone has the best of intentions, but reasoning is entirely from the negative aspects. The prohibitions show elephantine exaggerations approximating the 100 to 1 overdosage that killed the Oklahoma elephant (Science 139: 684). Ecological factors, economic factors, nutritional needs, such as delineated by Modell for man, are ignored in favor of an emphatic "Don't." We are told that we are likely to have a licensing system for certain experimental animals—another emphatic and immoral "Don't" because an outfit going out of business was careless about disposing of dead dogs. Eventually the immoral, unethical and ridiculous aspects of this problem will reach Congress and the reasonable people of this country if science and the Dr. Modells keep at it. As Modell stated, "A negative attitude toward drugs may develop * * * it would be an unforgivable disaster today, for never before has our ecologic balance been so dependent on drugs."

Very truly drugs,

PAUL D. HARWOOD,
Vice President in Charge of Research.
WILLIAM M. DILLARD,
Director of Field Research.

The Relation of the Church to the Whole Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vast amount of urban renewal being undertaken in so many of our large cities, especially in the older ones, the role of the inner-city church increases in importance. Because this is a matter that concerns all of us, I wish to bring to your attention the timely and thought-provoking address made by the former Governor of Maryland, Theodore R. McKeldin, to the men's bible class of Christ English Lutheran Church in Baltimore, on April 7:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, FORMER GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, TO THE MEN'S BIBLE CLASS OF CHRIST ENGLISH LUTHERAN CHURCH, CHARLES AND HILL STREETS, BALTIMORE, MD., SUNDAY, APRIL 7, 1963

I welcome this opportunity to speak to the Bible Class of Christ Church in order that I may pay tribute to it as a civic, not as a sectarian institution. It is not necessary to be a Lutheran to realize the size of the contribution that this church has made to the secular life of Baltimore for three-quarters of a century. Its influence upon the religious life has been greater, I have no doubt, but I leave that to persons better qualified to discuss it. My theme is the relation of the church to the whole community, regardless of creedal bounds.

One remarkable aspect of this relation has been its unusual stability. For the first 73 years of its existence, Christ Church was served by only three pastors, each of whom became identified with the city not only as a religious, but also as a civic leader. Leander M. Zimmerman, O. F. Blackwelder, and John L. Deaton were clergymen and Lutherans, but they were also Baltimoreans, widely known and greatly trusted by men of all creeds, of all occupations, and of all races. The church itself has been a center of religious activity, but it has also been a center of activities generally regarded as secular, but that contributed to the moral and intellectual welfare of our people.

Christ Church, therefore, has been more than Lutheran and more than a temple; it has been a source from which light and healing have poured out over the whole community. Its long and faithful devotion to the service of mankind has proved to people who are not Lutherans that in deed and in truth it was built to the glory of God.

"There is a natural aristocracy among men," said Jefferson, himself the great philosopher of democracy. "The grounds of this are virtue and talents." Dr. Zimmerman, founder of this church and its pastor for 38 years, was one of those natural aristocrats. His virtues made him a hero of the faith, but his talents made him a powerful influence on the intellectual life of this city; proof of this is abundant, but I cite only the one fact that he commanded the respect and esteem of another powerful intellect of a different faith, that of the late Cardinal Gibbons.

Dr. Blackwelder, his successor, held the pastorate for 8 years, a long tenure in many churches, but the shortest in the history of Christ Church. His quality is attested by the fact that he was drawn from this church to serve one in the National Capital, a post of importance not merely to his congregation, but to the whole denomination.

Dr. Deaton, pastor for 26 years, is naturally the one of the three best remembered by the contemporary generation. Of him there is little need to speak, for his memory still profoundly affects men and women yet living. It is enough to say that he added luster to the record of his predecessors, both as a clergyman and as a citizen.

To the fourth pastor, the Reverend Dr. Warren C. Johnson, one can only say that he has come into a great inheritance and a correspondingly great opportunity. Yet his tenure of a little less than 2 years—brief indeed for Christ Church—has already filled his friends with confidence that the standard, high as it is, will be worthily upheld.

I venture to point out, though, that at no time, not even in the time of Dr. Zimmerman, has the upholding of that stand-

ard been more important, either to this congregation or to this city. Dr. Zimmerman's work was that of an intellectual pioneer, the transfer of the faith from the German language in which it had been embodied, to the English, in which lay its future destiny.

Dr. Johnson's work is of a different kind, but no less essential and no less difficult. It is that of holding the ground gained against heavy counterattack; and it is clearly of as great importance to the secular city as it is to the religious faith.

Baltimore is engaged in a tremendous task of reconstruction. We call it urban renewal and its progress is visible in the activity of wrecking crews followed by builders trying to eliminate the physical blight that has afflicted a large part of the old city.

I suggest, though, that this physical activity with steel and brick and stone will be largely ineffective unless it is accompanied and sustained by a moral activity with the minds and hearts and lives of men. Where, then, should we expect to find centers of that kind of activity except in such places as this? The record of Christ Church in that respect is a notable one. At least 12 of its children have already devoted their lives to that service. The Reverend A. C. Waldkoenig, S.T.D.; the Reverend C. S. Klug; the Reverend Augustus Hackmann; the Reverend Howard O. Walker; the Reverend Leigh Bell; the Reverend Lawrence Folkemer, Ph. D.; the Reverend Carl Folkemer; the Reverend Gordon Folkemer; the Reverend Edgar Koehnlein; the Reverend Donald Gallion; the Reverend L. Crosby Deaton; and the Reverend Barron Maberry.

This record the church must maintain if it is to stand in the future as it has in the past; one of the strong points in our city's line of defense against the moral blight that is more destructive than the physical.

For it will avail us little to have modern housing and magnificent boulevards and magnificent temples of commerce if they are accompanied by a deterioration of civic virtue more ruinous than the attacks of dry rot and termites and corrosion that destroy the work of builders. A city that is magnificent to outward view, but morally rotten is a travesty of civilization; but it is as necessary always to fight moral blight as physical.

I am not thinking primarily of abstention from the grosser sins that too many of us think is all that constitutes morality. Prostitution, drug addiction, juvenile delinquency, and the like are, indeed, blots upon the reputation of any city; but all of these together are less dangerous than a subtler form of moral decay that attacks, not the wretched denizens of "skid row," but the privileged classes, prosperous citizens who are considered, and consider themselves, pillars of the community.

When men who are personally honest see evidence of public corruption, and dismiss that evidence with a shrug; when it is taken as a matter of course that money slipped to a fixer will take care of violations of public law; when men of high standing are too indolent or too apathetic or too much creatures of habit to go to the polls and vote shady characters out of office; when officials acquire the habit, if abuses are exposed, of prosecuting the victims rather the villains, and respectable citizens observe the process with a cynical smile—then the city is attacked by a moral blight more damaging than the activities of pimps, and bookmakers and purse snatchers.

I dare assert that the churches themselves have not been entirely immune to this infection. Too many of our churches, like too many of our citizens, tend to imitate the priest and the Levite on the road to Jericho—they draw their skirts about them and pass by on the other side, instead of stooping to minister to the man fallen among thieves.

It is to the glory of Christ Church that, when so much of the wealth and culture of the city fled to the suburbs, it did not follow, to live at ease among those who need not a physician, but remained at its original post of duty. It is no less to the credit of the congregation that they do not put their own convenience ahead of their loyalty to the work that Dr. Zimmerman began on this spot—the work, not of transferring the faith from the city, but that of transforming the city by maintaining the faith. In 1887 all Baltimore had about 400,000 people, so the task today is four times as big as it was then. Our need is for four times as many churches of this type as we had then; instead of which we have lost many congregations of wealth and culture.

Is this not an indication that our religion tends to become one of convenience rather than of conviction? If that is true, it is no wonder that our politics is shaped more by conformity than by conscience. If a man's religion means paying tithes of anise and cummin and neglecting the weightier matters of the law, of course his politics will mean being a Republican or a Democrat rather than being right. For moral blight, once started, will affect every phase of life.

Christ Church thus far has held out against this danger; and in holding out it has not diminished, but is stronger and greater today than ever before; which is the best of reasons to believe that while it continues to hold out, it will continue to increase in size and power. Not as a Lutheran, but as a citizen of Baltimore I rejoice in that prospect; and I offer you the assurance of my hope and belief that the tenure of your fourth pastor may exceed that of your first both in years, and in testimony to the glory of God and faithfulness in the service of mankind.

Distress of Lumber Industry Continues

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1963, the Tariff Commission made its report to the President, concerning its investigation of the softwood lumber industry, under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The purpose of the investigation to which this report relates was to determine whether, as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements softwood lumber is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause serious injury to the domestic industry producing like lumber.

This investigation was originally instituted on July 26, 1962, on the basis of an application by the Lumbermen's Economic Survival Committee, Seattle, Wash.

Since the decision by the Tariff Commission was announced, my office buzzer has been sounding like a leaky water faucet dripping on a hot stove.

In the Commission's report, it is recognized that softwood lumber "is being imported in increased quantities," within the meaning of the statute. In their investigation, the Commission interprets "being imported" as referring to the rate of importation during the most recent years. Whatever number of recent years is selected for this purpose, it is clear that the trend of imports of softwood lumber is upward. However, the Commission is here called upon to determine merely whether the trade agreement concessions are "in major part" the cause of the increased imports.

The imports of Canadian softwood lumber from Canada presently amount to 17 percent of the softwood market in the United States.

The advantages the Canadian producers have over domestic manufacturers, include a devalued currency, government-pegged lower stumpage rates, government-granted transportation advantages, a sizeable tariff differential, and positive government assistance in export development. The lumber industry of America has taken every administrative procedure, every legal procedure, and has patiently cooperated with the Government to assist in leviating its industry to overcome the disadvantages at which it finds itself, through no fault of its own. The lumber industry contributes greatly to the economic importance of our Nation. It is the fourth ranking employer of manufacturing labor. The industry's annual payroll is about $7 billion. It contributes approximately $27 billion overall to the gross national product.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House and the other body have proposed that all necessary steps be taken by the Federal Government and the industry to eliminate these inequities so as to provide equal opportunity for the sale of American lumber in the United States and its possessions, specifically:

First. That the industry give full support to the U.S. Government in any effort that is undertaken to increase the sale of American lumber in both export and domestic markets.

Second. That the Government establish a Federal transportation policy which will equalize costs on waterborne shipments of lumber between American and foreign vessels and which will eliminate the competitive advantages of foreign railroads and will encourage the efficiency of carriers.

Third. That the Government take appropriate action to prevent the manipulation of foreign exchange rates which has had the effect of providing a subsidy on lumber imports into the United States.

Fourth. That the Government immediately undertake negotiations to equalize tariffs on lumber imports and exports so that comparable opportunity exists for sales in competing nations.

The Tariff Commission stated, and I quote:

> The Commission observes further that while international commitments may deter Congress from legislation to conflict therewith, these commitments do not prevent Congress from so legislating. Congress may if it so elects, legislate in conflict with any international commitments.

The Tariff Commission thus offers the Congress of the United States a green light to assume the responsibilities for correcting this situation.

Specific suggestions have been made by Members of Congress and by the lumber industry which would have the effect of meeting the problem of increasing softwood lumber imports from Canada. As important as this situation is, we are not talking about increased imports that are based upon traditional free market advantages of the Canadians; but rather, advantages offered by specific Canadian Government actions that constitute what has been described as a subsidy for Canadian lumber producers. I think it unfair for the Congress of the United States, or for this Government, to expect the lumber industry of America to compete in U.S. markets with lumber from Canada which enjoys the advantages given Canadian producers. I feel it is incumbent upon us to deal forthrightly with the issue and to move swiftly to counteract these artificial advantages enjoyed by the Canadians.

Some Members of Congress are reluctant to deal with the area surrounding the Tariff Commission particularly that of requiring that all lumber imported into the United States bear a mark identifying the country of origin. To my knowledge, lumber is the only product imported into the United States which does not have to be so stamped. The Tariff Commission reached three important conclusions with regard to the 1938 agreement with Canada which exempted Canadian lumber from marking requirements.

The Commission states:

> The trade agreement with Canada that came into effect in 1939 provided inter alia for the suspension of the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show country of origin * * * since that time, however, the use of modern equipment has greatly reduced the cost of marking individual pieces of lumber. Currently, country-of-origin marking would involve little expense in addition to that already incurred in complying with the grade-marking requirements instituted in 1960 by Federal Housing Administration. Further, that marking requirement cannot be regarded as a trade-agreement concession within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Lastly that:

> It is clear that its restoration (that is, the restoration of the requirement for country of origin marking) in recent years would not likely have contributed to a reduction in the level of imports of softwood lumber. On the basis of evidence obtained by the Commission, its restoration might well have had a contrary effect.

Mr. Speaker, for some time the lumber industry has asked the Congress that a law be passed to require that imported lumber have the stamp of country-of-origin identification. Industry feels that the consumer public of the United States should have a choice of selecting domestic lumber. The Commission stated that the withdrawal of the present exemption would not constitute a violation of a trade agreement concession. It further stated that there would be very little cost involved for the Canadians, and further, such markings might even benefit the Canadians. I have introduced legislation, along with other colleagues, that would require all imported lumber to carry the country-of-origin identification. Any objection to this legislation would be unfair to decent business practice. I urge the Congress to institute such legislation as an act of good faith to the domestic lumber industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to another proposal which has been offered as a method of assisting the domestic lumber industry. Chairman RAINS, of the Housing Subcommittee, introduced H.R. 2628, a bill to require the use of domestic lumber in all FHA insured housing. This would require the Federal Housing Agency to insist that domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products be used in the construction of all FHA insured housing. Perhaps all of my colleagues might not be acquainted with the numerous disadvantages our lumber industry must cope with. It came as quite a surprise to me to learn that FHA currently approves a number of Canadian grading agencies. It is also true that a number of U.S. grading agencies sell their grade stamps to Canadian lumber producers for use in grade marking lumber which eventually winds up in FHA housing. Yet, there seems to be no practicable way—at least which is apparent to me—for the use of these grade stamps in Canada to be policed by the FHA. Consequently, the proposal that has been put forward and which deserves some very careful consideration by the Congress would require that lumber imported from Canada which is intended for use in FHA housing be grade marked within the United States, where there is an opportunity for policing by the FHA to insure that the lumber approved by these grading agencies is in fact on grade. It seems to me that we may be operating currently under a double standard to permit Canadian lumber to have access to the FHA market on a different basis than that which is available to our domestic producers.

Through three tariff cuts, the first in 1936, one in 1938, and again in 1948, U.S. tariffs of softwood lumber have been reduced to 1.3 percent of the average value of the imported lumber.

There are many competitive advantages enjoyed by the Canadian softwood producers—some by Government action on the part of the United States and others by Government action on the part of Canada. For whatever reason these actions were taken, they have worked to the severe detriment of the American softwood lumber industry. The price of lumber imported from Canada is now so low as a consequence of competitive and governmental advantages, that many American producers are unable to compete and have been forced to curtail production or to close their doors.

It is my belief that some appropriate action should be taken to protect one of America's basic manufacturing industries. The most direct way to accomplish this is by the implementation of a quota on the import of Canadian softwood lumber. The Canadian Government has seen fit to impose a tariff averaging 10 percent upon American softwood lumber being exported to Canada. It is only equitable that the United States should take some similarly appropriate action to protect its domestic industry.

I propose the imposition of a quota of 6 percent based on the average quarterly domestic softwood consumption in the United States during the calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

This quota would allow the basic minimum protection needed by the domestic softwood lumber industry. It is urgent that this or similar action be taken at the earliest possible time to prevent any further damage to the lumber industry.

Mr. Speaker, the United States depends upon trees. Few natural resources have contributed as much to our growth and prosperity as have the forests during the past 350 years. Over this period of time our citizens know it is good business to keep America green. Further, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out my desire to have America enjoy the best relations with our northern neighbor, Canada. However, I cannot bring myself to believe that it is necessary to sacrifice America's fourth largest industry in terms of employment on the alter of international relations. If this country is to subsidize the economy of Canada, let us do it as a Nation forthrightly, openly, and worthily. However, let us not expect one industry to do that job for us, or the employees in an industry to give up their only means of livelihood in order that it be accomplished.

President Kennedy Lauded by Socialist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, by his actions and the people he seems to be the most comfortable with, President Kennedy indicates more than a passing interest in Socialist philosophy and an antipathy toward capitalism. Perhaps this explains why so many of the New Frontier programs seem bent on undermining the private enterprise system to force the United States into socialism.

The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune, citing high praise by the leader of the British Socialists for President Kennedy, speaks for itself. Should the American people take warning from these remarks and other indications as to the direction in which the Kennedy administration is leading us?

LEFT SPEAKS TO LEFT

> Harold Wilson, the leader of the British Socialists, who figures himself as Prime Minister in a coming Labor government, has returned home after a tete-a-tete with President Kennedy to report that he and Mr. Kennedy have established a cozy relationship. A Labor government, he said, would be more closely alined on some major policies with the Kennedy administration than the present Conservative government.

This we can well believe. Mr. Kennedy and the crowd of Americans for Democratic

Action which surrounds him are temperamentally inclined toward the notions of left-wingers abroad, even though they don't choose to call the domestic product socialism.

On foreign affairs there would not be much to quarrel about between Wilson and Kennedy. The British Socialist is an advocate of disengagement to avoid trouble with the Communists, and Mr. Kennedy, on the record in Cuba and elsewhere, is reluctant to be beastly to the bolos.

The British Socialist is just the type to get cordial treatment from Washington. The welcome is always out for a Ben Bella, but not for a Tshombe. The pinkish imperialism of Indonesia gets the most respectful and considerate treatment, but there is nothing but lumps for an ally like Portugal or Holland. If you're out in left field, you are the New Frontier's boy. The saying that left speaks to left is abundantly verified by what goes on in Washington.

What the Average American Citizen Can Do About U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we frequently hear our constituents ask what the average American citizen can do about U.S. foreign policy.

It is not always easy to answer their questions.

Recently, Mr. Carter Davidson, commentator for Station WBBM-TV, a Columbia Broadcasting System affiliate in Chicago, gave what I thought was an excellent answer to this question. Mr. Davidson is one of the Nation's most distinguished analysts of foreign affairs. During World War II, he served as an outstanding war correspondent and since the end of the war, he has lectured widely and has also participated very actively in the formulation of American foreign policy through several leading organizations which deal with this very difficult subject.

In recent years, he has won the highest commendation of the people of Chicago for his penetrating daily television commentary on news and foreign affairs.

Mr. Davidson is conductor of the very popular television program broadcast each Saturday night from Chicago called "At Random," which brings to the television audience a new dimension in understanding national and international problems through a penetrating discussion among outstanding Americans who participate in this program.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davidson's commentary on the question, "What can the average American citizen do for U.S. foreign policy?" follows:

WHAT CAN THE AVERAGE AMERICAN CITIZEN DO ABOUT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY?

Good evening. Many times, by telephone and by mail, and in person when I have made lecture appearances, the question arises of just what can the average American citizen do about U.S. foreign policy.

It's not an easy question to answer because policy is made at high level, a long distance from here.

It also is made because of developments not always, in fact seldom, known to ordinary mortals like you and me.

It is easy, of course, to sit back and criticize foreign policy when it doesn't work. It is not often that we praise it when it does.

In truth, we are only a partially informed people, partly because not all information is available to us, and partly because we too often neglect to read, hear, or understand what is.

Because of this, and because of our distractions with such necessaries as earning a living, taking 50-mile walks, and watching cowboy movies, the answer to the question of what can the average American do about his country's foreign policy is: He can do nothing, directly.

But there is much, indirectly, that can and needs be done in a country where government governs too much because citizens too seldom practice their citizenship.

It is often said that politicians have faith in the fundamental complacency of the American people.

It is not as often recognized that the main force in a democracy is gravity, that, like a front porch whose underpinnings grow weak from rot or termites, it is bound to sag unless the supports are refurbished.

If the refurbishing doesn't come from people, like us, it comes from government and the result is too-big government.

Too many of us preach civil rights and equality for all while living in restricted suburbs and apartment buildings.

We often indignantly demand honesty in government while cheating on income tax or trying to bribe a policeman.

We curse the government for managing the news, and when the paper comes we turn to the sports pages, comic strips and saloon columnists.

We are anguished at high taxes and call foreign aid a vast giveaway, while annually spending more on packages to put things in than a third of the world's 3 billion people earn in a year.

These are notes, at random, as it were, on some of the contradictions in our conduct. Thoughtfully considered they could give some answers to the question: What can the average person do about things?

He can do much, and it could just possibly be fatal to the country if all of us neglect to do at least some.

Man of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the April 11, 1963, issue of the Washington Evening Star which pays a well-deserved compliment to Chairman John Macy of the Civil Service Commission, for putting a stop to the political screening by the White House and the Democrat National Committee of student applicants for summer employment in the Government.

Since these applicants for employment came under civil service rules and procedures, to have permitted any such shoddy patronage scheme would have been a deliberate attack by the White House and Democrat National Committee on the civil service merit system.

The Star editorial follows:

MAN OF COURAGE

A special medal of some sort should be struck off to commemorate the intestinal fortitude of Civil Service Commission Chairman Macy in killing a cheap little patronage scheme cooked up by some of the Democratic politicians in the White House.

This was a plan to require that all summer Government jobs for students be cleared through the White House. In other words, grab the kids while they're still young and introduce them to the practical side of politics. And, possibly, there might be a few breaks in the process for Democratic parents.

This shabby business now has been scotched. The Civil Service Commission has served notice that the project "is illegal and will not be tolerated." As one CSC official put it, "We couldn't allow the situation to continue. The reputation and integrity of the Government's civil service merit system were at stake."

This certainly was true, and, in our opinion, the reputation and the integrity of the Kennedy administration also were at stake. For this reason, we take with a grain of salt the suggestion in the news reports that the CSC action was not cleared with the White House. President Kennedy may not have initiated the action, but he surely didn't oppose it. For aside from the pettiness of the whole thing, he would recognize that the political reaction inevitably would be adverse.

In saying this, however, we detract nothing from Mr. Macy and his CSC colleagues. They have done a good day's work.

Tax Credit To Offset Gold Drain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Eliot Janeway recently recommended an export earnings tax credit. One of the purposes of this type of tax credit is to offset the gold drain, by providing individuals and corporations with an incentive to earn hard currencies abroad. I ask unanimous consent that his article, which was published in the Chicago Tribune on March 11, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 11, 1963]

SUGGESTS TAX CREDIT TO OFFSET GOLD DRAIN

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, March 10.—February, like January, saw the United States lose another $50 million of its gold. This means that the dollar is under pressure, because Americans are earning less from the outside world than they are spending in it.

The pressure on the dollar is hurting us politically as well as financially. Remember that French President Charles de Gaulle taunted us with the weakness of the dollar at the same time that he held up Britain's

entry into the Common Market and turned down President Kennedy's offer of Polaris missiles. He asked, in effect, how we could expect to be taken seriously as a power so long as we fail to find customers able to pay us, as De Gaulle put it, in good money for the goods and services we need to sell. De Gaulle's remarks emphasize the critical importance to the United States of developing a program to increase the earnings of hard currencies abroad by Americans.

MUST EXPORT TO LIVE

All Europe knows that every country in it must export to live. Just so, De Gaulle's remarks made clear that the United States must export—and to countries with good money, not just to the underdeveloped countries—if she is to hang onto her allies and (shades of 1960's election campaign oratory) to her prestige.

In the world as it is today, however, it takes effective Government policymaking to mount a competitive export drive. The Russians have had it, and that is why their exports have done so well. The industrial countries of Western Europe have had it, too, and that is why they have been outselling us in world markets (including even our own).

The Kennedy administration has talked exports up, and it has spent a good many dollars promoting exports to countries whose currencies aren't usable as reserves for the dollar. But it hasn't produced a program to increase earnings of hard currencies abroad by Americans.

Here is a suggestion for doing it. Let the U.S. Government give a tax credit to any and all taxpayers, whether corporations or individuals, who earn hard currencies usable to offset our dollar losses. This would be a very easy tax credit to audit, and there would be no gimmicks or loopholes in it.

All the Treasury would have to do would be to publish a list a couple of times a year of currencies which the United States needs to pay its short-term debts (so as to keep the dollar stable). Any U.S. taxpayer who could show a receipt of usable currency turned in for dollars would qualify for the export-earnings tax credit.

MEETS ALL STANDARDS

In this year of controversy over tax cuts and tax reforms, an export-earnings tax credit meets all the standards of approval. It would not be limited to corporate taxpayers to the exclusion of individuals. Individuals could earn it, but at the same time it could stimulate corporate investment and earnings.

Such an export-earnings tax credit would open up incentives to individuals to earn the currencies we need regardless of whether they are in the upper or lower income tax brackets.

Moreover, a tax credit on new earnings of foreign exchange is one form of tax cut that would pay its own way. After all, the question of whether or not we head off a run on the dollar boils down to our ability to increase our hard currency earnings abroad by just $2 billion a year or so.

INCENTIVE TO OUTSELL

In our $550–$600 billion economy, this isn't very much new money for our corporate and individual work force to earn once it is given a take-home pay incentive to go out and earn it.

For a taxpayer in the 50 percent tax bracket (which is where most black-ink corporations sit), such an export-earnings tax credit would be incentive enough to outsell the rest of the free world in its back yard.

This is the way our creditors, who are also our competitors, have bootstrapped themselves—by giving domestic tax credits as an incentive to earn needed foreign exchange. In fact, it is the way they got out from under and wound up as our creditors. One way we can get out from under is to copy this European recipe for success.

Address by Senator Bayh at the Indiana Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a speech recently delivered by the junior Senator from Indiana, BIRCH BAYH. It was delivered on the occasion of the Indiana Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, April 6, 1963, in Indianapolis, Ind. The speech displays an appreciation for the accomplishments of President Kennedy's administration as well as an awareness of the opportunities we have for serving this generation. Senator BAYH is the pride of Indiana and we have every reason to believe that his service will be long and distinguished. The text of the Senator's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAYH AT THE INDIANA JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

Tonight we meet to celebrate a victory—a victory most Hoosiers thought an impossible task only 12 short months ago. Through your faith and devotion, with your energy and dedication to purpose, together we won the good fight. Words are insufficient to express the deep gratitude which Marvella and I feel in our hearts for you who honored me by bestowing the honor of serving as your U.S. Senator from Indiana.

Yes, there were those who said Democratic victory in Indiana was impossible. There are those who utter this same sterile sounding slogan tonight. Let us here and now proclaim to those pitiful prophets of doom who declared it impossible to elect VANCE HARTKE to the U.S. Senate, who thought it impossible to seat Matthew Welsh in the Governor's chair, who pessimistically prophesied that a young State legislator from the city of Terre Haute was wasting his time—let us say to them at this very hour that the Democratic Party does not now nor will we ever again believe that the election of Democrats in Indiana is impossible.

Let us start now determined to elect and reelect Democratic mayors throughout this State. Let us decide now that a Democrat will be elected Governor, that Indiana will continue to have two Democratic Senators, that Democrats shall control the next general assembly and that Indiana shall cast its electoral votes for John Fitzgerald Kennedy in 1964.

The people of Indiana want good government and we are giving it to them. Hoosier citizens demand straight talk and solutions to complicated problems. This we pledge. This is our goal.

As Democrats we can be proud of the heritage to which we fall benefit. From the time the principles of the Democratic Party were laid down by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, ours has been the party of the people—the defender of minority groups—the party of progress.

Shortly after the founding of our party, Thomas Jefferson defined its goals, characterized its philosophy and contrasted it with opposing forces when he said:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the high classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as most honest and safe * * *."

In the span of nearly a century and a half from Jefferson to Kennedy, a great nation and the world's oldest democracy has sprung from the waiting lands of a continent and the hearts of a people and has spread around the world. And across this Nation is emblazened the record of the Democratic Party, its belief in the people, its belief in the dignity of every man, its belief that there is no more noble aspiration for a political party or government than to tend to the needs of its citizens and to promote the basic opportunities of each individual American.

The Democratic Party has pursued these goals with a concrete legislative program. Democrats have been responsible for the cornerstones of family security, the social security program, unemployment compensation, consideration for the aged, the blind, our children. Democrats established the minimum wage and throughout the years we have improved it and increased its coverage. We have made considerable progress in the field of civil rights.

But we need not dwell in the past to talk of Democratic accomplishments. The Democratic Party is a party of the present and the future. After 2 years of the New Frontier, at the quarter post of the Presidency of John F. Kennedy, we can see progress that has improved life here and around the world. Great progress has been made. Yet we are determined to solve problems still unsolved.

America has long been known for its Bill of Rights. Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke eloquently of the Four Freedoms. Today a space-age America must echo these thoughts and must rededicate itself to insure certain basic opportunities for each American.

Each American must be given the opportunity to secure a job sufficient to provide for his family. Through the leadership of President Kennedy more Americans are gainfully employed today than at any other time in the history of our Nation.

Over 71 million American working men and women labor in the industries, shops, farms, and mines of this country. Yet the challenge remains as long as many Americans workers cannot find jobs; as long as young minds and bodies are not properly equipped to find employment in space-age occupations. We, as Democrats are determined to meet this challenge with tax reviews to spur lagging economic growth; with retraining programs to assist those with unneeded skills; with a special youth program to guide and assist our younger citizens.

We are equally determined to provide this opportunity for those who labor on the farms of America. The efforts of the present administration have brought about an increase in farm income of approximately 10 percent during the last 2 years. Yet we will not rest until the American farmer enjoys equal prosperity with the rest of America, and the abundance from American farms is utilized as a blessing to a hungry world rather than as a stumbling block to high farm income.

Those who labor in business, large and small, must be guaranteed the opportunity to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home and abroad. We, as Democrats, believe in a truly free economy, free from government control and free from the oppression of monopolistic power. Ample opportunity for the small businessman is an important goal.

Each American, as a member of a family group, should be afforded the opportunity for compatible family living. The opportunities for jobs, for decent housing, and

for adequate medical care during the twilight years of life are important steps toward attaining this goal. And we as Democrats must continue the efforts made in past years to see that adequate legislative programs are enacted in this important area.

Finally, each American child must have the opportunity for a good education. No investment we make as a nation is more important than that which we make in providing adequate training for our most valuable natural resource, our children. Every child must have the opportunity to develop fully his own potentiality. To be sure it takes classrooms, it takes teachers; and these take money. But investment in our Nation's future through education is our best guarantee of meeting the challenges of the space age and the future.

If these opportunities are to be provided for Americans today, each of us must be resolute in opposition to those few persons who would deprive them to some Americans because of race, religion, or national origin; for full American citizenship means freedom of worship, freedom of access to public places, freedom to speak without fear of reprisal, and freedom to vote one's own convictions in the privacy of a polling place.

The cold war struggle today finds communistic totalitarianism and democratic freedom locked in mortal combat.

A waiting world is watching the American response to the challenges of this age. Awakening nations, searching for a better way of life, are asking, Will democracy and freedom work?

Let us answer with a hearty chorus of yes. Let us answer by renewing our determination to keep the United States a land of opportunity—for all Americans—for each American.

Support for Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, from my own personal knowledge I have long been aware that the good people of Nebraska know the value of a dollar—especially the farm dollar which is the backbone of Nebraska's economy.

Nebraska folks are conservative and fiercely independent in their thinking and perhaps it is for this reason that both farmers and businessmen have supported wheat programs in previous referendums.

Apparently they are taking the same attitude this year. It has been estimated that Nebraska wheat farmers stand to win or lose over $48 million pending the outcome of the May 21 referendum.

Two of Nebraska's biggest and most oustanding daily newspapers, the Lincoln Star and the Lincoln Evening Journal, on April 4 published editorials supporting a yes vote in the May 21 referendum. I commend these two editorials to the attention of my colleagues and wheat farmers everywhere:

[From the Lincoln Star, Apr. 4, 1963]

THE FARMERS' CHOICE

(By William O. Dobler)

It will be a long time before we forget the interview of a few years ago with Charles B. Shuman, president of the farm bureau. The interview will long be remembered because it is our firm opinion that Mr. Shuman was not at all against controls for the farm economy but was interested only in who did the controlling. When you came to the end of the line with his reasoning and logic, the farm bureau would be in the driver's seat and every farmer would be accountable to the organization.

BUREAU URGES "NO" VOTE

This is because the farm bureau would be handling the marketing of farm products. It would have all buyers tied up with contracts so that there would be no market for farm grains except through the farm bureau. The matter is pertinent today because the farm bureau is out urging farmers to vote May 21 against the national wheat referendum. They are trying to sell the farmer on the idea that he would be voting himself into eternal bondage if he approved the scheme being perpetrated on him by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

It is our belief that the farm bureau doesn't want a Government program simply because it wants to gain control of agriculture itself. And if you think the NFO with its ideas of a solid, voluntary farm front and organized withholding actions constitutes a threat to the food market, you better think a minute of what it would be like if the farm bureau got its hands on every acre of land in this Nation.

When the farmers go to the polls in May, it is hoped they keep a few fundamental truths in mind. There will never again in our time, at least, be the free and prosperous kind of agriculture of which we might all dream. Unlimited production of wheat and feed grains with market prices that will give the farmer a living wage are as far gone as high button shoes.

If the farmer is free to produce as he wants, he is going to produce at least twice the wheat and other grains that can ever be used. The day this happens he won't be getting even as much as a dollar a bushel for his wheat and the harder he works at the problem, the quicker he will send himself into bankruptcy. Make no mistake about it, there are going to be controls in agriculture. The controls will come in any number of possible ways. They could come, after much hardship, through such an organization as the Farm Bureau and with Mr. Shuman as the king of agriculture. They could come simply by a process of evolution in which the smaller farmers went broke and agriculture fell into the hands of large operators or corporations who, in traditional business ways, matched production with demand to control prices for a guaranteed return of 6 percent or so on their investment.

There wouldn't be any bread then which sold at a price that included only a penny for the wheat producer. And all the other foods on the American table would include a good profit for the grain producer, not just what somebody else decided to give the producer. Finally, the controls can be operated through the government at the option of the farmer himself. They would be controls, to be sure, but controls the farmer has something to say about, such as he does by voting May 21. If it were up to the Farm Bureau or a giant corporation, there darn sure wouldn't be any voting. All down the line from the farmer to the consumer, it would be a take-it-or-leave-it proposition.

Nor does the May 21 vote have anything to do with oblivion, as opponents of the 1964 wheat program would have us believe. There would be another vote for the next year's program and if the first year showed the proposed plan to be bad, unpopular, too costly or anything else, all the farmers would have to do is then vote it out.

In the past couple of years, the surplus of crops in this Nation has been substantially reduced and the net income of farmers has been improved. Neither of these things is at optimum levels but they have been improved since we abandoned the ridiculous free market ideas of Ezra Taft Benson. It just doesn't make sense that the Kennedy administration and Mr. Freeman would now propose a plan that would lose all this hard-fought-for ground.

WHAT CONGRESS MIGHT DO

And the 1964 wheat program is advocated by wheatgrowers themselves through the National Association of Wheat Growers. Is it logical that they would advocate a plan of ruination or enslavement for the wheatgrower? It is said that Congress will provide a new and better plan for the 1964 crop if the present proposal is voted down. This is pure conjecture but the better likelihood is that Congress would do nothing at all and the program will fall back on an old plan of voluntary controls at a support level of about $1.25 per bushel.

This would boost production far in excess of demands and cut support prices 75 cents per bushel below those approved for the current proposal. The May 21 referendum may not offer the farmer all he wants but it offers him the greatest prosperity and freedom he can get. The alternative would be chaos for the farmer and the entire economy of the country.

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal, Apr. 4, 1963]

NO SECOND CHANCE FOR WHEAT MEN

With election day now set for May 21, the battle on the national wheat referendum is fully joined. Even before the voting date was fixed, farm organizations were split wide-open on the issue with the farm bureau against the proposed program and most other groups favoring it.

Broadly speaking, passage of the program by a two-thirds affirmative vote will mean a higher price for wheat but restricted production; rejection of the program will mean considerably lower wheat prices and unlimited production.

In the coming weeks it will be imperative that every wheatgrower become entirely informed on the pros and cons of the issue and that he understand precisely what will happen if the referendum carries or fails.

Only on this basis should he determine his vote. It would be most unfortunate if any wheat producer should vote against the program on the assumption that, if it is defeated, Congress will pull his chestnuts out of the fire.

It has been suggested by some members of Nebraska's congressional delegation that Congress will bail out the wheatgrowers, with a better program, if the referendum fails. This is a highly misleading and dangerous assumption. There is no basis for it at all.

On the contrary, several congressional leaders have specifically said that, for the wheat farmer, "this is it"; no relief will be forthcoming if the referendum fails.

The latest to voice this view is House Democratic Leader CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma. Representative ALBERT called talk of possible new wheat legislation "irresponsible" and said, "I am convinced that there will be no new wheat legislation this year."

Republican Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota has said that if the program is turned down, chances of a better program are "mighty, mighty slim."

Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, conceded that a negative vote would be "calamitous." But he added that, even if this happens, "Congress cannot and should not take ac-

tion to further deal with wheat problems for this year."

These views come from key individuals who will control, to a very large extent, any agricultural decision to be made by Congress.

Those holding out hope for a congressional reprieve in the event of a referendum defeat should cite the top leaders of Congress who are prepared to fight for an alternative program. They also should make it clear at this time what alternative they would press for if the referendum loses.

Otherwise they will be guilty of leading wheat farmers down the primrose path to economic ruin.

Foggy Thinking From Foggy Bottom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the location of the Department of State in the district known as Foggy Bottom is symbolic of the foggy thinking eminating from the State Department in the handling of Cuba and Soviet aggression in this hemisphere. Now that this Nation is committed by the President to protect Castro and to desist from embarrasing Khrushchev, perhaps it is time to take a long look at the lack of logic behind this dangerous policy.

Our determination to prevent patriotic and freedom-loving Cubans from liberating their homeland and to make the Western Hemisphere safe for Castro and Communist subversion can never be explained in the light of reason. We can only hope that this latest reckless policy enunciated by the State Department will arouse sufficient interest in Congress to bring about a full investigation of the State Department and to determine once and for all who is responsible for our ridiculous policies which continue to result in Communist victories and U.S. defeats.

The following column by Ken Thompson in the Dallas Morning News points up the bad logic behind the ban on Cuban raids:

FOGGY BOTTOM—OUR LOGIC BAD ON CUBAN RAIDS

(By Ken Thompson)

"Irresponsible and ineffective"—that's the verdict handed down by the State Department to describe the recent series of bold raids against Russian ships bound for Havana and other daring acts of sabotage committed against the Castro regime by Cuban exiles.

Such raids and sabotage will no longer be tolerated by Washington, we are told. The reason? Not only do these acts make the Communists mad, says the State Department (which always goes to great lengths to avoid irritating the enemy), but they serve to strengthen, rather than weaken, Castro's hold on Cuba.

Now, we've all learned that one can't always expect reason to prevail in Foggy Bottom, but this surely takes the cake for just plain bad logic.

It is hard enough to comprehend how any attack upon the enemy—no matter how small it might be—could strengthen his position. But if these attacks have been helping Castro, why on earth would they make the Communists mad?

No one, of course, has ever suggested that this kind of sabotage alone will overthrow the Castro regime; that is not the basic purpose of the raids.

The principal aim is psychological. Brave Cuban exiles have been risking their lives in these attacks, primarily to keep alive the hope that someday Cuba will be free again.

Their purpose is to encourage internal resistance, to dispel the myth that the Castro regime is invincible—a myth which unfortunately has begun to take hold, now that much of the underground has been destroyed and one major attempt to overthrow the regime (at the Bay of Pigs) was a complete failure.

A principal goal of the Castro regime is to break down all resistance, to convince the Cuban people that they must resign themselves to a lifetime under Communist rule.

If Cuba is ever to be free and this hemisphere secure, Castro must never be allowed to achieve that goal. History has amply demonstrated the fact that mere diplomatic and economic pressures are not enough to keep the spark of resistance alive. Unless dramatic, physical blows are struck against tyrants, their captives eventually resign themsevles to living in chains.

In the early stages of World War II, numerous small raids were launched against Nazi Germany by British commandos and American rangers. These raids were tremendously successful in destroying the myth of the German superman and kindling resistance to Hitler's army throughout occupied Europe.

Yet, by the State Department's logic today, those successful World War II raids would have to be termed "irresponsible and ineffective."

Since World War II the Communists have used sabotage and other forms of guerrilla warfare extensively throughout the world. In fact, this has been the number one weapon in their arsenal, the chief method by which they have expanded their empire.

If the Communists were to restrict their guerrillas as the State Department has tried to leash the Cuban exiles, we would have little cause to fear Soviet expansion in Asia, Africa, or Latin America today. Unfortunately, there is no indication the Soviets are going to do this.

For a number of years, American foreign-policy makers have permitted the Soviet Union to call the shots in the cold war. One of their principal requirements has been that free-world countries are fair game for Communist sabotage and subversion, while areas behind the Iron Curtain are off limits to attack from the West.

Under these terms, no matter how many times the Reds may lose battles, every one they win is a total victory, adding to the Communist empire, while every one they lose is merely a disappointment which has cost them no ground.

As long as our policymakers accept this strategy, freedom at best can only be defended. It can never be extended, and is almost sure to diminish.

And that kind of strategy comes a lot closer than the Cuban exile raids to fitting the description "irresponsible and ineffective."

A Lad Named Ronald Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in these days of conflict over the issue of human dignity, a little town in West Virginia has offered the American people one of the finest, if heartrending examples of love for fellow man that has been seen in years.

It involves a tribute, both posthumous and living, to a young Negro lad, Ronald Costly. It is a tribute with spiritual values that every American might well embrace.

Fortunately, the Associated Press saw fit to give this story full coverage. My regret is that this dispatch was not printed, as far as I can determine, in Washington, D.C., where Costly was born. It was published in the Baltimore Sun of March 28, 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOLE TOWN PAYS RESPECTS AT NEGRO YOUTH'S FUNERAL

ELIZABETH, W. VA., March 27.—More people than the census lists as the population of this central West Virginia town opened their hearts and purses last week in the burial tribute to a friend.

Ronald Victor Costly was the victim of a heart attack March 14. He was president of the student body of Wirt County High School, an outstanding athlete and an honor student. Ronnie, 19, also was the lone Negro among the school's 400 students.

The funeral was held March 16 in the school gymnasium. More than 1,000 persons attended—or 250 more than the number who live in this farm town which hasn't a single Negro family. All but 75 present were white.

AN OUTSTANDING BOY

Expenses for the funeral came from the Ronnie Costly Fund initiated by the townspeople. About $500 was donated.

What brought on this tribute?

"We all loved Ronnie. He was an outstanding boy and overcame tremendous obstacles to win the respect and admiration of everyone who knew him," school Principal Ray G. Jarvis said.

Born in Washington, D.C., Ronnie had lived with his grandparents on a farm near here since he was 5. He got up each morning at 5 o'clock to help with the chores before walking a mile to the school bus for the 10-mile ride into town.

When the school was integrated in 1957, he was among several Negroes admitted. He would have been the first member of his race to graduate from the school which draws students from throughout the county.

MOST POPULAR IN SCHOOL

"The most amazing thing about Ronnie was that his achievements were entirely his own," Jarvis said. "When he ran for student body president last year we had a hard time finding anyone to oppose him. He was so popular that he won by a 10-to-1 margin. In

fact, Ronnie was the most popular person in the school.

"The day after he died it was terrible. Students were crying openly in the classrooms and many wandered through the halls with a lost look. We had to call an assembly so the school chaplain could calm them."

Ronnie's grandmother, Mrs. Ernest Mayle, received hundreds of sympathy cards.

"White folks who I had never seen before came by the house to help out and express their sympathy," she said. "Ronnie was a good boy, when he wasn't helping out around the house he had his nose stuck in a book. I never saw anyone so set on book learning."

The Mayle family farm doesn't produce enough food to feed the family. They are welfare recipients, but they scraped $13 together, to show their appreciation to the school by buying a book for the new library.

"Ronnie had planned to go to college and study science. Two schools had offered him scholarship. He ranked 10th in his class," Elizabeth Riley, the school guidance counselor, said.

The boy also excelled at football and basketball.

This year he also was out for track for the first time and was issued his equipment the day he died. Ronnie was in the dressing room when he was stricken.

"Many of the schools in the conference never had competed against Negroes before Ronnie played, yet nearly all of them sent flowers," Basketball Coach Joseph Craffey said. "This is something I've never heard of before."

The town plans to change the name of a nearby roadside park to the "Ronnie Costly Memorial Park." Money left over from the funeral will be used to purchase a monument for his grave.

Sign Up and Then Vote "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, C. H. Varner, a businessman and farmer, living in Edgar County, Ill., urges all 15-acre wheat farmers in the Corn Belt to "sign up and then vote no" in the forthcoming wheat referendum, May 21. Mr. Varner's comments have a vital importance for all American farmers, and therefore, I am inserting the text of his statement for the benefit of my colleagues and the public generally. His statement was prepared for the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. Varner's comments follow:

SIGN UP AND THEN VOTE "NO"

My hat goes off to Representative DELBERT L. LATTA, Republican, of Ohio, a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

He has very ably pointed out in a speech on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives that Agriculture Secretary Freeman is attempting to use double standards for our Nation's farmers in the coming wheat referendum, in that one method of voting would be required for the small 15-acre wheat farmers and another for the larger producers.

Those of us who have 15 acres or less wheat allotments must say "yes" in order to vote "no." Of the 1,800,000 total voters eligible in the United States, 1,200,000 are in my category.

Since I am a 15-acre wheat producer, in order for me to vote "no" or against this socialistic program I must sign up and agree to go along with the Freeman wheat supply management program if the referendum passes.

The Secretary is asking over 100,000 farmers in the State of Illinois to say "Uncle" or not vote.

Congressman LATTA has urged Secretary Freeman, in fairness to those of us who are small wheat farmers, not to put this proposed regulation into effect.

If the Secretary does not follow Congressman LATTA's suggestion, I strongly urge all 15-acre wheat farmers in the Corn Belt to sign up and then vote "no" as the real issue involved in this wheat referendum is, Who will manage the farms of America, Freeman or the American farmer?

Additional Views of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Gubser, and Mr. Chamberlain to H.R. 5555

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the House Committee on Armed Services favorably reported H.R. 5555, the military pay bill. My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] and I had serious reservations regarding the manner in which this bill treats members of the military services on the retired list. We have, therefore, filed additional views which will be a part of the committee report and have been joined in these views by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit our additional views herewith and commend them to the attention of all Members who are interested in fair treatment of those who have devoted a lifetime to military service:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. WILSON, MR. GUBSER, AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN TO H.R. 5555

This bill contains a major inconsistency. While purporting to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service.

For more than 100 years, it has been traditional that retired military pay should be based on active duty pay. Some have stated that the right to recompute retired pay on the basis of new and increased active duty pay was only a moral obligation. However, just last year Secretary McNamara submitted a memorandum to the Senate Armed Services Committee which demonstrated beyond doubt that the authority for recomputation of pay is definitely based on clear provisions of law rather than on a mere practice. The Comptroller General, Secretary McNamara disclosed, has consistently held that section 6149 United States Code, title 10, and other laws establish this right. The abovementioned section reads in part, "* * * the retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates."

In 1922, Congress departed from the traditional principle of recomputation but promptly corrected its error in the next Congress. The principle prevailed until 1958. In a drastic and sudden action, with no warning to retired personnel, Congress provided that all officers who retired prior to June 1, 1958, would only receive a 6-percent "cost of living increase." Because the 1958 Pay Act corrected the situation where grades of lieutenant colonel and above had been underpaid for many years, this created a considerable injustice to officers on the retired list. Ironically, many of the officers affected by this repudiation of a long-standing commitment were those who served in two world wars.

At page 1577 of the hearings an experienced recruiting officer testified as follows:

"Every man on the retired rolls and on active duty has been told by the recruiting officials that his retired pay would be based upon the active duty pay scales."

We all know that fringe benefits, including retired pay, have always been offered as an inducement for servicemen to accept less money in the military than they would receive in civilian life.

We believe it is out of character for the U.S. Government to make a promise and then refuse to keep it. We do not believe that budgetary considerations can replace morality.

Former President Eisenhower urged Congress to correct the mistake it made in 1958, and on May 12, 1960, the House unanimously passed H.R. 11318 which would allow those retired after June 1, 1958, to recompute on the basis of the 1958 act. President Kennedy committed himself to the principle of recomputation in his campaign of 1960 and Defense Secretary McNamara recommended that the bill before you today allow recomputation on the basis of the 1958 act. Additionally, Subcommittee No. 1, after weeks of hearings on this bill, accepted the principle of recomputation and reported it to the full committee.

While we admit that the Department of Defense proposal and the subcommittee recommendations fall short of retaining the traditional concept of recomputation for the future, they at least overcame the wide discrepancy in retirement pay between those who retired May 31, 1958, and those who retired on the following day. We believe the full committee erred in not accepting the subcommittee recommendations.

According to established scales of comparability with civil service, active duty military personnel have always been underpaid. Part of this has been made up through noncontributory retirement, hospital benefits, commissary privileges, and other benefits. Even after decreasing comparable civil service pay by the 6½ percent retirement deduction and increasing military pay to include the taxes which are not paid on subsistence and quarters allowance, the pay of a colonel under this bill is almost $200 a month below that of his civil service counterpart. Certainly with such a differential, the military man should be able to look forward to the fulfillment of what he had been promised upon entering the service. Removing the right to recompute will be one fringe benefit gone. Already we have taken the practical benefit of commissaries away, and present policy is to eventually make it impossible for retirees to receive medical care and hospitalization. One by one, the fringe benefits are disappearing and the pay differential remains. How long can we expect our military people to feed their families on their great sense of duty and patriotism?

It is a common error to state that the military retiree does better than his civil service counterpart. The truth is that the military man who serves a full 30 years is not doing as well as the civil servant who gets longevity and can increase his "high 5" average years. After 30 years of service he can go up to as high as 80 percent of his "high 5" average. On the other hand, the military man gets only 75 percent of his basic pay and is not given retirement credit for

his allowances. Figures clearly show that the civil servant draws more retirement pay than military men of equal rank and equal years of service. After 2½ to 3 years, the civilian has gotten back all of his contribution.

In fiscal year 1963 the Government's share of civil service retirement was $896 million. At present the civil service retirement fund is deficient actuarily by $36 billion.

Military retirees have generously contributed to their retirement through acceptance of substandard wages based upon comparability tables. Furthermore, military retired pay was not conceived as a pension and has never been considered as such. In the case of *United States* v. *Hooper* (U.S.C.M.A. 643–645) in 1958, the Court of Military Appeals held in part: "Officers on the retired list are not mere pensioners in any sense of the word * * * the salaries that they receive are not solely recompense for past services, but a means devised by Congress to assure their availability * * * in future contingencies." This is why members of the retired list are still subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Retired pay is different than civil service pensions and should not be compared with them. But if one insists upon making a comparison, then he should remember that it is not more of a financial drain on the Nation's future revenues than civil service retirement, it is not as generous, and it has been earned by the serviceman through the acceptance of comparably lower rates of pay.

It is true that the retired list will be expanded dramatically in the near future. But this is the cost of World War II and the Korean conflict and the huge force levels required in the past 25 years. This is the fulfillment of a promise made to those who served their country during its period of greatest trial.

A good portion of the national debt is represented by the cost of our national defense in the past 25 years. No one would suggest that we repudiate our bonded indebtedness and refuse to pay interest to our bond holders. Why then should we repudiate our promise to the men and women who served in our military forces?

For the sake of $32 million, the cost of recomputation, a vital tradition has been destroyed and a solemn commitment has been violated. The $32 million cost would decrease each year as the numbers of those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, would deplete. It will eventually disappear as an annual cost.

The $32 million increase in the cost of this bill will still keep the total figure below that which has been requested by the President in his fiscal year 1964 budget.

Appropriations for veterans benefits continue to increase and the deficit in the civil service retirement fund increases. Always there is money to pay these increased costs. We believe we can find the money to keep our commitments to retired military men.

We strongly urge that as a matter of honor and justice, the Department of Defense recommendations allowing those on the retired list to recompute their retired pay on the basis of the 1958 act, should be adopted.

Legislative Conflict of Interest

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in stating for the RECORD my personal financial situation.

Upon election to Congress, I withdrew from my law firm and from the practice of law and I receive no legal fees.

I own no stocks or bonds and I am not a member, officer, or director of any business enterprise. My assets consist of a small savings account, life insurance, my contributions to the Civil Service retirement system and an equity in my home in Ohio. My salary as a Member of Congress constitutes more than 90 percent of my annual income.

Hjalmar Petersen on the Appearance of Theodore Roosevelt in Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Mr. Hjalmar Petersen, publisher of the Askov American, has had a long political career in Minnesota. He was Governor of the State in 1936. He has been a railroad and warehouse commissioner since 1955. He has been an active leader of the Farmer-Labor Party and later of the Democratic Farm-Labor Party.

Early in his political career he was in Milwaukee to hear Col. Theodore Roosevelt campaigning under the Bull Moose ticket. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Petersen's article recounting that eventful evening be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT TAKES MORE THAN THAT TO KILL A BULL MOOSER—THOSE WERE THE EXACT WORDS OF THEODORE IN THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE 50 YEARS AGO

(By Hjalmar Petersen)

Theodore Roosevelt, the 26th President of the United States, was the youngest man to attain that highest office, at the age of 42.

A very vigorous man, "Teddy," as he was familiarly known, once said: "In order to be truly great a man must blend a life of study with a life of activity."

Before relating the story of the attempted assassination of Theodore Roosevelt in the city of Milwaukee during the presidential campaign of 1912, when your writer was present to hear him speak, let us review his life's experiences briefly.

Theodore Roosevelt was born in New York City on October 27, 1858. He died in 1919, at the age of 61.

In 1881, at the age of 23, he was elected to the New York Assembly. Elected twice more as Sate lawmaker. He worked closely with the then Gov. Grover Cleveland, Democrat.

In 1884, after the death of his mother and his first wife, Roosevelt bought a ranch on Little Missouri River in North Dakota. He hunted buffalo and enjoyed ranch life, though lost money in cattle and land speculation.

He enjoyed writing and "Winning of the West" was one his best books.

Roosevelt married Edith Kermit Carow, a childhood friend, in 1886.

Benjamin Harrison defeated Grover Cleveland for President in 1888. Roosevelt was appointed U.S. Civil Service Commissioner and he worked hard for the merit system.

Roosevelt was appointed president of the police board, New York City, in 1895. He was aggressive and fought to stamp out dishonesty in the police force.

At 38, he fought for William McKinley, Republican, as President. He became Secretary of the Navy, and prepared for the Spanish-American War because of Spain's abuses in Cuba.

Roosevelt was elected Governor of New York on his war record, and while in that office recognized the need for curtailing the power of entrenched wealth.

In 1900, Roosevelt was elected Vice President with President William McKinley. In that campaign, Teddy delivered upward of 700 speeches. Six months later, Roosevelt became President when McKinley was assassinated.

Roosevelt knew that big business interests of that day not only gambled but cheated, so pleasant relations between big business and Roosevelt did not last long. He was influenced by his sense of moral rightness and moral wrongness.

The Panama Canal was built in Roosevelt's time and the gold rush in Alaska was exciting.

A quote from the World Book Encyclopedia: "No President before him had done so much to educate the people on the problems of the day."

Theodore Roosevelt died on January 6, 1919. He was buried at Sagamore Hill in Oyster Bay, N.Y.

The mistress of the White House, Edith Carow Roosevelt, was a fitting partner for the man known as the "Apostle of Energy."

COLONEL ROOSEVELT SPOKE WITH A BULLET IN HIS CHEST

The 12th of October, in the year 1912, was a beautifu day in the city of Milwaukee, Wis. It was the evening that Col. Theodore Roosevelt was scheduled to give a political speech at the Milwaukee auditorium in his campaign for President on the Bull Moose ticket.

I got to the auditorium about 7 o'clock that evening to be sure of getting a good seat, not too far from the speaker, so as to be able to hear every word, for I was already then much interested in politics and government.

A brass band was playing familiar national airs and popular music. Roosevelt bandanas were being sold (I still have my bandana) and there was an air of suspense to see and hear this popular vigorous former President who was now again a candidate for the presidency.

A few minutes after 8 o'clock, when the dignitaries had been seated on the stage, a man came rushing out from back of the scenes and shouted: "Is there a doctor in the auditorium?" Ten or more doctors filed up and went behind the scenes. Those of us in the audience were naturally wondering if anything had happened to the speaker of the evening.

After an interval of 5 to 10 minutes of hurried examination the doctors, with Colonel Roosevelt, entered the stage. The colonel was seated and the chairman of the evening announced in these few words: "In spite of a bullet in his chest, the great colonel will speak this evening."

There was tremendous applause from the audience and when it had died down, a man up in the galleries shouted: "We're from Missouri, Teddy, we want to be shown."

Standing there and looking pale, the Colonel ripped open his coat and vest. There was blood all over his white shirt. He shouted: "But it takes more than that to kill a Bull Moose."

The colonel then buttoned his vest and coat and took out his eyeglasses from the case. Likewise, he took from his coat pocket

the manuscript of the speech he had intended to deliver that evening in retaliation to what Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic candidate for President, had said in New Jersey. The bullet had passed through the eyeglasses case. He admitted that he did not feel as well as usual and, therefore, would speak at random.

I was fortunate enough to be in a seat in the seventh row so could hear well and had good visfon of what was taking place.

In about the middle of the speech, the colonel was wavering slightly and he was very pale, no doubt from the loss of blood. An elderly lady in the row just ahead of me arose partially and asked: "Colonel, don't you think you better stop"? Roosevelt was sharp enough to get that remark and directing his attention to the woman, he said: "My dear lady, I'm all right and when I get through here, these men (pointing to the doctors) will take care of me."

The speech went on, lasting altogether about 40 minutes. In the meantime, all arrangements had been made for a special train to take Colonel Roosevelt to a hospital in Chicago. Another special train was to take his daughter, Alice Roosevelt Longworth, from Ohio to Chicago, so that she could be at the bedside of her illustrious father.

Coming to Milwaukee that day, Colonel Roosevelt was a guest at the Gilpatrick Hotel on Third Street, only a few blocks from the auditorium. When he left the hotel for the auditorium, the street was crowded with thousands of admirers, all of whom wanted to be near the colonel. It was then that a person rushed up and fired three bullets, one of them taking effect in the chest of the colonel. Within a few minutes, however, he was at the auditorium for his address.

Excitement ran high in the old brewer city that night. The person who did the shooting was from New York City and lived there at the time Roosevelt was police commissioner of the city. The would-be assassin was apprehended immediately and lodged in the Milwaukee city jail. He served 31 years, until his death, at the Wisconsin State Prison in Waupon. During all that time he had never received a letter from anybody and no personal callers.

An operation was performed on Roosevelt at the hospital. The bullet had lodged in a rib and was never removed. He lived 7 years thereafter and even enjoyed a lion hunt in Africa with friends.

The result of that 1912 presidential election was that Woodrow Wilson, the Democrat, won out. Theodore Roosevelt, Bull Mooser, came in second, and President William Howard Taft, Republican, was third.

Proposed Legal Holiday—Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 22, 1963, the anniversary of the birth of George Washington, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 48 to make the 17th of September a legal holiday.

The Daughters of the American Revolution has passed a resolution endorsing this proposal and I ask leave to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE CONSTITUTION

Whereas the President of the United States, in accordance with a joint resolution passed by the Congress October 9, 1962, issued a proclamation dated October 10, 1962, designating the period from September 17, 1962, to July 4, 1963, inclusive, as a period dedicated to a renewal of national awareness of the priceless heritage which the Constitution represents and calling upon the people of the United States during that period to engage in such educational and inspirational activities as will deepen their understanding of the Constitution and strengthen their devotion to it; and

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a Senate joint resolution to make the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge all its chapters to respond to the President's request by continuing through July 4, 1963, the observance of this most significant anniversary in our history and urge the Congress to pass the resolution which will make September 17 of each year a legal holiday, to be known as Constitution Day.

Philanthropic Contributions by One American Corporation, the Polish National Alliance, Have Benefited American Education in the Amount of More Than $5 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed among the people of our Nation that our greatest single resource for the continuance of democracy is the intellectual capacity of our Nation's citizens.

We Americans have developed institutions of higher learning which not only manifest the culture of America but also are a source of inspiration throughout the world.

I am very proud to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that the Polish National Alliance, the largest Polish-American fraternal organization in the world, which has its headquarters in Chicago but which has local chapters in virtually every community of the United States, has contributed more than $5 million to Alliance College, which is supported by the Polish National Alliance, in Cambridge Springs, Pa.

This vast contribution by the Polish National Alliance to maintain an excellent institution of higher learning should be a source of satisfaction to all Americans. Through its efforts to help Alliance College, the Polish National Alliance manifests an abiding desire to help maintain educational standards in the United States unequaled anywhere in the world. These impressive contributions by the Polish National Alliance reflect again what a tremendous impact this imposing organization has exerted on the development of our Nation.

The Polish National Alliance stands as a beacon for Americans of Polish descent to help guide them to those attributes which have made America a citadel of hope for people throughout the world.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, and Mr. Edward Kozmor, censor of this fine fraternal organization, have worked arduously toward helping Alliance College become one of the finest institutions of higher learning in America. The entire membership of the Polish National Alliance joins these two dedicated officers in helping provide young Americans these impressive educational opportunities in a setting just south of Erie, Pa., which inspires great appreciation of nature's beauty.

Alliance College lies in a lovely valley of the Allegheny Mountains. Before World War II the free Government of Poland sent thousands of evergreen saplings which have grown into giant trees and transform the entire Alliance College campus into a virtual wonderland. It is in this beautiful setting blessed by nature that students pursue their intellectual curiosities.

Alliance College stands today as a living monument to the high ideals espoused by the Polish National Alliance and its membership. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the early Polish settlers who landed with Captain Smith in Jamestown in 1608 would have found great pride in knowing that some day their successors on the American Continent would make such an impressive contribution to the educational and cultural growth of America.

Following is a list of contributions made by the Polish National Alliance to Alliance College. From the time the college was founded until 1929, the Polish National Alliance had given the college $1,595,190.58. Annual gifts thereafter amounted to:

1930	119,985.78
1931	124,496.28
1932	124,377.04
1933	116,149.70
1934	116,995.60
1935	110,946.34
1936	133,449.21
1937	126,229.58
1938	129,032.77
1939	122,814.03
1940	82,240.37
1941	76,497.72
1942	76,143.68
1943	80,511.33
1944	81,486.93
1945	83,894.03
1946	85,588.14
1947	83,816.48
1948	135,208.75
1949	78,650.07
1950	80,515.73
1951	92,249.08
1952	123,079.46
1953	119,069.70
1954	119,161.12
1955	115,732.92
1956	164,026.69
1957	113,713.40
1958	108,363.24
1959	109,360.24
1960	128,765.08
1961	126,244.50
1962	143,027.05
Total from 1912 through Dec. 31, 1962	5,227,012.62

This impressive list of contributions clearly demonstrates how one American corporation, composed largely of the sons and daughters of immigrants from Poland, contributed to America's educational needs. I trust we can all agree that so long as private corporations such as the Polish National Alliance continue contributing toward the educational needs of this country, our future is secure. Only through intellectual achievement can Americans demonstrate to the people of the world that indeed our system of government offers the greatest degree of hope for mankind.

Mount Holyoke Panel Discussion on "Women in Government": Congresswoman Edith Green and Public Housing Commissioner Marie C. McGuire Are Participants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the series of events commemorating the 125th anniversary of the founding of Mount Holyoke College, at South Hadley Falls in my congressional district, was a panel discussion on Tuesday of this week entitled "Women in Government: Facing Human Needs." Our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon, Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, was one of the participants, and another was Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration.

Under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the newspaper account of the discussion taken from the Springfield Union of April 10:

WAR BETWEEN THE SEXES FUN, BUT NEW CLICHES ARE REQUIRED, PANELISTS TOLD

SOUTH HADLEY.—Some new cliches for women, a discussion in depth of the public housing problem, and a general condemnation of men were covered in the second in a series of four panels at Mount Holyoke College Tuesday evening.

MISS FLEESON MODERATOR

Moderator was Miss Doris Fleeson, a syndicated Washington correspondent, who started the panel rolling as she noted her distaste for being told "you think like a man." She said the war between the sexes has been "a lot of fun, but we need some new cliches. Thinking has no sex," she said.

Miss Fleeson introduced the panel of four as "women who have entered fields previously restricted to men."

First speaker in the panel entitled "Women in Government—Facing Human Needs," was Mrs. EDITH GREEN, U.S. Representative from Oregon. She spoke on Federal support of higher education. Described as being one of the most forceful women in Congress, Mrs. GREEN is now serving her fifth term.

She said there is a tremendous need for better financing in regard to education. "Since we must realize that we are living in the space age, we must do better with our schools," she said. She quoted remarks by President Kennedy to the effect that the progress of the Nation can be no swifter than the progress in educational fields. Figures show, she said, that 80 percent of scientists most widely respected for their work are living today, and that 50 percent of the most valuable research knowledge has come since 1950.

REGARD FOR RICKOVER

She noted the tremendous regard she has for Admiral Rickover, called the father of the atomic submarine, although he has not been popular with her committee, which has under study means of aiding higher education. Rickover, she said, felt that funds should be taken from the defense budget and applied to educational fields.

Mrs. GREEN said there is a strong lobby for an increased space budget, but that there is no unified voice for education. There are some 2,000 institutions eligible for Federal aid, yet 90 percent of Federal funds are channeled to but 100 institutions, she said.

She said a major consideration of her committee is whether to continue to pump Federal funds into areas that have defied Federal laws, and referred to the South. She also mentioned that the committee has under study means to further assist students at the higher education levels in continuing their studies.

The problem of high school dropouts also was taken up by Mrs. GREEN, who said that she believed that the solution to the problem started with youngsters in the fourth and fifth grades. She referred to a Negro girl in elementary school that was from an underprivileged family, but with an IQ of 170. She said she hopes for a program of guidance and counseling for the younger children as well as those on the college level, and hoped that this program would expand to both extremes of the age group.

FAVORS CENTERS FOR EXCELLENCE

A bill filed by the Oregon Representative is now up for consideration calling for a cooperative center for academic excellence. In line with this she praised the program shared by local colleges—Amherst, Smith and Mount Holyoke, along with the University of Massachusetts. She said, however, that this cooperation could well extend to libraries and mean a better use for the Federal dollar.

She said each year 1 million drop out of high school, and that the heart of the matter would appear to be a lack of institutions giving trade skills. With further emphasis on this, she said, "We will not have the problem of the unemployed or the unemployable."

"For years," she said, "we have built bowling alleys with Federal funds instead of classrooms."

She also mentioned the "muddy area" of the religious issue in regard to Federal funds. She wondered to the college audience why "a Sunday school donation was tax deductible, while a Monday school donation was not."

She stressed the need for more Federal aid to education with figures indicating that 515,000 took national merit scholarship exams for 1,000 grants.

MRS. BARISH, SPEAKER

Mrs. Emilia C. Barish, counselor of the permanent mission of Costa Rica to the United Nations, told of "conserving Costa Rican resources."

Mrs. Barish said that great efforts are underway to conserve the resources of Costa Rica, and particularly efforts have been channeled to public health, mental health, preventive medicine, shelter for the aged, and free prenatal care. In the social field, she said, other efforts are being directed toward protecting the laborer, somewhat in line with this country's social security.

She made reference to President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, and said that the Costa Rican budget now allotted 30 percent for education. But, she added, Costa Rica is unable to maintain the pace without the Alliance assistance.

In regard to women in Costa Rican politics, she noted that the pace was slow, but that there is now a woman ambassador to the Organization of American States, and 3 years ago there was a woman minister of education.

TELLS OF WORLD BANK ROLE

"The role of the World Bank today" was the topic of the third speaker—Miss Alice A. Brun, executive director for the Nordic countries in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

She explained the World Bank as consisting of shareholders representing states throughout the world. There are now 83 members. The bank was created shortly after World War II, and now has capital of $20 billion. Only one-tenth of this, she said, is in real money, with some $18 billion in guarantees from member states. The total amount lent by the World Bank to date is $7 billion, and some 60 countries have received loans. She explained the World Bank as a system to aid struggling countries leading to "liberty and welfare of the people."

Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, speaking on "prospects for better housing in the United States," was the final speaker on the panel. Mrs. McGuire is U.S. housing commissioner.

There is no housing problem with people who have a steady income, she said. The real problem is with housing for people of a low income. She said, in bringing the problem close to home, that she noted that abject ugliness of the countryside on her train trip to the campus from New York. There are some 9 million substandard homes in the country, she said.

She said it was 1937 when Congress first moved for Federal aid for public housing, and that for the past 25 years it has been a controversial issue. "However, we are thinking differently than we did in 1937, and urban renewal projects are doing a great deal to point up the problem." She noted the matter of increased longevity as a major problem.

A new problem has arisen recently in the field of Federal assistance for public housing, she said. Recently 46 different tribes of Indians have requested low rent housing, and she cited the difference in tribal customs as being an important factor to be considered.

LONG, HARD LOOK

But in regard to federally assisted housing projects, Mrs. McGuire said that the Federal Government is taking a long, hard look at the possibility of rehabilitation of older homes. She said "We can no longer afford to build new housing entirely." She feels that many of the "gray" neighborhoods can be rehabilitated and attract private capital. "Many cities are running out of land," she said, "and whether we like it or not we will have to accept family living in high-rise buildings." She said that it is on request of President Kennedy that the U.S. Housing Commission is taking a detailed look at group living.

She also mentioned that the Commission is concerned with designs for the handicapped, which is "something we didn't think about in the 1930's."

Summing up her discussion of housing, Mrs. McGuire said that the problem of slums cannot be solved by federally assisted public housing—but it is a start. "We must have the motivation," she said.

MISS FLEESON AMUSES

Earlier in the day, Miss Fleeson amused a large gathering of newsmen as she scored men in general, but more particularly male newsmen and politicians. "There are so few

women in Congress," she said, "that we can't impose a sense of housekeeping." She said the new Senate dining room is worse than the old, and planned by men. "There is more room for tables and noise—but the same lousy food."

"People fail to use their ability," she said in the informal discussion. Hotels still think in terms of the traveling man—and resort to high bathroom hooks and fluorescent lighting.

Pointing to Massachusetts, she alluded to a rather tender point for a number of motorists. "Your numbers are peeling off your license plates—there should be another rally of the minutemen."

In line with the 125th anniversary program at the college, and more particularly the panels this week, Mrs. GREEN joined with Miss Fleeson in some gentle ribbing of the male side of the picture. In response to a question on cooperation from male Members of Congress she said there was as much cooperation between male and female Members as there was between male and female members of the press. "The idea is to keep women barefoot and pregnant—but today women want a voice."

Miss Fleeson said she had not observed that men don't want women, but noted that in Washington she is barred from the National Press Club, and in Los Angeles she has to take a separate elevator from male entrants.

The Padre of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it may be interesting to my distinguished colleagues to know that Father Joseph F. Thorning, the world-renowned priest-scholar who offered the prayer today on the 19th annual celebration of Pan American Day is a citizen of the Free State of Maryland and a resident of my own community in the heart of Maryland. It may also be considered noteworthy that this friend of many Members of the U.S. Congress, including myself, was first described as "the padre of the Americas" by one of the great leaders of the legislative branch of our Government. I refer, of course, to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, now the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. It was this gentleman, himself distinguished for his vision and valor in the development of the good-neighbor policy, who, speaking on the floor of this House many years ago, characterized Dr. Thorning as "The Padre of the Americas." The title became the popular characterization of my friend and constituent.

Indeed, in recent years, the achievements of this apostle of good will have added luster to his name and to his reputation. We in Maryland are happy to know that, each year, Dr. Thorning, by conscientious research, study, and writing, enriches our Maryland heritage by his devotion to religious principles, great American traditions, and the ideals of freedom. This is added evidence of his love of God and country. It also explains why numerous leaders of the Congress of both political parties and all religious faiths have welcomed this Maryland priest, educator, author, and diplomat to the House of Representatives for 19 consecutive years to invoke God's blessing upon us and our labors for the Commonwealth.

It is a privilege for me, as the Representative for the Sixth District of Maryland, to join my esteemed colleagues of both parties in expressing respect, admiration, and affection for a servant of God who has deserved well of the Republic. In the words of another friend and a distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, we can all believe that the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Frederick County, Md., will be remembered in the history of the United States of America and the Western Hemisphere and throughout the Iberian Peninsula as "a great American and a man of God."

The archidocese of Baltimore can be happy that such a faithful priest serves in its historic jurisdiction. And, as a Member of the Maryland congressional delegation, I would like to congratulate Father Thorning's archbishop, the Most Reverend Lawrence Joseph Shehan, D.D., LL.D., upon the contributions to the cause of inter-American amity which have been made by Father Thorning and other members of his archdiocese, both priests and lay leaders, at a time when such service to God is also national service.

A Tribute to the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki, Member of Congress From the Second District, Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my sincere pleasure to participate in a tribute to Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI sponsored by the Department of Wisconsin, Polish Legion of American Veterans, in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am sure my colleagues will be happy to learn of the very high regard that the people of Milwaukee and, indeed, of Wisconsin have for our colleague from the Second District in Wisconsin.

Throughout the evening, it was evident that those participating in this tribute recognized CLEM ZABLOCKI's impressive contribution as a Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs toward helping carve an effective foreign policy for the United States.

It would be difficult to fully describe CLEM ZABLOCKI's impressive contribution toward a better understanding by all Americans of the serious problems with which the free world is faced in Berlin, in Laos, in Vietnam, in the Soviet Union, in Red China, and in Latin America.

CLEM ZABLOCKI's wise judgment and penetrating counsel have been woven deep throughout all the great decisions in the difficult field of foreign relations and international affairs made by our Nation in the past decade. I was happy to bring to the people of Wisconsin a picture of how thoroughly CLEM ZABLOCKI is respected here in Congress on both sides of the aisle and yes, Mr. Speaker, in both Chambers of the Congress of the United States.

His wise counsel and great dedication to the cause of freedom are a source of inspiration to all of us here in Washington and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have dwelled on this particular subject at greater length to those participating in this great tribute to CLEM ZABLOCKI.

It was particularly fitting that Governor Reynolds, of Wisconsin, would personally participate in the tribute to CLEM. The Governor joined the others present in extolling the impressive record of accomplishment that CLEM ZABLOCKI brings, not only to the people of his congressional district in Wisconsin, but yes, Mr. Speaker, to all the people of America.

It was with a deep sense of pride that I observed during this tribute to CLEM the abiding sense of purpose in the American cause that CLEM ZABLOCKI brings to this Congress and to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ZABLOCKI was overwhelmed by the tribute paid him and the truly humble spirit of this great American was best reflected in his own remarks which concluded this very impressive banquet.

I should like to take this privilege to incorporate these remarks in the RECORD today because they so eloquently describe the greatness of our colleague from Wisconsin's Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ZABLOCKI's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF ACCEPTANCE BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER GIVEN IN HIS HONOR BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN, POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, SUNDAY, MARCH 31, 1963

Congressman Pucinski, Governor Reynolds, Mr. Firmin, Mr. Borkowski, Commander Bieganowski, Department Commander Nedweski, Mrs. Wozniak, Mrs. Zalewski, Reverend Taterczynski, the Madrigal Singers of Alverno College, and friends, some of you may remember that recently there was an attempt to name a library for me. At the time, I said it didn't seem like a good idea since public buildings are usually named for deceased persons and I was not dead yet. Tonight I am not sure whether I am really still alive. Sitting here and listening to these tributes is a little like attending one's own funeral.

Seriously, I am sincerely happy to be alive and here to receive this honorary membership citation in the Polish Legion of American Veterans. It is an honor which will be remembered and cherished always.

I only wish my wife could have been here tonight to share in these warm and wonderful proceedings. Unfortunately she could not be present.

This tribute you have paid is not, I know, purely a personal one. It is a tribute to the office I hold as Representative to the Congress of the United States, the most powerful lawmaking body on the face of the earth. It is my privilege to hold this post by the grace of God and the unstinting hard work of my

family, friends, and acquaintances, many of them here tonight. I know you will forgive a personal privilege, if I single out my mother and present her to you. I attribute much to her for what I am.

To you, my friends, belong the real praise, for you have aided me without thought of gain or personal privilege. You have trusted that I would represent you in the Halls of Congress as you would want to be represented, and I hope that I have not betrayed your trust.

I am proud to accept this tribute because to me it signifies in a true sense the basic purpose of the PLAV. Your organization's efforts to promote good citizenship and Americanism are well known.

You honor me not as one of Polish ancestry or solely for having assisted Poland in some way, but to inspire and encourage others to seek service in Government and participate in Government. And that is as it should be. For while we are proud of our national backgrounds, we are prouder still to be Americans, citizens of one of history's great nations.

Our American way of life presupposes a pluralism of racial, national and religious backgrounds. We have a country which is truly unified in its diversities. To my mind it would indeed be a tragic day for our country if all Americans conformed to the same customs, manners and culture. We are not meant to be poured out of one mold.

It is a pleasure and privilege for me to work with Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI in Congress, one of the most heterogeneous groups in our Nation. Congressmen are of varied national backgrounds, hold varied political, philosophical and religious beliefs. They come from all parts of our Nation. The interchange of ideas and wisdom which takes place on Capitol Hill is in no small measure due to the diverse backgrounds of our national representatives.

We can be proud that our country is a melting pot; that each national group has made its contribution to our life and culture. But the process is far from over. There is still much that can be contributed to America by all of us who are interested in preserving for posterity the traditions and culture of our native lands.

As members of the PLAV you have chosen not only to preserve the heritage of America, and attend to the welfare of your fellow veterans and our way of life, but also the glories and triumphs of Poland. The latter you are conveying to your children, and sharing with those who might otherwise never know about them. In doing this you are promoting Americanism just as if you were once again fighting for the freedoms we hold so dear.

Further you are engaged in promoting a better understanding of the real image of Poland and the people of that great nation. Your organization is dedicated: to the restoration of individual human dignity to the unfortunate enslaved brethren; you are dedicated to the liberation of Poland from Communist domination and you are determined that Poland will return to the family of free nations where she rightfully belongs, for Poland has contributed much to the development and culture of the West.

I am confident your work and the efforts of all understanding citizens of this great country of ours will not be in vain.

As a Christian nation, soon to commemorate its millenium of christendom, Poland will never succumb to the pressures and wiles of communism. Poland will be free. Her people will again rise and rejoice. Their voices will again glorify God in thanksgiving and in supplication that freedom shall be through all ages and forever theirs.

To this end not only your organization but all of us are committed. Ours is a great challenge. But our task is not insurmountable. May we be inspired with the zeal and dedication to fulfill our obligation.

In closing, may I again express my sincere gratitude to all of you.

Minnesota Legislature Resolution on Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was sent to me by the Minnesota Legislature. The resolution is in regard to agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
St. Paul, Minn., April 5, 1963.

Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of Resolution 5 of the 1963 Minnesota Legislature regarding agricultural commodities.

Yours very truly,
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

RESOLUTION 5

Resolution memorializing the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Congress of the United States to enter into agreements with members of the European Common Market and other countries which will encourage a greater flow of agricultural commodities into these countries and to resist any attempts to barter away existing favorable trade advantages which agricultural products may now enjoy.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed legislation permitting the President and members of the executive branch of the United States to negotiate with the Common Market for freer interchange of goods under the Trade Expansion Act and other laws; and

Whereas the export of agricultural products to the countries of the Common Market amounted to net earnings of approximately $1 billion in fiscal year 1962; and

Whereas net earnings from the export of industrial products of the United States to the countries of the Common Market have been less than one-fifth of this amount in the same period; and

Whereas Western Europe is America's best dollar market for farm products. The six Common Market countries: France, West Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgian and Luxembourg; buy one-third of all U.S. exports sold for dollars; and

Whereas there could be great pressure from the producers of industrial products to gain an advantage for their products at the expense of the agricultural products of the United States; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota is a large exporter of agricultural products and therefore is vitally concerned in the proper administration of this trade program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the President and the members of the executive branch who are responsible for negotiation with the Common Market and the Congress be requested to provide adequate safeguards to the fullest extent possible for the free flow of agricultural commodities without restrictive tariffs, trade barriers, unreasonable and unnecessary regulations and inspections which tend to react unfavorably against the agricultural imports by these countries; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the U.S. Secretary of State, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, and each Member of the U.S. Congress from the State of Minnesota.

——— ———,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
A. W. KEITH,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives this 27th day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the senate this 28th day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

——— ———,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved: April 3, 1963.
KARL ROLVAAG,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed April 4, 1963.
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

We're Not Suffering From Overproduction; We're Suffering From Underconsumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the April 13 edition of the Saturday Evening Post carries a very revealing article about Sol Polk and the chain of appliance and homefurnishing stores operated by Polk Brothers.

The article points out that Sol Polk is the world's biggest dealer in nationally advertised homefurnishings and appliances.

I am particularly happy to see this national recognition given to Sol Polk because Polk Brothers got its start in the heart of my district on Central Avenue just north of Diversey.

We all experience a sense of pride in knowing that from its humble beginnings, Polk Bros. has risen to a position where today the hundreds of dedicated sales people who move appliances and homefurnishings from the showroom into the living room throughout Chicago are indeed creating a vast number of jobs for people throughout America.

Mr. Sol Polk has coined the philosophical slogan that "We're not suffering from overproduction; we're suffering

from underconsumption." I believe this brief analysis clearly points up his method of positive thinking. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this type of dynamic thinking on the part of America's business community can keep the wheels of our industry rolling.

The fine article on Mr. Polk and his organization follows:

WE'RE NOT SUFFERING FROM OVERPRODUCTION; WE'RE SUFFERING FROM UNDERCONSUMPTION

Sol Polk, a rather ordinary looking 45-year-old bachelor of Chicago, recently saved the good name of America. The State Department, in keeping with its policy of winning friends for the country, had invited a group of French businessmen to witness the wonders of American industry, and the Department's representative was finding the going a bit sticky. Through New York, Pittsburgh, and Detroit the visitors remained visibly bored. "We have more modern steel plants in France," the group's leader remarked, "and just as good assembly lines."

Finally the man from State took his charges to Chicago and introduced them to Polk. Billing himself as the world's biggest dealer in nationally advertised homefurnishings and appliances, Sol Polk is sometimes called the king of the discounters, and after spending a bemused hour or two under his spell the Frenchmen's ennui dissipated like fog under a hot sun. "This," said their leader, "is the first time that anybody has shown us the secret of how to sell."

Polk is indeed uncommonly persuasive on the subject of selling. His creed, repeated over and over again, is, "We're not suffering from overproduction; we're suffering from underconsumption." If so, it's no fault of his. Starting from scratch 28 years ago, he has built Polk Brothers into a 10-store complex which numbers one of every three Chicago families among its customers. Although the business is wholly owned by Sol, his sister, and three older brothers, and does not give out financial statements, the annual gross is estimated to run close to $100 million.

Despite his own success Sol doesn't think much of this country's ability to sell. As researchers and manufacturers, he feels, we're tops. But when it comes to moving the goods, he considers us downright backward. He points to the fact that, even with bank deposits at a record high, only about 9 percent of the Nation's housewives own dishwashers, a state of affairs he equates roughly with original sin.

"You've got to give salesmen back their dignity," he says earnestly. "They're the ones who keep the factories humming, the people employed. Do you know who won the last war? The salesmen. They built the industry we needed to win the war." Warming to his thesis, he continues, "What we need is more advertising, more promotion and better distribution to bring prices down, down, down and customer interest up, up, up."

From the age of 17, when he opened his first store, Sol has done his utmost to bring about that happy state of affairs. While most of his competitors—both discount houses and the department stores which have had to match discount prices—work on a markup of 28 percent or more above cost. Polk Brothers have been able to keep theirs to 18 percent. This keeps profits low, a little more than 1 percent of total sales. But the price differential enables Polk to sell more appliances than all the great department stores on State Street put together.

One reason the company can prosper on such a thin markup is that it stays out of such high rent districts as the Loop. Furthermore, although Polk outlets are clean and adequate, they have no frills. The largest—Polk City on North Central Avenue—will never win architectural prizes. Many would consider it an eyesore: It is garish, guady, and plastered with signs. But it offers an enormous selection of merchandise in all price ranges. Furthermore, Polk stores have instant communication with a huge warehouse to which all orders are immediately transmitted. It is not unusual for a customer to buy something at 10 p.m. and have it delivered to his home by 8 the next morning.

"He's cut all the water out of distribution," says Polk's friend, Red Quinlan, manager of Chicago TV station WBKB. "Yet it's a clean operation. He never asks or gets special prices from manufactures. This kind of merchandising has ruined the small merchant, but Sol is convinced it's good because more people get more things for less money."

Although most people, admirers included, consider Polk a discounter, the word makes him wince. When he thinks of discounters he thinks of bad service, indifferent employees and poor customer relations. Specifically, he thinks of a scene he witnessed not long ago when he scouted a big New York City discount house. Three couples were shopping in the air conditioner department; no salesman offered to help them, and two of the couples finally walked away. The third husband after comparing two models, timidly approached a salesman and asked, "Could you tell us the difference between these two sets?"

"What's the matter, are you blind?" replied the salesman. "The difference is $20."

Such treatment would be unthinkable at Polk Brothers. Polk's 500 salesmen are not just instructed to go out of they way to be helpful, they must go to school 2½ hours each week to become better acquainted with their products. Just after the war, when merchandise was hard to get, Sol never permitted his men merely to take an order for an appliance; they had to sell it. "Someday," he prophesied, "we're going to have to sell, and we don't want to forget how."

To Sol Polk, of course, selling is a game. Like all other born salesmen he can say truthfully, "It's my hobby. I never work at it; I play." And because he has such a good time in his stores he feels this customers should enjoy themselves, too.

"Buying household things is a family affair," he says. To make sure that it works that way his stores are open every day, including Sundays, and on weekdays until 10 at night. "We want the whole family to come," Sol beams, "especially the kids. We even let them play with the knobs and dials. Someday they'll be customers too."

To help turn browsers into buyers, Polk constantly thinks up bonuses for his customers, goodies they can tote home free, or for a nominal sum, if they buy a major appliance. Last year, for example, Polk Brothers gave away 80,000 rose bushes, one with every appliance. If the customer lived in an apartment house he was encouraged to donate the roses to a church. This year the garden giveaway is being repeated.

Over the years Polk customers have walked away with such bonus gifts as crates of oranges from Florida, apples from Washington, watermelons from Georgia, and Christmas trees from Nova Scotia. Sol was particularly proud of the monster watermelons, some of which ran to as much as 90 pounds.

"What does a person do when he's suddenly presented with a melon of that size?" he was asked recently.

"Well, that's the point," explained Sol patiently. "It's too big to put in the refrigerator, and so you give part of it away to the neighbors. In so doing there's a 30-minute conversation telling how it came from Polk Brothers. That's the best kind of advertising, word of mouth."

QUEEN ELIZABETH LENDS A TOE

Sol has demonstrated uncanny instinct for finding promotional stunts in unlikely places. When Queen Elizabeth came to Chicago in 1959 and was scheduled to visit a series of exhibits at Navy pier, Sol donated and installed a red carpet half a mile long for the royal toes to tread. Later this same carpet was used to cover floors in Polk stores. The slogan was inevitable: "We treat every woman like a queen at Polk's."

Perhaps Sol's biggest single promotional effort was "the world's biggest birthday party." In 1955, he took over the Chicago Stadium to celebrate Polk Bros. 20th anniversary, inviting every customer who could produce a Polk's receipt, old or new. Twenty thousand people jammed the stadium to watch Ed Sullivan do his regular Sunday night TV stint as well as to see a complete "icecapades" show. Using their distribution know-how the Polks managed to serve 20,000 people ice-cold soda in a matter of 6 minutes.

If Sol had taken time on the anniversary to look back he might well have reflected on the distance he had come in a few short years. The youngest son of immigrant Jewish parents from central Europe who had settled in Chicago, he got a part-time job selling the Saturday Evening Post at the age of 8. By the time he was 12 he'd become a branch manager. When he finished high school in the depression year of 1935 he took a job selling appliances for Commonwealth Edison, neglecting to tell the company he was not yet 18. He soon had saved $1,000, half of it from his Post earnings. With this he rented a store for $50 a month and set up business as an appliance retailer. After he closed the shop at night he sold his wares door to door, and in no time at all the business had grown big enough to take in his sister and brothers. During World War II they minded the store while he served as an infantry sergeant in north Africa and Europe. It wasn't until he got back, however, that Polk Bros. exploded into the bigtime.

Ever since, Sol has been so busy he hasn't had time for a vacation, much less marriage. Once several years ago he did try to take a holiday. He flew off to Miami Beach after a resounding sendoff by friends and employees; in 3 days he was home again, bored and ready for work. He had not been idle during those 3 days. He'd managed to sell color TV sets to 18 beach-front hotels.

As for matrimony, Sol Polk doesn't seem to have time in his 18-hour working day even for a date. And anyway, as his longtime friend, advertising man Jack Leonard has asked, "How could he get married to a woman? He's already married to a refrigerator."

Because he is so wedded to his appliances, manufacturers constantly consult him on design and production. "I spend a lot of time getting people dissatisfied," he said recently. "I tell manufacturers and designers they're not realizing their potential." At the moment, for example, he is trying to spark a revolution in kitchens.

"I'm angry with kitchens," he declares. "Once you fix 'em you can't change 'em." In the near future, thanks partly to Sol, kitchens will behave more and more like living rooms. Cabinets, stoves, refrigerators and dishwashers will not only look like furniture but will be so movable they can be pushed around just as easily.

Bathrooms also displease Polk, and he envisions the day when they will become "health rooms." These will contain pooltubs for the whole family, electronic-memory scales, laundries that will wash, dry and fold a towel in seconds, exercise equipment, sunlamps, steamrooms, and power showers that will automatically soak, soap, rinse, dry and scent the user as he walks through.

No matter how grand his design for the future, however, Sol has no intention of re-

linquishing the personal touch in selling. The business may grow by millions, but he still plans to spend at least part of his time out there on the floor, selling his customers and insisting that they can have as much fun as he does. He also intends to continue showering them with surprises.

Last Christmas, for example, Sol offered a special sale for major appliance buyers—60,000 plastic Santa Clauses. They were not just ordinary Santas, either. They were 5 feet, 3 inches tall, almost as big as the customers who paid $5 to haul them away. None was shipped; none was boxed. All had to be carried home, as is. The sight of people all over town lugging king-size Santas is one which Chicago could not easily ignore. Its impact on the city can be summed up in the remark of a girl of 6 whose father had taken his Santa Claus home, put a light in it and set it up on the front lawn. When he had finished, he turned triumphantly to his small daughter and asked, "Do you know who that is?"

Without hesitation the girl replied, "Sure. That's Sol Polk."

Perhaps no salesman has ever achieved a more total victory in image building.

Part 15: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba (February 1, 1963–February 7, 1963)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part of my chronology could be termed the "confessional" because various Government officials now began confessing that things had taken place in the Cuban affairs which the public had already learned of through other public statements.

For example, on February 1, Secretary of State Dean Rusk conceded there was indeed a "significant Soviet military presence in Cuba which is of great concern to the United States." Although not news to many, this nevertheless made it official.

Senator STROM THURMOND—southern Democrat—now entered the controversy by statements in a newsletter home as to the military buildup in Cuba. He gave a figure of between 30,000 to 40,000 troops in Cuba, under command of a Soviet general. Secretary Rusk had stated there were 16,000 Soviet troops in Cuba. Pentagon "spokesmen" declared the Senator's information was at wide variance with U.S. intelligence data—and suggested they would appreciate the Senator providing proof of his statements. Although ignoring the challenge he did not change his estimates—instead announced there was between 100 and 200 ballistic missiles, with ranges of up to 2,200 miles, still in Cuba. Pentagon "spokesmen" countered with a statement that there was no evidence of such ballistic missiles in Cuba, and neither was there any evidence of nuclear warheads. Neither won the argument—and neither gave an inch. However, no one cried "partisan politics" for the obvious reason that the Senator was a majority party member.

An Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs also conceded in a television appearance that it was possible Russian troop strength in Cuba was 10 times what it was before the missile crisis in October—but explained the discrepancy in figures by claiming original estimates had undoubtedly been faulty.

Senator STENNIS, whose subcommittee was to investigate the Soviet buildup in Cuba, called for a firm, hard policy in dealing with Soviets in Cuba—and was joined in this by various majority party members, and others.

Congressman DONALD BRUCE, of Indiana, announced that the Soviets had originally sent 82 to 88 medium-range ballistic missiles to Cuba, which meant obviously that since 42 had been removed, almost that same number still remained as a threat to our security. This, too, was promptly disputed.

Several majority and minority party members now took turns making public statements on how bad the situation really was in Cuba—always being swiftly contradicted by Pentagon "spokesmen" and others.

The now famous "eat your hat" offer was made to Secretary McNamara by Senator KEATING. The Secretary accepted the challenge, although admitting he did not really own a hat but would be glad to provide one since he meant to refute the Senators statements. He then made his unprecedented appearance on a nationwide television hookup—on orders of the President—and tried to prove by aerial photographs of missile sites that there were dismantled sites and the missiles sent back to Soviet Russia.

Everyone was admonished to "keep our heads" by the President, and when a reporter sympathetically asked what the administration could now do to convince Republican critics that the Russians had withdrawn all offensive weapons the American public gave a collective snort of derision because it was now obvious the administration was having as much, if not more, trouble convincing members of its own party that this was true.

Which all goes to prove that our beloved Will Rogers was wrong when he said:

There is no more independence in politics than there is in jail.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA [1]—FEBRUARY 1, 1963 TO FEBRUARY 28, 1963

February 1, 1963:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk conceded that there was a "significant Soviet military presence in Cuba which is of great concern to the United States."

In his news conference, the Secretary of State did not depart from earlier administration estimates of the strength of Soviet military personnel in Cuba.

He said the 16,000 Soviet troops there are something "which this entire Hemisphere must be concerned about." He added that he does not believe there has been a recent significant buildup of any major proportions in Cuba.

Sharply different views and figures on the military situation in Cuba were given by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Senator THURMOND said there are reliable estimates that between 30,000 and 40,000 troops in Cuba are under command of a Soviet general. A Pentagon spokesman contradicted the statement.

"Behind the brush curtain around Cuba is a formidable Soviet strategic military base," THURMOND said in weekly newsletter to constituents.

He listed an array of missiles, bombers and other armament which he said "indicates the presence of a complete Soviet army, and the inventory normally assigned to a Soviet air army."

A few hours after THURMOND made the remarks public, a Pentagon spokesman told newsmen:

"The information contained in Senator THURMOND's weekly newsletter is at wide variance with carefully evaluated data collected by U.S. intelligence from continued surveillance and other sources.

"The information obtained by our intelligence has been and is being made public to the extent it does not comprise intelligence sources.

"If Senator THURMOND has proof of any kind to support the information he has released, which differs from official intelligence information, the Department of Defense would like to receive the evidence."

THURMOND made public his estimates without identifying his sources. The size of the Soviet force which he said is under command of Gen. C. O. Slakenzo is at least double the 16,000 to 17,000 Soviet military personnel President Kennedy said are still in Cuba.

The Pentagon spokesman contradicted the Senator's figure of 30,000 to 40,000 Russian troops and took issue with his statement that there are in Cuba missiles with ranges up to 2,200 miles.

THURMOND's statement that there are between 100 and 200 ballistic missiles with ranges up to 2,200 miles was countered with Pentagon insistence that "there is no evidence of any ballistic missiles."

The spokesman also said "we have no evidence of any nuclear warheads."

February 2, 1963:

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, charged the Defense Department with being less than frank about the size of the arsenal.

Brushing aside a Pentagon challenge to supply data on his claim that the island is fast becoming a strategic base for increased Soviet troops and missiles, THURMOND said in a statement:

"The business of gradually and reluctantly admitting more and more Soviet power in Cuba can never bring about a facing up to the situation as it is now.

"Even if the latest admissions by the Defense Department represented all that is in Cuba—which they don't—the most serious questions are raised about our security and our policy on Cuba."

In a newsletter to constituents, THURMOND said he had learned from reliable sources that Cuba is a formidable Soviet strategic base with ballistic missiles and 30,000 to 40,000 troops. A Pentagon spokesman disputed the report.

February 3, 1963:

The United States may be forced to demand that Russia pull its troops out of Cuba just as it demanded that the Soviets remove their offensive missiles and bombers, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, stated.

STENNIS, who heads a Senate subcommittee that will investigate the Soviet buildup, made the statement as the Government prepared

---

Footnote at end of speech.

to issue a new crackdown against foreign shippers engaged in trade with Cuba.

An order that may be issued soon will bar U.S. Government cargoes to shipowners whose vessels have traded with Cuba since January 1. Shippers could free themselves from the ban by removing their vessels from the Cuban trade.

In another development a little more light was thrown on the activities of Soviet troops in Cuba last night by Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. He said in a television interview that the Government believes some of the troops are helping to build "defensive facilities and storage facilities" for the Cuban armed forces.

Martin, appearing on the Howard K. Smith program (WMAL-TV, ABC) said it was possible that Russian troop strength is now 10 times what it was before the missile crisis in October.

Immediately after the crisis, the administration said Russia had between 7,000 and 8,000 troops in Cuba. Officials have said the number is now between 16,000 and 17,000.

"I don't think our figure for last July is accurate enough for me to be sure that it would be 10 times, but I think that this is within the range of possibility," Martin said.

STENNIS, in a separate radio-television interview, said that intelligence data suggested that the Soviet buildup was designed in part to promote "blackmail, subversion, intimidation, threats of coercion, and even an invasion" of smaller countries in the hemisphere.

STENNIS' Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is undertaking an investigation of the Soviet buildup.

"I want to get all the facts, but with this formidable strength, I think we must have a hard, firm policy about it—convince them we are going to be hard about it," he said. "It could lead to the proposition that we'd have to make demands for this force as we did for the missiles and bombers.

He said the subcommittee would try to find out whether the missiles and bombers that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev purportedly removed from Cuba last October "are really gone."

STENNIS said he hoped to make public "basic facts" developed by his subcommittee. He added that "without anyone being accused of wrongdoing," the people have not been told all the facts.

"I think we ought to have a hearing so that there will be congressional information as well as that for the people," STENNIS said. He said he expects the sessions to start with testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Director of of Central Intelligence on Soviet strength in Cuba.

February 4, 1963:

Representative DONALD C. BRUCE, Republican of Indiana, declared in a House speech that diplomats of friendly governments have informed the State Department that Russia originally sent 82 to 88 medium-range ballistic missiles to the Red-controlled island and removed only 42 of them.

The Defense Department promptly disputed the statement, declaring:

"No friendly government has so informed the United States. There remains no credible evidence that there are offensive Soviet weapons in Cuba."

Senator KEATING, in a copyrighted interview published in the U.S. News & World Report, reiterated his charge that Russia is "continuing to maintain medium-range missile sites" in Cuba and is working at some of them around the clock.

He also declared that there are "20,000 or more" Russians in Cuba, including 6,000 to 8,000 combat troops.

Two other Members of Congress contributed to the mounting pressure for tougher administration action in Cuba. Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Republican of Michigan, introduced a resolution calling upon President Kennedy to clear Cuba of all foreign Communist armed forces by whatever means required.

And Representative PAUL ROGERS, Democrat of Florida, asked in a House speech for "effective action" instead of "timid overtures" to end the Communist menace in Cuba.

The Associated Presss quoted McNamara as saying that five types of Russian defensive missiles "undoubtedly are stocked in Cuba."

The five types listed by McNamara were: "(1) Air defense missiles; (2) air-to-air missiles used by fighters to attack other fighters; (3) surface-to-sea missiles used for coastal defense purposes; (4) missiles for coastal purposes fired from patrol-type boats; and (5) ground-to-ground missiles for short-range use against troops in the field."

Meanwhile, the State Department clarified a statement by Assistant Secretary of State Edwin Martin that there might have been a tenfold increase in the number of troops in Cuba since last summer. It declared that Martin meant 10 times the estimate of 1,500 Soviet technicians believed to have been on the island in July.

February 5, 1963:

The United States is moving to tighten up its Cuban policy as the controversy over the extent of the Soviet military buildup continues.

The administration is acting in two ways:

1. Original measures to discourage shipping to Cuba announced in October before the missile crisis will be strengthened and implemented immediately.

2. Brigade 2506, which invaded Cuba in April 1961, will not be supported as a unit by Washington. Members will be encouraged to join Cuban units attached to American forces.

Under a four-point shipping restriction plan announced by the United States about 4 months ago:

1. American ports will be shut to the vessels of any country whose ships carry arms to Cuba.

2. U.S. Government cargoes will be denied to the vessels of any firm whose vessels are employed in Cuba-Communist bloc trade.

3. U.S. shipowners will be prohibited from engaging in Cuban trade.

Secretary McNamara was reported to have told the House Armed Services Committee that statements by lawmakers questioning Defense Department information about the Soviet military establishment in Cuba were "disgraceful" and "irresponsible."

Representative STRATTON charged that Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, "has been guilty of disgraceful irresponsibility in his frantic efforts to get headlines by pretending he knows more about what is going on in Cuba today than do the properly designated intelligence agencies of our Department of Defense."

Senator HUMPHREY, in calling for public hearings, said that Senator KEATING and other Members of Congress unnecessarily created doubt and suspicion by making accusations before giving their information to the CIA.

Simultaneously, Senator DIRKSEN supported charges that Soviet offensive missiles remain hidden in Cuba despite administration denials.

February 6, 1963:

MIAMI (Associated Press).—Manuel Artime, leader of the anti-Castro brigade in the Cuban invasion, said that U.S. military personnel soon will begin training members of the brigade, liberated last Christmas from Cuban prisons.

Artime, in a news conference at his home, said the training would be voluntary and that 1,400 to 1,500 members of Brigade 2506 had been invited to take part.

He said the training by the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force would last 6 to 8 months. It would be conducted at different sites within the United States, according to the type of training.

February 6, 1963:

The United States prohibited foreign-flag ships that trade with Cuba from carrying U.S. Government-financed goods, in an initial step to tighten the free-world economic boycott of that country.

The ban, a White House announcement said, would apply to vessels that have engaged in Cuban trade since January 1, through foreign shipowners who promise to refrain from conducting such trade in the future will be allowed to share in U.S. Government trade.

Already in effect is an edict prohibiting U.S. shipowners from shipping strategic materials to Cuba.

February 6, 1963:

Both the Defense Department and Central Intelligence Agency presented detailed intelligence data and aerial photography to support administration statements that no offensive Soviet weapons remain in Cuba.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara appeared before an extraordinary, 2-hour news conference carried on radio and television to lay out his evidence and submit to questioning by reporters.

Under reporters' questioning, McNamara said he believed that the Russians moved nuclear warheads into Cuba during last fall's missile buildup. But he said that "we observed" the shipment of the vehicles believed to have had A-warheads out of Cuba and back to the Soviet Union.

Earlier in the day, John A. McCone, Director of the CIA, appeared before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee behind closed doors to present the full top-secret intelligence picture on the Russian military situation in Cuba.

A censored version of McCone's statement summarized the same data about the Soviet military force in Cuba that was given in greater detail by McNamara and an aide at the news conference.

The unprecedented presentation of intelligence data, including both high and low-level photographs of Cuban bases and ports, was made by McNamara in the State Department auditorium.

The lengthy intelligence briefing and question-and-answer session were ordered by President Kennedy.

For well over an hour, John Hughes, a top official of the Pentagon's Defense Intelligency Agency, presented slides giving data on the Russian weapons in Cuba, and showing aerial photographs of missile sites, airfields, ports and weapon-laden Soviet ships on the high seas.

The long series of remarkably clear photos traced the early buildup of Russian forces on the island late last summer and fall, and revealed the progress of dismantling the offensive missile bases, the loading of missiles and bombers aboard Soviet ships and their movement back to Russia.

Hughes' commentary also told how the Air Force and Navy reconnaissance planes followed the offensive weapons on trucks along the roads and into the ports. He listed what missiles left on which ships from named ports on specific days.

Other photographs showed the buildup of the defense weapons still remaining—Mig-21 fighters, beach defense areas with antiwarship missiles, SA-2 antiaircraft missiles and the military camps of four Soviet Army armored units, with the latest Russian weapons.

McNamara said the United States has a record of the missiles observed in Cuba and that the exact number has been recorded being removed. He also declared that the entire island was photographed and that

only 42 offensive ballistic missiles were located and that they were observed being shipped back to Russia.

The Secretary was reminded that Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has said that the aerial photography would not show what missiles may be in caves in Cuba. McNamara said it is "unlikely beyond any reasonable doubt" that such weapons could have been unloaded and stored underground.

McNamara seemed to differ a bit from McCone in his appraisal of the reliability of aerial reconnaissance to reveal what is going on in Cuba. The CIA Chief said yesterday that absolute assurance that no missiles are stored in caves can come only from "continuing, penetrating on-site inspection."

The Pentagon leader said aerial reconnaissance would not provide completely reliable data on the number of Soviet troops in Cuba, but that he was satisfied it showed what weapons are there.

KEATING called a new conference before the McNamara appearance to answer questions and propound a long list of questions he felt the Secretary should answer. He also stressed that the 1,100-mile medium-range ballistic missile sites in Cuba were "still in place."

The New York Senator offered to eat his hat in front of the Capitol if McNamara could refute this statement. McNamara was asked about this after photographs described as dismantled IRBM sites were put on the screen.

"I don't have a hat, but I hope he does because he is going to have to eat it on the basis of the evidence we have presented today," said the Secretary.

KEATING later said he had no intention of eating his hat, as McNamara had not satisfied him.

McNamara told reporters that the evidence showed that 5,000 of the 22,000 Russian troops in Cuba last October left when the missiles and bombers were withdrawn.

Remaining in the hands of 17,000 Soviet troops, he said, are: some 24 operational antiaircraft missile sites, each with 6 launchers and a total of 500 missiles; about 42 Mig-21 fighters and 60 other Mig's; 4 operational coastal defense missile sites with 150 missiles; 12 Komar guided-missile patrol boats; 4 armored groups with a total strength of about 5,000 men.

Newsmen wanted to know why these were ruled "defensive," as the question of whether they are for offense or defense depends on intent.

The Secretary said there were no amphibious ships in Cuba able to move any such small force to other countries in this hemisphere. He also declared that the Mig-21's were not now adapted to carry A-weapons, and if they were they would have only enough range to bomb the tip of Florida.

McNamara said he had no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries. He also declared that there is positive evidence that no Russian submarine bases have been built there.

As the conference ended, a reporter asked McNamara whether the newsmen should conclude from his comments that Cuba has become less of a threat, rather than more, in recent weeks.

"Cuba is a lessening military threat to the extent that the military personnel of the Soviet Union and their equipment are being removed," he replied.

"Five thousand Soviet military personnel have moved out in the last 8 or 9 weeks, and there appears to be some continuing movement out. What the future holds, I can't say."

February 7, 1963:

President Kennedy assured the Nation that the Soviet Union's forces and weapons in Cuba are not a military threat to the United States.

He was talking at a news conference about the Cuban situation as it is at the moment. Refusing to prophesy about the future, he said, it could not be proved that the Russians won't again try to ship nuclear missiles to the island.

"The Soviet Union and Cuba and the United States must all be aware that this will produce the greatest crisis which the world has faced in its history.

"So I think that the Soviet Union will proceed with caution and care, and I think we should."

Mr. Kennedy, backing up a statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, said the Russians have reduced the size of their forces and the amount of their equipment since the pull-out of missiles and bombers last fall.

He said it was a time to "keep our heads," that Premier Fidel Castro has been "discredited" in recent months and that the United States and the Soviet Union are continuing talks about the removal of Russian forces and weapons from Cuba. He indicated that the United States had no present thought of an invasion of Cuba.

"You have said that the presence of Russian forces on the island is a matter of concern," a reporter said. "I would like to ask this question: Do you think that Cuba is a serious military threat to the United States?"

"I think we ought to keep a sense of proportion about the size of the force we are talking about," Mr. Kennedy replied, adding that the Russians had about 4 organized military groups in Cuba, totaling about 6,000 men.

"Obviously," he continued, "those forces cannot be used to invade another country. They may be used to maintain some sort of control within Cuba, but obviously they are not a force that can be used externally.

"And, in addition; Cuba cannot possibly, it lacks any amphibious equipment, and, quite obviously our power in that area is overwhelming."

Mr. Kennedy said the big dangers in Latin America—illiteracy, bad housing, maldistribution of wealth, and so on—were unrelated to Cuba. It was at this point that he said that Castro had been discredited since October. But he went on to say that he was concerned about Cuba being used as a training center for Red agents and as a base for propaganda and subversion.

He repeated that Cuba was not a military threat now, and would not become one unless Russia reinforced offensive weapons there.

Asked about the chances of eliminating communism from Cuba, the President refused to make an prediction. One way, he said, would be for the Cubans to revolt, which he thought would be difficult now.

"The other way would be by external action," he said. "But that is war, and we should not regard that as a cheap, or easy way to accomplish what we wish."

A reporter wanted to know what more the administration can do to convince Republican critics that the Russians have withdrawn all offensive weapons from Cuba.

Mr. Kennedy said he didn't know—that Secretary McNamara and CIA Director John McCone had asked anybody possessing information aboute a Russian buildup to turn it over to the Government so that it could be checked.

But even some Members of Congress have refused to do this, after spreading reports and rumors, the President said.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York, said after the President's news conference that he still cannot accept the much touted distinction between offensive and defensive weapons.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican of Florida, another critic of the President, said that Congress had authorized the Chief Executive to use armed force, if necessary, to prevent any further buildup in Cuba, but that mandate is being ignored.

---

[1] Unless otherwise stated excerpted from the Washington Post and the Washington Star; reproduced with the permission of the Washington Post and Washington Star.

The Chicago Committee of One Hundred Makes Its Annual Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the Chicago Committee of One Hundred made its annual awards to an outstanding group of citizens who were designated by this very distinguished organization as "good Americans."

The Chicago Committee of One Hundred was organized in 1941 and has pledged itself, as an organization of business and professional men and women, to foster civic, social, and economic improvements in the city of Chicago. This distinguished group has espoused a philosophy that the leadership which our great Nation can offer a troubled world today totally depends upon its ability to continue producing Americans who are passionately and vigorously dedicated to the sacred ideals which have brought our country to unparalleled greatness.

During this year's presentation ceremony, stress was placed on the fact that the recipients of the Good American Award have helped carve a better image of our Nation by practicing in their daily lives the basic principles of American democracy.

The good Americans selected for 1962 by the Chicago Committee of One Hundred, whose president is Mr. Ernest Rather, included men and women from all walks of life who have one common denominator: An abiding faith in those principals of human dignity which are found in our Nation's Bill of Rights.

Among this year's recipients of the Good American Award were U.S. Attorney General Robert Kennedy; the Most Reverend Bernard J. Shell, auxiliary archbishop of the Chicago Roman Catholic Archdiocese; the Honorable Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps; Col. Jacob M. Arvey, Democratic National Committeeman from the State of Illinois; Mr. J. Paul Austin, president of the Coca-Cola Co.; Marshall Field, Jr., publisher of the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. Speaker, I am listing all of this year's Good American Award recipients at the conclusion of my remarks. It gives me a deep sense of pride that I

had the great honor of being one of this year's Good American Award recipients.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the two principal speeches delivered during the presentation ceremony in Chicago's McCormick Place: the remarks of Mr. J. Paul Austin, president, Coca-Cola Co., and the principal address delivered by Mr. Sterling C. Quinlan, vice president, American Broadcasting Co. Both of these gentlemen were recipients of the Good American Award.

The committee also presented certificates of commendation to 45 corporations in the Chicago area for observing the fundamental right of equality of employment opportunity. I shall include the names of these companies at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Mr. J. Paul Austin follow:

REMARKS BY J. PAUL AUSTIN TO THE COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED

Mr. McKittrick, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen. No one within hearing of these proceedings could fail to note the inspiring endeavor of this Committee of One Hundred—bringing to all of us a living reminder of our heritage and our obligations as Americans.

It is primarily because of my association with one of the world's great international corporations—an organization of people who subscribe to the simple and powerful principles set down in the scroll which constitutes this award.

A good American does not live in a vacuum. The most noble objective of any man is to become a good citizen in his own generation and to bring up good citizens in succeeding generations. A good American is, by a strange paradox, the product of the very environment which he, himself, helps to create. America's greatness is the greatness of her individual citizens and the greatness of her individual citizens is the result of America's greatness.

This principle—expressed in our Constitution and reflected in the worlds of this award seems to me to signify and clarify the duty of everyone who would accept the benefits of citizenship in this Nation. Further it seems to me that each person should, in whatever ways are presented to him, strive to develop in this vibrant, awesome world that sense of character, of competence, of responsibility in the whole of our people that might gain for all of us the increasing respect and confidence and esteem of other free peoples everywhere who would welcome the raising of a standard to which, as our country's first great President said, the wise and honest might repair.

It is therefore difficult or impossible for any of those here tonight who have been singled out for this honor to have the temerity to accept such an honor without a clear acknowledgment of what it means to us as individuals and to those with whom we may associate.

The tenets of this award as set down on the Committee of One Hundred scroll are valid for all men and women—devotion to our truest ideals which transcends all selfish indulgence, a refusal to deny our own Nation's Constitution, the recognition that fairplay is a two-way street and that to accept is to give, to be respected is to respect and to be honored is to honor.

This then is the important democratic principle of man dependent on his neighbor and yet retaining his rights as an individual. This is the bedrock upon which our freedoms rest and the principle which will forever keep us as we are today, a free society.

Following are the excellent remarks of Mr. Sterling C. Quinlan, who was the principal speaker and who is vice president of the American Broadcasting Co.:

REMARKS AT COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED AWARDS DINNER

Well I see some familiar faces around here tonight. And I note some of the winners. All smiling, all dressed up, brilliant, capable, humble.

Yes, the biggest of them are humble. Because they're not boys any longer. They know it's a short way out no matter how you look at it. Our life, our human condition is not a long trail that knows no turning. It's a short road that knows a definite turning, and we know where it turns. And it turns too soon for most of us.

That makes us humble. Very humble.

We're sitting around this campfire tonight in the city of Chicago calling ourselves good Americans.

I don't know what a good American is.

I wish I did.

I've been told that I am a good American. But I can't really say I am because I don't really know.

The American today is torn as never before. Split from pillar to post, he faces personal and national challenges he never faced before. He has a responsibility that he both wants and yet shrinks from. He must be all things to all peoples. His heart goes out to the Nations of the world and yet he knows he must lead by direction and example those very nations which may envy or even hate him.

He knows that he must set a moral example that is frightening in itself—because he never knew that, so soon, he would be required to exhibit such vaunted leadership.

Leadership is a tough plateau. If you are a good American, you're in a rough spot. Every time you prove it, you wince a little.

I say this still with the admission that I'm not entirely sure what a good American is; but, I submit, there is a feeling about it. Sometimes you know. And most of the time when you're not a good American, you'll be damned sure that you've been just the opposite of a good American.

The feel. The feel. Yes, the feel of it—that's what I'm trying to say. And I realize that it is a little incongruous for a person like me who has to be competitive in the marketplace every day, to be talking to you, some of whom are among the most brilliant brains in our society today, to be talking about the "feel" of being a good American. But I think it's coming to this. A national conscience is beginning to emerge in our land.

No matter what is said, I submit that, as a species, we are emotional animals with a rational overlay; rather than the reverse. The heart rules; the emotions rule; the senses rule. The mind slowly keeps up, resisting change, cautioning our other instinctive reflexes—and sometimes improving our emotional natures.

My evidence for this is that all the words to live by have been written in the past. All of them.

We don't need new words to express our aspirations, our goals, our responsibilities. Our need and hunger for love, respect, and human dignity. Listen to these words:

"Every civilization rests on a set of promises: moral promises about how to behave toward each other, physical promises about how to use our economic system. If the promises are broken too often, the civilization dies, no matter how rich it may be, or how mechanically clever. Hope and faith depend on the promises; if hope and faith go, everything goes.

"We Americans have promised each other to treat our neighbors as equals. The promise rests on our old creed that every man has in him something of the divine, some spark of the eternal, which gives him as much right to be taken seriously as every other man.

"This is a noble promise, and from it has come our liberty, and such democracy as we possess; but it must be expressed in terms of action, of something we can all do every day.

"Here is something definite which we can all do. We can do it without passing a law, without running for office, without founding a committee. We can do it on our own, without asking anybody's permission.

"We can start today by treating each other—rich and poor, Jew and Irishman, Mexican and Chinese, Negro and white—as if we believed in the basic promise which is America."

Those are pretty good words—the last few paragraphs. They're not mine. They were written a long time ago by Herbert Agar, editor of "A Time for Greatness," and I found them in a slim volume called "Words To Live By"—a volume that gathers dust in a bookcase in my office.

Yes, we have the words, ladies and gentlemen; have had them for a long time. Like cliches, they're only meaningful as we invest meaning in them.

Well, I began by saying I didn't know what a good American is. Only by the most intense kind of self-examination, can a person determine if he is a good American. And even then he may be deluded by a monumental ego.

But I'll tell you this: An American who has doubts about how good an American he is—that person, I think, has a chance of becoming a good American.

I guess that's the point I'm trying to make.

Self-examination, self-scrutiny, within a framework of strength, this is the formula that helps one be a good anything.

I have my own little formula in this regard. Being of Irish extraction, I recognize a sense of humor as being invaluable in keeping one's values in focus.

I live next to a cemetery. Well, almost. Half a block away, I pass a cemetery. A Jewish cemetery. There's a fine little monument that meets my eye as I take that road every day. It proclaims in well-chiseled workmanship, the fact that Liebowitz rests there. Every day Liebowitz and I have a little dialogue. With my hpyerthyroidic imagination, I sometimes fancy that Liebowitz is talking back to me—without an accent.

And the other day he forcefully reminded me of my friend, Muldoon.

Now Liebowitz I didn't know. Muldoon, I did. In fact, I helped bury Muldoon several months ago.

I attended Muldoon's wake, and a very fancy affair it was. Reminiscent of the gala Irish wakes of bygone days.

Muldoon was a sight to behold. Lying there resplendent in the best bronze coffin his Knights of Columbus insurance policy could afford. Muldoon looked wonderful. He had been to Florida for the winter, and he had a beautiful sunburn. In fact, he was still peeling. And I had an irresistible urge to reach down and pull a large piece of skin off the edge of Muldoon's nose.

Now Muldoon wasn't an earth shaker, if you know what I mean. He wasn't an Olympic champ at anything. He had more than his share of hates and prejudices. And he liked his fifth of sour mash every day, that's what he liked. (Although, in later years, a fifth could last 2 days, because his liver got so bad.)

But in later years, Muldoon took to reading. Reading all those words that have been written through the years. And Muldoon came to realize what a damn fool he'd been

for many, many years. For one thing, Muldoon began to like the Jews, Jews whom he had hated heretofore, Jews who had never hated him.

Well, this shows you what kind of a pickle Muldoon had been in. What kind of problems he had to overcome.

But he did overcome them, or at least a great many of them. You see, the words alone didn't do it. Muldoon had to be in the mood for the words. He had to have the feel for the words.

As I pass Liebowitz every day now, I can't help but think that Muldoon and Liebowitz are off there somewhere playing gin rummy and kibitzing about the rest of us trying to be good Americans.

I'm sure Liebowitz didn't have Muldoon's problem, and I'm glad Muldoon caught up with his own.

Somewhere between those two points—between Liebowitz who didn't know the problem existed, and Muldoon who finally overcame it—somewhere between those two points, most of us exist. And there, in that vital area, is where we begin to be good Americans. There are many other criteria, to be sure, but that one is pertinent to this fine evening.

Thank you very much. This honor this evening shall help me to try and be a better American tomorrow than I was today. And as I travel to work Monday I shall proudly tell Liebowitz all about it.

RECIPIENTS OF THE GOOD AMERICAN AWARD, 1963, FOR OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RELATIONS AND FOR PRACTICING THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The Honorable Jacob M. Arvey, Democratic National Committeeman, State of Illinois.

J. Paul Austin, president, the Coca-Cola Co.

Mrs. Sarah Patton Boyle, author, "The Desegregated Heart."

The Honorable Charles F. Carpentier, secretary of State, State of Illinois.

George S. Cobb, president, Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Chicago.

David L. Daniel, assistant director, public assistance division, Cook County Department of Public Aid.

Thomas L. Davis, vice president and general manager, Radio Station WAAF, Chicago.

John D. deButts, president, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.

John Doremus, WMAQ-Radio-WNBQ-TV, Chicago, National Broadcasting Co., Inc.

The Honorable Robert Jerome Dunne, judge, Probate Court of Cook County, Ill.

Mrs. Marjorie L. Everett, executive vice president, Arlington Park and Washington Park Jockey Clubs.

Dr. Arthur G. Falls, physician and surgeon.

Marshall Field, Jr., publisher, Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago Daily News.

Paul C. Fisher, president, Fisher Pen Co.

Peter Fitzpatrick, attorney at law.

Dwight W. Follett, president, Follett Publishing Co.

Henry Ford, II, chairman of the board, the Ford Motor Co.

Mrs. Irene McCoy Gaines, chairman, Women's Auxiliary, American Negro Emancipation Centennial Authority.

Dr. Francis J. Gerty, director, Department of Mental Health, State of Illinois.

Miss Althea Gibson, community relations representative, Ward Baking Co.

Willard Gidwitz, president, Helene Curtis Industries, Inc.

Patrick E. Gorman, international secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.

Dick Gregory, comedian.

Mrs. Eloise B. Johnson, proprietor, Eloise Exclusive Millinery, Chicago.

The Honorable Constantine N. Kangles, Master in Chancery, Superior Court of Cook County, Ill.

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General, United States of America.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

David Saul Klafter, architect.

The Honorable Marshall Korshak, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Jerome F. Kutak, president, Guarantee Reserve Life Insurance Co. of Hammond, Ind.

Edward C. Logelin, vice president, United States Steel Corp.

Cecil J. North, president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

William L. McFetridge, president, Marina City Building Corp. and Chicago Flat Janitors Union.

Patrick L. O'Malley, president, Automatic Canteen Co. of America.

Ignatius A. O'Shaughnessy, president, Globe Oil Refining Co.

William E. Payne, director of Special Markets, Pepsi-Cola General Bottlers, Inc.

The Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, Member of the U.S. Congress.

Robert F. Quain, senior vice president, Hilton Hotels.

Sterling C. Quinlan, vice president, American Broadcasting Co.

Jackie Robinson, vice president, Chock Full O'Nuts, New York City.

The Honorable Carl T. Rowan, U.S. Ambassador to Finland.

Mrs. L. S. Schwartz, director, central region, the Advertising Council, Inc.

Nathan H. Schwartz, attorney at law.

Ramon S. Scruggs, public relations manager, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Charles F. Sebastian, president, Radio Station WTAQ, La Grange, Ill.

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary archbishop, Chicago Roman Catholic Archdiocese.

The Honorable Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director, the Peace Corps.

Mandel Siegel, president, Kenwood Chamber of Commerce.

The Honorable Fred W. Slater, judge, Superior Court of Cook County, Ill.

The Honorable Otis M. Smith, justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan.

Wendell Smith, newscaster, WBBM-TV-CBS, Chicago.

Samuel B. Stratton, lecturer on Negro history, University of Chicago.

Ed Sullivan, master of ceremonies, the Ed Sullivan Show.

Charles R. Swibel, president, Marina City Management Corp.

The Honorable Orlando W. Wilson, superintendent of police, city of Chicago.

J. Howard Wood, publisher, Chicago Tribune.

RECEIPTS OF CERTIFICATES OF COMMENDATION, 1963, FOR OBSERVING THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT OF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT REGARD TO COLOR, CREED, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN

Acme Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.

Agar Packing Co., Chicago, Ill.

Al Abrams Motor Sales, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Allied Chemical Corp., New York, N.Y.

American Broadcasting-Paramount Theatres, Inc., New York, N.Y.

American Can Co., New York, N.Y.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York, N.Y.

Balaban & Katz Corp., Chicago, Ill.

The Bendix Corp, Detroit, Mich.

The Borden Co., New York, N.Y.

Bresler Ice Cream Co., Chicago, Ill.

Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Burton-Dixie Corp., Chicago, Ill.

Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C

Coca-Cola Bottling Co., of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.

The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Chicago, Ill.

The Garrett Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.

General Dynamic Corp., New York, N.Y.

General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

General Precision Equipment Corp., Tarrytown, N.Y.

The Greyhound Corp., Chicago, Ill.

Guarantee Reserve Life Insurance Co., Hammond, Ind.

Illinois Bell Telephone Co., Chicago, Ill.

Illinois Public Aid Commission, Chicago, Ill.

International Foam Corp., Chicago, Ill.

S. S. Kresge Co., Detroit, Mich.

Mercy Hospital, Chicago, Ill.

Michigan Bell Telephone Co., Detroit, Mich.

Motorola, Inc., Franklin Park, Ill.

National Broadcasting Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.

New York Telephone Co., New York, N.Y.

Pepsi-Cola Co., Chicago, Ill.

Schenley Industries, Chicago, Ill.

The Standard Oil Co. (an Ohio Corp.), Cleveland, Ohio.

Stouffer Foods Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

Transportation Services and Allied Works Union, Chicago, Ill.

The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Western Electric Co., New York, N.Y.

The Western Union Telegraph Co., New York, N.Y.

Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

F. W. Woolworth Co., Chicago, Ill.

Zenith Radio Corp., Chicago, Ill.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Easter: Time for Reflection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the column by Mr. James Reston in yesterday's New York Times represents a most refreshing point of view. At a time when the Members of Congress are preoccupied with somber fiscal, economic, and security considerations, it is well that we should be reminded from time to time of the spiritual sources of the Nation's strength.

As Mr. Reston puts it:

The philosophers are entitled to their day, especially during the Easter festival. They have been talking about what really saves nations for centuries and advising us on where to place our hopes.

It is fitting that the encyclical of Pope John XXIII, calling for a new effort to establish a world of peace and brotherhood, should come at the Easter season. An editorial appearing in yesterday's New York Times, entitled "The Pope's Message," applauds the efforts of the Pontiff to promote an end to the arms race, disarmament under effective control, and voluntary acceptance by all nations of a world law.

The editor of my hometown newspaper, the Daily Republic, has also applauded recent efforts by Catholic and Protestant laymen and clergymen to explore the possibilities of closer cooperation between the various religious denominations.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article by Mr. Reston, and the editorials from the New York Times and the Daily Republic be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963]

FIERY RUN, VA.—HOW TO ENDURE WASHINGTON IN ONE EASY LESSON

(By James Reston)

FIERY RUN, VA.—Between the Potomac and the Rappahannock lies one of the loveliest stretches of country in the world. From the tidal water of the Chesapeake Bay, it rolls in ever larger hills to the Blue Ridge, and at this time of year is fringed with green and ablaze with flowering trees.

This is Washington's escape hatch, its retreat from the pit of politics, its consolation and its memory.

The men who make our laws need such a retreat. It widens their perspective. They see farther from here. It reminds them that problems are not new or insoluble, and that there are other laws in the world besides the ones they make in the Federal Capital.

This seems a particularly useful lesson this year. Lately Washington has been overwhelmed by economists. It has been arguing about the price of steel, and the balance of payments, and the outflow of gold, and the export of frozen chickens to Germany, and rates of growth and unemployment, and, of course, it has been arguing about taxes.

DEPRESSING ECONOMISTS

All these things are important, but the economists are a depressing lot. The way to salvation, they tell us, is to take a tax cut and grow. The family farm, they tell us, is obsolete. We are producing too much food, so the farmers have to move to the cities where, again, there is too much production and not enough jobs.

It is an ironic situation, but fortunately the philosophers have another view, or at least some different questions. Is a surplus of food a bad thing or a good thing in a starving world? Are we to ask the price of everything and the value of nothing?

Is there another question about the effect of driving people off the land? It is good for the economy, says Walter Heller. But it is bad for the character, says Mr. Jefferson, and, who knows, the old boy may not be so obsolete even now.

Everybody has a tax-free license to reject fear at Easter time and it could be that the economists and the soldiers, who have a vested interest in fear, don't have the whole answer after all.

"Fear plays a greater part in life and in the course of history than we often realize," said Herbert Butterfield, the English philosopher, "and sometimes we know that it is fear which is in operation when individuals and nations are bullying or bragging, or taking a crooked course. * * *

"There comes a moment when it is a healthy thing to pull every cord tight and make an affirmation of the higher human will. When we seem caught in a relentless historical process, our machines enslaving us and our weapons turning against us, we must certainly not expect to escape save by an unusual assertion of the human spirit * * * everything is going to depend in fact upon what we do over and above the works of self-defense."

This has an old-fashioned sound these days. Washington is not talking much about the human spirit. It is appealing to the mind and not to the heart, and relying on the economist rather than on the philosopher. Moreover, it is preoccupied with defense above everything else: defense of the country from Cuba (of all places), defense of the dollar, defense of "the American way of life," which unfortunately is seldom defined.

Lately, the President has been talking, not about assertions of the human spirit, but about the rhythm of history" and "the rhythm of unemployment," as if success followed failure in these fields as inevitably as spring follows the winter in the rhythm of the seasons.

THE PHILOSOPHIC VIEW

The philosophers, however, are entitled to their day, especially during the Easter festival. They have been talking about what really saves nations for centuries and advising us on where to place our hope, and few of them have urged us to bet on the economists.

When Matthew Arnold came to this country over 100 years ago, he was asked how nations were saved. He gave Plato's answer first: nations were saved, Plato said, by "the remnant" of the wise and the good and the righteous.

Then Arnold gave his own answer: "We must hold fast," he said, "to the austere but true doctrine as to what really governs politics and saves or destroys states. Having in mind things true, things elevated, things just, things pure, things amiable, things of good report; having these in mind, studying and loving these, is what save states."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963]

THE POPE'S MESSAGE

The encyclical which Pope John XXIII addressed to all humanity this Easter week has struck a responsive note among millions. Protestants, Jews, Buddhists, Moslems, Communists and atheists have joined Catholics in approval of the Pope's moving words. This approval will almost certainly be heightened by the extension of the same theme of international cooperation for peace in the Pope's Easter message yesterday.

The feature that sets the Pope's appeal apart from the conventional calls for peace is its generous humanitarianism. John XXIII's basic doctrine is that the common humanity which binds all men and all nations is more important than the doctrinal or racial differences which divide them. On these premises, he calls for an end to the arms race, for disarmament under effective control, and for voluntary acceptance by all nations of a world law.

The most striking demonstration of the Pope's desire for reconciliation of all mankind is in the encyclical's veiled, but unmistakable, references to Communism. Great historical movements, the Pope declares, cannot be simply identified with the vague, false philosophical teachings from which they may have originated. These teachings—the Pope clearly means Marxism-Leninism—remain the same; but the movements themselves may evolve to meet changing historical situations. And as these movements evolve, the Pope concludes, they can come to "contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval." What a blow this attitude deals to the ideological fanatics on both sides of the doctrinal dividing line who reject all idea of a reasonable compromise and think only of burying their opponents.

At the core of the Pope's thinking is the realization that in this thermonuclear era men must learn to live together lest they all die together in the inferno of fusing atoms. To accomplish this, he calls for negotiation, mutual concessions and an understanding of the common interests which unite all of us. This is an inspiring doctrine, the only sane response to the terrible dangers that threaten all life on this planet. It will not be easy to realize this program in a world riddled by suspicions, jealousies and hatreds. But it can be done if the leaders of the world follow the Pope's example and rise above national and doctrinal hatreds that lead only to disaster.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Apr. 6, 1963]

CHURCH UNITY HOPES RISE

For the first time in this country, Catholic and Protestant scholars met in 4-day colloquiam at Harvard University's Divinity

School the last week in March to discuss theological issues. The worldwide movement of Christian unity received fresh impetus from the attendance of Augustine Cardinal Bea, 81, called the Cardinal of Unity, the Catican's most authoritative spokesman on Christian union.

Theological talks among experts of different Christian persuasions "will undoubtedly yield good results," Cardinal Bea said, but "the way will be long and hard." He delivered three lectures to the interfaith colloquiam.

In the first lecture, the Cardinal related scientific research and university training to the quest for Christian unity. He defined the ecumenical attitude as consisting simply in the fact that "we seriously accept the New Testament teaching baptism and its consequences."

In the second lecture, the Cardinal outlined the work of the Vatican Council, listing three positive results: The establishment of an official organ in Rome to foster Christian unity, the presence of non-Catholic observers at the council and a realization that "all Christians belong to each other."

In the third lecture, the Cardinal scanned the prospects for the future. Although emphasizing that nothing could be changed in the doctrines that the Roman Catholic Church regards as essential parts of its divinely revealed faith, he said that developments could be confidently expected in clearing up misunderstandings about church teachings and in doctrinal points which have never been definitely defined. These include the union of Christians with Christ, the membership of non-Catholic Christians in Christ's Church and the practice of the church in divine worship.

The Roman Church's most authoritative voice on union thus brought to the United States both hope and a glimpse of the way for ultimate unity among Christians the world over.

Writer Says Reds Shun Profit for Cuba's Untapped Minerals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press article by Jesse Gordon, published on March 28 by the Record of Hackensack, N.J.

Mr. Gordon recently returned from Cuba with a report on Soviet mineral and oil explorations there, indicating the degree to which the Soviet Union may hold a mortgage on the resources of the island. He is listed by Andrew Tully in "CIA: the Inside Story," as one of the few expert observers on conditions within Cuba.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Mar. 28, 1963]

WRITER SAYS REDS SHUN PROFIT FOR CUBA'S UNTAPPED MINERALS: CLAIMS SOVIET MINING TECHNIQUES MAY SAVE CASTRO—FOR RUSSIA

(By Jesse Gordon)

NEW YORK.—There is no special reason why I should have been chosen as the only one of many newsmen in Cuba to be shown a Soviet technicians' new report on Cuba's mineral resources.

Suffice it to say that luck, a little adroit wire-pulling, and the affability of Dr. Augusto Henriquez, director of the Cuban Institute of Mineral Resources, conspired in my favor.

The report is a massive document, replete with maps, tables, and technical jargon. The portly, patient Dr. Henriquez—he works directly under Maj. Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Castro's righthand man—took 4 hours off a busy day to go over it with me in his office in the Jesus Menendez Building, located in downtown Havana.

"I am not an engineer," I said toward the close of the interview. "Yet, I see well enough that the Russians, in 18 months' time, have decided that they can get many times as much wealth out of your ground in a few years as American engineers have taken out of Cuba in half a century. How is that explained?"

Dr. Henriquez smiled, even more affably than usual, and raised an admonitory pencil.

"Socialistic mining," he said, "is quite different from capitalistic mining. Capitalist mining only scratches the surface; socialist mining digs deeper."

At the time, the remarks seemed to me one of those Marxist cliches that spring so readily to the lips of a Communist. It was not until several months later, in New York, when I was showing my notes on the Soviet report to American mining engineers who had worked in Cuba under previous regimes, that I realized Dr. Henriquez had not been talking through his Marxist hat.

PROFIT MOTIVE

The American engineer scanned the tables I had copied on the Soviet estimates of Cuba's nickel, manganese, chromite, iron, and oil reserves.

"I'm prepared to accept these figures," he said. "They seem high, but not implausible. We've always known there was a lot of stuff down there."

"Then why didn't you take it out?"

"We took out only what we could sell at a profit," he answered. "That's what mining outfits are in business for. Generally speaking, the farther down you have to go for your ore, the more it costs you to bring it to the surface. Cuba wasn't our only source for these ores; what we could get out of Cuba cheaper than elsewhere, we took out; when we could get the stuff cheaper elsewhere we stopped producing in Cuba."

But Socialist mining, when designed to achieve national security, or increased autonomy, takes little account of profits. The iron, manganese, chromite, oil, copper, and so forth that American miners have been spurning, may prove the salvation of Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

MAY AID CASTRO

Granting that most of these materials are now in surplus in the world and that something expensive to produce has little leverage—even for Socialists—in world markets where cheaper goods hold sway.

Still, these Cuban resources may—I don't say they will, but they may—enable Castro to solve the long-range economic problems that, in truth, present more peril to him than invasions from the United States.

And—a final irony—they may turn Cuba from an economic fief of the United States—which Cuba has been called for many decades—into a fief of the Soviet Union.

For all available data indicate that the Soviet Union will one day demand a reckoning from Castro for the estimated $450 million in aid—industrial, military, and financial—that the Soviet Union has already poured into that country.

And available data indicate equally clearly that Cuba has neither the capital nor the technical know-how to exploit the mineral potential revealed in the Soviet report.

So the capital will come from the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.S.R. will hold a mortgage on every drop of oil, every ounce of manganese, iron, nickel, cobalt, and copper drawn out of Cuba's earth.

American-Canadian Relations Placed in Proper Perspective by Columnist Max Freedman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, now that the Canadian election campaign is over, it is gratifying to know that the circumstances leading up to the fall of the Diefenbaker government, and the subsequent election last Monday, have been placed in their proper perspective by the distinguished columnist, Canadian-born Max Freedman, who has a profound knowledge of United States-Canadian relations in particular, and foreign affairs in general. Mr. Freedman did this in his article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star last night. He discusses our longstanding American relations with Canada, praises President Kennedy's forbearance and reveals the true facts as he knows them. I ask permission to have Mr. Freedman's article printed with my remarks at this point:

KENNEDY AND CANADA'S ELECTION—PRESIDENT'S FORBEARANCE PRAISED AS TIME COMES TO REPAIR POLITICAL DAMAGE

(By Max Freedman)

The worst election in Canada's history has now come to a weary and inconclusive result. Lester B. Pearson and the Liberal Party have emerged from the election with a doubtful mandate.

He will be able to lead Parliament only if the new Democratic Party, which is opposed to his defense policy and is critical of many aspects of American leadership, is ready to support him. In the campaign itself, Pearson gained few laurels. His friends have always said he would be far better in office than on the hustings. Now at last he has his chance.

Not even the personal courage and tenacity with which Prime Minister John Diefenbaker waged his campaign can be allowed to obscure the shameful nature of his appeal to the Canadian people. For the sake of victory in an election, he made charges that have hurt Canadian-American relations beyond all precedent.

If Canadian public life were in a healthy and normal mood, instead of being suspicious and inflamed, such a contemptible campaign would have been visited with the angry rebuke of the voters.

The size of Diefenbaker's vote, and his apparent willingness to try another desperate flirtation with the Social Credit Party, now shrunken to a fretful protest movement in Quebec, indicate the tragic prejudices that are demoralizing public debate in Canada.

It is the aspect of the election that requires the most patient and thoughtful attention of policymakers in Washington.

No doubt President Kennedy and his advisers will move swiftly to wipe out the ugly legacies of this campaign, to the extent that wisdom and generosity can achieve this reconciliation, and will wish to restore Ca-

nadian-American relations to their former high estate. No other task can equal this one in urgency or importance.

Of Diefenbaker the politician, no more need be said. He can be left to the doubtful consolations of his conscience, the most eccentric and underworked instrument in the history of government.

It is a source of special gratification, however, that Howard Green, his Foreign Affairs Minister, went down to defeat after a campaign in which he diversified abuse of America with misrepresentation of Canada's role in world affairs.

But something must be said, even though with restraint and in terse summary of the altogether false impression given during the campaign of President Kennedy's relations with the Diefenbaker government.

The stories which have appeared in the Canadian press on this subject are garbled, inaccurate, and misleading. Above all they touch only a superficial fragment of the real issue.

The full account can be told only by President Kennedy years from now if he chooses to do so in the history of his administration. But it is intolerable that the the impression should have been allowed to gain root that Mr. Kennedy behaved with a lack of dignity, or showed a lack of respect for Canadian independence and sovereignty.

Since his name has appeared so frequently in newspaper reports, it should be explained that Walt Rostow, then an assistant to President Kennedy and now a senior member of the State Department, has an absolutely clear record.

He is guilty of no misdeeds. He is a devoted and consistent friend of Canada, just as he is a vigilant servant of American policy.

It is time that the American and Canadian people both knew that President Kennedy, in the face of undeserved and unprecedented challenges by Diefenbaker, has never once wavered from his steadfast conviction that the repeated tantrums in Ottawa must not be suffered to impair cooperation with Canada or a frank and generous response to Canada's best interests.

In short, the real story is the exact opposite of the one which Diefenbaker has put into circulation and is very different indeed from the fragmentary speculations of Canadian reporters.

As one who is familiar with the whole record, I wish to testify that the publication of this record would, forever, shatter Diefenbaker's standing as a public figure and would triumphantly vindicate the fairness and generosity with which President Kennedy has invariably dealt with Canada's claims and interests.

Let little men stir in their discarded venom. The task for all citizens of good will, in both countries, is to move at once from the squalor of this campaign to the restoration of complete cooperation between Canada and the United States.

U.S. Subsidies: How To Get 40 Cents Out of a Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the outstanding news columnist, Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt, has written an excellent column on subsidies by the National Government. This column has been printed in a number of newspapers around the country and was carried in the Columbia Record of Columbia, S.C., on April 12, 1963, under the following headline: "How To Get 40 Cents Out of Dollar, 'Get Something for Nothing' Illusion and U.S. Subsidies." I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia Record, Apr. 12, 1963]

HOW TO GET 40 CENTS OUT OF DOLLAR—GET SOMETHING FOR NOTHING ILLUSION AND U.S. SUBSIDIES

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

The eternal illusion of getting something for nothing is the only possible explanation for a Federal subsidy system which returns to the taxpayer only a part of the dollar which he himself has contributed.

For example, the State of Delaware received in 1959 only 40 cents out of the dollar of taxes paid by Delaware citizens for Federal subsidy programs. The Connecticut taxpayer received only 43 cents for his dollar and the New Jersey citizen 44 cents.

NEW JERSEY LOST

The New Jersey taxpayer reports that in 1960 that State lost $143,100,000 through Federal taxes for subsidies to other States. Pennsylvania lost $125 million; New York, $206,500,000, and Virginia $6,300,000. Some States showed a profit at the expense of others.

Surely, Americans must be aware that there is no way to "beat the Federal machine." But just as they line up before slot machines—knowing in advance that they will only get back a part of what they paid in—so each year they pressure Congress for a new round of subsidies.

By 1960 this gambling instinct had brought more than 90 Federal subsidy programs into existence at a cost of $12 billion—or $66 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

For an average family of four that means a yearly tax bill of $264 must be paid to maintain Federal subsidies and the "matching" funds required to receive these funds.

Two-thirds of all Federal subsidies are available only on a "matching basis." This means that State and local governments have to put up some specified percentage of their own funds to receive the Federal Government subsidy.

Often the taxpayer must ante up more State and local taxes to get these Federal subsidies as well as pay his Federal taxes.

There are those who rationalize Federal subsidies by saying that the Federal Government has a broader tax base than State and local government. As a matter of fact, the States had power to levy direct taxes on income, the primary source of Government revenue, long before the Federal Government was given that power.

SUBSIDY STUDY

"The sales tax, real estate tax, personal property tax and other taxes of less general use and acceptance are all available to State and local government," says a study on "Federal Subsidies." This study was published this spring by an official State agency of the State of Virginia, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, 605 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

The Federal Government taxes are higher because Congress is less subject to direct control by the people than State or local governments, the State study points out.

Another argument used to justify Federal subsidies is that the Federal Government has a borrowing position superior to that of the States and local government. But what are the facts?

The Federal debt on June 30, 1961, was $289 billion. This sum is equivalent to 67.2 percent of national income. State debt is only 4.7 percent, and local debt 12.8 percent, of national income.

As of June 30, 1961, States and local governments had made loans to the Federal Government totaling $18,700 million. Far from being in a superior borrowing position, the Federal Government is actually in a borrowing position inferior to that of the States and local governments.

The biggest illusion is the belief that control can remain with local authorities. Take a recent case in Ohio. In that State, employers had paid to the Federal Government $30 million in taxes to administer an unemployment compensation program. Of this sum, $17 million was to be returned to the State for unemployment compensation payments. The Federal Department of Labor threatened to withhold the $17 million if Ohio did not adopt two procedural rules. Yet the Ohio courts had approved this program.

Authorizing Virgin Islands To Issue General Obligation Bonds

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee is aware of the fact that our committee is in substantial agreement on the need for giving to the Virgin Islands the same authority that is given to any municipality in the United States.

I believe we have reason to be proud of the development of the Virgin Islands during recent years. It is not too long ago many of us can recall we were terribly disturbed about the abject poverty there, and the common use of the expression "the poorhouse of the Caribbean."

The Virgin Islands have reached a point in their development where, instead of scratching along in the mud and not even thinking of capital improvements and expansion, they are ready for that and should have the right to obtain that. It should be made clear the only difference between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself is over the amendment he proposes to offer. In effect, he is going to say through his amendment that the things we permit our municipalities and agencies of government to finance from bonds shall be limited in the case of the Virgin Islands.

I might point out that some of the things which would be eliminated are things which are very close to most of the municipalities in our country: bridges, wharves, harbor facilities, sewers, sewage disposal plants, electric dis-

tribution systems. Now, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is on a very high plateau. He wants to give the Virgin Islands authority to build hospital facilities, which they need desperately; he wants to give them authority to build schools, which they need desperately. But, unfortunately it becomes my unpleasant duty at this Eastertide to get down to more mundane things, and I doubt very much if any of us would want to live in a community where we had a wonderful hospital, beautiful schools, but no sewage. And, I am sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not want to put the Virgin Islands in that position.

And, I might point out, too, that quite recently a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations made it very clear that we were appropriating for the last time moneys for the electric plant in the Virgin Islands. Now, that means that the Virgin Islands are going to have to take over that plant. I am sure that the Government will allow very easy terms for taking it over, but there will immediately emerge the necessity for improving that plant, which is not capable today of taking care of the needs of a growing area. That could run into millions of dollars, and I think if we are going to at this time allow the Virgin Islands to have the 10-percent borrowing authority, which we give to all our municipalities, we should not limit it and exclude things which we know are necessary and force this Congress, our committee, to come back year after year and ask that the borrowing authority be extended to these other vital areas.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 13, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, APRIL 13, 1963

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—ADMINISTRATION BOONDOGGLE

The fiscal irresponsibility of the Kennedy administration was clearly indicated this week with the passage by the House of the supplemental appropriation bill of 1963 containing $450 million worth of new public works projects. In spite of determined Republican effort to cut this $450 million boondoggle from the bill it was passed with 208 Democrats voting for it, and 151 Republicans against it. Only 20 Republicans (of 177) voted for the spending and 33 Democrats (of 258) against it, proving once again that basically the Republicans stand for fiscal responsibility and reduced Federal spending. I spoke against the bill as follows:

"I oppose this deficiency or supplemental appropriation bill because we are appropriating money for new projects which is not the purpose of a supplemental appropriation bill. The list of new starts * * * clearly shows the improper procedure. Further, it is wrong to spend additional money for public works at this time of deficit financing. The accelerated public works project was wrong at its inception last year and restoring money to the program is wrong now. Pump priming did not work before in correcting or relieving unemployment and it will not now.

"Our country faces fiscal collapse because of wild Federal spending. We must economize to protect our currency value, gold on hand, and our entire economy. We must bolster confidence in our economy and Government by responsible action now. Let us reduce Federal spending, not increase. Let us cut the national debt, not add to it. Let us then reduce taxes. Each of these steps separately and collectively will bolster confidence in our Government's fiscal self-discipline and preserve our private economy. Let us stop financing socialism. Capitalism is the bulwark of our country's economic health, not Federal spending."

DEVALUING OUR CURRENCY THROUGH SUBTERFUGE

H.R. 5389, to repeal the law dealing with the purchase of silver, passed the House: This action in reality sets the stage for devaluation of our currency and, in fact, actually does devalue the dollar. The bill's stated purpose is to free silver from Federal controls by (1) Repealing the Silver Purchase Acts, (2) Permit the Federal Reserve System to issue in $1 denominations under the same terms and conditions it now issues currency in $5 and higher denominations. (This means substituting Federal Reserve notes for the present $1 bills which are silver certificates, backed by 100 cents on the dollar in silver.) (3) Remove the tax on transfers of any interest in silver bullion. This legislation rightfully comes within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, but because of the part dealing with the transfer tax, it had to also be considered by my Committee on Ways and Means.

The repeal of the Silver Purchase Act is long overdue and I am for it. Federal pegging of the price of silver, instead of a free market, is wrong. My opposition to this bill is the lack of guidelines and stemmed from (1) it actually does devalue the dollar because it provides that our $1 bills which are now backed by 100 cents worth of a precious metal (silver) will henceforth be supported by 25 cents in a precious metal (gold), (2) Secretary of the Treasury Dillon admitted, though not planned, this step is necessary if our currency is to be devalued, (3) Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, testified it would affect our gold supply by $500 million, (4) President Kennedy is selling a capital asset ($2 billion in silver, to pay current expenses. These views in opposition contradicted the bland assurances of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that our gold supply would not be reduced and that silver would not be sold to pay current Government expenses.

The further pressure on our imbalance of payments contained in this bill concerns me and I presented tables showing that as a result of five large successive deficits in our balance of payments we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities. Foreign nations now hold $24 billion of our money, callable in gold ($11.7 billion of our $15.8 billion gold supply must be reserved for backing our currency). In this dangerous position we, as the world's banker, could not withstand a run on the bank if our foreign creditors demand payment of outstanding obligations. It is long overdue, but let us hope not too late, that Congress immediately direct its attention to solving the imbalance of payments and the gold outflow. This means cutting Federal spending, an immediate balanced budget, a reduction in our debt, and with that background, tax reform which primarily means a drastic cutback in the tax progression and a reduction of rates.

CONFUSED AND BEWILDERED PRESIDENT NOW PROTECTING COMMUNISTS

The United States, on Presidential order, is now taking a stand against freemen and using our might to protect a vicious and bloody-handed dictator. The end result of the confused and bewildered policies of President Kennedy must be the complete Communist takeover of Central and Latin America and Communist encirclement of the United States. The brave actions of President Kennedy this week included the arrest of more Cuban exiles whose crime is wanting to free their homeland; a break with Dr. Jose Miro-Cardona, Cuban exile leader, and further efforts to curtail critics of Communist dictators Khrushchev and Castro in order that the administration could make deals with the Soviet boss. There is no reasonable explanation for the Kennedy failure to enforce the Monroe Doctrine or to refuse to demand the immediate removal of all Russian troops and war material from Cuba. Whatever his motive, the actual result is appeasement of the Communists and history records that appeasement always results in victory for the Reds and defeat for us. Last year the Kennedy administration bought the Communist coalition as a solution in Laos. As we all knew, the Communists are at this moment, after breaking another agreement, taking over completely there. What is the President's answer to this failure? He has rewarded the architect of the Laos disaster, Averell Harriman, by promoting him to a higher position in the State Department where he will be responsible for mapping all our political relationships with the Communists. An insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, of California, notes the activities of Dr. Walt Rostow and McGeorge Bundy, close advisers to the President and apparent architects of a new U.S. policy reversing our support of anti-Communist exiles which is forcing Russian and Baltic exile groups to restrict their anti-Communist activities. Before it is too late, President Kennedy should tell the American people now what secret deals are planned and who and what is behind the strange policies, or lack of policies, which continue to increase the strength and prestige of the Soviet Union and weaken U.S. leadership of the free world.

SPOTLIGHT ON URBAN RENEWAL

In an effort to expose the direction in which Federal urban renewal and public housing is leading this free Nation, I took the floor of the House this week for another major speech on this subject. The bill of particulars against Federal urban renewal and public housing includes: (1) Because of urban renewal, the Supreme Court has reinterpreted the Constitution, and violated the letter and spirit of the law, (2) private property can be taken away for esthetic and spiritual reasons for private—not public—use, (3) the Federal contribution results in Federal control of local government, (4) local need for Federal help has been fraudulently determined both by local and Federal Government, (5) the financially less able cities and States are supporting the wealthier cities and States in the Federal aid distribution, (6) Federal guidelines, procedures, criteria, and formulas are inequitable and cannot be made equitable, (7) misuse of Federal aid is scandalous, (8) windfall profit at taxpayer expense is commonplace, (9) public housing is forced on communities that want urban renewal, (10) crime abounds in public housing and is getting worse; morals and moral values are being destroyed, (11) urban renewal and public housing are being use to effect sociological changes in U.S.

society at the planners' whim, (12) when people know the facts and there is a referendum, public housing is rejected.

Regional Preference Bills Opposed by Southern California Water Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Southern California Water Conference is made up of the public and private water groups, including municipal, county, and special water district authorities of that area. Southern California's water requirements are such that large quantities of electric power are required for pumping. The State's new multibillion-dollar Feather River project will require very large quantities of electric power for pumping. These requirements will be in addition to other growing needs of this virile area of the United States.

At a time when California's power needs as well as those of the rest of the Nation are commencing to see some possibility of surcease from regional power interties made possible by new developments in electric transmission technology, Congress is being asked to strangle that technology as it is being born in order to promote the selfish interests of a few.

Regional preference bills are laying before the Interior Committee of the House, while the other body this week passed such a bill. By giving artificial preferences to users in regions in which power is produced, the legislative fiat of these bills, if enacted into law, will effectively throttle the interregional pooling of power resources, to the great economic detriment of the entire Nation. It is notable that such regional superpreferences would not even be limited to public bodies, they would inure to the special benefit of private corporations as well.

For a nation which has zealously prided itself on rapid development and adoption of technological advances which have given it the greatest standards of abundance of any nation in the world now to reverse that course and junk the precepts which have spurred its miraculous developments is suicidal, indeed. Particularly when it is to be done only in response to the greed of a few local interests.

Any regional problems which equitably deserve solution because of new possibilities of interregional power pooling are those involved with past reliance upon availability of then known quantities of electricity which encouraged large capital investments in manufacturing facilities. It is possible to handle those problems on a basis which does not forever in the future segment the power capabilities of the Nation into less than top efficiency fragments. With electric power requirements of this Nation doubling every decade, the patent unwisdom of establishing the precedent of blanket regional preferences, as called for by the legislation in question, should be apparent even to its sponsors.

The position of the Southern California Water Conference is set out in the following letter, which I recently received:

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
WATER CONFERENCE,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 8, 1963.

Re S. 1007, H.R. 994, H.R. 4071, H.R. 1160.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: On April 1, the Southern California Water Conference had a full and complete discussion of the plans of the Bonneville Power Administration to sell power in California. A representative of the administration, as well as representatives of virtually all of the potential customers of Northwest power participated in the meeting. The discussion analyzed the proposed power preference bills represented by the above legislation now pending before Congress.

The aforementioned bills were disapproved by the conference, and as chairman I was asked to notify those Members of Congress who are primarily concerned with such legislation. In opposing these bills, the conference did not take a position on the broader question of whether or not and on what terms Northwest power should be marketed in southern California. The proposed regional power preference bills would enable the Pacific Northwest to sell its surplus hydropower to California on a maybe basis. However, should any customer of BPA, for any reason need that power, including the industrial user or the private power company at the bottom of the preference list, it can recapture it. The investment by power customers outside the marketing area would bear the entire risk of losing such power in a critical water year. On the other hand, the enormous advantages to the Northwest in being able to market its surplus power and to avoid a rate increase to its local users is a benefit of considerable magnitude.

All these benefits to the Northwest should justify some risk. As the law now stands, power generated in the Northwest may be sold to California customers No new legislation is needed. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co, for example, has already agreed to build a line with private capital and purchase Northwest power as a nonpreference customer. This means that all public agencies which contract for Northwest power must be fully satisfied before P.G. & E., as a private company, is entitled to receive any power in the event of a shortage. The proposed bill would put the P.G. & E. even further down the preference line. It would get power only after all users in the Northwest, public and private alike, had been satisfied and, in addition, after all public agency customers in California had first received all the power to which they are entitled. A defeat of this measure would not prevent the Northwest from marketing its power. It only means that all customers who purchase Northwest power, whether within that region or outside of it, must take it on the same customer preference basis. Aren't these economic advantages of marketing surplus power sufficient to justify the Northwest in leaving the risk of shortage where it is rather than attempting to shift it to new customers who have just as much at stake as regional purchasers?

In southern California we are wary of regional preferences. Since the early 1930's we have lived with the regional water preference law that has threatened sensible water development. When the Federal Government was faced with this California statute in developing the Trinity River diversion of the Central Valley project it balked, and the California Legislature adopted a special act to exempt that project from this troublesome regional water preference law.

There is little comfort in the suggestion that the Northwest situation is unique. Particular problems breed special solutions. But the exceptions soon become the rule. And the incentive to build a fence around a powerplant in a particular river is inviting. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. In the process the whole principle of reliance on power contracts with the Federal Government is imperiled, and the guiding philosophy that works built by all the people, for all the people is placed in jeopardy.

I trust the opposition to these bills as expressed by this conference can be brought to the attention of all our Congressmen and Senators. A copy of the membership of the conference, indicating both its stature and geographical representation, is attached for your convenience.

Very truly yours,

JAMES H. KRIEGER,
Chairman.

Award to Constantine N. Kangles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago recently, a group of distinguished Americans received the Good American Award from the Chicago Committee of One Hundred, a civic organization devoted to the promotion of better human relations. The award is conferred on those "who champion the cause of equal human relations and who practice the basic principles of American democracy without expecting recognition or reward," according to Ernest R. Rather, president of the Chicago Committee of One Hundred.

There is one recipient of this award, Constantine N. Kangles, to whom I should like to bring special attention. I do this because the very scope of his activities and the magnitude of his efforts have brightened the lives of many individuals, directly and indirectly.

Constantine Kangles is a Chicago attorney and a master in chancery of the Superior Court of Cook County, Ill. I think that he is a very remarkable man. In our age of automation and complexity which is still suffering from some barbaric customs he is in the tradition of the renaissance man. He is both contemplative and active. His vocation as a practitioner of the science of the law has not detracted from his love of literature and the fine arts. But what distinguishes him, above all other things, is his devotion to his fellow man. Constantine Kangles is representative of other Americans like him; who, through our history, have fought to preserve and

protect our system of law and justice; our institutions of religious expression, culture and education; our thriving commerce and industry; and, above all, the basic human rights of equality of opportunity for all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

This devotion to human rights is probably the most important activity in which all of us can engage. Representing a district such as mine, in which we are trying to break down the last vestiges of discrimination; and as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa; I know how vital it is that we bring full rights of citizenship to all Americans as speedily as possible, not only because it is right and just, but because it is necessary if we are to continue to be the leader of the free world and if we are to hold the respect of Afro-Asian nations to whom second-class citizenship in America is most repulsive.

Constantine Kangles, in every phase of his life, has striven to bring us closer to our American ideal. Although he is of Greek descent and has been active in Hellenic organizations, the Justice for Cyprus Committee and the Greek Orthodox Welfare Foundation, much of his work as an individual and as an attorney has been directed toward improving the conditions in Latin America. Before President Kennedy had taken office and brought to our attention the vast problems of our sister republics, Kangles had been directly working to solve many of these problems and has recently been instrumental in the release of Americans and others imprisoned in Cuba, and in handling many matters involving Latin Americans seeking political asylum.

In the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, where he resides and practices most of the time, Mr. Kangles has constantly worked to open up the opportunities for employment for individuals who have been discriminated against for prejudicial reasons. He was an articulate proponent of the first fair employment practices bill to be passed into law in 1961.

As I indicated before, Constantine Kangles bears resemblance to the Renaissance man, or to Jefferson and Franklin, to whom we Americans can proudly refer. His activities have not been solely directed toward seeking equality but also toward creating the type of atmosphere in which life is robust, healthy, and harmonious. And so, much of his effort has been in behalf of educational institutions—North Park College, Loyola University, Chicago, the Chicago-Kent College of Law and Clark University to name the few in which he is most active. He was also a cochairman of the Chicago Committee for the Harry S. Truman Library and is a member of the Bishop Sheil Foundation.

Last year he was appointed by President Kennedy as a member-at-large of the National Advisory Council to the Small Business Administration established to evaluate the effectiveness of Government programs.

I could go on to speak of his activities in Masonic organizations on behalf of children and the crippled. Or of his interest in the strength of our system of government by his participation in the affairs of the Democratic Party.

Let me conclude, however, in speaking of Mr. Kangles on the occasion of his receiving the Good American Award, that his interests and his energies have pervaded many of our most worthwhile activities, and his dedication to his fellow human beings should stand as an inspiration to those who have been associated with him, to those who have benefitted from his hard work, to those who read this tribute, and to us as we try to do our best in insuring peace, prosperity, and good health for our Nation, and indeed, for all mankind.

A Second Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the wilderness bill I was much pleased with the Senate's action in passing it, and as an American I was proud that our generation has taken a step toward maintaining the quality of our primeval lands. In consequence, the editorial comments of Mr. Sam Donaldson on Washington's WTOP-TV on April 9, 1963, were welcome to me. I therefore ask that his fine editorial, "A Second Look," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SECOND LOOK

It is characteristic of the American mood to develop and commercialize everything we touch. Action and speed and profit are our household goods, and the man who resists the changing times is punished at every turn.

But now, the U.S. Senate has moved to preserve and isolate a small portion of the fast-diminishing American wilderness and keep it as untouched by 20th century civilization as possible.

In passing the Wilderness Act, the Senate sought to insure that future generations will be able to enjoy the lure of the wild, to escape the cluttered world of America's megalopolises, to camp, and hunt, and fish, and find occasional respite in the beauty of virgin country.

The Wilderness Act provides for 8 million acres of undeveloped Federal land in 9 Western States to be set aside as a preserve for the enjoyment of visitors. Another 53 million acres of national forests, parks, and wildlife sanctuaries will be reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior for possible inclusion. Congress may veto these recommendations if it chooses, and the President will have the authority to restore any lands to full use if necessary.

Once declared a wilderness area, all development will cease. Mining operations in progress may continue, as may animal grazing privileges already established.

But no other commercial enterprises will be allowed. There will be no hot dog vendors, no sightseeing buses and no souvenir shops. No roads will be built. There will be only mountain trails once tramped by Jim Bridges, Big-Foot Wallace, and Kit Carson. Americans may explore the clean waters of our high mountain streams, sleep under a smog-free sky, sniff the scent of pines and spruce, and hear the call of the whippoorwill announcing the dawn.

It is the satisfying isolation of a Henry David Thoreau that the Senate proposes to save—to preserve, in the words of the bill, "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

Although the Senate passed similar legislation in the last Congress, the House did not act, and may not act now.

The House feels that wilderness areas should be set aside by individual concurrent resolutions of the Congress, rather than by unspoken agreements to executive recommendations.

The House fears possible mistakes in judgment on the part of the executive; the Senate fears that under the concurrent resolution procedure, powerful committee chairmen could block land withdrawal simply for the sake of mining or other commercial interests.

But the friends of the Wilderness Act on both sides of Capitol Hill are hopeful the differences can be resolved. For if our grandchildren have nothing more to escape to than polluted streams, traffic jams, and neon lights, we will have lost—in losing the wilderness—a valuable builder of the American character, and a most concrete reminder of our national heritage.

Administration Test Ban Proposals Blueprint for National Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during early March pertinent terms of a new test ban treaty offer soon to be made to the Russians by the Kennedy administration were revealed to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. These proposals contain the seeds of a potential nuclear Pearl Harbor. They amount to blueprints for a U.S. suicide weapon or a Soviet murder weapon, depending only upon which side of the Iron Curtain they are viewed from.

The proposed treaty's elaborate on-site inspection provisions need not be discussed because they are utterly meaningless. This is because the treaty's contemplated machinery to spot test cheating is so inadequate that suspicion of monitors will never be aroused and no on-site inspectors ever will be dispatched.

Disarmament Agency and State Department advisors have censored data and withheld from President Kennedy scientific evidence proving there is a big hole for Soviet test cheating in these upcoming proposals.

This evidence definitely exists and is ignored completely by these officials who also are trying to keep it from the public. A well-organized campaign of distortion and half-truths is being carried on aimed at brainwashing the American public into meek submission to a disastrous agreement-for-agreement's sake cave-in

in the form of drastically scaled down treaty demands incorporated in these new proposals. The latter have already been drafted. They merely await a propitious time at Geneva to be given as an official offer to Communist negotiators.

The well-organized campaign I refer to is carried on by statements and letters to the editors of key newspapers over names of well-known personalities who want an effective test ban treaty, but who have not been informed of the facts proving administration proposals will result only in an ineffective treaty—one which stops all U.S. weapons progress while simply trusting an unpoliced Soviet promise not to continue theirs secretly and attain the nuclear weapons superiority needed to back up a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

Facts establishing the "big hole" for Soviet cheating in these proposals were placed on public record by Atomic Energy Commission and Defense Department expert witnesses during the above mentioned joint committee hearings March 5 to 12.

Rather than face them, admit errors in judgment and mistakes in evaluation, the Presidential advisors on the test ban question stubbornly have refused to budge from dangerous positions which undermine the very foundation of national defense against communism's drive to achieve world domination and bury the United States as part of the process.

It must never be forgotten that these people are part of the same crew which so badly misjudged the Bay of Pigs situation that disaster followed. In the present instance the magnitude of disaster which could follow only a few years of clandestine, one-sided Soviet nuclear progress is infinitely greater.

Only demands by an aware, aroused American public can reverse the administration's sure-lose test ban strategy of gradual nuclear self-mutilation. In the end that strategy will bring a terrifying rain of H-bombs on America if we choose not to surrender when the ultimatum is hurled. Only if we demand and get an effective test ban treaty—one which stops nuclear progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain—might the risks our country faces in the nuclear war be somewhat reduced.

The indisputable facts which establish the existence of the "big hole," brought to light during the joint committee's hearings were these:

First. Disarmament Agency witnesses testified that both current Anglo-United States proposals, and new ones, already drafted and soon to be offered to the Soviets, will rely on seismic observatories outside the Soviet Union to discover underground cheat testing inside its borders. Only a token number, nine, of unreliable, delayed reporting, tamper-prone unmanned and, as yet uninvented, "black box" devices will be demanded for placement inside the U.S.S.R.

Second. The Defense Department's top seismologist, Dr. Carl Romney, testified that the capability of seismographs to record intelligible data is physically limited by natural earth background noise which occurs everywhere. Its effect on seismographs, wherever located, is similar to static on a short wave radio—unless a seismic signal is larger and stronger than background noise, it is simply unintelligible.

Seismic signals double the background noise level are needed to "detect" seismic disturbances, whether they be created by man or by nature. Signals 10 to 20 times the background noise level must be recorded to be able to "distinguish" unnatural seismic events in the U.S.S.R. from the many hundreds of similar-sized earthquakes which occur there annually.

Recording signals big enough to make this distinction is the key to arousing the suspicion of monitors and of setting a treaty's onsite inspection machinery into motion. This is where the "big hole" comes in.

Although the earth's normal background noise averages about 15 millimicrons in signal size—the common flu virus is 60 millimicrons in diameter—by combining quiet locations with electronic and mechanical suppression, it is claimed that some seismic observatories might be installed with background noise levels approaching only 1 millimicron.

Assuming this is possible, then 10 millimicron seismic signals created by a series of cheat tests would be detectably recorded along with similar-sized earthquakes. However, they still would be too small to be distinguished from those earthquakes and, therefore, would not be identified as originating from cheat tests.

The key to arousing suspicion and dispatching onsite inspectors would be missing. Cheating would be undiscoverable by the administration's proposed seismic monitoring network. Very significant underground nuclear tests could be carried on in the over 2½-million-square-mile area of the interior of the U.S.S.R., which lies 500 to 600 miles inside its borders, without discovery from the outside.

This is because Soviet scientists can keep seismic signals from clandestine test in the "big hole" smaller than 10 millimicrons in size as they travel outside their country's borders by the following means: First, holding yields down below 3 kilotons and testing in formations like alluvium which transmit seismic waves poorly; second, testing in underground cavities which "decouple" explosive shock from surrounding earth and drastically reduce the seismic signal; or, third, a combination of the foregoing.

Third, the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, testified that the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of military interest, except very large yield super H-bombs which the Soviets already have anyway, can be perfected by tests carried out under these conditions of undiscoverability. As an indication of where military interest lies, General Betts revealed that even without a need for secrecy approximately one-half of U.S. underground tests in Nevada are carried on precisely at these very low, undiscoverable yields.

These are the facts of record. These are the facts which establish the "big hole" for clandestine, undiscoverable cheating through which the Soviets could sneak undetected to gain overwhelming nuclear weapons superiority. These are the facts which must be faced if nuclear test ban negotiations are to be carried on with the realism American citizens demand of their Government.

It is little wonder the Americans are unwilling to trust an unpoliced promise by the Soviet Government not to sneak through the "big hole." Less than half a year ago that same Government was caught redhanded while sneaking nuclear rockets into Cuba. Americans distrust communism enough to spend willingly over $50 billion a year to forestall its threat of world domination. They have a right to insist the "big hole" be closed. The present state of the seismic art indicates it only can be closed by returning to demands for adequate numbers of manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union.

Even the most ardent test ban proponents should join in vigorously demanding closure of the "big hole." They seek to reduce the risks the U.S. faces in today's nuclear world with a test ban treaty. But it is only by an effective treaty—one which inhibits nuclear progress to the same degree on both sides of the Iron Curtain which might have any chance of doing so.

An ineffective treaty only would serve to exchange whatever risks exist from continued unrestrained testing for the obvious risks involved in stopping nuclear weapons progress on our side, while providing opportunity for the other side to proceed with it surreptitiously and achieve the military superiority needed to back up a "surrender or die" ultimatum.

Discussing what may or may not be effective treaty terms, however, must not divert attention from an even more imperative inquiry. It is the basic question of whether or not even an effective treaty actually will, on balance, reduce the risks we face. Under it the Soviet Government still could keep topflight Soviet scientists secretly at work in Iron Curtain laboratories for many years devising the weapons which would give it nuclear superiority. Whereupon that government could wantonly abrogate the treaty and provide those scientists sudden opportunity to test their work.

Mr. Foster, Director of the Disarmament Agency, states this risk of surprise abrogation can be minimized by a U.S. policy of maintaining our laboratories and continuing our readiness for testing.

Yet, on March 2, 1962, discussing such a possibility, President Kennedy stated:

> But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution.

The survival of the United States well could depend on widespread informed public discussion to ascertain which of these gentlemen is correct.

The Federal Reserve Board Should Immediately Reduce the Discount Rate to 2½ Percent—This Would Do as Much as a Tax Cut Toward Bringing About Economic Expansion and Reducing Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Members return to their hometowns during the Easter recess, no doubt many well-meaning constituents will ask, in the style of the day, what they can do for their country.

My answer is that they can call upon the Federal Reserve Board to reduce the discount rate immediately from 3 to 2½ percent and, of course, follow through with the kind of monetary policy that such a reduction implies.

We are now witnessing some very encouraging signs of business expansion. It is entirely possible that, given half a chance, the economy will recover to something approaching reasonably full employment of our labor force and productive plant. It is even possible that, given half a chance through a congenial monetary policy, the economic system will generate a sufficient expansion, on its own, without our having to reduce taxes and expand the Federal deficit in order to pump purchasing power into the economy.

We have been treated to a long series of excuses, scares, and bugaboos to justify a tight credit, high interest rate policy. Throughout the Eisenhower administration, the bugaboo was inflation. Throughout the Kennedy administration, to date, the bugaboo has been balance of payments.

The Joint Economic Committee has considered very carefully, with continuous studies of more than 2 years, the role of interest rates, tight money, unemployment, and slow economic growth in the United States in the balance-of-payments picture; and it has not been able to find any justification for the tight-money policy. On the contrary, the evidence is extremely persuasive that the tight-money policy is actually worsening our balance-of-payments problem.

The Joint Economic Committee's report on this subject, filed on March 14 of this year, has not had, I believe, sufficient attention. Naturally the committee recognized that monetary and debt management policies go hand in hand and must be coordinated to bring about a level of interest rates conducive to economic expansion and continuing ecoomic growth. I urgently commend to the attention of the Members a brief section from this report of the Joint Economic Committee as follows:

MONETARY AND DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

We do not agree with the Council of Economic Advisers that: "Monetary policy has remained favorable to economic expansion." The widespread urge for supplemental fiscal action is evidence of the general feeling that monetary policy has not been favorable enough to bring forth enough expansion. Since mid-1962 active consideration has, accordingly, been given by the executive departments, by Congress, and in public forums, to tax reduction and reform as necessary Federal moves for reducing unemployment and stimulating growth.

This shift in emphasis which has pushed fiscal policy to the forefront in current policy discussion in no way eases, however, the responsibility of the Federal Reserve authorities to do more than in the past to restore the desired growth pattern. Indeed, if there has ever been any uncertainty as to the force of the public mandate in calling upon the monetary authorities for stimulative measures, vigorously pursued, that uncertainty can no longer exist. The widespread demands for stimulative tax reductions are by the same token demands for stimulative monetary action. Monetary policy must now help fiscal policy to do the stimulative job which, unfortunately, the monetary authorities have not done. Similarly, in these circumstances debt management should be handled so as to reinforce expansionary fiscal policies.

"We recommend that the monetary authorities follow a policy of assuring that the money supply expands in line with the rising needs of an expanding economy. Such a policy will reinforce the proposed fiscal policies and at the same time spare the Federal Reserve System their perennial explanations of why monetary policy is blameless in the face of a lagging economy."

The failure of monetary measures, unaided, to bring about a satisfactory reduction in unemployment and an improved rate of growth stems in part from the policies which have been pursued. Increases in money supply have been allowed to lag behind the growth of the economy. Another aspect of recent policy involves the alleged constraints imposed by the balance of payments.

The adverse effects on the economy, when emerging from recession, of a tax system which operates to impose a drag upon the economy by rolling up a disproportionately large tax "bite" out of the increased activity are being recognized in current tax discussions. On the monetary side, the economy has had to contend with a similar institutional drag. The "money supply" has been allowed to level off with each weakness in the economy but is not permitted to expand to appropriate new high levels as the economy struggles to come out of the downswings.

As the volume of transactions of goods and services grows, something like a similar expansion in the media of exchange is necessary. Under our banking system, this means an expansion of the volume of credit. The Federal Reserve System was expressly designed—and is expected—continually to adjust the money supply to the increasing needs of the economy. If an expansion in available reserves is not forthcoming, either the volume of transactions must be curtailed or the existing money supply called upon to do extra duty. But money conservation measures are not costless. They are likely to be used only when the needs of expanding trade strain the available means of settlement. The upward trend in the turnover of demand deposits, most rapid in years of monetary restraint, is thus an indication that the public has not been supplied with sufficient amounts of new money in relation to transactions and income.

The ratio of money supply, that is, currency in circulation together with demand deposits, to gross national product, has steadily declined since 1950 (table 2). At the end of 1954, when the distortions of the Korean war had been liquidated, the money supply amounted to 35.9 percent of gross national product. As recently as 1958 it was 31.1 percent, down more than 10 percent, while in 1962 it was down to 26.4 percent, a decline of more than one-fourth in the decade.

TABLE 2.—*Money supply, total liquid assets, and gross national product with comparisons*

[Amounts in billions of dollars; ratios expressed as percentages]

Period	Gross national product	Demand deposits adjusted and currency outside banks	Total liquid assets held by the public [1]	Ratio to gross national product	
				Money supply	Total liquid assets [1]
1951	329.0	119.2	281.0	36.2	82.6
1952	347.0	125.2	296.0	36.1	81.8
1953	365.4	128.3	311.5	35.1	85.6
1954	363.1	130.3	320.3	35.9	85.9
1955	397.5	134.4	332.5	33.8	81.3
1956	419.2	136.0	343.2	32.4	79.6
1957	442.8	136.7	356.0	30.9	80.3
1958	444.5	138.4	373.1	31.1	80.2
1959	482.8	142.3	393.9	29.6	80.5
1960	503.4	140.9	399.2	28.0	79.0
1961	518.7	143.2	424.6	27.6	78.2
1962	553.6	146.0	458.3	26.4	80.9

[1] December each year, seasonally adjusted.

Source: Federal Reserve System data.

Stated another way, at the end of 1954 the money supply was called upon to support a gross national product 2.8 times its size. Eight years later it was being called upon to do one-third more; that is, the gross national product was 3.8 times the money supply.

If combined currency and demand deposits today had the same ratio to business activity as they did a decade ago, the money supply (demand deposits plus currency) would be over $200 billion instead of $146 billion. No one would suggest that the postwar lag in the money supply now dictates an immediate, or drastic, effort to catch up. Congress and the people have a right to insist, however, that in the decade ahead, the economy will not again have to make a 70-percent increase in gross national output of goods and services fit a 23-percent increase in money supply.

An expanded concept of money, including other so-called "liquid assets," is often used by the Board of Governors in its annual report discussions. The extent of the lagging financial means for carrying on business is less marked with this concept, but nonetheless real. Even when these other popular ways of holding substitute "money" balances are included, the liquid wherewithal for doing an enlarged volume business has been declining relatively. From 1954, after the

Korean war, to 1961, total liquid assets held by the public have fallen from 85.9 percent to 78.2 percent of 1961 gross national product. It has been up somewhat in late 1962, returning to the 1957 levels. Recent evidence, coupled with the statement of the Chairman of the Board of Governors that some lessening of ease was decided upon in December 1962, shows that the authorities are already returning to the pattern which prevailed before this yearend increase in the ratio of liquid assets to gross national product.

"We again recommend that the monetary authorities provide the basis for secular increases in the money supply as the economy grows, through open market purchases of longer term Federal Securities, rather than by lowering reserve requirements."

We have in the past repeatedly recommended that the Federal Reserve provide the basis for an expanding money supply for our growing economy by open market purchases of longer term Federal securities. This policy gives the taxpayer a break through return to the Treasury of earnings of the Federal Reserve on such security holdings, instead of providing a free gift of earnings to the private banking system as occurs when expansion is provided through the lowering of reserve requirements. In addition, such open market purchases of longer term securities help the Treasury lengthen the debt, and tend to keep prices of longer term securities up and interest rates on these securities lower than would otherwise be the case. In turn, lower interest rates in the long end of the market tend to encourage investment, particularly in plant, equipment, and housing, which contributes to a higher rate of long-term economic growth. We can see no excuse for any other policy.

The monetary authorities have been going directly contrary to this committee's recommendation on this matter. They have reduced reserve requirements. The recent report of the Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency indicates that further reductions in reserve requirements are under consideration. The Joint Economic Committee, therefore, requests that the monetary authorities advise this committee before taking any further actions which run contrary to this committee's repeated recommendation that secular increases in the money supply be provided through open market purchases of longer term Federal securities rather than by lowering reserve requirements.

"We disapprove of the action of the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee in December 1962 when it moved to tighten monetary conditions. Tight money is not now needed either to fight inflation or to 'protect the dollar.'"

The hope that monetary policy will aid, rather than hinder, fiscal measures was vitiated by the ready confession of the Chairman of the Board of Governors to this committee on February 1, 1963, under questioning: "I will say to you now that you are correct in your analysis that the Federal Reserve is pursuing a slightly less easy policy." This statement was made in answer to a question as to whether policy had changed in December 1962, for the first time in 2½ years. The Chairman of the Board of Governors did not satisfactorily explain the grounds for even a slight deliberate tightening of credit. The change of policy was confirmed and reasons for the action were set forth in the record of the Open Market Committee's actions for 1962 that was made available to the committee after the hearings in response to our request. The action still seems to us both perplexing and premature.

It is thoroughly irrational to tighten monetary conditions while business activity is unsatisfactory, unemployment is high, large amounts of our capacity are idle, and the price level is stable. We hope that, if Congress should enact tax reduction measures, the monetary authorities will demonstrate enough faith in the judgment of Congress to lend their active aid and cooperation well in advance of the need for financing a deficit. They should not wait idly by while a tight credit situation is allowed to develop because of rising business credit requirements in an economy striving to grow.

Not even the balance-of-payments argument about "protecting the dollar" provides excuse for tighter money and higher interest rates. The extensive hearings of our Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments provided no evidence that differentials in interest rates between United States and foreign countries provide any substantial stimulus to capital outflows and hence to gold losses and a deficit in our balance of payments. Indeed, evidence points to many other factors, such as the needs of trade, and so forth, as being of far greater importance.

A distinguished Swiss economist, amplifying views expressed to the committee by other international witnesses, emphasized that—

"In general, it must be recognized that international capital flows do not depend just on interest rates, but on interest rates plus the state of confidence in the currency concerned.

"If this confidence is high, a country may be able to sustain very low rates, thus Switzerland probably has about the lowest interest rates anywhere.

"If, on the other hand, this confidence is shaken, even rather high interest rates may be insufficient to stabilize capital flows. In fact, some of the money the United States has been losing in recent months was going to a country with even lower rates, that is, Switzerland. Conversely, Germany found in 1960–61 that low rates did not stop the influx of foreign money,"

Additional evidence against the overemphasis on differential interest rates lies in the relative smallness of recent differentials. When the risks of foreign exchange are insured, rate differentials have at times been in favor of New York. In any case the advantage or disadvantage has been small and swinging back and forth, with major difference easily acocunted for by the special circumstances, e.g., those involving Canadian exchange, which have tended to outweigh interest considerations.

Several empirical studies presented during the year likewise suggest that the needs of commerce for strategically placed working balances, tax considerations and other non-interest-rate factors are far more likely to be primary forces behind short-term capital movements than are modest opportunities for interest arbitrage.

The Nation has now been brought to the active consideration of tax reduction for economic stimulation. Even if such measures are adopted and succeed, we will nonetheless require domestic monetary expansion. Instead of continuing to rely upon an asserted need for relatively high interest rates, we think that trade expansion and other avenues offer the preferable approach to the serious balance-of-payments problem.

Raising interest rates for balance-of-payments reasons can also be ruled out because such action merely provides an opportunity for other countries to raise interest rates. A competitive race toward higher interest rates would not be in the interest of this country or of other economies abroad. In fact, with postwar inflationary pressures eliminated, the case for a somewhat lower structure of interest rates is overpowering. To the extent that international capital movements provide any basis for corrective action at this time, the appropriate remedy is to be found in a multilateral payments agreement of the type suggested later in this report. The alternative of stifling our economy through high interest rates is unconscionable.

"The Federal Reserve must either be persuaded or compelled by law to institute a better and more timely system of reporting to the Congress and the public the actions taken by the Open Market Committee and the Board of Governors, together with the specific reasons for such actions."

The Federal Reserve is a direct servant of the Congress. It acts solely as the agent of Congress in carrying out its functions of controlling the supply of money. This power is given to Congress by the Constitution and the Federal Reserve authorities merely act for Congress under delegated powers. By both law and sound principle, the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee must report their actions to Congress, together with their reasons for taking these actions. This information must be so explicit and clear that Congress can reasonably judge whether the monetary authorities have exercised the delegated monetary powers in accord with congressional instructions and in the national interest. The reports also must be timely, and hence should be submitted to Congress in time for their review by this committee in connection with its annual hearings on the President's Economic Reports; that is, by January 20.

The report of actions, and the reasons for actions taken, as is set forth in the Board of Governors annual report, have been notoriously inadequate, uninformative, and confusing, as this committee has noted in the past. We are quite disappointed to discover in the record of actions for 1962 no significant improvement in this respect.

The meeting of December 18, 1962, at which a change in policy took place is typical. A few phrases from that record are illustrative of the unsatisfactory character of the record. At this meeting it will be remembered that while the country was talking about the need to stimulate the economy by tax reductions, the Open Market Committee was deciding upon a contrary program of less monetary ease. From the report of the meetings we learn what everyone knew, that "evidence of solid additional achievement was still limited," or, to use the words of the directive, "recognizes the unsatisfactory level of domestic activity, the continuing underutilization of resources, and the absence of inflationary pressures." In spite of these preponderant considerations, clearly dictating no less "ease" in the money markets, that committee voted 7 to 5 for "maintaining a firmer tone in the money markets while continuing to provide moderate reserve expansion in the banking system." The contradiction in this portion of the directive calling at once for a "firmer tone" and "moderate expansion," confusing as it is, does not obscure the fact, as Chairman Martin told this committee in his oral testimony, that a new policy of less ease had been instituted.

The most disturbing aspect of the problem is the conclusion implied by their 1962 report, if we can accept it as a complete, clear, and accurate record. The confused nature of their annual report and the vague words of the so-called "directives" suggest that the monetary authorities themselves have hazy and unclear concepts of what they are trying to do. When one undertakes to give operational significance to such expressions as "somewhat" less ease, "moderate" expansion or similar differences, the confusion is not necessarily that of the observers but more probably that of the actors. We would prefer to think that this is not the case but the alternative is to believe that the authorities are unable to make an effective report on their policies. This matter remains a troublesome issue involving the relationship of Congress with one of its own agents.

"Under present conditions of high unemployment and excess capacity, debt manage-

ment should be handled so as generally to reinforce expansionary fiscal and monetary policies."

A Federal deficit of sizable proportions must be financed during 1963–64, regardless of whether action is taken to reduce taxes. Indeed, as we have earlier pointed out, the cumulative deficit to be financed over the next 3 fiscal years will be smaller if an effective tax reduction and reform program is adopted, than if no such action is taken.

Under present conditions of high unemployment and excess capacity, debt management must be handled in ways which generally reinforce the needed expansionary fiscal and monetary policies. Baseless fears of inflation or balance-of-payments considerations must not be allowed to constrain public debt operations occasioned by the transitional budget deficits.

These considerations dictate that "lengthening the debt" should be given less weight for a while. This is no occasion for large amounts of Treasury borrowing at long term, since this places the Treasury in competition with the demands of private businesses and individuals for investment funds. Furthermore, Treasury borrowing on short term under these conditions may actually aid the balance of payments by supporting domestic short-term interest rates while weakening long-term rates. To the extent that changes in short-term interest rates have any influence on international capital flows, such a policy would be all to the good.

On the other hand, there is no reason to pursue a policy of extreme shortening of the debt structure. To the extent that the Treasury enters the long end of the market, they should do so via the auction method of selling Government bonds. This is a policy we have urged repeatedly in the past. The Treasury is commended for its initial exploratory move in this direction, and for the success which attended the sale of the $250 million issue of bonds of 1988–93 on January 8, 1963. We recommend that the practice of offering longer and medium-term Treasury bonds at competitive bidding be employed regularly and be made an established part of debt management practices.

The United States has for some years faced the problem of bringing its balance of payments under control in a manner consistent with its objectives of maximum employment and a more rapid rate of growth of the domestic economy. We reject the notion that the United States must raise domestic interest rates or follow restrictive fiscal policies—causing a low growth rate and high domestic unemployment—in order to solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. Indeer, the strength of the dollar ultimately depends on the strength and growth of the underlying U.S. economy.

The committee is of the conviction—shared by responsible authorities in Europe—that the United States must move rapidly toward maximum employment, production, and more rapid growth.

Authorizing Virgin Islands To Issue General Obligation Bonds

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize the Government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to prolong this discussion. I think we have a practical situation here, but I do think before we vote on this amendment it is my responsibility as manager of the bill to point out that the committee instructed us to support the bill as it appears as reported by the committee. While I am inclined to limit this to certain specific activity, I do think we should be aware of the fact that too often in this Congress when it comes to legislating for offshore areas, where the people are not citizens in the full sense, we are inclined to adopt a double rule. We have one rule for those on the mainland and we have another rule for the offshore areas.

I intend to support the amendment because it is the practical thing to do, but I do not intend to support it in a paternalistic way or attitude toward those people because I think they have as much responsibility and ability to govern as any municipal council throughout the country.

Cuba and Broken Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an article on U.S. foreign policy with regard to Cuban communism as prepared by Mr. Hugh J. Boyd, principal of Lake View High School in Lake View, S.C., in eloquently expressing his opinions in U.S. handling of the Cuban problem. Mr. Boyd has reflected much of the sentiment that I have detected among my constituents in South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an impressive column by Mr. Robert Morris, of Dallas, Tex., entitled "Broken Treaties"; and also my newsletter of April 8, 1963, which, like Mr. Boyd's article and Mr. Morris' column, is also on the subject of Cuba.

There being no objection, the article, column, and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE CUBA OF TYRANNY

(By Hugh J. Boyd)

It's time for us of the United States to stop our wrist-slapping of those Cubans who are making heroic efforts to destroy a few of the vermin who have occupied their homeland. Our own people constantly remind us that we might anger someone if we allow such activity to continue. Some say we must tread lightly or we will step on some little Red toe. We have heard so much of this that we are beginning to draw the conclusion that our country, the United States, is afraid to put its foot down anywhere for fear of its touching the ground. We are told it is better to wait.

What are we waiting for? When are we supposed to get mad? What side are we on anyway? Have we so perverted our sense of justice and reasoning that we now condemn those who would gladly strike for freedom, knowing full well the possible if not inevitable consequences? Have we forgotten the courage displayed by our own heroes who struck for freedom against overwhelming odds and won.

To those who say, "Oh, we must not let them do such things, the blood will be on our hands," we say, "On whose hands is the blood of all those who have died under the oppression in Cuba? Is it not already dripping from the hands of those who for reasons of poor judgment, or pure ignorance are responsible for the rise of Castro?" This we cannot justify, but we can certainly face up to our responsibility, admit a mistake, and make every attempt to free Cuba of its tyranny.

As to a fear of war, this seems stupid; for have not the little rats run for their holes each time their hand has been called? Certainly, no one wants to die, but neither does anyone want to survive in a living hell. This is the blueprint for us, the United States, for the Americas, and every time we give in, or back up, or fail to support those who fight hand-to-hand combat with the Communist, we are asking for just that living hell. Every time we show embarrassment at a mistake—or apologize as we withdraw from an impasse—the beedy-eyed little tramps sharpen their teeth for a little larger bite—and lick their chops with a little more anticipation.

The Communists, as individuals, are a weak, slimy lot—the fishy handshakers. Certainly, they are devoted to their cause and collectively they are strong; individually they are cowards, losing themselves in a cause for the simple reason they lack the courage to face the world's problems as individuals. It's about time we reduced them to the sniveling, incipid denominator which is common to all of them; and if not actually act to annihilate, at least to aid and abet those who are devoted to that cause. It's time we pictured ourselves in the position of the Cubans for a few minutes with the stinging tears of anger and insult streaming down their faces, seeking only one thing in life; the privilege of going home to live in peace. We say that we cannot help them, in fact we say we must prevent such provocative attacks against those who occupy Cuba for we run the risk of starting a war.

Is there one among us who believes that if the Communists believed that they could destroy us that they would hesitate one minute with or without provocation, or righteous justification. To whom do they have to answer, or to whom must they plead for mercy for such a sin against mankind? They know no God. There is no consciousness of right or wrong, only that which says "we can win, or we can lose," which would serve to stay their execution of us in their distorted "hall of justice."

Make no mistake, when the Communists think they can win, they will strike; until then, and this need not ever be if we seize the initiative, they will continue to head for the ratholes when we show the necessary determination. Of course, they will continue to graw away at our freedoms while still "holed up," creating new pockets of resistance which we must also ferret out and destroy. Give them no peace anywhere.

The dictates of commonsense demand that we take cognizance of the fact that we are losing a war; that there are those who sincerely want to win in their struggle for freedom. We must help them, but more than this, we must realize that we, you and I, are much more involved in international affairs than were our predecessors when entering World War I and World War II; and yet we are still sitting on our too-wide "dead ends," doing absolutely nothing.

It is time the United States set its foot down, and, if necessary, make the whole of

South America shake with its thunder. When the "commies" set tail and run from there, follow them to their nests, ferret them out, and make them continue until they are again back in their own paradise with Niki or Maw. There is certainly such a thing as righteous anger.

BROKEN TREATIES

(By Robert Morris)

There was a day when the image we cast around the world was the subject of deep preoccupation on the part of our leaders. If this were so today the mood of those concerned would be one of abject shame.

A few years ago our present Chief Executive complained that we were not sufficiently helping Cuban exiles to restore freedom to their homeland. Later he stated that we could not tolerate a Soviet satellite on our doorstep.

The spectacle for all to see today is that we are indeed tolerating a Soviet satellite at our doorstep. Dramatizing that abject fact, we are conspicouously apprehending, even illegally, not the Castro agents who are radiating from Cuba to destroy freedom in Latin America but the Cuban exiles who aspire to free their homeland.

How dread must this spectacle appear to the people of Central and South America, the next targets of Castro and Khrushchev, particularly in the light of other reflections of the underlying abject mood?

The legal framework that solemnly exists today is clear. Not only do we have the Monroe Doctrine but it has been specifically implemented by the treaties of Rio de Janeiro, Caracas and Punta del Este. These are serious treaties under which we pledged to eradicate not only Soviet power but Soviet ideology from the hemisphere. A Soviet beachhead is proscribed. We are expressly committed by these solemn pacts not to tolertae it, coexist with it or guarantee its integrity. Yet we are patently flouting these compacts.

The Cuban exiles, on the other hand, apparently take the solemnity of these OAS treaties seriously and we now know what is in store for them. We even seize them, and have them seized, in international waters without waiting until they come within our territorial waters.

Of course despair prevails among the Cubans. To show how deeply committed to this illegel posture, emotionally, our State Department people are, they even smear, with dishonorable leaks to the press, the leader of the Cubans in exile.

As if to mock the folly of this Cuban performance, the similar mood of surrender that we engaged in with respect to Laos is now turning into a possible disaster.

In Laos, as in Cuba, to induce Khrushchev to keep his word we pressured General Nosavan's forces, the loyal Laotians, to cease resistance to the Communists and enter into a Soviet-leaning coalition government, on the troika basis.

The pro-Western forces withdrew militarily, according to their pledges. The pro-Soviet forces, reflecting their nature, not only did not withdraw from strategic positions but aggressively moved forward, with augmented strength, from North Vietnam.

Now Secretary Dean Rusk complains that the Communists are not keeping their word. In other words in 1963 he is still attributing to them what have been our standards and our meaning of "keeping one's word." The Communist meaning of a treaty is officially set forth—and put to practice thousands of times—"treaties like pie crusts, are made only to be broken." They will keep a pledge only as long as it serves their purpose.

But an even more chilling spectacle can be found by looking ahead. If we, by our example and by our flouting of protective treaties, continue to crush resistance to Soviet power in Latin America, one country after another will topple. Strategic Brazil and British Guiana are already well on the way.

Castro's agents are moving aggressively ahead. When the leaders of Central America showed signs of taking protective action against Soviet power, our Chief Executive went there to discourage them, promising nevertheless to aid them in stopping subversion.

The subversion—even sabotage—however, continues. Our State Department is not lifting a finger. No, I am wrong, they are lifting a finger—a forbidding finger but the finger is directed at Frances Knight, the competent head of the Passport Division of the State Department who wants to deny passports to Soviet agents going abroad to further world communism.

As we have pointed out, previously, Miss Knight has testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that her superiors forced her to issue passports to 547 persons she knew to be Communists, who were going abroad, obviously to subvert.

The conditioned American who does not seem to be disturbed at the prospect of a Communist Latin America should think twice when he beholds the trend toward control over our destiny by the United Nations. There we of the West are a minority today. But if we lose the supporting Latin American bloc that makes us somewhat respectable in this minority position, we will be almost alone, surrounded by our enemies, but this time—helpless.

A CHOICE FOR AMERICANS

(By Senator STROM THURMOND)

The raids carried out by Cuban exiles against Castro and Russian Communist forces in Cuba have inspired a reaction of official displeasure from the United States. U.S. reaction has been expressed in both action and words. The action has been in the form of arrests of some Cubans in the United States suspected of participating in the raids. Verbally, the United States has officially characterized the raids as irrational.

The actions taken by the United States may have less effect on the Cuban raiders than the raiders themselves have on the combined Castro-Soviet military grip on Cuba. The raiders, so far as is known, do not operate directly from U.S. soil. Those not arrested have announced their intention of continuing their anti-Communist raids.

Verbal expressions of displeasure unleashed by U.S. officials against the Cuban raiders may, in the long run, have a far graver significance than the official U.S. actions, for they will surely be interpreted as an indicator of U.S. policy toward all those who rise up in arms against their Communist captors and rulers.

The Cuban raiders have been labeled "irrational" by State Department spokesmen. However badly the actions of the Cuban raiders may conflict with real or imagined U.S. interests, the charging of Cuban raiders with irrationality ill becomes Americans, of all people.

Cuban refugees have lost much, including their homes, their jobs, friends, loved ones, and above all, their liberty. Political asylum in a foreign land is no substitute. Having lose virtually all else, is it "irrational" for them now to risk their lives, even against hopeless odds, when there appears no other hope that their country will soon escape the terror, hunger, and captivity of Communist tyranny? After all, it is a fact that no country which has been taken behind the Iron Curtain has ever been freed, and the United States has never supported any movements toward liberation.

The Cuban raiders are by no means the first men to gamble against seemingly hopeless odds to gain liberty. Almost 187 years ago, other men, against almost equally hopeless odds, undertook to free their country from foreign tyranny, and to this end, they pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. To American patriots in 1776, there was no other honorable course. So it may seem to Cuban refugees today.

The Cubans are not alone in their plight, however. Millions in eastern Europe, in the Balkan states, in Korea, on the mainland of China, even in non-Russian areas of the U.S.S.R. itself, are suffering from the same tyranny. There are those among these peoples who may again reach the limit of their endurance and conclude that they have no other honorable course but to rise up against hopeless odds.

Would the official reaction of the U.S. Government to such an uprising be condemnation for "irrationality?" Were the uprisings in East Germany 1953 "irrational?" Was the uprising in Hungary in 1956 an example of "irrational" conduct? Both these events caused a crisis in relations between the Communists and the free world. According to our policymakers, had the United States actively supported these uprisings, or even threatened to interfere with Soviet efforts to crush the uprisings, there would have been a risk of escalation into general war. For those who participated in the uprisings, the risk was already total—and most of them paid with their lives, either in the fighting, or in the executions which followed.

For the United States to aline itself with the aspirations of captive peoples for liberty involves a risk. It has been and is official U.S. policy to discourage "non-evolutionary changes" in Communist-held countries in hope of minimizing the risk of war to the United States. It also keeps us on the defensive against the constant efforts of the Communists to continue extending their tyranny worldwide.

Captive people all over the world will recognize in the charge of "irrationality" against Cuban raiders the U.S. policy of minimizing the risk—to Americans. Indeed, it may for them be the "convincer" that captive peoples can never hope to gain American support for their liberty hopes, and trigger against Communist rulers uprisings born of the belief that the future holds no better odds for throwing off the tyranny of communism than the present. At some such point, all Americans, and not just their policymakers, must face the sober choice—to minimize the risks to ourselves, or like our ancestors, to pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to the cause of liberty.

The Rev. James Logan Delk of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news article published in the Lexington Leader of Thursday, April 11, 1963, relating to the death of the Reverend James Logan Delk.

Dr. Delk was born in Tennessee, near the birthplace and home of World War I hero Sgt. Alvin York, whom he knew well. Yet he lived a great part of his life in Kentucky, and was a citizen of the State.

While always actively engaged in the ministry, he took a great interest in governmental affairs and politics—and several times was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senate and other offices. He was known by many in public life in Kentucky, and throughout the Nation, of both parties.

I had known Dr. Delk for many years, and while we belonged to different political parties, I valued his friendship. He was a colorful figure, a good friend, and a man whose great interest was in helping the poor, the unemployed, the sick—all those who are less fortunate than their fellow Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY.—The Reverend James Logan Delk ran for sheriff of Christian County nearly 40 years ago. He lost.

Persistently, the stern, dignified evangelist tried five times for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senator. Each time he lost.

Once he sought the party nomination for Governor. Again he lost.

But Delk was a man who could laugh at his political misfortune—and run for office again.

"I've never won yet but I'm not discouraged. The great Abraham Lincoln tried 13 times before he was elected," Delk once said.

This year, he sought the Democratic nomination for Governor again. It was his last political effort.

Delk died at the age of 75 Tuesday at Jamestown, Tenn., not far from his native Pall Mall. He became ill this winter and left Frankfort, his home for 11 years, to go to Hopkinsville, where a daughter lived.

Delk was a picturesque figure. His long hair curled at the nape. His blue eyes sparkled and he never wore glasses. His hat often was broad-brimmed and white and he carried a cane strictly for effect.

Born in the mountains of north-center Tennessee near the home of World War I hero Sgt. Alvin York, Delk spent his boyhood on the farm.

At 16, he enrolled at God's Bible school in Cincinnati and became an evangelist for the Church of God in Christ. He preached in 48 States, Canada, and Mexico.

Once Delk flew to England for the Pentecostal World Conference. Another time he was a delegate at a church meeting in Toronto. In 1945 he represented his church at the United Nations in San Francisco.

National President of VFW Auxiliary, Mrs. Merton Tice, Encourages Korean Cottage Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as a longtime resident of Mitchell, S. Dak., I am proud of the fact that this city has produced in recent years both a national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and a national president of the VFW auxiliary.

Judge Merton Tice of Mitchell served as national VFW commander for the years 1954 to 1955. Now, his wife, Elfrieda, is serving as national president of the VFW auxiliary. Both of the Tices have brought an unusual degree of energy, imagination, and force to their leadership responsibilities.

Mrs. Tice and her 16-year-old daughter, Virginia, have recently completed a 21,000 mile tour of the Far East. Their tour was a valuable contribution to our country's interests abroad and its meaning has not been lost on the Tices.

Mrs. Tice came back with a determination to aid the homeless of Korea. She has called upon her auxiliary sisters to throw their support to the project—Courage Cottages—under the auspices of the American-Korean Foundation. Under this plan, a home for a Korean family can be built for less than $100. Through the efforts of Mrs. Tice and her auxiliary sisters in all parts of the Nation, it is hoped that many Korean families can get out of their mud floor hovels into a respectable cottage. All of us who believe in the promise of a better life for the children of the earth are inspired by Mrs. Tice's courage and energy.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about this worthwhile effort which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of February 9, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN HOMES BUILT BY VFW AUXILIARY

(By Mary Ann Grossmann)

Many Korean mothers and their babies no longer will live in thatched mud huts or GI surplus cook tents by the time Mrs. Merton Tice finishes her current tour of duty as national president of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary.

Energetic Mrs. Tice, of Mitchell, S. Dak., is in the Twin Cities through Sunday paying her official visit to the VFW Minnesota Auxiliary.

"I took office in Minneapolis last August during our national convention," Mrs. Tice said, "and at that time I chose as my theme 'Women of Courage.' Now I'm here to tell the auxiliary members how we can be women of courage."

Mrs. Tice said she found the real meaning of women of courage during a recent 21,000-mile trip through the Far East. She and her 16-year-old daughter saw Okinawa, Korea, Manila, and Hong Kong.

"We went to see the seamy side of life," she admitted. "And we saw just that. Keeping away from luncheons, balls, and parties, we saw refugees in Korea and the conditions under which those women live."

It was in a resettlement center just north of Seoul, Korea, that Mrs. Tice reached a decision about how to implement the auxiliary's international woman-to-woman project.

"This settlement is run by the American-Korean Foundation, and they need help. This is where I got the idea of courage cottages—inexpensive cottages that can be built by the Koreans themselves with funds from auxiliary members."

Mrs. Tice hopes that by the time she leaves office all 51 department (State) auxiliaries will have contributed $100 for a courage cottage.

"This project has really caught the enthusiasm of our members," she smiled, "and it looks as though many local units are going to finance their own courage cottages.

"These cottages are only two-room huts of concrete and mud," she said. "But to people who have fled before the Communist terror—who literally have no place to lay their heads and shelter their children—a courage cottage is a palace.

"For every $100 we can give, we are showing that we have a responsibility for those who fight on our side, on the side of world freedom."

Mrs. Tice said that in many resettlement centers throughout the Orient disease is widespread.

"These people need help with housing, schools, and health needs. The Government is helping with their health problems and they take care of their own schools. But housing is what they need help with."

Throughout her journey, Mrs. Tice said she found mothers that realized the advantage of keeping their families away from communism and going to schools which teach freedom.

"Everywhere I talked with people who had terrific pride in their nation," she recalled, "and who wanted their nation to be free."

Besides the courage cottages, Mrs. Tice said, she has two other projects. One is to see that each auxiliary visits a historic spot in their part of the Nation.

The second is for auxiliaries to purchase an album of records telling of 13 incidents in American history. The albums will be donated to hospitals and school libraries.

"I've visited 30 departments since I took office," Mrs. Tice said. "And everywhere I go I sense a new interest among women in the heritage of our Nation, in the history of our country."

Today Mrs. Tice will attend an auxiliary council of administration meeting in the Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis; be guest of honor at a 2 p.m. tea hosted by West St. Paul Auxiliary 4462; and be guest of honor at the VFW and auxiliary annual midwinter dinner in the Radisson.

The Detergent Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, further evidence of the national scope of the detergent problem appears in the Los Angeles Times of March 27, 1963. The enactment of the detergent control bill (S. 1183) would afford relief from such difficulties. Detergent suds are now creating a traffic hazard near a water reclamation plant at the Whittier Narrows Dam. I ask unanimous consent that a news item from the Los Angeles Times of March 27, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as well as an editorial published the following day, and an article by the science editor dated April 7, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 27, 1963]

SUDS FROM DETERGENTS SLOW TRAFFIC

Motorists traveling near Whittier Narrows Dam are grappling with a new traffic hazard—suds.

Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli reported Tuesday that detergent suds from the Whittier Narrows waste water reclamation plant often flood the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Bluff Road.

Autos agitate these suds, Bonelli said, and the bubbles float through the air and hamper driving.

The board of supervisors unanimously passed a motion for a study by the county flood control and report on corrective detergent legislation pending in Sacramento.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 28, 1963]

SUDS ON THE STREET: A SYMPTOM

Startled motorists out Whittier way are likely to conclude that tidy gremlins are busy in the neighborhood when they find the Washington Boulevard and Bluff Road intersection covered deep with suds.

It may be pleasing to find the atmosphere full of bubbles glinting in the afternoon sun, but Supervisor Frank Bonelli says it is a driving hazard.

The suds come from waste water overflow from the reclamation plant at Whittier Narrows. Detergents used by housewives resist present water purification processes, and cars churn up a thick blanket of bubbles in the detergent-laden overflow.

Charm aside, this is a symptom of a problem national in scope. Creeks and rivers polluted by detergent-bearing wastes show a heavy scum of bubbles. Detergents are lethal to fish, and the full effect of detergents on ground water supplies used for agriculture is not beneficial.

Officials responsible for pure water supplies are concerned about the growing use of detergents and their effect on wildlife, public health, and agriculture.

It is not too early for State and Federal studies in this field, to keep detergent pollution from becoming a problem as serious and costly as air pollution.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

CHEMISTS BATTLE SUDS-FOUL WATER

(By Irving S. Bengelsdorf)

Those wonderful detergent suds in today's washing machines are fouling up Mother Nature's water systems.

And once again conflict has arisen between the synthetic world created by man and the natural world in which we live.

From California to New York, in Britain and in West Germany, the pollution of surface and underground water supplies by synthetic detergents has set off a chain of legislative action, economic hassles, and technical research programs.

Chemical research programs, however, may find the answer to the current detergent pollution problem within the next few years.

The controversy stems from one of the major triumphs of chemistry in the last generation—the preparation of inexpensive artificial cleaning agents which are superior to soap.

SYNDETS TAKE OVER

Since their introduction following World War II, synthetic detergents (syndets) have taken over the place of soap in more than 75 percent of household cleaning tasks; more than 900 million pounds of detergents were manufactured in 1962. Their phenomenal success may be directly responsible for their downfall.

More and more people, using more and more washing machines, are flushing more and more syndets into septic tanks and waste water treatment plants. These unaltered syndets travel through the soil, polluting streams and ground waters, wherever they appear, either above surface or in underground water supplies, they cause the water to foam.

They interfere, too, with the proper operation of waste water treatment installations.

For these reasons, legal action to ban the sale of present "miracle" washing products has been taken in West Germany, and similar bills are pending in Congress and various State legislatures.

Chemically, a good detergent is made up of two parts:

1. A long "tail" composed of carbon and hydrogen atoms; this hydrocarbon tail is soluble in soil, grease, dirt, etc. It is repelled by and is not soluble in water; for this reason, the hydrocarbon tail part of the detergent is said to be hydrophobic (Greek: Hydor means water; phobos, fear).

A short "neck" made up of a central atom surrounded by oxygen atoms, and a "head" which usually is sodium. The "neck and head" portion of the detergent are soluble in water, but not in soil or grease; this is the hydrophilic portion of the detergent (Greek: philos means love).

PART IN, PART OUT

When placed into water, as in a washing machine, the detergent lines up at the surface with the hydrophilic neck and head portions sticking into the water and the hydrophobic tail portions sticking out of the water into the air. Whenever the detergent solution comes into contact with soil on clothes, the extended hydrophobic tails grab and hang onto the soil particles.

The agitator action of the washing machine now knocks the loosened soil particles and attached detergent off the fabric. The removed soil is kept suspended in the water, away from the fabric, by the continued action of the detergent around it. This, essentially, is the way a detergent cleans.

Known for more than 2,000 years, soap is the oldest detergent available to man. Its hydrophobic tail usually consists of 18 carbon atoms and 37 hydrogen atoms. Its neck is made up of a carbon atom and two oxygen atoms; a sodium atom forms the head.

This trouble with soap lies in its use in hard water. Hard water contains calcium; the calcium atom boots out and replaces the sodium atom in the head. This new soap, with a calcium head, now is insoluble in water; it deposits itself as a greasy, curdy material on clothes, dishes, and sinks.

This is the ring around the bathtub formed by the calcium-head soap. It is not only unpleasant and undesirable, but is economically wasteful; it uses up and destroys soap which ordinarily would be helpful in the cleaning and washing process.

In the early 1930's, the chemical industry came up with a substitute for soap which could be used in hard water—a synthetic detergent. The material resembles soap; it has a sodium head and a long slender tail of 12 carbon atoms known chemically as an alkyl group. The neck, however, is different; it is made up of a sulfur atom surrounded by four oxygen atoms. These materials, called sodium alkyl sulfates (SAS), are excellent detergents but somewhat expensive.

PETROLEUM MATERIALS

The coming of World War II, and the need to wash clothes in sea water, led to the preparation of synthetic detergents based upon inexpensive materials obtained from petroleum. These detergents differ from soap in that they have a stubbier, bushier alkyl tail attached to a more complicated neck; the latter is made up of a sulfur atom, three oxygen atoms, and a hexagonal portion called a benzene ring. For these reasons, the new detergents are known as alkyl benzene sulfonates

By 1953 the sales of alkyl benezene sulfonates had surpassed those of soap, by 1954 water wells began to foam.

The difficulty lies in the bushy alkyl tail of the ABS. Whereas the slender tails of soap and SAS readily are broken down by bacteria in the soil or the waste water treatment plant, the stubby tail of ABS makes it more resistant to biological attack; its breakdown is much slower. ABS, therefore, continues to exist, and work, in soil and water long after it has done its duty in the washing machine.

According to the Soap & Detergent Association, there is no indication that ABS is toxic to wildlife. Where fish have been killed by stream pollution, the trouble has been shown due to other organic pollutants, not detergents.

The detergent industry currently is spending more than $5 million annually seeking another detergent which will be broken down—made harmless—by biological action.

One thing is certain: there is little chance of a return to the use of soap in washing machines.

When available, within the next few years, the new detergents probably will cost about 15 percent more than alkyl benzene sulfonates; they will have excellent cleaning abilities.

West Germany already has passed a law which forbids the sale of ABS detergents after October 1, 1964, if they are not at least 80 percent broken down by biological action. Similar and even stricter bills are pending in Congress and the legislatures of Connecticut, Maryland, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

California areas having detergent pollution problems include the lower San Joaquin Valley, the Barstow area, and the Colton Narrows region, near San Bernardino.

To prevent possible statewide ABS pollution, Assemblyman Don A. Allen, Sr., Democrat, of Los Angeles, has introduced a bill to prohibit the sale and use of detergents which can't be broken down biologically.

The bill, since amended to provide for the establishment of standards of detergent breakdown by the State water pollution control board, has been sidetracked for further study by the legislature.

Detergents also are providing headaches in the operation of a unique and pioneering effort to demonstrate that the waste water of a large, semidesert area, such as the Los Angeles Basin, can be reclaimed for reuse.

The Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation plant, near Rosemead and San Gabriel Boulevards, handles 10 million gallons of waste water daily in a three-step process:

1. Settling tanks receive raw waste water and permit the solid waste materials to separate out. Water arriving at the Whittier Narrows plant runs about 10 parts per million in content of ABS. The waste water, minus the solids, is then run into—

2. Oxidation tanks which biologically remove organic matter. At this point, about 65 percent of the ABS is broken down and destroyed. The water is then discharged into—

3. Chlorination tanks which complete the destruction of bacteria and organic matter. This operation does not affect the amount of ABS in the water, which at this point is 3.7 parts per million.

The water which comes out of the chlorination tanks is known as effluent; it is sterile water and conforms to U.S. Public Health Service standards—except it is higher in ABS content than the USPHS acceptable standard of only 0.5 parts per million.

A detergent removal tank operation, only one of its kind in the country, has been added between the oxidation and chlorination treatments at the Whittier Narrows plant. Air is forced through the effluent to make it foam. The foam then is removed and discharged to the outfall system for disposal in the ocean. This cuts the detergent concentration from the previous 3.7 parts per million to 2 parts per million—a total of 80 percent removal of the original ABS.

The effluent then is soaked into the Rio Hondo River basin. Filtration and bacteria in the river bed soil removes more. The low-detergent water percolates through the soil, and after dilution with river and imported waters, is used in wells downstream.

It is to be emphasized that water from these wells meets all the USPHS drinking water standards. They are checked care-

fully and continuously; thus far, the ABS-content is far below the acceptable 0.5 parts per million.

The Whittier Narrows plant is setting the research pace for the rest of the country with respect to reclaimed water. Its techniques will serve other communities faced with ever increasing demands upon their fixed available water supplies.

Detergents are only one of the problems of pollution as increasing populations put more demands on our water supplies. Control of household and industrial wastes in water, therefore, becomes of great importance.

Water will have to be reclaimed and used over and over again.

It is estimated, for example, that the water in the Ohio River presently may be reused four times as it flows from Pennsylvania to the Mississippi.

Richard L. Woodward, chief of engineering of the Public Health Service's division of water supply and pollution, says:

"We must not make the mistake of believing we can solve all of our problems by simply doing away with alkyl benzene sulfonates. It is only one part of the much larger problem of water pollution, reclamation and conservation."

The Nuclear Test Ban: An Appraisal of Mr. Foster's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, submitted a statement on the nuclear test ban issue to the GOP conference committee on nuclear testing. It is to be found at page 1551 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4, 1963. Of the many statements submitted to the committee, Mr. Foster's contribution is perhaps the most significant, since it almost certainly must represent the official views of the administration of the subject.

In what follows a critical appraisal will be made of Mr. Foster's statement. Admittedly the test ban issue contains a number of vital factors which are not amenable to scientific or even logical analysis. These factors relate to the great political issues which enfold the problem and there is little doubt but that they are the truly determining factors in the final judgment which one makes on the matter. As such it is only natural that the test ban issue should be a highly controversial one, as all important political issues are apt to be. However, in the overall assessment of the problem it is crucial that those scientific and military factors which are subject to reasonable analysis be understood and clearly expressed by those who attempt to arrive at judgment decisions. Rather than challenge Mr. Foster's statement in those areas which pertain to political judgments, this appraisal will mainly be restricted to an examination of those arguments which include technical and military considerations.

Section I of Mr. Foster's statement is headed by the contention that "a test ban treaty is in our national interests." To support this contention the following remarks pertaining to nuclear weapons development are made:

Without a treaty and with continued unlimited testing on both sides, there would be a further increase by both in the efficiency of weapons at the higher-yield end of the scale. Our advantage in small-weight, high-yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would enhance their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would eventually be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. Overall, the trend would be more toward equality between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. The U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unsettled or undiscovered by both sides. The developments of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period.

Implicit in these remarks are two basic assumptions: First, our current knowledge of Soviet nuclear weapons technology is sufficiently accurate to permit an assessment of the relative nuclear capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R., and, second, a test ban treaty would not permit significant progress to be made by unverified clandestine testing.

It should be understood that our knowledge of Soviet nuclear weapons is based far more upon speculation than upon cold hard facts. Edward Teller has described our process of evaluation as akin to trying to determine a neighbor's cooking by means of sniffing the smoke from his kitchen. Evaluation of this kind must of necessity be highly narcissistic, in that we must guess the Soviet technology by assuming that it is essentially the same as ours. To put it mildly, such methods are bound to be highly inaccurate and subject to human interpretation. As a result our evaluation process is really a result of human compromise rather than an exact analysis.

Dr. Hans Bethe, who is the Chairman of the evaluation panel which assesses the Soviet tests, reported early last year that the Soviet tests in 1961 had produced very substantial gains in multimegaton warhead technology, especially in the 1 to 5 megaton category and indicated that the yield-to-weight ratios they had achieved would permit them to attain hardened missile capabilities similar to our own. Such remarks as these hardly conform to the statement by Mr. Foster that we hold an advantage in small-weight high-yield weapons. If there is indeed a difference between Bethe's interpretations and those of Mr. Foster, it should be explained to a concerned public.

Incidentally, Mr. Foster chooses to ignore the relative position of the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the very high yield range, that is, tons of megatons. One wonders whether this is because he attaches no military significance to this range or whether, perhaps, he believes the Soviets now lead us in this area.

The lower the yield which the Soviets elect to test, the more difficult it is for our diagnostic system to analyze the debris from the explosion. And should the Soviets have elected to conduct extensive underground tests similar to our own, our ignorance of the nature of these tests will be complete. In this context it is important to understand that we really have only the most sketchy knowledge of low-yield Soviet tests. Since these yields are representative of those most preferred for tactical military operations it is both misleading and dangerous to assume that our tactical arsenal is superior, more diversified, and more numerous than that of the Soviets. Unfortunately, the current administration, and, but to a lesser extent, its predecessor, have elected to take a "what we don't know won't hurt us" attitude toward unknown and poorly known Soviet nuclear tests. This has been both fallacious and highly perilous, considering the great importance of the test issue to our national security.

In order to assess Mr. Foster's remarks on the progress that could be made in the event of a test ban treaty it is necessary to obtain an idea as to how effectively a violator might operate through clandestine testing which cannot be verified under the treaty conditions. In discussing these possibilities, what are believed to be our present detection and verification capabilities—in terms of our more recent proposals to the Soviets—should first be briefly summarized.

It is generally conceded that the major obstacles to effective detection and verification of clandestine tests arise from considerations of underground and outer space testing.

Over the last few years the proposals we have advanced toward monitoring underground tests have reflected a belief that explosions of approximately 20 kilotons and above could be effectively policed. The advisors to the current and the last administration have, in their considered judgment, on the matter tended to minimize the effect of seismic decoupling, and have, in effect, ruled it out from serious consideration. Rather than making serious efforts to reduce this yield threshold, that is, 20 kilotons, to a lower, and presumably safer, value, the recent gains in seismic verification capability which have been claimed have been used to wipe out any threshold whatever and to lower the inspection quota, and thus constitute a concession to Soviet demands instead of an increase in the effectiveness and security of the system. In this light, let us examine some of Mr. Foster's statements on the possibilities of successfully catching the Soviets at clandestine underground testing.

Mr. Foster states that—

None of the seismic systems proposed by the United States from 1959 on would be capable of detecting with any certainty many explosions of 3 kilotons or less if they occurred in alluvium, a common soil formation similar to gravel. Moreover, artificial decoupling (i.e., the so-called big hole technique), might permit considerably larger

yield explosions without detection. Furthermore, an evader testing in alluvium would probably have little assurance that the cavity produced by the explosion would not collapse, leading to a large visible surface crater which might itself be detected. Moreover, due to the variability in the size of the seismic signals which can occur from explosions of the same size, an evader could not be sure of evading even seismic detection at low yields by testing in alluvium. "Big hole" decoupling is both time consuming and expensive. Preparation of a large cavity might itself be detected during the construction phase. Moreover, since this form of decoupling has never been tried on any practical scale so far as we know, a potential evader would again be unsure that he could escape detection. Finally while single tests might sometimes escape detection by seismic means, a test series would be far more difficult to hide. Yet little progress can ordinarily be made with individual, isolated tests.

An examination of these statements shows that they are incomplete, inconsistent, and illgoical—with respect to those facts which are incorporated in our actual test ban proposals, present and upcoming.

Perhaps the seismic network can detect some number of underground—but also undecoupled—events in the range, of, say, 3 to 20 kilotons. But what about the probability that these detected events can be distinguished from earthquakes and be verified, through on-site inspection, as cheat nuclear explosions? Considering that we are now bargaining over an inspection quota which involves but only a handful of inspections each year and taking into account the fact that there will be many hundreds of earthquakes each year in the Soviet Union which will be indistinguishable from nuclear explosions in the 3 to 20 kiloton range, many more below that, it would hardly seem that we stand a good chance of catching a violator even if no other problems existed.

With respect to the remarks on the efficacy of decoupling, the conclusions reached in Mr. Foster's statement are misleading and contain a strange brand of illogic. It is stated that "big hole decoupling is both time consuming and expensive." It would appear from this that we have made up the Russians' minds for them on whether they felt that such procedures would work toward their advantage—this is certainly fallacious reasoning. However, what is perhaps more important than "big hole" decoupling is "small hole" decoupling, which need not entail excavations too much larger than those we have been making in our underground tests in Nevada; and the AEC has recently stated that underground testing has actually proved to have a number of advantages not previously foreseen. To decouple a nuclear explosion to the maximum theoretical extent—that is, by a factor of 300 in reducing the strength of the seismic signal—might well entail a "big hole" and involve considerable time and expense. But the far more germane point is that a relatively "small hole" type of decoupling could lead to a serious degradation in the efficiency of the monitoring system.

For example, a 20-kiloton explosion could be reduced in seismic strength to well below 1 kiloton, and thus be undetectable, less alone be distinguishable as an explosion, in a hole which is but a few tens of yards in diameter—hardly an evacuation which is too time consuming and expensive. Perhaps we could get a much better idea of how far the Soviets might be willing to go in decoupling if the Disarmament Agency would release some rough estimates of the relationship between the cost of such measures and the gains in weapon system effectiveness which can be achieved. After all, it must be realized that such gains can represent sizable cost savings in weapon systems for which we have spent, or will spend, billions of dollars.

Without meaning to do so, Mr. Foster unconsciously displayed a degree of both illogic and conceit in stating that—

Since this form of decoupling has never been tried on any practical scale so far as we know, a potential evader would again be unsure that he could escape detection.

Because we have not yet done decoupling experiments on a practical scale by no means should lend any degree of assurance that the Soviets have not done so. And if the Soviets have achieved a reliable understanding of how far they can go in such evasive tactics, they could get away with a lot more than Mr. Foster's estimates indicate.

How much the Soviets can get away with is something which only they can decide, not we. But one statement that does seem reasonably safe to make is that they can test underground, without too much difficulty, at yield levels in excess of 20 kilotons, and with propensively less difficulty at successively lower yields, with little fear of detection and with a really trivial chance of being caught. In this respect, if the cheating is not even detected, it will be of precious little good to have observed the preparation of the test during the construction phase. The treaty we are proposing does not allow for suspicion, it covers only the positive verification that a nuclear explosion has taken place.

It is most peculiar that the possibility of cheating through tests in outer space is not even mentioned in Mr. Foster's paper. Perhaps this is because our present state of knowledge does not permit any practical scheme which could detect and verify nuclear explosions in outer space.

In testifying before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee last September, Dr. Franklin Long, who is Mr. Foster's technical director in the Disarmament Agency, answered a number of questions posed by Senator JACKSON, regarding outer space detection and verification. Dr. Long made the following remarks:

I think the Senator's point is basically correct; namely, that if you have a test in far outer space, the type of verification that for near tests we think of as adequate, is not accessible to you—the thing is very far away. But you do not get positive verification in the sense that you can never know for sure that some natural phenomena might have produced the same signal. So in that kind of sense, verification of an outer space test is difficult.

The best that Dr. Long could say about attempts to monitor such tests was that they could lead to a "heightening of suspicion, perhaps."

Should we sign a test ban treaty with the Soviets if it is extremely doubtful that we would attempt to establish an effective monitoring system, such as satellite detection systems orbiting around the earth and the sun. The expense of such systems would be prodigious and they would not be able to provide positive verification; and, as previously remarked, suspicion is not covered by the treaty.

The question to which the American people deserve a fair answer is what types of gains in nuclear technology can be made by our outer space testing? Several years ago, when space technology was in its infancy and we were making efforts to orbit grapefruit-sized objects, it was fashionable to dismiss space testing of nuclear weapons as being Buck Rogers stuff. It is not so easy to do this today and our recent Venus shot gave proof enough of the great wealth of information that can be telemetered back to earth. And we should keep in mind that the Soviets are still adjudged to be ahead of us in placing large payloads in outer space.

Admittedly, space testing will be expensive but it would not be irresponsible to claim that it is infeasible. The question then is whether such tests would be worthwhile to the Russians; and, of course, only the Russians can provide the answer. However, we might get some clue to the answer by considering our own possibilities.

Take for example, the warhead for our Minuteman missile, which will soon constitute the major strategic weapon system of the Air Force, or equally well, one could consider the warhead for the Navy's Polaris missile. Over the coming years we are going to invest tens of billions of dollars toward developing and maintaining these systems.

Suppose that it was possible, through such improvements as increasing warhead yield and decreasing warhead cost, to effect a substantial decrease in missile requirements, or, conversively achieve a substantial increase in missile of fractions. Substantial fractions of tens of billions of dollars represent substantial sums indeed, and thus the question of space testing is far from trivial.

Many experts hold the firm belief that space testing, expensive as it may seem, would be a huge bargain to a would be cheater. In all fairness to the American people, they should be provided by the Government with the opinion of the Disarmament Agency on this matter and the relevant factors—which need not reveal sensitive information—should be brought into the light of public scrutiny.

Having discussed the frailties of the arguments which Mr. Foster advanced to defend the effectiveness of our proposed detection system, we can now turn to an examination of his statements re-

garding the effect of clandestine testing upon the balance of military power.

Mr. Foster states that with a treaty "the U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time" and "our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer." It is interesting to note that his views on this matter were not quite so optimistic a few months ago. Testifying before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Mr. Foster was queried by Senator GOLDWATER, who said:

The point that I would like to raise is this: Is detectable testing required to develop the type of tactical weapon in which some of us believe we are still deficient and in which the Soviet Union is also believed to be deficint?

Mr. Foster replied:

There can be some developments in that type of weapon, presumably below the threshold of detection. Whether this is adequate to, in a sense, to distort the tactical balance, I don't know. The military decision, has been—the military advice is that in weighing that risk against the risk of continued testing, it is in the national interest to attempt to get a comprehensive test ban which would terminate presumably tests in all environments and at all levels.

Senator GOLDWATER:

I can appreciate that. But knowing the nature of the enemy, I don't think we can have much faith in their stopping testing at any level at which they think they need further development. I can believe that they might agree to stopping the testing of large yield weapons. They might even agree to stop testing at all levels. But they could continue with the testing of weapons of a strength that we could not detect. I am talking now of the yield of weapons that will measure in pounds and small tonnages, not kilotons or megatons.

It would appear that the discussion between Senator GOLDWATER and Mr. Foster, was based upon consideration of the much publicized all-fusion bomb, or, as popularly called, the neutron bomb, and Mr. Foster admitted to some uncertainty as to whether the development of this weapon might distort the tactical balance. Furthermore, he divulged the military opinion on this matter—namely, that it would be in the national interest to get a ban which would not permit clandestine testing of such weapons.

But is such a ban possible? Apparently not, and Mr. Foster's statement on all-fusion weapons confirms this.

Mr. Foster states:

Many important scientific principles involved in nuclear weapons can be studied with nuclear explosions of less than 3 kilotons, including certain of the principles involved in developing possible pure fusion weapons and in reducing weight-yield ratios. This figure is significant, for explosions of this size and smaller may not always be detectable. However, for the weapons developments and knowledge of weapons effects which are of primary concern to us, and which might make a substantial change in the military balance in a way which would be unfavorable to us, clandestine underground testing would be unsatisfactory * * * and pure fusion weapons would not be of a great advantage to us because they would constitute primarily a cheaper substitute for the explosive component in our already large stockpile of nuclear weapons. Hence, any inhibitions on the development of these weapons would appear to be to our net advantages.

An analysis of this train of reasoning quickly reveals two gross discrepancies: First, a complete ignorance, or avoidance, of the fundamental importance of pure fusion weapons, and, second, a strange inconsistency regarding the importance of pure fusion weapons.

First, we shall consider the inconsistency, and then we shall examine the implications of all fusion weapons. It is contended by many of our most knowledgeable experts that this class of yet undeveloped—at least by us—weapons is one of the most important factors, if not the most important, entering into the test ban issue.

The inconsistency is briefly, the following:

It is first implied that pure fusion weapons can be developed by testing at yields, less than 3 kilotons—which are well below the threshold of effectiveness of the monitoring system we have proposed. Next, it is claimed that such weapons would not be of great advantage to us. And, finally, it is concluded that inhibitions on the development of such weapons would be of our net advantage.

It is quite apparent that the thought process behind such remarks could not have been very deep, for they are plainly self-defeating. If the pure fusion weapon is not advantageous then why worry about whether or not its clandestine development can be detected? On the other hand, if, as stated, inhibiting such development works to our good then there must be some advantage to the weapon. But plainly, since our proposed monitoring system is incapable of inhibiting such development, there is this puzzling inconsistency which leads to the growing question: Are those weapons advantageous or are they not? It is truly surprising that a statement dealing with a subject of such great importance should contain such obvious inconsistences.

During the past 3 years, a number of public statements regarding the importance of pure fusion weapons have been made. To do those statements full justice would be far too time consuming. and only a relatively brief synopsis of them is presented here.

In may 1960 Senator THOMAS J. DODD gave a major speech in the Senate on the test ban issue. In an incisive analysis of the then existing weakness of our proposals at Geneve—which have since became increasingly weaker—Senator DODD brought up the importance of the neutron bomb:

The production of a clean tactical nuclear weapon would open the way to a whole series of technologically significant breakthroughs. By definition such a weapon would have to have a fusion warhead—that is, a heavy hydrogon or tritium warhead.—If a straight fusion weapon can be developed—and there is no doubt that it can—this would open the way to the production of thermonuclear weapons of all yields in vastly increased quantities and at much smaller cost.

And then there is the matter of the neutron bomb, to which there has already been some reterance in the press. Such a bomb can be theoretically produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons. Such a burst would do negligible physical damage, but it would immediately destroy all life in the target area. It would in short, operate as a kind of deathray.

I consider all the hush-hush that surrounds the neutron bomb to be glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. To keep the facts of life on the nuclear age from the American people is foolish, and potentially disasterous. If there is a possibility that a neutron bomb can be built, if there appears to be any chance that the Soviets may succeed in building one before we do, then the American people have a right to the facts.

In April 1960, Freeman Dyson, a nuclear physicist and also a consultant to the AEC nuclear weapon laboratories, wrote an article in the magazine Foreign Affairs. The article discussed the important characteristics and military implications of pure fusion weapons. In concluding the discussion of these weapons, Dyson stated:

Imagine a hypothetical situation in which the United States is armed with existing weapons, while some adversary (not necessarily the Soviet Union) has a comparable supply of nuclear fuel and has learned how to ignite it fission-free. The adversary's bombs would then outnumber ours ten or a hundred to one, and theirs could be used with far greater versatility in infantry warfare. Suppose that in this situation a local war of the Korean type should begin. God help the American infantryman who is sent in to fight, against these odds. Practically speaking, our army would have only two alternatives, either to retreat precipitously or to strike back with our much more limited number of heavier nuclear weapons and thoroughly destroy the whole country. This is not a pleasant situation to contemplate, and yet it is necessary that our people understand that it is a possibility. Any country which renounces for itself the development of nuclear weapons, without, certain knowlege that its adversaries have done the same, is likely to find itself in the position of the Polish Army in, 1939, fighting tanks with horses.

John Wheeler, a nuclear physicist who did pioneering work with the famed Niels Bohr on the physics of nuclear fission and has long consulted with the AEC and the Department of Defense on nuclear weapons problems has very recently issued the following statement:

As a physicist and specialist on nuclear fission I see a decisive loss to national security from a test ban.

It will prevent us from developing a technology of pure hydrogen devices free of fission fallout. I am convinced that present nuclear weapons will be outdated in 3 to 10 years. The new technology will have important peacetime applications in mining and earthmoving and will revolutionize ground warfare.

If we do not keep this scientific leadership others will take it. Second level nations will be able to make these ultimately inexpensive devices. No responsible proponent of any detection system has claimed ability to detect a minuscule pure hydrogen detonation underground.

It is unconscionable to renounce for the free world a revolutionary device which others will then make without our knowledge.

If these statements, and many others made by responsible public officials and scientists—who have held access to the

so-called secrets of nuclear weaponry—are at all correct, then Mr. Foster's statements that a test ban treaty would allow "our advantage in smaller weapons" to "persist over a longer time" and that "our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer" simply do not bear out. In fact, quite the contrary would be true; we would fall greatly and tragically behind and the credibility of our tactical forces would disappear, and so might much of the free world.

After introducing a bold and imaginative new strategic counterforce concept which held high promise of greatly reducing the level of death and destruction to the civilian fabric, in case of thermonuclear war, the Department of Defense is now retreating to a position of nuclear statemate. If this transition is to actually occur the balance of thermonuclear terror will again begin to act upon the will of the American people—a prospect which is not a happy one to contemplate.

The rationale behind this new and unpleasant shift is twofold:

First. Both sides will soon have invulnerable strategic weapons, that is, hardened missile sites and undetectable nuclear submarines armed with ballistic missiles; and

Second. There is no evidence that the defense against ballistic missile attacks will become feasible and practical.

Both of these premises are inherently dangerous because they are based upon an inherent smugness that technological breakthroughs will not occur to destroy the strategic balance. History has invariably shown such assumptions to be ill-founded and disaster has frequently resulted from such stubborn opinion.

Indeed, it was little more than a dozen years ago when some of our leading nuclear weapons experts were arguing against the H-bomb development and were recommending that we concentrate upon improving our A-bomb technology. Incidentally, in the foreground of those who argued against the H-bomb in this vein was Hans Bethe, and it is revealing to note that Bethe was an early pioneer in helping develop the new "nuclear stalemate" concept.

At present it is difficult to perceive how hardened missile sites can be destroyed in an economical fashion and how Polaris submarines can be located and destroyed. But it is not nearly as difficult to conceive of advanced antimissile weapons which could dangerously offset the presently envisaged nuclear stalemate.

From time to time there have been reports in the press that the pure fusion bomb would have an important effect upon the development of a successful antimissile system. Very recently, Senator DODD intimated quite strongly that this is the case. With these in mind, we return to Mr. Foster's statement that a test ban treaty would slow down the development of antimissile systems on both sides.

If these contentions about the importance of the pure fusion warhead ballistic missile defense are essentially correct, then Mr. Foster's claim is only half true—we would be slowed down, but not the Soviets. And, if pure fusion warheads were to provide the final step to the feasibility of an antimissile system under development by the Soviets, a test ban treaty might portend a disaster of a magnitude which is difficult to even comprehend.

The criticisms which have been leveled here against Mr. Foster's statement are not intended to be a personal attack against him. Indeed, Mr. Foster must bear the responsibility for his statement, but it is incorrect to state that he is fully responsible for its contents. Like any high-ranking Government official who is called upon to guide a large, complex effort which embraces many different skills, some of which are extremely technical, Mr. Foster is in no small measure at the mercy of his advisers and consultants. It is against certain of these advisers and consultants particularly the technical experts, that this criticism is directed.

That a certain body of scientists has figured prominently in the test ban positions held by this administration, and its predecessor, is a subject which has not been thoroughly understood and appreciated by the public. However, such has indeed been the case; and although proved wrong and even biased, time after time, these scientists have continued to have a profound influence upon the proposals we have made at Geneva and upon the rationale which the current and past administrations have adopted.

To question the intellectual competence of these scientists would be folly; practically all of them represent top caliber in their fields. But to question their judgment on these vital matters appears to be well in order.

Mr. Foster's statement is far from reassuring. Without questioning the validity of his political judgments, relating to such subjects as the proliferation of nuclear capabilities and the effect of a test ban treaty upon future arms control agreements, the great variance between the technical-military arguments he presents and those which have been presented here in rebuttal is extremely disturbing. And its is emphasized again that the judgment of his scientific advisers is open to serious question as it appears highly probable that their technical judgment has been conditioned to a large degree by nontechnical considerations.

The differences in opinion, on such a crucial issue, which have been brought out here are too great to go unresolved. If our democracy is to remain strong, effective, and truly democratic then a greatly concerned, worried, and confused citizenry must be given sufficient data to participate in debates which affect their very existence.

Thus far, the artificial security barriers erected by the current and past administrations have prevented the necessary healthy public debate. The basic information necessary to foster such debate need not include numerical detail and specific weapon designs; such information would not even be understood by most people. What is needed is a qualitative appraisal of the important technical factors which bear the test ban. Such information should be released as soon as possible.

We should keep in mind that all of these secrets will be of little avail in the future if we are to act falsely and unwisely in our negotiations with the Soviets and consummate a treaty which will allow them to fully exploit their potential while we remain paralyzed by our good intentions. It will be of precious little comfort for our Nation to perish with its secrets clasped tightly to its bosom.

The importance of secrets is not whom they are kept from but how they are handled and interpreted in deciding the destiny of our country. The American people have every right to know whether these secrets are being treated objectively in the deliberations of those who provide the guidance for our top decisionmakers, such as Mr. Foster. If the strong criticism made here is essentially fair and correct then the advisers to Mr. Foster have not been objective in their interpretation of the meaning of classified material. Let the people decide for themselves who is more nearly right. They have every right and reason to do so; it is their fate which hangs in the balance.

Loss of the "Thresher" and Its Men a Great National Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was shocked and stunned by the tragedy which overtook the nuclear submarine U.S.S. *Thresher* and the loss of 129 lives. The pall of grief is especially deep in Connecticut which contributed 27 of the gallant men who went down with the *Thresher*, nearly all of them from my district. This is a very grim and very tragic toll of human lives.

As the Nation mourns the loss of these men, our hearts go out in sympathy to their bereaved families, the wives and children, the mothers and fathers, the sisters and brothers, who suffer the loss of their loved ones in the closest and most personal way. For them, the loss is most irreplaceable. For all of us it is a great national tragedy.

For all of us throughout the Nation this tragedy should serve as a reminder of the supreme sacrifice that is still being made, even in these days of so-called peace, by brave men who serve in this country's Armed Forces. They have given their lives in the defense of our country, just as those who have done so in time of war. Let us pay tribute to their memory and let us cherish that memory in our hearts and in our minds for many years to come.

The great American poet Edwin Markham once eulogized a friend in these words:

And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a kingly cedar—green with boughs—
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills
And leaves a lonesome space against the sky.

The men who went down with the *Threser* also went down in whirlwind—a whirlwind not of their own making—and they left a lonesome space, not against the sky, but right here deep in our hearts. We shall always bear this lonesome, empty spot in our hearts for the rest of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD three brief editorials commenting on this great tragedy from the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin; the New London (Conn.) Day; and the Chicago Sun-Times, which contains a beautiful parable in its concluding paragraph. I am also including the list of the heroic men abroad the *Thresher*, their next of kin, and their home addresses, as related by the U.S. Navy. Perhaps some day soon a grateful Nation will memorialize their names in an appropriate manner so that generations to come will know of their brave hearts, courageous deeds, and patriotic devotion to their country. This is for us a roll of honor.

The editorials and the roll of honor read as follows:

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, Apr. 12, 1963]

DOWN TO THE SEA IN SHIPS

A deep pall of gloom settled over eastern Connecticut yesterday when it became known that the nuclear submarine, *Thresher*, had disappeared several hours before in the Atlantic and was presumed lost. Ironically the disappearance of the *Thresher* with its crew of 96 enlisted men, 16 officers, and 17 civilian observers, came the day before the 63d anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Submarine Base at Groton, on April 11, 1900.

Although operating out of Portsmouth, N.H., the *Thresher*, reportedly the fastest and deepest diving submarine in the world, was attached to group 2 at the Groton Submarine Base and was manned by many submariners who make their homes in eastern Connecticut, 21 to be exact. While the oil-slick that was discovered near the place where the *Thresher* took its dive in the Atlantic, 220 miles east of Boston, was an indication that the submarine had met with disaster, all hope was not abandoned. Families of the men who comprised the crew of the ill-fated underseas craft prayed for a miracle and were joined by friends and neighbors who came to offer hope and courage in the period of uncertainty.

As the hours passed the hopes became dimmer but those who were keeping the vigil could not reconcile themselves to the fact that loved ones may have passed on. Even when Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, said from the Pentagon that he and the Navy had given up hope of any chance of survival, the Nation hoped on. But it seemed a forlorn hope as bits of cork insulation were found floating on the ocean surface which indicated that the hull of the *Thresher* had been crushed.

To these men whose dedication to the service of their country took them into realms of devotion and courage that is typical American goes the tribute of this Nation. To the families of those men goes the sympathy of the Nation. Perhaps no other part of America feels so deeply as do the people of eastern Connecticut. We knew them; they were our friends and neighbors; they had lived among us; their children had attended our schools and churches. To us they were good people, sincere people and devoted to the service and to their families.

We also pray for the miracle that would bring them back to us. But whether they return or not we honor them, for it is men like them who have kept this Nation strong both in war and in peace—these men of the submarine service.

[From the New London (Conn.) Day, Apr. 11, 1963]

DISASTER AT SEA

Nothing short of a miracle can alter the story of the probable fate of the nuclear submarine *Thresher*, a fact all too well known in this submarine-conscious area.

Nothing can soften the shock of this Nation's probable worst submarine disaster—the kind of catastrophe dreaded in the service because a submarine, helpless at such great depths, is bound to be crushed by the great pressure. The *Thresher* and her crew, plus the civilian advisers and experts aboard on her test run after overhaul, may never even be exactly located.

The sense of loss to service associates, former shipmates, and those of the extensive submarine training and supplying agencies hereabouts is incalculable. There have been other submarine sinkings, none recently. But many in this area well recall the desperate hoping existing in three other disasters off the coast, the S-51, the S-4, and the *Squalus*. In the *Squalus* sinking it still seems almost unbelievable that so many of those aboard could be rescued. The agonizing uncertainties of the possibilities of rescue prolonged the suspense. Nothing, of course, could have been done in much deeper water.

To the families and friends of the crewmembers living in this vicinity, little but sincere sympathy can be extended—certainly not much remote hope of strange circumstances that will improve the chances of the men. The *Thresher* tragedy seems likely, in fact, to become one of the mysteries of the service—what went wrong and where, exactly, the vessel rests on the ocean bed.

It is a sorrowful day for the silent service.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Apr. 12, 1963]

"TRANSFERRED TO OTHER DUTY"

The submarine service of the U.S. Navy is a volunteer service and the men who live in and go down into the sea in submarines have always considered themselves to be the very best men in the Navy. The right to wear the gold and silver dolphin insignia that denotes the qualified submarine man is hard to come by and deeply cherished.

The men of the U.S.S. *Thresher* (SSN 593), now presumed lost in the dark depths of the Atlantic Ocean, were of a special breed. They were submarine men. Highly trained, closely knit as a crew, intensely oriented to their complicated vessel, they were devoted to their special branch of the service, as are all submarine men.

Men volunteer for submarine duty for many reasons. It is a difficult service, a demanding service. The responsibilities are very heavy and every man shares them equally. The technical knowledge and skills required to live and serve aboard submarines are great. To serve aboard a submarine is to be tested every hour of every day. The challenge of meeting that test is a magnet that draws from the Navy the best men available.

The loss of the men of the U.S.S. *Thresher* is a grave tragedy. To their families and loved ones we can only extend the deepest sympathy and a parable that gained some currency among the submarine forces that fought in the South Pacific during World War II.

It went like this:

"No submarine sailor is ever lost. The Commanding Officer who governs all our movements has only issued him a new set of orders and transferred him to new duties. Sooner or later his family and his shipmates will receive the same orders and they will all serve together once more."

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, Apr. 12, 1963]

REVISED "THRESHER" ROSTER

WASHINGTON.—The Navy made public Thursday a revised list of those aboard the nuclear submarine *Thresher*, including in many cases the identification of parents as well as the men's own current addresses:

1. Lt. Comdr. Philip Harcourt Allen; wife, Jane Whitman Allen, 15 Meadow Fox Road, North Hampton, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Otis Whiting Allen, 17 Wright Street, Easthampton, Mass.

2. Chief Engineman Tilmon Joseph Arsenault; wife, Mrs. Josephine Mary Arsenault, 438 Colonial Drive, Portsmouth, N.H.; mother, Mrs. Josephine Gaudette Arsenault, 49 Carroll Street, Chelsea, Mass.

3. Lt. (jg.) Ronald Clare Babcock; wife, Martha E. Robertson Babcock, 19 Richards Avenue, Portsmouth, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert S. Babcock, 1018 Y Street, Lincoln, Nebr.

4. Engineman 2c. Ronald Eugene Bain; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Bain, 409 Herbert Street, Mount Vernon, Ill.

5. Machinist's Mate 1c. John Edward Bell; wife, Carrie Ann Saunders Bell, Packer Road, Route 95, Mystic, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Bell, Route 3, Toccoa, Ga.

6. Lt. Robert Donald Biederman; wife, Bettie Boehringer Biederman, Mary Batchelder Road, Hampton, N.H.; mother, Mrs. Dorothy Biederman, 29 Manchester Street, Hartford, Conn.

7. Lt. Comdr. John Hilary Billings; wife, Dolores W. Billings, 96 Portland Street, South Berwick, Maine; mother, Mrs. Edna M. Billings, 306 Wellington Road, Mineola, N.Y.

8. Electrician's Mate 2c. Edgar Solon Bobbitt; parents, Mr. and Mrs. James A. Bobbitt, Route 2, Box 57, Midland, Tex.

9. Electrician's Mate 3c. Gerald Charles Boster; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Standon Marrell Boster, 9850 Colony Drive, St. Louis, Mo.

10. Steward 3c. George Bracey; wife, Letha Bracey, 39 Red Oak Road, Groton, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Lela Bracey, 317 Clifton, Jackson, Miss.

11. Engineman 2c. Richard Paul Brann; wife, Jo Ann M. Brann, 2 Morrison Street, Sommersworth, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Brann, 4 North Street, Windsor Locks, Conn.

12. Engineman 2c. Richard James Carkoski; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Steve Carkoski, 504 West 10th Street, Grand Island, Nebr.

13. Storekeeper 2c. Patrick Wayne Carmody; daughter, Vickie Ann Carmody, 6, South 15th Street, Jacksonville Beach, Fla.; Father, Edward Carmody, 676 Wallbridge Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

14. Torpedoman's Mate 2c. Steven George Cayey; wife Donna Lee Cayey, 170 Broadway, Norwich, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Cayey, Route 4, Potsdam, N.Y.

15. Seaman Edward Christiansen, parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oliver Christen Christiansen, 3900 Greystone Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

16. Electrian's Mate 2c. Larry William Claussen; mother, Helen Mae Claussen, 1312 Lincoln, Topeka, Kans.

17. Electronics Technician 3c. Thomas Edward Clements, wife, Elaine R. Clements, 740 First Street, Westfield, N.J.; mother, Mrs. Mary C. Ball, 740 First Street, Westfield, N.J.

18. Lt. Merrill Francis Collier; wife, Helen Harveycutter Collier, Box 118, Route 3, Harvard Road, Gales Ferry, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Etta B. Carnes, 125 Fagley Street, Bethel, Ohio.

19. Sonarman 2c. Francis Michael Cummings; mother, Mrs. Helen Catherine Cummings, 13 Clovelly Road, Wellesley Hills, Mass.

20. Electronics Technician 2c. Samuel Joseph Dabruzzi; wife, Carrie Ann Dabruzzi, 61 Wyman Avenue, Kittery, Maine; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam (N) Dabruzzi, 425 Monroe Street, North Hudson, Wis.

21. Electronics Technician 3c. Clyde Elcott Davison III; father, Clyde Elcott Davison II, 1005½ South McKinley, Hobbs, N. Mex.; mother, Mrs. Fawnette Burnett 312 East Green Acres, Hobbs, N. Mex.

22. Engineman 3c. Donald Clifford Day; wife, Jane Olive Day, 3 Inn Street, Newburyport, Mass.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Herchel Day, 8532 South 78 Court, Oak Lawn, Post Office, Ill.

23. Electrician's Mate 1c. Roy Overton Denny, Jr.; wife, Carol Lee Denny, 10 Howard Street, Kittery, Maine; mother, Ellen Catherine Denny, 2 Maxon Road, Groton, Conn.

24. Seaman Peter Joseph DiBella; parents, Mr. and Mrs. John J. DiBella, 153 Ranger Way, Portsmouth, N.H.

25. Lt. Comdr. Michael John DiNola; wife, Edna G. DiNola, 51 Cable Road, Rye, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas A. DiNola, 341 West 24th Street, New York, N.Y.

26. Electronics Technician 2c. Don Roy Dundas; mother, Mrs. Gladys Carol Dundas, New Apartments No. 1, Russel, Kans.

27. Electronics Technician 1c. Troy Earl Dyer; wife, Ginger L. Dyer, 157 Dogwood Cle., Groton, Conn.

28. Electronics T1c. Raymond Peter Foti; wife, Frances Dora Foti, North Hampton Trailer Park, North Hampton, N.H.; parents Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Foti, 820 Maple Drive, Webster, N.Y.

29. Chief Sonarman Ellwood Henry Forni; wife Mildred Marie Forni, 37 Betancourt, Mystic, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edmund Forni, 402 Greenwood Road, Pikesville, Md.

30. Fire control T2c. Larry Wayne Freeman; wife, Patricia Ann Freeman, 80 Wyman Avenue, Kittery, Maine; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Carlson 1659 Lyon Street, Des Moines, Iowa.

31. Electrician's Mate 2c. Gregory Joseph Fusco; wife Frances Rita Fusco, 12 Watts Street, Kittery, Maine; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Libba Anthony Fusco, 412 Maple Street, Endicott, N.Y.

32. Chief Hosp. Corpsman Andrew Joseph Gallant, Jr.; wife, Rose Edne Gallant, McKinley, Maine.

33. Steward 1c. Napoleon Thomas Garcia; wife, Charlotte Lee Garcia, 4242 Fourth Street SE., Washington, D.C.; mother, Mrs. Rufina C. Garcia, 856 Maine Street, Paranaque Rizal, Philippines.

34. Yeoman Seaman John Edmond Garner; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Chester G. Garner, 1313 Carl Avenue, Vallejo, Calif.

35. Lt. Comdr. Pat Mehaffy Garner; wife, Alice Stets Garner, 21 Rhonda Drive, Mystic, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Lucille Garner, Mariana, Ark.

36. Engineman 2c. Robert William Gaynor; wife Anita Edith Gaynor, 35 Proteus Avenue, Groton, Conn.; mother Mrs. Dorothy Louise Gaynor, Sweetbrier Street, Keyport, N.J.

37. Seaman Apprentice Robert Howard Gosnell; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Lloyd Gosnell, 1706 Patton Road, Raleigh, N.C.

38. Lt. (jg.) John Gilbert Grafton; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Grafton, 104 Jamesville Road, DeWitt, N.Y.

39. Chief Sonarman William Edward Graham; wife, Dorothy Mae Graham, Cedar Drive, North Stonington, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Russell M. Graham, 2939 Bank Street, Louisville, Ky.

40. Quartermaster 1c. Aaron Jackie Gunter; wife Doris Mae Gunter, 29 Suzanne Drive, Portsmouth, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Aaron Simpton Gunter, 4240 Marquette Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

41. Electronics Technician 2c. Richard Charles Hall; parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Willard Hall, 2702 South Cleveland Street, Arlington, Va.

42. Lt. Comdr. John Wesley Harvey; wife, Irene Joyce Harvey, 127 Glenwood Avenue, New London, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Manning James Harvey, Sr., 680 Rennard Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

43. Electrician's Mate Norman Theodore Hayes; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Marvin Hayes, 5616 North Loma Avenue, Temple City, Calif.

44. Machinist's Mate 1c. Laird Glenn Heiser; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert George Heiser, Box 183, Topon, Pa.

45. Machinist's Mate 2c. Marvin Theodore Helsius; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bruno Bernhardt Helsius, Box 111, Trout Creek, Mich.

46. Lt. (jg.) James John Henry, Jr.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. James John Henry, Sr., 4591 Kings Highway, Brooklyn, N.Y.

47. Chief Electrician's Mate Leonard Hogentogler Hewitt; wife, Bodil Naomi Hewitt, 55 Moore Street, Kittery, Maine; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Downs E. Hewitt, 5330 41st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

48. Torpedoman's Mate 2c. Joseph Hartshorne Hoague; wife, Judith A. Hoague, 58 Exeter Road, Hampton, N.H.; stepmother, Mrs. Elizabeth P. Hoague, 98 Norfolk Avenue, Swampscott, Mass.

49. Electrician's Mate 2c. James Porter Hodge; father, John Walter Hodge, 1225 Wharton Avenue, Tarrant City, Ala.

50. Engineman 2c. John Francis Hudson; wife, Ronna Lee Hudson, 69 Larch Road, Groton, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Mary Hudson, 118 Woodside Drive, Newark, N.Y.

51. Fireman John Penfield Inglis; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert P. Inglis, North 9904 Ivanhoe Road, Spokane, Wash.

52. Fire Control Technician 1c. Brawner Garth Johnson; wife, Mary Elizabeth Johnson, 25 Orion Street, Groton, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Edna A. Johnson, 513 Lombardy Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

53. Chief Engineman Edward Albert Johnson; brother, Robert Thomas Johnson, North Jay, Maine.

54. Radioman Seaman Apprentice Richard Lee Johnson; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar C. Johnson, Box 342, Hendricks, Minn.

55. Chief Torpedoman's Mate Robert Eugene Johnson; wife, Rizalina V. Johnson, Mobile Manor Lot 49, Cutts Road, Kittery, Maine; mother, Mrs. Marie N. Johnson, 1534 15th Street, Wyandotte, Mich.

56. Electronics T1c. Thomas Benjamin Johnson; parents, Mr. and Mrs. William B. Johnson, Fairview Drive, Montoursville, Pa.

57. EM2c. Richard William Jones; parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Perly Jones, Wilton Road, Milford, N.H.

58. Sonarman 2c. Edmund Joseph Kaluza, Jr.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edmund Kaluza, 15 Dorrance Street, Williamset, Mass.

59. Electronics T2c. Thomas Charles Kantz; mother, Mrs. Anna Lucile Kantz, 1817 Avondale Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.

60. Interior Communications Electrician 2c. Ronald Dean Keller; father, William Keller, 119 North Broadway, Green Bay, Wis.; mother, Mrs. Josephine Mary Wergin, 807 Colonial Avenue, Green Bay, Wis.

61. MM 3c. Robert Dennis Kearney; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hubert Joseph Kearney, 46 Indian Spring Trail, Denville, N.J.

62. MM 2c. George John Keisecker; wife Lily M. Kiesecker, 9 Sanborn Street, Exeter, N.H.; mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Kiesecker, 382 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

63. Engineman 1c. Billy Max Klier; wife, Mary C. Klier, 49 Proteus Avenue, Groton, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Sadie Klier, 114 West 5th Street Santa Ana, Calif.

64. Lt. Comdr. Robert Lee Krag; wife, Olga Krag, 513 Ocean Avenue, New London, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Inga Margaret Krag, 321 8th Street NW., Minot, N. Dak.

65. Commissaryman 3c. George Ronald Kroner; parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Kroner, 4908 Franklin Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio; legal guardian, Francis Lindsey, 1933 Duss Avenue, Ambridge, Pa.

66. Q.M. 1c. Norman Gilbert Lanouette; wife, Florence Barbara Lanouette, 2050 Montgomery Street, Rahway, N.J.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry J. Lanouette (same address as wife).

67. Yeoman 1c. Wayne Wilfred Lavoie; wife, Gerine E. Lavoie, 27 Oak Street, Gonic, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred Lavoie, 7 Harding Avenue, Gonic, N.H.

68. Lt. Comdr. John Sheldon Lyman, Jr.; wife, Joan Boerner Lyman, 8 Cook Street, Kittery, Maine; parents, Mr. and Mrs. John S. Lyman, 620 SE. Bianca Drive, Palm Bay, Fla.

69. Engineman 2c. Templeman Norwood Mabry, Jr.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Templeman Norwood Mabry Sr., 2432 Barcelona Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

70. Lt. (jg.) Frank Ohmalinski; father, Frank Malinski, Jr., Romada, Tucson, Ariz.; mother, Mrs. Margareta Bodnar, 321 Medlock Drive, Phoenix, Ariz.

71. Interior Communications Electrician 2c. Richard Herman Mann, Jr.; wife, Katherine Ann Mann, Box 57, lot 45, Lafayette Road, North Hampton, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Richard H. Mann, Sr., route 1, Brookfield, Center, Conn.

72. Quartermaster 1c. Julius Francis Marullo, 106 Buckeye Road, Groton, Conn.; Jr.; wife, Deborah Woodman Marullo, parents, Mr. and Mrs. Julius Francis Marullo, 1327 Market Street, Galveston, Tex.

73. Electrician's Mate 2c. Douglas Ray McClelland; wife, Margaret A. McClelland, 350 Broad Street, Portsmouth, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. McClelland, 2033 South Dellrose, Wichita, Kans.

74. Machinist's Mate 1c. Donald James McCord; wife, Amy C. McCord, Pine Crest Park, Exeter, N.H.; mother, Edna Leona Griffith, Marocco, Ind.

75. Torpedoman 3c. Karl Paul McDonough; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. McDonough, rural route 1, Box 303A, Titusville, N.H.

76. Machinist's Mate 1c. Sidney Lynn Middleton; wife, Barbara A. Middleton, 32 Proteus Avenue, Groton, Conn.; father, Marion Forrester Middleton, route 6, Mempa, Idaho.

77. Commissaryman 2c. Ronald Arthur Muise; mother, Dorothy Runnals Tierney, 1631 Rodney Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

78. Electronics Technician 2c. James Alton Musselwhite; wife, Barbara L. Musselwhite, 5 Commercial Street, Kittery, Maine; father, Herman H. Musselwhite, 515 Knowlwood, Winston-Salem, N.C.; mother, Mrs. Margaret Smith, 215 Oakland Drive, Fayetteville, N.C.

79. Commissaryman 1c. Donald Emery Nault; wife, Alva Gladis Nault, 61 Orion Avenue, Groton, Conn.; mother, Mrs. Sarah O. Nault, 52 Market Street, Portsmouth, N.H.

80. Chief Radioman Walter Jack Noonis; wife, Pauline Jane Noonis, 34 Columbia Street, Portsmouth, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Jakiunas, 6163 Hessan Road, Anchorville, Mich.

81. Electronics Technician 1c. John Daniel Norris; wife, Cecelia Arlene Norris, 245 Charter Oak Drive, Groton, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Cecil D. Norris, Box 34, Pahokee, Fla.

82. Electrician's Mate 2c. Chesley Charles Oetting; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Karl Godfried Oetting, 512 Byron Street, Mankato, Minn.

83. Lt. (jg.) Guy Carrington Parsons, Jr.; wife, Marjorie Parsons, 90 Greenridge Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Guy Carrington Parsons, Sr., 1099 North Street, White Plains, N.Y.

84. Chief Electrician's Mate Roscoe Cleveland Pennington; wife, Doris V. Pennington,

37 Orion Avenue, Groton, Conn.; son, Gregory Charles Pennington, 199 North 46th Street, San Diego, Calif.; sister, Willie Moore, 1501 Illinois Street, Fort Worth, Tex.

85. Chief Electrician's Mate James Glen Peters; wife, Dorothy Louise Peters, 15 Irwin Street, Kittery, Maine; father, William Henry Peters, 341 Erickson Avenue, Essington, Pa.; mother, Mrs. Romayne Estella Adelman, 1115 West Sixth Street, Wilmington, Del.

86. Sonarman 2c. James Frank Phillippi; parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Mack Phillippi, 11761 North Third Street, Yucaipa, Calif.

87. Engineman 2c. Dan Andrew Philput; wife, Gale Anne Philput, 658½ Central Avenue, Dover, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer J. Philput, 625 South Decatur, Denver, Colo.

88. Machinist's Mate 2c. Richard Podwell; wife, Leslie Dinah Podwell, Pinecrest Trailer Park, Amhurst Road, Exeter, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. William F. Podwell, 807 Trenton Street, Toronto, Ohio.

89. Machinist's Mate 1c. John Sage Regan; wife, Della Mae Regan, 402 Burningtree Drive, Groton, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Henry Regan, 93 Soen Street, Naugatuck, Conn.

90. Radioman 2c. James Patrick Ritchie; wife, Frances Jean Ritchie, 31 George Street, Burlington, Vt.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leo Frank Ritchie, 46 Lafountain Street, Burlington, Vt.

91. Quartermaster 2c. Glenn Alva Rountree; wife, Francis Rose Rountree, 95 Mechanic Street, Portsmouth, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney C. Rountree, 3648 Saint Nicholas Circle, Jacksonville, Fla.

92. Seaman Pervis Robison; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Pervis Robison, 8 Passaic Avenue, Butley, N.J.

93. Electronics Technician 2c. Anthony Alexander Rushetski; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Rushetski; 807 Saint John Street, Allentown, Pa.

94. Electrician's Mate 1c. James Michael Schiewe; wife, Joan Marie Schiewe, 41 John Avenue, Bristol, Conn.; mother, Pearl Haisler, 6732 Avenue E, Houston, Tex.; stepfather, Wesley Anthony Schiewe, address unknown.

95. Chief Electrician's Mate Benjamin Nathan Shafer; wife, Joyce Constance Shafer, Route 5, Box 871, Gales Ferry, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Neil Davis Shafer, Drive In Trailer Park, Poquonnock Road, Groton, Conn.

96. Chief Electrician's Mate John Shafer; children, John D., Jr., 9; Jefferson D., 7; Joseph A., 5; James A., 3; 20 Knoxville Court, Poquonnock Bridge, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Neil Davis Shafer, Drive In Trailer Park, Poquonnock Road, Groton, Conn.

97. Machinists Mate 1c Joseph Thomas Shimko; wife, Helen Christine Shimko, Post Office Box 34, New Market, Ala.; father, Joseph Shimko, Route 2, Box 20, Exeland, Wis., mothers, Leona Frances Brown, Route 3, Ladysmith, Wis.

98. Electronics Technician Seaman Burnett Michael Shotwell; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Burnett Earl Shotwell, 25 Cooper Boulevard, Red Bank, N.J.

99. Fire Control Technician 2c Alan Dennison Sinnett; wife, Mary Sinnett, 437 Burning Tree Drive, Groton, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. George L. Sinnett, 19 Mandalay Road, Weymouth, Mass.

100. Lt. John Smarz, Jr.; wife, Joyce Alice Smarz, 422½ Richards Avenue, Portsmouth, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Smarz, Sr., 466 Howe Avenue, Shelton, Conn.

101. Boilerman 1c William Harry Smith, Jr.; wife, Agnes Cooper Smith, 542 Faitoute Avenue, Roselle Park, N.J., parents, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Smith, 1375 NW. 113th Terrace, Miami, Fla.

102. Machinist Mate 1c James Leonard Snider; wife, Phyllis A. Snider, Uncasville, Conn.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clint Howard Snider, Route 1, Box 53A, Belen, N. Mex.

103. Electricians Mate 1c Ronald Hal Solomon; wife, Fay Laverne Solomon, West Side Manor Trailer Park, Exeter, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hal B. Solomon, 1811 West Olive, Springfield, Mo.

104. Sonarman Robert Edwin Steinel; wife, Doris Ella Steinel, 46 Railroad Avenue, Salisbury Beach, Mass.; mother, Grace Ethel Steinel, 3839 West Avenue, Los Angeles 41, Calif.; father, Andrew M. Steinel, address unknown.

105. Interior Communications Electrician 1c Rogert Edwin Van Pelt; wife, Lucile S. Van Pelt, Fritz' Trailer Park, Box 999D, Kittery, Maine; parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Pelt, 2718 South Adams Street, Denver, Colo.

106. Radioman 1c Joseph Alfred Walski; wife, Carole Dee Walski, 55 Leavitt Road, Hampton, N.H.; father, Joseph P. Walski, East Hampton, Mass.; mother, Mrs. Helen E. Krawcynski, 22 Elmdale Street, West Springfield, Mass.

107. Radioman Seaman David Allan Wasel; parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Robert Wasel, 2041 Corbin Avenue, New Britain, Conn.

108. Fire Control Technician 1c Charles Louis Wiggins; wife, Patricia Ann Wiggins, Pinecrest Trailer Park, Exeter, N.H.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Everett Benjamin Wiggins, 2204 East Mission Street, Spokane, Wash.

109. Lt. (jg.) John Joseph Wiley; wife, Patricia Ann Wiley, 135 Whiple Road, Kittery, Maine; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Chester Wiley, 1121 16th Street, Altoona, Pa.

110. Chief Machinists Mate Donald Edward Wise; wife, Virginia Rose Wise, 10 Pine Court, Arlington, Mass.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dexter L. Wise, 103 North Main Street, North Reading, Mass.

111. Quartermaster Seaman Ronald Eugene Wolfe; wife, Patricia Louise Wolfe, 17 Tracy Avenue, Jewitt City, Conn., father, Charles Albert Wolfe, Blythe, Calif.; mother Mrs. Virginia Wolfe, Phoenix, Ariz.

112. Electricians Mate 2c Jay Henry Zweifel; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Frederick Zweifel, 3141 State Road, LaCrosse, Wis.

The following personnel are shipyard officers and civilians not in the regular crew of *the Thresher:*

Robert D. Prescott, Sanford, Maine.

Robert E. Charron (Ruth N. Charron), Newburyport, Mass.

Paul A. Guerette (Annette Guerette), Portsmouth, N.H.

Richard K. Fisher (Margaret Fisher), Durham, N.H.

Laurence E. Whitten (Elizabeth Whitten), Northwood, N.H.

Daniel W. Beall (Joan Beall), Somersworth, N.H.

Richard R. Des Jardins (Elizabeth Des Jardins), Kittery, Maine.

K. R. Corcoran (Priscilla Corcoran), Charlottesville, Va.

Maurice F. Jaquay (Mrs. Maurice Jaquay), Middletown, R.I.

D. Heuster (Marion Heuster), West Hyattsville, Md.

D. Stadmuller (Ethel Stadmuller), 8 Peachtree Lane, Roslyn, N.Y.

Kenneth J. Critchley (Dorothy Critchley), Biddeford, Maine.

Paul C. Currier (Barbara Currier), Exeter, N.H.

Fred P. Abrams (Shirley Abrams), Kittery, Maine.

Franklin J. Palmer (Mary L. Palmer), Durham, N.H.

George J. Dineen (Gabrielle Dineen), Biddeford, Maine.

Henry Moreau (Rhoda Moreau), Portsmouth, N.H.

Some Navigational Lights for Troubled International Waters—Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been much impressed with a recent address which was delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States and now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., entitled "Some Navigational Lights for Troubled International Waters." The address was delivered on March 15, 1963, before the Executives' Club of Chicago.

Mr. Farley has expressed some very sensible thoughts on what should be U.S. policy with regard to the threat posed to the free world by the forces of international communism. I think he most elequently gives expression to his thoughts on the Cuban problem and has demonstrated once again that he is a man of sound judgment and dedicated devotion to his country, and the principles of freedom.

I commend this address to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME NAVIGATIONAL LIGHTS FOR TROUBLED INTERNATIONAL WATERS

(By James A. Farley)

When Lindbergh first flew the Atlantic Ocean to Paris, the wife of a major business executive rushed to tell her husband the news. "Thank of it," she said, "Lindbergh has just flown the Atlantic—alone."

"It would have been even more remarkable," said her husband thoughtfully, "if he had done so with a committee."

My point is that the American Ship of State is in an international storm of increasing ferocity; and to ride the mounting hurricane we need, like Lindbergh, not the reports of committees, but the courage and resolution within our own hearts.

This is overlooked by many Americans but it most certainly is a matter of prime interest to the Kremlin. Night and day its propaganda is directed toward breaking the will of the American people to resist. And, very unfortunately, there are well-meaning Americans who unwittingly assist them. They argue that this is a time of greatest danger—and therefore greatest care must be taken. This is certainly true but there is a vast difference between taking care—and taking to the woods—in the face of an armed enemy. No one wants a fight—but if there is going to be one the surest way to lose it is to start running away from it. It is my belief—that the first line of defense—is to arm every American heart—with the truth. The cold, hard truth is that there is grave danger of a devastating world war. The risk is great—but it will not become less by denying that it exists. On the contrary, it will become greater.

But even as those of faint heart note that this is a dangerous century—I wonder if they would, sometimes, be kind enough to mention a century which wasn't. Do you think there was much safety in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776—when John Hancock scrawled his name to the Declaration of Independence? Do you think they rang the Liberty Bell as an alarm signal for Americans to flee for their lives—or as a call to arms—to stand up and fight for their country? This has been a century of marvelous inventions—but no man yet has found a substitute for a truth by which millions of Americans have lived—and hundreds of thousands have died. That fundamental truth is the rock upon which this Republic was founded—and by which it continues to live. That basic conviction is that we are determined to lift up our heads as free people—though the price of that freedom—is the risk of our necks. It seems to me that any American's answer to the villainous Red propaganda is just this simple; you commissars may have a weapon which will blow me to Kingdom Come; but the weapon has not yet been invented which can put a yoke on my neck. There is nothing startlingly original about this American sentence. I assume Patrick Henry meant it when he said, "give me liberty or give me death." I certainly mean it now, and I have tried to bring up my children and grandchildren to repeat it after me. It's just that plain and simple—and the truth of it is marked by a half million gravestones from Bunker Hill to Tarawa. In blunt terms, to stand as an American you must be prepared to fall as one.

So many of the traits of our national character have been subjected to scurrilous Red attack, that it alarms me, on occasion, that such attacks seem to have raised doubts in the minds of a small section of American youth.

It seems to me that these attacks can best be met—not by a rebuttal of palable lies—but by a more intensive study of the American heritage in our schools.

Thus, it is charged that we are a soft people, afraid of hardships. But the pioneers who settled our land have provided a complete answer. Only a short century and a half ago, nearly every American settler started out with a wagon, a plow, an axe, and a good woman as his wife—to cut a home for them both out of the wilderness. Certainly, these people were not seeking security; they were leaving it—to accept the challenge of a continent. Certainly they were not seeking ease. They expected to work because they did not intend to starve; and they knew that even their children would be born in a wilderness cabin. Nothing but belief in themselves—and in God—could have carried them through. It seems to me that our youth might well be taught that while these are present all is possible—and that if an enemy ever deprives them of this belief all is lost. I further believe that strength is a continuing asset of the American people. Captain Hull demonstrated it from the decks of the *Constitution*; Farragut, from the decks of the *Hartford*; Dewey at Manila Bay; Halsey with Task Force 58—and Lieutenant Kennedy from the PT-109. King George III did not believe that Americans would fight; the Kaiser thought we were a cowardly and unmilitary people; Hitler thought Americans would never wake up—and it is a great pity that Mr. Khrushchev doesn't read more history.

I think our schools should teach that for nearly two centuries Americans have made their way by trusting in each other—and in God. That is what counts, in the end, as in the beginning—and it can't be calculated on an electric computer.

No more than our famed Navy and merchant marine could have been built and manned—if every man was for himself—can our ship of state be maintained—if each citizen thinks only of his own immediate problem. Our children should be taught that it is not in our tradition for an American to leave his post because it is dangerous. We are not that kind of people. We do not scuttle; we do not abandon ship. In times of danger we go to our battle stations and await the orders of our Commander in Chief. This discipline of a democracy has carried us through two centuries of turbulent history—and it will carry us through the storms which are immediately ahead.

It is my considered opinion that this basic truth has not been brought home to the American people. All the committee reports in the world will not wash away the lines on the map; and the lines on the map, as certainly as the calendar on the wall, indicate that this country is under attack. I had no higher formal education—but I have had extensive dealings with American statesmen for nearly half a century—enough to defy any professor who tries to peddle the nonsense that the Communist occupation and arming of Cuba is not a threat to the security of the United States—and therefore to the whole free world. In my opinion, that menace must be removed. To remove it, world war three may have to be risked and, for myself, I am prepared to take that risk. But the decision is not mine. That decision rests with the loneliest man in the world—the President of the United States. He bears burdens heavier than Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Roosevelt. Where they had to risk armies and navies, this man may have to risk a whole civilization. It does not lessen his burden for people to insist that the risk need not be taken at all; it increases it.

Let me speak in unvarnished terms. The ramparts we watch are now—of necessity—worldwide. And, every time an American falls in maintaining them the President is boldly and brutally asked—is this death necessary?

Do they think the President doesn't feel the anguish of Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt? Do they suppose that the President, who knows the agony of the battlefield, has forgotten his own wounds? Do they think that a man who has offered his own life for his country does not know the sacrifice it involves?

I say this not of John F. Kennedy because he is a member of the Democratic Party; I say it because he is President of the United States—and I urge him to act firmly on a free Cuba—as I publicly urged President Eisenhower to stand firm on Berlin.

That, it appears to me, is the duty of every American so minded. I believe it fortifies an American President to know that the American people stand behind him whatever the risk involved in the defense of our country and of the free world.

The decisions of a President are agonizing enough without adding to them the task of being messenger of bad news for the American people. I suggest the reverse; we know the news is bad, but let us bring to the President—any President—the good news that we back him and this Republic as Americans always have; with our fortunes, our lives, and our sacred honor.

I believe our greatest trial is immediately ahead. I also believe that no man—and no nation—can stand trial—without a clear heart. Our clear record proves our clear conscience. Let us consider it carefully. The Reds accuse us of trying to conquer the world. But—when their armies were reeling under Hitler's blows, we sent them the weapons to repel the Nazi armies. Stalin himself publicly thanked the American people—stating that without their treasure and their sacrifice, the Red army could not have been victorious in the East. Were we imperialist then when we rescued Russia from the Nazi terror?

When the war ended, we grounded our Air Force, mothballed our fleet and brought our armies home. Are these the acts of a nation which seeks to dominate the world?

When we had atomic weapons, and they had none, we offered to internationalize the process, subject only to international inspection. With the greatest weapon superiority in world history—we offered world disarmament—and they refused the offer. Was the offer of America the act of a nation which sought to enslave all others?

And did our Nation seek to exploit the war-weary world? No; we did not. For the first time in history, a victorious nation—the most powerful in the world—taxed itself more than $60 billion—to go to the aid of the fallen and defeated countries. And did the Communists join—in the name of humanity—to assist the starving and homeless hundreds of millions? No; they did not. As our tractors arrived, and our Army departed, they sent in their tanks. They derided the Marshall plan—even as they removed the American labels and pasted on their own. All this we might have ignored. The fact that they declined our offer to disarm, that they ignored our pledge of good faith by disarming ourselves, and even that they refused to allow our products to help their own people would not, of itself, have produced this world crisis.

But, like a python attacking, they progressively threw the Communist coils around helpless free peoples. They substituted for the totalitarian state of Hitler the terrorist state of Stalin. The great peoples of Central Europe—the Poles, the Czecks, the Hungarians and seven others—all of them found that victory had brought them nothing more than one brand of brabed wire for another and the firing squad or the gas chamber. Like the Nazis, men in opposition were met with murder, and even the kidnapping of their children.

They, not us, were bent on world domination. They, not us, were the encirclers. Invariably the pattern was the same. First, Communist fifth columns brought internal disorder to a country. Then the Red army massed on its borders. Then the internal Communists offered a coalition government. Once in a coalition government they seized the communications and police department and the Red armies massed on the border stood ready to march as they squeezed the life of liberty from the victim state. To do this, they had to violate over 70 treaties. Their success has been spectacular. Over a billion people and 15 free nations have fallen victims to this technique without loss of a single Russian division.

Now, common sense tells you that they are not going to abandon a technique which has proved so successful. Today, they dominate China; they threaten India, and with unbelievable cruelty they have put much of the whole population of Tibet to death. They expanded west until stopped by NATO. They marched into Korea, and then down into southeast Asia. They have exploded a dozen Communist wars in the Mideast and Africa. And now they have advanced to Cuba. Do you need a committee to tell you what they intend?

Would you take their word that their hearts are filled with the desire for peaceful coexistence?

Again let us look at the record. For a few years, there was a mutual understanding that there would be a moratorium on nuclear weapon testing. They violated that treaty—by exploding a 100-megaton bomb. Now they hint at offering another treaty. But would any sane man trust the ink of a contract signed by a man who had just broken a previous contract?

Before the world, the United States proved that the Kremlin lied when it stated there were no atomic weapons in Cuba. Finally, even the Reds had to admit that they lied. But if the Reds lied about putting weapons

into Cuba, can anyone believe them when they say they have taken them out? Or—after they have demonstrated that they can put atomic weapons into Cuba secretly—would you take their word that they will not put them back?

The peril, of course, is not only to us. The Communist python is already throwing its coils southward into Latin America. Communist attempts have been made to assassinate President Betancourt of Venezuela; Communist saboteurs have blown up a sixth of that nation's oil supply. Arms and trained operators—from student agitators to professional terror squads—are flooding into South America.

Unlike some of our statesmen, I do not think the danger is subsiding. I am sure it is mounting—mounting to a challenge which must be met decisively.

I expect to be called an alarmist and even a warmonger. My answer is to point to the map.

The map proves that we are not moving toward war with the Communists; they are moving war toward us. Each time that we seek to disengage with them they confront us nearer home. Today they are on our front doorstep.

One of the world's most powerful transmitters has been installed in Havana—to bombard the will of the American people with Communist propaganda—a propaganda designed to incite racial and class warfare.

In a sense, I am sorry that I must speak on this grave note. But in truth, I have no apology to make. I believe the American people must face the danger and the risk involved. How, when, and where the will of the American people must exert itself is the sole decision of the American President. But I think it the duty of every American to share the burden of the President—to convey to him that however, wherever, or whenever he seeks to assert the will of the American people that the American people stand behind him in the awful risk, confident that as the great American Presidents who preceded him, he will exert that will, only because he can do naught else, and again prayerful that it is also the will of God—in whom we trust.

In the meantime, as our ship of state plows through the international hurricane, there are two great and unwavering beacons upon which we can rely: the light of liberty handed down to us by the Founding Fathers and the light of clear conscience in our heart.

Economic Points of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress two important articles which I think shed valuable light on some of our current fiscal debates.

The first article, by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, entitled "The Gap Between Economist and Politician," appeared in the New York Times magazine of April 14, 1963.

The second article appears in the Washington Post of today's date. It was written by Harold B. Dorsey under the title, "Critics Miss Point on Federal Finance."

I ask unanimous consent to have these two excellent articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine, Apr. 14, 1963]

THE GAP BETWEEN ECONOMIST AND POLITICIAN

(By Seymour E. Harris)

One of the main difficulties in dealing with the economic problems of the United States is the gap in understanding between professional economists and professional politicians. It is my contention that the gap is widening because, on the one hand, economists tend to give too much weight to purely economic reasoning in matters of policy and, on the other hand, politicians tend to be too slow in recognizing the importance of new ideas in the field of economics. It is important that this gap be closed. As we shall see, the 1963 tax proposals reflect an unusual accommodation of economic views to political necessities.

There is nothing new, of course, about the timelag between the formulation of an economic idea and its acceptance as public policy. Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," for example, with its plea for free trade, appeared in 1776. England's Prime Minister Pitt, because he had read the book, arranged a trade treaty with France in 1786. But it was not until 70 years after 1776 that England finally achieved anything like free trade, and even then it first required the heroic efforts of two of the most persuasive men of modern times: Richard Cobden, the articulate reasoner, and John Bright, the master of oratory.

In our own century, more than 30 years have passed since Lord Keynes began to preach the simple theme that it is government's responsibility to adapt its contribution to spending to the fluctuations and trends of the private economy. Thanks largely to Keynes' skill as a persuader, this simple maxim and related ideas have been built into an economic system that has achieved much. Yet the doctrine is still far from being accepted in practice by many politicians.

The extent of the gap in understanding between economists and politicians can be shown by four case studies from the Kennedy administration. They cover fiscal policy, the dollar problem, the trade expansion program, and agricultural policy.

First, fiscal policy. Last summer I presided over a meeting of 25 top economists who were unanimous in their view that the economy needed a lift—and soon. To them, an immediate tax cut was the only practical therapy. Yet the President at that time decided against it.

Why? The refusal to press for a tax cut was not due, as Senator JAVITS suggested, to "agonized indecisiveness." The main reason was that the President, after a careful polling of its leaders, became convinced that he could not count at that time on the cooperation of Congress, which had already taken 18 months to consider a relatively modest tax bill. There was also considerable doubt that Congress would accept the principle of the economists' medicine: a $10 billion tax cut might spurt a rise of $30 billion in the gross national product and produce $5 billion in additional tax receipts, but the total deficit for the fiscal year of 1963 could still reach $12 billion (inclusive of the likely pre-tax-cut deficit). Congress seems to have felt that a deficit of these proportions would be a political liability, and the President perhaps shared that view. At any rate, he was not disposed to accept a gratuitous rebuff from Congress. A President will fight for a program only when there is a reasonable chance of victory.

By late 1962 and early 1963, the situation had changed. The view that the country needed a tax cut as a means of improving incentives to invest and of stimulating consumption and demand generally had gained considerable momentum. A substantial reduction of taxes and a resultant increase of gross national product of two to four times the tax cut and many times as large as the increase in the deficit associated with the tax cut—on those a consensus had emerged. The President, labor, business, and economists were in agreement. Economic wisdom had miraculously become politically palatable.

But no one believes that we are to get an ideal tax measure which in a year or two will bring us full employment. My guess is that if we had asked the top 60 economists—say, the officials of the American Economics Association in the last 10 years—their advice on tax policy, their average recommendation would have been a $10 to $12 billion tax cut concentrated in 1963, and tax reform later, not concurrently.

But this is not what the President recommended. We are likely to get a small net tax cut in 1963 and reform concurrently (as the price for the indispensable cooperation of Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee).

Has the President then erred, as many of his liberal supporters now contend? Not at all. He has to fight for the possible. Those who criticize the President for the inadequacy of his fiscal program are in fact asking for certain rejection of his program. They seem to forget that by going as far as he has in exploiting modern economics the President is taking large political risks. No other President has dared to go nearly so far. The country is not ready for a $15 to $20 billion deficit and the Congress even less so; hence the President's request for a moderate tax cut stretched out over several years. Indeed the President should lead the Congress. But he seems to be out in front of the Congress and the public as far as he can be and yet be effective. Leading the ball carrier by 50 yards is not very effective blocking.

A similar conflict between economic theory and political expediency exists over the second issue: the dollar problem. Ask 20 or 30 of the top economists in the country what to do about it and many will probably say: Devalue the dollar vis-a-vis foreign currencies, raise the price of gold or provide flexible exchanges.

Here again, they are concentrating largely on the purely economic issues. When a country is having difficulties in paying its bills abroad, the economist tends to seek the simplest way out, and devaluation improves the competitive position in the quickest, surest way. Dollars become cheaper in other currencies while retaining, at least for a time, their original purchasing power at home. Hence, it becomes cheaper for other nations to buy goods in the United States (which means more exports) and more expensive for Americans to buy abroad (which means fewer imports). Yet neither in New York nor in Washington is there any serious talk of devaluation or a rise in the price of gold. I may add that I am not at all convinced by the economic case for devaluation.

The President has expressed his opposition to devaluation several times. Washington prefers to improve our competitive position by containing wage and price inflation; by raising productivity; by stimulating the marketing of goods and services; by encouraging foreign tourists; by transferring some of the burden of military expenditure and foreign aid to its allies; by discouraging excessive exports of capital;

and by increased procurement at home for economic and military aid abroad.

This approach carries favor in Washington although it is the hard way out. It imposes discipline on the managers and operators of the American economy, keeping money supplies and debts down; it protects Amerca's prestige abroad, which might be hurt by devaluation, and it assures the U.S. position as a reserve center.

Thus, for mostly noneconomic reasons, the Government (and practical men of finance) are again at odds with the economists. Devaluation or a rise in the price of gold will receive consideration only if the formidable arsenal of weapons mobilized—and others still to be exploited—fails to bring the dollar market into reasonable balance. And improvements since 1960 have already been substantial.

Over the third major issue—trade expansion—there was little disagreement. But the passage of the trade expansion bill, allowing the President greater freedom to negotiate with the European Common Market, was mostly due to his political genius. As one who for years watched congressional attitudes on trade matters for the New England Governors, I was convinced that no such extreme move toward trade liberalization would get far. Increasingly, since the war, Congress has shown itself to be more and more protectionist. Yet the President saw the political as well as the economic possibilities and achieved a great victory. He capitalized, for example, on the fact that, whereas the Ways and Means Committee was allergic to spending programs, it was friendly to other legislative steps—like trade expansion—that might raise income without raising taxes.

The President's political sagacity was thus a necessary condition for success. Under Secretary Ball's contributions were important but had not the President appeased, with tariff concessions, the textile, glass and other interests first—and thus assured the support of a dozen key Senators—it is extremely doubtful that he could have put his bill across.

Finally, there is the vexed issue of agricultural policy. It would be hard to find an economist who has had a kind word to say about it in the last generation. Artificially support prices and great advances in productivity have contributed to larger and larger surpluses and costs to the taxpayer. The obvious solution, for economists, is to reduce support prices and thus encourage a curtailment of output. This was the theory behind the program of Secretary Benson under Eisenhower. It was also implicit in the Committee for Economic Development program of 1962, and in a similar plan by my distinguished colleague, Professor Houthakker. Both tried to soften the impact of withdrawing supports by suggesting temporary subsidies and other measures.

What happened? Benson, of course, failed and the Committee for Economic Development spokesmen before the House Agricultural Committee did not even get to first base—although they were represented, among others, by a top businessman and economist, Theodore Yntema, a vice president of Ford, and although four able economists had worked on the program. Why did they receive such a cold reception? They had largely disregarded the political issues involved.

In farm policy, the Kennedy administration has shown a much greater sense of the politically possible than either Benson or the Committee for Economic Development. The proof lies in the slight margin of defeat for the original Kennedy-Freeman program, the administration's partial success with the revised bill and prospects for greater success in 1963. The President compromised with the farm interests: in return for adequate income, the farmer must pay in production controls.

Over each of these disputed issues, therefore, the advice of professional economists—though perfectly sound and logical in terms of economic theory alone—has been either rejected or substantially modified by politicians with executive or legislative responsibility. And in each case it is clear that the underlying reason has been the economists' neglect of the powerful noneconomic factors involved in the making of public policy. The economists were not wrong—but they were only partly right.

Economists are essentially specialists and specialists inevitably oversimplify—in the sense that they tend to concentrate on their particular studies and to neglect the wider practical problems of applying their conclusions. Politicians, in contrast, are necessarily concerned with all the factors at work in a given situation—specialist advice being only one of the considerations they must take into account in determining policy. Sound economic reasoning alone, therefore, may sometimes make poor sense politically, and this explains why the White House and Congress occasionally seem to be ignoring the advice of their own experts.

The remedy, therefore, would seem to rest mostly in the economists' own hands. If they do have the specialized knowledge and training required to solve the Nation's economic problems, their first job is to persuade their political colleagues of it. And I believe that they will succeed in bridging the gap between them only by broadening their studies into the wider realm of political economy—as distinct from theoretical economics; by demonstrating their awareness and understanding of the other relevant social and political factors at work, and by framing their advice to take such practical limitations into account.

In return they are entitled to expect from politicians a greater willingness to listen to new ideas and a greater readiness to reject outworn economic dogma in favor of a more pragmatic and scientific approach to contemporary problems.

The precise nature of the contributions which can be made by economists depends to some extent, of course, on whether they work in or outside the Government. On the outside, in the academic world, their primary task is to advance the frontiers of economic knowledge, while on the inside they are called upon mostly to perform as economic technicians.

Major gains in pure economics, and ultimately in economic engineering (public policy), come from academic economists. These are the men who spawn the theories of income formation, production, growth, economic incentives, money, prices, wages, distribution, interest rates, consumption, investment taxation, spending, fiscal management, the balance of payments, and so on, and their views are ultimately reflected in official policy.

In the last generation, however, the trend of economics has been unfortunate in one important respect and the contribution of academic economists less than it might have been. This has stemmed from the invasion of economics by mathematicians. More and more, academic economists are becoming intrigued by mathematics but, unfortunately, its excessive use is tending to divert our best brains to the solution of comparatively minor problems and their work contributes little to the treatment of the great issues of the day.

If they are not to lose sight of their true role, they would do well to remember what Keynes once said: "Mathematical economics often exercise an excessive fascination and influence over students who approach the subject without much previous training in technical mathematics. They are so easy as to be within the grasp of almost anyone, yet do introduce the student, on a small scale, to the delights of perceiving constructions of pure form and place toy bricks in his hands that he can manipulate himself, which gives a new thrill to those who have had no glimpse of the skyscraping architecture and minutely embellished monuments of modern mathematics."

But what of the few thousand economists employed by the Government? What is their mission? They are not fundamentally policymakers—although this does not mean that they have no influence on policy. Theirs is primarily the task of estimating what effects alternative policies will have on growth, prices, employment, business cycles, distribution, the balance of payments, and so on. The variables they consider relevant and the weights they give them will influence purely economic solutions and, insofar as these are relevant, will have some effect on policies.

What, for example, will be the effect of, say, a $10 billion tax cut on consumption, on investment, on income, on the balance of payments? And what form should the tax cut take to achieve the optimum results? Ideological, political, and other aspects of the problem are considerations for the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. The economists in the Government, instructed to restrict their contributions to the purely economic analysis, need go no further. But often economists in different departments come out with varying results and the White House then has to make a final decision not only on the weight to be given to economic analysis but also on which analysis to accept.

Themselves practitioners in an inexact science, economists must, therefore, realize that when Government does not always choose to follow their advice, the politicians and national leaders concerned are not necessarily knaves or fools. And equally, when those responsible for national policy are urged by economists to change their course, they should treat the advocacy of new ideas with no less respect. The national interest demands that the present gap between them be closed without delay.

KEYNES ON IDEAS

Economists who feel that politicians do not pay sufficient attention to their ideas would do well to remember what Lord Keynes once wrote:

"The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. I am sure that the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1963]

CRITICS MISS POINT ON FEDERAL FINANCE

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

There is a propensity among critics of government expenditures and taxes to concentrate on the Federal Government's financial operations and to ignore those of the State and local governments. There have been instances where the word government has been used so loosely that the Federal Government tends to be criticized for State and local government actions.

In the 5 years through 1962, the number of workers on the Federal Government payroll increased 124,000 (5.6 percent). The number of employees on the payrolls of State and local governments increased by 1,435,000 (26 percent). State and local government workers outnumbered Federal employees by 2.9 times last year.

Federal Government debt in the same 5-year period increased about 14 percent. The debt of State and local governments increased by about 55 percent. On a cash basis, Federal Government expenditures in the same period increased about 34 percent and the State and local government expenditures increased 43 percent. Furthermore, the increase in the Federal expenditures includes substantially larger grants-in-aid to the State and local governments.

When we think of Government levies siphoning off an increasing proportion of the productive efforts of the nongovernment economy, perhaps we should note that, on a cash basis, Federal receipts increased by approximately 27 percent in the 5 years through 1962, whereas the State and local government receipts increased by about 43 percent.

Five years ago (1957), Federal Government purchases of goods and services accounted for 11.8 percent of total gross national product and last year the proportion was 11.3 percent. The proportion for similar State and local government purchases was 8.3 percent in 1957 and increased to 10.3 percent last year.

It is quite clear, then, that in all of these measurements of employment and fiscal operations, the State and local government figures have been rising much more rapidly than those of the Federal Government. I doubt that there is a broad comprehension of these facts. This is unfortunate, because it leads to many misunderstandings in the interpretation of business and Government statistics.

For example, the Federal tax burden is not difficult to follow—and to criticize—because the bulk of it consists rather simply of income and social insurance taxes. The bulk of the State revenues comes from property taxes and from various types of sales and excise taxes, and license fees. Most of the sales and excise taxes are directly added to the price of goods and services sold and tend to be overlooked. Some portion of the increase in the cost-of-living index is caused directly by these taxes.

The rising importance of State and local government activities vis-a-vis the Federal Government deserves more attention in the projections of business prospects. Business analysts labor over the economic effects of Federal receipts and expenditures, but usually do not have a proportionate interest in the same figures for the State and local governments.

Similarly, the effect of Federal debt on the banking structure is analyzed carefully with little thought being given to the effects of State and local government deficit financing. In the past 18 months there has been little change in the commercial bank holdings of Federal securities, whereas their holdings of State and local government issues have been rising quite sharply.

There is not enough space here to even tabulate the economic, sociological, and political interpretations that are distorted by a failure to comprehend the rapidly changing relationship between the Federal Government's financial operations and those of the State and local governments.

One small item occurs to me that may be germane to the current situation. The beneficial effects of a reduction of, let us say, $10 billion in Federal income taxes are likely to be offset, in part, by the steady increase in the tax burden of State and local governments, even though these latter levies may be fairly well hidden in sales and excise taxes that increase the prices of commodities and services.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Walter Francis Dillingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in Hawaii, the name of Walter Francis Dillingham is almost synonymous with that of the islands.

Mr. Dillingham, who was born before Gen. George Custer fell among the Sioux at Little Big Horn, is a builder who carved out an empire in Hawaii and, in doing so, helped prepare the islands for its great postwar era.

Today the company Mr. Dillingham founded undertakes projects throughout the world.

On the recent occasion of Mr. Dillingham's 88th birthday, the Honolulu Advertiser published an editorial entitled "To Mr. Hawaii, at 88." I have the pleasure of bringing this editorial to the attention of fellow Members of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO MR. HAWAII, AT 88

Walter Francis Dillingham, whose 88th birthday is being celebrated tomorrow, is a giant among men in Hawaii—and would be anywhere.

It could be said of him at the peak of his career, as it was of his father, Benjamin Franklin Dillingham, he was "nothing if not progressive. He is a pusher, a fearless, enterprising businessman, a born leader of men, a big-hearted, good-natured gentleman."

When Walter Dillingham was born on April 5, 1875, Rutherford Hayes was still to be elected President and Custer had not yet fought the Sioux at Little Big Horn. He was 3 years old when the first commercial phone exchange was opened, in New Haven, 6 when President Garfield was fatally shot, and 8 when the Brooklyn Bridge was opened.

In 1875 David Kalakaua was King of Hawaii and as a small boy Walter Dillingham and his friends tipped their hats as the white-suited monarch rode by in his coach, returning their greeting with a friendly wave of his hand.

Within a few years came Wilcox's revolt, the ascendancy of Queen Liliuokalani, the provisional government, the establishment of the Republic of Hawaii, and the annexation of the islands as a U.S. territory.

As a boy Walter tended the chickens at the family home, Woodlawn, which until 1920 occupied the site of the present Central Union Church. He had, even then, the makings of the entrepreneur; when his father advertised for 50,000 orange seedlings at 5 cents each, Walter came up with between 300 and 400 which he had grown himself.

He was not happy at the school he was then attending, so joined others who were being tutored by his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Abigail Smith (whose husband, the Reverend Lowell Smith, had founded Kaumakapili Church).

Then, ironically, just as his father had left Massachusetts to go to sea partly because of health and had landed in Hawaii, so partly because of health was Walter sent from Hawaii to Massachusetts to go to school. He was a tall boy, but thin, due in part to the fact that the quality and purity of dairy products and even of water in those days left much to be desired.

At about 14, he enrolled in the Newton, Mass., High School, living in nearby Newtonville with an uncle and his son, whose bed he shared. Walter got $35 a month from home. Of this a dollar a day went to the uncle for his keep, $2.40 went for carfare and "the rest" was his spending money.

One year his parents sent him a suit, the next year a coat. After graduation, he returned to Hawaii where in 1889 his father had formed the Oahu Railway & Land Co. to link the plantations and the waterfront.

Walter served first as a general errand boy, carrying messages and delivering just-written letters to departing mail ships. When his father's bookkeeper quit on 3 days' notice, he took over the books—not an easy task since his father had introduced double-entry bookkeeping to the islands.

But even as he worked he yearned to go to Harvard, and did, in 1898. Out of class, he played tennis, rowed and sang, becoming the first sophomore to be president of the Harvard Glee Club.

After 2 years at Harvard, he was called back in 1900 to the islands because of his father's failing health. By 1904 B. F. Dillingham was quite ill and Walter took over management of Oahu Railway & Land Co.

The railroad at the time had a debt of more than $4 million, greater than the debt of the Republic of Hawaii. Walter, then 29, went to San Francisco, seeking financing. Within a week, he had successfully negotiated with some six banks. On the ship from Hawaii he had written out on the back of an envelope the agreement he wanted. The lawyers changed but one word.

He continued to run the railroad, together with a dredging company he had started 2 years earlier, over the protest of his father, who felt he could spare neither his son's time nor any money. Walter went ahead by borrowing $5,000.

With his dredges, he finished a major channel-cutting into Pearl Harbor, he made a port at Kewalo Basin for fishermen, through reclamation added 5,000 acres to Honolulu's waterfront, including Ala Moana Park. The dredging company now undertakes projects all over the world.

His activities in the business world, in education, in the civic field are well known. He has been honored often and widely. But we daresay tomorrow's community testimonial, sponsored as it is by the Aloha Boy Scout Council, will mean more to him than many earlier honors. For the Boy Scout movement has long been close to his heart.

He has always placed great store on the good deed, the kind word, the understanding ear, the largest possible supply of patience. He exemplifies these qualities. He is still young in spirit and still as interested as ever in the youth who will be tomorrow's leaders.

Walter Dillingham, whose 88 years span Hawaii's history from monarchy to statehood, is a remarkable man. We join the community in a hearty salute to him, the Mr. Hawaii of his time.

Alliance for Progress Aids U.S. Private Capital in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I pointed out that one of the best ways we can help the Latin American peoples is in the field of housing, and I cited Mexico as one of the countries where there is an urgent need for housing. I was therefore very pleased to learn that the Alliance for Progress has recently announced that it has approved a guarantee for the financing of a housing project in Monterrey, Mexico, which will have over 1,200 units to accommodate 6,000 persons.

A very interesting article describing this housing project was published in the San Antonia (Tex.) Light on April 3, 1963. I believe that this is the first time financial help for housing in Mexico is being guaranteed under the Alliance for Progress program, and this should be an encouragement for other Latin American countries who look to us for help.

The article is written by the well-known news correspondent, Larry Allen, a Pulitzer Prize winner who covered top news developments in many countries over the past 25 years. The interesting part about the article is the fact that the Alliance for Progress is backing United States and Mexican private capital in an effort to help solve the acute housing shortage in Mexico by building homes for workers near the industrial hub of Monterrey.

The groups of private U.S. investors is headed by Fred A. Orleans of San Antonio, an internationally known law-

yer, economist, and writer. He has lived in Mexico for many years and is an expert on United States-Mexican affairs, as well as on Latin American affairs generally. He has just been elected a member of Mexico's Academy of International Law and is the recipient of the La Cruz de Cultura y Derecho decoration from former Mexican President Miguel Aleman. Dr. Orleans is also a member of the American Society of International Law, the Inter-American Bar Association, and other prominent legal groups.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the article by Larry Allen, referred to above; the text of a release issued by the Alliance for Progress through the Department of State on the Monterrey housing project; and the text of a release issued in Mexico City on the election of Dr. Orleans to the Academy of Internatianal Law. They are as follows:

[From the San Antonio Light, Apr. 3, 1963]

MONTERREY TO GET 1,208 WORKERS HOMES

(By Larry Allen)

MONTERREY.—A two-pronged attack on Mexico's acute housing shortage is being launched within the shadow of the sunswept western Sierra Madre on the fringes of fast-growing and bustling Monterrey.

Just 8 miles west of the heart of this mountain-rimmed industrial hub, the Alliance for Progress is joining hands with private United States and Mexican capital to build 1,208 homes for workers. The cost is estmiated at $3.8 million.

The U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) is guaranteeing financing required of a group of private U.S. investors, headed by Fred A. Orleans, San Antonio.

FIRST TIME

This marks the first time financial help for housing construction has been guaranteed by AID within the framework of the Alliance for Progress in Mexico.

The guarantee, an official announcement said, will enable the Sociedad Comercial Constructora, S.A., to start building houses on a 110-acre site by late spring. Construction may take 2 years, but some workers probably will move into new homes by the end of 1963 or in early 1964.

Luis Tellez Benoit, a prominent Mexican engineer, who heads the Mexican group associated with Orleans, said the attractive, modernistic two- and three-bedroom dwellings would be sold to Mexican workers—mostly employees of industrial plants in what is called the "medium low" pay bracket—for from $3,100 to $4,000.

Workers are to pay for the homes over a 15-year period under easy interest terms and amortization to be announced later.

HONOR LOPEZ MATEOS

The housing development will be named Unidad de la Vivienda Popular Adolfo Lopez Mateos in honor of Mexico's President.

Land for the houses was donated to Nuevo Leon State by Arnulfo S. Garza, a Monterrey businessman. The state, through Gov. Eduardo Livas Villarreal, is donating spacious lots to workers who thus will only have to pay the costs of the building of their homes and improvements.

U.S. Consul-General Richard Johnson, who joined Livas Villarreal in announcing approval of the housing project by Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, said he hoped the development would be a showcase for more such projects initiated by private United States-Mexican enterprise and guaranteed by AID.

Livas Villarreal said the Nuevo Leon state government was very satisfied that concrete evidence of what the Alliance for Progress could do was taking shape and promised the State would assure the construction of schools, markets, social services, and essential utilities in the new development.

POPULATION SOARS

The governor emphasized the sensational rise in Monterrey's population—now near 900,000 and the third largest city in Mexico—sharply accented the need for more housing as fast as it could be built.

He said Monterrey—booming industrially and expanding rapidly—was registering a 10-percent boost in population annually, compared with the national average of 3.5 percent.

Livas Villarreal also said he estimated 20,000 new homes were immediately needed to provide for Monterrey's citizens and that many more annually would be required in the immediate future years.

"In this area of rising industrial production and with new plants developing, there will be more employment," the governor asserted. "In turn, that means more workers earning 1,000 pesos ($80) per month or more will be in a position to buy homes at low monthly payments and interest rates."

Orleans said Monterrey workers will be moving into some new concrete and brick homes, built 100 percent with Mexican materials, and by Mexican labor, by next winter. He added the project's completion was scheduled within 2 years after construction started.

The houses are expected to accommodate 6,000 persons. From 2,000 to 3,000 workers will be employed in construction.

Eighty-seven percent of the houses will have two or three bedrooms, in addition to living and dining rooms, baths, and all essential facilities. Thirteen percent will have three large bedrooms in addition to the other accommodations.

Just who will move into the new homes will be determined after a careful screening of worker applicants as construction progresses.

Moscoso telegraphed Livas Villarreal congratulations "to you and the group of Mexican and North American businessmen who have accomplished the first project of low-cost housing under the Alliance for Progress in Mexico. I consider it a magnificient example of the participation of private initiative in the Alliance for Progress."

Orleans said conservative estimates indicate that in all Mexico more than 1 million housing units are needed immediately, and another 1 million urgently require reconditioning or rebuilding.

"Just to keep up with the requirements of the population growth, Mexico must build at least 200,000 housing units per year. But public and private construction has been at the rate of only 30,000 to 50,000 per year," Orleans declared.

To help ease the situation, the Mexican Government recently required private mortgage institutions to give preference to construction of medium- and low-cost housing, and authorized banks to grant mortgage loans for low-cost housing up to 80 percent of the value of the security.

The nationalized oil industry, Petroleos Mexicanos, also have developed a home construction loans plan for employees, and the Mexican Social Security Institute is pushing a multimillion-dollar homes building program.

Orleans said "Concrete, specific, and well-directed action must be taken wherever possible to ease the acute housing shortages, not only in Mexico, but throughout all Latin America, for almost everywhere the almost everywhere the lack is critical.

"Homes must be built now and in large numbers or all the efforts of the United States to help Latin America through the Alliance for Progress will be in vain. Those who can do the job must be allowed to proceed and all redtape must be eliminated. The big hope is to put to work the financial resources or potential resources and initiative of private enterprise. That's what the American-Mexican Sociedad Comercial Constructora is starting to do here in Monterrey.

"And, one thing is certain," Orleans concluded, "There is no better way to turn back the Red tide of Communist agitation, propaganda and subversion in Latin America than to make it possible for a man to have his own home for his family."

[Release by the Alliance for Progress Agency for International Development]

AID GUARANTEE TO ASSIST ALLIANCE HOUSING PROJECTS IN MEXICO

A guarantee for the financing of a housing project by a private firm in Mexico under the Alliance for Progress was announced today by the Agency for International Development.

Consisting of 1,200 dwellings, the housing development will be built in Monterrey by Sociedad Comercial Constructora, S.A., a United States-Mexican company. The United States will guarantee up to $3.5 million which represents 90 percent of the loan, to be made from funds provided by U.S. private enterprise.

The demonstration housing project is part of AID's special guaranty program to encourage overseas investment and stimulate private enterprise.

The houses, in the $3,000 to $4,000 price range, will require 10 percent down, with the balance payable over 15 years. This is in contrast with current commercial terms as high as 40 percent down, with the balance payable in 5 years.

The homes will be built along the Monterrey—Saltillo Highway, 6½ miles from downtown Monterrey, and close to an industrial complex of 17 plants employing 3,500 persons. Monthly payments of $30 to $45 will be within the budgets of the industrial workers with family incomes ranging from $200 to $240 a month.

The development will consist of two- and three-bedroom homes with kitchens, bathrooms with hot running water and utility rooms. Construction will be of concrete block with stucco facing, and homes will range in size from 667 to 980 square feet.

Sociedad Comercial Constructora, S.A., is a Mexican corporation formed recently by United States and Mexican citizens to build the housing project.

ORLEANS ELECTED TO ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

MEXICO CITY.—Fred A. Orleans, of San Antonio, Tex., has just received the high honor of being elected a full member of Mexico's Academy of International Law.

Dr. Orleans, internationally known lawyer, economist, and writer, was cited by the academy for his acts of "outstanding friendship for Mexico and Latin America and his work for peace and respect for international law."

This is the first membership awarded by the academy to a U.S. citizen. Dr. Orleans also received the decoration of La Cruz de

Cultura y Derecho from former Mexican President Miguel Aleman.

Dr. Orleans presently is pushing plans to build 1,208 homes for workers on the western fringes of Monterrey. He is the head of a group of U.S. investors who, with Mexican associates, have received a guarantee from the Alliance for Progress to assure construction of the $3.8-million project.

American Mount Everest Expedition of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, an advance party of the American Mount Everest expedition of 1963 has reached the south col of the peak, according to today's reports. The valiant efforts of this very strong party of mountaineers, supported by the contributions of thousands of Americans, will be of interest to us all. The tragic loss of John E. Breitenbach, of Wyoming, while the party was still on the lower parts of the mountain, is a sad feature of the endeavor. But our hopes are high for the months that remain, and I ask that the first account of the expedition, by James Ramsay Ullman, published in Summit magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNT EVEREST EXPEDITION: THE FIRST WEEKS

(By James Ramsey Ullman)

With the advance guard 3 weeks ahead of us, and doing most of the dirty work, the main body of the expedition, 15 strong, assembled at the Hyatt House Hotel, near San Francisco airport, on the evening of February 7, and the next morning took off by Pan American jet into that wild blue yonder. Will Siri, deputy leader of the expedition, held the combined role of scoutmaster and finance minister. The others in the party were Allen Auten, Jake Breitenbach, Barry Corbet, Dave Dingman, Dick Emerson, Tom Hornbein, Lute Jerstad, Jim Lester, Maynard Miller, Dick Pownall, Barry Prather, Gil Roberts, Jim Ullman, and Jim Whittaker.

On the surface, perhaps, we seemed a fairly routine group of travelers; but inside there was enough concentration of energy, excitement and anticipation to have powered the plane if all four of its jets had failed.

Some may think that the longest day is a book and a movie. But those who have crossed the Pacific east-to-west know otherwise. It was 10:30 a.m. when we left San Francisco, 6:30 p.m. when we landed in Tokyo. But in between the clock was set back 7 hours, and in the middle of nowhere we leapt suddenly from Sunday to Monday. Short stops were made in Hawaii, which beckoned alluringly, and Wake Island, which did not beckon at all, and in the air our stewardesses kept us going by serving us chain-lunches at intervals of 3 or 4 hours.

Then Tokyo at last, the Hotel Imperial, and 3 full days, and nights, in Nippon's metropolis. Highlights, as with the advance guard, were eating, sightseeing. Turkish bathing, and meeting with members of the Japanese Alpine Club; and thanks to these latter, we had the opportunity of seeing a special screening of the film of the Communist Chinese Everest expedition of 1960. It was wonderfully interesting, of course, to us prospective Eversters, but threw no light on the much-doubted Chinese claim that they reached the summit.

There were a few lowlights, too: among them the pervading fear that the whole expedition might be wiped out by Tokyo traffic, and a fair number of stomach upsets. But Drs. Gil Roberts and Dave Dingman promptly clamped down with a stern set of dietary laws, and ailing digestions and bowels were soon minimized.

After Tokyo came 3 days in Hong Kong, where personal bankruptcy loomed menacingly after an orgy of shopping, and 2 days in Bangkok, where time was divided equally between sightseeing and the hotel swimming pool. And then came 24 hours in Calcutta, which we both reached and left in a warm smoldering dawn. The advance guard having fought and won the traditional battle with Indian customs, we were relieved of such chores and free to wander about. For many of the team, especially those who were seeing the Orient for the first time, the poverty and squalor of the city made for a depressing experience.

The next morning, February 13, however, depression was far behind and below us, as our Royal Nepalese Airlines DC-3 took off and bore northward. First, spread beneath us, there were the brown plains of west Bengal, and presently the wide curving channels of the Ganges. Then at last came what we were waiting for: "There they are" came a shout from one of the window seats. And from then on 15 faces were pressed against the panes, as the great white wave of the Himalayas rose up before us. Yes, there they were all right: hundreds of them, a horizon filled with them; and some, higher than the rest, we could easily recognize. Far to the east there was the sprawling bulk of Kangchenjunga. Diagonally ahead was Makalu. And behind Makalu was it, our goal, what we had come for: the peak of Everest rising above all the others, its snow-plume streaming across the cloudless sky.

Someday not too distant, we hope, some of us will have a view of that peak from a very different angle. But, for the moment, what we saw now sufficed, and it is safe to say that there was not a heart in that plane that was not beating faster. Then we were over a range of foothills. We were over the valley of Nepal. The plane banked and descended. The white wave vanished. In its place were Kathmandu and its airport, and the advance guard waving its greetings, and Dan Doody behind his tripod, and Norman Dyhrenfurth shouting "Don't look at the camera."

Then came February 20, the date set more than a year ago for the beginning of the trek to Everest. And miraculously it all came off on schedule. The day before, Jimmy Roberts, most of the Sherpas and all the loads had gone off by truck to Banepa, which marks the end of the road at the eastern end of the valley of Nepal. And on the morning of the 20th the rest of us followed. The scene that followed in an open field beyond Banepa was something straight out of the imagination of the late Cecil B. DeMille. The expedition members were there. The Sherpas were there. Hundreds of seer-offers were there, all armed with cameras and good wishes. Most essentially, our army of porters were there—Sherpas and Nepalese; men, women and children—and for upwards of 3 hours they filed past in endless procession, while their loads and identification tags were assigned to them.

The final figure was 909 porterloads. Each load weighed some 60 pounds. Total: 54,540 pounds, or more than 27 tons. And now at last, slowly but surely, all those tons began to move. In single file, bent under their loads and headstraps, our armless army moved out of the field at Banepa onto the trail beyond, in a procession so long that it took 2 hours to pass a given point. Among the porters, spaced at wide intervals, were the members of the expedition, turning, waving, calling goodby; then turning to the east and disappearing among the terraced hills. The adventure on which we had come was no longer a dream. It was a fact.

Oppression of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a recent communication received by me deplores with most deep apprehension the apparent shelving of the Hungarian question. In order that others may learn of the concern of the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations, I ask unanimous consent that this communication be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF CALIFORNIA FOR FREEDOM OF ENSLAVED NATIONS,

Los Angeles, Calif., April 3, 1963.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The United Nations General Assembly at its December 20 session terminated the assignment of Sir Leslie Munro as special representative of the U.N. for the investigation of unjust oppression of Hungary. The U.S. proposition transferred this task to the general agenda of U.N. Secretary General Mr. U Thant.

Freemen all over the world as well as the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain and especially we American citizens of ethnic origin, learned of this shelving of the Hungarian question with the deepest apprehension. We are frightened at the prospect of another Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Therefore, we, the members of the American Committee for Freedom of Enslaved Nations urgently request and respectfully ask your help and support that:

1. Free nations everywhere and the United States particularly should insist on carrying out the 1956 U.N. resolution on Hungary.

2. Free nations in the U.N. and the United States especially should fight with equal vigor for the dissolution of Russian Soviet colonialism, as they fight for the freedom and independence of the people of Africa and Asia.

3. Free nations in the U.N. and the United States especially should be mindful of the fact that the puppet Kadar regime repre-

sent only Russian interests rather than the interests of the Hungarian people.

DR. EMIL ONACA,
President.
C. BLAZE,
Secretary.

Hungarian:
Rev. L. KEESKEMCKIY

Polish:
EDWARD SKIRMUNTT

Rumanian:
Mr. and Mrs. I. PETRESCU

Latvian:
A. G. TUREK

Ukrainian:
W. S. SIYAK

The Ugly American Gets a Face Lift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, after hearing about the ugly American image abroad, it is refreshing to be advised that this image is undergoing a face-lifting. American businessmen throughout the world are busily and successfully doing good, and doing well while they are at it.

An example of this fine representation is the story of a Pan American Airways director in Thailand who has become the confidant of Thai political leaders, businessmen, and statesmen and has been described by the Thai as "one of our country's firmest friends." He is Martin J. Taylor, Jr., and although Marty, as he is known to friends, has no formal training for the life that he leads, he has managed to make friends in all walks of life in Thailand and set the pace for the American community as well. It is said that the Pan American office there is "a kind of unofficial Thai-American bridge."

There are examples of Marty's kind of American ambassadors of goodwill all over the world. These people have helped bolster the economies of such countries as the Dominican Republic, after Trujillo, of Berlin, Bogotá, and countless others. In order to aid these men and send them to their new habitats better equipped, the Business Council for International Understanding is coming to the rescue. They are training business executives and their wives in the "do's" and don't's" of foreign manners and prime them on the outlook and questions to be expected from their new neighbors abroad.

Mr. President, I am elated to hear about this new image of Americans abroad and would like to say that I find it to be a very commendable trend. I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in Parade magazine in the March 10 edition of the Washington Post, which elaborates on this subject, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1963]

THE UGLY AMERICAN GETS A FACELIFT

Around the world, American businessmen are doing their best to pretty up the ugly American. Leaving the spotlight to the Peace Corps and the glory to the diplomats, they are spreading their own kind of foreign aid.

They not only mix patriotism with profits in their business dealings abroad, but also help underdeveloped countries to help themselves. They send in economic task forces to help native businesses caught in political upheaval. They serve as goodwill ambassadors to critical lands.

One of these unofficial emissaries of Americanism is Martin J. Taylor, Jr., 42, Thailand director for Pan American Airways. But there are a million more like him in all parts of the globe.

U.S. businessmen, for instance, may have saved the Dominican Republic from total anarchy after the collapse of the Trujillo dictatorship. For 31 years, the island's key businesses had been in the hands of the Trujillo family and their handpicked managers. When the dictator died, the surviving relatives and their business leaders fled.

The new government cast about desperately for some way to keep vital industries going. The only people available for managerial posts were trustworthy but untrained. American industrial leaders, working through the Business Council for International Understanding, came to the rescue. They sent down a task force of 14 top specialists, who quickly boosted production and efficiency.

Business has also bolstered beleaguered Berlin. At the request of Uncle Sam, several firms have opened new plants there. International Business Machines recently installed there a $3 million computer previously intended for Stuttgart. Yale & Towne has leased a plant to manufacture locks. Ford Motor Co. is considering a spark plug factory.

Far more important is what individuals are doing. In Bogotá, Colombia, the wife of an American executive is leading a campaign to establish a playroom in the local children's hospital. In Buenos Aires, an American wife is raising funds for a new chapel for a local church.

Business personnel going overseas have become so numerous, and so important, that several schools have set up blitz courses in oversea living for them. American University in Washington, for instance, offers a 4-week course covering such topics as what foreigners think about the United States, how to adjust to the local economy, how to answer anti-American criticisms. A 1-week course for wives emphasizes the same problems plus those of daily living.

EATING IN AFRICA

Dr. Harold Randall, the program's director, acknowledges that it's sometimes difficult to teach another country's social customs. He recalls an American executive who ate with local chieftains in Africa and felt proud that he had gone through the whole banquet eating with his fingers, as he had been coached to do. But later he was ruffled to find he had used the wrong hand.

Another graduate, however, was so tactful in managing his company's affairs in Brazil that he was made an honorary citizen, despite the fact that he couldn't seem to master Portuguese. His understanding and patience showed through.

Another school training young executives for overseas posts is the American Institute of Foreign Trade, near Phoenix, Ariz. It offers college seniors postgraduate training for work in any area of the world, so far has sent 1,000 graduates to 78 countries. The school's director is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, usually regarded as a foe of foreign aid. GOLDWATER claims that the work of the Institute is an example of assistance that counts.

CONFIDANT AND LEADER

But Pan American's man in Bangkok, Marty Taylor, has had no such formal training. He has attained the friendship and respect of the Thais strictly through his own efforts. Taylor, a warm and genuine type, has become a confidant of Thai political leaders and at the same time an acknowledged leader of Bangkok's 3,000 Americans. Consequently, the airline office is a kind of unofficial Thai-American bridge.

"This is a small country," Taylor says, "and we live close to one another. Whatever Americans do is noticed. So it's important that we and the Thais understand one another."

Taylor has made it a personal goal to advance such understanding. He speaks Thai passably well, thanks to a vigorous self-education campaign; he can frequently be found in his dining room, reviewing his vocabulary with the help of records. His friends are Thais, and so are those of his wife Clare and his children, Terry, 9, and Jimmy, 11.

The Thais as a result treat him as they do few other Americans. A government airline competes with Pan American, yet Thai officials have felt free to ask Taylor's advice on tourist and travel problems. Taylor has been awarded the Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant, a cherished decoration, for his services, and several times invited to be a guest of the royal family. In fact, when the Queen was taking a trip to Hong Kong recently, she asked Taylor to make the arrangements.

Taylor also is active in dozens of Bangkok civic groups, including some in which he is virtually the only American member. By keeping one foot in each camp, he and other businessmen have been able to work for United States-Thai understanding. They meet once monthly with Ambassador Kenneth T. Young and tell him what's new in the Bangkok business community. He in turn explains and interprets U.S. far eastern policy.

THEY NEVER FORGET

"The Thais are wonderful people," says Marty Taylor. "They never forget people or a country that shows it is interested in them."

"We are glad to have Mr. Taylor with us," says a spokesman for the Thais, Prince Wan Waithayakon, an elder statesman, once president of the U.N. General Assembly, who told Parade, "He is one of our country's finest friends."

In countries around the globe, local leaders are similarly praising U.S. businessmen—our most important unofficial ambassadors.

On the Prevention of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the April 23 edition of National Review,

there appears a review written by Dr. J. D. Atkinson of the book, "On the Prevention of War," by John Strachey. Mr. Strachey is a member of the British Parliament and a former Secretary of State for War. In the event the Labor Party came to power in Great Britain, Mr. Strachey would undoubtedly be one of the key figures in Great Britain's defense establishment. Therefore, his book, "On the Prevention of War," assumes added significance. Dr. Atkinson's review of Mr. Strachey's book is quite penetrating, and for those who will not be able to find the time to analyze this book for themselves, this review will be most helpful. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the book review entitled "The Dimensions of War" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DIMENSIONS OF WAR

(By James D. Atkinson)

("On the Prevention of War," by John Strachey.)

This book is a singular melange of lucid, often brilliant, ideas and incredibly naive ones. Mr. Strachey's analysis of the Soviet fear of provocation and Soviet caution in avoiding escalation into total war has hardly been better put. Thus he writes: "Russia gives the impression of being determined to have her way whenever she can, and of being not in the least averse to using force to get it, if she thinks she can do so without undue risk."

Equally, his cogent chapter on the arms race emphasizes that now, and increasingly in the future, competition in armaments is primarily qualitative, not quantitative. This concept is most important since our public policy seems to be based on the idea that the so-called arms race is an interaction between the United States and the Soviet Union. This would, perhaps, be applicable if the arms race were solely quantitative and thereby dependent on productive capacity alone. This is not the case. While the United States might be able to convince the Soviets that we can and will maintain superiority in production, it is most unlikely that they can be convinced that they are incapable of achieving scientific breakthroughs in particular areas, areas which might lead to a high level of weaponry, giving them parity, and possibly even superiority, for some period. It is difficult, for example, to conceive how the United States could convince the U.S.S.R. that it is precluded from coming up first with a defensive weapon such as an antimissile missile, or an offensive weapon such as a continuously powered (or intermittently powered) nonorbiting spacecraft. Despite Soviet lack of the capability to produce an offensive weapon of this kind in great quantity, this could well render our present—and projected—numerically superior missile capability relatively unimpressive.

To turn to the naive, Mr. Strachey compares present-day capitalism and communism and finds that neither, to be sure, is by any means ideal. Certainly, it would take a long day's journey to find a larger spoonful of pap than this, unless it be a later sentence that communism is just a very large fact of the 20th century which has to be dealt with and lived with like all the other facts.

More dangerously naive is Mr. Strachey's failure to perceive the nature of the nontraditional warfare in which we are presently engaged. The war Mr. Strachey wants to prevent—this is the central theme of his book—is a nuclear war. Who can fault such a laudable aim? But Mr. Strachey's idea of war is a traditional one. Is it a proper guide either now or for the coming years in face of nontraditional Marxist-Leninist warfare? Mr. Strachey's war is posited on the premise if war should come. It precludes the hard question: Isn't the real and present struggle taking place without the crossing of the peace-war line so familiar in the past?

A striking feature of the present world crisis is that articulate and prestigious public men like Mr. Strachey seem not to recognize the complex operations which make up the current conduct of war. So great is their concentration on the purely military effects of nuclear weapons that they neglect their psychopolitical fallout. Ban-the-bomb demonstrations, peace marches, and strikes for peace are as much a part of the weaponry of today's battles as the nuclear weapons themselves.

While ardent and high-minded men strive to prevent a future nuclear war, their society's destruction is being encompassed by the very real but nontraditional warfare going on today. What overt, declared act of war could Mr. Strachey point to in Vietnam? In Laos? Has any open expeditionary force been landed in the current struggles in Venezuela, in Guatemala, in Brazil, in British Guiana, in Nicaragua? What overt act of war accompanied the building of the Berlin wall?

The Communist legions move forward with muted trumpets and muffled drums. They do not disdain the hardware of war, the missiles, the nuclear weapons, but they much prefer to exploit the psychopolitical fallout from these things in attempting to force compliance with their will. What is significant about Cuba, for example, as a Communist point d'appui is not merely that it can be used as a base for directing missiles, aircraft, or submarines against the United States. More portentous is the fact that it is the intelligence and operations center for the conduct of nontraditional warfare against the United States and all of Latin America and the islands of the Caribbean.

The thought processes reflected in "On the Prevention of War" much resemble those which inspire the policies of the United States and the other Western democracies; we strive to preserve peace; the Communists strive to win a new, a nontraditional, but a very real war. Given the continuation of this pattern of thinking—and acting—the world authority capable of maintaining peace envisaged by Mr. Strachey may come about. But it may be the kind of authority envisaged by Khrushchev when he said: "When the last spadeful of earth is thrown on the grave of capitalism, we will do it together with China."

Aid to Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the need for increased private financing for housing for the elderly is very clear. This point has been made repeatedly by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, with whom I was pleased to join in offering S. 1170, a bill to open new sources of financing for such housing.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board recently implemented the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 providing for a special housing for the aged lending program for Federal savings and loan associations, authorizing them to invest up to 5 percent of their assets in loans on housing for the aged. Federal associations will be permitted to make mortgage loans up to 90 percent of value with maturities running up to 30 years. The new regulation helps to meet a pressing social need. Needless to say, this authorization for the institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System is barely a beginning. It will take a determined effort, including legislation such as S. 1170, before satisfactory progress can be made toward achieving a solution of this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an amendment to the rules and regulations for the Federal Savings and Loan System (12 CFR Part 545) be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 545.6-16. Housing Facilities for the Aging:

(a) General provisions: Subject to the provisions of this section and the provisions of paragraph (a) of section 541.12 of these regulations, a Federal association may, if permitted by the terms of its charter, invest in installment loans or participating interests therein which are secured by improved real estate designed for the purpose of providing accommodations for occupancy by aging persons over 55 years of age, or of providing rest homes or nursing homes, so constructed or altered as to be suitable primarily for the occupancy of aging persons over 55 years of age, and limited principally to the occupancy of such persons. Said authority shall be exercised by a Federal association only by the making of loans in accordance with the provisions of this section. Such loan plans, practices and procedures, not inconsistent with this section or with other provisions of this part otherwise applicable to such loans, as may be used in the making of such loans, are hereby approved by the Board.

(b) Basic limitations: (1) A Federal association may make or invest in loans, or participating interests therein, under this section only when (i) the real estate security is located within such association's regular lending area, (ii) the loans are made on a monthly installment basis and (iii) the aggregate amount of the investments made under this section does not at any one time exceed 5 percent of the association's assets.

(c) Limitations on specific loans: (1) the principal obligation of each such loan shall be specified in the security instrument with respect to such loan and shall not exceed (i) 90 percent of the value of such real estate security therefor, if the loan is not an insured loan as defined in section 541.15 of these regulations, or (ii) the maximum percentage of the value of such real estate security acceptable to the insuring agency, if such loan is an insured loan as so defined.

Each such loan shall be repayable monthly within 30 years or, if an insured loan, within the period acceptable to the insuring agency.

(2) A Federal association shall not make any loan pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained a statement signed by the borrower or, if the borrower is a trust, partnership, corporation, or syndicate, signed by its authorized officer or agent, certifying that the security property has been or, as a result of such loan will be, constructed or altered to provide housing accommodations suitable primarily for aging persons over 55 years of age or to provide a rest home or a nursing home for such persons and certifying that the initial occupancy of such property will be limited principally to aging persons over 55 years of age.

(3) A Federal association shall not make any loan on existing housing accommodations for the aging, rest homes, or nursing homes pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained evidence from the appropriate State or local authorities that the security property has been approved by such authorities, for occupancy by aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, as a rest home or a nursing home for such persons. In any jurisdiction where such facilities are not subject to regulation under State or local laws or ordinances, a Federal association shall not make any loan pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained a statement signed by an architect or, in the absence of an architect, such other qualified person as the board of directors of the association may designate certifying that the security property is designed primarily to provide housing accommodations for aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, to provide a rest home or nursing home for such persons. If the security property is to be constructed or altered as a result of a loan made pursuant to this section, a Federal association shall not make such a loan unless and until it has obtained evidence from the appropriate State or local authorities that the plans and specifications for the construction or alteration comply with all applicable State and local laws or ordinances and that the security property, if completed according to such plans and specifications, will be approved by such authorities for occupancy by aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, for occupancy as a rest home or a nursing home for such persons. If the security property to be constructed or altered as a result of the loan is located in a jurisdiction where such facilities are not subject to regulation under State or local laws or ordinances, a Federal association shall not make any loan pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained a statement signed by an architect or, in the absence of an architect, such other qualified person as the board of directors of the association may designate, certifying that he has inspected the plans and specifications for the construction or alteration and certifying that the security property, if constructed or altered according to such plans and specifications, will be designed primarily to provide housing accommodations for aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, to provide a rest home or a nursing home for such persons. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subparagraph 3, if the loan is an insured loan as defined in section 541.15 of these regulations, the association may accept the determination of the insuring agency as evidence of compliance with the requirements of this subparagraph 3.

(d) Relationship to the other provisions of the regulations: Except as expressly provided by this section, the exercise of any authority conferred on or vested in any Federal association by this section shall be subject to, and limited or restricted by, all other provisions of this part: *Provided*, That loans or investments made pursuant to this section shall not be included in the aggregate amount of investments referred to in section 545.6–7.

(Sec. 5, 48 Stat. 132, as amended; 12 U.S.C. 1464. Reorg. Plan No. 3 of 1947, 12 F.R. 4981, 3 CFR, 1947 Supp.) (Effective May 13, 1963.)

By the Federal Home Loan Bank Board:
HARRY W. CAULSEN,
Secretary.

News Management a Phony Issue—Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on April 3, 1963, a very interesting editorial, entitled "An Editorial: News Management a Phony Issue," appeared in the Press newspapers of Honolulu, Hawaii.

As all my colleagues are aware, hardly a day passes without some member of the press discussing "news management."

I am certain my colleagues will be interested to know the views of Mr. Richard L. Dairs, the editor of the Press Newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EDITORIAL: NEWS MANAGEMENT A PHONY ISSUE

(By Richard L. Davis)

For months the charge of managing the news, aimed at the Kennedy administration, has been echoing with some regularity from the Aloha to the Empire State.

Hardly a day passes without a newspaper, magazine or newspaper trade publication taking up the battle cry of "news management."

For all these months we have suspected our colleagues in the newspaper business of using this sly device to default on their responsibilities as working newspapermen, crying "wolf" so their readers will overlook their own lax reporting.

EDITORS TUNED OUT?

We have also watched, almost to the point of being amused, the breast pounding by editorial writers who apparently aren't even tuned to the same frequency over which their reporters are filing stories.

Our suspicions appear now to be more than justified with independent reports from two veteran newsmen, working for two different media of communications—John Scali, ABC–TV's 18-year State Department reporter; and James (Scotty) Reston, the New York Times' Washington ace.

Reston says there is less managing by Kennedy than was found working with the Eisenhower administration. He cites the Spirit of Geneva summit conference of 1955, and Eisenhower's second illness as a couple neat handling jobs.

He also goes on to say that any managing is a product of the time which finds our Nation in a limbo of half-war, half-peace thus requiring a certain amount of censorship on critical chess moves. He also points out that more than 40 allies must be consulted before any official move is publicized.

MORE LIKE SURVIVAL

Cold war security, particularly in an age of push-button rocketry, cannot be called management nor labeled as unfair censorship—not in our book.

Top officials of the Kennedy administration are more readily available than any other set of officials in Washington during the past 20 years, Reston declares.

To make his point, Reston said that even during the height of both Cuban crises, officials who knew what was happening were taking urgent telephone calls from reporters at all hours of the day and night.

Admittedly, in Reston's view, this administration may have conned a few reporters into being sympathetic and not the skeptical breed they are supposed to be, but this he blames on the reporters, not the administration.

Just last week Scali, ABC's diplomatic correspondent reported to viewers of KHVH on channel 4:

"I've covered the State Department, all told, 18 years. The furor over news management has not come from working reporters on the diplomatic beat. In all my experience I can't recall a time when legitimate information is easier to obtain for newsmen who are willing to work for it.

"Even during the Cuban crisis at the moment of supreme peril, responsible newsmen often could, and did, find out the facts from officials who knew that truth was the best answer."

President John F. Kennedy and his Defense Department aides have repeatedly questioned the validity of this charge. The President's accusers, to put it charitably have been slow in citing specifics.

Going to the heart of the complaint, the President's press chief, Pierre Salinger, is a personal friend. Our acquaintanceship with "Lucky Pierre" dates back to our San Francisco newspaper days when he was bird-dodging for the Chronicle and we were legging it for the San Francisco Examiner.

Pierre has been a hard-hitting, hard-driving competitive reporter all his life. He even tried the accommodations of San Francisco Bay area jails in a series of exposés which resulted in jail reforms.

As a digging reporter, we know precisely how Pierre operates, even in the White House. The "diggers" come up with the news. The "handout boys," accustomed to filing stories while developing a shine on the rear of their trousers, are out.

Carrying this a step further, we do not cry news management when Iolani Palace stops ladeling out releases due to a change in administration from, say, Gov. William F. Quinn to Gov. John A. Burns.

While we admit Quinn's press chief, Roger Croyell, made our job a mite easier, we do not condemn Burns' man, Don Horio, for failing to call on us with releases as did Coryell. The responsibility for prying news out of the administration in Hawaii is strictly ours, be it a Republican or Democratic administration.

We in turn direct our staff, as any shirt-sleeve editor does, into areas of investigative reporting, and we expect our reporters to be vigilant and tenacious so our readers can learn exactly how well their State government is being run.

We do not dash to a typewriter complaining editorially to cover up the laxity of our reporters, and this we believe is the crux of all the fuss about news management.

It is our belief that if reporters in Washington, D.C., representing the complainers, would move off their backsides and wear out some shoe leather their misguided editors would find it difficult to substantiate some of their heated editorial mutterings.

Perhaps our managed news complaints here in the islands can be excused since they can afford little time in the office between trips to Germany and the Far East. They must have precious little opportunity to maintain communications with their own Washington bureaus before unloading with editorial broadsides.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Senator Bayh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on April 6, 1963, at Indianapolis, Ind., the junior Senator of Indiana [Mr. BAYH] was called upon to deliver the principal address at the Indiana Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

The junior Senator of Indiana performed eloquently, giving to his audience a clear picture of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian principles, and how those principles are applicable today.

For the benefit of all of those who did not have the privilege of hearing my distinguished colleague of Indiana, I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY SPEECH

(By Senator BAYH)

Tonight we meet to celebrate a victory, a victory most Hoosiers though an impossible task only 12 short months ago. Through your faith and devotion, with your energy and dedication to purpose, together we won the good fight. Words are insufficient to express the deep gratitude which Marvella and I feel in our hearts for you who honored me by bestowing the honor of serving as your U.S. Senator from Indiana.

Yes, there were those who said Democratic victory in Indiana was impossible. There are those who utter this same sterile sounding slogan tonight. Let us here and now proclaim to those pitiful prophets of doom who declared it impossible to elect VANCE HARTKE to the U.S. Senate, who thought it impossible to seat Matthew Welsh in the Governor's chair, who pessimistically prophesied that a young State legislator from the city of Terre Haute was wasting his time, let us say to them at this very hour that the Democratic Party does not now nor will we ever again believe that the election of Democrats in Indiana is impossible.

Let us start now determined to elect and reelect Democratic mayors throughout this State. Let us decide now that a Democrat will be elected Governor, that Indiana will continue to have two Democratic Senators, that Democrats shall control the next general assembly and that Indiana shall cast its electoral votes for John Fitzgerald Kennedy in 1964.

The people of Indiana want good government and we are giving it to them. Hoosier citizens demand straight talk and solutions to complicated problems. This we pledge. This is our goal.

As Democrats we can be proud of the heritage to which we fall benefit. From the time the principles of the Democratic Party were laid down by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, ours has been the party of the people, the defender of minority groups, the party of progress.

Shortly after the founding of our party, Thomas Jefferson defined its goals, characterized its philosophy and contrasted it with opposing forces when he said:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the high classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as most honest and safe."

In the span of nearly a century and a half from Jefferson to Kennedy, a great nation and the world's oldest democracy has sprung from the waiting lands of a continent and the hearts of a people and has spread around the world. And across this Nation is emblazened the record of the Democratic Party, its belief in the people, its belief in the dignity of every man, its belief that there is no more noble aspiration for a political party or government than to tend to the needs of its citizens and to promote the basic opportunities of each individual American.

The Democratic Party has pursued these goals with concrete legislative programs. Democrats have been responsible for the cornerstones of family security, the social security program, unemployment compensation, consideration for the aged, the blind, our children. Democrats established the minimum wage and throughout the years we have improved it and increased its coverage. We have made considerable progress in the field of civil rights.

But we need not dwell in the past to talk of Democratic accomplishments. The Democratic Party is a party of the present and the future. After 2 years of the New Frontier, at the quarter post of the presidency of John F. Kennedy, we can see progress that has improved life here and around the world. Great progress has been made. Yet we are determined to solve problems still unsolved.

America has long been known for its Bill of Rights. Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke eloquently of the four freedoms. Today a space age America must echo these thoughts and must rededicate itself to ensure certain basic opportunities for each American.

Each American must be given the opportunity to secure a job sufficient to provide for his family. Through the leadership of President Kennedy more Americans are gainfully employed today than at any other time in the history of our Nation.

Over 71 million American working men and women labor in the industries, shops, farms and mines of this country. Yet the challenge remains as long as many American workers cannot find jobs; as long as young minds and bodies are not properly equipped to find employment in space-age occupations. We, as Democrats are determined to meet this challenge with tax reviews to spur lagging economic growth; with retraining programs to assist those with unneeded skills; with a special youth program to guide and assist our younger citizens.

We are equally determined to provide this opportunity for those who labor on the farms of America. The efforts of the present administration have brought about an increase in farm income of approximately 10 percent during the last 2 years. Yet we will not rest until the American farmer enjoys equal prosperity with the rest of America, and the abundance from American farms is utilized as a blessing to a hungry world rather than as a stumbling block to high farm income.

Those who labor in business, large and small, must be guaranteed the opportunity to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home and abroad. We, as Democrats, believe in a truly free economy, free from Government control and free from the oppression of monopolistic power. Ample opportunity for the small businessman is an important goal.

Each American, as a member of a family group, should be afforded the opportunity for compatible family living. The opportunities for jobs, for decent housing, and for adequate medical care during the twilight years of life are important steps toward attaining this goal. And we as Democrats must continue the efforts made in past years to see that adequate legislative programs are enacted in this important area.

Finally, each American child must have the opportunity for a good education. No investment we make as a nation is more important than that which we make in providing adequate training for our most valuable natural resource, our children. Every child must have the opportunity to develop full his own potentiality. To be sure it takes classrooms, it takes teachers; and these take money. But investment in our Nation's future through education is our best guarantee of meeting the challenges of the space age and the future.

If these opportunities are to be provided for Americans today, each of us must be resolute in opposition to these few persons who would deprive them to some Americans because of race, religion, or national origin; for full American citizenship means freedom of worship, freedom of access to public places, freedom to speak without fear of reprisal, and freedom to vote one's own convictions in the privacy of a polling place.

The cold war struggle today finds communistic totalitarianism and democratic freedom locked in mortal combat.

A waiting world is watching the American response to the challenges of this age. Awakening nations, searching for a better way of life, are asking will democracy and freedom work?

Let us answer with a hearty chorus of yes. Let us answer by renewing our determination to keep the United States of America a land of opportunity, for all Americans, for each American.

Panama Revolutionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions, I have mentioned Panamanian revolutionists by name. An interesting news story by Ralph K. Skinner, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor on the isthmus, further identifies certain revolutionary activists on the isthmus.

The indicated article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 8, 1963]

PANAMA SLOWS REVOLUTIONISTS

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA CITY.—Over the past few years, there has been much talk in Panama of a need for revolution, for drastic social and political changes.

Despite the continuing clamor of opposition leaders, the possibility of immediate action here seems to be fading.

The revolutionary movement received a setback recently when political firebrand Roberto (Tito) Arias, of the publishing family, was jailed and charged with complicity in the smuggling of hundreds of cases of liquor. He is the son of the late former President Dr. Harmodio Arias.

Tito Arias was identified by the Government as a leader in planning the invasion of Panama by Castro fighters in 1959. Later that year he participated in an abortive revolutionary attempt which forced him to spend 15 months in exile.

An avowed revolutionist, Tito Arias is known to have connections with Fidel Castro. He is a close associate of Deputy Thelma King, Panama's outspoken legislator who is a close friend of Dr. Castro. Deputy King visits Dr. Castro in Cuba so frequently that she is considered a possible liaison between Dr. Castro and prominent revolution-oriented persons in Panama.

Many of Deputy King's sympathizers and followers have received special training in Cuba. She, herself, is dedicated to revolution as the only remedy for Panama's problems.

Deputy King, speaking over her own station, Radio Tribuna, suggested on April 1 the establishment of diplomatic relations between Panama and the Soviet Union. She has visited the Soviet Union and is a frequent apologist for that nation. She pointed to acceptance of Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev or members of his family at the White House and the Vatican as a pattern which Panama should follow.

In reiterating her demand for a revolution in Panama, Deputy King makes full use of her immunity from arrest as a member of the National Assembly.

Her primary target is the incumbent Chiari administration which she claims exploits the masses and enriches the monopolists who control the country. Her outspoken attacks have given her a following among the working class, the unemployed and the "humildes" in Panama.

Also associated with Deputy King is Andres Galván, self-appointed spokesman for the working class. When he returned from an extended tour of Communist China and other Communist areas, Mr. Galván stormily denounced the United States. Since then he has taken another long trip to Cuba (he says he also visited Guinea and Ghana) as the guest of Dr. Castro.

Changes resulted from this last trip. Mr. Galván talked more mildly to this correspondent recently, discussing Panama social conditions. He spoke, however, of a Panama revolution as the only way of establishing an honest government here. He accused the United States of support in the oligarchies generally in power throughout Latin America.

The revolutionary movement in Panama lacks internal spontaneity and untainted leadership. The self-proclaimed revolutionists appear concerned with the achievement of personal ambitions for power.

From Cuba to Laos U.S. Foreign Policy Smacks of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the April 15, 1963 issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly:

FROM CUBA TO LAOS—U.S. FOREIGN POLICY SMACKS OF APPEASEMENT

The Kennedy administration, as its most ardent critics must admit, has consistently displayed admirable skill in the use of words. Last week the President himself was in rare rhetorical form. After keeping the Nation in mounting suspense for 36 hours, Mr. Kennedy on Thursday snapped the tension, and sent the stock market skyrocketing, with one of the most adroitly phrased political pronouncements on record. While remaining firmly opposed to across-the-board increases in steel prices, he stated, the powers that be are willing to accept selective adjustments up or down, as prompted by changes in supply and demand. The day before the steel crisis, at a ceremony conferring honorary American citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, the Chief Executive rose to the occasion no less nobly. In a glowing tribute to his new compatriot, the President said in part: "In the dark days and darker nights when England stood alone, he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty."

In saluting the verbal prowess of Sir Winston, the President was speaking not merely as head of state but also as one professional to another. Since taking office John F. Kennedy more than once has sought to rally his countrymen with stirring calls to arms; at times he has succeeded in sounding almost Churchillian. Unfortunately, however, the resemblance ends right there. For in translating words into deeds, the Kennedy administration has acted not with the boldness of the great Prime Minister, but with the irresolution and timidity of his inglorious predecessor. In Latin America, Southeast Asia and in the heart of Europe, the White House, despite an occasional flash of spirit, has been pursuing a policy of appeasement. Day by day and step by step, in consequence, the Communist tyranny has gained ground; the forces of freedom, contrariwise, have been in steady retreat. In a desperate quest for peace in our time, as the author or "Why England Slept" must know, Neville Chamberlain unwittingly paved the way for World War II. To prevent history from writing a catastrophic sequel, the President and his official family would do well to learn from it.

A prerequisite to learning, of course, is the willingness to face facts. On this score the White House and its advisers have proved sadly deficient. A case in point is Walt W. Rostow, a man whose global knowledge of economic and political affairs is matched only by his apparent lack of insight. In a far-ranging speech in Philadelphia recently on the cold war, Professor Rostow (who serves as counselor and chairman of the Policy Planning Council, Department of State) reported progress on all fronts. To be sure, he conceded, "none of the crises on the national agenda as of January 1961 has been finally and satisfactorily settled. The treaty arrangements in Laos remain precarious, still violated by the continued presence in that country of Vietminh units under the control of Hanoi. * * * West Berlin stands firm, confident and prosperous, but the threat to its future remain. And evidently the crisis over Cuba is not at an end." Nonetheless, in a stunning nonsequitur he proceeded to conclude: "We have achieved something substantial in these 26 months: the momentum of Khrushchev's post-sputnik offensive has been halted, and in vast areas which have been threatened by it free men breathe easier."

More dangerous nonsense would be hard to come by these days. Under the hapless leadership of the New Frontier, as even its staunch supporters now concede, the free world has suffered a dreary succession of defeats. Regarding Cuba, for example, William V. Shannon, Washington columnist for the leftwing New York Post, recently pulled no punches. Two years ago, he observed last week, "a brave and active underground movement against Castro was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow." Since then, however, their hopes have been dashed by one betrayal after another, from the Bay of Pigs to the incredible blockade imposed by the U.S. Coast Guard, not against the Communist regime in Havana, but against its mortal foes. Such perfidy now has led to the rupture of friendly ties between Washington and the Cubans in exile, a denouncement which, wrote Mr. Shannon scathingly, "Brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance and moral confusion. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor."

In Laos, too, the once firm U.S. posture has developed a perilous sag. Until 1961 this country actively supported a regime in Vientiane which, despite its defects, was pro-Western and willing to resist the thrust of Communist aggression, launched years before by native Reds aided and abetted by north Vietnam and Red China. However, in the ill-founded hope of restoring peace to the embattled land, the Kennedy administration, through its roving ambassador, W. Averell Harriman, began urging, and finally pressuring, its Laotian allies to form a coalition government with a neutralist group and the local Communist Pathet Lao. Last summer at an international conference the three factions signed an agreement which established such a troika government and demanded the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Laotian soil.

Describing the settlement as a calculated risk (Barron's chose at the time to call it a witless gamble), Washington promptly complied. The Reds did not. On the contrary, they quickly set about demonstrating once again that every treaty with a Communist is an open invitation to trouble. The Pathet Lao first tried assassination, one of the trusted lieutenants of Kong Le, the misguided neutralist who originally launched the revolt, was murdered a few weeks ago. Next came subversion, a tactic revealed last month when a loyal Laotian soldier shot the foreign minister and denounced him as a traitor. Finally, in early April the Pathet Lao launched an unprovoked attack against the neutralist forces on the Plaine des Jarres, capturing several strongholds and other strategic real estate.

To the latest outburst of naked Communist aggression, the New Frontier reacted with its customary vigor. Even as his diplomatic handiwork was collapsing, Averell Harriman was promoted to Under Secretary of State. His boss, Dean Rusk, appealed for a cease fire. And the SEATO Alliance, at U.S. behest, announced plans to stake an impressive show of force, not in Laos, where the shooting happens to be, but in neighboring Thailand, where freemen (Mr. Rostow to the contrary notwithstanding) today surely breathe no easier.

"Don't worry, they're still 90 miles away," proclaims a satiric Republican car sticker. Evidently, Washington hasn't gotten the message. Even as fighting broke out afresh in Laos, the White House was recording its elation over another dubious diplomatic stroke, the tentative agreement to set up a direct line to the Kremlin. Even as President Kennedy was eloquently hailing a now retired champion of freedom, the cause of freedom was suffering. Appeasment is an ugly word, and one which even Nelson Rockefeller, who sounds more like a party standardbearer every day, backed away from last week. History has no such qualms. Unless the current disastrous course of events is reversed, there will be only one place in history for the Kennedy administration. And it won't be among the profiles in courage.

U. S. Agencies Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an important article by Frank E. Karelson entitled "U.S. Agencies Praised."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AGENCIES PRAISED—VALUE STRESSED OF HELP GIVEN LATIN AMERICAN MASSES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During a recent visit to Peru, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, I had the opportunity to observe the efforts and accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress, the Agency for International Development Program, the Peace Corps, and the food-for-peace program.

On my visit I talked with many dedicated persons in each and all of these agencies. I conversed with people in numerous fields of endeavor, including educators, psychologists, housing experts, and so forth. I visited with workers and underprivileged citizens, with bankers, businessmen, both American and native.

My conclusions, based on this research and my own observations, were that on the whole each of these agencies was doing a splendid job in which every American can take pride. True, some people are doing better work than others, and there is still a vast amount to be accomplished. To make even slight headway is a stupendous task.

For centuries a small percentage of the people of South America have had all the cream and have no desire to help the masses who, because of centuries of virtual servitude, have become discouraged and disheartened. A beginning must be made so as to prevent these masses from turning to totalitarianism, and our agencies are making that beginning. It will take time, dedication, and a great deal of money to make an important impact. It will require the cooperation of American business interests as well as the education of the small percentage of the people of wealth in South America. There will be failures and successes.

From the standpoint of the citizens of the United States this is not charity. It is something that we must do in order to prevent the United States from becoming an island surrounded by Communist revolutions—revolutions which can and will bring down the vices and bloodshed of the French revolution.

FRANK E. KARELSEN.

NEW YORK.

Upstream Flood Control in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at the 34th annual State convention of the Oklahoma Garden Clubs, Inc., Miss Sally Cooksey of 1425 East Fifth Street, Ada, Okla., a senior at Ada High School, was judged the winner over a large field in competition on a speech entitled "Upstream Flood Control in Oklahoma."

The address speaks for the thoroughness with which Miss Cooksey researched this subject. Also, it indicates the great foresight she has into the future of the State of Oklahoma.

Miss Cooksey is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Cooksey. She intends to continue her speech training in college, and anyone who will read her speech on "Upstream Flood Control in Oklahoma" can understand why I believe she will be successful in this venture.

I ask unanimous consent to place her speech in the RECORD in order that it may have wide circulation and be preserved for those who will do research on this subject in the years to come.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPSTREAM FLOOD CONTROL IN OKLAHOMA

(By Sally Cooksey)

Let's suppose the time is—say—1980.

The place: Oklahoma.

The locality: Your county.

A drive through the country shows you fields abundant with fully ripened grain, the land dotted with small lakes and ponds, curving terraces green with sod.

Does this sound like a description of a paradise or a fantasy of a dream world? I wonder if we could make this dream a reality.

Let us now think of another dream which was a reality and it was a nightmare for our parents. I have heard and read just as you have about the terrible droughts endured by people living in Oklahoma not too many years ago. We are told that at the end of a long, dry summer fields literally became parched and dead and worthless, that the ponds at which cattle drank became hard, crusty holes in the ground and farmers were forced to haul water to keep the animals alive.

Now what makes the difference between this paradise we could have and the ugly truth learned by Oklahomans in the recent past? The difference lies in the Upstream Flood Control. Could this one matter of controlling water in our streams take us from drought to abundance? There are many men who feel that it can, that one of the greatest needs in Oklahoma today is the successful management of our water resources.

How, then, can we do this? Is it one of those things that is simple and yet not so simple? For one thing it is a long-term program. I was surprised to learn that work in this area started as far back as 1903. The work progressed slowly for several reasons—probably because of lack of interest and certainly because of lack of funds. It seems that it takes a great deal of time and money to just survey and see what needs to be done. The current watershed program carried on is a big step in the right direction.

I was interested to learn how and where these projects begin. An authority in the field explained to me that a watershed program must originate with a local group. They in turn prepare an application for a conservation district which they submit to the State agency. They then send experts to make a detailed study of that district. If the work is approved by State and Federal Governments, then the Federal Government will share with the State in financing the project. So, you see, each flood control project is a local undertaking with Federal help, not a Federal project with local help.

I believe educators tell us that the first step toward solving a problem is to recognize that we have a problem and to face it squarely. So, for a few moments, let's analyze our situation in Oklahoma. I know one group that saw the problem for the first time 2 years ago—that was the high school students who prepared for this same contest sponsored by the garden clubs. That year we studied gullies and the matter of soil erosion and we saw firsthand the terrible results of uncontrolled streams. By letting small streams run at will wherever the slope led, we were allowing this unruly water to do great damage to valuable land. Now, with this year's study of upstream control I can see that this runoff water damage could be prevented.

Of course, when we say the word "flood" the picture that comes to my mind is of low lands, or bottom lands which we have seen literally flooded and standing in water. We recognize that many times crops are lost by too much water just as by too little.

Actually, I guess, the kind of floods which harm people are even more serious than those which destroy land. So a big part of our problem, then, is our neglect of larger rivers which rise and swell, and spread to engulf and endanger human life. Years ago floods were accepted as accidents—unpredictable and unavoidable. But men have learned that this is not entirely true. Men have learned something of control and prevention.

There is another phase of our problem encountered by people who travel by car over our highways. Oklahomans, like all Americans, increasingly spend more time and travel more miles in automobiles. It is not uncommon in certain areas for creeks, swollen by excessive rains, to dislodge a bridge and carry it forward in strong torrents, leaving the road impassable.

In the face of all this I'm afraid we have to acknowledge that uncontrolled water running rampart over our State is a problem and should not be ignored. Our own watershed has its own combination of problems. So do all the other watersheds of the Nation, and solutions must fit the problems in each.

Now—is there a solution to our trouble? Luckily, there is. I believe the old saying is—"Heaven helps those who help themselves." And so it does.

We will have to have farmers, ranchers, small people, important people, conservation offices, State and Federal agencies all working together to correct some mistakes that have been made and to take immediate action for improvement. All the people must be fully informed about what is being done and why. And what each group's responsibilities are. This calls for a continuing program of information and education. One thing that has been used for several years and is proving very successful is the land treatment called "terracing." The county and State conservation service has taught land users the great value of retaining land by this method. Now the newest plan is what is called small detention dams. The idea here is that by having many small dams upstream the moisture is kept on areas that need it, rather than rushing downstream where it is not needed. One reason this is a good plan is that the smaller dams are so much less expensive than one very large dam making one large lake. The small upstream dams are usually earthen dams.

I want to take just a minute here to talk specifically about the construction of these dams and the control system used. Perhaps the reason I am especially interested in this is because of an "on-the-spot" inspection I made of several damsites. A few weeks ago two men from our local conservation office took me on a lengthy tour to see some structures in various stages of building. Our first stop was to see just the proposed location of a small dam. It had been surveyed and approved, but no work had been started. Our next stop was to one nearing completion, and the final and most impressive view was of a large dam which had been finished and in use for 2 years and which backed up quite a few acres of beautiful water. My escort explained that the base of this dam, and others, is clay. Above that is a dirt fill and on the very top is 6 inches of topsoil. This last layer had been sodded with Bermuda grass to prevent erosion. The next thing my guide pointed out was probably the most important feature of the flood control and that was the concrete spillway. This, he said, can be in any of various positions at the base of the dam, but is always in a very deep spot. This drawdown, as it is sometimes called, had a 36-inch pipe for the water to flow through constantly. As I watched that water flowing through the pipe I found it a little difficult to imagine that it would continue on to New Orleans and maybe even to the sea.

Another protective measure on pastureland is the building of ponds to hold water that might be a serious hazard if left free.

Here in this connection we become very aware of how closely water conservation ties into this flood control discussion. While I think the immediate concern in this upstream control program is not the accumulation and saving of water for future use, some day this may prove to be a great asset. We are being told by national planners the amount of water our Nation's people are using is rising tremendously and that there is danger that we may some day experience a real shortage of water in America. We had an example of this very close to home a few years ago when Oklahoma City found itself with an inadequate water supply for its growing population. So it will be well if anything we do now in the way of controlling water may later prove more valuable than we know.

Perhaps we should mention a matter that seems of less importance and that is that some of the larger dams are holding beautiful lakes which afford recreational facilities for Oklahoma residents.

Now let us suppose that it is April 1963 and the place again is Oklahoma. We can be mighty glad that at this point we see great sums of money being spent to preserve our land. And we should hope that in our future we can see the dream of the good earth come true.

The Big Change in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of April 14, 1963, our good friend and fellow Chicagoan, Mr. Thomas H. Coulter, civic leader and chief executive officer of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, pointed out the amazing improvements and advances made by the city of Chicago in the last few years.

It can be truly said that, under the dynamic leadership of the mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Richard J. Daley, as well as the leaders of industry, business, and labor, these changes have been brought about. Thomas Coulter's observations are realistically portrayed in this interesting article dealing with the present and future growth of a great city, the queen of the midwest plains.

THE BIG CHANGE IN CHICAGO

(By Thomas H. Coulter, chief executive officer, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry)

As I stand on the Michigan Avenue Bridge today, or drive along the lake shore, I have to marvel at what this city has accomplished in the last few years. Change? That's our middle name. Five years ago there was no Marina City, no Sandburg Village, no McCormack Place. Many of the glittering new glass houses on the gold coast were just gleams in the architect's eye.

Now we have changed, and how. The wreckers' ball has leveled acres of slums. Everywhere, the old brownstone and brick eyesores are tumbling from view and bold new buildings are rising from the rubble. People are beginning to talk about the exciting changes in Chicago everywhere in the world.

Show a photograph of Marina City to a London shop owner (or to a West German or a Japanese for that matter) and it's a good bet he'll identify it as Chicago's round, twin tower skyscraper. What's more, he'll probably want to discuss it at some length.

Mention Chicago-O'Hare International Airport nearly anywhere in the United States and someone will tell you they've heard it's the busiest airfield in the world. It is. No other airport comes close to O'Hare's annual total of 500,000 plane movements and 13 million passengers.

I believe the reason for Chicago's newly emerging reputation as a business and idea-exchange center can be traced to its recent phenomenal growth, which comes on top of a decade of great prosperity.

Since the completion of the Inland Steel Building in 1958, which ended a 20-year hiatus in skyscraper construction in the city's Loop, Chicago has been hammering away in the biggest building boom in recent history. Last year alone, 830 commercial buildings were under construction. They represented investments of $200 million.

As the old market tipsters used to say, it takes money to make money, and Chicago is rolling. Industrial investments here last year rose to $428 million, making it the biggest year since 1956. The amount this year will be boosted by a splurge of new steel plant construction, including a $250 million complex to be built by Bethlehem Steel Co.

Chicago is rolling in other ways too. A whole network of new expressways and tollways have changed a jumble into a joy ride for the area's 2 million automobiles. The Chicago Skyway, Tri-State Tollway, and Edens, Congress, Northwest, and Dan Ryan Expressways put the Loop within 25 minute's drive of anywhere in town. To anyone who has been away for 5 years or so, these highways make Chicago look like a new city.

It is a new city. New and proud and confident. It's a growing city, too. The population of the six-county metropolitan area as of December 2, 1962, was 7,084,900, an increase of 27 percent over 1950.

Seven million busy people in search of their private goals. They're going places and doing things. It's a new city all right, but it's still jazz happy Chicago and it still jumps. It has its own brand of satire in Second City, its own kind of key club in Playboy, and now it's exporting both. In a more serious vein, Chicago has its hand in all the arts. Its orchestra, its art institute, and its museums need no introduction anywhere.

This is a bigger market than 12 of the 50 States combined. And, looking at the future, one must remember that this market has a high percentage of war babies. They are beginning to reach marrying age, and this has great significance for residential construction and related industries.

There will continue to be more and more retired people in our population. And those employed will have more and more leisure time. This will increase the demand for recreation and leisure time products. Chicago manufacturers make these items, lots of them. But indications are that the city's industry will have to increase its production 30 percent by 1975 just to meet the local demand.

The industry of the new Chicago has built itself on the old, but it has grown more diverse. It has gained in chemicals and petroleum products, in pharmaceuticals, and in printing and publishing. Chicago has long had the glamor industries, electronics, industrial research, and nuclear power, and new job categories are opening in these fields every day.

Growth has been a self-perpetuating impetus to Chicago's fast-rising reputation as a place in which to live, work, and do business. In 1959, the new Chicago was brought to the attention of the world in dramatic fashion with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, linking the city to other major ports of the world. But that was 4 years ago, and things are changing even faster today.

In fact, Chicago's big era of development is just getting started. The city can say, with the brawny construction worker getting ready to toss a rivet a floor or two higher, "You ain't seen anything yet."

Elementary School Children Visit Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, recently, my administrative assistant's son, who attends Westmore School in Fairfax, Va., enlisted his father's help in arranging a tour of the Capitol for his sixth grade class.

I was privileged to receive a visit from this fine group during the day and found the youngsters well mannered, interested in the operation of their National Government and receptive to the problems confronting my native State, Arizona.

Members of the class included Edward Breeden, Paul Crider, Donald Conley, David Evans, Michael Hohlfelder, Dwight Horning, Daniel Jenkins, James Karr, Steven Parvey, Michael Shaw, Hunter Shelly, Ross Smith, James Hill, Geoffry Everly, Kenneth Marton, Phillip Revelinsky, Richard Westbrook, Audrey Cameron, Bonnie Hall, Donna Hodges, Shirley Huffman, Bonnie Hunter, Linda Johnson, Karen McGauhey, Victoria Musser, Cheryl Raines, Sue Roberts, Anne Sherwood, Bonnie Tarpley, Lynne Thompson, Mary Turner, Carol Walkinshaw, Tina Woods, and Brenda Stamper.

Accompanying them were their teacher, Miss Alice Pharr, and Mrs. Carl Jenkins, Mrs. Paul Conley, Mrs. Larry B. Marton, Mrs. Charles Turner, and Mrs. William Hunter.

Several days after the visit, I received a number of letters from the young students which I would like to share with my colleagues.

The letters follow:

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: As you probably remember, I was the first girl that walked in your office, and I want to thank you for being so generous with your time by inviting our class into your office. We enjoyed your information about Arizona very much.

We are also very grateful for the nice world map you sent us.

Thank you for everything.

Sincerely,

ANNE SHERWOOD.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thank you very much for arranging our wonderful field trip. I also thank you for letting our class visit your office. I enjoyed it very much.

Your friend,

MIKE HOHLFELDER.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thank you for arranging our trip to the Capitol. We enjoyed hearing your talk on the problems of Arizona. I hope you get your $1 billion to fix the dams and pumping system. I know Arizona is a beautiful State, and I'll try to get out there sometime. Thanks again for all of the fun and knowledge the tour of the Capitol gave us.

Your friends,

SHIRLEY HUFFMAN AND
MISS PHARR'S CLASS.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 11, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: I would like to thank you for permitting us to come into your office. We enjoyed it very much. Thank you for the map and booklet you gave us. I enjoyed meeting you.

Sincerely,

LYNNE THOMPSON.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thank you very much for letting us visit your office. Thank you for the talk you gave us on Arizona.

Today Kenneth Marton showed us the map you sent us. He said that he would bring in the booklet tomorrow.

Thank you again for everything.

Your friend,

AUDREY CAMERON.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Your great friendliness truly made us very happy. Your map and information on Arizona was quite interesting.

I am sure my classmates enjoyed meeting you as much as I did. It was very nice of you to make our field trip possible.

Your friend,

KEN MARTON.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 11, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thanks for helping Mr. Marton arrange our field trip, giving us the world map, and letting us visit your office.

Your friend,

HEBERT HUNTER SHELLEY, Jr.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: We thank you very much for arranging the field trip. We liked the House and Senate Buildings very much. We hope we can go back some day. We think it was a very nice tour.

Sincerely,

PHIL REVOLINSKY.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thank you for letting us come in your office and giving us a talk on what is being done in Arizona. I know that a lot of the preparations on the field trip went through your office. I think you are a very nice Representative. I hope I meet you again sometime.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT HORNING.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thank you for letting us see your office and telling us about Arizona.

Today Kenneth brought in the map of the world. We thank you for the map. It is a very kind of you.

We hope we can see you again. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

KAREN MCGAULEY.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thanks a lot for letting us come to your office. I enjoyed your talk on Arizona. I enjoyed it and I know my classmates did to. By the way thank you for the map.

Sincerely,

DANNY JENKINS.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thank you for letting us see your office. It's very nice. We all enjoyed hearing about Arizona and the Grand Canyon.

Thank you for sending us a map of the world and a booklet.

Sincerely,

VICKY MUSSER.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: Thank you for letting us visit your office. We enjoyed it very much. We also enjoyed the book and map you gave us. I am sure the trip will be long remembered.

Sincerely,

BONNIE HALL.

WESTMORE SCHOOL,
Fairfax, Va., April 8, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENNER: We all thank you very much for letting us go to the Capitol. We enjoyed the visit very much. It was just beautiful. We also enjoyed going to your office, and when you explained a little about Arizonia and its dams. Also I got to shake hands with a real Congressman for the first time. Oh, and thank you very much for the map and the booklet.

Your friend,

BONNIE TARPLEY.

Canal Zone Flag Suit: Report of Progress—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of April 4, I quoted an informative news story in a Panama (Republic of Panama) paper about a pending suit in the U.S. district court for the Canal Zone against flying the Panama flag alongside that of the United States in the Zone.

The latest information about the indicated suit, as reported from Balboa, C.Z., in a special dispatch to the New York Times, follows:

CANAL ZONE JUDGE WEIGHS SUIT ON FLAG

BALBOA, C.Z., April 5.—Without ruling on a motion before him to dismiss a taxpayer's petition for an injunction to prevent the Canal Zone Governor and the Secretary of the Army from flying the Panama flag in the Canal Zone, a Federal judge voiced the tentative conclusion today that the flag was probably flying illegally.

The suit was filed last October by Gerald R. Doyle, Jr., seeking to restrain Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., and Secretary Cyrus R. Vance from flying the Panama flag alongside that of the United States in the Canal Zone in alleged violation of U.S. laws The suit also seeks to restrain them from selling Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone.

Judge Guthrie F. Crowe said the latter matter appeared to come under the administrative discretion of the executives and hence did not seem illegal.

He said, however, that inasmuch as Congress had outlined specific regulations for flying the U.S. flag it would seem that provisions of the law were not being followed. The law states no other flag shall be flown above or at same level with the U.S. flag in a State, territory, or possession.

District Attorney Rowland K. Hazard had sought to prove that Mr. Doyle lacked status

to sue, but Judge Crowe said the Government position was not sufficiently strong and complainant probably had the right to petition for injunction.

The Cost of National Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the costs of establishing a national holiday, written by Frank E. Taylor, of the Associated Press, and published in the April 21 edition of the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ROBERTSON EXPLAINS COST OF ADDING NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

(By Frank E. Taylor)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—What's the price tag on a national holiday?

There are pending in Congress more than a dozen proposals for five new legal holidays. There now are eight.

Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, noting proposals for Columbus Day, Constitution Day, Election Day, Good Friday and Lincoln's Birthday, decided he would delve into costs.

Another national holiday for Government activities, he learned, would cost approximately $70 million.

INDUSTRIAL COSTS

For all of American industry, he was informed, an educated guess points to approximately $900 million.

"So the total cost would be in the neighborhood of $1 billion, exclusive of the cost to States and municipalities for the local government employees," ROBERTSON said.

The information, he said, was gathered from the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Labor.

Some of the figuring goes like this:

The base number of work days, for Government employees is 260 a year. From this is deducted 20 days for annual leave, 8 days for sick leave, and 8 days for existing holidays. This leaves 224 actual work days.

PRESENT RATES

The average cost per man per man day in the Government is $26.78. Based on 224 actual work days and an average of 2.5 million Government employees, the cost is approximately $67 million. To this is added $3 million for those employees, such as prison guards and others, who would have to work anyway and who would receive premium pay.

"After dealing with figures for 30 years," ROBERTSON commented, "I have become cost conscious. I've never heard what a national holiday costs. I decided to find out."

ROBERTSON said the information can help in deciding what position to take on voting for any new legal holidays.

The proposals call for holidays on February 12, Lincoln's Birthday; Good Friday, before Easter; September 17, Constitution Day; October 12, Columbus Day, and the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, Election Day.

Lumbermen Face Year of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, British Columbia sawmills have taken another 15-percent bite from the American lumbermen's share of the Atlantic coast lumber market. At the rate our neighbors to the North are eating into our share of this waterborne market, our industry soon will not have even a bone to chew on.

In 1953, Oregon and Washington shipped 66 percent of the waterborne timber sold through east coast ports. During the first 2 months of 1963, these States shipped only 23 percent.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dave James, of Simpson Timber Co., in a letter to me, asks if 1963 will be the year west coast sawmills must decide they have lost permanently a market they held for many years.

There are several proposals before the Congress that would help alleviate the frustrating problems our lumbermen face. A temporary quota on Canadian lumber imports into the United States and amendment of the Jones Act are two pieces of legislation I have introduced which would aid the timber industry. Unless these or other measures are taken, I am afraid our lumbermen face the year of decision to which Mr. James refers in his letter.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter in the RECORD.

SIMPSON TIMBER CO.,
Seattle, Wash., March 28, 1963.

Representative JACK WESTLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: The February report of the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau, issued today, confirms our concern that British Columbia sawmills refrained from pressing the U.S. Atlantic coast market in the latter part of 1962 while awaiting the decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

In the first 2 months of 1963, British Columbia mills have taken 77.4 percent of this waterborne cargo market compared with their 1962 "take" of 62 percent.

Here are the 1963 figures:

[In board feet]

	British Columbia	Oregon-Washington-California
January 1963	90,252,829	26,751,307
February 1963	96,347,238	27,612,268
Total	186,600,067	54,363,575

British Columbia shipments aboard foreign flag vessels chartered at rates now reported to average $22 per thousand board feet ($14 below the Jones Act required shipping rates of west coast mills) are going in gobs of as many as 11 million feet per shipment.

We are always looking for years of decision. Will 1963 be the year west coast sawmills must decide they have permanently lost an American market they held from 1920 until world charter rates crumbled to the advantage of Canada in 1961?

Sincerely,

DAVE JONES,
Director of Public Affairs.

Proposed Lincoln Memorial Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth, explains the need for marking the trail which Abraham Lincoln took during his formative years.

The trail, which has merit to say the least, is noteworthy in view of the fact that last year I introduced legislation calling for a Lincoln Memorial Parkway.

Unfortunately, no action was taken on this proposal, but I intend to reintroduce the bill in the Senate in the near future.

So that my distinguished colleagues might know of the trail as proposed by the sister States of Indiana, Kentucky, and Illinois, where our great President Abe Lincoln spent his boyhood years, I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the Elkhart Truth editorial of April 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN HERITAGE TRAIL

A third conference of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky Governors is due in Kentucky this week to spur tourist interest in the Lincoln Heritage Trail project.

Trail markers will be placed this summer to guide motorists to points of interest in the land where Abraham Lincoln spent his pre-presidential years, it is pointed out by Indiana Highways for Survival, Inc.

From the commercial standpoint alone, Lincoln Heritage Trail promotion has special interests for Indiana. Last year, Indiana was 48th among all continental States in the multibillion dollar tourist trade industry.

But quite aside from the commercial angle—and more important—is the value of stimulating deeper knowledge concerning our national heritage.

From Lincoln's birthplace near Hodgenville, Ky., tourists will be directed to the Pioneer Memorial State Park at Harrodsburg and to other Lincoln landmarks in Kentucky, and then northwest to Lewisport, close to where the Lincoln family crossed the Ohio River into Indiana.

In the hills of southwestern Indiana, visitors can see the Lincoln State Park, Nancy Hawks Lincoln Memorial and Rockville's Pioneer Village.

This is the area where the future Civil War President spent his formative years from 7 to 21. The trail will then travel westward to Vincennes and on to Springfield, Ill.

It is good to read of Lincoln's life. But that alone cannot substitute for treading the very ground he trod, and reconstructing in mind the events which shaped his character.

The Lincoln Heritage Trail should be a notable exercise in patriotism.

Case Against Socialized Engineering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the continuing expansion of Federal bureaucracy was recently highlighted by Mr. Murray Wilson, of Salina, Kans., in a speech to the Kansas congressional delegation and their assistants here.

Mr. Wilson, a highly successful practicing engineer and past president of the National Society of Professional Engineers, points out how Government is depriving consulting engineers of many opportunities. In 1960, over 61,000 engineers were employed by various agencies of the Federal Government and this figure is growing by leaps and bounds.

I believe Mr. Wilson has done a real service in calling attention to another area wherein bureaucracy threatens to stifle initiative and if permitted to go unchecked actually exterminate the consulting engineer.

The text of Mr. Wilson's speech follows:

CASE AGAINST SOCIALIZED ENGINEERING

It is indeed an honor and a pleasure to speak to you gentlemen this morning. Not only for myself, but for the Consulting Engineers of Kansas, I want to thank each one of you for taking time to visit with us. It is our sincere hope that we can present to you the information we have in such a way that you may feel that the time is well spent.

The basic question we want to look at this morning and present to you, can be briefly and bluntly stated as follows: "Should Consulting Engineers Be Exterminated"? That's not really a rhetorical question. I haven't seen it in print—nor have I heard it expressed so bluntly—but reduced to its simplest terms—that is one of the questions facing the United States and the engineering profession. To aid you in considering this question, we should take a brief look at this thing we call the profession of engineering.

Due to the careless use of the term "engineer," the census figures are always misleading because a well recognized group has placed the figure of total engineers in the United States as of last year at a number in excess of 850,000, but a sampling in various places proves that this figure is much too high and includes many subprofessionals and technicians. After spending considerable time in studying the matter, I have arrived at a possible total of not to exceed 600,000, and probably less. But if we assume that the 600,000 is within reason, the distribution of these by type of employment would be something like this:

Engineers in industry	360,000
Engineers in Government	140,000
Engineers in private practice	75,000
Engineers in Education	25,000

In 1960 the Federal Government acknowledged the presence of 61,000 engineers in their employ, and this has grown apace during the last 3 years. The balance of the 140,000 mentioned above are the engineers in the employ of States, cities, counties, and other non-Federal units of government. As an example of bureaucratic growth, in 1960 NASA had 4,100 engineers, while a year ago I heard the head of the personnel department of NASA state that the number of their engineers had grown to 5,600, and that they were planning to add engineers and scientists, together, at the rate of 1,000 to 1,500 per year for the next 4 or 5 years. The impetus has been very definite during the last 2 years to enlarge all bureaus as much as possible, and in the case of the Bureau of Public Roads, this trend has been extended beyond the Federal realm by their urging the State highway departments to build up their forces so that contracting for engineering services could be held to a minimum.

It would be quite possible to enlarge and extend the activities of the bureaus which have departments of engineering to the point where they could perform the engineering services for the entire field of public works. Loans and grants are now a part of a large percentage of new work at all levels—city, county, and State—as well as strictly Federal projects. The inclusion of "free" engineering as an added inducement to the units in the lower echelons of government would add to the readier acceptance of the programs and give excellent grounds for increasing the budget. It would also be the surest and most direct way of instituting more rigid controls and of exercising more rigid and detailed authority.

This is not a new or an original idea, but a dream that has been espoused by various people at various times in the past. I hung out my shingle as a consulting engineer in 1932, when no one was looking for engineering services. For the next few years the small amount of business which we were able to secure was mostly of the kind generated by one of the relief programs, such as PWA, WPA, CCC, etc. During those years the Government bureaus grew swiftly and each year saw more engineers on the Government payroll. Time after time, well-meaning friends advised me that I had chosen the wrong outlet for my energies because there was no question but that within a few years all engineering in connection with public works would be done by men in the employ of some branch of the Government; or in other words, this phase of engineering would have been entirely socialized. World War II changed the picture with the fantastic amount of construction that needed to be done in the shortest possible time in order to bridge the gap of unpreparedness. The engineers in private practice were called upon to help accomplish the work. During the late forties and most of the fifties, the backlog of needed improvements, the Korean "police action," and the general activity in the Nation's economy kept the engineers in private practice well occupied and many new firms were added to the list during those years.

The seriousness of the problem of socialized engineering varies in different parts of the country. In the industrial centers there are many firms of consulting engineers who devote most of their energies—and in some cases, all of them—to working for private corporations, principally manufacturing concerns. These men of course are not personally concerned with the trend in allocating the design of public works. However, in the Midwest, where industry has not developed to a great extent, the principal source of business of all the consultants is the public works program, including such work as is done by counties, cities, States, and the Federal Government.

We consulting egineers class ourselves as, private enterprise, even though most of the work we do is for some branch of Government. When industry arrives at our front door, we are ready, willing, and able to assist them in designing the facilities which they will need. So in a nation which theoretically is commited to private enterprise, and where private enterprise is the base and the source of all revenue, both private and public, we feel that we play an important part in the Nation's economy. We think that the growth of socialism in engineering should be looked upon with at least as much disfavor as the entrance of government into the business of dry cleaning, or laundry, or feeding the public.

Don't misunderstand me—I am in nowise pleading or suggesting that the engineers in Government should be discharged. As the organization of our Government has developed, its is essential that there be engineers in full-time employment, representing the authority of the Government, to administer the part which the Government takes in the programs of public works. But we believe that the economy of the country will benefit, and that the art and science of engineering will advance more rapidly if the design of public works is kept flexible and an atmosphere is maintained which will permit and encourage the development of a strong and healthy group of consultants.

The contributions in the field of technology made by consulting engineers and their staffs have been out of all proportion to their number. In the field of public works, it is the inevitable trend of Government bureaus to develop certain standards which, by the time they have been made the subject of many conferences and many discussions, are often out of date by the time they are adopted, and when once adopted, the inevitable inertia provides enormous resistance to any change. During the last quarter of a century, the infusion of new ideas into the Federal bureaus and State departments by consulting engineers has been a beneficial factor which is much greater than the number of men involved or the relative amount of work which they have designed.

A pertinent example lies in the field of highway design and construction. The turnpikes which were built during the past 25 years furnished the opportunity for many consulting engineers to try out and prove new theories, new designs, and new materials. The lessons learned on these projects have formed the bases for the criteria used in developing the plans for the Interstate Highway System. Thus the entire Nation is benefiting from the practical research of the consultants on various turnpikes which was made available at no direct cost to the Government. Time does not permit an enumeration of the contribution which the consultants have made at the local level, helping solve the problems of counties, cities, and towns, but it would be a long and impressive list. The problems have been of an infinite variety, and the men who have solved them represent the entire range of specialties which make up this varied and complex profession.

Our Nation needs the best engineers they can find to head each of the Federal projects. And they should be paid in proportion to their ability and their responsibility. We believe strongly that our country will be better served if each of these bureaus will call on firms in private practice to perform a portion of their design work—say 40 to 50 percent of it in order to maintain a healthy, solvent, versatile body of technical auxiliaries. Such a system will bring to bear a greater diversity of talent, will reduce lost motion, and provide a source of comparison by which the efficiency of both groups can be encouraged, checked and improved.

The skill, versatility, and availability of the independent ones will be of inestimable value to our Nation in time of another emergency. I am opposed to the procedures which lead toward the extermination of the consulting engineer, for I believe it is not in the public interest.

Kicking Congress Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 18, 1963:

KICKING CONGRESS AROUND

The complaints of congressional lethargy are heavier than usual this year; in 3 months the lawmakers have produced practically no significant legislation. The current Easter vacation is sarcastically called a recess within a recess.

Yet, as President Kennedy reminds the critics, Congress is customarily slow moving at first, picking up speed as a session advances, and there's nothing necessarily wrong with that. Even so, it seems to us the charges of excessive inactivity this time are at the least a little unfair.

Those who condemn apparent inactivity as though it were some kind of crime ought to ask what are the overriding national issues which Congress should be acting on. The issues are by no means automatically what a political administration—any administration—says they are in the form of the bills it presents or its congressional lieutenants sponsor. Many in Congress quite plainly believe this administration does not always fully grasp the needs of the times in either domestic or foreign affairs.

Though the Nation's basic foreign policy is not in question, Members of Congress are understandably disturbed at recurring signs of weakness against the Communists. Certainly there has been no very effective follow through of last October's strong moves in the Cuban crisis. And it is particularly distasteful to find this Government curbing the activities of anti-Communist Cubans against Castro; no matter how it be rationalized, it doesn't ring right.

Some lawmakers are also unhappy about the deterioration of relations with a couple of America's important allies, whatever the extent of the Government's responsibility for it. Nor are they all convinced that foreign aid is as potent a weapon against communism as its proponents claim.

In short, these are aspects of the world struggle, with all its fateful potentialities. It is proper for individual Members to criticize what they think wrong, for committees to inquire into what is going on in defense and foreign affairs, for Congress as a whole to debate and propose other courses. And it hardly adds up to inactivity.

There isn't any reason, either, for Congress to rush through the various domestic proposals. The Nation is not in a depression calling for measures like a Youth Conservation Corps or enormous new public-works outlays. If a lot of Members believe such projects would be useless or worse, they are entitled to that opinion; certainly they have not been made aware of widespread public support for the administration's domestic program in general.

As for the tax reduction and reform proposals, they are so needlessly complicated that no one ever suggested they could get quick congressional action. Many a taxpayer would have reason to regret it if some of the recommended changes were approved uncritically in the name of action.

Even more important is the question of the administration's basic economic approach—the theory that the sound way to expand economic activity is through large, continuing, planned Federal deficits to finance rapidly increasing Federal spending and encroachments. This is completely at variance with the belief of many in Congress and the Nation that the economy and its financial structure would be healthier with far less interference and inflationary fuel. Should they be silent and docile?

The economic issue, now posed so badly by the administration, is indeed one of the overriding issues before the Nation, for it affects the value of the people's dollar, the international balance of payments and the military power which must rest on economic strength. It deserves more of a hearing than it is getting in Congress or elsewhere, but at least Congress cannot be said to be complacently ignoring it.

So we think the annual sport of kicking Congress around for alleged inertia can be overdone. Over the years Congress has probably been too active in loading laws on the people. But it ought to be evident that a legislature obsessed with action for its own sake would be bad for the Nation and unbecoming to its political values.

Gettysburg Address Centennial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution which would authorize and request the President to proclaim November 19, 1963, as Gettsyburg Address Centennial Day.

The suggestion that the President proclaim Gettsyburg Address Centennial Day belongs to a constituent of mine, Mr. Harold Emery of Everett, Wash. It was through his efforts that the Earl Faulkner Post No. 6, American Legion, has endorsed a resolution in support of such a proclamation.

I agree with Mr. Emery that observance of Gettysburg Address Centennial Day would contribute to the rejuvenation of the spirit of patriotism among all of us who are American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter accompanied by the resolution to which I referred. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter and resolution in the RECORD. The resolution basically is the same as the House joint resolution I have introduced in the House today:

EVERETT, WASH.,
March 18, 1963.

Hon. JACK WESTLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WESTLAND: When my children started learning the Gettysburg Address recently, it was brought to my attention that November 19, 1963, was the 100th centennial of the Gettysburg Address. It was then my thought that this should be brought to the attention of all the people of the United States.

There is a reported decline on the emphasis of observance and recognition of patriotic events throughout the Nation. In an effort to help rejuvenate the spirit of patriotism that has made our country great, I have drafted the enclosed resolution.

I presented this resolution to the local Earl Faulkner American Legion Post No. 6 on March 12 and it was received with much enthusiasm and interest. They made a resolution to send this to their State and national committees and requested that I take on personally the opportunity of submitting this idea to our Congressmen.

We could see children throughout the United States memorizing the Gettysburg Address for observance of this date. I am sure veterans' organizations will insist that their local school boards and school administrations celebrate Lincoln's Gettysburg Address centennial with appropriate ceremonies.

I do hope that you will cooperate with the other legislator from this area to sponsor a joint resolution to this effect.

Sincerely,

HAROLD EMERY.

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS CENTENNIAL DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas November 19, 1963, will mark the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; and

Whereas Lincoln's Gettysburg Address is considered near perfection of expression of the importance of self-governed free people; and

Whereas free people the world over are constantly confronted with and challenged by tyrannical ideologies and dictatorships; and

Whereas the people of the United States, and particularly our younger generation, should be reminded of the effect and importance of the principles expressed in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States of America proclaim November 19, 1963, as Gettysburg Address Centennial Day to be appropriately observed on that day and during the week of November 17 to 23, 1963, in the schools, in the homes, and at all public gatherings throughout the United States of America.

How Can I Help Preserve the American Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion sponsors a statewide essay contest each year among students of both public and parochial schools throughout the State of Ohio. All students in grades 9 through 12 are eligible to participate. This year one of the students from my district is a State winner. He is William Lewis Martin, 9084 Winton Road, Cincinnati, Ohio. William is an 11th grade student at St. Xavier High School in Cincinnati.

William Martin's essay, "How Can I Help Preserve the American Democracy?" is so outstanding that I feel it should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The essay follows:

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

(By William Lewis Martin)

Democracy is my heritage.

I can best preserve American democracy by first understanding what it means. It is

not only a word that describes a form of government—it has come to mean a way of life for a free people in a free society. Democracy for me is not only a birthright—it is a sacred trust.

The concept of American democracy was born in the minds of noble men and my freedom was won by valor of arms. But nobility of birth and strength of arms no more guarantee the continuation of my democracy than my exposure to the philosophy of Christ and wearing a crucifix guarantees I am a Christian. I will work for democracy in positive ways.

I will demand equality under the law not only for me but for you because special privileges and exemptions in the courts are a sign of corruption in the government.

I will speak boldly and freely for even the unpopular causes if I truly believe in them. I will insist on your freedom of speech also, even if I disagree with you. As a good citizen I will compromise with you on many issues but not on the basic principles of democracy or Christian philosophy.

I will be interested in public affairs. If elected to public office I will serve with integrity and honor to the best of my ability. I will expect you and every man to do likewise because public officials hold a public trust.

I will worship my God in the church of my choice in my own way. I will protect your right to do likewise because religious freedom is the basic requirement of democracy.

I will treat the so-called common man with dignity and respect but I ask you to join me in trying to be uncommon men because a democracy needs leaders of ability and courage.

I will use words like dignity, honor, loyalty, and responsibility freely whenever I can. I encourage you to do likewise because I believe they represent the character of democracy.

I will uphold the Constitution of the United States of America and bear arms against all enemies both foreign and domestic. This is the oath of a soldier. It is my oath. The Constitution is my guarantee of freedom. The right to bear arms is both my privilege and my responsibility. I have an obligation to all our honored dead from Lexington to Pork Chop Hill. I will keep the trust.

Panama Canal: Republic of Panama to Receive Water Supply Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order that the cognizant committees of the Congress may be kept informed concerning potential developments on the Isthmus of Panama that relate to the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, I quote a recent news story from a leading Panama newspaper:

[From the Panama American, Panama, Republic of Panama, Apr. 8, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA TO RECEIVE WALTER SUPPLY FREE FROM CANAL ZONE, PAPER REPORTS

The Canal Zone will furnish Panama with its water supply free of charge as one of the advantages resulting from current talks between high-level representatives of the United States and Panama, the administration tabloid El Dia predicted today.

At present water for the needs of the terminal cities of Panama and Colon is sold to Panama by the Canal Zone.

On his return from the recent San Jose meeting of the Presidents of Central America and Panama with U.S. President John F. Kennedy, President Roberto F. Chiari had told a press conference that Panama was seeking certain new benefits from the United States rather than an outright increase of the $1,943,000 annuity the Republic now receives for U.S. occupancy of the Canal Zone.

El Dia, which usually has access to exclusive government information, said that although it could not be accurately determined how much the compensations being sought would amount to in terms of cash, it is understood they would exceed many times the annuity Panama now receives.

Chiari had declared that the compensations Panama is seeking included:

The widening of the U.S.-built and maintained two-lane Trans-Isthnian Highway and of the road between Thatcher Ferry Bridge and Arraijan.

Port facilities on the Atlantic side of the isthmus.

Salary increases for Panamanians employed in the Canal Zone.

The suspension of commercial activity by the U.S. Government on the Canal Zone.

The President said at the press conference that compensations would contribute directly to the economy and development of the country.

These points were discussed between Panama Planning Director David Samudio and Alliance for Progress Coordinator Teodoro Moscoso during conference held in Managua last week, El Dia said.

U.S. Ambassador to Panama Joseph F. Farland is expected to leave shortly for Washington to push plans for putting the proposed benefits into operation.

Farland and Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., are the U.S. representatives in talks which began last year in Panama City with Republic of Panama representatives, Foreign Minister Galileo Solis and Octavio Fabrega.

Cut, and Leave Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Selbyville (Ind.) News is an excellent one dealing with the very important effort of Republican House Members to restore a measure of fiscal stability to the Federal Government. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

CUT, AND LEAVE PLENTY

Recent press dispatches from Washington tell us that a group of Republican Members of the House Appropritaions Committee are preparing for a large-scale budget-cutting effort in this session of Congress. These plans indicate that appropriation reductions of at least $10 billion and possibly as much as $15 billion are feasible. Many conservative Democrats in the House agree, and intend to support this effort.

But that won't get the job done, as important as it is to the fiscal integrity and economic welfare of the Nation. In order to assure the success of such an effort, there must be a groundswell of communications from back home urging that the budget be cut and cut substantially. For citizens of Shelby County, these communications should be addressed to Congressman RALPH HARVEY, House Office Building, and to Senator VANCE HARTKE and Senator BIRCH E. BAYH, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

An outline of feasible budget cuts has been prepared under the guidance of former budget director Maurice Stans, applying the following basic principles in determining possible reductions:

1. Limitation of personnel additions to requirements of nondeferrable workload increases.

2. Absorption by all agencies of the additional payroll increases due January 1, 1964, by personnel attrition and other expense economies.

3. Postponement of a large portion of new nonemergency construction and some stretch-out of previously authorized capital outlays.

4. A moratorium on initiation of new programs not fully essential for the national welfare or security.

5. Conscious reappraisal of existing programs with a view to reducing those of low priority and levelling out those, such as research, which have enlarged substantially in recent years.

Representative FRANK T. BOW, chairman of the budget-cutting task force group, recently made the point in a press conference that even with appropriation reductions of $10 to $15 billion the 1964 budget would not be an austerity budget. This is apparent from a comparison of the 1964 budget figures with the original budget for 1962. The appropriations total in the 1962 budget was $80.9 billion and the 1964 total is $107.9 billion. This is an increase of $27 billion or 33.4 percent in just 2 years. With such a budget growth in these 2 years, it is inconceivable that reductions of the magnitude proposed would harm the economy or security or the welfare of the Nation. But it would practically guarantee substantial tax reduction in 1963.

Pike County Dispatch Agrees on Navigable Wabash River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on April 8, 1963, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] and I attended hearings before the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at Terre Haute, Ind., regarding a proposal to make the mighty Wabash River navigable. We invited the public to voice its views at these hearings.

The April 4, 1963, issue of the Pike County Dispatch agrees that the Wabash River could be navigable and urges that it be done now.

This editorial is most noteworthy because it so well presents the case for a navigable Wabash River. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that

the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WABASH COULD BE NAVIGABLE

U.S. Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH have invited the public to present to them at the Student Union Building, Terre Haute, 1:30 p.m., April 8, the needs and advantages of a navigation program in the Wabash River watershed. Congressmen from Indiana and Illinois, Governors and public officials are all invited to express their views and ideas as to the advantages of navigation in this area.

Col. James L. Lewis, Robert Hayes, chief engineer of the Louisville District of the Army Engineers will represent this department. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior, Department of Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare will be interested parties to the testimonies of the people. Each of the above departments will be participating in the comprehensive survey that has been authorized for the Wasbash River watershed. People of the Wabash River watershed are expected to present written and oral testimonies, their views as to the advantages of a total water resource development program of the Wabash River watershed.

This should include their ideas as to what rivers within the watershed should be navigable, and the economic value to their community if this program should be completed.

The following questions need to be answered at this hearing:

1. Do jobs and industry follow navigable streams? For instance in the Ohio Valley, the last 13 years, $17 billion of new industry has located along the Ohio River.

2. National Defense: in time of emergency; inland water transportation is important to national survival.

3. Would an adequate channel of the various tributaries of the Wabash River watershed be an aid to flood control as well as navigation?

4. Would navigation stimulate the development of our natural resources, coal, sand, gravel, limestone, gypsum, oil, and many others?

5. Would it increase farm income by providing 4 to 9 cents cheaper transportation rates per bushel on grain produced in the Wabash River watershed?

The Wabash River will someday be a waterway route from the Great Lakes to the gulf. People in the Wabash Valley Basin need new industry and more jobs.

People, interest and concern will be the largest single factor in causing a public concern with the problems involved in the total water resource development.

The Wabash River will someday be navigable. Why not start now? Be sure to attend this meeting.

National Park Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a study of the North Cascades area of Washington State is scheduled to begin soon. Much of the area involved lies in the Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests of the congressional district which I represent. The outcome of the study, therefore, will have a direct effect upon my constituents, many of whom rely upon these forests for their income.

Because this matter is of utmost importance to the State of Washington and to the Second Congressional District, I have made it the subject of my current newsletter.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this newsletter in the RECORD.

The article follows:

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK

You know, the bureaucrats are at it again. Secretary of Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, with the President's approval, have authorized a study of the area between Mount Baker and the Canadian border, ostensibly to determine the best way to use the resources of the North Cascades.

But, the North Cascades Conservation Council has prepared a draft bill to create a 1,308,168-acre North Cascades National Park. The Seattle-based council claims Secretary Udall suggested it prepare the bill for introduction in Congress.

The proposed legislation, which is marked confidential, calls for a national park that would extend from Stevens Pass to Ross Dam, including 606,429 acres of the Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests of the second district. Maybe the people of Washington State want another national park, I don't know. If they do, I'll have no objections. However, I don't want to see a decision by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., instead of by the citizen owners.

I know the national forests belong to all the people of the United States, but I believe the people back home should have something to say about this proposal, because they are the ones who are really affected.

It seems to me another study of the North Cascades will only duplicate what has gone before. In 1939, a committee composed of National Park, Forest Service, and State officials made a study. The people of Washington State didn't go along with the idea of a national park then.

When Glacier Peak was being considered as a possible wilderness area, there were further studies. Again, last year a study to set the policy for use of our high mountain country was completed. Now, the taxpayers are being asked to finance another study.

During 1962, about 450 million board feet of timber was harvested in the Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests. This volume is capable of supplying jobs to 4,500 persons employed directly in the timber industry and would support another 11,250 persons indirectly. A national park would mean the loss of livelihood for a great percentage of these people, because timber isn't harvested in national parks. Unemployment is too high as it is without adding fuel to the fire.

Each year the Forest Service returns 25 percent of its receipts to local counties in proportion to the amount of national forest area each contains. This amounted to $304,476 for Whatcom, $173,783 for Skagit, and $244,199 for Snohomish last year. Any area redesignated national park land would reduce these payments now available to the counties for schools and roads.

I'm for more recreational opportunities and have supported both the Forest Service and the National Park Service in their efforts to provide for the recreational needs of our growing population. And, as I've mentioned before, if the people of Washington State really want another national park, I'll have no objections. However, the decision should be left to the people, not the bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

Aid to Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Richmond, Va., News Leader of April 16, 1963:

AID TO ANDERSON

The little town of Anderson, in southwest Missouri, is marching up to the U.N. with its hand out: It wants something like $450,000 from the U.N. Special Fund to build its natural gas system. A joke? No, sir; it isn't.

As a matter of fact, a lot of funny things have been coming out of the U.N. Special Fund lately. The Special Fund stands revealed as the method by which U.S. dollars have been transferred to Cuba for agricultural and educational projects. Recently we praised Representative DURWARD HALL, a Missouri physician, for his fight against the process by which U.S. dollars are sent through the Special Fund to finance atomic energy projects in Yugoslavia. Last week, Dr. HALL further ransacked limited-circulation U.N. documents to turn up a host of U.N. technical assistance projects conferring U.S. dollars on Yugoslavia, Poland, Albania, Cuba, Bulgaria, and even the U.S.S.R. itself. The Red bloc got away with much more money than it contributed; the United States got nothing for its usual 40 percent share—$1.2 million of the $3.1 million in projects for Communist nations next year.

The detailed descriptions and tables that Dr. HALL put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are no joke either. The humanitarian aims of the U.N. appear to be best served by programs in metalurgy, automation, transistors, locomotive design, welding, refrigeration, aerial survey, industrial chemistry, meteorology, shipbuilding, and space telecommunications, to name just a few. We are even helping to pay for a TV documentary in Yugoslavia; one hopes that the program will describe the nuclear reactors which our dollars are building for the Yugoslavs.

Some may think that the petition from Anderson, Mo., is in poor taste. But is not Missouri, like Albania, a developing area which has exhausted all help available? The Federal Home and Finance Agency says that no money is available for Anderson in the Federal public works program. Where else can Anderson turn?

And there are other American towns which should qualify for U.N. aid, too. For instance, Greencastle and Muncie, Ind., were once thriving producers of zinc sheet. But in the past 10 years, importation of zinc sheet has jumped from practically nothing to 48 percent of domestic production. Half of the imported zinc comes from Yugoslavia, where Communist wages are only an eighth of ours. As long as U.N. technical assistance programs are training Yugoslavian metallurgists and metal technicians with American dollars, it only seems right that Greencastle and Muncie should get U.N. assistance, too. Here there is special reason for all deliberate speed: President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act requires him to suspend favorable treatment of Yugoslavian imports, but he has not yet chosen to put the law into effect.

It strikes us, then, that Anderson can make out a pretty good case for U.N. aid, with no reason to snicker.

P.S.—Anderson is in Dr. HALL'S home district.

Crown Point, Ind.—A Hoosier Hello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday New York Times of yesterday published the following article concerning the city of Crown Point, Ind.

All Hoosiers are indeed proud of the progress made by this typical American town in extending hospitality and welcome to visitors who come to their community. This news item is but one of many commendations contained in newspapers both in this country and abroad concerning the hospitality of the citizens of Crown Point, Ind.

A HOOSIER HELLO

(By Donald Janson)

CROWN POINT, IND.—A group of 75 touring Frenchmen visited this small Midwestern town not long ago, and left convinced that they had discovered the real American.

The group, composed mostly of doctors and their wives, included this trim little county seat of 8,500 population on their 2-week bus tour in the hope of rediscovering the easy-going friendliness they remembered in American GI's during World War II. Their enthusiastic comments indicated that their quest had been successful.

"The welcome we received here surpassed all our expectations," said Dr. Raymond Deffarge of Billom, a town of 4,000 near Lyon. His wife added that the contrast between Crown Point and the great urban centers they had been visiting was immense.

HOW WE REALLY LIVE

"In New York last week, we had a feeling of complete absence of contact with the people," she said. "If you just visit museums and speak with the employees, you have no understanding of how Americans live.

"We wanted to meet average people. Crown Point has made America come alive for us."

The French tourists received a gala welcome from the local townspeople. As the two buses carrying the group swung into Crown Point, they were preceded by a police escort, with sirens wailing.

French tricolors, sewn by Mrs. Ray Sundquist, waved from staffs placed all around the town square. Greetings in French were displayed in the windows of shops, taverns, a seed company, the pool hall, the ice cream parlor, and the pizza restaurant.

Dozens of citizens met the buses. Greetings were warm because the travelers and the 47 Crown Point families who were to be their overnight hosts had already become somewhat acquainted through correspondence.

Residents here formed a class 2 months ago and were taught how to say faites comme chez vous and other conversational bits. Their tutor was Miss Joan Scott, French teacher at the Robert A. Taft Junior High School here.

PART OF THE FAMILY

Mayor Marvin G. Erlenbach, addressing the Frenchmen at the red brick community building, said, "Your hosts want you to consider yourselves not as visiting guests but as members of the family."

He then pronounced them all honorary citizens, and they went off to homecooked meals of roast beef, ham and sweet potatoes, and fried chicken.

At times, the round of parties and festivities became a bit wearing on the Frenchmen. At one point, the tired doctors were called upon to serve as captive audience for a typical American high school band concert, a demonstration of square dancing, and a songfest by a junior high school choir clad in jeans, wearing holsters and singing such choice items as "Home on the Range."

But the doctors learned much from the visit. They were shown the offices of the five doctors in town, and Dr. Pierre Etienne of Loudéac expressed amazement at the size of one clinic and the modern equipment it contained.

Dr. Leon Braeman and his wife of Crillon marveled at the dishwasher, garbage disposal and other kitchen equipment in the home of their hosts, Dr. and Mrs. Philip Becker.

The visitors snapped pictures of everything, from the belfry-topped 1879 courthouse in the square to the animals on Harold Wheeler's 260-acre farm, which the Frenchmen called "huge."

Dr. Paul Bernard of Villemur said he would have 1,000 photographs to take back by the time the tour ended. He said that many would be of Crown Point, the place where the welcome for his party was "from the heart."

"Many of them consider it the highlight of the trip because only here have they been able to see how Americans really life," said Mlle. Odette Roberts of Brussels, a guide on the tour.

There was a good deal of crying and kissing as Crown Point's new friends boarded their buses and left here for Chicago. They gave the Crown Point Library Board $500, about the same amount they saved for having spent the night here with friends rather than in hotels. It was indicated the money might be used to buy books on France.

The Frenchmen were not the only ones impressed wtih Crown Point's hospitality. Sidney Garner, a local realtor and cochairman of a committee that arranged for the Frenchmen's stopover here, said that officials of the Federal Government's "Visit U.S.A." program had asked for photographs of the town to use in their promotion work abroad.

The request, he said, stemmed from earlier evidence of Crown Point's friendliness to tourists. Nearly a year ago, another group of French tourists, also searching for the "real American," dropped in on the town unannounced.

The visitors, all pharmacists, were so impressed with the spontaneous warmth of the reception that they spread the word back home. Two more groups followed them and made lasting friendships. The latest visit brought to about 600 the number of Frenchmen with firsthand acquaintance with Crown Point.

CROWN POINT'S FAME

NEW YORK.—Another group of 30 to 35 French tourists is scheduled to visit Crown Point, Ind., on April 29 and partake of the town's special brand of Hoosier hospitality, a spokesman for the United States Travel Service announced last week.

The small Indiana town, described as being "a few cornfields" away from bustling, industrial Gary, is becoming through the expansiveness of its 8,500 citizens, a focal point in the Federal Government's "Visit U.S.A." program.

It was just about a year ago that the first group of French tourists visited Crown Point, after requesting that their guide take them to a typical American town. The reception proved so warm that 3 more groups, 500 Frenchmen in all, have descended on the town since then.

The newest party of Frenchmen scheduled to visit Crown Point is part of an increasing wave of foreign tourists arriving in the United States, the Travel Service spokesman said.

In the first two months of this year, 75,514 oversea visitors came to this country, an increase of 37.4 percent over the first 2 months of 1962. The total number of visitors for 1962 as a whole was 603,715, an increase of 17 percent over 1961.

Citing results of a recent survey, Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service, declared that satisfied customers are the world's best salesmen for the "Visit U.S.A." program.

The survey was conducted at Honolulu International Airport by officials of the USTS in an effort to determine what factors prompted foreigners to visit the United States. A total of 250 airline passengers on 35 flights were interviewed.

"About 21 percent said their interest in the United States was aroused by friends who had seen our country and talked enthusiastically about it," Mr. Gilmore said.

Forest Association Opposes Change in Capital Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently I presented a statement to the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to the proposed changes in section 631 of the Internal Revenue Code, which would modify or eliminate those provisions which allow a capital gains consideration of timber held for more than 6 months.

There are many tree farmers in my district and the State of Washington who share my concern about this proposal. Typical of their views is a letter from William H. Larson, manager of the Washington Forest Protection Association. This letter contains a resolution unanimously adopted by the association on April 2, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Larson's letter in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON FOREST
PROTECTION ASSOCIATION,
Seattle, Wash., April 4, 1963.

Hon. JACK WESTLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At its regular meeting of April 2, 1963, the board of trustees of this association considered the proposed change in section 631 of the Internal Revenue Code, the Bailey amendment, which would virtually eliminate capital gains consideration for timber held more than 6 months. After detailed consideration they unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas timber is the only taxable growing crop in Washington State; and

"Whereas sustained yield forest production is the basis for half of Washington State's economy, including job opportunities; and

"Whereas the public are the recipients of many free benefits from these taxpaying private lands, including varied types of recreation, and production of water for all purposes; and

"Whereas the accumulation of taxes and other expenses coupled with the risk of carrying trees through their many years of growth to maturity makes tree growing a hazardous financial enterprise; and

"Whereas our State legislature this year recognized the need for equitable taxation to assure our forest future by passing two laws which direct the responsible officials to pursue proper principles when computing and levying local taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Washington Forest Protection Association representing 63 percent of the private forest land in western Washington urges the responsible officials of the Federal Government to also adhere to taxing policies which foster the continued practice of sustained yield forestry on private forest lands. Specifically, we urge that the proposals to substantially eliminate capital gains treatment of forest harvests from the Federal taxing structure be not favorably considered."

We urge you to oppose this proposal in the House Ways and Means Committee as being inimical to our State's interest.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM H. LARSON,
Manager.

Inquiries: Democrats Handcuff GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the Davenport Daily Times recently printed the following editorial:

INQUIRIES: DEMOCRATS HANDCUFF GOP

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL and those associated with him in the demand for the Republican right to appoint 40 percent of staffs of House committees are so right that its denial is nothing less than a ruthless power play by Democrats.

Actually, the proposal is so fair that it lost by only 1 vote, 10 to 9, in the House Administration Committee.

Democrats in the House are leery of investigations, a major reason for holding the overwhelming number of investigators under their thumbs.

The inquiries which are apt to engage attention of committees extend into the labyrinth of Federal-State appropriations, particularly into the use of funds for Federal highway construction.

In Massachusetts, for instance, that type of scandal has wider ramifications touching figures whose reputations are of concern to party colleagues.

In other States, inquiries have suddenly been dropped at times, Republicans say, as pay dirt appeared on the horizon.

The liberal Washington Post, supporter generally of the Kennedy administration, says editorially:

"Representative SCHWENGEL has estimated that fewer than 50 of about 500 committee employees are Republicans.

"It does not follow, however, that the other 450 are Democrats.

"In many cases where appointments have been made on merit, the political affiliations of the employees are not known and are of no significance, and this is as it should be.

"The professional employees ought to be available to serve the minority as well as the majority, with the object of advancing the work of the committee and not of merely making political hay."

The Washington newspaper must expect its readers to be naive to swallow the defense it presents for the failure to give Republicans enough staff members to bring about some semblance of adequate personnel for their committee work.

The Republicans ask 40 percent of the 500 staff members, which is certainly a reasonable proportion based upon Republican representation in Congress.

And the idea that professional staff members do not know the Democrats are their bosses and do not carry out their bosses' will is too foolish for argument.

The Washington Post's statement that "it does not follow that the other 450 are Democrats" would bring questioning from Democratic Members of the House if they did not feel that this large group is Democratic enough to hold its place on the Federal payroll.

We're Paying for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Saginaw (Mich.) News of April 17, 1963:

WE'RE PAYING FOR IT

Representative GEORGE MEADER, of Ann Arbor, a member of the House subcommittee investigating managed news, is reported as trying to find out the size and cost of the army of public relations people working for your Uncle Sam as so-called press information personnel.

Says MEADER: "The cost of publicity and propaganda activities, including countless publications of the Government, must be tremendous. So far as we know, it never has been ascertained, or even estimated. Even more important than the cost, however, is an assessment of the importance of these activities in shaping public opinion and influencing legislative and national policies."

Representative MEADER really has something here. There can be no doubt these activities are costing the taxpayers of this country many millions, possibly even billions of their hard-earned dollars. With all the press information people scattered throughout every county in the land, handing out their press releases on behalf of their respective departments, they account for a goodly proportion of the vast total of Federal employees. Their principal purpose is to justify the actions and decisions of their bureaucratic bosses. No wonder Congressman MEADER is concerned about "the importance of these activities in shaping public opinion and influencing legislative and national policies."

Michigan manufacturers complained that the Ford-Canton decision of the Michigan Supreme Court forced them to finance strikes against themselves—and they have made out a pretty good case.

But this nationwide propaganda system of Federal Government agencies makes Ford-Canton look like a piker. For it amounts to a system of taxing every taxpayer for the privilege of being propagandized by the "powers that be" to keep them in office."

Soviet Debts to U.N. Total $70 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star of April 21 carried an article by Lawrence Sullivan which brings up to date the cynical disregard of the Soviet Union for its financial obligations to the United Nations. This sorry record of all the Communist member nations, including Russia, serves to point up the now demonstrated fact that if the United Nations engages in controversial activity, it can be expected that some nations will withhold financial support. This raises the pertinent question as to whether the United States would continue financial support of U.N. programs put into effect if the Communist bloc had a majority vote in the General Assembly.

As I have pointed out before, there are definite limitations to the possible role of the U.N. in view of the sharply contrasting ideological belief of the governments of member nations. If the U.N. is to survive and play a useful role, it seems the time has come for an objective and realistic appraisal of its future. The United States cannot indefinitely continue to play lady bountiful to this idealistic creature which tries to assume the characteristics of a world government.

I commend the article by Mr. Sullivan to the attention of the Members of the House and, under unanimous consent, include it with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SOVIET DEBTS TO U.N. TOTAL $70 MILLION

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

Communist Russia owes the United Nations $70,348,493, but contends some of the assessments are illegal and says frankly she will not pay up.

Some of Moscow's past-due accounts in the U.N. Budget Office date back to the Suez Canal crisis, in October 1956, but most carry over from the Congo crisis of July 1960.

If Moscow would pay, the U.N. could remain solvent for at least one more year. But if Premier Khrushchev can't dig up some long-overdue rubles somewhere, the U.N. faces bankruptcy at the end of 1963, with a cumulative operating deficit then approaching $250 million.

The official U.N. account books as of February 28, 1963, show that Russia owes:

On regular budget account	$16,587,450
On Near East emergency account	16,362,153
On Congo emergency account	37,398,890
Total Russian arrears	70,348,493

Thus, far, the Russian default has been financed largely by the special U.N. bond issue of $200 million. The United States took up half of this total on a dollar matching basis with all other member nations. But the bond issue, even if absorbed fully by the members, merely covers about 80 percent of the U.N. cash deficit to the end of 1963. If

the delinquent members do not begin to pay soon the U.N. faces bankruptcy.

STATUS OF OTHERS

Eight other Communist members also are behind on their U.N. assessments, as follows:

Albania	$121,385
Bulgaria	547,811
Cuba	947,444
Czechoslovakia	4,758,762
Mongolia	85,412
Poland	4,542,754
Rumania	1,435,860
Yugoslavia	642,147
Total Communist arrears	13,081,575

By these official figures from the U.N. books, Russia and the eight nations listed above are responsible today for $83,430,068 of the present U.N. deficit. As of February 28 this year the total current deficit on all accounts was $202,756,445. The Communists' share makes 42 percent of that total. The remaining 58 percent is billed principally to the impoverished new members in Africa, and the struggling marginal states of Asia and Latin America—in all, some 40 paper states which often have paid their U.N. assessments only with United States foreign aid funds.

For example, among the states still delinquent in some accounts as far back as 1957 we find Afghanistan, Bolivia, Libya, Panama, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen.

U.S. ASSESSMENTS

The United States is current in all her assessments, a total of 18 different accounts, including UNESCO, WHO, WFO, Congo, Near East, ILO, and the World Meterological Organization. The United Kingdom likewise is current in all acounts. France owes $19,739,569 on past assessments.

Under the U.N. assessment formula, the United States contributes 32 percent, Russia 15 percent, Great Britain 8 percent, France 6 percent, and 100 other members the remaining 39 percent. The regular operating budget currently runs $80 million a year. Next, the U.N. operates 17 subsidiary budgets for special projects. Every account on the book shows 6 to 20 nations currently in arrears, some for 2 years, others for 6 years.

DEFICIT ON CONGO

Roughly one-third of today's U.N. deficit, or $73 million, is on the Congo account, in which Russia has declined to participate since its establishment in July, 1960. As of February 28 this year, 69 members out of 104 were in default on the Congo account.

In July, 1962, the International Court of Justice at The Hague issued a formal advisory opinion that the Congo assessments were regular and legal under the U.N. Charter, and must be paid. Any member two years in arrears may be deprived of his vote in the Assembly. Mr. Khrushchev has declared publicly he will ignore the court's ruling.

This is the historic crisis facing the approaching General Assembly of the U.N. Will the 69 Congo defaulters (well more than half the members) lose their votes?

A Rebuke to the New England Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "New England Council Statement in Answer to Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR." It not only challenged my knowledge of the problems of the coal industry, but also questioned my veracity in this regard.

The council purported to substantiate its attack through the medium of a report on residual oil imports issued by the Office of Emergency Planning, whose conclusions on the oil import control program were so obviously fallacious that even the Department of Interior took issue and the White House itself rejected the Office of Emergency Planning recommendations.

It is not my purpose today to reexamine the Office of Emergency Planning proposals or to protest the New England Council's vicious attack. In view of the selfish attitude of the council in years past, its latest unfounded and inexcusable charges are not surprising. What is disturbing, however, is that this scurrilous material would find its way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In assuring the gentleman that I have no intention of replying in kind to this abusive treatment, I should like to suggest that he and his New England colleagues may in the future choose to examine closely any and all council statements before repeating them.

I recognize that the gentlemen are so hard put to satisfy the council's voracious demands that it is impossible for them to give the necessary attention to the statistical information brewed in defiance of accuracy and principle at the council's chambers in Boston. Apparently frantic distribution of the propaganda is deliberately planned on the theory that the delegation patently and patronizingly serving the council will place the material on public display without questioning its authenticity. I trust that my friends from New England will in the future be more cautious on this treatment of the printed products of the council.

The council attack on me inserted in the April 4 issue of the CONGRESSIOAL RECORD is by no means the first instance of the careless handling by the New England delegation of matters pertaining to the question of oil imports. When the gentleman from Massachusetts was recognized on the floor of the House for 3 hours last March 28, I sat throughout the subsequent discussion and was frankly fascinated at the coordinated participation of the several Representatives from New England and the Members from other areas they had been able to solicit for the meeting that—unless so well managed—would have fallen completely flat because of the obvious exaggerations and irrelevancies that echoed time and again through this Chamber. The gentleman was so gracious as to permit me and my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] time to inject pertinent questions which, of course, were never answered but nevertheless became an official part of the proceedings.

It was not until the transcript of those proceedings reached my office later that evening that I discovered that the New England floor show had apparently been contrived in the same haste that has marked other instances of the campaign against the oil import control program. Without in anyway attempting to embarrass any of the Members who participated in that day's discussion, I should like to call your attention to a photostatic copy of a page that inadvertently had become a part of the transcript. Scribbled in longhand on one page of the transcript—the official transcript of the proceedings of the House, I remind you—was the notation:

Questions will be asked by Mr. ———— of ————.

So perhaps, with evidence such as this at hand, we should be more cognizant of the pressure exerted by the New England Council. We should be more disposed to understand why the gentleman from Massachusetts would be so indifferent to the House amenities as to insert in the RECORD the inexcusable statement by the New England Council attacking the integrity of a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that subsequent presentations produced in deference to the imported oil merchants of the East will also provide for a response to one question which I have submitted without success to my friend from New England for the past several years:

Is New England willing, if in fact the oil import control program should be abolished and no restrictions placed on the volume of foreign oil moving into this country, to permit free import—without tariffs, quotas, or other restrictions—of textiles, fish, brass mill products, rubber products, footwear, watches, bicycles, and whatever other products are manufactured in the northeastern portion of our country?

Here is the fundamental issue. In its glib reference to the restoration of free enterprise, does the New England Council proclaim to want the products of New England accorded the same competitive conditions to which it would subject America's coal industry?

Mr. Speaker, can we expect this matter to be resolved at the next New England prayer meeting that takes place here in the House of Representatives? I repeat that I do not wish to embarrass any of my colleagues, even those who would give publication to improper and undignified remarks such as those leveled by the New England Council. For this reason I shall not name the Member of the House who, just 5 days after he took part in the March 28 rumble against oil import restrictions, stood on this very same floor and made violent protest against importation of woolen goods so destructive of the New England economy that they have been responsible for the closing of a plant in the home State of my friend who gives currency to the New England Council's criticism of a Member of Congress.

The two-part travesty is available for reading on pages 4675 and 5227. In the first instance, the gentleman stanchly asserts that New Englanders want to pay the free world price for their fuel; the next week he demands that the President immediately impose quantitative

restrictions on the importation of woolen goods. New Englanders must pay 27 cents more for domestic than for foreign residual oil, he asserted on March 28; 5 days later he said that the Massachusetts plant had been closed because their fabrics cannot meet the competition of Japanese products, which sell for 40 cents per yard cheaper. As I interpret these remarks, our friends in New England expect Americans to pay more for textiles in order to keep New Englanders employed. I concur with that philosophy. But I should like to hear some attempt at justifying the position of those same New Englanders who are willing to see Pennsylvania and West Virginia coal miners lose their jobs in order that greater volumes of foreign residual oil may be made available on the Atlantic seaboard.

For the record, I feel compelled to dwell briefly on that 27-cent figure to which I have just referred. Here is the way my colleague used it on March 28:

> Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire residual oil consumers feel they are being unfairly treated by the Kennedy administration. They are being forced to pay 27 cents extra for a barrel of residual oil than foreign consumers pay.

Now, this difficult-to-understand conclusion is another indication of how the New England Council has been able to confuse even their protagonists in Washington. I would suspect that most economists would acept as a truism the fact that a commodity—any commodity—would vary in sales prices according to points of production and consumption. A barrel of oil—any kind of oil—would be expected to be cheaper in Saudi Arabia or Venezuela than it is in Portsmouth, Pendleton, Pago Pago, or Rahway Junction. It is also likely that a sheaf of writing paper produced in New Hampshire is going to cost more at Las Vegas or Buenos Aires than it does in Manchester.

Now let us take a look at the New England Council's own reference to this magic figure unquestionably developed in Boston's Statler Building. The attempted calumniation of a Member of Congress by the council, as placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my friend from Massachusetts, includes this sentence:

> Residual import restrictions have forced the cost of residual oil to 27 cents per barrel more than in Canada and other countries.

It is my earnest hope that, when the New England delegation next favors us with its stereotyped routine, an attempt will be made to get that 27-cent item on the proper shelf. If it has not been picked out of thin air, then certainly it can be presented with some degree of lucidity. Meanwhile the New England delegation might want to attempt to square its calculations with data released April 15 by the Office of Emergency Planning, the outfit whose recommendations for abandoning the oil import controls program was evidently not politically agreeable to the White House. OEP lists the February residual oil cargo sales price at $2.01 in New England, a reduction of $1.18 since February 1957. You will remember that the mandatory control program, which went into effect in April 1959, used the 1957 figure as criteria for the quota system. The OEP chart shows no indication that at any time in the past 8 years has the selling price of residual oil in New England been lower than it is at the present time.

The New England Council, as reported through the good offices of the gentleman from Massachusetts, quotes me as having said that the import quota system has at no time been used to benefit affected coal producing regions. I have indeed made such a charge, and I reiterate it. The April 1 increase in quota allocations is summary proof that the levels have been adjusted to court the favors of New England Members of Congress and President Betancourt of Venezuela without regard to the economic impact upon coal mining areas. If, as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] averred on March 28, unemployment in West Virginia is of concern to all Americans, then I ask him to consider the impact of the increase in residual oil imports that went into effect on the first day of this month.

For the past year coal companies, railroads, and public utilities have been cooperating in an effort to bring about a substantial reduction in the delivered price of coal through the introduction of the unit train. The experiments have been so successful that some of the lines were able to initiate price reductions of as much as $1.50 per ton on coal moving from western and central Pennsylvania to the east coast—traffic that would normally cost from $4 to $4.50. This new concept in coal transportation has been looked to by residents of mining regions as the method through which present markets could be preserved and others regained. Since oil importing companies are able to adjust sales prices without regard to production and shipping costs, the peddlers of foreign oil need have no worry about competing with domestic coal regardless of the extent to which delivered prices may be reduced.

The increase allowed by the Department of Interior in residual oil imports for the year beginning April 1 amounts to 50,000 barrels per day. To serve the markets into which this foreign fuel will move would require the service of a series of unit trains, two of which—each made up of 100 60-ton cars—would move every day of the year from Pennsylvania's mines to the east coast. Under the new order, those trains will not go into service. Their operating crews and maintenance men will remain idle. The miners who would produce the coal will continue to wait for their jobs to reopen.

This prospect obviously meets with the approval of the New England Council. I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House of Representatives, assuming a less narrow perspective, will no longer concur in this malevolent philosophy and will no longer stand ready to broadcast character assaults on Members of Congress as perpetrated and effectuated by the Council.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 31, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I feel that the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives is a measure of utmost importance and requires speedy action and passage by the Rules Committee and the House. Thank you for introducing this resolution.

Very truly yours,

HEINO LAISK.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
March 30, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Because of the present world condition where Soviet Russian lies are accepted as true, it is vital that unbiased and objective knowledge about the captive nations be available to Congress

and the people of the United States. Therefore, this letter is to urge your favorable consideration of the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14, and that it be submitted to vote by the Rules Committee.

Such a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would provide a center of information on the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations. These people are the Achilles' heel of the Soviet empire; and such a weakness once realized and understood would be of vital importance in the shaping of our foreign policy.

It is strongly urged, therefore, that you give your full support to the Flood resolution.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

OLEG R. MYKETEY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch, New Haven, Conn.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 7, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We the students of Drexel Institute of Technology fully support our Ukrainian friends of Philadelphia branch of TUSM that are attending our college in their petition to support Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD's House Resolution 14.

Hoping you will support this in your Rules Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Peter V. Wilson, Paul P. Slawek, Len Rothman, Bill Slotter, Robert K. Boven, Stephen C. Cabe, Charles E. John, Eugene D. Barber, Daniel F. Ryan, Russell C. Huber, Barry E. Hunsberger, Louise Sargin, Ruth Dudley, Davis G. West, Charles N. Fox, Alan B. Brown, Jr., Linda Tontarski, Dana Huafink, J. Oliver Malibury, Roberta Kyle, Nancy Omar, Sandy Allen, John C. Wear, Larry A. Benner, Susan Davenport, Roberta Masi, Mary-Beth Hughes, Phyllis Geesy, Nancy Williams, Ronald J. Singer, Wandell Evans.

MILLVILLE, N.J.,
April 13, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member, U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Congressman SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, asking him for his support of House Resolution 14 for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee.

I sincerely hope that the resolution submitted by you will be passed by the House Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

ASKOLD SKALSKY.

MILLVILLE, N.J.,
April 13, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I would like to ask you to give your favorable consideration to the House Resolution 14 calling for a special Committee on the Captive Nations. I sincerely believe that such a committee would be of great service to the American people as well as to the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain and it is only fitting that America, as the leader of the free nations of the world, should be the first to take such a step.

I hope that you will consider this request favorably. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ASKOLD SKALSKY.

APRIL 7, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Would you kindly send me a copy of your recent statement regarding the proposed creation of a House Committee on Captive Nations and the State Department's opposition to such a committee.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN H. JOHNSSON, Ph. D.

Washington's Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Washington's Economics."

WASHINGTON'S ECONOMICS: A GERMAN SCHOLAR SEES NATION MOVING INTO FISCAL SOCIALISM

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

(NOTE.—This article, originally written in German, has been adapted by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman, of Bucknell University. Professor Roepke, a longtime student of the American economy, left Germany when Hitler came to power. Since 1937, he has been on the faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies of the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He is the author of "Economics of the Free Society," translated by Professor Boarman and recently published in this country by Henry Regnery Co.)

Thirty years ago, I published an article severely criticizing the economic policies then being pursued by President Roosevelt in the name of a "New Deal." "The grave question arises," so my article concluded, "of what will become of us all when the economically most powerful country in the world allows itself to be led by anticapitalist slogans to certain ruin."

If today, one were to subject the economic policies of the Kennedy administration to a similar analysis, the criticism would doubtless be less severe. It is hardly possible to equate what the "New Frontier" has thus far accomplished with the upheaval of the American economy engineered by Roosevelt. But enough has been done to warrant deep concern. Of particular interest to the economist is the fact that the overall policies of the Kennedy administration, including those pursued in the arena of world politics, are shaped to an unusual degree by specific economic theories. It is these theories which help explain, in particular, the clear defeats which the administration's economic program has thus far suffered.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that the two principal problems which confronted the Kennedy administration at its inception are still unsolved. The deficit in the balance of payments and the associated gold loss still continue, nor is there any evidence that the ship of the American economy is any nearer than before to the open waters of full employment and full production. Both of these phenomena, however, are intimately interrelated.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

Where a country suffers from a balance-of-payments deficit, there is always a strong temptation—and the Kennedy administration has succumbed to it to a degree—to shift the burden of the blame, if not to unlucky juxtaposition of the stars, then to other countries. The weakness of the dollar is attributed not to discrepancies, between cost and price levels in the United States and abroad, especially in respect to internationally traded goods, but to excessive capital exports. From this the conclusion is easily drawn that the dollar is less in need of an internal policy of strict monetary and fiscal discipline than of a reduction of the burden on the balance of payments stemming from capital exports. To help in the accomplishment of the latter objective, proposals are advanced which would restrain the outflow by exchange control, discriminatory taxation of foreign earnings, and other drastic devices which have little in common with a free enterprise economy. Simultaneously, other countries are cordially (and sometimes not so cordially) invited to assume an increased share of the U.S. burden of defense and foreign aid.

The theory is seductive in its simplicity. A country suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, no matter how rich (and the United States remains far and away the country with the richest endowment of capital) must curtail its export of capital. Corresponding to this is the view that a country enjoying a balance-of-payments surplus, however capital poor it may be (West Germany, for example), must on this very account strive to achieve a net export of capital. The truth is that the one argument is as untenable as the other, for in both cases disturbances of external equilibrium are wrongly identified with changes in internal capital wealth. What is needful is that a country adjust its balance of payments (by means of appropriate internal policies) to its capital resources, not its capital resources to its balance of payments.

THE WAGE SPIRAL

The root cause of the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States is the internal wage and fiscal inflation which has been allowed to develop in that country. The official assurances that these sources of inflation have been stopped up carry little conviction because both wage inflation and budget deficits financed by bank reserves rather than by genuine savings have increased uninterruptedly. It is not sufficient in the American case merely to hold wage increases within the limits which the Government has designated as politically feasible or socially desirable. What is necessary is that wage increases be held well below productivity increases; realistically, they should be suspended altogether. But in fact a number of the most powerful American unions have not even managed to hold their wage demands within the administration's guidelines.

It is the labor unions, in the final analysis, which must be accounted responsible for the fact that wages for the past 5 years have been pushed ever higher, in spite of persistently high levels of unemployment, placing the American monetary authorities in the perpetual dilemma either of accepting the unemployment caused by high wages or of overcoming it by inflation. The intemperance of the American unions, in turn, is bolstered both by the administration's policy of deliberately favoring labor and by its overall economic philosophy. The latter is based for the most part on monetary expansionism of an extreme type, distilled from a

schematic and mechanical Keynesianism. Almost routinely, the managers of the New Frontier look upon any and all economic problems as ultimately soluble by an increase in the level of effective demand.

It is no accident that the principal architect of the administration's economic policy, Prof. Walter Heller, is the same person who in 1953 urgently advised the Bonn Government to cure the then substantial unemployment in West Germany—unemployment which was clearly due to a shortage of capital and hence definitely not of the "Keynesian" variety—with a bold program of monetary expansion. His advice, had it been followed, would have pushed the young German market economy ineluctably to its doom over the cliffs of inflation. The Heller philosophy, which the West Germans fortunately rejected, is one characterized by a perpetual impatience to give free rein to the money-creating mechanisms of society. Obsessed by fear of deflation, it is blind to the danger of inflation which persists undiminished in the almost ritually recurring rounds of wage increases. Nor is the danger of inflation any less serious because it emerges in the American case in conjunction with unemployment and business pessimism. Indeed, it is precisely in this combination that it is most to be feared.

It is not easy to restore the world's confidence in a currency which has suffered, as the dollar has, from protracted illness. Even the support for the dollar provided by the international community, as indubitable a sign as it is of the price which other countries are prepared to pay to underwrite the key currency, cannot dispel the disturbing possibility which has been summed up in a famous phrase of Talleyrand's: "A ministry which needs support is a ministry which will fall." Of decisive importance, therefore, is the overcoming of the basic deficit itself.

EMBERS MAY FLAME UP

Doubtless the current inflationary tendencies in Europe will ease the task of the Americans in moving in an anti-inflationary direction. The probability is then that the balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced, providing other circumstances are favorable. But to the extent that this hoped for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever higher levels of effective demand, the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too precipitate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persists that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilization of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and repressed inflation. As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Government's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the New Deal and New Frontier finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked, but in an openly defiant glorification of big government and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the developed countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German Parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that "the continuous enlargement of the government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population." The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that Government expenditures insure a wiser use of the peoples' income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary Government expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular, is verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized state of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

Clearly, there are limits to the process of continuing growth of Government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well as in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment, the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it takes off like an airplane from the ground. The developmental process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of takeoff has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of high mass consumption. In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by democratization and liberalization. This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forbearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millenium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistible desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuousness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular, constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accoutrements of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most agregious and alarming defect of the Rostovian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE RICH GOT RICH

Progress in science and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary but by no means sufficient conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The rich countries of today are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the one-sided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social, and political system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of a pseudoreligion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is the mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely because it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with a network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but in increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

The 100th Anniversary of the Naming of Fort Sumner, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 31, it was my privilege and pleasure to participate in the dedication of an historic marker in the suburban community of Sumner, Md., marking the site of Fort Sumner, which was named after the Civil War general, Maj. Gen. Edwin Vose Sumner, 100 years ago.

The Fort Sumner Citizen's Committee, under the leadership of Comdr. J. Conway Hunt, chairman of the historical committee, arranged for the unveiling of the marker at Westpath Way and Sangamore Road, Montgomery County, Md.

Present for the ceremonies was the great-great-ganddaughter of General Sumner Mrs. Howell Estes, wife of the deputy commander, Andrews Air Force Base, Washington, D.C.

It was my pleasure to meet Mrs. Estes and pay tribute to her and her grandfather in my brief remarks. Ceremonies of this kind are important because they remind us that we should be interested and concerned about history, and especially about American history. Carl Sandburg gave us a wise admonition when he said in essence, "when a nation forget its hard beginnings, it is beginning to decay."

Markers such as the one at the site of Fort Sumner constitute another way in which we can keep alive the interest in history. They remind everyone who pass their way and who take the time to read the legend on the markers, of other chapters in the history of this great country of ours.

The Fort Sumner marker reminds us of the defense of our Capital City in a critical time. It symbolizes the great sacrifices which were made by the people of that time, the kind of sacrifices I hope none of us will have to make, but if we are called upon to make them, I trust that we will be prepared to respond just as heroically.

I commend all of the members of the Fort Sumner Citizen's Association who arranged for the marker and took part in the unveiling. I was particularly impressed by the remarks of Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg, Troop Information Officer, Military District of Washington, who was speaker at the event.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Captain Breitenberg's speech at the unveiling of the Fort Sumner marker, appear at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY CAPT. EUGENE H. BREITENBERG, MDW TROOP INFORMATION OFFICER, MARKING OF SITE OF FORT SUMNER, SANGAMORE ROAD AND WESTPATH WAY, SUMNER, MD., MARCH 31, 1963

Consistent with Public Law 85-305 and a Presidential proclamation dated December 6, 1960, inviting all Americans to take a direct and active part in the centennial of the American Civil War, called by Sir Winston Churchill "the noblest and least avoidable of all the great mass conflicts," I am honored to join with you today to pay homage to a great soldier and servant of our country during a time when stanch men often made the difference between victory or defeat.

Maj. Gen. Edwin Vost Sumner, native of Boston, Mass., was born in 1797. He was commissioned an officer in the U.S. Army in 1819. He served with gallantry in the Black Hawk War, the Mexican War, and the Civil War, called by many historians the War Between the States. He was also at one time acting Governor of New Mexico.

During the Civil War, he obtained his greatest military responsibility, that of commander of the 2d Corps of the Army of the Potomac. General Sumner's greatest military service is found in the Battles of Fair Oaks, Antietam, and Fredericksburg. He held the unique distinction of leading men in combat at 66 years of age.

Why was Fort Sumner named after this man? Was it because of political reasons? Was it because of a fast friendship between President Abraham Lincoln and General Sumner dating perhaps from the Black Hawk War? Or was it primarily because the name "Sumner" called to mind the traits of steadfastness, discipline, preparedness, versatility, and longstanding endurance?

Let us briefly examine the character of this man. He never shirked duty. He was a simple, straightforward sort of a warhorse. He was devoted to duty. He respected discipline and authority. He never flinched from what seemed impossible. During the Battle of Fair Oaks, he was ordered to bring his corps over from the north side of the flooded Chickahominy River to aid two Union corps, isolated and hard pressed, on the south side.

When he approached the seemingly unfordable river he was warned by an engineer officer that the makeshift bridges were unsafe and that it was impossible to cross. Sumner roared "Impossible? Sir, I tell you I can cross." And cross he did, arriving in time to help repulse the Confederate attack.

This was just one of his conquests over what appeared to be insurmountable odds. Again on September 17, 1862, he led his corps in one of the decisive battles in the Civil War at Antietam, Md. This battle ended the first Confederate invasion of the North. His corps made the third Union attack of the day in probably one of the most bitter and desperate battles of the entire conflict fought in an area since named "the bloody lane." Facing intense rifle and cannon fire, his Union troops continued to push valiantly forward until at last they reached a position from which they later forced the Confederate lines to withdraw.

The justification for the name Fort Sumner appears ample. What better name could be given to the fort which guarded the northwest approaches to the Capitol of the American Republic, a young nation in a struggle for its very existence? Certainly to name a fort after an officer who had served in the Regular Army for over 40 years, especially when his traits of leadership were not only appropos to his day, but to all the days that free men shall live, fully justified the reason to so name the fort that once stood here. The decision also justified our presence here today to rededicate and commemorate this historical ground.

For the last words spoken by this brave man as he lay on his death bed leave a challenge for each of us present today as they do for all Americans. As he lay dying, his thoughts turned to old battles, perhaps of Fair Oaks and its reeking swamps, or the ambush by Dunker's church in the Maryland hills, or the doomed advance toward the stone wall below Maryer's Height, and he cried out suddenly, "The II corps never lost a flag or a cannon." His attendant came over to him and Sumner repeated more feebly, "That is true, never lost one." Then as he was raised up in his bed, and as he was given a glass of wine—he took one sip, and then intoned a message that should be our guiding light as long as time shall be "God save my country, the United States of America." Dropping his glass he passed on, an old soldier gone to join the great God of Battle.

So to a fellow officer of the 1st cavalry, although many years span our respective tours of duty with that great division, it is indeed an honor to join with you today to pay tribute to him for leaving so rich a heritage, a heritage of service for which all Americans can be proud. So as we dedicate this marker, let us rededicate our lives to the service of helping to preserve the freedom of this Nation and of joining in the struggle for freedom in whatever way we can, so that not only will all Americans be free, but so that freedom may some day prevail wherever mankind shall live or die.

The Wrong Fitting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has already been said about the terrible tragedy of the *Thresher* some 220 miles off the coast of Boston. We must never forget these men who lost their lives for the United States and whoever will remain with the heroes of the past who have made the supreme sacrifice. We must never forget, either, that there is a definite possibility that the *Thresher* sunk because of faulty mechanical defects as well as improper testing procedures. Vice Adm. Hyman D. Rickover, in a speech last August, listed a series of defects he found in various submarines that he tested. From the Boston Globe, of Saturday, April 13, I would like to enclose a summary and a warning in view of the potential future difficulties that we could face.

"THE WRONG FITTING"

While the Nation mourns the 129 brave men lost with the U.S. nuclear submarine *Thresher* 220 miles off Boston, the mystery as to the cause of this disaster persists.

Whether it will ever be solved remains in doubt. As officials in the Navy have stated, the extreme depth of the sea in the area of her disappearance makes salvage impossible and confronts with extraordinary hazards and difficulties any attempt to survey the wrecked craft.

In these circumstances the Navy is right in underscoring the complete absence of reliable factual information, as yet, upon which dependable conclusions may be based regarding the disappearance of the *Thresher*. Until the Naval Board of Inquiry at New London completes its investigation judgment should be suspended.

But that exploration should be pressed with the utmost vigor, especially in view of the disquieting disclosures by Vice Adm. Hyman D. Rickover, "father of the nuclear submarine." The admiral wasn't discussing the *Thresher*. His comments concerned difficulties the Navy has been experiencing with private industry in the construction of our nuclear-powered submarines. His speech last August, before the National Metal Congress

at New York, was given scant notice at the time.

The admiral's list of complaints was long and specific: a chronicle of faulty welding constantly encountered; "faulty radiography and defective castings"; wrong fittings; deficiencies in the "basic conventional processes of present day technology"; defective materials; inadequate testing; all-too-frequent failure on the part of construction firms to follow specifications; unauthorized use of substitute materials.

All these defects were discovered by naval experts in inspection tests of the finished nuclear submarines. A further hazard appeared when checkups revealed that inspectors employed on the work by private construction firms were "often quite untrained. In fact they were at times no better qualified to read radiographs than a layman is to interpret his own chest X-ray."

One costly failure of performance was traced "to the use of a small pin" which, under naval tests, proved to be made of cheap material, though specifications were explicit. "On more than one occasion I have been in a deeply submerged submarine when a failure occurred in a sea water system because a fitting was of the wrong material. But for the prompt action of the crew the consequences would have been disastrous * * *"

"I wish I could tell you," said Rickover last August, "that the somber situation I have described no longer exists. I can't. It is difficult for me to understand why management does not face up to its failure and its responsibility in this respect * * *"

Eight months have elapsed since Rickover spoke. They have not lessened the import of his warnings. Coming from one to whom the Nation owes so much, whose scientific knowledge and dedication are unimpeachable, they echo today with new meaning.

So also does his plea for excellence in technology, pride in workmanship and integrity in the use of materials.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

How To Subvert the Red Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, much has been published on the ways and means to overcome the Red tide which, since the end of World War II, has engulfed the homelands of many peoples and races.

A recent contribution to this subject by Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, distinguished British military analyst and historian, as published in the April 20, 1963, issue of Human Events, follows:

HOW TO SUBVERT THE RED THREAT

(By Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller)

Because every war has an individuality of its own, Clausewitz was right to stress that the most decisive act of judgment which a statesman and general exercises is rightly to understand * * * the war in which he engages, not to take it for something, or to wish to make it something, which by the nature of its relations it is impossible for it to be.

What are the relations that shape war today? They are that we live in a revolutionary age of contending ideologies which challenge each other's validity. Should these challenges lead to war, the contrast is between absolutes, such as orthodoxy and heterodoxy, liberty and tyranny, and democracy and autocracy, in which the aim is to maintain an old or establish a new dispensation.

Wars of this nature have constituted the great turning points in history; for instance the Crusades, the wars of the Reformation and of the French Revolution. Because of their absolute aims, all have been unrestricted and, within the regions in which they were fought, total.

Today we are faced with a war of this nature, or rather are living in a period of incessant ideological hostilities, which embrace the entire world.

It was initiated by Lenin in his October revolution of 1917.

To understand this cataclysm, it is necessary briefly to examine the components of Lenin's obsession. They are a mixture of Marxism and Muscovite imperialism, and although the first needs no comment, the second has received too little attention from Western peoples.

MUSKOVY ENVISIONED AS THIRD ROME

In 1469, 16 years after the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks, Ivan, Grand Duke of Muskovy, married the niece of the last of the Byzantine emperors, and to this union is attributed the myth that Muskovy was destined to be the third Rome and the last of the universal empires.

Be this as it may, from then on the expansion of Muskovy was phenomenal, and during the 19th century a number of Russian writers gave voice to the myth in the form of a contest between the civilizations of Russia and Europe for the dominion of the world.

"I believe and still believe," wrote Leontyev, "that Russia * * * is to give the world a new culture * * * and to replace the decadent civilization of Romanic-Germanic Europe by this new Slavic-Eastern civilization."

Bulgakov held: "Above the gigantic ruins of the West, Russia * * * will rise up like a holy ark * * * who will venture to doubt her predestination?"

Herzen dreamed of the longed-for decline of the West, and of "new barbarians who will come to destroy her."

And Bakunin was convinced that the Russian people "will introduce new fundamental ideas into history, and will create a new civilization as well as a new faith, new laws, and new life."

There were others obsessed by similar ideas.

This vision of a universal Russian empire dovetailed with Marx's vision of a universal Communist society, and, consciously or instinctively, Lenin grafted Russian imperialim onto Marx's predestined universalism, and thereby transformed the myth of the third Rome into the reality of the third international. It is a strange coincidence that a few years later Hitler founded the third reich, which he said was to endure for a thousand years.

Lenin believed that war between the Soviet Union and the bourgeois states was predestined by the law of his history, and because he looked upon war as an animal struggle in which no punches were barred, he repudiated Western morality and called it a capitalist deception and fraud. To him "morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all toilers around the proletariat, which is creating a new Communist society."

NOT UNTIL SHRIMPS LEARN TO WHISTLE

His experiment in Marxism was an unqualified failure. Instead of the state even beginning to wither away, it rapidly reverted to what it had been throughout Russian history—an autocracy. Marx became a sacred cow, and his philosophy a liturgical language in which Russian imperialism has since been wrapped.

Then, in 1955, at the height of the so-called peace offensive, Khrushchev proclaimed: "If anyone thinks that we shall forget about Marx, Engels and Lenin, he is mistaken. This will happen when shrimps learn to whistle."

The war the Western nations are faced with, and have been since 1945, is therefore very different from the great international conflicts previous to the Russian Revolution, which were fought within a common moral framework, and, with few exceptions, in accordance with conventions mutually agreed upon between civilized nations.

For example, the wholesale massacre of prisoners and civilians held to be hostile, which took place at Katyn, Vinnitsa and other places in World War II, would have been unthinkable before 1917.

Nevertheless, to Stalin and his henchmen they were nothing of the sort, because they held that they furthered the winning of the war and in consequence advanced the advent of the new Communist society, the instrument of Russian imperialism.

Further, although treaty obligations and solemn agreements have been broken from time to time in the past, today it is sheer waste of time even to contemplate entering into them with Russia, since her leaders hold that, because the end justifies the means, the Communist goal can more readily be gained by perfidy than bn integrity.

Arguing with a Russian is as profitable as arguing with a tiger; and after 17 years of unprofitable argument, this should be fully apparent. Time is, therefore, long overdue to cease deluding ourselves and instead to turn to reality. A little history will point the way.

In March 1918, at the time of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, Lenin defined his aim:

It was to unite the proletariat of Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia with the proletariat of Russia so as to "create a mighty agrarian and industrial combination from Vladivostok to the Rhine * * * capable of feeding itself and of confronting reactionary capitalism with a revolutionary giant, which with one hand would disturb the senile tranquility of the East and with the other beat back the private capitalism of Anglo-Saxon countries."

In brief, his aim was a union of revolutionary Russia with a revolutionary central Europe. Could that be achieved, the rest of Europe would be at his mercy.

Because, in World War II, Stalin violated the treaties he and his Western allies had agreed upon at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, through perfidy he was able to gain more than half of Lenin's aim. Not only did he occupy the eastern half of Germany, but the whole of eastern Europe, except Greece, and he later added Czechoslovakia.

FEARED WAR MORE THAN THEY LOVED LIBERTY

These vast territorial gains were forthwith communized; in other words, they became colonies of the Russian Imperium. In response, because they feared war more than they loved liberty, all the Western Powers did was to protest.

Between then and his death in 1953, why did Stalin not march into Western Germany and complete Lenin's aim? The dominant reason is not in doubt; it was the explosion of the first atomic bomb, dropped in part at least to assist him to overrun Manchuria, although, ironically, it bunkered him in Europe. Without it, any time after 1946 his hordes would have been free to advance on the Rhine or the Atlantic; because of it they were impotent.

When Khrushchev attained power, his problem was how to expand world revolution in the face of nuclear weapons. Fully aware that they could not be abolished, because their know-how cannot be deleted, he set out to convert them into psychological instruments of terror and to cultivate in western peoples a nuclear neurosis.

With the intention of keeping their minds concentrated on the horrors of war, he proposed total disarmament or, failing that, the banning of nuclear weapons. At each successive conference he discredited them as warmongers, and when to his own satisfaction he had succeeded in doing so, he wrecked the conference, confident that the terrified western peoples, determined to avert war at any price, would urge their governments to demand the convening of another conference.

Further to this, his Berlin policy clearly shows that in no way does he intend to abandon Lenin's aim of extending communism over the whole of Germany. In November 1958, he put forward the proposal that Berlin should become a demilitarized free city with guaranteed communications, and, failing its acceptance within 6 months, he threatened to negotiate a separate treaty of peace with the German Democratic Republic and to hand over to it the West Berlin approaches.

TO COMMUNISTS, HONESTY IS BOURGEOIS FRAUD

To neutral and peace-bemused nations this may appear to be an honest attempt to remove a bone of contention. But, as in the vocabulary of Soviet communism, honesty is a bourgeois fraud. Had his proposal been accepted by the Western Powers there can be little doubt that within a brief span of time Berlin would have gone the way of Danzig in 1939.

When they refused to dishonor their word, he alternately turned on and turned off the heat. At length, in the summer of 1961, the East Berliners took alarm and in thousands sought refuge in West Berlin. This "flight from Egypt" was halted by the building of the Berlin wall, a violation of the Quadripartite Agreement.

Exactly a year later, the Russians abolished their office of commandant in East Berlin, and the East German government appointed a city commandant of its own to fill the vacancy.

As he has no legal standing in Berlin, and as the East German government is bound by no treaty obligations whatsoever, legal control of Berlin is left in the hands of the three remaining members of the Quadripartite Agreement, the United States, Great Britain, and France.

What should they do? Because they are responsible for the maintenance of law and order throughout Berlin as a whole, they can legally occupy and take over control of East Berlin. Needless to say this is the last thing they are likely to do, because ever since the Berlin blockade of 1948 their policy has been grounded on fear that any positive action on their part might precipitate a total war.

Since then they have swallowed insult after insult, and aggression after aggression, with the result that their prestige and status have progressively been whittled away. If this policy of surrender by installments is to be halted, they will have to take the bull by the horns and substitute for it an active one.

However long it make take to attain, its ultimate aim should be the elimination of the present causes of war. Second to that, its immediated aims should be: (1) To prevent the outbreak of actual war, and (2) to win what is commonly called the cold war, the real war.

As regards the first, it should be borne in mind that, because the destruction wrought in a nuclear war is mutual, the terror its possible outbreak engenders also is mutual. No head of government fears a nuclear war more than Khrushchev, and this is the reason why, when a crisis has occurred which threatened to promote war, he has brandished his fire extinguishers, his rockets and missiles, to allay the possibility of its outbreak. In other words, he has relied on nuclear diplomacy to shield his offensive ideology.

CONDITIONS FAVOR AN OFFENSIVE STRATEGY

Although nothing is certain in an uncertain world, to be terrified by a phantom, when the odds against its materializing are a thousand to one, approaches the summit of cowardice. "Fear is failure and the forerunner of failure; therefore be without fear, for in the heart of the coward virtue abideth not."

As deterrents, nuclear weapons not only cancel each other out but also restrict the outbreak of major conventional wars, because they may develop into nuclear ones. They are negative and result in the passive defensive which, because it surrenders the initiative to the attacker, cannot indefinitely maintain the status quo, let alone improve upon it.

Only when related to a positive policy, one which admits of retaliation, can their power of deterrence be fully exploited. Hitherto it has been the lack of a positive element in Western policy that has been the cause of so many retreats.

In all ideological wars, and particularly in the existent one in which actual war has become mutually too dangerous to be profitable, the positive element is to be found in the conflict of ideas in which the art of winning without fighting battles is the chief characteristic.

Therefore, instead of thinking primarily in terms of military strengths, the Western Powers should think in those of subversive actions—an offensive a outrance in the ideological field. On them the Soviet cold war offensive is based, and on them should be based the Western counteroffensive. An aggressive strategy in the psychological field is therefore demanded.

Do conditions favor an aggressive strategy? They most certainly do. It should be realized that of the 220 million inhabitants of the U.S.S.R. nearly two-thirds are subjugated non-Russian peoples, vast numbers of whom are bitterly opposed to Soviet domination.

Of them, no less than 51 million are to be found on Russia's western flank in the Ukraine, Byelorussia (White Russia) and the former Baltic States which lie across Russia's western lines of communication.

In addition to them, of the 9 million inhabitants of the occupied countries, it has been estimated that some 90 percent are anti-Russian, and in East Germany violently so. Like a psychological bog, they lie between Russia and Western Europe.

Therefore Russia's strategical situation vis-a-vis Western Europe is far weaker than it appears to be. Although, in the event of war, she can put into the field many more divisions than her opponents, in face of the above two strategic obstacles, the more she does put, the greater become her difficulties in maintaining and supplying them.

A BOMB WAITING TO BE DETONATED

Today, in this age of anti-imperialism, the U.S.S.R. is an anachronism, the greatest colonial empire in the world, and incomparably the most brutal. It is a prison house packed with disillusioned peoples; a gigantic psychological bomb which, if detonated, would blow the Soviet imperium into fragments.

To Khrushchev this bomb is as great a deterrent as is a full-scale nuclear war; and once the Western Powers awake to this reality, their path is clear.

The internal strategic weakness of Russia has been revealed again and again in the past. In the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05 it was the threat of revolution within czarist Russia which won the war for Japan. In World War I it was the March revolution, and in the civil war which followed it no less than 15 of the subjugated minorities, including the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, and Turkestan, declared their national independence.

In World War II, when Hitler invaded Russia, the German armies were welcomed by the common people as liberators. According to Goebbels, the Ukrainians looked upon Hitler as the "savior of Europe," and the Byelorussians were eager to fight on the German side. "Wherever we went," writes a German soldier, "we were met by laughing and waving people. * * * The Soviet Empire was creaking at the joints."

Then came Himmler with his infamous security service, and Hitler was defeated by his own barbarites. At Kiev he lost his war against Russia by hoisting the swastika instead of the Ukrainian flag.

In the occupied countries the uprising of East German workers in 1953, the riots in Poland in 1956, the revolt in Hungary, also in 1956, in which it should not be forgotten that the only non-Hungarian people who fought on the side of the rebels were deserters from the Soviet army, and, since 1949, the flight from the German Democratic Republic of nearly 3 million of its disillusioned people, show beyond a shadow of doubt that the Soviet regime in these countries is poised on a knife edge.

Also, it should not be overlooked that more than half of Russia's fighting forces are recruited from the subjugated peoples and are unreliable in a crisis, as was revealed in World War II. Between June 1941—when Hitler invaded Russia, and Christmas of that year, the vast majority of the 2,500,000 Russian soldiers taken prisoner were deserters willing to fight against the Soviet Union.

In confirmation of this, General Anders, who commanded the Polish Free Army, states: "Many soldiers, seeing the war as an opportunity for a change of order in Russia, wished for German victory and therefore surrendered in great masses * * * many high Soviet officers went over to the enemy offering to fight against the Soviets."

In the armed forces of the satellite countries, disloyalty must be even more pronounced, and as for the East German Army, should it oppose the NATO forces it is highly probable that an advance guard of loudspeakers offering hospitality would persuade it to desert en masse.

Offensive readiness has many facets because today a major war is total global, a thing it has never been in the past. Again, time is immediate—there can be no mobilization on the old lines. You are either ready or unready, and, if the latter, there is no time wherein you can catch up. Space is universal, days are reduced to hours, and hours to minutes.

APPEASEMENT CAN LEAD ONLY TO DEFEAT

Further, means are vastly extended: peace is a state of war, and the economic and psychological offensive and defensive are as important as, if not more important than, the military. To think in the old terms of defense is willfully to play the part of the ostrich. Lastly, the meaning of words is tremendously important. Unless connoted with the spirit of the age and the environment in which they are used, they are corks which only serve to bottle up clear thinking.

If the causes of the present wardom are ever to be rooted out, the policy the Western Powers should pursue is now clear:

First, they must cease their lipservice to liberty and by their actions show that they are determined to fight and to die for it.

Second, they must cease to fear Russia's military might, which is held in leash by the dread of nuclear warfare and fear of internal revolution.

Third, they must realize that in this ideological and nuclear age subversive warfare is progressively replacing traditional warfare as the positive instrument of policy.

Fourth, they must see that this mode of conflict is waged on the enemy's inner front, which Marshal Pilsudski once defined as "the most dangerous of all fronts."

Fifth, they must appreciate that the Russian inner front is rotten to the core.

And last, they must understand that, in a war of wills and ideas, a strategy which is based on appeasement and containment, which can merely react to the enemy's offensives instead of counterattacking, ultimately can lead only to defeat and degradation.

San Diego—All American City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with great pride I join the National Municipal League and Look magazine in their award to San Diego, Calif., as an official All American City for 1963 and request that the attached article be included as a portion of my remarks in the RECORD.

THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE AND LOOK SALUTE SAN DIEGO AS AN OFFICIAL ALL AMERICAN CITY

The All America Cities Jury, which selected the winners for 1962: Dr. George H. Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion, former president, National Municipal League; Mrs. Hazel Blanchard, president, National Education Association; Albert C. Boyd, president, American Chamber of Commerce Executives; William T. Gossett, former vice president, the Ford Motor Co.; Mrs. Herbert E. Hawkes, president, American Association of University Women; Leo Kramer, assistant to the president, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO; Roy B. Martin, Jr., mayor of Norfolk, Va.; Williard V. Merrihue, board chairman, Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look; James M. Osborn, research associate, Yale University; Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, president, League of Women Voters of the U.S.; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington.

A baby is born, and an American city has a new citizen—and a new problem. As this child matures, he will require schools, hospitals, police protection and a host of other community services. His city government is nominally responsible for providing these services, but the final responsibility for maintaining a good city rests with his parents and other private citizens like them. As novelist and poet Jan Struther put it, "* * * A city's as great as the little people that live there." Effective citizen action, not merely good government, is the basic criterion for the All American City citations, which are awarded annually by Look and the National Municipal League. The size and wealth of a city do not matter. For instance, this year's smallest winner, Grafton, W. Va. (5,700), won because of its citizens' efforts to remedy a staggering unemployment problem.

In the years since the All-America Cities contest began, over a hundred communities have received awards for such diverse achievements as getting rid of a corrupt city administration or building a school. Some problems are common to many cities: providing services for a rapidly expanding population, renewal and rehabilitation of blighted areas, changing the machinery of government as adjacent municipalities grow together to become one city, and, always a danger, citizen apathy. Cities learn from each other in solving these, and other, problems. Falls Church, Va., a 1961 winner, learned about citizen political activity from Rockville, Md., a winner in 1954 and 1961. This year's 22 finalists were selected from almost 70 applicants by a committee of experts. Last November, the finalists presented their cases to the All-America Cities jury during the National Conference on Government at Washington, D.C. This year's jury hearings will take place on November 17–20 in Detroit.

SAN DIEGO

San Diego, third largest metropolis on the Pacific coast, is getting a new heart: Centre City. Centre City is the local answer to downtown deterioration, a common ailment of American cities. Working closely with local officials, San Diegans, Inc., a nonprofit corporation formed by 50 community leaders, financed four economic studies of the downtown area. The city government, guided by these surveys, produced a plan of rehabilitation that called for downtown construction of government buildings. Centre City's community concourse will include a 5,000-seat convention hall, a 3,000-seat civic theater, an exhibition hall and parking space for 1,000 cars.

When the city found it would need additional funds for the community concourse project, volunteers raised $1,600,000 in just 6 weeks. Businessmen joined in and began construction of commercial buildings with 1,500,000 square feet of space. The Centre City plan will provide, by 1965, an efficient, modern downtown area at a cost of nearly $75 million in public and private funds. With Centre City, San Diego lives up to the new slogan: "City in Motion."

The 27th Annual National Trout Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 the village of Kalkaska, in Kalkaska County, Mich., opens its 27th Annual National Trout Festival. This is one of the most unique celebrations in the country and Kalkaska County is probably the most suitable location in the United States for such an event.

With its 275 miles of trout streams, 85 lakes, 25 of which are abundant with fighting brown, brook, rainbow and lake trout, Kalkaska County is a virtual fisherman's paradise, attracting literally thousands to this event annually and throughout the year.

The scenic splendor of Kalkaska County complemented by an abundance of deer, partridge, bear and other wildlife gives me a feeling of homesickness, particularily at this time of year.

For this reason I would like to extend a cordial invitation to all my colleagues in the House to come to Kalkaska, Mich. this coming weekend and enjoy the wonderful hospitality that Kalkaska's citizens so freely offer.

If it is not possible to join in Kalkaska's National Trout Festival, I would like to extend an invitation to visit Kalkaska County at any time of year. Its recreational facilities know no season. I assure you will not be disappointed.

President Kennedy Urges Federal Agencies To Work as Hard as They Can To Reduce Jet Noise at Major Airfields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to fly to Chicago, together with other members of the Chicago delegation, with President Kennedy to participate in the dedication of O'Hare International Airport which lies on the very edge of my congressional district.

I was very much inspired to hear the President make an eloquent plea to the Federal agencies and the airlines to work as hard as they can to make sure that noise from jet aircraft which use O'Hare and other major airfields in the country is reduced to a minimum.

Millions of Americans can find comfort in knowing that the President of the United States, with all of his complex national and international problems, is cognizant of the way in which the jet age has disturbed and changed the lives of these people who live in the proximity of major airfields which have jet operations. The greatness of President Kennedy is reflected in this ability to understand the problems of each individual American.

President Kennedy stated in Chicago:

> I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half-million people whose homes are in the immediate area.

It is my hope that those Federal employees at all levels who are charged with the responsibility for operating traffic to and from airfields will heed the President's eloquent plea. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if the President of the United States can find understanding of this very serious problem affecting the daily lives of millions of people throughout this country, it is not asking too much that his subordinates at all levels of government show the same concern.

It was my privilege to discuss this matter with President Kennedy during our flight to Chicago and I know that the people who I represent and who have suffered indescribable hardship from the noise at O'Hare appreciate the fact that President Kennedy would personally help seek a solution to this problem.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I should like to add here that Mr. Najeeb Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and Mr. Alan Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, accompanied the President on this trip and witnessed his eloquent statement in Chicago. I am sure that all the people living in proximity of major jet airfields would be pleased to learn that both Mr. Halaby and Mr. Boyd shared the President's concern over this new phenomena

of jet noise which has followed the advent of the jet age in aircraft.

Both these men have assured me of their full cooperation to carry out the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, the text of President Kennedy's remarks at the O'Hare Field dedication follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mayor Daley, Governor Kerner, Senator Douglas, Government and State officials, ladies and gentlemen: 21 years ago this year, a young Navy officer stood at the White House and was decorated by President Roosevelt with the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism extending far beyond the line of duty. I remember as a young naval officer myself how the extraordinary feat of "Butch" O'Hare captured the imagination not only of our Armed Forces but also of the country. His extraordinary act in protecting his ship, shooting down, while he was alone, shooting down five of the enemy, during the difficult days in the Second War, gave this country hope and confidence not only in the quality and caliber of our fighting men, but also in the certainty of victory.

Therefore, 21 years later, I am proud to come to Chicago, to this airport, to take part in this act which commemorates his public service, his great naval service, and also reminds me of how much we owe to those who made this country of ours.

I think one of the extraordinary facts of the Second War was this number of men who were highly decorated, particularly with the Congressional Medal of Honor, who later lost their lives in combat in later days. "Butch" O'Hare was one of them, being killed 18 months after the act of honor by the President of the United States, when his life could have been much easier. John Basilone, who got the Congressional Medal of Honor, in the Marine Corps, in Guadalcanal, and who was later killed on the beach at Iwo Jima, was another. But time after time, men who could have stayed at home and felt their duty done, went out again and some of them were killed. So today we not only dedicate the International Airport, but we also recall all those who made it possible. This is an extraordinary airport in an extraordinary city, in an extaordinary country, and it is a tribute to the constructive action of the Federal Government, the State government, and the city government, under the distinguished leadership of your great mayor, Mayor Daley.

To keep these various interests working together and make this the most extraordinary airport in the world for this great city is an amazing feat. This airport lives up to its name. There is no other airport in the world where planes can make instrument landings on parallel runways, simultaneously. There is no other airport in the Nation which maintains three instrument landing systems. And there is no other airport in the world, and this should be a source of satisfaction to the people of Chicago, there is no other airport in the world which serves so many people and so many planes. Some 13.5 million airline travelers passed through O'Hare Airport last year. In 5 years it has gone from the 16th most active field in the country to the 1st, like so many other things about Chicago. During this airport's daily peak periods, an airliner lands and takes off every 43 seconds. Every day, 1 out of every 5 air travelers in this country passes through this airport, enough people in 1 day to equal the population of Bloomington, Ill. Every day, some 1,300 to 1,400 landings and takeoffs occur. So I think this airport is an extraordinary national asset, named after an extraordinary American.

All of this traffic in and out of Chicago proves, as it has since the beginning of this country, that Chicago occupies a most important and vital strategic area in the United States, where all the lines of communication cross. That is why the future of this city is so bright. Indian canoes traveled this route from Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River before this was the United States.

And it will be doing the same thing in the year 2000. Railroads, highways—all the rest will come and meet in Chicago and make this a vital, booming city. These are all the things that can be done, but I think a good deal more must be done. One of the problems is with the people who live around the airports. I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half million people whose homes are in the immediate area. In addition, air cargo is only beginning in importance. In addition, I think we must make a special effort at O'Hare and all our other airports to welcome the people who come from abroad. This may be the first view they have of America. We want them to know what a warm and vital and vigorous country this is. And I hope we will make every effort to make them at home, and to urge their countrymen to come and visit us.

Finally, we look forward to the day in aviation when we are going to travel three times the speed of sound, and go to any place in the world in a few hours. And when that happens, we want the United States to be in the lead, as it has been in the lead in jet transportation since the jet was invented. All in all, I am proud to be here in Chicago taking part in a great ceremony, honoring a great American to whom we owe much, looking to the past and saluting him, and looking to the future and saluting the City of Chicago. Thank you.

Deficit Financing, Foreign Aid and What it Gets Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., points up some powerful arguments as to why the Kennedy policy of deficit financing to continue support of Communist and Socialist regimes is doomed to failure.

MARK TWAIN WAS CORRECT

The amount of foreign aid to be voted by Congress this year continues to be a focal point of interest not only in Washington but elsewhere in the country.

Of historic significance is that what might be termed our country's "era of deficit financing" coincides completely with the record of foreign aid handouts and other expenditures made in the name of the common defense of the West. It is an obvious exercise in arithmetic to point out that in years past, and in this very year, the elimination of this recurring expenditure for foreign aid would substantially affect, for the better, the fiscal picture of our own governmental operation. For example, the amount of foreign aid likely to be settled upon for this coming year will be in the range of $4 billion. This is roughly the sum by which it is proposed to reduce Federal income tax collections. Applied to the anticipated deficit, the red ink figure, not counting the tax cut, would be $4 billion less.

In the meantime, while the American taxpayer wrestles with payments for foreign aid, the Kennedy administration has been steadily losing to Communist aggression in southeast Asia and in our own hemisphere. Billions of American dollars, not only under this administration but in preceding ones, have been used to beef up Communist or Socialist regimes which saw to it that the fruits of our generosity never trickled down to the masses of people whom we intended to aid. Side effects of our profligate generosity have led to the loss of our gold reserves and have enabled foreigners to acquire $24 billion in short term dollar credits redeemable in gold.

At long last and after the expenditure of more than $100 billion in foreign aid since World War II, we have been driven to the bitter conclusion that not only has our money been to a great extent wasted, but has gained us little friendship among the beneficiaries of our largess.

Mark Twain said it in a sentence:

"If you pick up a starving dog and make him prosperous, he will not bite you. This is the principal difference between a dog and a man."

A Difference in Attitudes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, appeared in this morning's Washington Post, and is timely and very accurate.

Having just returned from a conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union where I have had the opportunity of talking to many delegates from the east and west, I can assure the House that the Cuban situation is generally looked upon as a slight victory for the U.S.S.R., and the admission, on our part, that we will accept coexistence even in this hemisphere and even 90 miles from our shores.

The article follows:

CUBA AND CRITICS: A DIFFERENCE IN ATTITUDES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Since neither the President's supporters nor his critics favor U.S. military invasion, what is there in the administration's attitude toward the situation in Cuba which causes so much controversy, confusion and unease?

The reflex response of the White House to almost any criticism over Cuba is: What do you want us to do, invade?

Since those who are dissatisfied with the administration's Cuban policy do not advocate invasion, what do they feel is lacking in the President's stance?

It seems to me that there is a deep difference in attitude between Mr. Kennedy and his critics over Cuba. It is this:

The Soviet Union is practicing a hands-on policy toward Cuba.

The United States is practicing a hands-off policy toward helping Cubans recover their freedom.

Khrushchev openly supports "wars of liberation" wherever he wishes, whenever he wishes, with whatever means happen to be at hand.

President Kennedy not only shows no sign of helping the anti-Castro Cubans fight their war of liberation, but is now acting to pre-

vent the Cuban exiles from doing what they can about it on their own.

In effect, the United States is conceding wide freedom of action to the Kremlin to support Castro's war of tyranny, and is denying to itself any freedom of action (and denying to the exiles all freedom of action) to help the anti-Castro Cubans in any effort at liberation.

I am not assuming that the Cuban exiles are always right. In connection with the Miro Cardona statement, I find no evidence that Mr. Kennedy pledged to support another invasion. But I do think that this comment by one of the Cuban exiles, who fought both Batista and Castro, gets to the heart of the matter:

"Of all the lessons Fidel Castro has taught us, the bitterest and most obvious is this: He who proclaims himself a Communist can count on help from the Soviet Union even though he is 9,000 miles from its borders, while he who proclaims himself a democrat can fight and die 90 miles from the shores of the United States and no one will come to his aid."

This is the gap between the President and his critics over Cuba: The Soviet Union successfully asserts its freedom to support Castro's war of tyranny while the United States not only finds no present way to aid the anti-Castro war of liberation but actually prevents the Cuban exiles from harassing Soviet and Castro forces.

Two years ago this month, in a stirring address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, which brought his audience to its feet cheering, President Kennedy said:

"Cuba is not an island unto itself; and our concern is not ended by mere expressions of nonintervention or regret. * * * The American people are not complacent about Iron Curtain tanks and planes less than 90 miles from our shores."

This was just a week after Soviet tanks and guns in the hands of Castro's army had mowed down the Cuban freedom fighters at the Bay of Pigs.

Today, 2 years later, there are far more Soviet tanks and guns in the hands of Castro than there were when the President first said we must not be complacent about them.

Today there are not only Soviet tanks and guns in Cuba, there are Soviet troops in Cuba, the spearhead of Soviet empire on the march in the Western Hemisphere.

Secretary Rusk repeats again and again that the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba is "unacceptable." But what are we doing to make them unacceptable? And how long are we going to accept them? Mr. Rusk says we aim "to keep the outtraffic of Soviet forces moving."

What about the intraffic? The President says about 4,000 Soviet troops moved out last month and Senator KENNETH KEATING, whose disclosures have been right in the past, says that about 4,000 Soviet troops moved in.

What are the dissenters really criticizing about the administration's Cuba policy? It is this: The Kremlin is prepared to take all the risks of supporting a Communist regime 9,000 miles from its shores with troops, arms, oil and almost unlimited economic aid, and we remain immobilized.

Story of a Diocese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the 25th anniversary of the Roman Catholic diocese of Paterson is being celebrated this afternoon with a solemn pontifical mass at St. Philip the Apostle Church, Clifton, N.J., offered by Most Rev. Thomas A. Boland, archbishop of Newark, with Most. Rev. James A. McNulty, bishop of Paterson, presiding.

This memorable event gave rise to a most inspiring article written by Miss Anna Mae Buckley and published April 18, 1963, in The Advocate, the official publication of the archdiocese of Newark and of the diocese of Paterson.

It is a pleasure to offer this article:

STORY OF A DIOCESE

(By Anne Mae Buckley)

The diocese of Paterson is 25 years old.

It was on April 28, 1938, that the first bishop of the 1,214-square-mile see, Bishop Thomas H. McLaughlin, was installed. The anniversary celebration, April 22, will be one of the last official acts of Paterson's third bishop, James A. McNulty, bishop designate of Buffalo. The See of Paterson will begin its second quarter-century with a new shepherd, Bishop James J. Navagh of Ogdensburg, N.Y., who will be installed May 9. The installing prelate will be Archbishop Thomas A. Boland of Newark, who had been Paterson's second bishop.

The history of the Paterson diocese and the history of the Catholic Church in its three counties, Passaic, Morris and Sussex, often appears as an interesting blend of the pat and the paradoxical.

For example: It is the youngest diocese in New Jersey, but it claims North Jersey's oldest Catholic church, St. Joseph's, Macopin—and hospital, St. Joseph's, Paterson—and women's college, St. Elizabeth's—and its cathedral was dedicated as a church in 1870.

The first parish erected after formation of the diocese, St. Peter the Apostle, Troy Hills, is the neighbor of one of the newest, St. Christopher's, Parsippany-Troy Hills.

Despite the fact that throughout its quarter-century Paterson, like almost every other diocese, has needed and sought more priests, it launched a program of help to priest-poor Latin America last year when Bishop McNulty sent three priests to staff a parish in Caranavi, Bolivia, and undertook financial support of another parish in Bolivia's capital, LaPaz.

And Paterson, which began a mission for Negroes under Bishop McLaughlin and an apostolate to the Spanish-speaking under Bishop McNulty, will have in its fourth shepherd, Bishop-designate Navagh, a leader with a vital interest in both groups, born of work with Puerto Rican people in Buffalo and Negro people in Raleigh.

The erection of the Paterson diocese was directed in the papal letter Recta Cujusvis, December 9, 1937, to aid in "promoting the greatest spiritual good of the faithful of Christ and rendering easier their pastoral government." The words were prophetic of the progress of the next 25 years, during which the number of Catholic schools more than doubled, the number of students increased more than three times, and the number of priests grew to more than twice the original number.

In 1938 the Catholic population of the Paterson diocese was 128,961; now it is 243,673. In 1938 there were 54 parishes and 23 missions; now there are 87 parishes and 19 missions.

In 1938 there were 92 diocesan priests; now there are 189. In 1938 there were 10 religious orders with 86 priests; today it is 13 orders with 195 priests. There were 34 young men of the area in seminaries in 1938; now there are 126.

There were 46 schools enrolling 10,743 children in 1938; now there are 97 schools with a total enrollment of 35,088. There were 21 congregations of Sisters with 916 members here in 1938; today there are 1,327 Sisters belonging to 26 congregations.

Climax of the progress of Paterson came in 1957 when Bishop McNulty launched the diocesan development fund, primarily for the erection of three new high schools and the expansion of a fourth—Pope Pius, Passaic. Pope Pius was Paterson's first diocean high school; it was opened in 1939 by Bishop McLaughlin. Bishop Boland founded 3 high schools, along with 4 new parishes, and 7 new grade schools, in addition to authorizing the construction of 5 new churches, 13 school buildings, and 2 major school additions. Bishop McNulty founded 14 new parishes or missions since initiating DDF 5 years ago.

During this period of Paterson's own rapid expansion, its people raised their contribution for the universal church to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith from $25,038 to $196,670.

Paterson's impressive network of diocesan agencies and organizations took birth in the very first weeks of Bishop McLaughlin's episcopate and flowered significantly under Bishops Boland and McNulty.

Even before the chancery office opened in early June 1938, in a stucco building to the rear of St. John's Cathedral, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, Associated Catholic Charities, and the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine had been launched. At the end of June the Holy Name Federation for the men of the diocese was underway, followed quickly by the St. Vincent de Paul Society, CYO, and Franciscan Third Order, which was being promoted as a diocesan project for the first time in the United States.

In 1939 came scouting and the diocesan unit of the National Organization for Decent Literature; in 1941 the diocesan Catholic Nurses Guild, in 1944 the Diocesan Council of Catholic Men, which was only the seventh in the United States, and the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, and in 1954 the Guild of Catholic Lawyers.

In 1949 under Bishop Boland the groundwork was laid for what is now the Family Life Apostolate and for the Legion of Mary activity which flowered into the Paterson Curia in 1953 and then spread throughout New Jersey.

One of Bishop McNulty's first actions in 1953 was inauguration of the Apostolate for Vocations which was aggregated with the richly indulgenced Pontifical Work for Priestly Vocations in 1960. Also in 1953 he established The Advocate, which had been Newark's paper since 1951, as Paterson's official weekly, with the complete parish coverage plan.

In 1954 he opened the Paterson branch of Seton Hall University. In 1955 he dedicated the Mount Carmel Guild Social Service Center and Hospital for Alcoholics in Paterson and adopted Cooperative Supply Services as the purchasing agency for Catholic institutions in the diocese. In 1957 he invited the Association for International Development to open its headquarters here. In 1960 he brought the liturgical movement of the diocese to its climax with inauguration of lay participation in the mass.

Thirty-four lay people have received papal honors in recognition of their services to the Paterson Diocese—three have been named Knight Commanders of St. Gregory, 17 Knights of St. Gregory, and 14 women have received the Cross "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice."

The new See to which Bishop McLaughlin ascended 25 years ago embraced some of the oldest centers of Catholic life in New Jersey. October 23, 1768, is the oldest baptismal record at Macopin, where three iron-mining families settled in the mid-18th century and were ministered to by the traveling Jesuit, Rev. Ferdinand Farmer, S.J. In 1829 the first small church was built at Macopin, for

a congregation of 100, including a substantial proportion of Irish immigrants.

In 1860 the motherhouse of the year old Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth was established in what was then Madison, now Convent Station. In 1875 the Franciscan monastery was opened in Paterson which was to become the first headquarters of the order's eastern province, whose priests founded 16 north Jersey parishes.

And among the works accomplished by Dean William McNulty had been the foundation of a general hospital, St. Joseph's, Paterson, in 1867; along with a cemetery, an orphanage, and a high school; and the building in 1870 of a church which became the cathedral of the new diocese in 1938.

Still, despite its rich Catholic history, the new Diocese of Paterson had to be pioneered, and many of Bishop McLaughlin's actions, and even appointments, survive to this day. The Chancery Office remains in the converted parish hall of St. John's where he established it, the Bishop's residence is still the Italian-style house given by Mrs. Veneranda Scola in 1938, and these priests appointed by him remain in the same key posts: Msgr. William F. Louis, chancellor; Rev. Andrew V. Sefan, vice chancellor; Msgr. John J. Shanley, director of Associated Catholic Charities, and moderator of the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women and the Catholic Nurses Guild; and Msgr. Joseph M. O'Sullivan, moderator of the Diocesan Council of Catholic Men and the Holy Name Federation.

Also still working is Bishop McLaughlin's program of filling the need for more clergy by bringing priests here from Ireland; to date 14 Irish priests have come to serve Paterson. In the early years five priests were loaned by the diocese of Pittsburgh and Rochester, also.

Paterson has had three vicars general: Msgr. James T. Delehanty was the first, succeeded by Msgr. John J. Dauenhaur, and finally by the present vicar general, Msgr. John J. Sheerin, appointed by Bishop McNulty in 1954. Monsignor Dauenhauer had been on the original chancery office staff, as officialis, in which post he was succeeded by Monsignor Sheerin, who was in turn followed by the present officials, Msgr. Joseph H. Hewetson. Msgr. Walter Hill, now rector of St. John's Cathedral, was the first superintendent of schools, a post now held by Msgr. Denis Hayes. In 1954 Rev. Frank J. Rodimer became the first assistant chancellor, by appointment of Bishop McNulty.

In 25 years 13 priests have been raised to the rank of protonotary apostolic, 17 to domestic prelate and 10 to papal chamberlain. In November 1943, a diocesan synod was held.

Bishop McLaughlin suffered a coronary attack early in 1941, but still managed to continue the initial expansion of the infant diocese. He founded St. Peter Claver Institute for Catholic Negroes. The last parish he founded was St. Berndan's, Clifton. He died March 17, 1947.

Bishop Boland was appointed Paterson's second bishop June 21, 1947, and installed in St. John's Cathedral, September 18, 1947. As auxiliary bishop of Newark he had on several occasions officiated at confirmations in Patterson during Bishop McLaughlin's illness.

It was Bishop Boland, himself a graduate of the North American College in Rome, who inaugurated the program of sending Paterson seminarians to study abroad. Bishop McNulty added his alma mater, Louvain University, Belgium, to the program.

During Bishop Bolands' episcopate a new hospital, St. Clare's, Denville, was erected, becoming Paterson's fourth hospital. The others, St. Joseph's, St. Mary's, Passaic, and All Souls, Morristown, began before the turn of the century. Don Bosco Technical School also opened during this period, and two notable pieces of construction were the architectural award-winning St. Philip the Apostle parish plant, Clifton, and St. Anne's (maternity) Pavilion at St. Joseph's Hospital.

In November 1952, Bishop Boland was appointed archbishop of Newark, where he was installed January 14, 1953. On April 9, 1953, Bishop McNulty was appointed bishop of Paterson, and his installation took place May 20.

Then began the decade of Paterson's most rapid growth, a decade also charatcerized by dramatic new developments. Near its close Bishop McNulty went to Rome to participate in Vatican Council II, the first ecumenical council in 100 years. He left predicting a new era of "vigorous Catholic life" and proclaiming that he was "proud to represent at the council such wonderful priests and wonderful people."

Shortly after his return he journeyed to Latin America to erect Paterson's parish in LaPaz, Bolivia, and visit Paterson's priests in Caranavi. It was while he was there, last February, that the news came of his appointment to the Buffalo Diocese and Bishop Navagh's succession to Paterson.

Bishop Navagh has visited Paterson only once, when he gave an address here at the invitation of Bishop McNulty. But he has traveled through New Jersey often, and his first comments after his appointment are appropriate as Paterson's parishes, priests and people survey the achievements of their past and prepare to begin their second quarter-century with him as their new shepherd.

"I've had the impression that New Jersey's people are very alert and progressive," Bishop Navagh said: "New Jerseyites are people with a past, a very active present, and a wonderful future."

Advertising: An Agonizing Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the advertising business has contributed more toward the Nation's "vigor" and "moving forward" than probably any other category of business in our time.

I urge my colleagues to peruse the following remarks excerpted from "Advertising: An Agonizing Reappraisal," a succinct composition written by Theodore S. Repplier, president of the Advertising Council of Washington, D.C.:

ADVERTISING: AN AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL

(By Theodore S. Repplier)

It happens that the winds of criticism which blow so briskly in what John Kenneth Galbraith calls "these days of massive introspection" have been huffing and puffing even more portentously than usual around the house of advertising. And although an advertising man is no stranger to criticism, I find some of the new antiadvertising statements difficult to swallow whole. Especially when some people would apparently find it to their taste to blow advertising's house down.

Not that anyone should object to valid criticism: Nothing but good can come from honest, intelligent criticism. The trouble is, as usual in this illogical world, that only a small part of the criticism of advertising takes off from solid ground. A considerable part of it comes from educators, but by no means all; the man does not live who has not at some time been annoyed to exasperation by an advertisement.

No intelligent advertising man (and only a normal proportion of them is unintelligent) objects to criticism of advertisements—individual messages, written or spoken. Indeed, no one rails at certain advertisements more violently than do advertising people. But when it comes to flailing about with sweeping generalizations about advertising as an unmitigated evil, that is something else again.

It is the purpose of these observations, therefore, to put the subject in slightly better focus, without, at the same time, baying down every economic trail which might profitably be explored.

WHO AND FOR WHOM?

The first thing to bear in mind in discussing advertising, it seems to me, is that there is actually no such entity. There are only individual advertisements, created and approved by people with all the individual strengths and frailties that distinguish mankind.

This would seem to be so obvious as scarcely to warrant mention, but the point has been completely ignored by some notable critics. It is easy and tempting to say that "advertising exaggerates wildly" or that "advertising makes people want things they cannot afford." Yet this makes no more sense than to say that salesmanship is exaggerated or that teaching is unintelligent. People who write and OK advertising are as different and as varied in talent and ethics as are salesmen and teachers, and sweeping generalities just won't do. There is no point in confusing the container with the thing contained.

The advertising process is so ubiquitous in America that almost everybody gets into the act, beginning with the classified ads in the newspapers, which are laboriously and lovingly composed by whole families with old pianos or lawnmowers to sell. In every department store and in millions of specialty shops from Brushy Fork to New York, people of varying degrees of education, talent, integrity, and taste work hard at setting down one word after another about the merchandise offered for sale. There are 4,200 advertising agencies in the country, each employing anywhere from 2 to 2,000 people, in which the act of creating advertising is taken with the utmost seriousness, and which compete with each other aggressively for talented people. And there are also hundreds of thousands of small businesses whose advertising is apt to be written by the boss' son right out of college or by the relative who really wasn't much good at anything else.

In short, advertising reflects people and contains all the talent and stupidity, brilliance and bad taste, inspiration and dullness that mark the remarkably varied collection of individuals, who, in a dozen ways too technical to go into here, had a hand in giving it birth.

The second reason why advertising—again, particularly broadcast advertising—is bound to be often annoying is because of a recent phenomenon in which we Americans rightfully take great pride: the explosion of the middle-income group. People with little education and a background that includes few social advantages have suddenly acquired good incomes. They are prospects for every item in the supermarket and for services as divergent as Arthur Murray dance lessons and life insurance.

MULTIPLYING COMMON MEN

In 1880, for example, the disposable income in America—what is left to spend or save after payment of all taxes—was $26.7 billion. Today it is more than 11 times that. Between 1929 and 1956, the families in the lowest-income group (under $2,000 per year)

fell from 12,900,000 to 8,300,000, those between $2,000 and $4,000 remained about the same, and those above $4,000 rose from 9,200,000 to 30,900,000. Between 1950 and 1960, the number of families with real incomes over $10,000 increased 167 percent in terms of 1960 dollars.[1]

For the time being, then, there is in the United States a nouveau riche class, tremendous in numbers, whose family incomes have risen faster than their tastes and culture. It is the group that Joseph Wood Krutch must have had in mind, when a few years back he asked the question, "Is the common man too common?" and answered it in the affirmative. It is also this group who will so largely buy the products that make the jobs that provide the incomes and supply the profits that pay the taxes and accumulate the capital that powers our economic growth. But mass advertising, which must be common denominator advertising if it is not to go over the heads of our new rich, is almost certain to annoy intellectuals. This is not, I must point out, a phenomenon which is confined to advertising. Such mass-directed Americana as movies, popular songs, and comic books have an equal capacity to irritate eggheads, and for precisely the same reasons.

Happily, this condition is changing, and changing swiftly. The educational level in the country is on the rapid rise, and if our tastes climb aboard the same elevator—not at all a foregone conclusion—the level of mass-directed advertising will rise with it. In the meantime, perhaps in the interest of balance and humility, intellectuals might recall Abraham Lincoln's compassionate observation, "God must have loved the common people. He made so many of them."

The most common mistake, from my point of view, made by those who view advertising through a glass darkly, is in treating it as though it existed in outer space, without relation to the American society which spawned it and of which it is a characteristic part. It is like considering a stand of wheat while ignoring the ground on which it grew, or considering an arm without relating it to a body.

Advertising is a manifestation as well as a builder of a highly industrialized society. It can be judged only in relationship to this society. Indeed, according to historian David M. Potter of Yale, advertising comes close to being a uniquely American institution, upon which our free press and our whole system of mass communication is built. It is, in considerable part, responsible for the beanstalk economic growth of this country in recent years—which, in turn, is one reason, perhaps, why the U.S. economy is currently "resting." Economist Arno Johnson points out that in the 32 years between 1929 and 1961, we added $194 billion to our total personal consumption, an amount roughly equal to the entire growth in the 320 years between the landing of the Mayflower in 1620 and the best pre-war year of 1940. This trend to greater industrialization will continue, for, as Gunnar Myrdal has observed, it is the industrialized countries which are industrializing further.

PRICE OF PROGRESS

Yet few things in life are an unmixed joy, and our swiftly industrialized society makes us pay a certain price for its conveniences, efficiencies, and opportunities. Take, for example, that world renowned symbol of U.S. productivity and prosperity called the automobile: We proudly point out to foreign visitors the crowded parking lots adjacent to our factories, jammed to the last inch with workers' cars. There are few more striking examples of our economic egalitarianism. Few Americans would wish the automobile away; we accept it as a modern necessity. Yet there is no denying that it has brought with it a whole host of nightmares. Motorists die hideously in highway accidents. Families on wheels litter the roads, parks, and woods with the ugly refuse of our convenient living. Automobile graveyards, with acre after acre of repulsive metal carcasses, are open sores on the countryside. Traffic jams threaten to choke our cities to death. Smog and fumes are becoming a national problem.

Industrialization, as it progresses, brings with it enormous benefits, not alone material. It provides unique opportunities for men to expand their horizons and enlarge their souls. It permits the great majority of us to rise far above the age-old, grinding struggle for mere food and shelter. Yet it also brings undeniable negatives which tax our ingenuity to correct. If it also brings some negatives perpetrated by those who use advertising, certainly no one should be either surprised or shocked. Indeed, what field, in this stage of swift Yankee industrialization, is free from them?

MADISON AVENUE, MOSCOW

Thus far I have ignored some of the economic arguments about advertising—for two reasons. First, the human element in the situation has been the most neglected; second, the equating of advertising with waste seems to me to be self-defeating. In these days of the profit-squeeze, every company hunts waste with a magnifying glass and a battery of computers, yet advertising expenditures continue to rise.

To those who credit such arguments, however, there is now disconcerting new evidence from a society which, in theory, has scorned advertising as a capitalist depravity. I refer, of course, to the U.S.S.R.

According to a study recently made by Prof. Marshall I. Goldman, of Wellesley College, who is also an Associate at the Russian Research Center of Harvard University, the Russians are adopting, in the interest of greater efficiency, the very practices castigated by certain critics of U.S. advertising as inefficient and adding little to social welfare. There is waste, these critics allege, in tolerating a number of similar products which pour out their advertising dollars merely to attract the customers from Tweedledum to Tweedledee.

Professor Goldman quotes a Soviet economist, V. A. Nikiforov, as explaining the new Communist party line in marketing. It seems that the products of different firms in the same industry or ministry are to be hereafter differentiated. In fact, the goods are to be plainly identified by a proizvodstvennaia marka or production mark. Comrade Nikiforov's rationale on the subject has a familiar ring: "This makes it easy to establish the actual producer of the product in case it is necessary to call him to account for the poor quality of his goods. For this reason, it is one of the most effective weapons in the battle for the quality of products." No doubt the trademark is another Russian invention.

Thus, even in a country where the consumers still can exert little pressure because the choice between products is so limited, the Russians are learning what free societies have known for years—that differentiation and competition between products is very much in the consumers' interest. Says Professor Goldman:

"It should be pointed out that the amount of advertising and product differentation required to reduce the overall cost of distribution need not reach the proportions found in the West * * * nevertheless there now seems to be considerably more advertising and product differentiation in the Soviet Union than at any time since the start of the 5-year plans. In addition to the increasing utilization of newspaper ads, posters, billboards, and handbills, there are now even radio and TV commercials. Advertising agencies have been opened by the State and a special journal devoted especially to advertising was introduced in 1958. * * * By 1965, it is hoped to have 30 to 40 different brands of radios and phonographs and about 20 types of television sets. Differentiation extends even to laundry soaps and detergents."

Thus does the brave new world of communism turn, in its quest for efficiency, to the very practices scorned by certain Western theorists as inefficient.

THE ADMAN IN PUBLIC SERVICE

There is a certain stereotype of the American advertising man which, launched some years ago by Frederic Wakeman's "The Hucksters," has proved to have astonishing durability. This sprightly portrait of the adman, layered over with additional images in the same vein, has permanently associated him in a considerable segment of the public mind with the dry martini, sex, and dubious deals—in approximately that order.

Now images are notoriously untrue to their originals, and no one should be unduly excited by such chimeric libels. My rebellion is therefore mild. I have met a few rascals in my 30-odd years in advertising, but have found most advertising people to be bright, hardworking, and with above average talent. As to their character, I offer only one piece of evidence.

For 20 years, beginning with the early days of World War II, the advertising industry has maintained a remarkable public service through the Advertising Council. It is a contribution to the country which is unmatched by any other industry. The council is run by a board of directors representing all phases of advertising—industries which use advertising, advertising agencies, magazines, newspapers, broadcasting, outdoor, and transit advertising. The board selects the 14 or 15 national projects which it considers to be of importance, enterprises of either a Government agency or of a nonprofit private organization. Advertising agencies then prepare the advertising for these campaigns free of charge, and the advertising space for them is donated by the media or by advertisers.

Through this remarkably altruistic system, there are carried on in America campaigns to sell U.S. savings bonds, to reduce forest fires, to lessen traffic accidents, to recruit for the Peace Corps, to spread a more informed and sympathetic understanding of mental illness, to increase support for colleges, and many more. About $225 million worth of free advertising is mustered annually for these undertakings, and millions of dollars worth of agency service is performed as a labor of love.

Since the council has done only a minimum of hornblowing, the results of this work are little known. Here are a few of the things that have happened coincident with its campaigns:

"Forest fires in America have been cut in half, and acreage burned is now less than 10 percent of the prewar average. This in spite of greatly increased use of wooded areas.

"Contributions to colleges have been stepped up as follows: from alumni, an increase of $107 million; from nonalumni, $108 million, and from business firms $91 million.

"Thirty thousand people have filed applications for the Peace Corps.

"Ninety-three million people were persuaded to have one or more polio shots.

"The motor vehicle death rate has been more than cut in half.

"Four billion, five hundred and thirty-nine million dollars worth of small-denomination U.S. savings bonds were sold in 1961. In all, $44,485 billion worth of E and H bonds were outstanding—more than $1 billion over the total in 1960.

[1] According to Dr. Arno Johnson of the J. Walter Thompson Co.

"Contributions to the United Community campaigns totaled a record half billion dollars in 1961; contributions to the Red Cross totaled more than $85 million."

SELF-INTEREST AND DECENCY

Self-interest alone would scarcely sustain a public service of these dimensions over two decades. It exists and flourishes only because through most of the men and women who are in some way connected with advertising, there runs a vein of sentiment and patriotism. Moreover, they share with me a concern for the battle of ideas between the free and Communist worlds.

While Lenin and his successors have believed profoundly in propaganda and have used it intensively, cynically, and with skill, we in America believe in it very little and use it timidly. We have been, I fear, so infected by those who have heaped scorn on advertising that we mistrust our part in the war of words and wish the whole ideological contest would go away.

Our oversea information program is frequently attacked as "globaloney" and a waste of money. Like domestic advertising, it has its critics who make scornful references to "selling America like selling soap." It is easy to make the program a political football and a weapon with which the "outs" belabor the "ins," for its few friends are seldom vocal enough to carry weight with vote-conscious Congressmen.

Let Congress cut a farm appropriation or a military expenditure, and the howls of pain and anger will be heard from coast to coast. Yet Congress can and often has cut the heart out of the appropriation for the U.S. Information Agency, which runs our oversea propaganda, and not a murmur will be heard. Except for an occasional protest by an advertising group, nobody raises his voice to point out that the lawmakers are providing insufficient ammunition in the only hot war being fought today—indeed, a war perhaps more likely to decide our fate than a nuclear holocaust which may never come.

DANGER OF ECONOMY

To explain U.S. foreign policy, to transmit accurate news of events, to make clear our motives, to identify ourselves with the rightful aspirations of emerging peoples, to publicize U.S. foreign aid, to combat communism, to destroy some of the damaging myths about us—for all these enormous ideological tasks and many others, the Congress gives USIA about $140 million annually to conduct campaigns in 90 countries around the world. This is perhaps one-twentieth of what our Communist opponents spend. It is $50 million less than one company spends in the United States alone to sell its products.

This disparity between the Communist and free world ideological effort is, alas, not apt to be soon remedied. For sufficient distrust has been sown so that an effort which is, after all, essentially advertising, is unlikely to receive any outpouring of public support. Only those who has studied the two programs, who have observed the shrewd, cynical, and openhanded way by which the Communists gain control of channels to the public in critical countries, view the unequal propaganda war with proper apprehension.

Advertising, particularly in America, is an economic workhorse which has performed prodigious feats with very little credit. It is a workhorse which, like it or not, must largely be depended upon to pull the American economy uphill. Yet there is no denying the workhorse has some annoying habits. He pokes his nose in places where he is not wanted. He sometimes has horse flies and needs a deordorant. The thing to remember is that he is a workhorse and a very useful one. It may be all right to whack him occasionally, but since we all ride behind him, there is no point in tripping him up.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising April 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago a group of tortured and abandoned men and women, their children hidden out of sight, gave vent to the desperation of their situation and with guns, bricks, bottles, and even their own bodies as weapons, took on the might of a well-equipped army with but one idea—to fight, to the death if necessary.

The Nazi army marched into Poland in September of 1939. Not only did this mean the beginning of a war that would rock the world for the next 6 years, it also marked the start of a campaign of mass slaughter and extermination that still leaves one stunned at the enormity of the crime committed. Before the end of the war 6 million Jews, mostly of Eastern Europe, would be dead, methodically killed under the orders of one man, Hitler, carried out by his sadistic henchmen. The center of this slaughter was Poland. Throughout Nazi-conquered Europe, a policy of Jewish extermination was carried out against heroic resistance by many of those doomed. Yet the heart is stirred most by what happened when the Warsaw ghetto finally exploded with wrath against the mass murder camps in the Polish countryside to which the Jews of the ghetto were taken to die, just for being Jews.

When the first stories began to circulate among the ghetto population of what actually happened to those who were taken off to "work camps" in the country and never heard of again, there was disbelief. When the real nature of these camps was established beyond doubt, there was fear. When the word was passed that the Nazi commandant had been ordered to dispose of the remaining Jews of the ghetto in a like manner, there was finally a will to fight.

It was the time of the Passover, a time of reflection for all Jews on the greatness of their history; it was the evening of April 18, 1943. The news spread quickly among the remaining 40,000 in the ghetto that tomorrow the Nazis would come to round them up for their one-way trip to death. But they had decided that the end would not come without resistance. As the storm troopers, with their Polish and Ukrainian police support, marched into the ghetto that Saturday morning, the fighting began. Since the invaders were taken completely by surprise, German dead sprawled on the streets. The Nazi high command was aghast. More troops were sent in and repulsed. The situation was serious, and Hitler was in a rage at the spirit shown by the Jews. Finally the local German commander took the last course available—he put the torch to the ghetto area. The partisans were driven from their attic hideouts into underground bunkers, covered by the rubble of falling buildings. Food and water were short, and weakened women and children were dying. The weak in spirit, willing to sell their souls for food and the chance to live a little longer, stole out to the Nazis and gave away some of the hiding places of the fighters. Rather than fall into German hands, sons shot their own mothers, mothers killed their own children, and still the resistance went on.

Outside the walls of the ghetto it was Easter. Spring had come to Warsaw, and while thousands were dying in the flames, the rest of the city carried on its usual business with only the smoke and ash marring the festive spirit.

On May 8 the main bunker was captured and most of the leaders of the movement killed. By the end of May most of the ghetto area had been destroyed and all but a handful of the fighters vanquished. The end had come, but only in Warsaw. The fight was carried on in the woods and hills. It is still going on today in the creation and preservation of the Jewish State of Israel. It is for us to remember in all honor and humility the brave freedom fighters of the ghetto of Warsaw. A monument to their sacrifice must be built and maintained in all our souls.

Chicago's Northwest Side Needs Mass Transit Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Jefferson-Park Press, which is published in my district by Mrs. Morton Steinman, carried a most convincing editorial in support of the mass transit bill which we hope will come before the House for action very soon.

Miss Sally Swanson, very capable civic affairs editor of the Jefferson-Park Press, has certainly stated the case in support of the mass transit bill in terms which should help every Member of Congress better understand how the people at the grassroots level in this country feel about the massive traffic jams which clog our large and small cities daily during rush hours.

I was very pleased to see this frank editorial since it has been my privilege to be among the first Members of Congress to cosponsor this legislation.

Recently, I appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in support of this proposal to help America's communities develop a more effective mass transit system.

More than one-half million people living in Chicago's Northwest Side, most of whom I represent in Congress, would benefit from this legislation.

I am including my own testimony in my remarks today following the excellent editorial by Miss Sally Swanson.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Swanson's editorial and my own remarks follow:

MOON TALK MAY GET COOL RECEPTION ON NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY

(By Sally Swanson)

Yesterday the Nation's first astronaut to orbit the earth, John Glenn, came to town, signalling the start of Chicago space month, and for the next 30 days talk of spaceships, meteorites, and moon blast-offs should excite the imagination.

One segment of the population may be indifferent. A trip to the moon in this decade? How will that strike the bumper-to-bumper crowd known collectively as the Northwest Expressway commuting public?

The man caught twice a day in a car-choked nightmare, may consider a moon launch ludicrous as he stops, starts, dodges, and listens to his car radio chide: "Northwest Expressway congested today." Like yesterday and tomorrow.

A trip to the moon? The trip to work is challenge enough.

Two and a half years ago when the expressway opened, the Northwest Side hailed a new era of automobile transportation. The area has drawn closer to distant parts of Chicagoland, with driving time unthinkable a few years ago.

But not during rush hours. Disgruntled motorists insist they make better time on city streets.

The congestion could be eased simply enough, according to experts, by installation of CTA tracks in the expressway's median strip. Simple enough except for one problem: money.

About $46 million is needed to install the tracks, including an extension from Logan Square el, to O'Hare Field.

INFLUENTIAL GROUPS REAPPRAISE STAND

Provisions were made for the CTA system when the road was built, and installation was expected in due course. The plan toppled in the spring of 1961 when four powerful business and civic groups which had planned to help the CTA get the necessary money withdrew their support.

Instead they asked for a study of the Northwest Side's overall transportation situation.

It surprised no one when a bill for the CTA expressway subsidy failed to pass the State legislature.

Last November—18 months and several thousand dollars later—the transportation survey reported that the CTA tracks would be "the most effective single improvement in public transportation" to relieve the Northwest Side's traffic woes.

The CTA expressway received a second important endorsement last fall from the Chicago area transportation study, a 6-year research program costing $3½ million.

Principal opposition has come from the Chicago & North Western Railroad, whose officials complain that as a private enterprise the railway could not compete with a subsidized public agency.

Perhaps the protests have been effective because of the railroad's sincerity in attempting to make its commuter business pay.

It has replaced dirty, ill heated, and often overcrowded coaches with doubledeckers that are roomy, air conditioned, and altogether comfortable. It has added more trains to its schedule, and inaugurated a river cruiser connection from its depot to Michigan Avenue. All draw the respect of a free enterprise society.

RAILROADS HAVE DISADVANTAGES

But railroads best serve the suburban commuter—Northwest Expressway is within the city of Chicago—and it has distinct disadvantages for city riders: High fares, few stops, no transfer privileges.

Long delay in the CTA system could be costly. Experience proves that congested expressways create a demand for more expressways.

And expressways are expensive. Their construction costs many times that of a CTA installation and they remove land from the tax rolls, to say nothing of incalculable expenses from disrupted neighborhoods, displaced homes, and air pollution.

And so it was encouraging news when Walter J. McCarter, general manager of the CTA, proposed Thursday that construction of Northwest Expressway CTA have top priority if Federal aid to mass transportation is approved by Congress.

The bill, which would offer up to two-thirds of the difference betwen the cost of the project and the amount paid by fares, has been approved by the Senate. It faces a steep hurdle in the House.

Hence the fate of the urban transit bill this week in Washington is vitally important to Northwest Side motorists. Possibly more important than an "Operation Moonlift."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI BEFORE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, permit me to express my gratitude to you and your committee for affording me an opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 3881, which would provide up to $500 million for development of mass urban transportation systems.

It has been my privilege to submit identical legislation—H.R. 807—both in the last Congress and again in this Congress.

Gentlemen, I have here an aerial photograph of my district showing the Northwest Expressway which goes right through my district. It has been our hope to develop in the median strip of this expressway a rapid transit system to relieve the tremendous automobile congestion which makes this expressway one solid mass of automobiles every working day during the early morning rush hour and the evening rush hour.

Chicago at present has three expressways: the Congress Expressway, the Northwest Expressway, and the Dan Ryan Expressway. We are now in the process of building our fourth expressway, cutting through the southwest section of our city. All of our expressways have been specially designed to provide a median strip for rapid transit.

The Northwest Expressway, the Dan Ryan Expressway, and the Southwest Expressway were all financed by Federal grants-in-aid as part of the National Defense Highway System.

I am sure your committee will agree that with 78 percent of America's population now living in urban areas, the decision to extend the National Defense Highway System into the large cities is indeed a wise one. This decision to extend the National Defense Highway System in the large cities was made in order to afford these cities an opportunity to move huge masses of people out of the city very quickly in the event of a national emergency.

However, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that under the existing situation in all of the large cities of America, including Chicago, if an enemy force ever wanted to wreak havoc and destruction on this country, the time for a sneak attack would be during the early morning rush hour or the evening rush hour when perhaps as much as 60 percent of this Nation's entire industrial labor force is hopelessly bogged down in traffic snarls all over America.

While I hope this bizarre prospect never develops, I mention this merely to emphasize to the committee the complete futility which faces the large urban communities of America in trying to relieve this indescribable traffic congestion during rush hours without some form of Federal assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I consider this legislation to provide assistance to our cities for development of rapid transit systems as important to our national defense effort as any single appropriation now before us in the multi-billion-dollar defense program.

The Chicago Transit Authority has done a magnificent job in developing what I believe to be the finest mass transportation system in the world.

Earlier this year you heard testimony from Mr. Virgil Gunlock, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority, and also from Mr. Walter McCarter, general superintendent of the Chicago Transit Authority. I am sure their experience is similar to that of transit operators all over the country, whether the transit system they operate is privately owned or publicly owned. In each instance they are faced with the dilemna of either raising the fares to bring about necessary improvements and seeing their passenger volume decline, or leaving fares at their present rate and foresaking the needed modernization programs.

There is no question in my mind that in all of the large cities of this country, present rates have reached their peak, and any further increases would result in a tremendous decline in rider volume.

It is quite proper that the urban communities of America should turn to their Federal Government for assistance. These large cities are the life blood of the Nation. From these large industrial centers flows the revenue that makes it possible for this country to meet its defense commitments and, yes, Mr. Chairman, its very struggle for survival.

We do not hesitate to appropriate an estimated $8 billion a year in this country to help the people in the rural areas of America remain in the economic stream of the Nation. It is a long-established fact that when the rural areas of America suffer economically, it is only a matter of a short time before the economy of America falters.

Mr. Chairman, nor did we hesitate to appropriate billions of dollars in our country in military and economic assistance to our allies because we realize that the survival of freedom could be decided by the rebuilding of the large industrial centers of Europe in making these countries economically independent.

Why, then, should there be any strong objection to helping solve one of the most serious problems facing America's urban areas in this 7th decade of the 20th century?

If the local communities could resolve this problem through their own resources, I certainly would agree there is no need for Federal intervention. But study after study shows conclusively that these urban areas of the country cannot solve their transportation problems without some form of assistance from the Federal Government, and for this reason I strongly urge adoption of this measure.

I would, however, like to call your attention to some provisions of this legislation which would create very severe hardships to employees of the mass transportation industry.

Section 3 of the bill provides for grants or loans to State or local public bodies or agencies for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, reconstructing, or improving existing transit systems.

In many States, when a private operation has been acquired by the State or a political subdivision of a State, the public body has taken the position that it is legally disqualified from entering into collective bargaining with the collective bargaining agent of the employees and also from entering into arbitration agreements with such collective bargaining agent, even where, as is usually the case, the employee has been for many years represented by a union under a system of collective bargaining with provisions for arbitration.

It would be my hope that this legislation can be amended to include provisions to protect public utility workers in the right to union recognition.

It is my further hope that some provision can be made which would give these employees of publicly owned mass transportation systems the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements and to negotiate with management. Certainly these provisions should include the right to agreements which would provide some channel for settling grievance disputes.

Mr. Chairman, if in the judgment of this committee you cannot agree on appropriate language to guarantee these rights to collective bargaining of employees working for publicly owned mass transportation systems, perhaps the committee would consider including in its report language which would make it clear that the intent of Congress on this legislation is not to deny in any manner or form, directly or indirectly, workers from exercising their right to collective bargaining if in fact the majority of the workers in a given union endorse such an action for collective bargaining.

A second shortcoming in this legislation which I hope will be corrected by the committee is its failure to provide protective conditions for employees who would be displaced or adversely affected as a result, at least in part, of the Federal financial assistance program.

One way in which transit employees of existing transit companies could be adversely affected is where a rapid transit operation is undertaken by a public agency with Federal assistance, and the private transit company continues in existence. It is inevitable, for example, that if a rapid transit line is erected which serves the same area as is presently served by a private bus line, that patronage will be attracted from the bus line, and employees of the bus line will be adversely affected.

Here, also, perhaps this problem can be resolved by language in the report establishing legislative intent that an effort should be made to absorb displaced workers from existing public transit systems to newly developed transit systems financed through Federal assistance. I would suggest that perhaps some reference should be made to the Manpower Retraining Act so that where employees are dislocated from their existing jobs because of new transit systems, these dislocated workers, if they need additional training, should get this training under the Manpower Retraining Act and then be absorbed by the newly developed transit system.

Certainly if we are going to spend Federal funds to develop new mass transit facilities, it is not asking to much that we at least establish in the committee report a recommendation that displaced workers in existing facilities, wherever practicable, be given priority in applying for employment with the new facility.

I am reasonably convinced that the Federal assistance which urban areas could receive under this legislation would indeed create so impressive an expansion of mass transit facilities throughout America that the workers presently employed in this country would be absorbed into new job opportunities. However, I am sure that we can understand the concern of those presently employed in the transit industry that modernization and automation may eliminate their jobs. It is my hope that the committee will give serious consideration to this concern, and I am confident that reasonable men can work out reasonable solutions in this difficult field.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for giving me this time to appear before this committee, and I shall be very happy to answer any questions you might have.

Resolution of the Beargrass Christian Church of Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement of the President's tax proposal, and the so-called reforms which would tend to penalize middle and lower income groups who are striving to get ahead a little in this life, my mail has been enormous in opposition not only to a tax cut without accompanying substantial reductions in expenditures, but also in regard to the reforms.

One of these reforms would contribute to the already weakening moral fiber of our country and the opposition to this reform has been almost unanimous.

In this connection, I would like to call the following resolution, adopted by the Beargrass Christian Church of Louisville, Ky., whose thinking is in keeping with all of the other people of my community, to the Members of this House:

RESOLUTION

The official board of the Beargrass Christian Church, representing a church membership of some 1,400 members, on Tuesday, April 2, 1963, in official session, being fully apprised of the tax proposal offered to the Congress of the United States and embodied in the President's message of January 24, 1963, gave consideration as follows:

"Whereas as an integral part of the President's tax proposal an additional amount of tax is sought to be recovered through so-called tax reform including a 5-percent limitation on all deductions to churches and educational institutions; and

"Whereas this particular legislation, if passed, would in most instances be directed against the individual of middle-class income; and

"Whereas the church membership of Beargrass Christian Church is made up of this middle-class income group, and any successful legislation of this nature would be a penalty against this church and its membership and would seriously curtail the free will giving of its individual membership; and

"Whereas it is felt that this is restrictive legislation directed at a particular class of individuals and working unduly to their detriment as an economic class; and

"Whereas it is the feeling of this official board that other means could and should be taken by the present administration such as fiscal responsibilities directed toward reducing expenses: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the official board of the Beargrass Christian Church, acting on behalf of its 1,400 membership, does hereby oppose the tax proposal as submitted to Congress by the President of the United States, specifically to that portion that would place a 5-percent limitation on deductions; therefore be it further

"*Resolved*, That this opposition be spread on the minute books of the church record and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Third District Congressman and to the two U.S. Senators from Kentucky; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Jefferson County commission (Christian churches) and that a copy be forwarded to the General Assembly of the Kentucky Association of Christian Churches, Richmond, Ky., and that our delegates to general assembly on April 16–18 be instructed to place this resolution on the agenda for ratification as a Christian church body."

This resolution was moved and seconded, and unanimously passed on April 2, 1963.

No Federal Aid to Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if American industry wants to take the risk for a share of the earnings, knowing they'll ultimately lose their investment, that's their business. They may even convince some socialists of the advantages of private enterprise, capitalism and the profit motive.

But no U.S. tax money should be given to Indonesia. Socialism must not be subsidized:

INDONESIA COMPROMISE: NATION WOOS U.S. CAPITAL WITH LIMITED SOCIALISM

(By Norman Sklarewitz)

JAKARTA.—When discussing American business methods with officials of the Indonesian Government here, a U.S. embassy official noticed the two sides agreed on principles as long as capitalistic terminology was dropped. If the American meant profits but instead called them the fruits of cooperation, the Indonesians fully approved.

Such word games are a whimsical byplay of a serious effort now underway: Socialist Indonesia is sucessfully luring companies from the United States and other foreign nations to invest here, but under curious conditions. In effect, the U.S. firm must agree in advance to ultimate nationalization. Neither side here uses that word, of course, but refers to the idea of foreign development and management of a state-owned enterprise as "production sharing."

This acceptance of partial free enterprise reflects less a change in Indonesian devotion to Marxist-style concepts than a need to find some immediate way out of the desperate economic crisis now gripping the once fabled Dutch East Indies. Even though the United States has pumped $710 million in economic loans and grants into Indonesia, and the Soviet bloc has made available $644.2 million, its economy continues to sag. Production of such dollar-earning resources as rubber and tin is falling and foreign exchange reserves are at a record low. While rated officially at 45 to 1 U.S. dollar, the rupiah is sold on the black market at a record 1,200 to 1.

EAGER FOR RICHES

Despite martial law, public criticism is coming into the open. "The president says that the 'riches of the soil' belong to the people," grumbles an office worker waiting to shove his way aboard an already overloaded city bus, "but such riches do us no good if they remain under the ground."

Since socialistic state planning and generous infusions of aid have failed to curb the runaway inflation or to get domestic production going, the Indonesians are now cleverly enlisting the help of foreign investors.

Some Western observers here question Indonesia's sudden willingness to do business with foreign concerns it branded as "neo-colonialists" not many months back. "Their

system can't get production going so they put their Marxist plans aside temporarily," says one American. "But what happens after the foreign managers put the Indonesian company into business? We'll be out and the leftists will have grown stronger on our risk capital."

There are others, however, who feel more positively about the value of this contact with free enterprise. Even with strong feelings of nationalism and a desire to exercise control over private enterprise, they see a number of high Indonesian officials softening their erstwhile hard left line.

"The Indonesians are beginning to appreciate the role that private foreign enterprise can play in their economic development and the need for mutual cooperation," says U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia Howard P. Jones.

RUBBER COMPANIES REMAIN

As further evidence of their new look toward foreign exploitation of the country's vast resources, Indonesians point out that American rubber companies are still in business here although a land reform decree 2 years ago raised the specter of nationalization. Despite that threat, the U.S. Rubber Co. today is running its plantations under a new 12-year agreement with the Government while the Goodyear Co. and several other rubber plantation operators are negotiating on terms by which they may be here for up to 20 years more.

Production sharing contracts were signed last year by Pan American Indonesia Oil Co. and the Van Camp Seafood Co. Also, the Union Oil Co. of California now has a representative standing by in Jakarta and the Continental Oil Co. sent one of its agents out to look the situation over.

Under the general provisions of production sharing, a foreign concern brings in the plant, equips it and provides technical skills and the management in order to export and earn hard currency abroad. The Indonesian Government can provide rupiah to cover local salaries and other domestic expenses. For its investment, the foreign firm gets a share, anywhere from 15 to 85 percent of the foreign exchange realized after deducting depreciation of the plant and all operating costs involving dollars. But full title to the plant reverts to the Indonesian Government or the state-owned company after an agreed-upon period. Foreign manufacturers or sales representatives here now must get Government approval to convert locally earned rupiah into foreign exchange and such approval is rarely granted.

Production sharing probably evolved from a deal worked out by Harold Hutton, president of Refining Associates of Long Beach, Calif. A gravel-voiced veteran of 38 years in the oil business, Mr. Hutton accepted an offer to develop an oilfield for the Indonesian government-owned Permina company early in 1957. His contract called for the sale of crude oil brought out of the Sumatra Island jungle fields to pay off the cost of the production with a percentage of the profit split between the American contractor and the Indonesian firm.

"We welcome American companies to come to Indonesia and work with us under production sharing," says Minister of Production Suprajogi who, like many other members of the revolutionary cabinet, is an army general. "We have great potential for mining, timber, fishing, copra and other resources which can be profitably exploited," he adds.

As the Indonesians now see it, even oil—the country's No. 1 dollar earner—can be taken by foreign companies under the fashionable cloak of production sharing. The biggest such deal so far was made last June when Pan American Indonesia Oil Co., owned by American International Oil Co. of New York, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of Indiana, was granted rights to explore for oil on the island of Sumatra.

Pan Am will invest a minimum of $28.5 million in its first 8 years of operations. The U.S. company gets to charge off all capital investments but, at the end of 30 years, title to the plant, storage facilities and pipelines goes to the state-owned Indonesia oil company.

Even bitter competitors of Pan American say the deal was a "good sign" for foreign business.

"We had strong doubts a few years ago that we'd ever see a Western oil company come into this country again," says an old-timer in the oil industry here, sitting in the shaded patio of his company-owned bungalow. "Sure, that Pan Am contract is full of socialist language and the Indonesians do get all the company's facilities in the end. Even so, it's a contract you can work under and make money."

TECHNICAL BARRIERS

While the Indonesians granted Pan American Oil survey rights on Sumatra, they denied that same request made by P. T. Stanvac Indonesia, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey and Mobil Oil Co., which has oilfields here that are badly depleted. A spokesman for the Indonesian Foreign Ministry described the refusal as one based on "technical details," not any old animosity toward Stanvac, which came originally into Indonesia on a generous Dutch concession. The "technicality" is generally conceded to be simply that Pan American agreed to terms which, at the time, Stanvac felt were too harsh.

Officials of Stanvac, Caltex Pacific and Shell Indonesia have been negotiating with the Ministry of Basic Industries and Mining on and off since early 1960 on government demands for new operating terms. The Indonesians wanted to replace the traditional 50 to 50 profit split with a 60 to 40 split in their favor, and they wanted title to production facilities, refineries and the domestic marketing organizations.

While the protracted talks were dragging on, Pan American Oil came onto the scene and agreed to work in Indonesia as a contractor, that is, to explore for oil, develop fields and export the crude all for a straight 60 to 40 percentage. This move broke the solid front of the established foreign oil interests and gave the Indonesians an obvious bargaining weapon against them.

"The Indonesians shrewdly played one foreign firm off against the others," says a European diplomat.

Even though concessions are made to Western companies out of hard economic necessity rather than any shift in political convictions, the powerful Indonesia Communist Party (PKI) is pushing President Sukarno to abandon Western contracts in favor of full socialization of production. Backed by 2 million members of his PKI, party chairman D. N. Aidit wants an end to economic help from the West and an overhaul of the Indonesian economy to give government control of all remaining private industry.

HEEDING MODERATES

For the moment it appears that the President is heeding the advice of moderates who see Western investments as the best hope to get the creaking machinery of production moving again.

Ambassador Jones and Edward Fox, Agency for International Development director for Indonesia, are discussing with the Indonesian Government an investment guarantee agreement which could be signed before the end of the year. Under it, U.S. firms will be eligible to take out insurance backed by the U.S. Government to cover losses which might be incurred in Indonesia due to nationalization ahead of any contract schedule, war or loss of currency convertibility rights. "Once the agreement is signed, I think there would be good opportunities in Indonesia for American companies," says Alan C. Herzig, visiting Jakarta for Pan-Alliance Corp. of New York, which specializes in investments in underdeveloped countries.

"If you have steady nerves and are a good poker player, then you might come out of negotiations here with a profitable deal," sums up a U.S. Embassy economist.

Capt. John Cassin Cantwell, U.S.C.G., 1859–1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the uniformed services of the United States are rich in tradition but none richer than the Coast Guard.

Typical among many hundreds of officers whose lives of dedication to service have built the fine traditions of the Coast Guard was Capt. John Cassin Cantwell. The highlights of his career were summarized in a 1940 article by Harry W. Frantz, distinguished Latin American correspondent of the United Press International.

In order that the career of Captain Cantwell may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I quote the indicated article as part of these remarks:

SPIRIT OF THE COAST GUARD: CAPT. JOHN CASSIN CANTWELL, 1859–1940

(By Harry Warner Frantz)

Capt. John Cassin Cantwell by his own last wish was buried at sea outside the Golden Gate from the cutter *Daphne*, on October 10, 1940, as befitted a gallant officer who loved the sea, the wind, the stars, and the U.S. Coast Guard. He had died the day before at Sausalito, Calif.

This event was more than an episode in Coast Guard annals because for 3 score years Captain Cantwell had been part and parcel of the fine traditions of seamanship, national loyalty, and humanitarian service which have made the Coast Guard one of the proudest organizations under the American flag.

A skilled seaman, Captain Cantwell was also a talented writer, with the result that his many accounts of cruises, ship rescues, and incidents of exploration have attained a value beyond that of mere personal narratives. Gen. Adolphus Greely, famed Arctic explorer, said that Lieutenant Cantwell's "Report on the Operations of the United States Revenue Steamer *Nunivak* on the Yukon River Station, 1899–1901," was one of the finest books ever written about Alaska.

John Cassin Cantwell, born at Raleigh, N.C., January 9, 1859, had distinguished seafaring ancestors. At 20 he enlisted as seaman with rating as boatswain in the Revenue Cutter Service, progenitor of the present U.S. Coast Guard. He was appointed cadet in 1880, and in the next 40 years served through all ranks to commander, and also held commission as senior captain in the period of the World War.

At various times he served on the *Alert*, the *Bibb*, the *Corwin*, the *Bear*, the *Nunivak*, the *Manning*, and a score of other ships famed in Coast Guard annals, cruising in most of the seas that border the American Continent. He also had many shore commands, includ-

ing the Naval Reserve Training Camps at San Pedro, before his retirement, with rank of commander, in 1920.

I had known Captain Cantwell in Havana and Washington, and exchanged letters with him through many years. When I heard of his last rendezvous, outside the Golden Gate, I felt an impulse to write of him, for I felt that he typified many hundreds of excellent but little-known American officers whose lives have built the fine tradition of America's oldest maritime military organization. This organization, incidentally, had its beginning just 150 years ago, when President George Washington on August 4, 1790, signed the act creating the Revenue Marine Service of the United States.

Millions of inland Americans no less than folks along the seacoasts have a certain affection for the Coast Guard, derived from occasional news dispatches of ship rescues, ice patrols, life-saving incidents, or marine exploration. But the Guard has rarely dramatized even its greater personalities, whose names have slight public currency. Thus the name of the good old *Bear* is legion, but who can remember one of its many commanders?

At Coast Guard headquarters I was permitted to consult two fat files of accumulated service letters, reports, and miscellany concerning Captain Cantwell. From several hours' boring, I derived the salient impressions that he was a very able seaman, a very loyal shipmate, and an excellent writer. His reports about the saving of the *Nunivak* on the Pacific coast, and of the salvage of the *Manning*, in Alaskan waters, are rare accounts of danger and bravery at sea, and one of the last notations on Captain Cantwell's service record.

From yellowing letters known only to their authors and the file clerks there came the spell of days long gone at sea; of hurricane roaring off Cape Hatteras, of storm-tossed cutter in the Bering Sea, of half-wrecked schooners waiting for rescue. From stern episodes of hard life and bold adventure, there remained only such physical mementoes:

A letter from Pendleton Bros., ship brokers, at New York, dated February 13, 1909, which said: "We write to express our appreciation and gratitude to Capt. J. C. Cantwell and officers of the Revenue Cutter *Onondaga* for the seamanship and ability that was displayed in finding at sea and towing into Norfolk the wrecked schooner *William J. Lermond*. The vessel was totally dismasted, rudder gone, and it was the best case of handling a derelict of this kind that we have ever known."

A letter from Rev. John W. Chapman of Anvik, Alaska, August 23, 1900: "I write to express the warm appreciation of the people of this place of the action of Lieutenant Cantwell, commanding the U.S. Steamer *Nunivak*, in stopping to give us the assistance of a physician, and to render whatever help was in his power at a time of unusual distress. I have never, during an experience of 13 years in this place, known a season of such universal and serious sickness among the natives as the present."

A letter roughly penned from Leon R. Swift, Master of schooner *Charles Whittemore*, dated Norfolk, Va., November 19, 1910: "Dear Sir: Just a few words to thank you and your officers for the kindness shown me, in towing my vessel to a safe anchorage when I was lying at the mercy of a dangerous sea with a disabled rudder, your work and the work of the Revenue Cutter service is far beyond words of expression and i shall always think kindly of yourself and officers as long as i remain in the Merchant service hopeing that i may be able to do as mutch for you."

Dozens of similar letters might be adduced, which although addressed to this particular officer would, in fact, be tribute to the great humanitarian organization whose spirit he shared. The motto of that organization is "Semper Paratus"—always ready.

Regarded historically, Captain Cantwell's most distinctive service to the Coast Guard probably was in Alaska. He served there during years when the great empire of the north was only beginning to come within the ken of the American people, and also during the period when the gold rush caused strange migration to the northlands.

He first visited Alaska in 1885 while serving as junior officer on the cutter *Corwin*, in a region embracing the entire coastline of the territory from Dixons Entrance to Point Barrow. In 1899, he was commander of the *Nunivak*, which cruised from San Francisco to a Yukon River station, thought to be the first great transoceanic trip ever made by a river steamer.

"Prior to the voyage of the *Nunivak* some 25 or 30 steamers of this class had undertaken the voyage from ports on Puget Sound, and of this number fully 50 percent had either been lost en route or else had arrived at their desination so badly injured as to require extensive repairs to be made on them before they could be operated," said the official report.

"It should, then, be a matter of congratulation with the Treasury Department, as it is one of just pride to the officers who took part in this expedition, that after traversing over 4,000 miles of ocean navigation, in spite of gales of wind and the unavoidable mishaps incident to such a voyage, the *Nunivak* finally reached St. Michael practically ready for immediate duty and in as good condition as when she left San Francisco."

Characteristic of his generous nature, one of Captain Cantwell's difficulties in writing a report was to abridge the tributes which he invariably made to his fellow officers and crew. Witness a letter to headquarters after return from the Yukon Station, which said in part:

"Finally, I desire to thank each of the officers of the service who were attached to the *Nunivak* while under my command for their unwavering zeal, courage, and efficiency in the performance of the many novel duties which fell to them during the progress of the cruise. I gratefully acknowledge their untiring devotion to duty under the most trying and arduous conditions, and, while it is difficult to mention individuals without apparently detracting from the services of the whole body of officers, I desire to call attention of the Department especially to the remarkable journey of over 1,000 miles across the country, made in the dead by winter by Assistant Engineer Lewton, R.C.S. (Revenue Cutter Service), in obedience to orders to join the *Nunivak*, which orders were sent with the expectation that the vessel would be met at St. Michael; to the remarkable series of observations of meteorological conditions, amounting to nearly 30,000 different observations, which were made under the personal direction of Lt. Eugene Blake, R.C.S. and which entailed an enormous amount of labor and constant attention, and to the excellent pilot charts of the Yukon and Koyukuk Rivers made by Lts. B. H. Camden, R.C.S., and Eugene Blake, R.C.S."

Captain Cantwell's prophetic vision of the territory of Alaska, only now approaching realization, was written in 1901 as follows:

"From our experience in the country, covering a period of over 2 years, and from information gathered from various authentic sources, I am irresistibly drawn to the conclusion that the winter climate of the interior of Alaska is superior in many respects to that of many of our Northern States. With cheaper means of transportation, by which the necessaries of life can be procured at less cost, and better facilities for communication with the outside world, there is no good reason why this little known and greatly misrepresented country should not become the abiding place of a large and prosperous community.

"God grant that the day is not far distant when the youth of this country, whose forefathers hewed from the icebound shores of Maine and Massachusetts the foundations of the great Republic, will awake from their lethargic dream of life under the tropic skies of the land of manana and set their faces toward our northern province. Here, amidst sterner but healthier surroundings, may they make their homes and perpetuate a race of fearless, self-reliant, and strenuous men and women of the type which—

"'Born of the hulls and nurtured by the winds,
Knows only Freedom's mighty song of life.'"

Ability to observe natural phenomena is a fine index to a seaman's mind, and the capacity to narrate such observations skillfully is a rare gift. Lieutenant Cantwell demonstrated such talents in the following account of the Arctic winter and aurora borealis:

"The end of November 1899, found us in the midst of an Arctic winter. Snow fell with more or less regularity during this and the preceding month until now the country was covered to a depth of 3 feet or more with a mantle of spotless white. Every branch and twig of the smaller growth of trees, the willows, and alders and birches, were sheathed in a gleaming armor of ice, and the tall, somber spruces carried upon their dark, spreading branches each its burden of fleecy snow. Hardly a breath of air stirred in the woods, and the lagging sun rose each day like a great silver disk and ran its course across a sky that was absolutely free from clouds. Long after the sun disappears below the crests of the mountains which lie to the south the radiance of his setting bathes the sky in tender color, now green, and pink, now softest lilac, shot with silver threads, and gradually as night comes on the more delicate colors fade away and insensibly the whole southern sky darkens to a splendid purple, lighted up by a host of trembling stars.

"The month of November was marked by the most brilliant displays of the aurora borealis observed during our stay in the North. Some of these displays were so remarkable that we would frequently leave our warm quarters to watch the magnificent spectacle with fascinated interest while it lasted or until the intense cold would cause us to seek shelter.

"As a usual thing the auroral displays were observed to be most brilliant just previous to a period of lower temperatures; but they were rarely seen during the prevalence of excessively cold weather. The phenomena of the aurora have so often been described by abler writers that I shall not attempt to do so here. There are no words at my command adequate for the purpose. The spectacle must be seen to be fully appreciated, and for one who loves nature in all her moods nothing can be more beautiful—and at the same time so awe-inspiring—than this mystic northern light drenching the sky from the zenith to the horizon with cascades of evershifting color. Now set in rigid lines of prismatic hue, and again tremulous and waving in crinkling folds across the sky, festooning the firmament with clinging, silken fabrics, through which the light flows and filters with soft radiance, and again, breaking into myriads of glistening, flashing particles—a whole world of jewels to be strewn across the interspace with such reckless prodigality as to blind the eye and confuse the mind and to make any mere word description of its wonderful beauty weak and futile."

There will be no stone marker over Captain Cantwell's grave. But there will be memory in the sunlit blue of the Pacific off the Golden Gate. There will be remembrance in the white sails of passing ships, and the silver hulls of the soaring clippers; and by night in the shining stars. Distant foghorns and the toll of buoy bells will bring echoes from his friendly soul.

And when in lonely seas, hard-pressed sailors battle with the storm until some swift cutter brings rescue, thoughtful men will know that there is in fact a Coast Guard spirit, a spirit born of brave lives through 15 past decades of Capt. John Cassin Cantwell and 10,000 other officers not unlike him.

HARRY W. FRANTZ.

WASHINGTON, *November 23, 1940.*

Phony Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda attending the President Kennedy to the rescue of Mrs. Martin Luther King episode badly needed to be fumigated, and to that end the Washington Evening Star has rendered a good public service with the following editorial:

JUST A BIT PHONY

If one is merely a reader of headlines, an Associated Press story from Atlanta could be taken to mean that the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., now jailed in Birmingham, Ala., was able to call his wife, who has just had a baby, only through the gracious intervention of President Kennedy. To the extent that the story conveyed this impression, it was a phony.

What happened, as far as we can find out, is that the President, according to Mrs. King, "had been in touch with Birmingham." This is a bit on the vague side. Mrs. King added, however, that the President phoned and told her: "I've arranged for your husband to telephone you very shortly. You probably know we sent FBI agents in last night to talk with him and he's all right."

Having in mind that the burdens of the Presidency are said to be the heaviest in the world, it is good to know that Mr. Kennedy, even while on a brief vacation, at Palm Beach, could spare the time and energy to intercede in the Rev Mr. King's behalf. The only thing that concerns us is whether the President really did much, and if so what it was that he did.

To the best of our knowledge, no one in Birmingham was preventing the Rev. Mr. King from calling his wife. In fact, police chief Jamie Moore, who enjoys a local reputation in Birmingham as an honest man, says that the Kings talked to each other on the day before the President-to-the-rescue story appeared, and that the telephone conversation between husband and wife "was not arranged by Kennedy or anyone connected with the President."

All of which causes us to wonder. If President Kennedy called Mrs. King and told her he had "been in touch with Birmingham," we certainly do not question the accuracy of the statement. But what, precisely, does this mean? With whom did the President get in touch? Was it this getting in "touch" which made it possible for the Rev. Dr. King to call his wife? We doubt it very much. And we wonder what this business is all about. Could it possibly have anything to do with such things as votes, gullible people, or politics?

Selden and Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee is headed by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR. It has been my privilege for several years to serve on this very important subcommittee of which Mr. SELDEN is the chairman. All of us who serve here know full well the fine leadership, the dedication, the intelligence, the independence, and the well-reasoned attitude of the able gentleman from Alabama.

In the field of Latin-American affairs and particularly with respect to the problem of Cuba, he has worked very diligently and earned our respect. He speaks not only in his own right, but with the full support of those Members who have been privileged to serve with him on the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

As chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] has always waded into the controversial, sometimes complicated and always difficult problems of U.S. relationships with Latin America. Always, the subcommittee hearings and reports have been of substance. His work, and that of the subcommittee, is highly regarded, and it should be. Recently, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] as chairman of the subcommittee, issued two reports: "Castro Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere" and "Special Study Mission to Latin America: Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, Costa Rica." Both of these reports are the result of a great deal of hard work and considerable study. They have received national recognition.

It is pleasant to know that Mr. SELDEN's efforts have been properly recognized by the people of his own State. A good job well done is reward enough in itself. However, it certainly cannot be amiss to know that the plaudits of your constituents have been accorded you and are likewise well deserved. I am particularly pleased, therefore, to bring to the attention of my colleagues three editorials from highly regraded newspapers in the State of Alabama which have analyzed the recent reports of the subcommittee and have spoken in commendation of the efforts of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I am sure that my colleagues will join with me in gratification at the well deserved praise and recognition of Mr. SELDEN's efforts and accomplishments.

The editorials follows:

[From the Mobile Press, Apr. 18, 1963]

SELDEN AND AMERICAS

Although his position has often been in sharp conflict with that of the Kennedy administration, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, of Alabama, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, urges that Americans forget the quarrels of the past and nestle down to hindrance of Communist subversion in the hemisphere.

In the relatively brief period in which he has served in Congress and as chairman of an important committee, Mr. SELDEN has gained a solid grasp on the problems that face the hemisphere and has never failed to speak his mind.

He has been vigorously calling for more concerted action on the part of Americans to thwart communism in Cuba since as far back as 1960.

But the Greensboro Congressman, who upon the invitation of President Kennedy accompanied the Chief Executive to the San Jose Conference, now considers the hindrance of subversion the No. 1 job of all the Americas.

"In short," he declared in a talk at Livingston this week, "Khrushchev and Castro know that an open Communist military assault on any nation in this hemisphere would demand a firm and direct response by the United States and the Organization of American States. Communist strategy therefore is to gain their hemispheric goals by subtler means."

He pointed to a finding of the subcommittee as follows:

"The subcommittee addressed itself to the current theory that economic aid alone can counter this Communist offensive threat. Success of the Alliance for Progress, the subcommittee found, is endangered by continuing Castro Communist efforts to increase political tensions in Latin America. Therefore, long range economic plans must be preceded and complemented by immediate steps to meet the threat of subversive aggression.

"Unless such steps are taken, the Alliance for Progress is doomed to failure. Only after the threat of Castro and communism is eliminated from the hemisphere can Latin America move forward politically and economically."

In our estimation, this is a splendid example of putting first things first. It is a highly logical approach which President Kennedy and leaders of Latin American nations can hardly fail to adopt.

[From the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News, Apr. 18, 1963]

SPEAKING FIRMLY ON CUBA

People of this congressional district have a right to be proud of Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN and the important position he has achieved in Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. SELDEN might be called a country lawyer, but if so, the term would be in tribute and not in criticism. He is close to the people. But as a Member of Congress he has grown in stature and in value to his Nation through his interest in issues relating to the Americas.

One of our most pressing problems now is what to do about Cuba. We have a cancer growing there. Agreement is universal that such a condition is undesirable. There is some disagreement over what to do about it.

Mr. SELDEN is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. He has made several study missions to Latin America. Perhaps his understanding of the problems of Latin American peoples is the keenest in our Congress. When he expresses an opinion, it is backed up by knowledge and information.

Recently, Mr. SELDEN appeared at a dinner meeting of the Livingston-North Sumter County Chamber of Commerce where he spoke about the Latin American problem as it affects the United States. He made specific recommendations on what to do about Cuba, following the line laid down in his committee's report after study and after hearings in Washington.

Mr. SELDEN rightly contends that we should spend litle time arguing over the mistakes of the past, and that our energy and effort should be aimed at making de-

cisions to protect our future. He believes the best way to handle the Cuban problem is to quarantine it.

Specifically, the recommendations are that the President use whatever means may be necessary to prevent the spread of subversive activities from Cuba; that we be ready to help, with military force if needed, any nation endangered by Cuban Communist subversive force; that hemispheric security be strengthened, and that the United States should seek total economic and diplomatic quarantine of Cuba.

In such recommendations, we are offered a course requiring courage, ingenuity and carrying considerable risk. But the danger of not being positive in the Cuban crisis is much greater.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Apr. 17, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE SELDEN'S GOOD WORK

Alabama's Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN headed a subcommittee which made a study of Latin America. First reports have been issued.

The subcommittee reports that the United States has "a more favorable position in Latin America than it has had for many years." But it also says that our neighboring countries must do more to help themselves. Particularly, the governments must "capture the allegiance of their people by being responsive to their needs." Unless this is done, says the group, then there will continue to be instability among our Latin associates.

The report, from press summaries, appears well balanced and helpful. It sees and notes good; it identifies the area of fault.

The News believes all Alabamians are proud of the work ARMISTEAD SELDEN and his subcommittee performed. The matter of communism in Latin America is very serious. And it is a problem which has led some, at least, to exploitation of difficulties. There has been more than a little political purpose behind some prompt criticisms. But, as has been observed elsewhere, there is fault enough to go around.

Alabama people who know ARMISTEAD SELDEN are not surprised at the balanced nature of the report. It is, however, desirable to footnote that, in dealing with a subject which some might have been tempted to maneuver for their own particular ends, the Selden committee exercised prudence and a genuine statesmanship.

Tax Chaos Threatens 140,000 Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the serious impact that the new regulations on expense accounts are having on one of America's basic industries, namely, the food-dispensing industry, is graphically described in an article titled "Tax Chaos Threatens 140,000 Jobs," which appeared in a special edition of Hospitality magazine published in Chicago.

I am taking the liberty of calling this very important article to the attention of my colleagues because I feel that every single congressional district in this Nation is affected by this crisis which is now facing the hotel, motel, and restaurant industry in America.

This particular industry does more than $83 billion worth of business in America every year. The magnitude of this figure shows that this is a basic industry in our country, and when this overall volume begins to lag the effect on the entire Nation's economy could indeed be catastrophic.

I am pleased to note that Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Mortimer Caplin has announced public hearings will be held on May 6 and 7 here in Washington, at which time spokesmen for the industry will have an opportunity to comment on the most recent proposed rulemaking regulations regarding expenses announced by the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, the Hospitality magazine article follows:

CRITICAL CONSEQUENCES MULTIPLYING RAPIDLY

New Federal tax rules on expense account spending, overzealous interpretation of them by officials, conflicting statements and misunderstanding have created a situation in the hospitality industry that may reach the proportions of a catastrophe unless action is taken quickly to remedy and clarify it.

Already the situation has produced—

Reductions of from 10 to 55 percent in food service sales.

A drop of 4 to 28 percent in hotel and motel room occupancy.

Cut of 10 to 30 percent in convention attendance and 10 to 25 percent in future bookings.

A 20-percent slash in the demand for beef by restaurants and hotels.

Lessened demand for coffee and other basic supplies used to feed business guests.

By the end of the year, consequences will include:

Elimination of $666 million in restaurant sales, about a third of normal expense account spending, half of which goes to workers in wages.

Certain failure for several hundred formerly successful restaurants and hotels.

And an addition to already record unemployment rolls of 140,000 men and women whose jobs will be wiped out by these failures and by sharp reductions in other operations.

These are facts and figures—not estimates or guesses but hard statements determined by surveys of the hospitality industry conducted by the hospitality group of magazines, the National Restaurant Association, the American Motor Hotel Association, and the American Hotel and Motel Association—which have resulted from the nationwide fear and confusion produced among businessmen and companies by the new expense account tax legislation and the interpretation of the new law by the Internal Revenue Service.

Business and industry, fearful of running afoul of the new law, have cut back business trips and expense account entertaining by their salesmen and sales and manufacturing officials.

Employees of these companies, afraid various expenditures will not be allowed, have cut back further in many cases.

WIVES LEFT AT HOME—THEATERS, SHOPS HIT

Wives formerly taken to meetings have been left at home, reducing double occupancy of rooms with a consequent reduction in the room rental rate, halving the meals consumed in restaurants and hotel dining rooms and at banquets by the double attendance, and eliminating thousands of dollars spent by them in the retail stores of every big convention city.

Harsh statements by the Government on enforcement of the new rules started the action that is swiftly rolling into a catastrophe.

A lack of understanding on the part of the businessmen affected hastened it along.

Failure to remedy it quickly may complete it.

Besides the results mentioned:

The entertainment business—theaters, night clubs—is hurting.

With a lessened demand for beef, cattle growers are being hit.

Farmers, with a lessened demand for raw foods by hotels and restaurants, will be hurt.

Investors in thousands of operations will see their investments wiped out by failures or devalued by profit margins critically reduced by loss of business due to the tax legislation.

While Treasury officials say the new rules aren't as harsh as the public seems to think, many people apparently do not want to be bothered by all the recordkeeping the tax collectors apparently now require to support expense account deductions.

What was intended to be a move to end expense account living may result in the loss of more revenue through loss of taxable income, failures of business, and loss of jobs than will be gained by the new legislation.

A survey by the hospitality group of magazines of restaurants catering to the businessman and hotels and motor hotels where many conventions and meetings are normally held, showed the figures cited on the opening page of this article. Excerpts from many of the replies will be found at end of article.

A survey of 387 restaurants in 40 cities across the country by the National Restaurant Association shows that business in January and February was 16.4 percent below the same 2 months of 1962 and that employment in these restaurants was down 11 percent, or 22,000 jobs, based on a 1962 payroll of 200,000 in these operations. Dinner business was down by a third.

The average restaurant check was lower, and waiters reported that tips were smaller. There were also more single guests because of wives left at home.

A drop of $666 million in 1963 restaurant revenue is seen by the National Restaurant Association as a result of the cutback in expense account spending, with half of this amount representing wages that normally go to restaurant workers.

Proof that the drop in restaurant revenue is due to curbs on business spending is provided by operations such as those in Kansas City where a restaurant operator owns a coffee shop and an expense account restaurant across the street. With the same location, same weather, same management, there was a 20-percent difference in their performance in January.

Select Restaurant and Hotels of Washington, which handles credit charges for over 50 restaurants in that State, reported a drop of 15 percent in business as a result of the new tax legislation and uncertainty regarding it.

A survey by the Restaurant Association of Maryland in the Baltimore area indicated a 14- to 22-percent drop in gross business representing a $190,000 loss, precipitating a substantial layoff and further aggravating an already bad unemployment problem in that area.

With considerable business lost due to the new restriction, a well-known Washington, D.C., restaurant reported guest checks for food and liquor off 40 percent among those business people still patronizing the operation. Total sales were reported down from 50 to 55 percent.

At the peak of the winter season in Florida, a famous Fort Lauderdale restaurant reported sales down 4.4 percent in January, 7.5 percent in February, and 12 percent for the first 4 days in March.

A Chicago restaurant which has experienced spiraling sales since 1952 stated that

business the past 60 days was down 10 percent.

Lowest January sales in 5 years were reported from a San Francisco restaurant.

MAY CLOSE NIGHTCLUB—END $20,000 PAYROLL

With better entertainment features, business in a well-known supper room of a Dallas hotel was off by 50 percent since January 1 with a consequent drop in employment. As a result, this hotel said it may wipe out its nightclub operation, abolishing a union payroll of $20,000 per month.

With local business up 7 percent, a San Francisco hotel noted that convention attendance and occupancy declined 30 percent, due in a great measure to wives not attending the meetings. Convention bookings also were down, food sales dropped 20 percent and beverage sales dropped 11 percent.

In Boston, one of the city's large hotels reported food sales for the first 2 months of 1963 down $50,300, including $47,604 in banquet business; convention occupancy 8,765 nights compared with 10,205 in 1962 and total occupancy 60.4 percent compared with 66.48 percent a year ago.

DISASTER AHEAD FOR MUSICIANS, WAITRESSES

Layoffs of musicians, growing each day, may reach disastrous proportions as reduced volume forces the closing of food rooms where they provided live background music or live entertainment, and other rooms are forced to reduce the size of musical groups to meet lower income. Adding to the gravity of the situation are the cancellations of many private parties where music was used.

Typical of the situation: Three musicians and a performer laid off by one large New York City hotel with elimination of music and entertainment in one food room, with two more musicians laid off with cut in orchestra from six to four in another room. Musical trio dismissed at another hotel where food and liquor sales dropped $10,000 a month and an even greater drop expected. Eight men in two bands on dismissal notice since March 3 in one well-known restaurant. Nightly entertainment reduced from daily to two nights a week at one hotel, from daily to one night per week at a restaurant; eight men on notice at another hotel; orchestra cut from 16 to 8 at one hotel and from 14 to 10 at another; music eliminated at eight restaurants employing 25 musicians.

Layoffs of waiters and waitresses as a result of the new rulings are growing greater, unions admit. In Chicago alone, 1,000 waiters have been laid off since the first of the year, according to a survey of 98 restaurants there. Other cities are reporting similar situations on varying scales.

More than 15,000 maids, busboys, porters, etc., and 7,000 food service workers will lose their jobs in the motel industry if the trend continues, according to S. Cooper Dawson, Jr., president of the American Motor Hotel Association, based on a survey of eight key States and chain and referral organizations. Totals for the overall lodging industry have been estimated at 60,000 jobless by the end of the year.

One referral group, representing 690 motels with over 34,000 rooms, reported a drop of 13.2 percent in room sales for the first 50 days of 1963, Mr. Dawson said.

Cutbacks in purchases by steakhouses and restaurants serving prime ribs have been felt by meat purveyors in the institutional field. A typical restaurant ordering 30 to 40 prime ribs now orders 25 to 30 at the most, one meathouse reported. Similar cases are reported by others.

LOWER PRICES AHEAD, CATTLE FEEDERS WARNED

Cattle feeders were warned by one big meat company in a half-page ad recently in the Drovers Journal that, with cattle prices already down, there may be a further decline of 20 percent unless they join in stopping the destruction of the market for prime meat by the new expense account rules.

Conflicting statements on the tax situation are blamed for which of the confusion and fear that has hurt business in the hospitality industry. Lack of final clarification of such substantive measures as what is deductible and what is not, and defining such broad terms as "lavish" and "extravagant" entertainment is also responsible.

To eliminate some of the fear and confusion among potential business customers, individaul restaurants and restaurant associations, spearheaded by the National Restaurant Association, have opened an educational drive based on the placing of small booklets and table tents in front of customers emphasizing that business meals are still deductible. The same message is provided in stuffers for envelopes mailed to customers.

Protests also have been made to congressional leaders regarding interpretations of the law that it is felt do not accurately reflect the intent of Congress when it passed the legislation.

Modification of some of the restrictions imposed last year by Congress on the tax deductibility of business entertainment and travel expenses or at least on the rigid interpretation of the law by the Internal Revenue Service was indicated early in March after a closed door meeting of the Senate Finance Committee and IRS Commissioner Mortimer Caplin, and restaurant, hotel, and motel operators can help bring this about by making committee members and their Congressmen and Senators aware of the vital necessity of taking such action.

Senator SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, declared at the meeting, it is reported, that the IRS has gone far beyond congressional intent by:

1. Requiring the keeping of receipts for any single travel or entertainment expense exceeding $25.

2. Requiring "meticulous records" to document a business discussion preceding or following entertainment to make the expenditure tax deductible.

3. Requiring a description of the type of entertainment provided.

4. Requiring a listing of the names of persons entertained.

5. Establishing that an employee in some instances would have to pay taxes on his reimbursements for travel and entertainment costs that aren't allowed by IRS.

CLAIMS REGULATIONS BADLY MISUNDERSTOOD

To these statements, Mr. Caplin contended that the recordkeeping regulations are badly misunderstood. He claimed that:

1. A businessman's records do not necessarily have to contain the names of persons entertained if those names are of a confidential nature.

2. Exceptions will be allowed in the case of receipts that are difficult to obtain even where the expenditure exceeds $25.

3. A great deal of time need not be devoted by the taxpayer to maintaining minimum records.

GRAVEST PROBLEM EVER FACED

John Green, president, American Hotel & Motel Association: "Nationwide drops in business due to the recent Internal Revenue Service regulations on travel and entertainment expenses is perhaps the gravest problem ever faced by the lodging industry. American Hotel & Motel Association, through its Washington office is in the forefront of a drive together with the many similarly affected associations to get the IRS to relax these rulings before permanent harm is done. We know that Congress did not intend IRS to create such burdensome regulations. We feel that it was the intent of Congress to eliminate excesses but that the present regulations go far beyond what was intended when the enabling legislation was passed last year. The business community is bewildered by the regulations which have already been announced and apprehensive over what is allowed and not allowed. The results of the regulations are causing our industry to layoff employees and in some cases shut down previously successful facilities. Members of the innkeeping industry are flooding Washington with cold, hard facts which demonstrate the bad effects these rulings have had on the industry."

MISLEADING STATEMENTS A CAUSE

Henry Montague, president, National Restaurant Association:

"The confusing and misleading statements on the expense account law are already beginning to have a detrimental effect on the Nation's economy. Misinformation regarding the law has hurt business in many areas of the country. This has already forced workers to be laid off, thereby adding to the Nation's serious unemployment situation.

"Although the new regulations on expense accounts are just taking effect, surveys we have taken of leading restaurants in major cities on the east coast, south, middle west, and west coast report that January business is down due to confusion over the new law. This decrease in restaurant business has forced layoffs in many areas. Actually, the increase in unemployment in the restaurant industry is only a small segment of the overall problem. There are 1,600,000 employees in the restaurant industry, making it the fourth largest industry in the Nation.

"Directly supplying the needs of the restaurant industry are many other workers in the raising, processing, distribution, and preparation of quality fruits, vegetables, meats, bakery goods, dairy products, as well as all types of supplies and equipment used in the restaurant industry. A substantial reduction in the volume of business in restaurants not only forces layoffs in this industry but causes a chain reaction which has a direct impact on employment in all related areas of the food-service industry. This adds to the already serious problem of employment throughout the Nation.

"One of the great traditions which has helped the growth of American industry is the informal business meal whereby a businessman uses the friendliness of a restaurant meal to create good will which may ultimately help his business. This good-will entertaining is normally done in the better restaurants. These establishments pay top prices for the premium quality of meat and other foods they serve. A substantial reduction in the volume of foods (meat and produce) used in these restaurants causes disruption in the entire marketing structure and pricing schedules of all foods. Eventually, this hurts every consumer as well as the farmers, ranchers, meat packers, and food processers.

"It is clearly evident from the record in both the House and the Senate that Congress did not intend for the new income tax law to cause severe dislocations in the Nation's economic progress, but misleading statements and confusion concerning the law are already having a detrimental effect on business and causing unemployment in many areas."

TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND TO LOSE MOTEL JOBS

S. Cooper Dawson, Jr., president, American Motor Hotel Association:

"A drop of 16.3 percent in room, food and beverage sales in motels is reported for the first 2 months of this year as compared to January and February sales a year ago.

"This sales lag is directly attributable to curtailment of expense account spending, and if this trend continues, more than 22,000 employees in the motel industry will lose their jobs as a result of decreased sales. About 7,000 of these are food service workers and about 15,000 are maids, busboys, porters, etc.

"Our findings come from a survey just made in eight key States and from chain and referral organizations and trade magazines covering the United States.

"One referral group, representing 690 motels with over 34,000 rooms reported an across-the-board drop of 12.3 percent in room sales for the first 50 days of 1963 with curtailment of expense account spending as the principal cause. Surveys within the States of California, Arizona, Nevada, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, and Minnesota boosted the total for loss of business during January and February to an average of 16.3 percent.

"The National Restaurant Association has reported that 80,000 workers in public restaurants stand to lose their jobs if sales do not increase. With 22,000 employees affected in motels alone, it is reasonable to expect that at least a total of 60,000 people face unemployment in the lodging industry, which, combined with the restaurant total, adds to about 140,000 jobs that would be jeopardized in the combined food service and lodging industries.

"Our reports show that there is confusion, misunderstanding and apprehension on the part of businessmen and executives as to what types and amounts of expense accounts are tax deductible. This confusion is responsible for much of the drop in sales and must be cleared up before normal business can be expected."

RESTAURANT SUPPLIERS HIT

Meat: "For the first time, no overtime is being required for truck drivers to supply the demands of restaurants and hotels."

Liquor: "A tremendous dropoff in sales at a time when conventions have been a stable factor in company sales."

Coffee: "A 15 percent decrease in orders with our company which sells coffee only to the food and lodging industry."

Fish: "At the height of the lenten season, sales are down 20 percent among our high class restaurant accounts."

Beer: "The worst February in sales in many years by our company (a major beer distributor in the Chicago area)."

Tableware: "A trend to second grade items by restaurants replacing quality products because of lower revenue and profits."

Bread products: "February and March sales off 5 to 10 percent. Hotel accounts affected seriously as compared to a year ago."

Trade Act Shortcomings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no law passed last year was a better example of government of men rather than by law than the Trade Expansion Act, 1962.

Already we see the dictatorial aspects of this law as the President or his appointees can enact trade restrictions, voluntary or otherwise.

Already we see the avenue cleared for increased trade with the Communist satellites, so our dollars go to support their economies.

The imbalance of payments will accelerate with the further drain on our gold, all at the whim of the President or his associates. Meanwhile, we do not know who will make up the Common Market, which in turn is the basis for determining which tariffs may be cut.

It is encouraging to note that the Tariff Commission's going slow on Federal subsidies, a new form of unemployment compensation to workers and industries.

A BREAK FOR CONSUMERS

For all the talk of freer trade, last year's Trade Expansion Act included features mighty appealing to protectionists.

In the first place, there was the fact that the President was given sweeping powers not only to cut tariffs but to raise them. Then, too, the act preserved the prior law's escape clause and added something new—adjustment assistance.

Under these provisions, anyone who believes he has been injured by imports stemming from a tariff cut can appeal to the Tariff Commission for higher import duties. And he can ask an assortment of direct financial and other aid to remedy his alleged injury. Not only was the way open to backtrack to protectionism, but a whole new system of Federal subsidies seemed to be in the making.

So it's encouraging, not to say surprising, that the Commission so far has been taking a hard look at appeals under the new act. So hard, in fact, that it has turned down all six pleas on which it has acted. The Commission found that the pleas did not meet the law's requirements, that tariff cuts and increased imports were not the major reasons for the petitioners' troubles.

The connection between tariff cuts and increased imports is often slim; imports may rise chiefly because of rising American consumer demand for such things as Europe's small cars. And in some cases a businessman's troubles may stem more from bad management than from imports. In any event, any dislocations suffered by some businesses must be balanced against the higher price burden that tariff boosts impose on consumers.

There's no telling whether the new legislation will bring more or less trade freedom. But right now the Tariff Commission may figure consumers pay enough visible taxes without being soaked with a lot of new hidden ones.

Cuban Blowup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, until and unless President Kennedy, himself, lays before the public the whole sordid mess of the Bay of Pigs fiasco and subsequent events bearing directly on the Communist takeover of Cuba, neither the citizens of this country nor the expatriates of that unhappy island will be convinced of anything.

It is not enough for Attorney General Kennedy, brother of the President, to attempt to explain away the sequence of failures and lack of policy. He is not the Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Armed Forces. If he has been designated as such, the citizens of this country ought to be advised as to when the Constitution was amended and who amended it.

Until and unless President Kennedy personally lays bare the whole sorry record with respect to Cuba, fixing responsibility specifically where it belongs, the controversy will continue and it should.

The following editorial from the Washington Evening Star throws needed light on this subject:

CUBAN BLOWUP

The roaring row between the Cuban exiles and the State Department is a very ugly piece of business. And it may well get worse before it gets better.

As it has appeared in fragmentary form, a statement by Jose Miro Cardona, president of the Cuban Revolutionary Council of exile groups, hardly stops short of challenging President Kennedy's integrity. Among the accusations reportedly appearing in the statement is one which says that Mr. Kennedy, on the day of the final failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion, personally "formalized a pact which called for a new invasion."

In a formal announcement, the State Department asserts that the statement by Dr. Miro Cardona is "highly inaccurate and distorted," and that there is documentary evidence to establish this. Dr. Miro Cardona retorts: "I told the truth. I do not tell lies."

To say the least, this is a nasty mess. And it reinforces the view which we have repeatedly expressed—namely, that this Government should tell the American people the whole story of the Cuban affairs and its aftermath. Certainly, it cannot be covered up much longer.

We would like to touch on a few other points. The State Department says "the United States cannot coexist with a Soviet satellite in this hemisphere." Yet it seems to us that this is precisely what we have been and are doing. The next paragraph in the formal statement speaks of our Government's desire to continue consultations with the exiles with a view to the ultimate liberation of Cuba by "suitable methods," but that in determining these methods "the policies of the Government in the field of foreign affairs, particularly those which carry the risk of war, will continue to be determined by the Government and the people of the United States." We suspect that the "people" will not have much to say in the matter. But we fully agree that the Government, and not the Cuban exiles, must determine the issue of peace or war. Meanwhile, the outlook, despite the disclaimer, is for continued coexistence with a Soviet satellite in this hemisphere.

Now, just a word for Dr. Miro Cardona and those who may follow in his footsteps. He was a leader of the Cuban revolution and served for a while as Fidel Castro's Premier. It was he and others like him, not the United States, who brought this disaster to Cuba. And their wretched experience should at least serve as a warning the next time some phony Robin Hood comes along with promises of a new deal for an oppressed people.

A Wise U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lodi, Calif., News-Sentinel of April 4, 1963:

A WISE U.S. POLICY

Many Americans doubtless find it rather odd that the Government should, as it says it plans to do, take every step necessary to keep Cuban refugee groups from raiding Cuba from U.S. territory. It is a fair guess that there is much sympathy for the idea of looking the other way and letting the refugees do what damage they can.

Fortunately, such emotional thinking has not guided official policy. For the danger in private military action against Cuba is far greater to the United States than it is to Cuba.

The explanation for this is not complex. Every such incident carries in it the seeds of outright confrontation with the Soviet Union. Any such confrontation should be on our initiative. We cannot afford to be pushed into perilous situations by the actions—irresponsible, however well motivated—of Cuban patriots.

National Award for Harrisburg Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, a well-deserved tribute was paid to the Patriot-News, a Harrisburg, Pa., newspaper which won the National Headliner Award for consistently outstanding editorial pages.

As a regular reader of the Patriot-News and as a former printer and newspaperman, I consider the Patriot-News to be one of the better newspapers of our country.

This newspaper is not published in my district but its good reputation is known far and wide in the State of Pennsylvania.

Its criticism of public officials has been constructive. It shows no political bias or partiality. Its editorial page is excellent. It presents various points of view in addition to publishing its own well-written, informative, and wholesome editorials.

In these days of confusion and increasing criticism of our democratic system of government, by forces opposed to progress, it is truly a pleasure to congratulate the Harrisburg Patriot-News for its devotion to responsible commentary on current events and for its receipt of this well-deserved award.

I request unanimous consent that the following article, "National Award To Be Given Patriot-News Editorial Page," from the April 6 edition of the Harrisburg Patriot-News be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

"CONSISTENTLY OUTSTANDING": NATIONAL AWARD TO BE GIVEN PATRIOT-NEWS EDITORIAL PAGE

The National Headliner Award, won this year by the Patriot-News for "consistently outstanding editorial pages," will be presented to James R. Doran, editor, at a gathering of the National Headliners Club on April 20 at Atlantic City.

The decision, announced yesterday, marks the first time the award for editorial page excellence has been won by a Pennsylvania newspaper.

On the same occasion, 26 Headliner medals will be presented to other winners in the nationwide newspaper, magazine, radio, and television competition.

The Patriot-News editorial page staff consists of George Draut, chief editorial writer, and editorial writers Bern Sharfman, James Welsh, and Paul Beers.

Other top winners in this year's National Headliner competition included the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution—a special citation for its golden anniversary Sunday magazine edition. The Constitution pioneered in the newspaper Sunday magazine field.

Newsweek magazine was awarded the honors for outstanding coverage of a major news event by a national magazine.

The Dallas (Tex.) Morning News was the newspaper winner for outstanding major news coverage for its reporting of the Billie Sol Estes case.

The award for outstanding public service went to the Miami (Fla.) Herald for its "Operation Amigo," a campaign of bringing Central American students into the United States to combat Russian airlifts of the same student groups.

Frank McGee, of the National Broadcasting Co., became the second man in the history of the awards to become a winner in both radio and television newscasting. The other man was Edward R. Murrow who won in both radio and TV at CBS. McGee won the network radio newscasting award in 1958, and this year was voted the medal for consistently outstanding TV network newscasting and shared honors with the NBC news department for consistently outstanding radio network newscasting.

Other individual awards:

Raymond R. Coffey of the Chicago Daily News, outstanding coverage of a major news event for his stories on the University of Mississippi campus riots. Some of Coffey's dispatches have appeared in the Evening News which is served by the Chicago Daily News Service.

Hugh Mulligan, the Associated Press, generally outstanding feature writing.

United Press International photographers Joel Landau for his sports action picture of the Emil Griffith-Kid Paret fight and Joel Schrank for his picture of survivors receiving last rites at the Idlewild, N.Y., airport crash scene.

Bill Beall, of the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, feature picture.

Charles O. Bissell, of the Nashville Tennessean, for consistently outstanding editorial page cartoons.

Worth Bingham, of the Louisville (Ky.) Times for his news feature series, "Our Costly Congress," which was reprinted in the Patriot.

Charles E. Teeple, Louisville Times, outstanding special feature columns.

Joe Aaron, Evansville (Ind.) Courier, best local interest columns.

Dallas Reporter Raises Questions About Public Attitude Toward Kennedy Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it may well be that in his apparent lack of understanding of the people, President Kennedy does not realize the grassroots opposition to his ever increasing demands for more and more Federal spending. I have found, in traveling to almost every section of the Nation, that the people are far more aware of the dangers connected with unlimited spending, inflation, and the drain on our gold supply than is the administration. In my opinion the people of this country are not willing to accept a socialist dictatorship which is bound to result from the continued expansion of welfare programs and Federal controls.

President Kennedy either does not realize this mood on the part of the people or does not care about it because he continues to advocate more welfare programs, more centralization of power in the Federal Government, more spending.

The following article written by Robert Baskin, head of the Washington bureau of the Dallas Morning News, warns that the mood of the people may not support President Kennedy's demands and I hope that the Members of the House have been able to learn more about the attitude of the people at home during this past week:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 15, 1963]

FEW BILLS PASSED NOT SIGN OF FAILURE BY 88TH CONGRESS

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—The much-afflicted 88th Congress straggled home over the weekend for the annual Easter recess, apparently in an uncertain mood and undetermined about what to do in the rest of this session.

Its record so far has been under fire from a number of sources. Overlooked, undoubtedly, is the fact that congressional inaction may be an indication that the legislators are really doing their work.

Passage of a lot of bills is no criterion by which to judge the Congress. So far this Congress has passed very few. This, under no circumstances, should be viewed as a failure.

In all the avalanche of words that comes out of Washington, it is frequently overlooked that House and Senate committees have been rather steadily at work for some time now.

If it is decided that a bill should not go to the floor, that is a committee judgment under a procedure that has long been the rule of Congress. Somewhere the great mass of bills that flow into the hoppers of the two Houses must be sifted out. Yet there are critics who say that everything must come to the floor for a decisive vote.

Congressional critics are crying very loudly these days for reform of Congress. This demand has a good deal of support from the Kennedy administration, whose bright young men want things decided quickly and in their favor.

But Congress obviously is not sure of the temper of the country. The Kennedy administration, coming as it does largely from the Northeastern part of the Nation, has no particular knowledge on this subject. Congress is not willing to take its word that this or that piece of legislation is precisely what the Nation wants. In many ways there are signs that the country at large is quite satisfied with the status quo and desires no "get this country moving again" projects.

Aside from pockets of depression, mostly in the East, the Nation is faring well economically. But President Kennedy frequently talks as if this country was in the depths of a dreadful depression.

The measures he has sent Congress are mostly New Dealish in concept. The central theme is pump priming. The House has just approved another $450 million for a WPA-

type of public works, and the Senate has given the go-ahead to a revival of the old depression-days Civilian Conservation Corps. But the New Frontiersmen want a good deal more.

This situation can only raise one question: Are we really this bad off?

If you look at the official publication of the Democratic National Committee, you quickly gain the impression that the United States is made up largely of unemployed coal miners, old folks who can't get medical care, and teenagers who want work but can't find it.

Pictures in this publication may well be copied by Pravda and Izvestia. They are a severe indictment of the American nation. One can only wonder if they are not an indictment, too, of the Kennedy administration, which has been in office nearly 2½ years now. After the ringing pronouncements of the 1960 campaign, one can wonder, is this all that he has done for us?

Congress may find some answers as to the mood of the country when its Members go back during the coming week and talk to the folks at home.

So far the evidence is that they don't want and drastic action on the homefront.

Birmingham's Ambassadress Completes Good Will Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, recently the people of Birmingham, Ala., sent a good will ambassadress to the people of Birmingham, England. Miss Norma Lea Lindsay was chosen. She made a very favorable impression on all who met her.

While she visited here in Washington on her way to England, she dined with Senators HILL and SPARKMAN and myself in the Capitol.

The following article by Mr. Robert E. Lee, promotion manager of WBRC–TV station in Birmingham, who accompanied Miss Lndsay on her good will mission, reports on the success of this program.

I know all the Members will be interested in this article from the Birmingham magazine and I commend it to their attention.

The article follows:

A SOUTHERN ACCENT MELTS BRITAIN

(By Robert E. Lee)

A pretty ambassadress from Birmingham has thawed Britain's frozen winter with a gracious smile and a portfolio of Southern charm.

Twenty-year old Norma Lea Lindsay was winner of the key role in the whirlwind 9-day project sponsored by WBRC–TV, Birmingham Ad Club, and Trans-World Airlines.

Her unique diplomatic mission included stops at Washington, D.C., New York City, Birmingham, and London, England, where she spread the good word "It's nice to have you in Birmingham, Ala." to newsmen, radio, and TV audiences and dignitaries.

Norma was selected from among 50 Jefferson County contestants to represent the city on behalf of the people of Birmingham.

The trip came about after Shireen Dixon, the Birmingham, England, Press Ball Queen, paid a visit to the magic city as guest of WBRC–TV last November.

Norma's dazzling trip began with a flight to Washington, D.C. During her stay in the Nation's Capital she toured the British Embassy and had tea with England's Minister of Information in the United States, Michael Robb, and his wife.

She also had lunch with Senators JOHN SPARKMAN and LISTER HILL and Representative GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., in the U.S. Senate dining room.

Representative HUDDLESTON spoke of the unique goodwill mission on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, and it was recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In New York City Norma toured the United Nations, the Empire State Building, and network TV stations.

She arrived in London via TWA jet and was greeted by members of the press ball committee from Birmingham, England, who drove her to their city.

The following 3 days were a whirlwind of civic receptions. She was received by Birmingham's Lord Mayor, Alderman Ernest W. Horton. On behalf of Birmingham's Mayor Arthur Hanes she presented him with a key to the Magic City and auto tags with the familiar slogan "It's nice to have you in Birmingham." On her last evening in Birmingham, the press committee held a ball in her honor.

Norma was allowed time to be a tourist, too. She saw Shakespeare's home, an English football game, a good bit of the English countryside and had dinner at a 16th century Warwickshire inn.

Next official stop was London where Norma spent 4 days visiting famous places including Buckingham Palace, Parliament, Big Ben, and Westminster Abbey.

Here again she met members of the press and presented dignitaries with tokens of esteem from the people of Alabama.

"It was a wonderful trip," Norma said upon her teturn, "and I don't think we missed seeing a thing. The English are such warm hearted people. They also know the meaning of the word 'hospitality.'"

King Buys Out New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the National Industrial Council's Washington Chatter of April 8 indicates that in addition to all of the "high living" by Morocco's King Hassan, he also gave a $30,000 party in Washington—I do not know who for. Washington Chatter goes on to say that since 1952, the United States has furnished almost $500 million to Morocco in foreign aid and that there is an increased amount budgeted in this year's foreign aid bill. I must say that I was shocked when I read the above report and since that time I have received correspondence from the people of my district. These are taxpayers, honestly desiring to meet their tax obligation, to pay the mortgages on their homes, to educate their children, and to provide a decent and honorable living for their families.

It would seem to me that the recipients of our assistance should not be those countries who have sufficient funds in the till to support this kind of living.

The following is an Associated Press report bearing a New York, April 6, dateline and which appeared in the Louisville Times on the same date:

KING BUYS OUT NEW YORK—FIVE CADILLACS JUST A STARTER FOR MOROCCO'S "HASSAN THE SHOPPER"

NEW YORK, April 6.—King Hassan II of Morocco showed New Yorkers what it means to go first class this week, making shopping trips seem like something out of Arabian nights.

The King, who ended a 10-day visit to this country yesterday, included a little shopping for the royal household on his agenda.

So, with one sweep of his arm, he bought more cars than the average American will purchase during a lifetime.

With another wave of his hand, he ordered more blankets, towels, sheets, mats, robes, pillowcases, and bedspreads than any housewife could ever dream of buying.

The whole thing took less than 3 hours.

On Monday night, he made his additions to the royal livery. He headed for an automobile showroom where 18 cars in the General Motors line were on display, especially for him. They ran the gamut from the most luxurious Cadillac to the simplest compact.

The King and his party looked at all of them within a half hour. He placed an order for at least five Cadillacs, and an unspecified number of other cars, through the firm's oversea division.

"There's never been anything like it," commented George B. Brown, a representative of the agency. "The cars were placed so the King and his entourage—about 20 in all—could circulate freely without any congestion.

"He's a very decisive man," Brown continued. "He knows just what he wants and he knows things about cars the average man never heard of."

The King and his party headed for a textile house Thursday, where the night before the management had prepared for the royal shopping trip by having butlers, maids, a bartender, a supply of orange juice and Turkish coffee standing by.

The King didn't show up then, but when he came in Thursday, things still were in readiness.

When he began to inspect the firm's best lines, an order taker and a liberal amount of pads were standing by. When he had finished, a rush call had been issued for more ordertakers—and more pads—to keep pace with the King's needs.

The exact figures still haven't been tallied. Estimates range as high as 5,000 of the bedroom-bathroom items, including 150 blankets that will be packed to leave with the royal party. This trip lasted about an hour and 45 minutes.

But the problems didn't end there.

The King wanted the royal crest, coat of arms, and monograms put on every item, some of which had to be finished for his departure.

"It's all been very hectic," one of the company's spokesmen said, quite out of breath.

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, April 19, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, when power-hungry Nazi forces un-

der their evil-minded leader, were on their victorious rampage in most of the Eurasian Continent, destroying and devastating everything before them, and terrorizing peoples by the hundreds of millions, a small band of gallant, stout-hearted, and desperately embattled people in Warsaw initiated a glorious fight against their ruthless and unconscionable Nazi oppressors. That bold and daring move marked the uprising of the remnants of once the largest Jewish ghetto in Europe, numbering at one time more than 400,000 but now, through deportation, starvation, and death, reduced to only 63,000. While many of these were not physically fit to fight, they all were determined to carry on the struggle against their mortal enemy, and they all managed to sell their lives at a terrific cost to the enemy. In this unequal struggle, in which no quarter was given and no prisoners taken, 13,000 fighting Jews lost their live in the course of 27 days, while some 50,000, mostly aged, women, and children, surrendered, and it is estimated that less than 80 escaped through the sewers under the ghetto walls.

In that uprising and desperate fight the oppressed and downtrodden Jewish people proved to the world that, even under an impossible and despairing circumstance they still retained their faith in the righteousness of their cause, their right to live and the right to fight for the preservation of their lives. While so many of these unfortunate souls lost their lives in this historic uprising, yet by that very act they covered themselves with glory and honor, profoundly setting a moving example to their descendants. We honor the memory of these unknown gallant fighters for freedom, fighters for elemental human rights, on the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the Nazis.

We May Be Losing World War III Without Realizing It Has Already Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we succumb to the Kennedy advocacy of peace at any price, perhaps we had better stop and take a look at what is already happening in the world. President Kennedy continues to court Khrushchev in an apparent desire to do anything to prevent world war III. What the President evidently does not realize, or will not admit, is that the war is already here and the Communists are winning the battles. Every time we make a deal with Khrushchev, whether it be in closing our eyes to what is going on in Cuba, or demanding a coalition government in Laos, the Communists win and we lose.

How many battles do we have to lose? How much of the world has to go behind the Iron Curtain, before President Kennedy will admit that world war III is here and the Communists are slowly attaining all their objectives?

The following column by Dr. Robert Morris in the Dallas Morning News points out what is happening.

RED CONQUESTS: WORLD WAR III ALREADY HERE

(By Robert Morris)

I recently heard an otherwise serious man make the assertion that, if we all did not moderate our expressions about Castro, we might be provoking world war III. The speaker, like most people, does not understand that world war III is already here. If the people generally do not soon become aware of it, it will be soon over.

Stalin and Khrushchev have waged war implacably. They have literally killed millions of men. They have taken more terrain than has been taken in any other war to date.

The fall of mainland China alone, with 700 million people, represents a conquest that dwarfs the achievements of almost any other conqueror. Our own United States has been clearly earmarked as the ultimate target.

Khrushchev has moved his expeditionary forces across the Atlantic to Cuba and his attack is radiating from there. His advance guard is softening up Brazil and laying siege to the Indonesian Archipelago. He is moving aggressively in the important military frontier of outer space.

A small boy sketching these patent conquests on a globe can readily understand them beacuse boys, despite their dreams, can comprehend reality.

The boy's busy parents, because they listen to their leaders and accept the conventional assessments of the prevailing forces in the mainstream of life, do not comprehend these elemental facts.

Today a Rip Van Winkle, awakening after only 5 or 6 years, would be shocked to realize that a Soviet Army was operating out of Cuba and that the West was evacuating Africa.

Khrushchev's conquests are so well wrought that he makes them, at once, seem like retreats to placate possible opposition from the still strong and at the same time the wave of the future to the weak and the marginal peoples.

The conquests are exceedingly well done but all according to a well contrived plan manipulated by professionals who have wormed ther way into the vitals of the West.

Let us look at their present campaign to crush resistance here to their future aggressions. They have now successfully equated any resistance (other than the theoretical which they tolerate) to Communist offensive with right wing activity. To make such abhorrent they have distilled a concoction that is consistenly poured forth copiously for all to see.

This concoction is held up as the right wing. Few people now want to act or even to speak out against the Soviet juggernaut. They are afraid that the word "right" will be applied to them by their conventional friends.

The Communists do not object to opposition in the abstract. They encourage it and reward with the label moderate those people who speak airily of the evils of the Communist system but who are careful not to be specific or to criticize the measured retreats of the policy planners.

This label moderate is now a great asset in business, in politics, and in academic and ecclesiastical activities; but it is lost once the wearer adverts to world war III.

This achievement of Khrushchev's public relations department of making opposition to his advances unfashionable, unbusinesslike, and a political liability is a master stroke.

No wonder he moves remorselessly ahead. No wonder most of our people do not even know that world war III is all around us.

Taxpayers: Paying More but Getting Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I challenged Secretary of Agriculture Freeman—on Tuesday, April 16—to explain why taxpayers are paying more but getting less results in the feed grains program this year, compared with 1962.

In my letter to Freeman, I quoted Department of Agriculture reports which predict Government stockpiles will be reduced far less while payments to farmers are up $98 million.

The stockpile cutback was 393 million bushels for the 1962 marketing year. Payments were $842 million, for a $2.14 average for each bushel cutback. In 1963 the predicted cutback will be only about 107 million bushels. Payments will be $940 million, for an $8.78 average for each bushel cutback.

Why this shocking jump in cost for 1963? Before Congressmen give the feed grains program a new 2-year lease on life, an explanation is in order.

Full text of my letter follows:

APRIL 16, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Next Wednesday the House of Representatives takes up the proposed 2-year extension of the feed grains program. Before debate begins I respectfully suggest you explain why taxpayers are paying more but getting less results in the feed grains program this year, compared with 1962.

According to your Department's "Feed situation" report released April 10, this year's feed grain crop will be 151.6 millions tons—up 8.5 million tons from 1962. After harvest feed grain supplies will be only 2 million tons less than the year before. Feed grain disappearance during the 1963–64 marketing year, according to the report, may "rise a little from the 154 million tons estimated for 1961–62 and 1962–63."

If disappearance holds even, stockpiles would be down only 2.4 million tons when the 1963 marketing year is over. This compares with an 11 million-ton cutback in the 1962 marketing year. Clearly disappearance would have to rise more than "a little" to match the 1962 marketing year cutback.

What makes this especially puzzling is the fact that payments to farmers in the 1963 program are up $98 million from 1962.

In 1962, payments were $842 million with a stockpile cutback of 393 million bushels (11 million tons) for the 1962 marketing year. This figures $2.14 per bushel.

In 1963, payments will be $940 million. If we allow "a little" increase in disappearance, say, 600,000 tons, that would mean stockpiles would be down 3 million tons, or 107 million bushels. This figures $8.78 per bushel. Even if disappearance should climb to 155 million tons, the cost per bushel

would still be $7.74, compared with $2.14 the year before.

These cost figures include only payments to farmers. Realized losses to Commodity Credit Corporation and administrative costs are not included.

Why this shocking jump in cost for 1963? Before Congressmen give the feed grains program a new 2-year lease on life, an explanation is in order.

Midwest Space Month Opens in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the city of Chicago launched its Midwest Space Month in an effort to demonstrate the tremendous opportunities now available for industries engaged in the space program.

Television station WBBM-TV, which broadcasts on channel 2 in Chicago, carried an excellent editorial on this subject last week and I take the privilege of calling it to the attention of my colleagues.

This CBS affiliate has for some time been editorializing on vital issues on a daily feature called Standpoint. Mr. John Madigan, highly respected American journalist who is known to many of my colleagues here in Washington, is the editor of this very important public service program carried daily by WBBM-TV.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Madigan's remarks on the Midwest Space Month in Chicago follow:

MIDWEST SPACE MONTH OPENS IN CHICAGO

Writing an editorial on a civic-type project is much like planning the enterprise. You know the project is important. But to some it will not appear so. How do you convey the message? How do you command attention? How do you prove that it is in people's self-interest to participate?

The solution is to steal a page from the book of those who planned the project. You put the opening spotlight on the top personality involved: a real, live, all-American hero, Col. John Glenn. Then you outline the wondrous displays and exhibits of science and space. Then you close with your message: Space is here to stay; in education, in industry, in business. And Chicago and the Midwest must not be left behind.

This, in capsule form, is the meaning of Midwest Space Month, just opening.

Too many of us know too little of what this space boom is all about. All the activity isn't out beyond the pull of gravity. Each thrust into the atmosphere has multiple reaction, and preaction, here on earth. For our children in school, our economy, our future. The peaceful uses of our space knowledge will be the wonder of the future.

The U.S. Government is committed to a multibillion-dollar space program. World attention will focus on Chicago this month. Not just because of the keynote address of John Glenn, nor the giant Atlas missile to be erected in Congress Plaza, nor the exhibits at the Museum of Science and Industry, and other points.

Behind the tinsel and show will be a straightforward effort to put us into the space picture. It was just last summer that the bad news came to Illinois and the Midwest: we were (and still are) far behind much of the Nation in both military and space contracts.

Somewhat belatedly, businessmen, professional and scientific leaders, officeholders began to move. Mayor Daley flew to Washington. Federal officials flew here. Governor Kerner alerted other Governors. Civic committees became genuinely concerned.

Space Month is a prime result of this activity. In the words of Hale Nelson, Space Month general chairman: "We're focusing attention on Chicago's and the Midwest's potential in the space age." "Television 2" feels the new focus comes none too soon.

Some Federal officials have attributed our area lag to a lack of scientific brains: this about a city in which the first sustained nuclear reaction was accomplished. A scientific aid to President Kennedy told us frankly some months ago that we missed the "scientific bandwagon" because of our concentration on consumer production.

Let's hope that whatever the cause, it is all behind us. That industry, business, civic groups, elected officials, teachers' and students: all of them begin, this month, to operate on that well-known communication: "All systems go."

Space Month ends with a series of meetings and lectures: the Third National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, May 1 through May 9. We urge all Chicago to visit the exhibits: make this a new breakthrough for the Midwest.

Freedom Versus Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by my good friend, Mr. Abraham Schlacht, publisher of the East Side News on Saturday evening, March 23, at the East Side Post No. 4, Jewish War Veterans, 126 Clinton Street, New York City on the occasion of the presentation of an award "for his distinguished service to the people of the East Side of New York and for his untiring efforts on behalf of all veterans." Following the completion of Mr. Schlacht's address, he received a standing ovation, the first of its kind in the history of the post.

FREEDOM VERSUS APATHY

Past Department Commander Leo Price, County Commander Louis Guttman, Past Commander Morris Rothstein, Post Commander Milton Retter, Rabbi Seymour Nulman, Rabbi Arthur Steinberg, friends and members of the East Side Post No. 4, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, I am deeply touched by this gathering, and I find it difficult to express in words the sentiments surging within me. I stand overwhelmed at the thought that the East Side Post No. 4 has selected me as its 1963 recipient "for distinguished service to the community and to the veterans." I shall treasure your award for the remainder of my life. I wish that my beloved brother Harry had been with me tonight to share in this joy.

I should be remiss in my obligations if I failed to pay tribute to Commander Milton Retter, whom you have chosen for three consecutive terms as the standard bearer of this post. Under his leadership this organization has made rapid strides and is winning still greater recognition at the hands of this community. He is truly respected for his simplicity, his modesty and his profound and unstinted dedication to the Jewish war veterans not only of this post but of all posts in the United States as well.

There is another gentleman in our midst whom I have known almost a lifetime, and for whom I hold a deep affection and admiration. For more than 25 years his name and fame have been associated with this post. In his heyday he was a crusading commander, contributing, greatly in point of actual achievements to this militant and civic group. And as the years began to accumulate, and the clouds were slowly gathering, he preferred to step aside and allow younger commanders to assume the helm. Today he is the post's elder statesman, respected everywhere for his fine personal attributes. I should like to make a public confession respecting this gentleman. Had it not been for him, and I say this in sincerity, I might have had no introduction to this post. It was he and he alone who made me acquainted with the fine work that you have been rendering in behalf of the residents of this community. He is no other than Past Commander Morris Rothstein.

As I look about, I see many people from other parts of the city who might not be acquainted with the historical background of this popular post. For them, I should like to mention that this organization has been in existence for a quarter of a century. During that period it has maintained close association with the veterans of the last two World Wars. To its everlasting glory, it has never neglected its soldier members, no matter how difficult the task might have been. Each year it holds memorial services for its deceased members. It makes periodic visits to the disabled veterans at the hospitals, joining with them in prayer in their Friday night services and making them feel that they are not alone.

The East Side Post is also a civic organization. It serves the wants of this community. It is open almost every night of the year. It joins with other civic groups to improve the welfare of our people. Many of you may not know that this post was the first to have passed a resolution calling upon the city to erect a new hospital. Many may not know it was the first veteran group to have recommended the enactment of a law permitting elderly widows or widowers to obtain low-cost housing accommodations. There are some who do not know that this fighting group called upon the city fathers to afford greater police protection to the residents in the housing projects. To this day it maintains a Passover fund for indigent families.

I should like now to strike a serious note which I trust will find a responsive chord in your hearts. Like other veterans organizations, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States performs a vital mission in our land. It is the sentinel of our liberties, the defenders of our way of life.

There are those who take our freedoms for granted, believing that no oppression can befall us. They are mistaken. Little do they realize that the things they take for granted have been acquired at geat costs of blood and treasure. Little do they realize also, that thousands of our American soldiers gave up their lives so that we might enjoy the blessings of peace. Turn the pages of world history and you will note that there have been despots who found their irresistible satisfactions in lust for power, for domination, for territorial aggrandizement and for human enslavement, and with no regard for the lives of countless thousands of innocent subjects sent to the slaughter field.

History demonstrates that when a nation, a race, a people do not guard their freedoms zealously, do not fight every form of discrimination or injustice, despots, tyrants, demogogs inevitably emerge and take over. The curse of the world has been apathy, indifference on the part of the masses, and the consequences have been human servitude.

Human enslavement has been a tragic characteristic of nations. A little reminder of history may prove somewhat refreshing and profitable.

Many of you tonight may recall something of ancient history, which you have studied during your high school days. You will recall that Egypt, Chaldea, Assyria, Media, Babylonia, Persia, Partha, with the exception of early Greece, were regarded by their rulers as masses—as human cattle. These peoples were ruled with a bloody hand. The slightest infraction or violation of an order or a command by a superior officer to a subject meant instantaneous death. Personal freedoms? That was unknown. All the ancient monuments, palaces, amphitheaters, and a multitude of other beautiful structures were erected with naked slave labor.

The only nation in those days where liberty meant something to her citizens was Greece. In thought and in action the Greeks were the best individualized of all the peoples of that period. The other nations were mere collections of humanity indistinguishable in member or in part. But the Greek was differentiated from the rest. He counted one. All other Greeks counted one. The units stood apart. The nebulae of liberty broke into stars in the firmament of Greece. As much as the Greeks loved freedom it was meant for themselves and not for others. He who went to war with a Greek did it with the knowledge that he was running the risk of perpetual slavery.

You will recall that in old Europe and in modern Europe peoples were and still are regarded as slaves. It was nothing unusual for one nation to hold another in subjection. Nor was it unusual for people to be burned at the stake for holding a contrary religious view, or to be beheaded for holding a controversial political opinion.

It is hardly necessary for me to dwell on human slavery which prevails today. Human liberty is as unknown in many parts of the world as it was in the early days of mankind. I venture the guess that there are more slaves today in our present generation than there were in all the previous eras combined.

What does all this teach? It simply means that we must never, never take our liberties for granted. They must be defended at all costs, however slight the injustice, the discrimination, or the violation.

Therefore, to the members of this post, and to all other veteran posts associated with you, it is your patriotic duty to adhere to those freedoms which have made our Nation great, and which have excited the admiration of freedom-loving peoples the world over.

Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today we hear much about depressed areas and I would just like to pass along to the Members of the House some words that appear on the wall of the Ox Bow Inn near Brandenburg, Ky. While I do not know the author, it certainly appears to me that they are apropos in the thinking of the modern day:

New England was a depressed area, too—but the people took all they had—an ax, a plow, two hands, courage, and self-respect—moved out of their depressed area and founded the great West. When it is let alone—when the Government keeps its wasteful hands off—the profit motive leads men to outdo themselves, create their own frontier, grow, and prosper, but when Government decides it is its function to "take care of" the people, it kills ambition, progress, self-respect, and that kills the Nation.

Downgrading of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the downgrading of Congress is dangerous to our society today. We have seen the Supreme Court move into the legislative field. We have seen both the transference of authority from Congress to the Executive, and the assumption of power, almost dictatorial, by the President.

Then we see the various attacks on Congressmen intended, wittingly or unwittingly, to discredit the legislative branch by both false accusations on the one hand and justificable criticism of a few as equally deserved by all.

The downgrading of Congress, of the voice of the people, can only harm our country, as a President, who combines failures with a dictatorial attitude, attempts to consolidate power in his own hands.

Members of Congress should reassert their coequal status.

Further, what this Nation needs is not more new laws but a reevaluation and elimination of many now on the books.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 18, 1963]

KICKING CONGRESS AROUND

The complaints of congressional lethargy are heavier than usual this year; in 3 months the lawmakers have produced practically no significant legislation. The current Easter vacation is sarcastically called a recess within a recess.

Yet, as President Kennedy reminds the critics, Congress is customarily slow-moving at first, picking up speed as a session advances, and there's nothing necessarily wrong with that. Even so, it seems to us the charges of excessive inactivity this time are at the least a little unfair.

Those who condemn apparent inactivity as though it were some kind of crime ought to ask what are the overriding national issues which Congress should be acting on. The issues are by no means automatically what a political administration—any administration—says they are in the form of the bills it presents or its congressional lieutenants sponsor. Many in Congress quite plainly believe this administration does not always fully grasp the needs of the times in either domestic or foreign affairs.

Though the Nation's basic foreign policy is not in question, Members of Congress are understandably disturbed at recurring signs of weakness against the Communists. Certainly there has been no very effective followthrough of last October's strong moves in the Cuban crisis. And it is particularly distasteful to find this Government curbing the activities of anti-Communist Cubans against Castro; no matter how it be rationalized, it doesn't ring right.

Some lawmakers are also unhappy about the deterioration of relations with a couple of America's important allies, whatever the extent of the Government's responsibility for it. Nor are they are convinced that foreign aid is as potent a weapon against communism as its proponents claim.

In short, these are aspects of the world struggle, with all its fateful potentialities. It is proper for individual members to criticize what they think wrong, for committees to inquire into what is going on in defense and foreign affairs, for Congress as a whole to debate and propose other courses. And it hardly adds up to inactivity.

There isn't any reason, either, for Congress to rush through the various domestic proposals. The Nation is not in a depression calling for measures like a Youth Conservation Corps or enormous new public works outlays. If a lot of members believe such projects would be useless or worse, they are entitled to that opinion; certainly they have not been made aware of widespread public support for the administration's domestic program in general.

As for the tax reduction and reform proposals, they are so needlessly complicated that no one ever suggested they could get quick congressional action. Many a taxpayer would have reason to regret it if some of the recommended changes were approved uncritically in the name of action.

Even more important is the question of the administration's basic economic approach—the theory that the sound way to expand economic activity is through large, continuing, planned Federal deficits to finance rapidly increasing Federal spending and encroachments. This is completely at variance with the belief of many in Congress and the Nation that the economy and its financial structure would be healthier with far less interference and inflationary fuel. Should they be silent and docile?

The economic issue, now posed so baldly by the administration, is indeed one of the overriding issues before the Nation, for it affects the value of the people's dollar, the international balance of payments and the military power which must rest on economic strength. It deserves more of a hearing than it is getting in Congress or elsewhere, but at least Congress cannot be said to be complacently ignoring it.

So we think the annual sport of kicking Congress around for alleged inertia can be overdone. Over the years Congress has probably been too active in loading laws on the people. But it ought to be evident that a legislature obsessed with action for its own sake would be bad for the Nation and unbecoming to its political values.

Birmingham Museum of Art Making Tremendous Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Birmingham are very proud of

our Birmingham Museum of Art which was set up in 1951. Over the past few years it has grown both as to the quality of artistic items which it houses and in its physical facilities. In 1959 a beautiful museum building was erected as a result of a bequest from Mrs. Oscar Wells.

Many Members will be interested in reading the following article which appeared in the Birmingham magazine about the work and activities of the Birmingham Museum of Art. I insert the article which appeared in the March issue of Birmingham magazine herewith.

The article follows:

A PURPOSE AND A PLAN

The Birmingham Museum of Art was created with a purpose and a plan, setting it apart from similar institutions which have grown by accident. It is the Southeast's finest art museum and one of the finest small museum buildings anywhere.

Its purpose is to bring to a lusty young city the art of the ages; to bring the culture of all the centuries to a region going forward with the space age but inheriting the gracious background of the pioneer South.

This purpose was given momentum by the bequest of funds for the construction of the Oscar Wells Memorial Building, so located and designed as to be accessible, logically installed, and comfortable to visit. About 100,000 visitors each year attest to the validity of the purpose.

The purpose was furthered by the great gift from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation of 53 objects of Renaissance art valued at over $2 million; the Rives Collection of Palestinian art; many fine English and Dutch paintings, particularly a spectacular Rubens; the Lamprecht Collection of iron art loaned by the American Cast Iron Pipe Co.; and nearly 3,000 objects ranging from English silver, European porcelain, Oriental bronze and jade, to African weapons and American Indian objects.

The plan is to provide facilities for full enjoyment in the artistic field of the humanities; to give cultural service from the space city of Huntsville to the Port-of-all Nations at Mobile, and to contiguous areas; to create a shining peak upon the Pyramid of Progress whose base is Birmingham's Southern Research Institute, its medical center, its three colleges and university extension center and its unequalled library system; and to maintain a flow of alert, eager, and interested people from the industry and commerce of the city.

The plan further envisages expansion into new fields of art; continuous growth of the museum's physical plant, at least doubling its present exhibition facilities; adding a fine arts auditorium; providing more space for teaching; and raise the standards of the present collections.

Although the standard of the museum's collections is high, it has few works by the great masters; but most of its objects of art are excellent examples of the work of well-known and significant painters, sculptors, and craftsmen.

The Birmingham Museum's service is manifold: The museum is open free to all the people 7 days a week. Visitors from every State of the Union and scores of foreign countries come to see its permanent collections, its many tailor-made exhibitions, its local and regional shows and its many other interesting circulated displays.

In its educational service, the museum offers classes in painting, sculpture, ceramics, and weaving to adults and children; guided tours for schoolchildren and other groups; catalogs, bulletins, and brochures.

Each month there are addresses on art by distinguished lecturers at the museum. Each week television programs are broadcast over the Alabama Educational Television Network which covers Alabama and parts of adjoining States. A special service to surrounding cities and towns is offered by its unique "circuit riders" organization.

Many organizations, many volunteer workers and many enthusiastic friends assist in all phases of the museum's services.

In any time of complexity, it is heartwarming to find a community working with unity toward ideals. To lift its people into the peace brought by the contemplation of beauty is the real purpose of any museum. There is an unparalleled possibility, in this wide region burgeoning with a space age economic revolution, to offer to this and future generations the means for their pursuit of happiness.

This is the purpose and plan of the Birmingham Museum of Art.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BIRMINGHAM MUSEUM OF ART

The museum board of the city of Birmingham was created by an ordinance adopted August 1, 1950, which has been amended several times and was last amended October 9, 1962.

The museum board consists of 15 members and the comptroller of the city of Birmingham as ex officio member. The board has the power to choose its chairman or its secretary, or both, from among its members or from nonmembers. If a nonmember be chosen chairman or secretary, then such officer becomes an ex officio member of the board when approved by the city commission. The present chairman of the board, William M. Spencer, was a nonmember of the board at the time of his election January 25, 1955.

The members of the board are: James A. Simpson, lawyer; member of the firm of Lange, Simpson, Robinson & Somerville; Joseph F. Johnston, lawyer; member of the firm of Cabaniss & Johnston; Harry J. McCormack, real estate; president and treasurer of Ramsey-McCormack Land Co., Inc., and Ensley Land Co.; Ellen Gregg Ingalls, president of the Ingalls Foundation; a director of the Ingalls Iron Works founded by her late husband, Robert I. Ingalls; Thad Holt, chairman of the board of Metalplate & Coatings, Inc.; television consultant to U.S. Information Agency; R. Hugh Daniel, president and treasurer of Daniel Construction Co. of Alabama; Pauline Tidmore, artist and civic worker; wife of J. Erskine Tidmore, sales manager of Industrial Electric Co.; J. J. F. Steiner, real estate appraiser; Lydia Eustis Rogers, organizer of the Women's Lecture Committee of the museum and of the Museum Store; her late husband, William McM. Rogers, was a member of the law firm of White, Bradley, Arant, All & Rose; and later, president of the Birmington Electric Co.; Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., publisher of the Birmingham News; Mervyn H. Sterne, investment banker, member of the firm of Sterne, Agee & Leach; William J. Rushton, president of Protective Life Insurance Co.

The following three directors are officers of Birmingham Art Association, Inc.; Catherine K. Hammond, president of Birmingham Art Association, Inc., and a director of Alabama By-Products Corp., founded by her late husband, Horace Hammond, and associates; Elizabeth Plummer, vice president of Birmingham Art Association; her husband, Frank Plummer, is chairman of the board and president of Birmingham Trust National Bank; Margaret G. Livingston, vice president of Birmingham Art Association, Inc.; her husband, James A. Livingston, Jr., is vice president and actuary of Liberty National Life Insurance Co.

Ex-officio members: S. Grady Fullerton, comptroller of the city of Birmingham; William M. Spencer, chairman of the Museum Board; lawyer, director of Industrial and Financial Corporations and Farmer.

Director of the museum: Richard F. Howard, director of the museum, was graduated from Harvard College, to which he returned for graduate work from 1929–31; he has taken special courses at Cornell, the University of Pennsylvania and at Yale.

He served as staff psychologist of the Philadelphia Museum of Art from 1932 to 1935; he was a director of the Museum of Art in Dallas, Tex., from 1935 until 1942 when he was called into active service of the U.S. Army as captain, artillery, and rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel before 1946. His next assignment was chief of monuments, Fine Arts and Archives for the Office of Military Government for Germany, United States. This assignment carried with it the full responsibility of returning hundreds of thousands of works of art to the countries from which they had been removed by the Germans during the war, reconstitution of German art agencies, disposal of heirless art property in Germany, and liaison with 17 foreign governments. After his return to the United States, he became director of the Des Moines Art Center, and in 1951 he became the first director of the Birmingham Museum of Art.

Howard is the author of many articles and pamphlets, including the standard "Museum Security" published by the American Association of Museums, and a number of specialized articles on "Lighting." He has given numerous lectures, radio and television talks.

Valuation of museum collections: The estimated book value of the objects of art belonging to the museum is approximately $2,500,000. The same are insured for above $2 million. The estimated market value of the objects of art is approximately $4 million.

Affiliated organizations: The Birmingham Art Association, now a corporation, was organized in 1908. It prompted the idea of a museum for Birmingham, and its principal object now is being of aid and assistance to the museum. It has approximately 1,000 adult members and 500 junior members. The art association sponsors evening lectures, a sidewalk art show for the benefit of the museum; an annual members' nonjury show and an annual members' jury show, both held in the museum, and other cultural activities.

The Women's Lecture Committee, and agency of the museum board, sponsors lectures by eminent authorities on subjects pertaining to various phases of art; it also provides volunteers to operate the museaum store and renders other services in connection with the promotion and development of the museum.

The Circuit Riders, a unique organization, circulates exhibitions of art in population centers throughout the State, and, upon request, will supply a lecturer on any art related subject to clubs or other cultural organizations.

The Beaux Arts Committee, a corporation, conducts a Beaux Arts Ball, the opening event of the annual Birmingham Festival of Arts. The net proceeds of the ball are given to the museum.

The Red Mountain Garden Club built the museum's formal garden and maintains it.

In addition, the museum receives aid from many other organized cultural and social groups.

THE COLLECTIONS

The collections of the Birmingham Museum of Art are being built up in a logical manner from the greatest antiquity to the most recent contemporary work. They are more fully described in the booklet "Guide to the Collections" and in the catalog of the Samuel H. Kress collection, but may be outlined as follows:

There is an unique collection of Paleolithic and Neolithic tools and points from Palestine.

Classical antiquity is represented by a few Greek vases, some sculpture and pottery from Greek and Roman Palestine.

The Far East is represented by a variety of minor Chou dynasty bronzes, Han, T'ang, and Sung pottery and celadon, and Korean bronzes, and recent Japanese and Chinese ceramics and textiles. Although lacking in monumental sculpture and painting, the museum contains a superb 10th century Indian relief and a Sung lacquer Buddha.

The Near East is well represented by a long series of pottery vases, lamps, and small bronzes from Palestine, but, except for a fine group of Luristan bronzes, there is no Mesopotamian and only a little Iranian material. An excellent group of Egyptian pieces is on loan but few of them are owned by the museum.

European romanesque and gothic sculpture is barely represented. The Kress collection contains an excellent group of Italian paintings of gothic and renaissance periods, and there is a scattering of objects and paintings from other regions including tapestries, stained glass and furniture. English portraiture is well represented, but there is no 19th century French work. Modern European painting is not represented. There is, however, an excellent selection (nearly 300 prints) of engraving, etching and lithography.

Art of the Americas has a good start. More than a dozen fine pre-Columbian pots, figures and other objects provide the base for a still growing collection of Middle America. Indigenous pre-Columbian is available locally (Moundville, Talladega, Mobile Bay and other sites) and the collections are growing. Unique is a collection of approximately 100 named projectile points which have been found in Southeastern United States, principally in Alabama; this collection covers a span of more than 10,000 years. Dakotah and northwest coast 19th century material is good and in some quantity. The Southwest is poorly represented. Contemporary American painting is mostly regional but with a fair sprinkling of national figures. Lacking is 17th and 19th century American material. There is a large and fine collection of English and American silver and a considerable amount of European porcelain.

The Lamprecht Collection of Iron Art, furnished by American Cast Iron Pipe Co. is exceptional.

ACTIVITIES

The facilities of the Birmingham Museum of Art are continuously in use. Many of the civic, cultural, and social groups and clubs of metropolitan Birmingham hold one meeting in the museum each year. The museum places a condition on all such meetings that some phase of art be incorporated in the program.

An interesting development of this activity is that, during the past year, several clubs from other sections of the State have requested permission to hold one of their meetings in the museum to hear a lecture on some collection in which its members are particularly interested. It might be said that the museum is becoming the drawing room of the people.

Nearly 100,000 visitors from every State in the Union and many foreign countries visit the museum yearly. It is considered to have the finest and most interesting collection of art objects within a radius of 500 miles, and popular interest in art is constantly increasing. It is the desire of the museum board to stimulate such interest by enlarging and increasing the quality of its collections.

Exhibition programs are designed to fill gaps in existing collections and to provide stimulating events. At least one or two major exhibitions each year are hand picked by the director to illustrate a theme (examples are "Steel, Iron, and Men," "The Uses of Color in Art," "Spain Speaks," "The Archaic Smile," etc.). Three competitive exhibitions for local and regional artists are held each year. Occasional one-man shows of national or of local interest fill in, and a relatively few readymade shows from circulating agencies round out the program. The permanent collections are frequently rearranged to improve their effectiveness and to call attention to otherwise neglected facets of them.

The State of Alabama had the first educational television network in the entire United States. It was planned and set up by a member of the museum board. It covers the entire State and parts of Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Florida. The museum director is presently giving a series of 36 weekly half-hour programs over the network, which the museum board believes to be an effective means of stimulating interest in art, inculcating art appreciation and building good public relations. Wiring for television is installed in the museum building, and the board has plans that when color television receiving sets become more generally in use, it will make arrangements to telecast in color the best and most interesting objects of art in the museum.

The museum cooperates with school authorities, both local and throughout the State, in making available planned tours for school children. Visits by school children and college students are always welcomed and encouraged. Frequently, college and university professors assign work to their students to be done in the Museum of Art, and, when requested, the director gives lectures on the history of art and related subjects.

OPERATING FUNDS

The city of Birmingham makes an annual appropriation to pay for maintenance and upkeep of the museum building and salaries of its employees, excepting the director. In addition, the museum board secures private funds for miscellaneous expenses, including cash gifts earmarked for special purposes, such as the purchase of specified paintings and acquisition of designated museum facilities.

The museum has no endowment fund.

I Am Afraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. R. E. Lawrance of Los Altos, Calif., I submit an article by Mr. Raymond C. Ellis, entitled "I Am Afraid," which appeared in the January 1963 issue of the New Age.

The article follows:

I AM AFRAID

(By Raymond C. Ellis)

If we were to see this country from a great height, about 25 years before the opening of the American Revolution, we would find a thin line of settlements running along the Atlantic seaboard beginning about at Augusta, Maine, where Fort Weston stood, all the way down the coast and into Georgia. About 3 million people lived in these colonies. There were only four cities—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston. Charleston was the center of literature, of music, and of culture. New York City did not extend beyond city hall and had a population at the time of the American Revolution of about 25,000. The people were small tradesmen, farmers and fishermen. They lived in widely distributed towns and villages with their trim and well built houses. They had come to these shores for quite definite reasons and have given us a heritage of three fundamental principles upon which to base our lives.

First, these people believed in God and served God. All along the coast are the beautiful architectural gems dedicated to God, that were built with the money, the faith, the love, and the heart's blood of people who realized they could not exist without an awareness of a Heavenly Father who was a very present help in time of trouble and who would never leave them nor forsake them.

Second, they believed in work. There was no social security or unemployment insurance when the Pilgrims landed in Plymouth. They had to work to live, and they toiled through the long hours of the day from dawn until dark.

Third, they believed in and loved liberty. As one advanced through the settlements along the seacoast and beyond tidewater, there one would find in the long, narrow, trough-like valleys of the Alleghenies, running from north to south, a desheveled fringe of settlements. The people were mainly of Scotch-Irish origin, who had passed through the towns of the tidewater settlements and carved out homes in a virgin wilderness.

When a settler entered one of these narrow valleys he first felled the great trees of the virgin forest, built his lowbrowed log hut, and sowed his grain among the stumps of the fallen monarchs. There, with his family, usually miles from his nearest neighbor, he lived a life of appalling loneliness. He had no one to depend on but himself. He raised his own food, hunted his own meat, made his own clothes, and worked from dawn to dark just to keep himself and family alive. On all sides rose the dark and mysterious forest like a palisade. It was an area of perpetual twilight, danger, and mystery. No one knew how far it extended. When he left the sunlight of his clearing he entered a sort of noonday gloaming. The sunlight seldom penetrated through the foliage of the great trees, the branches of which interlaced and shrouded the ground in a gray half light. There was little undergrowth in the virgin forest and a man would often ride horseback at breakneck speed among and between trees 6 and 8 feet in diameter. Looking down from above, the forest stretched out, league upon endless league to the westward, nobody knew how far. It was a leafy maze rolling over hill and valley in billows of interminable green. In glimpses only was this wild primeval world revealed, with its dark green mountains flecked with morning mist and the more distant summits penciled against the horizon in dreamy blue.

On every side lurked danger in its most horrible form. No one knew when the uncertain peace with the Indian tribes would be broken. Without the slightest warning the raids would start, cabins go up in flames, women and children butchered without discrimination or carried away in captivity. It is only by reading the detail of blood as set down in the untutored words of those who saw and felt it can we have even a faint understanding of the terror which haunted their lives—the mortal fear of women and children, waking and sleeping, in the solitude and loneliness of their wilderness homes. Theodore Roosevelt in his "Winning of the West" stated that it was impossible for anyone to live any length of time on the frontier without having lost close relations in the neverending Indian wars.

After the defeat of Braddock, outside of where Pittsburgh now stands, the frontier

was aflame. The sufferings of the people fleeing to the forts at Bedford and Carlyle is indescribable. Washington saw it and was a part of it. He was so overcome that he wrote in a letter to his brother Lawrence the following words: "The supplicating tears of the women and moving petitions of the men melt me into such deadly sorrow that I solemnly declare, if I know my own mind, I could offer myself a willing sacrifice to the butchering enemy, provided that would contribtue to the people's ease."

Why, we ask, would any people undergo such suffering and hardships? The answer is because of a consuming passion for liberty. They loved it and were willing to pay its price in blood and toil and sweat and tears. It should be remembered that they were but a generation or two away from the stake, the rack, and the torture chamber. They could understand what liberty meant and were willing to pay its price, and they knew that part of that price was eternal vigilance.

We should never forget that in their veins ran the blood of men who wrung the Magna Carta from Prince John at Runnymede. In their veins ran the blood of men who fought with Oliver Cromwell in England for civil liberty. In their veins ran the blood of men who stood behind John Knox in Scotland. In their veins ran the blood of men who rallied behind Martin Luther when he nailed his 95 theses to the door of the church at Wittenberg. In their veins ran the blood of men who had fled to this country from France at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. In their veins ran the blood of men who under William of Orange and Maurice threw off the Spanish yoke in Holland.

With such a background, they knew the value as well as the price that people must pay for liberty. As these people gradually moved westward, they marked their love of liberty in the very names of the towns and villages they founded—Liberty, Freedom, Independence, Freedom Crossing, Liberty Corners. When we look back across the years and realize what these people felt and did, there is no American who cannot say with a deep sense of pride, "Yea, I have a goodly heritage."

Today the world is in a state of change and flux. It is quite evident that civilization is balanced on the thin knife edge of possible destruction. We, too, live in perilous times, and our Nation and the world is in grave danger. Of that, there can be no question. But, grave as the dangers may be that threaten us from without, they are minor compared to those that threaten us from within: apathy, indifference, complacency. These are the great American crimes. I do not underestimate the dangers from without, but I am convinced that no power from without can beat us. But we can beat ourselves.

I am much more afraid of the Americans than I am of the Russians.

I am afraid of Americans who have become victims of apathy, indifference, and complacency.

I am afraid of Americans who have become indifferent to the decay of national ideals—who have become so accustomed to every form of political chicanery, graft, and corruption that these are accepted with little protest as a normal part of our life.

I am afraid of Americans who are apathetic to the tender loving care with which, so it seems, the Red, the pink, the traitor, and other subversive elements are treated by our courts, from the Supreme Court down.

I am afraid of Americans who have become so hardened to all types of crime, including murder, that the chief offense is no longer the criminal act itself but in having been found out.

I am afraid of Americans who are indifferent to the use of the ballot—who don't vote on election day on the theory that one vote more or less won't count. Yet by one vote Edward Everett was elected Governor of Massachusetts. By the late returns from a few districts in Coney Island, New York State went Democratic, and Grover Cleveland became President of the United States. In this room today there are many who can recall the election eve when Charles Evans Hughes went to bed thinking—with everyone else—that he had been elected President of the United States. Then, in the small hours of the morning, the late returns rolled in from Humboldt County in northern California. California went Democratic and Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States.

I am afraid of Americans, who ought and who do know better, who give lipservice to the fight against inflation and then, for financial profit, do all they can to promote it.

I am afraid of Americans, who also know better, who succumb to the siren call of policies of fiscal idiocy and sell the economic future of their children down the river.

I am afraid of Americans who are unconcerned that better than 4 out of every 10 boys called up for military service are unfit mentally, morally or physically to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States.

I am afraid of Americans who put first things last and last things first, who underpay their ministers and teachers, who, if we were to have a recession, would first economize by cutting their contributions to churches, hospitals, and schools, and later economize by reducing their liquor and luxury bills.

I am afraid of Americans who have given way to the corrosive force of luxury, and who have put their trust in material things. No one on this earth owns anything. We do not own our house, our bank account, or the stocks and bonds registered in our name. We are only stewards of the things we seem to possess. We cannot take them with us.

No nation in history has survived if it has turned its back on the moral and spiritual values responsible for whatever of greatness to which it may have attained. We would do well to remember this basic historical fact, as well as that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and that we will be the "land of the free" only as long as we are the "home of the brave."

"My lines have fallen in pleasant places." No people ever had their lines fall in more pleasant places. No people ever had a more goodly heritage than the American people. We would do well to return to the ancient landmarks of our heritage that are important, the things that are permanent and the things that are real, before it is too late. Time is short and time is always running out. The reverence of God, the dignity of work, and the priceless heritage of freedom.

No people need be concerned if God is their King; if work is a part of the warp and woof of their personalities and characters; if deep down within the hearts of all there is a consuming passion for liberty, freedom of thought, and independence—and a willingness to pay the price therefor.

This is our heritage, founded upon a rock which no storm or wind can shake, and which no American should ever forget.

Strengthening Rural West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11 I had the honor of listening to an excellent address by our former colleague from Nebraska, the Honorable Larry Brock, who now serves as assistant administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

Speaking at Parkersburg, W. Va., at ceremonies closing a $330,000 loan to the Claywood Park Soil and Water Association for a new water system, Larry Brock ably outlined some of the great progress made in West Virginia through the efforts of the Farmers Home Administration. I would also like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the leadership of the State director of FHA in West Virginia, the Honorable James Manchin, who was also present at this occasion.

Administrator Brock's address follows:

STRENGTHENING WEST VIRGINIA

I have been looking forward to being with you today, to participate in the closing of this $330,000 Farmers Home Administration loan to your Claywood Park Soil and Water Association.

West Virginia is indeed a beautiful State, populated by hard working people. But times here have not been easy. Pockets of severe and prolonged unemployment in the cities, and underemployment on the smaller farms, have been a serious drag on your State's economy.

Some mineral deposits have been exhausted, oil has replaced coal, automation has cut the work force in many mines, and some industry has moved away to better locations and more efficient plants.

In human terms especially, the costs caused by these factors have been heavy.

But I think, and recent developments such as the Government report last week on the reduction in unemployment bears me out, that the economy of West Virginia and States with similar problems is on the upswing. From a high of 17 percent in January 1961, unemployment has dropped to less than 14 percent in January 1963, not a big change, but certainly a move in the right direction.

However, unemployment and underemployment problems remain formidable and call for every effort, at every level of government. We have an administration in Washington that cares deeply and is determined to overcome these problems and to create a better economic environment for the community. President Kennedy personally expressed these aims when he said in one of his messages to the Congress, "We must begin now to lay the foundations for livable, efficient, and attractive communities of the future."

Foresighted leaders in the Congress like your Senator ROBERT BYRD, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH and Congressman KEN HECHLER believe as the President and have supported and provided favorable legislation which will help the community attain economic recovery.

I am proud that I served with these gentlemen in the Congress and am personally honored that Congressman HECHLER could take time from his busy schedule to be present here tonight.

Senator BYRD, Senator RANDOLPH and Congressman HECHLER have been unfaltering in their belief and promotion of programs that will help West Virginia.

The Housing Act of 1961, the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the accelerated public works program are a few of the impressive arsenal of weapons which Senator BYRD, Senator RANDOLPH and Congressman HECHLER have supported and which are available to hard-pressed communities. On the local level these officials have been supported by the members of your county

court, house of delegates and other officials.

The community can use these tools to tackle local problems in a coordinated way that takes into account the need for more jobs and for more planning for community development. The two needs are very much interrelated.

The primary goal of the Farmers Home Administration's program in West Virginia, and in the Nation, is a strong family farm and healthy rural community. We seek to strengthen rural America, and we denounce any proposals that would reduce farm income, and force farmers and residents of rural communities and small towns to migrate to other areas.

Mr. James Manchin, our very capable State director for the Farmers Home Administration here in West Virginia, and Judge Robert Hedrick, our State chairman, tell me that the loan we are making today will finance facilities for enough good water for nearly 300 families and a school.

This water system will be an asset to the Parkersburg area and to the State.

Your communities have made aggressive use of our loan program during the last few years to finance improved water supplies.

Our Farmers Home Administration staff in West Virginia has worked diligently to finance the water systems you need. They have paid particular attention to the engineering of good systems and to the extension of waterlines deep into rural areas in an effort to serve every possible family lacking good water.

They have worked hard, too, helping your local leaders to organize a water system that will give good service for your children and their children.

Special honors should also be paid to your own leadership for their efforts in arranging for this loan. Congress can provide the legislation and we can see that the credit services are made available but it takes community leaders, aggressive in nature, with initiative and imagination, to capitalize on these services and use them for a worthy purpose. I am referring now to leaders like Bill R. Pfalzgraf, your attorney, Charles A. Townsend, president of the Claywood Park Water District; J. H. Milam, engineer for the association; Bill Brown, mayor of Parkersburg; and Bill Muncey, water commissioner for Parkersburg. They worked closely with our FHA County Supervisor, Bob W. McGlothlin, and FHA County Clerk, Frances Start, providing the leadership necessary so that this loan could be made.

Even though you have only scratched the surface, your State has been one of the most active in securing Farmers Home Administration financing for water development. Communities in your State previously plagued with atrocious water problems—hard water, iron water, sulfur water, polluted water, or worse still, no water at all, have used FHA loan funds to build modern water systems.

Our Farmers Home Administration staff in West Virginia has made five loans, similar to this one today, to rural groups since July 1961. Nearly 1,000 of your families are or will benefit directly and communities once face to face with extinction are now growing and prospering—providing attractive locations for industrial, commercial, and residential development. These loans total approximately $1 million. Every single one has been fabulously successful.

Mr. Manchin tells me that his staff is processing eight additional loans to groups.

We are proud of the improvements that our loans have helped you finance within the State.

Our agency can and will be of even further service to you in the future. In addition to loans for water systems and watershed development, we have the credit tools today to finance the operation, development, and purchase of family farms, and to finance new homes in rural areas with special provisions to provide homes and rental housing for elderly persons. We also can make loans to farmers for developing and operating income-producing outdoor recreation on family farms. Loans can be made too, to small towns and other rural groups to make long-range changes of land use—shifting it into use for outdoor recreation, grazing, forestry, and other purposes. This might include lakes and ponds for swimming, boating, and fishing, or facilities for camping, picnicking, and horseback riding, any of the healthful outdoor recreation sports that we all enjoy and should take a more active part in.

These loans, especially those to finance income-producing recreation enterprises on farms, should have a special attraction here in West Virginia.

Because of modern transportation facilities, your State is strategically located near large industrial and urban centers in Pennsylvania and Ohio.

In the next 10 years, three interstate highways will go through West Virginia—interstate 77 extending south from Cleveland to Charleston to Charlotte, N.C., interstate 79 extending from Erie by way of Pittsburgh to Charleston; and interstate 64 extending from Newport News by way of Richmond to Beckley, W. Va., and on to Charleston and St. Louis—to make West Virginia easily accessible from all directions and give you a better chance to benefit from more recreation facilities. This means cash in the pockets of West Virginians.

Your natural landscape, with its mountains and valleys, streams and rivers, furnish the atmosphere city people look for on their weekends and vacations. Farmers Home Administration recreation loans are brand new and I am sure you will be hearing more about them as time goes by.

West Virginia stands on the threshold of a new era and is in a position to capitalize on our Nation's fast growth. The Nation's population is increasing at the rate of 340 persons an hour, 8,000 per day, 3 million per year. Total population will number somewhere between 330 and 385 million by the year 2000, approximately double the 187 million persons now living in the United States. Along with our Nation's fast population growth will come an increasing demand for more industrial goods and recreation facilities. West Virginia can play a large part in filling these demands and can someday be a virtual industrial and recreation mecca of the East. It now remains for each and every one of you to continue to pursue with vigor and imagination the better community that can be yours.

Goldwater Can Save America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most obvious open secrets in today's political picture is the popularity of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

People see him as a real man, no pantywaist. He is vigorous, dynamic, articulate—a composite personality embodying high-powered political sex appeal.

Most important, BARRY GOLDWATER is a self motivated thinker, not a "me-tooer." People are tired of me-tooism in political life. They are tired of those Republicans who damn the Democrats and then ask a little less of the same tried old Federal hand-out and control.

People want a change. To them BARRY's positive, constructive, conservative do-it-ourselves philosophy of traditional constitutionalism and limited government, stressing individual initiative and importance, is like fresh air in the smoke-filled room.

In a two party society where liberal-radicals dominate the Democratic Party. The Republican Party will not attract votes and voters by offering a little less of the "big Federal Government" philosophy. The Democrats have a corner on that market. Only a constructive alternative can challenge the neo-socialism of the Democrats.

Republicans will never beat the Democrats at their game, of pumppriming deficit spending unbalanced budgets of the New Deal—Fair Deal—New Frontier philosophies.

Republicans will win the Presidency with an unabashed unapologetic conservative who defends and preaches capitalism and U.S. sovereignty.

BARRY GOLDWATER offers the alternative needed today when capitalism is in a life or death struggle with socialism at home and abroad, BARRY GOLDWATER clearly champions capitalism. President Kennedy does not and cannot.

When our "Republic within a democracy" is being assaulted by alien forces at home and abroad, BARRY GOLDWATER is the living embodiment of a Representative of the Republic. President Kennedy is not.

At a time when the sovereignty of the United States is under attack by one-worlders, and U.N. advocates at home and abroad, and at a time when our foreign aid is being used to subsidize socialism, communism, and neutralism—all against us, BARRY GOLDWATER can champion in clear, unmistakable fashion U.S. sovereignty, and one leadership of the free world. President Kennedy has not, is not, and will not.

The Democratic Party and its titular head, President Kennedy no longer can champion capitalism, the Republic, or U.S. sovereignty. BARRY GOLDWATER heading the Republican team can indeed by word and deed, in letter and spirit, offer the people the clear choice of Americanism as against one-worldism.

BARRY GOLDWATER not only can win the Presidency, but can carry with him into office a Republican Congress.

No matter the differences in clashing viewpoints of differing Republicans, the unity of purpose, ideals, and creed between Republicans far outdistances their differences, as compared to the irreconcilable clashes of viewpoint of Democratic Party members.

This unity is clear in the Republican Party behind BARRY GOLDWATER. No political force can withstand it today. The list of failures of the Kennedy administration, and the attempts to secure dictatorial power comprise so damning an indictment the people will clearly support BARRY GOLDWATER if given the chance. The U.S. News & World Report carries an interesting article about BARRY

GOLDWATER that should be of interest to all patriotic freedom-loving Americans, including members of the Republican Party.

The article follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, April 29, 1963]

DRAFT GOLDWATER MOVE STARTS—ITS MEANING

(Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the Arizona conservative, is more and more a man to watch for the Republican presidential nomination in 1964. Influential Republicans are rallying to his support. A draft movement is in the making).

A sudden surge of interest in Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona is showing itself inside the Republican Party.

A draft GOLDWATER move is taking shape. The Arizona Senator no longer is discouraging groups who want him to have the Republican presidential nomination in 1964. At the same time, Senator GOLDWATER plans no effort to obtain the nomination for himself.

Why the sudden rise in Goldwater sentiment among Republicans? The answer seems to come in two parts:

First, a growing number of Republicans are said to feel there is nothing to be gained in bidding for the liberal vote by nominating Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York. The idea is that Mr. GOLDWATER would draw clear issues against President Kennedy and assure a dramatic campaign.

Second, this factor is at work: Word is being passed among Republican leaders that Mr. GOLDWATER would be assured more electoral votes than Governor Rockefeller. The claim is that the Senator would sweep much of the South as a starter, while Mr. Rockefeller would have little hope of carrying more than a few Southern or border States.

Also there is a feeling among some Republicans that, by drawing forthright issues between conservatism and liberalism, Mr. GOLDWATER would help increase the conservtive strength in Congress.

ENOUGH TO WIN?

The figures show combination of electoral votes that Goldwater supporters say can be put together to assure the election of the Arizona Senator if he is nominated by the Republican Convention.

Behind all this is the suddenly increasing belief of many Republican leaders that the conservative Mr. GOLDWATER carries great political weight in the conservative South. The Senator would leave it to the States to decide their own social and law-enforcement problems.

It also is occurring to Republican leaders that, if they nominate Mr. Rockefeller, with his strong civil rights program, one result would be tickets of independent electors who could deny the votes of a number of Southern States to either party.

Thus crosscurrents now at work assure excitement in the 1964 election year.

President Kennedy will go into the campaign as the favorite to win a second term. Only twice in this century has an incumbent President been defeated for relection—once when the Bull Moose movement resulted in the defeat of President Taft in 1912, and again in 1932 when Herbert Hoover lost in the depths of a depression.

In the past, however, Republicans hardly ever have had a chance to carry States in the South and some border States. Goldwater strategists, however, now see a good prospect of taking 100 or more electoral votes—of 270 needed to elect—in this political territory, once closed to Republican candidates.

Democratic strategy since 1932 has been to count on most or all of the South, and add to that the big industrial States with their large populations of union members and minority voting groups.

This time the Goldwater supporters see evidence of some disaffection even in big city States.

Ohio, with 26 votes, has been in a strong Republican trend and is tightly organized for that party. Illinois barely gave its electoral vote—26 in the next election—to John F. Kennedy in 1960, and a recent mayoral election in Chicago revealed a sag in Democratic strength.

Wisconsin, with 12 electoral votes, is fair game for the Republicans. So are Iowa and many other States in the farm belt from the Dakotas down through Kansas and Oklahoma. The Mountain States have relatively few electoral votes, but recent trends in most of these States have been sharply Republican.

Adding votes from the west coast and northern New England, the Goldwater people figure that, with breaks, their man could amass a total of 280 electoral votes. That would put him in.

Many, of course, will not agree with that figure of 280 votes.

JFK'S BIG ONES

These estimates concede the big industrial States to President Kennedy. They give him such prizes as New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan and Minnesota, among others. They add up the President's electoral total as 196 votes—74 short of victory.

In addition, they call California, with 40 votes, undecided. That State is to be a major 1964 battleground in any event. At present it has a Democratic Governor and a strong Democratic organization. Republicans are fighting among themselves.

Most importantly, the Goldwater people estimate that, if Mr. Rockefeller ran against President Kennedy, the Governor could expect no more than 191 votes, or 79 short of victory. They give most of the big industrial States, including New York and California, to Mr. Kennedy. They concede Mr. Rockefeller virtually nothing in the South.

The comparison between Rockefeller versus Kennedy and GOLDWATER versus Kennedy is to become the central theme of the Goldwater push. Already the slogan "Rockefeller can't win" is being raised. It is to be emphasized, quoted repeatedly as convention time approaches.

ECHOES OF 1952?

It is recalled that just such a slogan was raised against the late Senator Robert A. Taft in 1952. Many politicians think it was highly important among the influences that turned the convention of that year to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

At the same time, the figures intended to show that Senator GOLDWATER can take the election are to be dinned into the ears of the convention delegates.

One Goldwater man puts it this way:

"There is a gradual realization that the situation in the South has added a new domension to nomination prospects. GOLDWATER—not Kennedy or Rockefeller—would start off with a big chunk of votes, almost the Solid South. That's a tremendous advantage."

First, of course, the Goldwater backers must obtain the nomination for their man. On the basis of history alone, most politicians think this may not be easily done.

Since 1936—when Alfred M. Landon was nominated—the liberal element of the party has prevailed in conventions. It nominated Wendell L. Willkie, Thomas E. Dewey, General Eisenhower and Richard M. Nixon.

Most conservative elements went along with these choices. Their effort was to provide a candidate who could cut into the coalition of labor and minority groups that had been built by Franklin D. Roosevelt. Only General Eisenhower succeeded in winning.

A ME TOO PROBLEM

Many conservative Republicans denounced their presidential nominees, privately at least, as being me too men, ready to preserve and extend the plans of the New Deal and of President Truman's Fair Deal.

Many conservative Republicans now are criticizing Governor Rockefeller for me-too-ism. They say, and Senator GOLDWATER joins them, that nothing is to be gained by trying to entice the labor and minority groups of the North into the Republican column. What they want is a sharp-spoken conservative nominee, and where they are concerned Senator GOLDWATER fills the bill.

Governor Rockefeller long has been considered the frontrunner and probably easy winner at the convention. That, the Goldwater people say, was before any real opposition developed. The Governor has been busy making speeches and cultivating party leaders across the country. Nevertheless, at present there is no way of measuring any convention support that Mr. Rockefeller may have obtained. But politicians are now giving this factor a new and searching look.

One Goldwater friend had this to say:

"There are three varieties of Republicans: the hardcore conservatives; the conservatives who think the party cannot win with a conservative nominee, and the liberals.

"Ususally, at a convention, the liberals and the second group are in control. But the first two groups could control things just as well. If there is a candidate who all the conservatives think can win, then there will be a different picture at the 1964 convention from what we have seen in the past."

So it is the purpose of the Goldwater groups to convince a majority of the convention that Mr. GOLDWATER can win—and that Mr. Rockefeller cannot.

Whatever the dispute about these estimated figures, Senator Goldwater apparently is to have the support of a cohesive and important party group.

The Arizona Senator has emerged from the position on the far outside and become, his backers say, a very real possibility for the nomination. Plainly, he is to be a powerful figure at the 1964 convention.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Charitable Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion pro and con about the merits of certain foundations in the United States.

The Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, has recently concluded a series of articles on many good works performed by certain of these foundations. Feeling that the information contained in these articles, written by Mabel Gouldy, would be of interest to Members of Congress, I have obtained permission to extend them in the RECORD at this point.

The first three of these articles are submitted herewith for inclusion:

CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS—PROBE FAILS TO CONSIDER GOOD WORK BY GROUPS—PART I

(By Mabel Gouldy)

Tax dodgers?

Accumulators of massive wealth and power?

Competitors to the small business economy of the Nation?

These are some of the charges currently reverberating through the Halls of Congress and on front pages across the country.

They are sparked by an investigation of tax-exempt, charitable foundations and their impact on the economy of the United States.

The investigation is being carried on by the House Select Committee on Small Business.

It was instituted by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, while he was chairman of the House Small Business Committee and before he became chairman of the House Banking Committee.

However, he has retained his membership on the Small Business Committee. And the committee is continuing the investigation.

What is the truth about foundations and their activities?

The New York Times in an editorial last August said, among other things, that "Mr. PATMAN's studied omission of the constructive role played by foundations" was the "most glaring omission" in the committee reports.

The Times also said any tax-exempt organization should provide a full accounting of its operations and be prohibited from engaging in any unrelated business.

"What is needed," the editorial concluded, "is a stricter enforcement of the statutes already on the books, for to follow Mr. PATMAN's advice (to declare a moratorium on granting tax-exempt status to foundations until Congress enacts stricter legislation) would be to penalize the majority of legitimate and law-abiding foundations because of the misdeeds of an errant few."

The Star-Telegram, with that in mind, has made a study of a group of large and small foundations in Texas and the work they are accomplishing, in many instances at great savings to taxpayers.

Much of the work done by many foundations could not have been accomplished otherwise except through the expenditure of tax dollars.

The Amon G. Carter Foundation was selected as the first subject.

Amon G. Carter, Jr., Mrs. J. Lee Johnson III and Mrs. Carl (Katrine) Deakins, the directors, and, respectively, the president, vice president and secretary-treasurer of the Carter foundation, made this statement:

"A congressional committee, headed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has, for a considerable period of time, been conducting an investigation into the operation of tax-exempt foundations and has, from time to time, released statistics and announced tentative conclusions obtained from, or based on, the committee's studies.

"Some of these releases have dealt with the Amon G. Carter Foundation.

"As reported in Texas papers, and elsewhere, these statistics and conclusions have been misleading and have tended to create false impressions.

"We, as directors of the Amon G. Cartre Foundation and responsible for its activities, believe that a decent respect for the opinion of the public requires that the record be set straight and, accordingly, make the following report as to the Amon G. Carter Foundation and its operations to the close of the year 1962.

"Amon G. Carter Foundation was organized as a Texas nonprofit corporation without capital stock on June 23, 1945, for the purpose of supporting charitable, religious, educational, and like activities and purposes.

"Upon commencement of active operations, September 11, 1947, it received from the late Amon G. Carter and Mrs. Burton Carter a gift of properties having a net value of some $8,500,000.

"Upon the death of Amon G. Carter, the foundation, as the residuary beneficiary of his will, received properties of the approximate value of $9,500,000, which amount was many times the total of his bequests and devices to his wife, children, and grandchildren.

"Since its organization, the principal activities of the Amon G. Carter Foundation have been managing the properties so received and distributing its revenues for the purposes for which it was organized.

"From organization to the close of 1962, the gross operating revenues of the foundation have totaled $20,398,383 and its net income from operations for the same period amounted to $12,187,113.

"The total administration or overhead expense (salaries, legal fees, etc.) for the period has amounted to $561,037, some 2.75 percent of its total gross operating revenues; a record for economy of operations which will compare favorably with any business or other organization in the country.

"In addition to its operating income, which is calculated just as is the operating income of a business organization, with deductions such as ad valorem taxes, depreciation and other direct operating costs, various assets received by the foundation have enhanced in value and some of these enhancements have been realized by sales.

"These capital gains are not considered by law or the Internal Revenue Service as income required to be distributed for the exempt purposes which the foundation was organized to support; and, accordingly, a substantial portion of these capital gains have been reinvested so as to produce further income for charities, etc.

"The bylaws of the Amon G. Carter Foundation have always provided that neither Amon G. Carter, nor any member of his family, should ever receive any compensation or other benefit from the foundation; and this provision has always been strictly followed.

"Since its organization to the end of 1962, the benefactions of the Amon G. Carter Foundation have totaled $11,983,751.

"This figure includes the cost or value of properties leased in perpetuity for $1 to various charitable or educational organizations or irrevocably dedicated to the public.

"By classifications, these benefactions have been as follows:

"Civic enterprises including the Fort Worth Children's Museum, the James R. Record Aquarium, etc., $239,743.

"Churches, $163,862.

"Universities and other educational institutions, $3,765,000.

"Orphanages, infirmaries, hospitals and medical (all fields), including the Carter Blood Bank, etc., $2,690,571.

"Welfare, youth and like organizations (YMCA, Boys Club, etc.), $1,741,559.

"Art museum, art collections and library, $3,261,027.

"Miscellaneous, $121,989.

"Total, $11,983,751.

"At all times since organization, the Amon G. Carter Foundation has, upon full disclosure of its activities, been classified by the Internal Revenue Service as exempt from income taxes because it was organized and operated exclusively for charitable, religious, educational and like purposes.

"The foundation has consistently operated so as to merit and maintain this classification and to obey and follow to the letter and spirit of applicable law.

"If the Congress sees fit to change the law applicable to it, the foundation will, as a good citizen should, meet any burdens and comply with any restrictions so placed upon it.

"Until such changes are made, and thereafter to the extent such changes permit, the Amon G. Carter Foundation shall earnestly and sincerely try to follow what its principal benefactor said in his will:

" 'As a youth, I was denied the advantages which go with the possession of money, and, therefore, I am endeavoring to give those who have no such advantages, but who aspire to the higher and finer attributes of life, those opportunities which were denied to me.

" 'I am a part of the heritage of Texas. Its pioneer spirit that peopled the wide spaces and laid the foundations of a happy future comes down to me in the strain of the blood, and I wish to share it with others who would make Texas their home and their inspiration.' "

CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS—HOUSTON ENDOWMENT FAR FROM A "FINANCIAL OGRE"—PART II

(By Mabel Gouldy)

Financial ogres?

That was one of the descriptions given tax-exempt charitable foundations in two reports last year by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana.

Charges against foundations were the result of studies by the House Select Committee on Small Business, then headed by PATMAN as chairman.

What kind of financial ogre, for instance, is Houston Endowment, Inc.?

Well, for one thing, it has expended a total of $24,218,906.69 with worldwide effects since organization.

Is it stacking up large sums of unexpended income and paying unreasonable salary schedules as implied in scattergun charges by the congressional committee?

The endowment was organized under Texas law September 25, 1937, by the late Jesse H. Jones, financier and holder of high governmental posts, and his wife, Mary Gibbs Jones, who died in 1962.

FRACTION OF 1 PERCENT

A total of $13,843,675.41 was expended for the benefit of the people of Texas and the United States during the first 22 years of the endowment's existence, or from 1937 through 1959.

Grants for the period of 1960 through 1962 totaled $10,375,228.28.

"Houston Endowment's direct salary-fee schedule amounts to a fraction of 1 percent of its earnings," says John T. Jones, Jr., president of the charitable foundation.

"Mr. PATMAN has inferred," he added, "that many foundations exist to accumulate tax-free income, and I am sure that in some cases he is correct.

"However, Houston Endowment's last major grant of $6 million for construction of a performing arts center for the city of Houston involved an invasion of capital that we will be several years in replacing.

FACILITIES IN USE

"While this is the largest, we also have on our books grants of more than $1 million that will be payable within the next 36 months.

"A substantial portion of these payables is involved in a grant toward construction of a new wing at Harris Memorial Hospital in Fort Worth, as well as a smaller construction grant payable to St. Joseph's Hospital, also in Fort Worth," Jones continued.

A $750,000 grant from the endowment to Harris Hospital made possible the Mary Gibbs Jones Women's Building at Harris, where some facilities went into use in February while construction continued on the rest of the project.

The grant to St. Joseph's is for $250,000.

Diversity has been the hallmark of Houston Endowment.

Grants have ranged from multi-million-dollar construction to a new roof for a Negro church and funds for the education of young Hungarian freedom fighters who reached political sanctuary in this country.

Many foundations are limited in scope of purpose or geographic area in giving.

Houston Foundation is not.

NATIONAL SCOPE

The income from properties willed by Mr. and Mrs. Jones to the endowment is, under Texas law, restricted to use within the State of Texas.

However, income from properties given the endowment during the lifetime of the Joneses has no such restriction.

No geographical limitations have been placed on the latter funds because of the national scope and broad range of the interests of Jesse Jones.

Giving substantially all of the net earned income each year for charter purposes has been a policy of trustees.

The charter, which is purposely nonrestrictive, calls for "support of any charitable, educational, or religious undertaking."

Why do some men set up tax-exempt charitable foundations and do those organizations pay any taxes?

Under the will of Jones, in which he was joined by his wife, Houston Endowment acquired income-producing assets of varying nature, according to the present head of the foundation.

Included was West Texas ranch land, together with oil and gas leases and production income from some of them.

AD VALOREM TAXES

Also, a great deal of improved and unimproved urban real estate in Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth, and New York was obtained.

Fort Worth real estate includes the Fair Building, Oil, and Gas Building, Medical Arts Building, Electric Building, and Worth Hotel.

Ad valorem taxes are paid on all these properties.

City, county, school, and State taxes are paid on the real estate in the Jones estate.

"It is particularly true in the case of these real properties that their earning power can only be maintained through continual reinvestment of moneys in the form of maintenance, remodeling, additions, etc.," Jones declared. "Therefore, Houston Endowment may show a very considerable overall income, but its overall expenses are coresponelingly high and should not be compared with the performance of a philanthropic trust whose principal assets are composed of income-bearing stocks and bonds."

The majority of the endowment's grants, it is pointed out by trustees, have been in the field of education, principally in the form of college scholarship and fellowship assistance.

Academic performance of scholarship holders has been more than gratifying to trustees.

CAMPUS LEADERS

Dropouts, for all reasons, have been fewer than 10 percent.

Many holders are on deans' lists and are campus leaders and members of honorary academic orgnizations. One is currently a Rhodes scholar.

Almost 80 percent of funds has gone for purposes broadly defined as educational; about 15 percent has been used for charitable purposes, and the remainder has gone to religious activities.

Hundreds of schools, institutions, and charities and thousands of individuals have benefited.

Flexibility marks the benefactions and no request, however unusual, is arbitrarily ruled out without consideration.

Incidentally, the odd and impossible requests received by all foundations are the reason trustees often have been understandably reluctant to detail their activities to the general public.

Governmental records, of course, make disclosure of activities and expenditures.

Houston Endowment trustees have a definite policy against granting scholarships to individuals. They are made available through grants made directly to a long list of educational institutions in Texas, the Nation, and even in Canada.

BREAKDOWN GIVEN

College or university authorities administer the funds and select the winners.

Grants to permanent endowments are not made.

An idea of the spread of the funds is gained from the manner in which the $13,843,675.41 was expended during the first 22 years of the endowment.

The breakdown is:

Educational purposes, $10,402,514.72.

Charitable purposes, $2,858,400.56.

Religious institutions of all denominations, $582,760.13.

When Jones and his wife organized the endowment they gave relatively small annual amounts to it that steadily increased until it was further enriched by their bequests.

HUMBLE START

The life of Jones may supply the key to why he steadily built a foundation to benefit his fellow man.

Born on a tobacco farm in Tennessee, he received little formal education in rural schools of that State and considered himself a mediocre student.

Later, in Dallas, he attended grammar school briefly.

The business career that was to culminate in the accumulation of personal millions and the loaning of $50 billion of Government money as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had an humble start.

Jones worked as a laborer in a Hillsboro lumberyard as his first gainful occupation. Before that he had helped his father on the farm prior to the latter's death when Jesse was in his early teens.

But despite the tremendous sums of money he made and managed Jones put more faith in men and ideas than material possessions and placed his greatest faith in the youth of the United States.

CHARITABLE FOUNDATION—COOPER UNIT AT WACO HAS "WELL DONE" RECORD—PART III

(By Mabel Gouldy)

"There is a pressing need for an immediate moratorium on the granting of tax exemptions to foundations."

Those were the words of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, last July when he presented the first report of a House subcommittee's study of tax-exempt charitable foundations.

President Kennedy, whose family has a foundation, in a press conference following the charges, commented that many foundations "have done a tremendous job in wide ranges in a most efficient way."

"The Government wants to be fair," he added, "but we want to be sure to catch those who are penalizing the others."

The Wall Street Journal of August 23, 1962, in reporting the press conference, said:

"The President tried to avoid any impression of starting a wholesale crackdown that would involve all the foundations.

"The Cooper Foundation of Waco has a record qualifying it for the accolade of a good job well done."

And it makes periodic reports to the public on the management of the fund whose trustees are authorized to make expenditures from income for "any charitable, educational or benevolent purpose, which, in their opinion will make Waco, Tex., a better or more desirable city in which to live."

There is only one other limitation on expenditures.

Disbursements must pay for the asset or project whatever it is, in its entirety.

The first grant from the foundation, following its inception in 1943, was for $100 to provide a new boat-trailer for the Waco Fire Department.

Among the latest—voted last year—was $14,500 to pay the cost of a survey and master plan for the Waco Municipal Airport.

This was requested by the airport planning subcommittee of the Waco Chamber of Commerce and will point the way for orderly development of the airport from the present time to 1980.

Many municipal projects have been instituted or received a boost from the Cooper Foundation but it also has a broader range.

It was established by the late Madison A. Cooper, Jr., as a nonprofit, unincorporated trust, wholly for the purposes of benevolent public usefulness.

It is a memorial to the founder's parents, the late Madison A. Cooper and Martha Roane Cooper.

Assuming the risks of new civic and charitable enterprises is one foundation function.

Thus, a new organization is given the opportunity to prove its worth.

Quite often, the foundation provides funds for an experimental period of time. Then if the organization proves worthy it is hoped it will be taken into the United Fund or find another sponsoring agency.

Human relations courses in the Waco public schools and Baylor University; Bible courses for high school students there, and the Waco Legal Aid Clinic originated on foundation grants.

When Goodwill Industries was established in 1955 the Cooper Foundation put up $7,500 to match an equal sum from the national organization and finance the operation for the first year.

Because of these grants, the Greater Waco United Fund admitted Goodwill as a member agency in 1956 and agreed to provide it with up to $5,000 a year for 5 years.

Tests of new and untried equipment and studies and surveys that will produce public benefit it still another function of this truly civic-minded foundation.

Trial use of voting machines was foundation financed.

Intoximeters for drunk driving tests were first used by the police department through a grant.

Foundation funds have paid for surveys of the operations of the Waco municipal government; and Waco's industrial potential (in conjunction with the chamber of commerce), and welfare and youth agencies and services in the city.

The Waco radium bank was established by a 1951 grant and the citizens traffic commission was established with another grant.

A study of the 80 grants thus far made shows that almost every area of community life has been benefited by the Cooper Foundation.

Grants have totaled $522,765.99 since 1943.

During the fiscal year of 1961–62 grants voted totaled $72,469.99 and grants paid during that period came to $144,271.43.

The foundation's report to the public includes a listing of all stocks and bonds owned with their book and market values.

Investment counselors set up the program and by percentages it is diversified in this manner: U.S. Government bonds, 6.20 percent; other Government bonds, 0.42 percent; commercial bonds, 18.84 percent; preferred stocks, 3.16 percent and common stocks, 71.38 percent.

A balance sheet of revenue and expenditures on the last fiscal year is also included.

Foundation trustees consider that they have a responsibility to report affairs of the organization to the public.

These reports are made annually.

Income for the fiscal year that ended March 31, 1962, totaled $141,662.34.

It came from farm rents, city property rents, interest, dividends, and oil royalties.

Expenditures for that period totaled $220,016.32 and the excess of expenditures over revenue was $78,353.98.

Ad valorem property taxes of $12,041.32 were paid by the foundation.

West Virginia Forests Will Murmur in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, all of us have cherished memories associated with the words of the poet, Longfellow:

This is the forest primeval, the murmuring pines and the hemlocks.

To me these words recall the unspoiled mountain forests of West Virginia, which I knew and loved as a youth.

It was with pleasure, therefore, that I learned, in an article appearing in the April 21, 1963, edition of the New York Times Sunday supplement, that the murmur of West Virginia forests will be heard in the great metropolis of New York, when the World's Fair is held in that city next year. Stereo sound will re-create the natural music of the woodlands that are a part of the largest unspoiled nature preserve in the eastern half of the United States.

Because this article is of wide interest to all our citizens, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA FORESTS WILL MURMUR IN NEW YORK

An exciting spirit of growth and progress marks West Virginia and her people as this beautiful, friendly State enters into her second hundred years. The visitor to the West Virginia pavilion will see, hear, breathe, touch, and sense this dynamism through guides, motion pictures, audiovisual aids, television, recordings, displays and lifelike dioramas. Visitors are cordially invited to stop in for some pleasant moments of respite and get to know the spirit of the "Land of Relaxation."

Occupying over 34,000 square feet, the pavilion features five main areas: the information rotunda, where exhibits will depict the history, culture, government, and educational institutions of the State. The industrial park will house fascinating exhibits sponsored by leading industrial firms in chemical, electronic, ceramic, forest, glass, coal, metal, paper, tobacco, textile, and other products.

West Virginia Vacationland will dramatize the State's unsurpassed vacation facilities and activities. With the largest unspoiled natural preserve in the eastern half of the United States—within 1 hour's flying time for 125 million Americans—West Virginia features a "four seasons" plan for year around fun and relaxation for the whole family. A futuristic mountain lodge will enable the visitor to dine in gracious surroundings typical of the natural beauty of the State. The circular dining area will be surrounded by water stocked with game fish from West Virginia. Special West Virginia dishes will be served. Stereo sound will recreate the murmur of the forest, while color films will project the visitors into a scenic tour of the State. The Gift Shop will be well stocked with beautiful souvenirs.

The pavilion itself is of sculptured panels and artistically treated glass. The outer structure features majestic full-color views of West Virginia's leading scenic resorts. Wood is used extensively for interior finishing and exterior grilles. A free-form pool surrounds three sides of the building, and a towering cultural symbol rising to a height of 50 feet represents the aspirations of the people of West Virginia through the development of industry, education and natural resources. The pavilion will serve as a dynamic showcase for exhibiting the State's master plan of progress. Specific targets for the sixties will be announced for the establishment and acceleration of industries, housing, public works, business and trade expansion, and tourism.

The State Department of Commerce will have industrial development personnel at the pavilion to advise out-of-State business executives of the almost limitless opportunities and facilities for establishing new plants in West Virginia. Reservations will be taken for businessmen to take actual tours of the State, inspect potential sites, and confer with governmental and community leaders. And a vacation planning service will make all necessary travel and hotel accommodations for families interested in a wonderful West Virginia vacation.

A Peacemonger Answers Some Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last Sunday's New York Times magazine carries a most significant article on the all-important subject of world peace. The author of this essay, Mr. Amitai Etzioni, is an associate professor of sociology at Columbia University and a research associate at the university's Institute of War and Peace Studies. He is also the author of an important new book entitled "The Hard Way to Peace: A New Strategy."

Recognizing the fundamental interest which all of us have in exploring every possible step toward peace, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Etzioni's excellent article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PEACEMONGER ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS

(By Amitai Etzioni)

(Amitai Etzioni is an associate professor of sociology at Columbia and a research associate at the university's Institute of War and Peace Studies. His book "The Hard Way to Peace: A New Strategy," appeared in 1962).

In recent months I have been speaking to a large variety of groups across the Nation about the dangers of war and the need for disarmament. Practically every group—from the campus of UCLA to Harvard Yard, from New York to Texas—has asked me the same questions. They want to know: How can one talk about peace and disarmament when the goal of Communism is world domination? Is not a strong America the best way to protect peace? Could the American economy survive disarmament? Would the Russians allow effective inspection? Who would enforce disarmament?

Here are the questions asked a peacemonger, and his answers.

How can one talk about peace and disarmament when the goal of Communism is world domination?

When one asks how we can have peace while the Communists seek world domination, the word peace is usually being associated with harmony, absence of conflict. But such a world is impossible. People are going to have differences of interest and belief, and hence conflict, the way they have had them in every country—and family—since time began. Peace requires not the elimination of differences of interest and belief, but the prevention of their turning to violence; not the elimination of conflict, but the prevention of armed conflict. The new world this peacemonger is working for is not a kingdom of heaven on earth, but one in which we can survive together. This

does not require the Communists—or us—to give up the values we believe in; it requires only that they—and we—give up one, and only one, set of means by which international goals are pursued—i.e., the wielding of violence.

Thus, there is nothing incompatible between Communist ambitions and disarmament. The Russians still would have open to them the means of propaganda and agitation, and of economic and technical aid, to forward their cause.

The Communists have been declaring for the past 30 years that they desire general and complete disarmament. They firmly believe that they will do as well, if not better, in a competition in which they can draw on the appeal of their doctrine of equality for people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; and on their rapid method of industrializing, which these people desire. Now, we may know that their "equality" is a false one, and that their industrialization is inefficient and requires a high human cost, but this does not stop them from believing in it and in its appeal to people all over the world. That belief might well suffice to make them genuinely willing to disarm.

We should be willing to accept that challenge of a disarmed competition, to match the exposition of their ideas with ours, and to see where the chips fall. Certainly we have to insist that the arms will really be checked in, but our fear should be of a failure in disarmament, not of disarmament itself.

Is not a strong America the best way to protect peace?

The question has many variations: Why take risks? What if the Russians hid a dozen nuclear bombs at the bottom of a lake and then, by threatening to drop them—perhaps from a civil airliner, if all missiles and military planes had been destroyed—impose their will on the rest of us? Has not the present balance of terror kept the peace for the past 15 years? Why could it not do so in the future?

My answer is that there can be no disarmament without risks. But these risks need to be compared with the most grave risk—that the balance of terror will become unbalanced.

Do not take the word of the peace movement; take that of the military experts. Herman Kahn, the author of "On Thermonuclear War" and "Thinking About the Unthinkable," an authoritative consultant to the Defense Department, has prepared a list of the dangers.

There might be a nuclear war as the result of a mechanical accident. Three years ago, for example, a flock of geese was recorded on the radar screens in a way that looked like a major missile attack closing in. Only at the last moment was the order to strike avoided when the true nature of the radar blips was discovered.

Secondly, unauthorized action cannot be prevented with absolute certainty. Various safety devices, such as locks on missiles that require the insertion of two keys before firing is possible, prevent a single enlisted man from starting a nuclear war, but a commander can order two, four or as many men as necessary to fire. How can his subordinates tell whether his command is truly "authorized"? To the best of my professional judgment, there is no psychological test that will positively screen out people who—especially as international tensions mount—might assume the responsibility of "protecting" the United States (or the U.S.S.R.) from a "soft" President or Premier by taking the nuclear initiative into their own hands.

Escalation is one more widely recognized path to war. Since World War II, west and east have frequently become involved in local conflicts, such as those in Vietnam, Lebanon, the Congo, Cuba, Guatemala, Greece, and others. Once the prestige of a major power becomes firmly involved in local fighting, especially if there has been a large number of casualties, the temptation to become more involved is great. The escalator might be stopped, 9 times or 99 times, before reaching the nuclear level, but if it drags us up all the way just once, millions will die, and the survivors may well envy the dead.

No less dangerous is a miscalculation. Khrushchev has said that he thinks that the United States would not fight over West Berlin. He is deadly mistaken; the United States is fully committed to defend the city. If Khrushchev acts on the basis of such a misjudgment, there will be a war.

In the West, the success of the American action for the removal of offensive Soviet missiles from Cuba has created a similar danger of miscalculation. The Soviets might retreat every time they are challenged, but if we should make one major mistake, as President Kennedy has said "there will be 150 million deaths within the first 18 hours." Can we expect governments never to miscalculate?

Finally, less likely but most dangerous, is the possibility of a major technological breakthrough. The balance of terror rests on the assumption that if you hit me, I can still hit you back, good and hard, and vice versa. But the United States and the U.S.S.R. are working day and night on new weapons. If one of them comes up with an antimissile defense, for instance, that nation could hit the other with impunity. Most military experts believe that an invention of the magnitude to give any power such a critical advantage is quite unlikely, but the possibility cannot be excluded. It is most dangerous, for the way to exploit this sort of critical breakthrough would be by an all-out strike.

All these are possibilities. Experts do not disagree that they might occur; they disagree as to how likely they are. Sir Charles Snow, the British author and scientist, believes that a nuclear blowup in the next 10 years is a certainty. Herman Kahn states that if we are to reach the year 2000—probably even 1975—we must somehow reach an agreement with Russia on limiting the arms race.

Could the American economy survive disarmament?

To answer this question is a task for a major volume on the American political structure. Briefly, one must point out, first, that disarmament does not come free. At least 10,000 Westerners would have to serve as inspectors to verify that commitments to reduce arms were carried out as agreed. These inspectors would have to be militarily trained; hence many ex-officers would find employment in the inspection agency. Inspection instruments, from U-2 planes to satellites carrying TV cameras, would have to be produced, keeping busy some of the assembly lines now working for armament.

Second, about 10 percent of the labor force and of the American economy are involved in military production. Since disarmament would be carried out in 5 years at the very best, it would mean a fairly small annual adjustment of 2 percent per year. A much larger cut in the military budget and production was carried out in 1946 without crisis.

Third, there are many ways we could use those resources now going into armaments—from building schools to improving medical facilities, from increased foreign aid (which would become a more important instrument in our competition with communism) to increased contributions to international institutions whose activities would have to be extended to guard disarmament. Even some tax reductions should not be out of the question.

Surely Americans, as well as the citizens of other Western countries, would resist—as would citizens of the Socialist republics—any solution that protected their lives but not their values. But multilateral disarmament seeks a peace in which no country is asked to sacrifice its beliefs; it seeks a new international life in which the various camps will continue to promote their values and ideals, but will have to refrain from using arms to advance their beliefs. There is nothing in such a world Americans cannot afford.

Will the Russians allow effective inspection?

I would not think of giving up my arms if the other side does not also, and I would trust no country to carry out its commitments unless effectively verified. But it is necessary to distinguish between verification and inspection. The need for verification is absolute; it cannot be compromised or circumvented. At the same time, we must recognize that some disarmament steps can be verified without inspection, and many others without on-site inspection.

If, for instance, the United States and the U.S.S.R. would agree to turn over to the United Nations, each year, a certain quantity of nuclear weapons to be converted to peaceful uses, no inspection would be needed to verify that these commitments were fulfilled.

When inspection was needed, often methods other than sending inspectors into the Soviet Union would be feasible. For instance, the closing of bases and dismantling of installations can be effectively inspected with photographic and electronic surveillance; the embargo on the shipment of weapons to other countries can be verified by border inspection. A recent study of the Institute for Defense Analyses provides a long list of disarmament measures which can be verified through "intelligence, open sources, voluntary self-disclosure, and 'common knowledge'."

It is significant that whenever weapons have been clandestinely produced or shipped on any significant scale—as in Germany in the early thirties, in Palestine under the British, in Greece in 1947, in Cuba last fall—no one ever has succeeded in concealing the fact. That verification can work—without entry into a country—has been shown in the recent Soviet arms reduction in Cuba.

Of all the verification methods, that of sending foreigners into a totalitarian country for onsite inspections is the one such societies resist most strongly. To allow foreigners to poke their noses wherever and whenever they wished would require a major reorganization of the societal fabric, possibly compromising essential principles of the regime. Hence we find the Russians' persistent objection to on-site inspection, which often is misinterpreted as objection to verification in general.

The question we need to ask ourselves regarding each disarmament measure is: Are there other, equally effective, methods of verification than manned inspection? It might well be that we could progress a long way toward disarmament by relying on nonmanned inspection. We would probably reach a stage at which manned inspection would be needed, as an international police force would be; but this might be a long way off. Carrying out some disarmament before that stage would largely change international relations: mutual suspicions would be reduced as the sides observed each other carrying out arms-reduction agreements; processes of liberalization within closed societies would be accelerated by shifting resources from arms to consumer needs. These developments might well open the way for manned inspection.

I say "might." I do not know what the Kremlin "really" thinks, or what would happen once the cold war subsided and arms were reduced. I cannot guarantee that if we offer a disarmament plan based on effective, nonmanned verification, with manned inspection as a later phase, the Russians will accept it. But I would surely prefer to offer them such a treaty than to sit back in my

armchair asserting that they will not accept it.

I should not close this long answer to a brief question without pointing out that there is—and will be—no foolproof verification system, manned or unmanned, or both. We should nevertheless, I suggest, accept the marginal risks that remain, should the Russians accept a system which our experts consider effective. These risks seem to me far smaller than those involved in continuation of the arms race.

Who would enforce disarmament?

This question raises the issue of world government. Would not an international police force strong enough to maintain disarmament—to protect the disarmed nations from a violator—require an executive authority to give it orders? And who would that be? Would there not have to be global law for this body to enforce, and would not this law have to be enacted by a world legislature? And would the U.S.S.R. and the United States ever agree to submit themselves to such a world government?

Here one has to distinguish carefully between the short and the long run. In the short run, such international institutions are not a necessary requirement for the initiation of disarmament. The two blocs could check on each other to satisfy themselves that commitments are fulfilled. Britons and Canadians, for instance, could verify Russian arms reduction for the West, and Poles verify American arms reduction for the East. Differences of opinion could be brought for arbitration before a panel of "wise men," selected by both sides from among men known throughout the world for their integrity—as U Thant is, for example. Even an "international" police force could be initiated on a two-bloc or three-bloc basis.

In the long run, stronger international institutions might develop. Once the arms race was reversed, once the cold war barriers of suspicion were shattered, many possibilities now viewed as unlikely would open up. Few expected that Japan and Germany would become intimate allies of the United States; that Germany and France, after three generations of hostility, would enter into an intimate union; that Soviet Russia and Communist China would come into bitter and open conflict. An international police force seems now as unlikely, and might be just as possible.

The road toward disarmament is not without risk, and the development of effective international organizations is far from guaranteed. Those who support disarmament can only state that they prefer to take those risks over those involved in the continuation of the arms race. I belong to a large group of people in the West who want peace but not appeasement, disarament but not communism. It is true that some members of the peace movement are appeasers or worse; but will we close our hearts to a world with its waiting megaton graves, just because a few abuse our concern for the survival of our lives and our values, and are willing to trade the one for the other?

Scientists Link Smog to Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article, which appeared in the Valley Times Today on Thursday, April 18, 1963. This is one of many fine newspapers in the 27th Congressional District in California. I have been very interested in the menace that air polution, better known in Los Angeles as smog, has on the health of the people throughout the whole United States. The following article spells out this menace as it has to do with cancer:

SCIENTISTS LINK SMOG TO CANCER

Smog causes changes in human lung cells similar to early stages of cancer, according to scientists at the Pasadena Foundation for Medical Research.

Dr. Donald E. Rounds, Dr. C. M. Pomerat and coworkers said Wednesday they have found the first scientific evidence indicating "there are sufficient carcinogens—cancer-causing chemicals—in the atmosphere to trigger the initial steps toward malignancy."

"We can't say we caused malignancy," the scientists said in describing how they exposed human lung cells to smog, "but we can say the changes in the cells were nearly identical to changes when carcinogens are used."

The Pasadena scientists first exposed human tissue to a chemical used routinely by laboratories for causing cancer. Then they recorded on motion picture film the changes in the cells which were triggered by the cancer-causing chemical.

The photographs showed the growth rate was increased and that the cell chromosomes, the carriers of hereditary material, underwent abnormal changes.

Having established the nature of the changes caused by a chemical known to cause cancer, the scientists repeated the experiment with fresh cells but this time exposed them to Pasadena air on smoggy days.

Rounds said the growth rate and the chromosome abnormality were nearly identical to those appearing in the first experiment.

How Indispensable Was U.N. in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Ed Delaney appearing in the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register, April 16, 1963.

It is high time that the American public realizes that the foreign affairs of this country are being determined by the United Nations which has no interest whatsoever in the preservation of the free world or of this Republic:

HOW INDISPENSABLE WAS U.N. IN CUBA?

(By Ed Delaney)

According to Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations, that Red-riddled organization was never so "indispensable as it was in the Cuban crisis." Bunche made that statement in an address at Chapman College, Orange, and added that due to the statesmanship of President Kennedy in submitting the problem to the U.N. "we were afforded an opportunity to achieve a solution." What solution? If the U.N.'s meddling in the Cuban crisis is all they can offer to justify its existence, then we can dispense with the U.N. now, and good riddance.

With much publicity U Thant, Secretary General of the U.N., went to Cuba, embraced Castro and informed him that the U.N. wanted to make an inspection to ascertain the facts about the missile bases that were or had been in Cuba. Castro said "No." U Thant flew back to the U.N. Temple of Hypocrisy on Manhattan Island and related his interview with Castro. It was the unilateral action of President Kennedy, without consulting the U.N. or any of the Western Allies, that halted the Soviet buildup in Cuba. To credit the U.N. with any part in averting a crisis in Cuba at that time is typical of those, such as Bunche, who are professional propagandists for the U.N.

He said also that no war was waged by the U.N. in Katanga. That is deliberate falsification of the known and published facts. On February 12, 1962, another apologist for the U.N., Carl T. Rowan, of the State Department endeavored to convince a Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate that the U.N. had not engaged in wanton massacre of the people in Katanga. The committee chairman, Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, cut Rowan short with the assertion, "I can tell you that there has been slaughter of people in Katanga and elsewhere and it had been public knowledge." Rowan endeavored to hem-and-haw but knew Senator DODD had been in Katanga and the Congo, where he made personal investigation of the situation.

But the U.N. supporters, such as Ralph Bunche, endeavor to impress their audiences with the importance of the U.N. and to ridicule all who denounce its deceptions and acts of aggression. It is the John Birchers, the sick-minded, the isolationists, and stupid people who decry the noble and lofty ideals of the U.N. according to Ralph Bunche and coworkers.

It is matter of public record that President Moise Tshombe of Katanga stated in December 1961: "the United States is furnishing planes which are transporting men and materials to bomb our cities and villages and slaughter our people, planes which fly the U.N. flag. Indian soldiers are indiscriminately killing civilians."

As recently as March 14, 1963, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cites a report by Archbishop Joseph Cornelius, of Elisabethville, Katanga, which "confirms the cruelty of the killing of Katangese civilians. A girl was violated and bayoneted in the stomach, also two others killed. Seventy corpses were brought to Prince Leopold Hospital. All this was done by the Ethiopians." As Columnist William S. White summed up: "The ugly truth is that deceit and evasiveness and incredible arrogance have marked the U.N.'s course in the Congo from first to last."

There are copious, indisputable records of how the U.N. waged war against Katanga without the slightest legal or moral justification. But Tshombe was anti-Communist and pro-Western, so he had to be destroyed and his country subjected to U.N. dictates because Moscow decreed it. The records also show that as far back as 1936 Ralph Bunche praised "the principles of equality and humanitarianism of the Soviet Union." We witnessed the manner in which those principles were displayed in Katanga.

More inaccuracies of Bunche: the U.N. has achieved much since the admission of the African states into that organization, he said. What has it accomplished? Those so-called states have no stable governments, no knowledge of how to make profitable use of what natural resources they have. They are mendicants in every sense of the word, barnacles on European or American economy. Without financial and technical aid from Europe or America they will revert to the primitive state in which they were before being developed by non-Africans. The United States pays 47 percent of the cost of the Congo operations. Heaven speed the day when we may get the United States out of the U.N. and get the U.N. out of the United States.

The Ugly Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert A. Stanton, industrialist, merchant, and philanthropist of the 11th Congressional District of California, wrote the following essay on "The Ugly Communist" which I am sure will meet with a favorable response from all Members of Congress:

THE UGLY COMMUNIST

The picture of the "Ugly American" has been accepted in many quarters as typical of our diplomatic deficiencies. It is time we made a careful study of Communist methods and the technique of Soviet propaganda, so that the "Ugly Communist" is exposed in his own true light. It should be required study, by our diplomats, in our schools and colleges, so that we may better meet our competition in the battle of ideologies. The following notes were taken from careful studies of the "Forces for Communism."

Like all political systems whose appeal is not based on reason, Communist totalitarianism moves ahead less on the conviction of its members than on the confusion of its opponents. Communist Parties are merely firebrands, and the main effort of the Kremlin is to pervert or weaken the fabric it sticks them into. That is the governing idea behind active minorities which bolshevism put in theory and into practice from its inception. It has always won power—especially in the U.S.S.R. and China—with parties very much in the minority, but in undermined and deluded society.

Furthermore, the aim for years has no longer been to promote communism as an ideology, but to further the international game of the Soviet state. It is therefore a dangerous illusion to think that a country is safe because its Communist Party is weak, if pro-Soviet views meet with a wide response.

Trade unions are an infiltration area aimed at by Bolshevism for the longest time, concerning which Lenin, in the "Childhood Disease of Communism" wrote the following, which can stand as an epigraph to all Soviet infiltration, and if the free world does not take heed, as an epitaph on its own tomb:

"We must learn how to make use of all strategems, of ruse, adopt illegal methods, keep silent at times, conceal the truth, with the sole aim of getting into the unions, staying there, and accomplishing the task of communism there in spite of everything."

It can be said that the whole edifice of Soviet propaganda is built on the pyramid of secret factions. The leaders at the top of each CP can be a faction for infiltrating the party. The party itself constitutes a faction for infiltrating parallel organizations. Parallel organizations are factions for infiltrating the whole society. From top to bottom prevails the governing idea of Bolshevism, which is to subject a majority without cohesion to a well-knit minority. Why not use this technique to influence new nations toward freedom—not a peace army only, but a freedom army?

Soviet diplomacy is not diplomacy in the usual sense of the term. It is another one of the principal spheres of Soviet propaganda. Every form of exchange between Communist and other countries, whether diplomatic, cultural, commercial, technical, or athletic, is conceived and worked out with propaganda in mind—not of course open propaganda for communism, but propaganda of an indirect, enveloping, underhanded kind for pro-Soviet views. All members of Soviet missions abroad are trained primarily to charm and lull to sleep high political or financial circles in the countries they are to undermine.

Soviets also derive a considerable propaganda advantage from organized visits of delegations and prominent people whom they invite to the countries they dominate. Under the guise of information and goodwill tours, an enormous machine of hoax and perversion is hidden. The operation of this machine has become a real industry. In the U.S.S.R. and China it employs tens of thousands of people full time.

Regarding radio broadcasts, this propaganda channel is too well known to need emphasizing. We shall only remark that in this sphere where the United States has made an exceptional effort, the Soviets still surpass them by a ratio of 4 to 1 in broadcasting time.

The various forms of Communist propaganda throughout the world involve a personnel of about 500,000 and an annual expenditure of approximately $2 billion.

This effort is made to circumvent about 1 milliard (1 billion) people outside the Communist orbit, so that it can be said that Moscow (with slight aid from Peiping) spends $2 a year per freeman to be subjugated. To grasp the magnitude of this figure expressing the scope of the political war Moscow wages against us, we should remark that an American Senate committee has estimated the sums allocated by the United States to world propaganda at 1¼ cents per person a year. If the budgets of all other free countries are added to the total it hardly comes to 2 cents.

On this point the Soviet effort is roughly 100 times as great as that of the rest of the world, and thus it is a phenomenon of an entirely different nature. In fact, the Communist and para-Communist propaganda apparatus is a colossus unique in kind and scope, in human history. That is one essential truth about communism which must be always borne in mind.

The motive power of this fantastic machine is money, drawn from overexploitation of enslaved toiling masses under the Communist yoke. These masses work to exhaustion for absurdly low wages to enable their masters not only to dominate them the better, but also to deceive more successfully the toiling masses in free countries.

With regard to the role of money, it should be emphasized how unworthy it is for professedly rational thinkers to pretend to innocence, and belief in miracles where communism is concerned, while refusing to admit that the sympathy of many freemen for so ruthless a tyranny as Moscow's can only be explained by corruption.

Propaganda spreads the terms; it is the organization that maintains the epidemic. Organization is to propaganda what the factory is to science. A Communist is the bourgeois of organization as the capitalist was the bourgeois of manufacturing.

Strange as it may seem, a third motive force behind Soviet propaganda—and not the least—is the eagerness of the free world's press to respond to it without charge. With their love of sensation, their search for exciting news, their need to sell, their naivete about Soviet tricks and lies, they repeat a number of these tricks and lies of their own free will, without even having to be induced to do so by the auxiliaries that infiltrate them. There is no limit to their falsehood and duplicity. That Bolshevism has attained to absolute falsehood is apparent from its basic position, for it promises total liberation and organizes total enslavement.

Not much thought has been given in the West to the fact that for the first time in history a political system has actually been built on 100 percent lies, with the other characteristic that lying is practiced ostentatiously. The strong point of this excess is that it saturates and wearies mistrust. Freemen living in a world where a minimum of good faith is observed (if only because political rivalry prevents one side from carrying a falsehood too far since the other can unmask it) simply cannot believe that falsehood can reach this point.

The notion that the U.S.S.R. is a power "like the others" in its international behavior caters to intellectual laziness because it eliminates the necessity of giving special treatment to Soviet ways. And that yields the Kremlin substantial profits, for it induces Western leaders to believe that with the Soviets a conference, a treaty, a minister are a conference, a treaty, a minister, when actually the Kremlin dictatorship has turned them respectively into a trap, a rag, a menial.

The Kremlin, now much more colonialist and imperialist than the West, plays on the uneasy conscience that the past faults of the West created in western public opinion.

It plays on the traditional pacifism of this public opinion to make all firmness to look like war mongering.

It plays on liberal circles concern for objectivity to incite neutralism on the pretext of striking a balance between America's faults and those of the U.S.S.R., when it is impossible to be neutral between the camp of freedom and the camp of slavery.

Many of the successes of Soviet propaganda are due not to conviction, but to fear. The Kremlin displays its power to the maximum and even displays more than it actually has. In this way it develops a concession reflex among the masses, and gets a great many prominent persons to go over to its side, in the belief that in case of victory such a power will be ruthless to its opponents, which no risk is run in berating the Western camp, considering its tolerance.

Communist propaganda pounces on every bone of contention that divides the free world and embitters conflicts at will. It drums up our national ideological and economic rivalries.

We are faced with a conflict between two "blocs," the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America and since the question is only one of rivalry between interests, inducing uninvolved countries to believe they can stand aside and therefore remain neutral. Yet the conflict is neither rational nor economic. It does not take place between two empires nor between socialism and capitalism. Whatever opinion one may hold on these two systems, it is clear that the rulers of the Kremlin hate socialism as much as capitalism when appearing in a democratic form. For it cannot bear on its flank the presence of a free society whose way of life dissolves the Soviet armature of lies and fascinates its fettered subject. It is because the West personifies democracy that the U.S.S.R. wants to crush it.

The conflict is then between freedom and dictatorship, between humanistic open-society civilization and despotic closed tribe systems. That is the reason why minds even more than territory are at stake. That is the reason why it concerns every man, at every corner of the earth. If bloc is to mean the the totality of threatened nations, then the term must be widened to cover the whole of our free world, not limited to the United States. And in this whole the most directly coveted part today is Europe and Asia, not America.

The truth is that to resist Soviet propaganda the most urgent thing is aid, not to underdeveloped countries, but to underdeveloped minds, in the West as well as in the East.

Our survival depends on counterpropaganda and before reviewing the means that should be brought into play by the free world to counter this formidable propaganda and conspiracy machine maintained by the Soviets, it is important for us to convince ourselves that the task is urgent.

The very survival of the West is at stake. We only resist in fact on the military front. But, owing to the balance of horror reached between atomic armaments, it is not in this sphere that the contest will be decided; it will be decided in the sphere of propaganda, where the West is inactive.

Moving Headquarters From City to Suburb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, American Cyanamid Corp., is about to open formally its executive and administrative offices in Wayne Township, N.J., which is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The company, its officials and personnel are indeed welcome.

The new headquarters are in a beautiful setting and are themselves a model of architectural splendor. I append an interview with Dr. Wilbur G. Malcolm, chairman of the board, American Cyanamid Co. in the Industry & Community National Report of April, 1963.

The article follows:

MOVING HEADQUARTERS FROM CITY TO SUBURB

Question. Dr. Malcolm, how long ago did you move your headquarters from New York City to this country setting in Wayne Township, N.J.?

Answer. Our building was completed in April of last year. We occupied it immediately after. The move involved some 1,600 employees.

Question. It is a beautiful building in a beautiful setting. How far is it from New York City?

Answer. We are 26 miles from the George Washington Bridge.

Question. Has this distance isolated your headquarters from business affairs in New York City? Has the distance hurt sales?

Answer. Not at all. We have transportation available for any of our people who have business in the city. The trip takes less than an hour. As for customers and others calling on us here, we have as many visitors here as we had when our offices were in the city. People enjoy coming out here from the city. The atmosphere is tranquil and pleasant, a delightful contrast with the city.

Question. What were your reasons for moving from the city?

Answer. There were a number of reasons of course. They have to do with convenience, cost, efficiency, productivity, and the preference of most of the employees involved for suburban living.

Question. Would you spell those out in a little more detail, please?

Answer. Before we moved here, Cyanamid's executive and administrative offices were scattered in numerous buildings in New York City. That was inconvenient and costly. Informal communications among our people were difficult to carry out. We lacked meeting rooms, which meant that we were constantly renting hotel space for such purposes, which is costly. Now at our new location, these various problems are eliminated. I feel that having people of common interests under one roof leads to greater efficiency and greater understanding of the problems of business management. Here our employees are able to work together better. They are in closer touch with one another. They arrive on the job in a better frame of mind, for they haven't had to fight traffic or search for a parking space. They have a more friendly, familylike spirit here than they had in New York. It would be hard to measure, but it is unmistakable.

Question. Isn't it a pretty daring thing to break the traditional pattern of locating one's administrative headquarters in New York City, the greatest commercial center in the world?

Answer. I have two answers to that. In the first place, as I mentioned before, we have not isolated ourselves from the city. We are still part of the New York metropolitan region. And second, Cyanamid is not alone in our industry in making a move of this sort. Abbott Laboratories did it when they moved to Skokie, Ill. So did Cutter Laboratories in Berkeley, Calif. And so did Eli Lilly in suburban Indianapolis. As a matter of fact, we ourselves had had previous experience with a similar move.

Question. When was that?

Answer. A few years ago when our Lederle Laboratories had its sales and executive offices in New York City and production, research and so on in Pearl River, N.Y., across the Hudson, we consolidated all of Lederle's operations in Pearl River, N.Y., noticed an immediate improvement. The cooperation and understanding that developed among the various groups that previously had dealt with one another at arm's length resulted in a degree of efficiency that we had never before experienced. So, you see, I had a good idea of what to expect when we moved our headquarters here.

Question. Is your headquarters now less accessible to your plant personnel than it was when you were in the city?

Answer. To the contrary, it is more accessible. Apart from headquarters we have nine plants or facilities that are located from Princeton, N.J., to Wallingford, Conn. Transportation between headquarters and these facilities is necessarily by automobile. Our new headquarters are more accessible by automobile than our city offices were. Besides that, the driving is more pleasant, and we have plenty of free parking.

Question. Would you tell us a bit about the headquarters building itself?

Answer. Well, it is 927 feet long, 4 stories high, and encloses 363,000 square feet of space, of which 280,000 square feet is office space. It is designed for efficiency as well as appearance. For example, 85 percent of our mail is handled by a pneumatic tube system by which we can move a bundle of mail from one end of the building to the other in less than a minute. We have a cafeteria that seats 600 and is available for large meetings and special dinners after hours. Those two facilities alone produce great economies over our previous situation in New York City.

Question. How did your employees react when you first announced that the headquarters would be moved to Wayne?

Answer. We announced the decision in September 1959, immediately after it was made. Occupancy was scheduled for April 1962. This gave employees more than 2½ years to get used to the idea and to adjust their personal plans accordingly. My guess is that 90 percent reacted favorably to the announcement.

Question. What did you do to help employees understand the move and to decide what they might do to prepare for it?

Answer. On the day we announced it, we sent all New York office employees a lengthy memo giving all pertinent data about the location, the communities nearby, schools, and so on. Also, we told employees that it was our intention to help them gain the fullest benefits possible from this move and to do our best to minimize any inconvenience that might result. We sent them maps and route information, urging them to visit the site and look over the area. We produced a special periodical just to keep them up to date on our progress. Most importantly, we set up an information center at which employees could obtain informed help on all problems pertaining to moving their families to the area. We also gave a great deal of attention to the question of transportation for those who chose to continue to live in the city, as a few have.

Question. Did all of your employees from the New York offices follow you to Wayne?

Answer. Not all of the clerical workers did. In anticipation of this, we set up a hiring program for people in the Wayne area 6 months before we were ready to move. This was an important step because it enabled us to maintain personnel standards and avoid last minute hiring to fill in gaps.

Question. What do you think is the greatest benefit so far from your move?

Answer. Beyond doubt it is in the higher morale and increased efficiency of employees. I think it goes deeper than merely working together under one roof in a tranquil setting. It stems in large part, I suspect, from the feeling on the part of many that the move has enabled them to offer more to their families, both in terms of a good environment and in the extra time they save from commuting. For most of us, life has become easier in some ways, which gives us more energy to put into our work.

Feed Grains Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, since this body will start immediate consideration of the feed grains bill (H.R. 4997) tomorrow, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following two insertions concerning this legislation.

The article follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Apr. 9, 1963]

FEDERAL FARM CONTROL

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Thirty years ago this month the New Deal was begining the most audacious adventure in economic control ever undertaken in this country before or since.

Now it is $48 billion and six Secretaries of Agriculture later. The farm problem of 30 years ago is in some respects worse than ever. Human misery is no longer involved, but not even a close approach has been made to an economically sound and permanently workable solution. Political problems have been eased. Farmers as a class are fewer, smarter and better off.

After the passage of all this time and the spending of a vast treasure to increase farmers' incomes, the great farm technocracy is facing a key decision. This decision is whether or not to take the final plunge into the strictest form of control and regimentation of private enterprise ever seriously proposed in this country.

The issue rises because the loose and circumscribed control systems of the past 30 years, in all their myriad forms, have not worked satisfactorily.

On the whole, surpluses have continued to mount until it costs nearly $1 billion a year merely to carry them. Every agricultural program devised has fallen afoul of technological progress.

Farmers can produce food faster than Government officials can think up schemes to hold them back. This has been the great technological revolution of our time. There are half as many farmers today as in 1930. They can supply food and fiber to at least twice as many people as they could in 1930.

The issue turns on a new control system for the production and marketing of wheat. About half the farmers in the Nation grow wheat. They have operated under a control system involving limitation of acreage and marketing and fixed prices.

But never have the producers of wheat, or any other commodity, submitted to the strict controls of planting and marketing which would virtually convert their farms into State enterprises.

Now, under law, such a program of controlled acreage and controlled marketing is to be submitted to the producers of wheat in a referendum on May 21.

Under this program Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman would hear every grain of wheat that falls. Bushel by bushel, wheat would flow into its various uses by Government permit and certification and at Government prices.

Farmers would be harnessed in a system providing fines up to $5,000 for violating regulations and jail sentences up to 10 years for fraud.

A wheat farmer could oppose this program with all his heart and mind, and go out of business if his convictions were strong enough. For the Government pays him nothing for an independent conscience. If two of his three neighbors want the program, and he does not, he is sacrificed to the general interest; he conducts his business their way or not at all. The new wheat program will be mandatory on all if it is approved by a two-thirds majority.

It is widely believed that if wheat farmers approve the new program the way will be opened for a similar State enterprise system for the producers of corn, feed grains, livestock—and in the end all forms of agricultural control will take this pattern.

Many years of observing the development of farm programs leads clearly to the conclusion that a relatively small group of wheatgrowers will make the national decision of the greatest importance to all farmers. In the great farm organizations, and in the Government, it is sensed that this is the critical hour of decision.

Farmers now are faced by the facts of stringent Government control, and they must ask themselves if this is really what they want. If wheat farmers say no on May 21, they can change the whole course of the Freeman-Kennedy farm program. They can, in fact, blow it out of the water.

This choice is made by a semblance—something it is a travesty—of democracy. In a previous referendum only 235,700 farmers voted, perhaps no more than one-sixth of the total farms on which acreage allotments existed.

By every means that is legal the vast agricultural bureaucracy is trying to sway the vote in favor of the State enterprise system.

The absurb claim is made by Secretary Freeman that farmers are choosing between $2 per bushel and $1 per bushel wheat. That is not even statistically correct.

Freeman is trying to persuade farmers that Congress and Kennedy will leave them in the lurch if they turn down the new control program, and there will be nothing but an old control program that will cut their income in half. This is so unrealistic that few farmers will be fooled.

Farmers won't be left in the lurch. They are given a chance now to escape a new regimentation that they will come to hate even more than some of them detest their present restrictions.

If the wheat farmers say no, Congress will come immediately to grips with this problem again, and there is no lack of effective programs which could be enacted.

The choice is not between $2 and $1 wheat. It is a choice of freedom and responsibility or the intensification of control systems which haven't yet been able to do the job.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

OFFERS PLAN TO ELIMINATE FARM PROPS—U.S. CONTROLS IRK HOOSIER FARMER

(NOTE.—American agriculture is approaching a crossroad May 21 when farmers vote on whether to adopt the Kennedy administration's 1964 wheat program and thus establish the tighest and most complicated controls ever seriously proposed for any crop. If they reject it, they may precipitate a change in the whole pattern of subsidization of farm prices, and a move toward a freer farm economy. The Government now stores a year's supply of wheat for domestic and foreign use, and 10 months' supply of cotton. The wheat referendum has brought bitter controversy between opposing forces in agriculture, with demands being made in some quarters for junking the whole confused mass of Federal farm legislation and starting anew. Elmer Gumz, who farms 2,000 acres at North Liberty, Ind., and who is a graduate in economics of Wabash College, here presents his program "by a farmer for farmers" for ending all farm support legislation within 3 years, and starting anew.)

(By Elmer Gumz)

Since 1920 farmers have been confronted with farm problems with varying degrees of intensity. The Government has enacted legislation on behalf of farmers, but has never, at any time, come anywhere near a solution. The reason for Government failure to solve farm problems is simply that the Government cannot legislate farm programs that would be simultaneously successful for farmers and completely satisfactory to consumers.

A government cannot legislate on matters of economics.

World War II solved our 1939 unemployment problem, it increased the demand for food and fiber, and the agriculture problem, for the time being, was solved.

CROP SUPPORTS PASSED

Then the Government passed legislation to support agricultural prices for the duration of the war plus 2 years. The support prices were continued at an artificially high level to the year 1954. In the meantime Europe had recovered, the demand for American agricultural products had lessened, and the Government started to accumulate huge surpluses of most farm products to be stored at taxpayers' expense.

This costs every American family about $100 per year in extra taxes. The existence of $8½ billion of farm products in Government hands will prevent prices from ever adjusting to the satisfaction of the farmer. The law of supply and demand is not allowed to function.

Today Congress is getting fed up with the cotton program, the tobacco program, dairy products—in other words, the whole thing has become a complete mess. The time has come when we should not look toward the Government for answers to any of our problems. What course then should be followed? I offer you a simple farm program that will return sanity, sense, and prosperity to the American farmer.

WHAT HE OFFERS

I recommend—

1. The Government shall freeze all surpluses now held in storage. It would earmark a percentage of these products necessary to the national security in case of emergency. It would dispose of some of these surpluses to needy people of the world, as well as continue to dispose of surpluses through Public Law 480 for a 3-year period.

[Public Law 480 provides for the sale of surplus farm commodities abroad for foreign currencies, authorizes their use in barter for strategic materials, and permits donations for famine relief and other emergencies.]

2. All present legislation shall be either repealed or allowed to expire.

3. Congress shall provide legislation for the leasing of about 50 million acres of land on a bid basis in every county of the country on a yearly basis, this 50 million acres on an expenditure not to exceed $2 billion for the first year, $1½ for the second year, and $1 billion for the third year. The extent of governmental authority would be over land only and no particular crop. If the Government is going to control one crop, it should control all crops. By controlling land, it would control all crops indirectly. This would simplify the problem, lower the costs, give the farmers freedom for adjustments which are imperative because of variables such as weather, diseases, available outlets, and take care of changes in consumer habits, expanding world markets, etc.

4. The Government shall support prices on all farm crops at 50 percent of parity. [That is, the Government would pay to farmers up to 50 percent of the amount needed to bring the prices they receive for their produce into line with the costs of the things they have to buy in order to produce their crops.]

In order to be eligible for this 50 percent, farmers would store their own crops at no cost to the Government. Farm commodities stored by the farmers would be better cared for at no expense to the taxpayer, allowing farmers to sell when their particular market suited them best.

LIKE FHA GUARANTEES

In event it became necessary for the Government to support a price at 50 percent of parity, the Government's role should be nothing more than a guarantee similar to the Federal Housing Administration's guarantees on loans in real estate. The farmer would go to a local bank and borrow money privately.

For legislation to become active, a referendum would be held by all farmers on the entire program, not wheat farmers voting for a wheat program, cotton farmers for a cotton program, etc. To become applicable, a majority voting affirmatively would be sufficient instead of a two-thirds majority as we now have it, crop by crop.

The Congress today is waiting for an obvious move on the part of farmers as a signal to dispose of all farm programs. A negative vote in the wheat referendum is the answer.

Then a free agriculture can go to work and produce at the lowest possible cost all food and fiber necessary for domestic and export needs.

The American farmer will have no problem in competing with the Common Market countries or any other part of the world with modern machinery, chemicals, and American know-how. He will have no fear of the future. That will be a glorious day.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resoluton 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committe. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 9, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned students at Villanova University, urge you to support the resolution of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD (H. Res. 14), which calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. We feel that such a committee could objectively study all the captive nations and present their plight to the world so that all free peoples could realize the true nature of Russian colonialism and thus more energetically check its spread.

Sincerely yours,

John C. McMullen, Albert D'Arcangelo, Jr., Richard M. DeFuria, Cesar Seoam, Armando Cuesta, James Dakin, Eduardo Perz, Francis Lavelle, Joseph Minecci, D. F. Sullivan, John Amendola, Joseph A. Lundy, Russell J. Dobbs, Roman Cyhon.

STAMFORD, CONN.,
April 9, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to inform you that the original of the enclosed copy has been sent to the Honorable Abner W. Sibal.

Very truly yours,

VERA SPINKEELA.

STAMFORD, CONN.,
April 9, 1963.

Hon. ABNER W. SIBAL,
House of Representatives, 145 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have learned that within the past several days you have called for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee in the House.

Permit me to congratulate you for this worthy action. No doubt such a committee will efficiently serve as a movement which can help to deter communism. I hope that the House will soon put this committee into action.

Sincerely yours,

VERA SPINKEELA.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *March 30, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I have great respect for you as chairman of the House Rules Committee. Many men have held this important position but few have equaled your sense of justice.

I urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large while Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a Nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL MELNYKOVICH,
Tucson, Ariz.

BRONX, N.Y.,
April 11, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I would urge you earnestly to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee. I would also ask you to give it your favorable support.

A Committee on the Captive Nations is important to every American and to our Government.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN S. HOLIAT.

ASTORIA, N.Y.,
April 10, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Member, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I would like to ask you to put on the agenda of your committee the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), calling for creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Happy Easter,

DR. AL. SOKOLYSZYN.

West Virginia "Electrifying"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the importance of cheap electricity to the growth of industry is a recognized fact. Less generally known is the fact that West Virginia's virtually limitless reserves of bituminous coal are an ideal source for ample, low-cost electric power.

The New York Times, in its Sunday supplement for April 21, 1963, has an article which tells why West Virginia's atmosphere and economy are "electrifying." Among other power achievements is the initiation of the first 500,000-volt commercial transmission line, one segment of which will extend into the Washington area.

The advantages of cheap electric power in West Virginia is of such importance to industry in general that I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA "ELECTRIFYING"

There's an electric atmosphere in West Virginia's economy. And it goes a long way in making the State a natural location for expanding heavy American industry. Here's why:

The State is at the center of the greatest markets of the Nation—East, Midwest, and South.

And yet the State isn't crowded or overindustrialized. There's plenty of elbowroom for new locations and growth.

The State's modern transportation system includes barge shipping on the Ohio River and its tributaries, with direct access by water to the gulf and entire Mississippi River system.

Importantly situated on virtually limitless reserves of bituminous coal, West Virginia is ideal for production of ample, low-cost electric power.

In 1960 West Virginia was exporting over 40 percent of its power production to other States, sending "coal by wire" to industries, homes, and farms served by interconnected electric utility systems beyond its borders.

But the big advantage to American industry in utilizing the State's massive coal reserves in the most profitable way is through a West Virginia plant location to which power may be delivered in large blocks under conditions of greatest economy and at rates competitive with any other area in the Nation.

Here's the situation as of the start of 1963: Five investor-owned electric companies are serving the people and industries of West Virginia with an investment now of around $600 million.

To this add a $111 million generating station, under construction by Virginia Electric and Power Co. in Grant County with one 500,000 kilowatt unit to be in service early in 1965 and a duplicate to follow a year later. The plant will feed power into the Nation's first commercial 500,000-volt transmission line, one segment to extend into the Washington area, the other to Richmond. The

350-mile loop will add $45 million to the overall construction cost.

Announced by Allegheny Power System, of which Monongahela Power Co. and Potomac Light & Power Co. are the West Virginia operating units, are plans for a new $57.5 million 500,000-kilowatt generating station to be constructed on the navigable Monongahela River north of Morgantown. Ground will be broken this year, with completion date 1967. An anticipated second unit of the same capability is not yet scheduled.

The Monongahela River generating plant is part of a $350 million power supply development to which 18 investor-owned electric utilities are making contributions. At an added cost of $17.5 million, two 500,000-volt transmission links totaling 130 miles in length will be extended from the new Monongahela River plant west to the Ohio River and north to interconnect with other units in an undertaking bringing together the major power markets in the metropolitan East and the Midwest.

To be among the first in the Nation to utilize transmission lines of 500,000 volts, electric companies serving West Virginia also include members of the American Electric Power System which, with manufacturer-cooperators, is engaged in a 5-year study of transmission at higher voltages. AEP's member companies in West Virginia are Appalachian Power and the Wheeling Electric Co. At Apple Grove in the Ohio Valley, where AEP's Sporn plant of 1,100,000 kilowatts is the State's largest to date, there is a major project underway on aspects of the movement of large blocks of power at 775,000 volts as a new step toward economies.

The electric companies serving West Virginia are alert to the requirements of modern industry and are staffed with people to help industries with their plant location programs. These are not only power salesmen and engineers but include geologists, water specialists, wood products specialists, and community planners.

For plants requiring large acreages the utilities are prepared to show sites owned outright or some other form of control so that buyes may inform themselves as to price without obligation, or fear of a premature disclosure of plans.

Major power users as steel, aluminum, and chemicals in West Virginia give testimony to the ability of the utilities to deliver electric power at competitive figures.

There's a Principle at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a long-standing principle of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence—guaranteed in America by the first amendment—that freemen may edit and print a newspaper as a medium for expressing their aspirations, policies, ideas, and observances so long as those expressions not be obscene, libelous, slanderous or otherwise contrary to law.

It is also a long-recognized principle of freedom of speech and press that except in matters of national security representatives of the press may refuse to divluge their sources of information.

Consequently, the growing efforts both in Britain and here in the United States to prosecute press representatives for holding to those principles is alarming. It makes one wonder, indeed, if the days of John Peter Zenger have not returned.

The latest case involving confidential news sources and freedom of the press is outlined below in the following editorial from the April 18, 1963 Edina-Morningside (Minn.) Courier, and in the April 19 column in the Minneapolis Star by Roscoe Drummond:

[From the Edina-Morningside (Minn.) Courier, Apr. 18, 1963]

THERE'S A PRINCIPLE AT STAKE

It's getting so that just about anybody who is anybody in the newspaper business has spent some time in jail.

As regularly as colored folks storming voter registration booths in the South, the Nation's reporters and editors come to the bar of justice, are found wanting, and sent straightway to the pokey.

These newspapermen—and women—get in trouble with the law for one reason only: the profession's unwritten code—that protects the source of news.

The latest newsmen to run afoul of the law are the president and city editor of the Philadelphia Bulletin, the largest evening newspaper in the United States. As the president, Robert L. Taylor, said in a front-page Bulletin story early this week, "There is a principle at stake here which I firmly believe is bigger than I am, or the Bulletin, or the city of Philadelphia. * * *"

"This is the right of a courageous newspaper to fight for good government, regardless of forces or parties in power * * * and the right and indeed the duty of such a newspaper to protect its sources of information."

Taylor had been asked to turn over tapes of conversations that led to a series on corruption in Philadelphia's city hall. He refused, arguing that to do otherwise "would be to say to past and future sources, to our readers and to all the world that the Bulletin has bowed to pressure or expendiency, surrendered its principles and violated a sacred trust with respect to its sources." As a result, he and city editor Selby draw $1,000 fines and 5 day jail sentences.

This is no picayune matter, for only by allowing its informants to remain anonymous and by securing that anonymity at all costs can newspapers hope to smoke out and expose corruption in government. Consistently, though, the courts have held that this principle violates the law of the land, and so men like Taylor and Selby, and many, many others must take their medicine.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Apr. 19, 1963]

CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES VITAL TO FREE PRESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Like other newspapermen in the past, the president of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Robert L. Taylor, and City Editor Earl Selby are risking prison rather than disclose to a grand jury confidential sources of information.

There is no doubt that the preservation of confidential news sources is in the interest of newspapers. If a paper did not protect its confidential sources, it would not have any confidential sources. That makes if a professional necessity.

But the question I want to examine is whether this practice is in the public interest as well.

No one will lightly wish to make the taking of evidence in a judicial proceeding more difficult. When a district attorney is investigating crime and corruption in public office, naturally he wants the maximum help from those who could help. The court can subpena and the citizen is rightly required to testify of his knowledge with very limited exceptions.

Editors and reporters have made their own exceptions. The wisdom and propriety of their doing so is already confirmed in the laws of 12 States, including Pennsylvania. At one time or another in every city of the United States newspapers have brought official crime into the open and prepared the way for prosecution and reform.

This serves the public interest by keeping public officials under powerful scrutiny. To some degree official investigation may be made more difficult by refusal to disclose news sources, but unless confidential sources are kept confidential by the newspaper there would often be no basis provided for subsequent investigation.

It is accepted that an attorney cannot be required to divulge statements made to him in confidence by his client. Obviously it would be easier for the police or an adversary attorney if this immunity did not prevail. But this immunity is not merely convenient for the lawyer; it is vital to the practice of the law.

A reporter's privilege not to be forced to disclose his confidential relationship to his news source is comparable. This is not something merely convenient for the reporter; it is vital to the practice of a free press. Otherwise much news which can be obtained to protect the public would dry up like dew on the desert.

The Philadelphia Bulletin case, which will go to the State supreme court and perhaps to the U.S. Supreme Court, involves an interpretation of the Pennsylvania statute exempting newspapermen from disclosing their confidential news sources. But Judge Bernard J. Kelley has ruled that since the Bulletin published the name of one of its sources, it was legally obligated to provide additional information. The courts will have to determine the validity of Judge Kelley's ruling.

But the security of the newspapers against being forced to disclose confidences has never rested on statutes. It has rested, in part, on the long tradition of respect for this professional code. Most of all, it has rested on the willingness of newspaper editors, like Taylor and Selby, to choose penalty, including prison, over disclosure.

The right to a free press is imbedded in the Constitution, not for the convenience of newspapers, but for the protection of a free society. Newspapers exercise this right in trust. It is their wise and courageous use of their special rights which is the best protection.

For newspapers to abandon the security of confidential sources would be to abandon part of the substance of a free press itself.

Makes the Picture More Encouraging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, currently the House Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing has before it H.R. 904, legislation which I introduced to the Congress and which provides for the elimination of futures trading in Irish potatoes. Hearings were conducted on this bill on April 8, 9, and 10.

I have, over an extended period of time, believed that the function of futures trading, as conducted by the New York Mercantile Exchange on Irish potatoes,

is inconsistent with the best interests of potato growers in Maine and throughout the country. I insert into the RECORD an article from the April 13–14, 1963, issue of the Bangor Daily News, which also supports this view:

MAKES THE PICTURE MORE ENCOURAGING

Efforts to remove potatoes from futures trading on the New York Merchantile Exchange have been opposed in past years by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It now has taken a neutral stand, neither favoring or opposing the removal proposal, which requires legislative action by Congress.

This should lift the spirits of Maine potato growers, the great majority of whom don't like to see their product subject to the price fluctuations that result from operations by brokers.

They feel as Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE does, that potatoes should "go to market with a price established in the market place and not on ticker tape." MCINTIRE is sponsor of a House bill which would remove potatoes from the exchange and a member of a House agricultural subcommittee which is considering the bill.

MCINTIRE and other proponents come up with a potent argument by citing the history of the Nation's onion industry. This industry was ailing until Congress removed onions from futures trading a few years ago. Now it is making a good comeback.

The only remaining perishable subject to the ups and downs of trading, reports MCINTIRE, is potatoes. It seems reasonable to assume that what has been good for onions would be good for spuds; that prices would be stabilized and marketing more orderly.

Opposition to the legislation remains, but the neutral position taken by the Agriculture Department is a favorable and, we hope, a significant development. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE is pushing similar legislation in the Senate and perhaps by unified effort Maine growers will get what they have wanted for years—a chance to sell their potatoes free of the influence of the New York Mercantile Exchange.

A Tribute to Charlie Ross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for many years I knew and appreciated Mr. Charlie Ross and Dr. Griff Ross. The Ross family is a splendid and outstanding family in east Texas. We all greatly miss Mr. Charles Ross and Dr. Griff Ross.

Under unanimous consent I include the following material:

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE ROSS

"Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?
Like a swift-fleeting meteor, a fast-flying cloud,
A flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
Man passeth from life to rest in the grave.

"The leaves of the oak and the willow shall fade,
Be scattered around, and together be laid.
And the young and the old and the low and the high
Shall molder to dust, and together shall lie."

—*William Knox.*

In recent months we in Rusk County have seen a number of our citizens pass down the river of time.

It was really a blow to Rusk County—and Mount Enterprise—when we lost Mr. Charlie Ross. His amiable ways and the sunshine that prevailed among his innermost being really should have earned for him the title of "Ambassador of good will," for he endeavored to lift people up. He was one of the most charitable men with his time that I ever knew. His drug store might be called the "hub" or information center of Mount Enterprise. He was especially friendly and helpful to strangers. Mr. Ross loved humanity and hated no one.

I went to Mount Enterprise on a number of occasions and felt that my trip was void if I did not go by and see Mr. Ross, for there was something about his personality and kindness that elevated me. Then, too, he knew the news. He would question the salesmen and various people from scattered parts of the State and learn what was going on. That was why he was so good at forecasting elections.

The politicians knew Mr. Ross. At election time they meandered their way to his place of business for he had lots of influence over the voters. Various candidates sought his support. Mount Enterprise changed from a very liberal box to a conservative one. In my estimation this trend can largely be attributed to Mr. Ross' influence. He supported whom he thought to be the best man for the job irrespective of the party.

He was also a civic- and business-minded man. His heart was in Mount Enterprise, forever wanting to see it grow and prosper. He enjoyed seeing people trade more than any man I ever saw. Ofttimes he was the mediator between the traders. His telephone was frequently used by those who needed it, and he would often volunteer to talk for other people. It did not matter whether it was someone who wanted to buy a baby calf from a local dairy or someone who wanted to buy an oil and gas lease. He made many lease deals for companies and individuals. Mr. Ross worked exceedingly hard for the exploration and development of the oil and gas business.

Although it is a grievous loss, we can still entertain hope and vision with the eruption of spring with its mantle of green and multivarious flowers predominant about us. Amid the glory of nature, the song birds, the little choristers of the air, will sing for every heart of hope, of love and death together. For a lifeless body there is hope beyond the grave.

Two-Price Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the existing two-price arrangement for cotton is one of the most critical and one of the most confusing situations ever to beset American agriculture. It is the unpleasant progeny of a union between America's policy on agriculture and its policy on foreign trade. As things now stand, foreign textile mills are allowed to buy cotton in the United States at about one-fourth less than American mills are forced to pay for the same cotton, due to domestic price supports. A subsidy is given to exporters to allow them to buy raw cotton at the domestic price and sell it to foreigners at the world price. The subsidy equals the difference between the two prices. The result, of course, is that foreign producers buy American cotton at the lower price, ship finished fabrics back to the United States, and undersell American mills.

Everyone admits that the results of this system are grossly unfair to American mills, but no agreement has yet been reached as to how best to remedy the situation. A number of solutions have been proposed, however, and the following editorial, broadcast on April 10, 1963, by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Charlotte, N.C., is a thoughtful commentary on two of the most recent ones:

TWO-PRICE COTTON

In our previous discussions of two-price cotton we have considered the administration's 5-cent compromise proposal and the wage differential between American and foreign mills. Our present remarks concern two proposed alternatives to the two-price system, tariffs and import quotas.

Both of these would soften the effects of the two-price system but would not eliminate the cause of the trouble.

Tariffs are largely ineffective, because they are subject to reprisals and because the United States would find a high tariff inconsistent with its obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades which it signed with other nations.

When President Kennedy raised the tariff on carpets to protect American manufacturers and their employees, the Common Market countries raised their tariffs on eight major commodities that the United States had been selling to them. That is the kind of trade war invited by high tariffs.

Further, the tariff would merely reduce the amount of finished goods imported into this country. It would not help American raw cotton to hold its own in competition with foreign cotton, which now accounts for a third of the world market.

Import quotas are hard to police. For example, in the first 6 months of the Geneva compact on quotas, imports into the United States amounted to more than the agreed figures for the whole year. Ten countries had exceeded their quotas, and nobody seemed to know what to do about it.

The cotton situation has been growing steadily worse as other countries have entered the world market. Egypt, India, Brazil, and Southeast Asia are strong competitors of American cotton, and if Russia and Red China get into the world market on a large scale, our handicap will be even heavier.

Already our share of the world market is dropping. If this decline is added to the gradual wasting away of the cotton textile industry in this country, we shall eventually see the end of both cotton growing and cotton manufacture.

Under two-price cotton since 1956 the number of active cotton spindles dropped 9.1 percent and is going down at the rate of 40,000 a month.

Cotton is essential to both the economy and the national defense. The late Secretary Frank Knox, of the Navy, said in defense work cotton was second only to steel. The Armed Forces use hundreds of cotton articles for which there is no synthetic substitute. At the peak in World War II we used 11.2 million bales annually. The postwar decline reduced stocks until during the Korean war an embargo had to be declared on exports of cotton.

It can be seen, then, that there is an actual national danger if both cotton markets and cotton manufacture are killed off. If present trends are an indication, this is just what the two-price system is doing to one of our most essential industries.

Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn Recognized for Leadership in Developing Republican Support From Nation's College Professors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding young professors of political science in our country today is Dr. Robert Huckshorn, a graduate of Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield, Mo., who during the past year has given distinguished service as the Director of the Arts and Sciences Division of the Republican National Committee.

It is gratifying to note that members of the press as well as Members of Congress are giving the recognition to Dr. Huckshorn for the constructive work which he is doing in enabling professors all over the country to share with Republican legislators their thoughts and programs for the betterment of this Nation. A wholesome climate prevails when Members of the House and Senate share with professors and students from leading academic institutions throughout the country different approaches and ideas on how well all of us can do our jobs better and serve the public more constructively.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the work of Dr. Huckshorn and his political scientists. The full text of an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis, Mo., Globe-Democrat, Friday, March 22, 1963, follows. It is indicative of the recognition Dr. Huckshorn is receiving.

GOP PUSHES DRIVE TO WIN SUPPORT OF NATION'S PROFESSORS

(By Robert Hochstein)

WASHINGTON.—The Republican Party, which has not always looked endearingly at the intellectual community, is now stepping up a drive to enlist the support of the Nation's professors for GOP candidates in the 1964 elections.

The arts and sciences division of the Republican National Committee, headed by Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn, hopes to have as many as 1,000 professors actively working in behalf of the party by the time the elections roll around and thousands more academicians lending moral support to the GOP cause.

A roster of 12,500 educators, who have indicated Republican Party affiliation or sympathy, has already been compiled. The professors are located in every congressional district and represent every conceivable field of academic interest.

HOPES FOR 25,000

By 1964, Dr. Huckshorn hopes to have lined up 25,000 teachers on the Nation's campuses who, at a minimum, are willing to stand up and be counted in the GOP ranks. At many schools, the GOP official noted, political activity on the part of the staff is frowned on.

Of the 12,500 Republican-oriented professors now on GOP rolls, about 4,000 have expressed a willingness to participate in some political activity. But for the majority of them, this means little more than lending their names to support GOP candidates.

However, Dr. Huckshorn said the number willing to be actively involved in such things as writing speeches, conducting research in areas of special competence, delivering talks and acting as liaison with local political, business, and fraternal and church groups is increasing.

OHIO LEADS WAY

The Ohio Arts and Sciences Division of the Republican State Committee, under leadership of Republican State Chairman Ray C. Bliss and Dr. Arthur I. Peterson, director of the Institute of Practical Politics at Ohio Wesleyan University, currently leads the way in GOP professors enrolled in the Republican cause with about 2,400.

There are similar arts and sciences divisions attached to GOP State organizations in California, Oregon, Washington, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, Maryland, and Colorado. In Texas, GOP academicians have banded together and formed their own organization, not formally affiliated with the State committee.

Dr. Huckshorn said State Republican committees in Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Kentucky have indicated a desire to establish an arts and sciences division to utilize the talents of Republican-minded professors.

MISSOURI HAS 150

In New York, about 600 educators have expressed a willingness to be involved in the GOP cause; in Pennsylvania, 630; Missouri, 150; New Jersey, 160; California, 1,000; Texas, 220; Oregon, 200; Alabama, 25, and Louisiana, 25. In all other States, there are at least a few.

Dr. Huckshorn has been traveling around the country trying to stimulate and encourage State Republican committees to follow the lead of those that have already set up arts and sciences divisions.

The task can be difficult. Sometimes a party professional may be a little leary of having a professor breathing down his back, feeling that the academician may be more concerned with correcting his English than with winning an election.

In general, though, there is apparently an increasing recognition, even on the local level, that the professor with a special area of competence can supply needed background and information to deal with the practical issues of the day.

The Opelousas Daily World Speaks on Nuclear Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 the Opelousas, La., Daily World carried a penetrating analysis of the nuclear test ban issue in a column written by that newspaper's editor, John R. Thistlethwaite. In part, the column reads as follows:

NUCLEAR TESTING AND MANKIND

(By John R. Thistlethwaite)

One of the ablest voices in the nuclear field is Dr. Edward Teller, often called "the father of the hydrogen bomb." It is he, more than any other man alive, who made it possible for the United States to have reached a stage of near perfection of the hydrogen thermonuclear explosive process at the time that the world was horribly shocked with the announcement that Russia had exploded an atomic bomb. This country owes Dr. Teller—who fought ably, impressively, and effectively at the highest levels to continue development of hydrogen nuclear fusion—a tremendous debt.

We had the pleasure of introducing Dr. Teller at the UPI Editors' Conference in San Francisco last October. We brought back a copy of his speech, which had to be transcribed from a tape because he doesn't write his speeches. He has one of those orderly minds which does not require a manuscript. We are going to give you a couple of quotations from his speech:

"It is my guess * * * that the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear weapons today. This need not be fatal; it probably isn't, because even our nuclear weapons present to them a big enough danger to deter them * * * they will not attack us unless they can do so with sufficient safety to themselves. But let them steal another march; let them prepare in secrecy for another few years, and then spring on us another test series to which we will not be prepared in good enough time, and they may have the edge. They may then have sufficient lead to be able to tell us, 'We can hit you and you cannot hit us back'."

Dr. Teller told of the urgent emphasis for continued nuclear research, ending in tests—research must be tested. And he gave three answers to those who would argue for halting nuclear tests:

(1) "Not to be prepared in the nuclear age with nuclear weapons; to rely in the nuclear age on conventional weapons, is as sound a policy as to stick to the bow and arrow after firearms were introduced. * * * Only thorough and detailed knowledge * * * will allow us to use nuclear weapons in the right way * * * whenever and wherever needed and without hurting the innocent bystander."

(2) "You cannot turn the clock back. You can no more prevent additional nations acquiring nuclear knowledge and nuclear weapons than you can prevent your teenagers from finding out about the facts of life by keeping secrets from them. * * * We live in the nuclear age and we had better get accustomed to the idea that power in this nuclear age is unavoidably intertwined with and unavoidably rests upon the use of the most powerful and most easily transported sources of energy. * * * And this is true for war and * * * true for peace equally."

(3) "Yes, the nuclear age is dangerous. It is also full of opportunity. In a rapidly developing dynamic stituation, negative attitudes, turning back the clocks, setting up prohibitions which can be violated at will by the bootleggers, will not pay. The only thing that will is a positive policy; the only thing that does help is the type of behavior which we adopted shortly after the Second World War, when we helped Europe rehabilitate itself. * * * It is dangerous to withhold from our allies nuclear weapons, because that will cause them to stop being our allies. We cannot hold them in a dependent state forever, and it is obvious to any conmmonsense observer that they will not stay in that state. We must at least get together with our good friends."

At that time, and still today, as far as we know, Dr. Teller was engaged in "Project Ploughshare," the U.S. project aimed at developing civilian, peaceful uses for nuclear energy.

It is somewhat sickening to hear people say that the development of nuclear energy is a monstrous thing which must be halted and its progress erased. We heard one talk a year or so ago on the thesis that mankind has "created a monster which he can no longer control," and must be eliminated.

How little faith in mankind and in one's God can one have?

Nuclear energy is more than a mere opportunity. It will be the eventual salvation of mankind. The best minds, projecting the most extensive possible mineral discoveries, do not forecast sufficient fossil fuels available in the earth's crust to provide energy for mankind, at its rate of expansion, for more than another century. There simply isn't enough oil and gas and coal for the long-term future.

Mankind has, in the past decade, completely eliminated that threat from the futures of his descendants with the discovery of atomic fission and nuclear fusion. Because of these fruits of the minds of men such as Einstein and the work of men such as Dr. Teller, mankind has a glorious prospect ahead. If that isn't God-given, and exactly the antithesis of monstrous, what is?

True, today we are threatened with slavery; with a creeping menace to the dignity, freedom, and glory of the human individual that will surely ring down another millenium of dark ages should the Communist conspiracy succeed. Wherever it has succeeded, the human being as an independent, thinking, creative creature has ceased to exist.

It is a contretemps that at the time that man reasoned his way to a limitless source of energy destined to free him for all time from the limitations of physical toil, mankind became embroiled in a battle for his personal liberties and the free conduct of his individual affairs. And this new source of energy became the prime physical weapon in the battle.

We may yet lose these liberties and freedom through our own selfish destruction of the institutions we have erected through the centuries to protect ourselves from ourselves. But the quickest and surest way to lose them is to hand to the forces of slavery and darkness the means for violent use of these new forces, while at the same time denying the deterrent power of them to the free world.

All we have to do is permit them to perfect these things to the point at which they can act with impunity to themselves, through our lack of progress.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly I am told how eagerly readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD await the insertion of Arthur Hoppe's columns which appear in the San Francisco Chronicle.

Recently, he visited Washington to get a personal view of some of the activities of our Nation's Capital City and I believe the following observations will be of particular interest:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 10, 1963]

YOU CAN'T TRUST THE COMMUNISTS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

MACUTO, VENEZUELA.—That's just fine. I've lost my faith in Communist terrorism. And my friend, Mrs. Connagan, has lost $10 all because the luxurious new Macuto Sheraton Hotel failed to open with a bang.

Not that it wasn't a very gala opening. It was. But as Mrs. Connagan, the wife of an American oil company engineer, said ruefully the next morning: "Imagine: not one lousy stinkbomb. Eleanor will be insufferable."

Eleanor is Mrs. Connagan's friend. Each has lived more than 10 years in Venezuela and both have developed a somewhat jaundiced view of Venezuelan politics. And that includes the band of young Communists usually referred to in the press as "the faln terrorists."

"Hah," says Mrs. Connagan. "A bunch of practical jokers. They stinkbombed me out of two concerts already this year."

Indeed, Mrs. Connagan and her friend, Eleanor, have a pool on where the faln will strike next. And Mrs. Connagan drew the gala Macuto Sheraton opening. "It's a natural," she said, all delighted. "The hotel represents American financial interests. President Betancourt will cut the ribbon and they love to embarrass him. And, best of all, you international press are on hand, so it'll get worldwide coverage. Oh, Eleanor's just furious."

So at 7 p.m. we all took our places in the handsome modern lobby to await Mr. Betancourt with the scissors. The travel writers crowding toward the front, us political experts crowding toward the back.

I idled the time by casing Mr. Betancourt's bodyguard, posted strategically around the scene. Each was wearing a grim steel helmet, and matching expression. And each packed a chopper, finger on the trigger. "Don't let them make you nervous," said Mrs. Connagan. "They never can hit a thing they're aiming it."

I said that was very reassuring. Sort of. And I started to reach for a cigarette. Only to remember they were in the inside pocket of my jacket. Kind of where a shoulder holster would be. So, as a bodyguard was eyeing me with interest, I decided to chew my fingernails instead.

The military band went: "Ta-dah," and as I went 3 feet straight up in the air this gave me an excellent view of Mr. Betancourt coming down the stairs. That was the last I saw of him because a large, thick pillar got between us. But I could tell when he cut the ribbon. Everybody winced. Only nothing happened. Mrs. Connagan, however, kept a stiff upper lip. "Maybe later at the ball," she said hopefully. Only nothing happened there either. The moon shone bright on the Caribbean and everybody danced all night to the strains of a white tied orchestra. Everybody that is, but me. I decided to go to my room early and curl up under the bed with a good book.

I ran into Mrs. Connagan the next day and she was pretty disappointed, let me tell you. "It just shows you can't trust those lousy Communists," she said irately. And I think she's right. Communism simply isn't what it used to be. Except in the press.

But what about those of us who have faith? Those who believe Communists are supermen, smarter, braver, more dedicated than we. Isn't there still one place in the world where this dogma burns bright and ever unchanging? Isn't there somewhere that—. Say: I think I'll go to Washington.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 11, 1963]

DICTATORS, NO—DICTATORS, SI

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—The wonderful thing about Washington is the way it never changes. It always gives you a sense of security to find, no matter how long you've been away, that everything is still the same. The Capitol is still enduring, the monuments are still gleaming, the flags are still waving and Senator GOLDWATER is still attacking Cuba.

I guess there's nobody who objects more violently to Mr. Castro's dictatorship than the Senator although, of course, everybody objects violently to dictatorships. Except maybe the Senator. "I don't object to a dictatorship as violently as some people do," he says, "because I realize that not all people in this world are ready for democratic processes. In fact, very few are."

At first I thought maybe this confusion was just battle fatigue. After all, the Senator's been on the offensive against Cuba for all these years and he hasn't even crossed the Potomac. But then I ran into the famous Washington political expert, Mr. A. Reliable Source (Unimpeachable's younger brother), who explained the whole thing.

Question. Mr. Source, shouldn't we object to all dictatorships?

Answer. Oh my, no. That would be naive. There are good dictators and bad dictators. For example, Castro, Khrushchev, and Mao are bad dictators. Chiang, Franco, and Salazar are good dictators.

Question. How do you tell good dictators from bad dictators?

Answer. A good dictator heads free world governments. Bad dictators rule ruthlessly over slave nations. The former are trustworthy and distinguished. The latter devious and perhaps insane.

Question. Do they govern differently?

Answer. Certainly. Good dictators bring stability to the country and guidance to the people with the help of their loyal armies of dedicated fighting men. Bad dictators impose naught but tyranny at bayonet point.

Question. Do the people differ, too?

Answer. Drastically. Those who live under good dictators are ignorant, lazy, lovable people unready for self-government. While those under bad dictators are intelligent, energetic, oppressed people yearning to be free.

Question. What about freedom of speech?

Answer. Bad dictators stamp it out because they fear the truth. Good dictators can't allow it because they fear a bad dictator might take over and stamp it out.

Question. What about foreign policy?

Answer. Bad dictators lust to conquer the world. Good dictators only wish to retake what is rightfully theirs.

Question. Well, thank you, Mr. Source. But it's awfully complex. Isn't there some single, simple method of distinguishing the good dictators from the rest?

Answer. Yes. They're the ones on our side.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 12, 1963]

THE ANT CULTURE OF THE PENTAGONIANS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Work is going apace on my book, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." I've got a new chapter ready on one of the largest indigenous tribes, the Pentagonians. Or, as they're usually called by the other natives, "the Dambrass."

The Pentagonians dwell in a strange hive-like edifice called the Pentagon, where they've evolved a weird culture comparable only to that of the soldier ants of northeast Mozambique. Within their fortress the Pentagonians are virtually self-sufficient. Except for one staple of their life process. This is called appropriations.

For appropriations, the Pentagonians depend upon another native tribe, "the solons," who dwell on nearby Capitol Hill. This parasitic relationship duplicates that between the ant and the aphis. Which the ant, as you know, milks regularly.

Like the aphis, the solons appear to enjoy being milked by the Pentagonians. And the more they're milked, the more they give. But the solons bellow with outrage and alarm on being approached by even the most skilled milker of any other tribe.

The milking process is in the hands of the most feared of all the Pentagonians, who are called the generals. And seeing them scurrying to and fro on Capitol Hill

with more and more appropriations is a sight to behold.

The nominal ruler of this strange colony is known as the Secretary of Defense. Or, in Pentagonese "the SecDef." The current SecDef is known to his subjects as "that Damacnamara." But not to his face.

Oddly enough, the Pentagonians invariably hate their SecDef. This appears due to the ritual of choosing the SecDef from the very lowest and despised rank of Pentagonian: "The Civilians." (While civilians abound in the Pentagon, they are, like drones, assigned only the most menial tasks.) The reason for this ritual is unclear. It appears to have something to do with an old dogma called civilian control of the military. But no Pentagonian believes in it.

That Damacnamara is hated even more bitterly by the Pentagonians than his predecessors. This is due to his efforts to curtail appropriation hunting. On the grounds the Pentagonians have more now than they need. Such interference with the Pentagonian life process has naturally stirred up the ant nest and confusion now abounds. With generals darting hither and thither, feelers quivering, pincers poised.

The solons, who love to be milked, are, of course, aiding the generals. And they keep heaping more appropriations than he wants on that Damacnamara. Which is apparently a horrible kind of punishment.

However, more and more appropriations are desperately needed as the Pentagonians are the fastest growing tribe in Washington. Indeed, some experts fear they may outgrow their appropriation supply and attempt to conquer the other native tribes.

I consider this most doubtful. Firstly, the all-consuming interest of the Pentagonian is in milking the solons, a pastoral pursuit. Secondly, even a cursory tour of the hivelike Pentagon would convince any anthropologist that whatever the Pentagonians are fit for, they aren't fit for war.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 14, 1963]

CULPEPER, A NEW NATIONAL SHRINE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

CULPEPER, VA.—Oh, I know what you're saying. You're saying, "What's that fool Hoppe doing in Culpeper, Va.?" Well, I don't think that's very reverent of you. I happen to be here on a pilgrimage.

For it was on this hallowed ground that Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, an orator whose eloquence is indescribable, delivered the most moving speech of the 1960 presidential campaign. Comparable only to Mr. William Jennings Bryan's cross of gold address. In pithiness.

It was a sunny morning. The LBJ special had chugged out of Washington 60 miles to the north at dawn. Mr. JOHNSON was in rare form. From the black platform he stirred the hundred or so Culpeperians present to the depths of excitement. And then, as the train began to move, he leaned over the rail and uttered those immortal words: "And remember, folks, what's Dick Nixon ever done for Culpeper?"

The Culpeperians looked at each other, took stock of their one ancient hotel, three gas stations and Ritz Hi-Hat restaurant, and voted solidly Democratic. The rest, I need not to tell you, is history.

So it was with a lump in my throat that I drew into Culpeper on this spring day more than 2 long years later, my emotions a mixture not only of nostalgia and reverence, but of dedication. For burning on my lips was the question I am sure the whole Nation is now yearning to hear answered:

"What's LYNDON JOHNSON done for Culpeper?"

I can hardly describe the look that came into the eyes of the young Culpeperian at the gas station when I put this crucial question to him pointblank. "Who?" he said.

Nor is it easy for me to record the reply of a sturdy yeoman in faded overalls and a denim cap who had been there on that historic day: "Haint seen hide nor hair of him since."

And so it went. The responses ranged over a dizzying gamut from "nothing" to "not a dang thing." Although one voluble young lady at the counter of the Ritz Hi-Hat restaurant did speak out firmly in Mr. JOHNSON'S defense: "What could anybody do for this burg?"

Well, I still think we ought to make Culpeper a national shrine. We could erect a suitable monument with Mr. JOHNSON'S immortal words chiseled on the base. For you can't deny they sum up all campaign oratory, past and future. And atop the monument would be a heroic figure. In hip boots. Holding a shovel.

West Virginia High in Colleges Per Capita

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, although my State of West Virginia is well known for the rugged grandeur of our mountains and the brawn of our miners, we are also proud of the high ratio of colleges per capita we have maintained through our first 100 years of history.

An article in the Sunday Supplement of the New York Times for April 21, 1963, traces the history of higher learning in West Virginia back to such patriots as Edmund Randolph, Patrick Henry, and Ebenezer Zane. The 20 vigorous collegiate institutions of present-day West Virginia have a median age of 75 years, providing a continuous link between historic, ivy-covered halls and ultra-modern facilities.

In view of the importance we all ascribe to education in this technological age, I believe this article is of general interest to the Nation, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA HIGH IN COLLEGES PER CAPITA

The recent history of higher education in West Virginia is descriptive of dramatic progress, encouraging stability, and wise planning for the future.

The educational accomplishments of the State can be regarded as the response to the challenge of historical hardships—of frontier isolation, of uncoordinated efforts, of poor financial resources. But the urge to educate was there from the beginning.

Men such as Edmund Randolph, Patrick Henry, and Ebenezer Zane were planning academies for the western counties of Virginia as early as 1787. These institutions, drawn from the loins of the mountains, hewed from virgin timber, performed some of the functions of a junior college and graduated men prominent in law, surveying, the ministry and politics.

Colleges in the modern sense date back to 1839. The number that flourished and declined during the past century does not reflect lack of interest but rather the adverse effects of economic hardships. If anything, the abandoned buildings were a tribute to the daring sacrifices of people who highly valued a college education.

Impressively surviving the Spartan process of elimination in West Virginia are 20 vigorous, modern collegiate institutions, including 3 junior colleges and 2 State universities, with a median age of 75 years. They offer all the more common curriculum on the undergraduate and graduate levels, including law and medicine, and present some unique and highly successful studies on the undergraduate plane.

Rivalry, always a spur to greater effort, is wisely tempered to common purposes by West Virginia's three college associations; one for the seven 4-year private colleges representing six leading religious affiliations; one for the State-supported institutions, and a third for all—the West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents.

The latter is currently coordinated by means of a "unified project" backed financially by the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. It is the only group in the country in which the privately financed and publicly supported colleges of a State are working together in a cooperative program.

Through research and discussion of mutual interests, problems are defined, solutions proposed, and the public is made aware of the fine opportunities for higher education within the State.

West Virginia ranks high among the States in colleges per capita, a boast that might be empty were it not for the regional accreditation of virtually all of these institutions.

Their viability now seems to be assured and the increasing legislative appropriations, burgeoning development plans, and buildings rising from the ground give proof that the State of West Virginia is building men to match her mountains.

Olympic Athletes in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would permit employees of the Federal Government a leave of absence with pay for the purpose of participating in recognized international athletic events.

I cite for the attention of the House the case of Herman Stokes, an employee of the Los Angeles Post Office.

Mr. Stokes, I understand, is one of the two most outstanding athletes of his particular classification that we have in the United States. This year, Mr. Stokes is unofficially a member of the U.S. team that will be competing in the Pan American games to be held in Brazil in the month of April. Also, Mr. Stokes is a likely candidate for the U.S. team that will be competing in the Soviet Union during the month of July.

It is necessary for Mr. Stokes to be granted at least 4 weeks of leave with pay in addition to his normal vacation leave to participate in these major international athletic events.

Mr. Speaker, the honor and prestige of the United States of America becomes a matter of great concern whenever a team from this country enters an international amateur athletic tournament. Whatever the semantics of discussion on sportsmanship may entail, the fact remains that our Nation is judged by people all over the world on the success or failure of our amateur athletes.

The Post Office Department is sympathetic to the problem presented here; however, under existing rules and regulations can do nothing to aid or assist this fine young man in his desire to bring international sports trophies home to America.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will speedily deal with this proposed legislation. I believe the majority of honorable Members will support it, and I believe our country needs it.

A Solution to the Dairy Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Clark County Press, Neillsville, Wis., on April 11, 1963.

The editorial is as follows:

A SOLUTION TO THE DAIRY PROBLEM—DAIRY PROGRAM WOULD ACCOMPLISH AIMS OF ALL

(By Robert Harvey, Editor)

The Clark County Press this week unveils its promised dairy program, which it believes is necessary to (1) take the Government out of dairying; (2) strengthen the competitive retail position of dairy products, and increase consumption through a free market; and (3) give the dairy farmer an opportunity to achieve returns for his product in line with those of other business and industry.

This program is not a panacea, nor is it strictly new or novel in its approach. With one possible innovation, portions of the program have been suggested at various times by various farm groups. The program borrows a little from the Farmers Union program, from the Farm Bureau program, from suggestions made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and from several farm leaders of Wisconsin who are closely associated with the dairy industry and who are intensely interested in the fight for survival of the industry and the dairy farmer.

ESSENCE OF PLAN

In essence, this is the program:

(1) A voluntary signup by farmers to participate by cutting back production to the point where the surplus will be eliminated;

(2) Purchase by dairy manufacturing plants of milk on the basis of a free and open competitive market. This includes the elimination of Federal milk marketing orders which hamstring midwest milk producers, provide unfair competitive advantage to those in areas affected by such orders, and result in unrealistic prices of dairy products to consumers in those areas;

(3) Direct payment by the Federal Government to farmers of subsidies through the ASC offices. The amount of subsidy would be based upon the amount of cutback required to eliminate surpluses. This point is explained in detail further on.

(4) Withdrawal of the Federal Government from the purchase of surplus milk products and from the warehousing of them as rapidly as present warehouse supplies can be liquidated; and

(5) Purchase by the Federal Government of its needed supplies of dairy products on the open market and at competitive prices. These purchases would include all those used for foreign and domestic programs, including the school lunch program, foreign aid or aid to underdeveloped countries, and military services.

VOLUNTARY

Under this program no farmer would be forced to enter into a quota agreement. If he wanted, he could continue to produce at his present level, or increase it. However, his production, like that of those entering into the program, would bring open market price.

Those signing agreements to cut back production would do so under a variable quota arrangement tied to supply of and demand for milk. This, in turn, would be gaged by consumer purchases of dairy products from retail shelves, and from export business. In a free economy, of course, these would be directly connected with the retail prices.

As dairy products remained plentiful, prices on the retail shelves would adjust downward, making the dairy products more competitive, and thus increasing the consumption and demand. As the program takes hold, prices would increase until a balance of supply and demand has been achieved. Growth, then, would depend on natural economic and growth factors in the Nation and in the world.

SETTING OF QUOTAS

Setting of quotas would be relatively easy. Dairy plants can provide production figures for their patrons for years in the immediate past. They also would be required to furnish data on milk delivery of their patrons and prices paid to them on a monthly basis to the ASC offices in each county.

The ASC offices, then, would draw checks in payment of the subsidy to those cooperating in the voluntary cutback program. The amount of these checks would depend on the percentage of volume cut back to achieve a balance in supply.

The support price would be set at a rate of 1 percent above the current levels of support for every percent of cutback in milk volume. In other words, with the current support price at 70 percent of parity, if the Government felt that a 10-percent cutback in quantity of milk were required, an increase in support level to 80 percent would be established. This would assure dairy farmers cooperating under the voluntary program that they will have at least the same gross income during the transitional period as they now have.

The support level would fluctuate in accordance with the percentage cutback as the program is adjusted at frequent intervals to meet the developing market situation.

EXAMPLE

Thus, on current prices, 1,000 pounds of production brings a price of $31.30 on a 3.5-percent butterfat basis. Suppose a 10-percent cutback were required in the original instance to eliminate the surplus, and the free market price paid at the plant were to slip to $2.79 per hundredweight. The farmer would receive $25.11 for that 1,000 pounds of milk from the plant. In addition, he would receive the difference between $2.79 and $3.55 per hundredweight (80 percent of parity), or $6.84, from the Federal Government, represented by a check from the ASC office. The total of the two, then, would amount to $31.95 payment for the 900 pounds of milk (1,000 pounds, less the 10-percent cutback equals 900 pounds).

As the effect of supply and demand took over on the market, and prices paid by plants increased, the Government would trim its subsidy payments in like amount until the market was supporting a full 80 percent of parity. At that point the Government could adjust the cutback to a lower percentage figure until the full effect of a free market were achieved.

When the point of parity is achieved, however, the Government would not withdraw from supervision of the program. It would continue to adjust milk quotas for those producing under the program, and would hold itself in readiness to resume subsidy payments to individuals operating under the voluntary program should the price dip below the proper mathematical percent of parity.

ASC FOCAL POINT

Young men and others starting in the dairy farming business would be able to go to the ASC office and be assigned equitable quotas without charge of any kind. These quotas would be based on the judgment of the ASC county committee, in cases where no previous record is available, or on a basis of the quota of a farm which the individual purchases. The total production thus added would be reflected in the overall national supply, and on that basis would be but a drop in the proverbial bucket.

It is the opinion of the Clark County Press that such a program would have an immediate and beneficial effect on the sales of dairy products on the retail level. It would result in almost immediate lowering of prices of butter, cheese, ice cream, milk, and other dairy products. The decrease in retail price would be appreciable. Past experience has proved, for instance, that as little variation as 1 cent in the retail price of butter has a marked effect on sales and consumption of butter at the retail level. Consequently, the program would result in lifting the per capita consumption of dairy products.

STRONGER MARKET

As consumption increased and a balance in milk supply is achieved, prices will begin to rise on the retail level, and these increases will be reflected in increased prices paid to dairy farmers by plants operating on a free market. Prices will become stronger increasingly until they have reached a point where a legitimate profit is available to all connected with the dairy business, from farmer to retailer.

When that point is reached, cutbacks in milk production may be reduced, permitting the dairy industry as a whole to remain competitive with substitutes.

Such a free market, too, would encourage plants, as well as the industry, to promote their products and their sales as the industry returned to the initiative prompted by a strong, solid, free, and competitive market.

The long-range cost to the Government of such a program would be progressively lower as the market for dairy products strengthened. As fast as the current warehoused supplies could be liquidated, this large and unproductive cost would be wiped out.

Too, the saving to the consumer on the retail market would be considerable in the go-in on this program; but eventually he would pay a fair and just price for a good product.

We are well aware that the dairy program suggested here by the Clark County Press will have its detractors. Largely they will be those who have received political or financial advantage from the inept programs with which the dairy industry has been saddled in the past. It also will not be particularly palatable to segments who have reaped a windfall harvest of dollars from operating large warehouses; and it certainly will be heavily opposed by the moneyed interests in substitute products, whose encroachment on the markets of dairy industry will be stopped in their tracks.

Some, too, will oppose the program on the principle that they are opposed to Government subsidies. We are, too, for we feel that generally speaking paternal Government has served only to smother and subdue the dairy industry to the point where its very life now is threatened. However, it would be impossible at the moment to move toward a free market once again without providing assistance of Government in the transitional period.

Dr. Heller's Perpetual Motion Machine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the April 22 edition of the Chicago Tribune:

DR. HELLER'S PERPETUAL MOTION MACHINE

A frequent characteristic of perpetual motion machines is that they can be made to sound just plausible enough to fool the unwary into believing that a machine can, indeed, keep going indefinitely without any external source of energy.

The Kennedy administration promises even more than perpetual motion in its plan to increase Government revenue and thus balance the budget by cutting taxes and not cutting Government spending. This plan starts off with the plausible and correct assumption that cutting taxes will stimulate business. Then the President's economic adviser, Dr. Heller, invokes what he calls the "multiplier and accelerator effect," to suggest that business will be so stimulated that taxes on the new business will offset the tax cut and presto, we'll have a surplus.

We doubt that many people understand this multiplier and accelerator effect any better than they understood the "equidistant downdraft manifolding" boasted by the makers of the Marmon automobile 40 years ago. But they may find it easier to believe than to dispute, and it would no doubt be pleasant to think that the way to keep our economic machine running is to sit back, pay fewer taxes, and let the Government spend more money that it doesn't have.

Ellerton A. Lodge, a vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, recognizes this as a silly pipe dream and has shown effectively, in a personal letter to Representative MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, that the multiplier effect cannot do what Dr. Heller says it will.

In the 15 years from 1946 to 1961, Mr. Lodge says, the country's net public and private debt rose from $397 to $937 billion, while the gross national product, which reflects and even tends to exaggerate the state of business, rose only from $310 to $521 billion. In the early part of this period it took $30 billion in new borrowing to raise the GNP by $10 million; more recently, it took $44 billion in new borrowing to do the same.

On the basis of the multiplier and accelerator effect propounded by Dr. Heller, $44 billion in new borrowing, whether by Government or business, should bring at least $44 billion in increased tax revenue. Instead, as Mr. Lodge wrote Mr. MILLS, we have had repeated deficits and today the Federal Government, "having reached the limit of taxation on earnings, is proposing to levy a tax on savings, through inflationary budget deficits."

"It is obvious," according to Mr. Lodge, "that the Government sector cannot, any more than the private sector, substantially accelerate the growth of our economy merely by creating debt."

If it could, Mr. Lodge marvels at what might be achieved by eliminating all taxes and running at a $100 billion deficit. Just think how this "strong deficit" might swell the tax revenues under the Heller theory. The bigger the deficit, the bigger the surplus. Not even perpetual motion can offer anything to match that.

Liberal Formula for Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, peculiar twists in semantics has taken place with respect to the definitions of "liberalism and conservatism." Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones writing in the Washington Star has done an outstanding job defining the misguided "Liberal Formula for Happiness."

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues as follows:

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS—SOME ACCUSED OF CHAMPIONING LIBERTY WHILE FAVORING CREEPING COERCION

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Self-styled "liberals" are generally nicer people than sourpuss reactionaries.

It would be better to be cast away on a desert island with an outgoing and outgiving liberal than with a guy who's against everything including the construction of a raft. But this doesn't mean that liberal government is a good recipe for equity or human happiness. Many liberals suffer from smug assumptions about human behavior and political theory that simply don't jibe with reality.

They are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma. They honestly believe themselves to be champions of liberty while they favor creeping coercion as long as they can be the authors of the coercion. They are so sure their theories are good for you that they think they are only doing you a favor when they tie you to a post, pry open your jaws, and pour their nostrums down your throat.

Willie Howard, the late great Jewish comedian, had a skit in which he impersonated a Communist holding forth in Union Square.

"Comes da revolution," shouted Willie, "you'll eat strawberries and cream."

"But," protested someone in his stage audience, "I don't like strawberries and cream."

Willie assumed a contemptuous sneer: "Comes da revolution and you'll eat strawberries and cream."

This is not a bad description of the "liberal" formula for human happiness.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. Every time he sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually and with the best intentions he weaves a net of verbotens and must-dos that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible injustice, eventually you arrive at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes a contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation. When mulish taxpayers balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the sound theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. The argument: "If Oklahoma doesn't take the money, Maine will" is a potent one.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite logically at his advocacy of centralized power. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his greed. Federal aid to schools will provide more teachers without raising school district taxes. Ninety-percent Federal highway money means that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Increased Federal relief means that local responsibility can be shirked. And so supergovernment grows and the liberal is delighted.

He is delighted because he questions whether local government will ever have adequate social vision. But he will see to it that the supergovernment has. There will be plans, bold plans of new frontiers entered into with vigor.

The liberal also seems to hold a double standard in the matter of human behavior. He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But the mugger in the park who stabs for $20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong if there had been enuogh social legislation.

The liberal can't believe that removing the penalties for misbehavior or lack of performance could increase human cussedness and sloth. Instead, according to his theory, what we need are more social workers, more public housing, more youth clubs. And with them we keep getting more chiselers, more illegitimate children, more delinquency and crime.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He looks at labor-management problems as though the Pinkertons were still shooting the strikers at Homestead. The significance of Jimmy Hoffa eludes him. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing capabilities of the United Steel workers. He is still chasing Commodore Vanderbilt and the beef trust.

The liberal thus deludes himself with the comfortable assurance that he is farseeing, a progressive, a man of the future. In his effort to cure injustice by piling on more government he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of government.

He has, with minor interruptions, been in power in America for 30 years. He is getting gray, and even a little quaint. He won't admit error or consider pragmatic results. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy. He is loving us to death.

Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Raymond Mason, of Jacksonville, Fla., has asked that the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD include the following proclamation by the Governor of Florida.

I am glad to have this included as follows:

PROCLAMATION: STATE OF FLORIDA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, TALLAHASSEE

Whereas the written word serves as the fuel to feed the burning flame of inquiring minds; and

Whereas the libraries of Florida present for many of her citizens the doorway to knowledge, adventure and entertainment and as a stimulus for creativity and competence in a variety of fields; and

Whereas the development of libraries in Florida is of broad concern, at the highest levels of State government to the smallest communities served by regional library systems; and

Whereas interested citizens can make substantial contributions to the future development of libraries in Florida by their active interest in local planning, and participation in the support of libraries by service in such organizations as Friends of the Library: Now, therefore, I, Farris Bryant, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim April 21–27, 1963, as Library Week in Florida, and urge all citizens to visit their local libraries during this period to draw there upon the reservoir of knowledge, the magic of imagination and the enjoyment of a well-told story, that only the world of books can make available.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 29th day of January, A.D. 1963.

Attest:

FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor.
TOM ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

Berlin, Cuba, Test Ban All Doing Poorly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 the Wall Street Journal carried a column by William Henry Chamberlin which assessed present performance of the Kennedy administration on three important issues as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1963]

FRUSTRATION FORMULA: ADMINISTRATION MIXES TIMIDITY ON CUBA, UNREALISM ON ATOM TEST BAN, WEST BERLIN

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The word "frustration" frequently appears in dispatches from Washington at the present time.

The Kennedy administration probably reached the height of its prestige in foreign affairs when it faced down Nikita Khrushchev on the issue of withdrawing the missiles which had been stealthily installed in Cuba.

Since that time, however, much has gone wrong from the standpoint of American foreign policy. General de Gaulle, by vetoing British admission to the European Economic Community and insisting on his national nuclear deterrent, tossed a monkey wrench into administration plans for closer Western defense and trade coordination. Soviet troops have remained in Cuba, emphasizing a clear breach of the Monroe Doctrine. The fragile agreement for the neutralization of Laos is beginning to fray around the edges.

Some of these disappointments are due to factors beyond the control or anticipation of the administration. But on three issues, at least, the United States has been pursuing policies based on questionable premises and therefore inviting failure and frustration.

First, there is the attempt to reach an agreement banning nuclear tests at almost any price. This might be justified if it could be assumed (a) that the Soviet Union would observe any such agreement and (b) that the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers would thereby be stopped. On any coolheaded survey of the situation, in the light of past experience, both these assumptions seem most improbable.

BROKEN TREATIES

It would be superfluous to recite the long list of Soviet broken treaties and agreements. One need only recall the unpoliced moratorium on nuclear testing which began in October 1958, and dragged on until the end of August 1961, when it was unilaterally denounced by the Soviet Government, although Khrushchev had solemly affirmed earlier that the Soviet Union would never be the first to resume nuclear testing. It is difficult to estimate how much the United States lost by denying itself the advantages of research while the Soviet Union, at the very least, was preparing for new tests.

Nor is there any reason to believe that an American-Soviet agreement would stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Is there any reason to believe General de Gaulle would cease and desist from his development of French nuclear power merely because an American-Soviet agreement had been signed? Would Red China, visibly on the outs with Khrushchev, heed a request from him to stop its nuclear development?

Second, there is an obvious disadvantage about the talks on West Berlin which have just been resumed. There could be no objection to raising, as a serious potential threat to peace, the unnatural partition of Germany. But a discussion limited to West Berlin places the United States before the awkward alternative of making unilateral concessions or refusing any change in the present situation.

THWARTING ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS

Third, some aspects of our policy, or lack of policy, toward Cuba since the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles are timid, self-contradictory and calculated to raise the question whether our diplomatic victory in Cuba last October was as complete as it seemed.

We have all but renounced any intention to use our own forces in an invasion of Cuba. No one in his senses would like to see a repetition of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Both as Senator and as President, Mr. Kennedy has expressed the hope that the Cuban people will rise to vindicate their freedom. The implication would seem to be that the American Government, through properly covert channels, should extend all feasible aid to the anti-Castro Cubans.

By announcing a crackdown on the activities of such groups we are making our avowed objective look ridiculous and creating doubt as to the steadfastness of our will and purpose among our friends in countries threatened by Castroite propaganda and subversive activity. Successful guerrilla movements have always depended on support from without. The Algerian nationalist bands that eroded French rule in that country would, in all probability, never have succeeded if they had not received a steady supply of arms from across their frontiers.

It is unlikely that boycotts and other forms of economic pressure will bring down the Castro regime so long as all the resources of the Soviet bloc are mobilized to prop him up, and many of our NATO allies refuse to join in the boycott of Cuba. To give Castro the protection of our Armed Forces while proclaiming his downfall as our objective is a policy of sorry confusion.

Talks that lead nowhere and are unlikely to lead anywhere and policies that are self-contradictory furnish an excellent formula for frustration.

The Violent Revolutionaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial entitled "The Violent Reactionaries" appearing in the April 20, 1963, issue of the Trinidad Guardian came to my attention.

I think this editorial sums up in a concise manner what may be expected from Castro's protected sanctuary in regard to the promulgation of communism in the Latin American countries.

The editorial follows:

[From the Trinidad Guardian, Apr. 20, 1963]

THE VIOLENT REVOLUTIONARIES

It is never easy for an outsider to get hold of the true facts behind a revolution in a Latin American country. Indeed, it is probably not easy for the average citizen in these countries to understand fully what is going on. This particularly applies to present-day Argentina, with its recurrent bids by various persons and groups to seize power. We are accustomed to seeing generals and admirals at the head of these bids, but we have now been told about a different element seeking to gain power—writers, diplomats, and politicians who belong to a "Latin American type of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement."

We have commented before on the stepped-up campaign now being conducted by Communist bloc countries to spread subversion in Latin America. But, so far as we know, this is the first time the Argentine Government has openly stated that a Communist, or a Communist-type organization was about to make a bid to gain power. This substantiates recent reports and rumors that Castro's regime in Cuba, doubtless acting on instructions from both Moscow and Peking, is giving increased support to many leftwing extremists all over Latin America who are working to bring down their governments by violent action.

A recent BBC talk had some interesting things to say, for example, about what has been going on in Ecuador. There is apparently an organization there called "The Revolutionary Youth Movement," which is dedicated to using violence to take over the Government. As long ago as 1960 Castro was made its honorary president, and he has supplied it with weapons, money, and propaganda material. Several of its members have been trained in Cuba in guerrilla tactics. In January, this year, a police raid on its headquarters discovered firearms and material for making bombs.

The "writing on the wall" could hardly be clearer. But, if further clarification is needed, it is to be found in a speech made by Castro to the Congress of the Women of the Americas in Havana in January. He categorically stated then that he was determined to encourage every movement aiming

to extend revolution by violence in Latin America. He said that he did not deny the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism, but it had not been possible in Cuba nor anywhere else in Latin America yet. Few statements could be more explicit.

Prize-Winning Orations by Two Oklahoma College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include prize-winning orations by John Gilpin and Joe Dollins, representing two outstanding colleges in my district, Southeastern State College at Durant, Okla., and Eastern Oklahoma A. & M. College at Wilburton, Okla., respectively.

The orations follow:

OUR DIVIDED WORLD

(By John Gilpin, Southeastern State College, Durant, Okla.)

The world, the whole world has never before been so completely divided because it has never before been so completely united. The obstacles which for years have prevented the close contact of men and nations have fallen to modern technology. Within a generation mankind has come to the threshold of unification and polarization. The human race has become a seamless whole, in which the murder of a Congolese chieftain sets off reverberations in the centers of world power thousands of miles away. And every day the whole is cut more deeply into two hostile halves.

But this division and conflict is not limited to our globe—for in the past 10 years outer space has become a field of competition between the two ideologies that divide the world. President Kennedy warned us of the danger of falling behind Russia after the single orbit flight of Russian Maj. Yuri Gagarin in 1961. The United States was still lagging behind when another Russian astronaut completed 17 orbits a few months later. But the United States regained a sensational amount of this loss when Col. John Glenn orbited around the earth three times in February 1962.

These successes intensified a race between the United States and Russia that will cost America and Russia over $30 billion apiece in the next few years.

But these billions of dollars involved in the space race represent only a small part of the divided world's burden. The divided world so nearly united is also a poor world so nearly rich. Never before in the history of mankind has the possibility of a decent life for men everywhere been so real, yet it is so far away. Because as long as the deadly struggle between the East and the West is continued we can never hope to concentrate any of our effort on the homeless and starving people of the world.

Each day the struggle continues, the division is deepened. The entire world is being drawn into the division. Increasing pressure is being put on the neutrals from both sides. And the more they resist the greater the pressure becomes. They are beginning to realize that they must choose, and the choice will be final, between the East or the West.

This division of the world into two hostile halves is not new, in fact it is as old as history itself. But the known world was only a very small part of the world at the time of Greece and Persia, Athens and Sparta, Rome and Carthage. But nevertheless there has always been a divided world of the rich and the poor, of those who owned and those who toiled. Plato echoed this theory in one of his works when he said that the city of the rich and the city of the poor would always be at war with each other.

The present world division may well be attributed to the attitudes accepted by the United States and Russia immediately after the Second World War. No historian places the entire blame for this division at the door of the Russians. Rightly or wrongly, a long string of provocations has been pointed at the Americans, the British, and the French in the partition of Germany. Regardless of this it is probable that a few weeks after the bombing of Hiroshima the Soviet Union would still have seen in the United States its mortal enemy. The United States was the genuinely successful capitalistic society, and America was now capable of producing a unique power for making war. More than that, the United States was now the only mainstay of the old capitalist empires.

Soon after the war the Communists returned to their goal of world revolution. They returned to the tactics laid down by their forefathers, Lenin and Marx, and they began their ruthless sweep through Eastern Europe. This reminded Western leadership of the revival of Communist imperialism. The violently reawakened Russian nationalism played upon the postwar chaos to create a buffer zone to defend the Soviet Union against the West. Also the West began to see the real picture of international communism and its aims.

The age-old theory of keeping a balance of power is out. Up to now it was accepted belief that maintaining a marginal balance of power over your enemy was sufficient. The new doctrine calls for absolute, and not marginal supremacy over your enemy. We must have this supreme edge over the Communists if we hope to contain the Russians in their present area, while maintaining our position at the pinnacle of world power. We started this policy 16 years ago and we are still following it today.

The United States will continue to strive for peace. But we are not alone in this task, the Communists since the end of World War II have been professing their desire for world peace. Of course, the objective of the Russians are much different than those of the United States. There is a popular anecdote in Washington and Moscow going around concerning this uneasy peace we are now in. A holy man was asked to inquire of God if there would be a war. After a suitable interval the holy man said he had done so and had been told by the Lord: "There will be no war, but the struggle for peace will be so furious that there shall not be left one stone upon another."

But I would ask: How can there be peace with two such colossal forces standing face to face in the world with nothing to restrain them? Never before in history has there been peace in a situation such as this.

While Hiroshima burned, President Truman told us "there must never be another war." War, at last, has become too horrible. But is peace humanly possible? Why not? Warring families have become tribal communities, warring tribes have become villages and then cities, and these city-states have been formed into nations. And in the last generation nations have combined into international communities. Within these large social organizations peace has always been the rule and war, revolutionary or civil war, the exception. There have been struggles between classes, races, and parties, but the community has always survived. Why then should there not be a community of the world within which violence could be restrained as the national community. Although it would be extremely idealistic to contend that the world in its present condition could ever unite, isn't the only hope for world peace going to exist in world unification?

The dream of a world community is not new to men. In fact, the idea is as old as history itself. In early Grecian history the city-states of Athens and Sparta warred against each other for the power to rule over the known world. Later because of the influence of an outside force these nations united for mutual protection. As these nations, and other nations throughout history, have seen the need for unification we today must also realize this need.

Must man be made one before the world can be made one? This question is answered in the outstanding novel "The Brothers Karamazof" when its leading character says, "To transform the world, to re-create it afresh, men must turn into another path psychologically. Until you have become really, in actual fact, a brother to everyone, brotherhood will not come to pass. No sort of scientific teaching, no kind of common interest, will ever teach men to share."

MY UNCONQUERABLE SOUL

(By Jo Dollins, Eastern Oklahoma A. & M. College, Wilburton, Okla.)

"Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever Gods may be,
For my unconquerable soul."

With these words, William Earnest Henley asserts his freedom. Freedom not from physical bondage, but rather mental enslavement. He magnifies the thought, "individuality is freedom lived."

The initiative of individuals granted, not gave, literally gave to us the freedom under which we live. Why then doesn't individual initiative characterize our present day society?

I wonder what has happened to the bold American. You know, "give me liberty or give me death." When Patrick Henry made this familiar statement, I think he pleaded not only for his country, but also for himself. Perhaps that's just it. Because Patrick Henry and other men like him knew the horror of not having freedom of thought, they fought and gave this freedom to us.

Why don't we use this freedom? I think it's because like I said, others gave it to us; we haven't had to fight for it, therefore, we don't fully appreciate the privilege that is ours.

Justice Stanley Reed made the statement, "Without freedom of thought, there can be no free society." Since great individuals have given this freedom to us, I would say, "Without utilization of this freedom of thought, a free society cannot be maintained."

People, not individuals, but people say that the growing social pressure smothers their personality. That is a person's good reason for not being an individual, but their real reason is that they find under pressure, conformity is easier than individuality. What if Dorthea Dix had yielded to the conformed idea of the public toward mental illness? Where would our Nation be today if Mr. John F. Kennedy hadn't taken his firm stand on the Cuban crisis last October? As Emerson puts it, "Who so would be a man, must be a nonconformist."

The Creator seems to have given different people different ways of apprehending reality. Different personalities possess different insight into matters. This is the reason we as individuals must assert our view and be creative in the manner for which we were created, not conform to the activity for which a separate being was molded. A teacher of philosophy said it this way, "God created

man in his own image, that man like him may create." Yes, we must be industrious to fulfill the very purpose for which we were placed upon this earth. Man was made an organism; not a mechanism. A few days ago I was reading the editorial in the Saturday Evening Post. It was discussing the possibility of machines ever replacing men. It said perhaps they could do the algebra or calculus, but it took men to make the split second decisions.

I began to think, quite ironically, is not our society a machine with only a few individuals to make those split second decisions? You know, a machine can take the place of 50 ordinary men, but 50 machines cannot replace one outstanding individual.

People fail to be this outstanding individual when they fail to recognize their own personal capabilities and personal securities. They fail to recognize these when they simply fail to exercise them by being creative. We can be creative, whoever we are, a doctor, teacher, or hairdresser, if that is our own method of expression. Whoever we are, we need not become a victim of life's monotonous routine that would stump the projection of a handiwork of God, ourselves.

Oh, we seem to project ourselves when we say, "Look what we did; we sent John Glenn around the world." But, just what did we do? I'll tell you. While he soared through space, we sat back on our laurels and said, "Look what we did." Well, of course we can't all be an astronaut, or build a spaceship, but we can specialize in that individual field best suited to us.

If you aren't an individual, then perhaps you're a person that desires to be. Where and how does the individual manifest himself? As many things begin in one's home, this does also, for if you can't have unrestrained expression around those that love you the most, your family, where can you? Upon development of yourself, you'll find reliance upon you by not only your family, but by your community and country.

The condition of this country expresses the extent to which it relies upon the expression of singularity. The annals of history provide us with the most astute examples of this. The Senate room was packed. The dignity of a nation and the integrity of a President lay in the hands of Edmund Ross. Johnson was impeached. The popular vote was to indict him. The Congress was one vote short of their two-thirds majority. Senator Ross held in his hands the remaining vote. He defied the populace and majority of Congress, because he felt Johnson should not be removed. He saved the pride of a young and shaky Government for posterity. Perhaps, we can't vote for something as significant as the removal of a President, but we can determine our vote according to our own beliefs and not because of family ties or the contemporary fad. Our Nation was built by individuals, it is composed of potential individuals, and it depends upon development of those individuals if it is to stand.

You say you can get more done with a number of people than you can alone. Numbers are fine, but remember this: Progress isn't made by a group of people conforming; progress is made by a group of individuals cooperating. The Founding Fathers of our free society of whom Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams were only a few, were each independent individuals uniting their many views, not conforming to one view.

There was however in history, one great civilization built without remembering the individual and his contribution to society—the Roman Empire, which fell. It fell simply because individuals no longer maintained their identity as individuals. Is a nation that offers us freedom of expression going to maintain our Nation by maintaining this individualism, manifest it through creativity and self-expression, and refrain from condescending to the mass of society? I am just optimistic enough to believe that we shall maintain this inherent individualism. You say, "What can I do, I'm just one person?" That's just it, you are one person.

People-to-People Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, ever since its inception, Project Hope has been fascinating to me. It is exciting to contemplate the tremendous potentialities such a program has, not only to help many people for whom modern medical care has not been available and is sorely needed, which is, of course, of primary importance, but to express the concern of the American people for others in our world.

This interest has been heightened by the experiences of my friend, John C. Rawling, M.D., of Flint, Mich., who has volunteered for service abroad the SS *Hope* in Vietnam last year and in Peru this year.

It was indeed a pleasure to read the following editorial in the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal on April 10, 1963, calling attention to the great contribution made by Project Hope in convincing our friends of Latin America that we are truly interested in their welfare and desire to be of tangible assistance to them.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE AID

What happens when foreign aid is converted from a government-to-government project into one administered, financed and implemented by private individuals? Does the people-to-people concept of help really work?

One good answer can be found in the record of *Hope*, the American hospital ship which specializes in bringing medical aid to areas of the world where "Yankee go home" has been a favorite slogan. It would take a fleet of Hopes to answer all the invitations extended to the de-mothballed Navy ship.

It is true that Project Hope is not entirely a private venture. The ship was donated by the Navy. But all of her operating expenses and supplies are paid for by private donations. The Grace Line provides a crew at cost. All of the medical personnel are volunteers, and it is obviously not the salary which attracts them. Nurses are paid half of what they would receive in any large hospital.

Drug companies have contributed large stocks of medicines and the latest drugs. The host country pays not one cent. Yet on its relatively meager $2.8 million annual budget, the *Hope* has traveled halfway around the world bringing the latest medical knowledge and equipment to lands where even a sterile bandage and antiseptic are unknown.

Now in New York for refitting, the *Hope's* story is told. In May, 1962, the *Hope* arrived at Trujillo, Peru, and was greeted by "Cuba si! Yanqui no!" signs.

After almost a year of training medical students and midwives, performing 2,000 major operations, treating 46,000 patients and inoculating 136,000 persons against polio and other infectious diseases, the *Hope* left an entirely different city. The signs had long since disappeared, as had the Castro beards which were once popular among Trujillo citizens.

More than 40,000 people honored the *Hope's* staff in a stadium farewell ceremony and a newspaper editorial said, "'Gringo,' since May of 1962 has meant for Peruvians he who saves lives and alleviates pain."

Come to the Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year from yesterday, April 22, 1964, the gates will open on what Mr. Robert Moses has described as "the biggest, most fascinating showcase ever conceived and constructed by the mind and hands of man"—the New York World's Fair 1964–65. With equal humility I would like to say that this is undoubtedly going to be the greatest demonstration of peaceful international competition in the history of mankind—the Olympic of the arts, sciences, industry, and trade.

As the vast and complex preparations for this grand event move into the homestretch—we have less than a year to go—I extend a cordial invitation to every Member of this body and to his constituents. Come to the fair.

Today, with so little time left before the great occasion, it is difficult to imagine that the site for the fair, Long Island's Flushing Meadow Park, will be the magic city envisioned by Mr. Moses. It is a raw looking place-cluttered with piledrivers, bulldozers, mounds of earth, and slabs of concrete.

The dream seems more real when you stop to consider the amount of work that has already been done to achieve this plateau of several hundred acres interlaced with miles of cable, conduit, and pipe, and containing all of the necessary roads, bridges, and utilities for this, the greatest of all fairs.

You become confident of the reality when you realize the infinite amount of planning and negotiation necessary to bring to the construction stage the exhibits of most of these United States, nearly a hundred foreign governments, and hundreds of producers of goods and services from all over the world.

This will be the greatest, but by no means the first, transformation of Flushing Meadow. In the mid-1930's a stalwart group of New Yorkers, including a new and zealous park commissioner, Mr. Robert Moses, began one of the most ambitious and unlikely reclamation feats of that era. They attacked almost 700 acres of ugly and odorous dump with the express purpose of creating on that site an international exposition. Through their diligent efforts, a blot on the New York landscape which F. Scott Fitzgerald described in "The Great Gatsby" as "a

desolate area of land—a valley of ashes" became the scene of the legendary 1939 World's Fair.

After the fair the land was made into a park and became a pleasant oasis in what is now the geographic and population center of New York. It is in this oasis, Flushing Meadow Park, that is once again preparing to play host to the world.

The variety of exhibits and events at the New York World's Fair 1964–65 will be almost endless. Visitors will have the opportunity to see the best in architecture and design from across the continent and around the globe. With a minimum of restrictions, the fair is encouraging the free display of talent and imagination in the construction of pavilions and exhibits.

Each State, country, and industry will bring forth their finest. A number of special exhibits, such as that Michelangelo's "Pieta" and other religious art from the Vatican, will offer an impressive array of sights and sounds. Every major religion will be represented.

American and foreign industry will capture much of the fair's audience with diverse spectaculars ranging from lifesize reproductions of giant dinosaurs to a $5½ million futuristic wall-less pavilion displaying products of the gas industries. I cannot begin to describe the wonders of the fair. Let it suffice to say that this will be, without a doubt, a billion dollar fair.

There will be even more to the fair than the activity at Flushing Meadow. The cultural activities of the entire city of New York will be geared to the fair. Museums and galleries will hold special exhibits and the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts will integrate its program with the performing arts presentations at the fair so that this fine new facility can be used to the best advantage of those visitors interested in opera, music, theater, dance, and related offerings.

In addition to all the wonderful things that will greet you at the fair, there is probably no other location that is so well suited for such a vast undertaking. The New York World's Fair 1964–65 will be accessible by parkway, expressway, bridge, tunnel, railway, subway, ship, or plane. Over $100 million is being spent in an accelerated highway improvement program to make the fair even more accessible to those visitors coming by car. Over $4 million in waterway improvements are underway and a 2,000-boat marina—the most modern—will accommodate those traveling to the fair by water. The hotel and dining facilities are more than adequate. Over 600 hotels and thousands of restaurants are keyed to meeting the needs of millions of visitors annually.

In 1 year the New York World's Fair 1964–65 will be ready to welcome you. Arrayed around the 135-foot-tall "Unisphere," symbol of man's achievements in an expanding universe, will be the fruits of the minds and hands and hearts of a good portion of mankind. On that spring evening a 24-billion candlepower tower of light will shoot into the sky and, surrounded by countless satellites, will send up a beacon that may be seen from Boston, Mass., to the District of Columbia.

For New York it will signal, among other things, the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the city's founding and the opening of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. For all of us it will mark the launching of a magnificent endeavor toward that most difficult goal, "Peace Through Understanding." The international cooperation and peaceful competition demonstrated by the opening of the fair will give definition, form, and meaning to democracy for the 70 million people who will attend during its 2-year life. It is less than 1 year away. Mark it on your calendar and start planning now. Come to the fair.

National Council on Crime and Child Delinquency Dinner in Honor of Justice Miles F. McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency dinner honoring Justice Miles F. McDonald:

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY, BOARD OF TRUSTEES DINNER IN HONOR OF JUSTICE MILES F. MCDONALD, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, 1956–62, TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1963, SHERRY-NETHERLAND, NEW YORK CITY

Mrs. BENNETT CERF. In behalf of the Board of Trustees of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, I am delighted to welcome each of you. This is a happy moment and an historic occasion for NCCD.

My assignment tonight is both pleasant and brief. I am pleased to have a part in the festivities for Judge McDonald whom I admire and whom I have come to know through services on the Youth Council Bureau and NCCD.

It is most fitting that Judge McDonald's pastor is with us this evening.

My first assignment is to ask the Very Reverend Charles E. Diviney to give the invocation. Later I will introduce our chairman of the evening.

Rev. CHARLES E. DIVINEY. May God, the Almighty and just Ruler of all nations, the great and merciful Creator of all things, the kind and gracious Father of all men bless all those here present and all these gifts which we are about to receive from His bounty and goodness. Amen.

Mrs. BENNETT CERF. I have the pleasure of introducing our chairman of the evening. He is a man of many achievements. He has spent a lifetime in the advertising world and started his career as an account executive with N. W. Ayer & Co. In 1929 he joined Young & Rubicam, became president in 1942, chairman of the board in 1944 and has only recently retired from that post. He has served as the national vice chairman, Citizens for Eisenhower, as a member of the Mayor's Committee on Mobilization, and in President Eisenhower's administration on the President's Committee on International Information Activities. He is a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, a Trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, and a member of the National Defense Executive Research.

He asked me to cut that out because he said my credits for him were too long, but they could not be too long for this marvelous gentleman who has always been with the NCCD and obviously, from his list of credits, done whatever he could for the good of his country and for the good of his fellow man.

He now serves on the board of trustees of the NCCD and is our vice president.

Ladies and gentlemen, Sigurd S. Larmon. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. First of all, I think we owe a vote of thanks to our very charming chairman of the evening, and I am going to ask you here and now to give that vote in the way of applause to Mrs. Bennett Cerf. [Applause.]

When Mrs. Simon—she was the first to suggest it—brought up the question of what we might do in NCCD in the way of some recognition for the dedication and the work that Judge McDonald has given to NCCD for a period of years, the first thought was just a small group, probably the NCCD directors, but then it began to expand, and I give you my word if we had broadcast this evening's function to all of Judge McDonald's friends and admirers we could have filled the ballroom of the Waldorf Astoria.

Our charming chairman is completely responsible for the arrangements here tonight, the fact that we have these tables and we have no dais and no honored guests to introduce. If we were to introduce the honored guests, we would have to introduce everyone here. Of that I am convinced because I have never met so many judges and so many prominent people in civic life and in activities in New York and in our county than I have met here this evening.

We have some telegrams from some of Judge McDonald's friends who were unable to be here, and I shall read but one of them.

"Heartiest congratulations and warmest regards. I am truly sorry we cannot personally be among your many friends tonight to share in this greatly deserved tribute to you. Your dedication and unselfish efforts over the years on or in behalf of humanity are unparalleled. You are a great source of inspiration to others. I hope that God will bless you with a very, very long life of happiness and good health." Kitty and Morris Rosenfeld. [Applause.]

Our very charming chairman was also very specific in limiting the time of all the speakers, including myself, and in order to limit my time I have here a manuscript which I propose to read. I am reminded, in reading it, of a story that Tom Watson told at a lecture that he delivered at Columbia University last year. He told of a gentleman, a businessman, who was called upon to make a very large number of speeches and he engaged a very competent speechwriter, and the gentleman in question got very favorable comments on the various speeches that he made and the speechwriter began to feel that he was not being properly rewarded nor properly compensated. One evening this gentleman had a speech to make and he was handed the manuscript just before he went on the podium, and this was a speech where apparently a lot of emotion was involved. He got into the middle of his speech and turned the page and there in the middle of the page were three short lines which read as follows: "From now on, you old goat, you're on your own." [Laughter.]

It is a signal honor to represent the board of trustees in the tribute which is being paid tonight to Judge McDonald. Those of us who have worked with him in NCCD have

come to respect him for his ability and for his dedication. We have been honored with his friendship. Our view of him has been in just one of the many phases of his contribution to good citizenship and our way of life. If the mark of a man is the degree to which he leaves a world better for having lived in it, Miles McDonald deserves the highest rating.

We in NCCD knew of Miles' impressive record as a public servant, first as a racket-busting district attorney in Kings County and as U.S. district attorney, and in recent years a leading jurist as a member of the supreme court bench in New York State.

We were, of course, aware of his important role in the formation of the National Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, and more recently as chairman of the National Conference of State Trial Judges, but the judge in his modesty never led us to understand the great esteem and affection in which he is held by countless thousands of worshipers.

Had we left matters to Miles McDonald; we would have had a decidedly smaller group here tonight, but as it is we have had to limit the group. Typical of the affection and esteem felt toward Judge McDonald in Brooklyn is the fact that the Board of the Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service and Children's Aid Society has its representative here tonight. Paul Ely is with us tonight and I am going to ask Mr. Ely, if he will, to stand. [Applause.] In asking Mr. Ely to stand, I am giving recognition and heartfelt appreciation not only to BBSS, a fine Brooklyn social agency, but to all those with us tonight who represent this bureau.

Under Judge McDonald's leadership, the National Council of Crime and Delinquency has changed from an organization concerned with merely two of the methods of correction and rehabilitation, probation and parole, to a dynamic organization which is concerned with the entire crime and delinquency problem.

As a first step we created an advisory council of judges which has brought 50 leading jurists from all levels of the courts to work in concert with NCCD in producing some of the finest guides and training materials now available for the judiciary.

The second important step, the logical outgrowth of the Advisory Council of Judges, was the citizens' action program. Through this instrument we have found a way of bringing the top leaders of business, industry, labor and the professions, together with the bench and the bar, for effective action in strengthening and improving the correctional process. These State councils have long been Judge McDonald's dream. In 1958 when he addressed the National Institute on Crime and Delinquency, NCCD's annual forum, the judge stated, "No field of public service suffers as great a lack of broad support as does correction and its allied branches, probation and parole." The citizen action program, which began as a pilot project, has developed into a most fruitful instrument of action and in the early years received support with a major grant from the Ford Foundation. Citizen councils are now operating in 17 States, including New York, and the ultimate plan is to install these councils in most States. Judge McDonald's vision in recognizing the vast potential of this nationwide movement will result in a marked reduction in the number of hard core delinquent spawning families; make vastly more first court appearances of delinquents or youthful offenders their last, and drastically reduce the number of repeaters who now spin their lives in the vicious circle of offense, court, jail, release, offense, and repeating the cycle again.

The third important step was the development of the long-needed National Research and Information Center. Now for the first time we have on the American scene an agency which collects on an international scale information on research, practical projects, demonstrations, programs, experiments, innovations, and developments in the field of crime and juvenile delinquency. NCCD's research and information center is a most useful clearinghouse in the correction field, and now gives us the means to eliminate duplications of effort and wasteful expenditures and serves to focus research activities on the basic problems of crime control and prevention.

Judge McDonald joined the board of trustees of NCCD, which was then the Council on Probation and Parole, in 1946 and became its chairman in 1956. When Miles McDonald first joined our board our organization had an annual budget of a quarter of a million dollars. When he became chairman we had a budget of approximately half a million dollars. During 1963 the budget is over $1 million. Money has never been the measurement of this agency's effectiveness, but as our support has grown we have been able to undertake so much more of what must be done if we are to succeed in our efforts. Therefore, what dollars buy is important. From an agency which helped no more than 100 communities a year, we have grown to an agency which helps over 400 communities and makes over 1,000 consultation visits. In this capacity we serve as nonprofit management consultants to government and voluntary agencies for crime control, prevention and treatment, to communities throughout America.

These, briefly, are some of the major accomplishments with which we so proudly associate the leadership and vision of Miles McDonald.

Many of you here tonight never heard of NCCD or if you have were not aware of Judge McDonald's role in shaping its destiny. We hope that this marks the beginning of your understanding of the important work which this agency carries out and its commitment to long-term efforts to work for prevention and control of crime, and that we will continue to have the interest, help, and support of those of you who are with us tonight out of loyalty, admiration, and friendship for Miles McDonald.

It is now my pleasure to call upon those who are in a particularly unique position to draw for us a full picture of the stature and breadth of the man we are here to honor.

The first man I am to call on is the president of NCCD, Herbert Kochs. Mr. Kochs is an industrial chemical manufacturer from Chicago and London, England. He is not only from Chicago and London, but I was talking to him this evening and I believe very shortly he is going to open a plant in Singapore. As a matter of fact, they have plants all over the world. He is chairman of the Diversey Corp.; long associated with the National Probation and Parole Association; chairman of the Board of Managers of the Uhlich Children's Home in Illinois from 1956 to 1958; and one of the people associated with Judge McDonald in advancing the citizens action program and the new look of NCCD. [Applause.]

Mr. KOCHS. Thank you very much, Mr. Larmon, for your entirely too flattering remarks of me.

As president of NCCD and as one who perforce had to spend a good deal of time away from these shores, I am greatly indebted to Mr. Larmon, Mrs. Cerf, Mrs. Simon and the other NCCD leaders for carrying such a tremendous amount of responsibility for this joyous occasion. It is indeed a pleasure for me to be among those who tonight express the commendation and appreciation which Judge McDonald has so industriously earned and so richly deserves.

I wish to cite one bit of very tangible evidence which underscores the accomplishments of the citizen action program with which Judge McDonald is so closely identified. I refer to the results achieved in Michigan directly resulting from the work done by our Michigan council. The latest word is that cell blocks have been closed in 2 institutions because inmate population has been reduced by 2,000.

You have before you a booklet describing the Saginaw project and what it has done to save lives and cut the cost of treatment of offenders. I hope you will take this booklet with you and that you will regard its story as a lasting tribute to the career of Judge McDonald. It reflects a long step forward in realizing his hopes for a sound administration of justice and a way of hastening the rehabilitation of the offender with greater protection for the public and at less cost for the taxpayer.

Judge McDonald has seen come to fruition some of his hopes and dreams. May I wish for you, sir, that in the years to come all of them will come through. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. I stated that we were not going to introduce the head table, but there is one person that I think should rise and be recognized by everyone here and that is the charming Mrs. Miles McDonald. [Applause.]

The next gentleman I will introduce has long been active in a number of welfare activities. He is past president of the Welfare and Health Council of New York City, now the Community Council of Greater New York. He is a director of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies. He is a trustee of the House of St. Giles the Cripple, a member of the board of trustees of NCCD, and chairman of the New York Citizen Council, and part time he is president of the Home Title Guaranty Co. Mr. Coverly Fischer. [Applause.]

Mr. FISCHER. Thank you, Mr. Larmon. I thought this dinner was in honor of Judge McDonald.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to extend the greetings of the New York Citizen Council of NCCD. My closest bond with Judge McDonald developed from the fact that 33 years ago I married one of the two lovely daughters of the late New York State Supreme Court Justice Edward L. Garvin, and he was one of the founding fathers of NCCD.

About 10 or 15 years ago—time goes so fast I don't know just when—he decided I was paying too much attention to his daughter and I should have an outside interest that was a healthy one, and he interested me in NCCD. It was about that time, possibly a little earlier, that he sold the same bill of goods to Judge McDonald. That is how we happened to develop this bond that I speak of.

Of course, Judge McDonald, as you are finding out tonight, has already proven the wisdom of my father-in-law's decision to get him into NCCD. I am afraid we still have to find out what the results will be of the program of the New York Citizen Council before we know whether he was so smart that he got me involved in the situation.

It is Judge McDonald's sound belief that citizen understanding of the problems of crime and delinquency and citizen sponsoring and support are necessary and vital steps that must be taken to solve these problems that can and will change the alarming rate at which crime and delinquency have been increasing not only in New York but throughout the Nation.

We of the New York Citizen Council consider it a challenging and exciting experience to share the responsibility of putting into action Judge McDonald's convictions.

There are others here this evening who are delivering the well-deserved words of praise and gratitude to Judge McDonald for his inspiring leadership in developing this

nationwide citizen action movement and for his successful accomplishments in many other areas.

I just wish to say on behalf of the members of the New York Citizen Council: First, that in our deliberations we are ever mindful of Judge McDonald's wise counseling on the occasion of our inaugural meeting which took place in this very room last May, particularly with respect to what he had to say about facing the real enemies of a successful crime prevention and control program, and you will note that his words are appropriately recorded in our printed program this evening.

Secondly, I want to say that although the newspaper strike has so far caused us to hide our candle under a bushel, our council and its subcommittees are really hard at work developing a program that we hope to put into action early this spring.

To you, Miles, we pledge our every effort to make our achievements a deserving tribute to your outstanding courage, wisdom, and humanitarianism. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. Next you will notice on your program are tributes, but before we come to the tributes—and I know Miles will not want me to do this—I am going to ask Milton Rector and the members of his staff at NCCD to rise, if they will. [Applause.]

I met Coverly's father-in-law, Judge Garvin, some dozen years ago. He called up, said he wanted to see me, and came to my office and asked me to go on the board of what was then the National Probation and Parole Association. I had no knowledge of what the organization was doing, but he was very persuasive, and as a result of that persuasion I have been indebted to him ever since. I went on the board, but any organization such as this is just as good not only as its leadership but as its executive staff, and I know Miles is going to pay tribute to Milton and his organization. I have never worked with a more efficient and more effective staff and organization than we are working with under Milton Rector's direction.

I am highly honored really to make the next introduction because the next speaker is the chief judge of the Court of Appeals of New York State. He was born in Buffalo, attended the University of Buffalo. He was a member of the Marine Corps Flying Force in World War I. He was on the New York State Board of Social Welfare from 1935 to 1939. He was appointed to the New York State Supreme Court by Governor Lehman in January 1940. In November of 1940 he was elected to the court of appeals, reelected in 1954, elected chief judge in 1959. He is a member of the law faculty of Cornell. He is now on the Advisory Council of Notre Dame Law School. He has been a lecturer at the Law Schools of Yale, Notre Dame, and the University of Virginia, and the author of many books on law.

It is an honor to introduce Charles S. Desmond. [Applause.]

Mr. Justice DESMOND. Mr. Chairman, Justice McDonald, Mrs. McDonald, and friends, I speak as a judge and am proud to associate myself with those who are honoring a jurist highly admired and revered by the judiciary of this State and of the Nation.

A good many years ago, before most of you were born, there was a well-known writer named Finley Peter Dunn who had a comic character called Mr. Dooley, and one of Mr. Dooley's supposedly humorous remarks on one occasion was that he said "I have a judicial temperament; I don't like work."

That was in the dear, dead days beyond recall when judges lived in ivory towers and were not concerned very much about the mundane affairs of men, and when it could truly be said that the judiciary and the courts were distinguished for tradition unhampered by progress. But about 8 or 10 years ago, and about the time that my predecessor, Albert Conway, became chief judge in New York, there came a great change and the judiciary of this State decided to join the 20th century.

As of last year, as you know, there were passed in this State constitutional amendments reorganizing the courts, and in about a dozen or 15 more States similar movements are pending now. We have learned that we can mix progress with tradition; that we do not have to push the good old things out of the way, we can make room for the new ones. That these things can be accomplished is due to the presence in our ranks of people like Miles McDonald who regard their offices not just as dignified and pleasant ways of earning a living, but consider them as the keepers of a dream, one of the oldest and best dreams of the race, a dream that was old when the world was young, a dream that will never die, the dream of prompt and inexpensive justice for all the freemen of a free society.

It has always been sort of fashionable for people to make snide remarks about judges. One of them which I hope you have never heard and which I hope you will not repeat is that a judge is a man with two heads, one where his heart ought to be.

Miles McDonald is a judge with one good, clear, efficient head. I don't think he has physically two hearts. He has a heart that is big enough for two people.

Miles, representing the judiciary of this State, from my heart I congratulate you. I thank you for your judicial service, and I wish you well. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. That was a beautiful tribute. You know, there are times that I wish I had been smart enough to go to law school too. [Laughter.]

The next gentleman about whom I am to speak is not here this evening, Judge George J. Beldock. Judge Beldock and Judge McDonald are very close friends. They were rival candidates for the office of Kings County District Attorney in 1945. Judge McDonald won. Two years later Judge Beldock became a supreme court justice. It was not until 1953 that Miles McDonald succeeded to this body. Amusingly, Judge Bedlock is now presiding justice of the appellate division of the supreme court, second judicial department, and is Miles' boss. They are the closest of friends.

Unfortunately, Judge Beldock is ill and cannot be with us this evening, but he has asked Justice Henry L. Ughetta, an associate justice of the appellate division, second department, to represent him and bring his personal message. Judge Ughetta. [Applause.]

Mr. Justice UGHETTA. Mr. Larmon, Judge McDonald, Mrs. McDonald, ladies and gentlemen, first I will speak for myself. Originally I was invited as a guest and was delighted to accept in joining you in paying tribute to a long, valued friend and neighbor. I learned tonight that he owes me a little money. He originally lived around the corner from where I live. I am sitting at a table with his son and learned that his son had been breaking my windows for years. [Laughter.]

I saw George Beldock about half-past six tonight and he asked me to say that he is deeply appreciative of your support and help.

As Judge Desmond indicated, on September 1 we started a new court system. During the summer our court had very little rest. There were no rules for the court, and so far as the criminal division is concerned, I think Miles did more than any man on the bench. The rules that are in effect in Brooklyn now, and which have really produced some astounding results, which are probably not interesting to anybody except the judges and lawyers here, are the result of Miles' efforts. When we started out in September he had charge of the entire criminal division of the supreme court. He did a tremendous job to the extent that the jail cases in Brooklyn were substantially reduced.

Miles, George asked me to tell you that he is deeply appreciative and thankful to you, and hopes that your health will continue. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. I am next going to introduce a man I have met several times, a man whose work, whose dedication, and public interest I have admired for many, many years, Frank S. Hogan. Frank Hogan and Miles McDonald are old friends. They served together on the youth council bureau, an agency serving the offices of the district attorneys of the five counties in New York providing guidance and casework services to youngsters in trouble with the law. The judge and Frank Hogan were assistant district attorneys in their early days, and both rose to high posts of responsibility in their respective counties, Frank Hogan in New York County and Miles McDonald in Kings County. Not only are they close friends, they share common objectives for the fair treatment of offenders and their rehabilitation, at the same time protecting the public from the dangerous criminal. Frank S. Hogan. [Applause.]

Mr. HOGAN. Reverend Father, Mrs. Cerf, Mr. Larmon, Mr. Kochs, Mr. Fischer, our highly esteemed chief of the judiciary in New York State, Judge Desmond, our equally highly esteemed former chief, Judge Conway, Judge Ughetta, distinguished guests, our guest of honor, Miles McDonald, Mrs. McDonald, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to join in this tribute of admiration and affection for Supreme Court Justice Miles Francis McDonald. Miles McDonald was a great district attorney, as all present will recall, and history will attest. I may say that he was succeeded by a great district attorney also, who is with us this evening, Ed Silver. Mrs. Silver is with us, also. [Applause.]

Curiously enough, when Miles was winning the commendations for outstanding contributions to civic decency and when he was being prominently mentioned as a candidate for mayor and governor, he said to me and to many others repeatedly "I just want to be a judge. I think I would be a good judge." He was right. He has been an excellent judge, an excellent judge because he couples with exceptional ability a conscientious application to every task undertaken, a willingness to accept responsibility, and unswerving devotion to the highest ideals.

Of course he carried much more weight when he was district atorney than he does as a judge, about 40 pounds. [Laughter.] I have always envied his slim figure and his driving energy. For a long time I couldn't understand how he did it. As for myself, I get a good night's sleep; pop out of bed early in the morning; take a quick shave, a brisk shower; do some setting-up exercises; eat a hearty breakfast, and I'm exhausted. [Laughter.]

Sometime back Miles told me his secret. It seems that every day for lunch he has only a glass of milk and a biscuit, but what a biscuit. Although it is low in calories it contains, among other things, vitamins A, B, C, riboflavin, amonium bicarbonate, hydrogenated oil, calcium, phosphorus, and iron. The very next time Mrs. Hogan started to praise the McDonald figure and disparage my own, I got me a batch of these biscuits. They come in four flavors, lemon, vanilla, orange, and chocolate. Unfortunately, I am an indecisive man, so that at the very first luncheon when I partook of these wonder biscuits I sampled each of the four flavors. The effect was instantaneous and murderous. [Laughter.] I shot out of my chair like a jet-propelled missile, charged about the office full of phosphorus and iron and browbeat assistants, abused witnesses and pommeled defendants.

I suppose in about 20 minutes I set due process back about 40 years. A large number of my assistants were called upon to restrain me, and after lashing me to a pillar they forced me to pledge that I would never eat again any of McDonald's biscuits.

So if any of you are tempted, just take vanilla. [Laughter.]

In spite of this violent attack on my person, I have a great admiration for my assistants, although perhaps not too oddly they seem to become younger and younger as times passes. They are also fresher and smarter.

I suppose, Miles, when we were young we thought that we were smarter than our older associates too, but we had the grace, decency, and courtesy to conceal it. Not so these young fellows. They strut a great deal. They tell us older people off regularly. They know what it's all about.

Such smug sophiscation is difficult to take in the very young, and some of my assistants remind me of the three French boys who were walking along a sidewalk in Paris in the early dusk of a spring evening. They were brothers, 4, 6, and 8 years old. The 4-year-old stopped suddenly, pointed at a window and said, "Look there, the beautiful lady and the young man; they are wrestling." The 6-year-old looked and said, "No, no, they are not wrestling; they are making love." The 8-year-old wandered over, took a long look, shook his head wearily and said, "Yes, they are making love and badly too." [Laughter.]

Well, this tendency becomes maddening at times and you find yourself saying things that you don't exactly mean. I wandered about the office the other day, walked into a room and found a young assistant on his knees. I said, "What goes on here?" He said, "I'm praying." "What are praying for?" He said, "Well, if you must know, I'm praying for a raise." Well, I lost my temper and found myself saying, "You got a hell of a nerve. Just for that you don't get it. Nobody around here goes over my head." [Laughter.]

I don't know, Miles, whether you have that trouble with junior judges. I guess, Judge Desmond, there is no such thing as a junior judge, they are all judges, but come to think of it, we think of Miles as a senior judge. Time passes quickly. He has been judging since January 1, 1954. I remember participating in that induction ceremony and at that time I extolled him unmercifully, and something I said at that time I will attempt to paraphrase now. Emerson argued persuasively that you can do wrong today and scorn appearances if you have done so much right before as to defend your actions now.

Mrs. Hogan and I delight to join you in doing honor to Alice and Miles McDonald and in wishing them every happiness. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. Over a quarter of a century ago there were two men who attended Holy Cross in Worcester, Mass., and became chums and very close friends. Later they served as attorneys for the firm of Wingate & Cullen. They helped shape each other's destiny for each in turn introduced the other to the girls who are now their wives. The gentleman I am going to call on is Mr. J. Courtney McGroarty, who has given us great help in reaching Judge McDonald's many friends in Brooklyn. He typifies the cooperation we have had from all of Judge McDonald's friends in helping to make this affair a success. Mr. McGroarty. [Applause.]

Mr. MCGROARTY. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Cerf, Mr. Justice McDonald, Alice, and all the friends of Judge McDonald who have turned out here tonight to honor him in this well-deserved tribute to his efforts on or in behalf of this wonderful organization.

I think that is particularly true of our guest of honor. He did not fall into an honorable course of action; that is ingrained in his character. The moral principles which guide him are his daily course of conduct. They made him a great district attorney; they made him a great judge; they insure, we hope for him, many years that he will continue to have complete fidelity to that judicial function.

I would add only one thought, a most important thought. Miles has had exceptional ability, complete integrity. He also has a great incentive and inspiration. They are supplied by the richness of his family life, his four children, but especially and principally by his gracious and lovely wife, Alice.

I would like tonight to limit my remarks to some personal observations arising out of the very close association that Justice McDonald and I enjoyed over the years. When I left Brooklyn so many years ago to travel away to what was then a far-distant college town, I met a tall, very agreeable man from that upper strata of society, the sophomore class at Holy Cross. It was with great temerity that I even approached him, although I had been directed to look him up when I had reached there.

When I met Justice McDonald, he took me in, made me feel at home, and that was the beginning of a very close, long, and wonderful friendship.

I had the great pleasure of being closely associated with him in the practice of the law for 14 years. As a matter of fact, he was the one who diverted me from what may have been a brilliant teaching career. He got me into the practice of the law because at that time there happened to be a vacancy in the firm with which he was then connected. We went on as young law clerks trying to shift from one to the other the onerous burdens and tasks of filing papers in the proper file, running errands for the lawyers on the staff, getting insurance policies changed, and all that. Then we became members of the staff and it developed into one of those associations which was intimate, and yet imbued as we both were with a keen and terrific desire to make this our profession, what we thought it should be, we gradually deteriorated into that "do you mean to tell me" level. With it all, with all that "do you mean to tell me" level, we were close and fast friends.

You know, when you want to know and measure a man there is no better crucible in which to measure and evaluate his character, his intelligence, than living with him, and I have lived with Justice McDonald both on the land and on the sea. We spent many, many happy, pleasant hours and days together in his home out on the eastern end of Long Island, and he and I and Frank Rogers, prominent New York attorney who is here tonight, spent many happy days on a little 26-foot boat known as the *Mamalu*. We traveled to Canada up through the canals and out through the far reaches of the waters around Long Island Sound, and there was always that "do you mean to tell me this; do you mean to tell me that tonight is my night to wash the dishes; do you mean to tell me that I was the man who hung that hook halfway between the top of the water and the bottom and we lost the boat; do you mean to tell me that I was the man that let the side of the ship hit against the side of the locks on the Champlain Canal." With it all was that constant arguing of points which we enjoyed so much and which at the culmination of the evening we would forget with a pleasant dinner someplace ashore at some yacht club in the Long Island waters.

I have very few claims for distinction. Sometimes I wonder how much honor I can comfortably absorb. I am already a notary public [laughter] and beyond that how far can I afford to go? [Laughter.]

One of the greatest honors and distinctions which I claim is that I dragged Mr. Justice McDonald to the Crescent Club in Huntington, Long Island on a very hot August day. He wasn't much of a tennis player, although he will tell you differently. I claim that I could always take him, and he always claims that he could take me. I took him to the tennis match and he had no interest whatever in the match that was going on. I was somewhat nonplused as to his complete lack of interest. Then I saw him watching a young lady on the other side of the stands, and when the match was over it was my great pleasure to bring him over and introduce him to a young lady I knew, Alice Shelare. That was a match immediately. I knew it, Miles knew it, Alice didn't quite get around to the point where she knew it. We have often laughed about that, and Miles jocularly once in awhile refers to it, as I do, because he got even with me shortly thereafter when he introduced me to my own beloved wife.

Two weeks ago he was sitting in trial term sending cases out and I thought, "Well, maybe I will get by today. I can use this day to do a little office work. Maybe tomorrow will be just as good or the next day will be just as good." My clerk called me up and he said, "Get right over here. I was in before Judge McDonald. Judge McDonald said, 'Listen, Mr. McGroarty introduced me to my wife. I am going to get even with him. Tell him to come over here and pick a jury immediately.'" Miles and I have jokingly and laughingly referred to that, because if ever a man did another a favor I think we can both mutually pat ourselves on the back and say that we were wonderful matchmakers.

You know, it does not take much to learn what a man is. Constant observation, close association with him will bring forth and demonstrate his sterling qualities. Miles was a terrific lawyer; he was an active practitioner. Miles and I had the unfortunate experience of having to start our law practice in the depths of the depression. He and I thought that all the practice of law was was liquidating banks, and as young lawyers it was quite a novelty to us to go out to some little bank, some small bank that we were liquidating and call all the directors around and say to them very boldly, very forthrightly, "Gentlemen, now is the time to decorate the mahogany." Thank God that didn't last very long. Miles was destined to greater service in the public interest.

We regretted that we had to lose him, but we knew that that day would eventually come to pass. He was a wonderful lawyer; he was honest, industrious, forthright, meticulous with respect to the care of his clients' interest. He was an aggressive, hard-working, courageous district attorney, as we all know, and he has made a wonderful, fine judge.

You know there is an old saying that the apple doesn't fall far from the tree. I had the great pleasure and distinction of knowing Judge McDonald's parents. John McDonald I think it can be said was one of nature's noblemen. He had thousands and thousands of friends, and I shall never forget the impression that he made upon me. Lucy McDonald, his mother, was one of the noblest ladies it has ever been my pleasure to know. I think of them often. I am proud that I had the opportunity and the pleasure to know them so intimately. Mr. Justice McDonald, their son, is a credit to them. He fulfills all the aspirations and the hopes that they held out for him. They would be proud of him if they were here tonight.

As one of his friends, and there are many of long years' standing who are here tonight, I am delighted that this honor is being given to Judge McDonald tonight, as they are, for while he has ears to hear and the heart to throb and a mind to be inspired, it is due him that these tributes be accorded him for

the wonderful service that he has given to his fellowman. I think as you do that there will be many more honors due him in the future. It is a great pleasure to be here with him on this wonderful occasion. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. The next speaker is an outstanding community leader in Brooklyn. He is the president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, executive of the Red Cross, Brooklyn chapter, where he and Judge McDonald served together in the building fund drive. They have been close personal friends for 20 years. Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe. [Applause].

Mr. ROSCOE. Mr. Chairman, Madam Chairman of the Planning Committee, Madam Chairman of the board of trustees, Very Reverend Father, distinguished members of the judiciary, members of the McDonald and Shelare families, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a great pleasure that I respond to the invitation of your chairman, for I have known Judge McDonald for more than three decades. As a matter of fact, just because Mr. McGroarty opened the door, may I mention that about 30 years ago I was cashier of a little $5 million national bank when the average national bank was only $200 thousand in assets, and we placed the bank in liquidation. When I was told that a mighty institution will take my little bank and I will be exposed to a law firm, a very distinguished mutual friend of Mr. Justice McDonald and myself, Pete Loran, said, "You're in good hands. Miles McDonald will represent you."

When I received the gracious invitation of our charming Secretary of State to participate in the tribute to Judge McDonald in a few brief remarks, I did some research to check my bearings.

I believe that the careers of some of our distinguished men are cast after and molded after the lives of other men who now belong to history.

I found a parallel between the life of the late Owen J. Roberts, associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and the life of our own Judge McDonald. Some of the resemblance seemed natural. Both started their careers by association with distinguished law firms, and then as assistant district attorneys and U.S. attorneys, but their records of accomplishment, their dedication to community welfare presents an even more striking resemblance. Where Judge Roberts served on the National Council of Boy Scouts of America and many other youth organizations, was chairman of the board of the Advancement of Education in Pennsylvania and was also chairman of the Pennsylvania Commission for the Selection of Rhodes scholarships, our Mr. Justice McDonald served as a member and the guiding spirit of our Boy Scout movement, on the board of directors of the Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service, the Catholic Child Care Society, the Guardian Angel Home, the Youth Council Bureau, chairman of the Grand Ball of the Emerald Association. The proceeds of the ball, if you please, support very, very important activities on or in behalf of your youth. I could go on and on. He is also a member of the board of trustees of Long Island University, which today is a college of international distinction.

It is wonderful to have our borough president here because Brooklyn has not been remiss in recognizing the contributions that Judge McDonald made to the welfare of the community. In 1950 the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce honored him with its Distinguished Service Award, and in 1954 the Brooklyn Association presented him with its Gold Medal for Most Distinguished Service for Brooklyn. This tribute was also recognition of the great leadership and the tremendous effort that Judge McDonald has favored us with. He has helped bring about the building of that beautiful building of the American Red Cross in Brooklyn. This building is a fitting monument to his great efforts and is testimony of his ability that he converted his background, his heritage, his education into a mighty force for civic and social good.

It is simply wonderful to see the rise of a young lawyer who was president of the West Flatbush Association in 1930, the chairman of the board of your council which is honoring him today. I know that I am voicing the sentiment of thousands and thousands of people in Brooklyn when I say to Judge McDonald that we extend to him with humility, with warm friendship and deep sincerity our gratitude for his manifold contributions to the welfare of our community. We ask him to consider this honor as just the end of the beginning. We hope you will be blessed by providence with good health so that you can carry on and meet with even more striking success. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. We are going to have a change of pace. The next gentleman we are going to call upon is a longtime friend of mine. He is active in NCCD. He is going to talk about money, and he is qualified to talk about money. He is chairman of the board of Utica Corp. That is a division of Genesco. I don't know whether you know about Genesco or not, but they are in a lot of businesses. They own Bonwit Teller, I. Miller, and Bendel, and again for a change of pace, Formfit and Rogers Lingerie, Johnston & Murphy, Christian Dior, and you name it. He is here with his charming wife. He is a citizen of Alabama who also has an office in New York. He has been very active as a member of the board of trustees in NCCD, and it is my privilege to introduce Jewett T. Flagg. [Applause.]

Mr. FLAGG. Mr. Chairman, and, as I always like to say, Madam Chairman, and friends of Judge McDonald, I am very honored to have this opportunity to make these brief remarks.

When a man dedicates his life to a mission as difficult and yet so humane, crime prevention and rehabilitation of defendants, an appropriate tribute should have the quality of durability.

The board of trustees of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency believes that a lasting tribute is the assurance that the NCCD-citizen action program will continue carrying on the work which our guest of honor has through the years played such a leading role in developing. Toward this end, a fund of $50,000 will be raised and will bear the name of Miles F. McDonald. It will serve to provide the support necessary for the conduct of NCCD's business and the fulfillment of CAP commitments in New York and in States throughout the country. It will be a source of inspiration for our leadership and our friends to tell the NCCD story and continue to build an everwidening circle of understanding and support.

At present we are pleased to report that $31,000 is already in hand, and I mean cash on the barrelhead. These contributions are from foundations, corporations, individuals, all friends of the man we do honor here tonight. By no means is this fund static, for we know that a number of gifts are on their way in his honor's honor.

Considering the amount thus far obtained through the quiet, personalized efforts of our board members and friends, the results are heartening and augur well for the future. I know this marks the beginning of an era of independent financing for growth, for help, and for hope that NCCD brings to those who come in conflict with society, a cause so deep to the heart of Miles McDonald. Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. LARMON. It is fitting that we should finally hear from one who has shared with Miles McDonald the direction and the building of NCCD into the effective organization that exists today. She has asked me to eliminate the credits. If I were to list them all, I would be here for the next half-hour. I have been privileged to work under her guidance as chairman of the executive committee, and she now succeeds Judge McDonald as chairman of the board of NCCD, a woman of rare talents, dedication, the secretary of the State of New York, Caroline Simon. [Applause.]

Mrs. SIMON. Mr. Chairman, Madam Chairman, Judge and Mrs. McDonald, I think now we understand Judge McDonald's interest in juvenile delinquency since we know about those windows. I see distinguished members of the bench and bar. We all agree that our lady chairman is not only very beautiful and very skilled, but also very gracious to give me the opportunity to have this role on our program which could so properly be hers, and I do thank her for allowing me to have this privilege.

I cannot help but thank the gentleman who spoke of his being a notary public, because that was a very nice commercial for the department of state, and we are very glad to have our licensees recognize the important role that they fill in our society. I don't need to have my husband's favorite program "What's My Line" or Mr. Ben Cerf figure out what my line is when you announce you are a notary public. Thank you for the commercial.

Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd wrote some time ago:

"Fill the seats of justice
With good men, not so absolute in goodness
As to forget what human frailty is."

This principle applies as well today as it did when Sir Thomas wrote these lines in the early 19th century. Miles McDonald is one of those very good men we are privileged to have fill the seats of justice in our State. Our chief judge of the court of appeals, our former chief judge, and many other distinguished members of the bench are here tonight as evidence that we do have good men on the bench in our State. Judge McDonald has forgotten neither what human frailty is nor what human strength can do to correct it. Justice McDonald has demonstrated this throughout his distinguished career as Federal attorney, Kings County district attorney, and as supreme court justice. Whether as prosecutor, impartial jurist, innovator of the Uniform Dependents Act, dedicated participant in programs to prevent delinquency and control crime, Miles McDonald has always recognized the human element. His effective leadership as chairman of the board of trustees of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency testifies to this deep human concern of his.

While I am unhappier than most that he no longer serves us in that official capacity, I am very honored that I am the one who is privileged to present to him tonight the plaque that symbolizes our recognition of how well he has served.

Some weeks ago when we still had papers there was a cartoon of a man with his fist clenched saying to another man, "The delinquency problem must be faced. We've got to build more jails."

Judge McDonald has expressed the wise point of view, the sound point of view reported in our program so precisely: "Our villians are antiquated laws, 18th and 19th century philosophies, undermanned staffs, overcrowded prisons, and inordinate delays in the corrective process." He has lived the philosophy of Charles Kettering that "The whole fun of living is in trying to make things better."

It is because he has lived that kind of a life that he is surrounded tonight by so many distinguished people, all of whom wish to express their wish for his and his wife's health and happiness in the important posts

he fills, and to ask him to accept from us all with hearts full of thanksgiving for the privilege of knowing and working with him this plaque.

Miles, would you come forward?

(Mrs. Simon presents Mr. Justice McDonald with a plaque.) [Applause.]

Mr. Justice McDonald. I knew this was going to be an emotional sort of evening and I wasn't going to go too far afield, so I wrote down a few thoughts I had. I will get to them in a moment.

If I were to acknowledge all those who are here present tonight it would sound like a litany of the saints, so if you will allow me I will just say, Mr. Larmon, my distinguished associates of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, my valued and generous friends, the extravagant praise I have received tonight places me upon the horns of a dilemma. Am I to insult my generous friends by questioning their veracity, or am I to presume upon your intelligence by blushingly admitting that I possess the virtues so ascribed to me?

I shall endeavor to extricate myself from this embarrassing situation by recounting two stories. One is, I am sure, true, and that expresses the way I feel. The other I know is apocryphal, and that will indicate what I think of the speeches that were made, and I hope they will relieve the burden imposed upon your credulity and not indict the speaker.

The first deals with William Butler Yeats, the Irish poet. They relate that a few years ago a number of extremely well-to-do Americans of Irish lineage were of the opinion that Yeats should be distinguished and honored by their group for his contribution to English literature upon the occasion of his being awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1923. Their testimonial was to be in the form of a dinner given to him in Dublin, at which time he was to receive a check in the sum of some £2,500 that they had raised, then worth over $10,000. The speakers on that occasion were savants from all over Europe and the literati of the British Isles. The speakers on that evening, in the course of their remarks, piled exaggeration upon exaggeration and unfavorably compared Shakespeare's "Sonnets" and Horace's "Odes" to those of Yeats. His virtues were extolled and his faults ignored; his successes were recalled and his failures forgotten, and Yeats, like anyone under those circumstances, became more embarrassed with every passing speaker. He had the good fortune that night of being seated on a dais where he could slump down and he kept sliding down under the seat until only the top of his head was visible.

The last speaker, as he reached his peroration, stated that on behalf of Yeats' admirers he was pleased to present him with a token of their regards, at which moment he extended a check of £2,500 in Yeats' direction. Yeats was a tall, thin, cadaverous-looking man with talonlike hands. Without even getting up, he reached his big fingers back, took the check, looked at it, and he made a remark which was particularly appropriate. He said, "It's damn little for the lies I had to listen to and the embarrassment I have suffered this night."

The second and apocryphal story deals with another member of Irish lineage who came to this country with the proverbial coat on his back, worked very hard until he built up a tremendous commercial enterprise. He was recognized as a leader in financial and communal life of his city. He was self-educated. He had one fault. He had never really learned table manners. His family was well educated. They said to him one night, "Don't you think in your status it is time you learned to behave at a table. You are a guest at great dinners and you embarrass us a little." He was smart enough to know that he did, and he took a course, I guess from Emily Post or maybe Amy Vanderbilt, but he learned just the right thing to do. He overcame all his bad habits but one, and that was he never could pass up a boiled potato. On one occasion when he was a guest of honor he had the cardinal of the church to his right, the Governor of the State to his left and they served boiled potatoes. Without thinking, he took the fork, popped it into the potato and put it in his mouth, and it turned out to be red hot. He spit it out in his hand and he made the remark that I have to make about those speeches. "Some damn fools would have swallowed all that."

It seems paradoxical to me that my association with the National Conference on Crime and Delinquency and its predecessor, the National Probation and Parole Association, should be viewed as worthy of appreciation, for my years of service with this activity have been most rewarding, among the most rewarding I have ever experienced. I have made valued friends of public-spirited men and women from every walk of life throughout the length and breadth of the land, men and women most of whom are present here tonight and who self-sacrificingly dedicate themselves to this important but sadly neglected phase of our national life.

During these years I have been privileged to work with knowledgeable, professional experts dedicated to what I believe is the most intelligent and successful effort to combat crime and delinquency that has yet been devised, the citizen action program of the National Council. I believe that by reason of this association I have been able to increase my own professional competence both as a district attorney and as a judge because the lessons I have learned through the experience of my associates contributed to my own improvement, I know, and I hope to the betterment of the community I serve.

I have watched this organization grow from one whose effectiveness was curtailed by a limited budget to one which now realizes its full potential on a budget of over $1 million a year.

During the last decade the national council has deservedly gained unqualified national acceptance as the most knowledgeable and competent organization in its specialized field in the United States, and I have seen the effect this program has had in improving the correctional process across the land. These are the rewards which I cherish and I am most grateful to you for your interest in the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and for this opportunity to express my own indebtedness to the council for permitting me to participate in this endeavor, and to all of you who have made its work effective and who, by your self-sacrifice, your efforts, your public generosity assure its continuance for the benefit of the decent citizens of our community.

I trust that you will realize that while I have tried to hide my embarrassment for this tribute of your affection, your kind remarks by humorous references to them, it does not mean I am ungrateful or lack appreciation for them. I shall treasure them always as I treasure your friendship. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

American Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, am inserting correspondence from the Legislative Commission of the American Legion, expressing deep concern relative to efforts to compromise the sovereign rights of the United States in the Canal Zone, and on the Panama Canal situation in general:

The American Legion,
April 9, 1963.

Dear Congressman: I am pleased to inform you that the American Legion supports House Concurrent Resolution 105, which you introduced on March 4, 1963, for the purpose of expressing the sense of Congress with regard to U.S. rights and authority in the Panama Canal Zone.

The American Legion is greatly concerned over the concessions that have been made to the Republic of Panama by our Government relative to the territory of the Canal Zone, and over the rumors of additional concessions now being negotiated. We believe those already made have tended to weaken our legal status in the zone, and fear that the United States may ultimately lose control of the Canal if the present trend is permitted to be continued. Our position in this matter is embodied in Resolution No. 230, adopted by the Legion's 1962 national convention. A copy of this resolution is enclosed.

During our recent annual Washington conference, a special committee gave further study to the problem. This committee, appointed by national commander, James E. Powers, was charged with studying the Panamanian situation and determining ways of implementing Resolution No. 230. As a result, it was decided to endorse your resolution and press for favorable consideration by the Congress.

We would appreciate hearing from you as to any further action we might take at this time.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Clarence H. Olson,
Director.

Forty-fourth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, Las Vegas, Nev., October 9–11, 1962—Resolution 230

Committee: Foreign relations.

Subject: Surrender of U.S. jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal opposed.

Whereas more than 50 years' experience in the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in a region of political instability, has completely established the wisdom of the 1903 treaty provisions for its exclusive control by the United States in perpetuity as indispensable for safeguarding the vital interests of our country and all free nations; and

Whereas a series of surrenders to successive demands by the Republic of Panama, through treaties and Executive agreements, and finally, by Executive order on September 17, 1960, to authorize display of the Panamanian flag over the zone (issued contrary to the overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives) has seriously weakened our legal position on the isthmus; and

Whereas notwithstanding solemn treaty obligations to maintain and operate the Panama Canal, the President has acceded to recent Panamanian demands for general treaty revisions that aim not only further to weaken the rights, power and authority of the United States on the isthmus but also to set a time for turning over control of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone to Panama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 44th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, assembled in Las Vegas, Nev., October 9–11, 1962, That the American Legion reaffirms the position expressed in Resolution 251, adopted by the

American Legion at its 43d National Convention, in Denver, Colo., September 11–14, 1961, which is:

1. That the United States should not, in any way, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance operation, and protection of the Panama Canal in accordance with existing treaty provisions;

2. That it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but as well of all nations and peoples, that all powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions;

3. That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any immediate control of whatever character over the Panama Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges the duties and obligations with respect to the canal;

4. that formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States, is violation of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic Canal policy of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion is deeply concerned over the published aspirations of the Republic of Panama to negotiate with the United States of America for certain concessions, which, if granted, would be contrary to the established policy of the American Legion; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion urges the loyal news media of the Nation to publicize the grave perils involved so as to alert and inform our people, with demands for prompt and forthright declarations and actions by the legislative and executive departments of the Government.

RELEASE OF APRIL 12, 1963

WASHINGTON.—The American Legion has given its support to House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, for the purpose of expressing the sense of Congress with regard to U.S. rights and authority in the Panama Canal Zone.

The Legion has expressed concern over the concessions that have been made to the Republic of Panama by the United States relative to the territory of the Canal Zone, and over the rumors of additional concessions now being negotiated. If the present trend is permitted to continue, the Legion fears that the United States may ultimately lose control of the canal.

Freeman Letter Means Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are in for trouble with farmers and other taxpayers if they try to explain their vote on the feed grain bill by quoting Secretary Freeman's April 19 letter to Members of the House. It tells only part of the story.

Text of Freeman's letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 19, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ———: I understand the Feed Grain Act of 1963 will come before the House shortly after the Congress returns from its recess. This legislation would extend for 2 years the highly successful measures enacted in 1961 and 1962 which have:

Contributed to a 10-percent increase in net farm income between 1960 and 1962.

Reduced feed grain stocks from a record 3.2 billion bushels in 1961—prior to the time the new feed grains programs became effective—to an estimated 1.9 billion bushels at the close of the current marketing year.

Maintained stable food prices for consumers.

Resulted in savings of $920,000 each day in grain storage and handling charges as compared with this date in 1961.

This is striking progress every citizen understands.

If the House reaffirms its actions of 1961–62 by passing this bill, it means elimination of the unneeded, unwanted feed grain surpluses by 1964. Once the carryover has been reduced to a level adequate for emergency and security reserves, a supply-demand balance can be maintained with less acreage diversion and less cost in the years ahead.

Further, if the House takes favorable action on this legislation, farmers participating in wheat and feed grains price support programs will have greater flexibility in utilization of their land. If the wheat referendum is approved May 21, and there is also a feed grains program, producers will be able to interchange these crops. It is desirable for farmers to know before voting in the referendum what the wheat-feed grain relationship will be.

I am hopeful the success of the feed grain programs and the importance of action now on feed grains in the light of the upcoming wheat referendum will make possible your favorable support of H.R. 4997.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

He calls the 1961–62 programs highly successful and says they helped to boost farm income. Note these facts:

When direct payments to farmers are deducted, net farm income went down—not up—between 1960 and 1962. The direct tax outlay to farmers rose faster—$1.2 billion—than net farm income—$1.1 billion.

The cost-price squeeze for farmers is actually the worst in years. The farm-parity ratio—prices related to costs—is 77—down from 81 when Mr. Freeman took over. In Illinois, the parity ratio is now 71—lowest on record since 1934.

Mr. Freeman claims his programs have reduced feed-grain stocks 1.3 billion bushels. He uses the word "reduced" at the beginning of the sentence but hid the telltale word "estimated" later on. This 1.3 billion figure is sheer speculation.

Based on USDA reports, I can prove that Government grain holdings are down less than half the amount claimed.

Mr. Freeman says the programs have "resulted in savings of $920,000 each day in grain storage and handling charges." This is not factual. It is guesswork, and it is misleading.

Total cost to taxpayers is actually up sharply. The Wall Street Journal, April 23, 1963, said:

This year's acreage cutting plan, providing for higher price supports on 1963 feed grain crops and lower payments for idling land, will cost taxpayers nearly $1.2 billion, Federal economists estimate. That's $100 million more than probable 1962–63 costs.

Taxpayers are spending more but getting less results. This table shows what is happening—figures from committee report on H.R. 4997.

[In millions]

	Diverted acres	Payments
1961	25.2	$782
1962	28.6	842
1963	25.8	983

NOTE.—Administrative expenses and CCC realized losses not included.

The latest report of the Commodity Credit Corporation shows total Government investment in farm surpluses $8,445,793,604—up 10 percent from a year ago.

The latest USDA "Feed situation" report clearly shows the 1963 program will get far less results despite increased cost. Taxpayers will shell out $8.78 for each dollar's worth of surplus feed grain disposed of this year.

The Secretary said in a letter last June to Senator ELLENDER:

The voluntary programs are too costly. * * * If the voluntary programs were extended further, through the 1966 crops, the cumulative additional cost would be about $4 billion. This amount is equal to the average yearly Federal income tax payments of nearly 5 million taxpayers; would build 27,000 miles of modern highways; would complete 4,000 watershed projects.

This bill would extend these costly programs through 1965. I contend they have been a gigantic and costly failure, and are a legislative mistake which should not be compounded.

Federal Fiscal Foolishness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Federal handouts impoverish the Federal taxpayers' coffers and endanger our fiscal solvency, the very value of our money.

Federal handouts subvert and weaken or ruin the backbone and willpower of those who receive.

Federal handouts proclaim the reasons for their unconstitutionality which our forebears wisely saw—the overlapping, the duplicity, the waste, which accompanies such activities.

The answer: Solve local problems locally, without Federal aid or regulation, through the normal competition which exists between localities and States in pride and the spirit of doing-it-ourselves.

This subject is ably discussed in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

THE HIDDEN GOVERNMENT

For several months now, a Senate subcommittee has been poking into the tangled relationships among Federal, State, and local governments, and it's a little disturbed about what it has been turning up.

What chiefly worries the committee is not the swift growth in outlays on Federal-State-local projects, though Chairman MUSKIE does seem impressed that such spending will

total around $14 billion in fiscal 1963, a rise of nearly 30 percent in a single year.

Instead, the Maine Senator frets that this "hidden dimension of government," as he calls it, "operates from no set perspective, is under no special control, and moves in no particular direction." Moreover, "no governmental agency is prepared to provide any specific data on this subject."

The inevitable result is a hodgepodge of overlapping authority and duplicating spending. More than a dozen Federal agencies are engaged, one way or another, in handing out money to States and localities for flood control, hospitals, housing, highways, and a host of other purposes. Speaking of aid to urban areas, Mr. MUSKIE observes, "The programs have grown rapidly at all levels with little attention given to their coordination and integration." Much the same can be said for the whole system.

The Federal Government, of course, pays most of the cost of this confusion; its share in the current fiscal year is close to 70 percent of the total. In the past decade, the Federal aid percentage of State-local revenues has risen from 10 to 15 percent.

Whats more, no end to the uptrend is in sight. State and local governments, partly because so many of their revenue sources have been preempted by Washington, are looking increasingly to the Federal Government for aid. And Washington needs little urging; sometimes none at all. The administration this year is proposing grants of additional billions for urban mass transit, education, and other purposes.

These needs must be met, President Kennedy declared in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors last week. And they must be met by the Federal Government, he said, because State and local governments simply are unable to meet them.

One result can hardly help but be a further breakdown in the ability or even willingness of States and localities to face their own problems. And yet it is surely at the local level that local problems can be most clearly seen, most efficiently solved.

But beyond that, the spiraling uptrend of Federal grants will add new twists to the confusing maze of Federal-State-local relations. As one witness told Senator MUSKIE's committee, we are fast approaching the point where Federal grants will become "an impenetrable jungle." The committee calls for further study as well as tighter control of the whole system.

That seems like a minimum prescription. The huge growth of this hidden government by itself is cause for concern. But much worse is a government which has no idea where it's going.

Red China Appeasement Committee Formed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Columbia (S.C.) Record of April 17, Victor Lasky tells us of a new Committee for the Review of Our China Policy, which has been formed with headquarters in San Francisco. It is the purpose of this committee to brainwash us into being more tolerant toward Red China.

From past actions, this should get a good reception amongst some presidential advisers, notably Mr. Rostow, who has stated in the past that Khrushchev is "mellowing" and that the "concept of nationhood" is outmoded.

It behooves us to be alerted to any sliding off to this line of thinking. With Averell Harriman, now in charge of the political division of the State Department as a reward for forcing a coalition government in Laos, the American people must beware of "peace seekers" who advocate appeasement and surrender to another Communist tyrant.

The article follows:

FORMER OREGON CONGRESSMAN PORTER MISJUDGED CUBA, NOW ERRS ON RED CHINA

(By Victor Lasky)

Charles O. Porter, a former Oregon Congressman, is the sparkplug behind a new organization seeking to make U.S. policy more tolerant of Red China.

Until his defeat in 1960, Porter, a two-term Democratic Congressman, had achieved a reputation as a militant foe of the late Dominican Dictator Rafael Trujillo and as an ardent supporter of Cuba's Fidel Castro.

Now he is associated with an old China hand, Ernest T. Nash, in the recently-formed Committee for the Review of Our China Policy, with headquarters in San Francisco.

Mr. Nash, who was born in China, was once deputy secretary of the Shanghai municipal government. Now living in semiretirement in Woodland, Calif., he has written numerous letters to newspapers urging U.S. recognition of Communist China.

MISSES FLAG

At the moment he and Mr. Porter are willing to settle for a revision of policies that now prevent U.S. trade with the Peking regime.

"I see the trade thing rather emotionally since I spent a lifetime in Shanghai," says Nash. "I get letters from France saying that this great port is growing again with flags from over the world, but none from the United States."

According to Mr. Porter, many businessmen are keenly interested in his new organization's efforts to stir discussion of U.S. policies toward Red China. But they are afraid, he said, to lend their names to the undertaking.

"They fear being criticized as disloyal," said Porter.

Mr. Porter has no such fears. In recent years he has shown up at various peace conferences including the East-West Roundtable Conference in Warsaw in 1961.

SHOW TRIALS

In February 1959, as a Congressman, Porter turned up in Havana to confer with the leaders of the new Castro regime. At the time, Mr. Porter told this correspondent that it was he who first proposed the show trials that Castro staged to show the perfidies of the Batistianos.

Undoubtedly, Porter has been inevitably disillusioned by Castro's emergence as the No. 1 Communist troublemaker in all of Latin America.

And he must have rued the small role he played in helping sell Castro to American public opinion.

But instead of learning the lesson of Castro—namely, you can't do business with the Communists—Mr. Porter is now actively engaged in selling us on the virtues of doing business with the Chinese Communists.

Yet—as bad as he is—Castro looks like Little Lord Fauntleroy himself when compared with the barbarians in Peiping.

PEACE SEEKER

Mr. Porter claims that his chief interest in launching his new China policy committee lies in preserving world peace.

But how do you preserve peace in a world in which the Chinese Reds keep vieing with their Soviet comrades on how best to bury the United States?

Mainland China is now in very difficult straits. Its economy is in desperate plight; it is beset by mass starvation brought on largely by its inhumane economic and political policies. Peiping's prestige has been declining severely throughout southeast Asia. One consequence has been Peiping's gobbling up of Indian territory.

In this adverse situation, any weakening of the hitherto firm opposition of the United States would be a godsend to the Peiping warloards. It would take attention way from their dismal incapacity to meet the elementary needs of the Chinese people.

But, more important, it will not bring the peace Charles Porter so fervently desires. Instead it will encourage Peiping's belief that the United States is truly a paper tiger, cowardly, frightened and easily susceptible to further Chinese blackmail threats.

German Scholar Warns of U.S. Move to Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am including the following article from the April 1 edition of the Wall Street Journal because I believe it is important reading for every American interested in saving our capitalist, free enterprise system.

The struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. Dr. Wilhelm Roepke, noted German professor discusses the contemporary status of these two philosophies in America today in this article:

A GERMAN SCHOLAR SEES NATION MOVING INTO FISCAL SOCIALISM

(NOTE.—This article, originally written in German, has been adapted by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman of Bucknell University. Professor Roepke, a long-time student of the American economy, left Germany when Hitler came to power. Since 1937, he has been on the faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies of the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He is the author of "Economics of the Free Society," translated by Professor Boarman and recently published in this country by Henry Regnery Co.)

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

Thirty years ago, I published an article severely criticizing the economic policies then being pursued by President Roosevelt in the name of a New Deal. "The grave question arises," so my article concluded, "of what will become of us all when the economically most powerful country in the world allows itself to be led by anticapitalist slogans to certain ruin."

If, today, one were to subject the economic policies of the Kennedy administration to a similar analysis, the criticism would doubtless be less severe. It is hardly possible to equate what the New Frontier has thus far accomplished with the upheaval of the American economy engineered by Roosevelt. But enough has been done to warrant deep concern. Of particular interest to the economist is the fact that the overall

policies of the Kennedy administration, including those pursued in the arena of world politics, are shaped to an unusual degree by specific economic theories. It is these theories which help explain, in particular, the clear defects which the administration's economic program has thus far suffered.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that the two principal problems which confronted the Kennedy administration at its inception are still unsolved. The deficit in the balance of payments and the associated gold loss still continue, nor is there any evidence that the ship of the American economy is any nearer than before to the open waters of full employment and full production. Both of these phenomena, however, are intimately interrelated.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

Where a country suffers from a balance-of-payments deficit, there is always a strong temptation—and the Kennedy administration has succumbed to it to a degree—to shift the burden of the blame, if not to unlucky juxtapositions of the stars, then to other countries. The weakness of the dollar is attributed not to discrepancies between cost and price levels in the United States and abroad, especially in respect to internationally traded goods, but to excessive capital exports. From this the conclusion is easily drawn that the dollar is less in need of an internal policy of strict monetary and fiscal discipline than of a reduction of the burden on the balance of payments stemming from capital exports. To help in the accomplishment of the latter objective, proposals are advanced which would restrain the outflow by exchange control, discriminatory taxation of foreign earnings, and other drastic devices which have little in common with a free enterprise economy. Simultaneously, other countries are cordially (and sometimes not so cordially) invited to assume an increased share of the U.S. burden of defense and foreign aid.

The theory is seductive in its simplicity. A country suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, no matter how rich (and the United States remains far and away the country with the richest endowment of capital) must curtail its export of capital. Corresponding to this is the view that a country "enjoying" a balance-of-payments surplus, however capital-poor it may be (West Germany, for example), must on this very account strive to achieve a net export of capital. The truth is that the one argument is as untenable as the other, for in both cases disturbances of external equilibrium are wrongly identified with changes in internal capital wealth. What is needful is that a country adjust its balance of payments (by means of appropriate internal policies) to its capital resources, not its capital resources to its balance of payments.

THE WAGE SPIRAL

The root cause of the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States is the internal wage and fiscal inflation which has been allowed to develop in that country. The official assurances that these sources of inflation have been stopped up carry little conviction because both wage inflation and budget-deficits financed by bank reserves rather than by genuine savings have increased uninterruptedly. It is not sufficient in the American case merely to hold wage increases within the limits which the Government has designated as politically feasible or socially desirable. What is necessary is that wage increases be held well below productivity increases; realistically, they should be suspended altogether. But in fact a number of the most powerful American unions have not even managed to hold their wage demands within the administration's guidelines.

It is the labor unions, in the final analysis, which must be accounted responsible for the fact that wages for the past 5 years have been pushed ever higher, in spite of persistently high levels of unemployment, placing the American monetary authorities in the perpetual dilemma either of accepting the unemployment caused by high wages or of overcoming it by inflation. The intemperance of the American unions, in turn, is bolstered both by the administration's policy of deliberately favoring labor and by its overall economic philosophy. The latter is based for the most part on monetary expansionism of an extreme type, distilled from a schematic and mechanical Keynesianism. Almost routinely, the managers of the New Frontier look upon any and all economic problems as ultimately soluable by an increase in the level of effective demand.

It is no accident that the principal architect of the administration's economic policy, Prof. Walter Heller, is the same person who in 1953 urgently advised the Bonn government to cure the then substantial unemployment in West Germany—unemployment which was clearly due to a shortage of capital and hence definitely not of the Keynesian variety—with a bold program of monetary expansion. His advice, had it been followed, would have pushed the young German market economy ineluctably to its doom over the cliffs of inflation. The Heller philosophy, which the West Germans fortunately rejected, is one characterized by a perpetual impatience to give free rein to the money-creating mechanisms of society. Obsessed by fear of deflation, it is blind to the danger of inflation which persists undiminished in the almost ritually recurring "rounds" of wage increases. Nor is the danger of inflation any less serious because it emerges in the American case in conjunction with unemployment and business pessimism. Indeed, it is precisely in this combination that it is most to be feared.

It is not easy to restore the world's confidence in a currency which has suffered, as the dollar has, from protracted illness. Even the support for the dollar provided by the international community, as indubitable a sign as it is of the price which other countries are prepared to pay to underwrite the "key currency," cannot dispel the disturbing possibility which has been summed up in a famous phrase of Talleyrand's: "A ministry which needs support is a ministry whch will fall." Of decisive importance, therefore, is the overcoming of the basic deficit itself.

EMBERS MAY FLARE UP

Doubtless the current inflationary tendencies in Europe will ease the task of the Americans in moving in an anti-inflationary direction. The probability is then that the balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced, providing other circumstances are favorable. But to the extent that this hoped-for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever higher levels of "effective demand," the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too-preciptate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persists that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilization of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and "repressed inflation." As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Government's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the New Deal and New Frontier finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked but in an openly defiant glorification of Big Government and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the developed countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German Parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that "the continuous enlargement of the Government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population." The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that Government expenditures insure a wiser use of the people's income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary government expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular is, verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized State of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

There are limits to the process of continuing growth of government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political, and economic foundations of a healthy democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment, the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it "takes off" like an airplane from the ground. The developmental process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of takeoff has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of high mass consumption. In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by democratization and liberalization. This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forbearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millenium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistible desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuousness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular, constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accoutrements of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most agregious and alarming defect of the Rostovian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE RICH GOT RICH

Progress in sciense and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary but by no means sufficient conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The rich countries of today are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the one-sided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social, and political system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of a pseudoreligion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is the mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely because it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with a network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but in increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

Obsolete Training Undermines Vocational Education Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of our brightest hopes for a solution of this Nation's long-term unemployment problem lies in sound and effective public and private training and retraining programs. Through a steady drive to upgrade our workers' skills to fill the new jobs created by automation and technological change, our high unemployment rate can be substantially reduced.

According to a recent column by Sylvia Porter, however, a key factor in this area—our vocational educational system—leaves much to be desired. Miss Porter says that vocational education schools are "obsolete, dreadfully equipped, staffed by undertrained instructors and geared to teaching the skills of the 1930's rather than the skills of the 1960's.

If this is, indeed, the case, drastic steps are needed to overcome such weaknesses in our vocational education system. Under unanimous consent I insert Miss Porter's column from the April 9 edition of the Evening Star in the RECORD at this point.

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—MOST VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS OFFER OBSOLETE TRAINING

(By Sylvia Porter)

With a few notable exceptions, the country's vocational-education schools are obsolete, dreadfully equipped, staffed by undertrained instructors, and geared to teaching the skills of the 1930's rather than the skills of the 1960's.

Yet, these are the schools on which we are relying to train thousands of jobless men and women under the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act and to make them capable of filling available jobs.

There are exceptions to this indictment: among the most publicized are the systems of Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Denver. But by any yardstick in this era, most vocational-education schools are just not adequate to perform the essential job of training people for today's jobs.

CALLED STUMBLING BLOCK

"The vocational schools and administrators were a major stumbling block from the very start of our work under the training program," remarked Max M. Horton, director of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, during my recent visit to his office in Detroit.

"Under the 1962 law no funds were specifically earmarked to develop an appropriate curriculum for training, and remembering the mess they had with veterans' training after World War II, many of the administrators were reluctant to cooperate. But surely, of all first things first in a training program, the selection of appropriate courses should be first. We had to rely on the help of instructions already overworked and in an overloaded field. We found many of the teachers themselves had to be retrained to teach the courses needed, and how were we to go about that? The facilities were so interior or useless it was heartbreaking. We have had to abandon training programs for jobs that exist in Detroit right now because we cannot get the needed facilities and teachers."

What Mr. Horton said is being echoed by other officials in the manpower training field the Nation over—and in the April issue of Harper's magazine, Edward T. Chase writes one of the most scathing indictments of our vo-ed system ever.

The vo-ed schools, says Mr. Chase, are "a national scandal." They are training youths in moribund skills, in effect turning "millions of young people into unemployables."

As Mr. Horton pointed out to me, so Mr Chase emphasizes that a third of all vocational-education funds (Federal, State and local combined) are still spent on training farmers at a time when only one applicant out of 10 can ever hope to find a job on a farm when he leaves school.

The system is "fantastically biased" in favor of farming and home economics. "So archaic is most of the training given in vocational schools," Mr. Chase declares, "that unions in the printing, plumbing, food and other trades refuse to give credit for it."

A simple but potentially immensely effective move, which Mr. Horton urges, would be a regional survey of our vocational schools to find out just how adequate the equipment, courses, instructors may be. Any local group can initiate this.

SKILLS SURVEY URGED

Another simple but potentially immensely effective move, which Mr. Chase urges, would be a major inventory of jobs and skills in demand in every section of the Nation by the U.S. Employment Service in order to launch a truly practical training program. Whatever this inventory would cost would be repaid many times over in new paychecks and extra tax collections.

There are weaknesses in the Manpower Training Act, and in this first year we have discovered that among the greatest are its failure to touch the fundamental problem of literacy among the unemployed and its reliance on an antiquated vocational education system to do a modern job.

Now we must work at eliminating these weaknesses—for let us not ever shrug off the central fact that in this age of skills, not even a business boom will offer jobs to that "hard core" who are neither literate nor skilled.

Idaho Territorial Centennial Calendar 1863–1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 I extended an invitation to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to visit Idaho and take part in our territorial centennial celebration. Communities throughout the State are par-

ticipating in this important historical event. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Idaho centennial calendar of events, which was prepared by Louise Shadduck, executive secretary of the Idaho State Department of Commerce and Development:

TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL CALENDAR—1863–1963

MAY

Full month, Pocatello, display of late 1800's travel.

First week, Ketchum, Basque Festival

May 2–4, Pocatello, Idaho State Federation of Music Clubs Convention—Theme: "One Hundred Years of Music in Idaho."

May 6–18, Boise, Music Week.

May 8–26, Boise, Fifth Annual Idaho International Photographic Exhibit. Special section of pictures of Idaho in commemoration of State's 100th birthday. Boise Art Gallery.

May 12, Boise, performance of massed chorus of 25 Boise Valley churches. Boise Junior College Gym.

May 25, Marsing, centennial celebration—parade, display of typical mining camp and whisker contest in the "Spirit of Early Days in Owyhee County."

May 25–26, Boise, 11th Annual Iris Show. State House Rotunda.

May 25–26, Boise, Pollen Daubers Iris Society Annual Show—theme: "Celebrating Idaho's Territorial Centennial." YWCA Ballroom.

JUNE

Full month, Lewiston, each Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, "Melodrama Festival," sponsored by Lewiston Civic Theater. Re-creation of such shows as the "Drunkard," "Ten Nights in a Barroom," and "Magruder Murder Trial." Between-act entertainment of the vaudeville and song-and-dance variety.

Summer months, Boise, art exhibit: "Idaho Art—Past and Present," sponsored by Boise Art Association and Idaho State Historical Museum.

Full month, Pocatello, display of railroads.

Third or fourth weekend, Idaho City, "Gold Rush Days."

June 2–3, Boise, 50-year class reunion of Boise High School Class of 1913.

June 9, Idaho City, First Annual Idaho Muzzle-Loading Tournament, sponsored by EE-Da-How Long Rifles.

June 9–16, Boise, 20th Annual Session of American Legion Gem Boys State featuring centennial theme. Boise Junior College.

June 10–15, Canyon County, stagecoach trip from Caldwell to Silver City and return, via DeLamar going and Murphy coming.

Commemorative half dollars will be issued which can be redeemed during celebration days or saved as souvenirs—Famous "Steunenberg Trial."

June 17–22, Weiser, Idaho Old-Time Fiddlers hosting National Fiddle Festival. Jack Benny, star of movies, TV and radio has been invited as a contestant.

June 21–23, Filer, Magic Valley Western Horse Show. Approved Arabian Quarter and Appaloosa.

June 22, Emmett, Cherry Festival Square Dance.

June 22–23, Pocatello, Idaho State Mounted Sheriffs Posse Show D–O.

June 25–29, Emmett, Emmett Cherry Festival.

June 26–30, Boise, National Appaloosa Horse Show.

June 29, Boise, Greater Boise Centennial observance. More than 165 Ada County and Greater Boise area organizations.

June 30, Boise, Religious Heritage Day—All churches will observe day in special services.

Picnic and barbecue at Ann Morrison Park.

JULY

Full month, Pocatello, display, Pocatello as it was from 1881 to 1910.

Full month, Blackfoot, display, Blackfoot Land Rush.

During summer months, St. Charles, dedication of a Gutzon Borglum Birthplace Memorial.

July or August, Sun Valley, centennial baton twirling contest.

July 1, Boise, Territorial Pioneer and Founders' Day.

July 2, Boise, salute to Idaho youth. Coronation of Miss Centennial will open evening pageant, concluded with fireworks.

July 3, Boise, Territorial Ladies Day. Recognition of outstanding women civic leaders at evening pageant.

July 3–4, Hailey, "Days of the Old West."

July 4, Sandpoint, Fourth of July Celebration with Centennial theme. Fireworks on Lake Pend Oreille.

July 4, Boise, Territorial Veterans and Independence Day. Parade and "old fashioned" Fourth of July celebration.

July 5, Boise, Salute of industry and commerce. Exhibitions and programs presented by industrial, commercial and labor units with recognition to leaders.

July 5–7, McCall, Centennial Funstitute sponsored by Intermountain Square Dance Association.

July 6, Boise, Territorial Good Neighbor and Basque Fiesta Day. Chuck wagon breakfast.

July 7, Boise, homecoming picnic for all present and former Idahoans.

July 11–14, Boise, 45th convention of American Legion and Auxiliary, John Regan Post 2, host.

July 14, Boise, centennial air show, Gowen Field. Thunderbirds, Air Force acrobatic team, and U.S. Army Ski Divers, parachute demonstration team.

July 19–21, Treasure Valley, centennial square dancing—workshop, pageant, chuck wagon, float down Boise River.

July 19–21, Priest River, loggers celebration.

July 20–22, Coeur d'Alene, diamond cup hydroplane races.

July 24, Hagerman, pioneer day.

July 24, Rigby, Mormon pageant and celebration.

July 27, Silver City, Owyhee cattleman's association convention.

July 31 through August 3, Idaho Falls, war bonnet roundup.

Last week in July or first week in August, Bannock Creek, Bannock-Shoshone Indian Tribe sun dance—2 days.

AUGUST

During month, Pocatello, official opening of replica of Old Fort Hall.

During month, Kellogg, centennial diamond jubilee.

During month, Nampa, centennial Spanish festival.

August 2–3, Yellow Pine, Cox's Dude Ranch square dancing.

August 4, Corral, Mannie Shaw's fiddling jamboree.

August 14–17, Parma, celebration of Old Fort Boise days with pageant.

August 19–20, Clarkia, old timers day.

August 23–25, Ketchum, wagon days.

August 31, Garden Valley, Payette River cattleman's annual barbecue.

August 31 through September 2, Twin Falls, Idaho centennial gemorama and Northwest federation show sponsored by Magic Valley Gem Club.

SEPTEMBER

During month, Pocatello, safety parade—school children floats depicting Idaho's history.

September 2, Bellevue, Labor Day centennial picnic.

September 12–15, Sandpoint, Bonner County fair and horse show—outstanding wildlife display.

September 13–15, Orofino, Clearwater County fair and lumberjack days.

Publisher Carl Estes, of Longview, Tex., and "Carl Estes Day"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include an article that recently appeared in the Shreveport Journal and another article that appeared recently in the Gladewater Mirror and still another article that appeared recently in the Longview Daily News about the outstanding work which has been done by Publisher Carl Estes of the Longview Daily News in bringing to east Texas many industries. It is a well-known fact Publisher Estes has been a pioneer in our section in effectively bringing to east Texas many splendid industries. He deserves the honor and the recognition which have been accorded him. I am very pleased to join others in commending him on the great success he has enjoyed. We of east Texas owe much to our great Texas citizen, Col. Carl Estes.

The articles follow:

[From the Shreveport Journal]

LONGVIEW'S CARL ESTES

The Longview City Commission set aside Wednesday, April 3, as "Carl Estes Day" in honor of the publisher of the Longview News-Journal. Few men have done more for their individual cities and surrounding area than has this tall and energetic Texan.

Some years ago Mr. Estes began to interest himself in industrialization of the Longview area. He established contacts which fed him information about industries seeking locations in the South or Southwest. Carl Estes wasted no time. He went to see the prospect, then brought the prospect to see Longview.

He saw that Longview had an industrial area where plans could locate. He got the railroads and utility companies to enter his industrial area. For water, he had a creek dammed up.

Once a company president told Mr. Estes: "Your country club isn't large enough to accommodate our junior executives."

"We'll build it bigger," said Mr. Estes.

And so they did.

In recognition of "Carl Estes Day," telephone calls from all over the Nation flooded the Longview News-Journal. Greetings came from the Nation's Capitol in Washington and from the Texas State capitol in Austin.

Perhaps no one summed it up better than J. T. Suggs, president of the Texas & Pacific Railroad. He wired: "If there ever was a citizen who deserved having his hometown set aside a day for him, Carl is that man."

[From the Gladewater Mirror]

LONGVIEW HOLDS CARL ESTES DAY

LONGVIEW.—Longview honored the publisher of the Longview News-Journal Wednesday by naming the day after him.

Carl Estes Day saw the publisher presented with a plaque at a special ceremony. Mayor J. Clyde Tomlinson praised Estes for his leadership in establishing industrial growth and expansion in the area.

"As a token of our esteem and respect and in public recognition of the unparalleled leadership and invaluable contributions he has made and continues to make to establishment of a strong economic base through industrial growth and expansion in Longview and our neighboring region.

"Publisher Estes has long been the leading exponent of industrial development in Longview and chief salesman of this area's advantages to industry, has led personally and with signal success campaigns which resulted in bringing in many basic industries to the Longview area, and continues to support personally and through his publications every effort for new and expanded industry in our area."

[From the Longview Daily News]

CARL ESTES DAY PROCLAIMED BY CITY

(By A. S. Parker)

The Longview City Commission Wednesday morning officially set aside April 3 of Texas Industrial Week to be Carl Estes Day in Longview as a token of our esteem and respect and in public recognition of the unparalleled leadership and invaluable contributions he has made and continues to make to establishment of a strong and economic base through industrial growth and expansion in Longview and our neighboring east Texas region.

The special honor to the Longview publisher was in the form of a proclamation issued and signed by Mayor J. Clyde Tomlinson.

A copy of the proclamation, inscribed on a plaque, was presented to Publisher Estes by Mayor Tomlinson at the city hall at 10 a.m. in the presence of all members of the city commission, a former city commissioner, and several other friends who in some manner had learned of what was going to happen.

"My colleagues and I are delighted to present you this plaque," said Mayor Tomlinson. "You have done more for east Texas than any other man in its history. This is one of my last official acts as mayor, and I can think of nothing that could afford me greater pleasure than proclaiming this day in your honor," he told the widely known newspaper executive. "The contributions you have made are invaluable and priceless. We—and I speak for the people of Longview—want you to know that we appreciate you.

"I am deeply grateful to you," said the publisher. "I would rather this came to me from you, my own people, than from the President."

He said that it was a privilege for him to have had the opportunity of working with officials of Eastman and all the other companies which established plants in Longview and the area.

The proclamation pointed out that Longview in postwar years has experienced major growth as a result of the location in this area of numerous industrial plants using area and regional materials and labor and providing products and services widely used in the Southwest, the Nation and the free world.

The full text of the proclamation follows:

"Whereas the first week in April 1963 has been designated as Texas Industrial Week for the purpose of recognizing the importance of industry and its vital contribution to the well-being of the people and progress of the cities and communities of Texas; and

"Whereas Longview in postwar years has experienced major growth as a result of the location in this area of numerous industrial plants using area and regional materials and labor and providing products and services widely used in the Southwest, the Nation, and the free world; and

"Whereas Publisher Carl Estes has long been the leading exponent of industrial development in Longview and chief salesman of this area's advantages to industry, has led personally and with signal success campaigns which resulted in bringing many of the major basic industries to the Longview area, and continues to support personally and through his publications every effort for new and expanded industry in our area:

"Therefore, I, J. Clyde Tomlinson, mayor of the city of Longview, do hereby proclaim April 3 of Texas Industrial Week to be Carl Estes Day in Longview, as a token of our esteem and respect and in public recognition of the unparalleled leadership and invaluable contributions he has made and continues to make to establishment of a strong and diversified economic base though industrial growth and expansion in Longview and our neighboring east Texas region.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this the 3d day of April 1963.

"J. CLYDE TOMLINSON,
"Mayor."

Remarks by Joseph Leonelli, National Commander, Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at National Executive Committee Breakfast, Friday, April 19, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an address made by Joseph Leonelli, national commander, Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at the national executive committee breakfast, Friday, April 19, 1963, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C.:

REMARKS BY JOSEPH LEONELLI, NATIONAL COMMANDER, ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC., AT NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BREAKFAST, FRIDAY, APRIL 19, 1963, CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

On behalf of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, I am indeed pleased to welcome you this morning.

As we look ahead to our national executive committee meeting tomorrow in our Nation's Capital, I believe it is fitting that we pause a moment and contemplate upon such fundamental questions as:

Who are we?
Why are we here?
Where are we going?

In 1930, a group of American veterans of Italian extraction banded together in Hartford, Conn., in order to give substance and form to an ideal. Stated simply, they sought an avenue upon which they could travel in their compelling desire to render continuing service to God, to country, and to their fellow Americans with whom they shared the common bond of proudful wartime service.

Thus was sprung an idea and an ideal: the conception of an organization comprised of American veterans of Italian derivation dedicated to serving the needs of America's veterans, their widows and their orphans—an organization devoted to further and to strengthen the noble experiment of democratic government upon which our Nation was founded.

From a modest beginning, the idea took root. Today, the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States spans 12 States, and increasingly attracts growing numbers from an eligible membership of nearly 2 million Americans of Italian origin who served our Nation in time of war. Today, throughout its increasing posts and auxiliaries, ITAM Vets invigorates scores of communities throughout our land as it directs its energies and its efforts in the vital areas of rehabilitation, veterans' services, patriotic activities, and civic programs. And today, ITAM Vets has captured the imagination, and has won the support, of the American public by dint of its sincerity of purpose and by virtue of the noble aims it espouses.

Our purpose in conducting our national executive committee meeting here in Washington is far from being singleminded. Let me assure the honorable Members of the Congress who have been kind enough to join with us this morning that we did not come here to add to your many burdens by soliciting your support of unreasonable demands. On the contrary, all that we ask is that you allow yourselves to grow to know and to understand ITAM Vets and its programs and objectives. I am not saying that to know and understand us is to love us. But I am convinced that out of a knowledge and understanding of our principles, our goals, and our accomplishments, confidence and support will follow.

We do seek your active endorsement of our legislative platform which was mandated at our 1962 national convention in Youngstown, Ohio.

ITAM Vets urges the Congress to enact legislation which will achieve these worthy and essential goals:

(1) Reopening national service life insurance for 1 year.

(2) Additional dependents' allowance for veterans with service-connected disabilities rated at 40 percent.

(3) The establishment of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

(4) Increase of service-connected and nonservice-connected death benefits for widows and orphans.

(5) Extension of veterans' benefit program to cold war servicemen.

(6) The establishment of Columbus Day as a national holiday.

(7) Expansion of facilities to meet the growing needs of veterans requiring long-term care.

(8) Last, but not least, to have the Congress pass legislation incorporating (congressional chartering) and/or recognizing the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.—a national nonprofit, nonpolitical American war veterans organization made up wholly and without exception of honorably discharged American war veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

Each of these legislative objectives has been thoroughly studied and reviewed. We earnestly hope that they will merit your enthusiastic support.

I am certain that each of the members of our national executive committee present here this morning shares with me the exhilaration and inspiration of being here in Washington. Among the highlights in our crowded, 2-day schedule are the ceremonies we will conduct at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery and visitations to the offices of our congressional delegations. And I know that we are all looking forward to the address at our NEC meeting tomorrow by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Now that our meeting in Washington has been reestablished, it is my sincere hope that we will continue to gather here each year. I am convinced that such a practice will yield untold benefits to our organization just as surely as it will aid the meritorious proposals we may advance.

For ITAM Vets, the future is bright with promise. Unlimited opportunities for growth are at our beck and call, and never before in our Nation's history has there been a greater need for service to the cause of veterans and to the ideals of freedom and democracy.

In the shadow of our Nation's Capital, we face the challenges of our times with high resolve and with abiding determination to serve our country and our organization in the noble tradition of devoted Americans. Thank you.

Preserving Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to have the opportunity to present for the consideration of the Members of the U.S. Congress a very fine and patriotic statement by Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, U.S. Navy, retired, chairman, board of trustees, Americans for Constitutional Action, that he delivered before the national society, Daughters of the Barons of Runnemede, last week.

Americans for Constitutional Action, commonly referred to as ACA, is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide, political action organization which is dedicated to these theses; first, that the Constitution of the United States, as originally conceived, provides a solid foundation upon which the structure of our free social order has been erected and, second, if we are to preserve that social order in America, it is imperative that we protect its foundation against erosion or destruction.

Adm. Ben Moreell, U.S. Navy, retired, is a most distinguished civic leader and accomplished spokesman for sound, responsible, conservative government. He was the founder and organizer of the famed Seabees and Chief of the Civil Engineers for the U.S. Navy during World War II. Admiral Moreell is the former chairman of the board and president of Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp. He is a former chairman of the Task Force on Water Resources and Power and the Second Hoover Commission. He has authored many fine articles on engineering, economics, politics, and related subjects. Adm. Ben Moreell is an accomplished engineer, a distinguished civic and business leader, and a great and dedicated American. I commend him for his accomplishments, but more than that, I admire him for his dedication to the cause of freedom and individual liberty and I am pleased to include his remarks in the RECORD at this point for your review and consideration.

ON PRESERVING OUR SACRED HERITAGE

(Address by Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, U.S.N. (retired), chairman, board of trustees, Americans for Constitutional Action, before the National Society, Daughters of the Barons of Runnemede, April 15, 1963)

During the past 30 years our country has suffered a seemingly endless procession of emergencies. We have endured depressions, recessions, inflation, unemployment, strikes, police actions and wars, foreign and domestic, hot, cold, and lukewarm. At the same time, the Federal Government has intruded farther and farther into the internal affairs of our local communities and the private affairs of the people, seizing ever-increasing power and burdening them with more and more taxes and debt.

We are afflicted by a national malaise, a deepseated apprehension, which is evidenced by the question so often asked but never convincingly answered, "Where will it all end?"

In these circumstances, it seems timely to review the progress of human liberty, as revealed by certain historic documents, in the hope that we may learn why we abandoned the trail leading to freedom, which was blazed through government oppression by the Founding Fathers of our Republic. Hopefully, we may learn how we can return to the principles which made ours the greatest Nation in history, in terms of human dignity, spiritual strength, and material prosperity.

If you accept the doctrine of "noblesse oblige," as I do, it is important that you be informed on these matters. In the year A.D. 1215, your ancestors forced a wicked king to sign a declaration of "liberties, rights and concessions," the terms of which were to be carried out under the supervision of a committee of 24 of those who compelled the king to sign. By that agreement, the barons assumed for "themselves and their heirs" * * * "in all places forever" the duty to preserve those rights which they had won at such great cost. This obligation is your heritage. The doctrine of inseparability of human rights and collateral duties was enunciated in 1790 by the great Irish patriot, John Philpot Curran. He said:

"The condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt." This is the obligation we must willingly assume if we are to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

First among the great pronouncements on liberty are the Ten Commandments. The first four of these define the responsibilities of man to his God, and are purely religious, while the last six define man's responsibilities to his neighbor, and are secular. However, it is clear that these religious and secular rules of conduct for mankind are interdependent and mutually sustaining. On this sound base there has been erected a great structure of religious and civil laws which define man's rights and duties in all areas of human activity.

It is important to note that the Eighth Commandment, which prohibits stealing, and the Tenth, which proscribes covetousness, and the protectors of the institution of private property. They establish the common identity of property rights and human rights, a doctrine contemptuously rejected by ideologs of the "liberal left" and by demagogs who seek to achieve power by "flattering the people in order to betray them."

Next, chronologically, came the Sermon on the Mount. Here Jesus defined His mission in these words, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." And, by "the law" it is clear that He meant the Pentateuch, the first five books of the Old Testament which include the whole of the Hebrew law, both secular and religious.

While the ethical principles which Jesus taught were those enunciated by Moses, there were divergences in exposition and in emphasis. His pronouncement of the Golden Rule and the Beatitudes, as well as other expositions of man's rights and duties, establish the doctrine that man's rights come from the Creator, not from any human agency, and so man owes no debt to a ruler, or to government, or to any other person or group in return for his rights. His debt is solely to God, to whom he must render an accounting of his negligences as well as his trespasses. There is no mention of government in Jesus' great sermon.

Thus the world was endowed with the greatest code of conduct ever bequeathed to mankind, a code which has deeply affected every facet of Western civilization.

As previously mentioned, in A.D. 1215 came the Magna Carta, which has been called "the first rock upon which the British Constitution was built." It was a long and complex instrument, destined to have a stormy career. But eventually, in the course of the struggle with the Stuart kings, it was accepted as the fundamental charter of the peoples' liberties.

But there was a basic difference between the concept of government held by the barons and that of the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

The latter, in the Declaration of Independence, adhered to the doctrine propounded by Jesus that man's rights, including the right to enjoy his honestly acquired property, come from God and are inalienable. To make these rights secure, our Founders established a common agency, which they called "government," and to which they assigned the duty of defending the lives, the liberties and the property of the nation's citizens; of invoking a common justice; and of keeping the records incident thereto. Other than this, the people were to be free to pursue their own interests, provided this would not lead them to trespass upon the rights of others.

These were truly revolutionary ideas. Never before had any people established themselves as a Nation of sovereign individuals. Never before had the political power, government, been relegated to the position of an agent, with only delegated, narrowly limited and sharply defined powers. Never before had there been established the inviolable right of the individual to the fruits of his own labor, to keep, to trade, or to give away, as he chooses. Always it was government that was sovereign, and any right to the products of one's labor, and often even to one's life, was a right granted to the people by the government.

But the wording of the Magna Carta reveals that even the barons thought of "rights," not as something which comes from God and is inalienable, but as something which they would have to take forcibly from the king when they had enough power to do so. For they made him sign this statement:

"Wherefore our will is, and we firmly command * * * that the men in our Kingdom have and hold the aforesaid liberties, rights and concessions * * * to them and their heirs, of us and our heirs, in all things and places forever."

In 1776 came our Declaration of Independence, followed by the Constitution with its Bill of Rights in 1787.

Our Constitution was designed to provide a "government of laws, not of men." In 1878, the great British Prime Minister, Gladstone, stated: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

But it was not a perfect instrument. It contained flaws, some which were noted at the time and others which were to be revealed later. George Mason, delegate to the Constitutional Convention and author of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, which served Jefferson as a guide for our Declaration of Independence, refused to sign the Constitution because it did not abolish human slavery and Mason believed it did not adequately protect the rights of the individual. The latter defect was corrected, in part at least, by the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments. But the former was not erased until we had paid for our sin by a bloody fratricidal war from the effects of which our Nation still suffers.

There were other flaws in the Constitution. It left unresolved the question of equal rights

for women, a defect not corrected until 1920 by the 19th amendment.

Furthermore, while the Virginia Declaration was specific in defining the citizen's right to use and dispose of his honestly acquired property, our Declaration substituted an ambiguous paraphrase which asserted the individual's right to the "pursuit of happiness." Over the years, zealous "do-gooders" and political opportunists have interpreted this to mean the "right to happiness, at the expense of someone else." They choose to overlook the fact that our forebears asserted only the right to "pursue" happiness, the responsibility for catching up with it resting with the pursuer.

Later, there were detected in the Constitution real or imaginary ambiguities in the wording of the general welfare clauses, the interstate commerce clause, and most recently, the provision in the first amendment which prohibits Congress from making any "law respecting an establishment of religion." As was to be expected, these alleged ambiguities have been seized upon as vehicles to enhance government power and to impose social changes on our people by use of government force, rather than to achieve them peacefully by education and persuasion.

But, in spite of these defects, which are in essence but reflections of that frailty characteristic of all human endeavor, our Constitution stands as a sturdy bulwark of individual freedom in these United States, this "last best hope of earth."

While this progress was being achieved in America, grave events were brewing in France. These culminated in violent revolution. In 1789, the French Constituent Assembly voted a Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. This was a major contribution to the progress of liberty. But it contained the seeds of its own destruction, as is evident when we compare certain concepts of our founders with those of the great minds of France who prepared their declaration.

The political agency envisioned in our Declaration and made operative by our Constitution was designed to end man's control of men. The goal was a society in which each person would be free to govern himself, with political intervention sanctioned only to remove outside interference with this aim. The disciplines and controls were to come from within a man's own being as he sought to live out the demands of his religion. Our founders held that individual freedom cannot survive unless it is policed by the inner disciplines of the moral law.

By contrast, the French revolutionaries of this period tossed both religion and historical experience overboard. They tried to establish a completely rational and completely new society, one which sought to emphasize the primacy of the rights of man by dening the existence of God. The result was the reign of terror, which ended in the dictatorship of Napoleon.

George Washington probably had both America and France in mind when he said in his farewell address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. * * * And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can prevail without religion. * * * Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Nevertheless, the French Declaration of Rights has a place of honor on the roster of great pronouncements on human liberty. It is notable that it asserted that the "public force," which we designate as the "political power, is instituted for the advantage of all," and is not to be used for the benefit of those who control it. Furthermore, although this provision was later to be "more honored in the breach than in the observance," their Declaration held that private property is "an inviolable and sacred right."

There remain in the chronological listing of the great documents of freedom the Emancipation Proclamation of President Lincoln in 1863, and the Women's Suffrage Act of 1920, to which I have already referred.

As to the Emancipation Proclamation, the fact that its application was limited to "all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States," and that slaves in States whose people were not in rebellion were not freed, raises the suspicion that the noble motive which inspired the Proclamation was somewhat tainted by the demands of political expediency. Even so, the Proclamation constituted a gigantic step toward the abolition of human slavery in the United States, which was ultimately achieved by the 13th amendment in 1865.

I have described these historic pronouncements on the rights and duties of man because I believe that, collectively, they constitute the guiding light by which we must chart the course of our thoughts and actions if we are to regain and preserve our sacred heritage of freedom in America.

Your President has suggested that I tell you something about the organization which I have the honor to head and whose purpose is to promote the principles I have described.

Americans for Constitutional Action was established in 1959 by a group of citizens who believe that the United States now faces a crisis of such proportions as to involve their very survival as a Federal Republic and ourselves as a free people.

The basic issue is freedom of choice for the individual. Freedom of enterprise, speech, worship, assembly and the others, are but reflections of this basic freedom. Impair free enterprise, free speech or any other and you are sure to impair the right of some individuals to choose freely.

To minimize the danger of obstructing freedom of choice, our governmental structure was designed to prevent concentrations of monopoly power in any branch of government or in any sector of society.

A system of checks and balances was devised to make sure that the power of the Government in Washington would be offset by the powers of the States. And within the States, there were to be similar checks on State powers by subordinate units of government. Furthermore, at each level of government there were to be balancing forces between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

Our political forebears believed that only by dispersion or fragmentation of power, whether it be physical, economic, social, or political, can one avoid the hazards of its explosive force.

Unfortunately, we have departed to an alarming degree from the principles which guided them. This is indicated by the gigantic growth of the Federal Government and the parallel shrinkage of State sovereignty and personal freedom.

The Federal Government now owns 33.8 percent of the land acreage within the boundaries of the 50 States. It owns and operates more than 3,000 business and commercial activities in competition with its own citizens, and its functions are carried on by some 2,000 major operating units.

Parenthetically, the land acreage now owned by all levels of government, Federal, State and local is 39.1 percent of the total. This constitutes an alarming restriction on the freedom of our citizens to undertake new ventures and thus to stimulate economic growth.

Our institutions—political, economic, educational and social—are largely in the hands of the enemy. I do not refer here to avowed Socialists and Communists. The bald fact is that the American people and their once free institutions have been engulfed by the welfare state and its protagonists whose goal is to centralize all power, political, economic and social in the hands of the political apparatus in Washington.

What does ACA propose to do about this?

We are a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide, political action organization dedicated to two basic theses: First, that the Constituton of the United States, as originally conceived, provides a solid foundation on which was built the structure of our free social order, and second, if we are to preserve that order, we must restore the original integrity of its foundation and then protect it from erosion or destruction.

ACA believes that if a significant number of dedicated constitutional conservatives are elected to the Congress of the United States, they will retard and, eventually, reverse the current movement of our Nation into socialism and toward a completely regimented society.

To this end, ACA helps to elect those candidates who, by their actions, have proved their allegiance to the original spirit and principles of our Declaration and Constitution. We have defined these principles as follows:

(1) Man derives, directly from the Creator, his rights to life, to liberty and to the means of acquiring and possessing property. These rights are inherent and inalienable. They are not mere privileges granted by Government, subject to withdrawal at the whim of Government, as decreed by political overlords.

(2) To deprive a man of his God-given rights is to violate a natural law. This will call forth its own penalties, as does the violation of any natural law, moral or physical.

(3) No man has a right to deprive his posterity of their God-given rights. Just as he may not sell them into slavery, so may he not vote away their economic or political freedoms. Jefferson held that the act of deferring payment on the public debt, thus imposing this burdens on future generations, is tantamount to enslaving them.

4. The powers of government are obtained from God, or by forcible seizure, or from voluntary delegation by the individual citizens. Long ago we rejected the doctrine of "divine right of kings," as well as "divine right of majorities." Nor do we concede the right of government to seize powers which belong to individuals. There remains only one morally sanctioned source of governmental power, i.e., voluntary delegation by individuals. But, since one cannot delegate that which he does not possess, it follows that governments can exercise, with moral propriety, only those powers which individuals first possessed and then delegated to government.

5. Because the essence of government is power, which is wielded by fallible human beings, safeguards must be erected against the abuse of government authority, to make sure that the instrument forged to protect the rights of the people will not be used to destroy those rights.

6. To secure the blessings of economic freedom, from which all other freedoms flow, we must preserve a free market, with government intruding only to protect individual rights and to prevent predatory action. It is only under this system that the individual can exercise his freedom of choice effectively, using his dollars as ballots with which he can vote for those enterprises which serve him best.

(7) Onerous or punitive taxation, including the cruelest tax of all, inflation, destroys economic freedom. It is unfortunate that we have carelessly surrendered freedom in the economic sphere, forgetting the old adage "whoso controls our subsistence controls us." Slavery is commonly thought of as ownership of one man by another. But

no slaveholder would care about owning the man if he can own the products of the man's labor. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied. From this premise the denial of all other freedoms follows.

(8) For every right there is a collateral responsibility. The rights with which an individual is endowed by the Creator impose on him a duty to use those rights in conformity with the moral law as derived from such statements as the Ten Commandments and the "Sermon on the Mount." From this source flows that inner restraint or self-discipline which is essential for a free social order. Edmund Burke said, "Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within the more there must be of it without." Unless there is a generally prevailing individual self-discipline, which stems from devotion to the moral law, it is impossible to achieve that balance between public order and personal freedom which is essential for spiritual and material well-being.

The ACA program consists of two parts. Part A is to distribute educational materials to inform our citizens with respect to the principles of constitutional conservatism, the organization and functions of government in a free society, the nature of the national crisis which now confronts us, and many related subjects. A great deal of such educational work is carried on effectively by other organizations. Therefore, ACA limits its activities in this area to providing supplementary aid and distributing publications which apply specifically to ACA's work.

Part B of our program is in the area of political action. Here we aim to furnish professional assistance to conservative candidates for the Congress in primary and general elections. In addition to expert advisers on political organization and procedures, ACA furnishes news releases, campaign literature and other data to the extent permitted by our financial resources.

While Congress is in session, we issue a monthly "Digest and Tally" which contains analyses of crucial measures pending in the Congress and records the vote of each Senator and Representative on such measures.

At the end of each session of Congress, we publish the "ACA-Index," which contains the voting records of all Senators and Representatives on those crucial measures acted on in the session just ended, as well as cumulative voting records from 1955 for Senators and from 1957 for Representatives.

The ACA-Index is comprised of one major and six subsidiary indexes which constitute the basis for rating the voting records of legislators. They are defined as follows:

(1) The consistency index: For safeguarding the rights of the individual and strengthening constitutional Government and against group morality, a socialized economy and centralization of government power.

(2) For sound money and fiscal integrity and against inflation.

(3) For a free market economy and against Government price fixing and controls.

(4) For States rights and against Central Government intervention in local affairs.

(5) For private ownership of production and distribution and against Government ownership and competition with private industry.

(6) For individual rights and responsibilities and against coercion and regimentation by Government.

(7) For strengthening our national sovereignty and against surrendering control of our foreign or domestic affairs to international organizations usually dominated by nations whose ideals differ drastically from those of most Americans.

These indexes are used to calculate the legislator's "voting score," each one of his votes as entered in the official records of the Congress being marked "plus" or "minus" depending on whether it supports or opposes the principle enunciated in the index or indexes under which the vote is listed by ACA.

By means of the ACA-Index voters throughout the country can learn what crucial issues were acted on by the Congress and how their representatives voted on them. This information can serve as a useful guide for our citizens in political and governmental affairs.

In addition to the ACA-Index and the Digest and Tally, ACA has organized 28 local chapters throughout the country, and more are being formed.

ACA issues public endorsements of those legislators whom it will support and who desire such endorsement. At the end of each Congress, distinguished service awards are presented to Senators and Representatives whose voting records indicate their substantial agreement with the principles of constitutional conservatism, and who wish to accept the award.

In the 1960 national elections, the first in which ACA was active, we assisted, in varying degrees, in 180 contests for 21 Senate seats and 159 House seats. One hundred thirty-three or 74 percent of the candidates supported by ACA were elected.

In the 1962 national elections, we supported 184 candidates in all, 19 for the Senate and 165 for the House. Of these, 135 or 73½ percent were successful.

We are frequently asked whether we would be more effective if we affiliated with one or the other of the two major parties. We believe we would not.

The 1962 elections revealed that both parties consist essentially of three groups, a liberal left, a conservative right, and a middle-of-the-road.

This presents a problem for the voter who wants to direct his moral, financial, or working support to one or the other of these groups in either party, because, in most elections the party label is the only distinction between opposing candidates. That is, a candidate receives the support of his party even though his political stance and his voting record differ greatly from those generally prevailing in that party.

This occurs frequently. The resulting conflict between party loyalty and the desire to support only candidates who will promote the political and economic views which the voter favors often induces him not to vote at all. If this practice grows, it may well cause a breakdown of representative government.

While the theory of party responsibility is in accord with American political tradition, it ceases to have significance when there are no generally prevailing fundamental principles which govern party policies and which distinguish one party from the other.

This explains why legislators frequently cross party lines in voting on such crucial issues as packing the House Rules Committee, medical care for the aged through social security, foreign economic aid, Federal aids to education, U.S. assistance to Communist-dominated countries, curbing the coercive power of labor unions, and others.

ACA provides a means by which citizens can support candidates in either party who vote to preserve the principles of constitutional conservatism.

In the foregoing I have tried to show that without individual self-imposed inner disciplines, the free society cannot endure; that our Republic was founded and grew prosperous on the doctrine of interdependence of religious and secular rights and duties; that in recent decades we have moved sharply away from the concepts of our political forebears; that, in consequence, we now face a national crisis of morals; and that it is the duty of each of us to shoulder his share of the responsibility for correcting our defections.

It is easy enough for any people to have a King John. All that is necessary is for good men and women to do nothing. But in such case we must ask: "From whence will come the barons who will fight to regain our lost freedoms?" No one can delegate his personal responsibility to anyone else. If each one here today joins with all other like-minded patriots throughout our land, we can regain and preserve our sacred heritage.

I conclude with these inspiring lines from Edward Everett Hale:

"I am only one, but I am one
I can't do everything, but I can do something
And what I can do, that I ought to do
And what I ought to do, by the grace of God,
I shall do."

Coexisting With Castro—An Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is taken from the Vision Letter, a privately published, weekly analysis of Latin American affairs. The editorial states propositions and asks questions that command attention and demand forthright answers in regard to our policy toward Cuba, if it can be called that. The editorial speaks clearly; we must all wish the administration did likewise:

COEXISTING WITH CASTRO—AN EDITORIAL

A major policy decision on Cuba has been taken in Washington. Despite protestations to the contrary, the administration has decided to "coexist" with Fidel Castro. This is the inescapable conclusion to be drawn from recent Government statements and actions, beginning with the President's "wall of dedicated men" speech in San José, Costa Rica, and ending with the clampdown on Cuban exile raiders.

The U.S. press in recent weeks has been nibbling at this story, sensing it but never quite believing it. The U.S. public, as a result, is in the dark. But it is a fact. After years of noise and alarms, troop movements, bellicose speeches and pronounciamentos, capital intrigues, etc., the Kennedy administration has finally thrown in the towel.

Out of bafflement as much as insight, the guessing game is on as to whether there is a "deal" behind it all: either between Kennedy and Khrushchev or Kennedy and Castro. But for the simple reason that the United States is getting all the bad, none of the good, the theory is doubtful. The Communists carry on, business as usual, openly in Vietnam and Laos, covertly in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And the Red regime in Cuba, with Washington's blessings, goes on as serenely as its own mismanagement permits. And the United States gets a consolation prize: only 12,000 Soviet troops in the Caribbean instead of 21,000.

The President must set the record straight. If there is a deal, the people should be told what they have gained to make a Communist Cuba more palatable. If there is no deal, they have a right to know about that too. If Castro's overthrow is no longer a prime U.S. aim, then the public not only of the United States but of the whole hemisphere should be told why. For the situation today

is just the opposite of what Kennedy has promised day in and day out for more than 2 years: tough talk and no action.

To critics, Government apologists offer a now monotonous answer: "What should be done? You tell us." This is the ultimate admission of defeat. Who outside the Government can have access to all the strings of information and analysis that would go toward making such a decision? What is the job of those in office except to make such decisions and take action accordingly?

From the day of President Kennedy's inauguration, there were three obvious ways to oust Castro and his regime: invasion, economic blockade, internal revolt. Failure of nerve undermined the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 when air cover was called off; failure of nerve negated the blockade last October when the Navy was ordered to let oil tankers through the cordon; and, now, failure of nerve is canceling the final alternative, the basis for which would have to be the supply of arms and ammunition to insurrectionary groups inside the island.

Despite all the failures, however, a basic Cuban policy had been thrashed out in Washington over the past 4 years. Its goals were: to work actively to overthrow the Castro government and, in the interim period, to block the spread of the Castroist disease in the rest of the hemisphere. The more important half of this program has now been jettisoned, and Washington's word for 1963 is "isolation." But there should be no mistake about it: isolation means nothing more or less than coexistence. Castro is here to stay.

This is a near tragic mistake, a mistake foisted on the Government by the legions of doom criers who preach a doctrine of paralysis based on fear of atomic war. Whenever a voice of reason is raised—that the Kremlin will not start a war for the same reasons that we will not—the apocalyptic racket becomes deafening. So we cannot step on Mr. Khrushchev's Cuban toe.

Cuba today is seething with unrest, its economy in tatters, its people sullen and angry. The sugar harvest, the wellspring of Cuban fortunes, is lower than it has been in a decade. An island paradise that once boasted the highest standard of living in Latin America now rations food, clothing, and even soap. Monitored broadcasts of Castro's own radio admit executions, food riots, mass arrests, and counterrevolutionary fighting in the hills. And suddenly, the United States intervenes on Castro's side.

The running of guns to Cuban revolutionary movements has been going on for 60 years while Washington looked the other way. It is the time-honored method of getting rid of Cuban tyrants, the method used by Castro himself. Now, when for the first time in those 60 years the tyrant is a Communist, the U.S. Government changes the rules, even earning a thank you from Castro himself.

Throughout the world the Communists are spreading the message that they represent the wave of the future. In Cuba today, and only in Cuba, the United States has the golden opportunity to give the lie to Communist boasting by breaking off a piece of the Red bloc and restoring it to freedom. With that prize in reach—in fact sitting in its lap—the Kennedy administration decides that the risk isn't worth the candle. It will coexist with Castro.

The Cuban dictatorship is held together by force; the only way it ever will be taken apart is by counterforce. For the United States not to face up to this responsibility—and opportunity—is to betray its history dating back to the Monroe Doctrine, its present-day hemisphere commitments and alliances, and its future role of world leadership.

Another Forward Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I want to express my sincere gratification at the passage of H.R. 5389, the administration's much-needed silver legislation. And to take this opportunity to congratulate all those who helped bring this about.

As Congressman-at-Large from the State of Connecticut, I am privileged to represent an area wherein some 22 establishments are engaged in the use and fabrication of silver as silver products and platedware employing approximately 6,000 employees. The payroll in 1958 for about 3,947 employees was $19,196,000. The value of shipments out of Connecticut in 1958 was $67,186,000 with a value added of $34,621,000. While this figure would be subject to modification because of the impossibility of differentiating out nonsilver products of these producers, the modification would be smaller for Connecticut than the Nation due to the location in Connecticut of such companies as the International Silver Co., Wallace Silversmiths, and Handy & Harmon Co., manufacturers of brazing alloys, silver paint, and silver contacts, and so forth, used in defense production; companies which produce the lion's share of such silver products for the entire country.

During the course of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, I was privileged to confer at length with Mr. Douglas Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John B. Stevens, vice president and general manager of the International Silver Co., and many representatives of mining and producing interests both from Connecticut and other areas. But early in these hearings, I came to believe sincerely that such legislation is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole for many reasons.

Mr. Speaker, although it is not usually my practice to introduce printed testimony in my remarks, I should like to present the following excerpts as I believe that they very appropriately present the questions in a suitably brief and easily understandable form.

First, I would like to quote from the testimony of Mr. Dillon as contained in the "Hearings Before the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 4413." His statements, I think aptly present the need for and purpose of this legislation:

Basic purposes of legislation: H.R. 4413 implements the recommendations of the President, going back to his instruction to me in November 1961 to suspend further sales of silver, and repeated in his Economic Report in January of this year. Its basic purposes are twofold:

(1) To afford the Government a sure and substantial supply of silver for its coinage needs by making available for this purpose the stocks of silver bullion backing the presently outstanding $1 silver certificates. This amounts to approximately 1,300 million ounces.

(2) To eliminate the obsolete and largely inoperative provisions on the statute books requiring the acquisition and holding of silver in our monetary reserves and putting a Government floor price of 90.5 cents an ounce under newly mined domestic silver, which is far below the current market price.

For many years now silver has not served any major purpose as a monetary reserve metal. While it has been held as a reserve behind outstanding silver certificates, the amount of these in relation to total currency in circulation is small (approximately $2 billion in silver certificates, compared with $30 billion in Federal Reserve notes). Our basic currency is the Federal Reserve note which is backed by 100 percent collateral, 25 percent in the form of gold.

Recent years have seen a sharply increasing worldwide demand for silver for industrial, professional, and artistic uses which is in marked contrast to the situation existing in 1934 when the Silver Purchase Act was passed and in subsequent years up to about 1959.

Today, silver is at a point where current world production is not sufficient to meet current coinage and industrial demands. Most recently, annual free world production of newly mined silver has amounted to about 200 million ounces, compared to a consumption of around 350 million ounces.

Since November 29, 1961, we have been retiring the $5 and $10 silver certificates, replacing them with Federal Reserve notes, and utilizing the silver so released for the coinage of subsidiary coins, but this supply is limited. Coinage requirements appear to be increasing each year, partly at least as a result of the ever-growing use of vending machines. Last year they amounted to about 75 million ounces.

In addition, our increasing population leads to a steady growth in the number of $1 bills required for circulation. Since at present $1 bills can only be issued in the form of silver certificates, this leads to a further annual requirement, which last year amounted to $49 million, or roughly 38 million ounces.

Problems arising if $1 Federal note not authorized: If the $1 Federal Reserve note is not authorized, the Treasury will soon be in the untenable position of being forced into the market to buy silver for its coinage needs. Since U.S. production is only one-third of our industrial requirements, all silver for coinage would have to be acquired from abroad, thus putting an unnecessary strain on our balance of payments.

The next excerpt, from a statement by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, U.S. Navy, retired, is of value because it dispels, I think, some longstanding misconceptions I have noted regarding the intrinsic monetary value of silver.

Silver as money: The act of March 14, 1900, established the gold dollar as our standard unit of value. The Gold Reserve Act guarantees an ounce of gold will exchange for $35. Silver was actually demonetized in 1873 and is not a standard unit of value. It has no guaranteed value despite the use in various laws of such words as "standard silver dollars," "monetary value," "seigniorage," and so forth.

Despite the 40-percent increase in the price of silver during the last 15 months, domestic mine production of recoverable silver rose less than 5 percent in 1962.

In fact, mine production in Nevada, Utah, and Washington declined. The gain in Arizona silver production reflects greater output of copper ore yielding byproducts of silver. An increase in the price of silver does not mean an increase in production because silver is largely a byproduct in the production of copper, lead, and zinc. These base metals are in oversupply.

Annual consumption of silver in the United States in now averaging 105 million ounces. A few large producers account for most of the 35 million ounces of domestic production. Approximately 40 percent of this production comes from ore mined primarily for its silver content—mostly in Idaho. The remaining 60 percent comes incidentally in the production of copper, lead and zinc.

It should always be borne in mind that foreign producers greatly benefit by our silver policies. Two-thirds of our annual consumption now comes from abroad. Such purchases amount to about 70 million ounces a year which result in a claim against our gold supply of about $90 million.

Secretary Dillon stated that the silver producing industry has no further need for Government assistance. He pointed out that since late 1961 the producers have seen a spectacular increase in the price of their product amounting to about 40 percent. He stated that the recent rapid rise has created difficulties for the users, who have had to cope as best they can with these increased costs.

Mr. John B. Stevens, vice president and general manager of the International Silver Co., Meriden, Conn., said before the House Banking and Currency Committee:

> I do not feel qualified to discuss the monetary aspects of silver, but I would like to confine myself to what I understand—silver as a raw material."

In his economic report of January 1963, President Kennedy said:

> I again urge a revision in our silver policy to reflect the status of silver as a metal for which there is an expanding industrial demand.

A year earlier President Kennedy said:

> It is uneconomic for the U.S. Government to lock up large quantities of useful silver in the sterile form of currency reserves.

This I understand and applaud because silver is the single most important raw material which the International Silver Co. buys. In a single year we use over 4 million ounces in our silverplated and sterling silver products. Silver is, of course, the largest component in the cost of sterling silver products and a surprisingly large element in the cost of silverplate. For example, at the present price of silver bullion of $1.27 an ounce, the silver content comprises 75 percent of the manufacturing cost of sterling silver knives, forks and spoons, and 60 percent of the cost of sterling silver holloware, which is the trade name for coffeepots, teapots, candlesticks, bowls, trays, platters, and so forth. Even in silverplate such as the famous 1847 Rogers Bros., the silver content is 20 percent of the manufacturing cost of knives, forks and spoons.

What this means in terms of selling prices is that the retail price of a typical five-piece sterling place setting, including the 10-percent excise tax, has had to be increased from $32.50 to $39.50 as a result of the increase in the price of silver which has taken place in the last year alone, if we are to maintain current profit margins. The retail price of a sterling teapot has had to be increased from $145.75 to $182.

When one considers the essential uses of silver in defense production as well as in less critical products such as silver-zinc batteries, alloys and solders, dental and medical uses, electrical controls, contacts and circuits, and mirrors, and so forth, and the smaller, less diversified companies dependent upon moderate price margins for survival, the price of the raw material assumes a greater significance. This last excerpt from a statement by Mr. C. Edwin Ireland, vice president and treasurer, Hamilton Watch Co., on behalf of Wallace Silversmiths, points up some of these difficulties:

> Our company buys about 2 million ounces of silver annually. The sudden increase in the price of silver has therefore added, quite unexpectedly, about $700,000 to our manufacturing costs. To state the situation bluntly, our profit expectations have been substantially lessened.

The question might properly be asked that if the entire industry is faced with the same increase in the cost of raw materials would not an industrywide price increase in the cost of the finished product pass the burden on to the consumer and reserve the profits for the manufacturer. Unfortunately, it just isn't that easy.

Changing our prices, once a year, in a period of rising costs can be handled. Changing prices twice a year in unusual circumstances can be tolerated. To do so more often is impossible.

Because of the wild fluctuations in the cost of our raw material, it is impossible to quickly adjust our selling prices to recover the added costs and still be competitive. In any industry, a price change normally entails careful forecasts of raw material costs based on past, current and anticipated cost levels. With most raw materials, forecasts can be made within reasonable degrees of accuracy. With silver, it is impossible under present conditions. As a result, we find ourselves continually in need of price adjustments to recover, at least in part, the fluctuating cost of silver.

With continued upward and unpredictable fluctuations in the silver market, together with consequent increases in our product selling prices, our retail customers are confused and wary as to their purchasing policy. In general, they are restricting their purchases awaiting some clarification to emerge from which they can gain some assurance of normalcy.

We believe that the price of silver will become far more stable and predictable if it is freed from all artificial controls and supports and is permitted to react to the normal pressures and influences of a free, competitive market. As we understand it, there was no shortage in the supply of silver during 1962 and that all industrial requirements were satisfactorily met from regular suppliers of the commodity. If this is true, then we cannot believe that the elementary law of supply and demand was permitted to operate in that period. In our opinion, there is no other way to explain a 38-percent increase in price when there was no shortage in supply.

As we interpret the effects of H.R. 4413, silver will find its own proper price level as a commodity. To make this possible, it seems to us of great importance that the bill be passed in its entirety. The Secretary of the Treasury must not be required to enter the market for artificial reasons. At the same time, the 50-percent transfer tax must be eliminated so that buyers and sellers can operate normally, and without penalty, in a free market.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone to more length here than I ordinarily would, but so strongly do I feel passage of this legislation to be in the national interest, that I wanted to acquaint as many as possible with the subject matter of the bill. I am also going to urge the two U.S. Senators from Connecticut, Senators THOMAS J. DODD and ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, to give this proposal careful consideration when it comes up in the Senate. Not only would it aid Connecticut industry, but also strengthen the United States by placing somewhat less reliance upon foreign producers for our silver, at least as far as U.S. coinage is concerned.

Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1963, the House adjourned for an Easter recess to meet again on April 22, 1963. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 11, 1963, I placed the fourth of a series of editorials from newspapers published in the State of Idaho. These editorials were highly critical of the proposal to extend the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. I advised my colleagues that the series of editorials would be resumed after the Easter recess. Today I am inserting the fifth of the series of newspaper editorials or articles relative to the desire of Bonneville Power Administration, which is now losing millions annually, for a larger area to lose more in.

I have been reliably informed that Secretary Udall has on his desk an order extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. The issuance of such an order, so I am told, only awaits a propitious political moment for two of its sponsors, the senior Senator and the senior Congressman from Idaho.

As pointed out in the following article on the matter by John Corlett of the Idaho Daily Statesman on April 12, 1963, the decision as to whether the $80 million or more of taxpayers' funds shall be used to build a highly questionable transmission line rests not on the Secretary of the Interior but upon the Appropriation Committees of Congress.

It is to be hoped that the Congress will act wisely and refuse to approve such waste of the taxpayers' money. If folly persists and the Bonneville power marketing area is extended into southern Idaho and Bonneville takes over part of the business of existing electric utilities, the loss of State and local taxes from such takeover may well adversely affect the political fortunes of its socialistic promoters.

The Interior Department has not released a factual financial feasibility report justifying the proposed extension of Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho. Mr. Corlett indicates that according to an official spokesman, such a feasibility report will be based, in large measure, on a crystal ball looking into the future development of southern Idaho. He says that if such a ball is bright enough, almost anything can be justified. It is unfortunate that the taxpayers of the Nation have to pick up the bill for the failure of future events to follow these crystal ball readings.

I am sure the majority of Americans do not believe in the tenets of socialism which preach "to each according to his needs and from each according to his ability." History proves that these and related tenets of Socialists and fellow travelers, whether they be called socialism, Fabian socialism, communism, or new frontierism, just have not worked in the past and will not work in the future. Let us face it, Fabian socialism is not just a bugaboo of the future but is here today. It is high time that all Americans who love this country of ours, which became so great under the private enterprise system, rise up and actively oppose this frightening growth of Federal bureaucracy. Let us act to reverse this trend before it is too late.

Mr. Corlett's article follows:

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Apr. 12, 1963]

POLITICALLY SPEAKING

(By John Corlett)

An order by Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall extending the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area into southern Idaho has been expected for at least 2 months.

Since the 1962 election, both Democratic and Republican Party leaders and others have expected the order to be forthcoming. The issue of whether the marketing area should be extended into southern Idaho certainly was not resolved in that election. Republican LEN JORDAN, who opposed the extension, was elected as were Democratic Senator FRANK CHURCH and Representative RALPH HARDING who favored it.

Since the election both CHURCH and HARDING have continued to urge the extension of BPA transmission lines into southern Idaho. Since the Kennedy administration and the Department of the Interior lean to public power, it is only natural to assume that Udall will in due course issue his order calling for Bonneville power to be brought into the Pocatello-Soda Springs area.

The question now is why it has taken Udall so long to issue his order.

A report on a study made through most of 1962 on the transmission lines into southern Idaho was supposed to land on Udall's desk late in February. The report certainly must have included a conclusion on the feasibility of extending the lines.

A preliminary report was subjected to hearings in Pocatello and Boise last December. This report did not contain a chapter on the economic feasibility of extending the lines into southern Idaho. This chapter will not be made public, apparently, until Udall issues his order to the BPA to extend its lines.

It could be that the BPA and the Department of the Interior are having some trouble in working out the feasibility of bringing southern Idaho into Bonneville's marketing area by way of a transmission line that would cost upward of $80 million and parallel the lines of private power companies.

The feasibility study must be accompanied by a financial analysis which will provide the justification for the expenditure of funds for transmission lines and perhaps other costs.

This justification must be agreed to by the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and by Congress before funds are made available for the transmission lines.

There are some indications that the Bureau of Reclamation, which certainly has a stake in any extension of BPA lines into southern Idaho does not agree with the financial analysis and justification of Bonneville Power. The Bureau now serves as the marketing agent for Federal power in southern Idaho.

At the hearings on the preliminary report last December, the Bureau and BPA officers said they had agreed that extension of BPA into southern Idaho would have no effect on repayment contracts of reclamation projects.

But the justification must include the effect of lower BPA rates on repayment of future irrigation projects which must depend on power revenues for financial help.

There are many other elements necessary in a feasibility study and justification of extending public power into a region geared taxwise to private power.

There is good reason why the BPA extension into southern Idaho was not properly debated in the 1962 election. This debate in the public forum cannot be real without all the facts and opinions developed in the report and the feasibility yet to be released by Udall.

Therefore, this issue will be raised before the Appropriations Committees and Congress itself in the justification expressed by the Department of Interior.

It can be anticipated that after the facts and opinions are developed, the BPA extension will become an issue in the 1964 and perhaps the 1966 elections.

The feasibility report of the Interior Department may be geared to a crystal ball, as one official put it, looking into the future development of southern Idaho. If the ball is bright enough, almost anything can be justified.

Southern Idahoans await the report and Udall's order.

Intolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News which sets forth the symptoms of a sickness which, if not curtailed, may cause the death of this Republic:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 20, 1963]

INTOLERANCE

With apologies to William Congreve, whose adage we have revised, it could be said in truth that there is perhaps no one more illiberal than a liberal scorned, nor anyone more intolerant than an advocate of toleration whose views are challenged.

How many times have we seen the irony and inconsistency of "peace marchers" throwing rocks and bombs, promoters of racial integration who reside in segregated neighborhoods and send their children to segregated schools, reformers who rise to power (like Castro) opposing the brutality of their predecessors but setting up firing squads of their own?

In the last few days there have been several apt illustrations of this tendency which caught our eye.

Item 1: The Federal Civil Rights Commission recommended to the President that all funds which the State of Mississippi receives from Washington be suspended until officials of that State knuckle under to Washington's point of view on civil rights. No mention, of course, was made that if this is done the people of Mississippi at least should not be required to pay any Federal taxes. Most important, only Congress can raise, appropriate, and regulate the use of Federal funds.

But the supreme irony is that those who counsel this course of action are the same people who scream bloody murder when it is suggested that strings should be attached to foreign aid.

While they are willing to propose that no funds should be given to a sovereign State until it does exactly as it is told, they would consider it an insult to suggest that no more funds be given to Yugoslavia or Poland until these countries throw off the yoke of communism.

Item 2: The board of education in Philadelphia removed Mark Twain's "Huckleberry Finn" from the school curriculum and replaced it with a version more acceptable to minorities. Talk about rewriting history, 1984, "newthink and newspeak." Even if "Huck" were not a classic which taught toleration and railed against man's cruelty to his brothers in Twain's own subtle fashion, it would be an outrage to amend this picture of life as it existed along the Mississippi River more than a century ago.

Item 3: The New York Times reports that National Democratic Party leaders (presumably including the President himself) have resolved to purge more than a dozen conservative southern Congressmen in the 1964 Democratic primaries. The Times listed 13 singled out for this purge attempt—including Texans JOHN DOWDY, JOE KILGORE, and OMAR BURLESON—and said that "many southern Democrats are not on the list only because the chances of beating them in the near future are not inviting."

Such purge attempts have almost always failed in the past. In fact, several notable attempts by Roosevelt and Truman actually aided the reelection bids of those they sought to defeat.

But the attempt itself violates a traditional rule against national party interference in local primary contests.

Under our system of government, the established principle is that Members of Congress are representatives of their constituents, not their party leaders. If their constituents oppose the Federal Government or the national party leadership on the issue of civil rights or any other matter, it is the duty of these Congressmen to reflect that opposition.

The other day, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, cleared the air a bit on this general subject. He said, in his opinion, the whole business of minority rights has been talked to death. "Cynical politicians are continually harping on the problems of minorities and offering glib solutions to them. The words they use refer to ending the divisions between our people. But I'm convinced that the net effect of this talk is to divide the American people and to inflate, rather than solve, the very real problems of our racial and religious groups."

There is more honesty and truth in that statement than in most of the self-righteous talk we have been hearing from Washington and New York recently.

U.S. Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Composite Company 5–48

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House to the U.S. Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Composite Company 5–48, which meets every Thursday while Congress is in session.

Ours is a volunteer training unit established in January 1957, to afford Members of Congress an opportunity to continue their active participation in the Reserve program of the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard. The time and place of meeting are such that Members may participate prior to the normal working day of their congressional duties.

Each weekly meeting consists of a classified operational briefing on Navy-Marine-Coast Guard matters throughout the world, followed by a formal presentation on a subject of current military interest by a foremost authority. Members receive no compensation for the performance of their assigned duties at weekly drill meetings. To further increase their knowledge of the military they engage in active duty training twice yearly. While these training exercises are scheduled during the Easter recess and fall adjournment of Congress, other 1- or 2-day inspections in the national military interest are arranged periodically during the session.

I am pleased to state that members of our unit take time from their already crowded and demanding schedules to participate in the Reserve program and inform themselves on matters which are vital to our national security.

The following Senators and Representatives assigned to U.S. Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Composite Company 5–48 are active in the Naval, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard Reserve.

NAVY MEMBERS

Representative WILLIAM H. BATES, of Massachusetts.

Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Oregon.

Representative EDMOND A. EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma.

Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas.

Representative JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.

Representative CHESTER C. HOSMER, of California.

Representative GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., of Alabama.

Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California.

Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland.

Representative HERBERT RAY ROBERTS, of Texas.

Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama.

Representative DONALD H. RUMSFELD, of Illinois.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.

Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, of Wisconsin.

Senator HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania.

Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., of Alabama.

Representative ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont.

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of New York.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey.

Representative ALBERT C. ULLMAN, of Oregon.

MARINE CORPS MEMBERS

Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER, of Maryland.

Representative JACK B. BROOKS, of Texas.

Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, of California.

Representative ROBERT C. WILSON, of California.

COAST GUARD MEMBERS

Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan.

Senator CLAIBORNE D. PELL, of Rhode Island.

Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, of California.

In addition to the Members listed above, congressional staff personnel with current reserve status are assigned to the unit.

Third Infantry Regiment's "Prelude to Taps"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have thrilled many times at the fine performance of military drill and band units. I feel that their contributions are greatly conducive to the patriotic uplift of our Nation and its people. One of these great spectaculars is the 3d Infantry Regiment's "Prelude to Taps." Anyone who has seen this performance has benefited. Theirs is a superb performance of know-how, precision, soldierly appearance interwoven with our heritage from colonial days. The Fife and Drum Corps, the Army Band, and the Army Chorus contribute significantly to this patriotic theme which brings tears of pride to all the eyes that witness their performance. I call attention to an article, which appeared in the April 4, 1963, issue of the Washington post, entitled "Old Guard Has a Hit," by Richard L. Coe:

ONE ON THE AISLE—OLD GUARD HAS A "HIT"

(By Richard L. Coe)

Here's a magnificent "show." It's free, has only two more performances, tonight and Friday, but is SRO * * * standing room only if any more can be squeezed into the Washington Coliseum.

This is the 3d Infantry Regiment's "Prelude to Taps," a spectacle of the U.S. Army on which some 500 men of Fort Myer have been working since January. The Old Guard, which predates the Constitution, provides the President's Honor Guard and maintains perpetual vigil at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers, here puts on a flourish that merits many more performances and a road tour all its own.

This is the fifth and splashiest edition of the Old Guard's "Prelude to Taps." The show changes every year but there are traditional production numbers and virtually all new casts as the regiment's personnel comes and goes. Under Col. John W. Gorn, the outfits commanding officer, and a production staff headed by Maj. Frank Belock, all hands have been tackling the assignment as though it's a major battle.

Lt. Col. Hugh Curry's Army band and chorus, Capt. Gilbert Mitchell conducting, starts this spectacle with marches and fanfares from the herald trumpets which, for the past 4 years, have become a White House ceremonial tradition. Then come different units from the various companies in specialty turns.

"Muskets in Motion," for instance, finds A Company and Lt. Samuel R. Bird in exercises guaranteed to cut the waistline. The lads look a bit as though they're doing a bossa nova with bayonets. There's a turn by the fife and drum corps and some hair-raising examples of ranger tactics, with knives at the throat and legwork that would appall the Marquis of Queensberry.

Most spectacular of the turns is surely the drill team of Capt. Don C. English's Honor Guard Company. Sgt. James R. Holder must be an iron man. This drillmaster stands in the center while 24 men toss bayonets with disciplined abandon, the result of 13 hours a day training for the past 3 months. Spectacular in another way is the same company's black-lighting "Black Manual," trick marching with only leggings, gloves, rifle straps and bayonet tips showing in the darkness.

One of the largest production numbers traces the Army's story from the Continentals to Korea, with accent on authentic costuming, some of which came from Columbia Pictures, others from the Western Costume Co. The Coliseum's ladies shuddered at the nurse's regalia of World War I and also had a glimpse of Col. Oveta Culp Hobby's first WAC design.

The finale begins with a well-timed flag history devised by Capt. Kenneth Ford for his B Company. The first performance drew unexpectedly loud cheers for Massachusetts from the back row. That turned out to be where Attorney General Robert Kennedy and his impressive brood were squatted.

Various British regiments have been touring this country with similar "Tattoos," but

this, apart from some erratic lighting, which sometimes is very good and other times inadequate, puts all other such in the tentative class.

Tickets for this start moving as early as December from Colonel Gorn's office and this is the longest "run" the spectacle has so far. Granted, as Colonel Gorn says, "the Army isn't in show business," but when it comes to putting on a show, the Old Guard has done it in spades.

In professional "show biz," this could pack the house for a thousand nights (as, indeed, "This Is the Army" did), but then professional "show biz" couldn't come up with 1,500 rockettes, sex male.

Columnist Bill Sumner Supports Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, examples nearby the Nation's Capital of the need for the wilderness bill were cited recently by columnist Bill Sumner in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram and other newspapers as follows:

ONRUSH OF THE SUBDIVIDERS SPOILS BEAUTY OF WILDERNESS

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—This city is the hub of a steadily growing metropolitan area which could stand as a bad example, close enough at hand for congressional inspection, of man's ability to ruin the land. Rolling farmlands in Virginia and Maryland are steadily giving way to the onrush of the developers as is the lush forest land that makes the area such a delight to a transplanted southern Californian.

Typical of such things, the developers of farmlands refer to their subdivision lots as farms and promise the life of a country squire (every other house has colonial-style columns) with the closest neighbor as much as 20 feet away. The ones who rip down the trees call their subdivisions forests. Those who have occupied tracts traversed by the small streams that vein the area can, of course, indulge in hair-raising flights of poetry in naming their subdivisions.

Some of this is, of course, a disease of the age. People have to live somewhere, and our main industry here—Government—has unlimited prospects for expansion. And as is usual in all parts of the land, the freeway which makes it easier to get from one major center to another breeds housing development along the way and creates its own traffic.

Some of the counties around us are more alert than others in controlling this spread. Nearby Fairfax, for example, awoke to the fact the other day that only a few hundred acres of wilderness land remained. And after allowing the most horrendous form of mid-20th century urban slum develop, its ruling body has decided to save what is left.

Others are not so enlightened. It took almost an act of God to persuade the officials of Prince Georges County, Md., not to erect a huge sewage disposal plant directly across the river from Mount Vernon. The Fairfax supervisors, though caught up in sudden enlightenment, are working hard to spoil their side of the Potomac by permitting construction of a skyscraping apartment complex.

One can still find unspoiled, virgin wilderness close at hand. With a short drive, one can have the Shenandoah River to himself, fishing for bass and catfish through timber or farm country. And there are many other streams and spreads of wild country where one can fish or hunt or simply wander out of sight of pizza and hamburger joints and the huge signs the developers erect to promise devastation. But all of this makes the rush of progress even more apparent and distasteful.

Just a weekend or so ago, for example, we were inspecting a farm about 15 miles out of town and the gentleman who was pridefully selling the development envisioned a countryside dotted with 5-acre estates, on old farmlands and forests on which Civil War breastworks remain standing. Oh, and to clear the way for the house we were looking at it had been necessary to rip down a 200-year-old farmhouse, stout portions of which were at that moment lying on a junk pile.

Well, it is idle sentiment to mourn the passage of such things, and the old man who had sold the land, and whose ancestor had built the old house and farmed it, was pretty happy to have his money.

But still the devastation taking place about them might possibly spur the House to get down to business on the wilderness bill which, though far from being the only solution, might help preserve some of the wonderful land from the spoilers who, given their way, will leave future generations an awesome mess of asphalt, eroded, treeless mountains and the ever-present and thus depressing face of humankind wherever one might wander.

Today's Most Explosive Controversy Affecting Jewish Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcript of a thoughtful sermon by Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, of Temple Beth El in Detroit, delivered on Friday evening April 5, 1963:

TODAY'S MOST EXPLOSIVE CONTROVERSY AFFECTING JEWISH CHILDREN

(Sermon by Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, Ph. D., Temple Beth El, Detroit, Mich., Friday evening, April 5, 1963)

The election last Monday over millage and school bonds has focused community attention on public schools, their problems and their predicament. Personally, I was depressed and saddened, though not altogether surprised, by the defeat for the public schools of Detroit. It takes a mighty smooth politician to get people to vote to raise their own taxes, and fortunately our school leaders are educators, not politicians. But politics of another sort is involved in another school controversy, affecting our children; and this is what I want to speak of tonight. It is a very complex issue involving many refinements and interpretations of constitutional law; yet it has become an emotionally charged battle arena in which the denominational lines are pretty well drawn. The entire controversy falls under the general academic heading of church and state. The issues are far from dull.

The papers have been full of church and state problems because of the congressional battle over Federal aid to parochial schools. That debate centered over the insistence of the Catholic hierarchy that Congress approve Federal loans to help finance construction of parochial schools; and unless its request is granted, the bishops will use their influence to oppose the whole school aid proposal of the Kennedy administration.

The real debate over church and state issues is centered not in the legislative branch but in the judicial branch of Federal Government, and specifically in the Supreme Court of the United States. There, the battle has been fought out in case after case. There, the issue of whether religion is to be put in the public schools, and if so, how, by whom, where, and under what controls, has been narrowed. Four times in the last 15 years the Supreme Court has dealt with the separation principle as it applies to religion and education. And happily, it has been the Supreme Court which beyond public pressure or vested influence has stood fast in support of the constitutional wall of separation between church and state.

Especially in postwar America has there been a rising tide of popular sentiment for putting religion in the public school. Religious holiday observances at Christmas and Hanukkah, prayer in the public schools, Bible reading, released time, free bus rides to parochial schools, common core religious principles, moral and spiritual values—these are all variations of one theme: put religion in the public schools. Save America from communism through religion. America is in the throes of a great religious revival. Never have the church, prayer, the Bible had so many supporters. Religion is acclaimed the panacea of our frightened and anxious age; and secularism is the enemy of religion. If communism is to be overcome, religion must be a means of winning the minds and hearts of American youth, say the advocates of religion in public education.

Unfortunately, all too few Americans seem unaware of the dangers in the current attack on separation of church and state. There is no longer among us the living memory of old world conflicts our fathers knew in Europe, which were ignited by the issue of an established church with state domination. We don't know enough American history to remember why the founding fathers insisted on enshrining in the first amendment this basic principle of separation of church and state: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Parents no less than their children in public school need to be reminded of the bitterness and conflict spawned by religious strife. It was to end this, and to guarantee both religious liberty and religious diversity, that the founding fathers established this Nation: so that religious conflict would never tarnish the bright image of religious equality.

I

Now have come a series of new cases before the U.S. Supreme Court dealing with questions of religious education in the public schools. One decision, handed down last June, aroused such a storm of opposition that a constitutional amendment was proposed in the Congress to vitiate the Supreme Court's decision.

Let's take a look at that case and its meaning. It is known as *Engel* v. *Vitale* and often referred to as the New York Regents Prayer Decision. Here is the background of *Engel* v. *Vitale*.

In July 1958 the board of education of the school district of New Hyde Park, N.Y., acting upon a 1951 recommendation by the State board of regents directed the district principal to order all teachers within the school district to begin their class each morning by having the students recite aloud the following prayer: "Almighty God, we

acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country." That was the prayer. Much ado about nothing, you think? Let us see the ramifications.

The school authorities established a procedure for the excuse of any child who objected to the prayer on grounds of conscience. A group of parents in the district challenged the constitutionality of this practice, claiming that it violated the 1st amendment to the U.S. Constitution, made applicable to the States by the 14th amendment. The parents, supported by the New York Civil Liberties Union, were defeated in the trial and appellate courts of New York State. The U.S. Supreme Court finally agreed to hear an appeal of the case. In addition, the Court granted a number of agencies the right to file amicus curiae briefs on behalf of either the plaintiff or the defendent. Filing for the plaintiff were the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, NCRAC, Synagogue Council of America, and the American Ethical Union. A group of 18 State attorney generals filed a brief amicus supporting the constitutionality of the prayer.

On June 25, 1962, the Supreme Court in a 6 to 1 decision struck down the prayer and ruled that the New York Board of Regents had violated the first amendment by composing and endorsing a prayer for use in the public school. Said Mr. Justice Black in the majority decision: "We think that by using its public school system to encourage recitation of the regents' prayer, the State of New York has adopted a practice wholly inconsistent with the establishment clause. * * * We think that the constitutional prohibition against laws respecting an establishment of religion must at least mean that in this country it is no part of the business of Government to compose official prayers for any group of American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government. * * * It is neither sacriligious nor antireligious to say that each separate government in this country should stay out of the business of writing or sanctioning official prayers and leave that purely religious function to the people themselves and to those the people choose to look to for religious guidance."

Jewish organizations hailed the decision, but a nationwide outcry against the *Engel* v. *Vitale* decision was stirred up. Widespread Catholic protest especially was biting. Cardinal Spellman of New York declared that the decision "strikes at the very heart of the Godly tradition in which America's children have for so long been raised." Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles called the decision "scandalizing." Cardinal Cushing of Boston termed the ruling "ridiculous." A Gallup poll released August 11, 1962, showed that 80 percent of a national sample of parents of children attending public schools approved of religious observances in the public schools; and public letters on the *Engel* v. *Vitale* decision reflected that Gallup poll. Protestant reaction to the decision was diverse. No one, of course, speaks for all Protestant opinion. Some individual clergymen like Bishop Pike of San Francisco, attacked the decision bitterly; other groups hailed the Supreme Court's protection of the "integrity of the religious conscience and the proper function of religious and governmental institutions."

The worst aftermath for Jewish relationships in America came on September 1, 1962, when the Catholic national magazine, America, which had previously attacked the dedecision and laid the responsibility for it on the protestations of a "well-organized and litigous minority," unleased a biting editorial "To Our Jewish Friends." The Jesuit fathers who edit America claimed there had been "disturbing hints of heightened anti-Semitic feeling" since the Court's ruling and asked its Jewish friends whether unpopular victories in the courts would be worth the breakdown of community relationships which would inevitably follow. "What will have been accomplished if our Jewish friends win all the legal immunities they seek, but thereby paint themselves into a corner of social and cultural alienation?"

That sinister editorial evoked a vigorous response not only from many Jewish organizations, but from Catholic and Protestant sources as well. The Christian Century bluntly asked, "Is America Trying to Bully the Jews?" America published the letters received and tried to put an end to the controversy stirred up, but one pertinent comment is worth mentioning here. Rabbi Jacob J. Petuchowski of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion faculty wrote, "It is imperative that the same amount of time, money, and energy which has gone into banning prayer from our public schools will now go into a serious reconsideration of the role of religion in our society, our schools, and the image of the American Jew."

So much for the hornet's nest raised by *Engel* v. *Vitale*.

But wait. Another two cases have now come to the U.S. Supreme Court, which will undoubtedly overshadow the Regents' Prayer case the vituperation its decisions will engender.

II

In the first case the Court was asked to review a 4 to 3 decision by the Maryland Court of Appeals upholding the reading of Bible verses and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the Baltimore public schools. The regulation imposed by the Baltimore school board provides that "each school either collectively or in classes, shall be opened by the reading without comment of a chapter of the Holy Bible and/or the use of the Lord's Prayer." In 1960, the board's ruling was amended to permit any child to be excused from this opening exercise provided his parents had requested his exemption in writing. The regulation was challenged by Mrs. Madalyn E. Murray of Baltimore and her son, William J. Murray III, both avowed atheists. Their plea was denied by the Maryland Court of Appeals in April, 1962, and their case was carried to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The second was an appeal by Pennsylvania State officials against a three-judge Federal District Court decision. In 1960, the District Court sitting in Philadelphia ruled unconstitutional a Pennsylvania law requiring the reading of at least 10 Bible verses at the opening of each day in the public schools. The lower court's ruling was in response to an appeal by Mr. and Mrs. Edward Schempp, Unitarians, who had brought action against the school board of Abingdon township, a Philadelphia suburb, asking the court to bar the school system from continuing the Bible reading practice. When the District Court ruled in favor of the Schempps, the Pennsylvania Legislature revised the State law and made participation in the public school religious exercise entirely voluntary on the part of the teachers and students. The District Court again found the practice to be unconstitutional, and State officials appealed this decision to the Supreme Court.

Neither decision on the two cases argued in February has yet been handed down. They are not expected much before June. How the Court will rule is, of course, anyone's guess. My guess and my hope is that the Court, in line with its recent history and present constituency, will strike down the Maryland ruling requiring the reading of Scripture and/or the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and uphold the Federal District Court which ruled a similar Pennsylvania law unconstitutional. Otherwise, tormenting and devisive questions will arise, like these, for example:

"Which version of the Bible will be used? Catholic Douay, Protestant King James, Protestant Revised Standard, Jewish Publication Society? Who will decide what 10 verses should be read? The teacher? Is it right for a public school teacher paid by the State to select a passage of Scripture for a public school class without violating the Constitution? Which Lord's Prayer should the children receive? How can the Bible be read without comment? And so on and so on and so on."

Many informed observers believe that if the Supreme Court rules, as I believe it will, the outcry against the Court will dwarf last June's protest. After all the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and reading the Bible are far more widespread practices than was the New York Regents' prayer confirmed to the State of New York. Many sincere Christians will doubtless feel offended by the elimination of admittedly sectarian practices like the Lord's Prayer or reading the Bible. Catholics, particularly some priests with whom I have had conversations in dialogue fashion, believe the schools to be under the domination of secularists hostile to religion. "You're either for God or you're against Him," they say. "Which shall the schools stand for: Godliness or Godlessness?" In the train of the gathering storm are bound to come interfaith tensions accusing the Jews of being responsible for the Supreme Court decisions and supporting them. What does this do to the Jewish community? How does this affect Jewish children?

III

Why do I speak on this subject just at this time?

I think it well, while the Nation is awaiting these two momentous Supreme Court decisions, for all of us to do a little exploring of the origins of the American Constitution and discover again why our forefathers, profiting from tragic experiences in Europe, were determined to push and keep church and state forever apart. I think it well for all of us to review the political philosophy which made this country great and unique. Said Leo Pfeffer in "Religion and the Public Schools":

"What Thomas Jefferson called a 'wall of separation between church and state' has been a basic element in the American political structure since its foundation. It was intended to safeguard our public institutions against potentially unhealthy pressures from organized groups. At the same time it was designed to protect the freedom of religious groups to organize their own spiritual life and religious education."

Jews are opposed to Bible reading in public school. We Jews hold that the reading and teaching of the Bible are better left to the synagogue and home, to rabbis and to parents. The Lord's Prayer, however, is another matter. It is specifically a Christian prayer; its recitation in the public schools is clearly a sectarian practice, offensive to Jews.

Jews oppose religion in the public schools because of their basic and general commitment to this institution. The American public school has become the first and foremost institution of Jewish integration into the American way of life. All children are treated equal, or should be.

All children, including Jews, are given an equal chance at the opportunities for education. Therefore, Jews agree (if they ever agree on anything) on the necessity of keeping the public schools free and clear of any challenge to their independence, control or erosion. In a pluralistic society, Jews want their children to go to public school without stigma or discrimination. Reciting the Lord's Prayer draws the line

between Christian and Jewish children. Reading the Bible in public schools again draws invidious distinctions between religions. The national tradition of separation of church and state has not only been the condition for democracy's development, it has also been the condition for Jewry's survival. We Jews in America believe it is a precious tradition that requires uncompromising watchfulness, a principle that needs to be maintained and defended.

Why do I oppose the Lord's Prayers and Bible readings in public schools?

1. The Lord's Prayer, so named because it was set forth by Jesus as a prayer for his followers, is a sectarian Christian prayer.

2. The choice of which Bible to use as the school text reopens a historic conflict: Catholics have objected to the King James version; Jews have objected to passages of the New Testament; nonbelivers have objected to any version of the Bible being presented as the Word of God.

3. The Bible has a place in the school curriculum as literature. Just as young people become acquainted with sacred music or religious art, so they should study the Bible in the context of literature and history. That is a far cry from using the Bible for religious stimulation, to be read "without comment" as the Word of God. Moreover, it is pedagogically unsound to read passages from the Scriptures which are not understood by many children, since explanatory comment is forbidden.

4. When for reasons of conscience a schoolchild is excused from participating in the Lord's Prayer or Bible reading, the situation is psychologically damaging. If he absents himself he is branded by other children as "different" (and children are great conformists; you either go along or "you're square"). Thus, the public schools plays a divisive role instead of being a unifying force. And if a child remains despite his personal convictions of conscience, the school makes of that child a hypocrite.

5. Never forget that keeping religion out of public schools does not make the schools hostile to religion. I only say that religion is the business of the home and the church or synagogue; and keeping religion separate from the schools places the burden of responsibility for teaching religion right where it belongs—with the parents and with the clergy.

6. Finally, I believe you can't teach religion by law. The Lord's Prayer and Bible readings in the schools won't foster sincere religious devotion. That is only surface piety. True religious commitment and spiritual response can flourish only when nurtured free of official government coercion—in the churches and synagogues and in the homes.

IV

Whichever way the Supreme Court decides by June, public reaction is likely to be bitter and controversial. It behooves us, therefore, as American citizens of the Jewish faith to be forewarned and prepared, to know what is involved and "how to answer the doubter." Church and state issues in public education have become the most controversial issue affecting our children.

It is time to return soberly to the wisdom of the Founding Fathers. Inroads and encroachments have grown serious. Prof. Edmond Cahn recently wrote in Harpers on "How To Destroy the Church." "If we do not speak out for principle today, we or our children may later have to fight for it. A little retreat, a little delay, a little appeasement—these will only encourage the misguided to attempt further aggressions. Silence has become too costly; we can no longer afford it. A little candor, a little courage, a little intransigence exhibited only here and now—these will surely preserve the integrity of our religious institutions."

Benson Spells Out Some Economic Truths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent article entitled "Benson Spells Out Some Economic Truths," which appeared in the April 6, 1963, issue of California Farmer.

The article follows:

BENSON SPELLS OUT SOME ECONOMIC TRUTHS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—We know that not all people agree with us, but personally we think Ezra Taft Benson is one of the outstanding personages of this decade. As a trained economist he has never been drawn off course by the rosy primrose paths of socialism. He thinks straight. He knows what has made America great. He has vision, he has courage, and he has the calm strength and solace of a man who lives his religion. Benson addressed the Western Agricultural Chemicals Association in February in Arizona. Here are a few excerpts from that talk.)

It has been truly stated that "the issue is this: Are we going to have a Government-planned, licensed, and regimented agriculture run from Washington, or are we going to solve farm problems in a way that will preserve freedom, expand markets and increase opportunity for farmers to make needed adjustments and to earn and get high per-family net income?"

The latest proposal by Government is what called a supply management program. As I view the new proposed program, part of which has now been passed by the Congress, I am convinced that our farmers are not going to be happy about a choice between rigid controls on the one hand and a price depressed by Government dumping on the other. Many of them don't really understand it yet. But they will.

The mandatory feed-grain proposal brings into farm policy debate many livestockmen who grow their own feed and who previously thought they had little at stake in the controversy. They are generally anticontrol. This will stir them up. I do not think there is a chance that the administration's proposals will be enacted in their original form. There seems to be a growing feeling that these proposals must be exposed and opposed.

Dr. Don Paarlberg has recently issued a summary statement on the so-called supply management proposals with which I agree and from which I will draw somewhat freely.

Presently production quotas and price supports are in effect for only a few farm products: wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. Acreage restrictions have been put into effect with pay—by producers of feed grain. Altogether, these controlled and supported commodities bring in about 25 percent of our farm income. In several States less than 5 percent of farm income is from the so-called basic crops.

By contrast, about three-fourths of our farm production decisions and more than half of our price decisions are made privately, competitively. In this category is found the bulk of our livestock, most of our eggs, vegetables for market, fruits, and many specialty products. Decisions as to how much of these products should be produced are made by the farm operators themselves, without attempted Government regulations. Prices at which these products are sold are determined in the competitive markets, at freely fluctuating prices, without price support in any form.

The prevailing idea is that agriculture is almost universally supported and controlled. This just is not true. The misinterpretation comes from the fact that the controlled and supported crops, being constantly in trouble, are constantly in the news. The unsupported and uncontrolled part of agriculture, being less often in difficulty, receives much less attention.

While the supported and controlled commodities bring in only 25 percent of the farm income, they are responsible for about 75 percent of the farm program costs and cause perhaps 90 percent of the controversy.

There has been before the Congress the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, a proposal which would extend production quotas to include feed grains and dairy products, huge sectors of agriculture hitherto free of controls. The feed-grain-livestock complex brings in nearly one-third of the Nation's farm income; the dairy industry brings in about 13 percent. Thus the proposed extension is of truly major proportions. It is of even greater proportions when potatoes, turkeys, and other commodities are added to the proposed list.

What has been the experience with production controls? Experience is that, except for a few commodities and in a limited way, controls will not work.

For a quarter of a century we have been trying to control the production of wheat. Yet wheat is our major problem commodity. Despite controls and despite disposal overseas of all we can sell, barter, and giveaway, our wheat stocks are at fantastically high levels. If we had not harvested a bushel of wheat in 1962 we would still have all we could possibly eat and export, plus a substantial carryover.

Why have controls failed for wheat? Why were acreage allotments voted out by corn farmers? Why did the cotton people move in the direction of less restriction on production and a more modest price objective? Because in a country with a representative government and a tradition of freedom, strict controls are not wanted.

The plain truth is that when controls pinch too hard on volume, on income, on jobs, on efficiency, on the farm supply industry, on the rural community, or on the independent nature of our people, then public opinion rises in opposition. Then come critical editorials, angry resolutions from farm groups, ominous letters to the Congressmen, stern delegations calling on the Secretary of Agriculture and telegrams of protest to the President. The machinery of representative government goes into action in behalf of individual freedom. And it is effective.

The experience of the past quarter of a century is clear: The Congress will not vote, the administration cannot enforce, and the farmers will not accept the strict controls which would be needed to balance supply with demand at the levels of incentive price support promised by the politicians.

What happens is this: A national economic argument is made to the effect that a high price objective should be sought, with strict controls to hold down production. The high price is real but the controls are not. The high price stimulates production more than the weak controls restrain it. Surplus results.

This is not a quick judgment. It is the experience built up under 2 political parties over a period of more than a quarter of a century, by 15 Congresses, 6 Secretaries of Agriculture, and 4 Presidents. The new supply management enthusiasts would do well to heed this record. When will we ever learn that the laws of economics are

just as immutable as the laws of nature, as moral laws or the Ten Commandments.

I have not said that it is unfair or immoral or illegal or unwise for farm people to join together, with some help from Government, to develop programs with the intended purpose of improving their economic position. This is a battle that has been fought and won. I applaud the victory.

But this hardwon victory should not be wasted in repeating or extending the errors of programs that have obviously failed. Rather, we should broaden outlets, improve the functioning of the market system, and keep open the doors of opportunity for our farm people.

The forces of the marketplace should be permitted to allocate resources. Price should be permitted to play its normal roll of directing production and consumption. We should keep our economy free.

The farms of the United States cannot be run from a desk in Washington.

Programs of education, research, some adjustment in land use, rural development with local and State directions and orderly marketing, all coupled with modest price objectives are of this kind. They are less dramatic but they are more effective.

Nine Famous Irishmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives, the following story:

NINE FAMOUS IRISHMEN

In the young Irish disorders in Ireland in 1848, the following nine men were captured, tried, and convicted of treason against Her Majesty, the Queen, and were sentenced to death: John Mitchel, Charles Duffy, Terrence McManus, Morris Lyene, Thomas Meagher, Pat Donahue, Richard O'Gorman, Michael Ireland, and Thomas McGee.

Before passing sentence, the judge asked if there was anything that anyone wished to say. Meagher, speaking for all said:

"My lord, this is our first offense, but not our last. If you will be easy with us this once, we promise, on our word as gentlemen, to try and do better next time. And next time—sure we won't be fools enough to get caught."

Thereupon, the indignant judge sentenced them all to be hanged by the neck until dead, and drawn and quartered. Passionate protest from all the world forced Queen Victoria to commute the sentence to transportation for life to far wild Australia.

In 1874, word reached the astounded Queen Victoria that Sir Charles Duffy who had been elected Prime Minister of Australia was the same Charles Duffy who had been transported 25 years before. On the Queen's demand, the records of the rest of the transported men were revealed and this is what was uncovered:

Thomas Francis Meagher, Governor of Montana.

Terrence McManus, brigadier general, U.S. Army.

Patrick Donahue, brigadier general, U.S. Army.

Richard O'Gorman, Governor General of Newfoundland.

Morris Lyene, Attorney General of Australia, in which office Michael Ireland succeeded him.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee, Member of Parliament, Montreal, Minister of Agriculture and President of Council, Dominion of Canada.

John Mitchel, prominent New York politician. (This man was the father of John Purroy Mitchel, mayor of New York at the outbreak of World War I.)

"O, Erin, must we leave you,
Driven by a tyrant's hand;
Must we ask a mother's blessing?
From a strange and distant land?"

Our Grandchildren's Heritage—Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now certain that President Kennedy feels he must have both his $12 billion deficit for 1964 and also a $13½ billion in tax cuts, which will result in our grandchildren being further burdened with public debt. Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, makes some excellent suggestions on how and why the budget should be cut and the Kenesian socialistic philosophy be discarded, in his article of April 16:

IRATE TAXPAYER TIGHTENS BELT, DEMANDS CONGRESS DO SAME

(By Leslie Gould)

Now that T-day—income tax day—has passed, everyone of the hapless millions—there are 60 million taxpayers—has completed "arrangements" for meeting the tab. For many this has meant dipping into savings or going further into debt.

Now it is time to take another pen in hand. This time to write their Congressmen and Senators, as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR SO AND SO:

"I have just completed making out my 1962 income tax return. It was an unhappy chore. I am broke and to put it mildly I am damn mad.

"Now, I have a question:

"What are you doing about reducing Federal spending?

"This spending will top $100 billion this year, the highest in any year of peace or war.

A PLEA FOR ECONOMY

"The tax 'bite' also is the largest ever, unless you and your fellow Members of the Houses of Congress do something about economy and about lowering taxes.

"The President does the requesting and the spending of what is authorized. But it is the Congress that does the appropriating. If the requested appropriations are reduced, the spending must be cut.

"President Kennedy is requesting $107.9 billion be appropriated for the fiscal beginning July 1. This is $15 billion more than was appropriated for fiscal 1962—his first full budget. That is an average increase of $5 billion a year.

"In 7 of the last 10 years, the Federal Government has spent more than it has taken from the taxpayers.

GRANDCHILDREN'S HERITAGE—DEBT

"This has resulted in an increase of more than $38 billion in the Federal debt, which will be the heritage of my grandchildren—all nine of them.

"The President is calling for a tax cut. Yes, 1964 is an election year. But he says nothing about balancing outgo with income.

"Some of the men around him argue that is alright, saying a tax cut will generate more tax revenues by stimulating business. That to reduce spending at the same time will defeat the purposes of the tax cut.

"This is spend yourself rich. It's a little like 'Asian flu' or some other virus. It is catching. To wit, the other day at lunch a broker friend, who happens to be a Republican, remarked taxes must be cut. What about spending? Well, Jim's comment was:

" 'I don't see how you can. What will happen to the economy if, say, $10 billion is cut from the spending?'

"So it was suggested that if the tax cut was matched by reductions in spending, the economy would be better off. Spending by individuals and business is more efficient and more stimulating than that by Government.

"So, I say to you, if I have to tighten my belt—which I will have to—why don't you in Government do likewise?

"Contrary to my broker friend, between $10 and $15 billion can be cut from the Federal budget, without any harm to the economy, nor to Government—other than eliminating waste, duplication and unnecessary activities. Senator Byrd says $12½ billion can be cut from the President-requested appropriations of $107.9 billion.

"If appropriations are cut back to the 1962 fiscal year, $15 billion can be saved.

SOME CUTS SUGGESTED

"Why can't $5 billion be cut from Defense, for which $53.4 billion is being requested?

"Health, Education and Welfare, which is down for $7.1 billion against $4.6 billion in 1962.

"Interior Department, which wants $1.3 billion against $929 million in 1962.

"Foreign economic aid, for which $3.9 billion is sought against $2.9 billion was voted 3 years ago.

"The Treasury is down for an added $1 billion. Agriculture wants $916 million more. And so it goes.

"What do you say?

"IRATE TAXPAYER."

Pension Plans: Hope for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a very short item in the Washington Star in the middle of last month made a significant comment on the growth of private welfare and pension plans in this country. Although the figures quoted were those of 1959 and 1960, they give a picture of the vitality of this aspect of our economy; similar progress has continued since the 1960 figures cited.

Clearly, these welfare and pension plans, 120,510 of them in 1960 with assets of $52.2 billion, are of real importance to the retirement security of America's workers. Until recently, they were restricted in the help which they could give in the medical field. However, one of the provisions of Public Law 87-792, a provision which came from my bill H.R. 10117 of the second session of the 87th Congress, has freed the hands of these pension plans to include health care benefits for the retirees they cover. As the utilization and importance of these plans increase, they will become

an ever increasing factor in providing resources for our elderly, helping them to meet all of the items in their budget but, through this amendment, especially the vital sector of health care costs.

I am placing this article from the Washington Star of March 18 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 18, 1963]

WELFARE PLANS RISE $4.5 BILLION IN 1960

Assets of 120,510 private welfare and pension plans totaled $52.2 billion in 1960, up $4.5 billion from the total listed by 118,660 plans in 1959, the Labor Department reports.

Contributions to the plans increased by nearly $1 billion to more than $11 billion while payments to participants and beneficiaries rose $1.5 billion to $7 billion, according to the Department's Office of Welfare and Pension Plans.

The report showed 1,050 plans with assets above $5 million and 100 with assets of $50 million or more.

Steel Price Control and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while the President assumes a seeming dictatorial attitude toward steel prices, our country's State Department is weighing the gift of a $600 million steel plant to India, to further increase the difficulty of U.S. steel's competition in the world market.

What we need is less Government and more private enterprise, less socialism, and more capitalism.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal is worth reading:

STEEL'S DEVILS

At times steel men are inclined to blame some of the industry's troubles on foreign competition. But this is nonsense, insists an official of the United Steelworkers. The industry should not waste its time trying to become "competitive in a world steel market we have never seriously exploited."

Instead, says Otis Brubaker, USW research director, the industry should focus its attention on increasing steel consumption in the United States. "Our problem in the United States," he says, "is that domestic consumption of steel has not kept up with growth of steel consumption abroad."

Well, increased domestic steel consumption would be fine, steelmakers would agree. But they would go on to point out that if the industry's competitive position poses problems abroad, these problems hardly disappear just because a steelmaker shuns foreign business.

In fact, the competitive pressures are at least equally intense. U.S. steelmakers must compete in their own backyard with aggressive producers of aluminum, glass, plastics, cement, and other materials. Not to mention importers of steel from West Germany, Japan, and elsewhere.

It has been these intensifying competitive pressures, rather than Washington's surveillance, that have largely accounted for the general stability of steel prices since 1958. And it has been these pressures, combined with the relentless upward push of labor costs, that have squeezed industry profits.

So what does the industry do now? It needs profits to finance new and more efficient machinery to partly offset rising labor costs and thus to continue to provide jobs. It needs profits to finance research and development of new products that might attract additional sales. This is the background against which steel companies are cautiously putting through "selective" price increases.

No one knows whether these increases will stick or not, but there doesn't seem to be any other good choice. Already, the steel union is thinking of new wage demands and talking of a shorter workweek with its inevitable increases in labor costs.

So in this sense steelmakers may indeed be wasting their time, as Mr. Brubaker puts it, by "looking for the solution abroad or for foreign devils on whom we can blame our problems."

Foreign Aid: Distasteful Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid critics are in plentiful supply. They generally fall into two categories: First, those who agree with the principle of foreign aid but dislike some of its workings; and, second, those who attack the whole concept and who would end foreign aid tomorrow.

These latter, the all-out anti-foreign-aiders, might well pause to consider the alternatives, spelled out in an April 8 broadcast of Alex Dreier, outstanding commentator for the American Broadcasting Co. Mr. Dreier put it succinctly:

REMARKS BY ALEX DREIER, APRIL 8, 1963, AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO. NETWORK

Defense Secretary McNamara today told Congress that all of us must face the facts of life in the 20th century and realize that as distasteful as it may seem to many Americans, foreign aid is absolutely essential to our own defense and security.

And the Secretary could not be closer to the truth. Yet, I can understand why many Americans tend toward the outmoded doctrine of isolationism these days. Often it seems that so many of our hard-earned tax dollars are being spent unwisely in the countries we seek to keep in the western camp.

But consider a few of Secretary McNamara's words before the House Foreign Relations Committee: "A return to the so-called fortress American concept of defense would lead to slow suicide. It is infinitely cheaper to put your dollars into collective security than it is to take direct action on your own every time a new trouble spot flares up."

Our thought is this: Perhaps what is wrong with foreign aid is not so much the fact of foreign aid, but of the concept people have of it. Too many Americans think of foreign aid as a kind of charity in which their tax money is being given away to countries in which they have no particular interest.

That is not foreign aid. Foreign aid is the investment this Nation makes in its own future, which is tied irrevocably to the future of the rest of the world. There is no such thing as a rich and safe America in a poor and desperate world. We are only well off when the rest of the world is well off. And we will be truly safe only when the rest of the world is truly safe.

The best way to evaluate foreign aid is to speculate on what would happen if there were no foreign aid.

No one can say for certain, but it is our guess that if we had never embarked on a program of financial and technical assistance to any of the nations of the world, most of Western Europe, Spain, half of Africa and most of Asia would be in Communist hands today. There would be no neutral nations. There would be only poor nations, have-not nations, yearning for the spoils of war and a handfull of well-off nations preparing to guard what they had against the hungry hordes.

Without heavy U.S. defense investments in such nations as Korea and Formosa, those countries would long ago have succumbed to Communist aggression. Without U.S. help Japan would be less than neutral as it is now. And no nation in Asia or the Pacific would have had the courage to join in any defense alliance spearheaded by the United States when they had so little with which to defend themselves. Foreign aid is actually U.S. aid. Weaken it and you weaken the United States.

Of course foreign aid is distasteful. So would be a Latin America all Communist. So would be a world that was 90 percent Communist and Socialist, but never kid yourself, it could happen. Foreign aid helps stave it off.

Blasts New Frontier Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for printing in the RECORD a newspaper report of a speech made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, to a meeting of the Fond du Lac, Wis., Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE VAN PELT BLASTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY

"If the present administration had a motto it no doubt would read 'If at first you don't deceive, try, try again' " said Representative WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, Republican, Fond du Lac, in a talk given Friday afternoon following a luncheon for Daughters of the American Revolution and their guests.

Appearing at Raulf Hotel, Representative VAN PELT, in discussing present national and world conditions; said "they are serious."

The Republican Party, the speaker recalled, is in the minority and has been for some time. "But we have fought, we continue to fight for the preservation of this Republic, the very things which the DAR holds dear," he said.

"In Oshkosh and elsewhere they say we have conservative Democrats who will hold the line, I say that just isn't so," the speaker declared. Then he mentioned some of the so-called "pork barrel" legislation pushed through Congress because it will provide things for the cities of the Representatives.

"I say to you that you get nothing for nothing. You pay for everything you get

and you pay more when the Government does it than if you do it yourself."

Representative VAN PELT then briefly reviewed the accomplishments of the 88th Congress emphasizing two situations on which he focused attention.

One of these is the Cuban situation "more serious than the administration will admit," according to the speaker.

"Maybe the President thinks it's the Soviet Peace Corps which we have in Cuba. I say that any weapon called defensive in nature can also become an offensive weapon.

"I say that so long as one Russian technician remains on Cuban soil, it is one too many. It's serious, it's like having a pistol pointed at your head 24 hours a day."

"And I also believe," the speaker continued, "that we are losing face with the other Latin countries, who no longer, because of our weak and vaccilating stand on Cuba, have any faith in the United States."

VAN PELT, before opening the meeting to a question and answer period, also touched on the Clay report on foreign aid.

"I have never realistically been able to see our aid program. We have tried to do something for all people and have spread ourselves so thin we have accomplished nothing," he declared.

The Clay report, the audience was told, "substantiates our stand that our aid is not accomplishing the purpose for which it was intended and should be curtailed."

The administration, he added, "practicing its customary deceit," curtailed a bit and recommended a small reduction.

"What will happen after the several committees complete their review, is hard to tell. All we can do is be hopeful. But let's," he urged, "stand up and be counted in the political arena."

The speaker was introduced by Mrs. O. C. Walstad, DAR regent, who welcomed the members and guests, seated for the luncheon at a flower-decorated table.

Kennedy Foreign Policy Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, our President, is an expert on "vigor." He talks about it. His foreign policy lacks it. But, as he says, we are "watching" the situation in Cuba. In Sunday's New York Herald Tribune, Robert G. Spivack very penetratingly discusses how much we have not done and how much there remains to be done.

The American people are sick and tired of indecision and appeasement.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

NEW CUBA FIASCO

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—Nowhere has the wisdom of this observation been more apparent than in the Kennedy administration's relations with the people of Cuba.

When Mr. Kennedy became President he inherited a bad situation. With the best intentions in the world, he and his brother Robert have allowed it to become a good deal worse.

The rift with the Cuban refugee leader, Jose Miro Cardona, is but the latest in a series of incredible blunders. Where it will end nobody dares forecast. But since Mr. Kennedy is his own Secretary of State, and Bobby is Under Secretary, it is difficult to shift to subordinates the blame for what is now happening.

The cold, brutal statement, issued in the name of the State Department, seeking to discredit the leader of the Cuban exile movement was unworthy of the U.S. Government. Mr. Cardona is an honorable man of centrist convictions, who is brokenhearted over the fate of his country and who has tried against great odds to weld a coalition of his countrymen.

The basic difficulty is that we have no clear Cuba policy. What we have is a half-policy. For the long run in Latin America—that is for tomorrow—we rely on the Alliance for Progress. That is all to the good, but visible results are years away.

What of today? We have no short-range policy. On the other hand, the Communists do have a blueprint for Latin America and a day-by-day action program. One need only note the endless guerrilla warfare against Romulo Betancourt's democratic regime in Venezuela to understand their ends and means.

There are various steps, short of nuclear war, that might be useful in ridding Cuba of Castro and allowing her people a free choice in naming their own government. As Nelson Rockefeller noted, we encourage guerrilla warfare against the Communists in Vietnam but shackle Cuba's freedom fighters. Guerrilla warfare is only one of many techniques. In any event, if we do not allow Cubans to try to liberate Cuba, then one day the full job, of course, is certain to become ours.

This administration of young men has never looked younger or worse than in the present situation. When they try to make it appear that firm, aggressive action by the anti-Castroites or by the United States will inevitably lead to nuclear war, they betray an unbelievable lack of knowledge of the Communist enemy.

Does anyone seriously think that Khrushchev would risk the destruction of the Soviet Union to protect an erratic follower who, despite denials, said only recently he could box the ears of the Soviet ruler? That one moment last fall when Mr. Kennedy was resolute in the Cuban crisis, Mr. Khrushchev backed away. This surprised some of our officials, but it is nothing unusual for a Communist leader.

Lenin told his comrades after the humiliating Treaty of Brest-Litovsk:

"If you are not able to adapt yourself, if you are not ready to crawl in the mud on your belly, you are not a revolutionist but a chatterbox."

If the young Kennedys do not know or understand the Communists, they understand the Cubans even less. Not all Cubans are as ludicrous as Fidel Castro. Among Latins they have been the proudest people and they remain so. They do not like to play puppet for the big powers. Yet when the administration talks about cutting off their paltry allowances, it is worse than humiliating treatment.

Does all this mean that the situation is hopeless, that we must coexist with Castro? Bleak as the outlook now is, we are recovering from other blunders in foreign affairs. There was the mishandling of the British in the Skybolt affair. There have been the grand miscalculations about General de Gaulle.

While none of this may be very reassuring to the American people and must be even less reassuring to our allies, there is no alternative but to start over with the democratic Cubans.

In the 2 years since the Bay of Pigs, we have frittered away the advantages that might have accrued to us at a moment when the Communist world has been so badly divided. That lost time is what cannot be recovered.

Square Spaghetti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to invite Members of the House of Representatives to the only guaranteed square meal in America—square spaghetti. At this moment the Prince Macaroni Co., of Lowell, Mass., is rushing to Washington with an exciting new product which may well revolutionize American eating habits.

Members of Congress and congressional employees, 3,000 strong, will be able to see for themselves on Wednesday, April 24, 1963, how a pasta product has been subjected to an incursion of progress, when they visit the House cafeteria and House dining room.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to point out that the new product, the first radical change in spaghetti since Marco Polo's day, has been introduced to our culture by a distinguished—and let me add, imaginative constituent, Mr. Joseph Pellegrino, president of the Prince Macaroni Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Lowell, Mass. The Lowell plant is the largest of its kind in the country, and I am mighty pleased that Mr. Pellegrino and some of his colleagues will be present in the Capitol on the occasion of pasta's taking a new shape.

I am happy to announce that the company has agreed to supply the product to the House restaurant and cafeteria tomorrow and I invite you all to participate in this event.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Jeanne Lesem, of the United Press International, which appeared in hundreds of newspapers recently, outlining the history of square spaghetti.

SQUARE SPAGHETTI MAKES THE ROUNDS: IT'S FIRMER, MUCH FIRMER; AND BESIDES, IT RESISTS SLIPPING OFF THE FORK

(By Jeanne Lesem)

NEW YORK.—Science, which squared pi for mathematicians, has squared spaghetti for pasta lovers.

The product is new to the United States but dates back to the 17th century in southern Italy. Legend holds that it first was made by an Abruzzi housewife who rolled dough on guitar strings to make spaghetti firmer than the usual round variety.

Modern science has confirmed the signora's theory, said Joseph Pellegrino, a manufacturer whose square pasta was tested at the Lowell, Mass., Technological Institute.

Prof. Luther Barcus, physicist and mathematician, reported that the square spaghetti remained firmer in cooking than did round, had 16 percent greater surface for holding sauce, and resisted sliping off the fork.

In Italy, spaghetti alla chittara is made on special wooden frames fitted with guitar strings. According to Pellegrino, a thinner variety also is made using mandolin strings.

ODD SHAPES COMMON

Odd shapes and names for pasta are common in Italy, said the Sicilian-born manufacturer in an interview. His company, Prince Macaroni Manufacturing Co., Lowell, Mass., is one of the "big five" in U.S. pasta production.

There are practical reasons for some, he added. Ditali and ditalini, thimble-size tubular macaroni, are easy to spoon up with beans or lentils, with which they traditionally are cooked. Pellegrino added that he'd like to see more Americans cook pasta with vegetables, as it is done in Sicily.

Vegetables such as summer or zucchini squash, broccoli, eggplant, beans, cauliflower, or peas either are precooked in a small amount of water, and the stock used for cooking pasta, or the vegetables are sauteed briefly in olive oil with herbs and other seasonings, which then are added to the pasta to continue cooking. Both methods produce their own sauce.

Now that Pellegrino has squared spaghetti, what next?

Harmonica-shaped macaroni, he said, to stimulate interest in music.

To cook spaghetti the Pellegrino way, trim outside leaves and stalk of a medium-sized head of cauliflower. Cook it in a deep, uncovered saucepan in salted water in cover, or cook one package of frozen cauliflower as label directs.

Remove cauliflower from pot, reserving stock. Cut cauliflower into small pieces. Saute the pieces briefly in a little olive oil with chopped garlic and crushed red pepper to taste.

Meanwhile, add enough boiling water to stock to total 3½ cups. Bring to boil and add one 8-ounce package of spaghetti. Cook covered. Stir often to prevent sticking. Add sauteed vegetable mixture a few minutes before pasta is done.

Tax Cuts and Tax Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, during this past week of Easter recess, I met with many of my constituents at various functions throughout the communities in my congressional district. The Seventh Congressional District of New York has a population of nearly a half million people.

The question most asked of me by my constituents and others was in reference to the proposed tax cuts and tax reforms. I found that they, by and large, favor a tax cut, but they have expressed their opposition to tax reforms as the "reforms" affect charitable contributions, medical expenses, real estate taxes, and mortgage interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced several bills which I believe will give the fairest tax aid to those who are in most need of same. I find myself in accord with the views of those who have written to me on this subject and those with whom I have discussed the proposals in my district.

The several bills I have introduced encompass the following proposals:

First. Deduction for certain educational expenses.

Second. Eliminate the present percentage limitations on the deduction for medical, dental, and so forth, expenses.

Third. Provide a partial exclusion from gross income of interest received by individuals.

Fourth. Increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer—including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness.

Fifth. Increase the maximum amount allowable as a child-care deduction, and to increase the amount of income which may be received without reducing such deduction in certain cases.

Sixth. Limit the deduction for depletion to the adjusted basis of the property involved, and to reduce the percentage depletion rate for oil and gas wells from 27½ to 23 percent.

It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will favorably consider these proposals during their present deliberations on tax legislation and that this Congress will give to the people the best and most just tax relief, relief which the people deserve.

Custom Lab Bares Dope Sellers' Tricks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is little point in placing an embargo on Cuban tobacco imports into the United States without ability to enforce it.

Recently there has been a spate of imports of tobacco from a number of countries in the Caribbean which never before exported tobacco. There was a suspicion that some, if not all, of this tobacco was of Cuban origin, being transshipped via the islands in the Caribbean as a means of sidestepping the embargo.

Thanks, however, to the acumen and skill of a group of chemists in the U.S. Bureau of Customs at Baltimore, we are now able to identify tobacco originating in Cuba and thus be in a better position to enforce the embargo.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following reprint of a report by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post and Times Herald on March 31, 1963, which summarizes the results of this chemical achievement:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1963]

CUSTOMS LAB BARES DOPE SELLERS' TRICKS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

At least a dozen drug addicts who lived along the eastern seaboard have died in recent weeks.

Police seized samples of the heroin the addicts had injected into their veins and sent it to a small laboratory operated by the Customs Bureau in the waterfront section of Baltimore.

Melvin Lerner, the chief scientist there, and an assistant, Albert L. Mills, quickly determined the deaths were caused by overdoses of heroin and it must be presumed they were inadvertently administered.

As explained by Lerner, users are usually sold drugs with an average from 2 to 5 percent heroin. The remainder is mainly quinine, sugar, and milk. Those who make and sell the drug reduce its narcotic content to the minimum in order to reap larger profits.

"But about 2 months ago," the chief scientist said, "a big batch was placed on the eastern market that, inadvertently, contained 20 to 25 percent heroin. The bodies of the addicts couldn't take the terrific overdoses and we have been told of seven deaths in New York City, two in Providence, and others elsewhere. We don't know the exact number but it is easily a dozen and very likely is larger."

Now the word is out among heroin users to take it easy.

The case of the deaths of the heroin addicts is just one of the many mysteries the compact eight-man laboratory made up of six scientists and two clerical helpers, is called on to solve.

Take the recent case of the ordinary appearing cigarette which is charged up with marihuana and which has baffled police in a dozen areas.

Enforcement officers can detect easily a regular marihuana cigarette by its looks and smell. Cigarette tobacco and marihuana are entirely different.

Police officers in New Orleans and other areas were stumped when known addicts smoked what appeared to be standard-make American cigarettes and lapsed under the influence of narcotics.

Cigarette samples were sent to the laboratory and Lerner and his staff went to work on them. They soon concluded that the merchandisers of the illegal drugs were using a slick new method to conceal and sell their wares.

The narcotic manufacturers had reduced the marihuana weed to a concentrated liquid and had used a drop of it on a standard brand cigarette. A new process developed by the laboratory extracted the narcotic element from the tobacco and identified it positively.

Cuban tobacco is another interesting case. It's blacklisted and it's illegal to bring it into this country in any form, even as a mixture in cigars or cigarettes.

Since our embargo, large shipments of tobacco have reached our ports from European, South American and other countries which usually buy but do not sell tobacco. Customs agents suspected much of it was Cuban, disguised by mixtures, but they are unable to prove it.

Again they beat a path to Lerner and his pocket-size laboratory. "We had no hope or faith we could be of any help," the 46-year-old chief chemist related, "for the simple reason that we doubted if Cuban tobacco is any different from that of any other country.

"But we were wrong," he conceded, "and we soon discovered that Cuban tobacco has peculiarly distinctive features that can be easily identified in any form through a laboratory test which we developed." He added that the test was being made available to Customs agents at Miami and other ports.

Lerner appeared to be more concerned about another problem which he and other officials suspect is originating in Cuba. For the first time in years, he revealed cocaine is being smuggled into the country and Customs agents are seizing it. "Cocaine hasn't been a problem but it's rapidly become one," he said.

Cocaine hops up drug addicts to the point where they will commit crimes they wouldn't dream of doing when they're not under its influence, the chemist explained. It's a white powder which is extracted from the coca leaf.

Laud Heroes of Warsaw Ghetto Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of

the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the Nazis I join in paying tribute to the heroic people who sacrificed their lives to preserve the cause of faith and freedom.

Although they gave their lives in battle they remain alive in our memory as an ever-present source of inspiration in our constant struggle for peace and freedom.

I am attaching an article which appeared in the Jersey Journal, Friday, April 19, 1963, concerning the discussion of the 20th anniversary of the uprising by the Bayonne Zionist district at its executive meeting:

LAUD HEROES OF WARSAW GHETTO FIGHT

The 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, which will be observed by Jews throughout the world Sunday, was commemorated by the Bayonne Zionist district, at its executive board meeting last night.

Speakers discussed the Jewish courage and fighting spirit displayed during World War II against the Nazis.

Herded into a walled-in ghetto in a tenement section of Warsaw, Poland, some 40,000 starved and ragged Jews started an insurrection against the Nazi military machine.

Rather than surrender meekly and be driven away to extermination camps, these Warsaw Jews fortified themselves with handmade small arms and exacted a high toll of Nazi soldiers and equipment before they were conquered in a 6-week siege. The battle started April 21, 1943, during the passover holidays.

Dr. Robert Schleider, ZOA president, said: "These men, women and children who met death during that courageous uprising symbolize the indestructible spirit of liberty which throughout history has ultimately triumphed against the forces of tyranny.

The indomitable spirt of those fighting Jews will forever be an inspiration to oppressed peoples everywhere," he said.

The commemoration of the Warsaw ghetto uprising has been set aside for Sunday in a joint resolution by both Houses of Congress. President Kennedy has issued a proclamation commemorating the occasion.

Automation Aids Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, automation—the name we use for the latest technological spurt in our economic growth—conjures up in the minds of some a vision of robot industry, unemployed workers, and destitute families. This image is false and it is important that we correct it so that America can face the economic progress of the future with confidence.

This is not to say that automation creates no problems. There are serious disruptions which are created, but these can be overcome and in the last analysis automation will be a blessing, not a curse, to all Americans.

John Chamberlain, writing in the Richmond News-Leader of March 27, made some good points on this subject, showing how automation will be turned to the benefit of the country and the people. He cites the reaction of certain unions to automation, but in fairness it must be said that this is not the universal feeling of our labor leaders, nor is labor the only force in our society which has noted its fear of automation. The important point in Mr. Chamberlain's article, however, is the perspective in which he places this latest, and perhaps greatest, advance we have made in economic technology.

I am placing Mr. Chamberlain's article in the RECORD with the hope that it will help dispel the fear that has been generated over automation and turn the thoughts of our people into more constructive channels, how we can best face the problems that will inevitably come with this progress, how we can benefit by this progress and minimize its social costs.

The article follows:

AUTOMATION AIDS EMPLOYMENT, DESPITE UNIONS

(By John Chamberlain)

American labor, if one is to believe some of its political spokesmen, is currently working itself up into a mood of machine smashing.

Of course, labor does not really object to automation, which has created the whole modern industrial machine upon which it depends for high wages. Nevertheless, it finds automation a convenient scapegoat for such things as the sticky rate of unemployment, which is now running at about 6 percent of the total number of people who are able and willing to work.

To attack the machine as the enemy of jobs has a superficial appeal, for when a clerk loses his immediate means of livelihood to an automatic punchcard operation he can feel what has happened to him. But if it weren't for the increased tempo of automation in recent years the American economy as a whole would almost certainly be floundering in a deep depression, with far more than 6 percent of the working population on the breadline.

If it hadn't been for the vast development of automatic calculating machines, punch card billing equipment, tape control for machine tools, and continuous flow processes for chemicals, our corporations would be staggering under such high costs that they would be unable to compete with low-cost labor in the outer world. Second, the capital goods industry—always a prime job creator—would be languishing in the doldrums. And, finally, the existing spending power of the Nation would be quickly exhausted in the purchase of high-priced necessities. There would be no margin left for amusements and luxuries, no surplus to be spent on travel or higher education.

To put the matter in perspective, let us try to imagine a world without labor-saving devices. It would be a world without automatic hoists, a world without steam shovels or tractors or linotype machines or electric mixers or telephones or vacuum cleaners. Think of the jobs that could be made if we had to dig up the streets without power drills, or if we had to hoe all the cornfields of the Middle West by hand.

Nobody in his right mind would advocate the obliteration of automation that has become familiar through use. Yet it is just as senseless to object to the continuing development of new labor shortcuts, for in the perspective of tomorrow and day after tomorrow these will appear as necessary and as beneficent as the sewing machine or the typewriter or the electric elevator or any of the great automated advances of the past.

The current political objection to automation gains plausibility simply because nobody has made a real nationwide study of the increases of employment that follow from the new labor shortcuts. A few companies, however, have come up with some individual studies that are illuminating. In a survey of its own operations the General Electric Co., for example, has produced some irrefutable evidence that automation both sustains old jobs and creates new ones.

GE has been busy mechanizing its lamp division operations ever since 1920, without detriment to GE employment. It now estimates that if it were still using the hand methods of 1908, a total of 10 million employees would be necessary to turn out the lamp production of 1962. GE currently sells a 100-watt lamp for 25 cents. If that lamp were being made by the methods of 1908, it would have to sell for $20 instead of two bits. It follows from the perspective of these figures that if 10 million people were to be hired to turn out the GE lamps needed for contemporary use, the price of their total output would be so high that nobody would have much money left to buy such things as automobiles or new Easter hats.

Another interesting statistic turned up by the General Electric study bears on the substitution of automatic computers for billing customers, predicting hurricanes, and calculating cakemix formulas. All of these have put people out of work. But these people have been absorbed elsewhere in the economy. GE makes this plain when it says that, "without automation, the bulging paper barrier of business would soon require every girl graduate in the country." The "girl graduates," it is obvious, just aren't there to be hired for the penpushing that would be needed if the products of the International Business Machines Co. were to be sent to the bottom of the sea.

President Kennedy Throws the People a Fast Curve in Presenting His Fiscal Theories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, whatever President Kennedy plans for the American people, he should be honest to play the game according to the rules and tell them the score. Instead, we have a continued flow of misinformation from the White House, conflicting statements and confusing proposals coupled with a brazen effort to manage the news with the end result is that no one can be sure of the direction in which President Kennedy is attempting to lead the country.

The President has thrown no more curves to the public on any issue than he has on taxes and Federal spending. For an exposé of how the Kennedy game is played in fooling the public, I refer you to the following column written by Henry J. Taylor and which appeared in the April 22 edition of the Washington Daily News:

WORKING FOR THE GOVERNMENT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The White House, proposing an increase, now asks taxpayers to pay $12.3 million a day—every day—for foreign aid. We don't

realize this because such presentations are pitched at us with a swerve; like Whitey Ford's curved ball that gets by you before you see it.

The White House Robin Hoods of the red ink may not view this as a big sum, as they contend, but it's mighty hard for our families to earn and pay it.

That's the dollars side. The moral side is even more important. President Kennedy's presentation, triple the length of last year's, voluminously relates the cost to our gross national product. Why? This carefully contrived pitch makes the cost look small.

The spenders making the pitch know this difference. They deliberately curve around their moral responsibility to us. They're on the receiving end of the money, we're on the paying end; every penny. Under Federal law, any company official, security underwriter, stock salesman, or borrower who solicited public funds (which is what the Government is doing) on a similar basis would go smack to jail; put there by the President's own brother. And they should.

Preparing such preparations—in England it's called "cooking the books"—requires a lot of thinking, a lot of premediation, a lot of intent. Once more, it's like the tax bill, which surely must have been written by Whitey Ford himself.

It was announced in thumping headlines as a "tax cut." It gave belated recognition to the incontestable fact that "taxes are a burden." It whooped for a tax cut "to get this country going." However, fiscal 1964 Federal income and excise taxes will go up an estimated $1.5 billion, despite the proposed "cuts." Social security taxes will rise $2 billion.

And the ballyhooed tax "cut" itself, on balance, turns out to be no tax cut when you include the injected gimmicks, provisions, limitations, and maybe-maybe clauses. Yet it took Senator BYRD's Finance Committee to make that plain.

The New Frontiersmen are already spending more than the entire incomes of everybody west of the Mississippi River, and propose to spend more. They're spending more money and collecting more taxes than even at the top of World War II.

We work nearly a third of every working day—2 hours, 21 minutes every day—just to deliver the overall taxes, including those hidden. We don't have an 8-hour day as the family breadwinner. We have only a 5-hour, 39-minute day as breadwinners and a 2-hour, 21-minute day as taxpayers. No wonder family budgets cannot stand the strain.

The most lavish administration in our history grows more lavish all the time and the only recommended way to lower these taxes is to borrow more.

Every working person is willing to pay his proper taxes, and perhaps emergency taxes, too, at a time like this. But he does not want to support a lot of waste and other things he has no business paying for. Taxation can be sound, but taxation also can be robbery. The solicitations should not be pitched to us with a swerve for any purpose whatever. Why must we look repeatedly for the curve ball? Why can't we just get on with the Nation's many problems?

Merger Fulfills Widow's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the widow of three-term Gov. A. Harry Moore, of New Jersey, will receive an honorary Doctor of Letters Degree today from Michael B. Gilligan, president of Jersey City State College, Jersey City, N.J. Mrs. Moore is being so honored in recognition of the many humanitarian acts she has performed on behalf of crippled and retarded children.

One of Governor Moore's main interests during his lifetime was helping handicapped children. After his death, Mrs. Moore continued his work and carried on with the tradition he had started of presenting a wrist watch annually to the child who had made the most progress physically and academically.

Today in Jersey City a celebration is being held in honor of the merger of Jersey City State College and the A. Harry Moore School for crippled children. Hereafter the school will be officially known as the A. Harry Moore Laboratory School.

The future teachers presently attending Jersey City State College as well as the pupils of the A. Harry Moore School will benefit greatly from this merger and the officials of both schools are to be commended for making it possible.

I join in paying tribute to these schools and to Mrs. A. Harry Moore for her unselfish and untiring efforts in carrying on with the great tradition her late husband started in helping these unfortunate children. She is one of New Jersey's finest humanitarians.

[From The Jersey City Jersey Journal, Apr. 19, 1963]

MOORE SCHOOL: MERGER FULFILLS WIDOW'S DREAM

(NOTE.—Barbara Behrens is a senior at Jersey City State College and a member of Who's Who in American Colleges. Miss Behrens, who plans to teach English in high school next fall, wrote this article after an exclusive interview with Mrs. Moore, one of the few interviews she has granted in recent years.)

(By Barbara Behrens)

The merger of the A. Harry Moore School with Jersey City State College exceeded the wildest hopes of the former Governor's widow.

"It is the most wonderful thing," she exclaimed, "that has ever happened to the school.

"Harry would have been very proud."

Next Tuesday the college will celebrate its merger of the famous crippled children's school across Hudson Boulevard. A special convocation will be held, with Mrs. Moore as the honored guest.

She will receive an honorary Doctor of Letters degree from College President Michael B. Gilligan for the "many hmanitarian acts" she performed on behalf of the children at the school.

Several of these acts came up during an exclusive interview with her—one of the few she has granted in past years.

Her voice was full of quiet emotion as she discussed her late husband, his work, and the interests they shared together.

"For as long as I can remember," she said, "Harry was interested in the welfare of handicapped children. I became interested because he was interested."

Mrs. Moore recalled how her involvement with the children and the school developed gradually.

"No one," she said, "could take part in activities with these children without growing close to them. The children are wonderful.

Her husband, a three-term Governor, used to present wrist wratches annually to the children who had progressed the most, physically and academically.

Since Governor Moore's death, the watch tradition has been carried on by his widow. She said she will continue to make the presentations at the college's A. Harry Moore Laboratory School.

Her reaction to the school's merger with the college was warm and enthusiastic.

"This action was beyond my wildest hopes for the future of the A. Harry Moore School," she said. "One of the most important things that came out of this is the training of new teachers, bringing them into contact with these exceptional children, giving them greater insight and experience.

"I think Harry would have been proud," she said again.

Mrs. Moore's constant reference to her late husband's work and achievements is just one form of her quiet modesty.

"I really don't see," she said with sincere emphasis, "how I've done anything important. I became interested because my husband was. I've only attempted to carry on his work.

"The only thing I can really say is that I've been there whenever they needed me," she said.

JCSC TO HONOR MRS. MOORE

Mrs. A. Harry Moore, widow of the Governor, will receive an honorary doctor of letters degree Tuesday during special exercises at Jersey City State College.

Dr. Michael B. Gilligan, president, said Mrs. Moore was being honored for the many humanitarian acts she has performed on behalf of the children at the A. Harry Moore School.

The ceremony will also celebrate the September merger of the crippled children's school with the college. It is now known officially as the A. Harry Moore Laboratory School.

The merger of the Moore School makes JCSC one of the few colleges in the world with a school for the physically handicapped on its campus.

Dr. Frederick Raubinger, state commissioner of education, will introduce Mrs. Moore to the students, faculty, and guests.

Forecast for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Granville Sentinel newspaper, Granville, N.Y., one of the leading weekly newspapers in the 30th Congressional District. The new owner of the Granville Sentinel is Lt. Col. MacArthur Manchester, grandson of the late James L. Manchester, who, in 1875, established this newspaper, which today is an integral part of the village of Granville and its surrounding communities. While presently serving as regional field officer of the Selective Service System in Lebanon, N.H., Colonel Manchester, as the new editor and publisher of the Sentinel, has given unstintingly of his time and resources toward improving Granville's welfare and its esthetic standards.

As an indication of Colonel Manchester's determination to continue the Granville Sentinel in the same journalistic philosophy of its founder, I wish to include an enlightening editorial, written by the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, entitled "Forecast For 1963." As a top-ranking member of the powerful Armed Services Committee, Representative GAVIN is fully conversant with the tremendous armed thrust of America's might. Representative GAVIN'S warm personality, firm patriotism, and dedication to the public interest is well reflected in his thoughts on the future of America's business.

The following guest editorial is one of many that has appeared from week to week under the new management of Lt. Col. MacArthur H. Manchester:

FORECAST FOR 1963

The plain truth about the business outlook for the next few months is that it is shrouded in heavy fog. Seldom before have so many professional forecasters been so cautious. If they agree at all, it is that the economy is sluggish and will remain so in the immediate future. If this seems pessimistic, at least no serious recession is in sight. By some miracle we escaped what could have been a really sharp downturn after the market dropped so swiftly last May 28. That is to say, we have escaped it so far.

Ignoring the spreaders of doom and gloom, some customers boosted retail sales in November to an annual rate of $235 billion, or about $15 billion higher than in 1961 (There was a 2 percent dip in department store sales during the last week of November and the first week of December). Durable goods are likely to reach a 1962 total of $75 billion, a comeback from the lackluster year of 1961 when the total was $67 billion. Auto sales, too, seem to be close to a big year, if not a record year.

But it is not fair to imply that all consumers are easy spenders. Savings and the purchase of Government E and H bonds are up. A good part of this increase represents not only new savings, but money no doubt that was switched from the stock market during and after the drop in the market. This savings account and Government bond money now represent what the economists call "liquid funds." When and if public confidence in the market increases, these funds can quickly be reinvested in stocks—or used to purchase consumer goods. This is a definite plus sign.

The fog arises almost entirely from the doubt about what the administration and Congress will do this year about spending and taxes.

No one doubts the need for tax reductions. The big questions are: When should they be made? Can reduction be combined with tax reform? Will tax cuts really be accompanied by spending cuts? Will the administration at long last propose a really sound tax program?

If these problems can be resolved favorably, the whole economic outlook would change. The corporate and individual income taxes place a higher penalty on extra effort and incentives here than in any other modern country. They are among the major blocks to our moving ahead.

The question is: Should the larger share of tax cuts go to those fewer individuals who tend to invest in stocks or corporate bonds or to the lower income groups? The first kind of tax cuts would stimulate the economy over the long range by helping to set up new jobs. The latter would stimulate consumer spending, which is so greatly needed, and so act as a quick shot in the arm.

The administration has not committed itself to any meaningful reduction in spending. And there are many who do not believe that tax cuts alone, any kind of tax cut, will help the economy, if they bring more deficits, more inflation. There have been consecutive deficits in the last 3 years, totaling $18 billion, and the national debt now stands at $305 billion. Any tax cut, without a spending cut, would simply add to this deficit, diminishing confidence in the business outlook.

So there really is no magic formula to restore the kind of prosperity the country enjoyed during prior administration.

This is not to say that nothing can be done or that our economy is weak. If the administration presented a balanced budget with both spending and taxes reduced; if the huge deficits in our balance of international payments were cut; if the integrity of the dollar and our gold reserves were restored; if the administration's economic advisers show some understanding of the role of profits in a free enterprise economy, the economy would move ahead with vigor. Surely, these proposals are not unreasonable.

And in all honesty, it must be said that business itself has a role to play. Neither tax cuts nor spending cuts will restore full prosperity. They cannot take the place of imaginative management. The fact is that the great consumer rush to buy which followed World War II is gone. We are now in a buyers' market. The consumer is not simply looking for things to buy. He is looking for new things to buy. And he is beginning to look at the price tags again. American business has returned to the old law of survival of the fittest. Businessmen who are slow to recognize this cannot be rescued by tax cuts, nor pamphlets from the Department of Commerce.

To sum up, business will grow and prosper if Government will get out of its way, and if businessmen revive the old American tradition of pleasing the customer—who, by the way, is king once more.

The Honorable LEON H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives, U.S. Congress.

Progress of the "65" Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have on numerous occasions called attention to the forward-looking efforts of the insurance industry to provide economical health insurance to help everyone in our society meet the high costs of medical care. Although debate on congressional proposals has centered on the question of health care for the aged, it is clear that this is a matter which touches everyone in the country and we must look to our health care system as it affects each and every person in America. Nevertheless, there is special interest in the problems which our senior citizens have in financing their health care. In this area one of the most encouraging new ideas is the inauguration of the "65" plans in various of our States, led by the Connecticut "65" plan.

The magazine Insurance in its April 13 issue carries an interesting and informative article by Mr. Morton D. Miller, president of New York 65, on how far these plans have gone and what they hold for the future. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Miller's article, "The '65' Plans and Their Future," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE "65" PLANS AND THEIR FUTURE

(By Morton D. Miller, president of New York "65" and vice president and associate actuary, Equitable Life Society)

On the basis of experience in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York with "65" plans, it can now be said that the idea of a pool of insurance companies to provide low-cost, comprehensive basic health and major medical insurance protection for those 65 and over is firmly established. There is every indication that the idea will spread to more States as enabling legislation is enacted.

Here is the latest status on the legislative front. Mississippi approved of legislation in 1962. Legislation has already been enacted this year in Nevada, New Mexico, and Washington. Legislation is now pending in Iowa, California, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, and Wisconsin. There is in prospect a regional western "65" plan covering a number of States and interest in other States such as Virginia and North Carolina where legislation has not yet been introduced.

The "65" program is gaining momentum and it is believed that in the next several years, millions of elderly people in various parts of the country will be protected by this type of insurance against the potentially ruinous cost of serious illnesses or prolonged hospitalization.

The "65" plans are growing because they meet a real need on the part of the public, and they provide an important public service opportunity to the insurance industry to help the elderly. This is especially important for the current generation of over 65's, many of whom spent their working years before widespread group insurance was in effect and back in the days when major medical insurance was unknown.

The "65" plans have also been a boon to sons and daughters and others who have the responsibility of supporting or helping to support aged parents, relatives, or friends. In all three States which have "65" plans in operation, the signature of the insured has not been required on the application. Returns showed that about 30 percent of all the applications filed were signed by other than the insureds, indicating that many younger people took advantage of protecting their loved ones through the "65" plans.

Pioneered in Connecticut: The "65" idea was pioneered in Connecticut. It started in 1961 with the formation of the Associated Connecticut Health Insurance Companies. The first open enrollment period was held in September of that year and 21,850 people of the State's estimated 242,000 elderly, were enrolled. Additional enrollment periods were held in Connecticut in the spring and the fall of 1962 which added 8,000 enrollees to the plan. A total of 32 companies participated.

The idea spread to New York and Massachusetts. In New York, the insurance industry went into action in the spring of last year after the State legislature, following the recommendations of the Governor and the insurance department, had unanimously passed the enabling legislation. A steering committee of eight New York domiciled company representatives went to work, and by the middle of August the formation of the New York 65 Health Insurance Association was announced. The membership grew from the original 7, who signed the articles, to a total of 49 companies. The first open enrollment period was held from October 15

to November 15, 1962, and over 107,000 out of 1,700,000 elderly enrolled.

The chronology in Massachusetts paralleled that of New York. Enabling legislation was signed by the Governor there at the end of April 1962. Eleven companies went into action and formed the Massachusetts 65 Health Insurance Association. Thirty-five additional companies joined subsequently, bringing the total to 46. The first open enrollment period was held during the month of October and resulted in 49,893 enrollments out of an estimated 572,000 residents 65 or over.

As to the types of coverage offered the Connecticut, Massachusets, and New York plans, while generally similar, differ in certain respects.

Connecticut 65: In Connecticut, the applicant had a choice of four additional plans.

Option 1 costs $10 a month and provides a lifetime major medical benefit limit of $10,000 of which no more than $5,000 may be used in a single year.

Option 2 costs $7.50 a month and provides a lifetime benefit limit of $5,000, with a $2,500 limit in a single year.

Option 3 costs $17 a month and provides the $10,000 major medical plus a plan of basic hospital and surgical benefits.

Option 4 costs $14.50 a month and provides the $5,000 major medical plus a plan of basic hospital and surgical benefits.

The basic hospital and surgical benefits of options 3 and 4 are designed to complement the major medical benefits and to be available only to those who do not have other basic benefits.

The basic hospital-surgical benefits of options 3 and 4 pay hospital room and board charges up to $12 a day for a maximum of 31 days in each calendar year; other hospital charges up to $125 per calendar year; surgical charges up to the maximum under a schedule of surgical procedures with a maximum benefit of $360 in any one year.

The major medical benefits contain a deductible which is applied on a calendar-year basis. The deductible is a variable sum consisting of $100 plus the amount of benefits provided under Connecticut 65 basic, whether the insured had Connecticut 65 basic or not.

Major medical expenses are classified into type I and type II. Type I expenses are hospital expenses; type II expenses are covered medical expenses other than hospital expenses. After the deductible, the plan pays 100 percent of all type I covered expenses up to $250, and then 80 percent of the remainder. It pays 80 percent of the type II covered expenses.

Type I expenses, under the $10,000 plan (options 1 and 3), are hospital room and board charges up to $18 per day and charges for other hospital services and supplies; or, after 5 days in a general or special hospital, room and board in a convalescent hospital up to $10 a day, for as long as 90 days in a year.

Type II expenses under the same options include surgical fees up to 1⅔ times the amount shown on the basic schedule; anesthesia fees up to 20 percent of the surgical fee allowance; charges for nursing by registered nurses in or out of the hospital up to $18 per day; doctors' calls up to $6; and the usual range of drugs, diagnostic services, and other medical services and supplies.

Under the lower $5,000 major medical plan, the specified limits on type I and type II expenses are somewhat less, but the principle is the same. For example, the limit on hospital room and board is $15 a day.

When a person is confined in a hospital or convalescent hospital within 31 days immediately preceding his enrollment, his insurance does not become effective until the first day of the calendar month following a continuous period of 31 days during which he has not been confined. Preexisting conditions for which there has been treatment within 90 days immediately preceding the effective date of the policy are not covered until 9 months after the effective date. Premiums are due monthly.

New York 65: In New York, three different coverages were offered which either alone or in combination produced five plans that were made available to the senior citizens. They consisted of a regular basic plan and an optional basic plan which could be purchased alone or in combination with the major medical plan, and the major medical plan which could be purchased by itself.

The regular basic plan provides coverage for—

(a) Hospital room and board charges for 31 days up to $18 per day.

(b) Miscellaneous hospital charges up to $150.

(c) Inhospital doctor's charges for nonsurgical confinement up to $6 per day for the first 7 days, $5 per day for the next 7 days, and $4 per day for the next 17 days.

(d) Convalescent nursing home charges for 31 days up to $7.50 a day.

(e) Surgery in or out of the hospital, and radiation therapy for malignancy according to a $250 maximum schedule that follows the amounts provided under the United Medical Service (Blue Shield) plan applicable to persons with family incomes of less than $4,000.

Under the optional basic plan, the hospital room and board benefit is limited to $12 a day while all other benefits remain the same.

The major medical plan is separated into two parts. Part I provides hospital and convalescent nursing home benefits with a maximum of $3,600 per confinement for—

(a) Hospital room and board charges up to $18 per day after 31 days of confinement.

(b) Miscellaneous hospital charges equal to 80 percent of the excess over $150, and

(c) Convalescent nursing home charges up to $7.50 a day for 60 days.

No benefits are payable on any day on which benefits are available under any other plan.

Part 2 provides benefits for the other major medical charges up to a lifetime maximum of $10,000 equal to 80 percent of the covered expenses which exceed $75 in a calendar year. The covered charges include—

(a) Physicians' and surgeons' charges subject to a maximum equal to the excess of the established Blue Shield fees in the insured's local community for families with maximum yearly incomes of $6,000 over the benefits payable under any other plan. If the insured has no basic coverage a deductible equivalent to the maximum benefit provided under New York 65 basic is made;

(b) Private duty nursing services at home or in the hospital up to $1,000 of charges per calendar year; prescription drugs and a variety of other services and supplies.

Where a person is confined in a hospital or convalescent nursing home during the 31 days immediately preciding his enrollment, his insurance is postponed until 31 days after discharge. Preexisting conditions are not covered until 6 months after the effective date. Because the New York 65 basic plan was not intended to duplicate other basic coverage, a preson could not enroll initially for New York 65 basic if he already had coverage for room and board benefits equal to $10 per day or more. However, this was changed later so that a person may enroll for New York 65 if he prefers it to his previously held coverage. Benefits under New York 65 are subject to reduction by benefits payable under any other health plans.

The monthly premium rates for the five plans mentioned above are $10 for the regular basic plan, $8 for the optional basic plan, $9 for the major medical plan, $19 for regular plus major medical, and $17 for optional basic plus major medical. Premiums are payable monthly. Any number of payments may be made in advance at any time, but no discount is given.

Massachusetts 65: In Massachusetts two plans were offered—part I, a major medical plan; part 2, the major medical plus basic hospital and surgical expense insurance. The basic coverage each calendar year provides up to $15 a day room and board for 31 days, $150 for hospital services and supplies, and doctors' fees for surgery according to a $300 maximum schedule of surgical operations. The major medical coverage pays up to $5,000 a year and $10,000 lifetime for a wide range of medical expenses.

Thus, subject to a deductible, the major medical covers—

(a) One hundred percent of surgical charges up to 166⅔ percent of the surgery schedule, hospital room and board charges up to $18 a day and, after 5 days hospitalization, convalescent home charges up to $56 per week for the first 3 weeks and $45 per week for the next 13 weeks.

(b) Eighty percent of charges for hospital services and supplies; doctor's visits up to $6 per day for each treating doctor; private duty nursing by a R.N. up to $18 per day for all nursing; prescription drugs and a variety of other services and supplies.

Under the major medical plan the deductible for each calendar year is $100 of covered medical expense plus the amount of benefits available under Massachusetts 65 basic insurance. If a participant is in a hospital or convalescent home during 31 days immediately preceding his enrollment, his insurance is postponed until the first day of the month next following a continuous 31-day period free from confinement. The only other restriction is that there is no coverage for the first 9 months the policy is effective for a preexisting condition where there has been medical care or treatment within the 90 days immediately preceding the effective date of the policy.

The premium for the major medical (plan 1) is $9 a month and for the major medical plus basic (plan 2) $17.50 a month. Plan 2 is not available for those already covered under any plan or policy providing hospital or surgical benefits. As of January 1, 1963, payments may be made monthly, quarterly, semiannually or annually at no discount.

Coverage for spouses: Connecticut provided that the spouse of an enrollee was eligible if not less than 55 years old and not working more than 30 hours a week. Massachusetts lowered the age limit of the spouse to 50, but included the provision that he or she must not be working more than 30 hours a week. Under the provisions of New York 65, the spouse of an enrollee was eligible to enroll regardless of age and regardless of whether he or she worked. This resulted in a number of under 65 enrollees with the youngest being 43.

Connecticut 65 is waiting with future open enrollment periods pending further actuarial studies based on their 15 months of claim experience, but under a recently adopted procedure eligible residents can apply at any time and become insured after 90 days.

New York 65 has also provided special interim enrollment opportunities for those reaching their 65th birthday, those who retire after 65, those over 65 moving into the State; the spouses of any enrollees in these three categories are also eligible to enroll regardless of age. In addition, a person who becomes married to an enrollee and a person over 65 whose spouse dies are also eligible for enrollment. In all of those instances, application must be made within 31 days of the eligibility date.

Massachusetts 65 has decided to accept applications at any time under the same provisions and conditions that applied during the October enrollment period. Insur-

ance will become effective on the first day of January, April, July, and October next following the receipt of an application and check for at least 1 month's premium. Residents of Massachusetts becoming 65 may be insured on the first day of the month following their birthday or on the first of any quarter thereafter.

Average age: The results of the enrollments of nearly 200,000 individuals in the 3 "65" plans in Connecticut, New York, and Massachusetts, gives us some concrete ideas about this group and guidance for the future. The average age is near 75. It was 75 in Connecticut and 73.5 in New York and Massachusetts.

Of the enrollees, nearly two-thirds are females and about one-third males. In Connecticut, the ratio was 68 percent female and 32 percent male. In New York 64 percent female and 36 percent male, and in Massachusetts the ratio was 64.2 percent female to 35.8 percent male.

As to the major medical and basic, here are the results from the 3 States. It must be kept in mind that New York 65 offered basic alone, while Connecticut and Massachusetts offered the basic only in combination with major medical. In Connecticut, 85 percent enrolled for major medical and no basic benefits during the initial enrollment period. Of these, nearly 14,000 chose option 1, $10,000 maximum, and nearly 5,000 enrolled for option 2, $5,000 maximum. Over 3,000 enrolled for one of the major medical options plus the Connecticut 65 basic.

In New York, 63 percent of the enrollees selected major medical either alone or in combination with basic and 37 percent chose basic alone.

In Massachusetts, 76 percent selected major medical only, while the remaining 24 percent bought basic hospital and surgical expense insurance combined with major medical.

The role of agents and brokers: Insurance agents and brokers participated actively in selling the "65" plans in all three States. Recognizing a public service opportunity, they willingly accepted minimum one-time commissions. In Connecticut, 3,000 agents and brokers participated. They accounted for about 50 percent of the enrollments and received $117,000 in enrollment fees. In New York, 23,500 agents and brokers participated and were responsible for 74 percent of the enrollments. These agents and brokers received $652,000 in enrollment fees. In Massachusetts, some 6,000 agents and brokers were responsible for 70 percent of the enrollments and received $277,000 in fees.

It is generally felt that the "65" plans were helpful to the agent and the broker. They affored an opportunity of offering their clients a timely service, and were used effectively as a door opener for new and renewed contacts as a good-will builder.

Claims experience: As to claims experience, Connecticut 65 has had the longest experience. In a report to the State insurance commissioner filed on March 1, 1963, Connecticut 65 reported that on the first 15 months of operation, it ended the first accounting period with a $550,000 deficit. But confidence was expressed in the program's continued growth and future success. It was pointed out that the financial results can be meaningful only over a much longer period of time and that the expenses included large costs involved in launching the program.

Connecticut 65 paid benefits amounting to $2,198,554 to 5,500 individuals more than 170 of whom received amounts ranging from $2,000 to $5,000 under the program's major medical plan.

New York 65's claim experience has been much more limited. As of March 15, 1963, 4 months after the close of the first enrollment period, a total of 7,714 claims had been received. The average amount paid per claim so far is $359. There have been several cases in which the benefits have exceeded $1,000.

Summary: In conclusion it must be kept in mind that the "65" plans do not replace company plans which are constantly expanding in terms of the coverage they offer. But the "65" plans with no medical examination required and with their low-cost, broad coverage provisions do fill a very real need on the part of many elderly citizens.

The "65" plans have made a constructive contribution to the public image of the insurance industry. They have tangibly demonstrated that the industry can marshal its resources in terms of men and money to do a real service job in the public interest.

Always mindful of the public-relations aspects of the industry, the companies which have participated in the "65" plans can take pride in their accomplishment. After a good start, there is every likelihood that the "65" plans will continue to expand and become an established feature of the insurance industry.

Automation and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, our economy is dynamic, not static, and employment-unemployment must be considered in that vein, as did Mr. CURTIS, of Missouri, in his book "87 Million Jobs."

Automation creates more jobs than are lost, yet labor leaders, ADA-ers, so-called liberals, overlook this basic economic fact.

Progress is not to be feared, capitalism is vibrant, dynamic, progressive. However, it is private endeavor not public, that is, Government. Let us hope our leaders recognize this in time to counteract the Hellers, Schlesingers, Galbraiths and other fuzzy economists. Along this line I call your attention to the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

THE FEAR OF PROGRESS

It wouldn't necessarily take a pessimist, looking at industrial America today, to persuasively predict years of continuing labor strife. For the fear of unemployment is growing, and so is the technological progress which gives rise to much of the fear.

How costly, and how nearly insoluble, this fear can prove is shown in the protracted east coast dock strike, the New York City newspaper strike, the threatened national railway strike, and many another dispute. All turn in large part on what is loosely called automation and its real or suspected effects on employment.

The dock strike was settled but the automation issue was not; it will still be there to haunt the negotiators a couple of years hence. The same is true of the newspapers; with no less than 10 different unions all intensely interested in job security, the blackout of these recent months could easily be repeated in even worse forms in the years to come. There is hardly any industry where resistance to advancing technology is not a large and growing problem.

The fear and the resulting resistance are thoroughly understandable. The image of the machine replacing the man is the source of countless jokes, but it is no joke to the man replaced or the one who can see that as a possibility. Holding back technology, on the other hand, would imperil the whole Nation's living standards and indeed its place in the world.

So it is important to try to look at the problem dispassionately. Some unions are doing so, figuring out how they can live with automation, but most unfortunately are determined to fight it.

First, how much unemployment is caused by automation today? Here is one scholarly estimate cited by Cornell Economics Prof. George H. Hildebrand in Du Pont's Better Living magazine: Not more than 300,000 jobs are displaced by labor-saving advances each year, while manufacturing turnover requires 3 million new employees each year.

This process would be better understood, Mr. Hildebrand suggests, but for a prevalent notion that the American economy is somehow static, with a fixed amount of product to be turned out. In fact, he says, "changing technology is constantly enlarging it." Whole new industries founded on technological progress—television and transistor development, for example—create employment rather than unemployment.

History abundantly affirms these observations, for American economic history is one of constant innovation accompanied by vastly increasing employment and consumer well-being. Between 1869 and 1955, certainly a period of enormous change for the better, the labor force rose from 13 million to 66 million; it is still growing, and today more than 66 million are at work. There is every reason to believe that the long-term trend of more jobs through technological improvement will continue if we can avoid killing the technology.

Whatever we do or don't do, others are not going to wait for us. Both our friends and foes in the world understand that technology, including automation, is not to be denied; on the contrary it is a large key to their peoples' aspirations and their hopes of rivaling or besting the American economic giant. Those in this country who would deny industrial advance must also reckon with that prospect.

It comes down to a clash, as Mr. Hildenbrand puts it, between consumer aspirations and the resistance of many producers to adaptive change. "The two opposing goals cannot be reconciled. They can only be compromised. Compromise implies accommodation."

Intelligent accommodation is possible and is occurring to some extent; the industrial future need not be bleak. But neither adjustment nor progress can be founded on a blind fear of all change.

One Hundred Thousand Mortgage Foreclosures Predicted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a very disturbing article by Joseph R. Slevin in the April 6 issue of the New York Herald Tribune reminds us of a very serious problem in the ownership of homes.

This situation requires the most urgent attention and it is hoped that this administration will take the proper necessary steps:

CRISIS: 100,000 LOST HOMES

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—Close to 100,000 persons will lose their homes through mortgage foreclosures this year.

Most of the homes will be small houses in the $10,000-to-$15,000 class. Some will be new. Others will be older homes. The typical owner will have had his house less than 3 years.

The number of foreclosures is high—too high—and it is causing worried discussions within the administration and in Congress.

The Federal Housing Administration recently completed an elaborate study of the problem. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is conducting an investigation. The Senate Housing Subcommittee staff is preparing a special report.

This year's expected 100,000 foreclosures will be more than last year's 86,444 and that was the largest number since the depression year of 1939. The record total came in 1932 when 252,400 persons defaulted on their mortgages. "It's not an alarming situation, but it isn't healthy," a top Government housing official declares.

A great many persons are being hurt. The number of foreclosures has been rising almost steadily since the end of World War II. The only bright spot is that the volume seems to be nearing a peak. But no one believes that the tide will recede soon.

The foreclosure situation doesn't look quite so bad if you put it in statistical percentages instead of people. The number of homeowners is increasing steadily and only 0.4 percent of the mortgaged homes were foreclosed in 1962.

The poorest performance is being turned in by the Government-backed mortgages. Foreclosures of FHA-insured mortgages are running at about a 1-percent rate, while foreclosures of Veterans' Administration guaranteed mortgages are at a higher 1.72 percent.

The FHA and VA programs were created to help persons buy homes and the foreclosures are the price that is being paid. Congress has made it possible for a man to buy a $15,000 house by making a 3 percent, $450 downpayment. He can borrow the remaining $14,550 from a private lender who will be insured by the FHA. If it is a new house, the borrower can have 35 years to pay. If it is an existing home, the maximum is 30 years.

Some of the foreclosures are taking place in the depressed textile and coal towns of New England and Pennsylvania. Others are in such communities as Killeen and Laredo, Tex., that have lost military bases. Sections that have stopped booming—like Orlando, St. Petersburg, and Miami, Fla.—are among the hard-hit areas.

FHA investigators have found that sketchy credit examinations are partly responsible for the rising volume of defaults. Lenders have been anxious to sign mortgages—with Government protection—and have been making only cursory checks of an applicant's credit standing. The FHA adopted stiffer rules and believes that it has the credit problem licked.

But the biggest cause of the high foreclosure volume is the ending of the post-World War II inflation and real estate boom. For many years, a person could buy a house and be reasonably certain that it soon would be worth more than he had paid for it. If he got sick, lost his job or had to move, he could sell his home and not have to suffer foreclosure. Inflation protected the home buyer, the mortgage lender and the insuring Federal agency.

The housing market now has gone the way of the stock market. It once again is a two-way street. Prices go down as well as up. When a borrower falls behind in his monthly payments, he may find that his house is worth less than he paid for it. He defaults and foreclosure follows.

Centennial of Manhattan College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this month Manhattan College in Riverdale, N.Y., is commemorating its centennial anniversary. Chartered on April 2, 1863, by the State of New York, the college has grown from 45 students to a present undergraduate enrollment of 3,300. In addition the school affords many evening, graduate, and summer students exposure to the stimulus of the expanding knowledge of the 20th century. This eminent institution is conducted by the Brothers of the Christian Schools whose labors and dedication in the field of education are widely known and respected. Though out of my congressional district the college is attended by many of its residents, and our area is indeed enriched through the presence of numerous alumni. Last Saturday the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, which I am pleased to say also celebrates it's centennial this year, accorded high editorial praise to Manhattan, to its growth, and to its singular participation in the educative opportunities of Yonkers and Westchester County. It has indeed bestowed 100 years of candlelighting. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission that the editorial appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Herald Statesman, Yonkers, N.Y., Apr. 20, 1963]

AS MANHATTAN COLLEGE TURNS CENTURY YONKERS AND WESTCHESTER SALUTE IT FOR GENERATIONS OF CANDLELIGHTING

Our city and county have every reason to join cordially in today's celebration of the 100th birthday anniversary of Manhattan College in Riverdale.

As the campus observance of the centennial goes forward on the campus, with His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman as presiding officer, there begins a season of celebration which will culminate in an alumni banquet May 11.

The local interest attaches, obviously, because Manhattan has been educating the sons of Yonkers and Westchester families almost from its beginnings.

From these several generations of higher education for our families, for example, there are now 1,395 Manhattan alumni living in this county, with more than 600 of these in Yonkers alone.

Last June 88 Westchester students received degrees from Manhattan, and 112 of the entering freshmen last September came from our county. Present figures indicate that 545 Westchester students are pursuing baccalaureate degree programs in Manhattan's 3 schools—arts and sciences, engineering, and business.

Of special interest to Westchester residents is the service rendered the county's law enforcement agencies through the Manhattan College Institute for Forensic Research.

By conducting forums on civic-social problems, the institute furnishes clinical answers to problems regularly faced by law enforcement officers and other correctional agencies.

The metropolitan law enforcement conference, with 800 members from a 7-State area, is a direct outgrowth of cooperative programs sponsored by the institute and the Westchester County Police Chief's Association.

From 45 students and assets totaling $70,000 a century ago, Manhattan has progressively advanced in academic stature as well as in enrollment and plant facilities.

As an institution of higher education conducted by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, Manhattan aims directly at the intellectual excellence of its students, emphasizing a profound Christian morality as the animating principle of sound citizenship committed to our free society.

As the college founders stated in their petition for incorporation in 1863, their purpose was "to give to young men who possess the proper qualifications the opportunity to broaden their intellectual horizons by increased culture—a refinement of morals, mind, and taste—and in this way to prepare them in a suitable manner for the various professions."

Only 35 years ago, Manhattan's operating budget was less than $150,000.

Today—with increased enrollment, expanded programs, and additional facilities—Manhattan College has an operating budget of nearly $4.5 million.

Plant and property are valued in excess of $12 million. With the acquisition and renovation of a three-story industrial building (formerly owned by Fanny Farmer Candy Co.) near the campus, major plant additions in the last 10 years aggregate more than $8 million.

The Herald Statesman itself is in a centennial mood, for this newspaper is in its 100th year, ready to mark its own centennial late in the autumn.

Manhattan was granted its charter from the New York State Regents barely 7 months before the Yonkers Statesman began rolling off the presses as a weekly—back there on December 5, 1863—largely to defend the then President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, who was under considerable attack in this section.

We therefore extend a hand of felicitation—from one centennarian to another—not only on the occasion of today's charter centenary convocation but upon the long and notable record of candlelighting that has been its role.

Idaho Youngsters Air Problems in Wildlife Through Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Wildlife Federation recently sponsored an essay contest for Gem State youngsters in observance of the 25th annual National Wildlife Week. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Jim Humbird of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game which appeared in most of the daily and several of the weekly newspapers around the State:

(By Jim Humbird, Idaho Fish-Game Department)

Some of Idaho's biggest problems with respect to its rich natural resources were aired by the younger generation now in junior and senior high schools around the State. The occasion is the 25th annual observance of National Wildlife Week.

Unlike most States, Idaho gives its youth this forum to speak on conservation matters through the medium of a statewide essay contest. This culminates in the announce-

ment of State-level winners in both school divisions, and in appropriate publicity during the week.

The contest and awards are sponsored by the Idaho Wildlife federation and the fish and game department in cooperation with the public and parochial school authorities. This year State Chairman Ted Trueblood, Nampa outdoor writer and associate editor of a national magazine, decided that the Idaho observance will carry the theme of the essay contest, "Water and Our Wildlife Heritage."

Three essays in each division were judged best in the State out of a total of 656 entries from 44 localities. The same number from the junior and senior divisions were selected for honorable mention. Following are the names of the writers of essays which won statewide recognition:

Junior high school division—Claudia Hollowell, Bliss, first; Lonnie Cowger, Pierce, second; and Kenneth Marcure, Coeur d'Alene, third. Honorable mention—Valerie McRill, Coeur d'Alene; Christine Murdock, Driggs; and Linda Lee, Kellogg.

Senior high school division—Penny Simmons, Coeur d'Alene, first; Janet Davis, Caldwell, second; and Lee White, Coeur d'Alene, third. Honorable mention—Palm Brownlee, Bliss; Gary Doman, Parma; and Susie Johnson, Wallace.

The history and purpose of National Wildlife Week goes back to 1938 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the first proclamation. It has been sponsored annually since by the National Wildlife Federation and the State groups that belong to the parent organization. The purpose of the week is to focus public attention on the importance of renewable fish and wildlife resources, and on the broad, pressing problems of conservation.

What do the young essay writers have to say that will command the attention of their elders around the State? They realize as future sportsmen that their heritage is priceless—and want to keep it that way. In the main, the essays hit three central points. These are water pollution, soil erosion and the drainage of swmps, farm ponds, and other wetlands. Related problems are some hydroelectric dams and overgrazing.

The following are quotes from the essays in the senior division of the contest.

Penny Simmons, Coeur d'Alene, first prize winner:

"Water generally is considered one of the most important matters on earth. Scientists tell us that it was in the water that life originated, and most people realize that it is the basis of the plant-animal-food cycle. Plants are dependent on it for food and all animals must have some form of it. Many animals live and reproduce in water. In needing water, the human being is no exception. Man can live for less than a week without fluid intake."

Janet Davis, Caldwell, second place:

"Men began studying the earth and its resources. They discovered what seemed to be a balance of nature; that is, left to themselves, soil, water and living things tend to reach a condition of natural balance. When man uses for his own advantage any of these three natural resources, he upsets the natural balance of nature. If it is disturbed, he must help rebalance it. In other words, if he takes something out of the earth then he must help return the same thing that he took out. If he doesn't, he finally will destroy both nature and himself."

Lee White, Coeur d'Alene, third place:

"The supreme danger to our wealth probably is our own apathy when confronting this issue. If, however, through its importance, we can all see what is at stake, then our interest surely will become enlivened. While searching for a means to affect a solution, one is bound to find three distinct areas within the problem. They are drainage, erosion, and pollution."

Following are quotes from the three winning essays in the junior division:

Claudia Hollowell, Bliss, first prize winner:

"Forest fires kill and destroy our wild animals, their homes and the soil in which their food grows. When the forests and grass burn, there is nothing to absorb the water. It rushes down the mountains, carrying valuable topsoil with it. It takes years to develop topsoil in order to grow useful plant life and even more years to restore the thousands of trees that provide lumber, shelter, protection, and are used in manufacturing.

"Overgrazing works much the same way as forest fires."

Lonnie Cowger, Pierce, second:

"Conservation means preserving. With minerals it means not mining more than we need and not wasting any excess that we mine. With forests it means planting enough trees for the next year. With farm lands, it means taking care of the soil so that it remains fertile and so that it will not be blown away by the winds or washed away by the rivers. A lot of Idaho's natural wealth already has been wasted."

Kenneth Marcure, Coeur d'Alene, third:

"Water, the lifeblood of the world, determines all environments, as does the lack of it. Water is interdependent with all resources: Soil, minerals, forests and wildlife. All resources affect wildlife through water. Water feeds soil, the soil grows plants that are the cover and means of life. Here wildlife lives, reproduces and fights for existence. Every animal has adaptations to live where it does. The destruction of their homes usually causes them to perish."

Thus, the younger generation has spoken, keynoting Idaho's observance of National Wildlife Week with the essay theme "Water and Our Wildlife Heritage."

Report on Boston University by President Harold C. Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I inform my colleagues of the outstanding success of the development program of my alma mater, Boston University. By 1969 when the university celebrates the centennial of its charter, $60 million will have been raised for the improvement of the academic plant, residence and recreation facilities, and for the expansion of its curriculum into such vital contemporary fields as African studies, law-medicine research, nursing, communications, and an accelerated 6-year medical education program. The university has already pioneered in these areas and will make an even greater contribution upon the completion of this program.

In order to share this outstanding record of accomplishment with my colleagues, I under unanimous consent, I include the inspiring report of Boston University President Harold C. Case, outlining the success of the program to date and the plans for the future, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

In a public report released today, President Harold C. Case of Boston University announced that $43,292,935 of the university's long range $60 million development goal had been completed since the program was undertaken 7 years ago.

The university hopes to accomplish the total objective by 1969, the centennial year of the university's charter.

Of the total in hand, President Case revealed that $37,185,100 had involved outlay for past construction or renovation of university facilities, as well as construction underway. Some $6,107,835 has been raised for endowment funds. He added that original plans called for some $23,500,000 in endowment funds, a substantial part of which to improve faculty salaries, and that "this leaves a balance of $17,392,165 to be secured in the next 6 years."

The accomplishments for facilities as of March 1963, include: $9,922,000 for academic plant, involving physical and biological sciences, medical research, seminar center, land acquisition, electric distribution system for the Charles River campus, Sargent Gymnasium, school of fine and applied arts, school of public relations and communications, and other capital improvements; $5,386,100 for auxiliary enterprises, involving smaller residence halls, Warren Hall for married students, the Towers residence hall for women, a parking garage for 500 cars, improvements at the Boston University Athletic Field, and crafts building, a water system and year round residence facilities for the university's Sargent camp in Peterborough, N.H.; $6,215,000 for buildings under construction, involving a university heating plant, the 18-story law-education building which will be completed next year and the College of Industrial Technology; $14,430,000 for special facilities under construction, involving the George Sherman Union Building, opened this spring and nearly completed, three high-rise dormitories at the westerly end of Boston University Field which will eventually house over 1,600 men and women; $1,232,000 for rental properties, involving apartment buildings for faculty members, land for future development and the future home of the college of basic studies at 881 Commonwealth Avenue.

"The next and most significant campaign," said President Case, "is to be the allout effort for the central university library which will be located on the Charles River campus between the Sherman Union and the Law-Education Building. We expect to be making some public announcements about this campaign soon and it will be the largest single development effort in the history of Boston University, with an objective of obtaining a gift from every alumnus and alumna, student, faculty member, administrative officer, and from individuals, corporations, foundations, and Government sources."

While stressing the "more visible" signs of the university's construction program, which will eventually unite 13 of the once scattered 14 schools and colleges of Boston University into "a magnificent high rise campus which is already changing the skyline of the municipality and the banks of the Charles River," President Case also commented that two other "less obvious but equally vital" developments are occurring at the institution.

These involve "the academic side and students," he added.

On the academic side, President Case said that the nine undergraduate colleges of the university admit only students whose "aptitude, achievement, and interest" promise to bring success in specific chosen fields and also that the university "provide a small college atmosphere within the bounds of a large and complex institution."

With each undergraduate unit now requiring a solid core curriculum in the arts and sciences taught by the faculty of the

college of liberal arts, "excellence is the undergraduate norm everywhere, the attrition of able students is reduced, and advanced graduate study is stimulated."

President Case remarked that although tuition at Boston University will be $1,350 in the fall, "this should not discourage able young men and women in all walks of life from exhausting the numerous opportunities that exist to get a first class education. Even loans incurred by promising students to finance their way can be obtained at relatively little cost later on and this will undoubtedly be the greatest investment of their lifetimes."

Dr. Case cautioned, however, that he was aware of the need for massive scholarship assistance from governmental and other sources, as well as for a broad Federal aid program in higher education, "something that I hope this session of the U.S. Congress will face as a sobering responsibility and act upon."

The student body, now with more than 11,000 full-time students and nearly double that number in part-time, is the largest in New England, added Dr. Case. In 1962, the University granted 3,126 degrees, including 870 master's degrees and 180 doctorates, "constant evidence of the enrollment of capable young people who complete both their undergraduate and graduate objectives and go out into society for constructive and, in many cases, distinguished service in many areas.

"We are interested primarily in quality at this University, not mere numbers, but we are proud that we are able to make such a large contribution to the welfare of city, state, and nation. Modern urban civilization—the megalopolis, if you will—has expanded so that extended urban conditions encompass entire regions. Just as the city of Boston is the megalopolitan center of New England, so Boston University correspondingly serves the whole of New England.

"It must be remembered that Boston University's functions are different from those of other New England universities. Some of these schools, for example, serve a limited number of students recruited without reference to local situations or to the enormous increase of 'war babies' soon to knock on college doors. Other institutions have set their sights primarily on quantity and even suggest unlimited growth. We at Boston University recognize the regional need and seek to provide excellence in education as the cardinal premise, but, without sacrificing quality, we intend to extend our enrollment on a conservative basis—with the criteria of excellence, and with emphasis on Boston and New England. Thus our growth will be steady and academically sound."

Pointing out that Boston University was at one time largely a commuter college, President Case said: "Today, the ratio has markedly changed until we are beginning the era when the university will enroll as many full-time resident students as commuters."

He remarked that Boston University plans to increase its full-time enrollment an average of 4 percent per year up to 1975, reaching a total of 18,500 in that year.

"This rate of growth is carefully established because of the onset of the college enrollment crisis and also because the University believes it can increase enrollment to this extent while putting first priority upon the quality of its educational program," he said.

An increase of 500 students in residence on the Charles River campus is being planned deliberately by the administration for every 24 months for the next 10 years, "although at the same time the university will render better service to commuting students than ever before," he added.

"I believe that the university has planned well for campus residence in the years ahead, just as it has for the academic program. Students within city limits and those who now come in on the new highways, such as Route 128 and the Southeast Expressway, will be able to mingle on campus with the increasing number of students from outside New England and nearly every relevant foreign country on the face of the earth."

Praising the university's "historic willingness to experiment and reflect a changing civilization and its needs," President Case promised that Boston University would continue in the future "to seek answers to the problems of a complex industrial, and technological society and be willing, within its financial abilities, to anticipate academic needs and develop the most appropriate curriculums and educational programs."

He added: "It will hold as a major concern the recruitment and retention of a prestige faculty, with proper emphasis on both the teaching and research functions, as well as the preserving of a vital climate for free expression and adventurous ideas.

"The latter is an organic part of what has made our institution great over the years and I have only to point to such contemporary undertakings as the accelerated 6-year medical education program, the African studies program, the human relations center, the law-medicine research institute, doctorates at the school of nursing, the pioneer school of public relations and communications, the college of basic studies which has been one of the most successful educational experiments in recent years, biological research with hamster cheek pouches, the world famous optics research in our former physical research laboratories, and many other areas of prime societal concern, to underscore this."

Finally, President Case referred to the university's rapidly growing Charles River campus as "a dynamic, self-repeating urban renewal project the like of which the city itself has only recently begun to experience elsewhere."

He said: "The university's many improvements in the Back Bay have remarkably reinvigorated what was once a deteriorating complex of factories, stores and apartments into a section which has attractive new buildings, banks, modern light industry, a computer center, a motel, medical clinic, a dramatically stabilized Kenmore Square area, and a tenfold increase in land values."

Dr. Case remarked that, similarly, the location of the Boston University Medical Center in the South End of Boston—the one integral part of Boston University which will not be located on the Charles River campus—has also had beneficial effects for a depressed area.

"Downward urban trends in these neighborhoods have been reversed, thanks to the university and cooperating private and public agencies, and larger, more varied and far-reaching city improvements are now the order of the day. We take pride in being effective partners in the 'New Boston'."

You Could Build a Wall Around the State of Arkansas and Its People Would Be Self-Sufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, every State has advantages of which its people are proud. Each Representative and Senator likes to extoll the State from which he comes. Arkansas, "the Wonder State" has much that could be said about it in connection with its natural resources, climate, agriculture, mining, recreational areas, streams, magnificent scenery, and its people. Mr. Lou Oberste, director of publicity, the Arkansas Park and Publicity Commission, has prepared a noteworthy résumé of some of the outstanding resources of "the Wonder State." Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the full text of Mr. Oberste's splendid article:

(By Lou Oberste)

Arkansas' Gov. Charles H. Brough (1916–20), is credited with the old adage that claims "You could build a wall around the State of Arkansas and its people would be self-sufficient."

The basis for this maxim can be found in the abundance of natural resources found in the State, plus the wide variety of soils, coupled with a mild climate, that makes it possible to grow almost any crop produced in this country with the exception of citrus fruits.

Early explorers found in Arkansas vast forested areas which covered about 85 percent of the State. The commercial value of this natural resource was quickly recognized and the first crude sawmill was erected at Helena more than 120 years ago. This mill was the forerunner of the multi-million-dollar lumber industry that exists today.

During the late 1800's, Arkansas' forests furnished timber for the railroads which were beginning to crisscross the country. Hundreds of new towns were springing up with large quantities of timber products being used in the construction of houses, barns, office buildings, also, for fences, cooper barrels, posts, tool handles, and other miscellaneous wood products. In order to satisfy the appetite of the construction hungry Nation, sawmills were built, and lumbering towns like Warren, Prescott, Camden, Gurdon, and Fordyce, boomed and prospered. By 1909, the lumber industry in Arkansas reached its peak with more than two billion board feet being produced that one year. Literally, thousands of saw mills dotted the forests, slaughtering the virgin timber. The drain on this natural resource was heavy, but not to depletion, as has occurred in many other sections of the United States.

In the early 1920's, the timber industry recognized the fact that timber was a renewable resource and that it could be grown and harvested as scientifically as any other crop. Working on this principal, the private companies at Crossett and Dierks developed a conservation program that has gained nationwide notice. The fundamental principle of this program is to maintain and increase forest growth at the same time production is being maintained. So efficient is this program that even while meeting the needs of an expanding population for wood and wood products, Arkansas' forests are not only keeping up with the demands, but are actually increasing in acreage each year.

The second growth timber and a plentiful water supply encouraged the pulp and paper industry to construct a plant to manufacture kraft specialties near Camden in the late 1920's. A second pulp mill at Crossett soon followed. The continuing expansion of this industry is indicated by the relatively new Dierks Paper Mill and the International Paper Co. facility at Pine Bluff.

The pulp mills in Arkansas work in close cooperation with the lumber and veneer manufacturers to put to use more of each tree harvested. Many of the larger lumber mills have installed barking and chipping machines to convert waste lumber to chips for the pulp mills. The pulp mills are using

over 400,000 cords of chips annually; material that until a few years ago was considered a waste and liability.

Arkansas' mineral resources were first exploited by the Indians long before the white man came to this country. The earliest mining operations in the State were probably the Indians working the novaculite deposits in the Malvern and Hot Springs area. This hard fine-grained stone was highly valued by the red man in the manufacturing of his arrowheads, spear points, knives, and other tools of war and peace. Indian artifacts of Arkansas novaculite have been found in the early inhabitants of Arkansas and the tribes of distant lands.

Today, Arkansas is still the number one source of supply for novaculite in the country. So fine are the whetstones made from this native resource that it is known worldwide as Arkansas Stone.

Arkansas is the Nation's primary source of bauxite, the ore from which aluminum is produced. Over 90 percent of the Nation's total output is mined between Little Rock and Benton, by the country's two major producers: Reynolds and Alcoa. Two alumina plants, for the processing of bauxite are located at Hurricane Creek and at Jones Mill on Lake Catherine and at Gum Springs near Arkadelphia.

While bauxite is one of the State's better known mineral resources, Arkansas ranks first in the production of syenite, barite, and quartz, and is fifth largest producer of manganese in the United States.

One of nature's most lavish displays of mineral deposits is found at Magnet Cove where more than 100 minerals have been identified. It is a fact that almost any mineral found in the United States can be found in Arkansas and some 25 minerals are mined in large quantities.

The real gem of Arkansas minerals is the diamond.

An ancient volcanic crater near the town of Murfreesboro is the source of this interesting mineral; here is the only place in the Northern Hemisphere where diamonds can be found in this natural matrix. Diamonds have been mined periodically since they were first discovered in 1906, but court brawls, mismanagment, and looting, have discouraged the owners and stockholders in the various companies that have attempted commercial operations. Over 10,000 diamonds have been registered since the first discovery, but it is estimated that over five times that many diamonds have been found.

The crater is open to vacationers and rockhounds, anyone can prospect for diamonds for a small fee, and "finder's keepers" is the rule.

A number of fine "gem quality" stones have been found by amateur collectors, the most famous is the "Star of Arkansas," a 15.31 carat diamond found by a Texas housewife.

Mineral fuels are also found in Arkansas. They include coal, natural gas, and petroleum.

Coal was first noted in Arkansas as early as 1818; the first recorded coal production was in 1848, when 220 tons were mined at the old Spadra Mines at the mouth of Spadra Creek in Johnson County. The Arkansas coal fields lie generally in the Arkansas River Valley, west of Russellville. Coal was the most valuable natural resource for years, and gave employment to thousands in Sebastian, Logan, Johnson, Franklin, and Pope Counties. Peak production was reached in 1909, when almost 2,400,000 tons were mined.

In recent years natural gas is fast replacing coal as a fuel, and coal production has been reduced accordingly. Very few mines are in operation today, but it is estimated that coal reserves in Arkansas are in excess of 2 billion tons.

Natural gas and petroleum were discovered near El Dorado in 1920. Within a few years the first refineries were established there and in nearby Magnolia. Two major companies, Lion Oil and American Oil, have extensive plants near El Dorado today, and a number of other plants have located in the area to produce asphalt roofing and other petrochemical products.

The State geologist estimates the reserves in the known petroleum fields to be approximately 390 million barrels of oil and 1,620 billion cubic feet of natural gas. New and deeper exploration is continuing; this, with new and improved technical methods of recovery and production, can extend these reserve estimates.

The temperate climate of the area, plus the wide variety of soil types, help to make Arkansas one of the leading States in agriculture. The topography of the State ranges from the fertile bottom lands of the Mississippi River Valley, through the sandy, gravelly soils of the south and southwest, to the limestone and sandstone soils of the Ozark and Ouachita Mountains. Cotton is still king in the rich delta lands, but soybeans and rice are beginning to challenge the monarch. In the highlands, poultry wears the crown as the most profitable commodity and rules over the apples, berries, grapes, beef and dairy cattle, hogs, and sheep, which thrive and prosper on the mountain soils. Peaches, melons, truck crops, hay crops, and livestock, flourish on the slopes and plains between.

In years gone by, critics of Arkansas have challenged Governor Brough's claim of the State's self-sufficiency on the grounds that we might have the raw materials, but without the processing and manufacturing capability, we still had to depend on outside help to convert our resources into usable goods. These critics may have had a point at one time but within the last decade, Arkansas has made giant strides in the direction of industrial development.

Arkansas' economy has traditionally been agriculture in nature, with crop values in excess of $525 million in 1961. Last year, for the first time, the industrial income exceeded that of agriculture.

Today, plants in the State are producing all kinds of products from the native resources; paper cups and cardboard boxes, furniture and flooring, roofing granulars and cement, textiles, paints, asphalt and petrochemicals are all being manufactured near the source of supply.

Typical of the new trend in industrial development are the new Borg-Warner Norge plant at Fort Smith; Phillips Van Heusen shirt factories at Augusta, Brinkley, and Des Arc; Monsanto Chemical Co. at El Dorado; and the Mohawk Rubber Tire Plant at Helena. Space does not permit the listing of the many big corporations that have discovered the industrial frontier that is Arkansas.

Important to the economic development of the State, both in agriculture and industry, is the plentiful water supply. Arkansas is abundantly endowed with good quality water for domestic, commercial, industrial, and recreational use. Arkansas has more unpolluted fishable streams and lakes than any other State in the Nation. Numerous multipurpose dams in the State create over one-half million acres of lakes and reservoirs for water needs. Electric power generated at these dams insure industry in Arkansas an interrupted source of energy at uniform rates throughout the State.

Time may well prove water to be our most valued natural resource.

All these resources combine to give merit to Governor Brough's old adage about the wall, but one resource that we have not mentioned is the natural friendliness of the Arkansas people. It is this friendliness that would never permit a wall to be built around the State, even if such a feat were possible.

Automation, Education, and the Changing Demand for Skills in Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the New York Times, a special section was devoted to the role of education in meeting the complex problems created by rapid technological advances and automation.

Educators and employers alike agree that each educational institution has an important and direct responsibility to prepare our young people for employment in our dynamic and changing economy. But vocational or professional training no longer ends with the completion of formal education. Rather, it is a continuous process to meet the economy's changing demands for skills.

Correspondence courses and industry-sponsored scholarships, fellowships, and research grants are making vital contributions in upgrading our workers' skills and in meeting the need for education beyond formal schooling.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased to see three articles in the supplement to the April 9 edition of the New York Times outlining the progress being made in the area of training and retraining in relation to the skill needs being created by automation and technological change. In order that others may note this progress, under unanimous consent I insert these three articles in the RECORD at this point:

AUTOMATION PUTS ONUS ON SCHOOLS—WHOLE EDUCATIVE PROCESS FACES CHANGES IMPOSED BY INDUSTRIAL TREND—RELIABILITY WITH MACHINES LINKED WITH ADJUSTMENT TO A COMPLEX SOCIETY

(By Leonard Buder)

The Nation's schools, never fully satisfied with their progress in conventional times, have suddenly been confronted by a new challenge—that of automation.

Technological advances in recent years, which some observers have described as "the Second Industrial Revolution," have imposed awesome demands upon education at every level. So new is the challenge—the word "automation" is only about a dozen years old—that it's dimensions have not been fully charted.

Automation, in the narrow sense, refers to two processes, which, used separately or in combination, have developed in recent years. These involve:

(1) The use of transfer machines, which perform a whole series of complicated tasks and produce a finished or semifinished product without human intervention.

(2) The application of the "feedback" principle, through which machines control and correct their operations.

BROAD TASK ENVISIONED

In popular usage, the term has become more or less synonymous with technological and scientific progress.

Educators tend to think of automation in the broader sense. They see their task as not only that of enabling students to work in a world of automation, but, more important, of preparing them to live successfully in a complex, modern society.

Some of the effects of automation are already apparent.

According to Eli E. Cohen, executive secretary of the National Commission on Employment of Youth, automation has accentuated the trend toward higher levels of education.

"It is debatable whether a college education is needed to watch dials or push buttons," he notes, "but employers are reluctant to entrust the operation of expensive equipment to employees whom they do not consider reliable, and level of education seems to be a major index of reliability.

"Regardless of whether automation, in fact, requires more education or less, all the forecasts are agreed that automation will mean greater opportunities for the educated and skilled and fewer for the undereducated and unskilled."

Mr. Cohen cites an illustration of the impact of automation on industry: A glass plant employing 14 workers, has been developed. It is capable of producing 90 percent of all the electric light bulbs needed in this country, 100 percent of the radio and television tubes (except for picture tubes) and, in its spare time, can manufacture Christmas ornaments.

Automation, Mr. Cohen also points out, has had an impact in fields other than manufacturing. Automatic elevators have displaced an estimated total of 40,000 manual operators. Vending machines and self-service techniques have eliminated the jobs of many salesclerks. The widespread use of business machines have enabled many companies to reduce the size of their office staffs.

What does all this mean to education?

Educators agree that the Nation's institutions of learning must adequately prepare young people to take advantage of the range of employment opened by automation.

RETRAINING ESSENTIAL

Attention must also be given to retrain those out of school to enhance their chances of finding employment.

The New York City school board recently reorganized its adult trade center and gave it additional responsibilities, including that of providing retraining programs for workers displaced by automation.

But if the schools are to meet the demands of a new vocational age, observers assert, they will have to do more than they have in the past—and this means they will have to receive the resources to do more.

Vocational education all too often has been a weak link in the educational chain. It has suffered in status and support. Vocational schools used to be and frequently still are treated as "academic dumping grounds." Only recently have they begun to receive a small measure of the attention they need.

Automation has also focused new attention on another old school problem: the alarmingly high pupil drop-out rate. Four of every 10 students, it has been estimated, fail to complete high school. And it is often these youngsters, when they enter labor market, who bear the brunt of unemployment, because of the disappearance of unskilled jobs.

Mindful of this, communities across the Nation have started new programs aimed at meeting the special needs of potential drop-outs and to attract back those who have already left.

Dr. Evans, who recently directed the project on the educational implications of automation, sponsored by the National Education Association, cities these other implications for education:

"First of all, there is an even greater need for every student to achieve proficiency in the basic skills. The vocational student will not find meaningful and steady employment in tomorrow's economy without basic mathematical and reading skill. To an increasing extent, manual skills alone will not enable him to support himself.

"Second, if we must educate for change but cannot predict accurately the direction of change, then skills and facts are not enough. New and improved methods must be found to teach students to handle and integrate new facts in totally new situations which cannot be predicted.

LIFELONG EDUCATION

"Third, the concept of lifelong adult education will have to become a reality for most of our population. It is likely that very few people will be able to go through life depending on their initial skills and fund of facts. Some may have to learn completely new skills; all will have to update their skills, their general knowledge and their professional training in order to function with maximum effectiveness.

"Insofar as automation increases leisure time, it also increases the need for adult education. Our average workweek has gone from 84 hours in 1800, to 60 hours in 1900, to about 40 hours a week today. The work week appears likely to continue its decline, thus providing most of our population with an increasing amount of leisure.

"Fourth, many communities may find it necessary to reexamine in a very basic way, training given to students who do not go on to college. It is likely that we will need an expanded system of community and junior colleges to fill the growing need for well-educated technicians.

"Finally, education must provide more than skills to insure economic survival. Automation is a complex phenomenon which calls for a variety of educational responses. In meeting the challenge of technological changes, we must not forget to teach about culture and the arts, responsible citizenship and meaningful human relations."

COURSES BY MAIL RETRAIN WORKERS—DEMAND FOR SKILLS SPURS USE OF HOME-STUDY PLANS

American industry's expanding need for skilled workers and technological unemployment caused by automation are posing a serious challenge for education. And the steady advance of technology seems to indicate that the problem of retraining and upgrading workers will be a continuing one.

Among the methods proposed for meeting the challenge is correspondence education, which has long been effectively used in a limited way by business and industry. More than 7,000 industries now use cooperative home-study plans to train and upgrade both new and experienced employees, according to Dr. David Lockmiller, executive director of the National Home Study Council.

Projections by the U.S. Department of Labor indicate that the need for skilled workers will increase by about 25 percent by 1970, while the male working force will increase by only about 15 percent. At the same time the numbers of workers in the prime working years between the ages of 26 and 44 will increase only slightly, although the total civilian labor force will grow by about 13 million.

TWO MILLION TAKING COURSES

Many of the new skilled workers will thus have to come from the age groups under 25 and over 45. With rapid technological change reducing the life of many skills to just a few years even as the average man's working life increases, it becomes apparent that the average worker may have to learn several new skills before he retires, the Labor Department has pointed out.

INDUSTRY WIDENS AID TO EDUCATION—NOW STRESSES IMPROVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHING

The business and industrial community is playing a significant part in efforts to improve secondary education with industry-sponsored scholarships and fellowships, research grants, the matching of alumni contributions by employees; and similar aid programs.

Efforts to improve teaching and to encourage high school students to attain their highest potential are receiving increasing emphasis.

A pioneer in this area is the General Electric Co., which 19 years ago established fellowships to enable high school teachers to take special summer college courses. These graduate fellowship programs, given initially in science and mathematics, were prototypes of those now sponsored by the National Science Foundation and others.

Through the General Electric Foundation, funds are provided to select institutions for the summer programs. The university itself sets up the program within broadly defined areas, chooses its own faculty, sends out the announcements, and screens and selects the fellows. The recipients of the fellowships receive travel and living expenses as well as tuition.

J. M. Bertotti, the GE manager of educational relations and suport, noted recently that private companies could afford to invest venture capital in such projects to get them started. "We stay with the programs as long as we think we are making a contribution," he said.

OTHER COMPANIES ACTIVE

As the National Science Foundation moved into the fields of mathematics and science, G.E. initiated programs in guidance counseling, and is now emphasizing institutes in economics for teachers of social studies. More than 3,000 high school teachers have participated in summer programs sponsored by General Electric.

The Shell Companies Foundation, which began a similar program in 1956, has sponsored summer seminars in physics, chemistry and mathematics that have been attended by some 650 secondary school teachers.

Shell has also begun a program of residencies for leaders in teaching improvement, selected for the impact they will have when they return to their school systems after a year of special graduate-level study. One of the problems they will attack is the adaptation and use in their school systems of the new curriculums developed in physics, chemistry, mathematics, and biology.

In another type of program the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., provides summer scholarships for science and mathematics majors interested in careers as high school teachers. The scholarships, ranging from $2,000 to $4,000 enable the recipients to obtain the necessary courses in education without affecting their regular curriculums.

The Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. launched a project in 1957 that provides outstanding teachers of mathematics, physics, and chemistry with an opportunity to teach advanced courses to selected students in high schools near company plants.

COVER PAY AND EXPENSES

Grants to the local school board cover the teacher's salary and relocation expenses. Where local school boards have not been able to obtain funds from the community, additional grants matched by National Defense Education Act funds provide specialized laboratory facilities.

The Olin scientific education plan, which is one part of the company's overall program of aid to education, is now in operation in six communities.

Still another kind of program was started in New York City last fall. Developed jointly by the board of education and David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, the industry-science teaching program is providing more than 50 lectures by RCA scientists and engineers. Speaking at four selected junior and senior high schools, the lecturers introduce the latest advances in the laboratory directly into the classroom.

So-Called Liberals Are the Most Reactionary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the futility of the widespread use of labels to try to identify the contradicting philosophies being expounded in this Nation is indicated in the thinking of our present so-called liberals. Actually those who lay claim to this title today are far from liberal in their thinking and in their plans to control your life and mine.

It is the conservative today who is fighting to maintain the American ideals of freedom for the individual. The liberal, while pleading the cause of the people, do not trust the people. They deplore the right of each individual to chart his own course and pursue his own destiny. The liberal wants to rob the individual of his incentive, his dreams, his ability to get ahead through his own hustle, sweat, and effort.

The liberal wants to replace the freedom of the individual with a controlled society wherein an elite group of bureaucrats make all the decisions and prescribe what the people shall eat and wear, how they shall be housed, whom they may choose for neighbors, and the conditions under which they will work and the places of employment. Out of their great and unselfish hearts they guarantee to take care of all your problems from the cradle to the grave and all you have to give in exchange is your freedom.

The "Liberal Formula for Happiness" is ably presented in the following column written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones in the Washington Evening Star of April 22:

[From Washington Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1963]

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS: SOME ACCUSED OF CHAMPIONING LIBERTY WHILE FAVORING CREEPING COERCION

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Self-styled liberals are generally nicer people than sour-puss reactionaries.

It would be better to be cast away on a desert island with an outgoing and outgiving liberal than with a guy who's against everything including the construction of a raft. But this doesn't mean that liberal government is a good recipe for equity or human happiness. Many liberals suffer from smug assumptions about human behavior and political theory that simply don't jibe with reality.

They are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imaging themselves to be the foes of dogma. They honestly believe themselves to be champions of liberty while they favor creeping coercion as long as they can be the authors of the coercion. They are so sure their theories are good for you that they think they are only doing you a favor when they tie you to a post, pry open your jaws, and pour their nostrums down your throat.

William Howard, the late great Jewish comedian, had a skit in which he impersonated a Communist holding forth in Union Square.

"Comes da revolution," shouted Willie, "you'll eat strawberries and cream."

"But," protested someone in his stage audience, "I don't like strawberries and cream."

Willie assumed a contemptuous sneer: "Comes da revolution and you'll eat strawberries and cream."

This is not a bad description of the liberal formula for human happiness.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. Every time he sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually and with the best intentions he weaves a net of verbotens and must-do's that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible injustice, eventually you arrive at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes a contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation. When mulish taxpayers balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the sound theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. The argument: "If Oklahoma doesn't take the money, Maine will" is a potent one.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite logically at his advocacy of centralized power. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his greed. Federal aid to schools will provide more teachers without raising school district taxes. Ninty percent Federal highway money means that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Increased Federal relief means that local responsibility can be shirked. And so supergovernment grows and the liberal is delighted.

He is delighted because he questions whether local government will ever have adequate social vision. But he will see to it that the supergovernment has. There will be plans, bold plans of new frontiers entered into with vigor.

The liberal also seems to hold a double standard in the matter of human behavior. He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But the mugger in the park who stabs for $20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong if there had been enough social legislation.

The liberal can't believe that removing the penalties for misbehavior or lack of performance could increase human cussedness and sloth. Instead, according to his theory, what we need are more social workers, more public housing, more youth clubs. And with them we keep getting more chiselers, more illegitimate children, more delinquency and crime.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He looks at labor-management problems as though the Pinkertons were still shooting the strikers at Homestead. The significance of Jimmy Hoffa eludes him. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing capabilities of the United Steel Workers. He is still chasing Commodore Vanderbilt and the beef trust.

The liberal thus deludes himself with the comfortable assurance that he is farseeing, a progressive, a man of the future. In his effort to cure injustice by piling on more government he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of government.

He has, with minor interruptions, been in power in America for 30 years. He is getting gray, and even a little quaint. He won't admit errors or consider pragmatic results. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy. He is loving us to death.

To Caroline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a poem from one of my constituents.

The poem ran as the lead editorial in the April 4 issue of the Cambridge Chronicle and Sun. When Editor Spalding sees fit to give such commendation to one of his contributions, I feel that the lines should be shared with other editors who agree with him and I am making them available:

TO CAROLINE

Little girl, sweet little girl;
  You seem lively as a sprite;
In that great, big, stately mansion,
  With its sides so gleaming white;
Where grim-faced men are standing,
  Just to keep all strangers out
And where many things are taking place
  That you don't know about.

Are you happy? That's the question
  In the minds of girls and boys
Who are near the age that you are,
  But don't have so many toys.
Some don't have a dad or mummie;
  Some have no sense of sight;
And some, I fear, are hungry
  When they go to bed at night.

Yet I'm sure they have no envy;
  In fact, they all are glad
To know you're thinking of them
  And don't want them to be sad,
They're glad to feel you prayed for them
  And hope things come out right;
And they, in turn, all pray that you
  Sleep well till morning light.

Little Lady in the White House;
  Live your childhood; dream your dreams.
Watched over by the elfins,
  Dancing mid the soft moonbeams.

—*William H. McMasters.*

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

The State of Kanawha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the State of West Virginia was created out of 39 western counties which were originally to be called the State of Kanawha. The convention during which the new State was born is described in an article by John G. Morgan in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail.

The article tells of the preliminary victory won by Virginia "divisionists" on August 20, 1861, at the second Wheeling convention. While opposing Civil War troops skirmished nearby, the delegates convened and passed an ordinance to combine 39 counties of western Virginia into a new "State of Kanawha"—the name deriving from the original Indian inhabitants of that region. The next step was to be a popular referendum on the proposed new State.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail]

THE STATE OF KANAWHA—DIVISIONISTS WON PRELIMINARY VICTORY AUGUST 20, 1861

(By John G. Morgan)

An ordinance to create a "State of Kanawha," embracing 39 counties in western Virginia, was passed 50 to 28 by the second Wheeling convention.

The action was taken August 20, 1861, while Yankee and Rebel forces skirmished at Hawk's Nest and Laurel Fork in Fayette County.

The ordinance said the new State would be separated from the Commonwealth of Virginia and "become a member of the Government of the United States."

However, the convention's long-awaited action was made subject to approval by the people on October 24 and later by the loyal State legislature and Congress.

Passage of the ordinance brought waves of favorable public reaction. Leaders of the statehood movement happily rode the waves and visualized freedom from old Virginia anew.

The Wheeling Intelligencer said:

"The (new State) measure is not quite all that most ardent divisionists would have preferred, but if we are not greatly mistaken in the temper of the people, we shall all be citizens of the State of Kanawha before many months roll around. Speed the day that is to save us from our connection with eastern Virginia."

Statehood pushers became bold and persistent soon after the second convention reopened at 2 p.m., August 6, 1861, in the U.S. customhouse at Wheeling. The public body, consisting of approximately 100 delegates from 34 counties, had been in recess since the previous June 25.

The convention quickly adopted a motion requiring President Arthur I. Boreman to name a committee to look into the whole matter of dividing the State of Virginia. One representative from each county and three additional members were named to the study group.

John S. Carlile, of Clarksburg, the newly elected loyal U.S. Senator and delegate to the convention, continued his oratorical drive for the new State. He submitted a series of resolutions which outlined his ideas for reporting an ordinance to the people. And he declared:

"Now, Mr. President, there is a just expectation in the country * * * that this action will be no longer delayed. They are looking for it, waiting for it, expecting it, and demanding it. Why, sir, should it be withheld?

"Everywhere loyal hearts are beating to come and share with us the destiny we ought to provide for ourselves and which nature has designed for us, if we have but the manliness and are equal to lift ourselves to the circumstances that surround us. * * * under the incubus of a false political philosophy we have remained here, digging, almost in a primitive State, from the bowels of the earth the necessary means of support, while nature has filled us to overflowing with all the elements of wealth, seeking nothing in the world but the hand of industry to develop them and bring them into active use.

"Cut the knot now. Cut it now. Apply the knife. You are compelled to wait at best for a realization of your hopes some 4 or 5 months, and by that time the advancing columns of the Nation's army will have moved rebellion far beyond your borders, or they will have been stayed forever in their march." [Loud applause.]

Some of the strongest and most respected Union men in the convention still believed that the movement for a new State was premature. Among them were Chapman J. Stuart of Doddridge County and Daniel Lamb of Ohio County.

Stuart, replying to Carlile's remarks, told the convention:

"I was not sent here for the purpose of dividing the State of Virginia or making a constitution. The thing never was mooted before my people, but just the reverse.

"I came here to aid the General (Federal) Government in putting down the rebellion, and if it was not for that, I do not know what I came here for at all.

"I do not propose to go into the merits of the question raised by the gentleman from Harrison. I merely wish to indicate to you why I think a hasty or premature action at this time would embarrass the General Government putting down this rebellion, and place us in a worse attitude than we are at present."

Stuart moved that Carlile's resolutions be laid upon the table. He said the convention soon would have the advantage of a report from the committee on division of the State and declared there was no point in burdening the delegates further with the resolutions. His motion carried 37 to 35.

Lamb, who had an acute knowledge of law, contended:

"We have been told * * * that this thing of establishing a new State was to be a perfect protection to us here against the dangers that surround us, that it would protect us against the arms of the enemy, that it would be equal to an army in the field. * * * Your lives and your property are not to be defended by measures of this kind. Nothing but stout hearts and strong arms will defend them. They are to be defended by the rifle and the bayonet and the cannon. Your paper constitution and your paper State will not be worth a single musket in defense."

Lamb contended further that application for admission as a new State inevitably would raise the slave question in Congress. He added: "They (Congress) will say to you: 'The slave population within your State is insignificant; come to us as a free State, and you shall be admitted.'

"Do you want to raise such a question as that? Do you want to push such a question upon the councils of the Nation, a question of that nature in the midst of the difficulties which surround us?"

One of the most effective weapons used by those opposing the new State was an opinion by U.S. Attorney General Edwin Bates.

The Attorney General said creation of the State would be an original, independent act of revolution. He added that any attempt to follow that course of action would involve a plain breach of both the Constitution of Virginia and the Nation.

The opposition made numerous efforts to block the progress of the new State movement, including several tries to adjourn the convention sine die.

Carlile's response was:

"I am perfectly willing to sit here until the sun rises tomorrow, and for one, I will vote against all adjournment until a vote is taken on this subject."

The long debate on the report of the committee on division of the State eventually resulted in the appointment of a compromise group.

Named to that group were Carlile, Lamb, Peter G. Van Winkle of Wood, James W. Paxton of Ohio and Lewis Ruffner of Kanawha.

When the committee brought out the proposed ordinance for creation of a State of Kanawha, several delegates decided that they didn't like the name.

Stuart was defeated in a quick move to strike out Kanawha and insert West Virginia.

On August 21, the day the convention closed its final 15-day meeting, loyal Gov. Francis H. Pierpont addressed the delegates for a few minutes in executive session.

Boreman, speaking while the convention was in regular session, said in his closing remarks:

"You have taken the initiative in the creation and organization of a new State. This is a step of vital importance. I hope, and I pray God it may be successful; that it may not endanger strife in our midst, nor bring upon us difficulties from abroad, but that its most ardent advocates may realize their fondest hopes of its success.

"So far as I am personally concerned, I am content with the action of this convention. I bow with submission to what you have done on this subject.

"I hope that each and every one of you may be permitted to go to your homes and that you may find your homes, your firesides,

your families, soon restored to their wonted peace and tranquillity and happiness."

Boreman, who was destined to become the first Governor of West Virginia, was among those voting against the ordinance to create the new State of Kanawha.

The convention adjourned 5 days before Confederate forces won a battle at Kesslers Cross Lanes near Summersville. Earlier in the month, on August 13, Federal troops marched from Grafton into Tucker County and captured 15 prisoners, 90 guns, 150 horses and cattle and 15,000 rounds of ammunition.

Battles and skirmishes in western Virginia continued through September, October and November of 1861. The Battle of Carnifex Ferry was fought on September 10.

Public interest mounted as the October 24 election approached. The Morgantown Star said on September 9:

"Let us give * * * one unanimous vote in favor of the proposition and select good and discreet men to form a constitution. We must make one more effort to get into position where God and nature has placed us."

The election results were: 18,408 votes for the new State to 781 against. Statehood leaders were jubilant. They saw complete victory beyond the legal jungle ahead.

Preston County gave the highest vote for the new State. Its totals were 1,764 for, to 9 against.

Monongalia County rated second with 1,610 to 18, and Marshall third, with 1,371 to 37. The vote in Kanawha County was 1,039 to 1.

Because of wartime conditions, no returns were received from 6 counties. Other returns were very light.

The lowest total vote was in Braxton County, which reported 22 for the new State and none against.

All voting counties approved the new State by thumping margins. The highest vote against the State was reported in Brooke County. The totals there were: 357 for and 154 against.

On the date of the voting on the new State, the people also elected delegates to the First Constitutional Convention, scheduled to start November 26, 1861, in Wheeling.

In the fall of 1861, amid the war and efforts to create the new State, Governor Pierpont spent much time writing and answering letters.

On September 3, he wrote to President Lincoln:

"I am convinced that the Confederate forces will exert the utmost of their power in western Virginia between this and December, perhaps in the next 30 days.

"There may be sufficient force in western Virginia to resist the rebels approaching, but I have my doubts on that point. Eight or 10 regiments of volunteer militia could be raised in western Virginia and Ohio and western Pennsylvania to occupy western Virginia.

"This would make a sure thing of what is now doubtful, and if western Virginia is held until December, it will be a death blow to secession in this region. The force I propose will be raw troops, but they are to meet raw troops.

"The policy of the rebels is to exert their greates force before frost, and it must be met by a corresponding vigor and crushed out."

Boreman wrote of a probable planned attempt on his life in a letter to Pierpont, dated November 11:

"I also see the name of a man named Middleton among the recent arrivals of prisoners from Kanawha County. * * * If he is the son of a Henry O. Middleton of Upshur County, then to say the least of him, he is a very bad man, as * * * I think (the son) was one of the leaders in the mob that wanted to hang me at Charleston in the early part of last June, because I was a Union man and had been making speeches over the country in opposition to secession.

"Had it not been for some gentlemen of Charleston—secessionists it is true—but friends of mine—this man Middleton and about 100 other men * * * would have no doubt mobbed me at least, and I am informed that they intended to take my life.

"I expect to be in Wheeling in the early part of December and should be glad to see the creature who wanted to take my life while I was engaged in my own business and not interfering with his or any that concerned him unless he is a traitor to his country."

Pierpont received a large amount of military correspondence. There were numerous requests for shoes, blankets, saddles, tentpoles and other equipment.

In his first Thanksgiving Day proclamation, recommending an observance on November 28, Pierpont said:

"Seed time and harvest have not failed; the early and the latter rain have fallen in their seasons and the toil of the husbandman has been abundantly repaid."

International Arrangements for Satellite Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House a very informative and timely speech delivered by George J. Feldman, who is one of the incorporators of the Satellite Corp. It is vital for our people to be informed of progress made in the satellite field and Mr. Feldman points out the international problems confronted by the Satellite Corp. The entire field of outer space is global in scope and we need to know the difficulties and problems faced by our various agencies dealing with this subject. Mr. Feldman is eminently qualified to speak on this matter. He was the director and general counsel of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space of the U.S. House of Representatives and also served on the Citizens Commission on NATO.

The speech follows:

INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

(Address delivered by George J. Feldman, April 12, 1963)

Last July 10, when Telstar went into orbit, communications via satellite literally entered the homes of millions of men and women. This historic event symbolized technical developments which open up unparalleled opportunities and will, in time, significantly affect the daily lives of people in many parts of the world. A new dimension has been added to communications by telephone, telegraph, radio and television.

Yet we must be on our guard against assuming that what has emerged as technical possibility will easily come to pass. The epochal achievements of Telstar and other experimental communication satellites are only a beginning. The realization of their promise is accompanied by legal, administrative, economic and international political problems, which do not lend themselves to rapid or ready solution.

As you know, the United States has led the way in satellite communications. My country has designed, made and launched all the communication satellites thus far. It has now moved forward to bring about a system of communications via satellite by act of Congress. Under authority of that act a unique corporate entity has been established and is moving into active life. Having taken this initiative and come so far, we have both as a practical matter and in the eyes of the world, assumed our share of responsibility for coping with the problems and have begun to do so.

Let us first review what has taken place, what vistas of accomplishment are in view.

As an idea, the communication satellite has a history of at least 20 years. The British author and rocket expert, Arthur C. Clarke, published a popular article on the subject as long ago as 1945. ("Extra-Terrestrial Relays. Can Rocket Stations Give World-wide Radio Coverage?" Wireless World, October 1945, pp. 303–308.)

But this idea was not advanced to experimental practice until less than 5 years ago. The world's first communication satellite, Project Score, was orbited in December of 1958 and transmitted a taped Christmas message from President Eisenhower. In August of 1960, the United States orbited Echo 1, a 100-foot plastic ballon, which, as a passive reflector, relayed the first two-way telephone conversation. Echo 1 was seen by millions of people in various parts of the world as a bright, fast-moving star, thus engendering an international community of shared interest in the event.

Since then, there have been several other successful communication experiments via satellite. The most dramatic was the demonstration of intercontinental live television via Telestar and Relay. The program was first transmitted from the United States and received and was shown in Europe, and then, with some national competitive spirit, programs were originated and transmitted to the United States from France, and the United Kingdom. The U.S. Information Agency reported that the effect of this overall demonstration was "as overwhelming as it was universal."

These triumphs of space engineering were accompanied by various discussions and pronouncements of policy. For example, on July 24, 1961, President Kennedy made a policy statement on communication satelites, declaring in part that the United States should provide opportunity for participation "through ownership or otherwise" to non-U.S. nationals and interests.

The policy, purpose and procedure for the United States was set forth in law in the Communications Satellite Act, approved by the Congress on August 31, 1962. This act, setting forth the national purpose of the United States, states:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable, a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

"The new and expanded telecommunication services are to be made available as promptly as possible and are to be extended to provide global coverage at the earliest practicable date. In effectuating this program, care and attention will be directed toward providing such services to economically less developed countries and areas as well as those more highly developed, toward efficient and economical use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum, and toward the reflection of this new technology in both quality of services and charges for such services."

The commercial corporation born under this act is itself without exact historical precedent. The President of the United States appointed its incorporators, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. The company will have the widest possible stock participation by the public. The domestic carriers will have a separate series of common stock participation. After the public stock issue, the board of directors will have six representatives of the public, six of the carriers, and three named by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The corporation will report to the President and the Congress. It will be answerable to its stockholders. It will work with various Federal agencies. Indirectly, it will be responsible to its consumers and to U.S. taxpayers at large.

Broad powers for realizing the objectives of the act are placed under the President of the United States who is to aid in the planning and development and the execution of the national program for establishment and operation "as expeditiously as possible" of a commercial communications satellite system. Under the President's supervision comes the coordination of the activities of governmental agencies with responsibilities in the field of telecommunication and such supervision over the relationships of the corporation which may be appropriate to insure consistency with the national interest and the foreign policy of the United States. Under the act the President shall transmit to Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive description of activities and accomplishments during the preceding calendar year under the national program.

With direct respect to foreign policy considerations a close relationship between the corporation and the Department of State is established. The relevant section of the act reads:

"Whenever the corporation shall enter into business negotiations with respect to facilities, operations, or services authorized by this act with any international or foreign entity, it shall notify the Department of State of the negotiations and the Department of State shall advise the corporation of relevant foreign policy considerations. Throughout such negotiations the corporation shall keep the Department of State informed with respect to such considerations. The corporation may request the Department of State to assist in the negotiations, and that Department shall render such assistance as may be appropriate."

As has been pointed out by Richard Gardner, U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, "although many problems are analogous to those which have been solved in connection with conventional communications systems, others raise questions that are quite new * * * different problems may require different kinds of arrangements—bilateral, regional, and multilateral."

In the relationship with other countries, there are such subjects and services as location, financing, and operation of ground terminals; use of the system for research and development; training of personnel; use of the system and its allotted channels for telephone, telegraph, data transmission, television, and other traffic; the question of division of revenues; relationship to other communication facilities, such as undersea cables, et cetera.

Each country concerned will have to determine its attitude toward these and other problems. Will they be contractors of the corporation? Will they wish to entertain joint ventures with the corporation and will they wish to participate in construction, launching, and ownership of the communications satellites? How will they use the service—as lessees, operators, distributors? And what of the scientific and technical contributions that will be made by the various participants?

By the nature of the state of the art and with the mandate that satellite communications "be made available as promptly as possible," the progress toward global communication will necessarily be evolutionary. Regional or bilateral point-to-point communication will come first. The United Kingdom and France, as noted, participated in the Telstar and Relay projects by building ground stations. Germany, Italy, and Japan have also built such stations, or are building them. In our host country, Canada, announcement has recently been made of plans for the building of an experimental ground station and the Scandinavian countries, acting together, also have announced similar plans for experimental ground station facilities. Economics and practicality would dictate that arrangements be made where they can be most effective to inaugurate the system.

The economics of satellite communication will be conditioned by the development of other communication forms. In that connection, the undersea cable is currently a booming industry and is expanding its available carrying channels for voice and written message. But world communication demands continue to rise with traffic projections higher than available communication possibilities exclusive of the satellite.

It may be noted in passing, that in the satellite, as in the new cables, there is a fusion of voice and written record, via this vehicle, bringing the telephone and telegraph into closer juxtaposition.

Cooperation on the international level, bilaterally and multilaterally, is a keystone of a successful communications satellite system and it is self-evident that the wider the range of the system, the more extensive will be the need for wider participation and agreement.

In that connection, the question is raised as to the role of the Soviet Union. Will it choose with its strong booster capability to launch a system of its own, or will it become an active participant? How will the political considerations be weighed by the U.S.S.R.?

The Soviet Union has agreed with the United States for cooperation in satellite weather forecasting. And just the other day, there was agreement in principle on the hot line communication channel link between Washington and Moscow for rapid communication. Will this go further?

The attitude of European countries is now under active discussion there. The European Launcher Development Organization is planning to build a booster capable of launching satellites. Eurospace, a West European Trade Association, has advanced a European communications satellite program. And the Conference of European Postal and Telecommunications Administrations, representing national governmental communications agencies, is considering what plan to evolve with regard to relationship with the U.S. system, with indications that it is working toward a proposal for cooperative arrangement.

In the United Kingdom, the Minister of Aviation has announced a decision to undertake a detailed design study for a communications satellite.

All the areas of interrelationship here and elsewhere will require much work in the complexity of economic, political, and technological factors.

The promise of the communication satellite has emerged in the United Nations. A resolution of December 13, 1962, stated the belief that "communication by satellite offers great benefits to mankind as it will permit the expansion of radio, telephone, and television transmissions, including the broadcast of United Nations activities, thus facilitating contact among the peoples of the world."

This resolution made reference to the forthcoming Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference to be held by the International Telecommunications Union, a specialized agency, in October 1963.

And the resolution considered "it of utmost importance that this Conference make allocations of radiofrequency bands sufficient to meet outer space needs."

There has been, from time to time, some talk of internationalizing satellite communications and turning its operation over to some supranational body, under United Nations auspices or otherwise.

I would oppose this suggestion, at least for the present and the immediate future, because its consideration could substantially delay the establishment of an operational system. It would also raise many novel and difficult questions and could lead to profound political, economic, and other consequences which cannot yet be foreseen.

The development of the communications satellite system is underway. It will involve intricate negotiation and arrangements, and there are many problems to be tackled. But technology has thrust greatness upon us and, as in some other manifestations of this technological revolution, we are summoned to the challenge.

Looking ahead we can see that our joint efforts can bring incalculable changes in education, entertainment, information, and, with hope, increased understanding. The volume of communication may be multiplied. There can be an increase in commerce and industry.

Technology continues to shrink our world. We draw closer together in travel time and speed of communication.

But, as ever, it's what we say and do, that counts. Perhaps more now than ever before.

A Tax Policy for Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Tax Policy for Economic Growth," delivered by me before the New Hampshire Associated General Contractors, at Concord, N.H., on April 19, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TAX POLICY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

(An address by U.S. Senator TOM McINTYRE, New Hampshire Associated General Contractors, Concord, N.H., April 19, 1963)

The most striking characteristic of the American economy has been its capacity to lift material standards of living and spread the fruits of progress widely throughout our society. Last year our output of goods and services exceeded $550 billion. If Daniel Webster had calculated the gross national product back in 1850, he would have found that it was $10 to $12 billion. We have had in the last 11 decades a fiftyfold increase in real income and the output of goods and services. The national rate of growth since 1850 has been about 3½ percent per year, a figure that we would do well to bear in mind

today. Had this Nation grown only at a rate of 3 percent per year, the gross national product in 1962 would have been $330 billion instead of $550 billion. A difference of one-half of a percent per year can be critical in deciding whether or not the potential of the United States is fulfilled in a time of serious challenge.

The single most disturbing development of recent years is the failure of our economy to approach the peak in using our productive capacity and the progress it enjoyed before 1957. In 1957 there were violent differences of opinion between the managers of the President's budget and the Secretary of the Treasury. The end result of the arguments was a reduction in Federal spending, dire predictions of recession, a cancellation of planned tax reductions, and tight money. The events of that year will be a subject of debate for some time to come. Blame may be fixed both upon an uncooperative Democratic Congress and a Republican administration that was dramatically divided over issues of economic policy. I say this not to discredit the past, but because we should be intelligent enough to learn from past experience.

Before 1957, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output. Since that time it has fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

Before 1957 those out of work barely exceeded 4 percent of the labor force. Since then unemployment has remained about 5 percent.

Before 1957 our total output, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent per year. Since 1957 the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

Today, lying idle and unused is productive capacity that could add some $40 billion a year of corporate income to America. Twenty billion dollars of that increase would be wages, whose payment would cut unemployment in half and add $10 billion per year to consumer demand. The economy has relaxed into sluggish cycles which have not plunged us into the depths of depression, but have not led us to the heights of confidence and expansion either.

The two critical elements in breaking out of the economic doldrums are consumer demand and industrial investment. By consumer demand we mean the money available for housing, or household goods, or services. If loans are available at low interest from banks, for example, then money is more freely available and consumer demand grows. From 1957 to 1962 consumer demand grew by 16 percent. A return to the 1957 rate of employment could add at least $10 billion to the money our families have to spend. Consumer demand is a way of referring to the size of the family market by indicating the amount of money available for purchases by families and individuals.

Fully one-quarter of American families have incomes so low that appliance, automobile, and housing expenditures are unattainable. Of course the overall Federal tax rate also has its effect upon all family income, drying up markets that would otherwise be available, and cutting into expenditures on food, clothing, automobiles, and housing.

There is another area of outstanding national need. This is the need to promote investment by business itself. While personal consumption increased 16 percent from 1957 to 1962, private investment on durable equipment and industrial construction actually decreased by 2 percent. In each year from 1958 to 1962 business investment has been smaller relative to overall national production than in any postwar year before 1958. This lack of industrial investment keeps us from employing our labor force at a satisfactory rate. There is no substitute for a high rate of private investment as a means for getting our economy moving.

From World War II to 1957, inflation was very favorable to industrial investment. Business had a high volume of liquid assets. Interest rates were low, and rising costs could be passed on in the form of rising prices. But after 1957 the situation was different. Profits declined, in part, because of rising labor costs and also because the level of economic activity was not high. While investment opportunities remained, the promise of profit was less. The cost of capital goods and construction rose relative to sale prices for consumers goods and this tended to depress the rate of return on investment. As the rate of inflation diminished, future profits from current investment were squeezed between steady prices and rising labor costs. Fewer and fewer business investment prospects could leap the hurdle of high tax rates. And so the rate of industrial investment declined. The profits squeeze in combination with the recession of 1957 explains the pattern of weakness in private investment over the last few years.

In both consumer demand and private investment, high tax rates have combined with other factors to slow down the economy. If all other conditions were sufficiently favorable, the obstacle of tax rates could be overcome, but that is not the case. Taxes are now the most powerful instrument that can be deliberately used to improve both the investment situation and consumer demand.

Under the circumstances I outlined before, the need for a tax cut is clear. We have a need for many things that could be produced by labor and capital and that would be bought with the incomes earned in their production. But we have erected a high wall between these resources and our needs, in the form of high rates of taxation that prevent resources from being used. We must bring down that wall and set free the resources of demand and investment.

A great deal of debate has been wasted in trying to say whether a tax cut should be centered on low income groups or upper income groups. While I think that meaningful reductions should be given in both the upper and lower brackets of personal income taxes, and also in corporate income taxes, the purpose of those cuts should be to spur consumer demand and industrial investment. Doing one without the other would be shortsighted. The overwhelming need, as I have made plain, is not to free money to the upper income brackets so that people will invest in business. What we need far more is a sufficiently large reduction in taxes paid by business so that funds will be available for investment by businesses themselves. This would mean new plants, new jobs, and new products in response to the larger consumer demand that would be created by cuts in personal incomes.

I also believe that the Federal Budget must be made to yield a surplus by 1965. To go back to our critical date of 1957, let me point out that in the 11 years preceding 1957 there had been seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The six succeeding Government fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all in fiscal 1959 ($12 billion), for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. And the reason for these deficits has been that the whole economy has not risen to a sufficiently high level. If there was a full employment today and full use of our industrial capacity, the present tax structure would yield an additional $10 billion in corporate taxes and an additional $10 billion in personal income taxes. This would permit an annual reduction in the Federal debt by more than $10 billion per year. But because of the sluggishness of business investment and consumer demand, that extra $20 billion simply isn't there. It lies on the other side of that wall of high taxes.

As a result the people are faced with a choice in policy in balancing the budget. Either the economy must rise closer to its potential capacity, expanding the tax base for greater yield of revenue, or the expenditures of government must be decreased and brought in line with the revenue we already have.

Now let me say this about budget deficits. The budget deficits before 1957 were not serious, because they occurred only at a few low points during a period of economic progress. Succeeding years of high activity wiped out the deficits and yielded a surplus. The budget must be balanced, but it should be balanced over the period of the business cycle itself. Then Federal policy would respond easily to the natural cycles of the whole economy, instead of an artificial accounting period. To build a higher tax wall when demand is sluggish is to condemn our working force to unemployment and tighten the strangling profits squeeze that is the cause of trouble. If there were a $5 billion deficit one year, it could be carried forward until the business cycle started up. When a $5 billion surplus is generated, that surplus should not be used to increase Government expenditure, but ought to be applied to the $5 billion deficit that had been carried forward. Government, like business, should be permitted to incur debts when money is in short supply. But it is sound government as it is sound business to apply a surplus to those debts as soon as possible. In this way the Federal budget can be kept in balance over each 2- or 3-year cycle of recession and expansion.

But the deficits since 1957 are serious. They are not being wiped out by surplus. They are adding to the national debt year after year. The business cycle has flattened out so that a low point is not followed by a peak to yield a surplus that can be applied to the deficits. So the choice arises between drastic curtailment of Government expenditure, or a tax cut to improve demand and promote investment. The difficulty we face is that a simple reduction in Government expenditures will not do the job of spurring the economy. And with Government expenditures continued high, a tax cut cannot do the job alone either. I therefore call for a simultaneous reduction in Government expenditure and a tax cut, so that if the budget cannot be balanced in 1964 it could show a surplus by 1965.

So I do not advocate solving all of our economic problems by immediately reducing Federal expenditures until they equal revenue, although some very noisy critics say we should. This is not the year to do so. We would only repeat the experience of 1957, perhaps with the awesome consequences we should all have been able to glimpse during the stock market tumble of last May 25. Second, it would leave the tax wall in place. Third, it would reduce the Government sector of demand, not only for construction but for procurement in support of needed space and defense programs.

Now I differ with some of the wide-eyed optimists on the effect of tax reduction all by itself. Just to reduce taxes will not spread enough wealth for the economy to yield sufficient revenue to bring the Federal budget into balance. This is really pulling yourself up on your own bootstraps. A straight tax cut of $10 billion would work its way out into the economy, be spent and respent, and eventually return to the Federal Government at a rate of some $4 to $5 billion per year. To be sure, this would stimulate demand, but not all of those dollars would return to the Government and we would be faced with a net loss. We would be using a direct subsidy to increase the size of the gross national product, but at great public expense.

That, as I see it, is the dilemma. A direct tax cut would throw the Federal budget further out of balance. A cut in Federal expenditures alone would lead to greater unemployment, less demand, and a downward spiral similar to that which followed the similar Government policy in 1957. I think I have demonstrated that the panaceas of the far right end of the far left are not suited to the needs of today. A tax cut alone would not cure all our ills. But an outright reduction in Federal expenditures without a tax cut, even if designed to balance the budget this year, would be even worse.

We must not permit the forces of depression and unemployment to dictate to the people of the country. If you closed down your garages and sold your equipment the first month you didn't have orders, you would be bankrupt in short order. It is defeatist and unsound business to let the bottom of the cycle dictate your plans. You hold onto that equipment and work for more orders. It's sometimes awfully tough to meet a payroll, but you know that you won't be able to bid on any projects at all if you lose all your workers. Well, America has lost orders, and we have lost workers, so the revenues of the Government have fallen off. Are we to permit this fact to dictate bankruptcy? This is the course now advocated by the rightwing in this country and it is as wrong for the public's business as it would be for yours.

I advocate a gradual tax cut on the order of $10 billion, spread over a 3-year period. In this way confidence would grow and industrial investment would increase, putting private dollars to work before the falloff in tax revenue was completed. The industrial base would grow, employment would increase, and consumer demand would rise, encouraging even more investment. In this way, increased tax revenues would match the tax reductions for each year. We cannot expect the Government to finance industrial expansion and economic growth all by itself. Not only do I have a preference for the use of private capital and initiative for this purpose, but I think the history of our economy shows there is no other way. With a tax cut to be completed in 3 years' time, Congress would create a promise of industrial expansion. The fulfillment of that promise in capital outlays and jobs would yield the tax revenues that we need to balance the Federal budget.

That is only one essential ingredient of the policy I recommend. The other is a reduction in Federal Government expenditure, not down to the level of this year's tax receipts, which would call for a reduction of $8 billion in Federal spending, but a reduction that would be sufficient to promote confidence among private investors and show that Congress means business in relating all programs of spending to our central needs. I think a reduction of $3 to $4 billion in the Federal budget for the coming fiscal year would serve that purpose. It is for that reason that I voted against the President's proposal to aid mass transit companies, a vote that could have saved this country $100 million this year. I would like to see further reductions in foreign aid, noncritical defense expenditures, proposed cotton subsidies, and other programs whose impact on our economic growth is small, and which have an adverse effect on business decisions. If the Federal budget could be cut to a level of $95 to $96 billion in expenditures, with a tax cut of some $2½ billion in the first year, we could lay the foundation for a surplus by 1965. Only in this way could we unleash the forces of the American economy. But I have no use for rash and intemperate calls for budget cuts too soon and tax cuts too late.

The course I have outlined, involving a 3-year tax reduction and a $3 billion cut in Federal expenditures, is the one which I think meets public needs for Federal spending and private needs for investment and tax reduction. There is yet another argument against drastic reductions in Federal programs and it is political in nature. By drastic reductions I mean the sort of reductions that reach through fat and start tearing away muscle, and it is such cuts that some rightwing prophets are calling for.

It is now only 6 months since the direct encounter between Soviet and American military systems in the Caribbean. It was a chilling experience for all of us, in which the question was whether the Soviet Union had learned the lessons of responsibility that accompany the vastness of thermonuclear power. The confrontation could have led to a war that would have destroyed human civilization. It did not, but other occasions will continue to arise until we have pressed our advantage home. Right now the forces of the Chinese Communist Army are marshalled among the Himalayan frontier of India. Berlin, Laos, and Cuba are potentially as explosive as they ever were. The forces of freedom in the world may be called to a showdown at any time. I do not like to emphasize the peril of our situation, but I think it my duty to do so. Under conditions of imminent total destruction war, it is for us who would lead the world, to maintain our strength and press forward as swiftly as possible to lay the foundations of peace. It is by answering the age-old challenges of hunger and disease that we will turn the balance of world conflict against the Communist empire. Communism feeds on the frustration of human hopes. Freedom shall triumph through their fulfillment.

The strains of heavy armaments and space are far more telling upon the Soviet Government than they are upon ours. The rate of Soviet industrial growth has declined sharply. Their military and space programs force heavy demands upon their scarce manpower resources and produce even greater strains upon their ability to produce goods. Recently large groups of African students have been leaving the Soviet Union, and returning home to describe their disappointment. Last June Mr. Khrushchev announced drastic increases in the price of meat and butter, and in October the Soviet Government announced the cancellation of a scheduled income tax cut, part of a promise to eliminate income taxes by 1965. Drastic cutbacks in rural construction have been announced. A lack of adequate investment, particularly in the use of chemical fertilizers, has led to persistent failures to meet agricultural production goals. Our unremitting pressure in reaching toward space and increasing our military preparedness is having its effect. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, attaches the greatest importance to our continued pressure on the Soviet economy. My friends, now is not the time to call off the race. Now is not the time to abandon our grim encounter with the Communist world.

Now is the time to increase our productivity, to attack the unemployment problem, and to put America back to work at the limit of her capacity. The burdens upon Federal Government revenues are large. I am sure you know that over two-thirds of the national debt has arisen from the expense of World War II and the Korean conflict. More than 70 percent of the Federal budget goes for defense, space, and interest upon the cost of past wars. These burdens, while heavy, are not overwhelming. They are a smaller percentage of our gross national product today than at any time since World War II began. I say we can bear these expenses until the Communist empire renounces its aim of world conquest.

If there is a political basis for this general economic program I have laid before you this evening, it is here. Who would dare advocate stagnation in America in such a time? Our economic offensive against the Communist world should lead them to foreswear conquest. Shall their economic offensive against us cause us to abandon the struggle? Our country, my friends, is a slumbering giant. To succeed in this ultimate struggle, our productive powers need only be set free.

Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished friend, the majority leader, has raised a question which is very important. I have tried to make it very clear throughout this whole debate that the major issue here is a matter of health. What the House passed on last year and what the gentleman from Indiana referred to was the general education program. This is not a general education program. It is a health program altogether, and it should be considered by this House and the American people as such, just like the hospital program, the research program, and the rest.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman agree with me that the bill that was enacted by the House of Representatives last year for increased aid for higher education, for public and private colleges, that passed here overwhelmingly, if it had finally become law could have made available funds for the construction of medical and dental schools as is contemplated by the bill now before us?

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that these schools would have been eligible for construction grants, just as medical and dental students have been eligible under the National Defense Education Act for loans. But anyone in the field of medical schools, health, and so forth, knows that these provisions are not suitable for health programs. They are designed for general education programs and they do not meet the needs of the medical requirements and the professional personnel of the country.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows of my high regard for him.

Mr. HARRIS. And mine for the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. If that bill that passed here in the House of Representatives last year had finally become law, and money by reason of that action had

become available to build medical or dental schools, does the gentleman mean to say to me that would not have been available for the teaching of medicine or dentistry?

Mr. HARRIS. I say to the gentleman that the requirements and the restrictions under the bill would not have met the needs of the medical and dental institutions in meeting the health needs of the American people, just as the National Defense Education Act loan provisions do not meet the needs of medical students. They are two entirely different programs. Furthermore, under that program, it is known that the Commissioner of Education would administer it. I contend and I think we all contend—that the reason this Committee has jurisdiction is that this is a matter for administration by the Surgeon General, and that is the official who should administer it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

The Lively Papacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, few documents of modern times have had such an electrifying effect as the encyclical of John XXIII entitled "Pacem in Terris." I think it would be hard for any educated human being, regardless of his faith, to read the encyclical without being moved by its eloquence, inspired by its call to order of the quarreling human family, and humbled by its admonition that the person who errs "retains in every case his dignity as a human being."

I think one of the best brief comments on the encyclical is the one by Emmet John Hughes which appears in the April 22 issue of Newsweek. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Apr. 22, 1963]

THE LIVELY PAPACY

(By Emmet John Hughes)

A smiling portly 81-year-old man, born Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, a son of north Italian peasants, last week gave all nations of the world—as his Easter present—something to think about. This explosive gift from perhaps the most genial of modern Popes was the encyclical of John XXIII quite innocently entitled "Pacem in Terris." It was not only intended to stir the minds of millions of all faiths. It was also designed to erase the smile from a few complacent Christian faces.

The stately language of "Pacem in Terris" hardly hides the boldness of its assertions and the vigor of its thrusts, for the eloquence oddly smooths the Pope's words to a finer edge—like swords that enter almost painlessly.

In plain Latin—he strikes at authoritarianism—as sternly on the political right as on the political left.

All 15,000 words of John XXIII disdain the stale slogans and cliches of contemporary political warfare—with not even one use of the word "communism." He proclaims the rights of man "universal, inviolable, and inalienable." He reaffirms the classic right of rebellion: "Insofar as it falls short of right reason, a law is * * * a kind of violence." He concludes: "Human society is realized in freedom." And such principles can expect roughly as much welcome in Franco's Spain as in Tito's Yugoslavia.

He scorns all economic doctrine fancifully returning to 19th century laissez-faire.

Audaciously, he lists as the first of human rights "the right to security." Explicitly, he catalogs its meanings: educational opportunity, just wage, health, housing, and a shield against the hazards of unemployment and old age. Fortunately, he needs no sanction from a conservative American Congress to propagate such radical notions.

He excoriates racial and national prejudice.

Within nations or between nations, the law of God and the nature of freedom are one: "All men are equal in their natural dignity." So, and "above all," there must be "the elimination of every trace of racism." And no arrogant form of nationalism—Soviet or Gallic or American—can defy the moral unity of "the human family * * * on the path toward the juridical-political organization of the world community."

He warns free society against parochial opinion-makers—either state-appointed censors or self-appointed oracles.

As for the individual: "Every human being has the right * * * to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions." As for mass media, the moral requisite is that they "be used with serene objectivity." And to journalistic as well as political institutions, the warning reads the same: the practice of calumny is scarcely worse than the pretense of omniscience.

He assails the shallow moralisms that can denature national policy and world diplomacy.

By his criteria, the diplomacy of the United States in the 1950's fares poorly. Two tests suffice:

(1) The "neutrality" of smaller nations—despised as "immoral" by Washington not many years ago—is affirmed by John XXIII as a "right" anchored by "the natural as well as international law."

(2) The conduct of "negotiation" with Soviet communism—so recently shunned by a U.S. diplomacy frantic to impose moral quarantine—is hailed by the Pope as a moral and political necessity "to discover better the bonds that unite."

He insists, finally, upon respect for the rights of all who may be wrong.

The warning rings urgently: "One must never confuse error and the person who errs * * * (for) he retains in every case his dignity as a human being." The call carries particularly to "traditionally Christian nations" viewing their own lives with limitless self-esteem. Glancing at their secular institutions, John XXIII tartly concludes that "not infrequently" they are "but slightly affected by Christian motivation or inspiration."

These and kindred pronouncements of a remarkable Pope may provoke more astonishment than they deserve. In a serious sense, four centuries of modern history stand behind them. A Catholic tradition rarely distracted, over those centuries, by the premises—or the promises—of an unbridled "free economy"—can greet a new age, more alert to the common weal, with a sigh of relief and recognition. And a Catholic tradition stubbornly fighting rampant nationalism, through those same centuries, can rejoice, too, in the renewal of Europe's and the world's ancient quest for political unity.

Thus, the slow sweep of modern history, rather than the sudden plaudits of enthused statesmen, endows "Pacem in Terris" with its grave and lasting meaning.

And one can imagine that—as John XXIII's words were read round the world, with joy by many and fury by some—the gentle smile on the round face had rarely been more full and knowing.

Foreign Policy Gimmick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, having been unsuccessful in most phases of our foreign affairs, President Kennedy thinks up gimmicks for easy solutions. One of these is a hot line to Khrushchev.

The Wall Street Journal, in its issue of April 16, analyzes how little this will help when the Kennedy administration lacks principle in foreign policy, too:

HOT LINE AND COLD WAR

If the statesmen aren't careful, they may get the proposed new hot line between Washington and Moscow badly clogged up. The United Nations headquarters indicates it would be pleased to be cut in, and presumably other capitals would like to get in on the act.

All this conjures up the somewhat silly picture of so many diplomats and interpreters babbling in their various languages that the communications link would be useless or worse for Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev. Yet the fact is that a great many people do attach a lot of importance to the hot line, as though it were a form of disarmament or a major new hope for peace.

Just why it should be necessary at all is not entirely clear. Communication between capitals is the reason for the elaborate embassies and all kinds of mechanical devices. If the hot line is to serve any purpose, it is as just that, one more tool which might come in handy in a new emergency.

But it does not bring real peace any nearer. If peace depended merely on communications, everyone could breathe easier. Nor does peace between America and Russia depend on the UN, though the peacekeeping organization has been known to undertake wars of its own. Whether the world can keep even the present uneasy peace depends instead almost solely on the intentions of the Communist rulers and how effectively the United States can deflect them from their unlimited ambitions.

It will not do a bit of good, for example, for a President to pick up a phone and try to talk Khrushchev into removing the rest of the Soviet troops from Cuba. Unless, that is, our military attitude and diplomatic demeanor have already made clear to him that we mean business. Unfortunately, after a good start last fall, the United States has not appeared particularly strong regarding Cuba; it is as though we were more fearful of endangering a Soviet soldier than anything else.

For similar reasons the United States finds itself confronting new problems in Laos, where fighting has resumed and only a most fragile truce presently prevails. Trouble was built into the initial settlement between the Communist and non-Communist forces, for the settlement was to form a coalition government which the Communists predictably have been trying to subvert or attack ever since.

No matter how much men may hope or dream of getting along with the Communists, that is almost bound to happen with these coalition governments. It is said that the United States had no choice in Laos, other than a difficult and wasting war, and this view may well be correct. But we can see today that the settlement did not settle anything, and it ought to be plain that no amount of communications improvements can solve such an intractable problem.

Even if Mr. Kennedy could persuade Mr. Khrushchev to call off the Laotian Communists, the circumstances may be beyond the Kremlin's control and much more up to Red China. We trust no one will think there is any point in adding Peiping to the hot party line.

Much of the confusion about the cold war stems, in fact, from mistaking gimmicks and gadgets for substance. If there is anything certain about disarmament, for instance, it is that the Soviets will not agree to safe and substantial measures until they believe their own national interest compels it. On that rock have foundered all the disarmament conferences for the past 17 years.

In short, if there is one thing the cold war has never lacked it is communications. The one thing it has never had is good will from the Communists. In that situation, a new link may do no harm, but it also does not remove any responsibility for keeping our defense and diplomatic line in the best repair.

Changing the Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, "Changing the Name" is the title of a historical article in the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail, on the origin of my State 100 years ago.

This article describes the debate over naming the new State, which was originally to be called Kanawha, an Indian tribal name related to our word for salt. Kanawha, already being the name of one county and two rivers in western Virginia, lost favor among the delegates to the First Constitutional Convention, held at Wheeling in November 1861. And although some delegates were against all ties with the mother State, a rollcall vote settled on West Virginia as the new State name.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the entire article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail]

CHANGING THE NAME: THERE WAS MUCH OPPOSITION TO NAME KANAWHA

(By John G. Morgan)

For more than 3 months, the people of western Virginia were reasonably certain that the name of their new State was to be "Kanawha."

The Indian name, meaning "Place of the White Stone" (salt deposits in the Kanawha Valley), was the choice of a five-man compromise committee at the second Wheeling convention.

The convention gave its approval in an ordinance adopted August 20, 1861. Further approval was given by the people in an election held the following October 24.

However, the convention and the people voted only on the issue of whether a new State should be formed. No direct vote was taken on the name itself.

After the election, considerable reaction against the name began to build among the people, especially in those areas far removed from the Kanawha Valley.

That reaction was reflected by the delegates attending the first constitutional convention, in session at Wheeling on December 2, 1861.

On that day, the clerk of the convention read this language in article 1, section 1 of an original document drafted for consideration by the delegates:

"The State of Kanawha shall be and remain one of the United States of America."

Some delegates immediately began to display their eagerness to amend the section by first striking out Kanawha and then inserting names of their choice.

Delegate Harmon Sinsel of Taylor made the first move to strike out Kanawha. He was seconded by Delegate John M. Powell of Harrison.

Delegate Peter G. Van Winkle of Wood asked for an explanation.

Sinsel said he preferred some name that would continue to link the proposed State with old Virginia. He added that he was born and reared in Virginia and that he liked the name, though many of its citizens had done wrong.

Delegate Granville Parker of Cabell, supporting Sinsel's motion, said the proposed State already had a large county and a pretty river named Kanawha. The same name for the State would cause confusion, he said. Also, the name had "no particular euphony," he added.

Delegate James H. Brown of Kanawha pointed out that the name was approved in the adopted ordinance and later ratified by the people.

Delegate Chapman J. Stuart of Doddridge said no one in his constituency liked the name of Kanawha.

Delegate Thomas H. Trainer of Marshall said a "more proper" name was needed.

Delegate Edward P. Mahon of Jackson declared that the people of his county had voiced their objections.

Delegate Daniel Lamb of Ohio said the people of western Virginia never had received anything but outrage and oppression from the eastern part of the old State.

"The principal boundaries are the Kanawha—the little and the big Kanawha," he said. "We are just pursuing the example which has been provided in a dozen or 20 instances around this country.

"But if Kanawha is stricken out, I do not want to see anything that has Virginia in it inserted in the blank."

Delegate Elbert H. Caldwell of Marshall said he stood for the name of Western Virginia.

U.S. Senator Waitman T. Willey, also a convention delegate, said Kanawha was a hard name to spell. [Laughter.]

"I have no objection to any name that is convenient," he added, "though I will say that in this case I think the rose would smell sweeter by some other name." [Laughter.]

Delegate Richard Lauck of Wetzel said "Loyal Virginia" would be a good name.

Delegate James W. Paxton of Ohio, in reference to the previous actions of the other convention and the people, asked: "Have we any right to change the name?"

Van Winkle commented:

"Sir, we are like the Israelites of old. We have crossed the Red Sea, and we have just entered upon the borders of the wilderness * * * before we reach the promised land.

"And, sir, as of old, the cry is going up: 'Would to God we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the fleshpots and when we did eat bread to the full.'

"Those gentlemen who are so tender for their old mother should be a little more magnanimous, sir, and when they are going to rob the old lady of her territory should not try to steal her name, too.

"If we have West Virginia or New Virginia, the world will think Little Virginia."

Van Winkle's remarks were classic as far as the convention was concerned. Thereafter they were reference material when any delegate wanted to accuse another of liking Old Virginia too much, of "hankering after the fleshpots of Egypt."

Delegate James H. Hervey of Brooke said he would vote for a change of the State name.

Stuart declared that the five people on the compromise committee shouldn't have the power to "stultify the voice of the people." In urging the name of West Virginia, he declared:

"It is a name I have listened to ever since I have been able to speak—that of West Virginia. It is familiar all over this broad land of our country—West Virginia. Something attaches to the name that ennobles us in the eyes of the country.

"I intend so far as I am concerned that we will have it. If we change the name and submit it to the people and they approve, there can be no technical objection."

Willey said that "with scarcely a dissenting voice," the 2,400 voters in Monongalia were dissatisfied with the name of Kanawha. He said he had no personal preference, but added:

"We have fought the fight under the name of West Virginia. We are known and recognized as West Virginia—on the continent, over the sea, in Europe, and everywhere.

"We are spoken of as West Virginia, and as men rising up in the majesty of our love of right and of liberty and of periling our lives and our fortunes and taking a stand in defense of our rights * * * we are not adopting the principle of old or east Virginia with the name. Such a conclusion is utterly illogical.

"We are standing by the principle upon which we have been fighting hitherto under the name of western Virginia; and we can stand as steadfastly and loyal hereafter."

Paxton again raised the question of the authority of the constitutional convention to vote against the ordinance.

Delegate Gordon Battelle of Ohio said his vote would be controlled by the ordinance. He declared:

"We are now forming a new State. I, for one, want a new name—a fresh name, a name, which if it were not symbolical of especially new ideas would at least be somewhat indicative of our deliverance from very old ones."

Suddenly the vote was taken to strike out Kanawha. The results: 30 for and 14 against.

Van Winkle moved to insert the name of Alleghany. Other delegates moved to insert Columbia and New Virginia. Confusion followed.

Caldwell gave notice that he would move to amend with the name of West Virginia.

"When we canont unite a knotty problem, it may be best to cut it off," Lamb remarked. He suggested voting by ballot, with each member simply writing in his choice.

It was later agreed to call the roll, with each delegate to answer by stating the name he preferred.

The results of the rollcall: 30 for West Virginia, 9 for Kanawha, 2 for Western Virginia, 2 for Allegheny and 1 for Augusta.

And so article 1, section 1 was amended to read:

"The State of West Virginia shall be and remain one of the United States of America."

After adopting the new name, delegates grappled with the difficult problem of fixing

a boundary for the proposed State. Debates on that subject lasted 10 days.

The discussions centered on a special committee report, which proposed that 31 counties be annexed in addition to the 39 already included in the adopted ordinance.

Some delegates wanted to move the eastern border to the Blue Ridge Mountains and thereby include the Shenandoah and other valleys in the middle section of Virginia.

Expansion in northeastern and southwestern directions was considered.

The practical value of mountain barriers during wartime, the natural flow of commerce and the extent of slavery in each county were among the factors given great weight in the discussions.

The attitude of the people in each county, whether they sympathized with the South or North, was a prime consideration. Delegates wanted to avoid including a county that might be overloaded with Confederates.

Ultimately, it was agreed to include 5 additional counties—Pocahontas, Greenbrier, Monroe, Mercer, and McDowell—bringing the total up to 44.

Provision was made for including more counties if the people in those areas voted to approve the new constitution.

Eventually approval of the original 39 and an additional 9 brought the total to 48 counties. Berkeley and Jefferson were annexed soon after the State was formed. In later years, five more counties were created within the State's borders.

On December 14, 1861, Delegate Battelle, the Ohio County minister, opened the proceedings with prayer and later offered the following resolution:

"No slave shall be brought into this State for permanent residence after the adoption of this constitution.

"The legislature shall have full power to make just and human provisions as they may be needful for the better regulation and security of the marriage and family relations between slaves, for their proper instruction; and for the gradual and equitable removal of slavery from the State.

"On and after July 4, 1863, slavery or involuntary servitude except for crime shall cease within the limits of the State."

The resolution was referred to a committee at the request of Battelle. No further action was taken.

Statement by Commission on Cancer on Smoking and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1963, the California Medical Association, through its council, approved a statement on the subject of smoking and health issued by the Commission on Cancer of the California Medical Association. At the same time, the council, which acts as the board of directors for the California Medical Association, passed a short resolution relative to steps which should be taken to publicize the statement of their Commission on Cancer.

The statement and resolution follow:

STATEMENT BY COMMISSION ON CANCER ON SMOKING AND HEALTH

The Commission on Cancer of the California Medical Association has observed with interest and concern, the accumulation of scientific information on the harmful effects of smoking on health. To date, the commission has not expressed a formal opinion, believing that the evidence speaks for itself. However, since silence may be interpreted incorrectly, the commission feels obligated to affirm that this growing body of data supports the claim that cigarette smoking and, to a lesser degree, other tobacco products, are serious health hazards.

In this short statement, there is neither need nor space to cite the many studies relevant to this conclusion. A number of official, voluntary and other scientific bodies have reviewed the evidence bearing on this association, and the interested physician is referred to them.

Of relevance here are the objections made to the epidemiological and other studies associating cigarette smoking and cancer of the lung. Each objection has been disproved, from the claim that the rise in lung cancer was the result of improved diagnostic ability to the statement that lung cancer was associated with an underlying somatic factor which caused both smoking and lung cancer. We can find no reason to modify the conclusion that the sum total of the evidence available today is most reasonably interpreted as indicating that cigarette smoking is a major causative factor in the increasing incidence of human carcinoma of the lung.

Much of the confusion and some of the objections have been based on a misunderstanding of the word "cause." Those who choose to use it as meaning that one event is always followed by a second event can say that lung cancer is not caused by cigarette smoking. However, causation in lung cancer is more complex than this and more accurately means that the incidence of lung cancer is more frequent in those who smoke than those who do not. Not all who smoke will get lung cancer, nor is it the only cause of lung cancer. This second definition is not new to medical science and is true for most biological events.

It is not the intent of this statement to suggest or recommend measures which would reduce the incidence of lung cancer. A habit so deeply ingrained in the population is not amenable to simple preachments. However, any situation which leads to 39,000 deaths in 1 year, a rate which will undoubtedly increase, is serious enough to warrant careful consideration by every physician. The benefits accrued from effective action will reduce suffering and loss of life, and demonstrate to the public how a profession accepts and meets its responsibilities.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, MARCH 27, 1963

RESOLUTION NO. 36

Resolved: That the California Medical Association takes steps on a Statewide basis to publicize, particularly in schools and homes, the harmful effects of cigarette smoking.

Some Straight Thinking on the Tax Reduction and Tax Reform Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it will not be long until the Ways and Means Committee reports out a bill on tax reduction and tax reform. In this connection, I am moved to call attention to a letter which I received recently from a constituent of mine, Mr. R. N. Hoerner, Jr., vice president of marketing, research, and development, Hoerner Boxes, Inc., Keokuk, Iowa.

Mr. Hoerner has done some serious thinking on the proposal and has come forward with some observations which will be of value to all of us as we consider any bill of this type.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the letter which Mr. Hoerner wrote me on this issue:

HOERNER BOXES, INC.,
Keokuk, Iowa, March 14, 1963.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: I have just returned from an extended trip and am beginning to notice with some alarm some of the proposed changes in our tax structures. I suppose that you have received thousands of letters on this by this time so I would like to direct my remarks to two contemplated revisions which I feel would be not only damaging to the economy, but also in direct counterpurpose to the direction which the present administration has said they intend to go.

The first one has to do with the attempt to tax at straight income rates all lump-sum payments from profit sharing and retirement trust funds. It is very difficult for me to understand how the administration can propose a thing like this when not too many months ago they were proclaiming from the housetops that they wanted increased care for the aged in the form of medical payments to them out of social security. These payments which are made from profit sharing and retirement trust funds directly to individuals at the time they retire from their respective jobs, or at some earlier date depending on the specific arrangements of the different plans, could certainly go to pay the medical care, or anything else for that matter, and now the administration is proposing that we tax those payments on a straight income basis so that there will be less money in the hands of those people. Then they propose that we turn around and increase payments from social security to cover these medical expenses. This seems like a lot of fund juggling with nothing accomplished but a larger function for the administrative branch of our Government. I would also suggest that this harms the person who is depending upon his profit sharing and retirement plan to do certain things for him and now suddenly finds that because of a change in the tax law his plans are not now adequate to meet his future obligations. If he is conscientious about it, then this would mean that he would have no choice but to reduce his present living standard in order to provide security for himself in his old age. But this type of saving or investment would not be in the risk category, which brings me to the next point.

There is apparently an attempt to force capital gains payment on the transfer of all property, either through gifts or through estates, in addition to the now present gift and estate taxes. There is, of course, the old argument that this is a confiscatory tax which would deprive a person of some of the rights of owning property. What it actually does is to erode the principle of private ownership of anything. I hesitate to mention this because I am sure that this principle is being reiterated millions of times and I only do so because I happen to believe in it and think that it is true. And I believe that this policy impinges upon two factors which the present administration says that it supports. It seems to me that this action would certainly discourage private risk tak-

ing investment. Why should a man invest his money and say that, when he can't really pass it on or do what he wishes. But the present administration says that it supports risk-taking investment and that is one of the principal reasons why it is seeking a tax cut.

The second and corollary point is, that without this sort of investment our growth rate is going to become slower and slower and lower and lower. I should think that what we would be wanting to do would be to encourage, nurture, and foster this system of economy which our country has invented. But in my opinion these types of proposals do the very opposite and naturally when you throw a monkey wrench into a machine it just doesn't function the way it was supposed to. It may be unfortunate, but it is certainly true, that risk capital comes from people with high incomes who can afford to take the risk. You will find that responsible people do not advise a man of limited means to make investments with a high degree of risk. And yet it is these types of investments which can grow very rapidly and which can really help our economy.

It would seem then that because of the above two points, that some of the others which are being proposed such as the 5 percent limit before gifts can be declared as deductions, that the proposed tax cuts will not do what the administration says it is trying to do with them—which is to promote investments of risk taking nature. It would lead one to conclude that there is a lot of lipservice being paid to this sort of an idea but that the guts are being taken out of it by some of these proposed tax revisions. What surprises me is that eleemosynary institutions of this country are not really up in arms about some of these proposals because I would certainly think that they would be damaging to the income source of these institutions. And this is another reason why it is very easy to be pretty critical of these proposed tax revisions.

I think that a reduction in taxes is fine. And I would certainly agree that the method of taxation needs a careful reappraisal. But I do not agree that it needs a reappraisal in the light of socialistic thinking. I agree that economic growth must come partly from investment and that investment should be so encouraged. But I am also a great believer in incentives, and I believe that the incentive to invest has been already shackled to some degree by our present tax structure and the proposals being put before Congres at this moment will tend to shackle them further.

I hope that you will get to read at least a part of this letter because I realize now it is too long to ask any busy man to wade through. But it does express my point of view and I hope that you will give it some consideration.

Sincerely,

R. N. HOERNER, Jr.

Union Leader Unfair to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a proverb in reverse: "Do as I say, not as I do." This could apply to Mr. David Dubinsky, head of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, who apparently does not want his staff to become unionized. The National Labor Relations Board thought differently.

The New York Herald Tribune comments on Mr. Dubinsky's being unfair to unorganized labor:

A LAUGH ON DUBINSKY

In that case of a little union within the big International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, the National Labor Relations Board has slapped down David Dubinsky's big union.

ILGWU argued that union officers weren't a proper unit for collective bargaining, and even fought these dissenters to the extent of holding up their merit pay increases. But the NLRB has upheld the staff union and found ILGWU guilty of unfair labor practices.

The curious part, of course, was that the Dubinsky union, with its long and valiant record, should have fought against letting its own staff organize. But this was taken as an intolerable thorn; the record of attempted repression is quite clear. In short, ILGWU couldn't take it when an issue of labor's rights erupted in the family kitchen.

Even now the big union is making noises about going on to the Supreme Court, for it professes to be intensely aggrieved. So far, though, the Federation of Union Representatives, for all its difficulties, has carried off the victory. And this, at minimum, is cause for amusement.

Mr. Dubinsky, it seems to us, should admit to himself that ILGWU, as a champion of labor, doesn't look good in losing this one. For this is the prime paradox—that this union, of all unions, is found unfair to labor.

Studies in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the news of selected price increases by the steel industry is met with the expected frown from the White House and the expected national interest and commentary.

Typical of the enlightened comments made by the international press is an editorial which appeard in the Chicago Sun-Times, Tuesday, April 16, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

STUDIES IN STEEL

Intended, perhaps, as a go slow warning on price increases by the steel industry, President Kennedy has ordered a White House study of the increases announced Sunday by the Lukens Steel Co. This was followed yesterday by an announcement by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, that the Senate-House Economic Committee, which he heads, will make an investigation into the steel industry's prices, profits, and production problems.

An impartial congressional investigation could make a useful contribution to public understanding of the squeeze in which America's steel industry finds itself.

We cannot say the same of Mr. Kennedy's inquiry into the Lukens increase to determine what percentage of Lukens' output would be affected by the price increases. The company has said the boosts would affect less than half its production. The White House, apparently, is skeptical of this figure.

Mr. Kennedy thus gives the impression that the White House intends to sit in judgment on every steel price increase that companies see fit to make. The wrath and retribution that flowed from the White House when steel raised prices a year ago are still fresh in memory. Mr. Kennedy set up a new and reasonable presidential attitude on steel price rises last week when he said:

"I realize that price and wage controls in this one industry while all others are unrestrained would be unfair and inconsistent with our free market economy * * * selective price adjustments, up or down, as prompted by changes in supply and demand, as opposed to across-the-board increases, are not incompatible with a framework of general stability and steel price stability and are characteristic of any healthy economy."

This pronouncement obviously was intended to give Presidential blessing to the first price increase made by Wheeling Steel Corp. last week. And while conciliatory, it is still no more than a Presidential attitude. It has no force of law, and there is no obligation or power in the President's Office to see that the steel industry conforms to it.

The law of the marketplace and the law of supply and demand still are, or should be, the governing factors in setting the price of steel. Competition or a falling off of demand may yet force the companies to reconsider even selective price increases.

We hope some of the witnesses at the upcoming congressional investigation into the steel industry will remind both Capitol Hill and the White House that Congress has as yet passed no law giving the President the right to impose his will or economic philosophies on industry. The President has pointed out the national interest in overall price stability. The national interest also is served in letting the free-enterprise system work unhampered by a heavy Presidential hand.

Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support restoration to the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1963 of $450 million to finance public works projects pursuant to the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962.

In 1962 the House of Representatives authorized $900 million and in that year we appropriated the first $400 million to get the public works projects underway in a great effort to meet the problem of unemployment in the United States. If we appropriate $450 million today we will but fulfill the expectation we created in 1962, namely, that we are concerned with unemployment and that we will do something about it. That is the issue facing us now. We have an opportunity to relieve the stress of unemployment in seriously depressed areas in the United States and to construct useful and meaningful public work projects throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I will support a restoration of $450 million to the supplemental appropriations bill and I urge each Member of the House of Representatives to support it as well.

The Men of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, 61 delegates framed the constitution of the newly born State of West Virginia over 100 years ago. An article by John G. Morgan in the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail's historical series tells us about these men.

The article describes the delegates to the First Constitutional Convention for the proposed new State, which opened at Wheeling on November 26, 1861. As reported by the very astute secretary of the convention, a Mr. Ellery R. Hall, the description gives us a lively impression of this remarkable body of men, most of whom were farmers, lawyers, and ministers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article by Mr. Morgan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEN OF THE CONVENTION

(By John G. Morgan)

Most of them were well dressed. Much black cloth and a few satin vests were in evidence. One man wore a blue coat with brass buttons. Another displayed a sparkling watch chain and a gold ring.

They were mostly farmers, lawyers, and preachers. They were eminent and obscure, well educated and uneducated. They were the makers of a constitution for a proposed State in western Virginia.

This unusual assembly of men gathered at 11 a.m., November 26, 1861, in the U.S. courtroom of the customhouse at Wheeling. They remained in session 85 days and then reconvened for 9 more days a year later.

On this first day of this First Constitutional Convention, 37 delegates attended. The number gradually increased until a total of 61 men participated in the 2 sessions.

Among the 61 were 21 farmers, 17 lawyers, 8 ministers, 4 physicians, 3 merchants, 2 mechanics, 2 school teachers, 1 salt manufacturer, 1 hotel keeper, 1 bank cashier, and 1 carpenter.

In addition to the eight ministers, there were at least six lay preachers, or "exhorters," who were classified under their regular occupations. The presence of this group, plus the fact that virtually all of the delegates were church members, placed a strong religious influence on the work of the convention.

The delegates were from 24 to 66 years of age. One of them was a native of Ireland. Six were born in Pennsylvania, three in New York, two in Ohio, two in Massachusetts, and one in Maryland. The others were natives of Virginia.

They were big and small, handsome and homely. Some had pretty whiskers, others had ordinary beards or mustaches, and a few were clean shaven.

They were bushy haired, gray, and bald. They had large and small noses. They had little, piercing eyes and large, luminous eyes. Some wore spectacles all or part of the time.

A number of delegates further distinguished themselves by their speeches, facial expressions and mannerism.

Ellery R. Hall, the 27-year-old secretary of the convention and a talented writer, gave his impressions of most of the delegates in word sketches printed in the Fairmont National, a contemporary newspaper.

Among the most prominent delegates were the following, listed with minimum statistics, plus kernels of information written by Hall:

Peter G. Van Winkle: 53, Wood County lawyer. Very large, portly, good-looking man; eyes very large and blue, nose prominent, mouth large, chin small and doubled, cheeks broad and fleshy, neck large, ears small, not much hair on his head, combs what little he has on the sides over the top and succeeds rather badly in hiding a splendidly formed head. Probably the best statesman in the convention, excellent speaker, writer, debater, looks like a good eater, dresses well in black cloth, wears a standing collar, very ordinary looking spectacles. A "whale" in the convention, being among the largest in more senses than one.

Waitman T. Willey: 50, Monongalia lawyer and a loyal U.S. Senator. A very tall, elegant, dignified gentleman, clean shaven, with brilliant eyes, bony arms. Most eloquent man in the convention. Has a peculiar voice with a pleading, trembling quality that carries great powers of persuasion. (He and Van Winkle later were elected as the first two U.S. Senators from West Virginia.)

William E. Stevenson: 40, wood farmer. Medium size, dresses plainly like a farmer. Thick dark hair, bright blue eyes, a little beard and high cheekbones. A standing collar, a very thoughtful face, denoting study and intellectual labor; one of the best debaters and clearest thinkers in the convention. (The future third Governor of West Virginia.)

James H. Brown: 42, Kanawha circuit judge (later a supreme court judge). Tall, sallow-visaged man, black hair and whiskers, long face. Put down by most members as the "smartest man in the convention."

John Hall: 56, Mason farmer. The lone Irishman who was elected president of the convention. Heavy set, well built, active and intelligent; a round, jovial Irish face; hair gray, forehead high and broad; eyes large and sparkling with mirth, mouth large, chin round, cheeks wrinkled with age, complexion florid, and countenance radiant with humor * * * for many a joke has he.

Abraham D. Soper: 66, Tyler lawyer. Oldest man in the convention. Hair white and thin, face wrinkled, but florid and radiant; eyes bright and intelligent, countenance sad and thoughtful, exceedingly active, walks like a young man, speaks well, venerable appearance. Elected president during the second session of the convention.

Daniel Lamb: 51, Ohio bank cashier. The new State's first codemaker. Small man with light hair and beard, a very pleasant countenance, eyes large and clear, sparkling with intelligence, lawyer by education, probably the best in the convention. Writes a most beautiful hand. Poor voice for speaking, not much oratorical power, but what he says is ready for the printer.

Gordon Battelle: 47, Ohio minister. Hearty, good-natured looking man; round-faced, spectacles; thick, bushy hair; wears black cloth of excellent quality. Chaplain of First Virginia Regiment, a man of fine education, pulpit orator first class.

Benjamin H. Smith: 63, a resident of Kanawha but a representative of Logan, lawyer. One of the finest looking old gentlemen in the State; tall, heavy set, large frame, pretty fleshy, small piercing eyes; flat, broad face, small mouth and nose, large head and hair short and as white as snow; short white beard under his chin.

Chapman J. Stuart: 41, Doddridge lawyer. A small, round-faced gentleman with long, bright, sandy hair. Countenance betokens much study and deep thought. Eyes small, blue, and piercing. Sometimes wears black cloth but often indulges in a blue, homemade jeans coat. A pleasant vein of wit and a fair proportion of sarcasm. A member of the Richmond and Wheeling conventions, a State senator.

James W. Paxton: 40, Ohio merchant and bank president. Finest looking man in the convention. Six feet, four inches, exceedingly graceful in his proportions, whiskers all over his face; dresses well, speaks little, but clearly, distinctly, and positively, without any attempt at oratory.

Lewis Ruffner: 64, Kanawha salt manufacturer. A man of excellent sense and considerable education. Makes himself useful as a member of the House of Delegates and the convention. Brother of Dr. Henry Ruffner, who wrote the antislavery pamphlet.

The other members of the convention, listed alphabetically, with Hall's impressions given for most of them:

John Boggs: 48, Pendleton farmer. Owns slaves and large tract of land.

Richard Brooks: 52, Upshur minister. Especially interested in the establishment of free schools.

John J. Brown: 35, Preston lawyer. A sharp-featured gentleman with short, thin whiskers, wears a blue coat with brass buttons. Prepossessing in appearance, agreeable.

William W. Brumfield: 33, Wayne farmer. The prettiest whiskers in the convention and one of the most handsome men.

Elbert H. Caldwell: 52, Marshall lawyer. Looks like an Episcopal minister or a Presbyterian elder.

Thomas R. Carskadon: 24, Hampshire farmer. Youngest member of the convention. Wears blue spectacles.

James S. Cassaday: 40, Fayette farmer. Quiet, soldierly-looking. Holds a position in the Army.

Henry D. Chapman: 63, Roane physician. Quite gray, lame; says nothing but votes sound for the Union.

Richard M. Cook: 41, Mercer farmer. Long, heavy, and sandy hair. Sharp, prominent features, florid complexion.

Henry Dering: 50, Monongalia merchant. A fine looking man, a little gray; beard under chin, dresses well.

John A. Dille: 40, Preston lawyer. Perhaps the most ardent new State man. Tall, not very pretty.

Abijah Dolly: 44, Hardy farmer. Looks and talks like farmer. (He was the father of 18 children—nine by each of two wives.)

David W. Gibson—32, Pocahontas physician. Served as a physician in the Union Army during most of the war.

Samuel T. Griffith: 32, Mason physician. A replacement in the 2d session. His child was named West Virginia Griffith.

Robert Hagar: 51, Boone minister. A circuit rider with little education and excellent sense.

Eprhaim B. Hall: 39, Marion lawyer. Tall, dresses well. Speaks earnestly but sometimes tediously.

Stephen M. Hansley: 42, Raleigh farmer. Small man who wears spectacles. Never speaks except to vote.

Thomas W. Harrison: 37, Harrison lawyer. Disciple of Blackistone, tolerably tall, hair stands straight up.

Hiram Haymond: 55, Marion farmer-merchant. A brother of a secessionist, but faithful among the faithless.

James H. Hervey: 41, Brooke lawyer. Long whiskers tinged with frost. Pleasant, agreeable.

Johanis Hoback: 26, McDowell teacher. Little, athletic, round faced, black hair, eyes and mustache.

Joseph Hubbs: 54, Pleasants farmer. Plain, honest looking, intelligent farmer.

Robert Irvine: 47, Lewis lawyer. Long hair, thin and slightly gray. Very long coat, reads with spectacles.

Richard Lauck: 49, Wetzel lawyer. Clean shaven, very sociable, good talker.

Edward P. Mahon: 45, Jackson farmer. Small man with brown hair and whiskers. Has appearance of well-to-do farmer.

Andrew W. Mann: 29, Greenbrier farmer. A trainmaster in the Union Army, later raised company of home guards.

John R. McCutcheon: 51, Nicholas farmer. Small, sharp face, brown hair, Spectacles, black cloth and satin vest.

Dudley S. Montague: 61, Putnam hotelkeeper. Can keep a good hotel, which he does at Red House Shoals on Kanawha River.

Emmett J. O'Brien: 42, Barbour mechanic. Tall, sharp face, long nose. Wears low-crowned, wide-brimmed hat.

Granville Parker: 51, Cabell lawyer. A humorous fellow, gestures much, something of the theatrical in him. A writer.

James W. Parsons: 49, Tucker farmer. Tall, stoop-shouldered, long face. Standing collar and black cloth.

David S. Pinnell: 50, Upshur physician. Former storekeeper and mill owner. (Later speaker of the House.)

Joseph S. Pomeroy: 40, Hancock minister. Lively, bushy-haired man, rather portly. Talks loudly, sensibly.

John M. Powell: 36, Harrison minister. Small, delicate man; mild, low forehead, bright eyes, black cloth.

Job Robinson: 45, Calhoun farmer. Tall, heavy sandy hair and whiskers, large mouth and nose; good clothes.

Andrew F. Ross: 47, Ohio teacher. Held chair of ancient and modern languages at Bethany College 17 years.

Edward W. Ryan: 25, Fayette minister. Noted evangelist. Made two trips to the Holy Land.

George W. Sheets: 38, Hampshire carpenter. A good fellow, mild, inoffensive and intelligent; smooth face.

Josiah Simmons: 47, Randolph farmer. Long sandy hair, short whiskers. Doesn't trouble the convention much.

Harmon Sinsel: 44, Taylor mechanic. Luxuriant beard, very large head filled with knowledge. Tenacious in his opinions.

Benjamin Stephenson: 35, Clay farmer. Not bad looking, nice black whiskers, small eyes, sharp nose, dresses well.

Benjamin F. Stewart: 52, Wirt merchant. Dark hair, eyes, and whiskers; dresses in fine cloth and satin. Wears a sparkling watch chain and gold ring.

Gustavus F. Taylor: 26, Braxton lawyer. Handsome little fellow with goatee; green cravat and black cloth.

Moses Tichnell: 56, Marion minister. A veteran circuit rider who developed rheumatism.

Thomas H. Trainer: 42, Marshall minister. Chaplain in Infantry unit organized at Wheeling. Large, affable man, black whiskers.

William Walker: 34, Wyoming lawyer. Served with Army Cavalry.

William W. Warder: 40, Gilmer farmer. Very black and pretty whiskers. Honest, true Union man.

Joseph S. Wheat: 60, Morgan farmer. A former civil engineer and tanner.

Archbald J. Wilson: 60, Ritchie farmer. Wears wig, spectacles, and black cloth. Good natured.

Cedar Creek Watershed Project, Twin Falls County, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at a time when many of our Federal employees are being severely criticized for their activities with various Federal agencies as being an unwarranted and unwanted interference with local and State problems, it was particularly gratifying to me to receive a letter from one of my constituents in which he offers high praise and commendation to several departments and agencies of the Federal Government and their employees for the assistance given to his community.

The letter refers to the Cedar Creek watershed project in Twin Falls County, Idaho. This is a rehabilitation program for the water supply used on the more than 5,000 acres on the Roseworth tract. It was initiated by the Cedar Mesa Reservoir & Canal Co., and the Twin Falls Soil Conservation District with the assistance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, and ASC, as well as the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and Fish and Wildlife Service. The Idaho State Department of Reclamation is also assisting in the project.

The original project was constructed over 40 years ago and the land reclaimed from the desert by the early pioneers. The project has long suffered from a lack of sufficient water and the situation has been compounded in recent years by the state of disrepair of the canal system. Much valuable water was lost before ever reaching the tract because of the leaks in the present flume. Thanks now to the efforts of the farmers on the project and the assistance of several Government agencies, the irrigation system is being rehabilitated under the provisions of Public Law 566, the Small Watersheds Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 12, 1963.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Federal Building, Boise, Idaho.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: It is timely to report to you that on December 5 last the final documents were executed preliminary to formal launching of our Cedar Creek watershed project which has as one of its objects the rebuilding of the Roseworth Irrigation Works. Since then, a contract for 54-inch concrete pipeline to replace the outworn flume and concrete ditch has been awarded and bids for installation of this pipeline are to be open next week on April 3.

This occasion has given rise to some reflections about the means for its accomplishment. I am appalled by the time and effort demanded of many able people and by the sheer expense, for mere promotion of a project whose merit and economic worth were easily and quickly established several years ago. On the other hand, I am warmed by awareness of the good will and help extended to us by many busy men, some of whom (I feel sure) we do not even know.

You and Mr. HARDING served us well. Without your and his help I do not believe we could have been successful in organizing this project. You both deserve the lasting appreciation and respect of every Roseworth farmer and also of the entire county, whose economy is vitally affected. To a substantial degree your and Mr. HARDING's concern for Idaho's progress is known, but I would be remiss in not emphasizing its importance here.

Many others have helped us. I cannot name them all, but the following have been prominently involved and their contributions should be acknowledged.

The Soil Conservation Service designed this project and has shaped it to our needs from the beginning. Withal, their basic attitude has been detached, as it should be. They have said in effect: "We have faith in Roseworth and believe you may be able to qualify under the Small Watersheds Act, Public Law 566, for Federal aid in solving your watershed and irrigation problems. If and when you make it clear to the Service that our asistance is desired, we will help you to develop a program." Their engineer, Clarence Hedrick, proposed this approach to me; the local soil conservation district agreed to sponsor a comprehensive program under Public Law 566 and their chairman, Glen Nelson, has been zealous in our behalf. Douglas Hole, Soil Conservation Service engineer, now transferred to Hawaii, was persistent and very effective in preparing the work plan and influencing its acceptance in Washington. But these efforts in themselves would not have prevailed had we lacked the continuing interest and support of our entire Soil Conservation Service staff in Idaho, from Lee Morgan, director, to Forrest Closner, area conservationist, Jack Walker, project engineer, and their several able associates.

George Carter, State reclamation engineer, interested himself in our program and was instrumental in obtaining adoption of one vital improvement in engineering design.

Our State office of Farmers Home Administration has made it their business to insure that we obtained all possible consideration under Federal regulations for financing the project and, out of their broad experience, they have advised us in setting up a fiscal plan and necessary controls. Messrs. Max Hansen, director, A. J. Passey and Glen Barker personified our business with this agency. Beyond them, we suspect others must have examined our problems with sympathy, but they are anonymous and we can only guess the extent of their contribution. The important factor is, I believe, that this agency took the positive position, in effect: "We have studied the Roseworth operations, believe them to be economically sound and will make available to the community our support and help in shaping financial plans to implement the required construction. Bring to us questions and problems and we will work together with you to devise a program for your purpose which will also qualify under our regulations." This they did, generously and effectively.

Inevitably questions of rights-of-way were encountered. The Bureau of Land Manage-

ment told us very simply and directly, "We believe your objectives to be constructive, sympathize with your aspirations and will help you where we can." This they have done, with a minimum of fanfare. Messrs. Mike Solan and Bill Mabutt are the individuals with whom we dealt and they have been unreserved in their efforts on our behalf. I trust we may continue to enjoy this agency's invaluable support.

Within our Twin Falls community, Harry Eaton, president, Twin Falls Bank & Trust Co., has supported our plans from the beginning. He has used his influence where it was needed and his associates have advised us with respect to fiscal problems. Messrs. Shields and Rangen, of Buhl, and Bill Grange, manager of the Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce, have supported our efforts and particularly, they have certified to the importance and economic soundness of the Roseworth agricultural operations. The Twin Falls highway district has explored with us what measures will be required to transport heavy construction traffic over light duty roads and are cooperating generously to meet these special problems.

It is proper to rail against the dictatorial methods of bureaucratic administration, sometimes with good reason. However, throughout the promotion of this project, the ideal of public service has been exemplified to a noteworthy degree. This has been a reassuring experience of considerable importance and I am gratified that it can be recorded here.

On behalf of the Roseworth community, as well as on my own account, I thank you and Mr. HARDING and also our many other friends for believing in us and for supporting our aspirations.

Sincerely,

W. B. ARNESS.

Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want the RECORD to show that there are Members of this House who are acutely aware of that need without recognizing the Federal Government as the way to solve it. I think this shows once again failure of the liberal doctrine that we can bury everything with money. There are those of us who feel there are private means of doing that, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] pointed out on the floor when he said that this bill may ultimately destroy the very cure and hopes of those who would solve the problem of medical education. We say that the need can be met privately, without Federal aid.

I simply want the RECORD to show that I and many others do not believe we can solve it by throwing the Federal Government into this program.

Address by Mr. Earl V. Wise, Jr., at Groundbreaking Ceremonies for a New Wise Potato Chip Co. Factory at St. Augustine, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to enclose a copy of a talk that was made by Mr. Earl V. Wise, Jr., on the occasion of the groundbreaking ceremonies for a new Wise Potato Chip Co. factory in St. Augustine, Fla., which is in my congressional district.

The Wise Potato Chip Co. is another one of the many Horatio Alger stories of the success of private enterprise in America. From a small beginning 42 years ago, Mr. Earl V. Wise, Sr., began making potato chips on his mother's kitchen range. As a result of hard work and the practice of diligent and persistent merchandising policies, this small beginning has now flourished into one of the biggest operations of its kind in the country. We are delighted to have this business operation in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, and I was glad to welcome Mr. Earl V. Wise, Jr., personally to St. Augustine this past week.

Mr. Wise's address at the groundbreaking ceremonies follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. EARL V. WISE, JR., AT GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONIES FOR A NEW WISE POTATO CHIP CO. FACTORY AT ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

Mr. Maltby, Congressman Matthews, Mayor Lindsley, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, no words can adequately convey the feeling of gratitude that we must have for the welcome you have given Wise Potato Chip Co. It is not so much the extraordinary kindness that you have all so eloquently expressed here today, as the many actions and deeds that we have seen in bringing this moment into fruition.

The site that we are about to dedicate is more than just a mere new plant, it is testimony to the dreams and ambitions of all of us here to fulfill a promise of our time; to make us as one with our era. Progress is one of our Nation's greatest commodities. The intelligent and fruitful use of our time and energies in making that progress meaningful and profitable should be the 20th century goal for all Americans.

The building of a potato chip plant here is a small and perhaps insignificant contribution to the mainstream of growth of American industry and to the economic security of our Nation. I cannot help but feel with some measure of pride, I might add, that however small a contribution, it is still part of that American industrial mainstream.

Our decision to build our new plant on this spot was in no way arbitrary. It was the result of considerable thought, analysis, and judgment. Our company is not a stranger to St. Johns County and to St. Augustine. We have been partners for many years. I use the word "partners" advisedly. Our company is in the potato business and our main product is a potato product. You here in St. Johns County are also in the potato business. Industrially we are related. Our decision to locate here has merely been a decision to move in with our relatives. Aside from the commercial considerations of our decision, I know that we will reside together for many years to come; happily, profitably, and successfully.

Many of you here knew my father, Earl V. Wise, Sr. I can only gage that some higher judgment deprives us of his presence here today. I know that this moment is one to which he looked forward. It certainly represents a milestone in the history of our company.

Our company was started in what I am proud to call a typically American way. It began with an idea and grew and thrived on the enterprising energy and ability of one man who sought a better world for himself, his family, his friends, and his community. Some 40 years ago my father had a grocery store. When he found himself with an inventory of potatoes that couldn't be sold because of a shipment of new potatoes, he took his surplus home to his mother's house, and on her kitchen range made the first Wise Potato Chips. He sold them over the counter and he sold them door to door. His first deliveries were made by bicycle. From this beginning has grown one of the largest potato chip operations in the world.

We are here today to celebrate another link in a growing industrial chain that represents American enterprise.

My father recognized very early in his career that no man makes it all by himself. One factor which I think has contributed mightily to the growth of our company has been the executives who have helped us run our company, as well as the kind of people we have always been fortunate to attract to our employ. We have always enjoyed the people with whom we worked on every level. This is one reason why I believe that the new plant to be constructed on this site has seen every omen for good.

The people in St. Augustine and in Florida, all of you here today—too many of you to mention by name, have demonstrated to us that you are good people, warm people, friendly people. The fact that we are here today doing what we are doing is testimony to the alertness, the cooperativeness, and the foresight of the people of St. Augustine and St. Johns County.

As you know, the plant we are about to construct is a small plant. We have no great plans for expansion beyond the small operation we are installing. But this does not mean that we shall be any less citizens of the community than if we were many times our size. Nor shall we shirk our responsibilities as citizens of the community. St. Augustine will grow. If we grow with St. Augustine we shall be pleased and proud and honored.

Again, many thanks to all of you for making this possible and for your presence here today.

That Hellish and Dismal Cloud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to include the following article, which appeared in the New York Times, April 21, 1963, by George H. T. Kimble, a member of the geography department at Indiana University. The article is aptly titled "That Hellish and Dismal Cloud," but whether you call it a hellish and dismal cloud or air pollution or, as we do in Los Angeles, smog, it still amounts to the same dirty air; air as Mr. Kimble so rightly points out, that grimes our public buildings, impairs the beauty of our skies and earth, undermines our health and shortens our lives, air that we ourselves have dirtied. My bill, H.R. 3765, along with several other bills, is trying to get at the root of this serious problem.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1963]

THAT HELLISH AND DISMAL CLOUD—THE AIR THAT 100 MILLION PEOPLE IN 10,000 COMMUNITIES ON THIS CONTINENT BREATHE REPRESENTS ANOTHER, AND, IN ITS OWN WAY, EXCEEDINGLY DANGEROUS, FALLOUT

(By George H. T. Kimble)

(George H. T. Kimble, a member of the geography department at Indiana University, is currently working on a long-term geographical study for the 20th Century Fund.)

The recent introduction in Congress of a bill giving enforcement powers in air-pollution cases to the Federal Government was a sharp reminder, if one were needed, that we are dirty people. We spend fortunes on detergents, toothpastes and cleansing creams; we keep battalions busy taking care of our trash, and there is not a place in all the land where the voice of the sudseller is not heard. But we are still dirty, for we dwell in the midst of dirty air—air that grimes our public buildings, that impairs the beauty of our skies and earth, that undermines our health and shortens our lives: air that we ourselves have dirtied.

Today, on this continent alone, at least 10,000 communities, representing a population of more than 100 million, are now seriously affected by pollution. In South America, Africa, Asia, Australia, and Europe there is hardly a city of any size that is stranger to irritating haze and industrial fallout.

Nor is it merely the cities of the earth that suffer in this fashion. City-made pollution is no respecter of city limits; it goes where it is borne by the wind. Frequently it is borne many miles, as any New York suburban housewife knows, and as anybody can see by observing the movement of factory smoke downwind on a quiet evening. We also need to remember that many rural areas make their own brand of pollution. Half the farmers of the world continue to burn brush and grass during the dry season, and almost as many continue to plow up land that takes flight in the slightest breeze. When I was in New Zealand during World War II, it was periodically possible to write one's name in the dust that had been carried from the dried-out wheatlands of Australia, more than 1,200 miles away.

No less modern, and more sinister, is the growing toxicity of the air. Until recent times the prime cause of air pollution was the excessive and grossly inefficient combustion of coal. Although there is still plenty of this kind of pollution, the prime cause of pollution in most large cities today is the emission of gases and solids from internal combustion engines and from industrial plants. Automobiles are generous contributors of nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide (in London they contribute about 2,000 tons of the latter daily; in New York and Los Angeles upward of 10,000 tons). Metallurgical plants contribute such toxic substances as hydrofluoric acid, sodium and calcium fluorides and, often, arsenical compounds. Chemical and petrochemical plants contribute hydrogen and sulfide, chlorine, sulfur dioxide, and often, compounds of selenium, tellurium and beryllium. Other poisons injected into the air of our industrial cities include sulfuric acid, hydrochloric acid and compounds of zinc and lead.

The damage done by these pollutants is compounded by the chemical reactions that frequently take place once they get into the air. In many cities it is these secondary pollutants, as they are called, that are the real villains of the piece. In Los Angeles, for instance, some of the most harmful ingredients of the smog are those produced by sunlight working photochemically on the hydrocarbons that are present in fumes from incompletely burned fuel.

To make matters still worse, the world now has to reckon with pollution from radioactive debris. Although there are differences of opinion concerning the territorial extent of the danger arising from this source, to say nothing of the immediacy of the danger, nobody doubts that the danger exists. The first thing the British Atomic Energy Authority did when radioactive debris escaped from its plutonium plant near Carlisle was to quarantine the nearby farms and prohibit the sale of their produce, because soil, grass, cattle and milk had all become contaminated.

A third feature of air pollution that is comparatively new is the sheer bulk of it. During last winter's London smog, smoke and sulfur compounds were being poured into the air at the rate of thousands of tons a day. At its worst, the smog is believed to have contained between 600 and 1,000 tons of smoke particles alone. In the Ruhr Valley of Western Germany the daily fallout of ashes and soot is put at 1,500,000 tons; that of sulfur dioxide, at 4 million tons. Even in so comparatively clean and pleasant a place as Puget Sound, several thousand tons of industrial wastes daily become airborne.

The full cost of air pollution to the communities producing it, to say nothing, of those that simply catch it from their neighbors, has never been calculated, and is probably incalculable. Such attempts as have been made to put a price on the damage it does to property, crops, cattle, and materials indicate that in the United States alone, it may be as high as $12 billion annually, or more than $60 per person. But clearly nobody can put a price on the 400 lives lost in the 1962 London smog, let alone the 4,000 lives lost in the one 10 years earlier, or on the loss of health, temporary or permanent, suffered by thousands more. Nor can anybody weigh the deprivation of beauty, happiness, and comfort which pollution imposes upon those who have to live with it.

What is being done about the problem? A great deal, as any citizen of St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Los Angeles will be happy to tell you. St. Louis has almost forgotten what bad smog is like since it prohibited, in the late 1930's, the use of certain types of soft coal. Pittsburgh, though later in taking legal action against the polluters of its air, can likewise point to visible gains, not the least of which is the ability of its people to see the city about twice as often as they could 20 years ago.

In Los Angeles County, notwithstanding its phenomenal growth (from 3,900,000 people and 9,800 industries in 1948 to 6,500,000 people and 16,000 industries in 1960), the volume of contaminants entering the air from stationary sources is less than half what it was 15 years ago, and about 5,000 tons a day less than it would have been but for the control measures taken in the interval. Even London believes it is getting to the point where it can see daylight for since the Clean Air Act was passed in 1956 the average concentration of smoke over the city has been reduced by roughly 40 percent.

Of course, much more can be done, as speaker after speaker at the National Conference on Air Pollution pointed out in Washington last December. Our lawmakers can prohibit the open burning of trash in backyards and city dumps, including the burning of junked cars, tires, batteries and so on; and they can enforce the use (as they are beginning to do) of after-burners on all gasoline-fired vehicles. Our chemists can go on applying their wits to the problem of trapping the gases and solids that escape from engine exhausts, commercial and residential furnaces and industrial plants of every kind. Our city planners can make better use of their chief tool of pollution control, namely zoning.

Perhaps the meteorologist can do something about it, too. Given enough heat and air movement, any unwanted accumulation of airborne gases and solids can be dispersed. During World War II, when round-the-clock aircraft patrols were frequently necessary, many British airfields were kept open in thick weather by firing gasoline fed through perforated pipes laid along the edges of runways. The intense heat generated by the flames evaporated the unwanted moisture in the air and so increased the visibility.

The cost, needless to say, was considerable. Fifteen million gallons of gasoline were used over a period of 2½ years in bringing in 2,500 planes. Quite clearly, no commercial airline could afford to expend 6,000 gallons of gasoline per plane per landing. More recently, unwanted water particles and other solids have been dispersed on an experimental basis by means of the seeding technique: that is, by spraying the air with silver iodide, or some other nucleating agent.

But will air pollution ever be eliminated completely? I very much doubt it, for two reasons. First, everybody is a polluter of the air, whether he is only a cigarette smoker or a leafburner, and it seems as unlikely that we can ever legislate effectively against universal sin as against universal selfishness, a species of which air pollution is.

Second, not every part of the world is fitted, atmospherically, to cope with air pollution. What makes it the habitual and serious problem it is in a place like Los Angeles is not so much the fact that the county has 3,500,000 vehicles and 16,000 industries as the fact that there is not enough rainfall or wind to clear away the resulting impurities. For southern California lies close to the heart of one of the most persistent high-pressure (or anticyclonic) systems to be found anywhere on earth.

Such systems are generally notable for three things: their aridity (the air in them spends most of its time subsiding, that is, warming up and so becoming drier); their "airlessness" (the winds are at best light and near the center are often impalpable), and their inversions (that is, the existence in their lower layers of a temperature gradient that is the inverse of the normal one, since the temperature increases with height). The aridity means that there is seldom any rain to wash the impurities out of the air; the airlessness that there is seldom enough wind to displace them horizontally; the inversion that there is virtually no chance of displacing them vertically.

Of the three features, the inversion is the one that gives Los Angeles the most trouble, because it closes the only escape hatch for the impurities. These impurities can no more rise into the warm air that lies above the colder surface air than a plume of cigarette smoke can rise above the ceiling of the room in which the smoker sits. Besides building up an ever greater accumulation of themselves just under the ceiling of the inversion, these suspended impurities act as heating surfaces for the incoming rays of the sun, and so raise the temperature of the

air around them, thereby reinforcing the ceiling. It is largely because of this that a Los Angeles smog is hard to budge once it has become established. And the longer it lasts, the higher the concentration of toxic impurities becomes, with all the attendant hazards for the smogbound.

Theoretically, it should be possible to destroy the ceiling by heating the air below it, but the cost of doing this would be considerable, since it would take all of 3 million megawatts to raise the air temperature above the city by as little as 2° F. an hour. Theoretically, too, it should be possible to disperse the impurities by blowing them away, but here also the cost would be considerable, since the ventilating plant would have to generate at least 250,000 tons of fresh air a minute.

True, the meteorologist may one day lick the problem by stopping the inversions from forming, that is, by controlling the circulation of the atmosphere to the point where he can shift an anticyclone as soon as he sees it beginning to form in the Los Angeles area. The only trouble about this, though, is that San Francisco might get the shifted system and the smog that goes with it. On the second thought it might be cheaper and more satisfactory all around to shift Los Angeles, which, as any geographer knows, should never have been built where it is in the first place.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 7, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We the undersigned ask you, Mr. Chairman, to support Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD's resolution, House Resolution 14 on creation of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations. A copy of this is sent to Mr. FLOOD.

Sincerely yours,

Natalie Mysho, Susan Mutz, Jo Ann Voit, Elain Narod, Joan Black, Rhona Neddle, Janice Omer, Mary Drain, Barbara Treck, Sandy Smith, Adrean King, Patricia Jones, Areta Hajduczoh, Peggy Mooney, Helen Wadle, Wilma Wolf, Susan Kene, Marie Bells, Geraldine Smith, Loretta Guncer, Rita Peerz, Ann Marie Comitta, Kathy Woods, Jeonette Seymore, Jaroslawa Harasyn, Joanne Magrisi, Carolyn Jacques, Mary Ann Koszowsky, Carol Ann Korbel, Mary Frances Lawlor, Sandra J. Lowery, Donna Koch, Marie Kobylakiewicz, Margaret Kober, Linda Leszczap, Carol Kovalitsky, Kathleen Sabrin, Veronica Lee, Roma Kostiuk, Pat Scott, Linda Lyons, Veronica Hocht, Bernadetta LaPletla, Diana La Rue, Susan Brastowicz, Francis Kaminsky, Pat Anderson, Joanne Gillin, Kathryn Jordvia, Patricia Storm, Cristine Hanas, Barbara Smith, Sandra Kowalskyj, Angela Bright, Mary Anne Brennan, Paula Prartey, Maureen McGuire, Eileen McGuire, Damita Makar, Nadia Mischtschuk, Sue Crupi, Lucille Bonfiglio, Vanda Gulak, Theresa Ravert, Narene Lutman, Barbara Leonard, Carolann Lobley, Sr. M. Ruth Angela, Frances La Pera, Linda Lee, Charlotte Latta, Marian Caroselli, Larraine Logan, Pete Sycz, Pauline Cappetta, Anna Radosz, Olga Radosz, Joan Wojtkiewicz, Veronica Watson, Alice Szalwinska.

IRVINGTON, N.J., *April 10, 1963.*

Hon. D. J. FLOOD,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations (H. Res. 14) will assist the young American generation to realize the difficulties of Eastern Europe, primarily Ukraine.

I am sending a similar letter to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH.

Respectfully yours,

KWITHA SEMANYSHYN.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to inform you that I sent the enclosed letter to the Honorable A. W. SIBAL.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS FINIW.

Hon. ABNER W. SIBAL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Stamford radio announced on March 31, 1963, "Congressman A. W. SIBAL called for creation of Captive Nations Committee in the House."

Allow me to extend my hearty congratulations to you for your action. In my opinion this committee will serve the best interest of the United States and will help the captive nations, among them the country of my ancestors, Ukraine, to regain freedom.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS FINIW.

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.,
April 3, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representative,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of a letter we sent in behalf of our organization to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH in support of your resolution calling for the establishment of congressional Committee on Captive Nations.

We greatly appreciate your interest in the plight of enslaved nations and your effort to help them in their struggle for freedom and liberation.

In behalf of our organization and all the members and all the citizens of Ukrainian descent in this city, I should like to express our sincere thanks for your effort and interest in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE TARASIUK,
Chairman.

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.
April 3, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: In behalf of our organization and all the members once again we raise our voice in support of the resolution introduced by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, House Resolution 14, calling for the establishment of congressional Committee on Captive Nations.

It is an established prove that such a committee is needed to study and advise the Government of this country in formulating its policy on Soviet Union and captive nations. We urge you to submit the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14, to vote by your committee and we ask you to give it your favorable consideration. While Communist Russia has been championing the cause of national liberation in Africa, Asia, and all over the world, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

Instead of hitting the enemy in most sensitive area which is Russian imperialism and colonialism, we are helping him by our money to champion his propaganda against dying Western European and nonexistent American imperialism by such publication as a booklet, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," published by UNESCO.

We sincerely hope that you will consider favorably the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE TARASIUK,
Chairman.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
April 3, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: You probably know about the article in the current issue of National Review relative to a bill you introduced in Congress in 1961 to create a House Committee on Captive Nations. I don't remember ever having heard of it but I think you are to be congratulated for having made such a proposal.

National Review indicates that the State Department opposed the bill on the ground that passage of it might annoy the Russians

and prevent an agreement on Berlin. It seems to me that virtually everybody in this country (except the State Department crowd and the Communists) would regard as highly desirable anything that might annoy the Russians. And the State Department's contention that passage of your bill might have prevented an agreement on Berlin has to be judged in the light of the fact that your bill was defeated and, after 2 years, there hasn't been any agreement on Berlin.

The antics of the U.S. State Department almost daily remind me of one of the classical stories of the First World War. It concerned an Australian who held a commission in an ANZAC unit and who was mobilized at the outbreak of the war in 1914. He served at Gallipoli and later at the western front. In 1917, after 3 years in service, he was ordered to report to the War Office in London. He had never been there and knew nothing about the city except that the War Office was located on a street called Whitehall. He crossed the English Channel at night and was put up in a West End hotel. After breakfast next morning he took a walk and found himself at an intersection on Whitehall. Looking down one side of that street, he noticed a line of obviously governmental buildings. Looking down the other side, he saw another line of the same. The only person nearby was a postman who was taking some mail out of a pillar box. One of his sleeves was empty, showing that he had been invalided out of military service. Walking over to him, the Australian asked: "Pardon me, can you please tell me which side the War Office is on?" And the postman immediately replied, in a heavy cockney accent and with much bitter and passionate emphasis, "Well, mate, you can be bloody well sure that it isn't on our side."

National Review's article about your 1961 bill states that your irritation with the State Department parallels the irritation of many another legislator against ever-increasing power grabs by the executive agencies. I hope that National Review correctly reported your feelings, because I think that we have a desperate need in the United States for restoration of the balance of power between the legislative and executive branches of governments. I think that things have got out of kilter not only because of usurpations of powers by executive branches of governments but, in addition, because of abdications of responsibilities by legislatures. We have that trouble here in our municipal government and it seems to be manifest in every other governmental level, being at its worst in the Federal stratum. Any effort you may make to correct the trouble will be a patriotic service. If you are working along that line, more power to you. Have you thought of reintroducing your bill to create a House Committee on Captive Nations? If it were before the House, I would be glad to write Congressman GEORGE H. FALLON in whose district I am domiciled and ask him to support it.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. IAGO.

The Birth of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the formation of West Virginia as a separate State, over a hundred years ago, came about as a result of opposition in the loyal counties of Virginia to secession from the Union.

An article by John G. Morgan in the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail describes the meetings of protest that took place in western Virginia, following the ordinance of secession passed by the Virginia convention on April 17, 1861, at Richmond. The next step was the call for a convention to assemble in Wheeling, on May 13, 1861, to determine how opposition to secession could be most effectively employed.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST WHEELING CONVENTION

(By John G. Morgan)

A festival atmosphere prevailed in Wheeling on May 13, 1861, a day of great expectations for the people of western Virginia.

It was the day of the first Wheeling convention, the first general meeting of Virginians who lived on the western side of the Allegheny Mountains.

Hopes were high for positive action that would keep the western side of the Old Dominion in the Union. A growing number of people wanted a new State.

It was a clear day. A light breeze stirred large national flags on many housetops and on cables stretched across the streets.

Smaller flags were abundantly displayed in windows and doorways. Little pennants fluttered near the ears of horses.

People, arriving by steamboat, train, and in all kinds of horse-drawn vehicles filled the streets in the busy town on the Ohio River. Many wore Union badges or red, white, and blue rosettes.

Outwardly, the people were happy. But it wasn't a time for supreme happiness; the Civil War was a month old.

One way or another—usually in county or district mass meetings and sometimes in secret sessions—a total of 436 delegates from 27 counties were elected to the convention.

The number of delegates from each county varied widely. Wood County chartered a steamboat and sent 70 delegates. Marshall County sent another 70, Monongalia 38, Hancock 38, and Mason 30.

Only a few delegates were sent by some counties. None represented Kanawha or Cabell, or numerous other southern counties where sympathy for the Confederate cause was widespread.

The convention attracted national attention. Among reporters covering the event were representatives of the New York Herald, New York Times, Cincinnati Commercial, Cincinnati Gazette, Pittsburgh Chronicle, Pittsburgh Dispatch, Cleveland Morning Leader and Chicago Press and Tribune.

At the time of the convention, Wheeling was by far the largest town in western Virginia. Census figures for the previous year show that it had a population of 14,083, compared to 3,364 for Martinsburg, the next largest town. Charleston was ranked fifth with 1,376.

Wheeling, lying on a bench of land between the river front and the hills, had two main streets, shaded by rows of poplars, and factory districts at each end of the streets. Soft coal smoke, rising from busy steamboats and factories, filled the atmosphere much of the time.

The town had four of the largest nail manufacturing plants in the Nation and was sometimes known as the "nail city." It was famous for its glassware, stogies, beer and furniture.

There were 14 churches, 2 academies, a commercial school, 3 banks, and a custom house. The McLure House was rated as the best hotel.

Many delegates arrived a day or two early and stayed over at the hotels. On the night of May 11, 2 days before the convention a large crowd gathered in front of the McLure House and called for some speeches. Bands played martial music to help force the speakers out.

John S. Carlile of Harrison County, who was a Union ball of fire as a delegate to the Virginia State Convention held earlier at Richmond, appeared on the balcony.

He told the crowd he hoped the First Wheeling Convention would decide to create a separate State. There was prolonged cheering.

Francis H. Pierpont, the Fairmont lawyer who had distinguished himself in recent weeks by making Union talks, was the next balcony speaker.

"I tell you the mountain counties are moving," he declared. "The people are * * * meeting together for the protection of themselves, their wives, their children, and their liberties * * *."

In a dispatch from Wheeling, the New York Times said on page 1 the next day: "There is an immense feeling here in favor of division of the State, and it is increasing hourly at the moment. Songs are heard in its favor in all public places."

The convention remained page 1 news for several days in the Times. One headline said: "Western Virginia on the Move."

A reporter for the Pittsburgh Dispatch complained of the "long, tedious wait for breakfast call at the hotel." In one of his stories, he said that Virginia Gov. John Letcher and former Gov. Henry A. Wise were burned in effigy at the Market House.

The Wheeling Intelligencer said on the opening day of the convention:

"We must do something * * * or, by weakness and vacillation, sink down as willing and helpless slaves, and receive with lamb-like meekness the manacles Jeff Davis has already forged for us.

"The time is opportune; the people are ready-ripe, eager for the action that will give them something around which they may rally * * *".

At 11 a.m. on opening day, a huge number of delegates crowded into Washington Hall. The auditorium was filled with what one contemporary writer described as an "eager, expectant, fluttering mass."

William B. Zinn, of Preston County, described as a "rugged old mountaineer," was named temporary chairman. Rev. Peter T. Laishley of Monongalia County offered prayer.

A short time later, Dr. John W. Moss of Wood County was elected as the permanent president. C. B. Waggener of Mason, Marshall M. Dent of Monongalia and Gibson L. Cranmer of Ohio were chosen as secretaries.

As one of the first speakers, Carlile made a characteristic fiery speech:

"Let us act; let us repudiate these monstrous usurpations; let us show our loyalty to Virginia and the Union; and let us maintain ourselves in the Union at every hazard.

"It is useless to cry peace when there is no peace; and I for one will repeat what was said by one of Virginia's noblest sons: 'Give me liberty or give me death.'" (Great and continued applause.)

Carlile introduced a resolution proposing that the committee on Federal and State relations report an ordinance for creation of a State to be named "New Virginia."

John J. Jackson of Wood County was shocked by what he considered a premature move by Carlile. At one point Jackson became so irked that he threatened to take his hat and leave the convention.

Waitman T. Willey of Monongalia County, a conservative, also opposed the resolution. He said the Carlile plan would be treason against the Governments of Virginia, the United States and the Confederate States.

The Monongalia delegate and other conservatives, including Pierpont, succeeded in heading off the resolution.

An agreement was reached to the effect that no action should be taken until after the election of May 23, when Virginia voters would ratify or reject the secession ordinance passed in Richmond on April 17.

However, the convention did name a "central committee," consisting of nine persons, with Carlile as chairman.

A resolution setting up the committee said that in the event the people ratified the secession ordinance, then the counties of northwestern Virginia should choose delegates June 4 for another general convention on June 11.

The committee was instructed to prepare an "address to the people of Virginia" and to "circulate it as extensively as possible."

At a night session on May 15, the third day of the convention, Willey was a principal speaker as the session was about to adjourn.

"Fellow citizens," said Willey, "the first thing we have got to fight is the ordinance of secession. Let us kill it on the 23d of this month. [Applause.]

"Let us bury it deep beneath the hills of northwestern Virginia. Let us pile up our glorious hills on it; bury it deep so that it will never make its appearance among us again." [Applause.]

At the same time, Willey spoke of Virginia as a mother State whose "every inch of soil I love, her mountains and valleys from the seaboard to the Ohio border."

He said he hoped the time would come when the Stars and Stripes would again float over the entire State as the ensign of "universal liberty."

Prayer was offered. The "Star-Spangled Banner" was sung, "about" nine cheers were given for the Union, and the convention adjourned sine die in what was described as a "perfect blaze of enthusiasm."

The delegates returned to their homes to await the work of the central committee and the outcome of the election. Some of them may have left Wheeling on the *Ben Franklin*, which was advertised on the last day of the convention as a steamboat "now completed, and will leave for Cincinnati this evening."

The newspaper advertisement said the boat was "admirably furnished with the best of everything that good taste could suggest." The pilot was Captain Jack, "an experienced steamboat man and a clever, genial gentleman."

An address to the people was promptly prepared by the committee. Part of the text said:

"What is secession? A deed not to be accomplished in the brood glare of noonday sun, but a deed of darkness, which had to be performed in secret conclave, by the reckless spirits who accomplished it, in contempt to the people * * *."

In closing its appeal, the committee said:

"Fellow citizens of northwestern Virginia, the issue is with you. Your destiny is in your hands. If you are worthy descendants of your worthy sires, you will rally to this defense of your liberties, and the Constitution which has protected and blessed you will extend over you its protecting aegis. If you hesitate or falter, all is lost, and you and your children to the latest posterity are destined to perpetual slavery."

The results of the May 23 election, as announced by Gov. John Letcher, were: 125,950 for secession and 20,373 against. The totals didn't include the returns from the northwest, where approximately 44,000 votes were cast against secession and about 4,000 for it.

The 44,000 and 4,000 totals were mentioned by the late Dr. Charles H. Ambler, eminent West Virginia historian. They are disputed by at least one modern scholar.

Dr. Richard Orr Curry, author of "A House Divided," a doctoral dissertation at the University of Pennsylvania, in 1961, says that totals of 30,000 against and 10,000 for would be more realistic for the northwestern area. In the entire area of what is now West Virginia, he estimates that the vote was 34,000 against and 19,000 for secession.

Curry's conclusions are based on extensive research which uncovered new evidence. In his rather dashing but scholarly work, he says that the evidence blasts the "myth of Union solidarity" in western Virginia.

He says that 25 counties in proposed West Virginia, comprising two thirds of the area of the State and about 40 percent of its population, "supported the Confederacy and opposed dismemberment" (creation of a new state out of old Virginia).

Curry also attacks earlier historians for failing to give what he considers sufficient weight to the "changing patterns of conflict" in the sectionalism that preceded the formation of West Virginia. At one time, he stresses, the Shenandoah Valley was aligned with the western part of the State, but shifted later to the eastern way of thinking. By 1861, he says, the valley and southwestern counties had no more in common with northwestern Virginia than "a cobra and a mongoose."

In any event, the results of the election on May 23, 1861, were a final public endorsement of what the Virginia Convention at Richmond, the state government and militia already had done. Secession from the Union was an unalterable fact.

The results comprised the last crushing blow to the fading hopes that the whole of Virginia could be saved to the Union.

But in the depths of their disappointment, more and more people from west of the Alleghenies thought of their future in terms of a new dominion to be carved out of the Old Dominion.

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Hanson W. Baldwin, a noted and respected military columnist for the New York Times, recently wrote an article in the Atlantic magazine, April 1963, highly critical of the administration's policy of managed news. I share Mr. Baldwin's feelings about the unfortunate trend which this establishes in the relations of our Government and our people; I share his concern over the undermining effect which it has for our form of government. Sadly, the people can no longer trust the word of their Government.

Especially interesting to me in this article was a paragraph which Mr. Baldwin devoted to the treatment of Mr. Charles Murphy, Washington editor of Fortune magazine, who wrote an article analyzing the failures of Government in handling the Bay of Pigs invasion. I placed Mr. Murphy's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 20, 1961, pages A7456–60, and, after the President had roundly denounced it, I made notice of an award which Murphy had received from the Overseas Press Club for this article for its accuracy of reporting, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1962, page 7829. Later I introduced into the RECORD comments on the way in which President Kennedy had attempted to suppress the story which Murphy wrote and a comment of former President Eisenhower on the question of managed news, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 30, 1963, pages A394–95.

Now, Mr. Baldwin in his article offers further background information on this article which Murphy wrote and which the President tried to suppress and, after it was published, punished Murphy for writing. The paragraph is quoted immediately below; following it is the entire Hanson Baldwin article which deserves the attention of every person in this country who has an interest in the future of our national freedom.

When Charles J. V. Murphy, respected and experienced Washington correspondent for Fortune magazine, published in the September 1961 Fortune a complete and thorough account of the Lao and Bay of Pigs fiascoes, his article was denounced by the President personally at a press conference. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor was then sent to New York with a bill of complaints to see Henry Luce. He was politely received, but when he was all through, astonishment was expressed at the picayune nature of the objections. Later, Murphy, a colonel in the Air Force Reserve who for years has had a mobilization assignment in the Office of the Air Chief of Staff, found that under pressure the Air Force had been compelled to shift him to a minor post elsewhere.

The article follows:

[From the Atlantic Monthly, Apr. 1963]

MANAGED NEWS: OUR PEACETIME CENSORSHIP

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

("The blatant methods used by the administration and its tampering with the news deserve considerably more criticism and discussion than they have received," says Hanson W. Baldwin, the military analyst for the New York Times. In the article which follows, Mr. Baldwin describes these methods and points out the danger of Government manipulation of the news.)

The problem of reconciling security and freedom is not new to the Kennedy administration. It existed when the Nation was young, and it has troubled every era of our history. But it has become acute only since the end of World War II, when the twin threats of the atomic age and the Communist conspiracy have posed the greatest dangers to national security in our history. There has been, in the last two decades, an inevitable growth of Government secrecy in an age when man has the power to destroy himself and in an era when an aggressive, expansionist communism poses hidden dangers, with its secret subversions, to the body politic. The pressure ever since 1945 has been clearly on the side of more secrecy.

This pressure has been greatly increased by the tremendously strengthened influence in Government of the Federal police power (the FBI, and especially the Central Intelligence Agency) and of the intelligence mentality, which tends to enshrine secrecy as an abstract good. A significant growth in the power of the Presidency and in the size, power, and centralization of the executive

branch—checked only slightly during Eisenhower's administration by his concept of a Congress which proposed, a President who disposed—has strengthened the wall of secrecy which has gradually been built around Government.

The trend poses some long-term dangers. James Madison noted in the Virginia Convention of June 16, 1788: "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpation." It is the gradual and silent encroachments upon many past concepts of press freedoms that have greatly troubled close observers of the Kennedy administration.

John F. Kennedy, during his first 2 years in office, has proved to be, in his press conferences and rockingchair chats, an articulate, winning, and persuasive President. He and his administration have been extremely sensitive to the public image of the man and the office as mirrored by the press and other public relations media.

Despite this sensitivity (or perhaps because of it), despite the President's highly articulate phrases, there is a major question about the methods employed in the administration's public relations policies, a doubt that the people are really being taken into the confidence of the President to the same degree that they were during World War II and Korea.

This vigorous and cocky young administration has provided the yeast of the New Frontier, which, mixed into the dangerous ferment of our times, has produced, in the opinion of many newsmen, some astonishing examples of news repression and distortion, management and control, and pressures and propaganda.

It should be emphasized that news management is not new with this administration. It has been attempted and sometimes practiced successfully in the past, often with a Madison Avenue flair and heavy overtones of propaganda, by various Presidents, by the individual armed services, and by other executive departments. It can even be argued that some degree of news management may be necessary in the last half of the 20th century, when nuclear weapons and Communist conquests pose unparalleled dangers to democracy. But the Kennedy administration has shown a sensitivity to criticism, a readiness to resent it, and a willingness to use unorthodox methods to meet it that have troubled many people. The elimination of the New York Herald Tribune, leading Republican critic of the New Frontier, from the list of papers subscribed to by the White House was but the surface symptom of a widespread administration attitude. The management and manipulation of news at the source have been publicly defended by a minor administration official, who nevertheless was clearly voicing the views of the administration.

THE USE OF THE FBI

What form has this control and management and manipulation taken? The first and most dangerous form has been the freewheeling use of Federal police power to investigate leaks.

FBI agents have been employed in at least half a dozen separate instances in the past 2 years in investigations of the sources of news stories. Investigations of this sort are not new with the Kennedy regime. The Eisenhower administration several times used the Federal sleuths in attempts to detect the sources of stories published by various papers. But Mr. Kennedy called upon the FBI far more frequently in cases of this sort than any prior President, and the methods used by the FBI in this administration, though sometimes repudiated or apologized for later, have smacked of totalitarianism rather than of democratic government.

Federal agents have visited the homes of reporters and newspaper employees in attempts to question them about their sources. Reporters say they have been shadowed in the corridors of the Pentagon, and many newspapermen, as well as military officers and Government officials, believe their phones have been tapped.

Newsmen who have experienced the treatment include some of the most highly respected reporters in Washington, men like Lloyd Norman of Newsweek, a thorough, careful, and discreet veteran of Pentagon coverage; John Richard Fryklund who covers the Pentagon, and Earl Voss, the State Department, for the Washington Evening Star; and many others.

In all these cases the newsmen concerned have told the FBI in effect that their sources were their business. But this has not prevented extensive, intimidating FBI investigations involving checks into the newsmen's contacts, friendships, and associations. These investigations have ranged throughout the Pentagon, the State Department, and other executive branches of Government, and far afield outside Government. And Mr. Kennedy has been the first President to send the FBI into the Pentagon, superseding the services' own investigative and internal security agencies.

FBI agents have questioned civilian officials and commissioned officers of all ranks, from the most junior rank to the three- and four-star generals and admirals. The interrogations have been detailed and sometimes hectoring; junior officers have even been threatened with lie detector tests. To men who have devoted a lifetime of loyal service to their country and who, their commissions read, are worthy of "special trust and confidence," such treatment is demeaning and destructive of morale.

The administration says that these investigations are intended solely to plug leaks and to prevent disclosures inimical to the Nation's security, and are not directed in any way against a free press. Nor are they intended, it is claimed, to downgrade the status of the officer corps. Yet the stories which have produced F.B.I. investigations have nearly always dealt with subjects and facts fully known to the Russians and to many others besides; few if any of these stories have harmed the Nation's security. Usually, however, they have been embarrassing to the administration for one reason or another; often newsmen have divulged information before the administration was ready to announce it. In several cases, official ire was aroused because many topranking government officials who by intent or bureaucratic inefficiency had been left in outer darkness first learned the facts from published stories.

Regardless of the avowed intent or ostensible purpose of the F.B.I. investigations, the methods used—visits of agents to the homes of newspaper employees, the chivying and tacit threatening of government employees and officers, tapping of telephone lines, and shadowing of reporters—have had, as they almost certainly were intended to have, an intimidating and restricting effect. The kind, the amount, and the character of news, particularly military news, available to the public has been reduced.

THE PERSONAL APPROACH

The second method employed in the past 2 years to control or shape the news is the frequent use by high administration officials, including the President himself, of the personal reprimand, request, admonition, complaint, or compliment. The direct approach to working newsmen or to editors or publishers is not, of course, new with this administration, but the frequent participation of the President himself in such approaches is unusual. The President reads widely; quite often he picks up the telephone to chide, complain, or praise a reporter or editor for a story which has irked or pleased him.

The inclusion of correspondents, editors, publishers, and commentators on the President's appointment calendar or the White House guest list is another tacit form (a Washington status symbol) of attempting to influence the news. In this administration such favorites are expected to be sympathetic, not too critical; otherwise they may be cast, along with the Herald Tribune, into outer darkness.

Some of the President's advisers, particularly the Attorney General, Theodore Sorensen, and Pierre Salinger, are even quicker on the trigger; they frequently complain or cajole; some say they have even tacitly threatened. In one instance, when a Washington newspaper published an editorial which declared that the facts available to it did not entirely agree with the President's public account of the incident, Salinger telephoned an executive of the paper and wanted to know whether the paper was calling the President a liar.

The President, the Attorney General, and others have frequently inveighed to visitors about criticism of the New Frontier, and the President has sometimes utilized Cabinet meetings as a forum for his complaints.

When Charles J. V. Murphy, respected and experienced Washington correspondent for Fortune magazine, published in the September 1961 Fortune a complete and thorough account of the Laos and Bay of Pigs fiascoes, his article was denounced by the President personally at a press conference. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor was then sent to New York with a bill of complaints to see Henry Luce. He was politely received, but when he was all through, astonishment was expressed at the picayune nature of the objections. Later, Murphy, a colonel in the Air Force Reserve, who for years has had a mobilization assignment in the Office of the Air Chief of Staff, found that under pressure the Air Force had been compelled to shift him to a minor post elsewhere.

RESTRICTING THE NEWS

A most important method of controlling and restricting the news is the tremendous centralization of authority that has been effected by this administration. There has been a trend in this direction ever since World War II, but under Kennedy the process of centralizing and restricting authority for releasing news has gone very much further than it has ever gone in the past. Despite the global responsibilities of the Armed Forces and the tremendous size of our Government, an attempt, at least partially successful, has been made to control from Washington the nature, the kind, and even the details of news released in Saigon, Okinawa, Alaska, or Frankfurt. In the Pentagon the discretion and responsibility of the individual services and of the subordinate commands have been so greatly curtailed by restrictions that even the simplest kind of release requires clearance by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester. In the State Department the control is not so tight, but it is nevertheless less flexible than in the past.

Both departments carry out the public relations policies and also the detailed instructions of the White House. The White House, in respect to news, does not really mean Pierre Salinger, the President's press secretary. Salinger is not one of the inner circle, and the basic policies are established by Sorensen, McGeorge Bundy, the Attorney General, or the President himself. The press and public affairs assistants in this administration have none of the concepts of their predecessors; they do not really represent the public's right to know, nor do they play any major role in the development of public relations policies. They are rather mouthpieces of the administration.

UNDER GUISE OF SECURITY

The Cuban crisis revealed still another means of controlling the flow of news vital to the people. This was achieved quite simply, under the guise of security, by blocking the press from access to the sources of news. Restrictions that exceeded those of World War II or Korea prevented the press, radio, and television from covering the quarantine, or blockading, fleet or from visiting our beleaguered base at Guantanamo until the immediate crisis ended. Stringent rules were put into effect in the Pentagon and State Department, which funneled all official statements through a Pentagon or State Department spokesman.

In the Pentagon the secretaries of the individual services were bypassed, and Assistant Secretary Sylvester issued an order which required the presence of a third person during any interview with a news media representative, or, alternatively, the filing of a report by the person interviewed, summarizing the subjects discussed and identifying the interviewer. A similar though less drastic rule was applied in the State Department, but after strenuous objections from newspapermen, it has been lifted. As this is written, the Pentagon rule is still in effect. It has had, and was bound to have (as it was intended to), a restrictive effect upon the kind and character of news emanating from the Pentagon. This simple measure, with its implications of punitive action if someone treads on forbidden ground, has gone a long way toward restricting news to the "Poppa knows best" kind, to stories and data which the Government wants to release.

THE CALCULATED LEAK

Still another tactic used frequently by this administration in its attempts to shape the news and to achieve its ends is the calculated leak, the carefully disseminated canard or half-truth from someone close to the throne. This, too, is not new, but the crudity and the frequency of its use in recent years are exceptional. The account in the Saturday Evening Post by Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett which purported to depict the alleged softness of Adlai Stevenson during the 1962 Cuban crisis was but the most recent of several such episodes.

All of them had the same earmarks: a favored reporter close to the President was given high-level background information for publication. The publication of this information did not commit the President, but in each instance it certainly weakened the position of the victim; in fact, it cut the ground from under his feet. Chester Bowles was the first to feel this snickersnee between his ribs; later the Joint Chiefs of Staff, collectively, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, its chairman, got somewhat less severe treatment. Then it was Stevenson's turn. The beauty of this gambit, the gambit of the calculated leak, is that the President, if he wants to, can disavow the article (he was loyal enough to Bartlett, his old friend, not to do so), but it will do its work nonetheless.

DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD

A corollary to the calculated leak is what might be called the policy of the open door. This was utilized to the maximum after the steel price rise controversy, and particularly after the successful termination of the Cuban crisis of 1962. The word is spread by the White House that the administration will be glad to open some doors to favored news media so that the full background story of the days of crisis can be told exclusively in the Blaptown Bugle.

After the October 1962, Cuban crisis, a rash of now it can be told stories, each purporting to give the inside story, each claiming an exclusive quality, appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, Time, Life, the Reader's Digest, Look, and a number of daily papers. A few writers were careful to state that this was an administration account, that the full story would have to await history.

This kind of shaping and manipulation of the news—utilizing the lure of inside information, the open door, exclusive interviews, and off the record appointments—is old hat to official Washington. But in degree and kind, and particularly in the slanting of the released information to enhance the image of the President, it is unusual in this administration.

There was a time when the word of the Government was its bond; the people could have faith, allowing for mistakes and erroneous interpretations, in what Washington told them. Public confidence has been severely shaken many times since World War II; the U-2 case exposed the dangers of governmental falsehood for all to see.

But the Kennedy administration does not appear to have learned from these past horrible examples. During the Cuban crisis and at other times, the successful restrictions upon news coverage and the centralization of authority for releasing news enabled various Government spokesmen, particularly those in the Pentagon, to withhold or slant at will, or in some cases, without expert advice, to make unintentional mistakes. Only later did some of the public come to realize that a picture had been painted differing from reality.

CUBA: PROPAGANDA VERSUS NEWS

During the Cuban crisis the details of what was going on were limited to brief generalizations from the White House and the reading of terse announcements by a "Pentagon spokesman." The Pentagon did not announce hailing of the first ship passing through the blockade until after it had been announced by a Congressman; the first photographs of the missile sites in Cuba were released in London. Pentagon spokesmen denied, at a time when the facts were in hand, any knowledge of the removal of 42 Soviet missiles from Cuba until it was announced on a television program a day later.

The crisis also produced from a "civilian spokesman," unhindered by or disdaining military knowledge, statements which were grossly inaccurate. Some of these restrictions and mistakes can be extenuated on the grounds of crisis. Certainly the Nation's press, as it showed at the time of crisis, willingly withheld detailed news of military movements until the crisis had ended. But many of the news restrictions and much of the news management imposed by the Kennedy administration as ostensibly temporary measures remain in effect. Few Americans realize that Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was prior to the crisis; that there are still thousands of Soviet troops on the island, hundreds of tanks, scores of jet fighters, and many of the latest type of ground-to-air missiles. Castro and the Russians know the details of Russian military strength in Cuba; some of our allies know them; but for many weeks the American people were kept in darkness.

In other words, an aura of propaganda has surrounded the Government's public presentation of the Cuban situation since the beginning. The major political and psychological victory achieved by the Kennedy administration in its dramatic confrontation with Premier Khrushchev has not been balanced by a calm assessment of the negative aspects: the greatly increased military strength of the Communist-Castro regime; the possibility, even the probability, that some long-range missiles are still concealed in Cuba; the likelihood that Cuba, like the albatross in "The Ancient Mariner," will hang around the neck of U.S. foreign policy for an indefinite future.

CANCELLATION OF SKYBOLT

The Skybolt missile issue provided another example of distorted news handling. To hear Pentagon spokesmen talk one would gather, inaccurately, that the Skybolt development program was far behind schedule, that all of its initial tests had failed, that it was a technical dud. There was no reference to the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored continued development of the missile, that an air-launched ballistic missile coupled with a nuclear-powered aircraft and a navigational satellite to help fix the launching plane's exact position in space offered a growth potential of tremendous importance for the future, and that the missile's development program was approximately on schedule.

The cancellation of the Skybolt could be fairly defended and explained on a cost basis; it presented an addition to the Nation's nuclear delivery armory, an armory that was already extensive and that had the capability of overkilling Soviet Russia many times. But the adverse political effects in Britain were discounted, and the strategic advantages and technical capabilities of the Skybolt were deliberately downgraded. The result was a distorted picture as far as official Government statements were concerned.

INFORMATION IS POWER

What does all this add up to? Is it merely, as some editors have maintained, the grippings of a lazy press, too slothful to penetrate the bureaucratic maze in Washington, too conscious of the newspaper's privileged place in American life, unaware of its own irresponsibility? Is it simply another chapter in the conflict between the President and the press?

This question is best answered in the words of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Mr. Sylvester executes policy; he does not set it. But his actions and his words are never lightly chosen; they represent administration and White House policy. If they did not, Mr. Sylvester would long ago have been sacrificed, as others in the Pentagon and elsewhere have been.

Mr. Sylvester has twice discussed publicly, once in an interview and once in a speech, his (the Government's) concept of the role of a free press in a democracy. He told the Associated Press some months ago that "news generated by the action of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has." He defended the Government's management, control, and restriction of the flow of the news so that a free press might speak "in one voice to your adversary." Later, in a speech to the New York chapter of the Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity, Mr. Sylvester declared, "It is the Government's inherent right to lie if necessary to save itself when faced with nuclear disaster; this is basic." He added that the Defense Department would continue to use news to further the aims of American foreign policy, because "information is power." This is strange language from a man with more than 20 years of newspaper experience, 16 years of it in Washington, D.C.

There are many familiar and foreboding nuances in Mr. Sylvester's phrases. They are a direct reflection of the "intelligence mentality," which has steadily increased in influence in Washington since the war, and which also holds that information is power and must therefore be hedged around with secrecy and safeguards.

His reference to news as a weapon echoes some of the old debates that heralded the permanent establishment as an arm of Government of the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Agency. The press expressed fears then that the participation of Government in the dissemination of news to foreign countries might well become, as indeed it was bound to become, the use of news to further American foreign policy; that is, the management, control, and direction of the news toward a specific purpose, the

propaganda or the slant which a free press rightly fears. This same concept, then viewed as a support for our foreign policy, but for oversea export only, has now been, in Mr. Sylvester's words, applied to the domestic regulation of the news.

THE DANGERS OF SECRECY

What are the dangers and the adverse effects of such management, restriction, and manipulation of the news? One of them is internal. The mania for secrecy often prevents the right hand of Government from knowing what the left hand is doing. The dissemination of information on a so-called need-to-know basis has led to a compartmentalization of facts and background, with consequent increased expense, loss of time, and sometimes inchoate Government actions, which have cost us dearly. Undue secrecy not only makes for inefficient government; it protects inefficiency and hides corruption.

The second result is the adverse effect upon the morale of Government employees and the armed services and their relatives. News about their doings, even though carefully sieved when necessary so as to reveal no vital information to a potential enemy, is not only conducive to morale, but it represents a right of the American people, whose sons are doing the fighting and sometimes the dying.

A corollary danger is that many of the carefully built-up channels of cooperation between press and Government established during and since World War II by careful selection and training of Government information officers are tending to break down. The concepts, finally established in World War II despite the objections and suspicions of the old order, that the "press is on our side, too," and that "honesty is the best policy" have been taught to successive generations of commanding officers, officials, and public information officers at service and civilian schools ever since the war. Recent governmental policies make a mockery of these tried and tested principles, and the centralization of authority, the close control over the release of news make many public information officers of great capability errand boys, parrots of administration mouthpieces.

The fundamental case against the kind of news management, restriction, control, and censorship which has been practiced recently is, quite simply, that it impairs the constitutional rights of a free press and hence poses a potential danger to our form of democratic and representative government. No people can be really free if its press is spoon-fed with government pap or if the news which provides a democracy with the rationale for its actions is so controlled, restricted, managed, or censored that it cannot be published.

The blatant methods used by the administration and its tampering with the news deserve considerably more criticism and discussion than they have received.

Representative JOHN E. MOSS of California, Democratic chairman of a Special House Subcommittee on Government Information, who has been one of the critics, pointed out, quite correctly, that the Nation's press should lead the discussion. He viewed with some concern the restrictions imposed on the press on the coverage of underground nuclear tests in Nevada, secrecy about military space activities, a blackout of information about Soviet satellite efforts, and the manner and method of applying various news guidelines suggested by the administration during the Cuban crisis.

"We have in the past few weeks," Mr. Moss said in late November, "experienced a degree of Government news management which is unique in peacetime."

Three newspaper organizations—the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and the National Editorial Association—have discussed the Government's restrictions and have warned against possible consequences: "We are concerned lest Government * * * look upon news of what the Government is doing, not as an honest report of what happened, but as a means to some desired end." The Nation will suffer "if it departs from its own tradition to imitate a totalitarian enemy, by regarding news not as news but as a weapon or other instrument of national policy."

The services and the technical press, which are familiar in detail with many of the military subjects that have been surrounded by a paper curtain in the Pentagon, have been particularly outspoken in their criticism. Their basic point is that the Government has withheld and is still withholding from the American people large amounts of pertinent information about which the Russian Government is fully informed.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE PRESS

Is the press free from blame? Of course not. Too large a section of it, seduced by the friendship of the political high and mighty in Washington, by the blandishments of power or fame, or by the hope of scoops, color the news or pull their punches. Others, slothful by nature, have accepted the ease of the Government handout. And there are the reckless and the irresponsible, who rush into print without first weighing the consequences of what they write in the balance of the national interest and on the scales of history. Yet none of these evils can be cured, save at a far greater cost, by restricting, managing, or controlling the news.

If we are to have a free press in a democracy, there are bound to be leaks; in fact, it is imperative that enterprising reporters continue to break through the wall of secrecy around government. When no leaks occur, I shall really begin to worry.

The fundamental obligation of a free press is to serve as a monitor of government. It must owe nothing, save fairness and truthfulness, to any administration. Its ultimate loyalty must not be to any government or any party in or out of office, but to the Nation, to the greatest good of the greatest number. In turn, the Government must recognize this higher loyalty and obligation and must understand that the American press has as great a stake in the welfare of the country and its security as the administration and that its responsibility for informing, for monitoring, for criticizing is paramount.

This does not mean, of course, that freedom is license. Time after time, in instance after instance, every responsible newspaper has withheld, temporarily or permanently, information that in its judgment would be inimical, if published, to the best interests of the Nation. But time after time newspapers have printed information that to the Pentagon or the State Department is classified. And sometimes the press has been wrong in its judgments.

Generalization about this issue is not possible. Each case has to be judged on its merits and the pros and cons weighted on the scales of the national interest. During World War II many of my articles were picked up by enemy propagandists and broadcast back to the United States or its fighting men in partial or distorted form. But critical articles which described the poor management and inefficiency of some of our replacement depots in Italy, the inadequacy of our tanks, and the perilous situation in the South Pacific during the early phases of the Guadalcanal campaign produced remedial action.

It can be argued, with some cogency, that things have changed since World War II and that in a world where nuclear suicide is possible, all information must be safeguarded. It is true that irresponsibility, sensationalism, and occasionally real breaches of security—all of them evils of a free press—may cause disproportionate damage in the atomic age. Yet it is also true that undue secrecy can pose greater perils.

Responsible newspapermen, for instance, will avoid, unless the Government approves it, the publication of detailed technical specifications of a new weapon, new radar, or other militarily useful devices if their publication would enable a potential enemy to crib from our developments. Yet even in such cases no clear line can be drawn in this scientific age, for scientific freedom and scientific development imply the free publication and exchange of virtually all scientific data. Normally, unless there are other counterbalancing considerations, the responsible reporter will avoid printing intelligence data with such exactitude and detail as to pinpoint the source of the information, unless that source is already known to a potential enemy or can be easily deduced. Similarly commonsense requires the withholding—in areas of combat, like south Vietnam—of news of planned military operations before they actually occur. The responsible newspaperman may also withhold, in delicate and critical situations, detailed discussions of contingency plans or the exact status of secret negotiations.

To decide whether to print or not to print is never easy, for there is no general guideline save the common good. In the age of megaton bombs, secret intelligence apparatus, and Communist plots there is clearly an ill-defined no-man's-land, a fuzzy boundary between what is and is not fit to print. The Government, like the press, is bound to grope through the fog of insecurity in this technological age; both are bound to make mistakes. It is not the isolated mistake but the pattern of attempted news management and control in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration that is cause for concern.

There are two rules that can serve the Nation well. The first is that honesty, as full and complete as possible, is in the long run the best policy for governments as well as individuals. The second is that the artificial curbs and restrictions, the tacit censorship over the news that have existed should be removed. Contacts, official and unofficial, formal and informal, between Government and press at all levels should be encouraged not monitored or discouraged or limited.

If the ultimate power is to continue to rest in the people, the people's need to know must be filled by the press. Except in the case of formal military censorship in time of war, the press itself, with that great diversity of judgment which is the salvation of democracy, must decide what it will publish. Otherwise, its freedom, and ultimately the freedom of us all, is a mockery. Needless to say, this judgment should always be exercised—most of all in the atomic age—with a great sense of responsibility and dedication to the common good. News is not a commodity, but an inherent democratic right and a public trust.

The Age of Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Dr. T. Marshall Hahn was in-

stalled as the president of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, my alma mater. It was indeed a pleasure for me to attend and participate in these ceremonies on the campus at Blacksburg, Va.

Among the addresses delivered at the installation was that of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. It is appropriate, I believe, that Secretary Hodges' remarks be brought to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

We are today concerned wtih the subject of assistance to education. We will undoubtedly have this subject under discussion many times in this session, and Secretary Hodges reviews some of the reasons for Federal aid to education. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Secretary Hodges' speech.

The speech follows:

THE AGE OF EXCELLENCE

(Address by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges prepared for delivery at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Coliseum Auditorium, Blacksburg, Va., Thursday, April 4, 1963)

Dr. Hahn, it is indeed a pleasure to participate in your inauguration as our Nation's youngest president of a land-grant institution of higher learning.

I want to congratulate both you and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute on this timely joining of your destinies. Together you symbolize, especially to a member of the Kennedy administration, the challenging opportunities for achieving new frontiers of excellence in the field of higher education.

By your very youth, you represent the future of our country.

As an educator and a scientist, you also represent the two forces which will have the greatest impact in determining what the future of the United States will be.

But most of all, by your willingness to accept such heavy responsibilities at an early age, you embody our hopes for a new generation of men and women who will be educated to the fullest extent of their capabilities to cope with the complexities and challenges of an age of revolutionary change.

This great educational institution is also symbolic, both of our past and of our future.

As a native of Virginia who grew up just across the State line in North Carolina, I know something of what VPI has meant to the economic progress of this State and of this whole region.

I have seen the great change in our Nation from a largely agricultural society to the greates industrial society the world has ever known. I have seen our advance in agricultural productivity, largely as a result of the work of our land-grant universities and their agricultural extension services.

A century ago, the food produced by one farmworker would feed fewer than five persons. Today, 1 American farmworker produces enough food for more than 27 persons.

I cannot imagine Virginia's progress, or North Carolina's progress, or the rise of these United States to the great nation we are today, without the enormous contributions of our land-grant colleges and universities over the past century.

I think of this whenever I hear Federal aid to education denounced as a menace to our American system. I think of how much we owe to the Morrill Land-Grant Act which led to the establishment of these vivtal institutions all across our country.

Our primary educational obligation is, of course, a local obligation. It rests on the people of every American community in proportion to the resources of the community. It also rests on the States according to their resources.

But the logic of the Morrill Act is as valid today as it was 100 years ago. The Federal Government has a proper interest in education, and it has an obligation to make national resources available to assure the broadest possible geographic distribution of quality educational opportunities for the American people.

It has that obligation even more urgently today, because quality education has never been more important or more costly to provide, from the kindergarten to the graduate programs that must produce our research scientists and engineers and our future leaders in every field.

We were the first nation to realize that our greatest resource lay in the minds of our people. We developed the world's most broadly based educational system to develop that great resource.

And we see the material and social benefits of this great investment all around us.

But we have only begun to put the emphasis on excellence that is required in this increasingly complex technological age.

Millions of inadequately educated Americans are finding that there is no place for them in our economy. Their jobs are disappearing as machines do more and more of the work that requires only muscle power and routine thinking. And many of them find that they lack the basic educational qualifications for rapid retraining for more skilled work.

And manual and unskilled workers are not the only ones who are being affected by technological change. Thousands of our older engineers are finding that they are ill equipped for modern engineering work. Their training in engineering fundamentals was not broad enough or deep enough, or they have failed to keep up with the technological advances of the last 10, 20, or 30 years.

We face a massive job of education, retraining, and upgrading throughout our labor force. And we face the equally important challenge of educating all of our young people so that they will be able to meet today's higher standards and be able to continue their development to meet even higher standards tomorrow.

Our need for better quality education at all levels is a matter of great national importance. But our need for better educational opportunities at the upper levels, especially in engineering, science, and mathematics, is becoming critical.

There are two very important aspects of this problem. On the one hand, the Soviet Union is educating scientists and engineers at a much faster rate than we are. More than half of their college students are enrolled in these areas, and they are turning out more than three times as many engineers each year as we are.

On the other hand, our domestic demand for scientists and engineers for our defense and space programs is taking up the bulk of our new talent, especially in the area of research and development. Our civilian economy is in danger of being starved for new talent to develop the new technology which is necessary to undergird both our military and nonmilitary efforts.

This year we expect to have about 30,000 new scientists and engineers available for research and development work. Our space programs alone will require 25,000, of these additional research specialists. Only a few thousand will be available to expand research and development work in all of our civilian industry. This is not enough.

More civilian research and development is absolutely essential if American industry is to increase its productivity, and provide better incomes—wages and profits—for the American people; if American industry is to provide an adequate technological base for our defense and space efforts, as well as for our civilian economy; if industry is to develop the new and improved products we must have for expanded domestic consumption and for increased sales abroad; and if we are to be able to compete in world markets in the future, both in terms of price and in the quality of American export goods.

For the time being, we are still well ahead of the Soviet Union in total number of scientists and engineers, and in the quality of our scientific and technical personnel. Keep in mind the astounding fact that 90 percent of all the scientists ever trained are still living. So our problem is in the future. If the Soviets continue to educate scientists in vast numbers, they eventually will have as many or more good scientists and engineers than we have.

Our emphasis must be, however, not only on numbers, but even more on expanding our supply of top quality scientists and engineers with advanced degrees.

We also face keen competition from other western industrial nations in this field of professional scientists and engineers.

Unlike the United States and the Soviet powers today, the countries of Western Europe and Japan are not required to devote the bulk of their scientific and technical manpower to defense and space exploration. They are putting their best talent into developing new industrial processes and new consumer products which strengthen their domestic economies and improve their ability to compete in world markets.

Of the nearly $17 billion a year we in the United States are spending on research and development, only about $4 billion is spent by American industry for nonmilitary, nonspace work. And of that $4 billion, only about $1.5 billion is aimed at increasing the productivity of our economy.

The countries of Western Europe are spending twice as large a proportion of their gross national product for civilian research and development. West Germany has more than twice as many scientists and engineers, per 1,000 workers in their labor force, working on new consumer products and new industrial processes, as do we in the United States.

Japan, which many people still think of as an imitator and copier of western scientific and technical developments, actually has as high a ratio of scientists and engineers working on its civilian technology as we have. And their textile industry, their civilian electronics industry, and other industries have been showing the results of this high quality work by Japanese scientists and engineers.

The Japanese have learned how to get twice as much production from some of their textile machines as we do. They have introduced the first transistorized television sets in our own market. They have developed automated ships which carry far more cargo with smaller crews than American ships.

American industry must be much more alive to the need for more research and development work in the civilian sector of our economy. There must be a wider diffusion of this work throughout industry, and there must be greater industry support for the training of people capable of doing this work.

Some 80 percent of all our industry sponsored research is done by 300 companies, and 73 percent in only 5 industries.

Two of these industries, aerospace and electronics, account for 25 percent of the industry sponsored research, but their products account for only 3½ percent of the total production of goods and services in this country.

Such large industries as building and construction, textiles and apparel, and food processing, on the other hand, account for 10 percent of our gross national product, but perform less than 4 percent of our privately supported research and development.

Such industries as building and textiles are composed largely of relatively small companies that lack the resources for significant research programs. They lack not only the scientists and engineers to do original research, but often they do not have the technical personnel to understand and adapt for their own plants the research and development work that is done in our universities.

To help meet the needs of such industries, the Department of Commerce has proposed a new program of contracts and grants to institutions organized for research, education, or the dissemination of technical information. These institutions can be industry research organizations or universities or other broadly based organizations.

The purpose of this program is to attack technical problems common to an entire industry, and to make the results of this research readily available to all of the companies in the particular industry.

We also are proposing a nationwide university and industry extension service, similar to the agricultural extension service which has stimulated such a miracle of productivity in our farm economy.

In looking at one of your bulletins on VPI, I was struck by the fact that five paragraphs were devoted to your agricultural experiment stations and their extension work, while only one paragraph noted your engineering experiment station and its extension services.

I hope this does not reflect the actual emphasis here, but by and large, throughout the country including my own State of North Carolina, we have failed to realize that our industrial economy is now vastly larger than our farm economy, indeed, we now have almost as many business enterprises in this country as we have individual farms.

In recent years, agricultural productivity has increased much more rapidly than the productivity of the industrial sector of our economy. And both of these far exceed productivity increases in the service sector which now employs more than half of our total labor force.

We must give much more attention to the lagging sectors of our economy if we expect to make the productivity gains that are necessary for a steadily rising standard of living for the American people.

We should begin by giving much greater attention to the vital industrial sector which affects the efficiency of our whole economy and especially our ability to compete in the sale of our manufactured goods in other countries.

The Commerce Department's proposed pilot program for more effective industrial extension services is a major step in this direction. Its future growth will depend largely upon the willingness of industry, our universities, and our State and local governments, to join in financing this effort to improve our civilian industrial technology.

This program will help us meet our national need for more scientists and engineers, especially in the civilian sector of our economy. It will help by promoting better use of existing technology while we expand our scientific and technical manpower. And it will help train additional manpower, especially the people we need who understand industrial research and development problems, by providing additional research programs in association with our universities. And this program offers VPI additional challenges and opportunities which I am sure it will accept.

The President's program for improving our educational system also includes vitally important provisions for increasing the number of potential researchers who go on to obtain advanced degrees in science and engineering.

We have a serious shortage of top quality people in all fields, but perhaps none is more serious than the shortage of engineers with doctor's degrees.

These are the engineers whose research capabilities are indispensable for the translation of our scientific discoveries into practical industrial technology. Their research and design capabilities are our best guarantee that American technology will be the envy of the world in the future as it has been in the past.

Our leadership in the world today does not depend upon our vast natural resources or upon the size of our population. We are the leader of the world because we are the leader in technology. We have the greatest resources of trained brainpower and we have done the best job of applying that brainpower to the work at hand.

But we can maintain our leadership in a world in which billions of people are discovering the possibilities of education only if we drive for quality and more quality in our educational efforts.

We are entering an age in which excellence will count as it never has before, because this excellence must be broadly shared, without in any way impairing the full development of our most outstanding individuals.

We must not fail to develop this excellence in every part of our country and every part of our population. This is a matter of national importance, but it is also important to the people of every State and every region of our country.

In recent years there has been a growing concentration of our scientific and technological resources in a few areas of the country, primarily in California around the California Institute of Technology and in Massachusetts around MIT.

Our military spending for research and development has promoted this concentration of scientific and engineering manpower and facilities—in the aircraft and missile companies of the Pacific coast States and in the electronics companies of the New England States.

But it was the scientific resources of such institutions as Cal Tech and MIT which attracted many of these companies and stimulated their growth in the forefront of scientific and technological development.

The universities that had the top scientists and engineers, the universities which were training scientists and engineers for the advanced degrees necessary for research and development, attracted the research contracts and the companies engaged in research and development work.

These companies, in turn, have won the big defense production contracts, and have devoted part of their expanding resources to improving the scientific capabilities of the universities in their areas. One feeds on the other.

This has not been an unmixed blessing for these areas, because military research and development is not automatically translatable into the civilian technology that is necessary for the healthy growth of consumer industries. And consumer industries are more stable in their production and employment than defense industries.

But the important lesson is clear: The industrial development of any area in this highly technical age is going to depend directly upon the scientific and technological capabilities of the universities and colleges of that area.

The development of this area is going to depend in large measure on this institution, on the quality of its instruction, on the adequacy of its facilities, and on the appropriateness of its programs to the needs of its State, its region, and the Nation.

Today, 20 universities graduate two-thirds of all our people with doctor's degrees. And these 20 universities are located in only 12 States.

The remaining 38 States, with half of the Nation's population, produce only one-quarter of our people with the most advanced degrees.

It is estimated that we need to develop at least 50 additional top quality graduate education centers throughout the Nation to meet our needs for highly trained personnel in all fields.

VPI should be one of those centers.

Your aim should be to develop an educational center second to none in the Nation. You should be able to give your students the opportunity for the fullest development of their capabilities. You should be able to give your State and your region, its industry and its agriculture, the best university facilities that this technological age may require.

This is the challenge the future imposes upon you, Dr. Hahn, upon your faculty, and upon the members of this great student body. You should be satisfied with nothing less than the best, and you should be constantly aware that the best today will not be good enough for tomorrow.

To the students here today, let me say that your challenges will be matched only by your opportunities for self-realization and for service to your fellow men in this new age of rapid technological and social change.

Make the most of your opportunities while you are here. Learn to work hard and effectively. Arm yourself with understanding as well as knowledge, with character as well as competence, and above all, with a lasting devotion to excellence in all that you do.

It will serve you well, and you will serve well in the future.

Thank you, and my very best wishes to you all.

School of Advanced Studies in Real Property Acquisition in New York Hears Views of Congressman Cramer on Need for Highway Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, an address by our capable and highly respected colleague from Florida, Mr. CRAMER, was delivered at the School of Advanced Studies in Real Property Acquisition, Special Seminar for New York Court of Claims, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.

Due to Mr. CRAMER's pressing duties, he was unable to personally participate in the seminar and Mr. Clifton W. Enfield, minority counsel of the Committee on Public Works, delivered Mr. CRAMER's address.

As the ranking minority member of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, Mr. CRAMER's remarks concerning right-of-way acquisition and the illicit practices uncovered concerning this subject are particularly germane to the work of the subcommittee of which I am the ranking minority member, the Select Subcommtitee on Real Property Acquisition; as well as to the work of the entire Congress as it determines legislation needed to correct these improprieties.

For these reasons, I am asking permission to insert the complete text of Mr. CRAMER's address in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM FLORIDA, DELIVERED BY MR. CLIFTON W. ENFIELD, MINORITY COUNSEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. CONGRESS, AT THE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED STUDIES IN REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION, SPECIAL SEMINAR FOR NEW YORK COURT OF CLAIMS, GIDEON PUTNAM HOTEL, SARATOGA SPRINGS, N.Y., APRIL 19, 1963

Mr. McMorran, Mr. Mackie, Judge Young, and your colleagues from the bench of the New York Court of Claims, and distinguished persons all, Congressman CRAMER asked me to express his profound regrets in not being able to attend and personally participate in this seminar, but other pressing matters in which he is engaged made it impossible. However, his absence has become my good fortune. I am honored by this opportunity to be with you, to see so many of my old friends and to make new ones, and to bring to you Congressman CRAMER's views on some very important aspects of land acquisition for public purposes.

There are many things that we could discuss, such as the absolute necessity for sound and fully documented appraisals, the value of good severance damage studies, and the duty of public officials and appraisers to give recognition to special benefits that will accrue to an owner's remaining property from the construction of a public improvement. But time does not permit going into all of these subjects, and I assume they have been, or will be, included in other portions of the program of your School of Advanced Studies in Real Property Acquisition. For the next 30 minutes, I would like to talk with you about two things of the greatest importance to every person engaged in right-of-way acquisition, integrity, and education.

The modern day right-of-way agent faces many complexities, and he must be proficient in many areas of endeavor. Some time ago I tried to list the qualities you have to have to be a first class right-of-way agent. I listed them something like this: 25 percent appraiser, 25 percent salesman, 25 percent engineer, 25 percent lawyer, 25 percent governmental administrator, 25 percent economist, 25 percent public relations expert, and 25 percent psychologist. You add that up and it is 200 percent—a double-sized man. It is a man who has the ability to unite the knowledge of many separate professions and to bring them to bear harmoniously upon a public undertaking in such a way that all affected parties are at least reasonably satisfied. This takes skill and patience.

Great right-of-ways agents are not born; they are products of education and training; they must be men of the highest integrity; and they must be dedicated to public service. Superintendent McMorran and the State department of public works are to be congratulated for conducting a School of Advanced Studies in Real Property Acquisition, of which this special 2-day seminar is a part. Schools of this kind, which provide training at a professional level, ably presented by highly qualified and respected person in the right-of-way field, can do much to fill the educational void left by our institutions of higher learning, very few of which offer a curriculum designed to graduate a trained right-of-way man. In right-of-way acquisition, as in every other profession, a continuing educational program is essential, both for public employees and private practitioners, to promote the growth and dissemination of a specialized body of knowledge and to spark new ideas for the development of better methods and techniques.

The need to secure the best possible information as to value and damages and the essentiality of competency to and integrity of those engaged in public land acquisition is readily apparent when we consider the vast sums of money being spent by all levels of government for all types of public works. Right-of-way for the interstate highway system alone is estimated to cost in excess of $6 billion, and when we add to that the costs of real property for all other highways and streets, dams and reservoirs, canals, public buildings, urban renewal, and all other governmental activities, the amount of money involved becomes astronomical. Unfortunately, public works programs of such magnitude, which involve such tremendous sums of money and the participation of so many thousands of people, are bound to attract some incompetent people and some dishonest, and unscrupulous persons who are looking for opportunities to profit at the expense of the public. To illustrate how this can occur, it is appropriate to look at some recent disclosures of incompetency and dishonesty in the highway program.

The State and Federal officials and employees charged with the responsibility of carrying out the Federal-aid highway program are, in the main, honest, competent, and dedicated public servants, who have fully justified the trust placed in them; however, there has been a disturbing frequency of incidents of incompetency, graft, and dishonesty.

Reports and rumors of fraud and thievery in the highway program quickly followed enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. In Indiana, the chairman of the State highway commission and several others were indicted and convicted of fraudulent activities in the acquisition of highway right-of-way. In Arizona, the chief right-of-way agent for the State highway department was accused of allegedly causing a State warrant to be issued to a fictitious person, and of pocketing the proceeds. In Arkansas, a subcontractor and a highway department engineer were convicted by a Federal court on charges involving false certification of the quantity of materials delivered to a Federal-aid project.

Because these incidents and other reports and rumors, in September of 1959, the House Committee on Public Works established the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program to conduct continuing investigations and to act as a congressional watchdog to protect the public interest. So far the subcommittee has held public hearings with respect to highway practices in five States: Oklahoma, Florida, New Mexico, Massachusetts, and West Virginia. In all of these hearings, the disclosures were most disturbing.

The first of these hearings, in May of 1960, involved the construction of an interstate highway bypass around Tulsa, Okla. The hearings disclosed that there had been a deplorable failure to meet specifications. An alarming picture was presented of inadequate or no supervision by the State, failure to make proper tests and inspections, and falsification of test reports and preparation of bogus test samples by highway department employees. It was further disclosed that a member of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission was a concealed partner of a firm bidding on highway department sodding contracts. The report of the subcommittee made a general finding "* * * that conditions were so incredibly bad that they created a climate virtually inviting the prepetration of fraud."

In Florida it was shown that for many years highway contractors had made payments of cash, whisky, turkeys, and other things of value to highway department employees who were assigned to supervise and inspect their work. Testimony also disclosed that due to inadequate planning, insufficient lead time for the acquisition of rights-of-way and disposal of improvements, and plain incompetency, the State disposed of valuable improvements on rights-of-way in total disregard of the public interest by turning them over to contractors and allowed such contractors and speculators to reap windfall profits which should have accrued to the State and the Federal Government.

The hearings involving New Mexico disclosed events somewhat similar to that found in Oklahoma. Evidence was presented showing incompetent and nonexistent inspections and wholly inadequate supervision by highway department employees, failure of the contractor to comply with specifications, and failure of a highway project even before it was opened to traffic. There was also evidence that two members of the State highway commission were suppliers of automotive supplies and equipment to firms bidding on State highway department contracts.

I have merely touched upon the highlights of these hearings. Those of you who may be interested in more details will find the printed hearings and subcommittee reports interesting reading.

Reports have not yet been issued on the hearings involving right-of-way practices in Massachusetts and West Virginia; however, the printed hearings are available. The Massachusetts hearings disclosed unbelievable laxity, incompetency, and fraud in the acquisition of rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways. The Department of Public Works became a spawning ground for a variety of conspiratorial patterns which grew and flourished. The evidence showed that incompetent appraisers were employed by the State and that there was no adequate review of appraisals. The hearings disclosed a revolting pattern of conspiracy between certain State officials and employees, appraisers, and attorneys, resulting in the payment of greatly inflated prices for property needed for highway rights-of-way. Mr. Oscar Beasley played an important role in this investigation and hearings. He was employed by the Bureau of Public Roads to review the appraisals of right-of-way on certain sections of Federal-aid highways, many of which had been the basis for settlements, and he found scores of them to be completely inadequate and inconsistent with actual market value. Sixteen individuals and corporations have been indicted with respect to rights-of-way matters brought out at this hearing, 12 of which have been convicted, including an associate commissioner of the Department of Public Works, three rights-of-way employees of the Department, four independent appraisers, a private attorney, a real estate broker, and two corporations that owned property acquired by the State. Indictments are still pending against a former right of way engineer of the Department of Public Works and a private attorney who was later appointed as a judge of the State courts.

The time has come when members of the right-of-way profession, as well as all others associated with the highway program, must be brutally objective and honest in the evaluation of themselves and their associates. Those who are competent, honest, and dedicated are a credit to the profession and an asset to the highway program. I am sure that the great majority of persons engaged in right-of-way acquisition for the highway program fall into this category. However, there are others who are neither a credit nor an asset to anything.

First, we have the dishonest person, who is seeking to profit at public expense. Nothing we say here will eliminate him. We can do only two things to protect the public against such a person: be alert to his activities, and enact laws which will promote his prompt detection and punishment. I will say more about such laws in a few minutes.

Second, we have the person who is basically honest but who simply does not know how to do his job and hides the fact from his superiors. You might say that, by reason of this, he, too is dishonest. but such motivations as job retention and pride can

becloud one's sense of moral and ethical values.

Hearings held by the special subcommittee on right-of-way acquisition practices in West Virginia disclosed deplorable examples of what can result from employment of this latter type of person.

It was shown in these hearings that certain responsible positions in the right-of-way division of the State highway department were staffed with people who had little or no background in right-of-way work; there was no inservice training of any real substance and no manual for the guidance and instruction of employees, many of whom changed with each new administration; bewildering and ambiguous formulas for fixing value were adopted that bore no relationship to accepted appraisal standards; the highly important function of appraisal review turned out to be, for the most part, nothing more than a perfunctory check for arithmetical errors; and unconscionable overpayments had been made for rights-of-way. It was further disclosed that State highway department employees were asked to make regular monthly contributions to a political party's sustaining fund. State employees were even furnished coupon books for their use in making monthly payments.

The West Virginia hearings were devoted principally to the acquisition of rights-of-way in the town of Beckley, W. Va. The testimony indicated that State right-of-way personnel were extremely anxious to avoid court proceedings for condemnation of real property, because they were convinced that court awards would be excessive, and the history of past court awards tended to substantiate this fear. I make this observation not to defend the practices of the right-of-way personnel, but simply as a matter of background and to give you food for thought. It is common knowledge that right-of-way settlements in many States have been made above appraised value because highway officials fear, on the basis of past experience, that court awards would be even higher. This demonstrates either a lack of confidence in court procedures or a lack of confidence in the attorneys handling cases for the State, which certainly does not contribute to the desirable practice of acquiring rights-of-way at prices which are fair and just, both to property owners and to the public, who pays the bills.

In any event, the West Virginia Highway Department right-of-way personnel sought to avoid court proceedings at all costs. Properties were appraised, and offers were made on the basis of such appraisals. If such an offer was not accepted, the property would be reappraised, and if necessary reappraised, with additional elements or amounts of value and damages being added each time until a figure was reached that was acceptable to the property owner. The testimony disclosed that in order to justify amounts acceptable to property owners, the State's appraisals included such things as allowances both for the full amounts of proximity damages and for the full costs of moving and reestablishing buildings away from the highway, an obvious duplication of payments.

The testimony also showed that the State right-of-way people wanted to be fair to all property owners. If one property owner held out for and received a settlement in excess of the appraised value of his property, the State frequently added substantial amounts to the settlements previously agreed to by owners of other similar properties to assure that all owners were paid on an equal, even if not a rational, basis.

Obviously, the result of such practices was exorbitant expenditures of public funds. Let me emphasize the fact that, generally speaking, the West Virginia hearings disclosed no evidence of fraud or personal profit on the part of State personnel. They were simply honest people sincerely trying to get the best "deal" for the State, without being quite sure of how to go about it, without full knowledge of the appraisal process and how to apply it, without benefit of proper supervision and review, and without confidence in court proceedings.

The solution to problems of this kind is competency through education, and continuing education. Schools such as that being conducted by the New York Department of Public Works, seminars like this one, and the continuing efforts of right-of-way and appraisal organizations, the bureau of public roads, and State highway departments can minimize, if not eliminate, such problems. Two things probably can never be completely eliminated: controversy as to particular acquisitions and the occasional thief. But if all right-of-way personnel are thoroughly trained for their jobs and if their work is properly supervised and reviewed, controversy can be withstood, and the occasional thief will be as unusual as the dishonest bank teller.

I am convinced that the vast majority of persons building our highways are honest, competent, and dedicated to serving the public interest; however, the disclosures of the special subcommittee have made it abundantly clear that fraud, graft, thievery, and incompetency are far more widespread, and involve far more people, than most of us would have suspected or believed before these hearings.

I have heard many of my friends in State highway departments express shock over the irregularities found in other States and then say that it cannot happen in their States. But it can and very possibly has happened there, to some degree.

It is difficult to be suspicious of a friend. It is hard to be suspicious of people that you have known, liked, and worked with for a long time. But the cases of dishonesty and incompetency revealed in congressional hearings occurred largely because honest and competent highway officials and employees assumed that everybody else was equally honest and competent, and therefore did not review the work of their subordinates or associates carefully or critically. They accepted everything at face value, and thus created the opportunity for fraud and incompetency.

I am not suggesting that we establish a spy system where nobody trusts anybody. I am saying that we should not take everything for granted. We should not blindly accept a statement or certification that a job has been done. We must make some inquiry or examination to assure that the work has actually been done, and done properly. This is the only way that we can minimize the opportunity for fraud and incompetency, and have some assurance that dishonesty will be promptly detected and punished.

It is to serve this end, and for the protection of the public interest and the reputation of the thousands of honest, competent highway officials and employees, that Congressman CRAMER, as ranking minority member on both the Roads Subcommittee and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program of the House Committee on Public Works, has urged the Congress to provide Federal law enforcement agencies with tools that are adequate to root out and punish those responsible for dishonesty, graft, and incompetency, which could detroy public confidence in and support of the Federal-aid highway program. These tools are embodied in a bill introduced by Congressman CRAMER in September of 1961, and reintroduced, with some changes, in the present Congress on January 24 of this year.

The present bill, H.R. 2557, which would provide for an act known as the Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act of 1963, would revise and strengthen existing law by prohibiting officials, employees and other persons performing services in connection with a Federal-aid highway project from having any personal interest in any contract with respect to which they have any official authority or responsibility, and would prohibit such persons from having any interest in any real property acquired for such project without full and public disclosure of their interest. It would prohibit contractors on Federal-aid highway projects from giving money or other things of value to Federal, State, and local officials and employees who are supposed to be supervising their work, and would prohibit the solicitation of such payments. The bill would further make it a crime to knowingly perform work or furnish material or to permit the performance of work or furnishing of materials not in accordance with the plans and specifications. Further, with respect to rights-of-way, the bill would extend the provisions of existing law relating to false statements and representations concerning Federal-aid highway projects to the acquisition, administration, and disposition of real property. Finally, the bill would prohibit political contribution by anyone who is at the time negotiating for or performing a contract in connection with a Federal-aid highway project, including the sale of real property therefor. This would extend to Federal-aid contracts the provisions of existing law which apply to contracts with the United States.

The Department of Commerce also recognized the need for revising existing criminal statutes relating to Federal-aid highways and submitted proposed legislation to the last Congress in March of 1962. On the 4th of this month, the Attorney General of the United States submitted similar proposed legislation, which was developed in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, to the Congress. This proposed legislation has not yet been introduced, but it is substantially similar to Congressman CRAMER's bill, except that it does not contain a provision prohibiting political contributions, nor does it completely prohibit conflicts of interest, but simply requires full disclosure of situations which might lead to conflicts of interest.

It has often been said that you cannot legislate morals or judgment. Legislation such as that proposed should deter fraud and other wrongdoing, and it should make easier the prosecution of those who commit such acts, but it will not make moral those who are immoral, nor will it make competent those who are incompetent.

Morality and competency must spring from those in the highway industry, and no area is more sensitive to its lack than right-of-way acquisition. The spotlight of public scrutiny will continue to be upon right-of-way throughout the life of the Federal-aid highway program, and it is incumbent upon everyone engaged in real property acquisition to insist upon the highest standards of competency and integrity at all times, and to establish such checks and safeguards as may be necessary to assure that any departures therefrom will be quickly detected and corrected.

This challenge should be welcomed, for it affords an opportunity for right-of-way people to demonstrate their ability to perform professional services in a manner to merit public confidence, and I am satisfied that, with the leadership of such men as are assembled here, the right of way profession will meet this challenge.

For a Real Vacation It's Time You Came to West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, much has been written about the scenic beauty of West Virginia, the sweep and roll of its marching hills, the inspirational quiet of its forestlands, the enchanting rush and sparkle of its many streams and rivers, the stalwart, windblown, hardworking people who live in the narrow valleys and on remote mountainsides. But none can appreciate the splendor of nature's handiwork, nor feel the sheer pleasure of being alive, without traveling through West Virginia and breathing deep its cool and invigorating air.

The Cheapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of West Virginia believes as I do that it is time for city dwellers to reinvigorate themselves by coming to West Virginia for a real vacation. In an advertisement in the April 21, 1963, edition of the New York Times, the company acclaims the virtues of, and the experiences to be enjoyed by, traveling through or vacationing in the Mountain State. I ask unanimous consent to have this unusual public service advertisement by the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A REAL VACATION, IT'S TIME YOU CAME TO WEST VIRGINIA

Why, there is so much pleasure country here, it's backed up on itself from every border. Fishing, camping, hunting, hiking country, hunkered up like skidwrinkles in a throw rug.

West Virginia is a State sized nature place, set down uncrowded between the crowded East and South, ridged and valleyed to squeeze in more of all that a real vacation is.

Towering timber stands, church quiet, with shadowed floors spotlit by sunshafts piercing high leafroofs. Splashhappy streams teasing bouldered banks. Mountain scrubbed air filtered cool through thick foliage, so fresh and sweet you know you're first in all of time to breathe it. Nature trails that turn and pause to sniff at every curious woodland thing, with civilization tacked on handy at each end but not a hint of it between.

West Virginia is the living sum of all the places your father took you in the bright young years before the old creek dried up and the game fled, and the trees and fields gave way to the advancing ranks of dwellings where outdoor living is a backyard fireplace and a picture window.

The old enchantments never died in West Virginia. They are here, and real, and only half a day of driving from the East's big cities.

It's time you came, and brought your family.

We've been quiet about our State till now, but this is the year of our hundredth birthday and we want you here to help us celebrate. Besides, we now have roads to get you in. Carving good roads into mountainsides is not a task that's quickly done, and we have a way to go, but you'll get around fine.

Oh, we still have sidetrails best taken muleback, but those are special. And even the broadest roads we've pushed through our hills are humpbacked and curveswept where the hills pushed back. But you wouldn't want to see this State on the straight and level: some places are just too pretty to swoosh through.

And when you round a hairpin, up where a mountain peaks, and the hills part to show you a valley forested deep in hardwoods and fresheted with streams, and rimmed by other mountains marching off to the world's edge, it's kind of satisfying to hear your engine puff a little, as though it's earned this height and the sight of beauty you are looking on.

For hunter, skier, fisherman, hiker, camping family, this beauty is a bonus where the sport is prize enough. Trout run as prime and plentiful as when young George Washington surveyed this ground before the Revolution. Game is abundant, deer, bear, grouse, wild turkey, pheasant, wary and creature cunning but not trampled and shellshocked into hiding. Camping, your choice, from rough tent sites as remote and solitary as you please to the comforts and congeniality of modern lodges, or just-like-home cottages, or fine motels.

A hundred years ago, the State of West Virginia was created as an act of war. Today, her once disputed borders compass battlegrounds of two wars, where relic and terrain impress on you a sense of vital causes being fought for. History trudges the roads you travel. Yesterdays hover close and meaningful around old structures meticulously preserved.

Now, do not think that West Virginia is all past history and present wilderness. Our cities and towns, if reft of their mountain backdrops and hill-titled underpinnings, would look at home in your State. Great automated industries sweat rich and ugly at our riverbanks. Barges draw deep under cargoes of our mineral wealth. Even the unmoving hills are thriving forest farms producing hardwoods endlessly. Like the terrain, our economic landscape has its low and shadowed places hid among the reaching summits, but our massive prospects for development might be coveted by any State. These are things that have no bearing on your visit, and you'll see little of them, but we'd like to have you know.

On a pleasure trip, you'd normally avoid the cities. In West Virginia, this centennial year, we hope you will not. During 1963, a multitude of anniversary events—pageants and parades, exhibits and spectaculars, many with historical themes reflecting West Virginia's birth in war—are being staged in our cities, towns, and villages. A historical drama playing in Beckley, "Honey in the Rock," was acclaimed in the Times' dramatic pages, and has brought visitors from every State. It alone is worth the trip. There is a great deal more.

It's time you came.

The Famous Forbes Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as I noted Monday in connection with the celebration of National Library Week, one of the truly distinctive libraries in the United States is the well-known and important Forbes Library in Northampton.

Rarely have I seen an article with the depth and historical perception of one that recently appeared in the home city paper of Forbes Library. I refer to an article by Bernard Decker, an excellent and talented newspaperman. Quoting Judge Charles Edward Forbes to the effect that the development of modern thought is, in good measure, the product of the world of books, Decker brilliantly reviews the history of the sixth largest library in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and one of the most influential anywhere. His article, from a number of standpoints, deserves wide reading. I am pleased to include his article, from the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Northampton, Mass., of Monday, April 22.

The article follows:

[From the Northampton (Mass.) Daily Hampshire Gazette, Apr. 22, 1963]

JUDGE'S BEQUEST TO CITY HE LOVED; LIBRARY THE ENVY OF OTHER TOWNS

(By Bernard Decker)

As befits a city with its reputation as a center of learning, Northampton possesses a library much larger communities might envy. Whether one wants to read Shakespeare or Suess, listen to Beethoven or boogie-woogie, look at reproductions of Degas or Dali—one can do so at Forbes Library.

This cultural wealth is the legacy of a 19th century eccentric, Judge Charles Edward Forbes. In his will, setting aside the money for the library, Judge Forbes wrote:

"It has been my aim to place within reach of the inhabitants of a town, in which I have lived long and pleasantly, the means of learning, if they are disposed to learn, the marvelous developments of modern thought, and to enable them to judge of the destiny of the race on scientific evidence, rather than on metaphysical evidence alone. The importance of the education of the people cannot be overrated."

Forbes Library has been placing the means of learning within reach of Northampton inhabitants for 67 years now. It contains 263,721 volumes; 800 phonograph records, 897 reels of microfilm; 7,759 maps; 21,191 sheets of music; and 46,030 photographs.

This abundance places Forbes as sixth largest public library in the State, though there are 34 communities more populous. And even this placement is misleading, according to Lawrence E. Wikander, present librarian. Forbes' volumes are almost all titles, with few duplicates, he notes. This is opposed to a city like Newton, officially recognized as having a larger library, where there are several branch libraries, each requiring duplicates of volumes contained in the city's main one.

As Mr. Wikander notes in this year's library report: "Figures do not lie, but librarians know they cannot tell the whole truth. Libraries are engaged in providing materials, principally books, for education, information, and recreation. The measure of their success is only a count of the number of books pushed across the desk. No reckoning is made of the books consulted in the library, and no account can be rendered of the effect of the library on the need of the people it seeks to serve."

Even by this admittedly arbitrary yardstick of book circulation, Forbes is an unqualified success. In 1961 there were 10,622 registered users, a percentage larger than one-third of the city's population. These users took out 230,505 books, an average of 22.5 per person.

This use is an excellent response to what Mr. Wikander naturally considers a superior

library. Its superiority is due to the endowments left it by Judge Forbes and others though, he is quick to point out.

"If the city got what it paid for," he says, "Forbes would be only an average library."

There is more than $700,000 in principal from which the trustees draw income to maintain the library and buy books. Judge Forbes' bequest was the largest single endowment, a total of $220,000, from which this principal is formed. He made the bequest in a will both unique and eccentric, apparently mirroring the man's personality.

Charles Edward Forbes was born Charles Fobes August 25, 1795, at Bridgewater, a descendant of Puritan stock. (He added the Edward and the "r" in Forbes upon coming to this city, according to one source.) His family moved to Enfield the following year, and he came to this city in 1817 to practice law after having graduated from Brown University in 1815.

His rise was steady. He served as Hampshire County attorney (equivalent to today's district attorney), in the State legislature twice, and as justice of the peace three times. In 1844, the then Governor Briggs offered him the chief justiceship of the Court of Common Pleas (now Superior Court), which he turned down. In 1847 he accepted the post of associate judge in the same court, and the following year an associate judgeship in the State Supreme Court.

"About 8 months afterward," according to the Gazette of October 23, 1894, while the full bench was sitting in Worcester, Judge Forbes sent his letter of resignation to the Governor and then started for Northampton, without saying even a word to his associates.

"The judge was notional, and the only reason given for this sudden act was that he wanted his own time and did not like to feel that he must leave everything when he heard the "bell," meaning the courthouse bell which rang for opening sessions.

"On returning to this city he confined himself to chamber practice, never again appearing in court."

Despite his eccentricity, he was thought of highly. Governor Briggs reportedly said of him: "That had Judge Forbes remained on the bench he would have succeeded Judge Shaw as chief justice. This was the general estimate placed on his abilities throughout the State wherever he was known."

In a description of him, Judge Forbes was said to be "a striking figure. Tall and erect, fully 6 feet in height and well proportioned, with strong and expressive features and a clear-cut face, he impressed one as being no ordinary man."

(One almost has to take the word of the author of this statement. Judge Forbes would allow no likeness of him made while he lived. The library's oil portrait and bronze bust are based on a death mask and on a photograph made after his death.)

His personality was another thing. In an editorial after his death, the Springfield Republican remarked that he was noted for being "closefisted" and "miserly," but that he had a gift for "unostentatious charity."

"He was easily irritated and sharp in his language to those who happened to offend him. A young lawyer called to see him one day, and paying him in advance asked several questions. The young man on going downstairs thought of something else he wanted to know and returning was roughly accousted by the judge with 'Damn it, young man, do you think I work by the day?' "

His last years were spent "in reading and studying the philosophical questions then absorbing the thoughts of the leading minds of the world." This study is reflected in his will. His first was drawn April 11, 1870, but was stolen in the famous Northampton bank robbery, along with more than $1 million in bank funds. (Authorities later recovered the will and it is in the library's possession.)

A second was drawn September 25, 1876, similar in tenor to the first, Judge Forbes died February 13, 1881, 85 and unmarried. When his will was made known, there were those who said it would have been better had he not drawn the second will. For he distrusted religion in general after his years of philosophical study, and so stated in the will.

"It has been asserted that there are between 2,000 and 3,000 different systems of religion in existence. But as a general rule these are the inventions of cunning men or the vagaries of semilunatics speaking boldly and impudently in the name of God, of whose decrees and purposes they know as little as the most ignorant of their victims. The result is seldom doubtful. It is wealth and power on the part of the prophets, ignorance and poverty on the part of the disciples."

Despite this strong feeling, Judge Forbes did not exclude religious texts from his proposed library. He wrote:

"It is my design to form a library of works of science and the arts in their broadest acceptation, of ancient and modern of our own and other nations; but as theological works cannot be wholly excluded, in the selection of these latter works no preference shall be given to any sect or system of theologic inquiry but strict impartiality is to be extended to all of them."

The will designated $50,000 for a building fund, $20,000 for an aid fund, and $150,000 for a book fund. This money could be accumulated for a 10-year period under the terms of the will, if the trustees wished. Then it was to be applied to a library that was to be constructed "fireproof, and situate as centrally or as near the present courthouse in said Northampton as circumstances will permit, and so disconnected from all other buildings as not to be endangered by fire originating in them."

This last provision was to cause almost as much controversy as the judge's strictures concerning religion. For though the townspeople voted to accept the provisions of the will by unanimous rising vote at the annual town meeting of March 21, 1881, it was not until 1894 that a library was completed.

One faction wanted an addition built onto Memorial Hall, which already housed a public library.

This library was the outgrowth of several located in the city over the years. First of these was a social library organized in 1830, followed by a young men's society in 1834, to which were transferred the books of the first. In 1839 a book club came into being, to be followed in 1846 by a Northampton Young Men's Institute. This was incorporated in 1853 and contained the books of the social library and some of those from the book club.

In 1850 selectmen had given the institute use of a room in Town Hall for their library, which was a subscription one. The institute then offered its books to the town for a free library in 1860, an offer accepted by the town. In 1869, $25,000 was appropriated for erection of a combination public library and memorial hall. Subscriptions were collected to a total of $29,000, of which $5,000 was donated by John Clarke. Another $20,000 was appropriated by the town and the building was constructed.

John Clarke died July 5, 1869, and in a codicil to his will, left the town $40,000 for the benefit of the library. (In March of 1873 the library became a fullfledged free public library.) Christopher Clarke, a descendant, led the faction arguing for an addition to be constructed on Memorial Hall with Judge Forbes' bequest.

This proposal was blocked by two trustees named by Judge Forbes, who plumped for a separate library, to be built on the Turner site, eventual home of Forbes.

Aiding in the fight against the Turner site was the Gazette. It noted that among objections raised against the site were: "remoteness from the business center, inaccessibility, hard climb of college hill to the location; Smith College interference in the use and management of the library, built so near itself and so far from the town to which and for which it was founded."

The Gazette found this last complaint "not all imaginary nor sprung from senseless jealousy." An editorial June 30, 1885, read: in part:

"Their (Smith students) fine clothes and fine manners would create an atmosphere of superiority about the place which would keep the people of common clay away, because they would not feel at home in it."

The Gazette also commented:

"It is a mistake to let a literary institution with 300 students and one president swallow a city of 12,000 people and nearly a whole city council and mayor to boot. We are going just as Amherst has gone. A big college with a small town around it."

The controversy raged on for years, with letters appearing in the newspapers on both sides of the question and from various persons, wellknown and littleknown. One of the former was John B. O'Donnell, Irish and Catholic, who had been mayor of the city in 1892 and 1893. He wrote:

"While I consider Judge Forbes' attack upon religion and the clergy entirely out of place in an instrument of this kind, yet his views were his own and he was entitled to them. In his act he nobly rose above his prejudices, and gave this munificent gift to the people irrespective of race, color or creed; and I hope to see this building on the Turner lot rising grandly and majestically above the rest, a monument to his memory forever."

The controversy occasioned in the Springfield Republican of July 10, 1887, the following summation of the situation:

"If the future management of this great trust shall cause as much perplexity and discomfort as the subject of its location and building has engendered the citizens will regret that the money was ever willed to the town in the form it was."

The city council finally gave in and directed the trustees to proceed with the building of the library. It was begun in 1891, but not completed until 1894.

"In 1894 the imposing structure, agreeably semiromanesque in style, its walls of Milford granite, with Longmeadow sandstone trimmings, with a capacity of 400,000 volumes, ample room and space, and of the best type of library construction of that day, was completed at a cost of nearly $114,000," a later librarian, Joseph L. Harrison, was to write in his "Forbes Library—The Half Century."

The building was dedicated October 23, 1894, by which time the Forbes' bequest totaled nearly $500,000, or double what the judge had left. It was opened to the public July 1, 1895.

(The Memorial Hall library was now named the Clarke Library, to distinguish it from Forbes. It was not until 1916 that the council voted to combine the two. In addition to 41,869 volumes from the Clarke Library, Forbes was also the beneficiary of a sizable fund, the nucleus of which was part of the proceeds of the farewell concert May 6, 1852, of Jenny Lind. She had donated the money to the city she so loved and had named The Paradise of America.)

Judge Forbes was not yet forgiven the indiscretions of his will, as is evident from the account of the dedication that appeared in the Gazette.

"The great library is done, the Forbes-Earle (Dr. Pliny Earle) Library, for we shall in years to come feel more indebted to the latter than to the former.

"It is very simple. Its outlines are pleasing, not striking, but they will seem pleasing the longer.

"Our trustees started off pretty heavily with ministers of religion and even had prayer. It may be well to give the ministers considerable latitude at the start, as the will prohibits their having anything to do with hereafter."

(This last was sarcastic reference to another provision of the will: "I further will and direct that none but laymen shall be competent, or fill any office, or exercise any control in the management of the library.")

Otherwise, the Gazette seemed satisfied: "The stranger will hardly need to ask if the building is for a library: it looks like it."

The newspaper could hardly let the opportunity slip by, however, without one more slap at Smith College:

"But there is one drawback, and that is the music room of the college, from which are wafted the clattering sounds of a dozen pianos and the warbling and screeching of a dozen hearty maidens. These may be heard on a still autumn day on the opposite bank of the Mill River."

The trustees named as the new library's first librarian Charles Ammi Cutter, world famous for his Cutter system of classification.

Mr. Cutter's roots were as Puritan New England as those of the library's benefactor. Born in Boston March 14, 1937, he entered Harvard College at 14, graduating 4 years later third in a class of 50 and a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He graduated in 1859 from Harvard Divinity School.

The ministry failed to win him however. A stint at assisting in the cataloging of a collection acquired by the divinity school turned his bent to library work instead. After his graduation, he became assistant to the head cataloger of Harvard College Library, one of the largest in the world at that time. For 8 years the two men worked at a new cataloging system for the library, an experience that was to lead to Mr. Cutter's later emergence as an expert in this field.

This Harvard catalog was the first set up by author and class, alphabetically, on small cards for the reader's use.

In 1868, Mr. Cutter became librarian at Boston Athenaeum, famous private library. He stayed for 25 years, during which time he cataloged its volumes.

This cataloging was "epoch-making in the history of the American library" as it was "the first successful attempt to unlock for the public the secrets concealed in a large library," according to the biography of Mr. Cutter written by William P. Cutter, his nephew and second librarian at Forbes.

W. P. Cutter declared his uncle's printed dictionary catalog revolutionary, "the most important attempt ever made in the realm of cataloging, unique in its plan and superior in its execution." It was the basis for the cataloging and classifying system installed and still operating at the Library of Congress.

(A library catalog lists the descriptive details of books: author, title, publisher, price, number of pages, etc.; a library classification is the system whereby books are given numbers so that they can be arranged on shelves by subject matter.)

Mr. Cutter introduced the system to Forbes, but before he could complete it, he died.

When he entered the field, "few would have had the temerity to dignify librarianship as a profession, W. P. Cutter wrote of his uncle. "It remained for Charles Cutter, and a few others like him, to bring it up to the professional level."

The second Mr. Cutter followed his uncle as librarian, as was noted above. In so doing, he stepped into the midst of a most unusual and interesting feud, one which pitted the library trustees against those of Smith College.

It was 1904 and the library had faced deficits in its maintenance fund for some years. Smith had been paying $500 a year toward this fund in recognition of the use made of the library by its students. That year Forbes' trustees proposed a $2,000 increase in this contribution. Smith trustees balked, countering with an offer of a $1,500 increase.

Forbes' trustees dismissed the offer and voted to charge a fee of $5 to Smith students.

Before the impasse was resolved by the contribution of the disputed $500 by an unidentified donor, an exchange of letters took place between Smith President L. Clark Seelye and Arthur Watson, chairman of the library's trustees, that was unusual, if not extraordinary.

President Seelye says in his first letter, turning down the library proposal: "No other institution in the city contributes as much to the city's wealth or is more worthy of generous consideration by city officals.

"In view of these facts, the trustees of Smith College feel they must respectfully decline to comply with your request to make up the deficit in the expenditures which they have never authorized and over which they have no control, on the ground implied in your letter that the members of the college are not entitled to the services of the library for which those expenditures were made."

(Has there ever been a more cultured way of saying "Nuts to you"?)

President Seelye went on to point out that Smith's trustees went to great pains to husband their funds so that they saved money from their income and increasing endowments. The trustees were not likely, therefore, to force a possible deficit at the college to relieve one at the library, he concluded.

Mr. Watson's reply was incisive:

"The trustees are glad that Smith College is able to save from its income and rejoice with you in your increasing endowments, but they do not undertsand the plea of poverty."

(One has a mental picture of two Victorian gentlemen dueling with pens.)

Fortunately both sides swallowed their pride, ignored the slightly veiled insults and smoothed over their differences. It is told that in later years President Seelye thanked Watson, noting that the disagreement pointed up to the trustees the need for a library at Smith. Today, relations are more than amiable between the two institutions.

Following this rather startling introduction into library affairs at Northampton, William Cutter enjoyed a placid stay for his 7 years as librarian. Though expected to continue the classification begun by his uncle, he was more interested as an ardent outdoorsman, in what nature had to offer in this area. The cataloging remained unfinished when he left, at which time it was said of him that he was "a sincere and kindly man, a lover both of books and the great open beyond the walls of the library."

Joseph LeRoy Harrison followed the second Mr. Cutter as librarian, taking office January 1, 1912. He held the post for 39 years.

Mr. Harrison brought an interesting background to the post. Born in North Adams October 12, 1862, he attended schools there and graduated from Cornell University.

From Cornell he went to work on a New York newspaper, serving as its assistant Washington correspondent in 1888 and 1889. He attended the University of Heidelberg in 1890 and the New York State Library School in Albany from 1901 to 1903.

He was in charge of the American Library Association exhibit at the Paris Exposition in 1889, sublibrarian at the New York State Library, and, immediately before coming to Forbes, librarian at the Providence Athenaeum.

Attorney Walter L. Stevens, a library trustee, paid tribute to Mr. Harrison after his death for "his aspirations for a children's library, his collection of material relating to the service of our men in two world wars, his collection of books by Northampton authors, and of books published in Northampton." Mr. Wikander, too, considers important the local history collection Mr. Harrison established and developed at the library.

Mr. Wikander succeeded Mr. Harrison as librarian, assuming the post August 5, 1950. A native of Pittsburgh, he graduated from Williams College with a B.A. degree in political science and entered the library field "quite by accident," he recalls.

He had taken work with an insurance firm in New York City after graduation. There he shared an apartment with friends, the mother of one of whom was librarian in a small New England town. On a visit to New York she told of her experiences and Mr. Wikander found himself fascinated. Soon thereafter, he left his insurance job and went to Columbia to study library practice.

His first post was with Carnegie Library in his native city, from which he moved to the District of Columbia Library. While there, he married a library school classmate. "Then, as they say in the movies, came the war," Mr. Wikander remarks.

He entered the Army in 1942 as a private, and was discharged in 1946 as a captain. He served in Africa, Italy, and Austria as a member of military intelligence, working in conjunction with British forces in translating captured enemy papers.

After the war, Mr. Wikander took a post with Sullivan Memorial Library at Temple University in Philadelphia. While there he attended University of Pennsylvania nights, acquiring a master's degree in history.

He came to Forbes from this last post, and has been librarian for 12 years. During these years there have been many changes, among them creation of the Coolidge Room, a tribute to the city's most famous citizen.

"My public duties much to my regret have made me almost a stranger to my hometown," Calvin Coolidge wrote to a city resident 2 months after receiving official notification of his nomination as Republican vice presidential candidate in 1920. Even then Librarian Joseph Harrison was gathering materials that were to form the nucleus of the collection of Coolidge memorabilia found in the Coolidge Room on the second floor of the library.

Uncounted number of papers, 2,000 books, portraits, scrapbooks, photographs and cartoons clog this pleasant room. Our 30th President recognized the tribute intended, contributing many of the things himself.

Outside the room are draped three flags: The State, United States and President's. The last is flown with permission of the Government. A stone tablet is on the wall outside the room, marking its dedication in 1953. "Appropriately enough," Mr. Wikander notes, "it is Vermont slate." (President Coolidge was a Vermont native.)

The room is large, 55 by 40 feet, with burnt sienna walls basking in soft overhead lights. Portraits of the President and his wife, Grace, dominate the room from a far wall as you enter. They are official White House portraits, donated by Coolidge.

Innumerable mementoes fill glass cases, which abound in the room: Indian regalias given to the President on his trip to the Black Hills of South Dakota in 1927; political cartoons gathered during his long career; photographs of his family and himself, including "tintypes" and daguerreotypes; scrapbooks which follow his career via newspaper clippings; books owned by him and books about him. There are other personal items, such as a desk he used in a local law office while "reading" for the law.

On one wall is a glass-enclosed phonograph record made of the former President's voice. A repeating tape has been made from the record and, by pushing a button, one can hear Coolidge speak, the nasal twang betraying his Vermont heritage.

Two manuscript safes contain the library's proud possessions: Gubernatorial and Vice Presidential papers of Coolidge and a collection of addresses, remarks, proclamations and statements, including his press conference remarks. Many are unique to Forbes.

Coolidge's Presidential papers are in the Library of Congress, but Forbes will acquire microfilm copies.

Among the papers is the handwritten message which became the famed telegram sent to labor leader Samuel Gompers during the Boston police strike of 1919. Gompers had asked that the strikers be reinstated. Coolidge turned down the request, noting in his telegram: "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime."

This remark is credited with catapulting his name into the national spotlight, which led to his nomination as Vice President on the winning Republican ticket of 1920 and his eventual succession to the Presidency with the death of Warren G. Harding.

No official tally is kept of the number of visitors to the Collidge Room, but hardly a week goes by without some out-of-town visitors being shown the room, Mr. Wikander says. The room's contents are a treasure trove for those conducting research into Coolidge's life. At least four or five such persons use the room during each year, according to Mr. Wikander.

There have been other changes during Mr. Wikander's tenure. These include construction of a children's library in the basement, installation of a roadway around the building, conversion of the heating system to oil, relighting of the entire building, and creation of an art gallery on the second floor.

Mr. Wikander considers his most important achievement the pruning from the library of its surplus and uncataloged volumes—60,000 over the 12 years.

He hopes more changes will be made. For one, Mr. Wikander would liketo see parking facilities increased; for another, installation of an elevator to carry persons from the first to the second and third floors. (The library's art and music section is on the third floor.) If the latter could be achieved. Mr. Wikander believes he could realize a further dream—creation of a quiet reading room for older persons in the far reaches of the library.

The library is, however, an excellent one in his opinion. He feels it is adequately provided with collections in art, music, and general nonfiction, particularly history. If there is a weakness, it is in the science field, according to Mr. Wikander, and even this weakness is offset by the new western Massachusetts interlibrary loan service. This service involves all public and college libraries in the four western counties, and has Forbes as its center. Mr. Wikander regards the service as an experiment of great magnitude.

As Mr. Wikander is satisfied with Forbes, so are the residents of Northampton. They would have to agree that Forbes has lived up to the prophecy made by Smith Pres. Seelye at the dedication ceremonies in 1894:

"A public library has appropriately been called 'The people's university.' Such a university this library is destined to be."

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Tuesday, April 23, 1963, in opposition to H.R. 3669 and companion bills. My statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 3669 AND COMPANION BILLS (QUALITY STABILIZATION) APRIL 23, 1963

H.R. 3669 is the latest version of that hardy perennial, a national fair trade bill, to permit, indeed encourage, retail price fixing.

Concealed as usual behind a fog of euphemisms, this consumer price increase bill is presented to you in this session, as in the last session, dressed up in the seductive sheep's clothing of a quality stabilization bill. Last year's "quality stabilization" price-fixing bills contained a large economy size preamble of unfair trade practices the bills purportedly would have prevented. At that time I suggested that the length of the preamble gave rise to the inference that a black and white animal resided in the bill.

This year there is no such covert attempt to conceal the price-fixing purpose of this obnoxious legislation. Nevertheless a small dose of Chanel No. 5 has been applied to this black and white animal by euphemistically dubbing it a Quality Stabilization Act.

When a cat would eat her kittens, she calls them mice.

H.R. 3669 is as drastic a fair trade price-fixing bill as has ever been proposed.

Before pointing out its particular features, which are the bases of this assertion, I propose to deal with the main thrust of the bill.

I. IN THEORY AND PRACTICE THESE BILLS ARE AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST

I have long been an opponent of the system of price fixing that is permitted by the so-called fair trade laws. Such price fixing flies in the face of our antitrust laws and the free competitive system which the antitrust laws are designed to protect. This bill would gouge out a large hole in our antitrust laws.

Fair trade was spawned by wholesale and retail merchant associations, primarily the National Association of Retail Druggists, to permit vertical price fixing in the depression days, when the Federal Government was sanctioning horizontal price fixing by manufacturers through NRA. A powerful lobby was able to pressure 45 States into accepting the NARD's draft of a fair trade bill. Although manufacturers were comparatively inactive in this early effort, the rallying slogan then as now was "protection of the manufacturers' trade name or trademark." Somehow all trade names and trademarks were elevated to Cadillac significance, subject to being sullied by association with anything but an artificially high price.

A. Detriment to the consumer

The history of the last two decades has demonstrated that fair trade laws work to the detriment of both the consumer and the small businessmen purportedly protected by them. Most impartial commentators have condemned them. In some 24 States the courts have invalidated fair trade acts, or at least their nonsigner provisions. In an appendix to this statement I have attached excerpts from the opinions of a number of such courts. Some of the sponsors of these quality stabilization bills, I note, come from States where fair trade laws have been invalidated in whole or in part. These bills would impose a Federal fair trade law even on those States where fair trade has been rejected.

The principal evil that results from fair trade—the maintenance of artificially high consumer prices—has been exposed in State after State. After the Supreme Court of Ohio ruled the nonsigner clause unconstitutional, for example, prices on automatic coffeemakers quickly dropper from the $39.95 fair trade price to a $29.97 competitive price. Electric frying pans, which had a list price of $19.95 were reduced to $13.87. After an initial flurry of reduced price sales, in Ohio as in the case of other States that outlawed fair trade, the market soon became stable. The dire consequences that had been predicted by the fair traders—widespread business failures, increased concentration, and predatory excesses by monopolists—did not occur. The only result was that the consuming public received the benefit of having prices settle in the competitive market at about 20 percent lower than the former fair trade prices.

The Department of Justice in the past has presented to Congress several surveys which have demonstrated how much more the consumer must pay in fair trade States than in nonfair trade States.

In 1952, when the McGuire Act was being considered, I conducted a survey and brought into the House of Representatives three baskets. I had purchased 11 identical articles in 3 different Peoples Drug Stores. I purchased one basket in the District of Columbia, where there was no fair trade. I purchased the same articles in Bethesda, Md., where there was fair trade. I purchased another basketful in Arlington, Va., where there was fair trade, and compared the prices that I paid for these identical articles. On no item did I pay less than 10 percent more in a fair trade State than in the District and on some items I paid as much as 53 percent more. My statement to the House appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, 1952, at pages 4909 and 4910, as follows:

"I purchased 10 cubic centimeters of u. 40 protamine zinc Lilly insulin, used by diabetics. The price in the District of Columbia was 98 cents. The price in Maryland was $1.29. The Maryland price was 32 percent above the District price. In Virginia—in Richmond, for example—the same article, Lilly's insulin, was sold at $1.48. If you can tell me that the public is protected by fair trade, I would like to know why those differences in prices.

"I purchased a BD Yale 26-gage 1-inch hypo needle, used to inject insulin into a sick person's body. In the District of Columbia the price was 15 cents. In Virginia the price was 20 cents—33 percent higher in Virginia. In Maryland the price was 23 cents—53 percent more in Maryland.

"I purchased 100 Bayer aspirin tablets in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia the price is 46 cents. What was the price in Virginia? The price was 59 cents. I paid 28 percent more for the same article in Virginia. What was the price in Maryland? Fifty-nine cents. Again I paid 28 percent more for the same article in Maryland.

"I purchased some 12-ounce bottles of Phillips milk of magnesia. Here are the bottles. In the District of Columbia the price was 34 cents. In Virginia it was 14 percent higher, or 39 cents. Similarly, in Maryland it was 14 percent higher, or 39 cents.

"I purchased some large tubes of Ipana toothpaste. See the difference in these pur-

chases. I paid 27 percent more for the Ipana toothpaste in Virginia than I did in the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia the price was 37 cents. In Virginia the price was 47 cents; and, likewise, in Maryland, it was 47 cents.

"I purchased packages of 20 Gillette blue blades. In the District of Columbia the price was 87 cents, whereas in Virginia I paid 11 percent more, or 98 cents, and also 11 percent more in Maryland, namely, 98 cents."

There were other articles that I purchased and for which, under fair trade, I had to pay 20, 25, and 30 percent more for the identical articles.

I am told, moreover, that in 1960 there were striking differences between fair trade and nonfair trade prices as follows, in the following nonfair trade States:

In Columbia, S.C., a sick person could buy Achromycin V capsules and Declomycin for $7.20 instead of $7.65; Serpasil for $6.50 instead of $7.50; Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75; Coricidin for 75 cents instead of $1.08, and Neo-Synephrine for 65 cents instead of 90 cents.

In Houston, Tex., for example, an invalid could obtain Achromycin V capsules for $6.96 instead of $7.65; and similarly as to Declomycin. Premarin could be bought for $6.73 instead of $8.25; Orinase for $5.25 instead of $6.75; Unicaps for $2.69 instead of $3.11; Theragran for $8.19 instead of $9.45. At the hearings on H.R. 6245 before the Antitrust Subcommittee last year, Senator Kefauver noted that Merck charged the retail druggist $170 for 1,000 Prednisone tablets whereas the fair trade minimum retail price is $255. Senator Kefauver added that Ciba sells 1,000 Serpasil tablets to the druggist for $39.50, while the fair trade minimum is $65.83.[1] The hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on the drug industry, and of the House Antitrust Subcommittee on H.R. 6245 last year, abound with instances of the astronomical profits of drug manufacturers.[2]

As noted below, these very drug manufacturers would be empowered by this bill to soak the invalid by enforcing artificially inflated retail prices over and above the extortionate prices charged to the retail druggist.

In an appendix to this statement I have listed similar examples in other cities and States, including Miami, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Lousiville, Ky.; St. Louis, Mo.; Seattle, Wash.; Spokane, Wash.; Huntington, W. Va.; Minneapolis, Minn.; and Cleveland, Ohio. Congressman DINGELL, in his minority report on a similar bill in 1959, adduced many more instances of lower prices where fair trade did not prevail.

In September of last year I engaged in another shopping excursion. What did I find? For 51 cents I was able to buy Coricidin (25's) in the nonfair trade District of Columbia, but I had to pay $1.08 in Maryland (fair trade). I paid $1.77 in the District for 100 Unicaps and $3.11 for the same amount in Maryland. Bayer Aspirin cost me 99 cents in Washington, D.C., and $1.48 in Maryland. I paid 54 cents for Phillips Milk of Magnesia in the District of Columbia and 63 cents in Maryland. The economy size Ipana Toothpaste cost me 60 cents in the District, 69 cents in Maryland; 10 cc u. 40 Protamine Zinc Lilly Insulin cost me 99 cents in the District and $1.48 in Maryland.

Finally, I bought something dear to the heart and gullet of many of us. I purchased a pint of Old Crow (only 86 proof, I may add). In the District it cost me $2.30 (including 7 cents tax); in Maryland, $3.07 (including 9 cents tax).

Thus, the same items which could be bought in the nonfair trade District for $7.20, cost $10.89 in the "fair" trade State of Maryland. This means that if during the year I had paid $70 for these items in the District, in Maryland the cost would have been over $30 more for the same items.

Last year, at hearings on H.R. 6245 before the House Antitrust Subcommittee, there was a great deal of testimony to the adverse effect on ill and elderly persons of the high price of drugs. I think that each of us in Congress should hesitate to add to the burdens of these people by enacting legislation which must have the necessary effect of increasing the price of drugs they buy. How can you justify this legislation to them, if it is passed?

We are told that the consumer need not worry since it is effective only when he can buy goods usable for the same general purpose as the price-fixed item. But this is small comfort indeed when, as most often happens, both items are price fixed. And the Lord only knows to what extent even this vague limitation applies where a price is fixed on several items sold as a package.

These bills will increase prices to the consumer.

B. Detriment to the merchant

And what have these fair trade laws done for the small businessman? They promoted the use by big retailers of their own private brand goods which could be sold for less than the smaller retailers' trade-name goods, purchased from the manufacturers. They favored the inefficient retailer over the efficient retailer. They facilitated the rise of the discount house. They deprived the retailer who wanted to use price as a means to compete with his larger competitors of the right to do so. They made less service and less price an infraction of the law and insured that less service would not be accompanied by less price. They took away any incentive for retailers to urge manufacturers to lower high prices. And now the proponents of these bills, in the name of free enterprise, would impose upon businessmen and the public alike, socialism in the form of federally-supported and enforced price fixing.

Made no mistake, this bill is not only a consumer price increase bill, it is an anti-free enterprise bill. The retailer cannot set a price on what he sells based upon his own efficiency, the cost savings that may be available to him because of self-help, long hours, use of cost savings devices, selling for cash, or what have you. He is instead to become a slave of the manufacturer, and of his competitors, who wish to keep him at their level.

Recently, in the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Sun Oil Co.*, 371 U.S. 505, the defendant argued (p. 524) that the retailer "is but a 'conduit' for the supplier"—in that case, the Sun Oil Co. The Supreme Court replied (p. 529): "Having consciously chosen not to effect direct distribution through wholly owned and operated stations, Sun cannot now claim for itself the benefits of such a system * * *."

This bill, by giving the big manufacturer carte blanche to engage in vertical price fixing, would indeed confer on the big manufacturer "the benefits of such a system," leaving the burdens to the small retailer who would become a mere "conduit" or "outlet" for his supplier's goods at prices dictated by the supplier. If the retailer should insist on setting his own competitive price, this bill would permit the large supplier to summon the Federal courts to his aid in subjugating the retailer into economic serfdom. I should think small businessmen would be appalled at this prospect.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania only last month pointed out how "fair" trade laws shackle, if indeed they do not strangle, small businessmen. In *Mead Johnson & Co.* v. *Breggar*, CCH 1963 Trade Cases, pars 70, 721, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court said:

"Price fixing is at its best a drastic curtailment of competitive free enterprise, one of the main pillars of support of the entire American economic structure. At its worst, it can become a straitjacket on initiative in business, resulting in monopoly manacling progress so as to serve a possible conspiratorial status quo.

* * * * *

"The very idea that a commercial entity may hold in one fettering price-fixing grasp all businessmen engaged in vending a certain product, just as a herdsman holds lassoed cattle on the plains, offends against the most elementary concept of a free and independent society. The Fair Trade Act is not only in derogation of the common law, it is in defiance of principles which the Federal Government has on countless occasions enunciated in its antitrust legislation and litigation."

Since references are often made to discount houses at these hearings, a few words on that subject may be in order.

As Mr. Bicks, former head of the Antitrust Division, explained to this committee in 1959, "initially, fair trade gave discounters an unimpeachable nationally advertised price to cut. The buyer could clearly see the savings involved. Beyond that and more important, by attempting to stifle price competition, the fair trade laws created an economic vacuum into which the discount houses rushed." Business writers have also pointed out that:

"Through the fair trade laws * * * and other devices, our legislators and courts have sought, in effect, to bottle up price competition, especially at the retail level. The discount house may be viewed as a manifestation of the explosive pressures which are likely to be generated as a result of an attempt to eliminate price competition in a competitive economy. * * *"[3]

Whatever may be said of discount houses as such, they have curbed inflationary prices and afforded the forgotten man, the consumer, the opportunity of purchasing his needs at lower prices. They have also helped relieve manufacturers of surplus stocks. To those who look askance at discount houses as price cutters, I would point out that price cutting is simply good, old-fashioned free enterprise, so long as it is not predatory. Since when, may I ask, has price competition become "unethical"? Most new types of retailing, including the department store, the mail order firm, and the supermarket, have started as price cutters. Therein lies their appeal to the public. The widespread popularity of discount houses, supermarkets, and department stores today shows that the public—your constituents and mine—is vitally interested in the savings to be achieved through price competition.

Last year, the National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealer's Association went on record as favoring this legislation. It is interesting to observe, therefore, a statement made by the president of that association in 1956:

"The discount houses * * * came into being as a counterbalance to distorted retail margins. These margins weren't distorted until we came into volume retailing. The discount house was a natural development, and when you hear a dealer talking about his 'rights' he's on his way out—because he hasn't any rights."

And how did the small businessman accept this "fair" trade "bonanza"? Well, many fought it and are continuing to fight it. Thus Mead Johnson & Co., in a 3-month period in 1961, brought over 100 fair trade suits. These small businessmen wanted, presumably they still want, to sell at a price which leaves them with a profit and also leaves the consumer with more money to make additional purchases. Parke, Davis not long ago sent out more than 200 warning letters in the New York area and started 123 suits. Yet in a recent case it was shown

Footnotes at end of speech.

that in at least 100 instances 89 retailers had refused to be bound by Parke, Davis' "fair" trade prices.

Out of this natural desire to compete has spouted a veritable torrent of litigation. One has to go back to prohibition days for a comparable number of lawsuits brought to enforce legislation so justly unpopular. To greatly augmented legal staffs of the large manufacturers engaged in policing their resale prices, there have been added commercial spies euphemistically called "professional shoppers."[4] And the cost of all this is borne, as always, by the consumer. Thus, in 1955, one company is reported to have announced it would spend $750,000 to enforce fair trade in just one of its departments. Sunbeam is reputed to have spent $1 million a year for such purpose.

And who have been the primary instigators of fair trade lawsuits? They have been drug manufacturers recently shown in the hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and of the House Antitrust Subcommittee to have garnered extortionate profits in many instances. As Senator KEFAUVER pointed out the other day, "In the ethical drug industry, the rate of return on investment, after taxes, is higher than that of any other industry. Since 1957 it has averaged around 20 percent as compared with 10 percent for all manufacturing. The net profit on sales has also averaged about double that for all manufacturing."[5]

Nevertheless, we find Parke, Davis & Co., suing a drugstore in New York City because a professional shopper purchased MYADEC vitamin capsules for $5.75 whereas the fair trade price was $9.67, and ABDEC vitamin preparation drops for $2.65 whereas the fair trade price was $3.51. Parke, Davis & Co. in 1958 had a 16-percent net profit on drug sales.[6] This case illustrates what the consumer loss by fair trade, the harassment of small business under fair trade, and the unconcionable profiteering which fair trade protects.

The fair trade cases in which an opinion is published are collated in the annual volumes of the Trade Cases series of the Commerce Clearing House. I had my staff review the fair trade cases in the bound volumes of that series covering 1960 through 1962. In most such cases the fair trade violator, by any test, would be considered a small businessman. To mention some of them:

California, John F. Walker, a liquor dealer.

Illinois, Topps of Niles, Inc. and Darby Sales Co.

Minnesota, Playtime Sporting Goods, Inc.

New Hampshire, Max Dichter Company, Inc., operating a retail store in Manchester, N.H. and Man-Bur Sales Inc., operating the hardware department in the store.

Louisiana, Robinson Wholesale Co., a partnership composed of Robinson, his wife and brother-in-law. Among those alleged to have sold Bulova watches at less than fair trade prices were Daniels Jewelry Store, Davidsons Furniture Store, and Sales Jewelry Store.

Ohio, Norwood Vitamin & Cosmetic Distributors, Inc.

New York, Janel Sales Corp., Berner's Pharmacy Corp., Mr. Less, Mr. Falleta, the Courtesy Drug Store in Hicksville, N.Y.

Pennsylvania, Wright Motor Sales Co., a gasoline dealer and Mr. Kostak, another gasoline dealer.

Proponents of the bill assert that the retailer who wants to set his own prices is free to do so by turning to the products of a nonprice fixer. But the very purpose of this bill is to promote price fixing on the part of national advertisers, and the realities of business practice make it impossible for a retailer to shift readily from a nationally advertised fair trade product to a nonnationally advertised nonfair trade product. Moreover, this bill will prevent price competition by grocers, hardware store owners, or druggists who must, as a practical matter, carry a wide selection of similar goods of different manufacture.

Proponents of this kind of legislation shift from arguing that it is necessary to protect the brand name of the manufacturer to urging that it is necessary to keep the retailer in business. The short answer to the first claim is that many brand names continue to be held in high repute despite the absence of any attempt to use resale price maintenance for such purposes. The shorter answer to the second is that the retailer in fair trade States has not been shown to have fared any better than the retailer in the nonfair trade States.

There has been a great deal of loose talk about how the loss of fair trade protection would cause the failure of countless businessmen.

Let us examine the failure rate per 10,000 concerns in States without fair trade acts:

Now, let us take some comparable "fair trade" States:

	Failures [1]			Merchants' bankruptcies [2]	
	1957	1958	1959	1961	1962
Missouri	18.6	26.9	23.6	87	69
Texas	32.2	29.8	28.5	119	115
Vermont	19.0	23.0	20.1	11	16
District of Columbia	41.8	32.6	30.2	13	16

[1] Final report of House Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 17.
[2] Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Tables of Bankruptcy Statistics, June 30, 1961, table F-3, and June 30, 1962, table F-3.

Now, let us see the situation in some of the States which had the whole, or the nonsigner provision, of their "fair trade" law invalidated, 1956–58:

	Failures [1]			Merchants' bankruptcies [2]	
	1957	1958	1959	1961	1962
Illinois	37.3	42.6	45.6	120	306
Maryland	44.6	56.7	41.0	18	18
New Jersey	59.9	81.9	67.5	179	169
New Hampshire	27.6	27.2	23.6	12	7
Wisconsin	37.3	55.0	51.9	139	159
California	123.9	118.9	112.5	286	219
Massachusetts	34.9	42.9	41.5	57	60
New York	111.4	129.3	127.8	424	451
Pennsylvania	43.5	48.1	43.4	307	262

[1] Final report of House Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 17.
[2] Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Tables of Bankruptcy Statistics, June 30, 1961, table F-3, and June 30, 1962, table F-3.

	Failures [1]			Merchants' bankruptcies [2]	
	1957	1958	1959	1961	1962
Colorado (1956)	45.6	20.7	32.8	142	145
Indiana (1957)	20.0	27.0	22.6	42	38
Kansas (1958)	28.2	26.8	20.6	39	41
Kentucky (1958)	13.4	19.9	14.8	54	46
New Mexico (1957)	14.6	8.4	5.1	15	17
Oregon (1956)	198.0	201.5	175.3	51	91
South Carolina (1957)	40.0	44.3	47.4	14	11
West Virginia (1958)	26.5	26.3	35.7	20	23

[1] Final report of House Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 17.
[2] Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Tables of Bankruptcy Statistics, June 30, 1961, table F-3, and June 30, 1962, table F-3.

These figures demonstrate, I believe, that there is no visible relation between the survival of small business and fair trade resale price fixing.

Many retail associations, I am sure, will register in support of this bill. They have been pressured to do so repeatedly by the powerful, untiring National Association of Retail Druggists whose representatives are also much in evidence on Capitol Hill. In almost every instance, I believe, these retail associations have been subjected to a one-sided argument in favor of such bills. I think it highly significant, therefore, that a poll by the National Federation of Independent Business last year, in which arguments both pro and con were summarized, showed a slight majority opposed to those bills.

I am encouraged to note, moreover, that not only have consumer organizations opposed the counterpart of this bill at hearings last year, but also retailers, retail associations, and wholesale associations.

It has been contended by some of the supporters of this bill that it would not really restrict the retailer because he is free to take off the trademark and sell the unmarked goods at such prices as he pleases. This is a fallacious argument. What does the retailer have left when he tears off the covering on a tin can? If the trade name is imbedded in metal or glass is he supposed to use a blowtorch? If the price he pays includes the goodwill of a trade name, must he throw away that value?

I would point out to retailers subjected to the propaganda barrage of the proponents of these bills that if legislation of this sort is enacted, they will have given to the manufacturer the right to fix their profit margins, and the greater the demand for a fair traded product, the more likely that the margin will be narrow. To quote from the testimony of a representative of the National

Footnotes at end of speech.

Oil Jobbers Council, in reply to a question by Chairman MONRONEY of the Special Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Commerce last year:

"Do you know what happened to us in Pennsylvania when they tried fair trading up there? They cut the jobber's margin, gross margin, in a normal market, one-half cent per gallon. One-half cent doesn't sound much to you gentlemen, but one-half cent a gallon is the difference between a profit and going out of business. That is a specific instance."

C. What the farmer thinks

Last year I received a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation commenting upon H.R. 6245, a bill before the House Antitrust Subcommittee. Pertinent to this hearing are the following passages from that letter:

"Since 1947–49 wholesale prices of drugs and pharmaceuticals as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have declined 8 percent. This has occurred during a period in which most wholesale prices increased and in which wages in manufacturing industries increased 80 percent. On the other hand, the retail price of prescriptions and drugs, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, increased 21.5 percent during this same period * * *.

"The divergence of these price trends strongly suggests that primary attention should be directed to the margins between wholesale and retail prices.

"The drug industry has been the major proponent of retail price fixing under the authority of so-called fair trade laws, and the major employer of 'fair trade' pricing programs. We believe that retail price-fixing by manufacturers should be regarded as a harmful restraint of trade, contrary to the public interest.

"We recommend that Federal laws designed to protect State fair trade laws from antitrust attack be repealed. * * *"

D. High price does not ensure high quality

This bill assumes that high quality is the handmaiden of high price. On this assumption, low prices are the opium of the people. Under this theory, when the price of gasoline goes down, the quality of gasoline goes down and our cars rebel; when the price of gasoline goes up, the quality of gasoline goes up and our cars rejoice.

In the dream world of "fair" trade many such a canard passes for reality. To expose this canard—that the highest in price is the best in quality—I have had my staff spot-check Consumers Reports, the publication of Consumers Union, a nationally known testing organization. In one striking instance after another the highest priced product was not the highest in quality.

Testifying last year before the House Antitrust Subcommittee on H.R. 6245, Dr. Martin Cherkasky, director of Montefiore Hospital in New York City, stated: "A series of tests recently conducted by Drug and Therapeutic Information of New York and published in their Medical Letter confirms the unfortunate fact that price and quality often are in no way related."

There is no necessary correlation between quality and price. Indeed, if high quality and high prices were synonymous the magicians of Madison Avenue would be out of work. It has been said:

"In the light of the function of advertising as a creator of value increments of enchantment, it is not surprising to discover, as we have in the consumer testing field, that there is slight if any correlation between the price and quality of many of the branded goods now offered on the market."[7]

E. This bill is opposed to our current national policy

Proposed increases in the price of steel products last year and actual price increases in the steel industry this year have been a matter of concern to the Nation and to our Government. Yet the inflationary threat represented by a price increase in one industry, important as the steel industry is, is in no way comparable to the inflationary threat represented by this price-fixing bill which would promote and sanction price fixing—and consequently price increases—throughout all sectors of our economy.

At a time when the administration, with widespread support from all over the country, is seeking tax reductions in order to promote an expansion of our economy and to prevent a recession, it would be anomalous, at the same time, to enact legislation which would have the inevitable effect of insuring that the consumer taxpayer would be able to buy less and less with whatever additional funds a tax cut may provide him. The efforts of the administration to stimulate our economy through the natural interplay of a free market would be thwarted by legislation designed to turn our free economy and our free market into a controlled economy and an artificially controlled market.

II. ANALYSIS OF H.R. 3669

A. Elimination of States rights provision

Last year the price-fixing "quality stabilization" bills, as they came out of this committee, contained the following provision:

"Paragraphs (7) to (12) hereof shall apply to all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate except that nothing in such paragraphs shall be construed to permit, directly or indirectly, resale price maintenance in any State where the constitution or laws thereof prohibit such price maintenance."

Traditionally, resale price maintenance has been a matter for each State to decide for itself. One State's meat has been another State's poison. By this amendment this committee recognized two things. One was the fact that many States have rejected resale price maintenance. They want none of it. Second, the amendment recognized that such State policy should be respected.

H.R. 3669, however, contains no such exception. It represents an effort to use Federal supremacy to ram resale price fixing down the throats of the residents of all States whether or not there is a contrary State policy. One could hardly imagine a more ignoble death for States rights than to be buried under Federal price-fixing legislation.

Rejected, in whole or in part, by the courts of some 24 States, and turned down by the legislatures of at least five States—Missouri, Texas, Vermont, Alaska, and the District of Columbia—fair trade is sought through H.R. 3669 to be imposed, nationwide, on unwilling as well as on willing States. Those 29 unwilling States—more than half the States of the Union—which have rejected the sort of fair trade here proposed, would have it willy-nilly.

Worse, our basic national policy of free competition would be subverted into a policy of price fixing. The antitrust laws would be gutted throughout.

B. Price fixing on a grand scale

This bill proposes to override the decisions of the courts which have held that the price fixer may not avail himself of Stat fair trade laws if he competes on the same level of distribution as the retailer against whom he brings suit. This provision would make it easy to effect large-scale horizontal price-fixing agreements.

This bill would promote the very types of horizontal and vertical price fixing 73 years of antitrust legislation by Congress was designed to prevent. The businessmen who could not agree to fix prices or agree to have one of them fix prices for all, may do so under this bill simply by arranging for the trademark owner to send them a convenient price-fixing notice.

It is no coincidence, I believe, that some of the most ardent supporters of fair trade have been involved in price-fixing violations under the antitrust laws. I might add that in a number of antitrust cases, the courts have found that fair trade has been used as a means for carrying on a price-fixing conspiracy.

In many of our basic industries "administered pricing" and "price leadership" have largely eliminated price competition. This legislation bids fair to abolish price competition altogether by authorizing, indeed encouraging, horizontal and vertical price fixing. Even in those areas where price competition still persists, this bill would countenance its abolishment. What lipservice then could the proponents of this bill pay at their annual conventions to our vaunted free enterprise system which has served this great Republic so well since its foundation? I would suggest that the proponents of this bill should practice what they so piously preach. Let them compete in a free market rather than destroy it.

If the Congress is now to abolish price competition by Federal fiat, let it at least be candid about it, without resorting to hypocritical phrases about "quality stabilization."

As the Supreme Court of Oregon has noted:

"In substance, what is the real purpose of the Fair Trade Act? Regardless of how its true nature may be camouflaged by high sounding terms such as 'free and open competition,' 'unfair competition,' 'protection of good will,' etc., it is a matter of common knowledge that it is a price-fixing statute designed principally to destroy competition at the retail level. Protection of the 'good will' of the trademark owner is simply an excuse and not a reason for the law. * * *"

The sure losers in any such precipitate flight from free enterprise will be the consumers, the sick, the poor who cannot afford the extortionate prices which fair trade fosters. The working man, too, will be hard hit, he at least may enjoy a measure of protection because so many collective bargaining agreements today are geared to the cost of living. Yet, this in turn, would beget new dangers to the public interest. The creeping inflation which successive administrations, both Republican and Democratic, have been trying to rein in since World War II, would break into a gallop if this pernicious bill should become law.

C. Vendor's power after sale

This bill's reservation of property rights, even after a resale, would replace modern principles of law by the precepts of the middle ages. No principle and policy of the common law has been more widely and uniformly accepted and approved by courts and legislatures, by commentators and by the people than the rule against restraints on the alienation of property. This is true of goods as well as of real estate. More than 50 years ago the Supreme Court in the celebrated Dr. Miles case held that the seller of a trade name product could not fix its resale price. The product in question, I might note, was a drug. Concern for the trader and for the consumer, under our competitive free enterprise system, has denied any such reserved "right" to the patent and copyright holder. Is a "trade name" now to be deemed of such greater significance as to override this traditional concern, or is the next step to propose price-fixing powers for patentees and copyrightees?

Mr. Lowell Mason, a former member of the Federal Trade Commisison, testifying in support of a similar bill pending in the Senate last year, made the frank admission that the aim is to reverse a number of Supreme Court decisions and restore the old Colgate doctrine in all its vigor, namely, to deprive the retailer of supplies if he uses his own judgment in determining the price to sell to the consumer. To me it is quite strange to find Mr.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Mason, on the one hand, supporting these bills in the name of private property rights, and on the other hand, arguing that a person who has paid for an article should have something much less than private property rights.

This bill gives the owner of a brand name the right to compel a reseller to sell at a price or within a price range determined by the brand name owner. Apparently there is no limitation upon the power of the owner to make as many price changes as he desires. The reseller is a puppet subject to the pull of a remote string puller.

The reseller who sells at a price he thinks is fair is subject to having his right to resell the product revoked, no matter how much good will he has developed regarding the product by his own efforts. If he persists in selling at a fair price he is subject to a suit for damages, injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, and the costs of suit.

The deterrent imposed under the antitrust laws against the collusive price fixer is now to be imposed against the independent retailer who may mistakenly believe in free enterprise.

This bill also grants a right of revocation where misrepresentation has been used in the resale of goods.

The Federal Trade Commission has been attacking deceptive merchandising practices, with ever increasing vigor. Furthermore, there can be few States indeed which do not have their own laws dealing with deceptive practices.

H.R. 3669 would utterly confuse adequate, existing Federal and State laws dealing with unfair trade practices by superimposing upon them a loosely worded, probably preemptive, Federal law.

The bill provides that "Each such currently established resale price and resale price range shall be uniform at each level of distribution within each marketing area determined by the owner of the brand, name, or trademark." (Par. 14.)

The above quoted provision appears to give the brand owner the right to determine what is the "marketing area" for the purpose of having uniform prices. Apparently, at his will, it may be small or large. It is not clear whether the trademark owner is limited to including in such marketing area only an area in the United States.

D. Bait merchandising

Section "(8)" of the bill gives the trade name owner the right to prevent a retailer from selling the trade named article, if it is used "in furtherance of bait merchandising." This might give the trade name owner the power, even without a price-fixing provision, to prevent the retailer from having a "special" on an item in order to draw people to his store in the hope they might buy something else as well. This would be so even if the "special" price was one on which the retailer made a profit.

The bill does not define bait merchandising practices, and thus invites litigation as to the meaning of this term. It might include any unusual advertising device.

Those States which have seen fit to prohibit or limit "bait advertising,"—like my own State of New York—have devised appropriate remedies. Other States have not chosen to do so. Both those States which have acted in their own ways, and those which have not, would now have this amorphous, probably preemptive, provision thrust upon them.

E. Enforcement

The proposed statute would be applicable to "all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate." The rights given under the bill are also available to owners of a brand, name, or trademark, competing at any level of distribution, with the reseller.

The bill expressly provides that such suits may be brought in a Federal district court, without regard to the amount in controversy. As Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am sorely troubled by this provision which would engulf our already congested Federal courts in a torrent of penny ante price-fixing enforcement cases. I understand the American Bar Association is also dismayed at this prospect.

Furthermore, H.R. 6669 provides that "no action pursuant hereto shall preclude remedial action otherwise available for wrongful use of a brand, name, or trademark" (par. "(12)").

Thus, this bill, aside from the fault of its basic premise that from price fixing all blessings flow, creates a Mycenaean maze for businessmen, lawyers, and judges.

While creating a compulsory national fair trade law, it also seeks to preserve State fair trade laws. The merchant who sells below the price fixed by the manufacturer may find himself sued in a Federal court on one ground and in a State court on another ground. The courts may be widely separated, even in different States. What may be legal under State law may be illegal under this proposed Federal law and vice versa.

The bill gives a right of action to the consumer against the price fixer for any misrepresentation by the latter as to "size, capacity, quality, condition, model or age." This right of action in the Federal courts exists only if the price fixer is not subject to process "in the courts of the State in which such purchaser acquired such goods." This could readily give rise to extensive small claims litigation in the Federal courts. It also raises troublesome conflicts of law questions since the test seems to be the law where the article is purchased and not the law of the domicile of the purchaser.

F. Exemptions

The bill exempts sales to governments or government agencies. This means that there is to be one standard of business conduct in dealing with Government agencies and another in dealing with the public. Price fixing at the expense of the public is to be permitted—in fact, promoted—but price fixing at the expense of the Government is not sanctioned, and if the cost of a high price to most of us is a lower price to the Government, we may console ourselves by reflecting that such indirect form of taxation has not come about without representation, since it would be embodied in an act of Congress. There are other exceptions which have no logic except that of expediency; namely, avoiding the opposition of organizations capable of strong, organized opposition, while leaving the many unorganized to the not-so-tender mercies of the price fixers.

G. Other provisions

The bill does not say whether knowledge of the required selling price has to be actual or may be constructive. It permits those holding a monopolistic position to price fix resale items, since unlike prior fair trade acts, it protects the price fixer "if there are goods usable for the same general purpose." What that phrase means is anyone's guess but it would seem to be broader than goods of the same general class—the language generally used in State fair trade laws.

As to the right to return of goods by a nonconformer, as provided in this bill, the manufacturer may well find himself astride a Trojan horse, since he can never be sure that he has made a final sale. It is said that in 1954 the Sheaffer Co. spent $400,000 in buying back stocks of its own pens from price-cutting retailers.

III. THIS BILL IS AN ATTACK ON OUR CAPITALISTIC, FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

I think it cannot be gainsaid that a free market is essential to our capitalistic, free enterprise system. And most certainly a free market does not exist when the seller is free but the buyer is not, when the seller determines not only the price which the buyer must pay him but also the price at which the buyer may sell what he has purchased.

The concept of a free market also envisages a market where the consumer is not confronted with a network of price-fixing agreements sanctioned by law.

Increasingly State courts have found fair trade price-fixing laws an affront to those constitutional provisions of their respective States which condemn market control.

Legal rulings, moreover, have not been the primary causes that have led to the abandonment of "fair" trade in many areas. Consumer resistance to high prices, warehouses stocked with unsold merchandise and the relentless pressure of substitute merchandise from competitive distribution channels have been just as important. Fair trade simply doesn't work. The enormous costs involved in comparison shopping, legal fees, and policing fair trade enforcement, alone, have been major causes for its abandonment by many manufacturers.

The background of this bill makes it clear that it is intended to overturn two Supreme Court decisions, one decided in 1911,[8] the other in 1956;[9] two court of appeals decisions,[10] and one New Jersey Supreme Court decision.[11] In addition, as noted last year by the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in reference to a similar bill, such a bill might also overrule the Supreme Court's decision in the Parke, Davis case.[12] I suggest that this alone should give this committee pause before recommending legislation of this sort.

Small wonder that similar bills have been disapproved by the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Commerce. The Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws was opposed to fair trade legislation. Five States have refused to adopt fair trade legislation. In 24 States the courts have outlawed those consumer price increase acts. In August of last year the American Bar Association condemned a similar bill.

I could not hope to put the case against the policy of this bill as eloquently as Congress has already done in the preamble to the Small Business Act, when it said:

"The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed."

There can be no greater erosion of States' rights than this bill; there can be no more all-enveloping attempt to sanction nationwide price-fixing; there could hardly be a more vaguely worded or more unnecessary bill. If you want to have Federal price control, vote for this bill. I earnestly urge that it be rejected.

This bill is a consumer price increase bill. This bill is an antifree enterprise bill. This bill is a bad bill. It should be defeated.

APPENDIX A

Statements from several State court opinions declaring State resale maintenance laws unconstitutional:

1. The Supreme Court of Florida declared:

"As we have stated before, the real effect of the nonsigner clause is anticompetitive price fixing; not the protecting of the goodwill of trade marked products as other courts have held. Goodwill, it has been

Footnotes at end of speech.

said, should be determined by the price which the goods can command in a competitive market, and not by the ability of the manufacturer to sell at a pegged retail price which he himself selects. Corey, "Fair Trade Pricing: A Reappraisal," 30 Harv. Bus. Rev. 47, 60. Except in times of economic emergency such inflexible price arrangements which the act sanctions are not in line with our traditional concepts of free competition, which have traditionally been the 'yardstick' for protection of the consuming public. The real vice of the nonsigner clause is the absence of that standard, and the decisions of this court stated herein so hold. * * *" *Miles Laboratories Inc.* v. *Eckerd*, 73 So. 2d 680, 682 (Fla. Sup. Ct. 1954).

2. The Supreme Court of Colorado:

"The general assembly may validate resale price maintenance contracts between contracting parties within constitutional limits but when the effect of the act * * * is to make such price schedule binding upon noncontracting parties, the act is nothing more or less than price fixing by legislative mandate. An unwilling citizen cannot be thus bound.

"Any act of the general assembly which arbitrarily destroys or impairs the right of the individual to the free use and enjoyment of his property, lawfully acquired, and permits the fixing of prices for the benefit of a special group, is opposed to the constitutional concept of a free people and should not be allowed to stand. Legislation of this kind evidences the ability of organized minorities to induce legislation for their special benefit at the expense of the unorganized purchasing masses * * *. We have not yet arrived at the place in America where the many must yield to the few, so that the latter may make ever-increasing profits at the expense of those who still believe in the principle of free and competitive trade and commerce, untrammeled by legislative fiats." *Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.* v. *Francis*, 134 Colo. 160, 186, 301 P. 2d 139, 152 (Colo. Sup. Ct. 1956).

3. The Court of Appeals in Kentucky (highest State court) held: "This statute, we think, is a legislative invasion of the broad constitutional liberty of the people to acquire and protect their property and engage in free trade.

* * * * *

"What is wrong with a man selling his own property for what he pleases? We think the statute is the antithesis of 'fair trade.' It forces price fixing.

* * * * *

"On balance, the overwhelming public interest and welfare is the right of free people to engage freely in competitive trade in commodities that may not be injurious to the general safety and welfare, such as are within special regulation under a proper exercise of the police power. We agree * * * that the overriding purpose of that statute is to sanction price fixing and that the protection of a brand name or symbol of the producer seems to have been incidental." *General Electric Co.* v. *American Buyers Cooperative* (Ky. Ct. of App. 1958), 316 S.W. 2d 354, 361.

4. The Supreme Court in Minnesota:

"The Unfair Practices Act (sec. 325.04) is designed to protect the public from predatory or below-cost trade practices. On the other hand, under the apparent purpose of protecting the goodwill of the manufacturer of the brand commodity, the nonsigner provision (sec. 325.12), in reality, eliminates competition in price honestly based on differences in selling costs as between merchants whose costs of business may differ as a result of normal and natural competitive practices.

* * * * *

"In examining the grant of authority to the trademark owner it must be conceded that he is given the privilege to place the law in effect and to amend or alter it at his will. He may do this without regard to the interest or welfare of nonsigners or the consumer who represents the public. The law does not provide for any standard or condition as to the necessity for the act. It gives to the trademark owner carte blanche authority to make that determination alone. He is not required to consult with anyone. There is no one to review his act.

"In considering the justification for reposing this authority in the trademark owner, the real character and purpose of the Fair Trade Act should be examined. Its obstensible justification is to compel adherence to fixed prices so as to protect against debasement the goodwill of tradename commodities. Although this property right may be constitutionally protected, as witness the old Dearborn decision, an examination of the great number of authorities and the vast literature by way of reviews and reports dealing with the subject compels the conclusion that the real impact of the law is in the area of price fixing. The protection of the property right in trademarks and goodwill attendant to them is of interest to a limited number of persons and constitutes legislation for their exclusive benefit.

* * * * *

"* * * The record in this case contains the testimony of a respected economist to the effect that resale price maintenance under the so-called Fair Trade Act is detrimental both to the consumer and to the economy. He was of the view that the producer of the commodity who invokes the act is usually a member of a monopoly or oligopoly, because if there were numerous producers of a competing commodity few would abide by the pricing practices of one or two. His opinion that the policy of the act makes possible a price monopoly inimical to the public welfare is clearly borne out by the record. There is in force a fair trade contract in respect to Remington shells produced by plaintiff. The major competing shells are manufactured by Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. under the name of 'Winchester.' Olin Mathieson's shells are also fair traded. These two manufacturers control 87 to 90 percent of the production of shells in the United States. It appears from the record that for almost all types of shells produced by each of these manufacturers, in fact for every type which is common to the production of both of them, the price is identical to the penny. This is significant considering that the elaborate price lists of both manufacturers were printed and published 3 days apart. It is apparent the record here establishes that the act, rather than regulating and controlling monopoly power, creates a climate where monopolies may flourish. These views are in accord with the thought of authorities who have written and reported on the subject of retail price maintenance in the past few years." *Remington Arms Co., Inc.* v. *G.E.M. of St. Louis, Inc.* (Minn. Sup. Ct., 1960) Trade Cases 69, 673.

5. The Supreme Court of Arkansas stated:

"It is a generalization, but not an overstatement, to say that the effort to 'fix prices' is made by groups who desire to sell something for more than the sponsoring group believes that the purchasing public would pay for that 'something' without an enforced fixed price. It would seem apparent that the principal objective of minimum price maintenance is the protection of profit margins for retailers and distributors unable or unwilling to meet the pressure of competition." Quoted with approval in *Remington Arms Co., Inc.* v. *Skaggs* (Wash. Sup. Ct., 1959) Trade Cases 69, 520.

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF FAIR TRADE AND NONFAIR TRADE PRICES

In Miami, Fla., a sick person could buy Achromycin V Capsules for $6.40 instead of $7.65; Orinase for $5.25 instead of $6.75; Declomycin for $6.40 instead of $7.65; Unicaps for $1.79 instead of $3.11; Coricidin for 97 cents instead of $1.08; J. & J. Baby Powder for 54 cents instead of 59 cents; J. & J. Cotton for 33 cents instead of 39 cents.

In Indianapolis, Ind., the sick could buy Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75; Serpasil for $6.50 instead of $7.50; Diuril for $7.65 instead of $9; Unicaps for $2.83 instead of $3.11; Ben-Gay for 79 cents instead of 89 cents; Anacin for 99 cents instead of $1.19. The parent could also obtain J. & J. Baby Oil for 89 cents instead of 98 cents.

In Louisville, Ky., a person could buy Unicaps for $2.39 instead of $3.11, and One-A-Day Multiple for $2.36 instead of $2.94; Coricidin for 79 cents instead of $1.08; Dristan for 63 cents instead of 98 cents; and Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75. Colgate Dental Cream could be obtained for 53 cents instead of 69 cents, and J. & J. Baby Powder for 47 cents instead of 59 cents.

Additional examples are found in St. Louis, Mo., where one could buy Serpasil for $6.50 instead of a fair trade price of $7.50; Orinase for $6.50 instead of $6.75; Madribon for $4.35 instead of $4.90; Unicaps for $2.19 instead of $3.11; Poly-vi-sol for $2.49 instead of $3.59; Similac for 89 cents instead of 99 cents; Bayer Aspirin for 49 cents instead of 69 cents; Colgate Dental Cream for 55 cents instead of 69 cents.

In Seattle, Wash., a sick person could buy Declomycin for $7.20 instead of $7.65; Ilosone for $10.60 instead of $11.43; Madribon for $4.79 instead of $4.90; Bufferin for 99 cents rather than $1.23. He could also buy Colgate Dental Cream for 49 cents instead of 69 cents.

In Spokane, Wash., he could buy Unicaps for $10.60 instead of $11.43; Madribon for $7.99 instead of $9.45.

In Huntington, W. Va., the hard hit diabetic miner could buy Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75. A sick person could buy Serpasil for $6.75 instead of $7.50; Madribon for $4.50 instead of $4.90.

In Minneapolis, Minn., a sick person could buy Achromycin V capsules and Declomycin for $7.20 instead of $7.65; Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75; Chlor-Trimeton Maleate for $4.50 instead of $5.58; Coricidin for 76 cents instead of $1.08 and Absorbine, Jr. for $1.25 instead of $1.45. He could also pay 54 cents for Colgate's Dental Cream instead of 69 cents.

In Cleveland, Ohio, the sick could have the benefit of a price of $5.88 for both Achromycin V capsules and Declomycin instead of a $7.65 price. He could purchase Orinase for $4.99 instead of $6.75. Gantrisin for $3.97 instead of $4.90; Kynex for $2.70 instead of $3.55; Unicaps for $2.51 instead of $3.11; Dristan for 72 cents instead of 98 cents and Ben-Gay for 70 cents instead of 89 cents.

APPENDIX C

PRICE QUALITY COMPARISONS

Frozen shrimp ("raw" breaded): Two brands rated "very good" were less expensive than at least one brand rated as "good," four rated as "fair," and three rated as "poor." Of eight brands of frozen raw peeled shrimp only the cheapest brand received a very good rating.

Upright freezers: The three top-rated brands were comparable in price to most of those tested. Of the four highest priced, none was top rated, one was in the third quality bracket, and one was rated "not acceptable." There was also a considerable price range on identical models.

Kitchen scales: The two best rated were the highest priced.

23-inch TV consoles: Two makes were top rated. One was priced at $350, the other at $279.95. There were at least four other lower rated brands selling for $279.95 or higher.

Steam irons: The six top-rated models ranged from $10.88 to $19.95. The highest

priced model, $27.95, was "acceptable" but not top rated.

Seat belts: The price range of seven top-rated models was $10.95 to $14.95. Two models, one at $6.95, the other at $9.95, survived the highest-speed crash test but showed incipient failure. Seven $12.95 and one $14.95 models failed the highest-speed crash test. A number of $12.95 and $10.95 models failed all crash tests.

Tank vacuum cleaners: Of the four rated "very good," three were priced at $89.95 and the fourth at $99.75. Of those rated "good," two were the highest priced, $119.95 and $139.

Portable TV, 19 inch: The highest rated were priced at $199.95 and $209.95. A number of others not so rated were also priced at $199.95.

Transistorized electronic flash units: Of 10 brands tested the only unacceptable one was the highest priced (along with one which was acceptable).

Dehumidifiers: A number of the higher priced brands were not among the top rated.

Sun tan preparations: The two top-rated brands were among the lowest priced. Three of the highest priced were among the lowest rated.

Built-in electric ranges: The three top rated were priced $89.95 to $114.95. Many lower rated were higher priced.

Black and white film: The two brands rated "very good" and three rated "good" were identically priced.

---

[1] On Apr. 9, 1963, Senator KEFAUVER, on the floor of the Senate, noted that Ciba, the producer of Serpasil, had a markup of almost 1,500 percent.

[2] While H.R. 3669 would exempt sales of prescription drugs, it would be wholly unrealistic to expect this exemption to survive in view of the sponsorship of this legislation by the NARD. The Senate bill, S. 774, significantly has no such exemption.

[3] Alexander and Hill, "What To Do About Discount Houses," Harvard Business Review, 1955.

[4] Compare Wall Street Journal, March 21, 1963, p. 2: "'We have shoppers shopping all our dealers to see if they are selling below the agreed limit,' says one distributor." See also *Mead Johnson & Co.* v. *G-E-X Inc.* of Albany (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Albany County) 1963 Trade Cases, Para. 70,688: "The evidence clearly shows frequent inspection by representatives of plaintiff of the stores of retailers to ascertain if its minimum prices are maintained; if a violation is found it is promptly reported to higher authority of plaintiff, which sends letters to the offenders, to cease and desist; if such letters do not produce compliance, the matter is referred to local counsel, who employ a private detective agency to shop the offending retailer's store, and if the violation is found to be continuing, actions for injunctions are promptly instituted."

[5] 109 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5614 (Apr. 9, 1963).

[6] Last year this company announced it was no longer going to limit its sales to those observing its suggested prices. The president of Parke, Davis & Co. stated that the company's products would be placed on sale where people were buying them.

[7] Warne, "Advertising and Consumer Behavior," 10 Cartel 82, 85 (July 1960).

[8] *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *Park & Sons Co.*, 220 U.S. 373.

[9] *United States* v. *McKesson & Robbins, Inc.*, 351 U.S. 305.

[10] *Sunbeam Corp.* 1. Wentling, 185 F. 2d 903 (C.A. 3, 1950); *General Electric Co.* v. *Masters Mail Order Co.*, 244 F. 2d 681 (C.A. 2, 1957).

[11] *Gillette Co.* v. *Two Guys from Harrison, Inc.*, CCH Trade Reg. Cases, Par. 70, 223 (N.J. Sup. Ct. 1962).

[12] *United States* v. *Parke, Davis & Co.*, 362 U.S. 29.

The Pace of Our Forefathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the birth of West Virginia took place amid the shot and shell of Civil War, according to an article by John G. Morgan in the Charleston (W. Vr.) Sunday Gazette-Mail.

This article, entitled "The Pace of Our Forefathers," tells how the delegates to West Virginia's First Constitutional Convention at Wheeling deliberated unhurriedly at their task, in spite of the presence of Union and Confederate troops shooting at each other in the Allegheny Mountains.

The delegates liberalized the old Virginian constitution by deciding it was no longer necessary to exclude ministers of the gospel and bank officers from holding State office. Attorneys, however, were still debarred.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article by Mr. Morgan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PACE OF OUR FOREFATHERS

(By John G. Morgan)

Late in 1861, Yankee and Rebel soldiers continued shooting at each other in those beautiful hills west of the Allegheny Mountains. The hills still belonged to old Virginia.

In two of the main military movements at year's end, Union troops occupied Beckley, and Confederate forces captured Sutton and burned part of the town.

The First Constitutional Convention, grinding out the fundamental law for proposed West Virginia, continued its labors at Wheeling.

On December 19, 1861, convention delegates opened discussion on whether they should adopt this provision in the old Virginia constitution:

"No person holding a lucrative office, no minister of the gospel, or priest of any religious denomination, no salaried officer of any banking corporation or company, and no attorney for the Commonwealth shall be capable of being elected a member of either house of the assembly."

Delegates first considered whether they should strike out "no minister of the gospel, or priest of any religious denomination."

Delegate Chapman J. Stuart, the gentleman from Doddridge with the sarcastic wit, asked: "Is it necessary to protect ourselves from ministers? I have always looked upon them as the salt of the earth."

Delegate Henry Dering, the merchant from Monongalia, said he favored retaining the old Virginia provision. "Holy offices should not be prostituted by entering into our political deliberative bodies," he commented.

Delegate James H. Brown, the Kanawha circuit judge, arguing to retain the provision, said the ministry is a "high and holy calling, a sacred and separate calling."

Each delegate should ask himself the test question of how he would feel if his own minister descended from the pulpit and entered into "the dirty work of carrying out the party prejudices of those that put him in nomination," Brown said.

Delegate Peter G. Van Winkle, the jolly egghead from Wood County, said in response to Brown's comment:

"Let the preachers and the congregations alone determine that matter."

Brown said approval of preachers in politics would put the Methodists on one side and the Baptists on the other. It would then become a matter of who had the strongest congregation.

Stuart said he supposed that Brown wanted to keep the ministers out of politics so that he (Brown) could engage in the "dirty business" himself.

As soon as the delegates quit laughing, William W. Brumfield, the pretty whiskered farmer from Wayne County, moved that the convention adjourn.

"Let us settle this question," said Stuart.

"I would prefer that it not be settled tonight," said Brumfield.

The motion to adjourn was lost on a tie vote.

A vote then was taken on the motion to strike out ministers and priests. It was adopted 21 to 17.

And then the convention adjourned.

On the next day, discussion still centered on the section in the old Virginia constitution. A motion was made to strike out bank officers.

Brown, opposing the motion, declared that the "history of the country shows how influential banks have been."

Van Winkle responded quickly with these words: "I think the gentleman who has just taken his seat is very far behind the age; that if we follow his lead we will be going back gradually to all the old fogy principles that the last 50 years have been employed in getting rid of."

Dering said he wanted to protect the legislature from the "monied influence of banks."

Van Winkle remarked that the constitution couldn't correct the "fallibility of human nature" and added that it wasn't fair to say one class is more likely to abuse power than another.

The motion to strike out the bank officers was adopted 22 to 15. The astute Daniel Lamb, of Ohio County, a bank officer himself, didn't vote.

Early in December, Van Winkle offered a resolution proposing that the convention take a recess from December 20 until the following January 7.

The proposal, touching on personal problems of expense, time, and transportation, excited lots of discussion.

"I hope it may be the pleasure of this convention that we will take a recess, and I appeal to all the old bachelors in the body, if there should be any, or young bachelors, to extend that privilege here" Stuart said.

Ephraim B. Hall, the Marion lawyer, argued against a recess. He said he was willing to work every day except Sundays and Christmas until the work of the convention was completed.

Delegate Joseph S. Powell, the lively minister from Hancock, remarked: "I understand the gentleman (Hall) is somewhat differently situated from the rest of us, that he has his family here while we have not." (Merriment.)

Brown said he would have to spend a lot of the recess time in traveling. He said it would take him at least 3 days, and possibly 4, to get home. He inquired about the boat schedule.

Brumfield pointed out that many delegates would have to go home "by water."

Van Winkle said one gentleman told him it would require 7 days to get home and 7 to get back.

Hall defended his position this way: "It is said I am not situated as some are because I brought my family with me. I did that for the very purpose that I might remain here. Others had the same privilege, and if they did not choose to do so, let them take the consequences." (Laughter.)

"I want to see and mingle with my little prattling ones," Stuart said.

"I dispersed mine around among my neighbors before I came," Hall declared.

An amendment, making the recess end on December 31 was rejected. The original motion to recess until January 7 was adopted 25–14.

And so, with much work still to be done on the constitution, the delegates returned to their firesides for the holidays. But their happiness at home in the wartime atmosphere was severely limited.

As the new year of 1862 opened, a Wheeling Intelligencer reporter put down these words: "As we write, the old town clock away up in the steeple of the First Presbyterian Church is ringing out the old year at the stroke of 12. * * * A year that opened in national peace and prosperity closes in the face of the tramp and clangor of war. * * *"

On the first day of the session after the recess, Lamb read this message from President John Hall of Mason:

"I have been delayed on the river. Act in my place as president tomorrow."

Lamb took the chair, but later participated in floor action while Stuart occupied the president's post.

Up for consideration early in the first day's session was a constitutional provision that would prohibit those who fought duels with deadly weapons from holding "any office of honor, trust or profit" within the State.

The prohibition also extended to anyone who sent or accepted a challenge to fight a duel or served as a second in a duel.

Lamb expressed this opinion: "The men who are apt to engage in duels are generally aspiring politicians, and a provision excluding them from all offices is perhaps the most certain check to the practice which can be devised."

Van Winkle supported Lamb by declaring: "It is a vile crime, and all the worse because it is sanctioned by public opinion of those who consider themselves of the higher class. * * * It is a relic of barbarism and nothing else."

The provision against dueling was adopted without change.

In another section of the original draft of the constitution, the seat of government was placed at Wheeling. Van Winkle quickly tried to strike out the name and insert Parkersburg.

"We have plenty of accommodations there (Parkersburg) for the legislative bodies and the members, and it is a much more sensible and accessible place to the majority of the members than the city of Wheeling," he said.

"* * * for convenience of access, Parkersburg is the center of the State. You might find a geographic center up in Braxton where nobody can get. But we are at the end of a railroad on the river."

Lamb and Abraham D. Soper, a Tyler lawyer, opposed Van Winkle, saying it wasn't a good time to agitate the question.

But Van Winkle continued his argument: "We have a place of some 3,000 inhabitants. We have three large hotels besides small ones; as fine a courthouse as is in the western part of the State; two or three large halls—three if not four—that are devoted to public purposes. We have a delightful, pleasant atmosphere, free from smoke (laughter) and many other things which I do not like to allude to particularly." (Smiles.)

His motion to strike out Wheeling was rejected.

In a discussion to determine the length of the legislative sessions, Brown made this classic comment: "The difficulty is that * * * business is not dispatched in the early stages of the session and has to be crowded through at the end; and often do we see bills passed through at the heel of the session read by their titles, not a man except the patron of the bill knowing what the contents are. That is one of the great evils of legislation that we are to guard against."

It was decided that the legislature would hold 45-day annual sessions.

Salaries of the legislators were fixed at $3 a day for their service and 10 cents a mile for travel, with the president of the senate and the speaker of the house to receive an extra $2 per day each.

Van Winkle argued that the legislature should have the power to set the salaries of its members. "There may be a change in the prices of things," he pointed out.

On January 8, 1862, Delegate Dudley S. Montague, the hotel keeper from Red House Shoals in Putnam County, didn't answer a routine rollcall.

Delegate Benjamin F. Stewart, the Wirt merchant, apparently did something about the situation, and then announced: "Mr. President, the gentleman who was asleep is now awake and desires to vote."

Wisconsin Fills a Growing Need for a United Nations Informed Citizenry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fine work which is presently being done by the Wisconsin Governor's Committee on the United Nations. This committee was established in late 1959 to further understanding of the purpose and accomplishments of the United Nations as an instrument for peace. This committee, Mr. Speaker, is unique among State agencies in this country. Wisconsin is the only State in the Union having an official agency which carries on a continuing year-round educational program on the United Nations.

The committee, under the leadership of Mr. Bruno Bitker, of Milwaukee, has just prepared an annual report on the activities of this worthwhile group.

Some excerpts from this report follow:

WISCONSIN FILLS A GROWING NEED FOR A UNITED NATIONS INFORMED CITIZENRY

Members are appointed by the Governor. They represent all segments of the State, and include the heads of a number of statewide organizations which have taken an active interest in international affairs. * * *

Many Americans who ask only to be left alone find it extremely frustrating to be told that we live in a world so small that it is impossible to be left alone. The time between cause and effect of events abroad is so brief today that Americans become involved in world crises without being fully aware of the whys and wherefores of acts taken by the U.N. or of the pros and cons of the U.S. position on these actions. Under ordinary circumstances, the average American tends to be indifferent to questions of foreign policy. But when the headlines on the Congo or on Vietnam or elsewhere threaten to disturb the normal conduct of affairs, then citizens demand fast answers and speedy solutions. * * *

This is an annual 1-day institute featuring nationally known speakers and scheduled each spring.

The third annual conference was held on the campus of the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee on May 5, 1962. The theme for the conference was "The World's Children and the United Nations." It provided an opportunity for people to learn how the United Nations is helping to meet the needs of the world's citizens of tomorrow.

As part of its effort to promote a better understanding of the United Nations, the committee, during its several years, has sponsored and assisted with programs carried on in several of our State's educational institutions.

Throughout the year the committee has assisted schools at the primary as well as high school level in conducting classes about the United Nations.

Another major undertaking of the committee has been the sponsorship of United Nations Day activities throughout Wisconsin. The campaign to further this occasion began with the issuance of a proclamation by the Governor of the State, declaring October 24 as United Nations Day in Wisconsin.

In 1962 the committee has a record of the observance of U.N. Day in more communities in Wisconsin than ever before. Reports indicate 246 communities had some type of U.N. Day activity, including UNICEF programs. There were 97 chairmen officially appointed by Wisconsin mayors and village chairmen, and 56 mayors issued U.N. Day or UNICEF Day proclamations. School observances were reported in 98 communities. The special features carried on throughout Wisconsin's 310 libraries for U.N. Day is now almost routine. * * *

The committee has sought to supply the names of qualified speakers to organizations which request this service. Committee members have appeared before many groups. When a community or organization requests a speaker, the committee tries to suggest names of informed persons who reside in or near that community. The committee makes no charge for this service, but the group issuing the invitation usually pays the speaker's expenses, and in some instances pays an honorarium.

A wide variety of pamphlets, flyers, fact sheets, kits, posters, and letters were distributed by the committee's office during 1962. This was also true in 1960–61. The demand for printed information was greater than ever this year. Copies of documents distributed mounted into the thousands.

During the 3 years of its existence the committee has been concerned with several publications in addition to the annual reports. With the Institute for World Affairs Education, it issued the "Wisconsin Leader's Guide." This guide contained numerous suggestions for carrying out U.N. Day observance activities in communities throughout the State. A series of articles by H. Russel Austin, which appeared in eight successive Sunday feature sections of the Milwaukee Journal were reprinted by the Journal for distribution by the committee as a public service. The brochure was entitled "United Nations—1960."

One purpose of this committee has been to assist and cooperate with all recognized organizations in the State which are interested in learning about the United Nations. Members of the committee have aided in the formation of U.N. study groups and have appeared before many organizations and helped to arrange workshops and plan conferences.

There is no legislative budgetary allowance for this committee. Expenses are covered by contributions from public-spirited citizens, corporations, organizations and through absorption of the costs of certain events by other agencies and individuals.

The committee's activities have continued to grow in an attempt to keep pace with increasing demands for information about

the United Nations. It is gratifying to the committee that the interest of Wisconsin citizens in international affairs and the United Nations is greater than ever.

Secretary Zuckert's Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the April 1963 issue of the Air Force Digest contains an inspiring and challenging address by Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert which he delivered last month to personnel at the Air Force Missile Test Center at Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.

In his remarks, Secretary Zuckert outlines the strategic role the modern Air Force must play in our Nation's overall defense posture, in our searching probes into the uncharted frontiers of space, and in our continuing campaign for victory in the cold war.

Secretary Zuckert's speech inspires our imagination. Threaded throughout his remarks is the position that the American Air Force must attain and maintain firm superiority in space and elsewhere and settle for nothing less in every challenge which confronts it.

I heartily recommend the reading of the remarks of this brilliant service Secretary and I wish to insert the text of his speech in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

CHALLENGE TO AMERICA BY THE HONORABLE EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

It was suggested that I discuss the future of the Air Force in space. As both starting point and finish line for everything I say, just keep in mind that the job of the Air Force is not space; it is defense. It is not research and development, not strategic, not tactical, nor any of these. It is the application of airpower or aerospace power to the defense of the United States and the free world.

Some of my remarks may be responsive to the suggestion about space, but it seems more important to me to talk about the future of the Air Force in the defense of the United States. The future is from now on, and now is cold war.

The cold war, reduced to essentials, is a confrontation of sovereign powers in which one side maintains a pressure of aggressive expansionism, forcing the other to maintain a defense against it. The most urgent requirement of that defense is to deter the aggressor from using military force to attain his ends. We are the defenders.

I would like to make four points about that defense.

First, we must have superiority at the top level of intensity of war, and must extend that deterrent superiority to lower levels in order to contain or limit war and aggression.

Second, we must have flexibility and control of the application of destructive power at each level.

Third, we must be prepared to protect ourselves against the extension of aggressive pressure into space, and

Fourth, the Air Force role in this overall defense requirement presents the greatest challenge in the history of any military organization.

In this cold war confrontation, the technological and industrial capabilities of both sides are such that sooner or later, if not now, the unrestrained use of that power for nuclear destruction would make its employment in war a net losing proposition for both sides. The defender must have power to wreak unacceptable damage on the aggressor as a first requirement of his defense. This is where strategic deterrence starts.

But an aggressor whose political system may make expansion a necessity will, if deterred by fear of retaliation from using his full power, seek other opportunities. He will try to find the place to apply his power which he calculates will not provoke his own destruction. Close one avenue to him and he tries another. He can logically be expected to stay short of triggering his own destruction. The aggressor naturally has the initiative in this game so we must be able to apply whatever force is necessary to deny him his objective.

So far, we have been able to do so. The risk has been too great for him. We must keep it that way. We have our own reasons for desisting from war but until we can make him apply the same reasoning to his national behavior, we have no choice but to make sure —and make sure he knows—that war—any war he starts—means certain military defeat for him. We know, of course, that all-out war makes no sense for either side, nor for the rest of the world.

The defender, of course, has to maintain a force adequate to prevent ultimate defeat. This requirement may change, but the use of the force is his final effort. Two courses are then open. The defender can, as a matter of judgment, wait and weigh each application of the aggressor's power in order to or until he can decide it is sufficiently threatening to warrant the jugular response. As a second course, he can prepare to overcome the aggressor's military power before that point is reached. It seems to me that the first course is closed at the end. A sensible defense is to be ready to respond at a lower level with whatever force is deemed necessary to stop the aggressor—and at a net loss for his attempt.

The United States is leader of the free world, in President Kennedy's words, by both strength and conviction. Our conviction, both moral and military, is that we must be prepared to stop aggression at levels of intensity below the level of the maximum destruction.

Our basic strength, our power to deter aggression, our ability to defend ourselves must always be greatest at the top. In our strategic bomber and missile forces, we maintain power adequate to deter an enemy from striking for our jugular. Strategic forces, of course, have the capability of counterforce attack which does not constitute total devastation of a nation.

We have to maintain this superiority at the top, but we must also have it at levels of war more likely to be brought against us. That is why we are building deterrence down from the top level of intensity. The reason is simple. The only way we know of forcing an aggressor to keep down his use of military force is to make each level of intensity of conflict more certain of defeat for him than the one below it. He won't be deterred unless he knows that as his commitment goes up, his chances go down.

One hears talk about the danger and probability of escalation. The effect of my first point, extending the deterrent with superiority at each level, is to make escalation a penalty and not an opportunity for an aggressor.

At each level where we determine we want to stop aggression, we must be prepared to make the most efficient possible use of every resource available to us, skillfully employing advancing technology to save human resources. It is imperative that, for the long haul, we hold the investment at each level to the absolute minimum necessary to maintain effective deterrent superiority. The cheapest way to stop war is at the lowest level of conflict with the quickest possible stop to aggression. To me, this means we use tactical nuclear weapons whenever we determine the military situation demands their use, whether by Army, Navy, Marines, or the Air Force.

If we would have the aggressor desist from any course of action which may be desirable to him but unacceptable to us, we must have him know that we will use whatever force it takes, nuclear or nonnuclear, to stop him. This kind of deterrence employs all services.

The President has made clear his determination to have more choices than no response or total response. This is the purpose of counterforce. This is the reason we must have flexibility in strategic forces. This is why the great increase in what has been called tactical forces, now designated in the budget as general purpose forces. One phase of the buildup is the combining of ground power with airpower in the new STRICOM, headquartered at MacDill Air Force Base, Fla.

At the Air Force Special Warfare Center at Eglin AFB, the accumulated experience of four decades of air operations is being applied to the job of developing airpower techniques for the very low rungs on the ladders of war's intensity. This is the AF-COIN program, or the Air Force part of the Nation's preparation for counterinsurgency struggles.

For this work, we are trying out beefed-up T-28's and B-26's with more power and more weapons—14 .50-caliber machineguns and a dozen external ordnance stations, for example, on a B-26 with a thousand more horsepower than the original.

Support techniques are keeping pace. We can snatch a 10,000-pound cargo package off a C-123 without touching down. We can get a C-130E fully loaded into a grass or clay runway of less than 1,000 feet. We are working on a system for snatching a cagelike capsule of 20 to 25 men off one of these planes without landing it. This technique will be a big help to the Army in getting over that first difficult period of concentration of men during an airborne operation.

For the general roles of air superiority and interdiction, our effective power will go up by an order of magnitude with the advent of the F-4C added to the F-105, with both then to be supplemented by the first fighter designed from scratch for dual-service use—the F-111, better known as the TFX.

While we are extending downward the effectiveness of our deterrent power, great changes are taking place at the level of the strategic deterrent. Missiles are coming into the inventory to provide a very special kind of delivery system for nuclear explosives.

The concept of strategic deterrence, of course, is a progression from the strategic bombing concepts of the 1930's. The B-47's and B-52's also progressions from those early bombers, will continue to carry the burden of strategic deterrence for some years. Current projections of the strategic forces, however, assume that a major part of the job can be done by missiles—land based or sea based—at a lower investment of men, money, and machines than would be possible with manned bombers of today's design.

In other words, the B-52 is passing the heavy explosive delivery part of its job on to the missiles. The Air Force believes that the effective life of the B-52 could be extended, in a joint role with missiles, through use of the Skybolt, but the return on the projected Skybolt investment was judged not worth the cost in the light of all the factors involved.

The missiles do only the explosives delivery job. They have to be pretargeted and, once launched, cannot be recalled or redirected. They cannot follow a movable target. They cannot discriminate. They cannot assess damage, nor report battle conditions. They make for a rigid defense posture. While they necessarily carry the brunt of the strategic strike, total dependence upon them would not be consistent with our objective of controlling destruction and preserving always some foundation for ending the conflict.

Because of the variety of such requirements in our approach to strategic warfare, some type of manned system seems called for. The type of aircraft we've been calling strategic bombers are characterized by extreme range capabilities, very high ceiling, great load-carrying capacity, long endurance, multiman crews, and multijob possibilities. Our current studies are directed at determining the possible application of these flight characteristics at the point within the missions bracket between missiles on one side and high performance fighters on the other. The RS-70 is the most advanced of these concepts, but it is not by any means the only type of manned system of significant strategic potential.

We can not say now just where we will come out, but there doesn't seem to be any question as to the value of manned vehicles able to stay aloft for long periods, travel very great distances, fly high or fly low, and fly fast. There are many jobs to be done, reconnaissance-strike missions, observation or surveillance, command and control, or weapon launching.

We can get the flexibility of my second point with airpower. This is one reason why I have no taste for the salty beer that results from the crying into it by those who seem to write off manned systems because of the job changes I've mentioned.

But the main reason why I don't intend to join in drinking any tearsalted beer is that while we still have to do all the old jobs assigned to airpower, we have the difficult, demanding, challenging, and expanding new job to do in space.

Before I say anything about our future in space, let me establish two benchmarks. The first is that the Air Force needs everything it can get from NASA. NASA needs us, too, as the record of how NASA puts things into space indicates, but if there weren't a NASA, the same facility and capability would have to be created some other way.

There is reassuring precedent for the principle of having an outside-of-defense civilian agency provide the type of support we need. The case at point is the Atomic Energy Commission. Our own nuclear weapon flexibility as well as the Polaris-carrying submarine is sufficient testimony.

The clear lesson for us in the space field is that we must put requirements on NASA to meet whatever part of our needs can be met in this way. We must utilize every possible resource to build the necessary military capability, and I can assure you that NASA is ready to respond. Jim Webb, the NASA Administrator, harbors no illusions about NASA's responsibilities in support of national defense requirements.

The second benchmark is that there is no such thing as peaceful space or military space. There is just space. A new and massive space program in a civilian agency was launched nearly 5 years ago, with—for reasons which seemed not unreasonable at the time—a great hullabaloo about peaceful objectives.

The Nation is holding to those peaceful objectives, but we also know that the military services will have to do the same thing in space that they have always done in the media of the land, sea, and air. The Air Force forward space program is, therefore, aimed at two general objectives.

The first is to acquire the capability to utilize space in support of the military forces operating in the familiar environments of land, sea, and air. Space offers new aids. Observation, warning, communications, military geodesy, and meteorology are areas for the application of space technology to defense. All of the services have requirements of their own, and it is up to the Air Force to provide them the access they need for their purposes. The Secretary of Defense has assigned the responsibility to us.

Right here, let me caution against letting any interservice differences blur either judgment or vision. It is my position that competition in ideas among the three services is desirable. The imaginative, strongminded people we need in this business are going to have differences, and they must be resolved constructively.

Our second general objective is to acquire the necessary defense capability for the aerospace regions themselves. We must be able to protect the peaceful activities in space of the nations of the free world. We believe that space can be free to all for peaceful activity only if somebody keeps it free. We are that somebody. The job involves mastering the space environment in order to deny to a hostile power the uninhibited military exploitation of space. We can only do this if we have the ability to detect and counter any military threat. We believe that both manned and unmanned systems will be required, but we cannot say now in what relative investment.

We have a lot to learn. The recent agreement with NASA for joint participation in the Gemini program is one way. That agreement represents an answer from both DoD and NASA to critics who said there was no place in space for military man. Our own activity directed toward manned space vehicles will increase, and with NASA's backup we'll attain the needed capability earlier than we would otherwise.

A term you hear around Washington to denote the areas of cooperation between Government agencies is "interface" Such terms usually leave me pretty cold but this one does have some descriptive value.

There will be plenty of problems between the Air Force and NASA, but not by any means all at the "interface" points such as Cape Canaveral. Neither of us would be true to trust or tradition if there weren't. Any machine as big as the national space effort is bound to have some kind of friction. But just remember, a clutch is a friction interface. Its purpose is to join two shafts for the transmission of power.

The power we can get will provide protection for the free world in space. This was my third point—to make sure that no aggressor can exploit space, either for expansionism on earth or interference in space with the peaceful pursuits of the free world.

The people of the United States know they must have an Air Force second to none if they are to apply their strength constructively in peace. My fourth point covers just a few things, then, that the Air Force officer must believe, know, and practice.

Get these ideas straight:

The Air Force is at the highest state of readiness and response capability in all its history.

It is strengthening that posture almost monthly.

It needs better people than ever before. It has more opportunity for their professional growth and potential contribution to the Nation's defense than ever before.

It needs the old skills, but to a far greater degree, for AFCOIN and general purpose forces, for airlift and air defense, and for the new mission of heavy multiman crew, long endurance aircraft.

And then it needs that whole new range of skills, the skills and techniques which are being developed by the Slaytons, the Coopers, the Grissoms—and all of their colleagues, civil and military—to enable America to keep her place as freedom's leader by strength and conviction.

The Air Force is an organization of professionals. It takes brains and hard work to keep up. The competition is tough, but the opportunities to serve your country and make a mark in the service to which you have dedicated your lives will continue to expand.

It all adds up to a reminder for those who wear the Air Force uniform that the wild blue yonder is still beyond.

A Plan Needed for Liberation of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of our relations with the Cuban exiles and the apparent inability to cope with the Cuban situation stems from the apparent lack of any concrete plan by President Kennedy. In his usual manner of dealing with problems he confounds everyone by a series of conflicting statements emanating from the White House and through his brother, the Attorney General.

Since the Bay of Pigs disaster we have been told by the President, by his spokesmen, and by the Attorney General that we did promise air cover for the invasion, that we did not promise air cover, that we would support the freedom fighters in their struggle to liberate their homeland, that we would arrest any of them that tried it.

In a brave and heroic speech to the world a few days before the election last fall, the President demanded the removal from Cuba of Russian missiles and troops. The quarantine he called for turned out to be no quarantine nor blockade indeed. We never halted any ships and even allowed the first Russian vessel to proceed even though its cargo was oil, the most vital commodity necessary to the Castro economy. No on-site inspections were ever made to assure that the missiles had actually been removed. Months later we are still trying to get the Russian troops out of Cuba by appealing to Khrushchev to honor his pledges and accepting his word that they are being removed in spite of the fact that he has never been known to honor his word or any agreement.

At this point I would like to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal pointing out the risks of the Kennedy inaction, and that the President must formulate and execute a plan of action to reimpose the Monroe Doctrine:

THE RISKS OF INACTION

President Kennedy is perfectly correct when he observes that it's pointless for people to just say we've got to "do something" about Cuba. And he is equally right in noting that a good deal has been done since October in terms of restricting trade and maintaining surveillance of the Communist island.

But these are not the issues which bother so many people. The causes of concern are

an uneasy feeling that the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba, the unhappy spectacle of the U.S. Government bitterly fighting with the Cuban foes of Castro and, above all, the continued presence of Soviet troops with no apparent American plan for getting rid of them once and for all.

As former Vice President Nixon put it the other day, whether there are 12,000 or 17,000 Soviet troops in Cuba, Khrushchev's position "is firmer today than a year ago." Senator KEATING also says the precise number is somewhat beside the point; one Red soldier is too many. What matters is not Castro, who by himself would be just another pipsqueak dictator. Rather, the threat to all the Americas is Khrushchev in Cuba.

The New York Senator does, however, insist there has been practically no net reduction in the number since November, because the troops that have left have been replaced. Government officials retort in effect that it's easy to make such charges without documentation, and especially easy for political critics of the administration.

Unfortunately for that answer, the charges are coming from nonpolitical sources as well. For a notable example, from the New York Times' Ruby Hart Phillips, who spent 25 years in Cuba before being expelled by Castro in 1961 and who still remains in close touch as head of the Times' Miami bureau.

According to Mrs. Phillips' information, the Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Moreover, she declared flatly in a speech the other day that the missiles still remain in Cuba. "And I have not a doubt that they have a good submarine base and extensive submarine pens."

Such assertions, whether right or wrong, deserve more than an official brush-off. They could hardly be more serious; in Mrs. Phillips' view, unless Cuba is taken out of the Communist camp, all of Latin America is going to fall, country by country. Or, in Mr. Nixon's words, Khrushchev didn't spend a billion dollars merely for the purpose of acquiring Cuba; he has far bigger game in mind.

Nor do all those who are disturbed by administration policy take refuge in the "do something" generality. Mrs. Phillips is forthright enough; she says only force of arms will get communism out of Cuba. Many disagree, but it is a possibility that cannot be ruled out for all time.

Meantime Mr. KEATING, among others, advocates a number of further economic, diplomatic and military moves short of invasion. Certainly it does seem that, after facing up to Khrushchev last fall, it ought to be possible to demand the withdrawal of troops and weapons. It is hard to believe that it was necessary to lose October's initiative and move to the extreme of protecting Khrushchev's men from attacks by Cuban exiles.

Mr. Nixon may, perhaps, be charged with vagueness when he says the United States must make "a command decision to do whatever is necessary to force the removal of the Soviet beachhead." But his real point is that without such a decision, the problem can only get worse for us.

Will the risks of action, he asks, "be less in 6 months, 1 year, 2 years? If we allow Cuba to remain an example for Communist takeovers in other Latin American countries, the risks are certain to grow."

The issue is not, it seems to us, whether we should dispatch the Marines this minute. The deeply disquieting thing is the seeming absence of any real plan. Or if there has been any decision, for all the American people can tell, it is to accept an intolerable coexistence with Soviet conquest in our hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to emphasize the points made in this editorial: First, the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba. Second, it is not Castro, it is Khrushchev, Khrushchev's position is firmer today in Cuba than it was a year ago. Third, there has been no significant decrease in Russian troops in Cuba. The Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Fourth, there is substantial evidence that missiles remain in Cuba and a good submarine base and submarine pens are in existence. Fifth, there is increasing evidence that other Latin American countries are in danger of being subverted by Khrushchev-Castro directed Communists. Sixth, and, in my opinion, most important, the seeming absence of any real plan by the Kennedy administration for freeing Cuba and getting the Russian aggressors out of this hemisphere.

The President, in his news conference today, complained that his critics have not come up with any concrete plan. A look at the RECORD any day of the week will disclose that many of us have been advocating a number of measures, short of military action, which can and must be taken. I would suggest as a starter that the United States recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile. Contrary to the President's disavowal of the importance of exile governments in today's press conference, we have only to point to the important role such governments played in rallying underground forces in occupied countries in World War II to remind him that once again he is wrong or does not understand history.

Another phase of a positive program which we could enact now is to support a massive propaganda effort to encourage the Cubans, within and without that country, to throw off their dictators. Support internal uprisings of the Cuban people and let them know that we will not fail them if they do accept our promise to support their efforts to win freedom. We should institute an effective blockade. From all available information it is apparent that if we were to cut off only the oil supplied to Cuba from Russia, the Castro government would be in immediate danger of collapse.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Cuba can be freed and the Russian menace to the United States and this hemisphere can be eliminated if the President will quit the doubletalk and replace his high-sounding words with deeds and action. We can again take the initiative in winning the war in which Communist Russia is engaging us if the President will face the issue with courage and will trust the American people with the facts. He can electrify all those who believe in freedom and can reinspire the Cuban people to renew their fight for liberty if he will immediately impose the Monroe Doctrine and in no uncertain terms notify Khrushchev that all Russian troops and all Russian equipment and all Russian subversion must be removed from this area without further delay.

The people are ready to back you up, Mr. President. Are you ready to lead the Nation?

Of course the distasteful truth is that no action that President Kennedy initiates will be successful, if the President does not understand the need and reasons for it. The President disregards the dangers of Krushchev controlling Cuba, the military buildup, the base for subversion of other nations, the submarines bases, and the continuing violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the sound reasons underlying this doctrine.

To be successful what is needed is a sound consistent, firmly stated worldwide foreign policy of toughness and self-interest, then a consistent hemispheric policy and then consistent actions directed to freeing Cuba. Isolated single shot actions like the quarantine are worse than any action without a continuing, consistent, tough understandable policy.

The Kennedy policy of indecision, vacillation, inconsistency, appeasement, and accommodation is no basis on which to launch any new Cuban action.

The President's inability to see a clear course of action does not mean that such actions are not possible or are not seen by others.

Whose Side Is Egypt On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in th American Examiner of March 21, 1963.

I am greatly disturbed by the continuing support and assistance this country is rendering to President Nasser and his grand designs to rule the Arab world; I know that many other Americans and many of our colleagues are also disturbed by this. Recent events in the Middle East as outlined in this article indicate that further trouble can be expected; the situation in Jordan during the past few days should make us stop and think about the possibility that this dictator may gain control over not only his own country but over Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

A more distressing fact is the absurd position we find ourselves in when Egypt—a nation we have provided or committed ourselves to provide over $70 million in supporting assistance, developement grants, and development loans in fiscal year 1963 alone—votes in the United Nations almost consistantly against the United States and with the Soviet Union.

The American Examiner article follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON U.N.—NO ONE HAS KICKED THE UNITED STATES IN THE FACE MORE OFTEN THAN EGYPT, YET WE VALIANTLY CONTINUE TO SUPPORT NASSER

(By Saul Carson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Keen observers here are watching the new developments in the Middle East with a good deal of concern. Colonel Nasser, the dictator of Egypt, has risen once again from the ashes under which, it seemed for a time, his ambitions for leadership of the Arab hegemony were buried.

Nasser has a knack for comeback. Remember 1956 when Israel licked him in the Sinai but France and Britain bowed to him and he came out victorious—with the help of the United States and its manipulation of votes at the United Nations—plus pressures on its major European allies? One recalls also that, although Nasser's desire for recognition as the leader of the Afro-Asian bloc drew a clinker, he had nevertheless set himself up as the most powerful of the Arab rulers, able to maintain his own regime's stability. Taking these, and other factors into account—one cannot dismiss too glibly the more recent developments.

First there was a revolution, Nasser inspired, in Yemen. Then came Iraq. Syria followed. Now Nasser is bringing pressures on Jordan and Saudi Arabia. There is talk of a possible move for unity, at least on the military plane, among five Arab States—Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, and the so-called republican forces of Yemen. Once such unity is established the first drive would probably be toward whipping Jordan and Saudi Arabia into line. Once Egypt gets its toe into Jordan—the entire issue becomes of immediate concern to Israel.

Israel circles here are, in fact, saying almost nothing for publication. The problem of possible increase of tensions in the Middle East is not merely an Israeli problem.

Some people here are worried not only about Nasser and the possible Arab unity toward an anti-Israeli crusade, but also about the manner in which the United States seems to be too willing to continue to support Nasser. The Egyptian dictator is still talked of by Americans as a plus factor in the war against communism. The fact that, in both Iraq and in Syria, there is a campaign on to wipe out domestic communism, is meaningless. The U.S.S.R. has never hesitated betraying its own domestic pals in any country for the sake of larger moves on the international level. Let an anti-Israel war break out—and Moscow would be the first to offer arms to the Arabs, even if they put every local Communist before a firing squad.

Diplomats here are aware of the weakness in Nasser's internal economy. Recently, Peter Wright, an economist, made a secret study of that economy for the World Bank. The Bank is a U.N. agency. Mr. Wright found severe strains in Nasser's economy. Nasser has been siphoning off too much money for the purchase of Soviet armaments and for the fomenting of revolutions in other Arab lands. Nasser has had to impose severe restrictions on his country's foreign currency allocations, he has had to slow down the work on the Aswan Dam, and he is having a tough time financing those sops he wanted to give his own people in the form of improved educational facilities and housing.

Yet Mr. Wright's visit was a preliminary move toward formation of a broad Western consortium which would give Nasser still greater funds—wherewith to purchase more Soviet arms and tighten his hold on other Arab lands.

Here at the United Nations, some of the keenest diplomats shake their heads at American gullibility when it comes to Nasser. No member here has kicked the United States of America in the face more often than Egypt. Analyses have shown that, in one session of the General Assembly (in 1960), Egypt voted almost consistently against the United States of America whenever there was an issue at dispute between Washington and Moscow.

On 73 different occasions, Egypt voted the Soviet way 53 times and for the American point of view only 4 times—abstaining 16 times.

These figures hold, in general, for other Assembly sessions—including the session in 1962. By such a count—whose friend is Nasser?

Yet the U.S. official policy is to support him. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Kennedy administration has done much for Israel too. Of greatest importance was President Kennedy's decision (and it was a personal decision) to permit Israel to purchase Hawk missiles as a defense against Nasser's new rocketry.

No one here believes for a moment that the United States of America wants to sell Israel down the Nile. But people are incredulous at Washington's patience with Nasser.

Now that Nasser is moving toward a five-nation military bloc, which could lead toward a war against Israel, the puzzlement in regard to Washington's wisdom on the Nasser front increases in the halls of the United Nations.

How Can I Help Preserve American Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the 16th District of Ohio has the distinction this year of having produced two of the State's winners in the annual American Legion essay contest, and I am pleased to include the essays herewith in the RECORD.

The essays follow:

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

(By Eric Blatz, 751 Rotch Avenue, Massillon, Ohio 10th Grade, Washington High School)

Democracy is government by the majority of people under a constitution which protects the rights of all the people. It is a way of life that looks easy but is difficult. It recognizes the inner dignity of all men. Democracy in the strictest sense is rule by the people.

I can help preserve democracy in the United States by being proud of my country and by showing this pride in my speech and deeds. If I must oppose my Government, I should do it in a peaceful manner. I must not tolerate a one-party system, because it becomes a rubber-stamp government. Some men in high office are advocating a one-party system, at present it looks harmless, but it can grow and destroy our balance of a true democracy. A two-party system serves as a check and balance.

The Constitution guarantees me freedom of religion. I may practice the religion of my choice, and as a good American, should be tolerant of religions other than my own.

My right to vote must be exercised for many nations are without this privilege. In the last midterm election 51 million American people exercised their right to vote, but 58 million people did not vote.

I must respect our judicial system. We must rule by majority but recognize the rights of minorities. If I serve as a jurist, I should think with an open mind and arrive at an honest opinion. I must obey the law of the land to the best of my ability. We must respect the opinions of others even though they are different from our own.

Mob rule is a form of anarchy and has no place in a democracy. I should take no part in riots, unruly mobs, or unlawful acts of violence against man or subversion against my country. I should go through due process of law to right a wrong.

I must be well informed on certain problems of my country. Survival and preservation of freedom are our problems today. Mr. Herbert Philbrick said, "Apathy, indifference, and complacency on the part of many Americans are the reasons for the tremendous Communist gains during the past 45 years." Ignorance of geography and inability to live up to national ideals have been a big weakness too. The greatest weakness of our culture is unwillingness of our people to work hard and the inappropriate use of leisure.

I should serve and help defend my country at all times. In order to serve my country I should be physically and mentally prepared. Our forefathers knew that fighting for and winning liberty was not the end, but only the beginning. Many sacrifices were made by our Founding Fathers and patriots who have given their lives many times to preserve our Nation from military attack. We must guard against the temptation to accept the philosophy of defeatism.

By being proud of my country, practicing the freedom of worship, exercising the right to vote, obeying the laws of my country, having no part in mob rule, being well informed on my country's problems, recognizing and upholding the rights of my fellow men, and helping to defend my country at all times, I can help preserve the American democracy.

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

(By Thomas Burrier, Route No. 1, Newcomerstown, Ohio, ninth grade, Stone Creek High School)

Americans have a great heritage. We are proud of everything that has made the United States what it is today. We have a great democracy to save or to lose. We have heard President Kennedy's quote used many times: "Ask not what your country can do for you, rather, what you can do for your country." How can I as a student, help to keep the American democracy?

I can be a good student. Our country needs young people who are well trained in history, science, languages and literature. If we are good learners, it will help us to be good leaders.

I can be a good citizen at home and in the community. If we misbehave and do criminal things, we weaken our Nation. What we do today will shape what we will be tomorrow.

I can keep myself informed by reading newspapers, magazines, and books so I will keep alert to the world and to what is happening in it today. There are many troubled places in our world today. Cuba, the Congo, and Berlin, know no security nor place. These governments in distant countries have an influence on us. If we know the ideas and beliefs of these people, we will understand their problems and will not make the same mistakes ourselves. A great philosopher once said, "A nation that does not know history is fated to repeat it."

I can learn now to accept responsibilities and do my share. Too many people shirk their responsibilities and say "let George do it." This is wrong; because unless each of us does his part, the Nation is much weaker.

I can attack race prejudices and other injustices whenever I see them. When we refuse to let people eat in restaurants or enter schools because their skin is a different color than ours, we are being unjust and justice is a great preservation of democracy.

I can learn to obey and to get along with others now so that later I will know how to cooperate and accept the suggestions and plans of others. To preserve our democracy, I must be willing to obey laws that are written as well as unwritten laws such as kindness and unselfishness.

I can be honest. The honesty we practice today will help us to be honest later in our lives. Dishonesty and cheating other

people or our Government weakens our great democracy.

I can have a patriotic feeling toward my country. We can learn more about history and the traditions of our country so we will be proud of it as we ought to be. We should gladly make sacrifices in order to protect it.

I can study about politics. By joining such organizations as Young Men's Christian Association or the Boy Scouts of America, I can learn much about the democratic way of life.

I can go to church and get Christian training which will help me to live the way I should. I can get this training by attending the church of my choice regularly. We need God's help if we are to save the American democracy.

These are some of the ways that I can help to preserve our American democracy. It is my task to keep the United States a great Nation. The last four letters of the word "American" spell "I can." America is depending upon me.

Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD the sixth of a series of newspaper editorials or articles on why southern Idaho does not want the Bonneville power marketing area extended into southern Idaho. One can readily understand the reluctance of these southern Idahoans to having socialism forced upon them piece by piece. They know full well that the taxes paid by the private electric utilities now serving them so well at reasonable rates—rates which are well below the national average—provide for many of the necessary State and local services. In addition, the Idaho Power Co. pays large Federal taxes.

The editorial writer recognizes that this extension of the Fabian socialism program of gradual takeover by the Federal Government can only result in the usurpation of liberties and individual opportunity of the American people.

I wonder if the less than 50 percent of the Nation's voters in 1960 who were responsible for putting new frontierism into being realized that the New Frontier pledge to get the country moving again referred to getting it moving down the track of Fabian socialism which was begun under the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations.

I shall discuss this at some length in future items of this series on "Bonneville Now Losing Millions—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In." The editorial on "Federally Owned Public Power Usurps Liberties," from the North Side News of Jerome, Idaho, follows:

FEDERALLY OWNED PUBLIC POWER USURPS LIBERTIES

Supporters of federally owned public power as opposed to privately owned investor power usually term their position as one favoring social progress.

Don't be deceived by the term "social progress" or, for that matter, social reform.

The pretty sounding phrases are used by Democratic liberals as a substitute for the word socialism which they are working toward in the United States.

By clever devices they seek to create distrust of private enterprise, the capitalistic system and the profit motive—the foundation on which our U.S. economy rests.

Khrushchev has boasted that we will destroy our private enterprise system from within by accepting the socialistic doctrine piece by piece—then we will be ripe for the takeover.

We anticipate a Federal deficit of about $6 billion for this fiscal year and the figure could be higher.

At the same time the White House tells us that there must be tax reduction and tax reform to spur purchasing and investment in an economy which is faltering.

But the Government, in certain areas, is pursuing policies which—if successful and continued—will discourage private investment, will prevent the creation of new sources of tax revenue, and tap the public till (otherwise known as the U.S. Treasury) for more millions for completely nonessential Government projects.

The case in point is the current situation in Idaho where Idaho Power Co. has invested more than $300 million in taxable property since World War II.

During the next 5 years the company plans to spend an additional $140 million.

Idaho Power Co. is presently the State's biggest taxpayer and if its expansion plans are realized the firm will be even a bigger taxpayer.

Unfortunately, the Government's Bonneville Power Administration is considering selling some of its power in a part of Idaho—on, of course, a tax-free basis.

So Idaho Power Co. has been forced to announce that the company must abandon its plans if this is done.

With the Government on one hand saying that there must be tax reduction and tax reform to spur purchasing and investment and on the other hand supporting its position of tax-free public power—the question which arises is this: How long can wholly inconsistent national policies be endured?

The matter of public versus private power goes far beyond economic theory and fiscal interpretation.

If the people, through their elected representatives, sanction the continued extension of Government ownership of business and industry, they will set the trap that will ultimately crush their liberties and individual opportunity.

It is true that public power is low cost power.

That's because your money and mine is paying for it.

And charges that special interest groups are the only ones attacking public power is true.

That's because the biggest special interest group in the United States happens to be taxpayers—you and me.

A New Hampshire State Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress continue to practice hypocrisy and still persist in our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, the great State of New Hampshire decided to recognize and accept the obvious and capitalize on this universal human urge by establishing a State lottery.

The citizens of New Hampshire are to be congratulated for their wisdom in electing to the legislature fearless representatives who not only successfully resisted the strenuous objections from the bluenoses and hypocrites but responded to the wishes of the people.

In recognizing the indisputable fact that the inclination to gamble is an instinctive part of human nature, the State of New Hampshire will pump into its treasury millions of dollars a year in additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not display the same kind of wisdom and courage by creating a national lottery?

Why can we not regulate and control this gambling thirst for our own people's benefit?

Mr. Speaker, it is about time we became sensible and realistic about this gambling problem. A national lottery could easily, painlessly, and voluntarily produce over $10 billion a year in new income which would help relieve our heavy tax burdens. Let us be—not smarter—but just as smart as New Hampshire.

How Can I Help Preserve the American Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the many things which the American Legion does to stimulate patriotism and good citizenship is the annual essay contest which they hold every year.

We of the 11th District of Ohio are particularly proud this year to have the winner of first place in the State of Ohio, Dennis Nelson from Ravenna, a winner of Ravenna Post No. 331, American Legion. I know that the Members of this House and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested to read Dennis' winning essay, "How I Can Help Preserve the American Democracy," not only as an indication of the high type of thinking of our young people today, but also for the reminders which it contains for all Americans—young and old—of our responsibilities as citizens as well as of our privileges as Americans.

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

(By Dennis Nelson)

There are many ways I can help preserve the American democracy. One way is by voting. This is one of our greatest privileges as Americans. When I am old enough, I shall vote in both the primaries and in the general election. Before I go to the polls, I shall know what each candidate stands for

and what each issue is about. I shall not be influenced by other people but do what I think is best.

Another way I can help preserve the American democracy is to show interest in any problem that arises in all three levels of government; namely, local, State, and National. Instead of letting someone else decide for me, I shall voice my opinions. This is another one of our privileges as Americans. I realize that my opinion will be valued as highly as anyone else's, regardless of social status.

I shall always pay taxes promptly and willingly, because I realize that our Government is of the people, by the people, and for the people. If I don't pay taxes, I shall be hurting myself and other people, since we are the people who compose the Government. We are not taxed unjustly as some people in other countries are. I know that the money I spend in taxes will be spent wisely by the Congressmen I elect.

I shall never discriminate against other races. I think this is still one of the major problems in the United States, and this should not be. We should try to raise the standard of living of other races in America since they are also American citizens with equal rights and privileges. Raising their standard of living through financial assistance and education would help our democracy. The vote of an uneducated person is as powerful as the vote of an educated person. Educated citizens make better decisions, thus insuring better government.

I could serve in the military forces. The Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force resist any threats to the American democracy.

I can give money to or serve in such groups as Care, Radio Free Europe, American Field Service, Peace Corps, and many other organizations. These organizations show people around the world in different ways the privileges of democracy. Care provides food, clothing, medicine, and tools. Then through the Peace Corps the people learn to make the most of what they have. Because of the American Field Service an exchange student can see how Americans live and how democracy works. When he returns home, he will tell his people about democracy.

I should know what is stated in such documents as the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, then I shall know my rights as a citizen. Some of the most important rights are listed in the "Bill of Rights." These are freedom of assembly, trial by jury, freedom of worship, freedom of press, and freedom of speech.

I believe very strongly that democracy is the best form of government. I will do all things within my scope of abilities to preserve this democracy.

Faceless Punchcards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Mr. Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau, appeared in American Agriculture of April. The editorial is most timely and highly instructive. From my personal experience I agree with Mr. Shuman, that "Most farmers want less, rather than more, Government intervention in the farming business."

The editorial follows:

FACELESS PUNCHCARDS

Do you want to be a punchcard in an electronic machine? Recently Secretary of Agriculture Freeman dedicated a new electronic data processing center in Kansas City. He was quoted in the press as follows: "It applies new electronic instrument techniques to management of the country's agriculture." What did he mean by that?

Government supply management for all farmers and all of their production is advocated by the administration. Keeping tab on hundreds of thousands of farmers and their allotments, quotas, licenses and certificates will require a vast and complicated electronic bookkeeping and policing system. Each farmer will be identified and classified in this huge bureaucratic setup by a faceless punchcard. As these cards flash through the machines they can dispense all sorts of interesting information about each farmer for the use of the political farm managers in Washington. Maximum acres of corn or cotton, number in the family, hogs marketed during the year, political party affiliation, number of wheat certificates to be issued, farm organization affiliation, and so on.

This new Department of Agriculture would be a huge direct line agency with hundreds of thousands of inspectors and field men funneling data from each farm unit into the processing center. There would be little need for county agents or vocational agriculture teachers as much of their time is spent in helping farmers develop management skills. The farmers on the new frontier will not manage—they will need only to know how to follow orders. And these orders will be electronically printed and mechanically dispatched by the robot machine in Kansas City.

Will this automation reduce the size of the Federal Government payroll? Parkinson's law is well known to all students of government. It goes something like this: "In any activity or department, the amount of necessary work tends to expand to utilize the funds and manpower available." In other words, the money appropriated is always spent. Punchcards can take over the work of clerks in sending instructions to farmers but there will always be more paperwork to justify an evergrowing Government payroll. The number of full-time employees in the USDA is now approximately 116,000—up from 98,000 in 1960. This figures out to be one full-time Federal agricultural worker for every 17 full-time commercial farmers and in addition there are 100,000 part-time workers in the department. The wheat certificate scheme, unless defeated, will bring another big increase in the Government payroll.

Most farmers want less, rather than more, Government intervention in the farming business. With the parity price index now at the lowest point since World War II, it is apparent that Government supply and price management has failed to solve farm problems. But Congress has either not been convinced or it has been waiting for a chance to save face—to change the direction of farm policy without admitting past errors. The wheat referendum offers this opportunity. Rejection of this complicated double control scheme would be a clear mandate for Congress and the administration to get out of the political farm management business, to let farmers run their own farms.

Yes, the wheat referendum comes at an opportune time, its rejection will open the way for constructive farm legislation in Congress. It also gives wheat farmers a chance to cast their vote against becoming faseless punchcards in a brainless electronic machine.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

A Teenager on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was pleasantly surprised the other day to receive a letter from a teenager in my congressional district—Miss Dianne Bickler, of Linton, N. Dak.

We read so much these days about our teenage delinquents—and we hear so much about the harum-scarum, thoughtless ways of youth, and the fact that our young people of today are cynical, have no respect for the mental or spiritual qualities which adults are prone to stress—even though not all adults possess them—and have not learned to value the freedoms and mores of our established form of government.

For this reason, I was doubly impressed with the thinking evidenced by Miss Bickler's letter when she outlined her feelings—as a teenager—toward Federal aid to education. This young lady has not approached this problem from a one-sided point of view, but has looked into the pros and cons. She has analyzed some of the shortcomings of such proposals—and has stated them in a clear, concise fashion.

Further, Miss Bickler has stated a truism, in these words:

I believe that pride, initiative, and responsibility shouldn't be taken away from either the individual or the state.

These are qualities which first brought about the settlement of this country. They are qualities to be cherished. They are qualities which added to others—will keep this country the leader of the world, and the hope of mankind in its struggle against the all-enveloping opiate of communism.

Under unanimous consent I include Miss Bickler's letter with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today:

LINTON, N. DAK.,
April 4, 1963.

Representative DON L. SHORT,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. REPRESENTATIVE SHORT: I've hear so much last year about President Kennedy's Federal aid to education. Although the Democrats were unsuccessful last year, everyone knows they will try again this year. Since I am one of many affected, should this plan become a reality, I tried hard to follow all the pros and cons. But I don't believe the promises that the States will be able to retain control of educational plants, determine qualifications and salaries of teachers, etc. The Government can't give this aid unless it first gets the money from the taxpayer. Then large committees, fieldmen, investigators, and what else, will have to be put on the payroll. What is left of the loaf will then be given back to the States. So, where are all the big benefits?

Wouldn't it be better to let each State take care of its own? I believe that pride, initiative, and responsibility shouldn't be taken away from either the individual or the State.

I don't want what has happened to agriculture happen to education. I hope with

all my heart that we can count on you, Mr. SHORT, to fight Federal aid to education all the way. It would bring about so many, many injustices—and what it would do to education itself. From what I have heard and read, I honestly believe that we can count on you, Congressman SHORT, to protect and defend our rights, in your name—in the name of our parents—and in the name of us—the teenagers.

Yours truly,

DIANNE BICKLER.

The Joke Is on the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser of April 20, 1963.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Apr. 20, 1963]

THE JOKE IS ON THE UNITED STATES

Anderson, Mo., may become the most famous small town in America, if only for a few days, because it has petitioned the United Nations for the kind of help that is routinely dispensed to such improbable places as Senegal.

Anderson Mayor Bill Hall has solemnly informed the U.N. that the town needs a natural gas plant and $337,500 from the U.N. to get started on it. The usual agency for such requests, the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, informed Anderson that no domestic help was available. Whereupon Anderson's Congressman, Representative DURWARD HALL, sicced Mayor Hall (no kin) on the U.N.

Congressman HALL, who admittedly is no passionate admirer of the U.N., reminded Anderson that U.N. technical assistance is available in generous doses to almost any country that calls itself backward and to such members of the Communist bloc as Bulgaria, Albania, Cuba, Yugoslavia, and Poland.

Congressman HALL was impressed by the fact that the United States is the most faithful dues-paying member in the U.N. But whereas the United States got nothing back for its contribution to U.N. technical assistance programs, the Communist contributors came out with more than they put in:

So Anderson, Mo., is asking for about half what Senegal got for a mineral survey program and about a third what Cuba got for an agriculture station.

You are probably not wrong to sense a large element of horseplay in Anderson's petition, but the jest is not without meaning. Americans are reminded of the great lengths to which the United States has gone in an effort to keep the U.N. on its feet, even when so much is invested and so little withdrawn. The reference is not merely to money.

Anderson's practical joke—very practical, in fact—is well-aimed. Americans support the U.N. but they don't have to idolize it. They don't have to applaud when the United States clamps airtight sanctions on Cuba with one hand and, through the U.N., forks over money to Cuba with the other hand. Or when American dollars go to build the technology of a Communist country at the same time that many small American towns are gasping for want of local industry.

If it is to be largely supported by the United States, the U.N. is properly subject to the constant, scalding auditing that is directed at any other Government-supported agency.

The ones who give a pain in the neck are the fanatics who get a goofy look in their eyes and denounce any slight criticism of the U.N. as rank apostasy.

The Role of Business Confidence in Our Nation's Economic Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a factor which administration officials, businessmen and economists often overlook or insufficiently emphasize in discussing the problems of our economy is the role of business confidence.

According to a recent column by M. J. Rossant in the New York Times, business confidence is a positive factor that must be considered in any economic analysis. In his opinion, last year's steel price dispute "was a blow to confidence and had a definite, if immeasurable, impact on business activity." The quarterly survey of manufactures by the National Industrial Conference Board supported this conclusion by noting that during 1962, capital appropriations were increased "in every quarter but the second, the period embracing both the steel dispute and market break."

Mr. Rossant pointed out that consumer spending proved to be a vital support in the anxious days last summer when a recession was feared, but consumers themselves would have been easier with their money if businessmen had demonstrated more faith in the economy. He concluded:

It seems unwise to underestimate the power of confidence in a market economy.

In my opinion, Mr. Rossant offers a sound analysis of the confidence factor in any study of economic behavior, and I ask unanimous consent that his column from the April 15 New York Times be included in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1963]

CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE: A VIEW OF THE SPIRITS OF BUSINESSMEN AND HOW THEY MAY AFFECT THE ECONOMY

(By M. J. Rossant)

President Kennedy and the steel manufacturers, those battle-scarred veterans of last year's bitter dispute, are demonstrating an understandable reluctance to reopen the conflict. With an awareness stemming from experience, both sides appear anxious to avoid any new blows to business confidence, which has been undergoing a strong revival since its deterioration a year ago.

Last year's crisis of confidence was never healed through a formal truce. In fact, the President and Roger M. Blough, chairman of United States Steel, have continued to defend their actions. Regardless of the merits of each case, however, their dispute was a blow to confidence and had a definite, if immeasurable, impact on business activity.

The intangible factor of confidence has been of great interest to economists. Most agree that the expectations of businessmen and consumers influence the business cycle, but just how much has been a matter of dispute. Those who downgrade its importance note that we have never talked ourselves into a recession or out of one.

MOOD FLUCTUATIONS

This is true, but changes in mood can have a considerable economic effect, giving added momentum to an upsurge or acting as a depressant in a decline.

The late John Maynard Keynes, who is the patron saint of many of the administration's economists, stated that confidence, or what he called the animal spirits of businessmen, can have an impact on business activity.

According to Keynes, "if animal spirits are dimmed and the spontaneous impulse (to invest) falters, leaving us to depend on nothing but mathematical expectation, enterprise will fade and die—though fears of a loss may have a basis no more reasonable than profits had before."

The chilling of spirits is probably greatest when there is an abrupt change caused by some unexpected event. This seemed to be the case last year.

Just last week, before Wheeling Steel announced its selective price increases, Mr. Blough implied that the administration's successful effort in blocking the across-the-board advances in 1962 had weakened the economy and slowed growth.

Economists who give weight to the confidence factor tend to support Mr. Blough's position that the steel imbroglio and the market break that followed made the advance slower than it might have been.

One significant piece of supporting evidence is the survey of manufacturers' capital appropriations made each quarter by the National Industrial Conference Board. In 1962, these appropriations were increased in every quarter but the second, the period embracing both the steel dispute and the market break. Quite obviously then these events had a dampening, if temporary, effect on the spirits of businessmen.

If the second quarter reversal in confidence had not taken place, the rise in business activity might well have been spritely rather than sluggish last year. Fortunately, the economy has enough basic strength to withstand this caution when businessmen convinced themselves that the administration was intent on altering the delicate power relationship that existed between government, management, and labor; but it was a pretty close call.

CONSUMER STRENGTH

Consumer spending proved a powerful support in the anxious days last summer, when fears of a recession were growing. Despite the magnitude of the market decline, which meant heavy losses—at least on paper—for many investors, the strength of consumer demand helped to restore business confidence.

Consumers, too, however, might have been easier with their spending if businessmen had behaved less cautiously. Again, no one will ever know, but it seems unwise to underestimate the power of confidence in a market economy.

Confidence, it should be noted, has little to do with political preferences. Most businessmen are Republican partisans, yet the most serious deterioration in confidence took place under Herbert Hoover, a stalwart member of the business fraternity, and there were several jolts to confidence under the President Eisenhower administration.

Wherever businessmen congregate these days, there are jokes about the Kennedys, griping over the new expense-account rules and complaints about tax reforms. This, however, is a return to normalcy. There is no open hostility and no sign that they want to dig up the past.

This show of healthy animal spirits, which is apparent in the stock market, rising capi-

tal appropriations and in surveys of consumer intentions, can give added momentum to the economy, already in good shape. There may be some disappointment if tax cuts are not voted this year. But it is doubtful that failure to act on taxes will have much of an impact on either confidence or business activity in the short run. The real test will come in 1964 when animal spirits and the economy may both need a lift.

Heading Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy is heading nowhere. When President Kennedy first assumed office, it was understood that he had no experience; but he has been in charge for 2 years, now, and it would seem that some kind of foreign policy ought to be proposed. It is no wonder that frustration is in full swing.

In the April 16 issue of the Wall Street Journal, William Henry Chamberlin discusses this frustration and in today's New York Herald Tribune, David Lawrence points out the contradictions in our Laos and Cuban policies.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1963]

FRUSTRATION FORMULA: ADMINISTRATION MIXES TIMIDITY ON CUBA, UNREALISM ON ATOM TEST BAN, WEST BERLIN

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The word frustration frequently appears in dispatches from Washington at the present time.

The Kennedy administration probably reached the height of its prestige in foreign affairs when it faced down Nikita Khrushchev on the issue of withdrawing the missiles which had been stealthily installed in Cuba.

Since that time, however, much has gone wrong, from the standpoint of American foreign policy. General de Gaulle, by vetoing British admission to the European Economic Community and insisting on his national nuclear deterrent, tossed a monkey wrench into administration plans for closer Western defense and trade coordination. Soviet troops have remained in Cuba, emphasizing a clear breach of the Monroe Doctrine. The fragile agreement for the neutralization of Laos is beginning to fray around the edges.

Some of these disappointments are due to factors beyond the control or anticipation of the administration. But on three issues, at least, the United States has been pursuing policies based on questionable premises and therefore inviting failure and frustration.

First, there is the attempt to reach an agreement banning nuclear tests at almost any price. This might be justified if it could be assumed (a) that the Soviet Union would observe any such agreement and (b) that the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers would thereby be stopped. On any coolheaded survey of the situation, in the light of past experience, both these assumptions seem most improbable.

BROKEN TREATIES

It would be superfluous to recite the long list of Soviet broken treaties and agreements. One need only recall the unpoliced moratorium on nuclear testing which began in October 1958, and dragged on until the end of August 1961, when it was unilaterally denounced by the Soviet Government, although Khrushchev had solemnly affirmed earlier that the Soviet Union would never be the first to resume nuclear testing. It is difficult to estimate how much the United States lost by denying itself the advantages of research while the Soviet Union, at the very least, was preparing for new tests.

Nor is there any reason to believe that an American-Soviet agreement would stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Is there any reason to believe General de Gaulle would cease and desist from his development of French nuclear power merely because an American-Soviet agreement had been signed? Would Red China, visibly on the outs with Khrushchev, heed a request from him to stop its nuclear development?

Second, there is an obvious disadvantage about the talks on West Berlin which have just been resumed. There could be no objection to raising, as a serious potential threat to peace, the unnatural partition of Germany. But a discussion limited to West Berlin places the United States before the awkward alternative of making unilateral concessions or refusing any change in the present situation.

THWARTING ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS

Third, some aspects of our policy, or lack of policy, toward Cuba since the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles are timid, self-contradictory and calculated to raise the question whether our diplomatic victory in Cuba last October was as complete as it seemed.

We have all but renounced any intention to use our forces in an invasion of Cuba. No one in his senses would like to see a repetion of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Both as Senator and as President, Mr. Kennedy has expressed the hope that the Cuban people will rise to vindicate their freedom. The implication would seem to be that the American Government, through properly covert channels, should extend all feasible aid to the anti-Castro Cubans.

By announcing a crackdown on the activities of such groups we are making our avowed objective look ridiculous and creating doubt as to the steadfastness of our will and purpose among our friends in countries threatened by Castroite propaganda and subversive activity. Successful guerrilla movements have always depended on support from without. The Algerian nationalist bands that eroded French rule in that country would, in all probability, never have succeeded if they had not received a steady supply of arms from across their frontiers.

It is unlikely that boycots and other forms of economic pressure will bring down the Castro regime so long as all the resources of the Soviet bloc are mobilized to prop him up, and many of our NATO allies refuse to join in the boycott of Cuba. To give Castro the protection of our Armed Forces while proclaiming his downfall as our objective is a policy of sorry confusion.

Talks that lead nowhere and are unlikely to lead anywhere and policies that are self-contradictory furnish an excellent formula for frustration.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 24, 1963]

DICHOTOMY OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA AND LAOS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Most Americans can't pinpoint Laos on a world map. They know it's somewhere in southeast Asia. Yet they read in the newspapers that American marines are being rushed to the area, that American soldiers have been losing their lives next door in south Vietnam, and that the President of the United States is engaged in serious discussions which are indicative of a crisis with the Soviet Union about Laos.

In contrast, just 90 miles away is Cuba, where the Soviet Union has between 10,000 and 20,000 troops and technicians and the latest weapons of warfare, but the United States hesitates to invade Cuba, though it is apparently ready to threaten the use of military force in Laos.

It isn't explained just why it is an act of war to invade Cuba, but isn't an act of war to use troops in southeast Asia.

And it isn't clear to anybody just why international complications and the escalation from one stage in the crisis to another isn't feared with respect to Laos, but is given as the reason for American hesitation in Cuba.

The foreign policy of the United States today toward Russia is a mixture of strong words at times and long periods of inaction. The strange attitude with reference to Cuba because of a fear of offending the Soviet Union is, of course, explained in the hackneyed phrases of diplomacy. In the one case, it is argued that Thailand—next door to Laos—has invited American help, while, in the case of Cuba, it is pointed out that Castro has invited Soviet help.

But there is in both situations an anomaly. For the Government in Cuba doesn't represent the people, and in Laos the neutralist Government has been threatened from within by a Communist takeover, and it isn't clear just what any government in that area represents. There is an unwillingness in Washington, however, to recognize the Communists as the true enemies of the people in both Laos and Cuba.

Although, for instance, the United States has addressed several communications to Moscow about the missiles and the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba, there is no inclination to use force to clean up the situation there. With respect to Laos, however, the U.S. Navy is moving into the area with thousands of marines, and there is a definite threat to take military action. American officials state flatly that the Communists have broken the truce in Laos.

Meanwhile, the debate inside and outside of Congress continues as to whether invasion would mean a big war over Cuba. But for some reason there is little talk of a big war arising when the United States undertakes military steps to thwart Communist imperialism in Laos.

The Kennedy administration is well aware of the pressure of public opinion for a more determined policy with respect to Cuba. There is no doubt that public opinion outside the United States is manifesting an increasing disapproval of Washington's attitude of watchful waiting and indifference to Communist encroachment.

In the last few days, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, Democratic leader in the Senate, has come out in favor of an economic embargo against Cuba by all countries in this hemisphere. He wouldn't have made such a statement without the approval of the President. The plan undoubtedly is to mobilize sentiment behind the whole idea as the United States, through diplomatic channels, begins to urge the Latin-American countries to organize an economic boycott against Cuba under the auspices of the Organization of American States.

This, however, is a long and tedious process and looks like a temporary scheme to answer the criticism about a do-nothing policy. After several months it will become apparent that an economic embargo against Cuba is hardly effective. When and if, as Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, has urged, the United States faces up to the Communist threat everywhere and begins to consider a severance of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government, then—and only then—will situations such as have arisen in Laos and in Cuba begin to be changed from defeat to victory for the free world.

Liberal Formula for Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Washington's Monday edition of the Evening Star carried a fascinating article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones describing the practices of liberals as they assumed control of government.

I believe this article is a pentrating insight into the mental processes of professional liberals and is a most important contribution to understanding many of our political complications. With these thoughts in mind, I place the article into the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS: SOME ACCUSED OF CHAMPIONING LIBERTY WHILE FAVORING CREEPING COERCION

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Self-styled liberals are generally nicer people than sour-puss reactionaries.

It would be better to be cast away on a desert island with an outgoing and outgiving liberal than with a guy who's against everything including the construction of a raft. But this doesn't mean that liberal government is a good recipe for equity or human happiness. Many liberals suffer from smug assumptions about human behavior and political theory that simply don't jibe with reality.

They are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma. They honestly believe themselves to be champions of liberty while they favor creeping coercion as long as they can be the authors of the coercion. They are so sure their theories are good for you that they think they are only doing you a favor when they tie you to a post, pry open your jaws, and pour their nostrums down your throat.

Willie Howard, the late great Jewish comedian, had a skit in which he impersonated a Communist holding forth in Union Square.

"Comes da revolution," shouted Willie, "you'll eat strawberries and cream."

"But," protested someone in his stage audience, "I don't like strawberries and cream."

Willie assumed a contemptuous sneer: "Comes da revolution and you'll eat strawberries and cream."

This is not a bad description of the liberal formula for human happiness.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. Every time he sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually and with the best intentions he weaves a net of verbotens and must-do's that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible injustice, eventually you arrive at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes a contempt for money, he has almost a child-like faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation. When mulish taxpayers balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the sound theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. The argument: "If Oklahoma doesn't take the money, Maine will" is a potent one.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite logically at his advocacy of centralized power. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his greed. Federal aid to schools will provide more teachers without raising school district taxes. Ninety percent Federal highway money means that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Increased Federal relief means that local responsibility can be shirked. And so supergovernment grows and the liberal is delighted.

He is delighted because he questions whether local government will ever have adequate social vision. But he will see to it that the supergovernment has. There will be plans, bold plans of new frontiers entered into with vigor.

The liberal also seems to hold a double standard in the matter of human behavior. He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But the mugger in the park who stabs for $20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong if there had been enough social legislation.

The liberal can't believe that removing the penalties for misbehavior or lack of performance could increase human cussedness and sloth. Instead, according to his theory, what we need are more social workers, more public housing, more youth clubs. And with them we keep getting more chiselers, more illegitimate children, more delinquency and crime.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He looks at labor-management problems as though the Pinkertons were still shooting the strikers at Homestead. The significance of Jimmy Hoffa eludes him. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing capabilities of the United Steel workers. He is still chasing Commodore Vanderbilt and the beef trust.

The liberal thus deludes himself with the comfortable assurance that he is farseeing, a progessive, a man of the future. In his effort to cure injustice by piling on more government he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of government.

He has, with minor interruptions, been in power in America for 30 years. He is getting gray, and even a little quaint. He won't admit error or consider pragmatic results. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy. He is loving us to death.

Soviet Oil Offensive—Another Ultimate Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today the United States and the entire free world are threatened by a Soviet menace more severe and more dangerous in many ways than all of the firepower and armaments in the entire Russian weapons arsenal.

This menace is the Communists' ruthless use of petroleum and its threatening effect on allied strength and unity.

This Russian offensive using oil as its ultimate weapon is possibly more dangerous than all of the Soviet's nuclear capability. Oil and trade can be Russia's most effective arm in striking the crippling, if not fatal, blow to the jugular of the free world.

The Wall Street Journal of April 22, 1963, in a front page story highlights the advances made by the Russians in the exploration and use of petroleum and the threat which these advances present to the Western Alliance.

The Journal article points out that since 1950, Russia has displaced Venezuela as the second-ranking oil producer in the world and that the Soviets have been steadily gaining on the first-ranking United States.

If Russia continues at its present pace and if the United States does not accelerate its growth rate, the output of Soviet oil will surpass the U.S. production by the mid-1970's.

Today, Russia's principal weapon in the economic battle to win the cold war is oil.

The Kremlin is silently exploiting this weapon using a two-pronged attack by glutting vital Western markets with cheap Russian oil and by creating a dependency between Russia and the oil-poor nations of the world.

It has been said by our esteemed colleague Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, that the nations that control oil, control the world.

Russia knows well the wisdom of Congressman STEED's words and the Kremlin has an allout offensive to control this vital product. The importance of this Russian offensive cannot be overstated. The potential of the Soviet oil offensive should be recognized by every American. For this reason, I am inserting in the RECORD the entire text of the Wall Street Journal article, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 22, 1963]

SOVIET OIL PUSH—VAST PRODUCTION DRIVE FACES OBSTACLES BUT HAS MADE BIG GAINS; RUSSIA'S OUTPUT MAY EQUAL UNITED STATES BY MIDSEVENTIES IF MONEY, DRILLING PROBLEMS SOLVED, SHIPMENTS TO WEST SOARING

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

BAKU, U.S.S.R.—Edmund Gaikovich Iskenderov, an oil engineer, works in an office perched on steel pilings 2 miles out in the Caspian Sea, linked to the mainland and several dozen offshore oil wells by trestles.

Above the sound of a heavy sea and nearby pumps drawing crude oil from 6,000 feet below the sea's floor, he talks of pushing Russia's oil search further from shore. "We've got a new drilling rig that will operate in water 200 feet deep, twice the depth with present rigs," he declares. "With it we'll explore as much as 90 miles offshore."

None of this would startle U.S. engineers, who have drilled in water as deep as 287 feet. But it demonstrates the enthusiasm behind Russia's highly successful drive to find and produce oil. Since 1950 the U.S.S.R. has displaced Venezuela as the second-ranking oil producer and has been steadily gaining on the first-ranking United States.

RUSSIAN OIL OUTPUT RISES

Russia's daily average oil production rose to 3.7 million barrels last year, about half the U.S. output of 7.3 million barrels. In 1950

Russia produced only 800,000 barrels a day, one-seventh the U.S. level in that year.

Oil has become a major weapon in the Soviet push for trade with non-Communist countries. Partly through relentless price cutting, Russia boosted sales of oil and oil products to non-Communist nations to an estimated 560,000 barrels a day last year. That was a sevenfold increase from 80,000 in 1955. West Europe now gets 9 percent of its oil imports from the U.S.S.R. compared with less than 2 percent in 1953. Oil accounted for one-fourth of Russia's earnings of free world currencies last year, giving it funds it badly needs to buy advanced industrial equipment in the West. The U.S.S.R. has become a significant competitor of Western oil companies operating in Europe.

Assuming no acceleration in the growth rate of U.S. oil production and a fulfillment of present Soviet goals, output of Russian oil would move ahead of U.S. production by the mid-1970s. Soviet exports to the West would be likely to rise sharply, too. The National Petroleum Council (NPC), an industry group that advises the U.S. Government, estimates that Soviet shipments to non-Communist countries could rise 60 percent to some 900,000 barrels a day, just in the next 3 years.

But despite the spectacular gains so far, Russia's path to these goals will be far from easy. Soviet oil production, like output in some of its other basic industries, has shown some recent signs of losing momentum. Annual percentage gains in oil output, for instance, have declined steadily from a postwar record of 19.2 percent in 1955 to 12 percent last year. And while the Kremlin's oil production goal was exceeded last year, the 0.5 percent overfulfillment was the smallest so far in the current 7-year plan which runs through 1965.

CAPITAL SHORTAGE A PROBLEM

A major Soviet problem is a general shortage of capital. Last year, Russia's economic planners allotted only 5 percent more investment money to the oil and gas industry than in 1961, one of the smallest annual increases in recent years. For 2 years in a row, the Soviet weekly Economic Gazette recently disclosed, the apportionment of investment funds for the Tatar Autonomous Republic (Tataria), which accounts for 38 percent of Soviet crude oil production, has been reduced instead of increased. Lacking adequate electric power, pipes, storage tanks and related equipment, oilmen in the area have not been able to put all their new wells into operation, the publication said.

"For the past 2 years crude production (in Tataria) has increased more as a result of forced extraction from already drilled wells than from bringing new ones into operation," the Economic Gazette reported. And some fields have failed to fulfill production goals "for the first time in many years," it adds.

Deficiencies show up in other ways, Premier Khrushchev recently disclosed that the nation did not fulfill its production plan for oil-producing equipment in 1962.

The Russians also have experienced an important failure in drilling technology as they have drilled deeper wells in search of oil. Russia uses a turbodrill, which it claimed as a major development a few years ago, for about 85 percent of its drilling. Wells are drilled by a toothed, circular bit on the end of pipe, which is added in sections as the hole gets deeper. In most U.S. drilling, a motorized rotary rig at the surface revolves the drill pipe and bit, boring into the earth much as a carpenter drills into wood.

With the turbodrill, the drill pipe doesn't rotate. The bit is turned by turbine action as liquid mud is pumped down the pipe. This method overcame Russia's problems of making sufficient drill pipe that could withstand the twisting of rotary drilling. But it is understood that the turbodrill's high turning speed rapidly burns out bits as heat increases at lower depths.

TURBODRILL ABANDONED

Thus, Russia has decided to abandon use of the turbodrill below 2,000 meters (6,560 feet). Such wells are relatively shallow by modern standards. U.S. drillers have gone as deep as 25,340 feet.

Western oil specialists say a major part of the problem is that Soviet drill bits are inferior in quality. This gets support from Russians themselves. "Suffice it to say," a Soviet official told a Communist Party gathering late in 1961, "that in Bashkiria (part of the Volga-Urals field north of here) 80 to 100 bits are used in drilling a 2,000-meter well."

If the Russians switch to rotary drilling for deep wells, as seems likely, the Soviets soon may be shopping in the West for drilling pipe and bits, American oil men say. The United States maintains strict export controls on such items but other Western nations do not.

Russia already is getting a sizable amount of materials and equipment from the West for its oil offensive. According to an NPC study, the U.S.S.R. has placed orders in non-Communist countries for 35 oceangoing tankers. These, plus other vessels now being built in the Soviet bloc and in Yugoslavia, will make the U.S.S.R. self-sufficient in export tankerage by 1965. Russia now charters Western-owned vessels to carry part of its export shipments.

Three western countries—Italy, West Germany, and Sweden—contracted to supply about 40 percent of the 40-inch pipe the Russians needed to complete the 2,300-mile friendship pipeline system linking the vast Volga-Urals oilfields with Russia's Eastern European satellites. Since Soviet-bloc steel mills cannot provide enough large-diameter pipe, these contracts, according to the NPC, "breathed new life into the pipeline construction and averted a delay of far-reaching proportions."

SOME SALES BANNED

Under prodding by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, West Germany and Italy, but not non-NATO Sweden, recently banned further sales of large-diameter pipe to the U.S.S.R. The new embargoes are not expected to seriously delay completion of the line, scheduled for next year. Further plans call for two branchlines to Baltic ports to permit direct loading of oceangoing tankers. These lines are expected to cut the cost of shipping a barrel of oil across western Russia to 29 cents from $1.05 presently, using rail cars, according to the NPC.

Despite Soviet troubles and efforts by the United States to cut down on technical and other aid from the West, most American oilmen figure Soviet output will continue to grow, although perhaps at a slower rate than the Russians forecast. In 1961, according to NPC estimates, the U.S.S.R. had more geophysical field crews seeking oilfields than the entire free world.

Massive exploration already has paid off handsomely. Crude production from the Volga-Urals fields, developed almost from scratch in the postwar period, now represents three-quarters of Soviet output and dwarfs production from the once dominant Baku area. Important recent finds have been made on the Mangyshlak Peninsula on the northeastern shore of the Caspian, and at Markovo, in east Siberia. The Russians have glowingly described the Mangyshlak field, still undeveloped, as a multibillion-barrel find, comparable to many in the Middle East.

Russia's proved oil reserves are estimated at 28.5 billion barrels compared with 35.3 billion in the United States. But some geologists guess Russia may have reserves of 200 billion barrels, counting vast areas not yet surveyed.

CASPIAN DRILLING DRIVE

Offshore drilling is being pushed in the Caspian to provide a continuing nearby source of crude for refineries and shipping facilities here at Baku, long a major Russian oil center. Many land wells in the area have played out. About 60 miles offshore in the Caspian, the Soviets have built an entire town on stilts since 1949, calling it Neftyanye Kamni (oil rocks) for rock formations in the area. Workers spend 5-day stints on the 70-odd miles of trestles, commuting on their days off by helicopter and boat from their homes in Baku.

Soviet refining capacity, which has consistently lagged crude output, was to be expanded by some 92 percent in the economic plan which runs through 1965. Although there have been reports that this effort is behind schedule, it is known that 17 new refineries are being built and many more expanded.

At the new Baku oil refinery, built in 1952, Rza Gasanovich Aleev, deputy director, proudly shows a visitor a 156-acre expansion site, where two catalytic cracking towers are rising for use in breaking down crude oil into separate products, such as gasoline and diesel oil. "The tonnage here will approximately double," says Mr. Aleev, "but the value of our production will triple," during the present 7-year plan.

He says the new units will increase the maximum octane of gasoline produced at the refinery to 85 or 86 from the present 72. Russia's refineries have long been deficient in capacity to produce higher grade gasoline and diesel fuels.

Addition of this type of capacity could help Russia's export effort significantly. Russia has a surplus of gasoline but has had trouble selling it in the West because of its low octane. At that, refined products accounted for 38 percent of its total free world exports of oil and oil products.

To cope with the competition, Western oil companies are underbidding Soviet crude oil prices in some markets. Costs of taking oil out of the ground in Russia vary from 39.6 percent of the national average in Tataria to 217 percent in the Baku area and 331 percent on bleak Sakhalin Island in the Pacific. But on the average, by Soviet reckoning, it costs 65 to 70 cents a barrel. Adding exploration outlays, the cost rises to nearly $1 a barrel, which is about what mideast oil costs Western companies after Arab Governments receive royalties. These oil companies generally have lower transportation costs to Western European markets than do the Russians, although this advantage may diminish when the Friendship pipeline is completed. Most Western oilmen figure the Russians have been subsidizing sales in the West in order to earn foreign exchange.

Crisis in Canal Zone: Panama Urges Abandonment by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years the crisis in the Canal Zone has been featured by a steady erosion of U.S. rights, power, and authority; with accommodations on the part of our Government being followed by greater demands by Panama.

The latest information from the isthmus, in the form of an Associated

Press news dispatch dated April 18, 1963, and published in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., of the same date and two well-known isthmian newspapers, is that Panama will urge that the United States abandon control of the Canal Zone and return this territory to the jurisdiction of Panama.

The Panama Canal Zone is certainly no picnic site where the sovereign rights of the United States are casual or indifferent. Our Government has a tremendous responsibility, as defined by treaties, not only to its citizens but also to the world at large, to maintain, operate, and defend the Panama Canal fully and efficiently for the transit of vessels of all nations between the two great oceans.

These crucial obligations and tasks cannot be discharged by our Government unless exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone, as set forth in the 1903 Treaty with Panama, is given full force and effect. If the activities of the Canal Zone become political pawns of Panama, then all will be lost and Panama, the United States, and all other countries served by the canal will suffer.

Though any such proposal as the demanded surrender of sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory is beyond the comprehension of patriotic North Americans, especially those who have worked in the Canal Zone or served in the Armed Forces on the isthmus and know its problems, experience has shown that the danger is real and must be met forthrightly by our Government. This danger rests not on the strength of Panama but on the weakness or design of elements in our Government. The time for further evasions is past.

The necessary forthright action in the way of clarification and reaffirmation of our isthmian policy as to sovereignty over the Canal Zone is contemplated in House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and House Concurrent Resolution 113, introduced by myself, which are now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and early action is essential.

The indicated news stories follow:

[From the Panama American, Panama, Republic of Panama, Apr. 17, 1963]

END CANAL ZONE CONCEPT, REPUBLIC OF PANAMA PLANNING DIRECTOR SAYS

Panama Presidential Planning Director David Samudio last night described the Canal Zone as an area which places a brake on the republic's development and called for the elimination of the "Canal Zone concept."

Samudio spoke before a gathering of Business Executives Association members in outlining the Chiari administration's four-point reform plan which would be developed over the next 7 years.

President Roberto F. Chiari was in the audience.

The plan, Samudio said, is based on government, tax, metropolitan and agrarian reforms.

Calling the reforms part of the "change" promised by Chiari during his electoral campaign, Samudio said that while the Panama Canal should continue to operate, an understanding should be reached where the benefits from the waterway are placed wholly in the hands of Panamanians.

He declared that governmental reforms included increasing government investment in public services the elimination of overspending and incentive for private investment.

Samudio said that the tax reform plans included improving collection methods and harsh punishment for persons guilty of tax violations. He praised former Finance Minister Gilberto Arias for his efforts in helping to put these principles into effect.

The main object in the agrarian plan is to provide the Panama farmer with state-owned land which would improve his economic stability and serve as his guarantee of freedom and dignity.

[From the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, Apr. 18, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA WANTS WATERWAY TO KEEP OPERATING, BUT NO CANAL ZONE

Panama wants the canal to continue in operation, but is striving for the elimination of the Canal Zone in future negotiations with the United States. Planning Director David Samudio said Tuesday in an address to the Business Executives Association.

The goal, he said, is that Panamanians will carry out industrial and commercial operation in the Canal Zone. This will call for an agreement providing for the continued operation of the waterway, but placing the benefits from that operation fully in Panamanian hands. By way of illustration, Samudio said Panama does not want the sale of theater tickets, the production of ice cream and the milking of cows to continue as at present in the Canal Zone.

Samudio said the elimination of the Canal Zone concept is the main proposal in what he called the "metropolitan reform" in the long-range plan for economic and social progress which has been prepared by his office for the Alliance for Progress.

There are three other key reforms in the plan outlined by Samudio—governmental, tax, and agrarian.

The plan calls for an expenditure of nearly $1,300 million in the 8-year period between 1962 and 1970, of which about $862 million would come from the Government's current resources and the balance of $438 million would be provided under the Alliance for Progress.

In proposing the streamlining of the governmental set-up, Samudio pointed out that the Chief Executive at present lacks direct control over the independent agencies on which the implementation of the plan would fall. Of a total of $155 million in Government funds being handled annually, the Executive Branch has direct influence over only $63 million. The balance is handled by independent agencies, Samudio pointed out.

As to the tax reform, Samudio said it was proposed not to create new levies without first tightening up the collection of present taxes.

Discussing the metropolitan reform, Samudio pointed out that 19 percent of the economically active population in Panama City and Colon is unemployed and that even with all of the projected programs that unemployment figure would not disappear unless the country can avail itself of its geographical position as a transit route.

The agrarian reform, he said, is aimed at providing stability particularly for small-scale farmers.

The planning director said this was the real "change" pledged by President Chiari in his campaign for the presidency in 1960. It has taken 2 years, he reported, to complete the studies necessary to bring about the promised change.

A number of the business executives criticized Samudio's proposals on the grounds that they are contradictory or are not based on sound technical principles, but the general reaction was that a serious effort has been made to organize planning for the country's future and that it behooves all to cooperate in the improvement of the plan.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 18, 1963]

CANAL ZONE SOUGHT

PANAMA, April 18.—Panama will urge the United States to abandon control of the Canal Zone and turn the strip back to the Panamanians, Planning Director David Samudio said today.

Mr. Samudio told reporters elimination of the U.S. zone is a key point in Panama's 7-year, $1.3 billion plan for economic development under the Alliance for Progress.

He said the Panamianian Government is content to have the United States continue operating the Panama Canal, but it wants Panamanians to take over industrial and commercial operations in the zone.

Calendar of Events of the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART: CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MAY 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New reproductions: 11 inch by 14 inch color reproductions. Fragonard, "A Game of Hot Cockles"; Van Gogh, "The Olive Orchard"; Henri, "New York Street in Winter"; Renoir, "Madame Henriot"—25 cents each, postpaid.

Color postcards: Artist unknown, "Flowers and Fruit"; Goya, "Don Bartolomé Sureda"; "Doña Teresa Sureda"; "Victor Guye"; Grünewald, "The Small Crucifixion"; Hamen y Leon, "Still Life"—5 cents each, postpaid.

Concerts: The Gallery's Twentieth American Music Festival, which began on April 28, will continue through June 2.

Sunday lectures: A series of lectures on Great Artistic Innovations will begin on May 5 and will continue through June 30.

Lectour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these Lectour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 29, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 5

Painting of the week: Chase, "A Friendly Call" (Chester Dale collection), Gallery 71, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Science and Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Sculpture and Architecture of Phidias," guest speaker, Rhys Carpenter, professor emeritus, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: "Twentieth American Music Festival": Alard String Quartet, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 6, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 12

Painting of the week: Duccio, "The Calling of the Apostles Peter and Andrew" (Samuel H. Kress collection), Gallery 3, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Religion and Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Roman and Early Byzantine Mosaics"; guest speaker, William C. Kohler, department of fine arts, Harvard University, Cambridge; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: "Twentieth American Music Festival," Helen Boatwright, soprano; William Dale, pianist; east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MAY 13, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 19

Painting of the week: Gerard David. "The Rest on the Flight into Egypt" (Mellon Collection) gallery 39, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30

Tour of the week: "Philosophy and Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5

Sunday lecture: "Saint-Denis and the Development of the Gothic Style," guest speaker, Sumner McK. Crosby, professor of art history; Yale University, New Haven; Lecture Hall 4

Sunday concert: "Twentieth American Music Festival," National Capital Woodwind Quintet, Emerson Meyers, pianist; east garden court 8

MONDAY, MAY 20 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 26

Painting of the Week: Botticelli. "Giuliano de' Medici" (Samuel H. Kress Collection) gallery 9, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30

Tour of the week; "Society and Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5

Sunday lecture: The Sculpture of Donatello, Verrocchio and Leonardo, Speaker: Raymond S. Stites, curator of education, National Gallery of Art; Lecture Hall 4

Sunday concert: "Twentieth American Music Festival," National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; East Garden Court 8

Text of Remarks by Samuel Rose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Samuel Rose, Chief, Central Office, Contact Division, Veterans' Administration, before the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial reunion, April 20, 1963, in Long Beach, Calif.:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY SAMUEL ROSE

There is an old Latin proverb that fits this day's occasion, but I won't recite it to you for three reasons:

First, I don't speak Latin. Second, I don't, think many of you speak Latin either. And third, it sounds better in English.

The saying is this: "Your loss is my gain."

All of which leads to the fact that Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is sorry he could not accept your warm invitation to be the principal speaker at this memorial reunion. That part is your loss.

But he did ask me to attend in his stead. And because of my deep affection for you, and because of my love of Long Beach and this entire State of California—which, by the way, is the residence of my son and my grandchildren—this is my gain.

I'm glad to be here. I bring with me a salute to all of you from Jack Gleason.

This is a solemn occasion, and a sad one. This is a memorial reunion, a time for remembering great tragedy, the tragedy of the 1,102 who lost their lives that fateful day on December 7, 1941.

And yet this is a hopeful occasion, as well. It is hopeful because the tragedy of our 1,102 shipmates is ever fresh in our minds; because we are determined never to forget; because we, in our way, have dedicated a portion of our remaining lives to the memory of these gallant men—that they shall not have died in vain.

We do not forget our war dead. We remember them forever. We enshrine them in the same memorial that holds those valiant men and women who lost their lives in our country's wars.

They are a part of our history, now. And we, as civilized men and women, do not forget history. We learn from it. We revere it. We cherish it. Let me go further than that. We are a part of it. We, each and every one of us, have been shaped and formed, to a greater degree than we are aware, by that which has gone before.

Because these shipmates who lost their lives are now a part of the history of America, we are not the same. You and I are different persons, because the 1,102 live on within us.

And it is up to us, up to you and to me, to make certain that we live up to the dreams and aspirations they must have had—before that day of infamy, December 7, 1941.

Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee and a long-time champion of veterans, said so well, at the dedication of the memorial almost a year ago: "Those who sleep beneath these waters have been most generous toward us. They gave the noonday of their lives to us so that we could have our full share of tomorrows * * * that we could be free. They have passed on to us the most precious gift that man can inherit."

What are we doing to carry forth in the way that they would have wanted? What are we doing, each of us, to make certain that these men shall not have died in vain? We, the living, are their memorial. Thus, we cannot shirk our duty and our responsibility. We cannot; the choice is not even ours.

I firmly believe the strength of America's defense is our preparedness, a testament to the memory of these men; a solemn covenant with them that power-hungry, power-mad nations can never again find us unprepared for any emergency.

Listen again to the words of President Kennedy at his inauguration: "Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of man; tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself."

So spoke the President of the United States.

The struggle he mentioned—the struggle in which we are now engaged, against tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself—is a further fullfillment of our obligation to these shipmates.

Life on this earth can be better—must be better. They would have wanted it that way. They would have joined the struggle to make it that way, had they lived. So we carry forth, in their stead.

It has not been a long time since December 7, 1941. In time, memories may fade; they do not disappear entirely; and some aspects of the past do not fade at all. The 1,102, for instance.

Life in America and life in the world has gone through many changes in the more than two decades since that unforgettable day. Two decades is not long in the infinity of time.

What has happened in these two decades—between the tragedy of the U.S.S. *Arizona* and today? They brought to the world the age of the atom, the age when man finally achieved the power to blow himself off the globe or to harness this energy and create a new and better way of life for everyone. They brought speeds faster than sound—not as a rarity, but as a commonplace. These two decades brought a new concern with newly emerging nations of the world, rumblings of independence heard around the globe. These two decades brought us prosperity and employment undreamed of in earlier days; yes, even with pockets of unemployment that now exist, we do have affluence unheard of. These two decades ushered in more change, more lasting revolutions, on more fronts than any two decades ever before in the thousands upon thousands of years man has inhabited this earth.

I wish the 1,102 could have lived to see the drastic changes the past two decades have wrought.

I wish they could know that in a sense they were responsible for those changes; they in a sense were a part of history that led up to these fantastic changes.

But change has not been the only hallmark of the past two decades.

There has been something else. Constancy.

America's attitude toward her veterans, and toward their widows and orphans, has not changed. They are the same as they were in the earliest days of our history, when the Continental Congress enacted legislation caring for the needs of those disabled in battle. America's attitude toward her veterans, indeed, has deepened and grown firmer. But it has not changed. We do not forget those who served. We do not forget their families.

The nature of benefits has changed, has been enhanced, it is true, but the basic concept of recognition and remembrance of those who served—this is the constant of which I spoke; this is the constant that is tied in with the story of the 1,102; another testimonial to their memory—we do not, we shall not, forget!

Now let me tell you what the Veterans' Administration is doing, as an instrument of America's remembrance of those who served and, in a sense, as an instrument of America's remembrance to them.

It is a hopeful story. The men of the *Arizona* would have been proud of it.

The VA is giving better care to more sick and disabled veterans than at any time in its history, Administrator Gleason said very emphatically in a recent address, and he also said, "We expect to improve on our already superlative record in the future."

The Administrator cited the money appropriated by the 87th Congress * * * for the construction and modernization of VA hospital facilities.

The 87th Congress has appropriated an average of $76.6 million a year * * * as compared with an annual average of $31 million a year less during the previous 5 years. And, said Administrator Gleason, "we plan to do even better in the future." This fiscal year, 1963, our appropriation for medical and domiciliary care for the first time in VA history passed the $1 billion mark.

I would like to tell you that the VA is now paying annually about $2.8 billion in compensation and pension payments to more than 3 million disabled veterans.

In addition, 1,653,000 dependents of deceased veterans are receiving compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or pension * * * in the amount of $1 billion a year. This is $200 million more than was paid in fiscal 1960.

I am not going to burden you with too many details but did you know that the VA is the third largest Government agency in total number of employees; that it has larger expenditures—more than $5 billion annually—than all of the Cabinet departments but three; that it conducts the third largest mutual insurance company in the United States; that it manages the largest hospital system in the Nation; that the VA hospitals and clinics are conducting about 7,000 research projects in geriatrics, mental disorders, heart and blood vessel conditions, cancer, and virtually every disease and disability of man; that it administers a loan program responsible for building more than one out of every five homes in America since the end of World War II; that the VA employs 4 percent of all the doctors of the United States, in fact, the VA is the world's largest employer for more than 10 different professions which includes nurses, clinical and counseling psychologists, dieticians, medical and psychiatric social workers, physical and occupational therapists.

The VA is very much concerned with rehabilitating the handicapped, and in getting employers interested in giving the handicapped an opportunity to show how well they can work. It practices what it preaches. The VA is the largest employer in Government of handicapped persons. With only 7 percent of the total Federal civilian employment the VA, last fiscal year, added to its rolls approximately 16 percent of the handicapped persons hired by Federal agencies.

I could go on and on about the veterans of America, and what a grateful Nation has done to further their welfare—but I believe by now you have the broad picture. You and I know full well the responsible ways the veterans have used their benefits to help themselves and to help America. They have made us richer and stronger at a time when we needed that wealth and power. Their contributions are a living memorial to those whom we honor today.

In Abraham Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, he asked the Nation "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace."

What President Lincoln said was not just for his time, it was for all time.

I would like to close with some other words of this great President spoken at a dedication of a memorial to war dead. The place was Gettysburg, Pa., but it would be equally appropriate at Pearl Harbor, in speaking of the patriots whom we memorialize:

"It is for us the living to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they have thus far, so nobly carried on—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

These words are etched in the heart of America—let us not forget them.

The Motion Picture "Gogo"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention of the House to what I consider a very serious matter, so serious, in fact, that I have asked the Secretary of Defense to provide a full and complete investigation and to identify and punish those responsible.

This matter concerns a review published in the newspaper of show business, Variety, on April 17, 1963, of a moving picture entitled "Gogo" made in Iceland.

Variety's reviewer, who signs himself "Denk" expresses great surprise and concern over the fact that two of the actors in the movie are officers of the U.S. military service; that one of them portrayed a "souse" and the other a "girl-corruptor."

So that the record may be complete, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Variety review be made a part of my remarks at this point.

[From Variety, Apr. 17, 1963]

GOGO

(79 AV STODINNI)

(*Icelandic*)

Goteborg, April 1

Stivellproduction release of Edda production. With Kristbjorg Kjeld, Gunnar Ekjolfssen. Robert Arnfinnsson. Directed by Erik Balling. Screenplay, Godlaur Rosinkrentz from book by I. G. Thorsteneisson; camera, Jorgen Shov. At Aveny Goteborg, Sweden. Running time, 81 mins.

Gogo	Kristbjorg Kjeld
Ragnar	Gunnar Ekjolfssen
Gudmunder	Robert Arnfinnsson
Bob	John Teasy
US drunkard	Lawrence W. Schneph

This first picture ever produced on the tiny island of Iceland is a typical beginners work. There is an awful lot of pathetic acting, moralizing, car driving, boring landscapes and much too much cigarette smoking and whisky drinking as "business" performed by stage actors working before cameras.

It is simple "boy meets girl" plot from a local bestseller book. It is all about a beautiful widow-turned-prostitute who meets a local taxi driver and a romance starts, but there is no happy end. When the driver realizes that his prospective bride is a girl who entertains U.S. officers from a nearby base he gets mad also sad and performs a clumsy car-suicide.

In the second part of "Gogo" there are some short scenes of real dramatic value, but on the whole this is a picture of very slim export chances.

Almost unbelievable is the participation in this feature of actual U.S. military personnel stationed at the Keflavik Base but pictured as souses and girl-corrupters.

The unknown director of an insignificant picture managed to get two high officers from the local U.S. base Keflavik on Iceland to play roles of drunkards. One John Teasy, is believed a U.S. actor who is in charge of the U.S. Army TV network of the Keflavik Base. Another officer is Lawrence W. Schneph. Both are directed to act out the curse of America's "always present sun" on the nordic island and behave in a way the local population clearly despises.

The best thing said about Americans is a remark by a local taxi driver: "He is not like the other Americans."

The disclosure has already made front page news in Swedish press.

DENK.

And, now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of my letter to Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, be included at this point.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is addressed to you, the highest authority in our Military Establishment, for I believe it vitally necessary to do so, and enclose herewith a copy of an article which appeared in the newspaper Variety under date of April 17, 1963.

Mr. Secretary, if U.S. military personnel were permitted to participate in order to portray a "drunken, girl-corrupting image" of a U.S. serviceman, it is about time we fold up our tents and go home.

I therefore have no hesitation in requesting you make an immediate investigation—(1) To determine whether such a picture has been made for distribution in Europe (I have no doubt it has been been made); (2) To determine names and ranks of officers who participated; (3) And, to determine the names and ranks of officers, who must have had to give permission for their participation.

I am sure you must be shocked, as I am, and every other person who has seen this article. It is unbelievable. An immediate response from you, outlining the steps you are taking in order that this matter be cleared up and proper action taken against those who have participated, will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of thing, as I have told Mr. McNamara, is unbelievable. We spend billions of dollars building the American image and then, because of the foolhardiness of some superior officers, whose permission certainly must have been necessary for these men to play such roles, we tear it down in a crude movie.

You will note that "Denk" includes as a part of his review that "the disclosure has already made front page news in Swedish press." I would think it would, Mr. Speaker, and certainly those forces who downgrade America at every turn, will lose no opportunity to tell the rest of the world that our military officers are portraying the roles of "souses" and "girl corrupters."

I hope every Member of this House will read these remarks carefully and

study this case. I am sure that all will share the sorrow and indignation I did when this matter was called to my attention.

Free World Friendship Through Music Via U.S. Navy Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, gestures of friendship and good will by our American citizens abroad are too often overlooked. I would, therefore, like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following letter which reflects the warm feelings generated by the members of the U.S. Navy toward citizens of other free world countries through the U.S. Navy Band:

UNIT BAND 166,
F.P.O. New York.

Congressman JAMES R. GROVER, Jr.,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to extend my deepest appreciation on behalf of Musician Chief Lawrence O. Burlensen, the members of Unit Band 166, and myself for the letter which I received from you. It is good to know that our work is giving the people of the free world an idea of what American music is like. We, of course, wish there was some way to extend our music to even those people who are not able, because of political reasons, to hear it.

Since you have spent your time to write to us, I would like to give you some of the facts about our band, our music, and what we strive for while appearing for people wherever we go.

To begin with, our band is made up of all rated Navy musicians. We have all been musicians at various places before entering the service, and after we joined the Navy, we were selected to attend the U.S. Naval School of Music in Washington, D.C.

We play different types of music, ranging from an 18-piece concert band to an 18-piece dance band. We perform for various ceremonies aboard our ship, for the ship alongside ours while we are refueling, and generally to promote high morale for our shipmates.

During the time we are in a foreign port, we are requested to play for the people of the country in which we are visiting. Many times we travel many miles from the port we are at to where we have to play. The main reason behind our playing for the people of these countries is to bring the American music to the people who do not very often have the opportunity to hear it. I must say that we are always warmly received. The people enjoy our music to the fullest. Instead of going somewhere and playing the music the whole time for the people to listen to, we usually urge the people themselves to participate in the program, such as dancing.

The men in Unit Band 166 always remember above all that they are representatives of the U.S. Navy and never fail to give the best impression possible. They feel the same as myself, that since the people of these countries do not have the chance to see Americans very often, they will be judging America by what they see in us.

This is what our band does and what it hopes to accomplish in the future. I would like to say again that your letter was very much appreciated by all persons concerned.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL S. LEVY,
Musician Third Class, U.S. Navy.

Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram Views Test Ban With Caution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a brass ring engraved "R.I.P.," Rest in Peace, is said by some to be the only prize the United States might get from its ride on the Geneva test ban merry-go-round. This may be overstating the case a good deal. But even an ordinary look-before-you-leap attitude should cause a much more serious public discussion of both the peaceful and the lethal potentialities of such a treaty than thus far has occurred. It is heartwarming that U.S. newspapers are considering the matter editorially, as witnessed by the following editorial appearing in the Long Beach, Calif., Independent-Press-Telegram on April 23:

THE TEST-BAN CAROUSEL

After riding the test-ban carousel full circuit, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is back to the point where he suggests that the United States simply accept his promise instead of demanding inspections on Russian soil.

In an interview published in Italy last week, Khrushchev warned that Russia's readiness to allow even two or three inspections yearly on its soil may be withdrawn if the United States continues to insist on seven or eight.

He charged that "certain American circles would like to install, under the appearance of inspections, centers of investigation on the territory of the Soviet Union."

Besides, he added, Berlin is the burning issue which must be settled first of all.

What is behind these new complications and threats of obduracy?

Perhaps Khrushchev detects a mood of retreat on the part of the West and is pressing his advantage.

This theory is in harmony with the recent charges by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER that a disastrous cavein may soon occur in the Western position.

In the making, HOSMER fears, is a Western proposal which will depend on an unpoliced Soviet promise. Under this plan, the West would cease testing and would simply take Khrushchev's word that he wasn't continuing the tests necessary to attain a nuclear superiority.

HOSMER describes this plan as a "blueprint for U.S. suicide" and calls for an agreement which provides an adequate number of seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union. But even that, he notes, would not settle completely the question of nuclear competition:

"Discussing what may or may not be effective treaty terms * * * must not divert attention from an even more imperative inquiry. It is the basic question of whether or not even an effective treaty actually will, on balance, reduce the risks we face. Under it the Soviet Government still could keep topflight Soviet scientists secretly at work in iron curtain laboratories for many years devising the weapons which would give it nuclear superiority. Whereupon that Government could wantonly abrogate the treaty and provide those scientists sudden opportunity to test their work."

This risk, the U.S. Disarmament Agency argues, can be reduced by maintaining U.S. laboratories and readiness for testing. President Kennedy, however, has said the Nation can't keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of experiments which may or may not take place on some uncertain date in the future, and it can't keep large technical labs fully alert "on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement."

What, then, would U.S. policy be?

Representative HOSMER, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is perhaps the leading authority in Congress on both the political and the technical questions of nuclear competition. Other Members of Congress (most recently Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY) have debated his criticisms in public and come off second best. The questions he has raised have not been satisfactorily answered at any level of Government, including the White House. This only adds weight to another of his charges, which is that the lower echelons of the executive branch simply have not given the President a full and realistic nuclear briefing.

Destroying American Industry With American Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of a regimented and subsidized agriculture, it has been a source of pride with me to be able to point to the mushroom industry of the United States—largely concentrated in my congressional district—as an example of free enterprise operating at its best.

Down through the years this important industry has received but little help from the Federal Government, and the pitiful appropriations for mushroom research have been a mere pittance in a governmental operation running into billions. However, the mushroom people have carried on with a minimum of complaint and have reached their present efficiency of operation largely through their own efforts and investment.

When, however, the Federal Government, through its Agency for International Development, moves in as it has done in the case of Formosa, our people are about ready to throw in the sponge. Specifically, here is the classical example of an unwarranted use of taxpayers' money to undermine American agriculture as a diplomatic maneuver. Here we find a Taiwan mushroom export industry practically nonexistent in 1961, placing $3 million worth of canned mushrooms on the American market in 1962, canned mushrooms chlorinated contrary to American regulation so that they can compete attractively with our homegrown product, and be made additionally competitive with our American variety

through a progressive reduction of tariffs and use of American-owned counterpart funds.

I submit that this is an intolerable misuse of both authority and taxpayers' dollars and I hope that the resentment among our Pennsylvania mushroom growers will make itself felt at the only place where certain bureaucrats seem to be impressed; namely, at the ballot box.

Included as a part of these remarks is an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Kennett, Pa., News and Advertiser, a newspaper published in the heart of our mushroom area, entitled "The Other Side of the Success Story."

The article follows:

[From the Kennett (Pa.) News and Advertiser, Mar. 14, 1963]

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE SUCCESS STORY

Time magazine presented a happy picture of Formosa's success story in the March 8 issue. The article of the U.S. Government's role in the development of the Formosan economy, how American aid ($3 billion since 1949) has been dispensed wisely and put to work intelligently.

"To the surprise of Asia, the relief of the United States and the embarrassment of Red China," the article stated, "Formosa's economic effort is succeeding. So much so, in fact, that this week Howard Parsons, the new director on Formosa for the U.S. Agency for International Development, told the Taipei press: 'Within a few years, Taiwan will be in position to maintain a viable economy without special economic assistance from the U.S. Government.'

"Probably the strongest single force in the Formosan economy is the United States-Chinese Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, which has worked on some 3,000 economic projects and carried out a much-needed distribution of farm land that has benefited half a million Formosan families. The commission created a whole new export industry by teaching farmers in 1959 to raise mushrooms; this year Formosa will export 1 million cases of mushrooms worth $10 million."

Time readers were probably much impressed with the wise use of American dollars. Few of them realize that Formosa's entry into the mushroom export business is having serious repercussions in the United States—particularly in the Kennett Square area. The U.S. Government has been extremely miserly about allocations for mushroom research in America; in fact, the program is the most miserably supported that you will ever find in a mushroom growing country. When the Fifth International Mushroom Congress was held in Philadelphia last fall, the American mushroom industry practically apologized to the rest of the world for not being able to show more than it did. Whatever progress has been made in this country has been due mainly to the efforts of a handful of scientists and the resourcefulness of the mushroom growers themselves. The U.S. Government has done practically nothing to develop the industry, but it is now going allout to wreck it.

If we could climb a high mountain peak from which we could survey and consider the many problems of the world, perhaps we could find justification for the killing of an American industry to help the peoples of a less fortunate country. We don't think the U.S. Government or the U.S. Agency for International Development has climbed such a peak. It is proceeding with the development of the economies of other countries without any thought to the effort such development might have in the United States. Other people should be helped, but we don't think that such assistance should come at the expense of any segment of the American population, large or small. Where lies the wisdom in the spending of millions of dollars to help a foreign country if such assistance creates a problem of much greater magnitude in the country that is financing the project?

The U.S. Agency for International Development is doing a bangup job in other countries. We hope it can come home soon to direct the retraining of American workers.

Huntington, N.Y., Doctors To Launch Mass Polio Immunization Program With Sabin Oral Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a real source of satisfaction to me to know that another giant step forward is being taken to wipe out polio with Sabin oral vaccine.

Dr. Albert B. Sabin, University of Cincinnati School of Medicine, who developed the vaccine, has emphasized an important fact. The oral polio vaccine can break the chain of transmission which keeps polio circulating and thus makes it possible, not merely to halt, but to eliminate the disease.

Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of the House might be interested in the following announcement which I ask to be included as a portion of my remarks.

The article follows:

HUNTINGTON, N.Y., DOCTORS TO LAUNCH MASS POLIO IMMUNIZATION PROGRAM WITH SABIN ORAL VACCINE

A communitywide effort to wipe out polio throughout Huntington Township has been launched by the Huntington Township Polio Campaign Committee, under the direction of the physicians of Huntington Township and with the assistance of the Huntington Kiwanis Club, it was announced today by Drs. Sewall Pastor and Thurman B. Givan, Jr.

The Sabin oral vaccine has proven itself to be safe and highly effective and offers several important advantages over Salk, namely, (1) permanent immunity; (2) immunizes body areas that Salk doesn't; and (3) prevents people from carrying the virus.

For permanent immunity three doses are necessary, one of each type, even if the individual has had Salk.

Both doctors urged all citizens above the age of 3 months to turn out at immunization stations on Sunday, April 28, to receive their first dose of the Sabin Oral polio vaccine.

Dr. Givan says, "To wipe out polio you need Sabin oral vaccine whether you've had Salk shots or not. One of the biggest mistakes you can make about guarding yourself and your family against polio is to think you don't need Sabin oral vaccine because you've already had Salk vaccine shots. Everyone needs Sabin oral vaccine because: (1) only Sabin oral vaccine can prevent you from being a polio 'carrier', from passing polio to others even though you yourself are immune to it; (2) only Sabin oral vaccine gives you permanent protection against polio.

"Unlike Salk vaccine, Sabin oral vaccine requires no booster shots, no needles, it is taken by mouth on a lump of sugar. Take the Sabin oral vaccine series once and it's good for life. Get complete polio protection for you and your family. Start your Sabin oral vaccine series on Sabin oral Sundays."

"While there has been a dramatic decline in the number of cases of paralytic polio," Dr. Pastor said, "the disease is not yet defeated. In the United States, there were more than 1,500 cases of polio in 1961. More than 800 of these suffered either death or some sort of paralysis from the disease. The Sabin vaccine may be the final answer to the fight against this dreaded disease. The vaccine is easy to administer, no injection; it provides rapid action in about 1 week, and it helps break the chain of transmission by stimulating intestinal resistance to future infection." He added, "This means that the possibility of wiping out polio as a threat to our children or to their parents is closer than ever before. We have the tools. Now it's up to the community to use them."

Polio is caused by any one of the three types of viruses. The Government has licensed the Sabin oral vaccine against types I, II, and III. All three of the oral vaccines were developed by Dr. Albert B. Sabin of the University of Cincinnati School of Medicine.

Dr. Pastor said the Huntington Township Polio Campaign Committee has purchased 150,000 doses of each of the three types of Sabin vaccine from Pfizer Laboratories, division of Chas. Pfizer and Co., Inc. He added that the vaccine will be distributed free of charge. Each person will be asked to donate 25 cents. However, no one will be refused the vaccine.

The vaccine will be given at 20 immunization centers in strategic locations throughout the township. The vaccine will be administered to infants by dropper, spoon or paper cup. Older children and adults can eat a cube of sugar on which the vaccine has been dropped.

The vaccines have been distributed in the United States and other countries to more than 100 million persons and have proven to be safe and effective. Both polio and carriers of the dread virus can be eliminated if the entire community participates in this program; 100 percent is our goal.

The Sabin oral vaccine is recommended by the American Medical Association, the National Institutes of Health, the Surgeon General of the United States, the Suffolk County Medical Society, your pediatrician and your family doctor.

Profits and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are all concerned about strengthening our economy and increasing the opportunity for employment, I think we cannot overlook the factors of profit. Mr. R. G. Follis, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co., of California, recently wrote an editorial on the subject of profits and freedom which was printed in the April issue of the Standard Oil Co. bulletin and which I think is deserving of careful consideration by all those desiring to increase the employment opportunities.

The editorial follows:

PROFITS AND FREEDOM: A MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE TRUE ROLE OF PROFITS IN OUR PROSPERITY AND WAY OF LIFE CAN ALLOW OUR NATIONAL STRENGTH TO BE UNDERMINED; MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR US TO HELP OTHER FREE WORLD NATIONS

"You Americans," runs a familiar comment by some foreign observers, "can afford such luxuries as a high standard of living and material prosperity, plus individual freedom at the same time. That's because you found all your resources right at hand. Ours is a poor country. We, of course, can't afford it."

In many of these comparisons, the other country may have a number of material resources equal to or even greater than those in the United States. One key resource they ordinarily lack is investment capital and the opportunity to accumulate the surplus profits that would create it.

By any name (and it has been given many) profit is a margin of economic growth. It is the seed corn of growth; the energizing agent for continuously building, directing and automatically regulating productivity with a single beneficial end point—the most for everyone. Profit, in our free economy, provides the base which supports high wages, creates jobs and rising production, provides for research—and pays the bulk of all taxes.

Totalitarian systems nearly always try to replace the profit motive by authoritarian substitutes of one kind or another—the stick instead of the carrot. Allocating all resources from a central command post is hardly a new idea, nor is the idea of increasing productivity by coercion. In the long memory of mankind, the whip and the shackle have been much more familiar than freedom and opportunity.

That is why the profit motive alone is consistent and interdependent with the doctrine of individual freedom. Just as the vote and Bill of Rights are our bulwarks of freedom in the political sphere, so the profit motive is the manifestation of that same freedom in the economic field.

In the United States, sufficient profits over a number of years have enabled us to accumulate a backlog of investment capital. This base has supported an economic growth to a level as yet unapproached in history. In addition, it has today become a principal source of investment help to the less developed countries of the free world in building a capital base of their own. And even with such help, to build an adequate base from almost nothing is a formidable task.

In our own country, between a heavy burden of taxes and the tendency to put a squeeze on the margin of profit, that base of investment capital has been, and is being, badly eroded. Government economists are alarmed, and rightfully so.

The various measures suggested to correct this situation are, so far, temporary palliatives, not cures, while the erosion itself may well have already gone so far that it may lead to serious economic problems.

At the same time, some elements in both government and elsewhere in this country agitate for and encourage a still greater squeeze on profits. Attacks on profits in the past have managed to contribute to a widespread misunderstanding of their real role in our economy. To many, profits, while perhaps necessary, are not wholly admirable. We cannot much longer afford the luxury of such an attitude. It is time that all the elements of our society should grasp the true meaning of profits to both their own welfare and that of their nation. Together, all elements should support whatever we can do to see that not only our present margins of profit be maintained, but even increased.

Misunderstandings of profit are not confined to the United States. In the less developed countries of the free world, where private American capital, in partnership with local government or nationals, has invested its money, such misunderstanding can have serious results. Elements in these countries, inspired by an overzealous nationalism (and always eagerly seconded by the local Communist faction), mistakenly brand the legitimate profits of enterprise—particularly those involving foreign investors—as exploitation and demand that all such profits be seized by their governments.

Thus, even though private investment from abroad is just about the sole hope of achieving a base of investment capital in these countries, and with it independence and prosperity, a misunderstanding of the role of profits can not only halt such development, but discourage and fatally retard any future investment.

A clear concept of the vital and wholesome role which profits play in a free society is not only essential to the continued success of our economy at home, but also vital to those new nations that hope to achieve such economic success within the structure of freedom.

A GI Bill of Rights for Americans on the Hot Front of the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following thoughful article which appeared in the February 1963 edition of the Jewish Veteran, a publication of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

Justice demands that we provide the same benefits to our young men who are fighting and dying on the hot fronts in the cold war as we have provided those who fought in World War II and in Korea. It is not a question of how many have been killed or maimed for life as compared to those other two wars, it is rather a question of what is right.

The article follows:

[From the Jewish Veteran, February 1963]

A GI BILL OF RIGHTS FOR AMERICANS ON THE HOT FRONT OF THE COLD WAR

(By Felix Putterman)

The other day the Army awarded the Air Medal, a high honor indeed to a noncom for giving aid to casualties while in helicopter flight over combat areas in South Vietnam. While this was still another incident in a long series of quiet American bravery in the sullen swampland and jungles of southeast Asia, it serves as a reminder that this is still a part of what is euphemistically called peacetime duty.

Hardly a week goes by without an announcement of casualties and deaths among U.S. servicemen on the hot front of the cold war. Yet as far as recognition and benefits are concerned, there is no distinction made between garrison duty here at home and service abroad on this razoredge exposed nerve of the struggle between freedom and tyranny.

President Kennedy has taken an initial step in asking the Congress for legislative authority to award medals, the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Air Force Cross, and Silver Star, now restricted to heroic service in active combat with an enemy of the United States during wartime. Such legislation is consistent with the President's action of last April when Mr. Kennedy issued an Executive order to establish eligibility for the award of the Purple Heart to cold war casualties.

Many distinctions are drawn by the Government based upon the supposed differences betwen hot and cold war duty. Among these are a number that are artificial and arbitrary at best.

Servicemen carrying out the national commitment in Berlin, on the armistice line in Korea, in Laos and the agony of Vietnam cannot purchase national service life insurance. If they lose a limb, they are not eligible for the special automobile available to World War II and Korean veterans. The benefits of a GI bill are as yet unattainable. Their eligibility for service-connected disability compensation is severely limited by much stricter presumptions of preservice fitness than predecessors of Korea and World War II. After discharge, veterans of Vietnam, Berlin, etc., are not eligible for the same pension given war veterans totally and permanently disabled by reason of non-service-connected cause.

Apparently, the Government's distinction between hot and cold war has not inhibited insurance companies. There have been a number of complaints from parents and widows that policies held on deceased sons and spouses are not being paid because the death occurred on a hazardous mission overseas. An insurance company refused to pay double indemnity for an accidental death to the widow of a warrant officer lost in a transport crash in Laos 2 years ago. A number of dependents have been trapped in this whiplash between the Government's artificial distinction of what comprises wartime duty and the private insurance companies' strict views on accidental death.

Obviously, the situation beggars a sensible, rational, and humane solution. The Congress can take a constructive step in the right direction by adopting the President's proposal on awards. The logical next step would be an adjustment of our entire schedule of benefits to bring in deserving veterans who have been exposed to hazardous duty. The term hazardous duty should be interpreted in a limited sense so that the administration could not be accused of creating an all-encompassing Mother Hubbard for every peacetime serviceman. Finally, the GI bill for which Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has been leading a valiant and almost lonesome fight should be moved up high on the agenda of a Congress which may have time on its hands while waiting around a goodly portion of next summer for the tax bill to be reported out into daylight from the inner recesses of the Senate Finance Committee.

Admittedly the GI bill is expensive—not extravagant—but expensive. It is inconceivable that the talents of our most "fiscally responsible" Members of Congress cannot be used for something positive rather than merely being "agin" every spending proposal. One contribution would be a GI bill of rights, carefully drawn to limit, if necessary, its benefits to those cold war vets enduring the hazards of perilous duty while plugging the leaky dikes of the free world.

What is right is right. At the expense of some of our finest young men, the Government Treasury and private insurance companies have been eating their cake and having it as well.

Compulsory Health Insurance Called Vital to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful article to the North American Newspaper Alliance which appeared in the New York Journal-American on April 10, 1963, about the thoughts of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch on the problem of providing adequate medical care to the people of this great Nation.

The thoughts of Mr. Baruch are worthy of careful consideration during this time of hysterical opposition to meaningful methods for the payment of hospitalization and medical care through Government-sponsored insurance programs.

The article follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, Apr. 10, 1963]

BERNARD BARUCH GIVES HIS VIEWS ON MEDICAL CARE: COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE CALLED VITAL TO NATION—URGES MEDICAL DOCTORS TAKE LEAD IN PLANNING A PROGRAM

(NOTE.—Woodrow Wilson used to call Bernard M. Baruch "Dr. Facts." This was because he would say "let's look at the facts." The following article is made up of excerpts from a speech delivered by Mr. Baruch before the Medical Society of the State of New York in November 1947 giving his views on medical care. It is prophetic and timely because what he said then in a large measure applies today to the proposed medicare bill which the administration has reintroduced in Congress despite the rejection by the Senate in the last session. This article was read and okayed by Mr. Baruch.)

All my thoughts on medicine are colored by memories of my father, Dr. Simon Baruch. He was the wisest man I ever knew. He pioneered in surgery, physical and medicine and incurable diseases. Often, I heard him tell prospective medical students:

"Do not enter the medical profession to make money. Study medicine only with the idea that your greatest compensation will be knowing that you help your fellowman. Do not expect gratitude and you will never be disappointed."

As chairman of the War Industries Board in the First World War, I realized how important to defense was the health of our citizens. That awareness was reinforced manifold during this past war.

In preparing a report for the late President Roosevelt on manpower, I was shocked to learn at least 4 million men had been rejected as 4F's—unfit to defend their country. Some, not all, these defects were preventable.

How much more shocking would have been the record, if everyone had received the same examination?

Since then, I have given the problems of medical care much thought. It deeply concerned me that we not fail the returning veteran, so I studied their medical needs. From that, it was only a step to related problems of general medical care for all.

BENEFITS ACHIEVED BY MEDICAL SCIENCE

But before I list my conclusions, I would like to point out that the medical science and art have conferred a new and great benefit upon society in the last generation. The years of our lives have been heavily increased. This helps not merely the individual, who wants to go on living—and living in dignity and self-respect—but all the people to live more comfortably and freer from fear.

And now to go on with my exposition:

There is no question—the need for more medical care exists.

Also, there is no question this need will have to be met.

The problem is how?

All over the world, the masses are stirring for higher living standards. Improved medical care is a foundation of that better standard. Without good health, of what advantage are higher wages or shorter work hours, better education or greater leisure?

This striving of the masses for better living is felt everywhere. In the health field, doctors must steer that surging tide into channels of improvement. Then, the surge does not overspill into the revolutionary flood, which washes away more than it brings.

TIME IS RUNNING AGAINST OPPOSITION

In the matter of adequate medical care, too many doctors have been fighting a rearguard action for too long. I feel I must warn those doctors—time is running against them.

We must look for what can be done—and do it.

What is this adventure in health I see dawning, and toward which you all have been keeping the doctor's vigil through the night?

More and better doctors—in more places.

An immediate, complete survey to modernize medical education, with greater emphasis on chronic and degenerative diseases, mental hygiene, and preventive medicine.

More hospitals more evenly spread through the country.

Fewer specialists, more general practitioners.

Reorganize medical practice, stressing group medicine where needed and voluntary health insurance.

For those who cannot afford voluntary insurance, some form of insurance, partly financed by the Government, covering people by law. I would call this compulsory health insurance, if that term's proper meaning had not been lost.

Increased medical research.

Greatly expanded physical and mental rehabilitation.

Education to make health a national habit.

A vigorous, preventive medical program, reaching everyone, children, above all.

Creation of a nonpolitical, watchdog committee to safeguard progress in medical care of veterans.

Increased numbers of well-trained nurses and technicians.

Adequate dental care.

A stabilizing economy—inflation will make worthless any health program or anything else.

Even the least ambitious schemes for improving the Nation's health require more doctors, all competently trained. Why aren't more doctors being educated?

In studying that question, I was struck by how expensive training a doctor has become—in dollars and in time.

In its fine report on "Medicine in the Changing Order," the New York Academy of Medicine states:

"There seems no alternative other than Government aid if educational standards are to be raised or even maintained. * * * If medical schools are to continue as centers of research * * * here also Government aid may be necessary."

If science and medicine ask the Government for aid—which even the conservative deems necessary—they must expect he who pays the fiddler will call the tune.

This means the Government will rightly insist upon no discrimination in medical care because of race, color, or creed. It will rightly insist upon opportunity for all to enter the profession and advance on the sole basis of ability and character, without restrictions of race, color, creed, or sex.

How much more the Government is likely to insist upon will depend upon the more progressive leaders in the medical profession.

EXTENSION OF CARE CREATES PROBLEM

According to the academy's report—I quote: "There has been no fundamental reorganization of American medical education since about 1910."

That finding certainly calls for the medical profession undertaking—now—a most thorough, down-to-earth survey to modernize medical education, making recommendations so boldly inspiring the people will gratefully back them. No one can draw up a better program than doctors.

And now to what is perhaps, the toughest problem—how can better medical care be extended to those who cannot afford it?

Medical organizations have been particularly active in pressing voluntary health insurance. They have proven group insurance to be a sound, practical way. That is a great achievement.

But I would not be frank—nor friendly—if I did not add that it is not good enough.

Rome was not doctored in 1 day. It may be, as some have told me, that the needs of the bulk of our people can be met, given time, through voluntary insurance. What troubles me most are the needs of the sizable segment of society, which does not earn enough to pay for voluntary insurance.

The American Medical Association—its Bureau of Medical Economics—estimated in 1939 that families earning $3,000 or less—two-thirds the population—cannot afford the cost of serious illness. Some of these can afford voluntary insurance, although inflation has reduced their number. But what of the little fellows who cannot?

I have asked that of nearly everyone with whom I have discussed medical care. Nothing has been suggested so far, which promises success, other than some form of insurance covering these people in by law and financed by the Government, at least in part—what some would call compulsory health insurance.

ANY PROGRAM MUST BE FREE OF POLITICS

Nationally, the program might well be administered by a body of doctors and nondoctors to keep medical care as free from politics as possible.

As to financing, my own preference runs toward the Government meeting only part of the cost, with part coming from payroll deductions from employers and workers. In time, these deductions will become absorbed in general costs of production.

I have the utmost confidence in the efficiency of American industry, both labor and management, and which good health will stimulate. We can absorb these medical costs better than other countries which must also meet these needs.

The needs can be met, as in other fields, without the Government taking over medicine, or socializing it, something I would fiercely oppose.

I do not fear Government taking its legitimate part in medicine, any more than I fear it in education or housing. I do oppose socialization here. It leads ultimately to the police state, degradation of the individual and lessened well-being. There should be just one Federal agency, with Cabinet rank, for all health and human welfare problems.

I would hate to see any medical care program under guidance of others than those who have the know-how. So would the American people.

That is why I urge the doctors to get in and pitch, not stand by on the sidelines. They need fear politicians or bureaucrats only to the degree they fail themselves.

Little League Approaches the Quarter Century Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., opening general assembly of the Little League Congress, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, Tuesday evening, April 9, 1963:

LITTLE LEAGUE APPROACHES THE QUARTER CENTURY MARK

If you want to know who I am, among other things, I was a first baseman. I am also the grandfather of Brian Hickey, a little leaguer and incidentally a first baseman on his team in Grosse Pointe, Mich. He has been advising me regarding the caliber of the players he hopes will come up from the minors to join his team this year and that his club, as a result of the new players, will make a better showing than they did last season.

On this basis of holding common ground, I felt qualified to accept the invitation to address the Little League Congress and I am happy that my time and business schedules have worked out so that I could be here with you tonight. I am gratified for the opportunity to pay my respects to the members of the board of directors of Little League, to my fellow trustees who are here, and to the United States Rubber Co., whose faithful support and interests have never waned.

During my lifetime, I have always been interested in sports, even back in those days before I played first base for Grassy Point and Haverstraw in Rockland County where I was born and raised. I had never failed to be impressed with the rewarding associations, with the atmosphere and vitality of understanding one finds surrounding people from all walks of life who have common interests in sportsmanship. This is true in football, basketball, or boxing, in racing, in tennis, in golf, in bowling, in lacrosse or any other sport you might mention, even cricket, even 50-mile hikes. But this warmth of kindred sportsmanship is particularly present in the great game of baseball, now international, and still regarded as the great American game. To the largest number, team sports bring more pronounced benefits and baseball, the great team sport, is also a great builder of loyalty and mutual respect.

Now I ought to tell you that I am a Yankee fan, since 1904. I have had a box for years on the first base side of the Yankee Stadium and when in town I try to see every game when the Yankees are playing. Being a Yankee fan does not mean I am above being interested in the Mets. I am delighted that under Bill Shea's dedicated leadership New York is once more in the National League. They were loyally received by the old Giant and Dodger fans, in addition to the new generation of fans. I am sure they will again be loyally supported in the Polo Grounds and when they start playing in the new Shea Stadium across the river they will not only retain the fans they have now but will gain additional support from Brooklyn, Long Island, Westchester, and Connecticut and review the old necessary rivalry which existed between the Yankees, the New York Giants, and the Brooklyn Dodgers in the years that have passed.

There is sometimes an air of smugness about those who follow champions and I do not want to be accused of it. Above everything else, my interest is in the game more than it is in the great star performers. There is a great strength in being "for" something. It is part of sportsmanship. When fans gather to cheer or boo there is no social inequality.

This is the reason that I first became interested in Little League, and when I accepted the post of a trustee of the foundation.

I believe the game of baseball and what it teaches youngsters who try out to make the team is a very important thing and an asset in community life in many parts of the world.

Like other speakers who have gone before me at these Congresses, I am impressed by the unselfish nature of men and women who turn out in leisure time to teach the boys how to play the game. Most of the dinner meetings held in this famous ballroom are big business of corporate interest toward accumulation and disbursement of wealth or most important community and welfare functions, and in many instances the scene of great international gatherings. The search for material gain is always present and an important part of our Nation's progress, but it must be conditioned by the volunteer type service of countless men and women like yourselves who devote time to worthwhile movements. Otherwise, the balance of a democratic form of government is not fully rounded out. Federal aid is not the answer. It is necessary and it helps, particularly in effecting a start of new programs. But, it can never replace the volunteer in projects like Little League.

Looking back over the records of many years, I am always impressed by the unlimited goals to which today's athletes may strive if they refuse to acknowledge limitation or ceilings of achievement. I am sure that in the ranks of the Little League players of today, there are greater stars in the making than have ever had opportunity to come forward before this time. It is axiomatic that mass participation and increasing numbers will inevitably produce greater skills. Latest count shows 216 Little League graduates signed by professional ball clubs. Most of the young men who will come into organized baseball in the years ahead will be graduates of Little League. This process, under voluntary leadership, should remain constant since Little League is the largest organization in baseball.

"No man is so tall as he who stoops to help a child." This adage applies to all who work in Little League.

It is easy and entertaining to give the assistance but in the manner in which it is performed lies the key to whatever beneficial results come out of it. I know you will agree with me that for the eager young player coming along the game and the fun attached to it is all important; if this were changed, it would take away the appeal that Little League has always had.

The game is the appeal of the program. Everything else depends upon it. If it were not for the love of the game, secondary benefits would be missed and your program not so important.

But once this important point is set up, the fields, the facilities, equipment, and so on you have the attention of the boys magnetically; then a number of consequential benefits begin to take place.

In this area, Little League can render services that are difficult to attain under formal education. I doubt there are many cases where the schoolroom holds as much appeal or acceptable disciplines for a boy of 10 or 12 as a baseball diamond, a uniform, and an umpire in blue. Here the stage is set. It is now up to the men in charge to connote the virtues, to teach the youngsters manliness and fair play, how to play the game, to show exemplary conduct to the impressionable youngsters.

You must have an understanding of a boy's mental attitude and abilities, and his limitations. The adult frame of reference is different and it can be harmful unless it is modified to the speed of the subteenager.

The boys who play Little League baseball play under much more beneficial conditions than I did. We played on a small diamond across from the schoolhouse and where we had a board about a foot square for home base; rocks or cardboard were bases and most of the time we played with a rubber ball wound with yarn, about the size of a baseball. Most of the time, instead of having good bats, we had a stick somewhat similar to a broomstick for a bat, and incidentally very few of us had a first baseman's or a fielder's mit.

It may interest this gathering tonight to know that as Postmaster General I suggested the rough design of a baseball stamp issued at Cooperstown on June 12, 1939, and that the school and church depicted on the stamp in left field represented the school and church I attended as a boy. I shall always remember being present at Cooperstown with Judge Landis and all the baseball greats of that time, when the stamp was placed on sale for the first time.

The manner in which the skills of baseball are taught, more so than the extent to which they are ingrained, is surely the important reason for successful application and relationship of a good manager to his charges. This is the area where rate of change can be astonishing. The impressions you leave on the boys under your care will reflect in the character of the youngsters as they grow up.

This is an important consideration to keep in mind.

There have been many new activities on the American scene from time to time. In the field of youth there have been such valuable and important beginnings as the Boy Scouts, the Boys' Clubs of America, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Men's Hebrew Association, the Catholic Youth Organization and other similar activities, each contributing in it own way to the enrichment of the American scene.

The birth and evolution of any such great movements is generally accompanied by an outburst of spirit, self-sufficiency and resilient promise. Exposure has always lent benefits and enlivenment to the community which sponsors and supports activities of this sort. In your own case, you learned about the immense popularity of the Little League in a short period of time. Less than a quarter century ago it began.

However, anything which registers so strongly on the American consciousness always has before it a challenge to maintain the strength of its initial surge and to keep fresh and renewed the accomplishment of its goals as the profiles of its aims become more and more elevated.

This, of course, cannot be done by the children. It is a chore that must be kept in mind by adults, and particularly the parents and relatives of the players, who are part of a movement like this. It means you. It means me.

Now I believe a keynote speech should be to the point and memorable, if anything, because of its brevity. But there are always issues. There are a few things I ought to point out from my own observations as a trustee. I will try to give you some guideposts for your deliberations here in this Congress, and as you look forward to the challenge of the future.

It is always necessary that you take basic appraisal of what you are and what you represent, both individually and as a group. The Little League movement has not been on the scene too long and even though its popularity seems assured the great growth it has encountered may very well mean that its personality is not yet crystallized or completely identified.

I think of the youngster who pitched last August when I was in Williamsport for the Little League World Series. In the final game a boy of 12, over 6 feet, was the winning pitcher for the western team from San Jose, Calif. Although he resembled a man in size at heart he was still a boy of 12 who needed all the help he could get to maintain a semblance of poise, after his team won the championship.

Someday Little League will reach manhood, too, but I am sure that as yet it, like its youthful player counterpart in the world series, needs all the determination it can get to take on maturity of purpose and unity of function.

I have a strong conviction that one of the foremost things Little League people should be interested in as you expand the ledger of your accomplishments, would be to gather forces and strengths as a group and to class up what you are doing. To casual observers across the country, esteem for Little League is no greater than which can be observed locally—and since the local league may be the weakest link or the poorest operation, then this is what the public sees and this is how they appraise the entire movement. There is no need to be backward in asking for help. I know from experience that if the help is not forthcoming in cases like yours it is a reflection upon those who are disinclined to look for it as well as upon those who were unwilling to give. The history of America, generation after generation, is one of devoted people who have helped children, especially underprivileged children. You are properly authorized when you ask for assistance whether it be finanical or physical; and if it is for the boy who is the promise of the future, it cannot be too good.

So I would say to you, study here now in this meeting and in the future to improve yourselves, to register excellence of your program in the public domain, to improve your operations insofar as it comes within your ability to do so since each league is the facet that reflects the entire program.

In the same breath and with the conviction of a trustee, I would suggest that you support the Little League Foundation. It is a worthwhile cause because its benefits accrue to the children. It is an ambitious plan that calls upon the best in all of us. If you do not support it no one else will. The foundation is the underwriter of Little League Baseball for the future against any unforeseen lean days and for any augmented facilities or adult education projects. This is the one great friendly agency that is available to all leagues in the future when help is needed. It should be brought to maturity as quickly as possible.

I have been close enough to observe the operation of the headquarters of Little League Baseball to make some judgment as to its administrative ability and fitness. I know this group of men and women at Williamsport need all the support and cooperation you can put behind them. They are trying without adequate funds to serve in the manner in which they envisualize the scope of best possible accomplishments. It is a tribute to these men and women that the program has advanced as far as it has, considering its short span and the difficult job of keeping it balanced as it grew. Theirs is a strenuous and an uneasy task from year to year. Without too much help from any of us they have consolidated as they went along and have taken advantage of every step gained.

The roads ahead of us are accelerating constantly, although the goals are still unpredictable.

The great breakthrough and newest phenomenon of our amazing age in the second half of the 20th century is the conquest of space. Spurred on by the Russian challenge of Sputnik, America has launched into a race into what heretofore has been considered the realm of fancy. Like Columbus, we are now dipping a timid toe into the boundless realms of the beyond. Mankind, through scientific advancements and, I trust, with God's given wisdom, now essays to embark farther into the limitless ocean of truth. Contemplation of the possibilities that will take place in the next generation or two have galvanized the imaginations of everyone, and particularly the young minds of our growing children.

It is an age of rapid gains and more rapid obsolescence. The speed of obsolescence applies to preconceived ideas as well as to the material horizons. But one thing does not change nor ever will as far as the human race is concerned—despite its potential victory of space, and that is the human spark which brought us up from the beginning, which now causes man to rise upward and cope with the unknown, the uncharted, the difficult, and the unpleasant.

When you are encouraging a youngster to do his best, to play fair and strive to win, you are touching close to the indomitable spark of ambition that resides potentially within every boy.

This may sound naive and deceptively simple, but it relates parallel, in fact, to the history and manner through which any great movement has even come about and had its beginnings.

"Let me teach the children and the seed I have sown will never be uprooted," were the words of Nikolai Lenin.

Today in the Soviet school system, the doctrines of Lenin are faithfully served. Young pioneers, members of the Communist youth organizations, take an oath to study, to live, to fight as Lenin willed, as the Communist Party teaches. Lenin's image is displayed in every classroom and under this unholy dogma the Russian children study and accept willingly the yoke of oppression. By contrast, it pleases me to here quote from the Little League pledge:

"I trust in God; I love my country and will respect its laws; I will play fair and strive to win; but win or lose, I will always do my best."

How different it is in our own free world. How different it is where there is no governmental compunction needed to stimulate the will of a free people who do for themselves. We all ought to take pride in the things we believe in and are doing, and I mean pride as a group, as a unit force for good and not only in the individual accomplishments. To paraphrase an expression, it is reasonable to feel that the seeds sown on the Little League playing fields will, in their time, reflect credibility, bear fruit on the larger fields of life.

Little League fills a vital gap in our education and recreation system. It has ironed out in pioneer fashion many problems for which it was criticized earlier, but which now are proving themselves and, by example, solving awkward dilemmas for other larger and better equipped associations.

As you come together here in this sixth congress, you must take pride in the accomplishments, in the contagious Little League spirit which transcends barriers of wealth, social or religious origins to establish new horizons of family and community relationships. You must take pride in the broad research conducted by Little League baseball as a service to all sports as well as innovation to the schools and the medical profession. That this was done without prompting from other quarters as part of the standard administrative procedure bestows credit upon the foresight of the Williamsport headquarters.

In a day of extravagant exploitation and commercialism, you may take pride in the safeguards your headquarters has set up to maintain standards, avoid pitfalls. Currently, many evils seem to plague sports programs, fixing and the like, having to bring in arbitrators to knock heads together. By virtue of keeping straight ambitions toward its goals the program of Little League has kept free of political and social controversies, in fact, of gimmicks of all kinds. This is a worthy accomplishment.

Let me at this time pay a tribute to Peter J. McGovern and Harry E. Humphrey, Jr., for the leadership they have given to this great movement, with the assistance of the local organizations which have worked so closely with them. But, in my judgment, it would never have developed as it has except for their devoted guidance and the confidence they have inspired.

In going forward to the meetings which begin tomorrow morning, the congress and each district administrator assumes large responsibilities which must be discharged with wisdom and foresight. Meetings of the congress are decisive because they will chart the course and establish objectives for years ahead. The issues which face you are compelling and indeed challenging of your best efforts to advance Little League into another quarter of a century of solid progress.

But it is not enough that you come here from California and Texas, from Canada and Europe and Latin America to nominate directors, to resolve collective guidelines for the year ahead. Importantly, there is need to move together resolutely and positively to convert the vast wealth of experience and know-how that has accumulated over these first 25 years into an established unit force, and a ready reserve with which to proceed confidently, resolving problems of the future.

As I see it, these must become the aims and aspirations upon which we rest our best hopes and which we must approach squarely and consider intelligently during the next few days:

(1) We must always keep before us the interest of the boy and the wholesome educational values he can obtain from his Little League experience. Winning, to a boy, is highly important; but we must not permit our own adult ambitions to stimulate false and artificial concepts of winning at all costs, into the conscience of a youngster to the deteriment of playing the game for the fun and innocent pleasure that is in it. If we do not exercise good judgement in managing the boys we can become ridiculous in the eyes of the public and thus bestow discredit upon the entire program. There can be no disagreement on this. The boy always comes first and the local Little League field must be recognized as a healthy environ.

(2) We must unify and close ranks. We must have pride in the movement of Little League and share with one another the satisfaction of being part of so fine and rewarding a service. We must stand together and in total agreement that our purpose is common to the interests of those millions of little boys whose pride in wearing the Little League uniform can often make pale our own show of personal dedication.

(3) You who are district administrators must come forward in stature of leadership. The era of trial and error, of indecision, is

behind you. We are committed to an orderly plan of growth and development under a most favorable democratic process. It is time the district administrator takes his rightful responsibility in the chain of administrative leadership. His role becomes more important each year.

(4) The district, as an important level of organization, must take on singular identity and effectiveness. In reading the operations' manual, I was impressed by the emphasis that has been placed on the planning for the future and the obvious need for inserting new levels of administrative procedure in the structure of Little League. It is plainly apparent that the simple order which proved adequate 10 or 15 years ago is no longer sufficient. District administrators are now vested with the tools of broaded jurisdiction, better organization and hence better Little League programing generally. As one still somewhat remote from the intricate gearmeshing of the total program, it is nonetheless clear that a few and more operative Little League movement is foreseeable, when each of your 400 or more districts may become functioning entities.

(5) The final, but always constant issue, is that which deals with the personal integrity and good faith of the individual. In Little League, as in politics wherein men and women aspire to elective office, loyalty to the cause, personal integrity and self-effacing sacrifice are the hallmarks of honorable and distinguished leaders. As your manual so appropriately has phrased it—in accepting his election to office, the district administrator implies devotion to the principles and policies of Little League. On any other premise he has no place in the program.

In closing, I believe that your program can be best served and possibly only served by yourselves. The Little League movement is close to the core of America and no one could criticize you for speaking up in its defense, in calling it to the attention of all and sundry.

I believe that Little Leaguers as a group should take more interest in affairs of the country. If the trends of our Government, Nation, or State do not seem to agree with the will of the people then it becomes the plain duty of free citizens to make themselves heard, to fight every step of the way.

If the future seems dark for continuation of liberties for our children, then it is our own fault if we stand idly by without voice or spirit until we may suddenly discover the future of our children lost in regimentation and conformity. Within an international movement the size of Little League and in the nature of its unselfish instincts, there must be represented a balancing force of good judgment and commonsense reflected from the family circle and the grassroots. Inasmuch as your program produces tangible results without benefit of the tax dollar, I am sure your voice would be heard in public affairs where there is a great need for men of honest ambition and good will to express themselves.

You are doing a fine service to your country. But there is yet room to do more.

James A. Farley: The Statesman of Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., is a great American. Perhaps no single man has contributed more to the success of the Democratic Party in this century; for 50 years he has served with distinction in Government and private industry.

It is Jim Farley's personal attributes that have won him the respect and admiration of all who have had the pleasure of knowing him. He is a great and good friend and more qualified than any I know to speak on the subject of friendship. In these days, when every Congressman needs a real friend, the following item is most appropriate. It appeared in the March 31, 1963, edition of the American Weekly.

The article follows:

FRIENDSHIP: THERE ARE NO BARRIERS TO IT, ANYWHERE—EXCEPT THOSE WE CONSTRUCT OURSELVES

(By Thomas J. Fleming)

What's the key to making friends?

"Concentrate on being one yourself."

In a political and business career which has spanned over 50 years, and carried him to the topmost levels of government and industry, James A. Farley is famous for a number of things: masterminding Franklin D. Roosevelt's election, organizing the modern structure of the Democratic Party, prophesying with deft accuracy the results of forthcoming elections. But he is perhaps best known for his unique personal charm, the seemingly effortless way he makes friends by the thousands. Perhaps no one else in America is better qualified to serve as a spokesman (and vice president) of the people to people program, which is attempting to apply the principles of friendship to the problems of our turbulent world.

"The basic principles of friendship are really quite simple," he says. "At the top of the list I would put a sincere desire to help other people. Second, I think telling the truth, when a friend seeks it. I don't mean you always have to be ruthlessly frank. But when a friend asks for serious advice, I always tell him the truth, even when I know he may not like it."

Question. Can this sometimes ruin a friendship?

Answer. Temporarily, it may cause some strain. But anyone with real character will come around in a few days, and admit he would rather not be kidded.

Question. What are some problems in keeping up friendship?

Answer. One of the biggest and hardest is a friend's seeming lack of gratitude, when you do him a favor. I have tried—and sometimes succeeded—to help thousands of friends in my lifetime. Remarkably few of them ever bothered to write thank you letters. You have to guard against this kind of thoughtlessness souring your generosity. It's a minor, not a major flaw in people.

Question. What is the worst mistake a friend can make?

Answer. Asking a man for a second favor, without thanking him for the first one. Even a generous man finds this hard to take.

Question. Do you think people can spot a phony friend?

Answer. Definitely. Any mature person with a little experience in life can intuitively tell the difference between disinterested, sincere friendship, and the self-seeking kind. That's why sincerity in friendship is so important. If it isn't there, the friendship just won't last.

Question. Do you think American friendships are superfical?

Answer. No. Having rubbed elbows with thousands of people around this country and abroad, I think that most Americans know the difference between friendship and acquaintance. A friendship is a link that doesn't fade with time. I still consider the people in my little hometown of Grassy Point as my friends, and will go out of my way to help them, whenever they call on me.

Question. Do too many people today try to buy friendship?

Answer. There have always been people around with this illusion. It's a mistake, of course. You don't get friends by sharing your wealth—you get hangers-on. Friends are made by sharing your thoughts, your ambitions, by asking for help as well as giving it. A man too proud to ask for help when he needs it will never have many real friends.

Question. Can we get too sentimenal about friendship?

You can get too sentimental about anything, I guess. But I don't believe friendship can flourish without some sentiment. People who lack it impress others as cold and unfriendly. I have always thought they are more to be pitied than censured.

Question. What about making friends abroad?

Answer. The same principles prevail. I have been traveling around the world for the Coca-Cola Co. since 1941, and I have made hundreds of foreign friends, who are and always will be very important to me. Language, customs, are never barriers to friendship. In fact, I am convinced there are no barriers to friendship—except those we construct ourselves—anywhere in the world.

Before Tests Are Banned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, of California, to the "Letters to the Times" column in the April 19, 1963, edition of the New York Times:

BEFORE TESTS ARE BANNED: REPRESENTATIVE HOSMER SAYS A TREATY MUST BAR SOVIET CHEATING

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

This refers to your March 25 editorial claiming U.S. test-ban treaty proposals would assure detection of clandestine Soviet underground testing; Dr. David R. Inglis's letter of April 5 associating those who dispute the claim with such words as "irresponsible," "ridiculous," and "sabotage," and James J. Wadsworth's April 8 letter charging the GOP conference committee on nuclear testing seized upon one bit of testimony to present what he describes as biased and misleading findings.

In his own way, each of the writers exemplifies a common and perilous obliviousness to facts which destroy the claim and which were placed on public record during Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hearings March 5 to March 12.

The editorial writer apparently accepted and reiterated the Disarmament Agency's self-assessment of its own handiwork.

Dr. Inglis refused to face facts in a manner characteristic of the highly emotional fringe of test-ban proponents whenever they are confronted with facts which establish the "big hole" for Soviet cheating in administration treaty proposals.

REDUCING SEISMIC SIGNALS

Mr. Wadsworth haplessly based his criticism on the Disarmament Agency's weird contortion of these facts which culminated in its erroneous assertion that the "big hole" in Soviet test cheating depends for its existence on carrying out clandestine activities in U.S.S.R. alluvial soil. Actually the "big hole" exists, as explained below, because of the size to which seismic signals from significant cheat tests can be reduced irrespective of geology, not (unfortunately for Mr. Wadsworth, who staked part of his prestige on it) upon testing in scarce Soviet alluvium.

The indisputable facts which establish the existence of the "big hole," brought to light during the Joint Committee's hearings, were:

Disarmament Agency witnesses testified that both current Anglo-U.S. proposals, and new ones soon to be announced, will rely on seismic observatories outside the Soviet Union to discover underground cheat testing inside its borders. Only a token number of unreliable delayed-reporting, tamper-prone unmanned and, as yet uninvented, "black box" devices will be demanded for placement in Russia.

The Defense Department's top seismologist, Dr. Carl Romney, testified that the capability of seismographs to record intelligible data is physically limited by natural earth background noise which occurs everywhere. Its effect on seismographs is similar to static on a shortwave radio: unless a seismic signal is larger and stronger than background noise, it is simply unintelligible.

Seismic signals double the background noise level are needed to "detect" seismic disturbances, whether they be created by man or by nature. Signals 10 to 20 times the background noise level must be recorded to be able to "distinguish" unnatural seismic events in the U.S.S.R. from earthquakes.

Recording signals big enough to make this distinction are the key to arousing the suspicion of monitors and of setting a treaty's on-site inspection machinery into motion. Here the "big hole" comes in.

SIMILARITY TO EARTHQUAKES

It exists because Soviet scientists can keep the seismic signals from secret test so small in size by the time they emerge from Soviet borders that even though they are detected, they cannot be distinguished from hundreds of similar sized small earthquakes occurring annually in the U.S.S.R. This can be done by holding yields down below three kilotons and testing in formations like alluvium which transmit seismic waves poorly; testing in underground cavities which decouple explosive shock from surrounding earth and drastically reduce the seismic signal, or a combination of the foregoing.

This eliminates the key to arousing suspicion and dispatching on-site inspectors. While the United States stopped all its testing, in effect it would simply be trusting a Soviet promise not to test by these undiscoverable means.

The Atomic Energy Commission Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, testified that the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of military interest, except very large yield super H-bombs which the Soviets already have anyway, can be perfected by tests carried out under these conditions of undiscoverability. General Betts revealed that even without a need for secrecy approximately one-half of U.S. underground tests in Nevada are carried on precisely at these very low, undiscoverable yields.

These are the facts not faced by the abovementioned writers. They must be faced if nuclear test-ban negotiations are to be carried on with the realism American citizens demand of their Government.

Even the most ardent test-ban proponent should join in vigorously demanding closure of the "big hole" by installation of manned seismic observatories inside the U.S.S.R. Only an effective treaty which inhibits nuclear progress to the same degree on both sides of the Iron Curtain has any chance of reducing the risks of today's nuclear war. A "big hole" treaty would stop our nuclear progress and create the new risk of surreptitious Soviet testing to gain the surprise military superiority needed to back up a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, *April 15, 1963.*

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Thomas J. Rice, a 17-year-old junior at Regis High School, Eau Claire, Wis., was recently chosen as Wisconsin's winner of the 16th annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am very proud that a Ninth District student won the statewide contest and wish to call his essay, "What Freedom Means to Me," to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

"We the people of the United States of America. * * *" Think of the ideals that put freedom into that pronoun "we." These two common letters supply the lifeblood, people, behind the thought of freedom, personality, and courage. For truly, without men, freedom is a dream; and without personality and courage, men are helpless.

To any man—to us—personality means the individualism of freedom; for we each have our very own. We want to enjoy it and be proud of it. We want it to be as great as a personality can be. It means a life to us—to any man.

For freedom is the developing of a personality—the personality that gives men a mountain and the longing to climb it, gives them a challenge and the desire to conquer it, gives them a star and the wish to reach it. Pity the man without a star; his personality is incomplete. He's like a magnet in a cage. He has no freedom. Iron ideals are attracted to him, and he likes their strong points, but he can never quite touch them. He likes the ability of his friends, the nails, to hold rising ideas together, to unify hopes, and to make them firm. But he can't quite touch them. He can't pick up their sharper points and use them to give himself a broader, well-rounded personality. He likes the ideas his typewriter key friends have expressed; but he can't communicate with the keys. He's locked in. His personality is depressed; he loses friends; he has no ideas to cherish—all through loss of freedom. For being able to develop a personality is freedom.

But a growing personality is just the privilege of freedom; courage is its duty. Freedom without courage is complacency. Without courage, we are content at the bottom of the mountain. The challenge will be unconquered, and freedom will be lost. For freedom gives us the privilege of a personality, and the personality must have courage or the privilege will be lost.

It takes courage to be one of 6,000 privileged men crucified along the Appian Way, knowing that your wife and children will be sold in Rome's slave market for less than the price of a horse. Yet you are happy. You were born a slave, and under Spartacus you tasted freedom for 4 years. You feasted on the thought of Richard Lovelace: "Stone walls do not a prison make, nor iron bars a cage." You knew well that when the courage of freedom is defeated, there is no battle to win, no challenge to conquer.

But to most of us, courage won't mean death; but rather, a way of life—a life to pound nails day after day; to check accounts day after day; to drive a truck day after day. But still, a life to be lived in its fullest; a life that we must not live half-heartedly; a life guided by the words of the Reverend Bob Richards: "It's not where you are that counts, but in which direction you are going." And we know that we are going toward a star, helped along by courage.

We only hope that courage will never be defeated. If our personalities give us the words, we want to be able to say them. It means a life to us. It means freedom.

Yes, think of the men, the blood, the ideas, the hopes and prayers that put meaning behind the Hungarian freedom fighters—put meaning into the "we" who "hold these truths to be self-evident."

Cuba: Some Suggestions for Multilateral Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing discussion and debate concerning our Cuban policy, I wish to submit for consideration some constructive proposals for multilateral action which have been made by a professor at San Fernando Valley State College. This letter was printed in the western edition of the New York Times on February 28, 1963:

TO STRENGTHEN OAS—SUGGESTIONS OFFERED TO INCREASE INTER-AMERICAN UNITY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Cuban situation, the tension evident between Canada and the United States, and the widespread anti-Yankee feeling south of the Rio Grande all point, in this writer's view, to a great need: the strengthening of the Inter-American Community. There has been a great deal of discussion in regard to the North Atlantic Alliance, but very little mention of the fact that, after all, the United States and Canada are a part of the Americas.

I would like to propose that the Organization of American States be strengthened in the following manner:

Canada should be invited to membership along with the other American members of the Commonwealth;

An Inter-American Congress, representing the people of the Americas, should be organized. This body would help to cement the feeling of community by providing a common meeting place for delegates who would not be attached to a particular nation's diplomatic corps. It could be empowered to make advisory declarations on matters of concern to the Americas as a whole and it could, perhaps, be granted the power to enforce the OAS Council to consider a par-

ticular issue. It would, in effect, reflect American opinion.

The delegates to the Congress could be elected by districts of, say, 5 million persons, with universal suffrage. This would, of course, give the larger nationalities heavy representaton; however, such must be the case if the people of the Americas are to be represented. In any case, the OAS Council would continue to represent nations.

A multinational OAS military force should be created to handle acts of aggression in the Americas; and the concept of an Inter-American Common Market should be discussed.

Almost 140 years have passed since the first proposals for Pan-American unity were made. It is time that something was done to make the dream of American unity a reality, for there may not be much time left.

JACK D. FORBES.

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF., *February 8, 1963.*

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Hitler's invasion of Poland was the signal for a Second World War, it was the signal for treachery and deceit, it was the beginning of the collapse of the Balkan countries before Hitler's might; it was also the beginning of something far more. It was the beginning of the mass extermination of an entire race of people, for the Jews of Poland were to be erased by methods even now almost impossible to comprehend.

When the victorious Germans first marched into Warsaw in the fall of 1939, the wheels were already beginning to turn in the plan to take care of the Jewish problem, although very few realized what was in store. First there were the restrictions: Jews were forbidden to work for the government, to work in key industries, to bake bread, to earn more than a certain amount of money, to buy or sell from any outsider, to use public transportation, to possess gold or jewelry, and each had to wear a distinctive armband. How could any man be asked to do these things? If such were to happen to us we would fight back. But no, we have our homes, children, our past lives and all that we own and hold dear to think of. Maybe we must accept, because is it not more important to survive?

Next came the ghetto. All Jews had to move to a certain part of town, to be walled in so as not to contaminate others with their Jewishness. They could only leave their walled area by pass, to work in the factories supporting the German war effort. Surely now is the time to stop permitting ourselves to be so pushed around, but wait—we are still together, we are still a family, and we can move all of our possessions to the new area. Living may be more crowded, freedom even more restricted, but we are still alive.

Some found a chance to escape the ugly city life by going off on a work gang, into the countryside. The Germans needed men to help in the war plants. At least that is what they said when, first by asking for volunteers, then by force, they took whole families into their "work camps." They would suddenly arrive at a given section in the ghetto, call all inhabitants out of the buildings, and, if necessary, drag them off to the distribution center for shipment to the countryside. Families were broken up, children torn from mothers' arms, all property left behind was taken by the state to cover the Jewish debt. Yet still, in the ghetto, organized resistance to what was happening could not be started. Still the people clung to what they had left, hoping that quotas for the work gangs would soon be filled, that they would be left alone, even if isolated from the rest of the city. After all, there was a shortage of factory workers within the city, so those who were working for the Germans or their Polish supporters felt safe in their position.

Then rumors began to circulate. Those families that were sent off to the work camps in the countryside—nothing was ever heard from them again. Spies were sent out to follow the trains of misery, to learn what was happening, to confirm or deny some stories that were so incredible few dared repeat them. The spies went out, they saw, they returned. The work camps, they were death camps. The potential workers—their only work was to strip off their clothes and be marched into the huge communal showers, to be washed with poison gas, to be slaughtered by the tens of thousands, to have their bones cremated, to literally disappear without a trace. This was Hitler's answer to the Jewish problem.

Back in the Ghetto of Warsaw the stories began to circulate with more authority. As the awful truth dawned some were stunned into apathy, but others, many others, in the agony of their realty, broke down the resistance to concerted action—if death was all that awaited them, then they would not meet it voluntarily, they would fight.

The Nazi occupation authorities, and their henchmen, finally decided in reply to the insistent demands of Himmler and Eichmann in Berlin to get on with the job, that the remaining Jews in the ghetto were to be marched out to the distribution centers, to be prepared for shipment to the countryside, to annihilation. Word of this intent was received in the ghetto. Time had come to resist.

It was Passover. It was the time when Jews the world over remember the lot of their people in Egypt under the Pharaohs, when God sent down his plagues upon the Egyptians, when all the first born of the country suffered death, only the Jews remaining untouched. It was the time of year when one remembered Moses leading his people as the Red Sea parted, and they beheld before them freedom in the land of their ancestors. But this was the evening of April 18, 1943, the Jewish ghetto quarter of Warsaw. There was no Moses to lead these people to freedom, only their dedication and courage could give them honor. There was hope at least for a brief quiet time to celebrate the occasion with prayer and the breaking of unleavened bread. Not even this small hope was answered. The word spread quickly, the Germans were coming, they were marching to the walls. It was time to prepare a greeting for them.

And what a greeting it was. Hand grenades, gunfire, liquid fire, fists, and stones. The SS men were taken unawares, they fell back, leaving many dead in their wake. It was long in coming and they had suffered through unspeakable indignities, but the time had arrived—the people of the Ghetto were in revolt.

Nazi armies returned, and were driven back again. Ammunition of the ghetto fighters was running low, they were driven underground into bunkers, or hideouts in attics of buildings, yet the fight went on. During the day they hid out in cramped quarters without water and with little food. At night the streets were theirs, and they used the time to strengthen their positions.

Then disaster struck. The Germans set fire to the entire area, burning the fighters from their attic cover; all supplies were cut off, there was no water, no food, the women and children had to remain underground all the time. Some, men and women, with spirits broken, marched out to the Germans to surrender, the others held out. They held out against constant attack from the ground and air, against hunger and thirst, against fear of death yet fear of not dying before the Nazis got a hold of them. On May 8 the Germans launched a concentrated attack on the central bunker containing the headquarters operation. All 200 defenders, including the core of the leadership, were killed or committed suicide to avoid capture. Still, some held out to the end of May, a small group of heroic men and women. They held out even longer than did Poland herself against the German invaders. Finally, after almost the entire ghetto area had been flattened, with only 8 buildings still standing, resistance was broken. Of the 40,000 Jews in the ghetto at the beginning of the fighting only a few hundred were left to filter out, some through the gas-filled sewers, to continue fighting in the forests.

The revolution had been broken, but the spirit and heroism of the participants, the faith which made them withstand such torture, these are not forgotten. The State of Israel today, and the fact of its existence, stands as a living and dynamic monument to the heroic Jews of the Warsaw ghetto, who laid down their lives for life—for future life in freedom from persecution of their people.

On this 20th anniversary of the heroic uprising of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto against their Nazi persecuters, let us remember with awe their heroism, let us not forget what they were fighting against, let us honor with our prayers

the memory of their deeds, and in doing this rededicate ourselves to the preservation of all of the freedoms denied to them.

Pay Cut Came in a Week To Make You Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of military pay is one which vitally concerns the morale of our military services and, as a result, the security of our Nation. I am concerned that the much-needed economy drive seems to have become a false economy drive and is directed almost exclusively at our military people who have been underpaid for many years.

The following article, written by Mr. John J. Ford which appeared in the April 24 issue of Navy Times, clearly makes this point. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues.

(By John J. Ford)

It was a week on Capitol Hill filled with events which did not alter but illuminated—rather sadly—our time. It was a week to make you wonder. While the Armed Services Committee was approving a $600 million cut in the military pay raise bill unanimously recommended by its personnel subcommittee the House was approving a supplemental appropriation bill that included $450 million for accelerated public works—$450 million to be committed between now and June 30 on local construction projects like streets, sewerage facilities, municipal buildings and hospitals in depressed areas.

The cut in the pay bill was a frank bowing to the economy wave pressure in the House. The bill was carefully scrutinized to see where cuts could be made to save as much money as possible.

The Armed Services Committee cut the total monthly increase for each officer $26 below what Defense had recommended.

In its report accompanying the bill the committee reproduced a table showing that "military compensation has not kept pace with pay of other groups." The table shows that since 1952, pay of professional and technical people has gone up 49 percent, pay of production workers 44.8 percent, pay of civil servants up 39.8 percent (including the raises starting next January). By comparison, even with the pay bill voted by the committee, the pay of military men will have gone up only 28 percent since 1952.

This admission is important. It is one thing to say Congress has been slow to get around to adjust military pay or has neglected military pay somewhat in the last 4 years. But in publishing this comparison and then approving the bill, the committee is, in effect, recommending that Congress set it as national policy that military remuneration should drop in relation to other segments of the economy, that military compensation be at a lower comparative level than it has been in the past.

When one considers this in relation to the $450 million accelerated public works bill one wonders.

While it was ridiculed by its opponents as a make-work proposal involving swimming pools, ski slides and the like the public works money on the whole will go for permanent public improvements and will create some jobs.

But the public works measure, and other measures passed recently, got nowhere near the scrutiny given the military pay bill.

One of the public works items is an auditorium in a town in Pennsylvania, which could hardly be called a necessary public facility. It will cost $3.6 million. While spending for it was being approved, the Armed Services unit was cutting out uniform allowances for regular officers. The saving: $3.6 million.

During the week there was a story in the paper about a Pentagon long-range study (was there ever a short-range study?) of retiree problems pointing—as has been pointed out here before—that construction of military hospitals has been reduced in line with the recent policy of excluding beds for military retirees. Providing hospital care for these retirees will be a problem in the future, the story said, since the Government apparently doesn't feel it can provide for them in military facilities.

Among the items approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for inclusion in the public works spending program are 30 hospital construction items in Pennsylvania alone.

When Congress cut the number of requested beds in the Long Beach Naval Hospital—an all-service facility—from the 500 requested to 350 it was common knowledge it was cutting out beds that would be used by the military retirees living in southern California.

Among the items in the public works package was the replacement of a civilian hospital in San Diego. In all, six civilian hospital projects in California will get Federal money.

Among the items in the public works bill is expansion of a hospital in Miami Beach. One has a little difficulty envisioning Miami Beach as a depressed area.

Unless I miss my guess, the workers on these construction projects will be making union wages. Most of them will be making more money than new ensigns and second lieutenants in the service. All raises for these new officers were cut by the Armed Services Committee to save $150 million. They haven't had a raise since 1952.

In the Pentagon they have men who ride three-wheeled bikes around all day delivering messages. They are called corridor boys because the gag is that if you let them get out of their native corridor you will never find them again. The monthly pay of a corridor boy is more than the total pay and allowances of an ensign or a second lieutenant.

The Armed Services Committee cut for recomputation for military men retired before June 1958, in order to save $30 million. Two weeks earlier, the House approved a $23 million increase in Federal Government spending for "forest access roads." Total spending next year for "forest access roads," mostly in the Pacific Northwest, will be $60 million.

The Armed Services Committee cut out combat pay, which would pay at the maximum some $1 million a year to some 4,000 men subject to enemy fire in Vietnam. Two weeks earlier, in approving the Interior Department appropriation, Congress voted $1 million in assistance to the States for tree planting. The Interior appropriation also included $10 million for a "wetlands program." It would create refuges for migratory ducks, including some in Minnesota, Land of 10,000 Lakes.

During the week there was the tragic news of the *Thresher*. The lowest paid man in the crew was Robert H. Gosnell, SA(SG). "SG" means he went to submarine basic school. In base pay, clothing allowance, sea pay, and submarine pay, he got a total of $148.20 a month—$1,776 a year. Under the pay bill as reported he would not have gotten any raise.

Finally, there was the special bill introduced for Sgt. Noble Frank Smith. Smith was a Marine sergeant in Shanghai at the start of World War II. He was ordered to the Philippines, leaving his wife and young child behind. He went through the Bataan death march and his wife and child were internees in Shanghai throughout the war. Smith is now a farmer in Illinois with a family of five. A few weeks ago he got a bill from the State Department for $1,421.92. It was for the cost of subsistence and medical attention the State Department gave his wife and child through the Swiss Government while they were interned in Shanghai.

As I said, it was a week to make you wonder.

National Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the 7-day period beginning April 21, 1963, is National Library Week. It is probably one of the really worthwhile such observances in the course of the year as I look at a compilation of weeks designated by trade associations to commemorate doughnuts, dolls, and dimples. It is a time for a genuine recognition of a genuine contribution to civilization and the unfolding of the fullest development of mankind.

As one reads the records of history, the book has earned the gratitude of mankind by the nature of the enemies it makes—Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, and the petty censors of our towns, cities, and States with their long scissors and narrow minds. And the book has earned the gratitude of mankind by those volumes which have lifted the spirits of mankind and fed the hungry minds of inquisitive men who, in a phrase of Albert Camus, seek the desperate encounter between the human spirit and the silence of the universe.

Therefore, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles—both from the May 9, 1962, issue of the British periodical, Punch, entitled "**Learn With BOOK**" and "The Little Professor":

LEARN WITH BOOK

(By R. J. Heathorn)

A new aid to rapid—almost magical—learning has made its appearance. Indications are that if it catches on all the electronic gadgets will be so much junk.

The new device is known as built-in orderly organized knowledge. The makers generally call it by its initials, BOOK.

Many advantages are claimed over the old-style learning and teaching aids on which most people are brought up nowadays. It has no wires, no electric circuit to break down. No connection is needed to an electricity power point. It is made entirely without mechanical parts to go wrong or need replacement.

Anyone can use BOOK, even children, and it fits comfortably into the hands. It can be conveniently used sitting in an armchair by the fire.

How does this revolutionary, unbelievably easy invention work? Basically, BOOK consists only of a large number of paper sheets. These may run to hundreds where BOOK covers a lengthy program of information. Each sheet bears a number in sequence, so that the sheets cannot be used in the wrong order.

To make it even easier for the user to keep the sheets in the proper order, they are held firmly in place by a special locking device called a "binding."

Each sheet of paper presents the user with an information sequence in the form of symbols, which he absorbs optically for automatic registration on the brain. When one sheet has been assimilated, a flick of the finger turns it over and further information is found on the other side.

By using both sides of each sheet in this way a great economy is effected, thus reducing both the size and cost of BOOK. No buttons need to be pressed to move from one sheet to another to open or close BOOK or to start it working. BOOK may be taken up at anytime and used by merely opening it instantly for use. Nothing has to be connected up or switched on. The user may turn at will to any sheet, going backward or forward as he please. A sheet is provided near the beginning as a location finder for any required information sequence.

A small accessory, available at trifling extra cost, is the BOOKmark. This enables the user to pick up his program where he left off on the previous learning session. BOOKmark is versatile and may be used in any BOOK.

The initial cost varies with the size and subject matter. Already a vast range of BOOKs is available, covering every conceivable subject and adjusted to different levels of aptitude. One BOOK, small enough to be held in the hands, may contain an entire learning schedule.

Once purchased, BOOK requires no further upkeep cost; no batteries or wires are needed, since the motive power, thanks to an ingenious device patented by the makers, is supplied by the brain of the user.

BOOKs may be stored on handy shelves and for ease of reference the program schedule is normally indicated on the back of the binding.

Altogether the built-in orderly organized knowledge seems to have great advantages with no drawbacks. We predict a big future for it.

THE LITTLE PROFESSOR

(By Gordon Grindstaff)

Once upon a semester there lived a little old professor who was dear to his students. The lovable little man had much to offer his pupils and the world about him. He worked diligently. He was filled with kindness and good ideas, and he gave freely of these possessions.

Along with these exceptional gifts, the professor had one highly unusual characteristic: out of the middle of his head grew a bright red geranium. This geranium was more than a physical appendage. Indeed, it was part of his personality. The flower contributed to his brightness, both in its color and in its distinctiveness. Because it set him apart as an individual, the little professor looked out on the world with a fresh, vigorous perspective.

From the beginning, people of various callings commented on the professor's unusual attribute.

Some of the remarks were approving.

"How exceptional," said one.

"Colorful," remarked another.

"What a fresh point of view," exclaimed a third.

Other remarks were disapproving.

"How strange," remarked a professor from out of town.

"Vulgar," cried the marshal of the ladies' league.

"It's antireligious," sermonized a preacher.

"Shouldn't be allowed in our society," barked a major general.

"He doesn't have any right," reasoned a lawyer.

"He's harmful to little children," wrote the chairman of the State parents' association.

"Obviously he's a Communist," concluded a politician.

The clamor grew so great that one day the president of the university called for the professor.

"Now, professor, let's be reasonable," pleaded the President. "It might be satisfactory if you grew your own hat. Or even your own wig. But a geranium, preposterous."

"But president * * *" counterpleaded the little old professor. "This flower is me. I feel comfortable sprouting it. I can't keep it from growing and blossoming." A tear came into the professor's eye.

"I'm not harming anyone with my geranium, am I?"

The president of the university shrugged his shoulders and referred the professor to a psychiatrist, who analyzed, "He really ought to be put away in an institution—different, of course, from the one he's in."

"Unless," he continued, "we can change him."

The psychiatrist urged the president of the university to appoint a committee to decide the fate of the little professor.

Representatives of the village and the university huddled in conference. At last they arrived at a decision.

"Sorry," announced the chairman. "You must change."

The village barber performed the pruning operation.

"Don't feel bad, professor," he snipped. "Just pretend that you have a geranium on top of your head." And he cut away all the flower.

Without his geranium, the little old professor withered. He could not work diligently. His kindness began to wilt away. His good ideas no longer flowered. He spent his days sitting and staring.

The village and university folk suddenly realized that they had made a dreadful mistake. The president called another conference.

"We didn't destroy the flower," said the president sadly. "We destroyed our little old professor."

Then all the village and university folk decided that they would try to make amends by planting geraniums in their frontyards to symbolize the professor's flower. Each citizen bedded one red gerarium in the most prominent location he could find.

The president then turned to the people and said only one thing. "Each of us has his own geranium," spoke the president softly. He paused. "Each of us in his own way."

The professor looked up, and, for an instant, the people imagined that they saw a sparkle come into the little professor's eyes.

Barbara Ward Writes: How the Poor Can Help the Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the noted British political scientist, Barbara Ward, has set forth some knowledgeable views on the role of the free world in aiding the underdeveloped nations. Excerpts from a recent article in the Sunday London Observer follow:

Ever since 1947, the Western World has been able to congratulate itself on avoiding the economic errors and uncertainties which, in 1929, brought the prewar economic system to disaster.

The Marshall plan, the Common Market, foreign aid, international agencies of cooperation—the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs—all these innovations suggested that some log-jam in Western policy had been decisively broken and that fresh political and economic energies were being mobilized to produce a working and productive version of the market economy.

The prospect was exhilarating. But now we have to ask ouselves whether it was not an illusion after all. Even before the Brussels breakdown, the New World was not looking quite so brave. Since General de Gaulle's exercise of his veto, there are growing reasons for wondering whether it is even really new.

Today, the stimulus of reconstruction is long since spent, the boom has petered out in Britain and North America, while Western Europe shows the early symptoms of slackening steam. Britain has its National Economic Development Council on the model of France's Planning Commission. The members of the North Atlantic Council have formally accepted a 4-percent rate of expansion as a long-term objective; their Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development exists as a joint instrument for working out its larger implications. Inside the Europe Economic Community, the Brussels Commission has taken the first steps toward the projection of growth rates for the Common Market as a whole.

Between these outer realities of the developing world and the old, hard, industrial Atlantic core, there could be a new convergence of interest—Western capital, trade and technique going out to build up new centers of production and consumption and, by so doing, bringing about that vast enfranchisement of new consumers which the steadily rising productions of Western fields and factories demands.

All these hints and prospects began to add up to a sustained Western policy to raise the purchasing power and improve the trading outlets of the developing world. In this way—just as the workers of the West were drawn at last into the mass consumer economy—the millions of marginal migrants of Africa and Asia and Latin America would be brought across the threshold of the modern economy; their human needs would be satisfied and they would thus become a permanent factor in sustaining world economy.

Any international policy for sustained growth—whether by a concerted 4 percent annual expansion in the Atlantic arena or by a sustained effort to bring the developing continents effectively into the world market—demands the closest, the most sustained and the most fraternal of relationships between America and Europe. Neither Britain nor the United States can achieve the spurt of growth needed to break from their 2½ percent tradition of expansion without wholehearted cooperation from the countries of the Common Market.

It is even more certain that the needs of the developing world cannot be fully served without intimate Western cooperation. A Common Market cut off by high tariffs, open only to a group of African associated states, producing huge agricultural surpluses and financing uncontrolled exports through its import levies could quickly stimulate a rival protectionism in the United States.

A discernible movement forward toward a clear Western strategy for domestic growth and economic aid and stimulus to the developing world has been cut short. The momentum has died out of the West just as its profoundest economic problem—the problem of sustaining demand—has come to the surface once again.

There would thus seem to be only one path of wisdom for Britain—to seek with America and with its friends in Europe to rescue the great alliance from its Gaullist blind alley and get it back on the road of European unity and Atlantic partnership, the only discernible road leading away from the abyss.

Howard E. Whitaker of Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Howard E. Whitaker, chairman of the board of Mead Corp., was extended a rare and high honor by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina. A concurrent resolution was unanimously adopted by both houses extending to Mr. Whitaker an invitation to address a joint assembly on the Southern pulp and paper industry today. Mr. Whitaker very graciously accepted and a few moments ago addressed the joint assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this outstanding address to the attention of the Congress.

THE SOUTHERN PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY TODAY

(Remarks of H. E. Whitaker, chairman of the board, the Mead Corp., presented to joint session of the General Assembly, Columbia, S.C., April 24, 1963)

It is a rare privilege, indeed, to come before a joint session of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina as a representative of the pulp and paper industry in the South.

And, each one of the 86,000 men and women who work in our industry in the South appreciates this opportunity to tell the story of our growth and development. It is, we think, a great story—a story about a $500 million annual market for the purchase of pulpwood; and a story about the product of 60 percent of the Nation's pulp and 40 percent of the Nation's production of paper and paperboard.

As you know so well, in one generation the South has in many areas pulled far ahead of the Nation's economic development. The uninformed might ask "Why?"

And, we submit, a major factor is leadership.

Leadership which has sponsored and developed a better balance between agriculture and industry.

Industrial leadership like that of the pulp and paper industry which has fostered the growth from a few plants in pre-World War II years to 73 primary mills valued at $3.7 billion today.

Scientific leadership made possible the advances we have achieved in the development of trees in the 12 Southern States where growth of this resource exceeds consumption.

The result of combining natural resources, resourceful people and leadership with vision is summed up in the statistic: the annual value of shipments from the pulp and paper mills in the South amounts to $2 billion—$2 billion worth of goods which go to all parts of the States, and even overseas to the other continents.

This industry is, indeed, a realized economic dream: trees, people, amazing research and product development.

There are 73 primary pulp and paper mills in the South and they are distributed throughout the region as follows: Alabama has 8 mills, Arkansas has 4, Florida has 10, Georgia has 10, Louisiana has 8, Mississippi has 6, North Carolina has 5, Oklahoma has 1, South Carolina has 5, Tennessee has 5, Texas has 4, and Virginia has 7.

As a result, in terms of payrolls, purchases of pulpwood, forestry and reforestation activities, and aid to landowners, the economic impact of the pulp and paper industry is felt strongly in each of the 12 Southern States.

It has meant a higher standard of living for many thousands of families, money to spend, whole communities of new houses, cars on the bustling highways—yes, we have even added to the traffic problem wherever we operate.

I am certain that you know that pulpwood is harvested in more than 90 percent of the counties in the South. Moving by truck, train, and barge, every day in the week more than 90,000 cords of pulpwood are loaded in these communities, providing employment for tens of thousands of people.

Each pulpwood truck, a familiar sight on the roads in the South, represents about $25,000 in annual income to the community in which it operates.

Pulpwood comes from the forest, and today's forests are being improved because man works with nature. Professional foresters furnish know-how which gives landowners a new concept of wise forest management.

Southern pulp and paper mills employ 1,400 foresters. Important among their specialized tasks is counseling landowners on keeping woodlands fully productive. This is necessary because the pulp and paper industry is dependent on individual land owners for about 80 percent of its pulpwood supply.

The industry itself owns 11 percent of southern forest land; the largest part, 74 percent in relatively small tracts, is owned by 1.6 million people. And, these are the people the industry's foresters endeavor to reach with the story of the fundamentals of tree farming for profit.

The foresters make recommendations to landowners, and often they assist the landowner in marking trees to be thinned for pulpwood, and choosing fine specimens to be left as seed trees. He shows the owner how wornout land can be reclaimed for trees. He helps the landowner get seedlings and tree-planting machinery, and he counsels with him on protecting his trees from fire, insects, and disease.

This is an industry service and it is a good one, for every year a growing number of southern farmers are keeping their woodlands in top production.

Besides the direct help the pulp and paper industry gives landowners toward wise forest management, it sponsors living examples such as pilot forests, school forests, and other demonstration areas. The pilot forest program, for example, includes woodlands on 88 southern farms. Each pilot forest has one target: to demonstrate to landowners how to get the most from the forest. Many started on undeveloped woodlands. Today, these projects—averaging more than 80 acres each—are great, green laboratories. Each stands as a practical example of maximum woodland production. And, these projects are profitable to the landowner.

The industry sponsors 170 school forest programs each year. These programs provide woodland-management training.

Five-day forestry training camps in 8 States reach more than 1,000 young men, mostly 4-H Club and FFA members, with intensive forestry training plus recreation, each year. The industry has the valuable cooperation of State forest services, extension services, and vocational education departments in these projects.

And, the South's pulp and paper companies are working today for better trees tomorrow. In operations on their own woodlands, they set high standards in forest protection, harvesting, reforestation, and all other facets of scientific forest management.

These operations are the means to an end—product improvement. And, product improvement begins essentially with the tree. That's why many pulp and paper mills in the South are working on intensive programs for the selective breeding of trees with superior qualities.

In years to come, improved trees guided in growth by full expression of man's scientific knowledge will, we believe, change the characteristics of forests throughout the South.

The trees will be better able to resist attacks from insects and disease; they will grow even faster than trees grow today. Those trees will have a greater yield of fiber per cubic foot, and they will have a wood structure from which paper and board products, as well as other forest products, of superior quality, can be manufactured.

Research programs, southwide in scope, for creating strains of "pedigreed pines" are being advanced by foresters employed by pulp and paper companies. The first step in these projects is selection of superior trees in the forest—the 1-in-10,000 kind—from which can be propagated superior tree orchards.

Encouraging results already have been achieved. Within a few years, companies engaged in research for genetically improving species of trees expect to have an abundant supply of superior seedlings available both for planting on their own lands and for supplying individual forestry-minded landowners.

Pine trees are the principal source of raw material for the region's pulp and paper industry. Through the discovery of new techniques and production methods, however, many mills are utilizing increasing quantities of the hardwoods which constitute about half of the South's forest acreage. Currently, a fifth of the pulpwood supply comes from hardwood.

The industry also has made marked progress toward utilization of the whole tree. Twenty-five years ago, slabs and edgings from sawmill operations were virtually useless except for fuel and represented, in most cases, a disposal problem.

Today, in contrast, some 900 sawmills, veneer mills and other wood-using plants have chipmaking machinery that converts this "waste" material into chips for pulping at the papermills. Chips contribute upward of 12 percent of the pulp and paper industry's raw materials supply.

In addition, our mills use the waste bark for generating electric power and process steam. Some mills manufacture the bark into mulch and other organic fertilizer products; and such byproducts as turpentine and tall oil go into paints, detergents, printer's ink, and other products.

At every step, from better trees to better products, the pulp and paper industry's research and development programs are going forward. Scientists and trained technicians in company laboratories are constantly at work on projects to discover new products and better ways to make better the traditional products of pulp, paper, and paperboard. The southern universities are helping in this work—and we look to them to provide the scientists of the future.

For example, they are seeking to produce paper of greater durability, more strength,

and adaptability to an ever-widening spectrum of end uses. They work with test tubes, microscopes, and many kinds of specialized machines to unlock more and more of the secrets in the magic of wood fiber.

Such studies are resulting in exciting discoveries of additional uses for paper. The prospects are almost endless and serve to assure continued markets for wood from the South's abundant and fast-growing forests.

Now, what about the future of the pulp and paper industry?

Well, let's look at the basic factor underlying the industry: paper usage. Last year, each individual in the United States used an average of 435 pounds of paper and paperboard products.

And, per capita consumption of paper may be expected to increase as a result of new uses and applications constantly being developed for paper and board materials.

It is a recognized fact that as national wealth and the standard of living increase, so does consumption of paper. With normal population growth and continued improvement in the Nation's standard of living, the pulp and paper industry must continue to expand to meet demands for its products.

The bright future for paper use is backed up by assurances that the pulp and paper industry's scientific forestry practices of today, and those of its landowning neighbors, will provide an adequate supply of raw materials tomorrow.

The South may take justifiable pride in its accomplishments. The South's forests consistently produce well over half of the Nation's total supply of pulpwood and they are growing one-third faster than they did 25 years ago. The region's pulp and paper mills convert this basic raw material into more than 46,000 tons of finished product every day.

I am confident that expansions will increase this impressive output substantially in the future.

For the South's pulp and paper industry, the past is prologue. Growing trees, nurtured by men of vision, are symbolic of the South's new vigor and its economic promise for years to come.

Articulate Fuzziness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Canton Repository has once again cut through the rhetoric to get at the heart of what is wrong with increased spending and increased Federal debt, which I wish to include with my remarks:

[From the Canton Repository, Apr. 22, 1963]

ARTICULATE FUZZINESS

The articulate young man in the White House was rephrasing old arguments the other day when he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors that any sizable cut in his budget would imperal the economy.

President Kennedy's presentation should be articulate—he's said it many times before. But his thesis makes no more sense now than it did when he started hammering away at it last year.

What he has been saying right along is that a tax cut will touch off some sort of phenomenal surge in the rate of national growth—a surge powerful enough to offset the mushrooming deficit from continued spending increases.

That still sounds like awfully fuzzy economics. The whole idea cuts harshly across the grain of accepted and orthodox economic practice.

The President alluded to an average family man in a so-called Random Village to illustrate the effect his proposal would have in stimulating jobs and personal income.

But if this same average family man in Random Village applied the Kennedy technique to his own budget, how far would he get? How could he wriggle out of the financial chaos that would be certain to follow a spend more-earn less policy? He would be off to the Random Village poorhouse in short order.

An essential difference, of course, is that Mr. Average Family Man is spending his own money. The Government doesn't have any money of its own to spend. It, too, is spending Mr. Average Family Man's money.

And that is one of the places where Mr. Kennedy's up-spend-down-tax proposal falls flat. Since the Government can spend only what it gets from the taxpayer, wouldn't the taxpayer benefit if the Government spent less?

It makes sense to let the taxpayer spend his money for what he knows he wants instead of signing it over to bureaucrats who spend it for what they think the taxpayer should have.

Kennedy told the editors that "the right way to a balanced budget is to seek first a balanced economy. The tax cuts I have proposed, and the level of expenditures I have proposed, have been carefully fitted together with that chief objective in mind."

That is like trying to put two magnets face to face with the idea that they'll come squarely together and stick. But it doesn't work that way. The tax-cut magnet, designed to pull dollars back to the taxpayer, doesn't jibe with the spending magnet which pulls dollars in the other direction.

The President might be well advised to take a look at what an Ohioan named James A. Rhodes is doing in the budget-balancing business. The aim is the same—stimulate the economy and bolster employment—but there the similarity ends.

It will be interesting to see who makes the biggest strides toward the goal. If you're inclined to betting, better double check the odds before putting your money on Kennedy.

Altoona Senior High School Band Praised for Washington Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Altoona Senior High School Band, under the capable direction of Mr. John Monti, band director, had the distinct privilege of officially representing the great State of Pennsylvania in the annual Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, D.C., and winning two first prizes.

For the first time in the 60 year history of the Cherry Blossom Festival, one school won the top honors in two categories—band competition and majorettes, in competition with school units from throughout the country.

I wish to commend the 210 musicians and majorettes of the Altoona Senior High School Band, their director Mr. John Monti, administrators, school faculty, and directors and citizens of Altoona for making possible the fine performance and trip to Washington, D.C., and especially to Mr. John Monti. Without his untiring efforts, aggressiveness, personality, and spirit, the victory would not have been possible in the presentation of outstanding music, splendid displays and precision drills.

We in Pennsylvania are very proud to say that this fine high school is located in our State and in the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I have the privilege to serve.

Mayor John F. Collins, of Boston, Spearheads Move To Get the Nation's Mayors Behind Cut in Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives, the recent remarks made by Mayor John F. Collins, of Boston. As a result of Mayor Collins' activity on behalf of President John F. Kennedy's program of $10 billion Federal tax cut more than 500 mayors from every section of the Nation are now in favor of the administration's tax cut proposal.

The following article appeared in the Boston Globe, April 23, 1963, which commented on Mayor John F. Collins' efforts to bring about a tax cut for our Nation's citizens.

The popularity and personal persuasion of Mayor John F. Collins of Boston is beginning to make itself felt in the Nation's Capital.

Collins spearheaded a move to get the Nation's mayors behind the President's tax cut program.

Mayor Collins in a public statement said:

A Federal tax cut that stimulates employment can save the Nation's business firms much of the $3 billion annually taxed for jobless benefits.

During fiscal 1962, nearly 6 million unemployed persons received benefits under State unemployment systems. These payments total almost $3 billion and represented compensation for 84 million man-weeks of unemployment.

This widespread unemployment, which has persisted for 5 years, affecting all localities, is the result in large part of our repressive income tax structure. It has prevented our economy from moving ahead to full capacity of its human and physical resources.

A Federal tax cut is long overdue. We need one to increase our economic output to full capacity and create need for employment of millions now unemployed.

At the present time, with 5.8 percent of our labor force unemployed, we collectively

lack the purchasing power required to buy goods and services which our labor force and industry can produce.

A tax reduction will increase the income of the average American family. Since consumers spend 90 percent to 95 percent of their incomes, this money will be pumped back into the economy. Plants will need to produce more, and they will hire more workers.

Economists estimate that our total output and economic growth will be increased by an amount several times as great as the tax cut. Purchasing power will multiply three to four times as the tax-saving dollar is spent and invested.

President Kennedy has recommended to Congress a tax cut of $11 billion, which would increase our gross national product by $33 to $44 million.

The unemployed will go back on the payrolls and off the unemployment insurance rolls. Business firms will expand and more people will be at work.

In the long run, business will save money on unemployment. Thus, when unemployment is down, the payments to the unemployment trust funds will be lower.

Charitable Foundations—Texas Research Group Dedicated to Importance of Cultivation—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under previously granted leave to extend my remarks, it is by pleasure to include for reproduction the second three articles in a series on the subject of charitable foundations, as they appeared in the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram.

The articles follow:

CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS—TEXAS RESEARCH GROUP DEDICATED TO IMPORTANCE OF CULTIVATION—PART IV

(By Mabel Gouldy)

Texans are justifiably proud of their worldwide reputation for know-how and getting the job done.

And in the Texas Research Foundation, which incidentally, costs the taxpayers nothing, native sons and daughters can justify a whole crop of Texas brags.

The good earth has been made better in Texas, with possible benefits to all of mankind, through the work of the oldest privately supported research organization of its kind in the United States.

The foundation was chartered as a Texas corporation in 1944 and is located on a 1,000-acre tract at Renner, just north of the Dallas city limits.

This operating foundation has four primary purposes.

They are:

1. To undertake, supervise and integrate applied research in scientific and technological fields primarily related to agriculture and industry.

2. To carry on basic studies in the field of pure science.

3. To provide educational facilities for the training of farmers, technologists and scientists.

4. To serve as a clearing house for scientific and economic information for the public.

Men of vision established and maintain the foundation.

It is privately financed by businessmen, farmers, ranchers, and other friends.

There are nearly 3,000 contributors.

The foundation dispenses no grants or funds.

There are 10 holders of Ph. D. degrees on the staff consisting of approximately 43 persons.

Dr. C. L. Lundell, vice president and director of the foundation since its establishment, heads the staff.

In fact, the project was his idea.

Highly trained men and women on his staff have done work that has directly or indirectly benefited farmers everywhere as well as those who depend on the farmer for good or raw material.

Work of other research organizations has also been stimulated.

Private enterprise is the key to its inception and good works.

Founders ask a fundamental question.

Where, they query, would the petroleum, chemical, and other industires of the United States be today if they had left all research up to the Government?

Industrial research at TSF has benefited petroleum, chemistry, radiochemistry, the development of synthetic lubrication, and other areas.

Among outstanding scientific collections, made available to other researchers, in the foundation's library are the Ames collection, Blake collection, and Lundell herbarium.

Results of the probing of foundation researchers are made available to all at no costs.

The founding thesis of the organization was that poor land makes poor crops and that poor crops keep people poor.

Fertility of Texas land then was suffering from years of bad farming and grazing practices.

Land is regarded by the foundation as our greatest asset.

Another telling point of foundation sponsors is that during the past 25 years every dollar invested in agricultural research has yielded a profit of more than $200.

Any businessman understands that.

Also, that industry in the United States spends an average of 2 percent of its gross income on scientific research and development but that in agricultural research the total outlay is less than 1 percent of the national gross agricultural income.

Land and physical facilities of the foundation are valued at close to $3 million and an operating slogan has been "practical research from test tube to farm."

What has the foundation done in its chosen fields?

Too many things to be enumerated in one newspaper article.

It can, among other things, experiment in fields not open to individual farmers.

Seeds for one project were imported from India, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Israel, French Morocco, Greece, and Italy.

Successful development of this country's first commercial sesame crop resulted. Among uses are in shortening, cosmetics, margarine, paints, and cattle and poultry feed.

The good old American tradition of utilizing all resources and wasting nothing resulted in another practical project.

Over an 11-year period foundations workers developed a crop residue program.

Farmers once hauled off or burned crop residues.

TSF has proved that properly managed residues are as valuable as harvested grain.

And the foundation produces 52 bushels of wheat per acre.

State and National averages per acre are about 30 bushels.

Stubble and stalks, the research proved, when worked into the soil check erosion, conserve moisture, and greatly enrich the soil.

The agricultural awakening of Texas has been a guiding motive of the foundation.

The staff feels this has happened and cite as an example the fact that while there was national decline of farm income of 15 percent in 1959 the farm income of Texas soared to a new high of $2,383,768,000.

Grain sorghum was promoted to a cash crop second only to cotton through foundation efforts.

But cotton was not neglected.

Proper crop rotations and use of residue have shown the farmers where the yield was low to produce at the same level enjoyed by cotton farmers with better land.

An all-season pasture system developed by the foundation is credited with centering of about 40 percent of all cattle in Texas in the area within 150 miles of Fort Worth and Dallas within the past 15 years.

This is the only area in Texas where the number of beef and dairy cattle increased.

Crops and grasses are tested on the foundation's 308-acre tenant farm at Renner.

Farmers can see there how to improve crop conditions on the farms they are working.

Button clover, an annual legume used for forage and soil, was one of the new and improved crops introduced by the foundation.

That was in 1946.

Today more than 500,000 acres are seeded.

Corn hybrids, soybeans, and grasses, both native and introduced, are subjects of other successful experimentations.

The foundation agrees with Daniel Webster.

In 1840 he said: "Let us not forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man."

CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS—DRISCOLL HOSPITAL HELPING INDIGENT CHILDREN OF STATE—PART V

(By Mabel Gouldy)

"There is nothing quite like it anywhere dedicated solely to the care of our indigent children."

Those are the words of Dr. J. M. Sloan, medical director of an almost $2 million a year operation, the Driscoll Foundation Children's Hospital at Corpus Christi.

There is no cashier and never has been one at this hospital set up and operated by funds from a charitable foundation established by provisions in the will of Mrs. Clara Driscoll, who died in 1945.

She gave her entire multimillion dollar fortune to, in the words of her will, "provide funds for the construction, equipment and operation of a free clinic and hospital for crippled, maimed or diseased children" of the poor.

In addition to the more than 10,000 Texas children that have been beneficiaries of Mrs. Driscoll's generosity, there has been a substantial savings to taxpayers.

Dr. McIver Furman, chairman of the hospital's board, in a report to the community had this to say of the 10-year-old hospital:

"Were the Driscoll Hospital not in existence, the present child care would be cared for by Memorial Hospital and other agencies and so it is estimated conservatively that the Driscoll Foundation saves the city and county (Corpus Christi and Nueces County) some $500,000 annually.

BIG LOCAL TAXPAYER

"Besides this generous contribution to society, what of the Driscoll Foundation as an industry—contributing to local tax incomes, providing employment to hundreds and supporting other local industries?

"Although exempt from Federal income taxes, which makes the operation of this fine hospital in our community possible, the

Driscoll Foundation is one of the largest local taxpayers in the county."

This is the breakdown on latest taxpayments:

Nueces County taxes, $34,634; city and school taxes, $92,695; special district taxes, $398; taxes paid in other counties, $63,564.

The foundation pays the salaries of 561 employees. The total payroll is in excess of $1,476,620 annually, and utility and food bills, respectively, are $117,559 and $249,500 a year.

"It can readily be seen," says Dr. Furman, "that a foundation, especially one so thoughtfully established by Mrs. Driscoll, does not only give much needed care to the needy, but contributes substantially as an industry to the further welfare of the community."

QUESTIONING ARTICLES

Dr. Furman added: "There have been several articles in the newsprint lately regarding foundations and their value to communities and our country as a whole and some of these articles have questioned the adverse effect of foundations on our economy."

The hospital was built on a 20-acre site at a cost of $4,500,000 including a grant of $1,500,000 from the Federal Government through Hill-Burton funds.

Since opening in February 1953 the Driscoll Foundation has expended more than $8,500,000 in operating the hospital.

The hospital's budget is more than 1½ times the Corpus Christi United Fund budget.

"Please remember," Dr. Furman continued, "that a portion of each tax dollar in the city and county operate other health agencies, so that the Driscoll Foundation, in addition to caring for the unfortunate children of our community, without cost to that community, is likewise contributing its share of supporting other health agencies."

Plans in which the Driscoll Hospital and others will serve as coordinating and cooperating units will create in Corpus Christi a children's medical center which, it is felt, will be unsurpassed in the Nation.

OTHERS TO BE INCLUDED

This will include a unit for children now excluded by economic status from the entirely free hospital facilities.

This expansion will be carried through with the cooperation of the South Texas Children's Medical Center Foundation.

Physicians of Corpus Christi also give their services free and in addition to patient care spend many hours in teaching resident doctors.

Although Mrs. Driscoll, one of the most prominent Texans of her day and the leader in restoration of the Alamo, didn't plan it that way, provisions of her will have benefited children in the far corners of the world.

Her first intention was to establish and maintain a hospital for "the crippled and diseased children, natives of Texas, under the age of 16 years, who in the judgment of trustees are unable financially to secure the desired assistance in their infirmities."

But the hospital's benefactions have spread afar due to the fact 35 foreign doctors have trained at the hospital as resident physicians and returned to their own lands.

NEED EXEMPLIFIED

These have included 16 from Mexico; Turkey, 6; China and Cuba, 3 each; Iran, 2; Germany, Japan, Colombia, Thailand, and Denmark, 1 each.

The great need for the hospital is exemplified by the fact that in addition to the inpatients served there are some 40,000 to 45,000 visits yearly to the outpatient clinic.

More than one-third of children treated have come from outside Nueces County.

Children treated have been from 39 counties in all, with the farthest admissions being from Parmer, Hall, and Lubbock Counties in the northwest and Collin County in the northern portion of the State.

In addition to general pediatrics, the hospital population includes as many as 15 to 25 children with tuberculosis.

One of the few pediatric dental departments of any children's hospitals in the United States is at Driscoll.

A research program has been in progress since 1956. Trustees felt a study of the children in that area suffering from malnutrition would possibly contribute something worthwhile to other areas of the world.

ONE OF BEST UNITS

The research unit at Driscoll is now considered one of the three best nutritional study units on this continent.

A cardiac diagnostic center was established through a grant from the Ford Foundation and cardiac catherization has been provided not only patients at Driscoll but all children of the area as well as adults referred by the heart clinic of Memorial Hospital in Corpus Christi.

A training program was started in the early days of the Driscoll Hospital for residents in pediatrics and it has been further enhanced by a teaching affiliation with Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston.

After Mrs. Driscoll helped save the Alamo from destruction and made a gift to restore it, she wrote across the back of a picture of the Texas shrine, "The happiest day of my life."

Says Dr. Furman:

"Surely, if she were alive today to see the fruits of her benevolence, should would repeat, 'This is the happiest day of my life.' "

The fortune she bequeathed to unfortunate children was accumulated over three generations, starting with cattle and ending with oil.

She gave it in honor of her parents, Robert and Julia Driscoll, and her brother, Robert Driscoll, Jr.

ANDERSON ESTATE PUT TO GOOD USE—CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS—PART VI

(By Mable Gouldy)

When M. D. Anderson, one of the founders of Anderson, Clayton & Co., of Houston, the world's largest cotton merchandising firm, died in 1939 he was a bachelor and left an estate of $19 million.

Three years prior to his death, he had executed a trust indenture, appointed trustees and established the M. D. Anderson Foundation for philanthropic purposes.

Anderson's first gift to the foundation was $10,000 in Anderson, Clayton & Co. securities and at the time of his death additional contributions had brought the principal sum to $300,000.

In 1942, when administration of his will was completed, the foundation received Anderson's entire estate, which included an oil company he operated more or less as a business hobby.

Since that date the foundation has made grant payments totaling $24,233,273 and total grant authorizations come to $28,815,887.

Total asets, at book value, on December 31, 1962, were $29,856,779.

Total assets, at estimated market value, come to a little more than $44 million.

GOOD MANAGEMENT

Outstanding grant commitments total $4,582,614.

How has it been possible to make multimillion-dollar charitable contributions and continue to take in more money than was being given away?

Good management by trustees is the principal answer. Inflation and the increase in value of assets are other keys.

The Anderson foundation employs no professional personnel.

Named as trustees in the trust indenture were Col. W. B. Bates and John H. Freeman. There are two additional trustees now, W. S. Bellows and Leon Jaworski.

The four objectives of the nonprofit and wholly charitable institution are:

1. Improvement of working conditions among workers generally, as well as among particular classes of unskilled, skilled, and agricultural workers.

2. Establishment, support, and maintenance of hospitals, homes and institutions for the care of the sick, the young, the aged, the incompetent, and the helpless.

3. Improvement of living conditions among people generally as well as in particular sections or localities.

4. Promotion of health, science, education and advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people.

DIRECTED BY 24

The principal project of the foundation, since its beginning, has been the establishment and development of a large, modern, medical establishment in Houston known as the Texas Medical Center.

The center is a philanthropic institution with policies and activities directed by 24 of Houston's business and professional leaders.

It now includes 16 major institutions and 10 substantial medical programs associated with them.

"The center is a typically American undertaking in that gifts of generous citizens, foundations and corporations are providing the principal resources of support," says Carroll D. Simmons, assistant secretary and treasurer of the center's board. Simmons is also secretary of the Anderson foundation.

Teaching, research, and patient care are competitive with the best in America under center policy and frontal attacks are made on major medical problems, including heart disease, cancer, and mental disorders.

Capital investment in all units now exceeds $94,403,458 and the annual budgets are in excess of $35 million.

The center was established in 1945 as an instrument through which major medical problems could be conquered through a combination of resources of private philanthropy and city, county, State and Federal Governments.

The first grant of the Anderson foundation in 1939 was for $150.

PRINCIPAL SUM

The largest grant to date is $2,450,000 to the University of Texas to construct, equip and operate the M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research in the Texas Medical Center.

The foundation's principal sum, or corpus, is not expendable but is to earn interest.

The income account is interest and dividends on the principal and it is from that account that gifts or grants are made.

When the corpus was only $300,000 the gifts and grants had to be comparatively small. After that the capital account was enriched by the millions in Anderson's estate.

The first grant was to the Houston Junior League to buy glasses for indigent school children.

A little money went a long way on the project as doctors gave their services and the Junior League Clinic bought the glasses at cost.

Initial grants were limited to $1,000 or less and benefited a crippled children's clinic, the charity fund of an eye, ear, nose and throat hospital and enabled purchase for a general hospital of violet ray sterilization apparatus in its operating room.

Among major grants from May 22, 1960, to Dec. 31, 1962, were $1,560,000 to the Texas Medical Center for the M. D. Anderson Basic Research Building for use by Baylor University, and three grants to the University of Houston totaling $1,625,000.

DIVERSITY IS RULE

Another $500,000 went to Baylor University College of Medicine for basic science departments.

Sixteen grants in all were made in that period. The two smallest were $50,000 each to improve the building of the United Fund of Houston and Harris County and for research by the Houston Speech and Hearing Center.

Diversity has marked the investment program of the program.

Mortgages have supplied some of the funds and many loans to Negro and white churches alike have been made in the past.

"We felt church loans were good investments," Bates explained, "and, furthermore, we believed that when we made a church loan we not only had an income investment, but also we were aiding in development of the social and spiritual life of the community."

Trustees had noted that during the depression of the 1930's Houston had only one church foreclosure.

"Many churches struggled," Bates recalled, "but it was our idea that even in a time of great depression every church could pay its interest even if the principal payments were postponed until economic conditions improved."

Bates added that the foundation sustained no delinquencies in church loans except for one small church which at one time had slight difficultly and then was able to resume payments.

TRUSTEES DECIDE

The employment of no professional personnel is one of two ways in which the Anderson Foundation differs from many organizations with similar philanthropic purposes.

The other is that it does not give grants or scholarships to individuals.

All decisions are made by the trustees. Bates is a banker; Freeman and Jaworski are attorneys, and Bellows is a builder.

"We have a definite plan in spending this money," Freeman, who is board chairman, says.

"We try to get something rolling and encourage others to help," he added.

E. L. Summers in an article on the foundation in a Houston newspaper several years ago put it this way:

"The foundation bears approximately the same relation to the community as a spark plug does to an internal combustion engine. It sets the machine in motion."

Citizen Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem "Worthy Your Country's Name," by Vernon Boyce Hampton. Mr. Hampton is a resident of Staten Island, N.Y., and a graduate of Columbia University, New York University, Yale and Milton Colleges and holds the degrees of B.S., M.A., Ph. D., and Litt. D. His poem certainly expresses the feelings of the Staten Island people on the action taken by the Congress in making Winston Churchill an American citizen:

WORTHY YOUR COUNTRY'S NAME

(By Vernon Boyce Hampton)

Heroic lines converge
And cross the seas
In the Churchillian saga,
For centuries of ancestral harmonies
Evolved the pattern
Of this predestined hour.

Today
These United States
Embrace as Citizen and Son
Sir Winston Churchill.

America in this honor honors itself
As offspring of Sir Winston's sovereign England,
And pays its highest tribute to
Winston Churchill, American!

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Dodd at Opening of Theater on the Campus of the University of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 17, I had the pleasure of participating in ceremonies attending the opening of a splendid new theater on the campus of the University of Connecticut, the New College Theater. This marked the first new theater opening in Connecticut in more than 10 years and it provides an outstanding entertainment facility for the people of the university and the surrounding area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks which I made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE OPENING CEREMONIES OF THE NEW COLLEGE THEATER UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CONN., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1963

I wish to thank the sponsors of these opening ceremonies at Stanley Warner's New College Theater, here on the beautiful campus of the University of Connecticut, for inviting me to take part.

I understand that this is the first new theater to be opened in Connecticut in more than 10 years. So we have here something of a gamble; a demonstration of the new spirit of resurging confidence in an industry which has had its growing pains in recent years.

Up to tonight, this fine edifice has been just a building, a splendid building to be sure, but still mere stone, steel and mortar. Henceforth, however, it will somehow take on a new dimension and become interwoven into the lives and minds and imaginations of its patrons in a way that is difficult to describe or assess.

I try to think of what the local moving picture theater meant to me when I was a boy growing up not far from here in Norwich, and what the theater has meant to me in other places.

I think first of the hours of vicarious adventure, of the fascinating look at distant worlds, of the glimpse of the infinite variety of man's experience which so excited the imagination and stretched the horizons of the mind.

I think of the violent emotions so readily conjured up by the artistry of the screen; joy, sadness, indignation, inspiration, contempt, adulation.

Ofttimes, of course, the objects of these emotions were unworthy; the distance worlds were false worlds.

Ofttimes the appeal was to our ignorance or to our superficiality rather than to our intelligence and genuineness.

But, as there have been poor and even senseless films, so have there been great films, such as the one you are to see tonight.

It is, I think, auspicious, that the management has chosen the picture "To Kill a Mocking Bird" for its premiere presentation, for it presents to us the motion picture in its highest form, as an art, as a medium which helps us to perceive reality, an art form which causes us to grasp the significance and the poignancy of man's existence, which reveals to us our abiding bond with all men, though they may be distant from us in time, place and social climate.

Tonight's film shows us what a moving picture can be and reminds us of what it has been, many, many, times in our experience.

It entitles us to be hopeful about what films will be like in the future.

It causes us to look a little deeper into the human heart; to see injustice, not in the abstract, but in the flesh; to see virtue, not in a rule book, but in the lives of a man and his family; to see, perhaps with a new significance, the weaknesses and the strengths we see in our neighbors and ourselves; to recapture for 2 brief hours something of our childhood, with all its fears and all its limitless horizons; and to feel with a new immediacy and compassion the chords which link us to other men and to other times.

The motion picture is at once a distinct and sophisticated art form, and, as well, the popular art of the American people. As we view the development of this art, we learn something about a free society, something of alarm and something of hope.

In movies, as in all other aspects of a free society, we see the conflict between artificiality and artistry; between the shoddy and the substantial; between the tinsel and the true; between the shallow and the sublime.

For art, like politics, like economics, is another testing ground upon which the free way of life must prove itself.

We believe in the free system. We believe that men and women possess that divine spark which the fuel of free inquiry and free interchange of thought will ignite and cause to burn ever brighter.

We believe in the competition of ideas rather than in the censorship of ideas, and we are willing to accept much that is cheap and shoddy because we hold that over the decades a free people, seeing the contrast between the bad and the good, will not only in large measure reject the bad, to which the would be censor rightly objects, but will also go far beyond that and will come to insist upon a level of art and of truth higher than that which the mere censor could perceive or attain to.

This is the heart of our national creed and tonight, in a small way, we pay tribute to that creed by celebrating the opening of a new forum of free expression, as well as a center of entertainment for the people in this area.

And so I see this opening of the College Theater at the University of Connecticut as a notable occasion.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be here and I wish each of you the first of many, many, memorable evenings within its walls.

Sunbury Daily Item Explains Test Ban Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Sunbury Item is a highly respected daily newspaper with much influence in my congressional district in Pennsylvania. Recently it contributed an editorial worthy of broader view and comment than its normal circulation average. For this reason I am citing below this excellent editorial relative to the test ban problem:

SUNBURY DAILY ITEM EXPLAINS TEST BAN CHOICE

Take your choice: Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California, is sending broadside to the newspapers of the Nation a mimeographed release warning against an ineffective treaty with Soviet Russia to end nuclear testing while Gus Hall, leading spokesman for the American Communist Party is deluging the press with a booklet titled "The Only Choice, Peaceful Coexistence."

Congressman HOSMER, declaring that the nuclear test ban issue daily is assuming increasing urgency, charges that the U.S. disarmament agency has drafted an ineffective treaty. This proposed agreement, he states, "would stop U.S. weapons progress and, as a practical matter, simply trust a Soviet promise to stop their progress." And he adds: "This offer will be made to the Soviets at Geneva in the very near future."

As ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. HOSMER should know whereof he speaks. And he is deeply concerned over documentary evidence that the proposed treaty affords "almost unlimited opportunity for secret Soviet nuclear weapons progress toward overwhelming military superiority by undiscoverable cheating."

On the other hand, Gus Hall's primer on communism extols at great length the wonders of peaceful coexistence with redundant references to the "science of Marxism," and statements such as "Marxism-Leninism will continue as a living, flowing wellspring of fresh and stimulating ideas and concepts, which remain alive and ever renewing as life itself."

Under the heading "Cuba—A Decisive Victory for Peaceful Coexistence," Hall gloats: "This was a signal victory for the heroic people of Cuba, for the might of world socialism, and for the partisans of peace throughout the world. It was a victory for the forces that now determine the overall direction of history."

Take your choice between the warning of Congressman HOSMER and the Gus Hall lullaby. And remembering what the "decisive victory" in Cuba with all its hidden implications means to the security of your country, express to your Representatives in Congress your sentiments on the proposed surrender to Soviet Russia on the nuclear test ban issue.

An Eastern European Munich?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Eastern European Munich?" published in the Oakland, Ariz., Tribune of April 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oakland (Ariz.) Tribune, Apr. 11, 1963]

AN EASTERN EUROPEAN MUNICH?

Quietly, and without fanfare, the Kennedy administration appears to be radically altering American cold war diplomacy.

Heretofore, in defending the free world against incessant Soviet penetration, the United States has attempted to maintain at least a status quo by bringing the cold war to the doorstep of Russia. On Captive Nations Day each year, it was customary for President Eisenhower to reaffirm the intent of the United States to struggle for the liberation of Eastern Europe.

In recent months, however, President Kennedy's ubiquitous foreign policy experts, McGeorge Bundy and Walt W. Rostow, have initiated a drastic retreat from this country's previous cold war stance. Henceforth, the battleground of the cold war will be confined exclusively to free world territory, and Red-held territories will no longer be given hope of eventual freedom.

To put it another way, the Kennedy administration appears to have tacitly recognized the legitimacy and permanence of the Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe, and therefore has abandoned any plans to liberate territories that were engorged by Soviet Russia in the wake of World War II.

According to reports, a policy paper prepared by Mr. Bundy and Mr. Rostow specifically excludes U.S. intervention in the eventuality of another uprising in Eastern Europe. It also ordains that the United States will no longer encourage the overthrow of Communist regimes, or even support anti-Communist activity if it has warlike aspects.

This policy was apparently behind the President's failure to make the customary Captive Nations Day proclamation recently. It is obviously behind the harsh crackdown against the anti-Castro freedom fighters. And it is also behind the little-publicized forthcoming withdrawal of U.S. financial support for Baltic and Slavic anti-Communist insurgents.

The Bundy-Rostow diplomacy is certainly one of the most ominous and tragic developments to emerge from the Kennedy administration. The reason given for this clampdown on the activities of exile groups is that they "distract from the President's grand design of building a community of free nations which will expand by its inner strength and attractive powers." This a windy, specious, and meaningless argument, which treats world politics as a sort of innocent democratic game, in which subversion and repression and espionage scarcely exist.

Aside from the fact that the new diplomacy precludes any possibility of the ultimate triumph of the free world in this savage cold war, and even precludes the possibility of maintaing a status quo, there are other, serious consequences involved. In the eventuality of an uprising in the satellites, for example, the Soviets can move in ruthlessly against the rebels, secure in the knowledge that the United States won't lift a hand.

This was not the case during the Hungarian revolt, when the Soviets dallied for days until they were sure that the United States wasn't going to intervene. It is never good diplomacy to tell hostile powers what we will or will not do in future circumstances.

Even more tragic is the fact that the Soviets will no longer be constrained to cater to the peoples of the satellites. So long as these peoples enjoyed tacit U.S. support against their masters, it was politic for the Soviets to keep living conditions at least tolerable, so as to minimize the possibility of revolt and American intervention.

But now that the United States will not intervene in the eventuality of a revolt, the Soviets are free to bleed the captive peoples for all they are worth, with complete impunity. Thus, the Rostow-Bundy diplomacy is bound to increase the misery of millions.

Worst of all, however, is the heightened possibility of war that is inherent in the new diplomacy. The Soviet Union is now freed to provoke brush wars and power grabs without fear that the United States will turn the tables.

We can expect unremitting crisis from the new diplomacy, which will continue until such a time as the United States makes it clear to the Soviets that provocative activity in the free world will only jeopardize their own empire.

Let's Demand This New Weapon for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, at the first of next week, beginning on Monday, April 29, according to a notice I have read, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will hold hearings on a bill jointly sponsored by 13 Senators.

This measure is the Freedom Academy bill, S. 414, to establish a comprehensive cold war training institution.

Discussion of the Freedom Academy proposal is not new to this body. On a previous occasion, in August of 1959, this bill was adopted by the Senate.

However, this was as far as this bill advanced. No action was achieved in the House, and the bill died.

Since that time, this measure has been proposed to the Congress but has not had the benefit of further hearings, that is, not until the forthcoming hearings get underway next week.

And it is with these hearings in mind that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent report detailing how this Freedom Academy idea came to be developed; how it grew from the concern of a former paratroop commander of World War II; and how it came to the attention of a handful of Senators and Congressmen.

This report is in the form of an article by Mr. Eugene H. Methvin, a member of the Reader's Digest Washington staff. It is carried in the current issue—May—of the Digest.

This article tells an inspiring story of the dedication of a handful of Americans who so deeply believe in their country and its freedoms that they have devoted more than a decade of their private time to work for an idea which may well spell the difference in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind the fact that hearings on this important bill are to soon start, I earnestly commend the attention of my colleagues to this article and to the Freedom Academy.

I think after you have read this article your interest will be such that you will want to learn more about this important proposal which may well be presented to the House later this year after it receives the careful and earnest attention of the Members of the other body. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to have this article placed in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, May 1963]

LET'S DEMAND THIS NEW WEAPON FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

(For 13 years a group of private citizens and legislators has battled to establish a Freedom Academy for training leaders in cold-war techniques. You will be inspired by their dedicated efforts, dismayed by the frustrations that still, incredibly, beset them.)

Late one afternoon in March 1954, a lean young man named Alan Grant walked into the post office in Orlando, Fla., and stood fingering a hefty brown envelope. He looked at the address label with the boldly typewritten words "The White House, Washington, D.C.," and wondered whether anyone would read what was inside. Then, with a shrug, he dropped it into the box.

When the packet from Orlando was sorted out from the mounds of White House mail and routed to Brig. Gen. Robert T. Cutler, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, he looked skeptically at the accompanying letter. Its letterhead said unpretentiously: "The Orlando Committee." Yet as he read the encolsed 51-page study, he began to get excited. Few ideas as fresh and stimulating as this Orlando plan had ever come across Cutler's desk in Washington.

With clarity and force it analyzed Moscow's political warfare machine and showed how communism was assaulting freedom with an arsenal of weapons perfected in 60 years of revolutionary experience. Then in detail it proposed a new counterweapon for democracy: a national academy where top experts could instruct free world representatives, from labor leaders to diplomats, in Communist strategy and techniques. The goal: to teach men and women how to defeat communism's destructive tactics and how to build strong free societies. This "Freedom Academy," the proposal made clear, was to be privately financed, but obviously it needed official backing by Washington.

For 13 months Cutler had fought a losing battle to overhaul our creaky cold war machinery and install more effective policies to stop Moscow's many-sided offensive. Now he was astounded to find grassroots Americans laying a finger on the heart of complex problems.

He fired back a letter whose White House seal made Alan Grant's heart thump. "There is no doubt that you have identified and clearly analyzed a most important aspect of

the Soviet threat," Cutler said. Would the Orlando Committee send a representative to Washington to explain the Freedom Academy plan to a selected group of Government officials?

Would they.

For more than 3 years they had worked constantly—studying, researching and formulating the Freedom Academy concept. Now at last they, ordinary smalltown Americans concerned about their country's future, were to have a hearing in the Nation's highest councils.

The Orlando plan had a modest beginning back in September 1950. Alan Grant, then a 28-year-old attorney just months out of Harvard Law School paid a visit to Orlando's high school principal, Joseph Boone, and asked him if his school was giving its students any courses about communism and its techniques. "I'm afraid we aren't teaching a thing on communism," Boone replied. "Why do you ask?"

Grant explained that before he became a World War II paratroop commander, he had organized and taught a course in guerrilla warfare at Harvard based on writings of Mao Tse-tung, then an obscure Communist guerrilla. This experience had taught Grant to respect the tactics and leadership if not the principles the Communists were applying around the world. As he watched their progress after World War II in Czechoslovakia, China and elsewhere, he grew more worried. Now, in 1950, every day's headlines carried news of U.S. soldiers dying in Korea to keep Red armies from pushing them into the sea.

"It looks as if we're in for a long-term struggle with communism," Grant said. "Don't you think we ought to be teaching our young citizens what they're up against?"

Boone agreed. So Grant persuaded the school board to sponsor a series of "Know Your Enemy" lectures. Next he hand-picked 17 young lawyers, businessmen and educators as speakers. But before any public announcement was made, he resolved, they must all know absolutely what they were talking about.

For 6 months he and his recruits met nightly in Grant's cluttered law office. Dividing themselves into five research teams, they pored over case histories of Communist coups, analyzed Red riots, strikes, and guerrilla movements. Each man had to read 15 to 50 carefully selected books on Communist strategy, history, party organization, recruiting, and training methods. Finally, in February 1951, Grant felt ready to unveil the program to Orlando's high school students. What they received was one of the most comprehensive presentations on communism to be found anywhere in the country.

At one point in the lectures the speaker assigned to cover Lenin's life was called out of town. Grant lined up a University of Florida political science professor to pinch-hit. To everyone's dismay, after only a few words about Lenin, the professor launched into a flagwaving speech full of emotion but empty of information. When he finished, he apologized to Alan. "I sat down last night to write my speech and after three sentences realized I'd run out of gas. I hate to admit I know so little about the most influential political leader of the 20th century."

Grant was appalled. Like most Americans, he had always assumed the universities were centers of expertise about such vital matters as the history and techniques of communism. But on investigation he was shocked to find the Nation's entire educational system being run as if the Communist challenge did not exist. He could find only two colleges in the United States that offered even one course on Communist subversion methods.

Slowly an idea began to crystallize in Grant's mind. Why not a school to train our people in unconventional warfare and nonmilitary conflict, just as we train military men in the arts of conventional war at the service academies and advanced war colleges? On October 3, 1952, Grant made a speech to the junior chamber of commerce in Sanford, Fla., proposing such a school—a Freedom Academy.

"Military weapons are not enough," Grant said. "Man is the utlimate weapon—and nobody understood it better than Lenin. When he and his followers captured Russia, they immediately established a training system that today numbers 6,000 special schools in the tactics of espionage, subversion, infiltration, agitation, and propaganda. Today graduates of these schools staff 75 Communist Parties throughout the non-Communist world.

"But where," he asked, "can a young African, Asian, or Latin American learn how to organize a democratic political party or labor union, draw up and execute effective social reforms and fight back against the disruptive tactics of the trained Communist professionals? Worse yet, there is nowhere our own officials and students can go for a thorough course in the tactics of communism, let alone the sophisticated techniques for defeating it."

Grant's idea struck his listeners as so urgent that his friends pressed him to develop it, and volunteered to help. He assembled a four-man team; for 18 months they labored putting together the 51-page study that so impressed General Cutler.

When Grant arrived in Washington on July 22, he went to the headquarters of the Operations Coordinating Board across from the White House. In the second floor conference room, seated around a long table, the 25 top officials Cutler had called together from the Pentagon, State Department and other cold war agencies greeted Grant stiffly and extolled his "patriotism" and "interest" in coming to Washington to "help." Grant sensed a patronizing attitude.

Undaunted, he gave them the details about the proposed Freedom Academy. The Orlando Committee's thorough study, Grant explained, convinced them the program must encompass two levels. One would give career officials in Government 2 full years of training in cold war strategy through advanced study of democratic methods and Communist tactics. The other would brace up democratic anti-Communist defenses outside of Government, by offering basic short courses to labor leaders, journalists, agricultural technicians, civic and school leaders, from the United States and abroad.

When Grant finished, he felt hostility in the questions that followed. "Won't foreign governments resent the idea of their citizens being trained in a school run by the United States?" one official objected.

"Dozens of nations have been sending their own citizens into Annapolis and West Point for years," Grant replied. "We also have 7,500 foreign students from 70 countries in our numerous nonmilitary schools right now, and they'd send more if we'd let them."

"But Soviet propaganda is bound to brand this as an 'imperialistic plot' for training spies," said another.

"They tried to do the same thing to the Marshall plan and it didn't stop us," said Alan. "I don't think the time has come when we must give Communist propagandist a veto power over the U.S. Government, do you?"

For 4 hours the questioning continued. After the meeting one intelligence official, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, an internationally known authority on psychological warfare, introduced himself. "Mr. Grant, the Government will turn down your proposal, brilliant as it is. Have you ever heard of that obscure bureaucratic disease, NMH?"

Grant admitted he had not.

"It's shorthand for 'not made here.' To ask an agency to adopt a new idea it didn't think up is to ask it to confess its own shortcomings."

Weeks dragged by until August 20, 1954. Another letter bearing the White House seal arrived in the morning mail. Grant tore open the envelope. His eyes widened in disbelief. "You are aware, I am sure, that ideas of this nature sometimes generate a wide divergence of opinion within Government circles," said Operations, Coordinating Board Executive Officer Elmer Staats. "The variance of opinion with respect to your plan prohibits any concerted effort" by the Government.

But as Grant and his group reeled from this brushoff, an astounding thing happened. A delegation of Pentagon and National Security Council officials, indignant over the rejection of the plan, flew to Orlando. Grant's team learned that the rejection letter had actually been written by senior State Department officers who had blocked a favorable recommendation by persuading Staats to reject the plan.

"Don't quit now," the Orlandans were told. Heartened, the Orlando Committee launched an alternate attack. They wrote 160 organizations and prominent people, representing many viewpoints, who had shown responsible interest in cold-war problems, appealing for help. The response was overwhelming, particularly from the academic world, and in the spring of 1955 it looked as if the Freedom Academy might open for the fall term.

Then came a shattering blow. President Eisenhower announced he would meet with Stalin's successors, and the euphoric "Spirit of Geneva" enveloped the Nation. The word went out from Washington: Stop all activity that might irritate the Communists. Suddenly prospective financial support for the Freedom Academy disappeared.

In 1958 the Red-managed stoning of Vice President Nixon in South America jolted the Nation. New members poined the Orlando Committee, and Grant tried again, this time through Congress. In 1959 Representative A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Democrat of Florida, introduced legislation to establish a Freedom Academy. Representative Walter Judd, Republican of Minnesota, enthusiastically cosponsored the bill. On the Senate side KARL MUNDT and PAUL DOUGLAS enlisted a dozen cosponsors for a comparable bill.

All Orlando pitched in to launch a national drive. Letters from the Orlando Committee for a Freedom Academy went to every one of the Nation's 1,745 daily newspapers. Members of the Orlando Business and Professional Women's Club wrote and phoned other clubs across the Nation, and brought their national officers to Orlando for briefings. Result: the national federation, representing approximately 175,000 members in all States, endorsed the bill. The Orlando Jaycees won national endorsement of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce convention representing 50 States and 215,000 members. The national AFL-CIO added its backing. Support for a Freedom Academy swelled across the Nation.

One Friday early in June 1959 the news hit Orlando that the Senate Judiciary Committee would hold hearings on the Freedom Academy bill with several other anti-Communist measures. By the following Monday morning Grant and his team had such an imposing array of witnesses waiting to testify that the Senators set aside 3 days for hearings on the Academy alone.

The Senate overwhelmingly passed the bill on August 31, 1960. Then, tragically, late in the session it bogged down in the House. This meant starting all over again with a new Congress in 1961.

Meantime, behind the scenes, State Department officials were trying to sell the idea that our cold war training was adequate. They answered citizens' letters urging an Academy by claiming existing Fed-

eral and private institutions were doing the job. But when pressed for evidence, State admitted that one official who signed such letters "doesn't know anything about the bill."

With the new administration installed in Washington, the Orlando group redoubled its efforts. Circumstances favored them, for the New Frontier was soon facing dismaying cold war realities. When Attorney General Robert Kennedy returned from a trip around the world he reported, "In every country well-organized and highly disciplined (Communist) cadres concentrate their activities in universities, student bodies, labor organizations and intellectual groups. Against this, as I saw repeatedly, there is no one to question their positions, their facts. There is no organization. There is no cadre. There is no disciplined and calculated effort to present the other side. And so it is that a small, able, and well-trained unit can take over a meeting or an organization or even a government."

Gradually, the vital need for the Orlando plan gained wider recognition. A Gallup poll showed that the American people supported the Freedom Academy bill 4 to 1. In Latin America 17 liberal political parties from 14 countries joined under leadership of former Costa Rican President José Figueres and started an Institute of Political Education at San José, Costa Rico. In May 1962 the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, representing 21 nations, appealed to Congress to pass the Freedom Academy bill even as the League went ahead without U.S. help to found its own "Freedom Center" in Seoul, Korea.

Finally President Kennedy appointed his own White House Committee, headed by Dr. J. A. Perkins, now president of Cornell University, to look at the situation. Last December the White House reported its findings: "Existing public programs of training, education, and research in U.S. foreign affairs fall dangerously below" what the country should be doing and must be renovated by creation of a "National Academy of Foreign Affairs" independent of any department, paralleling the Orlando plan in significant detail.

President Kennedy immediately accepted the recommendation and promised to "move forward with this basic idea as soon as possible." Then the drafting of legislation was turned over—to the State Department. Not surprisingly, the draft finally sent to Congress was a lame substitute for the Orlando plan. It proposed to train primarily Government career men in the same old conventional diplomatic techniques.

Advocates of the Freedom Academy idea are frankly dismayed by the State Department substitute. The proposed Academy of Foreign Affairs, they argue, makes no solid provision for developing the whole new range of policy tools, governmental and nongovernmental, nor for training non-American spcialists for the common struggle, as originally envisioned. The State Department plan, they believe, might well kill the chance of establishing a genuine graduate level "West Point" of political and psychological warfare. Some critics, indeed, charge that official opposition to the Freedom Academy reflects policies geared to stalemating the cold war rather than winning it.

Despite covert State Department efforts to dissuade them, the original sponsors, eight Republican and five Democratic Senators,[1] have therefore introduced their own Freedom Academy bill again. "With White House backing, some plan for a cold war research and training program may be enacted at long last," says Senator DODD. "At stake is whether Congress will shape the legislation so that the new institution will actually pioneer new democratic methods for defeating communism and strengthening freedom, or whether it will be watered down into a propaganda center for more foreign aid and conventional methods."

Today, thanks to the sacrifice, bold thinking, and unremitting efforts of Grant and his Orlando colleagues, the Nation is vastly more alert to the education gap in the free world's cold war defenses. Their dedication is heartening reinforcement to the sagging principle that individual citizens can and must participate in the vital process of government, even in the face of overwhelming odds and a massive and lethargic bureaucracy. Their performance presents a clear challenge to Congress and the American people to see that the Freedom Academy opens its doors, and soon.

[1] Republicans MUNDT of South Dakota, FONG of Hawaii, GOLDWATER of Arizona, HICKENLOOPER and MILLER of Iowa, KEATING of New York, SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and CASE of New Jersey; Democrats DODD of Connecticut, LAUSCHE of Ohio, PROXMIRE of Wisconsin, SMATHERS of Florida, and DOUGLAS of Illinois.

Indonesian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 19 of this year I had printed in the RECORD a review of Mr. Arnold C. Brackman's book "Indonesian Communism: A History." Public response to Mr. Brackman's analysis of the history of the Indonesian Communist Party has been so favorable, that I would like to draw the Senate's attention to another review of this work. This review appeared in the March 28, 1963, issue of Reporter magazine and was written by Denis Warner, an expert observer of Indonesian affairs.

There is one portion of Mr. Warner's review that is especially well worded:

> The worst thing we can do now is to shore up Sukarno's regime. We have blundered enough, and we shall compound our blunders if we help Sukarno recover from his self-inflicted economic wounds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the review containing this timely warning be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LAND BEYOND HELP?

(By Denis Warner)

"Those poor Russians," said Sutan Sjahrir when the first significant deliveries of Soviet military equipment arrived in Indonesia 20 months ago. "They could spend 10 percent of their gross national product here for the next 10 years and still not be sure of the result."

Sjahrir, a right-wing Socialist with a profound appreciation of democracy and personal liberty, emerged during the struggle for independence between 1945 and 1949 as Indonesia's ablest and most responsible political leader. A measure of Indonesia's current irresponsibility is that Sjahrir and others like him are now involuntary guests in Sukarno's political prisons. "They have no place in our society," says Dr. Subandrio, now Foreign Minister and Sukarno's choice as his heir. With this remark Sjahrir would agree. Sukarno's "guided democracy" is the negation of everything Sjahrir believes in. Built on a framework of meaningless slogans, it has served primarily as a platform for Sukarno's own demagogy. His regime, Mr. Brackman finds, has been corrupt, demoralized, and inept. Such goals as the acquisition of West New Guinea's worthless real estate have been achieved only "at the cost of wrecking the economy, snuffing out representative government, trampling on civil liberties, mortgaging Indonesia's future to Soviet arms shipments, and providing the Communist Party with a rare opportunity to develop a base of mass power in Indonesia."

In a decade the Indonesian Communist Party has increased its membership from fewer than 8,000 to 2 million. What are its chances of coming to power and turning Indonesia into the Cuba of southwest Asia? As the Indonesian Communists see it, the chances are very good. In Mr. Brackman's words, they were lifted to ecstatic heights by Cuba. Time, they are now sure, is on their side, and the process that has led to the party's spectacular growth will also lead to power. As the biggest and best organized political party in Indonesia, with every island of consequence honeycombed with cells and with front organizations controlling another 10 million, including 4 million peasants, their chances might indeed seem very good. But Mr. Brackman is a qualified optimist of the Sjahrir school. In the chaos and the crumbling of guided democracy that will follow Sukarno's death, either naturally or by assassination, he believes the army, not the Communists, will move into the void and probably turn either to the Sultan of Jogjakarta or to former Vice President Mohammad Hatta, in either case with Sjahrir quietly in the background, to restore republican unity and hope to the disillusioned Indonesian people.

Yet with Gen. A. H. Nasution, the defense minister, and General Jani, the army chief of staff, now out-Sukarnoing Sukarno in the dispute with Malaya over Malaysia and even threatening a direct military invasion of the British Borneo territories, Mr. Brackman and all other serious students of Indonesia must be troubled by the growing irresponsibility of the army leadership. Given their Russion weapons, the military now seem all too anxious to get on with the job—any job. Sukarno has not given up the front running when it comes to expansionism; but jogging at his heels are that ill-matched pair, Nasution and Subandrio, and, of course, the Communist leader, Aidit. A good many Western hopes, including Mr. Brackman's, have been shaken by the new ambitions Nasution, who only a year ago dismissed Malaysia as of no concern to Indonesia but is now prepared to go to war to destroy it.

This does not detract from the value of Mr. Brackman's book, which is easily the most important on Indonesia since George McTurnan Kahin's "Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia" (1952). Communism in any of its forms presents the historical author with the most difficult of tasks, inasmuch as fact and what the Communists claim to be fact rarely bear any reltaion to each other. Over a period of many years, however, Mr. Brackman has sifted and screened his material, and the result is an admirable account not merely of the rise of the Indonesian Communist Party but also of the far from happy history of Indonesia through independence to the present day.

Mistaken Western policies and Sukarno's ambitions both contributed to the Communist advance. But Sukarno has no intention of putting the Communists into power—though he may do so by folly or miscalculation, neither of which Mr. Brackman feels can be completely ruled out. As the self-styled "Great leader of our revolution," he wants no competitors for the revolutionary leadership. The perpetual dilemma for the

Communists is whether to continue to identify themselves with Sukarno's disastrous internal policies or to move into revolutionary opposition. By choosing the first course they will some day bring upon themselves the people's inevitable wrath and revulsion; by adopting the latter they would risk destruction, for though the Communists have the numbers, the army still has the guns. The Communist following is concentrated among the Javanese, especially in the central Java area and, to a lesser extent, in east Java and around Djakarta and the south and east coasts of Sumatra. Even if Communist coup in overpopulated Java were possible, it could be achieved now only at the cost of anti-Communist uprisings throughout the other islands. By following either course, therefore, the Communists stand to lose.

What should the West do? Mr. Brackman's formula will surprise some Americans and please others. The worst thing we can do now, he believes, is to shore up the regime. We have blundered enough, and we shall compound our blunders if we help Sukarno recover from his self-inflicted economic wounds. "The West," says Mr. Brackman, "should continue to disengage. Indonesia's internal problems can only be solved by Indonesians, and only from within, not without."

Independence Day of Sierra Leone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, Sierra Leone will celebrate the second anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone, Sir Milton Margai, and His Excellency, the Ambassador of Sierra Leone to the United States, Richard Kelfa-Caulker.

The progress made within the country under the able Prime Minister during the past 2 years, economically and socially is noteworthy. His wise counsel and leadership during frequent consultations on matters of mutual interest between the other independent countries of West Africa has contributed immeasurably to this progress.

Sierra Leone originated in 1787 as a haven for freed Negro slaves. On land purchased from the local natives, the British Government established a colony to receive those liberated from slavers captured on the high seas, and with British support, to reestablish themselves in their native continent.

To the capital city, Freetown, with its beautiful natural harbor, came merchant ships of all flags and, over the years, the colony and the protectorate area adjoining grew in population and village settlement. With this population growth came more wealth and more chance for development of health and educational facilities.

Since independence Sierra Leone has continued its progress in all directions. Diamond mining, heretofor a major industry, is to be supplemented by new iron ore mines. Factory development is being stressed.

The University College at Fourah Bay, in Freetown, under its leader Dr. Davidson Nichol, is becoming a focal point in the joint moves to establish a uniform West African higher education program in both the English and French speaking excolonies. This program would raise academic standards generally to a consistent standard, and help in providing the compelling needs of the newly independent West African nations with able and well-educated leadership based on African traditions.

I would like today to salute Sierra Leone on its independence anniversary and wish it continued success in its important position as part of emerging Africa.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficent words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

APRIL 9, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned students of Chestnut Hill College, urge you to support the Congressman Daniel J. Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), since we believe that a permanent committee would help us to learn the truth about captive nations.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Congressman FLOOD.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Wood, Erika M. Huhn, Maurine Dooley, Katharine P. Winterick, Alice Notario, Cecile F. Heebner, Josephine Frances Pisarcyzk, Bonnie Wills, Jacindo Lam, Jo Ellen Obrecht, Casmina Klekotka, Patricia Oyler, Julia Redding, Claudette Simpson, Helen T. Cheyhowely, Bonnie Vasey, Patricia Max, Susan Harvey, Patricia Jeskey, Barbara Hink, Sally Thorne, Zdenna Krawciw, Christine E. Huhn, Marie Liebert, Rene Mullen, Christine Burlingame, Julie Gillespie, Jackie Sexton, Kathy Pusido, Helen Tete, Winnifred Ho, Mary Lou DeSantis, Maureen Whyte, Mary J. McGinnis, Denise A. Duckworth, Carol Lowe, Joellyn McDermott, Kathleen McFadden, Kathryn Magee, Leona Luongo, Sue Neisser.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 30, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member, U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed please find copy of letter sent to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH regarding the Flood resolution.

Sincerely yours,

MARY DUSHNYCK

Mrs. Mary Dushnyck,
President, Branch 72, Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 30, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of our members, who are American born, this appeal is being sent to you, as chairman of the House Rules Committee, to support the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) which is pending final vote in your committee. We are familiar with the plight of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain—the religious persecutions, the national oppression, the russification of the non-Russian nations, the economic exploitation, and the outright genocide, which facts are not generally known by the American people.

The Soviet Union, despite its deceitful overtures for peaceful coexistence, was, is, and will always remain a dedicated enemy of the United States, because our country is the only power that stands in the way of the Kremlin's drive for world conquest. The captive nations in the U.S.S.R.—such as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Turkestan, Armenia, Georgia, the Baltic States, and others—constitute the weakest points in the Soviet totalitarian structure.

Therefore, we must know and exploit these weaknesses. A Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would fill the gap. It would provide impartial and unbiased data on the captive nations, which information could be effectively utilized by the executive agencies

of our Government. Moscow is doing much to liberate the colonial peoples of Asia and Africa. Hundreds of African and Asian students are enrolled at the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow, where they are given training in the Communist philosophy, the art of sabotage and infiltration.

The least that we can do is to establish a Captive Nations Committee which would continually study the plight of the captive nations, with an awareness that their help may be essential for our own survival.

Sincerely yours,

MARY DUSHNYCK
Mrs. Mary Dushnyck,
President, Branch 72, Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc.

NORWALK, CONN.,
April 9, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am enclosing a letter I wrote to the Honorable ABNER W. SIBAL, Congressman of this district, asking him to support you with your House Resolution 14 on Captive Nations Committee. I feel quite sure he will be favorable to your resolution.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in trying to encourage your fellow Congressman to support this very worthy cause and also for submitting this resolution. You shall be remembered and praised for your enthusiastic contribution of this resolution and its future successful adoption. Many of hearts will feel much lighter and happier when people, who are under the heavy yoke of ironhanded rule and slavery, know that gallant men, like yourself, are remembering their plight and are striving to give them a hand.

Speaking for myself and all of my family, who still have relatives enslaved in the Ukraine, I want to express our most profound gratitude and personal thanks to you for all you have done for us.

Very sincerely,

HARRY SAMODEL.

NORWALK, CONN.,
April 9, 1963.

Hon. ABNER W. SIBAL,
House of Representatives,
145 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIBAL: On a recent announcement over radio station WSTC, Stamford, you were mentioned as having called for creation of Captive Nations Committee in the House.

I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to you for your action. I believe such a committee will be instrumental in helping all the captive nations, among them the country of my ancestors, Ukraine, to regain their freedom and take their proper place in this world among all freedom-loving people.

I strongly urge you to use your influence on your fellow Congressmen for a favorable consideration and an immediate realization for the creation of this committee. Thank you for your very kind attention and interest in this very worthy cause.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SAMODEL.

APRIL 9, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned students at St. Joseph's College, urge you to support the resolution of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD (H. Res. 14), which calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. We feel that such a committee could objectively study all the captive nations and present their plight to the world, so that all free peoples could realize the true nature of Russian colonialism and thus more energetically check its spread.

Sincerely yours,

James Wong, Joseph L. Mammone, John J. Ott, Joseph H. Davis, John Fralinger, Jr., Francis X. Rodgers, Stephen Dombhorhi, George M. Cyhan, Omelan A. Lukusewye, John J. Novielli, Joseph J. Daly.

CONNECTICUT COMMITTEE FOR
FREEDOM OF CAPTIVE NATIONS,
April 8, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Weshington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of all Americans of Byelorussian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, and Ukrainian descent in the State of Connecticut we appeal to you to consider favorably the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) calling for the establishment of a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of unbiased information and data on all the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. and other Communist-occupied countries, and it would inform the American people and the free world on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. Its primary function would be to assist the U.S. Government in formulating more realistic policies with respect to the captive nations subjugated by the Soviet Russian Communist Empire.

Recent developments clearly indicate that there must be a complete reassessment of our foreign policy, particularly with regard to the captive nations, if we are to exist as a nation.

In 1959 vilification was heaped upon Members of Congress for daring to pass the Captive Nations Week resolution. The mere reading of Communist periodicals at that time proved the vulnerability of the sore spot of the Communist empire. Their colonial empire was at stake and vilification was their only defense. Despite this, we displayed a complete lack of knowledge of our gain, we assumed a do-nothing attitude for fear of offending our enemy.

The days of complacency and the dreams of peaceful coexistence are over. The encirclement of the United States, which was predicted by Lenin some 40 years ago, is under way. But the only weapon which could be safely and effectively used in countering the Soviet aggressive moves is being completely ignored by the United States. Instead of utilizing the captive nations problem to our and the captive nations advantage, we are in the process of turning this weapon against the United States.

While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Asia and Africa, we assumed the role of a modern Pilate sacrificing our friends and allies in the name of peace.

We urge you to give the Flood resolution presently at your Rules Committee your full and unqualified support.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN BOYCHUK,
Chairman.

Resolution on Equal Pay for Equal Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Special Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor is working on bills to provide equal pay for men and women doing the same job, I believe it is timely to draw attention to the resolution on "Equal Pay for Equal Work," which was adopted by the General Board, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, at the time of its meeting in Denver, Colo., on February 28, 1963.

The Reverend Huber F. Klemme, an ordained minister of the United Church of Christ actively associated with the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, testified in favor of equal pay legislation in behalf of the national council on the opening day of the equal pay hearings. The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

Whereas the National Council of Churches has declared: "It is a clear Christian responsibility to work against those special forms of economic injustice that are expressed through racial and other group discrimination;"[1]

Whereas the basic principle of equal pay for equal work is a matter of economic justice; and

Whereas the persistent denial of this principle in the remuneration of women constitutes, in our opinion, a clear case of unjust discrimination against women; and

Whereas the justice of this principle as a matter of national and international concern has been widely recognized through the acceptance of 38 countries of the convention on the subject adopted by the International Labor Organization (including the six member nations of the European Economic Community): Therefore, be it

Resolved: That the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination on the basis of sex should be supported as a matter of basic economic justice; that the general board authorizes representatives of the National Council of Churches to testify at hearings in support of the embodiment of this principle in legislation, both national and State; and that the general board calls to the attention of member communions of the national council the special opportunity which is theirs to support this principle in their own employment practices, and to encourage a climate of acceptance of the principle by their churches and church members.

---

[1] Christian Principles and Assumptions for Economic Life, adopted Sept. 15, 1954.

TFX Judgment Is Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the dominant conclusions which is being made as a result of expert testimony coming from the congresstional investigation in the other body of the TFX fighter-bomber contract decision is that the Secretary of Defense may have chosen the second-best airplane in awarding the potential $6.5 billion contract to the General Dynamics Corp.

In voting for the record defense appropriations of the past 3 years, my votes

have been based on the assumption that we are not buying the second best defense but the very best weapons and military systems. The United States cannot afford to be second best in defense.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thought-provoking article written by Richard Wilson in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, April 24, 1963. This presentation is worthy of the attention of every Member of the Congress:

TFX JUDGMENT IS QUESTIONED

(By Richard Wilson)

A strong case against the judgment of the Secretary of Defense has been made before the McClellan committee by the commanders of the Air Force and the Navy.

This is dramatically unusual and little understood even among well-informed people who follow the news closely.

The air and sea commanders are saying that the Secretary of Defense is insisting on supplying them with a critically important airplane that they do not want to fly.

They do not want to fly it because they think it is a second-best airplane. They think it would risk maximum security in a contest with Russian aircraft. They want the "edge of advantage" they say would be provided by another design.

In this context they recall two distressing conditions in the past. One was the superiority of the Japanese Zero fighter at the opening of World War II, a superiority with a tragic cost to us. The other was the necessity of concentrating our very best aircraft at the time of the Cuban crisis last fall because our planes were likely to tangle with the Russian Mig-21. We did not dare risk anything but our best against the Russians, even in Cuba.

This has very little to do with "commonality." (The plane is to be used by both services.) It may not have too much to do with saving money. There is an argument about that.

But there is no argument, so far as the military commanders are concerned about the advantage of a tactical fighter plane (TFX) designed by Boeing over the General Dynamics design preferred, out of interests of "commonality," by the Secretary of Defense.

What this amounts to is that a man with a fine record as an advanced industrialist, but none as a military strategist or tactician, is telling the air and sea commanders that they cannot have the plane the commanders firmly believe our strategy and tactics demand.

This is a grave decision for a civilian Secretary of Defense to have made. It cannot be covered up by large sounding phrases and technical language, or justified by making a fetish of superefficient industrial management practices.

Nor are the facts of the matter so complicated that the average person cannot understand them.

Here are some facts, and they are not challenged. This tells you what the General Dynamics plane and the Boeing plane are planned to do. In this summary X stands for the secret capability of the plane in each category:

	Dynamics	Boeing
Nuclear bombs	X	X+50 percent.
Air-to-ground missiles	X	X+50 percent.
Demolition bombs	X	X+105 percent.
Fire bombs	X	X+250 percent.
Land mines	X	X+70 percent.
Rocket launchers	X	X+44 percent.
Air-to-air missiles	X	X+100 percent.

Secretary of Defense McNamara brushes this all aside by saying, in effect, that the air and sea commanders put performance of the airplane above everything else, that they want perfection. They do.

Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, told the McClellan committee: "Our ships, aircraft, and weapons must be superior to those we may face in combat * * * an edge of advantage is of greatest importance * * *. This edge can make the all-important difference between being able to defeat the aggressor (or) losing quickly. The latter being unacceptable, we must insure this edge is available to us."

This is not a case of military commanders going with mock reluctance before a Senate committee to air slyly the internal differences at the Pentagon for the advantage of their particular service. It is not even an argument about very much money, as defense costs go.

This is a flat, open, direct contradiction of the civilian Secretary of Defense on a matter affecting the security of our airmen in battle by both the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of Naval Operations.

An extremely difficult situation has been created in the Pentagon. Mr. McNamara's judgment on a vital security matter stands challenged publicly and without reservation by officers whose responsibility is as great as his, and whose experience in military matters is much greater. It will be a miracle of administrative skill if the Pentagon can survive such an inner strain without a crashing shakeup.

It is a headstrong risk not to provide U.S. military forces with the necessary margin of superiority. Mr. McNamara will have his say again in a full rebuttal before the committee in mid-May. Then the McClellan committee ought to make a report that pulls no punches no matter who is hit.

TVA Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in just a few weeks TVA will celebrate its 30th anniversary. Many changes have come to the valley since the new agency was created in 1933.

All the resources with which nature has endowed the area are better utilized. The people are more prosperous and contribute more to national strength.

I am very proud to offer for the RECORD an article which appears in this week's issue of Time magazine. It summarizes some of the achievements of these three decades:

SUCH A LOVELY GREEN VALLEY

A lot of unkind things have been said about the Tennessee Valley Authority. When the TVA bill was before Congress in 1933, shortly after veterans' benefits were reduced, Rhode Island's Senator Jesse Houghton Metcalf cried: "How on earth can we justify taking a decent living from the soldiers who suffered on the battlefields of France and pour it into the mudholes of Tennessee?" Arizona's Senator BARRY GOLDWATER today calls TVA "a giant Federal power monopoly—a hoax."

But TVA has survived such criticism. Next month TVA will celebrate its 30th anniversary and if nothing else, it is there. It works.

TAMED AND TRANQUIL

The very mention of its name still triggers theoretical arguments about public versus private power. Yet debates over its theory fade to futility when set against the real-life changes in the valley.

The Tennessee was once a treacherous river, red with the topsoil it carried away by summer, aswirl with the houses, horses, and barns its floods destroyed by winter. Today, more than two-thirds of its 900-mile length is virtually one tamed and tranquil lake. Hundreds of recreation sites occupy the valley's 10,000 miles of shoreline. Its waters provide one of the world's finest inland recreation areas, yield fishermen some 10 million pounds a year of 23 species of fish.

These waters—actually a series of reservoirs—were created by 31 major dams (six of them privately owned), which now function in a highly integrated system. "Today TVA can shut off the Tennessee River when the Ohio is in flood—shut it off just like a faucet," says David Lilienthal, TVA's early crusading chairman. TVA did just that a few weeks ago, and saved an estimated $100 million flood damage in Chattanooga alone.

Main stem dams have navigation locks, permitting the passage of vessels with 9-foot drafts. Some 13,100,000 tons of traffic moved on this waterway last year. The Tennessee's ports are linked with those in 20 States. TVA officials claim that such navigation has stimulated the investment of some $875 million in shoreline industry in the valley.

EROSION AND MOSQUITOES

To keep the valley's best soil from being continually washed into the river by the area's heavy rains, TVA has coaxed the farmers into using a variety of conservation practices: planting trees, contour plowing, diversifying crops, enriching their land with TVA-developed fertilizers. One byproduct of the reforestation has been the creation of a $500 million private forest-products industry. TVA has also fought mosquitoes to lick the valley's malaria, which in 1934 had infected more than 30 percent of the people living along the river in northern Alabama. Since 1949 not a single case of local origin has been reported along the reservoirs.

POWER

TVA's power production remains the most controversial part of its operation. Its generating capacity of 12,031,060 kilowatts is the largest of any power system in the Nation, amounts to 8 percent of all U.S. capacity. Through contract distributors, it serves 1,513,400 homes and firms. The average valley resident pays .96 cent per kilowatt-hour; the national average is 2.43 cents. The authority deliberately slashed rates to stimulate electrical consumption when it first set up shop, and with spectacular results: from 1933 to 1951 the number of homes in the valley using electricity for the first time jumped from 225,000 to 1,065,000, an increase of 375 percent, while the national growth was less than 100 percent. Total demand still is climbing about 10 percent a year.

The authority has been able to reduce rates partly because high production breeds efficiency. It claims that where private utilities average 4.2 mills to produce each kilowatt-hour sold, TVA's cost is 2.1 mills. As the Nation's biggest coal buyer, TVA pays $4.39 a ton for coal to fuel its steam plants, compared to a national average of $6.26. TVA, of course, has had the advantage of not paying Federal taxes (although for years it has paid sums to State and local governments) or interest on its initial capital. It now does, however, pay the Federal Government some $45 million a year in amortization and return on the taxpayers' investment, and finances expansion through its own interest-bearing bonds.

Despite TVA's gigantic operations, there is no evidence that nearby private utilities have been hurt. Most of them benefited from a boom in appliance sales when TVA's low rates first spurred electrical use. Competitively lowering rates, the private companies have kept them low—yet the latest studies show that their common stock earnings are twice as high as the U.S. average.

AWAY FROM WASHINGTON

U.S. taxpayers may always differ as to whether TVA has been worth the $1.757 billion it has cost them so far (although that sum is, for example, barely larger than total U.S. aid to Franco's Spain since 1945). But beyond the matter of dollars, TVA's advocates claim that the project has shown what the residents of a region can accomplish when encouraged. Says present TVA Chairman Aubrey Wagner, recalling 29 years with TVA: "People said to us, you can't go in there and build dams with the labor of those hillbillies. But the thing they didn't realize was that these people, working on the dams, knew they were building their futures. All we have done is to place the tools in the hands of the people here."

Lilliethal says that TVA also proved that it is an advantage to place such complex projects—which require a unified execution—beyond the reach of Washington's many uncoordinated agencies. "TVA is an arm of Government and yet we took it outside, away from Washington, and put it to work in the sticks. We had a valley, a river, an area, not just a plan or a dream—a chance to do something concrete."

One indication of TVA's progress was the remark of a foreign visitor who recently flew over the region. "Oh, isn't it wonderful," he said. "Yes, we must have a TVA. But weren't you lucky to have yours in such a lovely green valley?"

The East Atlanta Elementary Band Parents Association—Sponsors of the Best School Band in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the existence of a civic enterprise of unusual merit and achievement in my district—the East Atlanta Elementary Band Parents Association, Inc., accurately designated as "sponsors of the best school band in Dixie."

This group, of which Mrs. J. G. Strange, of Atlanta, is currently president, is a chartered, nonprofit organization, operated by the parents of the band members, for the purpose of advancing the musical education of children. These are average families, who, alone, could not give their children an adequate musical education, but by working together, they are able to provide the finest.

This band is made up of children in grades three through seven, from seven Atlanta schools, and a few children from DeKalb County schools. These children begin in C band, progress to intermediate, or B band, then to advanced or A band. Each child progresses according to his own rate, with no set rules governing his progression. The children are taught by the director, during school hours, for 15 or 20 minutes per week. About 5 percent take private lessons. The advanced, or A band is made up of 80 to 90 children, playing a wide variety of band instruments, the more expensive of which are owned by the association. The band's director is Charles I. Bradley, who organized this continuing group in 1947.

National recognitions of their outstanding achievements are numerous, their most recent honor being typical. The executive board of the Mid-West National Band Clinic has unanimously voted to invite the East Atlanta Elementary Band to attend its clinic in Chicago in December 1963. Each year only eight of the Nation's most outstanding bands are accorded this honor, and of the eight, only one is a grade school band. I take understandable pride in this distinction.

Record Prices for Prize Ham, Bacon, and Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia is celebrating this year the centennial of its admission to statehood, and in commemoration dozens of statewide and community events have been scheduled for the next several months. Literally everyone, from the youngest to the oldest, is being invited to participate in the celebration in some way, and organizations of every kind are orienting their programs toward emphasis on the centennial year theme.

One of the first events to take place reflected the remarkable work of our young farmers, many of whom are members of the Future Farmers of America. At the recent statewide Future Farmers of America ham-bacon-egg show, held under the cosponsorship of the Charleston, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce, what are believed to be record prices for a ham, bacon, and a dozen eggs were paid to young farmer-exhibitors.

The full story is told in "Kanawha Commerce", the monthly publication of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, and I call it to your attention with pride, and as another reminder that in West Virginia "there are things to see in '63:"

CENTENNIAL PRICES, $100 PER POUND ESTABLISHING WORLD RECORD, PAID FOR CHAMPION HAM-BACON

Apropos of West Virginia's centennial year, successful bidders paid $100 per pound for the prize-winning ham, prize-winning bacon, and prize-winning eggs—world record prices it is believed for the ham and bacon—at the auction sale which terminated the annual State Future Farmers of America ham-bacon-egg show at the Daniel Boone Hotel, March 16–17–18. The Charleston Chamber of Commerce has been a cosponsor of this event since its establishment.

Grover Waybright and Bob Phillips, well-known Charleston restaurateurs, were the purchasers of the champion ham, an 11-pounder, produced by Joe Sager, Jr., a student in Mathias High School of Hardy County. The check for $1,100 was the largest sum ever received by any West Virginia boy for the sale of his product at the FFA show.

Mrs. Oscar Nelson of Lewisburg purchased the reserve champion ham, paying $7 a pound for the 18½ pound ham to Joe Gregg, a student in Masontown, Preston County, High School.

The champion bacon produced by William Brown, a student in University High School at Morgantown, was purchased by Charles Young, Bob Phillips, David Long, and John Brotherton, all of Charleston. The bacon weighed 6 pounds and produced $600 for the Morgantown boy. The reserve champion bacon weighing 7 pounds was knocked down to Mutt Corey of Charleston for $2.50 per pound. It was produced by Jay Everly, a student at University High in Morgantown.

Eddie James, Sr., President of the James Produce Co. of Charleston, following his custom of many prior years, purchased the champion dozen eggs, paying $100 for the same. The recipient of this purchase was Roger Fansler, a student of Mathias High School, Hardy County.

The reserve champion eggs exhibited by Roger Nickelson of Romney, Hampshire County, were purchased by David Long for a bid price of $16.

Sale of products exhibited by the FFA boys brought a total of $6,039.59 with spirited bidding by an enthusiastic audience. The average price for 164 hams, exclusive of the champions, was $1.39 per pound.

The average price for 104 bacons, exclusive of the champion and reserve champion, was 82 cents per pound.

The average price for 64 dozen eggs, exclusive of the champion and reserve champion, was 60 cents per dozen.

The show and auction were rated by the committee in charge to have been the best in the history of the show.

City With a Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the April issue of the Eagle magazine, with the permission of the publisher.

There is only one Kingsport, and Kingsport, Tenn., is a city with a plan. Margaret (Mrs. Earl W.) Dysart has written a beautiful story on Kingsport and I thought it so interesting that I wanted to make it available to others.

Kingsport is my hometown, and I am mighty proud of its beauty, its industry, and its people.

Margaret Dysart is to be congratulated on presenting such an interesting picture of the model city.

The article follows:

[From the Eagle Magazine, April 1963]

CITY WITH A PLAN: KINGSPORT, TENN., DIDN'T JUST GROW; IT IS USED AS A MODEL BY CITY PLANNERS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

(By Margaret Dysart)

More than 3 years ago we were seeking to relocate in the South. After considering many sites, we found nestled in the pic-

turesque setting of the east Tennessee hills, abounding with lakes and forests, bordering onto the Virginia State line, the thriving model city of Kingsport.

Historically, the area is well known for having been the home of Andrew Jackson and his wife, Rachel. Andrew Johnson and James Polk were frequent visitors here. Earlier Daniel Boone had passed this way. Sullivan County in which Kingsport is located has the unique distinction of having belonged to Virginia-North Carolina area. This spirit is reflected in the great success of all community drives. Quotas are exceeded each year. On the basis of this foundation, Kingsport soon became nationally known. It has been featured in the Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest, and in films made by the U.S. Department of State for overseas. Kingsport has an annual payroll of $130 million with the industrial portion amounting to $90 million. Local industry gives year-round employment to 17,000, including many members of Aerie 3141. It was the first city in Tennessee to have the council-management form of government.

The welcome mat was put out for industry. Among the first to locate here was the Eastman Co. in 1920. A division of Eastman Kodak, of Rochester, N.Y., the company began in the illegal State of Franklin at various times. It joined the State of Tennessee in 1789, and was the only county in east Tennessee that fought with the Confederacy.

Unlike "Topsy," Kingsport didn't just grow. It represents the brain child of the late John B. Dennis and the late J. Fred Johnson. Over 45 years ago these dedicated men engaged the noted city planner, Dr. John Nolen of Cambridge, Mass., to formulate plans and map a blueprint on which hinged the future growth and progress of Kingsport. So the term "model" is aptly applied.

Acting upon the professional advice with the purchase of 35 acres and buildings belonging to the U.S. Government, today, Eastman is the largest industry in Tennessee. There are 9,500 employees with an annual payroll of over $70 million and they manufacture 275 products.

Aerie President Clyde Jeter and Vice President Lyle Hobbs are employed by Eastman. Lyle, an architect, designed the new aerie home. The aerie is fortunate.

Another large industry providing jobs for 2,200 people, including Eagles, is the Kingsport Press, one of the world's largest manufacturers of hardbound books. Beginning in 1922, with the clothbound classics, the company has progressed until today its publications are novels, encyclopedias, textbooks, and Bibles. "Kingcraft" is the trademark and that label appears on more than 2,100 different educational yearbooks.

The newest industry to move its entire operations to Kingsport is the American-Saint Gobain Corp. The $50 million glass plant is situated outside the city on a 700-acre tract. The ultramodern office building located within the city has a three-winged design which follows the firm's familiar trademark.

Keeping pace with the rapid growth of the town is Kingsport Aerie 3141. It was instituted on August 4, 1957, with 58 charter members. Hobart Legg was the founder and the first president. Of the original number, 35 are still active members. Currently, there is a membership of 715 including city, county, State, and National officials.

The history of the local aerie parallels closely the history of the town. Kingsport Aerie was begun in rented quarters. By the end of the first year membership and enthusiasm had mounted until it was deemed advisable to purchase a tract of land on the Bristol Highway, consisting of nearly 6 acres and a small building, for the sum of $19,500.

Work was soon completed on an addition to provide suitable space for the membership. It was evident in a short time that further expansion would be necessary. Since it has always been the policy of the aerie to be on a pay-as-you-go basis, work was postponed until the conservative trustees felt the work could be accomplished with ease.

Accordingly, in 1961 plans were put into operation and through cooperative efforts the membership used its talents to advantage in the construction of a beautiful, modern home. While the cost of the new acquisition is valued at more than $100,000, the entire property is estimated to be worth approximately $250,000. This tremendous achievement has been accomplished within a short span of 5 years, and what is more spectacular, it is mortgage free.

Light colored brick comprise most of the exterior of the building. An unusual window-wall effect forms the focal point on the upper level and a wide portico enhances the lower level. Anticipating an ever-increasing flow of traffic, a parking lot with space for 500 cars was provided. An imposing driveway encircles the building.

The dramatic simplicity of the interior of the main auditorium with its wood paneled walls and well blended lighting system testifies to the architect's purpose of focusing attention on the well designed stage. The hall has a seating capacity of 500.

The formal opening was held November 3 and 4, 1692, at which time Mayor W. W. Cawood dedicated the building. Other special guests were former Grand Worthy President Leo V. Connell of Indiana, and former Grand Aerie Outside Guard R. W. Cheely of Virginia.

From the date of its institution, the aerie has been interested in contributing to the progress and welfare of the town, county, State, and Nation. Some of the projects are the donation of three two-way radios to the life saving crews of Kingsport and Church Hill, contributing $1,500 for needy families at Christmas—a joint effort with the Salvation Army, supporting all local drives and celebrations, and donations to the Max Baer Heart Fund. It also recently sponsored the organization of Rogersville Aerie.

The aerie provides a well diversified social program for its members. "Something for everyone" appears to be the motto. The activities include bowling, social and square dancing, Christmas and Halloween parties for children. This list barely touches the surface. The courthouse is open every day except Sunday.

Although Kingsport's growth has been phenomenal by comparison with surrounding towns, it is still a mere infant. Its great potential for further development is unlimited.

Just as the town continues to advance, so will the other infant, Kingsport Aerie 3141. The same contagious enthusiasm which pervades the atmosphere accounts for the wonderful progress made by both.

I'm glad we found Kingsport and the Eagles. Our lives have been enriched by the association.

Independence Day of the Republic of Togo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, the Republic of Togo will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence. On this occasion we wish to extend warm felicitations to the people of this Republic.

On April 27, 1960, a small west African nation gained its independence from French control, the Republic of Togo. We can all remember our shock at the news last January of the brutal assassination of the President of Togo, Sylvanus Olympio. This able leader was cut down by machinegun fire at the very gates of the American Embassy, where he had gone to seek protection.

His death was only the latest happening in the strife-torn history of this area. Togolese territory became a German protectorate in 1894, and its peoples were ruthlessly exploited in the development of German plantations. By the League of Nations mandate in 1922 the country was divided between the French and British, where it remained under divided authority, first as a mandate area, then as a United Nations trusteeship territory, until the fall of 1956 when, by national plebiscite, the area became an autonomous Republic within the French Union.

After independence the country, under President Olympio, made good progress toward political and economic stabilization in spite of continuing border difficulties with the Republic of Ghana. Such progress made even greater the shock of last January's military uprising.

Togo is now under the political control of a council of ministers, headed by Prime Minister Grunitzky. Developments in Togo are being closely observed by neighboring African countries; the President of Dahomey, Hubert Maga, has been appointed by the governments of the other ex-French African colonies to offer guidance to the Togolese Government in its efforts to draw up a new constitution, and to insure the democratic process to the people of Togo.

This joint cooperation to help a fellow country going through a period of instability is but another example of the growing effort among the newly independent nations of Africa to secure for themselves a stable political situation in which to develop.

On this anniversary of Togo independence we should applaud the efforts to maintain the restrained policy being followed and extend to all those involved our sincere hope that such restraint will continue, and that Togo will emerge from this time of trouble a unified and strong nation, dedicated to progress and partnership within the free world.

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee opened hearings this week on the quality stabilization legislation. This legislation was

reported favorably by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Rules Committee in the last session. On account of the rush pending adjournment, it was impossible to have the bill considered on the floor of the other body last session. It was reported favorably by the Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce and Finance Committee.

Concerning the avalanche of support for this legislation over the country and also by Members of both parties in the House and Senate, I do hope that this legislation will be enacted into law as soon as possible.

The following is the statement I made on H.R. 3669 and H.R. 3670 before the committee at the opening of the hearings on Tuesday, April 23.

STATEMENT OF HON. RAY J. MADDEN, OF INDIANA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON H.R. 3669 AND 3670, THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL, APRIL 23, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, your cooperation in holding these hearings demonstrates that you are much concerned over the devastating methods of merchandising in recent years that is causing great damage to the manufacturers, retailers, and consumers throughout the country.

This bill last year obtained, after lengthy hearings, a favorable report from both the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and from the Rules Committee. It also obtained a favorable report from a Special Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee when our Congress adjourned.

Obviously thorough study has been given this measure. I respect the judgment of my colleagues who have given this bill their approval. It is a question of life or death for hundreds of thousands of small businessmen. Let's do our duty to them by moving quickly and effectively to make the quality stabilization bill the law of the land.

Basically, the quality stabilization bill offers a major step in curbing dishonest practices that are misleading the consumer in merchandise values. It spells out bait advertising, deceptive pricing, and published misrepresentations of the product as reasons why a manufacturer may protect the property rights in his brand name or trademark.

The public will be helped by the enactment of the quality stabilization law, since the established price and quality symbolized by the brand name will be a standard from which it may judge the competitive values of products. The consumer will be guarded against the unscrupulous operator who uses the honored brand name or trademark to build store traffic at the expense of his more honest competitors, while recouping his loss at the same time on overpriced, inferior, and blind merchandise.

This legislation will call for no Government bureaucracy or department to supervise or enforce it.

The law will be 100 percent optional with the manufacturer, retailer, wholesaler, and consumer.

It will provide incentives for quality products to be distributed through quality conserving resellers.

In our long and critical struggle against communism, the American system of free enterprise must be our major weapon. Business failures in recent years and the growing lack of protection for consumer purchases demand action by this Congress.

We cannot permit the further degeneration of the brand name system of distribution. We must arrest the growing rate of failure of small business in this country. We must give the incentive to the manufacturer in this country to build toward excellence, and we must protect the consumer from junk merchandise.

The quality stabilization bill covers specific areas in which a manufacturer can control, that is, prevent the unfair use of his own property—his trademark—by the reseller. These areas are:

(1) Intentional misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age, etc.; (2) bait and switch merchandising tactics; or (3) deviation from the established price.

The manufacturer who elects to use the quality stabilization law will publish the retail price or resale price range governing the sale of his product. He is given this right so that he may protect the quality of the product, the goodwill of his brand name, the ethical reseller, and the consumer. Competition will be promoted, not restricted, by the quality stabilization law, and the interaction of competitive forces will insure that the manufacturer's price represents fair value or else that manufacturer will be forced out of business. Any price established under this law will be at the manufacturer's peril. This is the way the free enterprise system should function.

If a retailer knowingly violates the published policy of the manufacturer by engaging in any one or all of the three specific practices named in the bill, then the manufacturer may revoke the right of that offending retailer to make any further use of the manufacturer's name, brand, or trademark.

The quality stabilization bill is not a one-way street. It imposes an obligation on the manufacturer as well. Specific provisions insure that equity be practiced by the manufacturer in his relations with his resellers and in the enforcement of the act.

Under the Quality Stabilization Act, both the reseller and the public will know where each manufacturer stands as to policy and quality consistency. The manufacturer no longer will have the convenient excuse that he cannot protect good resellers against unfair competition.

Essentially, this bill is only a confirmation by Congress of the unanimous decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Old Dearborn Distributing Co.* v. *Seagram-Distiller's Corp.*, 299 U.S. 183 (1936) which held that the manufacturer possesses property rights in the goodwill symbolized by his trademark. This bill implements that decision by charting a specific route the manufacturer may use to protect his trademark as it moves along the channels of distribution.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSURED

The Quality Stabilization Act would leave the anti-price-fixing provisions of the Sherman Act intact. Any group of manufacturers or wholesalers or retailers who effect collusive price fixing between themselves would be courting prosecution under the Sherman Act.

To underscore that the quality stabilization bill will promote competition, it must be emphasized repeatedly that the manufacturer alone must make the basic marketing decision—whether to stabilize his price, as a means of restoring and improving quality, or to rely primarily on price alone to attract customers. It is, after all, his brand and his reputation which is at stake. Only he can make the decision. However, before he can use the Quality Stabilization Act, there must be goods usable for the same general purpose available to the public from other sources. The brand name owner's product must be in free and open competition.

Wholesalers and retailers will be free, too, to determine whether they wish to handle products of stabilized quality or a competitive unstabilized one. They may elect to handle top brand lines which are stabilized and others on which they can vary the price. It is their decision. If they elect to handle the quality stabilized brand, they must respect the law and the manufacturer's established policy. This means that the reseller may not abuse the brand name by misrepresentation as to make, model, size, or age, by bait and switch merchandising techniques, or by selling that brand name product at other than the manufacturer's established price.

THE CONSUMER'S INTEREST

This legislation safeguards the consumer. This committee is not unmindful of the situation that results when an unprincipled retailer can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad. For every dollar spent by the misguided customer who is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends an estimated $9 for inferior products at the regular or higher price.

It does not take long for that honored product to lose customers. Soon the loss-leader advertiser drops the brand name product and picks up another quality product to pack temporarily his store with unsuspecting customers. It is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill will control by protecting the customer, the producer, and the small retail man.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in availability of products in which the public can have confidence, confidence in their stabilized price and in their quality. Customers can buy that which they seek: quality and price, or price alone. The retailer, by offering both quality stabilized and unstabilized brands, can give the consumer an excellent mix of durable, high-quality products and products of lesser quality whose prices fit his pocketbook or his limited needs.

There will be many brands, made by reputable manufacturers, which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization and then only as to the brand name thereof. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. But the discounter is optionally free to handle quality stabilized products along with merchandise that he does not elect to come under quality stabilization.

It is not the purpose of the quality stabilization bill to put anyone out of business. Indeed, it is my conviction that it will reduce the number of small businesses whose owners find it necessary to liquidate.

This bill will help sustain, in a positive way, our brand-name system of distribution that has in the past enabled legitimate retailers and manufacturers to build a successful marketing economy second to none in the world.

Opponents of quality stabilization legislation attack it by smear propaganda, identifying it with fair trade and price fixing. Anyone who reads and studies this bill can easily determine for himself that no provision in the bill identifies it with fair trade or even remotely with price fixing.

The quality stabilization bill contains none of the usual fair trade language. There is no provision for contracts as the bill is wholly predicated on the owner's property rights in his good name; there is no dependence on a nonsigner clause as is the case with fair trade. The essential difference is that fair trade enforcement is to compel a dealer to raise his prices for a

product, while under the quality stabilization bill, the action is one akin to trespass—to stop a reseller from abusing a manufacturer's property right in his trademark reputation.

HELP EMPLOYMENT

In urging speedy consideration of this bill by this committee, I direct your attention to the fact that unrestrained price slashing disables labor, industry, resellers, and the public. Unless the quality stabilization bill is enacted, our entire economy will deteriorate at a time when our President is asking for economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. In recent years consumers and small retailers have been asking me what can be done to reestablish confidence in retail marketing. Unemployment in my area is critical.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation before this Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts most. Congressman JOHN DENT will testify as to pressures upon our production economy resulting from the jungle merchandising prevalent today.

In conclusion I call to your attention that almost 70 national trade and professional organizations have endorsed the quality stabilization bill. These include:

National Retail Hardware Association.
National Office Machine Dealers Association.
Independent Garage Owners of America.
National Association of House to House Installment Cos., Inc.
National Sporting Goods Association.
National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers.
National Retail Furniture Association.
Retail Jewelers of America.
Master Photo Dealers and Finishers Association.
National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association.
National Wholesale Jewelers Association.
National Stationery and Office Equipment Association.
Wholesale Stationers' Association.
Toy Wholesalers' Association of America.
Billiard and Bowling Institute of America.
Gift and Decorative Accessories Association of America
Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association.
National Association of Sporting Goods Wholesalers.
American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association.
Archery Manufacturers and Dealers Association.
National Wholesale Hardware Association.
Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.
American Watch Association, Inc.
Watch Material Distributors of America.
Automotive Service Industry Association.
National Association of Bedding Manufacturers.
National Industrial Distributors Association.
Christian Booksellers Association.
National Shoe Manufacturers Association.
Wallcovering Wholesalers Association.
National Small Business Association.
American Research Merchandising Institute.
American Retailers Association.
National Art Materials Trade Association.
National Shoe Retailers Association.
Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association.
Northamerican Heating and Airconditioning Wholesalers, Inc.,
National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.
American Watch Manufacturers Association.
National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.
National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.
National Office Furniture Association, Inc.
National Outerwear and Sportswear Association.
National Frozen Food Association, Inc.
The Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc.
National Association of Glove Manufacturers.
National Marine Products Association.
National Association of Retail Druggists.
Paint & Wallpaper Association of America, Inc.
Retail Tobacco Dealers of America.
National Association of Tobacco Distributors.
National Retail Farm Equipment Association.
American Pharmaceutical Association.
National Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries.
Metropolitan Cities Drug Association Secretaries.
National Association of Chain Drug Stores.
Toilet Goods Association.
American Booksellers Association.
National Wholesale Druggists Association.
Automotive Electric Association.
Corset & Brassiere Association of America.
Proprietary Association.
The Independent Shoemen.
National Candy Wholesalers Association.
Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America.
Laundry & Cleaners Allied Trades Association.
Luggage & Leather Goods Manufacturers Association.

I call further to your attention that this is strictly nonpartisan legislation. Eleven U.S. Senators of both parties have cosponsored the quality stabilization bill, and approximately 25 Members, from both parties, have introduced the identical bill in the House of Representatives.

I remind you again of the approval given this measure last year by your committee, by the Rules Committee, and the special subcommittee of the Senate.

And I urge you to think of the purposes of the bill and its goals not in terms of theory, not in terms of statistics, but as a measure affecting people of flesh and blood with a real problem of survival or failure in a business that is perhaps small, yet still a precious thing to them. It is not coincidental that the thousands upon thousands of members of these 70 national associations view the quality stabilization bill as the one essential piece of legislation before this Congress.

Medical Care for the Aged Through Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the mayor of Baltimore, the Honorable Phillip H. Goodman is supporting enactment of the proposed program, medical care for the aged through social security. The text of his recent letter to me follows:

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
Member of Congress, Congressman at Large, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SICKLES: As mayor of the city of Baltimore, I respectfully urge you to give your immediate attention and support to the proposed health benefits for the aged through social security.

The benefits of modern medical science should be available to all citizens of this country. Health services are essential to social well-being and are expensive and likely to become more so in the years ahead. Without insurance protection against the cost of illness, the retired and aged must depend on public relief in times of sickness.

As mayor, I feel deeply responsibile for our aged community, and so certainly insurance coverage against the cost of illness which may occur after retirement, which can be paid for during the working years, is of extreme importance. I have given close scrutinization to the arguments against extension of old age, survivors, disability insurance to health care, and find I cannot agree with them. The patients' free choice of hospital and physician is guaranteed. This would, in no way, be a free service and is not a step toward socialized medicine. It is an opportunity to provide people with a basic need for extended life-health care.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP H. GOODMAN,
Mayor.

A National Standard for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover addressed the annual meeting of the Greater Grand Rapids (Mich.) Chamber of Commerce on April 18, 1963, on the subject "A National Standard for Education."

This specific address was extremely challenging not only to American educators but to all U.S. citizens. Admiral Rickover, whose interest in education as well as nuclear power for military and civilian use is well known, recommends a relatively simple method by which more significant meaning could be given to educational accomplishments and certificates of graduation.

I think that his proposal should be considered by educational and civic leaders throughout the country, and for this reason under unanimous consent I include his address with my remarks.

A NATIONAL STANDARD FOR EDUCATION

(By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy)

I am delighted to be here in the home territory of my good friend and fellow naval officer, GERALD FORD, and to speak to his many friends. I should like first to pay tribute to Mr. FORD and to the members of the House Appropriations Committee. Mr. FORD has served on that committee since 1951. In the last few years the Nation has been able to place in operation 18 nuclear powered attack submarines and 12 Polaris submarines, together with the nuclear powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the destroyer leader *Bainbridge*. We will also have under construc-

tion or authorized by the end of this year an additional 29 attack and 29 Polaris submarines and another destroyer leader. For this we must give credit to GERALD FORD and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

I speak from personal experience when I say that without the support he and members of the committee have unfailingly given, conversion of our fleet to atomic energy would have been delayed and might have come too late to be of use to the United States.

As a member of the Defense and Space Subcommittees, Mr. FORD has had, among other things, to become expert in judging difficult technical matters such as electronics, satellite communications, advanced computer systems, atomic energy, and the research and development which pertain to them.

Mr. FORD has constantly and wholeheartedly supported the naval program and devoted much time and effort to helping us. It is a comfort to be able to go to him for his wisdom, his objectivity, and kindly advice. I am proud to be associated with so fine a gentleman and patriot who does such honor to his State.

The one thing all of us have had to learn in our work in atomic energy is that we cannot indulge in illusions. To design and build atomic powerplants we have to face the truth and come to terms with it. I fear that in education we have not always been doing this, so it seemed appropriate to speak to you on "A National Standard for Education."

I presume you are as deeply concerned, as am I, with American education, and as desirous that it be the best that can be devised. There is overwhelming evidence that our children do not receive a good, still less the best possible education. So the question arises: Why not? There are many reasons and I have spoken elsewhere at length about them.

We have a philosophy of education that simply does not work, an educational establishment that has too many administrators and researchers who boss the teachers, and teachers whose educational and professional qualifications are inadequate; these are but a few of the causes of low academic achievement. Underlying all of them, accentuating and perpetuating them, is our lack of a national scholastic standard. This renders our schools highly susceptible to the strong pressure toward mediocrity that is present in any system of mass education. It also makes reform difficult and, if accomplished at all, likely to come about in a piecemeal fashion that will increase the already very great geographic inequalities that characterize American education.

It is to this defect and the urgent need to remedy it that I would like to address my remarks.

American schools and diplomas have always been qualitatively of the most amazing diversity. This was probably unavoidable in earlier times when Americans were still engaged in subduing a wilderness. Different parts of the country were then at different stages of development. And, of course, education reflects the state of culture. High culture comes when the material necessities of life have been provided for. Education was bound to be better in the long-settled communities along the Atlantic seaboard than in pioneer country.

Today technology has brought culture to the remotest farm. A child's educational needs are now the same whether he goes to school in Florida or California, in Wisconsin or Connecticut. Every American youngster must have knowledge of the basic subjects: of language, mathematics and science, of government, geography and history—all up to the highest level he is capable of achieving. Every child has the same need for development of his intellectual capacities so he will be able to reason logically and understand the complex world in which he lives and the public issues on which as a democratic citizen he is called to express independent and rational opinions. All our children need a good basic education to qualify them for the kind of jobs a highly technical society provides. Less and less will there be rewarding work in this country for the uneducated, no matter where they may live.

Is not the need for this knowledge and this skill the very reason why we have a public school system? We support it with our taxes because parents have neither the time nor—with rare exception—the competence to develop their children's mental capacities and guide them to intellectual maturity. As I have often stressed, schools that have our children in their care for but one-sixth of their waking hours—no more than the average child spends sitting before the TV screen—such schools cannot perform this task properly if they dissipate their energies on matters that can be done elsewhere. Education directed to the mind cannot be obtained anywhere else except in schools, colleges, and universities. These must therefore be judged by the competence with which they perform this all-important task.

I readily admit that as places for fun and games American educational institutions are unsurpassed in the world. But what concerns me is their performance in the intellectual field; what I call the school's technical task. It is just here that American education fails to live up to the needs of our society. It is here that there is too much scholastic inequality within our country. It is here that our competitive position vis-a-vis other advanced countries is unsatisfactory.

How is this possible when we pour so much money into education; when we offer it so generously to so many of our children? For over a century we have been committed to the ideal that no American child should be denied an education because his parents were too poor to pay school fees. We set ourselves this ideal early in our history, when we had no illusions of superiority; when we knew we were educationally backward. In many continental countries free universal and compulsory elementary education had long since been established. We did not attain even this until just after World War I, 200 years later than parts of Europe. But we were not content with merely catching up, we wanted to go Europe one better. We wanted secondary and even college education to be tuition free so our children should meet no financial bar in their climb to the very top of the educational ladder. This is what we then meant by democratic education, and that is what it really is.

Alas, our splendid ideal has foundered on the shoals of educational misconceptions about democracy and education. Adherents of the progressive theory of education, in particular, have confounded ability to pay with ability to learn, as when one eminent educator declared that we were unalterably committed to undifferentiated, comprehensive common schooling which, said he, "will unite in one cultural pattern the future carpenter, factory worker, bishop, lawyer, doctor, sales manager, professor, and garage mechanic." Indeed you can keep children of widely varying mental capacities, motivations, and educational objectives together in a common core program, but this is not education.

A child's—or his parent's—inability to pay for schooling is a removable bar to education; the child's inability to learn is an irremovable bar. Many a poor child is gifted, many a rich child is stupid; either child may be industrious or lazy. It is the giftedness or stupidity, the industriousness or laziness that ought alone to determine the educational levels a child may attain. When you eliminate ability to pay you get educational democracy; when you eliminate ability to learn you get noneducation.

In the past, when the common school of America served simple rural communities, we could tolerate keeping children of varying aptitudes in one schoolroom. The school did not extend beyond the primary years during which the subjects taught were elementary. These elementary subjects can be mastered by every normal child, though at greatly differing rates of speed.

In the small red schoolhouse a skilled teacher could manage things so that the fast learner progressed fast, the slow learner progresser slowly, without seriously interfering with one another. But as soon as you move beyond the elementary level, differences in aptitude create a situation where what the bright can and should study becomes incomprehensible to the average student. Each year the gap widens between children with varying intellectual capacities.

Between the two extremes of intelligence in a representative group of children, the gap in mental age will be almost 6.5 years in the sixth grade; even if the top and bottom 2 percent of the intelligence range is eliminated, the gap will still be over 3 years. Worse still, the gap in achievement levels is even greater; by age 11 children it may be 8 years.

Pleasantly democratic as comprehensive schooling may seem, when continued into secondary education it does justice neither to the fast nor to the slow learner. Nor is there anything democractic about automatic promotion and unmerited diplomas. If a child is promoted before he has mastered a prescribed grade course, he will only seem to move up the education ladder. In reality he will be standing still on the same rung, but this is camouflaged by educational labels that are as false as when sugar sirup is marked honey on the glass jar. When diplomas are awarded for mere attendance, they soon loose all value.

A child who obtains a high school diploma when he cannot yet read and write with ease and dexterity, has not really received a secondary education. True, he has been kept at school more years and his school has a different name but he has not mastered more than an elementary program. He hasn't even mastered that well. As for the high school diploma he carries away, this has necessarily shrunk in value so that in many cases it represents no more today than did grammar school graduation half a century ago.

Even as we have made higher education available to more children by eliminating fees, so have we taken away with one hand what we have given with the other. By not requiring so-called higher education and its diplomas to meet a fixed national standard, we have brought them down to what Dr. Robert B. Davis of Syracuse University so aptly terms "creeping lowest denominatorism." In the absence of a standard, our diplomas and degrees have inevitably suffered the fate of paper money that is not backed by gold bullion. As indicators of a student's educational accomplishments, the degrees "aren't worth a continental." You have to look up the institution that issued them and the course for which they were granted in order to evaluate their academic worth.

In this they are as different as can be from diplomas and degrees abroad which must conform to a national standard, and this whether they are issued in countries with a centralized or with a decentralized system of education. The irony is that our educational ideal has been adopted abroad where it is now being rapidly realized and realized better than here. For there scholastic standards have been retained. The higher education now attainable by children in Europe,

either at no cost, or on scholarship, or for very small fees, is as good or as high—academically speaking—as it ever was. This important point is always overlooked when quantitative comparisons are made between American and European education. We go by labels and we do not inquire what the labels stand for.

Naturally we have more children with college degrees, since we hand these out for intellectual work that nowhere else in the world is held to be of "academic standard." What other country grants master degrees for trailer park management, bachelor degrees for domestic science, or doctorates for thesis work on "Field Hockey in American Education With Special Emphasis on the Colleges of the Northwestern United States"? It is as if we had decided to print enough money to give every child a million dollars upon graduation from high school and then declared proudly that we had become a nation of millionaires.

Apologists often argue that in as populous a nation as ours you cannot have a national scholastic standard. But size has little to do with this. There is greater equivalence in degrees among the advanced countries of the Continent than exists within our country, yet they are politically divided and we are not. Taken together they are as heterogeneous and as populous as we. However, no country abroad wants to fall behind, so each informs itself on what goes on educationally in neighboring countries and makes certain its national standard is up to par. I should like to see a similar thing happen among the several States of the American Union. This kind of competition is altogether good, and the beauty is that it does not cost more to have good education than mediocre life-adjustment training. The latter, in fact, requires more expensive equipment. For the money we spend on some of our educational palaces with their swimming pools, model kitchens, workshops, athletic fields, and so forth, we could get first-rate teachers and put them to work in simple buildings, and you would be surprised at the results.

As a practical man I judge educational enterprises by their products. Thousands of these products pass through my hands and those of my leading scientists and engineers when we interview young people who apply for positions as designers and builders of nuclear reactors, or as officers and men to operate our nuclear ships. I find the percentage so qualified to be deplorably small. Even the best have lacunae in their education that you would not find abroad among persons of comparable intellectual stature. We run schools for reactor technology where we have to teach many basic subjects which in other advanced nations already have been taught at school.

A new engineering project, such as development of nuclear power, is a good touchstone for a modern educational system. It calls for mental qualities that are in wide demand in all parts of a highly developed industrial society. Flexibility and toughness of mind, in particular; the ability to emancipate oneself from routine, and to pioneer new ideas; the capacity to think professionally, as I call it, that is to view problems in a scientific spirit that disregards personal predilections. This latter quality has become scarce since the schools went over to life-adjustment training, with its emphasis on conforming to one's peer group. We badly need people who in their fields of special competence will stick to principle; people who will not compromise technical or professional judgment in order to get along with administrative superiors or to gain popularity.

To sum up: the overall level of general and specialized education in this country is far too low for our needs, both as individuals and as an industrial democracy.

We are plagued with serious deficiencies in virtually every class of occupation that makes demands upon a person's general and specialized education, whether it be at the level of the learned professional, the semiprofessional, the skilled craftsman, or the technician. Despite our enormous and costly educational establishment, this country has more functional illiterates than most other industrially advanced nations. We have more people who do not posses minimum knowledge of the elements of language, mathematics, history, and geography that are considered part of elementary education in advanced European countries and which every normal person there appears to absorb at school. Recently, the Army published the fact that 25 percent of draftees were unqualified to be modern soldiers—25 percent of a cross section of young America. In most cases the deficiencies were mental. In Switzerland, where every male does military service, the rejection rate is about 7 percent. Swiss standards for draftees are certainly no more lenient than U.S. Army standards. I refuse to accept this appalling difference between rejection rates of 7 and 25 percent as reflecting on the intelligence and educability of American youth. I blame American schools for this.

Compared to other advanced countries, American education is extremely inefficient. It wastes an inordinate amount of time and costs the taxpayer tremendous sums of money. For lack of an accepted standards, there is poor articulation between one grade and the next, between one school and the next higher. Repetition is inevitable when promotion is automatic. Teachers cannot at the start of the school year count on children in the new class having completed a prescribed course of study in the preceding grade. And so our schools cannot have the orderly sequence of carefully planned curriculums that makes European education so efficient; where each year builds on what has been learned before and there is no needless rehashing of the same subjects nor any gap in knowledge that might hinder orderly and rapid educational progress.

We have a fantastic stretchout in education. It takes average American children 12 years to reach achievement levels their counterparts on the Continent attain in a little over 8. The American bachelor degree comes at the end of 16 years of schooling, the Continental degree at the end of 12 to 13. At that, Continental holders of the baccalaureat are better educated than the majority of American college graduates.

The slow pace of American education harms all our children. The less able get discouraged and drop out before they have even acquired what abroad would be considered an elementary education. As late as 1958 a quarter of our youth quit school at the end of the 10th grade or earlier, and 10 percent quit at the end of the 5th grade. Only half our children obtained a high school diploma. A decade earlier the situation was worse. Well over half dropped out with less than 10 years schooling; one quarter with no more than 5 years; and only a third completed high school. Those who did not stay on through high school received less basic schooling than has long been required of all Continental children, whose attendance during the compulsory period is virtually 100 percent. In consequence we still have 8 million functional illiterates while parts of Europe have been wholly literate for a century, in some cases for a century and a half.

Educational inefficiency wastes the best learning years of our talented youth and contributes mightily to shortages of "professionals," men and women with fine minds and high educational qualifications without whom no modern nation can function properly. As you all know, we have a chronic teacher shortage we seem unable to overcome. It is aggravated by the educational stretch-out for, since it takes American schools longer than necessary to attain a given scholastic level, we need proportionately more teachers. We have a serious shortage in medical personnel. Currently, we are trying to lure nurses from Canada. We import almost a quarter of our physicians from all parts of the world since each year we graduate only three quarters of the number we require. Despite all our efforts to encourage more young people to enter engineering, our deficit grows year by year. We need 72,000 new engineers annually but graduate only 45,000. The Russians graduate three times that many and their engineers are competent. Former Secretary Ribicoff warned that we were coming dangerously close to a point where the balance of brain power in this important area may tip decisively against us.

Observe how the stretch-out contributes to our doctor shortage. Because of it Americans must put in 3 or 4 extra years before they graduate medical school. Mind you, these are not years added to the professional education; they will not make them better doctors. These years are the result of educational inefficiency, pure and simple. They are required because it takes that much longer to reach the bachelor degree in this country. You can figure for yourselves how much these needless years add to the expense of becoming a physician. Since in this country 80 percent of the cost of a medical education must be borne by the student, the school stretch-out will inexorably bring us to a point where only children of the rich can afford to become physicians. Even today families with incomes under $5,000 supply only 14 percent of our medical students, yet these families make up 50 percent of the population. As a result, the number of applicants to our medical schools is currently decreasing, yet with a soaring population we need more doctors.

The same shortages plague us in skilled labor. We have too few skilled and too many unskilled workers; exactly the reverse of the situation that exists in Europe where many countries are scouting as far as the Near East to find unskilled laborers. Switzerland has to import virtually all she needs in this category—she produces almost no unskilled workers herself. England's working force is 50 percent skilled, 12 percent semiskilled. Russia has a tremendous training program for technicians. Her technicums annually graduate 250,000 engineering technicians alone; we graduate 16,000.

Educational inefficiency hurts our children and it hurts the Nation. It also makes ours the most expensive school system in the world. We spend more money to carry a child to a given level of scholarship than any other country. This is a serious matter, given our very rapid population growth—almost three times more rapid than in most European countries. In the last 10 years State taxes have doubled, I believe, with education accounting for most of the increase. Can we just go on that way? According to the 1960 U.S. Statistical Abstract, the average cost per pupil in 1900 was $16.67; in 1956 it was $294.22; it has risen much higher since then. Some States now invest over $500 per pupil each year. Even making allowance for the shrunken value of the dollar the educational results are hardly commensurate with this enormous increase in cost.

There is a limit in free societies, no matter how relatively affluent they are, beyond which people cannot be made to sacrifice, especially when those who proportionately pay most quite often get the smallest personal benefit. Some school districts are approaching the point where no more taxes can be wrung from the populace. It is

becoming increasingly evident to thinking Americans that the problem of oncoming enrollment increases cannot be met merely by raising school taxes ad infinitum; we must also make a major effort to obtain a greater yield in genuine education for our tax dollars.

What then is to be done to improve American education? Well, local communities and State governments have the power to increase the amount of classroom instruction per school year. We have the shortest school day and school year among leading nations. They have the power to eliminate from school curricula everything that can be learned elsewhere. We are the only Western nation where precious school hours are wasted teaching children how to make fudge, twirl batons, drive cars, budget income, handle the telephone, catch fish, and become likable, lovable, and datable. They could improve teacher qualifications, bringing them up to the level existing abroad, and they could then put the educational enterprise under the supervision of our best teachers, giving them the necessary clerical and administrative assistance. Abroad where teaching is an honored profession, no one would dream of putting nonteacher administrators in charge of schools. We are the only country where teachers are bossed by educational administrators who often as not can lay no claim to scholarship, superior intelligence or higher education, and who may not have had experience in classroom teaching. Ex-athletic coaches are often made school principals, incredible as this may seem.

These suggested steps indicate the direction in which we must move. A few communities alert to the problem have begun to act, but progress is still extremely spotty. Of course, it is encouraging that Caltech now gets highly qualified students but its freshman class numbers only 182. The raising of admissions standards in the Ivy League colleges has had a most salutary effect on bright high school students who all of a sudden realize that a good education requires exertion. But the Ivy League colleges enroll fewer than 1 percent of all our college freshmen. One can easily be fooled by enthusiastic press reports about this or that innovation which supposedly will at one stroke raise education sky high. "From kindergarten to college in 5 years" the advertisement for one mechanical gadget promises. I do not think our deep-seated educational deficiencies can be overcome that easily; on the contrary, quite extraordinary effort on the part of the public, of parents and of public officials will be needed.

Specifically, I am convinced we cannot put through a really effective reform program unless we set up a national scholastic standard—a permissive standard, of course—but nevertheless potentially a great influence for good. Many countries have, at one time or another, discovered their educational systems to be unsatisfactory. I know of none that has been able to carry out speedy reform without making use of some such standard. Indeed we are the only advanced nation without a national scholastic standard.

Now the word "standard" has many connotations. I use it in the sense that comes first to mind: a specific requirement or level of excellence deemed worthy of esteem or reward. Not a law, enforceable in the courts; falling below standard does not put one in jail. Nor a conventional rule imposed by society; failure to meet the standard does not get one socially ostracized. No one has to live up to the standard. It is simply an optional criterion for determining the value of an act or accomplishment. For those who accept the standard it becomes the yardstick by which the worth of these acts or accomplishments is determined.

I do not share the pride our educationists take in the fact that we are the only leading nation with a school system that does not challenge its children to meet a national scholastic standard in order to receive academic rewards. I do not agree with them that children must not be judged; that each child has a right to equal education and equal status; hence that, as one superintendent of schools put it, straight thinking and democratically minded school administrators will hand out the same diploma, regardless of the variation of high school courses and the range of scholastic achievement that are presented by the graduates as evidence of accomplishment. I think this educator misreads the whole purpose of academic certificates when he notes with approval that: No longer does the diploma in its wording discriminate among the graduates, as was once the case when it carried the name of the course in which the student went through school, consequently implying that the accomplishments of the youth who did not take the highly academic lane were less worthy.

Nor do I share educationist concern that children who do not measure up to a standard will suffer pain and lose face. I suggest we set up a standard for different levels of aptitude, but in each case representing not the average accomplishment but the highest level children of this ability can with effort achieve.

All of life is a series of tests. Young people will be better able to take these tests in their stride if at an early age they begin to learn that everything worthwhile requires great effort but that the satisfaction derived from attaining a standard makes effort worthwhile. Given the wide differences of aptitude with which we are born and which we do not know how to alter, is it not good for young children to discover that some goals are beyond their capacities; that they cannot win all the tests? It is better to know one's limitations, as well as one's capacities, than to live in delusion which life sooner or later will rudely shatter.

Every American wants the best for the children of our country. In education the best we can give them is the chance to stretch their minds and reach the highest goal their intellect can encompass. "Democracy," wrote the late Dorothy Thompson, "is not to be conceived of as an invitation to share a common mediocrity, but a system that allows each to express and live up to the special excellence that is in him."

Last May, in testimony on English education before the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON asked me by what means I thought Congress might help to speed educational progress. I suggested that a National Standards Committee be created. This would be a small Committee composed of men of national stature and eminence—trustworthy, intelligent, scholarly, and devoted to the ideal of an American education second to none. The Committee would have two tasks:

The first would be purely informational; it would act as an educational watchtower announcing danger when it saw it approaching. The members would keep under continuous scrutiny, and periodically report on the state of American education. Does it meet the needs of our times? Is it competitive with education in countries at similar levels of culture and technology with whom we compete economically, politically, or militarily? How do American children compare in academic knowledge with children in Europe or Russia, say at age 12, or 16, or 18; taking, of course, into consideration different ability levels?

The Committee's second task would be to formulate a national scholastic standard on the basis of its findings; a standard which would make us internationally competitive and would also respond to our specific domestic needs. The Committee would do this by means of examinations set at different ability levels. No one would have to take them, but those who passed would receive national accreditation. The Committee would in no way interfere with established institutions now granting diplomas or degrees. It would simply set up a higher standard, offer it to anyone who wished to meet it, and certify those who had successfully done so.

Neither the Committee's informational nor its standard setting function would represent a radical departure from established practice. Many Federal agencies collect and distribute information. We need a disinterested agency to tell us the unvarnished truth about the true state of American education. The Committee would help prevent complacency and illusions of superiority and thus save us from the kind of painful shocks that Sputnik and other evidence of Russian scientific proficiency have given us in the past few years. There is precedent, too, for the Committee's setting of permissive national standards. We have something very like it in the 1961 amendment to the 1956 Water Pollution Act.

This amendment authorizes the Federal Government—if so requested by a State—to research and develop new methods of pollution control and to award grants-in-aid to localities and States wishing to use these federally established methods. In principle, you have here a national standard very much like the scholastic standard of the proposed Committee, in that it is not imposed but merely offered as a service on a take it or leave it basis.

Water pollution and mediocre education have this in common: They are problems that cannot be solved by local and State authorities alone but require some assistance from the Federal Government. Population growth threatens us with a severe water shortage unless we devise better means to preserve the quality of our water resources so that they may be used over and over again. Pollution abatement has therefore become a national problem and we accept a new kind of Federal aid. I believe improvement of the quality of American education is at least as pressing as the need for an assured supply of clean water. "Education," say the Ford Foundation report for 1959, "is now the indispensable medium for survival and progress." Education is so basic to the quality of our national life that by steering it in the right direction we can change America's future; we can make it secure. To steer it right, I believe we need a new kind of Federal aid—the kind of aid that the proposed National Standards Committee would offer.

I hope I may convince you that it would be entirely proper and extremely useful for us to have such an agency. Let me make it crystal clear that nothing in my proposal would violate the constitutional separation of power between Federal and State governments, nor go counter to our tradition of control of schools by the local community. I envisage the rendering of a service, not regulation in any way, shape or manner. The proposed committee would not usurp the functions of any existing institution.

Its job would be to draw up national examinations going deeply into a candidate's true knowledge and intellectual caliber—not IBM graded multiple choice tests. I suggested to the Appropriations Committee that we might well model them on the English national examinations which come at three levels and which offer many subject tests. Students choose the number of subjects and the level at which they wish to be examined. This is marked on their certificate which will list their so-called passes.

Our committee might provide one set examinations at the level appropriate for a high school graduate who aspires to enter a first-rate college; another set of examinations at the level of students who may wish to prepare for a semiprofessional or technician's job not requiring a bachelor degree but still requiring a good high school education. Still another for graduates of various types of colleges, especially those bound for the teaching profession. I stress again that no one would need to take these examinations; but those who did pass them successfully would obtain national certification; perhaps the notation N.S.—National Scholar—stamped on their regular diplomas or degrees. The seal would clearly indicate what the holder had achieved. There are many occasions when admissions officers of higher educational institutions or prospective employers have a valid reason for wanting to know what an applicant's scholastic qualifications actually are. Think how much time and money would be saved if the diploma were clearly to indicate this. Everywhere abroad it is taken for granted that academic degrees conform to a specific standard—a standard known to everyone. Setting the standard is not regarded as government intrusion or tyranny but as a welcome service to students, their parents and the taxpayers who pay for public education.

Everyone benefits when there is a standard. At one stroke it does away with misleading the means to judge whether a school or college is doing its job properly. By offering the reward of a certified diploma to our children many who now drift through school would be encouraged to aspire to higher academic goals. You can't expect children to study hard subjects such as mathematics, science, and languages when next door others are effortlessly accumulating equal credits by easy life-adjustment courses in "family life." It surely isn't undemocratic to reward those who exert themselves with a diploma that takes note of their accomplishments. This is what certification by a national standards committee would do.

There is no question in my mind that a large sector of the American people wants better education. Public interest has grown tremendously. In the recent primaries for election of a superintendent of the Los Angeles schools there was almost as great a voter turnout as in the primaries for Governor of California. The news media now gives much more space to educational matters than was the case but a few years ago. Every time I speak or write on education I receive a tremendous number of letters.

What strikes me in these letters is the sense of individual helplessness they reflect. Individually, my correspondents have long known that education must be drastically reformed but they don't know how to induce Government to act. The very size of our Nation alienates Government from the individual and accounts for much of the apathy for which the people are frequently castigated. Yet so often they can find no one in Government to supply the leadership that is needed to carry out their wishes. Especially when this requires tackling, on the local and on the national level, so powerful a lobby as our educational establishment. People like myself can try to bring the truth to the public so that it may be able to reach a consensus—and this I believe has now been accomplished. Enough people want school reform to warrant Government action.

I think this country has reached a stage where public education calls for a partnership of local, State, and Federal authorities, each having its particular service to offer. Any determined reform effort—be it at the local or State level—would in my opinion be greatly helped if we had a National Standards Committee. The permissive character of the Committee's activities would introduce into public education a needed element of choice. It would leave untouched the status quo for those who are content with it. At the same time it would provide facilities for people who prefer to set themselves a scholastic standard well above current achievement levels.

The Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset once wrote a book around the thesis—to quote him—that "there is no doubt the most radical division it is possible to make of humanity is that which splits it into two classes of creatures: those who make great demands on themselves, piling up difficulties and duties; and those who demand nothing special of themselves, but for whom to live is to be every moment what they already are." I read this as a young man and it impressed me deeply. And all my life I have unconsciously judged people and institutions by whether or not they set themselves a standard; whether they measure themselves against a criterion that requires effort because they deem it worthy of effort.

Let us in education as in everything else heed Jefferson's advice, to "dream of an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity."

Since my appearance here is under the auspices of the Greater Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce, and since your mission is the welfare of this community, I would like to take a few more minutes and relate what I have said to a major problem which I believe faces you.

Let me give you the gist of an address by Dr. Lloyd Berkner at the Franklin Institute in January of this year.

Dr. Berkner who is president of the Graduate Research Center of Southwest in Dallas, Tex., brought out a fact that is not yet widely understood: that today the greatest source of wealth for any nation, any community is educated brainpower.

In the past, wealth was derived from the application of labor to basic resources. But the science of today has created a new source of wealth—innovations derived from science and technology created by brainpower. Brainpower, then, becomes the resource upon which our Nation, as well as Michigan and Grand Rapids must depend for future economic and social health.

For example, a chicken factory can now produce 100,000 fowls with 3 or 4 workers, and the same efficiency is expanding to products of wheat and corn, to beef and pork. The number of agricultural workers dropped 2.6 million, or 37 percent in the last decade.

So in the 1960's our society finds itself plunged into a new social environment to which it must suddenly readjust. This readjustment requires a far greater emphasis at the boundaries of knowledge. No longer are labor, land or supply of raw materials and water the central concerns in locating a large plant. Instead, accessibility to brainpower takes first place.

The creation of new industry, new products and devices, now arise from the creative and imaginative insights of these scientific and technological leaders who have access to the very limits of knowledge. Without this top skill for innovation, men of lesser skill will lose their opportunity.

As Dr. Berkner showed, no training of numbers at the trade school, high school or college level, can in itself capture the new technology. What we need is men on the Ph. D. level. For each Ph. D. available to us, we can employ 5 to 10 engineers, and for each engineer, 10 to 15 skilled workers. Indeed, in the future, we may have to count 100 or more unemployed for each Ph. D. we fail to educate.

At the Governors' Conference at Minneapolis in March 1962, Governor Andersen pointed out that the science-oriented industry derived from new technology had grown from less than $2 million annually in 1950 to $770 million annually in 1961, to become one of Minnesota's principal sources of endeavor. This is graphic demonstration of the power of the new technology. In a mere 11 years, intellectual leadership had created employment for nearly 100,000 Minnesotans, representing the welfare of nearly a half million persons. But even with this remarkable performance, Minnesota is producing only one-fourth of the highly trained leaders needed to develop her requisite industrial base.

What is the relevance of all this to you? I find the following statistics on public schools for 1961:

Michigan stood 12 among the States in the number of high school graduates as a percentage of their eighth grade enrollment; 21 in the percentage of selective service registrants failing the mental test; 45 among the States in the percentage of elementary school classroom teachers with less than standard certificates; and 17 in the percentage of secondary school teachers with less than standard certificates.

I know it is difficult to compare educational excellence among States and that the statistics I have cited are not conclusive. Yet they do indicate there is room for improvement in Michigan's public schools.

Would not the simple expedient of a national standard help you to find out exactly where you do stand? Would it not help you decide whether you are getting the results you should for the large sums you are spending on education, and so point the way to necessary remedial measures?

For if the public schools fail in their purpose it will not be possible to develop in adequate number the brainpower and consequent innovation on which you must depend for your major capital development in the future—on the development which this community must depend for opportunity, employment, and happiness.

Charitable Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under previously granted leave to extend my remarks, I present herewith the last three in a series of articles published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on the subject of some Texas foundations.

It is not my purpose or intent in any way to disparage or take issue with the investigations being conducted into certain foundations by a House subcommittee. Unquestionably, the study can perform a useful function in exploring the operations of some foundations where abuses may have occurred. As in all cases, a balance must be preserved in considering the points of issue. Just as I felt that stories about abuses in Congress should be balanced by a presentation of the facts about Congressmen who honor the public trust, so also do I feel that the work of good foundations should not go unnoticed. It is my hope that the articles reproduced here are useful from that point of view.

The articles follow:

CITY ORGANIZATION PAYS NO SALARIES—VII

(By Mabel Gouldy)

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, in a continuing investigation by a U.S. House subcommittee in broad charges

against tax-exempt, charitable foundations, has implied many are tax dodgers.

There is reason to suspect that some are, but like persons who try to evade payment of personal income taxes, they are a definite minority.

One of the most direct forms of tax dodging is transfer of assets or business holdings and payments of large salaries, particularly to relatives.

Another common form is to set up a foundation and either buy or sell from the so-called charitable organization.

Under a revenue act passed by Congress in 1950, tax-exempt organizations are prevented from competing in business with taxable corporations.

One of PATMAN's complaints has been that foundations are competitors with small business.

Under the 1950 law it is specified that if a foundation actually goes into business it is taxed on its income just like any other corporation. Such earnings are termed unrelated net income.

The A. J. and Jessie Duncan Foundation is a good example of a relatively small Fort Worth foundation that can be called neither a spendthrift on administrative costs nor a threat of any kind to the local economy.

The foundation was set up by the late former president and then board chairman of Texas Electric Service Co. Mrs. Duncan resides at 1317 Washington Terrace.

The foundation was chartered March 1, 1955, to maintain, or support, religious, charitable, scientific or educational institutions and organizations.

Its financial statement of February 28, 1962, reflected total assets of $602,224.14.

Income is from investments, principally bank stocks.

For the last fiscal year income was $15,360.

There are no administrative expenses and no salaries are paid by the foundation.

Expenses from March 1961 through February 1962 totaled $962.

Of this sum, $302.39 was spent for legal expenses and another $300 was allocated for accounting.

Trustees make gifts from income only and do not go into the capital account of the foundation.

Gifts for the fiscal year ending in February 1962 were $22,421.63, or more than income for that period.

The Edna Gladney Home (for unwed mothers) has been the largest recipient from the Duncan Foundation, having received a total of $11,651.38.

Among other benefactions have been $1,000 to the building fund at St. Joseph Hospital; $500 to the Fort Worth Area Council of Churches; $3,000 to the family law section of the State Bar of Texas; $3,000 to the Moslah Shrine Temple fund for underprivileged children, and $2,500 to the Camp Fire Girls for a building site.

Other typicals gifts have aided a program for retarded children; a foundation for medical education; All Saints and Harris Hospitals; Texas Christian University and Texas Wesleyan College, as well as building and/or budget funds of First Presbyterian and University Christian Churches.

Expenditures have ranged from $10.25 to $8,000.

The foundation's range of contributions to community betterment and relief of human suffering is typical of the gamut of many Texas foundations that have been in position to authorize multimillion dollar grants.

Attorney Sproesser Wynn is the foundation's president and treasurer. Mrs. Duncan is honorary president.

TEXARKANA MAN STARTED BENEVOLENT WORK IN 1920's—VIII

(By Mabel Gouldy)

The late William Buchanan was a Texas pioneer in several senses.

He was a pioneer settler in Texarkana and operated a chain of lumber mills from that area south through central Louisiana.

Buchanan's mills cut much of the pine and other timber from the present townsite of Texarkana.

Also, he was a founder and builder of the Louisiana & Arkansas Railroad, now incorporated as part of the Kansas City Southern system.

But in addition to business successes, Buchanan was ahead for his day in this State in another way.

Under a deed of trust on October 19, 1923, Buchanan created the William Buchanan Foundation.

Its purposes were to support benevolent and charitable undertakings and for the alleviation of suffering and distress.

Trustees were authorized to make grants in Bowie County and adjoining counties as well as for the benefit of such other persons as in the judgment of trustees should receive the benefits of the activities and institutions established hereunder.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS AIDED

One section of the deed of trust stipulated:

"No trustee or any employee of said trustees shall receive or legally be entitled to receive any pecuniary profit from the trust fund or operations hereunder, except reasonable compensation for services rendered in effecting one or more of the purposes herein mentioned, or a proper beneficiary of one of the charitable purposes aforesaid."

The initial grants from Buchanan, his wife, and their son, W. J. Buchanan, amounted to $1,140,216.50.

Since that time, the foundation has expended $1,477,773.34 to various charitable organizations in Texas and Arkansas including grants of $651,732.85 to the medical school of the University of Texas and $500,000 to the medical school of the University of Arkansas.

The principal of the foundation amounted to $1,594,148.24 after payment of expenses and grants, the last audit revealed on August 31, 1962.

Total charges against the foundation, other than grants, from the time of inception to the last audit totaled $106,477.28.

ACTION BY DANIEL

Legal fees of $41,427.95 paid to outside attorneys were included in the latter.

The attorneys defended the foundation against litigation brought by Price Daniel, when he was State attorney general, to prevent it from making grants outside of Texarkana and its immediate environs.

An effort was made to prevent payments being made to the University of Texas and the University of Arkansas.

At the first meeting of trustees in October 1923, the following resolution was passed unanimously:

"*Resolved,* That this board of trustees hereby adopts, as part of its administrative policy, the expressed wish of William Buchanan that Negroes shall not be excluded from the benefits of the William Buchanan Foundation."

Only 4 of the original 14 trustees were related to the donor by blood or marriage. Buchanan was a trustee, of course, but died shortly after the foundation was established.

The other trustees were of wide repute and note in the Texarkana area.

COMPLETE LIST

In addition to the grants to the two State universities the complete list of disbursements to others by the foundation is—

Texas Eleemosynary Commissions, $5,000.
Hospital fees for children, $72.
Miller County, Ark., health unit, $2,616.65.
Bowie County, Tex., health unit, $19,439.60.
Council of Social Agencies, Dallas, $1,836.84.
Bowie County Child Welfare Board, $7,587.79.
Texarkana College vocational nursing program, $11,112.61.
Family Service, Texarkana, $97,000.
Collins Memorial, Inc., $2,500.
YWCA building fund, $5,000.
Optimist Boys Club, $1,100.
Texarkana Memorial Hospital, Inc., $100,000.
Texarkana College Foundation, $42,025.
St. Michael's Hospital, $30,000.
Girl Scouts building fund, $750.

BROWN-LUPTON GRANT AIDS BURN TREATMENT—IX

(By Mabel Gouldy)

A garage mechanic working under a car from which gas was leaking was enveloped in flames when a passerby lit a cigaret and tossed the match away.

A Texas doctor had returned from Korea where he served as a consultant to the U.S. Army on the effects of burns during World War II.

A Fort Worth charitable and tax-exempt foundation had put up $20,000 to help finance burn research by the medical branch of the University of Texas at Galveston.

How are these three events connected?

Very simply.

The mechanic was horribly burned over 90 percent of his body and face.

His case was considered hopeless.

The doctor is Dr. T. G. Blocker, Jr., whose work on burns has been outstanding at the medical branch and widely recognized.

The T. J. Brown and C. A. Lupton Foundation, one of Fort Worth's most active organization's of that kind and which is financed mainly by Coca-Cola stock, put up the $20,000 for research.

Dr. Blocker and his asociates were still making their studies in 1951 when the family of the mechanic agreed that he undergo experimental treatment with exposure therapy form of treatment the research had uncovered.

The injured man was hospitalized more than a year and eventually received treatment and care that would have come to $65,000.

Pictures were made of him each day that he was in the hospital.

The concluding photographs show full recovery and no disfiguring scars on his face or body.

This man happened to be white but no color line has ever been drawn on any of the foundation's benefactions.

During the 2-year study a 2½-year-old Negro girl with 75 percent flame burns also recovered when by all medical evidence she should have died.

The child had received only one blood transfusion when she was transported 300 miles to the John Sealy Hospital and arrived in most profound shock and with severe anemia.

Other burn victims have died with burns half as extensive despite excellent primary treatment.

Attorney J. A. Gooch, who is a director and secretary of the board of the foundation, feels that the grant was responsible for the present-day treatment of burns at the medical branch.

Substantial contributions have been made by the Brown-Lupton Foundation to cancer research, also.

"We have an income of $150,000 a year approximately and we spend it," Gooch said of the foundation.

There are no fees or salaries paid by the foundation, he pointed out.

On December 23, 1942, the T. J. Brown Foundation, Inc., was chartered.

The charter was amended March 21, 1947, and the name became the T. J. Brown and C. A. Lupton Foundation.

Directors are S. P. Woodson, Jr., Mrs. C. A. Lupton and her daughters, Mmes. Shirley Lupton Holmes and Gloria Lupton Tenni-

son, Gooch, V. J. Earnheart, all of Fort Worth, and C. P. Lupton, of Waco.

Purposes of the foundation are to aid religious, charitable, or educational undertakings.

The $1 million Brown-Lupton Student Center at Texas Christian University is an outstanding gift to a community and institution of higher learning in anybody's league.

Texas Wesleyan College and practically all local charities have received funds from Brown-Lupton.

A revolving student loan fund is another feature of the foundation's program and fellowship, at the graduate level and looking toward doctorates, principally in the field of education, are available on the condition that the teaching career will be in Texas.

Baylor University, Austin College at Sherman, Texas Technological College, Texas A. & M., and other educational institutions have received grants.

The foundation attempts to confine its activities of all kinds to Texas. And it tries to avoid dipping into capital and spending only income.

Taxes are paid on real property, which includes a ranch in the Rio Grande Valley.

Loans for education are based, among other things, on need.

Recipients also must work part-time.

Certificates of grades are required from second-year students on, showing they are in the top 25 percent of their classes.

Statements also are required from deans of schools and of student life.

Worthy students, regardless of race, creed, or color, may borrow from the revolving fund.

They are carefully screened, as are all other requests for assistance.

The Lena Pope Home has been a consistent beneficiary of Brown-Lupton Foundation generosity, and an estimated $100,000 has been contributed for immediate or long-range needs.

Between $2.5 million and $3 million has been expended by the foundation.

President Ben-Zvi, of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend the news of the death of Israel's President, Isaac Ben-Zvi, has cast a pall over the preparations for the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel. There as well as in many other countries throughout the world, the news of Ben-Zvi's death has come as a great shock and a sad reminder of the toll of time.

Mr. Ben-Zvi's role in Israel began early in the 20th century when the plan of a national homeland for the Jews was in its infancy. Ben-Zvi came to Palestine from Russia in 1906, uprooted and exiled in the wake of the cruel anti-Jewish programs that swept Russia at that time. From the moment of his arrival in Palestine, he had dedicated his generous heart and vigorous mind to the task of providing a place for Jews to live without ghetto and persecution.

Questions of national defense, education and the labor movement occupied this pioneer during the years between the wars. Uppermost in his mind seemed to be the work of preparation for the birth of a national state. The culmination of these labors of preparation came in 1948 when Ben-Zvi affixed his signature to the Israeli Declaration of Independence. Ben-Zvi directed his energies in the years after independence to the consolidation and strengthening of the gains he had given so much to secure. In 1952, Israel rewarded Ben-Zvi's 46 years of dedicated service by electing him the second President of the new State. He has served in this capacity until his death last week, 57 years after his arrival in Palestine.

I wish to join with Israel at this time in offering my deepest sympathy on the death of this distinguished patriot. Israel's sorrow will be tempered by its profound gratitude to one who, in the most honored sense of the phrase, gave his life to his country.

Government Loans for Medical and Dental Students and Interns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of Mr. Tilden Cummings, president of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, Ill. One of the largest and most reputable of this Nation's financial institutions, the Continental Illinois experience as a lender to students is not to be taken lightly. In making this statement available I trust it will be considered seriously by those who are entrusted with the final decision on the measure to which he refers.

The statement follows:

GOVERNMENT LOANS FOR MEDICAL CARE AND DENTAL STUDENTS AND INTERNS

(Statement by Mr. Tilden Cummings, president, Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Co.)

It is our understanding that the House of Representatives will consider H.R. 12 soon after the Easter recess. The purpose of this statement is to urge amendment by striking in its entirety the sections that provide for Federal Government loans at 3 percent interest for medical and dental students and interns.

Our position is based upon the Continental Bank's experience in lending to medical students, interns, and residents under the student loan program of the American Medical Association. A comparison of the provisions of the bill with those of the AMA program suggests the following reasons for this position:

(1) The bill would put the Government directly into an activity in the field of medicine appropriate to private enterprise, an activity already being handled adequately. Since the inception of the AMA student loan program in March 1962, more than 7,000 loans have come to us from borrowers located in 83 accredited medical schools in 40 States and possessions, and 462 accredited hospitals in 45 States and possessions. Disbursements under these loans total in excess of $7,500,000. The only security is an 8-percent guarantee fund of AMA's Educational and Research Foundation. Individual maximum borrowing limits are $1,500 per year for 7 years, flexibly allocated among school, internship and residency, and $10,000 total There is an understanding that both time and amounts may be expanded in individual cases by agreement as warranted. Repayment period is 10 years, following a 6-months' interim.

Although a hitherto untried kind of private credit, interest rates are substantially lower than those of other individual installment loans of substantially shorter maturities, whether made for educational or consumer purposes. While this bank has thus far pioneered the lending under the AMA program, it is expected that others in various part of the country will join as experience is built up. We also understand that a comparable plan has been adopted by the osteopathic profession. Nor do we see any reason why the same approach would not adequately serve the requirements of student dentists.

2. The bill contains provisions that in our opinion are an unwarranted subsidy contrary to the public interest for the following reasons:

(a) The absence of any accrual of interest during the school and intern period, notwithstanding the fact that the borrower would have had the use of public funds during this period of from 1 to 6 years.

(b) The 3 percent interest rate during the repayment period is a subsidized rate, well below the direct interest cost to the Government of funds which it will have to borrow to finance the program. This subsidized rate cannot, in our experience, support even the minimum administration costs of the program under H.R. 12, thereby constituting a further Government subsidy of an activity well suited to private handling.

Enactment of either of these provisions would substantially nullify any efforts aimed at private low-cost financing of medical education, a field where there is substantial progress in meeting critical defense and civilian needs.

It is our belief that the AMA program has already proved its adequacy, is growing steadily, and will continue to meet its increasing demands. Therefore it does not deserve to have imposed upon it the subsidized competition of Government lending.

The Important Role of the Republican Minority in the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. PELLY], during the Easter congressional recess, made an important speech to the chamber of commerce in Kennewick.

Under unanimous consent previously obtained, I ask that this speech pointing up the important role of the Republican minority in the 88th Congress be printed in full at this point:

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM AND PARTY UNITY

As a minority Member of Congress, mine is an important responsibility. Like other members of the minority party under the two-party system, it is my responsibility to

assure that the American people get as much as possible the facts of both sides of foreign and domestic issues. Under the Constitution, the minority of the legislative branch has an important role. The minority must examine the language and provisions of all administration legislative proposals. In order to strengthen good programs or avoid ill-conceived ones, the minority must suggest alternatives and debate the merits and demerits of all suggested programs. Today, the Republican Party rightly must challenge the policies of the Democratic Party where we find them wrong or ill advised. This is our role.

The press from day to day reports the respective viewpoints of both parties and the issues as the record is written in the daily proceedings of Congress, and thereby an informed public opinion is created. Consequently, the great force of public opinion is stirred and political action consummated.

One very important function of a partisan minority party is frank criticism of the executive branch leadership in the event preelection promises are broken, or power is abused, or mistakes are made. Indeed, a vigorous and vocal minority is absolutely essential, where, as under our Constitution, the sovereign power is vested in the people themselves.

A minority party is the manifestation of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is a manifestation of freedom of speech. It is the very safeguard of democracy.

In this spirit, in the role of honest opposition, I appear before you today. I am here as a part of the checks and balances of our Government. As a member of the legislative branch, I must criticize the executive branch where I think it is failing to do the right thing. I criticize freely but never disrespectfully the man or men who hold office, but never the office itself. For example, I have an obligation to not spare President Kennedy; at least, I must not withhold judgment of his actions.

Never has the importance of minority opposition been pointed up so emphatically as with the Cuban situation, or so it seemed to me, because I, myself, was involved. I suddenly discovered that Members of Congress and the press corps were being deliberately misled by our State Department in an effort to tranquilize the American people about the Communist threat in Cuba. This was at the very time the Defense Department had solid intelligence reports as to Soviet missiles and the Communist military offensive threat to the United States in Cuba. I was misinformed by the State Department and told no such threat existed. In briefings, the State Department not only withheld information, but on its own initiative gave false information. At that time, the public was, and still is, extremely concerned over the Cuban situation and it was obvious that an attempt was made to use the press and Members of Congress to calm public agitation, at least until after the November 6 elections.

Under our system of government, as you know, the people must have the true facts. The most serious and dangerous policy that I can conceive of under our constitutional form of government is for an agency of Government to deliberately misinform the public or withhold facts in order to justify its actions or policies.

Whereas 10 years ago there were less than 600 public relations positions in the various agencies of Government, we are safe in assuming that today there are not less than 1,350. These individuals are subject to the policymaking decisions of the administration and can be, and often are, used to sell the people on what a good job the administration is doing.

And the only safeguard against having the people and the Nation being brainwashed by those in power is an alert press and a vigilant minority party.

Right now, the subject of management of the news is being debated. How shocking to have an administration official, as was the case recently, uphold the right of a Government to lie. There is such a thing as national security, and no one asks that vital secrets be released. But in a Republic such as ours, the facts must not be twisted to fool the people. As a newspaper editor testified recently, catch a government lying and the people will never again trust that government.

As a member of the minority party, I am here to warn you that much as all of us might wish differently, our country and our freedom is not having easy going in this troubled world. The Kennedy administration has muffed the ball in its conduct of our foreign affairs.

The way we handled the Skybolt issue has cost us considerable respect in Great Britain. We spoke out of turn and caused a major political crisis in Canada. We have antagonized France and the solidarity of our common European and Atlantic defense is out of balance. In plain language, there is a growing official desire to coexist with our enemy, the Kremlin, and if necessary, to disarm and end nuclear testing without inspection. All the while, we are not getting along with the non-Communist nations. Bluntly speaking, we placate our enemies and insult our friends. We have been giving away our money through foreign aid, but getting no friends. We are in a war now, and American boys are being killed in South Vietnam. I do not suggest that Democrats or this administration want this war. The point is, however, that our foreign affairs are not going well, and do not let any White House press conference or managed news release convince you otherwise.

Like every American, I want the President to succeed. He is my President, too. But in all honesty, I can't go along with an administration which says Cuba is a showcase of Communist failure.

The truth is, Cuba is a Soviet beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. The truth is, the Monroe Doctrine has been violated and it is being violated every single day.

If Cuba is to be what Mr. Kennedy says it already is, an example of Soviet failure, then Castro and communism must be destroyed. That is the way to make it a showcase of Communist failure.

My job as a member of the minority is to keep that fact before the American people.

My job is to not let the alleged withdrawal of ICBM Soviet missiles obscure the sad story of the Bay of Pigs and the humiliation of the United States ransoming the Cuban freedom fighters. Nor should we forget our backing down on promised inspection of the missile withdrawal.

My job, as I see it, is to find out the details about any deals between Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy, because the public should have the complete details of any nuclear testing ban and any secret disarmament agreements.

Mr. Khrushchev is one of the shrewdest men of all history. He has no integrity nor any regard for his word.

A minority party has an important assignment in debating any decisions or arrangements the administration makes with him or with other nations.

Of course, the President has certain responsibilities in connection with foreign policy. He makes agreements. That's his job, not mine. As a member of the legislative branch, and especially as a U.S. Representative, my job is to see that he does the right thing. But as a Republican, I am not under obligation of silence to refrain from criticism, if criticism is called for.

What is bipartisan foreign policy? As Senator Vandenberg, the originator of bipartisanship in foreign affairs, declared, a minority party has a responsibility to debate foreign affairs. He said we should debate them totally, "down to the water's edge," to quote his own words. I am proud of the restrained way in which the Republicans in Congress have exercised this function.

As to domestic affairs, I make no bones about it, I am here to give you the Republican viewpoint., I am here to recall to you the words of Candidate Kennedy, campaigning for President, when he promised to "get the Nation moving again."

Candidate Kennedy called for a goal of 5 percent annual growth rate and reduction of unemployment to 4 percent. You remember that.

After the election, the President sought to achieve his goal by deficit Federal spending to increase the public purchasing power. He initiated an accelerated public works program and other vast spending measures. The minority party opposed this solution and warned that such fiscal irresponsibility would never create prosperity.

And now Mr. Kennedy has found that the Republicans were right. The growth rate did not improve. Unemployment went up to 6.1 percent with that massive Government spending.

And now it is my responsibility to point up a second mistake and to warn that in the light of this failure what the administration is proposing will aggravate and enlarge the first failure and could have extremely serious consequences. The President's plan, as you know, is to increase deficit spending by reducing taxes, to combine tax reduction with increased Federal spending.

Painful as it is to one who has long called for lowering of the tax rates, I must warn that this second Kennedy solution will never work. Instead, our Republican position is that Federal expenditures must be held to last year's total and not increased, which represents a cut in the Kennedy 1964 budget of at least $7 billion. On the other hand, a combination of curtailed expenditures and a tax cut will do the trick and provide a stimulant to prosperity and more jobs. We Republicans hold that confidence in our dollar will be restored with economy in Government, and will mean an end to the flight of gold; will mean expansion of business; will mean higher employment; will mean better consumer purchasing power; will mean an increase in Government revenue; will mean an end to continual raising of the national debt.

Republicans urge cuts in foreign aid, and President Kennedy now agrees, since the Clay report.

Republicans urge cuts in the cost of the space program.

Republicans say a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs and billions of dollars isn't necessary, with the farmer and everyone else paying the bill, just to provide certain big cities with assistance for mass transportation problems.

Republicans are opposed to increased Federal spending.

We oppose planned Federal deficits.

And my role as a member of the minority party is to raise these issues.

I say an increase in the national debt during comparative prosperity is unsound. Rather, we should be paying it off.

I say Federal aid to education, and ever-growing concentration of power in Washington, D.C., is dangerous.

I believe in keeping government close to the people, where the citizens have a voice in their own affairs.

Republicans oppose Federal regimentation and bureaucracy.

As a strong, vital party, Republicans can play an effective part in support of these principles.

In this respect, it is obviously essential that there be unity among Republicans.

My mission on this trip through the State and in traveling throughout eastern Washington with Bill Walter, the State chairman of the Republican Party, is to seek a GOP victory in 1964 through party unity.

Republicans won't win elections otherwise. Republican philosophy and principles won't prevail.

I emphasize—to win, we must have party unity.

If we hope to elect a Republican to the White House in 1964, there must be unity.

And the same formula is true with regard to winning the governorship in Washington State and to having a Republican legislature in this State.

Those of you who are Democrats will understand the problem of disunity. You have it, too. But the Democratic Party being numerically stronger can afford disunity in its ranks, where the Republicans can't afford it.

I have had letters from my constituents who have said that unless the presidential candidate they favor is nominated, when it comes to a vote they will abstain. Conservatives or liberals, they indulge in splinter-group thinking and put a personality above the overall common heritage of their political party. They overlook the fact that a President, be he liberal, conservative, or middle-of-the-road, under the Constitution must carry out the laws and policy of a duly constituted legislative branch. They overlook that Congress on the national level is where, properly, policy is initiated and programs made. Or, on the State level, it is the State legislature that writes the ticket, not the governor.

Republicanism is what this country needs. So I am pointing up the weakness of the Kennedy administration, and that it fails to understand the forces underlying growth that instead of accelerated massive Federal spending and planned deficits, the answer to prosperity is incentives and business confidence to modernize and expand industrial production plants and equipment.

This policy will make American industry more competitive and will preserve our own markets and increase foreign sales.

Pump priming and deficit spending create distrust and business uncertainty. They cause our economy to slow down.

True, some Republicans don't vote for economy and some Democrats do.

But, I submit that this is the record. Democrats, when they have control of Congress, have run up 93.4 percent of the national debt. That is the record. Our party philosophy is different from that of the opposition. Democrat congresses have approved deficit spending budgets or deficiency appropriations which resulted in deficits during 20 of the last 27 years. That is the record.

There were Democrats who voted against those spending sprees and Republicans who voted for them.

But, as the record of Congress will show, the majority of Democrats voted for them and the great majority of Republicans voted against them.

I have cited the record of Congress, but with the State legislature it is the same. The majority of Republicans steadfastly advocate under all possible circumstances that the people, not the Government, should manage their own affairs and spend their own money.

The majority of Republicans are opposed to Government providing benefits that the people can as well provide themselves.

The majority of Republicans tend to oppose increased Government intervention and the majority of Democrats tend to support centralized, big government.

That is the issue of the New Frontier, and frankly, I am here to raise that issue. In a nonpartisan meeting, one doesn't tell the audience how to vote. We just point up the issue as between the two parties.

But especially, as a minority Member of Congress, I point out now that in the first 3 years of the New Frontier, the national debt will have gone up $27 billion.

And I emphasize, this huge increase in the deficit is not a matter of the cost of the national defense.

President Kennedy's 1964 budget request proposes, for example, $2 billion more than in 1963 for other than military expenditures.

This is a $9 billion increase over 1961 for other than defense spending.

Under the New Deal and the Fair Deal and the New Frontier, et al., the Government has expanded until it takes more than 30 percent of all money earned by the people and spends it and a lot more besides, for socialistic programs. There are those who favor socialistic programs; well and good, that is what they are getting. But, I ask you, How long can the American worker, the American farmer, and the American merchant bear the burden? How long can our Nation and its Treasury and our finances be sustained under the stress of massive Government spending? I hope we never find out. If we do get to that point, our free enterprise system will have disappeared.

I assert, republicanism is the answer. Under a Goldwater or a Rockefeller, or a Knowland, or a Romney, if the Republican Party is united, I assert the party can win.

My role in raising a minority voice is to speak out for what I believe will leave to the future a strong America and a free America.

The Republican Party calls for wiser and firmer policies in foreign affairs.

The Republican Party calls for wiser and more prudent policies in domestic affairs.

If you disagree, then you have lost nothing but your time in listening to me.

If you agree with me, then I submit you should be active politically for a Republican victory in 1964 through party unity.

Finally, let me thank you for your attention and willingness, in the fine American tradition of freedom, to allow a political discussion in a nonpartisan meeting. No man or party has a complete monopoly on wisdom, but certainly I have logic on my side.

You have been patient; for that and for your friendly attention, I say thank you, and above all else, Republicans and Democrats can agree on one issue: "God bless America."

President Should Oust Faulty Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at the root of our difficulties in Cuba is the faulty advice of some so-called experts in the State Department. Whatever their reasons, there seems to be a hard-core group of dunder-heads shaping our foreign policy with the strange result that every time we follow their advice we lose and the Communists win.

In answer to the President's challenge to critics of his Cuban no-policy, to come up with a concrete program, may I venture to suggest that his first step be to fire the policymakers in the State Department who are completely unaware of the Communist conspiracy and the plans of the Soviet Union for complete world domination.

William S. White, in the following column from the Dallas Times Herald of April 22 makes a good point of why the President should exile his Cuban policy aids.

PRESIDENT SHOULD CONSIDER EXILING CUBA POLICY AIDS

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—It might be said that while President Kennedy is cracking down on Cuban exile groups in this country, he ought also to exile from his administration practically everybody under 45 who has any hand in our policy in this notably sticky matter.

The capacity for mischief-making of the whiz kids in the administration—an eager, an earnest and an innocently arrogant lot profoundly sure of many things that simply aren't so—is perfectly appalling.

Never has this fact been more sharply illustrated than in the melancholy and increasing bitterness between the administration and Mr. Jose Miro Cardona, the Cuban exile leader. Of course, some of this bitterness was inevitable, once the President decided to ban the hit-and-run raids being run against Castro Cuba with gallantry but also with total ineffectuality.

But it is next door to certain that the thing was unnecessarily rubbed up not merely by our restraint upon the Cuban patriots but also by the way in which it was presented to Dr. Miro and his associates by junior-grade eggheads from the American Government.

Here was a situation which cried aloud for adult tact of approach. We, the U.S. Government, were telling these Cuban patriots that while we deeply sympathized with their motives, we could not allow them to go on operating two-bit raids which could serve no purpose other than to solidify Castro at home and give Moscow some color of excuse to retain in Cuban those Soviet troops we are trying to get out of Cuba by diplomatic means. This is the only means open, since we are not prepared to invade.

We were also telling the patriots that much as we liked them, we could not allow them to embroil us in pointlessly weak military adventures, launched from our shores, which the constitutional authorities of this country did not approve. But didn't Mr. Miro and others get pretty nasty with this Government, too? Of course they did; but this is a big country—big enough to overlook the excesses in speech of the Miros, a small, unhappy and frustrated band.

All this was strong enough stuff for the Cubans to swallow. It was not easy for some Americans, including this one, to defend, either—but for the bleak fact that it happened to be right, so long as we ourselves were not ready to assume the responsibility for real and effective military action against Castro.

But what did this Government do? To deal out this complicated, this exasperating necessity for restraint to Dr. Miro, it sent a boy on a man's errand—a minor young State Department official named Robert Hurwitch. In the background of the new policy, moreover, were intolerantly and intolerably bright young men who had already set the patriots' teeth on edge by knowing all the answers to all Latin-American affairs.

It is unfair to suppose that all the really bright young and youngish academic types in the administration are in such a category. Some—including men like McGeorge Bundy and, for that matter, the much-shot-at Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—are simply in fact not in it, though to say so runs against much current mythology.

But there are enough of the authentically intolerably bright young kind around to

cause this administration enormous and unending trouble.

This is not to question the decency of their motives. But the truth is that, generally, they oscillate between two equally absurd ideas. Half of the time they are convinced that we have only to make the Latin Americans collectively love us—and never mind whether they respect us. And the other half of the time they think it proper to take up with individual Latin Americans of twice their age and experience a lecturing, schoolmasterish attitude.

In Memory of A. Whitney Griswold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Congressman at Large from the State of Connecticut, I respectfully rise to commend to my colleagues the memory of a a truly dedicated educator and leader, A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University since 1950.

Dr. Griswold, a descendant of the early colonial Governors of Connecticut symbolized with manful excellence the finest qualities of our people. He combined the energy and buoyancy of youth with a maturity of judgment that commanded the admiration of his peers. At 43 he was elected president of Yale. A noted scholar and author, he was many times honored at home and abroad. Throughout a lifetime before his death at age 56, Dr. Griswold championed the cause of the advancement of teaching and education in the liberal arts.

"Whit" Griswold will long be remembered by everyone associated with Yale University. For by his brilliant and farsighted service he has enriched that hallowed seat of learning. By his loyal dedication to scholarship in the highest traditions of the liberal education, he has ennobled it. Here, in his own words, is part of the philosophy that he lived, "No one is born to drudgery in a democracy and if drudgery is thrust upon us—as it is in some form or other upon all of us—the liberal arts are its antidote. We are all voters, and as such all equally in need of as much enlightenment as education can give us."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include for the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Bristol Press of Bristol, Conn., for Monday, April 22, 1963, in his honor:

WHITNEY GRISWOLD OF YALE

The death last Friday of A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale, at the age of 56, calls to mind the surprise announcement by the Yale Corp., the governing body of the university, of the selection of Mr. Griswold, in February 1950, to succeed Charles Seymour as president.

A member of the class of 1929, Griswold had been on the Yale faculty since 1933 when he received his Ph. D. at Yale. He held the rank of full professor of history when he was named to the presidency. His classmates knew him as one possessing a sharp wit and a keen sense of humor. At the same time they respected his scholarly attributes and his devotion to teaching at Yale. But Griswold's being named to the university's No. 1 post, 13 years ago, did have a considerable element of surprise, not only to Griswold's classmates, but to Whitney Griswold himself and to most of the academic world outside the university.

It would be an understatement to say that the confidence of the members of the Yale Corp. in Whitney Griswold has been more than amply borne out from his record in a variety of fields, as he piloted Yale's course in a critical period in Yale's history.

The university faced a number of serious problems in the postwar years. The campus was overcrowded with returning servicemen. There was desperate need for new facilities at Yale, for an expanded faculty and for better pay for the faculty. Yale's endowment while considered healthy by the prewar standards, was inadequate to keep pace with the inflationary costs of the postwar years.

Griswold appreciated the plight of the faculty and went to work to do something about it. The story is told that back in the 1930's during his younger days as an assistant professor, he had a special rubber stamp made and went about stamping "Raise faculty salaries" on menus at Mory's in New Haven.

In the 13-year period since 1950, President Griswold was instrumental in seeing faculty salaries doubled at Yale. This was achieved with numerous changes and improvements in the entire educational program. At the same time, major plant improvements with two new residential colleges and other notable additions to the university building complex were completed.

"A great university must never long be satisfied with things as they are—there must be constant self-criticism and self-improvement," he wrote in a recent annual report to Yale alumni. To effect such major changes and improvements as Griswold deemed necessary, Yale needed greatly increased endowment funds as well as added operational funds.

During President Griswold's administration, Yale endowment jumped from $121 million to $375 million this year. A major part of this record was the successful completion of the development fund campaign for the arts and sciences at Yale, raising some $53 milion in the past 2 years. Along with that, annual alumni fund giving at Yale rose from $770,000 in 1950 to almost $3 million last year. This year the goal is to exceed $3 million, a new national collegiate record.

Student editors of the Yale Daily News reviewed President Griswold's 10-year period in 1960 and praised it as the "Griswold Decade, unmatched by any in the long history of Yale, in the increase in the university's resources and in the expansion and reorganization of education programs at all levels."

At the same time President Griswold moved into the forefront of the Nation's academic world as a spokesman for liberal education. In an age of specialists and emphasis on vocational training, Griswold crusaded in defense of the liberal arts.

"The purpose of the liberal arts is not to teach businessmen business or grammarians grammar," he said "it is to awaken and develop the intellectual and spiritual powers in the individual before he enters on his chosen career so that he may bring to that career the greatest possible assets of intelligence, resourcefulness, judgment, and character."

Last Friday evening President Griswold's Yale class of 1929 had scheduled its annual class dinner at Timothy Dwight College. There was some question about postponing the date of the dinner in view of the critical condition of the most distinguished and most beloved member of the class. But word came back to those in charge of the dinner that "Whit" (as his classmates knew him) would most certainly want to have his classmates carry on with their original class dinner plans. Postponing the dinner out of deference to him would be the last thing he would want to see happen.

The Yale 1929 class dinner was held and as we all know, "Whit" Griswold was unable to attend. He had indicated previously that he would plan to be with the class "on an informal basis" if at all possible. News of "Whit" Griswold's death was received by his classmates just before they gathered in Timothy Dwight College dining hall for their class dinner. The first order of the assembled classmates was to memorialize "Whit" Griswold, paying tribute to his memory as they stood in silent prayer. The Yale 1929 men know that Whitney Griswold's influence on Yale would make his presence felt not only on all 1929 class gatherings from here on, but on all Yale gatherings for many years to come.

Summing up his president's annual report this past year, after referring to the success of the development fund campaign for the arts and sciences at Yale, Whitney Griswold said: "I conclude this report in the conviction that Yale's educational collateral is sound and that, while maintaining the university tradition of which she is part and the educational standards to which the tradition commits her, she is building for the future in ways that will justify the faith of all who have contributed to her welfare."

Heading the list of those who loved Yale and have contributed notably to her welfare should be written in bold letters, "A. Whitney Griswold, President Yale University, 1950–63."

The Late Dr. Meyer Jacobstein, of Rochester, N.Y., a Former Member of Congress From New York

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened the other day to read of the passing of a distinguished former Member of the House from my State of New York, Dr. Meyer Jacobstein, of Rochester.

Mr. Speaker, for many years Rochester was my home. I can remember very clearly when I was a boy in school that Dr. Jacobstein was one of the distinguished leaders of our community, and was a popular and much-beloved Congressman from our city of Rochester. I can recall very clearly, in fact, as a lad of 10, coming to Washington at Easter time, 1927, for my first visit. My parents and I called on Congressman Jacobstein at that time, since he was a friend of my father, and he arranged for the three of us to visit the White House and to shake hands with President Coolidge. How the demands on the President of the United States have changed since that day.

Many years later, Mr. Speaker, after World War II, I had the great pleasure to become much better acquainted with Congressman Jacobstein, when he was

serving as a major consultant with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I found him then, as the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] has already remarked, a most charming, vital, exciting, and stimulating person.

Mr. Speaker, Meyer Jacobstein was one of the men whose personality and intelligence, and sheer capacity for hard work, helped to develop the great city of Rochester into the industrial and cultural center it is today. We who lived in that city will always owe him a deep debt of gratitude. And we are, I believe, wiser and better people today for having had the opportunity to know him. He will long be missed and mourned both here and in New York State.

The Late Dr. Donovan C. Moffett, President of the State University College at Cortland, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day the people of my district and the people of New York State lost an outstanding educator, administrator, and community leader in the untimely passing of Dr. Donovan C. Moffet, president of the State University College at Cortland, at his home last week.

Dr. Moffett was the fifth president of this great college in the district which I have the honor to represent, and had a distinguished record as an educator in our State.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Moffett's passing has left a great gap in the community and in the university he served so ably, and he will be deeply mourned by all who knew him and were privileged to be associated with him.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on the life and work of Dr. Moffett, which was published in the April 19 issue of the Cortland Standard.

The editorial follows:

BRIDGING THE GAP—DR. DONOVAN C. MOFFETT

The college and community, joined together this afternoon in mourning the death of their friend and leader, may take strength in the bonds he built between them.

The bridge that spans the gap between town and gown owes much of its strength and promise to become an ever broader avenue of understanding to Dr. Donovan C. Moffett.

A leader among teachers in his chosen field, educator, administrator, Dr. Moffett, even in the midst of the countless responsibilities that go with fostering the growth of a college, always found the time and energy to serve the community in which he lives.

The American flag he served as an Air Force officer during World War II is at half mast on the campus. It is a mark of tribute on the ever changing face of the growing college. Many of the fine, new buildings there are indeed a memorial to the man under whose leadership they were erected.

The heads of the State university, his fellow educators and fellow townsmen gathered this afternoon in final tribute to Dr. Moffett may long be guided by the generous spirit and bonds of friendship he made between his college and community.

The Indiana schoolboy who became a college president brought with him to Cortland that certain human touch which is so necessary to a better understanding.

In each of his capacities at the Cortland College of Education, Dr. Moffett contributed not only a professional service but added his own personality, an energy of purpose that assured success.

Dr. Moffett came to Cortland in 1946 to assume duties as chairman of the Physical Education Department and director of athletics. It was through a mutual community-college interest in athletics that Dr. Moffett could serve his community.

Then, as director of the health, physical education, and recreation division, Dr. Moffett continued his unfailing service until 2 years later he was appointed dean of the college.

It was against this background of responsibility that Cortland College's fifth president was named in 1960.

Educator, administrator, soldier, and always friend of the students of his college and people of his community.

President Yitzchak Ben-Zvi

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened at the passing of the late President of the State of Israel, Mr. Yitzchak Ben-Zvi.

It was my privilege to have known him personally and to have spent some time with him in the privacy of what was undoubtedly the favorite room in his modest home, his library, where the walls were covered with well-worn volumes on religion, history, and archeology, as well as copies of his own works. I was particularly impressed with his gentleness, his kindliness, and his humility.

Although he was 78 years of age at the time of his death, one would never think of President Ben-Zvi as 78 years old; rather, he was 78 years young. He represented the intellectual element of the State of Israel complementing the activist group.

His idealism, his desire to foster the traditions of Judaism and his lifelong devotion to the State of Israel remained eternally alive until his last mortal moments on earth. His last official message contained a warning that the State of Israel had no choice but to keep its defenses at peak strength and alertness.

Few individuals are singularly fortunate to see come to fruition the ideals and visions of their youth. In the establishment of the State of Israel, and in the esteem in which the State of Israel is held today by all but its Arab enemies, President Ben-Zvi realized his dreams.

His death will be mourned by all who have known and respected him for his wisdom, his courage, and his devotion to the cause of human freedom and the principles of peace and democracy.

I extend to his family, to his lifelong friend, Prime Minister Ben Gurion, and to the people of Israel, my sincerest sympathies.

Federal Spending Can Be Cut if Congress Will Resume Its Constitutional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of April 23, "Can Spending Be Cut."

In a sentence I would like to say: Yes, spending can be cut if Congress will assume its constitutional responsibility to control the spending of the peoples' money instead of allowing the social planners under a bureaucratic minded President to take over powers not authorized in the Constitution.

The editorial follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 23, 1963]

CAN SPENDING BE CUT?

Robert D. Novak, Washington correspondent for the Wall Street Journal, has written an article for the current issue of the Reporter magazine analyzing the Federal budget and the prospects for cutting it. Although his conclusions are far from encouraging, Novak sheds a good deal of insight into the problems faced by fiscal conservatives in Congress and points the way in which these problems could, but probably won't be solved.

A majority of the Members of Congress, including almost all Republicans and a large number of Democrats, are honestly trying to curb Federal spending, Novak believes. But he thinks their task is doomed to defeat. They will be lucky, he says, to wind up with a cut of $1.5 billion out of a budget of nearly $100 billion, and there is no assurance that they will do that well.

The problem, in a nutshell, is this. Although most people believe that Congress still has a tight hold on the purse strings of Government, it does not, in fact, approve or disapprove of actual spending. Congress acts only on appropriations, and there is a vast gulf between appropriations and spending. The appropriation process is described by Novak as "a bewildering amalgam of past, present and future."

Much of the money appropriated by Congress is merely the sanctioning of dollars spent during the previous year. Other appropriations may not be spent for several years. Moreover, Novak explains, "once an appropriation has been voted, the executive branch is able to obligate, deobligate and reobligate the money in an intricate game of fiscal musical chairs."

The result is that a dollar cut in congressional appropriations does not guarantee that a dollar will be cut in spending that year. Republican leaders of Congress have predicted that $10 billion cut in the current budget would yield only a $4.5 billion re-

duction in actual spending. But that is only a guess.

Last year, Congress cut the budget by $4 billion, but actual spending for the fiscal year is almost certain to be higher than the President's original budget request.

Frustrating? That's not the half of it.

Novak points out the startling fact that, even if Congress should refuse to appropriate a single penny of the $108 billion in new spending authority requested by the President in his current budget, Mr. Kennedy would still be able to spend upward of $87 billion next year.

That is the total of unused spending authority previously authorized by Congress, and about half that amount is not earmarked for any specific purpose.

What, then, can be done to curb Federal spending? Novak says that conservatives in Congress currently have decided on the strategy of threatening to defeat two key administration bills—the tax program and the debt-ceiling increase—if budget cuts are not forthcoming. The problem is that Congress will most likely have to consider the tax program before final consideration is given to the budget and, when the chips are down, most conservatives will reluctantly vote to increase the debt if the Government can't pay its bills otherwise.

The only surefire method of blocking spending would be for Congress to pass a resolution setting specific limits on total Federal spending for the next fiscal year or perhaps a series of limits on categories of spending.

If this were done, however, the administration would then have the responsibility for deciding what programs would be eliminated to get under the ceiling .

Most Congressmen, Novak believes, would be reluctant to take this step. For it would mean an official abdication of their own authority over the details of the budget, even while they would regain control over the over-all spending process.

Strong consideration, however, should be given to this approach. In large measure, Congress has already abdicated its authority over budgetary details. By making that loss official and reasserting its control over the total budget, Congress would strengthen its hold on the Government's purse strings.

Rising Shoe Imports—A Great Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the New England Shoe & Leather Association has been in touch with me concerning the impact of shoe imports on the Massachusetts shoe industry.

It is pointed out that in 1962, Massachusetts production was 14.8 percent of the U.S. total production, and that the shoe industry is the second largest manufacturing employer in Massachusetts with a total employment in 1962 of 37,625 people. It paid to all employees about $124,100,000.

However, it is stated that total imports of leather type footwear for the year amounted to 55,057,457 pairs valued at $80,263,816 in 1962, and that total 1962 U.S. shoe imports equaled 8.9 percent of U.S. shoe production, as against 6.2 percent in 1961.

These figures standing by themselves show clearly what is happening to the Massachusetts and American shoe industry.

It is being overwhelmed with cheap foreign imports and its markets abroad are suffering the same fate.

Obviously, if this trend continues, the time is not far distant when the American shoe industry may be facing extinction.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the President urging that early consideration be given to remedial action to check the dangerous trend of shoe imports which is causing such a dire threat to the U.S. shoe industry.

If this appalling situation is not soon remedied, the great American shoe industry will be prostrate at a relatively early date and its faithful workers will be placed on unemployment rolls. It is high time for corrective measures.

Midtown Plaza: The Nation's Showplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, while in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., during the Easter recess, I had the honor and great pleasure to participate in the ceremonies held on April 15 to mark the first anniversary of the Nation's first and only urban shopping plaza. This is Midtown Plaza, a 7-acre business and shopping complex in the very heart of downtown Rochester.

The celebration of Midtown Plaza's first year centered around a patriotic theme and was highlighted by the raising of an American flag. The flag was one with special significance attached to it: It had flown over our Nation's Capitol.

At the anniversary ceremonies, I spoke to those gathered on one of the elements that has made our country the great and free land we cherish today.

That element is individual initiative—the kind of self-starting action that punctuates our national history—the kind of free enterprise which has built Midtown Plaza.

Midtown Plaza is a monument to the free enterprise system and a challenge to every urban redeveloper in the United States. It symbolizes the best in the American tradition, a willingness to take a chance, individual enterprise, courage, and faith in the future.

Midtown Plaza comprises a 1-acre 2-story covered Mall; Midtown Tower, an 18-story, office-hotel-restaurant building; and a 2,000-car city-owned and operated underground garage.

Midtown Plaza created 220,000 square feet of new retail space in downtown Rochester. More than a million square feet of retail space is accessible from it.

Midtown Tower is composed of 13 floors of office space, a 220-seat restaurant, and a 3-floor, 78-room hotel. It is Rochester's highest building. The Tower building provides 173,000 square feet—more than 4 acres—of new office space in the center of the downtown business district.

The 3-level underground municipal garage has an average daily turnover of 4,500 automobiles.

The stimulus to downtown business and the assurance of a prosperous and vital future for both business and the city provided by Midtown Plaza, mark Midtown as one of the most remarkable undertakings by American businessmen in recent years.

Midtown Plaza was built with private capital by its cosponsors, the McCurdy and Co. Department Store and the B. Forman Co., Women's Specialty Store. The stores have been close neighbors and keen competitors for many years.

The project is a monument too, to cooperation between a municipality and private business. In an agreement believed to be the only one of its kind, the city committed itself to build and operate the 2,000-car underground garage and make necessary street improvements all at a cost of more than $11 million.

The owners of Midtown agreed to construct a covered mall and an office building at least 10 stories high above the garage. The happy result for downtown business and the city of Rochester is a revitalized city.

Midtown Plaza today is the home of 33 shops and services, 6 of them new businesses in Rochester. Midtown Tower provides space for 34 firms. Of the 173,000 square feet, or more than 4 acres of space, all but 12,000 feet is leased or occupied.

Midtown Plaza is more than a complex of steel and stone. It is the fulfillment of a community desire to preserve a civic asset.

Midtown Plaza is living witness to the ability of local interests and local government to develop a community resource. This ability has caught the imagination of other communities throughout the Nation and has been well publicized in their news media.

But, above all, Midtown Plaza has become a source of pride for all of us who live in Rochester. We are proud of this downtown Plaza. We tell our visitors about it and delight in giving them a tour of it.

Midtown Plaza is durable. It will live and grow as part of a dynamic Rochester, a Rochester made more dynamic by its presence in the heart of the city.

Indonesia's Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, consistent with my interest in and concern for the problems of Indonesia—a concern prompted by the importance of this country for the future of southeast Asia—I would like to call our colleagues'

attention to an important article by Norman Sklarewitz which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 22.

Indonesia has recently modified its adherence to Marxist style concepts and is, in fact, encouraging a limited degree of free enterprise. As Mr. Sklarewitz has pointed out, however, this change is less a matter of reduction in devotion to socialism than a "need to find some immediate way out of the desperate economic crisis now gripping the once fabled Dutch East Indies."

This change, despite its motives, has significant implications for American business investment and developments in this sorely troubled area of the world and I believe our colleagues will find it both interesting and of importance:

NATION WOOS U.S. CAPITAL WITH LIMITED SOCIALISM

(By Norman Sklarewitz)

JAKARTA.—When discussing American business methods with officials of the Indonesian Government here, a U.S. Embassy official noticed the two sides agreed on principles as long as "capitalistic terminology" was dropped. If the American meant "profits" but instead called them the "fruits of cooperation," the Indonesians fully approved.

Such word games are a whimsical byplay of a serious effort now under way: Socialist Indonesia is successfully luring companies from the United States and other foreign nations to invest here, but under curious conditions. In effect, the U.S. firm must agree in advance to ultimate nationalization. Neither side here uses that word, of course, but refers to the idea of foreign development and management of a state-owned enterprise as "production sharing."

This acceptance of partial free enterprise reflects less a change in Indonesian devotion to Marxist-style concepts than a need to find some immediate way out of the desperate economic crisis now gripping the once fabled Dutch East Indies. Even though the United States has pumped $710 million in economic loans and grants into Indonesia, and the Soviet bloc has made available $644.2 million, its economy continues to sag. Production of such dollar-earning resources as rubber and tin is falling and foreign exchange reserves are at a record low. While rated officially at 45 to 1 U.S. dollar, the rupiah is sold on the black market at a record 1,200 to 1.

EAGER FOR RICHES

Despite martial law, public criticism is coming into the open. "The President says that the 'riches of the soil' belong to the people,' grumbles an office worker waiting to shove his way aboard an already overloaded city bus, "but such riches do us no good if they remain under the ground."

Since socialistic state planning and generous infusions of aid have failed to curb the runaway inflation or to get domestic production going, the Indonesians are now cleverly enlisting the help of foreign investors.

Some Western observers here question Indonesia's sudden willingness to do business with foreign concerns it branded as "neocolonialists" not many months back. "Their system can't get production going so they put their Marxist plans aside temporarily," says one American. "But what happens after the foreign managers put the Indonesian company into business? We'll be out and the leftists will have grown stronger on our risk capital."

There are others, however, who feel more positively about the value of this contact with free enterprise. Even with strong feelings of nationalism and a desire to exercise control over private enterprise, they see a number of high Indonesian officials softening their erstwhile hard left line.

"The Indonesians are beginning to appreciate the role that private foreign enterprise can play in their economic development and the need for mutual cooperation," says U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia Howard P. Jones.

RUBBER COMPANIES REMAIN

As further evidence of their new look toward foreign exploitation of the country's vast resources, Indonesians point out that American rubber companies are still in business here although a land reform decree 2 years ago raised the specter of nationalization. Despite that threat, the U.S. Rubber Co. today is running its plantations under a new 12-year agreement with the government while the Goodyear Co. and several other rubber plantation operators are negotiating on terms by which they may be here for up to 20 years more.

Production sharing contracts were signed last year by Pan American Indonesia Oil Co. and the Van Camp Seafood Co. Also, the Union Oil Co. of California now has a representative standing by in Jakarta and the Continental Oil Co. sent one of its agents out to look the situation over.

Under the general provisions of production sharing, a foreign concern brings in the plant, equips it and provides technical skills and the management in order to export and earn hard currency abroad. The Indonesian government can provide rupiahs to cover local salaries and other domestic expenses. For its investment, the foreign firm gets a share, anywhere from 15 to 85 percent, of the foreign exchange realized after deducting depreciation of the plant and all operating costs involving dollars. But full title to the plant reverts to the Indonesian government or the state-owned company after an agreed-upon period. Foreign manufacturers or sales representatives here now must get government approval to convert locally earned rupiahs into foreign exchange and such approval is rarely granted.

Production sharing probably evolved from a deal worked out by Harold Hutton, president of Refining Associates of Long Beach, Calif. A gravel-voiced veteran of 38 years in the oil business, Mr. Hutton accepted an offer to develop an oil field for the Indonesian government-owned Permina company early in 1957. His contract called for the sale of crude oil brought out of the Sumatra Island jungle fields to pay off the cost of the production with a percentage of the profit split between the American contractor and the Indonesian firm.

"We welcome American companies to come to Indonesia and work with us under production sharing," says Minister of Production Suprajogi who, like many other members of the revolutionary cabinet, is an army general. "We have great potential for mining, timber, fishing, copra and other resources which can be profitably exploited," he adds.

As the Indonesians now see it, even oil—the country's No. 1 dollar earner—can be taken by foreign companies under the fashionable cloak of production sharing. The biggest such deal so far was made last June when Pan American Indonesia Oil Co., owned by American International Oil Co., of New York, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of Indiana, was granted rights to explore for oil on the island of Sumatra.

Pan Am will invest a minimum of $28.5 million in its first 8 years of operations. The U.S. company gets to charge off all capital investments but, at the end of 30 years, title to the plant, storage facilities, and pipelines goes to the state-owned Indonesian oil company.

Even bitter competitors of Pan American say the deal was a "good sign" for foreign business.

"We had strong doubts a few years ago that we'd ever see a Western oil company come into this country again," says an old-timer in the oil industry here, sitting in the shaded patio of his company-owned bungalow. "Sure, that Pan Am contract is full of Socialist language and the Indonesians do get all the company's facilities in the end. Even so, it's a contract you can work under and make money."

TECHNICAL BARRIERS

While the Indonesians granted Pan American Oil survey rights on Sumatra, they denied that same request made by P. T. Stanvac Indonesia, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey and Mobil Oil Co., which has oil fields here that are badly depleted. A spokesman for the Indonesian Foreign Ministry described the refusal as one based on "technical details," not any old animosity toward Stanvac, which came originally into Indonesia on a generous Dutch concession. The "technicality" is generally conceded to be simply that Pan American agreed to terms which, at the time, Stanvac felt were too harsh.

Officials of Stanvac, Caltex Pacific, and Shell Indonesia have been negotiating with the Ministry of Basic Industries and Mining on and off since early 1960 on Government demands for new operating terms. The Indonesians wanted to replace the traditional 50-to-50 profit split with a 60-to-40 split in their favor, and they wanted title to production facilities, refineries, and the domestic marketing organizations.

While the protracted talks were dragging on, Pan American Oil came onto the scene and agreed to work in Indonesia as a contractor, that is, to explore for oil, develop fields and export the crude all for a straight 60 to 40 percentage. This move broke the solid front of the established foreign oil interests and gave the Indonesians an obvious bargaining weapon against them.

"The Indonesians shrewdly played one foreign firm off against the others," says a European diplomat.

Even though concessions are made to Western companies out of hard economic necessity rather than any shift in political convictions, the powerful Indonesia Communist Party (PKI) is pushing President Sukarno to abandon Western contracts in favor of full socialization of production. Backed by 2 million members of his PKI, party chairman D. N. Aidit wants an end to economic help from the West and an overhaul of the Indonesian economy to give government control of all remaining private industry.

HEEDING MODERATES

For the moment it appears that the President is heeding the advice of moderates who see Western investments as the best hope to get the creaking machinery of production moving again.

Ambassador Jones and Edward Fox, Agency for International Development director for Indonesia, are discussing with the Indonesian Government an investment guarantee agreement which could be signed before the end of the year. Under it, U.S. firms will be eligible to take out insurance backed by the U.S. Government to cover losses which might be incurred in Indonesia due to nationalization ahead of any contract schedule, war or loss of currency convertibility rights. "Once the agreement is signed, I think there would be good opportunities in Indonesia for American companies," says Alan C. Herzig, visiting Jakarta for Pan-Alliance Corp. of New York, which specializes in investments in underdeveloped countries.

"If you have steady nerves and are a good poker player, then you might come out of negotiations here with a profitable deal," sums up a U.S. Embassy economist.

Positive Action Needed on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in his press conference yesterday afternoon, President Kennedy attempted to silence criticism of his lack of initiative in Cuba by declaring that his critics have offered no solutions. Evidently the President ignores the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which has listed a number of statements by Members of Congress advocating a strong course of action, the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, a blockade of Cuba, support of a Cuban Government-in-exile, and other measures short of military invasion.

The public record is too strong for President Kennedy to sweet talk his way out of his inability to either understand the situation or his failure to deal adequately with it.

The following column written by William S. White, in the Washington Evening Star of April 24, explains the necessity of a total quarantine of Castro. The United States does have an obligation in the Western Hemisphere, an obligation history has given us and an obligation to protect our own self-interest in our legitimate sphere of influence. I commend Mr. White's column to you.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 24, 1963]

GRASP CUBAN NETTLE, U.S. URGED—ENFORCING TOTAL QUARANTINE OF CASTRO IN HEMISPHERE SEEN NECESSARY STEP

(By William S. White)

Of the massive Cuban headache the only possible prognosis now is that it will become much worse before there can be hope that it may get much better.

The area of acute pain has shifted from the hemisphere peril posed by the Soviet lodgment there, a chronic peril, but not the immediate problem. For this Government is moving into an immensely complicated task of a kind with which this Nation has never before had to cope. This is to deal with an exile movement transplanted to the United States much as the exile Czech and Polish and French resistance governments were dumped upon the British Isles during the Second World War.

The Cuban exiles have now been forbidden to continue those gallant but ineffectual hit-and-run raids against Castro Cuba which Washington felt would only give the Russians some excuse to retain troops in Cuba. The exiles thus have been neutralized militarily; but what to do with them in the future?

The first phase of the new American policy will be to try to unify these frustrated patriots, who presently are in a dozen separate major groups. Assuming this aim is reached—and this alone is iffy—more knotty questions will follow. To what degree can they then be used responsibly against Mr. Castro, with respect, for their own dignity but with respect also to the constitutional imperative that no set of foreigners, however decent, can be allowed to run the foreign policy of the United States? How can they be kept from falling apart into jealously rival factions, having always in mind that there has been no resistance movement in all history in which personal political ambition and self-seeking has not to some extent marched with unselfish patriotism?

And if and when the Castro-Communist cancer has been cut from Cuba, what regime will take its place—and how much will the United States necessarily be involved in the reconstruction of the new Cuba? Will it not be a burden to which there is no foreseeable end?

Undeniably, the future stretches out gloomily for us at best. Undeniably, too, the exiles have picked up that old American technique of calculated leaks to advance causes which may be honorable, or sometime self-seeking. A recent case suggests that the American press was misled by such a leak, ostensibly from the recently resigned head of all the exiles, Dr. Jose Miro Cardona.

This leak singled out one State Department official, Robert Hurwitch, as having dealt highhandedly with Dr. Miro Cardona. But Mr. Hurwitch has in his possession a handwritten "Dear Bob" note from Dr. Miro Cardona proclaiming continued friendship in these words: "You loyally serve your country; I with true passion serve my lost country." These words are reproduced here in fairness to Mr. Hurwitch, whom this columnist recently included by inference among the administration whiz kids who have been altogether too cocky and cocksure toward the exiles. Such whiz kids do exist, and so do such attitudes. But the record available here does not suggest that the indictment leaked from exile sources against Mr. Hurwitch personally ever even came from Dr. Miro Cardona.

To return to the central issue as to how we should deal with the exiles, the cold evidence suggests that the answer should be "not much." We ought not to leave any real responsibility to them for getting rid of Fidel Castro—because it is our own responsibility. We will never see the end of Castroism by letting some George—some exile group, some handful of small Latin American states—do it while we look the other way.

We shall do it only when we grasp the nettle and take up our full obligations to lead this hemisphere. We must force a true and total quarantine of Castro Cuba—by persuasion among our Latin American neighbors if possible, but by putting naked and limitless American economic force upon all breakers of the quarantine if we must.

Tribute to the Late Israeli President Izhak Ben-Zvi

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing deep sorrow at the passing of Izhak Ben-Zvi, President of the State of Israel.

The world has lost a valiant fighter for freedom, a true scholar, and distinguished statesman. And the people of Israel have been deprived of the great moral and spiritual leadership and inspiration that have helped to make it possible for this new nation to overcome what would otherwise have been almost insuperable obstacles.

This great man, born in czarist Ukraine in 1884, went through the shameful persecutions and pogroms of the 1905 year of revolution in Russia, and with his family experienced exile in Siberia.

As one of the early refugee-escapees to arrive in Israel, Mr. Ben-Zvi soon distinguished himself as a legal scholar as well as an organizer in the labor movement and one of the first leaders of Hashomer, the underground citizens' army which spearheaded the long struggle for an independent Jewish state.

It was my great honor and privilege to have met and talked with this outstanding citizen of the world during a tour of the Middle East and Europe in 1954.

I was thoroughly impressed by President Ben-Zvi's dedication and devotion for the cause for which he had worked and toiled for so many years and against such great odds. He will long be remembered and revered by men who cherish the dignity and rights of all men to live according to the dictates of their conscience.

Bring Me Your Tired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the administration's new policy of denying dock passes to Americans who wish to greet visitors arriving from abroad has prompted the following editorial comment from the West Town Crier, an outstanding newspaper in my district. I want to add my endorsement of the views expressed in the editorial and take this opportunity to urge that this unreasonable policy be reversed promptly.

BRING ME YOUR TIRED

If you're planning to meet anyone coming from overseas in the near future, beware. It won't be easy, on your patience or on your nerves. And if it happens to be a long lost cousin whose visage is unfamiliar, or a visitor or employee who speaks another language, you'd beter send them the traditional white carnation well in advance. Your job of finding them is strewn with obstacles planted by Uncle Sam, and the steamship companies have done nothing to help.

It all started on February 1 of this year, when the Kennedy administration—a group of young gentlemen who can't seem to find enough to do—decreed that, from now on, there would be no dock passes issued for those who wanted to meet incoming passengers. In other words, no one can get onto the pier to explore under the letter "P", or whatever, to find that lonely looking arrivee. Today, those who wish to meet a passenger are herded into a fenced enclosure and denied aid, comfort, or information.

Mr. Joseph P. Kelley, colector of the port of New York, tells us that "this action is the result of a study," and that it is really designed to make everyone happier. He also tells us that "steamship companies have set aside certain areas on the piers outside of the customs examination area, where visitors may await incoming passengers."

What he doesn't tell us is that (1) the customs employees guarding the proverbial gates are consistently rude and uncooperative; (2) the steamship people shrug their shoulders and say that none of this is their fault; and (3) not even the simplest mechanics have been set up to make it possible for a well-intentioned American to meet his guests, courteously or otherwise.

Perhaps this move is being made to foil the international diamond smugglers. Never having smuggled anything more significant than a copy of "Lady Chatterley's Lover," we can afford sympathy with the Government's efforts to keep them from being defrauded. We're not even sure that it is necessary to allow visitors to proceed inside the customs area.

But we are sure that it is the responsibility of those who changed the rules to find some way to accommodate the legitimate needs of the people who pay their salaries—us John Q. Publics. We don't like arbitrary bureaucracy in this country, and there's no reason that we have to put up with it. This is our customs service—not Big Brothers—and it should be run with a courteous and intelligent regard for our convenience.

Perhaps even more important is the impression left on first-time visitors to this country. In many cases, they are coming, trying to get away from stupid and pompus petty civil servants, who are neither servants nor civil. Many of them believe those words on the Statute of Liberty—the ones about welcoming strangers. It is unforgiveable that we should push them around on our first contact—and it certainly does nothing to enhance our relations with other nationalities.

One would think that the Washington nabobs would have enough to do getting us into trouble with the heads of state of our friends and neutrals alike—as they have been doing most effectively lately—without descending to the individual level. This seemingly small instance is important only in that it indicates the effect of unthinking bureaucracy, and shows a basic disregard for the normal rights and small courtesies to which citizens and foreigners are entitled at the hands of Uncle Sam.

The Cost of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was with real pleasure that I read the following editorial in the April 24, 1963, edition of Roll Call. This is the first time within recent memory that anyone has bothered to recognize the work that Congress does; it is like a fresh breeze after a storm.

The editorial follows:

THE COST OF CONGRESS

Taxpayers—and that includes practically every American of sound mind and able body—pay a certain amount of their total earnings each year to run the Government of their country.

It is a small price to pay for the privilege of living in a free country where opportunity is measured only by man's own limitations. The tax money is utilized to provide many services such as postal delivery, for social security payments to the aged, Government employees, and for other Government expenditures.

Among these is the appropriation for the legislative branch of Government.

Actually, the money allocated for the running of the Congress is an infinitesimal part of the total Government budget.

But every time the Congress votes itself new building space, money for paper clips, telephones, or writing paper, the press of the Nation swoops down as though they had discovered a major scandal.

It seems to us that the last service to be criticized by the taxpayer would be the Congress, for that is the Government branch which most directly works for him.

Congress is the voice of the people, and each citizen elects a Representative to represent him in the miasma of Washington bureaucracy. It is the Congressman's duty to look after the taxpayer's interest, to speak with his voice, to help in his business and personal problems with the Federal Government, to protect his personal freedoms, to legislate for his well-being and for the security and welfare of his country.

For this the taxpayer pays something like 5 cents on every $1,000. A bargain in any market.

We believe the press of the Nation has a duty to uncover and expose gross violations of the taxpayers' confidence. Seldom is this done. We read much of the petty foolishness which means little—an aid drives a Government car to a race track, someone has a sister on the payroll (who probably works diligently without time-and-a-half), or they're putting a swimming pool in the House Office Building—no great exposés, and hardly bigtime stories when compared with the real big story of Congress' silent but continuous and effective service to the people.

If a Congressman fails to represent the people, if he fails to make their voice heard, if he fails to serve them, then like any business or corporation, they should replace him on election day with another.

Meantime they should furnish their Representative with all the tools needed to do the job for them. The more staff he has to help, the more tools, the more office space, the more confidence the voters place in him, the better job he does for his constituents—the taxpayers, whose small tax investment is returned a thousandfold.

Eliminate Guidelines Distribution System in Our Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in which I urged the committee to vote favorably on legislation which would entirely eliminate the work measurement systems in the postal service. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, your committee has under consideration the subject of work measurement standards which now prevail in our postal system. I wish to express my strong disapproval of the guidelines distribution system now in effect and to urge that necessary action be taken to completely eliminate this system.

I am convinced that this multi-million-dollar measurement system represents a total loss of money; it is service disrupting and time wasting; it delays delivery of mail to patrons rather than improves service. You are familiar with the program; I wish to emphasize that the minutes each day that each employee must take to fill out the card reports now required, add up to many thousands of man-hours lost each year.

It is agreed that it is important to keep the Post Office Department operating at a top level of efficiency. At the same time, we must help keep the welfare and just treatment of our postal employees in mind; they are equally important. There is much evidence that the program creates tension which actually results in decreased production; postal employees insist that the program results in innumerable letters of warning, counselings, deprivation of overtime, harassment, intimidation, and termination of jobs, although the Post Office Department would have us believe that no disciplinary action of any kind is supposed to be taken as a result of statistics or data generated by the work measurement system.

It is pointed out that if measurements of mail production are required, they are readily available through other methods; number of bags of mail can be easily counted when they come into the post office; postage canceling machines can also give an accurate relative count of amount of mail handled on a given shift.

From the postal employee's standpoint, the program is based upon the presumption that the worker will not produce, will not render conscientious service, will not work at the required speed or efficiency unless he is watched or his work counted. This is obnoxious to the faithful employee who puts forth his best efforts in his job every day. He feels humiliated and unhappy, and these feelings are not conducive to good morale or high level performance in any field. The occasional laggard or unconscientious employee can be quickly spotted by the supervisor and proper disciplinary action taken against the offender; it is totally unnecessary, and most unfair to subject the entire working force to humiliation and harassment to take care of the few offenders.

I submit that the costly program of guidelines can be eliminated without decreasing postal service one iota; that it is unnecessary, and serves no good purpose whatever. The money saved can be spent to better advantage in a constructive manner to increase the service rendered by the Postal Department.

I urge your committee to vote favorably on legislation before you which would entirely eliminate the work measurement systems in the postal service.

Statement by Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at Live Oak, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting statement by Edward P. Cliff, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the Cooperative Field Forestry Meeting of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., on April 11, 1963, at Live Oak, Fla.

STATEMENT BY EDWARD P. CLIFF, CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AT LIVE OAK, FLA.

Much has been said and written about the small farm woodland owner. He has been studied, interviewed, and analyzed. He has been pictured as a poor farmer, a rich landowner, a lawyer, a sawmill operator, a merchant, an industrialist, and a schoolteacher. I'm sure that he may be any one of these and many more.

It has been said that his handling of his woodland, whether good or bad, is conditioned by a lack of forestry knowledge, by a desire for money by a lack of money, by a love of the esthetic or by a desire to leave his heirs a comfortable estate. I'm certain that any of these and other motivations have guided his hand in the woods.

Whoever he or she may be, whatever the profession, business or vocation of the owner and whatever the plan for the woodland may be, there is one thing we can say with certainty—he or she is a person; he or she is an individual and not a statistic.

This being the case, it is my firm conviction that no forestry program, private or public, can be expected to succeed unless it gives full consideration to the needs and the desires of the individual landowner. This means consideration of all of the potentials and limitations of managing his particular woodland for profit.

I believe the day is coming soon when the professional forester, as a matter of standard operating procedure in his walk through the woods with the woodland owner, will be fully primed to look for and alert the owner to every land use opportunity that exists there.

The potential for timber production will be fully explored; the fishpond site, if there is one, will be noted; the upland game habitat potential will be examined and called to the attention of the owner; the most suitable camp or picnic ground site will be discussed and the multitude of marketable special forest products, other than timber, that may grow in the family forest will be pointed out to the owner.

The land use plan geared to profitable woodland management will endeavor to harmonize the needs and desires of the owner with all of the potentials and limitations of his woodland. This practice of multiple-use will soon be accepted as being as logical for small woodlands as it has been demonstrated to be for public forests and the bigger industrial forests.

Not every open acre in the woods would go into trees. The woodland owner may choose to dedicate a 30-acre field in his forest to the construction of a profitmaking fish pond and to upland game fee hunting. To the owner needing those extra dollars, it can be a chance to secure an income from multiple use of his woodland while his trees grow into the more profitable, better quality and bigger sized trees.

I sincerely believe that this multiple-use "give-and-take" approach can be an important factor in helping to overcome one of forestry's biggest hurdles—that ever-present problem of premature harvesting of woodlands without serious regard for the silvicultural consequences. A woodland full of nondescript greenery may be pretty to look at but it won't contribute much toward paying off the family mortgage.

This team approach of woodland owner and forester, together harmonizing all of the needs and potentials of both the land and the people who depend upon it, deserves to be thoroughly explored on every woodland ownership. We are convinced that this procedure will become a rapidly growing trend among America's 4½ million small privately owned forest ownerships in the years ahead.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the far-reaching implications—extending far beyond the boundaries of my own congressional district—I would like to call attention to the following results, just tabulated, of my seventh annual questionnaire on legislative issues.

Like many colleagues, I have had a tremendous response to the questionnaires distributed both by direct mail and printed in many newspapers throughout Michigan's Sixth District indicating to me the vital interest of those at home in Federal Government problems. I have found such a poll most helpful in measuring the sentiments of the people from time to time with regard to the many important issues facing the Congress.

The tabulation of the replies, stated in percentages, is as follows:

1963 questionnaire results

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Should the Federal Government create a Domestic Peace Corps to help with social problems at home?	27	55	18
2. Do you favor the administration's request for a Youth Conservation Corps?	51	32	17
3. Should Congress approve $195,000,000 for a civil defense shelter program?	17	65	18
4. Do we need legislation to provide a Government-supervised secret ballot for union members before a strike can be called?	65	24	11
5. Would you favor a program of direct subsidies either to producers or processors of agricultural commodities to lower prices for consumers?	12	74	14
6. Do you favor the President's recommendations for tax reduction?	42	42	16
7. Should spending be cut to compensate for any tax reduction?	83	8	9
8. Should tax deductions be limited to amounts in excess of 5 percent of income for—			
Medical expenses?	25	58	17
Charitable contributions?	24	56	20
State and local taxes?	20	60	20
Interest payments?	20	59	21
9. If taxes are cut to stimulate growth, should reduction of the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles be part of the package?	78	14	8
10. Would you favor tax deductions for college tuition?	63	28	9
11. Do you approve raising the ceiling on the national debt?	10	76	14

12. Considering current economic conditions, do you regard a balanced budget:

	Percent
Essential	42
Desirable	49
Not important	7
No answer	2

13. Should the Federal Government aid colleges in construction of academic buildings:

	Percent
By loans	50
By grants	14
Not at all	31
No answer	5

14. With regard to medical care for the elderly, do you favor:

	Percent
Increasing social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing costs for those over 65 (King-Anderson approach)	22
A tax credit or Federal financing for private insurance for medical and hospital care for those over 65 (Bow bill)	24
No Federal participation in this field	32
Other	8
No answer	14

15. The budget requests $4.9 billion for foreign aid (military and economic assistance). Should this program be:

	Percent
Continued at this level	18
Substantially reduced	63
Discontinued	13
No answer	6

16. How do you rate President Kennedy's policies:

	Percent
Domestic:	
Excellent	8
Good	23
Fair	41
Poor	24
No answer	4
Foreign:	
Excellent	7
Good	21
Fair	34
Poor	33
No answer	5

A Salute to Richard Lloyd Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, a distinguished American, Richard Lloyd Jones, Sr., publisher of the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune, celebrated his 90th birthday.

Richard Lloyd Jones long ago earned his place in Oklahoma history as a newsman, a fearless publisher, and a tireless public leader and he has never ceased in his efforts to add achievements for posterity to follow and build upon.

Mr. Jones is one of the Nation's outstanding writers and journalists. His unswerving desire to reach the truth and to relate the truth to his readers in an interesting, clear and concise manner is a recognized Jones trademark. His courageous stands for his convictions and principles, regardless of their popularity or unpopularity, have come to be a trademark of the Tribune.

Mr. Jones is also one of the pioneer builders of the State of Oklahoma. His editorial leadership since assuming command of the Tribune in 1918, and his personal contributions to public service have earned him the gratitude of every Oklahoman.

In honor of his many years of distinguished service to the State of Oklahoma and to the Nation, Mr. Jones was presented with a book of autographed photographs and letters from his many friends in public life.

The Tulsa Tribune on April 15, 1963, reprinted some of the comments from the book. I think the remarks clearly indicate the affection and esteem we all have for this great American.

The Tribune article follows:

RICHARD LLOYD JONES 90, U.S. LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE

Richard Lloyd Jones, Sr., publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, celebrated his 90th birthday at his home Sunday.

In honor of the occasion he was presented with a book containing autographed photographs and letters written by a number of American statesmen.

President John Kennedy led with a signed photograph.

Ex-President Herbert Hoover said: "You have been my friend through thick and thin for 60 years. But much more important, you have served your community and the American people with courage and magnificent leadership every day of your adult life."

Richard M. Nixon: "Your life stands as a living memorial to the highest traditions of American journalism."

Alf M. Landon: "I met many men in 1936, but none whose memory I'll treasure more than yours to the end of my life."

Senator MIKE MONRONEY: "On this your 90th birthday I know that many thousands of Oklahomans join me in recognizing with gratitude your accomplishments during many years of brilliant editorial and reportorial endeavors."

Senator J. HOWARD EDMONDSON: "When opportunities presented themselves you grasped them. When there was a vacuum in leadership you filled it. When there was a need for public service you gave it."

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN: "I remember our visits to Tulsa in other days and how gracious and hospitable you were and how interested you have been in my political career and such contributions as I may have made to the cause of an improved public service."

Former Senator William F. Knowland: "You and your newspaper have been a vital force in the Nation. My father, Joseph R. Knowland (retired publisher of the Oakland Tribune) will have his 90th birthday August 5 and joins me in extending best wishes to you."

Former Senator John D. Bricker: "May I offer thanks for the longtime personal friendship. You have always been an inspiration to me as to your many friends."

Representative PAGE BELCHER: "As a stalwart American and a great citizen, you have lived and written the American dream * * * you have helped give us a Nation fit for heroes, wisely alert to the challenge of the future, confident and ready under God. For, after all, public service is to society what prayer is to the soul."

Representative CARL ALBERT, House majority leader: "Our entire Nation owes you a special debt of gratitude for the memorials to Abraham Lincoln which have resulted from your leadership and which attract thousands of visitors annually. We are particularly grateful for your preservation of Lincoln's boyhood home."

Representative TOM STEED: "In more than 40 years in Oklahoma you have made the Tulsa Tribune an institution with a unique contribution to the journalism of our State. As a newspaperman I have been particularly interested in how you have kept the traditions of personal journalism flourishing when in many parts of our country it has receded."

Representative JOHN JARMAN: "I should like to join with your legion of friends in paying tribute to your brilliant and eminent record as an outstanding publisher and dedicated American."

Representative ED EDMONDSON: "Your personal achievements and contributions in the area of education, community leadership, and public service are part of the rich heritage of Oklahoma today. I am sure that thousands of Oklahomans join me in wishing you a very happy birthday and many more in the years ahead."

Representative VICTOR WICKERSHAM: "Your accomplishments in the field of journalism, coupled with your devotion to truth, have created a living goal for those who are to follow you."

Representative ROBERT TAFT JR.: "I am extremely aware of the long and loyal support which you rendered to my father in his political life, and on behalf of my entire family I send every good wish."

Governor Henry Bellmon: "The progress of the human race has, in large measure, been due to the small minority of citizens who possess the vision and courage to think and speak boldly on issues of the day. I count you to be one of these."

State Senator Dewey Bartlett: "Because I am active in politics I am most appreciative of two of your accomplishments—your untiring efforts to perpetuate our American heritage, and your candid and forthright defense of that heritage."

State Representative W. Timothy Dowd: "I joined the Tulsa Tribune when you were a young man of 79. Hundreds know what the Tribune stands for as a newspaper. Very few persons know what the Tribune stands for as employer. I remember more than one employee who was off work for months due to illness and who received his check every week as well has having his medical and hospital bills paid.

"I recall the employee of only 3 months whose father died in Tulsa, 1,000 miles from his home. She was quietly handed the necessary rail tickets, an extra amount of cash, and told to take whatever time necessary to settle her father's affairs.

"But mostly I remember the young man who was assisted and encouraged to attend law school at night while working as a Tribune reporter. Without your support he would never have made it. I was that employee."

State Representative Joe E. Musgrave: "Few have contributed as much as you to the cultural, educational, and business life of our community. Since 1900 I have seen Tulsa grow from a population of 1,250 and I think I can speak with authority."

State Representative John W. McCune: "I have deeply appreciated the great moral points and fundamentals of Christianity and true Americanism that you so forcefully stressed during the long period when you wrote the 'Sermonette.'"

State Representative Ralph S. Rhoades: "I am reminded of the quotation: 'To laugh often and love much; to win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children, to have played and laughed with enthusiasm and sung with exultation—this is to have succeeded.'"

State Representative Laurance W. Gunnison: "Your life has been one of unselfish devotion to the welfare of your fellow men, and I want to personally commend you on this auspicious occasion."

State Representative Richard F. Taylor: "People have come to know and appreciate your great dedication toward justice and righteousness. You have always aroused people's attention to the great principles on which this Government was founded."

Mr. Jones was born April 14, 1873, in Janesville, Wis., where his father, a 27-year-old Unitarian minister, was holding his first pastorate.

In recent months Mr. Jones has been confined to his home with a back ailment.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give all Art Hoppe fans another treat by inserting five of his recent columns in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am sure they are equally as amusing and entertaining as those in the past.

The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 15, 1963]

STEEL TODAY, PLAY LATER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—I'm glad Mr. Kennedy finally got away to Palm Beach. I think the whole business of being President was beginning to bug him.

There he was, all packed, swimsuit in hand, halfway out the door, when the news hits: "Big Steel Price Hike." So he unpacks. Grimly. "Hah," he says. "They didn't learn their lesson, eh? Well, I'll show them who's boss. Again."

So he begins stewing and fretting and fiddling and negotiating and he has to postpone his vacation departure twice. And I assume the wife and kids are getting irritable—you know how it is. "Won't you ever be ready?"

So at last he sits down and writes a long statement saying it's OK to raise steel prices. If you only raise some steel prices. In fact, he writes, "selective" price increases are "not incompatible with a framework of general stability and steel price stability and are characteristic of any healthy economy."

And I imagine he reads that over a couple of times, scratches his head, finally says the heck with it and hurries out the door. That's what I usually do just before vacation.

Well, I'm sure Mr. Kennedy's first statement will be taken to heart by the lovable captains of our great steel industry. In fact, I can kind of see the captains all sitting around the captain's table in the board room of Great Steel Industry, Inc.

SENIOR CAPTAIN. Gentlemen, the President has spoken. It is now our duty to put aside any selfish motives we may have to hold steel prices in line. We must sacrifice ourselves and select certain items on which to up the price. In order to show we have a healthy economy. But we must be, above all fairminded and equitable in our selections.

VICE CAPTAIN. That's right, George. We ought to hold the line on half our items

and double the price on the rest. What could be fairer than that?

SENIOR CAPTAIN. Sounds equitable, Al. Which items do we double?

VICE CAPTAIN. Well, I've been going through the catalog and I'd suggest automobile steel, defense steel, structural steel, and boilerplate.

SENIOR CAPTAIN. Very imaginative but on which items do we hold the line?

VICE CAPTAIN. Oh, I've got a long list of them: Ladies' hatpins, No. 3 harpsichord casters, croquet wickets, size ought-eight screws for crystal set headbands, steel rims for steelrimmed spectacles (all sizes), and our No. 378-42A cotter pins for buggywhip handles.

SENIOR CAPTAIN (amid cries of "huzzah" as Homburgs fly in the air). A fair and equitable division. Selectively speaking. And now, gentlemen, a toast to our President. May he soon rejoin us at the Cosmos Club. For I feel I can say with confidence that we will enjoy the healthiest of economies. Here at Great Steel Industry, Inc.

Well, it just shows the change in Mr. Kennedy. In the last steel crisis he called out the FBI, the Attorney General, and a flock of congressional investigators to cave in the steel gentlemen. And this time he issues a statement and goes off swimming. So you can see the job's finally bugging him. No offense.

Besides, I'm glad of it. Give me a choice between a leader who calls out the FBI and one who goes for a dip and I'll take the latter, thanks. It may not be as decisive. But it's a lot more democratic. Indeed, I think one of the salvations of democracy is that being a decisive leader in this country eventually bugs you.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 16, 1963]

AN AGENCY WE ALL CAN IDENTIFY WITH

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—I wandered over to the new domestic Peace Corps to view with alarm the wasteful Government spending. Which is always fun on a nice day. And I was thunderstruck. The domestic Peace Corps isn't wastefully spending any money. Mainly because it hasn't got any.

I think this unheard of state of affairs is due to the fact the Corps doesn't exist. And won't exist until Congress gives it a couple of million dollars. But, of course, it has to turn out reports, studies, and press releases in the interim so Congress will be convinced it should exist. And it does all this by scrounging. The chief scrounger is Mr. Barney Ross, a tall, dryly funny, very likable veteran of Mr. Kennedy's PT-109 disaster. Due perhaps to his Navy background and certainly to his charm, Mr. Ross has managed to accumulate offices, furnishings, and a staff of 19. No to mention two desk drawers full of unpaid bills.

"We must have faith that we can meet our unmet needs," says Mr. Ross solemnly. "And so must our creditors."

The offices Mr. Ross scrounged are in a narrow, ancient onetime residence just half a block from the White House. A sign outside says, "International Air Transport Group." Another, in the rickety hallway, reads, "U.S. Army Research Translation Group Detachment No. 1." Up two flights of tilting stairs is the Corps headquarters, a series of barren, paint-peeling rooms.

"To us," says Mr. Ross, viewing this governmental tenement with a look of noble sadness, "deprivation is not a textbook word."

Mr. Ross gets his staff on loan from various permanent agencies. Such as, say, Interior. "Joe," he will say over the phone in tones of pure dedication, "we will be concerned with Indians. You at Interior are concerned with Indians. You must think of yourself as the father and we as your children. Now then, father—"

And the staff, under Mr. Ross' wise Faganship, shows great promise. They return daily to their parent agencies to make the Corps' long distance phone calls and fill their attaché cases with paper clips, pencils, and carbon paper. Indeed, the only cross Mr. Ross has to bear is that no Corpsman has yet been able to cop a mimeograph machine.

This proved a distinct handicap when the Corps decided to publish 50,000 copies of a 14-page booklet entitled, "Facts on the Proposed National Service Program." But Agriculture was kind enough to print it. After, that is, the booklet was rewritten to include some grand quotes by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. Indeed, it's now known privately around the Corps as "The Orville Freeman Fact Book."

"It is amazing," said Mr. Ross, shaking his head with an air of innocence, "how everyone wishes to help us."

Just then, a young man, presumably from either the Air Transport or Research Translation Group, came storming up the stairs. "All right," he said, "who the hell swiped my typewriter?"

Well, it all goes to prove what I've long suspected: our Government agencies would keep on running for years even if we didn't give them any money. And I do hope Congress will officially create the domestic Peace Corps. It's the jolliest agency now going. Of course, I'm not sure Congress ought to give the Corps any money. Why ruin a good thing?

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 17, 1963]

WE'D LOVE A LITTLE JUST PLAIN JACK

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Good morning, friends in television-land. It's time once again for another visit with Just Plain Jack, the cockle-warming story of a young man's struggle to get this country moving again. Half as fast as his family.

As we join Just Plain Jack today he and Portly Pierre, the faithful family retainer, are conferring in the Pale Mauve Room. The Beautiful Society Girl sits in a rocker labeled "Hers," knitting from a Vogues Bizarre pattern.

JACK (rubbing his hands). Well, Pierre, now that we've gotten through the winter of my discontent——

PIERRE (gloomily). Spring doesn't look so hot either, Chief. Congress is up to nothing, our space program is down to earth, our Cuban policy is up in the air and, most important of all, you're down in the polls. They say you've run out of steam and you're not producing anything.

SOCIETY GIRL. Does anybody have a persimmon? I have a sudden craving for a persimmon. With chocolate sauce.

JACK (annoyed). Please, dear, not now. (To Pierre) It can't be as bad as all that.

PIERRE (glumly). At the moment, Chief, you've got the image of an overboiled rutabaga. Do you realize you hit the cover of only one magazine this month? The Gastro-Intestinal Digest? This keeps up and you won't carry South Boston in '64.

SOCIETY GIRL (musing). No, not a persimmon, a quince. A jellied quince, I think, with horseradish and—

JACK. Please, Dear. Do you have to plan your dinner party menus aloud? (To Pierre) Well, the European junket ought to grab some space.

PIERRE (groaning). Of the worse kind. They'll say you're off gallivanting around on a grand tour while things go to pot. No sir, you've got to do something. Produce something.

SOCIETY GIRL (holding up the booties she is knitting). Look, Bunny. Aren't they darling? I couldn't decide on pink or blue. So I used cerise.

JACK (absently). I'm sure they'll look lovely on you, dear. Why don't you run along and show them to Oleg? (To Pierre) I could take up model airplane building. Or taxidermy.

PIERRE (shuddering). No, you've got to produce something noncontroversial. Something everybody will love and identify with.

SOCIETY GIRL (desperately). Bunny, I've been trying to tell you all evening. I'm expecting.

JACK (irritably). Not company again tonight. Really, dear, we're very busy. And besides, if it's that modern jazz clavichord quartet again—

PIERRE (leaping up). Wait, Chief, I think—(he kneels before the society girl and tenderly takes her hand.) Tell me, is it really true?

SOCIETY GIRL (blushing and lowering her eyes as she whispers). Yes.

PIERRE (jumping up and down, tears of joy coursing down his cheeks). Huzzah. Huzzah. We're saved, Chief. Oh, I'll go ring the bells and fire the cannon. (He rushes out.)

JACK (putting his arm around the society girl). All I can say at a moment like this, dearest, is that you've made Pierre the happiest man in the world.

Isn't it wonderful? Will everybody approve? Except Margaret Sanger? But isn't it wonderful? So tune in to our next episode, friends. And meanwhile, as you go the pathways of life, remember: When skies are grey, when folks are down on you, all you need to turn the tide is a little just plain jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 18, 1963]

LIFE IN WASHINGTON IS REALLY THE NITS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—I'm thinking of giving up work on my book, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." It's too depressing. Take the all-important chapter on "Interesting Native Handicrafts." Like nit picking.

Nit picking, as you know, ranks above even tale spinning and elbow bending as a major native art form. And most tribesmen devote their entire productive years to picking nits. Which are viewed by the natives as status symbols. Not unlike hippopotamus-bone nose rings.

Indeed, among the solons, who dwell on Capitol Hill where nit picking is a way of life, advancement in the tribe appears to depend in great measure on the number and loveliness of the nits the tribesman is able to pick. And the solon who accumulates the most nits is venerated and elevated to positions of honor. Such as "committee chairmanships" or "floor leaderships." Where the challenge is commensurate to his abilities.

Nor should this primitive craft be denigrated. It requires all the dexterity, skill, and imagination of Hugululap betel nut carving. To say the least.

What is little understood about nit picking is that it is not the size of the nit that counts. But rather the size of the issue from which it is picked. "The larger the issue, the fewer the nits it will produce," is the strange rule governing the art form.

For example, should an issue appropriating $50 billion to blow up the world be submitted to the solons, only the newest freshmen, or neophyte nit picker, would search for a nit. But let another tribe request, say $162.98 for seven new office chairs and every solon is on his feet. Tweezers in hand.

"Are these purported chairs of foreign design?" demands one in a transport of joy. "May I have a unanimous consent," say another, all aglow, "to introduce into the record an excellent report on the unquestion-

able value of genuine hoghide antimacassars, with which, I feel confident in stating, these so-called chairs are undoubtedly unequipped?" And so forth.

This seeming oddity can be explained of course, on the grounds the nit pickers feel more secure picking nits from a small issue they can understand. Such as seats. While big issues, such as blowing up the world, make them uneasy and inhibit their creativity.

But I prefer to think the artistic nit picker views the small issue as presenting a greater esthetic challenge. Comparable to pinhead engraving. And thus the native nit picker is much to be admired. If you like engraved pinheads.

But the problem, of course is, "What good are nits?" They have no intrinsic value in the real world, being neither edible, wearable nor salable. And how can we advanced societies help these poor, backward natives ever reach the economic takeoff point where they'll cease to be a burden to us? If they persist in this next fixation?

Oh, it's going to be a long, slow haul leading them to economic independence. I suggest we start by trying to teach them basket weaving. Or, even better, crude pottery making. Anything productive. But, frankly, it looks hopeless. The more I examine their economic structure the more depressed I get. No, sir, these natives are never going to make a pot. Not without our help, they're not.

[From the San Francisco Chonicle, Apr. 19, 1963]

DEAR GOVERNMENT: THANKS FOR NOTHING

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I know you're going to think I'm a starry-eyed idealist, a utopian dreamer, an impractical do-gooder. But I've formed another organization to save us all. It's called, "The National Committee for a Do-Nothing Government."

The need is acute. For the basic trouble with Government, if you ask me, is that it tends to govern. We elect a nice, likeable politician who pledges "decisive leadership." And the next thing we know he's trying to lead us all around decisively. Cuba? Vietnam? Berlin? He has this awful urge to do something. Which is usually a terrible mistake.

Domestically, it's no better. Every elected leader has a fixation on passing laws or issuing executive orders. And the laws and orders keep mounting year after year, inexorably constricting our freedom. So, obviously, something must be done. Or, to quote our battle cry: "Nothing must be done."

Not only do we have a battle cry, but I've spent the past couple of months drawing up blueprints for a vigorous program of hard-hitting political action. To stir up public lethargy.

The committee, I figured, will throw its weight behind selected candidates pledged to indecisive leadership, vacillation and, when the chips are down, complete inertia. Front groups will be formed. Such as the Committee for an Ineffective Congress, which will work to elect Southern Democrats. And the National Commission To Restore the White House. As a parking garage.

Annual awards, I decided, will be given to our public servants who best represent the virtues of boondoggling, fence-straddling and buck passing. These will be presented at our gala testimonial dinner to the legislator who has met the fewest number of rollcalls.

So then, I said to myself, let us who see the danger to our lives and freedom in a vigorous Government, unite under the immortal words of Mr. Thomas Jefferson: "He governs best who goes fishing."

And so it was, my bead a-buzz with plans for kickoff lunches and drum-beating press conferences, that I arrived in our Nation's Capital to launch, at long last, this desperately needed crusade.

Oh, with what zeal it was that, seeking congressional support, I marched over to Capitol Hill. Where seven of our Senators were in session. Six of them reading newspapers.

And ah, how my dedication burned undimmed as, hoping for Presidential backing, I hurried over to the White House, where Mr. Kennedy had gotten so disgusted with his lethargic Congress that he'd gone off to Florida for a week.

Well, I've mulled the matter over while calling on several friends in executive agencies, who were out at the ball game. Again, and I've decided to form the National Committee for a Do-Nothing Government anyway.

Because our system of checks and balances isn't perfect, I mean it doesn't do nothing. It just doesn't do very much awfully slowly. And the older I get, the more I'm for that.

But it needs our support. Of course, after a week in Washington, I've made one change in our committee's plans. I've rewritten the banner under which we will fight. It now says: "Let's Keep Things the Way They Are."

Taxpayers Charged for Wheat Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker. Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture are lobbying with the American taxpayer's money.

To persuade farmers to approve socialistic supply management over wheat in the referendum May 21, Secretary Freeman is:

First. Using perhaps 27,000 full-time and part-time Government employees;

Second. Holding a series of "informational" sessions in over 2,000 counties;

Third. Circulating 4 million copies of 7 different booklets—after distributing 2.4 million pamphlets last year—and

Fourth. Sending TV films and radio tapes starring Mr. Freeman to some 300 broadcasters.

Instead of letting citizens vote to influence Government policy, the Government is trying to influence citizens how to vote.

In another area of the world this would be called brainwashing. Here it has come to be known as news management or taxpayer-charged public relations or just politics.

This information is given in an article in the Thursday, April 25, Wall Street Journal. An excerpt of the article "Wheat Vote Fight" is given here:

FREEMAN MOBILIZES DEPARTMENT

Agriculture Secretary Freeman is mobilizing all his Department's vast field organization to "explain" the control plan to voters. A series of informational sessions in over 2,000 wheatraising counties is beginning; perhaps 27,000 full-time and part-time Government employees will be involved. Four million copies of seven different explanatory booklets are being circulated. Last year, there were 2 pamphlets and 2.4 million printings. "We're doing a lot more that we would if the Farm Bureau weren't after us," a Federal official concedes.

A special Freeman emissary, former Republican Congressman, Phil Weaver, of Nebraska, is crisscrossing Wheat Belt States, speaking to chambers of commerce, Rotary clubs and other groups in behalf of the control plan. TV films and radio tapes starring Mr. Freeman have been sent to some 300 broadcasters. In part, he hits directly at farmers' pocketbook interests. "With a 'yes' vote," he tells audiences, "the price of wheat will be $2 a bushel; with a 'no' vote, $1 a bushel."

There are no legal restraints on administration propagandizing, but some critics have questioned the propriety of open Agriculture Department pressure to sway the outcome. Hence much of the ballcarrying is being left to others. Powerful farm State Democrats, including Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD, of Montana, and House Majority Leader ALBERT, of Oklahoma, are calling for a "yes" vote and warning that Congress won't rush in with a stopgap wheat law if the control plan is rejected.

Science and Social Problems—Speech of the Honorable George P. Miller of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that we are experiencing a period of exciting technological change. Through the advances of modern science, we live in a world which has greater wealth and greater potential than ever before.

But does this increased wealth, does this increased knowledge, and do these new horizons mean that we have achieved material security? Are they true indicators of our national strength?

This is the critical problem to which our distinguished colleague, the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics addressed himself recently at the Dunsmuir House Conference on Space Science and Urban Life in Oakland, Calif. And, it is a problem, Mr. Speaker, with which we must all be concerned.

As the gentleman from California, Congressman MILLER, so incisively pointed out in his talk:

> I think one of the most pressing needs of America is the application of its scientific research and development resources to the solution of the human problems that weigh the human balance scale opposite ourselves, that contain within them the possible threat of our destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to participate in this Dunsmuir House Conference with the gentlemtn from California, Congressman MILLER, and I believe that after reading his remarks, our colleagues will join me in congratulating him on his timely and thoughtful address.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE SPACE SCIENCE AND URBAN LIFE CONFERENCE, DUNSMUIR HOUSE, OAKLAND, CALIF., MARCH 28, 1963

I am honored indeed to be here with you today and to be in the company of such distinguished gentlemen as Dr. Newell, Mr. Wyatt and Mr. Lingle, three of NASA's outstanding officials.

I must admit that at first blanch, I was somewhat appalled by the possible ramifications of the subject I am to discuss this morning. It is hard to think of any areas of national interest and needs where scientific research and development do not somewhere play an integral part except in Congress.

Incidentally, I have often wished that the uncertainties, the unknowns of politics and of legislative government could be explored and solved by research tools that are as precise as those scientists have to work with. What a boon it would be if tariff and tax problems could be solved neatly and conclusively by mathematical formula.

How wonderful it would be if the conflicting interests of Maryland and Virginia in the equitable distribution of shell fish in the Chesapeake Bay could be resolved by computers. I assure you that if such things were possible, the serenity of my daily life in Congress would be greatly enhanced.

It would be entirely pretentious for me to identify and describe in specific detail research problems that are of vital importance to our country. But I think it is certainly quite possible to identify, in terms of human needs, some pressing problems that deserve much more attention from the scientific community than they are presently receiving.

I hope you will agree that the eventual satisfaction of human needs, both philosophical and material, is the only ultimate end of all science, research, and technology. I include technology here solely to emphasize the fact that it is through technology that scientific knowledge most often can be translated into goods or power.

Now, I want to concentrate for a moment on the word "need." No doubt there are as many different interpretations of that word as there are points of view. Every facet of our society that depends more or less upon science and engineering for its continued existence contributes to the overall demand for new research products.

Hence, the research needs of this country can be best understood or analyzed in terms of the effect, the stimulus to respond thereby injected into our scientific community.

The National Academy of Sciences has estimated recently that a total of $17.8 billion was spent by the Federal Government and private industry for research and development during 1962. It is quite apparent to me that regardless of whether or not private or public money was spent, the expenditure of $17.8 billion was hardly done at random.

It is obvious that funding of such scope had to be directed toward acquiring specific knowledge to satisfying specific needs, or for exploration to determine what our research products will be in the foreseeable future.

No one will question that this era, these unprecedented times of truly global conflicts and convulsive expressions of surging nationalism will be known as the age of science and technology. This will be the label of the historian who has neatly divided the past into tidy divisions.

But we are not blessed with a historical view of the present; our full course has not yet been run. We can only look at the wealth we hold in our hands, the riches that surround us and then decide whether or not science and technology has up to now fulfilled all our needs.

We are housed better, fed better with more variety, clothed better, and entertained more than any other people in the history of mankind.

We have unprecedented means of communications. We have at our command industrial power and energy that exceeds any other nation on earth.

Our society has been made far more antiseptic through medical research than any other, and hence prolonged our productive lives. We have through applied research, achieved greater leisure than has ever been known before by so many.

Has science and technology satisfied our needs? If you limit them to food, clothing, shelter and security, then of course, far beyond any expectation.

I am tempted to say that science, engineering, technology actually is and has been preoccupied as much with our desires as with our needs.

I admit to a certain uneasiness, however, to a sense of unsureness, when I contemplate all that we have. Have we really achieved material security? Are all our symbols of wealth and well-being true indicators of our national strength?

Will our future vigor, security, and advancement as a people be assured by the use we are now making of our science and technology? Or have we built for ourselves through research and its applications a lotus land where we have become so preoccupied with enhancing our own material well-being, our national ego, that the human ills of the rest of the world tend to become remote and unreal?

The people of this world have always been generally divided between the "haves" and the "have nots." All conflicts between peoples are directly or indirectly rooted in this division. It lies at the original foundation of the causes for the ideological clash of today, of State control versus private enterprise, communism versus free society.

In all ages, including our own, the "have nots" have far outnumbered the "haves." The advancement of technology of other eras, as primitive as it may seem now, made possible the isolated development of culture and civilization out of a sea of barbarism.

It seems tragically paradoxical that the results of that very same technological advancement seems often to have led to gross national self-indulgence, to have insulated eventually a relatively few people from the harsh and unequivocal facts of life and death that confronted daily the rest of mankind.

And it has been the hungry, the homeless, and the harried who have been the witnesses, often the agents of the downfall and the destruction of empires.

Thus, the fact today of more than a billion illiterate people must have some meaning for us. The fact that more than half the peoples of the world exist on diets significantly below minimum standards for good health must have some import to our future.

The fact that insurance statistics assign to us an average longevity of 65 or more as opposed to less than 30 for substantial portions of the world population cannot be dismissed as none of our concern.

We dare not ignore historical precedent, not if we look beyond the period immediately ahead of us to the next 25 years or beyond.

Just consider the nature of the world we live in today. One part is divided into two hostile armed camps, the other composed of impotent but watchful bystanders who expect to become eventually the beneficiaries of the East-West conflict, no matter the outcome.

The Soviet Union and Communist China, both of which came into being out of the desperation of millions of hopeless, destitute people, are on the march. There is no doubt about the singlemindedness of their objective to acquire in any way expedient as much as possible of the world's goods and power.

Their assault upon the West will continue to receive a major impetus from the clamor of their people for a better life. And there are many, many sympathetic ears elsewhere in the world who are not unmoved or indifferent to what they hear.

The point is this; I think one of the most pressing needs of America is the application of its scientific research and development resources to the solution of the human problems that weigh the human balance scale opposite ourselves, that contain within them the possible threat of our destruction.

As you no doubt know, the United States has for many years poured out tremendous resources to build and strengthen the economies of nations all over the world in order to eliminate breeding grounds of communism and to create political stability. Since 1946, we have sent abroad more than $100 billion in the form of all types of assistance. This is in addition to the beneficial impact of expenditures for such joint efforts as UNESCO, NATO, SEATO and our own military establishments.

Our dollars and resources have been the major factor in the rebuilding of Europe and Japan. We have helped nation after nation, new and old, in every part of the world to survive the economic, political and natural disasters that have occurred since 1945 with food, technical assistance, and credit.

American people have, and are right now, risking their lives and sometimes losing them in Asia in order to prevent chaos, and alleviate human misery. We have many such people as Dr. Tom Dooley working unsung and unknown to bring hope and relief to millions of people in Asia, Africa and South America.

Surely, we have sent out technical advisers of all kinds to teach people how to cope with their own unique problems of food, clothing, shelter and health. We have operating now the Peace Corps, a bright but relatively small effort, that has achieved from all reports promising results.

But as great and as noble as these efforts are, and as vitally important as they are in countering the subversion of the Communist bloc, they are primarily corrective, not preventive measures. We have sent out our foods, machines, and some talents. But have we really sent them the knowledge to attack the basic causes for their misery?

Suppose, for instance, we mounted a major effort to find a means by which malaria could be as effectively eliminated from Asia and South America and Africa as we have eliminated smallpox or typhoid fever from America. Think of the human resources, the economic force that would be released for effective and constructive work in those politically unstable areas.

Suppose that we mobilized our scientific resources to produce insecticides to wipe out permanently the locust plagues that annually threaten millions of people with famine. Would that not make them less susceptible to the blandishments of communism?

Suppose we effectively attacked the problem of illiteracy by the adaption through research of communication technologies in which we already lead the world. Would not the effectiveness of our program to broadcast the messages of freedom, the dignity of man, government by law, not men eventually be magnified many times over?

You might say, "We are doing these things now." Yes, we are. But in what fashion? Relatively in dribs and drabs. We have not as yet on a national basis decided, not only for political reasons, not only for economic reasons, but for practical, pressing human reasons to mobilize our research to attack these ills.

It is entirely consistent with the history of our country that the scientific community should be assigned such a critical and vital role. And I firmly believe that the Biblical promise of the hundredfold return for bread cast upon the waters applies equally to nations as well as individuals.

It has long been acknowledged that our technological leadership of the free world is based on an unmatched ability to translate into practical terms the results of research. There is no doubt that this is our special forte. It has been a unique force in the hands of our people. It has been the imprimatur of progress and dynamic energy. It has supplied a momentum to our society that has carried this Nation through vicissitudes that have perverted or destroyed nations of our times and the past.

Our problem, then is to maintain that momentum, to preserve that strength of that unique force, through those who will come after us. It is our task to make sure that our scientific research will continue to serve the needs of the world.

This Nation is faced with the never-ending problem of developing scientific and technical people of greater and greater competence, to meet the challenges such as those I have just outlined.

It is true, as you well know, that the current programs we have undertaken, best illustrated by our space program, are demanding numbers of well-trained scientists and engineers that threaten to strain our resources of competent people.

Our urgent need for well-trained scientists, technicians, and engineers has already been reflected in educational institutions throughout the country from the primary grades through the graduate degree level. Great progress has been made by educators to establish rigorous and demanding curricula in our universities and secondary schools. We have clearly understood the threat of the Soviet Union to achieve parity, both economic and military, by increasing manyfold the numbers of scientists, engineers, and technicians available to the Soviet economy. It is a well-known fact that following World War II, the Soviet educational effort received such concentrated emphasis that today, Russia is producing two to three times as many scientists and technicians as we are. And there is no question that the Soviet Union fully intends to accelerate further its educational programs.

But what kind of scientists or engineers are the Russian institutions producing? Do these people match our image, our conception of what professionally trained people should be: Well developed professionally, intellectually, and culturally?

I think you will agree that we see in the average Soviet product of today a very well-trained individual who has been neglected in the development of those human qualities that would permit him the intellectual freedom to seek out and recognize absolute truth. And it is truth, and the ability to relate that truth to human progress that is the credo of science.

We, in buttressing our defenses against the onslaught of Soviet technology must not go the same route as have the Russians. We must not through our competitive instincts, and because of the urgencies of our days, limit or ignore the need for the philosophical development of our students.

President Barnaby C. Keeney of Brown University expressed his thoughts quite eloquently on this. He said:

"There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements or lack thereof in the arts and humanities."

Former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin concurs with President Keeney by saying:

"The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny."

We must continue to produce people who have been well-grounded, who have been trained how to think, how to use their minds, and how to apply their talents.

Here we are free from Government limitations of career choices and our graduates from higher institutions find their own niche in our economy. Here individual talents whether in the sciences, humanities or the arts, have the equal opportunity to become fully developed and refined.

Their usefulness has been limited only to the extent to which our economy can utilize them. Thus it is extremely heartening to me to realize that in our national community, characterized by dignified freedom of choice, we have achieved the highest levels of scientific and technological accomplishment in history. And it has been our educational institutions that have made a major contribution to that achievement.

I believe we must continue to foster and encourage in every way possible the breadth and depth we try to maintain in our approach to education. We need and must continue to produce greater numbers of people of higher scholastic achievement. And they must come from all the disciplines, not just from science and engineering.

Scientific research is neither good nor evil by itself. It is the use that men make of it that dictates the nature of its effect. And it is seldom the scientist who decides what use will be made of his handiwork.

This is in the hands of others who will dictate whether scientific achievement is to be a blessing or a curse. It is the systems under which people work and live that will enable or pervert technology.

The use men make of science is not governed by science. It is governed by men's philosophical and moral judgments. It is repugnant for me to contemplate a society in which scientists are cultural paupers. I am repelled by the thought of responsible men not thoroughly aware of the power science gives them. The thought of a system in which science and technology has been glorified to the point where it becomes the end objective rather than the means to a greater and nobler end, the advancement of human progress, is an anathema to me.

The basic integrity of our scientific community is an indespensable characteristic of this Nation. It is here that the scientific leaders of our generation have been able to find the intellectual climate in which to do their best work. Need I cite Einstein, Fermi, Seaborg, Von Karman, Lawrence and Teeler, to name only a very few?

Thus, I say our research needs are centered by circumstance, by logic, and by historical precedent in the elimination of those human ills that infect more than half the world's population. In all practicality and in all conscience, we cannot ignore that task if we are not to violate the moral basis upon which this Nation was founded. And we owe to our children, to the generations to come the opportunity to assume responsibility, such as that we now shoulder, by which future challenges to the rights of man can be courageously and willingly accepted.

Scientific progress in the United States, whether in Government or in industry, will be the direct reflection of the men and women who will lead or support it. It will be you and I, however, who will be responsible in great measure whether our memory will be blessed or damned.

Sooner or Later President Kennedy Must Face Up to the Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as each day's news announces increased Communist aggression in Laos, in Latin America, in Vietnam, and all over the world, it becomes increasingly clear that sooner or later, President Kennedy will have to face up to the Communist threat. He must recognize that you cannot deal with the Communists. The Soviet Union has a single objective, clearly stated by every Communist leader since Lenin, and that is world domination. They know that capitalism and communism cannot live side by side and they have no intention of allowing this to happen. As part of their grand strategy, they use coexistence for propaganda purposes and to enable them to continue the Red policy of subversion, but they make no effort to conceal the fact that the ultimate goal is to rule the world.

President Kennedy does not admit this objective of the Communists. He refuses to face the fact that the Communists cannot be trusted. He ignores the history of their broken agreements and treaty violations and continues to try to win Khrushchev over by making concessions and deals. The only way to deal with the Communists is to win the war they have initiated and we do that through a firm, bold, policy of strength.

The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of April 24, shows how the administration is facing the Communist threat:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 24, 1963]

FACING THE COMMUNIST THREAT: LAOS AND CUBA OFFER CONTRAST IN U.S. HANDLING OF TWO TROUBLE SPOTS

(By David Lawrence)

Most Americans can't pinpoint Laos on a world map. They know it's somewhere in southeast Asia. Yet they read in the newspapers that American Marines are being rushed to the area, that American soldiers have been losing their lives next door in South Vietnam, and that the President of the United States is engaged in serious discussions which are indicative of a crisis with the Soviet Union about Laos.

In contrast, just 90 miles away is Cuba, where the Soviet Union has between 10,000 and 20,000 troops and technicians and the latest weapons of warfare. But the United States hesitates to invade Cuba, though it is apparently ready to threaten the use of military force in Laos.

It isn't explained just why it is an "act of war" to invade Cuba, but isn't an act of war to use troops in southeast Asia.

Nor is it clear to anybody just why "international complications" and the "escalation" from one stage in the crisis to another isn't feared with respect to Laos, but is given as the reason for American hesitation in Cuba.

The foreign policy of the United States today toward Russia is a mixture of strong words at times and long periods of inaction. The strange attitude with reference to Cuba because of a fear of offending the Soviet Union is, of course, explained in the hackneyed phrases of diplomacy. In the one case, it is argued that Thailand—next door to Laos—has "invited" American help, while in the case of Cuba, it is pointed out that Castro has "invited" Soviet help.

But there is in both situations an anomaly. For the Government in Cuba doesn't represent the people, and in Laos the "neutralist" government has been threatened from within by a Communist takeover, and it isn't clear just what any government in that area represents. There is an unwillingness in Washington, however, to recognize the Communists as the true enemies of the people in both Laos and Cuba.

Although, for instance, the United States has addressed several communications to Moscow about the missiles and the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba, there is no inclination to use force to clean up the situation there. With respect to Laos, however, the U.S. Navy is moving into the area with thousands of marines, and there is a definite threat to take military action. American officials state flatly that the Communists have broken the truce in Laos.

Meanwhile, the debate inside and outside of Congress continues as to whether invasion would mean a big war over Cuba. But for some reason there is little talk of a big war arising when the United States undertakes military steps to thwart Communist imperialism in Laos.

The Kennedy administration is well aware of the pressure of public opinion for a more determined policy with respect to Cuba. There is no doubt that public opinion outside the United States is manifesting an increasing disapproval of Washington's attitude of watchful waiting and indifference to Communist encroachment.

In the last few days, Senator MANSFIELD of Montana, Democratic leader in the Senate, has come out in favor of an economic embargo against Cuba by all countries in this hemisphere. He wouldn't have made such a statement without the approval of the President.

The plan undoubtedly is to mobilize sentiment behind the whole idea as the United States, through diplomatic channels, begins to urge the Latin American countries to organize an economic boycott against Cuba under the auspices of the Organization of American States.

This, however, is a long and tedious process and looks like a temporary scheme to answer the criticism about a do-nothing policy. After several months it will become apparent that an economic embargo against Cuba is hardly effective.

When and if, as Senator THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, has urged, the United States faces up to the Communist threat everywhere and begins to consider a severance of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government, then—and only then—will situations such as have arisen in Laos and in Cuba begin to be changed from defeat to victory for the free world.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Feed Grain Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 4997 to extend the feed grain program.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, much has been said today about the feed grain problem and the farm problem, and a great argument has arisen about how to salve over the problem, but little has been said about the cause of the problem or the solution.

When a cancer breaks out, you can salve the sore externally, but unless major surgery is performed and the cancer removed, the patient will die. This feed grain bill, like most of this farm legislation, is salve on the sore; it does not recognize the cause nor does it recognize the solution.

Much has been said about figures and acreage retirement. Those who sponsor this legislation are proud of the fact that in 1961 the Department was able to divert 25.2 million acres at a cost of only $782 million. In 1962 they diverted 28.6 million acres at a cost of only $842 million, and in 1963 they diverted 25.8 million acres at a cost of $983 million. Those who have opposed the legislation contend that this price for diverted acres is exorbitant.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the price in dollars is not only exorbitant, but the price in agricultural production is 10 times worse. It is foolish, it is asinine, and it is destructive. Let me point out what I mean:

In 1962 there was imported into the United States over 2¾ million head of 1,000-pound beef. This is an increase of one-half million head over 1961.

The Department of Agriculture advises me that on a nationwide basis it requires the production of 28 acres to produce a 1,000-pound beef and put it on the market. For easy figuring and to be safely in line, I have used the figure of 20 acres. On this basis the 2,726,528 head of beef produced in foreign countries and shipped into the United States, which went onto the American market, displaced the production of 54,530,560 American acres. In other words, had we in America, either through quotas or tariffs, reduced beef imports by only 50 percent, there would have been no need for the taxpayers buying 25 or 28 million acres through diversion and hundreds of farmers and ranchers would have been permitted to remain on the farms to raise the beef on these 38 million acres that was otherwise removed from production by beef imports.

Instead of bragging about how the Department of Agriculture was able to take 25 million acres out of production for $983 million, suppose we had permitted the American farmer to raise the beef imported last year. It would have saved the American taxpayer not $983 million, but three times that amount, because the 2¾ million head of beef displaced the production of more than 54 million acres.

This is only one example. During the past 10 years the disappearance of barley, oats, and rye has been greater than the domestic production of barley, oats, and rye, and yet the American taxpayer is called upon to spend some $20 million annually for the storage of barley, oats, and rye. Whose feed grain is being stored? Not the feed grain of the American farmer, but imported feed grain, if you please, while the American farmer is being required to take his acres out of production to make room for barley, oats, and rye imported into this country in direct competition with American production.

Imports of lamb, mutton, and pork jumped several million pounds last year, further displacing thousands of domestic acres. Sugar imports displaced the production of 1.8 million acres, to use only a few examples. This is the cancer, Mr. Chairman; it is the cancer that must be removed instead of sitting here today putting salve on the sore.

The Department of Agriculture tells us today that 10 percent of the beef eaten by Americans last year was imported. In other words, 1 out of 10 farmers are driven from their farm by the imports of beef alone.

Last year when we were considering the farm bill, I pointed out that there were 2¼ million head of beef imported in 1961. Congress took no action, the President took no action, but the State Department was as busy as a beaver. They have been arranging for agricultural imports from almost every country.

For instance, the Argentine press under date of May 9, 1962, carried a big story quoting the U.S. Ambassador, Robert McClintock, to the effect that he was asking the U.S. Government to permit large shipments of cooked beef into the United States. It quoted the Ambassador as saying:

> This afternoon, Dr. Urien asked me to cable Washington saying that Argentina was in agreement, in principle, with the scientific recommendations made to inspect meat in Buenos Aires and in the meat packing houses and to have it marked with seals of our inspectors. Thus, cured meat, after undergoing the corresponding process, may enter the United States.

He also said:

> Personally, I will see what can be done for my country to buy more Argentine cooked meat.

He added that he would send a telegram to Washington to have an answer on a final decision as soon as possible.

The Argentine press story concluded:

> Secretary Urien then announced that a group of U.S. inspectors were coming to Argentina to confirm the excellency of the Argentine meat.

This is only one example of how our Government is deliberately planning to destroy the American farmer by importing the food that goes onto American tables and the fiber that goes onto American backs, requiring the American farmer to year by year reduce his production to make room for these imports.

The American people are propagandized daily about what a wonderful thing the European Common Market is and how the Common Market will take over world trade. This is true because the Common Market countries are protecting their industries and their farmers by tariffs and quotas. Secretary Freeman stated on January 8 that this year we would lose $800 million of agricultural exports to the Common Market countries. Their tariff on poultry alone kept 300 million pounds of poultry raised for export this year from going into the Common Market countries. This 300 million pounds of unexportable poultry was dumped onto the domestic market and had more to do with the slump in beef prices than anything else.

If it is good for the Common Market countries to protect their farmers against ruinous imports, why is it not good to protect the American farmer? Why are agricultural imports invited into this country forcing the American farmer out of business, forcing the American taxpayer to spend billions of dollars to subsidize the farm industry, rather than permitting the American farmer to have his own market and raise the food for the American people?

Oh, yes, I know the manufacturers and American business generally are anxious to sell their product abroad and to arrange for the farmers of these foreign countries to be able to market their agricultural products in America to provide dollars to buy machinery and so forth. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the farmer of the Middle West is a good market. Put him out of business, put him on the rolls of the unemployed, as we have been doing by these so-called farm programs, and industry of the East has lost the best market in the world.

When do we wake up? When do we take a page from the book of the Common Market countries? When do we look back into the pages of American history and see what made this country great?

"The Ugly American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Richard L. Coe, the well-known and experienced critic of the Washington Post, has written a review of the motion picture film "The Ugly American." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1963]

BRANDO FILM IS A PHONY

(By Richard L. Coe)

"The Ugly American," Universal release produced and directed by George Englund. Screenplay by Stewart Stern, suggested by the novel by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick. Photographed in Eastman color by Clifford Stine. Music by Frank Skinner. At the Warner.

(The Cast)

Harrison Carter MacWhite	Marlon Brando
Deong	Eiji Okada
Marion MacWhite	Sandra Church
Homer Atkins	Pat Hingle
Grainger	Arthur Hill
Emma Atkins	Jocelyn Brando
Prime Minister Kwen Sai	Kukrit Pramoj
Joe Bing	Judson Pratt
Rachani	Reiko Sato
Munsang	George Shibata
Senator Brenner	Judson Laire
Sears	Philip Ober
Sawad	Yee Tak Yip
Andrei Krupitzyn	Steffan Schnabel
Col. Chee	Pock Rock Ahn

The ads proclaim each moment threatened by the terror just beyond their bedroom door, Marlon Brando tours the land abjuring us to take "The Ugly American" seriously and what are we to make of it?

Nonsense, I regret to say. The key lies in an early scene purporting to be between two old friends united in today's southeast Asia, the American as our Ambassador, the Asiatic as the gentle friend who welcomes him with oriental charm.

Do they discuss, as two such friends unquestionably would, the riot which greeted the American Ambassador on his airport arrival? No, they get drunk fiction sytle, avoid what two presumably thinking people would talk about and wind up, at evening's end, giving lectures on mistaken ideas. In time, these ideas create a feud which leads to the Asiatic's death and the American's honorable conversion to self-awareness.

This is nothing more than a western about the bad guys and the good guys, misunderstanding and murder. The ad showing the Ambassador and his lady in bed has nothing to do with what goes on, thereby underscoring the film's split personality.

If Brando and his accomplices had wished to make an honorable movie about our current southeast Asia headlines, they should have been less commerce minded and more to the point.

OILY SENATE SCENE

Their film begins with a supposedly hard-hitting Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing over the suitability of Ambassador-designate Brando Sarkhan. The scene is oily, not honorable, in conception, playing, or direction. Had I been a member of such committee I easily would have argued my colleagues into turning down the Presidential appointee on the grounds of smug self-satisfaction. Anyway, Brando, eternally fiddling with his pipe and briefcase, does get the job, walks into the aforementioned scene and wholly demolishes the film's subsequent story.

Had this American and this Sarkhanese been the friends they are stated to have been, what price glory, then? The scene, emphasizing, even in its photography, the difference between them with the subtle force of width, does not support what follows.

Conceivably, the idea of "The Ugly American" is to dramatize our failings but the film dramatically falls into assuming that its critical scene is valid. Because the scene itself is merely facile melodrama, the film's pretentions become (if only gradually) apparent and we are left with the schizoid premise of phony uplift.

FILMED IN THAILAND

The settings are impressive, visibly Thailand, and an actor named Eiji Okada plays the misunderstood rebel, Deong, impressively. Brando is the omnivorous star, eating up every scene. His sister, Jocelyn, is infinitely more the actress, nicely underplaying a helpful American wife who, while her engineer husband (Pat Hingle) has been building a controversial road, is conducting a natives' clinic. Plain and grayhaired, she is what this misdirected, presumptuous film actually should have depicted.

Senator FULBRIGHT's remarks about the film before its creation have been amply fulfilled by: "Each moment threatened by the terror just behind their bedroom door," which has nothing to do with the case except as a come-on.

Sixty-five–Thirty-five Unwisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, some of the unwisdom of legislative interference in the allocation of naval ship repair work is indicated in the following editorial of April 21 in the Tri-City, Wash., Herald:

DEFENSE IS MOST IMPORTANT

A proposal in Congress that at least 35 percent of the money spent on naval ship repair or alterations be spent in private shipyards may well be the death knell for institutions like the Pudget Sound Naval Shipyard in Bremerton.

For approximately 90 percent of the new-ship construction is already being done in private shipyards. Now naval shipyards presumably would be forced to give up a major slice of their repair and alteration work.

The idea seems completely without merit. It appears to be more a case of being penny-wise and pound foolish.

In time of peace it may be possible to do the work in private yards and save some money too. But at what cost?

A House subcommittee 2 years ago made a study of a similar proposal. Its conclusion—one which is no less valid today—was that the existing naval-shipyard-support complex "is essential to our national defense."

Any effort to reduce or abolish this support system, the subcommittee found, would result in reducing naval strength.

Such an effort would then—and would be now—tampering with our national security by reducing our ability to defend ourselves.

We cannot afford now or ever to put dollars ahead of our national security.

A case at point concerns the Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co. in Seattle which won a contract to convert two Navy fleet oilers, part of the $15 million contract will be sublet to Japanese shipyards. Two torpedo boats have been built in Norwegian shipyards.

It seems inconceivable that Congress would seek to knock our naval shipyards in the head and yet the trend seems to be toward that type of killing blow. We trust wiser minds in our Congress will call a halt to this before critical damage is done.

Old West Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Kenneth E. Crouch and published in the Bedford Bulletin-Democrat. This article provides an interesting description of the life of a Virginia family that moved in 1886 to the Dakota Territory.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bedford (Va.) Bulletin-Democrat, Apr. 25, 1963]

VIVID STORIES OF OLD WEST TOLD BY SOUTHSIDE RESIDENT

(By Kenneth E. Crouch)

Between "The White House" and Staunton Baptist Church, on the west side of the Anthony's Ford Road in a grove, stands a unique granite marker simply inscribed "Saunders—James G. Saunders, born July 26, 1841, died October 15, 1914; Mattie C. Saunders, born March 25, 1847, died November 7, 1916."

This simple inscription, on a marker over 7 feet tall, fails to record the career of a famous son of the southside in the War Between the States and in pioneering in the Dakota Territory.

The many interesting exploits of this man and his family can be told today with vivid memory by his 83-year-old daughter, Mrs. Sabra Saunders Palmer, who lives with a son and daughter-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Philip A. Palmer, near the Staunton River High School site on Route 24.

IN THE OLD WEST

A visit with Mrs. Palmer, who lived for many years in the Dakota Territory, gives one a fascinating personal account of the early days of the old West. Mrs. Palmer was born at Union Hall, in Franklin County, daughter of James Goob and Mattie Dudley Saunders.

Mr. Saunders served 4 years in the Confederate Army, a member of the first outfit to leave Bedford County for service.

His unit was the Rifle Grays, later to be known as Company B, 14th Regiment, Virginia Infantry, Armistead's Brigade, Longstreet's Division, which was formed at Mount Pleasant Academy west of Huddleston and left April 24, 1861, for the war. Mr. Saunders was twice wounded, once at the Battle of Seven Pines.

BEWARE OF MOONSHINERS

Mr. Saunders was Franklin County surveyor for 8 years, and Mrs. Palmer said he "used to tramp over the hills of Franklin County surveying for the small sum of $2.50 per day. The mountains were infested with moonshiners and woe to the one who discovered their still.

"In 1883 the Northern Pacific Railroad had been built through the Dakota Territory, had been given a Government grant of land, and was anxious to bring in settlers," Mrs. Palmer said. "The road was offering special inducements of free land, and literature praised it as a land of milk and honey. My father decided to head into that country, so on March 4, 1886, we left Rocky Mount. I remember the peach trees were in bloom—they bloomed earlier then than they do now—the air was fragrant with early lilac blossoms, and the grassy lawns stretched away like green velvet. This was our last glimpse for many years of the little village we had loved.

THE IMMIGRANT TRAIN

"From Rocky Mount to Gladstone, Dakota Territory, it took 5 long days on the immigrant train. To keep diseases away, as daddy said, we carried with us a small bottle of brandy, and one morning sister Ola was crying. We later found it was because she had been missed in the morning dram.

"On March 9, this weary little band, father, mother, and six children, landed in Gladstone with a raging March blizzard our welcome. It was very cold, and mother wanted to return to Virginia, not to unpack our trunks, but dad said 'No,' and we stayed."

Mr. Saunders became U.S. deputy surveyor for the Government lands in the Dakota Territory, and his visions came true when he surveyed the boundary that separated what were later to become North and South Dakota.

STATES ARE BORN

Mrs. Palmer told of the statehood celebration in North Dakota: "The first Fourth of July we attended heralded North Dakota as a State. Theodore Roosevelt, who lived at Medora, was the speaker." Dakota Territory was composed of the area that become the States of North and South Dakota on November 2, 1889; part of Montana, which became a State November 8, 1889, and part of Wyoming, which became a State July 10, 1890. The Dakota Territory had been organized March 2, 1861.

"We rented three rooms over a little furniture store and lived there until father could build a house. In June we moved to the homestead, 8 miles out of Dickinson, the 160 acres he had bought for the filing fee of $23.75. It was beautiful level land. We dug four wells but no water was found so we had to carry water from a neighbor's well half a mile away. In winter we melted snow for drinking water. It's a good thing there weren't any germs in those days. In 11 years on the ranch we never had a doctor in the house, and a bottle of castor oil was still unopened when we moved away.

A TERRIBLE WINTER

"The winter of 1886 and 1887, our first one in the West, was the worst in the history of the country. Hundreds of cattle froze to death on the range, we lost our chickens, cow and our only mule was stabbed to death by a squatter. One bitter night we brought the two old horses into the woodshed to keep them from freezing. Food that winter was scarce, our diet for days was biscuits and black strap molasses.

"Our first Christmas present was a handful of brown sugar and we children were happy. I remember one awful drought, and to make the picture darker a ranging prairie fire swept down on us. We saved our shack by wetting gunnysacks and beating the fire out. We lost our haystacks, barn, and thousands of range cattle perished. Their bones, and those of buffalo, deer, and antelope, were bleached during the winter and in the summer we children picked bones for 2 days, got a load which we carried into Dickinson and sold for $2.75.

SCARED BY INDIANS

"On Thanksgiving Day, 1887, our parents were invited to Gladstone to a dinner. All the old settlers were invited but not the children. In those days children were seen and not heard. About noon we saw Sioux Indians coming over the hill. Indian fashion, one after the other, squaws carrying their papooses on their back. Of course we children were frightened, ran upstairs and crawled under the bed. My older sister held her hand over my mouth so I wouldn't cry, but no need of that, I was so scared I could not make a sound. The Indians went around the house, pounding at the doors, finally went to the henhouse, gathered the eggs, ate them shell and all.

"In 1888 father got his first Government job and we bought a flock of sheep. In the summertime I was the sheepherder; imagine a 9-year-old girl following sheep all day on a pony. I had a faithful little sheepdog and my 40-82 rifle to keep away the wolves and coyotes."

In surveying the Badlands area, Mr. Saunders platted the settlement of New England, N. Dak. The residents were from Vermont and Massachusetts and asked him to name the settlement New England for their former home.

ABOUT SITTING BULL

"In the early 1890's the Indians went on the warpath, led by old Sitting Bull, who had returned from Canada to a reservation in the territory. A courier came to our ranch home by night and informed us the Indians were headed our way. Father slept that night with his rifle by the bed while my brother Goob and I moulded bullets that night to have a supply on hand. In a few days father organized a company of ranchmen. The Government had already sent carbines for our protection. One morning, a very smoky one as the Indian campfires were burning day and night, the men started for the Grand River (now across the boundary south of Dickinson in South Dakota) to meet their foe. In a short while they came riding back in a hurry and father wired to Washington for aid at once. We were in a desperate condition. Those few days seemed like years to us; each night we could see the campfires burning a little closer. Some troops from Michigan were rushed in by special train to our aid and went south to meet the Indians. But in the meanwhile old Sitting Bull had been killed by an Indian policeman; with their leader dead the Indians returned to the reservations. I can still see those campfires at night, it was an experience you cannot forget."

TURNS TO POLITICS

Mrs. Palmer said her father, after many trying years on the ranch, decided to try the political field. In November 1897, he was elected clerk of the Stark County, N. Dak., court and moved to Dickinson. He held that office until his retirement in 1913.

Mrs. Palmer attended school in Dickinson and for 2 years taught a small school of 20 children near Davis Butte, N. Dak. The children were mostly from the German families who settled in that section and she had a difficult time.

In 1900 she was married to James H. Palmer of Fargo, N. Dak. Mr. Palmer was with the Northern Pacific Railroad and after 1 year in the North Dakota Capital they were transferred to Townsend, Mont. He was also agent for the Northern Pacific at Belfield, N. Dak., where their sons, Lyle, now living in Raleigh, N.C., and Lester, living in Roanoke, were born. Later in 1905 Mr. Palmer was transferred to Glendive, Mont., where their son Philip was born.

TO CALIFORNIA

In 1909 she was taken ill and decided to go to California for the winter. Mr. Palmer was given the Salt Lake City and San Pedro Railway Agency at Toronto, Calif., and they lived at Redondo Beach.

Mr. Palmer's next assignments took him to Glendive, Mont., Dickinson, N. Dak., and Terry, Mont. She stated "We had rooms over the depot at Terry. It was a quiet little village except when the cowboys would get too much firewater and try to shoot up the whole town. There was one church in the village, the congregation was small. One Sunday I was embarrassed as there were only three ladies in the church and the minister asked me to take up the collection, which consisted of 1 nickel and 2 pennies."

BACK TO VIRGINIA

Again Mrs. Palmer's health forced the family to leave North Dakota and they returned to Virginia, buying the old Saunders home on the Anthony's Ford Road. "It was a big three-story brick home, had six fireplaces and it took 47 gallons of paint to paint the big house. Originally known as 'The Big House,' we renamed it 'Five Oaks,' representing the father, mother, and three boys as well as the five oaks then in the yard. We lived there 11 years."

Mr. Palmer was with the Virginian Railroad after returning to Virginia, being agent at Huddleston and later at Cullen, where he died in 1928.

Since then she has made her home with her children, taking trips to North Dakota in 1929, 1939, 1949, and the last by plane in 1951. On one of those trips, with relatives, she visited in the Western Provinces of Canada. On her trips into the West she included stops at Gillette, Wyo., to visit a first cousin, W. Boone Saunders, former State senator and for 1 day acting Governor of Wyoming.

HER FIRST VOTE

She remembered casting her first vote in 1920 at Valley Mills, near Huddleston, for Warren G. Harding for President. In 1952 she voted for Eisenhower for President but did not vote in the last presidential election as she had not transferred her registration from Raleigh, N.C., to Bedford County.

While in the Dakota Territory she was a member of the Congregationalist Church but upon returning to Bedford County joined the Baptist Church, being baptized by the Reverend G. G. Turner near his home at Huddleston. She is now a member of Morgan's Baptist Church near Moneta, where the Palmer family attend. A grandson, Jim, was baptized Easter Sunday night at the church.

In 1908 she joined the Eastern Star in Glendive, Mont., and is now a member of the Electa Chapter in Roanoke.

Exiles Not Key to Cuba Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, many words have been said and many thoughts expressed on the problem of Cuba, many of which have only served to confuse and distort a very difficult matter which is of grave concern to us all.

The thoughtful analysis of the noted columnist Marquis Childs, however—an analysis which appeared in the Washington Post on April 26—goes to the heart of one important aspect of this problem.

As Mr. Childs states, and I believe quite correctly:

The United States cannot impose a government on the Cuban people made up of exiles, no matter how dedicated and devoted they may be.

Mr. Childs development of this position is illuminating and deserves, I think, our careful attention:

EXILES NOT KEY TO CUBA POLICY

(By Marquis Childs)

For all the passionate partisanship that Cuba has generated, it is possible one lesson had been learned—the United States cannot impose a government on the Cuban people made up of exiles, no matter how dedicated and devoted they may be.

The more realistic and hardheaded among the Cuban exile groups have themselves come to realize this in the aftermath of the angry charges made by Jose Miro Cardona in resigning as head of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. Miro Cardona's letter with its confused accusations would not have attracted so much attention if it had not been for the bumbling efforts of the State Department to anticipate and counteract it.

The revolutionary council was one of the unhappy hangovers from the Bay of Pigs fiasco. The President compounded the error in his speech to the returned Cuban prisoners in Miami last Christmas. He seemed to be putting his stamp of approval on the council as the instrument for the overthrow of Fidel Castro and, by implication at least, as the core of a new government.

Playing exile politics has been one of the most mischiefmaking elements in the whole Cuban mess. The worst offender, certainly in the months leading up to the Bay of Pigs, was the Central Intelligence Agency. The attempt to play favorites and to suppress other elements was a conspicuous part of the whole tragically misconceived attack.

If this game is now ended, then it is possible to hope that we may be saved from the worst consequences of trying to install an approved government in Havana. Whether by direct American invasion or whatever means this would always be Washington's creature, and it would inevitably have to be propped up by force and with billions in economic aid.

The shores of recent history are strewn with the wrecks of governments imposed in the wake of American intervention. The trouble begins after the Marines have restored order. The result is too often a Trujillo in the Dominican Republic or a Somoza in Nicaragua. The leader installed, thanks to American power, looks to Washington and not to his own people for guidance. A disastrous entanglement ensues, and, as we have seen in the Dominican Republic, American force in a somewhat more subtle form is finally used to get rid of an incredibly cruel dictator.

How then is Castro to be removed and what sort of government will replace his Soviet-dominated dictatorship? These same exile leaders with a sense of the realities say that it can only be done by revolt from within. This can be greatly helped from the outside by exile Cubans contributing to rebel strength inside Cuba. But it cannot be controlled and guided from outside.

The recent release of 27 Americans, exile leaders point out, was obtained at the price of accepting 1000 Cubans who wanted out. This is playing directly into Castro's hands, they insist, since those who want desperately to leave will do everything they can to avoid giving the slightest offense to the regime in the hope of eventually getting the coveted permit. So long as the escape hatch is open, the fire of disaffection and eventual revolt will be damped down.

As to how Castro is removed and what comes next, the administration has for the time being no answers. In the interval while waiting further developments there is no fixed Cuban policy. Some White House advisers believe that by early September the Russian troops will have been removed and Premier Khrushchev will give this his own special twist by announcing that they have completed their mission which was to train Cubans to man the latest antiaircraft missiles and to fly advanced MIG's.

Within the State Department this thesis is viewed with considerable skepticism. The skeptics point out that the best intelligence appraisal shows that the roughly 4,500-elite-force in charge of the missile installations last October has been diminished scarcely at all. The President's principal advisers on Soviet affairs contend that Khrushchev, realizing the awful peril of the October confrontation and a similar risk in permitting large Soviet contingents to remain in Cuba, will take out the troops. That belief is being put to the test in this uneasy waiting phase.

There are those in the administration still talking hopefully of a Cuban government-in-exile. This would unite all exile factions. But the experience of World War II, when a dozen governments-in-exile waited for the Allies to liberate Europe so they could return to power, should disabuse any illusions on this score. Events, except in one or two instances, had passed them by.

Wheeling Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, natural resources and human enterprise are the mainsprings of industrial greatness in our country. They have given rise to giant metropolises, such as New York, Chicago, and Pittsburgh. Today, another industrial metropolis is being created out of the city of Wheeling, W. Va. Here, immense coal reserves combine with the restless flow of the mighty Ohio River and the dynamic energy of a people whose forebears pioneered the virgin wilderness of the Alleghenies.

Wheeling lies at the center of the Nation's greatest soft coal fields. Abunddance of coal has at times been blamed for the economic woes of the city, such as periodic unemployment. But modern research is opening up such immense new vistas for the use of coal and coal products, and now Wheeling is looking forward to a huge industrial expansion based on its riches of black gold.

The Ohio River, too, has been feared in the past because of the flood danger to Wheeling. But now that engineering skill has learned to control this rampant river with strategically placed dams on tributaries, we can look ahead to a harnessed Ohio serving the city with a cheap water transportation system connecting the Great Lakes region with the gulf coast.

In an article in the April 20, 1963, edition of the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer, editor Harry Hamm tells how the people of Wheeling are courageously attacking the obstacles that confront their city in its resurgent growth as a budding metropolis. Because I believe this article will be a source of inspiration to others interested in urban development, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hamm's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Apr. 20, 1963]

WHEELING LOOKS AHEAD

(By Harry Hamm)

A bright, prosperous future for Wheeling in the next 20 years and beyond is being fashioned today although contemporary society recognizes it not.

The citizens are too busy coping with the irritations and frustrations stemming from the process of community development to indulge in the luxury of looking ahead.

What is actually taking place at the moment in Wheeling, a city which gave birth to a State 100 years ago, is another birth, this time the birth of a metropolitan heart. There is bound to be pain, suffering and anxiety.

Geographical location, looked upon for so many years as a hindrance to the city's growth and prosperity, is destined in the years to come to be a key factor in the emergence of Wheeling as the heart of a metropolitan upper Ohio Valley region. Even in these incubator years of development the Ohio Valley is being heralded, mainly by outsiders, in terms of greatness. The "Ruhr Valley" of the United States some writers of the day have seen fit to call it.

As might be expected those standing closest to the emergence of the metropolitan heart can see only a seedy, grave, dull city with all signposts pointed downward.

In the final analysis geography and human enterprise determine a city's or area's growth and prosperity and current statistics to the contrary Wheeling is in excellent position on both scores.

Landlocked cities everywhere would give anything to have a mighty body of water rolling by the front yard as in the case with Wheeling and the Ohio River. Old man river, which plagued the community with its recklessness for so many years, now is in the process of becoming tamed and managed. The mammoth flood control dams in the headwaters already have stilled the long-time cries for a floodwall around Wheeling.

As time passes the dream of a flood-free Ohio Valley draws ever nearer to becoming a reasonable certainty. Thus those that come behind will someday realize and cherish the true value and worth of the Ohio.

Human enterprise is not lacking in Wheeling despite the sometimes topsy-turvy state of affairs which surround many an issue that seems important at the moment. Truth of the matter is that civic spirit in Wheeling is unique. Scores of citizens from every walk of life work without stint and without salary to help solve the critical and even minor problems of an old community in a modern age.

Accentuating this determination to tackle the impossible can be found in Wheeling's most recent history of progress. After two failures at the polls, urban renewal, a process expected to loom large in the city's future,

became a working reality because of far-sighted and courageous businessmen. A volunteer boost in taxes came at just the moment when urban renewal faced a do-or-die test.

The desperate cries of anguish we hear now over the community's lack of choice land site for development only can lead in the end to finding the solution which rests in part with conversion of present outmoded land use to that which is most productive and in the community interest.

Much of center and south Wheeling is destined in time to be recarved by municipal surgery, better known as renewal, so as to contain an industrial-business complex not yet envisioned by those who think only in terms of factories and production lines of the past.

Other idle acreage now hidden from view because of physical incompleteness, lacking highway access or in a flood plain, can become a firm part of the community's economic base providing job opportunity for local citizens and products for wor'd trade.

An area blessed with the basic industrial force—coal, steel, aluminum, and chemicals—cannot by any stretch of the imagination be written off because of today's technological revolution which has caused momentary hardships.

Imposing coal reserves stand ready to meet the rising demands for energy. Scientists predict that some day coal will be the primary source of not only solid fuel but of liquid or gaseous fuels in the United States.

By 1983 steel will be five times stronger and the new uses for the metal will increase many times over. The ziptop can of 1963 opens only a small view of the world of aluminum to come. The giants of the chemical industry are a part of metropolitan Wheeling and the products to be derived from research will reshape the physical surroundings for all.

The Ohio Valley's contact with the space age is yet to materialize but the day of launching grows ever so close. Nearby Pittsburgh's bold entry into the field cf outer space research and development in time will spill over the boundary lines and extend into the Wheeling region.

Key to the emergence of Wheeling as the real heart of a metropolitan Ohio Valley rests with the imposing new network of traffic 'arteries planned here. Once these lifelines are established the heart will become stronger and the pulsating beat shall be more regular than we know it now.

Strategic east-west Interstate 70 will cut a path through Wheeling itself including the long dreamed of tunnels through Wheeling hill. Thus the population centers of the Nation will draw ever closer to the Ohio Valley. A bypass interstate route will open new land areas for development in the southern sector of Wheeling proper. And a modern State Route 2 will provide access to the city from the emerging and growing industrial areas to the south.

As the major highways unfold the need and determination to provide linking and feeder access roads will develop. While new land areas now unproductive or in minimal use will become rich new sectors contributing to the community's vitality and strength.

Just such an artery known as the proposed northern parkway will unshackle the vast hilltop acreage which lies west of Stockyard Hollow. It is in this area that planners foresee a shift of population where whole new neighborhoods will spring up. The abandoned level, lowlying valley areas will be reconstructed to make way for commerce and industry to provide the jobs of the future.

Education must stand as a beacon light in any community desirous of healthy growth and thus it seems only right that Wheeling's first true brush with the "city of tomorrow" revolves around a proposed new consolidated high school for Ohio County. For in conjunction with the construction of the modern school there is tied the first development of the northern parkway. In this instance education truly can light the way to a community's progress.

No better reason for viewing the future with optimism can be found than the evidence available in the area's startling growth and expansion of facilities for higher learning. The workman's hammer rings out clearly and with promise on all three college campuses—Wheeling, Bethany and West Liberty State Colleges. There is assurance in this that the metropolitan heart will have with it an alert and educated mind.

The Wheeling of tomorrow must have a dramatic focal point around which all activity revolves. Downtown Wheeling is cast in this role and cannot shrink from the task even if it desired. Although thousands and thousands of dollars already have gone into a facelifting of the central business district the surface has only been brushed lightly with the artist's hand.

Now in the very first stage of development is a massive urban renewal project for the northern sector of the downtown as we know it today. Labeled the Fort Henry project, planners envision major surgery in the whole area surrounding the site now occupied by the Market Auditorium. The market will be razed and a new street pattern keyed to the demands of vehicular and pedestrian traffic will emerge.

No one with any vision at all can believe that the renewal of the uptown sector will be restricted by manmade boundary lines. Certain to be embraced later will be massive or total renewal of the entire business district coupled with an extension of presently constituted boundaries pushing out along 16th Street where a complex of new buildings already enhance the downtown skyline.

Wheeling for too long has been wedded to commercial trade to believe that the community's leaders and citizens will neglect this vital phase of the metropolitan city's future redevelopment. While up to now growth in the service industries related to a commercial center has not kept pace with national trends a reversal of this pattern seems a certainty once the ribbons of concrete pave easy access to the center city.

On the fringe of the business district plans are in the making for the renewing of an entire area adjacent to the expanded and modernized Ohio Valley General Hospital. Medical facilities in the community are not lacking today and there is no reason to believe that progress in this field will not keep abreast of future advances in modern medicine.

Metropolitan Wheeling citizens will enjoy more recreational and leisure time pursuits in the years ahead and on this score the community boasts an excellent running start. The present city parks system needs no elaboration for only recently Wheeling Park was doubled in size with the acquisition of additional acreage. This is an accomplishment of note in an age when cities of every size are fighting for the preservation of land acreage for park use.

Oglebay Park's fame is getting nationwide attention as this outstanding facility truly portrays Wheeling as the heart of a metro area serving the people that reside therein.

Many of the steep hillside slopes in Wheeling hold a potential for increased recreational use as natural wooded hiking trails, picnic sites, and facilities for nature study.

Wheeling Island, onetime called the city's garden spot can again come in for praise as gradual long-range redevelopment fashions new open recreational sites. Coupled with the sure-to-happen phenomenal growth of water sports and related diversions along the Ohio River, Wheeling Island can become metropolitan Wheeling's playland of tomorrow.

The facilities that a community must have in order to be assured of meeting the challenges of an urban society are not being neglected. Private utilities are constantly expanding and modernizing in the Ohio Valley and new lines will extend out into the fringe areas with a suddenness that will be shocking once the projected roads become a reality. Wheeling now is preparing to launch a major overhaul of its water system with an eye to serving outlying areas where growth is expected.

Without adequate communication progress can be delayed or diluted, and in this field Wheeling again is moving forward. The newer glamour mediums of communication such as radio and television are a part of the community and evidence faith in the future throught their improvements. But it is with the local press, where an emerging new State found encouragement and direction 100 years ago, that Wheeling today receives a positive impetus for a greater city tomorrow.

Often critical, constantly agitating for civic purpose but always informing, the press of Wheeling is dedicated to lighting the way for the birth of a metropolitan heart which is Wheeling.

Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, in a real sense this measure, H.R. 12, concerns itself with two very basic problems in the area of health and medical care: The first is an adequate supply of doctors, dentists, nurses and other needed medical professionals which will enable the people of this country to enjoy the level of health that is their right; the second, and more implicit problem, is the loosening in a modest fashion, of the economic and institutional barriers which restrict the entry of talented young people into the field of medicine.

The committee report on this bill is replete with facts and figures showing the need, across the country, for additional trainees in the field of medicine and dentistry. For example, the committee tells us that at the present time, there is something over 1,700 people in the United States for every family physician—general practitioner, intern, or pediatrician. The committe also tells us that, even to maintain our present inadequate ratio, we will have to increase the number of enrollees in medical and dental schools from 46,000 to 75,000 by 1970.

The national figures are important, but I am particularly interested in how these problems affect Hawaii.

Figures supplied to the committee by the Office of the Surgeon General indicate that the average number of non-

Federal physicians per 100,000 population in metropolitan counties, which would include such areas as the city and county of Honolulu, is about 145; however, Honolulu only has about 106 non-Federal physicians per 100,000 population. The average for the State of Hawaii as a whole is about 101 non-Federal physicians per 100,000 people; this is below California's 144, Oregon's 121, and Washington State's 118. Of course, Hawaii does rank head of some States; Mississippi, for example, is listed as having 72 per 100,000; many of the predominantly rural States also suffer from a severe doctor shortage.

It is, therefore, extremely important that we do everything we can to increase the number of doctors across the Nation. The tremendous cost of a medical education is usually too much for a student to bear alone. We certainly should not restrict the medical profession to the wealthy; nor should we make the financial burden such as to force young doctors into the cities and the higher income areas of medical practice. Sickness knows no boundaries; it can strike the farm family as well as the city dweller; it falls as often on the poor as on the rich. Our supply of medical talent must be available to meet all of these needs. This bill will help.

There is a final factor which has probably caused the American Medical Association to enter its last-minute opposition to the student loan provisions of H.R. 12: The loans under the bill are far more desirable than the loan programs presently promoted by the AMA. The interest rate is around 3 percent and will not start to accrue until the student has finished training. Even more important, the fact that the money will be owed to a Government loan program will tend to dilute AMA control over members of the medical profession, and this, I suspect, is one of the basic reasons for AMA opposition to the student loan provisions.

Of course, the AMA program is of minor assistance to Hawaii. The exhibit submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, April 23, by our Republican opponents of the student loan program shows, on page 6462, that Hawaii only has six AMA loans outstanding and that only two areas in the Nation where such loan programs exist, the Canal Zone and Rhode Island, have fewer. This same exhibit, on page 6456 of the RECORD, indicates that Hawaii, unlike many States, has no loan program sponsored by the county medical societies.

Mr. Chairman, the medical profession in this country and in Hawaii should be open to all young people with the requisite talent who desire to enter it. This honored profession should not be stifled by the domination of any clique or by the forces of economics. H.R. 12 is a modest step in the right direction.

Judge Loble's Experiments With Juveniles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the March 1963, issue of the Catholic Digest carries an excellent article by Donald John Giese entitled "Judge Loble's Experiments with Juveniles." Judge Lester H. Loble is district judge of the First Judicial District of the State of Montana and is also currently serving as a Special Adviser to President Kennedy's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. His interest in the problems of juveniles has long been evident throughout the State of Montana.

The tremendous success Judge Loble has had in curbing juvenile delinquency in his district, I believe, Mr. President, should be made known to others with the thought and hope that perhaps some of his theories might be used by other law enforcement officials with the same degree of success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this timely article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic Digest, March 1963]

JUDGE LOBLE'S EXPERIMENTS WITH JUVENILES

(By Donald John Giese)

Juvenile crimes in Montana are growing fewer, and the credit for it goes to Judge Lester H. Loble of Helena. Montana had been keeping abreast of the national trend: juvenile crime outpacing population growth by a ratio of better than 4 to 1 until this maverick juvenile judge stepped into the picture.

A recent police study of juvenile crime in Judge Loble's district (pop. 50,000) showed felony cases down 49 percent, nonfelony cases down 68 percent, and traffic cases down 75 percent. To appreciate these figures, place them against FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's recent warning that nearly half of all major crimes (robberies, burglaries, murders, assaults, auto thefts) reported in the United States in 1961 were by offenders under 18.

Judge Loble's success took a lot of doing, and involved drastic changes in long established court procedures. The gray-haired, 69-year-old jurist came to the bench in Helena 8 years ago, from a background of nearly 40 years as a prominent Montana trial lawyer. He took a long look at Montana's juvenile problem.

"Juveniles were being coddled. Their crimes were increasing. They were being protected from the glare of publicity by Montana law, and their parents could hide behind the same cloak of anonymity. People were losing their confidence in the juvenile court system," Judge Loble says, "and in general, the picture was black."

"On top of all this the so-called 'experts' were spoonfeeding us the idea that all juvenile law breakers were basically sick, had no free will, and were the helpless victims of society's ills. This, of course, is a lot of high-grade baloney."

The first thing that had to be done, the judge decided, was to get Montana's juvenile court law changed so that all under age felony (serious crime) offenders would appear in an open court (not a closed court, as in most States) and be exposed to the piercing glare, along with their parents, of newspaper, radio, and television publicity. Getting laws changed, as Judge Loble knows better than most, isn't easy.

"I drew up a draft of a new law that would provide an open court for juvenile felons, and sent it to J. Edgar Hoover," Judge Loble recalls. "He sent it back with his complete approval. Then I started touring the State, giving talks, buttonholing legislators, drumming up support for what was a radical new law. When the legislature met, I tried to get the law introduced. It didn't even get out of committee. I decided to try it again the next session."

While Judge Loble waited, he didn't sit quietly. He stumped the State from end to end. People, tired of being victimized by youthful criminals, began listening. They passed along their views to their legislative representatives. Legislators listened. The next time around, in July 1961, the law passed. Juvenile felony offenders would now be treated as adults.

The first juvenile felon to appear before Judge Loble for trial saw a different kind of courtroom. Reporters were present. The public was admitted. Photographers took pictures outside the courtroom. The under-18 offender's name and background were published. All the details—age, address, previous offenses, parents' names—were released.

The result was electrifying. No longer did Montana newspapers print news of a "15-year-old robber." The offender was identified. His friends, neighbors, and relatives saw his name in black print, and heard it on the air. His parents suffered the shock and humiliation of seeing their boy's name bared before the public as a lawbreaker.

One distraught father of a 16-year-old offender rushed up to Judge Loble just before court opened, and pleaded that the judge keep the court closed. "I'll lose my job if this gets in the papers," he cried. Judge Loble was unmoved. "You should have thought of all this 16 years ago," he said.

Cruel treatment? "No," Judge Loble says. Effective treatment? "Very effective," he says.

"We are no longer indicting a whole class of youngsters before the public, as we used to do when we referred in the press to 'a 16-year-old burglar' rather than 'John Doe, 16, convicted of burglary,'" Judge Loble claims. "Now we are putting the finger of publicity where it belongs, on the individual, not the group.

"Parents are no longer getting off easy. Their indifference as parents is exposed, and they suffer consequences they could have avoided by being good parents in the first place. The day of coddling, juvenile lawbreakers and their families is over in Montana. We are breaking new ground, and we are getting results."

The police survey of juvenile-court cases in Judge Loble's district covered the 18 months before the new law was passed and the 18 months following its passage. It strengthened the judge's decision to go on being a maverick, even at risk of harsh

criticism by such fellow judges and progressive juvenile authorities as embrace the philosophy that the juvenile lawbreaker is sick.

News of Judge Loble's success in Montana has traveled far. He was recently appointed a special adviser to President Kennedy's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. On the long list of authorities who endorsed him was J. Edgar Hoover. A formal report of his progress under the new open-court law has been sent to the FBI Director.

"The people are solidly behind me," says the judge. "They continually support my decision to treat juvenile hoodlums as hoodlums. The people want protection. I owe them protection. That's what they are getting.

Underage felons who go before Judge Loble invariably leave with lasting impressions. "If some young hoodlum slugs and robs a citizen out my way," the judge says, "he gets the full treatment. He might be smiling when he comes in, but when he goes out with the sheriff on his way to the reformatory, he isn't.

"When a kid needs help, I'll help him to the limit," the judge says. "But when a smart aleck young tough comes in, he's not feeling so tough when he goes out.

"By being firm I've stopped a lot of kids from going on to more serious trouble. Swift and certain punishment, despite what the progressives think of it, is often a great teacher.

"The judges who coddle the youthful offender and embrace the foolish philosophy that he's sick and can't choose between right and wrong are hurting the juvenile himself, society, and the juvenile court.

"Some judges are probationing young lawbreakers to death—sometimes literally, if they go on to more serious crimes and suddenly get hit by a police bullet. Sure, I'll give a good kid—and I think 97 percent of them are darn good kids—a break; but when I do, I tell him that if he comes back a second time he'd better bring his toothbrush, because he's going."

While Judge Loble swings a big stick in his court, and appears all business as he sits on the bench in his black robe, he has a heart as big as all Montana. Periodically, at his own expense, he makes trips to the State's reformatory and prison to visit inmates he has sent there.

"I want them to know that the mean old buzzard who sent them away cares about them, and will do all he can to help them, without coddling," he says. "No one has taken a swing at me yet, and the only complaint I've had was from a youngster who said I should have sent him to reform school the first I saw him, instead of the second."

All of the many fees the judge receives for his numerous speeches before civic groups go to the Judge Lester H. Loble Trust Fund, and from there to correctional institutions to be used for the personal needs of the inmates. Thousands of dollars have gone to the Montana State Industrial school, at Miles City; Yellowstone Boys' Ranch, at Billings; the State Vocational school; the House of the Good Shepherd; and the Twin Bridges Children's Center.

One man heard Judge Loble speaking on radio, and left $10,000 of hand and machine tools to the Yellowstone Boys' Ranch, which now has one of the finest shops in the country.

Money from the fund has been used to buy dresses for girls who all their lives have worn nothing but hand-me-downs; to make it possible for a youngster to send home a postcard, or a small present. It is also used to help send the kids home for Christmas.

"Some of my colleagues, who endorse the currently popular progressive approach, think I'm some kind of fossil, living in the past," the judge says. But, in the face of an ever-mounting juvenile crime problem which contributes heavily to the $16 million daily cost of American crime of all kinds, Judge Loble is getting unexpected support from many of those who are now reexaming delinquency.

Speaking at the National Institute on Crime and Delinquency held recently in Seattle, two psychiatrists reported on their success with what they called a "reality therapy."

Dr. William Glasser, consultant psychiatrist at the Ventura, Calif., School for Girls, and his colleague, Dr. G. L. Harrington, advised delinquent youth workers to quit explaining to wrongdoers why they are doing wrong, and point out instead how and why they ought to do the right thing.

"Regardless of what causes his bad behavior," Dr. Glasser reported, "the child is primarily responsible. We assume, as traditional therapists rarely do, that he has a workable set of principles, standards or values. If everyone working with a delinquent child holds him responsible to himself for what he does, the child soon learns the pleasure of doing well and getting credit for it."

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, the newspaper editor and syndicated columnist whose speech on "Moral Decay in America" was one of the most widely discussed talks of 1962, recently wrote in his column that "the more we blame society for youthful outrages and the more society struggles to remove the causes, the more outrages we have."

Jones also observed that "listening to a psychiatrist explain that father rejection caused you to rob the filling station may only give you the idea that some force you can't control is going to make you rob another. If you pay enough attention to the garrulous characters and oddballs who provided material for the Kinsey report, you get the impression that morality is a vapor, and that anything goes.

"No one gains strength as long as he is preoccupied with finding reasons for his weaknesses," Jones wrote. "While self-blame can be overdone by a few overly conscientious individuals, the effort to avoid self-blame at any cost is a far commoner and more debilitating disease."

J. Edgar Hoover agrees with Judge Loble that parents must be made, through publicity or otherwise, to assume their parental responsibilities.

In a recent letter to me, Hoover stated: "Unquestionably, the greatest blame for the current surge of youthful criminality can be placed on parental neglect of children. Due to this neglect, an increasing number of young people are growing up without compassion or concern for their fellow man. In case after case of vicious crimes committed by youth which I have studied, there has been gross neglect of the children on the part of the parents."

In Montana, because of its new open court law, parents are suddenly taking a greater interest in the activities of their children. Judge Loble feels they are doing a better job of being parents because the penalties for doing a poor job are now more severe, in terms of painful exposure and public censure.

Even though only felony and traffic cases are open to the press and public when a juvenile is involved, Judge Loble feels that nonfelony cases, which are still held in closed chambers, have also decreased, 68 percent and 75 percent, respectively, "because parents now know that if they lie down on the job of being parents, the consequences are going to be painful."

Judge Loble makes no claim that he has the answer to the juvenile delinquency problem, but he feels there is a lot of room for improvement in the progressive system.

"Before the progressives judge my system too harshly, I wish they would look at the record, examine the hairraising statements that J. Edgar Hoover has been making about juvenile crime, and then take a look at how my oldfashioned ideas are working in Montana. That's the main point, they're working. The progressive theories, by any measurement, are failing every day.

"Americans are tired of watching the juvenile crime rate climb year after year. They are beginning to cry out for commonsense in our courts and for action by our judges. That's what we are trying to provide in Montana: commonsense, action."

Progress on Controlled Nuclear Fusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Star of April 22 recounts the slow but persistent progress we are making in controlling the nuclear fusion process for mankind's benefit:

CHAINING THE INFERNO

Some years ago, during his chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission, Lewis L. Strauss commented periodically, but reservedly, on the possibility of harnessing for peaceful uses the preternaturally wild power of the hydrogen bomb. At one time, in a flash of characteristically cautious optimism, he summed up the prospect in these words: "Anyone who thinks fusion cannot be controlled is a fool; but anyone who thinks it is going to be easy is an idiot."

When this statement was made, back around 1956 or 1957, Mr. Strauss and some of the best experts in the field hazarded the guess that thermonuclear power—a veritable inferno, a kind of manmade hell, in its exploding form—would be chained and put to work of the good of all mankind in the 1970's. But in the years since then, Project Sherwood, which is the name of the enterprise, has been moving forward at a pace seemingly as slow as a snail's, if not even slower.

Through all this time, however, the AEC has held fast to the faith that the thermonuclear fusion process eventually will be contained and controlled—just as atomic fission has been—to generate electricity and otherwise serve the interests of peoples everywhere, with limitless sources of deuterium fuel in the seas and oceans of the world. And now we have some highly significant confirming news from the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory of the University of California. In the AEC's words, the news is this:

"An encouraging advance in the long-range exploration of techniques for the generation of power produced by thermonuclear reactions has been made.

"The work represents the first results from the operation of Alice, one of a new generation of machines for exploring the behavior of hot ionized gases (plasmas) confined by strong magnetic fields.

"While * * * the work does not represent a major breakthrough, it may constitute the beginning of research at a new level of sophistication."

These words may prove to be historic. Although they are surrounded by many "ifs," "buts," and "maybes," they strongly suggest that the AEC, including particularly its Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, has acquired a new degree of optimism about the possibility of controlling the hellish power of the

H-bomb for the benefit of peoples everywhere. In that respect, the almost unimaginably terrible nature of this force may yet prove to be a blessing.

The AEC announcement indicates, in any event, that the promise implicit in the H-bomb (not the all-too-obvious threat) is tremendous, and that steady progress is being made toward its fulfillment. And if that fulfillment comes, as expected, the world will have at its disposal a limitless source of beneficent power. Nothing can better illustrate the general duality of our earthly nature—the night and day of it, its good and evil, and the astonishing way in which the ghastliest of man's gadgets can be benign if put to work in humanity's behalf.

West Virginia Centennial 1963 Highlights Achievements and Future as Mountain State Hosts Tourists in Record Numbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia as a State of the Union. In commemoration of this historic event citizens of the Mountain State are enthusiastically supporting plans and programs for memorable centennial observances designed to illustrate not only our rich heritage, but also rededication to a new 100 years of achievement and growth.

In his open letter of centennial welcome to the public, Gov. William Wallace Barron observes that—

West Virginia has launched an intensive economic development program which has already seen a major cleanup and facelifting program carried out statewide; unemployment ranks substantially reduced; an unprecedented highway construction program implemented; and major new tourist and industrial development measures instituted. Thousands of our citizens have been retrained to give them the skills and capabilities required to attain the better life for themselves and their families. Tourists and new industries are coming into West Virginia in record numbers and our existing plants are expanding at an unparalleled rate.

Section 11 of the April 21 issue of the New York Times, was composed of colorful and well-written advertisements informing readers of the beauties, resources and capabilities of West Virginia, and advising them of the meaningful activities which are to be held shortly in connection with our centennial year celebration.

Responsible for the compilation and publication of this attractive pictorial magazine was the West Virginia Department of Commerce, created in 1961 by the State legislature. This purposeful group, headed by the respected and energetic business leader, Hulett C. Smith, acts as a well-rounded, frontline economic task force to spearhead the drive for new industry, more tourists, increased business activity and community development.

In conjunction with the Department's seven-man advisory board, composed of keen-minded businessmen and industrialists from all sections of the State, policy and operating procedures were established for this economic development unit composed of three divisions.

1. Planning and research, which serves as the State planning agency, working with local groups in the field of community development by providing counsel and coordination for such activities.

2. Industrial development, which, with its trained, professional staff of industrial and financial specialists, works with out-of-State industrialists to fill their requirements as to location and financing and assists existing State firms to expand and prosper.

3. Travel development, which works in all fields of activity concerned with developing the tourist trade, attractions, facilities, and accomodations.

But this was only the beginning in the wide range of activities the Department of Commerce was to undertake, and the efforts of our citizenry have been an added and powerful force.

An indication of West Virginia's determination to continue this pattern of civic interest is found in the strong emphasis which is being placed on education. The informative material carried in the Times is quoted as stating that—

The recent history of higher education in West Virginia is descriptive of dramatic progress, encouraging stability, and wise planning for the future.

The educational accomplishments of the State can be regarded as the response to the challenge of historical hardships—of frontier isolation, of uncoordinated efforts, of poor financial resources. But the urge to educate was there from the beginning.

Men such as Edmund Randolph, Patrick Henry, and Ebenezer Zane were planning academies for the western counties of Virginia as early as 1787. These institutions, drawn from the loins of the mountains, hewed from virgin timber, performed some of the functions of a junior college and graduated men prominent in law, surveying, the ministry, and politics.

Colleges in the modern sense date back to 1839. The number that flourished and declined during the past century does not reflect lack of interest but rather the adverse effects of economic hardships. If anything, the abandoned buildings were a tribute to the daring sacrifices of people who highly valued a college education.

Impressively surviving the Spartan process of elimination in West Virginia are 20 vigorous, modern collegiate institutions, including three junior colleges and two State universities, with a median age of 75 years. They offer all the more common curriculum on the undergraduate and graduate levels, including law and medicine, and present some unique and highly successful studies on the undergraduate plane.

Rivalry, always a spur to greater effort, is wisely tempered to common purposes by West Virginia's three college associations: one for the seven 4-year private colleges representing six leading religious affiliations; one for the State-supported institutions, and a third for all—the West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents.

The latter is currently coordinated by means of a unified project backed financially by the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. It is the only group in the country in which the privately financed and publicly supported colleges of a State are working together in a cooperative program.

Through research and discussion of mutual interests, problems are defined, solutions proposed, and the public is made aware of the fine opportunities for higher education within the State.

Among the leading industries in the Mountain State is the production of glass and glass products. More than 70 factories make West Virginia one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of glass. Included are such impressive names as Blenko, Fostoria, Corning, Rainbow, Johns-Manville Fibre Glass, Libbey-Owens-Ford, Pittsburgh Plate Glass and Fenton Art Glass Co., along with the Vitro Agate Co., world's leading manufacturer of marbles, and the Morgantown Glassware Guild whose glassware, Mrs. John F. Kennedy has announced, graces the White House tables.

Popular tours are conducted through the glass plants where the visitor can enjoy a first-hand look at glass as it is crafted by hand using basic methods unchanged through centuries. Such an inspection is an educational and recreational experience.

And, the production of bituminous coal has long been an extremely important factor in the economic well-being of West Virginia. Ranked as the Nation's No. 1 producer of this widely used fuel, the Mountain State has felt the squeeze of unemployment resulting from the introduction of methods of automation in coal mining. However, rich deposits of this widely used mineral will continue to provide a source of power for eastern markets and commercial support for industrial growth in West Virginia.

The following excerpt from the April 21 issue of the Times clearly illustrates the importance of coal in West Virginia:

West Virginia's economy is quite literally built on bituminous coal, which underlies all but 7 of her 55 counties. Coal production is the State's leading industry and on the ready and economical availability of this fuel a good portion of the Mountain State's industry is based.

West Virginia is the Nation's No. 1 coal producer, with an output of 113 million tons in 1961. Based on an average price of $4.94 per ton at the mine, this meant that West Virginia's coal production pumped nearly $660 million into the State's economy.

The task of producing more than a quarter of America's coal output has not seriously tapped West Virginia's reserves of bituminous coal. Beneath her hills and valleys lie more than 103 billion tons of coal yet unmined.

Although an important amount of West Virginia's coal is used within her borders, the demand for it is worldwide. Important tonnages of high quality metallurgical coal are shipped from West Virginia to Norfolk, Va., thence through the Panama Canal to the steel mills of Japan. Other metallurgical coal from West Virginia goes to the steel industries of Canada, and to West Germany, Italy, and other European countries.

Most West Virginia coal moves from mine to market by rail, over the seven major carriers serving the State. However, barges are important West Virginia coal carriers also. Nearly 9 million tons a year move on the Kanawha, Guyandot, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers from West Virginia mines. And modern electric generating stations, which use

coal almost exclusively, transmit coal's energy to thousands of customers in and out of the State.

This transportation network will be supplemented during the next few years by interstate pipelines and extra high voltage transmission lines. At least one pipeline is planned to carry coal from northern West Virginia to the New York-Philadelphia area. A large electric generating station near Morgantown, to be completed in 1967, will be tied in with a network of 500,000-volt lines carrying electricity to Philadelphia and New York. It will consume 1.3 million tons of coal a year.

Another aspect of growth in West Virginia is the State's concerted effort to attract new industry and plant expansion in order to create additional jobs and bolster the economy. A program showing major industrial sites, in which private and public agencies work together, opens to American industry the opportunity to evaluate potential plant locations in West Virginia and check price tags without fear of premature disclosure of plans, or of fluctuations of costs.

A majority of the sites involved are held under long-term options or some other form of control by the utilities serving the State, all of them members of the West Virginia Industrial Development Association.

By agreement these properties may be shown to prospects by the State Department of Commerce, local or regional development groups, subject only to final approval by the controlling company.

The controlled properties are chiefly in larger acreages, from 25 to 100 acres, and substantially more. Some are served by river transportation in addition to rail and highway.

Transportation is another area in which West Virginians are exerting a major effort. The year 1963 is destined to be a significant one in the construction of highways and in the improvement of existing roads. The Times carried the following information concerning the State's road network:

West Virginia's centennial year may well go down in the State's history as the greatest year from the standpoint of highway construction.

The Interstate System, crisscrossing the State, represents significant strides in road-building. More than 40 miles of interstate highways are now open to traffic and much additional mileage is expected to open to traffic during 1963.

Interstates 64, 70, 77, 79, and 81 coming into West Virginia from the Great Lakes, Midwest, east coast and New England are opening up the State to more industrial and tourist traffic.

Highway transportation throughout West Virginia is on the upswing as far as new road construction is concerned. The Interstate System is giving State officials every reason to believe that new industrial opportunities are growing with every mile of new road leading into and out of the State's vast resource centers.

Naturally, transportation is a vital factor in the attraction of tourists from other areas of the United States. The scenic wonders of the Mountain State are without rival in their unspoiled beauty, and with the construction of convenient routes of access, tourism will continue to grow.

In 1962, over 8 million persons visited West Virginia, an increase of 14 percent over the previous year. Some $300 million were spent by tourists in the State in 1962, and private interests are now committed to investing some $17½ million aimed at hoisting tourist trade.

A 5-month period in that year saw an increase of 42 percent in visitation at the National Monument at Harpers Ferry; the annual demand for accommodation in the State parks increased 20 percent; during the first 6 months of 1962, the State sold more nonresident fishing licenses than in all of 1961.

These are but a few tangible indications that more and more Americans are becoming conscious of the fact that enjoyment, education and relaxation await the visitor in West Virginia—accompanied by a natural hospitality and charm which has been a hallmark of the area for a century.

As Governor Barron has stated:

Here in this land of relaxation is one of the greatest outdoor recreation reservoirs in the country for the vacationer. Here the worker and his employer find the finest in religious, cultural, educational, and recreational facilities a few minutes from the plant or office. Our welcome mat is always out in West Virginia * * * particularly so during this, our centennial year.

The 15th Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 28th of April, Israel will celebrate its 15th anniversary as a state, and I am pleased to join with her friends in honoring this date. It has been my custom on past occasions to direct my colleagues' attention to various aspects of Israel's outstanding achievements on the road to becoming a nation once again. In other years I have spoken of the history of Israel's rebirth in the 20th century, its continuing problems in its surroundings and its internal development and progress.

Today I would like to center my remarks on the program which Israel has initiated in the field of technical assistance to other developing countries. The experiences which have come from the struggle to build a state in Israel are being made available to those who are willing to learn from them. Owing to prevailing psychology in many of the newly created states, Israel represents an ideal source of assistance. The Israeli experience in the face of internal and external difficulties makes an eloquent appeal to countries whose problems are similarly overwhelming.

Modern Israel has developed into a stable, technologically advanced state. The generous assistance which organizations like the United Jewish Appeal have rendered Israel over the past 15 years has had much to do with this progress. However, there is another factor which has had an even more important influence on Israel's remarkable growth. The sense of belonging to a common effort, highly intensified by external dangers and internal needs, has been fruitfully channeled into a wide variety of cooperative enterprises and institutions. This spirit was mobilized to deal with the special problems which Israel faced with its land and population. Over the years this process has produced a body of specialized experience and expertise.

The newly created states of Africa and Asia have found in Israel an example to emulate, and Israel has responded by making available to these nations the great benefits of its experience. And what are the successes to which the new nations are attracted? At its inception Israel entered upon the task of equipping its people with a common language and with the necessary skills to begin building a nation.

The urgency of these needs led to the development of new techniques of civil, general, and vocational education. Many of the problems Israel has had to deal with are similar to those which the underdeveloped nations now face, and the striking success of Israel's efforts and methods are appealing. Israel has been asked to share with other states its experiences and it has responded generously within its limited resources.

In order to deal with the growing volume of requests for cooperation and assistance, Israel created a department of international cooperation within the Ministry for Foreign Affairs Because of limited financial and manpower resources, Israel's programs of assistance must adhere to certain basic considerations. First, the effectiveness and impact of the assistance on the development of the recipient country must be taken into account. Second, Israel must concentrate its aid in those areas where Israeli experience has produced expertise which is particularly relevant to the problems of the new nations. Third, Israel usually emphasizes tangible projects which can be completed within a relatively short period of time and which require a minimum of resources, but which will lay the foundations for further development plans.

There are now four main categories into which Israeli technical cooperation falls. First, the program provides for manpower training in Israel. Second, experts, advisers, instructors, and survey teams are dispatched on request to interested countries. Third, Israeli teams plan and organize training facilities abroad. Fourth, teams prepare and implement itinerant courses in developing countries using the latest training aids.

In the area of manpower training Israel has provided courses for 1,547 trainees from 77 countries. In view of the paramount impact of agriculture on developing countries, many of the courses deal with the techniques of modern farming, for example scientific feeding and breeding methods with dif-

ferent types of livestock and crop rotation. Agriculture is one of the specific spheres in which Israel has acquired considerable experience in the course of her own development. In addition to the agricultural programs Israel provides training in education, the vocational fields, nursing, cooperative movements, and others. One of the more dramatic examples of Israeli cooperation has been carried out in Burma. While a group of over 100 Burmese ex-servicemen was trained on several agricultural settlements in Israel, a team of Israeli specialists in soil conservation and irrigation surveyed an area in Burma's arid zone and drew up plans for revitalizing the land. The Burmese, on return, worked with the specialists and applied their Israeli training to the production of new crops by mixed farming and irrigation.

Israel has been asked to play a role in several vast, multilateral development schemes. In conjunction with the Government of Upper Volta and the U.N. Special Fund, Israel established an agricultural training center to implement the benefits in the field of agriculture arising from the Upper Volta project.

In its program of international cooperation Israel has organized joint companies with Israeli private firms and local interests or governments of development countries as partners. For example, Zim, Israel's national shipping line ran the Black Star Line together with Ghana; the Ghanaian Government holding 60 percent of the share capital. Zim set up a nautical school at Accra to provide marine officers and crews. As Ghanaian seamen became fit to command and sail their ships the Israeli crews returned to the Israel Merchant Navy and the Israeli capital was withdrawn from the Black Star Line for reinvestment elsewhere in developing countries.

In addition to training nurses for medical and public health work, Israel has undertaken several ambitious projects in the field of medicine and Israel now manages and directs several hospitals in Ethiopia and Ghana. Staffs for these institutions and others are training in the Hadassah-Hebrew University Hospital in Jerusalem. An eye clinic was established in Liberia by Israeli surgeons and physicians while a doctor and 10 nurses from Liberia were given specialized instruction at the Hadassah. Within a few years, the Liberians themselves will be fully competent in ophthalmology and able to take over the central clinic.

These then, are some of the programs which Israel has so dynamically undertaken within her limited resources. The moving spirit underlying all of this is, in my opinion, a genuine attempt to spread a gospel of international cooperation and assistance within a framework of hard work or self-help. Young nations, sharing similar problems, have much to gain from sharing their solutions to these problems. The Israeli technical assistance program involves much more than technical assistance. The spirit and dedication which have infused the steady growth of Israel inspires the new nations to get on with the task before them.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me and to many others, that we all can benefit from Israel's experience with her foreign aid program. In many ways it lends itself to more efficiency and accomplishments than does a program launched on a more grandiose scale. No one country or organization, including the United States or the United Nations, is able to undertake by themselves the solving of the myriads of problems facing the emerging underdeveloped nations of the world. If Israel's efforts are copied and used by other nations who have reached this point of maturity there is hope that through the interchange and cooperation of one small country with another, great strides will be made toward eliminating much of the poverty and underprivileged conditions now prevalent in many areas of the world.

To me there is no better way to honor the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel than to pay tribute to her unselfishness in helping others less fortunate, when she is still faced with almost unsurmountable problems of her own.

News Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 23, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, distinguished Pulitzer prizewinning journalist, addressed the U.S. Senate Press Secretaries' Association on the news management issue.

As a representative of the Cowles Publications, publisher of Look magazine, a writer for the Minneapolis Star and Tribune and the Des Moines Register and Tribune, and a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, Mr. Mollenhoff's professional competence to evaluate the extent and impact of managed news is unquestioned.

With Mr. Mollenhoff's permission, excerpts from his address to the group of Republican and Democratic press secretaries have been recorded for distribution.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a copy of his excerpted remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the exerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF, WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT, BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE PRESS SECRETARIES' ASSOCIATION MEETING, TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1963

I am not going to compare the Kennedy administration's activities in the information area with the Eisenhower administration's activities. This would serve no useful purpose, for the problems are different. It would be like comparing apples and oranges or horses and pigs.

There was plenty to complain about in the Eisenhower administration with its extreme use of executive privilege to block the press, the Congress, and the GAO from records and testimony dealing with Defense Department spending and scandalous conditions in the foreign aid program.

There are other grounds for complaint in the Kennedy administration, and I think it is better to be specific than to get off into that old and impossible debate as to whether the Kennedy administration or the Eisenhower administration has the greatest respect or disrespect for the principle of open government. I'll leave it to the professional politicians to do the comparing, and will try to deal with specific cases.

Today there is much discussion of the news management with complaints about a wide variety of practices. Some of the complaints are legitimate in that they focus attention on false, inaccurate or misleading statements by Government officials about Government business. Some of the complaints are of questionable value, for they quibble about normal efforts of the administration to interpret itself in the best light. We have always had some news management in the respect that public officials always like to place themselves in the best light. The complaints are justified in only those cases where there is actual news distortion.

I'm not going to rehash the Eisenhower administration's distortions, for I've spent the greater part of a book documenting the case of unjustified secrecy by that administration. I would suggest you read it so you keep your thinking in perspective on the subject. I would also say that the best political approach with regard to the present administration is an objective nonpolitical analysis.

I will deal with the Kennedy administration because that is the administration in power today. I do not feel it is necessary to deal with a lot of quibbling on information policies that might be considered petty or might be subject to legitimate challenge.

To avoid the charge of petty quibbling, let us pick the largest Department, the Defense Department with about 4 million employees and annual spending in excess of $50 billion.

Let us discuss the head of that Department Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and his chief spokesman, Arthur Sylvester.

Let us discuss the public pronouncements of that Department on the biggest and most controversial contract, the $6.5 billion program for the TFX fighter plane for the Navy and the Air Force.

The documented record shows that Secretary McNamara's department has engaged in a broad pattern of false, inaccurate, and misleading statements on this major contract investigation.

What is troublesome to me is that up to this moment Defense Secretary McNamara has been able to get by with this grand deception.

He has been able to get by with this broad deception despite a well documented record established by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, through careful work that contradicts McNamara on his broad premises on TFX and on his minor points.

McNamara and his top aides have been able to do this because of a lack of diligence on the part of the press and on the part of the Republican Party.

Most members of the press do not know they have been deceived because they simply have not read the record established by MCCLELLAN.

Most Republicans do not know how great the deception has been because they have not read the record, or they have not read

it carefully with an eye to making a real analysis of the case. Too many are willing to snipe on superficial or cute things. Too few are willing to do the careful work to make a solid case where one exists on a complex matter.

I believe that it is quite possible that Secretary McNamara has even deceived his own administration. I have difficulty believing that the highest officials of this administration would support him so fully if they were aware of the details of the record made by Chairman McCLELLAN and his committee. I believe that the President and others are good enough politicians that they would try to correct the record if they were aware of the full details. In this respect, it is quite possible that President Kennedy has placed too great a faith in Secretary McNamara as the infallible man, and in this way has made himself vulnerable. We should be able to remember back as far as the Eisenhower administration where President Eisenhower was unaware of a conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates case, and was unable to protect himself. The same was true of the problems over in the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), where President Eisenhower ignored the problem and left it to others until he had a full-blown scandal on his hands.

The TFX case has the potential for doing the same damage to the Kennedy administration, and largely because some high officials simply have not read the record and have accepted the self-serving declaration of Mr. McNamara that he is right, that his decision will save a billion dollars, and that those who oppose him are petty politicians trying to disregard the national interest to win the contract for the home State.

What do the the facts show?

(1) McNamara overruled the unanimous recommendation of the top level Source Selection Board for the Boeing version of TFX. The recommendation was based on a finding that the Boeing plane had a much higher performance rating, and was cheaper by $100 million to $415 million.

(2) McNamara has the burden of proof upon him to establish that he was right in awarding the contract to General Dynamics Corp. He signed a memorandum of justification last November 21 that was loaded with errors, including a little slip-up on the performance rating of the General Dynamics plane. He also had a little error of $77 million, a little error of $32 million, and a little error of $29 million, according to the McClellan committee record.

(3) McNamara admits that the Boeing performance rating is better. He admits that the contract price proposed by Boeing is cheaper. He relies upon a contention that because of greater commonality in the General Dynamics plane there will be great savings on maintenance, repair, spare parts, and training. The experts, military and engineering, testify that the General Dynamics plane has no advantage over the Boeing plane in this area, and that the idea of any savings is poppycock.

(4) McNamara downgraded the modern braking device, the "thrust reverser," in the Boeing plane as being a risky engineering venture. The General Dynamics plane has a conventional dive brake, which may make the plane obsolete before it is in production, and the Defense Department is already considering putting the "thrust reverser" on the General Dynamics plane. Experts have testified it will cost $446 million more to do this, and there may be a necessity for major redesign on the General Dynamics plane that will result in a delay of 6 to 9 months.

(5) Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, have expressed their approval of the Boeing plane. They have expressed their doubts about the General Dynamics plane. Admiral Anderson has stated that we are knowingly taking the plane with the second best performance evaluation at a time when we need to strive for the best performance if we are to maintain the vital "edge" over the Soviet Union.

In the face of that record before the McClellan committee, Defense Secretary McNamara appeared before the American Society of Newspaper Editors and stated:

"The really difficult decision (on the TFX) was not the choice of contractors, but the cancellation of the services two-plane program and the substitution of a single aircraft to serve both the Air Force and the Navy. After extended discussions and great controversy, both the civilian and military leaders now agree such a program will meet the military requirements. It will yield a saving of approximately $1 billion. The choice of a contractor for such an aircraft was a subsidiary decision. Both contractors presented acceptable designs, each capable of meeting the military requirements, and with little to choose between them on the basis of performance. The choice of contractor, therefore, could be determined by the civilian authorities who are charged by law with making such decisions, on consideration of ultimate cost and program risk."

The statement by McNamara before the American Society of Newspaper Editors was totally misleading, and inaccurate. It was either an unknowing presentation or a grand deception on the TFX contract. To me it would appear to have all of the characteristics of the worst news management, for it is news distortion.

It is the responsibility of the press to point up these cases. It is also the responsibility of the Republicans and Democrats in Congress to assure that the facts are kept straight if the press fails to understand, or fails to emphasize the important points on such news distortion.

I do not believe it should be done in a partisan manner, but in a clearly objective manner. The documented record is there, and it is up to the press and the men in Congress to be sure that it is not overlooked on a contract involving a weapons system that could be of such importance to the entire Nation.

Kennedy Administration Waiting Game Policy in Foreign and Domestic Affairs Viewed as Healthy, Hopeful Pause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration's domestic and foreign policies have been severely criticized, particularly the Kennedy Cuban policy. In the midst of all of these attacks and charges, it is reassuring to pick up a newspaper and read the distinguished columnist Charles Bartlett's article impassionately analyzing and interpreting with understanding the aims and purposes of the Kennedy policies. The critics of the Kennedy Cuban policy are making panacean proposals to eliminate Castro and Soviet influence on the Caribbean island, some of which could lead to all-out war. Mr. Bartlett views the national leadership in a waiting game, that is, "the pause—both healthy and hopeful."

Mr. Speaker under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Bartlett's column, taken from the Boston Sunday Globe, with my remarks:

HEALTHY, HOPEFUL PAUSE—WHITE HOUSE PLAYS THE WAITING GAME

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—National leadership is for the moment a waiting game, and officials who view the pause as both healthy and hopeful are puzzled by less sanguine interpretations which have begun to blossom in the press.

Washington journalism tends to run in patterns, and the emerging pattern depicts the President and his aids as gripped by stalemate and frustration, defensive and out of sorts. Actually nothing could be further from the truth.

The post, Samuel Cole, spoke of wielding "the power that waits and wins" and Disraeli wrote that "everything comes if a man will only wait." The thesis has been modernized in a jingle: "Everything comes to him who waits—if he waits in a place that's meet. But never wait for an uptown car on the downtown side of the street."

Top officials of the administration feel strongly now that they are waiting on the right side of the street for events that are moving in a favorable direction.

The act of waiting in these circumstances is not distasteful. It is infinitely preferable to some of the postures which can be imposed upon political leaders in a volatile world.

It is conceivable that the President can view his situation with some gratitude as he looks around the world. He can certainly be glad that he is not Khrushchev, beset at home and abroad by powerful undertows in the tide of communism.

De Gaulle has had his fling and its effects may linger on but he did not stir the broad response for which he clearly hoped, and his popularity is being impinged by economic strains within his country.

Macmillan and Adenauer have lost their thrust at home and have settled into a waning instead of a waiting game. The Canadians and Italians are headed into elections which seem unlikely to afford any decisive mandate for power. Nehru is widely demeaned as a leader whose lifetime has outlasted the validity of his basic doctrine of nonalinement.

The observers' discernment of frustration within the Kennedy administration rests heavily upon the 10-percent drop in the President's Gallup standing, which currently reflects support by 66 percent of the voters.

But the professional politicians do not take a gloomy view of this decline. They know that the post-Cuban crisis ratings were unrealistically high in a nation where sentiment is closely divided between the major parties and that the gap between Mr. Kennedy and any Republican candidate is bound to narrow as the election nears.

The nature of the waiting is the key to the mood which actually exists. The tax cut is the essence of the legislative program. The proposal is not popular in the country and its enactment is coming slowly, but officials are almost unanimously confident that it will be passed after the long parade of witnesses has finally ceased and that it will add new steam to an economy already showing some momentum.

The wait may be longer for a resumption of the European integration blocked by De Gaulle, but a broad confidence also exists that the French President has misjudged his capacity to turn all of Europe to his national purposes.

He can delay integration and make it more difficult, but he seems to stand little chance of permanently altering its ultimate course.

The wait over South Vietnam will also be long—some say 3 to 5 years—but the trend of the fighting has affirmed the judgments made in 1961 and eroded the bleak outlook which has prevailed there until recently. The experts dare at last to say that the West is winning this insidious war.

The wait over Cuba is the most burdensome, but the Russians have many reasons to take their troops home and time is clearly working against Castro.

The public is finding it difficult to live with the situation, but the administration has the comfort of a conviction that its policies will be justified by the expected sequence of events and that its armed strength will be sufficient to deal with the unexpected.

The uncertainties hovering about the Presidency of a great nation are many and varied, and the surprises are usually unpleasant. The liberals invariably say he is going too slow, and the conservatives invariably say he is going too fast.

The current mood is not marked by easy assurance or unhappy frustration. It has been a cold winter but spring has come early to prove that the predictions of winterkill were exaggerated.

Distinguished Service Citation to Mr. Benjamin C. Willis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at a recent annual ROTC luncheon sponsored by the Cook County Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association, Mr. Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of the Chicago Public School System was presented ROA's Distinguished Service Citation for outstanding contributions to the cause of national defense.

Maj. E. J. Hand, an Army Reserve officer who is a member of the Chicago Police Department, made the award as president of this fine chapter in ROA. Col. H. R. Eichenberg, a Chicago businessman and outstanding member of the Army Reserve, has for years made this annual ROTC luncheon an outstanding event.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a brief account of this occasion appearing in the March issue of the Officer, official monthly magazine of the ROA, and to the address of Mr. Willis. I therefore ask unanimous consent that these texts be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Officer magazine, March 1963]

COOK COUNTY CHAPTER HONORS OFFICER TRAINEES—THREE OTHERS

(By Maj. Eddie Deerfield, USAR)

Nineteen Army, Navy, and Air Force senior ROTC cadets and midshipmen were honored with ROA certificates of merit, Saturday, February 9, in colorful luncheon ceremonies sponsored by Cook County chapter at 5th U.S. Army Headquarters, Chicago.

The officer trainees, from 11 Midwest colleges and universities, were selected by their schools for exceptional performance of duties.

Distinguished service citations were presented to Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of Chicago schools; Maj. Gen. Lloyd R. Moses, 5th Army deputy commander; and Brig. Gen. John A. Seitz, chief of staff.

The award to Brigadier General Seitz was "top secret" up to the time of the actual presentation, and came as a surprise to the popular 5th Army general.

The three men were cited for outstanding contributions to the national defense effort and the Reserve forces program.

Maj. Gen. Charles G. Dodge, newly appointed 5th Army commander and former Army Chief of Information, and Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, military executive, Reserve Forces Policy Board, were the principal speakers.

Major General Dodge said, "Man is the most important commodity, the key to land, sea, and air power. I came away from Korea with a deep respect for the modern American fighting man. The ROTC is one of the prime sources of young leadership, and the Nation's principal source of officers. Gen. George C. Marshall, Gen. Herbert Powell, and Gen. George H. Decker are only a few of our great military leaders with an ROTC background."

Major General Palladino reviewed the present status of the ROTC junior and senior programs, remarking that the budget document for fiscal year 1964, which does not include funds for continuing the junior ROTC program, is a proposal only for thorough consideration by Congress.

Brig. Gen. Lafeton Whitney, USAF (retired), made the presentation to Dr. Willis on behalf of Maj. Gen. John H. Foster, national ROA president, who was unable to attend.

Col. William Watson, president of the Department of Illinois ROA, gave the citation to Major General Moses.

The surprise award to Brigadier General Seitz was presented by Col. H. R. Eichenberg, former Cook County chapter president and national ROTC committee chairman. Colonel Eichenberg organized and directed the entire affair, attended by 250 Reserve officers and their wives.

He was assisted by Maj. Edward Hand, Cook County chapter president.

The ceremonies included music by the 5th Army band and a high school ROTC fife and drum unit, and a dramatic presentation by the 12th Special Forces Group (Reserve).

The honor of extending the ROTC Army, Navy, and Air Force certificates went to Major General Dodge, Rear Adm. Nunn, commandant, 9th Naval District; Brigadier General Whitney and Col. John Slezak, chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board.

The award-winning cadets and midshipmen were:

Army: Michael Mersch, University of Wisconsin; Henry D. Phillips III, Wheaton College; Donald R. Drescher, Purdue University; Robert A. Frey, University of Notre Dam; Richard C. Kasprzyk, Marquette University; Carl L. Vacketta, University of Illinois; Walter A. Hess, DePaul University; and Frank P. Baukert, Loyola University.

Navy: Donald Herms, University of Wisconsin; Wayne F. Henderson, Purdue University; Ronald C. Wilkinson, Northwestern University; John R. Clickener, University of Illinois; Jack C. Hefter, Illinois Institute of Technology; Paul M. Lehner, University of Notre Dame; and John W. Boyan, Marquette University.

Air Force: John R. Theorell, University of Wisconsin; Glenn C. Peck, Purdue University; Paul J. Litteau, Illinois Institute of Technology; and David M. Dirks, DePaul University.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD, RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 9, 1963

(Address by Mr. Benjamin C. Willis)

It is with deep humility for the recognition and honor being bestowed upon me today that I accept this distinguished service award. I am sensitive to the significance of this award for all of my colleagues in the Chicago Public School System, as well as for its symbolic recognition on your part of the importance of educational defenses for our country. In honoring me, you have in substance said, that the American educational system is the first line of national defense.

In turn, I wish to pay tribute to the importance of organized military service in the American life. We are accustomed to the significance of this service in times of national emergency. Among our proudest and most popular songs are the Army, Navy, and Marine songs. Organized service has been however, significant in times of peace as well as in times of emergency. The contribution not only of the constituted career branches of military service but also the Reserve forces such as the National Guard are fully recognized both through legislation and national organization and through public support.

The importance of the various Reserve Officer Training Corps in colleges must also be emphasized as should the Reserve Officer Training Corps programs in the high schools.

The boys who select ROTC have an unusual opportunity to be associated with disciplined men of wide experience. Whether the officers in charge are commissioned officers or noncommissioned officers they have several important characteristics in common. They have all come through the discipline inherent in any organized service, military or nonmilitary.

They have maturity, balance, and a long and anticipatory view of the potentialities of the recruits who stand before them as freshman boys. They have also vast experience, many of them in foreign lands or at least in distant parts of the United States.

The officers to whom both the military service and the public school systems have entrusted the boys enrolled in the high school ROTC bring the highest qualities of teachers and the best principles of teaching to the drill hall. These officers become working members of the school faculty. They take their places in the faculty as teachers, not as officers. They utilize the curricular outline within their sphere of study as diligently as do the teachers of science or mathematics or foreign languages. As the result of this professional approach, when the boys march, or practice close order drill, or engage in exercises on the rifle range they are not merely parading or making neat patterns or shooting at targets. They are instead learning the disciplines required in group activity, the controls both muscular and psychological which make close order drill possible, and the perfection of skill that is far more than merely hitting the bullseye.

We must not forget that this experience transcends the 1 to 3 years of enrollment in high school officers training corps. The benefits of organized activities will remain with them long after high school is in the past. We must also remember that this high school experience may lead to a variety of further opportunities such as the Reserve officers training program in our colleges or scholarship at any one of our military academies. If neither of these is contained in their futures, the experience in the Reserve officers training corps may very naturally lead to enlistment in the National Guard or other modifications of the Reserve program.

Irrespective of the post high school military commitment of these boys, the high school ROTC provides a special kind of beneficent discipline and an opportunity to

perform according to expectancy. Perhaps, the opportunity of performing according to expectancy is one of the specific manifestations of discipline, a word which is losing some of its pure meaning and its richness as a descriptive of a major component in normal life. I spoke earlier of the distinction in the contribution of military service in times of emergency and in times of peace. No one can pay too much tribute to the contribution of the military services to the security and preeminence of the United States of America. Not only have the regularly organized military services responded magnificently in our past history; when the need arose, the general public has responded in full support through the services as needed.

The ability of the organized military service to absorb the volunteers and the draftees in large numbers in times of emergency is a further tribute to their discipline, capability, and organization. Traditionally, this country has maintained a relatively small core of military. We have depended upon our public's response to expand the services as needed in an emergency but we have also, unknowingly, relied upon the hard core military organization to absorb these laymen, that is what they are, and to create armies and navies, air corps, marine corps, almost overnight. This ability to absorb and expand can be directly traced to the high qualities of leadership, discipline, and organization to be found among the career personnel in our armed services.

It is possible to suggest that there are several parallels to be found between both the burdens and demands of the military services and the burdens and demands of education. Both are vital lines of national defense. Both depend for their responsiveness upon high qualities of leadership and administrative organization to the smallest element. Both also are subject to the pulse of national life and both must respond to the needs of the country, each within its own sphere.

It is with this thought in mind that I wish to indicate that I feel that all of the personnel in the Chicago public schools share this honor with me today. It is with this thought in mind that I accept this award with appreciation for the honor, and with pride for all of us in the Chicago public school system.

I would convey to you not only the educator's respect for your contribution to teaching and your contribution to the American way of life; I would also convey our sense of common purpose in the cause of the young people of the United States of America.

Stalinism Returns to the U.S.S.R.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a penetrating analysis of the probable return of Stalinism to the Soviet society, as well as perceptive sidelights on the Khrushchev image are contained in an essay just written by E. E. Smith.

Mr. Smith has had more than a little experience in Soviet affairs. His first tour of duty in the American Embassy in Moscow was in the period 1948–50 when he served as assistant military attaché. He served in the same Embassy again as a Foreign Service officer in the period 1954–56. A graduate of the Naval Intelligence School, Mr. Smith has specialized in Soviet affairs for the past 20 years with the exception of duty as a front line infantry officer in the 3d U.S. Army in Europe. His tours of diplomatic duty have included The Hague, Paris, Munich, Berlin and, of course, Washington, among others.

Mr. Smith's essay is as follows:

TO BEAT OR NOT TO BEAT

(By E. E. Smith)

I. TEARS FOR A TYRANT

"When they buried Stalin, there were tears in the eyes of many, including myself. Those were genuine tears. Although we knew even then of several personal defects of Stalin, we trusted him." This disconsolate passage was part of a 15,000-word speech Nikita S. Khrushchev delivered before a group of the Soviet elite in the Kremlin on March 8, 1963. That date was 2 days less than 10 years from Stalin's death in 1953, an event not mentioned in the Soviet press.

The text and tenor of the speech suggested that a meeting of the ruling Kremlin hierarchy had taken place in the recent past. Serious pressures on Khrushchev combined with strong differences of opinion among the confreres had precluded hard and fast decisions. As an interim measure, however, a minimal consensus obliged Khrushchev to issue a somber warning to the Soviet peoples; de-Stalinization must stop.

Khrushchev, aware of Stalin's mass murder as a central issue in Soviet life today, chose the occasion to deliver the most important political pronouncement on internal affairs since his celebrated "secret" speech before the XXth Party Congress in February 1956. Indeed, his March 8 speech was in many ways an extension of the "secret" discourse.

His speech, which was given the widest possible coverage in the U.S.S.R. bore all the earmarks of having been prepared with great care. Not only was the content of the message well thought out but the presentation was a masterpiece in Aesopian semantics. Small wonder that it has been misunderstood widely. If the analysis to follow appears to be overly involved and in some instances far-fetched, the reader should remember that Communist speeches of this type cannot be comprehended unless they are subjected to a sort of exegesis usually applied only to archeology. In particular, the frequent excursions into history are not meant to exhibit erudition but are indispensable for interpretation. Khrushchev himself did not delve into history to prove that he had read a few books and reports but to make points of the greatest importance for the future of the Soviet Union and the world.

II. THE SECRET SPEECH

In the midthirties, when Stalin had embarked upon his horrid purges, the Eighth Extraordinary Congress of the Soviets (1936) took place. Khrushchev spoke about his teacher, Stalin, in servile praise:

"Our party has victoriously led * * * the working class, because at its head stood that genius of mankind, Lenin, because our party is now being led by the brilliant Stalin. * * * During the civil war Stalin appeared in every place where the issue was in doubt, and wherever he appeared victory remained with * * * the revolution * * * Stalin, his genius and his will, are familiar to all of us * * * because there is not a single undertaking directed toward the strengthening of the might of our motherland, toward its Socialist well-being which has not been inspired by * * * Stalin. * * * We know, comrades, to whom belongs the main credit for our victories * * * to our leader * * * Stalin. * * * Wherever this gang of murderers and scoundrels, whose crimes can hardly find precedent in history, were quickly unmasked and destroyed, we are indebted primarily to Comrade Stalin, who sagaciously summoned the party and * * * workers of our country to an intensification of revolutionary class vigilance." [1]

Best evidence suggests that it was pressure of events and political rivalry, and not his free will, which pushed Khrushchev to desecrate Stalin 20 years later, in February of 1956. Most assuredly he was again under heavy pressure in March 1963 when he spoke on the unlikely subject, "high devotion and artistic mastery—the great strength of Soviet literature and art." [2]

Much has happened since Khrushchev, shocking the delegates to the party congress, tore the veil from Stalin and his insane terror.[3] He reported "prolonged tortures * * * insecurity, fear, and despair * * * mass repressions and brutal acts of violation of Socialist legality * * * terror against honest workers" and these were merely "a few manifestations" of Stalin's despotism.

"He practiced brutal violence, not only toward everything which opposed him but also toward that which seemed to his capricious and despotic character contrary to his concepts. * * * Whoever opposed (him) was doomed * * * to moral and physical annihilation."

Khrushchev's present problems began when he partially exposed Stalin's crimes and condemned certain aspects of his former boss' "terror" but failed to cleanse himself of the suspicion of complicity.

If he intended to "de-Stalinize" himself, Khrushchev had much to account and atone for. That he was forever connected with Stalin and his mass homicides was a matter of record. But we now know that he was unsuccessful in trying to disassociate himself from Stalin.

Denunciation of Stalin in 1956 seemed to imply that there would be no repetition of gross injustices, chief among which was murder, and no reimposition of the "terror." The impression created after the "secret speech," whether mistaken or not, was that short of outright treason, the citizens of the Soviet Union henceforth were to enjoy a certain degree of freedom from political persecution, a "reform" to which in the fifth decade of the revolution they were patently entitled. A subsequent ostensible reduction in the arbitrary power of the terroristic and punitive organ, the secret police, tended to reinforce this expectation.

Khrushchev's policy then was to create the impression that past crimes were expurgated genuinely. But the catharsis was phoney. It assumed two distinct forms: some of Stalin's victims were rehabilitated and Soviet writers were allowed to publish toned down stories of Stalin's crimes. The apparent hope was that controlled candor would act as a safety valve; people would tire reading about concentration camps, and soon the whole phenomenon would be forgotten. Not surprisingly, this childish attempt to liquidate communism's—and Soviet Russia's—great crisis of conscience by allowing a thaw in literature failed. No one and no party can talk itself out of murder; hence the present need to embark upon a new course in exculpation: Stalin's victims were innocent, but their murder was somehow justified.

III. BEWARE THE IDES OF MARCH

The malignant tone of Khrushchev's March 8 pronouncement sent chills through the marrow of Soviet citizenry: It semed to mark the birth of neo-Stalinism. In his remarks, Khrushchev left no room for doubt that de-Stalinization in the Soviet Union must stop because, mild though it was, it already had exceeded permissive limits. Khrushchev announced in effect that he does not intend to preside over the liquidation of the Soviet

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

regime, nor does he intend to be deposed. The signal was couched in the innocuous "Aesopian" form of a criticism of contemporary art and literature:

"In the past years," Khrushchev affirmed, "activists of literature and art have * * * concentrated on that period * * * connected with the cult of the personality of Stalin. All this is fully understandable and legal. Works have appeared in which the realities of those years are accurately illuminated * * * for example * * * the novel of A. Solzhenitsyn, 'One Day of Ivan Denisovich,' several poems of E. Yevtushenko, the film * * * 'Clear Sky,' and other works."

To these efforts Khrushchev interposed no a priori objection: "The party fully supports accurate, artistic works of whatever side of life they concern—if they assist the people in its struggle for a new society."

However, a stricture must be kept in mind: "We consider it necessary to direct the attention of all creative workers to * * * mistaken motives and tendencies. * * * These incorrect tendencies consist in the main in that all attention is exclusively concentrated on illegality, arbitrariness, and on the misuse of power."

Khrushchev did not hesitate to confess: "The years of the cult of the personality have had serious consequences. Our party," he added mendaciously, "has spoken truthfully about this to the people."

But, he avered, Communists must "remember that these years were not a period of stagnation in the development of Soviet society * * * as our enemies represent them. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, under the banner * * * of the great Lenin, our people successfully built socialism. The Soviet Union * * * was transformed into a mighty socialist government which withstood the heaviest military experiences" and won "the greatest war in history."

This was the stage setting when Khrushchev proceeded gingerly to explain his own implication in the terror.

"Now, there are frequently questions about why during the life of Stalin illegalities and misuse of power were not uncovered * * * and how should this have happened?"

It develops that this matter was extensively discussed in inner Kremlin circles.

"In party documents our point of view on this question has been more than once fully explained in sufficient clarity. Unfortunately, this has been misunderstood by some people, among whom are workers in art who try to illuminate events in a distorted manner. Therefore, even today, we are again addressing ourselves to the question of Stalin's cult of the personality."

The "sufficient clarity" of undisclosed "party documents" quite obviously was insufficient. The Soviet reader who after 46 years of "Com-Lies" (Communist Lies—the term is Lenin's) has become a great skeptic, probably is very curious about these documents which a decade after Stalin's demise still are kept locked in party safes.

"The cult of the personality"—a euphamism for such crimes as mass murder—has caused, Khrushchev suggested, a vexing problem in literature. Tongue in cheek, he pithily indicated: "They say there has been a spate of writings in magazines and publications about life of people in exile, in prisons, in camps." This is deeply disturbing.

"I repeat still once more that this is a very dangerous theme and difficult material. The less a person has responsibilities for today and the future days of our country and party, the easier it is for him to throw out this material to sensation lovers. If all writers began to write only on this topic, what sort of literature would there be? Who would dash for it? Flies, enormous fat flies. Every sort of bourgeois scum from abroad will crawl toward it."

But the people whom Khrushchev named "fat flies" were precisely the hapless subjects of the Soviet dictatorship, including, presumably, the surviving Communist idealists.

As Khrushchev continued, he sounded more and more like Baron von Munchhauson:

"It is being asked, did the leading cadres of the party * * * know about the arrests at that time? Yes, they knew. But did they know that completely innocent people were being arrested? No. This they did not know. They trusted Stalin and they did not entertain the thought that there could have been * * * repression against honorable people devoted to our cause."

Here Khrushchev's lying became clumsy. It was not that innocent people found themselves arrested. This has happened before and may occur in any free society. Under Stalin (and Khrushchev was then running the Ukraine, with one-quarter of the Soviet population) innocent people were arrested all right, but they went on to interrogation, torture, slave labor, and the "moral and physical annihilation" Khrushchev has earlier described.

The misuse of power and arbitrariness of Stalin had a specific purpose—to terrorize. To be effective, terror must be known, especially to those powerful figures whose opposition is to be deterred. The assertion that the terror escaped Khrushchev is a palpable bit of nonsense resembling an allegation that the Inquisition was intended to be known only to those who perished on the rack.

Lying is difficult and Khrushchev waded into trouble with this particular exercise. He condemned, in the same speech, Ilya Ehrenburg for his theory of silence, a contention that many Russians kept their mouths shut although they were painfully aware of the innocence of Stalin's victims. However, Khrushchev added, Mikhail A. Sholokhov, author of "Quiet Flows the Don," was singularly knowledgeable: He wrote to Stalin concerning the terrible hunger and despair in his native Don country. Stalin, not disputing what had happened, alleged that there was a quiet war being waged by the Soviet peasantry against authority, in fact an Italianka (sabotage) against the army in need of food. He replied to Sholokhov that he was seeing only one side of the problem, but politics demanded that the leader recognize both aspects.

Thus, a curious spectacle emerges from Khrushchev's text: Khrushchev himself, though a most important official of Stalin's regime, had no knowledge of terroristic crimes; Ehrenburg condemned the terror but said nothing until now, thus inviting Khrushchev's sarcasm; Sholokhov sitting in his distant Don country, knew, was better informed than Khrushchev, spoke up, but his protest to Stalin was to no avail.

That the members of the Politburo did not know even about a few of the millions of innocent victims is absurd: many of their closest friends were murdered. But if of all the leading cadres of the party, only Khrushchev (and presumably some of his present colleagues) were not aware of the arrests and extermination of "honorable people devoted to our cause," a proper question is whether such a naive dunce is fit to head the Soviet State.

Khrushchev insisted, with humble unction, that "we only found out about Stalin's misuses of power and the facts of his arbitrariness after his death and the exposure of Beria * * * that enemy of the party and people, the spy and odious provocateur."

This diversion to Beria, weak though it is as an alibi, offers nevertheless a clue to Khrushchev's present objective: He attempts to whitewash Stalin and thereby save himself. It was not Stalin who persecuted innocent people, it was Beria, and only after Beria's exposure in 1953 did the truth come to light.

The Soviet populace now presumably understood that "many, including myself" wept at Stalin's bier. But the murderers and scoundrels whom Khrushchev was castigating in 1936, included those party members whom Khrushchev's government is now rehabilitating—some of them. Yugoslav Communists place the toll of murders during Stalin's reign at 7 million—plus 7 million arrests.[4] Actually, the total is much greater. But whatever it is, Khrushchev was responsible for a portion of this bloody torrent. So far he escaped the penalty, but the ghosts have begun to haunt him and will never leave him in peace again.

IV. THE CASE FOR A REFINED NEO-STALINISM

Ghosts and survivors, prisoners and citizens suffering from slow malnutrition (as a result of Khrushchev's doctrinaire agricultural policies), as well as the skeptical new generation, must comprehend that Khrushchev's absolution was complete because of Stalin's great services to the revolution.

"The party's struggle with enemies of the revolution and socialist construction was headed by Stalin * * * Stalin's contribution to the revolutionary struggle * * * was * * * known to everyone * * * in the later years of socialist construction. Stalin's authority grew particularly in the period of the fight against the anti-Lenin tendencies and opposition groups within the party."

Khrushchev, to put it bluntly, resanctified Stalin's politics of murder. "When plots against the revolution were uncovered, Stalin * * * led the stduggle for the cleansing[5] of the country from plotters * * * and enemies of the people." The party allegedly "trusted and supported him in this." And Stalin deserves great credit for "there was not once a case of treachery or treason to the cause of the revolution [like], for example, the provocation of Malinovsky[6]—a member of the Bolshevik faction in the State Duma."

Khrushchev also defended Stalin's fight against such alleged foes of Leninism as the Trotskyites, the Zinovievites, the right opportunists (also referred to as Bukharinites) and the bourgeois nationalists. In this struggle, too, the party and masses trusted him, supported him.

But here, Khrushchev is skating on thin ice and betrays his fundamental allegiance to Stalin and Stalinism.[7] Opponents of Stalin, like Zinoviev and Bukharin may have been wrong[8] but they were not guilty of the crimes for which they were executed. Trotsky was murdered in Mexico many years after he left the Soviet Union. Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev, et. al., were opposed to Stalin for myriad reasons; but, foremost among the criticism of these authentic party members was misuse of power and arbitrariness of Stalin. Khrushchev damned these men despite the fact that their arguments were proved correct—Khrushchev himself was the man who, albeit by implication, disclosed the correctness of the "line" of the executed opposition. The true heroes of communism (like Trotsky and Bukharin) still have to be rehabilitated, and some of the foremost names, like that of Rykov, still have to be mentioned. Hence Khrushchev justified Stalin's main purge, or as he put it, "the Flushing" (ochishchenye).

Actually, by linking, in one sentence the party opposition with bourgeois nationalists, Khrushchev again read these men out of the party. By equating the party opposition not only to nationalism but to the bourgeoisie, the class enemy, he implicitly echoes Stalin's argument that they were enemies of the party. All Khrushchev is ready to admit is that a few party members were wronged. Thus, in effect, he is upholding Stalin's party purges even today.

In the certain knowledge that millions of innocent persons perished in the Stalin era,

Footnotes at end of speech.

it would have been in order, according to Socialist legality, to refer the problem of whether Communists were purged for cause or simply because Stalin wanted them out of the way, to a tribunal of the Nuremberg type. No justice can ever be obtained without judicious consideration by impartial persons.

V. WHO WAS STALIN?

If the purges were justified after all, Stalin, though he may have gone too far, must have been all right.

Sure enough: "Vladimir Ilyich Lenin considered Stalin a Marxist, an outstanding activist of our party, devoted to the revolution." Actually, Lenin never considered Stalin to be a theoretician, hence he hardly regarded him as a genuine Marxist; Lenin, however, did regard Trotsky, Bukharin, and Zinoviev as genuine Marxists. The point would be trivial if it did not denote an attempt to use Lenin, the patron saint, as a character witness for the defendant.

"We are still of the opinion that Stalin was devoted to communism. He was a Marxist. One cannot and should not deny this."

The word "still" and the entire phrasing suggests that doubts about Stalin's dedication to Marxism and the revolution were raised but not sustained.

What is the significance of this remark? For many years the question of whether Stalin served as an Okhrana agent has been debated. Alexander Orlov, whose testimony on other matters was amply borne out by Khrushchev's 1956 speech, stated that evidence of Stalin's Okhrana connection was found in police files. This find was no small factor in Stalin's purge of the NKVD, his own Okhrana during the 1930's. Khrushchev's speech indicated, as clearly as can be, that someone in the party has been digging about in prerevolutionary history of the Bolsheviks.

In other words, Stalin's whole history was investigated. Khrushchev's phrasing suggests that he was given a report on the matter. This report, it can be surmised, raised the question of whether de-Stalinization should be pushed further and the name of communism be cleared by disclosing that Stalin had been a police agent. Such a suggestion was turned down: At this crucial point the brake was put upon de-Stalinization.

But perhaps the question is not yet closed. Khrushchev may still be of the opinion that Stalin was an authentic Communist. Is he therefore still fighting those who evaluate Stalin differently? And if there is such a debate, is it not obvious that some evidence linking Stalin to the police was found, and that the unresolved problem now merely is whether Stalin was a police agent pure and simple, or a double agent who worked with the police for the party? Obviously, explosive material is lying around.

VI. THE MURKY ROAD OF PROVOCATION

Police and subversive operations are plainly on Khrushchev's mind. In more than one passage Khrushchev called attention to the entrapment type of intelligence operations Russians dub "provokatsiya." There has been no such preoccupation with the subject of "provocation" in any speech by Khrushchev since he came to power. Moreover, there has been no significant public pronouncement by any Soviet dictator on the subject of Czarist secret police penetration into Lenin's group for over 40 years. In this speech, three agents were mentioned in connection with pre-1917 events, and one who operated after the Bolshevik coup d'etat. Two and possibly three of these four were Jews.

The Soviet security forces from Vcheka to KGB have their genesis in the Czarist Okhrana.[9] Khrushchev is fully aware of this background and his speech indicates, as already pointed out, that he must recently have studied the history of police provocation with some care. Throughout his discourse were scattered references to the Czarist Okhrana, but also to Soviet security froces, and to various foreign intelligence services which duped Stalin. Odious provocations appear to have exerted considerable influence on revolutionary history.

For example, Khrushchev discussed the arrest, interrogation, and death of General Yakir,[10] "an outstanding bolshevik and military personage." He reported that as the general was about to be shot, Yakir shouted: "Long live Stalin." Khrushchev insisted that throughout the entire interrogation Yakir refused to believe that Stalin had anything to do with his arrest. Someone around Stalin had arranged a provocation to which Yakir had fallen victim. But Yakir was not the only victim to provocation, nor the single case of a Communist who failed to grasp Stalin's true role. Why then make a case out of him? He was a Jew and commanded the military forces in the Ukraine. Skilled dialectician that he is, Khrushchev, in discussing provocation, also wants to score some points in the never-ending national struggle.

VII. THE SUPERIOR LEADERSHIP OF KHRUSHCHEV

The basic tactic of Khrushchev is to prove, not only that he is the best of all contemporary Communists, but also that he is superior to Stalin and even to Lenin. The latter, he implied, was taken in by agent provocateurs. This won't happen to Nikita.

It will be recalled that Khrushchev claimed he had learned about Stalin's arrests of innocent people only after Beria's exposure. But he insisted that Stalin did not permit "one case of treason * * * to * * * the revolution * * * (like) that of Malinovsky." This name has not been mentioned publicly in the Soviet Union since 1918. Malinovsky, close comrade-in-arms of Lenin, was exposed as a police agent but probably acted as a double agent helping the party rather than the police. Khrushchev apparently sides with those who considered Malinovsky to have betrayed the revolution. Since Lenin did not believe in Malinovsky's treachery, the clear implication is that Khrushchev will not be so naive and fallible as Lenin. Khrushchev intimated that Lenin fell repeatedly in police traps, for example, he also was impressed by Zhitomirsky.[11]

At to Stalin, "his guilt consisted in the fact that he made gross mistakes of a theoretical and political character against the Leninist principles of state and party leadership, misused the authority entrusted to him by the party and the people."

Thus he caused serious damage to communism. This fine line between gross mistakes and criminal acts hides an important point. Stalin's criminality is to be argued away. But since criminal acts were committed, was Stalin a criminal by nature? Not at all.

The purges resulted, Khrushchev revealed, from Stalin's beguilement by certain foreign intelligence services. These organizations, "knowing his sick mistrustfulness and suspiciousness," produced cases and documents which seemed accurate and created the belief that "there were groups of military specialists * * * developing criminal plots in our country against Soviet authority * * * and the Soviet state."

Khrushchev's attempt to cast himself in the role of a superior Vozhd, who is immune to provocation, led him, some days after his speech, to release documents of the Nazi Gestapo which—fed to Stalin via Benes, the President of Czechoslovakia—caused the execution of Tukhschevsky and the flower of the Red army.

It remained unexplained, however, why Stalin who, according to Khrushchev, was sick only toward the end of his life, bit on such pap. Nor did Khrushchev care to argue the possibility that Stalin fed fabricated material to the Gestapo in the first place, only to have them passed back to the NKVD. Khrushchev hinted strongly that, unlike Stalin, he would not fall prey to such subterfuge.

By now the scenario was prepared for Khrushchev, the hero. None other than he helped to curb and counter Stalin's sick suspicions. Stalin had more dyela, i.e., purges in mind, but Khrushchev recognized the trouble and saved the Soviet Union from untold grief:

"Stalin was in the last years of his life * * * deeply ill * * * suffering from suspiciousness and a persecution mania. The party * * * has informed the people about how Stalin created such cases as the Leningrad affair, the doctors' plot, and others. But, comrades, there would have been significantly more * * * if those who worked alongside Stalin * * * had agreed with him about everything. I have spoken about how Stalin and decided on the case concerning the so-called Moscow counterrevolutionary center. But not everyone had become a yes-man and the cadres of the Moscow organization were not subjected to new mass repression."

In any event, if Stalin was only sick in the last years of his life, he must have been healthy during the 1930's and 1940's, when he committed his greatest crimes. The fabrication of cases such as the Leningrad affair and the doctors' plot may have been due to a deep, horrendous disease, but that disease was not identified. At any rate, suspiciousness and persecution mania are symptoms and not a disease.

But again, Stalin was not just sick, he was egged on "by Beria and Kaganovich, afraid that among the creative intelligentsia in the postwar * * * Ukraine, some kind of nationalistic tendencies were ripening. He began to push things in order to dispense with the most outstanding writers and activists of art in the Ukraine. If the Ukrainian Bolsheviki had supported Stalin's feelings the Ukrainian intelligentsia would have suffered huge losses and probably there would have been a case (dyelo) against the Ukrainian nationalists."

Khrushchev was the leading Bolshevik of the Ukraine at that time. Hence it was his own adamant and courageous stand that prevented a postwar purge there, just as he implied that he forestalled the purge of the Moscow party organization at the time when he stood at its head.

Hence we have the following set of assertions:

1. Stalin was a true Communist.

2. In the thirties, he was provoked into the purges by foreign elements. However, he also killed many whose liquidation appears justified even now.

3. Khrushchev did protect the innocents in the Moscow organization who otherwise might have been killed by Stalin at a time when he was not yet sick.

4. Stalin was almost pushed by Beria and Kaganovich into a purge of the Ukraine at an unnamed time but was blocked by Khrushchev.

5. The Leningrad affair and the doctors' plot occurred when Stalin was deeply ill but it might have been worse had not Khrushchev interceded.

Of course, the Leningrad affair did run its full course. If Khrushchev tried to stop it, was he convinced of the victim's innocence? By contrast, the case of the doctors' plot got underway; it was ended abruptly by Stalin's death. For which action, then, is Khrushchev claiming credit? For Stalin's death? The confusion in his alibi building is plain. But it also is clear that Khrushchev is trying desperately to make his leadership claim stick.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Just as Lenin met his beguilers, so Stalin was entrapped by Beria,[12] a spy and enemy of the party and the people, who did not even consider it necessary to conceal his happiness at the grave of Stalin. Were Khrushchev's tears in good taste after all?

What is the sweating dictator trying to say? That both Lenin and Stalin were lacking in Bolshevik vigilance? What is the message? Simply this: After Stalin's death, Beria "tried to assume power and leadership in the party. At the time there actually existed a real danger. From the very first after Stalin's death, Beria began to take steps disorganizing to the work of the party * * * directed to the disruption of our friendly relations * * * with fraternal countries of the Socialist camp. Together with Malenkov, he * * * made a provocative proposition to liquidate the German Democratic Republic as a Socialist government, and * * * the Socialist Unity Party of Germany."

Lo and behold, Khrushchev was smarter than Stalin. He recognized Beria for what he was. It was unnecessary to remind the 1963 audience that Khrushchev purged Beria without benefit of Socialist legality. The liquidation of this vile person, we must infer, was justifiable terrorism. One does not talk about provocations and of means of combating them, unless there is a significant correlation to the present. If Zhitomirsky's, Malinovsky's, and Beria's are lurking about, Nikita Khrushchev is alert. The warning, we may be sure, is coming through loud and clear.[13]

VIII. REEMERGENCE OF TERROR

Khrushchev's arguments are leading back to Stalinism in its rawest form. Citing almost verbatim one of the key teachings of Stalin, Khrushchev maintained we must conduct a ceaseless struggle against the survivals of the past within the country * * * defeat the attack of the organized class enemy in the international arena. We have no right to forget this struggle, even for 1 minute. A few years ago, Stalin was condemned for the theory, then deemed to be incorrect, that the class struggle sharpens after the Communist seizure of power. Now it turns out Stalin must have been right in warning against the apparently immortal survivals of the past.

Stalin also was extolled for his contribution to communism: in defending the revolution, he was fighting "enemies of the people." This very expression "enemies of the people," which Stalin used to label his personal opponents, was strongly criticized after the 1956 speech. Thus, Stalin received credit for the very excesses for which he was being condemned.

The ceaseless struggle justifies endless terror. "Did the revolution have to defend its conquest? Yes, it had to do this, and it did it from the first days—with all decisiveness. In the first months of Soviet authority, by decree of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, there was created a mighty organ of the proletarian dictatorship—against the enemies of the revolution—the Vcheka in the struggle with counterrevolution." [14]

The thrust of this statement is that Lenin is heralded as the originator of the terror organ. Usually, this honor is reserved for Felix Dzerzhinsky who, helpfully, was a Pole. It was Lenin who instituted terror—this precedent would legitimize the resumption of terror by Khrushchev. This is the key message of the speech.

IX. ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

In the past, Khrushchev has demonstrated great sensitivity to the Jewish question. Now it appears that the Jewish issue has again sharpened. No other conclusion may be drawn from the unprecedented length of his discourse on the Jewish problem. With some exceptions, the overwhelming majority of persons mentioned in his speech are Jews: Azev, Zhitomirsky, Beria (Russians insist, probably incorrectly, that he was Jewish), Kaganovich, General Yakir, General Kreiser, Rosa Luxemburg, Ehrenburg, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and others.

His lead into this sticky wicket was by way of a criticism of Evgeny Yevtushenko's now celebrated poem, Babi Yar, describing the Nazi massacre of Jews in a Kiev ravine. Yevtushenko was reprehensible because he did not mention non-Jews who also were killed at Babi Yar.

In an obvious bit of apologia, Khrushchev insisted: "From the very first days of the October revolution * * * Jews were on an equal footing with all other nationalities of the U.S.S.R. * * * The Jewish question did not exist for us and those who suggest it are echoing an alien voice."

There were outstanding Jewish generals in the Soviet past. Even now, Khrushchev disclosed, General Kreiser commands all Soviet troops in the Far East. Was Khrushchev able to find only one Jewish Soviet general? The Jews account for about 3 percent of the Soviet population.

There are different types of Jews, Khrushchev explained. For example, one Jewish officer, Vinokur, telephoned him during the Battle of the Volga (Stalingrad) and said that von Paulus' interpreter Kogan, a former Khrushchev aide from Kiev, was a Jew. "One Jew served as interpreter on von Paulus' staff and another Jew served in our forces that took von Paulus and the interpreter prisoner." This precisely takes off where Stalin left the eternal theme of the "international Jew."

There is little doubt about what happened to the interpreter. Lest the lesson be lost, Khrushchev proceeded with a bit of interesting reasoning. "It is absurd to attribute to the Russian people guilt for the filthy provocations of the Black Hundreds [15], but it is also absurd to attribute to the whole Jewish people the responsibility for Nationalism and the Zionism of the Bund, for the provocation of Azev and Zhitomirsky ('Otsov'), for the various Jewish organizations connected in their time with the 'Zubatovites' and the Czarist Okhrana (Okhranka)."

Apart from some deliberate falsifications (the Bund was Menshevik and not Zionist), the Soviet dictator recited here an impressive and quite one-sided indictment. The fantastic contributions of Jewis physicists to Soviet nuclear weapons, space exploration and electronics were not mentioned, even though such praise would have alleviated anti-semitic sentiments. Most interesting are the references to agent provocateurs, to the Okhrana, and the gratuitous reference to Zubatov, an Okhrana official who organized socialist groups to keep the revolutionary movement under control. The policy instituted by Zubatov often has been criticized for having brought about bloody Sunday, a massacre, which was the overture to the revolution of 1905. This revolution fractured the monolithic autocracy of the Czar.

Does Khrushchev fear a Zubaton-type entrapment maneuver against him?

X. NO TIME FOR FATHERS

In a candid passage, Khrushchev admitted the visceral craving for freedom emerging from the thaw in his unhappy empire. Most of the current unpleasant problems stem from an abominable hankering for more liberty. "One hears conversations about some kind of absolute freedom . . . I do not know what they have in mind here, but I consider that there will never be absolute freedom even under complete communism."

That settled the crucial political problem. The question of "relative freedom" was not discussed and the reins of government will not be loosened. Nor will ideological deviation be permitted.

Yet, unreconstructed bolshevik that he is, Khrushchev has recognized and identified the most serious long range challenge to the Soviet system. This challenge he described as the so-called father-son relationship. The increasingly sophisticated Russian youth is inquiring why papushka did nothing to halt the Stalin terror. Are Khrushchev's own descendants in a questioning mood? Equally vexing has been the unquenchable youthful desire for explanations from parents, teachers, and ideologues concerning the Stalin era. Soviet youth wants to know how Stalinism could have happened in the Soviet system? Could it recur? What guarantees against its recurrence have been effected?

Khrushchev approached this most serious of problems by way of a criticism of the film, "The Guard of Illych," as yet uncompleted. In this movie, he intoned, the young people "love no one and they respect nothing, they not only refuse to believe their elders but they even hate them. They are dissatisfied with everything. They laugh and spit at it."

What is the true picture of soviet youth? "Our soviet youth are continuing their lives in labor and struggle * * * the heroic tradition of the foregoing generation, proving their great devotion to the ideas of Marxism, Leninism, and to the years of peaceful construction * * * at the fronts of the great fatherland war. Our youth are very well depicted in * * * Fadayev's novel, 'The Young Guard'."

In the bitter winter of 1948–49, the writer saw the première of "The Young Guard" (pt. I) at the main movie theater in Kharkov. If soviet youth was very well depicted in that film, it remains difficult to dismiss the memory of youthful viewers howling with laughter as they watched Nazi troops charging into the Ukraine, occupying beautifully constructed homes—which "our youth" knew very well did not exist in 1949, and do not exist even now.

But Khrushchev, highly exorcized about the so-called father-son problem, launched into a bitter tirade against "The Guard of Illych": "I have previously spoken * * * of the serious question raised by the meeting of the hero of the film with the ghost of his father killed during the war. To the question of the son about how to live, the father's ghost in turn asks the son how old he is. And when the son answers he is 23 years old, the father says, 'but I am 21'. You want us to believe in the accuracy of such an episode? No one will believe it. Can you imagine that a father would not answer the question of his son and not give him advice on how to go on a proper course in life?"

Khrushchev, father of his people, puts all his sons on guard, that he will indeed show them the "proper course."

But what is this proper course? Soviet youth undoubtedly has examined, for example, the statistics of the recent Russian census (the first in three decades). They know that Stalin's terror castrated soviet manhood: more soviet males in their prime perished at the hands of Stalin's executioners than were killed by the Nazis in World War II.[16]

Is the suffering, which soviet adults experienced under Stalin, to return? The fathers knew the agony; the sons know what the terror did to their country.

Khrushchev, contended that "in soviet socialist society there are no contradictions between generations * * * problems of 'father vs. son' do not exist in the old sense." But then he lashed out: "Do you want to set the young against the older generations * * * to bring dissensions into the united soviet family?" This anguished outcry merely proves that after 46 years the revolution has not become a solid accomplishment. Soviet youth is beginning to under-

Footnotes at end of speech.

stand that the sins of communism cannot all be ascribed to Stalin. They sense that Stalin was just a symptom of a deep disease—communism. Khrushchev fears that soviet youth is about to consider him, too, as a symptom of the same disease.

XI. THE CASE OF A FEW MILLION GHOSTS

The plain fact of the matter is that Khrushchev rose to power under Stalin, that he participated in Stalinism, and that he knew all about the excesses of Stalin.

His words show plainly that he is involved in a deep personal and political crisis and that his power position in the Kremlin is under attack. To extricate himself, he is both accusing and exculpating Stalin. Apparently, afraid of provocation (infiltration and entrapment), he is putting the lurking schemers on guard that they would be summarily dealt with. In addition, he is warning the population at large that he may institute what could be called neo-Stalinism—selective terror against his opponents rather than blind mass terror against foe and friend alike.

Beset with problems that threaten to get out of hand, Khrushchev quite obviously feels insecure. It would be so easy to invoke the Castro solution to his domestic problems—"Paredon" ("to the wall"). But despite the bravado of this speech, it is not easy. The years of Stalin's unspeakable brutality still are visible in too many millions of faces.

Khrushchev knows that he is living in a jungle. He is convinced that Lenin was right when he said: "Today you must not stroke the head of anyone—they will bite your hand. It is necessary to beat them over the head, beat without mercy." Stalin, as Khrushchev himself disclosed, ordered his terrorists to beat, beat, and beat once more. To beat or not to beat—that is Khrushchev's burning quandary. But he will be damned if he beats and damned if he doesn't. Khrushchev is now the prisoner of history. The future will tell for how long he succeeded in postponing the inevitable.

---

[1] Pravda, Dec. 2, 1963, p. 4.

[2] Pravda, Mar. 10, 1936, pp. 1–4.

[3] Walter Ulbricht, the Stalinist dictator of East Germany, called the speech a "healthy shock."

[4] Robert Conquest, The Spectator, "The Great Purge," Nov. 9, 1962, pp. 706–711.

[5] Here Khrushchev used "Ochishcheniye" rather than the usual "chistka" (purge). "Ochishcheniye" is a much stronger term and has no English equivalent. In Russian parlance, this word connotes a complete cleansing out, a flushing, and frequently pertains to a radical expurgation of the body.

[6] Roman Vikentyevich Malinovsky (born in 1878 in Poland) was the principal agent (or double agent) of a remarkable intelligence operation. His connection with the czarist department of police (Okhrana) began during the Russo-Japanese War. He entered into a close relationship with the Okhrana in 1909 after he became prominent in Russian trade union organizing. By directive of the director of police he attended the 1912 Bolshevik Congress at Prague. There he made a great impression on Lenin who saw to it that he was elected a member of the party's central committee. Thereupon, Lenin appointed him to the post of No. 1 Bolshevik inside Russia. Malinovsky was thereafter the principal organizer of Pravda and the leader of the Bolshevik faction in the Fourth Duma. His speeches to the latter were occasionally edited by both Lenin and the czarist police director.

Early in 1914, for reasons still obscure, he resigned his seat in the Duma and went abroad. A German prisoner of war, he performed propaganda work in prisoner-of-war camps during 1915–17. Lenin and Krupskaya sent him parcels and propaganda materials to his camp.

Prior to 1918, Lenin furiously defended Malinovsky, then under suspicion by other socialists. After the Bolshevik seizure of power Malinovsky returned to Soviet Russia, patently certain of Lenin's support. Nonetheless, after a party tribunal, he was shot.

Lenin never forsook Malinovsky. It was Stalin who damned him; here Khrushchev supports the Stalinist (as opposed to the Leninist) interpretation; namely, that Malinovsky was an "odious provocateur" in the pay and service of the Okhrana.

[7] It is interesting in this regard to compare Khrushchev's remarks at a Kremlin banquet honoring a Chinese delegation headed by Chou En-lai (Pravda, Jan. 19, 1957): "Basically and in the main may God grant, as they say, that each Communist knew how to fight, as Stalin fought * * * for the interests of the working class, for socialism * * * and against the enemies of Marxism-Leninism."

[8] Khrushchev's economic policies are patterned after Bukharin's theories. Had Khrushchev wanted to avoid re-Stalinization, he could have easily pulled out arguments of the early 1920's, in which Stalin supported Bukharin's comparitively mild economics, particularly as related to the peasant question. By damning Bukharin, Khrushchev supported Stalin's harsh policies of the 1930's, and recondemned the peasantry to provide the capital to pay for Soviet armament. Had he been looking for reform, he would have found the justification in Bukharin's writings.

[9] The term "Okhrana" (Okhranka) is usually used in references to the tsarist department of police in St. Petersburg and its various domestic and foreign offices. It was the first truly modern authoritarian police intelligence system. There was precious little it did not know about the pre-1917 revolutionary operations and personalities in and out of Russia. Professionally competent, yet subject to the pitfall which beset all such organizations, its operational methodology reflected a predilection for subterfuge and the black arts.

[10] Iona Emmanuilovich Yakir was born in 1896 and became a member of the CP in April, 1917. Together with Tukhachevsky, he helped modernize the Red Army. Both were tried (in camera) and executed in 1937.

[11] Iakob Abramovich Zhitomirsky, a physician recruited to intelligence work by the German police while a student in Berlin in 1902, was almost immediately thereafter transferred to the Okhrana as an agent. He, too, occupied an important position in Lenin's organization. Among his specialities was arranging for the despatch of Bolshevik propaganda materials across the Russian frontier from abroad. His operations were conducted in the full knowledge of the Okhrana, which seized most of the propaganda. Last identified as a surgeon with the Franch Army in World War I, Zhitomirsky's fate is unknown.

[12] Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria, a Georgian, was head of the Soviet secret police from 1938 until his arrest and execution in 1953. He was accused inter alia of having been a British intelligence agent since 1919.

[13] Both the syntax and style of Khrushchev's speech markedly resemble Stalin's later pronouncements. This leads to speculation whether one of Stalin's speechwriters drafted the March discourse.

[14] Established on Dec. 20, 1917, 6 weeks after the Bolshevik advent to power, "Vcheka" stood for the All Russian Extraordinary Committee for Combating Counterrevolution, Speculation, and Delinquency in Office.

[15] The "black hundreds" was a relatively small terror gang organized by the Tsarist regime for the purpose of arranging pogroms. Khrushchev knows that they were not representative of the Russian peoples. He did not mention his own personalized "pogrom." In an attempt to find scapegoats for the miserable condition of the Soviet economy, Khrushchev's internal security forces have been busily shooting persons charged with fraud, embezzlement, and theft. The overwhelming majority of those executed have Jewish names. That some 3 percent of the population (the Jews) should have committed more than 50 percent of the economic crimes punishable by death, taxes credulity.

[16] Pravda, Feb. 4, 1960.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an exceedingly fine article entitled "Effects of U.S. Policy of Strangling Cuba," written by Mr. Richard Dudman, and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 21, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 21, 1963]

EFFECTS OF U.S. POLICY OF STRANGLING CUBA

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—After a week of mounting criticism, President Kennedy's policy toward the Castro regime in Cuba remains what it has been for the last 2 years, an effort at slow strangulation and ultimate reliance on internal revolution.

Charges by the exile leader José Miro Cardona that the administration had reneged on promises to liberate Cuba by military means have not been substantiated, officials said.

His 25-page letter, when finally made public, did, however, tell about the mood and hopes of the exiles. It told how the Cuban Revolutionary Council, came under attack for not "making war" on the Castro regime and how it began to fall apart when the hoped for invasion did not materialize.

The exile leader's resignation as president of the council came after months of abuse by the restless exiles concentrated in Miami. They had begun chanting, "Miro, Miro, to the wall," meaning "to the firing squad" and calling members of the council "check swallowers," a reference to their monthly payments from the Central Intelligence Agency.

In Miami bars and cafes frequented by the exiles, juke boxes played the "invasion Cha-Cha," with a line that went, "Mother I didn't come to get a check at the refugee center—I came to get a rifle."

Another record, called "The Last Family," portrayed Fidel Castro seeking asylum in Florida and asking the way to the refugee center, where he could get his $100 a month, free medical care, and special food for the children.

In that atmosphere, it was considered inevitable that Miro Cardona would resign rather than make further pretense of congeniality with the administration. His exile constituency was no longer with him.

Although there is no evidence that the administration promised after the Bay of Pigs

disaster 2 years ago to participate in or finance another invasion, the exiles easily could have assumed there was such a commitment from what Mr. Kennedy told them in the Orange Bowl in Miami last December. Addressing the ransomed prisoners from the unsuccessful invasion, the President said:

"By helping to free you, the United States has been given the opportunity to demonstrate once again that all men who fight for freedom are our brothers, and shall be until your country and others are free.

"I can assure you that it is the strongest wish of the people of this country, as well as the people of this hemisphere, that Cuba shall one day be free again and when it is, this brigade will deserve to march at the head of the free column."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, accused the President of "coloring the facts" by speaking of withdrawals of Soviet personnel from Cuba. KEATING said the number had remained close to 17,000 since mid-November.

But the Senator said that he saw little to be gained "in engaging in any numbers game with regard to Soviet troops in Cuba" and that the problem was the same whether there were 17,000, 14,000, or 20,000 Soviet troops there.

On the main points, KEATING seemed to agree completely with the administration. He said he opposed a blocking or quarantine at this time and always had opposed an invasion. He concurred also with the ban on hit-and-run exile raids from U.S. territory, although he questioned the justice of stopping raids based on Caribbean islands not under U.S. jurisdiction.

Official sources here cite figures to show that the strangulation policy is gradually working. Cuba's gross national product, they say, has dropped about 25 percent below the 1959 level.

Production of sugar, by far the most important single product, is said to be dropping off rapidly because of a shortage of cane cutters, sabotage of mills, burning of cane fields, mismanagement, scanty rainfall, and a shortage of lightweight machetes from England and the United States and substitution of heavier machetes from Communist China.

Production, which used to run as high as 6 million to 7 million tons, was estimated at 4,200,000 last year. For this year, estimates range from 4 million down to 2.5 million tons.

Shoes and clothing came under rationing last February. Most foods already had been rationed since early last year.

Trade with the non-Communist world, about $750 million in 1959, the last normal year, dropped below $100 million last year and is estimated at $50 million to $60 million this year.

Taking its place in part is trade with the Communist bloc, which began on a large scale in mid-1961 at the rate of $350 million a year and has been rising slowly since then.

Despite a Presidential order intended to dissuade non-Communist shipping from calling at Cuba, 54 such ships have stopped there since January 1, the effective date of the order.

The President decreed that no Government-financed cargo may be carried on any ship that has called at Cuba this year. A shipowner may remove this ban from one of his ships only by promising that none of his ships will call there in the future. No owner has yet taken this course.

Of the 54 ships now blacklisted, 17 are British, 15 are Greek, and the rest are scattered among 9 other countries. Most of them are under long-term charter to Communist bloc countries.

In an effort to make matters worse, nightly propaganda broadcasts from Swan Island off the Guatemalan coast, call on Cubans to burn the canefields, to carry matches at all times to be ready for sabotage opportunities, and to slip into offices and telephone booths and take the receivers off the hooks to tie up the communication system.

A special appeal is to smash as many bottles as possible. Beer supplies in Cuba are said to be limited by a shortage of bottles.

The station, which helped signal the Bay of Pigs invasion and was off the air during the October missile crisis, is ostensibly a private operation but widely understood to be financed and run by the CIA.

Officials will make no prediction even privately as to how soon the various strangulation measures may bring about a collapse on rebellion inside Cuba.

Publicly, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said this week the United States did not accept the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba as a normal state of affairs. But he said he would not want to speculate about the date when there might be a return to normality.

Few Cuban exiles seemed to find much comfort in Washington's plans for the eventual overthrow of Castro. As a result of Miro's resignation, the revolutionary council faced a decision on whether to dissolve itself or to try to rebuild with new members. Eight members resigned with Miro, leaving seven.

The council Vice President, Manuel Antonio de Varona, acting as council spokesman, said he hoped to see relations between the exile organization and Washington restored. He is trying to keep the council intact and to bring more exile groups into it.

"Anybody who thinks that he can effectively wage a campaign against Castro without the help of the United States is just daydreaming," he said.

United States City Asks United Nations Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in case anyone has missed the latest man-bites-dog story, here it is as reported editorially on April 16 by the Richmond, Va., News Leader on April 16:

AID TO ANDERSON

The litte town of Anderson, in southwest Missouri, is marching up to the U.N. with its hand out: It wants something like $450,000 from the U.N. Special Fund to build its natural gas system. A joke? No, sir, it isn't.

As a matter of fact, a lot of funny things have been coming out of the U.N. Special Fund lately. The Special Fund stands revealed as the method by which U.S. dollars have been transferred to Cuba for agricultural and educational projects. Recently we praised Representative DURWARD HALL, a Missouri physician, for his fight against the process by which U.S. dollars are sent through the Special Fund to finance atomic energy projects in Yugoslavia. Last week, Dr. HALL further ransacked limited-circulation U.N. documents to turn up a host of U.N. technical assistance projects conferring U.S. dollars on Yugoslavia, Poland, Albania, Cuba, Bulgaria, and even the U.S.S.R. itself. The Red bloc got away with much more money than it contributed; the United States got nothing for its usual 40 percent share—$1.2 million of the $3.1 million in projects for Communist nations next year.

The detailed descriptions and tables that Dr. HALL put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are no joke either. The humanitarian aims of the U.N. appear to be best served by programs in metallurgy, automation, transistors, locomotive design, welding, refrigeration aerial survey, industrial chemistry, meteorology, shipbuilding, and space telecommunications, to name just a few. We are even helping to pay for a "TV Documentary" in Yugoslavia; one hopes that the program will describe the nuclear reactors which our dollars are building for the Yugoslavs.

Some may think that the petition from Anderson, Mo., is in poor taste. But is not Missouri, like Albania, a developing area which has exhausted all help available? The Federal Home and Finance Agency says that no money is available for Anderson in the Federal Public Works program. Where else can Anderson turn?

And there are other American towns which should qualify for U.N. aid, too. For instance, Greencastle and Muncie, Ind., were once thriving producers of zinc sheet. But in the past 10 years, importation of zinc sheet has jumped from practically nothing to 48 percent of domestic production. Half of the imported zinc comes from Yugoslavia, where Communist wages are only an eighth of ours. As long as U.N. technical assistance programs are training Yugoslavian metallurgists and metal technicians with American dollars, it only seems right that Greencastle and Muncie should get U.N. assistance too. Here there is special reason for all deliberate speed: President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act requires him to suspend favorable treatment of Yugoslavian imports, but he has not yet chosen to put the law into effect.

It strikes us, then, that Anderson can make out a pretty good case for U.N. aid, with no reason to snicker.

P.S. Anderson is in Dr. Hall's home district.

Representative Blatnik Urges Restoration of Construction Grant Funds for Sewage Treatment Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the author of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 and the Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1961:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN A. BLATNIK, OF MINNESOTA

I was deeply disturbed to learn that the Appropriations Committee cut the President's request for $100 million for the water pollution control program to only $90 million. I believe that this action was not only a serious blow to the program but raises

problems which go far beyond the actual dollar amount involved.

If the House of Representatives reduces the level of expenditures authorized in 1961 for construction of waste treatment facilities by the $10 million as recommended in H.R. 5888 by the Appropriations Committee, it will in effect:

1. Fail to meet the objectives set by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 to underwrite a maximum Federal effort to solve the water pollution problem;

2. Deny the economy some $60 million worth of badly needed construction activity; and

3. Reduce also by some $60 million the practical effectiveness of the public works acceleration program for which the House overwhelmingly approved $450 million within the last 2 weeks.

If the Congress acquieses to the Appropriations Committee recommendation to deny the additional $10 million in construction funds authorized by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 it will be breaking the pledge it made in that year to support a maximum Federal effort to clean up the Nation's growing water pollution problem.

The effect of denying additional $10 million authorized by the Congress in 1961 is that an additional $60 million worth of badly needed sewerage construction activity will not take place, and the very substantial amount of employment activity that this expenditure would involve this year will be lost. This is true in that the ratio of local to Federal dollars invested in this program has been about 5 to 1.

The House less than 2 weeks ago approved an additional $450 million for accelerated public works activities. This program was overwhelmingly approved because the Members recognized its tremendous importance as a stimulant to employment in those areas of the Nation where economic activity has lagged. The House, if it sustains the denial of these funds for the construction of waste treatment plants, will, in effect, be reducing the $450 million APW apropriation something in excess of $30 million. Those Members who support the accelerated public works program will remember that the funds authorized under that program were to be used, not as a substitute for local money or Federal money already authorized, but were to be in addition to programs planned for and funded by the governments involved.

Indeed, the whole objective of the program is to stimulate State and local governments to raise new funds over and above what they had planned to spend by providing Federal matching grants so as to stimulate employment and to provide badly needed public facilities at the State and local level.

If the House approves this reduction in the authorization for grants for waste treatment plant construction, the principle of the public works program will have been violated and precedence set to cut back on other Federal programs involving construction activities. Such cuts can only result in the complete loss of the stimulatory effect of the public works acceleration program on employment.

Through the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 we finally succeeded in getting Congress to approve of construction activity which we needed 10 years ago and which we will finally achieve this year if we can move the program in accordance with the request of the President. For the House to acquiesce to the reduction proposed by the Appropriations Committee would be a serious setback to the program and will mean that many of the Nation's communities will be forced to curtail and delay actions long overdue to clean up serious pollution problems.

The applications already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. Following is a list of these pending applications for the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

ALABAMA

Municipality:	Grant request
Opelika	$250,000
Talladega	105,000
Tuskegee	90,000
Alexander City	103,350
Berry	7,500
Childersburg	60,000
Fayette	36,000
Jackson	60,000
Springville	30,000
Sylacauga	150,000
Elba	73,170
Jefferson County (Leeds)	90,000
Jefferson County (Tarrant)	180,000
Newton	24,000
Sulligent	15,000
Vernon	12,000
York	58,500
Bayou La Batre	22,500
Boaz	151,530
Brewton	132,000
Chickasaw	161,100
Clayton	32,700
Collinsville	12,000
Columbia	6,000
Columbiana	14,190
East Brewton	9,600
Fultondale	12,000
Hamilton	24,000
Leeds	52,500
Leighton	21,000
Luverne	24,000
Mobile	180,000
Mobile	250,000
Muscle Shoals	120,000
Oakman	9,000
Prichard	135,000
Parrish	15,000
Samson	16,500
Thomasville	13,500
Warrior	34,500
Butler	60,690
Foley	61,500
Gordo	19,260
Trussville	36,000

ALASKA

Seldovia	63,900
Nordale School (Fairbanks)	18,240
University Park School (Fairbanks)	19,020

ARIZONA

Gilbert	4,290
Scottsdale	403,560
Mesa	183,680
Tempe	176,620
Scottsdale	223,680
Glendale	60,000
Tolleson	20,000
Peoria	20,000
Phoenix-Scottsdale	703,560
Payson	30,000
Wickenburg	15,000
Tombstone	37,500
Snowflake	45,000
Sierra Vista	30,000
Safford	7,500
Phoenix-Mesa	360,000
Gila Bend	75,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

ARKANSAS

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Amity	$10,000
Beebe	20,000
Bardling	10,000
Bradley	15,000
Bryant	18,000
Cabot	12,000
Cotter	12,000
Dyess	20,000
Earle	20,000
Gentry	250,000
Gurdon	12,000
Fort Smith	250,000
Fort Smith	180,000
Fort Smith	250,000
Fort Smith	250,000
Hampton	10,000
Hughes	15,000
Joiner	22,000
Keiser	8,400
Leachville	15,000
Lepanto	13,500
Lewisville	13,500
Lincoln	9,000
Lockesburg	10,000
Lonoke	25,000
Mammoth Springs	30,000
Mansfield	30,000
Marked Tree	20,000
McNeil	10,000
Mountain View	25,000
Mountain Pine	25,000
Mulberry	19,200
Nashville	18,000
Newport	30,000
Norphlet	20,000
Paragould	138,000
Paris	20,000
Portland	10,000
Prairie Grove	12,000
Prescott	41,000
Rector	20,000
Rison	10,000
Russellville	200,000
Salem	15,000
Star City	13,500
Tuckerman	9,000
Waldo	13,500
West Memphis	122,000
Wilmar	20,000
Wilson	15,000
Yellville	20,000

CALIFORNIA

Capitola	101,430
City of Gridley	191,250
City of Riverbank	149,170
City of Needles	168,000
Tuolumne County	79,800
Buena	250,000
City of Red Bluff	250,000
City of Tracy	250,000
City of Jackson	72,000
American Canyon County	80,070
San Simeon Acres	35,250
East Cliff	40,350
June Lake	58,560
Snelling	12,000
Springville	29,980
Denair	28,500
City of Folsom	66,420
Cambria County	146,050
Pinedale County	60,000
City of Stockton, South	172,200
San Juan Capistrano	28,020
Callinas Village	28,560
San Buenaventura, Ventura R. Int.	78,300
City of Auburn	105,600
West Sacremento	42,000
City of Oxnard	250,000
San Buenaventura, Ol. Br. Int.	175,740
San Rafael	164,000
City of Los Angeles, Hyperion	127,470

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

CALIFORNIA—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
City of Los Angeles, Terminal Island	$149,340
City of Ceres	74,040
City of Millbrae	43,330
City of Burbank	195,000
Marina County	111,720
City of Farmersville	46,770
San Pablo	78,450
City and county of San Francisco	250,000
Northeast Sacramento County	250,000
San Francisco Port, piers 27–33	45,820
San Francisco Port, pier 45	29,460
San Francisco Port, piers 19–23	21,110
Goleta	82,130
Meiners Oaks	62,960
City of Kingsburg	28,950
Hagginwood	132,000
City of Oroville	29,100
Sacramento County Sanitary District No. 2	149,550
Sacramento County Sanitary District No. 6	250,000
City of Mendota	7,440

COLORADO

Cortez	239,100
Glenwood Springs	27,000
Mead	9,000
Idaho Springs	9,000
Georgetown	7,500
Eagle	15,000
Lafayette	27,000
Louisville	9,000
Rifle	14,990
Hugo	6,000
Eads	6,000
East Lake	6,000
Fruitdale	18,000
East Canon	6,000
Blende	6,000
Trinidad	30,000
Fruita	18,000
Leadville	18,000
Walsenburg	18,000
La Veta	9,000
Rye	7,500
Cheyenne Wells	9,000
Denver Metropolitan Sewer Authority	1,889,697
Padnia	9,000
Hotchkiss	9,000
Olathe	9,000
Boulder, Sanitary District	30,000
Steamboat Springs	105,000
Greeley	300,000
Swink	9,000
Las Animas	6,000
Gregory Gulch	18,000
Arvada	24,533
Denver Metropolitan	510,303

CONNECTICUT

Groton	600,000
Groton	90,000
University of Connecticut	240,000
Seymour	250,000
Stonington	250,000
Manchester	250,000
New Hartford	100,000
Middletown	180,000
North Haven	600,000
Plainville	150,000
Stratford	103,500
Washington Depot	90,000
East Haven	150,000
East Haven	85,000
Hamden	600,000
Milford	300,000
Woodbridge	101,000

DELAWARE

Townsend	30,000
Millsboro	41,700

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Maine Avenue interceptor	$75,000
Chesapeake Street outfall	600,000
Upper Potomac interceptor	600,000
Upper Potomac interceptor	600,000
East Side interceptor	600.000
Rock Creek interceptor	483,000

FLORIDA

Sebring	213,480
Key Colony Beach	52,700
Indian Rocks Beach	175,200
McKay Creek Sanitary District	250,000
Oldsmar	32,745
Daytona Beach	250,000
Lakeland	144,000
Duval County Sanitary Sewer District 1	53,453
Hollywood	174,111

GEORGIA[1]

Macon	441,610
Barnesville	10,487

HAWAII

Kaneohe Bay-south interceptor sewer, sec. 2	231,000
Eulioupu SPS and FM	52,500
Wahiawa interceptor sewer, sec. 3	46,500
East Loch interceptor sewer, secs. 1 and 2	186,000
Weianae STP, unit 1 and outfall sewer	450,000
Eulioupu interceptor sewer	180,000
Kaneohe Bay-south interceptor sewer, sec. 3	198,000
Waimalu SPS and FM	160,000
Makaha interceptor sewer, sec. 1	105,000
East Loch interceptor sewer, sec. 3	218,000
Mailiili SPS and FM	70,000
Wahiawa interceptor sewer, sec. 4	60,000
Halawa SPS and FM	106,000
Manakuli interceptor sewer, sec. 1	105,000
Makaha interceptor sewer, sec. 2	105,000
East Loch interceptor sewer, sec. 4	128,000
Nanakuli interceptor sewer, sec. 2	105,000
Wahiawa STP, model 3	115,000
Eihapai-Kainui Drive interceptor sewer, sec. 1	250,000
Ewa Beach STP, unit 1 and outfall sewer	300,000
Honolulu	87,000
Honolulu	78,900

IDAHO

Fairfield	14,922
Shoshone	51,896
Ririe	25,758
Meridian	9,429
Hansen	51,000
Homedale	22,500
Ketchum	75,000
Fruitland	15,000
Kellogg	150,600
McCall	49,200
Mountain Home	36,000
Kendrick	18,000
Firth	9,000
Shoshone County Sanitary District	600,000
Emmitt	60,000

ILLINOIS

Paxton	183,000
Richton Park	84,950
Deer Creek	20,000

[1] Listing incomplete.

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

ILLINOIS—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Walnut	$52,533
Sterling	587,700
Plano	51,000
Nelson	12,900
Granville	54,200
Creve Coeur Sanitary District (Tazewell County)	404,770
Belleville	151,950
Peoria Sanitary District	784,000
Olney	304,000
Wood River Township Sanitary District	229,528
Bloomington-Normal	600,000
Port Bryan	60,600
Alton Interceptor	100,000
Manhattan	48,360
Swansea	153,397
Pittsfield	34,800
Maple Park	22,491
Cherry Valley	21,750
Hoyleton	10,100
Tremont	24,000
Macomb	96,000
Pocahontas	33,000
Clayton	23,400
Dakota	12,500
Fairview	10,410
Hinckley	48,223
LeRoy	53,200
Lisle	122,100
Malta	40,704
Monito	28,000
Moweaqua	46,620
Pawnee	33,000
Granite City	600,000
Madison	72,000
Venice	57,000
Brooklyn	21,000
Fairmont City	31,500
Washington Park	69,000
Rosemont	10,500
Caseyville	25,400
East St. Louis	600,000
Monsanto	600,000
Cahokia	168,000
Alorton	34,500
Centreville	142,500
Edwardsville	350,000
Collinsville	350,000
Trenton	28,000
Christopher	37,500
Eldorado	70,400
Prairie du Rocher	10,000
Keyesport	7,000
West Frankfort	100,000
Marissa	37,500
Livingston	15,000
Arcola	54,000
Atwood	33,000
Champaign-Urbana	250,000
Tolona	30,000
Coal City	48,000
Carpentersville	60,000
Braidwood	25,500
Harvard	40,500
West Dundee	24,000
Fox River Grove	18,000
Oswego	18,000
Mendota	105,000
East Side Levee and Sanitary District	600,000
Cordova	60,000
Warren	30,000
Lanark	30,000
Moline	600,000
Dunlap	6,000
Aquawka	20,250
Viola	30,000
Brighton	25,000
Alpha	20,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

INDIANA

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Whiteland	$60,237
Shirley	21,300
Mount Auburn	6,600
Milton	22,500
Kentland	60,000
Lynn	40,000
Oldenburg	20,000
Plymouth	200,000
Ridgeville	60,000
Pendleton	26,229
Columbus	26,400
Ashley	23,130
Westfield	66,900
Elwood	230,000
Dyer	246,000
Cloversdale	23,820
Bloomfield	34,200
Denville	95,700
Richmond	250,000
Clermont	61,800
Westport	31,248
Crothersville	32,000
Upland	52,800
Linton	194,400
Syracuse	78,000
Greenfield	250,000
Hebron	52,000
Haubstadt	77,900
Frankton	45,350
Markleville	40,293
Cambridge City	96,300

IOWA

Mapleton	37,800
Urbandale Windsor Heights Sanitary District	150,000
New Virginia Sanitary District	9,000
Evansdale	147,000
Geneva	7,350
Denver	15,000
Iowa City	60,000
Osage	60,000
Danbury	16,800
Waucoma	12,000
Agency	11,775
Carroll	84,000
Centerville	85,500
Chillicothe	2,649
Coralville	61,500
Dumont	13,117
Edgewood	33,548
Ely	17,112
Fairbank	28,041
Fostoria	8,160
George	11,604
Hills	27,094
Lone Tree	19,566
Macedonia	6,950
Mount Pleasant	74,986
Meola	6,760
New Hartford	17,682
Oskaloosa	46,300
Palo	19,210
Riceville	26,100
Roland	10,800
Sheffield	42,997
Shelsburg	21,375
Spillville	13,321
Strawberry Point	37,710
Underwood	11,670
Walker	22,275
Whiting	20,535
Charles City	180,000
Halbur	6,300
Humeston	16,800
Keosauqua	19,500
LeHigh	21,000
Ollie	7,350
Storm Lake	150,000
Floyd	10,500
Exira	27,000
Fort Madison	600,000
Morning Sun	23,100
Kirkville	5,250
Logan	37,800

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

IOWA—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Denison	$210,000
Rock Valley	23,000
Blencoe	7,350
Jesup	30,000
Lawton	5,400
Madrid	36,000
Corning	30,000
Altoona	30,000

List of Pending Applications for Municipal Waste Treatment Works Construction Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the applications for construction grants for waste treatment works already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a list of these pending applications for the States of Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, and New York:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

KANSAS

Municipality:	Grant request
Milford	$12,000
Wakeeny	45,000
Shawnee	60,000
Longford	8,000
Projects not identified (14)	425,300

KENTUCKY

Kentucky State, Danville	52,516
Kentucky State Penitentiary	66,780
Lexington	250,000
Russell	18,870
Louisville	250,000
Marion	64,400
Cumberland	87,000
Maysville	250,000
Harlan	183,000
Shelbyville	60,000
Winchester	90,000
Carlisle	39,600
Falmouth	45,000
Catlettsburg	180,000
Olive Hill	60,000
Grayson	50,000
Millersburg	45,000
Clinton	45,000
Silver Grove	30,000
Irvington	21,000
Shepherdsville	21,000
Irvine and Ravenna	66,000
Jenkins	160,000
Greenup	30,000
Hartford	30,000
Hickman	30,000
Jackson	30,000
Livermore	30,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

KENTUCKY—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Uniontown	$30,000
Russellville	45,000
Albany	95,000
Nicholasville	30,000
Stanford	30,000
Springfield	30,000
New Castle	21,000
Benton	30,000
Loyall	30,000
Clay	30,000
Manchester	30,000
Martin	30,000
Hawesville	30,000
Beaver Dam	30,000
Sturgis	45,000
Tompkinsville	30,000
Lancaster	30,000
Somerset	75,000
Sebree	45,000
Northern Kentucky S.D.	250,000
Earlington	30,000
Cadiz	67,310
Pineville	152,500

LOUISIANA

Westwego	208,689
Basile	41,137
Baldwin	43,996
Cameron	77,200
Gramercy	57,570
Kenner	225,000
Jefferson Sanitary District No. 1	250,000
Baton Rouge	250,000
Caddo Sanitary District No. 1	183,891
St. James	166,635
Maringouin	17,000
Youngsville	18,750
Vidalia	85,710
Baton Rouge	200,000
Jefferson No. 8	600,000
Caddo Sanitary District No. 1	225,000
Caddo Sanitary District No. 3	40,000
Denham Springs	150,000
Des Allemands	24,000
Destrehan	41,000
Elton	60,000
Garyville	169,000
Hahnville	46,000
Iowa	30,000
Jefferson Sanitary District No. 5	250,000
Jefferson-West Bank	250,000
Jennings	250,000
Jennings	60,000
Kinder	60,000
Lake Charles	250,000
Lake Charles No. 1	200,000
Leonville	20,000
LaPlace	244,000
Logansport	100,000
Lower St. Bernard	170,000
Luling-Mimosa-Lone Star	57,000
Mamou	100,000
Marrero	200,000
New Sarpy	24,000
Nine Mile Point	200,000
Opelousas	30,000
Paradis	13,000
Pleasant Hill	30,000
Plaquemine	250,000
Rapides Parish Sanitary District	
Roseland	250,000
No. 1	55,000
Sterlington	25,000
Sunset	100,000
West Monroe	250,000
Slidell	238,735
Gramercy	79,251

MAINE

Saco	600,000
Old Orchard Beach	40,665
Biddeford	486,600
Yarmouth	269,700

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

MAINE—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Thomaston	$105,000
Wilton	48,000
Norway, South Paris	232,860
Rockland	420,000
Augusta	150,000

MARYLAND

Denton	112,125
Baltimore County, Minebank Run	200,000
Howard County, Elkridge	44,500
Howard County, Ellicott City	200,000
Howard County, Patuxent	125,000
Frostburg	200,000
Halfway	150,000
Hampstead	20,000
La Vale	137,500
Manchester	21,000
New Windsor	17,000
North East	50,000
Ocean City	150,000
Preston	30,000
Severna Park	250,000
Sykesville	30,000

MASSACHUSETTS

Ashland	80,000
Westfield	227,100
Metropolitan District Commission (Wellsley sewer extension)	2,400,000
Metropolitan District Commission (Arlington interceptor)	600,000
West Springfield	240,000
Whitman	300,000
Rockland	225,000
Millbury	180,000
Brookfield	60,000
Metropolitan District Commission (North Charles interceptor)	300,000
Franklin	45,000

MICHIGAN

Lathrup Village	159,000
Dexter	30,000
Houghton	379,955
Hancock	307,901
Cedar Springs	36,750
Ypsilanti Township	360,000
Ionia	198,000
Constantine	69,000
Shepherd	48,000
Genesee County Sanitary District No. 2	490,350
Romeo	72,000
Trenton	250,000
Oscoda Township	62,400
Morrice	24,450
Perry	40,200
Saugatuck	7,800
Lake Odessa	27,000
Union City	24,462
Linden	68,400
Twelve Towns Drainage Board	196,251
Wayne County DPW north line	233,400
Road Interceptor, Wayne County DPW down river project	2,400,000
Walker Township	165,000
Charlevoix	27,048
Zeeland	78,000
Lowell	75,000
Edmore	69,000
Newaygo	36,000
Nashville	34,200
Berrien Springs	40,500
Wayland	51,000
Lakeview	19,800
Ishpeming	207,000
Lansing	250,000
Kalmazoo	104,264
Sturgis	193,650
Fenton Township	478,000
Ottawa County	13,500
De Witt	51,090
Grandville	250,000
Scottville	41,700
Wayne County	2,400,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

MINNESOTA

Glenwood	$81,167
Cannon Falls	157,500
Norwood	104,460
Lyle	22,470
Winnebago	45,867
Upsala	15,390
Bayport	92,100
Blue Earth	190,137
Mound-Spring Park	290,000
Lake St. Croix Beach	29,232
Hutchinson	160,500
Longville	7,732
Worthington	250,000
Excelsior	86,100
Fosston	51,460
Elmore	49,859
Graceville	11,312
Blue Earth	190,137
Eden Valley	29,657
Long Lake	77,070
Janesville	45,173
Ivanhoe	21,296
Cologne	38,562
Dennison	16,560
Stewartville	22,500
Hills	20,973
Eagle Lake	18,232

MISSISSIPPI

Ackerman	5,250
Amory	52,500
Bay Springs	42,000
Bruce	17,750
Clarksdale	90,000
Collins	10,500
Drew	21,000
Greenwood	300,000
Grenada	76,000
Kilmichael	7,500
Lexington	31,500
Winona	42,000
Harrison County, 115	471,555
Harrison County, 117	80,553
Harrison County, 118	84,800
Jackson	526,980
Cleveland	55,200
Isola	22,000

MISSOURI

St. Joseph (Whitehead pump station)	337,500
St. Joseph interceptor	580,500
St. Joseph (Brown's Branch)	69,000
St. Joseph (Lagoon)	36,600
St. Joseph (Lagoon)	16,500
St. Joseph	17,400
St. Joseph	17,100
Scott City	10,260
Seneca	13,410
Springfield	62,700
Valley Park	81,150
Webb City	90,008
Kansas City Municipal Airport	59,400
Kansas City	250,000
Kansas City (pump station and force mains)	250,000
Kansas City	393,000
Kingsville	8,412
Lake Lotawana	50,000
Lathrop	12,551
Liberty	75,180
Mattese sanitary sewer district	51,800
M.S.D., River des Peres	178,200
M.S.D., sec. I	187,156
M.S.D., sec. II	218,235
M.S.D., sec. III	250,000
M.S.D., sec. VI	180,000
Mexico	188,611
Monett	80,340
North Kansas City	198,300
Pevely	9,119
Platte County sanitary district	37,300
St. Charles	309,355
St. Charles	67,200
St. Joseph	600,000

MONTANA

Scobey	19,500
Froid	12,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

MONTANA—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Saco	$21,000
Wibou	15,000
Superior	45,000
Thompson Falls	45,000
Fairview	15,000
Terry	15,000
Ekalaka	6,000
Helena	60,000

NEBRASKA

Columbus	99,000
Gering	48,000
Terrytown	45,000
Beaver Crossing	7,200
South Sioux City	50,400
Valentine	32,400
Pender	17,640
Gothenburg	36,000
Auburn	46,800
Wahoo	72,000
Tecumseh	39,600
Falls City	144,000
Ainsworth	36,600
Fremont	180,000
Papillion	28,800
North Platte	182,000
Syracuse	23,400
Neligh	36,000
O'Neill	72,000

NEVADA

Clark County Sanitation District No. 1	135,300
Clark County Sanitation District No. 1	250,000
Carson City	130,000
Eureka	3,000
Minden-Gardnerville	150,000
Sparks	250,000
Winnemucca	5,000

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Portsmouth	108,270
Laconia	423,000
Ashland	156,000
Claremont	250,000
Dover	250,000
Exeter	507,300
Lincoln	300,000
Rochester	300,000
Somersworth	300,000
Colebrook	75,000
Newport	300,000
Concord	600,000
Conway	168,000
Farmington	30,000
Hudson	600,000
Manchester	600,000
Lancaster	103,500
Boscowen	35,400
Hillsborough County	360,000
Northumberland	90,000
Epping	135,000
Peterborough	69,000
Durham	30,000
New Hampton	150,000
Bristol	225,000

NEW JERSEY

Ewing-Lawrence	543,000
Deptford Town	73,000
West Wildwood	18,840
Sayreville	150,000
North Arlington, Lindhurst	4,500
Scotch Plains	75,000
Medford Town	10,000
Newark	270,000
Madison	120,000
Landis Town	37,500
Union Beach	120,000
Absecon	250,000
Lincoln Park	378,600
Hackettstown	100,000
Little Silver	105,000
Plumstpead Town	48,000
Weymouth Town	18,000
Jersey City	600,000
Allentown	250,000
Dover Town	71,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

NEW MEXICO

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Anapra	$1,800
Roswell	7,791
Seboyeta	6,036
Mesilla	35,622
Alamogordo	90,000
Albuquerque	347,036
Artesia	9,000
Carlsbad	75,000
Cimarron	12,850
Clayton	15,000
Elida	22,500
Grants	22,500
Hagerman	15,000
Loving	7,500
Not identified	36,000
Springer Boys School	9,900
Thoreau	5,427

NEW YORK

Holcomb	80,730
Watkins Glen	17,199
Rockland County Sewer Agency	2,400,000
Mamaroneck, West Chester County	1,500,000
Union-Vestal	726,000
Hilton	42,900
Glen Cove	24,000
Salamanca	481,800
Audorn	150,000
Avon	32,700
Norfolk Town	43,300
Village of Hilton	42,900
Village of Cayuga	76,000
Tenfield Town (Sanitary District No. 3)	169,200
New York City (Wards Island)	600,000
John City Village	600,000
Keesville Village	194,500
Tenfield Town	34,500
Newark Village	91,300
City of Jamestown	288,000
Ithaca	34,200
New York City (Hillcrest Center)	45,000

List of Pending Applications for Municipal Waste Treatment Works Construction Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the applications for construction grants for waste treatment works already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. I am inserting in the RECORD a list of these pending applications for the States of North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Tennessee:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

NORTH CAROLINA

Municipality:	Grant request
Apex	$51,000
Canton	136,950
Clarkton	12,518
Concord (westside outfall)	216,204
Creedmoor	26,178
Davidson	33,000
Elizabethtown	41,700
Goldsboro	250,000
Granite Quarry	52,200
Greensboro (N. Buffalo plant)	60,000
Hazelwood	83,775
High Point (eastside plant, etc.)	250,000
Liberty	12,600
Monroe	250,000
Plymouth	165,720
Robbins	177,900
Spindale	249,032
Spruce Pine	129,780
Waynesville	250,000
West Jefferson	45,600
Wingate	56,000
Winton	9,360
Carolina Beach	39,000
Cary	168,000
Cordova	12,000
Mebane	150,000
Southern Pines	30,000
Southport	27,000
Trenton	4,000
Winterville	18,000
Zebulon	47,000
Burgaw	15,000
Burlington	250,000
Burnsville	40,000
Candor	25,000
Carthage	20,000
Charlotte	250,000
Colerain	5,000
Hot Springs	10,000
Lowell	30,000
Marshall	15,000
Randleman	64,000
Roanoke Rapids	250,000
Roseboro	16,000
Roxboro	210,000
Salemburg	6,000
Wilmington	250,000
Wrightsville Beach	20,000
Angier	40,000
Asheville	600,000
Beaufort	75,000
Belhaven	70,000
Benson	65,000
Boiling Springs	30,000
Bonnie Doone	50,000
Clyde	20,000
Cramerton	140,000
Draper Sanitary District	165,000
Dunn	72,000
Gastonia	250,000
Hertford	50,000
Kinston	250,000
Kure Beach	12,000
Leaksville-Spray	500,000
Marion	150,000
Marshville	18,000
Morehead City	130,000
Scotland Neck	75,000
Warsaw	35,000
Wendell	48,000
Belmont	250,000
Bethel	30,000
Cornelius	40,000
Cumberland	10,000
Durham	250,000
Erwin	105,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Fair Bluff	$30,000
Fairmont	40,000
Hookerton	5,000
Lincolnton	200,000
Manteo	15,000
Nashville	30,000
Newton	170,000
Pineville	45,000
Richlands	20,000
Rose Hill	21,000
Snow Hill	12,000
St. Pauls	22,000
Stanley	22,000
Sylva	10,000
Valdese	165,000
Waxhaw	15,000
Andrews	25,000
Beulaville	25,000
Bryson City	60,000
Buies Creek	10,000
Cliffside	80,000
Columbia	12,000
Columbus	25,000
Conover	50,000
Elm City	15,000
Enfield	38,000
Franklinton	40,000
Highlands	80,000
Kings Mountain	205,000
Lenoir	200,000
Norlina	25,000
Pisgah Forest	15,000
Robbinsville	10,000
Saluda	10,000
Shelby	250,000
Warrenton	40,000
Aberdeen	40,000
Acme	10,000
Alexander Mills	20,000
Bladenboro	35,000
Boone	150,000
Brevard	35,000
Chadbourn	55,000
Charlotte	600,000
Elizabeth City	250,000
Franklin	100,000
Hayesville	7,000
Jefferson	20,000
Lake Lure	60,000
Landis	40,000
Laurinburg	100,000
Lumberton	250,000
Maxton	30,000
Murphy	65,000
Raleigh	250,000
Sparta	20,000
Tryson	30,000
Whiteville	12,000

NORTH DAKOTA

Bismarck	250,000
Drayton	12,000
Fairmont	7,500
Harvey	18,000
Kerenare	12,000
LaMoure	12,000
Mandan	90,000
Portel	5,400
Powers Lake	9,000
Regent	6,000
Tioga	15,000
Towner	12,000
Velva	15,000

OHIO

Aberdeen	28,350
Belpre	159,000
Brook Park	180,000
Columbiana	150,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

OHIO—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Columbus	$600,000
Fairfield	600,000
Genoa	100,000
Green Springs	28,200
Hebron	50,000
Lakewood	600,000
Loveland	186,000
Maple Heights	250,000
Milan	20,700
Napoleon	68,700
New Albany	42,414
Pataskala	41,980
Paulding	100,000
Plymouth	95,000
Pomeroy	81,165
Quaker City	29,310
Reynoldsburg	120,000
Sylvania	150,000
Union City	30,000
Wadsworth	100,000
Warsaw	40,000
Wauseon	50,000
Woodsfield	52,200
OKLAHOMA	
Harrah	14,171
Adair	12,000
Pryor	78,500
Eufaula	70,500
Inola	11,779
Duncan	167,271
Butler	5,850
Oakland	5,136
Cleveland	77,955
Gage	4,912
Idabel	7,205
Apache	20,467
McAlester	233,405
Hollister	6,900
Freedom	10,786
Catoosa	39,058
Longdale	14,336
Ames	10,936
Hitchcock	9,803
Gould	9,962
Sterling	3,600
Del City	107,307
Snyder	42,573
Norman	414,000
Verden	5,640
Stigler	69,100
Duncan	248,625
Afton	45,000
Atoka	22,500
Alva	24,000
Barnsdall	7,500
Bixby	7,500
Bethany-Warr Acres	30,000
Bokchita	37,500
Boley	24,000
Butler	21,000
Cement	6,000
Cordell	12,000
Crescent	10,500
Durant	18,000
Dustin	30,000
Edmond	15,000
Fairview	12,000
Foss	18,000
Geronimo	7,500
Guthrie	15,000
Holdenville	18,000
Hooker	3,000
Keota	37,500
Keyes	6,000
Laverne	12,000
Marshall	7,500
McAlester	247,500
McCloud	3,500
Midwest City	37,500
Morrison	22,500
Mountain Park	15,000
Mulhall	7,500
Nash	18,000
Newkirk	7,500
Nicona Park	15,000
Okay	30,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

OKLAHOMA—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Okemah	$12,000
Okmulgee	19,500
Orlando	13,500
Paden	30,000
Perry	7,500
Ponca City	30,000
Prague	24,000
Ringling	7,500
Ryan	7,500
Stilwell	9,000
Sulphur	75,000
Tishomingo	18,000
Wetumka	12,000
Wheatland	10,500
Yale	24,000
Wilson	20,000
OREGON	
Bandon	41,700
Brookings	7,570
Brownsville	58,200
Corvallis	62,100
Eastside	48,000
Eugene	421,920
Gold Beach	32,620
Manhattan Sanitary District	20,310
Metzger Sanitary District	201,000
Multnomah County	63,220
Portland	250,000
St. Helens	28,000
Salem	600,000
Sunset Valley	61,750
Tigard	36,670
White City	35,340
Woodburn	66,600
Pentleton	6,300
Aloha Sanitary District	210,000
Arlington	15,000
Echo	9,600
Forest Grove	75,000
Maplewood	63,220
Oakland	30,000
PENNSYLVANIA	
Monroeville	132,210
Spring Town	34,265
Elizabethtown	83,550
Philadelphia	250,000
Spring Town—No. 1 plant	97,788
Cumru Town	64,077
Highland Sewer and Water Authority	94,520
Turtle Creek	19,273
Colebrookdale Town	137,253
Churchill Borough	6,947
Marysville	127,560
Hamburg	194,048
Hempfield	250,000
Youngwood	84,731
Zelienople	22,650
Warminster	168,480
Wilkins Town	71,368
Canonsburg-Houston Authority	250,000
Philadelphia	250,000
Mt. Pleasant	135,000
Smithtown	18,900
West Newton	44,700
Hastings	49,800
Patton	69,000
Alexandria	14,100
Mapleton	17,400
Orbisonia	27,900
Smithfield Town	38,100
Port Royal	17,400
Kistler	10,500
Lower Alsace Town	73,800
St. Clair	61,500
Hazleton Area	600,000
Freeland	120,000
Duryea	[1] 210,000
Dupont	-------
Avoca	-------
Old Forge	-------
Moosic	-------

[1] Includes grants for Dupont, Avoca, Old Forge, Moosic.

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

PENNSYLVANIA—con.

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Taylor	[2] $600,000
Scranton	---------
Dunmore	---------
Johnsonburg	108,900
Hughesville	40,500
Kane	123,900
Couder Port	100,500
Shinglehouse	41,100
Mansfield	83,400
Foxburg	18,300
Moon Town	270,000
Leet Town	43,800
Liberty	88,200
Washington Town	503,100
Brownsville	111,900
Dawson	20,400
Fayette City	35,100
Point Marion	44,700
Vanderbilt	43,200
Greensboro	20,400
Confluence	24,300
Monongahela	121,500
Cannonsburg	206,100
Dunlevy	15,600
New Eagle	62,100
Hempfield Town	168,000
Greensburg	324,300
RHODE ISLAND	
Bristol	24,000
Cranston interceptor	420,000
South Kingston	600,000
Smithfield	210,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Columbia	240,000
North Charleston	90,000
Kershaw	15,000
Blacksburg	15,000
Holly Hill	3,000
McColl	10,000
Columbia	1,000,000
Jefferson	9,000
St. Matthews	28,400
Bishopville	118,600
Hardeeville	40,500
Wagener	36,500
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Alcester	6,000
Alexandria	6,000
Andover	3,000
Ashton	1,500
Canistota	6,000
Clear Lake	3,000
DeSmet	15,000
Freeman	9,000
Gayville	3,000
Hudson	3,000
Lake Norden	9,000
Marion	9,000
St. Lawrence	1,500
Salem	9,000
Timber Lake	6,000
Tripp	6,000
Tyndall	9,000
Viborg	6,000
Welsey	3,000
TENNESSEE	
Cleveland	250,000
Jackson	600,000
Oliver Springs	61,286
Humboldt	229,752
Obion	56,109
Pikeville	34,050
Centerville	88,500
Bemis	96,300
Somerville	49,980
Monteagle	20,700
Hohanwald	57,900
Henderson	69,000
Halls	33,000
Greenfield	28,000
Collierville	34,500
Ridgely	51,252
Dandridge	16,500

[2] Includes grants for Scranton and Dunmore.

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

TENNESSEE—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Knoxville	$250,000
Bristol	30,000
Knox County	250,000
Lexington	193,500
Jefferson City	69,900
Savannah	180,000
Copperhill	36,000
Jellico	78,000
Trenton	76,500
Jamestown	31,800
Erin	120,000
Tiptonville	56,700
Memphis	250,000
Loudon	186,450
Jacksboro	19,500
Cumberland Gap	24,000
Oak Ridge	25,488
Greenville	30,000
Tazewell	84,900
North Tazewell	30,000
Alexandria	30,000
Nashville	250,000
Kingsport	250,000
Troy	30,000
White Pine	45,000
Murfreesboro	109,500
South Jackson Utility District	125,000
Chapel Hill	27,000
New Providence	120,900

List of Pending Applications for Municipal Waste Treatment Works Construction Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the applications for construction grants for waste treatment works already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. I am inserting in the RECORD a list of these pending applications for the States of Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and Puerto Rico:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

TEXAS

Municipality:	Grant request
Abilene	$250,000
Jefferson	24,000
S. Jefferson Co	250,000
Celeste	8,400
Deer Park	97,800
Clarksville	58,283
Sampson Park	57,261
Rhome	10,905
Wharton	15,098
Anahauc	132,000
Amarillo	246,231
Strawn	14,682
Teague	24,720
Beverly	15,600
Lubbock	249,619

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

TEXAS—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
New Braunfels	$116,265
Texas City	289,500
Silsbee	92,143
Groves	86,340
Alice	180,000
Amarillo	300,000
Anahuac	19,800
Aransas Pass	91,800
Archer City	21,600
Arlington	54,000
Bay Cliff (Gal Co)	30,000
Bellaire	111,000
Boyd	6,000
Breckenridge	70,500
Carrollton	18,300
Castroville	15,000
Clyde	9,000
Coleman	69,000
Colorado City	73,800
Cuero	84,000
Calhart	64,800
Daingerfield	30,000
Denver City	37,500
El Paso	250,000
Deer Park	40,980
Graham	215,000
Devine	22,500
Eagle Pass	126,000
Grapeland	9,000
Greenville	180,000
Haltom City	30,000
Hurst	54,000
Jacksonville	99,000
Jasper	48,000
Junction	27,300
Kenedy	45,300
Kerrville	83,400
Kountz	18,300
Laredo (Del Mar district)	250,000
Littlefield	69,000
Lone Oak	15,000
Marble Falls	21,600
Meadow	4,500
McKinney	120,000
Newcastle	15,000
Newton	15,000
Palacios	30,600
Pecos	87,000
Port Neches	90,000
Quitman	9,000
Refugio	51,000
Robinson	15,000
Rockwall	17,400
Sabinal	15,000
Sabine Pass	9,000
San Antonio	250,000
Sanger	15,000
Slaton	57,000
Spur	24,000
Sulphur Springs	97,500
Terrell	66,000
Tom Bean	15,000
Tyler	250,000
Van Horn	15,000
Victoria	450,000
Waco	300,000
Walk Village	15,000
Waller	15,000
Weslaco	82,200
West	22,500
Jefferson City area	360,000
Galveston-Houston area	600,000
Tarrant County area	600,000

UTAH

Roosevelt	43,500
Moab	75,000
Salt Lake City SID No. 1	275,000
Salt Lake City	300,000
Logan	525,000
Wellsville	45,000
Lewiston	22,500
Parowan	24,000
Chesterfield	40,000
Corinne	15,000
Cedar City	56,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

VERMONT

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Brattleboro	$88,500
Berlin	65,880
Middlebury	223,830
Vergennes	48,490
Stowe	60,900
Plainfield	37,800
Woodstock	150,000
Northfield	300,000
Hartford	60,000
Marshfield	24,630
Milton	41,920
Wells River	58,800
South Rye Gate	42,800
Groton	48,000
Richmond	43,440
Cavendish	91,200
Williamstown	75,000
Brighton	48,000
Winooski	270,000
Waterbury	84,000
Wilmington	61,500

VIRGINIA

Alleghany County	7,160
Lovingston	27,000
Abingdon	240,000
Alleghany County	23,115
Altavista	25,500
Amherst County	30,750
Amonate	30,000
Appalachia	150,000
Arlington	250,000
Arno	30,000
Bishop	30,000
Boissevain	60,000
Boykins	60,000
Brookneal	60,000
Cambria	60,000
Cape Charles	60,000
Cedar Bluff	60,000
Chilhowie	75,000
Cleveland	30,000
Coeburn	105,000
Damascus	90,000
Darby	30,000
Dayton	60,000
Deel	60,000
Dorchester	75,000
East Stone Gap	60,000
Fairfax County Park Authority	10,500
Fincastle	30,000
Gate City	120,000
Grundy	120,000
Honaker	60,000
Hurley	21,000
Jonesville	60,000
Keokee	18,000
Montague Estates	60,000
N. Tazewell	60,000
Pocohontas	120,000
Prince William County	250,000
Rich Creek	60,000
Rocky Mount	180,000
Roda	60,000
Saltville	90,000
Shenandoah	60,000
Smithfield	90,000
South Hill	75,000
St. Charles	30,000
St. Paul	75,000
Stuart	60,000
Tazewell	90,000
Timberville	60,000
Toana	21,000
Tookland	60,000
Vansant	60,000
Victoria	90,000
Vienna	117,300
Virginia Beach	30,000
Weber City	90,000
Hendico County, sanitary district No. C	250,000
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 3	110,448
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 6	14,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

VIRGINIA—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 7	$250,000
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 13	250,000

WASHINGTON

Metaline	14,460
Pasco	162,500
La Crosse	12,000
Spokane	90,000
Spokane	60,000
Anacortes	57,000
Benton City	6,000
Blaine	45,000
Cle Blum	3,000
Concrete	45,000
Douglas County Sewer District No.1	100,000
Ellensburg	50,000
Harrington	15,000
Kettle Falls	6,000
La Center	7,500
Millwood	20,000
Moses Lake	10,000
Normandy Park	78,000
Oak Harbor	15,000
Olympia	120,000
Port Angeles	141,000
Rosalia	20,000
Roslyn	18,000
Selah	30,000
Sultan	51,000
Vancouver	45,000
Washougal	30,000
Westport	24,000

WEST VIRGINIA

Belmont	28,778
Nutter Fort	78,600
Martinsburg	300,000
Bethlehem	200,000
Beckley	30,000
Glenville	60,000
Matewan	60,000
Fayetteville	24,000
Belle	30,000
Charles Town	30,000
Ranson	30,000
Mannington	105,000
Davis	45,000
Kingwood	90,000
Barboursville	150,000
Chapmanville	60,000
Welch	600,000
Ronceverte	60,000
Petersburg	60,000
Keyser	210,000
Clarksburg	600,000
Morgantown	450,000
Fairmont	450,000
Shepherdstown	60,000
Ridgeley	60,000
Follansbee	150,000
Wellsburg	150,000
Shinnston	90,000
Grafton	150,000
Athens	12,000
Triadelphia	21,000
Sutton	30,000
Gassaway	27,000
Rainelle	54,000
East Rainelle	39,000
Grant Town	36,000
Star City	45,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

WEST VIRGINIA—continued

Municipality—Continued	Grant request
Westover	$60,000
Red Sulphur public sanitary district	60,000
Pea Ridge public sanitary district	150,000
Midway public sanitary district	60,000
Lilly Grove public sanitary district	60,000
Green Valley public sanitary district	60,000

WISCONSIN

Amery	33,621
Plainfield	20,622
Cassville	32,243
Monroe	110,173
Dallas	18,531
Chetek	31,673
Unity	9,732
Meenah-Manasha Sewerage Commission	500,000
Green Bay Metro-Sewerage District	25,886
Menomonie	12,090
Milwaukee Sewerage Commission	250,000
Cameron	21,450
Barron	199,425
Thorp	72,000
Kieler Town Sanitary District No. 1	22,197
Pigeon Falls	25,912
Two Rivers	62,090
Stockbridge	27,645
Metropolitan Sewerage Commission (County of Milwaukee)	600,000
Somers Sanitary District No. 1 (Kenosha)	72,044
Belmont	31,546
Muskego	34,825
White water	52,500
Lake Geneva	108,519
Menomonie	19,235
Mount Hope	22,697

WYOMING

South Sheridan	31,200
Rock River	3,000
Basin	4,500
Cokeville	3,000
Cowley	6,300
Evanston	2,100
Ranchester	1,500
Burns	6,000
Sheridan	180,000
Fort Bridger Sanitary District	3,000

PUERTO RICO

Margarita Trunk Sewer	105,000

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Truman Urges New Look at Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the views and opinions of former President Harry S. Truman on any subject are worthy of deep consideration. President Truman enjoys and possesses the deep affection and strong respect of the American people.

In my remarks, I include an article written by my valued friend, President Truman, and appearing in the Washington Post of April 28, 1963:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1963]

TRUMAN URGES NEW LOOK AT FOREIGN POLICY

(By Harry S. Truman)

INDEPENDENCE, MO., April 27.—The more I think about it the more I am convinced that the time has come to take a searching look at our foreign policy.

We are in an unprecedented time in history. The general run of people has not changed very much over the centuries and they act and behave in the same way that they always have. But the conditions surrounding them have changed drastically, and they find it difficult to adjust to a totally new environment. These changes in our everyday life are the result of a succession of revolutionary advances in science and technology.

It is noteworthy that Pope John XXIII, in his encyclical on "peace on earth," has given recognition to the great change that has come into the life of man, and the need to reconsider some of our past attitudes and commitments. It is folly to invoke the past as a guide to the future, and it is foolhardy to dream of the good old days, days which are never to be again and which really never existed, except in the minds of some people.

The situation began to unfold itself in the closing days of the last war and the need for a new look at our responsibility as a leading power, and for a redirection of foreign policy, not only as it concerned our relations with individual nations, but more particularly our relations with the free world which led us to work in terms of a world foreign policy.

CITES 1949 INAUGURAL

We took great care in study and preparation in formulating our new course and I decided to touch on it broadly in my inaugural address on January 20, 1949, when I proposed that:

"The supreme need of our time is for men to learn to live together in peace and harmony. We are moving on with other nations to build an even stronger structure of international order and justice. * * * We must embark on a joint new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. * * * Our aim should be to help the free people of the world through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials, and housing and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens. * * * With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture and labor in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living."

I made the proposal because I felt then, as I do now, that the freedom and dignity of the individual and his right to a full life should be the purpose of all governments.

Only the reactionary forces of rigid socialism, the Communists, have failed to fall in step with the trend of the times. We, for our part, have had little difficulty in coexisting with systems and ideologies different from ours. We have never sought to impose our way of life or our ideas of free government on any nation and the only thing we expected of them was not to attempt to intrude their ideas on us. At the same time we have always been ready to come to the aid of any nation or people in distress, no matter what their beliefs or systems might be.

Our hopes for an orderly and peaceful world, after the war, built around the United Nations organization, were soon dispelled. Militant, aggressive communism under Stalin began its drive with a subversion of the satellite nations and designs upon neighboring Greece and Turkey, and we found ourselves in a long, costly, wasteful cold war.

Having failed to vest in the United Nations the means of enforcing the peace, we had to be content with its moral force instead. As a consequence, we have had no choice but to continue to build our military might, as a safety measure for peace.

ALTERNATIVE IS CAPITULATION

While it is not entirely certain that in the event of an all-out war between the East and the West that both sides would be totally destroyed, although the damage would be appalling and catastrophic, nevertheless, we have done and will continue to do everything possible to avert such a conflict. The other alternative would be to capitulate, something that is abhorrent, even to think about.

And, so, we have no choice but to maintain this frightful power that we have built up, until such time as the Communist dictators are ready to join in a peaceful settlement. The great question is, will they?

If and when that welcome day comes, a great murden will be lifted from the shoulders of mankind and a United Nations, capable of maintaining the peace, will come into its intended role.

In the intervening years, since the end of World War II, we have sustained some serious losses and severe trials, the Korean invasion, the Berlin blockade, the difficulties in Asia and the latest tragedy, that of the Communist conquest in Cuba.

At the same time it is not an altogether discouraging situation from our point of view, for we of the West have grown stronger over the years, while in the Communist world there have been outcropping of difficulties, not only in the ideological conflict but in the basic areas of the Communists' first commitment that they will always see to it that the hungry get enough to eat. This, they have not been able to do. And they have no solution in sight, and even tend to get panicky about it.

HOOVER'S WORKS

It should be remembered that immediately after World War I, we undertook the monumental task of feeding the multitude of hungry victims under the great leadership of Herbert Hoover. And, again after World War II, we organized a much more comprehensive program of feeding the hungry, and our great humanitarian, Herbert Hoover, enlisted the effort and performed wonders.

I would like to see us give much more immediate and sustained attention toward meeting the plight of the hungry, whoever they may be, this side or the other side of the Iron Curtain. There still remains much to be done on this hemisphere where widespread misery continues to ravage millions of men, women, and children. We are not the ones to draw the line on who shall live and who shall starve. And I know that as a people, we always stand ready to share our good fortune with all those who do not have enough to carry them through the day, as well as those who are striving to achieve a better life.

Then there is a situation in this country we have never faced before. Machines are rapidily displacing men in many of our key industries. And if our economy fails to keep pace with growing productivity, our army of the jobless will grow, and the problem could well get out of hand. We are going to have to find some way to get the jobless back to work. If present methods should prove unavailing, we are just going to have to look for other ways that may be distasteful to our heads of industry, who should be among the leaders in search of a solution.

Under our system of government, the interests of the people come first. To put it another way, industry exists not for its own ends and purposes but essentially to serve the interest and needs of the people for the basics of food, shelter, and safety. Ownership can expect to enjoy a full measure of its rights and privileges providing it meets its inherent responsibilities to the people. This has always been accepted and understood as it applies to our form of government, where its obligation is to serve the people, that is mandatory. That is to say, the government serves the people and not the other way about. Although the people must understand their responsibility to make the government work efficiently.

We are committed to the principle that every person should be able to enjoy a standard of living in keeping with the dignity of man. And hunger here or elsewhere is the one human tragedy that we never neglect and we must never forget that responsibility. And when this deals with the problem of foreign aid I feel that our most immediate obligation is to the hungry wherever they may be, and other programs are to follow. We not only want to help them through their immediate misfortune, but we are even more interested and more concerned about doing everything we can to start them off on the way to be able to help themselves and, incidentally, ourselves too.

This approach to the problems of the needy illustrates some of the many differences betwen our attitude and that of the Communists. We place a major emphasis on the importance of life, the life of every person, of whatever origin. On the other hand, the Communist dictatorships talk vol-

ubly about their concern for the working man, and yet everything about their actions proves that they in practice regard life as cheap, and the individual as subordinate to and the property of the state. This is particularly evident in the conduct of the Communists who have imposed their oppressive brand of communism on the longsuffering people of Red China.

Then there is the other mischievous deception propagandized by the Communists, they talk of peace but prepare for war. They have probed our will to resist and they have tried our patience in their many attempts to provoke war by fomenting crises to force us into making impossible concessions.

History, I expect, will charge the Communists with forcing upon a reluctant West the burden and the danger of the arms race. For it is they, the Communists, who prevented the first effective effort in the history of man, as a community of all nations, to come together and set up the machinery for an enforceable peace. This was contained in the U.S. proposal to place the control of the A-bomb within the United Nations, and this was at a time when we had sole possession of it. But, as we know, though some tend to forget, the Russian Communists blocked this tender, by refusing to accept inspecting to prevent cheating.

BLOCKED FREE WATERWAYS

History, too, will charge the Communists with preventing the opening up of the world's waterways including the Panama Canal to free navigation to all nations. This was proposed by the United States at the Potsdam Conference, and Stalin balked at the idea. Our proposal was intended to aid in the common interest of commerce between nations, and as a practical step in the direction of peaceful coexistence among all nations, regardless of ideological differences.

The Communists have been in control of Russia and China and Eastern Europe for a long time now, and to this day agriculture continues to be their most pressing problem. Yet they control a great deal of the earth's most fertile soil.

The sciences have brought many great and marvelous changes in recent life, but science has not been able to change human nature. And we see that with all modern equipment, and pressures from Moscow and Peiping, the collective farms in Russia and the communal farms in China have not been able to produce enough to feed their own people, much less to feed those whom they have brought under their yoke.

Admittedly, the Russian Communists have done much better in space and there at least they have been able to make important progress to feed their special kind of hunger—hunger for power. But this much-heralded progress in space was accomplished at the expense of those who want food and shelter.

Let me again emphasize that in our announced purpose to extend aid to needy nations, that we manage to tackle first things first and do the best we can in that important area.

In line with this approach I strongly feel that we should waste little time in launching a full-scale drive to attend to the many that suffer from hunger among those of our neighbors to the south. That is something that we have put off too long.

Of course, it is regrettable and deplorable that the men of wealth and power in these nations have been either slow or indifferent to the plight of their peoples, but this has been a condition that has prevailed for a long time and habits are not easy to change, even as viewpoints are hard to alter.

There is, of course, the added problem of exploding populations, a very touchy subject in some quarters, but there are but two choices we can make. Either we increase the output of food and other necessities to meet all new demands, which I feel certain we should be able to do, or else we shall have to adjust matters by some acceptable method to control the rate of the population growth.

Address by Former Vice President Richard Nixon, Before American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 20, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors former Vice President Richard M. Nixon made one of the most penetrating and thought-provoking addresses that has been made in the Nation's Capital for a long time. Indeed, many members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in attendance stated that it was the most stimulating message they had ever heard at an annual meeting of the society. And this is one of the most knowledgeable and discriminating audiences to address.

I take great pleasure in appending former Vice President Nixon's speech to these remarks. I strongly urge all Members of Congress to read it and to read it analytically. You will find it penetrating, imaginative, and constructive.

I particularly invite attention to the tactical and strategic moves by the United States so earnestly advocated in this address by Mr. Nixon. Since the New Frontier took command in downtown Washington there have been wailings, time and time again, for "constructive alternatives" for the progressively deteriorating and weakening actions of the administration currently in power. In a forthright manner Mr. Nixon unhestitatingly offers his suggestions for our American foreign policy which, to say the least, warrant serious consideration on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

While former Vice President Nixon confined his address to an analysis and recommendations with respect to American policy abroad, I most ardently hope he will soon give us the benefit of his thoughts on our domestic problems.

In this inspiring address former Vice President Nixon makes an appeal for a return to the American zeal for freedom and the rights of man. His proposals to take the offensive in world affairs against the unyielding enmity of imperialistic communism, his call for explicit moves to rid this hemisphere of the Soviet beachhead 90 miles from our shores, his thoughtful discussion of foreign aid and recommendations that this program be sharpened and forced into patterns of commonsense and frugality, that it be made more realistic and in accord with American ideals, his call for a modernization of the Monroe Doctrine that there may be a freedom doctrine for the Americas, his incisive appraisal of the unfortunate chain of events which have led to the current great difficulties in the Atlantic Alliance, all this, and more, make Mr. Nixon's April 20 speech one of courage and encouragement that merits the attention of every thoughtful American citizen.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the former Vice President of the United States be inserted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF RICHARD NIXON BEFORE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 20, 1963

On such an occasion as this, a battlescarred political veteran is probably expected to pour it on and let it go at that. If only I were the partisan type what a field day I could have.

In Cuba we have goofed an invasion, paid tribute to Castro for the prisoners, then given the Soviets squatters rights in our backyard. We have courageously dared a blockade to keep the peace, withdrew the blockade to avoid war, pledged the Cuban exiles that their flag would fly in Havana, then pledged ourselves not to reinvade, then offered the exiles service in our Armed Forces which are forbidden to invade, then instituted aerial surveillance to determine whether or not we need to invade.

In the United States, we have bewailed the occupation of Little Rock, pledged categorically not to let it happen again, then marched militantly on Oxford where we do insist on "on the ground" inspection.

In Europe, we have proposed multinational polarises, multilateral polarises, missile armed merchant vessels, missle armed aircraft carriers and then evolved a nuclear trigger which by some slight of hand will be simultaneously shared by all and kept in our hands. We have broadcast to the world America's determination to keep missiles in Turkey, then announced the removal of the missiles from Turkey.

We have boldly stood for victory in Laos and then agreed to compromise in Laos.

We have predicted glittering gains for freedom from the Alliance for Progress only to see economic chaos and three more dictatorships born south of the border.

We have scorned Eisenhower deficits as bad for America and then advertised Democratic deficits as beneficial for America, then berated Brazil for having any deficits at all.

We have recommended a $5 billion foreign aid program, then proposed a half-billion-dollar cut, leaving us with a half-billion-dollar increase, then opposed other cuts, then endorsed the Clay recommendations calling for another half-billion dollar cut, and then as an indication of hard, new realism we denounced the Brazilian Government as Communist-infiltrated and on the heels of that handed that government a third of a billion dollars in foreign aid.

Other examples could be given but I see no useful purpose to be served in proceeding in this vein.

I appear today before this group in a different role than I have occupied before. For 16 years I have spoken as a candidate, as a party leader, or as an administration official. Today, I appear only as an individual citizen speaking without regard to any effect my words may have on my own, my party's or my administration's political popularity.

Why speak out at all? President Kennedy answered that question when speaking as a candidate on September 20, 1960. He said: "Some people say it is wrong to say we could be stronger. It is dangerous to say we could be more secure. But in times such as this

I say it is wrong and dangerous for any American to keep silent about our future if he is not satisfied with what is being done to preserve that future."

With these guidelines in mind, I should like to make some observations with regard to the conduct of our foreign policy. My comments will necessarily question some administration policies, but only where I believe this criticism will help the cause of freedom and not hurt it.

That is why I am not going to demand the release of the polls about the decline of American prestige. We have enough troubles abroad without running America down at home.

As far as prestige polls are concerned, I belive first the administration should ignore those that have been taken. Then I believe they should assign the politakers to some more useful activity like finding out what is right for the longpull for America rather than what may be popular for the moment abroad.

We should always have a concern for the sensitivities and opinions of our friends in other nations. But, as the strongest Nation in the world, it is our responsibility to lead, not follow, the forces of freedom. Our policies should never be compromised to the level that only the weak and timid may approve.

We should have respect for the right of any nation to be neutral but in developing the defense and foreign policies of the United States we should remember that if it were not for the power of the United States no nation in the world today could enjoy the luxury of neutrality.

Nor do I charge today that because of the failure of our economy to grow as fast as was predicted when this administration came into office we are in deadly peril of being outproduced by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc in the foreseeable future. We should never rest on our laurels because the way to stay ahead in a race is to move ahead. But the United States today, together with our friends in Europe and in Japan, are outproducing the entire Communist bloc by a ratio of at least 3 to 1. We can maintain that advantage provided we play our game economically and not try to play theirs.

Nor do I charge that this administration is trying to appease Mr. Khrushchev. The word appcasement connotes intent, intent to surrender principle or territory for the purpose of satisfying the demands of an aggressor. The decisions to resume atomic tests, to defend Vietnam, and to impose the Cuban blockade, all of which I supported at the time they were made, were completely inconsistent with such an intent.

And all Americans can surely applaud the eloquence of the President's speeches in defense of the cause of freedom for Laos, for Cuba and Berlin. It isn't the administration's intentions but its policies which are subject to question, not its words, but its deeds.

As a result of these policies, the Atlantic Alliance is in disarray, Cuba is western Russia, and the rest of Latin America is in deadly peril.

It is dangerous nonsense to attempt to gloss over these problems by pointing out that there are also troubles in the Soviet camp.

Khrushchev may be old and sick and it is true that he backed down when confronted with our blockade in Cuba. But he is shrewd enough to know that while he took one step back he had already taken two steps forward. Cuba, today, is the strongest military power in the Western Hemisphere with the exception of the United States and Canada. As long as even one Soviet soldier remains in Cuba, it cannot be free. While freedom-loving Cubans are willing to risk their lives fighting for Cuba's independence against Castro's Cubans, they cannote be expected to take on the whole Soviet Empire.

Red China and Russia are having their differences. But we cannot take too much comfort in the fact that what they are debating about is not how to beat each other but how to beat us. They are simply arguing about what kind of a shovel they should use to dig the grave of the United States.

Communism has its troubles. But we must face up to the fact that in 40 years it has extended its power to over a billion people and a third of the world and it has yet to give up an inch of territory anyplace in the world.

Communism is on the move. It is out to win. It is playing an offensive game. Where in the world today do we expect trouble? In the Communist satellites of Eastern Europe? No, in the free nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia.

What is the administration's policy for dealing with this great Communist offensive? A common theme runs through the policy statements we shall hold the line against further Communist gains in the hope that communism will eventually wither and die. As President Kennedy put it January 25, "The West has the power to hold back the expansion of communism until the time it loses its force and momentum." The basis for this strategy is that we assume time is on our side and that if we can only hold what we have we will win the struggle for the world because the Communists will lose it.

This is not a policy of appeasement but it is a policy of containment. Because it is essentially defensive in character, it is doomed to failure.

We can regain the initiative only by adopting a strategy of victory for freedom to meet the strategy of victory for communism.

I know that talk of victory over communism is not fashionable these days. And there can be no doubt that that cause has not been helped by the shrill irresponsibility of those who proclaim that the only way to victory is to get out of the United Nations, stop all foreign aid and start a preventive war.

But I refuse to accept the contention that our only choice is between coexistence, which is another word for creeping surrender, on the one hand, and no existence on the other hand. I believe there is a responsible strategy which will avoid both war and surrender.

Three elements are essential for a victory of strategy, all based on maintaining the military superiority of the West: (1) Reestablishment of unity among the Western Allies; (2) more effective assistance for the struggling free nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who are threatened by Communist subversion; (3) developing a new program to extend freedom to match the Communist efforts to extend slavery.

To gain the initiative in the world struggle and to launch an offensive for victory, I suggest that the United States should take positive action in the following three controversial, but critical, areas.

THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

First, the Atlantic Alliance must be reassembled and strengthened.

No purpose would be served by rehashing the reasons for disarry in the alliance. In sum, it is a crisis of confidence—confidence of the United States in Europe and of Europe in the United States. Whether because of our new emphasis on conventional forces, our curt cancellation of Skybolt, our opposition to France's nuclear force, the withdrawal of Jupiter bases in Italy and Turkey, our indecision at the Berlin wall, or our downhill negotiating at the nuclear test ban conferences, some of our European allies have concluded that we don't trust them and that they can't trust us.

Nothing less than restoration of confidence can save the alliance. Stopgap plans for sharing our nuclear weaponry—multilateral, multinational, interallied mixed crews, by whatever name—turn out to be form without substance. Each has a built-in trigger guard, some gimmick to make certain that the ultimate control remains in our hands. The heart of the problem is not the possession of nuclear weapons by our allies, which is inevitable, but agreement on a strategy which would permit the alliance as a whole to exercise a unified control.

A leading French journalist summed it up with typical Gallic logic:

"General de Gaulle wants France and the other nations to regain their independence in matters of war and peace through their own efforts and at their own expense. This is impossible.

"President Kennedy wants the European allies to have complete confidence in the United States in those matters and to rely on Washington for their defense and their destiny. This also is impossible. Because to judge as to the necessity of war is the greatest and most inalienable mandate entrusted by any people to its government."

There is only one solution to the problem. The United States must take the lead now in expanding NATO from a pure military alliance to a political confederation, the primary object of which will be to develop a unified and total defense strategy for the United States and our European allies. An American pledge to respond to a European formula for nuclear cooperation within a unified Europe and within the NATO framework could lead at last to an enduring solution of our greatest problems involving our alliance friends.

I do not underestimate the significance or the difficulty of the President's making this decision. At the outset, U.S. atomic legislation would have to be modified in order to permit the transfer of a limited number of nuclear warheads appropriate for the use of our European allies. We have always hesitated to take this step because of our fear of proliferation of nuclear weapons. I have, in the past, shared that fear. But against that danger, we must weigh the greater danger of the deterioration and eventual destruction of the Atlantic Alliance. The choice is between the risk of nuclear sharing with our allies or nuclear destruction from our enemies, between nuclear unity in the West or nuclear anarchy. The hour of decision on this critical issue has arrived. A political, as well as a military, confederation of free nations is an essential element in the strategy for victory over the dictatorship of the Communist world.

FOREIGN AID

I should like to turn now to the second major element of our victory strategy, our foreign aid program.

For the 14 years I was in Washington as a Congressman, Senator, and Vice President, I voted for and supported the foreign aid program. I believe that that program in its military and economic aspects, despite some shocking failures, has, on balance, been necessary and beneficial to the foreign policy interests of the United States. The time has come now for a reappraisal of the program. The Clay Committee's recommendations provide at the very least the minimum that the administration and the Congress should do to eliminate waste and bring the program more in line with current American foreign policy interests. To those who on the one hand would abolish the program or emasculate it in the name of economy and who at the same time advocate a strong stand against communism abroad, I can only say you cannot call upon the President to adopt a strategy for victory over communism and deny him one of the indispensable tools for doing the job.

But in three areas our foreign aid program needs to be substantially altered.

First, I do not believe we can any longer justify military assistance to nations that are not firmly committed to the side of freedom.

Second, in the field of economic assistance we should grant aid only where we are convinced that it will actually strengthen the economy and political stability of the nation assisted. That is why, under no circumstances, can we justify aid which is to be used by the recipient nation for socializing or nationalizing a basic industry. Any nation has a right to choose socialism if it desires. But no American administration has a right to ask the American people to pay for that experiment. Whether it is a government steel mill in India or government-operated oil fields in Brazil, American economic assistance should not be granted to subsidize such projects.

A third area in which American foreign aid programs must be critically reappraised is in the field of population control. The Draper Committee brought this issue into the open 3 years ago. The Clay Committee report deals with it only in passing. Just yesterday the National Academy of Sciences proposed that the United States take the lead in this area. The subject is immensely controversial at home and abroad but it can no longer be swept under the rug. The United States cannot justify spending billions of dollars for economic assistance for the purpose of raising living standards in underdeveloped countries and discover year after year that population growth outruns growth of the economy. It is time for this Government to take the leadership in cooperation with recipient governments to develop in conjunction with our foreign aid programs, population control programs which are consistent, to the extent possible, with the religious traditions of the nation involved. Anything less will not be consistent with what must be the necessary justification for any foreign aid program, that it will actually be helpful in improving economic conditions in the country receiving aid.

EXTENDING FREEDOM

Let us now turn to the third major element of the victory strategy, developing a program to extend freedom. I would like to begin by referring to Cuba. My purpose is not to second-guess the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion, but rather to see how Khrushchev's Cuban venture fits into the Communist strategy for world conquest and to determine how American policy should be changed to deal with that strategy.

We can be sure that Khrushchev did not spend a billion dollars to establish a missile base in Cuba simply for the purpose of gaining control of that island nation with its 5 million people. The Cuban venture was a dress rehearsal for Venezuela, Brazil, or some other far more important target. The Communist grand strategy is still total world domination, and this includes the Western Hemisphere.

For Khrushchev, the operation was a net gain, not a loss. No matter whether there are 12,000 or 17,000 Soviet troops now in Cuba, Khrushchev's position, with American acquiescence, is firmer today than a year ago.

Mr. Murrow says that the presence of Russian troops in Cuba is strengthening the image of the United States throughout Latin America. This is a classic example of George Orwell's double think, strength is weakness. The Latin Americans see that Castro is being totally supplied by Communist aid. They also see that Cuban exiles are being leashed for fear of upsetting Khrushchev. The moral is clear: Go Communist and get aid; fight for freedom and go it alone.

We must no longer postpone making a command decision to do whatever is necessary to force the removal of the Soviet beachhead. The United States cannot tolerate the continued existence of a Soviet military and subversive base 90 miles from our shore.

The administration claims that there are risks involved. But this is the real question: Will those risks be less in 6 months, 1 year, 2 years? If we allow Cuba to remain an example for Communist takeovers in other Latin American countries, the risks are certain to grow. I am convinced that the risks of inaction are far greater than the risks of action.

A second rationalization for our present policy is to the effect that we should not act now because "time is on our side; the tide is going our way." Those who take this position point to economic chaos in China, a power struggle within the Communist world, an economic boom in Western Europe, and the superiority of American ballistic missiles. And from this, they conclude that the Communists are anxious to maintain the status quo, and are therefore ready to meet us halfway. It is only necessary to show that we are equally accommodating. If, on the other hand, we push Khrushchev too far, they contend, we would weaken him in his struggle with the hardline Communists.

The result of this strategy in Cuba has been that after seizing the offensive in the struggle with world communism last October, we then proceeded to pull defeat out of the jaws of victory.

The Cuban example graphically illustrates our basic misunderstanding of communism and the Communist leaders. Of course the Communists are concerned over developments which indicate weakness in their camp and strength in the free world. But there is not one sign that they have abandoned their plans for world conquest. Therefore, any American policy of trying to stabilize the status quo is bound to fail in the long run. For to the Communist, the status quo is just a launching pad for their next conquest. To put it bluntly, Mr. Khrushchev will not treat us gently because we treat him gently but only when and because he respects our power to deal firmly with him. I believe that a continued policy of going easy on Khrushchev in Cuba rather than convincing him that he should go easy on us elsewhere is likely to have exactly the opposite effect. We must never attempt to judge his motives by our own standards.

Before leaving the subject of Cuba, I want to touch on one other very fundamental point. The United States has been embarrassed by the fact that our support of Cuban exiles in the Bay of Pigs expedition had to be covert. A national debate has been raging over whether the Government in peacetime should have the right to conceal the truth, not only from our potential enemies but from our own people. And now today we are in the contradictory position of proclaiming that our objective is a free Cuba and at the same time denying to Cuban exiles the right to organize expeditions to fight for the freedom of Cuba.

The Communists have no trouble on this score. They openly claim that they will support Communist revolutions in any free country against any non-Communist government, as they did in Cuba, and that they will support any Communist government against any anti-Communist revolution as they did in Hungary.

We must fit our policy in the Western Hemisphere to these stark realities. There was a time when we could rely on the Monroe Doctrine to define our response to outside aggression in the hemisphere. But the Monroe Doctrine was based on the concepts of traditional conquest. Today we are confronted with a different method of conquest—through indirect, internal, and subversive action. In answer to this new challenge, we must redefine the Monroe Doctrine to include our responses to these new types of aggression: (1) When any free nation in the Western Hemisphere is internally threatened by forces under the control of international communism or any other foreign power, the policy of the U.S. Government should be to openly support the forces of freedom; and, (2) when any force is organized for the purpose of overthrowing a foreign-controlled government in this hemisphere, it should be the policy of the U.S. Government to openly support the forces of freedom inside and outside of that country.

I recognize that President Kennedy has endorsed such concepts in principle, but he has been reluctant to implement them on the grounds that they might increase the risk of war. Yet only by announcing and enforcing this freedom doctrine for the Americas will we reduce the chance of Khrushchev's miscalculating our will to resist. This is the way to prevent another crisis such as the one that led to the October blockade.

Today Cuba is sealed just as tightly behind the Iron Curtain as it would have been if the Soviet forces had invaded and occupied it in the first instance, rather than using Castro as their instrument to gain power. We have tried unsuccessfully to deal with this new kind of aggression, which goes under borders rather than over them. The time has come for America to frankly recognize the problem of Communist takeover by revolution and to deal with it openly and directly.

I have suggested concrete proposals for action in three specific areas which will contribute to gaining the initiative in the battle with world communism.

I turn finally to what I believe is the most important factor of all. I refer now not to what we do but the spirit with which we do it.

I base the observations I am about to make on 14 years of firsthand contact with the representatives of the Communist movement in all parts of the world.

From Moscow, to Vietnam, to Caracas, from confrontations with Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Togliatti, and Castro, I have had a chance to analyze the basic character of communism.

Communism's strength and appeal is not primarily its military power, its economic productivity, or its materialist philosophy, but in the spirit of those who become infected with the Marxist virus. Call it drive, dedication, will to win, anything you like, Communist leaders have a conviction that they should win and that they will win. No risks, no defeats seem to discourage or weaken that will and it is this spirit that they pound into their people. On hundreds of billboards on the highways in the Soviet Union I saw the slogan, "Work for the Victory of Communism." And on thousands of placards in every factory I visited the same message was repeated. People in other countries are naturally attracted to such a message because they want to be on the winning side and simply through conviction and repetition the Communists convince them that theirs is the winning side.

This vital, dynamic drive has been characteristic of all great revolutionary movements, including our own. We must not forget that it was Thomas Jefferson who said at the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, "We act not for ourselves alone but for the whole human race." And Woodrow Wilson, just before World War I, said, "A patriotic American is never so proud of his flag as when it comes to mean to others as well as to himself a symbol of hope and freedom."

I would not deny for one moment that much of this spirit exists in America today. President Kennedy caught it when he said in his inaugural address, "Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country."

But now the impression is gaining ground that we seem to be running out of steam.

We hear too many Americans talk of our goal being to hold our own, of not taking risks, of welcoming neutralism in other countries. We are generous with our material aid and our dedicated peace corpsmen go willingly abroad. But the fashionable line which is gaining currency is that American ideas are not for export. Dr. Charles Malik pointed out the dangers of this kind of thinking when he said, "Those who keep insisting that their civilization is not for export, only their industrial products, are digging the grave of their civilization and way of life."

I say that it is time for us proudly to declare that out ideas are for export. We need not apologize for taking this position. In two World Wars, 1 million Americans lost their lives and since World War II we have generously given $100 billion in foreign aid to other countries. For what purpose? Not for an acre of territory or to gain domination over any other people but because we believe in freedom, not just for ourselves but for others as well.

It is this kind of spirit that must inspire us now. To the Communists who say that their goal is a Communist America, we must answer our goal is nothing less than a free Russia, a free China, a free Eastern Europe, and a free Cuba.

Only such a great goal, deeply believed in, constantly repeated, selflessly worked for, is worthy of the efforts of a great people in this gigantic struggle. Only such a goal will blunt the Communist ideological offensive and regain the initiative for the cause of freedom.

The President of the United States, as the elected leader of all the people, can inspire us in this direction but the men and women in this room can also make an immense contribution. No group gathered in any room in America has as much power to affect the thought of the American people as the editors of our great newspapers. Disagree however you wish on parties or candidates, on the tactics we should adopt, but use your eloquence to stir in the hearts of our people their love for America, a clearer appreciation and understanding of its ideals and a determination and burning zeal to do what is necessary not just to defend freedom but also to extend it and share it with others throughout the world.

Our Aid Effort: A Time for Commitment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Frank M. Coffin, a former distinguished Member of the House and now Deputy Administrator for Operations of the Agency for International Development, recently delivered a cogent speech on foreign aid at the 28th annual meeting of the Michigan Credit Union League in Detroit, Mich. Mr. Coffin's speech, "Our Aid Effort: A Time for Commitment," is as follows:

OUR AID EFFORT—A TIME FOR COMMITMENT

(Remarks by the Honorable Frank M. Coffin, Deputy Administrator for Operations, Agency for International Development at the 28th Annual Meeting, Michigan Credit Union League, Cobo Hall, Detroit, Mich., Friday evening, April 19, 1963)

One hundred eighty-seven years ago today a civic-minded silversmith, the father of 16 children, rode into the pages of history by the simple act of riding his horse through the countryside and warning his fellow colonists of the approach of the Redcoats. Paul Revere's feat was one of a courageous initiative. But his task was not complex. The threat was on our shores, immediate, tangible, visible. Awareness had long seized the country. For months a consensus had been forming in the land, a consensus that George III no longer knew best what was needed in the American colonies. The batterboards of a new nation had almost imperceptibly been erected by the unspoken agreement of most of our 3 million ancestors. All that was needed was a spark to ignite the tinder that lay everywhere.

This month we have seen once again, for the 16th time, an administration go to Congress for legislation and money to meet another kind of threat and opportunity, that hovering over the underdeveloped world. What poles apart these two conditions are. In 1776 we were the world's newest emerging underdeveloped nation, beset with the herculean chores of organizing a government, creating institutions, maintaining order, raising an army, and fighting a war. We were wholly occupied in the all-absorbing task of building our Nation. Now, in 1963, while grappling with the problems of a nation of 183 million, we are also deeply concerned with the nationbuilding efforts throughout the free world. Our very success in building our own Nation has brought to us a position of leadership and responsibility in this far-flung movement.

There is, therefore, a stream of historic causality connecting those remote days in the spring of 1776 with the current debates and decisions on our foreign-aid policies and programs. For the Spirit of '76 has been our most valued and influential export. It is now the spirit moving over a billion people in some 80 countries around the globe.

But in 1776 the Nation had come to a consensus as to how it should meet the threat it faced. Can we say that the Nation today has come to a consensus as to the nature of the threat, the dimensions of the opportunity, or the direction in which it should move?

President Kennedy in his April 2 foreign aid message said: "There is, in short, a national consensus of many years standing on the vital importance of these programs. The principle and purpose of U.S. assistance to less secure and less fortunate nations are not and cannot be seriously in doubt."

There is no doubt that we have long had a policy of assisting other nations, to help strengthen and enlarge the boundaries of the free world, to help lessen the suffering of other peoples, to quicken the pace of social and economic progress in other lands. Our first major efforts date back 21 years to 1942 when Congress authorized the Institute of Inter-American Relations. Four Presidents and 11 Congresses have broadened our efforts and have written some triumphant chapters in world history: the creative revival of Europe and Japan, the survival of Greece and Turkey, the launching of the south Asian subcontinent on a course of democratic development, the emergence of free China within a decade as a viable nation, the rallying of Far Eastern countries in the cause of their own independence, the channeling of new African energies into national development, and, most recently, engaging all of Latin America in an epochal attempt to harness our joint energies in the modernization of their economies in this decade.

But has this policy rested on a consensus? One would not think so to observe the annual hearings and debates in Congress. This is my seventh exposure to this unique decision-making process, with 4 years as a Congressman hearing executive branch witnesses and 3 years as a witness and official. For 6-months each year aid officials are engaged in hearings before four committees of Congress concerned with aid legislation and appropriations, two committees concerned with Government operations, and, this year, at least three other committees whose jurisdiction concerns personnel, education, and small business. Apart from the hearings and investigations of these committees, the Agency for International Development is constantly under the surveillance of its own inspection staff, the Inspector General of the Department of State, the General Accounting Office, and inspection teams visiting various countries.

Our aid program has ben the object of more investigations, more studies, more hearings, more changes in organization and leadership than any other major governmental activity within the past decade. Its reputation as a magnet for advice and controversy is legend. Indeed, I think we have reached the point where the conventional wisdom is self doubt and criticize and where the critics feed largely on each other. This is the reverse of Hans Christian Andersen's story about the emperor who wore no clothes. In this case the emperor is wearing a pretty well-tailored suit, while people are still under the impression that he is naked.

I think the President was both right and timely in pointing out that a consensus exists. The Clay Committee report is the most recent expression of consensus that has been developing, particularly over the past 6 years.

This Committee, composed of 10 distinguished citizens independent of the administration, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, was charged last December with the task of reviewing our military and economic assistance programs to determine if "their scope and distribution was contributing to the optimum security of the United States and the economic and political stability in the free world." The report made three major contributions. It faced frankly criticisms frequently voiced by the American people. It set forth principles, standards, and objectives designed to meet these criticisms. And it left no doubt of the vital importance of foriegn assistance to the national interest of the United States.

But before we consider the specific findings of this Committee, let us consider the deeper significance of this report in helping the American people toward a decision in depth on the reason for being, the principles, and goals of foreign aid.

The slow but steady growth of consensus can be seen by anyone who takes the trouble to read the yearly reports on aid of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It can be seen in the annual messages on aid by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, not to forget the earlier historic address by General Marshall and the point IV message of President Truman.

But in the past 6 years there have been four major events dramatizing particularly the march toward consensus.

The first was the 1,600-page volume of studies on aid commissioned by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Here we see spelled out the basic connection between sound assistance programs and the national interest; the vital need for know-how and skills; the unavoidable necessity for capital aid, for countries which know how to use it; the principal stress that should be given aid as an incentive to the self-help efforts of recipient countries themselves; the importance of country development programs; the need for continuity and a long-range view, to get away from crisis financing.

The second milestone was the report of the Draper Committee, appointed by President Eisenhower in 1958. This Committee, also made up of 10 leading citizens, although primarily charged with studying the military assistance program, addressed one of its reports to economic assistance.

The highlights of this report significantly foreshadow consensus. It recognized that "the strength of our economy and the survival of our free institutions are dependent upon our being a part of a community of nations which is making acceptable economic and political progress." It stressed more selectivity "in choosing those countries and projects which will yield the greatest results in increasing free world strength." It emphasized the principle of self-help, saying that "our aid should be conditioned on reasonable mutual undertakings, and should be extended only so long as the recipients reasonably carry out their undertakings." It called for "an even more important role" by our Western allies and Japan. It advocated an increased emphasis on multilateral assistance with specific reference to the then new International Development Association, proposed as a soft loan subsidiary of the World Bank. It underscored the importance of technical assistance and the need to improve its quality by drawing upon the universities, foundations, and nongovernmental organizations. It urged a more affirmative attitude toward the promotion of private investment. It set forth the objective of reducing grant assistance. It endorsed long-range country development planning as the basis for U.S. aid.

The third major event in this accretion of agreement on aid policy was the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. This legislation was the outgrowth of exhaustive task force action drawing on experts both in and out of Government. The features of the legislation were a unified central aid agency, equipped to administer loans, grants, and technical assistance on the basis of long-range country plans, and, as President Kennedy said when he sent the legislation to Congress, giving "special attention to those nations most willing and able to mobilize their own resources, make necessary social and economic reforms, engage in long-range planning, and make the other efforts necessary if these are to reach the stage of self-sustaining growth."

Now we can appreciate fully the significance of the events of 1963. The Clay report not only reaffirms the necessity of "properly conceived and administered" aid programs. It endorses the validity of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and recognizes the improvement that has taken place in personnel, programing, and operations. It is a development-oriented report and concentrates on the conditions of development, laying primary emphasis on self-help and encouragement of private sector activities. It urges deliberate speed in phasing down military and strategic assistance. But it recognizes the necessity for maintaining what is calls "the frontier of freedom," even to the extent of suggesting a reduction in our defense budget rather than necessary support for the forces of this area.

Some idea of its view of proper range of aid purposes can be gained from its conclusions that 91 percent of aid is addressed to the strategic areas on the Sino-Soviet border, the Alliance for Progress, and our contributions to international organizations; that continued economic growth in freedom of the Asian subcontinent is of critical importance; that the United States has a stake "in helping to create a climate of stability and growth" in Africa; and that increased support should be given the International Development Association. It lays stress on involving other industrialized countries in improving their quantities and terms of aid and on our hardening our loan terms as countries increase in their capacity to service debt.

With all of these basic principles and directions, there is agreement. The President's aid message of April 2 listed six specific objectives of aid on which he said there was fundamental agreement between the executive branch and the Clay Committee. These were: stricter standards of selectivity and self-help; aiming for the "earliest possible 'takeoff' date" when a country can be self-supporting; securing the increased participation of other industrialized nations; lightening the impact on our balance of payments and economy; continuing to help defend countries threatened by internal and external Communist attack; and increasing the role of private investment and other non-Federal resources.

Finally, AID Administrator David E. Bell specifically announced his acceptance of these basic principles in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on April 9.

The deeper significance of this latest citizen effort, therefore, is to underscore the broad range of consensus on aid which exists among the academic community, business, agriculture, labor, Congress, the President, and the Agency for International Development. This is not to say there will be or can be unanimity on all projects, programs, or even specific country policies. The complexity of this arena of international affairs defies easy formulation or complete avoidance of controversy. But the issues which may arise will be those of timing, tactics, and practicability in current situations of stress. They should not obscure the fact that a basic consensus in depth exists.

What should this mean for the future? It should mean an end to the endless, self-defeating rechallenging of goals, policies, and procedures. It should produce an annual exchange between the executive branch and Congress directed to improvement of policy (as far as the authorizing committees are concerned) and improvement of practice (as far as the appropriations committees are concerned). The basic purpose of aid, the objectives of specific programs, the principal methods used to reach these objectives would not be at issue. For they are encompassed within the consensus staked out over the past half decade. All of this should mean less of an ordeal for all concerned, the Congress, the executive branch, and the American people, in reaching agreement on the amounts required to carry out these objectives.

If this proves true, the area of difference between Congress and the Executive will be relatively small. Both will be in agreement that aid well administered is essential; that, while existing commitments must be honored, military assistance and supporting assistance should, to the extent the world situation permits, trend downward; that, nevertheless, the area on the Sino-Soviet borders has a "most evident" direct relationship to free world security; that the great venture in development in India and Pakistan must continue; that the United States has a stake in helping "create a climate of stability and growth in freedom" in Africa, even though Europe should continue to be the principal source of capital aid; that "a decade or more of sustained effort" is required of both the United States and Latin American countries to make the Alliance for Progress a success; that multilateral organizations should be strongly supported; that there is a continuing need for high quality technical assistance; and that "an ample contingency fund" should be provided to give the President flexibility to meet unknown challenges.

Once these areas of agreement exist, as they do in fact now exist between the Clay Committee and the executive branch, the remaining margin for differences of judgment will be no greater than those which exist in other governmental programs. Then debate can be more sharply focused and more productive. Then we can proceed in the confidence that foreign aid is recognized as a national program in the national interest and backed by a steady consensus in depth of the people and the Congress.

We are within reach of this objective. The time is long overdue. Not only is the effort of the Sino-Soviet bloc faltering through its internal political and economic problems but our industrialized partners have strengthened their own efforts. It is both vital and feasible that further progress be made. The United States can and should play a key role in assuring this progress. But it must first demonstrate not only that it has a policy and a program but that they are backed by the deep commitment of the American people.

The calendar decrees that this is a time for legislation by Congress. But the slow fruition of consensus suggests that this is a time for commitment by the country.

Mr. Speaker, the basic premise of this speech is that after 21 years of foreign aid of one kind or another, a consensus has taken shape in Government and among the public which accepts it generally as a necessary feature of national defense. It further states that this consensus should be focused in such manner as "to mean an end to the endless, self-defeating, rechallenging of goals, policies, and procedures. The basic purpose of aid, the objectives of specific programs, the principal methods used to reach these objectives would not be at issue."

The Clay report, and the Draper—Eisenhower—Committee report on military aid both are used as references.

I see nothing in it that might be embarrassing or questionable, although the reference to a statement in the Clay report that foreign aid is so important that if cuts are necessary it would be preferable to have them in the military defense programs, might draw some fire. Mr. Coffin does not advance this as his view but simply uses the statement from the report to buttress his pitch on the value of foreign aid to the national interest.

It strikes me as being a first-rate speech.

Washington Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently I was interviewed on the radio program "Washington Viewpoint," by Ann M. Corrick and Jim Snyder, of the WBC Washington News Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of this broadcast be included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD'S INTERVIEW ON THE RADIO PROGRAM WASHINGTON VIEWPOINT, PRODUCED BY THE WBC WASHINGTON NEWS BUREAU

Guest: Democratic Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Interviewed by: Ann M. Corrick, assistant chief, WBC Washington News Bureau and Jim Snyder, chief, WBC Washington News Bureau.

Miss CORRICK. Good evening. This is Ann Corrick with Jim Snyder in the Senate Radio-Television Gallery on Capitol Hill. Our guest on Washington Viewpoint this evening is the majority leader of the Senate, Democratic Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Senator, this is the time of year to engage in the annual pastime of assessing the work of Congress to date. This was a late starting Congress, which so far has produced only two or three major laws. Some of your colleagues are beginning to think this slow pace is quite acceptable to President Kennedy, that he would just as soon Congress didn't get into some of his more controversial new frontier proposals until his tax cut and foreign aid programs are well on their way through. Is the administration willing to let everything else go down the drain in order to push taxes and foreign aid?

Senator MANSFIELD. No. Some of my colleagues to whom you refer are expressing their own thoughts and wishes rather than the facts. The President does want his program passed. The Congress, at least the Senate, after a slow start due to the fight on the change in rule XXII, and the makeup of committees, did get underway about a month and a half ago. The committees since then have been functioning quite well. The legislation which has been reported out has been given quick consideration on the floor of the Senate. And I am very satisfied with what the committees and the Senate as a whole have done. I think we've made a respectable record, and we'll do our very best to get the President's program enacted into law. May I say that it isn't a question of quantity, but rather a question of quality. We should not be judged on the number of bills which we pass or report out of committees, but on the type and the quality of the bills which are considered and become laws.

Miss CORRICK. Have the Democratic leaders considered sitting down with President Kennedy and working out a schedule of priority for his major bills so that the Members of Congress can get its work done and get out for the year at a reasonable time?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, we've never done that. We know what the President's chief priority is every session. For example, last year it was the matter of the trade-policy bill. This year it's the tax-plus reform measure. There's nothing we can do in the Senate on that until the House completes its hearings and debates the measure. That will be the first of June. Then it will come over here. Chairman BYRD will hold hearings which will consume half the time that the House has, and we'll report a bill, probably in August, and pass it by Labor Day.

Miss CORRICK. That sounds like it's going to be another late session this year.

Senator MANSFIELD. No. We were delayed so much at the start that I thought we'd be in until Thanksgiving Day. Being able now to guess at a Labor Day adjournment is pretty optimistic in comparison.

Miss CORRICK. Jim Snyder.

Mr. SNYDER. Senator MANSFIELD, the public image of the Congress seems to have suffered quite a bit in the last year or so. And at the beginning of this session the wrangles over the rules changes, all this talk about a slow legislative pace, now charges of congressional cheating, seem to have dropped the congressional stock in the minds of some people. Does this concern you? And do you feel perhaps that reform of congressional procedures should have a higher priority than it seems to have been given?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, image seems to be the word nowadays to describe a lot of things. The Congress goes along. It has its ups and downs. Attempts are made to reform it or to speed it up. But somehow or other it is able to take care of its legislation, and look after the interests of the country, and the individual Senators are able to look after the interests of their States as well. Now there is a need for some reforms, but I certainly do not think we ought to act hastily. I think we ought to act on an evolutionary basis, and do what we can to keep alive the principle of long-drawnout discussions on occasion, on most important questions, and certainly not reform ourselves to the extent that we operate under the 5-minute rule, and thereby speed it up to such an extent that the consideration of legislation is almost impossible to see in a fair light. Some reforms are needed; very few. The Senate has functioned quite well. It has been a safeguard for the American people. These reforms will come in time, but they will not come overnight.

Mr. SNYDER. What are some of the reforms you feel are needed?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would like to see a change from the two-thirds rule to close off debate, down to three-fifths. In other words, from 67 down to 60 if all Members are present and voting. I would not under any circumstances go below that. I would not be in favor of a bare majority to close off debate because it means that one or two votes could be shifted to one side or the other and an extremely important question thereby settled. I think also this question of the secret session, which we had the other day, ought to be looked into, because I don't believe any two Members should have the power if they desire to use it, and they have now, to force the Senate to go into secret session. I believe in more open hearings and while there is a need for secret sessions, I think that ought to be decided by a majority vote in the closing of the doors and the holding of the session, and not by the first step of two Members asking for it as it is now .

Miss CORRICK. Senator MANSFIELD, Senator CASE said on this program a few weeks ago that he thinks President Kennedy might take the initiative in trying to bring about some reforms of the legislative procedures, because, Senator CASE said, the President is the one man who has the most to win or lose in the sense of getting his legislative program through. Do you think this area is one that President Kennedy should get into?

Senator MANSFIELD. I certainly do not. And I do not think that Members of the Congress should always throw the ball to the President. After all, as far as we're concerned, this is our responsibility. I would be opposed to the President interfering in any way in the internal affairs of the Senate. We're down here; we have responsibilities; we have authority; and if we can't keep our own house in order and do what we think must be done, then I think we all better go home and let somebody else take over our jobs.

Miss CORRICK. Senator, in a little different area, the debate over Cuba continues without letup. One of your colleagues recently called for a multilateral invasion of Cuba as a last resort; this is, a combined effort by the Organization of American States, with active U.S. participation. Do you think that is the ultimate answer, that eventually we'll have to take direct action?

Senator MANSFIELD. No. I cannot see that in the foreseeable future. It may happen, but I think anyone who looks upon that as the ultimate answer is taking an awful lot of responsibility and authority on his shoulders. It appears to me that what we ought to consider there, and this has been brought out by other Members of the Congress over the past months, is the possible recognition, and this is the Smathers idea, incidentally, of a Cuban Government-in-exile. At the present time you have 12 major groups of anti-Castro Cubans. You have more than that in smaller groups. There is no coordination to speak of, and the result is that the administration cannot, because of this diffusion of feelings, responsibility, and power on the part of the Cubans, work with the Cubans as a whole. Until the Cubans get together and organize the different anti-Castro groups into one body under a responsible and recognized leader, it will be impossible to bring about the recognition of a government-in-exile.

But, getting back to your question, I think that some of the measures we could take at the present time are perhaps the reimposition of a quarantine by the Organization of American States, which would include us, against Cuba on the same basis that it was imposed against the Dominican Republic in 1960 and imposed effectively. And then I think what we ought to consider most seriously is the prevention of the training of propagandists and agents between Cuba and Latin America, and do that on a both way basis, two-way basis, and in that way lessen contacts between the Communist leaders in the parties in Latin America with their counterparts in Cuba. Then there's one thing more we ought to consider, and that is this, that the Organization of American States ought to, instead of passing resolutions and making declarations, use the power it has in its organization to take more of a lead in facing up to Castro, because Castro is not a menace just to us alone, he is a menace to the entire hemisphere, and, therefore, it is a hemispheric responsibility.

Miss CORRICK. Senator, just how far can we go without reaching that point where we will be forced to commit ourselves militarily? And, if you agree, once we do reach that point of committing ourselevs militarily, it's not going to be just a simple one division of Marines or something, it would be a full military operation. What is that point?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, that's a point that we cannot foresee at the present time, but some of these possibilities which I've just suggested might be able to take up some of the slack in the meantime, and perhaps could even solve the problem. Unless they're tried, we'll never know. But I would point out that those who are considering an invasion of Cuba, direct military action, better face up to the realities of the situation. It would take a long time, a matter of a couple of weeks, I believe, to mount such a force and I have understood that if such action is undertaken it will take approximately six divisions, and it would be successful, of course, but what you would have confronting you then would be guerrilla-type activity, and we know on the basis of activities of this type in other parts of the world, and even in Cuba, just how effective action of that kind can be.

Mr. SNYDER. Senator, in recent months you've made several efforts to discourage your Republican colleagues in the Senate from making speeches attacking Cuban policy. And you seem to have made some progress in that direction. It has been softening and just the other day Senator KEATING made what you called a statesmanlike speech on the subject. However, now we find that Governor Rockefeller has made a few statements here and there on the subject. Do you feel that despite your best efforts in the Senate that this thing is going to become terribly involved in the Presidential campaign, the debate that went on in the Senate will now move out to the political stump?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, I think it's a strong possibility. It was a factor in the last campaign. The action by the President on October 22 in calling back the leadership and imposing a quarantine on Cuba and, in effect, laying down an ultimatum that the Soviet

missiles should be withdrawn, took it out of the campaign temporarily because the people as a whole understood fully that this action took us to the very brink of nuclear war, and that if the missiles were not removed that very likely there would be nuclear activity between this country and the Soviet Union. Now, as far as the present situation is concerned, I would say that by and large the Republicans have not been too unrestrained in what they've had to say. Most of them have been fairly constructive in their criticism. Others have offered alternative policies, and some have even indicated that we ought to invade Cuba or blockade it, which is an act of war. Well, you may disagree with those people, but at least they are making their position known and they are offering an alternative. The people who criticize for the sake of criticism are the ones who are doing the country no good, and making it more difficult to administer the foreign policy of the Nation as a whole. Now you mentioned Mr. Rockefeller. He was down in Washington lately. He met Republicans of all stripes and of all factions. He certainly was running for the Presidency. I dare say he considers himself the frontrunner. But he did not act like a statesman while he was in Washington because he indirectly accused the President of appeasement. He, by innuendo, raised the question of a possible relationship correspondencewise between Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy. And I think he did himself and his party little good, but much harm. And I think he was a disappointment, because he wasn't the Rockefeller that the people knew who had worked with him.

Mr. SNYDER. Senator, on another topic, there's been quite a bit of bitterness between the Pentagon and the Senate over the TFX investigation. Are you concerned about Pentagon charges that the investigation is causing unnecessary damage and expense to the Defense Department, and has provoked lamentable questioning of the integrity of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I'm not provoked or disturbed about it. I think that Mr. McNamara and his aides should be subject to call by the appropriate committees on specific subjects. This is a very important subject. I think an explanation is in order. Mr. McNamara has given his explanation, is prepared to justify his decision in this matter. And I think that the Senate and the Congress generally is extremely happy to have a man of Mr. McNamara's capability, ability, integrity, and know-how, as our Secretary of Defense. And speaking personally, I think he is by far the best Secretary of Defense we've had. I think he has brought about a type of accommodation between the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which was not noticeable before. And I think also that he has once again emphasized what is in our Constitution and what General Eisenhower in his last speech before leaving the Presidency stated, and that was that in the Department of Defense the military must be subordinate to a civilian head and when it comes to making decisions, if they can't do so, Mr. McNamara is there; he's made them; he will make them; and I hope he continues to make them because that's his job and he's living up to his responsibility.

Mr. SNYDER. The TFX contract investigation is continuing.

Senator MANSFIELD. That's right.

Mr. SNYDER. Do you favor that?

Senator MANSFIELD. I certainly do. I think that Mr. McNamara or any other Cabinet official should, under certain circumstances, be subject to call by the appropriate committee. This is over a $6 billion contract. There is an argument between General Dynamics on the one hand, which has been given the contract and Boeing on the other. Mr. McNamara made his decisions. He is prepared to justify what he has done, and I think that the Congress has a right to ask questions on this matter.

Miss CORRICK. Senator MANSFIELD, the administration is getting criticism from another direction. This is on our effort to negotiate a nuclear test ban treaty. This criticism isn't all coming from Republicans. Just recently an influential Democrat—Congressman HOLIFIELD—expressed some misgivings and warned against acceptance of what he calls a weak treaty. With all this demonstration of suspicion before a treaty is even worked out, do you think the Senate would ratify one if presented any time soon?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would say that it would be most difficult to ratify at this time. Much would depend upon the type of treaty negotiated, as you have indicated. There has not been much progress made to date. At one time I believe we wanted 21 or 22 on-site inspections. The Soviet Union would stand for none. And they have come up to three on-site inspections. We have gone down to eight or nine. And I would suppose that we would be prepared, and I do not know whether this is true or not, to carry on negotiations to probably split the difference. If there is a treaty negotiated, it must be one which allows for enough on-site inspections and must be one which will allow the regulation of this inspection so that we will not be caught short and there will be mutual trust, if that is possible, between the two sides in this particular area.

Miss CORRICK. President Kennedy has said there are many risks in negotiating a test ban treaty, and Secretary of State Rusk has admitted that chances of getting an acceptable treaty from the Russians are quite slim. How long do you think we should go on trying?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, we've been going at this for 3 or 4 years now, and I think there's nothing to be lost while we keep on trying to negotiate. And who knows, some day a satisfactory arrangement might be made, and it should never be said that we failed because we were too proud or too huffy to negotiate. We have to keep in mind the fact that if we ever engage in a thermonuclear war, it will be devastating on both sides or all sides if it comes to that, so there's little to lose through talking. There's much to lose through the unleashing of the nuclear terror.

Miss CORRICK. Do you think we're going to have to resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere?

Senator MANSFIELD. I wouldn't know the answer to that. I would suppose that would be up to the members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department, in view of what the relation of the resumption or lack of resumption of tests would be to our national security and defense.

Mr. SNYDER. Senator MANSFIELD, back in February as Chairman of the special fourman committee which toured southeast Asia, you made a series of recommendations on our aid programs in that area. In that report you expressed doubts about the effectiveness of our aid to South Vietnam and you stressed the importance of our not permitting the South Vietnam war to become our war. Now the situation out there has been deteriorating lately with new fighting in Laos. Do you still feel the same about our South Vietnam policy, and do you think it may become necessary for this country to again send troops to calm things down in Laos?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, that's a far-ranging question or series of questions. I would say that the suggestions made in the report on southeast Asia by Senator PELL of Rhode Island, Senator BOGGS of Delaware, former Senator Smith of Massachusetts, and myself, would still hold up. That report has, of course, received a good deal in the way of criticism since it was issued several months ago. It still comprises the combined thoughts of the four-man group, which visited Vietnam and other parts of southeast Asia. I want to say that I have a high regard and a great respect for Ngo Diem, the President of South Vietnam who, I think, is one of the really good rulers, despite his deficiencies, and we all have them, but who is a man of integrity, devotion, and patriotism, and who I hope would take a more active personal interest in the running of the affairs of his country. I was happy to note, incidentally, that he did make a broadcast a few days ago to his people, known as "operation open arms," in which he promised forgiveness and amnesty to certain rebellious groups, not their leaders, not the hard core people, but the people themselves, if they would come over to the government's side. I commend him for it, because he is doing something which I think could have a beneficial effect, and it's in the tradition of the Tungku's policy in Malaya and President Magsaysay's policy in the Philippines.

Now as far as Laos is concerned, I still think that the only reasonable solution there is the possibility of the tripartite government between the rightests under Phoumi Nosavan, the neutralists under Souvanna Phouma and the Pathet Lao, the extreme leftwingers, under Souphanouvong. We all understood that such a coalition was tentative at best. It may or many not work out. But we ought to do everything we possibly can to see that it does work out and Souvanna Phouma remains in power as Premier, and we ought to do what we can also to get the King Savang Vathana to take a more active interest in the affairs of his country and use his personality and prestige as a level to bring these groups closer together. At the present time things do not look too good in Laos, but I do not think we ought to accept all the reports we receive at face value because it is easy to overemphasize the picture in that country as far as hostilities and fatalities and things of that sort are concerned. But if the coalition government doesn't work, then I suppose the next step would be a division, but I hope that the coalition government does work and that the partition does not come to pass.

Mr. SNYDER. One final question, Senator, how do you feel about the pattern of price increases that has been established in the steel industry in the past week?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, steel has a case because they have had—last year their profits were the lowest in a decade and maybe two decades. Their costs have increased, and I think that in contrast to the political attempt last year to raise prices across the board, which I think could be looked upon possibly as collusion, that this year it is the economic facts which have motivated the steel industry, and they have indicated that on the basis of selectivity, there are certain products which they produce which they feel they must raise their prices on. And I would point out also that the number one in the steel industry—United States Steel—has raised its price on fewer products—more, of course, over the total produced—and their prices have, in general, as I understand it been below the $6 average which was inaugurated by Wheeling Steel. I would express the hope that steel would show industrial statesmanship to the end that inflation would not run hog wild, and would recognize the fact that in this matter of price increases that they do have a responsibility and that that responsibility is theirs primarily and not the Government's.

Miss CORRICK. Thank you, Senator MANSFIELD. I'm sorry to have to bring this discussion to a close, but our time has run out. Our guest on Washington Viewpoint this evening has been Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, the majority leader of the Senate. This is Ann Corrick with Jim Snyder in the Senate Radio-Television Gallery on Capitol Hill.

Red, Dead, or Neutral in Laos?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial in the Peoria Journal Star of April 26, 1963, written by Mr. Charles Dancey, editor, and entitled "Red, Dead, or Neutral in Laos?"

RED, DEAD, OR NEUTRAL IN LAOS?

The report that there is more likelihood or risk, if you please, of American troops going to Laos than to Cuba is a sober fact, and an inescapable one if you coordinate the statements of American officials here in Washington.

I heard more than one official who cannot be named under the rules of the background conference describe our choices in Laos and the situation there as the Reds apparently are threatening to destroy the neutral deal.

Officials had felt that this came about somewhat by accident—that the Reds sought to put pressure on the neutralists and subtly replace them with cryptoneutralists who would really be Red agents. Thus they would capture the two parts of the three-way coalition deal made up of the pro-West group, the Communist Pathet Lao, and the neutralists which by agreement have ruled jointly.

If the Reds could also masquerade as neutralists they could dominate the coalition and take over Laos by sheer trickery, leaving us high and dry.

However, they overplayed their hands, in assassinating a key and highly respected real neutralist leader. An exceptionally violent reaction came from the neutralists who promptly assassinated the leading cryptoneutralist—i.e., Red agent.

This pushed the Reds into a position where they are threatening to eliminate the neutralists and destroy the coalition—instead of successfully and sneakily taking it over.

It puts them in more of a risky situation than they intended but present signs are that under the prodding of the Chinese hard line they intend to push ahead instead of wiggle out of the mess they've made.

We hope they'll recognize our own determination and ultimately settle for another status quo arrangement of some kind but it is doubtful if they will in view of the pressures against Khrushchev's so-called soft line of recent years.

What is they push ahead?

I heard another American official discuss with great concern the problem of Khrushchev being replaced by somebody harder to deal with, or of Khrushchev being forced to go along with the Chinese attitude, or of the Chinese capturing the leadership of the Communist movement to a greater extent.

This seems to be a matter of prime, if not desperate concern, as greatly increasing the threat of a nuclear exchange—fatal to both sides.

This feeling is so strong that some "Kremlinologists have recommended that we "bail Khrushchev out" by throwing him some sort of a plum—but we have rejected that because we just can't find anything to give him that would help him without it being a serious loss to us.

If we submit to a serious setback in Laos, this would not only be a victory for communism over the free world, but a victory for Chinese policy over Russian.

The impression is that the latter is of more grave concern to the administration than the former. In any case, a real Red push there will involve both.

Against the background of these two discussions, what happens if no new deal is possible in Laos? What if the Reds won't deal this time?

Then, according to an American official, we have only two alternatives left—write it off, or fight for it to the degree that is necessary (hopefully with help to others but admittedly the "others" are hard to find in Laos).

Could we possibly afford to present Laos as a major victory to the Red Chinese philosophy, thus discrediting Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence policy and proving the aggressive Chinese attitude is the right course for the Communists?

In the light of these two strong current points of view among officials, this would seem impossible.

These two premises, if we continue to hold them, inevitably mean that we could not tolerate a Chinese victory.

Since the Chinese do not have a nuclear capability, we might well feel obliged to have a showdown in some form of nonnuclear war in Laos—and elsewhere—rather than see a Chinese war philosophy adopted in Russia where they do have nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles.

And hope that the Russians would not feel too bad to see Chinese philosophy suffer a setback and the "paper tiger" doctrine dispelled—so that they can get along with the Khrushchev doctrine without further interference or opposition.

Would we really have a choice? If we believe what American officials obviously do believe at this moment?

It may seem strange that little Laos, 9,000 or more miles away, is of more concern in Washington today than Cuba, 90 miles away—but it is—and this is why.

C. L. DANCEY.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 8, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Congressman FLOOD'S House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations cannot but become a vital factor in national security. It will underline the fact that the United States is vitally interested in the plight of the captive nations in Europe and Asia, serving a warning to Russian colonialism as well as adding substance to President Kennedy's "Walk softly and carry a big stick" policy.

We, the undersigned Temple University students, recognize the importance of such a resolution in that it will provide irrefutable footenotes to the Russian colonial myth; and, therefore, we urge you to give your most kind attention to House Resolution 14.

Sincerely yours,

Edwina Stuczynski, Gwendolyn Smith, Helen Kosopud, Daria Kyweluk, Wm. Cipolla, John Lansbury, Nicholas Pyahuk, Anthony Nepoli, Howard Rhodes, William O'Brien, Richard Feketo, Michael Golden, Vivien Sinclair, Mark Iwasz, Antonio J. LaBranche, Zoreslava Kolinko, Walter Wanchycky, Zoreslava Bobynska, Eleanora Karpinicz, Christine Nitka, Catherine Shekinska, Stanley S. Rulin, Oksana Nikovich, Zishe Bernelyn, Myra Konysh, George Luciev, Paros Pow Dobrowelskyj.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 8, 1963.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of the letter sent to Congressman Smith requesting his vital support for your resolution regarding the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Let me take this opportunity to express my personal esteem for your edifying and meritorious work in behalf of captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER PRETKA.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 8, 1963.*

Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I strongly urge your support in the passage of the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14, which would create a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

As chairman of the House Rules Committee, your powerful support of this resolution would be quickly and effectively demonstrated by submitting this resolution for vote in your committee.

All peoples of the captive nations as well as all good Americans would be eternally grateful for your zealous support of this resolution. Passage and implementation of this resolution would clearly show those millions of unfortunate victims of Russian imperialism that America is still the champion of human freedom, liberty, and self-determination, even though our indecisive action

in Cuba and a profound ignorance of the facts regarding captive nations as demonstrated by our Secretary of State might make them believe otherwise.

You can be certain that establishment of the Captive Nations Committee will be one in a series of events leading to the final destruction of Russian imperialism, victory for America in the cold war, and a true and lasting peace among nations.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER PRETKA.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 6, 1963.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

HON. REPRESENTATIVE DANIEL J. FLOOD: I take the liberty on behalf of the members of the Ukrainian National Council of the State of Minnesota to write you a few words about your great effort in formation of a Special Committee for Captive Nations.

As you may recall in an official statement our Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated that all those countries are members of the Soviet Union by tradition and not enslaved.

We, Ukrainians of the State of Minnesota, express our greatest regret on Rusk statement and the present policy of the State Department. Such policy destroys all hope for the people enslaved by the Russian Communist.

Now let us look at the map of the world as it was over 40 years ago. At that time there were only about 150 million people in Communist chains. Now let's look at the world as it is at the present time. This 6th day of March 1963, over one-third of the earth's area is under Communist control and over 900 million people in Communist chains. Now the question is: Has that also happened by tradition?

Is there any sovereign state in the world—independent, democratic, economically vigorous, and having a high standard of living—which would willingly invite military occupation and political subjugation by a large neighbor? Would such subjugation be welcome when that neighbor had a lower living standard, had no democratic institutions, and was under the rule of a cruel dictatorship?

The Soviet Union at the U.N. contends that 88 territories under the sovereignty of other nations having a total population of 71 million are still under colonial rule. But it says nothing about the progress that has been made in recent years. The Soviets do not mention the 850 million people in some 37 countries which have achieved political independence since 1945 from non-Communist countries. The Soviets, are significantly silent about the 100 million non-Russian people living under the Soviet rule who have never been given an opportunity to decide whether they wish to remain part of the Soviet dictatorial empire.

I only hope that our diplomatic authorities would never in the future repeat such grave mistakes, as it happened during and after the Second World War.

Dear Representative, we deeply appreciate for your understanding and your honest effort in formation Special Committee of Captive Nations. We all must put as much effort as possible for its realization. Let us work together in combating Communist slavery and tyranny.

We hope to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER MELNYCHENKO, Jr.,
President.

HEADQUARTERS, BYELORUSSIAN LIBERATION FRONT,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 8, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We know from your letter of March 20, 1963, that you are planning again to introduce in Congress on March 27, 1963, a proposal to organize a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

We are very grateful to you for your efforts which you have made on behalf of the captive nations enslaved by communism and we believe that at the present time when Communist danger is noticeably increasing, the organization of such a committee would be desirable and very useful in the political struggle against communism.

We cannot know the results of your last appeal in this question, but we kindly ask you, Mr. Congressman, to take all necessary steps so that at the proper time you can organize this committee which you have planned.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN SHIMCHIK,
Chairman.

THE UKRAINIAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION OF HARTFORD,
Hartford, Conn., April 5, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member, U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent by our organization to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman House Rules Committee, urging his support of your resolution in the Rules Committee. We are firmly convinced of the extreme importance of such a resolution, and we wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you for your undaunted support of this measure.

Respectfully yours,

IHOR ZACHARIASEWYCZ,
President.

THE UKRAINIAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION OF HARTFORD,
Hartford, Conn., April 5, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The Ukrainian Student Association of Hartford wishes to take this opportunity to urge you strongly to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee and to give this vital resolution your favorable consideration.

At the present time there exists an imperative need for the creation of a Committee on Captive Nations which would serve as a source of comprehensive and objective information about this strategic region which unfortunately up to now has often been neglected and about which there still exist many misconceptions. Having now recognized the inadequateness and fallaciousness of much of our knowledge about this area, it is essential that we adopt positive measures to counteract these shortcomings. Keeping in mind that "a little learning is a dangerous thing," we should not hesitate or be afraid to seek out and make known all the pertinent facts about the captive nations. The success of our future foreign policy depends upon our thorough knowledge of this important area.

It is our sincerest hope that you will give your full and unqualified support to the Flood Resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

IHOR ZACHARIASEWYCZ,
President.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, when Congress forced prohibition on the American people, the only ones who reveled in it were the bootleggers and gangsters because it had provided them with a new source of revenue.

However, we learned the hard way that prohibition did not stop people from drinking. It merely forced legitimate human desires to go underground. After spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in trying to enforce an unenforceable law, we found ourselves caught in a net of terrorism, gangsterism, and corruption.

It was only the sensible repeal of prohibition, Mr. Speaker, and the subsequent governmental regulation, control and supervision of the alcoholic industry that finally put an end to that bloody bootleg era and started to pump billions of dollars into our economy and into our own treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House some very interesting figures. Since 1935, the Federal Government has collected over $93 billion in revenue from this industry. Last year alone, the Treasury took in over $5½ billion. The revenue to the individual States and local governments, since repeal, came to over $33 billion. In addition, this industry has made a tremendous contribution to our national economy. Recent figures show that it employs over 1⅓ million workers with earnings of over $5 billion a year.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it was only after we took the liquor trade out of the hands of the underworld that we were able to restore normalcy in the drinking habits of our citizens, enrich our Government treasuries and contribute to our national economy.

Today, Mr. Speaker, because of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, we have permitted and allowed this activity to grow into a $50 billion a year business and become the chief source of revenue for organized crime.

It should be crystal clear by now that our antigambling laws have not stopped—and never will stop—that normal human urge to gamble. Like prohibition, these laws against human nature have driven that desire underground. It should be further obvious to us that no matter how much we try to tighten and strengthen our laws against the professional gamblers, we will never quench the American thirst to gamble.

Mr. Speaker, just as repeal of prohibition brought an end to the bootleg era and new revenues into our treasuries so

would the end of hypocrisy in our treatment of gambling strike a lethal blow at organized gambling and pump a good portion of these moneys into the coffers of our Federal Government.

Only a national lottery could tap this $50 billion a year gambling business and produce at least $10 billion a year in new revenue for our treasury which could be used to cut our taxes and reduce our gigantic national debt.

Let us not compound the errors we made with prohibition. Let us have the Government regulate and control this gambling industry so that our economy, our treasury and our people will become the beneficiaries.

Blueprint for Suicide?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 19, 1963:

BLUEPRINT FOR SUICIDE?

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The intelligent citizen urgently needs guidance on national defense and a nuclear test ban just as he recently needed guidance on foreign aid and what should be done about it.

Nonpartisan, responsible guidance is what the intelligent citizen urgently needs. President Kennedy provided that kind of guidance on foreign aid when he named the Clay Committee to investigate. Mr. Kennedy commissioned Clay's Committee because the taxpayers seemed to be making up their minds to cut foreign aid down to size, very small size.

It is the consensus here that Gen. Lucius Clay's temperate report will protect the 1963 foreign aid appropriation against meat ax surgery under which it might have expired altogether. It probably is fair to say that the Clay Committee restored much public confidence in foreign aid and in the administration's explanations as to why it is necessary.

Now mounted against the Kennedy administration on national defense policy in general and a nuclear test ban in particular is the kind of formidable opposition that almost brought foreign aid down to defeat. Regularly published is a pamphlet, "Washington Report," sponsored by the American Security Council. It is frightening reading. The latest issue says the United States is hastening toward a technological Pearl Harbor.

"By hook or crook," the report says, "we are abandoning the nuclear race. Frantically we pursue the nuclear test-ban treaty. Instead of catching up, we continue to negotiate. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, during more than 2 years in office, has not authorized a single new weapons system. He is slowing down our technological progress deliberately. All things considered, it does not look as though under the stewardship of Mr. McNamara, the United States is being equipped to forestall a nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor."

What is the intelligent citizen to make of that? It's not as if the security council could be brushed off as a council of nobodies. It is not. The national strategy committee of the security council includes: Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, retired; Adm. Ben Moreel, retired; Dr. Robert Morris; Adm. Arthur W. Radford, retired; Adm. Felix B. Stump, retired; Dr. Edward Teller; Adm. Chester C. Ward, retired; and Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, retired. It is not possible to laugh off, brush off, or disregard such men.

House Republicans have set up a committee on nuclear testing of which Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, is chairman. Representative HOSMER is a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. On April 16, Representative HOSMER circulated a news release captioned "Administration Test Ban Proposals Blueprint for National Suicide."

That is might strong language. But Representative HOSMER cannot be laughed off or brushed off, either. He is, in fact, reflecting some responsible military opinion and some responsible civilian judgment, too.

Neo-McCarthyism of Peter Edson and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a decade ago so-called McCarthyism was the subject of vast attacking crusade by the red hot liberals of this country. Literally miles of newspaper and magazine columns were devoted to the evils of guilt by association. The syrupy voices of numerous radio and television correspondents choked with tears while deploring it.

But now things seem a little different. With the emotional, bleeding heart fringe of test ban treaty proponents faced with irrefutable facts indicating Kennedy test ban are neither safe nor sane, that the United States is in effect proposing to stop all nuclear progress and simply trust a Communist promise to do likewise—guilt by association seems to have become respectable.

If a man's arguments and logic cannot be met, then smear the man. Throw him in a pot along with a stew of mixed characters which you think already are discredited in one way or another. Then sit back and wait for his point of view to boil away in a steam of venom.

The resurgence of McCarthyism was evident in a recent letter to the New York Times written by one Dr. David R. Inglis which associated those opposing administration test ban proposals with such expressions a "irresponsible," "ridiculous," "sabotage," "nightmare," "false statement," and so on. A letter in a similar vein written by James J. Wadsworth was printed in the same newspaper. Editorial handling of the test ban issue by the Baltimore Sun on April 17, was not far from newly legitimized McCarthyism in its echoing of such expressions as "rightwing cry," "nonsensicality," and "final black disaster."

Although this characteristic temper-tantrum syndrome exhibited by many pseudo-intellectuals when caught on the side of illogic may be diagnosed as no more than an amusing psychological retrogression, in relation to vital test ban issue; it is a sickness dangerous to the national security and should be identifield as such in its early stages. The following editorial in the April 26 issue of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram does a good job of diagnosing an attack of neo-McCarthyism:

DISARMAMENT, YES, BUT NOT NATIONAL SUICIDE

Falling into patterns of logic and expression which he would have deplored in a Senator Joseph McCarthy, Columnist Peter Edson writes:

"A drive against disarmament and a nuclear test ban treaty with Soviet Russia has sprung up in various parts of the country as the newest conservative cause."

The principal rightwing objective, he declares, "seems to be repeal of the 1961 act of Congress creating the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the State Department."

Next, in the same breath in which he mentions the introduction of a resolution to abolish the Disarmament Agency, he states that a group of Republicans headed by Representative CRAIG HOSMER is concentrating on opposition to the proposed test ban treaty.

He goes on to describe the "rising campaign against disarmament efforts" with such terms as "vicious attack," "misrepresentation," "noisy," "rightwing," and "hotbed of opposition."

Perhaps some of those terms apply in some cases. But the total effect of Edson's column is to make opposition, on any basis, to disarmament and test ban proposals look like the irresponsible ranting of wild-eyed rightest extremists.

This impression does a great injustice to many reasonable, moderate citizens—among them Representative CRAIG HOSMER—who support disarmament, but not national suicide.

Representative HOSMER voted in favor of establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He states he has not been and is not now in favor of abolishing that Agency. Nor is he campaigning against disarmament or a test ban treaty. The following is his position:

"If the purpose of a test ban treaty is to reduce the risks of the nuclear world in which we live, then we'd better get an effective treaty—one which stops the other side's progress when we stop ours—and which does not depend on Communist promises alone to do it."

To show why he feels it necessary to approach with caution the signing of any treaty with the Reds, he points to a statement from a report of the American Bar Association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives:

During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words (700 volumes). All this talk led to 52 major agreements, and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them.

The statement seems conservative. A report by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has listed 61 Soviet treaty violations. However, the exact number of violations is not in issue. Soviet duplicity and faith need not be proven but have become matters of common knowledge.

If a man expresses skepticism about agreements which depend on nothing more than

Soviet promises, should he be labeled as an opponent of disarmament? Obviously not. He is wisely distinguishing between the desirable goal and the unrealistic means proposed for its achievement.

We hope that all citizens will make that distinction, even at the risk of being lumped among the extremists by those naive people who would throw Red Riding Hood to the wolf if he assured them he was grandma.

E. Stanley Jones: Catalyst for Reconciliation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have noted that a group of members of the Swedish Parliament has nominated Dr. E. Stanley Jones for the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1963. Even a minature review of Dr. Jones' life as a man of God recommends him for the highest acclaim. He has truly been a "blessed peacemaker." In my mail I have received the following summary of the life of Dr. Jones which I offer to all for their review.

The article follows:

E. STANLEY JONES: CATALYST FOR RECONCILIATION

Much has been written over the past 4 decades concerning Dr. E. Stanley Jones' efforts to bring reconciliation between clashing, even warring, groups of people, and to mediate political and ideological disputes between states. Based in this deep-rooted faith that God desires all men to live as brothers and in peace, that all problems are human problems, and as such can be solved when men sit down together and honestly try to understand one another, he has gone to earth's "trouble spots" and spoken freely for frank facing of all situations. Indeed, 30 years before the United Nations came into existence, Dr. Jones publicly proposed "a roundtable of the nations that would help eliminate the three throttling forms of imperialism: political, financial, and racial."

Without any portfolio other than that of his faith, he has traveled among the peoples of the earth, a catalyst acting upon other persons—many of them in high government posts—who helped promote international understanding. Only briefly can we note here some of the movements for peace and reconciliation he advanced:

BURMA

In 1949, on a visit to Burma where the Burmese people and the Christian Karens (traditional enemies) were on the verge of war, Dr. Jones helped the Karen leaders draw up "A 12-Point Program for Peace"—the central suggestion being a Karen State in the Union. Both sides agreed, but later charges of Burmese treachery led to open clash—and 10 years of rebellion. Only recently have some of the points helped guide the nation to peace.

KOREA

After the Korean war, the Methodists (as other Christians) were badly split over charges of collaboration with the Japanese. Dr. Jones preached to the leading laymen and ministers on forgiveness and reconciliation; leaders of both factions clasped hands, and the competing conferences voted to unite—unconditionally. The church in South Korea then opened doors and hearts to refugees from North Korea.

THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR (1937)

Dr. Jones made extraordinary efforts to help promote peace between China and Japan, as a friend of both nations. "We could not wait for governments to act," he said later, "but we could act as Christians across international boundary lines." He counseled not only with government officials of both nations, but with foreign residents, missionaries, and student groups. He addressed open letters to the people of Japan, to the Christian people of America and Great Britain, and to the Christian people (and conscience) of the world. The letters were widely circulated in the newspapers and magazines of Asia, Europe, and America. The war did come: but the world understood that governments had failed the cause of peace. Madame Chiang Kai-shek later wrote to Dr. Jones: "You have taken the only honest attitude compatible with Christian ideals. Japan takes the silence of the powers as approval of her methods."

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

For 3 months before the attack on Pearl Harbor, Dr. Jones labored, principally in Washington, to avert the struggle that seemed imminent between the two nations. He was trusted as a friend of Japan by the Japanese envoys who came to Washington to seek a basis of peace: Dr. Jones, and others who knew the men, have faith that their quest was sincere. He was trusted by President Roosevelt and by many other leaders who encouraged him to consult and negotiate unofficially on the whole problem; he actually had hundreds of interviews. Indeed, the final cable that the President sent the Emperor of Japan—a cable that if it had been placed in the Emperor's hands on time might have prevented the war—was a direct result of Dr. Jones' negotiations.

When Dr. Jones visited Japan after the war, he was greeted with banners saying, "Welcome to the Apostle of Peace." Admiral Nomura and others publicly cited Dr. Jones' efforts on behalf of peace. The Emperor thanked him for what he was doing for Japan's spiritual regeneration. General MacArthur welcomed him as an apostle of good will and peace.

Dr. Jones did not prevent the war with Japan. But he did lay foundations of understanding and trust on which both nations are building new cooperation.

THE BELGIAN CONGO

On the eve of the Congo's independence from Belgium in 1960, Dr. Jones was invited there by missionaries and African leaders, to discuss, at roundtable conferences and public meetings, the future relationship of the foreign missionary and the African church under the new form of government. There the Africans named Dr. Jones "the reconciler." He was appalled at the lack of preparation of the people for independence, and the lack of educated professional men. In an open letter to the people of the Congo he urged peace, good will, understanding; and he urged education as a means toward wise leadership. The letter was widely circulated in French and in African tongues. Largely out of this conference grew the present expanded efforts of the missionaries to prepare the Congo people for industrial leadership and self-government.

RACE AND DISCRIMINATION

Taught by his faith that all men are brothers, sons of the one God, and that each is capable of infinite development, Dr. Jones has been outspoken against racism and racial or color discrimination in any part of the world. And he has been no less outspoken in his own United States than in South Africa.

Once in Columbia, S.C., where Negroes were not allowed to register (and therefore not to vote), Dr. Jones announced in a public meeting: "I have an obituary notice to read. Democracy died today in the city of Columbia when American citizens were denied the right of suffrage because of the color of their skins. For those who have the eyes to see, the ballot box will henceforth be draped in mourning. Let us pray" Columbia newspapers next day bannered: "Stanley Jones Reads Obituary for Democracy in Columbia." Two years later Negroes were voting in Columbia. In other of his meetings in the South, Dr. Jones insisted on Negroes and whites worshipping together.

During a visit to the churches in South Africa, Dr. Jones wrote a widely published open letter to the people of South Africa, urging them to abolish apartheid policies and practices.

RELIGIOUS BASE OF PEACE

To Dr. Jones, his religion and his efforts for peace and reconciliation are not two separate quests of his career. They are one and the same. "Peace," he says, "is not something concerning which you can say, 'Now let us have peace.' Peace cannot be had that way. Peace is a byproduct of conditions out of which peace naturally comes. * * * If reconciliation is God's chief business, it is ours. We are to carry on God's reconciling work. We are to reconcile in three directions: between man and God, between man and himself, and between man and man."

The Patent Trader Warns of Test Ban Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Patent Trader is the largest paid circulation non-daily newspaper in New York and New England, serving upper Westchester and Putnam Counties of New York. Yesterday, April 28, its Sunday edition carried the following cogent editorial warning concerning the dangers in present test ban treaty proposals:

THE PATENT TRADER WARNS OF TEST BAN TRAP

On April 20 Premier Khrushchev told an Italian editor that he was pondering whether or not to scrap the two or three on-site nuclear inspections the Russians have been talking about at Geneva. This information was disseminated in U.S. newspapers dated April 22.

On April 22, the same day, the Kennedy administration announced it had instructed its Ambassador in Moscow to sound Khrushchev out on the possibility of big three talks on a nuclear test ban treaty. But, according to the New York Times' report, it was seeking this meeting at the insistence of Britain and against its better judgment.

The fact that the administration wants no credit for the proposed meeting can only portend a further U.S. capitulation to Russian demands and another victory for those fighting for an agreement for agreement's sake, no matter what the consequences to our national survival.

Elsewhere on this page we have reprinted the remarks of Representative CRAIG HOSMER, ranking House minority member on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as they

appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 15. He argues that the on-site inspection provisions are meaningless and goes on to prove his point. He states that a new set of "drastically scaled down treaty demands" has already been drafted for submission to the Russians. An ineffective treaty, he says, can only provide the Russians with the opportunity of building up their own nuclear superiority—while our nuclear potential remains stagnated—until they can back up a "surrender or die" ultimatum.

And he mentions a little noted remark President Kennedy made a year ago to the effect that our technical laboratories would be closed down and our topflight scientists would go to other jobs if there were no prospect of future nuclear testing.

There well may be those in the Kennedy administration who would prefer to be red than dead, but if history holds true we face a far, far greater danger of nuclear attack if we are the secondary nuclear power than we do if we maintain and perhaps increase our own superiority.

No war, hot or cold, has ever been won by the weak.

Unemployment Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, having restored the funds last week to the accelerated public works program and with such measures as Youth Conservation Corps and tax cut legislation in the offing, it is proper that Congress once again inform itself as to the necessity for such legislation.

Ed Townsend, the labor correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, collated the following unemployment observations and statistics in a recent article as follows:

WHO ARE THE JOBLESS?

Few who pay even the slightest attention to national affairs are allowed to forget for long the troublesome statistical bulk of the country's unemployment. It is a social, economic, and political problem, and a constant subject of debate and propaganda.

Everyone seems to agree that the unemployment situation is serious and that something must be done about it. There is much less agreement on exactly how serious the problem really is, whether it is worse than the Kennedy administration concedes it to be or not nearly as bad as the national figures would suggest.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz announced in Washington a few days ago that unemployment figures for mid-March show encouraging improvement; the number of jobless had declined to 4,501,000 or 5.6 percent of the labor force, and the number employed to 67,148,000. However, Secretary Wirtz added that the decline in the unemployment rate to the average for 1962 should not be considered cause for a broader satisfaction. The number who are jobless is much too high, Mr. Wirtz said.

The March figures are a more than seasonal improvement over those for February when 4,900,000 or 6.1 percent were jobless; 1,300,000 of them for 15 weeks or longer.

The Labor Department figures for the unemployed excluded workers who were only partially employed during the survey period; if they worked a few hours a week, they were not counted among the jobless. Additional figures show 2,100,000 were underemployed, working less than full weeks.

Although Government economists estimated the gain in employment in March at 800,000, they noted that such an increase, even if it can be maintained, would not be enough to keep pace with the steady increase in the labor force and that the unemployment rate may rise to 7 percent by 1967 if jobs are not opened up faster than they have been since the late 1950's. Unemployment has averaged 5½ percent or more annually over the past 5 years. When the Kennedy administration took office, it talked of the necessity of lowering this rate to no more than 4 percent.

In comparison, the jobless level has been 3.1 percent (700,000 to 800,000) in Great Britain, where the unemployed rioted recently in protest against government inaction.

BLURRED PICTURE

The fact that there has not been more open protest in this country may be laid in part to the uneven geographic impact of unemployment and to the fact that the groups hit the hardest tend to be the least articulate.

Generally, the official unemployment statistics give only a blurred, far-off picture of the problem. They show the bulk but not the particulars.

For better understanding, it is necessary to separate the mass of the unemployed into individuals, men and women who say they want to work but cannot.

The 5.6 percent average of unemployment in March was a national figure, covering all parts of force, derived from the busy industries (some working overtime) as well as the depressed ones only barely getting along.

In some areas, including West Virginia and other coalfields, the rate of unemployment may run as high as 20 to 25 percent instead of 5.6 percent. There is a degree of hopelessness and helplessness in these areas that is not to be found elsewhere.

This is equally true of depressed industries. Unemployment rates are high. In some, occupations, not just jobs, have been wiped out.

Unemployment is affecting various parts of the population just as differently. The jobless, and particularly the long-term unemployed, are most likely to be concentrated in the ranks of young workers, women, workers over 45, Negroes, and other minorities.

Most tend to be unskilled or low skilled. But, according to a Labor Department study of 1,800,000 workers who received extended jobless aid between April, 1961 and July, 1962, they are likely to be "for the most part * * * the chief source of support for themselves and their families and * * * in the prime years of their working lives."

President Kennedy recently warned in a manpower report to Congress that "1 of every 7 youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work." This is something over 13 percent unemployment among the newcomers to the labor force.

PROBLEM ASSAYED

Many economists and sociologists consider the unemployment problems of young workers to be the most important that must be faced—the number of young workers entering the labor force is now increasing at an unprecedented pace, according to a manpower report submitted by President Kennedy to Congress. He added:

"In the years ahead the labor market will be flooded by young people. In 1960, 2,600,000 turned 18 in the United States. Two years from now, in 1965, the number reaching that age will have increased by almost 50 percent, so that 3,800,000 will turn 18 that year."

Jobs must be created for those who leave school or, after their graduation, for those who continue their education. If openings do not develop in sufficient numbers, the young people will be a restless hard-core, unemployment group. The administration is particularly bothered by this because Justice Department files show that juvenile delinquency and youth crime rates tend to move along with youth-unemployment rates.

Harvard's former president, James Bryant Conant, recently warned that this could be social dynamite for the future—and the administration agrees in general with this.

Along with the young, the older workers are particularly hard hit by unemployment. The rate for those 55 or over is about 13 percent as compared with the national average of 13 percent. Workers between 45 and 55 are only a little less affected.

WOMEN HIT HARDEST

Seniority provides some protection for the older workers when layoffs come, but once they lose jobs it becomes much more difficult for them to get new ones. Most employers prefer to hire in a 21-to-45 age bracket. Moreover, in many instances where retraining is involved the older workers, having less background of formal schooling, are not as quickly or as easily prepared for new jobs. Finding new jobs for them in their old skills is becoming increasingly hard.

Women are affected more than men, at all ages. A Government survey in 1962 found women had an unemployment rate that averaged 6.2 percent at the time, as compared with the male rate of 5.3 percent. At the time, women made up one-third of the labor force, and about 1 woman in every 17 was jobless, according to a Labor Department study, a higher rate of unemployment than that of men "primarily because of the increased numbers of women who enter or leave the labor force for short periods of time."

This is a factor that tends to inflate jobless rolls slightly. Over half of all women hold jobs for some part of their lives, and many drift into the labor force. They take jobs in tight labor markets, when jobs are easily available, and leave them and collect unemployment compensation at other times, some technically more than actually still in the labor force. They take jobs when their husbands earn less than their normal takehome, or when debts are undertaken, and drift out of the jobs when the need passes, but remain on compensation rolls as job seekers.

RANKS INFLATED

Negroes and members of other minority groups, in some areas Puerto Ricans and Cuban refugees inflating their ranks, also tend to be hit hard by layoffs. The Negroes in factories are victims of the seniority systems; the last hired, they are among the first fired. In other instances, their reemployment problems are increased by the low level of their skills, not a result of a lack of ability as much as a consequence of the lack of opportunity to be trained in apprenticeship and other programs.

Unemployment among Negroes averaged 11 percent in 1962, double the white unemployment rate. The level was even higher in February, 13 percent, and it could go up further in the months ahead.

These, then, are likely to be the unemployed: the young jobseekers, under 21; workers 55 and up and, to a less extent, those 45 to 55; women of all ages but more likely the younger ones, who tend more to be casual, more inclined to drift in the labor market; and members of minority races.

The problems of these groups become greater where job opportunities are shrinking the fastest, in coalfields, in packinghouse centers where many Negroes once found jobs,

and few now do, and in distress areas and industries.

However, unemployment can hit almost anyone. Last year, 14 million workers, of roughly 65 million, were unemployed for some part of the year, the fortunate ones for only a week or so, others for months. Some 750,000 workers were unemployed for 26 or more weeks during the year. During 1961, a postwar high of 2,100,000 workers were jobless for 15 weeks or longer.

The average unemployment term in 1962 was 14.7 weeks, a little less than the 15.5 weeks in 1961 but more than the 12.8 weeks in 1960.

Short-term unemployment is generally considered to be frictional in nature; it is caused by temporary dislocations, plants down to balance production and orders, workers changing jobs, similar kinds of flux. When President Kennedy talked of "full employment" with no more than 4 percent jobless, he was thinking of holding unemployment to frictional levels.

However, many employment economists contend that today's lower turnover in manufacturing jobs, once about 6 percent a month, and now down to about 1 percent a month, due in large part to fringe benefits based on length of service, means that frictional unemployment is seldom more than 3 percent of the labor force. Whatever is beyond that, now the additional 3.1 percent involves serious job losses.

These have persisted and built up from one economic downturn to another, never cleared away by intervening recoveries. In the past 5 years, employment experts have noted the increasing number of persons sifting to the bottom of the economic heap, the so-called hard core of unemployed who remain out of work even in prosperous years.

Labor Secretary Wirtz recently commented about them, "There is a real danger of people getting used to unemployment."

HARDSHIP CUSHIONED

Some employment economists go so far as to say that they might as well get used to it; many now unemployed will never work again, they say, and our unemployment-compensation laws that cushion their hardship should be revised to provide some form of dole for them. Fortunately, this group is in the minority. Others are seeking more constructive ways of solving problems.

The Michigan Employment Security Commission, for one, is conducting a valuable study of the hard core—18,000 in the State jobless a half-year or more—to find how they can best be helped. Its findings show the group is increasingly isolated, socially and economically; it is generally demoralized, with poor attitudes, dejection over long inability to get work, and lack of incentives; it almost has hardened into a class likely to be concentrated, with low-income workers, in central city areas, and it is in a poor position to be retrained for new jobs—according to the study, "these hardcore people lost production jobs because they weren't able to cope with the new skills demanded today."

To retrain the hard core under programs such as the Federal Manpower Development Training Act, to enable the jobless to compete with younger better educated workers pouring into the labor force, would take months and use most of the act's allotment on relatively few people. Then, too, the manpower act requires that only those with a reasonable chance of getting and holding a job be retrained. This requirement discriminates against the hard core.

"Those in greatest economic need are those least able to compete for training," a Michigan study spokesman said.

The lack of skill, and of ability to be trained for needed skills, generally highly specialized, can explain an incongruity: with high unemployment, many jobs are open because they can't be filled. Another explanation is that unemployment is spotty, high in some places, low in others, and today's unemployed workers lack the mobility to move from one place to the other, some lack the means to move, others the willingness to tear up roots in one place to go to another.

Many of these factors result in criticism of the unemployed, sometimes harshly as chiselers who feel that the Government owes them a living for not working. There are many abuses of unemployment laws; nobody can deny that. But the bulk of claimants of compensation undoubtedly are legitimate and deserve sympathy and understanding, with more consideration of what can be done for them.

The hard-core unemployment we now have is a social and economic phenomenon unlike any in U.S. history; it persists in relatively good times. It doesn't compare with the unemployment in the depression, when unemployment reached 30 percent in Detroit, for example. It carries a social stigma now that it did not when times were bad and unemployment touched nearly every family at some time.

The greatest problem is: It is to get worse if the economy doesn't jump higher and faster than most economists expect it to.

Shalom, Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 15th anniversary of the rebirth of Israel, and I join with all her friends in commemorating this day and in paying tribute to her valiant people who have struggled against seemingly insurmountable problems to achieve their outstanding progress. Their dedication to the advancement of their country is a fitting example for the millions of people throughout the world who have recently gained their independence.

I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following editorial from today's Chicago Sun-Times:

SHALOM, ISRAEL

On this day in the Gregorian calendar (5 Iyar 5723), according to the Hebrew calendar, the State of Israel celebrates the 15th anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence in the ancient homeland.

The new state has come a long way since May 14, 1948 (5 Iyar 5708) when after nearly 2,000 years of exile and servitude Israel was revived.

It has not been an easy journey. Never in history did such a small country open its doors to so many people in such a short time. Seldom, if ever before in history, has a people worked with such energy to build a modern industrial nation on the ruins of the past.

A country once desolate now blooms. A people once forced to roam the face of the earth now have a homeland. Land once worthless now is fertile and produces 75 percent of the food necessary to feed its people. Ancient deserts now ripple with grain and the soil has been enriched with the blood Israel's people.

On this day, significant in world history, we are privileged to salute a gallant country and a proud people. May the years to come bring happiness and plenty.

Shalom.

A Dynamic Crusader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Tarentum (Pa.) Valley News, commending the efforts of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to combat organized crime.

The editorial is as follows:

[From Tarentum (Pa.) Valley News, Mar. 29, 1963]

A DYNAMIC CRUSADER

America's powerful crime empire, including its segment in Westmoreland County, has met its match in energetic and determined Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

Never have the Nation's czars and kings of organized crime faced such a threat from law enforcement as confronts them today. They know they're dealing with a young man who will give them no quarter. They fully realize that he is resolved to put them out of business. More than that, they know he is capable of doing it.

Alle-Kiski Valley residents have been appreciative observers of the anticrime war as Mr. Kennedy has waged it in Westmoreland and Washington Counties. He has not won the war in this area but he triumphed in many battles and he is fighting harder than ever. The county's overlords of crime have learned that no deals can be made where Mr. Kennedy is concerned.

No Attorney General in recent history of the United States has even begun to blast away at the bigtime gamblers and racketeers as Mr. Kennedy has done. His success in dealing with these hoodlums is largely the result of his being able to unite all Federal law enforcement departments in a continued and ceaseless hammering away at organized crime in many parts of the Nation, with the big shots—the men who are usually able to scorn the law and get away with it, his major targets. No other Attorney General has been able to obtain such united effort.

Mr. Kennedy's sincerity is demonstrated in the fact that he has thrown political consideration to the four winds. Some of his areas of operation are parts of the Nation where the power of the Democratic Party is strongest. Westmoreland and Washington Counties are good examples of this.

The Attorney General's strategy, and it has worked well, has been to assault the crime empire with every weapon in his arsenal. And he has many weapons and a tremendous arsenal at his command.

In what he is doing, Mr. Kennedy is rendering a genuine patriotic service to his country, one that is not exceeded even by those in the forefront of the fight against communism. The vast empire of crime is as great or even a greater menace to the security of America than communism because its main stock-in-trade is to corrupt public officials and government. In so doing it weakens the home base of the Nation where it needs to be strongest, if it is to be successful in rolling back the tides of communism.

This newspaper is proud of the achievements of Mr. Kennedy in his war against crime, especially in Westmoreland County. He has only begun to fight, and as he carries forward his crusade he deserves the support of all law-abiding citizens.

Duplication of Disability Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out that under amendments to the Social Security Act it had become possible for a person to draw more in combined social security disability and State workmen's compensation benefits than that same person had earned in wages. Furthermore, these payments are not subject to the Federal income tax which further widens the disparity between the earned wages and the benefits.

The Illinois State Senate is opposed to any legislation enacted by the Congress which would infringe on the right of Illinois to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation laws. To emphasize their strong feelings on this matter, they adopted senate resolution No. 34 on April 8, 1963.

It is my understanding that my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] has introduced H.R. 5210, the purpose of which is to prevent duplication in this area. I am sure the aforementioned bill will be of considerable interest to the Illinois Legislature as well as all of the other State bodies, and I am hopeful the House Ways and Means Committee will take prompt action on the Herlong legislation.

The Illinois Senate resolution follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 73D GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 34

Offered by Senators Laughlin, Carpentier, Kerr, Drach, Downing, Hart, Friedrich, Meyer, Collins, Sours, Peterson, John A. Graham, Larson, Davis, Broyles, Martin, Canfield, Fawell, Paul Graham, Sprague, Schlagenhauf, Ozinga, Swanson, Gilbert, Gottschalk, Hoffelder and Arrington.

Whereas the Congress of the United States by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956 to 1962, has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and disease; and

Whereas the State workmen's compensation laws were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases, and their administration has, for over 50 years, been the function of the several State industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases constitute a severe threat to the survival of State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Senate is opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of this State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation law, and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs and strongly urges that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the State workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and diseases; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States; Secretary of Labor of the United States; Senate Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Illinois.

Adopted by the Senate, April 8, 1963.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.
EDWARD E. FERRANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Filed April 24, 1963.

Oroville Mercury Warning on Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of California's fine newspapers, the Oroville Mercury, on April 25 issued the following editorial warning against an ineffective test ban treaty:

WE'RE AT THE COLD WAR'S WORST PHASE

We have come now to the most dangerous period of the cold war. It is the time when individuals' minds have become dulled to the dangers of nuclear war and people in the free countries have turned their attention almost exclusively to the problems of their economy, leaving the big problem to their government. Even now our negotiators are readying another concession.

We have heard so much about the unlikelihood that Russia will attack that we have about come to the conclusion that the danger is over and past. This is far from the truth.

When the time comes that the enemy has perfected an unquestioned superiority, then will come the ultimatum: Surrender or take the consequences.

This could come about through several eventualities. We could agree to a treaty to end nuclear testing—a treaty that would be binding upon us but would be broken (evaded) by Russia.

We could, in the interest of economy, fail to perfect an antimissile missile while Russia, secretly breaking the test treaty, succeeded in producing such a defensive weapon.

We could allow Russia to gain superiority in nuclear submarines with atomic missiles aboard.

Any one of these possibilities would make it impossible for us to survive in freedom.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, ranking minority House member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is in a position to know what is going on in Washington and Geneva with regard to a test ban treaty. He has warned our country that the U.S. Disarmament Agency and the State Department have censored data and withheld even from President Kennedy scientific evidence proving there is a big hole for Soviet test cheating in proposals now being made by our side for a test ban treaty. Under our plan, says HOSMER, the machinery to prevent cheating is so inadequate that suspicion would not be aroused until it was too late.

Such a development would be just what the Russians needed to allow them to perfect the antimissile missile, a means to nullify our nuclear deterrent.

HOSMER believes that the Disarmament Agency is so eager to perfect an agreement for agreement's sake, that it is engaging in a well-organized campaign of distortion and half-truths aimed at brainwashing the American public into meek submission to such a disaster.

He states that facts establishing the big holes for Soviet cheating in our proposals were placed on public record by expert witnesses of the Atomic Energy Commisison and the Defense Department during hearings in March. Rather than face them and admit errors, says HOSMER, the presidential advisers on the test ban question "stubbornly have refused to budge from their dangerous position that undermines the very foundation of national defense against communism's drive to achieve world domination and bury the United States."

HOSMER calls for an aroused public to prevent this catastrophe. It will be hard to arouse the public now that it has settled back into apathy. Meanwhile, in the absence of any public opinion at all, the Communist dictators are free to proceed with their unalterable design to force us into a position where we must surrender without firing a shot.

First-Class Mail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent increases in postal rates to an alltime high, the increase of $227.5 million in the 1964 fiscal year appropriations over fiscal 1963, granted by the House, and the assurances of members of the Committee on Appropriations that the $92 million cut in the Post Office Department budget request would not impair postal service, I can see no justification for the recent claims made by the Postmaster General that present service cannot be continued.

I am hopeful that the House will stand firm on these cuts and will not accept any increase which the Senate may propose simply because of the Postmaster General's emotional outbursts, obviously aimed at influencing the Congress.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following editorials:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 26, 1963]

FIRST-CLASS MAIL?

Granting that his budgetary problems make most others look like child's play, it still is too bad that Postmaster General Day has seen fit to cut off mail service to selective customers. Blaming a financial pinch, he has barred mail deliveries to all new business and residential buildings with less than 90-percent occupancy.

What that means in numbers is not clear. But what is clear is that every one of these neglected taxpayers has a right to feel discriminated against. If he wants his mail, he has to go to the post office for it.

Mr. Day lays the blame for his edict, affecting 68 major cities, squarely at the door of Congress. First, the House turned down a $8.3 million supplemental request for this fiscal year and then sliced next year's budget by $92 million. Result: A cutback in personnel hiring despite a growing population and a projected increase of 2.5 billion pieces of mail next fiscal year. With 80 percent of its budget frozen for wages and 12 percent for transportation costs, the Post Office has less maneuvering room than most departments for budget adjustments.

The Post Office's excuse for cutting mail service now is that there presently are no funds, nor any promised in the future, with which to hire employees to serve new customers. But if the Post Office indeed is in trouble, and something has to give, it should not be in the area of first-class mail delivery.

The whole thing looks suspiciously like a fund-seeking grandstand play to Congress.

[From Chicago's American, Apr. 23, 1963]

ISN'T MAIL A PUBLIC SERVICE?

We find comfort in Chicago Postmaster Harry H. Semrow's estimate that present postal service may be preserved in Chicago with the use of "a little care, conscientious thinking, and some rescheduling." Since he took over as postmaster, Semrow has shown an unflagging interest in giving Chicago good mail service.

But what we can't understand is why there should be a continuing hassle between Congress and the Post Office Department based on the theory that the transportation and delivery of mail in the United States must be a self-sustaining industry. It is a public service. If some tax money had to go into supporting it, might that not be better than having Saturday deliveries discontinued—a thing Postmaster General J. Edward Day is threatening to do unless Congress restores $92 million cut from the Department budget?

One economy proposed by the Post Office Department, though—cutting down on the handling of junk mail—would impose almost no hardship on the public. The measure should be among the first applied if money must be saved.

Much of the stuff lugged in by the mailman is as welcome in the average household as a case of mumps. Postmaster General Day would become a popular hero by shutting down the flow.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 25, 1963]

THE HEAD POSTMAN IS ANGRY

The Post Office is threatening sharp curtailment in service unless Congress restores cuts made in the Department's budget requests. This reminds us of an old story about a traveling salesman on a day's ride on a hot, dirty, dinerless train. Finally there was a stop in a small town where a lunchroom was visible across the square.

The famished traveler hailed a small boy lounging at the station. "Here's two quarters," he said. Run over to that lunchroom and buy me a ham sandwich; and get one for yourself."

The boy trotted away and presently returned munching his sandwich. Handing the salesman a quarter, he explained, "They only had one."

Similarly, if there is any deprivation to be endured as a result of shortages in postal funds it will be borne by the taxpayers, who recently took a 2.5-percent price increase in mail charges when President Kennedy was bellowing that a 6 percent rise in steel was wicked and cruel.

The House knocked $92 million out of the $554 million Post Office budget for 1964, and $8,300,000 from a supplemental appropriation to last until June 30. Twisting at the arms of Congressmen to restore these cuts, Postmaster General J. Edward Day is threatening to eliminate Saturday deliveries, reduce the number of business mail deliveries, and give no mail service at all to new buildings and housing developments less than 90 percent occupied.

The cuts in the postal budget reflect the conviction that sufficient allowances was not made for higher revenues resulting from postal rate increases. We assume, hopefully, that Congressmen were not merely hacking blindfolded when they arrived at the reduced budget figures, although we would be more confident of the integrity of the congressional position in this matter if the Members didn't load the mails with millions of pieces the only purpose of which is to make future votes.

Nevertheless, the bureaucratic response of defiance strikes us as insufferable arrogance. If the House budget-cutters can make a reasonable case for their trims, we should like to seem them stick to their guns and then listen to President Kennedy's Postmaster General explain why he must keep his limousine and chauffeur while Joe Doaks has to wait 3 days for his mail.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 25, 1963]

THE BLACKJACK

Postmaster General J. Edward Day has decided to use his blackjack on the taxpayers. He has issued orders to 68 major post offices to cut back on all expenses and services because the Appropriations Committee of the House has cut the $4.9 billion Post Office budget by $92 million.

Day has now put into execution a severe cut in postal deliveries.

This is a blackjack operation, pure and simple, because the total cut of Day's budget is less than 2 percent. There is no reason for this arbitrary decision other than the simple fact that this is the reaction of a petulant politician wounded in his most vulnerable spot—his budget.

The Chicago post office operation is an example in point of the foolishness of this order by Day. Under Postmaster Harry J. Semrow, who took over in 1961, the Chicago post office has cut its total number of employees by 4 percent while handling 9-percent more mail. Other economies have been effected in route deliveries and pickup work. Semrow is a businessman and he has worked at making his operation a businesslike one. Now he must cut back even more—and there is nothing left to cut except service to the taxpayer.

On Monday, on this page, it was pointed out that the Post Office does a great many things in addition to handling the mail. There is room for considerable economy in transferring to the proper departments of Government some of these extra-curricular activities now carried by the Post Office. Unfortunately, Postmaster General Day is running true to Parkinson's law—as a bureaucrat he is not about to let loose any activity now under his immediate jurisdiction.

Day has support from some Congressmen in this threat. These Congressmen might take a look at a report issued recently by the General Accounting Office—if they want to find $92 million for Day.

The GAO reports that for the 5 fiscal years 1957 through 1961 the Department of Defense overpaid the military services by more than $100 million.

If the Congress were as attentive to the reports of waste uncovered by the GAO as they are to the peevish indignation of a bureaucrat who threatens to cut a public service by as much as 15 percent in retaliation for a 2-percent budget cut—we might have something resembling a balanced budget.

How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of Handicapped Workers—Winning Essay by Kathleen Johanna Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce to my colleagues the winner of the 15th annual "Ability Counts" essay contest. The winning essay was chosen from many entries in the contest sponsored by the Pennsylvania Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and was written by Kathleen Johanna Lewis, age 17, of 425 Martin Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the reading of this inspiring essay on "How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of Handicapped Workers." It reveals a courage and faith of which we can well be proud.

Mr. Speaker, the essay is as follows:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Kathleen Johanna Lewis)

The paths of life are many and long. For some of us, the world's doors will soon open and we'll walk straight ahead, chin up, ready to face whatever comes. The doubts we have are soon mountains of confidence. We are the fortunate, the teenagers of today, citizens of tomorrow. The road signs read "Slow, caution." Blindly, we rush into the trap, full speed ahead. We don't take time to ponder the consequences of our foolish actions. Below is the story of a young girl who ran the race of a cheerful, carefree teenager. It unfolds here:

"All about me was veiled in a blanket of pure white. First, it was my white prom gown with the blue sash, white slippers, and pearly evening bag. After the prom, it was the brilliant whiteness of the spotlight at the country club where we danced. Then, on the way home, amidst the laughter and music, the glaring of headlights that ended our dream night. Upon awakening, I was in a fuzzy cloud until the doctor in starched white told me that I would never dance at another prom. There was pain and hurt in his eyes. Did he feel the same bitterness as I? I don't know much of anything that happened after that, except that I decided my life was over. What could be left for a girl of 17 who would never walk the grassy trails of life?

"A few days later my clergyman came to see and comfort me. At first I rebelled but soon realized that God meant this to happen and that I couldn't escape reality.

"Adjusting to the wheelchair and braces was difficult. I hated the two numb legs that stretched before me. Why, why me? I'm young. I have a license to the years of fun that belong to a teenager. My heart cried for someone strong to help me bear my cross.

"Soon I was home, among friends and family. It took quite some time for me to smile at those looks of pity. I heard the whispers: 'Oh, what a shame; such a lovely girl.' Yes; it was a shame. They didn't realize that while they were whispering to each other, I was telling my heart that one day I would walk again. Bills began to mount. My family loved and sacrificed for

me. Why, that year we didn't even have Christmas. When I mentioned this to my little brother, he just smiled and said, 'Momma says Santa wants to wait until you are well; then, we can all celebrate together.' God bless the trusting children. It was then that I vowed we would have a Christmas next year.

"A few months later, a friend suggested that I get some kind of work to occupy my mind. I had been helping Mom with the housework, but was limited and hours were left idle. I answered an ad for a typist at home. Being good in school, this appealed to me. I was hired and pleased my employer so much that he offered me a job in his office. During this time, I had been going to rehabilitation classes, learning to use my braces and crutches. So this offer didn't present much of a problem. I went to work and was surprised to see others more handicapped than I. After getting acquainted, all went well.

"This employer had the right idea, employing the handicapped and giving us a chance to prove that although we were not whole in body, we were whole in spirit. Our ability was not hampered by our disability. Wouldn't it be wonderful if more people realized that 'Our Nation's strength and prosperity depend upon the utilization of the skills and abilities of trained workers—without prejudice to qualified workers who happen to be handicapped.'" [1]

This story has a happy ending. All stories, similar or not, could have the same conclusion if we would help. Lift up your chin and walk straight. Help the handicapped and help build a stronger America.

"The cry for help is loud and strong
If we refuse, 'Tis we who wrong.'" [2]

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following newspaper article with reference to the essay contest:

PHILADELPHIA GIRL IS WINNER OF ANNUAL ESSAY CONTEST TO PROMOTE HELP FOR HANDICAPPED

A Philadelphia high school senior was judged State winner in the 15th annual Ability Counts essay contest, Secretary of Labor and Industry William P. Young has announced.

She is Kathleen Johanna Lewis, 17, of 425 Morton Street, who attends St. John the Baptist High School. Her entry was chosen from among 71 essays on "How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of Handicapped Workers" submitted in the contest sponsored by the Pennsylvania Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Miss Lewis will receive a 4-year gubernatorial scholarship, a $200 U.S. Savings Bond, a trip to Washington, D.C., to attend the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, May 9 and 10, and a certificate of merit. In addition, her essay will be submitted in the national contest to compete for $2,500 in cash prizes contributed by the Disabled American Veterans and for other awards.

On the State level, Pennsylvania State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, contributed $575 in U.S. Savings Bonds for the five best essays and Pennsylvania AFL-CIO provides transportation and expenses for the Washington trip. The gubernatorial scholarship is good for Pennsylvania State University, Temple University, or University of Pennsylvania.

Other essay winners who will receive bonds and certificates of merit are: Second, Martin Stoehr, 16, Hollidaysburg, junior at Bishop Guilfoyle High School, Altoona, $150; third, Nancy Keller, 16, Carlisle, junior at Carlisle High School, $100; fourth, Carol Reichert, 16, Washington, junior at Immaculate Conception High School, Washington, $75; and fifth, Leslie Ann Stengel, 17, Fullerton, senior at Central Catholic High School, Allentown, $50.

COMPETITION DRAWS 10,598

Awards will be presented at ceremonies sponsored by local committees on employment of the handicapped in each winner's community. These local committees throughout the State awarded $5,579 in prizes in community contests where 10,598 juniors and seniors from 247 high schools wrote essays on this year's topic.

Judging the 71 local contest winners entered in the State competition were: James R. Doran, editor, Harrisburg Patriot-News; John H. Baer, public information director, State department of public welfare; and Thomas B. Shriver, Jr., director of publications, Pennsylvania Bankers' Association.

Both Secretary Young and Jack Brown, executive director' bureau of employment security, were present when the committee met in Harrisburg to make its final selections.

[1] Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMGR Ret., Chairman, President's Committee. Quoted from "Mr. Employer, you need able workers, so hire the handicapped."

[2] Poem by Kathleen J. Lewis.

No Funds for Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the fight for civil rights continues with increasing intensity, while the Congress continues to appropriate money which will be used in segregated programs. I have introduced H.R. 5471 which provides that no Federal financial or other assistance may be furnished in connection with any program or activity in the United States in which individuals are discriminated against on the ground of their race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin. A letter by Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP which was published in the New York Times today, April 29, points out some of the reasons why the approach of H.R. 5741 deserves our support. I urge all my colleagues to read the following letter:

NO FUNDS FOR MISSISSIPPI

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Times in its April 19 editorial, as well as in the columns by Arthur Krock (April 18) and James Reston (April 19), fails utterly to come to grips with the central issue raised by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' proposal "to withhold Federal funds from the State of Mississippi until the State of Mississippi demonstrates its compliance with the Constitution and laws of the United States."

Simply stated, the issue is whether patriotic law-abiding citizens can legally or morally be called upon to subsidize subversion of the Constitution of the United States. The interim report of the Commission on Civil Rights documents Mississippi's defiance of Federal authorty, points out the inhumanity of the State's officials, and recognizes that only "the Federal Government can arrest the subversion of the Constitution in Mississippi."

Not only Mississippi, but other Southern States as well, stand greedily reaching for any Federal handouts while seeking to undermine the constitutional basis for the source of this bounty.

The principle asserted in the Commission's report is not new. It has been declared before and implemented. In the 1948 restrictive covenant cases the Government's amicus curiae brief held:

It is fundamental that no Government agency should participate in any action which will result in depriving a person of essential rights because of race, color, or creed.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

Dwight D. Eisenhower, while President, reaffirmed his conviction that Federal funds could legally, morally, and logically be made available only on a nondiscriminatory basis. Executive orders prohibiting discrimination on work performed under Government contracts and in federally assisted housing programs are further expressions of this principle.

On August 29, 1961, at the request of the President and on behalf of 35 national organizations affiliated with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Arnold Aronson, secretary of the Conference, and I submitted to the White House a 60-page memorandum setting forth the Federal programs which are administered in such a way in most Southern States as to cheat Negro citizens of their just share. The memorandum urged the President to withhold, by Executive action, Federal funds from any and all racially segregated programs. It further cited authority for the President to take such action.

In 1960 Federal grants totaling $1,116,800,000 were made to 11 Southern States, all of which in some measure at least require, support or condone racial discrimination. These Federal contributions represented from 10 to 22 percent of the total budgets of these States.

Mississippi, the most defiant of the States, paid 25 cents in taxes to the Federal Government for every dollar of Federal funds received. In contrast, New York paid $1.77 for every dollar received. We are not opposed to the principle of to each according to his need, from each according to his capacity. We are opposed to official State discrimination in administering these funds.

LITTLE LOSS TO NEGROES

The Times concern lest poverty stricken Negroes suffer if Federal funds are withdrawn is not well founded. They get so little of these funds by way of services or wages that they will not miss their withdrawal.

It is highly significant that the Commission's report was unanimous, inasmuch as three of its six members are southerners. Even more pertinent is the endorsement of this report by the State advisory committee to the Commission, composed entirely of Mississippians.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the other national organizations associated in the leadership conference heartily support the Commission's recommendations and call upon President Kennedy to take appropriate steps to implement them not only in Mississippi but in any State in which Federal funds are utilized to maintain racial segregation in defiance of the Constitution.

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary, NAACP, and Chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

NEW YORK, *April 20, 1963.*

Remarks of Assistant FBI Director Cartha D. DeLoach in Pomona, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a summary of the remarks of Assistant FBI Director Cartha D. DeLoach who participated in special ceremonies held April 24 at the Public Safety Building in Pomona, Calif.

The Public Safety Building is a unique $1.5 million structure which will combine all communications of a modern city, including police, fire, public works, water department, and the city hall switchboard and civil defense into a single intelligence and command department.

The communications center is underground and is capable of feeding and housing 150 people in the event of a civil defense emergency.

The entire community is proud of Pomona's new center, as well as the other improvements Pomona has been making, such as the Pomona Mall, a nine-block-long shopping center which has arrested the attention of many communities across the Nation.

At the ceremonies, Mr. DeLoach sealed a capsule containing historic documents which will be opened on Pomona's 100th anniversary in 1988. His comments for the occasion follow:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR C. D. DE LOACH, POMONA, CALIF., APRIL 24, 1963

It always is a pleasure to visit California. Each of my trips here has been enjoyable and memorable. This one, however, will be recalled especially because of the opportunity it afforded me to take part in stirring events affecting law enforcement.

On Monday it was my privilege to speak before the retraining session of the California Chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates, an organization in which your chief of police, Ralph Earl Parker, is a prominent member. It is most reassuring to witness the determination of these leaders of law enforcement in your State. They are not disillusioned men—they are determined. They are fully cognizant of the problems facing them and are approaching them with a zealous desire to solve them.

We in the FBI are proud of the men who have attended the National Academy. Those of you who know Chief Parker can appreciate why we are proud of them. They are men of knowledge, courage, and integrity—living examples of the code of the National Academy.

But in spite of the determination and dedication of these men and the hundreds like them throughout the Nation, we are continuing to experience a shocking increase in crime and youthful criminality. National crime in 1962 went up 7 percent over the prior year. During the same period the arrests of persons under age 18 rose 9 percent, ranging from an 11-percent increase in municipalities under 25,000 population to 7 percent in rural areas.

I am sure this is not news to you men and women of Pomona. As leaders of your community, you naturally are alert to the events not only in Pomona, but in your State and your Nation. As such, you certainly realize that the forces of evil are mounting a growing offensive against law and order all across our land. You must know also that law enforcement agencies in many areas are severely hampered in their efforts to cope with the criminal hordes.

The greatest impediment to efficient law enforcement is an apathetic citizenry—citizens who reject even the thought that they have certain responsibilities with respect to the enforcement of laws. No law enforcement agency will succeed for long in a community where the residents either prefer that laws not be enforced or don't care whether they are or not.

It is obvious Pomona is not such a community. Your progress through the first 75 years is marked by civic pride and citizen interest. Even before your community was incorporated as a city it played a vital role in the development of this region as a hub of rail traffic and as a prosperous center of citrus orchards.

Your heritage is a proud and affluent community. I am sure the city fathers of old would look with pride at the manner in which you are carrying on certain traditions while progressing at the same time. The industry of your city is ample evidence of the fact that you have not been passed by in this missile age. The scientific and technical skills and knowledge of the men and women attracted to your city by the space-age industries naturally enhance the overall intellect of the community.

The revitalization of your downtown business district has gained recognition and respect for your city all across the country. Your plans for the civic center complex also are attracting wide attention. Let me compliment you on your choice of the Public Safety Building as the first structure in this complex. The success of any government is dependent on the maintenance of law and order and the protection of the people.

Too many individuals give no thought whatever to the essential nature of police and fire departments until they have a personal need for their services. The modern facilities you are providing for the various groups charged with protecting public safety cannot help but enhance the efficiency of these agencies. Perhaps the greatest benefit will accrue to them as a result of the increased public attention focused on their activities through functions such as this.

The more the citizens of Pomona become aware of their police department, the more interest they will take in it, and the more concerned they will become with its problems, its successes, its shortcomings. Concerned citizens become informed citizens, and informed citizens are willing and able to provide the intelligent support and cooperation essential to good law enforcement.

A short time ago you sealed a time capsule into a cornerstone of your Public Safety Building. The items contained in this capsule no doubt reflect your problems, your achievements and something of your shortcomings. Probably the most important ingredient in that capsule, however, is an intangible—your hopes.

Each of you present at the ceremony, and many who were not, consciously or unconsciously expressed a hope that the problems of today will be solved and forgotten 25 years from now; that the achievements of today will have been amplified to true greatness; that the shortcomings will have proven minor in nature. There is a good chance these hopes will be answered, for time is a great and merciful healer. History, however, can be cold and cruel when events are examined without the benefit, or disadvantage, of the emotions which prevailed at the time they occurred.

"He who lives on hope will die fasting," is an old English proverb. "Hope for the best, but prepare for the worst," is another proverb of great wisdom.

In short, these proverbs mean that your hopes are doomed to certain failure if you do nothing but hope. Action must be the watchword of every good citizen of Pomona, of California, of the United States. Crime will continue to spread unless the good citizens of each community across the Nation back up the hopes with action.

The only way to solve tomorrow's problems is to master the challenging problems encountered today. Administering to the needs of today's young people, with all their complexities of life, is one problem we have not mastered. Finding a solution to this demanding problem is truly an adventure in hope and courage.

When one looks at the ever-increasing numbers of young people being arrested for serious crimes, can there be any doubt that the crime rate will grow with each passing year unless concerted effort is made to stop it. It is indeed encouraging to note the fine work your police department has been doing and is doing with the young people of Pomona. The car clubs sponsored and supervised by the policemen of Pomona and splendid examples of what young people and law enforcement officers can accomplish when working together.

Pomona is not alone in the benefits derived from these car clubs. The supervision and training given these young people by your policemen unquestionably have made the streets and highways of this entire region much safer. There is much which can be and is being accomplished in this respect by law enforcement agencies throughout the country. Car clubs, junior police groups, police athletic leagues and similar organizations are wonderful deterrents to youthful crime.

But, they are not enough. There are only about 2 police officers for every 1,000 inhabitants of the United States. Clearly, this small group of dedicated men and women cannot cope with even the basic enforcement of the laws, much less the fringe activities such as youth work without help. They need your help. They need your cooperation.

What can you do? First and foremost, you can obey the laws yourself. Even minor traffic violations require many thousands of policemen-hours to control.

You can avoid dealings with the merchants of vice—the bookies, numbers writers, loan sharks, and others like them. These are the taproots of organized crime, the men who collect the small sums from hundreds of thousands of basically honest citizens which add up to millions of dollars. This is the wealth which is being used to corrupt public officials in various parts of the country, to pay hoodlums to administer a severe beating to some businessman who dared oppose a racketeer, to pay for the slaying of a person who posed a threat to some underworld operation.

In addition to respecting our laws and abiding by them, good citizens have a responsibility to report information they possess about criminal activities. Too many citizens today take the I-don't-want-to-get-involved attitude. They foolishly and cowardly turn their heads from crime. Some will go so far as to tell a law enforcement agency about a crime but then refuse to testify about it in court. "I told you Harry was a bookie. It's up to you to prove it," they tell the policeman. The members of the organized underworld expect and depend on such citizen irresponsibility—they could not exist for long without it.

Such irresponsibility and cowardice are prevalent no matter what the crime. Earlier this year in a midwestern city a man was attacked by three persons in a parking lot. He put up quite a struggle and there were considerable noise and commotion. No less

than six persons witnessed the assault; yet not one bothered to render assistance to the victim or even call the police. The victim was not seen again until several weeks later when his body was found in a shallow grave under an abandoned farmhouse. Why hadn't these six people taken any action when they saw the violent crime being committed. Their excuses ranged from "I thought it was a drunk," to "I didn't want to get involved."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is high time that you and every other citizen realizes that you are involved, that you can't turn your back on crime. You may not be the victim directly, but you are helping to pay the cost of crime—some $22 billion a year. You may not be the victim today, but the criminal who remains free today because you failed to act will strike again. Tomorrow it could be you or your wife or daughter.

Another important contribution you can make toward the preservation of law and order is to control your offspring. Keep track of your children—know of their whereabouts and activities. Don't leave such duties to the police or other public agencies. Supervise them and teach them yourselves to respect the law and the rights of others. These are your responsibilities, not the responsibilities of your community.

You have a law enforcement agency here in which you can justly feel great pride. Chief Ralph Parker and his men deserve your trust and support. They not only deserve them, they need them. The forces of evil at work in the United States today are constantly alert for any signs of weakness which will enable them to spread their operations. The organized underworld seeks always to expand its activities. You men and women and the other good citizens of Pomona can insure this expansion does not take place here by insisting on and assisting in the just enforcement of your laws.

Sumner Says Congress Being Set Up as Patsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting commentary on who is doing what to whom is contained in the following column by Bill Sumner of the Ridder newspapers, which was published in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram and other papers around the country on April 23:

KENNEDY SETS STAGE TO PUT BLAME FOR LAG ON CONGRESS

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—The image of Congress has been getting an intense working over since the start of the year. It is a large topic of discussion in Washington, at any rate, where its creaking machinery can be heard more clearly than in the provinces. The stage is being set for 1964, when any lack of moving ahead can be blamed squarely on the Congress.

It is obvious that such a strategy is going to be necessary, for it may be too much to believe that a President with the large majorities this one has in both houses has failed so badly to get the country moving again.

While it was not the opening gun, the President's promise of a depression or recession if he could not have his way on his tax program was a real hint of things to come. But with his majorities, the current alarm has necessarily to deal with reform. There can be no blasts, Truman style, at a do-nothing Congress. The blasts will be directed at a system which gives Southern Democrats control over most of the major committees and permits unholy alliances between these conservative gentleman and the minority party.

There are those about the land who thank God for the stubborn old men, of course, but actually the hip pocket vetoes they exercise are neither American nor constitutional nor are they particularly responsible. While their actions are sometimes a delight to those who agree with them philosophically, they have actually established a rule by an "elite" minority which thwarts the American system.

Those who approve of them for protecting States rights, too, are approving a sham. For save in the case of HARRY BYRD, and one or two others, these gentlemen of the South are as venal as any when Federal money is involved and stand four square for the rights on one issue alone.

Saying that all of this is so, however, the major drag on Congress has been an unbelievably ineffective leadership in both the House and Senate as well as failures of leadership in the administration itself. If the old men rule, they rule partly because of the abdication of the Senate majority leader and the fumbling of the House Speaker. If they are arrogant, the Congress as a whole has been subjected to an administrative arrogance that seems to know no bounds.

Mainly, though, it is in the leadership of the House and Senate that the cause for the current anarchy can be found. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD seems like a nice fellow. He is articulate. He is honest. He does not threaten or rage, nor does he appeal to venality. He is no LYNDON JOHNSON. The speakership is in a shambles. Exercising merciful charity, one can say that JOHN MCCORMACK is no Sam Rayburn. His lieutenants—CARL ALBERT and HALE BOGGS—are unimpressive.

There is the problem. The Congress is in need of reform. Those who want to reform it do not believe in Congress. The leadership that in days past has made the creaking machinery move is in a daze which, unfortunately, is the way the administration seemed to want it.

Certainly it will be much more complex than the Truman campaign of 1948, but then these people are talented and have a feel for the complex. And the campaign against Congress has merit, though not quite as much as they would have you believe.

It is quite true that the fate of all legislation is dominated by a group of arrogant old men in the Congress, some of them shaking in their dotage, and it is quite true that the 88th Congress is foundering about in a legislative swamp. But it is equally true that this administration, as with most of the administrations since 1932, has taken an aggressive and creative role and views Congress more as an obstacle than as an equal.

The Economics of Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has eloquently stated the great challenge of our times. In his speech before the United Nations on September 25, 1961, the President stated:

> Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind * * *. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

The quest for disarmament under effective international control is the most important endeavor of this Nation. Professor Emile Benoit of Columbia University has devoted his creative energy to the search for peace. A distinguished economist, he has served as a consultant to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and will shortly publish, with another distinguished economist, Kenneth Boulding, a book entitled "Disarmament and the Economy."

On Sunday, April 28, the New York Times magazine published an article by Professor Benoit on the economics of disarmament. This significant article explodes the myth that the Nation must suffer grave economic consequences if we disarm. Professor Benoit's incisive analysis is a substantial contribution to the disarmament effort and should be carefully studied by the Members of Congress.

The article follows:

WOULD DISARMAMENT MEAN A DEPRESSION?

(By Emile Benoit)

There is one aspect of disarmament upon which the Governments of the United States and the U.S.S.R. are fully agreed—and which has been rather overlooked in our disagreement over the test ban and other first steps toward comprehensive disarmament. On December 5, 1962, the Economic Committee of the United Nations unanimously approved a joint declaration by the United States and the U.S.S.R. urging nations to plan for economic and social adjustments to disarmament. The declaration took favorable note of a detailed study on this subject prepared by a committee of experts, including United States and Soviet members, which concluded that economic adjustment to disarmament would pose no unmanageable problems for any country, including the nUited States.

The basic thinking behind the U.S. concurrence in that conclusion was explained in a report by a panel of American experts—under my chairmanship—called "The Economic Impacts of Disarmament," which was published early in 1962 by the new U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in Washington. Since this is one of the very few areas in which it has been found possible to achieve full agreement with the Russians, it is well worthwhile for all Americans to understand the thinking that lies behind this optimistic appraisal—especially since it flies in the face of many popular impressions.

Something less than one-tenth of the output of our economy is now devoted to defense—about $52 billion out of a total production or gross national product (GNP) of $550 billion. A somewhat similar proportion of our employment is now absorbed in defense activities. Out of a total labor force of around 75 million, about 6.5 million people are employed directly or indirectly in defense work—roughly 2.5 million people in defense industry, some 3 million in the armed forces, and over 1 million as civilians in the Department of Defense and related agencies.

The big industrial concentration of defense production is now in the aerospace-electronics-nucleonics complex, which accounts for about four-fifths of all procurement. There is also a heavy geographic concentration of

defense plants and installations, making such areas particularly vulnerable to the effects of disarmament. In Kansas, Washington, New Mexico, California and Connecticut, at least 20 to 30 percent of all those employed in manufacturing work on defense projects. In Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia and Virginia, one-tenth to one-quarter of all income is generated by military pay and allowances, or Defense Department civilian wages and salaries.

For individual communities and areas the problem may be even more acute. In a recent year, 82 percent of all workers employed in manufacturing in San Diego worked in missiles and aircraft; the corresponding figure was 72 percent in Wichita, 53 percent in Seattle, and 27 percent in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area.

The sudden termination of all this defense activity would obviously create quite a problem. However, we can be almost certain that disarmament will not occur overnight. To set up proper procedures for inspection and the prevention of disarmament treaty violations and aggression, and to man the necessary agencies, will take time—probably a dozen years at the minimum.

Even assuming a production cut-off, in the first stage, of bombers, liquid-fuel missiles and other vulnerable strategic delivery vehicles, plus an immediate scaling down of military manpower, defense spending probably would not be reduced by more than $5 billion in any 1 year, even in the initial period of maximum impact. This would amount to less than 1 percent of our GNP; by contrast the cutback in 1946 was 30 percent of our GNP and in 1954, 3 percent.

We were able to handle these much steeper defense cutbacks without major economic letdowns. To be sure, conditions are different today and our economy may be less resilient, lacking the big backlog of unsatisfied demand for durable goods and housing and the abnormal level of liquid savings created by $180 million of World War II deficit financing.

Today a cutback of even $5 billion would cause trouble if there were no offsetting increases in other public and private expenditures. It is unlikely, however, that we would allow a downward spiral to develop without some increase in Government spending programs for education, health, housing, roads, or whatever, all of which have been held back because of urgent defense priorities. Moreover, we are still taxing ourselves at close to Korean war levels, and there is obvious scope for tax reductions which could increase the power of consumers to purchase and of industries to invest.

The chief depression danger would arise from fear, and hesitation to invest and to spend on the part of business and consumers alarmed at the novel prospect of a long series of deflationary budget cuts over a decade or longer. Pessimism might be heighened if a stock market break occurred at this time.

Such fears could be overcome if the Government could persuade the public of its willingness and ability to generate adequate offsets quickly enough to sustain aggregate demand. Faith in such Government assurances would depend largely on the capacity demonstrated to protect prosperity in the period before disarmament. From this point of view, the time to start preparing for disarmament is now.

Even if we avoid an immediate depression, as I am confident we can, we may still face a tough problem over the long run in keeping unemployment down and sustaining an adequate rate of growth. Failure in this respect could involve a heavy political cost, since with the end of the strictly military struggle between East and West, the economic competition between them would be raised to a new level of importance. Stagnation and mounting unemployment could damage our international prestige and national morale.

Our unsatisfactory experience after the Korean cutbacks points up the problem. Between 1953 and 1960, real defense expenditures, making an adjustment for price increases, dropped 30 percent—most of the drop coming in 1954. In this same 1953–60 period, the average rate of industrial growth dropped by two-thirds, and the number of unemployed rose by 40 percent as compared to the preceding 1948–53 period.

We entirely failed to proved adequate offset programs. At the very time we were cutting real defense spending by 30 percent, we also cut real Federal nondefense expenditures on goods and services by 30 percent. And, instead of providing adequate tax cuts, tax rates were kept at close to Korean war levels; by 1960 the Federal Government was collecting 37 percent more in taxes and other revenues than it had been in 1953.

As a result, in 4 out of the 7 years, 1954 to 1960, inclusive, the Federal Government took more purchasing power away from private consumers and business than it restored to them by its own expenditure and benefit programs.

We would have to steer a quite different course to stay out of trouble in the event of disarmament, and such reorientation would encounter political obstacles. Even in the unlikely event that Congress would approve a doubling of nondefense Federal programs, this would offset only about one-quarter of the probable net cutback in defense expenditures. Tax cuts, though popular, might be restrained by a feeling of moral obligation to use part of the defense savings to reduce the national debt—a feeling which public opinion polls show is quite strong.

A pattern of holding back on new expenditures and tax cuts in order to achieve a budget surplus for debt reduction could cause a good deal of trouble. Cuts in defense contracts have an immediate restrictive effect on the economy even before there is any actual reduction in Government spending. This underscores the crucial importance of replacing defense contracts with new spending programs or tax cuts almost immediately—if possible at the very time that the defense cuts are announced.

If disarmament occurs, the Government's main economic contribution will, therefore, probably consist of maintaining a brisk demand in the economy by prompt and adequate tax cuts and expanded public expenditure programs. There should be no difficulty in finding worthwhile public programs that could be speeded up. Despite the stereotypes of runaway public spending and extravagance, the fact is that on a real basis—allowing for price increases—Federal expenditures for goods and services, other than defense, have declined, not risen, over the years.

Indeed, on a per capita basis, they are now only about half what they were back in 1939. Even if we add in State and local government expenditures, total real government purchases, for other than defense uses, have declined from 16 percent to 11.5 percent of gross national expenditures over this period.

Tax cuts in a period of disarmament should be partly permanent and partly temporary and flexible. For the permanent tax cuts, emphasis could well be given to selective cuts in business taxes which would have beneficial indirect effects. For example, reductions in excise taxes would lower the price of travel, entertainment, telephone calls, and many goods, thereby helping to stabilize the cost-of-living index and combat inflation. As another example, lowering the tax on business profits used to buy new machinery could stimulate investment and productivity and help us sell more goods abroad.

For the temporary and flexible tax cuts, I suggest "tax holidays." Whenever sufficiently adverse trends in unemployment and expenditure appeared—as defined in advance by Congress—the Treasury Department might request business firms simply to omit the withholding tax on their employees' earnings for one or more payroll periods. The Treasury would also permit the taxpayer a corresponding percentage deduction from taxable income when making out his income tax statement at the end of the year. This procedure would be a lot simpler from a bookkeeping point of view than giving the President the power to modify the basic tax rate, as he has recently proposed, and would make it quite clear that the tax concession was of a temporary character.

The excellent United Nations study, "Economic and Social Effects of Disarmament," documents in considerable detail the various needs to the satisfaction of which the resources freed by disarmament could be allocated.

The existence of such needs requires little demonstration. Even in our so-called affluent society, nearly 7 million families and single individuals have incomes of $40 a week or under. Our commuter and urban transportation systems, much of our housing, our municipal services generally, our provisions for public health and education, and other public-welfare programs obviously fall far short of the standards which a highly prosperous nation could reasonably expect. And our need to modernize and expand our industrial plant, if only to remain internationally competitive, is becoming a matter of serious concern to well-informed people. Beyond our own shores, the magnitude of the world's needs is appalling.

Thus there can be no question of inadequate needs for the resources which disarmament would release; there can only be a question as to how these needs could be endowed with sufficient purchasing power to transform them into effective economic demands, capable of putting people to work and turning out goods and services. The knowledge of how to do this does exist in modern economics.

Those who doubt the survival capacities of private enterprise should be reassured by the brilliant progress of the European private enterprise economies in recent years, despite substantially lower defense expenditures than in the United States and major defense cuts after Korea.

The European Common Market countries increased their industrial output by 82 percent between 1953 and 1961—compared with only 20 percent in the United States. They thus equaled or exceeded the growth rate of the Soviet Union, especially when due account is taken of the Soviet's relatively poor performance in agriculture, housing, transportation, and services.

As I suggested in a recent book, "Europe at Sixes and Sevens," Europe's recent growth has outstripped that of the United States not only because of the beginning of the Common Market, but also, and primarily, because of its more expansionary monetary-fiscal policies (especially its avoidance of budget surpluses) which provided a stable framework within which European companies could confidently plan for expanded investment and employment.

What of the "structural problems" of industries, regions, communities, and occupational groups which now depend heavily on defense activities, and which would have to make occupational changeover as a result

of disarmament? It is my belief that these problems will be less troublesome than many people fear, providing we succeed in maintaining aggregate demand and opportunities for growth.

American workers are motorized and highly mobile; if new jobs are available they will usually get to them. Similarly, factories are usually willing to retrain and upgrade workers when order books are bulging. Incidentally, an exceptionally high proportion of defense workers are skilled, and even have professional qualifications, while our Armed Forces are better educated and more highly skilled than the average population.

Some strengthening of public employment services and unemployment compensation systems would, of course, be helpful for such an emergency, as well as the further development of the recently installed program of area readjustment and development, and the worker retraining program now under consideration. Because of the rising cost of such community facilities as housing, schools, and hospitals relative to the cost of factories, the case for aiding new industries to enter areas where there are pools of skilled unemployed labor is becoming more persuasive than the case for major Government programs for aiding worker relocation.

In any case, it is clearly unnecessary to plan out in advance just what each factory will make in a postdisarmament situation, and just where each worker will go. Our private enterprise system has great flexibility in guiding a restructuring of productive processes in accordance with the new demands which will emerge, and it is the task of monetary-fiscal policy to assure that the overall total of such demands will be adequate.

The chief structural problem in my view is not that of merely finding a place where the resources released from the defense program can be deposited; rather, it is the problem of making the best use of the valuable productive potentials of the high-caliber human and physical resources now employed in the defense effort.

This refers particularly to the exceptionally able and smoothly functioning teams of scientists, engineers, and management people now working within the framework of the defense program on some of the most difficult scientific and technical problems facing mankind. There are problem areas which urgently require the fresh and creative analysis such teams could provide. Space exploration is perhaps the most dramatic example; research on problems of inspection and controlling disarmament is another.

There are many other such areas where highly organized and dynamic attacks on key problems of broad national and international significance could have very large payoffs. Examples taken more or less at random would include improved urban transportation and commuting systems; a fundamental attack on the related problems of electronic microscopes, cell functioning, aging, cancer, and on circulatory and mental diseases.

Other examples—which might contribute particularly to the removal of bottlenecks in world economic development—include unconventional energy sources (nuclear fusion, solar energy, fuel cells, etc.); teaching machines; desalinization of water; population control; climate control; mass batch production of key nutrients in which tropical diets are deficient; and mass production of standardized components for housing, factory construction, and production of simple types of machinery.

With this type of reconversion program, we could be much more alive to the positive and constructive aspects of disarmament and could enjoy its economic challenge.

Tribute to the State of Israel on Its 15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today, in saluting the State of Israel on its 15th anniversary, I quote from the Genesis xviii: 8:

And I will give to thee and to thy seed after thee the land of thy abode, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.

These words of the divine promise to Abraham were the inspiration of Joshua who led the entry of Israelites into the land of Israel.

The prophecy has become the present.

On each anniversary of this young, vigorous State of Israel, we in Congress have paid tribute to its progress and achievements within its few years of survival, and have praised the courage, ideals, and tenacity of a great people.

We are deeply aware of the significance of this great realization of an unshakable faith, finalized in the emergence of this state. From this we may well take renewed inspiration to continue the battle of free nations and freedom loving people against the creeping, insidious menace of communism to our personal, political, and religious freedoms; to strengthen our belief in the ultimate breakthrough from fear, enslavement, and misunderstanding between the races of mankind to victory and the achievement and preservation, insofar as humanly possible, of the ideals and a way of life which are inborn and a part of our mortal heritage under God.

On this milestone of Israel's 15th anniversary, I am privileged to bring to your attention a glimpse into the future as written by Levi Eshkol, Minister of Finance of the State of Israel. To me, it is an inspiring forecast, and an expression of the indomitable faith on which this state is founded.

The article follows:

SETTLING ISRAEL'S SOUTHLAND

It is presumptuous to prophesy in this land of the prophets, and the pitfalls are particularly obvious in the light of the past 50 or 60 years of our history. Carefully laid plans have dissolved into nothingness, like wisps of smoke in the hard light of day, while Messianic dreams and impossible fantasies have been transmuted into living and enduring fact.

It is, therefore, with some trepidation that we shall attempt a forward glance over the short span of 6 or 7 years, and predict some of the changes that may have taken place by the beginning of the third decade of Israel's national resurgence.

Our population should be approaching the 31-million mark, and the major task of the third million will be pioneering in our arid southland, the Negev. Today, this word is synonymous with desert, but in the days of which we speak, the waters now going to waste in the north will have been brought down by a major feat of engineering to fructify the soil and supply the needs of a large population, and the power of the atom may have been harnessed to drive our industry.

At the southernmost tip of this revivified Negev, Eilat will be a city of 25,000 inhabitants, with a well-developed deepwater port on the Red Sea. It will welcome the ships of many nations, which will depart laden with the products of our mines, farms, and factories, linking Israel with Africa and the Far East and constituting the southern terminal of a dryland Suez Canal between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean.

While other countries shiver in the snow and rain, Eilat's modern hotels will be crowded with visitors, attracted by its unique climate, its facilities for sport and relaxation, and the beauty and legend of the Red Sea. Trim El Al jetliners may fly directly from New York to a modern airfield on these historic shores.

Nearby, a water-desalination plant using an Israel-invented process will supply fresh water for the city and its developing industry. Production at the Timna copper mines will be doubled. Eilat's hinterland will consist of dozens of flourishing villages, created by the flower of our pioneer youth. These will be fortresses of the creative, spiritual and pioneering energies of our people, linked through the rocks and sand of the Negev to the caves of Qumran and the Dead Sea scrolls. They will recreate the tradition of Bar Kochba's freedom fighters, who challenged the tyranny of Rome 2,000 years ago and whose archives have been discovered recently in the caves of Nahal Hever in this very area.

The children of those settlements will hear a new sound echoing through the Negev canyons, the whistle of railroad trains, speeding the products of the Dead Sea and other goods along Israel's developed transportation arteries. The Dead Sea itself will have been transformed into a well of lifegiving substances with the completion of a series of giant dikes to create drying pans in its very midst, which will produce vast quantities of potash and bromine for fertilizing tired fields to feed hungry multitudes in remote parts of the globe.

Along a network of fine, wide roads, linking the Negev with Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, new towns and villages will arise in what is now an empty wasteland. Mitzpe Ramon, with less than a thousand pioneers today, will have 10,000 inhabitants. Dimona, which was a stretch of empty sand dunes 6 or 7 years ago, will house 25,000 people. Beersheba, the capital of the Negev, will be reaching out to the 100,000 mark in population, with its own university and other cultural institutions.

Last year we began the settlement of Arad, on an extensive plateau overlooking the Dead Sea, 600 meters above sea level, with an excellent dry climate like that of Jerusalem, and pioneering families are leaving Tel-Aviv and Haifa to make new homes there. Four thousand years ago the Cananite King of Arad defeated Moses and the Israelites on their way from Egypt, compelling them to turn aside and wander 40 years in the desert. Its strategic significance is as great today as it was then, and its economic potential is equally important.

The new town is situated in the heart of natural gas fields; it will be the first in Israel to have its streets lit by gas light and its housewives to have gas piped into their kitchens for cooking.

A marvelous feat of engineering will have brought Arad to within minutes of the Dead

Sea by blasting a road through apparently impenetrable mountains, in the area where our Father Abraham fought against the Mesopotamian coalition of King Chedorlaomer and where Lot's wife became a pillar of salt.

West of Beersheba is the Besor area, thousands of acres of good fertile land will be covered with citrus orchards. Its center will be the town of Besor, which may one day compete with Beersheba and perhaps with Tel Aviv.

Our national water scheme will by then have been completed, and the precious waters of the Sea of Galilee will be surveyed to Besor, through the giant concrete pipe we are now imbedding in the soil, to turn the area into a veritable garden.

Further to the North, the new deep sea port of Ashdod on the Mediterranean will have been completed; through it will pass to the world markets thousands of tons of potash, bromine, and phosphates, the treasures of the Negev, and millions of crates of Besor oranges.

All of these things are within our power to achieve, by pioneering, enterprise, investment, sacrifice, work, brains and unity of purpose. But the attainment of peace with our neighbors within the period of which we speak is another matter. That is our most cherished aspiration; we ask for nothing but to be left to carry on unhindered with our constructive work, and we know that peace can open up the way to a new efflorescence of the entire Middle East. But it is not within our power to prophesy when the longed-for day of peace will come; it is for our neighbors to decide when they will put behind them the hostilities of the past, and turn their faces, with us, to the future.

I am glad for this opportunity to join in the celebration of this 15th anniversary of the state of Israel, and know that I speak for millions of Americans when I say we again pledge our friendship and mutual hopes for the future in wishing its people happy birthday.

California 31st District Democratic Council Resolution on Responsibility for Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Bakersfield convention of the unofficial and volunteer movement known as the California Democratic Council, a great deal of confusion was left in the public's mind as to which agency, source, or office within our Government was believed by California Club Democrats to hold final responsibility for the handling of foreign affairs.

The organized and active Democratic Club workers within my own district felt very strongly that their position in this regard should be made clear.

Therefore, Mr. Stephen Notari, chairman of the 31st District Democratic Council has brought to my attention the following resolution adopted by the members and officers of the 31st District Democratic Council, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION ON RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Whereas the President is the Chief Executive officer of our Nation; and

Whereas there are certain insidious movements, both right and left, alien to our constitutional form of Government; and

Whereas the President, as Chief Executive, has the responsibility of charting our course through these troubled times; and

Whereas the President has steered this country through a most perilous period; and

Whereas the President has been subjected to undeserved criticism because of policies promulgated prior to his leadership; and

Whereas the President and our Congress have the primary responsibility in the area of foreign affairs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 31st Congressional District Council of Democratic Clubs of California, That the President and Congress be, and they are hereby, memorialized to reject any and all statements and opinions that would weaken the position of the President in his leadership in the field of foreign affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That the Members of Congress and our own congressional Representative be congratulated for their support of the President and his policies in the field of foreign affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the 31st Congressional District Council of Democratic Clubs are in complete accord with the conduct of, and leadership by, the President and Congress in the field of foreign affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each member of the congressional delegation from California.

Mr. Speaker, the opinions of the active, grassroots, club Democrats have continually been distorted by the leadership of the unofficial and extra-legal California Democratic Council.

These so-called leaders have always claimed to speak for the entire California Democratic Party. Such, of course, is not the case. The working Democrats of my district represent, I am sure, the thinking of the vast majority of the dedicated and loyal members of our Democratic Party in California.

I trust that all those people interested and concerned with California political affairs will take note of this fact, and will draw the proper conclusions from any future events.

Mark for Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is the original purge story as it appeared in the New York Times international edition:

DEMOCRATS PLAN PRIMARIES PURGE—THIRTEEN DISLOYAL SOUTHERNERS ARE MARKED FOR DEFEAT

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—National Democratic leaders, contrary to the ancient rule of neutrality in primary contests, are prepared to take sides in some southern congressional districts. Thirteen such districts are so marked now.

Kennedy pragmatists have decided that Democrats who wear the label but consistently disregard the platform and leadership cannot fairly complain if that leadership supports a challenger more sympathetic to the party.

In line with this reasoning, a staff man from national headquarters recently carried the message to party loyalists in the South that, if they produce attractive, aggressive candidates to oppose less loyal incumbents in Congress, their petitions for national party assistance will be heard sympathetically.

"We can't do the job for them," said one staff man at Democratic headquarters. "They have to do it themselves. But we can help if they want help."

Help means that money, manpower, and influence will be made available, even while there may be denials on the record that such intervention is taking place.

THIRTEEN ARE PICKED

The southern districts and the Democratic incumbents who may encounter opposition that is abetted by the top of their own party are these:

Texas: Seventh, JOHN DOWDY, Athens; 15th, JOE M. KILGORE, McCallen; 17th, OMAR BURLESON, Anson.

Louisiana: Fourth, JOE D. WAGGONER, JR., Plain Dealing.

Mississippi: Fifth, ARTHUR WINSTEAD, Philadelphia.

Florida: Fifth, PAUL G. ROGERS, West Palm Beach; seventh, JAMES A. HALEY, Sarasota.

Tennessee: Ninth, CLIFFORD DAVIS, Memphis.

Georgia: Seventh, JOHN W. DAVIS, Summerville.

South Carolina: Second, ALBERT W. WATSON, Columbia; third, W. J. BRYAN DORN, Greenwood.

North Carolina: 10th, BASIL L. WHITENER, Gastonia.

Virginia: Seventh, JOHN O. MARSH, JR., Strasburg.

These 13 Members by no means represent the total disenchantment of the Kennedy circle with Democrats in Congress. The pragmatists, however, are not looking for fights with people they have no chance of beating now.

IT WORKED IN 1962

Party headquarters says that it intervened in some southern primaries in 1962. On the whole it is said that the pilot project worked well. The winners who are supposed to owe some measure of their success to national headquarters are CLAUDE PEPPER, SAM GIBBONS, and DON FUQUA in three new Florida districts; RICHARD FULTON, of Nashville, and CHARLES L. WELTNER, of Atlanta.

In the Texas seventh headquarters was rooting for Benton Musslewhite, former Southern Methodist football star, to beat Representative DOWDY. The challenger lost by 41 votes.

In Chattanooga, the story goes, national headquarters helped nominate Wilkes Thrasher, Jr., over a Democratic incumbent, but a Republican, W. E. BROCK, came along and beat him.

And therein lies a further tale. The Republican threat in the South has passed the joking stage. There have been some significant Republican breakthroughs. The pressure is mounting.

The Democratic leadership is aware the intervention in primaries runs counter to standard party doctrine. President Roosevelt, disdaining the advice of James A. Farley, the national chairman, tried to purge Senator Walter F. George of Georgia, and Senator Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland, in 1938. Both attempts backfired.

Americanism Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. James E. Powers, in a recent issue of the American Legion magazine has reemphasized Americanism and has presented a noble and thought-provoking definition of Americanism 1963.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Powers' definition of Americanism 1963 in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A DEFINITION OF AMERICANISM FOR 1963

(By National Commander James E. Powers)

Recently, as your national commander, I was challenged to give an adequate definition of what Americanism means in 1963. Someone had written a book, I was told, which claimed that the meaning of Americanism had changed with changing times, so that the ideals of Americanism which The American Legion founders had expressed in 1919 are now long out of date.

I was told that the book's author claimed that by failing to provide a new, modern, progressive definition of Americanism for 1963, our American Legion has lost whatever claim it ever had to leadership in things patriotic and in things beneficial to our country.

I like a challenge, but when I was challenged by an interviewer to come up with a definition of Americanism for 1963, I could only think that I would prefer to tougher challenge than that. I told him that I had not read the book of which he spoke, but that no Legionnaire should have any trouble with the question.

I simply drew out of my pocket my American Legion membership card, turned it over, and answered about as follows:

"Here is the Preamble to the Constitution of The American Legion.

"It was written in 1919.

"It is recited as a part of the opening ceremony of every American Legion Post meeting.

"It is printed on every American Legion membership card.

"Nobody should have any trouble finding it if he is interested in the American Legion's view of fundamental Americanism.

"It sets forth ten basic statements of Legion ideals.

"One of them refers to mutual helpfulness between one Legionnaire and another.

"One of them refers to the memories of our war service.

"One of them dedicates us to a 100-percent Americanism.

"The other seven of them set forth the fundamental things that we mean by Americanism.

"Let us read them one at a time, and see if there is any trouble in understanding them, and look to see which may have become so outdated that they are no good any more.

"To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. Has progress of some sort since 1919 made this 'old hat'?

"To maintain law and order. We are opposed to anarchy. We believe in a government of laws, not men. Surely this is American to the core. Has some imagined 'progress' now made lawlessness the American ideal?

"To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation. Our constitutional government grants to us inviolate individual rights, and place in the people the power to choose its leadership. With these rights and privileges go obligations, about which we usually hear less than about our rights and freedoms. But we can only govern ourselves and preserve our rights if, as citizens, we voluntarily participate in public affairs without thought of individual reward, and qualify ourselves to participate wisely and constructively. What is there about 1963 which makes this less fundamentally American than it was in 1919?

"To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses. We will oppose, and do oppose, any attempts to establish an aristocratic government, or a dictatorship, or mob rule in the United States. This has been implied as fundamental American doctrine since the Declaration of Independence was adopted in 1776, and it has been official American doctrine at least since Rhode Island became the 13th State to ratify the Constitution in 1790. No progress' altered it as basic Americanism from the 1770's to 1919, and I know of nothing that has occurred between 1919 and 1963 to change the picture.

"To make right the master of might.

"To promote peace and good will on earth.

"Both of these ideals are, if anything, more difficult of achievement in 1963 than in 1919. For that reason they are, if anything, more important to uphold as ideals of Americanism in 1963 than in 1919.

"To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy. I can read that forward and backward, and see no part of it that some sort of modern innovation in the changing world has consigned to the trash heap of outworn notions of what is American."

If it is words that we need to make Americanism clear in 1963—I give you the preamble as an enduring definition.

But mere words are little more than a vain boast without a record of living by them. So my real definition of Legion Americanism for 1963 would be the living record of what Legionnaires do this year to improve community, State, and Nation in thousands of projects—what they do to give backbone to law and order—what they do to oppose militantly the endless drive to supplant our American way with a dictatorship—what they do to transmit American principles to posterity through our boys States and girls States, through Boy Scouts and Girl Scout sponsorship, through teaching hundreds of thousands of youngsters the rules of fair play and teamwork on the baseball diamond—what they do to make the Constitution of the United States a familiar text to more hundreds of thousands of boys and girls in our oratorical contest—what they do to make whole the broken lives of future citizens through our child welfare program.

A full account of these deeds would be a definition of Americanism so huge that it would fill an unabridged dictionary all by itself. It is a definition that is modern, progressive, fundamental, and alive. Let's keep it that way.

Israel's 15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend marked the 15th anniversary of the reemergence of the State of Israel and viewing the past Israel has much in which she can take pride.

Skeptics said that Israel, surrounded by a sea of hostile forces, with arid land, depleted resources, and a divergent and impoverished people, could not survive. They were wrong.

Today the agriculturally cultivated land has more than doubled its acreage of 1948. Irrigation has steadily increased; and she has developed a well-working industrial plant.

Diplomatically, Israel began from scratch. Today it is a nation with high standards, with highly trained statesmen, and with established government agencies that match those of the most experienced in the world.

On her 15th anniversary, the great homecoming continues, more than a million Jews have reached her shores since 1948. Over the past years, Israel has performed the monumental task of receiving, rehabilitating, and resettling these tens of thousands.

There has been scientific and cultural advancement, and a system of higher learning has been established which is on a par with the finest systems throughout the world.

Israel's record for creativity is a good one, and in the process of sharing with the Israelis joy of seeing the small state prosper, we in the United States express the strong hope that the relations between our two countries will continue in close harmony with mutual devotion to the principles of freedom.

Israel has had more than her share of handicaps and heartaches in her first years of independence. Not one, but a hundred challenges have been met and mastered.

This weekend we commemorated these achievements. Israel's success is the highest testimony of all to the dedication and energy of her people. More than anything else, it is proof that the will to live and create can survive all the handicaps of history and can triumph through tears.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to my constituents:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

APRIL 1963.

THE TRUTH ABOUT WAURIKA

Much newspaper space has been devoted to the Waurika project and accompanying legislation. One of the more recent articles, written by Mr. Allan Cromley, Washington correspondent for the Daily Oklahoman, deserves some comment. In his usual slanted style of mismanaging the news against me, although the next election is more than a year away, Mr. Cromley infers that I was wrong in introducing the Waurika bill this

year in the House, and states that friction between me and Representative WALTER ROGERS of Texas is holding up action on the bill in his committee. Mr. Cromley says the Waurika project is caught up in a legislative snarl. I submit just the opposite.

First, I introduced the bill in the House, and it was referred to Mr. ROGERS' committee, giving the project two routes through the House this year—through Mr. ROGERS' committee and through the Public Works Committee. This was in line with an agreement between the late Senator Kerr and myself in the 87th Congress and was in compliance with the wishes of those promoting the project. Whether the Public Works Committee or the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approves the project, both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation stand ready to build it. Two routes are better than one; it is not important who builds the dam, but that it is built. I am confident that action will be taken on it in a short time.

Second, if there is any friction between myself and Congressman ROGERS, it exists only in the mind of Mr. Cromley. All Mr. ROGERS wants are assurances that Texas' historical water rights will not be disturbed when the Mangum project is built. I sympathize with Mr. ROGERS' problem, for much of the watershed for the Mangum project is in Texas. It is understood by most people in Washington that until Mr. ROGERS is satisfied over these water rights, there will be no Waurika project or any other Oklahoma Bureau of Reclamation project approved through his committee. It is just that simple. I stand ready to assist Mr. ROGERS and work with him in any way I can. The Interstate Water Compact Committee must make its finding, which I am hopeful will meet with everyone's approval. Mr. Cromley has a unique style of writing. I know of no other reporter that can keep as close to the facts and still twist the meaning into a distorted picture for the reader. He has taken journalistic potshots at me for several years, with limited success. Apparently the Daily Oklahoman's editorial opposition to the Waurika Dam is now taking on a different approach, through its Washington bureau.

DUKE ARA PROJECT APPROVED

Biggest news for the people of southwestern Oklahoma came in April when a $2,636,725 Area Redevelopment Administration loan was approved for Republic Gypsum Co. to construct a $4 million wallboard plant at Duke. The huge plant will create more than 200 new jobs and bring untold benefits to the economy of southwestern Oklahoma. With the approval of this loan, the way is paved for other new industry to come into the area. Construction is expected to begin in 60 to 90 days on the plant, which will manufacture gypsum wallboard used in the construction industry and have an annual payroll of $1 million. Another ARA project soon to be approved is a loan to Sequoyah Mills, Inc. at Anadarko. A $60,000 loan has already been approved to Caddo Electric Cooperative for relending to the mill which will manufacture carpet for a five-State area.

VISITS WITH CONSTITUENTS ENJOYABLE

The Easter recess of Congress provided me with an opportunity to return to Oklahoma and visit with my constituents, the first such opportunity this year to do so. I was able to visit all 23 counties. The tour was interrupted when it was necessary for me to return to Washington to vote on a $450 million accelerated public works appropriation bill. I cast my vote in favor of the bill to restore funds cut in committee. The APW program has already spent $636,000 in Grady County and $64,000 in Greer County to help unemployment in those areas. The program is a good one and should be continued.

AGRICULTURE HEARING HELD IN LAWTON

More than 100 farmers, ranchers, industrialists, and agriculture officials met in Lawton April 12, at my request, for a discussion of the general status of agriculture in Oklahoma. Testimony presented at the meeting will be prepared into a report and transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture. Many farmers never have an opportunity to air their views on the solving of Oklahoma's farm problems. I think this meeting was a step in the right direction, as it allowed the farmer to be heard and allowed me to become better informed on what most farmers want in the way of a farm program.

POST OFFICES DUE IMPROVEMENTS

Post office improvements are scheduled in the near future for Anadarko, where a $207,000 modernization program is planned, and at Elk City, where $386,000 will be spent to build a new post office-Federal building. Post office improvements are also slated at Waurika, Frederick, Hollis, Lawton, and Mangum.

CLINTON-SHERMAN AFB HOUSING PLANNED

Construction of 100 new family housing units at Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base costing $1,477,059 will get underway soon, another sign that Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base is on the map to stay, playing a vital part in the defense of our country.

NAVAL ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

Three fine young men, Thomas Rock and Curtis Cowgill III, both of Beaver, and Donald Waid, Waurika, have won my appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy for 1963. They were appointed on the basis of scores made on competitive examinations. My best wishes go with them for their future careers.

CUBAN SITUATION OUTLINED

Much of the mail the past few months has concerned Cuba and Castro. At the present time, here is how we stand in regard to Cuba:

The policies of the United States toward Cuba are to continue to insure the security of the United States, fight the spread of Castro communism, tighten the noose and isolate Cuba, and seek to free the Cuban people. We have substantially isolated Cuba, trade has been cut drastically. Rationing of goods is becoming more and more common. We are attempting to control the spread of Castro communism by supervising the travel of people to Cuba, watching the spread of literature and the transfer of funds from other nations to Cuba. At present, 14 countries have broken relations with Cuba, 5 still maintain them. We have beefed up our propaganda by broadcasting 9 hours per day in Spanish over the Voice of America and are putting out tons of anti-Communist literature.

Support of Castro in Cuba is limited, though he remains strong. I am of the opinion, however, that if Castro is ever removed, it will be done by the Soviet Union, not by the Cuban people. Security measures are very tight and removal of Castro by the Cubans themselves would be almost impossible. Castro and Cuba are costing the Soviet Union $1 million per day, with Cuba facing the worst economic year in its history in 1963. The Soviet Union will have to bolster its aid if Castro is to survive. Those who advocate the ouster of Castro by American intervention must remember that war will be the consequence of that action. We must arrive at another solution. This will most probably be through the Organization of American States and a united action by member nations.

Anytime I may be of service to you, please call on me. I always enjoy hearing from my constituents.

Cordially your friend,

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

A Plan To Create Jobs in American Industry Through Stimulation of Production and World Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, many plans for creating jobs at this time of increased unemployment have been advanced, but Mr. Richard J. Elkus, a constituent of our district, has suggested a rather novel idea of meeting the problem.

Mr. Elkus is a native Californian serving now as president of the United States Leasing Corp. He is a director of the Canadian-Dominion Leasing Co., Toronto, the Mercantile Leasing Co., Ltd., London, and the Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif. He was formerly a director of the Wells Fargo Bank of San Francisco, and president of the First National Bank of San Mateo County, Calif.

His plan follows:

A PLAN TO CREATE JOBS IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY THROUGH STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND WORLD MARKETS

(By Richard J. Elkus)

(Richard J. Elkus is a native Californian long associated with cultural and community activities in the San Francisco Bay area. He has had a varied and successful business career and is currently president of the United States Leasing Corp., San Francisco. He is a director of the Canadian-Dominion Leasing Co., Toronto; Mercantile Leasing Co., Ltd., London; and Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif. Formerly he was a director of the Wells Fargo Bank, San Francisco, and president of the First National Bank of San Mateo County, Calif.)

THE PROBLEM

Creating millions of jobs each year through growth of the U.S. economy represents probably the greatest economic and social challenge of this era.

With neither an internal growing frontier nor a major new domestic industry to vitalize the economy, the United States shows sluggish aspects of a mature economy while other industrial nations have been leaping forward with the latest manufacturing techniques and plants.

With a slow growing domestic market and stiff competition for existing world markets, industry receives insufficent stimulus to create jobs through purchases needed for its growth.

THE NEEDS

To meet this imposing challenge calls for:

(1) Encouraging industry to buy equipment and supplies needed for growth, thereby creating jobs among producers of these goods, the mines and lumber camps, the producers of raw materials, manufacturers of equipment for production of materials.

(2) Stimulating our economy so increases in volume and the lower proportionate tax rates thus made possible can help U.S. manufacturers lower their prices in competition with other countries.

(3) Creating new trade frontiers abroad by helping present noncustomers and noncompetitors to build up their economies so they can become potential purchasers.

(4) Making it possible for manufacturers to increase foreign sales from output of U.S. plants employing U.S. workers, rather than

accelerated extension of manufacturing operations abroad.

(5) Assuring that U.S. resources will keep ahead of the world pace, our best security in international relations and defense.

(6) Featuring healthy economies in emerging nations so their vigorous free economies will be bulwarks against Communist subversion.

(7) Establishing momentum of these forces on a permanent, long-range basis, rather than relying on repeated stopgap and emergency policies.

THE BACKGROUND

(1) Unemployment in the United States is currently (March 1963) at 6.1 percent. The large surge of young people entering the work force, in addition to other factors, in coming years threatens to increase this rate, generating explosive social as well as economic consequences unless creation of new jobs is accelerated.

(2) In contrast with the newly built production plant of other industrialized nations, many of which have virtually rebuilt their facilities since World War II, much of the U.S. production plant is outdated. The combination of below-optimum production facilities and the world's highest labor rates creates an insurmountable disadvantage in many fields of international trade competition.

(3) This is reflected in the shrinking U.S. share of the export market for manufactured products, from 27 percent in 1951 to 20 percent in 1961.

(4) These circumstances are leading to further rises in comparative costs, resulting in continued loss of oversea markets—the frontier of the 1960's—and increased exporting of job-creating operations.

(5) Vast potential areas of foreign purchasers of U.S. equipment and supplies are stagnant because they lack the capital and the tools to build a consuming industrialism.

(6) The stultifyingly high tax levels on U.S. consumers and industry are due largely to:

(a) Defense costs necessitated by the growth of the Communist threat in many parts of the world.

(b) Foreign aid that gives transfusions to underdeveloped countries on the brink of possible Communist domination.

THE PLAN

(1) Create jobs in American industrial plants, mines, forests, and farms by accelerating the purchases of U.S. industry.

Allow American companies to contribute their outmoded but usable capital equipment to a central pool. By replacing this with new equipment of U.S. origin at equal or greater original cost, these companies can be eligible for a substantial tax credit (perhaps 50 percent) on the old equipment, regardless of book value.

A cycle of stimulation will be felt immediately throughout the entire U.S. economy: industry, raw materials, and supporting services. Tax revenues from increased corporate profits and broadened individual incomes will increase sharply. The rate of growth of the GNP will be accelerated and maintained, since this will be a continuing process, rather than a shot-in-the-arm approach.

By increasing the efficiency of U.S. production operations, manufacturers will be able to reduce their costs and compete for world markets from home plants, reducing their need to set up manufacturing plants in lower-cost areas abroad. This, of course, will create additional U.S. jobs.

(2) Assist underdeveloped countries to develop health economies on a growth basis, spread across a wide base of local enterprise, at substantially lower costs to U.S. taxpayers than cash aid.

The pool of outmoded equipment turned loose by U.S. industry will be inspected, rated, cataloged, and stored. This available equipment will be provided through appropriate channels to businessmen, potential industries, and governments in all non-Communist, nonindustrialized countries. It will not be provided to any markets now able to buy equipment on normal terms.

An enterprise that can utilize such equipment can apply for it through the office established to administer this program. If analysis indicates the enterprise is sound and fills a need, it can obtain the equipment on a liberal basis, such as 10 percent of the original purchase price, payable 1 percent a year for 10 years, out of profits only.

This will encourage the growth of many profitmaking enterprises, which will represent a firm foundation and stabilizing force in any society. This ultimate goal of U.S. aid is seldom achieved through the present from the top down sift of foreign aid. In this process we will provide benefits for the underdeveloped areas that are clearly enriching to them, while Russia works essentially to develop chaos and take over governments. The development of local industry will be the result of visible U.S. aid, rather than the invisible dispersal of dollars that can defeat the purpose of U.S. assistance.

The industries thus stimulated in many parts of the world will then require parts for the machinery and equipment, and a wide variety of materials to process with the equipment. U.S. manufacturers can expect to sell much of this material. Again, this will mean more jobs in the United States and higher tax revenues from industry and individuals.

(3) Strengthen the base of individual countries, forestalling the inroads of communism. This will make possible a gradual reduction of U.S. cash aid and, ultimately, lower the percentage of our GNP that must be devoted to defense budgets.

With tax revenues increased from our growing industry and higher employment, and with lower relief expenses, decreased foreign aid and controlled defense costs, far more funds can be available for public expenditures for universal benefit, such as education, health, urban renewal, et cetera.

IMPLEMENTATION

The agency established to carry out this activity should include representation from labor, industry, economics, and international affairs. The concerns and considerations of all these elements would be weighed in the operations, grants of equipment, collection of revenues, relations with governments involved, effects on the United States and other economies, and other functions.

Hanford Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will remember the Hanford, Wash., power project discussed with much interest in this Chamber not many months ago.

Recently, in Portland, Oreg., Under Secretary of the Interior, James K. Carr, delivered a major address on the financing of the Hanford project. I am sure all Members will be equally interested in reading it:

HANFORD REVISITED

Not many months ago if someone had predicted we would be here this evening at such a meeting, considering the sale of Hanford power project bonds, he would have been dismissed with a shrug as a chimerical dreamer. Less than a year ago the proposal was so snarled in bitter, political controversy that to expect any ready, reasonable solution bordered on indulgence in sheer fantasy. For some of you to be here it should be exciting like coming into the last act of the play just before the curtain falls. It isn't a tragedy. This story ends well.

One thing sure, it is to the great credit of many Members of the Congress, President Kennedy and his administration, representatives of privately owned and publicly owned power suppliers, several individuals, and particularly Owen Hurd and Charles F. Luce, that we are meeting tonight. For ours is the purpose of moving forward toward an outstanding national conservation achievement.

Production of power with Hanford steam is now a real, live, program to utilize valuable energy and prevent inexcusable waste. You are being given an attractive opportunity to participate in this tremendously worthwhile effort.

You will recall that the Congress rejected the Hanford steam-electric plant when it was first proposed as an all-Federal project. The Washington Public Power Supply System, under the able leadership of Owen Hurd, stepped forward with the proposal, now written into law, for harnessing the byproduct steam from the new Hanford production reactor, and prevented what would have been a shameful waste of the Nation's energy resources. It will add more than 900,000 kilowatts of firm capacity to the Pacific Northwest Power System.

Devoted and dogged, Owen Hurd, his associates, many citizens from all walks in the Pacific Northwest and particularly members of its congressional delegation on both sides of the aisle—Senator JACKSON, first and foremost, Senator MAGNUSON, Congresswoman HANSEN, Congresswoman MAY, and Congressman WESTLAND—deserve a full measure of gratitude from the people of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation for conserving and putting this extremely valuable resource to work in the public interest. Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD of California; then chairman, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, and others on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, also merit a considerable share of the credit. The dedication of these men and women and their final victory is an inspiration to those of us in the public service.

All requirements of the authorizing legislation have been met. In a little over 6 months since the Hanford steam electric plant was authorized, the Washington Public Power Supply System, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and their consultants have been working virtually around the clock to bring us to this point where, in a short 3 weeks, revenue bonds in the amount of $122 million will be offered for sale. This is where you as financiers come in.

In making your own decisions on the bond proposal you will consider a number of factors. Although engineering and financial analyses are far more important, one factor in analyzing a proposal which involves the Federal Government so heavily is the attitude or guiding philosophy of the incumbent administration.

Let me speak briefly regarding the objectives and general guidelines of the Kennedy administration's power marketing program and its national electric energy goals as set forth by Secretary Udall based on policy established by the Congress.

Together with the Federal Power Commission and the other independent agencies involved, we in the Department under President Kennedy's leadership wish to encourage and assure construction of the most efficient electrical generating and transmission system that modern technology can help us achieve. The achievement of this highly efficient and necessary electric system requires the construction of larger and larger thermal electric plants serving, where feasible, the needs of one or more or several utilities. There must also be full development of the Nation's remaining, renewable hydro resources wherever practicable. The administration's goal requires the interconnection of systems between various areas and regions to take advantage of time changes, weather differences, resulting in diversity of peak loads. The program demands the use of extra high-voltage transmission systems, including the use of extra high voltage direct current lines where feasible to reduce transmission costs and save land with smaller right-of-way requirements. The full and final spirit in which we should turn to our task is to strive for the utmost efficiency in design and operation of existing and future facilities, bringing scientific and technical advances to bear in the fundamental effort to drive down the cost of electric power to the consumer. Isolated power systems with "tea kettle" size generation have no place in the new era where electric energy so vitally affects our way of life.

In the next 20 years privately owned and publicly owned agencies will have to invest an estimated $125 to $130 billion in new generating and transmission facilities. This will include primarily investment by the privately owned utility industry of the Nation, which accounts for 80 percent of the power suppliers. In addition, it will involve the publicly owned systems—Federal and non-Federal. Any saving we can make by greater efficiency as we face this tremendous investment means possible savings to the power users of billions of dollars. The ultimate goal is lower cost power to the power user. This is a prerequisite for an expanding economy in the United States and will assist us in competing successfully in the markets of the world.

Secretary Udall has repeatedly said that the job should be tackled by publicly owned and privately owned utility systems in the spirit of "competitive cooperation." This will require a lot of patience, a great deal of understanding, but basically a realization that all utilities exist because of the service they render to the public. There is not room for venemous controversy over philosophy. That is a luxury paid for by the power users which we cannot afford. Toward that desirable goal of low-cost power through cooperation, although the system suffers some imperfections, we in the Department of the Interior intend to use our energies to preserve the diversity of ownership of utilities which is the traditional American system. This pattern of private and public utility ownership has served successfully in building the greatest power generation and distribution system in the world.

It has produced the necessary power to meet the Nation's growing needs. It provides competition in a service that is of its nature, monopolistic. We firmly believe that although the trend in many parts of the world is toward greater government ownership of power generation and transmission facilities, there is no necessity for significantly changing the pattern of utility ownership in the United States. And that means public power agencies have and will continue to serve a very useful purpose in the national interest.

The Pacific Northwest's history is a good example of why we think this way. In the Pacific Northwest, publicly owned and privately owned suppliers are learning to pool their resources, and to interconnect the systems. It's just good engineering. In this way, they live together, prosper together, and build their region economically together.

All utilities in the region are interconnected hydraulically and electrically through the Northwest Power Pool. A Federal agency, the Bonneville Power Administration provides the backbone grid for the Northwest Power Pool. The power grid is interconnected at nearly 500 points with the non-Federal utilities. Bonneville wheels non-Federal power over its lines, and the non-Federal utilities, both public and private, wheel Federal power over their lines. Through an unparalleled and high degree of coordination and cooperation, the electric utilities of this region, by taking advantage of diversity of loads, are able to squeeze more than 1 million additional kilowatts out of existing hydro plants.

The region to date has been almost totally dependent on hyroelectric power, largely for two reasons. First, it is blessed with the greatest power-producing river in American—the Columbia. Second, it has no proven reserves of oil or gas, and only limited deposits of high-grade coal. Because a river must be developed not only for power, but for flood control, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and other purposes for which there is no return for private investment, the bulk of the job of developing the Columbia has been done by the Federal Government. Power pays its full share and much of irrigation's share, about 80 percent of the total cost.

Federal power is sold through the Bonneville Power Administration—about 40 percent to publicly owned utilities, about 15 percent to privately owned utilities, about 30 percent to the aluminum industry and about 15 percent to other industries and Federal agencies. The Bonneville Power Administration markets about 60 percent of the power in the region. Except for one State—Washington—the majority of the customers in the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area are served by private utilities.

And here in the region, family use of electric power is among the highest in the Nation—over 10,000 kilowatt-hours per residence compared to the national average of about 4,000 kilowatt-hours. Rates, both public and private, are among the lowest.

The Federal Government has 6½ million kilowatts of installed capacity in the Northwest, with another 3½ million kilowatts under construction or authorized. When fully installed, this 10 million kilowatt capacity will represent a Federal investment of about $2.6 billion in generation, plus $800 million in transmission. The non-Federal utilities, public and private, have nearly 5 million kilowatts of installed capacity in the same region, and more than 2½ million kilowatts under construction or licensed, exclusive of the Hanford steamplant. This represents an investment of more than $2 billion for non-Federal generation in the region. Much of the power output of the local public utilities has been contracted for by the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest.

Without question, one of the finest examples of cooperation between public and private power, here in the Northwest or in the Nation, involves the Hanford steamplant. It is a non-Federal project, to be financed through the sale of revenue bonds, constructed and operated by the Washington Public Power Supply System. Its output is being purchased 50 percent by 5 private utilities and 50 percent by 71 public agencies. Through a unique exchange agreement among the Washington Public Power Supply System, each of the participants and the Bonneville Power Administration, the output of the reactor is to be turned over to the Bonneville Power Administration and marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration channels.

Getting back to the specific subject of the bonds that will be offered for sale: It is my opinion that the Hanford project power bonds represent one of the finest financial opportunities ever offered to private capital through the bond market. My judgment is based on the belief that the Hanford power bonds are backed by the criteria that make for a high-quality security. More to the point, there is a ready market for the power; there is a highly diversified sharing of risk; and the project has had the advantage of the best engineering and technical brain power in America.

I should like to elaborate:

First, there is a ready market in the region for this power. The output of the reactor was oversubscribed by the public agencies, alone, and when the private utilities contracted for their 50-percent share, the public agencies' subscriptions had to be cut back more than half. Regional load growth now is on the order of 400,000 kilowatts a year—equivalent to a new Bonneville Dam every year—and soon it will be 600,000 kilowatts annually. Without the Hanford steam plant, the region would have faced a power shortage in late 1965 and 1966, because no major source of new hydro power is scheduled to come on the line until mid-1967. Hanford power, during the dual-purpose stage, will cost less than power from alternative sources and, during the single-purpose stage, the cost will be comparable to that of the modern steam-electric plants.

Second, it is a worthy security because of the highly diversified risk-sharing among responsible utilities. Seventy-six participants with total assets of $2.4 billion, including five privately owned utilities, have pledged to pay all costs of the project in return for receiving its entire output. The contractual arrangements underlying this security are much the same as those for the Priest Rapids, Rocky Reach, Wanapum, and Wells Dams, where the power was sold on a "slice-of-the-cake" basis, and the price paid by each purchaser was based on an equivalent share of the total costs of the project.

There is, however, this important difference in the case of the Hanford project. In my judgment it makes the Hanford project securities even more attractive. Each purchaser of Hanford power has been given, and has accepted, the opportunity to exchange its share of Hanfords' electrical output for a quantity of Bonneville-generated electricity delivered at its load centers. The exchange account is settled by applying standard Bonneville rates to the billing which the party to the exchange has received for its share of Hanford power. Stated another way, the exchange contract between Bonneville and each purchaser of Hanford power guarantees the purchaser that for the sum it pays each month to the Washington Public Power Supply System for Hanford power it will receive from Bonneville, at its load centers, the amount of firm power that sum would purchase under Bonneville standard rates. Bonneville is obligated to supply the power and energy to the participant regardless of whether the Hanford project is actually generating energy. The exchange agreement remains in effect until the bonds are retired.

The participating utilities are presently buying about 40 percent of their power from Bonneville. Hanford power, in turn, represents less than 40 percent of the kilowatt-hours they purchase from Bonneville, and only about 15 percent of the total kilowatt-hours they use.

Third, this project has had the best engineering and technical brainpower in America behind it from its conception 10 years ago by General Electric engineers. The whole complex of General Electric engineer-

ing know-how has been and is being applied to this project—the reactor, itself, and the steam plant—through design, production and construction stages. Two outstanding consultant firms, Burns & Roe, for powerplant and reactor design, and R. W. Beck & Associates, utility analysts, have been advising the Washington Public Power Supply System. Bonneville engineers have reviewed all stages of design, and the Atomic Energy Commission's experts have stayed on top of this project from the beginning.

The Hanford power project of the Washington Public Power Supply System will become a reality because, despite powerful opposition, it is a project so undeniably sound, so urgently needed, so sensible that when the true facts became known it received the approval of the Congress of the United States. The battle for conservation at Hanford will live as a symbol of the people's defiantly determined effort to conserve and prevent the waste of energy resources. To the world it is a symbol of this Nation's ability to use nuclear power for peaceful purposes. The Hanford plant will be the world's largest nuclear steam-electric plant. The investor, as I said at the outset, is being given an attractive opportunity to participate in this conservation achievement in an investment for the future of the Pacific Northwest and for the future of America.

In closing, I should like to say this. In terms of larger generating plants, pooling of power, interconnection of regional power systems, use of direct-current transmission lines, where feasible, the Nation has a magnificient opportunity to demonstrate true conservation and exhibit its determination to make a more efficient use of its abundant, yet limited energy resources.

People are becoming increasingly aware what is being accomplished in the Pacific Northwest and specifically at Hanford. With that enlightment, I hope we are at the break of day when agreement will soon be reached on the manner of providing extra high-voltage transmission lines to link the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. These will help assure that the cost of electric power to the ultimate consumer will be as low as possible, consistent with sound business principles. And this is in accord with the national power policy as it has been repeatedly set forth by the Congress of the United States.

We are striving to carry out that policy in the national interest. You and your business associates are being given an opportunity to participate.

Israel's 15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 15th anniversary of the independence of Israel. This event is being observed by the people of Israel and by Israel's many friends in the free world.

The festivities are marred this year by the death of Israel's President, Itzhak Ben-Zvi, last week. An outstanding scholar and statesman, he was loved by the people of Israel and many people in other lands who knew him. He was President of his country during 11 of 15 years of independence, and under his administration Israel made great progress in every endeavor. His death is a loss not only to Israel but to the whole free world.

Over these 15 years of its existence, Israel has maintained the most cordial relations with the United States. Her people enjoy a democratic form of government, very much in the image of American democracy. Israel has utilized our economic assistance to the best advantage of its people, so that today the head of our foreign aid program, the Agency for International Development, is able to report to the American people—as he recently did—that Israel has made great economic strides and our aid in this field will no longer be needed in the future.

For a number of years the general situation in the Middle East has been relatively quiet, and many of us in this country had hoped that peace could be attained for all concerned. Unfortunately, Egypt has recently embarked on a program for the development of nuclear missiles, with the aid of scientists from West Germany. As a result of this situation, Israel now feels that its security and its indepedence are threatened since President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, repeatedly keeps talking about destroying the State of Israel.

The recent federation of several Arab States into the United Arab Republic and the work being done on nuclear missiles in Egypt constitute a definite threat to the peace and stability of the Middle East as a whole, and to the security of Israel in particular. Israel finds itself in a very precarious position militarily. She sees the balance of military power shifting toward Egypt, and consequently she is forced to adopt means to build up her own military power. This will undoubtedly lead to a new arms race in the Middle East, which can only have tragic consequences for the nations directly concerned and possibly also for the world.

I believe the United States should take immediate steps to prevent an explosion in this area, which could lead to a new world war. Our country must exert every possible effort to convince Egypt to discontinue its activities in the field of nuclear weapons and to send back to Germany the scientists working on the development of these horror weapons. We have been furnishing vast economic assistance to Egypt these past few years, reaching as much as $150 to $200 million per year in the form of grants, loans, and surplus food commodities. The least we should get from Egypt in return is a definite guarantee that she will not stir up trouble in the area and refrain from attacking her neighbors.

In the event President Nasser, of Egypt, refuses to abide by our request, I would strongly urge the following steps, which I am sure many of our colleagues will support:

First. That we discontinue immediately all economic assistance to Egypt, including grants, loans, and the shipment of all food commodities.

Second. That we issue a declaration guaranteeing the security and independence of Israel in the event of an attack by the United Arab Republic.

Third. That we inform Egypt that unless she suspends immediately her work on nuclear missiles and sends home the German scientists, the United States will supply Israel with the necessary arms to defend herself.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that such steps would be in the interests of world peace and consistent with American foreign policy. It would help maintain stability in the area and preserve the independence of existing states, including Israel.

On the occasion of Israel's 15th anniversary of its independence, I extend my greetings and sincerest wishes to the people of Israel and to all friends of Israel in this country. We wish for it many years of genuine peace, prosperity and freedom.

First Pleasure Drive to Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in the Congress realize, I believe, how inextricably the future well-being of Latin America is tied to the future well-being of our own country.

For that reason we must surely applaud all efforts to strengthen the friendship and neighborliness that exist between the nations and the peoples of our hemisphere. One such effort is the Inter-American Highway, linking the United States with seven of its Latin American neighbors.

A few months ago Tom Stimson, western editor of Popular Mechanics magazine, took a friend and drove a family-type car along this new highway. I commend to my colleagues his report, entitled "First Pleasure Drive to Panama," which will appear in the May issue of Popular Mechanics:

The article follows:

[From Popular Mechanics, May, 1963]

PLEASURE DRIVE TO PANAMA

"Drive a car all the way to the Panama Canal? Are you crazy? It can't be done. First, you have to ship the car by rail from Mexico to Guatemala. From Costa Rica you have to go by sea. You can't get through the jungles. The maps show that there aren't any roads."

Well, the maps are out of date.

I know, because I recently drove to Panama with no trouble at all. You can do it yourself. The road is open all the way. In fact, the official opening of the inter-American highway is being celebrated in early May, in Washington.

This past winter Joseph Barnett of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads told me that the road could be driven, that most of it was paved, that the last bridges in Cost Rica were completed. Paul White, a friend of mine, and I decided to try it. We wouldn't be the first car over the route; a number of four-wheel-drive vehicles, for instance, have driven it on an adventure basis. But we weren't after adventure. We didn't want to build any log bridges or hire Indians to slash out a trail. We wanted to find out whether typical vacationists in a typical pleasure car

could drive to the Canal Zone with ease and safety.

Paul is an old hand at pioneer driving. He has driven from Cape Town to Cairo, and most of the way around Australia. Guided by past experience, he assembled an assortment of tools and spare parts, including shovel, towrope, chamois for filtering gasoline and a hydraulic jack. We also carried emergency supplies of medicines, food, water, gasoline, and oil. This was all good insurance, but we didn't touch any of the supplies. We carried two brandnew spare tires, and blew one tire from a rock cut on a freeway just south of Mexico City. That was the only trouble we had.

We traveled through eight different countries (including the United States) and saw smoking volcanoes, orchids by the ton, iguanas, strange tropical birds, and spectacular mountain and jungle scenery. Each country has its own monetary system, and we got accustomed to quetzales in Guatemala, lempiras in Honduras, cordobas in Nicaragua, as well as colones, balboas and pesos. We drove the 5,000 miles from Los Angeles to Panama City in just under 3 weeks and could have done it in less time.

We made the trip in a 1963 Dodge 440 sedan that I broke in myself. The Dodge is a typical low clearance modern car and was entirely stock except for the tires; we turned in the original two-plies for four-ply nylons. After a grease job and a wash in Panama the car looked and performed as it had in California. There were a couple of small gravel scratches in the paint, but there wasn't a squeak that needed attention.

What's the road like? It ranges from excellent to awful. In places the road is slow. Some days the speedometer stood at 70 hour after hour. Other days we crept along at 15 and 20, sometimes getting up to 40 miles per hour. We took 5 hours to drive the 85 miles from San Jose, Costa Rica, to the little town of San Isidro on the other side of the Continental Divide.

Actually from the U.S. border to its termination 42 miles south of Panama City, the road is paved all the way except for 60 miles in Mexico, 152 miles in Guatemala, 200 miles in Costa Rica, and 77 miles in Panama. These unpaved stretches are described as all-weather gravel. All weather they may be, but some of the gravel consists of loose, 4- and 6-inch river stone. To the driver it was like a rocky streambed.

There's an explanation for this. Ralph Agnew, Bureau of Public Roads regional engineer in Costa Rica, told me that except for Mexico, whose excellent highway system is financed entirely by Mexico, U.S. money has been matched with local money to build the different sections of the highway. The U.S. funds become avalaible sporadically. The result is that a section of highway may be surveyed, graded, and a subbace of stone put down and then lie untouched until additional money becomes available. Meanwhile truck and bus traffic begins on the unfinished road, and within a few months it's torn apart. In places it is an obstacle course of ruts, rocks, weeds, and slides.

Drivers can make better time, and the climate is somewhat nicer in the winter dry season than in the summer rainy season. There is one small section of the road in south Costa Rica that receives an average 25 feet of rain per summer. Heavy summer rains were the major reason two sections of the highway were incomplete until recently.

NEGOTIATING THE CORK

The first of these sections is the El Tapon stretch in northern Guatemala. El Tapon (the cork, or plug) is a 7-mile length of road that is cut into the side of a narrow canyon. Landslides occur frequently in the canyon during summer rains. Actually, El Tapon is only part of a 95-mile section of dirt and gravel road that is subject to slides. This was the area that previously had to be detoured by the rail trip from Mexico.

Highway officials now regard this section as all-weather, passable at all times of year. Trucks and buses go through year around, and even pleasure cars make the trip in the summer rainy period. But the road is apt to be closed for a few hours any time during the summer while a path is bulldozed across the top of a new slide.

No attempt is being made to keep this part of the road at full width as yet. Traffic moves up and over the slides, or around them. Parts of the road are one-car wide because of undercutting by the river. A couple of bridges aren't finished. Cars splash through a few inches of water at these points during the winter. During summer high water, all traffic takes a long detour to several narrow 10-foot-wide stone arch bridges, one of which has been in use since 1640.

Public roads officials are waiting for the El Tapon section to stabilize itself before they bring it to full width and pave it. This is planned for about 4 year from now. Personally, I wouldn't want to pull a travel trailer over this part of the highway (which climbs to 9,500 feet), but it would be an easy trip for a pickup with camper top. In January, dry and dusty, we drove the Dodge through most of this section at 25 to 40 miles per hour.

The other previous bottleneck on the inter-American highway was a 133-mile stretch of jungle in southern Costa Rica that was impassable, mainly because 44 streams and rivers had not been bridged. Today an engineered roadway with wide sweeping curves has been cut through the jungle, final grading has been completed and all of the bridges are now in use. The road is open all year around, and traffic is moving with no delays.

Landslides are common in this area, but traffic simply detours around them.

When White and I reached Panama's western frontier we assumed that all the poor road was behind us, actually, the worst was yet to come. From south of David to Santiago, 114 miles of old pavement has been allowed to break down into loose boulders and gravel because of plans for a new high speed concrete road that eliminates the poorest 33 miles of the old road. It was being completed at the time we made the trip, and is now in use.

The inter-American highway comes to an abrupt end at the edge of a river just beyond the town of Chepo, 42 miles east of Panama City. Trucks and jeeps can ford the river at low water and continue on to a couple of small jungle settlements, but the building of an improved road through the Darien Gap to connect with the highway system of South America is still a number of years away.

YANKEE, GO HOME?

Are there any feelings against Yankees in Central America? Not that we could discover. A smile and a few halting words in Spanish on our part would start a friendly conversation anywhere. People often went out of their way to be helpful. In San Jose, Costa Rica, for example, a taxi driver with a passenger went out of the way to guide us halfway through the city to the hotel we were seeking. This was a great help, for we were in a maze of narrow one-way streets and the signs that showed circulation were hard to find. If there are any anti-U.S. feelings we weren't aware of them. We saw painted on walls, "Castro No. America Si."

Parts of the inter-American highway have been used for years and country-to-country commerce and bus traffic is on the increase. Now, international tourist travel is beginning.

What about passports, accommodations, gasoline? The Travel Division, Pan American Union, Washington 6, D.C., will mail you "Motoring in Central America and Panama" for 25 cents. "U.S. Tourist Requirements for Entry Into Latin American Republics" for 10 cents, and has other literature as well.

Briefly, here are some of the things you need to know:

Passport: You need a current U.S. passport ($10), current smallpox vaccination certificate, automobile ownership certificate, Inter-American Highway driving permit ($2 from A.A.A.) and a dozen or so passport-type photos. A visa of permission to enter each country must be stamped in your passport ahead of time by one of the country's consulate offices. Some countries charge a visa fee of $2 or $3, some do not. All Central American countries have consulates in Los Angeles and in several other large U.S. cities. In some cases it may save time to enter Mexico on a tourist permit (multiple entry: $5) and obtain visas for the other countries at consulates in Mexico City.

Domestic automotive and public liability insurance is not good south of the border. A few U.S. companies with agreements in other countries can write policies for Central American coverage, and more work is being done on this. It usually is best to buy Mexican short-term insurance at the border.

Border formalities: The Central American countries have not yet streamlined their border formalities for tourists, as has been done in Europe. It takes about an hour to check out of one country and enter the next. Passports must be stamped, a description of the car entered into a ledger, and possibly one suitcase must be opened for casual inspection. We found all border officials helpful and friendly; some speak a little English, some do not.

Most border stations are open 24 hours a day but are officially open from 8 a.m. to 12 noon, and 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. During these hours all paperwork is free. Fees amounting to about $6 are charged for entering or leaving a country at other hours or on weekends or holidays.

Tourist accommodations: The highway is still so new that motels and trailer parks are not in evidence south of central Mexico. Good hotels, even luxury hotels, can be found in the capital city of each country and in a few other large towns. Usually you can drive from one capital to the next in a short day. English is spoken at the best hotels and their restaurants are excellent. It is best to order lunches the night before, to be eaten en route the next day.

Cost of lodgings ranged from $4.80 to $20 a night, and averaged about $12.

Gasoline: There are filling stations in every town and sometimes out in the country, 75 miles apart at most. In Mexico gasoline costs about the same as in the United States. In the rest of Central America it costs about half a dollar per gallon for the best grade, often of low-octane rating. My fuel bill from Los Angeles to Panama (one way) was close to $140. There are no credit eards. South of Mexico, the service stations are operated by several U.S. oil companies and are modern and spotless—quite a change from the usual Pemex station in Mexico. Good repair facilities exist only in the larger towns. Spare parts for United States and foreign cars are available in every capital.

Money: It's best to carry traveler's checks and to cash only minimum amounts. This avoids the nuisance of carrying one country's currency into another and then trying to exchange it. At Paul White's suggestion we each carried 50 $1 bills and these were acceptable everywhere for border fees or gasoline, avoiding the cashing of larger sums when on the way out of a country.

Lyle C. Wilson Discusses Nuclear Test Ban Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Lyle C. Wilson is the United Press International bureau chief in Washington and byline columnist for the organization. He has viewed the Washington scene and written of it for almost half a century.

Recently many UPI subscribing newspapers throughout the Nation carried Mr. Wilson's thought relative to defense matters in general and the nuclear test ban negotions in particular as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

HEADING TOWARD A TECHNOLOGICAL PEARL HARBOR?

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The intelligent citizen urgently needs guidance on national defense and a nuclear test ban just as he recently needed guidance on foreign aid and what should be done about it.

Nonpartisan, responsible guidance is what the intelligent citizen urgently needs. President Kennedy provided that kind of guidance on foreign aid when he named the Clay Committee to investigate. Kennedy commissioned Clay's committee because the taxpayers seemed to be making up their minds to cut foreign aid down to size, very small size.

It is the consensus here that Gen. Lucius Clay's temperate report will protect the 1963 foreign aid appropriation against meat ax surgery under which it might have expired altogether. It probably is fair to say that the Clay Committee restored much public confidence in foreign aid and in the administration's explanations as to why it is necessary.

Now mounted against the Kennedy administration on national defense policy in general and a nuclear test ban in particular is the kind of formidable opposition that almost brought foreign aid down to defeat. Regularly published here is a pamphlet, "Washington Report," sponsored by the American Security Council. It is frightening reading. The latest issue says the United States is hastening toward a technological Pearl Harbor.

"By hook or crook," the report says, "we are abandoning the nuclear race. Frantically we pursue the nuclear test ban treaty. Instead of catching up, we continue to negotiate. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, during more than 2 years in office, has not authorized a single new weapons system. He is slowing down our technological progress deliberately. All things considered, it does not look as though under the stewardship of Mr. McNamara, the United States is being equipped to forestall a nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor."

What is the intelligent citizen to make of that? It's not as if the Security Council could be brushed off as a council of nobodies. It is not. The National Strategy Committee of the Security Council includes: Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, retired; Adm. Ben Moreel, retired; Dr. Robert Morris; Adm. Arthur W. Radford, retired; Adm. Felix B. Stump, retired; Dr. Edward Teller; Adm. Chester C. Ward, retired, and Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, retired. It is not possible to laugh off, brush off or disregard such men.

House Republicans have set up a Committee on Nuclear Testing of which Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, is chairman. HOSMER is a member of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. On April 16, HOSMER circulated a news release captioned "Administration Test Ban Proposals Blueprint for National Suicide."

That is mighty strong language. But HOSMER cannot be laughed off or brushed off, either. He is a responsible Member of Congress. Moreover his blasty attack on administration test ban policy conforms generally with the position of the American Security Council. It is not enough, therefore, to say that HOSMER is making a partisan issue of the test ban. HOSMER, in fact, is reflecting some responsible military opinion and some responsible civilian judgment, too.

The intelligent citizen cannot have access to the facts nor has he the background knowledge to form any intelligent opinion in all of this although his very life may depend on what policy prevails.

It would be helpful to the intelligent citizen, therefore, if a committee enjoying public confidence could be named to study this nuclear test ban problem. The citizens urgently need guidance.

Government Fiscal Irresponsibility Catching Up With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been warning that the Kennedy and liberal Democratic lack of understanding of our economic system and the reckless spending which has gone on for three decades would someday bring us to a day of reckoning.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that this day is closer than we realized. The following editorial from the Richmond News-Leader provides material for some provoking thoughts. Perhaps it is not yet too late to save our system of free enterprise, capitalism, from the onslaughts of the dreamers who thought the dream could go on forever without an awakening to the hard reality that someday, somehow, debts must be paid.

[From the Richmond News-Leader, Apr. 23, 1963]

DAY OF RECKONING

"DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

"In order to pursue the greater security of our country, and of our fellow citizens in the ranks of business and industry, we shall vigorously promote broad ownership of U.S. savings bonds, and the benefits of acquiring these instruments of security through systematic payroll savings. By so doing, we hope to strengthen the interdependent resources of our people, our industry, our Nation.

"We recognize, further, that increased public ownership of the national debt—through U.S. savings bonds—is essential to the sound management of our Government's finances, to the stability of our currency, and—consequently—to our continued ability to meet our responsibilities in the defense of the free world. This volunteering exercise of thrift secures both individual and Nation against adversity and emergency, and earns the participant a greater share in the abundance of America.

"DOUGLAS DILLON."

The foregoing document is impressive and tolerably well turned out. In fact, it is an expensive piece of printing, on fine parchment. With these flourishes, the Secretary of the Treasury is promoting thrift—not for the Government, but for the average citizen. Mr. Dillon beseeches the Nation's business leaders to back the most intensive payroll savings bond drive since World War II. Translated from the Newspeak, the Secretary's Declaration of Interdependence means one thing: The country is going broke, and we're all in the crackup together.

The old puritanical virtues have disappeared from Government, but luckily Mr. Dillon has found them in the people. He is in a quandary because we're losing our gold at the same time that the big bond issues of the wartime years are coming due. Twenty-one percent of the national debt is in U.S. savings bonds. Mr. Dillon already has proposed that both gold and silver backing be removed from all forms of paper currency. But more important is what the Treasury calls "sound debt management" to postpone the day of reckoning.

Sound debt management is based upon some rather arresting principles: What is the public debt? "Nothing other than the difference between what we have spent as a Government since 1789 and what we have received in the form of taxes and other receipts," says the slick campaign literature. How much have we spent since 1789? "Your Government has spent through last December a shade under $1 trillion 600 billion." How much did we get? One trillion 300 billion dollars." How much of that debt has been incurred since 1945? Oops, no answer.

But there are other answers for the worrywarts. "A debt of $300 billion seems like (sic) it must be a huge burden upon our economy and it is, of course, a very sizable amount." The real worry lies elsewhere: "The major problems of debt management are not related to the size of the debt, per se, but rest in two other areas: rapid changes in the size of the debt and the structural aspects of the Federal debt." Those rapid increases—er, changes—are never explained.

Surprisingly, Mr. Dillon already has persuaded 28 of the busiest executives in the country to put their names to a national proposal which they could hardly endorse for their own businesses. He makes a blatant appeal to self-interest, saying that industry should be grateful for the Kennedy tax credits. He urges company presidents to pass the thinly veiled threat down the line by putting the bond campaign in the hands of promotion-minded aids.

But with all these dubious aspects, the campaign does have one hopeful aim. Secretary Dillon desires to get the national debt out of reckless Government hands. His plan would put "ownership of the national debt in the hands of genuine savers." We wonder how Walter Heller is these days.

Poll Indicates Georgia-Pacific Corp. Employees Want Repeal of the Jones Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

herewith a letter from Vernor Schenck giving the results of a poll involving the proposed repeal of the Jones Act as it affects west coast lumber shipments:

GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP.,
Portland, Oreg., April 8, 1963.

Hon. WALTER NORBLAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NORBLAD: There has been a question as to whether or not union members favor repeal of the Jones Act as one of the partial solutions in equalizing the American lumber industry's position for competition with Canadian lumber. Accordingly we have just asked our 6,300 Oregon employees what their opinions are. With an above average return on the survey, we find that 96.68 percent of union members want repeal of the Jones Act. Of our nonunion employees 98.96 percent agree with this.

The forms used for the survey carried no place where a signature or location was requested. Despite this, many of them came back signed and many of them carried remarks supporting their opinions.

I am sending the same information to other members of the Oregon delegation so that they, too, will have an indication about how Oregon lumber products employees are thinking.

Sincerely yours,

VERNOR SCHENCK,
Public Affairs Manager.

Tennessean Wins National Award—Ability Counts Essay Contest—Address of Miss Judith Keith Sikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Miss Judith Keith Sikes, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., has been named winner of the 1963 Ability Counts contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. In winning this distinguished honor, Miss Sikes competed with students from all across the Nation. We in Tennessee are very proud that this outstanding young student at Murfreesboro Central High School has been selected to receive this honor which includes a $1,000 first prize.

I want to congratulate her and commend her for her outstanding essay, pointing out how her community benefits from the abilities of handicapped workers. She has cited several cases in Murfreesboro and Rutherford County of handicapped persons who have surmounted their disability and are making significant contributions to the life of the community.

This contest, now in its 15th year, is part of the President's Committee's overall educational program aimed at making more people aware of the problems facing the handicapped in obtaining jobs, the work being done to help the handicapped help themselves, and the admirable accomplishments of many severely handicapped individuals.

The entries were judged by U.S. Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama; Dr. Dorothy C. Stratton, former commanding officer of the Coast Guard Women's Auxiliary, and Mrs. Dexter O. Arnold, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Sikes has written a truly outstanding essay and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD. Her essay follows:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Judith Keith Sikes, Murfreesboro Central High School, Murfreesboro, Tenn., first prize 1963 ability-counts contest)

This is my community, and the community of my handicapped brothers.

Come with us to the square.

Stand at the entrance of the majestic old courthouse where many great men have stood.

Around us within a radius of several miles are the banks and office buildings, stores and cafes, post office and city hall, and jail.

Woven in among these are the churches and schools, some new, some old.

In and beyond all this lie the people and their homes—homes of influence, homes of the average, and homes of the poor and underprivileged.

A fairly average community, it seems. But it isn't.

Ours differs from the average community in that we are blessed in having a group of handicapped people who play leading roles in the development of our community.

To take part fully in a democracy or in a democratic community such as ours, the handicapped must be economically independent; he must be employed.[1] When such is the case, the handicapped ceases to be a problem and becomes, instead, a benefit.

The word "handicapped," in past generations, often implied to the employer lack of ability or capacity to perform useful work competitively. People chose to ignore the fact that Bach, Sara Bernhardt, John Milton, and Paul of Tarsus, like many other great people, also had handicaps; but how much they contributed to so many.

Within the last few years, however, people have begun to realize what an asset the handicapped worker can be to the development of a community. The so-called handicapped workers have proven successful in thousands of jobs where their skills and abilities have been matched with work requirements.

Actually the handicapped differs little from the mentally and physically able-bodied worker because the whole world in all her physical manifestations is a collection of the handicapped. The man who possesses the physically unimpaired body has a handicap of some type, somewhere. It may be a fear of failure, an ungovernable temper, an inferiority complex or a feeling of frustration. Whatever it is, this disability very likely handicaps him as much as the loss of legs does the paralytic.

According to leading men who specialize in work with the handicapped, there are four different groups of handicapped people.

First there are the slightly handicapped who are generally found in the schools and social activities because their parents usually refuse to notice any disability in their child for fear of losing social position. Instead, they insist on his being a part of the so-called normal group. When given a proper chance to excel in some type of vocational work, these prove to be very capable.

[1] Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, retired, "Jobs for the Handicapped" pamphlet, 1962–63, p. V (the "First Word").

For example, there was a young boy in our community who was a slow learner. However, because a friend insisted, he tried out for the football team; and today he is remembered as one of the best athletes in his school. He has a good job, has self-respect, and is a contributing citizen.

Next are the moderately handicapped or those who can be helped in special education. A few are found in the schools, but most are trained in special classrooms to excel in something they are interested in. An unusual fact to be kept in mind is that the moderately handicapped along with the more severely handicapped are interested in only a part of a thing at a time. In riding through an industrial town full of new construction he might see just a post and be particularly interested in it.

Such was the case of a young man who was unable to learn in classroom work. While driving a friend's car, they passed a field of trees, cattle, sheep, and a horse. Immediately the young man noticed the horse and soon developed a strong love of horses. Today, with the help of teachers and friends, he is a horse trainer in our community making $3,000 a year. He also pays income tax. It is evident that he is doing his part in building a better America.

Then we come to the physically handicapped who are limited in their abilities. They, too, can contribute a great deal.

Mr. N—— is in his last year of college and is a practice teacher in one of our schools. Because of his ability as a teacher, one would hardly notice, that he, having lost one leg, is physically handicapped.

Then, too, there is Mr. G—— who was injured by shrapnel on an observation post in World War II. Today he is giving of himself and his time to numerous projects, and has served efficiently for many years in a responsible position in our county. As President Kennedy said: "Utilization of physically handicapped persons in productive employment is sound and necessary, both for the contribution handicapped citizens can make to our national productivity and for the sense of independence and well-being which they can derive from doing a job."[2]

In our final group are those who are severely handicapped and must have help in their activities. However, through workshelters which our community provides and special supervised training which competent members of our community are giving plus self-determination, these people, too, are becoming assets to the community.

So it is that each of us in his own way in keeping with his own talents contributes his share.[3]

The handicapped does not want pity. We must guard against this as the mother of a handicapped child must guard against self-pity. To all of us the handicapped says: "It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, this I have done."[4]

In this way the handicapped takes his place in, and contributes to, the community in which he lives. We feel that our community is making determined strides in this direction so that we can truly say, "We are not our brother's keeper, we are our brother's brother."[5]

[2] The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, "Jobs for the Handicapped pamphlet, 1962–63," p. 12 (the "Last Word").

[3] The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, "Jobs for the Handicapped pamphlet, 1962–63," p. 1.

[4] Henry Viscardi Jr., "The Sweet Dignity of A Productive Life," June 17, 1953, p. 3.

[5] Stuart Currie, "The Presbyterian Survey," Dec. 1962, p. 22.

A Deficit Is a Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, out in the Great Plains where the air is clear and the thinking sharp, a spade is a spade and a deficit is a deficit.

The Stockman's Journal, published in Omaha, recently editorialized on this matter of "deficits of weakness and deficits of strength" and concluded it is so much hogwash.

The editorial is interesting and to the point, and I think it will be of interest to other Members of the Congress:

A DEFICIT IS A DEFICIT

The President's chief economic adviser, Walter Heller, got himself in a bit of hot water the other day when he classed the American people's reluctance to go along with Government deficits as a Puritan ethnic. His inference was that ideas of thrift and balanced budgets, with respect to the Government, are somehow old fashioned and characteristic of straitlaced Puritans of ancient colonial days. Democrat Party bigwigs were pained no little by Mr. Heller's bluntness, we hear, fearing that modern-day Puritans who don't agree might take offense and register their feelings at the polls.

This now famous quotation came on the heels of another Heller utterance that is still ricocheting off the economic walls of official Washington. In a previous speech Mr. Heller acknowledged that the current Government budget deficit probably will total around $8 billion, and he further acknowledged that the President's proposed tax cut would do little to correct that financial imbalance.

But, said Mr. Heller, "The current deficit is a deficit of weakness because in the current period, the Nation's economic productive capacity is not fully realized; whereas, the new deficit will be a deficit of strength because the tax would encourage greater use of industrial facilities and curb unemployment."

Apparently to some economic thinkers in high places these days, a deficit is not always a deficit. Or, if a deficit is always a deficit, at least there are different kinds of deficits, some bad and some not so bad, or even good. Supposedly what we have proposed now is not only a bigger deficit, but a better one.

Does the public buy this kind of economic hocus-pocus? The issue is unresolved in Congress as yet, but there seems ample reason to believe that there is enough Puritan ethnic left in the American people's consciousness to say "no" to Mr. Heller and his kind.

As pointed out by one modern-day Puritan the other day, "A deficit cannot be anything else but a deficit. A deficit is a liability. A deficit is a minus. A deficit is never erased until it is paid. A deficit can never be a sign of strength until there is no more deficit. A liability always remains a liability until it is paid. A minus always remains a minus until it is erased by a plus, and to categorize deficits into deficits of weakness and deficits of strength is economic nonsense. * * *

"It is obvious that deficits may be incurred temporarily and justifiably when used primarily as instruments of profits or vehicles of creating assets. But deficits that are consistently piled up without provisions for their replacement can never be called or even imagined to be symbols of strength.

"The proposal by Mr. Heller to incur further deficits without provisions for correspondingly cutting expenditures to erase these deficits is as fallacious and as unrealistic and as disastrous as it can be. When one spends more than his income, he is only headed in one direction—namely, bankruptcy. And unless Mr. Heller claims for himself the ability to change irrefutable economic laws, we are headed for inevitable economic destruction."

Was Mr. Heller really serious in his reasoning? Much as we might wish he, as the top economic expert in the Federal Government today, was merely clowning, we fear he was dead serious and was speaking for those in charge of our national affairs. Among other things, this emphasizes the dimensions of the task facing those Puritans who would return this country to a policy of sound fiscal management.

President's Envoy Seems To Be Confused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the current visit of the President's special envoy to Moscow, Averell Harriman, emphasizes the futility of the Kennedy policies in dealing with the Communists. Harriman, the architect of the Lao disaster, the man who arranged the coalition government in Laos, tells us now he has won agreement from Khrushchev "in principle" on the need to keep the Lao fighting from getting out of hand.

Did not Khrushchev agree "in principle" last year when the coalition government was set up? The President said he did and, if you remember, the Kennedy administration hailed last year's agreement on Laos as a great victory for the free world. Was somebody fibbing then? Did not Khrushchev agree to the coalition and promise to pull out the Russian influence?

Mr. Speaker, the failure in Laos is just another in the long list of failures of President Kennedy who seems unable to cope with a world on fire or to understand the motives or objectives of the Communists. Unless we can somehow reach the President and instill in him the knowledge and the courage to pursue a policy of strength and determination to halt Russian Communist aggression, this Nation and the entire free world is in imminent danger.

The following news item from today's Wall Street Journal, concerning the Harriman visit, is full of foreboding for the future if this is the type of impractical representative we are depending on to deal with the Communists.

The news item follows:

Averell Harriman, U.S. Under Secretary of State, left Moscow for London at about the same time Castro was arriving. Harriman, who discussed the Laotian crisis with Soviet officials and Khrushchev, said he had won agreement in principle from Khrushchev on the need to prevent the Laotian fighting from getting out of hand. But there was no certainty Russia has enough control over pro-Reds in Laos to prevent them from continuing military advances against "neutralists."

Manmade Fibers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the cotton industry of America—from the producer of cotton to the spinner of cotton—now is beset on two fronts, one by the competition of cheaper synthetic fibers and the other through the importation of cheap cotton goods from abroad where mills are able to obtain cotton at a much cheaper price than our own mills.

The world price of cotton is approximately 8½ cents a pound below the domestic price our mills must pay. Our Committee on Agriculture now is trying to develop legislation that will enable our own mills to buy cotton at the world price. Our object is to restore American cotton and cotton goods to a fair competitive position, in relation to importation of goods and to synthetic fibers.

Mr. Burke M. McConnell, vice president of Burlington Industries, Inc., and chairman of the Man-Made Fibers and Silk Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., made a report for his committee at the recent convention of the institute which presents concisely and forcefully the problem we face in maintaining our markets for cotton and cotton goods. I think that Mr. McConnell's statement is of such a character that it will be helpful to all of us in our efforts to deal with the problems involved and, therefore, I, under unanimous consent, include this report in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BURKE M. MCCONNELL, CHAIRMAN, THE MAN-MADE FIBERS AND SILK COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, THE AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, INC., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1963

Since reporting to this board last October on the alarming increases in imports of fabrics and apparel made of man-made fibers, we have seen a 1-year total figure surpass all previous records.

Imports of man-made fiber fabrics in 1962 rose to a volume 58 percent above the previous year. Entries of apparel swelled this increase by still another 105 million yards. The steep rise in the figures for broadwoven fabrics is attributable to large shipments during 1962 from Japan. As indicated on the chart attached to the resolution before you, the climb over a 10-year period is from 15 million square yards in 1953 to 168 million square yards in 1962. Note particularly the extreme jump from 52.3 million square yards in 1958 to 134 million square yards in 1959. It is interesting to relate the greater volume of imports of man-made fibers products to the periods of greatest pressures for restrictions on cotton textile imports.

We recognize, of course, that the total yardage of imported fabrics and apparel in chief value of man-made fibers appears to be inconsequential in comparison with the much larger volume of imports of cotton textile products. The significance becomes apparent however when the two import figures are viewed in relation to either production or fiber consumption of the respective segments of the industry. On the basis of a slightly more than 4-to-1 ratio, based on production of broadwoven goods, a volume of roughly 230 million yards of imported man-made fiber products would be equal in

impact to a billion yards of cotton textile products. The figures for 1962 are alarmingly close to that amount and, in fact, are 68 percent above the relative figure for cotton textile imports at the 1958 level when the cotton industry claimed disruption with imports at less than half the present level.

A series of recent announcements indicates increasing interest in blends of fibers on the part of traditional cotton textile manufacturers. We have no way of knowing, just now, the real extent of this trend. An effort is underway to set up a new series of industry reports which we believe will be extremely valuable to everyone. A subcommittee of the technical task force which advises the economic policy committee has had one very satisfactory meeting in New York and a second meeting is scheduled in 2 weeks. This small working group will make every effort to fill the present statistical gap on production of blended fabrics regardless of fiber combination. We feel that this will be a highly significant contribution to the entire industry. Available statistics indicate a switch of considerable magnitude is underway.

Cotton's share of the market continues to decline while the relative position of the manmade fibers steadily improves. The increase, to date, has been primarily through claiming a larger share of the growth market rather than by a major displacement of natural fibers. Price may have had some influence but price alone has been a relatively minor factor.

There are both practical and esthetic reasons for this increasing use of manmade fibers. Some familiar illustrations where substantial shifts have occurred for such reasons are: The use of nylon in place of silk and cotton for lingerie; the virtual replacement of silk and cotton by nylon in hosiery; polyester blends in men's summer suits; glass in drapery and industrial fabrics; and the current inroads of polyester blends in shirts, dresses, and sportswear; acrylics and textured nylon in the carpet field; acrylics in blankets and sweaters; and so on. Even the apparent trend toward polynosic-type rayons is largely for functional and esthetic reasons. These new modified rayons, priced between the clean cost of combed and carded raw cotton, are gaining acceptance due to superiority over cotton in resistance to deterioration from certain chemical finishes, their higher luster, more luxurious hand, and greater color depth and clarity.

We cite these developments to emphasize the growth in fibers already accepted in the market. Their potential is vast both in present and new end uses, not to mention the possibilities represented by polypropylene, spandex fibers, the new beta glass fiber, etc.

While I have stressed that fiber price to date has had only a little to do with the diminishing use of natural and and increased use of manmade fibers, we now face a situation where price relationship can have a very great bearing. Last year's alltime high consumption of regular 27 cent rayon will be maintained and doubtless accelerated by the present unrealistically high price of cotton. Textile mills and textile machines are reasonably flexible and are largely indifferent to which raw fiber they process. Management flexibility, in relation to market needs, usually determines how fast a textile mill can adapt to a fiber change.

This potential for increased usage of manmade fibers is not ours alone. The technology and the ingenuity are at present worldwide. Also, there is an exceptional incentive under existing trade and restraint agreements which restrict cotton but permit imports of fabrics and products of other fibers. Cotton and polynosic blends are finding a place in our domestic market. They are being produced in our cotton mills—where they belong. The Japanese and others are in a position to hurt these mills because of the lack of restrictions on synthetics—and these goods will come in under a synthetic classification—not cotton. Cotton mills in India, Korea, and Taiwan, worsted mills in Japan and garment plants in Hongo Kong are now changing to manmade fibers. Others will follow and imports will flood us. Restraints on imports of textile products regardless of fiber are therefore mandatory for our entire textile industry.

Whatever the import peril may have been in the past, in the case of fibers other than cotton, it is clear that the recent trends now pose a most serious threat—not only to manufacturers using synthetics and silk but to the cotton system and also to those of you who may be turning, in the future, to manmade fibers. Unless checked quickly, these imports of manmade fiber, silk, and wool textiles will continue to increase and choke us all. It behooves us—now—to use all the force and influence we can muster collectively to see that the problem of imports of all textile products—regardless of fiber—gets the attention it so urgently needs.

President Itzhak Ben-Zvi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, President Itzhak Ben-Zvi, of Israel, died last week at the age of 78. Few men typify more accurately the pioneering spirit of the Israeli people than their late President.

Born in the Ukraine in 1884, Ben-Zvi carried on the Zionist tradition of his father. After visiting Palestine in 1904 to see firsthand the work of the Zionist settlers, he returned to Russia to found the labor Zionist movement. When the Pogrom of 1905 broke out, Ben-Zvi managed to escape the fate of his family, who were exiled to Siberia, and traveling through Europe he made his way to Palestine.

In Palestine, the Jewish settlers were forced to fight not only the rocky, barren soil, the swamps, malaria, and typhoid, but bands of marauding Arabs as well. Together with David Ben-Gurion, who became a lifelong friend, Ben-Zvi organized the first Jewish defense force in Palestine, known as Hashomer—The Watchman—to guard the new settlements. After World War I, Hashomer became the Haganah, which, after bearing the brunt of the war of independence in 1948, became Israel's Army.

Not satisfied with purely military accomplishments, Ben-Zvi went on to help organize both the Mapai Party, the foremost political party in Israel today, and the Jewish Federation of Labor, the Histadruth, which now counts among its members nearly 90 percent of Israel's working force.

After the First World War, Ben-Zvi was asked to join the governing body of the Jewish community in Palestine. He became chairman of its executive committee and, from 1945 to 1948, served as president of the National Council of Palestine Jews.

Ben-Zvi's service to his people did not end with the birth of the State of Israel. He was elected to Parliament twice. And when Israel's first President, Chaim Weizmann, died in 1952, Itzhak Ben-Zvi was elected to succeed him, and he was reelected for two succeeding terms.

In the tradition of his people, Ben-Zvi was more than a politician. He was an outstanding scholar and a prolific author. His books included a study of the Samaritans, an ancient Jewish sect; the history of the Jews of Peki'in, a village in Palestine where the Jews lived uninterruptedly since the destruction of the Second Temple; a history of Palestine, and geographical treatises. He was especially interested in the oriental Jewish communities and the communities of the Middle East.

With his passing, the citizens of Israel have lost one of their greatest leaders, Jews everywhere one of their outstanding scholars, and the world, a statesman.

Employment for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News of April 26, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH

In recent years automation has increased the demand for skilled and semiskilled labor but at the same time has materially reduced the need for unskilled workers. The result is a shortage of skilled help in the economy at the same time that substantial unemployment exists.

This change in labor demand has had special impact on the youth group who are out of school and who cannot qualify for available jobs. During the last few years there have been from 700,000 to 800,000 out of school and unemployed in the age bracket of 16 to 21. The percentage of unemployment in this age group has been about 13 to 16 percent, or well over twice the rate in the labor force as a whole.

It is broadly recognized that the solution to the problem of youth unemployment requires (1) the creation of more total job opportunities through a higher rate of economic growth, and (2) adequate training of youth to qualify them for the skills that are currently needed. No one claims that the basic problem can or will be solved by placing young people into temporary jobs created by a makework program under government auspices. Yet, that is what the President proposed and the Senate recently approved as a partial answer to joblessness of American youth.

The Senate-approved bill (S. 1) is now before the House where a similar bill (H.R. 5131) has been favorable reported by the Education and Labor Committee. Since the President has labeled this priority legislation, early action by the House can be expected unless it becomes tied up in the Rules Committee.

The pending youth employment legislation has been described in an analysis pre-

pared by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce as a palliative that would do little more than provide a relatively small number of youths with temporary unskilled jobs at a cost running into hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

"Inasmuch as the primary objective of the legislation is to increase the employability of unemployed youth," the analysis said, "it is worth noting that the cost of placing a young man in the Youth Conservation Corps program for 1 year is almost exactly twice the cost of 1 year's enrollment in the Nation's leading private universities and three times the cost in State universities. Also the cost of 1 year in the YCC is five times the cost of training youth in the Nation's better vocational high schools."

Taking administration cost figures, the Council analysis estimated the program might run as high as $675 million a year with 150,000 enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps.

Despite this public expenditure, Council Research Director Eugene F. Rinta found that the young people would be in just about the same position upon completion of their training that they were before enrolling. They would face the choice of somehow getting apprenticeship or vocational training or seeking one of the diminishing number of unskilled jobs.

The council analysis called attention to better and less costly ways of making youth more employable. It cited several positive means of increasing employment opportunities for youth that were pointed out in a minority report of the House Education and Labor Committee.

These include enlarging and redirecting the vocational education system to adapt vocational training to present day needs, expanding the youth training sections of the Manpower Development and Training Act and raising the existing 5-percent ceiling on expenditures which may be used for youth training, and correcting laws and regulations that deprive young people of employment. Examples of this latter are the administration of the Federal minimum wage law and the Walsh-Healey Act.

The report added: "Another and presently underused avenue to qualifying youth for the skills in demand is apprenticeship training. Promotion of apprenticeship programs among labor unions and industry could create many thousands of opportunities for young people to earn while they learn a skilled occupation."

Most importantly in the council's opinion, however, is the need for development of a business climate which is conducive to optimum economic growth. The analysis said:

"It is only through greater growth that more jobs in the aggregate will be created and that is the basic answer to the problem of unemployment generally. Perhaps the most effective thing that Congress could do to open the way for accelerated economic growth would be to enact an income tax rate reform measure which would increase the incentives and capital for job-creating investments."

Back to the specific question of what can be done to help solve youth employment problems, it should be noted that Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz himself acknowledged during the Senate hearings on S. 1 the "there is no suggestion that this training program (Youth Conservation Corps) will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation." And he recently told the House Labor Committee that "there is no future in this country for the unskilled worker. What has been his job is going to be done by machines."

President Kennedy also noted this situation in his message on education last January 29. He cited a special study committee report showing "the need for providing new training opportunities—in occupations which have relevance to contemporary America—to 21 million youth now in grade school who will enter the labor market without a college degree during the 1960's." The President said, "These youth—representing more than 80 percent of the population between the ages of 16 and 21—will be entering the labor market at a time when the need for unskilled labor is sharply diminishing."

Dallas Morning News Warns on the Test Ban Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of April 24, 1963, and compliment both our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], and this newspaper for their understanding of the situation.

The Dallas Morning News points out the very real dangers facing the United States because of the refusal of the Soviets to honor any agreement is a danger recognized by most American citizens.

Our colleague has done an outstanding job as a student of the problem and legislator in informing his associates in Government and the people of the need for a sensible test ban or no test ban at all, rather than acquiesce to the false blandishments of the Soviet Union. The United States must not unilaterally bind itself ever again to nuclear test ban on the peril of our extinction on the face of the earth.

The above-mentioned article follows:

TEST-BAN DANGERS

Dangerous omens are contained in the report that the United States and Britain are preparing a new direct appeal to Khrushchev to break the deadlock over a nuclear-test-ban agreement. The primary barrier to any agreement over weapons-test control has been the Soviet Union's steady refusal to accept a realistic inspection system which would permit Western observers to examine possible violations of the agreement within the Soviet Union to insure against cheating.

To date there has been no indication that the Soviet Union is willing to accept an effective inspection system. It seems likely that if any new compromise agreement is reached, most of the compromising will be done by the United States and Britain.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, ranking Republican member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, predicted that this would be the case in a speech on the floor of the House last week. HOSMER said that pertinent terms of a new test-ban treaty soon to be offered to the Russians by the Kennedy administration had been revealed to his committee last month.

These terms he described as "blueprints for a U.S. suicide weapon," adding that the inspection provisions were utterly meaningless and the machinery to spot cheat testing completely inadequate. HOSMER feels that the new treaty being prepared for submission to the Russians constitutes "a disastrous agreement for agreement's sake."

What are these terms which have upset Representative HOSMER, regarded as an expert in the field of atomic energy?

The current Anglo-U.S. proposals, he says, will rely on seismic observatories outside the Soviet Union to discover underground cheat testing inside its borders. "Only a token number—nine—of unreliable, delayed reporting, tamper-prone, unmanned and as-yet-uninvented black box devices will be demanded for placement inside the U.S.S.R."

HOSMER pointed out that Dr. Carl Romney, the Defense Department's top seismologist, told his committee last month that, under the proposed terms, significant underground nuclear tests could be carried out in the interior of the U.S.S.R. without discovery from the outside.

He also explained that the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, testified that the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of military interest, except very-large-yield super H-bombs which the Soviets already have anyway, can be perfected by tests carried out under these conditions of undiscoverability.

A test-ban treaty without effective guards against cheating could provide the Soviets with means to achieve nuclear superiority over the United States. Only a treaty which guarantees that nuclear progress is stopped on both sides of the Iron Curtain might help to eliminate the danger of nuclear war.

But even an effective test-ban treaty could be risky. The Soviets still could keep their scientists at work in the laboratories on weapons designed to provide them with atomic superiority, and the treaty could be broken as soon as these weapons were ready for testing.

HOSMER reminds that President Kennedy, in March of 1962, flatly stated that the United States could not protect itself from this kind of treachery.

The President said: "In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on preparations for an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

These and other facts we hope our over-anxious disarmament negotiators will bear in mind as they make another of their many trips to Geneva.

Aid to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken and written about the alien order of communism which has dedicated itself to world conquest contrary to the will of the people. Many Americans are extremely concerned about the assistance which is given to Communist-controlled and Communist-sympathizing countries by the United States through the use of their tax dollars. Most all of the people of the Third District of Kentucky oppose the use of their tax money for assistance to Communist countries and now the Jefferson Post No. 15 of the American

Legion is attempting to alert the people to the fact that many of them are aiding the cause of communism by the purchase of materials and products made in a Communist economy.

I commend to the Members of this House the following resolution passed by the Jefferson Post in Louisville and hope that it will serve as a guide for other partiotic organizations throughout this country:

Whereas the international Communist conspiracy has pledged itself to bury the United States and the free world in economic warfare, or otherwise; and

Whereas the purchase of Communist-made goods serves to put valuable dollars into the Communist economy; and

Whereas the credit for any economic advancement that accompanies trade between Communist nations and the United States is a credit to the Communist masters of those countries; and

Whereas the building of the prestige of collectivist dictatorships serves only to further enslave the masses; and

Whereas, the jobs of American workers have actually been placed in jeopardy and in some cases lost because of Communist imports; and

Whereas the sale of American-made goods to Communist nations accomplishes, aids, and abets avowed enemies of freedom: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the executive committee of Jefferson Post No. 15 of the American Legion declares its opposition to the purchase of Communist-made products and calls upon all patriotic Americans to join it in a pledge to purchase only American-made and free world merchandise; and be it further

Resolved, That the patriotic merchandisers of Jefferson County and the State of Kentucky be requested to join us in this enterprise by restricting their own handling of merchandise to products made in nations that believe in freedom rather than in nations that suppress it.

Adopted March 19, 1963.

WILLIAM A. CHENAULT,
Member, Executive Committee.
MILTON J. MONEY,
Commander.
WALTER J. DOERTING,
Acting Adjutant.

Selective Service Mental Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Parade, a magazine section that is published in many Sunday newspapers, including the Washington Post, contained the following article on April 28, 1963, under a column entitled "Intelligence Report," which I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Congressmen:

Who's smart? Which selective service registrants fare best and worst on the mental tests given them for military induction? Those from Utah and Washington pass the tests most frequently. Those from South Carolina and Kentucky fail most frequently. More than half the South Carolinians and Kentuckians fail. Their failure rate is 54.6 percent. The failure rate of those from Utah and Washington is only 4.7 percent.

To the above might be added that Utah, which has long been proud of and has emphasized education, ranks No. 1 in the number of years of schooling completed by persons 25 years of age and over. The average number of grades completed by this age group is 12.2—1960. It further follows that with this same age group, Utah ranks first in the number of persons completing at least 4 years of high school. Furthermore, we rank top, along with Colorado and Delaware, in the number who have completed at least 4 years of college.

In Utah's secondary schools, 49.4 percent of our teachers hold master's degrees; 98.6 percent have bachelor's degrees; and 93.2 percent of our elementary teachers hold bachelor's degrees.

This admirable achievement has not come easy to the people of our State, or our teachers, for there have been many difficult and seemingly insurmountable hurdles to overcome, among which are some of the following: Because of the percentage of school-age children per capita, which places us as second in the Nation; our high percentage of pupils attending public schools—97.4 percent; and our lower percentage of disposable income per capita; it has been necessary for both teachers and all Utah citizens to make many sacrifices in the interest of better education. It has been necessary for us to levy taxes to the extent that Utah has the second highest percentage of State taxes earmarked for educational purposes for higher education, and is first percentagewise for State and local expenditures for all public education. Even with this effort on the part of State and local governments, the result has been large-size classes—Utah ranks 39th in the Nation in average number of pupils per classroom teacher in public elementary and secondary schools—and lower salaries for our devoted teachers—90.1 percent of the national average.

Another factor which I would like to point out is that much of our land in Utah is federally owned—second only to the States of Nevada and Alaska. Thus we are unable to draw revenue for State and local government from this land. We do receive some aid for our schools through Federal appropriations such as Public Law 874 and Public Law 815; however, I am proud to say that the bulk of our education expense is carried by the people of Utah, for only 4.8 percent of all schools are paid by the Federal Government. This might be compared with Alaska, which receives 24 percent of its school costs from the Federal Government.

I am proud to say further that Utah is one of nine States which has no State debt for education. We have followed in our State a sound fiscal policy of meeting current expenditures with current revenue—this also holds true in other departments of our State government.

The success of our school system in Utah may be attributed to many factors, but for the most part it is the educational philosophy of our founding forefathers, who felt that the first order of importance was establishing schools. This inherent philosophy of the value of a good education is apparent with all people throughout our State. This, coupled with the devotion to and love of education demonstrated by our teachers, has made Utah one of the top States in education in America in the past, as well as at present.

On Preparing Athletes for Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the views of the U.S. Gymnastics Federation concerning development of athletes for the 1964 Olympic games.

The federation takes sharp issue with the request of the Amateur Athletic Union for half a million dollars to prepare athletes for these forthcoming Olympics.

Following is the text of a letter to Members of Congress from Mr. Donald N. Boydston, president, U.S. Gymnastics Federation:

APRIL 23, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: It has recently been brought to our attention that Mr. Donald Hull, of the Amateur Athletic Union, has written to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY requesting $500,000 to help develop our athletes for the forthcoming 1964 Olympic Games. A copy of this letter has evidently been forwarded to the Members of Congress.

Mr. Hull has indicated in his letter that this amount of money is needed to enhance the performance of our athletes in the 1964 Olympic Games. He wrote as if he were speaking for the "major sports governing bodies" of the United States. We assure you he is not. In at least two areas this letter is both misleading and erroneous. First, it has never been a function of the Amateur Athletic Union to develop athletes. The coaches, trainers, and teachers who actually develop our athletes are members of the now functioning sports federations. For instance, the many clinics, developmental meets and championship meets which the U.S. Gymnastics Federation conducts are in no way connected with the A.A.U. To place such a sum of money in the hands of a group not involved in actually preparing our athletes would be a mistake.

Second, the training of athletes also calls for the facilities necessary to conduct such training. The member institutions of the various sports federations are those organizations which administer and are responsible for the facilities needed. Therefore, most of the personnel and facilities which have in the past and present been responsible for producing and training athletes are both represented in the sports federations.

Third, the U.S. Gymnastics Federation could successfully operate on $500,000 for 10 years—and during that time conduct clinics and meets for all ages, as we are now doing, and greatly improve the physical fitness of our youngsters as well as improve the competitive performances of our Olympic athletes to come.

Fourth, we believe that if such funds should be made available for the express purpose of helping to develop athletes we must look into the future. The high school girl

or boy of today is the Olympic performer of 1968. Given many times the amount requested the Amateur Athletic Union could do nothing measurable to improve our performance in the 1964 Olympic Games to be held just 18 months from now. It takes coaches, facilities, and years of training to produce a great athlete. We have the coaches, the facilities, and the ambition and desire to improve the performance of our athletes in the future. We are beginning with the youngsters and simultaneously helping the members of our future Olympic teams.

We have as members of our organization the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations; the American Turners; the National Collegiate Athletic Association; the National Association of College Gymnastics Coaches; the Women's National Gymnastics Association; and many others indicate they will soon join. There is a job to be done—and we have the personnel and the facilities with which to accomplish the task. We do not feel the A.A.U. leadership has been honest in saying they can develop a team that will see the Soviets are "thwarted." It is true they can sponsor meets and go on international trips but as for getting our athletes ready or providing those necessities which are needed, only the sports federations have what it takes to build winning programs for the future.

Respectfully,

DONALD N. BOYDSTON,
President, U.S. Gymnastics Federation.

Wisconsin's Traffic Safety Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, with the rising death toll throughout the Nation caused by traffic accidents, I call to the attention of my colleagues the significant program that has been launched in my own State of Wisconsin to combat this growing problem. As a Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin, I have always been proud of the record achieved by Wisconsin in the area of traffic safety. But since January of this year, there has been a stepped-up program in this area, sparked by some 954 deaths recorded for 1962. This renewed determination on the part of the Wisconsin Council of Safety, the State Motor Vehicle Department and the many civic leaders throughout the State provides a singular example for other States throughout the country to follow.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will insert into the RECORD excerpts from a letter sent to me by the public information director of the Wisconsin Council of Safety, Inc., in which he describes the stepped-up program of public education and information that has been undertaken in Wisconsin. I will also include excerpts from a pamphlet, entitled "Four by 1964," issued by the council which describes four legislative proposals supported by the Wisconsin Council of Safety.

The material referred to above follows:

FOUR BY 1964

UNIFORM RURAL ENFORCEMENT

The problem: Duplication of effort between county and State law enforcement officers in many areas. County officers restricted by county lines. Lack of uniformity in enforcement throughout the State.

The solution: Permit county boards to transfer their traffic patrols to the Wisconsin State Patrol with full civil service status and certain other guarantees.

The cost: Traffic enforcement costs now borne by the counties through their property tax levies will be assumed by the State through existing vehicle registration, driver license and gasoline tax receipts.

IMPLIED CONSENT REQUIREMENT

The problem: Drinking drivers are a serious menace. But they frequently go unconvicted for want of sure evidence—while the innocent may be mistakenly charged with driving while intoxicated.

The solution: Pass an implied consent law to help convict the guilty and protect the innocent. Make the driving privilege contingent upon the driver's agreement to submit to a chemical test if charged with driving while intoxicated.

Lower the prima facie intoxication evidence level from 0.15 to 0.10 percent, in recognition of known facts about the effects of alcohol consumption.

The cost: Minimal costs of equipment or laboratory analysis to be budgeted for by enforcement agencies.

TRAILER SAFETY REGULATIONS

The problem: Considerable public opinion over inadequacy of existing safety regulations governing trailers was expressed following a July 4, 1960, accident near Spring Green in which a horse-carrying trailer broke loose from its towing vehicle and crashed into a family car, killing six persons. Since more trailers are being drawn by motor vehicles each year, the need for stricter safety regulations is apparent.

The solution: Up-date current requirements governing lighting, brakes, hitches, and chains on trailers.

The cost: The cost would be very small to the individual vehicle owner who intends to tow a trailer. This safety investment would be for his own protection and that of the traveling public.

HELP FOR PROBLEM DRIVERS

The problem: Some drivers, by their records, have shown the need for counseling and help before they cause a serious accident. Personnel to perform this service are not available.

The solution: Create a specialized group of driver improvement personnel whose task would be to interview drivers whose accident experience and violation records indicate need for consultation, retesting or refresher training.

The cost: For the biennium, salaries for 15 driver improvement specialists plus other necessary costs would run $216,553.

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF SAFETY, INC.,
Madison, Wis., April 1, 1963.

Congressman MELVIN LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: May I take this opportunity to tell you what is going on in Wisconsin.

As you probably know, 1962 was the second worst year in Wisconsin's history as far as traffic deaths were concerned. To date, 954 deaths have been recorded, and with some persons still on the critical list, it's possible the final total may exceed the all-time high of 955.

This has spurred a stepped-up program of public education and information, as well as an attempt to meet the State's priority traffic safety needs with sound legislative measures.

Since January, the Wisconsin Council of Safety, in cooperation with the motor vehicle department, has produced and distributed nearly 125,000 copies of the three enclosed leaflets dealing with traffic safety proposals. The remaining two will be prepared and distributed shortly.

In February and March, nine traffic safety clinics were held throughout the State to help generate public interest and support for the suggested programs. More than 400 legislators and interested citizens attended.

Scheduled in early April, is a series of 14 recorded interviews on aspects of traffic safety. Experts from throughout Wisconsin will discuss such topics as engineering, chemical testing, pedestrian safety, law enforcement, traffic courts, citizen support and driver education, and the discussions will be recorded and distributed to each radio station in the State in the form of 15 minute programs.

We believe this project will do much to inform the public on what the problems and possible solutions are in each of these key areas.

In addition, queries from many persons on some of the problems of freeway driving, have encouraged several organizations to arrange a 2-day clinic on freeway driving. An instructional session will be held in the evening, followed by a bus tour of freeway areas in the Madison area the next morning. This will be held in late April, and the entire week will be designated as Freeway Driving Week. The vocational school, motor vehicle department, AAA and Wisconsin Council of Safety are cooperating in this venture.

Sincerely,

ALAN CHECHIK,
Public Information Director.

Water Pollution Control Program in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, H.R. 5888, would reduce the funds for water pollution control grants from the $100 million requested by the President to only $90 million. In view of the fact that there are now applications already on hand for $170 million of Federal aid, any reduction would be an unfortunate setback to this urgently needed program.

It is particularly disturbing that the cut was made on the erroneous basis that communities could turn to the accelerated public works program to make up the loss. The fact is that that program is available only in communities with high and persistent unemployment, so that the communities which would lose out under this cutback could not necessarily use the other program. More importantly, the Congress in authorizing the accelerated public works program and in appropriating funds for these grants did so in order to make a net addition to the construction activity and thereby create jobs to relieve unemployment. A basic principle of that

program is that the funds are not to be used for projects which would have been built without the aid and are not to be used to replace funds for regular Federal programs.

Last Friday, a list of nearly 1,600 communities which have applications pending under the water pollution program was inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD beginning on page A2538. Because of the special method of processing followed in the State of Georgia, whereby applications must be a completed or final package, it was not possible to include a full listing for that State. Even the additional information now available does not present a complete picture since I understand there are many communities in Georgia actively developing projects under this program. I am inserting in the RECORD a listing of a number of additional communities in that State which have pending applications for grants under the water pollution control program and which could be adversely affected by the reduction in funds made by H.R. 5888.

Supplemental list of pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants

GEORGIA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Alma	$33,190
Augusta	600,000
Athens	410,400
Barnesville	10,487
Brunswick	165,800
Columbus	350,000
Dalton	110,000
Fayetteville	73,400
Fulton County	465,000
Hazelhurst	61,200
Jefferson	32,430
Macon	441,000
Milledgeville	600,000
Ocilla	56,700
Savannah	61,500
Valdosta	269,700

Bonneville Stands on Its Own Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, has taken unusual interest in the fiscal problems of Bonneville Power Administration. His interest certainly is most welcome and proper and his concern is appreciated. Unfortunately, however, the gentleman from Pennsylvania made certain comments which I fear left wrong impressions.

My distinguished colleague advocates a BPA rate increase on a the-sooner-the-better basis. His insistence comes at a time when the 88th Congress has before it a program that would permit BPA to net between $6 and $15 million a year by marketing surplus power in the Pacific Southwest.

My first point is this: Any BPA rate review should await the approval or disapproval of Congress on the proposed marketing program.

The proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie would have a very favorable impact on BPA's financial position. BPA rates come up for review and possible change at 5-year intervals. Existing rates will continue until December 20, 1964. BPA Administrator Charles F. Luce has stated BPA will not wait that long, however, to review its rates. That will be done this year after Congress has had a chance to act on the intertie program. There will be plenty of time, after Congress considers the intertie, to review rates and recommend adjustments.

Can you imagine what would happen if a private utility were to appear before its regulatory agency and petition for a rate increase at the same time ignoring a sales program that would substantially increase its revenue? Surely, only one thing would happen. The increase would be denied. And the utility probably would be chided for upsidedown thinking. It would be nudged out the door and admonished not to return until its marketing program was resolved.

After Congress wishes are known, BPA can thoroughly review its financial requirements. It can take many factors into account, including the intertie, and Mr. Luce will then recommend to the Federal Power Commission whatever rate revisions are necessary.

I spoke of wrong impressions. For one thing, the gentleman from Pennsylvania said this—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4:

> Mr. Luce has indicated in his letter that BPA realizes that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964–69. This realization will be welcomed warmly by the taxpayers provided that the increase is sufficient to eliminate the drain which the BPA currently inflicts on taxpayers' funds.

First of all, BPA does not currently inflict a drain on taxpayers' funds. BPA pays its own way with interest.

I shall explain this in a moment. But first, may I emphasize that when BPA repays the investment in Northwest power projects, these projects will continue to produce revenues for the U.S. Treasury for the benefit of the Nation's taxpayers for scores of years.

The Federal Government's investment in 15 Pacific Northwest multipurpose projects in operation as of June 30, 1962, totaled $1,880 million. Of this amount $1,540 million is to be repaid from power revenues. The rest is charged—and properly so—to such nonreimbursable benefits as recreation, navigation, and flood control. Another $520 million invested in transmission lines raises BPA's total obligation to the Treasury as of June 30 to $2,060 million.

BPA receipts to last June 30 totaled $860 million. Of this, $221 million was used to repay in full annual appropriations for operations and maintenance. Another $318 million was applied to interest on the capital investment. The remaining $321 million was used to repay capital investment and, as of June 30, this amount was about $20 million more than the repayment schedule called for.

Thus, while it is correct to say that the taxpayers' money has been invested to develop Northwest multipurpose Federal projects, this is an investment that is being repaid—with interest. This is more than can be said of many public works financed with Federal appropriations in other parts of the country. The service life of the Columbia projects will span many, many years beyond the repayment period.

Now, this brings us to my distinguished colleague's remarks on interest, which I fear also left the wrong impression. I was disturbed and left more than a little confused by his reference to interest rates—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, page 3244—and by what he left unsaid. So I delved into the matter. I found that the interest rate paid on U.S. Treasury marketable securities from 1939 through 1960 averaged 2.252 percent. BPA has paid 2.5 percent on projects constructed by the Army engineers and on one small reclamation project, and 3 percent on other Bureau projects, which include Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse Dams.

The Congressman from Pennsylvania did not make any particular point on interest rates other than to imply, perhaps, that they should have been higher, although, as it was, they still were above the going Federal rate.

My distinguished colleague makes no reference to the fact that private utilities, in effect, have obtained interest free loans from the Government through fast writeoffs amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. Frankly, I am critical of this omission.

If my distinguished colleague's goal is to see BPA operate on a sound financial basis, he should support programs such as the intertie. This program, if built at Federal costs, certainly will pep up BPA's financial outlook.

In these days of intense international competition—a contest which involves our very survival—we must take great care not to impose an economic handicap or burden on any region. I am confident that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania realizes that he cannot promote the economic interest of his own region by hobbling the forward progress of the Pacific Northwest.

President Kennedy made this point ably in August 1962 in connection with BPA's 25th anniversary. He said:

> When you help build a region, you help build your nation. The economic growth of the Pacific Northwest has created a bigger market for Detroit cars and Pittsburgh steel and Boston shoes and Atlanta textiles. The list is almost without end, and proves again that the economic vitality of one region affects the economic vitality of all other regions.

A selfish approach to regional interest does not build the Nation's strength. Indeed, such an approach is fraught with peril.

If the intertie program and its attendant legislation should fail to pass, the opponents of these measures would perpetuate restrictions that prevent BPA from selling at a profit power that now wastes into the Pacific Ocean. This is power available whenever streams are above minimum flows.

In each of the past 5 years when BPA has had annual deficits, electrical en-

ergy substantially greater than the year's deficit went unsold for lack of a market. The water was spilled unused over the dams. In other words, in these 5 years we wasted power worth approximately $125 million. Surely this is a waste in natural resources that we can ill afford.

Water is a self-replenishing resource and by using it prudently we may conserve our supplies of fossil fuels. It makes good sense to do so.

BPA in the past 25 years has achieved a remarkable record of marketing Federal power at the lowest possible cost. As Administrator Luce has stressed, BPA is committed to a program that will put it back on a sound financial basis.

Because of a surplus accumulated prior to 1957, BPA is still cumulatively $20 million ahead of schedule in meeting its obligations to the Treasury. We realize that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964 through 1969.

The amount of any increase will rest largely on what Congress does with the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. An essential part of this program is the legislation which I described and which, by the way, is supported unanimously by the Pacific Northwest congressional delegation. If Congress approves this program, the raise in BPA rates will be small and not likely to hinder electric consumers. The program also will lessen a shameful waste in natural resources. These things are, of course, vital to our country's welfare.

Americans Dying in War That Is Not a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following news item from this morning's Wall Street Journal notes the 80th American boy to die in the fighting in South Vietnam. Why are American boys dying in a war the President refuses to call a war yet commits our forces to it? What does the Nation tell the parents and loved ones of these boys who are dying on a lonely battlefield in a faraway and strange land? What are we, the Congress, going to tell the American people as we stand by and allow American boys to be engaged in a war not declared by Congress? We have taken a solemn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and the Constitution gives only Congress the power to declare war. By what right does President Kennedy commit armed forces to a continuing war without the sanction of Congress in accordance with the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, is it not time for Congress to exert its constitutional responsibility and notify the President that we expect him to live up to the supreme law of the land? In keeping with the oath we took as Members of Congress, we must return to Congress the powers delegated to us in the Constitution. Perhaps, then, we can bring about a policy which will make some sense in our dealings with foreign nations and the Communist threat. At least, American boys will not be sent to die in an undeclared war.

The news item follows:

Red guerrillas in South Vietnam killed a U.S. Army master sergeant and 40 South Vietnamese troops in a battle 320 miles north of Saigon, Vietnam military sources said. About 60 other Government troops were missing. The U.S. sergeant was the 80th U.S. military adviser to die in South Vietnam since the United States began aiding South Vietnam militarily 2 years ago.

Alton G. Lacy, Superb Congressional Secretary, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, Alton G. Lacy is retiring May 1 as secretary for the office of the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia. Mr. Lacy has served in this capacity since March 4, 1931, with the exception of the year 1954 when he returned to his native county to serve 1 year as clerk of the circuit court of Halifax County under appointment of Judge G. E. Mitchell, Jr., of that circuit. Alton Lacy is a man of sterling worth and qualities of character. He is a dedicated public servant. He is intelligent and capable. He knows the people of the Fifth Congressional District as well as their needs and problems. He has labored indefatigably to serve them. The dexterous and faithful manner in which he has performed the duties of his position has earned and merited the appreciation and affection of the citizens, not only of the Fifth District, but of the State of Virginia at large.

He belongs to an old and highly respected southside Virginia family. The Lacy family of Halifax County has had a prominent part in the public life of Halifax County for at least 75 years.

The Danville Register of Danville, Va., in its issue of Sunday, April 28, carried a story dealing with the impending retirement of Mr. Lacy and included an editorial which demonstrates to some extent the esteem in which he is held by the people especially in that section of our Commonwealth.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the newspaper article and the editorial from the Danville Register hereinabove referred to are as follows:

AFTER 32 YEARS ON THE HILL ALTON G. LACY, TUCK'S SECRETARY, ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT MAY 1

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Alton G. Lacy, for 32 years a congressional assistant on Capitol Hill, announced today that, for reasons of health, he will retire as secretary to Congressman WILLIAM M. TUCK, of the Fifth Virginia District, on May 1.

His retirement will bring to a close the second longest period of service of any aid presently connected with the Virginia delegation. No successor was announced.

He has served successively as secretary to Congressmen Thomas G. Burch, Thomas B. Stanley, and Tuck, all of the fifth district, and is recognized as one of the best congressional assistants on Capitol Hill. Twice during his period of service, when vacancies occurred in 1946 and again in 1953, he had full management of the district's congressional office, a capacity generally referred to in Washington as that of acting Congressman.

Along with Calvin Haley, secretary to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, and M. J. Menefee, administrative assistant to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Mr. Lacy recently was cited as one of the veterans of Virginia's congressional staff. The combined service of these three aids totals more than 100 years.

In addition to his duties in Washington, Lacy has been active in Virginia politics. He was a member of the fifth district Democratic committee and the Democratic State central committee, where he has served for many years. He also is recognized as an authority on Virginia election laws and on the Democratic Party plans, and had a role in drafting several of the State's Democratic platforms.

He comes from a family long associated with public affairs in Halifax County, Va. His father was the late State Senator James T. Lacy, who served in the Virginia Legislature with the father of Congressman TUCK, the late Robert J. Tuck.

Looking back over the years, Lacy said in an interview that he never has regretted his decision to come to Washington as a congressional aid.

"It has been an interesting experience," he said.

"I have formed many friendships, and my three employers were men of high principle, honor, and integrity," he said.

"But probably the most solid satisfaction," he added, "was being in a position to help others. Looking back, this assumes more real importance than helping in legislative matters or any other work."

Lacy will be honored with a scroll from the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce at the Virginia Congressional Dinner, scheduled for Hotel Washington on Tuesday evening, as a feature of the annual session of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Also to be honored at the dinner are Burr P. Harrison, former Seventh District Congressman; Haley, the dean of Virginia congressional aids, and Menefee.

Lacy was born in Scottsburg, October 6, 1898. After graduation from the high school there, he worked for 2½ years on his father's farm and then served as deputy clerk in the Halifax County Circuit Court under his father and later under his brother, the late Ernest C. Lacy. During this time, he also served as a member of the Halifax town council.

In 1930, he managed successfully the campaign of Mr. Burch in Halifax County for the seat in Congress from the Fifth District. On March 4, 1931, he came to Washington as assistant to the new Congressman.

When Burch was appointed to the Senate in May 1946, by Governor Tuck, Lacy assisted him with his Senate duties and, at the same time, continued to manage the congressional office on the House side.

Stanley was elected to represent the Fifth District in November 1946, and Lacy was employed as his secretary, continuing in that capacity until the former resigned to run for Governor of Virginia. After a period of 3 months in which the assistant again managed the office, the vacancy was filled by Congressman TUCK, under whom Lacy has served continuously with the exception of a year's leave in 1954, when he was appointed clerk of the Halifax Circuit Court following the death of his brother, Ernest C.

In 1926, Lacy married Miss Agnes Baptist of Scottsburg. He is a member of the Beth Car Baptist Church of Halifax and of the Halifax Masonic Lodge No. 96.

A DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT RELAXES

On Capitol Hill in Washington and here at home in the Fifth Congressional District, the office of Representative WILLIAM M. TUCK in the Old House Office Building is known as the congressional office with an extraordinarily efficient staff and an exceptionally good looking distaff.

The person in charge of efficiency is Alton Greenwood Lacy, of the Halifax Lacys, and the good looks, along with their share of efficiency, are provided by Mrs. Madonna Haworth and Mrs. Shirley Scearce Wiggins, formerly of Danville.

Alton Lacy announced late yesterday that he will relinquish his responsibilities as secretary to Representative TUCK. But he is not leaving that office altogether. He will retain a desk and he will be there when needed and as his health permits. That is good news along with the bad. That office would not be the same without the occasional presence of the man who has directed its staff and been confidant, counselor, aid, and friend of three able Virginia Congressmen.

It takes seniority to enable a Representative or Senator to advance up the congressional ladder and seniority is, basically, experience. Alton G. Lacy has 32 years of seniority in congressional service, more even than Virginia's two U.S. Senators who recently were honored for 30 years on the Hill.

Long before President Roosevelt found it necessary to remind his White House aids that they should "have a passion for anonymity," Alton G. Lacy was practicing that quality assiduously, and always has. It is his nature to work hard in being helpful to others and to remain in the background. Among his most ardent friends have been the men he served professionally: Representative and Senator Thomas G. Burch, Representative and Governor Thomas B. Stanley, and Representative and Governor William M. Tuck. Lacy stuck to the congressional office of the Fifth, while Burch went on to the Senate, and as Stanley went into the Governor's office. He was there and waiting for his lifetime friend when TUCK, after a rest from the strenuous term as Governor, entered the House to fill the office Stanley had held.

In a moment of reminiscence, TUCK recalled that he and Alton Lacy had been close friends for 45 years and that their families had shared the bonds of personal friendship and political alliance for generations.

"He has been devoted to the cause of good government in Halifax County, in the Fifth District, in Virginia, and in the country," TUCK said of his veteran aid. Then, with a look that seemed to span four decades and more, "BIG BILL" observed, as if talking only to himself: "He is one of the warmest and dearest friends I have ever had."

The Virginia State Chamber of Commerce is going to honor Mr. Lacy and others on Tuesday night, but here in the Fifth the people by the thousands already have honored him with their good wishes and kind thoughts and personal gratitude for helpful assistance, provided for a third of a century to those in need of a friend to perform quick, effective work in Washington.

A tribute to Lacy by a friend included an observation that he probably knows more ins and outs of the sprawling Federal bureaucracy, that is, the executive department, than any man he knows.

Alton Lacy has considered it a part of his job to know the whos, whats, and hows of the Federal Government. Possession of such knowledge has enabled him to perform more effective service to his principal, the Congressman, and to the people who are the Congressman's constituents.

As he relaxes somewhat his labors as a concession to health, Alton Lacy will have the grateful appreciation and the sincere good wishes of the people he has served and their families—and that, to be sure, is a lot of people to count as friends and well-wishers.

A Five-Point Plan for Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Republicans are fully aware of the President's responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy and stand ready to support him in any course of action we believe will contribute to the extension of freedom throughout the world and promote peace with security and justice. But I believe we have a responsibility to oppose administration policies which result in a deterioration of America's position abroad—for example, the policies which permit a Communist beachhead to remain 90 miles off our shore.

Last Thursday evening, April 25, the chairman of the national Republican congressional committee, Congressman BOB WILSON, of California, issued a direct reply to the President's wish in a recent press conference that opponents of his foreign policy would submit specific alternatives to his Cuban policy. The Baltimore Sun carried the story the next morning with a front page banner headline, and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD both the remarks of Congressman WILSON and the story by the Sun's highly respected and extremely competent reporter, Howard Norton:

EXCERPTS OF CONGRESSMAN WILSON'S REMARKS

Candidate Kennedy came into office pledged to revitalize the Western alliance, restore bold, imaginative leadership to the free world, and renew America's prestige abroad. In contrast, his administration has followed a foreign policy which can best be described as one of defeat, retreat, and deceit. From our humiliating defeat at the Bay of Pigs to the present Communist drive to take over Laos, New Frontier foreign policies are collapsing all over the world. It is difficult—if not impossible—to name one area where the United States, under the so-called leadership of John F. Kennedy, has stood up to our enemies as vigorously as it has opposed our friends.

America suffered a major defeat at the Bay of Pigs because the President committed American prestige, but failed to deliver the required military and naval support. We not only have failed to remove the Communist threat from this hemisphere, but we have retreated from our demands for an on-site inspection of the island. We have openly accepted the continued presence of Soviet troops and so-called technicians in Cuba, and have clamped down with "vigah" on raids by Cuban exiles. As far as I can tell the only congratulations President Kennedy has received for his bold action have been from Fidel Castro.

In other parts of the world we are in serious trouble. We have not halted the advance of communism in southeast Asia, but we have succeeded in toppling the pro-Western government in Laos and replacing it with a coalition which—as we feared and forecast 15 months ago—is resulting in a Red takeover of that country. The architect of this brilliant bit of foreign policy, that famous failure, Averill Harriman, has been rewarded with a promotion to Under Secretary of State.

We have not removed the Soviet influence from Africa, but we have removed from power the only pro-Western anti-Communist leader in the area, Moise Tshombe, and denied self-determination to the people of Katanga. Today we not only do not have peace in the Congo, but we see increasing evidence that the Central Congolese Government, which we helped bring into power, is playing the Soviet's game in Africa.

We have reached the point in our history where we, as American citizens, can no longer believe what our Government says. We have witnessed a policy of deceit blatantly practiced by administration officials who glibly claim that its the right of the Government to lie. For what purpose? To try to keep high the ratings and solid the image of the architect of the plan—John F. Kennedy.

Is this the bold, imaginative leadership Candidate Kennedy had in mind? I believe we could do with a little less of it and a little more frankness and commonsense. I believe, in short, it's time for a change.

There are a number of courses of action open to this Nation if the Kennedy administration really wants to eliminate the Communists from this hemisphere. As a starter, I would suggest:

1. Recognition and support of a Cuban Government in exile.

2. An economic quarantine which would include the cutoff of all U.S. aid to nations which trade with Cuba and a cutoff of U.S. funds to Latin American nations which insist upon maintaining economic and diplomatic ties with Castro.

3. Closing of the Panama Canal to Cuban trade from Red China and the Soviet bloc countries, which has risen sharply in recent months and is sustaining Castro economically.

4. An ultimatum to the Soviet Union that we will sever diplomatic relations unless Soviet troops are removed from Cuba within 30 days.

5. The strict enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine in the future to prevent more "Cubas" from developing in Latin America.

Because of the Kennedy administration's reluctance to take these five steps, the American people must supply the sixth step toward eliminating the Communist menace from the Western Hemisphere and restoring this Nation's respect and honor in every corner of the globe. The sixth step must be the election in 1964 of a Republican President and a Republican House of Representatives to put some backbone into our sagging foreign policy.

We need but 1 winner to accomplish the former and but 40 to achieve the latter. With the help and organization of devoted Republicans in particular and disgusted Americans in general, we can—and will—change what has become a retreat for the United States around the world into an all-out defense of freedom.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 26, 1963]

GOP ASKS ULTIMATUM TO RUSSIA ON TROOPS IN CUBA—WITHDRAWAL OF ALL SOVIET UNITS URGED—SEVERANCE OF TIES SUGGESTED IF 30-DAY DEADLINE ISN'T MET

(By Howard Norton)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The Republicans tonight unveiled a five-point plan for defeating the Communists in Cuba and all of Latin America.

The plan includes an ultimatum to Moscow, threatening the severance of diplomatic ties unless all Soviet troops leave Cuba within 30 days.

In a speech before 2,000 GOP women from all parts of the Nation—a speech believed to be a preview of what the Republicans will offer in the coming campaign—Representative WILSON, Republican of California, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, urged:

1. That the Government close the Panama Canal to Cuban trade from Red China and other Soviet bloc countries—a trade that has risen sharply in recent months.

SUPPORT EXILE GROUP

2. That the U.S. Government give formal recognition and support to a Cuban government in exile.

2. That the White House send an ultimatum to the Kremlin, announcing that this country will sever diplomatic relations with Russia within 30 days unless all Soviet troops are removed from Cuba.

4. That Washington declare an economic quarantine which would automatically cut off all U.S. aid to countries which trade with Cuba. This should also include the cutting off of all U.S. funds to Latin nations which insist on maintaining economic and diplomatic ties with Castro's Cuba.

5. That this Government announce a strict enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine in the future to prevent more Cubas from developing in the future.

PREDICTION MADE

Wilson told the nationwide gathering of GOP women that if the Kennedy administration does not do these five things, then the American people next year must take a sixth step—the election of a Republican President and Congress, "to put some backbone into our sagging foreign policy."

Senator MORTON, Republican of Kentucky, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, commented upon President Kennedy's statement that he thought it "unfortunate that he (Castro) was permited to assume control in the 1950's and perhaps it would have been easier to take an action then than it is now. But those who were in positions of responsibility did not make that judgment," he added.

"The facts are," MORTON said, "that those who are in a position of responsibility did make a judgment and did take action. In March of 1960 under the Eisenhower administration steps were begun to train and equip an expeditionary force of the Cuban exiles to invade the island.

"For various reasons, among them the difficulties of finding the proper leadership, that invasion could not be implemented during the remaining months of the Eisenhower administration.

"It was attempted in April of 1961, under the Kennedy administration," MORTON said.

IT FAILED

"It failed."

"Most people agree," MORTON continued, "that its failure was caused by Castro's air superiority. The attorney general says that the invaders were never promised air cover.

"Yet evidence is clear that the invaders were assured that there would be no air opposition.

"It is also generally accepted," MORTON declared, "that militarily Castro's forces are 10 or 15 times as effective today as they were in April 1961."

MORTON pointed out that when the President finally took his firm stand against the Russian missile installations in Cuba, he supported him "to the hilt," as did most Republicans.

Some Republicans and some very important Democrats asked for even stronger measures, MORTON said.

"In any event, the United States was hailed throughout South and Central America and, indeed, throughout most of the free world for seizing the initiative.

"Unfortunately," MORTON told the Republican women, "in conforming our Cuban policy to expediency, we have seen the edge of our blade dulled. The bold initiative of last fall has become a wishy-washy policy of backing and stalling this spring.

CANNOT GO UNCHALLENGED

"I repeat, the statement made by President Kennedy yesterday cannot go unchallenged."

MORTON also told the women that 1964 is going to be a Republican year in the Senate.

Of the 34 Senate races at stake, he noted, only 9 are held by Republicans, and 25 by Democrats, only 4 of these in the deep South.

Under these conditions, he indicated, GOP gains in the Senate are virtually assured.

MORTON, with tongue in cheek, told the women that he didn't care to make any predictions himself so, to insure objectivity, he quoted from a statement issued recently by his opopsite number in the Democratic Party—Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee.

He quoted the Washington Senator as saying that only 7 out of the 25 Democratic senatorial aspirants for reelection were "sure things."

MAGNUSON admitted, according to MORTON, that a number of Democratic Senators are in danger of being unseated, including: BURDICK, of North Dakota, HART, of Michigan, HARTKE, of Indiana, MCGEE, of Wyoming, MOSS, of Utah, YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Even Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Senate majority leader, faces a tough fight to keep his seat, according to MAGNUSON'S analysis, and he is quoted as saying that stiff battles are ahead also for CANNON, of Nevada, DODD, of Connecticut, JACKSON, of Washington, KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, MUSKE, of Maine, PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, and WILLIAMS, of New Jersey.

MORTON called on the GOP women to encourage aggressive and articulate candidates to come forward in their States to seek the Republican nominations.

The only other speaker at the opening session of this 3-day annual meeting of Republican women leaders was a Republican woman Congressman, CHARLOTTE T. REID, of Illinois.

The only new woman Member of Congress this session, Representative REID noted that women are the predominant force in politics today.

"There are 4 million more women voters than men, and the majority of these women vote Republican," she said.

PLEA MADE TO WOMEN

She urged the women not only to vote, but to use their influence—particularly on the men.

The chairman of the opening session was Mrs. Clare B. Williams, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee.

The speakers, however, were introduced by the national committee chairman, Representative MILLER of New York. MILLER did not himself deliver a speech.

At morning and afternoon sessions tomorrow and Saturday, the GOP women are to hear a variety of Republican national leaders, including Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, a leading contender for the GOP presidential nomination; Representative HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, minority leader in the House; Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, minority leader in the Senate; William O. Walker, Negro leader and currently director of industrial relations for the State of Ohio.

A number of Republican Governors also will be heard, including the first Republican to head the State government in Oklahoma, Henry Belmon, and Gov. John Chaffee, of Rhode Island.

There is to be a banquet tomorrow night, featuring an address by MILLER, and an ideaswap session on Saturday, for the exchange of tactics that have proved successful in past campaigns.

Before presenting the GOP ideas for defeating the Communists in Latin America, Representative WILSON described the New Frontier's policy as one of defeat, retreat, and deceit.

"From our humiliating defeat at the Bay of Pigs to the present Communist drive to take over Laos," he said, "New Frontier foreign policies are collapsing all over the world."

DIFFICULTY NOTED

"It is difficult—if not impossible," he declared, "to name one area where the United States, under the so-called leadership of John F. Kennedy, has stood up to our enemies as vigorously as it has opposed our friends."

"In addition," he asserted, "we have reached a point in our history where we, as American citizens, can no longer believe what our Government says.

"We have witnessed a policy of deceit blatantly practiced by the administration officials, who glibly claim that it's the right of the Government to lie."

The reason for this lying, he argued, is simply to try to keep high the ratings and solid the image of the architect of the plan—John F. Kennedy.

Farm Slickers and City Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 29, points up the fact that the Feed Grain Act of 1963, which I opposed and which passed the House by a narrow margin last week, is premature and will not serve the interests of either the farmers or the taxpayers of this country:

FARM SLICKERS AND CITY CONGRESSMEN

By a narrow margin, 208 to 196, the Kennedy administration has obtained passage by the House of Representatives of its bill to extend the present feed-grain program through 1965. By a still narrower vote, 205 in favor, it prevented recommitment of the bill to the Agriculture Committee until after a nationwide referendum among wheat-growers May 21.

Republican Congressmen and more than a score of Democrats would have preferred to hold the feed-grain bill until after the referendum. To have done so would have permitted Congress to shape up a revised program both for wheat and for feed grains if farmers turned down the drastic controls proposed in the wheat program.

But the forces siding with Agriculture Secretary Freeman insisted on confronting the wheat referendum voters with a "this or nothing" prospect. Further, there is said to be an "out" in the new measure by which farmers could divert wheatland to corn or sorghum, or vice versa, and still collect payments for reducing acreage.

Ability of farmers to grow more grain on fewer acres already has largely gotten around acreage controls and built up costly surpluses at subsidy prices.

The margin of the administration's victory was supplied by Democratic Congressmen from city areas. These normally would incline to vote against agricultural subsidy legislation. They were persuaded in this case to vote as they did in order to discourage wheat farmers from rejecting the control plan thrown at them in the referendum. It is very doubtful whether these city Congressmen served the interests of their constituents in taking this course.

It Seems to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, as an insight as to how the U.S. Department of Agriculture Conservation and Stabilization employees operate, I am inserting an article by Howard Harris which appeared in the San Mateo County Farm Bureau News in April of this year.

The article follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Howard Harris)

AT YOUR EXPENSE

A bunch of us U.S. Department of Agriculture Conservation and Stabilization employees were called to Santa Rosa the other day, at your expense, to talk about some matters of common interest. This writer was somewhat horrified to hear the State chairman of the ASC state in effect that it would be good to have livestock people managed like the other crop price support programs. I had to stand up in the meeting and state that the law of supply and demand was the best way to handle many of our problems. The chairman really bawled me out, stating in effect that the law of supply and demand was old fashioned, no good, and never did operate anyhow.

At the meeting (which was called to explain the wheat program), a letter was read which was rather uncomplimentary to Farm Bureau. To make matters worse, every county ASC office apparently got a copy of an editorial which was insulting to Farm Bureau and was ordered to "forward it to newspapers in your county." Needless to say we did not give it to the press.

As chairman of the county A.S.C. committee, I feel it is my duty to tell the farmers the whole truth about the Government programs, not just the good or bad. I refuse to become a propagandist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This recent attempt to order the county committees to give out untrue propaganda against Farm Bureau is not only disgusting, but raises the questions as to how far our Government should use our own tax money to propagandize us.

It seems to me that we can defend a low level price support program for a commodity which program does not end up with encouraging overproduction of that commodity, but places a floor high enough to guarantee production of essential commodities and prevents economic chaos in the Nation. But it is difficult to defend programs which prices commodities out of their markets or which are harmful to other commodities.

It is interesting to note that under the new proposed wheat program the 9 million acres taken out of wheat may be used to graze livestock. I wonder how the cattlemen who produce feeders are going to like this kind of subsidized competition. But only wheatgrowers are to be allowed to vote, not the cattlemen and the others affected. And only certain wheatgrowers can vote—the small growers will not be allowed to vote unless they agree ahead of time to sign up for the program.

So that the whole story is presented, here is what wheatgrowers will be asked to approve.

(1) A 10-percent cut in wheat acreage allotments over last year.

(2) No growing wheat without an allotment (15 acre minimum eliminated.)

(3) A promise of about $2 a bushel for 80 percent of the normal crop.

(4) Market price for the remainder ($1.35 suggested).

(5) Stiff penalties for violation up to $10,000 fine and 10 years in jail for violations of the regulations.

(6) The county committees will have to guess what each grower's production will be and permits will be in bushels.

The supporters of the program maintain that if this program is not adopted, wheat prices will drop to as low as $1 a bushel. But since the world price of wheat is $1.35 it is rather difficult to see how this could happen.

The supporters argue that we need something to stop large surpluses of wheat going into Government storage. We agree. We also like the proposal to eliminate the 15-acre exemption.

Well, anyway, let's hope the wheat growers will all go to the polls and vote either yes or no, and we'll see how our future is going.

Following is a letter from President Rozzoni to ASCS offices:

"To: ASCS Offices, ASCS County Chairmen.

"DEAR FRIENDS: Under date of March 15, 1963, the California State Office of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service addressed a memo to you transmitting a copy of an editorial entitled 'Wheat Fact and Fancy' which appeared in the Des Moines Register, March 6, 1963. You were requested to forward this editorial to newspapers in your county.

"As you are the elected farmer committeemen in your respective counties, I desire to bring to your attention several items in connection with the editorial from the Des Moines Register and the direction you were given with respect to it.

"(1) In our opinion there is a serious question as to the propriety of distributing this type of propaganda through Government offices and at Government expense. I shall not dwell on this point, however, as it can be safely assumed that the California State office was ordered to do so and had no choice in the matter.

"(2) The editorial printed by the Des Moines Register needs clarification in the following respects:

"(a) The editorial questions the basic importance of the wheat referendum. However, both the proponents and the opponents have emphasized its importance. For example: in the March 1963 issue of Farm Journal Mr. James G. Patton, president of National Farmers Union states: 'In this year's national wheat referendum, the Nation's farm families who grow wheat are being asked to make the most important decision in agriculture since the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933.' In the same issue of Farm Journal, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of American Farm Bureau Federation, states: "The administration's wheat control certificate scheme in which producers will vote in this year's referendum includes the tightest, most binding controls ever considered for a farm commodity.'

"(b) The editorial states: 'If farmers vote for the program, they will not be commiting themselves to it for all time to come but only for the 1964 wheat crop.' However, according to Associated Press writer Ovid Martin, President Kennedy in his message to the annual meeting of the National Farmers Union said that the results of a referendum to be held soon on a new wheat control program will show whether or not farmers want a national policy of farm supply and farm income stabilization and that Mr. Kennedy broadened the issue to include the administration's entire farm policy in his statement. This proves what Mr. Shuman said: 'The referendum is not just another vote on wheat marketing quotas. This referendum will determine whether farmers want to go all the way down the road of Government supply management.'

"(c) The editorial maintains that Farm Bureau warnings concerning the severity of the controls provided in the wheat program are made in extreme and careless language. Yet it stands without denial by the proponents that the proposed wheat program provides for diverted acre controls and cross compliance. This kind of control was never forced on tobacco, cotton, or sugar producers. Such controls were instituted but at the request of farmers, were repealed by Congress.

"(d) The editorial says, 'If two-thirds of the farmers vote in favor of the program, every wheatgrower will be required to comply with his acreage allotment.' The Des Moines Register should know, as nearly every farmer knows, that a favorable vote of two-thirds of the farmers will not be required to institute this wheat program but a favorable vote of only two-thirds of the farmers voting.

"We bring these points to your attention to indicate that a great deal of the information being distributed, at public expense, is incorrect and misleading.

"We sincerely hope that no ASCS office in California will cause such information to be published in any of our newspapers.

"With kindest regards,

"Sincerely yours,

"LOUIS ROZZONI."

Mississippi Alibis Self—A Distortion of Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Detroit News, of April 27, 1963:

MISSISSIPPI ALIBIS SELF—A DISTORTION OF FACTS

"The question arises as to how much longer the white population of Mississippi will continue to be taxed and drained of its sustenance for the benefit of a race, and a nation, which show no appreciation for their sacrifices."

So speaking, Mississippi's State welfare commissioner, Fred A. Ross, demonstrated how far Mississippi stands from true understanding of what rolls race relations in Mississippi—and elsewhere—today.

Negroes get 79 percent of aid to dependent children, he says, while whites get but 20 percent. Over a 2-year period, he says, his State spent $577,877 for white charity patients in private hospitals, $662,952 for Negro charity patients.

Negro classrooms get 63 percent of State school funds, he says, though they are only 45 percent of the State's population.

Whites own 90 percent of the property on the tax rolls, he says, and therefore paid 90 percent of the property taxes.

"The undisputed facts are," he says, "that the white population of Mississippi give * * * more money, goods, and services to the members of the Negro race than do the white people of any other State in the United States, when the comparable ability to pay taxes is considered."

Mr. Ross' facts cannot pass undisputed. In fact, he misses a damning point in his own recitation.

He reports that the 1961–62 school census showed 329,215 white and 337,871 Negro schoolchildren. But he reports, too, that teachers in white schools were paid $40,601,-189, while Negro teachers were paid $25,107,-469. Separate but equal?

And property taxes are not the only taxes people pay in Mississippi. Twice as much is raised by State sales and excise taxes, which are quite colorblind.

But even such discrepancies as these miss the real point, a point at once simple, yet sometimes hard to grasp.

Even if undisputed, Mr. Ross' facts would be irrelevant. All the material largesse in the world would not be enough to compensate for daily assaults on the soul of a man. (Yes, Negroes in Mississippi and Detroit have souls.)

Welfare payments provide no moral armor for segregation and discrimination. White welfare recipients are not barred from the polling booth, the town library, the public parks. They are not told they must ride in the back of the bus and stay away from lunch counters. And no white in search of work is told that he has no business aspiring to certain jobs.

Without doubt there are many Negroes in Mississippi dependent upon some degree of public largesse. It is little fault of those who use the term "uppity" with great ease that there are not more.

Without doubt, too, an increasing number of Negroes in Mississippi and elsewhere are aware—and resentful—of one big factor which helps to make and keep so many of their number dependent.

The pathos of Ross and those whose feelings he voices is that they cannot see what is happening. They think they want gratitude; they really want, know it or not, servility. Neither is possible any longer.

The 1964 "Purge"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Quarterly is highly respected. The following article in the April 26 issue will be of interest throughout the country:

DEMOCRATS DEBATE 1964 "PURGE" OF DISSIDENTS

A 1964 "purge" of conservatively inclined southern Democratic Congressmen who have opposed the President's program is currently being planned by some party leaders in the Democratic National Committee and at the White House. The plan is opposed, however, by other national committee and White House advisers and his aroused strong opposition among Capitol Hill Democratic leaders.

The purge report was first carried in the March 28 international edition of the New York Times and repeated in the Times' domestic edition of April 11. The story, under the byline of Joseph A. Loftus, listed 13 Members who might encounter liberal primary opposition abetted by the national committee:

Texas: Representatives JOHN DOWDY (7th District), JOE M. KILGORE (15th), OMAR BURLESON (17th).

Florida: Representatives PAUL G. ROGERS (sixth), JAMES A. HALEY (seventh).

South Carolina: Representatives ALBERT WATSON (second), W. J. BRYAN DORN (third).

Georgia: Representative JOHN W. DAVIS (seventh).

Louisiana: Representative JOE D. WAGGONNER, Jr. (fourth).

Mississippi: Representative ARTHUR WINSTEAD (fourth).

North Carolina: Representative BASIL L. WHITENER (10th).

Tennessee: Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS (ninth).

Virginia: Representative JOHN O. MARSH, Jr. (seventh).

The Times report said that "attractive" liberal candidates in these districts could expect money, manpower and influence to be made available on their behalf from Washington, "even while there may be denials on the record that such intervention is taking place."

ROLE OF COPE

The Times story—with the exception of the 13 specific names marked for purge—was substantiated and amplified by the Washington Star April 22 under the byline of David S. Broder. The Star said there was no firm evidence that President Kennedy has approved the plan or had even been formally consulted on it, but that both supporters and opponents of the purge believe it is in accord with the thinking of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. The Star reported that the most detailed discussion of possible "purge districts" took place at recent AFL–CIO COPE (Committee on Political Education) conferences held March 2–3 in Norfolk, Va.; March 6–7 in Gatlinburg, Tenn.; March 13–14 in Houston, Tex.; and March 16–17 in Little Rock, Ark. Top-level Washington COPE officials attended. Also present was Charles D. Roche, deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Roche is a former Boston Herald writer and close friend of the Attorney General who served on the Kennedy campaign staff in 1960 and assumed his present national committee duties, which include frequent contact with organized labor, in 1961. Roche told the Star the essence of his message to the labor political planners was: "The voters in the district will pick the candidate in the primary. We on the national committee hope it is someone who will support the national ticket. If he will, we will support him."

Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey publicly disclaimed responsibility for or knowledge of any purge, saying: "The Democratic National Committee has no purge list of Democratic Congressmen and it has no intention of changing its traditional rule that the officers and staff of the committee do not participate in Democratic primary contests."

THE 1962 NATIONAL COMMITTEE INTERVENTION

The rule of neutrality in primaries was breached several times by the Democratic National Committee in 1962, however. The districts in which the committee was authoritatively reported to have given some form of aid or assistance to liberal challengers in primaries included:

Georgia Fifth (Atlanta): CHARLES L. WELTNER (Democrat), a moderate, defeated conservative Representative James C. Davis (Democrat) in the primary runoff. One of the national committee's top staff men went to Atlanta before the primary to lend undercover assistance to WELTNER.

Texas Seventh (east central): Representative JOHN DOWDY (Democrat), a conservative, defeated Benton Musslewhite, a young Kennedy supporter, by only 41 votes. Musslewhite then went on to the Democratic National Committee payroll as a field man in other areas for the general election campaign. He is considered an all but sure candidate again in 1964.

Tennesse Third (southeast, Chattanooga): Wilkes T. Thrasher, Jr. (Democrat), liberal, defeated incumbent Representative James B. Frazier, Democrat) a conservative, in the primary. In the general election Republican WILLIAM E. BROCK III defeated Thrasher.

Tennessee Fifth (Nashville): RICHARD H. FULTON (Democrat), a liberal, challenged Representative J. Carlton Loser (Democrat), a conservative. The primary result was disputed, with no winner certified. Both men ran in the general election and FULTON won by 17,574 votes.

Tennessee Ninth (Memphis): Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS (Democrat), a conservative, successfully rebuffed a primary challenge from liberal Ross J. Pritchard (Democrat).

Texas 22d District (Houston): Conservative Representative Bob Casey, Democrat, was challenged by Claude E. Hooten, Jr., Democrat, a Harvard classmate and close friend of Senator Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy, Democrat. Casey was an easy primary winner. In its 1962 spending reports to the Clerk of the U.S. House, the Democratic National Committee listed a $300 preprimary payment to Lou Harris & Associates, New York pollsters, for a survey in the Texas 22d District. When asked whether the results of the poll were released to either Hooten or Casey, Bailey told Congressional Quarterly, "It is not our policy to discuss (the) content or use" of opinion polls ordered by the committee.

Virginia 10th (north Virginia suburbs): The national committee aided August C. Johnson, Democrat, a Kennedy Democrat, against two more conservative primary opponents. Johnson lost the general election to incument Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican, however. Democratic National Committee spending reports for 1962 confirm a $750 preprimary Lou Harris poll on the district which was reported in the local press in 1962.

HILL REACTION

National committee involvement in primary contests has drawn adverse comment from House Democratic leaders including Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. Referring to the "purge" leaders, KIRWAN said, "They ought not to be doing it. I'm for uniting everybody, not destroying one another. The National Congressional Campaign Committee never interfered in the primaries and certainly won't as long as I'm chairman." Another Hill Democratic leader said the purge reports "are like a permeating poison, creating suspicions within the party. They've already done a lot of damage. We're diametrically opposed to this whole deal."

Many Democrats suggested that the net effect of a purge could be to elect Republicans. They pointed out that Thrasher's defeat of Frazier in the Tennessee 3d District led to election of a conservative Republican in 1962, and that several districts on the proposed purge list—among them the South Carolina 2d, Louisiana 4th, North Carolina 10th, Tennessee 9th, and Virginia 7th—have

strong Republican parties and could switch to the GOP if Democrats failed to nominate a conservative candidate.

An opposite view is reported among some White House aids, however. Referring to the 1962 Tennessee Third District primary, the Star quoted a White House official as saying, "What did we lose? We got Frazier off the Ways and Means Committee, where he was voting against us on 'medicare.' All it cost us was one more Republican in the House, a man whose legislative influence in the next 10 years will be zero."

PURGE RATIONALE

The downtown Democrats who support some form of purge—a group that is reported to include the Attorney General—apparently feel that certain interim losses to the Republicans may be a necessary part of weaning the South away from its conservative stance. They point out that increasing industrialization and urbanization of the South inevitably disturbs the old one-party political system and that the true ideological conservatives are most likely to drift into the GOP. The chief long-term hope of the southern Democratic Party, as they see it, lies in increasing Negro-registration (soon to be expedited by adoption of the antipoll tax amendment), a new emphatis on urban problems to coincide with changing legislative apportionments under court pressure and close ties with an increasingly strong trade union movement. Viewing this as the "wave of the future" in southern politics, they feel it proper and necessary that Democratic Congressmen who refuse to adapt their views and votes be replaced by men closer to the northern Democratic point of view.

A more traditionalist point of view is said to prevail, however, among Bailey and some of his national committee associates and several White House political aids. They feel that pressures from within individual Southern States and districts will gradually change the votes of southern Democrats to conform more with those of the northern party without arousing unnecessary enmities through a Washington-based purge. Executive branch liaison officers who work on getting southern Members' votes for current legislation are said to feel they are making good progress under current conditions and that purge talk can only sour relationships. Both friend and foe of the current purge plans are reported to feel that the early publicity may endanger any chance it had for success by placing southern conservatives in a martyr role. An example was the April 11 statement of Representative DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, one of the men on the reported purge list:

"It is utterly incredible that some little Caesars in Washington would openly and boldly threaten money, manpower and influence to oppose me in a South Carolina Democratic primary in John C. Calhoun's old congressional district. It will be a pleasure to run for reelection against any candidate they might select. South Carolina voters and South Carolina Congressmen will never be controlled by money, manpower or influence from New York or Washington. Voters in South Carolina will never permit their Congressmen to be bought, sold and voted by any unelected party hack or big-city ward heeler."

To prevent unfavorable publicity from dooming their plan, many of the advocates of a purge are said to be anxious to keep it under wraps as much as possible. Under no conditions do they advocate open involvement by President Kennedy.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

The only successful intraparty purge ever carried out by a President occurred in 1918 when Woodrow Wilson sought to defeat two southern Democratic Senators and two southern Democratic Representatives who had opposed his legislative program. Three of the four men whose defeat Wilson advocated were retired by the voters.

Annoyed by growing opposition to New Deal legislative proposals, President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1938 asked for the defeat of nine Senators and three Representatives. In a June 24, 1938, fireside chat to the Nation by radio, Roosevelt defended New Deal programs and principles and said, "I feel I have every right to speak in those instances where there may be a clear issue between candidates for a Democratic nomination involving these principles, or involving a clear misuse of my own name." Among those Roosevelt sought to purge were Senators Ellison (Cotton Ed) Smith, Democrat, of South Carolina, 1904–44; Walter George, Democrat, of Georgia, 1922–57; and Millard Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, 1927–51. Of the 12 men Roosevelt marked for purge only 1—Representative John J. O'Connor, Democrat, of New York, 1923–39; chairman of the House Rules Committee—was defeated. After the election, party disharmony increased among Democrats. Former Democratic National Chairman James A. Farley subsequently wrote: "I knew from the beginning that the purge could lead to nothing but misfortune, because in pursuing his course of vengeance Roosevelt violated a cardinal political creed which demanded that he keep out of local matters." Since 1938 no President has participated in an attempted purge of his own party incumbents (1962 Weekly Report, p. 1969).

Balanced Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional activities, I have come to place special confidence in the fairness and good judgment of Henry Fowler, the Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Secretary Fowler demonstrated these qualities in a recent speech on tax policy. He stressed the prime importance of increasing consumer demand.

But—

As he pointed out—

if we are to increase the long-term growth rate of our economy we must encourage investment so that our modern technology may be quickly translated into new industries and new jobs. The rate of growth of a country's real output, such as the United States, becomes a function, then, of both an adequate and effective demand and the level of investment or capital formation.

His speech is a cogent summary of the reasons for passage this year of a balanced program of reductions and reforms in our tax structure:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1963

I am particularly happy to be able to participate in the last of these timely discussion sessions on "Achieving More Adequate Economic Growth." My comments will be addressed primarily to the President's tax proposals—proposals which lie at the heart of the administration's overall economic program to move America forward.

The tax program alone cannot bring us to our national goal of achieving adequate growth; it is only one element. But, its relationship to the expansion of demand and investment in the private sector of our economy makes it the key to speeding economic growth in the sixties.

The overall economic program of this administration goes to the central core of the problem of growth in our type of national economy—it is designed to release and encourage the inherent expansionary forces in our great private enterprise economy. The essential element of this program is a new tax policy, designed both to eliminate an unduly heavy drag on purchasing power and demand and to provide new incentives for investment and effort.

Other economic programs—the coordination of fiscal and monetary policies to encourage full employment and growth, the provision of adequate resources for improved education, manpower retraining, enlarged opportunities for youth, area redevelopment, and the removal of limitations on and encouragement of civilian technology—to name some of them—can and will play a useful complementary role.

But these are not likely to be fully effective in ending the 5-year period of sluggishness without the catalytic and dynamic influence of a new tax policy designed for growth.

The acceleration of national economic growth requires the adoption and promotion of policies designed to increase aggregate demand so as to fully utilize available manpower and facilities in the framework of an already developed technology put into practice. But full employment is not enough. More rapid growth also requires policies designed to increase the share of our national wealth and effort committed to expanding technology and the capital formation for investment that moves the new technological developments from laboratory to production line and distribution or service center. This is the process whereby a fully employed society becomes increasingly productive.

There is and will be no shortage of investment opportunities in the United States as long as our growing population is educated to a more abundant life and the rising industry of discovery flowing from our science and technology fosters a large and growing demand for goods and services, improved or new.

As education and technology multiply new investment opportunities by opening up new products, services and demands, as well as training both young and old to participate effectively in the creation and utilization of these new products and services, there is no place for the theory or practice of economic stagnation in America because of inadequate demand.

But, education to utilize or participate in the production and distribution of new goods and services needs capital formation for practical application and translation into plants and jobs. Investment opportunities must be translated into reality to be meaningful.

Sometimes there are great lags in the pace of capital formation and investment to take advantage of investment opportunities. The degree of lag between technological development and investment in a private enterprise society, such as ours, depends on general economic conditions, i.e., adequacy of market demand, or purchasing power, profits, other incentives, and the availability of capital on reasonable terms.

Public policies play an important part in providing the type of economic climate in which this system will work to advantage. Budgetary policies, debt management, mone-

tary policy all play a role in the scheme of things. Private policies by management and labor can affect the general economic climate for better or worse. Also, buyer and investor confidence can be of decisive importance. But in a society where a large percentage of the annual income is drawn off by government—national, State, and local—a tax policy designed to promote growth is fundamental if the Nation is to benefit from rapid growth and the lags between invention and investment are to be minimized.

The rate of growth of a country's real output such as the United States becomes a function, then, of both an adequate and effective demand and the level of investment or capital formation.

During the first year of the present administration, a reasonably satisfactory recovery and expansion from the recession gave hope that the Nation was breaking the grip of slow growth and below capacity operations. Under those circumstances, President Kennedy gave first priority to the adoption of tax policies that would encourage investment in productive equipment, stating that "the immediate need is for encouraging economic growth through modernization and capital expansion."

This initiative resulted in a two-pronged program—now an accomplished fact—administrative liberalization of the tax treatment of depreciation and legislative enactment of the investment tax credit. The change in the administrative rules concerning depreciation of machinery and equipment did more than reduce the lives of existing machinery and equipment for depreciation purposes to up-to-date practice; it sought to encourage the translation of the fruits of science and technology from the laboratory to the production and distribution line in an ever faster cycle; it put forth a new test that permits a businessman to fix his preferred life for machinery and equipment, provided only that his replacement pattern conforms to his estimate.

The investment tax credit reduces current taxes for a business by 7 percent of annual expenditures for new machinery and equipment. It was also designed to provide an incentive to translate discoveries of new products and new processes into the main stream of economic growth.

The combined effect of these two measures which became effective, for the first time, in July and October of 1962 cannot yet be assessed. Already, however, sharply increased business appropriation for investment and forecasts of a rising trend of outlays this year indicate that these tax policies are playing a significant part in the move toward growth. The resulting benefits of these changes in tax policy in cash flow, increased rate of return on new investment, and shortening the period of risk of investment in capital equipment should serve as long-run measures to stimulate investment for modernization and growth, thereby giving science and technology a broader opportunity to contribute to overall economic growth through both increased capacity and productivity.

At the outset of 1962, after 9 months of rapid recovery, this expansion slackened. Between the fourth quarter of 1961 and 1962 our gross national product rose barely enough to hold our own on rates of unemployment, profits and capital use. The overriding lesson of this 1962 slowdown was that the pattern of slow growth since 1957 rather than the spurt in 1961 was the true measure of our economic problem.

This brings us to the second phase of forging tax policy for growth which the President has made his number one legislative objective for 1963.

This tax program is based on the principle that there is clear need for a tax program that will further increase demand and investment for growth. It is a balanced program designed as the President, himself, has said "to expand demand among both investors and consumers, to boost the economy, in both the short-run and the long-run, and to achieve in time both a balanced full employment economy and a balanced Federal budget."

The main feature of the program is the enactment this year, in a single comprehensive bill, of a top-to-bottom reduction of rates of tax on capital gains, individual and corporate income to take effect in stages in the 18-month period beginning July 1, 1963, through January 1, 1965. For all groups of individual taxpayers combined the overall reduction would be 18 percent. The effect of lower top tax rates for each taxpayer—a reduction from 20 to 30 percent in the top rates in every income bracket—would be to increase effort and incentive; the market rather than tax consequences would become more the prime detriment of economic decisions; and the door to substantial increases in net disposable income after taxes—the final test—would open more invitingly.

The second part of the President's program is to provide additional direct incentives for investment by increasing the rate of return or profit after taxes. The proposal would reduce corporate tax rates from 52 to 47 percent by 1965, and also reduce in 1963 the normal rate of tax on the first $25,000 of corporate income from a 30-percent rate to a 22-percent rate, constituting a 27-percent reduction in tax liabilities for the 450,000 small companies whose corporate income does not exceed this limit.

The third part of the President's tax program would revise the tax treatment of capital gains and losses, with its principal feature a reduction in the percentage of long-term capital gains that must be included in taxable income of individuals from the present 50 percent to a 30-percent level. This reduction and related features are designed to assist investment by providing a freer and fuller flow of capital by increasing the mobility of investment funds, the liquidity of capital markets, and providing a higher net return on profitable investment.

In summary, the simple thrust of the proposed tax program is a substantial reduction in rates on individual and corporate income and capital gains at all levels—reversing a trend of over 30 years which has witnessed rates moving upwards in war and in peace—lifting the repressive weight of tax rates imposed partly to constrain war and early postwar inflationary pressures—and now arresting growth.

May I summarize why this particular program will attack the root causes of the inadequate economic performance which your previous discussion sessions have developed.

This tax program will provide major support to economic growth from two general directions:

When in full effect it will directly release about $8.5 billion of consumer purchasing power, thereby generating a multiplied demand for goods and services as these funds are spent and respent; at the same time, additional investment will be stimulated as excess capacity is worked off.

Significant tax rate reductions for corporations and individuals will provide new investment incentives by raising the net return on capital and making additional funds available for investment. Taken together with last year's depreciation reform and investment tax credit, the profitability of new investment will be increased by nearly 30 percent. For example, corporate tax liabilities will be reduced by approximately $4.5 billion. The mobility of savings will be further increased by reductions in capital gains rates and related reforms.

Thus, the program is an appropriately balanced one. The impact on consumer demand will interact with the impact on investment incentives to produce a far greater total addition to incomes and GNP than if the thrust of the tax program was concentrated on one or the other impact alone.

More precisely, the economic stimulus from the tax program will proceed along four principal channels:

Individuals will receive larger after-tax incomes, part of which will be saved but by far the major part—over 90 percent—will be spent for consumer goods and services. Such additional spending will, in turn, add further to incomes, leading to higher spending and another round of increases in incomes, in a continuing process known as the multiplier effect.

Increased consumption will induce increased investment in both inventories and plant capacity and there will be increased requirements for residential construction. This is the so-called accelerator effect.

Business investment will be further stimulated by individual and corporate tax reductions, which will provide more funds for investment and raise after-tax profitability of new capital outlays. The pervasive, favorable effects of the tax cuts on business and consumer confidence and expectations, steadier employment, and attractive opportunities to exploit more rapidly growing consumer markets all will be major sources of encouragement to private spending. A more dynamic economy will spur technological innovations and the introduction of new products.

The enlarged investment spending will itself have a multiplier effect, since it will generate higher incomes which will in turn expand consumer spending.

Time and the need for concentrated emphasis on the vital relationship between the President's tax program and economic growth preclude discussion of many other important facets of the subject including, for example, the role and place of tax reforms for equity and simplicity, the relationship of that program to Government expenditure, and the impact of the program on our balance of payments.

In conclusion, it may be observed that the adoption of the President's tax program is the most important legislative task confronting the Nation in 1963—with the most direct consequences for achieving a more adequate economic growth. Whatever the differences in degree and emphasis on particular features of the tax program, let those who are concerned with the national goal of more rapid growth not fail to assure the modification of our tax laws along the general lines proposed in 1963.

Genesis of an Octogenarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Alexandria Town Talk is the largest daily newspaper in central Louisiana. Recently it celebrated its 80th anniversary, and on March 16, 1963, a special anniversary issue was printed.

On page 1 was an editorial entitled, "Genesis of an Octogenarian," which follows my remarks. It paints in clear and meaningful terms some of the things which have happened since the founding

of the Town Talk and what the picture is like today.

Regretfully, it is impossible to reproduce in the RECORD some of the human interest pictures which were presented in the issue.

I was also interested to note the variety of headlines which have appeared in the Town Talk during the last 80 years, and a sample of these was reproduced on page 1 of the special issue.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when large and powerful city newspapers have closed and are in danger, it is reassuring to note the healthy, vigorous press of Louisiana. A good example of years of service to the community and to the citizens who live in central Louisiana is the Alexandria Town Talk. I hope the next 80 years will be as much fun for the editors and that the readers in central Louisiana will enjoy the varied news stories and features of this paper.

The editorial follows:

GENESIS OF AN OCTOGENARIAN

An attempt has been made to blow up the bank at Saganrog, Russia.

A terrific explosion occurred in British Government offices at Westminster, England.

The President is reported to be afflicted with Bright's disease.

The President was Chester A. Arthur.

The Governor of Louisiana was Sam Douglas McEnery, who had gained the office upon the death of Gov. Louis Alfred Wiltz.

The date was March 17, 1883.

It was St. Patrick's Day. And Erin had need of its patron on this day. The clergy of County Mayo was accusing the government of neglecting "the distressed people."

The Mississippi River was falling after high flood stages. So was the Red. But rise or fall, the Red was still the main artery of commerce in this part of the country.

Alexandria was a bustling river port.

Mires Rosenthal was doing all right as a "fancy and staple" grocer. Ditto Henry St. John with his "pharmacy," Julius Levin with his lumber business, J. C. Goulden with his house painting, N. M. McGinnis with his cotton buying and dry-goods retailing, Cullen and Rogers with their "commission merchants" enterprise which dealt in "coal, lime, cement, corn, oats, hay, bran, etc.," and Mrs. E. S. Hetherwick with her combination dry goods and hardware store.

This was the news, the setting, the business community as the Alexandria daily Town Talk ventured forth with volume 1, No. 1.

It will be 80 years ago Sunday that two young Irishmen picked St. Patrick's Day to give this river town of 2,000 population a daily newspaper.

Edgar H. McCormick and Henarie M. Huie had been operating a printing shop in Alexandria for about a year when they launched their journalistic venture. But in addition to experience in the graphic arts, they possessed determination.

This was the quality which kept their venture going for the first few, trying years—through a depression in 1885, repeated floods, fire, tornadoes.

After only 9 months they were forced to revert to a weekly newspaper. Two years later—in 1885—the Town Talk became a triweekly. Then, on March 21, 1892, the paper returned to its status as a daily (except Sunday), and it has published continuously ever since.

The Town Talk has been a newspaper by and for people. After Messrs. McCormick and Huie there were members of the family who carried on in the determined tradition of its founders—Mrs. Margaret Brown Huie, Rollo and Hunter Jarreau, Mrs. Vera Huie Wilson, and the current president of the publishing firm, Mrs. Myrtle Huie Dellmon.

The Town Talk has surmounted all obstacles in the last 80 years and has continued to grow largely because it is a mirror of the prosperous communities it serves.

It remains today the only complete chronicler of all that happens in Central Louisiana. And as it has grown, and its responsibilities have become greater, it has added such comprehensive coverage of State, National and world affairs that a visiting publisher from a large northern city told the late Hunter Jarreau a decade ago: 'I don't know how you can put out such a paper in a town this size."

On its 80th birthday the Town Talk serves a twin-city area that has grown from 2,000 to 65,000—and a heart-of-Louisiana empire which comprises all parts of 12 parishes with a combined population of nearly 300,000.

It has grown into a rather big business, with more than 100 full-time employees and a large number of others who devote part of their time to gathering news and distributing the paper.

But it remains a newspaper by and for people—mirroring the successes and the failures, the joys and the tragedies, the ebb and tide of life itself, of its readers and their neighbors first, and then of their fellow humans around the globe.

It is the pledge of the management and the personnel of the Town Talk on this 80th birthday to continue in the future to be both the reporter and the interpreter of the passing parade that it has been since St. Patrick's Day, 1883.

Veterans' Home Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the very sound status of the veterans' home loan program in northwest Florida. Through information provided to me by Mr. Rufus Wilson, manager of the Veterans' Administration for Florida, I can state that the veterans of 15 counties including Leon and those west have received 13,375 home loans since the inception of the program approximately 18 years ago. Of this number, as of April 15, 1963, only 48 homes have experienced foreclosure. About this same number are in trouble as far as monthly payments are concerned, but some of these will become current thus avoiding foreclosure.

Of the total number of loans made to west Florida veterans, 1,164 were direct loans and the remainder were made by private lending institutions and guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

According to Mr. Wilson, VA along with FHA has given considerable attention to the issuance of speculative commitments. The VA is considering each subdivision on its individual merits and sales records. Through this method the agency has avoided large speculative subdivisions and yet at the same time has not prevented builders from building when they could sell homes.

Escambia County veterans have been approved for 5,152 home loans and 26 of the foreclosures have taken place there. Okaloosa shows a total of 2,780 loans with 8 foreclosures; 2,343 VA loans have been made in Leon County with approximately a dozen foreclosures as of April 15. Bay County veterans have made 1,711 loans with less than one-half dozen foreclosures.

In Florida approximately 163,000 veterans have taken advantage of the VA loan program to provide houses for their families. Foreclosures are spotted being concentrated mostly in four counties of the State. The portfolio of VA loans shows a total of more than $1½ billion. I join Mr. Wilson in complimenting the veterans of west Florida and the entire State for the manner in which they have met their obligations to a Government which has helped them.

While I have quoted Mr. Rufus Wilson, who has done very capable work as manager of the Veterans' Administration in Florida, I wish also to include Mr. Tom David and the entire staff of the VA who participate in housing loans for their sympathetic and cooperative attitude toward assisting veterans of Florida to obtain the housing they need.

Quarantine on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned with hemispheric action to weaken Castro, I was gratified to see the editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 27. It has been my hope that the Organization of American States would perform in a manner commensurate with the threat which communism in Cuba poses to the entire hemispheric community. In short, that the OAS would impose tight sanctions on Castro's island with the same spirit witnessed in that organization during last year's missile crisis.

Action by the OAS is a clear alternative to the Cuban problem short of an act of war, and as the Star states so equivocally, economic sanctions by the Latins would simply be an extension of the present U.S. embargo.

As author of a bill to ban trade with Cuba, which passed the House unanimously just prior to the adjournment of Congress in 1961, I would agree with the Star, and say that any government opposing communism would give credence to its position by halting such trade.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to have the editorial included in the RECORD at this point, and join in the hope that OAS action is forthcoming.

QUARANTINE ON CUBA

As far as he went, Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD was on the right track when he called upon the Organization of American

States to "consider the possibility of a hemisphere quarantine against Cuba."

Perhaps Senator MANSFIELD did not wish to put himself in the position of telling our Latin American friends how to run their business. Otherwise, he might have rephrased his statement to read: "The time is past due for the OAS to join the United States in economic sanctions against Fidel Castro's Cuba." Since he did not feel like going that far, we gladly do it for him.

As the majority leader said, the OAS has had 6 months to think things over since the Soviet missile showdown. In that crisis, all the American States responded courageously to strengthen our hand. Since then, as Senator MANSFIELD said, there have been too many resolutions and declarations, and not enough pressure exerted on Communist Cuba.

A squeeze such as the hemisphere put on the Dominican Republic falls short of invasion or blockade action. It simply would mean that Latin America had joined the United States in cutting off all supplies to Cuba except food and medicine.

Within a few days, the OAS is expected to release a committee report on its Cuban proposals. We hope there will be some bite in them.

Michigan's Ghetto Buster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following reprint of an article from Ebony magazine. It describes an unusual contribution to fair housing practices in Michigan made by Mr. James Del Rio:

MICHIGAN'S GHETTO BUSTER

While American Negroes have been more or less patiently awaiting the President's recent U.S. housing bias-banning "stroke of the pen," an impetuous Detroit real estate broker has waged a long and lonely battle integrating cities on his own. Since accomplishing the job in Pontiac, Mich., once notorious as the North's most segregated city for its population and size, he has turned on Detroit, where his plan is on the verge of a spectacular success.

"If some of my Negro colleagues had the guts and a little vision," fumed 38-year-old James Del Rio, "they could do the same throughout the country and the whole damn business of segregation would be wiped out overnight. The main problem is that most Negroes don't know that they can buy homes virtually anywhere they like with as little as a $100 downpayment or no downpayment at all."

To show what he meant, he invited Ebony to accompany him on a motor cruise through Pontiac (population 85,000, including 13,000 Negroes), where he opened a branch office 4 years ago. At that time, he explained, Negroes in the city were packed like sardines in a single, substandard housing ghetto of 40 square blocks with no other place to go.

"Take a look now," he invited, while pointing at neat rows of attractive, medium-priced (from $12,000 to $16,000) brick ranch-style homes in Herrington Hills, a Pontiac subdivision which only a few years ago had been restricted to whites. In front of the homes, Negro and white youngsters played harmoniously and obviously unconcerned about differences of race. In other parts of the city, the picture of racial harmony was repeated—Negro and white housewives chatting neighborly on their adjoining properties while tan-sprinkled groups of children sauntered by on their way to school.

There were other scenes too. In an older part of the city, sizable remnants of the old ghetto served as reminders that much work needed yet to be done. Conceding that Pontiac is still a long step from being the promised land, Del Rio pointed out that at least he had made it possible for prospective Negro home buyers to acquire property in virtually any city area of their choice. When he began his integration fight 4 years ago, he said, Negroes lived only in 3 of 11 city census tracts. Today, he added, they occupy 10 such tracts—a record figure for any U.S. city, North and South.

Del Rio's integration plan took shape in 1958, following his discovery that the Veteran's Administration issued listings of its repossessed homes on a segregated basis, with Negro brokers receiving only listing of properties in Negro neighborhoods. When confronted by him with this fact, VA officials quickly rectified the situation on a national scale. Having achieved open VA listings, Del Rio moved on to obtain open occupancy by scattering Negro families over many areas of Pontiac where once they were barred.

While he hammered away at the city's housing color bar, the local Urban League did its share, softening his blows. Through many conferences with community leaders and homeowners, it helped to create an accepting climate for the inevitable change. Apart from a few minor acts of hostility, such as the breaking of a few windows and the refusal of whites to speak to their new neighbors as the first Negro families moved next door, the league's behind-the-scene work and Pontiac official's no-nonsense policy did the trick. An added safeguard against trouble, Del Rio pointed out, was the fact that the homes involved were Federal property and thus enjoyed the protection of Uncle Sam. "Most people," he said, "will think twice before vandalizing Government property."

His success in Pontiac only served to whet his appetite for more. Turning his attention to Detroit, he soon discovered he needed something bigger than the VA club to bring the ghetto-ridden industrial giant to his knees. He found what he needed at the local field office of the Federal Housing Administration—an even bigger seller of repossessed homes than VA. After carefully combing through more than 1,000 home listings, he discovered what he had suspected all along, namely the same segregated listing method once practiced by the VA. With the cooperation of U.S. Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, he brought the matter to the attention of U.S. Housing Boss Robert C. Weaver, who promptly ordered a sweeping policy change to correct the oversight.

Del Rio did not stop there, but went on to pressure the city of Detroit into financing the printing of literature aimed at making the FHA change publicly known. Recently, he received his initial reward when the Detroit Courier, stirred by his fight to get the facts before the public, announced on its front page: "Del Rio's Fight Pays Off; FHA Homes for Everyone, Everywhere."

Del Rio's tenacity in pursuing housing integration has won him many friends in low and high offices, but also a large number of enemies. Foremost among the latter, he said, are white real estate brokers, agents, salesmen and builders organized as realtors, whom he termed "the greatest enemies of open occupancy."

In support of his charge, he quoted from a recent letter of Henry E. Pogue of Fort Thomas, Ky., Washington Committee chairman of the realtors' powerful and exclusive National Association of Real Estate Boards, to FHA Commissioner Neal J. Hardy. "We sincerely believe," Pogue wrote, "the action taken (outlawing segregated FHA listings) will prove inimical to the public interest * * *. Fifty-four years of experience of our association attests to what has almost become axiomatic in real estate brokerage, that maximum sales effort dictates exclusive listing * * *. We strongly urge that you reconsider this action; and that you provide an opportunity for a committee of realtors to meet with you and your staff at an early date."

To counteract the NAREB's organized resistance to open occupancy, Del Rio, in conjunction with the Detroit Cotillion Club and several Detroit Negro real estate firms, has filed a still pending Federal suit against the NAREB-affiliated Michigan and Detroit Real Estate Boards. In the suit, the plaintiffs attack the defendants' "code of ethics" requiring them never to be "instrumental in introducing into a neighborhood a character or property or occupancy, members of any race or nationality, or any individuals whose presence will clearly be detrimental to property values in that neighborhood." In addition to attacking the boards' "gentlemen agreements," the suit charges the defendants with conspiracy to restrain interstate trade to "prevent competition between Negro and white real estate brokers in the purchase, sale and financing of federally financed and insured real estate."

Unlike the realtors who claim that open FHA listings will result in irresponsible homebuying by insolvent persons and thus lead to an increased number of mortgage foreclosures and excessive losses to the Government, Del Rio insists that the new ruling will achieve the opposite. "The Government," he explained, "spends on an average of $1 million a year for upkeeping and rejuvenating properties of its approximately 4,000 to 5,000 homes homes in Detroit alone. Now that these houses are available for anyone to buy, they will sell faster and tax dollars for their maintenance can be saved." Rejecting the idea of irresponsible buying on the part of Negroes, Del Rio claims that years of experience have shown him that Negro home buyers by and large have a better business risk record than whites.

Del Rio does not mind being called a blockbuster, but hastens to point out that the term is often applied wrongly to "block moppers"—a fraternity of unscrupulous real estate speculators whose methods he detests. A blockmopper, he explained, spreads panic in an all-white housing block with rumors of a pending Negro invasion, alleging that it will lead to the depreciation of property values. In the resulting mass exodus of whites to safe neighborhoods, he pockets exorbitant profits, buying the homes cheaply and selling them to eager Negro buyers for up to twice their actual worth. The inevitable result: another all-Negro block.

"Block busting," on the other hand, he elaborated, merely involves the subtle placing of one or several Negro families in a formerly all-white block without any previous announcements and then leaving the block alone. "Look at what happened in Pontiac," he said. "Once we have put a Negro family on every block in the city, we have stable integration because whites, who are afraid of living next door to Negroes, simply haven't got a place left to which they can run."

Communists Threaten To Scuttle Wishful Thinking of New Deal-New Frontier Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago it was rumored that Haiti would be the next Latin American country to fall, with a Communist assist, and tonight may be the beginning of the end in that country. In spite of the loudly touted Alliance for Progress and the millions we continue to pour into Latin America, most of the countries there are teetering on the brink of Communist takeover, engineered and directed from Castro's Cuba which we are now protecting.

The fine speeches of President Kennedy, the bright slogans of the New Frontier, only slightly warmed over from the New Deal of the thirties, just do not seem to scare the Communists. The President's pleasant sounding words are no substitute for a firm policy and a strong will to keep this hemisphere free of Communist aggression. The next few fateful hours may chalk up one or more additional failures in the long list compiled by President Kennedy.

I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, the following column written by Ralph de Toledano which appeared in the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn.:

OLD SLOGANS NEVER DIE

(By Ralph de Toledano)

In politics, old slogans never die—they just become institutionalized. Most of the economic policies being touted today by learned liberal idealogues are based on the slogans of the 1930's and imposed by badgered legislators on situations of a far different nature than those which obtained them. And so it is with the Alliance for Progress, President Kennedy's answer to communism in Latin America.

The slogans on which the Alliance for Progress are based have become so accepted that few bother to determine (1) if they are valid, and (2) if the solutions to which they inevitably point will help or hurt in the fight against Communist penetration.

In answer to charges of a do-nothing Cuban policy, the President and other administration spokesmen have said repeatedly that the only way to defeat communism south of the border is to improve living standards and economic conditions. As a general proposition, every American will endorse the betterment of life among our Latin neighbors. But historically, the theory of "belly communism" has never been found to apply and this is demonstrably so in Latin America.

Look at the facts and figures.

Cuba under Batista was the fourth most prosperous country in Latin America, basing this figure on the per capita share of the gross national product. Yet Cuba went Communist. Venezuela, with the highest per capita share of GNP, is among the Latin American nations most threatened. According to some experts, it is poised on a razor's edge and may fall into the Red abyss at any moment. (Venezuela's GNP is more than double that of its closest rival.) Brazil, which ranks eighth, and is among the more prosperous Latin nations, is in a period of crisis and could be victimized by Communist revolt on the so-far withheld signal of Nikita Khrushchev. Some of the poorer nations of the inter-American alliance are among the freest from Communist infiltration or agitation.

So much for the basic thesis of the Alliance for Progress; namely, that improving economic conditions will forestall a Communist takeover. But what of the procedures whereby the Alliance for Progress proposes to bring prosperity to Latin America? U.S. foreign aid officials south of the border are pressing a program designed in Washington. The experts say that one important phase of it is more likely to hurt than to help the economies of the participating nations.

Here again, an old slogan dominates. The answer to poverty and the way to win over the lower classes which are presumably prey to Communist agitation is, we are told, land reform. (It used to be called agrarian reform until Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Reds took over that phrase.)

But "land reform"—as pushed by the Alliance for Progress—will do precisely the opposite of what it is intended to do. Very briefly, it will simultaneously decrease agricultural production and the income of the Latin American farmer. It will also depress the economy by forcing the countries involved to import more food—thereby reducing their foreign exchange and the capital accumulations necessary for the industrial growth so badly needed.

The reason for this is very simple. As former Under Secretary of Commerce Philip A. Ray points out in his careful study of Latin America, "South Wind Red," Latin American leaders are increasingly recognizing that the introduction of modern farm techniques in mechanization, irrigation, and fertilization rather than fragmentation or 'land reform' " is the sole means of increasing farm productivity. Modern techniques require capital and large land holdings to be workable.

At present roughly 50 percent of the Latin American labor force is providing an inadequate supply of food. If the farms of today are chopped up that percentage will rise. The labor force necessary for urban and rural industrialization will not be available—and Latin America will find itself in the same kind of economic bind as Red China and the Soviet Union.

If these points are not sufficiently convincing, there is one clincher. Country after country in Latin America has attempted land reform by fragmentation. It has never worked. If the United States wants to encourage individual initiative in Latin America, it should prevail on the governments there to turn over to venturesome souls some of its vast holdings of uncultivated land—as America did in the days when we opened the West.

Dr. Rowland To Be Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Pierre the Pelican, the trusted friend of young mothers and children all over the Nation, is now turning his full attention to the development of materials to be used to build good mental health.

For those who are not familiar with Pierre and his work in the field of mental illness, I would like to enter into the RECORD the following article from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, April 21, 1963, which tells the story of Dr. Loyd Rowland—better known to the world as Pierre the Pelican. Louisiana and the Nation can be truly proud of Dr. Rowland and his fine work.

The article follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Apr. 21, 1963]

DR. ROWLAND TO BE HONORED—EVENT TO MARK HIS PROMOTION

The best way to fight mental illness is to keep it from happening.

So believes Dr. Loyd Rowland, whose fame as Pierre the Pelican is international.

Dr. Rowland, who is being honored at a dinner Thursday night in the Grand Ballroom of the Roosevelt Hotel, has been a prime mover in the mental health movement since before the National Association for Mental Health was organized.

A farm boy from White Settlement, near Fort Worth, Tex., Dr. Rowland began his teaching in a Texas college classroom. His writings are now regularly received in homes and classrooms in all parts of the United States and parts of Europe.

Thursday night's event marks a change in status for Dr. Rowland from executive director to director of research and education of the Louisiana Association for Mental Health. The author of the "Pierre the Pelican" letters which have cheered and instructed young parents will now devote his full time to the development of materials to be used to build good mental health.

CREATIVE TEACHER

Back in 1945, the late Joseph Merrick Jones, its president, and other members of the board of the Louisiana Society for Mental Health, sought out a psychology professor at Baylor to head their group here. At that time the National Association for Mental Health had not yet been organized.

The man Jones persuaded to accept the job was a hard-working, creative teacher whose originality had already gained for him national recognition, but who never departed from his precept, "Never stuff young people with ideas they will have to unlearn."

He had received his bachelor's degree from Baylor, his master's from the University of Texas and his doctorate from the University of Chicago. He had taught at the University of Tulsa before returning to Baylor to head the psychology department there. He had more ideas than he could find support or funds to develop, so when the Louisiana group beckoned, Dr. Rowland became a displaced Texan.

As he continued his work in the comparatively new field of psychology, Dr. Rowland became more convinced than ever that the best way to fight mental illness is to prevent its happening. His desire to help build good mental health was responsible for what is probably his greatest contribution, so far, to the mental health educational field, the "Pierre the Pelican" letters. These are letters written in simple language, addressed to new parents, dealing with the many problems that beset them from the beginning of pregnancy until the first-born goes to school.

TRUSTED FRIEND

"Pierre the Pelican," with his concern for the emotional well-being of the child and his parents, became a trusted friend of young mothers all over the country. The Louisiana State Board of Health cooperated in distributing the pamphlets to every new parent requesting them. Health educators all over the country applauded the letters, adopted the service for use in their own States.

The letters, so successful in this country, attracted the attention of health educators in Europe. In West Berlin the pamphlets were translated and Peter Pelikan became as welcome a wise old bird in Germany as in Louisiana.

Dr. Rowland followed up his Pierre series with another, designed for teenagers, first called "Milestones to Marriage," revised last year under the title of "Milestones to Maturity." These are used nationwide by high school guidance counselors.

One of the first projects he undertook as executive director of the Louisiana association was the establishment of a new mental hospital in Louisiana, need that had been pressing for 50 years.

YEARS OF WORK

Five years' work—explaining, persuading, conferring with legislators—resulted in the establishment of Southeast Louisiana Hospital at Mandeville.

The association also became concerned with the treatment of the mentally ill at the time of commitment. Result was a film titled "Booked for Safekeeping," showing the approved approach to a disturbed person who must be hospitalized. Dr. Rowland provided the material for the script, supervised the film, using New Orleans police officers as actors, was rewarded by the film's acceptance by police training academies all over the country.

Success of the first film prompted a second, released this year, called "The Cry for Help," which deals with the depressed and potentially suicidal patient. The second film promises to be even more successful than the first.

SONS HELP HIM

Dr. Rowland credits his two sons with assists in his creative writing in the mental health field. He and his pretty wife, Lela, whom he met and married while at the University of Tulsa, have two boys.

The older son, Roger is a chemical engineer who is now studying law at George Washington University. Howard, the younger, enlisted in the Army and attends the Army Language School. He is now stationed in Turkey, where he is learning Russian after having majored in German and Spanish in college.

The honoree at Thursday night's dinner will devote his time to developing ideas for mental health education. His former position as executive director has been taken by George Saporito, his assistant for several years.

Shoppers' Guide to Communist Merchandise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have tried over the years to call to the attention of the Congress, the serious unemployment caused by the dumping of consumer goods into the United States.

I am especially disturbed over the failure of Congress to give my labeling bill consideration.

Daily, our shelves are being stacked with foreign goods and now, to add insult to injury, much of the stacking is being done by Communist Party line nations and workers.

I have said before and repeat, we can pass all the laws we can write, but unless we stop the cankerous growth of cheap imports and especially disguised and camouflaged foreign products, we shall never get our unemployed off the relief rolls.

Recently, a constituent sent me a documented list of products that appear to be produced in Communist areas.

Fighting communism in this fashion is about the same as beseiging a town and then dropping in supplies at night.

The list follows and it is only a scratch on the surface of the total products imported from these sources:

SHOPPER'S GUIDE TO COMMUNIST MERCHANDISE

Communist countries: Russia or the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Cuba, East Germany.[1]

SLAVE-MADE PRODUCTS AND GOODS

Hams and sausages: Brand names are Atlanta, Kraukas, Tala.

Fish products: Brand names are Ruby (J. A. Krisch Corp., New York, listed on can), Conservas Del Mar, Chateau.

Hops for beer: Anheuser-Busch, Budweiser.

Cheese: In bulk—Colby brand.

Candies, rums, liquors, wines: No brands listed. Check all.

Christmas tree ornaments: Fantasia brand and unmarked boxes. Ask for origin.

Cutglass, stemware, vases, crystal, etc.: Colony, Bohemia, Toscany, Arcadia, Marvel, Pasea, Knobler, Weil, Murmac are some of the brand names. In ads, this material is usually listed as "imported" with no country.

Wooden racks, children's chairs, kitchen tools, etc.: Nevco, Yonkers, N.Y. Check all items from this firm carefully. The name is on many Communist imports with the origin poorly labeled at times.

Typewriters: Optima, Aztec.

Cameras and lenses: Era, Zeiss, Exacta.

Handwoven/wicker baskets: Check all baskets carefully. Many have removable reeds with the country of origin that immediately become lost when entering the store. Marking is at all times very small.

Hangers: A few brands are Nevco, Manhatten, Duke, Duchess, Princess, Lora, Diplomat, Esquire. Some only have "Germany" on the metal parts. No names.

Bicycles and tires: Korlis and Stomil are two brands to look for.

Shoeshine boxes: Boxes made for the shoeshine kits of Esquire and KIWI polishes.

Check electrical fixtures in lamps, toys, games, jewelry, clothing, furniture (including Early American furniture), nuts and bolts, clothes, pins, transformers, cigars, cloves, chess sets. Nearly every item you can find on the shelves today.

For further information: Write your Congressman or the U.S. Government Printing Office (cost is $1) for:

Document No. FT 110, U.S. Imports of Merchandise for Consumption, 1961, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., published May 1962.

DID YOU KNOW WHAT YOU WERE BUYING?

If your merchant says he feels he is doing a service to America and that his customers wanted this material, ask him why he did not advertise the country of origin. You do not see "Furs from U.S.S.R." or "Furs from Russia" in your paper—you see "Furs imported from Europe." You do not see "Crystal from Czechoslovakia" you see "Crystals imported from Europe." Yet you do see "Paris Imports" or "Imported from Italy" all the time.

Ask him if he is so proud of selling these goods, why he does not advertise he sells Communist imports? Could it be he was trying to hide it?

WHAT IS WRONG WITH BUYING COMMUNIST IMPORTS?

1. American producers cannot compete with the costs of production through the use of slave labor in Communist countries. American manufacturers are losing money—some businesses have closed already. The job you save may be your own.

2. We pay for some of the goods with vital materials. Americans already have had the experience in World War II of the result of doing this kind of business—we sent Japan the scrap iron from the Second Avenue "EL"—they sent us back bullets. The life you save may be your son's.

3. We pay for other goods with our ever-shrinking gold reserve. Our economy depends on our gold reserve. The dollar value is shrinking as the gold reserve shrinks. Your dollar buys less and less today. The buck you save may be your own.

4. Humanitarians argue we should think of the "starving people" in the Communist countries, but our buying their goods will not feed them. The state owns all there. The state takes all the profits there. The state is shipping over their Polish hams and they have no meat. The only thing we are supporting or helping is the Communist domination * * * the "war machine" that has announced its intention is to bury us. Build up American economy—not the Communists who want to take us over.

Check labels—make sure the origin is marked on the product.

Stores are free to sell this material. You are free to buy there or not.

Be an informed consumer.

"THE BULLET THAT KILLED YOUR SON

"We trade iron ore for canned Polish ham.
The slave farmers starve, while our Uncle Sam
Settles back to enjoy the Communist roast
As the iron ores arrives at the Polish coast.

"Our State Department encourages this trade
So, eat up, my son, it's a cheaper priced grade.
It's inspected by men from a Communist land
Who started the war in South Vietnam.

"They fashioned a bullet from that iron ore
And, to stop it, your son is called to the corps.
'Killed in action' reads the brief telegram.
Correction—'Killed in your kitchen by a Polish ham.'"

"YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM,
FORT WAYNE, IND."

A BUYER'S GUIDE TO COMMUNIST IMPORTS

What products are for sale locally, what brand names are being used. Check your local stores. Stores are free to sell these goods. You are free to buy where you want.

It's up to you.

[1] East German goods are sometimes marked only "Germany." All West German goods are clearly marked "West Germany." They are proud to be free.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

"Technological Fallout" and a "Climate of Excellence": Benefits From the Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, almost overlooked in the excitement of the race for space is the way in which the Nation's consumers are going to benefit in terms of new products and even higher standards of excellence among producers. There is growing evidence that a great deal of practical good will accrue to the American people as a result of the extensive and expensive effort to conquer space—over and above our conquests in outer space.

An able New Yorker, William O. Bennett, vice president for research and engineering of the Bulova Watch Co., recently delivered an interesting speech before the Pittsburgh Rotary Club on this subject. An experienced scientist himself, Mr. Bennett cited some 145 examples of "technological fallout"—meaning consumer byproducts which have been produced thus far by space research.

There is much food for thought in these remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE-AGE RESEARCH AND BETTER MOUSETRAPS

(By William O. Bennett)

Gentlemen, every generation of man since the Renaissance has recognized the truth of the ancient saying, "We can see so far and so much because we are standing on the shoulders of giants."

But, gentlemen, I submit to you that at no other time in history has that saying been so apt as it is today. Our space-age civilization is building upon the achievements of men of the past, particularly the giants of the last 300 years.

Today the giants of our time—building on all this—are reaching for the stars literally. Just 30 years ago we were having a difficult time producing a four-engined airplane that would fly. Now we have entered the space age and expect to land men on the moon in a few years.

The scientific and technological advances that have marked our progress into the space age also have brought about what some call "an economy of abundance." It is said that never before have so many products of such high quality been available to so many people.

These products—and services, too—are the results of a technology that has been developing worldwide for many hundreds of years, and of a national technology that has out-stripped all others.

But much more than money is involved. Our space effort is being quickened by pride, by necessity, and by curiosity—not necessarily in that order. Actually, necessity is No. 1.

Our national pride has been freshened by our space effort, which has caught up our enthusiasm as has no other peacetime effort since our push to the Pacific of more than 100 years ago. Then we believed it was our manifest destiny to extend our country's boundaries from ocean to ocean. I'm sure that a good many Americans believe we have a new destiny in the conquest of space—many Americans who want to see our boundaries extended to the moon and, if possible, to planets beyond.

Necessity, of course, needs no explanation.

Curiosity, the third stimulant, is the underlying impulse to all scientific advances. It is estimated that our national space effort soon may employ nearly 1 million professional people, particularly engineers and technical specialists. Their collective assignment, to penetrate outer space, develop vehicles that will carry men to the moon and beyond, is one of the great challenges in the history of man. Man by his very nature is curious. He is spurred to seek answers to the unknown. I believe that our scientists, now that they have accomplished a beginning, will never cease their efforts to conquer space. Human nature is that way.

So we are indeed irrevocably committed to a great national effort, the exploration of space. There will be no turning back. Great sums are committed. Our national pride and our national security are involved. And our curiosity is aroused. We don't know how it will end, but the beginning is promising.

Some people just can't accept that the proverbial better mousetrap is being made here, now, in 1963. It is here and, at least in part, it is a byproduct of our space research programs.

In space-work vernacular, "technological fallout" is the term for byproducts that accrue to the consumer in the form of useful products and services. The list of fallout products is long and growing. It will continue to grow in the years ahead. The very enormity of our space effort insures that. We now are spending more than $10 billion annually for space and by 1970 that figure is expected to balloon up to $15 billion, possibly even $20 billion.

For example, I read that NASA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, had set out to determine whether our Nation's industry is making any products, or using any processes, stemming directly from the space program * * * in which the taxpayer has a multibillion-dollar investment and which will require an estimated $70 to $80 billion more over the next decade. The resulting survey turned up no fewer than 145 examples of what I have already termed "technological fallout."

But the effects of our space programs on industry go much deeper than the fallout of new products or of improved materials for existing products. They are changing the attitudes of people in company after company, producing a climate of excellence that did not exist previously. Without that climate of excellence firms involved in our space effort could not hire nor keep the brilliant scientists and technicians who want excellent facilities and freedom to follow where their scientific noses might lead.

When a manufacturer in the more prosaic field of consumer goods considers product quality, his attention usually is centered on the grade of materials used, the technical perfection of design, and standards of production. Then, a level of product quality having been determined, most firms carry out rigorous programs of quality control to insure the standards are upheld.

But the level of quality usually is set only in terms of meeting or beating the competition.

Our space program is changing all that, gradually in some companies, quickly in others. There can be no such thing in space as a product that is just good enough. Only the very best will do. In gyroscopes for guidance, for example, the spherical rotating mass must be machined to within a few millionths of an inch of perfect; in safe-arm devices for propulsion systems, safety and reliability of operation both must be within a few hundredths of 100 percent perfect. This demand by space companies for the very best, together with the climate of excellence that exists, promises to have a salutary effect on our entire industrial and business climate, promises to raise America's product standards to high, new plateaus.

The fulfillment of this promise is inevitable, in my opinion. I wanted to support my contention with figures that would demonstrate the ocean-to-ocean and border-to-border impact the space effort is having on American industry. So I had a query submitted to NASA asking how many companies are involved in space work and, second, how many of those companies doing space work also are producing consumer goods. Do you know, gentlemen, NASA couldn't answer that question. Our Nation's space program is so enormous that men and computers have not yet measured it. All NASA could tell us is, and I quote the reply as it was relayed, "tens of thousands of firms are involved in research, development, and production work for the space program. Thousands of these firms—Ball Brothers, producers of mason jars and scientific satellites; General Mills, makers of breakfast food and scientific instruments; Honeywell, manufacturer of thermostats and guidance systems; Mergenthaler, maker of linotype machines and bombing systems; Goodrich, producer of tires and space suits—also are producing consumer goods and services."

As the consumer becomes more aware of the technological fallout he is going to ask, "If they can make metals that don't melt and electrical connections that always work, why can't they make a coffee pot that lasts longer?"

I think that you will agree that it is a reasonable conclusion to draw that companies which daily must cope with production and performance requirements of micromodule electronics, self-adaptive control systems, thermionics, bionics, and so forth—which, I might point out, go far beyond the quality control checks generally used in responsible companies—will instinctively apply these same standards to their more conventional, consumer product line. The net effect, as I said, will be an extraordinary influence on the workmanship, the materials, and the quality of everyday items.

How far will this massive harnessing of men and resources take us? A long way, I believe, because we have created a fertile situation in which ideas can grow, perhaps to bloom tomorrow, or next year, or a decade

from now, in the form of products or services that can have wide consumer application.

I read just the other day, for example, that the director of Stanford University's student counseling service, estimates that half our children will ultimately be employed in occupations that do not even exist today. I'm sure they will be producing, distributing, and selling a better mousetrap than we are able to here in the early years of the space age. (Probably in another generation the mouse will be completely eliminated, so the reference to mousetrap is just symbolic.)

Since this is "Correct Time Week" in Pittsburgh, by proclamation of Mayor Barr, I'd like to tell you about Bulova's own space-age contribution. I have it here on my wrist, the Accutron electronic timepiece, the first major change in timekeeping in more than 300 years, the world's first and only electronic wrist timepiece. I'm very proud to have directed the Bulova research and engineering team that developed it. Today, just slightly more than 2 years after this timepiece was first placed on the market, our plant at Jackson Heights, Long Island, is operating 7 days a week to meet consumer demand. The Accutron is powered by a mercury cell—which eliminates winding—and has an electronic circuit and a tiny precision tuning fork. It is the tuning fork's precise vibrations, 360 cycles per second, that measure time in the Accutron. It is the most accurate portable timepiece in the world today and we're very proud of it at Bulova.

The Accutron timepiece was not developed for the space program at Government expense. It was designed as a superior personal timepiece and Bulova paid all the bills during the 8 years of development work that went into it. But the Accutron is such a superior product that it has been given a role in space. Four families of satellites carry special Accutron electronic timers that will shut off their transmitters after each satellite's useful life is ended. You could call our timer a space-age alarm clock. The one in the Telstar, for example, will shut down its beacon and command transmitters in July 1964, after more than 17,000 hours of operation. I'm sure you can understand why we're so very proud of our better mousetrap.

Incidentally, the Telstar concept is an outstanding example of technological effort. To my memory, no space product has ever jumped the gap between laboratory and commercial application so quickly as this communications device. Some day soon, communications satellites will serve as cables in the sky, so to speak, carrying television and data-processing signals around the world. They would open up a worldwide dial telephone system with many times the message capacity of today's underwater cables and transocean radio.

One of the biggest potential payoffs in our space program is promised by Government-operated weather satellites. These are designed to predict weather movements and also send back data that will help us to determine how these movements start and what governs their progress.

Our first Tiros satellite was launched in April 1960, and it was followed into orbit in subsequent months by five others. From the time of the first launching through the end of 1962, he six had logged a total of 1,157 days of useful life. And they transmitted back to us more than 203,000 pictures of the earth's cloud cover. Tiros satellites Nos. 5 and 6 still are in orbit and NASA now is planning to launch a number sufficient to establish a system that will make it possible for the Weather Bureau to follow the progress of storms everywhere in the world.

Ever since last October, when we started keeping closer watch on military preparations in Cuba, most of us have become more aware than ever of the advances in aerial observation. Less well publicized have been NASA's plans for orbiting observatories, which will carry telescopes and other astronomical and geophysical instruments. The president of one of our leading space research companies said that present plans to map Antarctica from planes could be done with satellites for half the money and in a fifth of the time. Satellites also could be used to observe and map the vast areas of Soviet Russia from which we are barred.

The same type of equipment used to check the performance of earth-orbiting satellites and missiles is being put to work to help automobile engineers make cars quieter. To get an accurate check of all noise and vibration, and check structural aspects that could be a source of annoying noise, Volkswagen is installing a two-channel electronic telemetry system that will listen to the sounds test cars make on the road and transmit signals to a sensitive receiver in a vehicle following behind. The system was built by a Bendix Corp. division that developed the telemetry equipment our astronauts use to transmit signals to tracking stations.

Also of interest to automotive people is a new control system that enables road pavers to lay perfectly smooth concrete or asphalt highways, regardless of rough or irregular roadbeds. This new system was developed by the Honeywell Co. and is based on the company's experience in producing inertial guidance systems for missiles.

The cars of the future that we drive over these perfect highways undoubtedly will be made of lighter, stronger metals developed for spacecraft. These metals could make a vast difference in the designs of automobiles, particularly if engine weight can be reduced. A great deal of work is being done by space companies in this field, because the spacecraft must be built to withstand intense strains and stresses of launchings and white-hot temperatures that develop during reentry into the earth's atmosphere. I believe it is just a question of time before we see many applications of these new alloys over a wide range of consumer products.

In the field of medicine we already have made dramatic advances as the result of space research. You may have heard of an electronic device being developed for persons with irregular heartbeats. These devices give the heart a tiny electrical shock at precise intervals that helps the heart to beat evenly. Microminiaturization, so important in space work, has reduced this device from the size of a portable radio to the size of a matchbox. It is inserted under the skin of the chest, and has an internal power supply that lasts about 4 years. At the end of that period, another operation has to be performed and the unit removed and recharged. An improved new unit, with a long-lasting external power suppy, may grow out of work being done to develop new, compact, self-contained power sources needed by satellites and spacecraft.

Gentlemen, I set out to convey to you today, my conviction that never before have so many products of such high quality been available to so many people. Also, I wanted to convey to you my belief that we have made only a beginning, that the wonders we of our generation will see in our lifetime very likely will appear dated and perhaps quaint to our grandchildren.

In summary, "man has hitched his wagon to the stars and it is unlikely he'll ever unhitch it again."

Catholic Paper Praises Struelens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic News, the newspaper of the archdiocese of New York which is presided over by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, in its issue of April 4, 1963, carries a very fine article by A. J. B. Adams, entitled, "Goodbye Mr. Struelens, We Shall Miss You."

This article typifies, I think, the sentiment of the millions of Americans who have learned of the unprecedented treatment of this fine man by our Department of State.

That treatment was carefully scrutinized recently by the Senate Internal Security Subcommitte and in that body's unanimous report the Senators found:

> The subcommittee feels that there may have been undue laxness in granting visas to known Communists and to persons believed to be Communists. There is unjustifiable inconsistency in a policy which arbitrarily excludes friends of the United States who are not excludable under the law, while granting visas to known Communists and mass murders [sic], who are sworn enemies of this country, and whose exclusion is called for by the law.

The report further stated specifically:

> Cancellation of the visa of Michel Struelens, and the surrounding and subsequent harrassments to which the Department of State subjected him, constituted a glaring abuse of the visa power and a performance unworthy of the Government of a great nation dedicated to the principles of freedom and justice.

The article in the Catholic News is worthy of our people who deeply appreciate Mr. Struelens' efforts to bring the truth on the Congo to them. The text of the article follows:

GOODBY MR. STRUELENS, WE SHALL MISS YOU

(By A. J. B. Adams)

This week the Katanga Information Office in New York closed down. It had long been the subject of controversy. For the State Department, in league with the U.N., made serious efforts to discredit and deport the man who ran it, Michel Struelens, a likable young Belgian who, before independence, had been part of the Congo's very efficient civil service.

The Department's methods in its cold war against Mr. Struelens were recently sharply criticized by a congressional committee as unworthy of this country.

Now Mr. Struelens is saying au revoir. His work, to try and present Katanga's point of view to the American public, is over. His hotel rooms will no longer, it is assumed, be searched by the FBI. There will be no more underhand efforts to rob him of his legitimate right to stay in this country—if he wishes to. And he will, let us hope, be accorded at least as much official courtesy as the numerous self-styled African leaders whose avowed purpose in coming to this

country is to make propaganda and organize rebellion against our allies.

There are many newsmen who, like myself, are sorry to see the closure of the Katanga Information Office, inevitable as it was. For in an era unsurpassed for official lying—which seems to reach its apotheosis under the auspices of the United Nations—Mr. Struelens' office was one of the few direct sources of information available to us on African affairs. And one did not have to be in favor of Katangan independence to appreciate this.

Mr. Struelens was accused of running a wealthy propaganda machine on behalf of Katanga. In fact from his small office on Fifth Avenue what he did do was expose many of the lies spread by officials of the U.N. and State Department in defense of their policies. The last information sheet put out by Mr. Struelen's office is a good illustration of this. It was a statement by the tribal chiefs of Katanga repudiating a faked letter, purportedly written by them, which was distributed by the U.N. at the time of its final assault on Elisabethville. In the fake, the tribal chiefs disavowed Mr. Tshombe and pledged their loyalty to Leopoldville.

This was officially distributed and exploited throughout the world as evidence of the rightness of the U.N.'s cause and the hollowness of Mr. Tshombe's position. Here at home, for instance, it was given prominence by the Christian Science Monitor and other worthy papers, all in good faith.

The incident itself is not important. But it is a symptom—a symptom of a sickness at the heart of our public affairs, where official denigrates official and lies are manufactured with such expertise as to confuse all but the wariest. The U.N., for instance, a few weeks after issuing the faked letter, piously proclaimed:

"Quite possibly no activity ever engaged in by the United Nations has suffered so much as the Congo operation from public misunderstanding of its purpose and activities. Much of this misunderstanding, of course, has been due to the deliberate campaign of the well-financed Katanga propaganda machine * * * The United Nations, through its public information services, has striven valiantly to counteract this propaganda, but has enjoyed only partial success."

The latest example of the U.N.'s "valiant striving" for truth about its Congo operation—no longer plagued by the "propaganda" of Mr. Struelens' office—concerns the fighting in Kasai province. After firmly and repeatedly denying reports of trouble and fighting in South Kasai over a period of several weeks, the U.N. finally issued a statement that active rebellion in that province was now over. According to Western correspondents, more than 5,000 persons were killed and scores of villages destroyed in the action, which the U.N. would have us believe did not happen.

Those of us who have endeavored to follow the tortuous events in the Congo know how skeptical one has always had to be of U.N. statements. We know what confusion reigns in that organization. And while we appreciate the job it is trying to do, we dislike many of the methods used, and particularly the glib lying to cover up questionable policies and the mistakes of third-rate officials.

That is why the Katanga Information Office was of such value. It was partisan—of course. But it helped newsmen, and thus the public, to get a balanced picture. It brought to light many facts which the U.N. and the State Department, wrongly in my opinion, tried to conceal from the very public which was financing and giving moral support to the whole operation.

Mr. Struelens, without the vast sums he was said to have at his disposal, but with a small staff, great energy and dedication, has performed an arduous task for a cause he believed to be right. In doing so, he has also rendered a considerable service to our democratic process. The American public—and newsmen in particular—owe him a debt of gratitude; and for the gauche ways of our public servants, an apology.

New York World's Fair, 1964–65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65 at the annual dinner of the Radio-News Reel-Television Working Press Association in the Hotel Americana in New York City. It is a very fine address, which makes some reference to many of our distinguished political leaders, and I am sure the address will be of considerable interest to other Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–1965, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE RADIO-NEWSREEL-TELEVISION WORKING PRESS ASSOCIATION, IMPERIAL BALLROOM, HOTEL AMERICANA, MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1963

Gabriel Pressman and gentlemen of the radio, television, and newsreel working press, we tell the world our fair story in current printed reports and by films, radio and television. We have called upon those who operate all the newest and most ingenious avenues of communication to help us, and they have responded generously and magnificently with every quaint device of the age of invention.

Without you, the abstract and brief chroniclers of our time, the task of reaching millions of potential visitors near and far would be unthinkable. You carry the myriad voices of the fair throughout the metropolis, to the hinterland and to the four corners of a shrinking globe. When you go out of business even temporarily, enterprises of great pith and moment lose the name of action.

You have seen Bob Considine's film and heard the Holy Father at the Vatican break ground for the pavilion which will accommodate Michelangelo's Pieta. You have had a glimpse of President Kennedy inaugurating the U.S. exhibit and beginning its construction.

When the fair was first announced, stage whispers, idle rumors and anonymous scuttlebutt spread the gloomy news that our enterprise was already a dud and never would get off the ground. Well, we have fooled them. The ship has long since been airborne. It flies jet-propelled, and in spite of the glooms will reach its destination on time.

I think most of you will agree that discovering leadership in our superfically sophisticated Gotham, even for a celebration of its 300th anniversary, is no picnic. We have too many professional detractors; that is, too many who live and thrive on criticism as such, criticism without worthy objectives, not sparked by humor or honest indignation. We New Yorkers spend altogether too much time in advertising our not overwhelming deficiencies, fouling our own nest, which in fact houses many great birds, confirming the worst suspicions of our critics, and exhibiting our sensitiveness to the plain high-minded envy of the citizens of Gath and Askelon.

We simply do not have time to debate the proper role of criticism in a free society. Few critics of the fair have been benevolent. If at this late date we paid too much attention to them, we should end with curare poisoning, stomach ulcers, coronaries, and chronic jitters.

As distinguished from specialized trade, local and traveling fairs and circuses, world's fairs become larger and larger and, if their central purposes and objectives are not sincere and honest, lack quality and invite elephantiasis and megalomania. The tendency is to do too much and to spend too great an effort in attracting every last industry, State, and foreign country and to apologize for a few absentees instead of emphasizing the virtues and contributions of those we have. At this point, I am more interested in greenery, landscaping, and resting places at Flushing Meadow than in renting every inch for building.

Some of you commentatros have been trying to get my goat about fun at the fair. I give you "E" for effort. It will be primarily a family fair. We are not bluenoses, but cheap Coney Island sideshows don't make a genuine international exposition. Why should we cater to the old codgers who can remember only Sally Rand, the hootchy-cootchy dancers, and the girl with the fluttering doves on strategic places? There will be fun, but joy need not be unrefined. We have made reasonable rules and shall enforce them. In the process we shall keep a watchful, if not jaundiced, eye on the impresarios who would like to put a hot dressing on their salacity.

I would stress one major objective of our fair, namely that it is an open, free, friendly competition of all the talents and accomplishments involving all industries and arts, foreign and domestic, in the very best traditions of the Olympic games. If you have progress to report and are not afraid of healthy rivalry, you are welcome at Flushing Meadow. Bring us only your finest products. Let the best men win the laurels. Out of this free competition we believe will grow the friendships such as sportsmen have formed since the beginning of time.

Are we modest in our World's Fair predictions. Indeed not. It would not be in the best American tradition. We promise a pageant so marvelous as to exhaust superlatives, one which old gaffers will remember as the high point in their lives, as they tell their fascinated progeny about the eighth wonder of the world at Flushing Meadow back in 1964 and 1965.

I come now logically to your guest of honor, President Harry S. Truman, an honorary president of our World's Fair, who is here in spirit and by family representation. He personifies action as against abstraction, deeds rather than words. He began the campaign of 1948 against an able and overconfident opponent under apparently insuperable handicaps. A battle of David and Goliath always appeals strongly to our sports loving public. The moral seems to be that the man who won't admit defeat can't be beaten. Mr. Truman needs no Niagara of molasses poured over him by postprandial orators. He is no retired human equivocation, stuffed shirt or cigarstore Indian. He stands, like the "Iron Duke" of old, four square to all winds that blow.

We incline at times to gloom and pessimism as we observe our political contemporaries in some of their less admirable and engaging manifestations, but then the sun breaks through and we observe the lift and leavening effects of appalling responsibility

on men suddenly lifted to great heights. That is how we recapture and renew our faith in the democratic process.

No one becomes a Lincoln merely by sleeping in Lincoln's bed. The requisite qualities must be there, latent but ready to be roused for the supreme public purpose. The motivation of a good President includes respect for the dignity of the highest office in the gift of the people. In viewing his most distinguished predecessors, he stops just short of idolatry. His inspiration is above ambition and ordinary challenge, beyond even the normal determination of a salient character to make good and to vindicate the faith of others in him at home, in his State, in the Congress, and in his party.

It is said that this is the world's toughest job, one of intolerable burdens not to be shared with others, of loneliness on the heights where the climber suffers from acrophobia. If so, it is curious how many seek it, and how furiously. The well-balanced man, risen above himself, prays for light and truth, but develops no sense of martyrdom.

A key to his character is to be found in Mr. Truman's faithfulness to old associates in trouble. The holier than thou no doubt shuddered on such occasions. In the case of Matthew Connelly, Mr. Truman might well have looked the other way or have murmured something about commitment to principles rather than people, but millions of plain folks liked it when he flew halfway across the continent to express his affection for a loyal friend of better days. The critics muttered something about Missouri politics, but hardboiled reporters were astonished to detect a tear in many a frosty Yankee eye. Savants have long been troubled about the rejection of Falstaff. Ph.D. theses have been written explaining it. The fact is that when Prince Hall got into the king business, he ran out on an old pal. Mr. Truman never did that.

It is probably well that most of our Presidents learned their political science, if it is a science, by trial and error in earthy and highly unacademic surroundings. Mark Twain's Missouri River, fed by meandering brooks and springs, flows unvexed to the Mississippi and the sea. I am sure Mr. Truman will recall the legend about two Missouri Senators, both originals in the Mark Twain tradition, who flourished around World War I, Gumshoe Bill Stone and Jim Reed. Reed made a nice distinction between them. He said, "Gumshoe and I both suck eggs, but he hides the shells."

It is true that Mr. Truman is by birth, affiliation and predilection a party man, but that does not mean a partisan. He has endeared himself to sportsmen by being ready always to rush once more into the breach whenever the tocsin of election sounds. Like the retired charger in the Bible, "He paweth in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength. * * * He saith among the trumpets, Ha, ha; and he smelleth the battle afar off, the thunder of the captains, and the shouting."

Mr. Truman finds immense satisfaction in busying himself with his library at Independence, Mo. Among our Chief Executives the descendants of small farmers as well as aristocrats seem to like to take their records home. Harry Truman is proud of Independence and Independence is proud of Harry Truman. I wish we had more of such local pride here in New York.

I am not one of those who believe ex-Presidents should automatically become Senators to wander around like ghosts in the setting of half-forgotten exploits of the past. John Quincy Adams is no illustration. He became an active elected Congressman, not a licensed spectator. A former President has immense influence even if it is exercised from a distance. He needs no toga and no badge of honorary membership in Congress.

Harry Truman has never suffered from, or inflicted upon others, what the Greeks called "hubris," and Shakespeare the insolence of office. In this case we need not debate how absolutely power corrupts, because Harry Truman never sought power for its own sake. In the most crowded hours the spirit of this mortal never became proud. He has always had in abundance the three H's which make power tolerable—humility, humor and humanity. That is why you riders of the airwaves, who are in the best position to evaluate the great and the near great, have concluded that Harry S. Truman had stood the test of time and has emerged as one of the great men of this era.

Automation and Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, during recent debate on H.R. 12, much was said in the press of debate and under obvious loyalties concerning one of the greatest of the professions. This especially applied to income and averages of the profession of medicine as compared with others, and so forth.

Although it has long been known that that income is not comparable on an hourly rate with some of our more highly paid laboring jobs, to say nothing of technical hourly work, I believe the following editorial from the Bulletin of the Greene County Medical Society, issue No. 4, volume XII, of April 1963, puts it in proper perspective:

AUTOMATION AND MEDICINE

The old joke about the definition of specialism in medicine being a process whereby doctors know more and more about less and less until they know everything about nothing has a counterpart in the industrial revolution of today.

It is becoming necessary for a man to work fewer and fewer hours in order to achieve the same output as before and efforts are being made not only to keep him employed but also to maintain or to increase his earnings. Thus it seems to be a natural heritage of man to do less work as his machines do more. This is all very fine, providing the human organism keeps itself above the level of a five-toed sloth in managing all this spare time.

There are, however, some fields of endeavor in which the concept of automation does not seem to apply. Medicine is one of these. It certainly is not apparent that advances in technology have resulted in any shorter workweek for a practicing physician. Indeed, recent Department of Commerce figures have shown that the physician's annual income has increased in keeping with the rise in national income but not through greater per-hour pay. Rather, this increase in income has come about by working more hours or, perhaps stated otherwise, by being busier more of the time.

Obviously, this device of working more hours can be carried only so far without becoming burdensome and ridiculous, especially if the trend for a great segment of the working population is in the other direction.

This provides interesting speculation for the future of medicine in the automated age. What will it be?

WILFRED E. WOOLDRIDGE.

Wall Street Hails Report of SEC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by syndicated Columnist Sylvia Porter which appeared in the Courier-Post of Camden, N.J.

In her article Miss Porter discusses the favorable reception by Wall Street of the first installment of the SEC Special Study Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WALL STREET HAILS REPORT OF SEC

(By Sylvia Porter)

One of the best gifts Wall Street has received in years is the Securities and Exchange Commission's critical report on the results of its 17-month probe of the stock markets of this country. Whatever additional regulations, improvements and laws that follow are sure to be constructive for the investor, for reputable securities firms and salesmen, for the economy as a whole.

This is not just my judgment. It is the appraisal of dozens of top financial leaders I checked in off-and-on-the-record talks Thursday when excerpts of the 1,600-page report became available in New York City.

Most significant is the fact that while the SEC found "grave abuses," "important problems" and the need for "additional controls and improvements," it also found no "pervasive fraudulent activity" and no need for "damatic reconstruction" of the securities markets or of regulations. Every informed Wall Streeter knows there are grave abuses, important problems and admits the desirability of additional controls and improvements.

Just as the medical profession has its quacks and the legal profession has its crooks so the securities industry has its dirty fringe, too. And just as reputable professionals in medicine and the law would welcome the elimination of the quacks and crooks, so reputable Wall Streeters would welcome the elimination of their fringe.

This is just the beginning. Here are other between-the-line constructive aspects of this long-awaited report.

1. The widespread and continuing publicity which will be given to the SEC's proposals and Congress hearings on them will make the investing public increasingly curious about the securities they buy and the firms with which they deal. Any move which stimulates investor education is constructive. Any step which makes stock buyers more aware of the importance of dealing only with responsible financial firms is beneficial. This greater curiosity is bound to expand informed public participation and confidence in securities.

2. The report will stiffen self-policing by the securities industry's own self-regulatory bodies, will raise standards for salesmen, for securities firms and for their executives. The SEC's report stresses the need for raising standards, and actually Wall Street began a drive for this on all fronts even before the SEC's probe got underway in 1961. Everyone will benefit from the lifting of standards except the fringe and the outright crooks.

3. It will speed the end of the unjustifiable double standard which exists between

stocks of companies listed on an exchange and those of companies which are traded in the over-the-counter market. The SEC recommends that publicly held companies with 300 or more stockholders that have unlisted stocks be required to make regular financial reports, to reveal data on "insider" deals, to give full proxy information to their stockholders—just as companies with listed stocks must do. Wall Street's own leaders long have urged this. The "full disclosure" rule wouldn't apply to small companies. It can't hurt reputable, big companies. It can only help the investor.

4. It will hike the standards of financial public relations firms and some financial writers—and the abuses in these fields have been an untold scandal for years. There is no defense at all for a financial press agent or financial writer who touts a company's stock, pulls in the gullible public, then bails out at a profit with other insiders. The SEC's warning to the public relations field and the financial writers is clear: police yourself or the policing will be done for you. To me, this part of the SEC's report is sickening—and actually, I know the SEC is being gentle in its accusations.

5. It will help wipe out "reckless dissemination of written investment advice," "irresponsible recommendations of securities." No one gains from this sort of thing except the borderline promoter. The self-regulatory bodies can handle this. There need not be a law.

By its spirited price rise after the report's main proposals became public, the stock market gave its judgment: "good." By their comments to me, Wall Street's leaders gave their appraisal: "a skillful, thoughtful, careful job."

Of course, there will be plenty of tough problems and debates. But whatever comes out will be on the plus side—which I might add is what the SEC has had in mind all along.

Jobs for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, indeed many from the other side, feel that the administration-sponsored Youth Employment Act is only a proximate and temporary stopgap and is not the real answer to our youth unemployment problem. Instead, we feel that other measures centered around increased emphasis on vocational education and more efficient and effective use of existing programs get to the heart of the program both proximately and remotely. Therefore, I was happy to see the following editorial from the April 30 Washington Post support the main thought behind our proposals:

JOBS FOR YOUTH

The quotation books are full of apothegms on the evils of idleness, including the incontestable observation that the devil finds work for idle hands. And idleness is at its very worst when it is involuntary and inflicted upon the young and vigorous who would like to work. It is an inescapable fact, however, as the President's Committee on Youth Employment has just pointed out in its report, that the unemployment rate for boys and girls 16 to 21 years of age is now so high as to constitute a most serious national problem.

The problem is at its worst, as might be expected, in cities, among the poorly educated, among Negroes and Puerto Ricans—that is, among those least able on their own to do anything about it. Their unemployment grows out of inadequate training, inadequate motivation to learn and, of course, out of discrimination by employers on account of race. The committee therefore recommends thrusts in two directions: improving the preparation of young people for jobs, and opening up job opportunities.

The fact of the matter is that, for a great many American youngsters, education today is unrelated to contemporary reality. While the members of the committee were in some disagreement about the make-work projects of the President's youth employment bill, they were much more united in urging an improvement in general education, especially for children who are not bound for college. They urge improved vocational training in classes small enough to afford individual attention and with materials which are not exclusively oriented to middle-class family culture.

It is interesting that Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, had almost exactly the same counsel to offer when he testified recently before the House General Subcommittee on Education. He put it very plainly:

"It may not be long before virtually all jobs will require some kind of specialized training, together with a good background in general education. If we do not make provisions in our schools for vocational education opportunities for everyone who might need them we will be compounding for the future our present problem of hard-core unemployed. More specialized training opportunities for dropouts, special work-study programs for potential dropouts, and special programs for those with academic, socioeconomic, and other handicaps are urgently needed."

Those who complain, as some undoubtedly will, that this remedy is bound to be a very costly one ought to compute the social and monetary costs of youth idleness, with its attendant delinquency, crime, and contempt for all the community's values.

Forgive Us Our Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Rev. A. McKay Brabham, Jr., has published in the South Carolina Methodist Advocate an excellent editorial entitled "Forgive Us Our Debts." I am very impressed with Reverend Brabham's comments on our national indebtedness, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORGIVE US OUR DEBTS

(By A. McKay Brabham, Jr.)

Baffled by what we read of the complexities of modern day financing as reported in an article on a great business empire, and overwhelmed by the immensity of the national debt which few people seem interested in paying, we have found ourselves retreating again into the simplicities of a childhood belief.

It is simply this; if you owe somebody something. and you are a person of honor and integrity, then you make every effort possible to pay that debt.

Out of the simplicity of that belief, we have and do find it unbelievable that a great nation should appear to be utterly unconcerned about the fact that it takes no realistic steps to reduce its national indebtedness and constantly increases the interest and the principal which each succeeding generation must assume.

We have and do applaud all who work for justice, truly improved race relations, sobriety, peace, and other philosophical, theological, judicial, and scientific improvements for the benefit of mankind. With all of this, we do not believe that God has done away with the individual, personal obligation which requires each of us to seek personal scriptural holiness and accept the righteousness which comes with God's foregiveness.

It appears to us that in the Nation's effort to forestall communism and alleviate the physical needs of mankind, it has forgotten the nature of personal sin and the need for repentance and divine redemption.

We say this not to undercut the divine imperative to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, but simply to say that when we give away food and clothes they ought to belong to the giver and not be something he is stealing from someone else.

By the unwillingness of our people to bear the load of taxation which would allow a reasonable and honest reduction in the national indebtedness, we are stealing bread and clothing from each succeeding generation.

We can only credit this to a national love of luxury and a consuming covetousness which is everywhere condemned in Scripture.

Public welfare, foreign aid, medical care for the needy, better housing, and better education, are worthy ideals and we would not belittle a single worthy goal of our people.

Nor are we prepared to say that we would have our Nation do less for others than is now being done.

We do believe that, as followers of the one who said: "If any man will come after me, let him * * * take up his cross daily, and follow me," that we who claim to be Christians should be willing to bear the burden of the costs involved.

Jesus had much to say about the material wants of men, but nowhere does he advise one to take from another to help the needy.

The time has come for us to turn the searchlight of the Gospel on the nature of our national integrity that we may see what God has to say about our collective and individual sin of unwillingness to pay our just debts.

Surely the righteousness of God demands personal and national honesty.

One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Pilgrimage to the Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, once a year in my home city of San Antonio we commemorate those heroic and dedi-

cated men who gave their lives in the fall of the Alamo. We do this not solely as a remembrance for those men who fell on that fateful day in 1836, but also as a reminder to ourselves and to the world of those ideals and beliefs for which men lay down their lives. It is a time of rededication. It is a time of pledging renewed loyalties to the best traditions of our country.

This past week San Antonio and all of Texas made its 127th pilgrimage to the Alamo. On that occasion Lt. Gen. Carl H. Jark, commanding general of the Fourth U.S. Army, gave a moving and worthy speech which should be shared with the Members of this House and the readers of its RECORD. Accordingly, I ask to have added to the RECORD the full remarks of Lieutenant General Jark.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. CARL H. JARK AT THE PILGRIMAGE TO THE ALAMO, SPONSORED BY THE DAUGHTERS OF THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS, MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1963

We have heard the impressive rollcall of the heroes of the Alamo. One hundred and eighty-six men, who died here 127 years ago, live again in our memories.

They were called Texans because they chose to make Texas liberty their cause. They came from 18 States in the United States and from 7 foreign countries. The Alamo was their destiny, and Texans will always call them their own, though their names be Courtman of Germany, Crockett of Tennessee, McGregor of Scotland, Esparza of Mexico.

The Alamo, then, stands as a monument to liberty for all the world to see, a symbol of hope to the oppressed, and a challenge to the free. The world has witnessed many freedom crises. In them giants have emerged, rising above normal stature, gaining immortality, and inspiring succeeding generations.

The Alamo was a freedom crisis, changing the course of history. In the Alamo there were 186 giants who are today our inspiration.

There are many features of Texas to which the word "giant" may be applied. But it is most applicable to those Texans who here made the supreme sacrifice. Each was a giant among men, who made his decision to cross the line Travis cut in the sand, knowing a fight to the death awaited him on the other side of that line.

Many were already living legends when they joined the Alamo garrison. Crockett, Bowie, and Bonham were known as patriots who loved life, and cherished liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. On this sacred ground, they kept faith with their greatness.

But more than that, their comrades in arms, little-known men until March 6, 1836, became giants in their own right, They, too, proved at the Alamo, that, while they sought happiness like us all, and loved life, above all they cherished liberty.

Think, if you will, of the fateful moment when William Barret Travis drew his saber and slashed a challenge in the earthen floor of the Alamo courtyard. Certainly every man at that moment suffered doubts, knowing he was lost to his loved ones once he crossed the line. He suffered fear, as all brave men do. He suffered indecision. He suffered physical privation, as is always the lot of men at war. Destined though he was for immortality, each hero of the Alamo was human.

As such, and one by one, they suffered and died on that day and turned the dust of the Alamo into bloody mud. But they died with honor and valor unsurpassed in history.

Last month marked the end of the centennial year of the Army Medal of Honor. This medal, placed around the necks of heroes by Presidents, is the highest award which America can bestow upon her soldiers. The Medal of Honor has one word of inscription: valor. More often than not it is presented to a mother, a widow, a son or daughter.

Had circumstances been such that it were possible, there is no doubt that the Medal of Honor would have been conferred, posthumously, on each defender of the Alamo.

Certainly they met the medal's sternest criteria.

San Antonio, in 1836, was embroiled in one of the very few wars with foreign powers in which Americans have had to fight and die on their own soil. The intervening world conflicts and the remoteness of Korea and Vietnam have tended to lull many of us into wishful thinking that this modern Nation of ours, with its novel and amazing technological advances and production, somehow is impregnable.

But we who enjoy liberty today are not as many as the multitudes who have lost it, or worse, who have never really known it.

Tyranny, oppression, subversion, and aggression again are on the rampage. Their name is communism. Communism is dedicated to destruction. It means to conquer our intellects without destroying us physically, if possible. But communism envisions our total destruction, if that is what is necessary.

We must resist with all our mights and minds. We must be prepared to use every resource at our command to insure the prepetuation of independent thought and the resurrection of freedom where it now lies dead or dying.

If these words tend to discomfort you, then think how you might have reacted to the challenging words, with a similar ring to them, of Colonel Travis, if you had been within these walls in 1836. Travis told men of the Alamo garrison what they faced and what they stood to lose. To his everlasting honor, each man of the Alamo chose to meet the challenge, disregarding the life he stood to lose in favor of the freedom his loved ones and future generations stood to gain.

We are here today to examine our American spirit, in the same manner in which the men of the Alamo looked into their innermost selves as they sought their answer to the challenge of Travis.

If we crowd out of our minds the unpleasant spectre of Communist threats, and if we waver in choosing the only honorable course of action, to resist, then, ladies and gentlemen, we give but lip service to the American heroes, like the men of the Alamo, who gave us our birthrights.

Modern-day successors of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin only superficially deviate from the Communist plan of world domination. They hold hundreds of millions in subjection, they build the Berlin wall, and dig the trenches into which Castro's firing squads shoot their victims. They contemplate an entire world in slavery under Communist mastery.

Our determination must be just as stanch to lead all mankind to a world in which each person is free from injustice.

Such a world cannot be had for the asking. It must be won, and protected and preserved. We must be prepared as men have never prepared before, to resist any encroachment and defeat any aggression.

Engraved on the sally port in the famous fort named for Tennessee's Sam Houston, who turned Texas giant to avenge the Alamo at San Jacinto, are these words: "In peace prepare for war."

We know these are words of wisdom, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Now it is our time. Never before in history has liberty been faced with such challenge and danger. We are target number one for the Communists, never doubt it. They know that if we fail the rest of the free world can be conquered with ease.

Had those Texas patriots we honor today given in to their doubts and fears and the overwhelming odds against them, they would be buried now in oblivion. And the new Republic of Texas, which declared its independence during the Alamo siege, would have had a short life indeed. But with their uncompromising determination to die for freedom, because they scorned the coward's query: "What's in it for me?" They gained precious time for Sam Houston and his Texas army, gave them their battle cry, "Remember the Alamo," and insured the preservation of liberty and justice in Texas.

So let us resolve this day to give to these immortal heroes of the Alamo more than lip service. Let us pattern our own patriotism after their fierce loyalty to freedom and their fellow men.

In his last written appeal for aid, Col. William Barrett Travis wrote to "the people of Texas and all Americans in the world: * * * I shall never surrender or retreat * * *" and ended with the three words "victory or death" above his signature.

We must take up his gauntlet from the blood-consecrated dust of this freedom shrine. We must be determined, as these valiant men were determined, to die if necessary so that future generations may be free to remember the Alamo.

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it was a great pleasure recently to welcome to Washington Miss Kathy Fong, a Boise, Idaho, high school girl of Chinese ancestry who won the statewide Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Kathy proved a most charming ambassador of good will for our State during her visit here.

One has only to read her prize-winning speech to realize that she was richly deserving of the VFW award.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine address, as it appeared in the San Francisco Chinese World of February 25, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chinese World, Feb. 25, 1963]

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Katheryn Fong)

My name is Katheryn Fong, a unique name in that the first is of my native American birth, while the Fong bears the identity of my Chinese ancestry.

With the hordes of Chinese families fleeing to Hong Kong from Communist Red China this past year, I could fearfully sense

what horrible tortures they must be enduring.

Amongst them I see a young teenage girl, her frail body quivering from the cold, and the fear visible in her almond eyes. She grips the tiny hand of her baby sister, trying to give confidence when she herself has lost most of hers. They stand barefooted, dirty, clothes unkempt, and unbearably hungry.

I wonder, could I, could I be this young Chinese girl escaping to Hong Kong in search of a small bowl of rice, a warm jacket, and a place to rest? I imagine myself in flight from the Bamboo Curtain of China not really knowing why I must leave my home. Politics—what do they mean to me? I live my life, not disturbing anyone or anything. But they come anyway. These people who promise so much good for the country; more food in our stomachs, more money in our pockets; oh, yes, they make beautiful promises. They say they need what money and food we have to support the troops who fight to liberate us from the evil governments. So they took the little rice we had labored for from the mouths of our families to feed a cause we knew or cared little about. We have no realizations of governments that make promises, but were happy to keep what was ours. Then, our stomachs were full, we had clothes on our backs. Now, I must leave my old home searching for a scrap of food, a place to rest my tired eyes, and some rags to ease the pain of the cold.

Yes, yes, I could very well be that suffering girl, but no; I am much more fortunate. My father had the door of opportunity opened to him at the age of 15 when offered the chance to come to America, and he stepped through this door. He left his aging father on the dock in Hong Kong and bid a sad farewell to his home in China. Poor and ignorant of American customs and ways, he came. Why? Because he had heard stories of the great democracy in this country and was eager to plan his future in such a land. Dad was a frightened young boy who didn't even know the language, alone in a new land, but he wanted to be a part of this country and its people; so he studied and observed the ways and manners of his new home. It was a long hard struggle but he kept on trying—hoping someday he could make a life for his family here. He went back to China in 1938 for his bride, my mother. She was as frightened as he had been, but she had a husband who by now was a well-known Chinese merchant, a naturalized American citizen, and had served as a court interpreter. The father of nine children, he had become owner and operator of a Chinese restaurant by the time of my birth, the eighth child.

With the death of my father several months ago, we realized then the meaning behind his efforts. He believed in opportunities for every man who reached out for them. On the basis of my father's philosophy, four of my brothers have gone to college, one of my older sisters is employed by the State government, and my younger sister and I are attending public schools. Only in our free society could this have been possible. Yes, my father was a wise man who had the greatest faith of his adopted homeland. He loved his old China, but he died a true American.

When asked, "What does freedom mean to me?" I go back and I think of being on the outside, looking in—of that shivering girl fighting for a few grains of rice. I know that I will never know hunger as this Chinese girl has, or experience the misery she has known. Why do I know this? Because I am Katheryn Fong—American citizen.

Address by Hon. Thomas B. Curtis Before the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the very fine speech made by Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, before the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., which gives a clear picture of the fiscal situation of the U.S. Government as it relates to the proposal to cut taxes at this time.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE 18TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC.

It's a pleasure to have the opportunity of talking with a group like this on probably one of the most crucial issues that's going to face the 88th Congress. It's been played up in the press, as everyone is well aware, this question of tax cut. And I don't think there's any question that everyone in this country would like to see a tax cut. Unfortunately, whether or not to cut taxes isn't the sole issue. It's important, I think, that we get this entire fiscal question in context, in order to understand what we're going to face.

Probably the easiest way to get it into context is to discuss a little about the priorities that are going to exist as far as legislation coming before the House of Representatives, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee. I mention the House of Representatives rather than the Senate, because tax measures, revenue measures, must originate in the House of Representatives, and is one reason why the Ways and Means Committee becomes of key importance.

The President, in his budget message, said that one of the first measures that this Congress was going to have to act upon was to continue the temporary $308 billion ceiling on the Federal debt. The Ways and Means Committee is the committee that has to consider where we get the revenues to pay our bills. If we don't get them from taxation, we have to get them from selling bonds. The so-called debt limitation bill is really not a debt limitation. Its correct title is The amendments to the Liberty Loan Act. The so-called debt ceiling is descriptive of how much and of what kind of bonds—obligations of the United States—that may be outstanding at any given time. It is the outstanding obligations that are referred to when they talk about the debt ceiling. The law allows at the present time $308 billion of bonds that can be outstanding representing the debt. The actual total debt obligations of the United States may be more because all such obligations are not subject to the limit. Incidentally, the $308 billion ceiling was put on a temporary basis last year, and is automatically to revert to $285 billion on July 1, 1963, with intermediate adjustments. So, it's very obvious in light of the budget that has been presented to us, that we are going to have to do something about this debt ceiling almost immediately as a first order of business.

The President also said in his budget message, that sometime around July or August, he will have computed what the debt ceiling is going to have to be for 1964, and this session of Congress is going to have to do something about that. He has estimated around $315 billion, and actually, I think a realistic guess would be around $320 billion. Now, here's a problem that faces the Congress, the representatives of the people. What do we do in this deficit financing atmosphere to handle the Federal debt involving a rollover of around $90 billion a year of maturing bond refinancing? Fortunately, the Treasury has done a fairly good job of anticipating bond maturities so we only have about $60 to $70 billion to refinance. Add to this refinancing problem the problem of marketing, if we're going to have a $10 billion deficit, or you're going to have a $10 billion tax cut, marketing this additional $10 billion plus of new bonds necessitated by new deficits and a possible tax cut.

One of the arguments the Executive presents to us is that tax cutting is necessary to stimulate our economy. I don't think anyone could be more in favor of tax reforms than myself. I have been trying to point out the need for lower taxes for many, many years, and so have others. The real damage that is being caused to our economy and to our business opportunities is due to this high tax rate structure. But, when we point this need out we have also tried to point out that in order to accomplish tax reduction we have to get our Federal expenditures down to a point of manageable size. We have to control spending so that when we talk in terms of tax cuts we are not talking about financing a tax cut by a new bond issue. Because, all a bond is is deferred tax increases.

A question I have asked Dr. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Secretary Dillon of the Treasury, and other witnesses of the executive branch who appeared before us last August when we were talking about a "quickie" tax cut to stimulate the economy is—"What is the impact on the economy when we give $10 billion back to the private sector in the way of cut taxes, and then market $10 billion of bonds to finance that cut? Can we take the same amount back?" Well, Dr. Heller in effect replied: "I don't expect you to sell the bonds to the private sector. I expect the Federal Reserve System to absorb a good portion of them." I asked Dr. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the same question, and he said: "Well, we can't handle this kind of bond. You put this additional amount in the Federal Reserve System, and all you're doing is monetizing the debt, you're just printing more money."

This raises the danger of what will inflation do to our economy? These are not easy questions. Yes, I'd like to be able to tell this group and other groups around the country, "Let's go to it. We're going to cut taxes." But, if we cut taxes without cutting expenditures, we run into debt management problems, and I am very concerned over this impact of additional problems in the field of debt management on our balance-of-payment problem. We don't owe this debt just to ourselves. The nationals and governments of foreign countries—people abroad own over $20 billion of our dollar obligations. What's going to be the impact on those people and their willingness to hold our debt? Are they going to buy more of these bonds? Will they create a market or will they demand gold?

Last August the Treasury offered $750 million, 30-year bonds, 4¼ percent, the highest return that we've ever offered, and we sold $250 million worth. Sure we're selling a lot of E-bonds to our people, but our people are cashing in more E-bonds than they're buying. Now, has our country come to the point where we're not willing to face up to these problems? I begin to wonder when I read the press. I've said what I'm saying here, for months now, and, if there happens to be any press here, they'll quote me and say that Congressman CURTIS said that tax reform is very necessary and is right in line with the President's request for tax reform. They forget that what I've been saying all along is that this must be in a context with expenditure reform at the same time as tax rate reform, unless somebody has a new idea, a new way, whereby you can just continue marketing bonds without creating these impacts.

Let me turn to a little brighter page, in one sense. The theory on which the administration has promoted this concept of tax reform is that deficit financing actually will stimulate an economy. That Federal expenditures by the political bureaucracy with its alleged better understanding of what and how money should be spent will stimulate the economy. Well, this is the old New Deal theory, except that the New Deal never urged tax reduction. This concept of deficits may have had some validity in a society which has an economy based on the laws of scarcity. But, today our society, the first society in history, is moving into an economy where plenty is the problem, not scarcity. I don't say we are there yet; but this very group that I'm talking to will recognize what I'm saying, because in the agriculture sector, what would happen if you increased consumer purchasing power? Would we increase demand for agricultural goods and services? You increase consumer purchasing power which is automatically converted into consumer demand; the consumer demand for the goods and services increases the utilization of our plant and that employs more people. Now, are we going to utilize more of our agricultural plant if we increase consumer purchasing power? I think it's very clear that we are not going to do a thing in this great field of agriculture with its surpluses by increasing consumer purchasing power. Our doctors actually are telling us to eat less, not more, and we have a deliberate Government policy to close down some of our agricultural plant.

The argument is made that if we create a bigger deficit by cutting taxes that we will not let loose the forces of inflation because we have idle plant capacity, and we have men who are unemployed. It is argued that you do not create inflation by putting more purchasing power out. Let's relate that again to agriculture. Would some of the lands that are now being put out of production be restored to production? Would some of the people who are now, and have been since this country was established, going out of agriculture as an employment pursuit return to agriculture? People will agree with my use of the agriculture example but will say: look at steel which is operating at 60 percent of capacity. What would happen if we increased consumer purchasing power at a time when we are having in many respects a record-breaking year. For 2 years in a row automobiles and construction, two of the great users of steel, are at these high levels. I suggest that this idle steel plant capacity is not in demand and would not be in demand and would not be in demand even at a higher consumer demand because it is a capacity that is obsolete. Look what steel did this year with a 60-percent plant capacity utilization, it spent well over a billion dollars building more plant. More plant to produce the kind of steel for which they had the plants? No. This billion dollars is to produce a very thin steel sheet so that they can compete with plastics and other metals such as aluminum, that are moving into the markets that steel once held.

These are the problems of rapid economic growth, not of a tired, sick economy going nowhere. You don't have obsolete equipment and obsolete skills in a tired economy. If your economy is going nowhere, you have no change. Whatever your occupation is, it is still useable. It's only when your economy is growing rapidly that you have this increased obsolescence of plant and equipment. And so these are some of the problems, gentlemen, that underlie this issue of whether or not to cut taxes that is before the Ways and Means Committee; and then it will move on to the floor of the House and to the Senate. Briefly on the subject of tax rate reform I would say that reducing the corporate tax rate from 52 percent to a rate of 49 percent or a 47-percent rate actually would produce more revenue, in my judgment, because we are now beyond the point of diminishing returns in the high rates. Now, that kind of reform can come at any time, and should come at the earliest possible time, but it follows a completely different economic philosophy from that which says that this tax reduction is going to release purchasing power to the private sector, or investment power if you want to use the money for investment. Support for the need to cut the corporate rate and the top bracket individual rates is on the theory that the tax rates themselves are so high that they produce diminishing returns. I think that if we can get some people to come along with that kind of thinking, we may come forward with some tax reform legislation.

Tax reform of the nature urged by the administration is going to take many months to develop if it is developed at all, because of the requirement that if we cut taxes, we have to compensate revenue-wise by closing what are called loopholes. Well, what is one man's loophole in another man's equity. And one of the most important areas that has been pointed out as a loophole is something that affects your industry. I refer to the depletion allowances. Is this allowance really a loophole? Actually, it's a differential, reflecting the fact that in the extractive industry, you are bringing out capital—a portion of what you dig out of the ground is depleting your capital asset, and under the 16th amendment capital recovery is not to be taxed as income. Depletion is necessary so that when you have depleted an ore body or mineral deposit, you can replace it and remain in business. But, if an attack on depletion is going to be the kind of reform that the administration urges or if the Treasury comes forward with the proposal to repeal the dividend credit, which was put into the tax laws in 1954, then there is serious doubt that there will be substantive tax reform this year.

I want to say just a word about this dividend credit and then close out my remarks. The dividend credit was put in the tax laws not to give a break to the investor at all. The issue is this. There are three ways a business can finance its growth. One is from retained earnings, another is from borrowing—either from a bank or debt financing—and the third way is through equity financing by floating new stock issues. The first two ways are taxed only once. Retained earnings have the corporate tax of 52 percent, but they do not get taxed against the individual holder, that is unless he wants to sell, and then it's only taxed at 25 percent. Certainly if you borrow from the bank to finance your growth, or issue bonds to finance growth, you deduct the interest that you pay from the income subject to the 52-percent corporate tax, and it's only taxable once. A new equity issue, the healthiest way, I might say, to finance growth, is taxed twice. It's taxed at the 52 percent, and then when the corporation declares the dividends, it's taxed at the personal income rates. And all we were trying to do in 1954 was to, in a small way, bring about a little equalization so that this form of financing was not put at a disadvantage with these other two methods.

But, you notice, and the only reason I use this to illustrate it, some of the complexities involved in some of these tax issues, particularly as you relate them to economics and you relate them to economic growth. The issue of tax reduction and reform is not anything that's going to be decided immediately. The area of tax reform is something that we should be in at all times. I have a number of bills introduced that I hope we can move forward on. One is a small business tax bill. I call it the seed corn bill. I was talking with a group this morning to see what chances there might be of moving this forward, and I told them this: "Don't lose hope, because once we open the door to reviewing our tax structure, we don't have to pursue the economic line that the administration has presented, which I do not agree with because it is based upon this concept of deficit financing." The kind of tax reform I am now advocating and discussing is always applicable. It is a matter of equity. It's a matter of specifics. In your industry you can point out that tax rates are impeding your economic growth. We have something to talk about when we deal with sound fiscal principles, sound economics, and sound tax policy. Under those conditions I think that we might have some good tax reform, even in this coming Congress, and that would be, I might say, with the help of people on both sides of the aisle.

The Problem of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the President's first manpower report, submitted to Congress last week, was a historic and significant document which gave exhaustive confirmation of the fact that unemployment is our major domestic problem today. The report also made it clear that our Nation is suffering from underuse of our human resources, that the unemployment problem is complicated by forces never encountered in our economy before, and that the problem will be further complicated in the future.

Two recent editorials—in the March 12 issue of the Daily Journal, of Elizabeth, N.J., and the March 18 issue of the Washington Post—give excellent reports on some of the major points made in the report, and discuss some of the programs intended to deal with the most pressing problems of our national unemployment emergency. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT

President Kennedy's first manpower report, submitted in accordance with the pro-

visions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, is a sobering document which should convince even the most casual reader that unemployment, the Nation's most pressing economic problem, is not susceptible of quick and easy solutions.

Since 1947 some 10 million new jobs have been created, bringing the volume of employment to an all-time record of 67.8 million in 1962. Nevertheless, employment opportunities have failed to keep pace with the rapidly growing labor force, and since 1958 the average rate of unemployment has been well in excess of 5.5 percent. There are now 4.9 million jobless persons who comprise 6.1 percent of the labor force, and unless the present trend is sharply reversed, the problem will become more acute. According to the President's calculations:

"The net growth of the labor force in the sixties is expected to be about 13 million, more than 50 percent greater than in the fifties.

"Unless the growth of new job opportunities is also accelerated, unemployment totals will rise. If in the next 5 years we provide new employment at the pace of the last 5, by 1967 unemployment will come to over 5½ million, or more than 7 percent of the 1967 labor force."

Although our knowledge of the causes underlying the rising trend of unemployment is as yet imperfect, some of the more salient factors are readily discernible. Labor has been displaced by advances in technology and the striking gains in man-hour productivity. Since 1947, output per man-hour in private industry has increased at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, and these gains, rather than increases in man-hours of work, account for more than 80 percent of the growth of total output since 1947. Employment in the manufacturing sector has been declining since 1956, and the introduction of labor-saving technology has doubtless affected employment even in those sectors of the economy which have been growing most rapidly.

The technological innovations of the past 15 years have also created employment opportunities, but the jobs which they have produced demand skills and a degree of sophistication that cannot be supplied by the traditional blue-collar worker with a limited education. Yet 7.5 million out of the 26 million young people entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970—or some 29 percent—will lack high school diplomas. Unless the gap between the requirements demanded by the new technology and the educational attainment of those entering the labor force can be narrowed, widespread unemployment among young people is likely to persist.

The difficulties created by rapid technological change can be substantially mitigated by fiscal and monetary policies designed to accelerate the overall rate of economic growth. But their elimination will require a massive program for the retraining of displaced workers and a nationwide effort to lower the high school dropout rate. While a promising start was made with the passage of the Manpower Development Act which will provide for the training of some 400,000 people over a 3-year period, it is only the beginning of what will prove to be a very long campaign.

A PLEA TO CREATE MORE JOBS

Wasted lives and unrealized production indisputably are potent forces retarding the Nation's economy that can be lessened, if not obliterated, as President Kennedy suggests in his latest communication to the Congress. He again called for action on his tax cut proposals and other programs designed to spur economic growth and job expansion.

Automation, seasonal conditions, inability of skilled workers to find suitable jobs, and sloth are factors in unemployment. Employment has increased only 17 percent in the last 15 years, while the potential labor force was growing by 21 percent.

Even at the moment the ratio of unemployment is rising when it should be subsiding under normal pressures and it now exceeds 6.1 percent. The recent norm has been 5.5 percent, which many economists consider as too high. The President fears it will be more than 7 percent by 1967.

Mr. Kennedy contends that Federal tax reduction is the practical way to spur the economy. A major effect, he believes, would be to open up more jobs, and as more men and women went into gainful pursuits, abandoning idleness and the unemployment compensation rolls, production and sales would be stimulated to new proportions.

There are many people who think that a tax cut should be accompanied by overhaul of the whole tax structure and budget reduction. Nevertheless the President's data and comments on the impact of a lightened tax load on unemployment will be persuasive.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the largest advance in employment has been in Federal and State Government, mainly teachers. This of course is less stimulative to the general economy than creative jobs in industry and commerce.

American production is less than its potential, but it cannot rise nor can the marketplace absorb more products until more men and women are employed gainfully. A tax cut would allow each more money to pour into the economy, both for necessities or for an occasional luxury, and then that spending would open up more jobs.

The Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, Oklahoma's major industry is agriculture and we Sooners are proud of this fact. Agriculture is a good industry. It has sustained Oklahoma's economy in the past, and it offers great hope for the future.

Oklahoma for years has been a national leader in a number of farm products. We are proud of this. But, above all, we are proud of the wholesome young men and women who are the product of farm life.

Recently, the Future Farmers of America bestowed the high honor of Star Farmer on five of our young men for their outstanding agricultural activities. Among these winners was John Kusel of Fort Cobb, who was named the 1963 Star Farmer of Oklahoma.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and as a fellow Oklahoman, I congratulate these young men for their accomplishments in this field so important to Oklahoma and to the Nation.

A summary of their work is given in two articles published by the Daily Oklahoman. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE'S STAR FARMER NAMED

(By the State Staff)

STILLWATER.—A 17-year-old Fort Cobb farm boy was named the 1963 Star Farmer of Oklahoma Thursday.

John Kusel, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Kusel, received the State's highest award for Schoolboy Farmers during ceremonies Thursday at the 37th annual Oklahoma Future Farmers of America convention. The award includes a $200 check from the National FAA Foundation and the Governor's Trophy presented annually to the Star Farmer.

Kusel, whose farm projects are worth $11,123, was earlier one of 335 FFA boys to receive the Junior Master Farmer degree as the State's outstanding graduating seniors studying vocational agriculture in high schools. The convention is being held on the Oklahoma State campus through Friday.

The 335 youths from 170 communities have a net worth of $1,507,135 or an average of $4,409 each. For the fifth consecutive year, Junior Master Farmer candidates had an investment of over $1 million.

Kusel was among the five district star farmers honored before the closely guarded secret of the Star Farmer's identity was revealed.

Other district winners were Jimmy Colpitt, Collinsville; Charles Hartin, Madill; Carl Jay Jarboe, Lexington, and John Aaron Linn, Red Rock.

John started his farm career in a small way. He purchased six pigs from saving a weekly allowance when he was in the eighth grade. He charged the feed, sold the pigs in the spring, paid for the feed and raised six acres of cotton. From the cotton and pig money he bought a cow. He planted 12 acres of wheat the fall he enrolled as a high school freshman.

With income from these efforts and $340 he borrowed, he increased his projects when a sophomore to 21 head of swine, 8 head of beef cattle, 50 turkeys, 132 acres of wheat and 10 acres of maize.

He has followed the same program of increasing the size of his projects and now owns 22 head of beef cattle and 7 head of swine valued at $5,435. He also has 120 acres of wheat and 45 acres of peas and rye on maize.

The youth owns a tractor, cultivator, planter and harrow. For his crops John pays cash rent on 160 acres and crop rent on 142 acres. He trades labor and machinery with his father and younger brothers.

He has served as president, vice president, and reporter of his FFA chapter. He has won first place in district speaking contests. He has served as a page in the legislature, a class officer, has been a delegate to Boys State and is a member of the honor society.

During 4 years of high school, he has an almost straight A average.

FFA SALUTES CREAM OF CROP

STILLWATER.—Five Future Farmers of America youths—including Star Farmer John Kusel, of Fort Cobb—Thursday were named 1963 star farmers of their respective districts.

The other four include Carl Jay Jarboe, 17, of Lexington, central district; Jimmy Colpitt, 18, of Collinsville, northeast; John Aaron Linn, 18, of Red Rock, northwest; and Charles L. "Hank" Martin, 17, of Madill, southeast.

Kusel, 17, represented the southwest district.

Young Jarboe received his district plaque and pin and a $50 check from the National FFA Foundation after being one of the 335 FFA youths to receive Junior Master Farmer Degrees earlier in the day.

Son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Jarboe, Carl lives on the family farm southeast of Lexington. He has an outstanding FFA record and is a top vocational agriculture student at Lexington High School.

Jarboe obtained his start by working for neighbors and from a hog-fattening project on which he and his father split the profit. From this he bought his first hogs and heifers. He has accumulated four registered Hereford heifers and 17 head of registered Hampshire hogs.

Colpitt, also a Junior Master Farmer, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. James Colpitt, of Collinsville.

First starting in the Hereford cattle business, Jimmy sold his cattle and using this money and money borrow from his father, he purchased Angus cattle. Now he has livestock valued at $30,185.

To help pasture his cattle Jimmy rents 320 acres of land. Since his father is also in the cattle business, he allows Jimmy to use his machinery and equipment for necessary chores in return for which Jimmy helps with the feeding and care of his father's cattle.

Young Linn, another Junior Master Farmer, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Linn, and lives on the family farm north of Red Rock.

Linn has developed a well-rounded program including beef fattening, beef breeding, swine production, and crop production. He owns 28 head of Angus cattle and 51 head of hogs, all of which are valued at more than $7,500.

In addition he has bought 40 acres of land, and rents 10 acres which he uses for cropland.

A gift of a registered heifer from his grandfather was enough to get John Aaron started in the farming business, and by purchasing additional heifers and saving the offspring he has accumulated his present herd.

Martin, a Junior Master Farmer, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. F. L. Martin, southeast of Madill.

Charles was given a calf by his father as his start. He sold the calf and bought a registered cow. He then borrowed money from the bank and bought several more cows. His livestock is valued at more than $15,000.

Ratification of the United Nations Convention on Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York and chairman of the All Americans Council of the Democratic National Committee recently made a statement urging the U.S. Senate to ratify the United Nations Convention on Genocide.

The Convention on Genocide has been adopted by 64 member nations of the United Nations, but it has never been ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement of Mayor Wagner printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATIFICATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE

Fifteen long years have passed since the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Convention on Genocide, which forbids the intentional destruction of national, racial, religious, or ethnic groups.

More than 15 years have passed since the last unmarked trains, packed with doomed and guiltless men, women, and children, moved through the night toward mass graves and oblivion. Since that time, the crime of genocide has been committed again and again, most of all in Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain.

Today, 64 member nations of the United Nations, including the U.S.S.R., have ratified the Genocide Convention. The United States, which supported the measure in the U.N., has thus far failed to ratify the Convention. Since 1952, it has been pigeonholed in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This, of course, is contrary to the intent and spirit of America.

The U.N. Convention on Genocide should be ratified immediately. There is no reason for further delay. I am urging the President to use his influence in behalf of early and speedy action by the Senate.

Opportunity for the Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring the Midwest into more prominence as a center of space research and development, leaders in the educational and business fields of that area have sponsored the Chicago and Midwest Space Month, the highlight of which will be a 9-day National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, which starts tomorrow, May 1.

Space Month has opened up for the Midwest new possibilities of participation in the Nation's efforts to explore space. Certainly the outstanding educational and technological skills and industrial capacity of the Chicago area—the site of the first nuclear project—can, and will, add immeasurably to those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorials and news articles, which I call to the attention of my colleagues, dramatize the story of the Chicago and Midwest Space Month:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 29, 1963]

OPPORTUNITY FOR THE MIDWEST

As the Midwest Space Month draws to a close the most important of the scheduled events is left for the last. It is a national conference on the peaceful uses of space and it will take place in the Civic Opera House from May 6 through May 9. The conference is of immense interest to every company in the Midwest—whether they make toasters or tractors, glass or steel.

The Midwest has been called (and rightly) the "sleeping giant of the space age." For generations this great central part of the United States has been a leader in technological advancement and industrial know-how. During World War II the Midwest region around Chicago performed a full third of all the industrial contracts in the war effort. In 1960, boasting 20 percent of the U.S. population, this regional area produced 25 percent of the Nation's Ph. D.'s in science and engineering.

Yet the Midwest has been bypassed in the space age. There are 41 States with research and development contracts from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). California has 25 percent of those contracts; Florida 14 percent; Missouri 7 percent; Michigan 0.6 percent.

Illinois? A lowly 0.4 percent.

By any standard Chicago and the Midwest should have a leading role in the Nation's program to explore space. NASA is now teaming up with Midwest educators and businessmen to bring the conference to Chicago because NASA needs production capacity and research intelligence—if the area is interested enough to provide these vital essentials.

Hale Nelson, a vice president of Illinois Bell Telephone Co., who has been working night and day to alert the Midwest businessmen to the opportunities in space research and development says that this unusual and authoritative conference is of the utmost value to the businessman. Nelson says: "Any thinking businessman making almost any product should attend these conferences—if only in self defense. His competitors will, in all probability, be sitting in the front row soaking up the latest words on research and how to get at it. The experts—Von Braun, Minow, Pickering, Webb * * * there are some 50 like this who will be in attendance—will make their expertise clear and concise for the layman."

The heartland of the United States has been bypassed by the more glamorous (from the standpoint of weather and movie stars) parts of the country. Chicago and the Midwest have the know-how, the industrial capacity is there, the educational institutions are the best. The area should have far more of the NASA research and development work. This conference next week is the one sure way to find out how to go about getting that work.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 8, 1963]

KNOWLEDGE, FACILITIES ARE HERE: MILLER—INDUSTRY MUST COOPERATE

(By Ridgely Hunt)

The space age is not right around the corner. It is already upon us, lusty and loud—as loud as the voices that tell us Chicago is already falling behind.

A stern warning comes from Dr. Roscoe Miller, president of Northwestern University. He said the Midwest has the facilities and know-how to compete in the space age, but industry must cooperate in their use or "miss the ship * * * the space ship."

Governor Kerner laments: "The Midwest is only now beginning to realize its shortcomings."

WARNING BY LOGELIN

And Edward C. Logelin, president of the Chicago Association of Commerce warned that failure to invest in space research now could bring about the collapse of many of our outstanding commercial enterprises.

If this dark vision comes to pass, Chicago will become an economic no man's land, full of bread lines and silent factories. Could it happen?

"Baloney," snorted Charles W. N. Thompson, an engineering official at Admiral Corp. "Chicago has a hardnosed, hard-dollar kind of business."

Its executives are not blind to the space age, he said; they simply prefer to make their money in the consumer market.

SEVENTY-ONE ILLINOIS FIRMS ON JOB

Actually, the Midwest is doing much contract work for space projects:

(1) Seventy-one companies in Illinois are producing parts for the 2-man Gemini space-

craft. Among these firms are Allied Radio Corp. and Union Carbide Corp.

(2) Elgin National Watch Co. is turning out ion-trap program switches for space exploring satellites.

(3) A South Side Chicago company, DK Manufacturing Co., is providing fuel supply lines for the Saturn rocket.

(4) The AC Spark Plug Division of General Motors Corp., at a Milwaukee plant, is manufacturing a special gyroscope for the Apollo moon rocket navigation and guidance system.

Although this new industry is manned by flesh-and-blood people—the man next door, the person ahead of you on the CTA bus—they are using words and making products undreamed of 10 years ago.

NEW VOCABULARY

Businessmen have had to make themselves thoroughly familiar with the new vocabulary. Men like Hale Nelson, vice president of Illinois Bell Telephone Co., are not impractical daydreamers. But they chat easily about Atlas and Saturn, Mercury and Gemini, because this language is in common use on the production line and in the executive suite.

The Bell System, in fact, made the versatile Telstar and paid the Federal Government $2,700,000 to rocket it into orbit. The Bell System makes not a dime on Telstar, which bounces television signals across the ocean, because its licensing agreement forbids it to charge a fee. The company is betting on the future, gambling that a multimillion-dollar research investment now will pay handsome dividends tomorrow. And the phone company seldom bets on anything but a sure thing.

SPACE MONTH TO OPEN

Nelson is general chairman of Midwest Space Month, which opens here tomorrow, a massive effort by a few Chicago businessmen and educators to awaken the Midwest to the facts of life in the space age. Such institutions as the Museum of Science and Industry and the Adler planetarium will stage special exhibitions for the public.

But the underlying purpose of Space Month is to persuade businessmen here that they are in danger of a disastrous defeat in the space race, not at the hands of the Russian military, but in the fierce competition with east and west coast industry.

[From the Chicago American, Mar. 15, 1963]

HAS CHICAGO MISSED THE BOAT?—SPACE CONTRACTS SWELL JOB ROLLS: BUT NOT HERE

(By Norton Kay)

Winning more defense and space contracts won't solve all of Chicago's economic ills, but it would make significant inroads in Chicago's unemployment problem.

In one of Governor Kerner's periodic radio reports, he said that Chicago has added only 2,000 jobs in the electronics field in the last 3 years.

During the same time period Los Angeles, one of the bastions of the west coast defense effort, added 46,000.

Minneapolis and St. Paul, in recent years, have made a concerted effort to beef up defense procurement. In 1955, the Twin Cities had 86 electronics firms, employing 26,110 persons.

In 1961, they had 153 electronics firms employing 44,438, for net increases of 67 firms with 18,000 employees. The firms generated sales in excess of $700 million, with payrolls of more than $250 million.

DEFENSE WORK IMPROVES AREA

From 1950 to 1960, Boston, the hub of New England electronics development, cut its unemployment by more than 9,000—having found employment for 3 percent of its unemployed.

Securing defense work helps an area to improve itself in several sectors of the economy.

Simply adding the necessary research people to a firm's staff won't cut unemployment significantly. However, in an atmosphere of luring defense work, the fact that a firm is emphasizing research serves as an invitation to more electronics firms to build there; alerts suppliers to move into the area and generates competition by allied firms.

Once the resurgence begins to take place there is a series of economic repercussions. New employees will need new homes, bringing a boom for the construction industry.

New homes need furniture and TV sets, and a boom starts in these trades. Retail sales, including food and leisure goods, increase.

PRODUCT SPINOFF MOST IMPORTANT

But perhaps the most important offshoot is the spinoff of new products from research. Commercial spinoff means new industries, new factories and the employment of skilled, semiskilled, and most important, need for unskilled who can be trained.

At the request of Dr. Norton Long, economic consultant and special assistant to Governor Gerner, the Academy for Interscience Methodology, sent a list of suggestions on Chicago industrialists, civic leaders and government officials to consider. Among these suggestions were:

(1) Aim toward bringing 10-20 percent of the research and development production of atomic power to Chicago.

(2) Get involved in small reactor design.

(3) Get more deeply involved with byproducts of radioactive isotopes used in medicine, industry, agriculture and space.

(4) Watch for opportunities in developments from the field of solid state physics (transistors).

(5) Work toward winning prime Government contracts in satellite projects. This can best be done by a select working team from among interested Illinois firms. An early goal should be to seek the best purpose for which to propose a future satellite.

(6) Other areas of possible work are detection, navigation, homing, space simulation (that is simulating conditions of space such as, extreme colds and high vacuums) and validating ideas.

The letter contained this passage, which should serve as a warning to Illinois businessmen of what could happen:

"Before the end of World War II, the R. & D. production of nuclear reactors was the absolute monopoly of the Manhattan project (Enrico Fermi's nuclear reaction underneath Slagg Field. * * * In 1946, the project was moved to Oak Ridge and that summer, the first course in reactor design was given at Oak Ridge to people invited from industry. * * * Companies represented included General Electric, Westinghouse, and so forth. * * * These are now the experienced senior reactor design engineers for most of the companies involved in nuclear power reactor construction industry.

BOSTON FORMING SUPERORGANIZATION

"It is a tragedy that the Midwest, which supplied almost all the initial R. & D. in nuclear reactor work, did not followup industrially in the production phase."

Let no on be deceived into believing that a spasm of publicity automatically will bring defense contracts to Chicago. Areas that are ahead in the field plan to stay ahead and get further ahead.

Boston area electronics firms reportedly are forming a kind of superorganization—a nonprofit company at that. The company would represent various companies in the electronics field in Boston and would bid as a prime contractor, subcontracting to member companies.

There are reports that Texas firms trying to fight their way into prominence are organizing to present team bids and including Boston area research firms in the teams.

EFFORTS MET WITH LIMITED SUCCESS

Team efforts have been tried here in Chicago, but have met with limited success.

One wonders if, 10 years from now, someone will write, as did the Interscience Academy 2 months ago:

"If Chicago had started such a concentration of commercial power in reactor capability in 1946 to 1950, by today it could well have been the largest single center for such work."

No less an authority than George W. Beadle, president of the University of Chicago is optimistic about Chicago's chances. He said:

"It's not too late for the Middle West to develop an intensive effort to achieve a capability in space age industry."

One of the brightest hopes for the area is the fact that NASA has made a $2 million grant to the university to build an interdisciplinary space center connected to the Fermi Institute for Nuclear Research. Groundbreaking ceremonies will be held May 1 to coincide with the opening of "space math."

The lab will be locted between 56th and 57th Streets and between Ellis and Drexel Avenues. University officials are hopeful that the lab will be operational by the close of 1964. A unique aspect of the lab will be that scientists from a variety of disciplines, including social science, will do research work in the lab.

The Ruinous Consequences of Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal, entitled, "The Ruinous Consequences of Thrift."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUINOUS CONSEQUENCES OF THRIFT

Nothing could be more ruinous to the security of this country and our economy than big cuts in the budget, President Kennedy declared the other day. He had in mind reductions on the order of $5 billion to $15 billion out of total funds available to the Government, from past and prospective appropriations, estimated at $195 billion.

A citizen reared in a sterner time might react with a "how's that again?" to such profound opposition to thrift. On this occasion, however, the President took some pains to explain exactly what he meant by discussing the economic experience of the past 5 years or so, with particular emphasis on the earlier part. This period is increasingly being presented as one of the most dismal in our history, though most Americans may not remember it that way.

In 1957 and 1958, the President noted, there was a stretchout of Federal spending, with an especially sharp drop in defense orders. The upshot: A rise in unemployment, a lowering of business activity, a reduction of Federal revenues helping to cause a deficit

in fiscal 1959 of $12.5 billion—the highest, Mr. Kennedy recalled, in peacetime history.

Now since the Government does spend such huge sums every year, it is certainly true that sudden fluctuations will have an economic impact. Still, not even the President contends that this was by any means the whole cause of the 1958 recession.

And the argument against thrift, based on that experience, loses some of its potency when it is remembered that spending, despite any temporary stretchout of orders, kept right on rising. By no means modestly either; the increase from fiscal 1956 through 1959 was over $14 billion. So it is hard to find the alleged Federal frugality that allegedly had such untoward results.

We confess to some confusion, moreover, about that 1959 deficit. In the Government view, it was a terrible thing, and we agree. Yet the same Government carefully plans a fiscal 1964 deficit of $12 billion, barely squeaking under the 1959 figure, and proclaims it to be a wonderful tonic for the economy. One administration's poison, apparently, is another's meat.

The argument for ever bigger spending and deficits loses further force when the Government protests too much that everything it does is absolutely vital. Thus Budget Director Gordon has said that the proposed 1964 spending of $98.8 billion (more than $32 billion above 1956) should not merely be compared with previous years because the Nation is constantly changing, its needs growing.

Indeed it is changing; the demands of defense and space, whether exaggerated or not, are a sufficient indication. Yet this very change also means that many activities are wholly unsuitable to current conditions. The Government goes right on doing practically everything it has done for 30 years, the vast patchwork of subsidies and controls, and simply keeps piling new programs atop the old. To the Government, it would seem, change works in only one direction; it always means adding, never subtracting.

The constant additions impose new burdens on the individual and the economy, holding back the potential for greater growth. It cannot be entirely senseless to suggest that lessening the burdens would help rather than hurt America.

In any event, the official attitude toward thrift is highly illuminating. We have heard, as have perhaps the Federal economists, of spendthrift governments bringing down ruin. We are familiar with governments forgetting thrift out of sloth, incompetence, and political greed.

But it is something else—progress?—to find this one-time virtue not merely ignored but denounced as a positive vice.

Representative Cederberg Urges Firm Dedication to the Principles of Historic Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], addressed the annual Rendezvous Banquet of the National Society of Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company here in Washington.

Our colleague's remarks were very timely and presented a challenge to all freedom-loving Americans. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his address at this point in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE CEDERBERG URGES FIRM DEDICATION TO THE PRINCIPLES OF HISTORIC HERITAGE

It is particularly pleasant to speak to an audience composed of women descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company. I am doubly pleased to be here because your president, Mrs. Hugh Glover, Jr., comes from my congressional district. Your organization is made up of American patriots who have a deep appreciation of our national traditions. You can look backward with pride and forward with viligance.

The founding members of the Artillery Company, of course, were British subjects. The day of independence, which was to rock the entire world with its revolutionary concepts, was yet 138 years in the future.

As you know, on March 13, 1638, a charter was granted to Robert Keayne, Nathaniell Duncan, Robert Sedgwick, and William Spencer, providing that they, "and such others as are already joined with them and such as they shall from time to time take into their company, shall be called the Military Company of Massachusetts."

Several changes in the name were made during the first century of the company's existence. Since 1738 it has usually been designated as the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.

A multitude of changes have taken place since the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company was organized on the first Monday in June 1638. The colonial settlements prospered, our independence from the mother country was achieved, a new constitution was adopted, and a nation was wrested from the wilderness.

As important as they are, the dates, places and events of the colonial, Revolutionary and postwar period in which the early members of the Artillery Company lived, fought, and died may be said to be of secondary consequence when compared with the motives which produced these events.

I say all this because all of us know that the reasons men give their lives are always greater, at least to themselves, than is the fact that they are making such great sacrifices.

It was just this motivation, this devotion to the principles we recognize today as America's historic heritage, which allowed the militiamen of Massachusetts and the other colonies not quite 200 years ago to throw off the shackles of tyranny and found a land of freedom and plenty, the greatest the world had ever known.

Our internal economy has developed along lines undreamed of by our pioneer forebears. Our place in world affairs has changed, and the change has brought increased burdens and responsibilities.

MEANINGFUL HERITAGE

Despite all that has occurred in the past 325 years, the heritage left to us by our forefathers has meaning in the world today.

Liberty, patriotism, courage, industry and initiative—these are the principles that have made America great. These are the principles that will continue to sustain us in the years to come.

It does not minimize the problems faced by our forefathers to say that the world in which we find ourselves today is in a state of chaos and confusion.

Everywhere the evil forces of communism press against the frontiers of the free world. Crisis follows crisis. What the future may hold for us and for those unborn cannot be foretold.

Of one thing, however, we may be certain. The eternal verities by which men live will not lose their luster. In the critical days ahead the values that are so essential a part of the American tradition will be those that have always guided man in his long journey from darkness to light.

We have seen in the history of our country how in generations past this Nation has repeatedly been brought out of confusion because patriotic heroes stood fast.

They were not ordinary men. They were men who shared with Patrick Henry the noble sentiment "Give me liberty or give me death." They were men who would have scorned the shameful motto, "Better Red than dead."

They held in their keeping the safety and progress of the Republic. They kept alight the lamp of liberty because they refused to betray their spiritual heritage by abandoning the eternal values embodied in the concepts of truth, justice, mercy, and high regard for the integrity of their fellow men.

I know that I do not need to urge on this assemblage the value of perpetuating our American heritage. I am certain that we are agreed on the need to inculcate in the younger generation a sound knowledge of American history.

I fear the privilege of living in the United States in an atmosphere of liberty often suffers the same fate as many of the other good things in our lives. They are often taken for granted and treated with indifference.

REAWAKEN MEANING OF CITIZENSHIP

It is on occasions like this that we are reawakened to the meaning of citizenship in this land of ours. We are put on notice that we owe our country a firmer loyalty, a more active patriotism. This recognition is a stimulant for all of us.

The danger to America lies in certain attitudes that have become too common.

First, there is the attitude of certain sophisticates and pseudointellectuals who ridicule the idea of patriotism and the feeling of reverence for our great charters of freedom.

Second, there is the appalling ignorance of the American tradition on the part of a large body of our countrymen.

Third, there is the apathy toward our national traditions by those who have knowledge of them but think of them as true but trite.

Patriotism must mean more than merely cheering when the flag goes by. It must be active, not passive, deep rooted, not superficial.

As American citizens we must be vigilant and unwavering in defending our form of government and our way of life.

Civilizations have perished because individuals ceased to have a fighting faith in their cause and in themselves.

Our abundance and power among nations is attributable only to the principles that all men of this land should be forever free and be allowed to pursue happiness in their own manner, with the least possible interference or direction from government.

These principles were set down in the Declaration of Independence and were made legal guarantees in our Federal Constitution. In the composition of the latter document, painstaking care was taken to preserve its meaning and intent. A system of checks and balances was decreed for our Government to forever eliminate the possibility of dictatorial rule by the executive, the judiciary, or the legislative branch.

The most specific language was employed to protect the individual freedoms of all Americans, and the right of redress for wrong, whether by government, individuals, or private groups, was made amply clear.

DANGEROUS ATTACKS ON CONSTITUTION

It is paradoxical that many of the attacks on our Constitution have been

launched in the name of the very freedoms it guaranteed.

It is on these grounds today that the Communists, who have pledged to destroy our form of government, insist in the courts that freedom of speech, assembly, and press, which are our heritage, guarantees them the right to go about, quite openly, with their seditious and traitorous programs.

It is on these grounds that most of the other assaults have been made. Freedom of people to worship has been misinterpreted to mean that worship itself should be prohibited or restricted in certain cases. The freedom our forefathers enjoyed in raising their own food on their own land has been held to be a denial of the freedom of others to obtain a high price for their produce, and the Federal Government now tells us whether we are to sow or harvest and what, if anything, we may plant.

I could go on, for these attacks are continuous and are being carried out with ever greater determination and success, but I do not wish to take so much of your time with details.

It should be sufficient to say that our constitutional liberties are constantly under attack and the enemy is winning. He is winning because the average American either is apathetic to the patriotism which burned so brightly in our society during the first 150 years of our independence or because he accepts at face value the false premises of those who hold alien philosophies.

In fact, there is no phrase in the propaganda arsenal employed by the anticonstitutionalists with such telling effect as the term "superpatriot."

When I was a boy, I was taught that just about everyone who fought for American independence was a patriot, and it was implied, at least, that the superpatriots were those who made the extra sacrifice in the cause of freedom, such as Nathan Hale.

Today, this term is being used in application to everyone who believes in our Constitution and an assorted lot of extremists who don't. The inclusion of crackpot elements under the same covering term as is applied to those who are truly patriotic is a studied and calculated attempt to discredit those of us who sincerely believe in our constitutional system.

But there is one certain way to defeat such not-so-subtle attempts to discredit true patriotism. That is through the avenues still left open to us by the existing guarantees of our Constitution—the ballot. Your vote in behalf of patriotic candidates can and should be as powerful as the muskets in the hands of the minutemen.

BE PROUD OF PATRIOTISM

In addition, it would be well if all Americans were a little prouder of their patriotism, as you are. I think former President Eisenhower expressed this belief best when he said recently:

"Too many of us Americans have become so sophisticated that we are inclined to think of any honest emotion, including a public display of patriotism, as corny It is hard for me to imagine anyone being ashamed of patriotism, yet there it is. And this attitude can scarcely fail to seep down to our children."

General Eisenhower also recommended that American parents spend more time with their children in discussions of the proud deeds and idealistic traditions of our country.

It is our duty to see that the knowledge of this heritage is transmitted to our children. Our efforts in that direction have been hampered by so-called progressive educators. Over the last 30 years they have succeeded in introducing into many schools the so-called core curriculum. Under this system, history, Government, geography, English, and possibly other subjects are thrown together in a core course, taught by one teacher. At best, it is not always easy to secure teachers with sufficient knowledge of one of these subjects to teach it well. To find teachers who can teach all of them effectively is almost a hopeless dream.

In many cases the result is that students complete the course with little knowledge of any of the subjects involved.

Some years ago the New York Times conducted a survey to determine the proficiency of college freshmen in American history. Seven thousand students in 36 colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined.

A large majority of the college freshmen showed that they had virtually no knowledge of even the most elementary aspects of American history. They knew almost nothing about many phases of our country's growth and development.

Many of the students could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt.

They had little conception of the significant trends that have made the United States the Nation it is today.

Even more alarming than the lack of knowledge was the amount of misinformation that the survey disclosed.

For example, 1,705 of the 7,000 students, or almost 25 percent, did not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War. Over 150 students thought that Jefferson Davis was President of the United States during that period. Only 1,126 of the 7,000 students, or 16 percent, were familiar with the contributions made by Thomas Jefferson. Nearly 50 percent of the students confused President Andrew Jackson with Gen. Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson of Civil War fame.

Forty men were listed as President of the United States who never held that office.

The catalog of deplorable ignorance could be continued almost indefinitely, but these few examples serve to illustrate our need. The situation becomes more alarming when we reflect that this examination was given, not to school dropouts or to vocational students, but to those actually enrolled in a program of higher education.

One of the conclusions reached as a result of this study was that students are in need of a course in U.S. history on the college or university level. The results may also indicate that we need more emphasis on the subject on the secondary level.

Factual and inspirational sketches in American history might even replace such insipid narratives as "John and Jane Visit the Garbage Dump" as reading material on the elementary level.

Forty years or more ago, 1 year was devoted to the high school course in American history. The passing years have made it necessary to include much additional material. It may be that the course has been spread too thin. It is possible that 2 years rather than 1 should be devoted to the American history course in our high schools.

Cicero said, "Not to know what happened before one was born is always to be a child." We cannot go about this world of men as children.

A factory worker can push the buttons of an industrial machine with little knowledge of the technology behind the machine; but if he pushes the buttons of a voting machine without knowledge of American history and Government, our Nation is in danger.

In times of peril a nation can count among its resources not only its material strength but also its heritage of the spirit, a treasure built up by the struggles and accomplishments of generations of patriots and pioneers.

Our revolutionary ancestors bequeathed to us such a heritage in their triumph over the formidable odds posed against them by the might of the British Empire.

Their descendants and those who came later to our shores perfected that liberty. They added to our heritage by their fortitude and courage in the conquest of the frontier and by their industry and initiative in the development of our resources.

Your organization, I know, has been extremely active in teaching American principles to our children and I am convinced that these efforts will be rewarded many times over. For the youngsters who today learn and appreciate our American heritage will be the patriotic voters who fight alien philosophies tomorrow, and it is in them that we may find our Nation's survival in freedom.

It is my sincere hope that your campaign spreads and is taken up by other societies, associations, and organizations throughout the land.

SEEK REBIRTH OF PATRIOTISM

All of us, particularly you and I who are so aware of the dangers America faces, must work toward a rebirth of patriotism if we are to halt the erosion of our constitutional rights and restore the freedoms which our forefathers meant us to have.

Let us explain to our children the importance of historical events. Let's point out the significance of our national holidays—and we have several coming up soon. Let's make sure they understand the why of American history.

The history of America is the record of the experiences upon which our institutions are built. If we are to keep and develop these institutions, we must learn the names, dates, places, thoughts, ambitions, passions, sacrifices, and splendors that make up the story of human experience in America.

Today America is challenged by history. We can meet that challenge only if we know our history. We can be true to our heritage only if we understand that heritage.

The challenge can neither be declined nor ignored. The forfeit is freedom—national and personal alike.

Let's think of the cherished principles that are enunciated in founding documents when we observe the anniversary of our independence in July. Let us remind ourselves that if our constitutional freedoms are destroyed, then all freedom itself will vanish from the earth. Let us not forget that it was our revolution, our beliefs and courage, which set the pattern followed by other nations throughout the world in winning their own independence.

And let us always keep in mind that what made our forefathers sacrifice their lives for this country was patriotism, but not of the simple type which has been exhibited in a thousand wars and revolutions since the beginning of time. It was the true and dedicated patriotism which is so firmly rooted in human rights, individual liberties and personal freedoms.

We cannot, indeed, we shall not desecrate the graves of those great patriots who died that we may be free by supinely abandoning the fruits of their victory.

It is your fight, and mine, and our children's. With firm dedication to the principles of our historic heritage, we will win.

Secretary Freeman Should Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to second a motion offered here yesterday

by the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN]. He called upon the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, to submit his resignation to the President, to be effective immediately.

This is certainly a most timely suggestion. Since Mr. Freeman took office, we have learned that the number of Agriculture Department employees has increased in a startling inverse ratio to the decrease in the number of the Nation's farmers. If Mr. Freeman should depart, this disparagement would be reduced by one.

Of course, I am not suggesting that this remedy would be anything but temporary. Someone undoubtedly would take his place. But the farmers of the Nation might then entertain the hope, even if it were a forlorn one, that Mr. Freeman's replacement might not support a farm program which has lost all semblance of sanity.

They might even hope for a reduction in the vast army of Department of Agriculture snoopers who are going about the country to make sure that our farm lands are not too productive. Our farmers, without Freeman, might dare to hope that a new Secretary would even let them grow enough feed grains to feed their own livestock and poultry. Then they wouldn't have to go out and buy their feed at unrealistic support prices.

The farmers would not be alone in hailing the departure of Mr. Freeman. The taxpayers would join their ranks. They are footing the bill for about half of the Nation's farm income, which is now about $12 billion a year. The Congress generously, with the taxpayers' money, appropriates about $6 billion a year to support Mr. Freeman's farm price support program.

In the B.F. (before Freeman) years, one of our most stable and successful farm products was soybeans. The production was selling out, at home and abroad. But now Mr. Freeman has $50 million worth of them in his bean bins. He has also piled up $300 million worth of butter, cheese, and dried milk in Government warehouses. By August, cotton support at 32 cents per pound will account for an unprecedented 10 million bales in Freeman's warehouse stockpile.

Certainly a new Secretary of Agriculture would have to try awfully hard to beat this kind of a record. But if Freeman would only quit, we might all hope that the new man would not try so hard.

SEC: Cleaning Up the Edges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing earlier this month in the Christian Science Monitor.

The editorial discusses favorably the first installment of the SEC special study report. As chairman of the Securities Subcommittee, Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to note the following passage:

> Taken all together, and judging by this first third of the whole report, the SEC study should well satisfy the purposes of Congress in authorizing it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SEC: CLEANING UP THE EDGES

In a nation where it is claimed that nearly 1 person out of 10 holds common stock in a business corporation it becomes very important that the buying and selling of securities be on a reliably honest plane.

The first installment of a long-expected report from the Securities and Exchange Commission makes numerous recommendations—and there will be more in later installments—for improvement of the financial markets in the United States, but it does not find widespread fraudulent activity nor a need for drastic structural changes.

"The report should not impair public confidence in the securities markets," says William L. Cary, SEC Chairman, "but should strengthen it as suggestions for raising standards are put into practice."

No Government agency can take the uncertainty out of what is essentially a market for raising risk capital. Nor can it, for that matter, guarantee the future purchasing power of a savings account or value of a house. But it can to a large degree compel disclosure of information and penalize misrepresentation.

These functions can go far toward removing avoidable risks and can give the stock buyer criteria for gaging the degree of hazard he feels competent to undertake.

The SEC report addresses itself first to recommendations for establishing reasonable standards for entry into the securities business. This would involve a system of licensing for salesmen, supervisors, and firms, with attention to competence, experience, character, integrity, and financial responsibility.

Much of the reason for criticism, according to the report, arises in particular areas. One of these, it is said, is lack of adequate supervision of sales representatives, even in large firms. Another is a lack of securities experience especially among mutual fund salesmen and even among applicants for registration as broker-dealers.

In these areas there is need to strengthen the self-policing role of the stock exchanges and of the National Association of Securities Dealers, which includes most firms outside the exchanges.

Taken all together, and judging by this first third of the whole report, the SEC study should well satisfy the purposes of Congress in authorizing it. After a period of 30 years since the drastic investigations which produced Federal securities regulation it is only natural that some tightening up should be in order. Improved policing and self-regulation should benefit the securities business itself in the long run.

They Sailed Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Jessie M. Williams, of Chicago, Ill., composed a poem entitled "They Sailed Away" commemorating the 129 naval heroes abroad the ill-fated U.S.S. *Thresher*.

Under unanimous consent, I include this poem in the RECORD:

THEY SAILED AWAY

One hundred twenty-nine men
  Brave as could be,
Left on a test
  So sailed out to sea.

Submerged into the deep
  Of the oceans' bed
But God alone knows
  Why these men are dead.

They never returned
  From the mission intended
Deeper into waters blue
  From where they descended.

Broken hearts, a loved one gone,
  It's hard to heal the pain.
Brave were they, who sailed away
  They died, but not in vain.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last week the Berkshire Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass., published a very thoughtful editorial on the subject of civil defense. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWEEPING CIVIL DEFENSE UNDER THE RUG

At a press conference last summer President Kennedy summed up the civil defense problem pretty effectively in two sentences. "When the skies are clear," he said, "no one is interested. Then when the clouds come—after all, we have no assurance that they will not come—everyone suddenly wants to find out why more has not been done about it."

At the moment, the skies are relatively clear, at least to the extent that we haven't had a full-blown crisis for almost 6 months. So 2 weeks ago the House felt free to knock down the Defense Department's plea for a $61.9 million supplementary appropriation to complete the program of designating and stockpiling public fallout shelters for some 70 million Americans.

It was a foolish decision, made in the name of false economy at the behest of the House Appropriations Committee. If the decision is allowed to stand it will not only bring to a halt a minimal civil defense program which Congress authorized last year but will also enmesh our whole civil defense effort in further paralyzing uncertainty.

The House action would be understandable if it had been based upon an honest conviction that defense against the effects of nuclear weapons is impossible and that it is dangerous to continue a program which might encourage the public to believe that civilization as we know it could survive an all-out war.

But this wasn't the argument heard in the House. The Representatives who killed the appropriation weren't saying that the only sound civil defense lies in avoiding war. Most of them, in fact, are the same

Representatives who consistently argue and vote for even bigger military outlays than the Administration wants. The $61.9 million which they consider too much for civil defense is approximately the sum that we are currently spending every 12 hours, every day in the year, to maintain our military posture.

Quite possibly our civil defense experts are optimistic in estimating that a minimal shelter program might make the difference between 30-percent and 60-percent casualties, between total chaos and a measure of national survival. Obviously no one can forecast with any certainty the outcome of a disaster whose gruesome outlines can only be dimly perceived.

Yet the fact remains that as long as our foreign policy is predicated upon the threat of massive retaliation, as long as our thinking accepts the idea that we must be prepared to go to the brink of disaster when necessary, then it is fatalistic nonsense to ignore civil defense. War today is insanity, but to talk glibly of preparing for war without preparing for its consequences is insanity compounded.

Fortunately there is at least a fair chance that the civil defense appropriation will receive better treatment in the Senate, and that the House will therefore have an opportunity to reconsider its decision in conference. But it will require an all-out effort by the President to achieve this end, and it will require an expression of real concern from a public which has been altogether too inclined to rationalize inaction on the ostrich principle that because nuclear war is unthinkable it won't and can't happen.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

APRIL 7, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We believe that it is a great necessity at present time to establish a permanent Special Committee on Captive Nations. Therefore, we ask you, Congressman SMITH, to support Congressman FLOOD'S resolution (House Resolution 14) calling for this establishment.

A copy of this letter is sent to Congressman FLOOD.

Respectfully yours,

J. Fylypowych, Jack Kauffman, J. G. Haraman, Cary Linden, Larry Scheitz, Mary Jane Porter, Gail Carson, Joel Shein, Susan Williams, Wm. Schreiber, Diana Serano, David A. Dull, Gus Katsaios, Rose Ann Purlano, Mary Anne Capuano, Louis Della, Penna, Margaret Markley, Joan Scott, Richard C. Capuano, Harriet Luzowick, Robert Lee Humes, Ronald Johnson, Richard Bell, Thomas J. Taylor, Linda Hozmanion, Judd Wolfe, Lorna Ritchie, Robert Felice, Pete S. Down, Joseph Daily, Jr., Victor Goldium, Gene Block, Susan N. Schulman, Mollye Goroskin, Howard Friedman, Albert Buisch, Charles Mart, Robert Raomey, George F. Barnes, Charles Maurer, Penn State University.

BRIGHTWATERS, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
April 6, 1963.

The Honorable OTIS PIKE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PIKE: This is to call your attention to the excellent words of your fellow New York Democratic Congressman, the Honorable SAMUEL STRATTON (p. A1982 of the RECORD), concerning the Captive Nations Committee proposed by the Honorable DAN FLOOD.

Your support of Representative FLOOD'S efforts will be appreciated and will receive widespread acclaim in your district. After all, you will remember that a resolution passed by thousands of Suffolk County legionnaires was submitted last year in this regard.

If you can possibly uncover the reason(s) for the delay in getting this measure out of the Rules Committee, you will have performed a great service to your countrymen and to the captive peoples who are sans freedom. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Rules Committee members fail to send this to the floor of the House. Could it be that the Republican members of the Committee are responsible? If so, I suggest that they be given some prompting.

I hope you will have no objection to my sending copies of this letter to Congressmen UTT and FLOOD. And please extend my best wishes, and congratulations for his captive nations comments, to Congressman STRATTON. Thank you.

Respectfully,

E. LEE NORTH.

UKRAINIAN STUDENT ORGANIZATION
OF MICHNOWSKY (TUSM),
Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On the behalf of the Ukrainian Student Organization of Michnowsky (TUSM), Philadelphia branch, we urge you to support Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD'S resolution (H. Res. 14).

We believe that the creation of such a committee would provide an excellent source of factual and truthful information relating to the plight of the captive nations.

Therefore we strongly urge you to support that resolution in your Rules Committee.

A copy of this letter is also being sent to Congressman FLOOD.

Respectfully yours,

Roman Cyhan, president; Lesia Chornobrywa, secretary; George Fedoruk, Martha Stroegod, Zenia Sochor, Lesia Chornobrywa, Oksana Strogham, Natalie Kowalcheck, Tsold Skolsky, Oksana Basewacke, Walter Kostink, Mark Iwasz, Roman Keerosas, Bohaku Kermyckyj, Maria Hajduezok, J. Fylypowyzk, Olha Nadia Kazoriz, Nusia Drabrt, Romana Kastuik, Irene Mazepa, Irena Melnyk, Dario Dubujcha, B. Kulczycky, Oler Poseudzry, Ilaiwon Chabun, George Rudukvich, Irene M. Wolozzuk, Donna Kajaniasky, Marty Lucyskya, Iyna Knysh, P. Walter Procyk, Lesha Tkach, Eugenia Metanchuk, Bahdan Woloszezuk, Natalie Seleda, Walter Wanchycky, Corputa Skaran, Boris Paliswefj, Zirkie Kolinko, Zdanna Krawciu, Eugene Wanchycky, Doria Knysh, Netodz Boretsky, Vera Bilynsky, George Komarowsky, Christine Kullbycky.

APRIL 6, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Please support Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD'S resolution, House Resolution 14, which calls for the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations. We believe that such committee will help us to understand the situation that exists now behind the Iron Curtain.

We are sending the copy of this letter to CONGRESSMAN FLOOD.

Respectfully yours,

Irena Melnyk, Temple University, Elkins Park, Gayle Ethacker, Helen Cortellini, Richard Anno, Merton N. Howe, Carbert Fiard, J. Ellis, Benjamin J. Anderson, Joanne J. Seigfried, Judith Ross, Ronnie E. Jackson, Sondra J. Ackers, José Nelson, C. N. Hedhill, Enko Hakins, R. Blake, S. Goldman, A. Scott, J. K. Fulwater, Carol Lee Rights, Gera Guiner, J. Hull, Jane Herrich, S. Kuchner, Carol Rose, Carol Liotter, Dane Mann, Douglas A. Dawson, Jerry Kaufman, S. Ackerman, J. Kline.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WAR
VETERANS OF FORMER KINGDOM
OF YUGOSLAVIA, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., April 12, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the membership of our organization as victims from Hitler's Nazi, Mussolini's Fascist, and the Soviet's Communist conspiracy, now American nationals, I should like to congratulate you for your honest and brave effort

in introducing the resolution, calling on Congress for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We are writing our Congressmen, Mr. FLOOD, asking them to support House Resolution 14.

We believe that the creation of the committee is not only advisable, but essential, for such a committee will serve as the most reliable source of information and data on nations enslaved in the U.S.S.R.

It is only obvious that a Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations would at all times be fully informed of the true situation behind the Iron Curtain and particularly in Yugoslavia, the first victim of the Soviet Union after the Second World War.

It is vital to the security of the United States, and the free world, that the desire for freedom on the part of the peoples of the captive nations be steadfastly preserved. The people and the Government of the United States share the aspirations of the captive peoples to be free and independent.

Being past refugees from the U.S.S.R. and other communistic countries, we feel we are in a position to pass judgment with ample knowledge upon the state of affairs in the Soviet Union.

We assert that Soviet Union is not a free federation of republics, analogous of the federation of American States, nor that the people of the U.S.S.R. do form a single nation. The U.S.S.R. is an empire of the international communistic conspiracy. It is time for our leaders in politics, education, and religion to recognize the American Communist Party for what it is. It is a branch of the Kremlin's international murderous conspiracy, as other communistic parties in all communistic dictatorship regimes, including the communistic party of the Soviet Union branch in Yugoslavia. All communistic parties now, as before, and for future, are enemies of the free world and dangerous for peace in the free world. Communism is not an ideology, philosophy, political science, or a new religion. Killer Khrushchev keeps repeating that he is going to bury us. We are going to ignore Khrushchev's warning just as we did Hitler's and his "Mein Kampf."

It is our belief that at the present time of dying colonialism, bringing this fact into sharpest focus would be to the advantage of the captive nations, and a precise and most appropriate policy of the U.S. Government with respect to the captive nations would be most effective in the cold war confronting our Nation today.

The purpose of the resolution is to mobilize all our resources to defeat the more than 100 Communist parties in all worldwide, which are now waging a total war against the United States and all free peoples. I think and consider this resolution to be the last and only hope for avoiding the desperate alternatives of surrender or thermonuclear war.

This organization strongly supports the remarks of the Honorable Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD in the March 7, 1963 (pp. 3584–3585), issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

MILINKO D. ALEKSICH,

Director of This Organization, Wounded in Second World War With Battle Against Hitler's Military Forces Frontier in Yugoslavia, on April 12, 1941.

Once Wall Street Securities Analyst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by syndicated columnist Sylvia Porter entitled "Once Wall Street 'Securities Analyst.'" In this article Miss Porter discusses the findings in the SEC special study report insofar as securities analysts are concerned and predicts certain far-reaching consequences of the special study's findings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ONCE WALL STREET "SECURITIES ANALYST"

One of my first temporary jobs when I graduated from college in the depression 1930's was with a small Wall Street firm as a securities analyst. I, a teenager, with nothing more to offer then than a college major in economics, was given the job of analyzing a corporation's financial setup and prospects and recommending purchase or sale of its stock. Most of the time my boss accepted my reports as delivered, sent them out to the firm's customers under his name.

There were no regulations whatsoever—by Government or the securities industry—to indicate whether I was qualified to do this work—and I certainly was not. There were no professional standards I had to meet as an analyst—and if there had been I would have flunked cold. Luckily during the short time my boss was giving me deluxe on-the-job training, the stock market was rising; so we didn't hurt his customers. Also that was the period when public interest in stocks was at a minimum so we didn't have many customers to hurt.

Today, the stock research-analysis situation isn't that bad, of course, except among the fringe firms. Years ago the New York Stock Exchange and the National Association of Securities Dealers (the self-policing body in the over-the-counter markets) began promulgating broad general standards to govern advice on securities. The NYSE has established guideposts to control stock selling literature by its members, has recently stepped up its policing. The Financial Analysts Federation and the New York Society of Security Analysts—two top analyst organizations—have been working for a decade on hiking standards in their field. Only last fall the FAF adopted a code of ethics and it has developed a program to charter financial analysts, give them a professional standing equivalent to that of a certified public accountant.

But there is no question that in this area of securities research and analysis—the heart of the investment recommendations your broker gives you—there is pressing need for higher standards, stiffer supervision. In a 122-page section of the report the Securities and Exchange Commission handed to Congress this month, this is dramatically emphasized.

Yes, there are stock firms which go in for "meticulous, painstaking and time-consuming" research. At the other extreme there are firms whose publicized research is next to zero or worse when they simply pass on to investors under their own names material prepared by a corporation's public relations staff. Institutions and big customers or reputable firms can get "the highest research efforts." The little investor frequently gets "the most casual efforts." None of the self-regulatory bodies is doing an adequate supervisory job in this area. Even the NYSE, the SEC concludes, is not giving investors the minimum protection of prohibiting member firms from representing "that they perform research and advistory services which they are not reasonably equipped to perform."

The SEC has submitted an impressive and persuasive report on this, and as a result many things are likely to happen. To be specific:

(1) The self-regulatory agencies will step up their campaigns to raise standards for firms advertising their research and advisory facilities, and there will be tighter control over the market letters sent out by securities houses, whether or not they are exchange members.

(2) New self-regulatory bodies are probable to supervise and regulate registered investment advisers.

(3) The leading societies of analysts will be encouraged to intensify their efforts to certify analysts just as public accountants are certified. The FAF will give its first 4½-hour exam to about 300 experienced securities analysts in 20 cities this June. The drive to give analysts professional standing and require certificates from all who give investment advice and write market letters is well under way.

(4) Specific steps are likely to be taken in the future not only by the self-regulatory bodies but also under new SEC rules or even new law to prohibit "reckless dissemination of written investment advice."

Every reputable analyst in the country is greeting this section of the SEC report with delight. As for us, investors who must rely on our broker's research for guidance on buying or selling stocks we can only come out ahead.

"You Don't Grasp Economics," Said He

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents sent me the following article from a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune. Many people in my area prefer the Puritan ethic to the spendthrift ethic being urged by the Kennedy administration:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

"YOU DON'T GRASP ECONOMICS," SAID HE

"Hatter," said Alice, "can you explain Walter W. Heller?"

"Certainly," said the Mad Hatter, "Who is he?"

"He is the Government economist," said Alice, "who said the other day that our $8 billion deficit is bad * * * he called it a 'deficit of weakness'; but if we increased it by cutting taxes, it would be a good deficit—a 'deficit of strength.' If a deficit is bad, how can a bigger one be good?"

"Simple," said the Hatter. "The deficit we have came by mistake. The Government had planned a surplus. Anything that the Government doesn't plan is bad. The bigger one Mr. Heller is talking about would be created on purpose. Anything the Government plans is good."

"I see," said Alice, although she didn't. "But that's not what Mr. Heller said. He said that with an $8 billion deficit factories and workmen are idle, but with a bigger deficit they would be put to work."

"Naturally," said the Hatter. "If you offered me $1 for a hat, it wouldn't be enough. If you offered $3.50, then I, too, would go to work."

"But I don't have a dollar," said Alice.

"That doesn't matter," said the Hatter. "Borrow it."

"From whom?"

"From yourself. Give yourself an IOU and then, when you collect it, you'll have a dollar that you don't have now."

"But," said Alice, "if borrowing money from myself is good, why isn't it enough to borrow $8 billion a year?"

"Don't be silly," said the Hatter. "We borrowed almost $8 billion last year. How can we move ahead if we keep borrowing only the same amount year after year? Why, the way you talk you'd have us in a depression in 10 minutes."

"But didn't the President tell us last year," asked Alice, "that he wanted the budget to be balanced this year and next year?"

"Last year," said the Hatter, "this year was next year. He never said he would balance the budget this year."

"I'm afraid," said Alice, "that I'm confused."

"You just don't understand economics," said the Hatter. "And by the way, where is that $3.50 you were going to give me?"

Administration Tax Bill Would Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I have worked for the last several years in the area of the tax structure as it effects the opportunities for expansion of our independent businesses. I have sponsored legislation as have other members of the committee, because we feel that our hearings have shown clearly that our Main Street small business firms are placed at an unfair disadvantage under the present system in comparison with giant corporation competitors.

I am happy that President Kennedy's tax proposals, now being considered by the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, contain several provisions which would have a healthy, stimulating effect on small business enterprises in the United States.

In a letter to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, I recently set forth these provisions in detail. They are of such significance that I want to call them to the attention of Members, as they affect the small business economy, by entering here the full text of the letter:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1963.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with the administration's tax bill now pending before your committee, I should like to call your attention to several provisions of the bill which would have a salutary effect on small business enterprises in the United States. The Subcommittee on Taxation of the House Select Committee on Small Business of the 87th Congress, in its final report, dated January 3, 1963, made the following observation:

"Taxation has two major areas of impact on the business community in general; each acts with even greater effect within the small-business sector. The first of these is the effect upon business profits. Since, as has been shown in this report, small businesses produce a smaller net profit than larger businesses, any retarding effect caused by the tax structure is naturally more of an impedance upon small businesses.

"The primary area of impact, though, is upon the availability of investment capital. Present tax laws discourage investment in small businesses. Since most small businesses are obliged to use retained income to finance expansion, this is, of course, directly related to the impact of taxation upon profits.

In view of the public hearings which your committee is now conducting on the President's tax recommendations, I believe the best interests of the small business community would be served by directing the attention of your committee to certain provisions in the administration's bill which would help the small businessman overcome the problems mentioned in the report of the Subcommittee on Taxation. Specifically, I would commend to you the following provisions included in the President's recommendations."

1. Rate reductions—individuals and corporations.—The Select Small Business Committee of the House in its final report to the 83d Congress in 1954 reached the following conclusions which I believe to be equally as valid in 1963:

"This committee is of the opinion that current tax rates have acted as a major deterrent to an improved competitive status for small business enterprises. As mentioned earlier, many small concerns have been unable to retain sufficient earnings after taxes to finance necessary expansion through additions to working capital and fixed assets. Lack of capital has, therefore, placed undue emphasis on longer term borrowing which in itself has been difficult to obtain. It is felt that a healthier climate for small business might be achieved through further relief from the tax burden."

The corporate and individual tax rate reductions recommended by the President should contribute substantially to this healthier climate. The after-tax profits of the small enterprises will immediately increase as a result of the recommended corporate and individual rate reductions. Also, the reduction in rates should have the most desirable effect of attracting new risk capital to small business as a direct result of the increase in profitability of these enterprises. For the same reasons, the borrowing power of these small firms should improve. The proposed modifications in the taxation of capital gains of individuals and corporations should result in increased investment in small companies as investors discover that the lower effective rates of tax on capital gains facilitates new investment decisions.

I would particularly direct your attention to the recommendations which would reduce corporate income tax rates for companies with a net income of $25,000 or less from 30 to 22 percent. For many years, small business spokesmen and interested congressional and executive study groups have urged upon Congress the necessity of reducing effective tax rates on net income of $25,000 or less. For example, the House Small Business Committee recommended at the conclusion of the 84th Congress in 1958 that the existing rate structure be amended to effect a substantial reduction of the corporate income tax rates on small corporations. In 1959, at the close of the 85th Congress, the committee recommended legislation which would have reversed the existing corporate normal and surtax rates and increased the surtax exemption. Since we have previously advocated reversal of the surtax and normal rates, I am, of course, pleased that it is now an administration proposal and heartily endorse the proposal.

2. Income averaging: The incomes of unincorporated businesses, farmers, and ranchers vary widely from year to year; the income-averaging provision contained in the President's proposals would be of particular benefit to these small businessmen. If the impact of high tax rates on "bunched income" can be lessened, many small, unincorporated businessmen will receive the equivalent of a substantial tax rate reduction. This, in turn, will promote the favorable results mentioned above in connection with the direct rate reductions.

3. Multiple corporations: In 1958, the House Committee on Small Business specifically recommended that the tax laws be examined to see if they could be amended to assist the small retailer in his struggle for survival. The administration's multiple-corporation proposal should directly serve this goal. Under existing law, chains of multicorporate units are in effect paying small business tax rates by virtue of the multiple $25,000 surtax exemptions available to these units, yet they are simultaneously benefiting from the economies inherent in large businesses. As a result, the genuine small businessman or small corporation is placed at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis large businesses which are operating in multiple-corporate form. A collateral effect of this tax inequity is to render the truly small enterprise a less attractive investment. The President's proposal would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus restore competitive balance and enhance the prospects of small businesses to attract outside capital.

4. Research and development: The administration recommends, subject to certain conditions, a current deduction for tax purposes for expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research and development activities. Under the general rule of the proposal, expenditures for equipment used only part time for research and development purposes, or used to any extent in the performance of a Federal contract would not qualify for immediate deductions. Nevertheless, under a special provision for small business, any expenditures for equipment used directly for research and development could be expensed in an amount up to 4 percent of $500,000 of total expenditures

for research and development. For purposes of this special provision, equipment used only part time but at least 50 percent of the time for research and development would qualify, as would research and development equipment not used exclusively in the performance of a Federal contract. The current deduction for research and development expenditures for equipment used in Federal contract work should materially improve the position of the small businessman in competing for Government contracts. In the final report of the House Small Business Committee to the 87th Congress, the committee concluded that the percentage of Government contract awards for research and development going to small business was inadequate. The President's proposal should increase the capability of small firms to participate in these programs. The long-term interests and perhaps the ultimate survival of this country will depend to a considerable extent upon the effectiveness and speed with which its defense research and development program is carried out. Small business has contributed in the past to this important effort, and I believe the enactment of the President's proposal will provide incentives for future participation.

I am hopeful that your committee will give serious consideration to the effect of new tax legislation on the small businessman as you begin executive sessions on the administration's bill. The strength and health of the small business community which the President's proposals will generate should provide a strong stimulant for the entire economy. Since this result is of such vital importance to this country today, I believe that the President's proposals deserve your most serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Subcommittee on Taxation, Select Committee on Small Business.

God Help United States Without J.E.H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, every so often the rumor goes around that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is retiring. To set the record straight once more, I include the commentary of newsman Paul Harvey, April 25, 1963. The article follows:

GOD HELP UNITED STATES WITHOUT J.E.H.
(By Paul Harvey)

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is not retiring, and he is not considering it.

He bounced back from recent surgery like a man half his 68 years.

During a lengthy conference last week I found the Director in robust health. In no human did the Creator implant more vitality better disciplined by unalterable integrity and directed by an indelible devotion to his God, and a total dedication to his country.

If the Republic survives, tomorrow's historians must surely give much of the credit to the two factors which cut our Nation's enemies down to our size: The unharnessed atom and the harnessed energies of this splendid human dynamo.

Director Hoover is not retiring.

If you have heard otherwise, somebody's sinister wish was the father of that thought.

It is not so.

If we are fortunate, Director Hoover will stand watch for many more years, that our magnificent Government of laws might never become anything less.

And yet the relentless cancer of time is eating away at us all. Someday, as surely as the sun sets enough times, one day it will not rise again for each of us.

Conscientious men carefully delegate administrative responsibilities while they live, so that their ultimate passing will not cause uncomfortable adjustment, unnecessary hardship.

Thus has Mr. Hoover, custodian of the total conscience of our Nation, sought to develop men in his own image so that "The Bureau" might ever have a vast depth of able men in all echelons.

Unfortunately, however, this carefully secured fortress is not invulnerable.

As we face the unpleasant inevitability that Mr. Hoover must someday vacate that command post, those of us who live close to the making of history are chilled by the realization that his successor will likely be "a political appointee."

In other intelligence agencies, we can be less descriminating and survive our shortcomings. Not in this one. Little men are never desirable in big jobs, but in this post the result would be shattering to bureau morale and disastrous for our Republic.

You have probably sensed that I am trying hard to say something so important that the point must not be blunted by any suggestion of partisanship or personalities.

Mr. Hoover stands a sentinel between us and our enemies, foreign and domestic. But further, he is a keeper of the keys to the closet where our considerable conglomeration of skeletons are stored.

The files of the FBI are so utterly complete that there is hardly an elected or appointed official who would be immune from intimidation if those files were ever entrusted to the hands of persons who would use them for political blackmail.

Our vast press and information facilities thus could be brought to heel, all opposition surreptitiously silenced.

Again, Director Hoover is not retiring. He is not even thinking about it. But you and I must think about it. We must think long and hard about it. We must become so intensly aware of the gigantic responsibility which that office implies that when the dread day comes that the FBI must go on without Mr. Hoover, nobody will dare trust the keys to our national conscience to a culprit.

Our Visitors See Our Mines at Work: Are Pleased With What They Saw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Our Visitors See Our Mines at Work: Are Pleased With What They Saw," which appeared in the April 22 issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

OUR VISITORS SEE OUR MINES AT WORK: ARE PLEASED WITH WHAT THEY SAW

National Coal Association, which fends for the good old black diamond in the National Capital and elsewhere, was host today to a tour of our area's modern coal mines—guests being members of the Federal Power Commission, which like the NCA has its headquarters in Washington, and leading staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There was a lot for these visitors to see at Fies mine of West Kentucky Coal Co., where a lengthy underground trip had been arranged for this morning, and on an afternoon visit to Sinclair mine of Peabody Coal Co. at Paradise.

At these two modern, efficient, and well-managed operations of two of the major coal companies in our area the FPC and AEC folks and their host NCA were given a firsthand view of the hard-at-work industry as it exists in our field. On the itinerary, too, as has been stated in the papers, was a visit to TVA's big Paradise steamplant, powered by coal from our area mines.

Since the news about the Sunday-Monday-Tuesday schedule of the distinguished visitors was carried in the Messenger 9 days ago there has been considerable speculation on the subject of the visit by these top commission members and staff men, who took time out to accept a National Coal Association invitation to view two of the ultra-modern mines which are among a number here which produce coal in the manner in which it is produced by highly mechanized mines today.

To such inquiries as were addressed to the Messenger we replied that, to the best of our knowledge, the tour was not primarily a press tour on which big spot news would be made, but that, on the other hand, it had all the earmarks of being what National Coal Association's associate director of public relations, Herbert Foster, told the Messenger it would be—a tour "intended to educate these officials about the coal industry and its role in supply electric power."

Since so vast a tonnage of Hopkins County and Muhlenberg County coal is going to fill orders from coal's No. 1 customer, the electric utilities, the stated basis for a tour of the kind our community is seeing today is a sound enough one indeed, and hardly needs further explanation.

This for the reason that for some years now there has been a tendency on the part of some in the National Capital and elsewhere to overlook the basic importance of good old soft coal in the Nation's fuel picture. Also there are at times references by coal's rivals in the marketplace to a phrase coined a decade or so ago—that coal is a "sick industry." These ideas need to be corrected.

That coal is a healthy industry, in our particular field where our community's interest lies, was noted by our distinguished visitors today. That our visitors were impressed by what they saw at Fies Mine was evident when the tour party emerged from the portal, in hard hats and coveralls which they donned for the duration of the underground look-see.

The messenger is sure that some of the visitors, at least, will go from our midst tomorrow and return to Washington with an amended concept of how modern, efficient, and well-conducted coal mining is done these days. Unfortunately, the publicity which the coal industry gets nowadays is principally the woeful side presented in some fields which offer scribblers for the "big prints" a chance to use their talents for sensationalism. In an up-and-going coal industry such as the FPC and AEC folks were shown today as guests of an NCA-arranged tour, there unfortunately is less newspaper and magazine "copy" than is offered elsewhere by the woeful type favored by the sensation-seeking scribbler.

Now, as a result of their visit here, these important figures in our Government have seen modern mines of both types and have seen good old coal as it is properly produced

today. Our community was glad to hear that the commission members and staff members were coming to see us, we are glad they could spend considerable time in our midst, and we are glad they enjoyed their visit. In a community where coal is king, such get-acquainted tours are important to the future, and we hope NCA will bring its distinguished guests back to see us, and what we are doing, from time to time.

Nonmilitary Needs—Gaps in Our Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, has advocated that this country undertake steps for training of foreign service personnel going beyond the proposal for a graduate Foreign Service Academy of the kind under consideration now. Mr. Drummond's column in the Evening Star of Washington for April 29, 1963 gives impetus to the early consideration of proposals, such as my House Joint Resolution 358, calling for the establishment of an academy for training so that we may more effectively conduct the nonmilitary side of the cold war:

NONMILITARY NEEDS—GAPS IN OUR ARSENAL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Congress begins to take testimony this week on one of the most crucial, unresolved aspects of our ability to win the cold war.

I refer to the need to develop the trained personnel, the instruments and the strategy to wage—more expertly than the enemy—the nonmilitary side of this contest for keeps between freedom and communism.

We are not doing so today. If we don't begin soon, it will be too late.

The hearings are being conducted by the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of which Representative WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, is chairman.

Before the committee is the administration plan to create a National Academy of Foreign Affairs to broaden the training of Government officials—and a few other proposals. The issue is not whether this step is desirable. The issue is whether the State Department proposal is anywhere near equal to the need.

I am convinced that it is woefully inadequate, that it rests on a timid, narrow-visioned, ultradiplomatic approach to the development of new instruments in the global struggle against the Communists. It leaves large gaps in our nonmilitary arsenal—so that the Communists are outdoing us through our own default.

Let me give a conclusive example of where the proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs falls far short:

The State Department has cited the extent to which the Soviet-Castro regime is training in Havana non-Cuban nationals in cold war tactics and sending them back to the other Latin American countries to foment revolution. We deem this to be such a serious menace to the other governments in the Western Hemisphere that we are appealing for a stricter screening to travel to Cuba.

But are we doing anything significant whatsoever to train nationals of the free nations who want to equip themselves to counter such subversion through their own efforts?

We are not—and there is no plan behind the administration-sponsored National Academy to provide this training.

If we are aware that the Soviet-Castro training school is so powerful an instrument in the hands of the Communists that we propose to meet it negatively, isn't the time at hand to meet it positively by initiating the training and the planning which would do so?

This is only one of the inadequacies of the proposed National Academy. It doesn't provide adequate research into cold war strategy and tactics. It shows no intention to enlist the private sector of American talent in the training program. It proposes that the Academy be directed mostly by overworked Government officials—and a few outsiders—on a part-time basis.

These deficiencies reflect the massive inertia of State Department bureaucracy in an area which cries out for bold thinking. When the original Freedom Academy bill, which was adequately designed to do the job, came before the 86th Congress (and passed the Senate) the State Department helped to defeat it by assuring Congress that nothing was needed, that everything we were then doing was just dandy—and quite enough.

As the Freedom Academy idea gained support in the 87th Congress, the State Department worked successfully to sidetrack it by putting a little window dressing on the Foreign Service Institute. And now it sponsors its own version of a training academy to do just enough to look good and not enough to be good.

The Hays committee now has the opportunity to take a close, questioning, and independent look to see if it agrees.

Robert S. Kerr: Pioneer for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Senator Robert S. Kerr's outstanding book, "Land, Wood, and Water," one of the most substantial contributions to the field of conservation literature, has been reprinted this month in softcover form, in a revised version. Thus it will become available to a new circle of readers. One of the last acts of the Senator before he was fatally stricken January 1 was to complete the revisions for the new edition.

In one sense, Senator Kerr's political career lasted exactly 21 years. His announcement party as a candidate for Governor of Oklahoma was held on Jefferson's birthday, April 13, 1942, at Ada. And his final act as Senator was to complete the arrangements for the revised edition of "Land, Wood, and Water," to be published on Jefferson's birthday, April 13, 1963. An introduction by Vice President JOHNSON says in part:

Bob Kerr had the strength of the pioneers of old and the daring of the pioneers of today, and he gave both to his country in full measure. To his friends, he gave his brain, his compassion, and his wit. It is a duller world without him.

Just as history has identified George Norris with the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Arkansas River of tomorrow, bustling with the traffic of commerce and recreation, will be a living monument to the vision and leadership of Bob Kerr. This laboratory of trial and success in the Southwest is pointing the way for a national program of harnessing our rivers and cleansing the waters.

Now that he is gone, his printed message takes on new significance. It can help fill the vacuum of his absent leadership and inspire new effort for the cause of conservation, to which he dedicated his energies and his very life.

In a revision in the paperback, Senator Kerr recalls that the Special Senate Water Committee, of which he was chairman, urged the comprehensive development of the Nation's river basins, and the Kerr plan became the accepted pattern to bring this about. He quotes President Kennedy as saying that:

The administration accepts the goals urged by the committee to develop comprehensive river basin plans by 1970, in cooperation with the individual States.

And Senator Kerr concludes:

The Arkansas-Red River Valley is already showing the way to do this.

Senator Kerr always revered Thomas Jefferson for his fundamental principles and as the patron saint of the Democratic Party. In recognition of this, Bob Kerr chose to launch his own political career on Jefferson's birthday, at his hometown of Ada. His father, Sam Kerr, a Jeffersonian Democrat and an Ada pioneer, had a profound influence on Bob Kerr and his political thinking.

On April 13, 1942, a big rally was staged for Kerr at Ada for the formal launching of his candidacy for Governor of Oklahoma. His father had died 2 years before, but Kerr's mother was still living and occupied a place of honor on the platform. Kerr made several references to his father and the early influence. The Ada Evening News began its account with the statement that "Sam Kerr would have been proud of his son that night." His father had first planted the seeds of political ambition in his oldest son, and the governorship was the first goal.

Senator Kerr's staff member and biographer, Malvina Stephenson, recently found some handwritten pages prepared by him for a speech, most of which was devoted to Jefferson. One part says:

Jefferson, who saw far beyond his times and who helped build a foundation for a better day, was revered by many and loved by most. He was, however, hated by a few because of his so-called radical proposals, one of which was freedom of religious worship. He opposed the existing order whereby the church dominated the State and through it compelled all to become members of and to support the established church.

Like Jefferson, Robert S. Kerr saw far beyond his own day and helped to bend the future to his will. Like Jefferson, he built his home on a mountaintop overlooking the wide valleys and far-spreading plains of his native State, and from this commanding vista ever broadened his own horizon.

On the occasion of the publication of the revised book the Ada Evening News, one of a number of newspapers running excerpts from it in installment form, commented editorially on the Senator's career. This article, an appropriate tribute from the newspaper of Robert S. Kerr's hometown, follows:

[From the Ada Evening News, Apr. 16, 1963]

AIM HIGH—ACCOMPLISH GREAT THINGS

"What is the use of living if it be not to strive for noble causes and to make this world a better place for those who will live in it after we are gone."

The above quotation is from Winston Churchill, who lived to accomplish great things after he was 65 years old. It was not a political statement nor any effort on his part to appear as a missionary. He said what he thought and felt and knew. And he knew that for society to continue to live well, improvements must come.

We use the quotation, not to praise Churchill, but to illustrate that most great men have become great because they had great visions and brought those visions into realities.

The Ada News began yesterday an 18-installment series of "Land, Wood, and Water," a book written by the late Senator Robert S. Kerr which has already won a high place in libraries of science, government and sociology. You will feel elated, depressed, challenged, and above all informed by reading this condensation.

The book sums up the dream Bob Kerr had to make Pontotoc County, Okla., and the United States "a better place for those who will live in it after we are gone."

The book represents in no small way a lifetime of study and thought about the conservation of natural resources. But he had no opportunity to put his conclusions into practical application until he had gained power in the U.S. Senate. But even then he did not depend entirely upon his own conclusions. He formed a research group, headed by Don McBride, to study water problems principally in Oklahoma, but also in the United States as a whole. The book includes the results of the research as well as the things learned while Bob was a lad working in the field, a student at East Central State College, a student at Oklahoma Baptist University, a student of law, and the research into natural resources by the organization now known as Kerr-McGee Oil Industries. All of these studies were coordinated and brought down to sentences packed with thought and ways to accomplish the essentials to preserve nature's gifts.

If you did not read Monday's first installment, be certain to get your paper and read it carefully. Then you should read each installment as it comes out. And we suggest also that you clip the installments, fasten them together and keep them for reference in the future.

Bob Kerr did great things in many lines. His was a multipurpose mind and intellect. He built an empire of developing natural resources he had learned existed in various parts of this country. He contributed to churches and educational institutions. He got the Congress and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to put a research laboratory here near the center of the White, Arkansas, and Red River watersheds. This institution, which should grow to be of vast importance to all the Southwestern States, will soon rise on a beautiful hilltop 2 miles south of the campus of East Central, with which it will be coordinated. It will also be the first of what Ada folk believe will be a vast park for Government and private research. And naturally it will include a complex of Kerr memorial buildings, including the cabin in which he was born.

But don't overlook the opportunity to read the condensed version of the famous book, or if you prefer, get the book and keep it in your home.

The Ada News is delighted to bring this condensation to you. In fact, we consider it an honor to do just that.

Federal Aid for Medical and Dental Education Is Needed

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my support for H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, which is to be voted on today. The expected shortage of doctors and dentists in this country by 1975 requires action now. H.R. 12 answers the need with construction grants of $175,000,000 and student loans of $30,700,000.

All America will benefit by this bill. That is why such organizations as the National Farmer's Union and the AFL-CIO favor it. There is strong support for this legislation in my State—the State of Minnesota. Several Minnesotans have expressed their opinions to me as follows:

Dr. W. H. Crawford, dean, School of Dentistry, University of Minnesota: "We will appreciate anything you can do to make available funds for building and remodeling of dental and medical schools, and to provide loan funds for dental and medical students."

Dr. Robert B. Howard, dean, College of Medical Sciences, University of Minnesota: "Strongly urge your support of H.R. 12 as important measure that will add materially to health resources of Minnesota and entire United States."

Dr. Victor Johnson, director, Mayo Foundation, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.: "The Association of American Medical Colleges makes a good case for this legislation. As a member I voted to endorse it. Improvement in the quality and numbers of students graduating from medical schools will have an important effect on the graduate training program of the Mayo Foundation."

Carl V. E. Cassel, D.D.S., secretary, Minnesota State Dental Association: "I respectfully urge, on behalf of the Minnesota State Dental Association and the dentists of Minnesota that you support H.R. 12, which will provide construction funds for dental schools and a low interest loan program for dental students."

Phillip H. Moos, D.D.S., chairman, public policy committee, Minnesota State Dental Association: "The forgiveness feature of the student loan provisions should be most helpful in encouraging new graduates to practice in our smaller towns. This is good legislation for Minnesota, and I hope you will see fit to support it."

William F. Braasch, D.D.S., Minneapolis, Minn.: "I have made many inquiries among my fellow dentists to sound them out on their stand. We would very much like to see loan funds substantially increased beyond the 4 year $1,500 limit now placed. Many students are married and with their families, this makes it almost impossible for some worthy students to complete their educations. The dental education costs upwards of $5,000 for the 4 years and is in addition to the 2 years predental training. Upon graduation these boys have to borrow again to equip offices and this frequently costs $10,000 to $15,000. Help in financing educations would be a Godsend to these boys."

STUDENT LOANS

The argument is sometimes made that there are enough loan funds available already for dental and medical students.

What are the facts?

At the University of Minnesota 4,000 to 5,000 students seek help from the bureau of student loans and scholarships. Many very competent students taking predental and premedical courses have to change their goals to other fields for no other reason than that they cannot get enough money through present loan and scholarship programs to pay for a dental or medical school education.

At the medical school of the University of Minnesota in the 1962–63 school year there have been 279 loans for a total of $101,245. The American Medical Association loan program provided funds for 34 of these loans.

Under the main scholarship program for these 562 students at our medical school 57 awards were made—mostly of $500 each. There had been 163 applications.

The freshmen are hardest hit by the shortage of funds. Next year's freshman class of 150 contains 100 who have applied for scholarships. Eighty percent will be disappointed because there are only 15 or 20 scholarships available for freshmen.

In the dental school the situation is the same. Dean W. H. Crawford has written me saying:

I have talked with many young men who are thinking about entering dentistry but are giving it up because of the high cost. Minnesota is one of the lower cost university dental schools for residents and the absolute minimum for tuition and instruments at this university for a resident is $5,000 for the 4 years of training. This figure does not include room and board, clothing, or other expenses. It is possible for students to borrow $1,500 from the university during their 4 years of training. This is a far cry from what many of them need in order to get through the course in dentistry.

It is clear that H.R. 12 is needed. More students with the interest and ability to become doctors and dentists must receive financial help far beyond what is now available. Classrooms and laboratories must be expanded more rapidly than private funds and State legislatures have been able to provide alone. There is a nationwide shortage developing in the health professions. H.R. 12 is a national answer to this serious threat to America's health standards.

Why Give Off Charitable Giving?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a great many thoughtful and responsible citizens of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois have expressed deep concern about the President's recommended tax revisions, particularly the proposal to place a 5-percent floor on itemized deductions.

To homeowners, and to many charitable institutions, community social and welfare agencies, educational institutions, and churches which rely to a great extent on voluntary contributions, the 5-percent floor will add to the burden of the homeowning taxpayer and severely curtail contributions to worthwhile causes.

The Skokie, Illinois Home Owner's Council, in an unprecedented action, went on record as opposing this tax proposal. The council's president, Mr. Harvey Schwartz, in the following press statement, points out how homeowners would be penalized if the 5-percent floor were in effect:

The Kennedy administration's controversial tax reform measure which will place a 5 percent floor on itemized income tax deductions came under attack by the Skokie Home Owners' Council this week.

In an unprecedented action the council, representing Skokie's 14 homeowner associations, went on record opposing the tax reform measure. Under the present tax law, taxpayers who itemize personal deductions receive 100 percent of their deductions for such items as real estate taxes, mortgage interest, and charitable contributions. In the future, taxpayers who itemize their deductions would have their personal deductions limited to an amount in excess of 5 percent of their adjusted gross income. A taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of $10,000 with $2,000 of itemized deductions would be allowed to take only $1,500 of these deductions from his income tax. "The council would be remiss if it did not speak out on this proposal," said Harvey Schwartz, council president. "We will be paying more taxes than ever if this so-called reform becomes a law. The Government is attempting to take away the only relief the homeowner has from the real estate tax burden he is carrying. A lot of middle income bracket taxpayers may not be able to continue owning their own homes if they don't get 100 percent credit for their personal deductions. Certainly, this proposal will adversely affect an already soft real estate market."

Schwartz called upon interested Skokie taxpayers to write to Congressman DONALD RUMSFELD and Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and EVERETT DIRKSEN in protest of this action.

Mr. Speaker, in voicing my opposition to the proposed 5 percent floor, I should also like to include in the RECORD the following editorials, relating to the 5 percent floor, which appeared in recent issues of Chicago area newspapers:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 22, 1963]

WHY KILL OFF CHARITABLE GIVING?

In protesting the proposed elimination of the unlimited charitable contributions deduction from the Federal income tax, the Chicago Catholic Charities organization says:

"The administration points out that wealthy individuals who can qualify for this provision have been able to reduce their income taxes substantially. But aren't the real beneficiaries the churches or charities who receive contributions from such individuals and devote them to worthy causes?"

The answer is obviously yes. But one may wonder whether this fact is the primary concern of the Government tax theorists.

Implicit in the administration argument is the viewpoint that the main purpose of taxes is disciplinary, and that any detour around taxes must be in some manner heinous. Witness the almost criminal overtone that attaches to words like "avoidance" and "loophole." Even phrases like "expense deduction" and "depletion allowance" have been given an acid flavor.

The fact is, of course, that an individual in the 91-percent bracket who elects to give $10,000 to his church is evading nothing. He is paying out every dollar he would have paid in taxes and 9 percent more.

The further fact is that a church must subsist either by the contributions of its private beneficiaries or by the bounty of the Government. The former arrangement was favored by the Founding Fathers and has been the accepted practice ever since.

We do not suggest that the administration holds a contrary view. But it does appear that some of its advisers get so carried away with the idea of socializing the economy that commonsense gets lost in the scramble.

[From Paddock Publications, Mar. 14, 1963]

TAX ON HOMEOWNING

Northwest area realtors have raised a cry over an aspect of President Kennedy's tax reform proposals which directly affects suburban homeowners.

Crux of the controversy is that taxpayers who now deduct such items as interest on mortgage, charitable contributions, and State and local taxes from the gross income on which they pay Federal taxes would be allowed to deduct only the sum of these items that exceeded five percent of their taxable income.

In other words, a taxpayer with an income of $8,000 who claims $1,400 in deductions will be permitted to deduct only $1,000. Under present law he can deduct the entire $1,400.

Homeowners in northwest suburban communities are usually heavily mortgaged and local taxes are high, so the proposed changes would have considerable impact on their budgets.

The question to ask then is whether the tax cuts the administration is proposing would offset this tightening up in the tax deduction area? The question, of course, is unanswerable at present. Only by implementation would one be able to discover what benefits, if any, would be accrued.

What it could amount to is taking money from one pocket and placing it in another in a kind of fiscal sleight of hand.

There is merit, however, in the realtor's contention that Congress can always increase taxes but once deductions are lost their is little chance of getting them back.

The realtors further seem to think that this tax reform will prove detrimental to the home selling market. Whatever effect passage of such a proposal would have on this market is difficult to forecast.

It seems that potential home buyers are rare who inquire about the number of items they could deduct from the fact of homeownership. Then, there always apepars to be a group of younger buyers graduating from the rental stage to the permanancy of homeownership.

The realtors score another point, though, when they note that the proposals would adversely affect renters. If apartment owners are not permitted to take the full mortgage deductions, they will undoubtedly pass on this added expense to their tenants.

What this amounts to is that the tax cuts would actually feed an inflationary trend.

The necessity of curtailing these modest tax breaks homeowners now enjoy is questionable. Most of this group of mortgaged homeowners, whose taxes have been soaring as a result of the increased number of children requiring an education, budget pretty close to the belt.

The Illinois Legislature hiked the State sales tax a few years ago and hurt those persons who could least afford it (the lower income groups which spent most of their income on groceries) rather than examine others areas of possible tax reform. The same can be said for the home deduction tax plan.

Lawmakers would be well advised to consider revision of the oil depletion allowances which favor the giant oil industrialists. They might also look for new sources of income by studying a Wall Street Journal report of February 20 which reported that the corporate profits in the final quarter of 1962 "probably reached a peacetime record."

Or they might reassess the whole Defense Establishment in which arms expenditures now represent more than half the Federal budget and more than 10 percent of the gross national product.

Not only could they weigh the posibilities of trimming traditional military wastes, but they mght also exert more pressure on the Defense Department to insure an adequate return on the tax dollar for defense expenditures.

The taxpayer's confidence is not bolstered by the knowledge that the contract for the TFX fighter plane went to the highest bidder. The fact that the contract was awarded to a company located in States heavily populated with voters rather than to a lower bidder whose firm was in a sparse population area is further grounds for discouragement.

The point is that there are many other areas where tax reforms could be undertaken before penalizing the homeowner.

Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce Receives Award of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call the attention of the House to the award to be given this evening to the Greater Lawrence, Mass., Chamber of Commerce. The Greater-Lawrence Chamber has been named one of the top 25 chambers in America. This award is richly deserved.

The chamber has done an outstanding job of revitalizing the economic life of the Lawrence area. It has come up with exciting solutions to the serious economic problems facing our area of New England, and has worked closely with similar groups in surrounding communities to meet the challenges of the times through a program known as "Operation Bootstrap."

This award is a tribute to the chamber's leadership, to its membership and to the community. Similarly, it is an

outstanding tribute and memorial to the late Allan B. Rogers who died suddently last June after being elected president of the organization being honored in Washington today. It was Mr. Rogers who initiated the climactic stage of the chamber's now famous program.

Those who have followed the chamber's activities today recognize the outstanding work of President Robert M. Maguire, Executive Vice President Elbert G. Moulton, Jr., Walter Demers, Jr., and Albert B. Gordon, to mention just a few, as symbolic of the community's and organization's success. These officials of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce are attending the 51st annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and will be presented the National Chamber's Award of Merit signifying the Greater-Lawrence Chamber's standing as one of the top 25 chambers in the Nation.

This is a proud moment for the Greater-Lawrence area community, as evidenced by the accomplishments of the Greater-Lawrence Chamber of Commerce.

Cloudy Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR, Mr. Speaker, a great many Members of Congress, of the press, and a large segment of the general public have often questioned the discrepencies between various figures and claims made by the administration and certain Members of Congress in regard to the Cuban situation. The most recent example of these differences is whether the Russians are actually withdrawing troops from Cuba or are merely rotating them, bringing in new men as they take out some already there. Perhaps the following editorial from the April 29 New York Times gives at least part of the answer:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1963]

CLOUDY INTELLIGENCE

Are U.S. intelligence estimates being colored or distorted by policy?

The differences between President Kennedy and Senator KEATING about how many Soviet troops in Cuba could reflect a serious weakness in the elaborate apparatus the Nation maintains for collecting and evaluating the data on which policy must be built.

The problem is not new to this administration, nor did it originate with the Cuban crisis. But when intelligence becomes, as it has become today, the very cornerstone of policy, an almost superhuman objectivity is required on the part of our intelligence chiefs to avoid estimates and evaluations tailored to policy. Intelligence, if it is to be worth anything, must be completely nonpartisan.

A Senate subcommittee, which has been quietly investigating the Cuban crisis, has already found considerable evidence that the intelligence estimates of last summer and fall were keyed to the "it can't happen here" atmosphere, then prevalent in Washington. The belief of all the Nation's top Soviet experts that Premier Khrushchev would never risk installing Russian missiles in Cuba appears to have influenced most of the intelligence judgments that reached the President in that period. The awakening led to a concentration on missiles only, that caused us to downgrade the significance of the small Soviet force that had been sent to Cuba.

Today, the basic differences between the President and his critics concern the size of this force, and whether it is being reduced. Both Mr. Kennedy and Senator KEATING are getting their information from the same source—Government intelligence agencies. But, because Cuba has become a partisan issue, it is not easy for the top level estimates that reach the President to remain completely objective. The men who provide these judgments are appointees of the President's own administration. Given the present centralization of intelligence activities, it is especially hard for minority views, which might happen to be right, to reach the top.

This problem will not be helped by the appointment of Clark M. Clifford to replace Dr. James R. Killian, chairman of the board of directors of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. The board was established as a result of a recommendation of the Hoover Commission in 1956 to monitor continuously CIA and other intelligence activities.

Mr. Clifford has a brilliant mind, but, as a long-time troubleshooter for the Democratic Party, he is inextricably associated with partisan politics. He replaces a skilled and objective scientist-administrator. The selection is at best unfortunate. It is bound to give the impression that our intelligence activities will now be monitored—not by a chairman who is an expert in the field—but by one who is essentially a politician.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Independence of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as Israelis celebrate their 15 years of independence, they can be proud of the progress which they have achieved since the declaration of independence was first proclaimed on May 14, 1948. From a fledgling nation with fed resources and little manufacturing, the people have built their country into the stronghold of democracy which the Western World recognizes as a friend and ally.

From the first, the Israelis were forced to persevere over almost insurmountable odds. The massed attacking Arab forces threatened the very existence of the newly established state. Yet unity and the desire to survive helped the Jews to throw back their enemies and to acquire needed additional territory. Out of wartorn factories were constructed modern oil refineries and phosphate plants. Crops were planted in irrigated desert land to provide for the ever-increasing number of immigrants who came to live in this promised land. Everywhere in Israel there has been some form of development—the harbor and recreational facilities of Eilat, the irrigated lands of the Negev, the shipyards of Haifa, and the schools of Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv.

The record of development is stupendous. Credit for this achievement lies with the Jews who founded the state, with those who came to settle and to prosper, and with the leaders of the government, such as David Ben-Gurion and the late Chaim Weizmann and Itzhak Ben-Zvi, who had the foresight to plan ahead for the future.

On the 15th anniversary the future has been reached, yet even newer goals must be set so that Israel will continue to prosper. On this their important occasion, we in the United States extend our congratulations on the progress of Israel and offer our continued friendship to the people of this dynamic nation.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, the gallant State of Israel marks its 15th anniversary.

I am filled with deep admiration for the tremendous accomplishments of this tiny country, in this incredibly short period of time, against almost insurmountable odds.

The people of Israel have opened their doors to their brethren from the displaced persons camps in Europe, from countries behind the Iron Curtain, from Asia, Africa, and the Arab lands. They have housed and given employment—and a chance to start a new life—to more than 1 million immigrants since 1948. They have conquered the desert and have created cities where not so long ago there was nothing but desolate wilderness. They have built hospitals and schools, increased their agricultural output and industrial production and have doubled their exports.

But even more important, Israel has not forgotten the debt it owes to nations of the free world. Just as the countries of the West came to Israel's aid when the new state needed technical, financial, and moral support, so Israel has come to the assistance of the new nations of Africa and Asia.

Last year, more than 300 Israeli were providing expert knowledge in agriculture, education, health, construction, and economics to governments on four continents. Another 800 Israelis were at work on projects sponsored jointly by Israel interests and the foreign governments. And over 1,600 students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America came to Israel on scholarships. Although small and poor in material resources, Israel now has a technical assistance program in 83 states and territories. And the fact that its program empha-

sizes training makes it unique. The foreign student who comes to Israel returns to train others. The Israel expert abroad acts as a teacher—sympathetic and knowledgeable—but interested mainly in helping his student to independence. With this kind of program, Israel is bringing the tenets of democracy to the far corners of the world. These people are learning that even new nations, facing all kinds of problems, economic and social, can grow and prosper in a democracy. The success of Israel's experiment in independence is encouraging and so many of these new countries look to Israel as an example and guide for their development. This little country has certainly come of age and it now stands as a fully independent and self-sustaining nation in the world. Israel can be very proud of its 15th anniversary. I salute the people of Israel and wish them continued success.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to express my deep sorrow upon the death of His Excellency Itzhak Ben-Zvi, President of Israel. My sympathy is extended to the people of Israel; they have lost a distinguished scholar and statesman. The democratic world has lost a great leader and humanitarian.

They Did It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Indiana General Assembly recently completed its longest session in history, 101 days, broken down into the regular 61-day session and a special session of 40 days immediately following.

Much of this time was spent in study and action on a budget for the next biennium and tax proposals to raise funds sufficient to support budget proposals.

I wish to insert an editorial printed in the April 20, 1963 issue of the Indianapolis Star, the largest newspaper in Indiana, containing comments on the legislative session which are of interest to all Hoosiers, regardless of political affiliation:

THEY DID IT

One of the most political States in the Union must acknowledge the mastery of the art displayed by Democrats in the marathon of the Indiana General Assembly.

Gov. Matthew E. Welsh and Democrats in both bodies of the legislature maneuvered Republicans into adopting a program of oppressive taxation and openhanded spending. Down to the final technical detail, it was a superb performance.

Make no mistake about it. The Republicans must accept credit for the adjusted gross income tax, the sales tax, the corporate net income tax and the increase in the corporate gross tax. None other than the chief Republican in Indiana, Lt. Gov. Richard O. Ristine, cast the deciding vote. Significantly, Ristine even borrowed a Democratic turn of phrase to justify his vote when he said that "in order to get this State moving again, the chair votes aye." Probably it was unconscious acknowledgment of his acquiescence in a plan that was supported in almost brutal fashion by Governor Welsh.

The Democrats made certain that Ristine put his signature on this unsavory bundle. In a tense senate, one Democrat who would have been forced to vote against a sales tax quietly walked out while the red and green lights danced to a final tie.

Four Republican senators, and a Republican conferee, fronted for the 2-2-2 plan. One of them was from Marion County, while the others were ardent sales tax supporters who apparently believed that the cost of levying that form of taxation on Indiana was worth any price.

Just as they did in the house, Republicans in the senate had it in their power to kill this jerry-built structure flung together by the self-appointed tax reformers. Some Democrats voted for the program, but it was a coldly calculated number who drove the GOP majority into a corner.

This was dramatized by the fortuitous absence of Senator Walter A. Baran, Lake County Democrat who would have voted against a sales tax in all probability. With Baran off the floor, the stage was set for creating a tie vote.

The State has seldom seen such a political coup. Governor Welsh will have the greatest spending budget in the history of the State during the next 2 years. He was given more than a quarter-billion dollars by his political enemies.

In the process, he permitted the Republicans the pleasure of taxing the workingman through a sales tax, the salaried man through an adjusted gross income tax and the corporations through a net income tax. There must be some other groups left untouched by the crushing load of this Republican tax plan, but offhand, we can't think of them.

The fate of a political party is a matter of concern for professional politicians. The fate of the average Hoosier who must labor under the yoke of this onerous tax burden is of much greater import.

The tax package, and particularly the sales tax, is a mistake that some future legislature will one day have to rectify.

Nature's Own Lighthouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Compass, bimonthly magazine of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., carried a very interesting article by the well-known explorer, Wendell Phillips Dodge. As a boy aboard the "square-rigger" *Alexander Gibson* in 1900–02 making his first voyage around the earth, Commander Dodge first learned of the natural phenomenon in the south-central Pacific Ocean known as nature's own lighthouse.

As the great full-rigged ship passed near Christmas Island young Dodge heard what he took to be a tall tale about a natural lighthouse—a volcano in the sea—not far from the path of the *Gibson*. While the boy did not see the volcano, it greatly aroused his curiosity and the memory stayed with him.

Only recently, while conducting research on unusual features of the Pacific, did Commander Dodge discover that oceanographic and geophysical evidence resulting from exploration during the International Geophysical Year and after had indeed proved this myth to be true. In the Compass Commander Dodge tells of this phenomenon.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the article, "Nature's Own Lighthouse, Tofua in the Tonga Islands," by Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge, F.R.G.S.

NATURE'S OWN LIGHTHOUSE

(By Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge)

The Tonga or Friendly Islands are a rather widely scattered group in the south-central Pacific, just into tomorrow. They stretch roughly from 18° to 22° south, in the vicinity of 174° west, and are subdivided into three smaller groups. One of these is the Haapai group, comprising a number of relatively small islands in an area 40 miles long by 22 miles wide. Some of them rise abruptly from deep water with close-in depths of over 200 fathoms. Most of them, however, are low-lying, flat-topped, and densely wooded with sparkling white beaches marking their shorelines. Between most of them, too, channel bottoms are irregular and subject to frequent changes. It's a leisurely land whose sea-going traffic, for the most part, is limited to those relatively shallow draft, extremely colorful interisland trading schooners.

The area is noted for its volcanic activity. As a matter of fact, one of the Haapai Islands—Tofua (pronounced To-foo-a)—is an extremely active one and has been used by interisland traffic as an aid to navigation. For 5 minutes out of every 10 it emits columns of smoke by day, flaring flames by night, a phenomenon observed by Captain Bligh while adrift in the *Bounty's* longboat, and so noted in his log for April 28, 1789.

There is more, however, to the Tonga Islands than their being the home of a natural lighthouse. Actually, the area's extreme seismic activity, plus its massive Tonga Trench and Ridge, have made it a haven for scientific investigations that are adding much to man's knowledge of the earth's crust.

The earliest marine geophysical work in the Tonga region was done by Hecker in 1936. His expedition measured the value of gravity at sea using an apparatus in which a column of mercury is balanced against the pressure of a mass of air in a container, under constant temperature conditions. Through a study of the measurements made with the instrument, he was able to conclude that the Tonga Ridge has large positive irregularities and the Tonga Trench large negative irregularities, as if one were torn from the other by volcanic upheaval.

Oceanographic studies beginning with Benioff's work in 1940, made note of the elastic strain energy's release rate by numerous earthquakes in the area; probably the major timing device for Tofua. The Danes aboard the *Galathea* during 1950–52 also studied the general area with coring and sounding operations. They were followed by the Scripps Institute of Oceanography's geophysical work during 1952–53. Using its research vessels *Horizon* and *Spencer Baird*, investigations were undertaken that included echo soundings, coring, seismic refraction and towed magnetometer studies. Professors Raitt, Fisher, and Mason, in 1955, even constructed a bathymetric map of the Tonga Trench area based on these soundings and those made by the *Galathea*, as well as the ones found on U.S. Navy Hydrographic Office and British Admiralty charts.

A total of 132 gravity measurements were made in the southwest Pacific during the winter of 1956 with a Vening Meinesz pendu-

lum apparatus aboard the submarine H.M.S. *Telemachus* as part of the IGY program. About 60 of the stations used were located in the general area of the Tonga-Kermadec Trench, the Tonga-Kermadec Ridge and the Fiji Ridge, areas of great geological importance.

Collection and evaluation of all the information gathered by the various expeditions reveal, among other things, that the Tonga-Kermadec Trench, lying along the edge of the southwest Pacific Basin, is one of the greatest depths in the world. The maximum depth sounded there was 10,800 meters, plus or minus 200 meters (by Professors Raitt, Fisher, and Mason, 1955). Of even greater importance, however, was determining that the trench, together with the ridge to the west, is an island arc structure, typical except for curvature, of those bordering the Pacific—all noted for their seismic activity. In particular, it was found that the region contains the epicenters of a large number of earthquakes—the deeper ones occurring progressively westward. Small wonder then that there are islands scattered through the entire area spewing forth fire and smoke, releasing pressures built up in the bowels of the earth; none of them, though, with quite the regularity of Tofua, Nature's own lighthouse.

Whether a volcanic cone is dead or not is hard to determine, particularly if the cone is well preserved. Some appear to be extinct or sleeping, as in the case of one in the Sunda Strait. Long inactive, it erupted suddenly costing 36,500 lives. A similar, though smaller volcano in the same region, long thought extinct, suddenly came to life in 1929. An island in the Bering Sea was raised before the incredulous eyes of some seamen. Most people have heard of Krakatoa, the massive East Indies volcano that blew its top sending volcanic ash around the earth. And there is the one known as Tuluman, in these same Friendly Islands, that appears and disappears periodically, quite a menace to passing ships.

Most of the volcanoes listed above are on what Professor Schott described as the "Rim of Fire." This is a long seismic area that begins at volcanic Mt. Erebus, abeam Ross Inlet, Antarctica. From there it runs to New Zealand, onward through the Kermadec, Tonga, Samoan and Fijian Islands, the New Hebrides, Solomons, Bismarck Archipelago and into the East Indies. Though there are many volcanoes—some large, some small—along this "rim," it is primarily an earthquake producer. As such, the entire area is subject to vibrations, jars, or elastic waves propagated through the earth's rocky structure that are more general and destructive than the existing volcanoes. Though the latter do cause considerable damage, said damage is confined to a relatively small area. In contrast, an earthquake along the same fault could be felt for a thousand miles or more.

The volcanic-seismic proclivities of the Tonga Islands can be well documented from reports made by Scripps Institute scientists concerning the area. Returning to La Jolla, Calif., they told of having to dive 75 feet in order to examine a phantom bit of land in the Tonga group. It was little Falcon Island, first reported as a reef in 1865 by H. M. S. *Falcon*, hence its name. Since then it literally has had its ups and downs. With its volcano active in 1894, it rose 50 feet. Then oceanic erosion reduced it to a mere shoal by 1908. In 1928, it was 600 feet high and erupting violently. Then by 1953, the time of the Scripps expedition, it had disappeared from sight. Who can tell when Mother Nature will decide to bring it back once again.

Five-mile-long, 4-mile-wide Tofua has been Nature's lighthouse for more than 1,000 years. Uninhabited now, its lightkeeper is Mother Earth, who programs the smoke and flame by seismic control as accurately as could the most complicated electronic device. Of greater importance, however, is what the entire area stands for geophysically. Unquestionably, it will always intrigue scientists who will have increasingly complex instruments in hand to unlock the secrets now hidden by incredible depths. Then, once unlocked, who can foresee what fantastic benefits will accrue to mere man. And who knows exactly what role Tofua plays in this slowly unwinding mystery. It could well be that it plays the part of narrator always on stage to weave the plot's threads into a uniform pattern * * * stimulating man's scientific imagination. Some day Nature will press the wrong button and the island will disappear in a climactic explosion. That may well be the day geophysicists can throw away their book on the Tonga Islands and start all over again.

There is another of Nature's lighthouses in the Pacific that has warned mariners for years. Its name is Izalco and its location El Salvador. Blazing regularly every 8 minutes, it was once known as the "Lighthouse of the Pacific."

A Tribute to the Honorable Lewis Deschler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, House Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, is one of the most able, efficient and beloved persons who works in our Nation's Capital. Lewis Deschler is truly the world's No. 1 parliamentarian as Speaker McCormack had so apty referred to him.

The Nashville Tennessean recently carried an excellent article on Lewis Deschler by Neil Gilbride of the Associated Press, pointing out the important role Parliamentarian Deschler has played through the last 35 years.

He has truly made a significant contribution to the House of Representatives and to the welfare of the entire Nation through his wise and exacting opinions in his role as House Parliamentarian. He is a wonderful gentleman, beloved and respected by all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this very excellent article be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

MAN WITHOUT A PARTY LAYS DOWN THE LAW IN CONGRESS

(There's a man in Washington who never was elected to anything, yet has a powerful influence on the Nation's laws and history. Without his work, for instance, the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal could have been grounded at the beginning; Alaska and Hawaii might not yet be States. This is the story of the House of Representatives Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.)

(By Neil Gilbride)

WASHINGTON.—Meet the man who lays down the law to the Nation's lawmakers.

He is Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives—a big, genial Ohioan who for 35 years has passed judgment of legislation affecting millions of U.S. citizens and the world at large.

"I don't make rulings, I just give opinions," insists Deschler.

But so seldom have his opinions been challenged over more than a third of a century of both Democratic and Republican rule that he is accepted without question as the lawgiver of the House.

Deschler, a 6-3, 250-pound former tackle for Miami (Ohio) University, describes the job as "something like refereeing at a football game."

ELEVEN THOUSAND RULES

But no football referee ever faced the problems of the man who must have every one of the 11,000 rules of the House at his fingertips, and keep the 435 Members from each otherer's parliamentary throats.

Only once has he been overruled by the House, and then with his own agreement in order to straighten out a technicality.

He acts as constitutional lawyer, historian, adviser and professor to the always independent, sometimes rambunctious Members of the House.

Many Members call him "judge," but he has never presided over a courtroom or served as an attorney, and he didn't even have a law degree when he first took the job.

DECIDED HISTORY

Yet Deschler's opinions can decide the course of the Nation's history.

There would probably still be only 48 States instead of 50 if Deschler had not searched a century of House precedents to find a rule allowing Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills to bypass the Rules Committee, where they had been blocked.

And in depression days, he thumbed back through 15,000 pages of House rulings to find in President Andrew Jackson's era the legislative key that opened the door for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "hundred days" of high speed reform legislation.

IMPARTIAL ADVICE

At the same time, Deschler gave impartial parliamentary advice to Republicans who sought to use the rules to block Roosevelt's programs.

Deschler's opinion can mean victory or defeat in a bitter legislative battle, but Members of both parties trust him.

"They come to me and ask me questions. I answer them," he says. "It does not matter to me what party they belong to. They are all entitled to the same service."

More than one President has had reason to be grateful to Deschler.

When he was introduced to Franklin Roosevelt as "the man who had kept four House Speakers straight," the President—plagued by a balky Senate—replied:

"Why don't you let him work on the Senate."

Deschler's anonymity in the midst of a whirl of nationally known Washington personalities is by his own choice.

NOT RUNNING

"I am not an unduly modest man," he says. "I just believe these Members who have to run for reelection every 2 years should get any credit there is. I'm not running for anything."

"He is less well known in the United States than many men of less importance here," says Representative Richard Bolling, Democrat of Missouri.

Speaker John W. McCormack calls him "the No. 1 Parliamentarian of the world."

Says the Republican House leader, Charles A. Halleck of Indiana: "I have known no other person more fiercely proud of the highest traditions of the House."

Without the rules, and Deschler to interpret them, added Halleck, "we never would get anything done around here."

The late Democratic Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas used the highest accolade in his lexicon to describe Deschler: "A big brain man."

Deschler's minute knowledge of the complex workings of Congress would make him invaluable to any industry, but he has turned down offers to become a lobbyist at many times his $22,000 a year salary.

"This is my life, my love," he says.

Deschler was a Republican when first appointed assistant parliamentarian by GOP Speaker Nicholas Longworth in 1927, but now, as to politics, "I wouldn't describe myself at all."

Deschler's opinions have ranged from such solemn matters as the procedure for declaring war, to deciding how soon Americans can buy a drink after the repeal of Prohibition.

After a mixup in timing between the House and Senate, Deschler advised that April 7, 1933, was the earliest date a thirsty citizen could legally hoist a highball. The ruling stood.

The Constitution, Thomas Jefferson's manual and the nearly 2 centuries of precedents make up the rules of the House. They have confused more than one trained lawyer, but Deschler boils down the legalistic maze to one basic principle:

"The Nation," he says, "is entitled to fair play in enacting its legislation."

Deschler has been around so long that now, he says, "I can walk out on the floor and feel it when something is going to happen."

But one proceeding he failed to anticipate was the recent eulogy to mark his 58th birthday and 36th year as Parliamentarian.

A RARE TRIBUTE

A rare House tribute usually reserved for congressional bigwigs or other national notables, it covered nearly 5 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Looking proudly down from the gallery were Deschler's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Deschler, both now in their eighties.

"I never dreamed when I was a barefoot boy in Chillicothe that I would ever be here," Deschler said later.

If Deschler ever doubted his value to the House, there is no question in the minds of its Members, past and present.

One of them—President John F. Kennedy—sent Deschler this message:

"You have played a unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives. I had an opportunity myself as a Member of Congress to know of your wise and effective influence."

The Rugged Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, in reading the Sunday morning edition of the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., for April 28, 1963, I found a letter to the editor written by Harvey E. Oeffen. He gives his address as West Fargo but apparently he is a visitor there.

In his letter, Mr. Oeffen calls attention to services that are provided for individuals, with the final statement which I found quite intriguing. I therefore wish to ask permission for a copy of this letter to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Apr. 28, 1963]

HE'S FOUND THE RUGGED INDIVIDUAL

I am only a visitor in this area but I feel compelled to reply to letters and articles appearing in your newspaper running the gamut all the way from farm programs to urban renewal to what's next.

THE RUGGED INDIVIDUAL

It seems a young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus, and participated in the free lunch program. He entered the Army and upon discharge kept his national life insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State Capitol to supplement his GI check.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse and bought a farm with an FHA loan and then obtained a Small Business Administration loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of a GI loan and obtained emergency feed from the Government.

Later he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments helped pay off his debt. His parents lived comfortably on the ranch with their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity. The Government helped clear the land. The county agent showed him how to terrace it, then the Government paid part of the cost of the pond and stocked it with fish. The Government guaranteed him a sale for his farm products.

Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked money which a Government agency insured. His children grew up, entered public schools, ate free lunches, rode free buses, played in public parks and swam in public pools. The man owned an automobile so he favored the Federal-aid highway program.

He signed a petition seeking Federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area. He was a leader in obtaining the new Federal building and a new post office and went to Washington with a group to ask Congress to build a great dam costing millions so that the area could get "cheap electricity."

Then one day he wrote to his Congressman:

"I wish to protest excessive Government spending and high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people should stand on their own two feet without expecting Government handouts. I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

America, wake up.

HARVEY E. OEFFEN,
West Fargo, N. Dak.

Address by Senator Gaylord Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, over 400 loyal Democrats of my district—the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin—gathered for their annual dinner. Featured speaker of the evening was one of the most well known of my constituents, Senator GAYLORD NELSON. His address shows his continuing concern with the welfare of our citizens, a concern that inspired his highly successful tenure as Governor of Wisconsin and which will make him a particularly effective Member of the Senate. I include a press release and his speech in the RECORD at this point:

PRESS RELEASE No. 22

WAUKESHA, WIS.—Senator GAYLORD NELSON told Second Congressional District Democrats here Saturday night that America still has 40 to 50 million persons living in poverty.

Continued existence of such mass poverty corrodes democracy and proves that while conquering outer space, Government has failed to meet some of the simplest human problems, NELSON said.

"As the brilliant technology of our new society hurtles us into outer space and tames the cosmic wilderness, we may forget that this same advancing society has left behind a great mass of humanity for whom the new age promises but one thing—a bare existence in a life of poverty," NELSON said.

NELSON said that a number of studies of the poor had concluded that there were 40 to 50 million Americans earning less than $2,000 a year for a single person or $4,000 for a family of 4.

"They are the poor farmers, especially in marginal farming areas, who eke out an existence on $500 to $1,000 a year, unreached by a Federal farm program which pours $5 billion into our economy each year," NELSON said. "They are the migrant laborers; the unskilled and unorganized workers in offices, hotels, laundries, hospitals, and restaurants.

"They are the victims of automation in a strange industrial economy which marches forward at the same time that millions of workers slip backward. They are the residents of depressed areas. One-fourth of them are Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

"They are our senior citizens, an estimated 8 million of whom live in poverty and 1 million of whom live on less than $580 a year."

NELSON said these poor persons were largely unreached by Government programs designed for the purpose.

"Most of them do not qualify for unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, social security, farm subsidies, or Federal loans," NELSON said. "And almost every time we pass a new Government program, we carefully exempt them.

"The urban renewal bulldozers knock down the homes of the poor and replace them with shiny new apartments for the middle class, and the poor are compressed even more tightly and more invisibly in some distant slum."

NELSON concluded: "If we consign a fourth of our people to a life of poverty in the midst of our own prosperity, we corrode democracy. And we confess that in solving the greatest problem of all—the maintenance of the dignity of our fellow men—we have not triumphed at all. We have failed."

ADDRESS TO SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DINNER, ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, WAUKESHA, WIS., APRIL 27, 1963, HONORING REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

Mankind has entered the most challenging age in the history of human existence. Within our lifetimes, it now seems certain that America will shoot a man to the moon, and the fabulous mysteries of outer space, which have fascinated but eluded men for centuries, will be conquered by our own children. This age of breathtaking discovery should excite the minds of men everywhere and stand as a tribute to the power of human intelligence to solve the problems of the world.

Yet as the brilliant technology of our new society hurtles us into outer space and tames the cosmic wilderness, we may forget that this same advancing society as left behind a great mass of humanity for whom the new age promises but one thing—a bare existence in a life of poverty.

It seems old fashioned today to talk about the poor. Everyone knows that America is more prosperous than ever before. Everyone knowns that the New Deal of the 1930's, the war prosperity of the 1940's and the economic

boom of the 1950's struck a massive blow against poverty in America. Imaginative government programs helped business back on its feet in the 1930's. Unemployment compensation protected men thrown out of work. Social security gave the aged a resource for the day the paychecks stopped. We are striving today to continue the gains of the New Deal: Area redevelopment loans are helping depressed areas; small business loans are encouraging the enterpreneur; and we are fighting to add hospital care to the benefit guaranteed the elderly.

But it is a sad fact that these great changes of the last 30 years—this inspiring demonstration of the power of the cooperative effort of our people—has not eliminated poverty. It has only concealed it.

The Bible says we will have the poor with us always. And they are with us today. The changes in our society have simply made them harder to see. What we have with us today has ben described as "the invisible poor."

Are there really very many of them—enough to worry about? There are 40 to 50 million—one-fourth of the people of the richest nation on earth—not just uncomfortable but unable to get the mere necessities of life—living a shabby life of denial in what the New Yorker magazine has called a long vestibule on the way to death.

Who are they? They are the poor farmers, especially in marginal farming areas who eke out an existence on $500 to $1,000 a year, unreached by a Federal farm program which pours $5 billion into our economy each year.

They are the migrant laborers; the unskilled and unorganized workers in offices, hotels, laundries, hospitals, and restaurants. They are the victims of automation in a strange industrial economy which marches forward at the same time that millions of workers slip backward. They are the residents of depressed areas in the north, West Virginia, and the rural south. One-fourth of them are the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans—last to be hired and first to be fired—who get about half the average wage of a white man when they do find jobs.

They are our senior citizens, an estimated 8 million of whom live in poverty and 1 million of whom live on less than $580 a year.

And finally, they are our citizens with special problems—the handicapped, the alcoholic, the hillbillies who forsake their ancient society in the mountains for a life of confused poverty in the cities.

Why are they invisible?

Because the great American middle class, twice as big and twice as prosperous as before, has moved to the suburbs and left the poor behind in the central cities;

Because these 40 to 50 million Americans don't have powerful organizations to plead their cause;

Because their lives of grimy dullness don't make bright feature stories or technicolor movies;

Because old folks don't live with their children anymore but in upstairs rooms in gray old houses that are never written up in the beautiful magazines;

Because the rest of us have become so gay and so prosperous that we don't want to look at them.

Do they have problems? Well listen to these conclusions from a New Yorker review of several studies of the poor:

The very poor are four times as disabled by chronic illness as the well-to-do. Their illness is three times as likely to be psychiatric. If they do have a psychiatric problem, it is far more likely to be psychotic than neurotic—when compared with the well-to-do. They need hospital insurance the most, but they have it the least. They pay more taxes in proportion to income than do most of the rich. They have a drab social life. Most of our clubs are for the middle class and the well-to-do. Over one-third of the children of the poor don't go beyond the eighth grade, and probably will perpetuate the poverty of their parents.

Unlike the poor of the past, many of whom were new immigrants fired with hope for the future, the poor we have with us today are lacking in motivation and discouraged by the handicaps of age, race, environment, physical and mental defects.

But most of all, they are handicapped because they are a disorganized minority, without a spokesman, without a voice, without the means to bring their case to public attention.

The great Government programs which we have forged to meet their problems have met someone else's problems—but not theirs.

Most of them do not qualify for unemployment compensation or workmen's compensation or social security or farm subsidies or ARA or SBA loans. And almost every time we pass a new Government program—we carefully exempt them. When the fair labor standards act was broadened in 1961 it was deliberately drawn to exclude 483,000 laundry and dry cleaning employees. Even the pending hospital-care bill will exclude many because of its $90 deductible feature, which is 10 percent of the annual income of 3 million Americans. The urban renewal bulldozers knock down the homes of the poor and replace them with shiny new apartments for the middle class, and the poor are compressed even more tightly and more invisibly in some distant slum.

That is the face of America's poor which I wanted you to see. If you can't see them, I don't know who will. If we consign a fourth of our people to a life of poverty in the midst of our own prosperity we corrode democracy. And we confess that in solving the greatest problem of all—the maintenance of the dignity of our fellow men—we have not triumphed at all. We have failed.

The Loss Motive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on April 8:

THE LOSS MOTIVE

(By John Allan May)

Winston Churchill once taunted the first Labor Government here with being so bitter about the profit motive that, with the greatest determination, it pusued instead the loss motive. Not unnaturally, he said, this put the country in the red.

One has not heard much about it since; but the Beeching report on the future of the railways here has issued a very striking challenge to the Nation, and particularly to its economists, to consider thoughtfully just how much or how little a part of their philosophy the loss motive has since in fact become.

A new mathematical technique has been developed for seeking to establish and quantify social costs and social benefits as distinct from economic costs and benefits. While this is a useful tool to use to complement or illuminate economic criteria, its general use in isolation does seem to tend to lead to the conclusion, which can even become a prejudice, that where there are proven social benefits economic criteria no longer matter. When this happens the criteria that are ignored are almost always those that would establish that the desired course of action would be likely to leave society worse off. The end result of that can be a social philosophy that actually accepts that waste is no longer wasteful and that price is a mere useless invention.

When the public accepts this it becomes proof that those things that are desirable ought to be cheap; that if the state pays for them they can, and should, even be free; and that to have them cheap or free must obviously benefit society. Price, like the profit motive, it is then decided, is antisocial. The loss motive takes over.

To report that this view is already quite widely spread here is not to be guilty of much exaggeration. There has been much serious discussion about the benefits of having free railways, like the free medical service, the free schools, the free roads, and so on. And if the railways are not to be free there is certainly considerable popular support for having them cheap.

What impressed this reporter most perhaps about Dr. Richard Beeching, the man who was brought in from the world of big business to make the railways pay, when he answered sharp-tongued economists and frankly rather angry railway passengers on his several television appearances, was that he firmly, but in reasonable tones, attacked this argument at its (apparently) strongest point.

Higher fares will benefit commuters, he declared.

"Most of our complaints are about rush hour congestion," he went on, "and bad traveling conditions or old carriages or poor service. Higher fares will help a little to ease congestion. Higher fares will enable us to improve services and have better trains and tolerable, perhaps comfortable, traveling conditions."

While one may agree with critics who have remarked that this is only likely to hold true if railway reorganization is accompanied by proper roadbuilding and roadcosting, this simple explanation of how profit can itself be a social benefit certainly sounded pleasantly refreshing. Perhaps no commuters battered on the ticket windows of their local stations angrily demanding higher fares at once, but doubtless a few pondered as they resisted the swaying of the morning crush the possibility that to have to run a business or a service at a loss is to demand acceptance by your customers of worse goods or services than they are entitled to—and acceptance by your workers of lower wages and salaries and poorer conditions than they have the right to expect.

If those things are so, loss is a policy to be implemented only with the very greatest caution.

Now, the demand that the State pay the full economic costs of services like railways, making them cheap to the customer and yet profitable in the accountancy sense is a most reasonable idea, so long as that society is not demanding tax cuts. If the British taxpayer is willing to dig out another £200 million ($560 million) he can have an economic, and even profitable, free social railway service of great size.

But even that also presupposes that he does not intend at the same time to raise the pay of teachers and dentists and build new roads and new cities and abolish the very last of the slums. Which presuppositions cannot be sustained; for that is exactly what, as a Briton, he does intend. To do everything would require paying £2,000 million more in taxes.

What the Beeching report is doing, I think, as people mull it over, is to help reinstate the idea that services that can pay ought to pay, so that there is enough money for those that cannot.

Alabama Is a Panorama

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include "Alabama Is a Panorama," by Emory McDaniel, formerly of Marion County, now of Birmingham. Mr. McDaniel's poem contains both depth and breadth, and above all reveal his sincere love for his native State.

The poem follows:

ALABAMA IS A PANORAMA
(By Emory McDaniel)

A Panorama of the land,
The green trees, wind,
Lightning, storm, heat,
And cold. People bending
Their backs working in
The fields, mills, mines,
Woods, the black man
Groaning under a heavy load,
Sunshine, the trees, wood, the fields,
Is Alabama.
A Panorama of History
Is Alabama. The rivers,
Creeks, folks from every
Nation. Different peoples,
Different customs. The woods,
Creeks, the hills. There is
Everything in Alabama.
Alabama is a Panorama.
Alabama is a Panorama
Of beginnings and endings,
1712, at old Fort Tolouse
A French army officer decided
Soldiering was of no use.
Took off his French cuffs
Decided to play rough
With the Indian maidens
Thereabouts.
A Panorama of time
Is Alabama.
The French Army Officer
Went to the river bend,
Whistled in the wind.
Out came an Indian Maiden
From the tribe of Wind.
They married and then,
1812, one hundred years later
Red Eagle a descendant of that
Wind whistling match led Indians
And fought Andrew Jackson all over
Alabama.
Things have always
happened in Alabama,
Creating a continuous Panorama.
The trees, woods, land,
Mines, Mills, streams, fish frys,
Fourth of Julys,
Many things make up the Panorama
Of Alabama.
The Winters that freeze
The Summer heat that boils,
Poor hill land, sand,
And black belt soil.
The rivers, mills, fields,
Creeks that make good wash holes
For swimming.
The home of beautiful women,
A haven for imported women.
Alabama is a Panorama.
Courtesy is a mark of distinction.
Once when Lafayette, a French warrior,
On a visit when he was old,
Was carried on the backs of Indian
Warriors bold,
In a chariot through the thick forest
From the Georgia line to the
Mississippi border.
It took awhile,
But the Indian Warriors delivered
him in style.
Alabama always delivers.
Alabama is a Panorama.
The mines, the fields,
Woods, the trees, bushes that grow
Elephant ear leaves.
Mountain breezes, sea breezes,
Full moonlight you can read a
newspaper by.
The stories, the legends that
won't die soon.
The hills, the fields, the mills,
The trails, and dusty roads,
The black man groaning under a
heavy load.
The love stories, legends
That won't die soon.
The peak of Cheaha Mountain
Where Indian maidens once climbed
So they could slip a kiss to the
man in the moon.
Alabama is a Panorama.
Alabama is a Panorama.
Alabama is getting old in time.
It has been many a day
Since the first foreigner
Sailed into Mobile bay
And unreeled a line in 1699.
In the 1640's DeSoto, Fought over
Alabama. Alabama has been a
battlefield
For the Latin and the Red man to
fight over,
With sword, spear, and shield.
Alabama through the years
Has been a bloody battlefield.
A panorama of the things you see,
Hear and feel,
There is steel in the panorama
Of Alabama.
Alabama is a jig-saw puzzle of
geography.
The hills, the coast, the bay,
The waters that flow two ways.
The land of painted skies.
The creeks and rivers that flow
into the ocean,
And into the Mississippi river.
All waters flow to the ocean,
They travel different routes.
God knew what he was about
When he painted the Panorama
of Alabama.
Alabama is a land of diverse things.
Ugly birds, and birds that sing,
Woods, trees, colored leaves,
Many things, mines, mills that
make steel,
The colored man bearing a heavy load
And working the fields.
There is a lot of glamour in the
Panorama of Alabama.
Alabama is a Panorama.
The snows on the hills, the chill
winds
That freeze,
Frost that trims the leaves off
the trees.
The swamps, lowlands, mountains, the
bay.
The sea breeze.
Alabama is the home of the huguenots,
Hodge-podge, and Hottentots.
The population of Alabama is a
Panorama.
Alabama is the home of the Indian's
grave.
No race ever showed more bravery
In defending its home.
A Panorama of Alabama
Is a fabulous Panorama.
The land, forest hills,
Swamps, fields, mines, oil,
Creeks, branches, and rills,
Rivers that make up a song
As they travel along
To the ocean.
Alabama has the most fabulous water
Way known to man.
Alabama is a Panorama of creeks and
rivers
That drain the land.
Alabama is a Panorama
That eternally serves man.

Tito and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there continues a great deal of misunderstanding about the role of Yugoslavia and that nation's political leader, Marshal Tito, in world affairs. A recent editorial in the Washington Post does a great deal to clear away some of the clouds of misunderstanding. I request that it be printed as an extension of these remarks.

The editorial follows:

TITO AND TRADE

Marshal Tito's central concern in his letter to President Kennedy is the restoration to Yugoslavia of the tariff privileges withdrawn from it last fall. These privileges will expire unless this Congress undoes the damage wrought by its predecessor and puts the discretion to extend most-favored-nation treatment back into the President's hands. This certainly should be done.

Yugoslavia is not a part of the international Communist conspiracy. It poses no military threat to the interests of the United States. It does not belong to the Warsaw Pact and thereby denies its Mediterranean ports to Soviet submarines.

Recent events have given the impression that Marshal Tito has returned to the Muscovite fold. The impression, which the marshal is at pains to erase in his letter, is false. Despite Mr. Khrushchev's embraces, impelled in considerable part by his rivalry toward Peiping, Yugoslavia is an independent nation. It has not supported the Soviet Union on the key issue of Berlin. Its new constitution has just confirmed its economic and social heresies in relation to Moscow. Yugoslavia follows the Soviet line, when it chooses to. Often it does not so choose.

In an important sense, Yugoslavia is of more value to the West when it is closer to the Soviets, as now. Proximity puts it in a better position to influence the European satellites with the example of its own independence. Yugoslavia thus demonstrates the feasibility and the advantages of an opening to the West for Eastern Europe.

Finally, maintenance of trade privileges to Yugoslavia is the proof of American intent to offer Communist countries a viable alternative to dependence on Moscow. To scuttle the Yugoslavs—and current legislation would do precisely that—would be to inform the peoples of Eastern Europe that the United States has no interest in their fates.

These considerations apply with less force but equal validity to Poland, which faces a tariff reprisal similar to that ahead of Yugoslavia. The Common Market barriers will injure both countries. Unless the West takes forceful steps to continue their relations outside the Soviet bloc, their peoples will be materially deprived and their governments and economies will invariably be tilted toward the East. The Congress can take the first step by allowing the trade at issue to continue.

The Sham of Nonpartisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Prof. John S. Saloma III, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Social Sciences Department has made a real contribution to the current debate over the minority staffs of congressional committees in a recent article in Advance magazine. Mr. Saloma exposes the folly in the argument that expanded minority staffs would encourage political stalemate in Congress and points out that responsible partisanship demands sufficient staff to develop alternatives to majority programs and policies. Under unanimous consent I am inserting this article from the Spring, 1963 issue of Advance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE SHAM OF NONPARTISANSHIP

(By John E. Saloma III)

Congressional reform in general and the staffing of Congress in particular promise to be major issues in the new 88th Congress. One would hope that Kenneth Kofmehl's study of the "Professional Staffs of Congress" (Purdue University Studies), one of the few major academic works in this area snce the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, might contribute to a solution of these issues. But it is soon clear to the reader that Professor Kofmehl is more concerned with limiting the powers of Congress and its professional staff arm than in reforms to increase their effectiveness.

He raises the spectre of a "competing bureaucracy, which Congress, or rather more precisely, subordinate units of Congress could completely control and which would aggravate extant shortcomings in our system of Government." The increased congressional oversight of the executive branch made possible by congressional staff since 1946 is one of the "extant shortcomings" Kofmehl documents. The participation of congressional committees in the actual administration of laws is an "omninous development." While there may well be constitutional limits to congressional limits to congressional involvement in the province of the executive, the positive contributions of congressional oversight are virtually ignored by the author.

It should not be surprising that Kofmehl, a professed liberal Democrat, concludes that small, professional, nonpartisan staffs—smaller than authorized in the 1946 legislation for several committees—are the best complement to the centripetal forces * * * and the unifying influence of the institutional focus of the presidency.

By implication the best congressional staff is the least congressional staff. Kofmehl does not seem particularly concerned that the House Ways and Means Committee did not have a full-time professional staff member in the field of international trade when the President submitted the No. 1 priority legislation of the past session—the Trade Expansion Act, not to mention such other fields as social security and medicare. Nor is he bothered by the fact that the House and Senate Space Committees have not had technically competent staff to oversee the burgeoning space program.

Besides attacking the dangers of overstaffing, Kofmehl devotes the better part of two chapters to sharp criticism of the theory and practice of earmarking part of the committee aids for the minority. In view of the mounting campaign for earmarked minority staff—now under the unanimous endorsement of the House Republican Conference—Kofmehl's arguments deserve an answer. He begins with the bold statement that nonpartisanship is the rule rather than the exception of committee functioning and that nonpartisanship "permeates our entire governmental process." However, nonpartisanship in committee operation taken together with Democratic control of the executive and both branches of the National Legislature is a prescription for one-party Government. Kofmehl's arguments, based largely on data from the first three Congresses after the 1946 act, avoid the basic issue underlying the drive for minority staffing—the severe tactical and strategic disadvantages of a minority party controlling none of the staff resources of the executive and less than 10 percent of the staff resources of congressional committees. One wonders from his treatment of the subject matter whether he sees any role for the minority in Congress. Nonpartisanship under the current system means majority's domination of staff resources.

THE REAL ISSUE

Kofmehl seems to ignore the degree to which partisanship is built into our political system. The real issue is how to make such partisanship responsible, especially within the context of the committee system where the real work of Congress is done—how to provide both majority and minority with the information they need to draft constructive proposals and amendments, to debate major legislative issues, and to make intelligent decisions.

On the one hand, Kofmehl asserts that the members of the committees themselves, and not staff, are well qualified and presumably have the time to take care of majority and minority interests. On the other hand, he notes that Senators serve on 2 to 6 standing, select and joint committees with as many as 14 subcommittee assignments; members of the House, on 1 to 4 standing, select and joint committees and as many as 8 subcommittees. He devotes a full chapter to a description of staff work on legislation pointing out the vital function of staff as a conduit of services within and outside the legislative branch. His charge that the minority has made "only vague, unsubstantiated allegations of inability to secure the services of committee aids" sounds hollow in light of the documentation accumulated by Congressmen FRED SCHWENGEL, TOM CURTIS, and others during the past session of Congress. The heavy slanting of Kofmehl's data toward the Senate may help to explain this omission.

GOP CLEAVAGES?

The final argument—the reef that underlines the surface plausibility of the case for minority staff—is in Kofmehl's estimate, the deep factional cleavages within each of the major parties. Again Kofmehl's reliance on the Senate for his main point of reference leads him to overemphasize the extent of cleavage within each of the major parties. Part of the cleavage is produced by the very lack of minority staffing. This lack results in a dearth of minority alternatives to administration proposals, which forces minority members into a position of either accepting or rejecting a presidential bill—metooism or negativism. The House Republican task force on Employment in the Dynamic American Economy generated wide minority support for the Manpower Development and Training bill—a distinctive Republican approach to the problem of automation and structural unemployment.

Kofmehl's thinly disguised partisan treatment offers few suggestions for correcting the imbalance in staff resources controlled by majority and minority. He does not do justice to the range of proposals that have been put forward by various members of the minority. The issue is not how many Democrats and how many Republicans are on the committee staffs, but who controls the staff resources of Congress. The proposals to divide staff into majority and minority components is only one alternative. Rather than attacking these points from a preconceived position, it is regrettable that Kofmehl does not seriously explore other solutions to the problem, such as a three part staff—top echelon majority, top echelon minority, and nonpartisan professional staff for specific subject matter areas (presumably all three would meet minimum professional standards). Other possible improvements include formal institutionalization of the House policy committees with sufficient staff to cover committee subject matter areas, or the establishment of legislative assistants in House offices parallel to the Senate practice.

SPIRIT OF '46?

But the fact of the matter is that Professor Kofmehl sees no problem at all other than the intrusion of partisanship. All would be perfect if we could go back to the ideal of a professional staff completely isolated from politics. He suggests that the force of example and the dynamics toward nonpartisanship will eventually lead us back to the spirit of '46.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, however, has stressed that we must update our thinking about the objectives of the Legislative Reorganization Act, that we must broaden our concept of congressional staffing to recognize the two-party basis of the committee system, and the necessity for equitable control of staff resources between majority and minority.

The coming debate on congressional reform will expose these conflicting views in full. Professor Kofmehl's arguments are unlikely to convince many of those who see the need for more effective congressional government and a more articulate and purposeful minority position within the Congress.

Here Are Some Simple Economic Facts for the Fuzzy Planners in the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if there are those who wonder why the United States is not experiencing greater economic growth, perhaps the following item from the U.S. News & World Report is a clue. Economic growth depends on new investment capital and such capital comes only from profits. The unreasonable demands of a powerful labor monopoly, coupled with confiscatory taxes are strangling the steel industry, one of the foundations of a strong economic system. The article follows:

ECONOMIC FACTS FOR FUZZY PLANNERS

There's an effort in Congress to cloud facts about steel profits, prices. Official facts for period of the past 5 years show this: (1) Steel prices rose $7 a ton, on an average; (2) costs, including taxes, rose $11

a ton; (3) profits dropped nearly $4 a ton after taxes. After-tax profit margins, per dollar of sales, were down from 6.56 percent, to 3.88 percent.

Any way you look at it, the steel industry has been in a profit squeeze.

Wisconsin Journal Praises Mrs. Peterson's Fight for Equal Rights for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Wisconsin State Journal, a vigorous and hard-hitting paper in Madison, Wis., recently published a special article on "'Myths' Plague U.S. Women," following a speech delivered in Madison by the Honorable Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Among the "myths" which continuously have plagued women are the lingering notions that they are inferior workers, are not worth as much to an employer as men are, and are working for "pin money." Such statements as these are what they are labeled—myths, rather than facts. The demonstrated performance of women over the years has proved that they are excellent workers. They are proving this today in the fields of science and technology, as well as in the areas in which women's numbers have traditionally been large. It also is a fact that women work for the same reasons that men do, to support themselves and their dependents. The earnings of women are a substantial factor for many families in meeting the high cost of living.

I stress these myths at this time, because the Congress of the United States is considering administration proposals for equal pay. One of the reasons for "unequal" pay for women, in the opinion of those who have followed the course of women's work in the labor market, is the prevailing notions I have mentioned and those suggested by Assistant Secretary Peterson in her Wisconsin speech.

Accordingly, I ask that the report of Mrs. Peterson's speech, as printed in the Wisconsin State Journal, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe this article will be of interest to all who seek an end to the unfair and unwise policy of basing wage rates upon the sex of the worker, rather than upon the job content itself. The equal pay proposals before the Congress ask only that—that payment for the job depend on the work done, not on whether it is done by a man employee or a woman employee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

LABOR DEPARTMENT AID DECLARES "MYTHS" PLAGUE U.S. WOMEN—CONFERENCE TOLD THEY'RE EQUAL OF MEN AS LABOR

(By Harva Hachten)

An iron curtain of myths is hampering women in developing and using their full talents in America's labor market.

That's what Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor and Director of Labor Department's Women's Bureau, told 235 area women at a Conference on Professional Opportunities for Women at the Wisconsin Center Monday.

TEMPORARY WORKERS

Mrs. Peterson, an ardent and articulate modern-day "suffragette," a devoted worker for equal rights for women, proceeded to dispel the myths with the facts of modern-day life.

"Employers say they don't want to hire women because they're not worth the training investment because they are only temporary workers, quitting for marriage or children," she said.

But she pointed out that in this mobile society of ours, men aren't necessarily more permanent. She said that within the month one-half million men will change employers, 600,000 will go into a different line of work, and 400,000 will move to a new town.

NOT AT HOME

Another myth which needs revising is that a woman's place is in the home.

"These days that's nonsense," she said. "Today's homemaker no longer produces as she used to do the canning, grow vegetables, make clothes."

Because these tasks are done on the outside, a woman's place now is also in the marketplace, she declared.

"We have to make it possible for a woman to have a sense of usefulness, replacing the sense of value she used to have in the old economic system," she said.

WOMEN TO BLAME

Mrs. Peterson blamed women themselves for the perpetuation of the myth that they are not worth as much in the labor market as men are.

"We tend to put a low economic value on our work," she said.

On the other hand, employers tend to set up lower pay scales for women because they claim a woman is not the principal breadwinner of the family and doesn't need as much.

But, according to her figures, of the 24 million women employed today, 4 million contribute the largest share of the family's income while 3 million are the sole support of the family.

PROGRESS NOTED

Other outmoded attitudes and beliefs not supported by facts she said were that absenteeism is higher among women employees and that working mothers breed juvenile delinquency.

However, since World War II, there have been great strides made in the field of out-of-home work for women, she said.

Since 1940, for instance, there has been an increase of women working in public relations and publicity of 462 percent, 213 percent in mathematics, and 100 percent in personnel work.

"In peacetime, women have the best chance in fields that are growing and will be needing new workers," she said. "These fields, however—electronics is an example—will require educated, qualified workers."

TRAINING NEEDED

This need applies to men as well as women, she declared, since in today's technical world, the uneducated, unskilled worker becomes increasingly unemployable.

"We are no longer a blue-collar society, but a white-collar one," she said.

A panel discussion during the morning session dealt with "women who work out of the home."

Douglas Marshall, professor of rural sociology, who hires many part-time workers for research projects, drew on his own experience to discuss the special assets of the mature woman.

HOME CONDITIONS

He believes she is more self-reliant, easy to teach, is very conscientious, and easily deals with a crisis.

The conditions at home that make it possible for a woman to work were outlined by Mrs. Alice Post White, of Home Economics Education and Extension.

The three most important were: the husband and children have to be pleased with and proud of mother's job; the family has to delineate its values and find the hard core of must-do's; and the mother and family must guard their health and energies, making sure leisure activities are refreshing and not tiring.

Other panel participants were Martha Peterson, special assistant to University of Wisconsin President Fred H. Harrington, and Jean McNary, of the State bureau of personnel. Mrs. Kathryn F. Clarenbach, assistant dean of women, was moderator.

Soviet Treaty Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, officials of the Soviet Union, from the 1917 Bolshevik revolution onward through 45 years of Communist rule, have established an undisputed reputation for breaking their most solemn pledges.

The Soviet regime's consistent viewpoint on the relative unimportance of promises is not restricted to its dealings with other countries, but extends with equal force to its relationships with the Russian people and the various minority groups which comprise the U.S.S.R.

Only 3 days after the November 7, 1917 revolution placed it in power, the Communist regime abolished freedom of the press as a privilege too dangerous to be entrusted to the people. The people were promised, however, that the decree would be rescinded just "as soon as the new regime took root." This 45-year-old promise notwithstanding, the order still applies today.

Other instances in which the Soviet Republic has broken faith with its own people are legion. The revolution of 1917 was carried out in the name of democracy, and ever since "democracy" has been one of the most frequently used words in the Communist lexicon. But while the Communists have capitalized on the word, they have radically altered its definition—from "government by the people" to "government for the good of the workers." Since the Communists keep for themselves the right to determine what is "good" for the workers, the Soviet definition of democracy in fact has become "government by Communists."

After 1917, the Russian people wanted not only democracy but its specific institutions: a constitution, a parliament, elections, a secret ballot, trade unions, and so forth. They were given all these things, but in name only.

The Soviet Constitution is an interesting document to read. However, it is violated or ignored by the regime as a matter of course. The Soviet parliament meets regularly, but it possesses neither power nor function. Elections are held every 4 years, but the single-slate ballot gives the voters no choice. A

"secret ballot" is provided, but its purpose is to identify dissenters rather than protect them. Trade unions flourish, but only to make the worker more subservient to his employer, the state.

That promises mean next to nothing to the Communist official mind has been admitted by Soviet leaders:

V. I. Lenin: "Promises are like pie crust, made to be broken." "It would be mad and criminal to tie one's hand by entering into an agreement of any permanence with anybody."

J. V. Stalin: "Words have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

G. E. Zinoviev (first head of the Communist International): "We are willing to sign an unfavorable peace—it would only mean that we should put no trust whatever in the piece of paper we should sign."

The Soviet Communist regime has entered into hundreds of international agreements. The accompanying table shows how well the Soviet leaders keep their promises when it no longer appears to be in their interest to do so. It is emphasized that the accompanying table is by no means complete. Hundreds of other agreements have been entered into by the Soviets and broken. The table is only illustrative:

ILLUSTRATIVE TABLE OF SOVIET TREATY VIOLATIONS

Important note: This table is illustrative only. It is by no means a complete tabulation of Soviet treaty violations.

THE AGREEMENT	THE RESULT
May 7, 1920: Soviet regime signs treaty with independent Georgian Republic, pledging no interference in Georgia's internal affairs.	February 11–12, 1921: Soviet troops invade Georgia, in step leading to absorption of Republic in U.S.S.R.
March 16, 1921: In trade agreement with Britain, Soviet Union pledges not to engage in propaganda in that country.	May 26, 1927: Britain ends agreement because of Soviet violations, including failure to stop propaganda as promised.
June 5, 1922: Soviet Union concludes friendship agreement with Czechslovakia.	June 29, 1945: U.S.S.R. compelled Czechoslovakia to cede Carpatho-Ukraine to the Soviet Union.
December 12, 1943: U.S.S.R. and Czech government-in-exile sign treaty of friendship and mutual assistance.	February 25, 1948: Czechoslovak Government forced to accept Communist ultimatum, as Soviet Union completes arrangements to force country into its satellite empire. Ultimatum compels appointment of a cabinet of Moscow followers and climaxes Soviet postwar drive to absorb once-independent Czechoslovakia.
December 17, 1925: U.S.S.R. signs nonaggression and neutrality pact with Turkey.	March 20, 1945: U.S.S.R. denounces this pact, begins campaign to secure control of Black Sea straits.
August 31, 1926: Soviet Union concludes nonaggression pact with Afghanistan.	June 14, 1946: U.S.S.R. forces Afghanistan to cede border territory of Kushka.
September 28, 1926: Soviet Union makes nonaggression pact with Lithuania; later extending this agreement through 1945.	June 15, 1940: Soviet troops invade Lithuania.
September 27, 1928: Soviet Union adheres to Kellogg-Briand Pact for renunciation of war.	August 3, 1940: Lithuania is annexed by Soviet Union.
January 21, 1932: U.S.S.R. agrees to nonaggression pact with Finland.	Soviet Union violates this pledge by 1939–40 invasions of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, and Finland.
February 5, 1932: Soviet Union signs nonaggression pact with Latvia.	November 30, 1939: Soviet military forces invade Finland.
May 4, 1932: Soviet Union pledges nonaggression in agreement with Estonia.	June 16, 1940: Soviet troops invade Latvia.
July 25, 1932: Soviet Union signs nonaggression pact with Poland.	August 5, 1940: Latvia is forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R.
May 5, 1934: U.S.S.R.-Poland extend nonaggression pact for 10 years.	June 16, 1940: Soviet military forces invade and occupy Estonia.
June 9, 1934: U.S.S.R. recognizes Rumania, guarantees her sovereignty.	August 6, 1940: Estonia is annexed by U.S.S.R.
September 15, 1934: U.S.S.R. enters League of Nations, pledging thereby "the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another."	September 17, 1939: Soviet troops invade Poland.
August 21, 1937: Soviet Union signs nonaggression pact with Republic of China.	September 29, 1939: U.S.S.R. signs agreement with Nazi Germany to partition Poland.
July 30, 1941: U.S.S.R. concludes agreement with Polish government-in-exile, pledging mutual aid and cooperation.	June 27, 1940: Soviet Army invades Rumanian provinces of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina. Soviet occupation of these areas completed in 4 days.
	August 23, 1939: U.S.S.R. makes treaty with Nazi Germany, termed "a joint conspiracy" to deprive Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, and Rumania of their independence and territorial integrity.
	October 2, 1949: U.S.S.R. breaks relations with Republic of China, after recognizing Communist Chinese regime it helped to gain power.
	April 25, 1943: U.S.S.R. breaks relations with Polish government-in-exile on pretext of Polish request for Red Cross investigation of Katyn Forest massacre.
	September 24, 1961: Soviet Union pledges adherence to Atlantic Charter, which provides that agreeing countries seek no aggrandizement, that the countries desire no territorial changes not made in accord with freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and that they respect the right of all peoples to choose their own form of government.
	January 29, 1942—Soviet Union, with Iran and Britain, signs treaty of alliance, providing for military use of Iranian territory only until end of military operations against Germany.
	February 4–11, 1945—At Yalta Conference, U.S.S.R. agrees on various postwar measures—including adoption of a resolution that the liberated peoples of Europe should have the opportunity to solve their economic problems by democratic means.
	February 11, 1945—U.S.S.R., at Yalta Conference, agrees to declaration that Polish provisional government "shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot."
	April 11, 1945: U.S.S.R. signs 20-year treaty of friendship, mutual aid, and cooperation with Yugoslavia.
	June 14–18, 1945: President Truman and Premier Stalin agree, in an exchange of letters, to "free access by air, road, and rail from Frankfort and Bremen to Berlin for U.S. forces."
	July 17–August 2, 1945: At Potsdam Conference, U.S.S.R. agrees that there should be uniform treatment of the German people throughout Germany.
	August 14, 1945: The Soviet Union enters into treaty with Republic of China, containing these pledges: "Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take any part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party * * *. The treaty comes into force immediately * * * and shall remain in force for a term of 30 years."
	March 10, 1947: Council of Foreign Ministers, meeting in Moscow, agrees that all German prisoners of war should be repatriated by December 31, 1948.
	May 4 and June 20, 1949: Four Power Agreements of New York and Paris guarantee United States, British, French, and Soviet Union joint control of Berlin, all access routes to and from the city, and freedom of movement within the city.
	July 27, 1953: Military armistice established between United Nations Command and opposing Communist forces, assisted by U.S.S.R., of China and North Korea. Armistice agreement pledges signers to "cease introduction into Korea of reinforcing military personnel."
	January 14, 1956: U.S.S.R. signs agreement with Yugoslavia, pledging $110 million in credits for industrial construction.
	August 4, 1956: U.S.S.R. pledges an additional grant of $175 million, bringing total to $285 million.
	October 19, 1956: U.S.S.R.-Japanese Joint Declaration pledges the Soviet Union to refraim from interference in Japan's internal affairs.

Against these promises stands the Soviet Union's record of occupation and domination of Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Tannu Tuva, Afghanistan territory, Hungary, East Germany, Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, North Korea, Mongolia.

Soviet Union refused to withdraw its troops from Iran at the end of World War II.

In violation of this agreement stands the U.S.S.R.'s record of domination in Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, East Germany, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and other countries which were forced into postwar roles as satellites of the Soviet Union.

January 5, 1947: Soviet Union refuses to participate in meeting with Britain and the United States to secure compliance with the 1945 agreement pledging free elections in Poland.

January 19, 1947: Communist-controlled fraudulent election carried out under conditions of Soviet military occupation.

September 29, 1949: Soviet Union denounces this agreement.

April 1, 1948–May 12, 1949: The Soviet Union imposes the Berlin blockade by severing all land and water routes between Berlin and West Germany. Western Allies supply Berlin by airlift. March, 1962—Soviet Union harasses flights by Allied airplanes between Berlin and West Germany.

East Germany today continues to be a rigidly controlled Soviet satellite. Its people have been denied free elections, isolated from the people of West Germany, and victimized by the same kind of regimentation, police rule, and economic restrictions imposed on the peoples of all the Soviet-bloc states in Europe.

February 14, 1950: These pledges were broken when the U.S.S.R. made a new agreement with the Communist Chinese regime it had helped create. The Soviets did not even bother to change the basic wording. The new treaty also pledges: "Both high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance against the other high contracting party and not to take part in any coalition or actions or measures directed against the other high contracting party * * *. The present treaty will be valid for 30 years."

August 3, 1955: Soviet regime furnishes West German Red Cross with data on the health and whereabouts of only 20 of the approximately 14,000 Germans known to be still held in the U.S.S.R.

September 20, 1955: U.S.S.R. unilaterally transfers Soviet control over all access routes to and from Berlin to East German regime.

August 13, 1961: Construction of Berlin wall completely prohibits free passage from the Soviet sector to the Western sectors.

July 11, 1955: U.N. Command details long list of armistice agreement violations by Communist Parties.

May 6, 1957: U.N. Command, in another of series of official complaints, charges that Communists have sent troops into Korea's demilitarized zone six times in period of less than 4 months.

May 28, 1958: Yugoslav sources disclose that the Soviet Union has postponed for 5 years the grant to Yugoslavia amounting to $285 million. This represented an attempt to retaliate against Yugoslavia for its refusal to accept the Soviet Communist Party's ideological leadership.

1958: During the weeks preceding Japanese elections of May 22, Soviet radio beams propaganda at Japan violently opposing the reelection of Premier Kishi's government.

1959–60: U.S.S.R. threatens Japan with the possibility of nuclear war if Japan ratifies United States-Japan Security Treaty, signed January 19, 1960.

Barriers to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the long and arduous quest of peoples everywhere for a world free from war is paved with many roadblocks, not least among them being the difficulty of resolving the requirements of national security with the desire for the preservation of human life in the nuclear age. But in our absorption with the technical problems of disarmament, we often lose sight of the psychological and emotional barriers which have made the search for peace such an arduous one.

In the hope of shedding some light on a subject shrouded in misunderstanding, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following address entitled, "Peace and Politics: Aspirations and Limits," an address delivered by Dr. Donald Michael, director of the Peace Research Institute in Washington to the Adult Education Association and printed in Adult Leadership, February 1963.

PEACE AND POLITICS: ASPIRATIONS AND LIMITS

(By Dr. Donald Michael)

(NOTE.—Dr. Michael is director of the Peace Research Institute, Washington, D.C. Address delivered at the annual meeting of the Adult Education Association, Washington, D.C., November 5, 1961. The opinions expressed are the author's own and do not necessarily represent those of the Peace Research Institute or any other organization with which he may be affiliated.)

Let me discuss first what I hope you will allow me to let the title mean. Those of us intensely concerned with attaining and maintaining a peaceful world, who at the same time feel that this goal is not likely to be reached if present philosophies persist, find ourselves frustrated and disenchanted by the difficulties involved in getting leadership to attend to and publicly support new, bold, or radical approaches to this most important of all challenges. The question is why; why, for the most part, does our leadership give public support only to the traditional approaches? Why is it so hard to make them see sense? What I'd like to do is talk about the political problems which stand in the way of an easy embracing of new approaches to the old and desperate problem of peace. I'm going to use political in its broadest sense, as having to do with the process of gaining consensus and implementing that consensus. Thus, except as one factor in that process, I will not use the term politics in a partisan sense.

What are the aspirations of which we speak in the title? The aspirations, I think, are threefold in nature: the first is to discover new approaches to attaining and maintaining peace or new and significant variations on old approaches. New approaches in particular include proposals through which peace is to be attained by other than primarily military deterrent postures. For example: world government, a United Nations military force, very high levels of disarmament, arms control, progressive military disengagement by geographic zones, inspection by careful questioning of samples of the involved populations, etc., etc. The second aspiration ought to be to learn, through systematic study, both the logical and emotional validity of these proposals, as well as the means by which these new approaches might be applied. This second aspiration is seldom implemented because those interested in new approaches to peace usually have their eyes focused on the third aspiration, which is action through public and private influence. For example, the aspiration to have an international police force leads immediately, in many minds, to the aspiration to influence public opinion and national leadership toward direct action in that direction. We will explore presently some reasons why it is most difficult to attain action by such direct efforts. We shall also see why the seldom appreciated aspiration No. 2 is central to fufilling aspiration No. 3.

Let us ask, too, who are the aspirants? Obviously, the aspirants include some professional opinion leaders and some opinion makers. They also include some social service and public affairs groups, such as this organization. Thirdly, they also include some people in Government, especially in the Defense Department. Inclusion of this last group is not as surprising as it might seem when you realize that these, after all, are the people who most understand the implications of the weapons and who've had the most direct experiences with the irrationality and horror of war. Thus it is that some of the most intense aspirants to a peaceful world are in uniform.

For all of these aspirants, certain fundamental political processes stand in the way of large-scale public and leadership support of new ideas. The rest of this paper will discuss the sources and types of limitations presented by these political processes.

Let us recognize first that the most mandatory task for any government is to serve its own interests, and I do not mean that in any derogatory sense. For ours to do this effectively, since it is a democratic form of government, it must balance and reconcile internal and external conflicts about goals and means in order to achieve a national interest. For, government offices and agencies have their fiscal, operational, and ideological opponents inside the government as well as outside, and these opponents are much closer at hand than those outside our national boundaries. This means, of course, that the actions of leaders in government cannot always be compatible or in keeping with their own logical or emotional preferences—they must live with others and for others. On the issues of peace the government engages in prolonged negotiation inside itself as well as with other nations.

It is in the nature of human organizations that the means for reaching ends soon become the ends themselves. Thus, often, maintenance of the national interest becomes, in the minds of members of particular government organizations, synonymous with the perpetuation of those organizations and with the perpetuation of the ideas that presently characterize those organizations. For new ideas always carry with them the potential threat of upsetting established institutions. Thereby we have the vested interests of the military services, whose chief targets very often are next year's congressional appropriation and undercutting their fellow services in the race for funds for new weapons. We have the vested interest of the weapons systems industries, who, while some of them can conceive of alternate uses for their facilities, are disinclined to give up the comfortable methods of operating on cost-plus-fixed-fee research and development contracts in areas already familiar to them. There is the vested interest of the politician in the narrow sense of both terms. And so on through all the vested interests of all the groups in government who at present are supported and support each other by the prevailing system of values and ways of operating. While there are insidious aspects to these vested interests, there need not invariably be, and I don't intend to imply that these vested interests are necessarily a bad

thing. For a member of an organization has to believe in the goals of an organization and the rightness of the ways it pursues them if there is to be any stability in complex organizations, and particularly in democratic governments. But these traditional approaches inevitably lead to a strong tendency to repudiate radical approaches. Indeed, this is true in all organizations, not only government.

But we must go deeper in our analysis than this description of the disinclination of organizations to change, and ask from where this disinclination arises, especially with regard to examining and espousing new approaches to the attainment of peace.

It clearly arises in part from the culture-bound values and viewpoints of the men who comprise these organizations. These culture-bound values and viewpoints derive in part from a peculiarly Anglo-Saxon type of morality-based vindictive belligerence when threatened or offended. It has in part to do with our basic naivete about war and its consequences; very few have been exposed to it at first hand in the way the people of Europe and Asia have. It has to do with our middle class child training practices, which produce an inability to cope with feelings of hostility and aggression except on an all or nothing basis.

Second, the persistence of these vested interests derives from the inherent tendency of creatures who survive by learning how to survive (rather than surviving by instinct), to persist in behavior which has been successful in the past. And by definition, any organization, with some history behind it, which still exists today has in one way or another been successful in reaching, in a viable form, the present through the methods it has used in the past. But there are more successes than simply that of organizational survival. Our country has grown great and powerful and since World War II has taken on in one way or another, many roles and world responsibilities. We insist on seeing our accomplishments as being morally right and our means morally defensible. Thus, these past approaches, particularly military ones and their use in a spirit of punitive morality, and the whole infrastructure of national beliefs associated with a military approach (i.e., there is no substitute for victory), have been seen and are seen as the successful approaches. The natural response is, "Why rock the boat?" Why abandon a worthy craft? Why try untested roads to peace?

A third reason for not exploring and accepting the new ideas for attaining and maintaining peace is the difficulty that people have in accepting new ideas when they're in a threatening situation. There is much evidence from studies of people and institutions under stress and threat that they narrow their span of attention and limit the range of acceptable ideas, turning more and more to a kind of private, unverified image of what's really happening. Under stress they do less and less probing around to sense what is in fact happening and what could be done of a unique and radical means to cope with the threatening situation.

A fourth reason for the persistence of these vested interests is, I believe, a deep-set disinclination on the part of most people in most places in the Government and even in the military—to say nothing of the general public—to accept the reality of the threat of imminent annihilation. Not only is this personally difficult to accept for most people, but it is institutionally difficult to accept, especially in a fat and rich nation where progress is our business and the future lies before us. This disinclination to accept the reality of the threat of annihilation means that the tasks and challenges of today, of surviving in the internecine agency battling, of living in the present, are much more real than the possibilities of wholesale national death tomorrow. Since, for large parts of the electorate, survival is not a truly meaningful issue and since we live in a society essentially dedicated to the status quo and in a political system dedicated to reelections, it seems, to many, much more important to go on with what we have been doing than to shift direction radically and thereby face an unfamiliar as well as unknown future.

A fifth reason for disinclination to espouse new approaches to peace arises from the lack of commitment, the lack of sense of calling, regarding the operation of our whole society, which has been commented on and despaired about by many. To be sure, there are many dedicated public servants and civil servants, but on the whole I don't suppose there are any more of them than there are similarly dedicated people in other walks of life. The result is that the problems of personal and organizational survival come first very often, and the courage needed to espouse new causes and new ideas is lacking, fundamentally and deeply. If this dry rot is typical of our society at large, it is not surprising that public servants do not wish to "stick their necks out" when they believe there will be too little support in the general public or in their organizations for their courageous gesture.

But there is one more reason why the vested interests are disinclined to support the aspirations of those who would reach peace by other than conventional means. And this is the lack of clear evidence demonstrating the implications and utility of the new means proposed—in short, whether they will work. In the light of all the reasons we have given why organizations don't easily embrace radical ideas, it should be easy to understand how it is that careless, unthought-through statements about the desirability of world government, etc., can do much harm to the cause of world government, etc. There really is no reason why organizations should embrace new ideas until it has been demonstrated that these ideas in fact have substance and merit beyond the emotional appeal they have for those who espouse them and who aspire to them.

Whether or not one personally has deep faith in and dependency on careful logical analysis as the basis for making decisions and taking action, the fact is that this is the style in which much of leadership fancies itself operating. Thus, in the complex exercise of imagining and exploring new approaches to peace, it is mandatory for those proposing a new approach to demonstrate its utility and potentiality under at least some of the conditions of the "what if" sort by which it must necessarily be tested. Since the implications of the approaches more readily accepted by leadership have been carefully and logically thought through and the unknown aspects at least in part made clear, these approaches provide more to "depend on" than those which don't fit the old mold. It becomes all the more necessary, then, that the new mold be demonstrated to be at least as sturdy as the old. Understand I'm not saying that the approaches now espoused are in fact sturdy or even truly logical in many of their aspects. On the contrary, I don't think they are. But nevertheless, these approaches and the methods of judging them have the backing of the institutions, the vested interests, and the previous successes which we spoke of earlier, and it is against these which new ideas must contend. And they must contend in terms of the logical or quasi-logical questions which would be posed with regard to them.

This then brings us to a further difficulty or limitation in fulfilling our aspirations to see new approaches used on these old problems. And that is the difficulty of providing adequate communication between policy planners and decisionmakers and those outside of the Government who may have the ideas most worthy of further attention. The reasons for this lack of communication are many, but two are especially worthy of attention here.

In the first place, and this is very often overlooked by people on the outside, the world situation is extraordinarily complicated. The interlocking of historical, political, cultural, technical, and procedural problems is immense—so great that even within the Government there is no office where all of the aspects are appreciated equally well. And on top of these intermeshed, interlocking factors is an overlay of highly classified data about technology, people, and politics, data which must be understood in order to evaluate the potentialities of new approaches to peace. For without such data, it is sometimes impossible for the proponents of a new approach to fully think through the implications and validity of that approach, and of course it is not possible to demonstrate its utility under the conditions which the proponents do not even know exist. This is a true crisis in our society, which shows itself in many areas beside those involved with attaining peace. But the problem is all the more acute in this area where classified information may be especially important for assessing the utility of a new approach to peace.

The second reason why policymakers are disinclined to communicate with the public regarding fundamental problems of peace and war is really a melange of reasons related to the points made earlier in the paper about the vested interests of various offices. In oversimplified form, we could combine all of these and say that policy planners have at least that much more control over what they are responsible for if they do not have to cope with new demands, new approaches, and new pressures from various parts of the public. Since they are inclined to cope with the peace problem in ways already familiar to them, they do not particularly care to provide the public with the kind of information that would inspire it to pressure them to repudiate these old means of operating.

Thus we have seen that it is difficult for proponents of new approaches to peace to communicate with decisionmakers. It is difficult for decisionmakers to communicate with the public, and certainly as disturbing as either of these, it is also difficult for decisionmakers and policy planners to communicate among themselves. For here too the vested interests of the offices involved make it dangerous to rock the boat, not only as between offices, but within offices, since the proponents of radical approaches are never in the majority, and as such are as likely to antagonize their agency colleagues as to antagonize those in other organizations with which the agency must live and work. And so the few or the lone proponents those terrified by or depressed by present approaches, usually remain relatively ineffective, even in centers of decisionmaking and policy planning.

And over all we have spoken of so far rests a curious pervasive mist which magnifies events out of proportion, distorts images, and blots out significant factors for both policymaker and interested public alike. I'm speaking of the endless spew of words and shapes we refer to as products of the mass media. Even with the best of intentions, and the intentions seldom are of the best, the mass media by their very nature must select from reality and, by their very interest in making that reality newsworthy, must emphasize newsiness of the expense of balance. The result is that we on the outside and those on the inside who are affected by the mass media, see the world as made up of

sudden events, crises, and the like. And even though we may know that this is probably not the way the world goes, there is no way for most people to find out what really is happening. This inherent limitation in the presentation of news is amplified tremendously, in our democracy, by the deep cultural belief that the mass media not only reflect public opinion but make public opinion. The result is that too frequently decision makers in our Government are willy-nilly deeply impressed by what they read in the press and hear on TV and the radio. And the mass media, of course, are deeply impressed by what they hear out of Washington. In consequence, leadership frequently responds more to the mass media—believing the mass media to be affecting and reflecting public opinion and public interest—than they respond to the public.

Thus, those who aspire to implementation of new approaches to peace must somehow run the gauntlet of the mass media, obtaining in them favorable attention to new ideas, so that these ideas may be attended to by leadership, even if most of the public gives them little heed. Or those with new approaches they wish implemented must somehow get to that leadership which will be attended to in the mass media, thereby drawing the attention of more leadership to the idea. But the mass media are very selective, and they share essentially many of the same values and traditional approaches we've spoken of earlier, so that even though from time to time there are speeches by a Senator FULBRIGHT or a Congressman RYAN or others pleading for new approaches or repudiation of the old, they are given little heed.

The fact that there are Fulbrights and Ryans here and there in Congress, in the executive branch of the Government, in the Pentagon, in the news field, and so on does provide the hope for turning aspirations into reality, of surmounting the tremendous limitations with which an effective ongoing institutional system confronts us. Our only hope is to get our ideas to the few men who in turn can get them to the other men who must make decisions. But these ideas must be so well thought through, so carefully developed, that those who could defend them will wish to defend them, and those who risk much in embracing them will find that risk sensible, given the potentialities for survival and a better world associated with that risk.

Thus it is that aspiration two—the will to understand through objective study—becomes far more crucial than it has been in many of the efforts of those who would try new approaches to peace: we must understand to the best of our ability without access to classified information. If new ideas can be thought through carefully, they provide those with access to classified information, who are temperamentally in favor of these ideas, with the leverage to explore them more deeply and perhaps to make so good a case that it can withstand the many pressures, some of which I've tried to describe, which stand ready to crush it before it can be implemented.

Our last and most important two hopes, then, are the application of sufficient intellectual discipline to the exploration of ideas for attaining peace to produce an honest and detailed appraisal of their potentialities and a few men and women in the right places to transform these thoughts into action. Without both of these, I'm afraid that our aspirations will remain just that unless we somehow bumble through to a peaceful world—or, as is far more likely, die as individuals and societies in nuclear war.

Address by William R. Adams, President of St. Regis Paper Co., at the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Woods Demonstration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, recently the Seaboard Air Line Railroad sponsored a woods demonstration program at Live Oak, Fla., which was attended by representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce, as well as representatives from the various forestry organizations and business and industrial leaders. There were 1,400 people in attendance and it was a highly successful and productive program.

On this occasion, Mr. William R. Adams, president of the St. Regis Paper Co., addressed the group with an outstanding message. It is with much pleasure that I submit Mr. Adams' remarks herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM R. ADAMS, PRESIDENT OF ST. REGIS PAPER CO., AT THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD WOODS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM, LIVE OAK, FLA., APRIL 11, 1963

It's good to be here in Florida. The Seaboard Railroad, and particularly Bob Hoskins, are certainly to be congratulated on these forestry field days which they have been sponsoring during the last few years and especially on the precision and dispatch with which this one today has been handled.

One of the pleasures of this trip was some golf yesterday in Jacksonville with Jesse Smith, the Seaboard's president. That was the only thing on this trip that has cost me money. Having also played golf a couple of weeks ago with Tom Rice, president of the Coast Line, I can understand why the merger is expected to be profitable.

Again, I say, it's good to be in Florida. How many millions from the North say that so enthusiastically each year, to make tourism the biggest business of your State. I understand, however, that your State forester has said that next to tourism the sale of forest products rings the State's cash registers far more than any other industry.

Perhaps, we may catch up someday soon as we are moving pretty fast. It was only some 10 to 12 years ago that I had the pleasure of living in Florida briefly; one time in Pensacola and again, briefly, in Jacksonville while we were in major construction projects at those mills. In fact, it was for the original construction in Jacksonville; prior to 1951 we had nothing there.

There is one incident during that construction that has recurred to me often during the tough times the paper industry has been through in the last few years. We had some serious difficulties during the last few months getting ready to actually start. Progress seemed fantastically slow, there were around a thousand construction workers on the job, and costs were mounting rapidly. I was deeply concerned and spent a great deal of time touring the works to see what was being accomplished—and often it seemed like very little. On one of these tours, I overheard this question from one cement finisher to another as they were working away: "Say, have you any idea what this mill is going to cost?" I pricked up my ears because I had considerable wonder myself, at that point, of what it was going to cost. But the reply was simply, "No, I don't have any idea of what it's going to cost." The original inquirer hesitated and thought a minute and then came back, "All I can say is from what I have seen around here, it must be a lot cheaper to buy paper than it is to make it." I'll best he doesn't know how close to right he proved to be in some recent periods.

But St. Regis has invested in Florida something more than $100 million, substantially more than in any other State. Just to indicate that we are nationwide in our operations, it might be noted that the next two States in the magnitude of our investment are Washington and Maine, two other corners of our Continental United States.

The replacement value of all the pulp and paper industry's investments in Florida would, I would guess, come pretty close to a billion dollars. That, I think, means that Florida has been a good place to come, and it has been. On the other hand, we hope and believe that the industry has been a good thing for Florida. Perhaps, we could take a minute or two to see why.

We are a timber based industry, of course, and that is the principal reason we came here. Twenty-five to thirty years ago, when the first papermills began to come to Florida, your timber was used only for lumber. The lumber companies could not manage the land for the highest productivity and the maximum economic use because they could not use the smaller trees, resulting from thinning, and the income from the land, for sawlogs only, did not justify replanting after harvest nor planting new lands abandoned from farming. The result was a mixture of forested land, which had lost its vigor, and cutover or abandoned farm land that contributed nothing to the economy and probably very little to the tax collector. And, under these conditions, the lumber mills were just about making a go of it.

The nature of the paper business permitted a change in all this. The stands of sawtimber could be invigorated by thinning for pulpwood. The expense of replanting was justified when you could look forward to at least some economic return from the thinnings in 10 to 15 years. Even the expense of clearing scrubland and replanting was economically feasible. The possibility of a nearer term return, and a higher level of return, encouraged and helped pay for better management on the smaller farmer-owned tracts and, in some cases, even justified the abandonment of marginal row crop farming. Corollary to this was the development of year-round jobs in the woods instead of the highly seasonal manpower requirements of other crops.

I have encountered some who believe this has happened only on the lands owned by the companies themselves. Fortunately, this is not the case because none of us could exist without the wood supply that comes from other owners. In our own case, we, in 1962, supplied only 27 percent of our needs from our own lands and purchased some 850,000 cords from others. This is about the usual ratio and is, I believe, somewhat the same with most companies throughout the South. The paper companies, after all, own only about 11 percent of the commercial forest land in the Southern States and our needs are well beyond the productive capacity of that acreage. In fact, much of our effort and that of the State and Federal forestry departments is directed

toward increasing the productivity of these woodlands owned by others, which are so vital to our growing needs. Progress is being made, but I think it is generally felt that there is still a large potential for improved management on smaller holdings.

What kind of an industry is this that Florida's trees have brought here and made Florida one of the leading producers of its product? Well, it is one of, if not the most basic, manufacturing industry in America. The annual value of the paper industry's product is $14½ billion, one-fortieth of the gross national product, the total of all the goods and services of the country. Last year's production totaled about 38 million tons, almost four times the weight of all the automobiles produced. This 38 million tons, which does not include 5 million tons of newsprint imported from Canada, is a vital element in the business, government, communication, education, religion, politics, nutrition, health and culture of our country, perhaps, the commodity which, next to food, we could least do without.

Its use has more than doubled since the end of the war, and even in the last 5 years while many have felt that the general economy has been standing still and, in fact, many major industries like steel, automobiles, and petroleum have yet to exceed their 1955–57 figures, the consumption of paper has grown by 20 percent. We are one of the few American industries that can compete anywhere in the world and our exports are growing each year. We look for substantial growth in our markets in Western Europe as their improving standard of living causes their per capita consumption of paper to grow from the present approximately 100 pounds to something approaching our 450 pounds per person per year. With the Scandinavian countries, who are now large suppliers to Europe, approaching the limit of their forest resources and, thus, their ability to meet the growing needs, it is hoped that the European Common Market will not deny itself complete access to sufficient paper by imposing barriers to North American pulp and paper as they presently threaten to do. In return for a free access, we are quite ready to grant full reciprocity as we have confidence in our competitive ability under even terms. Incidentally, Florida, with more deep-water ports than any State on the Atlantic, should participate handsomely in this growing export market.

All of this leads to the projection that the paper industry will double its output in about the next 20 years. And practically all of it is based on wood, over 50 percent of which currently comes from the South. We believe that at least that proportion of the growth of the industry can be in the South, also, if we can keep improving the productivity of the southern forests, as we have in recent years, and we continue to receive the equitable treatment from the State and local governments that it has been our good fortune to enjoy up to this time.

This is a forestry field day we are observing here today, but we must not overlook the fact that while forestry and wood production are important in themselves, the greater importance to the economy of the State and the Nation is in the industry for which wood is the raw material. Each cord of wood, which has a value of about $6 as it stands on the stump, has a value of about $100 in the form that it finally leaves Florida for the markets up North.

In order to create that added value right here in the State, it means that there is a pulp and paper plant investment of almost $500 for every cord of wood produced annually and more than $10 of mill payroll for every dollar of woodland payroll.

The productivity of each acre of the South's timberlands is going to have to be encouraged by all means available, not only to support this present structure of tax-producing investment and payroll, but to provide the raw material for the dynamic growth of the industry that lies just ahead. Moreover, in a vibrant progressive State like Florida, substantial acreages of forest land are going to have to be taken for highways, pipelines, transmission lines, and residential sites for growing communities. This encroachment is already in evidence in the 9 percent, 2 million acre, reduction in the State's timberland total in the last 10 years.

"This severely tightening land situation," as the report of Resources for the Future, published just within the last 10 days, puts it, "will come about, even without taking into account the increasing demand for forest products. In fact the estimated demand for forest products by the end of the century (37 years hence) is expected to be so much larger that on the basis of present productivity something like 300 million acres would have to be added to the existing 484 million acres of commercial forests, an increase of some 60 percent."

It is evident from the facts at hand that the acreage of commercial timberland is much more likely to decline, not only in Florida but elsewhere, rather than to increase, to say nothing of a 60-percent increase. The most helpful solution is greater productivity from the remaining acres, and this has been demonstrated to be possible by careful, patient and comparatively expensive management. The full potential is well beyond present accomplishments, but it needs every encouragement that can be justifiably and equitably given. Here we have one of the Nation's largest industries—the fifth largest, I have heard it said—and an industry essential and basic to the whole American way, which is fortunately based on a renewable natural resources. This is not like the oil for which we go to Venezuela, the iron ore for which we go to Africa, or the aluminum for which we go to South America after our own American supplies are exhausted, but is a raw material which nature and our own wits and wisdom can make perpetual. Let's not miss the chance.

I don't pretend to be an expert in timber taxation, but with the Federal administration having so recently recommended the discontinuance of the capital gains treatment of timber sales and the constant pressure that State legislatures are under to find new sources of revenue, some observations might not be out of order. On the matter of Federal capital gains, not only is it more than likely that their cancellation, as proposed by Secretary Dillon, would cause a drastic curtailment in this vital private investment in forest improvement, but such a cancellation would be a serious breach of faith with those who have spent millions of dollars in timber growing during the last 20 years in anticipation of capital gains which have not yet been realized.

It would seem, in this case, and would likewise apply in the case of ad valorem taxes, severance taxes or any other taxes applying to the timber as it stands or as it is removed, that we should be careful not to squeeze the egg so hard that it never hatches the chick—that that cord of pulpwood is so heavily burdened that it never gets started on its travels through the circulatory system of the State, stimulating investment and payroll and the far greater tax revenue that results from them.

We were mentioning earlier the requirements of a growing population for land for various purposes. There is one important expanding need which can be, and is being, met without serious disturbance to the land's primary economic function of growing trees—that is, hunting, fishing, and other form of recreation. There are, in Florida, about 4 million acres of paper company controlled lands open to the public for hunting and fishing, and some 35 specific areas designated, often with some company provided improvement, as recreational areas. This represents practically all, 90 percent, of company owned lands in the State and it will become increasingly available as new company roads are built and older ones improved. It could be hoped that the availability of this land to the growing number of Floridians may ease the State's burden of expense in providing parks and other recreational facilities.

In commending the Seaboard, again, for the conception and execution of these forestry field days, and especially this one, I also want to call attention to the vital role the Seaboard and the other southern railroads have played in the dramatic development of the paper industry in this area. You are particularly blessed with strong railroads here in the South, not only the Seaboard, but the Coast Line and the Southern and the L. & N., and they were fortunately not only willing, but financially and organizationally able, to meet the needs of our industry promptly and effectively. Adequate and efficient trackage has always been immediately available for the many new mill-sites, new sidings for pulpwood loading, of which you see so many throughout the South, are provided promptly. The Southeastern lines have been pioneers in the development of specialized cars to meet the peculiar needs of our industry—rack cars for pulpwood, hopper cars for chips, heavy lading cars for incentive rate loading of outgoing paper. And with all this, an always adequate supply of cars and expeditious service to our customer's plants. It has been an important factor in our success and we salute progressive railroading.

I thank you and say again, it's good to be in Florida.

Hoard's Dairyman Comments on Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Vote Wheat on Issues," which was published on April 10 in Hoard's Dairyman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Hoard's Dairyman, Apr. 10, 1963]

VOTE WHEAT ON ISSUES

The upcoming wheat referendum vote promises to bring a battle of the ballots approximating that of a national election. To paraphrase an old slogan, "We're dairymen not wheatmen," but a large percentage of our readers will have an opportunity to vote in the referendum early this summer. Frankly, the wheat vote concerns us for two reasons.

First, we like to see issues decided on their merits. There is evidence that many votes will be based on political or organizational affiliation, not on knowledge of the alternatives.

Our second concern arises out of the implications of the wheat vote to dairymen. It is highly probable that the reverberations of the wheat referendum may have a major

bearing on farm legislation affecting all commodities.

As our readers know, we have long supported the domestic parity concept for a farm program. We believe it provides the most desirable blend of self-help, low Government cost, and desirable farm income. The wheat bill passed by Congress last year appears, to us, to be a constructive step in the direction of cleaning up a very messy situation. There are parts of the program which do not enthuse us. But those provisions can be weighed more realistically in the light of experience.

Opponents to the wheat certificate program promise alternative wheat legislation in the event the referendum fails. Here we come to an issue of "believership." Congressional farm leaders and the President have clearly stated that new wheat legislation is neither necessary nor desirable. It can be argued that such statements are offered soley to encourage a "yes" vote, that Congress and the President will reverse themselves and pass new legislation if the wheat certificate program fails to get a two-thirds vote. This is a gamble.

Our only plea is that our readers listen carefully to all of the arguments on the referendum and that each reader make up his own mind by applying his personal logic. Do not vote blindly. We are not interested in prestige battles between strong personalities or groups.

Faulty Federal Economic Policies Cripple Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery in economic growth. The private enterprise system, capitalism, has a proven record in the United States. No other nation in the world has ever achieved the economic growth with such great opportunities for the people.

Now the Kennedy administration speaks of economic growth in strange and bewildering terms and attempts to sell the idea that only through a planned economy and Government can we achieve and maintain a healthy economy. The basic fallacy of the Kennedy-Schlesinger-Heller doctrine ignores the real secret of growth, individual freedom and initiative and a chance for reward. To follow the economic fantasies they propose would wreck the private enterprise system and curtail, not increase, economic growth.

The copy from an advertisement in this week's U.S. News & World Report prepared by Warner & Swasey Co., sets forth in simple language the secret of growth.

The article follows:

IF YOU WANT ANYTHING TO GROW YOU HAVE TO NOURISH IT

The slogan of the day for the country—and a good one—is growth. But as any backyard gardener knows, if you want a thing to grow, you've got to nourish it. Wisely, generously, yet in restraint, too much violent stimulant will burn it out.

So, if unions want their wages to grow over the years, they have to earn them by more efficient production. Otherwise costs go up and wages vanish.

If businessmen want their profits to grow, they have to reduce costs and increase values by investing in constantly improved machines.

If Government wants the Nation to grow, it must keep down crippling taxes, and encourage progress, not penalize it.

There's nothing mysterious nor too difficult about growth. It just takes honest cooperation between garden and gardener.

Dr. Frances O. Kelsey Reports on Work of the Investigational Drug Branch of the Food and Drug Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the appropriation bill before us today for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I pointed out some of the reasons why the Food and Drug Administration will require a substantial increase in its budget in the coming fiscal year. Among other factors which I mentioned were the important new responsibilities of the agency in connection with experimental drugs, under the Drug Control Act of 1962.

I believe it would be of tremendous interest to the Members of Congress, and to all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to have available some of the reports made by Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, who is now the Chief of the Investigational Drug Branch of the FDA, on the assignment given to her branch under the new law and the way she and her associates are proceeding under the authority of the new law—a milestone piece of legislation and the most important law passed in this field of drug regulation since the enactment of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. I think it is appropriate that this material be included in the same RECORD which contains the debate on FDA's appropriation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I hereby submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following three reports by Dr. Kelsey, one of the heroines of American medicine:

CLINICAL REGULATIONS

(Draft of talk given at the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association Central Region Conference at Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill., February 11–12, 1963, Frances O. Kelsey, M.D., Chief, Investigational Drug Branch)

It is a pleasure to be given the opportunity to discuss the recently published investigational drug regulations and the anticipated benefits to the clinical evaluation of new drugs offered by them. These regulations will be helpful in assuring that adequate animal studies precede the various phases of the trials of an investigational drug in human subjects. They should improve the reporting of apparent side effects of drugs under investigation and raise the general level of the clinical evaluation of drugs. Hopefully, by insuring that the Food and Drug Administration is furnished with early reports on drugs being tested, they will lead actually to an acceleration of approval of applications for new drugs and at the same time provide greater protection to the public against hazardous ones. We are well aware that the drug manufacturers, new drug investigators, practicing physicians, hospitals, clinics, pharmacists, and all others engaged in investigational drug areas are vitally interested in these regulations. It is my sincere wish that the regulations will be helpful to us all.

Under the investigational drug regulations, the sponsor is required to submit a notice of claimed exemption to the Food and Drug Administration before a new drug is administered to human subjects. The requirements of this exemption include submission of details of animal studies that have been undertaken, and an outline of the proposed clinical studies together with information concerning the facilities and qualifications of the investigators for both the preclinical and clinical studies. The regulations also require notification to the FDA of any adverse reactions occurring during the testing of the drug and notification to the other investigators of any such untoward reactions. The sponsor is also required to present sufficient details regarding the manufacture of the new drug to insure adequate control of its quality.

A "new drug" is defined as a drug that is not generally recognized by experts as safe and effective for the use suggested in its labeling, or, one which has become recognized as safe and effective as a result of investigative studies, but has not been used to a material extent or for a material time as recommended in its labeling. It is not necessarily an entirely new entity, but may be an old drug proposed for a new use, a combination of two or more old drugs, or an old combination of drugs in new proportions, a new dosage form or method of administration of an old drug, or it may be a new drug because it contains a new component such as an excipient, carrier, coating or menstruum.

The anticipated procedure for handling the forthcoming submissions pertaining to new drugs for investigational use has been the subject of many inquiries and understandably is of interest to all parties concerned. Between now and March 9, the Investigational Drug Branch expects to receive the required listing of the investigational drugs used in clinical trial on or after August 10, 1962, whether or not these drugs are still in clinical trial. While only the name of the drug is required to be submitted, other pertinent information such as a proposed use of the drug, would be most helpful. This would, of course, permit more efficient planning for the receipt of the sponsor's statements within the 120-day period set forth in the regulations. All submitted lists will be acknowledged by a form letter. When the program swings into its second phase and the completed notice of claimed investigational exemption for a new drug is received, it will be acknowledged by letter, and a number will be assigned to the submission. It is anticipated that this will be designated as an IND (investigational new drug) number. It is felt that these initials will not be confused with the presently used NDA (new drug application) identification. Should the drug under investigation subsequently be submitted as a new drug application, a NDA number will be assigned and the sponsor may request that reference be made to the appropriate IND submission for supporting data.

Additionally it is envisioned that certain rather standardized information such as details of the pilot plant operation for manufacture of the investigational drug, facili-

ties and personnel for animal pharmacology and, in some cases, for clinical pharmacology may be submitted by the sponsor in some sort of a master file, especially in areas involving little change. There is one caution in this regard: such files should be updated, as needed, when changes do occur.

On receipt of the exemption notice, we will extract and index certain basic information as rapidly as possible. The anticipated magnitude of the task ahead makes electronic means for data storage and retrieval mandatory. Steps are already being undertaken to develop such a system, and it is to be hoped that at least some of the basic procedures may be put into operation by the time the claimed exemptions start to accumulate. Such means for rapid recall of correlated data will also speed consideration of subsequent submissions.

When the sponsor submits his claimed exemption he may proceed to distribute the drug for clinical trial without any go-ahead from FDA. Initially, we may be unable to correspond on such submissions except those presenting significant problems. However, as our staff grows in size and experience we hope to make additional helpful contributions to investigational programs.

In regard to the scientific training and experience of the investigators, it is acknowledged that numbers of publications, board certification, or even university affiliations do not necessarily give a true measure of an individual's research competence, nevertheless they do give some indication of the individual's background and experiences that may qualify him to investigate a certain class of compound. It would be helpful if the various specialty groups were to lay down specifications that they considered appropriate for investigators in their particular field. It may eventually be that some sort of criteria should be set up for clinical pharmacology, but it should always be borne in mind that very occasionally an apparently unorthodox approach to a problem may open up entirely new fields of knowledge, so that the doors should not be automatically closed to those individuals who fall outside of some such rigid system of evaluation.

In regard to animal tests, again no inflexible criteria are anticipated to be required before the administration of the drug to human subjects. While fairly comprehensive studies will be demanded for entirely new substances, the proposed use of the drug will be taken into consideration and obviously the same criteria could not be expected to be applied, for example, to a drug for the treatment of grand mal epilepsy as to a drug for the treatment of terminal cancer. Again, in the regulations, recognition is given to the fact that clinical investigations of all drugs do not necessarily fall into three clearly separable phases, or that such studies will follow clearly predictable patterns. In regard to the submission of information of adverse reactions, it is expected that reports will be as extensive and informative as possible, and in turn will be evaluated carefully and considerately by the investigational drug branch. It should be appreciated that there may be occasions when the Food and Drug Administration may have access to information not known to the sponsor relevant to a given drug, which may demand a different evaluation of the reaction. In such cases, of course, further discussions can be held and a decision reached as to what are the appropriate measures to be taken.

While it may appear superfluous, nevertheless it should be emphasized that a good clinical study must include an accurate description of the patient before, during, and for some time after the administration of a drug under study. All too frequently, however, an important side effect may not be reported, because the observer felt it could not be drug-related since no other cases of this complication had been reported. Prompt notification of suspected, or pronounced, adverse reactions should be made to all other investigators both to safeguard the patient and to alert the investigators.

The provision that the clinical trial should provide more than one clinical investigator is a recognition that bias may creep into any clinical investigation and that the use of several investigators serves to provide a more balanced judgment. Naturally, this should not be interpreted to mean that investigation of a drug cannot be discontinued if from the results obtained by the first clinical investigator, it is deemed to be unsafe or ineffective. In regard to clinical studies in which some of the patient care is delegated, for example, to interns or residents, by the clinical investigator, it would not appear necessary to outline the qualification of such junior men, recognizing that the responsibility for the exempt drug remains with the original clinical investigator. This investigator, however, may not furnish an independent colleague with the drug for separate investigation. In such a case it would be necessary for the latter individual to follow the normal procedures of completing the required statement of investigator form, stating his qualifications and outlining the plan of his investigations. His reports would be separate, as would be his study of the drug.

It is difficult to understand why any conscientious and experienced clinical investigator would object to supplying detailed reports of his work. It is to be presumed that he would keep such reports for the protection of his patient, and, it is assumed that as a scientist he would want the optimum benefits to come from his work. To cite from "Ethical Standards for Psychologists," volume 2, page 3, 1952: "As a scientist, the psychologist is committed to increasing man's understanding of man, and in this pursuit he places high value on objectivity, on integrity of procedure, and on full reporting of his work; he investigates where his judgment indicates investigation is needed; and he believes that society will be best served by his efforts when he follows conscientiously the methods of science."

Two sections that may not appear clear to the clinical investigator are those dealing with the sale of investigational drugs and with the dissemination of promotional material representing the investigational drug to be safe or useful for the purposes for which it is under investigation. Both of these are intended to curb commercialism before the drug has been released. It is appreciated, however, that there may be occasions in which sale of an investigational drug may be permitted if its distribution by other means places an undue burden on the sponsor. Furthermore, it is not the intent of the regulations in any way to stifle the presentation or publication of scientific papers or the reporting of such investigations in the lay press. The provision of a rapid means of adding new qualified investigators to those already listed in the notice of proposed exemption provides a means of supplying in emergencies what may prove to be a lifesaving drug. Obviously again, it is to the sponsor's advantage that insistence be placed on the requirement that the investigator supply adequate records of the use of the drug.

The limit placed on the unduly prolonged distribution of investigational drugs is again direct toward flagrant abuses when actually commercialization of an investigational drug has occurred, without any bona fide attempt being made by the sponsor to acquire scientific data or to file a new drug application. Ample recognition will be made of the fact, however, that with a drug used in a rare condition, a long period of time may elapse before adequate studies have accumulated to permit evaluation of the safety and usefulness of the drug. All too often such accumulation of data may be unduly delayed by the failure of users of the drug to provide adequate protocols after the drug has been made available to them. Again, the new regulations should facilitate the collection of this much needed supporting data.

It is somewhat surprising that objections should have been made to the provision that patients or persons used as controls, or their representatives be informed that investigational drugs are being used and that their consent be obtained before they serve as experimental or control subjects. While such provisions may not previously have been part of either Federal or State law, they are embodied in the code of ethics of the American Medical Association and have been upheld in civil courts. It should be noted that ample provision is made for the physician to withhold such information if in his professional judgment it is not in the best interest of the patient, or where obtaining consent of the patient or his representative is not feasible.

In conclusion, the 1962 Kefauver-Harris amendment of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the 1963 regulations for investigational drugs stress the need for improved procedures in the clinical testing of new drugs for safety and efficacy. Fears have been expressed that the additional requirements will discourage clinicians from testing drugs. However, it should be acknowledged that the current status of drug evaluation leaves much to be desired. Much of this is due to the lack of adequately trained and experienced clinical investigators. It is hoped that the new requirements for improved testing procedures will give added stature to the field of drug testing and that recent steps taken to provide fellowships and training programs in clinical pharmacology will be accelerated.

PROBLEMS RELATING TO INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS

(Talk given at the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, Medical Section, at Belleview-Biltmore Hotel, Clearwater, Fla., March 20–22, 1963, Frances O. Kelsey, M.D., Chief, Investigational Drug Branch).

Today, I plan to discuss some of the aspects of the new investigational drug regulations that have most frequently come up for discussion with either members of the pharmaceutical industry or with clinical investigators.

First in answer to the most frequently asked question, the total number of investigational drugs that have been listed is 2,445. These may represent some duplications, since occasionally two or more sponsors may list the same drug, particularly those agents used largely as tools for pharmacological research. Fifteen "notices of claimed investigational exemption for a new drug" have been received and are under review. While our staff is still small, we have had every assurance that additional members will be added to cope with the necessity of the rapid surveillance of the submitted notices.

We are often asked to comment informally on the adequacy of the proposed clinical trials of investigational drugs. We are glad to be of assistance in this regard. So that we will have full information upon which to base comment, we would appreciate the submission of a completed claim for exemption with requests for our review of proposed programs.

The question is frequently raised as to whether a "notice" should be submitted by June 7, for drugs for which an NDA has been submitted but which is pending or has been considered incomplete or inadequate. Under such circumstances, if the sponsor plans to continue clinical investigation of the drug, he must submit a sponsor's statement

and any information already a part of the new drug application may be incorporated by reference in such a statement.

In regard to products subject to the licensing provisions of the Public Health Service Act, we suggest that the "notice" be submitted directly to the Division of Biologics Standards, Public Health Service for review and evaluation. We are considering an amendment of section 130.3(g) of the regulations to provide for this.

Another question frequently raised concerns the possibility of allowing new drugs that have been approved for marketing in one form to be packaged, for purposes of conducting an investigational study, in another form without having to go through a new drug clearance procedure and without being considered investigational drugs that would require sponsorship under the new regulations. However, experience has shown that apparently insignificant changes in the formulation of a drug may have an effect upon its safety and/or effectiveness and has led us to conclude that issuing an exemption to permit such changes for use in investigational programs would not adequately safeguard the public health.

For example, if the preparation of the drug in a different form involves the use of excipients or fillers not present in the original approved new drug, there is the possibility that the added materials will change the therapeutic effect of the drug by interaction with other ingredients, or influence the absorption of the active ingredient. Any of these effects would of course nullify the effort to secure a duplicate of the original drug. We realize that every change of formulation will not lead to profound changes in effect of the drug; however, the task of submitting the amount of information that we need in the claim for exemption for a change in formulation will frequently be slight and will offer no problem.

Some concern has been expressed by investigators in regard to the patient consent aspects of the Kefauver-Harris amendments of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Apparently some investigators do not realize that the responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration extend only to the use of investigational drugs, i.e., new drugs for which there is no approved new drug application. It does not extend to the use of a drug already on the market which is being used for clinical investigation. For example, should an investigator wish to compare the analgesic effect of one or more drugs already on the market with that of a placebo, provided he used the dosage range, dosage form and mode of administration provided for by the new drug applications, the matter of consent would not involve the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Similarly, unless interstate commerce is involved, the same would obtain if the physician were to vary any of those criteria or to use the drug for a purpose other than that provided for by the new drug application.

It has occasionally been stated that the present laws and regulations will result in fewer new drugs. Certainly new drugs, whether certifiable or not will have to undergo rigorous evaluation, but no more rigorous than they should have undergone in the absence of any Federal law. The new law will require all firms to meet the standards recognized as proper by both the medical-scientific community and the more progressive manufacturers. There is no excuse for therapeutic adventurism or exploitation. While the unorthodox or unconventional approach should be be discouraged, we should not hesitate to take a firm though fair stand regarding those claims for safety and effectiveness based on pseudo-scientific concepts and inadequately executed or controlled experimentation.

Many inquiries have been made concerning the procedures to be followed in the use of drugs purely for investigational purposes with no apparent clinical application. Such studies would include drugs used to elucidate mechanisms of intermediary metabolism and possibly such substances as LSD_{25} or psilocybin used to explore mental processes rather than to alleviate any mental disease. Such substances, of course, fall under the definition of a drug, i.e., they are "articles (other than foods) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or animals." While such compounds are more often used in healthy volunteers than patients, admittedly when patients are involved such experiments may not be undertaken for the patient's direct advantage. However, we are aware that such experiments are not undertaken for idle curiosity, but with the hope that the information so gained may ultimately contribute to the improvement of human welfare by adding to the sum knowledge of the functioning of the human body in health or disease.

The role of the Food and Drug Administration in such situations would be to insure that adequate quality control had been exercised over the drug in question, that the individuals engaged in its investigational use were adequately qualified and had adequate facilities to undertake the work, and that the information gained from such studies would be available so that the safety and the usefulness of the procedure could be more readily assessed should the occasion arise. It is felt that new drug applications for a number of such compounds may ultimately be approved as sufficient information is available and labeling is prepared covering their safe use as research tools. In the interim, however, we believe that the paperwork required of the sponsor of such products, by the new law and the regulations is not unreasonable.

There appears to be some apprehension among investigators that their qualifications or clinical studies will not be acceptable to the Food and Drug Administration, and confusion has arisen as to the precise definition of a clinical pharmacologist. Ideally, phase I studies at least would be undertaken primarily by an individual with a broad training in pharmacology, irrespective of his field of medical specialization, who carries out his studies on drugs in human beings rather than animals, isolated organs, enzyme systems, or other nonhuman modalities. In general such individuals would be best qualified to observe subtle pharmacologic effects during initial trials. It is, however, realized that not all clinical studies submitted in support of a new drug application will necessarily represent comprehensive and exhaustive clinical studies. Many valuable observations have been contributed by clinicians utilizing powers of observation and commonsense rather than a battery of laboratory tests or double blind studies of intricate design. Additionally, some of the problems attendant upon the use of a new drug may not be readily appreciated until use of the drug passes to less experienced hands than those of the initial users of the drug.

The attainment of ideal standards will admittedly be difficult because of the dearth of pharmacologists for both animal and clinical studies. Results of a survey by Pelikan and Unna, undertaken for the Council on Educational Affairs of the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics (Graduate Education in Pharmacology Journal of Medical Education 36, 1266, 1961) indicate that an average of only 49 Ph. D's were graduated per year in the United States during the 4 years 1955–1959.

A program of training grants in pharmacology was established at the National Institutes of Health in 1957. This program had the vigorous support of the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, the members of which were well aware of the failure of the supply of pharmacologists to keep up with the demands for their services. Currently, there are U.S. Public Health Service grant-supported research training programs in 50 departments of pharmacology in medical schools in this country, with 338 trainees receiving stipends. Additionally, such training programs permit expansion and improvement of facilities and thus enhance the attractiveness of the field to prospective students.

There are also 10 training programs providing for 27 trainees in departments of anesthesiology throughout the country, which are oriented toward basic research in this discipline. It should be stressed, however, that of the approximately 11,000 individuals receiving support from training grants awarded by the National Institutes of Health, only about 5 percent are in pharmacology or related fields such as toxicology, pharmacy, and chemistry. Of the 125 awards made by the National Institutes of Health under the research career program, 38 were to pharmacologists. Thirty-seven of these were development awards and one, only, a career award. Perhaps the amended law will help indirectly to increase the numbers of well-trained research investigators and thereby improve the quality of drug research.

In conclusion, it is to be hoped that the challenges offered by the amended law will attract well-trained clinical pharmacologists and therapeutically oriented physicians into the Food and Drug Administration. Hopefully, too, one of the byproducts of the amended law will be the more frequent use of outside consultants and advisory committees on scientific matters.

THE ROLE OF THE INVESTIGATIONAL DRUG BRANCH OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

(Paper for the Science Writers Seminar at La Jolla Beach and Tennis Club at La Jolla, Calif., April 5–10, 1963, by Frances O. Kelsey, M.D., Chief, Investigational Drug Branch)

The Investigational Drug Branch is a newly established branch of the Division of New Drugs of the Bureau of Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration. Its role is in essence to assure that the food and drug agency be fully informed of any new drug undergoing trials in human subjects. In this regard, the definition of a drug includes not only articles used in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment or prevention of diseases, but also articles intended to affect the structure or any function of the body. Further, a "new drug" is defined as a drug that is not generally recognized by experts as safe and effective for the use suggested in its labeling, or one which has become recognized as safe and effective as a result of investigative studies, but has not been used to a material extent or for a material time as recommended in its labeling. It is not necessarily an entirely new entity, but may be an old drug proposed for a new use, a combination of two or more old drugs or an old combination of drugs in new proportions, a new dosage form or method of administration of an old drug, or it may be a new drug because it contains a new component such as an excipient, carrier, coating, or menstruum.

Prior to the passage of the Virus, Serum, and Toxin Act of 1902 and the Food and Drug Act of 1906 there were practically no restrictions on the manufacture or the sale of medicinal products in the United States. The 1906 law, however, merely permitted the Government to halt the sale of a drug if it was proved to be dangerous or misbranded. Control over the introduction of new, untested, and possibly dangerous drugs

did not exist until the passage of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. The need for restrictions, however, had long been evident and was tragically highlighted in 1937 when more than 100 persons died from the marketing of a solution of sulfanilamide in an inadequately tested solvent, diethylene glycol, which by the most rudimentary toxicologic tests could be shown to be highly toxic.

The 1938 law which required that all new drugs had to be shown to be safe before marketing, has recently been strengthened by the Kefauver-Harris drug amendments of 1962 to include the requirement that a new drug must be shown to be effective as well as safe. The Kefauver-Harris amendments and the revised regulations, brought about many other changes including provisions for the regulation of drugs under investigational use, that led to the formation of the Investigational Drug Branch.

Prior to the 1962 amendments, a manufacturer was free to distribute a drug for investigational use provided the drug was clearly labeled as such, that accurate records were kept by the manufacturer of its distribution, and that the drug was distributed to qualified investigators only. The investigator in turn was required to sign a statement that he had the facilities for investigating the drug and that the drug would be used solely by him or under his direction. If the manufacturer on the basis of such clinical trials wished to market the drug into interstate commerce for general use he was required to submit a new drug application to the FDA for review, containing full information showing that the drug had been adequately tested to show whether or not it was safe for use for which it was recommended. Such an application, known as a new drug application (or NDA) would include full disclosure of the nature of the drug; manufacturing data pertaining to the controls used in the manufacturing, processing, and packing of the drug; reports of appropriate animal or other biological experiments performed to establish the safety of the drug, particularly acute and chronic toxicity in various species of animals; and clinical studies performed by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of drugs. If, however, the manufacturer decided not to market the drug, he was not required to notify the Government of the investigations undertaken with the drug or even that such a drug was under investigation.

Under the new amendment and regulations, the sponsor of a new drug (e.g., the manufacturer or a clinical investigator) is required to submit to the Food and Drug Administration a notice of claimed exemption before the drug is first used in man. The notice of claimed exemption must include, among other things, details concerning the composition of the product, and such animal studies as have been done with the drug together with the qualifications of the persons who evaluate the pharmacologic studies. The notice must also include a description of the planned clinical studies with the facilities and the qualifications of the investigators undertaking such studies. As clinical studies progress, the sponsor is required to submit progress reports to the Food and Drug Administration. He is also required to furnish the Food and Drug Administration and all clinical investigators with details concerning any adverse effects associated with the use of the drug, whether or not these can be definitely ascribed to the preparation. The Food and Drug Administration may in turn halt further investigations or request modifications in the clinical trials if it is felt such adverse effects are sufficiently alarming to merit such action.

One problem which has recently attracted considerable attention is the question of the safety of drugs administered during pregnancy. Two particularly critical periods as far as the developing child is concerned are the first 3 and the last 3 months of pregnancy. It is known that certain drugs may cause fetal malformations if taken by the mother during the first 3 months of pregnancy. Additionally in the fetus and the newborn infant the mechanisms for disposing of certain drugs are incompletely developed so that the newborn infant may show ill effects from drugs which have been given to the mother during pregnancy and which have passed from the circulation of the mother to that of the child.

The development of laboratory methods suitable for the detection of teratogenic effect of drugs is of prime importance. Recently there have been several reports of the production of congenital malformations in various species of animals treated with thalidomide. While many of these studies involve rather high doses of the drug, this is not necessarily of significance since little is still known of the metabolism of the drug in animals or in humans. Injection of the drug into the yolk sac of the developing chick embryo offers a promising and convenient method for the screening of drugs for a possible teratogenic effect. The recognition and utilization for pharmacologic testing of strains of animals with hereditary defects or other special characteristics is a relatively unexplored field of great potential value. A new branch of science, in fact, pharmacogenetics, has developed in recent years indicating the close contact between geneticists and pharmacologists.

In the case of thalidomide, anticipation of a possible toxic effect in the fetus was prompted by the report that the drug caused peripheral neuritis in a fairly high percent of adults taking the drug ove an extended period. Preliminary reports suggested that some other factor, such as dietary deficiency, was associated with this side effect. It was felt that the embryo with its rapidly dividing cells and developing organ structures and imperfect enzyme systems might be particularly susceptible to the drug.

It has not infrequently been claimed that many adverse effects of drugs are not revealed during the stage of clinical investigation and specifically that despite widespread clinical testing the adverse effects of thalidomide were not recognized until the drug had been on the market for several years. However, the most widespread disasters from this drug occurred in countries in which apparently no preclearance of new drugs was required before they were introduced on the market. In the case of thalidomide, there is no evidence of studies, either in this country or in Europe, to determine the safety of the drug in early pregnancy. Had such studies been undertaken, they would surely have revealed the nature of the drug since reports indicate that at least 20 percent of women receiving the drug during the first trimester of pregnancy gave birth to malformed babies. Furthermore, reports indicate that even in the rather limited clinical trial that the drug had in this country, both peripheral neuropathy and phocomelia were produced by the drug.

Unfortunately these side effects apparently were not recognized as drug-related by the clinical investigators, whose index of suspicion may have been dulled by the assertion that the safety of the drug was assured by its several years of use in Europe. The existence of several thousand phocomelic babies must be considered to be due to the failure of adequate clinical evaluation in a number of countries before the drug was marketed for general use. It is hoped that the new requirements will result in improved procedures for preclinical and clinical evaluation of the safety and effectiveness of new drugs.

Feed Grain Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules of this House has had under consideration House Resolution 320. That resolution, if adopted, will make in order the consideration by this House of H.R. 4997, a bill authored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], which is designed to extend the feed grain bill. The bill, if enacted, will be known as the Feed Grain Act of 1963.

The rule, House Resolution 320, provides that in the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4997), the House may use 3 hours in general debate. The time shall be equally divided and it shall be controlled by the chairman, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate, the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

I am proud to have the privilege of presenting on behalf of the Committee on Rules the rule on this bill. I was born and raised on a farm, and have myself been engaged in farming, more or less, all my life. My State of Alabama continues to be, by and large, an agricultural State. Its agricultural interests are diverse within the State, ranging from the peanut area of southeast Alabama to the cotton area of Sand Mountain, and to the broiler area which stretches all across north Alabama. The rich lands of the Tennessee Valley continue to give forth a great harvest. The beef farms of Alabama's black belt are now among the finest in the Nation. Our farmers have very greatly improved their ability to grow corn and feed grains in the last 25 years. In dairying, Alabama has very substantial interests.

The average Alabama farmer is a man whose philosophy and expression have been tempered by hard work, an understanding of and appreciation of the laws of nature, and an abiding faith in man's movement toward the ultimate goal of goodness.

As I understand the Alabama farmer, he has his own immediate agricultural interests which have to do with his own economic well-being, but at the same time, he has an understanding and an appreciation for the overall needs of America's agriculture. He realizes that if agriculture is strong in the Southeast that it must be strong in the Midwest. If agriculture is strong on the Atlantic seaboard it must be strong in other parts of our Nation.

Now, the purpose of the bill which the rule before us seeks to make in order for immediate consideration is a bill whose purposes are fourfold. First, those who have studied it believe that it will raise farm income; second, those who have worked on this bill firmly allege and believe that it will lower the surplus stocks of feed grains; third, it is believed that the passage of the bill will save millions

of dollars of the taxpayers' money; and fourth, it will give the feed and grain producer more flexibility in the operation and the management of his own farm, which is a goal always to be desired.

Since this feed grain program complements and works along side and with the wheat program enacted by the Congress last year, prompt action on this feed grain measure is urgently needed in order for wheat producers to be in a position to make the best decision in the 1964 wheat referendum to be held next month, on May 21.

In summary, the bill, H.R. 4997, provides for a voluntary feed grain program for feed grain crops to be produced in 1964 and 1965. In the event that the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the total supply of feed grains is likely to be excessive, he would be required to develop an acreage diversion program.

Price supports for corn, if a feed grain acreage diversion program is in effect, would be between 65 percent and 90 percent of parity to those producers who participate in the acreage diversion program.

Price support for other feed grains would be comparable to that for corn; a portion of the price support would be made in the form of a payment in kind. The amount of the payment in kind would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure that the benefits of the price support and diversion program would benefit all cooperating producers.

If no acreage diversion program is in effect, the price support would be at the level authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, but might be restricted to those producers who do not exceed the feed grain basis established for the farm.

Land diversion payments-in-kind for 1964 and 1965 are authorized at levels not in excess of 50 percent of the support price, including that portion of the support price-in-kind which is actually paid in kind, and it relates to the normal production of the acreage diverted.

The base acreage used to determine the percentage of land to be diverted would continue to be 1959 and 1960 average adjusted acreage. However, the average acreage of wheat for 1959, 1960, and 1961 produced under the feed wheat exemption, which is under section 335(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in excess of the small farm wheat basis established for the farm would be included in the feed grain base under this bill.

A new feature of the bill is a provision to reserve not to exceed 1 percent of the estimated State feed base for apportionment to farms on which there were no acreages devoted to feed grains during 1959 and 1960, with specific guidelines for apportioning the reserve to such farms. Farms that receive bases under the provision would not be eligible for land payments in the first year. Farms that receive bases under the provision would not be eligible for land diversion payments in the first year.

The adjusted yield used to determine the normal production for price support payments and land diversion payments for the 1964 crop would be based on the 1959–62 average yield, and for the 1965 crop the 1959–63 average yield. For farmers who prove their actual acreage and yields, such proven acreage and yields shall be used in making the determinations.

The acreage to be diverted would be determined as that necessary to achieve the acreage goal, but could not exceed the larger of 50 percent of the base, or 25 acres.

Payment-in-kind involved in the price support and acreage diversion program would be in the form of negotiable certificates with CCC authorized to redeem such certificates for feed grains valued at not less than the current support price less that part of the support price made available through payments-in-kind, plus reasonable carrying charges.

The term "feed grains" under the bill means corn, grain sorghums, and barley. The term "feed grains" also includes oats and rye if the producers on a wheat farm so request, in which case the diversion program shall be applicable to oats and rye and the producers could, if they desired, utilize such acreages for the purpose of having acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains pursuant to section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. However, permitted acreages of oats and rye under the diversion program may not be planted to corn, grain sorghums, and barley.

While I recognize that there are many critics of the voluntary feed grain programs of the last 3 years, yet the results of those programs speak very eloquently for themselves. In 1961, prior to the impact of the first feed grain program, stocks of all feed grains were at a record 3.2 billion bushels. This year, it is estimated that stocks will be down to about 2.3 billion bushels. And, it is firmly believed that by the end of the 1963–64 marketing year, feed grain stocks will approach the reserve quantities which are deemed necessary to meet possible emergencies.

We all know that farm income in this country was up $1.2 billion in 1962 over 1960. Personally, I do not think that is enough of an increase but certainly it is a marked improvement. In addition, through June 30 this year, the cumulative savings to taxpayers in carrying charges alone on feed grains and wheat from the 1961 level will amount to nearly a quarter of a billion dollars. Eventual savings from the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grain programs alone will amount to somewhere in the neighborhood of a billion and a quarter dollars. We all know that throughout this period, consumer costs have remained very stable and in relation to income have actually declined. These reductions in stocks of feed grains and reductions in carrying charges have been accomplished without damage to our free market structure and without depressing prices. Two years ago the market price of corn in Chicago was $1.11 a bushel; today the farmer can sell grain on the Chicago market for $1.20 a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this rule should be adopted. At the proper time, I will move the previous question on its adoption.

Aid Program Blamed for Latin Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent pledge of the United States of $398.5 million in aid to Brazil has apparently smoothed the way for the Brazilian Government to nationalize $62 million worth of U.S.-owned power companies. Another example of government-to-government aid—given by the United States—encouraging socialism rather than private enterprise.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD an article by William Giandoni:

BRAZIL BUYS COMPANY—AID PROGRAM BLAMED FOR LATIN SOCIALISM

(By William Giandoni)

There is new evidence that the Alliance for Progress may be paying for a galloping socialism in Latin America.

Barely a month after Brazilian Finance Minister Francisco Santiago Dantas got pledges in Washington of up to $398.5 million in help for Brazil, announcement was made that Brazil is buying out $62 million worth of U.S.-owned power companies there.

This deal involved 10 subsidiaries of American & Foreign Power Co. which long has served some 7 million people in 346 cities, towns, and villages in 10 Brazilian states.

The company says its properties are valued at $162 million, the Brazilian Government got them for a bargain price of $135 million.

Although no company spokesman publicly voiced any complaint about the arrangement foreign businessmen in Brazil and elsewhere said there was no doubt but that Brazilian Government funds for the purchase were freed by the promises of Alliance for Progress and other foreign financial assistance for Brazil.

In truth, some observers said American & Foreign Power was fortunate. Three of its subsidiaries already had been expropriated by the governments of as many Brazilian states, which have such authority, and there was little likelihood of the parent company receiving much if anything for them until Brazil received its latest, massive foreign aid infection.

This was not the first takeover of American public utilities in Brazil. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. has lost several of its Brazilian subsidiaries.

Although the Brazilians' action is the most recent, the process of forcing American and other foreign-owned utilities to sell out has been underway in Latin America for a number of years.

But it seems to have been accelerated since President Kennedy announced the Alliance for Progress and it was decided to spend $20 billion over a 10-year period to wipe out poverty in Latin America.

Progressive nationalization of public utilities in Brazil marks a drastic reversal of Brazilian economic thought.

In a pamphlet prepared by American & Foreign Power 5 years ago, the company re-

ported that "special encouragement is given to the investment in Brazil of foreign capital in activities essential to the economy of the country."

It noted that, on July 24, 1954, the Brazilian Government's superintendency of currency and credit (SUMOC) issued a "list of industries classified as of important interest to the national economy."

Top priority was given industries "such as production of power and transportation and communications services."

It is precisely those fields where Brazil is buying up foreign properties.

Israel's 15th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, Israel is celebrating its 15th anniversary as a state, and I am happy to have the opportunity to join with Israel's many friends in observing this date.

We know that the joy of the people of Israel in reaching this milestone in their history has been diminished by the death of their great leader and dearly beloved President, Itzhak Ben-Zvi. Their happiness is also marred by the most recent threat against their existence—the treaty of union signed by Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, which, it is reported, includes an article calling for the destruction of Israel. How tragic it is that this brave, new state, which was attacked only a few hours after achieving its independence in 1948, has been forced to exist in a state of war ever since; that her neighbors refuse to grant her the peace for which Israel has begged and for which she has always aimed. Premier David Ben-Gurion, in his 15th independence anniversary message to his people, described for us the true, splendid character of the people of Israel and the deepest wishes of the state when he said:

> Let us all realize that before making demands on others we must first of all make demands on ourselves. Let us steadfastly and confidently continue to hold out our hand in peace.

The Israel people are to be congratulated upon their many splendid achievements in the face of overwhelming odds; truly, they have performed miracles. One miracle is that this small country has managed to survive, to grow, and flourish, despite a program of immigrant absorption that no one could believe possible and that no other country in history has ever undertaken before. Israel has managed to resettle and rehabilitate more than a million immigrants.

The people of Israel have labored with unbelievable energy and devotion. No tasks are too great, no sacrifices too costly in their efforts to reach their goals for their homeland. They have made the desert bloom. Worthless land has been made fertile and it now produces 75 percent of the food required to feed the people. Israel has followed an ambitious plan of economic development; she has created a diversified industrial structure, and the list of new and enlarged Israel industries is an impressive one; chemicals, pharmaceuticals, textiles, building materials, precision instruments, electrical appliances, metalworks, household and sanitary equipment, wearing apparel, and processed foods, and others. In addition to the expansion in industry and agriculture, the Israel Government has sponsored large investments in mining. Giant strides have been made in the field of education; three great universities have been opened. Housing, transportation, building construction, cultural advancement, are other goals which have been reached.

Because the new State of Israel has made such phenomenal progress, she is a shining example to newly created states of Africa and Asia who now seek to emulate her. Israel is responding generously; to the fullest extent possible, it is sharing its experiences with those who request it. Manpower training in Israel is provided; experts, advisers, instructors, and survey teams are sent on request; Israel teams plan and organize training facilities abroad, and trained personnel prepare and implement itinerant courses in developing countries, utilizing the latest training aids. Israel plays a leading role in a number of vast multilateral development plans. Israel trains nurses for medical and public health work and at present manages and directs several hospitals in Ethiopia and Ghana; an eye clinic was established in Liberia by Israel surgeons and physicians. The technical program plus the unselfishness of the Israelis, their dedication to their tasks, and their achievements in their own country have all combined to infuse the new nations with the hope that they can accomplish the same wonderful results.

We must admire Israel for her foreign-aid program; we can be grateful that the emerging underdeveloped nations look to her, for Israel has proved what united, dedicated people of a new nation can accomplish under a democratic form of government. All this is a powerful weapon against the spread of communism in the new nations. The United States must continue to do all in its power to help preserve the security of Israel and to save her from destruction.

We salute the State of Israel, our ally, our bastion of democracy in the Middle East. We hail her valiant citizens who, daily, have unflinchingly faced aggression by their neighbors. We praise them for their myriad achievements and their unselfishness in assisting others although still confronted with serious problems in their own land.

We pray that the gallant country of Israel will be granted the just rewards it has earned; happiness for its people and peace for the nation.

Lack of Strong Anti-Communist Policy by Kennedy Administration Gives Reds Advantage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Communists have again seized the initiative in the cold war simply because of the failure of the Kennedy administration to enunciate a strong and coherent foreign policy. The day-to-day vacillation of President Kennedy wherein one moment we are pledged to rid this hemisphere of the Communists, and the next we are protecting the Red dictator of Cuba from those who would free their homeland, has caused such a lowering of U.S. prestige that Khrushchev is once again emboldened to thumb his nose at us and create twin crises in Cuba and Laos.

How long, Mr. Speaker, can the United States hold up under the repeated failure of the Kennedy administration both at home and abroad?

The following article from the May 6 edition of U.S. News & World Report reminds us all too clearly what President Kennedy's failure in meeting Communist aggression in Cuba has caused:

WAR FOR U.S. IN ASIA, PULLBACK IN CUBA?

(NOTE.—Communists on two fronts have U.S. in a dilemma. Decision on Communist Cuba, right next door, is "hands off" for now. But Communists halfway around the world, in southeast Asia, have Americans fighting in one war, building up against another. What's the difference between Cuba and Laos? Much more than distance is involved.)

A contrast in policies of the U.S. Government toward operations of communism abroad is beginning now to raise new questions.

On the one hand, American soldiers today are fighting and dying in a war against Communists in southeast Asia—7,500 miles from home. During recent days, Americans have been edging toward another war in the same area to check a Communist takeover.

On the other hand, the U.S. Government has just thrown a screen of protection around armed forces of communism—including Russian armed forces—barely 90 miles off U.S. shores.

SOFT PEDAL ON CUBA

Cuba, next door to United States slipped as an attention getter after the U.S. Government clamped down hard on activities of anti-Communist Cuban exiles.

Laos, 7,500 and more miles away, jumped into the news when Communists broke a truce they had entered into only a few short months before.

The flareup in Laos was related to the war next door in Vietnam in which thousands of American troops are engaged. This is a war to keep Communists from taking over the southern half of Vietnam—a sort of miniature Korean war.

In recent days, the powerful U.S. 7th Fleet moved to the Gulf of Siam, ready to intervene if needed. American Marines were alerted. On April 24, announcement was

made that more than 3,000 U.S. troops will join with allies for massive maneuvers in Thailand, next door to Laos, in June.

NO-NONSENSE STAND?

In Washington, emergency sessions of the National Security Council were held. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State, said in London on April 23: "It is very important that we make the Communists realize that we are not going to stand for any nonsense." President Kennedy sent him to Moscow for talks with the Russians.

Mr. Harriman earlier had been convinced that the deal with the Communists to "neutralize" Laos could be made to stick. He had negotiated a settlement with the Communists in mid-1962, only to see it violated in one form or another from the start. Suddenly Communist armed forces had taken the offensive and put themselves in a position to dominate that strategic area.

Talk quickly revived that another deal now might be needed in which Communists would be given outright control over the northern half of Laos as they had gained control of North Vietnam and North Korea. Military men, however, argued that Communists, if permitted a secure base in Northern Laos, would be in position both to step up their effort to take over Vietnam and to threaten Thailand increasingly.

War could spread gradually, involving a still larger American military effort.

Laos, in other words, is seen to be a very strategic area. The country by itself is without economic or political importance. Its geography is described as the important thing: It lies in the center of the southeastern part of Asia that Communist China covets and expects sooner or later to get.

On the other side of the world—7,500 and more miles to the east—Cuba also holds a strategic position.

THE CLOSER DANGER

In Communist hands, Cuba lies athwart major shipping lanes to South and Central America and to the Panama Canal. The location is pictured by naval officers as ideal for a clandestine base close to United States for Soviet submarines that otherwise must be supplied across thousands of miles of water when operating off the U.S. coast.

It is this potential as a secret supply base for missile-carrying submarines of the Russian fleet that most concerns U.S. defense officials. A point is made that Russians were able to sneak into Cuba, itself, and to put in place batteries of missiles before United States happened to detect them.

Cuba in Communist hands and under Russian control, however, is taking second place to far-off Asia in the calculations of American officials.

In southeast Asia, American military forces are directly involved. In Cuba, American power is being used to protect the Communists against interference by anti-Communist Cubans.

Castro recently praised the United States for its effort to keep his enemies under control.

A CONFUSING SWITCH

It's this contrast between war against Communists in Asia and a form of coexistence with Communists next door to the United States that has raised questions. There are beginning to be hints, however, that this contrast may not always exist to the same extent as now.

A point is made that sporadic raids from uninhabited islands in the Bahamas—with use of small boats—could have only a nuisance value without interfering seriously with the Communist hold on Cuba. But some American officials point out privately that Cuba is highly vulnerable to effectively organized infiltration, internal subversion, and sabotage—all weapons that the Communists use freely whenever they get a chance.

LEAF FROM CASTRO'S BOOK

Cuba is plagued by shortages of all kinds. Oil must come from Soviet sources to be refined in Cuban refineries that are close to the coast. Cuba pays her bills to Russia with sugar, and sugar mills are easily tampered with. There are opportunities to organize and to supply guerrilla bands in the mountainous areas of Cuba—just as Castro organized his bands and was supplied from the United States during his successful campaign to unseat the anti-Communist Batista regime.

The problem of upsetting communism in Cuba, however, is complicated, officials say, by the presence of large Russian military forces on the island. One mission of those forces is to make sure than anti-Castro Cubans do not generate a successful uprising.

SOONER OR LATER

There are some important U.S. officials who are convinced that in the end—regardless of present policies—it is going to be necessary to threaten to put American troops into action in Cuba. These officials question the logic of using U.S. troops to do a job in Asia while drawing back from involvement close to home.

Another factor is advanced by high officials of the U.S. Government to explain the contrast in policy toward Communists in Cuba and in Asia.

In Asia, these officials say, the rising danger is from Red China. The Communists running Red China are pictured as hard and willing to assume great risks. They are in a mood to expand, and they have their eyes on the riches of southeast Asia—in terms of food, minerals, and oil.

Cuba, on the other hand, can rather easily be crushed by United States if the decision is made.

A DOUBTFUL BALANCE

The position of Soviet Russia in each case is a controlling factor.

American officials appear to hope that the Russians will be able or willing to control the Red Chinese. It is to Russia that China must now look for much of her oil and her industrial products.

But Russians also are in Cuba. If the United States presses too hard to get the Russians out of Cuba, then the chance to get Russian help in Asia will be lost. Instead, the Russians will heat up trouble in southeast Asia. And, if that is not enough, there is always Berlin that Russia can heat up. So the reasoning goes.

In either case, currently it seems in the opinion of some officials to leave the United States behind the eightball.

The Warsaw Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, before this month comes to a close, all of us should pause for a moment and pay tribute to those brave men, women, and children of the Warsaw Ghetto, who 20 years ago this month, rose in revolt against the ruthless oppression of Nazi tyranny. Theirs is a tragic, heartbreaking story, an all too vivid reminder of man's inhumanity to man.

The outstanding bravery of these Polish Jews and their 6 million brethren who died in Nazi horror camps, cannot and should not be forgotten. As others the world over have, let us join in reverence for the memory of these brave people.

Wall Street Journal Article on the Honorable Wright Patman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the leading article by Paul Duke in the Wall Street Journal on the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The article describes the unique qualities of integrity, knowledge, and dedication of WRIGHT PATMAN.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

BANKING BATTLER: REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN STIRS UP KEY HOUSE COMMITTEE TO TEST DISPUTED IDEAS—NEW CHAIRMAN INVESTIGATES BANK REGULATORY POLICIES, DRAWS NEW BEAD ON FRB—THE BUSY EASY MONEY MAN

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—One recent morning a construction crew filed into a congressional office building and began hammering up acoustical siding in a third-floor suite. Until a few weeks ago the rooms were graveyard quiet, but lately the din and clatter had become so loud, that in the words of one harassed employee, "you just couldn't hear yourself think."

The sound-softening step is symbolic of the great goings on these days in the House Banking Committee. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the controversial crusader from Texas, is transforming one of Capitol Hill's sleepiest panels into a bustling battleground for his disputed ideas. As the new committee chairman, the self-styled champion of small business is striking swiftly along a broad front against old enemies in the monetary and banking field.

Mr. PATMAN already is deep into plans for a scrutiny of bank ownership, ostensibly to determine whether monopolies exist and whether the antimerger laws need tightening to prevent big banks from gobbling up small banks. He is set to take a searching look at the bank regulatory policies of U.S. Comptroller James Saxon, under fire from many small bankers; hearings will start today.

Too, the new committee chairman plans extensive hearings on this month's report, by a group under Presidential Economic Adviser Walter Heller, suggesting major changes in Federal regulation of financial institutions. Mr. PATMAN feels the recommendations didn't go far enough. He and other Democrats are hoping to build steam for a major overhaul of the Nation's banking laws next year.

On one subject or another, this tireless investigator expects to hold hearings every working day in May. Come summer and Mr. PATMAN will top things off by fulfilling a lifetime dream: His own full-scale investigation of the money-regulating Federal Reserve Board. As one of the country's foremost champions of easy money, the 69-year-old zealot for years has waged a one-man fight with Federal Reserve officials on various issues, notably interest rate policies and the board's reluctance to help the Treasury hold

down borrowing costs by supporting prices of Government bonds in the open market.

"We've got the most combat-ready committee on the Hill," sums up one member.

HOSTILE COLLEAGUES

All this, however, is causing less anxiety in the banking community than might be expected, mainly because of deepseated hostility among his fellow Congressmen toward PATMAN theories. There is, to be sure, uneasiness among some banking groups about bad publicity. But Mr. PATMAN would have to marshal more than expected support either to revamp the banking laws as he wants or to compel the Federal Reserve Board to be more obedient to its congressional critics.

Nevertheless, the chairman is sure to raise a fuss in keeping with the historic PATMAN penchant for legislative warfare. He was one of the eight House Members who voted to impeach Herbert Hoover in 1932. He quarreled bitterly with F.D.R. over a $2.4 billion bonus bill for World War I veterans. He has battled with bankers, labor unions, lobbyists, editors, fellow Congressmen and countless business groups—almost always under the chivalrous cloak of defending the small man against the big man.

From a personal standpoint, it is hard to imagine a more unlikely creature of controversy then the soft-spoken dean of the Lone Star State delegation. His warm, brown eyes, boyish grin, snips of gray hair and dark blue suit smack more of a country parson in his cotton-growing east Texas bailiwick than a congressional hell raiser. Even when questioning Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, his No. 1 adversary, Mr. PATMAN jousts jovially and never raises his temper.

COMMITTEE'S BROAD POWERS

Although he has served as chairman of the Senate-House Economic Committee and the House Small Business Committee, neither of these units has the authority to originate legislation. But the banking unit, one of the most important committees in Congress, has broad jurisdiction over a wide variety of bills pertaining to banking, monetary, and housing matters. And as chairman, Mr. PATMAN possesses immense power over the activities of the 31-member committee as well as the legislation within its domain.

The liberal Democrat became chairman in January, succeeding Kentucky's retired 88-year-old Brent Spence. During Mr. Spence's 16 years at the helm, the Committee rarely ventured into storm fields, avoided dramatic investigations, maintained the smallest staff of any major congressional committee, and spent the least money.

Now, under PATMAN prodding, the committee has become one of the busiest in Congress. The chunky southerner already has pushed along several Kennedy administration bills, including ones to provide $50 million in subsidies to streamline metropolitan transit systems and to boost the Export-Import Bank's lending authority by $2 billion, and to OK more funds for aid to depressed areas. Mr. PATMAN personally shepherded through both the committee and the House the administration's package bill to overhaul the silver laws.

The installation of the soundproof siding was, of course, a manifestation of this spurt in activity. But there are others. To move more speedily, Mr. PATMAN summoned the committee into session at 9 o'clock one recent morning—an unheard of hour for transacting any kind of congressional business. While practically all of Washington officialdom relaxed at the American League's opening baseball game, Mr. PATMAN rebelliously held an afternoon hearing on the depressed areas bill; only 4 of the 31 Members showed up. "Business as usual with PATMAN means business all the time," cracks a close associate.

In contrast to the Spartan Spence reign, the new regime is operating on a 1963 budget of $180,000, many times greater than amounts spent in bygone years. The pedagogic Mr. PATMAN is busily mapping cross country itineraries to take his committee "pupils" on educational trips to Federal Reserve banks. The number of subcommittees has jumped from four to six and new personnel are streaming in, including three doctorate professors of economics. "We haven't had a Ph. D. around here in 20 years," chortles a veteran staffer.

NEED PEP PILLS

The invigoration movement draws hurrahs from many of Mr. PATMAN's colleagues. "Some of us will need pep pills to keep up with WRIGHT, but his dynamism is going to make this one of the great committees of Congress," exults Ohio's Democratic Representative VANIK.

But the VANIK view is by no means unanimous. Some Members believe Mr. PATMAN is roaming too far afield, undertaking too many projects and using the committee too much for his own designs. Critics contend Mr. PATMAN's prejudices against the Federal Reserve and "big banks" distort his judgment. By adopting what they regard as a rigid stance, they think the chairman is unable to see monetary and banking policies in the light of overall, modern-day needs. Even PATMAN defenders think he goes too far in his denunciations of the Reserve Board.

Democratic leaders are worried that some administration bills may go down to defeat under the PATMAN banner. This concern is based on the controversy that perpetually swirls about the old warrior and the suspicions that many rank-and-file Members have against his proposals. Even with the late Speaker Rayburn's support, the House twice overwhelmingly rejected PATMAN resolutions for full-scale monetary policy probes.

Administration masterminds, in fact, are looking to the Banking Committee's No. 2 Democrat, ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, for plenty of help. "He'll have to carry lots of loads," says a Kennedy strategist. Mr. RAINS is being counted on to carry the ball during floor debate on the transit aid measure.

THE PATMAN RECORD

But the PATMAN record is far from blank despite the low opinion many Members hold of his monetary views. He was coauthor of the 1936 Robinson-Patman Act designed to protect small businesses against predatory pricecutting of merchandise. He helped guide through Congress legislation authorizing credit unions for Federal employees and was coauthor of the 1946 law decreeing full employment as a national policy. A few years ago he was a principal sponsor of the bill setting up a new Federal fund to encourage the creation of small business investment companies.

Years ago, too, Mr. PATMAN originated the first congressional newsletter, now a must for nearly all Members. To this day it remains a gem of crackerbarrel comment on a wide range of topics. A recent issue contained a prediction of the economic outlook (sluggish unless there's a tax cut) as well as a tip on a new miniature watermelon (called the Craybelle) developed by the Agriculture Department.

Certainly Mr. PATMAN is one of the most prodigious workers in Congress. As a 7-day-a-week man, he grinds out a steady stream of statements, magazine articles, and even books. He recently authored a 401-page tome designed to serve as a guide for economists and lawyers studying the Robinson-Patman Act.

Running through all of this work is the PATMAN philosophy of low-interest rates, more help for small business and suspicion of big business. Mr. PATMAN never hesitates to seek converts and once even tried to put across his liberal ideas in a serious speech before the conservative Daughters of the American Revolution.

Although many Members don't buy PATMAN philosophy, he is well liked among his conferees. He was a close friend of Mr. Rayburn and is held in equal esteem by the present Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. Even critics concede Mr. PATMAN is a fair chairman who permits all sides their say.

Is the President Planning To Give up Guantanamo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today on the floor of the House I expressed concern that the President may be attempting to soften up the American public to accept a withdrawal from Guantanamo. Mr. Speaker, there is enough smoke on this issue to make us very suspicious that a fire, in the form of a deal, has already been kindled. I hope Congress and the American people will be sufficiently aroused to warn the President that no such deal can or will be tolerated.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of April 27 states the feeling, I know, of the majority of the people from the Fifth District of Texas and, I am sure, of the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

The editorial follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 27, 1963]

GUANTANAMO

The report that the Pentagon is requesting $18 million to expand Navy facilities in Puerto Rico has touched off speculation that the United States may be preparing to withdraw from Guantanamo. It is claimed that President Kennedy may have agreed to pull U.S. forces out of the Cuban base in his correspondence with Soviet Premier Khrushchev last October, or that U.S. military authorities are merely preparing an alternative site in the event that Castro should force us out of Guantanamo.

Whatever the actual facts on the Cuban base, it does seem strange that such a large increase in our Puerto Rico naval facilities is being asked at this time. Several Members of Congress insist that there is no indicated need for this increase—unless we are preparing to move Navy and Marine forces from Guantanamo.

Legally, of course, the United States cannot be forced out of the Cuban base. In 1903—after the Spanish-American War—we were granted a 99-year lease on "Gitmo." The original treaty set an annual rent of only $2,000 for the base, an exceptionally low figure that was indicative of Cuban gratitude to the United States for its help in winning Cuba's independence from Spain.

In 1934, this treaty was renewed and expanded, granting the United States a perpetual lease on Guantanamo which could be nullified only by the consent of both Cuba and the United States or if we voluntarily abandoned the site.

Considering the value of the base and its strategic location, it would be sheer stupidity to abandon it. An old installation, Guantanamo today is one of the most modern American naval bases in the world. Its facilities are valued at approximately $76 million. It is regarded as an ideal fair weather training center for the Atlantic fleet. Its harbor is well fortified and extensive enough to accommodate 50 of this country's largest warships. The mere presence of American forces on Cuban soil, of course, is of important psychological value and a tremendous embarrassment to Castro.

That is why Fidel listed U.S. withdrawal from Guantanamo as one of his five major demands last October 28. The ultimatum, however, was primarily a face-saving maneuver and designed for local consumption in Cuba. There is good reason to suspect that Castro is not really that anxious to see the United States pull out of "Gitmo."

Castro badly needs the American dollars he receives for our occupation of the base. Every year Fidel makes a big point of refusing to cash the annual rent checks—now about $3,400. But he never fails to cash the much larger check we give him for our water supply—amounting to about $178,000. Much more important to him, of course, are the dollars he receives from the 3,400 Cubans employed on the base. The annual payroll comes to about $7,500,000.

If it were not for his desperate need of these dollars, Castro naturally would be anxious to see us leave Guantanamo. He may, in fact, feel that our departure would be more valuable than this revenue. And we can be sure of one thing. If and when we do leave the base, Castro will blow up the move into one of the biggest propaganda victories in history.

That is why we cannot, under any circumstances, even entertain the idea of allowing our forces to be pushed off the base, much less giving up the facility voluntarily.

Small Firm Versus Industry Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point two articles which appeared in the Boston Globe on April 4 and April 5 of this year concerning the Airtechnology Corp., of Cambridge, Mass., of which my good friend, William H. McMorrow is president. I am more than proud of the tremendous courage shown by this small business outfit in my home city in making the decision to go forward against this giant of industry and of the great victory which they have achieved. It is my belief that it will cheer and strengthen other small business firms and I commend the articles for the attention of my colleagues in the House.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 4, 1963]

DAVID VERSUS GOLIATH: SMALL FIRM SUES INDUSTRY GIANT

(By Peter B. Greenough)

A Cambridge industrial mouse has roared back at the lion—mighty General Electric Co.

Airtechnology Corp., a smallish electronics concern, has just won two legal rounds against GE. If Airtech eventually succeeds in court (the case is being appealed), it stands to gain a penalty award of $128,734.

Nothing phenomenal, but the principle at stake is very great indeed for Airtech. And for almost all small businesses, too.

Involved is a civil suit which lawyers hereabouts term one of the most unusual ever seen. It comes out of the jungle of current defense contracting, where little outfits must fight for every small crumb.

This David versus Goliath tale dates back a couple of years when AirTech and G.E. got together on what the Cambridge firm believed (and the court agrees) was a team effort for the Air Force.

Under the so-called 477L NUDETS project, the Air Force sought a nuclear detection system for its many continental bases. The idea: locate a nuclear blast, assess the damage and feed it to a computer for evaluation. The resulting information would automatically be relayed to Air Force's headquarters at Colorado Springs.

In this system, as proposed by General Electric, AirTech would supply a key electromagnetic sensor under subcontract.

Briefly, things went well for a while between the two companies. Then it became apparent to AirTech people that something strange was afoot.

"It became reasonably clear to us that G.E. (through its Defense Systems Division at Syracuse, N.Y.) planned to go ahead and do things 'in house,'" says William H. McMorrow, president and treasurer, of AirTech.

"One of our men went up there, and they told him that we couldn't meet the delivery schedules," McMorrow adds.

From then on things deteriorated rather rapidly.

"We had certain misgivings about starting legal action against G.E. We're small business. But we felt so strongly about this that we had no other recourse," McMorrow continues.

Sue they did.

Last summer lengthy court hearings went on here, which tied up AirTech's scientific people and just about stopped the company in its tracks.

The testimony of both companies was taken under consideration by a special master appointed by the court: Theodor Chase of Palmer, Dodge, Gardner & Bradford.

Chase's report was submitted in January to Judge Reuben L. Lurie of Suffolk County Superior Court.

Within the last 10 days Judge Lurie issued an interlocutory degree sustaining Chase's report, with all exceptions made by defense counsel overruled.

Highlights of Chase's study show this:

General Electric "did not fully perform its part of the undertaking."

A General Electric engineer, W. J. Hynes, told Owen Cunningham, AirTech representative, upon receipt of the preliminary Air Force contract:

"We feel pretty good about it here, and I want you to know that your people (AirTech) had a heck of a lot to do with our getting it."

Then, according to AirTech, the runaround began.

Chase's report touches on the feeling among AirTech personnel that "GE had picked their brains and was now trying to get rid of them."

A certain amount of candor was exhibited by GE people on the stand. One acknowledged that the whole matter was "one of the most fouled-up procurement efforts ever seen at GE."

Mixed up, and also heated. At the Battle Green Motel in Lexington personnel from both companies met and apparently fought the Second Battle of Lexington. Chase merely describes the gathering as "a stormy session."

The master's report further shows that one GE official (Hynes) later told AirTech it "would be taken care of if it didn't create a fuss."

Although GE still contests it, Chase has recognized (and Judge Lurie, too) that there was a bona fide joint venture effort involved here. Therefore:

"Participation in this joint venture imposed an obligation upon each of the parties to do nothing inconsistent with the interests of the other in the common undertaking."

By a complicated mathematical formula Chase arrived at the $128,734 damages for AirTech. Conceivably it could be revised downward by Judge Lurie in his final decree.

Since the matter is still under litigation, General Electric officers decline to discuss it. Walter Ferris of GE's legal department at Syracuse acknowledges that it is a "very interesting case."

To Ferris' knowledge, there never has been similar litigation based on the "team bidding approach."

Here there exists an almost gray area of law and practice, yet one in very real need of proper definition.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 5, 1963]

EVEN LAWYERS PUZZLED: TEAM EFFORTS DEFY DEFINITION

(By Peter B. Greenough)

"Well, how—. Gee, I don't know. It's a normal definition where two or more companies agree to work on a project, isn't it?"

Lest you get the impression that the foregoing quotation comes from a bumbling idiot, let me set things straight.

This was an answer I got from an astute Air Force colonel in procurement at Hanscom Field, Bedford, in response to a relatively simple sounding question:

"How does the Air Force or the Department of Defense define the term 'team' in defense production?"

I wouldn't have blamed the colonel if he had suggested that I consult a good lawyer, not that it could have accomplished much, either.

Lawyers are equally in a tizzy when it comes to spelling out things in this area.

Considering the tremendous amount of cooperative effort between companies and varied industries in the complex area of systems development, the fact that a legal void does exist at all is somewhat astonishing.

This area of confusion bears further consideration in light of current litigation between AirTechnology Corp., Cambridge, and General Electric Co. In a column yesterday I described how AirTech had sued G.E., all because of the uncertainties involved in team relationships.

Small businesses are having a rough enough time, as is, in getting their share of major defense work. This is just another pitfall, but one that has received little, if any, public attention.

Lawyers themselves are at a loss for words in this field (this is possible?).

Even at General Electric's legal department within their electronics systems headquarters at Syracuse, there is confusion here. Through nobody's fault I talked to Walter Ferris, G.E., lawyer involved in the AirTech case. Here's what he said:

"What the heck is a team? Team bidding is not defined anywhere in armed services literature. There's no official designation * * * it is a very difficult area."

Warren F. Farr, attorney with Ropes & Gray, Boston, has also represented G.E. in this case. While he naturally will make no comment about the litigation with AirTech since it has not been concluded, Farr does admit this:

"If anyone knows what a team relationship is * * * procurement regulations and

people say they don't know anything. It is a very elusive type of concept. A very interesting case."

William H. McMorrow, president of AirTech, doesn't set himself up as any crusader against G.E. But regardless if his company wins or loses, it still will serve a useful purpose by helping to bring into the open a thoroughly confused situation.

"One of the repercussions that should come from this is a tightening up of the relationship between a prime and the subcontractor," says Henry W. Ekstrom, manager of AirTech's contract department.

If the Department of Defense will now insist on such a definition (and also perhaps draw one up), then other little outfits will not be placed in a similar bind.

AirTech by no means is the sole victim of such a situation. It merely got mad enough to sue.

One lawyer entirely independent of the case told me this: "This is fairly typical of how many big companies treat little ones."

Thus a change of rules becomes imperative.

Forty-one Million Americans in the Lower Brackets Are Paying for Kennedy's Spending Spree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy can make a heartrending appeal to the low-income groups in encouraging them to think that all his social welfare programs are a gift to them paid for by the filthy rich. At last, the facts do not support the President. It is those in the lowest income brackets who pay for the President's wild spending sprees. Even in his loudly touted tax cut, it will be minor for those in the lower brackets and an actual increase for the middle income group.

The Kennedy welfare programs are no gift. Somebody pays and it is the people the President is seemingly worried most about who pay the bill. The Kennedy administration is conducting the greatest shell game in history and the people are the victims. Let us wise up and bring about a return to fiscal sanity by living within our means as a nation and let the Kennedy family finance their own works of charity.

The following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News of April 26, shows who pays and the facts may startle some:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Apr. 26, 1963]

WAIT A MINUTE, CITIZEN: STOP AND PONDER HOW DEEPLY YOU ARE IN DEBT

We wonder today how many people in this country who are clamoring for more and more Federal spending regardless of what it will do to our national debt realize that it now takes all the income tax payments of 41 million Americans earning up to $6,000 a year just to pay the annual interest on the current national debt.

Think about that statistic for a moment. It takes the labor and the full income taxes of 41 million Americans just to pay the interest on our national debt which now amounts to $10 billion a year.

This is a frightening thing because it demonstrates the hellbent pace at which we are rushing toward financial disaster. Yet, despite the implication inherent in all this, there is no inclination to call a halt to Federal spending. Instead it grows apace and the few men in Congress who are trying to stop it and return the country to fiscal sanity are called stodgy old fogies who don't want to get the country moving again.

Moving where, we might ask? To complete serfdom of our people to a progressive income tax structure that even the spenders admit is crippling our incentive and destroying our initiative to work and to produce? To the mythical "Random Village" that President Kennedy pictured the other day where everybody lives the good life through the splendid generosity of our Federal bureaucrats? To a dream existence where everybody gets from these same bureaucrats while nobody pays the piper?

It would be nice if somebody didn't eventually have to pay for all the favors and all the aid that Government dispenses. But as somebody once said, "There's no such thing as a free lunch," and our Government has been living off the cuff for so long a time now that the idea has spread there is no limit whatsoever to the amount of debt we can pile up and put on the backs of present and future generations of taxpayers.

To those who might think this present administration isn't being as deceptive as regards our spending and debt situation as it has been in regards to the Cuban situation we recommend the reading of an article in the May issue of the Reader's Digest.

Entitled "The Real Truth About the Federal Budget," this article strips the deception away from President Kennedy's proposed $98.8 billion budget and reveals the truth about the phony economy claims being advanced by the administration. It reveals how the budget, itself, is an almost meaningless document as it fails to include "backdoor spending" which doesn't have to be approved by Congress and which is merely tacked on to our soaring national debt.

How many of us, for instance, know that whereas Mr. Kennedy's budget pegs spending at the aforementioned $98.8 billion figure, actual spending will come closer to $128 billion? And how many of us know that since President Kennedy took office defense spending has increased by 17 percent while nondefense spending has increased by some 27 percent?

Yet, in the face of these figures, administration apologists keep on bleating that nondefense spending is being held down and that desirable programs are being curtailed or postponed.

This is a crock of baloney. No President in this Nation's history has ever proposed such a wild-eyed spending program as President Kennedy has presented to the Congress. It is so fantastic in its present and future scope that when Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, who has been scanning Presidential budgets since some of the younger Members of the House were in diapers, first saw it, he threw it on the floor with the exclamation:

"I've never seen a budget like this in all my 40 years in Congress nor has anybody else."

Men like Representative CANNON and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, another budget opponent, are apparently in a minority, however. A few days ago we saw the House backtrack on a previous decision and add another $450 million to a gigantic Federal aid make-work program for State and local governments. Acting in the same spending mood this week, the House approved a $205.7 million spending program to provide construction grants and student loans for medical and dental schools.

It can be argued that these are desirable programs and perhaps they are. But few of us in life can afford to satisfy all our desires as the facts of economic life dictate that we use caution and prudence in determining what desires we can satisfy without spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

But prudence and caution seem to be unknown words in Washington these days as regards Federal Government spending. We have a breed in office that actually believes the people do not know how to spend their money for their own good and who think it is the Government's duty and prerogative to take it away from the people and spend it for them.

To these officeholders and bureaucrats a huge debt is nothing to worry about as we only owe it to ourselves and if it takes the annual tax payments of 41 million Americans just to pay the interest on this debt, who cares?

We happen to care and we think it is time millions of other Americans started to worry about where we are heading. We have got a bloated Federal Government that is beginning to eat us out of house and home, and unless its spending appetite is curbed we won't have to wait for the Russians to bury us, as we'll do the planting job all by our apathetic and happy little selves.

Israel's Rebirth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we observed the 15th anniversary of Israel's independence. Jacob Landy, a constituent of mine, has written a poem which should remind all of us of the strength of Israel. The poem follows:

ISRAEL'S REBIRTH

Hail to thee, eternal light
Which cruel oppression and armed might
Vainly striving for three thousand years,
Could never extinguish.

All hail thy deathless spirit,
Of freedom and independence,
Which has and still survives,
Indomitable.

Like anvil of best forged steel,
Thou hast withstood all hammers,
Nor been split asunder, by blows
Most vicious.

Scattered like dust by winds of long ago,
Are thy traducers and sometime conquerors;
Yet thou livest on; they were of an age;
Thou, immortal.

Whence came thy strength and courage,
Thy boundless hope under dire adversity,
That at long last, all would be well
With thee?

Yea, despite the wrangle and strife
Of covetous men and envious nations,
Thou surely wilt and must endure.
Verily thou art a troubled world's necessity,
For Israel's mission is peace.

—*Jacob Landy.*

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Case for Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Kansas delegation were present last night for a reception and dinner at the International Inn, sponsored by the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Ellis K. Cave, chairman of the board, Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, addressed the group. In my opinion, his remarks clearly state the case for free enterprise and the endorsement of the law of supply and demand to manage the market levels. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert his remarks into the appendix of the RECORD.

THE CASE FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

Fellow Kansans, Senators from Concordin, and Prairie Village, Representatives from Russell, Wakefield, Lawrence, Wichita, and Pittsburg, ladies, and gentlemen from all areas of the Sunflower State, I bring you greetings from home on the range, your Kansas and mine.

It is indeed an honor and a privilege for me, a Dodge City cowboy, straight from Boot Hill, to join in this roundup of our blue ribbon herd of thoroughbred stock from Kansas, and to have our seven head of trail herd leaders in Washington all corralled into one stock pen, where they can't easily get out, without jumping over the rails, and I'll say this is quite an elaborate corral. But having these seven in such a situation could afford a real opportunity to do some branding with a red-hot iron, if they were inclined to stray too far from the ranch, with their political grazing in our national pasture.

But since they are all on the right side of the fence, so far as I am concerned, I happily left the branding iron in the barn, and I intend this evening, only to feed and water them for a few minutes, then turn them back out to the rigors of the open range and the New Frontier with their devotion to the tasks confronting them and the leadership they are giving to the cause of Kansas and the Nation, I am content this evening to merely throw out a few bundles of feed on a somewhat different theme of leadership in our State and Nation, but an equally vital area of the subject, about which, I believe should all have deep interest and concern.

Our American history is filled with the early efforts of a people who amply demonstrated the values which are inherent in individual initiative, the pioneer spirit of voluntary self-reliance, and voluntary leadership.

As these pioneers began to settle throughout the country and began establishing the small villages and towns, many and varied organizations utilizing the help of voluntary leaders and workers were founded for the purpose of expanding the growth and development of the communities, and within this sphere of community development America has advanced and grown largely through the efforts of those who voluntarily banded together for their mutual good in reaching desired goals, and none has done a better job of this, on a broader basis and through so many years, than has the chamber of commerce.

So I want to concentrate on the chamber of commerce for a few minutes because I believe it is to be the one outstanding vehicle or mechanism by which we are able to harness and make effective the efforts of volunteer workers and to accomplish these objectives by volunteer leadership and endeavor.

Self-preservation undoubtedly was the motivating force behind the creation of the first chamber of commerce in Marseilles, France, in the 17th century, more than 300 years ago. It is believed that first chamber might have been founded to seek common protection against marauding bands of robbers; or perhaps to govern the conduct of trade, or to influence legislation. Its history does not reveal what the original specific aims were.

During the latter part of the 18th century the chamber of commerce movement spread through the British Isles and the United States. Some local chambers of commerce in Kansas were established in the 1880's, but it was not until 1924 that the Kansas State Chamber was established at a statewide meeting of business leaders in Hutchinson, Kans., for the purpose of making articulate the voice of business in Kansas.

Chambers of commerce in most other nations have very little in common with chambers in the United States. Although they are sometimes associations of businessmen, chambers in most other countries operate as quasipublic agencies vested with certain administrative and judicial powers with respect to trade. Such powers may include establishment of codes governing commercial practices; arbitration of disputes; issuance of certificates of origin, price and values; formulation of rules for navigation; and supervision of other commercial bodies.

Under highly centralized governments, chambers of commerce often have been used as agencies for directing and controlling economic activity in behalf of the central planning authority.

The chambers of commerce in the United States started out along those lines, but since the turn of the century they have broadened their field of interest. Around 1900, chambers of commerce in America were looking for new industry to provide additional jobs, just as they are today, and they were promoting trade. But those were about the only two areas in which they were active. Then, around 1920, the chambers of commerce generally broadened into civic associations to push for more and better schools, streets, roads, parks, and other civic improvements, in addition to promoting trade and industrial expansion.

They gradually multiplied in number and were developed until today the American Chamber of Commerce is a glowing example of real democracy in action. It is an organization of business and professional people, primarily, employers or job creators, who have banded together to do those things which need to be done to make their city or State or Nation a better place in which to live, learn, worship, work, earn, play, and do business, to do those things which can be done best through united action under enlightened, voluntary leadership.

Yet a chamber of commerce is no better than the individuals in it. Aside from a relatively small staff of paid help, most chambers of commerce work is carried on by volunteer workers, by the men and women who give freely of their time with no thought of personal reward, by people who work on committees, take on special assignments, study legislative and other problems, lead fundraising drives, and host important events like the one here tonight. Chamber people are not satisfied with the status quo so they try to improve and develop community life. They feel a deep responsibility to make their community into a better place than it is.

The chamber of commerce, as an institution, believes in freedom, and is a shining example of free enterprise in action.

Today, chamber of commerce people throughout the Nation are disturbed and seriously concerned about the growing idea among many citizens and among some Congressmen that only big, all-powerful, centralized Government can provide the security health, happiness, and peace of mind which all people desire.

Chamber of commerce people, of course, know that this soothing picture of a great and benevolent power bestowing blessings on all is a cruel deception. It still is impossible to get something for nothing. There is a price to be paid for every benefit obtained from Government.

Chamber of commerce people are disturbed because most of them now realize that by such seemingly harmless acts as demanding and accepting from the Federal Government benefits and services which individuals, volunteer groups, or local governments can and should provide, we are drifting away from the heritage of freedom, upon which our American system is based.

Chamber of commerce people know that the American capitalistic system, the American way of life, has created the highest standard of living ever known to man and a capacity for production that is almost unbelievable. With only 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's land area, our capitalistic system produces nearly half of the world's manufactured goods.

We know that the secret of this amazing success is based on the freedoms which are guaranteed by our U.S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Those freedoms endow each individual with a dignity that has no counterpart anywhere in the world. Those freedoms provide the incentive for work and achievement.

We chamber of commerce people know that Government has nothing to give that it does not first take away from the people. When Government distributes benefits to some, it takes the costs from the others. When Government competes with private business, it foreshadows the eventual denial of the right of its citizens to engage in business. More Government than is necessary means less and less freedom for every indiivdual.

I hope it is needless to point out here that voluntary organizations can exist only where freedom exists, where freedom-loving citizens are willing to assume their responsibilities as citizens, where they are willing to give as well as to get, and where they are still willing to roar like lions for liberty instead of bleating like sheep for security.

Voluntary organizations and voluntary leadership can exist only in a climate of liberty, of reason, of morality, and of religion. Conversely, there can be no voluntary association for local, State and national welfare and development in an air of compulsion, force, and materialism.

So, today, chamber of commerce people are concerned—yes, deeply concerned—about all of the governmental challenges to voluntary organizations and to voluntary leadership. Some of the recent challenges to this voluntary leadership were outlined by Freeman Carney, of Tyler, Tex., at a recent meeting of the Texas Chamber of Commerce managers. And these are a few that he mentioned and which I believe are significant and bear reviewing:

(1) At the mayors conference in Washington about a year ago, heads of city governments were urged to organize local business and civic leaders behind the Federal Government's program for economic development.

(2) At the White House Regional Conferences which were held around the country a few months ago, the keynote was an appeal for local leaders to put more pressure on the Federal Government to do more for local communities.

(3) A greatly expanded Housing and Home Finance Agency is being urged with subsidies for commercial and industrial development.

(4) An area redevelopment program has been set up under the Department of Commerce, with all the implications that it entails.

(5) Although defeated in the last session of Congress, there still is some drive behind a bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet status which certainly would, if enacted, cause some control of city governments to move to Washington.

(6) The U.S. Department of Agriculture is operating under a new philosophy through its rural area development program with the Extension Service and its innumerable other agencies, concerning themselves with the promotion of industrial and commercial development.

So, here we have a half-dozen new fronts, or should I say "New Frontiers," along which the Federal Government has challenged and is challenging voluntary leadership. And, I say to you that if this trend continues, voluntary organizations and voluntary leadership will disappear here in America as has already happened in Russia and in the other Iron Curtain countries.

When an approach is made to local businessmen (already practically drawn and quartered by taxation and regulation) when this approach is made by grant to give them free community development service, the first impulse of the local citizen is to accept the proposal on surface superficialities. Here (they think) is a chance to reduce the community load by taking advantage of assistance from a man who draws his salary from other sources, thus eliminating the businessman's need for making voluntary payments to support the chamber of commerce. Businessmen may not realize until too late that they are exchanging a man with a dedication to the local community for a man whose dedication is to his Washington superiors, that they are swapping local control for Federal control, that they are closing the one door open to them to take unified action at the community level against unsound Federal measures and placing their destinies in the hands of a bureaucracy that is not about to bite the hand that feeds it.

Fortunately, the governmental takeover of areas traditionally served by volunteer effort is not meeting with overwhelming success. New legislative proposals are encountering unexpected opposition, and the public across the Nation shows signs of becoming more alert to some of these bad trends.

In view of these and other recent developments at the national level, it seems to me that the continuation of voluntary leadership on a large scale, here in America, will depend on what we, all of us, do, and on what the U.S. Congress does.

First, the leaders of volunteer organizations must renew and reaffirm their dedication to the cause of volunteer leadership and effort, and do everything possible to make and keep our voluntary organizations so strong, and so active, and so effective that they can and will meet any and all competition.

Second, all of us must recognize that the future of America does not lie at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, but that our future is to be found along the main streets and country roads of America.

Third, we must continue here in America to believe in things of the spirit as well as in material matters; in ideals, principles, and character as well as in science, inventions, and skyscrapers; in the willing acceptance of responsibility, not merely in the calm assumption of rights; we must believe in moral integrity, and understanding rather than in false pride, arrogance, and bigotry; in blazing new trails for the future instead of merely retracing the pathways of the past.

Fourth, our goal should be to preserve the values inherent in our free society; to preserve our private enterprise economic system, for without the production of our enterprise system, social programs of any kind become empty promises; our goal must be to preserve our political system based on the sovereignty of the individual, upon the worth and dignity of the private citizen; and to preserve the rights and freedoms of the individual.

Finally, I think we need a crash program of economic enlightenment, of economic education, to help all citizens, especially the voters, to understand the economics of a free society. It seems clear to me that too many holders of high public offices in this Nation were elected to office because they promised the voters all kinds of direct Government subsidies and handouts instead of soundly offering to help everyone by promising to use the great power of Government to create a right economic climate; that is, an economic climate that will encourage the job-creating businesses and industries to expand and grow and create more jobs.

And I want to repeat now that I believe all of the Members of our Kansas delegation in Congress understand this problem very well, and I believe they are, to a man, the soundest and best group in the Congress of the United States. Also, I take this opportunity to thank all of them for their generally constructive voting records and for the excellent manner in which they represent Kansas.

Now, in conclusion, I believe this important fight to save our freedoms and the right to create jobs through the private sector can be won and will be won if the all free, competitive, private enterprise forces (that is, all who believe in freedom of choice) have vision enough to work together through their schools, professional associations, trade associations, parent-teacher groups, chambers of commerce, and the major political parties to make absolutely certain that all voters become educated well enough to understand, really understand, the economics of a free society. This I believe is our best assurance of survival.

The Challenge of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Mr. Malcolm Adams, the able city editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, has written three poignant articles on cancer. Himself a victim, Mr. Adams' exposition of emotions of shock, fears, and hopes present a provocative challenge to our society.

In order that as many persons as possible may read these interesting, informing articles, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTORS STRIVING TO ALLAY FEAR OF THE WORD "CANCER"

(By Malcolm Adams)

(First of three articles)

"Cancer" is a frightening, ugly word.

It should be. Without warning, cancer tears through a healthy body to cause death. Pathologists say the body's defense against cancer "is little, if any." Cancer strikes at any age. And only one cancer patient in three lives.

Actually there should be no more ugliness associated with the word than heart disease, which is the No. 1 cause of death.

Just yesterday I returned a story to a reporter with instructions to seek the cause of death of a 30-year-old Memphian.

"I can tell you now," the reporter said. "It was cancer but the family begged that we 'please, please don't say he died of cancer.' "

What can be done to remove the fear and ugliness which is associated with the word cancer?

"We must allay the fear of the cancer victim," a Memphis physician said. "We must remove the pessimism about cancer from the mind of the victim. Where heretofore cancer was a label saying death to the victim, it is now not necessarily so."

A year ago I noticed a swollen gland in my neck. I was certain the swelling came from diseased tonsils I should have had removed 40 years ago.

I felt fine. I had no pain, no fever. At my wife's urging, I went to the doctor. He prescribed an antibiotic. I completed the medication but the gland remained swollen. The doctor changed drugs. At the week's end the physician told me I had taken enough drugs to kill most any infection. My gland remained swollen.

The doctor recommended further examination by a specialist. I couldn't remember when I last had a complete physical examination. And I recalled that I had ignored a tiny lump which had appeared on my neck 6 months before.

At the specialist's clinic, the interviewing nurse scolded me a bit when I answered that I was at least a two-pack-a-day cigarette smoker.

The doctor found a tumor in my throat.

The next day I had a scheduled talk to volunteer workers in the 1962 Cancer Crusade. I wasn't up to it. I sent a coworker and went to the hospital for tests.

A biopsy was performed. This called for the removal of tissue from my throat. The tissue was sent to the laboratory to determine if there was a malagnacy.

With the laboratory reports complete, the doctor told me the tests showed "positive." "Positive" meant the tumor was definitely cancerous.

I doubt if any two men react the same when they are shocked with the blunt realization they have cancer and the odds are that they are going to die.

I really don't know the order in which the thoughts flashed through my tortured mind.

I thought of my dear wife, son, daughter, the grandchildren I wanted to spoil—why me?—for my sins? My true friends, the men and women at the office—did I catch it somewhere?

And I thought of God. And it wasn't an afterthought. I thought how little I had thought of Him. I knew He had blessed me with the attention of a skilled, God-fearing physician.

I prayed real hard for Him to take over. He did.

After more than a year marked by treatment, surgery and 6 months in the hospital, I am almost back to normal. At least for the time being.

Since last November, I have been doing a full day of work.

In my spare time, I have been reading about this mysterious disease. I learn that in many cases the doctor can tell the patient what caused the cancer.

Although some causes of cancer are known, the ultimate cause still hides from science. In my daughter's eighth grade, the children read about cancer. The science books recount that "cancer results from the rapid-growth and multiplication of certain cells in the body. Cancerous growth must be discovered and treated early. If they are not, the whole body may be poisoned."

Eighth graders are being taught that cancer "must be discovered and treated early."

Did I take the known measures to safeguard my own life?

I did not.

Did I have complete health checkups annually and learn to heed cancer's danger signals?

I did not.

How about you?

EARLY DETECTION BIG FACTOR IN WAR TO OVERCOME CANCER

(Second of three articles)

(By Malcolm Adams)

Many cancers can be cured if found early in their development and treated by surgery or radiation.

This assurance is given by the American Cancer Society.

How do you know if you have cancer?

One way to detect cancer early is to pay attention to the recognized danger signals for cancer.

Dr. David S. Carroll, president of the Memphis-Shelby County Unit of the American Cancer Society urges that persons who have one or more of the symptoms longer than 2 weeks should see a physician at once.

The seven American Cancer Society danger signals which are reproduced with this article are good indicators of cancer.

Can you have cancer without noticeable symptoms?

"Yes," says the American Cancer Society, "in their early stages, some forms of cancer may give no warning to the patient, but may be detected by a physician in a routine health checkup.

Question. Is cancer contagious?

Answer. No. There is no reported case of anyone having "caught" cancer from another patient.

Question. Can a person recognize cancer in himself?

Answer. No. Only a physician is trained to diagnose and distinguish cancer.

Last year about 275,000 Americans died of cancer. This year about 280,000 more will die.

Nine thousand Tennesseans will learn this year they have cancer. About 2,000 new cancer cases will be detected in Shelby County in 1963.

More men than women died of cancer last year in Memphis and over the Nation.

The ratio of death this year will be about 54 men to 46 women.

Question. Why is the cancer death rate increasing among men and not among women?

Answer. Mainly because of the rapidly rising death toll from lung cancer in men.

Question. Is lung cancer a special danger for men?

Answer. It is for men who smoke or who have been steady smokers of cigarettes, charges the American Cancer Society. Lung cancer is increasing faster than all other forms of cancer.

A year ago today I was waiting to undergo surgery after receiving treatment for a throat cancer. I had taken the radiation therapy following discovery of the cancer in January.

The surgery for the removal of a gland in my throat (a secondary infection from the throat tumor) was performed in early May. The operation went "very well" and I went home in 10 days.

Somehow I developed an infection in the area of the surgery and returned to the hospital. I remained there for 6 months because the tissue in my neck had received intense radiation during my treatments and was slow to heal.

I was talking with a doctor friend (not my physician) one night in the corridor at Baptist Hospital.

I remarked that although I was a chain smoker of cigarettes I never deliberately inhaled the smoke.

"Well, maybe it's a good thing you didn't inhale. If you had you probably would have lung cancer in addition to a throat cancer."

The American Cancer Society's chief research statistician, Dr. Edward C. Hammond, pulls no punches in discussing tobacco's implication in lung cancer. He goes a step further in charging that lung cancer brought on by cigarette smoking is "relatively unimportant compared to the damage tobacco does in a variety of other ways."

The captions over a Reader's Digest story of Dr. Hammond's charges relate:

"Far more than lung cancer is involved. Recent studies show that more cigarette smokers die of heart disease associated with smoking than die of lung cancer. Many other illnesses—from ulcers to pneumonia—are aggravated by cigarette smoke."

The magazine Advertising Age states that in 1961 the tobacco companies spent $144 million on advertising.

In an article condensed from Changing Times, the Reader's Digest (February 1963) says:

"The next time you see an advertisement which invites young people to smoke, consider this statistic from an American Public Health Association study: 'A million children now in school will die of lung cancer before they reach the age of 70.'"

The American Cancer Society charges that cigarettes are the principal cause of lung cancer, a disease that has increased 953 percent in the last 30 years.

A few days ago, Joseph F. Cullman III, president of Philip Morris, Inc., told his stockholders at Richmond, Va., that cigarettes will "ultimately be exonerated" of any connection with cancer.

"There is increasing evidence that implicates factors other than smoking 'as a cause of cancer,' Mr. Cullman said.

The answers to the cigarette-cancer question "will be found in the laboratories," the industry leader said. The tobacco industry is working toward this end through the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, he said.

The tobacco industry expects a gain of about 2 percent in U.S. cigarette consumption in 1963.

"The continuing increase in smoking vindicates our faith in the cigarette industry and the good judgment of smokers everywhere," he said.

Other tobacco industry leaders take exception to the mere mention of cigaret smoking and lung cancer in the same breath.

"How the hell can anyone blame smoking for cancer when no one knows or claims to know what causes cancer?"

VICTIMS' COURAGE INSPIRES CANCER RESEARCH FIGHTERS

(Third of three articles)

(By Malcolm Adams)

You really never know how brave a man is until you see him face death.

Even a little boy, taught by parents to have faith in his God and his doctor, can be brave. Real brave.

Like the 11-year-old boy from middle Tennessee who was down the hall and around the corner from the hospital room where I was confined for treatment of a throat cancer.

Snatched from play by disease, the boy with the contagious smile had just been told he would have to have a leg amputated.

"I trust you all," the little cancer victim told his parents and doctor. "How soon can I get my new leg?"

Later I saw him in a wheelchair as he loaded up with funny books from the drugstore. Still later he went home and now has revisited the hospital to be fitted with his new leg.

And then there was the little girl down in what the nurses called the "love ward." She was a deserving or service case and how I prayed that the much talked of breakthrough against leukemia will soon occur.

That's what many scientists think—a research breakthrough will come sooner against the disease than against any other cancer.

Leukemia, cancer of the blood-forming tissues, is considered primarily a disease of children. Actually it will kill more adults (11,500) in 1963 than children (2,300).

Looking on the hopeful side of cancer, physicians say that leukemia now can be arrested for a time by newly developed drugs.

Says the American Cancer Society:

"Evidence continues to accumulate that leukemia may be caused by a virus. If this is found to be true, then the possibility of developing a vaccine that might help to control leukemia in human beings is very promising."

The breakthrough against the disease could come at any research institution. Scientists at Memphis' new St. Jude Hospital are hard at work on the baffling problem.

Still on the bright, hopeful side of cancer, let's consider:

Uterine Cancer: Death from this dread form of disease (14,000 in 1962) would be as rare as death from typhoid fever if every woman over 30 took the proper tests each year.

The Pap smear is the recognized, quick (and without pain) technique for detecting cancer of the cervix.

There has been a steady decline in the uterine cancer death rate. It has been cut 50 percent among white women during the last 25 years. The rate in Negro women has been reduced only 35 percent.

An early checkup by a physician may result in discovery of the disease at a time it is most curable.

The smear is named for Dr. George N. Papanicolaou, who developed the technique.

Pap smear kits are now being tested to put cancer detection on a do-it-yourself basis. The kits are not yet available to the public.

Breast cancer: "Treatment too late."

Mark that down as the chief cause of death from breast cancer, advises the American Cancer Society.

In 1963, about 24,700 women will die of it. However, "about 82 percent of all breast cancer patients are saved when the disease is detected and treated while it is still localized.

"If the cancer has spread to other regions the chance of cure is only 48 percent."

The American Cancer Society stresses two protective actions to be taken by women:

1. Self-examination of the breasts once a month for possible irregularities or lumps.

2. A health checkup once a year, including an examination of the breasts by a physician.

Cancer of the colon: "Three out of four patients with cancer of the colon and rectum could be saved if the disease is detected when it is localized."

That is the American Cancer Society's bright statement on a disease that will take some 40,000 lives in 1963.

All adult men and women are urged to have a proctoscopic examination with their annual checkups.

Question. Why do so many people delay before consulting a physician when they suspect they have cancer?

Answer. Usually because they believe it is incurable. They do not understand that cancer in its early stages is among the most curable of all serious diseases and that the responsibility for it rests heavily on themselves.

Question. How many persons actually will be saved from death this year?

Answer. About 177,000 Americans will be saved from cancer this year.

Question. How many more could be saved?

Answer. About 88,000 cancer patients will probably die in 1963 who might have been saved by earlier and better treatment.

There are now 1,200,000 Americans, alive today, who have been cured of cancer. Cured means they are alive, without evidence of the disease, at least 5 years after completion of treatment.

Another 700,000 Americans are expected to enter the ranks of the cured. This means there are actually 1,900,000 Americans cured of cancer.

Address by Robert Moses at World's Fair Vatican Pavilion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Moses, president of New York's World's Fair, 1964–65, at the Vatican Pavilion, Flushing Meadow, Long Island, on April 16, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65, AT THE LUNCHEON FOR CARDINAL SPELLMAN AND OTHER PRIESTS ON VATICAN PAVILION, FLUSHING MEADOW, TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1963

Your Eminence and reverend clergy, I rise to express the gratitude of the directors, executives and staff of the fair, our many participants, foreign and domestic, public and private, large and small, for the Vatican Pavilion to which we all look forward with the liveliest interest and expectation.

The Pietà alone, not to speak of other treasures, has commanded the attention of the world and insured the success of our exposition. We believe that the confidence that you, Cardinal Spellman, have reposed in us has not been misplaced.

Visitors need not beat a path to your door. This, as you well have noted on your way here, we are doing with every machine and device of major construction. You need have no worries about access. The problem is not one of peak loads but of continuous unbroken demand as the pilgrims are drawn to your shrine by a magnetism which constitutes no mystery, requires no definition, and depends on no conventional exploitation.

The dramatic ceremony which accompanied the breaking of ground for your pavilion by his holiness at Rome, with the spectators awaiting the dawn in Flushing Meadow, attracted the attention of the world and brought to all peoples the universal message of peace through mutual understanding and human friendship. In this sign all conquer. In this spirit I welcome you here today.

Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, an American ship named *Hope* left Salaverry, Peru, with its mission accomplished. It also left hope behind in the minds and hearts of those who knew of or shared in the deeds performed by the *Hope's* crew.

I am enclosing a statement of the Assistant Secretary of State, Frederick G. Dutton; a report by the American Ambassador to Peru, and an address by Monsignor Frederico Perez-Silva, the Archbishop of Trujillo, Peru, that depict in clear, unmistakable tones the valiant and merciful undertaking of Dr. William Walsh and his associates of the *Hope* project. Here is a program that reaches the people and is easily understood. The country and the free world owe a debt of gratitude to those who carry the torch of hope to distant lands.

APRIL 16, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM H. BATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BATES: Thank you for your letter of March 19, 1963, concerning the excellent impression made by the S.S. *Hope* project in Peru. As you state in your letter, the *Hope* project is an outstanding symbol of American kindness and friendship.

In the last paragraph of your letter, you mentioned your understanding that the American Ambassador to Peru had filed a report on the mission of the S.S. *Hope* in Peru. Enclosed is a general report from the U.S. Embassy in Lima about the Ambassador's visit to the *Hope* just before it left Trujillo, and we know the Embassy considers that the *Hope* project, as a public relations effort throughout Peru, has done outstanding work in conveying a sympathetic image of the American as a person to the Peruvians. The fact that American professional people gave their time and skill freely to care for the sick of all walks of life brought home to Peruvians the nature of our concern for them.

The Department considers the *Hope* project an admirable undertaking and the U.S. Information Service has given widespread and extensive publicity in Latin America by radio and press releases to Project *Hope* activities.

If there is any additional information which you believe we can furnish, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

MARCH 6, 1963.

To: Department of State.
From: American Embassy Lima.
Subject: Ambassador's visit to hospital ship *Hope*.

At the invitation of directors of the *Hope* project, the Ambassador and several Embassy officers flew to Trujillo February 28 to participate in the farewell to the ship, which sailed for New York that day. After calls on the prefect and archbishop, the party was driven to the *Hope*, anchored in the Salaverry Harbor. Dr. William Walsh, president of the Hope project; Dr. Fernando Cabieses, president of the Peruvian-North American Medical Association and local coordinator for the project, and Dr. Archie Golden, *Hope's* medical director, were hosts aboard ship.

The program for the visit was quite informal, and the Ambassador and other members of the party had full opportunity to appreciate the massive and spontaneous demonstration of affection and good will which had been accorded the *Hope* by the local population.

The archbishop of Trujillo, Msgr. Frederico Perez-Silva, who had headed the committee which organized the formal farewell celebration in the Trujillo stadium 2 weeks earlier, said the crowd of more than 20,000 persons who filled the stadium more than doubled the attendance which had been anticipated. A copy of the archbishop's speech on this occasion is attached.

Dr. Walsh and others told the party of the almost nightly demonstrations of good will on the Salaverry pier by Salaverry and Trujillo residents. These, it was reported, were completely spontaneous and included thousands of persons.

The Ambassador and his party were aboard the *Hope* from about 10:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. During that time hundreds of persons—former patients and Peruvian staff members—came aboard to say their goodbys to the *Hope* staff members. The scenes of emotion and affection were quite moving.

Even more impressive was the exodus from Trujillo and Salaverry. By the time of the Ambassador's departure, at least 10,000 persons were crowding the pier and shore, many of them carrying flowers to be thrown onto the water when the *Hope* lifted anchor and sailed.

The road between Salaverry and Trujillo, a distance of some 15 kilometers, was clogged with vehicles—automobiles, buses and trucks—bringing more well-wishes. Later reports indicated that at least 20,000 persons were on shore at sailing time, 4:30 p.m.

The size and spontaneity of this and the other tributes to the *Hope* were convincing evidence or the great impact which the project had and of the secure place it had won in the affections of the Peruvian people.

(For the Ambassador).

FAREWELL TRIBUTE TO THE DOCTORS AND NURSES OF THE "HOPE," FEBRUARY 17, 1963

(NOTE.—Speech of the President of the Aid Committee to the Hope project by His Excellency, Frederick Perez-Silva, archbishop of the city of Trujillo.)

Honorable prefect of the Department, honorable mayor of the city of Trujillo, honorable representative of the U.S. Ambassador,

doctors and nurses of the *Hope*, ladies and gentlemen, in chapter 10 of St. Luke's Gospel we read this beautiful parable of our Lord: "And behold, a certain lawyer got up to test Him, saying, "Master, what must I do to gain etehnal life?" But He said to him, "What is written in the law? How dost thou read?" He answered and said, "Thou shalt love the Lord they God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength, and with thy whole mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." And He said to him, "Thou hast answered rightly; do this and thou shalt live." But he wishing to justify himself, said to Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?"

Jesus took him up and said, "A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell in with robbers, who after both stripping him and beating him went their way, leaving him half dead. But, as it happened, a certain priest was going down the same way; and when he saw him, he passed by. And likewise a Levite also, when he was near the place and saw him, passed by. But a certain Samaritan as he journeyed came upon him, and seeing him, was moved with compassion. And he went up to him and bound up his wounds, pouring oil and wine. And setting him on his own beast, he brought him to an inn and took care of him. And the next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper and said, "Take care of him; and whatever more thou spendest, I, on my way back, will repay thee."

"Which of these three, in thy opinion, proved himself neighbor to him who fell among the robbers?" And he said, "He who took pity on him. And Jesus said to him, "Go and do thou also in like manner."

Inspired most surely by this marvelous teaching of Jesus, Dr. William Walsh, a new Samaritan of the 20th century, dreamt of carrying out a work of mercy, new in its methods, but one which would answer fully the noblest aspirations of a profoundly Christian spirit, and so he threw himself into the task of organizing the Foundation of "People to People."

A herculean task, this work of mercy that he proposed. A hospital ship of great capacity would be necessary so that it could travel to far distant lands. Costly and complicated equipment would be necessary in order to make possible the use of modern surgical and medical techniques. Teams of doctors and nurses would have to be formed, enormous supplies of medicines and sanitary equipment, without taking into account the food, fuel, and an infinite number of additional supplies.

Refusing to be disheartened by the difficulties involved and thinking only of the thousands of sick which could be healed by means of this original adventure, Dr. Walsh lets his project become known in his native land, the United States of America, there he gets the enthusiastic support of his Government and obtains the rental of a Navy hospital ship. He enlists the support of some of the most distinguished physicians and surgeons of his country who offer their services free for several weeks to the project, he obtains the distinterested help of magnificent nurses who offer their services with marvelous skill and self-sacrifice. Medical supply houses agree to cooperate on the project and finally, generous donors make possible the financing of this tremendous private enterprise.

The first to benefit were the people of Indonesia and South Vietnam. And we have been the next. During 9 months, from the 26th of May of last year, the white silhouette of the *Hope* has given the peaceful harbor of Salaverry all the enchantment of an oasis in the midst of the desert. To it have come thousands of sick from Trujillo, from the neighboring provinces and even from the most distant corners of the country. All these sick were attended with exemplary devotion and skill, and even more, with great love and abnegation, without considering the social condition or the education of these sick, thinking only of curing them or of giving them the hope of a prompt recovery. The costliest medicines were given to them freely, the same as the care of the doctors and the nurses. And as if what was done on the ship were nothing at all, we have seen these same doctors and nurses spreading their goodness in the slums, giving milk to the undernourished children and carrying our widescale vaccination programs. Others attended numerous patients in Belen Hospital and performed difficult surgical operations. Faraway cities, such as Piura, Chiclayo, Arequipa, and others, have received visits from the doctors of the *Hope*, and there, before students and doctors alike, gave talks and technical demonstrations with the same unselfishness and good will which they had already shown so well in Trujillo.

And now I ask, would it be possible to carry out such a gigantic campaign of goodness and help without possessing an ideal that strengthens the will to noble effort and sacrifice, without being convinced that it is time well employed which is dedicated to assisting one's fellow-beings? Those great sacrifices presuppose a high ideal and such is the case of our friends of the *Hope*. The teaching of the parable of the good Samaritan has penetrated deeply into their consciousness and has made them understand that to do good to needy fellow-beings, to wipe their tears and to calm their sufferings is a command of the law of God which must be fulfilled.

I am one of those who have faith in the good intentions of this great Nation, the United States of America, this great Nation which desires to share its prodigious wealth—the wealth of its soil and of its industry—with its underprivileged fellow beings. Because of this it gives out the surplus food to many countries of the world, one of which is our own, through the good offices of CARITAS, which here in Trujillo brings this food to the needy through the parishes. For this reason the United States has established the Peace Corps, which has arrived at our shores and which works side by side with the poor of the slums, helping them build their own living quarters, modest yet clean and comfortable.

What a contrast. This deeply human attitude with that of other countries which, instead of exporting love, scatter hate with their poisonous, and subversive publications, which far from taking care of the health of the rest make attempts against their lives, arming fanatics to commit their crimes; which, teach, not to build, but to destroy and burn; which instead of giving of their own for their campaigns, teach them to steal from the banks the savings of the poor. I can think only of those words of Christ in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, "Every good tree produces good fruit, but every bad tree produces bad fruit * * * by their fruits you shall know them."

This enterprise of the *Hope* must not disappear without a trace when the ship lifts anchor in Salaverry on the 28th. It has given us a great lesson and we must learn it. To imitate it in all its magnitude would be impossible since we neither have nor hope to have the resources which could even compare with theirs. But what we can and ought to imitate is that preoccupation for the well-being of our neighbors, for our brothers in need, especially for the sick. For that we shall be able to count on for some time to come with the cooperation of some of the doctors and nurses of the *Hope* who shall remain among us. In order to carry out their plans they have confidence in the committee which I have the honor to head and we trust in the help of all those who have understood that we must give something of our own to alleviate the sufferings of others. Out of the generosity of great and small will depend the success of our task of helping others.

And now, doctors and nurses of the *Hope*, as president of the Committee of Aid to the project *Hope*, which has organized this overflowing tribute, I am going to make the presentation of the commemorative album of the gratitude of this nation toward you. Here you have 10,000 signatures, from the great to the lowliest, testimony to their gratitude for health recovered, or to their admiration for a work well done. We ask you to place this album in an honored place on the ship, so that, wherever you may go in the future, everyone shall know that here is a nation that has received benefits from you and that has known how to thank you sincerely and affectionately, that this land, this city is Trujillo, in Peru, the same people who have gathered here today round about you, in order to bid you farewell and to desire for you a prosperous pilgrimage throughout the seas of the world, seeking for people who need help. We hope that they know how to understand as well as we do this wonderful gesture of charity.

A Tribute to a Dedicated Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the span of a few recent years, Richmond Heights in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio has become one of the most rapidly developing suburbs in the State, and with a population increase exceeding 500 percent it has grown from a village to city status.

To provide adequate educational facilities for the influx of children, the village school had to be enlarged quickly to the proportions necessary to meet the needs of a city. It was a tremendous challenge and one man, Russell R. Fair, in a great measure is responsible for the successful transition.

Thirty-five years ago Mr. Fair was one of the 2 teachers in the Richmond Heights Village School of 3 rooms and 50 pupils in grades 1 through 8. He has served the cause of education continuously and will retire after the current school year. Through progressive study and professional associations Mr. Fair augmented his knowledge and skills in the matters pertaining to public instruction and administration. In the Richmond Heights local school district he advanced from teacher to principal and in 1958 was elevated to the high office of superintendent.

Implemented by his knowledgeable leadership the school system will soon be complete. It now has 40 rooms, well-equipped chemistry and physics laboratories, 44 teachers, 16 clerical and service personnel, a guidance counselor, an excellent library, a librarian, a large cafeteria and student enrollment of 678 in kindergarten through eighth grade

and 249 in high school. The value of the physical assets exceeds $1,600,000 and the school is operating on a budget of $529,000.

As an educator, Superintendent Fair was dedicated to the educational welfare of the students, their needs were his primary interest and concern. As an administrator he exercised vision and intelligent application of sound moral principles. He wisely evaluated the qualifications of each new staff member. As a financier he objectively analyzed the criteria involved in the various expansions of the school before submitting a recommendation for a levy or bond issue. He consistently maintained that the taxpayer be given the maximum value obtainable for each tax dollar expended. As a public servant he was always acutely conscious of his obligation to the community, the school, and its program.

Superintendent Fair served with integrity and efficiency in all areas of his many responsibilities. Public service rendered on such a lofty plane of proper motivation and conduct deserves high recognition and deep, humble gratitude. Thank you, Mr. Fair, for an exacting task well done. Best wishes for good health and happiness in your retirement.

America's Treat to Needy Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the UNICEF halloween trick-or-treat program through which the children of the United States can contribute to the underprivileged children of the world is a heartwarming effort. In 1962, the children of our country donated over $2 million to UNICEF from this one project. Not only will this sizable contribution improve the health and well-being of children in many countries; it will also strengthen the moral and mental fiber of American youth. It converts a frivolous, sometimes destructive day into a wholesome, worthwhile experience.

I am especially pleased that the children of my State, South Dakota, are singled out for special praise by the U.S. Committee for UNICEF. Eighty-six South Dakota communities planned and carried out Halloween programs with the proceeds going to UNICEF. The largest single contributions came from Rapid City.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from News of the World's Children, entitled "America's Treat to Needy Children," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S TREAT TO NEEDY CHILDREN

Thanks to the enthusiasm and determination of young people and adults throughout the country, 1962 contributions from the trick or treat for UNICEF program will go over the $2 million mark. This achievement is all the more noteworthy as, in large areas of the United States, Halloween brought cold winds and hard, driving rain.

The greeting card program also continued to climb to new heights in the United States with a gross income in 1962 that topped the one in 1961 by 35 percent.[1]

HALLOWEEN EQUALS UNICEF

The U.S. Committee for UNICEF warmly welcomed thousands of new groups across the country who trick or treated for the first time last fall. Once again, the example set since 1950 by young Americans who wanted to share rather than scare on the spooky night was emulated by new crowds of boys and girls. Many of them will make it an annual event. Among the very young ones, Halloween and UNICEF have become synonymous in many parts of the Nation.

INCREASED COORDINATION

Communitywide participation also showed a gratifying increase. Some 2,000 towns reported that at least several churches, schools, and organizations had worked together for a successful program. This increased coordination resulted in greater amounts collected.

Nevada reported the largest percentage boost in contributions of all States—95 percent. Intensive pre-Halloween education programs in public and religious schools added to the enthusiasm of the trick or treaters and to the total collected.

In South Dakota, 86 communities planned and carried out Halloween programs in 1962, as opposed to the 70 that participated in 1961. Newly coordinated groups within the State were greatly responsible for the 60-percent increase in results from the State, whose largest single contribution this year, from Rapid City, more than doubled the one from last year.

With an increase of 52 percent in its contributions, Alaska was one of the States with the best coordination. Schools, churches, and young people's groups combined their efforts to make this possible.

NO GREATER CAUSE

An example of the welcome effect of cooperation among groups came from Leominster, Mass., where both parochial and public schools collected UNICEF treats with equal enthusiasm. Organizers and promoters included the local recreation center and League of Women Voters; a paper company and a bank; 3 newspapers and 2 radio stations; the PTA's of 12 schools and 2 public-school superintendents.

"Though it was my intention to only serve as trick-or-treat chairman for this year, the gratifying experience prompts me to accept the chairmanship for next year," John H. Crain, Jr., reported from Leominster. "The cooperation of all concerned was overwhelming, and I know of no greater cause than to help the needy children of the world."

The first Halloween venture of Orono, Maine, was jointly organized by the League of Women Voters, St. Mary's Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, and the Church of the Universal Fellowship.

In West Liberty, Iowa, where over 60 percent of the schoolchildren trick or treated for UNICEF, the program was sponsored by the Legion Auxiliary, altar and rosary societies, Grange and Pythians, Eastern Star, T.T.T., Rotary Club, Lions Club, Committee on Social Concerns, and Y-Teens.

In Chippewa Falls, Wis., a dairy donated the collection cartons, while bakeries and bottlers provided refreshments for a party celebrating a successful venture cosponsored by the United Church Women and the American Legion.

[1] Sales of greeting cards, datebook-calendars, contributions, and related income.

GREETING CARDS BOOMING

Worldwide sales of UNICEF greeting cards in 1962 were estimated at 26 million cards, providing a net income of $1,600,000—enough to supply a daily cup of milk for a whole year to 2.2 million children.

In the United States of America, 11 million cards were sold, an increase of 14 percent over 1961. UNICEF datebook calendars, offered for the first time, sold over 150,000 copies in this country alone.

Consignment groups, whose number increased from 700 to 962 from 1961 to 1962, sold 3.2 million cards—a 25 percent increase over the same preiod. The number of mail orders received rose from 105,000 in 1961 to over 131,000 in 1962—an increase of about 24 percent—and accounted for the sale of 6,445,000 cards (5,785,000 cards being sold on mail orders in 1961).

The two leading consignment groups continued to keep up with each other: the Philadelphia group sold 143,000 cards, and 1,206 calendars, while the Los Angeles group sold 149,190 cards, and 1,290 calendars.

From the youngest trick-or-treater to the most experienced organizer of greeting card sales, the children, parents, teachers, ministers, priests and rabbis, youth leaders and civic organization officers—one and all were entitled to heartfelt thanks and the assurance of having accomplished vital work for mothers and children in all parts of the world.

A Bill To Provide for the Establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs.

For some time, a distinguished citizen of my community, Mr. Oscar H. Steiner, has dedicated his time and strength to the establishment of a University of the United States on Post-Doctoral Levels of Education. On June 27 and 28, 1961, Mr. Steiner sponsored a Cleveland conference for the prime purpose of assessing this issue. The distinguished educators attending this conference included Dr. William S. Carlson, president, the University of Toledo; Dr. William H. Cartwright, chairman, Department of Education, Duke University; Dr. Claude A. Eggertson, professor of education, University of Michigan; Dr. G. E. Giesecke, professor of high education, the University of Chicago; Dr. I. James Quillen, dean, School of Education, Stanford University; Mr. Sidney Tickton, consultant, the Ford Foundation; Dr. Edgar Bruce Wesley, Los Altos, Calif.; Dr. Howard E. Wilson, dean, School of Education, the University of California; Dr. Carl Wittke, dean, Graduate School, Western Reserve University; Mr. Ralph M. Besse, president, Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Cleveland, Ohio; and Mr. Oscar H. Steiner, president, Community Development, Inc.

The conference developed and adopted the following proposal:

A PROPOSAL FOR A UNIVERSITY OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE POSTDOCTORAL LEVELS LOCATED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

1. In order to fill certain unique and increasingly complex national needs, we urge the establishment of a publicly sponsored post-doctoral institution for study and research in Washington, D.C. This institution would be known, with unequaled prestige in the world, as The University of the United States.

2. Created by Congress, the University of the United States would serve the national interest though a series of continuing functions carried out by selected groups of scholars, creative artists, and public figures of the greatest distinction.

3. This seat of learning, set among the unparalleled research resources of Washington, D.C., would be justly national in its identificatition and orientation. Its governing body, the board of trustees, would be widespread, representing the 50 States. Its rotating faculty, chosen from and on loan from universities, the professions, industry and foundations throughout the United States, and, from time to time, foreign countries as one of the greatest possible academic distinctions, would be selected on the basis of outstanding achievement and capacity to serve the intellectual requirements of their special fields.

4. Members of this distinctive academic faculty of approimately 50 would be known as Fellows of the University of the United States. Its makeup and membership tenure to be determined by the board of trustees. The title—"Fellow of the University of the United States"—is to be retained for life.

5. As Fellows they would carry on their own research, supervise and direct the work of students, answer calls made by various branches of government for data and for help in solving problems, answering questions, or meeting issues, and make such public lectures as occasion might indicate.

6. The university's permanent staff would consist of a chancellor appointed by the President of the United States with the guidance and advice of the learned societies to serve until retirement age; a small administrative faculty and housekeeping personnel.

7. The University of the United States would grant no degrees, and its formal instruction would be at a minimum. Among its principal functions would be a service agency to other colleges and universities in the United States, and its research, on a policy rather than laboratory level would contribute to work in these other institutions. It should be more than a reference bureau; rather the embodiment of the American intellectual community rendering a function over any beyond what is already being done.

8. The University of the United States would catalog the vast study and research resources in Washington and, by advance arrangement, would receive young scholars recommended by other institutions for advisement and guidance in the use of these facilities.

9. Most of these young scholars are expected to be candidates for doctorates at their own university. Their work will be at a stage which requires research in one or more of the Washington libraries and repositories. In order to use these facilities to their full advantage, they will be able to call on the specialist in their field at the University of the United States, and receive his advice and guidance.

10. A University of the United States fellow would be available for periodic consultation with the scholar, but the scholar would remain a student at his home university.

11. In its work with other colleges and universities, the University of the United States would also focus widespread public attention on the purpose and functions of higher education in the United States.

12. Thus the National University would become, not a competitor of existing universities, but a brilliant colleague, exempt from envy and animosities, because of its noncompetitive nature and because of its obviously impersonal leadership. Supported by all, it would become the pride of all.

13. The University of the United States would be sensitive to the problems of our country, foreign as well as domestic. Thus the curriculum like that of any educational institution, would be determined by the society, the culture, the civilization that it serves. War and peace, disease and health, law and crime, progress and regression, the individual and society, things and ideas—these and other entities would become the area of exploration by the proposed university.

14. Financial support for the University of the United States would come principally from public funds, but the institution would retain the privilege of receiving and controlling gifts, donations, endowments and bequests from all sources through its board of trustees.

15. Historically, the idea of a national university is as old as the republic. In his first annual address to Congress on January 8, 1790, George Washington gave impetus to the movement. He recommended that the Congress promote science and literature and suggested that the establishment of a national university would be well worthy of a place in congressional deliberations.

16. Within the next few years, President Washington wrote to Vice President John Adams, Secretary of State Edmund Randolph, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Thomas Jefferson, and others concerning the proposed national university. In his eighth annual message to Congress on December 7, 1796, Washington urged the establishment of a national university as well as a military academy.

17. In his last will and testament dated July 9, 1799, Washington made provision for the transfer of his shares in the Potomac River Navigation Co. to Congress for the establishment of a university in the District of Columbia. As far as is known, the stock never reached its destination and its fate has not been traced by history.

18. As President, Thomas Jefferson twice recommended the national university to the attention of Congress. President James Madison three times requested Congress to establish the university. A number of later Presidents also supported the national university movement. A number of bills have been submitted to Congress, but through the years none of these have ever been voted upon.

19. It is our belief that the University of the United States would add to the stature of the Nation and fully deserves to be established.

Although the proposal of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs does not meet all of the recommendations of the Cleveland conference, it is desirable legislation which should be considered and perhaps amended to include the broader goals of today's needs as expressed by the Cleveland conference.

Mr. Steiner recently wrote as follows concerning the need for a National Academy of Post-Doctorate Study:

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

George Washington was deeply concerned with education as it related to our country's welfare. In drawing his will, July 9, 1799, he made certain provisions for the disposition of endowments which directly involved the U.S. Government. He expressed "an ardent wish to see a plan devised" leading to the "establishment of a national university."

This was a wish born of careful thought and after consultation with friends and associates. Both before and during his Presidency, he continually urged its consideration. He wanted to include it in his famous Farewell Address but, upon advice of Alexander Hamilton, he reluctantly omitted it. However, in his final address to the Congress on December 7, 1796, he again recommended its consideration. In this last important address as President, Washington said "the primary object of such a national institution should be the education of our youth in the science of government. In a republic, what species of knowledge can be equally important and what duty more pressing on its legislature than to patronize a plan for communicating it to those who are to be the future guardians of the liberties of the country?"

In the light of our growing international problems and foreign relations, we can only respect his farsighted judgment in urging the training of those who are to be the future guardians of the liberties of the country. The growing problems we face at home and abroad call for leaders trained in the science of government.

Washington was far from alone in his desire for a University of the United States. He has been supported down through the years by at least eight Presidents, large numbers of Congressmen and educators, and others. In fact, interest has been so persistent, the list of advocates so imposing, that a large book is required to detail the articles, bills, and proposals that have come before the Congress and the people. The Library of Congress has prepared such a volume at the request of Senator YOUNG of Ohio.

To give substance to his last wishes for a national university, George Washington bequeathed 50 shares of stock in the Potomac Co., value £5,000 sterling or approximately $22,200. The original value of the bequest compounded semiannually at 5 percent interest would represent in the neighborhood of $50 million today.

In his will, George Washington detailed his reasons why a national university is needed. The will continued:

"Item. I give and bequeath in perpetuity the 50 shares which I hold in the Potomac Co. (under the aforesaid acts of the Legislature of Virginia) toward the endowment of a university to be established within the limits of the District of Columbia, under the auspices of the General Government, if that Government should incline to extend a fostering hand toward it, and until such seminary is established, and the funds arising on these shares shall be required for its support, my further will and desire is that the profit accruing therefrom shall, whenever the dividends are made, be laid out in purchasing stock in the Bank of Columbia, or some other bank, at the discretion of my executors; or by the Treasurer of the United States for the time being under the direction of Congress; provided that honorable body should patronize the measure, and the dividends proceeding from the purchase of such stock is to be vested in more stock, and so on, until a sum adequate to the accomplishment of the object is obtained, of which I have not the smallest doubt, before many years pass away; even if no aid or encouragement is given by legislative authority, or from any other source."

A short while after Washington's death and despite the custodial responsibility of the Treasurer of the United States and the Congress, the stocks disappeared. They may have been destroyed in the fire of 1814. The mystery of what happened to them has never been solved. We know that they were not turned in when the Potomac Co. was absorbed and reorganized.

We further know that neither the Treasurer of the United States nor the Congress

has, to date, seen fit to "patronize the measure." Whether through neglect or ingratitude, nothing has been done to redress a deep and embarrassing oversight.

The Commissioners of what is now the District of Columbia surveyed and approved a site for it "extending south of Washington Circle along and between 22d and 25th streets to the high land known as Peter's Hill overlooking the Potomac River."

Because of my interest in this undischarged moral—if not legal—debt, I invited a group of representative deans of universities from across the country to a 2-day conference in Cleveland, Ohio. The purpose was not merely to confirm the existence of this obligation but to determine whether there existed today a need for such an institution. Their conclusions are incorporated in a formulation they prepared and adopted.

In brief, they recommended the creation of an institution in the District of Columbia on a post doctoral level. It would grant no degrees and its formal instruction would be at a minimum. In addition to aiding the Government on an international level as a foreign service academy, it would be a service agency to other colleges and universities in the United States, and its research, on a policy rather than laboratory level would contribute to work in these other institutions. It should be more than a reference bureau; rather the embodiment of the American intellectual community rendering a function on a national level over and beyond what is already being done.

This University of the United States would catalogue the unparalleled research and study resources already available in Washington within the various departments and agencies of the Government.

In its work with other colleges and universities, it would also focus widespread public attention on the purpose and functions of higher education in the United States thus becoming not a competitor of existing universities, but a brilliant colleague, exempt from envy and animosities, because of its noncompetitive nature and because of its obviously impersonal leadership. Supported by all, it would become the pride of all.

This institution would be sensitive to the problems of our country, foreign as well as domestic. The curriculum, like that of any educational institution, would be determined by the society, the culture, the civilization that it serves.

The closing statement in the formulation, prepared by these university educators, reads: "It is our belief that the University of the United States would add to the stature of the Nation and fully deserves to be established."

May I humbly add that an obligation is long past due and can be discharged to one whose wisdom and leadership still gives direction to our great purpose as a Nation. The bequest and wish of the Father of our Country deserves far better pleading.

May I leave with you an extended statement, a copy of the proposal prepared by the deans of education from universities ranging from the east coast to the west coast, along with their names, and a report prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at the request of Senator YOUNG of Ohio. This covers: "A short account of the national university movement."

REFERENCES

Extract from George Washington's will.

Documentary summary of efforts to establish a national university, 1775–1892.

Documentary summary of efforts to establish a national university or a somewhat similar institution since 1893.

Summary of arguments pro and con:

(a) Arguments for a national university.

(b) Arguments against a national university.

Digest of certain bills pending in the 87th Congress.

Arthur "Ted" Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a tribute to my good friend, in fact a friend to all the people in the San Fernando Valley, "Ted" Thomas, whose death I was notified of by Kay Martell, my field representative of Saugus, who phoned the office the moment she had been informed of his death. Kay's first words were that we had all lost a good friend and in saying this she was speaking for everyone that had had the pleasure and rich experience of knowing "Ted" Thomas.

The following tribute to Ted Thomas is from the pages of the San Fernando, Newhall-Saugus Sun, one of the leading dailies in the 27th Congressional District, of which Ted had been the managing editor since 1960.

TED THOMAS TRIBUTE

SAN FERNANDO.—Arthur "Ted" Thomas, managing editor of the San Fernando Valley Sun since August 1960, died Thursday night at City of Hope Hospital, Duarte, at the age of 57.

A victim of cancer, Mr. Thomas' death marked the end of a 3-mouth bout with the disease. He had complained of ill health since the Christmas holidays, and after a series of medical checkups entered Holy Cross Hospital February 4 to undergo surgery.

Following the operation, during which his left lung was removed, Mr. Thomas returned to his home in Chatsworth on March 8. Five days later, after complaining of pains in his back, Mr. Thomas returned to Holy Cross where further X-rays revealed the disease had spread to other portions of his body.

On March 21, he was transferred to City of Hope for cobalt treatments.

Mr. Thomas' career stretched from the east to the west coast. At the time of his death he was a member of the Los Angeles Police Department Examiners Board, a member of the Los Angeles City Board of Library Commissioners, and a director (for the third successive year) of the Valley Press Club.

MASTER MASON

He was a Master Mason and in June 1962 was named to Beta Phi Gamma, the national journalism fraternity.

Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., November 9, 1905, the son of the Rev. Charles H. and Mrs. Mabel Thomas, he received his early education in New York. After graduation from Flushing High School he came to California in 1925 to study at Deep Springs Junior College, then returned to the East, attended City College of New York and New York University. He also studied at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn.

In 1928 he became technical director of the Opera Comique, Brooklyn, and remained with the company until 1930 when he toured Europe. On his return to this country a year later he joined the staff of the Flushing Evening Journal, a publication later absorbed by Newsday, and also contributed to the Brooklyn Eagle and the New York Times.

CHANGES FIELD

In 1934 he changes fields, became owner and operator of a Long Island supermarket, a then novel retailing concept, followed this with a year in the Caribbean as a chef with the United States Lines. In November 1936 he married Miss Anita Youtt, and for the next 7 years he managed the Childs Restaurant in Times Square. From 1943 until 1946 he was purchasing agent for Cease Commissary Service, Dunkirk, N.Y.

The Thomas family moved to Los Angeles in 1947, settling in the valley. After several years in restaurant work, Mr. Thomas returned to journalism, becoming editor of the Granada Hills News-Tribune in 1956, the West Valley Herald Tribune in 1958, and managing editor of the Sun in 1960.

At his request, only a memorial service will be held, 1:30 p.m., next Sunday, April 28, at Oakwood Cemetery, Chatsworth. Friends are asked to omit flowers, send donations to City of Hope Memorial Center, National Office, 208 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles.

Mr. Thomas is survived by his wife, Anita; a son, John T. Thomas, of Santa Barbara; and a brother, Charles K. Thomas, Gainesville, Fla.

Marine Corps Weekly Friday Evening Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today received by mail an invitation from the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and I have been informed that all Members of Congress have or will shortly receive similar invitations. It is concerning this matter that I desire to make a few remarks.

In the 188 years since the dedicated and freedom-loving farmers of Lexington and Concord startled the world with their strong defense of the ideals of an independent Nation, there have been many demonstrations of the patriotic ardor which was so important to the establishment of this country. It is perhaps unfortunate that all of us cannot daily demonstrate to our neighbors that we are individually possessed of those beliefs which have contributed so significantly to the moral and physical strength which has always characterized this Nation and its citizens. With the expansion of our interests on the international scene, there has been a tendency to concentrate our thoughts on domestic economy and international diplomacy. As a result, I think we often overlook the basic yet profound principles which transformed our land from one which was suppressed and exploited into one which is dynamic and ever devoted to the liberty of its citizens.

To remind us of our heritage and instill in our children the basic values of the American way of life we have erected many memorials to our great leaders and patriots. Though inspiration can be found in these monuments, it is perhaps more meaningful to discover a living link with the spirit of 1775. Within a few short blocks of this Capitol there is an event each Friday which dramatically displays the qualities which inspired the

minutemen and have continued to be the fundamental force behind each succeeding generation of Americans.

In dress uniform adorned with colorful medals which they are honored to wear for distinguished service to their country, the marines of the Marine barracks, Eighth and I Streets SE., conduct an evening parade each Friday from mid-May until late September. This hour-long ceremony is held on the parade ground surrounded by buildings and traditions which began over 160 years ago. On a quiet June afternoon in 1801, President Thomas Jefferson rode on horseback from the Executive Mansion into Southeast Washington and directed that a marine barracks be established in the exact area where it stands today. In this weekly review our marines are able to demonstrate the virtues of loyalty, soldierly bearing, and sincere devotion to the ideals of America which we hold in such high esteem.

Upon entering the barracks one is transported instantly from the bustling city to a quiet tree-lined area surrounded by reminders of an earlier era. At the north end of the parade ground is the Commandant's house currently occupied by Gen. David M. Shoup. This remarkable residence, built in 1801, is considered to be the oldest continually occupied Federal structure in the Capital City. To the east and south stands the barracks itself with its three ramparts looking much like a small walled city. From 9 p.m. when the brilliantly shined brass ship's bell is sounded sharply, the parade is performed with great skill and precision.

The drama which exists throughout this famous ceremony is very evident as the celebrated drum and bugle corps plays a slow march and moves across the length of the parade field, returns to its original position, and sounds "Retreat." At this point, everyone stands, raises his eyes to the floodlit sky, and watches the American flag slowly lowered as the national anthem is played. Perhaps nowhere else in America is our national color lowered at the end of the day with such dignity, respect, and meaning.

The evening concludes when the combined elements of the Marine Band and Drum and Bugle Corps play an orchestrated of taps under dimmed floodlights. The whole barracks area then becomes completely dark and a taps echo is sounded by a lone bugler who is out of sight but whose music reaches the very depths of every individual who hears it.

In all respects, this weekly Friday evening parade commands admiration for its color and precision but it is its unusual quality of regenerating a sense of pride in and love for America which set it apart from other reminders of a citizens responsibility to his nation. I commend this masterful presentation to the attention of all Members of this distinguished legislative body and urge each of you and your visitors to accept this invitation to spend a truly rewarding evening at the Marine barracks. The event passes all too soon but its impact will certainly remain with you always.

President Kennedy's Envoy to Moscow Unfitted for Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has proved itself to be completely unfit to understand or deal with the Communists. The President and his advisers evidently do not understand the nature of communism and fail to recognize the facts of history which prove that part of the Communist strategy is to ignore agreements and treaties when it is to the advantage of the conspiracy to do so.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of April 26, 1963, pointing out the incompetence of Averell Harriman to deal with the Communists should be read carefully by every Member of Congress:

WHEN WILL WE LEARN?

If the situation in Laos were not so serious—with a strong possibility that the Communists can turn their victories there into conquest of all Southeast Asia—the current diplomatic moves by Washington would be laughable.

Latest news is that President Kennedy is sending a personal message to Soviet Premier Khrushchev to remind him that in 1961 and 1962 he pledged his word to help maintain a free and independent Laos.

Bearer of this message is Undersecretary of State W. Averell Harriman, who is supposed to meet with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to determine whether or not the Russians intend to live up to their commitments with respect to Laotian independence and neutrality.

What kind of nonsense is this? Even the most naive member of the State Department—and certainly the President of the United States—should by this time be fully aware that the Communists cannot be taken at their word, that they will not honor their commitments unless those commitments happen to work in favor of Soviet expansion.

For 50 years, the Communists have established a near-perfect record for treaty breaking. Last October, President Kennedy went on nationwide television to explain to the American people that Khrushchev had lied to him on the matter of Russia's installation of missiles and bases in Cuba.

What good does it do to remind Khrushchev that he has given his word on upholding Laotian independence?

The most likely result of this diplomatic nicety is that a showdown in Laos can be put off just a little bit longer. But even that offers no encouragement, for time is not working in our favor there.

It is genuinely ironic that Mr. Harriman should have been chosen for this mission to Moscow. For Mr. Harriman was the person most responsible for our disastrous decision last year to undercut the pro-Western Lao Government. It was at his insistence that anti-Communist leaders in that country were forced to share the reins of government with the neutralist and Communist factions.

It was also Mr. Harriman who played the key role last summer at Geneva, when the Western Powers agreed to remove their troops from Laos in exchange for a promise from the Communist bloc that it would do likewise. Neither the coalition formula for running the government of Laos nor the troop-withdrawal agreement has worked. For on both counts the Communists have broken their word.

We should, of course, have expected this. Similar coalition formulas were tried in China, Rumania, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia back in the 1940's, the State Department clubbing pro-Western governments in these nations to share their powers with the Reds. It was not long before all of them moved behind the Iron Curtain.

Significantly, Mr. Harriman played a key role in many of these disastrous diplomatic moves, particularly in Rumania.

In 1954 the Western allies made the same troop-withdrawal mistake in Indochina. The allies agreed to a truce specifying that they would pull their troops out of Indochina if the North Vietnamese Reds (the Viet Minh) would also withdraw. That agreement—and the folly of taking the Communists' pledge at face value—was very largely responsible for the difficulties we face in southeast Asia today.

When will we learn that the Communists cannot be trusted? When are we going to acknowledge the truth of the maxim that "those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it"?

The American Flag: Beacon of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Loyalty Day, May 1, 1963, I wish to commend the efforts of the Wakefield Item, a daily newspaper serving the people of Wakefield, Mass., in their American flag project. The Wakefield Item is promoting in an energetic fashion the importance of owning and displaying the American flag. As a result of the efforts of the Wakefield Item, 2,000 more homes and businesses have purchased and are displaying U.S. flags in that community.

President Woodrow Wilson once said about the Stars and Stripes:

> This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought, and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it.

These words eloquently express the worth of the efforts of the Wakefield Item in trying to encourage the flying of Old Glory.

I received a letter today from Mr. Jesse A. Rogers, of Arlington, Mass., a community which is in my congressional district. He sent me a copy of an essay written by his 12-year-old son, Howard, which states in simple, yet eloquent, language the meaning the American flag has to the free world.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert Howard's essay, entitled "The American Flag—Beacon of Hope."

THE AMERICAN FLAG—BEACON OF HOPE

Since the day Betsy Ross made the first American flag, our flag has been a symbol of hope to millions of people throughout the world.

Let's go back to the Revolutionary War. The flag to them stood for the hope that they may have their freedom. Men, women, and, yes, even children fought with this hope.

In World War II our flag was the hope that one day the world would have peace. Just think of thousands of men who died proudly on the battlefields. When they held or saw our flag it gave them this feeling deep in their hearts.

Today the many people who are behind the Iron Curtain think of our flag as hope that they may one day have freedom.

Hope is a big word. It's in the hearts of millions and millions of people, and our flag is the beacon of hope.

In a recent editorial in the Wakefield Item, mention was made of the fact that flags were not flying in any number on Patriots' Day. The editorial stated: "The purpose of owning a flag is to fly it. One of the most glorious days in human history was that when the American colonists finally took the arms to overthrow British oppression and led to the building of a land in freedom never before seen. It is a day to be proud of and a day on which Americans should fly their flag. Too bad there were not more of them to be seen." I believe that this statement has special meaning today, Loyalty Day.

Address by Robert Moses at World's Fair Japanese Pavilion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Moses, president of New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at the ground breaking for the Japanese Pavilion, at Flushing Meadow, Long Island, on April 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65

I come here today primarily to pay the respects of the officers and directors of the Fair to those who have been before, and shall be again, a very great people. Yours is a formidable bastion of freedom which, since Admiral Perry and extending throughout the stewardship of General MacArthur, has looked to the West for inspiration, and guarantees that inevitably in the long run the Far East shall be free.

The Japanese are an extraordinarily proud, courageous, ingenious and hard-working people. Day is dawning again over the Pacific. We are happy that you have space at the very center of the Fair for dramatic presentation of your ancient arts and your finest modern wares. We welcome these and other evidences of your meteoric rise from utter prostration to renewed respect, dignity, serenity and world leadership.

You will compete at Flushing Meadow in an atmosphere of friendship for the good opinion of the world, and by the end of 1965 you will surely have earned it.

Apollo and Its Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the editorial from the April 29 issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology magazine entitled "Apollo and Its Critics."

I believe the editorial to be exceptionally good and well timed, as it is true as the editorial states that each year at this time when the NASA budget is under consideration this particular program comes in for more than its share of criticism. Unfortunately, should the Russians succeed in landing men on the moon before this country, these same people who today are criticizing the Apollo program will be the first to write the Members of this body and criticize our handling of the entire program. I commend the editorial to each Member of this body.

The editorial follows:

[Aviation Week and Space Technology, Apr. 29, 1963]

APOLLO AND ITS CRITICS

Like all great pioneering ventures, the Apollo manned lunar landing program is the target of a continual barrage of carping. This anti-Apollo chorus usually reaches a crescendo in the spring, when the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget is facing significant congressional decisions, and dwindles to a barely audible pianissimo after every successful United States and Russian manned space flight.

This year the critics' chorus is louder than ever and studded with many familiar faces ranging from ex-President Eisenhower, who still wishes the space age would dry up and blow away, to an esoteric wing of the scientific community which appears to be disturbed by the fact that nonscientist types, such as engineers and pilots, have crept into the space program and are running their portion of it with vigor and enthusiasm directed toward specific goals that some scientists regard as unseemly.

We doubt if many Americans would wish to return to those final dismal years of the Eisenhower administration when the succession of Soviet space triumphs subjected this Nation to its worst international humiliation since British men-of-war stopped kidnapping Americans sailors on the high seas. Ex-President Eisenhower's abysmal failure to understand that the space age had dawned and his administration's lassitude in the first post-sputnik years certainly disqualifies him as a valid critic of the current national space program, even without his candid admission that he really knows nothing about space. We suspect that when the history of these times is finally written, one of the great differences between the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations will prove to be the former's inability to understand and cope with the technological tides of the era over which it presided, and the perception and vigor with which President Kennedy grasped this fact early in his regime by establishing the Apollo program as a top priority national goal and sticking with it despite the critics' chorus.

One of the most fallacious arguments advanced by the Eisenhower-type critic is that we are wasting money by trying to push into space too fast, and what we really need is a more leisurely and thus more economical pace. The history of the Eisenhower administration is studded with examples of research and development programs that were operated on this discredited philosophy. They resulted only in huge expenditures that produced few significant results. Actually, a technical program that is not run at its fastest feasible pace is the most wasteful of all. Apollo is now running at very close to its optimum technical pace, perhaps a shade too slow due to fiscal limitations. A slowdown or stretchout, as advocated by some critics, would only raise the eventual price of the program and delay the achievement of its significant goals and technology.

Another charge, oft-repeated by critics who have not firsthand knowledge of NASA's manned space flight programs—Mercury, Gemini and Apollo—is that Apollo's fast pace necessarily will impose undue hazards on lunar voyagers. There is always risk in exploration of the unknown. But anybody who has even a cursory knowledge of the operational philosophy of NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center and has seen it applied to Mercury knows that it is based on providing the maximum crew safety commensurate with mission fulfillment. The same engineers who are managing the Apollo program have a long background of managing high-speed flight exploration through the sound and thermal barriers with winged vehicles and later with Mercury capsules, and most of their pilots are still around to tell their stories.

Because of this special devotion to safety and the tremendous responsibility for transporting a man instead of a black box, the reliability record of the Mercury capsules and boosters has been far superior to that of the unmanned space probes and satellites.

The scientific community has traditionally provided the most solid opposition to the manned space flight program, but there has been a steady rate of conversion from critics to supporters during the Mercury years. This has been helped by the fact that it has become obvious that NASA does not intend to neglect scientific exploration because of the Apollo priority. As the NASA program has unfolded with the years, it has become apparent that considerable scientific exploration by instrumented satellites and probes is a necessary preliminary to extending the parameters of manned space flight. It is also evident that manned space flight itself will offer a greater opportunity for scientific exploration of the universe than could ever be possible using only remotely controlled instruments and data transmission. In fact, the major steps beyond the Apollo program are aimed at establishing manned laboratories on the moon and large earth orbiting space stations to expand the frontiers of scientific exploration beyond their present limitations. While the first Apollo lunar voyages will probably be made by astronauts instead of scientists, it is certain that once mission feasibility is demonstrated, these spacecraft will be used to transport a wide variety of scientists to the moon and orbital laboratories.

A successful program of manned space flight to the moon requires considerable advance scientific scouting by instrumented probes to produce data on which its operations must be calculated. The failure of the Ranger program to achieve its scientific objectives added no luster to the advocates of pure science above all. They could better lend their talents to insuring the success of

the Surveyor lunar exploration program than continually carping from their ivory towers of detachment.

There are a great many valid, vital reasons why this Nation must continue to press its exploration of space at the maximum feasible pace.

We intend to discuss them as the Apollo debate continues. But for the moment, there is no better summation of the purpose in this national effort than that stated by Brainerd Holmes, NASA's director of manned space flight and the chief engineer of the Apollo program, when he said in a recent speech:

"If we do not make these efforts we will not be first on the moon, we will not be first in space and one day soon we will not be the first on earth."

The 75th Anniversary of the Chartering of Temple University, Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in 1861, the year which ushered in one of the mightiest upheavals in American history, a young sophomore at Yale answered the call of his country and joined "Lincoln's Army." From 1862 to 1864 this brilliant youth of stable New England ancestry marched with the boys in blue. Graphic stories from the pen of Russell Conwell, vividly depicting the horrors of the war, earned for him a position as cub reporter and ultimately an around the world trip as foreign correspondent for the New York Tribune and the Boston Traveler.

Enroute from Baghdad to Ninevah, on the banks of the Tigris River a Turkish guide, emulating the timeworn customs of his progenitors, wove endless tales for the entertainment of his American tourists. Ever alert, young Conwell was deeply impressed by a legend about a wealthy Persian farmer, one Ali Hafed, who, lured by the stories of a Buddhist priest, deserted his fruitful lands to wander in search of fabulous wealth in mythical diamond fields. Far and wide he roamed, footsore and weary. Youth and wealth dwindled into nothingness and Ali Hafed, aged and discouraged, died an unhappy pauper.

"And so," said the guide, "after searching far and wide, for many years, Ali Hafed, reduced to poverty, disappointed and disillusioned, died, far from home. Not long after, the fabulous diamonds, acres of them, in the search for which Ali Hafed had devoted his life, were found on his own land." Having finished his story, the Turkish guide chattered on in an effort to amuse his American patrons. But the seeds of a great truth had been sown in a strong mind.

To the guide and other tourists this was just another story, but to the young correspondent it was a lesson in life. To him it said, "Your diamonds are not in far distant mountains or in yonder seas; they are in your own backyard, if you but dig for them." Russell Conwell returned to America.

During the ensuing years Conwell sowed the seeds of service which reaped for him his harvest of opportunities. As a lawyer in Boston, at the age of 36, he was consulted for advice concerning the disposal of a bankrupt church in Lexington. With ready sympathy he determined that the church should not be sold, but rebuilt. How he was ordained and accepted his first charge in that church; how a certain deacon who came to hear him invited him to a struggling Philadelphia pastorate at the salary of $800 a year; how, with 57 cents, he opened the building fund for the Baptist Temple; all these and many more were episodes illustrative of a great spirit and a remarkable vision.

One evening after the Baptist Temple had become a reality, a young man went to Dr. Conwell in his study, expressed a desire to prepare for the ministry, and asked for advice. Always welcoming the opportunity to help someone, Dr. Conwell offered to teach him 1 night a week. Could he bring some friends? As many as he wished. On the appointed evening, seven earnest young men appeared. Here were Conwell's diamonds, here at his home, in his own community, in Philadelphia.

That was in 1884. Within a short time the services of other teachers were enlisted and it was necessary to rent a room, then a building, then two. Within 4 years the group had grown from 7 to 590 students, a college charter was secured and Dr. Conwell took office as the first president.

Meanwhile Dr. Conwell had utilized the old fable to help his enterprise. His famous lecture, "Acres of Diamonds," was first given at a reunion of some of his old Civil War comrades, as he himself described it, "a mere accidental address." But it was called for again and again. It encouraged everyone to "do what you can with what you have where you are today." After each lecture, some worthy student received a check to help him continue his education.

It was 75 years ago, on May 12, 1888, that Dr. Conwell secured the charter of Temple College. This was the beginning of a university which today has an enrollment of almost 31,000.

No one can now say with certainty that Dr. Conwell envisioned a university in his attempt to help one young man, though it is known that he had long pondered the problem of those denied an education in the usual way.

It is certain, however, that the young men and young women who attended those early classes soon became Dr. Conwell's "Diamonds", just as the educational facilities he offered them became their Acres of Diamonds.

In 1891, the College of Liberal Arts established a day department and obtained the power to confer degrees.

By now, the increasing popularity of Dr. Conwell's doctrine of "education for all" brought such a large student body that it became necessary to build Temple College Building and acquire several halls and dwellings adjacent to it.

The growth of the university proceeded with the same extraordinary rapidity. Throughout the years, the different units and divisions came into existence as follows: in 1891, the Samaritan Hospital—now the Temple University Hospital; in 1893, the School of Theology; in 1895, the School of Law; in 1901, the School of Medicine and the School of Pharmacy; in 1907, the School of Dentistry—formerly the Philadelphia Dental College, one of the oldest and largest institutions of its kind in the United States—and the Garretson Hospital—Hospital of Oral Surgery and a part of the Philadelphia Dental College; in 1913, the School of Music; in 1915, the School of Chiropody; in 1918, the School of Commerce—now the School of Business and Public Administration; in 1919, the College of Education; in 1921, the Evening Technical Institute, the School of Oral Hygiene, and the Greatheart Hospital—Maternity Department of the Medical School; in 1935, the Stella Elkins Tyler School of Fine Arts; in 1945, the Day Technical Institute; in 1948, the Community College; and in 1950 the School of Medical Technology.

During the administration of the second president, Charles E. Beury, who was appointed in 1925 to succeed the founder, the university continued its advancement in educational improvement and physical expansion. In addition to the divisions which were formed during this period, other notable achievements were the building of a stadium; the rehabilitation of the professional schools; the building of Carnell Hall, a 12-story recitation building; a new and well-equipped medical school housing several important clinics and laboratories; the building of Mitten Hall, a beautifully and handsomely furnished student recreation center; and construction of the Sullivan Memorial Library.

On September 26, 1941, Robert Livingston Johnson was elected as the third president of Temple University.

In 1946, in an attempt to provide for the increasing influx of students, Temple University opened two new undergraduate centers. As a supplement to these centers, Cedarbrook, a freshman unit, was opened in 1947. By the addition of these college centers, hundreds of students, who could not have attended college, were given the opportunity to begin classes.

At the present time, the Cedarbrook Center houses the Community College where terminal courses are offered for students who wish training for specific objectives, but are unable to take 4-year programs.

In 1956, Temple University's building program accelerated. A new hospital building, an 8-story outpatient building, and an ancillary service building were added to the medical school facilities.

During the summer, classes were held for the first time in Curtis Hall, a newly constructed classroom building. Modern in design and completely air-conditioned, Curtis Hall added 50 classrooms to university facilities.

Also in 1956, construction was completed on Peabody Hall, a new dormitory for women.

Barton Hall, the new science building, was completed in 1960, and Johnson Hall, a new dormitory for men, was opened in 1961. A new chemistry building is virtually complete.

With these projects, Temple University is well advanced in its extensive development program which, eventually, will encompass a 40-acre tract.

Under the leadership of Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, elected president in 1959, Temple University continues to fulfill a distinct purpose built upon the ideal of Russell H. Conwell, "to make an education possible for all young men and young women who have good minds and the will to work."

A permanent planning committee keeps its fingers on the pulse of the times and continually recommends new offerings as well as changes in curriculums and methods. As it observes its diamond jubilee, Temple University is a growing institution, growing in outlook as well as in size, in usefulness and in the determination to unearth the acres of diamonds yet uncovered.

A Tribute to Cyril and Methodius, on the Occasion of the 1100th Anniversary of the Conversion of the Slavs to Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a world that is currently engaged in a struggle between the God-fearing decency of democracy and the godless outrage of communism, it is highly rewarding to look back upon Christian history, that we may point up deeds of glory involving those persons dedicated to the will of God. In this way, we are able to trace, in part, the career of Christianity, and to draw from that story the strength inherent therein. This is an old Christian custom, particularly popular with the Slav people of eastern Europe, and one that has served them well over the centuries.

As a people, the Slavs have always sought in this way to emphasize their devotion to the Lord and to Christian teachings, by hailing the names of their great apostles, Cyril and Methodius, whose work in behalf of Christianity, 1,100 years ago, entitles them to sainthood and world recognition.

Cyril and Methodius were brothers, born in Thessalonica in the years 827 and 826, respectively. Although they came from a family long established in politics, and were thereby in a position to serve as senators, both of them rejected political honors in order to enter the church, and thereupon went to live in a monastery. In time Cyril was called upon by the Emperor Michael III to go among the Khazars, a Tartar people theretofore devoted to the pagan religion, and teach Christianity to all who were willing to hear him. This required of Cyril that he learn the language of the Khazars before he even could begin his task. But learn the language he did, and in short time was busily engaged in the process of converting the Khazars to the Christian belief.

Meanwhile, a call was received from the Bulgarians of Thrace and Moesia, and Methodius was sent to minister to their needs. He, too, was highly successful, baptising Bogoris, King of the Bulgarians, and with the blessing of the monarch, evangelizing hundreds and thousands of the Bulgarian people.

At the request of Rastislav, Duke of Moravia, the brothers next entered the Slavic countries within the Moravian domain. German missionaries already had sought to convert the Moravians, without success. It was known, however, that the Germans' inability to speak the Slavonic language was largely responsible for their failure in this regard. On account of their vast lingual abilities, Cyril and Methodius were chosen to try again where the German missionaries had failed. In preparation, they compiled a Slavonic translation of the Scriptures and chief liturgical books, and by their services in the mother tongue were able to win the hearts of the Slav people.

Following their success in Moravia, the brothers were called to Rome to explain their teaching technique to their superiors. Here Cyril died, in the year 869, at the age of 42, thereby depriving the world of one of its great teachers and great linguists. And yet, before passing, he had played so great a part in the lives of the people of eastern Europe that their descendents were never to forget him. Indeed, the Scriptures and the chief liturgical works translated by the brothers into the Slavonic language became the foundation of all Slavonic literature. Moreover, the Cyrilic alphabet, modified out of the Greek by Cyril, superseded the more ancient Slavonic alphabet over a wide area.

At the request of the Moravian princes, Rastislav and Svatopluk, and the Slav Prince Kocel of Pannonia, the Roman Emperor Adrian II formed an archdiocese of Moravia and Pannonia, declared it independent of the German church, and appointed Methodius archbishop.

In the capacity of archbishop, Methodius became a highly controversial figure in consequence of his insistence upon using the Slavonic language in the liturgy. Time and again jealous priests denounced his conduct to the Pope, charging him with unorthodoxy and misinterpretation. And yet, nothwithstanding temporary doubts arising from all the accusations, the Pope was obliged to stand behind the work of Methodius, in the knowledge that he was succeeding in spreading the word of the Lord, where no one else, save his departed brother, had managed to succeed in even the slightest degree.

Following many years of strenuous labor in behalf of the Almighty, Methodius passed away on April 6, in the year 885, but not before he was able to recommend a Moravian disciple, Gorazd, as his own successor.

In former times the feasts of Saints Cyril and Methodius were celebrated in Bohemia and Moravia on March 9, but the date was changed by Pius IX to July 5. Leo XIII, by his Encyclical "Grande Munus" of September 30, 1880, extended the feast to the universal church.

To everyone concerned with the worldwide struggle for men's minds, the deeds of Cyril and Methodius have always stood forth as symbols of God-fearing labor and love. Even unto this day, in the regions where Cyril and Methodius lived out their lives, the work of Christ goes on, in the face of great obstacles. Nor will it ever be any different, so long as the Slav people retain their love for the Almighty, which is another way of saying forever.

Vice Admiral J. S. Thach: Freedom of the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in an outstanding address to the Cadet Midshipmen of the Royal Australian Naval College, Rear Adm. J. S. Thach emphasized how freedom of the seas is the key to thwarting the threat of communism.

Admiral Thach is commander of the Antisubmarine Warfare Force, Pacific. His remarks are well founded and important. I believe they should be made available for the information of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his speech:

ADDRESS BY VICE ADM. J. S. THACH, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE FORCE, PACIFIC, TO THE CADET MIDSHIPMEN OF THE ROYAL AUSTRALIAN NAVAL COLLEGE, H.M.A.S. "CRESWELL", JERVIS BAY, A.C.T., AUSTRALIA, MARCH 27, 1963

I'm honored to be here this morning and quite relieved. With 40 years in the U.S. Navy and with something less than that left to go, I had begun to despair of ever getting down to see your wonderful country. So I count this, my first visit, as a rare treat and opportunity. I had, many years ago, gotten a distant glimpse of your northeastern shore from my plane, but like Moses, I never quite made it to the Promised Land. So let me repeat for the record: I'm awfully glad to be here.

It strikes me that there ought to be some proper way in which we could celebrate the coming of age of Australian-American cooperation, which began in earnest just 21 years ago. It started, very hastily as I recall it, in the closing days of 1941, and arrived at its finest hour 6 months later with our victory in the Coral Sea in May of 1942. It was a glorious victory—a stunning victory, but not without its price—for you. It stopped Admiral Yamamoto's invasion plans to be sure, but alas, not even the Good Lord himself could save you from the Americans. I understand the ransom finally came to a matter of several thousand brides and unlimited rights to sing, play, hum, and other-

wise butcher that great Australian epic "Waltzing Matilda."

I, for one, am delighted to note that our close association has continued to this moment, strengthened not only by such formal ties as the ANZUS and SEATO Agreements, but by a steady and solid growth of understanding and genuine good will.

So I greet you this morning as my country's warm friends and staunch allies, with my hearty wish that you ever remain so.

I come here as well to acknowledge a debt owed in a special sense to your college. For the past year I have been privileged to have the services of one of the fine officers of your navy, Lt. Comdr. Ike Wilson, who was a member of the Philip Year which entered the Royal Australian Naval College at Flinders in 1945. Since reporting to me, he has kept himself busy with the complex problems of Control of Shipping with which my staff must deal. In addition, he has proven to be a valuable channel of communication. It is rumored that he has established himself as the Hawaiian area recruiting officer for the Royal Australian Navy. I consider his appointment to my staff a symbol of our common interests in getting an important job done. It is a job which will become more important with each passing year, because it vitally affects our continued ability to keep open the sea highways that join us to each other, and to our friends of the free world.

Our two nations are alike in many things. We share a great heritage of law and language and custom. Each of us is geographically remote from the world's central block of land and people and power—separated from it—and from each other—by thousands of miles of blue water. We are bounded by enormous lengths of coastline, and we have heavily concentrated our population and industry in our coastal areas. Shipping and foreign trade are important to us, and we are dependent upon certain key imports and exports which are essential to our economies and which grow more demanding every year.

For example, there are 77 strategic raw materials which my country requires for its economic well being. We are self-sufficient in only 11 of these materials, and I imagine that the "Aussie" aircraft which transported me here today was basically dependent on fuel brought to this country via the sea. Although I understand that you have great hopes for your recent oil discoveries.

However, I believe your graziers would be rather unhappy if they suddenly found that there was no shipping available to export this year's wool clip.

We are, both of us, maritime nations with a great and abiding interest in the sea, and in the great ships that sail it. Whatever affects the free passage of ships on the oceans of the world affects us, directly or remotely. No threat to shipping is too small to deserve our attention. For the truth is simply that these patient, plodding ships that serve us carry 99 percent of all the goods that move in our oversea commerce, and that is quite enough to make their defense, in the words of our Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Anderson, "The most crucial task of the United States today." I am sure Admiral Harrington has similar convictions about the mission of your navy as well.

We must use the sea. We must keep it free, and we must be prepared to meet and defeat the most devious means a resourceful enemy can think of to exclude us from areas where we have a proper business to be.

We have too long taken for granted the doctrine of the freedom of the sea. You know, it is not a natural condition, and no divine authority guarantees the sea's continued use to us. In reality, the sea is free only because free men have chosen to make it so, and it will remain free only so long as free men have the strength and resolution to resist those who would have it otherwise.

I'm not talking about a threat that may someday present itself as part of a general war in some distant, hazy future. I speak of a clear and present danger—one that is with us now, and has been for several years gone by. Look around at what has been happening to the free nations of the world since you were born.

How is it that the Communists are able to extend their control without the expense and trouble of a major war? They do it by pressure—by steady, relentless pressure, by wedging and probing, by filling up the empty spaces and engulfing those that are weakly held—but always keep up that subtle, continuous, unyielding pressure until the free nations get tired or discouraged and yield the issue.

Up to now this tactic has been most noticeable on land, where the Communists have had the advantage of contiguous boundaries, large numbers of expendable troops, and the opportunity to practice the guerrilla warfare in which they excel. But I can tell you, it is also happening at sea, although it usually goes unnoticed until some spectacular incident reminds us of it. But the pressure is there, just as it is on land.

The Soviet Union has, in defiance of the historic 3-mile convention, claimed sea areas out to 12 miles from its shores as territorial waters. The Sea of Okhotsk—one-half million square miles of the Pacific Ocean—has been closed for years by nothing more legally substantial than Soviet edict; and ships using the Gulf of Bothnia and the northern half of the Black Sea are left in no doubt of the Soviet proprietary interest in those areas. American aircraft have been shot down over the open ocean.

The Chinese Communists have just issued another of their so-called serious warnings against free world ships transiting the China seas. I believe they envision this as a congealing process, like a lake freezing up in winter, first around the shores, then steadily extending toward the center, till at last the entire surface is frozen solid.

I, for one, expect no letup in this Communist campaign to freeze us out of an ever-widening proportion of the world's sea areas. Is it too much to imagine that they may someday seek to exclude free world ships from the Yellow Sea, the Sea of Japan, or, say, the Java Sea? I think not.

We are living in strange times, and there is not the clear, sharp boundary between peace and war that existed when I was your age, and I believe it will grow even fuzzier and more ill defined than it now is. The threshold of provocation to general nuclear war gets higher each year, and indeed it is the policy of every civilized nation to prevent it altogether. However, we can still expect no end of mischief in the areas of cold and limited war, and we must be prepared to defend ourselves against—

1. Harassment of shipping and naval forces;

2. A strong and concentrated bid to control such vital areas as the approaches to the Suez and Panama Canals, and the Strait of Malacca;

3. More illegal claims of exclusive rights to open sea areas; and

4. Perhaps the outright sinking of ships by unidentified forces.

In short, the maritime nations of the world stand to be attacked at their most vital point: the sea routes which bind them together. And we would do well to accustom ourselves to the thought that some very rough water lies ahead.

The Soviet far eastern submarine force today counts just about twice the number of submarines with which Germany entered World War II. It is the largest submarine force ever to operate in the Pacific in peacetime, this being about one-fourth of their total submarine strength. Moreover, the Soviet Union has placed over twenty of its submarines at the disposal of the Chinese Communist regime. This action and the arrangements for placing Soviet-built submarines in so-called neutral countries has set the stage for use of submarines in limited wars. These submarines could be used covertly in such a manner that it would be hard to prove their actual nationality. The majority of these subs are the long-range, offensively armed Whiskey class, and are designed for one mission, primarily: The sinking or interruption of shipping of nations dependent upon the sea—and this includes Australia, New Zealand, and the United States.

It seems obvious. The free nations of the world are dependent upon the sea; our enemies are not, to any great degree. The free nations are preeminent in naval power on the surface of the sea and above it. The Soviet Union, as a landlocked nation with little dependence on the seas, has taken the natural course: It has directed its limited resources into the submarine, a weapons system which has great potential for denying our use of the seas. You will recall that the Germans began the Second World War with 57 submarines, and during the course of it built 1,000 more. They never had more than 325 operational at any one time, but they sank nearly 3,000 allied merchantmen, amounting to a total of over 14 million tons.

In many ways, the submarine takes the art of the guerilla to sea. The same features prevail: Stealth and concealment; ambush and evasion; anonymity and ambiguity; initiative and surprise. It is a made-to-order instrument for an enemy which has traditionally sought its victories at limited commitment and cost.

And every advance in technology seems to add to the submarine's natural advantage. The World War II submarine was eventually defeated, although at tremendous effort—because it was short-winded and slow.

The snorkel-equipped boats of the Soviet postwar submarine fleet are a significant advance over the older models, and the nuclear-powered boats which are now coming out of the yards represent a quantum jump in both speed and underwater endurance. This has complicated our problems of detection, classification, and localization—which were difficult enough even with the old adversary. Add to this a stand-off capability for the submarine—the ability to fire a missile a hundred miles or so—and you have a challenge well worth your best efforts.

I do not mean to imply that the problem is insurmountable. We have made some very great advances over the past decade in both the tactical and technical approaches to antisubmarine warfare, and we shall go on making more.

The fact is, this is a fascinating business. There is scarcely any segment of the U.S. Navy that does not have some role to play against enemy submarines. Our attack carrier striking forces would destroy their building yards and operating bases, and the tenders which support them; our aircraft, surface ship, and submarine ASW forces would destroy them in the narrow straits they must transit on the way to their patrol areas; our hunter-killer groups would seek them out in their own hunting grounds. When we need it, we have an enormous amount of power we can bring to bear on this particular task of our naval forces.

Meanwhile, we go on searching for improvements—more effective hardware, and better ways of using it. We have continued to improve the range and definition of our sonar, both active and passive, and we have not given up looking for a window in the electromagnetic spectrum that will let us see through sea water. Computer techniques look good to us as a means for classifying underwater sounds. And we are doing a lot of research work in that area. We have developed various ways of getting under ther-

mal layers, including variable depth sonars.

In the field of weapons, our early attack rocket, ASROC, in both torpedo and depth bomb versions, has been operational in our fleet for several years. We are watching the develoment of your IKARA ASW system with great interest, and sincerely wish it every success. It is my firm conviction that the allied navies need the best and most versatile ASW arsenal possible. The development of weapons like IKARA will help insure that we achieve a more effective kill capability.

And this brings me back to the point from which I started this morning. It is that we can help each other greatly—and we must do so—if we are to meet the common threat that makes no distinction as to name, interests, population, or on which side of the equator we live. This is a threat which menaces all maritime nations equally, and one we must meet successfully or give way to an order of far less promise and potential, but one which grasped the essential meaning of the sea to those who live along its shores.

To you young men of Australia and New Zealand who will soon be prepared to man and fight the ships of your fine navy, I leave these thoughts: Antisubmarine warfare is a demanding, exacting, and sometimes frustrating task that requires the constant attention of dedicated men. Not only must we of the free world's navies be concerned with insuring our free use of all the seas, upon which our economies are so dependent—but we must also concern ourselves with the antisubmarine warfare problems attending so-called limited, local, or brush wars. The ability of the free world powers to project their military might wherever and whenever it is needed and the ability to support and sustain these forces for as long as necessary depends on our allied antisubmarine warfare capability—and the importance of this allied naval capability is going to steadily increase.

The impact of the remarkable Polaris system on the balance of power has been profound. However, we must recognize that future Communist progress in this same field will undoubtedly provide them with a like capability—to assume anything less would be distastrous. When this point is reached, there will have occurred what is often referred to as a complete nuclear stalemate. Then the factor which will decide the balance of power will be our capacity to effectively reduce the enemy's capability to employ his submarine force. And so it may be that the free world's antisubmarine warfare capability will become the key to our very survival.

What Economy Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the continual expansion of Federal governmental activities and increased civilian employment by the administration are the major reasons why Federal budgets and deficits continue to grow.

Since taking office, the present administration has added 132,901 civilian employees to the Federal payroll. In addition, the President requested 36,500 new jobs in his 1964 budget.

The average annual wage of these employees is $5,800 and this places an added burden of approximately $1 billion per year on the budget, excluding the necessary expenditures for equipment, office space, etc.

These facts belie the administration's claim of a vigorous Federal job economy program.

A Helping Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as you know a number of Members of this House have introduced bills to implement the President's proposal for creation of a National Service Corps. The purpose of this legislation is to open new opportunities for Americans of all ages to perform useful services for those within our society who are in need of a helping hand. Although I do not wish to anticipate events, I would imagine there will be those among us who will ask "What can a National Service Corps do?" It is therefore with great pride that I commend to you the following article which appeared in the New York Sunday Times of April 28. It describes a program recently launched in New Jersey wherein students from Princeton University, Trenton State College, the Princeton Theological Seminary, Westminister Choir College, and Rider College have undertaken to tutor children in the public schools who might be classified as potential dropouts. I do not think it is possible to overestimate the enormous potential for good this program will have for the children who are to be instructed and the community at large. My purpose in bringing this program to your attention is to suggest this as an example of the kind of activity in which the proposed National Service Corps might fruitfully concern itself.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1963]

COLLEGIANS HELP BACKWARD PUPILS—VOLUNTEERS TO EXPAND THEIR TUTORING IN TRENTON

PRINCETON, N.J., April 27.—Collegiate volunteers in this area are planning to expand this summer a month-old project to tutor problem students in the Trenton public schools.

Two hundred and four students in Trenton, mainly from junior high schools, are being tutored, an increase of more than 40 from the total in the first weeks of the program. There has been a corresponding increase in the number of tutors.

One hundred and forty-one students from Princeton University and 52 from Trenton State College form the bulk of the staff of the Trenton Tutorial Project. Ten others from Princeton Theological Seminary and Westminster Choir College, as well as the wives of two Princeton University graduate students, are also participating in the program. Students from Rider College are organizing a tutoring force.

Fifteen more Princeton undergraduates have begun tutoring 35 seventh grade students from Princeton Borough.

"This program is a model for next year. We'll try to recruit more tutors and more pupils then," said Ronald Glick, a Princeton sophomore from Wilmette, Ill., one of the organizers of the project.

He said the group was trying to recruit New Jersey high school seniors as well as additional college students to continue the program during the summer.

Anne Naples, a Trenton State senior who helped Mr. Glick organize the project, expects to hold remedial reading classes in Trenton during the summer. These will be open to students from the third grade through high school.

"Very few of the students being tutored have dropped out of the program," Mr. Glick said. "We've gotten additional pupils who came in after hearing about it from their friends."

A similar project begun in Philadelphia last July by the Northern Student Movement provided a guide for the project.

"We knew something like the Philadelphia program was needed in Trenton," said Mr. Glick.

"But we've made several changes. In Philadelphia they tutor high school kids. We're aiming at the junior high level. At that age kids are beginning to shape their plans for the future."

TWO TYPES OF STUDENTS

The project is directed at two types of students, he said: the potential dropout who is doing less than adequate work, and the talented student whose level of work is not high enough to guarantee admittance to college.

"Most of the kids that get into trouble are the ones that are back in their school work," said the Reverend Sam Bagley, pastor of the Galilee Baptist Church, in Trenton, one of the four churches and civic centers at which the tutoring is done.

"I don't think there will be as much juvenile delinquency if we can get all the kids into this program. It will keep them out of trouble."

The idea for the Trenton project came to Mr. Glick during discussions in December with members of the Northern Student Movement, a civil rights organization with headquarters at Yale University.

In early February he and Miss Anne Naples, a Trenton native who is cochairman of the student government's human relations committee at Trenton State, surveyed the city to find a suitable area in which to work.

After interviews with school officials and an examination of 1960 census reports, they settled upon trace 20, a section in which the school dropout rate is 33 percent, the median family income is $739 below the city as a whole, and in which there is no organized social or recreational agency.

Acting upon recommendations from teachers at Trenton Junior High Schools 1 and 2, the Woodrow Wilson Elementary School and Trenton High School, Mr. Glick and Miss Naples interviewed potential pupils.

Stubborn Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call

to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, April 28. This editorial can be even more graphically exampled by the case in point communicated to me last Monday. The case is a major general who served in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and retired in 1957. He will receive $2,000 less per year than a major general who retired in 1958, with service in World War II and the Korean war. I use the ranks of major general only to illustrate the obvious injustice. There are thousands of other great Americans whose service will not be compensated for, due to the June 1, 1958, cutoff, and I strongly raise my voice in an effort to correct this inequality.

The editorial follows:

STUBBORN INEQUITY

Once again, an effort is being made to delete from the laws a retirement pay provision that penalizes every officer who left active duty before the 1958 military pay bill went into effect. Before 1958, there was a century-old tradition of relating retirement benefits to active duty pay. But the military pay bill provided for 6-percent increases for officers who retired before June 1, 1958, and retained the traditional system only for those who subsequently left the service. It would be a simple matter—costing at most $30 million—to correct the injustice, as the Department of Defense has urged.

Yet in the pending military pay legislation, Congress again fails to remedy the defect. By a 19-to-13 vote, the full House Armed Services Committee rejected the unanimous subcommittee recommendation for removing the discriminatory feature. "This bill contains a major inconsistency," a minority of the full committee pointed out. "While purporting to encourage competent members of our Armed Forces to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service."

These sentences sum the matter up. Surely the House will amend the bill when it comes up on the floor, and thereby point the way to Senate adoption of a similar corrective. This legislative wrong has been a reproach to the country for altogether too long.

Music and Mrs. May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Herbert A. May has again this year underwritten the "Music for Young America" program, continuing her efforts to provide the excitement of hearing great music played by a great orchestra for boys and girls from the 50 States.

I am told the National Symphony plays more concerts for young people than any comparable orchestra in the country. Through the years, Mrs. May has made it possible for thousands of young people to enrich their lives through the enjoyment of these concerts under the excellent direction of Dr. Howard Mitchell, and the American Federation of Musicians honored her the other day in Washington with a richly deserved citation.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star in tribute to this gracious and generous lady who, as music is a heavenly gift, is truly an angel of the highest order.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 24, 1963]

MUSIC AND MRS. MAY

The National Symphony Orchestra is fortunate to have thousands of "angels" who contribute to its welfare. But a very special angel is Mrs. Herbert A. May who for 5 weeks each spring practically owns the orchestra. Graciously, she shares Howard Mitchell and his 95 players with visiting school children so they may enjoy "Music for Young America." This is the series she began financing 8 years ago with the dual purpose of (1) enriching the lives of young people through an introduction to good music and (2) financially assisting the orchestra members by extending their season.

The opening of this year's series was particularly auspicious. For the American Federation of Music recognized Mrs. May's generosity with a bronze plaque. It was an award well deserved, but no more significant than the audience of bright-faced youngsters from Wautoma, Wis.; Suncock, N.H.; Whitesboro, Ky.; New York City; St. Louis; St. Paul; Mount Vernon, Ohio; and 14 other cities. For many of them it was the entry into a new and wonderful world.

Israel's 15th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the valiant people of Israel on the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

The phenomenal growth of this country in population and economic stability against the greatest of odds stands as a monument to the will and sacrifices of her people. With all that this country has had to do, we might think her only task was to build her own resources, but these people have extended the helping hand of friendship to those in need on four continents.

This anniversary is marred only by the passing of a great leader, Ben-Zvi, and the continual striving of other nations to destroy this valiant country. We know that these great people, with the help of all free people, will survive these dark hours and go on to greater achievements.

The United States has been generous in its aid to Israel. Where has our aid done a greater job? We can take justifiable pride in our part in the establishment of Israel, congratulate her on this 15th anniversary, and pledge our continued support to her worthy goals.

This I Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am including the following excerpts from the address on "Living Philosophy," which Mr. Paul C. Clovis, president of the Twentieth Century Press, recently delivered before the Chicago Sunday Evening Club, because I believe that every American should read these words of warning and ask himself whether he will pursue a course that threatens the great heritage bequeathed to us or strive to preserve individual freedom, with responsibility, which has made this country great. Our Nation stands at a crossroads today, and the path we take will determine our future.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 22, 1963]

THIS I BELIEVE

(By Paul C. Clovis)

I am certain that we all share a deep concern about the speed with which we are moving into dangerous ground both internationally and as an economy.

In our relations with other nations we still have not learned that respect and friendship are not for sale—that they cannot be bought, even with countless billions.

At home the old-fashioned qualities of industry, ingenuity, honesty and thrift are fast becoming outmoded. "Something for nothing" and "more for less" have become cancerous growths on old-fashioned American ambition and pride of achievement.

On the morals and the good faith of our leaders and our people and the preservation of our national strength depends our future.

I am convinced that a unified and vigorous America can be preserved if we shed our apathetic attitude and go to work in earnest on the job.

What we face is the biggest selling job in the history of the civilized world—that of reselling to those who have become confused by one cause or another the utter desirability of retaining the blessings which they enjoy as the result of more than 187 years of thought and sacrifice, industry and ingenuity and thrift, high courage and heartache and honesty, decency and drive and dedication to their tasks of all those generations who have gone before in the building of America.

What can we as individuals do to help keep America strong and healthy?

First, we can put true facts and thoughts into the minds of those who are confused.

And we need have no hesitation or embarrassment in asking them to help sell free America to their friends and acquaintances who need to be sold.

Second, we must be alert so that those who seek to undermine us or threaten our liberties shall find us ready to resist instantly and vigorously any such attempt.

Third, we must retain a sound sense of values, remember that we have a right to demand that our tax dollars be spent honestly, wisely and effectively.

Fourth, we must remember that the Government actually cannot give something for nothing—for it has nothing except our money and our future earning capacity as American citizens.

Fifth, we must make certain that we do not invite or encourage public servants to

forget their obligation of good faith or honesty by offering improper rewards for special consideration.

Sixth, we must vote every time we have the opportunity, and as intelligently as we possibly can. Having voted, we must keep informed with respect to legislation, executive action, and the appointment of individuals to positions of responsibility in the Government.

The only way that we can hope to survive as a great free nation in this highly competitive world is to produce a generation of honest, able leaders, and honest, intelligent, articulate followers.

In order to be an intelligent follower, one must make an earnest effort to judge the honesty, the sincerity and the ability of his leaders and he must be alert, prompt and firm in voicing his comments about the quality and performance of his leadership and not stand mute.

This is the duty as well as the priceless privilege of a good American citizen.

And make no mistake about it—our legislators and other leaders will listen to us just as we must listen to those whom we lead—for the power is still in the people, where it must always remain if America is to remain free.

What Is a Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, you have often heard me say on the floor of this House that the farmer and his industry are the backbone of our U.S. economy. Our farmers spend two and a fifth times as much for manufactured goods when their dollar is worth a hundred cents at the counter than does any other segment of our people; hence our factory workers are greatly dependent on farm prosperity. For that reason I have consistently maintained that it is a national must to do everything possible to create and maintain a prosperous farm economy.

It is popular for the misinformed to rap the farmer, and claim he is all too willing to insist on and accept Government handouts. Believe me, my friends, this just is not so; certainly not true of the able, dedicated farmers who wear their badge with pride, as most farmers do.

So it is with pleasure today that I insert in the RECORD for all to read an editorial which appeared in the Jefferson, Iowa, Herald on April 25, ascribed to one of the great radio broadcasting stations of the Midwest, KMA, at Shenandoah, Iowa. It is entitled "What Is a Farmer?" and the piece follows:

[From the Jefferson (Iowa) Herald, Apr. 25, 1963]

WHAT IS A FARMER?

We liked it—and we'll bet you will too—this little piece provided by KMA in Shenandoah and entitled "What Is a Farmer?"

A farmer is a paradox—he is an overall executive with his home, his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personal director with grease under his fingernails; a dietician with a passion for alfalfa, aminos, and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers, or helping with housework.

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes heaven to stop them.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him—he is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 9, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: Please support Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD's resolution, House Resolution 14, because we believe it will create an excellent source of information concerning the captive nations.

Copies are being sent to Congressman LODGE.

Respectfully yours,

Jane Logan, Yaroslavia Rosola, Roslaw Henk, Maria Woistyay, Oleo Bay, Roman Oligart, Janislau Charieczko, Borys Leoczleo, Andrew Secogy, Boris Pasternack, Nicholos O. Martiola, Irene Feruniak, Maria Fecick, Lubow Kapy, Olga Cehelshy, Katrcyna Kowal, Neonila Chuma, Igor Buta, Jerry McMennenn, Jimmy Broadbeck, Bobby Dyron, Leslie Larry Chukachinow, Olga Rosola, M. Lucky, B. Lucky, M. Lisink, M. Kubynycz, R. Fedyna, P. Dworsky, John Kymacyk, A. Kapanistik, J. Norrel, John Schultz, Jose Carioca, Olet Pushkar, Roman Kohut, Zenon Kohut, Bohdan Kochanowsky, Peter Jiochenko, Jarodow Hafycz S. Pavolich.

ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIAN VETERANS,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 5, 1963.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Ukrainians in the free world, wholeheartedly support the lofty ideals of democracy and full personal and national freedom for all peoples. We encourage and support the United States of America in its efforts to foster basic human rights; in its struggle to denounce colonialism as an evil in all its forms.

We all know that the United States should, and will, strongly and unfailingly proclaim and uphold the right of individuals to democratic means of changing their government. The presence of Communist domination in countries reduced to the level of satellites constitutes an ever-existing threat to world peace. It becomes more urgent than ever that the United States assert its moral force and pressure in solving this major problem of our time.

In view of this most significant and pressing problem, it would be of vital importance to our Government to create a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, a committee devoted to the assembling of full and correct information on problems connected with nations suffering beyond endurance from totalitarian and imperialist aggression.

We, therefore, respectfully request and urge you to submit to vote by your committee the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14). May you, sir, become one of the first true cham-

pions of this worthy and all-important cause.

Thank you on behalf of our association.

Very truly yours,

W. FILONOARD,
Chairman.

I. MUREO,
Cochairman.

D. ROMANOWSKY,
Secretary.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 7, 1963.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a pleasure to support Congressman D. FLOOD's resolution (H. Res. 14) because it will help us to learn and understand better the problems of captive nations.

We urge you to support this resolution.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Congressman FLOOD.

Respectfully yours,

Irene Mazepa, Walter Neduchs, Anna Meyso, Jacqueline McMenamin, Patricia McMenamin, Luba Kuzminskyj, Patricia Kay, Irene Harvey, Zenoria Terlacky, Mary Jane Holmes, Irene Meomichel, John Doty, Chuck Walters, Dolores McAvey, Anna Radosz, Olga Radosz, Margaret McClaire, Maxie McCook, Marietta Moon, Patricia Makell, Jeannette Martin, Danuta Makar, Nadia Mischtschuk, Sue Crupi, Lucille Bonfiglio, Marian Caroselli, Antonina Tioraventi, Elizabeth Adams, Lorraine Logan, Pete Sycz, Pauline Cappetta, Qeba Nadia Kozoiz, Loretta Young, Sandia Marklin, Irene Zygmont, Carla Bennings, Beatrice Lowe, Celia Kite, Joanne Franklin, Ludwig Morris, Mary Annon, Boris Kuse, Nelia Jones, Myron Utrydro, Maria Kozoriz, Jane Jo Trossa, Suela Tyson, Theresa Lovilio, Joan Topper.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: House Resolution 14, calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations would do a great deal to refute the conciliatory attitude which United States and its allies had regarded Communist Russia in its colonial expansion. Its passage would undoubtedly provide an excellent source of valuable information which would contribute greatly to U.S. foreign policy relating to Eastern European affairs, as well as giving renewed hope to these subjugated, but unconquered, peoples. We therefore urge you, Chairman SMITH, to give your warmest support to this task.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to Congressman D. J. FLOOD.

Respectfully yours,

Lesia Chornobrywa, Dorothy Kaseminski, Belinda Schaffner, Madeline Varga, Barbara Jo Habza, Anna Wible, Sam Brocken, Marie Fussi, Eugene Rubel, de Chantal Collins, Inila Switerko, Theodore R. Stebly.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 15, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that there are at least two dozen resolutions before the House Rules Committee, which have for their aim the establishment of the permanent Committe on the Captive Nations.

It would seem to me that if we believe in the democratic system of government, and if we believe in the self-determination of all nations; African, Asian and European, then the establishment of the permanent Committee on the Captive Nations is not only necessary, but mandatory and logical.

The establishment of such a committee would be of immense moral and psychological advantage to us, as it would reaffirm the belief of the whole world that this great country has not abandoned its role as the champion of the oppressed and the land of freedom.

I think that it is most unreasonable how we apply pressure on our allies so that they would grant independence to their colonies, which, more often than not, have no conception of national unity and self-rule; and yet, for some strange reason, we shirk from even voicing our opinion about nations such as: Georgia, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Uzbekia and others, and their right for self-determination.

Most of these nations, and many more, in the so-called Soviet Union (Russian colonial empire in reality) have cultures, civilizations and national identifications that go back centuries and centuries. Yes, some of these nations existed when the word "Russian" was a strange and unknown term in the world lexicon. And yet these nations are denied their God-given right of self-determination in the time when Congo becomes an independent state. Is this logical?

It seems to me that the present policy of our present Government, and especially of our present illustrious State Department could be summed up in the following Golden Rule, of a sort: "Be kind to our enemies, be harsh to our friends". And then we are amazed and surprised when Canada and Western Europe cannot see the logic of this Golden Rule. Frankly, neither can I. Need I say more.

In the hope that you will receive this letter in the spirit of the good of our great country, the citizen of which I am proud to be, I remain

Respectfully yours,

BOHDAN HASIUK.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 8, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The creation of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations (H. Res. 14) will help the young American generation comprehend the problems of Eastern Europe, especially Ukraine.

We are sending a copy of this letter to Congressman FLOOD.

Respectfully yours,

Ann Drabit, Tatiana Krasij, Mary Kurchaha, Irene Fenkuniak, Luba Furczak, Dolores Flynn, Maria Ficiak, Geanie Rosola, Nedia Pisko, Lynn Dall, Theresa Oubek, Mary Dosiak, Rosemary Devlin, Nancy Dietrich, Josephine Davis, Maureen Duffy, Irene Dougherty, Helen Doran, Kay Doherty, Ann Dockley, Eleanor Donovan, George Thomorowsky, Donna Kajaniusky, Bohdan Mizak, Irene Flomziak, Orin Fouziak, Myron Lukowsky, Oleh Janusz, Bozena Skalchuk, M. Jerry Pebriw.

Mississippi and the Marshals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the recent report of an investigating committee of the Mississippi State Legislature, citing numerous instances of brutalities on students and citizens during the incident last September at the University of Mississippi, brought forth a denial of the charges by the U.S. Department of Justice.

In a statement issued in the name of the Department, instead of its executive officer, the Department contends that the investigating committee distorted the facts and said none of the incidents could be confirmed by "objective observers."

This statement was another in the numerous attempts of the Department to cover up the ugly, vicious, inhumane, and uncivil conduct of its trigger-happy marshals, acting under the direct supervision of high Justice Department officials who were dispatched to and on the scene during the entire incident.

Surely none would contend that Mr. James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader of Richmond, Va., is not an objective person. It so happens that he was on the scene and an eye witness to the conduct of the marshals and their directors.

Mr. Kilpatrick is one of the most respected newspaper editors of our country. His editorials are widely read and frequently quoted. A native of Oklahoma City, he was graduated from the Missouri School of Journalism in 1941. Since that date he has served the News Leader in various capacities, becoming its editor in 1951.

As a journalist and author of note, he has been the recipient of numerous awards and medals from the journalistic fraternity, and in 1955 was elected chairman of the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

Mr. Kilpatrick was an on-the-scene eye witness to "Operation Rapid Road," the official designation given by the Department of Justice to the campus occupation of the University of Mississippi under orders of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Mr. Kilpatrick was indeed an "objective observer." As such, he has categorically refuted the Department's attempt to cover up the inhumane brutalities visited upon defenseless students and citizens by the U.S. marshals.

As an on-the-scene observer, Mr. Kilpatrick has commented editorially on acts of brutal treatment to which he was an eye witness. The editorial appeared in the Richmond News Leader April 29, 1963. I include it as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to the Members of Congress, the people of the country, and particularly to the directors of "Operation Rapid Road" in the U.S. Department of Justice.

The editorial follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Apr. 29, 1963]

MISSISSIPPI AND THE MARSHALS

Last week an investigating committee of the Mississippi Legislature filed a report on the Oxford riot of September 30. We have not seen a text of this report, but we have seen an Associated Press story that gave two paragraphs to Mississippi's charges and three paragraphs to Bobby Kennedy's denial of them.

In brief, it appears that the report charges the Federal marshals with brutality that amounted in some instances to "physical torture." The marshals are accused of clubbings, manhandlings, denials of medicines to prisoners, and suppression of civil rights.

To these charges, Mr. Kennedy replied at length: Mississippi had filed "a grievous slander against courageous men." The Justice Department found it "shocking that facts should be distorted or ignored and incidents manufactured." A formal statement regretted that the Mississippi legislators had not interviewed "objective" witnesses. Mr. Kennedy said the report "appeared to be inadequate and incomplete, and said the committee should have questioned newspapermen who witnessed the incidents and some of the marshals who were there."

Well, we were there.

We were there at 7 o'clock on the morning of Monday, October 1, while the tear gas still drifted in stinging patches across the university campus. We stayed in the lyceum, the university's administration building, or very near it, until 4 o'clock that afternoon.

We were in the front hall of the lyceum as the marshals lined up their captives. These prisoners were mostly high school and college boys, with a scattering of scruffy hill types. All morning long, the marshals kept them standing in line with their hands clasped on their heads. After so long a time, the position gets to be agonizing. One by one, the prisoners were jerked forward and told to lean against a wall. Then a marshal would loosen the captive's belt, pull his trousers halfway down, and dump the pockets on the floor. Thus frisked, the captives then were escorted, or shoved, into an interrogation room. After a while, they were marched in groups, hands again clasped above their heads, to another room downstairs. Except in a handful of cases, no charges were filed against any of them. From the downstairs room they were marched to two prison buses parked in front of the lyceum where the tear gas was thickest. And there they sat, all day, their eyes burning, without food, water, or toilet facilities, and without opportunity to seek counsel. Late in the afternoon, most of them were released.

We were there, in the lyceum, at the stroke of noon, when Gen. Ted Walker was hauled away. One marshal would have been plenty of escort. Mr. Kennedy's burly commander, Mr. McShane, felt five husky deputies were required. They shoved Walker in a bum's rush down the hall, giving him plenty of hard elbow in the kidneys, and piled him into a waiting sedan. Then they smacked him with $100,000 bail (convicted Communists pending appeal, are free on $5,000 bail), and on the say-so of some psychiatrist 2,000 miles away, who read about Walker in the papers, they jerry-rigged an order to clap Walker in a nuthouse.

We were there in the town square of Oxford that Monday morning, when Federal troops closed off the area and made it their own domain. We were there when MP's with fixed bayonets forced local women and children out of their cars in order to search the automobiles. We were there when private merchants, remote from the riot, were ordered to close their shops; we were there when law-abiding townspeople were denied access to their own local courthouse.

On October 1 and 2, we talked to a score of newspaper, radio-TV, and magazine correspondents who had been physically present on the campus on Sunday night, September 30, when the riot occurred. Overwhelmingly, they agreed that experienced police officers could have prevented the riot by keeping their heads. They did not exonerate the students, but they put primary blame on the trigger-happy McShane and his undisciplined deputy marshals.

This was an ugly riot. We don't propose to pretty it up. But in our own view, "brutality" is a fair word for the marshals conduct. If the shoe fits, Bobby, put it on.

Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, I was privileged to attend the inauguration ceremony of the Navajo Tribal Council's newly elected chairman, Mr. Raymond Nakai, and vice chairman, Mr. Nelson Damon, at Window Rock, Ariz. These officers were elected by the Navajo people through the democratic process which is synonymous with our American heritage.

Mr. Nakai's inaugural address was most inspiring and held great promise for the future of the Navajo people. I thought it appropriate to have his address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Americans could benefit from his remarks and his glowing words could be preserved for future generations of Americans.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF RAYMOND NAKAI, CHAIRMAN OF THE NAVAJO TRIBAL COUNCIL, APRIL 13, 1963

My fellow citizens, today, as every 4 years, the Navajo people, their friends, well wishers and the seekers of their favor, assemble for the installation of a new council and chairman—a new legislature and executive—in the undimmed hope that newly installed officers will lead America's largest Indian tribe toward the varying goals of their hearts.

The goal toward which I propose to lead the Navajo people is the goal of all true Americans, is to a time when the free development of each individual is the condition for the free development of men—a government which respects the equal dignity of every human being as a child of the same Heavenly Father, a government in which all citizens have the same rights before the law, but more than that, rights which the law cannot take away, and responsibilities, too, in proportion to their gifts and achievements. It is government with a heart, whose helping hand is out to assist the unfortunate, not merely to keep alive in misery, but to create the greatest possible opportunity to revive their shattered confidence and realize their potential as human souls.

The future is no great mystery, at least in terms of our responsibility toward it for you and I the future is a baby named Ashkee, or a little girl named Bah, most of your obligation and mine can be stated in terms of what we owe them.

To achieve this goal I propose first, that the Navajo Nation adopt a written constitution, with a bill of rights protecting the individual's freedom of speech, association, and religion. This, it has been said, will restrict, rather than enlarge, the power of the tribal government. Let it be so. I shall never voluntarily surrender the ancient sovereignty of the Navajo people, or barter it away bit by bit, to private interests or other governments; but I will restrict the power of the Navajo government toward the Navajo people. In my administration, agents will not be sent out from Window Rock to tell the Navajos they cannot worship God in the way they desire, or cannot join organizations of their own choosing to improve their pay and working conditions, nor will the political opponents of this administration be treated as an underground or otherwise than as citizens with equal rights to our own to assemble peaceably, express their views, however mistaken, and make their plans, petitions, and demands.

Only he who makes his people strong, is strong, and only he who rules freemen is great. This shall be the motto of my administration.

The problems which confront the Navajo Nation are out of all proportion to its relatively small size. One-half of our adult population is deprived of the vote for their own President and Representatives in Congress by State literacy laws. The average Navajo's income is less than half the average American's. The percentage of us with the higher education necessary to lead our people to freedom from hunger, want, and fear is a tiny portion of the national average. Unemployment on this reservation is worse than in West Virginia.

I believe I know the solution to all these problems; but I do not claim I will solve them in the 4 years of my administration, or even that they will all be solved in the lifetime of anyone present. The solution is both simple and extremely difficult. It is the development of the Navajo individual—the forgotten man in the grandiose inflow from Window Rock which always seem to stop short of his door.

Let me be specific. The permanent tribal scholarship trust fund must be increased and its purpose broadened. It would do little good to make more money available for college scholarships when our young people are inadequately prepared to take advantage of what is now available. We must have a college preparatory school—a Navajo academy—to take the most promising of our boys and girls at the age of 10 or 12, and fit them by college age to meet the admission requirements of any university in this country, of the service academies, yes, even of foreign institutions of learning.

We need the Navajo academy also to reduce to writing, preserve and expand our own history and literature in the Navajo language, and to keep us proud of our own Navajo cultural heritage, as we grow too sophisticated for the medicine man and local historian.

At the same time, we must not neglect the boys and girls whose talents lie in other directions. We need trade schools, right here on the reservation, solid trade schools whose graduates can get good jobs in an economy demanding ever higher skills in the working people.

Cheap labor is no incentive for industry to come to this reservation or anywhere else. We need trained people who can do the job—who can command high wages and earn every cent they are paid.

We need an adult education program to overcome in some measure the long years when no schools were available to the majority of our population—to give new hope to our most tragically disabled people—the able-bodied middle-aged who cannot speak English, some of whom have great manual skills, but cannot follow their trade to where the jobs are because they cannot speak English. We need to encourage and assist these people to educate their children. We must help the vegetable pickers and other unskilled migratory workers, at least to break the vicious circle that keeps their children out of school and condemns them in turn to an almost subhuman existence.

We need a tribal employment program so that our aid to those we help educate will not end with a diploma, but continue until they are earning an honorable living in work worthy of a human being.

While we work for progress, however, let us not forget the elderly people, our fathers and mothers and grandparents, the examples

of their lives and the values they have bequeathed us. In their day, whoever heard of juvenile delinquency among the Navajos? My fathers and mothers, this administration will keep faith with you and your wise counsel will ever be remembered.

Many years ago, just following the Second World War, the Krug report stated the basis of the Navajo economic problem was that 75,000 people—it is nearer 100,000 now—were trying to eke out a living in an area with only enough resources to support 45,000. I reject such a short-sighted view. Switzerland, a land with even less resources, supports over 4 million people. Education and skill and hard work have accomplished this miracle. It cannot be done overnight, but it can be done—here.

As a start, I shall, in due course, lay before the council a proposal for a thorough economic study of the Navajo country, for such an exhaustive and imaginative study as has never before been undertaken here, of all factors, human and material, which can contribute to lasting productivity and employment of our people.

I shall propose a reevaluation of our attitude toward private enterprise in developing manufacturing, extractive, and service industries on the reservation. I propose that we tear down the walls of China that have kept private investment to a minimum in our country. I propose that we establish a Navajo Chamber of Commerce, and that we actively seek adequate and convenient sources of credit for those who wish to start enterprises in the Navajo country.

I propose that we encourage development even of our mineral resources in such ways as will give the greatest productive employment to our people. As long as I am chairman, in each and every case where we have the alternative of digging up and exporting our resources, often with job-eliminating draglines as big as houses, or of fabricating them on the reservation, I shall favor the course which gives the greatest long-term Navajo employment, regardless of which may bring in the greatest royalties, rentals and bonuses to the tribal treasury.

I shall seek the advice of the surrounding communities, and offer them our cooperation on job-giving projects to our common good.

I will propose the revision of Tribal leasing, licensing and credit regulations to give the greatest possible incentive to the establishment of small businesses by our Navajo people. In this connection I will propose an imaginative expansion of tourist and recreational facilities in our country.

I shall cooperate with the Federal Government in development of the Navajo Indian irrigation project, and at the same time, work toward maximum agricultural development of other parts of our reservation. I shall propose feasibility studies for deep-well irrigation in various areas of the Navajo country.

I shall propose industrial and agricultural projects for the checkerboard area, and land acquisitions where possible on terms that are not wholly unreasonable.

And I will always hold out the hand of friendship, cooperation, honesty, and plain courtesy to the private investor who wishes to help himself by helping us.

I will spend less money in my administration on monuments and white elephants and more for the direct and lasting benefit of the Navajos in the hogans. I will trim exorbitant retainers and expense allowances to persons on contract with the tribe and evaluate their services by the visible results, rather than their own self-serving boasts. I will seek advice from our non-Indian consultants, but not take orders from them, nor permit them to give orders to the personnel of my administration. I will engage economists to give economic advice, engineers to give engineering advice, and lawyers to give legal advice. For political advice I will go to the Navajo people.

I shall propose a greatly tightened administration of the fiscal affairs of the tribe, with full controls. I shall, with the cooperation of the council, seek to eliminate expenditures that cannot be audited. I will root out wherever found any instances of kickbacks, graft, nepotism or conflicts of interest among the tribal staff or consultants, and shall propose legislation to set up adequate criminal penalties for such misconduct.

I shall demand cooperation and mutual assistance among the heads of executive departments in my administration. I will treat my subordinates with honesty, loyalty, and candor, and shall expect to earn the same qualities from them.

I have already engaged an organizational analyst to study the executive branch of the Navajo Tribe, and will transmit his recommendations to the council in due course.

I shall propose supplemental and refresher courses for tribal employees to increase their skills and general education.

And a word to my friends in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. You are my friends. The Navajo Tribe needs your help, and under my administration will welcome it. We will seek also the help of the Public Health Service and other Federal and State agencies. Your help and cooperation, I am convinced, are there for the asking.

Of course we may have our differences of opinion, but the chip is off my shoulder. We may make mistakes but our mistakes must never be mistakes which result from failures of heart or abandonment of moral principles. It is the test of our courage, or our resolve, of our wisdom and of our essential decency. We know that it is your purpose that we shall not fail. The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. My administration does not regard it as any part of the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to act as a whipping boy for our own blunders.

To the States also I hold out the hand of friendship. Let us have no more jurisdictional quarrels. The boundary lines of jurisdiction are now well known. The problem is not to fortify frontiers, but to work together on the problems that affect us all. Our poverty cannot make you rich, our prosperity cannot make you poor. Your misfortune will not help us. From this day out let it be said the Indian wars are over, forever.

All of the program which I have outlined, the proposals that I will make specifically at a later date, and even the underlying ideal of them all, the development of the individual Navajo, are, members of the council, in your hands to advance or to hold back. Without you I can do very little. You will in my administration receive honest advice, and to the best of my ability true information on the issues before you. My administration will not make deals behind your back and rush your confirmation by one-sided presentations. It would be hypocritical indeed if the chief of an administration founded on the dignity of the individual did not respect the dignity of the delegates selected by the Navajo people to make their laws. I respect your dignity. I ask your help, Navajo councilmen.

And I ask your help, your good wishes and your prayers, all of my Navajo people. Without you I would not be here now, without your confidence I will not remain. To all who made my election possible I express my undying gratitude. I ask your help, too, those of you who voted against me, and hope my administration may be such that it will yet win your good wishes.

To the Navajo women who supported me in my long crusade for Navajo democracy, I express my deep appreciation, and to my wife without whose help I could not have won.

I invite those nominal leaders who find that their conscience cannot be squared, with the groping and the failure of their party leader to join hands with us here and now.

Now as new workmen, we enter the great unfinished edifice of the Navajo tribe. We must repair the damages we find, but the great task of building leaves no time for inquests over every crooked board. It is a better world we have to build, the one where every Navajo shall stand erect besides his fellow Americans as an equal among equals. Councillors and friends, the tools are ready and the task is tremendous let us now go to work together.

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question or two to the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee can tell us the total number of additional Federal personnel requested or involved in the original request to the Committee on Appropriations, and the number actually involved in the recommendation brought in by the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. The additional positions requested in the budget totaled about 5,000. The committee allowed 3,700, one-half of which will be employed by the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance Office in this country. And I will say that you may expect that program to increase in the years to come. The committee cut back about 1,500 positions that were requested but we still allowed 3,700.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the distinguished chairman whether this increase in the Social Security Administration is on the basis of increased workload or on the basis of anticipated new legislation?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; everything in this budget is based on the actual workload being experienced at this time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the chairman can make any comment as to the rather substantial increase in employees in the Social Security Administration in view of the considerable amount of automation and computer equipment being used by social security.

Mr. FOGARTY. The increase perhaps would be 2 or 3,000 more personnel under social security if we were not using

electronic equipment that we have at the present time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. One final question; can the gentleman reduce to dollars the amount of the request and the amount of the reduction?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not have that in dollars, but I should be glad to supply it for the RECORD.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I appreciate that, and I thank the gentleman. And in line with the comment of old Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, that we are grateful for small favors and larger ones in proportion, we are grateful for these reductions. As a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee I should like to say that we are constantly concerned about the increased number of Federal personnel and I regret the circumstance that has resulted again in a net increase.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. One point that has not been mentioned here in response to the gentleman's inquiry is that 644 of these increases come in the Food and Drug Administration. Both gentlemen on this side of the aisle supported the budget figure. I think the gentleman will recall back in 1957 when attempts were made to cut back in this area even in insignificant amounts, we were beaten down on something like 14 rollcalls.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I recall that.

Mr. MICHEL. This year we gave them that increase and hope that they will perform the job that they say they can do.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the gentleman's Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization on their attitude on this matter. The increases indicated by the gentleman from Rhode Island, a majority of them were due to the Social Security Administration's request for increases in the social security provisions last year. I might say that this is one agency in which productivity and efficiency have increased perhaps much more than in any other agency of the Government.

The gentleman well knows, because of his fine appreciation of the efforts of employees, that this is one of the best agencies with respect to dealing with the public in all of the 50 States, and the fantastic number of district offices which it has. I think perhaps this agency better than any other renders greater courtesy and more service and actually treats the people better than any of the other agencies in our Government.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I repeat that the thing that is of most importance to the committee members and to me as an individual member is that we have a doubletrack interest in this matter of personnel cost. We have a continuing increase in the number of Federal employees. It is because of the debate we had last year on the principle of comparability that we are now also confronted with proposed increases in pay which are pyramided one on top of the other, as we were very well reminded on yesterday when the President's message came up.

Sensible Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to inform the House that the Associated Industries of Massachusetts has been accorded one of the highest honors for American professional associations in being selected to receive the National Recognition Award of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as a result of a program which the AIM launched only a year ago.

I am enclosing an editorial from the Boston Record American entitled "Sensible Foreign Aid," which salutes the efforts of this organization, as well as an article entitled "Tools for Freedom News."

The editorial and article follow:

NATIONAL AWARD FOR ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF MASSACHUSETTS PROGRAM—TOOLS FOR FREEDOM ACCORDED TOP HONOR BY U.S. CHAMBER

The tools for freedom program of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts has been accorded one of the highest honors for American professional associations in being selected to receive the National Recognition Award of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

As soon as he was notified of the decision concerning the AIM project—launched only a year ago last month and already proved to be the catalyst for establishment of a national tools for freedom foundation to facilitate expansion of the program into other States—AIM President Don S. Greer said he would consider it a great privilege to go to the 51st annual meeting of the U.S. chamber in Washington, D.C., with Executive Vice President Robert A. Chadbourne and accept the coveted award on April 29.

FIRST IN CATEGORY

The U.S. chamber announced that the National Recognition Award, top annual award it presents, this year is going to four professional associations among the five budget categories in which public affairs project competition is invited. In its category, AIM won this award for 1962 endeavors.

The AIM tools for freedom program is a private enterprise people-to-people project under which Massachusetts manufacturers—and some in other States—contribute outdated but still usable tools, machinery, and equipment for technical schools in the developing nations of Asia, Latin America, and Africa. Individuals and nonmanufacturing concerns also donate such services as crating, trucking, use of forklifts, storage space, etc., and AIM presents Tools for Freedom Awards to all who participate. Thirty-eight such awards were distributed at last October's annual meeting of the association, and as many more already have been earned.

To date, over 66 tons of tools for freedom have been shipped from Boston to 24 schools in 11 countries—Colombia, Costa Rica, Jordan, Kenya, South Korea, West Pakistan, Philippines, Taiwan, Tunisia, and Venezuela—and more machinery and equipment is awaiting shipment and continually being donated. The need is almost boundless, with over 350 vocational schools in 26 underdeveloped countries of the free world currently seeking tools for freedom assistance.

Oversea shipping arrangements have been made by such other charitable, nonprofit organizations as CARE, Catholic Relief Services, American-Korean Foundation, Church World Service, and National Council of the YMCA's. Recently, the U.S. Navy, through its own people-to-people program Project Handclasp, undertook the task of transporting more than 5 tons of tools for freedom to India.

Convinced that it is a hopeful approach which serves both the economic and philosophical struggles for freedom, while being of broad public relations value for both the contributor and the U.S. image abroad, the Associated Industries of Massachusetts began its tools for freedom program as the result of a pilot effort by what was known as the Tecnico Foundation in the Worchester-Providence area. Members of the AIM board of directors who participated in that pilot program were instrumental in the manufacturers' association establishing tools for freedom. They serve on the program's steering committee, headed by Philip M. Morgan, president of the Morgan Construction Co., Worchester. The director of this unique means of assisting students in the emerging nations is its originator, Robert Morrow, whose office in New York obtains clearance of the schools, determines their needs, and assigns the contributed items to them.

TOOLS FOR FREEDOM NEWS

WASHINGTON, April 29.—The tools for freedom program of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts—whereby outdated but still usable tools, machinery, and equipment are donated by manufacturers so that students in technical schools in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America may become self-sufficient—has been selected to receive the National Recognition Award for professional associations in AIM's budget category at the 51st annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

In Washington to receive this award at the leadership dinner tonight are Don S. Greer, president of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, and president of the J. W. Greer Co., Wilmington, Mass., and Robert A. Chadbourne, AIM executive vice president.

This private enterprise people-to-people project was launched in Massachusetts a year ago this past March, and its success resulted in the establishment of a national tools for freedom organization, headquartered at 345 East 47th Street, New York City, to facilitate the expansion of the program into other states. This office was established initially to expedite clearance of schools and arranging for shipping the contributions to the Massachusetts project.

"We are naturally pleased with the high honor accorded the AIM tools for freedom program by the national chamber," said President Greer. "Similarly, we are delighted that our efforts have proved to be the catalyst for expansion of the tools for freedom endeavor nationally."

What AIM has done, and is continuing to do, has begun to be duplicated already on the broader national scale under the direction of the originator of the tools for freedom concept, Robert Morrow, formerly of Providence, R.I., and now of Bronxville, N.Y. Also here to share in the satisfaction emanating from the U.S. chamber award ceremonies, Morrow said that inquiries will be welcome at the New York office from individual companies as well as associations in any State.

To date, over 66 tons of AIM tools for freedom have been shipped from Boston to 24 schools in 11 countries—Colombia, Costa Rica, India, Jordan, Kenya, South Korea, West Pakistan, Philippines, Taiwan, Tunisia, and Venezuela—and much more machinery and equipment is awaiting shipment, with still more continually being donated and assigned for ultimate delivery to schools overseas. The need is great, because over 350 vocational schools in 26 underdeveloped countries of the free world are seeking tools for freedom assistance.

Oversea shipping arrangements have been made by such other charitable, nonprofit organizations as CARE, Catholic Relief Services, American-Korean Foundation, Church World Service, and National Council of the YMCA's. Recently, the U.S. Navy, through its own people-to-people program, Project Handclasp, undertook the task of transporting more than five tons of AIM tools for freedom to India.

Under the AIM tools for freedom program, not only are Massachusetts manufacturers—and some in other States—contributing machinery and equipment, but individuals and nonmanufacturing concerns also donate such services as crating, trucking, use of forklifts, storage space, etc. In recognition of participation in the program, AIM presents Tools for Freedom Awards to all who assist, including those who make monetary contributions to help finance the project.

Convinced that it is a hopeful approach which serves both the economic and philosophical struggles for freedom, while being of broad public relations value for both the contributor and the U.S. image abroad, the Associated Industries of Massachusetts began its tools for freedom program as the result of a pilot effort by what was known as the Technico Foundation in the Worcester-Providence area. Members of the AIM board of directors who participated in that pilot program were instrumental in the Bay State manufacturers' association establishing tools for freedom. They serve on the program's steering committee, headed by Philip M. Morgan, president of the Morgan Construction Co., Worcester.

The newer national tools for freedom organization has as its president Mansfield D. Sprague, vice president, American Machine & Foundry Co., and former Massachusetts Gov. Christian A. Herter, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, is one of the members of the board of trustees.

These Are the Guilty

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1963, Hon. Carleton Putnam addressed a Lincoln's Birthday dinner at the Willard Hotel in Washington. Mr. Putnam is the author of "Race and Reason," a current best seller, which deals with race relations from an objective viewpoint.

Mr. Putnam's brilliant Lincoln Day address is of such significance that I feel it worthy of being included here as part of my remarks:

THESE ARE THE GUILTY

(Address by Carleton Putnam)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. German, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by acknowledging a debt—a debt of gratitude and appreciation to Clifford Newell and Mark German for arranging this impressive meeting tonight. An attendance of over 600 is more than any of us expected, especially in the face of an ice storm in Maryland and Virginia. I'm proud and grateful to your committee for inviting me to speak here, and I'm proud and grateful to you for coming.

It's true that about 2 years ago I wrote a short book—hardly more than a monograph—called "Race and Reason" which has caused some controversy. A few attacks have even been made on it. Therefore, every now and then, friends of mine, here and there, have been good enough to give me a platform—like this one tonight—from which to answer those attacks.

So far it hasn't been an overwhelming task. I won't say that I expected a somewhat higher caliber of opposition, for that might be discourteous to our opponents. But there are only a few loose ends to clean up this evening, and then, ladies and gentlemen, I propose to launch an attack of my own. If I were a lay preacher I would take as my text the 16th chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark those who cause divisions and offenses in opposition to the doctrine which you have learned * * *. For such persons * * * by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

I propose to suggest to you tonight, in this world of rising racial tensions, just who they are who have caused divisions and—however sincere their motives and beliefs—have deceived the hearts of the simple. And in view of the fact that the last time I made a speech one of the press services complained because I referred to a certain individual "whom I did not name," tonight I intend to name names—not all, indeed, because large organizations are involved—but enough to satisfy the press. And I intend to say to you, and to them: these are the guilty.

But first let's go back to where it all began. I suppose nobody in this room doubts that the crusade for racial integration and the claim that races are all alike has its roots in the same soil in which most of the leftwing movements of our time originated. The socialism of Saint-Simon in France, of Marx in England and Germany, of Lenin in Russia, the Fabian Society of Bernard Shaw and the Webbs in England, all were, at least in part, an attempt to meet a horrifying problem among those who worked primarily with their muscles and their hands. They all had one valid common denominator among their objectives—improving the condition of the poor.

I will go so far as to say that many of us here, facing the situation that reformers found in England in the eighteen fifties and sixties, would have thought and felt exactly as they did. Here is the death notice in the London papers of Mary Anne Walkley, 20 years old, who in June of 1863 after sewing in a dressmaking establishment an average day of 16½ hours—during the season often 30 hours at a stretch—simply died of overwork. The doctor's words at the inquest were: "Mary Anne Walkley died from long hours of work in an overcrowded room. * * *" Because she could not stop for Death, Death kindly stopped for her.

As for the food the poor ate, their bread was bought mostly from what were called the undersellers and was adulterated with alum, soap, pearl ashes, chalk and Derbyshire stone-dust. Here is a description taken from official reports concerning conditions in the baking trade: "He [the poor man] had to eat daily in his bread a certain quantity of human perspiration mixed with the discharge of abscesses, cobwebs, dead blackbeetles, and putrid German yeast, without counting alum and sand." Of course, many of the poor simply starved. It wasn't until well along in the next century that the government stopped publishing statistics of deaths from starvation in London for lack of casualties.

Forgive this repetition of what will be to many of you an old story, but it seemed wise to refresh our recollections concerning the origin of today's leftwing ideologies. In those times and in those conditions were born all sorts of emotional attitudes and intellectual concepts, as well as practical schemes. Some of them succeeded and some of them did not, but progress was certainly made. The radical of 1963 inherits a legacy which we must understand. A year or so ago a reported for Time magazine interviewed me on the race question and it wasn't until our talk was practically over that I finally managed to make him give me his view on the subject. He was from the South and he was an integrationist. As he spoke, tears welled up in his eyes. But I could tell from what he said that those tears didn't have their source in the Negro problem, which he hadn't really thought through. They were part of the old legacy. They went back much further than Mary Anne Walkley.

There is no reason to doubt the humanitarian purpose of many of the welfare movements of those earlier days or to question their considerable accomplishments. Much poverty has been relieved. The problem now is to keep the floor under misery and failure without slapping a ceiling on everybody else—and to winnow out the large company of those who use the cry of humanity and brotherly love as an excuse for creating legal ways to break the Eighth Commandment. But that is a topic for a different forum from ours tonight.

I want to touch on only one aspect of that problem which leads us directly into our own field. Implicit in much leftwing theory and rhetoric, because it seemed to make existing conditions all the more reprehensible and in need of correction, was the doctrine of the equality of man. Few Socialists ever took the doctrine seriously in practice, I doubt if the Fabians ever took it seriously in theory, but we have all heard the slogans of the French Revolution and the Declaration of Independence.

I shan't go over again here what the evidence clearly shows regarding Jefferson's meaning—both as to the word "men" and as to the word "equal" in the phrase "all men are created equal"—nor need I repeat Hamilton's recognition that liberty and equality are mutually exclusive. It is obvious the Founding Fathers had no illusions about the equality of men in any sense except in equal rights to justice, and the Negro was not included even in that. But in America as the years went on, helped by the controversial Franz Boas, the notion of a utopian social, economic, and even biological equality persisted as a sort of demagogic fetish until things reached the point where the Swedish Socialist Myrdal actually dared to write in his "American Dilemma" that in the conflict between liberty and equality in the United States "equality is slowly winning," and Handlin, the Harvard professor, could bring himself to declare: "There is no evidence of any inborn differences of temperament, personality, character, or intelligence among races."

This last remark lands us finally in the middle of our subject with a splash. For the benefit of the press I give the full name, Oscar Handlin, professor of history at Harvard University, and while again I do not impugn his motives or sincerity, I assert that in my opinion Handlin's declaration is one of the most groundless and dangerously misleading statements to be found in print today.

Let us quickly review the evidence. All that we need is contained in that short, concise little book, "The Biology of the Race Problem," which I shall cite hereafter simply as the George report. In spite of the example

of the equalitarians, a thousand pages are not required to come to the point on this subject.

If you will consult section IV of the George report, you will note the findings of Bean, Connolly, and Vint on the differences in frequencies of occurrence of certain features of white and Negro brains. The importance of these differences is plainly set out in quotations and citations from and to Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann, and Herrick. I repeat, you will find it all in the space of 10 pages in section IV. If you want more data, I can refer you to the leading article in the Mankind Quarterly, volume 2, no. 4, which amplifies and still further documents Dr. George's material. The differences in question are physical and hereditary. That they account for differences in temperament, behavior, and intelligence between the two races is beyond doubt. That these differences make the amalgamation of the races undesirable is just as clear. All the other sections of the George report confirm these facts.

There isn't time enough tonight to discuss the full report. But I will call your attention to something on which Dr. George does not touch: In 1940 the illegitimacy rate for Negroes throughout the United States was eight and a half times the rate for whites. Nineteen years later, 19 years in which Americans have struggled hard to raise Negro standards, the rate is 10 times that for whites. In other words, as their environment has been improved, their performance has gone down. Taking the single State of Virginia in the 20 years between 1938 and 1958, the white illegitimacy rate declined slightly from 2.6 to 2.3 percent. In this same period which witnessed astonishing gains in Negro education, Negro housing, Negro income, and Negro job opportunities, the rate of Negro illegitimacy increased from 19.5 to 22.9 percent. This is difficult to explain if the Negro's limitations are due solely to his environment.

Speaking of explanations, it's going to be still more difficult for the professors to evade Bean, Connolly, and Vint. They've already begun to say: "Oh, but the samplings aren't adequate." [These samplings varied from 30 brains in some cases to 165 in others.] Well, I have a question to ask these professors and all those who criticize the George report on this most vital point. If you don't like the samplings of Bean, Connolly, and Vint, why have you never produced anything better? You have most of the money, you have the captive foundations—they have hundreds of millions—and there are plenty of other sources anxious to help you. Yet to the best of my knowledge you haven't even tried to assemble any contrary evidence. Don't tell us that you can't be bothered or that this isn't important. This is the most important point in the whole controversy. Either the Negro's limitations are innate or they're not, and this evidence settles the matter. So I ask again, why have you never even tried to produce any other samplings?

The answer is simple. You haven't tried because you don't dare. You know well enough what the results would be, provided you had an objective study and included a Dr. George or two on the panel. I suggest that you now make such a study—a series of any size you like of average West African Negro brains, because there you get the least diluted essence of the Negro, against a series of average white brains—the study to be jointly run by scientists on both sides of the question. Meanwhile we have Bean, Connolly, and Vint; Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann and Herrick. I dislike being rude to amiable Harvard professors but I must say to Oscar Handlin (and I'm going to say it to several others this evening): the time has come to put up or shut up. Either answer Bean, Connolly, and Vint, or explain to the public why you can't.

While I'm on the subject of the George report I have another suggestion to offer. The press quotes George F. Carter, a professor of geography at Johns Hopkins University, as having said about this report: "The arguments they put up in that booklet are Swiss cheese—full of holes." It so happens that early last fall a mutual acquaintance communicated to me Carter's complaints about the George report—this acquaintance listed 50 of them, acting as a sort of agent for Carter. I considered these 50 points carefully, and then I submitted them to Dr. George. Thereafter they were submitted to scholars in New York. All of this occurred before the Putnam committee undertook the distribution of the report, and it was unanimously decided that, apart from three or four points about which some shadow of argument might be made but which did not bear on any essentials, the 50 points were without any substance whatsoever.

There was one item which Carter considered to be a quotation out of context and which we corrected with an erratum sheet. Jerry Doolittle of the Washington Post made much out of this correction in the Post for December 9. So I have a question to ask Doolittle: Assuming Carter is right in his statement that differing climates had identical effects in the way they "sharpened the wits" of all mankind, can either you or Carter honestly believe that the climate of the tropics and the climate of northern Europe over tens of thousands of years had identical effects on the development of those special qualities of the civilized forebrain; namely, foresight and long-range planning? Carter's dwelling on one aspect of molding does not exclude the existence of other aspects. If Doolittle thinks it does, he had better consult someone else besides a geographer. He will find experts on that subject in other sections of the George report.

But let me come to Carter's 50 points and give you 2 examples: On page 27 of his report, Dr. George cites the work of Bean which was published in 1906. On this Carter remarks: "Reference from Bean is nearly 60 years old. Haven't there been any developments or thoughts in this long period?" If Carter had read the report with any attention he would have found that Connolly's work was published in 1950 and Penfield's in 1957. This brings Bean right up to date. But are we in some sort of competition here on dates? Does its date make Newton's law of gravitation invalid?

Secondly on page 68 Dr. George writes: "If there were more Negroes with talents for civilization, we would have no race problem or it would be a very different one." To which Carter remarks: "Again nonsense. Boston had a race problem with the Irish. Many people have a Jewish race problem even though these races have talents for civilization." Well, ladies and gentlemen, is not this what Dr. George has already just said? He has just said, "or it would be a very different one." And that is precisely what the Irish and Jewish problems were, "very different ones."

I leave you to judge where the nonsense lies in these two examples, and I invite Carter to publish in the newspapers all of his 50 criticisms of the George report, just as he has seen fit to publish his Swiss cheese. I have a science degree but I am not a professional scientist and I do not debate with professional scientists. However, I dare say scientists can be found who will answer Carter—also in the press. I simply suggest to Carter that he prepare better criticisms than the ones our mutual acquaintance submitted to me, unless he wants to lose the game by a score of 50 to nothing. And I warn him that before he can walk with Alive in the wonderland of unbridled environmentalism he must first get by the narrow gate of Bean, Connolly, Vint, and Penfield. I could have sat next to Caruso for dinner every night for a lifetime and never sung as Caruso sang. No amount of cultural contact, no amount of integration would have made the slightest difference, except that if I had tried to sing with Caruso I would have spoiled the opera. And what is true of the vocal chords is true of the frontal lobes.

Out at the University of Chicago, there is another professor who thinks he can brush Dr. George aside. For the benefit of the press, let me name him, Manning Nash, associate professor of anthropology. Nash had begun by attacking "Race and Reason" in a long article in Current Anthropology last June which was answered by me in a few short sentences on Bean, Connolly, and Vint which I put in a letter I sent to Sol Tax, editor of the magazine. Thereupon Nash wrote me saying he doubted if my letter would ever be published so he was going to answer me right off privately. He proceeded to ignore all the substantive issues by calling Dr. George, who is considerably above him in academic status, unscientific, and then he urged me to read the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, and the Articles of Confederation so that I might learn something about the legal equality of all human beings.

To Nash I answered: "Regarding your paragraph on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, you appear never really to have read 'Race and Reason,' or much American history. Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration, refutes you on page 62, lines 4–8, of 'Race and Reason'; Lincoln refutes you on pages 8–9. It so happens that Lincoln was a lawyer and you are not. Until the aberration of the 1954 Supreme Court decision no competent lawyer supposed that there was any legal right on the part of the Federal Government to force Negroes into white schools. And that Court reached its decision on sociological and pseudoscientific rather than legal grounds."

But to get back to the George report, when this report was first issued there appeared in many newspapers throughout the South, by some sort of spontaneous combustion, an answer from a man named Charles C. Perkins, chairman of the department of psychology at Emory University in Atlanta. Perkins was very patronizing, very sure that no even moderately reputable psychologist would come up with findings such as the report contained, quite forgetting Dr. Garrett, for 15 years head of the department of psychology at Columbia and a past president of the American Psychological Association. Perkins then went on to remark that while there "just aren't many facts that allow positive conclusions" and while he didn't want even his rebuttal evidence to be taken too seriously, nevertheless "Alpha examinations given World War I soldiers indicated the average northern Negro was smarter than the average southern white man."

It is difficult to understand Perkins' willingness to use this material even with apologies. This is the well-known and long-discredited Klineburg twist, and for the benefit of the press I am referring to Otto Klineburg, professor of psychology at Columbia University. What Klineburg did in this case was to take the four Southern States where the white averages were lowest and compare them with the four Northern States where the Negro averages were highest. If we take the whites in the same Northern States as the Negroes, these whites scored far above the Negroes. It's an old equalitarian trick to compare the best of one group with the worst of another and, of course, such a procedure has no validity whatever. If you take an above-average Negro and give him a lot of advantages he will do better than a below-average white man who has had very few. Wherever you have overlapping statistical distributions, the top of one will always ex-

ceed the bottom of the other. This is not the problem under discussion. The thing we are interested in is what the average Negro will do when compared with the average white man under like conditions. Anyone interested in the latter question will find decisive answers in the George report. This is the only issue, and it is the issue Perkins is clouding and confusing. I urge you in dealing with these people to keep them to the point. Their specialty is irrelevance.

I might say that I think the championship in this respect goes this year to a man up at the University of Connecticut. I refer to one Donald C. Simmons who is listed as a member of the department of sociology and anthropology. It would hardly seem proper to take your time with this 36-year-old assistant professor were it not for the fact that the New Republic magazine has seen fit on two separate occasions to publish his attacks which now include both "Race and Reason" and the George report.

My first brush with Simmons occurred last summer when the New Republic printed a review by him of "Race and Reason" in which he accused me of quoting scientists out of context. When I asked him for one example he was able to give none. Perhaps he was basing his criticism on hearsay from an article by Howard Margolis of Science magazine. Margolis made the same accusation, and when asked to provide an example gave my quotation from Kluckhohn on page 51 of "Race and Reason." I answered this accusation in a letter which Science published. I also answered it in a speech in New Orleans a year ago. I have heard nothing from Margolis since. And I doubt if I hear any more on this subject from Simmons either.

Simmons' most recent effort appeared in the New Republic for January 5 and is of a somewhat more specific nature. He begins by referring to the George report and the measurement of intelligence by brain size. Simmons mentions a group of male Negro brains which he says were found to weigh more than a certain group of female white brains. You will remember that on page 61 of the George report there is a footnote which reads in part as follows: "The essential point here is that, other things being equal [such as sulcification and microscopic structure of the cortex] and considering higher animals in general perspective the larger the brain relative to body size, the greater the intelligence." Note the phrase "relative to body size." Among other factors, the average body size of women is notably smaller than that of men. Thus their brain size would be expected to be smaller without lessening of intelligence. Apparently we have another case here of a man who hasn't read with any attention what he's attacking.

Next Simmons dances the Klineburg twist, about which no more need be said, and then he gives us a quotation from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues which reads as follows: "The more comparable the background of white and Negro groups, the less the difference in intelligence." However, if you will turn to the American Psychologist magazine for May of 1962 you will find that Dr. Garrett answered that statement by showing that there have been six studies on the subject and all of them contradict the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Our Connecticut friend then moves on to comment about some experiments in Baltimore purporting to show that no difference can be found between white and Negro infants up to 40 weeks, and that differences thereafter must be due to socioeconomic factors. But the lower centers of the brain and nervous system, in human beings and in animals, are the ones which mature first; the higher centers mature last. Therefore similarity of performance in the early stages of life signifies nothing as to adult potentiality.

Finally Simmons remarks on what he calls the racist accusation that the Negro never invented an alphabet and points out that many other races didn't either. But if he will read the "Biology of the Race Problem" he will see that George makes no such accusation. George says that the Negro never invented a system of writing. It is true that alphabets are rare. Systems of writing are not. The Negro never invented either. I shan't weary you further with Simmons. My only comment must be one of surprise at the acceptance of this sort of material for the second time by the New Republic.

Well, we've had a look at Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Emory, and the University of Connecticut. Let's return to Harvard for a moment, the university where the FBI had to arrest Zborowski, a research associate in the department of anthropology. I do not mention this in any criticism of the department at Harvard. It might have happened anywhere. I cite it as an example of how important the Communists consider it to be to corrupt the minds of our young people in this field.

The New York Times on December 9, 1962, ran a review of Dr. Carleton Coon's book, "The Origin of Races." This review was written by Prof. William W. Howells, chairman of the department of anthropology at Harvard. Up until the last two paragraphs Howells sticks to his subject and I have no comments to make. However, in the last two paragraphs he launches a thinly veiled attack upon my pamphlet, "Evolution and Race: New Evidence." He opens the first of these paragraphs with the remark that certain parts of Coon's book have been "pounced on with delight by the present cohort of racists." This opening gambit is the usual introduction used by these people in order to arouse anger rather than reason in their readers. If a man acknowledges the facts of race, he's a racist. I suppose if he acknowledges the facts of sex he's a sexist.

But I move on. Howells next says that even if Coon is correct, it is not possible to use his hypothesis to measure modern racial differences. Let's think about that for a moment. If Coon is correct, the Caucasian race passed the threshold of evolutionary development in brain structure from homo erectus to homo sapiens 200,000 years ahead of the Negro. This matter of brain structure is biological, inherent, hereditary. Evolution is a continuing process. If one race has a head start of 200,000 years over another, does Howells mean to suggest that this head start has no significance—does he see no possible relation between it and the differences found by Bean, Connolly, and Vint in white and Negro brains, or the results of intelligence tests, or the figures on crime and illegitimacy, or the level of civilization in Haiti, or the stability of governments in the Congo? Nobody is trying to take a pair of calipers and declare what is the exact measure of difference in the two races today. But I will tell Howells it makes enough difference to the southern mother when she puts her girls in school.

This amiable Harvard professor, furthermore, is not above playing a guessing game in these final paragraphs. At one place he refers to a passage from page 9 of the introduction to Coon's book which reads as follows: "It is a fair inference * * * that the subspecies which crossed the evolutionary threshold into the category of homo sapiens the earliest have evolved the most and that the obvious correlation between the length of time a subspecies has been in the sapiens state and the levels of civilization attained by some of its populations may be related phenomena." On this passage Howells makes the comment in parenthesis: "Those who are to tickled with page 9 of the introduction might try continuing to page 661."

Of course the average reader of Howells' review will not have at hand a copy of "The Origin of Races" and hence will not be able to evaluate the parenthesis because he will have no access to page 661. Does Howells intend to leave the implication of some contradiction? Page 661 deals both with selection and with the tendency to eventual resegregation of genetic chartcers in racial interbreeding. I wonder if Howells supposes this to be compensation to southern society which, after many generations of chaos, might look forward to such an eventuality. Thereafter the chaos would start all over again.

And while we're jumping about from page to page I might call Howells' attention to page 336. I shan't keep you in the dark about what is on that page. Here Coon refers to "the great variability of 20th century human beings, in evolutionary grades as well as in racial lines." Coon calls these differences important. He also says that from the perspective of life as a whole, they are slight. Obviously if you run the gamut from the amoeba to man they are slight. But what a whale of a difference a few brain cells make. You can find that discussed in the George report at page 34.

Finally our amiable Harvard professor sums up his view of my pamphlet in this extraordinarily penetrating remark: "Anyhow I see no way of using such arguments (the 200,000-year evolutionary lag) to disprove the Constitution of the United States." Would anyone in the audience care to tell me where the Constitution mentions the integration of schools? If we look at the 14th amendment, do we see any reference to schools? Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to share with you a not very well kept secret. The people who put the integration of schools into the Constitution were Howells and his kind, the equalitarian anthropologists and sociologists who misled the Supreme Court and the American people with their mess of half-truths and slanted evidence.

I say now to Howells and all his crowd: You have not only misled the Supreme Court and the American people, you have fooled the Negro about himself. You have poisoned his mind with expectations that cannot be realized and inflamed him with an arrogance that has no justification. You have set him against the white man. You have made him think he has a grudge against the white race when the truth is he owes the white race a greater debt than he can ever repay. Offer a few Negroes one-way tickets to Africa, where they can enjoy the culture of their own race, and see how many takers you get.

I tell you without fear of contradiction that the American people are as kindly a people as any in the world, that nowhere else in the world would Negroes in such numbers have found a better haven. Yet James Baldwin and these much publicized "angry black men" writing books and long articles for the New Yorker magazine damn the white American. Baldwin writes pityingly about his ancestor who was dragged to America in chains. But I say to Baldwin that if his ancestor had not been brought here in chains, he would have died a far more terrible death as a slave in Africa. Baldwin is lucky to be here.

And I say to Leopold Stokowski that I revere him as a musician but when he appears on David Susskind's "Open End" TV program and declares that the white man owes the Negro an apology he is guilty of a groundless and inflammatory statement on a subject about which he is incorrectly informed. He is encouraging the Negro to violence and revenge against a race to which the Negro owes an infinite debt.

In this matter Susskind and Stokowski and other public figures across the Nation run blindly with the pack. Yet standing here tonight it is not primarily these that I indict, nor the New Republic, nor even the

Supreme Court. Least of all is it the average Negro. I indict the men who have fooled and goaded the Negro—the men who have made it necessary for the rest of us to point out truths which the Negro might otherwise have been spared the telling. I indict the Howells, the Nashes, the Perkins, the Carters, the Klinebergs, the Handlins, the Herskovitses, the Simmonses, and the Sol Taxes who have spawned our racial tension here and abroad.

And I indict their associations. These men indeed run in packs. They have provided the basis for this whole house of cards that is starting to fall around their heads. If white settlers are being dispossessed and murdered in Kenya, if nuns are being raped in the Congo, if white men and girls are being slugged on the streets of our northern cities, if the Supreme Court has to warn its employees about going home at night, look to the source. "Mark those who cause divisions and offenses * * * and deceive the hearts of the simple."

Here I would like to incorporate by reference what I said a year ago in New Orleans (in "The Road to Reversal") about my exchange of correspondence with the president of the American Anthropological Association, Sherwood Washburn. Then I would like to ask: Have I now given you enough cases to demonstrate the utter lack of facts on the equalitarian side of this controversy and the poverty of their arguments? Out of all these universities and the resolutions of these associations not one iota of evidence or one shred of argument has come that cannot be exploded in 30 seconds. It is all as stale and empty as the notion that the sun revolves around the earth.

Have I also provided enough illustrations of the way these scientists operate? Because, if not, I could go on. I could mention the fact that on one occasion when a certain scientific association was about to pass a resolution condemning "Race and Reason" there was a pause in the proceedings. And someone asked for a show of hands on how many had read the book. In a room full of people how many do you suppose had read it? Three. And yet they were about to pass, and did pass, a resolution damning something they'd never read. Does that episode need any further comment from me?

Listen to what the man who was for 15 years head of the deparment of psychology at Columbia University (he was a member of the faculty for 30 years) has to say about these political resolutions by scientist. I quote you Henry Garrett in a letter to me last October:

"I knew Franz Boas personally. I was able to observe the influence of Boas as founder of the science of anthropology in America and to evaluate the extent to which Boas' socialistic ideology dominated his thinking and permeated the teaching of his disciples, first at Columbia and later at other universities fed from the Boas cult. I was also able to observe the increasing degree of control exercised by this cult over students and younger professors until fear of loss of jobs or status became common in the field of anthropology unless conformity to the racial equality dogma was maintained.

"I will go so far as to assert that the supporters of the equality dogma in science in America today fall into three classes—those who are intimidated, those who are driven by leftwight political motives and those who are honest but mistaken humanitarians. I can testify from repeated personal observation to the intimidation and to the pall of suppression which has fallen upon the academic world in the are of which I speak. It encompasses not only anthropology but certain other related sciences. In the light of this situation the resolutions are not surprising."

Dr. Robert Gayre has told me that not since the days of Galileo has science seen anything like it. When Simmons reviewed "Race and Reason," he asked if I were looking for an "apostate" anthropologist. You know what that word means. An apostate is one who departs from a dogma. Here, in other words, is one of the younger generation who doesn't even realize his self-betrayal—who has never learned that science is a matter of research and facts, not dogma.

In the face of this grotesque state of affairs I'd like to ask the Kennedy brothers a question. Next to population control, the race problem is undoubtedly the most urgent in the world today; it is basic to everything else, even to the cold war. Do you, or do you not, consider it desirable that you inform yourselves on both sides of this matter? All your lives you have been listening to political propaganda masquerading under the name of science. It would take you less than an hour to read section IV of the George report and the article in the Mankind Quarterly, less than an hour to talk to Dr. George or Dr. Garrett. Have you done either?

The decision of the Supreme Court does not relieve you from studying the subject. You've seen what that decision has done to the Nation. You are not President and Attorney General solely for the Negro population or the northern or western radicals. You also happen to be serving millions of people who believe the decision was viciously wrong and who know more about the matter firsthand than you'll ever know. Why have you never given a hearing to the scientists on their side? Are you afraid of losing some votes? Are you afraid of the Catholic Church? I have been told that this is the case, but I refuse to believe it. Any man who buys a vote by doing the wrong thing, or the ignorant thing, in a job like yours is on the skids of history, and you're smart enough to know it. And as for the Supreme Court, it would switch fast enough if you discovered the truth and went out and told it on the mountain. The American majority would respond with a roar and these minority-group arguments would vanish like last year's snow.

Stop and think for a minute. You have the record of the centuries and of today in Africa, you have the facts in certain countries of South America and you have them in Haiti. In the United States you have crime records and you have illegitimacy records. You also have 40 years of intelligence tests. All these point in one direction; namely, that the Negro has created his history and environment (not vice versa) and will create it again wherever he's allowed to. Next you have the microscopic studies of Vint, the morphology of Bean, Connolly, Halstead, and Penfield, and the recent evidence presented by Dr. Coon, president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. You have pages of other evidence in the George report. Finally you know the background of the equalitarian school, you know who started it and the political and social views of most of its leaders. All of this points in one direction.

For each of the above items some far-fetched excuse might be conceived. Any one of them might possibly be debated. But consider them all together.

Let me suggest a parallel. You are walking along a hotel corridor, and as you pass a bedroom door you hear loud, angry voices. Then you hear one of the voices say, "Take that, you dirty dog!" and you hear two shots and the sound of a body falling. So you open the door, and you find one man standing with a smoking gun in his hand, looking down at another man with two bullets in his heart.

After some personal risk and minor injuries you manage to capture the man with the gun, and at the trial the following facts develop. The dead man was shortly to have married his childhood sweetheart and was said by several witnesses to have been joyful over this, having courted her long and earnestly. Further, it appears that the dead man, the week before, had inherited $1 million, after taxes, from an uncle he had never seen. The accused, on the other hand, according to reliable testimony, had coveted the dead man's sweetheart and had been repulsed my her. In fact, he had several times sworn he would kill the deceased. The gun is found to have been the property of the accused.

The defense pleads that the death is a suicide. The point is made that the dead man might just conceivably have changed his mind about his fiancee and have become depressed at the thought of marriage. As for the million dollars, after taxes, this might not have been enough to compensate for the death of the uncle he had never seen. Regarding the remark, "Take that, you dirty dog!" this may have been the deceased talking to himself. Upon your telling the court that you knew the voice of the dead man, with whom you had been associated for many years, and that the voice was not his, the defense replies that the deceased was only 30 years old, and his voice may have been changing.

Concerning the gun, which turns out to be a Smith & Wesson, the defense proposes that this might just possibly have been stolen by the deceased from the accused, because, although the deceased had a Colt of his own in the bottom of his suitcase, he preferred suicide with a Smith & Wesson. Finally, in regard to the threats of the accused, these might by a remote chance have been unrelated to the shooting and due instead to cultural deprivation on the part of the accused.

On the basis of this evidence, the Court takes the case away from the jury and directs a verdict in favor of the accused. Although the accused has threatened to kill two other men in the community, his gun is returned to him and he is complimented and set free. The newspapers are loud in their praise of this verdict. A few weeks later you read in one of them that the other men who were threatened have indeed died under mysterious cricumstances thought by the staff writer for this paper to be suicide. On the following Sunday your turn on your TV and you see and hear certain prominent men apologize to the accused for the inconvenience the community has caused him. In the press that same Sunday appear editorials bitterly attacking the prosecuting attorney in the case. Clearly the whole tragedy, according to these papers, was a matter of cultural deprivation on the part of the dead man. As a matter of fact, you read in the news section that the prosecuting attorney has lost his job and is on relief.

At this point you might be forgiven if you put down your paper with a sigh, particularly after hearing on the radio that counsel for the defense was a fraternity brother of the judge.

A man with a weak, confused mind might perhaps be persuaded that some one or two of the following things were true, namely, that the deceased was depressed at the thought of marrying his childhood sweetheart, or that he could not bear the loss of his uncle he had never seen in spite of the million dollars after taxes, or that he preferred to steal a Smith and Wesson rather than kill himself with his own Colt, or that his voice was changing at the age of 30, or that the threats against him were due solely to cultural deprivation—but a man who could believe all these things ought to be in a mental institution.

By the same token, anybody who can believe that the Negro's limitations are solely environmental in the face of African history, and of Haitian history, and of U.S. crime

records, and of U.S. illegitimacy records, and of 40 years of intelligence tests, and of the microscopic studies of Vint, and of the morphology of Bean, Connolly, Penfield, and Halstead, and of the latest synthesis of Carleton Coon, and of the other evidence in the George Report, and of the unmasking of the infiltration of the life sciences by political dogma—any person, I say, who can believe the Negro is the product of his history and environment (instead of vice versa) in the face of all those facts may not belong in a mental institution, but I dread the thought of his teaching any child of mine.

I must warn you that on the equalitarian side of this controversy there is great cleverness and great evasiveness. Do not let yourself be distracted from the point. There is just one issue, and I will put it in this way: In one group you have masses of brains which, on the average, are at a certain evolutionary level. In a separate group you have other masses of brains which, on the average, are at a different evolutionary level. Is it wise to adopt public policies which will encourage the biological mixing of those two groups of brains?

You must not be confused by the mulatto red herring, or the overlap red herring, or the religious red herring, or the legal red herring, or the civil rights red herring, or the red herring of American democracy. These matters are all of the greatest importance but they have nothing to do with the fundamental issue. If the mixing is wrong, then public policies leading toward it cannot be Christian, they cannot be American, they cannot be civil rights—and they ought not to be legal.

Cleaning up the situation is going to require inspection of the evidence by intelligent public leaders, it is going to require listening to both sides and studying both sides. It is going to require going down to the end of the road on each item—statement and answer, rejoinder and surrejoinder, rebuttal and surrebuttal, until neither side has anything left to say. But I assure the President and the Attorney General: if you will investigate this matter and hear both sides impartially and to a conclusion, there is no doubt what that conclusion will be. You ought to have done it long ago. Eisenhower ought to have done it in 1954.

With particular reference to the Supreme Court, do you realize that most of the material we've been discussing tonight never was put before it? The whole record in the school cases is a scientific travesty. What is needed now—and has been needed since 1954—is executive leadership in channeling a new case based on new evidence up to the Court. I suggest to the President and the Attorney General that, having satisfied themselves as to the facts, they throw their weight behind getting a new case heard, instead of blindly talking about their duty to enforce a judicial decision which is a nightmare scientifically, legally and morally.

Let me add one last remark about my hotel drama. Any similarity between that episode and the groups in our racial controversy is purely a coincidence. Actually and in all seriousness I intend no parallel whatever between the Negro and the accused. I leave you to judge how I feel about counsel for the defense and the other characters in the story.

The time has come for me to draw these comments to a close. Today we have celebrated the birthday of a great man. He was not only an America hero. He was beloved throughout the world. He was a devout Christian, a man of wide compassion and sensitive tenderness. We know what he thought and said about the Negro and I shan't quote him on that subject again. We know that in 1858 he made it clear that he did not favor in any way the social or political equality of the white and black races. We also know that in 1864, when his days were nearly done, he wrote a letter to the Governor of Louisiana barely suggesting his hope that some very intelligent Negroes might be admitted to the franchise—of course under the control, and at the discretion, of the States. Surely with this we may agree.

However, I think we may be equally sure that Lincoln would have had nothing but contempt for these latter-day reconstructionists sitting here in Washington and elsewhere who at bayonet point would force the Negro into schools and other social situations with white children against the wishes of their parents. He would have had nothing but contempt for a welfare agency which farms out helpless white orphans to a Negro foster home. He would not have blamed the Negro for this. If ever there was a leader who would have cleansed the temple with a lash on the backs of the real culprits, Lincoln was the man.

But Lincoln was kind. I think he would have liked Dr. Garrett's way of expressing the difference between the white and Negro races. Dr. Garrett prefers to speak less of inferiority than of racial immaturity, and I have changed this slightly so that I speak now of racial youth. Indeed I have tried to make it clear wherever I have used the word inferiority that I am referring solely to limitations in adaptability to our specific Western culture. But watch the scientists and the equalitarian press—they will always drag out the phrase "Negro inferiority charged" and put it in headlines when they attack us. Like the word racist, it is a badge of their demagoguery.

Lincoln was kind, too, in his attitude toward the South. Had he lived he would have bound up the South's wounds as well as the North's. There would have been no Reconstruction period. And although the 14th amendment was passed after Lincoln's death, I will go so far as to say that if he could see the manner in which that amendment is being abused today, and hurled against the South, he would turn in his grave.

So tonight I am not going to end this talk with a quotation from Lincoln about the Negro. I am going to end it with a different quotation from Lincoln which I recommend to the meditations of the two anthropological associations, and of the Supreme Court and of John F. Kennedy and of Dwight Eisenhower: "You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

I might add that you can't fool nature any of the time. Genetic racial differences in intelligence, character, and behavior are the basic reality of life. As Dr. Coon has said, there is great variability in the evolutionary status of human populations all over the earth. This is the fundamental fact in the world today. National or international policy built on any other foundation is a house built on sand.

Near East Report Commemorates Israel's 15th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Near East Report, a newsletter edited in Washington by Mr. I. L. Kenen, has published a most interesting issue in commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel on April 28. I am including an article setting out a view of Israel's position in the world and excerpts from a second article reporting some of the aid Israel has extended to other nations.

The first article follows:

ISRAEL'S 15TH ANNIVERSARY

Many years ago, a contemporary Jewish prophet made a significant prediction about the Jewish state that would some day come into existence.

"It will be unique," he said. "In traditional colonization, the motherland exploits the colony economically, while the colony exploits the motherland culturally and spiritually. With Israel, it will be the reverse."

This was profoundly true. The Israel that was established in May 1948 had a Jewish population of 650,000. More than a million newcomers made their home there and Israel needed substantial assistance to settle them. The motherland, the Jewish diaspora, gladly helped Israel to absorb her immigrants, to build her economy, to insure her survival.

Friendly nations—most of all our own Government—generously provided grants and loans. And, as a result, Israel's economy and defenses have been strengthened. Today, she is a sturdy democracy, on the road to economic independence.

But what has Israel given in return? Has she in fact become the spiritual and cultural center she promised to be? What message does she have for others?

Jews who are old enough to remember when Hitler came to power, just 30 years ago, recall their horror at the brutality of nazism, the callous indifference of it collaborators, the paralysis of its opponents. They sank into a nadir of despair, numbed and shocked at the vast betrayal of conscience.

The struggle which culminated in the establishment of Israel restored the faith of Jews in their capacity to shape their future. It promised Jewish survival. Is Israel had done nothing more than that, it would still have made a glowing contribution to the regeneration of the Jewish people.

In the begininng there was Israel's act of humanity. Her doors would always be open to every Jew in need of a home. She took them all—the old and the young, the sick, the strong and the dying, the educated and the illiterate. This act of compassion was also an enactment of judgment, eloquently reminding the world that too many doors had been closed to the Jews when barbarians turned Europe into a vast charnel house.

In that act, Israel counseled a world that had become obsessed with material things and the art of destruction that it must cherish and honor people.

But Israel has come to mean much more. She has a message, not merely for Jews, but for the peoples of many lands. For Israel has come to symbolize respect for the right of the individual man to be free in his own home, to work with others in the common effort toward a better life and to be safe from the oppression of masters and the hostility of neighbors.

Israel was not overwhelmed by the squalor and desolation of the Near East slums and deserts. She forged a head to higher standards of living. Her example challenged her neighbors to raise their sights and to become restless and unwilling to dwell in the stagnation of the past. And, most significantly, she has literally become a light around the world.

Overleaping the frontier of ignorance and hostility, she has sent her teachers and

scholars to the far corners of four continents. She is teaching that every human being is entitled to live a full life, not a vicarious one, to develop his own personality, as he wills it and not as it is molded for him, and that he may work in cooperation with his neighbors, not in regimented battalions. Israel has become—in terms that can be grasped and understood—the promise and the proof that the free society works, that it truly offers the fullest opportunity.

The little nation remains independent, even though she is surrounded by enemies who threaten to destroy her. More than that, Israel tells us, people can advance and can overcome combinations of hostile circumstance by the cooperation of self-respecting free men.

Today, Israel is engaged in social action on an international scale, conducted by a people who have always preached that salvation is won by a life of good works in the present.

Mr. Speaker, although faced with demanding problems of development within its own borders, Israel has given aid to other countries as described in the following article:

In Asia: The Israel aid program started in Burma as far back as 1954. There are now 12 Asian countries where Israelis have been helpful—in irrigation, power, health, in the development of cotton and sugar-beet crops, in the establishment of frontier villages.

Some of these nations are threatened by the influence and power of Communist China, as is Africa.

In Africa: With many African countries on the verge of independence Israel was able to establish links with their future leaders, whom Israel's Histadruth representatives knew as fellow trade unionists.

These relations began on the west coast, but the end of the Aqaba blockade and the opening of Eilat facilitated new relations with countries on the east coast.

Every week a ship carries cargo back and forth between Israel's southern port of Eilat and the African ports of Massawa, Assab, Djibouti, Mombasa, and Dar es Salaam.

Once a month it carries passengers—most of them experts and businessmen. On return journeys it brings students. Some 60 percent of the 1,600 foreign students come from Africa, and most of these are from the more accessible and less expensive east coast. Tanganyika alone has sent more than 250 students to Israel.

Israeli scholarships are available in some African protectorates which are stil part of the British empire. And in some countries, British officials who resisted the Zionists in Palestine in the 1940's now give their blessing as promising students depart for Israel to prepare themselves for independence.

Africans welcome the Israel offers of scholarships because authorities can be sure the students will wind up in Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem and not in Moscow, Peking, or Sofia, as might happen if the scholarships were channeled through some third party neutral.

In Latin America: In the last 2 years, the program has spread to our hemisphere.

Some Latin American leaders know that they face communism if they do not push reform.

In Palm Springs, Calif., last month, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, described Israel as an ally in the struggle for democracy in Latin America.

Israel recently entered into an agreement with the OAS to provide scholarships. Some 200 trainees will take courses in cooperation, agricultural planning, arid zone development, and youth leadership. Others will study trade unionism. These courses will all be in Spanish.

Fluid Milk Supply in the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Mr. Otie Reed, executive director of the National Creameries Association was guest speaker before the 64th annual meeting of the California Creamery Operators Association in San Francisco. Mr. Reed addressed himself to the overall effect of price support policies on the dairy supply situation and then went on to report on his study of the fluid milk markets in 15 major Federal milk marketing order areas.

The conclusions drawn by this man of wide experience in the dairy industry on the effects of class I pricing policies of milk marketing are worthy of attention, and I ask that this part of Mr. Reed's address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Under the reduced level of price supports, there have been significant changes in total milk production, and in the production of butter and cheese.

I would now like to discuss the second major dairy program of the Federal Department of Agriculture, this being the Federal milk market order system. Previously the legislation authorizing Federal milk market orders was first spelled out in detail in 1935 and was reenacted in separate legislation in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

The act authorizes the issuance of orders which (a) fix the prices which handlers shall pay for milk entering each use class, (b) provide a method of pooling returns to producers on the basis of either a market-wide or an individual handler pool, and (c) may or may not provide for some base rating system of prorating returns to procedures.

Fluid milk (class I) prices are established on two bases, these being (1) a differential over manufacturing milk prices as established which, taken in conjunction with the current level of manufacturing milk prices, establishes the class I price, and (2) so-called economic formulas which relate the class I price to indicators of costs, consumer income, and the like—the latter type of formula being most prevalent in eastern markets.

Over the years various and sundry devices have been placed in orders such as establishing shipping requirements which determine whether a plant will be included in the pool, provision for allocation of milk transferred between handlers and from outside sources, provisions that specify the manner in which milk that is not included in the pool must be priced—the so-called compensatory payment provision, and the like.

The order system was designed primarily to encourage orderly marketing. It was considered to be a fact that the fluid milk production and distributing industry were, from the economic viewpoint, peculiarly unstable. A part of this arises from the nature of the demand for and supply of the commodity. Demand, or rather purchases by consumers, for milk varies significantly from day to day—seasonally, on holidays, and the like. These variations are rather unpredictable in magnitude.

On the producer side there is significant seasonal variation in production in most market supply areas. Although a market may be barely sufficiently supplied during the season of short production, during the season of flush production large seasonal excesses may be available. Under such systems, it would be expected that there would be wild swings seasonally in prices to producers for milk intended for fluid consumption, or producers would be dropped during the flush season, or both.

In addition to the foregoing, with the development of cooperative associations of producers, starting particularly in the 1920's and continuing to the present time, the fluid milk industry became one in which the economics of simple competition no longer applied and instead the economics of large-scale organization of both supply and distribution became operative. This, in much economic literature, is called the economics of monopolistic competition or the economics of administered price systems.

In this latter situation, prices that will be paid for fluid milk are not determined mechanistically as they would be in a simple competitive market with large numbers of buyers and sellers where the volume handled by each is quite small relative to the total market volume.

Instead, in the absence of a regulated situation, they are determined on the basis of bargains struck by large-scale organizations on the supply side and large-scale firms on the distribution side.

Under such circumstances, the price of class I milk may be indeterminate within a considerable range and the price prevailing at any particular time would depend upon the relative strength of relatively large elements both on the selling and producing sides of the picture.

This inherent element of instability due to market structure was compounded by the fact that except in very rare instances, cooperatives did not have control of all of the milk supply in the market. The result of this was that noncooperators in the pricing program on the distributive side could secure their milk cheaper than cooperating distributors purchasing their milk for fluid use at the class I prices developed by bargaining with the cooperative.

Producers delivering such milk to handlers, on the other hand, in many instances could receive more money than cooperative producers since their distributors as a general rule tended to handle considerably less surplus than the generality of distribution in the market.

It should be noted at this point that, although the act of 1937 was designed to maintain and enhance returns to dairy farmers, i.e., to "parity," the approach used is that of establishing "orderly" marketing conditions rather than through restriction of supplies on the market.

It was recognized quite early in the game, however, that artificially high prices would increase supplies on the part of the producers then supplying the market, as well as attract new sources of supply to the market.

For this reason, section 18 of the act provides that, if "parity" prices are deemed unreasonable by the Secretary, he shall fix prices which will properly reflect supply-and-demand conditions in the market, assure an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest.

Thus for practical purposes, the parity criterion in fixing milk order prices has not been used. Instead, the supply-demand and public-interest criteria of the act have been used, at least ostensibly, in fixing prices under milk orders.

Now, with this background information out of the way, I would like to proceed to an evaluation of the order system, as follows:

1. I think that the order system has imparted some degree of stability and orderliness in milk markets. True, quarrels and

a few strikes have taken place from time to time, but most of these had origins other than dissatisfaction with the order system as such.

2. I suppose that by and large there has been much less serious price cutting and other violent methods of competition in order markets than would have been the case otherwise. That is to say, the markets are more stable. Whether this overweaning desire for stability is justified, I will leave to you to judge for yourself.

3. Many representatives of milk producer groups think and state frequently, "Producers do not get enough money." However, I think that any objective appraisal of the matter would show that producers have faired very, very well; perhaps too well under the orders.

4. The general overall popularity of orders among fluid milk producers, as evidenced by the steady expansion of the system, offers the best proof, in my opinion, that such producers find them very desirable.

From a position of bitter opposition at the beginning, I now hear very little criticism of the order system on the part of distribution, from which I would assume that milk distribution has adjusted itself to the order system and probably would be quite loathe to see it discontinued.

So much for the factors that may be considered favorable results of the order system. Now the question arises as to whether or not there are serious criticisms. I think and I believe I am joined by many others that many of the features of the order system as it is being administered are to the long-run disadvantage of a sound and healthy dairy economy in the United States. I am not speaking here of criticisms levied by those who find the order system restrictive of their operations and their ambitions to enter Federal markets. Rather I state my criticism in terms of the long-run economic forces, and the changing patterns of dairy marketing and production in the United States, many of which are associated with the manner in which the order system has been and is being conducted.

I might as well warn you now about two things: First, I do not propose to speak of the California State order system since I have not followed it for many years; and, second, many people in Federal order markets equate criticism of orders with a desire to see them abolished but I most definitely think that they merit very serious criticism in many instances, and wholesale overhauling of goals and methods.

On two occasions I have served on a panel of "experts" to prepare a report for the Secretary of Agriculture as to the operations of the order system. One report was prepared for Secretary Benson in 1953–54, and the most recent was prepared for Secretary Orville Freeman in 1961–62. These panels were composed of men presumed to be expert in the marketing of milk, and it would be expected that certain definite answers and criteria would have been forthcoming from the deliberations of these two committees. Unfortunately, although there is much good material in the reports of these two committees, there is nothing very helpful in laying the groundwork for an overall modification of the milk order structure. I do not think we should be too surprised at this since committees which are drawn from the industry subject to committee appraisal and from universities where a prevailing regional or local attitude of mind toward these matters is prevalent, usually falls far short of reaching truly objective conclusions. This is not said in criticism of the membership of any committee, but I think is one of the facts of life.

But I digress. Many people are inclined, as I indicated before in respect to price support programs, to play down the influence of price upon production, marketing, and consumption. They can think of many other reasons why production is running so far ahead of consumption, alleging that most of this is due to technological advance. They can also find lots of reasons why consumers are consuming less milk and butter and some of the other dairy products, among these being worries about getting fat, heart disease and cholesterol relationships, radioactive fallout, and what have you. No doubt, all of these reasons have some degree of importance, but in my mind they far underestimate the influence of price. I sometimes feel, upon listening to one of these learned dissertations, somewhat like a much more knowledgeable person than I in a different situation felt upon listening to a mass of irrelevancies. He stated, "We have listened to a mass of corroborative detail designed to give verisimilitude to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative."

To put the matter bluntly, I guess I must be accused of being an economic mossback, but I think the facts bear me out. I have noted the very great expansion in the order system. This indicates to me that producers like them very well. And I am inclined to be old fashioned enough to believe this is due to the fact that they think the order system gets them more money.

In recent years the prices of milk used in fluid milk have increased greatly relative to the prices paid for manufacturing milk. From 1935 clear through 1946, fluid milk prices ranged from about 95 cents to $1.19 above prices paid for manufacturing milk at condenseries.

From 1947 these prices started a practically uninterrupted upward trend, so that by 1953 the margin was $2.32, and has ranged between $2.40 and $2.54 since that time. It is significant to note that neither of the Federal order committees mentioned heretofore could find any adequate economic explanation for this marked rise in class I prices relative to manufacturing prices.

I personally think the answer is not far to seek. Since the war, I am quite convinced that the goal of the orders, rather than being solely that of imparting stability to the pricing system, has been in addition to enhance returns to producers. Since we are dealing with a system of administered prices with various and sundry gadgetries, such as down allocation of outside milk, compensatory payments, and the like, designed to limit the impact of competition from outside milk on the classified price structure, what better way could producers find to enhance their income than to persuade the Department of Agriculture to raise class I prices, thereby materially enhancing their income because of the inelastic nature of demands for this commodity?

But it is to be noted that, in spite of all the gadgetry that has been and is still being employed to limit the competitive impact of outside milk on the fluid milk market price structure, these markets have always had a safety valve. That safety valve is that their surpluses can be shunted away into manufacturing milk outlets and I submit that this is what has taken place to a large degree.

Last year I ran off a few figures that are quite interesting. I took 15 markets which have had Federal orders since 1947 and compared class I sales in such markets to receipts from producers. In 1947, these markets had 36 percent of milk in excess of class I sales, and the trend has been upward so that in 1961 it was 46 percent of class I sales.

If we allow 15 percent above daily class I sales for a necessary reserve for the market, excess percentages were 26 percent in 1947 and 38 percent in 1961. The 1962 figures have not yet been summarized, but they will show about the same picture.

In terms of absolute volume, the figures are much more striking. In 1947, these 15 markets had excess milk of 4.9 billion pounds; in 1961, they had excess milk of 12.7 billion pounds.

Again, giving them 15 percent over class I sales as a necessary reserve, the 1947 figure was 3.7 billion pounds and the 1961 figure was 10.5 billion pounds. In 1961, the milk equivalent of CCC purchases was 7.8 billion pounds and in 1962, 10.1 billion pounds. The great significance of surpluses in Federal order markets is amply illustrated by these data.

We should also bear in mind that there is a lot of school lunch milk and special school program milk in the class I sales figures, since in 1961 about 5 percent of all fluid milk sales in the United States was accounted for under the school-lunch, special-school, and military-milk programs. The total of such subsidized distribution was about 3 billion pounds.

We must remember that during the course of this period of time, with markedly increasing population, the total consumption of fluid milk was increasing for all years, practically, except in 1961. Yet we find the surplus increasing both absolutely and relatively. I think this constitutes adequate proof that price structures in Federal order markets have been such as to encourage the expansion of milk production far more than was needed to meet the requirements of our population for fluid milk.

These figures become even more striking if we figure out, on the basis of current class I needs in these markets, at what time during the 1947–61 period were supplies merely sufficient to meet 1961 class I requirements. We find that for the 15 markets taken together, in 1952 they were producing as much milk as was needed to meet class I requirements in 1961. In Boston in 1947, they were producing enough milk to meet the 1961 class I requirements, and in New York-New Jersey in 1949.

We know that in many markets which were deficit before the orders were instituted, surpluses from local production have increased to the point where now large-scale manufacturing plants are either in actual operation or are being built. For example, right outside Washington, D.C., we have one of the largest surplus milk manufacturing plants in the United States. In the New York-New Jersey area huge churns have been placed in operation in the last couple of years. In some markets in the Southwest, surplus plants have been built to handle their local surplus, and so it goes.

Also it is interesting to note that in many of these Federal order markets it has been the practice in the past to price milk used in manufacturing at levels very considerably below the prices paid in Minnesota and Wisconsin for grade B milk delivered to manufacturing milk plants so that not only would we have the extra surplus in these markets fouling up our supply situation, we also meet cut-price competition from manufactured dairy products made from such surplus milk.

With due justice, it must be stated that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has endeavored to implement the supply-demand criteria of the act by including supply-demand adjusters in most Federal orders. In many instances these have not been permitted to work, being either suspended from time to time by administrative action on the basis of pleas from the markets involved or having been largely negated by the negotiation of marketwide premiums.

Starting from a base of no consistent practice in negotiating premiums a few years ago, the practice has now become very widespread so that currently 20-odd markets

have premiums and this practice probably will extend to more markets this year. Since the orders establish the regulatory framework within which it is possible to negotiate premiums, many orders now are merely hunting licenses for higher prices than can be found to be proper under the criteria of the act. Such actions negate the application of the supply-demand criteria of the act, are contrary to the public interest, and, in my layman's humble opinion, rest upon very questionable legal grounds in reference both to the antitrust act and the Capper-Volstead Act.

It is my opinion that any objective economist worth his salt would realize that there are long-run consequences of such policy of establishing class I prices at levels higher than necessary to call forth an adequate supply and thus using the device of price classification for enhancement of producer incomes to levels which create and maintain larger surpluses. We may list these consequences as follows:

(a) Higher prices to consumers, with consequent smaller volume of fluid milk consumption.

(b) Supplies at higher levels, resulting in larger surpluses because of increased supply and reduced consumption.

(c) The development of (1) more vexing problems in handling surplus, (2) excess capacity, particularly in surplus handling, (3) uneconomical expansion of production in high-cost areas, (4) capitalization of such enhanced income in increased land values and other costs, and (5) additional surpluses of manufactured dairy products—to the detriment of the producer of manufacturing milk and butterfat.

We may elaborate on some of these consequences just named in terms of the pattern of dairy production and marketing in the United States. Large surpluses must be handled or the milk thrown away. The development of large surpluses in many areas which prior to orders were deficit has led to the uneconomic expansion of manufactured dairy products production in such areas. Encouragement of surpluses by arbitrary class I pricing in milk areas already adequately or more than adequately supplied merely increases the volume of milk going into manufactured dairy products and complicates the operation of this segment of the industry.

I think we should all bear in mind that the longrun upshot of this whole business will be for the manufactured dairy products industry to become merely the satellite of the Federal order markets, with very serious repercussions upon some of the large dairy areas in the United States.

I would like to close this discussion with what I think is a constructive suggestion, particularly in reference to those problems which we as an industry can influence, perhaps even solve. And that is that it is high time that the entire dairy industry got wise to the fact that adjustment of our position in Federal order markets and in manufactured dairy products markets cannot be accomplished without great effort, sweat, and perhaps even tears.

The old adage states that you can't eat your cake and have it, too; and I think it is high time that the dairy industry with so many responsible leaders should acknowledge this fact and proceed to straighten out the situation with reasonable speed.

If this is not done, we are very likely to have imposed upon us the most serious types of production and marketing control straitjackets which may in time even lead to regulation of a public utility character. Perhaps this is what the dairy production and distribution industry wants, but I for one do not think so.

President Kennedy's Failure To Bring About Fiscal Responsibility Now Threatens New Wave of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been warning that the fuzzy economic thinking of President Kennedy and his advisers would bring about a new wave of inflation. For our efforts we have been charged with being negative and against the people. Now the administration chickens are coming home to roost. The Kennedy wild spending spree now threatens to bring about inflation with higher prices and the penalty this brings to the people of middle and low income. Our economy cannot stand much more of the Kennedy policies which are draining the resources of this Nation and threatening national bankruptcy.

The following articles from the U.S. News & World Report of May 6 shows what some of our leading economists now fear:

IS INFLATION ON THE WAY BACK?

(NOTE.—Suddenly, inflation—not deflation—is the growing worry among many economists. The strong rise in business is one reason. Huge Government deficits are cited as another. How much inflation is ahead—and how soon? Should you be thinking of ways to guard against a shrinking dollar? An exclusive survey gives some answers.)

Inflation, mild but real, appears to be on the way back in this country. Many of the Nation's leading economists are in agreement on that point.

A rise in the price of steel is viewed by these economists as only a symptom of returning inflationary pressures.

A little inflation, known as "reflation," apparently is going to be welcomed by both Government and business.

Reflation reflects rising demand for goods, a gradual approach to capacity operations in industry, a continued rise in rates of pay, an end to the caution and hesitancy that have made deflation the dominant force in recent years.

Once prices grow firm and rise a little, a lift is given to business. People, in that case, are more inclined to buy, less inclined to hold back, waiting for bargains.

Businessmen, for their part, are more ready to add to inventories when prices are firm, less prone to keep a minimum of goods on hand.

WHAT EXPERTS FORESEE

Among leading economists in business and universities, whose views were sought by U.S. News & World Report, a heavy majority looks for a revival of inflationary pressures during the months ahead—particularly toward the end of the year.

If taxes on incomes are reduced, adding to the Federal Government's deficit, then those pressures are expected to grow even more.

The new mood is reflected in this statement by the president of one of the Nation's biggest banks, who is also a trained economist:

"A while ago, most of us felt that inflation was a dead issue. That's not the feeling I get now. While inflation isn't going to be here tomorrow, the basis for a broad rise in prices now is becoming apparent."

From Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a private adviser to President Kennedy:

"I wouldn't be at all surprised to see some prices begin to go up as we move toward greater prosperity. I would be happier to see business sell more blue-plate specials—make more profits on a greater volume of business—rather than raising prices on the menu. But I expect what the business chefs will do is to raise prices somewhat. However, I don't expect any alarming increase in prices."

Then this prediction is made by Ira Ellis, economist for E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.:

"Inflation problems will be more severe next year than this. The threat in 1964 will be greater than at any time since the Korean war."

A number of reasons are given for expecting a renewed rise in prices.

A larger supply of money, growing out of continuing Government deficits, is one. Liquid assets held by the public—such as cash, bank accounts, savings and loan shares, savings bonds—have been climbing at record rates. A tax cut would add to the size of the Government's deficit—and to people's supply of spending money.

Economists warn that the fast-growing money supply sooner or later will be felt in consumer demand—and on price levels.

Improving business is another. As the economy shows new strength, businessmen stop giving price concessions and quote firmer or higher prices. This happened in steel and is being predicted for a number of other key industries.

In recent days newspapers have carried reports of price markups—immediate or in prospect—for a wide range of products, from appliances and gasoline to electrical equipment and aluminum sheet. Commodity prices are showing marked strength in both domestic and world markets.

Wage policy of unions is cited as yet another factor. With business enjoying rising sales and profits, unions are expected to push harder for pay increases.

Businessmen, in good times, are expected to be somewhat less inclined to resist union demands.

Result: The price of labor, which never stopped rising, now is seen moving up at a little faster rate, adding to business costs and to prices.

Those are the major reasons why a large number of the economists interviewed now expect upward pressure on prices.

A MINORITY VIEW

Several of the economists, however, thought that there is sufficient slack in the economy—in unused industrial capacity and in unemployed workers—to prevent a broad rise in prices any time soon.

A comment typical of the minority view is made by Martin Gainsbrugh, chief economist of the National Industrial Conference Board:

"Assuming gross national product will continue upward, to reach a $585 billion rate by the fourth quarter, the most widely accepted figure among business economists today, we would still be left with about 5½ percent of the work force jobless. There will continue to be ample slack in human resources.

"On the capacity side, too, I think we will be able to accommodate whatever excess or surge of demand that may be developing.

"However, there could be some tight situations, some price increases. But I think this will merely extend the life of the recovery rather than to touch off an inflationary surge."

COMMON CONCERN: U.S. DEFICITS

But even among those economists who see no immediate inflation problem, none is complacent about an inflation potential that is regarded as now building up.

The main inflation threat cited: Government spending and budget policies now being followed.

Says Jules Backman, professor of economics at New York University and a recognized authority on prices: "The main threat of inflation lies in the fiscal policies being followed by the Government.

"Outside of Government budget policies I am not especially concerned. Wage pressures don't bother me too much. We have excess capacity in industry. Competition at home and abroad is very strong. The Common Market is a growing competitor.

"What really worries me is the virtually callous disregard of the significance of large deficits. If we continue with the sort of spending programs that have been proposed with disregard of fiscal sanity, then it seems to me that inflation is bound to grow as a problem."

Warns Emerson Schmidt, research director of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

"Government budget policies pose a real danger of inflation for the future. Except for a small surplus in 1960, we have had deficits ever since 1957, and it looks like we are in for several more years of deficits.

"The prospect is that much of the Government deficit may have to be financed through the banking system. This builds up the money supply and adds to the dangers of inflation."

The soundness of the dollar is being threatened by Government budget policies, according to Du Pont's Ira Ellis:

"If we have a Federal deficit in 1964 of the order that is being talked about, following the very large deficit we will show in the current year, we will be heading for trouble.

"I think, in that case, we will get not only price rises, because costs are increasing, but also the inflation of the money supply which tends to generate rising commodity prices because more money is chasing less goods."

THE FORECAST IN DETAIL

How much inflation may lie ahead? Where will the pressures be felt—and how soon?

Here, in their own words, are the comments from some of the economists who now look for prices to edge upward.

Consider, first, the comments of Arthur Rosenbaum, manager of the research division of Sears, Roebuck & Co., in reply to questions from U.S. News & World Report:

Question. Mr. Rosenbaum, do you now expect to see prices begin to rise?

Answer. Yes, I do. I've had the feeling for some months— the last 6 months or so—that the wholesale price level was going to show a moderate rise.

By the end of this year, for example, I would expect wholesale prices for manufactured goods to be possibly 1 percent above a year earlier.

Some areas will continue soft, but others will be firming up, so that, on balance, prices of manufactured goods will show an increase.

Question. Stability in wholesale prices, thus, is coming to an end?

Answer. Well, the index has held about stable since the end of 1958. Now I look for a rise. I think we have reached rockbottom in the ability of many industries to absorb higher costs. From this point on, even modest wage increases are likely to be reflected in higher prices.

I'm not looking for anything spectacular, no big inflation. But there will be a tendency now for prices to firm up.

BETTER TONE, HIGHER PRICES

This flat prediction of a higher level of prices is made by Paul McCracken, professor of business conditions at the University of Michigan who was a member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower:

"Prices are going to edge upward simply because of the better tone of business.

"Total output of goods and services in the fourth quarter, under present expectations, will top $590 billion, at annual rates—$25 billion above a year earlier.

"While that is not high enough to make all our problems disappear, it is high enough so that price increases that in many cases would have been tried earlier, except for sluggish markets, are now going to be tried.

"We've been on dead center for so long that we forget that the quiescence in prices may have been just the other side of the coin of a rather unsatisfactory business situation."

The following assessment of the price outlook for the months ahead is from an interview with one of the Nation's most prominent economists, who preferred that his name not be used:

Question. Is price inflation—and a faster rise in the cost of living—now on the way back?

Answer. Yes, I think it is.

Question. Is a broad rise in prices imminent?

Answer. No, but it is bound to come.

Question. How soon would you say?

Answer. Oh, it is difficult to pinpoint these things, but I don't see how we can escape some inflation.

Once the economy gets moving with more vigor, advances in prices are bound to occur.

The laws of economics haven't been repealed; the lessons of past history are still valid. In times when business is advancing, prices tend to go up.

A year from now I would expect prices to be definitely higher than they are now.

As of today, people still are talking about excess capacity and are worried about it. Let the economy rise with any vigor for a year—or less—and everybody will be talking about shortages.

DOES EXCESS CAPACITY REALLY EXIST?

Wilson Wright, economist for Procter & Gamble Co., questions the reliability of figures on industrial capacity. His comment:

"This capacity problem probably is grossly overstated. I don't believe that we have any considerable volume of excess capacity in a large number of industries.

"Take the steel industry as an example. Steel companies probably won't sell more steel this year than last, and last year they did not sell more steel than the year before.

"But this year United States Steel, Bethlehem, and some of the smaller companies, such as Wheeling Steel, are building major new plant facilities which add to capacity.

"So, even in an industry where statisticians can calculate that a substantial volume of overcapacity exists, companies are spending money on new plants.

"These companies actually have a shortage of capacity when it comes to new, efficient facilities and equipment."

EFFECT OF WAGE TRENDS

Nearly all the economists listed wage trends as a major force that will influence higher prices in coming months.

Moderation in wage demands in the past few years, a number of the economists feel, has been due in large part to sluggish business conditions.

Now, with the strong pickup, that may all change.

Here is how Professor McCracken sizes it up:

Question. Professor McCracken, do you think the rise in business will bring stronger demands for pay hikes?

Answer. We are entering a period when that question, which has been on ice for 2 or 3 years, will probably have to be faced up to.

Question. You mean resumption of wage-price inflation?

Answer. Well, the broad problem of what happens to wages when you begin to get unemployment down. I don't see a basis for assuming that we have learned our lesson about wage-cost-price problems. In coming months, suppose that markets are strong, that prices are rising, and that wage negotiations take place in such an environment.

Under these circumstances, what is going to keep wage rates from rising at a rate that will bring an upward drift in our cost level? Now maybe we have marshaled public opinion enough so that we are at least better off in this respect than in, say, the 1950's. I think that, probably, we are.

Question. Still, you don't think the problem has disappeared?

Answer. I very much doubt it.

Question. But our competitive position in world markets—

Answer. That's the big rub. Prices have been rising abroad faster than in this country in the past few years. But, even so, we can't afford to forget about costs and prices without adding to our already serious balance-of-payments problems.

Du Pont's Ira Ellis had this to say about the importance of wage developments in the period ahead:

"Rising employment costs are a direct force under higher prices. And this situation is still very much with us.

"For instance, the longshoremen's strike raised some prices. The settlement of the newspaper strike raised some more prices.

"Business must hold down its costs. I admit that this is difficult to do. We must remember that commodity prices have more than doubled since 1941."

INFLATION WORRIES: HOW WIDESPREAD?

Are people showing renewed inflation fears as a result of the business upswing and the news of price increases in steel, other items?

Economists report little impact on the public.

There are no reports of people rushing to pull their money out of the bank and putting it into stocks or real estate as an inflation hedge.

But, here and there, signs are cropping up that some people—those who keep an eye on financial trends—are getting a bit nervous.

Says Proctor & Gamble's Wilson Wright:

"In the past few months I have found more knowledgeable people concerned with the prospect of inflation than in any time during recent years.

"They raise these questions: What kind of financial situation are we heading into? What can we do to protect our funds? Why won't action adopted to prevent deflation now bring about inflation?"

PEOPLE SEE DEFICITS PILING UP

Says the president of a big Chicago bank:

"We are getting inquiries from some of our customers about the possibility of new inflation—considerably more queries than 6 months ago, or even 3 months ago.

"They see these deficits piling up, a better trend in business, and, on top of that, talk of a sizable tax cut.

"Along with the fears of inflation go added worries about the dollar, a devaluation of the dollar. For the longer haul, some of our big customers think devaluation is more likely now than they did some months back."

When asked if people should now begin to think about ways to protect their savings, one economist answered:

"Smart people don't keep too much money in the bank. They put it to work elsewhere

because they are afraid of inflation. Over time, as history has shown, that has been the correct policy."

A LONG-TERM VIEW

Inflation problems in the United States are seen growing in the years ahead—say, in 2 or 3 years.

Consider this comment by Martin Gainsbrugh of the conference board:

"Look ahead a few years, and you can see that conditions might be quite different from the present day.

"For one thing, industrial capacity created in the first 10 or 15 postwar years by that time will be getting to be high-cost capacity. We might then get a strong upsurge in demand by industry for new capital goods.

"In addition, if we solve the unemployment problem, by 1965 we will begin to feel the effects of the coming of age of our postwar baby crop. Marriages will increase. There will be a step-up in family formations—with all that that implies for increased demand for homes, consumer goods, and the like. By then, the economy should be operating close to capacity levels."

Professor Backman expresses his concern about the longer run inflation threat in this question-and-answer exchange:

Question. Professor Backman, are you more concerned about the inflation problem say 2 years from now than at present?

Answer. Yes. I am. You see, real inflation is either the result of excessive fear or of excessive confidence.

Now, when people are afraid, they run away from dollars—put their money in things, such as stocks or real estate.

When individuals and businesses have excessive confidence, they use money more vigorously—in spending, investing, expanding.

Question. Do you see either fear or excessive confidence developing in the years just ahead?

Answer. I don't see excessive confidence as much of a problem under the Kennedy administration. And I don't think we are near the point, at this time, where the fear complex will develop.

Question. So you——

Answer. But I hasten to add that, when it comes to questions of psychology, very little things can touch off an explosion. The steel episode a year ago is an example. It had an enormous impact, far beyond what appeared on the surface.

Now, if we continue to show large budget deficits, without a determined effort to live within our means, we might get a bad psychological effect.

We may find that our balance of payments will get even more sour than it is now. There could be a run on the dollar which might force some form of devaluation.

The combination of budget deficits and devaluation would certainly be felt on the price level. That's the sort of danger we face when you look ahead a couple of years.

SUMMARY OF ECONOMISTS' VIEWS

Put it all together, and the majority of the economists seem to agree on the following:

A rise in prices, now getting underway in key industries, is seen slowly gathering momentum as the year wears on. By the year-end, it is felt, prices will be edging up on a broad front.

Renewed inflation is expected to be mild, restrained for some months to come by fierce competition at home and abroad.

Inflation threat, many economists believe, will be more serious in 1964 than this year.

Single biggest inflation force is said to be the large—and continuing—deficits in the Federal budget.

All in all, there is a significant change in attitude. Deflation had been the big worry among economists for many months.

Now inflation is beginning to cause concern.

Economic Indicators Published by Joint Economic Committee Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Al Altwegg, the able business editor of the Dallas News, recently offered high praise for the Economic Indicators, which is prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers and published each month. Mr. Altwegg points out that the Economic Indicators, while "one of the dullest-looking monthly magazines being published in the United States today, sells all over the country. And there's hardly an economist in the Nation who would be caught out of arm's reach from the latest copy of the publication."

Certainly, I find the Economic Indicators most valuable and peruse it each month when I receive it. Of particular concern to me is one item appearing in the table on national income, namely, net interest. I believe it important for every American to follow this series to see the extent to which interest burden is rising. For example, in the fourth quarter of 1962 net interest amounted to $23 billion on an annual basis. Back in 1950, the earliest year shown on the table, net interest amounted to only $5.5 billion. In other words, we are shouldering much greater interest burden in the economy today—by nearly 4½ times—than we did over a decade ago.

I join with Mr. Altwegg in commending the Economic Indicators to all who are interested in the welfare of our economy, and insert Mr. Altwegg's article from the Dallas News in the RECORD at this point:

YOU CAN'T TELL BY THE COVER

(By Al Altwegg)

One of the dullest looking monthly magazines being published in the United States today is a 32-page thing printed on newsprint that looks just about the same month after month.

But despite the fact that it carries no pictures except some charts and about the only thing that changes on its cover, month after month, is the issue date, it sells all over the country.

And there's hardly an economist in the Nation who would be caught out of arm's reach from the latest copy of the publication.

It's called Economic Indicators, is prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress by the Council of Economic Advisers, and is sold at $2 a year by the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office in Washington, D.C.

What makes it important is that it is the official source of the statistical evidence on how the Nation's economy is doing. And in these days, when so many people are interested in how the country's economy is doing, this is the place to look.

Each issue of Economic Indicators changes little. Every month or three there will be some new figures at the bottom of a page, as the new figures are gathered and reported by such original sources of data as the Departments of Commerce, of Agriculture, of Labor, the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Housing and Veterans' Administrations, the Treasury Department, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

So a man has to be really interested and dig into the long tables of figures to get anything at all out of the statistics in his new copy of Economic Indicators.

But if he will do that, he can uncover a lot of intriguing facts.

On page 1, for instance, are the figures on the gross national product.

This is the figure so many people talk about when they talk about how the Nation is doing. It shows that the GNP, as it is called, was running at an annual rate of $55.20 billion in the second quarter of this year, that it totaled $518.7 billion in 1961, $503.4 billion in 1960. It shows, also, what part of that was personal consumption expenditures, what part was gross private domestic investment, what part was the net of exports over imports, and what part was Government spending.

Over on page 9 are the statistics on employment in this Nation, with some interesting facts showing up, too.

It indicates, for instance, that for some reason this country's civilian labor force in July was actually slightly lower than a year earlier. But in most recent years the civilian labor force has grown 1 million persons or more each year.

Civilian employment is up in July over a year earlier, however. There are more than a million more persons with jobs. The difference shows up in a decline in unemployment. In July of this year, 5.5 percent of the labor force was unemployed, while 7 percent had been a year ago. But in 1955 unemployment was only 4.4 percent.

On page 14 are the figures on industrial production, a key indication how the producing part of the economy is going.

And on page 23 are the figures on consumer prices. This is what is called the cost of living, and it is accompanied by a fascinating chart that shows graphically how the prices of services are outclimbing all other factors involved in the cost of living.

Other pages give statistics on prices received and paid by farmers (including what parity is right now), on the money supply, on interest rates, consumer credit, and the current status of the public debt, and the budget surpluses or deficits month by month and year after year.

For anyone seriously interested in reading and mulling over the official economic statistics, there is another pamphlet that an amateur economist really ought to have.

It is called the 1960 Supplement to Economic Indicators, priced at 60 cents, and gives the historical and descriptive background on all the various tables that appear in the monthly publication.

It tells how the figures are developed and also goes into some of the statistics reaching further back into history.

There's just one thing that none of these publications tell, and that's what the future is going to bring. That's something that every economist, amateur or professional, has to try to guess for himself from the trends as he sees them.

Needed: A White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, although I have a fine personal relationship with

Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow, I have been one of the most outspoken critics of the policies he has sought to impose on the Commission and thereby on the broadcasting industry. Although it is emphatically denied by Mr. Minow and those supporting his point of view, I am convinced more by each statement made by him that his management of the industry can only result in censorship, which is clearly forbidden by the Federal Communications Act of 1934 as amended.

When the act was originally passed, apparently Congress thought of censorship only in terms of being execution by a heavy pencil. In printed matter, this concept is realistic. In broadcasting, it is quite a different matter; and it is my contention that the Minow philosophy can only result in a regulated program, which is just another facet of management of the news.

My point of view has been eloquently reflected in an editorial in Television Age. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD today:

NEEDED: A WHITE PAPER

Perhaps it is time that all of us took another look at the filament that enables the public media to cast light.

This filament is a thread spun of freedom. If that word freedom seems overworked in these times, it is because those in opposition aggressively deride it. Freedom is a principle to the oppressed, a poison to the oppressors.

Freedom is a heritage that was sought by the people of this Nation. It was sought by such persons as Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Washington, and others.

They were called upon to describe freedom and they did so in 10 articles called the Bill of Rights.

Rights were guaranteed by these amendments to the Constitution—rights such as freedom of religion, press and speech, and freedom to assemble. By guaranteeing them, the authors of the Bill of Rights meant that nothing should be done to limit or abridge them; specifically, that Congress should pass no law of limitation upon them. It is thus implicit that the creatures of Congress, such as agencies charged with carrying out the laws of the land, are not to delimit them, either.

These are not the rights of pastors, because of religion, or of publishers or broadcasters, because of press or speech. They are guarantees to the people themselves against the threat of tyranny—and it is a rightful function of pastors and publishers and broadcasters to protect the people against the usurpation of freedom. That function is served best in all cases by full and candid disclosure; by giving the people the facts and letting them decide.

It is obvious that any action which weakens the means of protecting this right of the people—whether it be against the pulpit, the soapbox, the press or the image orthicon tube—weakens the right itself.

Television Age believes that free broadcasting in America is being subjected, knowingly or otherwise, to an harassment by Government that, unless arrested, can desiccate the greatest system of free communication among people that has ever been devised.

Within the last 6 months, the Federal Communications Commission has held hearings on its own motion in two major cities (Chicago and Omaha) to determine what the broadcasters in those places are doing to ascertain the needs and interests of their audiences. There was implicit the vague notion that they were not doing enough, a suspicion that was not affirmed.

The Communications Act of 1934 (amended) which provides for the licensing of broadcasters spells out the terms for such licensing.

In section 326 of the act appears the following language:

"Nothing in this Act shall be understood or construed to give the (Federal Communications) Commission the power of censorship over radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."

Censorship is an abhorrent word in a free democratic society. It is practiced only in time of emergency when it is exercised by order of the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief.

But censorship has no prescribed methodology, and it even enlists good men in public office who know the media as sources of favor as well as of torment. It is not always the stroke of a blue pencil. It can be, as we have known in broadcasting, the lifted eyebrow—the suggestion of guilt by innuendo. It can be a word—like wasteland; or it can be an inquiry which is seeking something that does not exist, but suggests its presence.

It may not be correct in a legal sense to call such things censorship.

Nevertheless, if the authoritarian voice of Government is to be used in the deprecation of certain programs and the praise of others, it places an overwhelming pressure upon the licensee to submit to the judgment of men who know virtually nothing of his audiences' preferences. When this pressure is repeatedly exerted over long periods of time, as it has been since the onset of television, individual judgment and initiative can become eroded through sheer frustration.

There is a danger of this happening in America.

If it is not censorship per se, then censorship has a first cousin, no less repugnant to the American ideal.

We believe that the most important thing that the Congress wrote into the Communications Act was the caveat against censorship; we believe, also, that one of the most important things that Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues wrote into the Bill of Rights was language denying to Government any other course than to have inserted this phrase in the Communications Act.

We also believe that most of those appointed and elected to high places in our Government do not choose to diminish the service of our public media, but rather seek to enhance it.

Much has been said and written lately about drafting a new Communications law governing the broadcast media. Some able members of the Federal Communications Bar Association have suggested specific reforms.

This might be helpful, although we doubt it—because time has proven that law and regulation tend to extend themselves and multiply with disturbing persistence.

The pertinent issue here is freedom of communications. Shall broadcasters in the future be able to pursue their assigned tasks of serving the public interest without continuing and agonizing interruptions as well as gratuitous comment about their alleged inadequacies.

We say that the basic issue is freedom, because an extraordinary number of these time-consuming hearings and inquiries relate to the fundamental question of the limits to be placed on broadcasters in programing their own facilities.

This is true when we talk of section 315 and the treatment of political issues and candidates.

It is true in the case of the FCC program inquiries.

It was a recurring issue in the long network hearings.

It besets every person seeking a new license or renewal.

It was true of the Blue Book nearly 20 years ago.

And the ground rules for the broadcaster are mighty tenuous—subject constantly to new interpretation by new commissioners.

An opportunity does exist in broadcasting to take a new look at this one facet of freedom and express in permanent form, no less permanent than the Bill of Rights, what free communications really mean in this country.

This opportunity belongs to the members of the Federal Communications Commission.

We would like to propose that the commissioners turn their attention inward instead of outward for a brief experiment: the preparation of a white paper which will delineate in permanent form the Commission's views with respect to its involvement in broadcast programing.

Let the Commission reexamine its own courses of action which have touched upon programing matters. Against the background of such an examination, perhaps these seven men—setting aside partisan views as they were set aside 172 years ago—can compose their own interpretation of section 326 of the Communications Act.

There would remain then no opportunity for misunderstanding the philosophy of the Commission; nor would there remain any latitude for the use of innuendo, artificial hearings or platform polemics in chastising the Nation's broadcasters.

The industry, it is true, might not like such a white paper. But at least it would know finally what the Commission feels is the extent of its obligations and the nature of its limitations in matters of programing.

And there would be recourse to Congress, through orderly legislative procedures, if the product of such an exercise could not be accepted by industry.

It is even possible that the Commission might wish to undertake this as a joint project with a committee of the Federal Communications Bar Association.

However originated, the objective should remain clear—to spell out Commission philosophy on freedom in unmistakable terms.

We do suggest that they undertake the task in the spirit of such men as Jefferson and Madison and Franklin, whose contemplations were not interrupted by radio or television.

They were not concerned with instrumentalities. They were dealing with principles. And the guarantee of freedom is the most significant principle, of grave concern to all communications—now, and for generations to come.

Jobs Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, is mentioned as a current problem.

Does this mean that everyone who would like a job is actively seeking employment? Evidently some existing opportunities for even unskilled work are being passed up.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives made this statement recently:

The Michigan agency (Michigan Employment Security Commission) conducted an intensive campaign of recruitment, for agricultural employment, among the 60,000 known members of the hard-core industrially unemployed in that State. From the 60,000 workers, who were individually handed a recruitment brochure on opportunities in agricultural employment, approximately 17,000 applicatons were received (about 1 out of 4 who were out of work [1]). Nearly one-third of the applicants (less than 6,000 [1]) remained interested after working conditions were explained; over 90 percent of those interested (an estimated 5,500 [1]) were single workers; of these single workers, 48 percent quit within a week; this left fewer than 3,000, or about 1 out of every 20 unemployed, to work in seasonal agriculture employment in Michigan.

[1] Estimates in parentheses supplied by National Council of Farmer Cooperatives for classification. Source of information on Michigan experience: "Integration of Urban Unemployed Workers Into Agriculture" by Andrew Kramary, chief, Farm Placement Section, Michigan Employment Service Division, Employment Security Review, January 1963.

Let's Get Off McNamara's Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me on April 25, 1963, to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the pen of Malcolm S. Forbes.

Mr. Speaker, in the May 1 edition of Forbes magazine, I find an interesting editorial entitled "Let's Get Off McNamara's Back." I consider it well worth reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

LET'S GET OFF MCNAMARA'S BACK

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

I certainly hope Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara isn't as impervious to criticism or as oblivious to suggestions as his critics imply. With equal fervor I hope his innards are not as sensitive as the computing machines to which he is often likened. In recent weeks he must be wondering what's hit him. From every side and from some of the most unlikely sources he has been attacked and assaulted not merely for his conclusions and actions; his motives in addition to his methods have been keelhauled.

I hope he can take it because I share what I feel is still a widely held opinion that he is the ablest Defense Secretary we've had and the ablest man on the Kennedy team.

Nobody making decisions that involve both the placing and canceling of billions of dollars in contracts affecting tens of thousands of people's jobs and income can expect to win popularity contests. But such decisions have to be made and that's the Defense Secretary's job. It's heartening to find out that the Defense Secretary doesn't view his task as one of trying to keep the Army, Navy and Air Force happy in equal parts regardless of technical development and changing defense needs.

I don't know whether he made a mistake on the TFX contract. I don't know if getting one plane for the Army and the Navy at a savings of hundreds of millions of dollars is worth the saving. I always thought planes were built in relation to missions as well as costs; that perhaps carrier-based planes might have different requirements than land based, et cetera.

Etcetera.

Etcetera.

Etcetera.

But if I, who ain't in the business, have these thoughts; and if some Congressmen have them; and if some Army, Navy, and Air Force people have them; and if you have them—isn't it perhaps reasonable to suppose that they might have occurred to Mr. McNamara also? That he may even have taken them into account while feeding data into his little computer? I certainly think Congress is entitled to ask him if he did, to ask him to justify his decision. But on the record I think it is just a little naive to suggest that Mr. McNamara made his decision for some quaint whim unrelated to facts. Of course, if he placed this possibly $6.5 billion contract in Boston, I might have joined the ranks of the suspicious.

As the criticism repeatedly emanating from generals and admirals that he doesn't always follow their recomendations—good Lord, I'd hate to see the Army headed by men who didn't believe, and who know blamed well for the security of this country, that we need more highly trained, ready soldiers. I'd hate to see the Navy in the hands of men who didn't believe, and know blamed well, we need more Polaris submarines, et al., to insure our defense. I'd hate to see the Air Force headed by generals who thought they had all they needed to discharge their incredible responsibilities.

But, "wouldn't it be lovely" if they had a boss who agreed with them all and in fair shares for all. I am sure the Soviets would be happy to place that Secretary of Defense in the mausoleum next to Lenin in appreciation of his contribution to the collapse of the free world.

Mr. McNamara isn't God. He has no claim to infallibility. I'm sure he has made and will make mistakes. I hope and believe he listens to criticism—as for instance, C. L. Sulzberger's comments in the New York Times on what McNamara's reneging on the air defense ground environment plans for NATO would do to that De Gaulle-buffeted alliance. Such an act would have consequences far outweighing its short-term savings in dollars.

I repeat, however, the fervent hope that he is not getting unduly rocked inside by the pummeling he has been undergoing. He is doing a well-nigh undoable job and doing it ably. After undergoing so many weeks of nonadulation I think it's time some of us in McNamara's band strike up for him an encouraging tune.

Leo Welch, Tycoon in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Milton Viorst, the able reporter for the New York Post, has written a very illuminating article based upon an interview with Leo D. Welch, the chairman of the board of the Communications Satellite Corp., which was set up by Congress in August of 1962. There has been considerable interest in this private profit-making corporation which, its congressional supporters declared, would result in the expeditious development of a global commercial communications satellite system by private enterprise. On April 30, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. Welch testified that it would be 15 to 18 months before the corporation issued stock to the public. Meanwhile, for fiscal year 1964 NASA has asked Congress for $51 million for research and development on communications satellites, an increase of $7½ million over fiscal year 1963. It is apparent that the corporation expects to benefit from this continued public investment. This raises important policy questions which the Congress will have to resolve.

Mr. Speaker, I include Milton Viorst's closeup of Leo D. Welch:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 28, 1963]

CLOSEUP: LEO WELCH, TYCOON IN SPACE

(By Milton Viorst)

WASHINGTON.—Leo D. Welch looks like Hollywood's version of the modern tycoon, the kind who is so expert in the ways of big business that he can step in and run any corporation, whether it makes sheet steel or rubber nipples.

The theory is that these corporations have in common; whatever their product, the same goal: making money. It follows, therefore, that he who can make money for one corporation can make it for another.

Welch, who has made it for several, is tall and suave, basically bald but with enough hair to convey a handsomely gray presence. He has a mustache that is clipped close to the lip. His clothes, of course, are impeccably tailored.

At 64, he is starting out on a new career at a salary of $125,000 a year. He is not the least embarrassed by the fact that he earns more than the President of the United States. He says with a confident air that corporations must pay big money if they want to attract and hold top talent.

Welch has been named chairman of the board of the Communications Satellite Corp., the organization that Congress set up last year, after one of the bitterest fights in recent history, to own and operate a network of satellites which will transmit messages—telegraph, telephone, and television—around the world.

Welch comes to his new job after four decades of business apprenticeship. He is not an entrepreneur, in the old tradition of the American free enterprise system. He is a manager, a technician, a leader who devotes his skills to the advancement of the bloodless entity known as the corporation.

"When you have spent a great many years in making business policies," he explained in an interview, "when you have set up systems in different types of companies to get objectives done, you develop yardsticks in organization, finances, procedures. You learn how to make things work."

For 25 years, Welch made things work for First National City Bank. After his graduation from the University of Rochester in 1919, he began with a branch in Buenos Aires. Until 1943, when he was named National City's vice president in charge of Caribbean operations, he spent most of his time in South America. As a banker, Welch won a reputation for his skill in international trade and finances.

In 1944, he shifted his loyalty to Standard Oil of New Jersey and, step by step, starting

as treasurer, he made his way up the company hierarchy. He became a director in 1953 and a vice president 3 years later. In 1960 he was elected chairman of the board. As Standard Oil of New Jersey's top man, he directed the farflung activities of a corporation that has interests in virtually every corner of the globe.

Welch's vast experience in international business, plus his availability, led the President and the committee charged with laying groundwork for the Communications Satellite Corp. to propose him as the chairman of the board. He was in Geneva on one of his last missions for Standard Oil when the proposal was made to him. Without much hesitation, he scrapped his plans for retirement and decided to take the job.

"This was a very different bag of tricks from anything I'd ever been associated with before," he said. "The prospects were fascinating and attractive. But, outside of the technical problems, there isn't much difference between this and any other company that operates throughout the world."

As chief executive officer of the Communications Satellite Corp., Welch is not responsible for the technical problems. That is the domain of Joseph Charyk, a scientist, who has been named president at $80,000 a year. Welch's job is to create, out of the authority granted by Congress, an organization that will spend hundreds of millions of dollars to get a new communications system into operation while negotiating with dozens of foreign governments to carry the network around the world.

Welch compared his experiences as head of Standard Oil with the problems he expects to encounter in extending the satellite communications network abroad. "We had to take hold of different factors for each country," he said, "and work them out to enable them to get their energy, us to get our money and, at the same time, to keep our faces clean." These dealings often required, he said, "that we keep those governments looking good before their people."

It was the fantastic power, both diplomatic and financial, that Congress extended to the corporation that troubled the bitter opponents of the communications satellite bill, which was passed last year, after an acrimonious debate. These opponents also charged that turning over the fruit of millions of taxpayers' dollars to a private corporation was nothing less than a giant giveaway.

Welch shrugs off these criticisms. The key fact in the struggle over the bill, he said, was that fewer than a dozen Senators and only a handful of Congressmen voted against it. He feels there is no significant opposition to the corporation, either inside Congress or out.

"The President was very farsighted to set this operation up on a private enterprise basis," he said. "We need the greatest talent to move forward. We have a world of things to clear up, both scientifically and negotiationwise. Many problems must be researched out. We can do this best under private enterprise."

Welch denied that the corporation would act independently of the national interest, even though it is a private organization. He said Comsat (as it is now frequently called), while safeguarding its private character and prerogatives, would work closely with the Federal Communications Commission, the Space agency, the State Department, and the Defense Department, all of which exercise some statutory supervision over operations.

"This is a private corporation imbued with a sense of proximity to the Government," he said. "But we're still a private corporation with principal responsibility to our stockholders.

"I expect the Government to understand our problems as we will understand theirs. We will and must work in close harmony with the Government. We must give a periodic accounting to the Government. We will have differences, but I don't think they'll be too serious. I don't see much area of conflict as long as everyone remains cooperative."

One of the areas in which Government and the corporation must cooperate, Welch said, was in the division of responsibility—and costs—for research. Some Senators have objected strenuously to the $55 million the Space Administration proposes to spend next year for research on communications satellites. They argued that the corporation should pay for its own research

"We will have to go down the road with NASA," he said, "and decide where we land on research on communications satellites. The corporation will undoubtedly be required to spend some of its money. But as long as the objective is to keep ahead of the Russians, we have all got to spend money to research out the problems we have not yet solved."

These problems, Welch admits, mean that it is still too early to predict with confidence the date of an operational—as opposed to an experimental—communications satellite system. They also mean, he said that the Communications Satellite Corp., must recruit its staff with meticulous care.

For the moment the Comsat staff consists of Charyk and Welch, along with a few secretaries, all housed in beautiful Tregaron, the mansion of the late Ambassador Joseph Davies. Tregaron will undoubtedly be too small, Welch said, as soon as more hands come aboard.

"Negotiations are underway with a number of people," he said, and we expect to land a few of them within the next couple of days. Once we get the principal individuals—the general counsel, financial talent, public and government relations experts, specialists in communications negotiations with foreign governments—we'll have a nucleus to build around.

"We have candidates for all these jobs. We have a tremendous number of applicants, but those who come are usually not the ones we want. We usually have to go after them.

"That's why we have to pay high scales. We can't risk getting people to come here at reduced figures, then have them plan to go back to private enterprise to remain solvent. This communications industry is too competitive for that. We don't want people who are not sought after, desired and respected. The salaries we are paying them are justified in terms of the rest of the business world."

As for himself, Welch said, he did not take on the responsibility for Comsat because he needed the money but because it represented an exciting challenge. Both he and his wife, he said, were looking forward to his retiring from Standard Oil this spring.

"I've worked hard all my life," he said, "and I wanted to slow down the pace. I had invitations to join several boards of directors. I had planned to do some consulting work. These were enough to keep me as busy as I wanted to be.

"But what I have now is just the opposite. This job has accelerated my pace of life. Now I work on Saturdays and Sundays and I can't remember how many years ago it was that I last did that. But I must do it and I want to do it. The more I work at it, the more impatient I get about getting on with a job that badly needs doing."

Welch and his wife, Veronica, are currently living in Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel, which is 15 minutes by foot to Tregaron. Welch walks to work each morning as he did when he was with Standard Oil in New York. The morning walks, Welch said, help keep him as trim as he is.

Still reluctant to tear up their roots and move to Washington permanently, Welch and his wife keep their New York apartment on East 57th Street. He gets back frequently on business.

They both return as often as they can to see their daughter, Mrs. Emmet Whitlock, and their only grandchild, Penelope, who is 1½.

Before long, however, Welch said, he and his wife will have to find a permanent home in Washington. Comsat soon will be a going concern. After that—though no one knows how long—will come the satellites themselves, delivering their messages, by way of the heavens, to the farthest points in the world. It is only a matter of time before the problems of the Communications Satellite Corp. are solved. The chairman of the board will, according to all predictions, then preside over a corporation that is both powerful and profitable.

In Congress, meanwhile, there remains considerable feeling that more safeguards are needed to make sure these profits, while benefiting the stockholders, also serve the best interests of the United States.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Founding of the State of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is again my honor to rise to note another anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel—its 15th.

This year much of the joy of the celebration is marred by the untimely passing of Israel's President, Itzhak Ben-Zvi. He was an outstanding statesman, scholar, and author who was beloved by the people of Israel and all those who knew him. President Ben-Zvi served for 11 years, during which time Israel made great progress in its development. His death is a great loss to the people of Israel and the world.

Last year, in noting Israel's 14th anniversary, I concluded my remarks with the following:

> It is my hope that when the State of Israel reaches its 15th anniversary, peace will reign in the Middle East so that all of the peoples of that area of the world can start on the all-important job of developing the Middle East and improving the standards of living of the residents.

In view of recent developments in the Middle East, it is unfortunately obvious that my hopes have not been realized. Instead of making efforts to restore peace, Egypt has, with the aid of West German scientists, embarked upon a missile and aircraft development program. Combined with the new Federation of Arab States into the United Arab Republic and President Nasser's continuous threats, Israel once again finds her security in serious jeopardy.

Faced with this new buildup Israel must take steps to protect herself. Egypt's action will undoubtedly start a new armaments race in the Middle East.

We must, at all costs, prevent such occurrence as it is not only a threat to Israel, the Middle East, and Africa, but to the entire free world.

It is consistent with the foreign policy of the United States to take steps to prevent any military action against the State of Israel. The United States has negotiating points with which to work. They range from the discontinuance of economic assistance to the members of the United Arab Federation to action in the United Nations; that further assistance to these nations depends upon their endeavors toward the achievement of a just peace through negotiations of all controversial issues.

It is my earnest hope that the problems of the Middle East can be peacefully settled. I have said, and have introduced resolutions, and I believe that the way to achieve peace in the Middle East is to have all parties involved participate at a peace conference. It must be the duty of the nations of the Western alliance to insure the independence of Israel and other sovereign states in this area. The United States must again take the lead before it is too late.

Ohio American Legion Essay Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Ohio congressional delegation had the pleasure of giving a luncheon in the Speaker's dining room for the winners of this year's Ohio American Legion Essay Contest.

I am proud that one of the winners, Mr. Howard Hepburn, route No. 1, Glens Run, Martins Ferry, Ohio, is a constituent of mine. Mr. Hepburn is a student in the 12th grade at St. John's Central High School, Bellaire, Ohio, and I am including his thoughtful essay in the RECORD.

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

"Democracy alone can take no stand,
It alone can fight no man.
The people behind it create its drive
The people behind it keep it alive."

Democracy? Just what am I saying? Democracy! It is a word of words, a system of systems, a gift to be enjoyed only in the hearts of the free. A democratic government like ours is a system in which the power to determine political institutions and public policy is held and exercised, directly or indirectly, by the people. Democracy is like a plane in which the government officials are the pilots; and the people, the wings. The pilots can get the plane started and even make it move, but it takes the wings to get it up and keep it up.

But I am a part of the people. What can I do to help keep democracy going? Should I join the Army, fight a war? If it comes to this, it would be more than my duty to fight, even to death, for my country. But the art of preserving democracy is something far easier, not quite so heroic, yet just as demanding. It was a wise man who said that it is the little things in life that count. These little things that I do every day are what help mold my country into an impregnable fortress of the free.

Little things? For example? Well, I should learn what my country stands for and what it is doing around the world by simply picking up a newspaper or listening to radio or T.V. This gives me a complete, up-to-date account of the major issues facing my Government and of the people who are representing our interests in these issues. This is an excellent aid in helping me to vote wisely. Yes, it is true that I am not yet quite old enough (or wise enough) to vote; however, I shall soon be of age, and, by keeping abreast of the issues now, I can then walk into the polls with a solid foundation of knowledge which will enable me to vote for the person most capable of running my Government.

Then there is the "little thing" of loyalty and pride in my country and its leaders. Often while in public, or sometimes in my own home, I hear another exclaim, "He's a crook!" or, "That man couldn't run a corner candy store, let alone a government!" It is then that I should forget about my inexperience and challenge these hasty accusations. People who belittle our leaders are "imperfections," "rust spots" in the wings of democracy. Suppose that what they say is true. So what? Even "little inexperienced me" knows that it was these very same people and others like them who helped put these incompetent, corrupt men into government positions.

Besides, I should also consider the problems facing this country. Socially, we are confronted by such matters as integration, poverty, divorce, juvenile deliquency and crime. Economically, we must contend with corrupt use of government money, overtaxation, and the improper balance between production and consumption. Politically, we are faced with problems such as foreign aid, propaganda, public opinion, and the most dangerous problem of all, communism.

To overcome these weak points, I, the individual, must study them and learn what I can do to lighten the load which hinders the soaring flight of our great plane of democracy; for if I don't, too big a load may bring it to a flaming end. This must not happen! Democracy must be preserved!

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks by the Honorable John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, before the National Executive Committee of the Italian-American War Veterans in Washington, D.C., on April 20, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN S. GLEASON, JR., ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 20, 1963

It is a great pleasure to meet with you today.

This is my first opportunity to meet you of the National Executive Committee of the Italian-American War Veterans, so I can't help but think of what happened to one of my best friends in Chicago, Father Mario Fanelli, when he arrived at his new parish, and began his first sermon. Father Mario was rather nervous, but all seemed to be going well until an elderly lady with a very stern expression marched up the aisle and seated herself directly beneath him in front of the pulpit.

Father Mario watched her out of the corner of his eye as she opened up a little kit, and assembled the various parts of a rather elaborate hearing mechanism and affixed it to her ears. He then went on with his sermon, and, in fact, began to think he was doing pretty well, until he saw that little old lady suddenly remove the hearing aid, and put it back in its container. And for the rest of his sermon she sat there, hands neatly folded, with a smile on her face, not hearing a single word.

Yesterday, April 19, was the anniversary of one of the most important events in the history of the world, the anniversary of the Battles of Lexington and Concord. An Irishman by the name of Harrington, which they say is Gaelic for Antonio, pulled the trigger first and fired what everyone knows today as the "shot heard round the world" by everyone that is except people like that elderly lady in Father Fanelli's parish who aren't interested in hearing or learning anything about our country or some of its functions.

Well, this morning I am going to talk about a subject that everyone listens to. That subject is money.

Right now the Congress is reviewing the budget request made by the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year starting next July 1.

I think you might be interested in some of the highlights of that budget.

First, the Veterans' Administration is now paying approximately $2.8 billion annually to 3 million disabled veterans who are on the compensation and pension rolls. In addition, 1,653,000 dependents of deceased veterans are receiving compensation (dependence and indemnity compensation, or death pension) in the amount of $1 billion a year. This year, primarily as a result of the increased number of veterans expected to qualify for pensions, we are asking the Congress to increase the compensation and pension amount by another $89 million.

Next, our medical program, for the second year in a row, has reached a record high. This medical program is a complex one including research, construction, inpatient and outpatient care, recruitment of topnotch people, affiliation with medical schools, and many other elements. Yet, I have no doubt that all who know our medical program agree on one point: that the VA is giving better care to more sick and disabled veterans than at any time in its history. And our budget requests to Congress are designed to improve on this already superlative record.

Let me mention three aspects of our medical program, of which I am most proud.

The first is medical research, the key to the future. We are asking Congress for almost $34 million for research for the coming year, which will mean that the Veterans' Administration is pouring more funds into research in one year than were spent in the years 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1957 combined. Even with the smaller past expenditures, VA research has given much to man. And we expect the future benefits to be even larger as a result of research findings already made, or soon to be made.

Our latest medical report reflects progress in almost 7,000 separate research projects, involved in every aspect of the human body, and concentrating heavily on such vital fields as heart diseases, cancer, mental health, and the aging process.

Several items cited in this report might be of interest to you.

For example, our doctors have developed several amazing electronic devices. One, called the pacemaker, is actually implanted in the body to stimulate action of weakened hearts.

Another device, developed at the Hines Hospital in Illinois, is a tremendous help to the partially paralyzed victim of a stroke.

Instead of dragging his legs, an electronic impulse is triggered when his foot hits the ground and this electronic impulse gives the order to move to the nerves in that dragging limb. The result: the veteran walks naturally again.

These and other results from our life-saving research are immediately shared with the entire medical community and the country at large. It may not be going too far to say that a discovery already made, or being found right now in one of our hundreds of research laboratories, might save the life of one of you listening to me today.

The second vitally important part of our medical program is affiliation with medical schools. I have pledged myself to the proposition that our veterans deserve nothing less than the best medical care possible. And the most effective way to assure the attainment of this aim is by working closely with the source of new medical knowledge, the medical schools. Therefore, the new hospitals being built by the Veterans' Administration will be located right next door to leading medical schools.

Closely related to this policy is our effort in the training of doctors. Our 169 hospitals represent 8 percent of the total hospital beds of the United States. We employ 5,000 full-time doctors. And we constitute the world's largest employer of 10 different medical professions, including nurses, clinical and counseling psychologists, pathologists, and others. Therefore, we have a heavy responsibility to use this splendid medical machine for the utmost benefit of all Americans. And, I think we are meeting that responsibility for, each year, one-third of all new doctors in the United States receive an essential part of their training in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Furthermore, 18,000 medical students each year receive part of their education in our hospitals.

The third factor is medical care itself. We are constantly striving for better service for more veterans. I think one example may suffice. We are now treating a total of 67,000 more patients than we did 3 years ago with approximately the same facilities.

I could go on and on with these statistics, but I am afraid they might leave the wrong impression. For it is not the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to deal in cold statistics for we never forget for 1 minute that, though we are dealing with the needs of 22½ million veterans who, with their dependents, comprise 47 percent of our national population, we are, nevertheless, dealing with individuals, human beings, each one of whom was created after the image of his Maker.

To them we have an important, personal impact on many of their most vital concerns. For instance: we offer sustenance to 4.3 million veterans and dependants to whom we pay $3.8 billion each year in compensation and pension;

We offer security on behalf of the nearly 6 million veterans who provide for their loved ones through $40 billion worth of GI insurance;

We offer the key to health and a more productive life to the more than 3 million veterans treated each year by our medical and clinical programs;

We opened the door of educational opportunity to 11 million veterans who trained under the GI bills;

We helped fulfill the dream of home ownership for almost 6 million veterans who purchase homes through the aid of our loan programs, programs that have accounted for one out of every five houses built in America since the end of World War II; and we stand guard over the financial future of 500,000 orphans and other wards of the Veterans' Administration who have in our trust over $750 million in assets.

As a public official I am constantly aware that the difference between our system of government and the tyranny of communism is the fact that we in America are concerned with the individual and his potential.

I can think of no better example of this approach to people, and of its success, than with our citizens of Italian descent.

We all know that from the shores of Italy came the last and largest of the great waves of immigration that have enriched our shores. But of course Italians have been arriving in the New World ever since Columbus talked Isabella into visiting a pawnshop.

Some, like William Paca, a great-grandson of one of the early Italian settlers of Maryland, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. But many of those who immigrated in this century were poor and unschooled. Only the humblest kind of labor was available to them. Their poverty and their numbers disturbed some Americans who doubted whether this country could absorb them. But had they cause to worry? Had they reason to be concerned? In the free air of the New World, these Italian immigrants released talents heretofore submerged by the stifling lack of opportunity then existing in Europe.

And now, today, millions of Italian-Americans have come to occupy positions of distinction in every field of endeavor, particularly in the arts, the sciences, and in sports.

Perhaps the greatest single exhibition of the enrichment of this land by the sons of Italy was seen in our wars. Americans of Italian descent were among the first to go over the top in Flanders, and they were among the last to yield to overwhelming force on Corregidor.

The graves of Italo-Americans grace the soil of a thousand battlefields and mutely proclaim that the hyphen between Italo and American is never a division sign for men who love freedom, but rather a bridge, a unifying sign, an unbreakable link.

America would be a far, far poorer land without the vigorous blood of Italy, blood that, in the veins of America's veterans, pulses strongly in joy, in generous service, and in fervent devotion to both God and country.

Address of Mr. G. E. Leighty, Chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address of Mr. G. E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, entitled "Some Myths of the Railroads," given at a National Press Club luncheon on April 19, 1963. I have found it interesting and would like to bring it to the attention of other Members of Congress:

SOME MYTHS OF THE RAILROADS

I am greatly honored by this invitation to meet the Washington press corps at one of the famous National Press Club luncheons.

Before such an audience I deem it proper to take note of the success of the multimillion dollar public relations campaign railroad management has been waging. While I take vigorous exception to the purposes of that campaign and strongly dispute most of its claims as misleading, let me state frankly that I realize that railroad mangement has succeeded in getting its views before you gentlemen of the press, your editors, Government officials, Congress and the public to a degree perhaps unmatched by any other industry.

Relying upon clever words and catchy phrases, the railroads have not missed one bet in their massive propaganda drive to convince the American people that they are on the brink of financial disaster, that they are being squeezed out by the competition of other forms of transportation, that they are victims of unfair Government regulation and discriminatory transportation policies, and that, because of so-called featherbedding, they are being forced by greedy union leaders to pay excessive labor costs.

The facts dispute every one of these claims. The basic trouble with the railroads' propaganda campaign, as I see it, is that it has led railroad management into an Alice-in-Wonderland world in which Madison Avenue wordmongers create their own definitions. What would be affluence for the rest of us, has become abject poverty in the world of railroad officialdom.

What are the facts? Are the railroads broke? Are they being replaced by other forms of transportation? Are they, on the whole, being unfairly discriminated against by overstrict governmental regulation? Are they unduly victimized by our national transportation policies? Are railroad workers really featherbedding?

I submit that the facts indicate that a strong negative answer should be given to every one of these questions.

RAILROAD POVERTY IS A MYTH

Through advertising, publicity releases, speeches, the American people are being asked constantly to pity the poor railroads. Every time I hear another of these cries of "poverty" from the railroads, I get a mental picture of railroad presidents, directors and vice presidents—especially hordes of vice presidents—standing on every Wall Street corner with a bunch of pencils in one hand and a tincup in the other.

The railroad poverty myth is just that, a myth. The railroads are richer than most of you think.

The truth is that the railroads are by far the largest and most prosperous of the common carriers. They enjoy a net margin on gross that is two to four times that of their chief competitors, the airlines and highway carriers. The railroad industry as a whole is actually in the healthiest financial state in its history. The cash flow of the railroads is greater today than it has ever been.

Right now, for example, scores of railroads are using a plea of "poverty" in an effort to cajole the Interstate Commerce Commission into permitting them to merge. Among them are two of the richest, the Pennsylvania and the New York Central. Without exception that I know of, the position of railroad merger applicants, no matter how prosperous, is that the present state of the industry is bad, and the prospects for the future are worse. Neither claim is true.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, for instance, is our Nation's wealthiest railroad with shareholders' equity of over a billion dollars. The figure, to be exact, is $1,388,029,887, according to the latest report available, that for 1961. And the New York Central, which alleges that it also is threatened with financial ruin, is crowding the billion dollar mark in stockholders' equities.

If that is poverty, I think most of us would like to be so poor. The amounts I mention are those reported by the two railroads.

FINANCIAL REPORTS ARE QUESTIONED

Take the case of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. The Interstate Commerce Commission—with three Commissioners dissenting—recently voted to permit the Chesapeake & Ohio to acquire stock control to save the "poor" B. & O., because the B. & O. had reported losing some $31 million in 1961. As the dissenting Commissioners pointed out, the alleged B. & O. losses in 1961 actually were bookkeeping changes rather than real losses attributable to 1961 operations.

I ask you if it doesn't seem most unusual that B. & O. operations were profitable through 1960 and again in 1962, but in 1961 when C. & O. acquisition proceedings were coming up before the ICC, B. & O. operating income was off $31 million. What happened? Why did the B. & O. have a deficit that year, and only that year? The answers, it seems to me as a layman, ought to be news, but to date, I have not seen one newspaper article devoted to this rather astounding story. Railroad labor, let me assure you, is trying to get this information and our attorneys definitely will have some questions to ask on this score when our court test of the ICC decision in this case is resumed in Detroit on May 28.

PROPAGANDA AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

While we are on the subject of finances and the tremendous public relations effort that is being made to make everyone believe that the railroads are in real trouble, let's look for a moment at how this supposed financial distress has been used in the collective bargaining process.

A week ago, here in Washington, the chief counsel of the five railroad operating unions told the opening session of the emergency board appointed by President Kennedy that there indeed had been a new technological invasion in railroading. The unions' attorney said this technological invasion was propaganda campaigns which had been inserted in the collective bargaining process. In other words, the "featherbedding" campaign of railroad management was unprecedented in the peaceful conduct of collective bargaining.

To the men who man the Nation's trains, the dispute involves the eventual loss of 80,000 to 100,000 jobs that presently exist in our industry. This tremendous job loss would come about when and if railroad management ever got unilateral control of the working lives of these men. The issue, gentlemen, is not so-called "featherbedding" but rather whether the unions will retain their contractual right to negotiate on these jobs.

It certainly involves the serious question of safety on our railroads. In a broader sense it involves our economy. You cannot take 80,000 or 100,000 jobs out of the economy forever at a time when the Government is searching desperately to find enough jobs for the 15 million new job seekers the Department of Labor tells us we will have at the end of the sixties.

A LESSON IN ECONOMICS

If the railroads are really as bad off as they claim, one would expect the number of railroads in bankruptcy to be approaching the level of the depression of the 1930's when nearly one-third of the total railroad mileage of the country was in the hands of receivers. Actually, the miles of road in bankruptcy today are only slightly above 1 percent, and that figure includes the New Haven, a railroad clearly victimized by mismanagement.

The truth is that with a few exceptions like the New Haven Railroad, the railroads of the United States are prospering.

WHERE DID MONEY COME FROM?

Since the end of World War II, our so-called poor railroads have not only increased dividends paid out annually but at the same time they have reduced their funded debt—that is, long-term debt—very substantially.

The long-term debt of the railroads was reduced by almost a billion dollars between 1951 and 1961. During the same period they reduced all other debt by over $300 millions.

While accomplishing all this debt reduction U.S. railroads overall were investing an average of a billion dollars a year in plant.[1]

Where did all this railroad money come from? They didn't borrow it, in fact they reduced their indebtedness. The railroads have not increased the amount of outstanding railroad stock; they haven't been selling stock to raise money.

---

[1] Here are the figures from the railroads' own reports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

The answer should be clear to all of us. All that money came out of the railroad industry itself. It was earned by railroad operations.

REASONS BEHIND MYTHS

Why, if, as I say, the railroads are really prosperous, do they keep trying to sell the press and the public on their poverty myth?

The poverty myth, like attacks on alleged featherbedding by employees and the other fables in the railroad propaganda line, is a pressure weapon. It is the No. 1 reason the railroads advance when they seek preferential treatment at the expense of all the rest of us.

In the 10 years from 1951 through 1961:

Shareholders' equity in U.S. railroads rose from $16,602,472,000 in 1951 to $18,462,947,000 in 1961.

Capital surplus spurted from $287,805,000 to $1,909,967,000.

Retained income was up from $7,257,250,000 to $9,981,052,000.

Dividends—amounts paid out annually—increased by $11 millions, from $373,574,000 to $385,017,000. The average rate of 5.7 percent remained steady during the period.

When they seek tax abatements or special preferential tax allowances, they begin all over the hackneyed refrains: "verge of bankruptcy," "insufficient return on investment," "discriminatory regulation," "excessive labor costs."

When the railroads are called upon to discuss wages and working conditions, out comes the myth again. They can't afford, they say, to pay their workers rates comparable with those in other industries, even without taking into account the higher skills needed and the greater dangers working on the railroads entails.

They do that in the face of the fact that railroad workers are the most productive group in the United States. Proof is all around you.

Official figures of the Interstate Commerce Commission show that during the period 1921–60, output per man-hour of labor of railroad workers rose 263 percent.

RAIL BUSINESS IS GROWING

In 1921 there was practically no competition whatever from pipelines, highways, or airlines and the total revenue traffic units of the railroads in that year of virtual monopoly amounted to 381 billions. By 1960, despite all the new competition from other modes, railroad revenue traffic units were nevertheless up to 614 billions—an increase of 61 percent. Despite this huge increase in business, the number of railroad man-hours of labor dropped from 4.1 billion in 1921 to 1.8 billion in 1960. Thus while railroad traffic has increased by 61 percent over the last four decades, the man-hours of labor required decreased by 60 percent. In other words, today the railroads are handling 60 percent more business with only 40 percent of the employees.

Let us examine briefly the current propaganda plea of the railroads for freedom to compete. What the railroads are seeking behind this high-sounding phrase is not the creation of real competition, putting them on the same terms as every other form of transportation, but rather freedom to drive competitors out of business with a bankrupting rate war that would be harmful to shippers, the general public, and the smaller railroads. The fact is that the railroads, instead of being overregulated generally as they claim, have won more exemptions from Federal laws designed to protect the public interest than any other industry. They aren't ready to give up these special privileges.

In many States rail management is putting pressure on the legislatures to repeal the full crew statutes. What rail management doesn't tell you is that freight trains are longer, heavier, and faster, yet the standard crew is still five men. In the steam locomotive era 60 cars was a long freight train. Now, consists of 200 cars, 2 miles long and pulled by multiple diesel units, are commonplace.

I sincerely hope railroad management changes course before it is too late. The United States needs more railroad transportation, not less, now and in the foreseeable future.

One of the most important thoughts on the Nation's mind today is national defense. In the recent Cuban crisis, what means of transportation brought men and material into the Florida area? You know the answer. Of course, it was the railroads. The railroads were the backbone of military transportation in World Wars I and II. In another emergency the first soldiers in the crisis will be the railroads. They must be ready if our Nation is to be prepared. Yet even railroad management, while trying to cut back railroad plant even further, admits our present railroad capacity is less than was needed to do the job in World War II.

ADVICE FOR THE RAILROADS

Management should get together with its workers and work once again to give the people of the United States the finest possible railroad service for shippers and passengers alike. In short, management should put away its crying towels, end the bickering, and get down to running railroads.

It's high time the railroads stopped cutting back service. They should hustle for new business to use railroad plant to full capacity. I give you my word that, if the railroads ever stop trying to mislead the American people and get back to trying to give the public the kind of service to which it is entitled, the railroad unions will do all in their power to cooperate with management in this endeavor.

The railroads also should stop chasing the merger "will-o-the-wisp" which is at best a temporary palliative and ultimately means less railroad plant, service and profits.

Congress can help the railroads too, but not in the way the railroads ask. First Congress should declare a moratorium on all railroad mergers before the railroads go any further on that suicidal path. The railroads are not in dire straits. Delay won't hurt them.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, have, in this session of Congress, introduced bills to get Congress to order a merger moratorium. Either, or both, should be enacted promptly.

CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE

Then, Congress should make a complete and thorough study of the whole financial structure of our railroad systems. It should find out the truth about the industry's fiscal health. We know that it's good and getting better, but let's get the whole truth, find out how really good it is once we dig through fables and devious bookkeeping.

Congress also has a duty to determine who really owns the railroads. Too many real owners are hiding behind the nominal ownership of Wall Street stockbrokers and foreign banks. Congress, and only Congress, can uncover the hidden controls, the interlocking directorates with big business, big industry, big banks, big insurance companies, and foreign investors, all of which have other primary interests than a healthy railroad network.

Mergers like the destructive ones being contemplated will hamper economic growth. Reduction of railroad plant would leave some entire communities ghost towns.

You of the press can help us in our unending battle to preserve and improve railroad service. Just tell the people the truth, the whole truth.

"The Role of Cooperatives in U.S. Agriculture"—Address by Senator Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the evening of Monday, April 29, it was my privilege to address the National Conference on Cooperatives, which had been arranged by the six members of the Advisory Committee on Cooperatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This particular conference had been called in response to a challenge from the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman, to come forward with proposals which would substantially extend the role of cooperatives in building marketing power for farmers and, in general, to seek to better conditions in our rural areas and increased use of consumer co-ops.

The conference included representatives of six national federations of cooperatives. It was well attended and devoted its attention to some of the basic problems facing our agricultural producers.

It was my privilege to share the platform with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] delivered an outstanding address on the role of cooperatives today and in the future. His intimate knowledge of farm cooperatives brought forth an enthusiastic response from his audience.

It was my privilege to address the conference on the subject "The Role of Cooperatives in U.S. Agriculture." I attempted to emphasize in particular the importance of our farm cooperatives in increasing the bargaining power of our farmers in the marketplace and improving our export of markets.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF COOPERATIVES IN U.S. AGRICULTURE

(Speech of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before National Federation of Grain Cooperative, April 29, 1963)

Cooperatives are an accepted part of farming and business life of the Nation. In my own State of Minnesota it is so much so that it continues to lead the Nation in number of cooperatives and number of memberships and to stand second in dollar volume of business.

One of the country's leading grain cooperatives is located in Minnesota, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul. A brief look at some comparative figures of that organization will show its progress and its accomplishments and what it means to farmers in our region.

In 1938 G.T.A. started business with only $30,000 member capital. By 1962 it had $42 million in member capital. It moved from

assets of about $2 million in 1938 to assets of $106 million in 1962. And from 1938 through 1962 this cooperative marketed over 2 billion bushels of grain for farmer members.

Over the years, G.T.A. has averaged returning an extra 3 cents a bushel to members, or an estimated $60 million more than farmers would have gotten if they had not started their own cooperative business.

Or take the Farmers Union Central Exchange of South St. Paul. In 1961 its farmers made nearly $9 million added savings on $92 million worth of supply business. It is a growing, well managed, modern successful cooperative.

This wide acceptance of cooperatives in Minnesota may stem from our Scandinavian forebears who helped settle this region. They brought with them a deeprooted understanding of basic cooperative philosophy and a background of successful experience with cooperatives in their home countries.

But I think another ingredient, or trait, also entered into this acceptance. That was a willingness to venture boldly, to strike out on their own with their neighbors when there was a job to do.

This last trait was inherent in these people who had enough physical daring to leave their homes abroad and come to a strange and untried land. Thus, when the need arose, they had the business daring to strike out into cooperative development, even though it was as yet untried and unproven in their new land.

We make progress only because we are dissatisfied with things as they are, because we want things to be better. Certainly this applies to cooperatives.

All of you tonight can look back to the early days of the cooperatives you are here to speak for, back to the origins and why cooperatives were formed. These early pioneers found they had no power in the Nation's market places. To correct this wrong, they turned to cooperatives.

Perhaps they were getting paid the same for high quality cotton as for low grade. Maybe year after year they had watched wheat hit its lowest price for the year just when they had to sell at harvest time to pay interest and back debts.

Perhaps the seed they bought wouldn't grow, or the fertilizer had so much filler and so little nutrients that it didn't improve their crop yields or rejuvenate their soil.

These and many other serious buying and selling problems faced our sturdy cooperative pioneers.

I recall stories I have heard of the early stirrings of some of today's most successful cooperatives. One I'd like to recall is of a few Midwest farmers who met in a granary one fall day nearly 75 years ago to talk about the marketing vise they found themselves in, abundant crops but no good place to sell except at extremely low prices. From this small beginning has come a successful cooperative, one that had to fight bitter battles to get the first toehold on the terminal markets to sell their grain or to market their dairy products.

And I recall similar stories from my own State, tales of the fire and vision of one man who has been called the father of cooperatives creameries—Prof. Theophilus Levi Haecker—of how he first visited Danish settlers at Clark's Grove, Minnesota, who were successful with their cooperative creamery, of how he then moved from community to community with evangelical fervor talking to farmers everywhere and anywhere, sometimes in the community store where the potbellied stove would glow red behind him as he spoke.

He would ask how much farmers were getting for their butter. Often the answer was 10 to 12 cents a pound. Then he'd point out that the Clark's Grove Cooperative was getting farmers 22 cents a pound for quality butter.

After 5 years of stumping the State, with or without invitation, many cooperative creameries had sprung up. And more than once when Professor Haecker would hear rumors of trouble in one of them, he'd trudge all night on foot to reach the community to mend a quarrel and prevent a cooperative breakup.

There are many stories to tell of resolute cooperative men and early struggles of marketing cooperatives, and some more recent, as they move toward the main objective of giving the farmer member a greater say in the price for his product and the way he markets it.

The purchasing and service cooperatives also have in their histories the same story of struggle to prove their right to do business and of developing a base and form of operation that would best serve the farmers' needs.

Farmers have made great strides toward solving some of their problems through cooperatives. At the beginning they couldn't even be sure cooperatives would work, that they could get enough volume, money, and sustained courage to follow through on their plans.

From the past has come the inspiring heritage that is a built-in legacy of most of today's cooperatives, the heritage of free men freely working together to try to better their farming lot.

As we look to our accomplishments today and the firm place cooperatives have forged for themselves in our business economy, you can take a full measure of pride in the giant strides you have made.

One measure of success can be made by checking dollar value to farmers, more than $200 billion worth of business done by marketing, purchasing, and related service cooperatives since 1913, and a net volume of $12.4 billion in fiscal year 1961.

Another measure could be made by taking the proportion of total business cooperatives do. Figures collected by Farmer Cooperative Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that about two-thirds of the dairymen in this country belong to cooperatives, that dairy cooperatives handle three-fifths of the fluid milk, 60 percent of the butter, and 75 percent of the nonfat dry milk in this country. In Minnesota we have such outstanding cooperatives as the Land O' Lakes creameries, and hundreds of smaller ones.

A better measure of the importance of cooperatives can be taken by considering what services these farmer businesses perform.

Consider marketing first, for certainly the picture for marketing farm products shows some disarray, in spite of cooperative, Government, and other actions. We can take some comfort in the thought that things would be much worse if nothing at all had been done by all the people involved.

One of the great needs of farmers today is still to strengthen their bargaining position to give them muscle in the marketplace, as Secretary Freeman has so aptly expressed it. In the face of increased economic concentration of buyers and handlers of farm products, it is even more difficult than in the past for a farmer to market as one individual. By pooling both the volume of their products and their bargaining power through cooperatives, they have proved again and again that they can exert more influence in the marketplace.

Cooperatives help build markets and find outlets for farm products. The combined resources of many farmers often make it possible to process, package, and sell under a nationally known brand, thus creating a demand for the farmer's product and giving him a bigger share of returns in these added steps in handling his own raw product.

Cooperatives have helped farmers establish a reputation for good quality products by being leaders in adopting U.S. grades, by encouraging members to produce a better product on their farms, and by careful handling of a farm-fresh product on its way to the consumer.

Cooperatives have become a potent factor in the agricultural export trade, with some cooperatives being the biggest exporters of their respective commodities.

Groups of cooperatives also have joined together into larger cooperatives to go into the export trade. The Producers Export Co. has sold millions of bushels of co-op grain abroad since it organized a few years ago.

Right now, a group of soybean and cottonseed processing cooperatives are starting a new cooperative to sell abroad as well as at home. Its name is Boy-Cot Sales with headquarters at Houston.

Purchasing cooperatives also exert a great force for the good of the farmer in the supply and distribution picture. Farmers obtain their supplies at reduced costs by volume buying, by operating for their own interests, and often by doing their own manufacturing and processing. In addition, they obtain the kind and quality of supplies specifically fitted to their farming needs, since they are both owners and users of the business and can make their wants and needs known.

Although cooperatives supply only about one-fifth of the farm market for the major supplies they handle, their influence on daily prices and quality result in savings to all farmers that amount to several times the dollar savings shown in their annual audits.

Another contribution cooperatives make is in helping farmers operate their farming enterprise more efficiently. They get advice that improves their operations from field men specifically trained to recommend improved production practices, better seeds, better harvesting methods, and the like. Farmers may read about an improved practice in their membership publication or hear about it in a meeting.

Cooperatives often prove the goad, the gadfly that stimulates other businesses to do a better job for farmers. This is no small contribution. Just recently the major grain company in the United States had offered a firm marketing agreement to growers in its area that guarantee paying them a cash price above that given by a cooperative in the region.

Cooperative spokesmen often refer to the yardstick or pacesetting influence of their businesses. You all know instances where the price of a product has shown an immediate increase when farmers first formed a cooperative to market it, or the price of farm supplies has dropped when farmers started manufacturing their own through a cooperative, at times as much as 30 to 40 percent on some supplies in some areas. This is a contribution to all farmers in those communities, not just to members of the particular cooperative.

The acceleration of change in farming and in the outside environments in which farmers operate is throwing out as big a challenge as our agriculture ever has faced. Corresponding challenges are being thrust upon cooperatives. Many of you are meeting these challenges in good fashion; others who are doing little or nothing to keep up and adapt are falling behind.

I'm thinking particularly of merging when merging is called for; of modernizing and streamlining operations; of adding farm services such as bulk delivery and spreading fertilizer when farmers need them; or of being flexible enough to adjust to serving the larger family farms with increased specializations.

It takes courage and spirit of daring to take these steps, and a lot more money.

There are times when conditions today may call for starting a new cooperative. A recent example of the formation of a new

cooperative is a group of men with big orchards who had been their own packers and salesmen. They found the buyers wanting more of the product than they had as individuals, and also found themselves competing with each other on price with the same buyers.

So they stood around all one morning in an abandoned plant that was up for sale, discussing whether or not to form a cooperative, and finally how to go about it. From this has come a half-million dollar plant that built up good domestic and export markets in its first year of operation.

There are many men who dare, who can make bold ventures. These men had a solid backlog of experience to build on. They profited from mistakes other cooperatives had made and didn't repeat them in their organization and plans of operation.

Now, I would like to turn a somewhat broader look at the importance of cooperatives, to consider what they can contribute to maintaining the family farm and private ownership.

Our family farm pattern of agriculture has always been the basis of our agricultural progress and good community life, and I hope it always will be.

Cooperatives are the chief means of preserving this pattern that is so essential to a sound and progressive democracy.

The family farm today, however, must operate in an economic environment that is characterized by the bigness of the businesses in it. Here is where cooperatives have carved a firm hold. They have long since proved their ability to help farmers pool resources and volumes, and thus bargain on a better basis with the bigger businesses.

The cooperative may be the only answer in many cases as to whether family farming, which has been the bedrock of our agriculture, can continue to exist.

Family farmers, in the true democratic tradition of learning to work together, have developed their own extension of the free enterprise system in farmer cooperatives. These are a legitimate and desirable means of preserving individuality while allowing farmers to find a way to compete in an economy of bigness.

Who is more closely and clearly identified with free enterprise than a landowner, a farm operator, the family farmer, the American farmer? U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show he has about $4 billion of his own money invested in these cooperatives, with no Government money invested.

In addition, cooperators are in essence doing things for themselves, and therefore embody a spirit of self-reliance, of independence, and of initiative, all inherent in our system of free economic and political institutions.

They help us preserve our American heritage of a man with an independent spirit who is yet sensible enough to work together with others for his own and the common good.

I fail to understand why some people today seek to deny farmers and the cooperatives the same inalienable rights to do what others do without criticism. Other people, other businesses join together to do many things, small grocers and drugstores form buying cooperatives, to meet chainstores on a nearly equal basis; newspapers go together to hire reporters and collect news on a mutual basis; many businesses carry ownership of their product all the way from its raw state to the final consumer sale.

Often it is the very people who clamor the loudest about free enterprise who would deny the farmer the right to try to preserve his own private ownership of his farm by using cooperatives to help handle simply another stage or extension of his farming business.

Who has a better right and reason to market his own products than the farmer? Who has a better right and reason to get his supplies and services as economically and efficiently as possible?

This is only good business and good commonsense and an inherent right under our form of government.

Cooperatives seek to help man preserve his rights of individual ownership of land and farm, not deprive him of them. This is the opposite of the state ownership of productive capacity that is embodied in socialism.

Cooperatives help build better citizens in our democracy. Look around you here and you will see several hundred outstanding leaders from all parts of the country.

Many of you are or have been farmers who might never have had a change to become the well-informed individuals with the breadth and depth of knowledge and expecience you now have if it had not been for your cooperative.

This process of distilling leadership qualities and letting the men possessing them rise to positions of greater responsibilities is constantly going on in cooperatives throughout the country. At least 100,000 farmers are directors of cooperatives each year, with new members moving into these positions as the boards change. From this core come many of our best agricultural leaders and spokesmen, men who are better all-around citizens because of their cooperative experience.

Not the least of the cooperative contributions is their bestowal of dignity to the farmer. What man among us doesn't stand straighter if he feels pride in his work, confidence in his acomplishments?

The recent encyclical issued by Pope John XXIII considers this point of dignity. It says, "The right to private property, even of productive goods, also derives from the nature of man. This right, as we have elsewhere declared, is suitable means for safeguarding the dignity of the human person and for the exercise of responsibility in all fields; it strengthens and gives serenity to family life, thereby increasing the peace and prosperity of the state."

Cooperatives are helping safeguard human dignity of our rural communities by helping farmers retain their independent farming enterprise, "their right to private property, even of productive goods," as the encyclical phrases it.

Cooperatives help build better citizens under our system of government, by providing them the means to gain better standards of living, by increasing their knowledge, by encouraging initiative, and by making them feel more assurance of being a recognized and active element of our society.

For these reasons, the Government has for over half a century seen fit to give encouragement and assistance through research and educational programs for farmers and their cooperatives. Moreover, Government has assisted by providing loans to help improve and expand operations, as in the early days of the farm credit system and with the Rural Electric Cooperatives.

Farmers have proved the wisdom of this partnership between Government and agriculture by rapidly repaying the loans as they attained stature and maturity in handling their own businesses.

This is how we view cooperatives and their significant accomplishments in this country, and this is the same view held in many countries abroad. In Scandinavia, other European countries, and in most of the other democratic regions of the world, the right of farmers to own and operate their own farms and to then use cooperatives for needed services is fully recognized.

In other regions, behind the Iron Curtain primarily, almost the exactly opposite view is held of the way agriculture should be employed. Their state or collective farms in those countries are about as far as you could get from our free and independent associations of farmers.

Unfortunately, too many people try to lump our form of cooperatives into the same pot with the Communist collectives, and tar them with that brush. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our cooperatives help preserve independent action; collectives destroy it. Our cooperatives encourage enterprise; collectives stifle enterprise.

Our form of cooperatives are instruments of their owner-users, the farmers. The collectives are tolls of the state.

In all fairness, however, there are less advanced countries today that are finding the government must take a hand in getting cooperatives started. But in most of these areas, the governments are trying to educate the farmers to the stage where they can take more of the responsibility for operating these cooperatives. This idea may not be as far removed from our early cooperative development as we sometimes think. Our own Government gave us a hand in the form of loans, in the form of Government-paid staffs of experts to help farmers, something still in effect, and in giving backing through congressional laws and support.

One other point I should like to make here is that of the importance of cooperatives in combating communism. Where true cooperatives are strong, communism is weak.

Let me cite a few examples. Right after World War II, the rural people in Japan were encouraged to form agricultural, credit, and fishery cooperatives. Today many people say this is one of the prime reasons the rural people stand with us and against communism in that country.

In one area of Italy, communism was gaining strength. American cooperative groups helped the people there get credit for the local cooperatives, with the result that as cooperatives gained in strength, communism was rolled back.

In many of the emerging countries of the world we find keen interest in cooperatives and hope that their use will turn the shape of their agriculture into a pattern that provides for the individuals rights to own and till their own land and to reap a better living from it. The primeval urge to own and cultivate his own land remains strong throughout the agricultural people of the world.

This urge has been a most effective roadblock to the success of communism in many areas.

But if a farmer, wherever he may be, cannot wrest a living from his land, then the danger is still there that he will turn to whoever and whatever seems to promise him better things.

I have just recently returned from Caracas, Venezuela. Here the Americas took another step toward greater use of cooperatives and toward strengthening those already in existence.

I would like again to say that cooperatives long ago proved their worth in this country, and continue to reiterate this worth every day, and that they now are one of the rays of hope to troubled lands in all parts of the globe.

Peace Corps volunteers, staffs of the Agency for International Development, and the other agencies and people moving about abroad bring us reports of the aroused interest in how our cooperatives have helped farmers make this a land of abundance.

The perimeters of our world are shrinking in upon us, and we must do our share of keeping this ray of hope from cooperatives bright, and this in spite of the problems of agriculture and cooperatives still confronting us here.

But we have the heritage, we have the vitality, we have many of the means to solve many of our problems represented in the combined strength in this room.

We may need to change our focus, to redouble our efforts. To see just what you need to do is why you are meeting here this week.

Here and in countless other formal and informal groupings, you are beginning to form your new cooperative future.

I am confident you can exert your united strengths for a better rural America and with your usual generosity to help make a better rural life for many other parts of the world.

Thus, you can surely make progress one of your most important cooperative products.

War Damage Payments to Claimants in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a commentary by Joseph McCaffrey be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTARY BY JOSEPH MCCAFFREY APRIL 30, 1963

Last May 9, the House of Representatives defeated a bill which would have paid $73 million in war damages to claimants in the Philippines. A review of the long, sometimes heated debate shows many reasons for the failure of this bill which had first been requested by the Eisenhower administration and then by the Kennedy administration.

After its defeat, there was a clamor from the press for the passage of the bill. It was, the vigorous editorials declaimed, unfair to the people and the government of a friendly nation.

This editorial clamor helped keep the bill alive. It was brought back to the floor and, on August 1, approved. Both times the bill was floor managed by Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Far East and Pacific Subcommittee. The Senate approved the same bill, with little, very little debate.

Since then a Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigation has revealed that John O'Donnell, who had been a member of the Philippine War Claims Commission, had lobbied for the passage of the bill, without having registered under the Lobby Act, that he stood to gain a 5 percent fee from each of the claimants collecting, and that he had contributed, with funds from Philippine nationals, to several congressional campaigns.

The Senate immediately rushed through a provision that such payments by this country would be made directly to the Philippine Government.

Yet, as ZABLOCKI in a long and detailed House speech pointed out: This action may cost the U.S. Treasury anywhere from $10 to $20 million because much of the $73 million may not have to be paid out. Some of the claimants have already been paid, in part, so this amount would be deducted before the Treasury made its individual payments. Not only that but by now some of the claimants are dead and some cannot be found, reducing the amount payable even more.

But now, acting in haste, the Senate wants the full amount paid to the Philippine Government. This will cost the taxpayers an unnecessary $10 million at least, perhaps as much as $20 million.

ZABLOCKI, sticking by his guns, has asked the House to pay the claimants individually and bar any of this money from being paid to any former commissioner or employee of the War Damage Commission for lobbying fees.

No one who has followed this legislation or knows the members involved on the list of O'Donnell contributions has any reason—any reason at all—to believe anyone was bought on this legislation.

There is no need for the Senate, or the House for that matter, to panic because of criticism from some of the same editorial writers who originally demanded approval of the legislation. Acting in panic will cost the taxpayers at $10 million—perhaps $20 million.

This, it would seem, is too high a cost for purification.

Hydrofoil Commuter Service for New York Metropolitan Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently New York City witnessed the premiere of a new transportation concept. American Hydrofoil Lines, Inc., presented the hydrofoil, a 24-passenger boat capable of cruising at 32 miles an hour. The company has announced its intention to start commuter service with five boats between Manhattan and New York City suburbs on July 1.

While the hydrofoil will not, in and of itself, solve the myriad transportation problems of the metropolitan area, it does suggest one solution that, up to the present time, has not been fully explored. The development of high speed commuter service on the waterways should be fully examined to ascertain its benefit for urban commuters.

Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1963, contained an article relating to hydrofoil developments that should be of interest to all concerned with commuter problems and transportation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYDROFOIL COMMUTING PLANNED FOR NEW YORK, PERHAPS OTHER AREAS—LINE TRIES 24-PASSENGER BOAT IN HUDSON; COAST GUARD MAY APPROVE NEW JERSEY SERVICE

(By Richard P. Cooke)

NEW YORK.—A 33-foot, green and white boat that resembles a bus pulls out of its slip at the New York City Marina in Manhattan at 79th Street and heads down the Hudson River. As it picks up speed its hull rises out of the water and in a matter of seconds the craft is skimming along the surface on a pair of ski-like hydrofoils.

After a smooth, comfortable ride, passengers are deposited at a pier at the Battery on Manhattan's southern tip, about 7 miles away. The trip has taken 15 minutes, much faster than by taxi and no slower than by subway.

The 24-passenger vessel, named the *Albatross*, is the first of a fleet of five such craft with which a newly formed corporation, American Hydrofoil Lines, Inc., of New York, plans to start regular commuting service in the New York metropolitan area in July. If all goes well, American Hydrofoil expects to build its fleet to 35 vessels and extend service to the Boston, Philadelphia, Great Lakes, and Florida areas.

Though the hydrofoil concept is not new, the *Albatross* is the first such vessel to win clearance from the U.S. Coast Guard to go into passenger service. Earlier and larger craft built by Boeing Co. and Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. are being tested for military applications. The *Albatross* and its sister vessels of the American Hydrofoil fleet, however, will not long have exclusive claim to serving New York commuters by water. At least two other hydrofoil runs in the area are planned and probably will be in operation before 1963 is out.

TESTS ON SECOND VESSEL

Trial runs are scheduled next month on a 24-passenger hydrofoil built by Marine Systems Corp., of Florida, for North American Hydrofoils, Inc., headed by Chicago sailmaker Harry Nye. When this ship is approved by the Coast Guard, it is slated to go into service between Manhattan and Atlantic Highlands, N.J. The 20-mile run will take less than half an hour, or about an hour faster than competing bus and train service. In 1964, North American plans to ferry people from Manhattan to the World's Fair site at the edge of Flushing Bay.

Builder Harry Sudakoff, partner in the firm of Chutick and Sudakoff, says he is negotiating for a hydrofoil vessel to operate between Manhattan and Cryder House, a 20-story luxury apartment building he is erecting on the Queens shore near the Throgs Neck Bridge. Mr. Sudakoff estimates the trip will take about 20 minutes, or half as long as by bus or car. He plans to lease a vessel of about the same size as the *Albatross*.

Why the big push into hydrofoil commuting? "We believe the waterways around New York have never been properly exploited to help break the commuting traffic jam," says Ira E. Dowd, president of American Hydrofoil Lines. Mr. Dowd has operated ferry services using conventional craft between Los Angeles and Catalina Island.

LEAVES LITTLE WAKE

The hydrofoil is uniquely suited for commuting. In operation—or flying, as hydrofoil men call it when the hull has risen out of water—the craft leaves little wake. Thus it can operate in rivers and harbors where large or fast boats of conventional design would leave a destructive wake.

Hydrofoils also can achieve substantial fuel and operating economies over other boats, chiefly because it takes less power to propel them since friction between moving boat and water is at a minimum.

Greater speed is another advantage. The *Albatross* can cruise at about 30 miles an hour and reach speeds of 40. Later boats will be able to do even better. The vessel being built by Marine Systems for North American Hydrofoil is rated at a top speed of 50 miles an hour. Grumman has exceeded 70 with its *Denison*, a 90-ton vessel sponsored by the Maritime Administration and now in use by the Navy. In addition to an antisubmarine hydrofoil it built for the Navy, Boeing is testing and constructing several other hydrofoils, including an experimental craft that can reach 100 miles an hour.

Mr. Dowd acknowledges that American Hydrofoil expects to run into snags with its commuter boats. Ice, for instance, might interfere with service during the winter, but he believes that in average winters service would not be interrupted for too long.

Another problem may be price. American Hydrofoil's five vessels, being built by Wilson Shipyard of Wilmington, Del., a subsidiary of City Investing Co., will cost $75,000 each. Mr. Dowd has not announced which communities he intends to serve but he has investigated prospects for operating between such points as New Rochelle, N.Y., Port Washington and Great Neck on Long Island, and Manhattan piers at 63d Street, 23d Street, and the Battery. Mr. Dowd estimates the round-trip commuter fare between Port Washington and Manhattan, a distance of about 20 miles, would be $4. This is considerably more than the round-trip train fare of about $1.50 for commuters, but Mr. Dowd believes it is cheaper than by car, if bridge and tunnel tolls, wear and tear, gasoline and parking fees in Manhattan are considered.

Hydrofoil commuting may soon get an important ally—the State of New York. Gov. Rockefeller some months ago ordered a study of the practicality of linking communities on opposite sides of Long Island Sound by hydrofoil ferries. The report on this study, conducted by the engineering firm of Coverdale & Colpitts, is about ready, though it has not been made public yet.

The use of hydrofoil craft probably will be somewhat limited in the immediate future. William Carl, who heads hydrofoil operations for Grumman, believes that much testing in rough waters under varying conditions will be necessary before high-speed sea-going hydrofoils are perfected. But for the relatively smooth waters of Long Island Sound and the rivers and harbors around New York, present hydrofoil designs are adequate.

A ride in the *Albatross* discloses some of the impressions in store for pioneer hydrofoil commuters. On the trip between 79th Street and the Battery, the helmsman slowed the vessel occasionally when large swells from passing boats were encountered. There was some lateral motion as the moving hydrofoil was hit by the swells, but it was less noticeable than in pleasure power boats of conventional design. When the *Albatross* is moving slowly and its hull is in the water, the foils, jutting outward, give the boat unusual stability.

The seats are comfortable, similar to those on a bus. The noise level in the cabin is somewhat lower than that in a helicopter, but still much greater than that on a train or bus. Mr. Dowd says ships now being built will have more soundproofing than the *Albatross*.

John C. "Red" Morgan—Medal of Honor Recipient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor are to be honored tonight at a White House reception. As a new expression of the Nation's gratitude to them comes from the highest level of our Government, let us all pause a moment to recall their contribution. In the relentless press of prosecuting the hot-and-cold battle against Communist tyranny, we must never forget these heroes and their millions of unsung comrades whose sacrifices helped to vanquish past enemies of our freedom.

One of these men to be honored at the White House tonight grew to manhood in the principal city of the district I represent, Amarillo, Tex. He is John C. "Red" Morgan, now of Littleton, Colo., whose mother, Mrs. S. A. L. Morgan, and sister, Mrs. David Rasco, still live in Amarillo. Colonel Morgan is well remembered; to a younger generation in the Texas Panhandle, he symbolizes the heroic heights to which Americans can rise when the Nation is endangered.

On July 28, 1943, Flight Officer Morgan was the copilot of a B-17 bomber heavily damaged by an attack of enemy fighters while enroute to a target in Germany. The pilot was fatally wounded. Most other members of the crew were either wounded or rendered unconscious by lack of oxygen. With one hand, "Red" Morgan held the deliriously wounded pilot away from the controls while, with the other hand, he guided the damaged plane through a tortuous 2-hour flight to the successful completion of its mission and return to its base in England. "For conspicuous gallentry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty," "Red" Morgan was awarded the Medal of Honor. Less than a year later, his plane was shot down on a raid over Berlin and he was held prisoner to the end of the war. Today, Colonel Morgan is a legend in the Texas Panhandle—and I am most proud that he and other men of courage are being honored by our President tonight.

Boy Scouts and the World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Moses, president of New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at a Boy Scout luncheon in New York City on April 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOY SCOUTS AND THE WORLD'S FAIR

(Remarks of Robert Moses, president of New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at the Boy Scout lunch-o-ree, Grand Ballroom, Waldorf-Astoria, Wednesday, April 17, 1963)

We recently sent a message to the New York Mirror Annual Youth Forum. Some of what we said about the fair applies also to the Boy Scouts of America.

The fair is dedicated to man's achievements on a shrinking globe in an expanding universe, his inventions, discoveries, arts, skills, and aspirations. We aim at an Olympics of progress open to all on equal terms at which friendships will be formed and peace promoted through mutual understanding.

You may say that these are mere words, clichés, exercises in semantics, gestures, slogans, echoing the obvious. Every college shield prays for truth and light, and youth is constantly being told to burn with a cold and gemlike flame. Nevertheless, we must have purposes and they must be clothed in words, however, inadequate. It is only the implementation that counts.

What then are we doing to translate words into deeds; to build above the deep intent, to strike the blow? Let me tell you briefly: Our New York World's Fair will be a genuine international exposition, bringing to the very heart of New York City not only the finest products of our domestic arts and industries, but those of other nations which are designing and building pavilions where they will present the image they wish to impress upon a shrinking globe. We promise an Olympic atmosphere. We offer honest competition in the best traditions of sportsmanship. Here you will find more friendliness than protocol and more track suits than striped trousers.

Why should we of my generation appeal to you? It is because, as the Great Apostle said, you are strong. We may become wise, durable and stubborn, but strength is only for the young. It is one of the curses of my contemporaries never to have examined thoroughly the alternatives of war, of which healthy competition involving all the world's talents is an Olympic competition of industry, science, and arts is surely the most promising.

It is most fitting that the Boy Scouts of America should have a post of prominence in the World's Fair representing the youth of the Nation. As in the New York World's Fair of 1939 and 1940, the Boy Scouts of America will operate a Scout Service Corps of boys and leaders. This will be a valuable training experience for more than 2,000 topflight young men from every part of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In the New York World's Fair 1964–65, the Boy Scouts of America will be unofficial ambassadors for the youth of the world, greeting international visitors, and becoming a part of the various ceremonies welcoming young and old alike, arriving from the hinterlands and abroad to see the wonders of our great city and the fair.

We have made available for the use of the Boy Scouts of America under the leadership of Charles B. McCabe, chairman of Scouting's World's Fair Committee, a half-acre tract of exhibit space for the purpose of presenting their program to the fair's millions. Special Scout days for region 2, New York and New Jersey, have been set for June 13, 1964 and June 12, 1965.

July 13 through July 16, 1964 and July 24 through July 26, 1964, have been declared to be Jamboree Boy Scout Week by the fair. This is the period immediately in advance of and following the great national jamboree gatherings of 50,000 boys at Valley Forge. Your Scout officials expect that a high proportion of those coming for the jamboree will include a visit to the fair and New York City.

We have statistics on the Seattle Fair—not only the number of visitors by hours and days, but all sorts of interesting stuff as to their origin, by what means they came, what exhibits they patronized, individually and in families and groups, how much and where they ate, and so forth, all of which we shall translate into the terminology of Flushing Meadow, N.Y., 1964–65. We have a similar report on the New York Fair of 1939–40. Brussels tells us less because European conditions are so different.

We expect more than 70 million visitors in 2 seasons and they must be attracted, accommodated in town and nearby, moved in and out, parked, circulated, magnetized, separated, and classified in a dozen ways. But in the end the exhibits, shows, concessions, foreign, domestic, industrial, entertainment, cultural, and welcome we give, the atmosphere of friendship we create, the reputation, gossip and mystery we establish in the public mind through every medium of communication, are the things that count. Meanwhile the working days left for construction and installation become fewer and the opening days looms up more and more menacingly.

We already have enough exhibits to justify circus superlatives. A few foreign nations, States, and industries whose absence will be conspicuous will not affect the total attendance or financial success of the fair. Perhaps these initial absentees will be asking for space for the second season, but by then the vacant sites will have been sown to grass and planted with shrubs and trees as greenery, shade, and rest for tired eyes and sagging arches, and pleasant spots for relaxation. We now need landscaping more than additional pavilions.

We had a World's Fair at Flushing Meadow in 1939–40, and at the end the beginning of a great park. That park will be completed after 1965 and will remain as a living memento of the exposition. And so the 1964–65 fair will not, to paraphrase "The Tempest," fade like a insubstantial pageant, leaving not a rack behind it, but will rise again with trees, shrubs, and water courses and a few permanent buildings to serve a growing community. Visitors to the fair will contribute more than their presence and dollars, and receive more than education and amusement. They will have the satisfatcion of promoting world friendship and peace.

Praise for Junior Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the American Weekly and Jantos Airways are joint sponsors of a contest among the newspaper boys of the Hearst newspapers throughout the country, known as the Junior Diplomat's contest for newspaper boys from 12 to 17½ years old to be given a good will and educational trip to Australia.

The boys selected will act as Junior Diplomats from our country to Australia.

The winners of the various Hearst papers throughout the country will assemble in and depart from New York City on July 1, 1963, leaving for Australia, stopping at Hawaii, in Nandi in the Fiji Islands, and arriving at Sydney, Australia on July 3, 1963, remaining in Australia until July 10 and returning to the United States and arriving in New York City on July 11, 1963.

In Boston the contest will be conducted by the Boston Record American and Advertiser, the Hearst newspapers in Boston with two of the Hearst newspaper boys from Greater Boston being selected to join with the others selected by other Hearst newspapers throughout the country.

The sponsors of this project are to be congratulated. This project is a constructive one.

The interest in this project is great and the competition among the eligible newsboys keen and active. The committee in various cities making the selection of the winners are outstanding citizens and educators.

For example, in Boston, the committee is Rev. Father Albert W. Law, superintendent of the archdiocese of Boston parochial school system; Dr. Dennis C. Haley, president of Suffolk University, and Dr. Frederick J. Gillis, superintendent of the Public Schools of Boston.

The boys selected will in sense be junior diplomats, ambassadors of good will, and will make a most favorable impression upon the people of Australia.

In my remarks, I include an article written by Tommy Shulman, appearing in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of April 21, 1963, which includes a recorded statement made by me, and also a commendatory resolution adopted by the Boston School Committee.

This fine action on the part of the Hearst organization might prompt other newspapers and organizations to conclude a similar project or competition for trips by American boys to other countries.

The material follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Advertiser, Apr. 21, 1963]

McCORMACK PRAISES JUNIOR DIPLOMATS

(By Tommy Shulman)

JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., has sent his congratulations to the Record American and Sunday Advertiser and Qantas Airlines on the up-and-coming Junior Diplomats trip to Australia.

In a recorded message, featured on the "Newspaperboys' Radio Show," Sunday morning, at 9:30, over radio station WEZE, McCORMACK said:

"It is a great pleasure for me to extend congratulations to the Hearst newspapers, the Boston Record American, and Sunday Advertiser and the Qantas Airlines for offering a program which will give boys 12 to 17½ years of age an opportunity to enjoy all-expense-paid Qantas V-Jet holiday trips to Australia in July.

"The Junior Diplomat trip and the entire program are the most wholesome, educational, and stimulating of youth activities.

"I am quite familiar with the Record American and Sunday Advertiser newspaperboys Sunday morning radio show over WEZE, for I have appeared as a guest on several occasions and have enjoyed the talent of the young salesmen. It was also my privilege to call to the attention of Congress this youth building project and I am happy to say that my comments were written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I understand that the radio show is now observing its 25th year of broadcasting and I extend my heartiest best wishes for many more years of radio broadcasting.

"The world today is looking toward youth for ultimate leadership and the Junior Diplomats of today will be the senior statesmen of tomorrow.

"I congratulate the Hearst newspapers, the Record American and Sunday Advertiser for this wonderful project, which will mean so much in creating good will, not only between the people of America but the youth of America and the people and particularly the youth of Australia."

Newspaperboys David Humphrey, Joseph Saporito, Richard Murphy, Robert Baratta, and John Jones had their Junior Diplomats contest brochures autographed by McCORMACK and then presented their guest with an honorary membership card in the Newspaperboys Club.

[From the Boston Record American, Apr. 16, 1963]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the security of our country depends, in great measure, upon maintaining cordial relations with friendly nations throughout the world; and

Whereas the Hearst Corp. and the Qantas Airways have seen fit to promote the spirit of good will between our country and the Commonwealth of Australia: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Boston School Committee commends the Boston Record American, the Sunday Advertiser, the American Weekly, and Qantas Airways for their joint sponsorship of a contest among the newspaper boys of the Hearst newspapers which will allow two boys to be junior ambassadors of good will on a 2-week trip to the Commonwealth of Australia. This undertaking will be of great educational value to the winners of the contest and, through the exchange of ideas, will help to continue the already happy relationship we enjoy with that great nation down under; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be inscribed on the permanent records of the Boston School Committee and that a copy be sent to the Hearst Corp. and the Qantas Airways.

National Merit Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have 13 students from high schools in my district who were awarded national merit scholarships last week. So many awards from a comparatively small area in relation to the entire country is, I think, indicative of the high quality academic training young people are being given in the schools of suburban Minneapolis.

The names and schools of the qualifying students are listed in the following editorial from the April 28 Sunday Suburban Life:

CONGRATULATIONS

Kids in the suburbs seem to get brighter every year. This year, for example, 13 suburban high school seniors earned national merit scholarships in competition with youngsters around the country.

A few came from private or parochial schools, but most were the products of Lake conference schools—Edina, Minnetonka, Robbinsdale, St. Louis Park, Bloomington, Wayzata—where the level of excellence in teaching and administration reaches a statewide peak.

Congratulations to these smart students and the schools which spawned them:

Karen Anderson, Bloomington High School.

Margaret Thompson, Edina-Morningside High School.
Kathleen Burke, Robbinsdale High School.
John Formo, Edina-Morningside High School.
James Foster, of Robbinsdale High School.
Michael Jacobson, of Robbinsdale High School.
Robert Lowry, of Blake School, Hopkins.
Robert Hanson of Robbinsdale High School.
John Ladd of Benilde High School.
Sheldon Shaeffer of St. Louis Park High School.
Richard Black of Minnetonka High School.
Stuart Mitchell, of Wayzata High School.
Gary Sundem, of Wayzata High School.

Government Subcontractor Gouges $2.6 Million in Excessive Profits on Alaskan Communications Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, time after time, the Comptroller General has reported to the Congress on situations wherein a combination of fraud, illegality, irresponsibility, and negligence in the administration of Government contracts, has resulted in the loss of millions of tax dollars.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House, to another glaring example of the appalling maladministration, inefficiency and collusion that exists in this field.

In his report to the Congress on April 24, the Comptroller General disclosed that the Morris-Knudsen Co., of Boise, Idaho, made more than $2.6 million in excess profits on a Department of the Air Force subcontract.

In November of 1955, the Air Force awarded a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract to Western Electric Co. for the construction of a communications system in Alaska known as the White Alice system.

Western Electric awarded a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee subcontract to Morris-Knudsen for the construction of the necessary communication stations. After one contract revision, the estimated cost to Morris-Knudsen was placed at $48,244,-351, with a fixed fee of $1,224,974.

Western Electric advised the General Accounting Office that its selection of Morris-Knudsen as the subcontractor was based largely on the fact that Morris-Knudsen was the only construction company in Alaska with sufficient equipment to accomplish such large-scale construction.

Morris-Knudsen represented to Western Electric that the fixed rental rates proposed for the equipment it would furnish and operate to construct the White Alice stations under this subcontract would provide only sufficient revenues to balance Morris-Knudsen's equipment ownership expenses.

The Comptroller General charges, however, that at the time the contract was negotiated, Morris-Knudsen should have known that its rental rates were providing, and would continue to provide, revenues far in excess of related ownership expenses.

When, by subsequent amendments to the subcontract, equipment usage was extended far beyond the time period covered by the rental rates for full recovery of ownership expenses, Western Electric again failed to negotiate a reduction in rental rates.

It should have been readily apparent to Western Electric that the continued application of established rental rates for such an increase in equipment usage would provide for more revenue than Morris-Knudsen needed to balance its ownership expenses.

The GAO found no evidence whatever that Western Electric requested any adjustment in rental rates even though it had the contractual right to do so. Western Electric failed, therefore, to properly discharge its responsibilities as a prime contractor to the Government.

The use of rental rates that were excessive at the time they were established and the failure to adjust those rates when the subcontractor was amended has resulted in excess costs to the Government in the form of equipment rental profits to Morris-Knudsen, of at least $2.6 million.

Mr. Speaker, this unjust profit is more than twice the fixed fee Morris-Knudsen agreed to accept as complete compensation for its work and services.

Morris-Knudsen falsely represented to Western Electric and the Air Force that the equipment rental rates were only sufficient to cover their expenses. Morris-Knudsen's own records disclosed that the application of the rental policies and rental rates negotiated for the While Alice project had resulted in excessive profits to Morris-Knudsen.

The GAO revealed that the Air Force has instructed Western Electric to seek recovery of these excess profits from Morris-Knudsen.

In his report, the Comptroller General stated that—

> It is unreasonable and unjust for Morris-Knudsen to retain, at the expense of the Government, an excess of rental revenues over ownership expenses far beyond the intent of the parties.

The Comptroller General further cited Western Electric for its failure to appropriately protect the Government's interests when—

First. Western Electric did not avail itself of its contractual right to negotiate an equitable adjustment of the rental rates at the time the subcontract was amended; and

Second. Western Electric recommended a settlement of all rental claims against Morris-Knudsen in an amount far below the excess rental revenue Morris-Knudsen had realized under this subcontract.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that collusion, connivance, and civil and criminal conspiracy flourishes in large segments of our governmental contract awards.

Incompetence, maladministration, malfeasance, and misfeasance of office exists in too many of our Federal procurement contracts.

I trust that the Air Force will make every effort not only to recover the excess profits which have inured to Morris-Knudsen, but also to take adequate measures to discipline those U.S. officials and employees who are responsible for this substantial loss to the U.S. Government.

A Toast to Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech delivered by Mr. Thomas R. Reid of the Ford Motor Co., during the Michigan congressional dinner in Washington on April 30, 1963. It is an interesting summary about our great State and I hope other Members of the House will find an opportunity to read it.

The speech follows:

A TOAST TO MICHIGAN

All of us here tonight have in common only this: We are citizens of the same great State. To propose a toast in her honor is not so simple a matter as asking you to drink to the health of the President, or, in other lands, to the health of the Queen.

Nor can I offer mere words to which I ask you to raise your glasses.

Our State is too vast, too varied, too complex, too fervently alive for her meaning to be the same for each one of us. I cannot hope to catch all facets of her greatness.

But I am sure that our toast must include the physical grandeur of these pleasant peninsulas: bordered by four of the Great Lakes, we lie within and along the greatest body of fresh water in the world. Our water wonderland contains over 11,000 inland lakes and 19 million acres of forests, including 6 million in State and national forests. With almost 3,300 miles, our shoreline is as long as the Nation's Atlantic coast and longer than its Pacific coast. The combined length of our rivers and streams would reach almost one and a half times around the Equator. In all of this vastness are scenes of breathtaking beauty—the Lake of the Clouds in the Porcupine Mountains, the Tahquamenon (Tah-quah-men-on) Falls on the river which Longfellow immortalized as the Golden Stream in his song of Hiawatha, the pictured rocks near Munising, the 5-mile-long Mackinac Bridge, soaring 46 stories high above the water to unite the peninsulas.

We must include in our toast one of the most magnificent transportation systems of any State. Blessed with unequalled water transportation routes, we have 19 Great Lakes ports handling a million or more tons of shipping each year. The Detroit River is the busiest waterway in the world, and the Soo Locks rank next, carrying more tonnage than the Panama, Suez, and Kiev Canals combined.

By pushing forward our network of divided, limited access highways, more than a thousand miles of them, we are making our State ever safer and more accessible for the motorist.

Let us toast our State also as a playground. Its 18,000 miles of trout streams account for the issuance of more than 900,000 fishing

licenses per year. The deer herd of some 600,000 animals accounts in part for the more than a million hunting licenses issued annually. We have more winter sports centers than any other State. One of our tourist attractions, Greenfield Village, draws more than a million visitors annually.

Let us include in our toast our natural resources—the largest commercial deposit of native copper in the world, mined first by some unknown people 3,800 years ago. We have the world's largest underground iron mine, the world's greatest limestone quarry, and salt deposits estimated over 70 trillion tons. Our farmers gross $770 million a year, making agriculture our second largest industry. With all this, we still have business, industry, and labor to include in our toast, for our State symbolizes to the world the magic, the power of mass production. I know of no other pool of labor skills and management know-how to match that available in Michigan. We headquarter one of the largest and finest labor unions of the free world—the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

Nor is all this mostly a matter of automobile production, though our State has over 38 percent of the Nation's employees in this industry. We rank first, to mention only some of our products, in cereal preparation, public building furniture, paper coating and glazings, non-ferrous castings, gray iron foundry products, jigs, tools, dies, patterns, and many more.

The State we toast is an unmatched combination of industrial empire, recreation paradise, and diversified agriculture. But we drink to even more than this. Our State is a leader in science, education, and research. We stand first in per capita support of higher education. Our 74 institutions of higher education include the world's largest Catholic university and 23 denominational colleges. Our spiritual traditions stretch back to the establishment of St. Anne's by Antoine Cadillac in 1701, the second oldest continuously maintained parish in the United States.

Let us toast also the Michigan of culture and the arts. We offer the Nation one of its most beautiful and well-equipped legitimate theaters—the new Fisher. Distinguished repertory theater has long had a place in the Wolverine State. We welcome annually the Metropolitan Opera, the great ballet companies of the world, and the greatest musicians, poets, and actors. We house Cranbrook Institute, and the National Music Camp in the Virgin Pines at Interlochen. Our museums include the Detroit Institute of Arts, the only such institute in any of the world's large cities owned by the people.

We toast the Michigan of the past, first visited by Etienne Brule 2 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, and first settled at Sault Sainte Marie in 1668. The French, Spanish, English, and American flags have flown above our soil. Admitted as a state only in 1837, we mustered more than 90,000 men, from a population of less than 750,000, for the war that was raging outside this city 100 years ago today. And 100 years ago this year, Henry Ford was born in a farmhouse near what is now Dearborn.

The outlines of something of the on-rushing future are clear enough that we can include in our toast the Michigan of the future—

The Michigan which has two atomic power plants;

The Michigan which hopefully, will host the 1968 Olympic Games;

The Michigan which may host the 1964 National Conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties;

The Michigan of the new Soo International Bridge soon to be dedicated; and

The Michigan we know will ring with the hammering out of still newer projects and programs, the shape of which we can't conceive today.

But when you drink to our State, I ask you to drink to what she means to you. I have not touched on the essence of her meaning to me. Of all her glories, what strikes me as her greatest pride is the quality of her men and women. Not just the great names of the past, but the citizens of today busying themselves in countless constructive undertakings with what I can only call Michigan zest and enthusiasm. I will drink to their dedication and their wonderful quality of fervor in purposeful endeavor of every kind.

Ladies and gentlemen, I give you Michigan.

Key to Livelier GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, the New York Herald Tribune published in its columns a letter from Mr. Lindsay, of New York, which I believe is of interest to Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter in the RECORD:

THE KEY TO A LIVELIER GOP

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

In Washington the Republican Party is united, if not comforted, by the constant reminder that it is a minority and out. In the States and communities across the Nation there gathers, with increasing momentum, a sense of unity based partly on dissatisfaction with the ins, and partly on a positive wish to govern and to demonstrate capacity to govern. There is concern over the administration's barrenness of ideas and thinness of production, and uneasiness over organized arrogance in high places. There is also the stirring of hope for real leadership in the Grand Old Party.

The future of the Republican Party depends on whether it really wishes to be the majority instead of the minority and demonstrates why. Government means programs, because government, like all affairs of men and nations, constantly is in change. What kind of government will the Republican Party offer? This depends upon its willingness to draw from its roots and learn from history.

The Republican Party was born in a log cabin in a simple and lovely American town. It was nourished and grew strong in the ruggedness of green, uncut country. It came to the crowded cities and awakened and inspired the new millions. These millions found in Abraham Lincoln the pride of personal identity and the inspiration of the offer of selfless service. To Lincoln the people were the only proper repositories of power, and the people sensed this in him. To many, this was their definition of freedom. They understood that Lincoln would give leadership, and he did—unshakable, powerful leadership—but they felt in him also a pervading sense that power cannot be taken by any political leader to be used as a sledgehammer in order to achieve a result.

The Republican Party must take on the special task of defining the role of the individual in the midst of the part-garrison, part-welfare state. It must establish guideposts for unfettered individual betterment, and open avenues for the pursuit of individual excellence.

The liberties we must protect include the right to speak freely and to be critical, to associate with anyone or any group, to travel, to take up unpopular causes, to be unafraid of "the possible tyranny of the majority" and to avoid the frustration and pettiness of weighty bureaucracy.

The Republican Party must demonstrate that a concentration of central power through a government-dominated industrial-military complex is just as limiting to steady economic growth and to individual freedoms as are all other undue power concentrations. It must argue that the proper role of Government is to create the framework around which free, nongovernment economic, social, and cultural institutions may flourish.

The Republican Party must understand also that safeguarding of individual worth includes the creation or maintaining of basic conditions of living that will not permit any person, who cannot help himself, to live below a minimum standard of decency in a civilized nation. And, finally, Republicans must attune themselves to world affairs with a far greater awareness and maturity than any party or President has done or is doing.

The Democratic Party is often demonstrated to be collections of factions and warring groups. It is a strange coalition of opposites. It happily at one and the same time embraces anticivil rights interests in some areas and antiindividual big city machine interests in other areas. In both cases the dignity and worth of the individual long since ceased to have any real meaning. For the most part, the Democratic Party is the very opposite of Lincolnian philosophy. Lincoln foreswore both power for its own sake and motion for its own sake. When he used Presidential power aggressively and bluntly he publicly acknowledged regret at having to do so.

The Republican Party should find common cause in its roots. It should reject the antiindividual, antilibertarian forces that stem from every organized power group, whether that power group be the Central Government, the industrial-military complex, the big city machine or the local constabulary.

The Republican Party should adjust the framework of the Government, Central and local, according to individual needs and strict priorities of importance within the bounds of power and money which the people are willing to give to Government.

JOHN V. LINDSAY.

Arthur Greenwood

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words of tribute to this distinguished Indianian—Arthur Greenwood—who so ably served in the House of Representatives.

I did not serve in the House with Arthur Greenwood, but I came to know him after he moved to Florida and I developed a great respect and affection for him. I had the opportunity to visit with him frequently when he came back to Washington and was such a welcome guest here in the House Chamber with us.

He was a great American and he never lost his keen interest in and affection for the House of Representatives, where he was so well loved and respected.

All of us will miss Arthur Greenwood, and I join you in extending to his family my sincere sympathy.

The 75th Anniversary of the International Association of Machinists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 5, 1963, is a day of special significance to nearly 1 million families throughout the United States and Canada. These families will celebrate the 75th anniversary of the Inernational Association of Machinists, one of the continent's largest and most active trade unions.

We in the State of Georgia take special pride in the growth and the success of the International Association of Machinists. It was in our State, in the city of Atlanta, that the IAM was founded 75 years ago.

To commemorate the birth of this great organization, the Honorable Ivan Allen Jr., mayor of Atlanta, has issued the following proclamation:

Whereas the International Association of Machinists was founded in Atlanta, Ga., on May 5, 1888; and

Whereas the International Association of Machinists has always been guided by principles of honesty and integrity exemplified by its founder and first president, Tom Talbot, whose monument stands in Atlanta's Grant Park; and

Whereas the IAM began on the railroads like the city of Atlanta itself, and has grown to a membership of nearly 1 million in the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the membership of the IAM includes thousands upon thousands of the most skilled employees in vital and essential industries, who are esteemed citizens who contribute much to Atlanta's economy and progress: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Proclaimed, That as mayor of the city in which the International Association of Machinists was born and in fitting tribute and commemoration of the role its members have played in the progress and security of all America, that Sunday, May 5, 1963, marking the IAM's 75th anniversary, be and is hereby proclaimed Machinists Day in Atlanta.

The Honorable Carl E. Sanders, Governor of Georgia, also has proclaimed May 5, 1963, as Machinists Day throughout Georgia. Other governors and mayors throughout the United States have issued similar proclamations to honor the IAM.

The IAM was started at a meeting of 19 machinists. They gathered in a locomotive pit on what is now the property of the Southern Railroad in Atlanta. The date was May 5, 1888.

Despite its modest beginning, the IAM survived and grew to become one of the Nation's outstanding labor organizations, with nearly 2,000 locals operating in all 50 States and in the 10 Provinces of Canada.

The IAM now has a volunteer officer corps of more than 20,000 and full-time staffers of 840. It has regional offices in Seattle, Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Ottawa, Canada, and Atlanta. It owns its own 10-story headquarters building in Washington, D.C.

Sunday night, in Washington, President Kennedy will head a list of notables at the union's birthday party. It is safe to say that those 19 machinists who gathered in 1888 would be proud to know what has happened to their union.

I congratulate the International Association of Machinists and its members everywhere. In the years ahead, I know the members of this organization will continue to work for a stronger and better America.

Ten Years of Red Conquests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, ever since World War II, international communism has marched steadily onward, always encroaching on more and more territory which formerly belonged to the free world nations. Their policy is a simple one, but one which we in the free world cannot seem to understand: what is theirs is theirs, and what is ours they either seize forcibly or negotiate away from us. They move as fast as possible, as slow as necessary. Time i no factor so long as they're always moving forward, even if at a snail's pace. The Communists, as in Cuba last fall, are willing to take one step backward only to later take two steps forward.

Mr. David Lawrence has been viewing and commenting on history as it happens since 1910, when he first came to Washington with the Associated Press. He very pointedly asks, in the following Washington Star column of April 30, just how long it will take at this rate before the Communist world wears out our will to resist:

TEN YEARS OF RED CONQUESTS—ADVANCES CALLED PART OF WORLD-CONTROL PLAN THAT MIGHT TAKE 50 YEARS

(By David Lawrence)

Ten years is just a moment in history—at least it looks that way to the Soviet Government, which has used up a whole decade to carry on a series of aggressions in different parts of the world.

The Communists in 1945 grabbed seven independent countries in Eastern Europe and half of Korea. They are still striving to get the other half. In 1953 they began to get control of North Vietnam and now 10 years later they are in the process of taking over South Vietnam as well as Laos. They have their eyes on the Middle East and North Africa. They have a foothold today in Cuba and are driving to establish similar bases in important countries in Central and South America.

Meanwhile, the West is disunited. Its quaking officials cry out, "Who wants a big war?" So they continue to "negotiate" for the peace that never comes.

It was in the year 1953, after the Korean armistice had been signed in July, that the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, said in a public speech to the American Legion convention:

"A single Chinese Communist aggressive front extends from Korea on the north to Indochina in the south. * * * In Indochina a desperate struggle is in its eighth year. The outcome affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific, and we are already contributing largely in material and money to the combined efforts of the French and of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. * * *

"Communist China has been and now is training, equipping and supplying the Communist forces in Indochina."

On December 29, 1953, this writer pointed out that the aggression had come in Indochina, which had been cut in two by a drive of the Communists, begun on Christmas Day.

By the spring of 1954, the Western powers had agreed to a conference at Geneva to discuss the unification of Korea as well as the Indochina problem. This correspondent went to Geneva to cover that conference.

"Peace," said Secretary of State Dulles at the opening of the conference on April 28, "is always easy to achieve—by surrender. Unity is also easy to achieve—by surrender. The hard task, the task that confronts us, is to combine peace and unity with freedom."

It became obvious that France was not willing to internationalize the war over Indochina. The United States was naturally reluctant to do the job by itself. This correspondent wrote in July 1954:

"So now, with Red China in the process of virtually annexing North Korea in defiance of the U.N. resolution declaring her an aggressor and with a virtual annexation of the rich areas of Indochina, the Communist coalition is advancing to its biggest triumph. * * * It is an hour of great tragedy for the free world."

In that same year, on September 10, this correspondent wrote:

"Predictions were widely published in the press by realistic observers that, after the armistice (Korea) was signed, the military energies of the Communists would be turned toward Indo-China. Solemn warnings were issued by the U.S. Government that this must not be permitted to go unchallenged if it happened.

"But the Communists disregarded all warnings and stepped up the war in Indo-China. The French and British Governments favored appeasement and left America isolated. When the Indo-China armistice was signed, there was another wave of satisfaction expressed by the pollyanna spokesmen of governments that at last the world was going to see an end of fighting. * * *

"But the Communists haven't stopped fighting. They now have started another war—this time against Formosa.

"Again there is a disposition throughout the free world to minimize it as just a few raids in and around a few small islands."

Since those days, the situation in Formosa has periodically quieted down. Some American military forces are, however, still bogged down in the area and cannot leave it. Substantial numbers of American Armed Forces are at the moment being concentrated in Southeast Asia. The Soviet game is to keep U.S. military strength scattered all over the world. The setting up of a military base in Cuba was designed to publicize the threat to Latin America, which in turn will require a

large concentration of America's Armed Forces in that part of the world, too.

The 1963 negotiations in Geneva with the Soviet Government are really meaningless, as are the talks between Averell Harriman and Premier Khrushchev at Moscow. The Soviets are not interested in seeing any agreements made or maintained. They keep on talking about agreement "in principle," but they do about as they please in violating pledges.

The weakness of the British and French in handling the Indochina problem has left a legacy of trouble for the free world. It has since become the financial and military responsibility of the United States to take care of Southeast Asia. Already at least 80 Americans have lost their lives in the fighting around Laos and South Vietnam. The Eisenhower administration was severely criticized for not taking a firm stand with respect to Indochina but, without the cooperation of the British and French, it was not possible for the United States to go it alone.

The truth is the people in the Western world have seemed to care very little about what happens in southeast Asia. The relationship of this area to the Far East and to Red China's ascendancy has never been clearly appraised by the peoples of the West. Nor has it been realized that the continuous aggressions in southeast Asia—endangering India and Pakistan—are part of the Communist plan of world conquest which could go on for a half century. The Communists aren't in a hurry. They feel they can wear out the West's will to resist.

Thank You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my great pleasure to present an American flag which had been flown over this Capitol Building to Brownie Troop 164, of Camp Springs, Prince Georges County, Md. It is often my pleasure to make presentations similar to this, as I know it is the pleasure of all Members of Congress, but never during the 8 years which I have been privileged to serve in this body have I received such a graceful note of appreciation as I did from an 8-year-old member of that troop on behalf of the entire group. The author is Sue Wade, of 6223 Nottingham Drive, Weschester Estates, and her note was in the form of a poem, which reads as follows:

Thank you for the American flag,
We shall never let it drag.
My troop is so very proud,
We'd like to tell all the crowd.

We'll try to keep it very clean,
So clean, no dirt or dust can be seen.
We'll fold it right,
If it takes all night.

Sincerely,

TROOP No. 164.

Yes, we really enjoy and honor our flag. Thank you again.

I know all Members share my pride in this poem, for it is a sincere reflection of the deep reverence and respect which all Americans hold for their country's flag.

Mr. Speaker, the membership of Troop 164 includes: Becky Barbour, Lynn Barbour, Nancie Beatee, Susan Belshaw, Denise DuBast, Margaret Ford, Margaret Foster, Janet Gahacian, Donna Hamann, Susan Lockwood, Grace Merrel, Patricia Randall, Carol Russell, Valerie Van Ness, Sue Wade, and Mrs. W. Barbour, leader of Troop 164.

Bargaining by Industry Landis Cites Plight of Enterprise Unable To Meet Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the New York Times by the Honorable James M. Landis, former dean of the Harvard Law School and one-time special trial examiner for the U.S. Department of Labor, author, among other books, of "Cases on Labor Law," from New York Times of Sunday, April 28, 1963:

BARGAINING BY INDUSTRY—LANDIS CITES PLIGHT OF ENTERPRISE UNABLE TO MEET RATES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A number of recent events, including the newspaper strike in New York City, have brought to the forefront the issue of the social and economic place of collective bargaining.

As a vigorous and old-time proponent of the concept, I have always believed that the distributable profits of an enterprise should be fairly and equitably divided between ownership, management and labor. And that, to effect an equitable distribution to the third party in this group, it was essential that labor should not be fragmentized but organized, so that it could have stout brogans beneath the bargaining table.

This concept of collective bargaining, although historically adequate, appears somewhat jejune in the light of modern developments. What has been developing in our society is industrywide collective bargaining. The ability of a particular enterprise to meet wage rates negotiated by the industry as a whole is ignored.

For example, the recent industrywide negotiation between the railroads and the nonoperating brotherhoods required the New Haven Railroad, presently in an admittedly tragic receivership, to provide for a 10.28 cents an hour increase, boosting its costs by some $1,900,000 annually.

HIGH PRODUCTION COSTS

In eastern Kentucky, where seams of coal are too thin to permit mechanical extraction, insistence upon the payment of wages according to the United Mine Workers' scale, based on more profitable operations, has meant unemployment on a proportion of not 5 or 6 percent of the employable population, but in some areas close to 100 percent.

Admittedly there is a minimum below which wages should not be permitted to fall, and also that ownership (not labor) must bear the risk of temporary variations in profit, both on the upside and downside. But no enterprise can subsist without profits, and all three parties—ownership, management, and labor—must recognize that fact. Unfortunately, industrywide collective bargaining tends to ignore the naval theorem that the speed of a fleet is its slowest vessel. The wages, for example, that the employes of the Union Pacific might justly demand, if demanded from the New Haven and others similarly situated, could force these railroads out of business.

I have no answer to this problem. I simply pose it as a matter for serious consideration for those of us who before the dark days preceding the New Deal fought valiantly for the concept of collective bargaining.

JAMES M. LANDIS.

NEW YORK, *April 22, 1963.*

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is highly appropriate that we as a nation should set aside one day each year for observance as Law Day, for the rule of law is the embodiment of all the ideals, hopes, and aspiration of freemen everywhere. The rule of law forms the foundation of free societies, insures the right of individuals to live their own lives and pursue their own goals, and provide the impetus for the community of men to work peacefully for the solution of common problems.

Law Day is a reminder that as citizens we live under a government of laws, not men. It serves to reinforce our faith in the heritage of this Nation, and demonstrate the contrasts between our democracy and communism.

Therefore, I believe it is just and fitting that May 1 should be designated Law Day, because this is the day that the Communist countries throughout the world are displaying their military might and reasserting their intention to overwhelm the free world with force and despotism. Law Day, more than any other, emphasizes the contrast between the two principal forces in the world—that striving for a world of free and independent countries based on the integrity of the individual man, and that of communism striving for world domination and tyranny.

Just as today the Communist countries are reasserting their demonic goals, we in this country are once again expressing our desire for a world ruled by law, a peaceful world in which reason and right shall prevail.

This is the sixth year we have celebrated Law Day. It was inaugurated in 1958 by proclamation of President Eisenhower and has been observed each successive year with the full support of the Chief Executive and of Congress. I am happy to note that observance of Law Day is more and more widely celebrated each year—an indication, I believe, of the growing awareness and understanding of the need for a world ruled by law.

The objectives of Law Day are threefold: first, it is designed to foster a deeper respect for the law by teaching how laws serve all citizens; second, to encourage responsible citizenship by demonstrating that individual rights and freedoms involve individual obligations; and third, to promote national strength and unity by reaffirming faith in the rule of law, as the foundation stone of American life and government, and as an example to the world of what reliance upon the rule of law can mean to peoples of all nations.

In this connection, I would like to draw attention to the contents of the congressional resolution establishing May 1 as Law Day and to President Kennedy's comments earlier this year designating Law Day for 1963. The congressional resolution states that the first of May be "set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and their reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America; of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

And President Kennedy commented:

The story of man's advance from savagery to civilization is the story of reason and morality displacing brutal force. While law is reason systematized, it is more than reason alone. A great Justice of our Supreme Court said long ago, "The law is the witness and external deposit of our moral life. Its history is the history of the moral development of the race." In a time when all men are properly concerned lest nations, forgetting law, reason and moral existence, turn to mutual destruction, we have all the more need to work for a day when law may govern nations as it does men within nations; when systematized reason may bring us a confident future; when the moral development of the human race may assure a peaceful and law-abiding world.

These comments, I believe, express the reasons for Law Day as adequately as any could.

I would only add further that on this day it is important to remember that our tradition of living under the rule of law has been called the greatest legacy of freedom in the history of civilized peoples. Our legal order has enabled our country to attain its present place of world leadership and has given Americans their unusual freedoms and opportunities for individual achievement.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD at this point editorials from the Evening Capital of April 30, 1963, and the Washington Post of May 1, 1963, commenting on Law Day.

The editorials follow:

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital, Apr. 30, 1963]

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

The massed military might of Russia will parade in Moscow May 1 to show the world, and perhaps to reassure themselves, how invincible the workingman's paradise has become.

In America May 1 has a special significance, too, but in a less boastful and conspicuous way.

May 1 will be Law Day in the United States, sponsored by the American Bar Association and 1,400 State and local organizations of lawyers. Law Day calls attention to the contrast between freedom under law in the United States and governmental tyranny under communism.

The sponsors also hope the observance will foster respect for the law and increase the public's understanding of the place of law in the American way of life.

Law has made American freedom and progress possible. Our Nation has been devoted to it from its earliest beginnings. If it hadn't been, the history of the United States might have differed little from that of any of the less stable republics of the world, in which power is seized again and again by the momentarily strong.

The promoters of Law Day serve a useful purpose in pointing up the significance of this basic premise of our way of life.

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1963]

LAW DAY

The 1st day of May, which used to be an occasion for social protest by struggling trade unions, is celebrated today by bar associations throughout the United States as an occasion for restating the American commitment to the concept of a government of laws functioning within the boundaries prescribed by a written Constitution. One wonders, however, if protest would not be more appropriate to such an occasion—and more genuinely American—than self-congratulation.

"If Law Day were only an occasion for laudatory remarks about the Constitution," Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals has written in a trenchant comment for the Daily Washington Law Reporter, "its chief value would not be achieved. It is also an occasion for deeper inquiry into the way we as a society abide by the spirit of the Constitution." The judge gave point to this prodding by reference to the contrast between our formal professions and our actual practice and by citation of the long continuance of arrests for investigation, a police practice which lawyers recognize as unconstitutional.

This is a tribute to the best tradition of the law in the United States. The real purpose of law is to set men free for the realization of their individual potentialities. The law—and lawyers—must, therefore, be concecrated to the protection of individuals against overbearing or arbitrary governmental action. Respect for the law means a recognition that it entails restraints on the public, on the majority—on ourselves. It entails recognition of the rights not alone of the respectable and the law abiding but of the most lowly and the most abhorred.

Slow Start on Ending Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times, of April 28, 1963, entitled "Slow Start on Ending Bias":

SLOW START ON ENDING BIAS

President Kennedy's slowness in implementing his 5-month-old order to abolish racial bias in federally aided housing is bound to strengthen doubts in the Negro community about the sincerity of those who advocate moderate measures to end discrimination. On no civil rights issue did Mr. Kennedy speak out more forcefully in the 1960 campaign than President Eisenhower's failure to sign an order against bias in housing. Yet he waited nearly 2 years after his own election before exercising "the stroke of a Presidential pen," about which he had taunted the Republicans so persistently. Even then his order fell short of the recommendations of the Federal Civil Rights Commission and of the antidiscrimination rules in force in this city and State.

Against this backdrop of late and limited action, the administration's failure to provide any semblance of vigorous followup lends substance to the complaint of Chairman George H. Fowler of the New York State Commission for Human Rights that the order "must have been signed in invisible ink." Segregated housing patterns are a common blight in North and South. It is time for the White House to provide effective leadership in breaking them down.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include

the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.
April 15, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that there are at least two dozen resolutions before the House Rules Committee which have for their aim the establishment of the Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations.

It would seem to me that if we believe in the democratic system of government, and if we believe in the self-determination of all nations: African, Asian, and European, that the establishment of the Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations is not only necessary, but mandatory and logical.

The establishment of such a committee would be of immense moral and psychological advantage to us, as it would reaffirm the belief of the whole world that this great country has not abandoned its role as the champion of the oppressed and the land of freedom.

I think that it is more unreasonable how we apply pressure on our allies so that they would grant independence to their colonies, which, more often than not, have no conception of national unity and self-rule; and yet, for some strange reason, we shirk from even voicing our opinion about nations such as: Georgia, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Uzbekia, and others, and their right for self-determination.

Most of these nations, and many more, in the so-called Soviet Union (Russian colonial empire in reality) have cultures, civilizations and national identifications that go back centuries and centuries. Yes, some of these nations existed when the word "Russian" was a strange and an unknown term in the world lexicon. And yet these nations are denied their God-given right of self-determination in the time when Congo becomes an independent state. Is this logical?

It seems to me that the present policy of our present Government, and especially of our present illustrious State Department could be summed up in the following Golden Rule, of a sort: Be kind to our enemies, be harsh to our friends. And then we are amazed and surprised when Canada and Western Europe cannot see the logic of this Golden Rule. Frankly, neither can I. Need I say more?

In the hope that you will receive this letter in the spirit of the good of our great country, the citizen of which I am proud to be, I remain,

Respectfully yours.

BOHDAN HASIUK.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, *April 17, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: For over a year, a bipartisan group of Congressmen have been working for the enactment of House Resolution 14. This bill calls for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

The original captive nations resolution was introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, and to date, there are numerous similar resolutions. Recently, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Congressman of Illinois, renewed his appeal to the House of Representatives for support to create such a permanent committee. The Illinois Congressman emphasizes the anti-Communist, pro-Western histories and traditions of the people held captive in the Soviet Empire. Dr. Leo E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, is constantly stressing the pressing need for such a committee.

The Special Committee on the Captive Nations will perform an invaluable service in keeping the American people informed and will also focus worldwide attention on the desire of the captive nations, among them also the Ukraine, to be liberated from the yoke of Russian Bolshevism and Moscow's colonial empire. Our people and public officials should be properly and better informed about the captive nations, their spirit and efforts and of the possibilities of their contributions toward the winning of the cold war. The committee would produce recommendations of the greatest value to our national interest. We may see that in respect to the captive nations our high official circles, especially in the State Department, fail to understand the true nature of the Soviet colonial empire and the potential significance of the captive nations for the free Western World. A whole spectrum of activities in relation to the Red colonial empire could conceivably come for reexamination in the light of the committee's findings. This is a wonderful opportunity for the United States to take the offensive with a cause that the world could understand, appreciate and support as against the present dilatory and weak plan of merely defensive against an obnoxious aggressive offense. We had a good beginning in 1959. Let us not dissipate that beginning.

In July of 1959 the Congress of the United States of America enacted the resolution about observing each year in the month of July as "Captive Nations Week." Since then the Presidents of the United States of America have issued each year a proper proclamation to this effect. By this, Congress has shown that it supports the just aspirations of all people for national independence and freedom. The creation of the Special Committee on the Captive Nations would be only a logical sequel to this idea.

Mahoning County Chapter of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America stands firmly for the enactment of House Resolution 14. Won't you please give your support for this cause.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL YURCHISON,
President, Mahoning County Chapter of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

ASTORIA COMMITTEE FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS,
Long Island City, N.Y., April 19, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. HOWARD SMITH: On behalf of the Astoria Captive Nations Committee, I, as secretary, ask you kindly to put the renewed Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD resolution (H. Res. 14) on the agenda of your Committee of House Rules of which you have the honor to be chairman.

House Resolution 14 calls for creation of a special permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the U.S. House of Representatives, which would perform a valuable service defending our country against Communist subversion and penetration.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS RYWAK.

HARTFORD, CONN., *April 19, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: In writing this letter, I wish to urge you, sir, and the members of your committee to give your full support and vote in favor of the Flood resolution which calls for the establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

A special committee of this nature in the House of Representatives is of vital importance in a freedom-loving nation such as the United States. By means of a special Committee on Captive Nations more time, energy, and research can be utilized in obtaining unbiased knowledge and information on all captive nations. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

WASYL KRUPA.

STAMFORD, CONN., *April 13, 1963.*

Hon. J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Recently over radio station WSTC in Stamford, Conn., a news broadcast stated that Congressman ABNER SIBAL, of Connecticut, had come out in favor of the establishment of a permanent Captive Nations Committee.

This is brought to your attention to encourage further efforts and leadership on your part to fill a need in the Nation's and free world's battle against communism. The task you have undertaken has been recognized as a difficult one but certainly the creation of the Captive Nations Committee will be worth all the effort involved.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH LULSIW.

Research Not Subsidization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we are now spending better than $300 million annually to support the price of cotton at a competitive domestic and international level. Things may get worse before they get better. The one hope of economists is that cotton research will in the near future rid us of the expensive infectious boll weavil and as a result allow domestic producers to compete at world prices unassisted by the Federal Government.

It is no wonder that Secretary Orville Freeman last week appeared before the Agriculture Committee requesting a top policy position in his Department for research. He pointed up his case as follows:

RESEARCH NOT SUBSIDIZATION

I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before this committee. My purpose in being here is to ask your help in carrying out the responsibility which you and the Congress have placed upon the Department of Agriculture. The legislation on which I am testifying—H.R. 3850—proposes an additional top policy position in the Department. We need an additional top policy position in the Department. We need an additional Assistant Secretary. Behind the request is a story of a Department doing a job which has grown substantially in the past decade—a job which grows in response to a growing population with more people who need food to eat and clothing to wear, a place in which to relax, timber and material to build shelter, highly productive soil resources, and water to drink, to run factories, and for play and relaxation.

Since 1953, the demands made upon the policy staff in the Department of Agricul-

ture have increased enormously. In the past 10 years, the Congress has authorized a food for peace program * * * a small watershed program * * * a rural areas development program * * * a series of programs to reduce the critical surplus of grain. It has extended consumer programs to insure quality and purity of meats to poultry. It has greatly expanded research activities in the production, processing, distribution and marketing of the products of the soil. It has recognized that forests produce more than timber, and has requested fuller use of the resources of our national forests.

As the Nation has changed, and as new needs develop, the Congress has responded to the people. The programs which have come into being in the past 10 years reflect the needs of the farmer and nonfarmer alike.

The Department has accepted these responsibilities willingly, and has carried out its task with diligence. However, it has been, and remains today, one of the toughest administrative jobs in the Government. Its operations are carried out in over 10,000 locations in more than 3,000 counties and in every major metropolitan center in the 50 States * * * and in 55 nations around the world.

The responsibilities of the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries have expanded greatly and go far beyond an administrative and supervisory role. If the Government is to achieve maximum utility in providing public services, it will require close and frequent contact with the Members of Congress by the Department's top policymakers. I myself try to always be available for discussions with those who carry out legislative responsibilities—and who are properly concerned as to how congressional policy is being executed. This responsibility of the Department's policy staff extends to the other agencies of the Government as well. Where the functions of any of the several Departments and agencies coincide, progress can be maintained best by open and direct discussions to prevent misunderstandings which can grow into disagreements and to prevent duplication on the one hand and failure to act on the other. Too often, the mission assigned by the Congress is delayed because of no more than a lack of communication in the executive branch. It requires competent top policy staff to maintain effective coordination among the several Departments. And frequently only top policy people can adequately interpret programs to the many groups and organizations which represent individuals and firms with a direct interest in farm policies, programs, and decisions. Much time, therefore, is taken by conferences, public appearances and meeting with delegations to keep people informed of the attitudes and actions of the Department. All of this has meant that the time of the Secretary, Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries—even at a 16-to-18 hour, 6-day-a-week rate—simply won't stretch to do all that needs to be done.

Further, in addition to these important responsibilities, the Department's policy staff must insure that the programs assigned by the Congress are being carried out effectively and efficiently. As an administrator myself, first as Governor of Minnesota and now as Secretary of Agriculture, I have kept in mind for years an admonition by a distinguished Member of this Congress which reads as follows:

"Every legislator grows weary with the awareness of great concepts which grow meager in execution, of noble ideas corrupted in administration."

In the last 2 years we have been carrying on an intensive program of management improvement to upgrade our administrative effectiveness so this won't happen in the Department of Agriculture. It is designed principally to reduce unit costs at a time when the volume of services has increased sharply * * * as we would expect in a nation which grows by some 2.7 million persons a year.

I would like to review with you briefly what has been done * * * first in terms of the new procedures which are geared to a constant, on-going process of internal examination, review and improvement * * * and second, to set down some specific examples of actions taken by the various agencies within the Department.

We make no claims of perfection, or any generalized professions of excellence. But I am proud to report on the tremendous, dedicated effort which Department employees are putting into this program and on the progress that has been made. It has laid the foundation for modern administrative programs as measured both by techniques and procedures and by employee morale.

Let me begin by describing some of the self-improvement procedures and the internal review machinery that has been developed as part of the Department-wide effort. We began early, in my first year as Secretary, a massive internal review of administrative procedures through a series of self-survey task forces. USDA employees manned these task forces and from them have come hundreds of administrative improvements and recommendations. Some 548 specific projects have been suggested by these employee task forces to improve administrative efficiency in the Department.

In 1961, I established the Office of Management Appraisal and Systems Development to conduct surveys of management techniques practiced by Department agencies and to plan conversion of many of the routine paper-consuming activities to automatic data processing.

One of the first tasks undertaken by this management group was a study of how electronic computers—with the ability to make 100,000 mathematical computations a second—could be adapted to streamlining the Department's administrative and management procedures. This study became the MODE project which found that by using electronic computers to assimilate vast quantities of data we could provide rapid up-to-date information necessary for management decisions * * * even with a widely dispersed system of operation.

One of the first results of this project is the complete automation of the Department's payroll. We expect this to be in effect by this fall. This action also will include the personnel and accounting operations related to payroll. We estimate that the annual savings from this conversion to modern administrative techniques will amount to $1.3 million a year—the 1964 budget already reflects this saving—and will allow us to handle in one place the personnel work previously done in 130 offices and the payroling done in 87 offices.

Eventually the use of computers within the administrative area will help us measure how effectively expenditures and manpower are being used, the degree of progress—or lack of it—in programs assigned to us by the Congress, and provide greater opportunities for the exceptionally qualified person to advance to more challenging jobs within the Department.

We also have been very concerned with the need to break down the barriers of understanding which are barnacles on any bureaucratic structure, either public or private. Within the Department, top rank civil servants with administrative and management responsibilities in an agency often do not have personal contact with their counterparts in other agencies. They may know their name, but they are unfamiliar with their counterpart's administrative or management problems. In addition, many of these people are scientists or technical experts first, and have subsequently learned by experience the rules and practices of how to manage an agency. In many cases, this experience is limited to their particular field, although the problems of administration and management are universal. As a pilot project, we have established a series of executive seminars which expose these administrators to the national, local and international currents which affect the operation of the Department * * * and which give them an opportunity to discuss management within their respective agencies.

As an outgrowth of the recommendations of the employee self-survey task force recommendations, we began in 1961 to consolidate agency field offices at the State and county levels. The purpose here is to provide a one-stop service for persons doing business with several Department agencies as well as a centralized management service for such things as space needs, office supplies, personnel and other common housekeeping functions. Currently, offices in 26 States have been or are being consolidated under one roof, and offices in 1,273 counties—over 40 percent of those where USDA agencies operate—are in the same process.

Most recently, in respect to our departmentwide improvements, we have established an Office of Inspector General, responsible to the Secretary. All internal audit and investigation duties have been transferred to this Office to provide departmentwide flexibility and use of manpower. The consolidation of these functions also eliminates the need for cumbersome liaison arrangements essential when these functions were located in individual agencies.

These and other examples of broad administrative improvements, including the pioneering effort through the MODE project, are treated in greater detail in the attached report on "Progress in Management Improvement."

Let me turn now for a moment to some of the specific examples within the agencies where management reforms and advances have been and are being made.

Perhaps the most significant improvement has been made within the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service where a complete reorganization is nearly completed. It involves not only a realinement of functions within the Washington office but also a consolidation of commodity offices in the field.

In the reorganization we have sought to create a direct line of operating authority from the field to the Secretary's office. That line runs from the county ASC office to the Secretary through the ASCS administrator and the Assistant Secretary for Stabilization and Marketing. What was once confusion between staff and line responsibility is now clear. The number of operating divisions in ASCS has been reduced from 5 to 3 and the number of functioning units from 34 to 22. These changes have been completed.

While these changes were occurring here, there was even greater activity within the regional commodity offices. We established in November 1962 a data processing center in Kansas City where we will store in one computer all accounting data for grain under loan or in Government inventory. It is being put to profitable use for the taxpayers. It has greatly improved our ability to rapidly move or sell large amounts of grain, because we can maintain daily tallies of the more than 1 million grain-producer accounts under USDA management, together with records of 750,000 grain warehouse receipts.

With the application of computer technology to the recordkeeping needs of grain under loan or in Federal inventory, we have been able to consolidate the functions of the regional commodity offices at four locations rather than the seven required just 2 years ago. The closing of the three offices has not

interrupted the high performance standard of our regional offices, and it has enabled us to revise downward by $2.2 million the CCC budget request for operating funds in 1964.

Another project here in Washington which we recently completed is the centralization of the management-support services for 17 of the Department's smaller offices and agencies under a single Office of Management Services. This has worked so successfully that we are in the process of applying the same principle to other agencies which maintain separate management service operations for individual divisions.

We also are in the process of modernizing our mailing operations to handle much of the detailed recordkeeping through automatic data processing. We now maintain 600,000 file cards of individuals and organizations requesting one or more of the Department's regular publications. It now requires over a month to change an address. This time will be cut to less than a week under the new system.

Automatic data processing also has been successfully applied to forest management operations and to forest research at a savings of over $1 million a year. We are now able to store voluminous quantities of forest survey data covering 186 million acres of national forests to maintain current information on timber that can be cut.

In the Soil Conservation Service, we have applied automatic data processing to maintain up-to-date information on the extent to which local soil conservationist work plans have been completed. This allows greater flexibility in the use of manpower, and provides annual savings of $500,000 in administrative costs.

These are only some of the major reforms and reorganizations and improvements the Department has made in the past 2 years to increase its effectiveness in serving the public and carrying out the duties which the Congress has assigned. There are many others which, though minor, are important. They add up to a steady and strong current of improved efficiency and economy.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that these actions will necessarily mean fewer employees or lower budgets as a whole. Regardless of how high a level of efficiency is attained, more people will be necessary if the volume of services rendered increases. And, of course, the services we perform today are related—as they always have been—to the growing number of people living in the United States and to the nature and extent of the programs Congress gives the executive branch to perform.

Last year a proposal was made on the floor of the House that Congress limit the number of employees of the Department to the number of farmers. It highlighted the frustration of many Congressmen at the inability to keep the Federal agencies in general and the Department of Agriculture in particular from growing in total numbers of employees.

Many people chuckled about the proposal, but it would have been useful if the witty Congressman had asked and answered this question: Why does government at all levels—Federal, State, and local—whether under Republican or Democratic administrations—grow each year in total numbers?

With that question in mind let's take a look at the Department of Agriculture.

In the past decade, Department employment has increased by 32,473 man-years, but only 6 percent of that has come in ASCS, the agency which deals most directly with farmers, and that increase was due primarily to the staggering increase in the volume of commodities under CCC management. As we continue to administer the programs enacted by the Congress to reduce surpluses, we can anticipate a continued gradual reduction in manpower needs in this area.

Most of the remaining 94 percent of the increase has come in areas and programs where services benefit all Americans as consumers of food and fiber and as users of soil and water resources. These are services requested by the people and voted by the Congress.

In the last 2 years, employment in the packers and stockyards program, which protects producer and consumer alike, increased by about 34 persons, while at the same time the number of market dealers and agencies registered under the Packers and Stockyards Act increased by 5,700 * * * and the number of packers supervised increased by 700.

In poultry inspection services, the number of employees increased by 20 percent while the volume of poultry products increased by 38 percent.

By early 1963, the number of persons receiving food through the direct distribution program had more than doubled from 2 years earlier, but the increased workload is being handled with a 40 percent increase in employment.

In the past 10 years, the number of recreational visits to the national forests has increased by more than 218 percent. In 1962, total visits exceeded 113 million. This is only one of the increased pressures on the resources of our national forests. Each activity—whether it provides better recreation opportunities, more timber to supply the milk, or better rangeland or improved protection of water and timber resources—can be performed but it requires people to do the job. Forest roads and trails, picnic and camp grounds and firefighting can't be accomplished without bodies to do the work.

In 2 years, the number of small watershed programs authorized for construction has more than doubled and those authorized for planning have increased about 70 percent. In areas where such projects are being completed, new industries are developing, recreation opportunities are expanding and water supplies are becoming stabilized. During the same period, total paid USDA employment in soil conservation service has increased less than 3 percent.

Since 1960, the Farmers Home Administration has expanded its volume of dollars loaned by more than 160 percent, and is now providing housing credit services to the aged and to nonfarm rural residents where adequate private capital is not available. Rural community water systems are also being financed by the agency. FHA has shouldered the increased workload with a 4-percent increase in manpower, and last year actually did the equivalent work of 260 extra employees through overtime without compensation.

In the past 10 years the Congress has authorized 64 new research facilities under USDA supervision which require a combined staff of over 1,750 persons. The need for this is obvious since we live in an age where progress is determined by the level of scientific and technological achievement. And in agriculture and its related areas, as in few other industries, the basic and applied research which leads to improved efficiency on the farm and more effective distribution of our food abundance has been and is to a large extent dependent on research performed by the Department of Agriculture.

Agriculture exists today on a nervous balance between too much which could very quickly become not quite enough. Research helps to assure that we can avoid the human disaster of the latter, and intelligent legislation can help avoid the shattering economic consequences of the former.

But the role of research extends far beyond this. Only recently we successfully completed a test project—a research project—to determine if fresh fruits and vegetables could be shipped from this country to Europe with special constant temperature containers. Thus research helps open new markets abroad for our farm products. Not too long ago, USDA scientists perfected an apple juice concentrate. As a result, a new plant is being planned in a rural area near Yakima, Wash. Research provides new products which serve the consumer, create new markets for farmers, and provide jobs in the rural community.

Research also is required to help us live more safely with the products of the research lab. In the past 15 years, the growth in the use of pesticides has been enormous—not only in commercial agriculture but at the consumer level as well. We need to know more about the ultimate effects of these pesticides on plants and animals and humans. We also need to develop far more sophisticated pesticides and techniques of pest control. The field of biological controls is promising, as is the area of selective pesticides—chemicals that affect only one or two pests. Here, also, more extensive research is needed.

I have stressed the importance of research for two purposes. One is because I intend, if the Congress approves, to seek out the most competent person I can find as an Assistant Secretary for Research and Education. This office would give overall supervision to the research activities carried on now primarily in the Agricultural Research Service and would also have responsibility for the Federal Extension Service. It would maintain close and continuing relations with the Nation's land grant colleges and universities.

The second purpose is to emphasize the changing nature of the Department's role in a rapidly changing society. We now have three Assistant Secretaries, the same as we had in 1960, but their function has changed markedly. Two years ago there was no Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation, but 2 years ago we were only vaguely aware that the farm problem is as essentially a rural community problem as it is a commodity problem. Two years ago we did not have an Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, but 2 years ago few people understood the basic importance of agriculture to international trade and to our responsibilities in the free world toward the developing nations. Our exports of farm products are increasing. The Department is cooperating today more fully than ever before with the State Department in planning and policy formation on farm policy in relation to the European Common Market. We are involved in a greatly expanded and more aggressive trade development program to expand oversea markets for U.S. farm products. And we are maintaining close liaison and are cooperating actively in foreign aid programs designed to assist the developing countries—agrarian nations which we must help to grow as free nations.

The three Assistant Secretaries and the Under Secretary, together with an Assistant Secretary for Administration and my close staff associates, are the key policy officials who serve with me in the Department. They are doing an extraordinary job, but it is increasingly clear that their talents are being spread too thinly. As their capacity is overtaxed, it leads to the kind of situation where my own ability to carry out my responsibilities to the Congress and to the people can be progressively weakened.

The supervision and direction of the very substantial research activities within the Department and those carried out in cooperation with the State experiment stations and the Extension Service as it now stands must be handled either by the Under Secretary or myself, and presently we are not able to give adequate time to an area which is of vital importance to farmers and nonfarmers alike.

The relationship between the Department and the land-grant colleges and universities has always been and must remain close and harmonious, and this need can only be filled with a top policymaker with direct access

to the Secretary and the other staff people who help determine Department policy.

I believe that the enactment of H.R. 3850 will fill a gap which now exists in the top offices of the Department, and I urge this committee to give it full support.

How NSF Got Lost in Mohole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a provocative and informative article from the May issue of Fortune Magazine, entitled "How NSF Got Lost in Mohole," by Herbert Solow.

This project of the National Science Foundation has been termed "man's greatest geological project" and now, according to this article, it is "experiencing severe budgetary inflation and dragging delay."

Early in February, I raised questions about this project, pointing out that a Houston, Tex., construction firm had been selected to carry out this major project despite the fact that one National Science Foundation panel rated this firm third best in a field of three and another NSF panel rated four firms as better qualified. Subsequently, in checking on the progress in the first year of this contract, I was disturbed to learn that the project was considered behind schedule and that the estimated overall costs had been increased by almost 50 percent.

I offer this article in the thought that it will be helpful to my colleagues in the Senate when it is considering further appropriations for this project,

Mr. President, I have been advised by the Public Printer that the article, it is estimated, will take approximately 3¾ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $337.50. Accordingly, pursuant to regulation 11 of the Joint Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding this fact, the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NSF GOT LOST IN MOHOLE

(By Herbert Solow)

Eighteen years ago, when Dr. Vannevar Bush explained to the United States how that delicate bloom, basic science, could absorb Government nourishment without being wilted by the inclement atmosphere of bureaucracy, Fortune gave him a sounding board. His "Science, the Endless Frontier" was printed in condensation as a supplement to the September 1945 issue. Congress followed his recommendation and set up the National Science Foundation. After a dozen years of fine creative work sponsoring research with the advice of the scientific community, NSF came up against Project Mohole and took off on its own. The result is a mess involving one of the most promising of basic projects in big science.

Mohole is the project to drill 3 miles through the crust of the earth, underseas where it's thinnest. The scientists who conceived and started it saw this as likely to produce cores whose analysis could be fabulously revealing about the beginnings of life. They also hoped to study the globe's mantle itself, that mysterious stratum beneath the crust. And pioneering engineers saw Mohole as a stimulus to new technological developments of great value to the oil and other industries.

But NSF brushed aside scientists who originated the project, and now the Mohole project is experiencing severe budgetary inflation and dragging delay.

Dr. Vannevar Bush realized during World War II that science and government were not likely ever again to part company. He saw that the demands of national missions would evoke evermore complex and costlier basic research tools, such as cyclotrons, reactors, computers, and, beyond them, giant radio telescopes and instrument-laden outer space vehicles. The financing of basic research by government on a scale without precedent would be unavoidable. What worried Dr. Bush was how the fragile hothouse flower of basic science could absorb government nourishment yet be sheltered against the inclement atmosphere of agency bureaucracy. So, when Congress set up the National Science Foundation in 1950, it was placed under a protective limitation. NSF was not to perform but to initiate and support basic scientific research. This it now does at the rate of over $300 million a year. Uniquely among Government agencies, NSF was to be in Government but not altogether of it, a Federal agency responsive to the creative suggestions of the general scientific community. Thus it was hoped to maintain that special quality of spontaneity that is the wellspring of basic research.

Alas, pure science. NSF, Vannevar Bush's fragile flower, is right now being wilted by bureaucratic contamination of that source.

The trouble revolves around NSF's biggest venture, known as Project Mohole. This is a program to drill holes far deeper into the globe than man has ever probed before. The initial estimate of $47 million has been arbitrarily boosted by 46 percent, and the project is almost 2 years behind the schedule set for it by its scientist creators. Disturbed by the situation, NSF's governing board has named a panel to inquire into the project's status. Moreover, a resolution calling for a study of NSF's setup for managing big science has been adopted by an NSF statutory committee composed of outside scientific advisers. There is also White House talk of revitalization as a prime task for Dr. Leland J. Haworth, who has been designated to succeed Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of NSF ever since its founding.

Many scientists feel desperate about the state of Mohole, but not primarily because it is behind schedule and undergoing budget inflation. These are effects. It is the causes that produce the scientists' despair. For NSF has brushed aside those who conceived Project Mohole and has stepped into the area of decision making in which it lacks qualifications and experience. It has also let a dangling toe or two be nipped by politics and has stirred considerable criticism by its award of a major Mohole operating contract. Taken separately or collectively, these are pretty commonplace in a Washington that spends $100 billion a year, but in NSF's case they have foundation-shaking effects. "A foundation like ours," says Director Waterman, "can't succeed unless it has the confidence of scientists. This can come about only if there is clear communication both ways." Under Dr. Waterman's own terms, NSF is, in the Mohole instance, in danger of failing in its primary mission—to make the needed marriage between government and basic science truly creative.

A CORPORATE FASCINATION

To understand how things got off the track, one must appreciate the nature and evolution of Project Mohole and NSF's connection with it. Mohole points down, but its ultimate aims are vaulting. They spring from the imminent logic of geology, geophysics, paleontology, and oceanography, combined for a unique experiment. The project's name springs from a puzzling discontinuity, or shift, in seismic velocities about 20 miles below sea level under the continents. There the earth's crust, thus far penetrated by man only one-quarter of the way (the deepest oil well goes down 5 miles), meets the mysterious mantle that lies between crust and core. The discontinuity is called the Moho for its discoverer, a Yugoslav named Andrija Mohorovicic. Hence drill holes to the mantle will be Moholes. To produce one Mohole, even where the crust is thinnest—under the deep ocean where it is 3 miles thick—it may be necessary to drill 35,000 feet below the ocean's surface. This means perhaps 3 years of round-the-clock work. And Mohole will be spudded in beneath 17,000 feet of frequently turbulent blue water, rather than in about 100 feet as in offshore drilling.

To deal with expected intensities of heat, pressure, corrosion, wind, waves, and currents, the state of half a dozen arts will have to be upgraded. Basic requirements include improved drilling techniques, improved equipment, perhaps news materials for the drill pipe, and new orders of instruments. Engineers will have to work out a highly reliable system for positioning a free-floating vessel—holding it unanchored and unmoored within narrow tolerances. In short, Mohole wants much custom-designed, unconventional equipment, none of which is on anybody's shelf. The problem to be solved has been compared to suspending a single strand of spaghetti from the top of the Empire State Building. For this, engineers are needed who do not follow but rewrite the manuals.

The engineering developments that must be generated by Mohole can be of enormous value to the oil industry and to others who might want to exploit the ocean bottom's legendary riches. Less dazzled by economic potential, basic scientists of various disciplines will make, through down-hole logging, deep-level measurements of pressure, temperature, gravity, magnetism, and so on, for which they have long been yearning. Concurrently and later, they will recover and analyze samples of both crustal and mantle material. The project thus has scientific ramifications that its nicknames obscures. It is an adventure into all inner space. The information that it will yield may illumine the beginnings of evolution, from evidence in the deeper sedimentary layers, as well as the formation of the globe, and even the creation of the solar system—perhaps before anybody reaches the moon.

A lively sense of Project Mohole's mixed bag of values was shared by many companies that employ scientists capable of judging. Among those that showed eagerness to have a part in it were Socony Mobil, Shell, Standard of California, General Motors, General Electric, Texas Instruments, General Dynamics, Aerojet-General, Westinghouse Air Brake, Litton, Bethlehem Steel, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, and some top-flight nonprofit research and development firms.

A MISCELLANY OF SCIENTISTS

Mohole, as a practical idea, goes back 6 years to two seagoing scientists, Dr. Harry H. Hess, a Princeton geologist and a reserve admiral in the Navy, and Dr. Walter Munk

of the University of California, perhaps the world's top physical oceanographer. Their vision was caught by colleagues of diverse disciplines belonging to the American Miscellaneous Society, an informal group that is now known by the acronym, AMSOC. The National Academy of Sciences enthusiastically adopted the vision. (This, the brightest galaxy of U.S. basic scientists, is a private body that has served as an adviser to the Government since President Lincoln created it; it should not be confused with the National Science Foundation). Mohole—inner space—was a change from the prevalent orbital diet. AMSOC became a National Academy committee.

Thanks to its tieup with the academy, AMSOC got the National Science Foundation to provide, from its general funds, $1,700,000 for a 1961 test now known as Mohole Phase I. AMSOC's biggest test effort was off the lower California coast, in 11,700 feet of water, over 25 times more than in any earlier drilling off terra firma. These pilot operations were conducted over a 2-month period from a converted offshore drilling barge with specially designed equipment. The crust's second layer was penetrated for the first time 560 feet below the ocean floor, and the feasibility of ultradeep drilling from a free-floating vessel was demonstrated.

Such phenomenal success encouraged the AMSOC scientists to project an immediate drive to the Moho itself, 3 miles farther down. The men with the big, practical engineering ideas for this formidable task, as for phase I, were organized by Willard Bascom, 45. Described by friends as impetuous and even willful, he says of himself, "I am hard to please," and he is as diplomatic as a diamond drill. He had, however, built a reputation as an explorer and oceanic engineer in 17 years of service with the University of California and the academy. His associates, a dozen young specialists in ship design, electronic ship positioning, hard-rock drilling, and instrumentation, are unique in their knowledge and experience. Their studies of the problem convinced them that the best way to go about phase II was to construct two ships. The first would be an operationally economical craft that could obtain deeper crustal material and measurements, while techniques were being perfected for application to the second ship, larger and capable of drilling to the mantle. The Bascom group persuaded its employer, AMSOC, that this engineering approach—comparable to industry's use of a semiproduction plant—would prove faster, cheaper, and fully protective of the integrity of the dual Mohole objective: Crust and mantle studies.

AMSOC, backed by the academy, passed its recommendations along to NSF. It proposed categorically that it retain control over the scientific objective of phase II, as well as the right to review engineering paths, and to propose priorities for expenditures. No AMSOC member wanted to give up his personal scientific work to operate phase II of Mohole, however, and AMSOC recommended that a prime contractor be hired for the operating job, rather than leave it with a committee of part-timers.

But who could best operate? No single scientific or commercial organization had—to borrow the standard jargon—the "inhouse capabilities" to develop, apply, and integrate at predictable speed all the requisite technologies. Under the circumstances, AMSOC made some recommendations: in general, it urged that prime consideration be given to organizations with some inhouse capabilities relevant to Mohole. This, of course, would include R & D. service companies, electronic companies with their control skills, steel companies with their metallurgical wisdom, and major oil companies with their drilling know-how. The most desirable organizations would be those experienced in designing experiments and developing novel equipment.

These recommendations, as AMSOC saw them, added up to a requirement of scientific-engineering taste. They would include a burning curiosity about all the data that Mohole was expected to yield.

THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

NSF rapidly ran away from the AMSOC recommendations. It was then, with busy NSF Director Waterman running Mohole with one hand, that things began going awry. Dr. Waterman is a physicist who left the Yale faculty in 1942 for wartime service as a Government science administrator. He was honored for his work with topnotch Government research organizations, and in 1951 was named NSF's first Director by President Truman. When his term ran out, he was reappointed for a second 6-year term by President Eisenhower. A year ago, at the age of 70, he agreed to serve beyond civil service retirement age until the White House could find a qualified successor.

Under Waterman, NSF has won enthusiastic acclaim from the scientific community in performing its primary function: to dispense modest grants screened by scientific panels called in periodically by the directors of NSF's various programs—e.g., in earth sciences, mathematical sciences, psychobiology, etc. These grants, made chiefly to universities, are essentially gifts, with no strings attached. They leave the scientists free to pursue—or, moved by the evolution of experiment itself, to alter—their objectives, and to select their own tools within the limits of the funds provided. NSF has, in this way, done much for basic scientific research and education, and Dr. Waterman has done a bangup job of convincing Congress that the achievement matters. NSF's budget, a mere $3,500,000 in 1951, has grown to $323 million. NSF has asked for an increase of $266 million for 1964—more than its total 1962 budget—which could establish a peacetime record for Federal-agency expansion.

Now, sponsoring scientists' projects is one thing, but running them is another, and NSF is neither authorized nor organized nor staffed to run them. In the case of Mohole, however, once AMSOC recommended that a prime contractor be hired, NSF took over. Some responsibility fell to NSF's No. 2 man, Paul A. Scherer, who has an engineering background, and some to Dr. Waterman's executive assistant, Frank C. Sheppard, but the major influence in plotting Mohole's course became Dr. William E. Benson, head of NSF's earth sciences section. He is a geologist who got to his NSF job by way of 12 years with the U.S. Geological Survey, a brief term as an academy administrative employee, and a fling at mining in North Dakota. Others in NSF played parts from time to time, but these three became the agency's official Mohole committee.

The first step was to get a prime contractor. On July 13, 1961, NSF announced in the Department of Commerce synopsis that it would brief those interested in its Mohole requirements on July 27. It also sent individual letters to twoscore organizations, including some that had on their own initiative expressed interest in being the prime contractor. When these special approaches were followed by rumors that one company or another had an inside track, Socony Mobil, which was especially eager to do the Mohole job, sent a scout to sound out NSF. Everything seemed to be on the up and up. On the designated day some 200 people appeared in the NSF auditorium to represent 84 interested companies. After the scientific nature and prestigiousness of the project had been explained, NSF officials passed out a formal invitation to submit proposals. This called for:

A management plan, which would be evaluated on the basis of comprehension of Mohole's problems and an engineering approach thereto.

Information as to experience with experimental or research engineering projects "of comparable magnitude and complexity" and capabilities for experiment design.

Information as to what personnel would be assigned to the project, and the rate of fee for prime-contractor effort, subcontracting, overhead, and general and administrative expenses.

Some company representatives say that pronouncements by NSF officials on July 27 left them with two other impressions. One was that, in Dr. Benson's words, "any good bidder will want the AMSOC staff." There seemed to be no objection to that. The other impression was that NSF would give preference to no-fee, all-for-science proposals. At this point, some profit-motivated listeners shut their notebooks and retired from the field.

THE UNEXPECTED PROPOSAL

By the time of the deadline—September 11—responsive proposals had come in from 10 competitors, some with teammates, that had attended the July 27 session:

Socony Mobil, with General Motors, Texas Instruments, and Standard Oil of California.

Global Marine Exploration, Aerojet-General, and Shell Oil, in a joint venture.

Zapata Off-Shore, with the Eelectric Boat Division of General Dynamics and Dresser Industries (later, Continental Oil joined this team).

General Electric, with Kerr-McGee Oil, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Petty Geophysical Engineering Co., Waldemar S. Nelson & Co., and Lamont Geological Observatory of Columbia University.

Westinghouse Air Brake's Melpar, with Bethlehem Steel, Geonautics Inc., and four drilling companies.

Litton Systems.

System Development, a nonprofit corporation, with Offshore Co., a drilling company.

National Engineering Science Co.

The University of California's Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Battelle Memorial Institute (nonprofit), with Scripps, Texas Instruments, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, and Ocean Drilling & Exploration.

In four of these proposals, it will be noted, oil companies were involved. Indeed, the oil industry had shown lively interest ever since the project was conceived, and for a time it was widely thought that nobody but an oil company would want or stand a chance of getting this job. Of course, the oil companies had their motives. There was great attraction in the chance to do the development of the required equipment and techniques and to gather the scientific data, rather than to read about it later. Another motive, shared by nonoil companies, was prestige—to capture the headlines for bringing up the first certified sample of the earth's mantle. The package stimulated some companies to major efforts. The Socony Mobil team, for example, made original technical studies and spent some $150,000 on its Mohole proposal.

The design of the criteria of selection took until late September, and then the proposals were opened. There, along with those of the oil and the other industrial companies, and those of the nonprofit R. & D. companies, and those of the academic institutions, was a bid from a big engineer-construction firm: Brown & Root of Houston, Tex.

Brown & Root had never communicated with NSF until it sent in its proposal around September 5. It had not been on NSF's invitation list and had not been present on July 27. But there was a proposal. "It's quite true," Dr. Benson has vouchsafed, "that Brown & Root came as a surprise to us." But what was more of a surprise to

the other proposers, 6 months later, was NSF's announcement of its choice—Brown & Root.

Brown & Root recently became a subsidiary of Halliburton Co., a big Dallas oilfield service outfit. It continues operating, however, under the name it used for 43 years while rising to be one of the world's largest engineering-construction firms (annual revenues have recently averaged about $250 million). It employs over 600 engineers. Brown & Root's boss is George Brown, 64 years old, who succeeded to the presidency after the death of his brother, Herman, last November. George Brown is also chairman of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., and a director of Halliburton, International Telephone & Telegraph, Lone Star Steel, Trans World Airlines, Southland Paper Mills, and many smaller companies.

Brown & Root has engaged chiefly in two types of work. It has an international reputation for building many kinds of industrial plants, efficiently and economically. Second, it has creditably handled many public works contracts—for highways, dams, wartime naval shipbuilding, military bases, and so on. Recently, it had part of the Houston NASA Manned Spacecraft Center job. Brown & Root has done some drilling from floating vessels but these were anchored in shallow water, and even of this it did far less than any major oil company. It has had no experience in scientific work, employs only one Ph. D.—a paper chemist—and holds few patents.

OPPORTUNITY IN REOPENED DOORS

Brown & Root's unexpected Mohole proposal hardly differed from one for a standard industrial or public works competition. Of its 190 pages, all but 20 consisted of off-the-shelf promotional material. It was in marked contrast to some proposals that elaborated on possible solutions of Mohole's technical problems.

The proposals were rated on October 20 by NSF's preliminary evaluation panel on the basis of 50 or so criteria. These reflected in part AMSOC's recommendations. Two proposals scored over 900 out of a possible 1,000 points. Socony Mobil's team stood in first place and the Global-Aerojet Shell joint venture (GAS Co.) in second. Three teams scored in the low 800's: Zapata Off-Shore, General Electric, and Brown & Root. The last was fifth, with 801 points. The others were strung out behind. The panel reported to Dr. Waterman that Socony Mobil's proposal was "in a class by itself—outstanding as to every important aspect," and recommended that preliminary negotiations for contract be begun with Socony Mobil.

Dr. Waterman, instead, turned loose on the proposals and criteria a review panel of four NSF officials. This group confirmed the preliminary panel's ranking and got that panel to join it in a new recommendation: drop the low-ranking proposers and hold discussions with the remainder. The Director concurred, and on December 20, NSF wrote to the top five, advising them that they would be considered further, and "should feel free to explore the possible participation in the Mohole project" of any of those that had just been dropped. This opened a door to Brown & Root.

The Scherer letter, despite the fact that the July 27 invitation to submit stated that each proposal must be "complete, self-sufficient, and be able to stand on its own merits during subsequent evaluation," opened another door to Brown & Root by inviting amplification of any facets of the proposals.

In addition, the letter instructed each recipient that, if it had not earlier told how it would use the AMSOC staff, it should now do so. Socony Mobil and GAS had done so, but Brown & Root had not.

Having opened these doors, NSF invited the five remaining competitors to come through and make presentations in Washington on various dates in January.

Although George Brown had signed the early September letter covering his company's proposal, he says that it was only after December 20 that he personally became acutely aware of Mohole. The doors that NSF had opened could lead to the realization of an old dream. As a member, in 1951–52, of the President's Materials Policy Commission, Brown had become aware of industry's mounting problems in dealing with heat, pressure, and corrosion. Brown, a benefactor of Houston's Rice University, would like to see it become the country's greatest center of chemistry research, advancing man's mastery of heat, pressure, and corrosion. Experience on Project Mohole could contribute to this objective, and George Brown became much interested.

Brown & Root, the only one of the five survivors without teammates or impressive in-house technical capabilities, went through the newly opened door to line up for employment as subcontractors Minneapolis-Honeywell, Litton Industries' Western Geophysical Co., and A. H. Glenn & Associates. It added Rice University as a scientific associate. Brown & Root also went through the amplification door, telling NSF somewhat ambiguously that it "could certainly adapt" to putting the phase I technical group, headed by Bascom, in "an ad hoc advisory position."

After the five presentations called for by NSF, the preliminary evaluation panel rated the proposers anew. Brown & Root was moved up to third place with 899, or 98 points more than in the first go-round. GAS Co. gained 66, while Socony Mobil gained only 28, so that GAS now topped Socony, 968 to 964. The panel pointed out that while these two leaders had more in-house capability than Brown & Root, the latter had "an impressive record of major engineering undertakings, particularly marine engineering," and the panel recommended that further competition be confined to these three. On February 5, Zapata and General Electric were eliminated.

THE LAST HEAT

Following visits to the home offices of the three, the preliminary and review panels made a joint report to the director that did not recommend a company. What it said, as summarized later by the Comptroller General of the United States, was that the joint panel members were equally divided between Brown & Root and an oil company, with Global-Aerojet-Shell favored "if an oil company was to be selected." Thus NSF's elaborate criteria became as weightless as a man in space. The decision now rested on quite different considerations. These had been worked up over the months of the evaluation procedure in informal discussions, which Dr. Benson describes as follows:

"A major company of any sort versus a smaller company versus a nonprofit company versus a petroleum company—these questions pervaded the discussions all the way through. I really can't assess how much it was the fact of being oil companies or the fact of being large that we were considering Talk about oil comapnies grew like Topsy. We early discussed whether an oil company would deflect the project from its scientific objectives."

Preference began shifting to what NSF calls a "management company," that is, one that may lack relevant in-house capabilities but is experienced in recruiting special skills as required, project by project, as any professional contractor does. And, Dr. Benson recounts, as early as October some of those engaged in evaluating the proposals became enthusiastic for Brown & Root.

The decision, which finally became a policy question, as to the general class of company to be desired, had to be made by Dr. Waterman, to whom NSF's board had, months before, delegated the authority.

Faced with the policy question, Dr. Waterman wondered whether to consider the public reaction to whatever choice he might make. He put the problem up to Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, late in February. Dr. Weisner told him to make his selection on a merit basis. On February 28, Dr. Waterman announced the selection of the solitary management company for negotiations toward a contract.

Next day, Dr. Waterman and his staff appeared before the House appropriations subcommittee on independent offices, to justify their 1963 budget. The chairman is ALBERT THOMAS of Houston. Disappointed competitors took instant judicial notice of two facts—that Brown & Root had developed its capacity for getting Federal contracts concurrently with the rise to national power of Texas politicians, and that it is a commonplace in Texas that ALBERT THOMAS had been warmly supported by Brown in many political campaigns. When Dr. Waterman appeared before the Thomas committee, asking for $5 million for Mohole, he remarked that "Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Tex., have been selected for negotiation of a prime contract." Congressman THOMAS, often cool to NSF's proposals, said warmly that this particular budget was "a work of art."

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California, the home of Shell's partners, Global Marine and Aerojet-General, called on Comptroller General Joseph Campbell to investigate for possible impropriety. In June, Campbell came up with a Scotch verdict. "We are unable to conclude," he wrote KUCHEL, "that the award to Brown & Root was not in the public interest."

Why did Dr. Waterman choose Brown & Root? He says he shared some of the staff's concern that oil companies, as a class, might be tempted to pursue other objectives than the purely scientific. He also downgraded Socony Mobil and GAS because, unlike Brown & Root, which asked and got a fee of $1,800,000 (plus a cut on subcontracts), they did not ask a fee for the job. "Perhaps we were wrong," Dr. Waterman explained later, "but we felt that it was more businesslike to pay a fee." Right or wrong, this was a strange judgment in light of the fact that the two top-rated teams, along with others, had understood NSF's original ground rules as giving preference to no-fee proposals.

One thing Dr. Waterman has never claimed—that Brown & Root had in-house the technical capabilities required by Mohole, as did some of its competitors in large measure. But he did, for some time, argue that NSF, "being a scientific and technical organization," could "provide direction on the scientific and technical side." Capability aside, NSF here was getting dangerously close to what, as Dr. Waterman has often affirmed, is forbidden to it—scientific operations on its own hook.

PASSING A REPORT FROM HAND TO HAND

On March 19 a 90-day letter contract was signed. Brown & Root was thereby authorized to begin engineering studies at once and obligated to submit a report on its program. In early June it was ready with a report on a drill-rig design, which it sent along to NSF's new Mohole managing coordinator, C. Don Woodward, the phase I drilling superintendent who, when the letter contract was signed, was hired by NSF to work under Benson on phase II.

One look at the rig design and Woodward hastened to Houston. There the Bascom group, which, worried by the trend of events, had somewhat impetuously incorporated as Ocean Science & Engineering, Inc., was working on a 60-day contract, transferring to Brown & Root the information garnered in phase I. O.S. & E. and Woodward helped

produce on a crash schedule a new report for NSF's contractor. This was basically an adaptation of a ship conversion design developed earlier by the Bascom group for AMSOC. When the report reached NSF in mid-June, Woodward, in effect, accepted it from himself. On that basis, on June 20, NSF signed the definitive contract. It had decided to sink or swim with Brown & Root.

Whatever NSF thought of the report's quality, it characterized it as preliminary and, when providing AMSOC with several copies, indicated that the committee need not bother reviewing it as it stood. The executive group read it, but refrained from exercising that right to review which it had sought to reserve for itself.

Despite the help given by Bascom's Ocean Science & Engineering on the June report, O.S. & E. was not popular with George Brown. Bascom had said publicly that Brown & Root would "need all the help they can get," and Brown developed an allergy to O.S. & E. Brown & Root had never committed itself to hiring the group, and when it offered to take them on as individuals, they declined. As the 60-day subcontract ran out, the Bascom group proposed to design an automatic drill-pipe racking system for use on a ship. Brown & Root turned this down and thus totally separated from the project the unique technical staff of phase I.

A STORM IN THE SENATE

By that time Senator KUCHEL had subsided, but NSF's troubles in the Senate were not over. When Socony Mobil, a year earlier, wanted to sound out NSF about rumors of favoritism, it had arranged an interview with Dr. Waterman through the intervention of an old friend of NSF's, Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, in which State the oil company has an important installation. Later ALLOTT was offended both by the selection of Brown & Root and by Dr. Waterman's failure to keep a commitment to give ALLOTT advance notice of his decision. As NSF's hearing before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on independent offices approached in August, ALLOTT, a member, publicly called Mohole a fiasco, and the agency saw that a storm was brewing.

Now NSF hired Ocean Science & Engineering as consultant for a year at $183,000, bringing the phase I experts back to the project, though only to its periphery. When ALLOTT questioned NSF's Mohole arrangements at the hearing on August 16, Dr. Waterman drew comfortingly about himself the cloak of the new consultant's know-how. This did not keep ALLOTT from charging that NSF had "asked for experienced, competent people to come in with their proposals, and they then in effect brokered out this contract to Brown & Root." If in-house capability was not a significant consideration, ALLOTT indicated, he could have applied for the prime contract himself, getting "adequate scientific, engineering, and construction advice and help from all over the country."

Around the time of the hearing, AMSOC first learned that NSF had, on June 20, signed a definitive contract with Brown & Root. Right after the hearing AMSOC's chairman, Dr. Hollis D. Hedberg, who had been smoldering, burst into flame. Dr. Hedberg is a Princeton geologist, who had replaced an acting AMSOC chairman in December 1961. He is also vice president for exploration of Gulf Oil, a company that did not participate in the Mohole competition. Dr. Hedberg now asked the academy to get Dr. Waterman to promulgate a signed statement recognizing AMSOC's position as arbiter of Mohole's scientific objective. As this issue of Fortune went to press, Dr. Waterman had not got around to that.

As for Dr. Benson, he was still differing with AMSOC about an experimental ship that would also do crustal exploration. Reminded that NSF twice had obtained money from Congress on the basis of a dual objective, studies of the crust and the mantle, Dr. Benson said that the objective had been misstated to Congress. In any case, as stated by Dr. Benson now for NSF, part of the objective of the scientists who conceived the project and organized AMSOC has gone the way of AMSOC's contractor criteria and its engineering ideas.

IN SEARCH OF AN OVERALL PLAN

What has Project Mohole got in return for this deformation by NSF? Brown & Root has hardly done itself proud in its first Mohole year, during which NSF has spent $3,700,000 under the prime contract out of a total expenditure of $4,400,000 on phase II. The high priority Dr. Waterman had assured the Senate that Mohole would get from Brown & Root did not materialize. The contractor switched its first choice for manager, a young engineer, to the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center job when that contract was awarded to Brown & Root. In a little over a year Project Mohole has had four other titular or de facto managers. Though pay has been higher than at Brown & Root generally, recruiting has been slow and turnover has been high. There has been duplication of effort by project personnel and consultants. The oil companies, rejected as prime contractors, have remained largely aloof from Brown & Root's project.

Eighteeen minor subcontracts have been awarded. One major subcontract award that is awaiting NSF's approval is for the ship-positioning system. For this, Brown & Root last spring asked for and obtained from, among others, G.E., Raytheon, Philco, General Motors, and Minneapolis-Honeywell, expressions of their capabilities. It then wrote specifications and in August asked for proposals. Brown & Root office scuttlebutt is that Minneapolis-Honeywell's proposal was the best. This company, it will be recalled, had appeared at the January 1962, presentation as a subcontractor recommended by B. & R. for employment. Brown & Root's other major recommended subcontractor, Western Geophysical, last December won, with NSF approval, a site-selection job, beating out three competitors.

At the end of March, a year after starting, Brown & Root had not submitted an overall plan to NSF. It had, however, produced a new and overall budget, up from $47 million to $68 million, with little justification in new technological insights based on work under the contract. The date for spudding in, set by AMSOC in June 1961 for some time in 1963, has been put off. Woodward talks of Labor Day, 1964, Benson of early 1965. Dr. Waterman, asked to evaluate progress, said: "In general, Brown & Root have been slower than we expected. Recently we've been in closer cooperation with the thought in mind of going faster, so we're going ahead. With this new momentum, perhaps they'll carry on under their own steam."

NSF seems hard put to find areas in which Brown & Root has justified NSF's hopes. The foundation had, in effect, turned down companies with in-house technical capability in order to get Brown & Root's alleged ability to recruit, to involve any and all scientists and technical people, and to get things done. Yet in all these areas, Benson admits, Brown & Root has thus far been disappointing. "In a sense," he adds, "I'm fearful of an honest investigation because I've been devoted to this project and it wouldn't take much to sink it."

Mohole may be getting more expensive than can be justified, but to sink it would, in the view of almost all scientists in the related fields, be a crime against science and, indirectly, against technological advance and the national prestige. To keep it afloat, however, the buoyancy given by its scientific sponsors must be restored. Perhaps the first job of the new NSF Director, Dr. Haworth, will be to arrange just that. But then who will supervise the prime contractor? That NSF cannot do it properly as now constituted—and as its mission was originally conceived—is clear.

Yet not all that has happened has been the fault of the contractor or of NSF. Had AMSOC, after phase I, undertaken to operate the project as it had been doing, NSF might never have had a chance to get lost in Mohole. "Many of us now feel that AMSOC should have run phase II," says Chairman Hedberg. Even earlier, Dr. Munk wrote Dr. Hedberg:

"Scherer, Sheppard, and Benson have now replaced the AMSOC committee in its important functions; the only legitimate question is whether they are more qualified or less qualified than AMSOC to make the essential decisions? Were the chances for success enhanced when the project was removed from the authority of an independent group to an in-house NSF activity? And were the young men who gathered under Bascom's daring and devoted (though sometimes willful) leadership less qualified than an amorphous engineering firm which had demonstrated no previous scientific interest in the Mohole venture, or as far as I know in any scientific problem? I have never been able to learn on what grounds the direct approach of a few highly skilled people, which served so successfully in phase, I had to be replaced by the acres-of-engineers philosophy."

WHAT MIGHT BE SUNK?

Dr. Hedberg continues to feel a moral commitment to try to obtain from this project the maximum returns in scientific information for money invested and to restore its original broad scope. But this he wants AMSOC to do without becoming involved in the purely operational aspects. Can a formula be designed to make such a relationship as workable on big science projects involving a commercial contractor as on those for which NSF makes modest grants with no strings attached? Unless it is designed, what may be sunk is more than Project Mohole and its mixed bag of enticing values.

What may be sunk is a good part of the promise of publicly supported basic science as first envisioned by Vannevar Bush. A formula, both safe and flexible, had better be found, for scientists will go right on designing big projects of such basic character as can never hope for private financing.

The man who conceived what became NSF foresaw that Government and science are wedded, for better or for worse. So they are, whether we get Mohole or, as one scientific wag has put it, Nohole.

Is There an Excuse for Managed News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Dancey recently attended a State Department briefing during which the subject of managed news was discussed. Mr. Dancey's objective editorials in the Peoria Journal Star are highly regarded and I commend his report of the aforementioned briefing to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Apr. 29, 1963]

IS THERE AN EXCUSE FOR MANAGED NEWS?

I have had the interesting experience in Washington of hearing the Under Secretary of State for Public Affairs expound on the subject of managed news.

My impression is that it isn't desired, doesn't exist, and is impossible. "The Washington press is too smart," according to Under Secretary Robert J. Manning, that is.

"It's not a question of news management but of access," he argues, while describing how eagerly he tries to open the doors to a free flow of news, providing the source is the key policy people of the State Department.

There were some comments, however, that make one wonder.

Asked why "eyewitness" reporters were banned on occasion, most notably and dramatically those snatched off ships of the fleet and denied access to Guantanamo Naval Base during the Cuban blockade, he led off with the revealing words: "We were afraid things might happen and be reported before." After that it got a little complicated, but there is the heart of it.

Officials are naturally uncomfortable with events which they cannot control, and like to control the timing of news, at least, if possible, and in Washington they have not adjusted to living with events as they take place, unaudited by the administration.

This doesn't mean that such an adjustment is impossible or undesirable, except to them.

Asked if he didn't think rules requiring a "third party" (i.e. a public affairs specialist) at interviews and an official log of all subjects discussed between any official and reporter was not an "inhibition" on news, he replied that "as a reporter" he would not feel inhibited by a third party or a log system.

This doesn't answer how an employee or official of the administration can be expected to react, inhibited or otherwise, by such a practice, and it is the employee who can be fired and who is the source involved in such a conversation that counts.

Asked if he wouldn't consider it an inhibition if the "logging" rule were backed up by lie detector tests inflicted on the Government personnel making the logs, he hesitated, smiled, and said: "I would have to say, yes."

The reference was to a Defense Department report.

Asked about the amount of false information that has been circulated and attributed to "an American official," he said that this is the fault of the reporter concerned, not the administration. The reporter, he opined, ought to know if his source can be trusted and if not, ought not print the story.

Reference was then made to a series of presentations arranged by Mr. Manning, himself, and the initiative being the Department of State, involving a series of officials in very responsible official positions wherein the State Department originated and invoked the rule that they could only be identified as "an American official."

This practice is, after all, invoked by the officials, not by reporters, and unless reporters accede to it, information gets very cloudy indeed.

Finally, Mr. Manning made a bow to the numerous broadcasters present, and a slap at the press, saying that in regional State Department "conferences" where the identity "a U.S. official" was invoked, some 42 "exclusive interviews" were sought in which the officials were identified, all by radio and TV.

I cannot but suspect that this and other evidences of the administration's deep affection for radio and TV, which stations live or die on the basis of a license from this Government, had a touch of news management in them.

I cannot but wonder at the deliberate implication in these "42 exclusive interviews," and how many of them were merely token "stunt" movies of an important official saying a few innocuous words to the local "newscaster," how many were "mobile unit" slap-dash visits, how many of these "exclusive interviews" actually involved more than 1 minute of token conversation? Did that remark convey a "managed" message, while skipping over facts that would have made quite a difference?

Finally, Mr. Manning let slip an unfortunate metaphor when he, in friendly fashion, described himself as a former newsman now in "public affairs" for the Government—with these words: "I'm a poacher turned game warden."

Does a game warden flush birds for the hunters, or restrict the hunting, "manage" the hunting, if you please?

You cannot escape the impression, from this remark and others, that the job of such folks does, inevitably, include "guarding the king's deer" from the hunters of the press.

Which is a metaphor, I like, I never thought of us as in the "Robin Hood" role before, and I must say, the sheriff of Nottingham has every path in this Sherwood Forest pretty well staked out.

C. L. DANCEY,
Washington, D.C.

Kennedy Policy on Financing Competition for U.S. Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt left in the minds of anyone of the ridiculous policies being followed by the Kennedy administration, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 1 should remove them completely.

The White House policy is to use the money of American taxpayers to finance airlines operated by foreign countries to compete with American airlines at a time when there is acknowledged over capacity in world airlines.

It would seem the sole objective of the Kennedy administration is to wreck all types of American private business and industry.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 1, 1963]

A PATTERN OF THE PAST

A White House policy statement declared the other day that the Government intended to do all it could to help U.S. international airlines maintain their "health and growth." But whatever cheer the airlines may have found in those words was soon dissipated.

The statement, for example, said the United States will give "more intensive consideration" to aid requests from so-called underdeveloped countries that want to build up their own airlines systems. From the standpoint of such countries, these airlines often are little more than costly prestige symbols, drawing resources of manpower and money from more economically useful endeavors.

From the standpoint of the U.S. lines, a further stimulus to creation of new prestige airlines cannot help but increase the existing overcapacity on world air routes. Largely as a result of rising capacity of foreign lines, U.S. airlines in 1961 handled only 49 percent of the passengers flown between the United States and foreign points, down from 70 percent in 1951.

Well, it's one thing to encourage competition. It's quite another to subsidize the U.S. lines' foreign rivals. Especially when the White House statement fails to accord the American lines much flexibility to meet the intensifying competitive conditions.

These conditions are particularly severe on the transatlantic run, shared by Trans-World Airlines and Pan American World Airways with a growing host of foreign carriers. TWA has been having its financial troubles for some time and, together with Pan Am, has concluded that a merger would be a good idea.

Through a merger, they reason, they would achieve sizable economies and, perhaps, be able to compete more effectively. But the Government clings to its old rigid rule that there should be more than one U.S. line flying each major route, apparently dooming the TWA-Pan Am proposal.

Subsidies for the foreign lines and rigid rules for their U.S. competitors seem an odd way to promote "health and growth" of U.S. airlines. No businessman can compete for long if he's frozen in a pattern of the past.

Mr. Dillon's Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Secretary of the Treasury suddenly discovered that we may have $1 billion less deficit in fiscal 1964 than originally suspected. Of course this sudden discovery took place just prior to the Secretary's speaking before the chamber of commerce meeting, here in Washington.

I am delighted that our deficit will be less, but it would be much less if the Kennedy administration and its supporters in the Congress would use a little prudence in its recommendation of programs and their votes in the Congress. Today's New York Daily News editorial, though brief, has a few comments on the Secretary's forecast.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Daily News, May 2, 1963]

BIG NEWS FROM DILLON

Business is so good, says Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, that the Kennedy budget deficit may be only $11 billion instead of the previously forecast $12 billion.

Well, goody-goody gumdrop. That's fully as encouraging as it would be to a fellow up to his neck in debt to learn that the finance company, instead of repossessing his car today, had decided to put the matter off until tomorrow.

Kennedy Area Redevelopment Program Just Another Gimmick To Speed Demise of Private Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the area redevelopment program was sold to Congress and the people by President Kennedy as necessary to create jobs in economically depressed areas. Like all the other Kennedy programs, the real objective is coming clear as the program gets underway. In this case, the aim seems to be not so much to create new jobs, but to replace private enterprise with Government-backed businesses.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 28, cites some of the strange projects sponsored by ARA.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 28, 1963]

GAMBLING WITH JOBS

The Area Redevelopment Administration, set up to attack the problems of so-called depressed areas, has been finding itself under attack for its gambling and propensities.

To be sure, some Washington officials insist the agency has been moving along much too slowly. In its nearly 2 years of existence it has managed to okay only $84.8 million of loans and grants for public and private ventures aimed at creating new jobs, little more than a third of the funds it has had available. Any conscientious Federal agency ought to be able to spend more rapidly than that.

On the other hand, as Donald Moffitt reported in this paper the other day, there are others who claim the ARA may be going too fast. Recklessly enough, anyway, that it has been making some pretty strange moves.

The agency, for example, granted $75,200 to Mineral County, Nev., to improve the Hawthorne airport, though much of the airport's traffic consists of customers of the local gambling casino, an odd target for Federal aid.

More important, the agency has been injecting itself into local competitive situations, in a way that seems as likely to destroy jobs as to create them. In nothern California, it loaned a company $325,000 to open a plywood mill, though local lumbermen say there wasn't enough business to keep existing mills busy. And in Maryland, the agency is considering a $2 million loan for a new plant to process soybeans into poultry feed, though local businessmen say existing plants can handle all the soybeans the area seems likely to grow.

Promoters of the new projects contend the complainants simply don't like competition. "Some babies cry if they don't get all the candy," one observes. However, as one critic of the Maryland loan says, "we could hardly complain if this were a privately financed operation but it just isn't fair to use our tax money to build a plant to drive us out of business."

And that leads to perhaps the most important question of all. As Commerce Secretary Hodges concedes, the "more soundly secured" projects have little trouble finding financing outside the ARA. So the agency wound up with the "more difficult projects, the ones which had to be financed through ARA or not at all." In other words, the worst possible risks.

Even if the ARA were not crippling existing businesses and eliminating exsting jobs with its subsidized competition, just how sound a source of new employment are ts last chance gambles?

The Crippling Cut in the Post Office Budget Must Be Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, not often does a display advertisement appear that we think is worth reference in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and thereby becomes preserved and perpetuated. We refer to a cooperative ad, appearing in the Washington Post for May 2, and sponsored by organizations of postal employees and organizations interested in direct mail advertising or mail order business.

The central theme of the advertisement attacks the recent cut, by the House, in the Post Office budget. As Members should so well recall, it was on April 4, 1963, that the House rejected amendments designed to restore $92 million that had been cut by the Appropriations Committee from the budget of the Post Office Department.

Following House action, the Post Office Department announced that because of this reduction there is no alternative but to reduce the extent of postal operations to absorb this cut of nearly $100 million. As we suggested, it is not the usual thing to quote from display advertisements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but, as this advertisement suggests, the ad itself is unique because organizations and groups that have signed this advertisement nearly always disagree. They are even vigorous competitors. Never before in the history have they ever sponsored anything together, let alone a paid advertisement. In stating they agree with each other, the various organizations emphasize that they are not only in agreement with each other but they think the American people agree they must have good postal service.

The content of the ad includes the following:

The United States needs a better * * * not a worse * * * postal service. And, if we are going to get better postal service * * * the crippling cut in the Post Office budget must be restored.

Consider these points. They affect everybody.

1. You are paying $600 million more for your postage this year because Congress has raised your rates. In exchange for this increase in rates, this slice in appropriations would cut the heart out of your postal service. (Remember, the money you pay for postage does not go to the Post Office Department; it goes to the U.S. Treasury. The Post Office must operate within the appropriations Congress votes it.)

2. The Post Office Department does not control its own growth. You and we—the American people—control the growth. The American people increase the mail volume by at least 2,300 million pieces every year. The American people move into new homes at the rate of 4,000 every day. The American population grows by 4 million every year. The American people are opening new housing developments, new office buildings, new apartment house complexes—and they are starting new businesses—every hour of every day. The cut in the budget would mean that the Post Office Department would be expected to handle this enormous extra mail burden with fewer employees than it has now. This simply cannot be done.

3. If the cut in Post Office appropriations remains, at least 4 million Americans will soon be denied postal service to which they are entitled. At least 2 million other Americans who are now receiving mail delivery will have it taken away from them. Thousands upon thousands of businesses located in new office buildings will be denied postal service. Tens of thousands of farmers will be isolated from the postal service.

4. The proposed cut in appropriations will result in primitive, uncertain, and slower postal service. This will be annoying to the average postal patron. It will be seriously damaging to the businessman. And, for the thousands of businessmen and the millions of their employees who depend for their living on the ability to send perishable goods through the mails swiftly, it will mean downright disaster. Just at a time when we are trying to rejuvenate the economy by increasing sales and decreasing unemployment, this proposed cut in appropriations would cause much commerce carried on by mail to grind to a halt, thereby decreasing sales and increasing unemployment.

5. The money that is needed cannot be squeezed out of the hides of the postal employees. This is demonstrable. The productivity of postal employees has been rising at the rate of 6 percent per year, ever since the end of World War II. This remarkable performance is unmatched in any other comparable industry. The only way the Department can squeeze out this $2 million is by cutting down postal service to the bone and throwing postal workers out of their jobs.

6. The traditional American flow of information—one of the basic supports of our democratic way of life—will be seriously impaired, as all classes of mail get slow service.

Mr. and Mrs. America should have the greatest postal service in the world. They are paying higher postage rates to get it—the highest rates in the world. But, if this cut in appropriations is permitted to stand, the postal service tomorrow will be a nation disgrace and an international laughing stock.

The U.S. Congress is the key to this crisis.

The Congress can restore the money that has been cut out of the postal budget. Write or wire your Senators and Congressmen today. Tell them that Mr. and Mrs. America want to preserve the U.S. postal service from degradation and disgrace. Ask them to fight and vote for the restoration of the $92 million to the postal appropriations.

National Association of Letter Carriers; United Federation of Postal Clerks; Mail Order Association of America; Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc.; Mail Advertising Service Association International; National Mail Order Nurserymen's Association; and Parcel Post Association, Inc.

There is little doubt in my mind that this 1st session of the 88th Congress will be remembered and applauded for its sincere and constant efforts to reduce Federal expenditures. A good start has already been made. To recapitulate

some of these efforts, many of us voted against the amendment to increase funds for additional RS–70, which would have saved $363 million. The Interior appropriations bill saved $92 million from the budget estimate. Approximately $100 million was sliced from budget estimate by the House on the Labor-H.E.W. appropriations bill. The Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill was approved in an amount by about $149 million less than the budget estimates. However, $92 million of this is the center of the present argument over whether a budget reduction should be a sort of percentage thing, or an across-the-board reduction without reference to what happens, or should there be selective, carefully considered, reductions so they will not affect everybody in these United States adversely.

The clear-cut conclusions to be drawn from the huge reduction of postal appropriations are as follows:

First. That the American people will be paying $600 million more this year for less or poorer postal service than they received last year.

Second. The House has implied by its reduction that notwithstanding the Nation's growth in population of 4 million persons a year, the Post Office Department must continue to handle the growing mail burden just as efficiently with fewer employees. Anyone who can think at all knows this is impossible.

Third. This reduction will adversely affect commerce served by mail, decreasing sales and increasing unemployment, at a time when we are seeking to rejuvenate our economy.

Fourth. The present reduction cannot be absorbed by accelerated efficiency but only through reducing service and throwing postal workers out of their jobs. Productivity of postal employees has increased at over 6 percent each year since World War II. This is unmatched in any other industry.

In conclusion I want to add my own emphasis to the importance of the well-chosen words of the ad "the crippling cut in the Post Office budget must be restored."

Apologist for Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a very appropriate editorial in today's New York Daily News is submitted herewith, in view of the fact that Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas is so enamoured of recognizing Red China.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Daily News, May 2, 1963]

SHUT UP OR GET OUT

U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice William O. Douglas sounded off in Chicago Tuesday for U.S. recognition of Red China and for Red China's admission to the United Nations. With the sound-off went various kind words for Mao Tze-tung's broad and blood-soaked domain.

If the learned Justice is so hot to have Mao made respectable, why doesn't he quit the Supreme Court and join some organization dedicated to that objective?

How ethical is it for Douglas to use the prestige of his office to promote a cause opposed by the great majority of his fellow Americans who pay his fat salary? Narrow-minded though they may be in the Douglas view, those Americans haven't yet forgiven Red China for our 33,000 battle deaths in the Korean war.

Our Great Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the April 19, 1963, issue of the Morning Herald, Hagerstown, Md., entitled "Our Greatest Danger."

The editorial follows:

[From the Hagerstown (Md.) Morning Herald, Apr. 19, 1963]

OUR GREATEST DANGER

An undercurrent of worry is running through the country, worry about increasing unemployment, worry about confusion in Washington, worry about the failures of our foreign policy in Cuba and Europe, and worry about possible atomic war with Russia. But most people don't worry about the greatest danger of all the many dangers we face because they don't even recognize it as being dangerous.

The greatest danger to our future as a nation is simply the fact that it has now become politically impossible to control the Federal budget. This is not a reflection on any political party, because any administration that hoped to get reelected would be forced to handle the problem in much the same way, within a narrow range of difference. The inescapable truth is that considerably more than half of all voters, regardless of party, are getting some direct or indirect benefits from the Federal Government. Citizens now receiving benefits are not only extremely unwilling to surrender them but are also in many cases exerting considerable pressure to get more. Any determined effort in Congress or the White House to cut benefits is now recognized as a quick form of political suicide. There are 2½ million Federal employees, not counting almost 3 million in the Armed Forces. Almost 3 million farmers receive Government checks. Four million people are working on Government defense contracts, and the prosperity of many communities is entirely based on whether or not the local industries can get Government orders. The advertising, printing, and publishing industries are subsidized by postage at less than cost. Many industries are aided by Government subsidies to land, water, and air transportation. Over 2 million veterans and dependents are pensioned. More than 5 million people get electric power from cooperatives financed by 2 percent Government loans. Surplus food is distributed to uncounted millions. Old-age relief, medical assistance and survivor's insurance go to more than 3 million, and social security checks are reaching 13 million more. These are only the beginning of an enormous list of varied ways in which Federal money and Federal services reach the voting public.

Our present economic sickness has been diagnosed by many professionally competent economists, inside the Government as well as outside, as being caused by the high level of taxation needed to pay for only part of these benefits, a level which although it destroys incentive and discourages expansion, is still high enough to prevent the growth of an enormous debt. As a nation we are living beyond our means. Unless we can somehow reverse the trend, private enterprise will eventually be destroyed in this country, and we will sink into the hopeless gray bureaucratic mire of socialism.

The 3d of May: The Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the 3d of May, we in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, traditionally pause to honor on behalf of the American people the national holiday of free Poland. This year, in addition to commemorating Poland's great liberal constitution of 1791, we pay tribute to the patriotism, sacrifice, and love of liberty shown by the Polish people during the longest and bloodiest of their many fights against foreign tyranny: the Polish January uprising of 1863.

In that uprising, poorly equipped and insufficiently supplied, Polish patriots fought an occupation army for over 2 years, bending only to defeat when 350,000 seasoned troops were brought in by the occupying power. Over 250,000 of Poland's best sons, the flower of its manhood, were killed in battles, executed or exiled to slave labor camps.

Ironically, the 100th anniversary of that struggle again finds the Polish people subjugated by the same occupying power—Russia. Once again, however, evidence indicates that the same spirit of freedom and desire for national independence which was important in the January uprising and in the earlier uprisings against Russian rule—the Kosciuszko uprising of 1794 and the November uprising in 1831—is in operation.

The Poznan riots, the refusal of Polish peasants to accept collectivism, and the move toward increased freedom from Soviet trade domination, all illustrate this spirit. Among young intellectuals throughout the Communist world, Poland enjoys the reputation of being the freest trading place of ideas. There one goes if one desires the stimulation of the latest Western literary and artistic movements—and less openly—political and economic ideas.

We Americans salute the Polish people on their national day and during the 100th anniversary of one of their many struggles for freedom and we hope that

their present resistance to foreign control will continue to bring increased political, economic, and cultural independence.

We hope that once again soon the 3d of May will find the liberalism embodied in the constitution of 1791—so close in time and sentiment to our own Constitution—fully in operation:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation of the State, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting founda-

Let it be known that the mass of American people, as opposed to a minority of boycotters, support the Polish people in their fight in this direction.

Coalition and Beachhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in southeast Asia we are once again in the Communist aggression season. It comes every spring just as regularly as rain. The last time the Pathet Lao and the North Vietnamese started fighting in Laos, the Kennedy administration played a major role in the Geneva Convention and acceded to the primary objective of the Communist Chinese—the troika government in Laos.

Many of us questioned the wisdom of that decision at the time, and with the advent of this new aggression season our concerns have been shown to be valid. The same policy which was followed in Laos seems to be that which we are following in Cuba—what belongs to the Communists is theirs, what belongs to the free world is subject to negotiation and compromise.

The following Wall Street Journal editorial, of May 1, raises the same question:

COALITION AND BEACHHEAD

Short of a major war, there probably never was much the United States could do in Laos against determined Communist aggression. But of the available courses it seems to have chosen the one that could hardly be expected to work.

This was last year's coalition government representing Communists, neutralists and pro-Western factions. It didn't require any great prescience to predict the outcome, and now the Communists seem on the way to taking over the country; if they stop short it will presumably be only for some obscure reason of their own.

So once again the double lesson is driven home: coalitions of this sort are a route to Red victory, and for Communists agreements are made to be broken. As an alternative, some kind of partition arrangement, backed up by pro-Western troops, might at least have offered a hope of containing the Communists in one part of the country.

In addition, the Laotian mess underscores questions about U.S. policy elsewhere, such as Cuba. Strategically almost everything was against us in Laos, and it would be hard to argue that we should have fought for it. Regarding Cuba we are in a commanding position, and it ought to be possible to use that advantage to persuade Khrushchev to withdraw his troops.

The Communists' view is that we should stay out of any area they have or hope to get, while they are free to meddle wherever they please. When the United States sanctions a coalition in Laos and a Soviet beachhead in Cuba, people are bound to wonder whether the United States also believes they should have it both ways.

Poland Shows Who's Directing the Sellout of the Treaty in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is just too bad Khrushchev never seems to get the signals straight. While in Moscow he is "agreeing in principle" with President Kennedy's envoy, Averell Harriman, that everyone should live up to the treaty in Laos, Poland is doing everything possible to help the Communist offensive there. And Poland takes orders from Russia. In spite of the quick double-cross he gets every time he tries to make a deal with Khrushchev, President Kennedy keeps trying and continues to try convince the American people that the deeper in the mud he is pushed by the Red dictator, the greater our victory. No wonder the Kennedy policies, or rather the Kennedy no-policy, are confusing.

The following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 1, points out the double role Communist Poland is playing in Laos:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 1, 1963]

POLISH PUPPETS IN LAOS

In Laos, a new troublemaker emerges. It is Communist Poland, which furnishes a 50-man team as part of the three-nation International Control Commission charged with supervising the Geneva-made peace.

Our correspondent W. D. Friedenberg wrote about it yesterday from the Laotian capital, Vientiane. The Poles are plainly sabotaging the effectiveness of the control commission. They refuse to sign reports when Canadian and Indian observers on the ICC, as well as the Poles themselves, personally witness truce violations by the Communist side.

No one doubts that Communist Poland is Russia's operative tool in Laos. Thus the conclusion is that the Poles are a handy recourse for carrying on Moscow's dirty work in the war-threatened country while Russia professes to adhere to the Geneva accords and takes a stance for peace.

In this perspective, the Khrushchev pledge to Averell Harriman can't mean much. If the Poles got their guidelines from Communist China, their troublemaking would be understandable, as part of the struggle between Moscow and Peiping. But Russia is clearly their boss.

So, if Russia really wants to demonstrate good faith in cooperating with the United States on Laotian peace, Moscow had better put its Polish puppets in line. Monkey business on the scene, such as this, can't be hidden.

Smaller Business Association of New England Presents Legislative Proposals For Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, today members of the Smaller Business Association of New England are visiting in Washington and have presented in a very effective manner the legislative proposals which deserve the consideration of the Congress.

For the past several years officials of the Smaller Business Association of New England, which is the most effective and active organization of the small businessmen of that section of our Nation, have made their annual visit to Washington to present their views and make suggestions for congressional action.

I am pleased to present a summary of their legislative proposals and recommendations. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following summary of legislative proposals and recommendations of the Smaller Business Association of New England in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, small business produces 35 percent of the gross national product, pays 40 percent of the taxes, and employs 30 million of our citizens. Three out of every seven persons employed in the United States today is an owner, manager, or worker in a small business.

Small business is an essential ingredient of American economic and political freedom. It keeps our economy dynamic, providing consumers with a wide variety and high quality of products and services. It prevents concentration of political and economic power and consequent loss of individual freedom.

As small businessmen, we are disturbed by the problems that beset our economy today. Our population is soaring. In 1970, it will be 213.8 million, with 235 million forecast for 1975. Over 1 million new persons are being added to the work force each year. By 1970, our economy must have jobs for 85 to 86 million workers. Our gross national product is rising, but at a rate which barely sustains our standard of living, let alone improve it.

Foreign competition is increasingly boring into our domestic, as well as our foreign markets. Technological advances in industry are eliminating thousands of jobs, and new jobs are not being created rapidly enough to absorb the dislocated workers. As a result, we have reached a distressingly high plateau of unemployment nationally and in critical areas, direct Federal aid is required to maintain the standard of living at a substistence level.

Total employment is now at an all time high of 70 million. According to the Labor Department, however, 9.6 million new jobs will be needed in the next 5 years to offset automation. Normal population growth will add 6.5 million job hunters for a 16 million total. Yet, our civilian employment total has increased only 2.6 million since 1957. According to these projections, our economy must provide over six times as many new jobs in the next 5 years as it has produced in the past 6 years.

How can we find a sound and efficient way to move our economy forward so it will not only support our expanding population, absorb our technologically displaced workers, and meet our international commitments; but also continue the rising standard of living that is an American tradition.

May we suggest that the answer lies in the great potential capacity of small business.

Why? Because small business has more elements favoring growth than any other phase of our economy.

1. It can start faster and accelerate more rapidly than big business. It has less inertia to overcome, so less horsepower is required to get it moving.

2. It is widely diversified. Big businesses are concentrated in specific markets; whereas small businesses are scattered through every field of endeavor, either as direct suppliers of goods and services, or as vendors to large businesses.

3. It is rooted in the small cities and towns which are the backbone of America; whereas big businesses cannot utilize the work resources of scattered small communities, because they must have a large pool of employees within commuting distances.

4. Its management is strongly motivated because it is usually owner operated. Since the welfare of the owner's family is completely dependent upon the success of his business, he has a direct personal incentive which is sometimes lacking in the management of huge concerns. Furthermore, he is personally acquainted with his employees and has a strong interest in their welfare.

5. It is seldom engaged in speculation. In the financial section of your newspaper, you often find as much discussion of the prices of stocks of big business, as you see reports on how much they contributed to the gross national product. That is not true of small business. Ownership of the small business seldom changes, and to the average owner or operator, his business represents his best efforts to support himself and his family by meeting a need for goods or services.

6. It is uniformly distributed. Small business is not localized as is the automotive industry in Detroit, or the aircraft industry in southern California. From New England to Oregon—from Minnesota to Louisiana—millions of small businesses are operating—in every, city, town, and village.

7. Its capital requirements are low. It takes literally billions of dollars to organize a General Electric or a General Dynamics; but a small business is normally started with personal funds from the savings bank, and additional operating capital is usually the direct result of the operation of the business itself.

8. It represents every segment of the electorate. Small business cuts across economic, social, geographic, cultural and political boundaries. Electronics manufacturers in Massachusetts and California * * * the TV repairman in Louisville; ranchers in Nevada * * * the grocer in Duluth; the wholesaler in Atlanta * * * the stationery store on Main Street anywhere; the pharmaceutical house in New Jersey * * * the country doctor in Montana; garment firms on New York's Seventh Avenue * * * the Bon Ton Specialty Shoppe in Dubuque; dairy farmers in Wisconsin * * * the "Mom and Pop" store on Chicago's West Side. Butcher * * * Baker * * * Candlestick Maker * * * each helping to weave the fabric of free enterprise that sustains our way of life.

And may we remind you that these millions of operators of small businesses are not "small" in intelligence, ability or imagination, and that their operational efficiency is not necessarily lower than that of big business. Remember that small business is the incubator of big business.

But small business needs your help to do the job. Figures released by Dun and Bradstreet reveal on alarming increase in business failures since World War II.

It is true that our economy has expanded tremendously in this period, and thousands of new business ventures are launched each year. It is significant, however, that in the past 3 years, the number of failures has been approximately 60 percent of the number of new businesses. Furthermore, approximately 40 percent of the firms that failed were over 5 years old and 20 percent were over 10 years old. So, it is apparent that not only new businesses, but an increasing number of established concerns, are unable to operate successfully in today's economy. As small businesses encounter difficulty, many of them are merged into big businesses, and these mergers exert additional pressure on the remaining small firms.

Small business growth is restricted by monopolistic practices of big business and big unions. Furthermore, its experience and facilities are not being fully utilized by big government procurement—a vital segment of our economy today.

The program we have presented today represents a concerted effort by all members of our association to offer practical solutions to some of these problems. We urge your careful considerations of our proposals, which are summarized as follows:

1. Stimulus to increased investment: Freeing of capital for investment in new facilities through liberalized rates of taxation.

2. Increased share of Government procurement: Small business can contribute much more to our defense effort. All it asks is equal opportunity for all businesses, regardless of size.

3. Improvement of the labor climate: Management and labor must pool their resources to raise productivity to higher levels. Labor must accept the responsibility of full partnership in this endeavor.

The Smaller Business Association of New England appreciates the consideration you have shown to small business in the past, and we offer our sincere thanks for the time and attention which you have given us today. May we look forward to continuing cooperation between our association and the Congress of the United States.

Israel 15th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, none of us needs reminding that this is the 15th anniversary of the independence of Israel. The occasion is being commemorated, not only in synagogues and Jewish homes across the country, but also by all of us who cherish the values of freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

Today it seems hard to believe that only a few short years ago it was possible to despair of the Jewish people. Millions had been murdered by the Nazis; hundreds of thousands of others had been driven from their homes. But those who despaired in the dark years of the war forgot one thing: that the Jewish people had a vision—a vision of one day returning to their ancient homeland. The Jewish people sustained that vision, and the vision sustained them. And in the following years, like a phoenix from the ashes, the State of Israel arose—proud, strong, and free.

Today it ought to be possible simply to praise and rejoice at all that the people of Israel have accomplished. It ought to be possible simply to rest assured that the independence of Israel is inviolable. But of course, just as 15 years ago, Israel is in danger. Foreign rocket experts in Egypt are adding daily to that country's armed strength. The union of Syria and Iraq with Egypt will almost certainly lead to a revival of Arab militancy directed against Israel. Recent disturbances in Jordan pose a threat which cannot be ignored.

And, just as they did 15 years ago, the people of Israel look to us in the United States for assistance in restraining the Arab States, for support in the United Nations, for diplomatic moves to reduce tension throughout the Middle East. We in this country can no more think of denying support to Israel today than we could in her hour of greatest peril. I am sure all Members of Congress will agree with me when I say this—that the people of Israel may be confident that the United States is not going to abandon them now or in the future. I take this opportunity to reiterate America's friendship for the people of Israel and to pay tribute to their enormous devotion, industry, and heroism.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, Poland adopted a constitution which is still considered a milestone in the development of constitutional democracy as we know it today. This great liberal document provided for a sweeping governmental reform based on the principles of representative self-government and justice for all.

Poland was transformed into a hereditary constitutional monarchy, townspeople were given judicial autonomy and a degree of parliamentary representation, the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law, and religious toleration was established.

These progressive measures were joyously received by the Poles—from the enlightened King Stanislas Augustus to the humblest citizen. But they were not welcomed by Poland's neighbors, who were still in the grip of autocratic rulers.

Russia, fearing a strengthened Polish regime, invaded the country less than a year after the constitution had been proclaimed. Deserted by their Prussian allies, the Poles were defeated and forced to see their country completely dismembered by Austria, Prussia, and Russia in 1793 and 1795.

Despite this abrupt end to Poland's experiment in constitutional government, the principles of freedom and democracy embodied in the May 3 constitution have continued to serve as an inspiration to the Polish people in their troubled history. They have bolstered the Poles' spirit of resistance to the oppressive system under which they are forced to live at present.

The annual observance of Polish Constitution Day is thus a meaningful event for us all. It naturally has a particular significance for Poles and Americans of Polish descent. But all Americans share in the great hopes for liberty and self-government which this document symbolizes for the Polish people.

Summer Student Political Patronage Through the Back Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the White House political chiefs have waged a long and sometimes clever battle to add summer student employees to their patronage list. Fortunately, an alert press, the Civil Service Commission, and personnel officers within the various departments, backed up by Members of Congress, have revealed these machinations to the public and sought to prevent the first step toward possible destruction of the merit system itself. Each department and agency has had to submit summer hiring plans to the Civil Service Commission, and has had to sign statements that political interference will not be tolerated, before any summer student help could be hired.

The White House, however, which refuses to concede it has had any intention to use political pressure and patronage, continues to say more with actions than words. Today in the Washington Post, columnist Jerry Kluttz has revealed that White House letters are going to agencies on behalf of students stating blandly that they "expect" these students to be hired. With the front door slammed in their face by adverse public opinion and reaction by students and faculty alike, administration patrons are trying to get in the back way. Mr. Kluttz reports that the White House will undoubtedly check to see if their students are hired.

Fortunately, the Civil Service Commission also is interested in whether they are hired or not. Commission inspection staff members will concentrate on summer student hirings over the next months, and I trust this material on personnel records, reasons for applying, how a student got his job and the like will be made available in some form for further public scrutiny.

The number of jobs now available for summer students, however, has been reduced quite significantly due to the actions of the White House politicians, and the failures by the administration in trying to economize within the full-time work force. It would be unfortunate if any student desiring both the experience of working in Government and the financial rewards of a job, should now be cut off from both goals. There is some talk of hiring qualified students from slum areas which, in my opinion, is an idea worth considering, provided they are qualified and the jobs to be filled are not make-work projects of no value to anyone. Otherwise this program would simply be another welfare project, reflecting the inability of the administration to provide a job stimulating climate in the Nation in general.

The article by Mr. Kluttz follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1963]

CSC TO ALLOW SUMMER JOB HIRING FOR ALL

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Civil Service Commission will approve plans of every major Federal agency to hire students for temporary summer jobs in the Washington area.

At yesterday's deadline, it had not suspended the hiring authority of a single agency on grounds of partisan political interference with the hiring system.

Three weeks ago, CSC announced it would withdraw agencies' authority to make temporary appointments here between May 1 and October 1 because of reports that the White House was pressuring agencies to make appointments based on political pull.

At the time, the Commission said it would continue to permit only those agencies to make the appointments without its prior approval when their revised hiring plans promised full compliance with the law and its merit rules and not to base appointments on a political clearance system.

As a result, agencies that will use students this summer sent CSC details of their hiring plans along with certifications signed by their respective heads that political interference will not be tolerated. Each of the plans either has or will be approved by CSC.

Despite the black eye it received in the unprecedented Civil Service crackdown, the White House hasn't lost interest in the jobs even though it has denied all along that it plans to restrict student appointees to those it clears politically. The temporary jobs are under the merit system and Civil Service has made clear that it would be a direct violation of law to subject them to political clearances in any form.

Since the Commission's action, agencies report they have received letters from the White House recommending students for jobs, an accepted practice in which any person or organization is free to participate. Some White House letters state that they expect the students to be hired.

The White House, of course, would deny it is trying to pressure the agencies to hire by the use of the word "expect" or that it has cleared politically those it recommends, but the White House will check up to find out if the agencies followed its recommendations.

The names and addresses of hired employees will be sent to them by the agencies. This latter step has been approved by the CSC which explains it will help the White House to plan for student seminars and other activities.

Civil Service, however, has ordered its inspection staff to concentrate on student hirings here for the next month or 6 weeks.

The inspectors will start first with those agencies that plan to take on at least 100 students; next will be a look at agencies that hire between 50 and 100, and finally those with less than 50.

The personnel records of each student hired will be examined, and in many cases the student will be interviewed to find out how he happened to apply at the agency, how he got his job, if he has passed a CSC exam, et cetera.

Meanwhile, a new pressure, which agency officials are generally in sympathy with, is being felt throughout Government here. An appeal has been made to hire qualified students from slum areas as a preventative to juvenile delinquency and law-breaking.

Most agencies, however, have cut back sharply summer hiring plans because of the controversy over them and congressional actions which will require them to absorb from available funds a larger share of the cost of last year's employee pay raise. They haven't the money to hire large numbers of temporary people.

The bulk of the 3,000 to be hired in the Washington area will be typists, stenographers, and students who are pursuing professional studies.

But if the White House encourages agencies to hire more students here to get them off the streets and away from bad influences, the agencies could easily end up by doubling or tripling present hiring plans.

Late yesterday, CSC still hadn't approved summer hiring plans for Federal Aviation, Government Printing, Labor, and Post Office Departments. Their proposals didn't reach the Commission until yesterday. The personnel agency doesn't anticipate any trouble with them.

Montgomery Blair Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the name of Montgomery Blair is familiar to Americans as one of the members of the Lincoln war cabinet. His many other contributions to the Nation are less well known. The increasingly rare action of the Post Office Department in issuing a Montgomery Blair commemorative stamp has been the occasion for recalling something more about him. A ceremony will be held at Montgomery Blair High School in Silver Spring tomorrow, May 3, 1963, in recognition of the issuance of the stamp and in tribute to the life of a useful citizen. Some of the interesting aspects of Montgomery Blair's career are outlined in the appended resolution of the Republican State Central Committee of Montgomery County.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.

Whereas the U.S. Government has seen fit to issue a commemorative stamp honoring Montgomery Blair, Postmaster General in the administration of Abraham Lincoln; and

Whereas Montgomery Blair served with distinction as a graduate of West Point, as a lawyer and jurist, as counsel for Dred Scott, as president of the first State Republican Convention of Maryland; and

Whereas as Postmaster General, from 1861–1864, he introduced such innovations as the

postal union, free postal delivery in cities, money orders and salaried postal employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican State Central Committee of Montgomery County express support for the celebration of this historic event and commend the Post Office Department for its recognition of a truly great American.

The White House—Also City Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with the insatiable appetite for power of President Kennedy and his socialized advisors now in full swing in the White House, it is well to consider this article by Richard Wilson, in yesterday's Evening Star, wherein he points out how the White House may become the city hall for every small community and large city in the United States. The people must decide what they want. They must realize what they are getting into, before stampeding toward Federal handouts.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 1, 1963]

WASHINGTON: NATION'S CITY HALL?—ADMINISTRATION'S STATE-LOCAL PROGRAMS HELD LIKELY TO GROW UNCONTROLLABLE

(By Richard Wilson)

Occasionally in this world capital a flash of insight illuminates issues that are of real concern to people all over the country.

Residential zoning is one of these. In the Capital the issues are sometimes exotic. Militant residents of my own neighborhood, heady with victory over the Catholic Church on a school zoning issue, are now considering moving on the Embassy of Switzerland. The wild cries of the Swiss Ambassador's peacocks, which simulate the screams of a lady in distress, are disturbing the peace.

An author friend reports a chaotic zoning fight in remote Sanibel Island in the Gulf of Mexico. Even John F. Kennedy got tangled in a zoning contest when his in-laws sold some valuable property. The President didn't take sides; he merely pleaded that nothing unnecessary be done to upset his in-laws.

Daily and nightly in every city and suburb of the Nation rise the agonized complaints before municipal agencies of those who are objecting to being pushed closer and closer together. The spirit of '76 pales beside the passion of the embattled howeowner, his whole life story rushing to his stuttering tongue, as he fights some real or imagined challenge to his status, his home investment or his domestic tranquillity.

The Kennedy administration is rushing with all deliberate speed into the morass of municipal affairs in our crowded cities and teeming suburbs. It touches zoning on urban renewal and interstate highway projects. But the Kennedy aims are far broader and if finally achieved may yet make Washington the Nation's city hall.

President Kennedy exposed his own interests in a recent speech which obviously intrigued him but bored his listeners, and was generally ignored in the news stories. He talked at length about "Random Village," an imaginary cross-section suburb, and how its citizens are now, and will be in the future, involved with the Federal authorities.

Mr. Kennedy used Random Village's 100 residents as a vehicle to ride the whole range of his programs: tax cuts, youth corps, aid to education, public park improvements, medical care, mental care, urban renewal, water pollution, juvenile delinquency, employment retraining, etc. Before the President was finished, hardly a single resident of Random Village had escaped the embracing arm of Washington.

"In short," The President summed up, "the Federal Government is not a remote bureaucracy. It must seek to meet those needs of the individual, the family and the community which can best be met by the nationwide cooperation of all and which cannot be met by State and local governments."

In what seemed to some of his listeners a strange inversion of thought, Mr. Kennedy said that if Washington doesn't bear these burdens they will just fall back on the local States and communities. Some would say that is where they belong.

In the current issue of Reader's Digest, its Washington editor, Charles Stevenson, helps us understand the kind of thing that is going on in this field. If you will consult the Federal budget, you will find that the Housing and Home Finance Agency is credited with a $695 million expenditure in certain fields when, in fact, it will pay out 4 times as much—$3.7 billion—for the stated purposes. The President's budget is a masterpiece of legerdemain in this regard.

The Kennedy administration has started or is trying to start prorams which seem only a small part of the budget now, but are destined to grow into multimillion or multibillion-dollar enterprises. This is true of programs in education, mass transit, juvenile delinquency, employment training, the Hometown Youth Corps, the National Service Corps, medical care. All will grow into something far bigger than when they were begun, and the record shows Congress cannot control them.

Some of the facts about this cityside trend in the Kennedy administration are in dispute. The President says he is holding back needed nondefense spending. But House appropriations experts say defense spending has gone up 17 percent under Mr. Kennedy and nondefense spending has jumped 27 percent.

Mr. Kennedy's view is that while the Nation has grown greatly we are spending less of our national product for nondefense purposes than 25 years ago, and the percentage has remained almost unchanged for 10 years.

Whatever the merits of this argument, there is no doubt of the final Kennedy aim. It is to expand the Federal Government's services to the "individual, the family and the community" on a multi-billion-dollar scale. He is expanding concepts of Federal aid beyond those of his predecessors. "The Federal Government," says the President, "is the people, and the budget is a reflection of their need."

By this yardstock the Federal Government would absorb local responsibilities on an ever-increasing scale.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, we are today saluting the Polish people in their never-ending quest for political freedom. This spirit is best represented by that documentation of political moderation and liberalism, the Polish Constitution of 1791. Though framed at a time when Poland was surrounded by political reaction in Russia, Prussia, and Austria, some of the breath of liberty sweeping Western Europe as a result of the American and French Revolutions reached the eager leaders of Polish liberalism, led by an enlightened King.

In spite of intense opposition from the landed aristocracy, they drafted and put into law in the form of a Constitution, those basic liberties that should be enjoyed by all citizens in a democratic state. This Constitution was overthrown by force from a benighted Russia, abetted by Polish malcontents, yet defeat did not kill the spirit of Polish liberalism. The heroic patriots of Poland fought on, and still fight today against any form of oppression. Their liberalism and democratic spirit are admired by the free peoples of the world and, in our remembering the sacrifices made in the past to their dedication, may we assure them of our continued interest and support in their cause of liberty.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 of each year marks the national holiday of the Polish people known an Constitution Day. It was on that date in 1791 that Poland adopted a constitution investing sovereignty in the people and a bicameral legislature very much like ours was set up. This was the era of the American and the French revolutions which had planted the seeds of democracy in many parts of the world, and the people of Poland were among the first to accept these ideals and to establish a new democratic order.

Since then 172 eventful years have passed and yet the high ideals and principles advocated in the Polish Constitution still retain their validity and vitality because they hold the promise of freedom, independence and human dignity for the Polish people. The years since 1791 have not been happy for Poland, which had been pillaged and partitioned unmercifully and its people suffered many indignities.

It is not surprising to learn from history that on several notable occasions the people of Poland rose in arms against their Russian oppressors, the most dramatic being the Polish uprising of 1863 which was the longest and bloodiest in Polish history. It lasted for over 2 years and some 250,000 Poles were either killed in battle, executed by firing squads, or deported to Siberian mines and prisons from which many never returned. There was wholesale confiscation of property

and almost total destruction of the Polish economy. The Polish language was banned from the schools and public use in an effort by the Russians to destroy Polish culture.

Americans of Polish descent are this year observing the 100th anniversary of the uprising of 1863 and are utilizing this occasion to pay tribute to Polish patriots and fighters for freedom throughout the centuries of Poland's long history. Poland's lot under Communist oppression is not in the least better today, however, and once again the Polish nation is fighting for its freedom, its cultural and religious survival, and its way of life.

We in America are well aware of the deep anxiety in the hearts of our Polish friends and neighbors regarding their kinsmen who are suffering under the yoke of communism in Poland. They are suffering in that unhappy land today in grim silence, unable to speak their mind freely or even practice their religion openly. They are part of a vast prison of captive European nations which make up the Communist empire. Their masters sit in the Kremlin in Moscow, and from there they direct control of Poland and its people.

Americans of Polish descent have not forgotten their motherland nor the millions of their freedom-loving kinsmen there who have a profound attachment to Western culture, civilization, and ideals. Poles in this country have strong cultural and religious ties with Poland and its people. They are doing all in their power to encourage them, to keep their hopes for self-determination and their desire for freedom burning bright. In these efforts, we must assist them and give them all possible support.

We in Connecticut are particularly proud of our fellow citizens of Polish ancestry. They are a hard-working, sturdy and loyal element in the population. They retain the rich heritage of their culture and religion, as well as their passionate love for freedom. They have made great contributions to American civilization and have vastly enriched our way of life and our concept of democracy.

On this occasion of Polish Constitution Day we pay a well-deserved tribute to her national heroes who fought for Poland's independence in the past, and to her silent heroes of today who fight for her freedom in our day. We join with the Polish people abroad and in our own country in hope and prayer that Poland will once again attain its freedom in the near future.

Public Housing Does Not Breed Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the publication Human Events recently had a particularly vicious attack against the New York City Housing Authority in particular and the concept of public housing in general.

The Human Events article, which was written by a 19-year-old college sophomore, appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD on March 13, 1963. For a factual statement of conditions in New York's public housing I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter from the Honorable William Reid, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY,
New York, N.Y., April 24, 1963.

Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the remarks of Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, printed on page A1384 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1963, which consist principally of a reprint of an article published in Human Events, written by Stephen H. Marcus, entitled "Crime in New York City's Public Housing."

The members of the New York City Housing Authority are realists, and so are those who manage public housing developments throughout the Nation. We know that public housing cannot solve all of the problems of the low-income families whom we house. We move these families from unsafe, insanitary, and overcrowded quarters into decent accommodations where they have the opportunity to raise their children to be healthy and responsible citizens. A favorite device of those who oppose public housing is to assign to it responsibility for curing all the ills of our society and then berate it for failing to do so.

In New York City, almost half a million persons live in 106 public housing developments. Many of these developments are located in sections of the city where the authority has demolished the worst slums and has built new structures. Because of the nature of the surrounding neighborhoods, the authority supplements the normal protection provided by the New York City Police Department, by assigning housing officers to certain developments.

Some newspapers have followed the practice of giving wide publicity to each incident in a public housing development, thus giving the false impression that violence and crime are widespread in public housing.

Here are the facts:

There is not, and there never has been, any crimewave in public housing in New York City. Captains of the various police precincts in the city have consistently reported that there are fewer crimes and incidents in public housing developments than in the surrounding areas making up the balance of the precincts.

The records of the New York City Police Department and the authority's own records show that the arrest rate for public housing tenants is lower than that of the city as a whole.

Official records for the year 1961, the latest available, show a citywide arrest rate for felonies and serious misdemeanors, of 6.3 per thousand persons, while the tenant arrest rate for similar offenses committed off as well as on project grounds, is only 3.8 for every thousand persons.

Juvenile delinquency rates in public housing developments are lower than in the surrounding neighborhoods. A special analysis of developments located in high delinquency areas, shows a delinquency rate of 69 per thousand youths in public housing, compared with a rate of 98 per thousand youths in surrounding neighborhoods.

Homicides in public housing developments do not occur "almost daily" and do not occur "50 percent more frequently per hundred thousand residents than in the city as a whole." During 1961, the last complete year for which data are available for both public housing and for the city, 16 homicides were reported in public housing. This rate was well below that for the total city population.

The so-called confidential report referred to by Mr. Marcus, is nothing more than an annual report of the director of management, issued routinely and quite widely distributed. It most certainly does not state that "most of the persons apprehended for criminal behavior on project grounds, are project tenants," as Mr. Marcus asserts. Neither does it in any way justify the other outrageous statements and alleged statistics cited by Mr. Marcus. The careful records maintained by the authority prove that Mr. Marcus is adept at distortion.

Mr. Marcus is a 19-year-old sophomore at a local college. He never wrote to, or visited the authority's offices to obtain information for his article or to check his wild statements. The "facts" which he quotes in his article are a rehash of a series of sensational stories printed in one newspaper in this city.

Mr. Marcus is entitled to the opinions which he expresses toward "New Dealers," the New Republic magazine, and "liberals." We are concerned with the statements in his obvious political diatribe, which are intended to show that public housing has become the "festering place" of crime, and with the imaginary statistics he has used in his attempt to support his thesis.

It is inexcusable for Mr. Marcus with his wholesale scurrilous accusations, to characterize public housing tenants as degenerates and criminals. The residents of the public housing developments in New York City, by and large, are responsible, well-behaved people and differ from the general population only in the fact that they have low incomes.

We must assume that Mr. Marcus believes that it is preferable to have the underprivileged citizens of our country continue to live in ramshackle, rat-infested, firetrap, slum buildings, that lack the fundamental amenities for decent living, than to afford them an opportunity to live in public housing.

It is to be hoped that, before Mr. Marcus graduates from college, he will take, and pass, courses in ethics and statistics.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM REID,
Chairman.

Kennedy Approves Antimissile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, during the presidential campaign of 1960 we heard a lot about the missile gap prevalent under the Eisenhower administration. Shortly after Mr. McNamara was made Secretary of Defense, he pointed out this "missile gap" was a myth. Obviously, it had been used for purely political purposes by Candidate Kennedy.

Now a very disturbing report by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott points to Presidential feetdragging on the produc-

tion of our antimissile Nike-Zeus. Does President Kennedy think that Russian missiles aimed at this country are probably defensive, too?

ANTIMISSILE GAP WIDENS, WITH KENNEDY'S SANCTION

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary McNamara's adamant refusal to permit the Army to put its powerful Nike-Zeus antimissile into production for early deployment around major U.S. population centers and other key targets is in direct contradiction to what Russia is doing with a comparable weapon.

Not only is the Soviet producing ballistic antimissiles in quantity, but it is deploying them in considerable numbers for the protection of vulnerable military targets.

Already an extensive complex of at least 30 antimissile missiles, manned by full crews, has been established in a 100-mile arc around Leningrad.

Particular significance of this massive defensive system, whose existence is fully known to both President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara, is that these missile killers safeguard the air approaches over which 90 percent of the intercontinental ballistic missiles fired from the United States at Moscow would have to pass.

The same is true of the shorter range Polaris missile that might be launched from nuclear submarines patroling strategic areas of the Atlantic.

Intelligence authorities attach special importance to the fact that the antimissile missiles in the Leningrad concentration are on mobile launchers. This is positively known from photographs obtained by Samos reconnaissance satellites which traverse Russia at regular intervals.

The mobility makes these antimissiles readily available for other areas or uses, such as with field forces when the Soviet's improved antimissile is ready for deployment, estimated by 1965.

The Reds' current antimissile missile is a modified version of their deadly SA-2 and SA-3 antiaircraft missiles that shot down our U-2 planes in Russia and Cuba. Russian tests, monitored by the United States, indicate these missile killers have the capability of intercepting and destroying intermediate range ballistic missiles and certain intercontinental range missiles.

In one Soviet test, an antimissile armed with a nuclear warhead destroyed two ICBMs at one time.

Scores of SA-2's and SA-3's are now deployed in Cuba, particularly as coastal defenses. It is also definitely known that a number of these missiles are emplaced to fire at the Guantanamo naval base.

While Secretary McNamara and Deputy Secretary Roswell Gilpatric have privately admitted to Members of Congress and others that the Nike-Zeus is as good and possibly superior to Soviet antimissile missiles, the United States does not have an operational system of these weapons.

The Army is continuing to test and perfect the Nike-Zeus, and to develop an improved version, the Nike-X and the Sprint.

But that is as far as McNamara, with the President's complete support, is allowing the Army to go. There are some indications McNamara may be having second thoughts despite his continued public affirmations of his stand.

The Pentagon boss has quietly ordered a new study of the antimissile missile issue. This could be the prelude to a change of mind.

But even if this should occur, and it's extremely conjectural, the United States lags far behind Russia in this vital defense field. In the possession of operational antimissile missiles, the Soviet has a lead of 3 to 5 years.

Due to administration shillyshallying on the Nike-Zeus, even if this weapon were put into immediate production it would take at least 36 months before it could be deployed in numbers. If development of the Nike-X and Sprint is awaited, this gap will be increased even further, to 5 years and possibly longer.

These and other ominous details were bluntly spelled out by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, in the secret session of the Senate which he forced on this issue.

He warned that by 1967 Russia will have ringed all its strategic locations with massive antimissile defenses, and thus dangerously unbalanced the offensive stalemate that now is a major deterrent to nuclear war.

Significantly, these contentions of THURMOND were not disputed. Not one word of challenge was voiced against them.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who carried the administration's ball in this dramatic clash, argued against THURMOND on two grounds: (1) The Nike-X and Sprint will be developed in time to assure antimissile security for the United States; (2) by waiting for these improved weapons, upward of $2 billion will be saved.

To RUSSELL's economy argument, THURMOND retorted that it would be infinitely sunder to spend the money than to let Russia attain a stupendous antimissile gap that could doom the United States.

RUSSELL and the administration won this tensee debate; the Senate siding with them by a big margin. But the controversy is far from ended. THURMOND served notice he will submit further reports to the Senate, and may demand other showdown votes on the antimissile issue.

Fair Housing and the Kennedy Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of the House to a speech the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing, made recently before the 15th Annual Convention of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House. I believe that Mr. Lawrence succeeded admirably in placing the problem of discrimination in housing in its proper perspective and in illustrating the part that President Kennedy's Executive order of last November 20 will play in moving forward in this important area.

As Mr. Lawrence points out, however, the order is only "first step—a big step at that" but in order for its purpose to be achieved, help is needed from large numbers of Americans, "from the general public, from the action groups deeply interested in this field, from the churches and educational institutions, and from labor groups and business organizations" including, of course, "those in the homebuilding and real estate industries."

Mr. Lawrence refers once again to the necessity of seeing the struggle here in its proper place in the total struggle for full civil rights.

We can't have fair housing unless we have full housing. And we can't have full housing unless we have the economic growth our society demands and, with that growth, the closing of the economic gap between Negro and white incomes.

The choking circles of discrimination sometimes seem to mesh into one another. For want of a full education, employment opportunities are denied, and for want of a decent income, good housing is denied, and for want of full citizenship, the whole American ideal is denied. It is clear that this field of housing does not stand alone in the struggle for full civil rights for all Americans. It is an integral and a critical part of the whole.

Mr. Lawrence's complete text follows:

FAIR HOUSING AND THE KENNEDY EXECUTIVE ORDER

I appreciate not only your invitation to take part in this conference but also the fact that I have been given the first opportunity to try to answer the question as to who is responsible for housing discrimination.

It is clear that we are not going to dissolve into a melodramatic "hiss-the-villain" session. Obviously, that would not help solve the problems of discrimination which are so flagrantly evident in our country today. Beyond that, I fear that we would, to one degree or another, have to point the accusing finger at ourselves. Until recent years, few Americans, a very precious few, have not contributed to the ghettoizing of housing, either by direct action of encouraging it or by unseeing inaction in doing something to prevent it.

Having engaged in such brisk self-criticism, let me say that I recognize that some of those precious few who have concerned themselves with the problem and tried to alert their fellow citizens to its consequences are prime movers in conferences such as this. But the fact of the matter is that the concern evidently was not clearly expressed, and the costly consequences not sharply outlined, with the result that the pattern of housing discrimination is more far-reaching and severe today than it has been in the past.

Indeed I was struck by the fact that 30 years ago, more than 40 percent of the Negro citizens of Charleston, S.C., lived in blocks which were more than 50-percent white. And a half century ago, over a third of the Negro residents of Chicago lived in areas which were 90-percent white.

I realize that great, almost revolutionary changes have occurred in the intervening years, in the movement of people, from one section of the country to another, in the rapid urbanization of our Nation, and in relatively drastic changes in our building industry and in its financing.

So to get to the specifics of assessing the blame, it is inescapable that past policies of the Federal Government, which permitted and even enforced segregated communities, played a major role in creating today's housing patterns. It is undeniable, also, that the building industry, and that includes those who finance and build as well as sell, has been a strong and unbending force in maintaining what has been politely, and incorrectly, called "neighborhood stability."

I am aware, as are you, of the explanation given for such policies. We are only following the wishes of the community, they will tell you. It is not our job to lead, they will add.

And, in a sense, what they say has a measure of truth to it, even though it is more often an excuse than an explanation. And here is where the broader community must accept its share of responsibility. The schools, the churches, the labor unions, and

the civic groups have, admittedly, done a sluggish job, at best, in breaking down the prejudices which lead to discrimination. Again, I must modify my point, by admitting that the brush is broad, and that there have been notable, and successful, exceptions. They remained, until a few years ago, precious few.

In the light of the progress we have made in more recent days, and I have no intention of overemphasizing it, I wonder if the fear and the caution in us did not contribute more to our actions, or lack of action, than the push of conviction or the tug of conscience.

Yesterday, I represented the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the presentation of their annual awards to authors and magazines for articles contributing to better human understanding. And I was struck particularly with one of the winning entries, which appeared in the National Jewish Monthly and was written by Martin E. Spencer. The title summarizes Mr. Spencer's thesis, which is that prejudice develops into discrimination, only when it is socially approved. In the article, he describes a pioneer study into the differences between expressed prejudice and practiced discrimination, which may be well known to students of sociology but which is new to me.

"In 1934," Mr. Spencer reports, "a sociologist traveled through the United States with a Chinese couple. The group stayed overnight at numerous hotels and took their meals at restaurants, diners, and other eating places. In only one place, a tourist camp, were they refused service. At the end of the trip, the sociologist mailed questionnaires to owners of the establishments which had been visited. The questionnaire asked whether Chinese would be accepted as guests. Of these establishments, which had already accommodated the sociologist and his Chinese friends, over 90 percent answered that they would not accept Chinese as customers."

I suspect that many of the same conclusions could be drawn in the field of housing and housing practices. The truth is that we do have experience with housing which is open to all—good, modern, decent housing put up by alert, ambitious, successful businessmen. And that experience, which is valid even though limited, bears testimony that open occupancy can work and does work. It does not mean there have not been problems; obviously there have been, but problems are nothing new in the real estate and housing industries.

And there is another set of experience in this field, dating from 1954 and becoming more extensive and meaningful in the months and years since that time. That, of course, is the enactment of local ordinances and State laws aimed at helping achieve equal opportunity in housing. I think it is fair to say these actions produced neither panacea nor panic.

Certainly they did not ruin the real estate industry, but neither did they solve the problem, any more than our traffic laws have eliminated wreckless driving on our highways. What they have done is provide the legal underpinning for our moral convictions, making available public leadership and the mechanics of public adjudication in helping achieve equal housing opportunity.

We all know that legislation cannot, in itself, mold behavior, and certainly laws do not repeal prejudice. But they do establish public policy, clearly and directly, and in doing so they are essential instruments in the overall movement.

Those instruments, and may their number increase, have been given a strong ally in the Executive order which President Kennedy signed on November 20 last year. Before discussing the order and giving you a necessarily brief outline of what it seeks to accomplish, I should deal with its critics for a moment.

They divide into two basic groups, although some might suggest this is an arbitrary simplification. The first says the order is undesirable, harmful to the economy, and a usurpation of power by the Executive. The other insists the order is too late, too limited in scope, and lacking the virtue of retroactivity.

We might well assume that the same kinds of plaints were expressed about the Emancipation Proclamation.

I suggest that the desirability of the order has been well established by the reports of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and by the very visibility of the problems the order seeks to overcome. Segregated housing, or the whole ghetto complex, has grown more widespread, not less prevalant. And with it has come not only the social and moral cost of segregation, but the economic cost in disease, crime, underemployment, undereducation, loss of tax revenues, and increased public expenditures. It is an expensive as well as a foul disease. And this, of course, does not include the human demoralization it infests in its perpetrators as well as in its victims.

The harm to the economy complaint is equally difficult to justify. Local and State legislation produced no such result. Nor have studies borne out that property values decrease when minority families move into so-called majority neighborhoods. If panic is avoided, and such panic unfortunately is often stimulated for profit, the chances are about four in one that values will remain stable or actually increase.

As to the President's legal authority, the basis is well established. While the lawyers don't cite it, my layman's mind suggests that its genesis lies in the Declaration of Independence which certainly sets the moral foundation of this Nation, if not its basic law. But there are the 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, and the national housing goal set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, all of which provide clear evidence of the action's legal validity. It is, as the President has said, sound public constitutional policy.

On the other side, we have those who would have wanted the order sooner, had it broader in scope, and given it retroactive features. Timing, I have come to learn, is a very delicate gift. Many features had to be considered; the 1961 report of the Civil Rights Commission, the condition of the economy, the alerting of the various publics involved, and the actual framing of the order itself. As much as we might like it otherwise, it does take time and thoughtful effort, and the important fact is that the deed was done, the order exists, it has been issued.

Its scope was determined by experts in the field, and we are fortunate that there are such experts in the Federal Government today. It is the first step, and a big step at that, just as the first State legislation, while limited in scope, was imperative to that which has come to pass in more recent years.

The question of retroactivity presented serious problems, but I point out that the good offices section of the order does direct executive agencies to do all they can to encourage equal opportunity in federally assisted housing which does not specifically fall under the order.

Those of us called upon to administer the order believe we have a workable mandate with which to proceed. We recognize that it establishes new public policy as far as the Federal Government is concerned and we believe it to be right and proper policy. We believe in its purpose and we intend to see that it is achieved, with fairness and with integrity. But we are also realistic enough to know that we need help, help from the general public, from the action groups deeply interested in this field, from the churches and educational institutions, and from labor groups and busines organizations, and that, of course, includes those in the homebuilding and real estate industries.

We want the order to work, and we believe it can and will.

We also want to see homebuilding activity thrive and expand, and we believe that can happen also.

One does not mitigate against the other, if commonsense and calm reason guide our actions.

We believe, further, that the moral thrust of the order has made its impact, as the growing participation in the work for equal opportunity by the churches exemplifies.

And while I do not intend to evangelize you, I firmly believe that the rightness of the cause is its basic strength. There is nothing new about the concept of equal treatment and equal respect for our fellow men; that is at the very core of our religious teachings as well as being the bedrock of our national purpose. The depth of the work done to remind all Americans of our religious and national heritage is indispensable to tearing down the walls of discrimination.

It is apparent also, as others have already said, that we can't have fair housing unless we have full housing. And we can't have full housing unless we have the economic growth our society demands and, with that growth, the closing of the economic gap between Negro and white incomes.

The choking circles of discrimination sometimes seem to mesh into one another. For want of a full education, employment opportunities are denied, and for want of a decent income, good housing is denied, and for want of full citizenship the whole American ideal is denied. It is clear that this field of housing does not stand alone in the struggle for full civil rights for all Americans. It is an integral and a critical part of the whole.

The question then comes as how to proceed.

The regulations and enforcement procedures for the Executive order have been established by the various agencies concerned, and are being reviewed by the committee. Numerous conferences have been held concerning the most effective means of using the good offices of the executive branch to help bring about equal opportunity, and some progress has been made. A small, but significant, indication of this work was provided in a memorandum of Secretary McNamara on March 8, which requires nondiscrimination clauses in all Defense Department leases for family housing, and also provides that lists of available offbase housing will include only units available to all.

We are beginning to move.

But to move is one thing, and to move with dispatch and true effectiveness is another.

I realize that many people in this country are not as concerned with the problem of racism as we are, but I think they are wrong and we are right. I do not believe that the public policy of equal opportunity can take a secondary position to any other national goal. It must move forward in the front ranks, because it represents a vital part of our national security, our national economy and our national morality.

There is no good reason we can't help move a man into the house he wants and can afford, while at the same time, we are exerting the maximum energies to get some other man up on the moon.

I have one caution point to make, and I feel that my many years in public life, fighting for causes such as this, gives me the experience and the right to advance it. This

work is too vital, and the possible obstacles too insidious, for any of us to lapse into the luxury of wrangling among ourselves. I am sure there will be disagreement, from time to time, and that is as healthy as it is expected. But I believe we have an obligation to keep firmly fixed to our real purpose and to its speedy accomplishment.

Having said all that, I'll stop where I began, with a question and an answer.

The question is "equal housing opportunity—whose responsibility?" and the answer is not the President nor the committee which I head, not the urban league or the home builders, not the churches or the schools, not the unions or the corporations—the answer of course, ladies and gentlemen is the responsibility rests with all of us.

The Alliance for Progress and Other U.S. Programs in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which appeared in the New York Times on April 6. The letter was written by Frank E. Karelsen, a distinguished New Yorker who recently visited various countries in Latin America and had an opportunity to observe the Alliance for Progress, the Agency for International Development program, the Peace Corps, and the food-for-peace program at first hand. His comments on these programs should be heartening to all of us who wish to eliminate poverty, hunger, and disease from Latin America. The letter follows:

U.S. AGENCIES PRAISED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During a recent visit to Peru, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil I had the opportunity to observe the efforts and accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress, the Agency for International Development program, the Peace Corps, and the food-for-peace program.

On my visit I talked with many dedicated persons in each and all of these agencies. I conversed with people in numerous fields of endeavor, including educators, psychologists, housing experts, etc. I visited with workers and underprivileged citizens, with bankers, businessmen, both American and native.

My conclusions, based on this research and my own observations, were that on the whole each of these agencies was doing a splendid job in which every American can take pride. True, some people are doing better work than others, and there is still a vast amount to be accomplished. To make even slight headway is a stupendous task.

For centuries a small percentage of the people of South America have had all the cream and have no desire to help the masses who, because of centuries of virtual servitude, have become discouraged and disheartened. A beginning must be made so as to prevent these masses from turning to totalitarianism, and our agencies are making that beginning. It will take time, dedication and a great deal of money to make an important impact. It will require the cooperation of American business interests as well as the education of the small percentage of the people of wealth in South America. There will be failures and successes.

From the standpoint of the citizens of the United States this is not charity. It is something that we must do in order to prevent the United States from becoming an island surrounded by Communist revolutions—revolutions which can and will bring down the vices and bloodshed of the French revolution.

FRANK E. KARELSEN.

NEW YORK, *April 1, 1963.*

Impact of Imports on the Pennsylvania Shoe Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD "A Study by the Foreign Trade Committee for the Shoe Manufacturing Industry," which graphically sets forth the importance of this industry to the U.S. economy as well as a 1962 fact sheet on the impact of imports on the Pennsylvania shoe industry.

The study and fact sheet follow:

IMPACT OF IMPORTS

(A study by the Foreign Trade Committee for the Shoe Manufacturing Industry, representing, National Shoe Manufacturers Association, New England Shoe & Leather Association, St. Louis Shoe Manufacturers Association)

THE SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY IS IMPORTANT TO THE U.S. ECONOMY

There are over 1,300 factories located in over 600 communities, the vast majority of which are small towns where shoe manufacturing is the major source of income.

These are located in 38 States in over 260 congressional districts.

The industry employs 239,000 shoe workers according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The payroll is over $750 million a year. An additional 70,000 or more are employed in allied industries producing machines, materials, components and supplies for shoe manufacturers.

This results in shoe sales of $4,500 million annually.

THE SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY CONSISTS PRIMARILY OF SMALL MANUFACTURERS

The shoe manufacturing industry is highly competitive.

Average employment per plant is 180 workers.

The firms are progressive in their improvement of plant processes and products.

Efficiency is greater in American shoe plants than anywhere else in the world.

Profits are relatively low.

SHOE IMPORTS HAVE INCREASED AT AN ALARMING RATE

From 1955 to 1962, over 600 percent.

From nearly 8 million pairs in 1955 to more than 55 million pairs in 1962.

Based on current trends, imports are expected to total 77 million pairs in 1963, and in 1965, 125 million pairs.

Imports were 1.3 percent of a domestic production of 585 million pairs in 1955.

Imports were 8.9 percent of a domestic production of 619 million pairs in 1962.

Based on current trends, imports are expected to be over 20 percent of a domestic production of 600 million pairs in 1965.

Exports, from 1955 to 1962, have decreased 38 percent to only 2.9 million pairs.

FOOTWEAR IMPORTS ARE GREATEST FROM COUNTRIES WHERE WAGES ARE LOWER

From 1955 to 1962, footwear imports from Japan increased over 900 percent, from 2.7 million to nearly 28 million pairs.

Wages in Japan averaged 36 cents per hour for shoeworkers including an annual bonus.

Between these same 2 years, imports from Italy increased from 1.1 million to 14.5 million pairs, for an increase of over 1,100 percent. The average wage per hour in Italy in 1961 was 49 cents including fringe benefits.

In contrast, imports from the United Kingdom and Switzerland increased slightly. However, wages in these countries were many times higher than in Japan and Italy.

Information on Spain is not available. Reliable sources, however, indicate that a 16-hour day at 35 cents an hour, including fringe benefits, is the typical wage-hour structure. Children may work as apprentices as much as 2 years without compensation.

Increased U.S. imports related to hourly wages, 1955–62

Japan:	
Million pairs	+25.2
Per hour (cents)	36
Italy:	
Million pairs	+13.4
Per hour (cents)	49
United Kingdom:	
Million pairs	+1.1
Per hour (cents)	97
Switzerland:	
Thousand pairs	+219
Per hour	$1.15
United States:	
Million pairs (exports)	−1.7
Per hour	$1.95

Source: ILO "Yearbook of Labour Statistics"; Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor; National Shoe Manufacturing Association (for U.S. fringe benefits). All wage figures are for 1961, the latest available for other countries.

FIFTY-FIVE MILLION PAIRS IMPORTED ELIMINATED 21,000 JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Estimated imports of 125 million pairs in 1965 will cause the loss of 47,000 job opportunities in shoe manufacturing.

For example, Brockton, Mass., a major shoe-producing area has an unemployment rate of 9 percent or approximately 50 percent higher than the national average.

THE SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY HAS LOST ITS GROWTH TO IMPORTS

The rate of growth in the shoe manufacturing industry from 1940 to 1955 averaged 2 percent per year. At this rate, production should have been 672 million pairs in 1962.

IMPORTS HAVE REDUCED SHOE INDUSTRY PROFITS

A highly competitive, low-profit industry, shoe manufacturers have had their profits further reduced by imports. The seriousness of the injury is evidenced in the following table:

Net profit after taxes for all manufacturing corporations by industry—as a percent of sales

Industry:	1957 (percent)
Drugs	10.4
Petroleum refining and related industries	10.3
Chemicals and allied products	7.7
Stone, clay, and glass products	7.5
Primary metal industries	6.5
Instruments and related products	5.7
Tobacco manufactures	5.1
Paper and allied products	5.0
All manufacturing corporations except newspapers	4.8
Machinery (except electrical)	4.8

Net profit after taxes for all manufacturing corporations by industry—as a percent of sales—Continued

Industry:	1957 (percent)
Transportation equipment	4.5
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	4.2
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	4.2
Printing and publishing except newspapers	3.8
Other fabricated metal products	3.6
Furniture and fixtures	2.7
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	2.5
Lumber and wood products	2.3
Food and kindred products	2.2
Leather and leather products (including shoes)	2.0
Textile mill products	1.9
Apparel and other finished products	1.3

Industry:	1961 (percent)
Petroleum refining and related industries	10.1
Drugs	9.8
Chemicals and allied products	7.3
Tobacco manufactures	5.7
Stone, clay, and glass products	5.6
Instruments and related products	5.4
Primary metal industries	4.9
Paper and allied products	4.6
All manufacturing corporations except newspapers	4.3
Machinery (except electrical)	4.1
Transportation equipment	4.0
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	3.8
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	3.6
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	3.4
Printing and publishing except newspapers	2.8
Other fabricated metal products	2.4
Food and kindred products	2.3
Textile mill products	2.1
Lumber and wood products	1.8
Furniture and fixtures	1.5
Apparel and other finished products	1.2
Leather and leather products (including shoes)	1.1

NOTE.—Latest 1962 data not available at the time of printing.

Source: Quarterly financial reports, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Federal Trade Commission.

Of all industries recorded, in 1957, the leather and leather products industry ranked third from the bottom.

Of all industries recorded, in 1961, the leather and leather products industry was the lowest.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON THE PENNSYLVANIA SHOE INDUSTRY, 1962 FACT SHEET

1. Production: Pennsylvania is the second most important shoe-producing State in the Nation; 1962 shoe production (pairs), 87,889,000; shoe shipments (pairs), 87,990,000; value of shoe shipments (f.o.b. plant), $233,842,000; 1962 ratio of Pennsylvania production to U.S. total, 14.2 percent.

2. Employment: Shoe industry is the ninth largest manufacturing employer in Pennsylvania; 1962 total employment in shoe factories, 25,927.

3. Wages: Total wages paid to all employees in shoe factories in 1962, $85,334,073.

4. Imports: Total imports of leather-type footwear equaled 55,057,457 pairs valued at $80,263,816 in 1962.

5. Total 1962 U.S. shoe imports equaled 8.9 percent of U.S. shoe production; it was 6.2 percent in 1961.

Year	U.S. foreign trade in leather-type nonrubber shoes		U.S. shoe production	Pennsylvania shoe production
	Imports	Exports		
In pairs:				
1955	7,804,674	4,639,532	585,369,000	72,149,000
1956	9,998,939	4,531,686	591,757,000	73,189,000
1957	11,049,747	4,397,638	597,648,000	78,156,000
1958	23,596,541	4,224,648	587,115,000	81,059,000
1959	22,276,841	3,504,712	637,364,000	91,864,000
1960	26,616,508	3,224,316	600,041,000	86,243,000
1961	36,667,929	3,034,545	593,310,000	86,046,000
1962	55,057,457	2,867,235	619,407,000	87,889,000
Percent change:				
1962–61	+50.2	−5.5	+4.4	+2.1
1962–55	+605.4	−38.2	+5.8	+21.8

Columnist Sees Danger to Individual Freedom in President's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, where is the Nation headed under the policies and programs of President Kennedy? I am afraid the final goal must be dictatorship, because, unless Congress takes back the authority for which it is responsible under the Constitution, the Federal Government, under President Kennedy, will be in direct control of the lives of every individual citizen and of every local community and State in America. Dictatorship can be brought about here through speeches cleverly worded and by only showing the bright parts of the plan, covering the shadows and the ominous threats to our liberty with platitudes and bleeding heart pronouncements.

The following column, written by one of the Nation's outstanding newspapermen, Richard Wilson, appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 1. I commend it to every citizen concerned with the continued freedom of the people of the United States. The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 1, 1963]

WASHINGTON: NATION'S CITY HALL?—ADMINISTRATION'S STATE-LOCAL PROGRAMS HELD LIKELY TO GROW UNCONTROLLABLE

(By Richard Wilson)

Occasionally in this world capital a flash of insight illuminates issues that are of real concern to people all over the country.

Residential zoning is one of these. In the Capital, the issues are sometimes exotic. Militant residents of my own neighborhood, heady with victory over the Catholic church on a school zoning issue, are now considering moving on the Embassy of Switzerland. The wild cries of the Swiss Ambassador's peacocks, which simulate the screams of a lady in distress, are disturbing the peace.

An author friend reports a chaotic zoning fight in remote Sanibel Island in the Gulf of Mexico. Even John F. Kennedy got tangled in a zoning contest when his in-laws sold some valuable property. The President didn't take sides; he merely pleaded that nothing unnecessary be done to upset his in-laws.

Daily and nightly in every city and suburb of the Nation rise the agonized complaints before municipal agencies of those who are objecting to being pushed closer and closer together. The spirit of '76 pales beside the passion of the embattled homeowner, his whole life story rushing to his stuttering tongue, as he fights some real or imagined challenge to his status, his home investment or his domestic tranquillity.

The Kennedy administration is rushing with all deliberate speed into the morass of municipal affairs in our crowded cities and teeming suburbs. It touches zoning on urban renewal and interstate highway projects. But the Kennedy aims are far broader and if finally achieved may yet make Washington the Nation's city hall.

President Kennedy exposed his own interests in a recent speech which obviously intrigued him but bored his listeners, and was generally ignored in the news stories. He talked at length about "Random Village," an imaginary cross-section suburb, and how its citizens are now, and will be in the future, involved with the Federal authorities.

Mr. Kennedy used Random Village's 100 residents as a vehicle to ride the whole range of his programs: tax cuts, youth corps, aid to education, public park improvements, medical care, mental care, urban renewal, water pollution, juvenile delinquency, employment retraining, etc. Before the President was finished, hardly a single resident of Random Village had escaped the embracing arm of Washington.

"In short," the President summed up, "the Federal Government is not a remote bureaucracy. It must seek to meet those needs of the individual, the family and the community which can best be met by the nationwide cooperation of all and which cannot be met by State and local governments.

In what seemed to some of his listeners a strange inversion of thought, Mr. Kennedy said that if Washington doesn't bear these burdens they will just fall back on the local States and communities. Some would say that is where they belong.

In the current issue of Reader's Digest, its Washington editor, Charles Stevenson, helps us understand the kind of thing that is going on in this field. If you will consult the Federal budget, you will find that the Housing and Home Finance Agency is credited with a $695 million expenditure in certain fields when, in fact, it will pay out 4 times as much—$3.7 billion—for the stated purposes. The President's budget is a masterpiece of legerdemain in this regard.

The Kennedy administration has started or is trying to start programs which seem only a small part of the budget now, but are destined to grow into multimillion or multibillion-dollar enterprises. This is true of programs in education, mass transit, juvenile delinquency, employment training, the

Hometown Youth Corps, the National Service Corps, medical care. All will grow into something far bigger than when they were begun, and the record shows Congress cannot control them.

Some of the facts about this cityside trend in the Kennedy administration are in dispute. The President says he is holding back needed nondefense spending. But House appropriations experts say defense spending has gone up 17 percent under Mr. Kennedy and nondefense spending has jumped 27 percent.

Mr. Kennedy's view is that while the Nation has grown greatly we are spending less of our national product for nondefense purposes than 25 years ago, and the percentage has remained almost unchanged for 10 years.

Whatever the merits of this argument, there is no doubt of the final Kennedy aim. It is to expand the Federal Government's services to the "individual, the family and the community" on a multibillion dollar scale. He is expanding concepts of Federal aid beyond those of his predecessors. "The Federal Government," says the President, "is the people, and the budget is a reflection of their need."

By this yardstick the Federal Government would absorb local responsibilities on an ever increasing scale.

Partisan Politics for CIA, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, whether or not the U.S. Intelligence Agency is to blame for our supposed lack of information is not quite clear. I have the feeling, however, that it has been made the whipping boy, because information it has passed along has not reached the President.

Now President Kennedy has replaced an outstanding scientist, Dr. James R. Killian, as chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, with Clark Clifford, who has been high in Democratic politics since Truman days. This, of course, he has a right to do, but I am wondering whether or not this type of appointment is objective enough to correct whatever deficiencies there might be in such an important agency as CIA.

In last Monday's New York Times an excellent editorial points to this "political" appointment.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1963]

CLOUDY INTELLIGENCE

Are U.S. intelligence estimates being colored or distorted by policy?

The differences between President Kennedy and Senator KEATING about how many Soviet troops are in Cuba could reflect a serious weakness in the elaborate apparatus the Nation maintains for collecting and evaluating the data on which policy must be built.

The problem is not new to this administration, nor did it originate with the Cuban crisis. But when intelligence becomes, as it has become today, the very cornerstone of policy, an almost superhuman objectivity is required on the part of our intelligence chiefs to avoid estimates and evaluations tailored to policy. Intelligence, if it is to be worth anything, must be completely nonpartisan.

A Senate subcommittee, which has been quietly investigating the Cuban crisis, has already found considerable evidence that the intelligence estimates of last summer and fall were keyed to the "it can't happen here" atmosphere, then prevalent in Washington. The belief of all the Nation's top Soviet experts that Premier Khrushchev would never risk installing Russian missiles in Cuba appears to have influenced most of the intelligence judgments that reached the President in that period. The awakening led to a concentration on missiles only, that caused us to downgrade the significance of the small Soviet force that had been sent to Cuba.

Today the basic differences between the President and his critics concern the size of this force, and whether it is being reduced. Both Mr. Kennedy and Senator KEATING are getting their information from the same source—Government intelligence agencies. But, because Cuba has become a partisan issue, it is not easy for the top-level estimates that reach the President to remain completely objective. The men who provide these judgments are appointees of the President's own administration. Given the present centralization of intelligence activities, it is especially hard for minority views, which might happen to be right, to reach the top.

This problem will not be helped by the appointment of Clark M. Clifford to replace Dr. James R. Killian, chairman of the board of directors of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as Chairman of the Foreign Inteligence Advisory Board. The Board was established as a result of a recommendation of the Hoover Commission in 1956 to monitor continuously CIA and other intelligence activities.

Mr. Clifford has a brilliant mind, but, as a long-time troubleshooter for the Democratic Party, he is inextricably associated with partisan politics. He replaces a skilled and objective scientist-administrator. The selection is at best unfortunate. It is bound to give the impression that our intelligence activities will now be monitored, not by a chairman who is an expert in the field, but by one who is essentially a politician.

The American Flag—Beacon of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy at this time to insert into the RECORD of the Congress of the United States a brief paper on our American flag written by Howard Rogers who is the 12-year-old son of my good friend and neighbor, Jesse A. Rogers, of Cambridge, Mass.

It is a thoughtful expression by a splendid young American and I am proud to have the opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

THE AMERICAN FLAG—BEACON OF HOPE

Since the day Betsy Ross made the first American flag our flag has been a symbol of hope to millions of people throughout the world.

Let's go back to the Revolutionary War. The flag to them stood for the hope that they may have their freedom. Men, women, and, yes, even children fought with this hope.

In World War II our flag was the hope that one day the world would have peace. Just think of thousands of men who died proudly on the battlefields. When they held or saw our flag it gave them this feeling deep in their hearts.

Today the many people who are behind the Iron Curtain think of our flag as hope that they may one day have freedom.

Hope is a big word. It's in the hearts of millions and millions of people and our flag is the beacon of this hope.

Myths That Muddy the Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in recent years no issue within our country has brought greater hope to many people nor greater strains to old habits of our society than the question of racial integration. That these hopes may be realized and those strains eliminated, men of goodwill today seek ways to make our nation a stronger and more democratic one, now.

They seek ways to provide not only equal justice under law for all Americans, equal justice measured in educational and job opportunities, in housing opportunities, in political opportunities, but they seek to give equal hope to all our children in America.

There are those who worry most about the financial deficit we supposedly will leave our children. Far more important, I think, is the psychological and social burden we will leave them if we do not deal honestly and with facts in this most serious area of racial relations.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD an article in the February 12, 1963, issue of the Lutheran Standard by Rev. David Preus, pastor at the University Lutheran Church of Hope in Minneapolis. Dr. Preus calls on all of us to set aside the "myths that muddy the waters."

The article follows:

MYTHS THAT MUDDY THE WATERS

(By David Preus)

The drama of a Negro family moving into an all-white community is being repeated with ever greater frequency in ever more communities. Christian people are summoned to play redemptive roles in these potentially tragic situations. There is much that can be done. For one thing, we can counter a series of myths that give rise to fears that are too easily translated into hate and violence.

The greatest fear preventing fair housing is the fear of the unknown. This fear is undoubtedly fed by a variety of stories that have been well labeled "myths." I call them "myths that muddy the waters." Christians have the duty to be honest about them, and should be willing to set them aside if the Word of God and clear reason so indicate. Here are the major myths.

MYTH 1. REAL ESTATE VALUES DECLINE WHEN NEGROES MOVE INTO THE NEIGHBORHOOD

This is probably the most frequently used justification for racial exclusion in a given neighborhood. The best available information indicates that it simply is not true. "Property Values and Race," by Dr. Luigi

Laurenti (University of California Press 1960) reports on a scientific study of 10,000 real estate transactions made in 7 cities. Dr. Laurenti compared housing sales prices in neighborhoods changing from all white to racially mixed with corresponding neighborhoods that remain all white.

The main findings are these:

1. Of the neighborhoods 41 percent showed no significant differences in sale price between the mixed and corresponding all-white neighborhoods.

2. Forty-four percent of the mixed neighborhoods showed a comparative rise in prices ranging from 5 to 26 percent.

3. Fifteen percent of the mixed neighborhoods showed a comparative decline in prices ranging from 5 to 9 percent.

4. No cases of catastrophic decline of prices were found. Actually, price declines were usually for short periods with prices then rallying to normalcy.

The study indicates that there are no grounds for the widely stated assumption that interracial housing causes property value decline. The comparative declines that did occur (and they were not nearly so numerous as the comparative gains) resulted from panic selling. White families, responding to their fears, glutted the market and a buyers' market developed. As soon as supply and demand returned to normal the housing prices followed.

The Laurenti study is not the only one of its kind. It is the most recent and thorough. The American Friends Service Committee in a brochure "The Challenge of Houses and Race" cites several others. All bear a similar testimony.

The statement that "real estate values decline when Negroes move into the neighborhood" is apparently a myth. Christian concern for honesty and fairplay demands that we label it as such and quit muddying the waters.

MYTH II. DO YOU WANT YOUR DAUGHTER TO MARRY A NEGRO?

This belligerent question is a major fear rouser. It is usually good for a rise in blood pressure. The underlying myths are that:

1. Interracial marriage is biologically or theoretically bad.

2. The white American majority can justifiably deprive the Negro American minority of the right to live where they want to in order to keep their daughters from marrying Negroes.

There are many things to be said about this. Let me mention a few things I think pertinent:

1. It is not likely that your daughter will marry a Negro if you are white. We are still strongly tribal. We tend to marry within our tribal groupings. I use myself by way of illustration. I am fourth generation American, yet I found it quite difficult to seriously consider marrying outside the Scandinavian American subgroup. It was even a little difficult for me to leave the specifically Norwegian ancestral background and take to wife one of Danish extraction. That is extreme, I recognize, and I have become a thorough convert to the Danes.

It is certain that most whites are tribally oriented to whites and Negroes to Negroes. There will be no mad race to intermarry. Tribalisms involving racial differences will have to be disappearing before there will be widespread interracial marriage.

2. There is no theological or anthropological reason against interracial marriages. We need to speak the word clearly. The Scriptures do not speak against marriage across races. Rather they make it clear that "in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek."

The scriptural warnings frequently pointed out are against the intermarriage of believers and unbelievers. Our inner rebellion against the idea of racial intermarriage is a result of environmental conditioning. In Christian fairness to those who marry across racial lines we must be clear. There is no word of God prohibiting interracial marriages.

3. The imperative, "love your neighbor," calls us to insist on the same rights of citizenship for all Americans. I want my daughter to marry a Christian man. This does not mean that I should fight to prevent non-Christians from moving into my neighborhood. I do not want my daughter to marry a Roman Catholic. But I will not fight to keep Roman Catholics from buying a home in my neighborhood. If the truth must come out, I guess I do not even want my daughter to marry some other kind of Protestant. At least I will be most happy if she marries a Lutheran, and preferably of Scandinavian ancestry. But I am not going to try to keep all non-Lutherans and all non-Scandinavians out of my neighborhood. In fact, I will fight for the same rights of citizenship for all our countrymen, in the conviction that this is a central factor in responding to Christ's command to "love your neighbor."

Love without justice is fraudulent. Justice in this United States has to do with equal rights of citizenship for all peoples regardless of religious, racial, or national background. That includes equal rights to houses and neighborhoods. Neither the Negro nor any other American group can be singled out by Christian people using the stiff arm—"for whites only." Love demands that we be found on the side of justice.

4. Somehow the myth has been established that Negro men are particularly enamored of white women. It needs to be known, penitently, that an estimated 80 percent of American Negroes are part white. The vast majority of this intermingling of racial stock is a result of what white men have done with Negro women. If womanhood is to be pitied or protected, then please consider which women have been abused and which men are to be accused.

MYTH III. THE SOCIAL STATUS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD DECLINES WHEN IT BECOMES INTERRACIAL

It is difficult to give any factual answer to this statement. If the economic status of a neighborhood declines in our money-conscious society, the social status declines. This has frequently happened when a new immigrant group moves into a neighborhood. The social status changes, however, because poor people have arrived. It is not because Norwegians or Poles or Negroes have arrived.

The Laurenti studies show that real estate prices more often increase in racially mixed neighborhoods than in comparable all-white neighborhoods. It is difficult to see how that could mean that the social status has declined. In October of 1953, U.S. News & World Report said this in an article on "Restricted Area: Does It Pay?"

"The value of 'restricted' neighborhoods is getting critical attention now that the racially restricted covenants no longer stand up in court. Some appraisers are arguing that elimination of racial bars to owning property makes it more, not less, attractive. They are asking for a new look at the old belief that when minorities move into an exclusive area, values decline." That was written 9 years ago.

Let me add my witness. I would much rather live in a racially mixed neighborhood. In spite of my admitted self-conscious Scandinavian-American Lutheran tribalism, I am most grateful for the opportunity to live in a real American hodgepodge of a community. We are saved from all sorts of damaging idolatries by living as neighbors with all kinds and colors of Americans. It is fun to share in the varieties of life brought into one neighborhood.

It is the finest training for children who must grow up to live as neighbors in this world with Asians, Africans, Russians, Europeans, and all the other peoples of the globe. I am delighted that my children need not have unfounded fears of Negroes. They are growing up with them and are discovering them to be persons like us all—maybe even Lutherans. I am thrilled to visit public and church schools and see my children mingling as equals with children of Negro, Indian, Japanese, Mexican, and the variegated white backgrounds.

It is my observation that the social status of a neighborhood is enhanced greatly when it is racially well mixed. I think this is a feeling shared by increasing numbers in our society. It is time to lay this myth to rest, if it has not already happened.

MYTH IV. MINORITIES DO NOT MAINTAIN THEIR PROPERTIES

What studies there are deny this fact. People on the move up the socioeconomic ladder do not tend to imperil these positions. Each immigrant group as it comes to the United States went through its slum period. As people reached out for education, developed skills, and strengthened their economic position they found room in better housing areas. They worked hard to improve the lot of their families, and they did not easily let go of the new advantages. The same is true with Negroes. In most instances, their property maintenance will be superior. They know what is at stake. The statement, "minorities do not maintain their properties," seems a myth. Insist on facts. Observe the Negro family that has prospered sufficiently to move into a middle class neighborhood. Do not let the waters be muddied by myths.

CONCLUSION

Christians must help lay these myths to rest. In so doing, we can play a redemptive role in a tragically segregated society. Fair housing practices are just. God calls us to do justice. It is right.

The history of man shows his unwillingness to be subjected to the prejudices of others. The Negro is human. He will fight for his rights if need be. We have the opportunity as majority white Christians to make room for him peacefully. "Blessed are the peacemakers."

This Western civilization has so much to give. Woe unto us if we cannot accept the colored of the earth as members of the one humanity. Woe especially to us who carry the name of Christ if we cannot claim as brethren in Christ, and as neighbors, persons of any color.

Lutherans were summoned to faith and action in a statement issued by the National Lutheran Council at its 1958 annual meeting.

"We believe * * * that God created one human family and that all men everywhere, whatever their color, culture, class, or caste, are inseparably related and bound together as members of that one human family. * * * That Christians ought exercise their social responsibility by acting in their own communities to remove whatever injustices exist and to insure for all persons, without discrimination, just and equal opportunities, especially in housing, employment, education, and access to social welfare services."

May 3: The Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom each year to memorialize the

great devotion to liberty of the Polish people by paying tribute to the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

The May 3 Polish Constitution when it was promulgated served as a beacon light for liberalism in Poland and in the world. But the existence of this threat to tyranny was so intolerable that in 1795 Russia, Prussia, and Austria moved to effect a third partition of Poland and crush its people.

But the Polish yearning for national freedom is indomitable as various of this brave people's jailers have always found, much to their sorrow. Just 100 years ago, in the uprising of 1863, thousands of Polish insurgents fought the might of the Tsarist armies in a series of actions which failed only after nearly 1,000 battles and skirmishes had taken their toll of Polish patriots. Over 250,000 liberty loving Poles are reputed to have given their lives in battles, on the gallows, before execution squads, or in Siberian exile.

Free people everywhere are indebted to the Polish martyrs who through the centuries have sacrificed themselves and made the tyrants pay dearly for their victories. We must cherish the trust of celebrating the Polish Constitution Day on each May 3 until that time when a free Polish Nation can itself once again commemorate its great, inspired charter.

Threats at Trotters Shoals Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Chairman CLIFFORD DAVIS, of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, presided during the Trotters Shoals hearings in the finest judicial traditions with honor and distinction. These hearings were marked with much feeling, pressure, and bitterness. Some witnesses obviously came for the purpose of smearing individuals and Members of Congress while presenting little factual testimony. Chairman DAVIS, rather than subpena witnesses and initiate prosecution which might further aggravate a tense situation, for the time being very wisely left a threatening telegram up to the people involved at the local level. Mr. Speaker, I am including the threatening telegram and title 18, section 1505 of the United States Code, to be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. J. Wesley Hughes, manager of the Abbeville, S.C., Planning and Development Board, and listed as an official witness against Trotters Shoals and for free enterprise development of the Savannah River, after reaching Washington and while waiting to be heard, received the following telegram on Monday night, April 22, 1963:

J. WESLEY HUGHES,
Dodge House,
Washington, D.C.:

Learned today that you are a leader here of the opposition group appearing against the Trotters Shoals project. If you go through with this, county funds will be withheld from the supply bill for the development board. Today I telephoned Mr. Robert Hawthorne, development board president, and have already told Senator Carwile my position. This action is based on the expression of Abbeville County voters who favor Trotters Shoals. They are taxpayers supporting the development board.

WM. F. SNIPES,
Representative, Abbeville County.

SECTION 1505. INFLUENCING OR INJURING WITNESS BEFORE AGENCIES AND COMMITTEES

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness in any proceeding pending before any department or agency of the United States, or in connection with any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress; or

Whoever injures any party or witness in his person or property on account of his attending or having attended such proceeding, inquiry, or investigation, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or; [1]

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which such proceeding is being had before such department or agency of the United States, or the due and proper exercise of the power of inquiry under which such inquiry or investigation is being had by either House, or any committee of either House or any joint committee of the Congress—

Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 770.)

It is strange to observe that while Mr. Snipes and Mr. Hughes were both in Washington and Mr. Hughes received the telegram Monday night, the following appeared in the Anderson, S.C., Independent a short time after Mr. Hughes received the original telegram:

SNIPES WIRES HUGHES: STOP FIGHT ON TROTTERS OR BOARD FUNDS OUT

WASHINGTON.—The following Western Union telegram was sent Monday to the manager of the Abbeville (S.C.) Planning and Development Board by Abbeville Representative William F. (Bill) Snipes on the eve of a congressional hearing on Trotters Shoals:

"Mr. J. Wesley Hughes,
"862 Dodge House,
"Washington, D.C.:

"Learned today that you are a leader here of the opposition group appearing against the Trotters Shoals project.

"If you go through with this, county funds will be withheld from the supply bill for the development board.

"Today I telephoned Mr. Robert Hawthorne, development board president, and have already told Senator Carwile my position.

"This action is based on the expression of Abbeville County voters who favor Trotters Shoals. They are taxpayers supporting the development boards.

"WM. F. SNIPES,
"Representative Abbeville County."

The Abbeville Press & Banner, a highly respected Abbeville County newspaper, later in the week noted:

A copy of the telegram was sent to the Anderson Independent, which published same on its Tuesday morning front page. No copy was sent the Press & Banner, Calhoun Falls News, radio station WABV, the Index Journal, nor the Greenville News.

[1] So in original.

McAndrew Earned Award Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of April 26, 1963 carried a column by radio and television writer, Lawrence Laurent, calling attention to the recent presentation of the George Foster Peabody Special Award to William R. McAndrew, vice president in charge of NBC News.

Because of the extreme importance to the national interest in the adequate dissemination of news by the radio and television industry, I deem it appropriate to call further attention to the oustanding contribution being made by Mr. McAndrew.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the article, "McAndrew Earned Award Recognition," by Lawrence Laurent:

MCANDREW EARNED AWARD RECOGNITION

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The awards committee of George Foster Peabody Foundation went out of its way this week to honor William R. McAndrew with a special award. He was cited for the vision and leadership which have resulted in range, depth, and significance in news programing.

McAndrew is executive vice president in charge of NBC News and seldom has any broadcasting award been more deserved.

He's not exactly what one expects to find in an executive suite at Radio City. McAndrew is a no-nonsense administrator, known for his deliberate and careful decisions. To the NBC News staff he also is known as a man who fights for his workers, both at the pay window and for network news time.

For nearly 20 years, NBC News ran a poor second to CBS. The news department at CBS radio was the personal creation of top man William Paley. With the late Paul White as chief executive, Paley led radio into international news coverage. A staff, headed by Edward R. Murrow, Howard K. Smith, Eric Sevareid, Elmer Davis, and William Shirer became the standard of excellence in broadcasting.

This reputation carried over into TV. Then along came McAndrew, with Julian Goodman, Elmer, Lower, and Rex Goad as chief helpers.

Now, McAndrew's department produces more than a quarter (26 percent to be exact)

of the entire NBC-TV schedule. Last year, NBC News supplied 1,201 hours of programing on the network.

This is more hours of programing than was provided by any independent production group, by any other network program department or by any other network news organization.

(Television magazine listed CBS News with 798 hours and ABC News with 405 hours.)

Or, to demonstrate growth another way, NBC News had only one full-time news producer 5 years ago. That was Reuven Frank. Today, Frank is still on the job, but shares his distinction with 17 producers: Robert Asman, Robert Bendick, Craig Fisher, Eliot Frankel, Fred Freed, Gerald Green, Chet Hagan, Lou Hazam, Al Morgan, Robert (Shad) Northshield, Stuart Schulberg, John Sughrue, George Vicas, Al Wasserman, William Wilson, Ted Yates, and Arthur Zegart.

The success of NBC News, of course, will always be tied to the decision to pair David Brinkley and Chet Huntley on the weeknightly news report. No one at NBC News is willing to remember who decided to use the team as the replacement for John Cameron Swayze.

McAndrew also gets credit for the speed with which NBC News moves on a story. There are the instant specials, usually handled by Frank McGee and with full sponsorship. This is an attempt to explain a breaking news story, without delaying for a week or waiting for Sunday afternoon's unsalable time.

Another key factor in the success of NBC News has been the willingness to handle controversy and not to flinch when counterattacks are made. Some news programs, by the very nature of great public issues, are going to anger some people and some groups. And there has to be someone on the receiving end of the indignation.

At NBC, McAndrew takes the responsibility and he has the scars to prove it. He also has a tough mind, trained at Catholic University in Washington, sharpened by stints with the old Washington Herald, United Press, and Broadcasting magazine.

McAndrew had proved he can take the bumps and he has demonstrated the kind of ability that should bring many awards.

Evils of Federalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege on Wednesday, April 24, 1963, to attend the annual Shad Planking at Wakefield, Va., with my close friend and colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK. Representative TUCK is not only an outstanding Virginian, but he is a great American, as well as one of the most effective Members of the House of Representatives.

On this occasion, before about 2,000 persons, Representative TUCK delivered one of the finest addresses that it has been my privilege to hear in recent years. He pointed out the evils of federalism, the danger of looking to the Federal Government for help, and the great progress that Virginia is making today in solving her problems and building up her economy.

I am proud of Virginia, her people and her leaders. I deplore her detractors, particularly those living within her borders who publicly try to downgrade her in their efforts to mislead the people in an endeavor to take the reins of government from those outstanding Virginians who have charted her course these many years and helped keep her as one of the leading States in the Union, economically and morally, with one of the best governments in the Nation.

Congressman TUCK's address was so timely, so well received, and points up so cogently the situation in Virginia and the Nation, I desire to include with my remarks his address made on April 24, 1963, at the meeting of the Wakefield Ruritan Club.

The address follows:

REMARKS MADE BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AT WAKEFIELD, ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1963, AT 4 P.M., AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE RURITAN CLUB

My friends, I appreciate the invitation to join with you on this occasion. It is a privilege for me to participate in the program, and of course to enjoy the plank shad. I am as fond of baked shad as some of the generals in the Confederate Army. In fact, I deserted a battlefield to be with you here today.

I am proud to be a member of the Ruritan International. I appreciate the fact that this organization was formed only a few years ago and was fostered and nurtured in nearby Nansemond County. It was has grown to be one of the most useful and widely known service organizations in the country.

I am glad to be here in the district of my colleague and warm personal friend, WATT ABBITT. We have been friends for many years. The problems of our respective districts are common to us both and have thus drawn us closely together. Congressman ABBITT is faithful and diligent in his attention to the business of his office. He is alert and dependable and is one of the soundest and most useful Members, not only of the Virginia delegation but of the entire membership of Congress.

I am glad likewise to be in the district represented in the State Senate by my longtime friend, Senator Garland Gray. His friendship, which I value and prize highly, has meant much to me throughout the past 25 or 30 years. Senator Gray is one of our most outstanding Virginians and has rendered great service to our Commonwealth. I am glad likewise to be able to say that you have fine representation in the House of Delegates of Virginia, as well as in the Senate. I have known and worked with nearly all of the representatives in both branches of the general assembly for nearly 40 years. Thus, I believe I have some first-hand knowledge of the qualities that constitute a good representative.

We have come to you today directly from Washington. It is the so-called model city set up by several of our Presidents as an example for the rest of the Nation to follow. I hope that the States and other cities of the Nation will study this model city and take heed lest they likewise stumble and fall to disrepute.

In the establishment of this so-called model city, great assistance came from that modern-day Samson, Chief Justice Warren. He is not a synthetic Samson. He is genuine, for like Samson, he is not only blind, heedless, desperate and destructive, but he has also pulled down the temple, not only upon the people of Washington and America, but upon himself and his Court as well.

Still without apology for his utterly rash and senseless decisions, he is now appealing to Congress for the sum of $200,000 to acquire land for a parking lot adjacent to the Supreme Court Building. The basis for his appeal is on the grounds that the 35 or 40 ladies who work in the offices of the Supreme Court Justices must be spared the necessity of walking a half a block from the building to the present parking lot, because that area is crime infested and it is unsafe for them to do so. Numerous assaults, usually on females, have occurred in that area of our Capital.

His decisions, and I am speaking of several, not just the integration decisions, have resulted in an open reign of terror and horror in the District of Columbia. It is unsafe at night to walk unarmed on the streets of Washington. This is a fact well known to everyone who lives there, and no truthful person will deny it. The children and teachers in school are unsafe, so that the superintendent of schools has recently requested authority to impose corporal punishment. It is even dangerous to pray in open daylight in the synagogues and temples within 2 blocks from the U.S. Capitol itself. A lady secretary from a New York Congressman's office recently was attacked while kneeling in prayer in a church near her office.

Washington is a city also noted for its specious and spurious political doctrines and nostrums. There are people high up in government in Washington, I hope they are in the minority, who profess to believe that the genuine road to prosperity is to lower taxes and increase expenditures, although we are already running a deficit of several billions of dollars each year. If spending money and running deficits brings prosperity, we should certainly have a plethora of prosperity in this country today. According to the Economic Division of the Library of Congress, the Federal Government spent from 1789, the beginning of the administration of George Washington to June 30, 1945, through the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 487 and four-tenths billions of dollars. The same source discloses that from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1961, through the administration of Truman and Eisenhower, we spent a total of 971 and seven-tenths billions, almost exactly twice as much as was spent for governmental services during all the administrations of all the other Presidents combined, from Washington through Franklin D. Roosevelt. I may add at this point that some of these Presidents who preceded Truman did not attain fame on account of their parsimonious conduct. I do not have the figures of the amount spent by the present administration, but I am sorry to have to say that the spending has been on the increase rather than on the decrease.

Much of these excessive expenditures have been worse than squandered for the result has been the destruction by the Federal Government of many of the historical rights and powers enjoyed by the people of the localities and the States.

The public debt in the last 25 years has grown to astronomical proportions. The annual interest alone on the public debt now is approximately twice as much as was spent by the Federal Government for all purposes in the year 1939. On December 31, 1962, the Nation's public debt amounted to $303.5 billion. The latest total figures on the debt of the "free world" countries was 201.5 billions. In other words, the public debt of the American Government exceeds those of all other "free world" countries by $102 billion, and yet we have given away to these so-called "free world" countries over a $100 billion. There has been very little appreciation on the part of many of these countries for what we have done. For instance in France, the greatest beneficiary of our governmental largess, where we have given away

almost $10 billion, the present Government of France is uncooperative with the United States in international affairs. The public debt of America exceeds the debt of all other countries of the world, including Russia and others behind the iron curtain, by approximately $24 billion.

I could go on talking about Washington and the "new tragic era" which they are foisting upon the people of the South. I could compare our policies in Cuba 90 miles away, with the policies in vogue at Vietnam, but that would be useless. All those who are informed know that terrible mistakes have been made in respect to our international affairs. I hope that we may take a more firm and resolute stand against all Communist countries, and particularly Cuba. Although mistakes have been made we should do our best to repair the damage and to present a united front in fighting communism, whether the attack is from within or from without. We must face up to the danger of communism. The peril or threat is probably more from within than from without. The history of the advance of communism demonstrates this truth. Their method is to infiltrate and destroy from within. Let us never forget that communism must be eradicated from the Western Hemisphere for coexistence means nothing but gradual surrender.

Despite these baleful and pernicious conditions, at the national level fraught with so much evil, as well as many others not mentioned, we find some joining ill-advised and misguided persons as well as some power-hungry Virginia politicians, in with the tormentors and destructionists from the North advocating a new era in Virginia. They would demean and denigrate Virginia and her government by attacking the leaders responsible for the magnificent governmental conditions which now exist in our great Commonwealth. These same influences would enervate the Democratic Party by engaging in wholesale political funerals and driving from the ranks of democracy lifelong Democrats who have been faithful to the true principles upon which our party is based and who are its greatest exponents.

I am not in sympathy with those dissatisfied elements who wish to gain control of Virginia's government and subvert the pure Virginia government and democracy thus subjecting it to the control of scandalous and unscrupulous city machines. This gives offense to the conscience and moral feelings of all true Virginians and no doubt will receive their reprobation and condemnation. For my part, I hope the Democrats of Virginia will continue to harmonize their work together and fight for the sound principles of government which have made our State and Nation great.

I am opposed to making over the government of Virginia in the image of Washington, D.C.

I say, "Thank God for Virginia."

I have a notion that Sir Christopher Newport uttered those same words when he brought his little three-ship fleet into sight of American soil in 1607 and prepared to go up the James to start the first permanent English settlement at Jamestown.

They are significant words, for they refer to what I shall always consider the greatest State in the Union. Virginia is the Mother State. As such, I am glad to say it has set a fine example for the other States. It is a pity that more of them cannot be induced to follow those noble examples.

One of my greatest prides throughout life has been the knowledge that I was born on Virginia soil. Except for the short time I served in the Marines in World War I and my stay in Washington as a Congressman, I have lived on Virginia soil all of my life. When my public services have ended it is my firm purpose to spend the rest of my days on Virginia soil.

Virginia has much for which to be proud. Statisticians and economic experts, many of whom are not natives of the Old Dominion, but who recognize facts and comparisons as yardsticks, place Virginia at the top.

During the decade of the 1950's, Virginia, in her rate of growth, excelled the Nation as a whole and every State to the south of her and east of the Mississippi but one—Florida. Her 19.5-percent gain in population exceeded the national figure of 18.5. So was her 17.4-percent gain in labor force ahead of the Nation's 15.8 percent. And her 49-percent increase in personal income was 4 percent ahead of the figure for the entire country.

Virginia cannot be characterized as a typical State in the midst of a region. That's because she stands out as an important corridor for the north-south traffic. She is a transition State that shares common economic activities with each of the States around its periphery, but her economy is more diversified than that of any of the surrounding States.

She is populated by 4,177,000 persons, ranking her 14th among the States from the standpoint of population. Six important rivers course down from her mountain backbone toward the coast, giving her a tidal shoreline of 3,315 miles long, while three major rivers run across her alluvial soil and fields in the opposite direction.

Twenty operating railroads carry her commerce over 4,100 miles of railroad roadway, in addition to 2,750 miles of sidetrack. Supplementing these are the carriers running on 50,000 miles of highways, all built on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Our ports in the Hampton Roads are among the most important in the world. Ninety percent of the Nation's oceanborne exports of coal, 70 percent of its exports of tobacco, and a good portion of its exports of grain are shipped through these outlets.

Virginia's principal exports are coal, tobacco, grains, woods, fertilizers, paper products, food, iron, textiles—26,112,524 tons, according to the latest annual figure. Her imports, largely petroleum products, ores, and foods, amount to about a fourth of that.

For years now, the trend in Virginia has been away from agriculture and toward industrialization. But she still has 97,623 farms with a total farm population of 650,000. In 1961, she produced 10,500,000 bushels of apples, 192,400,000 pounds of peanuts, and 147,686,000 pounds of tobacco. She leads the Nation in the production of Beltsville white turkeys. She is successfully competing with the Midwest in the growth of soybeans, and with the Northeast and Northwest as a producer of apples.

Her oyster harvest is the largest in the Nation, representing one-fourth of all the yield along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

In recent years, manufacturing in Virginia has forged ahead, in both employment and value added, faster than it has in the Nation as a whole. She stands fourth among the 11 Southeastern States in expenditures for new plant and equipment and in manufacturing employment.

Textiles and chemicals lead among the industries. Next are food processing and lumber and wood products.

Virginia is noted for the fine furniture produced in our factories, many of which are based in the Fifth Congressional District.

Virginia ranks first in the Nation in production of synthetic fibers. Cotton also is an important part of her textiles. At Danville is located the world's largest single-unit textile mill.

Coal accounts for a major share of her mineral production. She is the sixth largest coal-producing State. In 1960 she produced 7 percent of the Nation's bituminous coal and lignite.

Since 1949 her nonagricultural employment has grown at an average annual rate of 1.1—a rate well above the eight-tenths percent recorded as the national average.

She has 301 commercial banks, according to the latest count, with total assets of nearly $4 billion and total deposits only a shade lower. During the last two census periods, the growth record of her retailers has surpassed those of the region and the Nation. Her travel trade went up 20 percent during the 1950's bringing in about $600 million annually.

Her labor force as of last October was 1,492,750.

Since 1929 Virginia's per capita income has grown 325 percent. After adjustment for price increases, the growth is still a respectable 146 percent—76 percent greater than the expansion of the national figure.

She has had a larger increase in personal income than any other State in the region. Her personal income per capita has gone up steadily from $990 in 1946 to $1,909 in 1961. Virginia is second in per capita income among the Southeastern States.

In Virginia labor-management relations have enjoyed peace and tranquility. We have had relatively few strikes and work stoppages compared with other States in the Nation. Working conditions are better in Virginia than many of our other sister States. This state of well-being is due largely to the leadership among our workers as well as our management, and also to the favorable, fair and impartial labor relations laws on the statute books. I am proud of the fact that our right-to-work law, as well as a number of other labor-management relations statutes were enacted during my term in Richmond and upon my recommendation.

The harmony enjoyed by industry and the workers in our State has undoubtedly done much to enhance the economy as well as to attract new industry to locate within our borders.

Virginia's future does look bright. In the 1960's we can look forward to an increase in labor supply of 2.3 percent a year compared with 1.7 percent in the 1950's. This means that it will be necessary to provide approximately 40,000 additional jobs a year.

The Governor's Industrial Committee established during the present administration has done much to enhance the industrial growth of Virginia. There is every prospect that much future goodwill result from the activities of this committee. In addition the present administration has accomplished a great deal toward increasing employment and working conditions in Virginia by its encouragement of tourism as well as other facets of our economy.

One of our most important resources is our history. It was on the soil of Virginia, not far from where we now stand, that our liberties were first proclaimed and established. Virginia furnished more than its share of the Founding Fathers of this Republic. Much of the system of government for which our country is famous was contributed by Virginians. Eight Presidents have been born on her soil, and we have produced other outstanding statesmen and men besides those who became President. At least one of them lives in this present generation and serves us now. He deserves to rank as one of the great Virginians of all time. I refer, as everyone knows, to none other than U.S. Senator H. F. BYRD.

Probably the brightest part of our picture in Virginia is the fine government which we have had here, at least since the "tragic era" of reconstruction. And much of the present-day progress is due to the leadership of Senator BYRD. Since 1928, under a pay-as-you-go fiscal policy, Virginia has increased her budget tenfold under moderate rates of taxation. The Commonwealth of Virginia operates with a surplus, is free of bonded debt, and its residents, unlike those of the Nation and many other States, are taxed to pay for current services only.

We have a fine system of highways, approximately 50,000 miles, much of which has been paved and hardsurfaced, and constitutes one of the best road system in the Nation, and for which Virginia and the people do not owe a cent.

But the greatest resource any State can have is her people. We are blessed with a wonderful citizenship who believe in responsible government. They believe in placing men in office such as our present Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and attorney general, who are capable and who are worthy, and who are dedicated to the highest public good.

Emerson, one of the greatest of our philosophers, in one of his essays said that the troubles of the world arise largely because the good and the better are forever in conflict, while the forces of evil are united. He said that if the good and the better would cease conflict and unite that triumph over evil could be easily secured. Let us hope that our Virginia people in the great dilemma and crisis which we now face may lay aside differences of an inconsequential nature which serve to divide us, and let us unite to strengthen our government and our State to the end that we may continue to enjoy the same happiness and prosperity which have blessed us for many past decades.

Yes, I say, "Thank God for Virginia." I think the entire Nation has a reason to say the same thing.

Contractors Support Small Business Set-Aside Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, in their opposition to the small-business set-aside program, the Associated General Contractors would like to have us believe they are speaking for the entire construction industry. It is refreshing, therefore, to learn that the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors is steadfastly opposed to the Associated General Contractors position and strongly in favor of the small-business set-aside program. So that all Members may be aware of the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors position, I insert for the RECORD a column from its newsletter, the Pipeline, dated April 1963. The column is written by C. D. Brownell, of Champaign, Ill., president of the association. It is a cogent argument for the set-aside program, and a deserved rebuke to the Associated General Contractors.

GENERAL CONTRACTORS GUNNING FOR SBA'S SET-ASIDES COVERING MAINTENANCE, REPAIR AND CONSTRUCTION

The concerted effort in New York State and other areas to undermine or destroy long-established separate contracts laws is not the only indication of a determined drive by the general contractors to pull the rug out from under the mechanical specialty contractors.

Another assault is currently underway by the generals on the Small Business Administration's set-aside program as it benefits small contractors in the construction field.

Specifically, the attack has been narrowed down to or focused on set-asides for maintenance, repair or construction, and this strikes right at the heart of the interests of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors members.

Twin bills have been introduced in the present Congress—S. 757, by Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, and H.R. 2029, by Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Republican of Pennsylvania—to amend the Small Business Act "to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction."

The bills have been referred to committee, which is where they should stay, as far as Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors is concerned. Meantime, pending the customary hearings and the possibility they may eventually be reported favorable for floor action in the Senate and House, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors members should wire their vigorous objections to the bills to their two U.S. Senators and Members of their State congressional delegation, as well as sponsors of the legislation in both Houses of Congress.

The Small Business Administration with its set-aside program is one of the stanchest friends of plumbing, heating, cooling contractors and mechanical contractors generally.

SBA operates a program under which Government construction contracts are set aside for competitive bidding by small contractors only.

When a Government procurement has been reserved for exclusive bidding by small firms only, it is said that it has been set aside for small business.

A set-aside is, then, a Government procurement reserved for exclusive competition of small business firms. It is a means of assuring small businesses an opportunity to compete with other small businesses for Government procurements.

Congress decided that in order to maintain and preserve the small business segment of the national economy it would be necessary that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government be placed with small business firms.

To this end, the Small Business Administration has declared it to be policy that all Government agencies utilize all means properly available to set aside a portion of all Government procurements exclusively for small business participation, so as to assure small businesses the opportunity to bid on and receive their fair share of the total.

Official statistics reveal that last year publicly financed construction work, both Federal and State, amounted to approximately $18 billion. Of this amount, only about half a billion was set aside for exclusive small business competition, leaving the remaining $17½ billion for unrestricted large business competition.

There are no figures to show just how much of the half billion set aside for small business firms actually went to them in contract awards. However, in connection with the military construction program, it is known that 90 percent of the construction industry, representing small business firms, has been getting less than 50 percent of the business. Ten percent of the industry, representing the large construction firms, has been getting more than half. Five years ago, small construction firms were getting over 70 percent of the contract awards in the military construction program.

These statistics speak for themselves. The small business share of military construction is steadily declining and the small construction firms, or 90 percent of the industry, are rapidly being displaced from Government work by their big competitors.

It is the steadily increasing danger of being crowded out of the American construction market which set-asides by the SBA are designed to meet. Set-asides serve to deprive the powerful outsiders of the opportunity to outbid the small contractor on a local project which is within his performance capability.

It is asserted that SBA is creating inexperienced competition to qualified contractors by making or quaranteeing loans to small firms which in many cases are regarded as poor risks and unable to obtain financing through normal channels.

SBA is not in the banking business in competition with private lending institutions. Its loans are solely designed to meet legitimate needs of those eligible and creditworthy small firms which are unable to obtain financial assistance from normal commercial channels.

Consequently, when an eligible and creditworthy small business applicant is turned down by private lending institutions, SBA may step in and, provided there is reasonable assurance of repayment, render financial assistance.

It should be noted in this connection that so important are loans to the survival of small construction contractors that the United Association, AFL-CIO Journeymen, Plumbers, and Pipefitters Union, and other building construction trade unions very strongly support the principle of the SBA's making loans to these small contractors.

How large should a construction set-aside contract be? The SBA follows the criterion that a proper set-aside contract is one which a sufficient number of small firms can perform and are willing to compete for, assuring the Government of a price that would not be increased, by virtue of the set-aside, over what could otherwise be expected.

If such a course were followed consistently without interference by the large construction firms, the very nature of the present-day Government construction projects would assure a fair share of contracts to both small and large firms in the industry.

Next month with Pipeline we will include forms for plumbing, heating, cooling contractor members to use in registering with the SBA as small construction contractors. The forms will be used by SBA in determining eligibility for contract awards.

In conclusion, the basic philosophy of SBA is to enable small construction contractors to participate equitably in the Government's construction business, without sacrifice of the primary objective of high quality at reasonable cost.

Experience proves that the small contractor's share of Government construction work would be inequitably reduced if authority to make small business set-asides were not available.

The Encouragement of Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of April 30, 1962, written by Mr. Charles Dancey:

THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF CAPITAL

WASHINGTON.—One of the most interesting exercises in Washington is to listen to officials discuss foreign aid or the Alliance for Progress in which they prescribe essential practices and reforms in foreign governments that we do not seem to follow at home.

An American official, for example, decrying the lack of investment in Latin America to bolster the Alliance for Progress blamed the Latins and said essential reforms are necessary to improve the capital investment picture.

He said that expropriation is not really the problem. There have been only a couple of instances in recent years, and both have been adjusted to everyone's satisfaction. Besides, the Government offers U.S. investors a form of insurance against this contingency.

No, the problems, he pointed out, are inflation, which makes the future hard to plan for an investor; bureaucratic interference which handicaps efficient management; and economic instability fostered in part by the misuse of Government revenues.

He said the United States is now withholding funds to insist on reforms, particularly to curb inflation.

He spoke disparagingly of officials in other countries who lack the courage to do what must be done—describing the need bluntly as "deflation instead of inflation."

Balanced budgets were mentioned as necessary. Better use of tax money more than tax reform. Reducing bureaucratic interference with business management. And, in Vietnam, especially, the development and encouragement of local independent government instead of national government domination of local decisions.

An interesting "must" list to cure the ills of the free world—everywhere except in the United States.

Any relationship between what we regard as sound policies in countries now seeking to get U.S. aid and the policies of the U.S. Government at home are rather difficult to find.

The basic problem as described seems vaguely familiar, when American officials speak feelingly of politicians in other lands seeking to be popular instead of facing up to realistic economic policies that would constitute an "austerity program" instead of inflation, less government interference in private business and local government, and an end to irresponsible spending of tax incomes.

At the same time as the present "tough" policy of the administration is described in relation to recipient nations, officials are quick to deny that the Alliance for Progress, for example, has bogged down; and an official stated that an impressive $90 million of capital investment in manufacturing was made in Latin America in the past year, as plus (if we ignore investments withdrawn in oil from Venezuela).

To get a better idea of how many $90 million in capital investment is in the whole of Latin America, we might look at something like $40 million in new construction announced so far in the city of Peoria alone, mostly downtown, and perhaps $30 million more in central Illinois community alone just in new home construction.

One plant like ADM involved perhaps $15 million.

Ninety million in manufacturing would not represent the total manufacturing investment presently existing in Peoria and East Peoria alone—and this for the whole of South America.

The Roots of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is nationwide concern over the continuing world tensions as they relate to the attempts of the Soviet Union to dominate the world. Much of the debate centers around present-day tensions which could be better understood by a knowledge of the past. A proper understanding of the menace the Soviet Union poses to the world can be realized only by a knowledge of Russian history.

The April 1963, issue of proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute carried an article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, an eminent authority on Russian history. His article, entitled "The Roots of Russia," dramatically portrays the historic development of the Russian empire. In view of its tremendous implication and educational content, I place the article in the RECORD at this point and know that the Members will give it thoughtful attention:

THE ROOTS OF RUSSIA

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Perhaps no subject is fraught with as many basic misconceptions and errors as that of Russia. What so often happens is that on the basis of these fundamental errors, misleading analyses are constructed, and invariably a number of false conclusions are drawn. Then, in time, the popularization of these conclusions only helps to reinforce and perpetuate the original erroneous premises. The cycle repeats itself on higher levels of assembled information, while the malformed perspectives spun about the subject become more entrenched than ever. At no risk of exaggeration, this is the general state of our so-called Russian studies in this country.

CURRENT MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT RUSSIA

Before we depict the broad outlines of a holistic view of Russia, it would profit us to glance at a few current misconceptions about the Soviet Union upon which some presume to base our policies. The first and foremost is that the U.S.S.R. is Russia. One may perhaps excuse the average journalist for notoriously perpetuating this myth and all the consequent errors it breeds, but it is clearly unpardonable for any responsible scholar or official to reveal his limitations by committing this basic error. Russia, the homeland of the Russian people, is no more coincident with the U.S.S.R. than the United States is with North America.

A second ruling misconception has the Soviet Union as a nation, with a Soviet people, a Soviet society, a Soviet economy, and a Soviet political system. Here, too, the Soviet Union is no more a nation than was the British Empire. Whether many realize it or not, these monolithic terms, which readily serve the semantic purpose of blurring the real, diverse, and distinctive elements in the Soviet Union, have for some time been the stock of Moscow's terminology for export. The true meaning of a soviet, as a council of workers, is now scarcely recognizable.

From these two paramount misconceptions many others evolve. For example, how often have you heard that the U.S.S.R. is like the United States, "a country of many nationalities and ethnic groups," some 177 or more of them; or, that like the United States, the Soviet Union has its "national minorities, the Great Russians constituting the majority"; or that the U.S.S.R. is a "federal union" like ours, Byelorussia being a counterpart of Massachusetts, or, as George Kennan would have it, the Ukraine being a counterpart of Pennsylvania. These notions have as much real meaning as those harbored by many uncritical Americans only two decades ago that the constitution of the U.S.S.R. is like ours and that in many respects the U.S.S.R. is a democracy like ours In fact and history they bear as much validity as the baseless assertions that "the Soviet Union was formed 44 years ago," that "Kiev, Kharkov, and Baku are Russian cities," that "there are the Russian peoples," and that there even is a gross national product of the Soviet Union, which again suggests the fiction of a Soviet nation.

Needless to say, the greatest part of anyone's education is devoted to an objective and accurate identification of things and events. If an address or lecture contained remarks to the effect that the United States was formed in 1776 or that Warsaw or Sofia is a Russian city, you would entertain prudent doubts about the interpretations and judgment of the speaker. It obviously follows with equal force of logic that if these misconceptions about the Soviet Union prevail, interpretations that follow can only be viewed with similar doubt. In fact, as the Nazi experience in the U.S.S.R. well showed, policies and plans based on flagrant misconceptions invite only disaster. The moral is simple: we cannot afford to misidentify the sources of the enemy.

If these are the dominant misconceptions, then the significance of this concise institutional analysis becomes manifestly evident.

THE INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE U.S.S.R.

Let us then look into these roots, into this institutional background of the U.S.S.R. One of the most misleading illusions is that the Bolshevik revolution represented a break with Russia's past and uniquely ushered in a new and chaste society. It is the height of unrealism to believe that any such institutional hiatus is achievable in the existence of any social organism. The eminent Russian historian, Peter B. Struve, points out in the preface to his authoritative work on "The Social and Economic History of Russia" that "the roots of the Russian revolution are deeply imbedded in the historical backwardness of Russia * * *." In a holistic view of Russian development down to the present, these roots and their long stems can be essentially summed up in three overall and determinative phenomena: (1) Russian imperialist expansionism and colonialism, (2) totalitarian despotism and tyranny, and (3) an institutionalized Messianism expressed in a variety of expedient ideologies. There are, of course, other strains of a more constructive and salutary kind, but they certainly fall short of the weight and predominance of these.

1. Russian imperialism and colonialism

Considering the first imposing feature of the czarist past and the pseudo-Communist present, probably no definition of it surpasses the one offered by Secretary of State Dean Acheson in 1951. He observed: "Historically, the Russian state has had three great drives—to the west into Europe, to the south into the Middle East, and to the east into Asia. * * * Historically, also, the Russian state has displayed considerable caution in carrying out these drives. * * * The Politburo has acted in the same way. It has carried on and built on imperialist tradition * * * the ruling power in Moscow has long been an imperial power and now rules a greatly extended empire. * * * It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire has got to be stopped." A glance at any political map covering this imperialist expansion is sufficient for one to appreciate the old Russian saying, "Russia grows larger and larger."

Tolstoy put it this way: "Russia is the continent and Europe its peninsula." A review of the record of Russian imperialist expansion reveals that there really is nothing new in the drives of the present-day Moscow. As every alert student of Russian history knows, pressure in three directions—west, south, and east—has always been present. Moreover, the frequency of wars and aggressions, the "eternal peace" gestures followed by broken treaties, constant meddling

in the affairs of other states, the tactic of alternation—first west, then east, again west and then south—and the relentless conquest of nations form an unmistakable legacy for the heirs of the czars.

Fortunately, American scholars are beginning to recognize this pattern. Dinko Tomasic, one of the most perceptive writers on the subject, captures the meaning of this institutional foundation of the U.S.S.R. when he describes its roots in terms of "expansion, greatness of the state, ideas of grandeur and Messianic ideas of world redemption or world domination." He writes accurately in "The Impact of Russian Culture on Soviet Communism," "This tendency toward exhibitionism and ideas of greatness was manifested also in the glorification of Russia, and the belief in the sacredness of its exalted mission in the world." In short, anyone who has read Russian history but failed to perceive its primary strand of imperialist conquest and colonial domination has lost sight of the forest because of the trees.

2. Totalitarian despotism and tyranny

Now let us consider the second institutional basis of typical Russian rule—totalitarian despotism and tyranny. Usually without defining what they mean, people ascribe to communism certain institutional forms which, significantly, are deeply rooted in the traditional Russian base of so-called Communist institutions. For policy and political action, the importance of grasping this institutional Russian continuum cannot be too strongly emphasized. With only differences in degree due to technology and bureaucratic skill, totalitarian despotism and tyranny—by which are meant thought and act aimed at the subordination of institutions and persons to a centrally dictating and boundless will—are not the mutational product of any supposed Communist innovation in Russia proper. They, too, have their sturdy roots in the cumulative tradition of Russian political institutions.

When one reads the reflections of a De Tocqueville or the journals of a De Custine, two able observers in the last century, he cannot but be impressed by the truth of this continuum. In his "Democracy in America," De Tocqueville makes a foresighted comparison of the profoundest kind: "The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the other by the sword." Supplementing this reflection today, it may be added that there can be no greater danger to civilization than the combination of modern technology and a barbaric scheme of institutions as found in the U.S.S.R.

Portrayed so vividly by De Custine, this scheme is a traditional one supported by the submissiveness, servility, and humility of the beaten Russian masses whose wounds have been largely palliated by dreams of the deliverance of the entire world. Russian history is replete with many writers of the stature of Timofeiev and Nekrasov who have rebelled against this chronic submissiveness to totalitarian rule. Too often in the past what was uncritically accepted as a mass Russian rebellion was actually non-Russian in character and depth; and in the past 40 years of the new empire, nearly all the mass eruptions were thoroughly non-Russian.

A systematic enumeration of the chief institutional forms of traditional Russian totalitarianism further demonstrates, except for minor accidents of degree and magnitude, the substantial identity of these forms in the past and present. The first form is statism and all that it entails in the way of leader worship, state dominance, parasitical bureaucracy, an expedient policy of concessions and the like. The farflung power of the state in the U.S.S.R. is self-evident. But what is not evident to many of us is the fact that barbaric statism has always been a typical characteristic of "Holy Mother Russia."

At the head of Russia was the "God-anointed" head of the state and empire, the Czar. For example, Peter I, in every major respect "the first Bolshevik," could without restraint dismiss the Moscow Patriarch and proclaim himself the "God-anointed Head of the Greek Orthodox Church." He and other Czars set the precedent of deification for Stalin later. State and personal worship, bureaucracy, class stratification, and unlimited power were the dominant characteristics then as now. Concessions and their reduction to the peoples were determined by the weakness and strength of the regimes then as now. In this century, for instance, Nicholas II, forced by defeat in the Russo-Japanese War of 1905 to concede a constitution and a parliament, soon quelled the revolution and by absolute decree neutralized the Duma.

How powerful the Russian institution of statism is can also be gleaned from the writings of Russians who oppose the present type of regime but not the power of "Holy Mother Russia." As a fair example, Alexander Romanoff, a Grand Duke of Russia, writes: "Could I, a product of an empire, an individual raised to believe in the impeccability of the state, still continue to denounce the present rulers of Russia? The answer was 'yes' and 'no' * * *. To remain loyal to Russia and to follow the example of the early Romanoffs who had never thought themselves bigger than their empire meant to admit that the Soviet Government should be helped and not hindered in its experiment and to wish it would succeed where the Romanoffs had failed." In passing it may be noted that the Grand Duke regarded the independent Baltic Republics—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—as "nonsense."

Even Alexander Kerensky is on record as saying, in 1943: "Russia—a geographical pivot of history—has to be mighty and strong no matter who or how he rules her. From this comes his [Milyukov's] testament for all of us: to be on watchful guard of Russia—no matter what her name is—selflessly, obediently, and to our last breath." These examples could be multiplied, including the Nacionalno-Trudovoy Soyuz—the Russian N.T.S.—which, ironically enough, receives American aid.

The second important institutional form, economic collectivism and planning, is also not without deep roots in the Russian colossus. So-called communism has only magnified and refined collectivist economic instruments for more extensive state political control. The 5-year plans and economic crash programs have in essence nothing over similar crash programs initiated by Peter I. Lauded by the present Russian totalitarians as a "progressive empire builder," Peter spared no costs, human or material, in the building of Petersburg and numerous industrial projects. In this century, on the eve of World War I, even Nicholas II ordered his Minister of Commerce and Trade to prepare a 5-year plan for state execution.

This traditional collectivist mentality is observable also in Russian agriculture. The commune, known as the mir, institutionalized collective ownership of farm property and was managed by an elderman—Starosta—who was appointed by the head of the local Czarist police. At the beginning of this century under the Stolypin reforms which allowed peasants to leave the commune, only small numbers in Russia did, and even some of these returned. In non-Russian Ukraine, however, as much as 50 percent of all peasant holdings were turned into privately owned farms by 1915. Thus, the transition from the "mir" to the present kolkhoz or sovkhoz was an institutionally easy one. The Russian Narodniki or Populists clearly envisioned this transition to complete socialist enterprise, and in the same 19th century, the Russian writer, Hertzen, shared this vision of the collectivist nexus.

To complete this institutional picture of the Russian continuum into the present, other dominant forms would include genocide and the Russification of conquered nations, censhorship and the methodical distortion of history, the Iron Curtain technique, the secret police, Siberian slave labor, anti-Semitism, the fraud of the Potemkin village, and diplomatic duplicity and fifth columns. These institutional forms are all compatible parts of a totalitarian whole and, again, despite differences in degree, have their able precedents in the tradition. The record of genocide is long and extends back to the slaughter of the people of Novgorod, the fourth Eastern Slavic nation. The mass murder of the population of Buturyn under Peter I, the drowning of 10,000 Crimean Tartars in the Black Sea under Catherine II, and the massacre of Polish revolutionaries and Ukrainian Catholics in the Kholmland under Nicholas I are just a few precedents to the crimes of Stalin and Khrushchev.

Russification programs under Stalin, and more subtly under Khrushchev, in Turkestan, Ukraine, Lithuania, and elsewhere, continued the czarist policies of banning books not in the Russian language, as under Peter I and the many cultural suppressions under Alexander II in the last century. The same holds true for censorship and official distortion of history. When, for example, in 1863 the czarist Minister Valuyev declared, "There never was, is not, and never will be a Ukraine," he gave eloquent expression to a policy of distortion and censorship which in different ways has characterized the modern princes of Moscow. Prohibitions against traveling abroad and passports for travel within the empire presented a czarist version of the Iron Curtain technique now practiced more severely by Red Moscow. As to the dreaded secret police, the current security force has its erstwhile predecessors in Czar Nicholas I's Third Section and Ivan III's Oprichnina. Needless to say, Siberia and slave labor have a perennial Russian meaning which surely was not conceived by Marxist ideology. So with anti-Semitism and the ubiquitous Potemkin villages, whether under Catherine II, Nicholas II, Stalin, or Khrushchev.

3. The ideologic masks of Russian messianism

Finally, for our understanding of Russia and its people, the third institution strand—Messianism as expressed by some deceptive ideology—must be briefly considered. Russian communism, as Berdyaev puts it, is the third form of Russian imperialism, the dominant preceeding forms being the Third Rome ideology and Pan-Slavism. In each, the Messianic elements of sacred mission, protection and liberation of others, the certain deliverance of the world, and the racist superiority of Russia to achieve these ends are present. They sanctify the conquest of nations and by pretext justify more conquests. This was so in the confined civilized world of the 15th to 18th centuries, in the more expanded world of the 19th and early 20th centuries, and by virtue of technology and science, the globe now.

The ideology of the Third Rome commenced with Ivan III in the 15th century when he claimed the privileges of the Emperor of Constantinople, proclaimed Moscow the third Rome, and adopted the double-headed eagle. The ideology was later formulated by the Pskovian Monk Philoteus who in 1524 wrote: "All Christian empires ended and were absorbed by one empire—that of our autocrat, in accordance with the prophetical books, the Russian Tsardom. Two

Romes have fallen, and the Third exists; but there will be no Fourth."

Serving the expansionist interests of Russia this Messianic belief has lasted 500 years, even into the present atheistic Russian empire. Peter the Great exploited it before he named, for the first time, his imperial realm "Russia." Propaganda before the partitions of Poland by Catherine II claimed that her fellow Orthodox had to be protected from Polish and Jesuit persecutions. "Protection of fellow Christians" and "protection of the Holy Places and the Orthodox" in Jerusalem preceded and sanctified the wars against Turkey. And in 1948, on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of the independence of the Russian Church, Bishop Hermogen, Rector of the Moscow Theological Academy, let it be known that the present Partriarchate of Moscow alone preserved the true Christian Faith, not shared by either the Catholic or Protestant worlds. Clearly, this Messianistic expansionism not only persists behind its Third Rome mask, but also, and more importantly, has been channeled into the latest form of materialistic millenarianism: Russian communism.

But in the tradition there was and still is another ideologic mask, Pan-Slavism. Here, too, it partakes of a sacred mission, one of protection and liberation, and is offered to Slav nations as a means of world deliverance. The czars proclaimed it their sacred duty to unify all Slav nations, and the constant wars in the Balkans ensued. It was also a sacred duty to hoist the Russian cross over the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and plant Russian interests in the Near East. However, as Hans Kohns shows in his work on "Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology," what started as Panslavism soon developed into the ideology of Pan-Russian. Pushkin gave literary punch to this since all Slavic rivers had to run into the Russian Sea. Nevertheless, this ideologic strategem was used in World Wars I and II; it was applied on our soil with the attempted American Slav Congress only a decade and a half ago; and is being skillfully exploited by Khrushchev in the Slav precincts of his empire today. In words that could be readily adapted to so-called Communism, Engels cogently observed that "in truth Panslavism is a smokescreen for world dominion, appearing in the cloak of nonexistent Slavic nationality, and is therefore our, as well as the Russian people's, worst enemy."

The new smokescreen for world dominion is the third Messianic form and mark, Communism. As a militant faith within the empire it vanished over 30 years ago with Lenin's new economic policy and with the reintroduction of traditional modes of totalitarian rule supported by mass submissiveness. It never actually took hold in the non-Russian nations conquered by the Russian Bolshevik armies. As many had predicted—among them the Russian scholar Hertzen—Russian Communism quickly proved to be "Russian autocracy turned upside down." Like the Third Rome and Pan-Slavist ideologies, it nevertheless continues to be a tool for the empire.

If one accepts this grounded institutional analysis, then romantic notions about some institutional chasm between the submissive Russian masses and their Moscow regime, about a powder keg of popular revolt in Russia proper, about evolution to freedom through technical Russian education are dangerous illusions which could only benefit the present heirs of a totalitarian tradition. "Psychologically," as Father Edmund A. Walsh persuasively taught, "the Russian people—upon whom the revolution is based and without whose acquiescence it could not have been launched or so long sustained—have always revealed qualities of frustrated mysticism which inclines them to constant acceptance of contradictions and paradoxes." Let us now look at this revolution and how the pains of this frustrated mysticism laid the foundation, in terms of conquered lands and nations, for the threat confronting our own national existence today.

THE RUSSIAN AND NON-RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONS OF 1917

In thinking about our present foreign policy, it is extremely important to understand the framework of essential events which occurred in 1917 and the period thereafter. First, an empire called Russia, and built in the course of nearly 500 years, was in dissolution and utter collapse. Like the demise of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires, its fate appeared to be sealed for good. Second, in that year there were three revolutions in the Empire, not just one. There were two revolutions on the soil of Russia itself and one vast revolution for national independence among the non-Russian nations in the collapsing Empire. What is called the Russian Civil War was mainly between the White Tsarist loyalists and the Red Bolshevik rebels: The revolution for national independence was fought by non-Russian patriots in the Baltic area, in Poland, in the Ukraine, the Caucasus and in Asia against foreign domination, whether white or red. And third, at the time both the Russian Bolshevik revolution and the national non-Russian revolution succeeded, the March Russian revolution with Kerensky failed.

The failure of the first Russian revolution and Kerensky's social democracy may be attributed to many proximate causes. For example, one was Kerensky's greater external concern for the imperialist retention of Ukraine and the Caucasus than for the political entrenchment of his government against internal Bolshevik opposition. The ultimate cause of this failure, however, rested in the conspicuous absence of any institutional environment for democratic function in Russia—a significant point for romanticists envisioning a spontaneous democratic Russia in the future. As now, there was no real middle class in Russia for Kerensky to build on, and the weight of the totalitarian past could not be easily set aside. Lenin, who a few years before never dreamed of ruling Russia, provided the controls that were in complete consonance with the institutional sinews of the long Russian tradition. Despite his expeditious coup, he had the broad support of the masses with promises of land, bread, and peace.

Careful scholarship and realistic thinking do not support the politically contrived notion that the Russian people were the first to be victimized by Bolshevism. In addition to Father Walsh and many others, the Russian scholar, George Fedotov, wrote: "Moscow and Petersburg succumbed easily to Bolshevism. * * * There must have been something in the Great Russian tradition that provided more food for Bolshevism than the soil of the rest of the Empire: serfdom, the village commune, Tsarist autocracy."

The truth is that in the rest of the Empire the struggle was not only against Bolshevism but also—even more so—against any form of Russian imperialism and colonialism. Decades before the full awakening of national consciousness in Asia and Africa, popular movements for national self-determination and independence surged forth in the very bowels of the Russian Empire. Significantly, passages from our own Declaration of Independence and the addresses of Lincoln and others were quoted to further inspire these movements; and with the announcement of Wilson's doctrine of national self-determination, they bloomed into open revolution.

As against Czarist bureaucrats and Kerensky Menshiviks, Lenin understood the full significance of these non-Russian liberation movements. Similar to what is going on today in Africa and Asia, the Russian Bolsheviks sought, even before the outbreak of World War I, to expoit the good and morally principled cause of national self-determination and independence for their own nefarious ends. Russian Bolshevik literature abounds with this appeal to the non-Russian nations. In essence, it repeats Lenin's cynical writings on self-determination. As late as May 1917, Lenin stated that "if Finland, if Poland, if the Ukraine break away from Russia, there is nothing bad about that * * * Anyone who says there is, is a chauvinist. Not nation can be free if it oppresses other nations."

In 1917 and 1918, not only Finland, Poland, and Ukraine declared their independence and popularly determined themselves as sovereign states, but also Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, North Caucasia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkestan. Even within the projected territory of Russia, the creation of a Federal Idel-Ural Republic was attempted by Moslems located between the Volga and the Urals; the Far Eastern Republic was founded in what is now the Soviet Far East; and millions of non-Russians and Russian "Siberyaks" in Siberia sought decentralization from Moscow rule. Many of these states, like Poland, Ukraine, Georgia, and Lithuania, were recognized not only by the new Soviet Russia, i.e., the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, but also by Western powers. Contrary to a common misconception, there was no Soviet Union in this period; there was truly a Soviet Russia with scarcely a colonial empire.

But this state of affairs was not for long. If not in words, certainly in deeds, Lenin and the Russian Bolsheviki proved to be old-style Russian chauvinists. By familiar Russian political devices of divide and conquer, fifth column infiltration, and the setting up of puppet regimes, Red Moscow picked up the institutional threads of the Russian totalitarian tradition and began to weave its own colonial empire. In this first wave of Red Russian imperialism, the newly independent countries were invaded and conquered one by one until Trotsky's Russian armies were stopped at the gates of Warsaw. Some, like Finland, Poland, and the Baltic nations, were fortunate to preserve their independence, thanks to Western aid and the absorption of Russian energy in capturing the economically richer prizes of the Ukraine, the Caucasus, and Turkestan.

This first series of conquests was made possible not only by the organizations, armed might, and political devices of the new Russian totalitarians, but also by the ignorance of Woodrow Wilson about the nature of the Russian Empire and on the part of others who materially supported the decadent czarist forces which likewise fought the independence movements. One could only contemplate how different the course of history might have been in our time had the principle of national self-determination been tangibly supported for all nations in the Russian Empire. History has shown, instead, that these early conquests laid the foundation both for an empire called the Soviet Union and for future aggressions leading to an even more expanded empire. In 1922–24, as a response to the national feelings of its first captives, Moscow formed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a spurious voluntary federation concealing a prison of nations. With this empire and the opportunities it presented, Moscow was prepared for a future of direct and indirect aggressions. We are witnessing and are also being threatened by the consequences of this original imperialist success of Red Moscow.

A Bill To Establish the Federal Housing Administration as an Independent Agency of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The Federal Housing Administration was created by the President pursuant to the National Housing Act which was enacted as Public Law 479, 73d Congress, on June 27, 1934.

On May 27, 1947, the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 creating the Housing and Home Finance Agency and transferring to the new agency the Federal Housing Administration, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Public Housing Administration. Of these, all except the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation were made constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This reorganization plan became effective on July 27, 1947.

Under the Housing Amendments of 1955, approved August 11, 1955, the Home Loan Bank Board, including the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, was removed from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Board, with its name changed to Federal Home Loan Bank Board, was established as a separate independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons which motivated the Congress to establish the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government are applicable to the Federal Housing Administration. However, there are even more compelling reasons today why the Federal Housing Administration should be restored to the independent status.

During debate on the Housing Amendments of 1955 the question was raised as to the proposed separation of the Home Loan Bank Board from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In justification of such separation, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, Mr. SPARKMAN, said, and I quote from page 6574 of the RECORD of June 7, 1955:

> The situation is that the home loan banks originally were made possible by the underwriting of their stock by the Federal Government, the idea being that they would gradually retire their stock. All of the stock has now been retired except about $66 million, and the home loan banks are ready, able, and willing to retire that amount now, and provision for this is made in the bill.
>
> If the stock is retired, why should not the Federal home loan banks have the same status as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Reserve System, which operate in the same manner? That is what is being provided for by the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Act, enacted in June 1934, authorized $10 million to be made available to the FHA to create a mutual mortgage insurance fund. Whatever public moneys were made available to the FHA have long since been repaid.

The FHA has accumulated reserves aggregating approximately $1 billion from the premiums paid by home buyers whose mortgages are insured by FHA. These reserves belong to the participants in the mutual system. The expenses incurred by FHA in administering the insurance program are far below its earnings from fees and premiums. The FHA had total assets of $1.6 billion, as of June 30, 1962, and its principal liability on that date was $496 million in long-term debentures issued in exchange for properties acquired by foreclosure.

When the Congress in 1955 established the Home Loan Bank Board there was, as the chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee stated, $66 million in stock in the hands of the Federal Government which had not as yet been retired. If the retirement of all but $66 million in Government-held stock was suggested as an argument for independent status for the Home Loan Bank Board, certainly the same reasoning would be even more compelling with respect to the Federal Housing Administration which owes the Government not one cent, and which operates without cost to the taxpayers.

The Federal Housing Administration's primary purpose is to conduct an actuarially sound underwriting mutual mortgage insurance system. I emphasize the mutuality of this insurance system because this characteristic of the Federal Home Loan Bank System was advanced as one of the reasons for the transfer of the system from the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1955.

As a mutual mortgage insurance system, operating without cost to the taxpayers, the Federal Housing Administration has made a tremendous contribution to the provision of housing for millions of American families as well as stimulating the home building and allied industries. It presents an excellent example of what I believe to be the Federal Government's proper role in the field of housing—to encourage rather than subsidize real estate and housing as an industry.

The Federal Housing Administration must remain deeply committed to a program of accurate underwriting based on adequate analysis and sound business judgment. On March 11, 1963, the FHA Commissioner in his first public address since his appointment was confirmed by the Senate, referred to the FHA's "paramount public service requirement to give the American people a mortgage insurance program consistent with sound underwriting principles."

However, the events of the past several years have served to reorient the Federal Housing Administration from the economically sound underwriting principles which have, until recent years, characterized its operations.

This reorientation is the result of trying to administer a sound underwriting system in conjunction with welfare subsidy programs. I believe, the Congress should consider the shifting of these welfare-type programs to the Housing and Home Finance Agency leaving to the FHA its independent jurisdiction over an actuarially sound mortgage insurance system.

Mr. Speaker, for several years, beginning in November 1947, the national conventions of the National Association of Real Estate Boards have adopted policy statements urging the Congress to enact the necessary legislation to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency of the executive branch of the Government. Under unanimous consent, I include the most recent of these—adopted in November 1962—to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Autonomy: The FHA has made a major contribution to the housing of American families and to the housing industry without expense to the public. However, political and social welfare considerations are eroding the economically sound underwriting standards which have been the hallmark of this agency since its inception. Therefore, we call upon the Congress to enact legislation granting independent status to the FHA under the direction and control of a board of directors appointed by the President, and to desist from adding responsibilities to the agency which are inconsistent with economically sound underwriting principles.

Mr. Speaker, the 1962 statement of public policy of the Mortgage Bankers Association recite some excellent criteria for a private national mortgage market mechanism such as the FHA. Under unanimous consent, I include appropriate excerpts from this policy statement, including endorsement of independent status for the Federal Housing Administration, also to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks along with the full text of the bill.

The matters follows:

THE ESSENTIALS OF A NATIONAL MORTGAGE MARKET

The ready acceptance of mortgages in a nationwide market requires a market mechanism that will serve the following purposes: (1) Provide a simple means for judging the quality of the mortgage security; (2) compensate for the special risks involved in high-percentage loans; and (3) minimize the task and the hazard of lending at long distances.

A quarter century of experience with the operation of the Federal Housing Administration has demonstrated that mortgage insurance can provide such a multi-purpose mechanism. The future usefulness of the FHA system, or any other similar system, as an instrument of a private national mortgage market depends upon the extent to which it will be able to meet the following requirements for a market-oriented system of mortgage insurance:

1. The system must have sufficient capital and reserves to warrant acceptance of its guarantee by mortgage investors.

2. It should be operative in all parts of the country; otherwise the purpose of broad geographic coverage cannot be served.

3. The procedures should be simple and of general applicability. The idea that there need be a special type of financing for every possible subdivision of housing demand is contrary to the concept of a free market. It also makes the system so complex and cumbersome to operate that its usefulnes becomes gravely imperiled.

4. The insurance premium should be variable according to the risk considered to be present in the particular class of transactions. If the principle of mutuality is maintained, better than expected experience may then produce a dividend for the borrower.

5. The interest rate charged on insured mortgages should be freely determined in the market.

6. The system should be completely supported by insurance premiums, examination fees and other charges for services rendered. There should be no quantitative limitation except that of prudent and efficient management on the use of income from these sources for necessary administrative purposes and the accumulation of reserves.

7. While the system should have some element of coinsurance, the method of paying claims should be prompt and involve a minimum of uncertainty.

8. The system must be subject to government supervision; but it should have continuity in direction and be removed from political influence that would impair adherence to the principles outlined above.

The Federal Housing Administration should be recognized as a federally chartered mutual insurance corporation administered through a board of trustees appointed, with staggered terms, by the President, and officers appointed by the trustees.

FHA should be made accountable for its operations directly to the President and to the Congress.

THE NEED FOR A SOUND MORTGAGE INSURANCE SYSTEM

(By Milford A. Vieser, chairman of the finance committee, the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark, N.J., March 1963)

In order that the mortgage market of the country be adequately supplied with funds to meet the future demands of the decade, it is vital to have a mechanism which will permit and encourage as free as possible a flow of investment across State lines and particularly from parts of the country having a surplus of capital to parts where the supply is insufficient for local needs. Such a mechanism is needed because of both the inadequacy of local funds in many communities and, in any case, the desirability of maintaining a healthy competitive situation among all types of lenders.

The essentials of a national market mechanism are: the provision of a simple means for judging the quality of the mortgage security; a method of compensating for the special risks involved in high-percentage mortgage loans; and a means for minimizing the task and the hazard of lending at long distance.

The Federal Housing Administration has demonstrated over more than a quarter century of operation that mortgage insurance can provide all these essentials. Moreover, no other type of mechanism of similar effectiveness has been devised; and it is doubtful even that an alternative system of mortgage insurance could serve the purpose to anywhere near the same degree.

The reasons why this is so are the following: FHA insurance is available in all parts of the country, while a substitute system would find the provision of equivalent coverage extremely costly and would require a very high initial capital outlay; State laws relating to loan-to-value ratios, maturities, etc., have been modified so that all types of institutions may compete in any locality on equal terms, while to obtain a similar dispensation for a completely private substitute would be most difficult; FHA's present reserve position, combined with the contingent liability of the Treasury on the debentures it issues in payment of foreclosed mortgages, gives it a prestige that could not be gained by a substitute system.

In view of these considerations, the more feasible course of action at the present time would appear to be to improve the functioning of the FHA system rather than to attempt to create a substitute system, and to transfer FHA from Government domination to private control.

The following difficulties have led to a decline in the use of the FHA system: an administered interest rate which has required market adjustments to be made through the unsatisfactory method of discounts on the mortgage amount, to be absorbed by the builder or other seller; inflexible limitations on the agency's use of its own earned funds for administrative purposes, resulting in repeated inability to provide prompt service to applicants; and an undesirable multiplicity of insuring methods and terms which, combined with an examination and rating procedure of unwarranted complexity, adds greatly to administrative cost and delay in handling applications.

While, in part, the procedural complexities can be and indeed are now being reduced by administrative action, the disabilities cited above can otherwise be fully corrected only by legislation. The problem, therefore, is that of persuading Congress not only of the desirability but also the propriety of making the satutory changes that are needed to give the FHA the market orientation and independence of action prerequisite to an effective mortgage insurance system.

In some degree this objective may be approached by creating a better understanding of what the FHA is and what its basic purposes are or should be. Because of the careless use of such phrases as "Government insurance," "FHA financing," and "FHA mortgages," and because also of the fact that authorization for the expenditure of FHA's income follows the same legislative procedure as does that for the appropriation of public money, the facts are often ignored that: FHA is completely privately financed by the users of the system; all Treasury advances made during its formative period have been repaid; and the remaining Treasury liability is now so remote as to have no practical fiscal significance. In short, aside from this remote contingency and from the fact that it is administered by Government-appointed officials, FHA is of a private character.

Moreover, because of the confusion as to its fiscal status and of a long sequence of socially directed legislation, the initial and essential function of FHA as a vital instrumentality of the private mortgage financing system has been submerged in a welter of aims other than those of facilitating a nationwide flow of mortgage funds, broadening competition among lending institutions, and hence contributing to the general improvement in the volume and quality of housing and the reduction and regional equalization in the cost of mortgage money.

If is probable, however, that more will be needed than a mere clarification of status and purpose—important as that is—if FHA is to be allowed to operate with the independence and the flexibility and the freedom from fixed interest rates that are essential to the fulfillment of its basic functions. In line with this view, statutory changes might be considered which would emphasize the presently strong private financial characteristics of the agency and assure its orientation toward the private mortgage market.

The following suggestions should be considered:

The reestablishment of FHA as an independent federally chartered mutual mortgage insurance corporation administered through a Board of Trustees appointed by the President and officers appointed by the trustees. Precedents for such action are the removal of the Federal Land Bank System from the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Home Loan Bank System from HHFA.

Elimination, in the reorganized agency, of all forms of special-purpose insurance, leaving three basic operations—one for one to four-family properties, including condominiums, one for rental housing property, and one for cooperatives. Special-purpose functions, if politically unavoidable, should be left in HHFA.

The reestablishment of an unrestricted interest rate structure that will respond to market forces. The rigid interest rate has been the main source of instability in mortgage and building activity since the end of the war.

The establishment of a simple method of issuing mortgage insurance by changing archaic documents and manual requirements to permit FHA to compete on a time basis with other financial institutions. The elimination of unwarranted complexity by the adoption of a system which would reduce administrative costs and greatly reduce delay in handling applications.

The transferring of FHA from Government domination to private control would contemplate, as at present, that the FHA pay for administrative expenses and make required additions to reserve out of premium income and other charges. Economies could be instituted and consideration would be given to adjusting the amount and method of payment of the FHA insurance premium.

The Federal Housing Administration is the finest example of cooperation between Government and private enterprise for the betterment of our people. In more than 25 years of its history it has not cost the taxpayers of our country $1 and the FHA has repaid to the Federal Treasury all advances made during its organization period. It has been a great force for good stimulating homeownership to the highest percentage ever attained by any country.

Now, for the reasons cited, it is no longer the dominant influence in housing as in the past. It needs change and rejuvenation. The wisdom and ingenuity which founded FHA must again be used in its rebirth.

In the past FHA has been tremendously successful in promoting homeownership in our new suburbs. While it must continue this role, it is absolutely essential that it be the vehicle which can expeditiously and effectively aid in the redevelopment of our American cities. It must once again take effective leadership if we are to meet successfully the housing problems of the future.

H.R. 6010

A bill to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Housing Administration, which was established pursuant to section 1 of the National Housing Act (48 Stat. 1246; 12 U.S.C. 1702) and made a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1947 (61 Stat. 954; 5 U.S.C. 133y-16), shall, from the effective date of this Act, cease to be such a constituent agency and shall be an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. (a) The functions and powers vested in the Federal Housing Commissioner by the National Housing Act, as amended (12

U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), are hereby transferred to a Board of Directors of the Federal Housing Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall consist of three members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be of the same political party. The President shall designate the members of the Board first appointed hereunder to serve for terms expiring respectively one, two, and three years after the effective date of this Act, and thereafter the terms of members of the Board shall be four years. Whenever a vacancy shall occur on the Board the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired term of the member whose place he is appointed to fill. Each of the members of the Board shall received compensation at the rate of $ per year.

(b) The President shall designate one of the members of the Board as Chairman. The Chairman shall (1) be the chief executive officer of the Board, (2) appoint and direct the personnel necessary for the performance of the functions of the Board, or of any office or agency under the Board, and (3) designate the order in which the other members of the Board shall, during the absence or disability of the Chairman, serve as Acting Chairman and perform the duties of the Chairman.

SEC. 3. (a) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Federal Housing Commissioner, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such taking effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the Board.

(b) All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by the Federal Housing Commissioner shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Board.

(c) Reference in any other Federal law to the Federal Housing Commissioner shall be deemed to mean the Board.

(d) The office of Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby abolished.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of ninety days following the date of enactment of this Act; except that the President may nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint the members of the Board at any time after such date of enactment.

The Soviet Agrees With President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week one of the Soviet Russians visiting Virginia told President Monroe's great-grandson that the Monroe Doctrine "is completely dead." The American people have known this ever since President Kennedy allowed the Russians not only to gain a foothold in Cuba but gave assurances to the Soviets that he would do nothing to put them out.

Today's New York Daily News editorial expresses so well what is galling the American people today: What? No prestige polls?

J.F.K. ASKED FOR IT

The week's most infuriating news story, we think, came Tuesday from Fredericksburg, Va. It concerned a Soviet Russian consul named Igor Kolosovsky, who was visiting the old law office of President James Monroe.

Monroe's great-grandson Laurence G. Hoes, handed Kolosovsky a copy of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, warning against further foreign colonization in this hemisphere.

To Hoes' request that Kolosovsky tell Khrushchev that the doctrine is "very much alive," the Russian replied with a sneer: "The document is completely dead."

That was an insult, delivered at a U.S. national shrine, to the Kennedy administration and to the American people—to say nothing of its being an insult to the memory of President Monroe.

What boils your belly is that, as of now, the facts are on the Russian's side, and the administration is backing off from any serious effort to reverse those facts.

As long as he refrains from clamping a real squeeze on Khrushchev to take his troops—all of them—out of Cuba, President Kennedy will be asking for more and deadlier insults of the Kolosovsky brand, and there will be no adequate American retort to them.

National Service Corps Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there follows a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 5625, the National Service Corps bill, introduced by me and nearly two score of my colleagues.

This analysis is of the bill as introduced:

Section 1 provides that the bill may be cited as the "National Service Corps Act."

Section 2 states the purposes of the bill. These are to open new opportunities for full-time service working with those Americans in greatest need; to illuminate those needs, so as to expand the attack on deprivation in the United States; to motivate many more citizens to volunteer their services in their own communities, thus encouraging communities to help themselves; and to inspire more people to choose professions that serve their fellow citizens.

This section declares that it is the policy of the United States to carry out the purposes of this act through a National Service Corps, which will be composed of carefully selected men and women of all ages who shall be made available—upon local invitation and in cooperation with interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies—to serve for a limited time in projects directed toward the critical human needs of our countrymen. Projects may include projects designed to make corpsmen available for work with persons in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded and during their return to normal living; in meeting the health and education needs of migratory workers and their families, Indians living on or off reservations, and residents of depressed areas and rural and urban slums; in care and rehabilitation of the elderly, the disabled, the delinquent young and dependent children; in improving standards of educational opportunity; and in other projects directed toward critical human needs. To the extent possible, each project carried out under this act shall provide for contributions by the cooperating agencies.

Section 3(a) authorizes the President to carry out projects in furtherance of the purposes stated in section 2 on such terms and conditions as he may determine. This bill, like the Peace Corps Act, provides for the granting of all authority and the appropriation of all funds to the President, with power to delegate any or all functions and to allocate any or all funds as he sees fit. See sections 4(b) and 7(c).

Section 3(b) provides that before undertaking a project, the President shall assure himself that it will not displace regular workers or duplicate or replace an existing service in the same locality.

Section 3(c) authorizes an appropriation to the President for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, of not to exceed $5 million to carry out the purposes of the bill. For each succeeding fiscal year this subsection authorizes appropriation of such amounts as Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Section 4(a) authorizes the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of the National Service Corps. The President may fix the salary of this officer at a rate not exceeding $20,000 per annum. This section authorizes the President to appoint a Deputy Director of the National Service Corps and to fix his salary at a rate not exceeding $19,500 per annum.

Section 4(b) authorizes the President to exercise any functions vested in him by the bill through such agency or officer of the Government as he shall direct. The head of any agency or any officer performing functions under the bill delegated by the President is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations and to delegate his functions under the bill. This subsection is identical to section 4(b) of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 5(a) authorizes the President to enroll in the National Service Corps for service in the United States, qualified citizens and nationals of the United States, to be known as corpsmen. It is intended that the terms and conditions of the service of National Service corpsmen be exclusively those stated in the bill and those consistent with the bill which the President prescribes. Because many of the statutory rules relating to persons regularly employed in Government agencies would be inappropriate or irrelevant to this type of temporary volu-

teer service, this subsection, patterned after the Peace Corps Act, provides that corpsmen are not to be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States for any purpose except as provided in the bill.

Section 5(b) provides that whenever the President determines that it is in the national interest, he may, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, enroll qualified foreign nationals in the Corps for service in the United States. It is intended that the authority granted in this subsection would be sparingly used to permit the enrollment, for example, of Cuban nationals resident in the United States for service on a project serving the needs of Cuban refugees or of Mexican nationals for service on a project serving the needs of migrant workers and their families.

Section 5(c) is similar to the comparable subsection in the Peace Corps Act and provides that corpsmen shall be furnished with such living, travel, and leave allowances and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing as the President determines to be necessary for their maintenance and to insure health and effectiveness. It is intended that, as nearly as practicable, the corpsmen will live on the same level as their counterparts in the host community. This subsection also authorizes the furnishing of transportation and travel allowances to applicants for enrollment and former corpsmen en route to or from places of examinations, training, enrollment, and termination. The authority with respect to applicants is included because persons will not be enrolled in the National Service Corps until they are finally selected, following training, and actually report for service.

Section 5(d) is similar to the comparable subsection in the Peace Corps Act and provides for payment of an adjustment allowance to corpsmen at rates fixed by the President but not to exceed $75 for each month of satisfactory service as determined by the President. These payments would accumulate monthly but would normally not be paid until the termination of service, as they are intended primarily to assist corpsmen during the period of transition back to life at home. However, in order to enable the corpsman while in service to meet important obligations, such as contribution to the education of other members of his family, payment of life insurance premiums, or emergency expenses, the President could permit a portion or all of the accrued amount of the adjustment allowance to be disbursed while the corpsman was in service.

Section 5(e) authorizes the designation of corpsman leaders from among the corpsmen. Corpsman leaders would be persons, generally senior to corpsmen in age and experience, who were required for supervisory or other special duties or responsibilities in the field. All the provisions of the bill relating to corpsmen would apply to corpsman leaders, and the term "corpsmen" throughout the bill includes "corpsman leaders."

Section 5(f) provides that corpsmen shall be treated as Government employees for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which provides for disability compensation payments and medical care in the case of injury or disease arising out of Federal employment. For the purpose of fixing the level of disability benefits, which is related to earnings, corpsmen would be deemed to be receiveing monthly pay at the lowest rate provided for GS-7 in the executive branch. Under this provision, at present GS rates, a corpsman who became permanently and totally disabled would receive approximately $300 per month.

As under the Peace Corps Act, where a corpsman suffered injury or illness while located in the United States, the rules applied in similar cases by the Federal Employees' Compensation Board would determine whether the illness or injury arose out of the corpsman's service. Although covered by FECA at all times, a corpsman would not begin to receive disability payments and other benefits so long as he was in service, since he would be receiving living expenses and full medical care during that time and would continue to accrue his adjustment allowance. This subsection also insures that the injured corpsman, or his dependents in the case of death, will not receive double benefits, by providing that any payment on account of the same injury or death received from the entity to which the corpsman was assigned shall be credited against any benefits payable under the FECA.

Section 5(g) provides that corpsmen shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and of title II of the Social Security Act, and any service performed by an individual as a corpsman shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States. It is intended that corpsmen would be treated equally with other persons with respect to income and withholding taxes, social security taxes, and social security coverage. There are no provisions in the bill comparable to sections 201 and 202 of the Peace Corps Act which amended the Internal Revenue Code and the Social Security Act to provide for exemptions from gross income for certain allowances, and for special "backpay" treatment of termination or readjustment payments.

Section 5(h) is similar to the comparable provision in the Peace Corps Act and authorizes the President to make provision for health examinations and immunization of corpsmen preparatory to service and complete health care during service. Under regulations prescribed by the President, such examinations, immunization, and care could be provided through available medical facilities of other agencies and in such cases the agency operating the medical facility would be reimbursed from National Service Corps appropriations. Where examination, immunization, or care were not furnished through other Government facilities, other arrangements would be made either by the National Service Corps or, in the case of some projects administered through other agencies, by the administering agency pursuant to agreement with the National Service Corps.

Section 5(i) enables corpsmen to obtain credit for the period of their volunteer service for the purposes of retirement, and also generally for the purposes of seniority, reduction in force, leave accumulation, or other rights and privileges based on length of service, in the event they later became employed in any of the various Federal civilian employment systems.

Section 5(j) authorizes the President to detail or assign corpsmen or otherwise make them available to other agencies of the U.S. Government or any State or subdivision thereof, private nonprofit organization, or other organizations, individuals, and firms. Corpsmen so assigned or detailed would continue to be entitled to the benefits, allowances, and privileges provided for corpsmen.

Section 5(k) provides that corpsmen shall be deemed employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act and other similar Federal claims statutes—such as the Suits in Admiralty Act—which waive the Government's immunity from suit. This means that the Government could be sued for damages for the negligent act or omission or certain other wrongful conduct of a corpsman under circumstances where the Government, if a private person, would be liable. Claims of this nature not in excess of $2,500 could be settled administratively under the Federal Tort Claims Act. This subsection also provides that corpsmen shall be subject to provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activities of employees of the United States.

Section 5(l) authorizes the President to terminate the service of a corpsman at any time at his pleasure.

Section 5(m) provides that upon enrollment every corpsman shall take the following oath prescribed for persons appointed to any office of honor or profit by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States:

> I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

Section 5(n) authorizes the President to provide training for applicants for enrollment as corpsmen and for corpsmen following enrollment. It is intended that actual enrollment in the National Service Corps take place after the basic period of training and after final selection for service on a particular project. During training, however, applicants for enrollment would be treated in all respects as corpsmen and would be subject to the same conditions of service as corpsmen, except that their training period would not be credited toward retirement or other benefits in other Federal services in which they may subsequently be employed. See section 17(c).

Section 5(o) provides that the number of corpsmen enrolled in the National Service Corps shall not exceed 1,000 during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, and shall not exceed 5,000 at any

time thereafter, unless otherwise authorized by the Congress.

Section 6 authorizes the President to employ such personnel other than corpsmen as the President deems necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of the bill. Such personnel, unlike corpsmen, would be subject to the usual rules of Government employment and to the provisions of the bill applicable to employees.

Section 7(a)(1) is similar to section 10(a)(1) of the Peace Corps Act, and authorizes the President, in furtherance of the purposes of the bill, to make contracts and agreements and otherwise cooperate with agencies of the U.S. Government or of any State or subdivision thereof, private nonprofit organizations, and other private organizations, individuals, and firms.

Section 7(a)(2) authorizes the President to accept voluntary services and gifts of money or property for the use of the National Service Corps in furtherance of the purposes of the bill. This provision is similar to one contained in section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act. It makes clear the National Service Corps' authority to accept gifts of money or equipment or to accept contributions, for example, to establish training or operating facilities which might provide the framework for National Service Corps projects. This subsection also authorizes the President to dispose of such donated property in furtherance of the purposes of the bill.

Section 7(b) provides that a contract or agreement for services of corpsmen may obligate current fiscal year funds available under the bill for a period of not more than 2 years, including funds for the purpose of paying or providing for the allowances and other benefits of corpsmen. Such contracts or agreements would be subject to termination if Congress terminated the program. This subsection is based upon section 10(c) of the Peace Corps Act which provided 3-year contract authority.

Section 7(c) is similar to section 10(e) of the Peace Corps Act, with minor modification. It permits funds available for the purposes of the bill to be allocated to any Government agency in connection with activities under the bill. Funds so allocated could be spent in accordance with the authority of the bill or in accordance with authority governing the activities of the agency to which the funds were allocated.

Section 7(d) is the same as section 10(f) of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes any officer of the Government carrying out functions under the bill to utilize the services and facilities of other Government agencies or procure commodities from other government agencies.

Section 7(e) is the same as section 10(g) of the Peace Corps Act. It sets forth the manner in which reimbursement or payment, when required, is to be made to another agency furnishing facilities, services, or commodities to carry out the bill.

Section 8(a) is substantially identical to section 12(a) of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes the President to appoint persons to membership on a National Service Corps Advisory Council to advise and consult with him with regard to general policies and programs designed to further the purposes of the bill. The members of this Council are to be broadly representative of various public and private organizations and groups as well as individuals interested in the programs and objectives of the National Service Corps.

Section 8(b) provides that members of the Council shall serve at the pleasure of the President and meet at his call. It further provides that members who are not employees of the Government may receive out of funds available for purposes of the bill compensation not exceeding $75 for each day, not to exceed 20 days in any fiscal year, spent away from their homes or regular places of business in connection with meetings or conferences of the Council, and while so engaged may receive travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law—5 U.S.C. 73b–2. This provision is similar to section 12(b) of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 9(a) is similar to section 13 of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes the employment of experts and consultants and organizations thereof in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 55a, with compensation at rates not exceeding $75 per diem plus travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law—5 U.S.C. 73b–2. The proviso at the end of this subsection authorizes annual renewal of all contracts under this subsection.

Section 9(b) exempts experts and consultants appointed under section 9(a) from Federal laws governing reemployment of retired officers or employees and simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities. The same exemptions are provided for members—except regular Government employees—of the Council referred to in section 8. These exemptions are the same as those provided in section 13(b) of the Peace Corps Act for experts and consultants and members of the Peace Corps National Advisory Board.

Section 10 provides express authority for a number of specific kinds of expenditures. Most of these provisions are designed to provide the express authority to make specific uses of appropriated funds which is—or appears to be—required by various statutes and Comptroller General rulings, or to overcome or modify certain Government-wide restrictions which would inhibit effective and efficient National Service Corps operations. Each of these authorities is provided with respect to the Peace Corps program by section 15 of the Peace Corps Act. Specifically, this subsection authorizes:

First. Payment of rents in the United States, for which express authorization is required by the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 34, 40 U.S.C. 304c, and Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950. This would enable the National Service Corps to rent recruitment or training facilities outside of Washington as well or facilities in the District of Columbia, utilizing Service Corps approprations. This paragraph also permits expenditures for repairs, alterations, and improvements to leased properties in excess of 25 percent of the first year's rent, the ceiling imposed by 40 U.S.C. 278a.

Second. Expenses of printing and binding without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919—44 U.S.C. 111. This provision, similar to that contained in section 15 (a) of the Peace Corps Act, would be utilized sparingly as necessary to meet the needs of the National Service Corps for recruiting materials and for printed matter on a time schedule which cannot be met under existing regulations.

Third. Expenses in connection with meetings concerned with the purposes of the bill, including meetings of experts or consultants appointed under section 13(a). This paragraph has been included, as in section 15(d)(2) of the Peace Corps Act, in view of the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 551 and 31 U.S.C. 673.

Fourth. Expenses of preparing, transporting and disposing of remains of corpsmen dying while away from their homes participating in activities under the bill. This is similar to the provisions of section 15(d)(10) of the Peace Corps Act and to authority presently available for employees of the Government and their dependents under 5 U.S.C. 103a.

Section 11 requires the President to transmit reports to Congress on operations under the bill at least once in each fiscal year.

Section 12 provides that all persons employed or assigned to duties and all corpsmen enrolled under the bill shall be investigated to insure that the employment, assignment, or enrollment is consistent with the national interest in accordance with standards and procedures established by the President. It is anticipated that under this provision the same type of investigations would be provided for National Service Corps personnel and corpsmen as are presently provided for Federal employees.

Section 13 authorizes the President to adopt a seal or emblem for the National Service Corps.

Section 14 is the same as section 20 of the Peace Corps Act. It amends the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to suspend principal and interest payments on such loans for student borrowers during the period of their National Service Corps service, as is now provided with respect to borrowers in military service. Because of possible constitutional objections to this amendment if applied mandatorily to loans outstanding on the date of enactment of the bill, a proviso has been added which would apply the amendments to loans outstanding on that date only with the consent of the lender.

Section 15 is the same as section 21 of the Peace Corps Act. It contains a technical amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act to assure that a corpsman who later became a participant in the civil service retirement system would not receive both annuity payments under that system and social security benefits based upon his period of volunteer service.

Section 16 defines various terms used in the bill. In particular, subsection (d) defines the period of service of a corpsman so as to include the training period prior to enrollment, except for the purpose of accruing retirement or other credit in connection with subsequent Federal employment. These definitions are substantially the same as those in section 25 of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 17 is a standard separability provision.

Section 18 provides that the bill's effective date shall be the date of its enactment.

Tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a glowing and deserving tribute was paid to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt at the opening plenary session of the American Association for the United Nations.

The AAUN Conference heard an oration by Jacob Blaustein, member of the AAUN's board of directors. Mr. Blaustein served as chairman of the association's 10th anniversary observance of Human Rights Day in 1958.

No woman, no mortal human, was respected, revered and loved around the globe as was Mrs. Roosevelt. In the following words, Mr. Blaustein expressed the feeling shared by many of her close associates and admirers:

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ROOSEVELT

After Adlai Stevenson's magnificent oration to the memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York on November 17, 1962, what anyone can say must be wholly inadequate.

And yet this occasion, the first annual conference of national agencies called since her demise by the American Association for the United Nations—an organization with which, and with the purposes of which, she was so indelibly associated—could not be permitted to pass without some words evidencing the void we especially feel in the fact that she is no longer with us.

She was one of us, in a very real sense one of our family. Not alone because, for these many years, she made the AAUN her official home. No, she did not sit by our fireside, as well she might have done, content to preside over our doings. She made herself one of us the hard way, by action.

"Do it yourself" was Eleanor Roosevelt's lifelong code. She applied it to building up the UN's human rights structure as if she were setting out to build a house stone upon stone. She was over 60 when she took on this job; yet there she was, day after day, as the first chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, laboring over the cornerstone, the universal declaration, hammering out the provisions in hour upon hour of debate and, what is often more exhausting, as all of you can testify, just listening.

And how she listened. The way she did it was actually an art. Behind that attentive, innocent expression there dwelled a thoroughly practical mind, capable of unsuspected toughness. Much like Socrates, she would ask questions in a tentative manner, hesitating, often professing ignorance. And by this gentle strategy she often extracted a "yes" or "maybe" where a frontal attack would have produced a "no." Watching her in action on one occasion, an observer from the State Department burst forth in amazement. "Never," he said, "has anyone seen naivete and skill so gracefully blended."

But it was in the give-and-take of ordinary life, as a person, not a personage, that Eleanor Roosevelt rose to her greatest heights. She infused the commonplace with her own humanity, and she found in the homely contacts of ordinary life the very essence of universal human rights. Her interest in human rights for all peoples everywhere, regardless of race, religion, language, sex, or social status, dated back to her early days when she was interested in the welfare of workers in factories and their working conditions. Here it is in her own words:

"Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home, so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person: the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world."

Mrs. Roosevelt's sphere of action was the world, but she also worked "close to home." And we may well ask ourselves: How at this moment, are we doing "close to home"?

As we look around, we can see plenty to disturb us. But we also see much that is heartening. We see the Government of the United States making equal rights its definite concern: equal rights in schools, at the polls, in interstate travel. We see the President ordering an end to discrimination in federally aided housing, and a Presidential committee enforcing equal opportunity in industries doing business with the Government. And all through the Federal Establishment, we see a new, unprecedented type of specialist—an intergroup relations officer whose job it is to foster mutual understanding and fair practices among all the myriad and diversified Americans who work for Uncle Sam.

In short, upholding human rights in everyday human affairs is now the Government's business, and the Government is getting on with it. This is what Eleanor Roosevelt wanted.

But pointing with pride to this quickening pace is not, in my opinion, all we should be doing. To put it bluntly, it is time for us, as voluntary, nongovernmental champions of human rights, also to step lively. In fact, your speaker believes that if we do not seize this propitious juncture to press forward with our own human rights agenda with renewed determination, we will be missing the boat, the same boat, be it said, that we ourselves launched almost 20 years ago at the Golden Gate in San Francisco. It has been sailing pretty much without us ever since.

You all know what I mean. What we launched at San Francisco, for the first time in history, by the inclusion of the human rights provisions in the charter, was the concept of universal human rights protected by a universal rule of law, official recognition of the fact that human rights and the treatment of individuals are of vital international concern. And when I say we, I mean ourselves, Professor Shotwell, Frederick Nolde, Clark Eichelberger and many other friends and relations of the AAUN family, including your speaker and my colleague Judge Proskauer.

Now, what were we doing there: Why were we, just citizens without portfolio representing voluntary groups, why were we invited by our Government as consultants to tell the State Department what, in our opinion, should be written into the United Nations Charter? The reason we were there is typically American: In our country, citizen groups serve as pathfinders, and this was recognized by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I shall never forget the talk your speaker and his colleague had with President Roosevelt less than a month before his death, in which he said to us, as he must have told others: "Go to San Francisco. Work to get those human rights provisions into the charter so that unspeakable crimes, like those committed by the Nazis, will never again be countenanced by world society."

Yes, those were the good old days when we were all in there pitching, with hopes that ran high. But the years that followed tell a different story. I need hardly rehearse what happened: How this country unfortunately abandoned its historic course. How the U.S. Senate, led by John W. Bricker, slowed the progress of the human rights covenants almost to a standstill. How our Government turned thumbs down on every instrument forged by the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the step-by-step process of cementing human rights in worldwide law, even those involving rights which have long been embedded in law and practice in our own country.

Just take a few glaring examples: 52 nations have ratified the convention against forced labor. We have not. Fifty-three are parties to the convention against slavery. We are not. And with the image of Adolf Eichmann engraved in our minds, we still have not ratified the Genocide Convention, now accepted by 66 nations.

This is a sorry record. But it need not hold us back forever. Today, with the Nation progressing at home more swiftly than ever toward equality of citizenship, of justice, and of opportunity, today is the time to drive the wedge into the roadblock which has made us conspicuous by our absence from the international human rights front.

We can at least make a start by securing ratification of the most elementary, noncontroversial conventions like the ones on slavery, forced labor, and political rights of women. And, of course, genocide, how long must a law against mass murder be treated as if it were a controversial question in our country?

Such are the ways in which we can keep faith with Eleanor Roosevelt.

At the unforgettable memorial service for Dag Hammarskjold, the spacious Assembly hall at the United Nations was filled with the voice of the lamented Secretary General.

His last speech to the Assembly had been recorded and was being played back as part of the memorial. His words and his voice pervaded the auditorium and audience with almost unbearable emotion.

In similar spirit, we now hear the voice and feel the invisible presence of Eleanor Roosevelt urging us to finish what she began. She gave her all, in strength, in dedication, in unwavering confidence in her fellow men.

Her life was crowded, restless, fearless, lonesome. And now that she is gone, we no less than her own family are the mourners. Her ideas, her endeavors, her views and plans must be carried forward as a living memorial. In her spirit we can do no less.

Logging Firm Chief Calls Forest Bids Unprofitable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the April 27 edition of the Idaho Daily Statesman, published at Boise, Idaho, concerning the practice of the Forest Service in establishing prices on standing timber that are forcing many lumber mills to liquidate. The statements in the clipping, made by lumber operators, corroborate my testimony at a recent hearing of the House Committee on Agriculture on my bill to establish an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Agriculture with the prime responsibility of forest resources policies.

The article follows:

LOGGING FIRM CHIEF CALLS FOREST BIDS UNPROFITABLE

SALMON.—The general manager of the Intermountain Lumber Co., charged Friday that Forest Service specifications make it impossible to bid profitably on Salmon National Forest timber sales.

J. R. Stevenson of Missoula, Mont., said an operator would lose money or scarcely break even if he were to purchase two recent offerings at the minimum Forest Service figure.

He said Salmon Forest headquarters, "contrary to policy in other forest areas, is setting higher and higher specifications on the conditions of sale and operation to make logging costs prohibitively high."

He cited higher logging road specifications and trash disposal regulations as examples.

Intermountain operates a large mill here with a payroll of about 40 persons. He said the mill has purchased only enough timber to stay in operation until September.

Stevenson said in a statement that the higher specifications are being made "despite the present depressed situation in the timber industry."

He said plans for a large-scale spruce budworm spraying program in the Salmon Forest this year is indication that the Forest Service recognized trees are dying.

"They are continuing to die, but many could be salvaged by properly planned logging," he said.

The Salmon Forest has announced that there will be numerous timber sales offered in the next 5 years. But unless they are offered under conditions that make logging profitable, the sales mean nothing.

Ed Waldal, manager of the Idaho Forest Products mill in Salmon, said his company had planned major improvements before opening for the season. But he said the improvements weren't deemed feasible under present Salmon Forest policies.

The Robinson Lumber Co. mill in Salmon, another lumber producer, is operating on timber purchased from another firm. It said it has no timber resources now purchased directly from the Forest Service.

Joel L. Frykman, assistant regional forester for the Forest Service in Ogden, conceded that the cost of roads may be high in regard to present low market conditions, and that for the Salmon area, many sales are submarginal and the cost of roads has a bearing on this.

But he said it should be kept in mind that the Salmon area is in a relatively remote area, far from rail terminals, and the transportation cost is necessarily higher than, say, in the Boise, McCall or Missoula areas where the timber is closer to railroads and therefore in a better competitive position.

Frykman said it is also true that the specifications for roads are more detailed and aimed at building better roads. He said congressional action in recent years requires better road construction plus more and more attention to multiple-use aspects.

But he said the roads are not designed in any special degree to serve recreational uses only. The primary purpose, he said, is for good roads that will serve all. All he said greater expenditures of Federal funds is called for on these roads so as to help make timber sales more profitable.

Have We Lost Our Integrity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as is often the case, Henry J. Taylor has a serious message for Americans that deserves our prayerful consideration, and I ask leave to include his column with my remarks.

The article follows:

HAVE WE LOST OUR INTEGRITY?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The greatest crime politicians can commit against the sovereign people is to deprive them of their own Nation's integrity. Our Government has done this regarding Cuba. We will pay for it, God help us.

There is no such thing as a simple moral problem. If it's simple, there is no problem. But of this you can be sure: Broken promises, unattainable promises, false promises, these three things are the curse of men and nations.

Our broken words, our idle warnings, our defunct solemn, solemn pledges about Cuba and the Soviet lodgement, will history forget these? No. History, instead, will engulf us in the results of them. For a nation faithless to its word is listening to the death tick in the rafters. Nothing is so costly to our security and thus to the peace of the world.

It makes no difference what our President said or did not say to Dr. Jose Miro Cardona. President Kennedy spoke plenty to the world. Our Nation heard, and the world heard, what America said again and again—"we will not tolerate, we will not hesitate," "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere," etc., etc. Twin columns this length could not house the eloquent, ringing warnings, quotations and guarantees. And they all expressed the minimum demand of the American people for our own national security.

From the Bay of Pigs forward to our October 22 Munich every one of these pledges have turned to mere intentions and melted like rancid, infected butter.

One commotion at a time, however, is about all the public mind can stand. Nothing is more convenient now than a debate about Dr. Cardona.

But, what has this to do with confronting the Red cancer 90 miles from our shores, with Castro and his Russian masters, with our so-called fight for freedom in the world? The people of the free world expect the President of the United States to lead America against the Communists, not against the anti-Communists.

Fanfare and a sound of plausibleness will win the White House battle against Dr. Cardona, et al. It will even succeed in obscuring the incredible fact that we are fighting against Castro's enemies instead of against Castro. It will obscure the debacle of having our policies and actions end up with a blockade against the freedom fighters instead of against the Soviet lodgement, now given sanctuary by our own great Air Force and the U.S. Navy. If we cannot send Castro into exile, why not send Dr. Jose Miro Cardona? And, most importantly, it will also obscure how we got in this incredible position in the first place.

But the penalties in history will not be obscure. In Greek the work "kakomiro" means a bad destiny, the word the chorus groans in ancient tragedies. This is the hour of our kakomiro, unless we rise to knowledge of our incredible failures and recover from these like the Americans that we are.

It is downright indecent to reduce the issue of imperiled America to a partisan argument of Democrats or Republicans, pro-Kennedy, anti-Kennedy or anything else. All that is utterly irrelevant. It is also pure pantomine to tell us that, all in due time, our defunct situation will be retrieved by Alliance for Progress money.

The Organization of American States expelled Castro's Cuba at the Punta del Este Conference in January 1962. And on the very eve of our October 22 Munich and our downhill negotiations with the Soviet its committee voted unanimous to expel the Communists from Cuba by force, if necessary. The rest of the downslide is our fault, not theirs. Rally around us again? Would you?

Gordon Clapp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death last Sunday evening of a distinguished native son of Wisconsin, Gordon Clapp, former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Clapp, a native of Ellsworth in Pierce County, served as TVA Chairman of the Board from 1946 to 1954, succeeding David E. Lilienthal, a former member of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. From 1927 to 1933, Mr. Clapp was director of admissions and assistant dean of Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., which awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1947.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am asking that the April 30 editorial from the Capital Times, Madison, Wis., be printed.

The editorial follows:

SOCIETY LOSES A VALUABLE CITIZEN IN DEATH OF GORDON CLAPP

Wisconsin feels keenly the death of Gordon Clapp, a member of a distinguished Wisconsin family who died in New York Sunday after a life of distinguished achievement in public and private pursuits.

The Clapp family is well and widely known in this State. Gordon was active in educational pursuits and was serving in a high administrative capacity when he went to the Tennessee Valley Authority with David Lilienthal, another distinguished Wisconsinite.

He rose to take Lilienthal's place at the head of this world-famed experiment in democratic planning and later became associated with Lilienthal in private business.

His brother, Norman, has also had a distinguished career. He was an aid to the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., later became an editor and publisher in Lancaster and is now the chief administrator of the rural electrification program in Washington.

It is a tragedy for the family, but it is a tragery for society, too, to have a man whose talents are at their peak taken by death.

Bureaucratic Drag on Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a busy bureaucracy as vast and all-pervading as we see in Washington today can have very damaging consequences on the vitality of our so-called free enterprise system. Certainly, it is time that we recognize that our economic system is based upon incentives and motivations that can be curtailed and even destroyed by meddling and harassment by the Federal Government. It is time that we look at our problems of unemployment and a slow growth rate in these terms instead of blindly turning to the elixir of Federal intervention, which only aggravates what ails us. This point is made and made well in the following editorial which appeared in the April 30, 1963, issue of the Daily Independent, of Kannapolis, N.C.:

[From the Daily Independent, Apr. 30, 1963]

BUREAUCRATIC DRAG ON PROGRESS

We hear a lot of talk in Washington these days about the necessity for business to expand, increase production, create more jobs, and meet foreign competition.

At the same time we see legislation proposed and actions taken by boards, bureaus, commissions, and legislators that virtually scare the pants off a man who has saved some money he would like to invest. By attacks on possible profits in comparison with risks involved, the incentive to invest and create jobs is being constantly discouraged.

A classic example of commission blockading of incentive is discussed in the Houston Post by Jim Clark when he comments on the antics of the Federal Power Commission in dealing with the sale of mineral leases, and not a sale of natural gas, in the Rayne Field, Louisiana, gas case.

He says: "What the FPC did was to overrule previous controlling decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, the Internal Revenue Service, and its own decision of an earlier date * * * the Commission ignored and ran roughshod over the law of the State of Louisiana."

Marion Cracraft, oil and finance editor of the Tulsa Tribune says: "gas producers have been making a terrible mistake for years—probably due to expediency and the necessity for getting things done—in knuckling under to bureaucratic rulings which flatly ignore the sanctity of contracts and impose other unconstitutional conditions. One big foundation stone of our whole business structure is a contract, equitably and properly arrived at by arms length bargaining."

Many other industries are laboring under petty bureaucratic dictatorship which drives capital into hiding and creates unemployment. How long will it take the smart boys in Washington to realize that employment follows stability and opportunity, not continuous political meddling?

Secretary McNamara and the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have, of course, been witness to the controversies between Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and a number of congressional committees. I shall not attempt to pass judgment on these subjects or the controversies. But I do feel that many important steps have been taken by Secretary McNamara for the improvement of the services and that dollars definitely are being saved for the American taxpayer through his leadership. For instance, one of the major steps taken by Secretary McNamara to improve logistics management in the Department of Defense was the establishment of the Defense Supply Agency.

The Agency became operational January 1, 1962 and consolidated logistics functions related to the procurement of common supplies and services at wholesale level.

The action was in line with recommendations of various committees of the Congress. Beginning with the recommendations of the Bonner subcommittee in 1952, the passage of the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 defense appropriation bill, and later the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958, the Congress had continually prodded the Department of Defense in the direction of unified logistics management.

Commenting upon this problem before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee March 28, 1963, Secretary McNamara said:

It seemed clear to me, as it had to this Committee for many years, that only through the establishment of a separate, single supply suport agency could we ever hope to find a lasting solution. The result was the creation of the Defense Supply Agency, which now does the buying, the stocking, and where necessary the surplus disposal of a wide range of commonly used supplies and services. Within its area of responsibility, it will greatly help to ensure that we buy only what we need.

As to the progress achieved by this action, Secretary McNamara listed the following: A reduction of 3,700 personnel by the end of fiscal year 1963; $33 million operations and maintenance saving; $233 million reduction of inventory anticipated in fiscal year 1963 and a further reduction of $112 million in fiscal year 1964; phased reduction over the next 2 years in the number of storage points for DSA-managed supplies from 77 to 11.

A significant factor in the successful transition from integrated commodity and service management within the military departments to unified management by the Defense Supply Agency has been the organizational arrangements approved by Secretary McNamara when he established DSA. To understand what this has meant in better support, more effective management of resources, and accelerated decisionmaking, it is necessary to review the situation which existed prior to DSA.

Within the Department of the Army, for illustration, an integrated commodity agency bought and distributed foodstuffs to all of the military services. This agency reported to the Quartermaster General who, on specified matters, reported to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. In turn, the DCSLOG reported to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics who next reported to the Secretary of the Army who finally reported to the Secretary of Defense.

Each succeeding level of authority reviewed, evaluated, and passed judgment upon the action proposed by the commodity manager. Much the same situation obtained in the Navy, where the reporting channel ran from the commodity manager through the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts to the Chief of Naval Materiel, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy, and thence to the Secretary of Defense.

Under the improved arrangement, the commodity manager reports directly to the Director of the Defense Supply Agency who reports directly to the Secretary of Defense. Thus, two to three levels of review and supervision were eliminated by establishing DSA as an independent agency of the Defense Department.

This has permitted substantial reductions in decisionmaking time, administrative detail, and paperwork. In the reporting area alone two significant achievements have been realized:

The Secretary of Defense receives a summary management data report monthly within 25 days after the cutoff date. Formerly he received a comparable report on a quarterly basis within 60 days after the cutoff date.

DSA's reporting system requires the field activities to expend a combined total of 100,000 fewer manhours than had been expended under the former organizational alinements.

Of 537 recurring reports which were required of the field activities by their former headquarters, 253 have thus far been eliminated—a 47 percent reduction.

It may be said, therefore, that improvements have been made in the timeliness of reporting and in reducing the reporting workload.

Other examples of efficiencies derived from eliminating intervening levels of review and supervision include the following:

Substantial reduction in the time required for preaward clearance of significant contract awards, which may range in amounts from $300,000 to several million dollars. DSA completes the clearance in 5.7 days.

Formerly cases arising out of defense contracts which required decision by the Board of Contract Appeals were prepared by the field activity, reviewed in the Army technical service, then by the Judge Advocate General, who finally presented the matter to the Board. Now the field activity presents the case to the Board, subject only to surveillance of the counsel, DSA.

By vesting the director, DSA, with the responsibility and authority necesary to the execution of assigned missions, the Secretary of Defense has made possible the realization of benefits derived from consolidating like activities under unified management, including reductions in overhead costs, reduced staffing, elimination of duplication, faster response, better utilization of inventories, reduced stockage, and faster decisionmaking.

Herbicides in the Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, we are accustomed to lauding American agriculture for producing food and fiber for our Nation in a measure that is the envy of the world.

A substantial part of the credit for tihs achievement is due the agricultural chemical industry for the fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides which it has made available to the country's forward looking, efficient farmers.

Recognition must also be accorded the scientists of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and those of the various State schools of agriculture. It is they who have helped the industry and the farmers with their knowledge so that the many marvelous pesticides and herbicides can most effectively be used to control insects and weeds which threaten the quality and yield of our crops, add to production costs, and reduce our standard of living.

This American know-how concerning agricultural chemicals and their application has been the special source of envy and consternation for the Communist bloc. For it is American food in the bellies of the world's hungry people which best gives the lie to the Red boast that they will bury us because their system is better.

Our agricultural scientists have shown us the way to grow more and better crops cheaper, with skillful use of chemicals. They have also shown us—and the Communists—how safe but effective herbicides can become new humane weapons in defensive warfare. For example, in Vietnam where Vietcong guerrilla killers used to lurk in the brush and trees along canals and roads to ambush Government troops and supplies, now the spraying of the vegetation with herbicides destroys crucial cover for the rebels. This development has helped significantly to turn the tide of the struggle in southeast Asia.

It was the close cooperation of U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists and Department of Defense engineers and technicians which made possible this highly successful counterinsurgency effort. The efficacy of the spraying program can best be judged from the violence of the propaganda reaction by Moscow and Peiping, which have even circulated wild charges of genocide.

To assist in putting the record straight I am pleased to include as part of my remarks a newspaper article by Jack Wilson in the Minneapolis Tribune of April 4, 1963, and a feature written by Mary Sanders and circulated by the U.S. Information Service.

The articles follow:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 4, 1963]

WEST WEEDS OUT RED VIETCONG IN VIETNAM

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Republic of Vietnam is fighting Communists this spring with the same weapons the American homeowner uses to fight crabgrass.

It's a seasonal operation in both cases, beginning early in the south and moving north; with the growing season. But where the ordinary husband in the United States carries on his battle against lawn weeds in a spirit of resigned skepticism, the South Vietnam Government has some indications that it is making headway in its attacks on the local flora.

One good sign is the howl that has gone up from Red China propaganda sources. They have accused the South Vietnamese of using chemical warfare weapons, of poisoning the wells and destroying the crops.

They're likely to holler louder during the next few months. This is the first season that the government forces have had both the equipment and the know-how to carry on a large scale campaign to strip jungle trees of their leaves and destroy the backwoods fields from which the guerrillas are getting their food.

The weapons involved are ordinary commercial weed killers, or herbicides, that have been widely used in the United States and elsewhere for about 15 years.

The chemicals attack plant life, in ways which are not thoroughly understood, and ultimately rot the roots. They have no effect on insects, animals, or humans. Plants which have been killed by the herbicides can be eaten without ill effects. Water that has been sprayed with them can be drunk, and has been, by demonstration officials acting to prove to villagers that the campaign was not a menace to them.

If the chemicals are sprayed on the foliage in low concentrations, they will wilt the leaves and make them fall off, but they'll grow back in a few weeks. In higher concentrations, the herbicides will strip the foilage and kill the trees. They ordinarily are applied by spraying from airplanes.

When the herbicides were first tried in South Vietnam they were used inexpertly and at the wrong season. The results were not impressive. A little over a year ago a group of scientists and engineers organized by the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) in the Pentagon went to Vietnam to find out what was wrong. They worked with Vietnam officials and perfected techniques of spraying, found the best chemicals for the purpose and determined that the spring growing season was the best time to carry on the campaign.

The herbicides have several purposes Sprayed along strips several hundred feet wide bordering roads and canals, they kill the brush, strip off the leaves and reduce the danger of ambushes. Sprayed on dense jungle areas infested by Communist guerrillas, they defoliate the trees and expose hiding places to both air and ground patrols. And they can be used to wipe out the guerrillas' food supply.

The uplands of South Vietnam are inhabited by a seminomad people called the Montagnards. They clear little fields, raise rice, maize or other crops in them for 2 or 3 years, then move on. The fields remain reasonably clear for 3 or 4 years before the jungle reclaims them. During that time they produce some scraggly remnants of the crops to which they had been sowed. These abandoned, isolated fields are an important source of suply for the Vietcong guerrillas. They are an important target in the herbicide campaign.

Defense Department officials who receive regular reports on the campaign feel that the Vietnam Government is conducting it with proper regard for its touchy aspects. Crop spraying has been limited largely to areas dominated by the Vietcong, and has been carried out only after the Montagnards have been evacuated and local chiefs have approved it.

HERBICIDES USED EXTENSIVELY IN MANY LANDS

WASHINGTON.—The chemical herbicides which are being used by the Republic of Vietnam in clearing out jungle growth to reduce the hazards of ambush by Vietcong bandits have been used commonly in the United States and other countries for the past 15 years by farmers, ranchers, and home owners.

The two herbicides—known as 2,4–D and 2,4,5–T—are used extensively in most countries of both the free world and the Communist bloc for selective control of undesirable vegetation. These chemicals are better for vegetation control than other compounds of a similar nature because they are not harmful to people, animals, soil or water. They are described by research scientists as "nontoxic, even when fed to cows and livestock at rates exceeding those used for vegetation control."

The importance of the use of herbicides in agricultural production is universally recognized. In fact, Premier Khrushchev, in reporting to the U.S.S.R. Central Committee on March 5, 1962, stressed the importance of herbicides and called for production on an industrial basis.

Premier Khrushchev said: "The problems of introducing chemicals into agriculture are being settled too slowly as are the creation of effective types of fertilizer and herbicides.

"During the first 3 years of the 7-year period, the plan for commissioning new capacities has been fulfilled by only 44 percent. The same situation applies to the organizing of herbicide production. Two years ago the central committee and government adopted a decision on this question. Time goes by but there are no herbicides.

"To insure the supply of herbicides to agriculture is of greatest significance. Now some comrades say that the treatment of sowing by herbicides is expensive; however, this is a temporary phenomenon. We produce herbicides under laboratory conditions. The matter demands that herbicide production be placed on a wide industrial basis."

The two chemicals, 2,4–D and 2,4,5–T, are now in regular use, particularly for weed control in rice paddies, other field and horticultural crops, and rangeland, in Asian coun-

tries such as Burma, Thailand, Philippines, Republic of China, Japan, India, Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand.

The herbicides are being used by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in the guerrilla warfare with the Vietcong in order to increase visibility on the ground and from the air.

By killing leaves on trees and brush in the jungle areas, the South Vietnam soldiers are able to detect Vietcong fighters hiding in the jungles or preparing to attack from ambush. Vietnamese planes are able to locate Vietcong fighters and follow their movements in the defoliated areas.

The chemicals are also being used to destroy food crops in areas that support Communists and are established beyond a doubt as Communist controlled.

Clearing of jungle land has long been a part of guerrilla warfare. Most of the attempts in the past have been only partly satisfactory. Earlier attempts at clearing were made by hand tools such as knives, axes and machetes. This method was unsatisfactory because the efforts were quickly obliterated by new jungle growth. Later, bulldozers were used but the operators were too easily killed by the enemy in hiding.

Chemicals have been much more satisfactory because of the speed with which they can be spread over large areas. The herbicides now being used by the Vietnam Government can be applied from sprayers, either on the ground or from the air in planes and helicopters.

At low rates of application, the herbicides wither the leaves and cause them to fall from the plants, but jungle plants usually regrow in about 30 days. At higher rates of application, the herbicides will cause defoliation, kill the top growth of brush, plants and trees, and prevent regrowth for a year or more.

The Government of South Vietnam has been very thorough in its investigations and decisions to use the chemicals, 2,4–D and 2,4,5–T. Scientists first set up a list of standards to be used in selecting any chemicals that might be used extensively in the country. All the areas sprayed in South Vietnam are first mapped and then selected after careful study.

Scientists have long known that the herbicides 2,4–D and 2,4,5–T are not toxic to people or animals. The two chemicals are registered in the United States by the Department of Agriculture for use on food crops, in rivers and ponds, and on rangelands where livestock graze. They are available for purchase throughout the United States and are labeled nonpoisonous.

Records on the production of the herbicides during the past 15 years show that workers in the chemical manufacturing plants have not been adversely affected. There has been no documentable death or injury from association with the chemicals. The same is true in the use of these chemicals in Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese are also learning that the herbicides can be most useful for them. In addition to getting rid of weeds, the farmers are now harvesting the trees of the sprayed jungle lands and using the wood for fuel. Previously the farmers were afraid to enter the jungles because of the threat to their lives from ambush by the Vietcong.

After harvesting the wood, the farmers are clearing some of the land for agricultural use.

In fact, the farmers have been so enthusiastic about the clearing of lands that the Government of Vietnam has asked them not to harvest wood too soon after chemical spraying because this practice reduces the effectivness of the herbicides in controlling the vegetation.

The herbicidal effects of 2,4–D and 2,4,5–T were discovered and published in 1944, Commercial manufacture of the chemicals was developed in the United States between 1944 and 1947.

During the 15 years since 1947, U.S. production of the two herbicides has averaged about 25 million pounds (11.3 million kilograms) per year. The herbicides are used on an average of 30 million acres (12 million hectares) per year.

The herbicides have been sprayed on more than 400 million acres (160 million hectares) in the past 15 years, while most of this land was under cultivation.

The herbicides are used in the United States to control weeds in cereal crops such as corn, wheat, oats, rice, barley and grain sorghums; for control of weeds on rangeland where livestock graze; for clearing ponds and streams of undesirable plant growth, such as water hyacinths; on lawns and parks to kill weeds where pets and children play; to kill poison ivy and other poisonous plants in wooded areas near campsites; and for killing weeds, such as ragweed and heavy pollen-producing plants, which are a threat to good health or create allergies in some people.

What's the Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the issues of the May 21 wheat referendum are of tremendous interest to millions of our citizens, and I believe that every possible fact should be developed before farmers go to vote. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce made a significant contribution to understanding of the issues when it presented the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], members of the wheat subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, in its weekly radio program, "What's the Issue?" April 21. Arch N. Booth, executive vice president of the chamber, served as moderator, and under unanimous consent, I include the text of discussion as a part of my remarks:

WHAT'S THE ISSUE?

Mr. BOOTH. Today our subject is agriculture—more specifically, wheat, the staff of life. There is, of course, no wheat bill for Congress to consider this year. But there is a bill, so to speak, before an even higher tribunal—the farmers of America. Within a month—on May 21—the Nation's wheat producers will decide to accept or reject a new type of federally directed supply-management program for wheat. And wheat is grown in all 48 mainland States. Congress authorized this program in the Agricultural Act of 1962. If the wheat producers approve it will become effective with the 1964 crop.

All Americans have a stake in the outcome of the May 21 referendum—as consumers and taxpayers. So it is pretty important that not only the wheat producers, but all of us know the consequences of this decision: whether it's a "yes" vote, a "no" vote, or a failure to vote at all.

To discuss this issue, we are fortunate to have with us today three Members of the Congress of the United States. All three are members of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. They are—

Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, Democrat, from the 13th District of Texas, and chairman of the wheat subcommittee;

Congressman DELBERT LATTA, Republican, from the Fifth District of Ohio; and

Congressman ROBERT DOLE, Republican, from the First District of Kansas.

Now, gentlemen, so that this program will be informative and helpful, let's keep two objectives in mind:

The first is to describe clearly how the new program would affect the production and marketing of wheat. The other objective is to bring into sharper focus some of the less tangible, but nevertheless important factors and issues which hang in the balance of this referendum. No doubt some of the views expressed here today will be controversial. But that's what's to be expected. That's what makes an issue, so let's proceed.

First of all, I'd like to ask each of you gentlemen why this particular referendum has attracted so much attention. In short, what is the fundamental issue the wheat farmers will be deciding when they vote next month? Congressman PURCELL, as chairman of the wheat subcommittee, will you lead off?

Mr. PURCELL. Thank you. I think the fundamental issue of the wheat referendum is the price of wheat for 1964. This will determine the income for farm families in the wheat area and the level of business activity in the rural towns all across the country in 1964. The direction of the wheat program is not actually involved, since the program in most respects is like the wheat program which has been in effect for over 25 years in our country.

Mr. LATTA. I'd just like to add to what Mr. PURCELL has said. This price situation is something to be concerned with in this program, but contrary to what we have read in the paper that if we don't adopt this program we will have dollar wheat. It's just not true because under existing law the price of wheat could not go below 50 percent of parity, and parity now is $2.49 a bushel. One-half of that would be $1.24½. When you add 5 percent to that you have 6 percent, or 6 cents makes it $1.30, plus carrying charges which would be about 5 cents a bushel. So it can't sink below $1.35 a bushel under existing law, that's been on the statute books for a good many years, if the voters turn this referendum down.

Mr. BOOTH. Congressman DOLE, how does it look from a representative of the great wheat State of Kansas?

Mr. DOLE. Well, coming from the State that has about 20 percent of wheat production, and from a district, I think the largest wheat-producing district in this country, I think there is a lot of interest, and I think perhaps the reason or reasons for it are many. First of all, this is the first time that I recall that any Secretary of Agriculture has gone all out to sell the program. I think before it's been a question of the farmers voting "yes" or "no" in a referendum. We find this time the USDA pulling all the stops in an effort to obtain a favorable vote. In the second place, we must recognize the facts that we do have a battle here between different farm organizations. And third, we have, of course, a battle of philosophy—whether we must accept Mr. Freeman's so-called supply-management program, or whether the wheat farmer shall be treated like other farmers and be entitled to a voluntary program. It seems to me that the issue is whether or not the wheat farmer is willing to accept a mandatory program in face of the administration's change of position lately in the feed grain bill and President Kennedy's statement which appears in the Majority Report on the Feed Grain Act of 1963, pointing out that it is a voluntary program. So if it's good for feed grains, the voluntary program would be good for the wheat producers.

Mr. LATTA. Before we pass on here, I would like to just stress this point that Congressman DOLE has made here, that this is the real test of the administration's supply-management approach to agriculture. It has been rejected by the Congress, and this bill just passed by a few votes on wheat. For other grains, and particularly, as he points out, in feed grains, this is the real test of supply-management. If this is approved by the farmers dealing with wheat on May 21, we probably will envision other types of supply-management programs in the future.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, if I might I would just like to point out at this point that the comparison has been made between the proposed wheat program and the existing feed grain program. Now, I think it only fair to mention at this point that the proposed wheat referendum, or the bill that calls for the wheat referendum, is quite similar to the legislation which has long been in effect in regard to other segments of our farm economy. Tobacco, rice, peanuts, and several of those crops are under now, and have been for a long time, a program very similar to the wheat referendum, or the wheat provision.

Mr. LATTA. Well, I think at that point, Graham would admit that this is a major commodity we're dealing with here, as far as wheat is concerned. And this is the first time we've had such an approach to a major commodity. It's true as you pointed out, that for these less minor, minor commodities, tobacco, that you do have a tighter program, and have had it for years. But we do have some problems cropping up, even in cotton, that you're well aware of.

Mr. BOOTH. Let's move to another question that will carry this discussion right along. I'll ask each of you to comment on this one, please. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, said that the program for 1964 is similar to the wheat programs we have had for the past 25 years. He pointed out that the changes which have been made are adjustments to meet new conditions which are very familiar to wheat farmers. Congressman PURCELL, will you lead off and let me ask you this question. If that statement is acceptable, then how can there be so much at stake in the referendum?

Mr. PURCELL. Well, to answer that question, I would have to pretty much repeat what I said in answer to the first question, which is saying, in effect, that this is an extension of the basic principles as far as the manner in which the farmer will function, that the wheat program has had all of the many years. Now, I would like to say at this point that if the wheat referendum fails, there have been statements made quite generally that then there would be new legislation. I want to express the feeling of all of those of us that come from agricultural areas and say that I know that all of us will do everything we can for the farmer, regardless of what referendum passes or fails.

Mr. LATTA. May I interrupt to congratulate the Congressman on that point. I think that's a proper approach, and we certainly will support him. Isn't that true Mr. DOLE?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, and I think that Mr. Purcell has pointed out the true theory of a referendum. In other words, you trot out something to the farmer, and if it's not satisfactory, he has the right to reject it. Then it's our obligation in Congress, I think, to come back with something else, and not to leave the wheat producer as a lone ranger on the horizon.

Mr. PURCELL. Let me continue and say that I know that all of us who come from the "breakbasket," if you want to call it that, or the farm areas of our country, are very sincere in our feeling. I think we learned last year that the chances of us getting a major program passed late in the summer this year will be most difficult, basing our judgment upon the activity of the congressmen from the city areas of last year. Mr. Chairman, I may not have dealt directly with the question you were asking, but I think that this is a significant area for us to think about.

Mr. BOOTH. Do either of the other two men have any comment about why there is so much at stake in this referendum, if it is true that the adjustments to meet the new conditions are familiar to the wheat farmers?

Mr. LATTA. Well, I might say that I disagree with Secretary Freeman when he says that this is something we have had in the past. Sure we've had mandatory programs for wheat producers in the past after they go through a referendum. But I might say that this is a different approach where we have this tremendous variation between the prices of wheat. For example, out in Ohio most of our wheat producers in the past have been outside these programs. And if they continue to remain outside the program they'll not get the market price for their commodity, but they'll get $1.30. Now that's a tremendous drop from $2. From that score, I think it's quite different.

Mr. BOOTH. We'll get some additional light on this question, I believe, if we'll bring just a few more details in front of us. Congressman DOLE, would you tell us, what are the key provisions of the new wheat program for 1964?

Mr. DOLE. Well, I might say, Mr. BOOTH, this is another area we might be bogged down on differences of opinion. But I think basically we could point out the course. The Secretary shall set the national wheat quota, and then he shall determine the acreage needed to produce this quota. Then he shall issue marketing certificates representing the amount of wheat to be eligible for sale, in other words the domestic quantity of wheat. Then, of course, the balance of the wheat will be so-called feed wheat and shall receive a feed price. And on the 80 percent of production used for domestic purposes, of course the farmer will receive around $2. On the balance—the feed wheat—he will receive around $1.30. Now we get into many areas here where we can differ. I would point out though, that under the program after 1965 the Secretary still has the authority to require a farmer to divert acres but there is no authority for payment for these diverted acres. We get into the free diversion concept which I don't believe many of the farmers understand. But to avoid any technical arguing, I think it might be just as well to point out those few highlights.

Mr. BOOTH. Fine. I'll ask Mr. PURCELL, then, if he'll elaborate a little about the certificates feature. Who pays for the differential on each bushel of certified wheat the farmer sells?

Mr. PURCELL. Well, the marketing certificates would be paid for either by the miller or by the exporter. And wheat selling at the market at $1.30 per bushel plus the 70 cents marketing certificate, will bring the cost of wheat to a miller to $2 per bushel—about the same as it is at the present time. Now eventually the certificate would be redeemed by the Government, either in kind or in cash, I believe the provisions are.

Mr. BOOTH. Let me go to Mr. LATTA, now. What about the small-farm provisions of the program, Congressman LATTA? Your State of Ohio has many of the 15-acre wheat producers. Will they benefit by the new program?

Mr. LATTA. Well, I can't say that they will. Now out in Ohio, we have approximately 170,000 wheat producers and about 150,000 of them who have not participated in the programs in the past. Now I have pointed out the discrimination towards the small farmer in this program right from the start. I did it in the subcommittee, in the committee, and on the floor of the House, and have done it since. This program requests the small farmer, meaning the 15-acre farmer, to take a double cut. This year, 1963, for example, we are entitled to a 15-acre exemption out in Ohio. Under this bill, now this is what they are gong to be voting on, on May 21, they will no longer have the 15-acre exemption, but they will be permitted to plant the highest of the last 3 years, the average of the last 3 years, excluding 1963. So if a farmer planted 15 acres for 2 years and 1 year in Ohio he did not plant any, where we rotate our crops, he has 30 acres. You divide that by 3 and you have 10 acres. So he drops from 15 acres down to 10 acres.. And when they go into this program, he must take another 10-percent cut. So he gets it twice. Whereas the larger producer only takes the 10-percent cut to go into the program. I think this is rank discrimination as far as the small farmer is concerned, and he just cannot live with this type of provision.

You take the farmer in Ohio who has been producing 15 acres of wheat. I'll just run a little tab here as to how much money he would lose. We all average about 40 bushels to the acre, so you end up with 600 bushels at $2 a bushel, which he got in 1963, and he has an income of $1,200. He goes into this program and he's planted 15 acres for 2 years and none for another year, and he ends up with 10 acres. Then he has a minus 10 percent which leaves him 9 acres. Nine acres times 40 bushels to the acre, he gets 360 bushels. Then he only gets paid, if he goes into the program, on 80 percent of that. So that leaves him 288 bushels at $2 a bushel, or $576. Then on the 72 bushels remaining, or the 20 percent, he gets $1.30, even though he goes into the program. This makes him $93.60. Then he gets a diversion payment out in Ohio of about $24 an acre. So you add those up—$576, $93.60, and $24—and you get $693.60, if he goes into the program, as opposed to what he would have in income on the same 15 acres at $1,200 in 1963. And I maintain our farmers can't live with that. So they'll have to make the choice as to whether they want to go into the program or whether they don't. And I think it's important to point out here that for the first time the 15-acre, or small-type farmer, will have an opportunity to vote in a referendum. We haven't had that in the past, and if there is any good feature about this program, I say it's giving these farmers the right to vote. But they have to sign up at least 7 days prior to May 21 in order to vote.

Mr. BOOTH. Now Congressman DOLE, let me come to you to get a little more of the economics of this question in front of us. If the $2 price objective is only 80 percent of the established parity price, I wonder if there are many farmers who would raise any wheat for the low support price of $1.30. I suppose if anyone can produce wheat at that price, the western Kansas farmers can do it. Is that correct?

Mr. DOLE. This is relatively correct, yes, but under this program of course, we can only produce so much at $1.30, which is another difference between this and what they originally talked about as the McNary-Haugen bill that's been around for about 40 years, and turned down by Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, and of course vetoed originally by Mr. Coolidge. And I think we should point out, too, that 100 percent of parity is $2.49, and as you pointed out, $2 is around 80 percent of parity. Now I call this the 80–80 bill. You get 80 percent of parity for 80 percent of your production. And on the balance you get 52 percent of parity. I remember very well the promises of President Kennedy when he was campaigning, about 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities. And I don't know of any, in fact there aren't any basic commodities now receiving as much as 90 percent of parity. And this brings to me, I think, a very significant difference between the present bill, the one the farmers will vote on,

and the one we've talked about in the past. In fact, one that Clifford Hope from my district, a member of the Agriculture Committee for 30 years and a well-respected Member of Congress, has long supported, which was called the domestic parity bill. Under this present 1964 program, we also have, in addition to bushel controls, acreage controls. So the farmer isn't free to plant all the wheat he wants. He can only plant so many acres. He must stay within his allotment, or he's subject to penalties and marketing quotas. I think, when we talk about the income to the farmer in the 1964 program, he just can't possibly maintain the income he had been receiving before. And from this standpoint, while the farmers of western Kansas would certainly raise all the wheat they could at $1.30, they can't do this under this program.

Mr. BOOTH. Congressman PURCELL, how much latitude does the Secretary of Agriculture have in changing the program in future years? It seems likely that the wheat producers will want to know the extent to which the program can be altered from year to year.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, the program for 1964 is not expected to change in any major respects from the program in 1963. The farm income under the program for 1965 can be as high, I think, as the 1964 program. The only major change for later years is the diversion payments are not authorized after 1965. However, it seems to me the income can still be maintained under the program because the Secretary of Agriculture is required to set price support at a level and quantities in a manner which will achieve the income objective of the farmer. And I would like to continue in this vein to say that the figures that have been quoted this morning I am sure are correct in saying that the price for wheat will be in the neighborhood of $1.30, assuming that the farmers stay within their allotments that have already been assigned. Now, if as many as 65 million acres of wheat are planted, like the Secretary and some of the figures in the Department have indicated they feel will be the case, then there will be so many farmers planting over and above and disregarding their allotment, and for that wheat there will be no price support, that then there could be dollar wheat for a large portion of our wheat. Now I'm not saying that to be argumentative. I think it is only fair to point out that if the allotments are disregarded, then there will be a lot of wheat, very likely, that is as low as $1 or in that neighborhood.

Mr. DOLE. I might state there, if I might, even if the referendum is turned down, then of course without Congress taking any action, those farmers who comply with their allotments are entitled to 50 percent of parity. And as Mr. LATTA has pointed out earlier, and as Mr. PURCELL has touched on, in addition to the $1.24½ which is 50 percent of parity, you add 5 percent above that plus carrying charges, which makes it about $1.35. This is the least that the Secretary can release surplus stocks on the market. And under section 407 of the 1949 act of course, he can strengthen the market if he wants to by raising this figure. So I don't think all is lost if the referendum fails.

Mr. LATTA. Let me point out something else here that will affect this price that we haven't talked about, and I think it's important that we talk about this. We're talking now about noncertificate wheat of $1.30. If this program doesn't go on the books, we've got $1.40 world price for wheat right now. So our farmers could sell their wheat on the world market, without benefit of any program at all. We're talking about the noncomplier, so to speak, and the compliers for 20 percent of their crop—$1.30, which is 10 cents a bushel less than the world price of $1.40 today.

Mr. BOOTH. Let's talk for just a moment about the farmer and the information he needs to help make up his mind about how to vote. Secretary Freeman has emphasized, and properly of course, that he would not presume to tell the farmers how to vote. That he would stick to the facts about the program alternatives. Now the Secretary has urged the farmers to visit the local county agricultural stabilization and conservation offices as the best place to go for information. But these men are employees of the Secretary and will of course sell the best points, emphasize the best points of the program. How can the farmer get both sides? There are two sides to this argument of course. One he can get all of, to some extent, from these offices. Where can he go to get the rest of the story?

Mr. PURCELL. I would like to respond, if I might, please. First, I don't mean to be defensive, but I would like to state that I think because the ASC county offices are employees of the Federal Government does not, per se, mean that they are not going to be fair about it. I think we should keep in mind that for 25 or 30 years this is the office where the farmers have come to get their information. I do not believe that the ASC offices have been putting out incorrect information. There are two sides to this question, and there might be other places that a farmer could go, but I would say he would get accurate information, if I may, by going to the ASC office.

Mr. DOLE. Let me state at this point that in Kansas, for example, since last March every county ASC office has been publishing a newsletter. I think this is good in some respects, but in the March 1963 newsletter that went out to every county, it said the big issue was $2 or question mark. Then it goes on in the next paragraph to say that it's between $2 and $1 wheat. This is the 1964 referendum. And these are the types of things I think have been unfair. It denies the farmer the freedom of choice that he's entitled to in the referendum. I certainly feel that my obligation, and I think the others would agree, is not to sell the program, not to try to defeat the referendum, but to give the farmer the facts. You'll find the farmers in Kansas, Texas, and Ohio can figure out which program is the best for them.

Mr. BOOTH. Our thanks to Congressman ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas; Congresman DELBERT LATTA, of Ohio; and to Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, of Texas, for shedding some light on this important and somewhat complicated issue—the proposed supply-management program for wheat. The complete text of this broadcast will be available to anyone who will write to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington 6, D.C. If you would like to have a copy of the complete text of the remarks made by these three Congresmen today during this program, just write to What's the Issue?, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington 6, D.C. It's yours for the asking. Next week, a special program on proposals for a new look at Federal income taxes. Each week this program brings you a discussion of the choices facing free Americans. This is Arch Booth, speaking for the chamber of commerce of the United States and inviting you to join us next week at this same time.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio House of Representatives has extended its congratulations to the Constitution Day Committee of Louisville, Ohio, and the committee's chairman, Mrs. Olga T. Weber, on the occasion of their receiving the Freedom Foundation's George Washington Honor Medal Award for their outstanding annual program celebrating Constitution Day.

The committee and the people of Louisville are to be congratulated for their untiring efforts to make Constitution Day an annual patriotic observance in Ohio.

Job Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a Government dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River would destroy opportunity. This huge Government expenditure would flood forever industrial sites, economic growth, and employment.

The following is from the South Carolina Electric Co-Op News, dated December 1962:

A NOTE TO DORN

Duke Power Co.'s mouthpiece concerning Trotters Shoals and the Savannah River has been Congressman W. J. B. DORN. He stated on the floor of Congress that he was "all for Duke." He has opposed orderly development of the river for the benefit of all the people.

We suggest that Congressman DORN study the returns in the Senate race to see if "his" people favor developing the river.

We might also point out that Duke Power Co. is a New Jersey corporation. Is Mr. DORN representing New Jersey or South Carolina?

The following editorials have created much interest:

[From the Greenwood (S.C.) Index Journal, April 29, 1963]

A RARE OPPORTUNITY

A controversy over the proposal to construct a Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River has developed considerable bitterness. That is greatly to be regretted, but the issue is so clear-cut that there is little room for compromise, and perhaps some bitterness is to be expected.

The position of the Index-Journal has been that much greater economic benefits would accrue to the entire area from the construction of the Mead Corp. paper mill and the Duke Power Co. steam plant than ever would result from the dam.

One of the points at issue is whether Mead really intends to build a paper mill on its site near Calhoun Falls. That is a valid point, but it seems that the statement of Fort T. Shepherd, Mead vice president, before the subcommittee hearing in Washington last week is about as close as a company can give to positive assurance that the plant will be built.

"We intend to use the site for the purpose for which it was purchased when economic conditions justify the huge investment," Mr. Shepherd said, "However, this important decision cannot be made until we are assured of our water supply and a flowing river for the adequate treatment and processing of our effluent."

No corporation could pledge unconditionally the expenditure of millions of dollars in new plant construction for some time in the future. The conditions are the same as when the Chemstrand Co. said when it began

construction here that it expected additional construction in the future if economic conditions and its own market conditions warranted it.

That is about all that can be said.

Mead also cannot build without some assurance that its water supply will remain accessible. In a kind of chicken-and-egg situation, Mead says it cannot build until this assurance is given. Proponents of Trotters Shoals say they want the dam because there is no assurance the plant will be built.

On this page today is a large part of the address given before a joint session of the South Carolina General Assembly by H. T. Whitaker, chairman of the board of Mead Corp. In it he gives some information on what construction of the Mead plant would mean to this section. He also gives some idea of the tremendous proportions of the paper industry in the South.

A pulpwood truck, battered as a rule from the hard treatment it receives, would hardly be chosen by the uninformed as the symbol of the South that the region is attempting to build. Yet Mr. Whitaker says that each such pulpwood truck represents about $25,000 in annual income to the community in which it operates.

At Chillicothe, Ohio, where one of the large Mead plants is situated, pulpwood trucks almost fill the highways. They bring a load of pulpwood to the mill and the owner or operator returns home with a check in his pocket.

It is our feeling that Mead has demonstrated as convincingly as it can that it wants to use the site for the purpose for which it was bought. We would like to see them given that opportunity. We can think of few industries which would spread its economic benefits over such a wide area of this section as would a paper mill. The opportunity to have one seems too valuable to be wasted.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle Herald, Apr. 28, 1963]

WE OPPOSE TROTTERS SHOALS

When plans were advanced some 20 years ago for development of the Savannah River, residents of this area—both in Georgia and South Carolina—were advised that an 11-dam complex would be required to effect the Government's program. Salient point scored by the Government engineers was that these were to be multipurpose dams designed to provide flood control, navigation, water supply, recreation, as well as electric power.

Both the Chronicle and the Herald endorsed the program. In the years since they have supported that original concept. We hailed the construction of the Clark Hill Dam and, later Hartwell Dam. In the instance of the latter we were told that it was necessary to raise the level of the river below Augusta and to lower the water temperature for the Savannah River Plant of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Now, however, we find that proponents of Trotters Shoals Dam have apparently lost sight of that original concept. In their advocacy of the project they are content that it will be, first, and foremost, a dam to produce hydroelectric power. Only in a "minor, secondary way," as one proponent told us, will it aid flood control.

On that basis, therefore, the Chronicle-Herald finds itself unable to lend its support to the proposed dam, which would be located near Elberton. To do so would be to give full endorsement to public power. This we do not propose to do.

While that is our primary motive in opposing the Trotters Shoals project, we do not lose sight of the fact that if the Government does not construct its dam, that area of Georgia and South Carolina will reap an even larger financial benefit by way of private enterprise.

It is our understanding that if no Government dam is ordered, Duke Power Co. proposes to erect a huge power plant in Anderson County which will produce approximately 10 times the electric power that would be generated at Trotters Shoals. In addition, the Mead Corp. has a site at Calhoun Fall on which it tentatively plans to build a $40 million paperboard plant employing some 1,400 men for construction and between 600 and 650 on a regular basis thereafter. It would have a payroll of some $6 million and a wood-purchasing program amounting to some $9 million annually.

If a dam is constructed at Trotters Shoals, the Mead site would be flooded.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Public Works Committee also indicates that other industrial sites would be lost. Additionally, the Trotters Shoals Dam would substantially decrease the bold water flow, which, while not militating against all industry that might want to locate between Hartwell and Clark Hill, would materially limit the type.

We do not believe that the people of either Georgia or South Carolina are willing to sacrifice—nor should they be asked to sacrifice—potential industrial sites in order for the Southeastern Power Administration to be able, as Administrator Charles Leavy testified, to market power for the Interior Department. Yet that is what would occur if Congress authorizes the Trotters Shoals Dam.

While it has been commonly believed that it was only South Carolina that was against the public power dam, and that Georgia wanted it, a surprisingly large number of Georgians have appeared before the subcommittee hearing in Washington to oppose the plan. Many South Carolinians also have voiced their objections.

Of them all, we like what 15-year-old Sam W. Jacks, Jr., of Abbeville, S.C., had to say in his testimony:

"We boys and girls bitterly oppose Trotters Shoals because we'll have to look other places for work since there would be none at home if Trotters Shoals is built."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Apr. 25, 1963]

A FIGHT FOR THE RIGHT

Jobs and income necessarily come before men's recreation; otherwise, there would not even be the means of getting to the places of recreation.

One of the prime issues over the proposed publicly financed Trotters Shoals Dam has now been boiled down to jobs versus recreation. Those favoring the development have admitted that highly suitable sites for industry would be inundated by the waters of the project, but point to the recreational advantages the lakes would provide.

It is not a good argument that potential employment would inded be drowned out but that a large new facility for recreation would be created. It is a very unsound argument. It places the cart before the horse.

It was Representative BRYAN DORN who drew from an officer of the Corps of Army Engineers the admission that this development would wipe out excellent industrial locations, and it was this officer whose rebuttal cited the recreational benefits which would come. The officer cited the success of the Clark's Hill development, on the Savannah River, below Trotters Shoals, as a center for the recreational pleasure of citizens, his point being that Trotters Shoals would serve a similar purpose.

This argument becomes doubly fallacious when one remembers how close Clark's Hill is to the area where Trotters Shoals' lakes would appear. Why not let industry grow in the Trotters area and let the holders of the new jobs and their families use the Clark's Hill center for their recreation?

We believe in adequate facilities for recreation. We aren't blind to the fact that properly practiced outdoor enjoyments do indeed recreate. But neither are we blind to the hard necessities of sustenance through income-earning employment.

The privately owned utility (Duke Power Co.) which would build a very large electric generating plant in the Trotters Shoals area would not risk so much private capital if it did not have reasonable assurance of industrial development there. Duke has been restrained by those who want the public project. Those who adhere to the idea that government should do what private enterprise cannot do are silenced in this instance. Private enterprise stands ready to provide.

The publicly financed project should be abandoned. Duke should be permitted to proceed with its job-giving, tax-paying enterprise. Jobholders with the incomes which the employment would provide would get their recreation.

Mr. DORN and those with him are making a fight for commonsense. They fight for the right as represented by firm realities which should not be questioned.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Apr. 30, 1963]

FREE ENTERPRISE AT STAKE

The man who may hold the decisive hand in the dispute over whether a public power development or one of private ownership should be built on the upper Savannah River is Gov. Donald S. Russell. And now is the time for the governor to make his decision. It would be a mistake for him to delay it. He is the man in the middle.

Reduced to its basic terms, the controversy lies between those who want the Federal Government to build at Trotters Shoals another in its growing series of dams along the Savannah River and those who wish to preserve the last remaining stretch of the upper Savannah for development by private industry.

Some effort has been made to label the dispute a fight between South Carolina and Georgia, since the greater measure of support for the Federal project comes from Georgia, and the greater opposition from South Carolina. But no real case for such a classification can be made out, since there are overlaps of both support and opposition.

The issue is not South Carolina versus Georgia; it is socialism verus free enterprise. The very alinement of forces on each side proves the point. The chief promoters of the Federal project are those linked directly or indirectly with the Rural Electrification Administration and who constantly seek to expand the public power empire.

Opposing them are businessmen, chambers of commerce, civic organizations, industrialists, and others who see a greater future for the region, the State, and the Nation if free enterprise is allowed to develop its potential for providing jobs, payrolls, and taxes.

In this particular fight, South Carolina already has lost heavily because of the "dog in the manger" attitude of some Georgia Congressmen and the public power bureaucrats. Duke Power Co., which was ready to proceed with the construction of the largest steam-generating electric plant in the world at Middleton Shoals, was thwarted in its effort, causing a loss in tax revenues alone to local, State, and Federal Governments of more than $13 million a year.

If public power partisans succeed in building their Federal dam at Trotters Shoals, they will effectively destroy all hopes for a multimillion-dollar paper mill pledged to the area by the Mead Corp. That mill, by its wood consumption, its employment, and its tax paying, would have a tremendous impact on the region's economy.

The issues are clear. The facts are at hand. The Flood Control Subcommittee of

the U.S. House Committee on Public Works is ready to vote on the matter. The man yet to be heard from is the chief executive of South Carolina, and his attitude will carry great weight, perhaps to the point of being the controlling factor, in the congressional vote.

Donald Russell has been both an articulate champion and a successful product of the American system of free enterprise and competitive private industry.

South Carolinians await his decision with more than passing interest. He must declare himself, and soon.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently held their annual essay contest throughout the country, using as their theme "What Freedom Means to Me."

In the State of West Virginia, a young man, Lewis G. Brewer, of Mannington, W. Va., wrote the prize-winning paper. He was invited to come to Washington to attend a banquet at which all State winners were present and where the national winner was selected. While his paper was not awarded the national award, it is extremely well written and deserving of consideration by my colleagues. I therefore have requested permission too have it inserted in the RECORD for my colleagues to read the thoughts of this fine young man from the First Congressional District of West Virginia:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

To me, freedom means more than just a theory or an ideal—it is a way of life. For a time freedom as we know it was mainly a theory in patriots minds', but under our system of Government this theory has come into practice and now, unfortunately, we too often tend to take our freedoms for granted. Too many people of my generation think that they are oppressed by their parents, school, Government, and adults in general. They are unable to see the many freedoms they are allowed and practice every day. But there is little I can do about that, I can only speak for myself and in so doing somehow enlighten others to the advantages of our way of life. Actually, I have so many freedoms it is hard to decide where to start. Many freedoms precious to me may be taken for granted by others and freedoms which to others are precious, I may take for granted. Strictly by chance let's start with the press. I may purchase and read newspapers with different political opinions. I may read editorials or news which praises the Government or I may read that which criticizes it and disapproves of its actions. Then we have radio and television where different opinions of Government may also be aired. Reporters for all these media are able to independently search for news and try to bring the public the best coverage. They may write their articles and print or broadcast them without relying on Government sources and approval.

I may attend the church of my choice or if I should happen to choose, not attend at all. I may attend meetings of political, private, and social groups and if I should please, I could even use this speech to criticize our Government without fear of reprisal. Our family is free from fear of the police entering our home to search for supposed contraband without a warrant supported by just cause. I am free from false imprisonment and even if justly accused I cannot be imprisoned beyond justification of the crime and severe and cruel punishments cannot be inflicted upon me. If I am accused of a crime I have the right to a public trial, I may freely communicate with people in other countries and may travel or move anywhere in this country freely. If I should one day invent or write something the Government would protect it for me. When I search for a job, I have the option of working in any honest field I wish. I can look forward to the time when I will be 21 and in this State I will be able to vote and thereby register my approval or disapproval of the people who make our laws and execute our governmental system. All of these things and numerous others to me are freedoms that I am thankful for and make me proud to live in this country. Our freedom is not unlimited. We have seen what happens when people run completely rampant with no restraint whatsoever. That type of freedom is more destructive than constructive. I am glad that our country has a blend of unequaled freedom and self-imposed restraint more successful than any system known to history and I am very thankful that I am blessed with the right to do as I please so long as I do not infringe upon the rights of others.

Czarist-Perpetrated Kishineff Pogrom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit Jewish News, of Friday, April 5, 1963. It was written by my dear friend and a distinguished citizen of Detroit, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, editor and publisher of the Detroit Jewish News, recalling with the Passover the plight of the victims of the Kishineff pogrom wherein a mob created fearful havoc against the person and property of a number of innocent citizens of Jewish extraction in Kishineff, Russia.

The article follows:

AN HISTORIC ANNIVERSARY: DETROIT'S ROLE IN AMERICAN PROTESTS AGAINST CZARIST-PERPETRATED KISHINEFF POGROM

(By Philip Slomovitz)

When we speak of freedom on Passover, we also imply courage. This Passover, more than on any previous observance of the Festival of Freedom in the present century, we will be thinking of the courage of a brave group of men, women and children who defied the Nazis, who risked their lives in order that they could die as human beings rather than submit to the fate that was in store for them in the ovens of Auschwitz and Treblinka.

While marking the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto resistance which took place on the Passover 20 years ago, we also recall many humiliations which inspired action and defense. Our people in Russia formed self-defense groups after the pogroms in the first years of this century. The story of the Kishineff pogrom and the manner in which American public opinion was mobilized in condemnation of the outrages deserve special attention and this page is devoted to it.

REMINDER OF TRAGIC YEARS UNDER CZARISM

Announcement has been made by the World Federation of Bassarabian Jews, in Tel Aviv, that the 60th anniversary of the frightful Kishineff program will be commemorated in Israel on April 18.

Because the observance will occur on the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, the memorial will assume special significance. But it stands out as an event to be remembered on its own infamous merits, as a reminder of the tragic years when the Jews were pawns in the hands of the blackguards in Russia.

A rich literature is available describing the events that transpired in Kishineff, the plotting against the Jews that was encouraged by Russian officials, the protests that were uttered against the outrages.

The Kishineff experience was so tragic that the Jewish Publication Society of America published a book, "The Voice of America on Kishineff," in 1904. The 500-page volume was edited by the late Dr. Cyrus Adler, the president of Dropsie College, who later became president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and of the American Jewish Committee.

In his lengthy introduction, Dr. Adler reviewed the history of the events that led to the massacres. A wealthy young Russian, Michael Ribalenko, was murdered on February 16, 1903, at Dubossary, a village in the southwestern Russian government of Kherson, not far from the Bessarabian town of Kishineff. It developed later that a relative of the murdered young man had committed the crime, in the hope of acquiring his fortune.

Ribalenko's body was found on February 22, 1903, but the rumor soon spread that Jews had committed the crime in order to obtain Christian blood for Passover matzos. The noted anti-Semite Khrushevan's anti-Semitic newspapers began a campaign of propagating anti-Semitic propaganda in Kishineff and St. Petersburg. Dr. Adler wrote in the volume he compiled for the JPS:

The agitation against the Jews was fomented throughout the month of March and during April, until it culminated, at the Easter holidays, April 19–21, in a 3 days' riot directed against the Jews of Kishineff. During this period of agitation, secret societies were formed whose object was the extermination or the harassing of the Jews, and hordes of Moldavian, Albanian, and Macedodonian ruffians were hired in outlying villages to come to the town at the time designated for the attack upon the Jewish quarters.

That the onslaught upon the Jews was not due to an overmastering impulse of the moment, but had been carefully planned, was obvious from the events of the first day. There was not one mob, but several mobs, operating at the same time in different localities. The police were inactive, and the military was not summoned, although representatives of the Jewish community had called upon the governor before the riots began, and had warned him of the dangers of the situation. Citizens belonging to the upper classes of society permitted it to appear that their sympathies were with the rioters, and on the part of the authorities nothing was done until the second day of the outrage was well advanced.

The official report (June 7) of the central relief committee at Kishineff makes the following statement of the depredations committed by the mob:

The number of families affected by the outrages is 2,750, of whom 2,528 reported to the committee damages amounting to 2,332,890 rubles (about $1,190,000). The number of victims killed on the spot and dying in consequence of injuries was 47; the number of severely wounded, 92; slightly injured, 345 (not including those treated by physicians outside of the hospitals). The 47 victims left widows and 123 orphans. These figures do not take into account the temporarily or permanently disabled, nor can statistical inquiry reach those whose business, trade, or position has been affected, more or less seriously, by the industrial and economic crisis that has ensued.

There were strong protests in this country. A former President—Grover Cleveland—and many leaders in government, the press, the clergy, joined in condemning the outrages.

Adding insult to injury, in spite of the contempt that was expressed for czarist Russia in all free countries, was a statement issued by the Russian Ambassador to the United States, Count Cassini, who stated, on May 18:

"There is in Russia, as in Germany and Austria, a feeling against certain of the Jews. The reason for this unfriendly attitude is found in the fact that the Jews will not work in the field or engage in agriculture. They prefer to be money lenders. Give a Jew a couple of dollars and he becomes a banker and money broker. In this capacity he takes advantage of the Russian peasant, whom he soon has in his power and ultimately destroys. It is when the patience of the peasant is exhausted that a conflict between peasants and Jews occurs. Ordinarily the Russian is a patient person, but it is only natural that he should entertain a feeling of resentment for the one who has wrought his ruin."

Thus a spokesman for a great country proceeded to misrepresent the facts and to deny realities as they were exposed to indicate that a barbaric government fomented wholesale murders.

The Jewish publication society took the lead to perpetuate the facts of that manifestation of horrors and of the bestialities that were condoned by Von Plehve, the Russian Internal Minister, and other members of his Government.

As Dr. Adler indicated in his book, there were meetings of protest in 50 towns in 27 States—including Detroit. Hundreds of speeches, many sermons, and other public declarations were heard in condemnation of what had taken place in Kishineff. There is included, in Dr. Adler's book, an American Kishineff diary, giving a day-by-day account of the protests in this country.

The mayor of Detroit at the time was William C. Maybury, who was elected to the mayoralty in 1897 and remained in office through 1904. There were then 34 aldermen representing 17 wards. The aldermen at the time were George P. Codd, David E. Heineman, Edwin Jerome, Clarence A. Black, William Gutman, William Nagel, Maurice J. Keating, Albert T. Allan, Alois A. Deimel, Frederick Mohn, Hugh R. Burns, Robert J. McClellen, Anthony Weiler, John Weibel, William W. Magee, John Harpfer, Louis E. Tossy, Basil A. Lemke, Edward J. Jeffries, Patrick O'Brien, Max C. Koch, Herman F. Zink, Otto Reinhardt, Philip H. A. Balsley, Joseph F. Dederich, Louis Brozo, William F. Moeller, Henry C. Nevermann, Jr., William H. Mahs, Charles H. Wieber, Edmund Atkinson, Hiram L. Rose, Fred W. Smith, William Hillger.

Of interest is the fact that one of the most prominent aldermen at that time was David E. Heineman, one of Detroit's leading Jews in the early part of this century, who was the designer of the flag of Detroit.

Dr. Adler's book, under the section reporting on the Voice of Detroit against the Kishineff outrages, includes the following:

"DETROIT, MICH.

"In Detroit, Mich., a special committee of the common council met with the mayor and the citizens' committee, and at a special session of the common council summoned for May 23, 1903, the following action was taken:

" '*To the Honorable the Common Council:*

" 'Gentlemen: Your special committee, appointed to consider the communication of his honor the mayor, as to the action of the citizens' committee, regarding the persecution of the Jews in south Russia, beg leave to report that the committee took up with the citizens' committee and the mayor the question of giving expression to our protest against persecution for religion's sake of any people, and knowing it to be un-American as well as unjust and unfair, we are united in our recommendation that a formal protest be sent to the Secretary of State of the United States, urging him to take such action as may seem proper to end these persecutions, or at least to intercede with the Russian Government in this regard.

" 'Your committee therefore recommends the adoption of the following preamble and resolutions, and would suggest that they be forwarded to Senator Alger and Congressman Lucking, both of whom are to be in the city of Washington during the early days of the ensuing week. These representatives and fellow citizens can avail themselves of the opportunity to present our protests to the Secretary of State in person. The resolutions are appended herewith.

" 'Respectfully submitted,

" 'DAVID E. HEINEMAN,
" 'WM. GUTMAN,
" 'MAX C. KOCH,
" 'ALOIS A. DEIMEL,
" 'WM. NAGEL.'

"Accepted.

"The following is the preamble and resolutions:

" 'In pursuance of the resolutions of the citizens' meeting, submitted to this body by His Honor the Mayor, and having reference to the persecution of the Jews in South Russia, it is unanimously

" 'Resolved, By the Common Council of the City of Detroit, that the massacres of the Jews in South Russia fill the civilized world with a sense of horror and detestation, and the sufferings of that people under the fearful cruelties inflicted upon them, because of their religious faith, arouse the deepest sympathy and pity of the American people.

" 'Resolved, That we denounce these atrocities and the perpetrators and abettors thereof, as wholly outside the pale of Christian civilization.

" 'Resolved, That on behalf of the united people of Detroit we solemnly protest against the persecution of these people, and appeal to the Government of Russia to suppress such outrages and to visit upon the perpetrators the punishment they so richly deserve.

" 'Resolved, That we urge upon the State Department at Washington that the protest of the American people be laid before the Government of Russia, to the end that that Government may be fully advised of the attitude of the American people in this most serious matter.

" 'Resolved, That these resolutions be certified by the city clerk with the city seal, and signed by the mayor, the special committee of this body and the special citizens' committee. and forwarded to Senator Agler and Congressman Lucking, with the respectful request that they present the resolutions in person to the Secretary of State of the United States.

" 'Unanimously adopted.' "

In the section in Dr. Adler's book recording the expression of editorial opinions in protest against the Russian outrages, appears the following:

[From the Evening News, Detroit, Mich., May 25, 1903]

"DETROIT, MICH.

"A weak czar and a strong anti-Semite minister

"The present is hardly a time for a reasonable consideration of the attitude of Russia toward the Jews. Every utterance is proof that human passions are too turbulent as yet to consider all its aspects dispassionately.

"Hebrews all over the world are justly indignant over the recent massacre at Kishineff, Russia. All they can say in execration of the Government which allows such horrors as have been committed is entirely justifiable. There is no question but there is a fanatical religious element which is struggling to make the state religion the universal faith, to oppress all other religionists but those of the Greek Orthodox Church. This element has for its head one of the ablest, most ruthless and intolerant of all the Russian ministers, the procurator of the holy synod, K. P. Pobyedonosteff. He and his policy belong to an age that is past. He seems to entertain the fatuous belief that an absolute despotism, in which the civil ruler is made the nominal head of a hierarchy, can dominate by force over spiritual as well as temporal affairs. That many will die for their faith makes little difference to a man of this type. He would harass heretics without compunction, and would stop at little in his determination to coerce Jews, Lutherans, Roman Catholics, and other religious sects other than the Greek Church.

"The czar appears to be a man of kind heart and actuated by altruistic motives. A natural question is: Why does he not carry into effect his good intentions? He could order the governor of Kishineff, the local military authorities and all the leaders in the outrages off to the Siberian mines, or to the island of Saghalien, for life. Why does he not do it? That would be a reasonable question if the present czar had the characteristics of Peter the Great and perhaps one or two other czars, who ruled as well as reigned. The present czar is a man of delicate constitution. He is the victim of a nervous disease which robs him of the stamina that is needed by any man who would be a real autocrat. He grew up in an atmosphere of terror. His grandfather, the emancipator of 20 million serfs, was blown to pieces by an explosive bomb when the present czar was a lad of 12 years. His father was under constant menace of death and had hundreds of hairbreadth escapes. In some respects the czar resembles Louis XVI, a weak, amiable, well-meaning scion of more rugged stock, who has fallen heir to problems not of his own creation, and which he may not be able to solve. It is easy to see how such a monarch may be dominated by an ecclesiastic of great energy. Nicholas associated with Pobyedonosteff, might be like Louis XIII with Richelieu and Mazarin. The fact that he is a man of religious tendencies and of high ideals would make him peculiarly susceptible to clerical persuasion that is eager to crush the Lutherans in Finland and the Jews everywhere."

The list of names of those who joined in the protests reads like a "Who's Who in Jewry" and "Who's Who in America." The great orator Zvi Hirsh Masliansky, Simon Wolf, of Washington, Dr. Marcus Jastrow, Prof. Richard Gottheil, U.S. Senator Chauncey Depew, Dr. Joseph Krauskopf, Joseph Barondess, Judge Mayer Sulzberger, Jacob de Haas, Dr. Harry Friedenwald, Felix Adler, and many other prominent Jews appeared at public meetings.

The tests of some of the addresses, in addition to the editorials, appear in Dr. Adler's book.

Among the important exposés of the tragedy was the book "Within the Pale, the True Story of Anti-Semetic Persecution in

Russia" by Michael Davitt, who was sent to Kishineff to get the facts by the New York American and the Evening Journal.

It was in response to a petition prepared by the B'nai B'rith for submission to the Emperor of Russia that Secretary of State John Hay said:

"The fact that no civilized government has yet taken action would bid us to proceed with care."

Thus, there always was, as there still is today, eternal caution.

President Theodore Roosevelt received the delegation that presented the suggested petition, and he told them:

"In any proper way by which beneficial action may be taken, it will be taken, to show the sincerity of the historic American position."

In addition to Grover Cleveland, Jane Addams, Clarence Darrow, and the Reverend Madison C. Peters, other noted Christian clergymen spoke up against the horrors.

This is an abbreviated account of what had taken place 60 years ago in Kishineff, the Detroit protest against the outrages, America's voice in condemnation of the inhumanities.

Much has happened since 1903 to lengthen the record of the catastrophes that were faced by Jews in Europe. None of the voices heard in disapproval or pograms, whether they were in Russia or in Germany, should be silenced. By recalling the events of 60 years ago, by supplementing them with accounts of the heroism during the resistance against Nazism in Warsaw 20 years ago, we retain a record that puts to shame those who are responsible for instigating man against man, those who instill hatred in human society.

Freedom To Be Restored to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Bend Reporter published in Rosenberg, Tex., printed on April 25, 1963, an illuminating article on freedom in America. This article was written by an experienced reporter, Mr. Sigman Byrd, and I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

BYRD PREDICTS FREEDOM TO BE RESTORED TO UNITED STATES

Some Victorian weisenheimer or other once wrote snidely that the only adventure left to cowards was marriage. He could not have been more wrong. Matrimony is a sacrament, not an adventure. But there are still some adventures available to cowards, even in this decadent era. Like gambling at Las Vegas; joining some Communist front clique for the senescent; or taking to some idiot fad like playing chicken or smoking reefers.

Somebody, not me, really ought to compile a more interesting list. For this here is the age of the coward. This is the day of better-anything-than-dead; the time of the cringing pacifist, the simpering peacemarcher, the ban-the-bomb exhibitionist, the unholy preacher of unnatural brotherhoods, or minority rule, the smear of the entrenched hatemongers, the Judas kiss, the sniveling conformist, the unmanly male in the executive suite.

Some dread moral and spiritual virus has infected the once vigorous corpus of our American life pattern, so that we, as individuals and as a nation, now exhibit the most craven attitudes of obsequiousness toward the hostile world around us. We shudder at the military blatherings of Slavic, Oriental, and Latin despots. We quake in our hand-tooled rodeo boots when some domestic socialist from the red light District of Columbia threatens us with invasion by some underdeveloped and pagan country where, after generations of missionary work, we are now spending millions in political giveaway rackets.

We are scared half to death by the military and secret police agencies of our own bloated Central Goverment, which we and our ancestors created as the common servant of a proud, free confederation of sovereign States. So that today we see whole cities, with hundreds of thousands of citizens, eagerly yielding up their constitutional rights to claques of demagogues and sociologists and embracing the most disgusting and un-American affronts to our historic social traditions all because we are terrified at the thought of having a gasbomb fired at our children by a Federal stormtrooper wearing a badge that we never gave him permission to wear.

The main difficulty in this intolerable situation is that there are somehow still a lot of Americans who are made of the same tough stuff as their pioneer ancestors. There are still some Americans, thank God, who are not afraid of the Devil, the chief dictator of the communist conspiracy, or the anti-Christ himself.

And a passel of these happily unregimented Americans are young men and women who have managed, almost miraculously, to escape infection by the poisons being spread by our so-called educators, clergymen, social workers, the entertainment industry, and the news media.

But another numerous company of unbrainwashed Americans are mature men and women who can never be sold any kind of collectivism because they will remember as long as they live the last decades of our gloriously free America, before the final sell-out began in the Wilson administration.

And all of these courageous countrymen of ours, both young and old, are first of all, a kind of temporary stumbling-block on the threshold of the phony frontier. But, secondly, they are themselves rather frustrated and indignant in this age of the American coward. Because they, the ones with guts, are the normal Americans. The normal American is by nature an adventurer, a pioneer, a fighter, a liberator, yes, even a hero ready for martyrdom in a holy cause.

For example, please remember, if you can, the Alamo, Valley Forge, and Vicksburg.

So what we need most desperately in this embattled Republic of ours is not a list of enticing adventures for American cowards, but a plan to draft and challenge the courage of brave Americans, young and old, to challenge their talents and energies for the liberation of our land and the restoration of constitutional government in our States.

Here, then, is the great adventure that calls for the stout hearts, keen minds and flexed muscles of all Americans who spurn the enticements of the professional poltroons, who loathe the contemptible conformity of the Reds, the pantywaist socialists and their pink punks.

The great adventure is politics.

The field is as wide open as the dawn of a new summer's day. It's as broad as public life itself. To mention a few of its specialties, as the recruiting services do, there is the field of psychopolitics. There are the major political parties, each one embracing every conceivable degree of political philosophy from right to left. There are the newer parties, at least one of which is filled with fine, dedicated people.

There are thousands of different movements, some overlapping in the patriot conservative camp. This is unfortunate, in a way, and yet it must be expected that one who truly believes in individual liberty will seek to put his principle into practice by acting independently when his conscience compels him to do so.

Thus we have moderate and militant groups in the anti-Communist forces; we have local and regional organizations. Some patriots band together to work in religious programs, others in education, labor, political action, public demonstrations, communications or more direct activities. Others work alone or in quite small groups in a multitude of planned efforts to warn other Americans about the Socialist conspiracy.

Of course, there are some phony patriot organizations. There are cliques of hypocrites, moneymaking opportunists, compulsive wreckers, political party hacks, and even some wideopen traps baited and set by provocateurs, whose aim in recruiting you is to catalog your motives and file a dossier on you for some league of professional subversives.

And how do you learn to avoid the fake programs and the political deadfalls? Well, you could ask someone you trust. But is your trust wisely placed? Is your informant half as well informed as he believes he is?

Ah, well, that's a part of the game. In the long haul, you well may find that experience is the best teacher in politics as she is in other arts and sciences.

I don't know how well you trust me. But if you are willing to follow my advice even partially, then here are a few elementary tips to help you separate the sheep from the goats. If you observe that a certain organization, although apparently anti-Communist and pro-American, consistently enjoys a good press, beware. If a certain organization is often denounced by highly placed spokesmen and widely circulated publications, chances are that organization has been hurting the conspirators.

Don't expect to find the most worthwhile of patriot groups completely free from traitors and other frauds. All effective groups have been infiltrated. And here is the reason this situation can exist: In politics, the stakes are the most precious of all prizes to be won in the material order, the control of other men, their fortunes, and their minds.

On the other hand, you can hear and readily or sanctimonious denunciations of so-called "Nazi" or "Fascist" organizations. Most such organizations are as phony as seven-dollar bills, and many are supported by the very people they appear to oppose.

Now, you may believe this or not, but politics can be a very dangerous adventure. In today's political machinations, you can lose your job, your reputation, your very life. And the more effective you become, the more you are in danger.

For example, the late Senator Joe McCarthy was one of the most effective enemies the Communist conspiracy ever had. He died young. His former assistants survive.

Just last week, in Austin, Tex., Robert Knight, a courageous and absolutely tireless fighter against communism and its fronts in Texas, lost his life in the conservative cause. Chances are, if you live outside of Austin, you never heard or saw a report about the tragic passing of this fearless Christian martyr.

Several weeks ago, Gen. Edwin Walker, veteran of many a hot military engagement, had the closest shave with death in his long military and civilian career. A would-be assassin's bullet missed him by an inch as he sat at a desk by night in his political headquarters in Dallas.

There have been other cases. Let your mind go back over the strange deaths, the highly suspicious "suicides," the deadly, cruel, never-explained persecutions of loyal Americans, in and out of public life, in recent years. Think of just the ones you know about, in your city or State. Think about the individuals involved, and ask yourself whether your own courage is equal to theirs.

If it is, then welcome to the ranks. Nothing you may have read in the most hair-raising fiction, no fantastic teleplay about espionage, not even the wildest of factual incidents in the vast world of political chicanery and rascality, can surpass the dramatic experiences awaiting you in your own precinct, your own town, your State.

With one possible exception, politics is the most important single force in the life of your community. But even money is influenced by politics, and vice versa. And there is one advantage in politics. You can plunge into it with little or no cash investment.

Just remember that your investment of time, energy, reputation, talent, and personal sacrifice, especially if you progress in effectiveness against the enemies of your country—may be costly indeed. In the end, it may cost you and your family more than your net worth.

One way to minimize such dangers is to be a soft conservative. Rightwing softies are often tolerated. As long as you do no harm to the enemies of your community and this country, as long as you deliver your attack at long or medium range, while flattering the city hall, courthouse and statehouse, you may be permitted to go on being a prima donna playing the role of a technical anti-liberal.

But, as I hope I made clear in the beginning, I meant to direct the observations to men and women of conscience, courage and clear vision. To loyal Americans who have at least heard about the conspiracy against us, who are at least willing to investigate further, who are capable of understanding that the Gothic enemy of our Christian civilization is not just in Moscow, nor even just in Havana, but is well entrenched in Houston, Richmond, Rosenberg and elsewhere in Texas. To courageous Americans who would rather be dead than even just a little bit Red.

One day you may pay for that knowledge and those attitudes as Bob Knight did. But isn't it better to go down fighting for a worthy cause than to wither away of old age or to watch the bloom of youth fade away over the empty years?

On the other hand, the chances are quite good that we shall win. Conservatives, patriots and other old-fashioned true Americans are waking up to the terrible dangers that threaten us with slavery and worse. And those already awakened are working night and day in various, not always unified, causes.

Those who are already working and fighting need your help. Your country needs you. Future generations of Americans, your progeny and mine, need you right now so desperately that it's almost a wonder we can't hear their voices across the mystery of time, imploring us to save them, the young and the unborn, from becoming the faceless, godless, soulless, slaves of the international gangsters of the United Nations.

If enough of us wake up in time, if enough of us are willing to fight to the bitter end for God and country right here and right now, then we may be able, through the grace of Heaven, to drive the moneychangers from our temples and the traitors and thieves and pharisees out of our forums and councils.

I believe we will win. That you and I will live to see responsible constitutional government restored all the way across this blessed land, and the despoilers of America punished under the very laws they tried to set aside through the edicts of their arrogant puppets. I believe we may look forward to the day when Americans can hold their heads high again, at home and all over a world where the letters USA are a synonym for "freedom's holy light."

As the Communists themselves used to say, back in the days before our treasonous leaders built them up as the false lords of our destiny, "We have nothing to lose but chains; we have a world to gain."

SIGMAN BYRD.

Ben-Gurion Reviews 15 Years of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by David Ben-Gurion which appeared in the April 28, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

Premier Ben-Gurion reviews the tremendous progress made in the tiny democracy of Israel, since its founding in 1948. When we stop to realize that Israel is circled by hostile nations bent upon her destruction, this achievement is all the more remarkable; schools, factories, roads and housing have been built to accommodate the large numbers of new immigrants. Thousands of acres of land that had lain fallow for centuries have been brought under cultivation; millions of trees grow where only the sand could be seen 15 years ago.

Israel is the promise of the future in the Middle East; her neighbors must one day realize this and take advantage of the tremendous technological assistance she can offer them.

The article follows:

ISRAEL: NOW AGED 15—STILL A LAND OF "MILK AND HONEY"

(By David Ben-Gurion)

At the end of the first 15 years of her renewed independence, Israel can look back over a stretch of road not inconsiderable in length and difficulty that she has succeeded in covering.

This is, I believe, the only state in the world whose neighbors proclaim night and day that it must be wiped off the face of the earth, though they all belong to the United Nations, which obligates its member states to settle all their disputes by peaceful means. The U.N. has been rightly concerned over any dispute that has broken out in any corner of the world, knowing that a single spark might kindle a world conflagration, and it has taken great pains to heal the breaches and smooth over the controversies. But it has not found it necessary to take any steps to insure, or even to demand, that the incessant threats from Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and others against Israel's peace and existence should be stopped by its members. Twice—in 1951 and in 1956—the Security Council decided that Israel, like any other country, must be assured freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal. A Security Council resolution is not merely a recommendation, like the resolutions of the Assembly; it is binding on all members; yet this decision is openly and constantly violated—and no one has a word to say.

On February 20, 1957, the President of the United States, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, in a broadcast to the American people, following the aftermath of the Sinai campaign, said that the United States recognized that military action against Egypt had resulted from grave and repeated provocations, and noted that Israel forces had been withdrawn from much of the territory they had occupied, though they still remained outside the armistice lines. He declared that if Israel withdrew, the United Nations should see to it that in the Middle East there would be a greater degree of justice and compliance with international law than had been the case prior to the Sinai campaign. I received a letter from the President, in which he stated, among other things:

"It has always been the view of this Government that after the withdrawal there should be a united effort by all of the nations to bring about conditions in the area more stable, more tranquil, and more conducive to the general welfare than those which existed heretofore. * * * Hopes and expectations based thereon were voiced by your Foreign Minister and others. I believe that it is reasonable to entertain such hopes and expectations and I want you to know that the United States, as a friend of all the countries of the area and as a loyal member of the United Nations, will seek that such hopes prove not to be vain."

I had the privilege of knowing General Eisenhower before he became President, and I also had a long talk with him during his term of office on many problems of the area and of the world at large. I know that he is not in the habit of giving promises that he and those he represents do not intend to keep, and I have not the slightest doubt that all his statements, whether by word of mouth or in writing, were made with complete sincerity. But I must point out, with deep regret, that the United Nations did not fulfill the hopes placed in it by the United States, through President Eisenhower, and it cannot be said that the "hopes and expectations" voiced by our Foreign Minister, Mrs. Meir, at the U.N. Assembly at the beginning of March 1957, have been realized.

The sword of Damocles hangs over our heads as before; the Arab League boycott has been intensified; the threats to our survival continue and grow more violent; the leading Arab country, whose "grave and repeated provocations" President Eisenhower stigmatized, continues to violate the U.N. Charter and the decisions of the Security Council, so that not a single Israel ship, or even a foreign ship bound for Israel, can pass through the Suez Canal; from both sides of the cold war barricades there is a constant flow of aid to Egypt: From the one side—the East—aggressive armaments of all types for land, sea and air forces, dedicated to the destruction of Israel, and from the other—the West—enormous sums of money, facilitating the acquisition and utilization of these armaments; moreover, scientists from the West are teaching the Egyptians how to use the most murderous weapons to carry out their designs against Israel, while respected and highly placed officials of the State Department defend these scientists on the ground that but for them their places would be taken by scientists from the East.

In the shadow of these dangers and injustices, Israel perseveres for the 15th year in succession in her arduous and constructive endeavors: the ingathering of the exiles, the conquest of the desert, the advancement of education and science, fraternal cooperation with new and developing states in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The trebling of the population in this small and impoverished country, flowing

with milk and honey but not with sufficient water, rich in rocks and sand dunes but poor in natural resources and vital raw materials, has been no easy task; indeed, practical men, with their eyes fixed upon things as they are, regarded it as an empty and insubstantial utopian dream.

But it seems that, besides the visible material reality, there is also a spiritual reality, which works out of sight. It is this reality that has been on our side and has refuted all the dismal prophecies that the unlimited immigration of improverished masses, untrained and uneducated—as were the great majority of the immigrants during the period of the state, unlike those who came before the dreadful holocaust that destroyed 6 million of the European Jews with their spiritual and material resources—would bring ruin and disaster to the young state. This immigration indeed brought to Israel many sufferers from various diseases from Asian and African countries, but today Israel is in the first rank for expectation of life and birth. It stands at 70.67 years for men and 73.47 for women—which is higher than in the United States, Britain, France, Germany or any of the other highly developed countries, with the exception of the three Scandinavian lands, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and Holland; and our mortality rate is the lowest in the whole world—5.7 per thousand.

In addition to half a million immigrants of European origin, we have absorbed over half a million from Asian and African countries, most of them entirely without capital, skills and education, brought up in backward ghettoes and earning their livings by peddling—and they have created hundreds of villages in Galilee and the Jerusalem Corridor, in the south and the Negev, and built over a score of development towns where they work in every branch of industry and handicrafts, from textiles to electronic and petrochemical manufactures.

On May 15, 1948—the day the state was founded—we had 333 urban and rural settlements; at the end of 1962 the number had risen to about 875. At the first census, on November 8, 1948, the population was 785,678—716,678 Jews and 69,000 Arabs. At the second, on May 22, 1961, the total was 2,179,491—1,932,357 Jews and 247,134 Arabs.

In 1948–49 there were 146,017 pupils—134,887 Jews and 11,130 Arabs—in our entire education system. By 1961–62 the total had grown to 641,986—586,539 Jews and 55,447 Arabs. In post-primary schools (academic, vocational, agricultural and teachers' training colleges) there were 10,945 students, including 14 Arabs, at the establishment of the state, and 77,416 including 1,587 Arabs, in 1961–62.

Every boy and girl between the ages of 5 and 14 is obliged to attend kindergarten (at the age of 5–6) and elementary school (between 6 and 14), and education is free. Secondary education is not yet compulsory or free, but tuition fees are grade according to the financial position of the parents, and poor students receive scholarships from the government.

In 1949 the Weizmann Institute was established in Rehovot for research in all branches of the natural sciences, and its standards are not inferior to those of similar institutions in the most highly developed European countries.

Israel still faces grave educational problems, however, for the gap between the pupils whose parents came from Europe and America and those originating from Asian and African countries is still great; there are considerable economic and cultural differences between children from wealthy and developed countries and those from poor, backward ones, especially as it was the poorest from the latter who came to settle in Israel. Intensive efforts are therefore being made, by lengthening the school day in kindergartens and elementary schools, establishing special schools, building dormitories for talented children from poor and large families, and other means, to close the gap; but, although the results of these efforts are encouraging, we still have a long way to go.

When the State was established, we found ourselves facing economic chaos. The Arab invasion, which was scotched only at the beginning of January 1949, the enormous mass immigration, which brought in some 700,000 immigrants in the first 4 years of the State—more than the entire population on the day it was created—the enormous expense and damage resulting from the war of independence, confronted the young State with appalling economic problems and shortages, which seemed to be almost insoluble. Until the end of the mandate, our country belonged to the sterling area. Our production, agricultural and industrial, depended largely on the presence of the British Army, which consumed but did not produce. There were economic ties of export and import with the neighboring countries. Complete isolation from the neighboring countries when independence came, together with the war and the Arab boycott, on the one hand, and the mass immigration that trebled our population in less than 4 years, on the other, faced us with a growing shortage of housing, food, employment, teachers, schools, and hospitals. A superhuman effort was required to overcome these tremendous shortages, and although we cannot claim to have succeeded 100 percent even at the end of our 15th year, by the end of the first decade we had already broken the back of the crisis. Today all sections of our economy, agriculture and industry, land, sea and air transport, are expanding, branching out into new fields and improving their efficiency; there is full employment in the country, and in some places there is even a shortage of labor.

The state budget, which in 1948–49 stood at I£20,855,000, amounted to I£2,990 million (about $1 billion) in 1963–64.

The cultivated area, which covered some 400,000 acres (of which 75,000 were under irrigation) in 1948–49, totaled almost 1,030,000 acres, of which 380,000 were irrigated in 1962–63. The afforested area increased from 13,000 acres in 1949 to over 80,000 in 1961. In 1949 the Arabs cultivated 85,000 acres; in 1961 they tilled 220,000. There were 681 tractors in the country in 1948 and no less than 7,835 in 1961.

Before the establishment of the state, our industry was concentrated in the narrow coastal strip between Rehovot in the south and Haifa in the north, and was devoted mainly to industries producing for home consumption, such as food, textiles, woodworking, paper and printing; in fact, it was chiefly concerned with the final processing of materials for the local market. During the 15 years of the state, our industry has been comprehensively reorganized. Our output, employment, and exports have grown. New branches have been established: metalworking, chemicals, petrochemical manufactures, electronics, arms manufacture, and their secondary branches, and output in other industries has been increased. In September 1955, oil was first discovered in Israel, in southern Judea, at a depth of 4,905 feet, and in 1957 a rich source of natural gas was found at Zohar, near the Dead Sea. Extensive deposits of phosphates have been discovered in the Negev, and copper mines at Timna, not far from Eilat. After the Sinai campaign, an oil pipeline was laid from Eilat to the refineries which the British left in Haifa.

By the end of 1962 there were 14,500 enterprises in the country, employing almost 200,000 workers, as against 88,000 in 1950. Between the rise of the state and 1962, some I£1,600 million (at 1955 prices) were invested in industry; in 1962 alone I£253 million were invested, as compared with I£85 million in 1959. Industrial output totaled I£500 million in 1962, compared with I£3.5 million, at the same prices, in 1949—an increase of 14 percent per year. Industry had emerged from the narrow limits of the coastal strip, in which it had been confined, expanding northward to Kiryat Shmona and Nahariya, and southward to Kiryat Gat, Ashkelon, Dimona, Mitzpeh Ramon, and Eilat. Industrial exports grew twenty-five fold—from $10.5 million in 1949 to $250 million in 1962–63.

Israel has not yet succeeded, however, in balancing her foreign trade. In 1949, with exports at $28.5 million and imports of $253.2 million, exports were 11 percent of imports. In 1962, the percentage was 46 percent—with $282 million exports and $616 million imports. In absolute terms, therefore, the deficit has increased, but exports per capita grew from $27 in 1949 to $212 in 1962, while the trade deficit per capita fell from $213 to $144.

Productivity of labor in Israel is steadily on the increase, although in most industries it is still lower than that of the most advanced countries in Europe; in others, however, it is approaching American standards of productivity.

Israel's economic and cultural progress is due to three things: the pioneering spirit that inspires the best of our immigrant and Israeli youth, who respond to the challenge of our desolate areas and the ingathering of the exiles; the feeling of Diaspora Jewry that they are partners in the enterprise of Israel's resurgence in the ancient homeland of the Jewish people; and the power of science and technology, which Israel unceasingly—and not without success—tries to enhance.

Israel is aware that she cannot equal other nations in military force, wealth, numbers or material resources, but she believes that there is no impediment to equality with the greatest nations in the world in intellectual capacity and moral standards—the only heritage bequeathed to her by Jewish history, which is imbued with suffering and spiritual valor.

By virtue of the pioneering energies of three generations, Israel is creating new ways of life in agricultural settlement, in cooperative transport on land and sea, and in a considerable part of her industry which is founded on labor partnership and mutual aid. Thus there have been created the hundreds of kibbutzim, smallholders' settlements and cooperatives in urban and interurban transport, shipping and basic industries. The medical services of the Histadrut, the General Federation of Labor, encompass some three-quarters of the nation. The Israel defense forces are dedicated not only to defense against the external enemy, but also to the molding of the human beings assembled from all over the globe into a single national and cultural entity, the welding of the fragments of the nation and its dispersed tribes with bonds of language, culture, and labor, with an understanding of our people's past and its vision for the future. For this purpose a special formation called Nahal (the Hebrew initials of No'ar Halutzi Lohem—Fighting Pioneer Youth) was founded, which has already established 29 kibbutzim and 4 smallholders' villages in the Negev and northern Galilee, most of them border settlements.

The army strives to fructify the desert in both the natural and the human landscape of our country. This is also the central task of the labor federation, which is unique in its organizational structure and methods. It is not only a trade union organization, a cooperative body and an educational institution, but also a league of builders of the homeland and the nation, makers of a new society founded on cooperation and brotherhood.

These special characteristics and creations of Israel have made her a lodestone for the best of the world's Jewish youth, not only from lands of distress and poverty but also from the affluent and prosperous countries. Moreover—and no less important—they have served as a model and example for the states that were established at the same time as Israel and in recent years, as well as for a number of ancient nations, in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

From the very beginning, Israel knew that independence is not the end but only a beginning—a gateway to development and progress, material and spiritual. The new states that have been established by the score in Africa and Asia have learned this truth from their own experience, and most of the problems with which they are wrestling are being solved in Israel. Thus in recent years Israel has become a school for thousands of young people from Asia and Africa, and Israeli instructors in military training, agricultural settlement, health and education have been working in scores of countries in Asia and Africa—and recently in some Latin-American countries as well. Israel does not possess the manpower, the wealth and perhaps the know-how of the United States, or even of the countries of Western Europe—not only of France, Germany, Britain or Italy, but even of Holland, Belgium or the Scandinavian countries. But in her spirit and her pioneering experience in development, education, social organization and health, she is no whit inferior to any country or nation in the world. Thousands of young people, from 36 countries in Africa, 14 in Asia (including India, the Philippines and Japan), and, in recent years, from 20 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as 5 in the Mediterranean basin (Cyprus, Greece, Persia, Turkey and Malta), have come to Israel to study her methods in agricultural settlement, the labor movement, youth education in Nahal and the "Gadna" Youth Corps, vocational training, cooperation, and various branches of science at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the Technion in Haifa and the Weizmann Institute in Rehovot. There are 634 Israeli experts in African countries, 137 in Asia, 75 in the Mediterranean basin and 23 in Latin America.

Israel realizes that her destiny is bound up with that of humanity as a whole, and her safety depends on peace among all the nations. In her own country she strives for the maximum ingathering of the exiles, the fructification and population of the wasteland, economic independence, the advancement of the individual, progress in education and science, and the establishment of a society built on liberty, equality, tolerance, mutual aid and love of humanity, as laid down in her state education law of 1953. In her foreign policy, she aims at maintaining friendly relations with all states, irrespective of their internal regimes, and permanent peace and cooperation with the neighboring countries, for the sake of peace and progress in the Middle East. Israel is convinced that only by closing the material and spiritual gap between the wealthy, highly developed nations and the poor, developing ones, by the establishment of true cooperation between all countries, will peace be established in the world, and she does all in her power to make her modest contribution to this partnership of all mankind.

Day Wielding Club on Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Massillon (Ohio) Evening Independent, who has some wise things to say about the operations of the Post Office Department:

[From the Evening Independent, Massillon Ohio, Apr. 25, 1963]

DAY WIELDING CLUB ON LEGISLATORS

The Post Office Department headed by Postmaster General J. Edward Day, has ordered the 68 largest post offices in the Nation to clamp down on new hirings and overtime pay and to curtail service if necessary.

This so-called economy move came because of cuts being contemplated by Congress in the Post Office Department's budget request for fiscal 1964, starting July 1.

And there folks you have a sample of the kind of pressure budget-cutting Congressmen and Senators are going to face in their efforts to whack sizable amounts out of President Kennedy's requested budget of $98.8 billion for the next fiscal year, the largest budget ever presented by a President in the history of the Nation.

So the pattern shaping up in Washington today—as it has many times in the past when budget cuts were contemplated—is this:

Some Federal cabinet member or head of a department which is facing Congress' pruning knife will up and blast out an order to those in his department to curtail operations drastically, hire no new employees, curtail certain services and inaugurate other economy moves to meet the reductions a mean and pennypinching Congress is contemplating.

So almost before the ink is dry on the department head's curtailment orders, telegrams, phone calls and letters from here, there and everywhere protesting the curtailment, will deluge the Nation's legislators and the poor boys and gals—fearing the loss of a vote or two back home—will make haste to reconsider their drastic "pennypinching" and decide to restore at least 75 to 90 percent of the money they wanted to save.

It's an old technique—as old as the Nation itself—this method of putting the pressure on Congress and once again it will prove that a lot of Americans are not as anxious for budget slashes as they first indicated when the President announced his spending requests.

To say that the budget of the Post Office Department—or any other department of the Federal Government—cannot be cut below the amount asked by the President is pure poppycock.

There has never yet been a budget developed by the bureaucrats in Washington which could not be materially reduced without damaging present Government services one bit.

Budgets are devised to create more spending of taxpayers' money, rather than less.

So when Postmaster General Day sounds off with an order to curtail services in the 68 largest cities in the Nation he is just issuing the first blast in his campaign and those of his bureaucratic associates to bring down the wrath of the people on the heads of the poor Congressmen and Senators who would like to fry the fat out of the budget but who are afraid that in doing so they will find themselves frying in the fat among their constituents back home.

Because it serves all of the people in the country, the Post Office Department has quite a lever to exert on the people. Just think, Day warns, the Postal Department may have to cut out Saturday deliveries entirely unless Congress restores the $92 million it planned to cut from the Department's $4.9 billion spending program for fiscal 1964.

We consider Day's curtailment order so much propaganda and we hope the people of this country take it as such. And we further hope that those budget-paring minded Members of Congress stick to their guns and make the contemplated cuts stick.

That's the only way economy in Government can be reestablished in this Nation and our Federal Government cut down to size so that the billions of dollars received from taxpayers each year will meet the needs of the spenders in Washington.

Now it's going to be interesting to see just what happens during the next few weeks or months. Will Day go through with his threatened curtailments or will our vote-minded Legislators change their views on drastic curtailment of the Kennedy budget and hasten to restore the shekels they have been inclined to whack off the budget?

Unless there has been a great change in thinking among our Legislators in Washington, Mr. Day is going to be the winner and get back most of the money he says he needs.

And the Postal Department will once again wind up in the red as it has in years past, despite recent drastic increases in the cost of postal services.

Law and the Quarantine of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and able legal advisor of the State Department, Abram Chayes, has in a few years in that position compiled an enviable record of great accomplishment including the successful advocacy before the World Court of the U.S. position on the financing of the United Nations activities in the Congo and in Israel. Because I know of his keen mind from the days that we were classmates in law school, I commend to my colleagues Abram Chayes' article in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, entitled, "Law and the Quarantine of Cuba."

LAW AND THE QUARANTINE OF CUBA

(By Abram Chayes)

The Soviet missiles in Cuba were a threat to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere. As such they endan-

gered the peace of the world. The action undertaken against this threat carried its own dangers. But as President Kennedy said on October 22, "the greatest danger of all would be to do nothing."

The course on which he then embarked was successful in securing the removal of offensive weapons from Cuba. This success was due, in the first instance, to the ability and will of this country to enforce the quarantine and to the mobilization of allies and others throughout the world in our support.

The confrontation was not in the courtroom and, in a world destructible by man, a legal position was obviously not the sole ingredient of effective action. We were armed, necessarily, with something more substantial than a lawyer's brief. But though it would not have been enough merely to have the law on our side, it is not irrelevant which side the law was on. The effective deployment of force, the appeal for world support, to say nothing of the ultimate judgment of history, all depend in significant degree on the reality and coherence of the case in law for our action. It is worthwhile, I think, to set out that legal case and to examine some of its implications.

II

The blunt fact of the quarantine is that it involved the use of naval force to interfere with shipping on the high seas, though, to be sure, the carriage of offensive weapons, against which it was directed, was something other than ordinary maritime commerce. Historically, the United States, as a great maritime power, has resisted interference with the freedom of the seas. In 1793, when France and England, struggling for the mastery of Europe, seized and blockaded U.S. shipping, Jefferson wrote:

"Those who choose to live in peace retain their natural right * * * to carry the produce of their industry, for exchange, to all nations, belligerent or neutral, as usual; to go and come freely, without injury or molestation; and, in short, that the war among others shall be, for them, as if it did not exist."

A few years later, British blockades, in defiance of our bitter protests, were one of the causes of the War of 1812, although Britain went far beyond mere blockading. Her warships often stopped American vessels on the high seas, declared without proof that certain crewmen were British deserters, and carried them off in irons. During the undeclared war against France, Joseph Story, then a Harvard student but later to become a Supreme Court Justice and one of our great admiralty lawyers, wrote with perhaps more ardor than poetry:

"Shall Gallia's clan our coast invade,
With hellish outrage scourge the main,
Insult our nation's neutral trade,
And we not dare our rights maintain?"

Less hoary examples could be cited.

When our own wartime necessities were involved, however, we took a different view of the matter. In the Civil War, over strident British objections, President Lincoln declared a blockade of 3,000 miles of southern coastline and sought to prevent any contraband from reaching Confederate hands. On the outbreak of World War II, the same 21 American nations that now make up the Organization of American States, meeting in the first Pan American ministerial conference, identified a zone in the high seas ranging from 300 to 1,200 miles wide which they said was of "primary concern and direct utility in their relations." They declared their right to patrol the zone and keep it free from "the commission of any hostile act by any non-American belligerent nation."

The thrust and counterthrust of 19th-century practice was codified with somewhat illusory precision in the Declarations of Paris in 1856 and London in 1909, dealing with the law of blockade and contraband. As a result, the legal textbooks have a satisfyingly categorical ring. They tell us that a blockade must be declared through competent authority, must be limited to enemy coasts and ports, and must be impartially applied. Most important, the blockade must be effective: the blockading country must have and use the power to enforce it. Similarly, traditional rules of contraband require a proclamation, after which neutral ships can be prevented from aiding the enemy by carrying objectionable goods, a category which, if not overly precise, surely includes weapons.

The rules were designed to minimize disruption of neutral commerce, primarily by limiting the scope of sanctioned interference and by notifying ships and sailors so that they could stay out of harm's way. Mutatis mutandis these aspects of the classical rules were complied with, to like purpose and effect, in the Cuban quarantine.

But there was a further overriding limitation in the traditional rules: they were part of the Law of War which says that only a belligerent in wartime can invoke the right to blockade or search for contraband. Unless nations were at war, there could be no justification for any interference at all with ordinary maritime commerce. Thus some have maintained that everything done in the October crisis would have been legal if only the United States had declared war on Cuba. This may be attractive as a syllogism, but it doesn't have very much to do with law.

The rules of blockade and contraband evolved, like most law, out of the interaction between moral precept, experience, and changing practical necessity. And they reflect rather accurately the shape of the international system—as well as the weapons technology—that prevailed in the last century. Relations between nations were episodic and largely bilateral. When force was applied, it was—at least in theory—a bilateral affair, or at most something between small and temporary groupings of nations on each side. The age of total war was only beginning and there was no general stricture in international law against the use of force as an instrument of state policy.

Resort to force was common enough, however, and was always dangerous enough to provoke rudimentary efforts at regulation. Thus evolved the law of war, a separate legal regime establishing—probably with a good deal more precision and coherence in retrospect than at the time—the rights and obligations of belligerents and neutrals. The declaration of war invoked this special regime. Its legal signification was that the declaring state was prepared to accept its obligations and claim its rights under the law of war. Thereupon, application of force within those confines was legitimate.

III

International law addresses different problems today and there is different legal machinery to deal with them. The overriding object of international law is not to regulate the conduct of war, but to keep and defend the peace. It is no longer possible for any nation to treat war, in Jefferson's words, "as if it did not exist." If nonalinement continues to be a goal for some countries, noninvolvement has become a luxury beyond price. A threat to the peace of any nation is a threat to the peace of all nations, and maintenance of peace has therefore become a collective responsibility. The first quarantine speech, President Franklin Roosevelt's call to "protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease," marked an early recognition of this collective responsibility.

The enduring monument of World War II is the United Nations Charter. It records the judgment of all nations that international law can no longer regard the use of force with benevolent neutrality. In article 2 of the charter, members pledge that they will "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

States living under the regime of that charter can no longer find justification for the use of force in their mere unilateral declaration.

Declarations against war had been known before, but the charter records also the judgment that, if these declarations are to be more than empty promises, collective machinery and processes of enforcement are needed. The United Nations Organization was the primary instrument designed for preserving the peace. Regional organizations, like the OAS, arose to perform the same functions within the area of their competence. These organizations are clothed by their charters with the authority to act collectively against aggression and threats to the peace. Through these collective agencies, worldwide or more restricted in scope, we have hoped to give reality to the pledge to maintain the peace.

The Soviet threat in Cuba was made and answered in the context of this international system. The U.S. response must be judged and justified within that same context. It is wrong, therefore, to view the Cuban crisis as though it were a 19th-century contest between two nations, the United States and Cuba, to be regulated by the traditional rules of blockade and contraband. And it is wrong to view the quarantine as a unilateral use of force by the United States in the course of such a contest.

IV

The charter obligation to refrain from the use of force is not absolute. Article 51, of course, affirms that nothing in the charter impairs "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense." The quarantine was defensive in character and was directed against a threat to the peace. But neither the President in his speech nor the OAS in its resolution invoked article 51.

Obviously, the United Nations itself can sanction the use of force to deal with a threat to the peace. So it did in Korea and in the Congo. But no United Nations organ ordered the quarantine of Cuba.

The quarantine action falls within a third category: action by regional organizations to preserve the peace. The charter assigns an important role to regional organizations in carrying out the purposes of the U.N. article 52(1) prescribes the use of "regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of national peace and security as are appropriate for regional action * * *." Regional organizations are referred to throughout the charter, and all of chapter VIII is devoted to their peace-keeping functions. These provisions were written into the charter with the Inter-American system specifically in mind. Alberto Lleras Camargo, later to be President of Colombia, was chief protagonist in early 1945 of the Act of Chapultepec, which foreshadowed the Rio Treaty, and was head of the committee at San Francisco which dealt with regional organizations a few months later.

The charter reflects the judgment of the world community that collective action is to be preferred to the unrestricted use of force by individual nations. Why? First, members of an organization, in signing its its charter, have assented to its powers and procedures. Second, decisions are made by political processes involving checks and balances and giving assurance that the outcome will reflect considered judgment and broad consensus. These principles can be seen in operation of the Inter-American system.

The assent of the parties to the Rio Treaty is real and significant. Though the present Government of Cuba is now and has been for some time the object of sanctions by the OAS, and has been suspended from participation in its agencies, Cuba as a state has remained a party to the treaties and a member of the Inter-American system, as, in a like case, did the Dominican Republic. The political processes in the Organization of American States are also real. It is not a rubber stamp, despite the disproportion of power between the United States and its neighbors to the south. Not until the danger was clear and present was the necessary majority mustered for the use of force. But when that time came, the vote was unanimous.

The quarantine action was authorized under the Rio Treaty of 1947, whose primary purpose was to organize law-abiding states for collective action against threats to the peace. This treaty, together with related agreements, forms the legal framework of the Inter-American system.

The treaty provides for collective action not only in the case of armed attack but also "if the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected * * * by any * * * fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America * * *." In such cases, a special body, the Organ of Consultation, is to "meet immediately in order to agree on the measures * * * which must be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent." The Organ of Consultation acts only by a two-thirds vote. The treaty is explicit as to the measures which may be taken "for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent." The "use of armed force" is specifically authorized, though "no state shall be required to use armed force without its consent."

On October 23, the Organ of Consultation met, in accordance with the treaty procedures, and considered the evidence of the secret introduction of Soviet strategic nuclear missiles into Cuba. It found that a situation existed which endangered the peace of America. It recommended that member states "take all measures, individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, which they may deem necessary to insure that the Government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet powers military material and related supplies. * * *" The quarantine was imposed in accordance with this recommendation. Indeed, the operative language of the OAS resolution is recited in the President's proclamation, "Interdicting the Carriage of Offensive Weapons to Cuba."

V

Some have asked whether we should not first have gone to the United Nations Security Council, before taking other action to meet the Soviet threat in Cuba. Perhaps in the original conception at San Francisco it was intended that the Security Council would be the agency for dealing with situations of this kind unless it chose to delegate its responsibility. This much may be implicit in article 53, which states: "No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council." The drafters of the charter demonstrated their wisdom, however, by making Security Council responsibility for dealing with threats to the peace primary and not exclusive. Events since 1945 have demonstrated that the Council, like our own electoral college, was not a wholly viable institution. The veto has largely disabled it from fulfilling its intended role in keeping the peace.

This paralysis of the Security Council has led to a reliance on alternative peacekeeping institutions. In the United Nations itself, the General Assembly and the Secretary General have stepped into the gap. Less dramatically, so has the OAS, pursuant to the provisions of chapter VIII of the charter on "Regional Arrangements."

A technical part of this evolution, if a quiet one, has been the construction of article 53 so as to limit its scope. Security Council discussion of sanctions imposed by the OAS against the Dominican Republic and Cuba, as well as the opinion of the International Court of Justice in the United Nations assessment case, have treated enforcement action as a rigorously narrow category. Perhaps more important, the debates in the Security Council in the case of the Dominican Republic revealed a widespread readiness to conclude that the requirement of authorization does not import prior approval, but would be satisfied by subsequent action of the Council, or even by a mere taking note of the acts of the regional organization. In this context, it is important that the Security Council met in emergency session before the quarantine of Cuba went into effect. The Soviet Union introduced a résolution of disapproval, but by general consent it was not brought to a vote.

This narrowing process of interpretation may be resisted by those who seek the comforting certainty of plain meaning in words—forgetting that they are, in Holmes' phrase, the skin of living thought. But surely it is no more surprising to say that failure of the Security Council to disapprove regional action amounts to authorization within the meaning of article 53 than it was to say that the abstention and even the absence of a permanent member of the Security Council met the requirement of article 27(3) for "the concurring votes of the permanent members. * * *"

This interpretation does no violence to the notion of the United Nations as the paramount organization. Regional organizations continue subordinate to the United Nations by the terms of the charter, and, in the case of the OAS, by the terms of the relevant inter-American treaties themselves. Like an individual state, the OAS can be called to account for its action in an appropriate agency of the more encompassing organization. In recognition of this relationship, the President ordered that the Cuban case be put immediately before the Security Council. The United Nations, through the Council and the Secretary General, became actively involved in the effort to develop a permanent solution to the threat to the peace represented by the Soviet nucelar capability in Cuba.

Since World War II, each of the actions to keep the peace—in Korea, in the Middle East, in Lebanon, in the Congo, and now in Cuba—has taken a different operational form. But each of them reflects our conviction that a breach of the peace involves us all and that we must meet it together, through institutions of collective security established for that purpose.

The quarantine, seen in this framework, is a significant addition to the developing body of postwar experience with collective responsibility and collective action to preserve the peace.

Gen. Thomas E. Moore, Commander of Sheppard Air Force Base, is Transferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, announcement was made this week of the departure from Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., of Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, who has been commander there for almost 4 years.

During this period of outstanding service, General Moore has endeared himself to the city of Wichita Falls, Tex., and all the citizens of the area around Sheppard Air Force Base.

Under General Moore's leadership, Sheppard has undergone tremendous change and expansion. Today this Air Force installation stands out as one of the most important in the Nation. It is slated to be space training headquarters for the Air Force. Outstanding facilities, including a new regional Air Force hospital now under construction, have been added under General Moore's leadership.

Even more important, perhaps, there now exists a relationship between the civilian and military community which is unexcelled anywhere. The feeling of harmony and unity of purpose, which has gained national publicity, is largely due to the continuing and dedicated efforts of General Moore and community leaders.

General Moore and his lovely wife will long be remembered in north Texas as dear friends and wonderful citizens. The community, Sheppard Air Force Base, and the Air Force will long remember with pride the service General Moore has rendered.

Following are two articles from the Wichita Falls Times. One, an editorial which appeared on April 30 titled "SAFB Transformed Under General Moore." The other an article announcing his pending departure which appeared in the Times on April 29.

[From the Witchita Falls, (Tex.) Times, Apr. 30, 1963]

SAFB TRANSFORMED UNDER GENERAL MOORE

Wichita Falls and Sheppard Air Force Base will prepare for the departure of Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, who will be leaving after almost four busy years as the commanding general of SAFB, with full appreciation for the unexcelled job he has done.

Since General Moore assumed command of the base August 1, 1959, it has undergone a transformation in mission and in physical assets that has had no equal dating back to the time it was first populated only a few weeks before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, brought the United States into World War II in 1941.

Chief among the changes in mission which have been accomplished as SAFB during the

administration of General Moore are the institution of missile training; the sharing by the Strategic Air Command of the base's facilities, including SAC bomber and refueling operations; and, revealed only last week, the center responsibility for Air Force space technical training to prepare personnel as ground crews for space and launch vehicles.

There are, of course, numerous other revisions in the program which was in existence when General Moore arrived and what is now going on at the base.

In physical facilities and appearance, the transformation has been as remarkable. The new Air Force Regional Hospital, existing only in preliminary planning when General Moore came, has advanced from paper to virtual actuality and will be completed this fall after General Moore leaves for Washington, D.C.

In addition to the regional hospital, extensive expansion of airmen's recreation and entertainment facilities has taken place, millions of dollars have been spent on new permanent buildings and the renovation of existing structures, and base military housing has been both doubled and refurbished.

Not the least of the sweeping physical changes which have been made is the completion of the new runway system and of the Wichita Falls Municipal Airport terminal.

Again, these are mere highlights of the facelifting and the improvement of SAFB which have been finished or undertaken during the command of General Moore.

To realize that all these things have taken place is to appreciate the able leadership which he has demonstrated.

Civilian and military relations have never been better than they have been in the last fours years, and this situation is another tribute to General Moore.

SAFB is an even more valuable part of the Air Force team because of General Moore, and SAFB is an even greater asset to this community because of the contribution made by the team of General Moore and his wife.

General and Mrs. Moore will be leaving this summer, but their contribution to the community, its civilian and its military life, will remain behind as a constant reminder of their all too brief stay.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times Apr. 29, 1963]

GENERAL MOORE TO TAKE PENTAGON POST

(By Katricia Cochran)

Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, commander of Sheppard Technical Training Center, is being transferred to Washington, D.C., where he will be on the headquarters staff at the Pentagon.

General Moore, whose transfer was announced Monday, will assume his new duties as Director of Personnel Planning in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff of personnel at headquarters, U.S. Air Force, July 15, 1963.

He is being replaced by Maj. Gen. Robert M. Stillman, now with the 313th Air Division at Okinawa, who will assume command of Sheppard on August 1.

General Moore, who during his tenure here has proven to be one of the most highly respected and popular commanders the base has had, has led Sheppard through many developments including the growth of the Air Force's missile training for the Atlas and Titan Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles.

LONGEST COMMAND

Commander here since August 1, 1959—longer than any other general officer at Sheppard—General Moore has also proven to be a man who has commanded the respect and admiration of the people of Wichita Falls. He has striven to maintain the cooperative relations between SAFB and the city.

General Moore said Monday that he and Mrs. Moore want to express sincere regrets on leaving the wonderful area of Wichita Falls and the many fine people here.

A veteran of almost 30 years in the service, General Moore was born in Lenoir, N.C., September 19, 1912. He graduated from Mars Hill Junior College in North Carolina in 1932 and entered West Point Preparatory School, Fort McPherson, Ga., as a cadet in July 1933.

PILOT TRAINING

In 1934 he attended primary and basic pilot training at Randolph Field and pursuit training at Kelly Field and the next year was assigned to the famous 1st Pursuit Group at Selfridge Field, Mich.

He was promoted to second lieutenant while stationed at Selridge. From June 1938 until December 1939 he was supply officer and crew commander, 27th Reconnaissance Squadron, Langley Field, Va.; from December 1939 until May 1941 he held the same position at Borinquen Field, Puerto Rico; and from May until September 1941 he was commander of the 5th Reconnaissance Squadron, Borinquen.

From November 1941 until November 1942 he was stationed at Howard Field, Canal Zone.

Then in November 1942 Moore was transferred to the 16th Bomb Wing, Biggs Field, Tex., where in January 1943 he became chief of staff and department wing commander. In October that year he became chief of staff of the 20th Bomber Command at Biggs.

PACIFIC DUTY

He was assigned chief of the operations section of the 21st Bomber Command in India in March 1944, and in February 1945, was named deputy chief of staff for operations of the 58th Bomber Wing in the Marianas Islands in the Pacific; then in December 1945 he was assigned the same post for the same unit at March Air Force Base, Calif.

From May 1946 to August 1946, he was air inspector of the 58th Bomber Wing at Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., and from August 1946 to July 1947, he attended the Air Command and Staff School at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

Serving as commander of the 3380th Technical Training Group at Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., from July 1947 to July 1950, he then attended the Armed Forces Staff College at Norfolk, Va. until March 1951; then, in succession was deputy chief of staff for Operations at South Ruislip, England, April 1951 to April 1954; deputy chief of staff for programing at Scott Air Force Base, Ill., May 1954 to June 1955, and deputy chief of staff for operations at the same station, June 1955 to June 1957; then chief of staff at headquarters of the Air Training Command at Randolph Air Force Base from June 1957 to July 1959, when he was assigned to Sheppard as base commander.

PROMOTIONS

Moore received his temporary second lieutenant commission in February 1936, and his permanent commission August 15, 1939; and his temporary first lieutenant commission in March 1939 and the permanent commission August 14, 1942. He had temporary commissions as a captain on May 4, 1942, as a major on June 25, 1942; a lieutenant colonel January 27, 1943, and a colonel August 19, 1943, before receiving his permanent commission as a lieutenant colonel July 2, 1948, and as a colonel July 23, 1953.

He was promoted to brigadier general December 10, 1955, and to major general August 1, 1956.

His decorations include the Bronze Star, November 6, 1945, the Air Medal, August 13, 1945, the World War II Victory Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Ribbon with five campaign stars, the National Defense Service Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the Legion of Merit, February 7, 1958, plus an oak leaf cluster, March 2, 1960, and the Air Force Longevity Award with one silver oak leaf cluster.

VETERAN FLIER

A command pilot, General Moore has more than 5,000 hours of flying time in jet and conventional type aircraft.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Moore of Route 7, Lenoir, he married the former Miss Alison Henning of Tarpon Springs, Fla., in June 1948. They have two sons, Thomas E., II, 10, and Todd Jay, 8.

While General Stillman is coming to this assignment from the 313th Air Division at Okinawa, he is already known to many Wichitans. He was the Armed Forces Week luncheon speaker in Wichita Falls in 1961 while he was then commander of Lackland Military Training Center.

General Stillman, a 1935 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, returned to the Military Academy each fall from 1937 to 1940 as a member of the football coaching staff. During that time he served with the 50th Reconnaissance Squadron at Hickam Field, Hawaii.

He has also served with the U.S. Air Force Academy. He became commandant of cadets at the Academy in September 1954 and remained there until September 1959 when he assumed command at Lackland Military Training Center.

His decorations include Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and Purple Heart medals.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Praise for Junior Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Hearst newspapers and Qantas Airways are joint sponsors of a contest among the newspaper boys of the Hearst newspapers throughout the country, known as the Junior Diplomat's contest for newspaper boys from 12 to 17½ years old to be given a good will and educational trip to Australia.

The boys selected will act as junior diplomats from our country to Australia.

The winners of the various Hearst papers throughout the country will assemble in and depart from New York City on July 1, 1963, leaving for Australia, stopping at Hawaii, in Nandi in the Fiji Islands, and arriving at Sydney, Australia on July 3, 1963, remaining in Australia until July 10 and returning to the United States and arriving in New York City on July 11, 1963.

In Boston the contest will be conducted by the Boston Record American and Advertiser, the Hearst newspapers in Boston with two of the Hearst newspaper boys from Greater Boston being selected to join with the others selected by other Hearst newspapers throughout the country.

The sponsors of this project are to be congratulated. This project is a constructive one.

The interest in this project is great and the competition among the eligible newsboys keen and active. The committee in various cities making the selection of the winners are outstanding citizens and educators.

For example, in Boston, the committee is Rev. Father Albert W. Low, superintendent of the archdiocese of Boston parochial school system; Dr. Dennis C. Haley, president of Suffolk University, and Dr. Frederick J. Gillis, superintendent of the Public Schools of Boston.

The boys selected will in sense be junior diplomats, ambassadors of good will, and will make a most favorable impression upon the people of Australia.

In my remarks, I include an article written by Tommy Shulman, appearing in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of April 21, 1963, which includes a recorded statement made by me, and also a commendatory resolution adopted by the Boston School Committee.

This fine action on the part of the Hearst organization might prompt other newspapers and organizations to conclude a similar project or competition for trips by American boys to other countries.

The material follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Advertiser, Apr. 21, 1963]

McCORMACK PRAISES JUNIOR DIPLOMATS

(By Tommy Shulman)

JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., has sent his congratulations to the Record American and Sunday Advertiser and Qantas Airlines on the up-and-coming Junior Diplomats trip to Australia.

In a recorded message, featured on the "Newspaperboys' Radio Show," Sunday morning, at 9:30, over radio station WEZE, McCORMACK said:

"It is a great pleasure for me to extend congratulations to the Hearst newspapers, the Boston Record American, and Sunday Advertiser and the Qantas Airlines for offering a program which will give boys 12 to 17½ years of age an opportunity to enjoy all-expense-paid Qantas V-Jet holiday trips to Australia in July.

"The Junior Diplomat trip and the entire program are the most wholesome, educational, and stimulating of youth activities.

"I am quite familiar with the Record American and Sunday Advertiser newspaperboys Sunday morning radio show over WEZE, for I have appeared as a guest on several occasions and have enjoyed the talent of the young salesmen. It was also my privilege to call to the attention of Congress this youth building project and I am happy to say that my comments were written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I understand that the radio show is now observing its 25th year of broadcasting and I extend my heartiest best wishes for many more years of radio broadcasting.

"The world today is looking toward youth for ultimate leadership and the Junior Diplomats of today will be the senior statesmen of tomorrow.

"I congratulate the Hearst newspapers, the Record American and Sunday Advertiser for this wonderful project, which will mean so much in creating good will, not only between the people of America but the youth of America and the people and particularly the youth of Australia."

Newspaperboys David Humphrey, Joseph Saporito, Richard Murphy, Robert Baratta, and John Jones had their Junior Diplomats contest brochures autographed by McCORMACK and then presented their guest with an honorary membership card in the Newspaperboys Club.

[From the Boston Record American, Apr. 16, 1963]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the security of our country depends, in great measure, upon maintaining cordial relations with friendly nations throughout the world; and

Whereas the Hearst Corp. and the Qantas Airways have seen fit to promote the spirit of good will between our country and the Commonwealth of Australia: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Boston School Committee commends the Boston Record American, the Sunday Advertiser, the American Weekly, and Qantas Airways for their joint sponsorship of a contest among the newspaper boys of the Hearst newspapers which will allow two boys to be junior ambassadors of good will on a 2-week trip to the Commonwealth of Australia. This undertaking will be of great educational value to the winners of the contest and, through the exchange of ideas, will help to continue the already happy relationship we enjoy with that great nation down under; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be inscribed on the permanent records of the Boston School Committee and that a copy be sent to the Hearst Corp. and the Qantas Airways.

Sinkiang: A Sino-Soviet Trouble Spot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Military Review, a publication of the U.S. Command and General Staff College at Leavenworth, Kans., has printed in the April issue a very interesting article entitled "Sinkiang: A Sino-Soviet Trouble Spot?" This article which was written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., raises some very important points about the little-heard-of country of Sinkiang and the important role which it could play on the international scene. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Military Review, April 1963]

SINKIANG: A SINO-SOVIET TROUBLE SPOT?

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(Anthony Harrigan is director, Foreign Policy Research Institute of South Carolina. Educated at Kenyon College and the University of Virginia, he saw service in World War II. Mr. Harrigan is associate editor with the News and Courier of Charleston, and is a frequent contributor to military journals both here and abroad.)

In view of the current disagreement between the Soviet Union and Communist China, it is time that students of military affairs take a look at the Sino-Soviet border area in central Asia. It is not outside the realm of possibility that some form of armed conflict may take place along this border in the years ahead.

"To outsiders," E. K. Faltermayer of the Wall Street Journal said recently, "the possibility of Red China encroaching on Soviet territory might seem remote. It doesn't to many Russians." The fact is that Red China, with upward of a half billion people and deficient in materials needed for industrial production, long has looked on the Soviet Far East with covetous eyes. Asiatic Russia has vast deposits of coal, enormous forests, diamonds, gold, abundant supplies of nonferrous metals, and considerable hydroelectric power production.

The Sino-Soviet frontier is approximately 4,000 miles long, a much longer boundary than any shared by other nations in the world. It extends from the Sea of Japan in the east to the Pamir Mountain Range near India's northwest frontier.

On the Chinese side of the border are Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, and Sinkiang. Across the border are the Soviet territories of Kazakhstan, Tadzhikistan, Kirghizia, and the region known as the Soviet Far East.

Whatever settlement is made of ideological disputes between the Soviet Union and Red China, nationalistic ambitions for territory seem certain to remain constant. Indeed, in appraising Communist China, it would be a grave mistake to overlook traditional Chinese ambitions in central Asia.

The late George E. Sokolsky, who lived in China for many years and who also was familiar with Asiatic Russia, wrote in May 1962 that:

"Red China plans to expand China to the Ch'ien Lung Line which means * * * that its actual territorial control would have a line from Turkistan to the Bay of Bengal."

This means that China's ambitions would extend westward to a region not remote from the Soviet's Caspian Sea.

Ch'ien Lung, who was cited by Mr. Sokolsky, lived from 1711 to 1799. For much of his lifetime he devoted himself to conquering new territories for China. It was during his reign that China expanded to her greatest extent and, it has been said, Mao Tse-tung's ambition is to restore China to the limits of Ch'ien Lung's empire.

SOVIET INTEREST

The Sino-Soviet border area has a long history of strife. As early as 1643, the Russians occupied the area west and east of Lake Baikal.

But the big Russian drive came in the 19th century. Prior to 1858, four divisions of what is now the Soviet Far East—the Maritime and Khabarovsk regions and the Amur and Sakhalin Provinces—belonged to China. In that year Count N. Muravičev-Amurski, governor general of eastern Siberia, fixed the Russo-Chinese border along the Amur and its right bank territory. Between 1858 and 1860, Russia forced China to cede the above-named territories. The Soviet Government proved no less interested in Asia, and Sino-Soviet border incidents continued after the 1917 revolution.

Japan's expansion onto the Chinese mainland resulted in serious trouble between Soviet and Japanese armed forces. In 1938 and 1939 the Soviet and Japanese Armies tested each other in two full-scale battles along the Manchurian border.

It is interesting to note that the Soviets supported a faction of nationalists in Sinkiang during the 1940's in an effort to establish an independent eastern Turkistan Republic, a satellite they envisioned as being similar to the Mongolian People's Republic. The "liberation army" of this Chinese secessionist group was led by a Soviet Army officer. But with the success of the Communist power drive in China in the late 1940's, the Sino-Soviet border difficulties came temporarily to a halt.

POSSIBLE DIFFICULTIES

If there are to be fresh difficulties in the future, it is likely that they will take place in Sinkiang. To understand why this is so, one has only to look at a map and follow the Sino-Soviet border.

In the east there are substantial populations and a condition of widespread and thorough settlement. Any Chinese encroachment near the Soviet's Pacific frontier would be sure to escalate into a major conflict because the conditions are not unlike border conditions in Europe.

Then, for approximately 2,000 miles, Chinese and Soviet territories are separated by the buffer state of Mongolia. This land is as Poland was to Russia and Germany in prewar days.

West of Mongolia is Sinkiang, where Soviet and Chinese territories meet in the great Altai range of red sandstone mountains. Continuing southwest along the border, one finds the Dzungarian Basin with an elevation of 600 to 1,500 feet completely ringed by mountains of the Tien Shan Range. Located here is the historic Dzungarian Gate, the ancient highway from China to the Kazakh Steppes and the Volga. The Tien Shan, with peaks over 20,000 feet high, snowfields, and glaciers, separates this area from the Tarim Basin to the south. Proceeding southwest along the Sino-Soviet border, one continues in a mountainous region. These mountains meet and join the mountains along the Afghan and Pakistan-Indian borders.

In short, this part of the Sino-Soviet border is very close to a region where Chinese imperialism is now being manifested; Red China's conquest of Tibet also emphasizes the long range, continuing interest of the Peiping regime in conquering lands to the west.

BORDERLAND

The name Sinkiang means borderland. A former province of China, it today bears the name "Sinkiang Autonomous Region." The territory is 660,977 square miles in size, with a population (as of 1958) of almost 6 million. Uighurs, a Moslem Turkic-speaking people, comprise 75 percent of the population; the Kazakh, people related to the Kazakhs across the border in the Soviet Union, comprise the second largest ethnic group.

The Uighurs are agricultural people settled in oases along the northern edge of the Tien Shan where it borders the Dzungarian Basin. The Kazakhs are nomadic herders who graze their livestock in the Dzungarian pasturelands. At last report, approximately 300,000 Chinese were in Sinkiang; they are government officials, military personnel, merchants, and professional workers.

Sinkiang's economy is chiefly agricultural, and grain crops and cotton are planted extensively. Development of irrigation after 1949 brought new areas under cultivation. In addition, about 60 percent of Red China's wool comes from Sinkiang. Oil was found in 1960 and prospecting is continuing for tungsten and other nonferrous metals. A major rail line crossing Sinkiang from Kansu Province to the junction of Aktongai on the Turksib railroad in the Soviet Union was opened for service in the early 1960's.

Across the Sinkiang border in the Soviet Union is the same kind of mountainous, wild country. Most of Kirghizia, the Soviet Republic of central Asia west of the Takla Makan Desert, is above 5,000 feet. In the Kazakh region to the north, anti-Russian guerrilla warfare flourished for many years.

CLASSICAL CONFLICT

Clearly, the Sinkiang border constitutes a region ideally made by nature and history for classic central Asian border warfare. In the mountains and deserts, Red China and the Soviet Union could duel as China and India have dueled. Conflict could take place without any formal declaration or without a major war resulting. Moreover, the empty lands of Sinkiang, with a border cutting through mountainous country, afford Red China wide opportunities for making threats with the Chinese population bomb. If Red China were to move large numbers of Chinese into this remote western territory, it would be the greatest kind of threat to the Soviets and one most difficult to counteract.

Soviet fear of this population bomb was in existence even before the present Chinese regime took power. Throughout the Stalin era, as well as during the Khrushchev years, the Soviet Government has put heavy stress on developing the lands opposite Sinkiang. This concern for building up the Soviet population in Asiatic Russia is evidenced in the following figures: In 1926 the population of the Soviet Far East was 1,200,000; by 1959 the total had risen to 4,300,000.

Sizable cities also are growing up in the area. Alma-Ata, located in the Tien Shan Range west of Sinkiang, had 455,000 people in 1959 and specializes in production of heavy machinery.

DIFFERING MAPS

One indication of potential trouble to come between the Soviet Union and Red China may be found in the maps prepared by the two countries. On these maps the Sino-Soviet border is often 60 miles apart; the disputed territory totals more than 25,000 square miles. In this connection it is appropriate to bear in mind that the mountain warfare between Red China and India had its alleged beginning in controversy over border positions.

Thus it would appear that if there is an increase in Red Chinese aggravation with the Soviet Union sufficiently great to lead to some form of overt action or pressure, it is almost certain to result in difficulties somewhere along the 4,000-mile border. Sinkiang is the most likely spot for action or pressure to be exerted.

Ten Milestones in Negro History After the Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the "Ten Milestones in Negro History After the Emancipation Proclamation" as cited in a special issue of the Cook County Bar Association News.

Edward B. Toles, distinguished Chicago lawyer, a former president of the Cook County Bar Association and the editor of its publication, in sending me a copy of this unusually interesting and informative issue, writes:

Our association has dedicated the enclosed special issue of the Cook County Bar Association News to Law Day, U.S.A., and also in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Emancipation Proclamation are milestones in the history of our beloved Nation, but the administration of President Kennedy and the constant intervention of the Justice Department for the protection of the basic doctrines of the liberties and rights under law of the Negro citizen, have given greater meaning and vitality to the Constitution and injected fiber and character to the fundamental paramount law of the Nation.

We are grateful for your interest in the Negro lawyer, and would appreciate your insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the "Ten Milestones in Negro History After the Emancipation" from the bar news.

The text referred to follows:

TEN MILESTONES IN NEGRO HISTORY AFTER THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

I

The reconstruction amendments

The 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution are commonly known as the reconstruction amendments, inasmuch as they followed the Civil War. Postbellum legisatures there—Mississippi, South Carolina, Georgia, for example—had set up laws which, it was charged, were contrived to perpetuate Negro slavery under other names.

"ARTICLE XIII

"Slavery abolished

"The following amendment was proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the 38th Congress (Feb. 1, 1865), and was declared to have been ratified in a proclamation by the Secretary of State (Dec. 18, 1865). It finally was ratified by 33 of the 36 States.

"The amendment when first proposed by a resolution in Congress, was passed by the Senate, 38 to 6, on April 8, 1864, but was defeated in the House, 95 to 66 on June 15, 1864. On reconsideration by the House, On January 31, 1865, the resolution passed, 119 to 56. It was approved by President Lincoln on February 1, 1865, although the Supreme Court had decided, in 1798, that the President has nothing to do with the proposing of amendments to the Constitution, or their adoption.

"1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

"2. Congress shall have power by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article.

"ARTICLE XIV

"Citizenship rights not to be abridged

"The following amendment was proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the 39th Congress (June 16, 1866), and was declared to have been ratified in a proclamation by the Secretary of State (July 28, 1868). The amendment got the support of 23 Northern States; it was rejected by Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and 10 Southern States. California took no action. Subsequently it was ratified by the 10 Southern States. Delaware ratified it February 1901, Maryland ratified it April 4, 1959.

"The 14th amendment was adopted only by virtue of ratification subsequent to earlier rejections. Newly constituted legislatures in both North Carolina and South Carolina, respectively (July 4 and 9, 1868), ratified the proposed amendment, although earlier legislatures had rejected the proposal. The Secretary of State issued a proclamation, which, though doubtful as to the effect of attempted withdrawals by New York and New Jersey, entertained no doubt as to the validity of the ratification by North and South Carolina. The following day (July 21, 1868), Congress passed a resolution which declared the 14th amendment to be a part of the Constitution and directed the Secretary of State so to promulgate it. The Secretary waited, however, until the newly constituted legislature of Georgia had ratified the amendment, subsequent to an earlier rejection, before the promulgation of the ratification of the new amendment.

"1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

"Apportionment of Representatives in Congress

"1. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

"Power of Congress to remove disabilities of United States officials for rebellion

"3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector or President and Vice President or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

"What public debts are valid

"4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for service in suppressing insurrection and rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

"5. The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

"ARTICLE XV

"Equal rights for white and colored citizens

"The following amendment was proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the 40th Congress (February 26, 1869), and was declared to have been ratified in a proclamation by the Secretary of State (March 30, 1870). It was ratified by 31 of the 37 States, and was rejected by California, Delaware (March 18, 1869), ratified (February 1901), and Kentucky, New York rescinded its ratification (January 5, 1870). New Jersey rejected it in 1870, but ratified it in 1871. Oregon ratified it February 24, 1959.

"1. The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

(The text above written about the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments is reprinted by courtesy of the New York World Telegram and the Sun, World Almanac, 1962, p. 622.)

2

Organization of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1909, and the National Urban League in 1910.

3

Executive Order No. 8802 issued by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 25, 1941, to insure merit employment in industries with Government contracts, and which paved the way for postwar fair employment practices legislation by 21 States.

4

Executive Order No. 9981 issued by President Harry S. Truman on July 26, 1948, which called for the racial desegregation of the Armed Forces.

5

The decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, declaring the fundamental principle that racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional and May 31, 1955, reversing and remanding to "district courts to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases." Decisions of the Supreme Court from 1955 through 1963 with similar declarations following the May 17, 1954, ruling in the areas of interstate transportation, restrictive covenants in housing, voting district discrimination, southern lunch counter sit-in movements and demonstrations against racial segregation (February 25, 1963).

6

Federal appointments by President John F. Kennedy of first Negro Federal district court judges; first Negro Federal district attorneys in Cleveland and San Francisco; first Negro Commissioner, District of Columbia; first Negro Federal Trade Commissioner; second Negro marshal, District of Columbia; Negro Ambassadors to Norway, Niger, and Finland; first Negro postmaster of a major metropolitan city; second Negro judge of U.S. Court of Appeals; and Negro Administrator of Housing and Home Federal Agency. Actions by President Kennedy's Committee on Equal Employment and Opportunity in hiring by the Federal Government of Negroes and their promotion to middle-level white collar and top executive posts in the Federal service; the impetus given the fight for equality by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and the actions of the Justice Department intervention in voting cases under the 1960 Civil Rights Act, interstate transportation cases, and the desegregation of schools including the James Meredith case at Oxford, Miss., and the Albany, Ga., mass protest movement.

7

Executive order, November 20, 1962, issued by President John F. Kennedy prohibiting discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin in housing financed by direct Federal loans or grants and by loans guaranteed or insured by the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, Farmers Home Administration, and future urban renewal projects.

8

Proposed constitutional amendment, 1962: The 87th Congress proposed to the legislatures of the 50 States the following amendment to the Constitution:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to endorse this article by appropriate legislation."

(Illinois on November 14, 1962 became the first State to ratify the anti-poll-tax amendment; it was a repetition of history for on February 1, 1865, during the Civil War, Illinois was the first State to ratify the 13th amendment outlawing slavery. Four States

have now ratified the proposed anti-poll-tax amendment with New York's approval in February 1963.)

9

The centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation was celebrated at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., on Saturday, September 22, 1962. Before thousands, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Federal Judge Thurgood Marshall, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, Allan Nevins, the historian, Chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission, and Mahalia Jackson, famed Negro singer, appeared on the program.

President John F. Kennedy presented the following anniversary message:

"I take great pleasure in greeting you on this centennial commemoration of one of the most solemn moments in American history. One hundred years ago today Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. He thereby began the process which brought a final end to the evil of human slavery, which wiped out from our Nation what John Quincy Adams called the great stain upon the North American Union.

"But the Emancipation Proclamation was not an end. It was a beginning. The century since has seen the struggle to convert freedom from rhetoric to reality. It has been in many respects a somber story. For many years progress toward the realization of equal rights was very slow.

"A structure of segregation divided the Negro from his fellow American citizen. He was denied equal opportunity in education and employment. In many places he could not vote. For a long time he was exposed to violence and to terror. These were bitter years of humiliation and deprivation.

"Looking back at this period, one must observe two remarkable facts. The first is that, despite humiliation and deprivation, the Negro retained his loyalty to the United States and to democratic institutions. He showed this loyalty by brave service in two World Wars, by the rejection of extreme or violent policies, by a quiet and proud determination to work for long-denied rights within the framework of the American Constitution.

"The second is that, despite deprivation and humiliation, the Negro has never stopped working for his own salvation. There is no more impressive chapter in our history than the one in which our Negro fellow citizens sought better education for themselves and their children, built better schools and better housing, carved out their own economic opportunity, enlarged their press, fostered their arts, and clarified and strengthened their purpose as a people.

"In doing these things, the Negroes enlisted the support of many of their fellow citizens both North and South. But the essential effort, the sustained struggle was borne by the Negro alone with steadfast dignity and faith. And in due course the effort had its results.

"The last generation has seen a belated, but still spectacular, quickening of the pace of full emancipation. Twenty-five years ago the Nation would have been unbelieving at the progress to be made by the time of this centennial, progress in education, in employment, in the evenhanded administration of justice, in access to the ballot, in the assumption of places of responsibility and leadership in public and private life.

"It has been a striking change, and a change wrought in large measure by the courage and perseverance of Negro men and women. It can be said, I believe, that Abraham Lincoln emancipated the slaves, but that, in this century since, our Negro citizens have emancipated themselves.

"And the task is not finished. Much remains to be done to eradicate the vestiges of discrimination and segregation, to make equal rights a reality for all our people, to fulfill finally the promises of the Declaration of Independence. Like the proclamation we celebrate, this observance must be regarded not as an end, but a beginning.

"The best commemoration lies not in what we say today, but in what we do in the days and months ahead to complete the work begun by Abraham Lincoln. 'In giving freedom to the slaves,' President Lincoln said, 'we assure freedom to the free.' In giving rights to others which belong to them, we give rights to ourselves and to our country."

February 12, 1963. President Kennedy at the White House in an unprecedented observance of the 154th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, received 1,000 guests at a reception. The Commission on Civil Rights created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, presented to the President a 207-page report, "Freedom to the Free" on civil rights progress in the last century. In accepting the report Mr. Kennedy said: "We still have some length to go." He said that while the American Negro had suffered many setbacks, he could take "some satisfaction in the record of the last 100 years."

10

The U.S. Supreme Court in *NAACP v. Button* rendered on January 14, 1963, one of the greatest opinions on civil rights for the Negro and particularly the Negro lawyer in history—freedom of speech. The Court held unconstitutional a Virginia race-litigation statute which prohibited the NAACP from encouraging Negroes to challenge racial discrimination through litigation financed by the NAACP and handled by NAACP attorneys. Because of the importance of this opinion to Negro lawyers during the centenary of the Proclamation, we are especially pleased to reprint the opinion in full.

West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the poet laureate of West Virginia, Roy Lee Harmon, has remarked that today the world is whizzing so fast that nobody wants to slow down and think—and read poetry.

Nevertheless, Mr. Harmon continues to tell the story of the Mountain State in Verse, for those who will take the time to stop and read it. His poem called "West Virginia" describes the heritage of freedom our montaineer ancestors bequeathed us. It was printed in the Raleigh Register of Beckley, W. Va., on April 8, 1963.

Because this heritage is important to all of us, I ask unanimous consent that the poem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA

(By Roy Lee Harmon)

This was no land for lily-fingered men
  Who bowed and scraped and danced a neat quadrille,
In towns and cities far beyond the ken
  Of mountaineers—who loved each rock and rill.

It was a place for lean, tall men with love
  For freedom flowing strongly in their veins,
For those attuned to vagrant stars above,
  To rugged peaks, deep snows and June-time rains.

And so our State was whelped in time of strife
  And cut its teeth upon a cannon ball;
Its heritage was cleaner, better life,
  Within the richest storehouse of them all.

With timber, oil and gas and salt and coal,
  It bargained in the world's huge market-place.
The mountain empire reached a mighty goal;
  It never ran a pauper's sordid race.

And best of all, it sired a hardy flock
  Whose fame will grow with centuries to be,
Tough as a white-oak stump or limestock rock,
  The mountaineers—who always shall be free.

Exchange of Letters on the Balance of Payments With Secretary of the Treasury Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 I addressed a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, making certain observations about special transactions devised by the administration in order to show an apparent improvement in the balance of payments in 1962, as well as to ease the immediate problem of the outflow of gold. It was my conclusion that without the use of these new and unique transactions—which in my opinion constitute a form of borrowing from the future—the balance of payments in 1962 might have shown a deficit of from $3 to $3.6 billion, instead of the $2.2 billion deficit actually recorded. I am not condemning the use of these techniques, but I hope that complete information about them can be put on the record so that the Congress can judge their usefulness as well as what real improvement in our balance of payments may have taken place over the past several years.

Secretary Dillon has now responded to my letter and affirmed that my understanding of these transactions is correct. However, because the Secretary's letter sheds little light on these transactions, I have written to him again, asking for additional information. In order that those who are interested in this problem have the benefit of the information and comments contained in the correspondence, I have asked unanimous consent that the exchange of letters between myself and the Secretary be included in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Part of the reason for the apparent improvement in the U.S. balance of payments over the past 2 years

has been advance debt repayments by foreign governments of about $700 million in both 1961 and 1962. To the extent that advance repayments improve our current payments position, they eliminate a source of balance-of-payments credits in future years when the debts normally would have been paid. In this sense, foreign debt prepayments represent borrowing from the future.

It is my understanding that in 1962 the administration began using a number of additional techniques based upon the same principle of borrowing from the future in order to improve the current balance-of-payments position. Without the use of these new techniques, excluding debt prepayments, it is my impression that the balance-of-payments deficit in 1962 would have been as much as $3 billion, instead of the $2.2 billion reported. If debt prepayments also are considered, the deficit would have been over $3.6 billion or about as much as the average in the 1958–60 period.

Since these techniques have received little or no public attention, there is a widespread impression that our balance-of-payments position is steadily improving. In order that the Congress and the public have a clear idea of what progress actually is being made, I wish to set forth my understanding of these techniques and to ask for your comment.

One of the new techniques being employed is the sale to foreign governments of nonmarketable U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies. This technique accounted for an improvement in the balance-of-payments last year of $250 million. In 1963, an additional $279 million of these obligations have been sold. When these obligations are finally paid off, there will be an equivalent debit item in our balance-of-payments.

Another new technique which temporarily improved the balance-of-payments in 1962 by as much as $460 million, was the firm commitment of foreign funds for military purchases in the United States. This was achieved when the German Government, on January 1, 1962, deposited this amount to the credit of the U.S. Government. These funds, which were set aside for the eventual purchase of military supplies and equipment, thus showed up as a credit in the U.S. balance-of-payments in advance of firm orders for the equipment and supplies. Normally the German payments would have appeared as a credit only after the equipment and supplies had been actually ordered or delivered. To the extent that this is the case, any improvement in the balance-of-payments in 1962 from this source was at the expense of the balance-of-payments in a later year.

Finally, the balance of payments appears improved by about $100 million because the United States has paid its subscriptions to certain international organizations as they came due, not in dollars, but in non-interest-bearing, nonmarketable securities. Sometime in the future, the international organizations will exchange these for dollars. In other words, the debit in our international payments represented by these subscriptions has been postponed from 1962 until a subsequent year.

I will appreciate having your comments on these observations.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

WASHINGTON, *D.C.*,
April 11, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I am happy to reply to your letter of April 2.

The data on special transactions as given in your letter are of course correct. As you may know, the March 1963 issue of the Commerce Department's Survey of Current Business, published in the past few days, notes these various factors and discusses their effect on our balance of payments. Through this and other means we would hope that such information is receiving wide circulation, and thus helping to bring to the public generally a full appreciation of our balance-of-payments problem.

The receipt items you mentioned in your letter reduced our liquid liabilities to foreigners. The overall balance-of-payments deficit, measuring our gold losses and the changes in our liquid liabilities to foreigners, reflected this situation accordingly. The $100 million outpayments item, representing certain subscriptions to international organizations in the form of non-interest-bearing notes, appears as a capital outflow in the balance of payments but will affect the deficit or change our liquid liabilities only when and as it is converted to dollars and spent abroad rather than in the United States.

There are, of course, special factors of this or other kinds almost every year. Very often, as you know, the comments that accompany publication of the balance-of-payments schedule call special attention to these items affecting individual categories or the payments schedule as a whole. You will recall the large amount of sales of jet aircraft and cotton sales in 1960 which was noted, at that time, as giving exports an unusual boost over the previous year. In 1959, a number of special factors were noted and included in the $435 million of debt prepayments which helped reduce the deficit that year.

In my view, these special transactions should not be considered as borrowing from the future. There are a number of contingent items which, in some sense, relate to the future both on the assets and on the liabilities side. For example, our balance-of-payments deficit does not take into account the claims we are accumulating from the large outflows of U.S. capital, and such claims on the asset side are not stressed. Insofar as military offset arrangements are concerned, including advanced military payments, they do reduce the liquid liabilities of the United States since the funds are earmarked mainly against firm orders and are solely for military purchases in the United States. They represent, of course, the result of our efforts to offset our military expenditures abroad by specific arrangements for increased sales to those countries of U.S. military equipment.

But, in my view, the important and significant question deserving particular attention involves the amount of our payments balance that must be financed in one way or another over a given period. This question of financing seems to me to focus attention on the present problem and to center concern properly on the need to effect those correctives which alone can provide real and lasting improvement.

As you are aware, we are pressing forward on all fronts to gain those correctives; we shall, indeed we must, gain them. But the process will take time and the objective of a balanced payments position cannot be predated in any precise sense. This is so because we rely on the operation of free markets. The program we follow includes such fundamental factors as responsible public and private effort to restrain wage and price levels, the appropriate influence of interest rate levels, export expansion and the fostering of an increasingly favorable investment climate at home.

While these forces continue to work to correct the situation, we have taken various measures both to curb Government spending of dollars abroad and to meet financing needs. In bridging the gap before balance is attained in ways consistent with a free trade and payments system, a whole complex of arrangements has been devised to assure that confidence in the payments system and in the U.S. dollar are maintained. I think that our efforts along this line have been quite successful in preventing speculative outbursts and in avoiding any disorderly exchange markets. This was the experience at the time of the stock market disturbances last spring, during the Canadian exchange crisis, and again during the Cuban showdown last year. In the process, the payments system has been buttressed by a series of financial arrangements designed to forestall or cope with any such pressures.

We must, of course, continue every urgent effort to overcome our balance-of-payments problem and thus, to bring to a halt the persistent deficits that have characterized our payments position for too many years. With this thought that your letter conveys, I most heartily agree.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of April 11 in which you comment on questions about certain special transactions in our balance of payments which I raised in a letter to you of April 2.

I have noted the article in the March issue of the Survey of Current Business to which you referred. While passing reference was made to the special transactions in which I am interested, both the article and your letter do little more than arouse in me a desire to know much more about them.

I am, of course, pleased to know that my general understanding of these transactions is correct, but I would appreciate it if you could send me detailed information about them and the underlying circumstances. The specific transactions in which I am interested include:

1. The sale to foreign governments of nonmarketable U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies;

2. The advance commitment of foreign funds for military purchases in the United States; and

3. The net transfer of non-interest-bearing, nonmarketable securities to certain international organizations as part of our capital subscriptions pending their need for cash.

Besides detailed information on these transactions, I would like the Treasury's estimate of what the balance-of-payments deficit would have been in 1962 without the use of these techniques as well as without the use of foreign debt prepayments.

In addition, I would like to know how the use of each of these techniques in 1962 will affect our balance of payments in later years.

Finally, with regard to (1) above, I would appreciate knowing the authority under which the Treasury is incurring nondollar debt and how this nondollar debt relates to the debt ceiling.

You make the point in your letter that "a whole complex of arrangements has been devised to assure that confidence in the payments system and in the U.S. dollar are maintained." It is precisely this "complex of arrangements" that interests me and that prompted my earlier letter.

It strikes me that unlike other special factors which affect the balance of payments almost every year, to which you referred, the special transactions about which I asked were devised by the administration in order to create an apparent improvement in the balance of payments in 1962 as well as to ease the immediate problem of the outflow of gold.

It is my impression, therefore, that the conscious use by the administration of

these special transactions reduced our balance-of-payments deficit significantly below what it would have otherwise been. Because of the nature of these transactions, it is also my impression that—like foreign debt prepayments—they represent a form of borrowing from the future.

I do not say that these transactions are undesirable. But I do believe that much more needs to be known about them before a judgment can be made and before it is clear what real improvement, if any, has been made in solving our balance-of-payments problem.

In view of the national interest in maintaining confidence in the dollar, I understand that this may be a sensitive area. At the same time, however, I believe that a clearer understanding of these transactions and their effects is important for the development of sound public policy.

As you know, the Joint Economic Committee is scheduling full committee hearings on the balance of payments next month or early in June. Your response to this letter and the testimony which will be given at these hearings should serve the highly useful function of shedding some needed light on these subjects.

With best wishes,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Fred Lange of Dallas Spreads Good Work of Community Chest in Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, my friend, Mr. Fred Lange, internationally known leader in the community chest movement has received much highly deserved recognition for his work with the executives and volunteers of the community chest of Greater Manila, Philippines, Geelong, Australia, and Auckland, New Zealand.

Mr. Lange was assigned to this responsible role as a part of the State Department's cultural exchange program. Because of the continuing significance of Mr. Lange's remarks and the importance of the community chest's programs throughout the world, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, this copy of the address which he delivered on his visits to these countries which I have mentioned, in July and August of 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY FREDERICK M. LANGE, L.H.D., EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, DALLAS COMMUNITY CHEST TRUST FUND BEFORE THE EXECUTIVES AND VOLUNTEERS OF THE COMMUNITY CHEST OF GREATER MANILA, PHILIPPINES, GEELONG, AUSTRALIA, AND AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND, JULY–AUGUST 1962

(Dr. Lange spoke at the invitation of leaders in these countries under the auspices of our State Department's cultural exchange program. He is considered one of America's foremost leaders and authorities in social welfare fundraising.)

I am very happy to have this opportunity to address you ladies and gentlemen on this important occasion.

In my various travels across the United States, and my visits to a number of countries throughout the world, I have always been impressed with one thing—the cement that binds all peoples together—and that is our common humanity.

My feelings have always been that no matter what our political, sociological, racial, or religious differences might be, there is one common denominator for all people—need, want, the care of children. These needs are basically the same in Dallas and in your community. The full range of these needs can be divided into four groups.

First of these four categories relates to dependency, or the need for basic living essentials—food, shelter, and clothing.

The second category relates to health or the need for necessary medical care.

The third category relates to social adjustment, or the need for counseling or guidance services for personal difficulties.

The fourth category relates to recreation, or the need to provide leisure time, adult education, and recreational activities, so that people can refresh themselves and maintain mental health.

The aim of every social welfare program is to meet all four of these basic needs. The important thing to my mind is that we should emphasize the value of our services in terms of human needs, for this alone gives significance to what we are trying to do.

We look upon such programs as an investment in people, an investment which will strengthen them, not only to lessen their later dependence on welfare services, but to increase their ability to live happier, more productive lives, from which they and the people around them will benefit.

Under the system of government by which we live, everybody has the right to be somebody. Every person is an individual and wants to be known and treated as an individual. These days we have made a great deal of efficient mechanics in philanthrophy, and rightly so, but let's never forget that in philanthropy as in every other walk of life, you cannot get away from the individual.

There was a time when philanthropy was looked upon as persons of means giving charity to the poor, unfortunate and downtrodden. I believe the community chest has played an important role in raising the whole concept of philanthropy to a higher level.

The community chest is not facts and figures and budgets and quotas. It is warm live human beings, and when you and I think in those terms, we are as close to it as we can possibly get. There is not a human being in this room today that is a self-made person. Everybody here is what he is today because of the help he received from other people. And there has never been a time in your life or mine when we did not need some kind of help. It may be advice, it may be something that does not cost any money, an encouraging word, perhaps, but we all need something.

And here, I think, is a very important point: Both you and I need our Community Chest.

True philanthropy gives a sense of purposeful living to every citizen who participates by giving.

And there are two ways we can give—through time and effort in working for the chest, and through dollars and cents. Let's consider the money angle first.

A wise man in Dallas once put it this way: "There is only one thing any two people will agree on, and that is what the third should give to philanthropy."

The same wise man also said: "I never met the man who would agree he was stingy."

How true that is. It seems to be the way of human nature to draw comparisons in order to get out of doing things. The worst of it is, we use the wrong kind of comparisons—we compare ourselves to the worst rather than the best, and we try to get by with a minimum of giving.

Well, I wish I knew some magic formula that would guarantee putting every chest campaign over the top. But all I know is that fund raising is the product of good organization, and coupled with this you need sound social planning, for both immediate and long-range objectives.

It sounds like hard work, but as we all know, hard work works. You might be interested in a few statistics from my town. In Dallas in 1961, about 8,000 volunteers in our United Fund Campaign raised $4,604,000. This meant that about 225,000 persons contributed from Dallas' total employed work force of approximately 400,000. We went over the top, which in turn means that 61 agencies with nearly 150 operating service centers, are able to perform their functions efficiently and fully during the current year. Our chest includes a wide variety of agencies . . . local, State and national, from the American Red Cross and Children's Medical Center, with the largest allocated budgets, through a variety of child care, family, youth, and health services, to our Veterans Service Center, with the smallest single allocation.

Let's pause for a moment and look at the total federated giving picture in the United States. Twenty-two hundred United Funds and Community Chest campaigns raised in 1960, for 1961 budgets, an alltime high of $477,979,689, an increase of $20 million over the previous year.

For the budget year of 1962, campaigns conducted in 1961 showed a preliminary estimated total of $497 million, nearly 4 percent over 1960.

In talking about philanthropy in America, you cannot tell the whole or true story of the American way of life, in terms of the profit motive alone. There is the nonprofit motive too, the effort made by our citizens to build schools, churches, organizations and institutions of all kinds for the good of the individual citizen and the community at large. We feel that what makes America great is not what America makes, but what America does.

Our Community Chest had been organized in the 1920's and in those 18 years before its reorganization never reached its goal. There were few givers, fewer workers, and little giving.

Our people had not realized that the type of program which our agencies carried out made Dallas a better place in which to live; therefore, it was the responsibility of the entire community to support their work.

But Dallas is not a town to be content with failure and after 18 years of seeing the community chest decline to the point where it was near abandonment our top executives got together to reorganize and in 1940 revitalized the whole program and started an educational program which has been amazingly successful.

Dallas had its first successful community chest campaign in 1941; there has not been a failure since, though the goal has gone from $550,000 to $4,600,000.

A lot of hard work has gone into the success in Dallas, but we know, too, that education, has been an important factor.

Start your educational program with a small group and let it spread throughout the community, but start big, start with the top leaders of your community, men who are listened to when they speak.

I have interjected these experiences in Dallas not to boast of our successes, but to help

give you heart in improving the success of your own united effort.

In your educational program, let these leaders help carry the message to the community that the community chest is a collective campaign; that you cannot give to the chest what you would normally give to just one agency; that the giver, the agencies and the entire community benefit; that personal contact is the only sure answer to recruiting volunteers as well as obtaining gifts; and that every business institution and every citizen should have an opportunity to give, employee as well as employer.

Remember, enthusiasm is contagious. If you bring yourself to give in full measure, you will find within yourself the will and the power to help others given in the same full measure. With participation comes interest, and the attendant satisfaction of just plain getting something done. The sense of sharing and belonging, which is the great cohesive which holds free people together, is also the force that makes or breaks the volunteer.

And as free people, we believe in the justice of giving, in the responsibility of those who have more, to share with others.

We hear a lot these days about the need to make the world better. Nobody would contest that. But I feel our great concern is not whether we make the world better, but will me make our own individual community better?

If enough individual communities did that, that would take care of the world.

Forestry Day in Live Oak Huge Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, many of the industrial leaders of this great Nation journeyed to Live Oak, Fla., on Thursday, April 11, to participate in the Forestry Day program held there by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad. It is my opinion that this was one of the finest programs ever staged in our State, as these industrial and business leaders joined with governmental officials for a comprehensive program to explain the forest industry.

Forestry is a basic industry of this Nation. It provides directly for the employment of a large segment of the American people and indirectly affects every American, either in production or consuming.

This event was considered so important that the entire Florida Legislature voted to recess to attend. I include here a copy of house concurrent resolution 1172 passed by the house and senate of Florida which expressed the appreciation of the legislature for having had the opportunity to participate in this fine program.

The resolution, introduced by State Senator Houston W. Roberts and State Representative Leon McDonald, went as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE APPRECIATION OF THE LEGISLATURE TO THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD CO. AND OTHER COMPANIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND OFFICIALS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL AND ENTERTAINING WOODS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PRESENTED THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1963, ON THE J. W. BLUME WOODLANDS IN SUWANNEE COUNTY

Whereas the members of the legislature, cabinet officials, heads of State departments, business and industrial leaders, and others traveled by a special Seabord Air Line Railroad train from Tallahassee to Live Oak and returned on Thursday, April 11, 1963, and were treated to a fine educational and outstanding woods program featuring forest management and wood utilization; and

Whereas the members of the legislature had opportunity to meet top business and industrial leaders from all over the Nation who arrived on a second special Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. train from Jacksonville to Live Oak and returned; and

Whereas the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. in cooperation with the Vocational Agriculture Department, the State and Federal Forest Services, and business and industrial organizations, presented this program for the purpose of informing those in attendance on all phases of this great forest industry and its importance to the State's economy from the planting of seedlings to the manufacture of finished products; and

Whereas all who attended the program were extremely impressed by the program and the officials, who so generously and ably provided the program, transportation, food, and refreshments; and

Whereas this program featuring the running of two special trains to a grassroots woods meeting made history in the State and Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Florida, the senate concurring, That the members of the legislature hereby express their appreciation for the woods demonstration program held on the J. W. Blume Woodlands in Suwannee County, on Thursday, April 11, 1963, for transportation and from the program and the food and refreshments, to the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., its president, John W. Smith, its General Forestry Agent Bob Hoskins, who handled personally all contacts with the business and industrial leaders out of State as well as those from within Florida, and who planned and directed this huge undertaking, to Wm. R. Adams, president of St. Regis Paper Co. of New York City, the principal speaker, and to the paper companies of Florida who contributed the tickets, to others who cooperated in this successful endeavor, and to the following: State department of vocational agriculture, Florida Forest Service, U.S. Forest Service, United States Steel Corp., Container Corp. of America, Rayonier, Inc., Owens-Illinois, Nelio Chemicals Co., Moore Dry Kiln Co., St. Regis Paper Co., St. Joe Paper Co., Southern Wood Preserving Co., Atlantic Cresoting Co., International Paper Co., Koppers Co., Florida Forestry Equipment Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each of the above.

Mr. Speaker, the above resolution is a testimony of the importance which the State legislature placed on this outstanding program.

Forestry is a billion dollar business in Florida and there were approximately 1,200 persons on hand for the program where they saw how best to conserve and utilize the pine tree.

Two trains converged on Live Oak with the legislators and industrial leaders to travel about 7½ miles west of that city for the demonstration.

Assisting the Seaboard in preparation for the demonstration were 16 other agencies that included a number of leading industries in the Nation and the U.S. and Florida Forest Services. The demonstrations ranged from the breeding and planting of pine trees to their harvest and eventual use in lumber, boxes and paper.

A rousing welcome was extended to the visitors as they arrived in Live Oak. Several thousand persons, including schoolchildren, lined the streets to wave at the buses that transported the guests to the demonstration area. Two high school bands, from Live Oak and Branford, were also at the station to greet the arrivals.

Robert N. Hoskins, general forestry agent for the railroad, served as master of ceremonies for the program. Mr. Hoskins made all the arrangements for this gigantic program and did a superb job.

Seaboard President John W. Smith of Richmond, Va., introduced Hon. C. Farris Bryant, Governor of Florida, who spoke to the assemblage as did Harry E. Wood, State supervisor of agricultural education for the State Department of Education; C. H. Coulter, State forester; and Edward P. Cliff, chief forester of the U.S. Forest Service; before the program got underway.

The demonstration stations and sponsors were:

Cone collection and nursery production, St. Regis Paper Co., Jacksonville; forest genetics, U.S. Forest Service, Olustee; mechanical tree planting and hand planting, Forestry Equipment Co., Jacksonville; fire control, Florida Forest Service, Tallahassee; forest insect detection and control, Owens-Illinois, Jacksonville;

Service Forestry, Rayonier, Inc., Fernandina Beach; hardwood control, St. Joe Paper Co., Tallahassee; markets and marketing of creosoted wood products, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh; production and treatment of farm products, Koppers Co. Inc., Gainesville; pulpwood production and paper manufacturing, Container Corp., Fernandina Beach; sawmilling, Southern Wood Preserving Co., Atlanta; seasoning of lumber, Moore Dry Kiln Co., Jacksonville;

Pole production and classification, Atlantic Creosoting Co., Savannah; cross tie production, Seaboard Air Line Railroad; outdoor recreation, International Paper Co., Mobile; naval stores, Nelio Chemicals Inc., Jacksonville; water bombing, Florida Forest Service; and helicopter seeding, U.S. Forest Service.

Among the guests for the program was Florida's able and distinguished U.S. Senator, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND. I had the pleasure of presenting the Senator, who I admire greatly and count as a close personal friend, with a Suwannee County ham. I also presented hams to Sea-

board President Smith, St. Regis President William Adams, Governor Bryant and R. E. McNeill Jr., New York, president of the Hanover Manufacturing Trust Co. Mr. McNeill is a native of Live Oak and a special guest of honor among his home folks, being also presented with a certificate denoting him as the No. 1 Citizen of the County and being presented keys to the city.

A sidelight I would certainly want to mention is that those who rode the train from Tallahassee to Live Oak, were met at the station by State Senator Charley E. Johns of Starke, former Governor of Florida, who at one time was a railroad conductor. Senator Johns served as conductor of the train and greeted the boarders resplendent in his old conductor's cap. He was a railroad conductor for 20 years on the Seaboard.

Following the demonstrations, guests were served box lunches.

State Future Farmers of America President David Brengle presented Honorary State farmer degrees to Russell F. Erickson, president of Rayonier, Inc., New York; William R. Adams, president of St. Regis Paper Co., New York; Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; John W. Smith, president of the Seaboard; and Governor Bryant.

This was a wonderful program, with industrial leaders from every section of the United States present. They came from the West, the East, the South, and the North for this program, which I think accentuates the importance of forestry to this great land of ours.

St. Regis President Adams made an outstanding address to the gathering in which he made several observations which I would like to quote:

The annual value of the paper industry's product is $14½ billion, one-fortieth of the gross national product * * * last year's production totaled about 38 million tons, almost four times the weight of all the automobiles produced. This 38 million tons, which does not include 5 million tons of newsprint imported from Canada, is a vital element in the business, Government, communication, education, religion, politics, nutrition, health and culture of our country, perhaps, the commodity which, next to food, we could least do without.

Its use has more than doubled since the end of the war, and even in the last 5 years while many have felt that the general economy has been standing still and, in fact, many major industries like steel, automobiles, and petroleum have yet to exceed their 1955–57 figures, the consumption of paper has grown 20 percent. * * * All this leads to the projection that the paper industry will double its output in about the next 20 years. And practically all of it is based on wood, over 50 percent of which currently comes from the South. * * * Each cord of wood, which has a value of about $6 as it stands on the stump, has a value of about $100 in the form that it finally leaves Florida for the markets up North.

On the matter of capital gains, not only is it more than likely that their cancellation, as proposed by Secretary Dillon, would cause a drastic curtailment in this vital private investment in forest improvement, but such a cancellation would be a serious breach of faith with those who have spent millions of dollars in timber growing during the last 20 years, in anticipation of capital gains which have not yet been realized.

It was a tremendous program, this Forestry Day, one of the best programs I have had the pleasure of participating in.

Our State legislators, members of the State cabinet, the Governor, and the numerous business and industrial leaders were unanimous in their praise of the program.

I do not wish to neglect the fine people of Suwannee County who enthusiastically supported the program. Mayor J. Marvin Phillips, of Live Oak, and the city council especially cooperated in making all necessary arrangements with the very fine cooperation of business and governmental leaders in that community.

The people of the county turned out in large numbers to enjoy the program immensely. I believe that forestry history was made in Live Oak on April 11 with this outstanding gathering.

It caught the attention of the press of our great State, naturally, and I would like to recite the following editorials which appeared:

This one came from the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville:

WISE FORESTRY PRACTICES VITAL TO FLORIDA

The Florida Legislature will be recessed by unanimous vote in Tallahassee today so its members will be able to attend a major woods demonstration at Live Oak featuring forest management techniques and wood utilization. The program, certainly one of the most comprehensive ever conducted in the Southeast on this vital subject, will be sponsored by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. The lawmakers' decision to recess their deliberations and attend the demonstration was an official expression of the importance placed on this industry within Florida. In so doing, the legislature is accurately representing the people of Florida who owe much of their economic progress in the last few decades, either directly or indirectly, to the wise growth and management of forestry industries.

Business and political leaders from all over the Nation will converge on the J. W. Blume woodlands near Live Oak for this event.

Among them will be William R. Adams, president of St. Regis Paper Co., who will deliver the principal address, and John W. Smith, president of the Seaboard.

The sponsoring railroad will run two special trains to the field forestry program, one each from Jacksonville and Tallahassee. Many Jacksonville civic leaders will be aboard the local special. It is fitting that on the trip to Live Oak the travelers will cross Florida's beautiful pine tree country where modern conservation measures have transformed the landscape.

Florida's forests have passed through many stages in comparatively recent times. Commercial emphasis not long ago was on naval stores. This was followed by the nightmare of the "cut out and get out" philosophy by small sawmills that left the land ravished. With the growth of the pulp industry, industrial ownership was first to see the possibilities of conservation and reforestation program. Wise timber management became commercially feasible in 1944 when the U.S. Government recognized capital gains treatment for tree farming.

A proposal this year by the Treasury Department to abolish this status is the largest threat now before the industry. If passed by Congress, conservation will become unprofitable and Florida could return to the days of "cut out and get out."

The forest will not be the only victims. The entire South, which has risen to new life on the growth of forest related industries providing new income and new jobs, will suffer.

The Tallahassee Democrat, of Tallahasse, had this to say:

THE PINE TREE'S DAY

Florida legislators, and a great many business and civic leaders of north Florida, know a whole lot more about the forest industries of our State today because they took in a day of demonstrations in the woods near Live Oak yesterday.

The Seaboard Air Lines Railroad and 16 private companies and Government agencies cooperated in putting on an event that was unprecedented in scope for Florida.

Special trains from Tallahassee and Jacksonville unloaded more than 1,000 men at Live Oak, where they were greeted by high school bands and paraded in buses to the J. W. Blume farm for a well-organized round of demonstrations.

They were told that forest industries exceed citrus and all others in producing dollars from the soil of Florida, and that pulpwood provides the greatest total wages of all agricultural industries in the State.

They saw how pine seeds are planted nowadays by helicopter, and how pine seedlings are set out by machine. They saw a demonstration of forest fire fighting by airplanes dropping liquid chemicals.

They were shown how the naval stores industry has developed from crude and destructive methods used for more than 200 years until 1906, and since then has gone through a series of scientific improvements that now get twice as much gum from a pine tree and still leave it sound for pulpwood or timber.

They were told about lumber treatment for insect control and fireproofing, about drying lumber by modern methods, about paper and cardboard box manufacturing processes, about modern sawmilling methods, about production of crossties by new portable saws instead of the old broadax method, about use of private forest lands for recreation, and about promising new discoveries which may put pine tree production on an orchard basis by selective breeding and superior trees and budding and grafting techniques which heretofore have been used mostly for fruit and commercial trees.

It was a good day, and an impressive demonstration of what the pine forests are doing and can do for the economy of north Florida.

And in conclusion, I quote here the editorial which appeared in the Jacksonville Journal:

NEEDED PROTECTION

It takes a long time to grow a tree and people who make a living growing and selling matured timber crops are subject to long-term hazards and risks, not the least of which are fluctuations on the market and within the papermaking and pulpwood industries.

No industry or natural resource development can thrive on uneconomic profit levels to offset the cost of longtime use of capital that is required in growing pulpwood, sawlogs, and other forest crops.

Recognizing these factors, the Federal Government in 1944 passed capital gains tax legislation to encourage forestry as a long-term investment to provide an incentive for increased production and to encourage better forest management and conservation techniques. The capital gains measure contributed to significant advances in the timber industry.

While industrial output has risen sharply, so has the demand for pulpwood and that demand continues to grow. Through its investments in research, scientific tree planting, and insect and disease control programs, the industry not only has kept up with the

demand but has managed to grow more trees than the demand requires. This would not be possible without the protection of the capital gains provision for timber growers.

Now, however, the Federal Government is proposing certain changes in the capital gains tax treatment of timber, changes the industry's leaders fear may have grave consequences.

These changes, in effect, would result in almost doubling the tax of those larger woodland enterprises which the Government admits have done the most to put their forest lands in productive condition, confident of Government protection of their long-term investments.

The industry's leaders fear, and for good reason, we think, that these contemplated changes would be unfair, amounting to discrimination against all the forest owners who have had the courage and foresight to invest in the future forest welfare of the Nation—acting in good faith that the Federal Government would permit capital gains treatment of income when the trees matured and were harvested. Moreover, the changes could have the effect of discouraging investment in this field and undermining the gains that have been made in forest management and improved conservation practices.

State forestry and business leaders gathered at Live Oak yesterday were heartened by the prediction of Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND that the proposed changes in the capital gains tax as applied to timber will not come to pass.

Rather than make any changes in the capital gains application to timber income, the Government should endorse that system and give assurance that it will continue unchanged in future years. Only such a gesture can provide timber investors with a stabilized and predictable tax policy. And this is absolutely necessary when dealing with long-range investment such as forestry—an industry vital to the southern economy.

Centennial Celebration of Boston College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding institutions of higher learning in our country is Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. From its rooms of education and learning during the decades of its existence have gone graduates engaging in all walks of human activity, who, in peace and war, have played an important part in our Nation's history.

On April 1, 1863, Gov. John A. Andrew of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts signed the University Charter which brought Boston College into being.

This year, 1963, is the centennial celebration of Boston College, a historic event in the life of Boston College, and of institutions of higher learning throughout the country.

The university charter was delivered in 1863 to the Very Reverend Father John McElroy, S.J., founder of the university.

The first president, the Very Reverend Father John Bapst, S.J., presided over a faculty of 6 and an initial enrollment of 22 students in a red brick building in the South End of Boston.

For the first 50 years, Boston College grew steadily as a small liberal arts college.

In 1913, Boston College moved to Chestnut Hill, then a rural area.

Still keeping at the core of the university a strong liberal arts college, it gradually filled out the dimensions of its university charter.

In 1925, the graduate School of Arts and Sciences was founded; in 1929, the Law School and Evening College; in 1936, the School of Social Work; in 1938, the College of Business Administration, and since World War II, the School of Nursing, the School of Education, and the Graduate School of Business Administration were inaugurated.

From the original faculty of 6 and the initial enrollment of 22 students, Boston College, on its centennial anniversary, under the leadership of its president and recognized outstanding educator and administrator, Very Rev. Fr. Michael P. Walsh, S.J.—at the beginning of its second century—comprises 12 colleges with a faculty of 700 and a total enrollment of 10,500 students.

Boston College under the leadership and guidance of its centennial president, Very Rev. Fr. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., envisions at the beginning of its second century, and in the near future, the construction of a science building, research library, a behavioral sciences building, a university threater and dormitories. It is only within the past few weeks that ground was broken for Carney Faculty Center.

On April 20, 1963, Boston College held its centennial convocation; a distinguished gathering from all walks of life was present.

On this occasion the degree of doctor of law was conferred upon Very Rev. Fr. Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president of Georgetown University. The degree of doctor of letters upon Lady Barbara Ward Jackson, and the degree of doctor of humane letters upon Dr. Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard University.

This historic occasion was graced by the presence of our beloved and distinguished President of the United States, Hon. John F. Kennedy, and by the great churchman, His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston.

In my remarks, I include the address delivered by President Kennedy.

The address of welcome was delivered by Father Walsh, which I include in my remarks.

Greetings from the church were delivered by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, which I include in my remarks.

From the colleges and universities greetings which I herewith include, were delivered by Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University, and from the Commonwealth, included in my remarks, greetings were delivered by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, his excellency, Hon. Endicott Peabody.

As its second century starts, Boston College looks forward to the future with faith and confidence, its students and graduates serving God, country, and mankind.

As was well stated by Father Walsh, S.J., the centennial president:

We begin the second century as the first century was begun with a faith that has not failed us, with a hope that has been fulfilled and forever in this university's bright future, with thanksgiving to God.

The addresses follow:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ADDRESS

Father Walsh, your eminence, Governor Peabody, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen; it is a great pleasure to come back to a city where my accent is considered normal, and where they pronounce the words the way they are spelled.

I take especial satisfaction in this day as the recipient of an honorary degree in 1956 from Boston College, and, therefore, an instant alumnus, I am particularly pleased to be with all of you on this most felicitious occasion.

This university, or college, as Father Walsh has described, was founded in the darkest days of the Civil War, when this Nation was engaged in a climatic struggle to determine whether it would be half slave and half free or all free. And now, 100 years later, after the most intense century perhaps in human history, we are faced with the great question of whether this world will be half slave and half free, or whether it will be all one or the other. And on this occasion, as in 1863, the services of Boston College are still greatly needed.

It is good also to participate in this ceremony which has honored three distinguished citizens of the free world—President Pusey, Father Bun, and our friend from the world of freedom, Lady Jackson.

Boston College is a hundred years old—old by the lifespan of man, but young by that of universities. In this week of observance, you have rightly celebrated the achievements of the past, and equally rightly you have turned in a series of discussions by outstanding scholars to the problems of the present and the future. Learned men have been talking here of the knowledge explosion, and in all that they have said I am sure they have implied the heavy present responsibility of institutions like this one. Yet today I want to say a word on the same theme, to impress upon you as urgently as I can the growing and insistent importance of universities in our national life.

I speak of universities because that is what Boston College has long since become. But most of what I say applies to liberal arts colleges as well. My theme is not limited to any one class of universities, public or private, religious or secular. Our national tradition of variety in higher education shows no sign of weakening, and it remains the task of each of our institutions to shape its own role among its differing sisters. In this hope I am much encouraged by a reading in this last week of the remarkable encyclical, Pacem in Terris.

In its penetrating analysis of today's great problems, of social welfare and human rights, of disarmament and international order and peace, of that document surely shows that on the basis of one great faith and its traditions there can be developed counsel on public affairs that is of value to all men and women of good will. As a Catholic, I am proud of it; and as an American, I have learned from it. It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths, and in recent documents of the World Council of Churches, and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing. We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed. It seems reasonable to hope that a similiar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of higher learning.

From the office that I hold, in any case, there can be no doubt today of the growing meaning of universities in America. That,

of course, is one basic reason for the increasing urgency with which those who care most for the progress of our society are pressing for more adequate programs in higher education and in education generally. It is for this reason that I urge upon everyone here and in this country the pressing need for national attention and a national decision in the national interest upon the national question of education. In at least four ways, the new realities of our day have combined to intensify the focal role of the university in our Nation's life.

First, and perhaps most obvious, the whole world has come to our doorstep and the universities, must be its student. In the strange geometry of modern politics, the distant Congo can be close to us as Canada, and Canada, itself, is worth more attention that we have sometimes given. Cultures not our own press for understanding. Crises we did not create require our participation. Accelerating change is the one universal human prospect.

Second, there is indeed an explosion of knowledge and its outward limits are not yet in sight. In some fields, progress seems very fast; on other, distressingly slow. It is no tribute to modern science to jump lightly to the conclusion that all its secrets of particle physics, or molecular life, or heredity, of outer space, are now within easy reach. The truth is more massive and less magical. It is that wherever we turn, in defense, on space, in medicine, in industry, in agriculture, and most of all in basic science, itself, the requirement is for better work, deeper understanding, higher education. While I have framed this comment in the terms of the natural sciences, I insist, as do all those who live in this field, that at every level of learning there must be an equal concern for history, for letters and the arts, and for man as a social being in the widest meaning of Aristotle's phrase. This also is the work of the university.

And third, as the world presses in the knowledge presses out, the role of the interpreter grows. Men can no longer know everything themselves; the 20th century has no universal man. All men today must learn to know through one another to judge across their own ignorance—to comprehend at second hand. These arts are not easily learned. Those who would practice them must develop intensity of perception, variety of mental activity, and the habit of open concern for truth in all its forms. Where can we expect to find a training ground for this modern maturity, if not in our universities?

Fourth and finally, these new requirements strengthen still further what has always been a fundamental element in the life of American colleges and universities—that they should be dedicated to "the Nation's service." The phrase is Woodrow Wilson's, and no one has discussed its meaning better. What he said in 1896 is more relevant today than ever before, and I close with a quotation from him.

I offer it to you with renewed congratulations, and in the confident hope that as her second century opens, Boston College will continue to respond, as she did in her beginnings, to the new needs of the age:

"It is not learning," said President Wilson, "but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation. It is indispensable," he said, "if it is to do its right service, that the air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms * * * the air of the world's transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of the race, the sense of the duty of man toward man * * * the promise and the hope that shone in the face of all knowledge. * * * The days of glad expansion are gone, our life grows tense and difficult; our resource for the future lies in careful thought, providence, and a wise economy; and the school must be of the Nation."

Boston College for 100 years has been of the Nation and so it will be for the next hundred.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF VERY REV. (FR.) MICHAEL P. WALSH, S.J., PRESIDENT OF BOSTON COLLEGE

One hundred years ago, Americans were girding themselves for what would be, until our time, the most massive single battle in military history, Gettysburg, when, with a magnificient act of faith in our Nation's future, and anxious to contribute what it could to the shaping of that future, Boston College began. Now after a hundred years, we pause to look back in a spirit of humble gratitude to God for the achievements of a century. Joining us in this spirit of joy are leaders of religion, education, and government.

To our faculty, students, alumni, and friends who have come in such impressive numbers to celebrate with us, it is enough to say that our happiness today is theirs.

Since Boston College has never failed to link its destiny with that of our beloved country, it is inspiring to observe that our Government, represented by its leaders in city, State, and Nation, has shown such gracious readiness to be with us today.

Represented here today are colleges and universities of this continent and Europe. To them, our confreres, we extend a most grateful welcome. They have come here with the most congenial and fraternal understanding of what their presence means to us, sensing as few other could, our pride in a century of achievement in higher education.

To Cardinal Cushing, at once of our most benevolent father and devoted son, our welcome is what it has always been, one of gratitude and deepest affection.

Mr. President, I speak for all the men and women of Boston College, for all our faculty and friends. We bless you and offer our profound gratitude for your bringing the splendor of the presidency to ennoble our centennial convocation. The words of our charter are bright again upon the ancient parchment because you came to be with us on our day of jubilee. You came because you understood the meaning of this day not only in the life of this university but in the history of the city whose name it bears. You came, in a word, for Boston.

A university must span many centuries before it can be said to be old; and so, after only one century, it would be more fitting to say that Boston College is still young. That is true of the spirit with which we celebrate today's anniversary. While we pay grateful and most respectful tribute to our past, our energies and our interest are directed to our future. We are impatient to move on with greater and firmer strides into our second century. This distinguished assemblage of friends of our university is witness most of all to a work which is beginning; for no growth is really vital which is not always just beginning. This solemn duty of the university's perpetual beginning we take up again as it was taken up with such courage and with such undaunted faith 100 years ago.

REMARKS OF RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING AT BOSTON COLLEGE CONVOCATION

Mr. President, Very Rev. Father Walsh, rector of Boston College; members of the faculty, members of the student body, and guests, it is my pleasant duty to express on this occasion the congratulations and gratitude of the church in honor of the centennial of Boston College.

The college has grown with the archdiocese of Boston and it has contributed enormously and indispensably to the growth of the church in this area. It was Boston College that encouraged throughout the years the vocations to the priesthood and the religious life that were necessary for the expansion of the church as the numbers of its faithful began to increase. For over 50 years the students in our diocesan seminary, founded in 1884, came almost entirely from this institution and from its sister College of the Holy Cross in Worcester. Today it is Boston College that provides educational formation and training for hundreds of teachers and administrators in our diocesan schools, so important for the healthy and normal functioning of the church.

There is another reason for our gratitude to Boston College and the Jesuits under whose direction it has grown to its present state of academic efficiency. The church has a part to play within the larger community in which its freedom of functioning is constitutionally guaranteed. It is erroneous to conclude from the concern of Catholics for the expansion of their ecclesiastical structure that their interests are exclusively sectarian, or that they evaluate their achievements in the field of education entirely from the supernatural point of view of revealed religion. Ultimately the church directs the minds of men toward the eternal happiness of the world to come. More immediately, however, the church is concerned with developing the highest ideals of personal integrity and public service. To be genuinely religious means to be conscientious and upright as a citizen, no less than to be loyal and unswerving in the fulfillment of religious duties.

As we find proof in our own day of the relevance of religious beliefs for the strengthening of our Nation against moral decay, we have reason to be thankful that institutions like Boston College are preparing young people for positions of responsibility, and bringing the highest standards of academic excellence into harmonious integration with the ideals of Christian tradition.

For what Boston College has done, is doing and will continue to do for God and for country, for the church and for the state, for the educational world and for the common good, we are thankful today. We pray that He who is infinitely wise and provident, infinitely good and merciful, may enable this institution to fulfill in years to come its divinely ordained purpose of keeping sound minds in sound bodies, of drawing from human powers their greatest measure of scholarly effort and of elevating the human personality to its rightful dignity of sonship with God through Christ our Lord.

GREETINGS FROM THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF DR. NATHAN M. PUSEY, PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The 1860's were a period of intense ferment in higher education in this country. This ferment was occasioned by two kinds of discontent. One, that the attention of our colleges was directed so exclusively toward literary studies, and these not even modern literary studies, that the colleges were making virtually no contribution toward meeting the practical problems of a rapidly developing society. Scorning the agricultural and mechanical arts they were, it was held by these of their critics using a kind of smear word, "irrelevant." Times have changed.

The other main criticism came from those who had caught a glimpse abroad, chiefly in Germany, of what a university as contrasted with a college could be. There has been a good deal of confusion on this subject ever since. There are many colleges in this country which grandiloquently call themselves universities. There are few universities which, like yours, are content to call themselves colleges. But in any event, in the past 100 years we are in a new period of ferment. Higher education has become extraordinarily almost too relevant. Witness the way President Kennedy has taken and needs a con-

siderable piece of higher education to help him in Washington. Witness the way his Science Advisory Board tells him that certain agencies of Government basically dependent upon the research activities of highly trained engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists will not be able to do their work a decade hence if the rate of producing these kinds of scientists is not quickly stepped up to 7,000 Ph. D.'s a year. Many other interests and concerns seem to me and to others to have equally good claims for this kind of scarce talent. It was only yesterday that the number of Ph. D.'s given annually by all universities in all subjects passed the level of 7,000. It is now about 10,000 per year. The Space Agency itself would like to have about 10,000. Clearly we have a great deal to do.

May I interrupt my remarks just to say about space that today is the day to test the aerodynamic properties of the mortar board. I hope if mine takes off into space I don't go with it.

We have much to do and we are not in the best shape to do it. We have all been struggling to make good the deficiencies which accumulated in our plants during the long, lean years of depression and war and to raise the funds to attract, to hold, and adequately recompense our faculties. Even more difficult have been the pressures for new programs, plants, and equipment originating in the marvelous burgeoning of knowledge. In the midst of this we are confronted with a shortage and therefore a fierce competition for first-rate teachers. And truly frightening is the prospect now breaking over us of soon having such numbers to cope with that we shall have in a decade virtually to double the whole enterprise of higher education in this country which it has taken more than 300 years of patient, devoted effort to bring to its present estate. Mr. President, may I say parenthetically it is our hope that you will be able to help us to get the legislators in the Capitol to see the implication of this remark.

Meanwhile it is a joy to see Boston College forging ahead through its own and its friends' efforts. Deep in the center of the present responsibility of higher education is the need to find ways to adapt to present circumstances the old basic learning with its concern for the development of persons and its own unremitting attention to questions of value. The institutions of higher learning entrusted to the Jesuits have an honorable record in this regard. It is to be hoped among all the other things we have to do that these and other institutions can work together to accomplish this task. May I, as the president of an institution more than 300 years old, say this discouraging word to Father Walsh and his associates, that the common task we share does not get easier with the passing centuries. But may I also for the colleges and universities of the United States felicitate Boston College on the achievements of its first century and of the great development and growth you have experienced in that time.

We welcome the advent of strong Catholic colleges and universities of which surely this is one of the chief, into the advance ranks of our institutions of higher learning. Together these institutions have already done much to build value into our common life and on them our hopes for a worthy future in large measure must surely now depend. The colleges and universities, and among them I should like to say personally Harvard, congratulate Boston College on the accomplishments of her first century. We salute her on this happy day for her achievement. We would speak of our pride in our association with her and we wish for her long life and a continuation of that strong forward surge with which she now so clearly and so creatively is moving ahead.

GREETINGS FROM THE HONORABLE ENDICOTT PEABODY, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Your Eminence, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Father Walsh, Father Bunn, Lady Jackson, Dr. Pusey, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Kennedy, Mayor Collins, members of the Board of Regents of Boston College, distinguished guests, and friends of Boston College, in 1847, Father John McElroy, S.J., arrived in Boston and planted the first seeds that have grown and flourished and produced the magnificent bounty we know today as Boston College, one of the great institutions of learning in the free world.

My presence here, today, as Governor of the Commonwealth, is symbolic of the continuing harmonious relationship between town and gown that was begun on that day in April 1863, 100 years ago, when my predecessor, Gov. John Andrews, signed into law the act of the Massachusetts Legislature granting your charter.

Fourteen years later, under the inspired leadership of the Reverend John Bapst, S.J., the first President of the college and corporation, the first commencement was held. Nine young men graduated. And again, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was present to bestow her congratulations in the person of my predecessor, Gov. Alexander H. Rice.

Now, on another day in April, in the year of our Lord, 1963, the Governor of the Commonwealth again comes to Boston College to join in this well-deserved and joyous celebration.

To the many devoted priests and laypeople who labored so humbly and faithfully for so noble a purpose, every citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts owes a debt of gratitude.

For education is one of this Commonwealth's most precious assets. We are indeed proud of the tradition of excellence in education which is so well represented here. All of us who are working for better educational opportunity in Massachusetts can draw inspiration from the story of the birth and growth of Boston College. From humble beginnings in the South End of Boston, you have matured into the magnificent institution of learning which stands before us today.

Sitting among you now, there must be some who were present at the laying of the cornerstone of B.C. at this site on June 15, 1913. One among them was the mayor of the city of Boston, John F. Fitzgerald. Now, 50 years later, on an equally proud occasion in the history of Boston College, how fitting it is that we are honored by the presence of that man's grandson, the President of the United States of America, John F. Kennedy.

Certainly our Commonwealth would be something less than what it is today were it not for the men and women of Boston College. Her contribution has been vast and varied. Doctors, alumni of Boston College, have exercised their merciful calling throughout the Commonwealth. In our classrooms, sons and daughters of Boston College have been astonishingly active.

The clergy who minister to the Catholic archdiocese of Boston have been predominantly men of Boston College. B.C. has given to the church such eminent men of God as William Cardinal O'Connell and our beloved friend and spiritual leader, Richard Cardinal Cushing.

In the courts of our Commonwealth, countless lawyers, men of Boston College, have pleaded and fought for justice. Just recently I had the pleasure of appointing as a superior court judge one of your law school's most distinguished professors. I am delighted that this appointment has been greeted as one of the finest of this generation.

I cannot resist noting with partisan pride that the first site of Boston College Law School, 11 Beacon Street, today houses my political alma mater, the Massachusetts Democratic State Committee.

The law school forums, the Boston College citizen seminars, the lectures on public affairs have in an extraordinary way blended the dedicated efforts of the good citizens of our community.

Here at Boston College you have achieved an inspiring blend of faith and reason. You have exalted the mind and soul of man. Your proud past is exceeded only by your bright future.

I can think of no more fitting tribute than to quote from a letter sent in 1934 by William Lawrence, the Episcopal bishop of Boston, to your then president, Father Gallagher. Bishop Lawrence explained that the land on which Boston College now stands, was owned by his father. He wrote: "Boston College, with its beautiful group of buildings, has given a grace and benediction to my boyhood haunts."

For me, for all of us, the presence of Boston College is indeed a grace and benediction for which we are most grateful. From your modest beginnings, you truly have earned your name, you have reached "the heights." As Boston College begins its second century of life, let it take with it our best wishes and Godspeed.

Right To Work Law Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate an excellent editorial which was originally printed in the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., and which has since been republished in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., on May 2, 1963. The editorial is entitled "Right To Work Law Pays Off." It points up the importance of the right of an individual to obtain employment without being forced to join a union against his wishes and also the rewards which maintenance of this right within a State brings, not only to the entire State, but particularly to workers in increased employment opportunities. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW PAYS OFF

South Carolina is one of 19 of the 50 States comprising the United States which has a right-to-work law. In essence, it means that no man can be forced to join a union. It means that no union can force a company to deduct union dues from the salaries and wages of all of its employees.

It means that if a plant is unionized, a worker has the law behind him if he elects to report for duty even though union leaders, to further their own selfish interests, have called a strike or work stoppage.

It enables a man to keep his pride in determining how he shall lead his life, for whom he will work, and to determine his own wage level according to his own capabilities.

The right-to-work laws are presently secure through section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law which reserves to the States their right to pass such laws. But it is now under attack by union leaders and their political pawns. George Meany, president of the all-powerful AFL–CIO, has urged that section 14(b) be repealed and repeal is now the No. 1 objective of union officials in the 88th session of Congress.

If the section is repealed, South Carolina and the other 18 States will lose their right-to-work laws.

Government statistics show that those States having right-to-work laws have shown more progress than the other 31 in many ways.

In wage rate improvements in the 10 States having the highest percentage increase, seven were States with right-to-work laws. The percentages were 37.5 and 33.3 (1953–61).

The personal income of people in the right-to-work States is increasing more rapidly than in the other 31 by 30.2 to 25.3 percent (1953–61).

Right-to-work States show a greater gain in capital expenditures for producing wealth than do the other 31 with 29.7 to 8.2 percent in capital expenditures and 57.6 to 34.3 percent in the wealth added in manufacturing. Both figures are for 1954–59, with neither Indiana nor Kansas included as their right-to-work laws were enacted in 1958 and 1959, respectively.

The bank accounts of people in right-to-work States increased more rapidly in the period 1953–61 than those in non-right-to-work States by 47.3 percent against 40.6 percent.

The rate of increase in retail sales during the period from 1954 to 1958 outstripped the non-right-to-work States by 20.8 to 16.5 percent.

The growth of retail payrolls in the right-to-work States during the period 1954–58 bettered the others 24.1 to 17.3 percent.

The gain in automobile registration in right-to-work States topped the gain in the other States by 34.8 to 29 percent in the 1953–60 period.

The figures quoted above were obtained from "Employment and Earnings," published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

They show the importance of the right-to-work law in South Carolina and Orangeburg County. And the law may become intensely more important in this area within the near future.

As an aid to this area's economy and its way of life, it should be protected and maintained. Those responsible for keeping section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law on the books, thus protecting every South Carolinian's and Orangeburg Countian's right to work, are in Washington. They have influence.

South Carolinians, and the people of the Orangeburg area in particular, should make their feelings known to their U.S. Senators and Representatives. Today is not too soon.

Mrs. Patrick Breslin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express my feelings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the recent death of an outstanding American and one of my great friends, Mrs. Patrick Breslin, affectionately known as Sandy. I knew "Sandy" Breslin for a number of years and I have never met anyone who was more sincere and genuine in her devotion to her country which was perhaps the predominating thought of her whole life. She made a special effort to aid in the rehabilitation of our soldiers when they returned from World War II and with her husband, Pat, extended to them the hospitality of their fishing concession without cost. Many wounded men as well as others accepted the Breslins' bounty and she and her husband erected a monument at Fort Monmouth to World War II veterans. Her host of friends in all walks of life are saddened by her passing and her patriotic devotion to American principles of "liberty and justice for all" will last forever in their hearts.

The following local newspaper articles tell in some detail about her activities and the appreciation that the people who lived in her community had of her thoughtful and magnanimous character.

[From the Red Bank (N.J.) Register, Apr. 30, 1963]

MRS. BRESLIN, OF PAT-SANDY FAME, DIES

ASBURY PARK.—Mrs. Beatrice S. Breslin, of 1207 Bergh Street, wife of Patrick B. Breslin, died yesterday in Fitkin Hospital, Neptune, at the age of 63.

Mr. and Mrs. Breslin, known locally as Pat and Sandy, for 20 years operated Pat and Sandy's pier on Shark River, at Belmar. They played host to over a million members of the Armed Forces, providing them with food, tackle, bait, and boats at no charge. For their kindnesses to military personnel, they were honored many times by Army and political figures.

For the last 7 years Mrs. Breslin operated a rooming house here.

She was born in Dublin, Ireland, daughter of the late John and Bridget McGraf McKnight.

Surviving, besides her husband, are a nephew, Father Joseph McKenna, of Fort Ord, Calif., and a niece, Mrs. John Nagle, of Camden.

Services will be Friday. Final arrangements are to be announced by the Francioni, Taylor & Lopez Funeral Home, here.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press, Apr. 30, 1963]

MRS. SANDY BRESLIN, 63, OF PAT AND SANDY, DIES

ASBURY PARK.—Mrs. Beatrice S. "Sandy" Breslin, who gained fame as half of the team of Pat and Sandy, which offered free boating and fishing facilities for thousands of servicemen, died yesterday at Fitkin Hospital, Neptune. She was 63 years old.

Mrs. Breslin and her husband, Patrick, moved to the shore about 30 years ago from Camden. They opened a small boat rental business on the island off the Belmar Marina in Shark River. Their reputation and initial investment of two rowboats grew over the years, and they soon leased a small rowboat and sandwich shop concession at the marina.

Shortly after the start of World War II the couple offered free boats, fishing equipment, and lunches to servicemen.

Shortly after their offer, Fort Monmouth, Earle, and Fort Dix expanded their facilities, to accommodate enlisted men from all over the country.

MEN ACCEPTED OFFER

The men soon accepted the Breslins' offer and the sandwich shop became a gathering place for soldiers as well as civilians.

Pat and Sandy entertained an estimated 300,000 men during the war.

Since then they were honored by local, State and national officials.

In 1944 their war efforts were remembered on a national radio show. The next year Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey, made a speech before the House of Representatives paying tribute to the pair.

Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, Mr. Auchincloss, and State Senator J. Stanley Herbert praised Pat and Sandy's efforts at the dedication of a shrine they bought honoring World War II veterans.

GREAT CITIZENS

"May this monument ever remind mankind of the devotion to the welfare of America * * * of the honest and patriotic enthusiasm of two great citizens," Mr. AUCHINCLOSS said.

In 1956 President Eisenhower thanked them for their work.

In 1960 they were presented with the flag that flew over the Capitol in Washington on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

The Breslins were faced with evacuation of their concession in 1948 when they couldn't find a firm to bond their boats when the concession came up for bids.

After they lost the business, the Veterans' Mothers Club of New Jersey raised over $4,000 for the couple.

With the money they bought a rooming house at 1207 Bergh Street, here, which they operated ever since.

TRIBUTE PAID

Paul Schweighardt, commander of the Harold Daly Post VFW, Asbury Park, said yesterday:

"The memory of Sandy Breslin is inscribed deeply in the hearts and minds of thousands of ex-servicemen entertained by her and her husband during World War II. Sandy was a true soldier on the home front and fought the war just as we in the front line trenches."

Mrs. Breslin was a communicant of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Church.

She is also survived by a nephew, the Reverend Hugh J. McKenna, California, and a niece, Mrs. John Nagle, Camden.

The Francioni, Taylor & Lopez Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

[From the Asbury Park Press, Asbury Park, N.J., May 1, 1963]

"SANDY"

Far beyond the circle of her close friends the passing of Mrs. Patrick Breslin will be noted with sorrow. To thousands of men called to military duty, particularly those stationed at Fort Monmouth in the World War II and Korea eras, she was affectionately known as Sandy. To these men, youngsters then, she was a genial lady with a warm heart that compelled her to be generous to a fault.

From that Pearl Harbor day in 1941, when she vowed that every man in uniform would enjoy recreation free of charge at Pat and Sandy's boat livery on Shark River, "Sandy" shared for 17 years her limited resources with servicemen seeking a pleasant interlude from military duty. Hundreds remembered her in correspondence from far-off places, including base hospitals.

Many notables recognized "Sandy's" rare contribution to soldier morale. When former President and Mrs. Eisenhower asked "Sandy" and her husband to the White House the occasion was informal. Of all the remembrances she received "Sandy" cherished most a personal gift from the First Lady.

Veterans of all branches of military service will agree with the tribute of Harold Daly Post, VFW, that " 'Sandy' was a true soldier on the homefront who fought the war just as we did in the frontlines."

[From the Red Bank (N.J.) Register, May 2, 1963]

"SANDY" BRESLIN

"Pat" and "Sandy" Breslin were known and loved by thousands upon thousands of World War II servicemen.

They were the true soldiers of the home-front—anxious to assist the cause.

They offered free boating and fishing facilities at their place of business on Shark River at Belmar. Servicemen stationed at nearby installations forgot the rigors of their training by spending many delightful hours at Pat and Sandy's place. It was all on-the-house.

Monday, Mrs. Breslin, the Sandy of the team, died at the age of 63.

Both "Sandy" and her husband share a solid place in Monmouth County's contributions to bringing about the end of the great war.

The honors they received from local, county, State, and national figures were well-deserved.

It was Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, Third District, who made a speech before the House of Representatives in 1945 paying tribute to the pair. Then Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll praised "Pat" and "Sandy" at the dedication of a shrine they bought honoring World War II veterans. In 1956 President Eisenhower thanked them for their work.

Mrs. Breslin and her husband gave of themselves to aid men who needed friends and companionship at a trying period. Mrs. Breslin long will be remembered for her service to mankind.

DAR Stands Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mrs. Edna Borden, of Marion, Mass., has requested that I call the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues. Some of us may not agree with the resolution of the Daughters of the American Revolution calling for U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. However, there is reason to question the effectiveness of the U.N. in many areas and the DAR is to be commended for taking a stand which it believes to be in the best interests of the Nation. There is no cause to doubt the sincerity, patriotism, or good intentions of the DAR.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Bedford Standard Times, Apr. 23, 1963]

DAR STANDS FIRM

The Daughters of the American Revolution can expect a lot more public support for their resolution, adopted again this year, calling for U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations.

Consistency ("* * * thou art a jewel") is a DAR characteristics, and on the U.N. issue the organization has shown impressive independent and farsighted thinking. The peace agency, under U Thant and policies of financial hypocrisy and forceful invasion of anti-Communist Katanga, has not made any new friends and has alienated many.

DAR resolutions reflect opinion based on principle and an understanding of the cold war. They oppose general disarmament and nuclear test-ban treaties, and advocate enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, national solvency, and less Federal encroachment on States rights.

This historic organization has its critics; a forthright attitude on any issue invites them these days. But its views are reasoned, sincere and patriotically motivated, and they earn respect. The DAR is a valuable part of the American way of life.

Combat Pay Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, together with a substantial number of Congressmen who have already indicated their active support, others may wish to join in coauthoring a combat pay amendment proposed to H.R. 5555, the military pay raise bill. The suggested amendment was requested by the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, and the Bureau of the Budget, and was approved by the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which held exhaustive hearings in studying and recommending this proposal.

The subcommittee proposal was not as broad as the Department of Defense, Army, and Bureau of the Budget proposal in that it did not cover times of actual declared war, being restricted to the present undeclared military combat operations in southeast Asia and any similar situation determined by the Department of Defense. The full committee struck the entire proposal from the subcommittee recommendations. The following amendment is the language approved by the subcommittee, being not quite as generous as the administration proposal. The amount of $55 was set because of this being the minimum amount of any unusual pay given for the many other things that have unusual pay added to basic pay.

The amendment which is expected to be offered on the floor is, therefore, no more generous than requested by the administration and is substantially in the exact terms of the administration proposal, being identically the language approved by the subcommittee which studied the matter. The precise language is as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF H.R. 5555

Insert the following new section at the end of the bill:

"SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE

"SEC. 14. (a) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) The following new section is added after section 399:

"'§ 310 Special pay; duty subject to hostile fire

"'(a) Except in time of war declared by Congress, and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service may be paid special pay at the rate of $55 a month for any month in which he was entitled to basic pay and in which he—

"'(1) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

"'(2) was on duty in an area in which he was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period he was on duty in that area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; or

"'(3) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

"A member covered by clause (3) who is hospitalized for the treatment of his injury or wound may be paid special pay under this section for not more than three additional months during which he is so hospitalized.

"'(b) A member may not be paid more than one special pay under this section for any month. A member may be paid special pay under this section in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

"'(c) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

"'(d) The Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress by March 1 of each year on the administration of this section during the preceding calendar year.'

"(2) The following new item is inserted in the analysis: '310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire.'

"(b) The Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 (50 App. U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is repealed."

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the proud and stouthearted people of Poland have always been restive under alien rule in their homeland. This was particularly true when they were forcibly held down by callous and ruthless Russian governors for more than a full century. By the year 1863 they had already endured the heavy yoke of the czarist regime, and now they were prepared to challenge the authority of their overlords by staging open rebellion against it.

In January this momentous but abortive move started well and at first appeared going well for the Poles. As the rising spread to most of the country, Russians were caught unaware and thus seemed unable to bring matters under their control. At this stage of the fighting the Poles were certain of victory, but as the protracted fighting continued and as massive Russian reinforcements arrived in Poland, the Polish cause seemed doomed, for without effective and immediate outside aid the gallant and dauntless Poles could not withstand the full force of mighty Russia. Thus ended

the most heroic attempt of the Polish people to get rid of their hated oppressors, 100 years ago. On the centenary observance of that important event all Poles can be proud of the fact that a century ago their forebears were as fully eager to regain their freedom and independence as the Polish people of today are praying for their freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 we marked the 172d anniversary of one of the greatest events in the history of Poland, the proclamation of a new liberal constitution in 1791.

The last decades of the 18th century were revolutionary times when many of our present democratic principles and institutions gained their first triumphs over the old order of autocratic rule. To the older tradition of British constitutional monarchy were added the turbulent French Republic and the young American democracy. Reforms were badly needed in Poland at that time, particularly since the country's internal weaknesses made it vulnerable to the aggressive designs of Russia.

Over a 3-year period the constitutional reforms were hammered out of the conflicting interests and attitudes of the various social groups. The result was a great liberal document which met the demand for stable government as well as the need for basic human rights and broader political representation.

On May 3, 1791, King Stanislas Augustus, who had taken part in the secret negotiations, introduced the draft constitution in the Diet and urged its passage. Most of the deputies favored the document, but a handful of reactionaries staged a wild attempt to defeat it. After several tumultuous hours the constitution was passed amid great rejoicing.

This moment of triumph and its promise for Poland's future were both short-lived. Catherine the Great, ruler of Imperial Russia, did not enjoy the prospect of a strengthened Poland and resolved to complete the partition of the country begun in 1772. Conspiring with three Polish dignitaries who opposed the new constitution, she ordered the Russian armies to invade Poland on April 8, 1792.

Deserted by the Prussians, who had promised to aid them, the small Polish army won three pitched battles but was nonetheless unable to stop the advance of the Russian forces. After 3 months of fighting, Poland was defeated and the King was forced to abandon the constitution. This led to the dismemberment of Poland by Russia, Austria, and Prussia in 1793 and 1795.

This great document was thus never given a chance to take root in the soil of political reality and grow into a living institution, as our American Constitution was able to do. Nevertheless, the Polish Constitution lives on as a testament to the Poles' longing for freedom and democracy, a desire which sadly today remains unfulfilled. On the occasion of Polish Constitution Day I join Poles everywhere in hoping that this inalienable right of self-government may be restored to their homeland.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a spirit of liberalism in an otherwise dark period in the history of personal freedoms, that is represented by the Polish Constitution drawn up in 1791 and presented to the Polish people by an enlightened ruler.

The 18th century alliance of Russia and Prussia had kept Poland as a vassal nation to these greater powers, but with the death of Frederick the Great in 1786, a rift developed between Russia and Prussia which allowed Polish nationalists to seize more authority for themselves. The names of three men stand out at this time for vigorous and capable leadership: Stanislaw Malachowski, Hugo Kollontaj, and Ignacy Potocki. Their united efforts helped in the raising of an army and the organization of an independent government. Diplomats were sent abroad to represent the new Polish national movement, and a commission sat down to draft a new Constitution based on the liberal spirit prevailing among progressive political circles at that time.

It took a year for the new Constitution to be drafted. As its liberal nature became known, part of the landed classes, some looking more for personal power rather than the national good, tried by all possible means to subvert attempts at the passing of this Constitution through the national legislature—the Diet. For 2 years the proponents of this document waited for the opportunity to have it presented for approval and finally, on May 3, 1791, their chance came. The Constitution was quickly passed into law. The new Polish Constitution was inspired by the same current of 18th century liberalism that was behind our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution as well as the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. This ray of liberalism in an otherwise benighted area found expression of a philosophy of government expressed in such terms as these:

> In human society all authority originates from the will of the Nation. In order therefore that the integrity of the country, civil liberties and the order of society may be forever equally maintained, three powers should, and by virtue of the present law shall forever constitute the Government of the Polish Nation: these are, the legislative power vested in the assembled estates, the supreme authority vested in the King and guardianship, and the judicial power vested in the jurisdictions established or to be established for that purpose."

This has the ring of our own Constitution.

It is futile to speculate as to how different the future would have been had the benefits of this constitution been granted to the people of Poland, and had such an enlightened government been allowed to grow. But the forces of reaction were too strong, both from without and within. Leaders of the dissident Polish faction joined forces with the new ruler of Russia, Catherine the Great; the czarist troops invaded Poland from the east. While after the breakup of the Russo-Prussian alliance Prussia had allied herself with Poland, this proved an unstable relationship. When Poland asked for aid from Prussia to fight off the Russians, the Prussian King reneged on his promises, and actually joined with the Russians in again trying to divide Poland. A gallant Polish army held out for 3 months, but defeat at the hands of stronger forces was inevitable.

When Poland fell victim to new partition between Prussia and Russia, the amazing documentation of Polish constitutional liberties was cast aside.

Yet the Polish people have always held out against foreign domination, keeping alive in their hearts that essential spark of liberty and national pride that always serves them so well. May it never be extinguished.

The many thousands of Polish-American citizens who reside in the Fifth Congressional District, the city of Philadelphia, and throughout the State of Pennsylvania, have an inborn spirit of independence and unity that have been handed down by their ancestors from previous national struggles.

They never have given up the fight for national independence for Poland; they never will until a free flag flies over her soil, free from domination by her communistic masters who hold only a temporary stewardship. Bound together with their people in the native land, the struggle for national independence will go on until the day when the leash will again be broken and the godless conquerers banished from the land.

On this, Polish Constitution Day, let us remember the struggles of these brave people in both war and peace to maintain national integrity based on freedom and equal rule for all citizens. Our best wishes should go to them in their never-ending efforts.

Jessica McCullough Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has saddened all of us who served in the

House with Jessica Weis to learn of her passing. She was a distinguished member, a most competent legislator, and a delightful person to know.

I had the pleasure of appearing with Mrs. Weis several times on panels, where she was a very able and knowledgeable speaker.

The loss of her gracious presence is felt by all of us, I know. Her fine qualities have left a lasting mark in the memories of those of us who were her colleagues.

Environmental Health Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a problem being given most serious consideration by the Congress and the American people these days is the effect of environmental factors upon our health. Recently a very lucid and forceful definition of environmental health was written in the Washington Star by Mr. Gershon Fishbein, editor and publisher of the Environmental Health Newsletter. I found it so well expressed that I am including it here as part of my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 17, 1963]

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAS ITS PROBLEMS, TOO

(By Gershon Fishbein)

Public concern has been increasing in recent years over a large number of actual and potential threats to health in the environment. This concern is reflected in such best selling books as Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" and other volumes on the bookshelves.

CONCERN ABOUT HAZARDS

Polluted air and dirty water, exposures to radiation, uncertainties about the effects of pesticides in food, the impact of noise and traffic and other stresses in an increasingly urban culture have created and fostered a larger public concern about the cumulative effects of these environmental hazards in the community.

This national mood of uneasiness about the air we breathe, the water we drink and the food we eat has given rise to a new concept in health protection. For want of a better and more descriptive term, it is called environmental health.

In his recent health message to Congress, President Kennedy called for establishment of a National Environmental Health Research Center in the Washington area to serve as a focal point of research in the multiple hazards of the environment. The U.S. Public Health Service has also proposed a Bureau of Environmental Health for the administrative regrouping of functions which were formerly handled separately.

Environmental health is based on the well-documented concept that all of the factors in man's physical environment are related to and compound each other. Thus, the individual living in a typical urban community such as Washington is likely to be the unhappy target of a number of pollutants simultaneously. The unpeaceful coexistence of contaminants in air, water, and food which reach the city dweller is an inescapable fact of 20th century urban life.

In seeking answers to the problems associated with the contaminants, environmental health calls on a wide variety of scientific disciplines not usually considered by the public to be involved in health protection. Physicians, sanitarians, engineers, statisticians are but a few examples.

ON MEASURING ILLNESSES

Environmental health protection also demands new methods of measuring and identifying illnesses. For the most part, the illnesses which result from exposure to environmental contaminants are not sudden and dramatic. They are not caused by viruses or bacteria which invade the body and quickly send the patient to bed with pneumonia or influenza.

With the notable exception of air pollution episodes which hit suddenly if infrequently, the effects of contaminants are generally slow acting. They are measured in terms of years of exposure to low levels of pollutants. Thus, the chronic or degenerative diseases become the special targets of attention.

The occupational physicians, nurses, and hygienists who will be meeting this week at the Sheraton Park are in excellent positions to make important contributions to this larger concept of environmental health. They have controlled populations at their disposal for study and treatment and have the facilities to extend that surveillance into off-duty hours in the community.

PUBLIC BECOMES ALARMED

Boisfeuillet Jones, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs to HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze, told the House Appropriations Subcommittee:

"When it appears that relatively little is being done to cope with the new health problems accompanying the rapid industrial development and concentration of population, the public justifiably is alarmed.

"It is confused by lack of scientific assurance on the toxicity of various agents, on the tolerable limits of intake or exposure, and on the reasonableness and rationale of control measures. It has a right to expect a concerted effort to find answers to these questions and to application of the knowledge in preventive and protective measures."

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, Friday last, observance was made that this date marked the 172d year the Constitution of Poland has been in existence.

The Polish Constitution was adopted in 1791, just 2 years after our own. Throughout these many years our two countries have had much in common and so, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with many Members on both sides of the aisle in paying honor to a gallant nation.

The Polish people, time and time again, have translated their belief in the democratic faith expressed in their Constitution.

In honoring freedom fighters of the past we wish to convey added strength to freedom fighters of the present. Today the people of Poland are still the oppressed captives of communism, but their hopes, their dreams, their courage has never faltered and we commend them for this spirit.

Hope is ever present in their hearts and we join with them in the fervant wish that the principles upon which their Constitution was based will soon be restored to the Polish people.

As we pay tribute to the people of Poland and commemorate Polish Constitution Day, let us all rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom and to the pilosophy of self-determination for all people.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the history of Poland has been one of unceasing struggle by its people for freedom and self-determination. Unprotected by any natural boundaries, it has for centuries past served as a battleground for warring powers and a prize for the victors. But despite this adversity, Poland has seen its days of glory.

The 16th century saw the golden age of Poland when trade and education flourished; in 1791, its great constitution came into being; and the interim of the two World Wars saw it again as an independent state, willing and able to take its place among the proud nations of the world.

But, for each victory, there has been a corresponding period of despair as Poland has been battered by the hammer of foreign oppression. And perhaps at no time has its plight been as severe as it has been since the last war. Poland, a once proud, vital, and ethnically strong nation, now lies pinned by the military heel of Russian communism.

So today, as on every May 3, free Poles across the world are joined by their many friends in the commemoration of one of Poland's most promising moments, the birth of its constitution in 1791.

Americans in particular can identify themselves with Poland's spirit of freedom. At the time of our War of Independence, two great Polish patriots fought for us on our soil; and 2 years after the signing of our Constitution, Poland's own came into being, as a beam of light in totalitarian darkness. Although almost immediately there followed recurring oppression and misery, that light has never been extinguished in the hearts of her people. And in her worst trials she now stands, her head is bloody, but unbowed, presenting a bewildering problem to the Russian empire. Her people, their spirit high and invincible, have forced concession after concession from her master, while her brothers and friends in the free world continue to press for her liberation. We do not doubt that the sun will again raise

over a free Poland, when her people can once more practice the national traditions that their sacrifices have bought.

Dr. Harlow Shapley Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, May 3, the citizens of Carthage, Mo., honored one of their distinguished citizens, Dr. Harlow Shapley, Paine professor emeritus, Harvard University.

Dr. Shapley has earned an outstanding national reputation for his research into the mysteries of space. He is an author and lecturer of note and an educator of the highest order.

A native of Barton County, Mo., he graduated in 1907 from the Carthage Collegiate Institute, Carthage, Mo., and in 1910 from the University of Missouri.

Following is House resolution recognition of Dr. Harlow Shapley Day.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 155

Whereas Friday, May 3, 1963 has been designated Dr. Harlow Shapley Day in Carthage, a homecoming sponsored by the Carthage Evening Press and the Carthage Chamber of Commerce for Dr. Harlow Shapley, Paine professor emeritus, Harvard University; and

Whereas Dr. Shapley was born November 2, 1885, on a farm in Barton County, Mo., and was graduated in 1907 from the Carthage Collegiate Institute, Carthage, Mo., and in 1910 from the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.; and

Whereas in the succeeding years, Dr. Shapley has conducted research into and otherwise probed the mysteries of space and time with such skill and devotion that he has earned the respect and admiration of men of science and letters throughout the world, having identified Shapley Center, the heart of the galaxy of which the planet earth is a part; and

Whereas Dr. Shapley is among the first to offer logical reasons for belief that there is life elsewhere in the boundless universe; and

Whereas Dr. Shapley has been titled with honorary degrees by 16 leading universities and otherwise lauded by institutions of higher learning throughout the world; and

Whereas Dr. Shapley is an author and lecturer of note and an educator of the highest order, whose superior mind has delved into the realm of philosophy and theology with illuminating results; and

Whereas Dr. Shapley is widely recognized as one of the great scientists of the ages; and

Whereas Dr. Shapley is a member of a distinguished family of learned persons who have combined to bring honor, dignity, and stature to their native State of Missouri through dedication to truth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of Missouri, That Dr. Harlow Shapley be commended with deepest respect and most profound admiration as a native Missourian of the highest order, who has improved both the condition and stature of man and figuratively engraved the name of the State of Missouri upon the fact of the heavens; and be it further

Resolved, That the people of Carthage and of Jasper and Barton Counties be heartily commended for remembering this distinguished Missourian, this leading American, this inspiring citizen of earth, with a homecoming at the place of his origin; and that appropriately inscribed copies of this resolution be forwarded to President John F. Kennedy; to Missouri Members of the House and Senate of the 88th Congress of the United States; and to Dr. and Mrs. Harlow Shapley, Peterborough, N.H.

The Envoy of Socialist Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, a very timely and appropriate editorial appeared in the Moline Daily Dispatch on April 30.

It very succinctly points out what many of us in the House of Representatives have been saying on many occasions. That the Castro dictatorship to be made a part of a worldwide conspiratorial power can no longer be denied.

It is sickening and disturbing to those of us who believe in freedom and freedom-loving people to read about the great welcome Mr. Khrushchev is rendering to Fidel Castro.

I, therefore, take this occasion to recommend the reading of the following editorial:

[From the Moline Daily Dispatch, Apr. 30, 1963]

THE ENVOY OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

In welcoming him to Moscow, Premier Khrushchev referred to Fidel Castro as "the envoy of the first socialist revolution on the American continent."

And by socialist, the Soviet leader of course meant Communist.

Whatever the terminology, Cuba is the first nation in the Western Hemisphere to become an integral part of the Communist world.

This is a well known fact, but it is given fresh emphasis by Castro's visit to the Soviet Union. This episode dramatizes the reality that Cuba, an island only a few miles from the shores of the United States, has been transformed into an outpost of the Communist empire, the first such in the New World.

Cuba is an old story in some respects. Expropriation of property without compensation, police-State justice, violent overthrow of recognized governments, assassination, socialism, communism—these and other features of the Castro dictatorship are not a new experience in this part of the world; they have, in fact, developed often.

But the Castro dictatorship is the first American dictatorship to be made a part of the worldwide conspiratorial power structure which is directed from Moscow.

Our European friends, who have been living with the Communist threat in their own neighborhood for years, sometimes think that our concern over Cuba is excessive.

If it is excessive, perhaps this is due not to any danger inherent in the Castro regime itself, or to fear of the Castro regime itself, but to the realization that it could mark the beginning of something much worse.

Only a small part of one tentacle is inside the door, but the whole octopus is just outside.

Castro's trip to Moscow gives us a fresh look at him: He's Moscow's man in Havana.

Our Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and as an American citizen vitally concerned with the state of our economy and our fight with the Communists, I am deeply disturbed with what appears to be a shallow attitude toward the size and effectiveness of our merchant marine fleet.

Since World War II this fleet has been decreasing steadily, the shipbuilders council estimates we have been losing about 30 ships a year. The fact is that now less than 10 percent of our trade is carried on U.S. flagships.

The loss of our merchant marine is most serious—not only do we lose employment for our seamen and shipbuilders but our balance of payments is upset. Further, our defense in the event of war is weakened by forced reliance on foreign powers.

The following editorial from the Quincy Patriot Ledger conveys to the reader the needed sense of urgency and describes the problem in depth. It suggests government action. Every Member of Congress should read and be ready to respond to this excellent editorial:

OUR MERCHANT FLEET

The tide is out for the U.S. merchant marine.

But it had better start coming in, or the United States faces serious difficulty.

This warning has been sounded, before, and has gone largely upheeded. The Shipbuilders Council of America points out that the American seagoing merchant fleet has been steadily declining at a rate of about 30 ships a year.

The U.S. coastwise and intercoastal fleet, which numbered some 700 vessels prior to World War II, now is composed of 307 vessels, mostly tankers, and less than 10 percent of the trade and commerce of the United States is carried aboard U.S.-flag ships, according to the council.

Troy H. Browning, national president of the Propeller Club of the United States, presented a cogent case for a strengthened U.S. merchant marine in a recent speech before the Houston Propeller Club. Mr. Browning noted that a strong merchant fleet is vital for this country in time of war, and that the U.S. cannot depend on foreign carriers to meet its wartime needs.

However, he makes the point that a strong merchant marine is also necessary in peacetime—to bolster our position as a trading nation.

"The basic issue involves national self-sufficiency in ocean transportation," Mr.

Browning believes. It "relates directly to national production and world trade, as well as international assistance in economic, political and social progress."

U.S. commercial flag ships are needed to keep shipping rates competitive, Mr. Browning states. "Take American ships off the trade routes of the world, and increased shipping rates charged by foreign ship owners would surely follow."

Our ships provide assistance in the balance of payments problem, since freight charges paid to foreign carriers mean money flowing overseas. American-flag ships—and foreign-flag shipping owned by U.S. citizens—"must be responsive to America's economic requirements when needed and where needed." Foreign shippers operate to make the most profits, not to take care of U.S. commercial needs.

The U.S. merchant marine is also a part of this country's cold war political arsenal, Mr. Browning points out. The Soviet Union, with a growing merchant fleet, is attempting to control "the flow of sea commerce into and out of selected countries whose geographic location is of strategic importance to free world trade." American and free world ships must be available to offer the new nations a choice of world markets for their exports, rather than allow the Soviet Union to tie up their trade.

Both Mr. Browning and the Shipbuilders Council concede that U.S.-flag shipping is expensive and largely noncompetitive with low-cost foreign flag shipping. Wages of U.S. merchant seamen, for example, are estimated to be three to five times those of foreign seamen, and the high cost of U.S. shipbuilding is a well-established fact.

The U.S. Government has lagged in meeting the challenges of providing a strong merchant marine. The Shipbuilders Council charges the Government with failing "to weigh the cost of maintaining a strong U.S. merchant marine against the benefits to be derived by the country in terms of national and economic considerations."

Congress last year appropriated $64.2 million to cover the Government's participation in the cost of building nine new ships as part of the long-range ship replacement program of the subsidized ship operators. Ninety-eight million dollars were made available the previous year.

But the Maritime Administrator pointed out in hearings that the current long-range program contemplates replacement of the subsidized fleet at a rate of from 15 to 20 ships per year—considerably above the level approved by Congress.

Mr. Browning asserts: "In the 1960's our Nation will spend about one-third of 1 percent of the Federal budget per year in the field of merchant shipping. We spend about the same amount on subsidization of peanuts."

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has shown himself to be no friend of the U.S. shipbuilding industry or of the merchant marine, as evidenced by his rejection of the Bethlehem Steel Co. application for Federal subsidies to build two iron ore carriers. The ships are being built in West Germany, which means a loss of work for an American shipyard, a loss in wages for workers and a flow of dollars overseas, adding to the U.S. balance-of-payments problem.

The Government for too long has paid lip service to the need for a strong merchant marine without doing much about it. It's about time the Government faced up to the issue and began taking action to strengthen our fleet.

GOP Names St. Louis Woman, Vera R. Glaser, Publicity Director for 1964 Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former newspaper and public relations executive was recently appointed publicity director of the Republican National Committee. Mrs. Vera R. Glaser, whose articles have appeared in many newspapers across the country was one of the first woman leaders in the Republican Party to recognize the need for increased staffs responsible to the minority on congressional committees.

The two-party system will be strengthened by her return to the Republican National Committee. I am sure my colleagues will note with interest the complete text of an article which appeared recently in the Washington Star and other leading newspapers announcing Mrs. Glaser's appointment:

GOP NAMES ST. LOUIS WOMAN PUBLICITY DIRECTOR FOR 1964 RACE

(By Alan Emory)

WASHINGTON.—With the 1964 presidential campaign right around the corner, the Republican high command has decided to compete with all that Kennedy glamor. For the first time in history, it has selected a woman, vivacious, blue-eyed Vera R. Glaser, to direct its press relations.

Mrs. Glaser, a native of St. Louis, whose flashing smile and lively personality have made here a favorite with newsmen during 7 years of stanch Republican service, is a former reporter for the New York Herald-Tribune and has been an active free-lance writer.

In picking a woman to run the vital press relations operation going into a presidential campaign, GOP National Chairman William E. Miller was choosing someone who lives and breathes politics. If she has a presidential favorite for 1964, Mrs. Glaser isn't saying.

But she has practiced up for spreading harmony within the party by arguing her differences over GOP candidates with Husband Herbert, a native Washingtonian and administrative officer of the National Labor Relations Board.

PROBLEM OF WORDS

Mrs. Glaser sees the Republicans as having a splendid opportunity "if they can get the word across." The problem, she says, is that the administration news outlets have so many words at their command.

Since joining the staff of former Senator Philip E. Potter, of Michigan in 1956, Mrs. Glaser says, she has learned certain keys to political success. One is the desire for anonymity.

"The most explosive problem in politics is who gets the credit," she said in an interview. "If you want to achieve something, the important point is that it gets done, but many people are always trying to grab the credit."

Another key is learning to cope with the unexpected gesture or unplanned event that may suddenly become a major campaign issue. Almost anything anyone in public life does can be translated into a major public event in the middle of a campaign, she says.

"The best politician must be responsive to the needs of the people," she adds, "because without that the best publicity campaign won't mean a thing."

Finally, she said, the role of a political party is to teach. She finds the great challenge to the Republicans in getting across the idea that the best government is not necessarily the one that promises to solve everything in Washington, but to take a mature attitude toward the proper division of responsibilities.

After 2½ years with Senator POTTER, Mrs. Glaser joined the Republican National Committee as director of public relations for the women's division. There she helped prepare for the 1960 national convention, including the development of facilities for 4,000 correspondents.

Her prize achievement, however, was the publication of a pamphlet on voting frauds called "Are You a Shadow Voter?"

BOOKLET ENDORSED

Now standard campaign material, the booklet, though a Republican production, is the only document ever released by any political organization that has won the endorsement of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

Mrs. Glaser says her new job will be like writing a page 1 news story every day.

"The Republican story will be the major political story," she insists. "The Democratic story will be all cut and dried."

Mrs. Glaser attended Washington University in St. Louis and George Washington University in Washington. The Glasers have a daughter, Carol, a high school student.

Although for the past year she has been press secretary to Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York and National Chairman Miller is a New Yorker, Mrs. Glaser says this does not mean she has any prejudice toward New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller for the Presidential nomination.

All she wants is a "progressive, forward-looking candidate"—preferably one who can win.

Political Use of Public Works Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Accelerated Public Works Act, if it is eventually passed, will be paid for of course by all the taxpayers of the country, Republicans and Democrats alike. However, I gather the impression that the public works projects will be doled out after advice from the Democratic county chairmen. I quote from an article printed in the May 1 Syracuse Post-Standard, Syracuse, N.Y.:

BAILEY MAKES REQUEST AT WATERTOWN

Democratic county chairmen from five north counties have been asked to establish a system of priorities for public works projects in the north country.

The request came at a closed-door meeting with John Bailey, national Democratic chairman and William H. McKeon, State Democratic chairman.

McKeon passed a list among the chairmen which had all the current projects submitted by municipal and county governments asking for aid under the Accelerated Public Works Act and told the chairmen to mark the projects in their areas one, two, and so forth.

This indicates to me at least that these public works projects are being located to secure democratic votes and it gripes me to have my tax money go for that purpose.

To the Graduates of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, at this season of the year many of our young people are joyfully preparing to graduate from high school and from college. Many words of advice will be uttered to these graduates in the coming weeks.

In this connection, I would commend to the Members of this House and to the Nation the following words from Tom Anderson, editor of Farm & Ranch magazine as appears in the May 1963 issue:

TO THE GRADUATES OF 1963

Once upon a time a mighty king condemned one of his lowly subjects to die. The wretch proposed and the king agreed to call off the execution if, within a year, the condemned could teach the king's horse to fly.

"Why postpone the inevitable?" a friend asked the wretch.

"It's no inevitable," he replied. "The odds are 4 to 1 in my favor: (1) The king might die; (2) I might die; (3) the horse might die; (4) I might teach the horse to fly."

Jesus said, "All things are possible to him that believeth."

A person who aims at nothing has a target he can't miss. Set an attainable goal. When you reach it, set another goal, higher. Many people flounder on the ship of life because they never chart a course. Make money the byproduct, not the goal. Drink at the fountain of knowledge, don't just gargle.

It's all right for you girls to be fortune-hunters, if you marry a man who's a fortune in himself. Marry kindness, ambition, courage, determination, diligence, intelligence, honesty, good manners, sympathy, integrity, enthusiasm—and you have married a fortune. And remember, it takes two to make a marriage a success, but only one to make it a failure. "Kissin' don't last but good cookin' do."

Don't ever let anybody sell you the idea that chastity is out of date. Chastity will never be out of date. Your children will want their mother to be as pure as you want your mother to be. If we lose our morality we will be enslaved, and vice versa. Freedom and morality are one ball of wax. The great Thomas Jefferson said: "Yes, we did produce a near perfect republic. But will they keep it? Or will they, in the enjoyment of plenty, lose the memory of freedom? Material abundance without character is the surest way to destruction."

Remember, freedom while God-given, does not perpetuate itself. There is only one great giver—and that is God, not government. Government can give you nothing but what it takes from somebody else. A government big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you've got, including your freedom. Government is not a creator, but a parasite. Government can be a good friend, or your worst enemy. Government must be studied, understood, participated in, and controlled by the people, else it may become not the referee it is supposed to be, but a tyrant. Demand that your government leave you alone, as long as you are not harming your fellow man.

You should be rewarded according to your ability and your effort, not your needs. Prepare to pay your own debts, but not the debts of the parasites. Go the extra mile to help him who would help himself, but give nothing to the leech who would live off the diligence of others. If you're determined to milk all possible pleasure out of life, buy your own cow, don't milk somebody else's through the fence.

Remember, you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. America represents the last hope of mankind, during our time, to be free. The enslaved of the world look to America. We may yet have the morality and the courage to free them from Communist tyranny. But if we lose our freedom, who will free us? If the lamp of freedom is blown out in America, the world will be thrown into darkness.

Every person can excel in something. Develop your God-given talents to their highest pinnacle. Do not accept mediocrity. In the final analysis, neither your government nor your parents are responsible for you—you are responsible for yourself. Believe in your God, in your country, and in yourself, and in that order. Repeat constantly to yourself: "It all depends on me."

There are two kinds of people; those who lift and those who lean. Some dedicate their lives to lifting their own character and fortunes and in making the world a better place because they are in it. The leaners, on the other hand, are parasites who live off the achievements of others. Be a driver, not a hitchhiker.

Recently a woman told me that my daughter, age 22, had more character than almost any person her age she had ever known. This brought a tear to my eye. This I had rather have heard than that she is the most beautiful, the best dancer, singer, writer, painter, athlete or anything else. This is the supreme compliment. For character is the only thing we earn on earth which we can take with us when we die. Reputation is what you're supposed to be; character is what you are. Reputation is what your obituary says. Character is what your angels say.

You can't help it if you're ugly at 18. But if you're not beautiful at 80, it's your own fault. You can't help it if you were able neither to earn nor to inherit much in wordly goods. But character is a victory, not a gift. If you lack it, blame not your parents nor society, blame yourself.

Confucius said: "To know what is right and not do it is the worst of cowardice."

The morning after Charles Lindberg flew the Atlantic nonstop from New York to Paris, an associate of Charles Kettering rushed into the research expert's laboratory in Dayton, Ohio, shouting: "He made it. Lindbergh landed safely in Paris. "He did it all by himself." Kettering looked up from his work momentarily and remarked quitely: "When he flies it with a committee, let me know." The great accomplishments of history have been wrought by individuals, not by the mass. Learn to sing solo. Anybody can sing when everybody is singing.

Thomas Carlyle said: "The great law of culture is: Let each become all that he was created capable of being."

Society advances mainly through those who're unafraid to be different. "The strongest man on earth is the man who stands most alone." Dare to be a Daniel. Dare to be square. Be a sovereign individual, not just a member of the mob. Be the chicken with the guts to say no to the crowd when the crowd's wrong.

The completely happy person who has no problems is either without sanity or conscience. Trouble is the common denominator of living. Clouds bring life-giving rainstorms and are a necessary part of life. Learn to face life as it is, and as it can be.

One of your most precious possessions is time. It's criminal to waste it. You'll never live this moment again. Cato confessed that the fault which he felt the greatest need to repent was spending an hour unprofitably.

Life is an opportunity, a skill to be developed, a victory to be won. Every passing second is a grain of gold—won or lost. The poet said: "Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: 'It might have been'." It might have been if we had so willed it.

TOM ANDERSON.

James J. Saxon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the hearings now being held before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which so far have been largely an attack on the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James J. Saxon, I thought the Members would be interested in seeing the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, May 3:

MR. SAXON'S OPPOSITION

The entire banking community has been stirred up by James J. Saxon, the Comptroller of the Currency, who is responsible for supervising nationally chartered banks.

Mr. Saxon is a brash and vigorous exponent of more competition and less regulation in banking, a point of view that most bankers preach rather than practice. His actions have aroused the ire of the Independent Bankers Association and the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, who are seeking to oust him.

Mr. Saxon's alleged crime is that he has challenged the sanctity of the dual banking system, under which National and State banks abide by the same local regulations. His willingness to charter new national banks and his desire to give them more extensive branching powers would mean increased competition in many areas now served by banks enjoying quasimonopoly positions.

This policy would stimulate bank expansion and offer the public, as savers and borrowers, much more efficient and cheaper service. The result would be healthy for the economy and would not damage the dual banking system. On the contrary, it would strengthen it.

The dual banking system is useful, but only if it is not looked upon as immutable. Banking cannot thrive unless it accepts the need to liberalize the rules. Those bankers and State supervisors who persist in defending the status quo will end up by stunting banking's growth and open the way for other types of financial institutions that are prepared to meet the needs of the public.

Greater competition in banking is essential and Mr. Saxon deserves applause, not condemnation, for saying so. He may be overzealous in his campaign and too sweeping in some of his proposals; but the shaking up that he is giving the banking industry is the best thing that could happen to it.

Lincoln: In Shadow and Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lehigh County Republican Committee in the district that I have the honor to represent, sponsors two essay contests on the "Life and Ideals of Abraham Lincoln" as part of the Lincoln Day celebrations, one being for senior high school students and the other for junior high school students of Lehigh County. The winning selections are made by a board of distinguished educators from several hundred essays submitted. I am very proud of the fine students and the essays they submit. This year the contest for the senior high school students was won by Evelyn Phillips, an 11th-grade student at Parkland High School in Orefield, Pa.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the winning essay of this young lady, entitled "Lincoln: In Shadow and Reality."

The essay follows:

LINCOLN: IN SHADOW AND REALITY

(By Evelyn Phillips)

A house divided against itself cannot stand, but Lincoln stood. In his statement Lincoln was referring to the Government, stating that it couldn't endure half slave and half free; but it had to be all one or all the other. In many instances his life could be explained by the various illustrations he propounded to prove his point or to argue a theory.

There has been much controversy concerning the mind and character of Lincoln. Some believe him to have been a lazy, brooding, two-faced individual who has risen to his present fame because necessary facts have been disregarded and thus his portrait falsely painted. Others hold him in highest esteem citing his honesty, his deeds, and his death as a martyr as their primary reasons. There probably never will be a settlement to this antiquated dispute, but it would be well to understand the facts before selecting the position we wish to adhere to.

Because of the wandering instinct of his father, Lincoln, as a child, lived a varied existence moving from one State to another. His environment was the basic factor contributing to his awkward clumsiness and crude, rustic manners, which he never improved. He was a hard luck boy, but his life as a farmer agreed with him, and he grew strong. His mother died before he was 10, leaving no one to console him and calm his fears. His father often knocked him around, which is probably why he adopted the philosophy of not wasting corporal punishment on the young. As a youth he was good natured, imaginative, but rather idle. Throughout his life he had less than a year's schooling, but made up for this lack by reading whatever he could borrow or buy.

Lincoln developed his faculty for storytelling while he was still a boy. This was the chief diversion of the wilderness, and everyone engaged in it. As a young man he turned this ability to biting satire. He stopped this practice abruptly when one of the men he had satirized, James Shields, challenged him to a duel. Lincoln realized his mistake and changed to more manly ways of showing his distaste and poking fun. His sense of humor proved in later years to be a safety valve by which to relieve the tension from his official trials and anxieties. He often passed time by reverting to his youth and spinning a yarn of his early experiences. It was also at this point that he set forth his purpose in life—to leave the world a better place than the one he had come into.

Before becoming a lawyer, Lincoln served in many different capacities. At first, he became a trader, making trips down the Mississippi to New Orleans. These voyages probably brought him into his first contact with slavery. Later, he became a clerk in a New Salem store, a surveyor of the prairies, a member of the Illinois Legislature, and finally studied law on the advice of John T. Stuart.

Contrary to the belief of most people, he did not always defend the poor and downtrodden, but he often took the side of the strong to try to eke out a meager existence to support his family. His lawyer habits were poor—frequently he was not prepared in court, he would take either side of a case, and sometimes he lost cases that should have been won. It is said that he would rather abandon a case than bolster up a false position, and that he usually didn't take a case unless he thought his client was right. By the standards which are applied to the conduct of lawyers, Lincoln was honest. When he became absorbed in a case, he used sharp logic and usually won it. He was modest in his successes.

Lincoln never attained any great wealth in his life, nor did he reach any high social position. Although he tried to advance his fortunes, he had no head for speculation and failed. He overlooked many opportunities that presented themselves, but kept seeking recognition. Lincoln had no taste for well-bred living, and found it hard to break into society. He was down to earth—truly, a man of the people.

Lincoln was moved by a desire to do what he thought was right. He was greately impeded, though, by the workings of his wavering mind. There seems to have been a division in his thinking which resulted in his frequent making of contradictory statements, which gave him a bad record in Congress. To compensate for this handicap, he found it necessary to take an indefinite stand on most issues and not mention his plans, purposes, and intents. He had to be cautious, deliberate, and precise to evade a hold by his antagonists. Although this seems to be the major reason for his slowness to rise and to find his position in the world, other truths must be considered.

Lincoln's goal, as stated before, was to rise above the life into which he was born and to arrive at a higher station than was the position of his youth. He craved the respect of his fellows. Since he disliked manual labor, he turned to law and later to politics to accomplish his aim, receiving his much desired praise. He saw honors being bestowed on others, but never on himself. He felt rejected and a failure. Although he said, "If in your wisdom you see satisfactory to keep me in the background, I have been too familiar with disappointments to be very much chagrined," his actions proved otherwise. Lincoln couldn't endure the pangs of defeat, for which he seemed to be a magnet, and he fell into the clutches of melancholy. Because his ambitions came to nothing and his future looked bleak, he began to feel as though life held nothing for him.

Lincoln had vague ideas about how he could rectify situations, but failed to put them into action. His mode of indecision seemed to be hampering him when the question of slavery became foremost in his day. But other factors contributed to his shaky stand. He actually had no definite solution to curb the expansion of slavery and remove its ills. He said that it should not be disturbed where it existed, but, by all means, should be kept out of the new free states so the welfare of the poor people would be preserved. Although he was criticized for issuing the Emancipation Proclamation and lost many supporters, he seemed to have at last taken a stand, used his own judgment, and accomplished a purpose.

If he would have been better informed on the cares of State and self-culture, Lincoln would have made a better President and found it unnecessary to complain of his difficulties. He loved the homely wisdom of Aesop, but knew little of history, military science, and affairs of Government. If he would have used his photographic memory and the publications in the Congressional Library, to which he had access, he could have abandoned his habit of patterning his ideas and attitudes after others. Lincoln was weak in this sense, but strong in others.

Because he pardoned so many men during the Civil War, Lincoln was censured. His reply to his critics, who felt that his action encouraged greater insubordination, on this matter revealed his incredible logic. He stated that it didn't improve a soldier to shoot him and that he wouldn't destroy his own men because the enemy was killing enough of them. His rebuttal also displayed his deep humanitarianism. He said, "It rests me after a hard day's work if I can find some good reason for saving a man's life."

Lincoln enjoyed simple entertainment. He engaged in few sports, but liked to bowl, wrestle, and engage in a game of handball. He applied the tactics of wrestling to his political career. He was usually on the defensive during trials and while engaging in debates, trying to prevent a hold. He had a tendency to tell self-derogatory jokes when he was relating the highest compliments that had been paid him. This practice seemed to place him on an equal plane with those he encountered.

Lincoln never joined a church because he believed in simplicity in religion. He stated that whenever any church would inscribe over its altar as its sole qualification for membership, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and thy neighbor as thyself," he would join that church with all his heart and with all his soul. The fact that he did not join a church, which would have helped him in his political career, showed his strength to stand by principle. But even though he was a praying man, read the Bible a lot, and used it for appeals to the people, he was inclined to be superstitious and believed in dreams. This fact is not so strange, though, because mysticism was inherent in all frontier people, and Lincoln was one of them.

Lincoln was thought to be a cold man because he seemed only to move with regard for his own feelings. He married Mary Todd to cure himself of his depression resulting from his broken word to wed her; he allowed no one to become familiar with him; he wasn't distressed over his father's death and refused to forgive him for his shortcomings; and he failed to realize how others felt and couldn't discern their motives. This wise man was found wanting.

But if Lincoln was such a controversial figure, why is he considered so great today?

What virtues did this man possess to account for his fame? Why does the memory of his deeds live on? Many people have tried to put their finger on something tangible in answer to these questions, but all have failed. The reason is probably because the man that was Lincoln had that something extra, perhaps personal magnetism, perhaps destiny, that defied all explanation.

Lincoln's greatness doesn't lie in the fact that he was a remarkable President, nor is it derived from any of his accomplishments. Rather, it comes from the whole of the man, himself. From the beginning, Lincoln had nothing superficial to offer the world—no good looks, no wealth, no admirable background. But he did have something finer—the humanity, the honesty, and the humility that overcame his handicaps and enabled him to emerge as a man among men. It was in recognition of these features that a desperate Nation allowed a country lawyer to lead them through 4 years of conflict.

Lincoln didn't have to build a monument to himself to perpetuate his memory, as some men have tried, because he was that monument—a tower of hopes and fears of an entire Nation. He was a man who had risen from the wilderness to the White House in an age of hostility with only himself as a buoy. He had cast aside all obstacles and had run the race to the finish.

It is hard to find fault with a man who can't defend himself. If Lincoln had lived, the shadow of his life might have faded into glowing reality, but the assassin's bullet prevented that vision from ever materializing. There probably never will be a solution to the legend that has grown from the man that was Lincoln, but the facts stand clear and the portrait is finished.

Good Advice by Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation people talk about the administration's Cuban policy as freely as they talk about the day's weather. Everyone knows that the storm still rages and that there is no letup in sight. Some of us think it is about time we left our cozy, isolated camp and braved the storm. Richard Nixon and the New Bedford Standard Times are among these. I would like to call the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New Bedford Standard Times, Apr. 23, 1963]

GOOD ADVICE BY NIXON

Former Vice President Richard Nixon has succinctly stated the issue that Cuba presents to this Nation: Whether it is not better to accept the risk of a stronger policy now than to await the consequences of inaction.

In either alternative, Nixon believes there is hazard, but the greater danger lies in sitting "too long on this powder keg" while conceding that ultimately the Soviet beachhead in this hemisphere must be removed. Although not advocating blockade or invasion, the former Vice President said that "what is necessary" must be done, including the removal of restraints on forays by Cuban exiles.

As Nixon pointed out, U.S. policy is an accumulation of contradictions. This he emphasized, stating "we have courageously dared a blockade to keep the peace," but "withdrew the blockade to avoid war." It is difficult to defend, in logic, a policy that permits the Soviet Union to strengthen a beachead in Cuba while denying Cubans a right to a beachhead of their own on the island.

Essentially what Nixon appears to have in mind in urging a "fundamental change in policy" is not a series of semibelligerent actions by the Kennedy administration but a basic change in the Government's attitude toward the Cuban problem, to make it more adamantly dedicated to getting the Russians out of the island.

This is a sound recommendation from one who is experienced in dealing with Soviet aggressiveness and treachery.

May 3: Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, just about 15 years after our Declaration of Independence, and not quite 2 years after the United States of America adopted our first Constitution, Poland signed its constitution, on May 3, 1791.

In its constitution, Poland incorporated enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. The Polish people thus demonstrated their love and attachment to freedom and independence—just as we, the American people did when we declared our independence from a mother country who practiced tyranny, and signed our famous Constitution "to promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness."

We, therefore, can fully appreciate and sympathize with the great longing of the peoples of Poland for freedom and independence, to live and to worship their God as they choose.

We, therefore, are honored and happy to join the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. This marks a time in the history of that great country when subservience to a foreign rule became unbearable. Poland had attempted several times before that to break the yoke of oppression placed upon her shoulders by Russia. In 1794 the Kosciuszko uprising took place; in 1831, the November uprising took place; then in 1944 the Warsaw uprising against German occupation took place—but of all these, the 1863 uprising against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in Polish history, spanning over 2 years.

This was one of the most costly uprisings—in terms of Polish people killed, captured, or deported to cruel Siberian mines. It brought about a ruthless and continuing attempt by the Russians to completely remove all traces of the hated Polish national spirit—by confiscation of private property—by destroying the Polish economy—by arresting and deporting many of its most influential citizens—and even by banning the Polish language from offices and schools.

We know this type of tyranny over a nation cannot possibly be successful as long as its citizens can recall days of freedom, days of independence of heart and spirit, days of honor, and days of happiness. In joining with Polish people everywhere in celebration of her national holiday, we are thus helping her remember a glorious past—and helping her cherish the hope that one day there will be a ceasing of tyranny, and Poland will rise again as a free and independent nation.

When Poland adopted its constitution on May 3, 1791—this was during a time in history when representative self-government, justice for all, freedom to worship, and freedom to live without fear was unheard of in European countries—who were still in the grip of autocratic rulers. Many of those countries are still in the grip of a ruthless and autocratic ruler—and we join with the Polish, and with other nations, in believing that ultimately justice will prevail and the pitiless grip of a godless communism will be loosened and completely removed.

A famous Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, John Jay, once spoke words which I feel should offer comfort and hope, and give courage to the Polish people:

God is great, and therefore He will be sought; He is good, and therefore He will be found.

If in the day of sorrow we own God's presence in the cloud, we shall find Him also in the pillar of fire, brightening and cheering our way as the night comes on.

In all his dispensations God is at work for our good. In prosperity, He tries our gratitude; in mediocrity, our contentment; in misfortune, our submission; in darkness, our faith; under temptation, our steadfastness; and at all times, our obedience and trust in Him.

God governs the world, and we have only to do our duty wisely, and leave the issue to Him.

The Late Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am especially saddened this morning to hear of the passing of Judy Weis. The State of New York and the United States have lost a distinguished public servant.

Judy had a remarkable warmth of personality. She had an integrity of public concept that was outstanding. To the very end of her life she concerned herself with matters of direct concern to the American people. I believe that her service in the House and as a national committeewoman was unusual and important.

I extend my deepest sympathy to her family. I believe that our Nation has truly lost a public servant who was a constant inspiration to those who had the privilege of knowing her. We have lost a great and gallant woman.

The Tyrone Guthrie Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening in Minneapolis, there will occur one of the most significant events of recent years for the American theater. It is opening night for the Tyrone Guthrie Theater, a revolutionary experiment bringing top-flight professional drama to America's midlands.

Yesterday's New York and Washington newspapers carried detailed stories about the Guthrie Theater; I request they be entered here and I respectfully call them to your attention:

[From the Washington Post, May 5, 1963]

NEW GUTHRIE STAGE MOVES THEATER OUT TO THE PLAINS—A DREAM COMING TRUE

(By Richard L. Coe)

The year's most exciting theatrical event occurs this week not in little, dirty, old New York but in, of all places, Minneapolis, Minn.

This afternon will bring the dedication of the new Tyrone Guthrie Theater in the Twin Cities. Tuesday, a company formed by Dr. Guthrie, one of the most admired directors of our times, will inaugurate a theater built by Minnesotans in his honor with a production of "Hamlet." In the title role will be George Grizzard, the Arena Stage favorite who went on to the New York stage, the Hollywood screen, TV, and to this most striking of assignments.

The Minnesota venture marks one more step in the stimulating world of today's theater to its decentralization from the hit-or-miss world of Gotham. One cannot overemphasize what this can mean to the American theater's future. We in Washington, rejoicing in Arena Stages magnificent achievement in a world which superficially is making less room for the exultation of living theater, can further rejoice, with the Twin Cities, that this new step is being achieved.

Dr. Guthrie is one of the world's theater leaders, respected not simply in Europe and America where his productions have been seen, but elsewhere where his work has been recorded and his writings admired. Six-feet-five, Dr. Guthrie is an extraordinary man. With his wife he travels the world, eschewing the fashionable luxury hotels, living in modest hostels with their portable (sometimes verboteen) Bunsen burner, passing up the posh restaurants to dream, quietly, of the sort of theater they love.

These loves have included long remembered productions of London's Old Vic, Broadway's "The Matchmaker" and the creation of Ontario's famed Stratford Shakespeare Festival.

The new Minnesota stage is a close kin to the one Guthrie created in Ontario's Stratford, for this too has a multilevel open stage, surrounded on 3 sides by 1,400 seats. Already Minnesotans are gasping that some $330,000 worth of tickets have been sold before the season even opens.

Two plays will start what in time will be a true repertory system this week, "Hamlet" opening Tuesday night, Moliere's "The Miser" opening Wednesday. "The Three Sisters" will enter the repertory June 17 and "Death of a Salesman" on July 16. The season will run through September 22, with "Hamlet" the final bill. Individual seats will cost from $1.50 to $5, with group tickets available. Further factual details may be had from the Tyrone Guthrie Theater, 725 Vineland Place, Minneapolis 3, Minn.

One of the theater's purposes was to give actors an opportunity to work outside of tense Manhattan and they have flocked to do so. Grizzard left his starring role in the year's top play, "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" to have his crack at Hamlet. Hume Cronyn, finished with his long "Cleopatra" assignment, and his wife, Jessica Tandy, will, between them, have roles in all four plays. Rita Gam accepted an "as cast" contract for "Hamlet" in order to have leads in "The Three Sisters" and the Moliere.

Washington knows many of the other players, Nicolas Coster, Clayton Corzatte, Ed Preble, Paul Ballantyne, Ellen Geer, John Cromwell, Lee Richardson, Ruth Nelson and Robert Pastene. Tanya Moiseiwitsch, who created so many of the Ontario costumes for Dr. Guthrie, is the principal designer and another Canadian who has scored both at Stratford and on Broadway, Douglas Campbell, is Dr. Guthrie's second in command.

When it was learned 4 autumns ago that Dr. Guthrie was considering creation of a theater removed from New York, several far-flung cities scrambled to attract the noted director, Minneapolis only one of them.

"There are too few chances for people to experience and enjoy the entertainment the classic plays can provide," Sir Tyrone told all comers, "yet theater is as important to the life of a community as an orchestra or museums or libraries."

Quick to get cracking were a handful of Minnesotans, among them the university's Frank Whiting, Publisher John Cowles, Jr., General Mills Board Chairman Harry Bullis, Critic John K. Sherman, the T. B. Walker Art Center and, as the new theater's first program is forced to say, "others too numerous to mention."

Anyway, Minneapolis rolled up its sleeves, found land, raised a million and a half dollars, went even further than Producer Oliver Rae and Production Manager Peter Zeisler had been promised.

The players have been rehearsing for 2 months and their phone calls and letters reflect precisely the enthusiasm Dr. Guthrie dreamed of: "The stage is magnificent, tricky at first, but wonderful * * *. The costumes, wait till you see 'em * * *. And the people, these wonderful, openhearted, generous people of Minnesota. What a relief from New York. We're going to give 'em some great performances."

The birth of a theater is an exciting portent. This is why Minnesota's Tyrone Guthrie Theater is one of the few major events of the American theater's year.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 5, 1963]

GUTHRIE REPERTORY COMPANY OPENING IN MINNEAPOLIS—THEATER FEVER RAGING FAR, FAR OFF BROADWAY

MINNEAPOLIS.—Tyrone Guthrie has given his name to a new $2 million theater and repertory company opening here Tuesday with Guthrie's own production of "Hamlet."

That Guthrie finds himself in the Midwest presiding over the establishment of the Tyrone Guthrie Theater represents something new. It represents, first of all, a protest against the stifling artistic and economic conditions of producing on Broadway. Its opening points up the fact that while theater may be shrinking on Broadway it is expanding elsewhere.

And the experience of Guthrie and his associates is spectacular proof that strong, untapped community support for theater exists—outside New York. Minneapolis has come through.

Minneapolis—indeed, all of Minnesota—found the money to build the theater. More than that, it developed enough interest in the community to support a season of four plays and a first-class company of New York professional actors. A year ago, a high goal of 15,000 subscribers was set for the first season. As of 2 weeks ago, the subscription list stood at 20,139 and the box office has taken $331,150. Minnesota has caught the theater fever.

George Grizzard leads off as Hamlet in a production that Guthrie describes as "Ruritar"—contemporary, that is, rather than all-out modern. The theater plan is repertory and the second play will follow the next evening—Moliere's "The Miser," with Hume Cronyn and Rita Gam in the leads. This one has been directed by Guthrie's artistic assistant at Minnesota, Douglas Campbell, a stalwart performer under Guthrie from the first days of the Stratford, Ont., Shakespeare Festival. He played "Gideon" on Broadway last season.

Guthrie's new theater is built to his stage specifications. He laid it out with Tanya Moiseiwitsch much as she and Guthrie collaborated in the creation of the Stratford theater, and the University of Minnesota architect, Ralph Rapson, executed the design.

The essential feature is an irregularly shaped open stage: no proscenium. The auditorium is also irregularly shaped and surrounds the stage on three sides, in a 200-degree arc, with a seating capacity of 1,437. The distance from the forestage to the back row of the balcony measures only 56 feet.

Almost as unusual as the form of the theater is the concept of a season. The repertory company's season will run 20 weeks through the summer until September 22—exactly counter to Broadway. One of the great problems in establishing a theater outside of New York has always been the availability of actors, who hate to be unavailable to Broadway. Minneapolis hopes it has solved this problem with its out-of-season season.

Besides Grizzard, Cronyn, and Miss Gam, the featured players in a company of 40 include Jessica Tandy, Mr. Cronyn's wife, and Zoe Caldwell. They have all been rehearsing here in makeshift rehearsal space since March 11. Late in the season, two more plays will be added to the repertory—"The Three Sisters," directed by Guthrie, opening June 18 and "Death of a Salesman," directed by Campbell, opening July 16.

This mixture of drama will find Cronyn playing the title role in "The Miser" and Willy Loman in "Death of a Salesman." Miss Tandy will play Gertrude in "Hamlet" and Mrs. Loman in "Salesman." Grizzard will step out of his role as Hamlet into the part of the clerk in "The Miser."

This whole theater and repertory idea came about because two New York theater people put their heads together with Tyrone Guthrie, a booster and creator of repertory, 3 years ago. The two are Oliver Rea, a former producing partner of Robert Whitehead in New York, and Peter Zeisler, who at the time was production stage manager of "The Sound of Music" at the Lunt-Fontanne Theater in New York.

Both felt that theater held more promise than the restricted life on Broadway and they went together to Guthrie in Ireland in the winter of 1960 to find an alternative. They then and there decided to locate a repertory theater well outside of New York in support of the idea.

Minneapolis made the most enthusiastic offer. First came a gift of $500,000 from Minneapolis' T. B. Walker Foundation to acquire the land. Further backing followed. A thousand women were recruited to help

solicit funds and develop subscriber support without which Guthrie and his associates knew they would be dead after one season.

A tandem organization setup will run the Tyrone Guthrie Theater. On the one hand, there is the theater foundation which will manage the rest-of-the-year operation when the repertory company is not playing. It must keep the house lit through the winter with music recitals, ballet, films and other attractions.

On the other hand, the repertory company headed by Rea is responsible for the theater season. It was helped through the 3-year organizational phase by a Ford Foundation grant of $118,000. A further Ford sum of $219,000 is available to defray any operating losses during the next 3 years.

[From the Washington Star, May 5, 1963]

OUT OF IT CAME GUTHRIE CENTER

(By George Moses)

MINNEAPOLIS.—A casual encounter on a football train helped bring to Minneapolis a novel experiment in professional drama, the Tyrone Guthrie Theater.

This is a community effort which will flower next Tuesday when the Guthrie Theater, the only permanent classic repertory theater in this country, opens under its own $2 million roof.

Sir Tyrone Guthrie, a giant of the stage, has dedicated 3 years of his life to the project. He will lead off a four-play season of nearly 5 months with "Hamlet."

Stars of the stage have virtually stood in line for the chance to act under Guthrie in the revolutionary 1,437-seat theater half a continent away from Broadway.

Back to the special train. It was en route from Iowa City, Iowa, to Des Moines after an Iowa-Minnesota football game in 1959. Aboard it were Oliver Rea and John Cowles, Jr.

Rea, then 35, was already a Broadway producer. A few months earlier he had met with Guthrie and Peter Zeisler, an expert on the technique of stagecraft.

THAT WEARINESS

They discovered they had something in common—a weariness of the Broadway "hit or flop" atmosphere, which Guthrie termed "oversupplied with theaters and actors and hampered by rootlessness."

They wanted a repertory theater far from New York and from tryout towns. Repertory is the alternating of several plays on successive nights by basically the same cast.

* * * * *

Cowles had not only agreed to head a monumental fundraising drive, but had already scored an important breakthrough; the T. B. Walker Foundation, operator of the modern-thinking Walter Art Gallery next door to the theater site, had not only pledged the land for it but $400,000 in cash as well. Since then, the foundation has added another $100,000.

Another $1.5 million-plus came in 3,000 individual chunks.

Cowles, disavows any crusade or patron-of-the-arts approach.

As vice president and editor of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, he scrupulously avoided putting his papers' resources into the drive. And he stayed out of the limelight to the point few local readers today are aware of his key role in getting the theater.

"But," Cowles says, "this was the one thing the Twin Cities didn't have" in the field of front-rank cultural attractions.

A NEW ATHENS?

And so, in the words of a politely envious writer from another city which wanted but didn't get the Guthrie theater, "it looks as if Minneapolis may become the new Athens of the West."

The new Athenians of the theater were all on hand for opening rehearsals in mid-March. With finishing touches still being put on the theater, they rehearsed first * * *.

The three decided to see if it could be done.

Cowles, young Minneapolis newspaper executive and heir, met Rea on the football train.

Rea told him of their plans and of their search, which had already taken them to several American cities.

"I hope you take a look at the Twin Cities," and Cowles, "and let me know when you come."

Minneapolis is a midwestern city of half a million persons, frigid winters, flour mills, fishermen-filled lakes in summers and, with sister St. Paul, lately the home of major league baseball and football teams.

ON CULTURE SIDE

But it's also, as the theater men noted when they accepted Cowle's invitation, the home of a first-rate symphoney orchestra, two outstanding art museums, and a State university of some 30,000 students with a flourishing theater.

In fact, Frank Whiting, university theater director, had earlier sought a new theater for the school, and had urged Guthries to consider locating here. Guthrie and Rea especially wanted a university connection.

So on Memorial Day of 1960, under a tree in the pleasant wooded site of the new projecting-stage theater, the announcement was made.

In its front yard is a vast park and playground area.

The theater and land will technically remain the property of the Walker Foundation, which leases it to the Guthrie Foundation. This foundation, under Mr. Cowles as president, raised the money. The foundation, in turn, rents to Guthrie's playing company, the Minnesota Theater Co. Foundation. In off seasons, the theater will be used for concerts, lectures, and the like.

The playing company is aided by a $337,000 Ford Foundation grant. The annual operating budget is set at slightly under $600,000.

Advance ticket sales hit 20,000 long before the opening. Mr. Rea said this was far above his expectations, and that he was certain it was a record for any such theater project anywhere.

Single tickets range from $5 to $1.50, the season tickets (one for each play) from $18 to $5.40.

To be permanently effective, Mr. Guthrie feels the theater must put down roots in Minnesota and become a part of the community. He thinks a link with the university theater via fellowships and other means is especially important.

A special series of university theater fellowships has been set up by a Minnesota businessman. Students will study at the university in the fall and winter, work as apprentices, understudies, and observers in the Guthrie Theater in the spring and summer.

The all-professional company of 22 this first season will be headed by Hume Cronyn and Jessica Tandy, Rita Gam, and George Grizzard.

They will present "Hamlet," Moliere's "The Miser," Chekhov's "The Three Sisters," and Miller's "Death of a Salesman" in the season ending September 22.

They will play in a strikingly modern theater, where the audience will surround the players on three sides, and no playgoer will be more than 58 feet away from the center of the stage.

The theater will open onto the Walker Art Gallery for between-acts viewing. It was designed by Ralph Rapson, award-winning head of the University of Minnesota School of Architecture.

The white-fronted theater overlooks the Minneapolis business district at the foot of a fine old residential area.

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1963]

ANOTHER TEST FOR DECENTRALIZATION

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

MINNEAPOLIS.—The professional American theater, caged by commercialism on Manhattan Island, neurotic with self-doubt and guilt complexes, loathed and loved by those who live in it, is about to experience an experiment that could help liberate it.

This experiment begins here on Tuesday when Tyrone Guthrie opens a 20-week repertory season with a modified modern dress production of Hamlet in which he dismisses the concept that Hamlet "is a constipated young man in long black tights."

Here, 1,000 miles from Broadway as the jets fly, in a bleaming $2,5000 glass-walled, 1,437-seat open-stage theater bearing Mr. Guthrie's name, the people of the Twin Cities (population 1,400,000) will launch a full-scale, truly professional regional repertory organization. Indeed, the theater will be supported on a scale and in the style that symphony orchestras have come to expect and enjoy.

REPERTORY TRADITION

This is not little theater; not stock; not straw hat; not road show; and it is definitely not show biz.

It is a happy marriage of community chest-type of impulse that raised contributions of $1,800,000 and the highest degree of professionalism innocent of profit motive. It is a long-awaited step toward the repertory tradition of Europe, Britain, and Russia but without Government support or direction.

If it works here, interest already smoldering in places like Milwaukee, Detroit, and Cleveland is very likely to burst into flame, the cultural course of this country may well be changed.

"I don't think a theater should be any more self-supporting than the public library," Peter Zeisler, production director, who with Oliver Rea, the administrator, makes up the troika that created the enterprise out of shared disgust for Broadway show business.

For the Upper Midwest the four-play season is the most important cultural event since the first concert by the Minneapolis Symphony 60 years ago. For the world of drama it is one more test of the long dream that decentralization spells salvation.

"A dream itself is but a shadow," Hamlet tells Guildenstern. No shadow at the box-office, the season is already a smash. Long before opening, advance subscription ticket sales ($18 top, down to $5.40) exceeded $221,000.

And total advance sales (single top $5, down to $1.50) exceeded $325,000. Optimism abounds that it will be a cinch to reach the 75-percent capacity needed to meet the $660,000 operating budget, which for comparable New York productions would be at least double.

Mail orders have come from as far off as New York, San Diego, and Biloxi. But much credit is given to 1,000 tireless women volunteers who have worked over an area in a 100-mile radius from the Twin Cities pushing the project at teas, cocktail parties, and dinners. Rita Gam and jovial Douglas Campbell, Mr. Guthrie's assistant, talked to a labor meeting and the AFL–CIO bought out an entire performance.

Dayton's department store sold about 40 percent of the season subscription tickets on its credit card and permitted the use of its 400,000-name mailing list for direct-mail advertising. A $377,000 Ford Foundation grant that came as a bit of a windfall will go a long way toward insuring financial help during the 3 years picked as the tryout run. The troika is cautious, however. The proj-

ect's real success will be measurable, they warn, 3 years hence when the novelty has worn off.

By artistic standards this is also a season of high promise. Besides "Hamlet," Mr. Guthrie—Tony to his close friends, Dr. Guthrie to a revering cast and middlewesterners too shy to use his title, Sir—will direct Chekhov's "The Three Sisters."

Mr. Campbell, like Mr. Guthrie a veteran of the Old Vic, will stage Molière's "The Miser" and Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman." The acting company includes Hume Cronyn, his wife Jessica Tandy, George Grizzard, late of "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf" and now the lead in "Hamlet," Rita Gam and Zoe Caldwell. Some supporting roles will be taken by University of Minnesota graduate students on leave under grants from the McKnight Foundation.

THEATER DESIGN

The theater, the acoustics of which are still doubtful and yet to get the acid test, was designated by Ralph Rapson, head of the university architectural department. The auditorium is horseshoe shaped. The seats, which are upholstered in subdued colors, sweep around the deep brown wooden open-platform asymetrical stage in a 200-degree arc. Ramps to the area below the stage allow startling entrances and exists through the audience areas.

In off-season the theater will be used for chamber music and jazz concerts, lectures, and other plays but probably never for standard road shows.

All this began 4 years ago when Oliver Rea and Peter Zeisler were working on the musical "Juno," which had a short run on Broadway. They agreed they were disenchanted and shared a hunch that the country might be right for decentralization. They joined forces with Mr. Guthrie, a kindred spirit whose successes at the Stratford, Ontario, Shakespeare Festival and the Old Vic made him a natural for this project. Along the line a luncheon with Brooks Atkinson, to whom they went for advice as a veteran champion of the far-off Broadway drama, resulted in a story about their dream in the New York Times. Response from around the country resulted in a Rea-Guthrie coast-to-coast shopping trip.

The turning point was reached after Mr. Rea happened to meet John Cowles, Jr., editor of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, at a football game in Iowa City. Mr. Cowles, hearing that the shopping team was coming to Minneapolis to see Dr. Frank Whiting, director of the university theater, promised to swing into action. He set up a meeting for Mr. Rea and Mr. Guthrie and it made no great difference that the individualistic Mr. Guthrie showed up in sneakers without socks. He is nothing if not eloquent.

Mr. Cowles lined up the keen, energetic young men that make the next-in-line group in the Twin City power structure and, as Mr. Guthrie put it, "Minn will come through."

Mr. Cowles quietly laid the groundwork for getting a $400,000 grant and a tract of land adjacent to the Walker Art Center from the Walker Foundation. Contributions began to flow in; they came from all the usual sources touched in community service drives and from 3,500 families, the Junior League, the Women's Club and even 37 cents from a Sunday school class in a small town called Mankato.

Mr. Rea and Mr. Zeisler are now emigrees from Broadway by choice and Mr. Guthrie, who will commute off season to his home in Ireland, has the rank of professor at the 28,000-student university which, in the words of Dr. Whiting, has a love affair with the theater without messy entanglements.

PAY SCALE

A chance to take part in a new theater enterprise and the promise of steady work in classic plays has made it possible to pay a scale well below that of the commercial theater and thereby draw on talent that normally would not be available outside of big show-biz centers. Mr. Rea, for his part, was willing to take a $14,000-a-year salary, and the top actor's remuneration is $400 a week, easily one-fifth of what a Broadway play might be worth to a good actor.

Here a theater can have roots, Mr. Guthrie says. No actors chasing too few jobs, or managers chasing too few theaters, or plays produced by people from somewhere else for buyers from Indianapolis. Not just show business and shopkeeping. Not 1 actor in 10,000 gets a chance to appear in 4 plays in 1 season, he added, not to mention the startingly few jobs available at all.

To Mr. Cronyn this engagement is like a doctor's taking a year off from his routine daily practice to do basic research.

"It is so much healthier and worth while. It's clean."

Signatures of 579 Students of the District's Western High School Petition Congress To Grant Home Rule to the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the author of a bill which would authorize limited home rule for the District of Columbia, I was especially gratified this week when I received a petition from Edward Mohn, president of the student council of Western High School, 35th and Reservoir Road, NW., Washington, D.C., bearing the signatures of 579 students of that school who favor limited home rule for the District.

The petition which the students signed stated:

We, the undersigned, students of Western High School in the District of Columbia, acting with the consent of our student council, petition the Congress of the United States for limited home rule in the District of Columbia. We believe that Congress is being unnecessarily burdened by the municipal problems of Washington, D.C. We believe that democracy, the right of the citizens of an area to govern themselves, is not being practiced in the Capital of this Nation. We believe that Washington, D.C. should be the example, rather than the failure of democracy. We urge the Congress to enact speedily the legislation.

In this letter to me, transmitting the petition, Edward Mohn wrote:

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: I am happy to send to you the results of the petition on home rule which was circulated in Western High School during the past few weeks. The idea was brought up and approved in our student council meeting on April 10. The student council decided to sponsor the drive. Afterwards, copies of the petitions were distributed in each homeroom. All in all, the drive netted 579 signatures.

I hope that you will use the results of this petition to the best advantage. I also hope that you will convey the petition to the other members of the House District Committee.

Speaking for the students at Western, we feel that our voice should be heard and should be made known, even though we are merely high school students. In this particular case, we want to show that there is support for home rule, and that it is a subject not to be taken lightly. We would like to see the Congress take definite, concrete action in the immediate future.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD MOHN,
President, Western High School Student Council.

Mr. Speaker, I assure Edward and the 579 students of Western High School that their voice has been heard and will be made known, not because they are merely high school students, but because they are young citizens who are alert to one of the most pressing problems of the day and want to see constructive action to right a serious wrong.

I am pleased with this petition. I trust it will set a pattern for their elders who should be equally as concerned and who should be thinking about this issue and doing something about it.

The House District Committee will receive this petition at the proper time. I trust the whole committee will accord it the same significance I have. And as the voice against the injustice of not having home rule grows, I trust it will be backed up by the signatures of not 579 more but of 579,000 more of those who really care.

More Fuzzy Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram:

MORE FUZZY THINKING

If U.S. Treasury Secretary Dillion knows what he is talking about, the Federal Government's deficit for the next fiscal year will only be $10.9 instead of $11.9 billion.

For that reason, he feels the time is ripe for a tax cut. A tax cut would be fine. But to make sense it should be accompanied by a reduction in expenditures, not just a reduction in our deficit spending.

The Federal Government has been wrong on many occasions in financial forecasts. Even if correct this time, Dillon's figures hardly justify a sizable tax cut.

The New Frontier spenders can't bring themselves to the sound fiscal policy of keeping spending within the Government's income. Dillon put forth the fuzzy thinking that our trouble is not that the Government spends too much, but that we produce too little.

This led one editorial observer to point out it was about the same as a man in bankruptcy telling a judge: "It isn't that I spend too much. It's just that I didn't make enough money to buy everything I wanted."

Deficit spending means more inflation. And more inflation would quickly wipe out any benefits of a tax cut. Kennedy and his pie-in-the-sky advisers can't, or won't, see it that way.

University of Chicago Space Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the University of Chicago, pioneer in the exploration of our universe and the site of the first sustained atomic chain reaction, adds another "first" to its record. On May 1, ground was broken for the construction of the first of five NASA space centers, designed to conduct research and experiments related to interplanetary and interstellar space.

The ground-breaking ceremony opened the Third National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, combining professional and lay sessions on the development of our space program.

The following article describes in more detail the purposes of this space laboratory:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1963]

BREAK GROUND TO BEGIN UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO SPACE CENTER

(By Ronald Kotulak)

Scientists and Government space experts broke ground yesterday for a new space center on the University of Chicago campus a few paces away from the point where atomic energy was ushered into the 20th century 21 years ago.

The $2 million laboratory for astrophysics and space research, the first Government-sponsored space center of its kind, will be designed to analyze moon samples and explore other secrets of the universe undreamed of 5 years ago.

The center will serve as a headquarters for related space projects and will increase the university's participation in the Government's space program. It will help plan and build space experiments and will serve as a base for analyzing material brought back to earth from space.

LAUDS CENTER

"The center represents a great university collaborating with the Nation's Government and joining directly with the social and industrial complex it serves in seeking to preserve this Nation's preeminence as a dominant force for peace throughout the world," said Thomas L. K. Smull, director of grants and research contracts for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Smull said that the facility would also act as a clearing house to convert space age technology into commercial applications for Chicago and the Midwest.

The ceremony signaled the beginning of the third national conference on the peaceful uses of space, which will outline the Nation's status in the space race.

LAY SESSIONS PLANNED

Professional sessions will run through Saturday at the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Illinois Institute of Technology, and Argonne National Laboratory. The lay part of the conference is scheduled for May 6–9 at the Civic Opera House and will emphasize the latest developments in space technology and how Midwest businessmen can procure Government contracts.

Several hundred persons attended the ground-breaking ceremonies in sunny weather at 56th Street and Ingleside Avenue. The laboratory will be adjacent to the scientific complex that includes the Nuclear Accelerator Building, the Enrico Fermi Institute, the Institute for the study of metals, and the Institute for Computer Research.

NASA SUPPLIES FUNDS

Funds for the space center are coming from the NASA project to build five such laboratories throughout the country in an effort to tap the scientific brain power at these universities.

"It is important and appropriate that this laboratory should be dedicated at the University of Chicago because this is one of the first universities to recognize the universe," said George Wells Beadle, university president and 1958 Nobel prizewinner.

Dr. Beadle and the center would allow the university to continue making scientific firsts, which include the first description of the milky way galaxy by George Ellery Hale, Albert A. Michelson's measurement of the speed of light, Robert Millikan's measurement of the charge on the electron, and the prediction of solar winds made by Eugene Parker.

READY BY NEXT YEAR

"Only a few steps from here the first sustained atomic chain reaction was carried out under the west stands of Stagg Field and this work later developed into the Enrico Fermi Institute," he said.

The center, which will be a two-story structure with two basement levels, is expected to be completed next year.

It will permit scientists to conduct work on solar flares, cosmic radiation, geomagnetic storms, data processing, lunar surveying, and experiments related to interplanetary and interstellar space.

The university's main planner for the laboratory is John A. Simpson, head of the cosmic radiation research group.

SHIELDED BY CONCRETE

One of the most unusual aspects of the laboratory will be its subbasement, shielded by 6 feet of concrete, which will be used for counting low level radiation in samples brought back from outer space.

Many of these samples will have 100 times less radiation than an ordinary brick and must be studied under well protected conditions. Other facilities will reproduce space conditions to test the life span of the experimental equipment. The radiation facility also will serve as headquarters for analyzing meteorites shortly after they strike the earth when they still retain some of the secrets of their creation.

The Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will be called upon shortly to consider the wilderness bill, H.R. 776, it appears timely that the requests of the National Horsemen's Association, Inc., be considered. I am inserting a letter which I received from Mr. E. R. Stallings, president of the National Horsemen's Association, Inc., who is also manager of San Mateo County and a constituent of the 11th Congressional District.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Palo Alto, Calif., April 30, 1963.

Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNGER: The horsemen throughout the United States have expressed a vital interest in provisions of the wilderness bill (H.R. 776) which is presently before Congress. While we realize that the debate on this subject has resolved itself around protection of local prerogatives, we would respectfully request your attention to what we consider to be one of the most vital provisions of the bill.

We would like to urge you and the other Congressmen of the United States to make proper provision within the wilderness bill to insure the maintenance of suitable and adequate riding trails throughout the appropriate areas classified within the wilderness program in order that the some 4 million pleasure horse owners in the United States will have an opportunity to ride through and enjoy, within the spirit of the legislation, the most scenic areas in the United States.

The added emphasis upon open space preservation and physical fitness are completely in accord with the objectives of the National Horsemens' Association.

Your favorable consideration of this most sincere request will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

E. R. STALLINGS,
President, National Horsemen's Association, Inc.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in times of misfortune and misery, people's thoughts invariably turn back to the happier and hope-inspiring days of the past. This is particularly true of the people of Poland who, after all the sufferings they endured and untold sacrifices they made during the last war, find themselves today once again enslaved in their homeland by a government controlled from Moscow.

Today, on the 172d anniversary of the adoption of their first democratic Constitution, the Polish people turn their thoughts to those distant days, reflect upon the fine spirit embodied in that document, and commemorate its anniversary as a national holiday.

The adoption of that Constitution in 1791 constitutes one of the brightest and most significant landmarks in Poland's entire political history. The event occurred at a time when nearly all of the nation was being parcelled out among the three monarchs of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. On the eve of such impending dangers a small band of Polish patriots drew up and presented the people of Poland a democratic and liberal document.

The Constitution made Poland a constitutional monarchy with a responsible cabinet form of government. Many old

class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the government was strengthened by bringing the peasantry under the protection of the law. What is perhaps more significant for those days and for that part of the world was the fact that this Constitution guaranteed religious freedom.

In this and in many other ways, the Polish Constitution of May 3d was in the forefront of democracy's advance into central and eastern Europe.

In commemorating the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, we are paying due respect to the memory of patriotic Polish leaders who drew up that Constitution, and we are also expressing our admiration for all Poles who hold high the liberal and democratic principles embodied in that Constitution.

At this time I insert into the RECORD a letter and an article pertaining to Polish Constitution Day, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1963.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: From the time, when first among the free nations of the world Poland heroically responded to the challenge of the Soviet-Nazi totalitarianism, the Congress of the United States has been annually demonstrating its feeling of faithful friendship toward the Polish nation. Each year a special observance is being held in the House of Representatives and in the Senate on May 3, in commemoration of Poland's great constitution of 1791.

This constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence. These principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism, and everpresent readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

As we approach May 3d, free Poland's national holiday, I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year mark's the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish uprising against the Russian rule—the Kosciuszko uprising in 1794, the November uprising in 1831, the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation, but the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.

During the night of January 22, 1963, units of the Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.

In the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant successes but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the Regular Russian Army, the fate of the uprising was sealed.

On one side were well equipped regular army units, on the other the heroic insurgent army poorly equipped, having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps the brave insurgents achieved many successes over Russian Army regiments in over 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland.

Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in public squares, the rest were sent to the mines in Siberia.

The last leader of the uprising, Romuald Traugutt and four of his assistants were hanged in the public square in Warsaw in view of the kneeling, praying, and weeping crowd of 25,000.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents led by Reverend Brzoska was surrendered and wiped out in April 1865.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.

The Polish nation lost 250 thousand of its best sons, the flower of its manhood, killed in battles, executed and exiled to Siberia.

United States at that time was in the throes of civil war and Europe was deaf to the cries of the martyred nation.

The Polish people suffered a defeat in the fight for independence but the social reforms put through by its leaders gave the Poles a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization were shattered.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years.

The Polish American Congress representing over 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry expresses its fervent hope that you will see fit to participate in the observance scheduled to take place on the floor of both chambers of the Congress on the 3d of May which day since 1791 is observed by all free Poles as Poland's national holiday.

I take the liberty to enclose for your attention a leaflet explaining in a few words the meaning of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative,
Polish American Congress, Inc.

MAY 3: THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday, the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland, without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder, succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late, and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then as it has been throughout the years that followed and even onto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words: "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the 3d of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May 3 deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory by one of our victorious allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

"God Grants Liberty to Those Who Live It, and Are Ever Ready To Defend It"—The 29th Odd Fellows' Pilgrimage to the Tombs of the Unknown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, in Arlington National Cemetery, the Independent Order of Odd Fellows held its 29th annual pilgrimage to the Tombs of the Unknown Soldiers.

Sovereign Grand Master Oakford A. Schalick, in his address to the assemblage, brought a message expressing a personal philosophy, as well as a political philosophy, for Odd Fellows, which should be known, understood, and practiced, not only by all Odd Fellows, but by all Americans, and all peoples, who treasure freedom in a free country. It renews the patriotic challenge laid down in the quotation, "God grants liberty only to those who live it and are always ready to guard and defend it. Let our object be our country."

Under previous permission, I include Sovereign Grand Master Schalick's address in the RECORD:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SOVEREIGN GRAND MASTER OAKFORD A. SCHALICK AT THE TOMBS OF THE UNKNOWN, MAY 5, 1963

In the quietness of this hour and in deep reverence to a gracious and ever-loving God, we pause to pay tribute to soldiers who have made the supreme sacrifice that we may enjoy a free country.

Three soldiers known only to God. Three soldiers who loved life. Three soldiers who died to preserve our right to salute Old Glory as it proudly waves over land and sea.

When 56 patriots affixed their signature to what was up to that time, the most revolutionary document even conceived by the mind of men, the Declaration of Independence, they knew full well the cost that would be exacted if the revolution should fail. Yet they were unmindful of danger or loss to themselves. All of that was superseded by an all-pervading desire that they and their children should live in freedom.

It is no small matter to be an American in today's world—just as it was no small matter to fight for ideals of liberty and justice in the War of Independence. Upon the shoulders of every American still rests the responsibility and the privilege of upholding the ideals and principles that have brought the United States to the forefront among the nations of this planet.

Washington and Lincoln are two of our greatest men. Washington has often been justly called, the Father of his country. Lincoln became its preserver when he was willing to go on to war to unite his Nation. Both relied heavily upon sustenance from a Divine Power and both spent much time upon their knees in supplication to Almighty God, not on their own behalf but for their country and its people. Both had their prayers answered and America was born and grew into greatness.

The Supreme Court has recently held hearings on prayer and Bible reading in our public schools. We know that our Supreme Court Justices are men of integrity. If they feel that prayer and Bible reading are unconstitutional there must be a serious defect in our Constitution and Odd Fellows and Rebekahs should lead the fight to correct it. This country was made great, not by the atheists and agnostics, but by those who have found real purpose and meaning in God and have loved both God and their fellowman. Our Divine Creator has blessed us beyond our deserving. We would be defying His great and Almighty power if we could not publicly pray to Him in any and all State functions.

Man does not live for himself alone. He lives for the good of others as well as himself. Everyone has his duties to perform. The richest as well as the poorest. To some, life is pleasure, to others suffering, but the best do not live for self-enjoyment or even for fame. Their strongest motive power is hopeful, useful work in every good cause.

The sphere of duty is infinite. It exists in every station of life. We have it not in our choice to be rich or poor, to be happy or unhappy; but it becomes us to do the duty that everywhere surrounds us. Obedience to duty at all costs and risks, is the very essence of the highest civilized life. Great deeds must be worked for, hoped for, died for, now as in the past.

We often connect the idea of duty with the soldier's trust. We remember the pagan sentinel at Pompeii, found dead at his post during the burial of the city by the ashes of Vesuvius, some 1,800 years ago. This was a true soldier. The others fled, while he stood his post. It was his duty. He had been set to guard the place and he never flinched. He was suffocated by the vapor of the falling ashes. His body was resolved to dust, but his memory survives. His helmet, lance and breastplate are still to be seen in a museum at Naples.

This soldier was obedient and disciplined. He did what he was appointed to do. Obedience to the parent, to the master, to the officer is what everyone who would do right should be taught to learn. We must be obedient even to the end. Duty in its purest form is so constrained that one never thinks in performing it of one's self at all. It is there. It has to be done without any thought of self-sacrifice.

The hope of this North American Continent in the present and in the future is the same that it has always been: It is the hope and confidence that out of unknown homes will come men who will constitute themselves the masters of industry and of politics. The average hopefulness, the average welfare, the average enterprise, the average initiative of these people are the only things that make this continent rich—the freedom of choice which God intended all men to have—the right to do, to speak, to worship, to dissent, to dream, to build, to fail, and to succeed.

We are rich in all the things that decent people yearn for. It is our task to live up to these values and to make them known to every nation, friend or foe. For on us has fallen the challenge to lead the free. How can this task be accomplished? By everyone joining in thought, prayer and speech with the throngs all over this continent who are dedicating themselves to a wider understanding of their rights and duties, for united we shall stand.

A boy had been given a beautiful globe of the world and the little fellow became so interested in it the first evening that he insisted upon taking it into his room and placing it on a table right beside his bed. Later in the evening the boy's parents were involved in a discussion of a foreign country and the father said he would slip into the lad's room and bring out the globe so they could find the place in which they were interested. Tiptoeing in the room the father picked up the globe and was making his way toward the door when his son aroused and inquired sleepily, "Hey daddy, what are you doing with my world?" What are we doing with it? It has been broken by war and strife, but we must always put it together again. All the pieces will fit in if we have the patience to maneuver them into place and if we use generous portions of cement made of Christian brotherhood, of friendship, love and truth, the old world will be safe and better than ever before.

Builders are needed today. The world is not hopeless, neither are the hearts of men. The materials for world peace lie about us. We have discovered power that will lift nations from poverty. We have a world consciousness that did not exist prior to the 20th century, but a generation of builders is needed. Unsettled conditions, the mad race for possession and power, cold wars, fears of the unlimited powers of destruction that may be loosed upon the world at any moment because of some rash thoughtfulness or foolish act of man. These and many other things are taking their toll of human peace and human hapipness. Yea even human life.

We like to think that no life has been in vain; that every span of existence has served its purpose and helped in the great plan of the universe; that every beginning and ending has formed some important fabric in the pattern, marking the handiwork of the Creator.

What does the future hold for this Republic—what does the future hold for all peoples and all nations? Franklin Roosevelt said: "We are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace."

Another great statesman has said: "God grants liberty only to those who live it and are always ready to guard and defend it. Let our object be our country. And, by the blessing of God, may that country become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration forever."

In the silence of this hour the whispers of those who sleep in Flanders' Field, in far-off Korea, in this Arlington Cemetry tell us of unfulfilled dreams, of cherished ideals, of loyalty to Old Glory. The whispers grow more intense, throbbing with urgency. Americans must not lose their birthright—the right to live, to be free, to worship, to hold their heads high and proclaim "I am an American."

The whispers silently fade away. In our hearts there is born a new determination—they shall not have died in vain. In reverent prayer we beseech Almight God that peace and understanding shall come to all men everywhere.

The Little Girl at the Berlin Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, last fall, while serving as chairman of a special study mission to Europe composed of members of my subcommittee, I visited Berlin.

Our study mission conferred on the problems of that divided city with Gen. Albert Watson, the then U.S. Military Commandant of Berlin; with the head of the State Department mission in Berlin, Ambassador E. Allan Lightner, Jr.; and with other United States and city of Berlin officials.

And then we visited the wall. It is impossible to describe the feeling of physical revulsion produced by the sight of the wall. The wall is an ugly, monstrous thing— a cruel barrier which divides brother from brother, parents from their children, and freedom from tyranny.

I have searched for words to describe my reaction to the Berlin wall—and I found them the other day in a very brief article written by my colleague from New York the Honorable OTIS PIKE.

The article, entitled "Pike's Peek at Capitol," can be read in a minute. It tells a simple, yet a heart-rending, story of a little girl who wanted to show off her new Easter dress to her grandmother in the eastern zone of Berlin. It is a story which, once read, will never be forgotten.

Under unanimous consent I place Congressman PIKE's story in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of the membership of the House:

PIKE'S PEEK AT CAPITOL

(By Congressman OTIS PIKE)

Sometimes the smallest and apparently least significant episodes can have the greatest impact on the viewer. I expect that for

the rest of my life I will always associate the difference between the free world and the Communist world with a little girl in a red dress.

On Easter Sunday I was in the divided city of Berlin. In the early morning I had the opportunity to attend one of the many outdoor sunrise services which were held all over West Berlin. It was a lovely day; the joyous and bustling crowds on the west side of the ugly little wall were in sharp contrast to the somber and stagnant atmosphere on the east side.

The small congressional delegation of which I was a member had Easter dinner with some of the troops of our Berlin garrison, and we were all once again impressed with the calm dedication of this small detachment of Americans. The greatest impression, however, came later.

In the company of an Army captain I was viewing the wall from an observation post on the roof of a building. A German border policeman brought a lovely 8-year-old girl up the stairway to the roof.

She was all shined up in her holiday best—a bright red dress and immaculate white shoes and socks.

The guard told me she had come to wave to her grandmother who lived in East Berlin. He said, "Watch the window on the third floor of the fourth building on the right side of the street."

The little girl in the red dress took out a spotless white handkerchief and waved it. There was a single answering flash of white from the window. The little girl saw it and laughed. She kept on waving for 5 minutes, although there was no other answering wave. In East Berlin they keep track of who waves.

Freedom is where grandparents love and play with their grandchildren. Communism is where they don't even dare wave to a little 8-year-old girl in her best red Easter dress.

Blueprint for U.S. Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Billings Gazette, April 26, 1963:

International disarmament would be ideal. It would be wonderful if mankind could concentrate all efforts on making a better life for everyone.

No young Americans would be fighting in Vietnam Men on the DEW line could come home and get the chill out of their bones. Thousands of other would not be facing conscription. Veterans' Administration hospitals could be closed when "taps" was played for the last war veteran.

Scientists could cease developing machines of destruction and machines to destroy machines of destruction. It would be wonderful.

It would be wonderful, too, if we could disband the local police force, do away with the highway patrol, have the sheriff's department wait around for a dead animal to haul away.

In short, if we had no wrongdoers we would not need the massive machinery of enforcement that every nation finds necessary to protect its law-abiding citizens from those who offend the rights and property of others.

To think seriously that disarmament will work in the ideologically split world today is stupid. We have no choice but to stay ahead of Russia and Red China.

But don't take our word for it. Here's what the American Security Council says:

"By hook or crook, we are abandoning the nuclear race. Frantically we pursue the nuclear test-ban treaty. Instead of catching up, we continue to negotiate (in Geneva where Red China isn't even a participant).

"Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, during more than 2 years in office, has not authorized a single new weapons system. He is slowing down our technological progress deliberately. All things considered, it does not look as though under the stewardship of Mr. McNamara the United States is being equipped to forestall a nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor."

The American Security Council strategy committee is composed of responsible military opinion, the opinion of men and scientists who have fought and won and don't want to be part of a nation looking helplessly at Sino-Soviet superiority.

The Kennedy administration nuclear test ban proposals as put forth by Disarmament Agency officials are described by Representative CRAIG HOSMER of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as "blueprints for a U.S. suicide weapon or a Soviet murder weapon, depending on which side of the Iron Curtain they are viewed from."

HOSMER says the Disarmament Agency and State Department advisers are seeking a disastrous agreement—for agreement's sake—with the Soviet negotiators that in a few years "will bring a terrifying rain of H-bombs on America if we choose not to surrender."

HOSMER charges that the Disarmament Agency is not telling President Kennedy there is a big hole in the proposed treaty, that Russia can continue to nuclear test without detection. We know it because approximately one-half of U.S. underground tests in Nevada are carried on precisely at undetectable levels.

As a weapon for peace, the present proposal is a dud that would soon find the United States caught with its nuclear pants down.

Wheat Farmers Coaxed With "Sweetened" Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of April 30, 1963:

WHEAT FARMERS COAXED WITH "SWEETENED" BILL

What he lacks in new ideas for a solution to the farm problem, President Kennedy makes up in stern party discipline.

He was able to hold urban and suburban Democrats, who normally vote against farm subsidy plans, in line to get his basic feed grains bill through the House. With Southern conservatives deserting the party, the President needed urban support. On a showdown, he got it.

The bill is essentially an extension of last year's program, under which the Agriculture Department managed to spend $7 billion to maintain a $9 billion pile of surplus food and fiber that we can't unload.

It does, however, go even farther than the 1962 program. The bill puts a "sweetener" in the pot for wheat farmers, who will vote in 3 weeks on a new, strict control program for their output. The sweetener would allow wheat farmers not to grow other crops—subsidized, of course—on land the wheat control program would take out of wheat production.

The "sweetener" clause was strictly an insurance policy for Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. His proposed wheat control program has proved so controversial that it is in danger of being defeated. Freeman hopes the extra bonus will persuade wheat farmers to go along with him in the May 21 referendum.

If they do, wheatgrowers in the United States will be under the tightest Government controls on their yield, diversity and prices of wheat they grow of any farmers outside a Communist collective. Every bushel of wheat will be subject to Government dictum.

In return, farmers will get what Freeman estimates as a $2 per bushel price-support level, subsidies on an estimated 10 million acres of land taken out of wheat production, and the sure knowledge that this is only the beginning.

If Freeman and Kennedy get complete control of wheat production, it will not be long until they seek the same kind of control over other crops. Next will be the feed grains—corn, sorghum, barley. These would be followed by yield and marketing controls over cotton, rice, peanuts, and other subsidized crops.

And eventually, the farmer, long hailed by politicians as a symbol of stern independence, would be reduced to the status of a high-paid ward of the Federal Government, with no control over what he grows or how he goes about it.

The Kennedy program might be the logical conclusion to an illogical program of paying people for not growing things. It hardly qualifies as good policy, good democracy or good economics. It only fits well with the concept that Big Brother is going to watch over us.

Outrage in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Times of May 5, 1963, succinctly discusses the shocking violation of human rights in Alabama. Not only are recent events there of grave harm to all Americans, but irreparable damage to our Nation's prestige on the international scene has been inflicted. I am inserting the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read it.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1963]

OUTRAGE IN ALABAMA

No American schooled in respect for human dignity can read without shame of the barbarities committed by Alabama police authorities against Negro and white demonstrators for civil rights. The use of police dogs and high pressure fire hose to subdue schoolchildren in Birmingham is a national disgrace. The herding of hundreds of teenagers and many not yet in their teens into jails and detention homes for demanding their birthright of freedom makes a mockery of legal process.

So do the acts of terror and hooliganism at the State line, where 10 freedom walkers were arrested for seeking to carry through the antisegregation pilgrimage a Baltimore postman began before he was ambushed and shot to death by fanatics on a Federal highway near Keener, Ala., 2 weeks ago. The arrest of the marchers, rather than of the

hoodlums who were pelting them with eggs and rocks, was a dismaying perversion of justice. What made it even more revoltingly reminiscent of totalitarian excesses was the police use of electrical prod poles to force the demonstrators into patrol cars.

On the international scene these outrages will be immeasurably costly to the United States. In all the emerging countries, our pretensions to stand for democracy and individual worth are undermined by what is happening in Alabama. But our immediate concern is less over what all this does to us in others' eyes than in what it does to us as Americans. We cannot stand mute against this degradation at home. Every one of us is diminished by the shocking violation of human rights in Alabama. It is the President's job to see to it that the Constitution is supreme in that State and in every other in which its principles are trampled.

Tax Delay in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of tax reductions are interesting not only to us on the Ways and Means Committee and other Congressmen, but to every citizen of the United States. Efforts are being made in some quarters to argue that recent improvements in the economic picture justify postponing positive action. In an editorial in the New York Times on April 25, the Times discussed the dangers of assuming that all is well.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial, as follows:

TAX DELAY IN WASHINGTON

President Kennedy is seeking help from the business community for his stalled tax proposals. A fresh approach is needed, for the brightening business outlook has provided a new excuse for doing nothing. Many Congressmen would prefer to wait until next year, when elections take place, to provide relief for voters; others favor marking time unless they get reductions in spending or can kill off reforms.

Admittedly, we do not need tax cuts to forestall a recession, despite what Mr. Kennedy was saying earlier this year. But the improvement in business does not make reductions and reform any less urgent. Prompt action is desirable to sustain the rise in economic activity and strengthen the position of the dollar.

With economic activity rising, which should help to reduce the expected budget deficit, we do not need the shock treatment of a once and for all tax cut best suited to countering a recession. But phased out tax reductions will help to prolong economic expansion without the immediate threat of an inflationary spiral. If accompanied by sorely needed reforms, they will mean a simpler and more equitable system and boost taxpayer morale.

The psychological danger of a new delay should not be underestimated. This year, increases in social security payments—along with the rise in postage costs and indirect taxes—have added to the taxpayer's burden. This has not had an adverse effect; taxpayers, as Mr. Kennedy pointed out yesterday, have expected reductions. If cuts are not forthcoming, however, the mood of expectancy may well give way to skepticism, with spending drying up until reductions are in hand.

Dragging our feet on taxes would also handicap the defense of the dollar. As long as tax rates remain fixed, credit policy has to struggle with the twin tasks of promoting domestic growth and protecting the dollar abroad. The use of a flexible fiscal policy, which involves tax reductions to spur growth, would give greater freedom to the monetary authorities for the job of safeguarding the dollar.

It will always be possible to come up with new excuses for stalling on tax action. But the sluggishness of the economy over the last few years suggests that we have been delaying action far too long. The current upsurge does not invalidate the case for reduction and reform. On the contrary, Congress has an oportunity to accomplish a much more deliberate and constructive program under present circumstances than under the gun of scare conditions. It should get on with the job.

HEW Employee Is Self-Styled Lobbyist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the Congress will be interested to know that an employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been quoted as referring to herself as a Federal lobbyist.

Mrs. William B. Akin, one of 35 congressional liaison officers employed by that Department, in an interview in Chicago last week told reporter, Judy Klemesrud, "I am really just a lobbyist."

I submit that this confession amounts to a disregard for the laws passed by the Congress and that the Secretary of HEW should consider her dismissal under the provisions of title 18, U.S.C., section 1913.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if the other 34 HEW congressional liaison officers hold views similar to Mrs. Akin's quotation as to their job description, they too should be dismissed and the Congress should strike funds for their salaries from the HEW appropriation measure now before the Senate.

The question arises, Mr. Speaker, if Mrs. Akin's self-announced title is accurate, just what is she lobbying for?

The answer to this question can be found in the interview which Mrs. Akin gave to a Chicago Daily News reporter between puffs on the cigar which is apparently her trademark. She is a lobbyist for passage of the King-Anderson bill 1963 version, and if these are her duties, then she should not be drawing her salary from the taxpayers, but rather from one of the organizations supporting that measure such as the Forand Senior Citizens Council.

The interview also suggests that she is using her present position as a springboard for a congressional race, and that she is a past Democrat national chairman for Texas who has been shifted to the Federal payroll.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that the U.S. Public Health Service has indicated on countless occasions that there is a direct link between smoking and lung cancer, it hardly seems fitting that an employee of HEW, the supervisory agency for PHS, should call attention to her unusual smoking habit. I realize this is a free land and she has every right to smoke, but is not the parallel between her cigar trademark and her employment by the Department of HEW rather incongruous.

The article follows:

JIM SMOKES CIGARS, PLUGS HEALTH CARE—WOMAN'S INTUITION TELLS HER BILL WILL PASS THIS TIME

(By Judy Klemesrud)

A pretty, cigar-smoking Texan named James (Jim for short) was in Chicago Monday to defend President Kennedy's hospital care for the aged program.

She's James Grant Akin (Mrs. William B.), 35, and she's a congressional liaison officer for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the only woman among 35 such employees in the executive branch of Government.

"I'm really just a lobbyist," she said, puffing on a small cigar.

(Ten cigar butts overflowed an ash tray on a bedside table in her Sheraton-Chicago Hotel suite.)

"And right now I'm sure that the King-Anderson bill will pass this session. Last November's election changed a lot of minds on Capitol Hill."

Mrs. Akin, an only child, said she was named for her "badly disappointed father," James W. Grant. She and her husband, an independent oil operator, have two children, a girl, James William, 10, and a boy, John, 9. Their home is Dallas.

"I can always tell when people know me well. They say, 'He's a great friend of mine'," she quipped.

"Jim," an all-American skeet shooter (1952–54), entered the University of Chicago as a political science student when she was only 15.

She said she "loves politics violently," and would like to run for Congress some day.

She's a past Democratic national finance chairman for Texas, and knows Vice President Lyndon Johnson "very well," but says she got her Federal job because she was one of President Kennedy's first supporters in Texas.

Mrs. Akin was in Chicago to debate the hospital care for the aged bill with Dr. Ernest B. Howard, assistant executive vice president, American Medical Association.

The debate was at the 16th annual Senior Adult Conference at the Bernard Horwich Center, 3003 West Touhy. The conference was sponsored by the Jewish Community Centers of Chicago.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with those who have paid tribute to the great Polish Constitution of 1791, Polish Constitution Day being properly observed on May 3, and to call attention once again to those enduring precepts of democracy that prompted the Polish Constitution, precepts which had just 2 years earlier prompted our own Constitution of the United States.

During the intervening years, Mr. Speaker, fate has not treated Poland and the United States with equal favor, and Poland has from time to time been and is now subjected to the tyrant's hand.

Throughout, however, the spirit of liberty has remained alive in Poland, and is deeply instilled in the hearts and minds of Poles wherever they live.

I know that the occasion of Constitution Day heightens the courage of every Pole, and all freedom-loving people, to look to the ultimate triumph of freedom and justice, when, as the Polish Constitution of 1791 so aptly puts it:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on a equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the commemoration of a day sacred to the heart of every free Pole. This is the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791; a constitution that incorporates enduring concepts of democracy, and principles rooted in the Polish love and attachment to freedom and independence.

These principles are still living in the hearts of Polish people wherever they may happen to be. In times of national well-being, as in times of crisis, these principles have served as the fountainhead of national consciousness and patriotism; as an ever-present readiness to make sacrifices to the common cause of freedom. We have only to look to recent times in the Nazi tyranny to witness the heroic defense of these high principles.

The year 1963 is doubly significant to every Pole. Not only is it the anniversary of the Polish constitution, it is also the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish revolts against the Russian rule, such as the Kosciuszko revolt in 1794 and the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the Germans in 1944, but the 1863 rebellion against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in Polish history. For a period of two years, gallant, fearless, patriots fought the Russian occupation.

It began on the night of January 22, 1863 and spread over Poland with the rapidity of a raging forest fire. It was only when the ruthless Russians brought in 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army that the fate of the uprising was sealed. Yet, these brave Poles fought on until they were literally ground to the earth.

In the course of the two bloody years, 20,000 Poles were killed in battle, thousands captured, and hundeds of their leaders executed or sent to Siberian salt mines. When the last leader of the revolt, Romuold Traugutt, and four assistants were hanged in the Warsaw public square, 25,000 of his fellow countrymen openly wept.

To the Poles, however, their cause was not defeated. Their fight against ruthless oppression continues to this day, for in the heart of every Pole is a spirit which cannot be bridled, a light which will not be put out. May it ever be so and may the bravery of the Polish people never be forgotten.

Polish Constitution Day, May 3

SPEECH

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we are today saluting Poland, and in so doing, we remember the efforts of her people throughout their country's history in its ceaseless fight for freedom and democratic government. That they are aware of every opportunity to strike a blow for freedom can be observed in reviewing briefly the events we are commemorating at this time.

Since the early 1700's Poland was only part of a nation—caught between Russia and Prussia. Her territory too strategic to be allowed much independence of action; she found herself a buffer between Russian and Prussian power. However, as will happen with allies, trouble developed between those two with the death of the Prussian Emperor, Frederick the Great. While Russia and Austria were busy fighting Turkey, Prussia wooed the Poles and gave them encouragement in breaking away from Russian control.

The ideological climate created by 18th-century liberalism and especially by the American and French Revolutions was felt in Poland by her liberal King, Stanislas Augustus, and the other reformers. With lessened pressure from her stronger neighbors, the Polish Parliament was called together in 1788 and set about to institute, among other things, constitutional reform. It should have been a time of quick action, but the tempo of change was very slow because many of the new and liberal ideas which were put forth caused heated political argument, especially among the military landowning class. It was only after 3 years of debate and inaction that the reforming party finally pushed through a constitution that, when read even today, shows to be a masterful blend of liberalism and conservatism, in which the King was ruler, but the form of government was democratic.

What did this Constitution offer to the people of Poland? It offered them liberty and independence, with respect for the law, for the person, and for property. It was brought forth, not with the shedding of blood as in France, but through the courage, foresight, and patriotism of a few dedicated and persistent men. The Constitution of 1791 was, fundamentally, an attempt to do away with the medieval and outmoded system of government used by outside influences to keep the country weak and divided, and to replace it with a modern constitutional monarchy, somewhat like that in England. It was as President George Washington wrote to a friend:

Poland appears to have made large and unexpected strides towards liberty, which if true, reflects great honor on the present King who seems to have been the principal promoter of the business.

But too much time was taken in the drafting and promulgating of this covenant of Polish liberty; there was too little time to gain the necessary internal political and economic stability to put the reforms into effect. Catherine the Great was now Empress of Russia, and to have Poland weak was important to her foreign policy. Furthermore, such liberalism as was now moving through that country could not be allowed into Russia. Once her war with the Turks was finished, Russia invaded, set on driving out the Polish reformers, the Jacobins of Warsaw, to destroy the Constitution of 1791, and, in league with some of the dissident elements of the landowning class in Poland, to break the new will for independence within the country. With a superior military force they were successful, especially when Prussia, who had pledged to defend Poland, backed down, sided again with Russia. The two of them set about to partition Poland anew, and the liberal Constitution and the personal freedoms of the Polish people were again thrown to the winds.

What the Constitution stood for has not been forgotten, however. We salute its spirit today, and we also salute the memory of those farsighted and clear-thinking men who sponsored that document of citizens' rights 172 years ago. What they initiated then captured a spirit inherent in the Polish people which cannot be driven out, a spirit of independence and freedom sought after and fought for so bravely and for so long, but enjoyed for such a short while.

Polish Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on the 172d anniversary of Poland's first democratic and liberal constitution, I am happy to salute the Polish people in America and abroad. In 1791 the Polish Diet enacted this historic document by unanimous vote, thus bringing about basic political, social, and educational reforms, and strengthened the Polish state. That this constitution was approved without violence and without bloodshed is evidenced of the statesmanship of Polish leaders, who were inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence

and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen.

At a time when the Polish people are unable to enjoy the rights for which their ancestors struggled, it is particularly fitting that we pause to pay homage to this great symbol of 18th century liberalism. In so doing, we pay homage to the love for freedom and independence which the present Communist Government of Poland has been unable to eradicate. The spirit of the 3d of May Constitution lives on, and the whole free world is committed to its fulfillment.

Polish Constitution Day, May 3

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating free Poland's national holiday. The 3d of May is comparable to our Fourth of July, and, like ourselves, the Poles on their greatest national holiday do not honor a single hero or a single victory but rather the spirit which has transcended all their glory and greatness. Names such as Kosciuszko, Pulaski, Chopin and Paderewski reflect this Polish spirit under which men freely abandon their personal careers, whether they be military or musical, and dedicate themselves completely to the battle for freedom.

The Polish spirit has moved the Polish people to valiant deeds in defense of their freedom and independence. One of the great wonders in the history of Western civilization is the durability of Poland for both man and Nature have seemed to militate against Poland's survival. Caught between Germany and Russia, Poland's territory has been a perennial battleground for envious armies and the Polish people have long been threatened with extinction. Nowhere in Eastern Europe has nationalism been so cruelly and continually oppressed, yet nowhere in Eastern Europe has the flame of liberty burned brighter.

We cannot help but admire and respect such a people and our admiration is constantly reaffirmed through our daily associations with the best of the Polish spirit among our own Americans. On this day especially we recall that the Polish Constitution followed our own by only a few years and that both were inspired by similar movements of liberalism designed to elevate man's position. Thus we read in article five of the Polish Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on lasting foundation.

It is this very will of the Polish people that is being violated today in their homeland. It is this will of the Polish people that we commemorate today as we share in honoring Polish Constitution Day.

What Cuba Has Cost United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hal Hendrix, Latin America editor for the Miami, Fla., News has raised some interesting points in a recent piece on "What Cuba Has Cost United States."

Such a tallysheet on the outpouring of U.S. tax dollars for questionable results serves a useful purpose as we put the administration's bungling of foreign policy decisions in its proper perspective. I commend Mr. Hendrix's provocative observations to my colleagues.

His article follows:

[From Miami News]

WHAT CUBA HAS COST THE UNITED STATES

(By Hal Hendrix)

The Kennedy administration's Alice in Wonderland policies for dealing with Communist Cuba already have cost the U.S. taxpayers nearly $500 million, and there is no end in sight.

Since a large share of U.S. expenditures related to the Communist Cuban problem float through classified channels, it is not likely that the American public will ever really know exactly how much the Caribbean fiasco has cost in dollars and cents.

Two of the biggest outlays have been tied to the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961, and the intensive U.S. military buildup last fall after the Soviet Union slipped an arsenal of offensive missiles into Communist Cuba while Washington persistently denied such a thing was possible.

No precise accounting has been made public, but spokesmen for the Bureau of the Budget have stated that last October's crisis cost more than $100 million. The Bay of Pigs fiasco overall cost reportedly was considerably higher, not counting the ransoming of the prisoners under the direction of Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

The welfare relief assistance payments to the 200,000 or more Cuban refugees and its administration, medical assistance programs, clandestine financing of antiCastro organizations and cost of U.S. manpower assigned to the Communist Cuba problem has run into additional millions.

What has the U.S. got to show for its continuing outpouring of taxpayers' dollars?

First of all, it has a firmly entrenched Soviet satellite, much more solidly implanted more than a year ago, in the Caribbean 90 miles from U.S. soil.

It has a garrison of somewhere between 17,000 and 30,000 Russian troops based in Communist Cuba, with a vague hope that Premier Khrushchev will withdraw them in "due course."

It has a training school for subversive agents in its backyard, grinding out thousands of Latin American guerrilla graduates for Communist work in their native countries.

It is faced with an impossible split within the Organization of American States, with countries like Brazil and Mexico steadfastly insisting on a "hands off" Cuba policy.

It has a nebulous agreement with Premier Khrushchev, made during the October crisis, which many observers feel convinced embraces a nonaggression pledge with respect to Castro's regime.

And for whatever it is worth, it claims Castro's image in Latin America has been deflated.

Outside of Lewis Carroll, who could dream up such an unbalanced balance sheet?

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years the U.S. Congress has annually demonstrated the feeling of faithful friendship on the part of the American people toward the Polish nation and people through special commemoration of Poland's great Constitution of 1791.

Beginning on May 3, and continuing throughout the month, Poles and citizens of Polish origin in America celebrate their Polish 3d of May constitution holiday. Wherever Americans of Polish extraction live, this event is marked with special exercises to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism and freedom in Europe.

It was on May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution in 1789, that Poland, without a bloody revolution or even without disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But following the unfortunate path down which history has led the Polish people for so long, this great rebirth and assertion of the rights of man came too late to forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The greatness of the May 3 constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles have raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their other glorious victories in their centuries-old struggle for freedom.

The right of man to freedom was formulated in these words in the 3d of May constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Meditation on the words of that constitution reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice and freedom for the Polish people even though their nation has since World War II been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and territory by Soviet Russia.

The Polish National Holiday

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, May 3, was the national holiday of Poland. It is a day of which we should all take note, not only because of our Polish friends and neighbors, but because it is an important symbol for free men throughout the world. This year the celebration is particularly important because it marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. On that occasion the Poles revolted against Russian tyranny in the greatest, longest and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, and under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to have included at this point in the RECORD a letter to me from Charles Burke of the Polish American Congress, Inc., and a leaflet explaining the significance of the Polish National Holiday.

The letter and article follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1963.

Hon. RICHARD E. LANKFORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. LANKFORD: From the time, when first among the free nations of the world, Poland heroically responded to the challenge of the Soviet-Nazi totalitarianism, the Congress of the United States has been annually demonstrating its feelings of faithful friendship toward the Polish nation. Each year a special observance is being held in the House of Representatives and in the Senate on May 3, in commemoration of Poland's great constitution of 1791.

This constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence. These principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism and ever-present readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

As we approach May 3, free Poland's national holiday, I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish uprisings against the Russian rule—the Kosciuszko uprising in 1794, the November uprising in 1831, the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation, but the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.

During the night of January 22, 1863, units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.

In the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant successes but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army, the fate of the uprising was sealed.

On one side were well-equipped regular army units, on the other the heroic insurgent army poorly equipped, having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps the brave insurgents achieved many successes over Russian army regiments in over 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland.

Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in public squares, the rest were sent to the mines in Siberia.

The last leader of the uprising, Romuald Traugutt, and four of his assistants were hanged in the public square in Warsaw in view of the kneeling, praying, and weeping crowd of 25,000.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents led by Reverend Brzoska was surrendered and wiped out in April 1865.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.

The Polish nation lost 250,000 of its best sons, the flower of its manhood, killed in battles, executed and exiled to Siberia.

United States at that time was in the throes of civil war and Europe was deaf to the cries of the martyred nation.

The Polish people suffered a defeat in the fight for independence but the social reform put through by its leaders gave the Poles a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization were shattered.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years.

The Polish American Congress representing over 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry expresses its fervent hope that you will see fit to participate in the observance scheduled to take place on the floor of both Chambers of the Congress on the 3d of May which day since 1791 is observed by all free Poles as Poland's national holiday.

I take the liberty to enclose for your attention a leaflet explaining in a few words the meaning of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish American Congress, Inc.

MAY 3: THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday, the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish Nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late, and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3d Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words: "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the 3d of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Mediation on the anniversary of May 3 depends the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though, Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory by one of our victorious allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

Mrs. Jessica Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to learn of the passing of our friend and colleague, Mrs. Jessica Weis. Mrs. Weis came to the Congress in the same year that I was honored by election to this body. We served on the same committee. I grew to know her well, and to respect the gentle determination, the loyalty and the dedication with which she carried out her legislative responsibilities.

Early in our first term, we were selected to participate in a panel here in Washington to discuss the political scene and political life with college students. I recall her animated interest

in the topic and the very real faith she had in the people and their Government. It was a great pleasure to have joined her on this program.

She was a charming, pleasant and able member of this institution. In the long hours which our committee has spent in reviewing facets of the space program, she was diligent and hard-working. I knew of her distinguished career in her home area of Rochester, N.Y., her strong belief in political principles, her sincere and warm interest in charitable works.

Not long ago, when she was in Washington, she took time to call Mrs. Daddario and myself and we welcomed her thoughtful rememberance. She has left her mark and her image upon this body, and we are sorrowed by her passing.

Socialized Medicine Is Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City carried an interesting editorial on April 22, 1963, containing factual information with regard to the socialized medicine programs in Italy, Canada and Britain.

The editorial follows:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE IS SICK

As deplorable as physicians' strikes are since they harm the public welfare, the doctors' strike that Italy experienced this week provides some telling arguments as to why government should stay out of medicine.

Under Italy's form of socialized medicine, the doctors were underpaid and overburdened with redtape. When the Government failed to redress their grievances, the doctors had no alternative but to strike.

If the Government had not decided to control medical care, the strike never would have happened. Any difficulties could have been worked out between the doctors and their patients on an individual basis.

Perhaps it's unfair to single out Italy. Canada also has had a doctors' strike directly attributable to socialized medicine.

In a way these countries have been lucky. Britain also has socialized medicine. While British physicians have not gone on strike, they have been leaving the country in droves.

Specifically, 14,000 British physicians and surgeons have come to the United States from 1952 through 1961. And in the past 5 years, another 1,071 British physicians have gone to Canada, 1,060 to Australia, 202 to South Africa, 184 to New Zealand, 145 to southern Rhodesia, and 119 to northern Rhodesia.

Even this, however, is not the worst of it. Untold numbers of Britain's young people have been deterred from entering the medical profession in the first place.

Much of the blame can be laid at the door of a medical system that encourages malingering because medical care seems to be free, but it is wrapped in expensive redtape. Many physicians under socialized medicine say they spend about as much time filling out Government forms as they do in treating patients.

Moreover, with such festering discontent on the part of medical practitioners under socialized medicine, it's entirely possible the public may not be receiving treatment as good as it might otherwise get.

The diagnosis seems clear: You can lead a physician to governmental medicine but you can't make him swallow it without producing repeated objections and serious discomfort. As long as that's the case, governmental medicine can't deliver anywhere near all it promises.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, recent and contemporary events often tend to obscure earlier ones, and, irrespective of the importance of the latter, relegate them to relative oblivion. This is true in the case of certain events in Polish history. We are so keenly concerned with the present unfortunate fate of the Polish people, that we sometimes think of Poland today only in terms of a large Communist concentration camp behind the Iron Curtain, almost sealed off from the free world.

But there were greater and brighter aspects in Polish history which should not be ignored and forgotten. Great names and lasting achievements abound in the annals of Poland. Poles made their signal contributions to our War of Independence through the distinguished services of Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski. Besides being gallant and dauntless fighters for freedom, Poles have also shown great talents in many other walks of life. By their Constitution of May 3, 1791, they proved to be pioneers of political reform in eastern Europe. That Constitution became a great landmark in Poland's history, and tomorrow marks its 172d anniversary.

The significance of that document is sometimes overlooked because before it was put into full force, Poland was invaded and lost her independent existence. The real importance of that Constitution, however, lay in the attempt of its framers to introduce a responsible cabinet type of government in that part of Europe. Monarchical authority was considerably curtailed, and that of the peoples' representatives was enhanced. The Polish peasantry was relieved from the arbitrary authority of local landlords and was placed under the protection of the law. Even more significant than any of these changes was the guarantee of religious freedom. Unfortunately these rights and freedoms have been lost to the Poles since those distant days, except for the relatively happy period of Polish independence in the two decades following World War I.

On this 172d anniversary of the promulgation and adoption of that liberal and democratic Constitution, I gladly join all Americans of Polish ancestry and birth in hoping that soon the people of Poland will again regain freedom in their homeland.

Leadership for Nursing, the Professional and University Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by Prof. Eleanor C. Lambertsen, chairman of the Department of Nursing at the Columbia University Teachers College on April 27, 1963.

The occasion was a testimonial dinner in the city of Boston, Mass., in honor of the retiring dean of the Boston University School of Nursing, Dr. Marie Farrell, and the title of the speech was "Leadership for Nursing: The Professional and University Role":

LEADERSHIP FOR NURSING: THE PROFESSIONAL AND UNIVERSITY ROLE

(By Eleanor C. Lambertsen)

Dr. Farrell—Professor Farrell, Dean Farrell—Marie. The very life of the colleague we honor this evening, and the social milieu in which she has practiced depict the evolution of the profession of nursing. One has only to review the record of achievements of Dr. Farrell to envision a prototype of leadership. Leadership which has resulted in more clearly defined goals for quality nursing service. Personally and professionally Dr. Farrell has meant many things to many people. The lives of all of us assembled this evening have been influenced either directly or indirectly through our many associations.

It is because of this that I hope to explore with you the vision and social action reflected in one career which has and will continue to influence our future role in meeting society's nursing needs.

The profession of nursing is at the crossroads of an era. The phrase, nursing in transition, is a sterile concept and connotes, in military term, strategic withdrawal.

In 1963, and the decade ahead, members of all health professions face critical decisions affecting the aims they will pursue and the tasks they will perform.

Three major areas, in which the majority of decisions may be grouped are:

1. The nature and scope of health services.
2. Organization for health services.
3. Provision of system of education which will insure that inter and intra national health needs will be met.

In this space era, we cannot afford to promote or concern ourselves with provincial approaches to health problems. Health problems have become universal problems rather than regional or national. Certainly we have built an impressive health record but the magnitude of the problems of health, disease and disability confronting us today is vast and perhaps incomprehensible.

The educational and economic level of the population has been rising steadily; resulting in an informed public expressing directly and indirectly increasing demands for health services. These demands are reflected in the rising numbers of workers in the health profession and occupations. In the past fifty years the Nation's population has

doubled, but the number of health workers has quadrupled, from 500,000 to more than 2 million.

But in the occupation of nursing the ghost of shortage of qualified personnel continues to influence excuses for mediocrity in patient and family services; in some instances this mediocrity has degenerated into unsafe practices. Practices may vary widely but the general trend in nursing is to delegate more and more responsibility for nursing services to semiskilled or unskilled workers.

The President of the United States, in his health message to Congress, stated that our health care can be no better than the knowledge and skills of the professional personnel to whom we entrust it. He further stated that it is essential that we always have a supply of such talent, drawn from the best and most gifted men and women in the world. The charge is overwhelming in its implications.

Intellectual leadership is not only essential but imperative in nursing. Preparation for such leadership is clearly the province of the university. But the university has a broader social role than preparation of future leaders; the faculty has a vital role in influencing essential social change. For major changes in nursing are essential. But an inescapable element is an attitude favorable to change. The attitude is as essential for faculty as for students. This is hard to develop. It requires faith in one's self and in the future. Insecure people dread change. The social isolate avoids change. Edgar Dale, in an article entitled, "Education For Flexibility," describes the insecure person as walking backwards into the future, clinging nostalgically, anxiously, and defensively to the past.

Broadly interpreted the university role as that of speeding up the processes of social evolution.

Public pressures and needs and professional pressures and needs must be continuously evaluated. To quote from Actions of the 18th National Conference on Higher Education, March 1963—

"An institution cannot allow itself to become only an instrument of its constituency or of public policy. It must always accept a responsibility to seek truth to raise the stature of man, and to contribute to society's advance even while remaining free and able to criticize and evaluate. Only by doing so, can an institution fully and wisely serve the democratic society of which it is a part."

Contribution to society's advance through insurance of safe, efficient, and therapeutic nursing services requires an examination of narrow constructed definitions of nursing. Preparation for leadership in the practice of nursing must be reexamined in light of the seeming emphasis upon health institutions rather than upon the nature of the service to be rendered. Do changing patterns of health services indicate a need to lessen the differences of our concept of the hospital nurse and the public health nurse? Our desperate need is for nurses who are more broadly prepared than narrowly prepared—nurses who can move efficiently from situation to situation and not be bound by the routines, mores and traditions of one particular employment situation—nurses with leadership skills which enable them to utilize social forces in a constructive manner rather than to accept these forces as an impediment—nurses with leadership skills which will enable them to establish precedent rather than conform to the immediacy of the situation. The goal we must strive for is education for flexibility for technological obsolescence is as pertinent to nursing as any other discipline.

Margaret Mead in the NEA Journal for October 1959 stated, "no one will live all his life in the world in which he was born and no one will die in the world in which he worked in his maturity." I have heard leading educators state that information acquired in educational programs is soon obsolete. For the explosion of knowledge is well known to any educator who attempts to keep up to date. Dr. Robert Oppenheimer has estimated that our store of knowledge is doubling in 8½ to 11 years. And knowledge which was highly specialized yesterday appears as general knowledge today. Is our emphasis in programs preparing for leadership to be upon essential content for nursing or upon the intellectual processes which assist the learner and practictioner identify the essential knowledge at the time this knowledge is required? Is there a danger in this era of too narrow a preparation in specialization?

Specialization is a symptom of an expanding industrial society. This is an era of experts. But intensive and narrow specialization has displaced self cultivation and wide knowledge as a value. The generalist is viewed with disfavor; the specialist has prestige. The issue in specialization is not that of denying the need for expertness, but rather that of specialization in a proper perspective. Specialization or expertness must reflect a social consciousness of things at large. It is this approach to specialization which will safeguard coordination in multidiscipline situations. I plea for a generalist approach to specialization; for leadership in nursing must insure against fragmented approaches to nursing services as well as to total health services. It is my strong belief that there has been too much emphasis upon role definition in isolation on the part of all professional health workers. We have all been too concerned with our independent roles rather than our interdependent roles.

Is not the university the setting where learners in the various professions can develop skills essential for peer relationships and coordinated approaches to the health problems of society?

Leadership as discussed in this paper has been described as behavior which results in an effective social action program with its goal that of social improvement—leadership for what may be rather than what is. Implied in the redefinition of the professional role of the nurse for such a leadership role is preparation for research and in research. For research in professional fields is designed primarily with a view toward discovery of means for increasing the effectiveness of the services of the profession. Much of the research in nursing, to date, has had to do with nurses rather than nursing. Little research has focused on the nursing needs of the patient who is the recipient of the services of the nurse. In this area research has made only a minute beginning. Today research in nursing faces a prime responsibility for finding, in a variety of nursing situations, new and better methods for patient care.

We have spent all too much time, "searching" not researching, what nurses are doing and proclaiming, as a result of these "searches," what they should not be doing rather than what might be done to improve nursing service and nursing care. I do not mean to imply that at one stage it was not necessary to identify nursing activities, but this has been accomplished. Our emphasis now must be centered upon nursing needs of particular kinds of patients with particular health problems.

Priority must be given in preparation of nurses for leadership positions in research.

The qualities and characteristics of leadership which have been discussed are not exhaustive but certainly a summary is indicated. As many of you realized I was actively engaged in study of leadership for many years. I have files of references on leadership traits and behaviors. But perhaps an example of the social effectiveness of Dr. Farrell can best be illustrated by a statement from the Bulletin of Boston University School of Nursing. For the behaviors identified as objectives for students upon completion of a program of study constitutes one of the best statements on leadership behaviors in the literature.

1. Acquire personality characteristics of maturity, integrity, wholesomeness, and humaneness enriched by contact with educational and cultural elements.

2. Recognize the need for continuing cultural and educational growth.

3. Recognize and assume the responsibilities of intelligent citizenship.

4. Understand the broad concept of nursing as promotion of physical and mental health, as well as care of the sick, which encompasses family health service.

5. Be prepared for competent nursing practice in homes, hospitals and other community agencies in urban and rural areas.

6. Be prepared to participate cooperatively with other members of allied professions as an effective professional worker.

7. Be motivated to improve constantly the quality of nursing provided by the profession to society.

We might all profit from such a self appraisal. Marie, bless you. All our past acclaims our future.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the tasks of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous

captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

APRIL 17, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: We feel that the establishment of a permanent Special Committee (House Resolution 14) on the Captive Nations will help to prove Communist lies false and help us to learn the true conditions existing in Ukraine, Hungary, the Baltic States, and others behind the Iron Curtain.

Therefore we urge you, Mr. Chairman, to support Congressman FLOOD'S resolution.

Yours truly,

Oler Z. Aysiak, Clifford Gilpin, Kobybabiuk Slauco, Alex Nikorovich, Igor Szwec, Erick Zlupko, Roman T. Krochalz, Walter Kieba, Eugene Pilkrig, Robert Greenage, Andris Evalds, Michael Wertheimer, Louis Shucher, Michael Saft, Robert McNinch, Borys Leoczleo, Robert F. Fortin, Alego Bak, Laurence Carroll, Frank Vaccaro, Jon Berger, George Montras, Scott Lager, Jeffrey Lerman, Mash Leon, Stuart Medoff, Robert Neu, Evan Luslin, James McNamarces, Martin Sipschutz, William Marder.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
April 16, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: This letter is written in regards to the House Resolution 14, which is introduced by Honorable Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, to establish a special committee on the captive nations. I think that it is a very important resolution because this committee will deal with captive nations and will prevent the coming of communism to our country.

Therefore I beg you to do everything in your power that the Resolution 14 would be passed. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

N. DOMASHEWSKY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 11, 1963.

Hon. H. W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The most virulent and potent weapon of the cold war that Communist Russia has at its disposal and which, I may add, she has used it with ability unhampered by any ethical scruple is the impenetrable atmosphere of secrecy and its natural derivatives, chicanery and subterfuge. Repeatedly, the West has been frustrated in all attempts to alleviate the tensions created by the cold war, and the reason for each failure to reach an amicable agreement has been invariably Communist unwillingness to make their position clear. Russian reticence was born in the infamous era of the czars and continued adamantly by the present regime, serving both dictatorships by withholding information embarrassing to each one, but being quite fluent and voluble with information which contributed to and reinforced their cause. The Communist bloc has developed management of news to a deadly art, which if allowed to continue in its unexcelled degree will only intensify the cold war and perhaps lower its kindling point.

The serenity with which the West accepted the annexation to Russia the countries of Ukraine, Hungary, Poland, the Baltic States, and others render strong testimony to the efficacy of the Communist Iron Curtain of silence. Man will prevail in the quest for freedom because of his simple will to live. But to do that he must have hope. He must know that the West and its leader, the United States, does care and expresses its concern by positive action.

Eastern European peoples are enslaved, but not conquered. The curtain of silence has muffled their voice, but not their will to freedom. The United States can utilize this salutary situation in Eastern Europe to penetrate that heinous curtain, and add impetus to President Kennedy's recent speech in the Orange Bowl in Miami.

Therefore, dear Chairman SMITH, on behalf of the executive board of Ukrainian Student Organization of Michnowsky, TUSM, which is comprised of students of various universities of the United States, I urge you to give your most sympathetic response to House Resolution 14, calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Respectfully yours,

BOHDAN KULCHYCKY,
President of TUSM.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I wish to urge that you submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote and give it your favorable consideration.

I believe that a special House Committee on Captive Nations would serve the people's interest in that it would provide a means for the legislative branch to exercise its balance of powers in relation to the Executive in the foreign policy field as respects these nations.

Respectfully,

RICHARD E. SUMPTER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
April 16, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL ROSTENKOWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: One of the biggest problems facing our Nation at present time is the threat of communism. Many nations had lived through that threat and found themselves under communism.

We, as free citizens, should do everything in our power to destroy the fear of communism and never let it in inside our Nation.

Therefore, I, as a resident of your district, ask you to present to the Congress a resolution for a special Committee on the Captive Nations. Also I beg you to support House Resolution 14 submitted by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD. I thank you.

Very truly yours,

N. DOMASHEVSKY.

REGIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S
LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Utica, N.Y., April 15, 1963.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations, which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

We all know that the rulers in the Kremlin will prevent the creation of the independence of the captive nations by all possible means, because they are the most productive part of the Soviet Union.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

On behalf of our organization we strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH to give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) in the Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

MARIA KOHUTIKK,
President.

The Need for the Captive Nations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations has received tremendous bipartisan endorsement. I am happy to report today that the active and well-organized American-Lithuanian community swung behind the resolution. The leading figures in American-Lithuanian political activities, meeting in a conference in Chicago, Ill., on April 19–20, voted unanimously to support, by all means at their disposal, the establishment of such a committee.

I would like to quote at this point from an editorial that appeared on April 26, 1963, in Draugas, the largest American-Lithuanian daily and one of the largest nationality papers in this country:

It would be very good if the U.S. House of Representatives established a Special Captive Nations Committee without delay. Should this undertaking fail to materialize in the immediate future, the House Rules Committee ought to be requested to give its consent to the establishment of the committee so that the House could vote on the resolution.

"Appropriate resolutions to this effect have been introduced in the House by two Congressmen, DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and EDWARD DERWINSKI, Republican from Illinois, both of whom are energetic fighters for the liberation of captive peoples. This means that the resolution has bipartisan support. The resolution failed to pass the House in the last session. It became stuck in the committee, mostly due to the State Department's lack of endorsement of the whole idea. This session has a much higher potential for the passage of the resolution."

There are dozens of supporting resolutions introduced in this session. But the editors of Draugas are correct in another respect—if one can speak of bipartisan support of the resolution, this is a case at its best.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to quote from Draugas, on the subject of our State Department's opposition to the

Captive Nations Committee. The paper said editorially on April 29, 1963:

We live in a free country. The fact that the State Department does not endorse the resolution 100 percent * * * does not mean we must throw in the sponge and wait until somebody else resolves our freedom problem. We did not receive the right to live free from the State Department * * * and in a democratic country even the State Department must pay attention to public opinion. America's democratic government is from the people and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, the same conference further resolved to work toward the commemoration of the Captive Nations Week this coming July, barely 2 months from this date. I understand that some Senators and Congressmen have already written the White House reminding the President not to forget the date and to issue an appropriate proclamation as provided for in Public Law 86-90. Perhaps more of us should follow this example and write the President without delay.

"Draugas," which claims to speak on behalf of 1 million American Lithuanians, also suggested that the resolution establishing House Special Committee on Captive Nations should be passed before the Captive Nations Week. The paper even urged its readers to write the members of the Rules Committee as well as individual Congressmen urging the passage of the resolution. I quote again:

There are quite a few Congressmen, friends of the captive nations, who support the resolution and are good friends of the Lithuanians. We must appropriately remind them of the need for action. Let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join in the American Lithuanian appeal: Let us do it. Let us pass House Resolution 14 establishing the Special Committee on Captive Nations before this year's Captive Nations Week. What could be more fitting than a Presidential proclamation and congressional action aiming at the same ultimate noble goal—liberation of captive peoples?

Let us do it, Mr. Speaker.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the 3d day of May is a date that lives in the hearts of Polish people everywhere. It is a date of reverence and of hope. It was on this date in 1791, just 2 months after the first Congress of the United States had adjourned sine die, that the people of Poland adopted their great constitution, transforming their country to a land of personal freedom under a constitutional monarch. This significant development gave to the people freedom to practice their own religion and did away with distinctions among the classes.

It is not difficult to visualize the sympathetic reaction accorded to this progressive step by the American Congress at that time. Today, we in the Congress are equally conscious of the eternal struggle for freedom. We also still remember the magnificent contributions to our cause made by Kosciuszko and Pulaski. Our hearts go out to those brave Poles who are today under the domination of Communist Russia. We join with the millions of Poles who have adopted our country and who have done so much to make the United States the great nation it is.

Mr. Speaker, it is our fervant hope that some day in the not too distant future these brave people, wherever they may be throughout the world, in their homeland or abroad, may once again celebrate without foreign restraint this cherished date in their long history.

Youth Corps Is Not the Realistic Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of comment on the Youth Conservation Corps. Most of it has come from the adults who are concerned about its development.

On the 20th of April 1963, one of the younger members of the Denver metropolitan community commented on this proposal in the Denver Post's "Voice of Youth" series. He is Mr. Richard Torpy, a sophomore at the University of Denver and a graduate of South High School in Denver.

Mr. Torpy's article is possessed of particular insight and perception. This young man, representing the group of young people who would be directly concerned with the Youth Conservation Corps, goes directly to the heart of the problem. I commend him for the excellent article:

YOUTH CORPS IS NOT THE REALISTIC SOLUTION

(By Richard Torpy)

(NOTE.—Richard Torpy, a graduate of South High School, is a sophomore at the University of Denver.)

The problem of the high school dropout who can't find a job is growing more serious yearly. These dropouts represent a serious waste of one of America's most valuable resources—youth. The creation of a youth corps is an attempt to solve the dilemma of this valuable waste of resources, but is not a realistic solution.

The purpose of the corps is to help alleviate the problems of the idle American youth who lack the proper training to find jobs in our ever-increasing complex society. Members would work at various jobs while serving the general public in their hometowns. Jobs would vary from helping in hospitals to chopping trees in forest camps similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the New Deal era.

Whatever his job, the idle youth would be taken off the streets and assigned a job that is supposed to help him develop useful skills for future employment.

The idea of a home youth corps appears very sound if only the above two factors are considered. It is the underlying faults that are not easily visible that make the plan unrealistic.

More than a million youths between the ages of 17 and 20 have neither a high school diploma nor the proper technical training needed to find a worthwhile job. The corps could use only 50,000 of these youths at one time, a mere 5 percent of the total. Another drawback to the plan is the question of whether a 6-month service in the youth corps would prepare a youth sufficiently to find a job after he left the Government service. It is doubtful that a youth chopping trees in a forest camp for 6 months would acquire any more technical skill than he had at the start of his service in the Corps.

Would it not be better to seek a solution that would benefit the majority of those concerned? If the purpose of the youth corps is to train the unprepared youth so he stands a better chance of employment, would it not be a better solution for the Government to foster individual initiative and let the youth help himself?

The majority of the unemployed youth dropped out of school because of academic difficulties. Not wishing to pursue the academic aspects of education, he is denied the chance for a technical education.

The creation of technical and mechanical schools where the idle youth could develop more basic skills than he could in the youth corps appears to be a better solution. High school shop classrooms could be used at night for such purposes, with the resulting program reaching more of the idle young people. The creation of such schools would provide the idle youth a chance to help himself.

What the unemployed young people really need is the chance to develop their own initiative. A 6-month stint in the youth corps where his Uncle Sam would watch over him would not help the idle youth, but only give him hope to expect further handouts from the Government.

The Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have contended for a long time that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has been using undue influence in trying to get a favorable vote in the wheat referendum to be held on May 21, 1963. Under questioning by me on this subject before the Committee on Agriculture on April 26, 1963, Secretary Freeman categorically denied that he is trying to influence the outcome of the referendum one way or another. The following news story taken from the April 20, 1963, issue of Wallace's Farmer rather indicates that my allegations have some basis of fact:

THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

"Were it simply a matter of winning this thing on a vote-for-vote basis. I believe we could do it; I wouldn't be worried. But when you need two votes for your opponent's one, it's a different situation. I just can't be very optimistic."

This studied appraisal by a high Federal official refers, of course, to the upcoming wheat referendum. A career man here says it even more succinctly: "We are running scared."

Despite, or perhaps because of, this attitude of underdogism (an attitude which policymakers do their best to hush) USDA wages a no punch pulled battle to salvage a victory. The fact that both sides are determined to win regardless of cost becomes increasingly obvious each day.

Win or lose, the cost promises to be high. In dollars alone, it's big money. But the cost will not be paid in dollars alone. Scars from the battle may long outlast results of the referendum itself.

Justified or not, USDA—as a Federal agency—draws more than its share of criticism for conduct of the ensuing battle. USDA men contend they were left no choice other than to defend the certificate plan in an effort to offset the smear efforts of opponents. Insists one Freeman defender, "The Secretary has an obligation to see that farmers understand both alternatives."

Even so, criticism alleging "improper activities" persists * * * dwelling on "USDA's extensive propaganda campaign."

While official leaflets to be distributed to farmers exhibit usual technical objectivity, statements by ranking officials show sharply less detachment.

Administration men, however, insist their efforts are strictly educational. In a recent talk, Freeman said "my role and the role of the Department, is not to tell the farmer how he should vote, or even to advise him how to vote. Our function," said the Secretary, "is to present the facts and provide the farmer with the information he will need in order to make an informed decision in the referendum."

That the above should be the role of the USDA is agreed to by almost everyone. That it has, in fact, been the role of USDA is agreed to by almost no one.

Assertions that "farmers will have $700 million more income if they vote yes," and "it would be tragic if our progress to develop reasonable trade relations on wheat were destroyed by a minority" appear difficult to jibe with the Secretary's contention he is by no means advising a farmer how to vote.

The tempo of the campaign likewise causes resentment within USDA ranks. Career government employees fume—although usually silently—over having been recruited for a role in what has become a partisan fight.

Some feel the forced involvement undermines their agency's hard-earned confidence of farmers and, in turn, their ability to serve farmers.

Outside USDA, critics accuse the farm agency Secretary of pitting urbanites against farmers * * * placing farmers in a poor public light should they reject marketing quotas on wheat. Case in point is Freeman's recent comment: "The consumer and taxpayer will watch this referendum with special attention to determine whether the farmer is really serious about cutting surpluses and taxpayer costs."

Congressmen also complain in increasing numbers. An off-and-on Democratic backer of the administration calls USDA activities completely out of line.

The often-voiced Capitol Hill comment is this: "In passing the 1964 wheat law calling for a referendum, Congress said, in effect, either outcome would be acceptable national policy; it should be a question of which one farmers preferred. If the Department of Agriculture believed one of the possible alternatives would be unacceptable, it shouldn't have supported the bill. And the President shouldn't have signed it."

No less of an eventual dilemma faces Washington should quotas lose and the clamor begin for new legislation. So absolute have both Government men and lawmakers been in insisting there will or won't be new legislation that some may find themselves politically embarrassed.

Similarly, USDA in its insistence on this or nothing may have neatly backed itself into a corner. "How," asks one observer, "can the Department insist in one breath that a quota defeat would be disastrous, and in the next breath contend—as the President has—that no new legislation would be needed?"

The Spectacle of Random Village

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the presidential campaign of 1960 we suffered then-candidate Kennedy's attempts to downgrade America. We might have hoped for a better performance from our President than the recent spectacle of a Random Village lecture.

This little exercise was significant, however, in the insight it provided into the typical thinking of the New Frontier on domestic problems. It seems to go something like this: First, order the bureaucracy to crank out pounds of statistics; next, draw averages from those statistics and paint the picture of the average American town; then, ply the Congress for passage of massive Federal programs to get the country moving again, based on the unfortunate plight of Random Village.

This approach makes about as much sense to me as gathering together a group of children, some of whom are less than healthy; and totaling the data on each child's diet, passing to all the children a plate of food designed to meet the average child's needs, when one might be suffering from a serious deficiency of Vitamin A, another from Vitamin B, one diabetic, and perhaps some had lunch only an hour before.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the New York Herald-Tribune of April 21, 1963:

THE POOR FOLKS OF RANDOM VILLAGE

To hear the President tell it, you'd think life in America is pretty grim.

In his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors he postulated a statistically structured community of 100—Random Village—in which it seemed all the woes of the world must be concentrated. The majority there are dependent on the minority with jobs. The average family man faces "a dismal choice between driving in rush hour traffic or waiting for an undependable, overcrowded bus or train." His son has an increasingly slim chance of finding a job if he seeks one on graduation from school. Random Village's residents find national parks crowded, the seashore encroached on by commercialism, the wilderness fast disappearing. They are haunted by unemployment. Many won't graduate from high school. Of those who do, nearly half will find college too expensive. During the year, the resident will suffer 26 injuries; 11 persons will be hospitalized, but there won't be enough doctors, dentists or hospitals. Three people in Random Village are mentally retarded, nine 65 or over (thus more likely to need hospitalization). A fifth of the houses are deteriorating or dilapidated. One family in eight has an income of less than $35 a week. Nearly 1 out of 5 of those employed will be unemployed at some time during the year.

Random Village, of course, was meant as a statistical microcosm of the United States, and the President's point was that his domestic program has to be enacted in order to correct the Nation's deficiencies.

But what he neglected to mention was that Random Village also contains people of imagination, initiative, inventiveness, people who are not ready to surrender to a concept that the only way to a better life is to find someone else who'll provide it. It contains people of pride and ability, at least some of whom are competent and ready to manage their own and their community's affairs—provided they are encouraged to do just that, rather than abdicate all sense of local responsibility.

Random Village also, we suspect, has a good many things to be thankful for. Most of its people are well fed, well clothed, well housed. Its economy is expanding, its industry modernizing, its farmers producing bumper crops. Its schools are being improved. New houses are being built, and perhaps a new civic center. Its children still have an opportunity to make of themselves what they will. It has a freely chosen local government, with whatever authority the citizens choose to give it to make civic improvements.

As a matter of fact, we can think of a good many people around the world who'd like nothing better than a chance to live in Random Village. And, though it's a far from perfect place, to take a large hand themselves in making it a better one.

The Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privileege, though a very sad one, to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague, Jessica McCullough Weis, one of America's outstanding women. I know she will be mourned by all who were privileged to know her.

Throughout her lifetime and as a distinguished Member of Congress, she merited the high respect and esteem of her colleagues for her devotion and unstinting efforts for her country, her State, and constituency. Judy Weis loved our country and the institutions which have made us a great Nation. She fought diligently to protect our constitutional Government and preserve our national heritage. During the 87th Congress, it was my good fortune to become acquainted with Judy Weis who I found to be a kindly person, generous in her advice and counsel to freshmen Members of Congress. I valued her friendship just as I admired her fine work, her wonderful qualities, and the contributions she made as a Member of the House.

Mrs. Weis was truly a great person, a great legislator and an outstanding lady.

Mrs. King joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the members of her family. Their sense of loss must be lighter realizing that it is shared by so many of us.

Disarmament: Wishful Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very pleased to read in the Evening Star of May 2, 1963, an excellent editorial on the subject of disarmament. It is entitled "Disarmament: The Grand Delusion." When I read this editorial, Mr. President, I had just finished preparing my weekly newsletter which is being made public today. It is also on the subject of disarmament and is entitled "Disarmament: Wishful Thinking." I ask unanimous consent that the Evening Star editorial and my newsletter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, May 2, 1963]

DISARMAMENT: THE GRAND DELUSION

The Soviet delegate says the Geneva test-ban talks are a waste of time. He is right. These talks are not leading anywhere, and they should not.

The test-ban concept, so far as we can see, has no meaning except as a step toward nuclear disarmament. The proposal was first put forward out of fear that tests would poison the atmosphere. That danger has been pretty well discounted by the experts; it makes more sense for use to worry about how often our children take on radiation by having their teeth X-rayed than about how they will be affected by reasonable levels of atomic testing, especially underground testing. The argument nowadays centers mainly on the notion that if we and the British and Russians renounce further testing, we will somehow inhibit proliferation of nuclear weapons to other nations. The French do not seem very much impressed with this logic—the Chinese, hardly at all. There is no reason why they should be.

No, the serious significance of a test ban must surely be that it would serve as a first step back from commitment to an atomic arms race—a psychological break in the cold war that might lead eventually to disarmament. The serious question about the test ban is whether it makes sense in this context.

We think not. We do not believe disarmament will be a practical possibility in the foreseeable future—certainly not until solutions are found for political issues such as Berlin. It seems to us silly to fiddle around with wishful steps in that direction.

Of course it is dangerous for the world to keep piling up atomic armaments. But if in fact that is what the world is going to do, it is more dangerous to tranquilize ourselves with delusions of safety. This is a dangerous world. It will become more dangerous. And much as we yearn for relaxation—much as we would like to feel we have everything under control—we are not going to enjoy that sensation in our time.

Our situation might be likened to that of a not very bright man in a room which is filling up with explosive gas. He can breathe it safely, but if he ignites it it will blow him to kingdom come. What do we worry about here—what do we want the man to do? Eventually, if possible, he should of course shut off the gas and clear it out of the room. For the present he does not know how to accomplish this. His chance of survival lies in a recognition of his limitations and his danger. He must understand that the room is charged with sudden death; that the slightest mistake on his part will set it off. The worst mistake we could make would be to lead him to believe things might not, after all, be as dangerous as they seem. Would we be doing him a favor if we suggested that by tinkering with the valves he might slow down the inflow? Might we not be encouraging him to test his new-found relative safely by lighting a match?

Like the man in the room, we are endangered most in this age of overkill by failure to apprehend the true extent of our danger. We will not be making things a little safer for ourselves by clutching at the straw of a little disarmament. Fifty superbombs are not necessarily safer than a hundred. If 50 less superbombs makes us feel safer, that in itself makes our situation more dangerous. The biggest think we have to fear is lack of fear itself.

This is not to say, either, that hydrogen weapons necessarily have made war obsolete. The inventor of dynamite thought he had done that. Peace through mutual terror, in Churchill's phrase, may well be as precarious today as it always has proved.

But we hold this gloomy view of the alternatives: If there is any chance that man will be restrained from war by the horror at his disposal, no good end is served by trying to pretend against our better judgment that the situation can be tamed.

And if on the other hand man is not going to be restrained, then we will, like our caveman ancestor, want all the weapons we can lay our hands on.

DISARMAMENT: WISHFUL THINKING

The cost of liberty is high, and there is no such thing as a deferred payment plan to live free now and pay later. When a challenge to freedom arises, there is a great temptation to look for an easy way out and to avoid facing up to the challenge and the hard, often risky decisions which an effective defense of liberty requires.

The free world is now confronted with the most serious challenge to liberty in history, for the Communists are relentlessly waging war against freedom. The defense of freedom falls primarily on the United States. The United States together with its Allies, has the strength to defeat the war against freedom, but we have failed so far, simply because we have sought an easy way out. Instead of resolving to win the war being waged against freedom, we have sought to "liquidate" it, or make it go away.

Many "easy ways out," separately and in combination, have been tried unsuccessfully—such as containment, foreign aid, cultural exchanges and "the spirit of Camp David," to name a few. In the past few years, a new "easy way out" formula has been expensively prepared, enticingly packaged and boastingly advertised. Early delivery has been promised, so the time has arrived when Americans had better take a long, hard look at the product—disarmament.

Disarmament is not a new product, but the latest model prepared by U.S. policymakers has a new name and several attachments. The new name is arms control. The principal new attachments are mutual deterrence and test ban.

The United States has proposed to the Communists a treaty for "general and total disarmament." This proposal provides for creation by stages of an "international peace force" and the reduction and elimination of all national armaments except those necessary for maintaining internal order. Even the U.S. policymakers correctly recognize, however, that the Communists, with all their devious practices of cheating on agreements, are not likely to agree to a stage reduction proposal while at the starting point the United States has a clearly evidenced superiority in nuclear weaponry. That is where the theory of mutual deterrence or nuclear stalemate comes in.

Mutual deterrence will come into being, according to "arms controllers," when both sides develop a "creditable second strike capability," or in other words, have the ability to strike back effectively even after receiving the first blow. At this point, our policymakers reason, neither side will have to fear the other, and the reduction in arms by stages can then begin. There can be no "mutual deterrence" stability, however, as long as weapons development continues, for one side might possibly achieve a weapons breakthrough and upset the balance. The first step, our policymakers therefore say, must be a nuclear test ban so that new weapons cannot be developed.

Like other "easy ways out," this attractive package will work only in an idealist's mind—never in practice. Consider a few of the defects:

1. The Soviets secretly prepared for a nuclear test series while we refrained from testing during negotiations. Then they surprised us with a series of tests. They would have everything to gain by another secret preparation under cover of a test ban and another surprise testing program.

2. The Soviets are not working toward "mutual deterrence," or a parity with U.S. strike forces. They are straining every resource to obtain a breakthrough in new weaponry that will give them nuclear superiority.

3. The disarmament idea is based on the presumption that both sides want "peace," as we understand the term. The Communists have repeatedly said—and proved—that their goal is world domination, not peace.

4. Armaments do not cause wars. It is the lust of men for power that causes wars; and military weakness, not strength, invites attack.

5. Disarmament proposals are directed at conventional and nuclear weapons. By far worse to contemplate than nuclear attacks are the attacks which can be waged with chemical and bacteriological weapons—small in size, easily concealed and deliverable to targets by human vehicles. What type of inspections will guarantee against use of CBR warfare?

The only sure road to peace is superior military strength. The only hope for freedom lies in total victory over communism. There is no "easy way out."

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Jessica McCullough Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn upon reading this morning's newspaper of the passing of our lovely former colleague, the Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis, of the

38th District of New York. Judy Weis was a charming lady and a highly competent and respected Member of this body. Her son and daughters have our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

U.S. Economy and Cold War Competition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the business economics section of the Commonwealth Club of California has for some time been considering the question "What does the U.S. economy require to meet the cold war competition?"

They have just issued their report which I believe would be of interest to all Members of the Congress.

The report follows:

PROS AND CONS ON WHAT IS NEEDED TO IMPROVE OUR COMPETITIVE POSITION

1. Should the future economy be one in which there is greater individual freedom of choice and more widespread assumption of individual responsibility?

Pro: Tradition and history of the United States recommend an economy based upon a large measure of freedom of enterprise. It is under this freedom that the U.S. economy has become the world's strongest. We should increase the area of free choice and decision instead of permitting greater governmental influence on the economy.

Con: In order to preserve the greater portions of our liberties and way of life, with the rights to property and rights of individual dignity and choice, we must forego some of the traditional freedoms. A more disciplined and managed economy is necessary, with less liberty and less free competition than we have had.

2. Should the Government rather than competition be the arbiter of economic standards and methods of industry?

Pro: When industry is subsidized, the Government must increasingly absorb technical and physical supervision of methods, techniques, and distribution.

Con: The tax burden and administrative costs of subsidized programs, the interjection of income tax, low depreciation rates and other regulations, inhibit the upgrading of our industrial economy. This so burdens our economy and decisions made by that economy that we cannot operate efficiently in relationship with those countries that do not operate within those limitations. Subsidizing any industry interferes with the free market.

3. Should the United States forego the claimed "advantages" of a semimanaged economy?

Pro: We would reduce the costs of Government by eliminating costly burdens such as costs of carrying agricultural surpluses, and other subsidies interfering with free enterprise. This would reduce taxes and reinvigorate the economy of individual private capitalism.

Con: The classic economy of individual private capitalism is a matter of the past and cannot be retrieved. In order to compete the Government must subsidize certain enterprises, protect and/or stimulate others. By necessity, this means governmental influence on business decisions.

Median: We should set a climate conducive to a maximum of free enterprise, by keeping taxes low and interference at a minimum. At the same time the Government should not abrogate its responsibility toward all classes of people, curb monopolies, reduce unemployment and guarantee the fundamental needs of all the people.

4. Should the United States provide welfare benefits for its needy citizens such as the unemployed, the aged, the mentally retarded and the physically ill at the expense of taxation on those who are able to earn a decent income?

Pro: Citizens of this country are entitled to assistance during time of need. A program such as social security is fully justified in allowing needy persons to obtain assistance with dignity.

Con: This segment of our population represents a sizable cost to our Government. A greater portion of the support of such people should be borne by relatives or charitable institutions thereby reducing the tax needs of our Government.

5. For this country to maintain its economic stature and competitive position in the world, is it necessary to improve the educational standards of its citizenry, with government support?

Pro: A free and equal education for all is the basis of democracy. Today's need for more knowledge requires that the Government assumes the costs of higher education as well as the primary education, traditional in this country, even at the expense of more taxes.

Con: Education beyond the primary level is a matter for the individual who can afford it and the gifted person able to get scholarships. America was made a great Nation by a succession of brilliant self-made men.

6. Should we pursue a policy of economic self-sufficiency and concentrate on strengthening our internal economy.

Pro: Our Nation is nearly self-sufficient. Supporting foreign countries creates a considerable drain on our economy which we can ill afford. We burden our taxpayers merely to create competitors abroad who subsequently take our best markets away from us.

Con: The world grows smaller, we are affected by events, economic or political, all over the world, and must carry our share of improving the economic lot of all peoples. Some countries are in obvious need of assistance which will be obtained from our cold war competitors if we do not supply it.

The conclusions and recommendations of this study section to the Commonwealth Club of California were determined by the mail ballot on the following section questionnaire:

RECOMMENDATORY VOTE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS SECTION

Recommendations to Commonwealth Club of California—subject to later vote of entire club.

A. In order to survive cold war economic competition should the United States:

1. Give greater incentives to capital? Yes, 162; no, 1; leave unchanged, 15.

2. Reduce its outstanding debt? Yes, 154; no, 23.

3. Reduce taxes? Yes, 133; no, 39.

4. Reduce subsidies in all fields? Yes, 149; no, 23.

5. Reduce its own trade barriers? Yes, 143; no, 25.

6. Demand reciprocal reductions in foreign trade barriers? Yes, 171; no, 5.

7. Increase or decrease its foreign aid? Increase, 6; decrease, 146; leave unchanged, 25.

8. Exercise more or less government influence on labor negotiations? More, 33; less, 124; leave unchanged, 20.

B. 1. Should the government be the main determining factor of the economic standards and methods of industry? Yes, 8; no, 171.

2. Should individual competition be the main determining factor of the economic standards and methods of industry? Yes, 166; no, 12.

C. Should the United States continue its trend toward a semi-managed economy? Yes, 25; no, 148.

D. Should the government seek to establish an economic climate conducive to maximum free enterprise? Yes, 163; no, 9.

E. Do governmental social welfare programs help the United States in meeting cold war competition? Yes, 44; no, 126.

F. Should the United States concentrate its resources on strengthening its internal economy (rather than devoting a part of its resources to strengthening economies abroad)? Yes, 126; no, 43.

G. Irrespective of your opinion on the questions above, do you approve the proposed section report as to form and coverage only? Yes, 157; no, 9.

WHAT THE U.S. ECONOMY REQUIRES?—ONE VIEW

(By Dr. Lloyd Ulman, professor of economics, University of California)

Two aspects of this subject which are of particular interest are: What the United States should do. What the U.S. economy requires to survive the cold war.

First, the economy must generate sufficient resources to maintain the military and for adequate implementation of foreign policy. The first claim on the economy must be adequate defense; and second, the problem of economic education in the country—1 year's experience in Washington has driven home to me the need for economic sophistication.

Economic education requires the revision of some of the popular economic beliefs. One might say the side in the cold war that succeeds in self-examining and correcting its economic beliefs has the best chance of winning out in economic competition.

ONE MYTH IS BALANCED BUDGET

The Russians, examining their beliefs, might give up the myth of centralized economy, their labor-cost theory of values; giving weight to nonlabor cost and profits. We have our own myths. One myth is that of a balanced budget.

Most important is the problem of providing for adequate defense. The section's report discusses the role of taxes in the American economy. It is a burden, and President Kennedy has done well to propose reducing this burden. As the gross national product rose, taxes took a large bite. On the other hand, when we look at the share of the Federal Government in the economy, we should make allowances—the growth of military expenditures; the increase in prices since the base year 1929 * * * Government services grow more rapidly in postwar inflation; the differences in employment and nonemployment between 1929 and 1961. Take the share of gross national product in constant dollars and prices (1954) that originated in the civilian activities of the Federal Government; 6 percent in 1929, 6½ percent in 1961. This growth was due entirely to defense expenditures.

WHEN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES STIMULATE BUSINESS

Tax receipts of all Government were 11 percent in 1929, rose to 27 percent in 1961. If we correct for the differences in level of employment, there is a 16 percent difference—4 or 5 percent resulting from the social security program.

Civilian government is preempting more of our potential. As long as there is excess unemployment, Government expenditures

stimulate rather than compete with private business.

Now to run down a television view of the President's tax reduction proposals, to see what he is thinking; a decrease in taxes over a 3-year period by $13½ billion; reduction of personal income taxes right down the line. This would be offset by $3½ billion revenue from tax changes; $2 billion would be absorbed immediately by the increase which already has taken place in social security taxes—net reduction of $10 billion.

WHAT THE U.S. ECONOMY REQUIRES—ANOTHER VIEW

(By Seth Axley, investment counselor and contributor to financial periodicals)

If we oust our economy's political management, free enterprise will make this country over. Let's not forget what capital can do.

In Cairo, where capital is short, it is often hard to distinguish between merchandising and begging. Men on the streets try to force goods into your hands. In moving a canal along the Nile without bulldozers, thousands carry mud in baskets on their shoulders. To make work, women in Spain scrub hotel lobbies on their knees. These people don't earn much because they don't produce much.

We use our manpower more efficiently. Secretary Hodges estimates our workers produce three times as much in an hour as a European worker and seven or eight times as much as a Japanese. Our workers mine 14 tons of bituminous coal daily compared with 2 tons by the average European. We run our railroads with 3.7 employees per mile; Russia uses 29.6, and even England, 29.2. Baggage flunkeys are busy only 15 percent of their time. Owned by the state, European railroads are not run for profit but to provide the security of feudalism.

MORE CAPITAL—MORE PRODUCTION

We use more capital per man, and capital looks for a profit. Competition won't let it waste money on flunkeys. Because it helps men produce, capital is labor's greatest friend.

Now this truth is not difficult for a politician to learn. But for a vote he will side with the man who can't wait until 5 o'clock for his TV and beer, who wants his feudalism and his annual raise whether he earns it or not. Do you need evidence?

In 1933 the New Deal took our economy by storm and usurped the management. Note what has happened since. Millions have quit working. Now politicians are surprised that the economy has slowed down. When Deering, Milliken—a textile firm that was losing money—tried to go out of business, the NLRB said it was quitting to spite the union and assessed it 6 months' severance pay for its workers. And politicians wonder why investment is droopy.

POLITICIANS DON'T TRUST YOU WITH YOUR MONEY

Robert G. Dunlop, president of the Sun Oil Co., says: "All of the profits after taxes earned by all of the corporations in the United States in 1961 * * * did not equal the fringe benefits paid on behalf of employees." Why? Because politicians so manage. Politicians are not interested in profit, nor gifted at producing. Their slogan is prosperity by spending. They take your money, not because they can spend it better, but because you can't be trusted to spend it. To get it spent they share the wealth. When that is done in other countries, we call it socialism.

Politicians' excuse in 1933 was that money was molding and this was a dog-eat-dog system anyway. They had just raised the income tax; they now took our gold, devalued the dollar, adopted an irredeemable currency, and began monetizing the debt. What put them in the driver's seat was money.

Because their faith was in consumers, their crusade swept the country. They set about fattening consumers by redistribution and protecting the prices and wages of the little man. Naturally, they didn't run it for a profit. They had a different theory.

POLITICAL MANAGEMENT KILLED ECONOMIC MOTOR

How has this consumer economy worked? Minimum pay has been raised six times. Although unions speak for only one-fourth of our workers, they hold a monopoly that's been untouchable for 30 years. In 1946 Congress voted unions an employment act, calling for nearly full employment, no matter what they ask. Wages paid on Government contracts are not the going rates nearby but in distant areas where rates are higher. At missile bases, where the profit system does not set the rules, strikes are every-day tribulations. Even though unions have priced their men out of the market, nobody suffers: unemployment pay and aid to distressed areas prevent it.

Well, what has this political management done to us? It has given us a $100 billion budget, a $300 billion debt (bigger than all others in the world combined), a 46-cent dollar, a tax load that has killed our economic motor, and now a gold crisis.

Theorists are betraying both the workers and the country. To boost wages by lightening competition among workers, they allow pay for not working, thus making retirement a national goal. To cut down unemployment, they allow unions to practice slowdowns, featherbedding and sharing the work, thus curing unemployment by not working at all. In spite of this, politicians boast of the standard of living they have given us, a standard built on debt instead of work. After 1929, when public and private debt amounted to $191 billion, we had to pay with our blood. Today total debt is $937 billion. To prove their pleasant theory that consumers make prosperity, they have inflated bank credit until money has become confetti, but faith in the dollar is near its low.

BURNED UP OUR CAPITAL

Worse, by letting us live far beyond our means on borrowed money, they have burned up our capital. Professor Kuznets, Harvard economist, finds that we are saving only between 6 and 7 percent of our disposable income, compared with 25 to 30 percent in our Nation's early decades. Risk capital has almost dried up. The Government acknowledges the shortage by going into the banking business.

Moody lists 36 Government corporations lending Treasury funds. But these agencies rarely lend savings; they lend inflammable bank credit obtained on Treasury notes. Because Joe Bush can use it half his life, he calls it capital. But capital isn't made with an Aladdin's lamp. It's made by sacrifice and sweat. Managed economy's one miracle is turning government credit into money. In this high finance, black ink is seldom used. Politicians, subsidizing losers, serving free lunch to millions, hiring the sleepy, exploring the planets and financing the world, leak money by the billion. With the prices and wages they arrange, they block enough trade to make every man rich.

SOCIALISM LIVES ON OTHER PEOPLE'S CAPITAL

Am I too hard on socialism? Socialism has always lived its short life on other people's capital. Of some 50 Socialist colonies set up in this country in the last 135 years, not one survives. Socialists seldom get up a sweat.

Nothing will revive this country but the work and saving that built it. Must we go through deflation and bankruptcy to learn again how to work and save? There is a less painful way. We can learn something about work from the Japanese, whose unions strike mainly on Sunday, a holiday; and we can learn what it means to be without capital by looking at China. Its ways are as backward as Noah's.

Work and saving—these are the secrets of wealth. But they thrive on incentive, the spark that fires human energy. Socialists chloroform incentive with taxes. And their handouts snuff out the energy spark—handouts instead of work as long as they can borrow. But is debt a mark of success? It may be a tool of the crafty. Russia is not our chief menace. We're taught to fear a country where 109 million live on farms, where Khrushchev promises his people an egg a day by 1985. Our menace is at home.

WHEN THEY TAKE PROPERTY, THEY TAKE LIBERTY

When our politicians bribe a third of us and smear private enterprise to tighten their grip, they have only one design. They can't take a third of our product without taking a third of our liberty.

There is a way to stop this socialism: shut off its money. There is a way to return control of the public purse to the people: return to the gold standard. The politicos tell us there isn't enough gold. There never was. Yet, except during the Civil War, we paid gold on demand for 99 years.

When our word could be trusted, not much gold was demanded. Common honesty and economy held down the demand. When the world holds $12 billion of gold earmarked, is common honesty what it expects of our medicine men? If we returned to the domestic gold standard, this $12 billion and more would flow back into our reserves and save the dollar.

UNDER POLITICAL MANAGEMENT WE'RE LOSING

To make excuses for managed economy is to shut our eyes. In 2 years Government employees have increased by 150,000. The Department of Agriculture numbers 84,500, enough to overflow the California stadium. No nation is so rich that it can be mismanaged and pillaged for a generation. If we oust this plundering management, free men will leap to risk. Their philanthropy will care for the weak in a far richer world.

Under free enterprise we never lost a war. Under political management we are not winning this one not even trying. By surrendering control of the public purse to politicians we are not building our strength. We are losing our liberty. To those who have lost it, this is the sweetest gift of God.

The Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the late honorable Jessica McCullough Weis was a colleague of mine in the House of Representatives of these United States.

Mrs. Weis also served as my counterpart in the Republican Party of the State of New York—that of national committeewoman. In these capacities, I learned to know and respect her as a friend and associate. Her capability, intelligence, and understanding achieved renown which will be unmatched for a long, long time.

I have missed her and I am sure she will be missed by her many friends. I

express my sympathy to her family. I am sure they believe, as I do, that their Judy is truly rewarded in her eternal home for all the good she did for others in this world—our temporal home.

Marist Tributes Well Deserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the recent celebration in my district in Louisiana of the 100th anniversary of the establishment in America of the Society of Mary—the Marist order. Two priests of the Society of Mary assumed operation of St. Michael's Church in Convent, St. James Parish, La., in May 1863, and since that time, the Marist order has expanded its activities in our country so that today there are 3 Marist provinces, 35 Marist churches, and 16 Marist educational institutions in the United States.

The Marist order has become an integral and active part of the Catholic church in America and throughout the world, and I am proud that the first Marist installation in our country was established in my district in south Louisiana. The 100th anniversary celebration of the beginning of the Marist order in the United States was held at St. Michael's Church in Convent, on Sunday, April 28, 1963, and representatives of the order from throughout the Nation and of the dioceses of New Orleans and Baton Rouge were in Convent for this memorable celebration. Among the leaders of the church who attended the ceremonies, and the solemn mass of Thanksgiving at St. Michael's, was Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi, apostolic delegate to the United States, and representative of His Holiness, Pope John, at the celebration.

Of the service which Marist priests have rendered to the church and to the laity in America, M. F. Everett, editor of the Clarion Herald, the new Catholic newspaper serving the people of the archdiocese of New Orleans, has written a column, and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Everett's column in the Clarion Herald of April 25, 1963, follows:

MARIST TRIBUTES WELL DESERVED

(By M. F. Everett)

Many tributes will be paid to the Marist Fathers in the celebration of their centennial in the United States. All will be deserved, for their impact upon Catholic life has been notable. Louisiana can be happily proud that their work in the United States, which now covers three provinces, first began in this area.

Parish administration, missions, retreats, and other works are carried on by these priests. Perhaps their most significant service in this area has been as educators, first at the old Jefferson College, Convent, and then at Notre Dame major seminary, New Orleans.

The training of priests, "other Christs" to carry on Our Lord's ministry, is the most exalted of educational tasks. Seminary professors educate and form young men as spiritual leaders, preaching God's word, teaching His eternal truths, and administering the sacraments for the salvation of mankind, the most vital vocation in the world. Through the priests they train, the seminary professors influence millions of souls.

The Marists at Notre Dame have not confined their work to the training of priests but have been foremost in preparing religious and lay persons to teach Christian doctrine. The theological institutes they have sponsored for several years present exhaustive and up-to-date discussions of theological questions of current interest. All have drawn capacity crowds of religious and lay persons.

In addition, the Marist Fathers have been associated with many movements and functions of Catholic interest. Their assistance has always been prompt and gracious. Not the least in this line has been counsel given to editors of Catholic Action of the South and the Clarion Herald when questions have arisen requiring expert knowledge of philosophy and theology.

This religious community numbers about 2,500 members throughout the world. Priests and professed scholastics in the United States total about 300. The society, founded in France in 1816 by the Ven. Jean Claud Colin, now has foundations in most European countries, the United States, including Hawaii; Australia, Japan, and Africa.

Among its early members were St. Peter Chanel, first martyr of Oceania, canonized in 1955; the recently canonized St. Julian Eymard, founder of the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament; and Blessed Marcellin Champagnat, founder of the Marist Brothers.

The spirit that brought some of its members to the honors of the altar pervades the society today.

All of us who have benefited from the services of the Marist Fathers, whether directly or indirectly, have reason to express gratitude to them, congratulations upon their centennial in the United States, and the hope and prayer that their fatherhood may multiply through the years for the glory of the Father in heaven and the sake of His children on earth.

Washington Financial Puzzle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following letter from one of my constituents including Dr. Lloyd Morey's talk "Washington Financial Puzzle," presented before the Pompano Beach Rotary Club, April 5, 1963:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich., May 3, 1963.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: Here is an excellent piece by Dr. Lloyd Morey, formerly a professor and president of the University of Illinois, and known throughout the United States as the No. 1 man in municipal and State governmental accounting and fiscal responsibility. You'll recall that when the Hodges scandal broke in Illinois some years ago Dr. Morey was called to the post of State auditor general to straighten out the mess and restore confidence.

I'd like to see this little piece reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Dr. Morey, a longtime close friend, has given me permission to ask you to do this.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. PATON.

WASHINGTON FINANCIAL PUZZLE: BUDGET, TAX CUT, DEFICIT

It is always a good time to be worrying about taxes, but never a time equal to the present. Taxes of all kinds are 26 percent of our gross national product, 30 percent of our national income. Federal taxes make up 70 percent of this total, 17 times 1940; 2⅓ times 1950. Yet we have gone $305 billion in debt and going deeper all the time.

Now we have a budget (for fiscal 1964) with an expected deficit of $12 billion. There have been many years in which for various reasons we have had deficits, but never before have we planned to have one. This is something new in Government finance in America.

This new scheme of finance is being exalted and extolled, we are urged to forget our long held ideas of economy, thrift and balanced budgets, and accept a wholly new brand of economics and public financial management.

The budget recommends expenditures of $98.8 billion, this is $22 billion more than 1960, $11 billion more than 1961, $4.5 billion more than the current year. There are increases in all divisions except agriculture.

The President says the budget can't be cut without "imperiling the country," any budget can be cut if you reduce the activities it is to maintain, the key to budget cutting is to do less and therefore spend less.

In the face of $4 billion increase in spending and nearly $12 billion prospective deficit, the President proposes a so-called tax cut, it is tied in to tax reforms by which everything given back in rate cuts would be taken away in readjustments, most taxpayers would wind up paying more than they pay now.

The President now raises a bogey of "recession"—that we must have a tax cut to "restore the economy," he should read the business headlines, most corporations are doing well, many are doing fine, (Chrysler, Standard Oil of New Jersey, General Motors), Columnist J. A. Livingston checked with 32 leading economists; only 3 believe a recession is likely, only 6 agree that a tax cut would halt one, 23 believe no recession is in prospect. We may well ask, Are we being talked into a recession?

It is true that rather high continued unemployment dims the picture some, but lack of buying power and interest are not the sole cause if indeed they are the cause of all, there are many other contributing factors. A tax cut would not cure a single one of these difficulties; and it would probably lead to greater deficits, more inflation, further deterioration of our currency, we should have less instead of more of any of these.

This, then is the prospect confronting us; we are asked to abandon tried and tested principles for a new experiment in Government finance, the outcome of which is highly problematical. We are asked to accept a so-called tax cut when people generally are able to pay and Government needs the money. We are asked to accept so-called reforms in tax laws whereby many advantages to the taxpayer are wiped out and he winds up paying as much or more than before. These programs are the brain child of a few liberal thinking academics and are not supported by the real economic and fiscal brains of the country.

Are we going to stand by and see our economic ship of state hijacked and led into uncharted seas by new theory economists? I cannot believe any large proportion of us

want to see that happen; if not, then we should let it be known in no uncertain terms that we are opposed to such ventures. The key to this situation is Congress, that is the only place where these directions can be changed, and it will act only if it hears the voice of the people back home. This is where you and I come in along with the other millions of voters; what we say does and will count, as it did in the case of the ill-advised dividend withholding plan in the last Congress. What can we do? First, as citizens and taxpayers: we can help inform others of the true meaning and effect of these proposals, through conversation, talks, letters to the editor, and distribution of informative material; second, we can write to our own Congressman and U.S. Senators, urging that they vote against these cockeyed schemes, also to members of committees in which bills are being considered, and to leaders of the two Houses when bills reach the floor.

Let's wake up to the realities of the situation and then speak up. Let's do our part to put our Government back where our Founding Fathers intended it should be: a government by the people and for the people.

Many years ago Calvin Coolidge said wisely: "There are only two ways to become self-respected; spend less then you make, and make more than you spend.

This is the lesson our Federal administration and Congress should be required to relearn and live.

Vice President Johnson Describes the Positive Policy of the Democratic Party in Milwaukee Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 4, 1963, Wisconsin Democrats gathered in Milwaukee for the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner had the great privilege of welcoming Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to our State.

This was a day to remember for the Democratic Party in Wisconsin and for Democrats everywhere. Vice President JOHNSON, in an inspiring speech that gave new strength and spirit to its hearers, set forth the positive policy of the Democratic Party in meeting the great needs of our times.

The faith of the Vice President in the triumph of our free democratic society, which was so eloquently evidenced in his speech in Milwaukee, should reinforce and enhance the faith of Democrats and all Americans in the world struggle against communism.

Vice President JOHNSON's speech follows:

VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON DESCRIBES THE POSITIVE POLICY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN MILWAUKEE SPEECH

A $100 a plate dinner often consists of a $2 steak, a two-bit salad—and a 2-hour nap.

Your good Milwaukee food has already upset that formula. And after that introduction by BILL PROXMIRE, I feel like making a wide-awake $97.75 speech—because this is no time for Democrats anywhere to be asleep.

You did not pay your $100 to see—and be seen—at a party gathering. You made the contribution—and, in many instances, the sacrifice—because there are values for which you stand, ideals in which you believe, and goals toward which you aspire as free men and women and as responsible Americans.

I know what is in your hearts because I know the Democrats you have sent to Washington.

You have an independent, courageous, vigorous team in the Senate—BILL PROXMIRE and GAYLORD NELSON. I can say on personal authority that they are not afraid to speak out against anything or anybody when they disagree. But it is even more important that they are always ready to speak up any time for the people.

In the House, your Democratic delegation has no peer. Call the roll of Wisconsin Democrats and you call the names of some of the most valuable Members of the Congress—a leader in the fight for peace, BOB KASTENMEIER; a fighter for the farmer, LESTER JOHNSON; a hero of the battlefield fighting today on the battlefield of human rights and justice, HENRY REUSS; a man taken away tonight for the proudest of family reasons, but a man always present and accounted for when the people need him on the job, CLEM ZABLOCKI.

You have sent great Americans and good Democrats to Washington. I am proud that at Madison this year you have another distinguished Democrat who is getting your Wisconsin's economy moving again—my good friend and your Governor, John Reynolds.

The party may have two wings in Wisconsin. But nearly everything that flies has to have two wings. I would only worry about Wisconsin if I were told the party was trying to fly on only one wing and a prayer. I can be sympathetic with his problems, but I am unreserved in my congratulations on the zeal and effort being offered by the leadership of your State Chairman, Pat Lucey.

As Americans, we are interested vitally in our Government today—because we know that there is a great overriding issue before all humanity—whether the future belongs to freedom or slavery.

We believe the cause of freedom must, can, and shall prevail. We have faith in the basic values of our system, in our country's future, and in the people. We are drawn together as Democrats by our faith—not by our fears.

That is the basic distinction between the two political parties.

Both parties are loyal. Beth are patriotic. Both are composed of honorable men and women. Both parties are determined America shall succeed and that communism shall be vanquished.

Loyalty is not the issue—and it has never been.

The issue between the parties is the kind of leadership offered for the people.

Let me say that in the great struggle between the philosophies of freedom and of communism, the issue of the kind of leadership is all important. We must understand that if we just call the roll on the differences between our country and the Soviet Union, the balance sheet in terms of resources and population does not guarantee success.

Here are a few examples:

1. In terms of population, the Soviet Union has a distinct edge—221 million people to our 187 million people.

2. In terms of arable land, the Soviet Union again has a distinct edge—585 million acres compared to our 188 million acres.

3. In energy fuels—oil and coal—Soviet reserves are definitely larger than ours, even though our production is more efficient and we make better use of our resources.

4. In many vital minerals—perhaps the best example is manganese—the Soviet Union has far larger reserves than do we.

5. In overall food supplies, we are far ahead—but this is efficiency of production and not resources, and we could be overtaken.

6. In housing our people, we take the lead—in 1960 we constructed 1½ times as much.

7. Soviet steel production is below ours, but at present rates of growth, we could be overtaken by the end of the decade.

8. In the field of space, the Soviets took an early lead in constructing big booster rockets, and we have not caught up to them yet—and they are also ahead of us in experience gained from manned space flights.

9. In electric power we are far ahead of the Soviets.

10. But in one vital field there is a disturbing trend which could be decisive—the field of education. In 1950 we graduated 52,000 scientists and technicians while the Russians graduated only 36,000. Ten years later, in 1960, we graduated only 38,000 and the Russians graduated 111,000.

When we look at these trends, I think it is apparent to all of us that—we cannot sustain freedom merely by satistical superiority. What counts—what can and must make the difference—is the superiority of freedom as a way of life and the willingness of people to work and to sacrifice for it.

This they will do only if we make our system work.

And it is in this field—making our system work—that we must really choose between the two parties.

One party has a program of action. The other party has only a habit of opposition. One party moves—the other holds back. One party lives with hope—the other lives with doubt. One party says "Yes" to the people—the other says "No."

Today, these distinctions are being clearly drawn—more clearly than in 30 years.

Out from under the comfortable shade of the canopy of plenty which has been raised during these abundant years, there are growing new needs among the people. Answers—affirmative answers—are demanded from the political parties of America.

The Democratic Party knows what it stands for. We believe in affirmative answers. We believe in moving—and facing up to the issues. We also know who we are for—our President, John F. Kennedy.

Let us look at the record of America's problems for every one of which our administration offers a program.

On the issue of Cuba last October our administration united all the people to prove American strength up to the hilt.

The strong young man in the White House stood up to the aggressor and drew the fangs of aggression. No one can rewrite that fact of history.

Today we have one national purpose and policy toward Cuba. That is to get rid of communism and Castro.

We are working every day toward that goal.

We are succeeding.

We are not dropping bombs, we are not attacking ships, we are not plunging the world into nuclear war.

But we have warned the world that we will not tolerate Castro's subversive activities through the use or threat of force. At the March meeting of President Kennedy and Central American Presidents in San Jose, measures were agreed upon to thwart Castro-Communist efforts at indirect subversion anywhere in the hemisphere.

Further because of our efforts—because of the respect and support and unity of our allies—Cuba is a showcase of Communist failure that is costing the Soviet Union more than $1 million a day to prevent complete and final collapse.

Cuba's gross national product has fallen 25 percent.

Agriculture is failing under communism there as everywhere else.

Food consumption is down 15 percent. The 1963 sugar crop is the smallest since World War II.

A quarter-million Cubans have left Cuba—and we have received 300,000 individual Cuba requests for visa waivers to come to this country.

Free world trade with Cuba last year was one-tenth what it was before Castro—and it will be only a trickle this year. Trade between Cuba and Latin America will virtually disappear in 1963.

The unity of the hemisphere has never been greater.

This is not failure. This is not a record of compromise. This is a record of proud American responsibility.

We are determined that communism in Cuba must go—and shall go.

We will not be satisfied until the Cuban people have been assured the opportunity of freely choosing their own government.

If anyone has more information than the Commander in Chief, more than the Joint Chiefs, more than the Secretary of State or the CIA, more than our patrol missions, we will welcome it and put it to use. And if anyone can offer a positive program that is not now being carried out, we will welcome any suggestions.

And I would like to add that no responsible leader of either party has come forward with such a program yet. We have heard words but no proposals for action.

We can have affirmative answers in the international field only if we have affirmative answers at home. And the Democratic party is aware of the problems of our times.

When the Twentieth Century began, only 1 out of 25 Americans was over the age of 65. Now, it is 1 of 10. There are 1,000 more Americans past 65 tonight than there were at this hour last night.

At the other end of the spectrum, 40-percent of our population today is under the age of 21. We have 1 million more 16-year-olds alone this year than last year. Our country is growing—30 million more people during the 1960's, 40 million more to come during the 1970's.

Fifty-six percent of the aged couples live on less than $2,000 a year. Eighty percent suffer chronic diseases. One in five aged couples have—hospital bills each year—and half the time the bills exceed $700—one-third or more of their total income.

There is a need. There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

For our youth, we must in this decade provide 26 million new jobs—but we are running far behind. Unemployment among young workers is 2½ times higher than the national average—and it will grow worse if we don't act.

Seven and one-half million pupils will drop out of our schools during the 1960's without a high school diploma—and enter the job market as unskilled labor.

Four out of ten fifth-graders today will never finish high school.

There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

Our cities must have efficient and economical mass transit. We must keep our air pure, our water clean, our drugs safe. Our agriculture must be strengthened. Small businessmen must have a chance to succeed. Prosperity and good times must not be allowed to pass by any region or any State.

No group of Americans among us must be forced to sit at the second table because of their race, religion, region, or national origin.

These problems—and all the rest—are not political issues, contrived by parties. These are problems in the lives of our people which the people expect the parties to help them solve.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

When I speak to you of these things America must do, I speak with the strongest of personal feelings. I hate poverty. I hate it because, like many of you, I have known it too well as boy and man. I say it is not enough for our generation of Americans to be the vigilant and uncompromising foes of communism abroad if we are to be indifferent companions and associates of poverty and waste and neglect among our own people at home.

America is not a declining and waning country. It is not second best. It is just the opposite—strong, vigorous, and healthy. While we have that strength and vigor and health, we must meet our people's needs for that will make us stronger.

The negative failure to come to grips with the people's problems is costing us far more than would affirmative answers. Underuse of our manpower costs our economy more than $30 billion a year. Racial and religious discrimination loses us $15 billion a year in productivity. Even the pollution of our air costs $11 billion annually. These are the costs we cannot afford.

Thirty years ago in the fateful year of 1933, the Republican Party began to tell the American people that they could never afford the cost of their own relief from economic depression. They were proved wrong, wrong beyond all doubt; and yet today we still hear the same song, America cannot do it.

Yesterday's programs will not meet today's needs—and today's Democratic Party is not attempting to reapply those programs. Today's Democratic leadership responsibly recognizes the burdens upon the people of tax rates adopted in other times for other needs, and proposes to reduce these tax burdens for our families and for our private enterprise. But it has become so inherent in the Republican Party to oppose that after decades of opposition to high taxes, Republicans today are even resisting the reduction of taxes because the reduction is proposed by a Democratic President—John F. Kennedy.

This issue of obstruction—this issue of the Republican "No" to the needs of the people—has become the central issue of American political life today, and we must carry that case to the people.

In 1935, only 1 Republican joined 253 Democrats to defeat a motion which would have killed the Social Security Act in the House.

In 1936, only nine Republican Senators voted for creation of the REA to bring electricity to our farm families.

In 1938, only two lone Republican Senators voted to establish the first minimum wage.

Today, the margins of opposition and obstruction have returned to the pattern of 30 years ago. Eighty percent of Republican Senators voted against the urban mass transit bill. Eighty-eight percent voted to cut funds for America's water resources. Eighty-six percent of the Republican Senators voted to defeat and succeeded in killing medical care for the aged. Twenty Republicans voted against—and only seven voted for—the youth opportunity bill.

No man can answer—not Rockefeller, not Romney, not even BARRY GOLDWATER—what the Republican Party is for. A negative party, a party without a program, a party without a leader, a party without an apparent and consistent purpose is not a party which serves the needs of America's people at home today.

America stands as a leader of a hopeful world. America stands as the leader of the hopes and faith of men everywhere who would be free. American strength is helping to keep peace for all mankind.

Only a few months ago in Greece and Turkey, I stood at the line that was drawn against Communist aggression 15 years ago by an American President, a Democratic President, Harry S. Truman. That line has never been crossed. I have seen the effort the people at Vietnam are making to keep their freedom against Communist subversion. I have seen the effort being made by people in Asia and Africa and Latin America to build for themselves the strong base on which freedom can stand and the people can prosper.

I live with faith that the tide runs with us. Fifty new nations have come into being since World War II—more than at any other such time in history. Not one of them has chosen the way of communism. But many of them have written their constitutions after the model of our own and look to us and to our system for guidance and inspiration in their own efforts now to remain free and grow strong and prosperous.

If we are to meet our responsibilities, if we are to fulfill this moment of opportunity for American greatness, we must have in our national leadership members of that party which answers "Yes" to the people's needs—answers "Yes" to the future of freedom—answers "Yes" to the hopes of mankind.

Kennedy Blamed for Sugar Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the May 5, 1963, edition of the Sunday Star carried an article by Hubert Kelly putting the blame for the recent sugar price increases where it rightly belongs—with President Kennedy.

The article follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., May 5, 1963]

USERS NOT SO SWEET—KENNEDY BLAMED FOR SUGAR PRICE

(By Hubert Kelly)

The price of sugar has shot right through the ceiling. And, as far as industrial users are concerned, the White House deserves the blame.

Two weeks ago sugar cost so much that food processors and soda pop bottlers, who consume 70 percent of it, were holding worried meetings and wondering what could be done.

On April 22, the world spot price for raw sugar was $7.70 per hundred pounds. By May 1, only seven trading days later, it had soared to $8.50 per hundred pounds, the highest in 43 years.

PRICE RISING IN STORES

Except for the cane and sugar beet growers, nobody seems to be happy.

Housewives have seen the price for a 10-pound bag of sugar go up 20 cents or more since February.

A member of the Industrial Sugar Users Group, composed of trade associations interested in sugar, said that the latest round of price increases "has made a lot of our members panicky."

Responsibility for the situation is being attached to the Kennedy administration. Last year the White House and the Department of Agriculture fought long and hard, and finally won, major amendments to the Sugar Act. The 1962 act, for the first time in the 30-year history of U.S. sugar legislation, tied the U.S. price directly to the world price. The administration assumed that the world price in the foreseeable future would be lower than the U.S. price. But they got caught. For a number of reasons, the world price has been rising fast.

But sugar users point out that world supplies have been tight before and that the pinch didn't bother the United States. The last time that world prices took a sudden leap was during the Suez-Hungary crisis, and during that period, when American growers were comfortably insulated from the world by the cozy provisions of the old Sugar Act, prices in the United States actually decreased a little.

But under the 1962 Sugar Act, that insulation was stripped away. Under its provisions, the Secretary of Agriculture each year announces a sugar consumption estimate for the United States. This year the estimate is that we will devour 9.8 million tons.

Of that amount, our own cane sugar and beet sugar producers furnish about 6 million tons and our friends in the Philippines, another million.

REST FROM WORLD MARKET

That leaves approximately 2.8 million tons which we will buy on the world market. Of this, the new law assigns quotas totaling 1.2 million tons to more than a score of foreign countries, including many of our Latin American neighbors. The remaining 1.6 million tons is a quota reserved for Cuba, when, according to last year's conference report on the Sugar Act, "that nation again becomes free and independent." Meanwhile, the act provides that this sugar be purchased on a "global quota" basis "with full recapture of the difference between the world price and the U.S. price."

The recapture device, which is in addition to the 62½-cent duty on imported raw sugar, is in the form of an import fee to be paid by anyone importing sugar into the United States. The amount of the fee is set by the Secretary of Agriculture and it varies according to the difference between the world spot price and the U.S. price.

Today, with the world price higher than the U.S. price, the import fee is zero. When it comes to lowering prices, the device has no utility.

Members of the Industrial Sugar Users Group, sugar refiners, and other interests have been taking a look at a variety of alternatives which might bring the price down. Here are a few:

Suspend all trading in sugar futures for 1 year.

Suspend all import quotas.

Suspend the 62½-cent duty on sugar.

Suspend the 5-cent per pound processing tax on sugar (a tax which is supposed to help defray the costs of the program).

Get the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the consumption estimate under the Sugar Act, say to 10.4 million tons.

Have the Commodity Credit Corporation purchase some sugar and resell it at a lower price, with Uncle Sam bearing the difference.

Why Manage the News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the American people are having their affairs administered by Government officials who admit that they manage the news and even go so far as to say that it is all right to lie to the very people who are responsible for them being in office, some basic analysis is necessary. The people who pay the bills and send their sons to war and make the sacrifices have the right to ask the simplest of questions: Why manage the news?

Herb Klein, of the San Diego Union, in a recent piece in that paper examined some of the facets of news management. His observations may not give much solace to those of us who are plagued with the question of "why manage the news" but he does show us how the policy is operating and what the ultimate risk to the Nation is.

I commend the article to my colleagues.

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 3, 1963]

WHY MANAGE THE NEWS?

(By Herbert G. Klein)

There are many facets to the question of news management.

But there are two basic points which go beyond any partisan consideration because they concern the credibility of the American Government and its strategy in the cold war. Only the President can provide the clear answers needed to these two questions:

1. Is it to be the policy of the U.S. Government to bar the press (and, thus, the public), from future, on-the-scenes examination of critical military development areas?

2. Was the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester, stating current U.S. policy when he said on October 30 that "The generation of news by actions taken by the Government becomes one weapon in a strained situation. The results in my opinion justify the methods we used"?

I would propose that the newsmen who will meet with the President in April to examine Government handling of information seek full answers for both questions. An affirmative answer in either case means a basic change has been officially adopted in our policy.

It should be made clear to the American public if the restrictive policies used on news in the Cuban crisis are to be permanent or if these resulted from a temporary misunderstanding.

Some argue that the atom, the missile, and the cold war have made some basic changes essential in news policy. But others recall what was perhaps the greatest secret of this era, the birth of the atomic bomb. During that time the Democratic administration asked that one reporter be detached from his regular duties to record the developments so there would be eyewitness accounts when the need for secrecy was ended.

As a result the American public was represented through the eyes of a trained science writer, William L. Laurence, at the opening of the atom age.

Reporters were present in top secret operations of World War I and II, the Korean war, and other crises, including the landings in Lebanon. Why not Cuba? Was there a new reason for secrecy?

There has been criticism that this nation has been too open in its missile and space tests, but both Republican and Democratic administrations have found one of our best countermoves to Soviet space feats has been the openness which has added creditability to American tests.

Privately, most military men make it clear they welcome news coverage of their operations. But today there is great inconsistency, not of military making, in government policy on covering crises.

In 1961 newsmen were barred when an American fleet was off Laos ready to offer support ashore. Today, the military is allowed to assist reporters as they cover actual shooting in Vietnam.

In the Cuban crisis, newsmen were not allowed with the fleet which set up the blockade. And newsmen were barred from Guantanamo during the height of the crisis. Even Marine correspondents found their copy held back at Guantanamo. No eyewitness reports were allowed. The news the public received came only from accounts by civilian government officials or the more speculative information some reporters were able to gain from refugees and other sources.

The question is which pattern will the Government follow in the future—Cuba or Vietnam?

This is not just a question of the press wanting to be on the scene to get an exclusive or to sell an extra copy or two. The question is vital to the American public because Mr. Sylvester's statement implies the Government wants to manage information—and this would appear to be linked to the unusual blockade on eyewitness reporting when the situation is touchy diplomatically. The logical extension of this thinking is to include almost any everyday event in the operation of the government in the category of "strained situation."

Traditionally, the American public has demanded the right to factual statements so it could determine independently how much trust it can or should place in official statements and actions by our Government.

Many who have been close to the Washington scene in both governmental and news fields wonder if a short range gain of public favor may not result in a long range loss for the creditability of the American Government and the free press.

Press secretaries from previous administrations of both parties have found that truth sometimes is painful, as in the case of the U-2, but there is no substitute for it.

Law Day Address by Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a recent speech given on Law Day, May 1, to students and alumni of the Georgetown University Law School by the majority whip of the House, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. In this very fine speech, Congressman BOGGS points up incisively the vast differences between the philosophy of law of our American democratic system, and the philosophy of the Communist system; and I commend his address to my fellow members and include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW DAY, MAY 1, 1963

It is most fitting that the United States should celebrate a law day on May 1 in order to contrast American fundamental values with those of the Communist system. The contrast is most vivid in the view of justice held in the two societies.

The American belief is that justice is ultimately based on the people themselves.

The Soviet belief, on the other hand, is that justice can be imposed on a people by the government.

It is this contrasting view of justice and law's relation to justice that I want to explore with you today.

Both the American and the Soviet systems of law aim at creating and maintaining order. Order means more than just a lack of violence, although a lack of violence is essential to both systems. What is central in the concept of order is the element of purpose. Order in a society is an arrangement for obtaining specified purposes or goals or ends. These ends can be the status quo in which case order implies stagnant self-satisfaction. The ends can also involve various degrees of change—from slight or incremental change at one end to violent revolution at the other.

It seems to me that it is this element of purpose which must be isolated in a comparison of the American and Soviet systems of law, order, and justice.

AMERICAN PURPOSE

What, then, is the central purpose in the American legal system? What kind of justice is the United States striving for?

The American view of its law and justice is, of course, based on the whole Western tradition—both its Graeco-Roman and its Judeo-Christian elements.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes put it: "The law is the witness and external deposit of our moral life. Its history is the history of the moral development of the race." I would also add that law is the external deposit of our political life.

Thus, the moral and political history of the Western World is also the history of the American view of law and justice.

The most important product of this long evolution is the conception of justice as based on the people. Lincoln epitomized this view: "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

This view of justice is seen throughout American legal history and practice. Several different elements of American justice reflect this concern with the justice of the people.

One element is the concern for justice in the sense of fair legal procedures. Most of the Founding Fathers were lawyers who had a great concern for such procedures. They had all had some direct experience with what it was like to be deprived of these guarantees. Their reverence for such fair play was, of course, expressed in capsule form in the Bill of Rights.

By these amendments the framers guaranteed that the Government they were creating could be kept within bounds by its citizens. The Government was not free to dispense justice as it saw fit but was limited by the definite standards which were established.

There were to be no unreasonable searches and seizures. A grand jury procedure was guaranteed. The Government could not try a person more than once for the same crime. The Government could not force a man to incriminate himself. Jury trial was guaranteed in all criminal cases and in most civil cases. These trials were to be public and the accused had to understand the charge against him and be aided by an attorney. Witnesses for both sides were to testify publicly. There were to be no cruel and unusual punishments. There would be no ex post facto laws.

An equal element in the American view of justice is the attempt to provide justice through legislation. The entire legislative process is based on the popular political will in the United States, thus assuring a popular base for such laws.

Most importantly, the entire constitutional system of restraints of the exercise of governmental power in the United States is based on the common concern of the American people. The constitutional order in this country exists to provide the arena for the attainment of both legal and political justice. This arena rests on a complex series of restraints of power, restraints which are effective and which are dependable. These restraints are based on a widely shared view of what government should do and what it should not do.

SOVIET PURPOSE

Now, what motion of justice is prevalent in the Soviet Union? What is the central purpose of its legal system?

Just as the American legal system and views of justice are descended from the whole Western tradition the Soviet legal system and view of justice are also descended from history. In this case, however, there are two traditions which must be mentioned: first, the specifically Russian tradition of law and of justice, much of which has been retained by the present Communist regime; and second, the Marxist view of law and justice.

Pre-1917 Russia used Western forms in its legal system but this law did not have truly Western contents—with its stress on rights of individuals, procedural safeguards, and the rule of law. The motion of stare decisis and the tremendous weight attached to precedent in the West were missing in czarist Russia, just as they are missing in the Soviet Union. The Western conception that law is a specialized extension of reason and that a rule of law must be a rule of reason was missing in Russia then as now.

Another pillar of Western law missing in Russia is our well known concept of equity.

What was unique about Russian czarist law from the Western viewpoint is that it allowed an alleged conception of justice to be developed by the rulers of the country and then imposed on the people of that country.

The Marxist view and practice of law has an interesting and varied history. But I think that its impact today in the Soviet Union is to reinforce the peculiarly non-Western elements of the Russian legal tradition.

Marx and Engels themselves viewed law as a superstructure, an unconscious reflection of economic relations in a society. Classical Marxism contented itself with exposing what it thought to be the ultimate sources of law: Law was another name for politics and justice was a euphemism for the predominance of the strongest class and its interests.

Until 1935 or 1936 in the Soviet Union there was a general attack on all law as a bourgeois product. Any kind of traditional law was under particularly strong attack in the early Stalin years, from 1928 to about 1936.

But, beginning roughly with the Constitution of 1936, the stress in the Soviet Union began to change. The new elements which were sought were stability, orthodoxy, and legality as means of consolidating the strength of the Stalinist regime. Law returned and was declared to be in accord with Communist purposes. Since that time law in the Soviet Union has developed particularly as another teaching device controlled by the regime. In short, law and legality are stressed specifically as entities to be used by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its rule of its subjects in their own supposed best interests. Justice does not emerge from the people but is imposed upon them.

Thus when Soviet law is shown to be primarily another tool in the hands of the regime, and when Soviet justice is understood as being essentially what the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proclaim to be just, then the nature of the Soviet totalitarian state is clear. If the law is the shaper of persons and is not shaped by them, a totalitarian result is inevitable.

CONFRONTATION

These conflicting views of law held in the United States and the Soviet Union have a real impact on the world order and on the prospects for world peace. The understanding of law and the purpose of law in the two countries is radically different.

Because of this, one of the major difficulties in dealing with the Soviets is the lack of communication between the two sides. I am suggesting that one crucial element preventing better communication is the difference in views of law. This lack of communication is one root of the struggle which daily threatens world peace and it is at the same time a complicating factor in any attempt to improve relations between the two nations.

Treaties are also a form of law. Americans believe that treaties made in the name of the United States must ultimately reflect the values of the U.S. citizenry and therefore must be respected and kept.

The negotiators of the Soviet Union, on the contrary, see no particular relation between what goes into a treaty and law which must be obeyed. Treaties, like all Soviet laws, are to be manipulated by the rulers of the party and state for the ends decreed by the party and state. This helps explain why the Soviet Union's record of keeping its word as given in treaties is so dismal.

SUMMARY

In summary, the worth of a given philosophy of law is best measured by the kind of society that it produces.

Throughout the centuries men everywhere have yearned for what Franklin D. Roosevelt called the four freedoms:

Freedom of speech and expression.
Freedom of worship.
Freedom from fear.
Freedom from want.

We will all agree that our American society had come near to the ideal in providing freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, and freedom from fear. We have not reached perfection, for here and there we still have blotches upon these freedoms, but the common conscience of our land impels us constantly to strive to eliminate entirely such infringements on these freedoms as still remain.

We can also agree that in the Soviet society, these three freedoms are almost nonexistent.

Now let's look at freedom from want. The U.S.S.R. and the United States have populations roughly comparable. They have natural resources of like magnitude. Both nations have made enormous industrial strides in this century. Both countries maintain comparable military forces.

There the comparability stops.

Under our concept of law—our framework of a free society—we have produced the highest standard of living for our people that the world has ever seen. No people before us ever had such a bounty of food and fiber, industrial products, and labor-saving devices. To be sure, we still have too much poverty, too much unemployment, too many poorly educated people, but the average American enjoys freedom from want plus many luxuries.

Now what of the society which has resulted from the Soviet concept of law?

We cannot deny that Russia has made material progress in this century, but her society is beset with illnesses which become more aggravated with the passage of time. In a crash program such as building missiles, the Soviets do very well, but in the day-to-day effort to provide freedom from want, her society is lagging.

A recent report of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe reveals that both production and investment are slowing down everywhere in the Soviet world. Labor discipline is weakening. Inferior goods are piling up. Unhappy farm workers are crowding into cities. Industry is beset with shortages of raw materials and manpower.

Agricultural production has lagged badly for decades in spite of the most forceful efforts on the part of the Soviet leaders.

In industry, the Soviet system simply fails to provide the incentive necessary for good workmanship. Those of us who have traveled behind the Iron Curtain are uniformly impressed by the shoddy workmanship which we witnessed on every hand. In 1961, for example, 60 percent of all television sets manufactured failed to operate for the guarantee period of 6 months—this is an official government report.

Some tractor operators made the statement that they "spend more time under the tractor repairing it than behind the steering wheel." This lack of quality—this tendency toward careless workmanship—which is so widespread in the Soviet society is not the result of incompetent workers; it is the result of a social system—a philosophy of law, if you please—which does not give the individual the incentive to do his best. As a result, the Soviet world is far from its goal of freedom from want.

To sum it up, we in America have approached the four freedoms because of the philosophy of law upon which our society is grounded. Conversely, the Soviets have not because their philosophy of law cannot—and does not—call forth the best efforts of their citizens.

What I have been trying to say was better said by that eminent lawyer and jurist, the late Learned Hand: "Two conditions are essential to the realization of justice according to law. The law must have an authority supreme over the will of the individual, and such an authority can arise only from a background of social acquiescence, which gives it the voice of indefinitely greater numbers than those of its expositors."

On this Law Day we should be thankful that we have what Jefferson called "A government of laws addressed to the reason of the people and not to their weaknesses." A Law Day celebrating law of any other kind would be an unhappy event. A Law Day celebrating what we do have is a valuable reminder of the ultimate strength of the American system.

Members of the Armed Forces Subject to Hostile Fire Are Entitled to Combat Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, has announced he expects to offer an amendment to restore the combat pay provision to H.R. 5555. I expect to support this amendment and believe that in the interest of fairness and equity my colleagues will also wish to support it.

H.R. 5555, as it will come before the House, provides for an annual expenditure of $632,486,960 in extra pay for specified performances in addition to usual duty pay. Individuals performing the following types of service would receive extra pay in addition to usual duty pay:

Parachute duty; demolition duty; flight duty, crew member; flight duty, noncrew; thermal stress duty; low pressure and high pressure duty; submarine duty; leprosy assignment; glider flight duty; human acceleration; diving duty; proficiency pay for P-1 and P-2 enlisted men; and extra pay for medical, dental and veterinary officers.

The military pay bill, as recommended by the Department of Defense, included combat duty pay. This was defined as duty subject to hostile fire. It was estimated that under present circumstances its annual cost would be about $2 million annually. I have checked with appropriate officials of the Department of Defense and they advise that considerable experience was gained in administering a pay provision of this type in the Korean War and little difficulty is anticipated in administering this feature under current conditions. It seems to me the height of unfairness to propose expenditures of more than one-half billion dollars for various types of extra-hazardous and specified performance pay and leaving out the small group of individuals being subjected to hostile fire.

American fighting men are not mercenaries. I think there is little doubt that those men and units assigned by the Armed Forces, subjecting themselves to hostile fire, will carry out their assignments with dignity and honor regardless of whether we pass this amendment or not. This has been the history and tradition of the American Armed Forces. On the other hand, it must be understood that these men are not naive or uniformed and they can look about them and see their colleagues receiving extra pay in situations far less hazardous and it is only natural that they should wonder about the justice of such a situation.

The administration favored this proposal, it was retained by the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, and I am confident that my colleagues will wish to support the amendment to assure that those members of the armed forces, subject to hostile fire, will be accorded fair and equitable treatment.

Savings and Loan Associations Under Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on my most recent trip home to Chicago it was a distinct pleasure to be a guest on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the Plaza of the Americas.

Apollo Savings and Loan Association, Charles X. Clancy, chairman, and Edward J. Kelley, president, conceived the idea of the Plaza of the Americas adjacent to their new multistory office building on North Michigan Avenue and they were most fortunate in obtaining for the dedication ceremonies the Ambassador of Costa Rica, Dr. Gonzalo J. Facio, who is also chairman of the Organization of American States.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include Dr. Facio's address and I commend it to my colleagues and the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS UNDER THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Address delivered by the Ambassador of Costa Rica, Dr. Gonzalo J. Facio, chairman of the Organization of American States, on the occasion of the inauguration of the Plaza of the Americas in Chicago, at 11 a.m., on April 20, 1963)

Gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to officiate at this ceremony of the laying of the cornerstone of the Plaza of the Americas.

I am glad indeed to help dedicate this plaza, which has today become a reality thanks to the generosity of Apollo Savings and Loan Association, one of the largest thrift institutions in the United States, in donating this square to the citizens of Chicago. I know it will henceforth serve as a reminder that the United States gives due recognition to her sister republics to the south, in a noble gesture of solidarity.

And when the Apollo Savings and Loan Association's tall and handsome new building soon to be fronting on this plaza, is completed, it will stand as proof that U.S. citizens are deeply interested in thrift and homeownership not only for themselves, but generously desire it also for the peoples of all Latin America.

Never more truly can it be said—here in the heart of America's famous "Windy City"—that it is an ill wind that blows no one some good. For from here, as well as from many other cities across the length and breadth of the United States, the warm winds of friendship and brotherhood have been blowing in our direction. These winds have been bringing us the sincere and generous efforts of members of the Apollo Savings and Loan Association and the National League of Insured Savings Associations, working closely with the U.S. Department of State, to create additional savings and loan associations in Latin America, so that more people may enjoy the great privilege, known only to a favored few, of owning their own home.

What the savings and loan associations have done for the United States has been and will continue to be truly remarkable. They have long been a primary source of funds for home financing. I am deeply impressed by the facts that 62 percent of U.S. families either own or are buying their own homes, and that 45 percent of all home financing is provided by savings and loan associations. They have helped finance a substantial part of the 20 million dwellings built since the end of World War II. Your country can well say with pride that it is the best housed Nation in the world.

The optimism that inspired your people to overcome the housing shortage left by World War II in such record time was soundly backed by thrift, as can be noted in the amazing growth of savings and loan associations in your country.

There are many optimists among Latin America, too, but we are also realistic enough to note that the comparatively low earnings in our countries make it a much longer and slower process to bring to our needy peoples a high proportion of homeownership. Nevertheless, throughout the continent the repressed longing for homes of their own is at last coming to the surface and is stimulating the people to make their wants known.

The authorities and responsible individuals in the United States as well as in Latin America, recognize that if we do not come to grips with our housing problem and try to alleviate this pressing need the Com-

munists will continue to have an ever increasing cause for agitation.

U.S. savings and loan association, have already begun to show the way in attacking the Latin American housing shortage, now estimated at over 12 million dwellings. Present needs call for construction on one and a third million homes a year. Current building programs less than one-seventh of this requirement.

Obviously, the primary requisites are an expanded program of financial assistance and intensive technical training. Only in this way can housing production be sufficiently increased, in even the short space of 5 years, as to create the tremendous impact necessary to show our peoples that strong efforts are being made to satisfy their wants.

Not only will such an achievement gladden our peoples, but thrift and homeownership, true savings and loan objectives, will help to produce a strong middle class, fight inflation, and help speed economic, social, and political development in our countries.

Approximately 40 savings and loan associations are now operating in 6 Latin American countries, and similar thrift institutions will probably open soon in 7 other nations. By 1965, such associations are expected to be operating in practically every nation of Latin America, a major achievement, labeled a "success story" by the president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations.

Eventually, the most important contribution of the National League of Insured Savings Associations may be its strong advocacy of the creation of an International Home Loan Bank to provide additional U.S. private investment capital to give the program an even stronger push and further speed its accomplishment.

Actively participating in this program, the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank have both been making vitally important contributions by providing seed capital loans for the new thrift and home loan institutions. The U.S. Peace Corps, working closely with the National League, has also begun to provide assistance in the form of volunteers as additional talent to help operate the new associations.

These are the worthiest of efforts. They follow closely the objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este, whose signing by representatives of 20 nations on August 17, 1961, established the Alliance for Progress.

In many fields, as well as in housing, the Alliance for Progress has begun to still the questions of the skeptics. Many countries have organized planning boards and mobilized its internal resources. The urge to do good can become as contagious as the example to do bad, and now a number of additional countries are planning similar reforms.

In order to achieve our goal it should be necessary once again to weave together the strands of our common history in the Americas. Let us have recourse to the inspiration of the past; let us overcome the discontent and temporary frustrations of the present; let us energetically raise reality to the high level of our ideals, and most certainly the future will be better.

We must preserve the yearning for freedom, now in its broader concept that includes not only the liberation from political tyranny, but from the tyranny of want. We must preserve all the equalitarian principles that up to now have inspired the inter-American system and that offer us the only safe way by which the bonds of respect and brotherhood between men and nations in this hemisphere can be made enduring. We must, above all, remove the cause of present discontent by promoting accelerated economic development and social justice within the framework of democracy in a joint effort, in an Alliance for Progress.

Let me congratulate the Apollo Savings & Loan Association and its officers on their happy thought to set aside this plot of ground which we have today inaugurated as the Plaza of the Americas, and which will serve to unite the people of this great city of Chicago and of all the United States, with those of Latin America, in ever firmer and closer bonds of friendship and understanding.

GOP March in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written in an effort to try to discredit those of us who have been labeled "conservatives" among minority groups, and particularly among Negroes. An effort has been made by many to connote segregation from the word conservative and, of course, nothing could be farther from the truth. Segregationists in the Democratic Party are rated among some of the most liberal voters on legislation and are the first through the tellers on a giveaway program, and are the first in line with their hand out for some sort of a Federal welfare handout.

A recent editorial in the New York Times, bearing date of April 24, 1963, asks some very challenging questions in regard to the Republican operation in Dixie. That editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1963]

ON THE MARCH IN DIXIE

"Republicans on the march in Dixie." So says the headline on a roundup of dispatches from five Southern States in the Republican Southern Challenge, a publication of the party's national committee. Texas reports that 50 Democratic precinct chairmen have walked out of the Democratic Party and joined the GOP. In Florida the Republicans are celebrating a 12-seat victory in special elections for the State legislature. Rosy reports come in from Georgia and Louisiana. Predicting additional gains in Texas and Virginia, the director of the national committee's southern division declares, "I think it's truthful to say that the Republican Party is bursting at the seams in the Southern States."

Something, no doubt, is happening in Dixie. States rights sentiment is traditionally strong throughout the South and there is widespread and unmistakable evidence of dissatisfaction over the course pursued by the Kennedy administration at Ole Miss, at the voter registration booths, and elsewhere. Some of this dissatisfaction seems likely to redound to the local advantage of the GOP, but how much will this be worth on a national scale? When anything bursts at the seams, there is always some risk of a consequent embarrassment.

The Republican Party, nationally, is pledged to try to do in the South precisely what the Kennedy administration has tried to do. The Republican Party is pledged by its national platform "to continue its vigorous support of school desegregation." It is pledged "to guarantee the right to vote of all citizens in all areas of the country." It is pledged to "continue vigorous enforcement of the civil rights laws and to prevent obstruction of court orders."

Two interesting questions arise: First, in the light of all these party declarations can the Southern States' Righters be convinced that the Republicans are any less desegration-minded than the Kennedy administration? Second, if the Republicans do succeed in that maneuver, how popular will they be in the large urban centers of the North?

Mr. Speaker, in response to this editorial, Mr. I. Lee Potter of the Republican National Committee wrote the following letter to the editor which amply answers each of the questions posed by the editorial and then poses some very pertinent questions himself. That letter follows:

[From the New York Times, May 2, 1963]

GOP'S SOUTHERN DRIVE—OFFICIAL SAYS PARTY'S VICTORIES PROVE NEED FOR BETTER GOVERNMENT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We appreciate the recognition of Republican efforts to create a two-party South provided by your April 24 editorial "On the March in Dixie."

As you stated, "Something * * * is happening in Dixie." Republican candidates have just won their fifth straight election victory. We're batting 1.000 so far this year, with the victories coming in Georgia, Mississippi, Florida, Texas and South Carolina.

You asked two questions in your editorial: "Can the Southern States' Righters be convinced that the Republicans are any less desegregation-minded than the Kennedy administration?" and "If the Republicans do succeed in that maneuver, how popular will they be in the large urban centers of the North?"

The answers are that we are not trying to convince southern voters we are "any less desegregation minded," and that we hope to be very popular in the urban centers of the North.

Our southern effort is based upon these factors: the need for competition in government through a two-party system; economic conservatism, and calling a halt to the expansion of the Federal Government, with its eroding effects on the rights of the individual and the States.

VICTORIES IN CITIES

The issue of civil rights—a moot question, now—has nothing to do with our gains. Our impressive victories in the 1962 congressional elections were in districts in which Republicans offered "moderate" candidates. Our strength is in the cities of the South, not in the rural areas, where the "diehards" are found.

The fact is that the Negro has as much at stake in the development of a two-party system in the South as anyone else. He will receive better government because it will be competitive government; he will receive the benefits of conservatism in the spending of his tax dollars, and he will have the individual opportunities afforded to citizens in competitive society. Ours is a program to benefit not just a single group but all the members of society.

Misguided opposition to the development of a two-party system by those who are civil rights advocates can only serve to defeat their own purpose. Their opposition will keep the Negro under the heel of the one-party politicians—just where he has been for the past 100 years.

If the Kennedys' actions at "Ole Miss" enter into the picture at all, it is only to emphasize the split personality with which the Democratic Party has been afflicted for a century. We have noticed, too, that it was with alacrity that the Kennedys went after the votes of segregationists in 1960. Indeed, without segregationist votes, they would not have won.

One might well ask the Kennedys these questions: How popular will they be in the large urban centers of the North if they continue to accept segregationist votes? How popular will they be among northern Negroes if they continue to imprison the southern Negro in a one-party Democratic South?

I. LEE POTTER,
Director, "Operation Dixie," Republican National Committee.

WASHINGTON, April 25, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, the principles and platforms represented by the Republican Party are those which have been responsible for the success of this country in its 187 years and regardless of the label that might be attached to it or the connotations that might be attempted to be placed upon any particular label, I think that it can rightly be said that the Republican Party and the platform of the Republican Party best illustrate and outline a philosophy that I refer to as the dynamics of Americanism.

One Hundred Thousand People Hear Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson's Tribute to the Polish Constitution, Delivered in Chicago May 5, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 5, the people of Chicago had the great privilege of hearing Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON join in a tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Vice President JOHNSON was the principal speaker in an impressive ceremony sponsored by the Polish National Alliance in Humboldt Park to mark the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

An estimated crowd of 100,000 people heard Vice President JOHNSON introduced by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, as the "greatest Vice President the United States has ever had."

The huge throng repeatedly interrupted Vice President JOHNSON's remarks with enthusiastic applause. The Vice President's firm reaffirmation of President Kennedy's principle that "while Poland may be a satellite government, the Poles are not a satellite people," brought a thundering ovation.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's speech follows:

THE BATTLE FOR FREEDOM

(Remarks by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, before the Polish National Alliance, Polish Constitution Day observance, Chicago, Ill., May 5, 1963)

On the 3d of May, in the year 1791, the patriots of Poland adopted the Constitution of Poland which we meet to honor and commemorate today.

In the preamble of that Constitution, there were these heroic and historic words: "Free from the disgraceful shackles of foreign influence; prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence and internal liberty of the nation whose care is entrusted to us * * * we do solemnly establish the present Constitution."

No one who has read that Constitution, no one who knows the history of Poland, no one privileged to know the Polish people wherever they may live would doubt for one moment that if the "shackles of foreign influence" were removed today, that same flame of liberty would burn more brightly than ever in a free and independent Poland.

As President Kennedy has said, "Poland may be a satellite government, but the Poles are not a satellite people."

Barriers separate us temporarily from one another now. Those barriers must some day come down. But barriers cannot separate the American and Polish peoples from their common heritage as friends in freedom's cause. That common heritage is nowhere better expressed than in the common nature, common objectives, and even the common language of our two Constitutions. The Polish Constitution of 1791 brought to the continent of Europe an expression of those principles of justice and self-rule which the American Constitution of 1789 had brought to the continent of North America.

Both were revolutionary documents.

Both eliminated distinctions of class.

Both guaranteed freedom of speech and conscience.

As it is fundamental to our American system that all power derives from the people themselves, so the Polish Constitution of 1791 declares: "All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

SIDE BY SIDE

It was because Americans and Poles thought alike that when Americans fought for their independence, heroes from Poland fought at their side. In 1772 a 29-year-old Polish officer decided to come to America during our Revolution because, as Pulaski himself said, "Wherever on the globe men are fighting for liberty, it is as if it were our own affair."

Along with Pulaski came the hero of two continents, Thaddeus Kosciuszko. This immortal hero was hailed by Thomas Jefferson as "the purest son of liberty I have ever known."

Kosciuszko—as Chief of Engineers—fortified some of the most vital points of American defense, led America cavalry through the Carolinas, and played a major role of command in driving the Red Coats from Charleston. Pulaski stood with Washington through the winter of Valley Forge and gave his life for the freedom of America on the ramparts at Savannah.

Today, throughout America, there are monuments and memorials to these great Polish heroes. Statues of both stand in our Nation's Capital. Streets and squares and counties are named for them all across the United States. Ten States have cities named in honor of Pulaski. At West Point—as well as here in this park—there is a statue honoring Kosciuszko.

By such monuments, America honors not these two men alone. America honors all those brave young men—bearing proud Polish names—who have given their lives in battle under the flag of the United States so that freedom shall not perish from this earth.

But to honor them and to honor our heritage requires more than statutes of stone. As the words of the national anthem of Poland expressed it more than a century ago:

"Long as Poles remain,
Chains the foe bound on her, never
Shall the foe retain."

A DETERMINED PEOPLE

The objective of the United States is—and shall continue to be—to see freedom returned to Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe.

We know the years of darkness have not extinguished the light of freedom in Poland. And the masters of the darkness know that, too.

Today, the world watches with keen interest the divisions appearing within the Communist bloc between the Communist rulers of Russia and the Communist rulers of China. This is important. The significance is very great. But we must not—and we shall not—forget that 7 years ago the unvanquished spirit of the Polish people forced Moscow to grant to Poland a new measure of national autonomy.

Poland is a much smaller country than China. There is no comparison in size of population or potential strength. Yet the Polish people—by the sheer strength of their unconquered will—succeeded in forcing the first major change of historical Soviet policy toward the captive nations.

The United States did not ignore the significance of that development. We supported and encouraged the greater autonomy for Poland by increasing our agricultural aid, expanding trade, and instituting programs of exchange in every major field of human endeavor.

Since 1956 well over 1,000 Poles have come to the United States under scientific and cultural exchange programs. More than 400 Polish students are enrolled in our universities now. We have welcomed many Polish groups—from jazz musicians to the Warsaw Philharmonic and the Poznan Choir, from athletic trainees to outstanding scholars.

In turn, many Americans have gone to Poland—some to lecture on cancer research, some to present artificial heart-lung machines to the Polish people, others to teach and train. It is very significant that the single most successful mission last year was the visit of an American professor helping set up courses for teaching English—a language the Polish people are most anxious to learn.

For the most part, these programs are not Government programs, but are being sponsored privately by our own citizens, foundations, and universities. Americans of Polish ancestry voluntarily send more than $10 million of food to relatives and friends in Poland each year. I believe you will agree it would be good if more Americans were going to Poland under these exchange programs. I believe you would also agree it would be good if Poles in Poland could receive as much literature in their language from the United States, including the Polish language newspapers published in American, as Polish families in this country are receiving unsolicited from Poland.

These efforts—private and public—are valuable because these exchanges serve to keep the Iron Curtain parted and open to let inside the truth about America and the West.

CHANNELS KEPT OPEN

We believe the channels between our peoples must be kept open.

We believe that people punished enough by their Communist captors should not be—and must not be—punished still more by freemen merely because they are involuntary victims of communism's tyranny.

Fight communism, yes—and fight all its works. But in this land of the brave and free, it is not bravery to strike back at those already struck down by communism by engaging in hit-and-run raids among the shelves of supermarkets against the goods produced by the Polish people.

Our policy has been expressed by President Kennedy in these words:

"Our task is to encourage and pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny."

We are not pressuring tyranny either by boycotting Polish-made goods or by imposing discriminatory tariffs—tariffs which only discriminate against the people of Poland and increase the pressure upon them to follow the puppet leaders, who would have them turn eastward rather than westward for the future.

Your administration opposed enactment of the discriminatory tariff amendment in the Congress, and your administration today advocates repeal of that amendment.

Out of our nearly $40 billion of imports annually from all countries, the total imports from Poland have amounted to only three-tenths of 1 percent. Those canned hams, fox furs, feathers, and Christmas-tree ornaments are not going to taint the freedom of America. But by maintaining the channels of trade to the West we can keep communism from completing its contamination of Poland and the lives of the Polish people.

The ties between our people are old and honorable. We must work to strengthen those ties—not to sever them. Isolation and reprisal should not be the reward for those whose courage and resistance and independence were the first to force the Communist slavemasters to relax their hold.

In 1772—4 years before our own colonies declared their independence—Poland was divided among Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Almost immediately, efforts began to unite all Polish people to stand against Poland's foes. Demands for great sacrifice were made—sacrifice of titles, positions, vested interests, ancient traditions. For nearly 20 years, that effort went on. The determination to win freedom never died.

In 1791—two full decades after the first partition of Poland—the Constitution of Poland was brought forth. A major revolution was accomplished peacefully—without bloodshed or disorder. The people of Poland brought into being a constitutional government closely paralleling that which had been established and was in operation on these shores. In the next year, Poland was invaded once more, by Russia. Kosciuszko returned home from the United States to organize the uprising against the enemy invaders. History tells that the most brutal means were used to crush the resistance of the Polish people and to accomplish the final tragic partitioning of Poland.

But where great and brave leaders had fallen, others rose up, and the determined fight for Polish independence went on. Poland won its freedom again, until the armies of Russia and Prussia invaded two decades ago.

We of the United States can never afford to forget this. Poland has known invaders and conquerors before. But the Polish people have never accepted any foreign yoke. The people of Poland could give lessons to some of their misguided critics about what it means to resist and stand up to tyranny.

We must keep the channels open.

We must preserve in our policy—and in our national attitude—a vital flexibility of maneuver and the inherent honor of an old ally so that the people of Poland may always know that we of the United States are with them and working always for the day when they can be free and independent once more.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of May 4, 1963:

THE PEOPLE MISLED ON SPENDING IN LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

(Washington Report by Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District, Texas, May 4, 1963)

Example of how the people are misled on Federal spending: The appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, which passed the House this week. The bill as presented called for appropriations of $5.4 billion. It was claimed this was a reduction of $309,501,000 from the budget request and $118,810,000 below the amount appropriated last year. So it would seem Congress is actually saving the taxpayers some $300 million. The facts tell a far different story. A thoughtful analysis of the book juggling in this appropriation was made by Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, during debate. A few excerpts from his study show how much effort goes into fooling the taxpayers when it comes to spending their money.

Congressman LAIRD pointed out the Labor-HEW bill contains $5.4 billion in direct appropriations, but completely overlook the other public funds there Departments are authorized to spend—the so-called trust funds. In addition to the $5.4 billion authorized in this bill for expenditure during fiscal 1964, these two agencies will spend $22,132 million from the trust funds account so the actual spending figure we are dealing with is $28 billion of the peoples' money. This is the largest appropriation bill the House will consider with the exception of the defense appropriation bill. (Trust funds include such things as the social security trust fund, railroad retirement fund, and the unemployment compensation fund, among others.)

Additional discrepancies in what the House did and what we said we did are pointed out by Congressman LAIRD. The total new obligational requests for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor and related agencies in the President's overall budget is over $7.7 billion. The reason the higher expenditures do not show up in the Labor-HEW bill is that some of the programs administered by these Departments come under the jurisdiction of other committees and authorization and appropriation will be called for in later bills to be presented to the Congress. Congressman GENE SNYDER, of Kentucky, reminded the House of one example of what he called "one of the poorest jobs of book juggling we have seen." He pointed out the appropiration bill showed $217,802,500 for aid to impacted areas school bill as being deleted. The impacted areas school bill has not yet been authorized but it is going to be and the $217,802,500 will be contained in that bill and you may be sure it will be expanded.

In my own statement during debate I objected to the new programs called for and the increase of 3,700 Federal employees in these two Departments alone. There is absolutely no need for further expansion of Federal programs and personnel beyond last year's highest peacetime budget in history. We are acting as though there were no limit to money. Who is going to pay for these programs? We are in a period of deficit financing. The budget of each Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare should be cut at least 10 percent below last year's budget. There are many activities in these Departments that are not the province of Federal Government. Many such activities must be terminated and the way to start in this direction is to reduce spending.

GOVERNMENT EXPANDS CONTROL IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Kennedy administration seeks to increase its control over our individual lives in another bill which passed the House this week—H.R. 1762, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation. In simple terms this bill sets up a new Bureau for Recreation to coordinate 18 existing Government agencies now dealing with outdoor recreation. The Federal Government does not trust the people to know how to play, so we have over 22,500 Federal employees already on the payroll to direct your leisure activities and the administration is asking for a new Bureau with an initial appropriation of some $2,460,000.

In speaking against the bill in the House, I said in part: "The Federal Government has no business in such wholesale activities in recreation. It does no good to say that we need a new Bureau of Recreation to coordinate present activities in 18 Federal agencies. Admittedly overlapping and duplication are wrong, but I do not intend to approve such Government participation in recreation as this bill carries. This is a good example of Parkinson's first law that more and more Government and employees are needed to do less and less. The seven reasons for this legislation effectively inject the Government into areas where Government has no place. Such activities are not constitutional. The Government has no constitutional right to encourage and promote recreational activities, individually or collectively. Swimming, skiing, fishing, golfing are all fine recreations. I enjoy them. Some do, some do not. But it isn't a matter of Federal subsidy. It does not follow that money should be taken in taxes to subsidize these and other recreations. The answer is not to coordinate and expand Government recreational activities. The answer is to get the Government gradually out of this field so far as possible. I refuse to approve such use of the taxpayers' money." It is my firm conviction the people know how to provide their own recreation, nor should they be forced to support through their taxes, other peoples' recreational activities.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT

Republicans dedicated to fiscal responsibility scored a major victory in the House this week in an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act Extension, H.R. 3872. The amendment provides for financing the bank through direct appropriations instead of backdoor financing. In the minority report on the bill Republican members pointed out that the Kennedy administration is responsible for a $27 billion deficit for the 3 budget years it has been in office. Much of this deficit can be traced to backdoor spending carried to record extremes by President

Kennedy. The amendment to H.R. 3872 is designed to stop the loose financial practice of authorizing $2 billion of backdoor financing of the Export-Import Bank. In its report the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee said in part: "As a matter of policy we believe backdoor financing is wrong. * * * We think it should be brought to an end, not alone for this program but for every other program that comes before our committee and the Congress for either new or additional fund authorizations. For approximately 150 years the Congress operated without engaging in backdoor financing. Furthermore, paragraph 7 of section 9 of article 1 of our Constitution in relevant part states, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by low." I heartily agree with the minority view and have never supported the expenditure of the taxpayers' money except where it is authorized by action of Congress. I am opposed to backdoor financing as morally and constitutionally wrong and believe, if the practice is not curtailed, the economy of this Nation will be completely wrecked.

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES THIS WEEK

Among other duties this week: A speech to delegates to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in which I urged the Nation's businessmen to fight for capitalism and the threat to it from the social and welfare programs being initiated by the present administration. Thusday evening, a speech in New York at a dinner honoring former Governor Edison, of New Jersey. I reminded those present, "The America of tomorrow, the free world of tomorrow, the continued existence of the freedom of mankind depends upon the strength and determination of the conservatives. To this generation is given the challenge of keeping America and the world free. We can sum up the challenge in three words: capitalism, sovereignty, the Republic. I believe in all three and I shall do my best to revitalize the enthusiasm of the people for preserving capitalism, the sovereignty of America, and the Republic for which, I hope for all time, we will stand."

It Depends on Which Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when the President first sent his tax message to the Congress, he stated that it was not with a recession in mind that he was proposing it. Subsequently, he told the American people that unless we had a tax reduction there surely would be a recession. Secretary Dillon has also been on both sides of this picture. Therefore, it is so apt to place in the RECORD this editorial from Friday's Wall Street Journal:

UPSIDE DOWN OR DOWNSIDE UP?

We try as best we can to keep au courant on the latest Washington economic thinking. But sometimes it does get a mite confusing.

Take this matter of taxes and the budget. We thought we understood everybody from the President on down as saying that we stood on the threshold of a recession if Congress didn't promptly cut taxes, vote more spending and shove next year's deficit up to at least $12 billion. The bigger the deficit the more we would get the country moving again.

Well, the slow-moving Congress hasn't yet got around to doing any of these things. But now, it seems, we got prosperity anyway. Prof. Paul Samuelson of M.I.T., one of the administrations' economic philosophers, calls it "Kennedy prosperity." And Secretary of the Treasury Dillon says we got so much revenue from it that the deficit is only going to be about $11 billion. So much for the prophets of last winter's discontent.

What's still a little confusing is what all this prosperity ought to mean in terms of the tax cut which after all was proposed to get us the prosperity we have already got without it. Since the hope is that the Government's deficit will be smaller, does this mean we can now better afford a tax cut?

That's the view of Secretary Dillon. Talking to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce the other day he said that it would have been "unrealistic" 4 or 5 months ago to expect conditions to be "so favorable" for a tax cut. "Now," he says, "the time is right."

Of course 4 or 5 months ago we were told the time was right then for different reasons. But no matter. The point now, in the Secretary's view, is that "a tax cut when the economy is reasonably buoyant would be far more effective in carrying us toward full employment than a tax cut when the economy is merely limping along."

This argument seems clear enough. But along comes Professor Samuelson again, and then you hardly know what to think.

Writing in the Washington Post, Professor Samuelson takes after what he calls "upside down" economics. By this he means in general anyone who thinks that the prospects of a Government deficit ought to get in the way of the prospects of either increasing spending or cutting taxes. And specifically he means the kind of argument Mr. Dillon is presenting.

"Already," notes Professor Samuelson, "one begins to hear arguments like the following: Now that the gross national product outlook is better, the outlook for tax receipts is much improved. This means a lower budgetary deficit. And with the risk of a large deficit now reduced, Congress can for the first time prudently accept the President's proposals for cutting tax rates."

"It is tempting," says Dr. Samuelson, to be persuaded by this argument, "to declare that the end justifies the means and that this argument ought to be exploited in order to increase the chances of a tax cut." Not so, he retorts. To reason thusly is a "resort to upside down economics."

The only purpose of a tax cut, in Dr. Samuelson's view, is to spread around more money, which of course is done better by a bigger deficit than a smaller one. He wants no nonsense with the idea that its purpose is "to relieve an economy that had exceeded the limits of taxable capacity."

So you take your choice. In January it's wonderful to have such a big deficit; in May it's wonderful it won't be quite so big. We must have the tax program because there's a recession; we must have it because there ain't. The purpose of tax cuts is to relieve the economy; on the other hand, it isn't.

The only choice you don't have is lower spending. Nothing is more upside down in Washington than the thought of getting the downside up.

Campus Needed Near Route 128

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the important relation of education and modern industry today has recently been clearly outlined by President Asa S. Knowles, of Northeastern University. In announcing plans for a new suburban campus in the area northwest of Boston, Dr. Knowles has pointed out the tremendous service that higher and postgraduate education can perform for the highly specialized electrical and research industries that line Route 128. Because of the significance of Dr. Knowles' comments for other sections of the country, I include under unanimous consent, this article from the April 1963 issue of Industry magazine in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAMPUS NEEDED NEAR ROUTE 128

(By Dr. Asa S. Knowles)

The proposed suburban campus would supplement the central campus in this particular suburban area. During the past two decades the cities and towns of the region have experienced a phenomenal growth in population. Attracted by the new research-oriented industries near Route 128, this population growth has created a demand for new public services, including higher education at the graduate level. Many of the residents are employed by the research-oriented industries, and they must continue the pursuit of advanced scientific studies in order to keep up to date and advance themselves professionally. For these residents an essential public service requirement is the establishment of a college campus offering advanced scientific programs on a part-time basis.

REASONS FOR THE SUBURBAN CAMPUS

Educational programs in this particular suburban area include graduate studies in science and engineering—physics, mathematics, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, etc.—as well as in the rapidly developing field of management—science and operations research and the application of electronic computers to problems of management and engineering. Northeastern University is the only institution of higher education in Greater Boston with such a spectrum of programs offered on both full-time and part-time basis. It is prepared to fill the educational vacuum in the area by establishing a campus which will make its offerings conveniently available to the residents.

SERVICE AND CONVENIENCE TO THE PEOPLE

A great many of the residents in this area are college graduates. In the towns of the area, for example, the percentage of engineers to the total population is about four times as large as it is for Metropolitan Boston as a whole. For these people education is not over when they finish high school or college; they must continue their education, enrolling in advanced programs and participating in adult employment, but also to a college campus.

The importance of the proposed campus to the residents of the area is indicated by the keen interest expresed by representatives of several towns. In the town of Burlington, for example, there had been a proposal that the town acquire the Nike site as a recreational area. However, the board of selectmen voted unanimously to waive this proposal in favor of the use of the site for a suburban campus by Northeastern University. Town officials in the area have also expressed an interest in having education courses offered on the proposed campus on a part-time basis. Of course, Northeastern University officials will be glad to cooperate with them in developing an appropriate program.

To establish a new college in the area which would offer the appropriate graduate work would take many years. Northeastern University, on the other hand, will be able to offer well-developed and full-fledged edu-

cational programs as soon as the physical facilities are available. In other words, Northeastern University will be able to give this region the benefit of its—

1. Courses and curriculums leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees.
2. A competent faculty fully qualified for teaching, research, and educational leadership.
3. The authority to grant undergraduate and graduate degrees.
4. The accreditation of courses and programs by the appropriate nationally recognized accreditating organizations.

Northeastern University is the only institution of higher education in Greater Boston which has available on a full-time and part-time basis all of the engineering and science programs which are most needed in the vicinity of Route 128 to the northwest of Boston.

For a great many people in this area the Boston campus of Northeastern University is inaccessible. Persons with responsible positions in industry find it impossible to travel regularly to the Boston campus, with all of the traffic problems, delays, and parking difficulties that are involved. This fact was confirmed by a study of the educational needs made by the university in cooperation with industries in the area. Professional employees must often give extra time to their work, and the travel time required for part-time study in Boston renders it prohibitive. A surburban campus is needed as a public service and convenience for the people of the area.

IMPORTANCE TO INDUSTRIES: RECRUITMENT OF PERSONNEL

It is commonplace today for research-oriented industries to give particular attention to recruiting engineers and scientists. Because of personnel shortages in these fields, many inducements must be offered, including opportunities for part-time graduate study and continuing education. Already the recruiting programs of some of the largest industries in the Route 128 area have been improved by Northeastern courses offered at Weston High School.

In several other sections of the United States where research-oriented industries are located, universities have already established branch campuses. These campuses make it possible for the citizens of the area to study on released time during the day as well as during the evening hours.

UPGRADING OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Today the fields of scientific knowledge are expanding so rapidly that formal education programs are needed by the people just to keep up to date. Scientists and engineers must make constant efforts to upgrade themselves, not only for their professional advancement, but to retain their present positions of responsibility. Today the demand for engineers and scientists is so great that these who are dissatisfied with the opportunities in one region can easily move to another. The greatest asset the Route 128 area has, is not its fertile soil, its minerals, or its climate, but residents who are well educated and who are keeping up to date in engineering and the physical sciences. So that this asset may be maintained and replenished, a college campus is needed in the region.

PROSPERITY IN THE AREA

During the past two decades the electronics industry and other research-oriented industries have rejuvenated the economy of eastern Massachusetts. For its continued economic development and prosperity, the region must now meet the growing competition from other nations and from other regions of this country where similar industries are developing. It is important that new patterns of cooperation be established between higher education, research-oriented industries and the residents of the area who are so vitally interested in advanced studies and continuing education.

DEMONSTRATED NEED

For many years the comments by students coming to the Boston campus have made university officials aware that Northeastern was not adequately serving the area along Route 128 to the northwest of Boston; many prospective students were not able to commute to Boston regularly for part-time study in addition to their demanding employment. Northeastern University's interest in a suburban campus was crystallized last year by a request from industries in the area. The immediate response by the university was to establish a graduate center on a temporary basis by renting the facilities of Weston High School for evening use.

When this temporary center was opened last September, it was anticipated that 300 students might enroll and that the numbers coming to Boston might be reduced. The actual enrollment exceeded expectations. Over 500 enrolled in the first semester (September 1961) and over 550 enrolled in the second semester (February 1963) at the temporary center. Enrollment in graduate programs on the Boston campus also showed an increase. This experience confirmed statements repeatedly made by personnel directors of firms located in the area. They stated that many more of their employees would enroll for college and graduate level course if a campus were located in the vicinity of Route 128 to the northwest of Boston.

San Francisco Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and to our colleagues attention the fact that the San Francisco Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee met on April 21, 1963. At that gathering over 1,000 San Franciscans met to observe the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. They met so that we would not forget "a chapter in the annals of human heroism."

From mid-April through the first week in May in 1943 the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto carried on a heroic and hopeless fight against the overwhelming power of the Nazi troops bent upon their extermination. As President Kennedy stated in his proclamation of March 8, 1963:

> The result was known by the Jews to be foredoomed. Yet, though they lacked both military resources and military tradition, they were able to conduct their struggle against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism, an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be best, as a general rule, to not remind ourselves of such inhuman conduct. Such is not the case here, for reflection on the Warsaw uprising demonstrates the valor of the human spirit and more importantly the need to prevent such recurrence of the depravity of which some men have been capable.

Rabbi Saul E. White, chairman, Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee and the organizations comprising the Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee, including the San Francisco Council of Rabbis, the Board of Cantors of Northern California, the Associated Jewish Organizations of San Francisco, the Bay Area Zionist Council, the B'nai B'rith Lodges of San Francisco, the Workmen's Circle, and the Jewish Labor Committee are to be commended for their task. We must never forget this most tragic and brutal historical fact. The generation grown up since 1943 and succeeding generations must know of this brutal extermination and must know of the human spirit and will of these valerous people.

The San Francisco committee has done much to keep alive our knowledge of the great human spirit and great will of those heroic men, women, and children who perished 20 years ago.

New Problems—New Solutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most significant radio address by Dr. Timothy W. Costello, chairman of the Liberal Party of New York State. The address was broadcast over WCBS on April 29. In his address Dr. Costello points out that the new problems of the sixties require not the answers of the thirties, but new and creative solutions. In outlining the problems which face us today, Dr. Costello brings to us profound insight. I urge all my colleagues to read the following address:

WHERE DO LIBERALS GO FROM HERE?

(As delivered by Dr. Timothy W. Costello, State chairman of the Liberal Party on WCBS Radio, April 29, 1963)

Back in 1944, a convention calling the Liberal Party into existence, opened with the following words: "America is entering a new age. Already the advance of science has transformed the foundation of our civilization." And that's how we began. Responding to the challenge of postwar America, the Liberal Party formulated and fought for a program of social action demanded by the times. It was a fight for freedom—a fight against the forces of totalitarianism abroad and against economic and social injustice at home.

Today, a scant generation later, America has again entered a new age. Once again new sciences are transforming the foundation of our society. Changing world conditions shift faster than we can meet them. The fight today is for survival as well as freedom, for the whole world and not America alone, for we have learned that unless all are secure and free, no one is. Does our response to the world of 1944 meet the chal-

lenges of 1963? Can we depend on the past for answers to the new problems? Can we even look to the past for the right questions? Where, in fact, do we Liberals go from here?

If we are to set upon our future course we must first understand what has been done up to now. As a legally constituted political party we have given the Liberals of New York State a powerful, independent voice in the selection of candidates for statewide, national, and municipal office. The half-million votes won by our former State chairman, Dr. George Counts, running as an independent candidate for the U.S. Senate, served notice on the entire electorate that Liberals of this State would be heard, loud and strong. In the last presidential year, the Liberal vote carried New York State and with it, the Nation, for President Kennedy. Only a year later, with Liberal support, Mayor Wagner was able to battle and emerge victorious over the county machines of his own party that sought to defeat him.

But the Liberal Party role does not begin and end with election campaigns. Throughout the year, we consider it our duty to present our programs for national, State, and municipal action. Throughout the year we carry on the fight for better government, more progressive legislation, more significant financial support. These battles are far from being completely won. Equal opportunity for all in every aspect of life is a foundation of our platform. Yet only this year were Liberals able to press for and win State legislation effectively barring bias in housing. Early in our history we pioneered the concept of consumer protection. Only now is the National Government coming to grips fully with this problem. Our municipal program in 1945 began with, "Public Education: The First Business of Our City." Yet today we must battle anew to preserve tuition-free education at our city university, a policy sadly abandoned by the State university this year. Because of a hard core of conservative resistance, we still do not have adequate medical protection for our old, adequate support for the education and training of our youth, or proper legislation and enforcement of the rights of minorities and underprivileged groups. Nor do we yet have democratic economic planning for a full-employment economy. No liberal can rest until these battles are won.

But yesterday's battles need not be won at the expense of the challenges of today. Liberalism is a moving force. Its present cannot rest only on its past: it must contain in it some of the future. The Liberals of a generation ago gave us the seminal ideas of social, economic and political reform that are the basis of our action today. Now it is up to us to envision the great causes, the imaginative solutions, the perhaps unpopular ideas to meet the challenges of present and future.

Twenty years ago Professor John Childs, Liberal Party State Chairman and his associates, formulated a platform and philosophy to help Liberals blaze a path for Nation, State, and city. Through legislation and appropriations, some of those ideals have been realized. But in a world changing faster and more radically than ever before, we must move forward not only in our goals, but in the means we employ to reach those goals. Here are some problems that require new, more creative approaches: Securing the peace. Can legislation or the spending of vast sums of money prevent war? Clearly, other strategies, innovative, perhaps as yet unexplored, even by Liberals, are demanded. Or the appalling stretches of poverty not quite hidden within our affluent society. Can laws and money alone help? Somewhat, perhaps, but the elimination of today's poverty requires more penetrating remedies; remedies we must seek even while we apply the lessons of the past to alleviate the most pressing pains of the poor. The two chronic internal tensions of our society—between white and black, and between management and labor. These will not be resolved by routine methods.

I would like to suggest areas that need exploring for the new ideas we seek, the new methods of approach to the problems that have thus far gone unsolved. Can we seek out tested formulas, developed in the social sciences, that will not only guarantee the legal right of the Negro to first-class citizenship but also create the climate for him to be able to live fully as a first-class citizen? Are there approaches to be found here that would make it possible for the trade unions and enlightened management, working together, to contribute the full measure of their talent and power to a resolution of the problems raised by automation? Are there not more uniquely human ways of seeking peace than to depend merely on the multiplication of means of destruction? We know the awesome changes science can make on our physical environment. Up to now, physical science has commanded 97 percent of Government research funds. If we allow the social sciences more than the 3 percent they are now receiving, perhaps we will learn to create a society where it will be safe for us to have all the power given to us by the physical sciences.

But there are other areas of imbalance in our society. How much longer can we afford the disparity between our consumer product surplus and the deficit in major public services? Electric can openers, battery powered tooth brushes, automatic shoeshine devices and many more consumer nightmares glut our store counters. Yet in every vital service, we are needy. We have too few doctors—less per capita than in 1880. Our schools and teaching devices are in many cases inadequate or obsolete or both. Hospitals and mental health facilities are understaffed. We travel on inhumane metropolitan transit facilities. Our supplies of unpolluted water and air run dangerously low.

Liberals today must think out new means of righting the imbalance existing here.

1. Is it not possible that a renewed emphasis on the services segment of our economy will help provide the jobs missing as more and more things are made by fewer and fewer people?

2. In the information explosion taking place today, we must find the means to research and diagnose today's poverty, so that we can learn to eliminate it and its concomitant, dependency. Is it a new form of social illness? Does it require a new mode of treatment, perhaps sheltered workshops and industries, where the unemployed and improverished can return to self-esteem and dignity?

3. What about our youth, already a major component of the army of unemployed. May our society mobilize them only for military service? Surely their humanitarian service in schools, hospitals and social agencies can be at least as vital to the country today. President Kennedy's Peace Corps program suggests how much more can be done in this way.

Cutting across every one of the issues we have mentioned is the question of values. What are the values we hold precious in our society, the goals that give us purpose? (1) That every person will have equal opportunity for education—employment—and the pursuit of cultural and recreational activities to achieve a sense of self-fulfillment; (2) that our children will grow up with neither the haunting fear of world holocaust nor the threat of economic deprivation; (3) that we learn the means of helping the many developing nations to achieve our own high standard of living—freedom, justice, and growth—for ourselves and for all people of the world.

It is here in these values—looked at in the light of the new age in which we now live—that liberals of today can find a sense of direction—as did liberals in the past. It is here that liberals find the answer to the question where do we go from here. Let us, while pressing for solution of today's problems, move forward into the future—with new ideas, dedicated vigor and strong purpose.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today we remember and do honor to a handful of liberal-minded, farsighted men, under the leadership of an enlightened King. One hundred and seventy-two years ago they brought forth a plan that had long received their attention, the drafting of a liberal constitution of citizens' rights for the people of Poland. This was a documentation of personal rights and obligations of the Polish people, sweeping in its reforms, democratic in its approach, but doomed to failure, not because of a lack of dedication to the cause of personal freedom among the majority of the Polish people, but due to the geographic location of the country and the conditions prevailing across her borders.

Long had Poland been the victim of her stronger neighbors, Russia and Prussia, both of whom used her as a buffer to their own military might, as well as a sphere of compensation for gains by the other on battlefields elsewhere. However, when Frederick the Great of Prussia died in 1786, relationships between Russia and Prussia deteriorated. Russia became involved in a war with Turkey. This involvement drew their attention from the Polish problem, giving the leaders of that country sufficient security to embark on a reform of the constitution, to bring it into line with the liberal thinking then current in western Europe as manifested in the American Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and the stirrings of the French Revolution. A meeting of the Polish Parliament was called in 1788 to set about drafting these constitutional reforms, and the patriotic liberals, with the encouragement of King Stanislas, were hopeful that their propositions would be given immediate and careful consideration.

However, as so often happens when the forces of change meet the forces of reaction, progress was considerably slowed. While Russian attention was diverted elsewhere, the urgency was immediate to set up, enact, and put into operation those political reforms necessary to stabilize the government and win united support for its policies. This was not the case, and the discussions dragged on with opposition to liberalism and moderation being led by the military and landowning aristocracy. Yet, with patience and awareness of every oppor-

tunity offered for progress, it still took until May 1791 before events were such that the proposed constitution was placed before the Parliament for ratification and, on May 4 of that year, was made the law of the land.

It was a great document and was received with much joy by the average citizen. It transformed Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy, with biennial parliaments and ministerial responsibility. The liberum veto, in which each member of the Parliament could veto any action individually and the so-called free election of kings, which had opened Poland to outside intrigue and pressure, were abolished. The executive was strengthened, class distinction curtailed, local community autonomy and representation allowed, land reform pressed for, religious toleration established, and the groundwork laid for the abolition of serfdom. Considering the time, and the outside pressures present, this constitution was, and still is when re-read today, a remarkable document in content and accomplishment.

Those outside pressures could not be denied, especially as the time of independent action for Poland had run out. Russia's war with Turkey had ended, Catherine the Great was Empress, and liberty and dignity for the average Russian was nonexistent. Neither could Russia allow the continued existence of a border country that was offering these very freedoms to their own people. Malcontents of the Polish aristocracy joined in an appeal to Catherine for aid in driving the reformers out and she accepted with alacrity. Poland was invaded and, within 3 months, due to far superior force and no outside help, the patriots were defeated, their constitutional dreams shattered, and their constitution abrogated.

Yet their spirit of defiance lived on, passed from patriot to patriot's son, and this spirit still lives today in Poland. As with ourselves, freedom of the individual under God and the rule of law are considered inalienable rights to be achieved at all costs by the Polish people. In remembering their manifesto to those liberties as framed in the constitutional reforms of 1791, let us salute all those who sacrificed so much for what all of us hold so dear.

Bert A. Gipple—In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, death wrote "30" to the career of Bert A. Gipple, one of the most colorful and oustanding weekly newspaper editors in Wisconsin. It was my privilege to be counted among the personal friends of Bert, whose distinguished career in the newspaper field began in 1890 and continued until his death at age 92. In 1897, he founded the Galesville Republican at Galesville, Wis., which is located in the district I represent in Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial about Bert Gipple which was printed in the May 1, 1963, issue of the Capital Times, Madison, Wis.

BERT A. GIPPLE, A COLORFUL EDITOR, DIES AT 92

One of the most colorful personalities in the newspaper game in this State has come to the inevitable "30."

Bert A. Gipple, the founder of the Galesville Republican, ended a colorful and eventful life Monday at the age of 92. In those many years, "Bag," as he often signed his trenchant comments, saw a lot of life and enjoyed every bit of it.

He could spot a phony with the best of them and he loved to stick his sharp pen in the stuffed shirts that wandered over this State.

He started out as a printer and founded his paper in 1897. He edited it until 1941 when he retired from the management side. But he continued to write and to serve as a member of the Trempealeau County Board to which he was reelected earlier this month.

Through the years, the editor of this paper has received many words of encouragement from "Bag." We were proud to count him among our friends.

One Way To Get Rid of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has found that one way to get rid of unemployment is to hire some of those unemployed. This is indicated in an editorial in last Friday's New York Daily News, which shows the trend toward socialism, so prevalent in the Kennedy administration:

UNEMPLOYMENT NOTES

Some interesting comments on unemployment and the Kennedy administration's success or otherwise in fighting it were unveiled in Washington Wednesday by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, and Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey.

PRIVATE PAYROLLS, PUBLIC PAYROLLS

True, unemployment dropped 713,000 between January 1961, when J.F.K. took office, and January 1963. But in the same 2-year period the Kennedy administration added 125,141 persons to the Federal civilian payrolls and drafted 192,000 into the Armed Forces; and State and city governments added 690,000 to their payrolls. That adds up to 1,007,141 (check it on your computer if you like)—and it indicates that 300,000 more persons are out of jobs in private business and industry now than when Mr. Kennedy became Chief Executive.

HALLECK'S comment: "The New Frontier doesn't have the answers [to unemployment], because it doesn't understand how the American system works."

Those are harsh words, maybe extreme words, but we think we detect a smell of truth in them.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy Poles have had their ups and downs in their long and eventful history. Their annals are full of glorious deeds and sad tragedies. And the Constitution of May 3, 1791, marks a glorious day in Poland's political history.

Late in the 18th century Poland was prey to her greedy neighbors. In 1772 she had already lost considerable territory to Austria, Prussia, and Russia by the first partition. Poland herself was not strong enough to prevent that tragic event. Her weakness and helplessness had become too obvious to the Poles themselves, and many enlightened patriots among them had been trying to devise means whereby the country's governmental structure would be improved and strengthened by the solid support of the populace. As early as 1788 a committee was formed for the specific purpose of drafting a constitution. The completion of this exacting task took a long time, but when completed early in 1791, it was regarded as the crowning achievement of a band of liberal, wise, and patriotic statesmen.

That historic Constitution as adopted on May 3, 1791, was an epoch-making document, a great landmark in Poland's history. The governmental machinery was modernized and brought up to date by the inclusion of many liberal and progressive features. The King's authority was limited, though he still retained many of the prerogatives of his position. His executive power was to be shared with a council of six "guardians of the laws," made up of the primate and the heads of five departments. This council may be regarded as the forerunner of cabinet government in that country. Roman Catholicism remained the official religion of the country, but the regime was tolerant of other sects. The nobles lost some of these privileges formerly reserved to noblemen. Agreements signed between peasants and their landlords came within the purview of the law. In short, by the Constitution of May 3, Poland moved from unlimited autocracy to a limited monarchy. In its day this change was considered a startling and phenomenal advance, especially when accomplished without bloodshed. It was the most advanced governmental reform yet carried out in any country in central and eastern Europe.

We all know too well what followed the adoption of this liberal Constitution. Poland's enemies, fearing that the birth of her liberal ideas might spread to their lands, made war on Poland. Before the Constitution was put into force, Poland found herself under attack. Against the superior forces of her mortal enemies she could not long resist. In the end she lost out. The second partition followed in 1793. The Constitution of May became a

dead, defunct document. Soon after that Poland was no more; she was again parceled out among her three powerful neighbors, and thenceforth for more than 100 years Poland lived only in the hearts and minds of suffering Poles. But they never gave up the hope of regaining their national independence and reviving the spirit of the Constitution of May. From then on, from the time of the adoption of that Constitution on May 3, that day has become a Polish national holiday. I am indeed happy to join all patriotic Poles in the observance of that great holiday, the Polish Constitution Day.

Shoe Industry Suffering From Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I attended a breakfast with leaders of the shoe industry at which we were familiarized with the current situation of this industry, particularly the disastrous effects upon it due to the large imports of shoes from abroad.

The shoe industry is of vital interest to the economy of New England, which leads the entire Nation in the production of shoes. Figures available for the year 1962 show that the United States as a whole produced a total of 619,407,000 pairs of shoes, and of these 203,395,000 pairs were produced in the New England States. This amounts to 32.8 percent of the total production of shoes in the country.

The shoe industry in the United States employs some 240,000 people, of whom 79,000 are employed in shoe manufacturing in New England. The total annual wages paid to all employees in the New England shoe factories in 1962 is estimated at over $258 million. This constitutes a very sizable segment of the economy of our region, and if this industry should be hurt the way textiles and others have been hurt, New England may find itself in a very difficult economic situation.

In my own district, the Second Congressional District of Connecticut, there are 7 factories producing nearly 4 million pairs of shoes per year. In one of these, located at North Grosvenordale, Conn., where there are employed from 200 to 235 persons, sales in the past year have fallen off by nearly 20 percent. The same is true at the other shoe factories. This is due primarily to the large imports of shoes from abroad which are competing with our own products.

The volume of shoe imports has grown phenomenally in recent years. In 1955 we imported less than 8 million pairs of shoes, but by 1961 shoe imports had grown to nearly 37 million pairs and in 1962 it had reached more than 55 million pairs. This is an increase of 605 percent within 7 years. At the same time we used to export about 5 million pairs of shoes a year, but last year our exports were less than 3 million pairs.

In all, we have some 1,300 shoe factories in the country located in about 600 communities, most of them being small towns where this industry constitutes their major and often only source of income. This means that every factory affected by the competition from abroad and forced to close down or curtail activities will at the same time affect the local community and its economy.

Of the 55 million pairs of shoes imported last year, nearly 28 million pairs, or about half of the total, came from Japan where the average wage is 36 cents per hour for shoeworkers. Smaller quantities of shoes are imported from Western European countries, which also pay their workers considerably less than we do in this country. This makes the shoe industry not only highly competitive, but also a low-profit industry, ranking among the lowest of all industries recorded in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I can well appreciate the need for expanding our international commerce on which the jobs of several million Americans depend, including many in the New England States. I believe, however, that the shoe industry constitutes a specific problem and deserves fuller attention to enable this industry to maintain its place in the Nation's economy. It has been suggested that a voluntary quota system be established in certain industries suffering from extreme foreign competition, and I can think of no better place to start with such a system than the shoe industry.

At any rate, speedy action is necessary for the survival of this industry because of its importance to the American economy, and also to protect the interests of American consumers who seek quality products. I urge the Congress and the administration to look into the possibility of setting up a voluntary quota arrangement which would restrict imports by category and also by country. This is fair and just.

Time To Honor Poland

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, from the time, when first among the free nations of the world, Poland heroically responded to the challenge of the Soviet-Nazi totalitarianism, the Congress of the United States has annually demonstrated its feelings of faithful friendship toward the Polish nation. It is appropriate indeed, that we should at this time take special note of the commemoration of Poland's great constitution of 1791. Representing a district that boasts of many American citizens of Polish descent, I am proud to join in this important observance.

This constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence, and these principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism and ever-present readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

It is fitting, indeed, that we should continue to pay warm tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past thousand years and those who carry on the fight of today.

Meditation on the anniversary of May 3 deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory. Curtains, walls, and propaganda will never extinguish the light of freedom in Poland.

Blind War Veteran Spends Last Days in Jail and as a Ward of Private Charity in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. J. M. DeW. Kyle II, 1954 Columbia Road NW., Washington 9, D.C., who is seriously and earnestly interested in our war veterans and their problems, especially their financial problems, and who undoubtedly feels, as many of us in Congress feel, that our Government would do well to spend less on foreign aid and more in behalf of our war veterans, I now wish to insert the following editorial taken from the American Legion magazine, May 1963, issue, pointing up one instance of a great hardship experienced by one of our World War I veterans down in the State of Georgia in recent months.

The editorial is as follows:

DO WE WAIT FOR THEM TO DIE?

A 73-year-old blind World War I veteran, Wilmer A. Summerville, died in Rome, Ga., on February 15, and the last months of his life were nothing for the United States to be proud of. Because he could not care for himself, the Veterans Administration had denied him care in one of its soldiers' homes (called "domiciliary homes" in Government parlance).

Five days before Christmas, Sheriff Joe Adams, of Rome, took pity on him and let him stay in the jail, where he lived as a guest for 46 days.

Summerville was receiving a VA pension (some $78.75 a month). Under a law adopted a few years ago under the sponsorship of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, when the VA heard that the old man was in jail it started steps to stop his pen-

sion, should his stay there come to 60 days. When it learned that he was a guest and not a prisoner the VA halted that action and started doing its best for him.

It examined the old man to see if he could qualify for a VA "aid and attendance" allowance. But being 73 and blind didn't qualify him, even though his inability to care for himself barred him from living in a VA domiciliary home.

On February 6, Mrs. Christine Perry, operator of a nursing home in Cedartown, Ga., heard of his plight through a VA social worker and took him in free of charge. Nine days later all the problems were solved as Wilmer A. Summerville died of a heart attack.

We have received quite a few letters protesting the "cruelty" of the Veterans Administration with respect to Mr. Summerville, but as Edward D. Jensen, Service Officer of the American Legion Department of Georgia, noted to us in a complete report of the case, the Veterans Administration did exactly as the law requires and that is its job.

But the case of Wilmer A. Summerville puts an exclamation mark after the insistence of the American Legion Rehabilitation Conference in Washington in mid-March; and after the insistence of the Legion's Special Committee on Problems of the Aging; and after the National Commander's testimony to the House veterans' committee, that the present laws, and the present policies supported by the Veterans Administration, are not adequate with respect to aging veterans. The VA is even favoring a policy of reducing (and has reduced) some of its domiciliary services, while the controlling men in Congress have yet shown no interest in raising the pensions of indigent veterans. This in a year when the average age of World War I veterans will cross 70. The American Legion would like to get far-sighted laws passed before there are too many more Wilmer Summervilles. Will we again have to wait until headlines of tragic case histories stampede the legislature? Summerville was too helpless to live in a VA soldiers' home, but not helpless enough to qualify for "aid and attendance," while his pension was so small that he lived in the jail.

If he had come onto the pension rolls since July, 1960, his pension would have been $8.75 a month less, under the new law—Public Law 86-211. We would like to hear the high-flown words in justification of the present setup, and the ponderous generalities about the budget, that cover Summerville's case and the many more like his that are looming if we don't get action in this session of Congress.

The Legion's pension bill, H.R. 1927, and its bills to increase Federal aid to State soldiers' homes, and its proposals on VA care for the aged are among its programs of remedy. We will keep you posted on them, and hope that, backed by Legionnaires everywhere, our final report on this session of Congress will be a good one.

Voting on Wheat Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in support of the passage by the House of Representatives of the legislation to extend the feed grain program, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of May 4.

I agree wholeheartedly with this editorial, and am hopeful that with the enactment of such legislation, we will be able to terminate this costly drain on the American taxpayer.

The editorial follows:

VOTING ON WHEAT CONTROLS

Wheat and feed grains are other farm products plaguing the Department of Agriculture, which is now hoping for approval of mandatory production controls over wheat. If two-thirds of the eligible wheat farmers vote affirmatively in a referendum on May 21, the Government will be in a position to control production, and thus bring an end to the wasteful and costly piling up of surpluses.

Opponents of the plan object that the administration favors compulsion over wheat production. This cannot be denied, but compulsion has beben practiced in other areas of agriculture (in tobacco, for instance) and it has worked. Government control may not be the ideal; but it is better than price supports without controls, which have been such a failure. It is also better than giving up any attempt to cope with the problem, which would mean chaos for a large part of the farming population.

If wheat, farmers agree, feed grains, corn, oats, rye, barley, etc., may be next. For the time being, the administration has not been above seeking to influence the wheat vote by allowing farmers to use land taken out of production for planting feed grains. If this leniency means increased surpluses, the administration's voluntary program for feed grains may also have to be replaced by full controls.

There is no telling whether compulsion will work. The only thing that is clear is that all the efforts to cope with the wheat glut have thus far been unsuccessful. At least so far as wheat is concerned, the proposed controls are worth a try.

Lyndon B. Johnson Described as the Greatest Vice President the United States Has Ever Had by Charles Rozmarek, President of the Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 5, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON was the principal speaker in Chicago during the 172d observance of Polish Constitution Day.

I am including the Vice President's magnificent speech in another part of the RECORD. However, I am certain that my colleagues will be as impressed as I was with the very sincere and inspiring introduction which was given to Vice President JOHNSON by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, which arranged yesterday's tribute to the Polish Constitution in Chicago.

The Polish National Alliance is the largest fraternal organization of Polish Americans in the world. It has local chapters in 38 States. Mr. Rozmarek has had a wide range of experience in dealing in international matters and in personal dealings with heads of state since the beginning of World War II.

It is significant that Mr. Rozmarek should describe Vice President JOHNSON as "the greatest Vice President the United States has ever had" because Mr. Rozmarek has indeed had an opportunity to study the history of our Presidents and Vice Presidents.

Mr. Rozmarek had occasion to discuss the problems of postwar Europe with President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy. He is respected as one of the most determined forces in this country to help restore freedom to the people of Poland.

An estimate of more than 100,000 people participated in yesterday's Polish Constitution Day observance in Chicago and heard Mr. Rozmarek's very inspiring introduction of the Vice President.

The introduction follows:

INTRODUCTION OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON BY CHARLES ROZMAREK, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE

It is truly a great honor to introduce to you our next speaker. As Vice President of the United States, as Chairman of the Space Council, and Chairman of the Advisory Council on the Peace Corps, he looks back over 25 years of service to his country. It is a record he can be proud of—a record any American can be proud of.

First, as Congressman of the 10th District of Texas and then, as a U.S. Senator from the Lone Star State, he distinguished himself as a legislative leader of deep insight into the problems which beset the United States in the postdepression era and during World War II. And he has a very keen understanding of the numerous international crises that have arisen in the current cold war between East and West.

As the majority leader in the Senate, he rose above partisan politics and rendered invaluable assistance to former President Eisenhower's Republican Government. He placed the welfare of the country above political considerations.

As Vice President of the United States, he appeared on the international stage as one of the most brilliant, gifted and resourceful diplomats of our times.

In 20 foreign missions, he inspired confidence in the United States among the European peoples during the darkest hours of the Berlin crisis.

When Southeast Asia appeared to be crumbling before the Communist onslaught, he undertook a mission to South Vietnam, the Phillipines, Taiwan, Hong Kong, India, and Pakistan, negotiating agreements and strengthening their military defenses and economies. Equally successful was his trip to the Middle East—to Lebanon, Iran, Turkey, Cyprus, Greece and Italy.

I am honored to introduce to you the greatest Vice President the United States has ever had—a great statesman and humanitarian—the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Minimum Rate Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following concurrent resolution was adopted

by the General Assembly of the sovereign State of South Carolina.

The General Assembly of South Carolina is a particularly outstanding and dedicated legislative body. They are acquainted personally with the rate problem in the transportation of bulk commodities.

I commend this resolution to the Congress and urge that its recommendations be immediately and earnestly considered:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 335

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon legislation now before that body exempting certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products and passengers

Whereas the general assembly has been informed that legislation is now before the Congress of the United States which exempts certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers; and

Whereas the enacting of this proposed legislation into law will serve as a tremendous stimulus to the agriculture of the State of South Carolina; and

Whereas the general assembly has learned that the Interstate Commerce Commission has alleviated the situation partially by allowing railroads to reduce rates on feed grains being shipped into the Southwest under conditions; and

Whereas while the general assembly appreciates that the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission has gone a long way in correcting the situation, it believes that a truly satisfactory solution can only be reached by allowing the railroads, on a basis of free competition, to effect the lowest practicable freight on bulk shipments of feed grains to any part of the country; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the proposals embodied in S. 1061 and H.R. 4700 will bring about the desired result and, if enacted into law, the sagging economy of the farmer will be rejuvenated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the house of representatives concurring, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to give favorable consideration to legislation now pending before that body which proposes to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products and passengers; and the general assembly has been informed that this legislation was introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress as S. 1061 and H.R. 4700; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress, and to the two U.S. Senators and each Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress from South Carolina.

By order of the Senate.

L. O. THOMAS,
Clerk.

By order of the House.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk.

A Sad Little Happy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 2, 1963:

A SAD LITTLE HAPPY DAY

We had a little party on our street the other evening to mark what might have been a happy day. But it was really to celebrate a sad joke.

It was just 25 years ago this spring that our neighbor, then a young man on the threshold of 40, decided to take one of those annuity policies that would let him retire comfortably in his old age on $150 a month.

In that distant spring $150 a month was a lot of money and the money it took out of each month's budget to buy the annuity was not easily come by. Often it meant some personal sacrifice, especially when the children went off to college and when, later, one of them came home bringing a new grandchild because the son-in-law had gone off to fight a war.

There were a few months, here and there, when our friend missed a payment and had to borrow against his equity. But somehow he caught up, and in the end all of the payments were made. For 25 years.

So now he's what's called a senior citizen and the happy day he dreamed of is here. True to its contract, the insurance company wrote him a letter saying that on the first of next month he would start receiving his annuity and wishing him a long life of pleasant ease. After so much sacrifice, it seemed to our friend worth some kind of celebration.

But we neighbors weren't gathered to celebrate his retirement because he couldn't. Today the $150 he thought he was buying are 150 pieces of paper that won't pay the grocery bill and the taxes, heat, light, water, insurance and repairs on the house he has lived in all those years, even though it's free of any mortgage.

We all laughed about it. We could laugh because our friend is not wholly dependent on his hard-earned annuity. He is lucky enough to have his health and a good job which he can keep a few more years.

Still, there was a sadness in the gaiety. It was sad to think of other people who also labored and saved for 25 years to make a dream come true and who may not be so lucky now that the dream is dross. And saddest of all to reflect how it came to happen that way.

For the truth of the matter is that our neighbor was defrauded by his Government. So has been every citizen who bought such a retirement policy, who long ago bought U.S. Savings bonds, all the frugal people who for years have put a little aside in some bank for their old age.

It is not merely that these people, including our neighbor, have not gained what they hoped. Anyone who trusted his savings to U.S. dollars years ago has lost not only any value in interest but a part of his principal as well; the dollars he gets back are worth less than the ones he put in, sometimes worth only half as much. Far from being rewarded, those people have paid a penalty for their thrift.

Nor has this been an accident. For a generation now it has been the deliberate policy of the U.S. Government to depreciate the value of its money. In order to spend more money than it received from taxes, its policy has been to print new pieces of paper, watering the value of its paper dollars as shamelessly as any robber baron of the fabled past.

This is still the policy of the Government of the United States. It is presented under all sorts of fancy names, wrapped in all manner of persuasive language, but the policy is not changed by a fraudulent label. In the next fiscal year alone the Government intends to water the money supply by at least $12 billion.

They will tell you in Washington they do this to make the country prosperous and that a little inflation—some say 3 percent a year, some say 5 percent—is good for everybody. If it gets too bad, so they say, they have all sorts of controls to protect the dollar; the same kind we used before and which did anything but protect the dollar.

Finally, they will tell you that, if worse comes to worse, it really doesn't matter. Compared to all the good that's going to be done, what's a little theft from frugal, trusting people?

Just the same, at our neighbor's house the other evening the Secretary of the Treasury in person couldn't have sold a 10-year baby bond, much less a 25 year annuity. For not even he could pledge with a straight face that a decade hence the innocent will not have once again been cheated by their Government.

That's why we were sad when everybody drank a little toast to the happy day.

Chicago-Kent College of Law Observes Its 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 the Chicago-Kent Colleague of Law will celebrate its 75th anniversary with a dinner in Chicago honoring its present dean, William F. Zacharias. Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg will be the speaker.

All of the people in Chicago, as well as scholars throughout our Nation, join in wishing this institution continued success. I am sure that in its 75 years of existence, it has helped develop legal talent which has made a lasting impression upon every single one of our Nation's endeavors. Today, Chicago-Kent College of Law stands out as one of the great legal institutions of our Nation.

It was my good fortune to start my legal training at the Chicago-Kent College of Law. I can personally testify to

the high standards this fine institution has developed—standards which have brought it nationwide and international recognition.

I am sure my colleagues will join me in wishing the best of success to those responsible for arranging this 75th anniversary observance and the tribute being paid to Dean Zacharias.

Second oldest college of law in Illinois, Chicago-Kent has trained lawyers who have become judges in every Illinois court and most Federal courts.

The dinner, arranged by the Chicago-Kent Alumni Association, will see a convocation of some of the most distinguished legal talents in the country as well as a representation of industrial, civic, and cultural leadership. Louis L. Spear, Chicago-Kent 1938, vice president of the Newspaper Division of Field Enterprises, and Roy H. Olson, senior partner of Olson, Trexler, Wolters & Bushnell, will serve as cochairmen.

Chicago-Kent has always been known as a school for ambitious young men and women who had to support themselves while preparing legal careers. It was founded, in fact, at the behest of law clerks who "read law" in a lawyer's office and did not consider this method sufficiently professional to assure them of the background they would need.

The young clerks met in the chambers of Illinois Supreme Court Justice Joseph M. Bailey and Appellate Court Justice Thomas A. Moran to ask formal instruction, and after a brief period of "classes" in the judges' chambers the college was established in 1888. Judge Bailey became the first dean.

A nonsectarian, co-ed professional school in the heart of the city, it has served the commuting student, the employed student, the talented student of limited means. Over the years the college has helped launch many such students into great careers. It also continues to help the employed student reach his goal.

Chicago-Kent College of Law alumni include such noted figures as Judge Elmer Schnackenberg, Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit; Judge Henry L. Burman, Illinois Appellate Court; Judge Abraham L. Marovitz, Superior Court of Cook; Judge Walter J. Kowalski, Municipal Court of Chicago; William J. Scott, Illinois State Treasurer; Helen W. Munsert, Examiner, Illinois Commerce Commission; E. Douglas Schwantes, former president of Chicago Bar Association; Paul W. Goodrich, president of Chicago Title and Trust; and many others. The late Judge Julius H. Miner, U.S. District Court, was also a graduate.

The goal of the college, according to Dean Zacharias, is to provide sound training in legal principles at lowest possible cost.

Over 92 percent of the students entering Chicago-Kent have already achieved their undergraduate degree at an undergraduate school in Illinois or out of State. Completing their education they either must attend the college for 4 years in the evening, or for 3 years in day session to earn a law degree. Day students, who comprise 40 percent of the student body, are permitted to accept only limited employment.

Situated in the heart of the city near all court facilities, the college enjoys the cooperation of the Chicago courts in its teaching program. Senior students try hypothetical cases before circuit court judges.

Most Chicago-Kent alumni practice in Illinois. They enter the college, however, from undergraduate institutions throughout the Nation and an appreciable number of Chicago-Kent graduates practice in other States. Chicago-Kent has alumni branches in most States.

Chicago-Kent College of Law has been fortunate indeed to have such an outstanding educator as Dean Zacharias head the college.

Dean Zacharias has been associated with the college since he entered it as a student in 1931 to complete his legal education.

Coming from the University of Chicago Law School, where he had earned the degree of Ph. B. he turned to Kent where the flexible program permitted him to conduct his business while he studied law. He earned the degree of LL.B. in 1933 and was admitted to practice in the State of Illinois that same year. Private practice, largely in real estate and real estate mortgage field, followed, along with graduate work at Chicago-Kent under a scholarship.

In 1934 he was awarded the LL.M. degree by Chicago-Kent. He received his J.S.D. in 1949.

Appointed to the faculty by the late Dean Webster H. Burke, while a graduate student, Dean Zacharias found that his growing interest in teaching and writing began to shape his career.

He has held the following posts at Chicago-Kent: 1934, assistant professor of law; 1935, professor of law; 1942–55, chairman of the editorial board of the Chicago-Kent Law Review; 1948–56, secretary of the faculty; 1951–56, assistant dean; 1956–59, acting dean.

In 1959, a quarter century of distinguished teaching and research was climaxed by action of the Chicago-Kent College of Law board of trustees which named Mr. Zacharias dean of the college.

During the years since he has been dean, Chicago-Kent College of Law has carried out a major rebuilding program.

The enrollment of the college has nearly doubled within the past 2 years.

William F. Zacharias was born in London, England, in 1905, fifth in a family of seven sons. When, at the age of 14, he set out to find his first job in London, he found a clerkship with the London solicitors firm of Pyke Franklin & Gould, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

In 1920 Mr. Zacharias and his family moved to Chicago. His first employer in the new country, Mr. Henry Utpatel, a 1900 Chicago-Kent graduate, was master in chancery for the circuit court of Cook County and tried to interest him in a career in law.

Working full time for Mr. Utpatel, Mr. Zacharias attended the evening sessions of Central YMCA High School and compressed 4 years of work into 1½ years. He helped found that school's first newspaper and served as its editor.

He was the first graduate of the Central YMCA High School to win a competitive scholarship to the University of Chicago. Working in an insurance and real estate business and studying over the next 3 years he achieved A grades in all of his 27 courses. At the end of his junior year he was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa and became president of his local chapter.

His education in law was formally launched the following year when he entered the University of Chicago Law School where he earned his Ph. B. in 1931.

The author of numerous articles on important legal subjects, Dean Zacharias is a member of the American Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. He is also affiliated with the American Law Institute, the American Judicature Society, the American Legal History Association, the American Foreign Law Association, and the American Association of University Professors.

He has served many professional societies in special capacity. For example, he has been a member of the Committee of 1,000 of the American Bar Association working to increase its membership; a member of the council of the section of legal education of the Illinois State Bar Association; a member of the executive committee of that organization's affiliate, the Institute on Continuing Legal Education; second chairman of the committee on development of law of the Chicago Bar Association.

Dean Zacharias is a member of Sigma Chi and a trustee of Chicago Barrister Inn of Phi Delta Phi, his own legal fraternity.

Dean Zacharias and his wife, Lenore, have one daughter, Diane, who is Mrs. James Manzelmann and the mother of their seven grandchildren.

Among the distinguished alumni of the Chicago-Kent College of Law are:

Catherine D. Agar, partner, McDermott, Will & Emery.

Bertha Bauer, former Republican national committeewoman of Illinois.

Judge Henry L. Burman, Illinois Appellate Court.

The Reverend Archbald Carey.

Cyrus J. Colter, member of Illinois Commerce Commission.

Judge Thomas J. Courtney, circuit court of Cook.

Peter Fitzpatrick, vice president, Illinois State Bar Association.

Clair W. Furlong, vice president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.

Paul W. Goodrich, president, Chicago Title & Trust.

Clarence K. Graves, president of Lutheran Bar Association.

Sue Brown Hasselle, founder, Kappa Beta Pi, International Legal Sorority.

Judge Harry G. Hershenson, superior court of Cook.

Carlton Hill, senior partner, Hill, Sherman, Meroni, Gross & Simpson.

Axel A. Hofgren, past president of Patent Law Association of Chicago.

Judge Elmer N. Holmgren, superior court of Cook.

Reginald J. Holzer, president of Decalogue Society of Lawyers.

David O. Jacker, past president, Covenent Club.

Weymouth Kirkland, senior partner, Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters.

Marshall Korshak, trustee of Sanitary District of Metropolitan Chicago, and former Illinois State senator.

Judge Walter J. Kowalski, municipal court of Chicago.

John E. MacLeish, senior partner, MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood.

Judge Abraham L. Marovitz, superior court of Cook.

George W. McGurn, Illinois State Toll Highway Commission executive secretary.

Judge Donald S. McKinlay, superior court of Cook.

Foorman L. Mueller, past president, American Patent Law Association.

Helen W. Munsert, examiner, Illinois Commerce Commission.

Sidney Neuman, past president of the Seventh Circuit Bar Association.

Richard B. Ogilvie, sheriff of Cook County.

James L. O'Keefe, public administrator of Cook County.

Arthur A. Olson, senior partner, Olson, Mecklenburger, Von Holst, Pendleton & Neuman.

Roy H. Olson, senior partner, Olson, Trexler, Wolters & Bushnell.

Abe R. Peterson, senior partner, Peterson, Lowry, Rall, Barber & Ross.

Theodore G. Remer, attorney with Union Carbide Corp.

Judge Daniel A. Roberts, Circuit Court of Cook County.

Judge Daniel J. Ryan, Municipal Court of Chicago.

Judge Elmer Schnackenberg, Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit.

E. Douglas Schwantes, former president of Chicago Bar Association.

William J. Scott, Illinois State treasurer.

Louis Spear, vice president, Newspaper Division, Field Enterprises.

Lawrence J. West, senior partner, West & Egan.

Austin L. Wyman, Illinois State Toll Highway Commissioner.

William F. Zacharias, dean of Chicago-Kent College of Law.

Lowell Thomas, former Chicago-Kent instructor, internationally recognized broadcaster and world lecturer.

The late Judge Julius H. Miner, U.S. District Court.

The late Holman D. Pettibone, chairman of the board, Chicago Title & Trust Co.

Governor Henry Horner was a member of the Chicago-Kent College of Law faculty.

Artists Don't Want Government Meddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not much of an art connoisseur but I can appreciate the importance of freedom of expression but we find the greedy hand of the Federal Government in on this, too. It was, therefore, most refreshing to read the letter from Mr. Frank Reilly, president of the Council of American Artist Societies in last Friday's New York Herald Tribune:

ARTISTS DON'T WANT GOVERNMENT MEDDLING

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

Creative artists are opposed to program interference in our affairs. Yet the Federal Advisory Art Council is promoting just such interference.

There is an irreparable harm resulting from the imposition on one man's or one group's art ideology on others. This obvious dictatorship is necessarily biassed, regardless of the ideology. Russell Lyons in a talk at Barnard College said, "Our arts seem to grow best when they are furthest from any kind of official control."

The business man (nonartist) has shown a desire to take charge of artists' affairs. He already is art juror, as museum director, and now the government man advising on art. This type of bureaucracy with limited art knowledge was responsible for the last government art fiasco: a traveling show that so misrepresented our country's art that it had to be recalled and sold at a great loss.

Government control of art would be the golden opportunity for the art propagandist. It could manifest itself in personal edification or it could result in a closed art ideology. Must we follow Russia's pattern? To quote a top Communist, "The aim of Soviet art today must be to form the consciousness of the people."

The fear prevails that no matter what high purposes or noble intentions the Advisory Council may have in the beginning, by the bland wording of the bill it could develop into a subsidized monster with doles for any who convince the advisers they are artists. This type of interference lowers art standards.

In the formation of the present art bill no professional practicing art organization has been called upon for advice.

We are opposed to the Council's bill because we receive indefinite, ad hominem replies to our letters from Senators HUMPHREY and JAVITS, Representative LINDSAY and Mr. HECKSCHER. The Advisory Council presents evasive generalities such as "This has been urged by leading organization." What organizations? "This legislation has received wide support." From whom? "Its members will be individuals of national repute and achievement." Who?

We are aware that these bills have been supported by members of the performing arts, but not by representative creative art organizations. Remember, the origin of the WPA was noble and of high purpose but its implementation bogged into bureaucratic scandal.

The Council of American Artist Societies includes professional practicing artists and their regional organizations from coast to coast. The council's stand is based on its own opinion and on the fact that similar efforts to obtain art legislation have been defeated in Congress. They were opposed by such organizations as the National Sculptors Society, the American Artist Professional League and the Society of Western Artists, along with the national council.

Art is our life. Our artistic integrity and our freedom are threatened.

FRANK REILLY,
President, Council of American Artist Societies.

NEW YORK.

Small Towns in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Main Street is a vital ingredient in our Nation's economy. The present status and future outlook of Neillsville, Wisconsin, which is located in the District that I represent in Congress, was outlined in an excellent article written by Doug Sorenson for the Wisconsin Agriculturist. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have that story printed in the RECORD.

THE COUNTY-SEAT CITY

(By Doug Sorenson)

Farm business and county government are the backbone of Neillsville's prosperity.

Its economy centers around its role as county seat of Clark County, one of Wisconsin's most agricultural counties. Reminder of the county government is the red brick courthouse which has been a landmark since 1875.

Neillsville's growth has been slow but steady—2,160 inhabitants in 1920, 2,728 in 1960.

County government jobs employ 110 people in Neillsville. Add to this another two dozen working in county branches of State and Federal offices and you can see the importance of county employment.

Hub of much county business is the agricultural extension office, where county agent John Oncken is headquartered.

"I make 130 farm and home visits, receive 115 office visitors and answer 200 phone calls a month," says Oncken. "This includes a day a week spent in the office in the northern end of the county."

Being county seat makes Neillsville an important communications center. It has a radio station, weekly newspaper, daily train and bus, and three trucking lines.

Airlines do not serve Neillsville directly, but commercial lines come into Marshfield, 24 miles distant, and Eau Claire, 58 miles away.

Neillsville's stable economy may well result from the stability of the agriculture of Clark County. For example, 5,000 farms in 1940 averaged 110 acres, and today 3,800 farms average 137 acres per farm. In 1940 there were 67,000 dairy cows, 72,000 in 1960.

Dairy plants in the county numbered 70 in 1949. The squeeze of the fifties reduced the number to 53 today. Typical dairy plant is American Stores Dairy Co. in Neillsville that continues to hold 350 patrons in spite of unfavorable milk prices over the last decade.

"Some changes we've seen are bigger herds and a trend toward bulk milk," says plant manager M. P. Blodgett. "But 60 percent of our milk still comes in cans and is picked up in several counties."

Small farms are common in Clark County. "We still have farmers who want to start farming on 80 acres, even though we don't advise it," says Howard Geise, executive vice president of the Neillsville Bank. Geise has more than 50 years' experience in rural banking.

Typical of many small farmers is Helmuth Schultz, who milks 16 cows and bags his feed for grinding once a week at H. H. Van Gorden Feed Mill.

Van Gorden sees the advantage of stable farming in his business, too.

"We have slightly fewer customers but just as much volume as a few years ago. Bulk feed has been good for customers who haven't enough help," he says.

Although business and government play a major part in the economy, Neillsville boasts an industrial payroll of some 160 people. Like many small communities the city has an industrial development committee which has helped to bring in new industry and expand industry already there.

Neillsville lies in a scenic valley which is just part of the natural beauty that makes it ideal for outdoor recreation.

Wooded hills provide deer hunting in fall, skiing in winter, and picnicking in summer. Bruce Mound recreation area attracted an estimated 10,000 skiers and skaters last winter—the second year of the recreational development.

Bruce Mound and Wildcat Mound are about 15 miles west of the city on good highways. Several miles south, west or northwest the tourist will also find good swimming, fishing and park facilities.

One of Wisconsin's best county forests lies just west of the city and plans are afoot to develop more fishing, hunting and camping there. Black River which flows through Neillsville is one of Wisconsin's outstanding fishing streams.

Although Neillsville is growing slowly, there is one important asset in its present population. The average resident is about 30 years old, and only 1 percent of the residents are over 65. This means that the present population is fairly self-sufficient with fewer of the problems which come when a large part of the population is of retirement age.

Chances are good that Neillville will continue to be a stable community. County government, so important in a rural county, will continue to provide employment to a large segment of the population.

Recreational development should give Neillsville a bigger share of the tourist dollar than it gets today.

And because of its location relatively distant from larger communities, the city won't become a big-city satellite.

Justice for All?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, for many years responsible members of the bench and bar and community leaders have discussed how best to provide legal counsel for the indigent defendant. This year, as in past years, many bills designed to meet this problem have been introduced. I, myself, have introduced one, H.R. 5330. Support for this needed legislation has grown over the years. This year we look forward to its passage.

One of the best brief statements of the need for such legislation I have seen is an article—the first in a series entitled, "Justice for All?"—by Edward S. Kerstein which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of Tuesday, April 23, 1963. For the benefit of my colleagues, I include this article in the RECORD, as follows:

POOR PERSON IS ON SPOT IN FEDERAL COURT CASE

(By Edward S. Kerstein)

If you are charged with a Federal offense, your chance of winding up in Federal prison is far greater if you are poor than if you are rich. The authority for that statement is James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. He is a strong advocate of the public defender system, under which poor defendants are provided competent legal counsel. In the December 1962 issue of the Legal Aid Brief Case, Bennett wrote:

"I can say from more than 30 years of experience that there are few rich men in prison. * * * One reason is that they can afford better lawyers and a thorough preparation of their defense. * * * The defendant who is unable to obtain competent counsel is swept rapidly through the machinery of our courts and begins his imprisonment in a bitter and uncompromising frame of mind. Any feeling he might have had that society is against him is reinforced."

PRESIDENT FAVORS PLAN

Mindful of the plight of the poor defendant in Federal court, President Kennedy last month asked Congress to set up a system of public defenders. He sent the House and Senate a draft of legislation which he said would "diminish the role which poverty plays in our Federal system of criminal justice."

Mr. Kennedy attached to his letter to presiding officers of the Senate and House a note sent by his brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, which pointed to "a striking portrait of our Federal court's inability to offer equal justice to the poor."

The Attorney General said:

"Under typical procedures prevailing in the Federal system, no attorney is appointed to represent the needy defendant until he is arraigned, that is, required to plead to the charge against him."

URGES SUPPORT BY BAR

Attorney General Kennedy urged the American Bar Association's house of delegates, policymaking body of some 200,000 lawyers, at San Francisco last August to support a Federal public defender system. He indicated the extent of the need for legal assistance by pointing out that nearly one-third of defendants in the 34,000 cases coming before Federal courts in 1961 could not afford to hire counsel.

To assure indigent and low-income defendants of competent counsel is "not a problem of charity but of justice," Kennedy said.

He continued:

"I cannot help but be concerned as to whether, despite the efforts of dedicated public officials and conscientious lawyers, there is in fact equal justice before the law here in the United States.

QUESTIONS JUSTICE FOR POOR

"Do members of ethnic or political minorities or people who speak our language imperfectly or who have low mentality or disturbed minds—or the largest group, those who are poor—really receive the same protection before the courts as the rest of our citizens? I say that all too often they do not."

Chief complaints raised against the system of court-assigned counsel now used in Federal courts are that:

The load of indigent cases in big cities is too great to be borne by charity lawyers.

Except in capital cases, judges tend to appoint young, inexperienced attorneys who are no match for a seasoned prosecutor.

No funds are provided to meet the unpaid lawyer's expenses in preparing a case.

Lack of funds for fees and other costs encourages lawyers to seek quick disposal of cases, with the result that guilty pleas are entered in an unusually high proportion of cases.

Under President Kennedy's proposal to Congress, the public defender would maintain a salaried staff of experienced criminal lawyers and have full facilities for investigation, for locating witnesses, and for taking other measures necessary to develop fully a defendant's case. Establishment of the system would not rule out the use of volunteer counsel from among private lawyers specializing in certain fields of the law.

BILLS SINCE 1939

Measures to establish an office of public defender in the Federal courts have been introduced at every session of Congress since 1939. The Senate has passed such a bill on three occasions—in 1958, 1959, and in October 1962. The Judicial Conference of the United States and the American Bar Association have supported the plan for a quarter of a century.

Former Attorney General Herbert Brownell characterized the present system of assigning unpaid counsel to represent indigent defendants as "outmoded * * * much like the use of the volunteer fire system in modern society."

Italian Vote Is Upsetting to New Frontier Dogma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite the high level practice of managed news that we are witnessing on the Washington scene these days, through the traditions of freedom of the press the public is still being treated to impartial analyses of current events by many columnists. A timely analysis of the Italian election results appeared in the today's Chicago Sun-Times, an article by Columnist Marguerite Higgins, which I place in the RECORD.

In view of the recent pronouncements of the successes of present foreign policy, this analysis merits careful reading.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 6, 1963]

ITALIAN VOTE IS UNSETTLING TO NEW FRONTIER DOGMA

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—The Italian elections have been more unsettling to the New Frontier than at first meets the public eye.

Look below the surface and it will be found that gains made by the Italian Communists constitute a most impudent assault on a pillar of New Frontier ideology: the doctrine the poverty breeds communism and that the answer, for example, to Moscow's ambitions in this hemisphere is to concentrate south of

the border on social reform and the gross national product.

Even in his Moscow-supplied military clothing, Prime Minister Fidel Castro is no threat to the United States, according to the New Frontier, and all the psychological, tactical, and subversive potential of a Soviet military presence in this hemisphere will be nothing if the good guys (us) can only get to Latin America fustest with the mostest in the way of a rising standard of living.

But wait a moment. Isn't this precisely where the Italian elections come in?

In the last year, the Italians have been the stars of Europe economically. In Italy, the standard of living has been rising faster than almost anywhere else, the gross national product has been spurting and the summation of it all is the current phrase "the Italian economic miracle."

So do economic miracles also breed communism?

It is a silly proposition, but it's useful at lease, if it makes the point that the opposite proportion—that poverty breeds communism—is equally silly if accepted as absolute dogma on the causes and cure of the Communist challenge.

Specifically, the Alliance for Progress is laudable and necessary to the United States regardless of the Communist threat, because the longrun economic good of this country will be adversely affected if its next door neighbors remain have-not nations with depressed economies.

It is deceiving to pretend, however, that higher standards of living are going to fend off the Communist challenge.

It was not poverty that bred communism in Cuba, which had the highest standard of living in Latin America before Castro, according to Dr. Alberto Camargo, former President of Colombia. It was a political-military revolution that carried Castro to power on the strength of false promises of freedom and an end to the Batista regime's corruption.

It was not poverty that bred communism in Vietnam. The overwhelming anxiety among the Vietnamese villagers was whether the authorities could offer them physical protection against the Communist infiltrators that came into the villages at dark. It was not poverty, but terror, that bred communism.

In fact, in 12 Communist-seized countries visited by this writer, there was not one in which the workers and peasants were in the Communist vanguard. It was only a tiny minority of intellectuals who had the leisure and freedom from hard physical work to initiate Communist activity.

At the decisive moment, the Communists won despite high standards of living (as in Czechoslovakia) or low standards of living (at in North Vietnam) by skillful, relentless use of violence.

In Latin America, there is no reason to believe that the Communists are going to let rising standards of living stand in their way in the future anymore than in the past.

It is fine to fight poverty. It is a mistake to believe that dollars and cents can buy freedom from fighting back against the Communists when they have declared war against those on our side.

The true measure, of course, of the cost to us on the Soviet military presence in the Caribbean is the degree to which it will enhance the Communist prospects in this struggle, which the Yankee dollars is powerless to buy off.

Local Chamber Rated in Country's Top 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the privilege of calling the attention of the House to the award received by the Lawrence, Mass. Chamber of Commerce. The chamber was named one of the Nation's top 25 for its economic and civic activities in the Greater Lawrence area. An article which recently appeared in the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune described the chamber's annual dinner which was held on April 18, and indicates some of the many reasons why the Lawrence group has received this distinguished award. Under unanimous consent I am pleased to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of the fine work that this group is doing in the Greater Lawrence area:

LOCAL CHAMBER RATED IN COUNTRY'S TOP 25

Officers and members of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce attending Thursday night's 76th annual dinner had their heads in the air long before they heard a talk on the Federal Government's space program.

They had just heard themselves described as one of the country's top 25 chamber groups.

Accolades for the past year's achievements still echoed in the ears of the more than 900 chamber members and their guests in the Memorial gymnasium at Phillips Academy, Andover, when Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER of California rose to speak on the need for the Nation's space expenditures.

His remarks were addressed to a group residing in a community described by Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE as the "friendliest" in the United States.

Enthusiasm was the keynote of this year's annual affair and it was sounded by Chamber President Robert E. Maguire who declared that this was "a great night for you, for me, and for the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce."

"It is a night," he said, "that many of us hardly dared to hope for a year ago. But there was one fellow who had no doubts. He was all confidence. He was the late Allan B. Rogers, a wonderful friend and truly an inspiration for us all."

A moment of silence was observed in his memory.

Continuing, Maguire said:

"I assure you that we can be enthusiastic tonight. We have just finished 12 months which the Eagle-Tribune in its special edition Tuesday referred to as "the chamber's great leap forward."

"We did get our 300 members.

"We did get our access roads.

"We did enlarge our chamber staff and program.

"We did affiliate successfully with the Andover Board of Trade.

"We have launched a new industrial division.

"We do have our operation bootstrap two in motion.

He warned, however, that the members not become complacent because there were many unrealized goals.

He expressed his appreciation to the hundreds of people who worked toward past achievements and commended Executive Vice President Elbert G. Moulton, Jr., and his staff.

ON TOP OF THE WORLD

Moulton said he felt like he was sitting on top of the world and told of his pleasant task of paying tribute to the people that have helped us, including the 150 who worked on the membership project; the 250 who went to the access road hearings; the committee chairmen, the Top Hatters, and the board.

He also recognized the members of the legislature for their "help and cooperation," the city council and the members of various municipal boards.

Maguire then presented four "Community Appreciation Awards" to Greater Lawrence firms observing anniversaries this year.

The recipients were: Maurice G. Phillips, general manager, Northern Manufacturing Group, J. P. Stevens & Co., 150th anniversary; Walter G. Wilson, chairman of the board, Andrew Wilson Co; James P. Holihan, president, Diamond Spring Brewery, Inc., and Louis M. Eidam, president, Eidam's, Inc., all 50th anniversaries.

Mayor John J. Buckley extended the appreciation of the citizens of Lawrence and expressed the wish that "the coordination of mutual needs which has marked the progress achieved by the chamber and Lawrence's city government—achievements so evident and so productive—will continue to expand and gain strength as the years go by."

The dinner mood of enthusiasm was sustained by the remarks of William P. Fails, vice president of U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who spoke of the national merit award to be presented the Greater Lawrence organization at ceremonies in Washington, D.C., April 29.

"These awards are not passed out freely," he explained, adding that "this year's competition was extremely close."

"So you can take extra pride that you were in the winner's circle this year * * * 1 of the 25 best in the United States and the only New England chamber to be so honored.

"We wish we had many organizations around the country like yours in Greater Lawrence," he concluded.

"GREAT TRIBUTE"—MORSE

Congressman MORSE, who introduced the featured speaker, assserted he had "never in his life attended a gathering with such great enthusiasm * * * It's a great tribute to the people of Greater Lawrence."

As an "outlander," he said he could testify that this was the "friendliest city in the United States."

Congressman MILLER said it was particularly appropriate that he speak on the space program in a community only a few miles from Auburn, Mass., where, in 1926, Dr. Robert H. Goddard launched the first liquid-fueled rocket.

MAGNITUDE OF CHANGES

The magnitude of changes that have occurred within our society, he said, has been astonishing as a result of unparalleled

achievements in applied science and technology.

As examples he pointed to the automotive, aircraft, and communications fields.

"These industries have been characterized by an accelerated growth of unprecedented vigor arising out of great national demands and economic expansion created by two World Wars," he said.

It is reasonable to expect such growths in the space industry, he said, listing recent accomplishments resulting from space probes.

Also, he said, "it would seem logical to expect the scope of investment opportunity to increase significantly."

The space program has influenced the educational systems, he said, making urgent demands on all institutions of higher learning to meet the challenges that involve scientific knowledge we do not now have.

"What is most important," he emphasized, "is for America to experience a rate of progress in every aspect of its culture that is dynamic and questing.

"If, by sending men into space we can discover new and far-reaching scientific facts that can eliminate hunger and poverty from the less favored portions of our world, then that alone is worth the price that we, along with other nations, will pay.

"We do not seek a space race with the Russians," he concluded, "we are probing space to gain scientific knowledge * * * to strip nature of the curtain with which she hides some of her features."

During the program, Thomas A. Leone was presented an award as the top salesman of the year for securing 27 new memberships.

Charles W. Seifert was master of ceremonies. Very Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, O.S.A., president of Merrimack College, gave the invocation, and Rev. William B. Dearman, vicar of St. David's Episcopal Church, Salem, N.H., the benediction.

The Meddiebempsters, an augmented double quartet from Bowdoin College, rendered several choral selections.

The presentation of colors was made by the Chieftains Drum and Bugle Corps and the National Anthem was sung by Mrs. Mark McComiskey.

Head table guests included Mr. and Mrs. Walter V. Demers, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. David Cutler, Mr. and Mrs. George Gelt, Mr. and Mrs. Willis G. Hartford, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rochon, Mr. and Mrs. William Finneran, Mr. and Mrs. John Shaughnessy, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Buckley, Franklyn W. Phillips, Congressman Morse, Congressman and Mrs. George P. Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Maguire.

Also, Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Seifert, Father McQuade, Mr. and Mrs. Albert B. Gordon, William C. Fails, Harold L. Whitworth, Rev. and Mrs. William B. Dearman, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Ash, Mr. and Mrs. James Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond DeRuisseau, Chester Woeckel, Mr. and Mrs. William E. Moriarty, Robert A. Watters, and Mr. and Mrs. Elbert G. Moulton, Jr.

Justice For Retired Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, very soon the House will vote upon H.R. 5555 and my amendment to this bill which will correct an injustice which was done to retired military personnel in 1958.

Columnist Gould Lincoln, who writes the feature column "The Political Mill" for the Washington Evening Star, wrote on this subject in the May 2 issue. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the article, entitled "Justice for Retired Officers," which appears below:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 2, 1963]

JUSTICE FOR RETIRED OFFICERS

(By Gould Lincoln)

Five years ago Congress set up a dividing line between the pay of military officers who retired prior to June 1, 1958, and the pay of those who retired later. An injustice was done to thousands of men who had served with honor in the armed services of the United States, many of them in two world wars and some in one such war and in the Korean war. Another opportunity to correct this injustice will be at hand when the new military pay bill comes before first the House and then the Senate, as it soon will.

In 1958, Congress enacted a bill which corrected a situation whereby grades of lieutenant colonel and above had been underpaid for many years. But without warning the Congress suddenly and drastically decreed that all officers who had retired prior to June 1, 1958, would receive only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase in their retirement pay. But all those who retired on that day or thereafter would receive retirement pay computed on the increased pay scales for active officer personnel. The 6-percent cost-of-living increases for the officers retired earlier were small. But the recomputed increases on the new pay scale ran from $526 a year for lieutenant colonels who retired June 1, 1958, and thereafter to $4,600 a year for retired chiefs of services. A colonel's retirement pay jumped by $1,000 a year, a brigadier general's by $1,400, a major general's by $1,900, a lieutenant general's by $2,400 and a general's by $3,200.

INVOLVE 25,000

More than 25,000 officers of these ranks had been retired prior to June 1, 1958. It is estimated that approximately that number are still alive and on retired pay. If Congress should now permit the recomputation of their retired pay, the cost for the first year, it has been estimated, would run approximately $30.5 million. Thereafter, as the ranks are depleted, the annual cost would be reduced until it was finally wiped out.

Over a period of 15 years, it has been estimated, the cost will not exceed $600 million. In the light of our annual costs for national defense, running into hundreds of billions of dollars in the next 15 years, this seems little enough to right an injustice to men who served their country well.

The House Armed Services Committee reversed the action of its own subcommittee proposing recomputation of retired pay for these officers. It ignored the fact that former President Eisenhower urged Congress to correct the mistake it had made in 1958, and on May 12, 1960, the House unanimously passed an act for recomputation. President Kennedy committed himself to the principle of recomputation of retired military pay during his 1960 campaign, and Secretary of Defense McNamara recommended that the bill now reported to the House allow recomputation on the basis of the 1958 act.

Three members of the House Committee, Representatives BOB WILSON and CHARLES S. GUBSER, of California, and CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, submitted views in this committee report on this subject, declaring that:

"This bill contains a major inconsistency. While purporting to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service. For more than 100 years it has been traditional that retired military pay be based on active duty pay." It has been 75 percent of the active pay. They maintained that every man on active duty and on the retired rolls has been told by recruiting officials that his retired pay would be based upon active duty pay scales. They continued: "We all know fringe benefits, including retired pay, have always been offered as an inducement for servicemen to accept less money in the military than they would receive in civilian life. We believe it is out of character for the U.S. Government to make a promise and then not keep it. We do not believe that budgetary considerations can replace morality."

REVERSAL OF FACT

These committee members insisted that it is a common error to state that the military retiree does better than his civil service counterpart. This, they said, is not true, but a reversal of the fact. They pointed out that the military man has in reality contributed to his retirement through acceptance of substandard wages based on comparability tables. One of the arguments raised by some Members of Congress against the recomputation principle in figuring retired pay is that civil service employees—Members of Congress themselves—make regular contributions—out of their salaries—to their retirement pensions.

An amendment to correct the injustice of 1958 will be offered by Mr. GUBSER when the military pay bill comes before the House. The amendment will propose, too, that the principle of recomputation for retired pay be extended—but not permanently—although he believes it should be, instead of increases on the cost-of-living principle.

H.R. 2332 Urged on Erroneous Pretext That It Helps Low Income Veterans and Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Legislature of the State of New Mexico adopted Senate Joint Memorial 11 urging the Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 2332, a pension bill advocated by one of the veterans' organizations.

The joint memorial apparently was based on the erroneous concept that H.R. 2332 is designed to benefit low income veterans and widows. This is not true. There follows a copy of a letter which I have written to the President of the Senate of the New Mexico Legislature regarding Senate Joint Memorial 11:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1963.

Hon. MACK EASLEY,
President, Senate,
State of New Mexico,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.

DEAR MR. EASLEY: This acknowledges recept of Senate Joint Memorial 11, "a joint memorial to the Congress of the United States on behalf of the veterans of World War I."

This memorial referred to H.R. 2332, pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and urged consideration of the measure as follows:

"Whereas the Veterans of World War I in New Mexico consider that passage of H.R. 2332 by the Congress will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332."

It is noted that passage of H.R. 2332 is urged on the pretext that "it will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows." This is incorrect. H.R. 2332 is a bill designed primarily to pay substantially increased non-service-connected benefits to World War I veterans and widows in the higher income brackets and provides relatively little benefit to low income veterans and widows.

Veterans' Administration has estimated that the additional first year cost of H.R. 2332 would be $1,266,247,000. The cumulative 5-year additional cost is $6,048,136,000, with a total cumulative additional cost to the year 2000 of $19,574,821,000. It should be emphasized that these costs are in addition to the $1.8 billion being spent on non-service-connected pensions this year, a figure which will rise in the future.

There are now approximately 1,862,965 World War I veterans and widows receiving a non-service-connected pension. These individuals qualify for a pension because they have met certain requirements in regard to disability, unemployability, and have met the established income limits of the law. These limits are $3,000 for the veteran with dependents and $1,800 for the single veteran or widow. Enactment of H.R. 2332 does very little for this low income group most in need of help. This becomes apparent through an examination of the cost estimates of the bill. Of the $1,266,247,000 proposed to be spent for increased pensions the first year of enactment, only $453,818,000 would go to increase pensions for the 1,862,965 low income veterans and widows now on the rolls. Eight hundred and twelve million, four hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars would go to add 713,100 new cases from the upper income groups to the rolls. In other words, 27 percent of the veterans and widows from the upper income groups would receive 67 percent of the benefits.

The inequitable treatment, which would result from the enactment of H.R. 2332, can be demonstrated by examining specific cases. Under existing law, a veteran with two dependents now receives $95 per month if he is in the lowest income bracket—0 to $1,000. If H.R. 2332 were enacted, he would receive an increase of only $5 per month. On the other hand, a veteran with substantial income well above the national average for his age group, who cannot now qualify for a non-service-connected pension, would receive a tax free pension of $100 per month in addition to this other income.

Under H.R. 2332, individuals could have a combined income of up to at least $6,000 per year, including a tax free pension of $100 per month. Yet according to data from the Bureau of the Census, the medium income for all families headed by a 65-year-old individual is only $2,897 per year. Half the male population of this country has an income of only $4,081 or less per year. This serves to show that the income limits set by H.R. 2332 are totally unrealistic and are calculated to add veterans and widows fortunate enough to be in the upper income brackets, thus resulting in substantial expenditures for that group and very little for the very low income group who are now receiving a pension in ranges varying from $85 to $100 per month, depending on dependency status. The gross inequity of H.R. 2332 is further demonstrated by the fact that it would require the payment of pension to certain veterans from the upper income groups based on 90 days service and unrealistic income limits, and require 23 million taxpayers to contribute to a tax-free pension for veterans with incomes higher than their own.

H.R. 2332 would eliminate the present requirement of law that the spouse's income be considered in computing the veteran's income level. This would open the way to return to the practice of veterans shifting income producing assets to their wife in order to qualify for a pension when little need actually existed. H.R. 2332 would not require the counting of the estate of the veteran or widow in determining eligibility for a pension as is now required by law. This would result in the payment of pensions, presumably based on need, to thousands of veterans and widows who have substantial holdings in the form of real estate and other income-producing assets and who are well able to care for themselves.

It should be noted that practically all of the representations made through individual letters and made by spokesmen for the groups advocating passage of this legislation are similar to the representation being advanced by Senate Joint Memorial 11. These are based on the erroneous contention that H.R. 2332 is intended to help the needy low income veteran and widow when, in fact, this is not true.

The Congress of the United States has shown great sympathy and consideration for the needs of low-income veterans and widows as demonstrated by the present program, which allows payments of a pension to elderly veterans or widows whose income falls in the bottom 50 percent of the income pattern for the elderly age group. On the other hand, the Congress has not been disposed to providing tax-free pensions to veterans and widows in the upper income brackets, thus guaranteeing those individuals annual incomes far in excess of the national average for their age group, while at the same time paying the 100-percent disabled veteran only $250 per month. Action of the type advocated by Senate Joint Memorial 11 would result in hundreds of thousands of non-service-connected pensioners, with short periods of service and substantial resources of their own, being accorded better treatment than most seriously disabled veterans who received service-connected disabilities during a war.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Who Was Abe Lincoln?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lehigh County Republican Committee in the district that I have the honor to represent, sponsors two essay contests on the "Life and Ideals of Abraham Lincoln" as a part of the Lincoln Day celebrations, one being for senior high students and the other for junior high school students of Lehigh County. The winning selections are made by a board of distinguished educators from several hundred essays submitted. I am very proud of the fine students and the essays they submit. This year the contest for the junior high school students was won by Katherine Feldt, an eighth-grade student at Salisbury School in Salisbury Township on the outskirts of Allentown, Pa.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the winning essay of this young lady, entitled, "Who Was Abe Lincoln."

The essay follows:

WHO WAS ABRAHAM LINCOLN?

Abraham Lincoln rose from humble origin to the Nation's highest office. One especially influenced him at a very crucial time of his life. Sarah Bush Johnson, Abe's stepmother, helped him in many ways to achieve his position. She encouraged him by supplying him with books to read and by supplying him with an opportunity to go to school.

Years after Lincoln's first mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, died he remembered little of her. He may have referred to his stepmother when he said, "God bless my mother; all that I am or ever hope to be I owe to her."

Lincoln's greatest asset was that of keen understanding. He always saw the light or humorous side of things.

Lincoln's second great asset was his ability to express his convictions so clearly, and with such force, that millions of his countrymen made them their own. He sought only to be understood by the people and to convince them.

Lincoln spoke in plain language that people could understand. A noble style of language and power logic glowed in the words: "Stand with anybody that stands right. Stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong. Stand with the abolitionist in restoring the Missouri Compromise, and stand against him when he attempts to repeal the fugitive slave law. In both cases you are right. In both cases you expose the dangerous extremes. In both you stand on middle ground, and hold the ship level and steady."

The speech was clear and simply expressed and was rich and vivid in thought and ideas. It was something new and different from the usual flowery political oratory of the day.

His third great source of strength was his iron will during the war. Lincoln never doubted that in the end, right would make might, and the North would triumph. He knew that right would win victories over wrong and that democracy would overpower slavery. His strength in his beliefs and his power to enforce them yielded victory after victory.

Lincoln used every spare moment he could to study. He loved books and what they contained. He found many worlds in books. This made him eager to explore and find out what was beyond his own log cabin home. Lincoln described his studies as:

"When I came of age I did not know much, still, somehow I could read, write, and cipher to the rule of 3, but that was all. I have not been to school since. The little advantage I now have upon this store of education, I have picked up from time to time under the pressure of necessity."

Lincoln's character was of great nobility and of leadership. He preserved the American Union during the Civil War. In preserving this Union Lincoln proved to everyone that democracy and freedom can be a lasting form of government. When conducting a war, Lincoln never became bitter himself. He realized at the beginning of the Civil War that the Union must be saved for the United States was the only important democracy in the world. He knew that self-government would be proved a failure if the Nation could be destroyed by just a few of its own people. Lincoln was determined that the Nation, and democracy would not be destroyed.

If the Union had not been preserved, the United States would have become two nations. Neither of these nations could have attained the prosperity and importance that the United States has today. Also Lincoln influenced the course of world history by his leadership during the Civil War. Millions of persons regard his career as proof that democracy offers all men the best hope of a full and free life. Lincoln's writings, as the Gettysburg Address, and his many speeches show his deep feelings of democratic beliefs and goals.

The American people knew little of Lincoln when he became President. Nothing in his past experience indicated that he could meet successfully the greatest crisis in the Nation's history. President Lincoln was often a careless, inefficient administrator. At times he gave way to political pressures which he might better have resisted.

The Bible was probably the only book the Lincolns ever owned. He disliked any display of bitterness among Christian people. This may explain why he never attended church regularly. Yet he became a man of deep religious feelings. Abe came to know the Bible thoroughly. Biblical references and quotations enriched his later writings and speeches. As President, he kept a Bible on his desk and often opened it for comfort and guidance.

Lincoln believed strongly in brotherhood. The Bible says: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." In Lincoln's Gettysburg Address he stated that all men are created equal and that they are in spirit brothers. He treated his fellow men thus. He understood the problems of people and tried, and in some cases succeeded, to help them. He was lovingly named "Father Abraham" for many a time did he sit holding a dying man's hand, or listening to the problems of wounded soldiers. Many a consoling word and his kind smile and friendliness did what medicines could not do.

The Thomas Lincolns moved to Indiana because he didn't believe in slavery, and Indiana had no slavery.

Lincoln, believing slavery to be a monstrous and evil thing early took a stand against it. "Wherever it is," he declared, "it has been first introduced without law."

Lincoln loved all children and no child ever felt strange in that homely man's arms. In fact, one small miss told her father that the President wasn't ugly, but "beautiful."

Lincoln was a kind man. He was always willing and eager to lend a hand or help a friend. All he really hated was lying and whisky.

One human life was a thing of priceless value to Lincoln. When somebody wakened him at night, telling of a boy to be shot, for sleeping on sentry duty, Lincoln wrote a note, and then dressed and carried the message himself to the War Department, to make sure that the boy would not be shot. He did not believe shooting "would make any man better."

Abe Lincoln was also called Honest Abe, a man who expressed his feelings outwardly. He was honest to the point of exaggeration. As, when he walked several miles just to return a book he had borrowed. Another time he walked several miles to return a difference in change.

Abe Lincoln's terrific incentive and persuasive personality with solid character, was a natural in building a basic solid foundation for the great man that he became. History has proven these essentials to be necessary for one man to control universal cooperation among peoples.

These traits have been and will be a challenge for people to lead our country forever forward.

LINCOLN

Like a gaunt, scraggly pine
Which lifts its head above the mournful sandhills;
And patiently, through dull years of bitter silence,
Untended and uncared for, starts to grow.
Ungainly, laboring, huge,
The wind of the north has twisted and gnarled its branches;
Yet in the heat of midsummer days when thunderclouds ring the horizon
A nation of men shall rest beneath its shade.
And it shall protect them all,
Hold everyone safe there, watching aloft in silence,
Until at last, one strong bolt from the zenith
Shall strike it in an instant down to earth.

John Gould Fletcher.

The Polish National Holiday

SPEECH

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, today is a day that all freedom-loving peoples

take special note of—the Polish national holiday. This year, perhaps with even greater emphasis than in previous years, we are especially reminded of the bravery of the Polish people for this is the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other uprisings against the Russian rule, of course. The one most recently in our memories was the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation. But the 1863 uprising against the Russian terror was the greatest, longest and bloodiest uprising in Poland's history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for more than 2 years. Although in the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant success, the uprising was doomed when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian army.

The brave insurgents fought Russian army regiments in more than 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland. More than 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged publicly. The rest were sent to Siberia.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents was surrendered and wiped out in April of 1865.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the uprising of 1863—on this day set aside for celebrating the Polish national holiday—we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years.

I join with the more than 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry in observing the Polish national holiday and taking note of the 3d of May constitution, a pioneering document of freedom and liberalism.

A Theatrical Dream Comes True in Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, tonight marks an important event in the history of the American theater. In Minneapolis, the first public performance of an experimental, noncommercial theater of international significance will take place. An American repertory company of the finest professional caliber will begin what is destined to be a career of great theater resulting from a special combination, the unique abilities of a genius director, Sir Tyrone Guthrie, the superior talents of a first-rate acting company, and the atmosphere of a new and specially designed theater.

This combination itself would mark a significant milestone in the American theater, but the community spirit and excitement, the enlightened civic leadership, the simple joy of participating in a creative experiment which the people of the Twin Cities have shown mark this as more than just another theater.

The story of its genesis and development is an interesting one which deserves the wide recognition it has received. Mr. Richard Coe's excellent article from Sunday's Washington Post has already been introduced in the RECORD, but I think a more detailed description of this major theatrical event will interest the Members of this body.

The article follows:

STORY OF THE TYRONE GUTHRIE THEATER

The story of the Tyrone Guthrie Theater is the story of a dream brought to life by bold and creative imaginations and an energetic and responsive community.

The idea struck New York Producer Oliver Rea and New York Production Director Peter Zeisler first. They were collaborating in New York on "Juno," and as the sets were being struck at the end of the run, they were meditating with dismay that the outpouring of creative energies so laboriously channeled into a successful production should suddenly be abandoned at the end of its run. Talents which through prolonged association adapt, inspire, and generally complement each other should be able to continue working together for mutual benefit and maximum creative success. Repertory, they decided, was the answer. A resident, repertory theater in a city outside New York, not overshadowed with Broadway commercialism; someplace where the community wanted and needed the uplift of the finest dramatic art; a city of sufficient size and sophistication to support such a venture. They talked to Tyrone Guthrie, world-famous director and founder of a similar project in Stratford, Ontario, who pledged his directing talents to the project and his help to the search for the location. Dreams turned to schemes.

The three theatrical patriots canvassed the United States for the right city and discovered Minneapolis. Here was a city that supported numerous museums, a symphony orchestra of international repute, a major league football and baseball team, and together with its twin city, St. Paul, was a crossroads of commerce and industry. The Nation's second largest university was located here, with an enterprising educational theater. Minneapolis met the objective qualifications and Guthrie, Rea, and Zeisler had an intuition: "We liked this place," said Dr. Guthrie, "and felt that theater of the kind we envisioned would prosper in this community."

For its part, Minneapolis wanted them. Inaugurated by a $400,000 grant and a tract of land from the Walker Foundation, a fundraising campaign began which eventually solicited $2,200,000 from the upper Middle West community, evidence of a faith in a promise of excellence. Contributions ranged from the munificence of the Walker Foundation to 37 cents given by a children's Sunday School class in a small Minnesota town. Individuals and corporations contributed. The theater would be a boon as incentive to industry personnel, an impetus to commerce, a continuing source of fine entertainment for residents of the area. This theater was to be constructed in the public interest; a nonprofit artistic organization serving the community which built it. Two nonprofit foundations emerged: the Minnesota Theater Co. Foundation which is charged with the production season, and the Tyrone Guthrie Theater Foundation which administers the theater proper.

The underlying artistic stratagem of the project was this: that classic drama provides the greatest entertainment; that whatever coincidental purgation the classics allow, they have endured because they entertain. And presented in repertory, the productions cannot only entertain the most people, but provide the greatest stimulation to the acting company they employ.

The ambitious ideal of theater demanded an ambitious physical theater. Ralph Rapson, head of the University of Minnesota Department of Architecture, was retained as architect. In collaboration with Dr. Guthrie and Tanya Moiseiwitsch (who designed Dr. Guthrie's productions, first at London's Old Vic and more recently at Stratford, Ontario, and was chosen by him to be principal designer for the newly named Tyrone Guthrie Theater, technical knowledge and esthetic functionalism came together in architectural design. The horseshoe-shaped auditorium holds 1,437 seats, racked around three sides of the open area stage. Seats are arranged in ramp formation on one side, and divide into orchestra and balcony sections as they sweep around the stage in a 200-degree arc. The stage projects as an open platform into the semicircle of seats. It is raised from the floor level by three steps which provide additional playing area and is a seven-sided, asymmetrical design of esthetic vitality. Separating the stage from the back wall is the permanent set, a contemporary interpretation of the Elizabethan stage house—two storied, constructed of two mobile sections. The architectural design derives from the Assembly Hall in Edinburgh and the Stratford (Ontaria) Festival Theater, which, in turn were inspired by Elizabethan and Greek theaters.

By this arrangement of stage and seats, no member of the audience is more than 52 feet from center stage, and communication between actor and audience—a criterion for this theater—is initiated physically. A feeling of intimacy arises in this setting, and the spectator is drawn into the spirit of the drama almost as a participant.

The professional and artistic company which will create the productions in the theater were chosen from the most adept talent available. The plays were selected from the library of the world's classic drama, as will be plays for future seasons: Greek theater, Shakespeare, restoration drama, classical French, Scandinavian, German, Russian, and 20th century American—classic entertainment which has or will endure.

The acting company comprises Hume Cronyn, Jessica Tandy, George Grizzard, Rita Gam, Zoe Caldwell, and 20 other highly reputed actors and actresses, as well as McKnight fellows, recipients of grants through the University of Minnesota for study at the Guthrie Theater, and local talent. Members of the Twin Cities community also serve as production assistants in the wardrobe, properties, and technical departments, as well as ushers, box office personnel, and administrative help.

When the Minnesota Theater Co. has finished its first 20-week playing season in September, the building will be made available through the Tyrone Guthrie Theater Foundation to other groups sponsoring entertainment which lends itself to presentation in the unique theater. Jazz, chamber music, dance programs, chamber opera, lectures, and films will occupy the theater during the winter months until the Minnesota Theater Co. again takes over for the following season early the next spring.

The contribution from the community has been great, the return will be greater. The Tyrone Guthrie Theater project is the center of international attention, not only for expectations of superb productions or for the bold design of the building, but also as a signal movement in theatrical history. With the inauguration of the Minnesota Theater Co. professional theater in the United States makes its first step toward decentralization. It spreads into the heart of the United States to a new and receptive audience. It fosters the development of the talent on which it thrives. And the materialization of this project is the culmination of a dream.

The Fallacy of Unequal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has been a consistent and vigorous advocate of legislation to assure equal pay for women when doing the same work as men. As a sponsor of equal pay legislation, and as a woman, I am proud to have the help of this outstanding newspaper in behalf of equal pay.

Recently, in discussing some of the arguments used by some business spokesmen in opposing the proposed law, the Post-Dispatch said it is "undeniably true" that costs of employment are higher for women than for men, but added: "The question is whether it is relevant." The editorial then stated that the norm in employment costs is, and has to be, a combination of male and female employment costs, "for industry and business could not get their work done without women who now represent about a third of the entire work force."

Mr. Speaker, I think the Post-Dispatch editorial makes some excellent points. However, from my own experience in the business community as director of training for the comptometer firm in St. Louis prior to my marriage, I personally doubt that, in a great many jobs where men and women do the same work, the true costs of employing women are any higher than the costs of employing men. Even so, wages in those positions are usually much lower for women. The discrimination is unfair and should be ended. I am glad that the House Committee on Education and Labor has again approved an equal pay bill.

I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to, "The Fallacy of Unequal Pay," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 27, 1963, as follows:

THE FALLACY OF UNEQUAL PAY

An argument being raised against equal pay for women legislation in House hearings, that costs of employment are higher for women than for men, is undeniably true. The question is whether it is relevant. The notion that pay for comparable work ought to fluctuate with employment costs is, we believe, untenable, and if applied generally—and not just to women—would produce a reasonable facsimile of chaos.

It is a fiction to maintain that male employment costs constitute a norm. If there is a norm, it is a combination of male and female employment costs, for industry and business could not get their work done without women, who now represent about a third of the entire work force. If they were withdrawn from work employers would face a labor shortage of severely critical proportions.

There is, furthermore, every reason in self-interest for employers to offer women the incentive of equal pay, for in the coming 7 years they will require 6 million additional women employees, an increase of 25 percent, according to the estimate of Secretary of Labor Wirtz.

Women are guaranteed equal pay by law in 22 States and under 40 percent of collective bargaining agreements, but 21 million of the 24,500,000 women workers in this country are outside the protection of labor unions. It is upon them that the burden of unequal pay falls most heavily, and as Secretary Wirtz says they are the ones least able to bear it.

A Federal equal pay law will stop exploitation of the weak bargaining position of these millions of underpaid women workers, increase national purchasing power, and enhance the ability of employers to attract into their service the millions of new women workers they will be needing in the next few years. Unequal pay for equal work is an injustice unworthy of the greatest industrial country in the world, and Congress should act forthrightly to redress it.

Bill Would Retain Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer:

BILL WOULD RETAIN INEQUITY

The Enquirer has wholeheartedly supported the proposal for increased pay to active and retired service personnel. The Defense Department outlined its request for the increases last year and submitted it to Congress in January with high hopes for passage of all details.

However, the bill that has now emerged from the House Armed Services Committee does not fill the need cited by the Defense Department nor covered in an earlier bill drawn up by a subcommittee.

A particular point on which the committee's version departs from the Defense Department request is in the matter of retirement pay for personnel who left the service before June 1, 1958.

The 1958 bill, which was the last service pay increase, failed to give men who had already retired the same consideration as those retiring after the new rates went into effect.

The Defense Department had hoped to correct this inequity by including in the new bill a provision to allow men who retired before June 1958 to recompute their benefits on current pay levels.

However, the committee knocked out this provision and recommended an across-the-board 5-percent increase which would retain the difference in the rate of retirement pay received by men who retired before June 1958 and thus perpetuate the inequity.

It is simply a question of providing a uniform rate for all retirees rather than drawing a line and saying those who come after this date deserve more benefits.

The full House should correct this shortcoming of the committee bill.

Also, eliminated by the committee were requests for special pay to personnel subject to hostile fire, special pay for duty involving unusual hardship, and additional uniform and subsistence allowance for officers.

Congress is actually toying with the idea of voting more money for machinery than the Defense Department requested. It should at least vote as much as was asked for the men who must serve if our Nation keeps its place in the world, and for those who have won our wars of the past.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, amid all the tumult and shouting it is difficult to appreciate the facts in the Cuban situation and the attitude of our country toward it. However, to those of us who are fortunate to have friends in a position to analyze the situation because of their connections, the real seriousness of the possibilities involved in our relationship to that unhappy country are somewhat clarified. I am blessed with the friendship of such an individual who is an outstanding citizen, the minister of the Presbyterian Church of Toms River, Ocean County, N.J., Rev. Ansley Gerard Van Dyke. Over the years Dr. Van Dyke, through the missionary work of his church, has been in close touch with developments in Cuba. Recently I received a letter from him, dated April 19, 1963, and with his permission I am pleased to have the privilege of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope my colleagues will read it because it represents the considered opinion of a dedicated man with a calm analytical mind. He does not preach pessimism but being a stalwart American is unequivocably opposed to communism and its godless ideology.

The letter follows:

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF TOMS RIVER,
Toms River, N.J., April 19, 1963.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I have just finished reading the text of the statement of Sr. Jose Miro Cardona as it was published this morning in the New York Times. I cannot help believe that much of what he has said there is absolutely true. Many of my Cuban friends know him to be a very sincere, capable lawyer and one who is not given to volcanic outbursts of temper.

It should go without saying that the average layman cannot be adept at international politics. But one does not need very good glasses to see that our national policy has been altered a great deal recently in regards to communism in this hemisphere. If there have been changes made, then I believe every citizen has a right to know what they are.

I am writing you to see if you can shed any light for me on this matter. I am very much concerned, as you well know, about the Cuban situation, because of our church's work there, and because of my many friends there and here who still hope to return to a free Cuba. What is our present policy toward coexistence with communism in this hemisphere? Why do we spend millions in Laos and other faraway places and then allow communism to entrench itself on our very doorstep?

Don't send this letter on to the State Department as you did last summer. Their replies are so vague and ultimately meaningless that it isn't fair to take up their time to reply. But I do plead with you to use all your ability and influence to undergird the trustworthiness of our commitments to the

Cuban people and our help to them in this hour of great, great need.

With best personal regards and thanks for your leadership.

Most sincerely,

ANSLEY GERARD VAN DYKE,

Lee's Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Advance in Lynchburg on Thursday, April 25, 1963, in connection with the bill I introduced to restore the full citizenship posthumously of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

The editorial follows:

LEE'S CIVIL RIGHTS

Confederate Memorial Day is observed tomorrow as a holiday in Alabama, Florida, Georgia and Mississippi. Its arrival invariably brings forth moving eulogies for Robert E. Lee, whose dilemma when forced to choose between duty to his country and duty to his State epitomized the tragedy of the War Between the States.

Lee's acceptance as a national rather than a sectional hero is almost complete. Former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy both have gone out of their way to voice their esteem for the memory of the Confederate chieftain. Back in 1957 Ike expressly dissociated himself from a remark of Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery that Lee should have been "sacked" for his conduct of the Battle of Gettysburg. And the same year J.F.K., then a Senator, cosponsored a bill to give back to Lee full rights of citizenship.

This year Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, a Tennessee Republican, introduced a bill which would restore full citizenship rights posthumously to Lee. Its passage would represent a splendid gesture although such action certainly couldn't add any lustre to a matchless Virginia name.

In fact, such a proposal in past years has never advanced very far in Congress primarily because of Southern opposition. Senator ROBERTSON declined to become a cosponsor of the 1957 bill, which was introduced by Indiana's Senator Capehart. At the time he quoted Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, Lee's distinguished biographer, to the effect that no action was necessary to restore Lee's citizenship because that was done automatically when he signed the parole in which he agreed not to bear arms against the United States.

Theoretically, Lee would not have been able to exercise certain of the rights of citizenship without taking an oath, because his application for a pardon apparently never came to the attention of President Andrew Johnson and wasn't acted upon. But Dr. Freeman concluded that Lee was so highly esteemed in his native State and community that no one there would have interposed objection if he had sought to exercise any normal citizenship right.

Senator ROBERTSON's belief was that any attempt to restore Lee's full civil rights "would be at best an empty gesture" and also "might be misinterpreted by many people as an effort to restore citizenship itself."

A Pattern of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach herewith a very pertinent editorial which was a guest editorial in the Decatur, Ill., Herald, of May 4, 1963, from an earlier edition of the Wall Street Journal.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I know exactly what they are talking about in this editorial. The competition of U.S. lines with foreign rivals has been tremendous. Our lines have operated a number of years without subsidy, while all the competitors throughout the world are either subsidized or government-owned; in either case they are able to survive regardless of rates or competitive conditions.

If we are to keep our oversea and world lines operating we do have to make it possible for them to compete with foreign lines, some of which were created at times when we were supplying foreign aid. In effect, we should have reduced foreign aid by the amount that those foreign lines were subsidized. It doesn't appear to me that any country who is receiving U.S. aid ought to be creating an international airline when there are plenty of them which are operating now without being a drag on the economy. There is nothing more important than freeing our own lines from some of the rigid rules under which they now operate to allow health and growth for those U.S. lines.

The editorial follows:

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald, May 5, 1963]

A PATTERN OF THE PAST

A White House policy statement declared the other day that the Government intended to do all it could to help U.S. international airlines maintain their "health and growth." But whatever cheer the airlines may have found in those words was soon dissipated.

From the standpoint of the U.S. lines, a further stimulus to creation of new foreign airlines cannot help but increase the existing overcapacity on world air routes. Largely as a result of rising capacity of foreign lines, U.S. airlines in 1961 handled only 49 percent of passengers flown between the United States and foreign points, down from 70 percent in 1951.

Well, it's one thing to encourage competition. It's quite another to subsidize the U.S. lines' foreign rivals. Especially when the White House statement fails to accord the American lines much flexibility to meet the intensifying competitive conditions.

These conditions are particularly severe on the transatlantic run, shared by Trans-World Airlines and Pan American World Airways with a growing host of foreign carriers. TWA has been having its financial troubles for some time and, together with Pan Am has concluded that a merger would be a good idea.

Through a merger, they reason, they would achieve sizable economies and, perhaps, be able to compete more effectively. But the Government clings to its old rigid rule that there should be more than one U.S. line flying each major route, apparently dooming the TWA-Pan Am proposal.

Subsidies for the foreign lines and rigid rules for their U.S. competitors seem an odd way to promote "health and growth" of U.S. airlines. No businessman can compete for long if he's frozen in a pattern of the past.

Congress Must Be Made Aware of Pay Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal Register of April 27, 1963:

CONGRESS MUST BE MADE AWARE OF PAY FACTS

Every effort should be made now to assure that when the service pay bill comes before the House, within the next week or two, every Member will be aware of the shortcomings that prevent this legislation from accomplishing its original objective.

We hope and expect, of course, that there will be members of the Armed Services Committee who will put up a vigorous fight in behalf of a stronger and more effective bill. But their task will be aided greatly if the individual members are apprised in advance of the weaknesses of the measure and what needs to be done. This can be accomplished if their individual constituents and patriotic organizations in their areas write to them now setting forth the facts.

It is certain that the legislators will be impressed by the plea of the captain of the ill-fated submarine *Thresher*, as revealed in last week's Journal and Register. The hazards of peace time service and the devotion with which the low paid men of the Armed Forces perform their duties are exemplified in the tragic loss of these sailors.

We hope, too, that the Members of Congress will read the letter which J. & R. Congressional Editor Louis R. Stockstill wrote to Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee, at the latter's request. In this, Mr. Stockstill has revealed the weaknesses of the argument against recomputation of retired pay. Mr. Stockstill points out that members of the Armed Forces regard Chairman VINSON "as the greatest champion they have ever had" and he expresses the hope that Mr. VINSON will change his view on this aspect of the pay bill.

It is important to note, as reported extensively in this issue of the Journal and Register, that Service witnesses before the House Appropriations Committee, while looking upon pay increases as a keystone to improving career incentives, are also insistent that, to be effective, pay increases should be backed up by improvements to other career incentives. These include better family medical and dental care, safeguarding retirement benefits, offsetting high living costs, ironing out promotion inequalities, and many other morale areas.

The danger in the present situation is that if the services do not get a good pay bill now, it will be some years before they can hope for improvement. Meanwhile, losses will continue, morale will suffer, training costs will increase, and combat effectiveness will suffer.

Public Opinion Poll of Hon. Robert T. McLoskey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am privileged to report to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the results of a public opinion poll recently completed in the 19th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor of representing.

The response to this poll indicates the people in this district have more than an average interest in national and world affairs.

Twenty-five thousand questionnaires were mailed out and approximately 12 percent responded. I feel this is a splendid return and I am most grateful to those who took the time and trouble, not only to return their answers, but who commented in detail on the issues and problems involved.

In general, I am pleased to report the views of the majority who answered parallel my own thinking on most major issues of the day.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD the detailed results. The figures used here represent percentages and not the number of persons who answered each question.

The table follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
I. Tax reduction and national debt:			
A. Essential to reduce expenditures before tax cuts are made	89.5	7.5	3.0
B. Taxes cut even if it increases national debt	9.0	85.0	6.0
C. Existing tax rates and expenditure patterns maintained	12.0	73.0	15.0
II. Medical care for aged:			
A. Medicare managed by privately owned insurance companies with Government paying premiums of those who could not pay themselves	43.0	40.0	17.0
B. Medicare managed by Government and financed by greater social security taxes	11.5	80.0	8.5
C. Kerr-Mills Act for medical assistance amended to correct any deficiencies or inequities	45.0	18.5	36.5
III. Labor-management relations:			
A. Labor unions subjected to antitrust laws on same bases as corporations	76.0	22.0	2.0
B. Compelled Government arbitration with decision binding to both parties in disputes declared by President to endanger national welfare	64.5	29.5	6.0
C. Favor increasing Federal minimum wage rate	16.0	68.0	16.0
IV. Agriculture:			
A. Satisfied with present feed grain program	11.5	58.0	30.5
B. Believe in controlled supply management	13.0	65.5	21.5
C. Price supports geared to mandatory allotment controls	15.5	43.5	41.0
V. Foreign affairs:			
A. Foreign aid should be— *Percent*			
Continued at present levels			
Expanded 1			
Cut sharply 81			
Ended 12			
B. Foreign aid given to Communist-dominated countries	3.5	92.5	4.0
C. Approve of overall foreign policy	9.5	79.0	11.5
VI. Domestic and welfare programs			
A. Favor Federal aid to college and postgraduate education	32.0	57.5	10.5
1. Student loans	65.0	30.0	5.0
2. Outright grants	11.0	76.0	13.0
B. Favor Federal aid to grade and high school education	21.0	74.5	4.5
1. General operation including teachers' salaries	10.0	84.0	6.0
2. Classrooms and equipment only	22.0	70.0	8.0
C. Establish domestic peace corps	19.0	65.5	15.5
D. Federal Government supply funds for mass transportation	9.0	80.5	10.5
E. Feel we are spending too much for public works, welfare benefits and low-income housing	67.0	28.0	5.0

Polish National Holiday: May 3

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the residents of my district of Polish descent, as well as all freedom-loving Americans in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, I rise in recognition of the Polish national holiday.

The Polish 3d of May Constitution Day, coming as it does immediately after the May 1 celebrations of international communism, serves to remind us again of the stark contrast between Soviet Communist claims to be champions of national independence, and the tragic reality of their continued suppression of Polish national freedom.

I join in this salute to the courageous contribution of the people of Poland to human liberty, and await the day of Polish independence from Communist imperialism.

Hon. Jessica McC. Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis brings sadness to her legion of friends and, especially, to the Members of Congress who were privileged to know her as a capable and distinguished legislator and a warm personality.

Her dedication to good government at the community, State, and National levels stands as an inspiration to all of us.

I shall treasure the memory of her friendship, and I join with her host of friends in extending sympathy to her family.

Center of Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial deserves the close attention of us all. We are being asked to commit the taxpayers to enormous expenditures of money, and because the initial cost estimates on space and space research projects have proven to be often far below the final spending requirements, it is essential that we give top attention to the manner in which these sums are being spent. I want to call particular attention to the reference to the Midwest in this national magazine's editorial. In the Minneapolis-St. Paul area of Minnesota, we have one of the truly exceptional university-industrial strength centers of the Nation where electronics and guidance systems development has already made major contributions to our national effort.

Without further comment, the following editorial appeared in the magazine Missiles and Rockets for April 22, 1963:

CENTER OF CONTROVERSY

(By William H. Coughlin)

One of the more controversial items in the projected fiscal 1964 NASA budget is the agency's request for initial funding of a planned $50-million Electronics Research Center in the Greater Boston area.

In view of Senator TED KENNEDY's campaign pledge to do more for Massachusetts, it perhaps is inevitable that the location and need for the Center are being questioned on political grounds. This is unfortunate.

The judgment by Congress should be made principally on the basis of whether or not the Center actually is needed by NASA. A thorough examination of the planned location also should be made without regard to its political advantages.

Equally unfortunate is the fact that the White House itself is bringing political pressure to bear in favor of the Center. This certainly increases suspicion of political motivations.

There is little question in our mind that the requirement for such a center should be carefully examined. As yet, NASA does not appear to have made a strong case for it.

Plans for the Center call for an initial expenditure of $5 million during fiscal year 1964. Over a 6- to 7-year period, the Center will be built up to a staff of some 2,000 and a capital investment of some $50 million. Congress has been told that annual operating expenses then will be about $28 million.

NASA's recent record in holding to such commitments has not been inspiring. The Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston was

sold to Congress 2 years ago as a $60-million center. Within months, the figure climbed to $90 million, and the space agency recently jumped this to $200 million.

The annual operating cost also is exceedingly low in comparison with other electronics centers with a comparable or lower level of effort.

The Naval Research Laboratory is a $55-million facility. Its fiscal 1963 budget is $68 million, significantly more than NASA is estimating for a $50-million installation.

The NRL operation also gives rise to another question about the proposed Boston Electronics Center. Official Navy estimates show that one-half of the NRL staff is engaged in electronics research. In fiscal year 1960, space-related research by NRL totaled some $22 million.

This is but one of many Government centers engaged in electronics research. The Air Force electronics research effort at Cambridge is on a level well over $60 million. The Army has a number of centers engaged in similar activity. Fort Monmouth, with an electronics staff of 3,500, is spending some $28 million inhouse; Fort Huachuca's Electronic Proving Ground, with a staff of nearly 10,000, some $26 million.

Overall, the latest complete figures for Government-sponsored inhouse electronics research and development total well over $246 million. That was in fiscal 1960; the effort has increased substantially since then.

At the same time, a Senate Government Operations subcommittee under Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has reported that as much as one-tenth of all Government-supported electronics research and development may consist of "unwitting, needless duplication of effort." That is, some $200 million out of an expenditure of $2 billion in 1960.

Albert J. Kelley, Director of Electronics and Control for NASA, told the House Space Committee the new center will not only direct electronics research but will do research in communications, data processing, guidance, instrumentation and control.

"It will be staffed and equipped to perform original work," he stated. He also noted that component test facilities will be provided to evaluate industrially developed experimental components.

A good argument can be made that the electronics firms in this industry already are fully capable of such basic work in electronics.

No one can quarrel with NASA's need for a capable electronics management group. As Mr. Kelley himself says, "NASA simply must have qualified people on its staff who are well informed on space missions and their related electronics systems performance requirements, able to identify the problem areas, and competent to evaluate the research results of others."

But whether the proposed Electronics Research Center is needed to develop and support this group is a question that deserves careful study.

So does location of the center in Boston.

Kelley has this to say on that subject: "The NASA considered many potential sites throughout the country for location of the Electronics Research Center. On balance, the overall university-industrial strength and capability in electronics and guidance in the greater Boston area resulted in its selection as the location for the Center. This area, noted for its past and current heavy concentration on electronics research, both in industry and universities, provides a compatible, stimulating environment for growth of NASA capabilities in this important area. * * *"

We would like to ask if these same criteria were applied in the selection of Houston as a site for the Manned Spacecraft Center. What compatible, stimulating environment brought about that selection? What industrial strength and capability did Houston offer in manned spacecraft?

If, as Mr. Kelley himself states, 70 percent of major spacecraft dollars now go into electronics, why wasn't Boston chosen as the site for the manned spacecraft center? Or conversely, if 70 percent of the dollars now being spent on manned spacecraft involve electronics, why do we need the Boston center in addition to the Houston center? Could the center, if needed, be located elsewhere—say, the Midwest—to stimulate the space industry there?

We hope Congress will carefully consider all such questions before voting the funds requested.

Improper Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, May 1963:

IMPROPER INFLUENCE

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, which precisely a year ago was up to its ears in the Billie Sol Estes scandal, is back in the news. This time the Service, an agency of the Department of Agriculture, is charged with carrying the ball for the Kennedy administration in improperly endeavoring to influence the outcome of the forthcoming nationwide wheat referendum. Representative JAMES F. BATTIN, Republican, of Montana, who made the charge in the House, called upon Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to resign.

The charge is based on a letter Representative BATTIN said he received from three members of the ASCS committee in McCone County, Mont. The letter related that the committee members had been instructed by a State ASCS official to find four local farmers who favor a yes vote to serve as promotional men between now and referendum day. It also suggested, according to Representative BATTIN, that the county committee provide poll watchers whose duty it would be to appraise the voters and get in touch with any farmers known to favor a yes vote who neglected to appear.

The committeemen said they were told that a fund of a little more than $900 was to be used to hold meetings in their area and discuss and encourage a vote favorable to the administration. They protested they are strictly prohibited by regulations from engaging in such activities.

The letter, said Representative BATTIN, refutes testimony of Mr. Freeman only a few days ago in which he assured the House Agriculture Committee that his Department was not trying to influence the voting but was merely trying to give farmers all the facts on the issue. The controversial referendum, scheduled for May 21, offers a choice between a program of high-price guarantees and strict production and marketing controls, which is favored by the administration, or one of low prices and virtually no controls.

This is not the first time the ASCS has been accused of touting Government subsidy programs among farmers or even of lobbying in Congress on behalf of the New Frontier. The agency, organized to administer farm programs, comprises a vast network of 90,000 full- and part-time Federal payrollers. It extends into every State and farming community in the land. State committees are appointed by the Secretary, but township and county committees are elected by farmers, ostensibly to provide for local control over programs.

How much local control farmers really have over programs is shown by new regulations published in the Federal Register of March 1. They provide that each county committeeman or alternate must sign a pledge of performance of duty before being permitted to take office and that he will support the programs he is called upon to administer. Thus any county committeeman who is under the illusion that his job is to represent the wishes of farmers who elected him is put on notice that his first obligation is to Washington.

Representative BATTIN's charge warrants an immediate investigation by Congress. The wheat program the administration wants farmers to approve in the referendum is one of the most restrictive plans to control private enterprise ever proposed in this country and would cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. Before the voting takes place, it would be enlightening to know if Federal employees and funds are being used to influence the outcome.

Friendship International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a resolution which was passed last week by the County Council of Baltimore County. It shows that Marylanders are determined to meet unfair competition with positive action by highlighting the many attributes of Friendship Airport.

RESOLUTION 7 OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MD.

Whereas since the construction and opening of the multimillion-dollar air terminal in Chantilly, Va., known as Dulles International Airport, the use of Friendship International Airport as a passenger terminal has been greatly affected; and

Whereas the Baltimore Association of Commerce estimates that Baltimore is losing more than $1,000 per day as a result of unfair competition from Dulles, which they believe results from the FAA acting as both airline policeman and airport landlord; and

Whereas this loss of business to Baltimore is adversely affecting not only Baltimore City, but also the surrounding metropolitan area, including Baltimore County; and

Whereas it is the feeling of the county council the leaders of industry and commerce and the private citizens should be made aware of the need for support of Friendship International Airport and be encouraged to give and promote such support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the County Council of Baltimore County, Md., this 1st day of May 1963, That industry, commerce, and private citizens be urged to use and support Friendship International Airport exclusively and to foster and promote its exclusive use and support throughout the Baltimore metropolitan area; and be it further

Resolved, That the citizens urge their elected representatives to the Senate and

Congress of the United States to promote and support an increase of airline service to and from Friendship International Airport; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the two U.S. Senators and eight Representatives to the Congress from the State of Maryland.

Jim McDevitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from the president of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International Union, Edward J. Leonard in which he enclosed a copy of the April issue of the official journal of that organization dedicated to the late James L. McDevitt. It was my privilege to know Jim McDevitt and to have some knowledge of his life and background. At the time of his death in March of this year, I joined with the many thousands of his friends in mourning his loss, the impact of which is only now beginning to be felt.

In the thought, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues here in the House of Representatives may be interested in reading something about Jim McDevitt written by those who knew him best, I am including the article in the extension of my remarks. As General President Edward J. Leonard so aptly put it:

There may be other public figures who would want to know more about the life of this fine, unassuming man who worked consistently and effectively to make the voice of the workingman heard in this country.

JAMES L. MCDEVITT

Hard knocks come when you least expect them.

The death of my close friend of many years standing, Jim McDevitt, came as the hardest knock I have had in many a year. Many other people that I know have experienced the same sense of loss at the unexpected passing of this stout son of Pennsylvania, who always gave his best to this union and to the labor movement as a whole.

All of us in Pennsylvania in the early days recognized that Jim McDevitt had unusual capacities. Moving from the State level, as the head of the largest State federation in the country, to the national level as director of the committee on political education, was a move that Jim McDevitt took in stride. He wore a big pair of shoes.

The general executive board has recounted some of the highlights of Jim McDevitt's fine career in the labor movement. Reading that story, you will see that a lot of distinguished people, both in and out of Pennsylvania, had many fine things to say about Jim McDevitt. As one who knew and worked with Jim for over 35 years (he was business agent of local 8, Philadelphia when I was business agent of local 31, Pittsburgh), I am here to testify that all the fine things said by these distinguished citizens—including Senators and Governors—are true. While he moved, at the end of his career, in the highest political circles, Jim never lost the common touch and he was as quick to shake the hand of the man with the trowel as he was the hand of the President of the United States. He moved comfortably in all circles, which was yet another indication of his stature as a man.

I have lost my close friend, who was a man of the highest principles. With a heavy heart, what more can I say?

Sincerely and fraternally,

EDWARD J. LEONARD,
Editor and General President.

PASSING OF JAMES L. MCDEVITT LEAVES VOID IN RANKS OF LABOR

James L. McDevitt, vice president and executive board member of the Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association, who died March 19 in Oklahoma City following a cerebral hemorrhage, was an outstanding labor leader at the local, State, and National levels.

As the director of the Committee on Political Education, Jim's particular union affiliation perhaps was not important to the large and varied groups of people he met all over the country, but his Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association membership always remained important to Jim. And Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association members everywhere were glad and proud that he was a member of their union.

Jim had gone to Oklahoma City to preside over one of a series of COPE regional conferences. He suffered a stroke on the morning of March 19 and another late that afternoon. He died the following morning.

Jim McDevitt was born in Philadelphia on November 3, 1898, the son and grandson of plasterers. His grandfather, Charles McDevitt, came to this country from Ireland in 1849, at the age of 12 and settled in south Philadelphia. He was apprenticed out as a plasterer and in 1873 helped to found the Operative Plasterers' Mutual Protective Association. Charles had two sons, John and William, and both became plasterers and trade unionists. Jim was one of the five children of William McDevitt.

In 1923, when Jim became a candidate for recording secretary of local No. 8, it was said jokingly that his family vote was enough to elect him. He had been apprenticed in 1916, but his apprenticeship was interrupted by World War I. He enlisted in the Army in 1918, saw service in France and was honorably discharged in July 1919. He resumed his apprenticeship and became a journeyman plasterer in July 1920.

After being elected recording secretary of local No. 8, he went on to become president and business representative. It was during these days that he first met up with President Leonard, then business agent of local No. 31, Pittsburgh, and Secretary-Treasurer John J. Hauck, then business agent of local No. 592, Philadelphia. In 1928, he was elected president of the Philadelphia Building Trades Council.

In 1938, when AFL leaders in Pennsylvania needed someone to hold together a State federation badly split, they turned to McDevitt, who was then only 40 years old.

McDevitt's first years as State federation president were stormy, and the federation was so impoverished by the split in labor that McDevitt continued on the unemployment compensation board of review so that he could forego his salary as federation president.

In 1940, during the third-term campaign of President Roosevelt, McDevitt's voice was one of the most powerful and persuasive raised in support of Roosevelt in Pennsylvania.

In 1947, the Pennsylvania State Federation established a permanent committee on political action. Its purpose was to put the federation's political activities on an effective and continuing basis. The first test came in the 1948 elections. The committee set out to reach the federation's 700,000 membership. It sponsored mass meetings, bought time on radio stations and space in newspapers and published quantities of its own literature to get its message across. McDevitt predicted that the liberal-labor vote in Pennsylvania would defeat 10 Congressmen who had voted for Taft-Hartley. Experienced reporters covering the campaign thought he was talking through his hat, but the returns showed that 11, not 10, Taft-Hartley Congressmen were defeated in Pennsylvania.

McDevitt once said that he grew up "more or less a Democrat because in Republican Philadelphia it was the only thing a sincere trade unionist could be." Nevertheless, he could commend Republicans who had been fair to labor and criticized Democrats when they menaced labor's interests. He once commended Republican Governor Edward Martin for a "glorious triumph" and he once told President Truman he was emulating the dictators when he asked for a draft labor law.

Expressing, once, the political philosophy of COPE, he said, "We believe that the well-being, the security, the freedom from economic fear, and the dignity of each person should be the first concern of each legislator whether it be in the State capitals or Washington."

In his years in Pennsylvania, McDevitt served on many State agencies under appointment by the Governor. In 1948, he and President Edward J. Leonard (then vice president) were designated by the U.S. Secretary of Labor as representatives of all labor in the United States at the World Safety Conference of the International Labor Organization, held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Jim McDevitt's activities in the fight against intolerance are reflected in the positions he had held on such groups as the Executive Committee of the State Council for Fair Employment Practices, the American Council for Christians and Jews, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Trade Council for Palestine.

McDevitt was named a vice president of the Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association in 1954 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of James M. Myles, who also had been a prominent citizen of Pennsylvania. In 1959, President Leonard appointed McDevitt to the General Executive Board. Jim rendered many services to the International Association, not the least of which were given in his capacity as Chairman of the Constitution Committee at International conventions. He took this post following the death of Vice President John Brennan, and his ready grasp of issues and command of parliamentary procedures made him a tower of strength during conventions.

Over the years, a lot of eminent people went out of their way to say nice things about Jim McDevitt. Here are some quotes:

"Jim McDevitt has proven himself a labor-statesman who seeks to advance both the interests of organized labor and the community in which they work."—WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator from Oregon.

"I have known Jim McDevitt ever since the days when I was serving in the State senate, and I have long been indebted to him for his ready ear, his sound counsel, his devotion to humanitarian ideals, and his eloquent presentation of labor's point of view."—George M. Leader, former Governor of Pennsylvania.

"Jim McDevitt is a man of character, integrity, knowledge, and ability. For many years it has been my great privilege to be intimately acquainted with him and like others who have come within range of his influence, I have admiration and affection for him."—James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former Chairman, National Democratic Committee.

"Even more impressive than his fierce dedication to the cause of labor, has been his unselfish devotion to the struggle for human rights and civic betterment."—Richardson Dilworth, mayor, city of Philadelphia.

"Since I am a card-carrying member of the B.M.P.I.U., we have much in common. I have watched Jim McDevitt grow from a mechanic of the trowel trade to the high position he now enjoys. This has been accomplished only by his dedication to the labor movement and his fair dealing with industry over the years."—John B. Kelly, prominent Philadelphia builder.

"It has been my good fortune to know some of the top men of the world * * * Jim McDevitt ranks with the best of them."—George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania and U.S. Ambassador.

"He has always been constructive. He is held in esteem and respect by all who have been brivileged to work with him."—Dr. George W. Taylor, former chairman, National War Labor Board, and well-known arbitrator.

"Jim McDevitt has stood for the ideals of good government, justice, and rights of the average American citizen."—Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania.

A solemn mass was held March 22 at St. Bartholomew's Church, Bethesda, Md., the Washington suburb in which the McDevitts resided. That same evening, a wake was held at the Oliver Bair Funeral Home, at 18th and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia. Burial took place the following morning, March 23, at Holy Sepulchre Cemetery, Cheltenham Township, Philadelphia. The survivors include his wife, Margaret Mary, and three children, Margaret Byrne, James L. McDevitt, Jr., and Lt. William P. McDevitt, USAF.

Meany's tribute: "No one served the trade union cause with deeper sincerity and greater diligence than Jim McDevitt. His contributions over the years, in every sense of the economic and social life of workers, can hardly be measured. Most recently, his leadership of COPE was instrumental in developing the political voice of American wage earners into a potent instrument, more nearly in keeping with their numbers.

"He will long be missed as a leader and a friend, and his place will be hard to fill."

Polish National Holiday

SPEECH

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is again my pleasure to join with many of my colleagues in paying tribute to the great Polish Constitution, which is a bare 2 years younger than our own U.S. Constitution. It is fitting that we in Congress recognize in this way the great Polish nation, its thousand-year history of struggle for independence, and the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry who have contributed so much to America.

This year also is the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 against oppressive Russian rule. It was a war which cost the Poles dearly—250,000 lost in more than a thousand battles. It was fought under the banner of freedom.

Look at a map and see where this country is located. Look in a history book and read of the sturdy tide of independence which has flowed from the Polish people. Look at the Polish Constitution of 1791 and learn of the charter of political and civil liberties proclaimed.

Then you will know why America is proud of the Polish who have come to her shores, and proud to join in the celebration of free Poland's great holiday of May 3.

Please, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, some of the frustration which Americans are feeling over the inaction of the past 2 years of this administration, especially as contrasted with the previous administration, is summed up very effectively in an editorial from the Westport Town Crier. I offer it for the RECORD as an excellent indication of what the people of the Fourth District of Connecticut are thinking.

The editorial follows:

PLEASE, MR. PRESIDENT

Please, Mr. Kennedy; the President one, we mean.

We've been patient about lot of things since you were elected. We've been trying hard to give you the benefit of the doubt, with the hope that you would, sooner or later, catch on to the job and get America moving again.

We've overlooked the fact that the missile gap you made so much of during the campaign never materialized; we figured that you were misinformed. We waited for 2 years for that housing desegregation that you clobbered Mr. Eisenhower so hard about.

We have taken no particular pleasure in the fact that the Democratic Congress has seemed so unwilling to follow your lead—even after all those things you said about Ike and his inability to get legislation out of Congress (which, incidentally, was not controlled by his party at all). We've been pretty quiet about the lack of an aid-to-education bill and the inactivity in a variety of other fronts upon which you based your campaign. We haven't even mentioned the fact that America's growth rate, about which you made so much, seems to be hobbling along at about the same old pace, even with all those Kennedys in Washington.

And, then, there are those foreign affairs. The Eisenhower administration was, perhaps, a little on the unimaginative side. At least, you said so. But, back in those days, at least our allies were our friends. Now it seems to us that everybody is getting angry with us. In any event, things haven't seemed to improve any. And, if you include Cuba, they've gotten considerably worse.

But, as we said, Mr. President, we figure a young man should have a chance. So we've been conducting these columns with reasonable decorum.

But, now, you and your minions have gone too far. Postmaster General Day, in a huff because of a threatened 2 percent cut in his $5 billion budget, has arbitrarily decided to reduce postal service. He's told new buildings in New York that they won't get any service at all unless they're 90 percent occupied, and he's told all of us that there wouldn't be any more deliveries on Saturday and Sunday—no matter what.

In other words, Postmaster Day is trying to put the screws on Congress and the people of the United States. If he doesn't get every penny he wants, he's going to blackmail us. It's just as if the local school board, faced with a similar cut, arbitrarily decided they wouldn't teach English any more.

Can anybody really believe that Mr. Day's budget is so precise that a 2-percent cut will throw it into a complete collapse? We can't. So please, Mr. Kennedy, speak to Mr. Day. Don't louse up our mail delivery, in addition to all those other things.

Information for Those Who Got Lobbied by the Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, just in case some of those who were lobbied by the so-called Women Strike for Peace group detected some professionalism about it all, a copy of their marching orders is reproduced below. This particular copy was mailed in an envelope bearing a Washington, D.C., return address. You will note the instructions call for "loud public clamor for a test ban." Notes on the interview with you were ordered taken. When not otherwise engaged, the ladies were told to "swarm" through the offices of certain Congressmen and Senators designated as "war minded." The interview with you was predicted to be "easy and fun and entirely revealing." It was calculated that "often as not" you would not be "learned" on the subject of disarmament and the ladies would "seem experts" by comparison. The women were told that "especially in the Senate" that someone in the office, rather than the Senator, often "has complete say" on disarmament questions. It appears whoever gave the ladies their marching orders thinks pretty poorly of the Members of Congress. Maybe even of the ladies themselves, since such explicit instructions were given. At least, they are proud of their lobbying abilities as the instructions claim credit for getting a larger vote against appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee than was "anticipated."

Here is the complete text referred to:

MOTHER'S LOBBY ON MAY 7 IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Our Mother's Lobby can affect the Geneva negotiations. Does this sound far fetched? Think of it this way. Only a few weeks ago world hopes for a test ban treaty were high. Then the Pentagon leveled its guns. The attack on the Geneva negotiations was unleashed, led by Rockefeller, Teller, Hosmer, Goldwater, and Dodd.

The administration countered with speeches by Foster, Fisher, Humphrey, and Rusk, but, lacking strong support throughout the United States, our delegation has taken a hardened position at Geneva. Furthermore, despite the U.N. General Assembly resolution for a January 1 cutoff date,

our Government has conducted 5 underground tests so far this year.

Khrushchev's reaction: a hardened Soviet position in Geneva.

Where do you come in?

Loud public clamor for a test ban is the only hope now. If we bolster the administration's efforts we can temper the climate for negotiations in Washington. This in turn may help break the deadlock in Geneva.

This makes the May 7 mothers' lobby in Washington of the utmost importance.

The lobby committee in Washington has organized the following overall plan for May 7 (still subject to revision):

Chartered Pennsylvania Railroad train will leave New York City at 8 a.m. bringing women from the eastern seaboard. All other women from other parts of the United States and from Washington will gather at Union Station to meet the incoming train at 12:30. We will rally and display signs from 50 States to indicate our actual or proxy representation. The press and TV coverage will concentrate on this rally.

Room 457 in the Old Senate Office Building is being reserved for us to gather in between 1 and 3:30 and compare notes or wait for appointments. Then, WSP has also reserved room 203 in the Carroll Arms Hotel at First and C Streets NE., for the day. There you'll find literature and hospitality. In Congress there are guards on all floors and room directories next to the elevators to direct you.

To make the day's schedule run as smoothly as possible, the following program is suggested:

Agency appointments: By prearrangement. Someone from Washington WSP will gather as many women as necessary and send them off to the ACDA, and so forth, by taxi to these appointments immediately.

Senate and House: Lobbying will follow a very simple scheme and will use our potential to the fullest. Guides at the station will give out specific assignments and the lobby literature at the same time and answer questions.

In small groups of three or four you will see one or two designated Congressmen. Naturally, we will concentrate our effort on the Senate and the agency appointments. One woman will take notes, a second report back on the interview when she gets home, a third can begin the interview: "Is the Congressman in? May we see him? If not, may we speak to his legislative assistant?

If you have had personal confirmation of an appointment you requested before May 7, take on your assignment first, then go to your appointment, unless timing prohibits this procedure.

Be sure to send confirmation of appointments with your Congressman to Folly Fodor, 4515 Drummond Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md. As you know, constituents are far more eagerly received and listened to. Bring any citizens campaign for a test ban signatures or statements and all appropriate press clipping with you. Let us know the number of people planning to make the trip if you can beforehand.

In between appointments we feel we can express our disapproval of the tactics of the warminded Congressmen by swarming into the offices of Senators DODD and KEATING, and Representatives HOSMER and HOLIFIELD (all four have many WSP's in their States).

With a simple instruction sheet, you will carry "A Nuclear Test Ban. What Are the Risks," and one or two other strong statements to lean on. From then on it's easy and fun and entirely revealing. Often as not these men are not learned on the subject of disarmament and you will seem experts. Otherwise they will lead the discussion and may have some good ideas. We have found that seeing the man in person is good, but seeing the office staff is frequently equally effective. Especially in the Senate, you may be talking to the one person in the office who has complete say on disarmament questions and can convince the Senator best.

We suggest this as a possible approach to a Senator: "Senators do influence the American people. President Kennedy is waiting for the people to give him encouragement. He's for a test ban, but has opposition. Sitting on his hands. Russians are indecisive now. Geneva talks are about to reopen any day. You can be more influential than ever. You can help make up the minds of constituents in this period of paralysis. The United States must assume the lead. We can take the initiative. Lean heavily on moral issues—we have no right to test: leukemia, birth defects, unborn generation defects."

Before May 7 it will be helpful to read some of the following: "Test Ban, What Are the Risks?" (Washington WSP pamphlet); William C. Foster (ACDA) testimony at Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hearings; Adrian Fisher (ACDA) communication from Washington Post, March 4, 1963; Judge Henry Edgerton communication from same paper, March 25, 1963; Senator JAVITS' press release for TV program March 10; U Thant's "The Human Situation, 1963" from Saturday Review, March 23; President Kennedy's press conference statement on test ban, March 21; and James T. Wadsworth's letter to New York Times, March 26.

As background, our experience with lobbying has shown us that Democrats may be expected to follow Kennedy's lead. Some say they leave matters of test ban entirely up to the President and State Department. Be sure to remind Republicans that their party must not seem the war party. We have visited about 210 offices of Representatives and seen 56 in person. Twenty-six Senate offices, nine of them in person, have been visited. All received our press pamphlet from the HUAC hearings and the pamphlet "Test Ban, What Are the Risks?" most have also received Senator HUMPHREY's report on the Economics of Disarmament. (Entire House and Senate). We are known everywhere and the receptions are usually polite and often very cordial. Our lobby efforts are said by those who know to have influenced the vote against appropriations for the HUAC. A considerably smaller opposition vote was anticipated.

Meeting: From 3:30 to 4:30 we will meet at the Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street. Dagmar Wilson will speak and we hope to have a top Government official also. There will be brief reports from some of you on your interviews. The return train will leave at 5 p.m.

All of the places you will be going to on May 7 are within walking distance of each other.

Men, Money, Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post, April 30, 1963:

MEN, MONEY, MISSILES

Congress displays a curious double standard in dealing with military spending. When it comes to missiles, bombers, and assorted hardware, Congress whoops through the requested money—and sometimes implores the administration to spend even more. But when it comes to men, Congress tends to stinginess and glowers darkly at money spent on mere people. The military pay raise legislation before Congress is a case in point.

The bill reported out by the House Armed Services Committee contains only the very minimum increases that fairness and commonsense require. Every possible corner has been whittled away from the bill approved in subcommittee. The bill would deny any increases whatever to 812,609 men during their initial 2 years in uniform. It would drop altogether a proposed $55 a month special stipend for men in combat. It perpetuates an old iniquity in not allowing already retired officers the full benefits accruing to those who left the service after 1958.

Other proposed increases are also voided—and to crown it all, the effective date for the raises would be delayed until next fall. All this was seemingly done in order to conciliate the Republican Policy Committee and other professional economizers. Doubtless the motive is good, but wouldn't it be refreshing if Congress for once tried to reward men as well as machines with additional funds? The armed services can be no better than the people who staff them. Every incentive ought to be offered to keep the ablest in the service and to attract better recruits.

In both House and Senate, a fight for the more generous subcommittee bill would command broad support. As it stands, the House legislation that Chairman VINSON of Armed Services describes as a "career incentive bill" provides excellent incentives for leaving the service.

Ring Around the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the language of Washington used to be called gobbledygook. The New Frontier, with its emphasis on proliferation and bottlenecks, has made innovations in the language. The Wall Street Journal in its May 1 issue describes the New Frontier semanticism as follows:

RING AROUND THE ANSWER

(By Joe Western)

WASHINGTON.—Most Federal bureaucrats try to be helpful. They really do. It's just that they haven't always been told what to say to reporters. So, even under normal circumstances, the typical public official develops a special skill at talking rings around an answer.

But at no time is this art displayed with more brilliance than when the routine of Government life is upset by a shuffling of personnel and realinement of units, such as has just occurred at the Agriculture Department, and the word from on high has not managed its way along the new organization charts.

Sit in on a recent interview with a relocated bureaucrat whose decisions on the disposal of farm surpluses can have an important influence on the commodity markets. Based on actual notes, the conversation ran something like this:

Question. Just what new goals do you think your division ought to work toward under the new setup?

Answer. It's far too early to tell the eventual size and scope of the Government's role in this field. We are, naturally, operating within the guidelines set down by the Congress when the public need for Federal action first became apparent.

Question. You mean you have no new plans; that you will continue as in the past?

Answer. Not exactly. You see, we are keeping the whole operation under continuous review with the aim of making desirable changes that will more efficiently utilize the management skills we have built up within the agency over the years.

Question. What would you say is the problem needing greatest attention currently?

Answer. You must realize that we cannot and have not neglected any phase of planning which in the national interest must embrace the whole spectrum of problem-solving methods to carry out our mission.

Question. If it's a bit too early to focus on policy changes, how about a few basic facts? For a starter, how many employees are now assigned to work on your agency?

Answer. We are in the midst of a complete restudy of our manpower needs, which in terms of man-years are not yet clear. We would hope that our studies will, within a very few weeks, give us some hard answers on this.

Question. I understand you have a staggering backlog of casework. How many people do you have available now to operate your programs?

Answer. Yes, we do have a big caseload. But through our staff planning research and policy review procedures we feel we will be able to prevent bottlenecks from developing.

Question. Well, then, how many employees should you have?

Answer. Most of our people are stationed far from Washington in county offices in the field; and of course States contribute, according to various formulas provided by law and regulations in helping maintain adequate supervision of ongoing projects.

Question. The budget estimates sent to Congress by the President for this agency show you, or somebody, intended to add 175 employees in the coming fiscal year. What comparable employment figures would these be in addition to? And what will these extra people be doing primarily?

Answer. We are in the process of setting up a task force to determine this very important matter. We would hope that in 2 or 3 months, if no hitches develop, that a survey of all available data can be completed so that some preliminary decisions can be made on just how to start planning to utilize these additional staff positions.

Question. After the task force makes its report, what is the next step? Do you think new legislation might be needed to help you do the work?

Answer. We would expect—not for quote, please—that an interagency committee would review the findings, working in close cooperation with this office and coordinating its study with those going forward in related agencies throughout the Federal Government. Hopefully, this committee would then prepare a preliminary set of recommendations affecting our future actions.

Question. This would be aimed at recruiting the experts you want?

Answer. If budgetary considerations do not present now unforeseen obstacles, the preliminary recommendations will be reviewed and hardened into action policies. They would be aggressively put into effect once the appropriate Executive orders from the White House were issued and detailed regulations implementing them are written, published, and circulated among our people and interested members of the public.

Question. If all this happens, how many people do you think you'll end up with in the agency?

Answer. It's far too early to tell just what.

The Impact of a Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an address made by one of my constituents which has a distinct bearing on a problem occupying the efforts of many of us in the Congress today, the problem of water. The gentleman who made the remarks, Mr. Victor H. Baunig, an engineer by profession, has a long and distinguished record of public service covering half a century. He is the manager of the San Antonio River Authority and is making great strides in flood control work, water and soil conservation and navigation in the 20th Congressional District.

The following is a transcript of the address made by Mr. Braunig before the Conopus Club in San Antonio:

A BARGE CANAL FOR SAN ANTONIO

On May 10 there will be a public hearing in San Antonio conducted by the U.S. Engineers. The object of this hearing is to determine whether San Antonio people are interested in developing a barge canal for this city; and if there is economic and engineering data available to support an intensive study at the expense of the United States.

It is very important for the success of this project that the businessmen of this city show interest at this hearing so that the U.S. Engineers who will conduct this Hearing will have something to present to their superiors in Washington, and later to the Bureau of the Budget, to support their request for enough funds to make a complete economic and engineering study. It is estimated that this will take at least 2 years or more to complete.

Years ago when the late W. B. Tuttle first organized the present San Antonio River Authority it was known as the S.A. Canal and Conservancy District and its sole function was to promote a deep water barge canal from San Antonio to the coast. I will be frank to admit that at that time I was among those who thought this was a pipedream. And, when it was abandoned at that time, it was reported that it was because there was insufficient water available to support a canal. It was suggested that when, and if, San Antonio should reach a population of 1 million people there would be water available from the return water, which finds its way into the river from treated sewage and at that time a barge canal would become a feasible enterprise.

Today, it is estimated that from 50 percent to 60 percent of the water used in a metropolitan area is returned in the form of treated sewage.

This is becoming an increasingly important factor in the lives of Americans. At the present time it is practical, and not uneconomical, to treat sewage up to 90 percent purity. It is also possible, and it is actually being done, to produce drinking water for human consumption from 100 percent sewage. However, this is still quite expensive. The art of purifying used water has now received a degree of success whereby entire communities are being served with treated sea water. This art, of treating bad water, is being researched intensively in our present era because across the Nation every State, every city is much more water conscious than ever before.

Americans have been made aware that we must conserve and develop every drop of fresh rainwater in the future, or there will not be enough water to go around. This applies not only to San Antonio, not only to Texas but to the entire United States. Also, we must assure a halt to the pollution of our streams or we will destroy our future growth.

Why are these facts important to the economic feasibility of the barge canal?

Most of you already know that San Antonio has a water problem and you also know that the water problem is the reason I am now working as manager of the San Antonio River Authority. My 3 years with the U.S. Study Commission have made me conscious of the fact that you can't solve a problem as big as the water problem by going at it in small doses.

The matter of water supply, flood control, navigation, pollution control, recreation, fish and wildlife, and soil conservation all tie together into one "ball of wax." None of these separate phases of the overall water problems can be solved alone, without affecting the overall picture.

Now going back to the question of navigation: Where will the water come from? Do we have to wait until we reach a population of 1 million people or, and this is very pertinent at this moment, will we ever reach a population of 1 million people, unless we secure an auxiliary source of water to augment our underground source of supply?

At the present time, as you know, the San Antonio River Authority is trying to reach an agreement with the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority for water. This agreement has not yet been signed by either of the two managers, nor has it been submitted as yet to the board of directors of the two authorities.

However, when such an agreement is prepared and approved by both authorities this would only be the beginning of the attempt to solve our water problem. The city, who owns the city water board, would have to be in agreement. The Texas Water Commission would have to approve the agreement, and finally it would go to Congress for approval and financing because the program would be too big to be financed by ordinary means of city-type financing.

There are presently 15 or more agencies selling water in Bexar County. All of these are using the Edwards Underground as a source of supply. Some means will have to be found to distribute the cost of surface water among all these agencies and the irrigators. Because surface water will cost more than the underground water now used and the city water board only uses somewhere around 50 percent in round numbers, of the total Edwards Underground water used in this country, and because 1 agency alone cannot pay for surface water and allow 14 others to get a free ride.

I point this out to give you some idea of the complexities which need to be ironed out, to formulate a program acceptable to all parties concerned.

I want at this time to give you an idea of the kind of agreement we are trying to make, even though such an agreement is not yet finalized:

1. We are trying to get an agreement with GBRA to allow us to be a partner in the development of the two damsites at Cuero. These two sites will produce over 360,000 acre-feet of annual yield.

It is being suggested that we would pay one-half the cost of that portion of the dams allocated to conservation water. (One-half the total will be allocated to Federal interests, and one-half to be paid for by local interests.) This means that SARA would be obligated for one-fourth of the cost of the dams. We would then get one-half of the water that would be generated at this point and what is most important, we would own this water in perpetuity. When the Federal loan was paid, after 50 years, we would still own the water and would only have to pay the cost of hauling the water. This is part 1 of the proposed program. In my opinion, this Cuero opportunity is the last chance San Antonio ever will have to own a water supply in quantities needed, up to 180,000 acre-feet yield per year, with the price fixed as of now.

Part 2 would be a similar agreement between the two authorities on the Goliad Dam site. We would agree that GBRA would be an equal partner with SARA in the development of this dam. We would pay one-half the cost of conservation water and each would own one-half such waters in perpetuity.

Now, it so happens that the yield of the two dams in Cuero location and the yield of the Goliad Dam are approximately equal (this is only true if the agreement becomes a fact). A third part of this agreement is a pipeline from Cuero to San Antonio large enough to haul at least 180,000 acre-feet of water per year. The financing of this pipeline will be up to San Antonio and could be a part of the overall Federal financing.

A fourth part of this agreement will provide the sale of any surplus that either authority might have in future to the other party at a price based on a formula agreed to at this time.

There are other parts to this agreement which safeguard the yield of other undeveloped damsites in obth basins, also guarding the future quality of water. In other words this agreement will be a master plan for both river basins.

Now, back to the barge canal.

We have told the U.S. Engineers:

(1) They should assume that the water problem will be solved (without a solution of the water problem there can be no canal);

(2) We are going to attempt at the hearing to produce sufficient data to show economic justifications.

Why is a barge canal important to this area?

You who have lived here for any length of time have heard the story many times and have seen it put into effect that heavy industry will not come to San Antonio on account of the freight advantages enjoyed by seaport cities.

The barge canal would remove this barrier.

But there are other factors. Take Houston for example. Why did Houston outgrow Galveston? In Galveston they have had deep water all the time. But Galveston has storms, and Houston has 50 miles of canal, every foot of this on both sides is ideal industrial development land.

If San Antonio can get the barge canal authorized, and built, San Antonio will create a new potential industrial area of 100 miles of which both sides will be available for development.

There are many people who deplore Government spending, who are opposed to Federal intervention, calling it a feeding at the trough of public funds, paid for by your taxes and my taxes.

But before you condemn Government spending remember this:

Experience has shown, that for every dollar the United States puts up for projects of this kind, they get back their money, 8 to 1, in the added taxes produced on the new industries developed.

Fifty years in the life of one human being is a long time—but 50 years in the life of a city, of a state, or of a nation is only a fleeting moment. San Antonio would be creating new industries not only in Bexar County, but in Wilson, Karnes and Goliad Counties, all in the San Antonio trade area, with the solution of the water supply problem.

Also, keep these benefits in mind: a solution to the flood control problem with an approved canal to the coast; the better treatment of reused water; the complete elimination of any water problem surrounding the proposed Hemis Fair in 1968 when millions of people flock to San Antonio. Plus all the economic and agricultural developments that will become a certainty under these developments.

There will be no limit to the future growth and greatness of our beloved San Antonio, with your help, your participation.

Is it any wonder that I have now changed my mind? That I no longer think a barge canal is a pipedream?

I agree wholeheartedly with Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ that now is the time to get the job done, and I also sincerely believe that if San Antonians want this canal and the dynamic future it holds out, they can get it because they have, at this time, the very Congressman who can put this project over.

There is only one thing he needs and that is the help of the entire community; give him this and he cannot fail.

In Commemoration of Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express a few words on the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. This, Mr. Speaker, was a remarkable document, structured very much like our own great Constitution, in which the basic and inalienable rights of every citizen of the State were guaranteed and set forth for all to see.

Why are we noting today this Polish Constitution; because it has survived the test of time, and stands today as tried and true as when first promulgated? No. Unfortunately this is not the case. Were we referring to our own Constitution this would be true, but the people of Poland were living in a country surrounded by powerful neighbors such as Russia and Prussia whose illiberal and oppressive governments gave them no chance to enjoy the freedoms guaranteed in this covenant of enlightened government. These neighboring nations could not allow an island of hope to remain as a beacon of personal liberty to their own oppressed peoples. Thus the Polish Constitution of 1791 died in 1792, put down by force of arms from Russia with the Prussians as allies, and with the aid of reactionary forces from within Poland herself.

Yet we salute the spirit of those farsighted pioneers who grasped at the current of 18th century liberalism pulsating through the Western World, as seen in the American and French revolutions, and who tried to adopt this spirit as their own. That they failed against superior force of arms is no disgrace. All too often the brave and true fail against the forces of evil in this world. Failure did not lessen the indomitable spirit of these peoples to be masters of their own fate, and, through the years since 1791, this voice of liberty has not been killed by continued pressure and control from foreign powers. May it never be stilled and may we salute those people whose dreams and aspirations are so much in keeping with our own in their continued efforts to keep freedom as their own heritage.

Is Moon Trip Needed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the national interest continually focused on our $20 billion Apollo manned moon expedition I feel each of my colleagues should review the following comments entitled "Is Moon Trip Needed?" written by Mr. Frank Macomber who is one of the most knowledgeable military-aerospace writers of our time. Mr. Macomber serves with the Copley News Service and for 14 years worked here in the Capital in the midst of our Nation's military-aerospace buildup.

IS MOON TRIP NEEDED?

(By Frank Macomber)

Is America's Apollo manned moon expedition a $20-billion boondoggle? Is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration fumbling the ball in its direction of the most ambitious and costly program since the space age arrived 5½ years ago?

Talk to enough scientists and space experts and you will get "yes" and "no" answers to both questions. And the so-called great debate over the merits or demerits of Project Apollo is echoing through space laboratories, scientific forums and the corridors of Congress.

There are some overtones in the White House, too.

President Kennedy has reaffirmed his position that the Nation must send Americans to the moon. He has promised there will be a continuing review of the Apollo program and that so far nothing has caused him to change his mind "about the desirability" of the program.

"I think," said the President at a news conference, "that time will prove, even though we can't see all the answers which we will find in space, that the overall expenditures have been worthwhile."

CALLED RAT RACE

Here is a look at some of the pros and cons of what one scientist wryly called a United States-Russian rat race to the moon to see if it really is made of green cheese:

Voluble Dr. Harold Urey, Nobel Prize-winning chemist and professor-at-large at

the University of California, San Diego, says this about NASA:

"I think NASA should be more understanding * * * and not try to go about things in such a high-handed, blunderbuss fashion."

He says NASA needs more top scientists, men like Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, who heads the Atomic Energy Commission, or Dr. Willard F. Libby, a top scientist—in its upper echelons.

NASA is not even making the best use of the scientists it has, nor is it consulting sufficiently with those outside the agency, he says.

VICARIOUS ADVENTURE

As for the Apollo program, Urey observes that "it is really being paid for because people wish to be excited. Vicarious adventure is the real reason. That is paying the bill."

Dr. Warren Weaver insists that scientific considerations fail to justify the magnitude of U.S. space programs. He is vice president of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and a member of the National Science Board and the National Academy of Sciences.

"Even more emphatically," says Weaver, "I don't believe the scientific considerations justify the frantic, costly and disastrous pace of our space programs.

"It is, of course, intellectually important that we gain more knowledge about the universe. But the fact is that a very large fraction of the scientific data which we need to collect in space and bring back to the earth can be collected by purely electrical and mechanical packages of equipment and can, through the marvels of modern telemetry and radio, be returned to listening and recording devices on earth. * * * The cost of this kind of experimentation * * * is small, indeed, compared with the costs of attempting to put men on the moon."

WILL IT PAY

William H. Meckling, director of the economics division of the Operations Evaluation Group, Center for Naval Analyses, Franklin Institute, disputes claims that the technological developments growing out of big space programs will more than pay for them.

Administration officials charge scientist critics have missed the chief point of the program to land men on the moon by 1970.

Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Chief of NASA, says the purpose of Apollo is to "advance the power of the United States in a new field of technology" and achieve "mastery and preeminence in space." It is not primarily a scientific project and never was intended to be, Dryden emphasizes.

Dryden says Apollo is not a program to find out whether the moon is "made of green cheese."

Rather, he emphasizes, it is an effort to develop the ability to do whatever space jobs, civilian or military, need to be done.

City With a Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the April issue of the Eagle magazine, with the permission of the publisher.

There is only one Kingsport, and Kingsport, Tenn., is a city with a plan. Margaret—Mrs. Earl W.—Dysart has written a beautiful story on Kingsport and I thought it so interesting that I wanted to make it available to others.

Kingsport is my hometown, and I am mighty proud of its beauty, its industry, and its people.

Margaret Dysart is to be congratulated on presenting such an interesting picture of the model city:

CITY WITH A PLAN

(By Margaret Dysart)

More than 3 years ago we were seeking to relocate in the South. After considering many sites, we found nestled in the picturesque setting of the east Tennessee hills, abounding with lakes and forests, bordering onto the Virginia State line, the thriving model city of Kingsport.

Historically, the area is well known for having been the home of Andrew Jackson and his wife, Rachel. Andrew Johnson and James Polk were frequent visitors here. Earlier Daniel Boone had passed this way. Sullivan County in which Kingsport is located has the unique distinction of having belonged to Virginia, North Carolina, and the illegal state of Franklin at various times. It joined the State of Tennessee in 1789, and was the only county in east Tennessee that fought with the Confederacy.

Unlike "Topsy," Kingsport didn't just grow. It represents the brain child of the late John B. Dennis and the late J. Fred Johnson. Over 45 years ago these dedicated men engaged the noted city planner, Dr. John Nolen, of Cambridge, Mass. to formulate plans and map a blueprint on which hinged the future growth and progress of Kingsport. So the term "model" is aptly applied.

Acting upon the professional advice, the founding fathers executed the plans to the letter. This accounts for the wide expanse of streets in the business and residential areas. It is also responsible for the earmarking of appropriate sites for religious, educational, hospital, park and playground facilities to meet the need of all races and creeds. Since this was to be an industrial town, vast acreage was set aside for industrial development.

Thus was created the brain child of two high caliber pioneers who sought to instill in the people a love of the town and it has paid dividends. There is unexcelled, cooperative enthusiasm which prevails throughout the entire area. This spirit is reflected in the great success of all community drives. Quotas are exceeded each year. On the basis of this foundation, Kingsport soon became nationally known. It has been featured in the Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest, and in films made by the U.S. Department of State for overseas. Kingport has an annual payroll of $130 million with the industrial portion amounting to $90 million. Local industry gives year-round employment to 17,000, including many members of Aerie 3141. It was the first city in Tennessee to have the council-management form of government.

The welcome mat was put out for industry. Among the first to locate here was the Eastman Co. in 1920. A division of Eastman Kodak, of Rochester, N.Y., the company began with the purchase of 35 acres and buildings belonging to the U.S. Government.

Today, Eastman is the largest industry in Tennessee. There are 9,500 employees with an annual payroll of over $70 million and they manufacture 275 products.

Aerie President Clyde Jeter and Vice Pesident Lyle Hobbs are employed by Eastman. Lyle, an architect, designed the new aerie home. The Aerie is fortunate.

Another large industry providing jobs for 2,200 people, including Eagles, is the Kingsport Press, one of the world's largest manufacturers of hard bound books. Beginning in 1922, with the cloth bound "classics," the company has progressed until today its publications are novels, encyclopedias, textbooks, and Bibles. "Kingcraft" is the trademark and that label appears on more than 2,100 different educational yearbooks.

The newest industry to move its entire operations to Kingsport is the American-Saint Gobain Corp. The $50 million glass plant is situated outside the city on a 700-acre tract. The ultramodern office building located within the city has a three-winged design which follows the firm's familiar trademark.

Keeping pace with the rapid growth of the town is Kingsport Aerie 3141. It was instituted on August 4, 1957, with 58 charter members. Hobart Legg was the founder and the first president. Of the original number, 35 are still active members. Currently, there is a membership of 715 including city, county, State, and national officials.

The history of the local aerie parallels closely the history of the town. Kingsport Aerie was begun in rented quarters. By the end of the first year membership and enthusiasm had mounted until it was deemed advisable to purchase a tract of land on the Bristol highway, consisting of nearly 6 acres and a small building, for the sum of $19,500.

Work was soon completed on an addition to provide suitable space for the membership. It was evident in a short time that further expansion would be necessary. Since it has always been the policy of the aerie to be on a "pay as you go" basis, work was postponed until the conservative trustees felt the work could be accomplished with ease.

Accordingly, in 1961, plans were put into operation and through cooperative efforts the membership used its talents to advantage in the construction of a beautiful modern home. While the cost of the new acquisition is valued at more than $100,000, the entire property is estimated to be worth approximately $250,000. This tremendous achievement has been accomplished within a short span of 5 years, and what is more spectacular, it is mortgage free.

Light-colored brick comprise most of the exterior of the building. An unusual window-wall effect forms the focal point on the upper level and a wide portico enhances the lower level. Anticipating an ever-increasing flow of traffic, a parking lot with space for 500 cars was provided. An imposing driveway encircles the building.

The dramatic simplicity of the interior of the main auditorium with its wood paneled walls and well-blended lighting system testifies to the architect's purpose of focusing attention of the well-designed stage. The hall has a seating capacity of 500.

The formal opening was held November 3 and 4, 1962 at which time Mayor W. W. Cawood dedicated the building. Other special guests were former Grand Worthy President Leo V. Connell, of Indiana, and former Grand Aerie Outside Guard R. W. Cheely, of Virginia.

From the date of its institution, the aerie has been interested in contributing to the progress and welfare of the town, county, State, and Nation. Some of the projects are the donation of three two-way radios to the lifesaving crews of Kingsport and Church Hill, contributing $1,500 for needy families at Christmas—a joint effort with the Salvation Army, supporting all local drives and celebrations, and donations to the Max Baer Heart Fund. It also recently sponsored the organization of Rogersville Aerie.

The aerie provides a well-diversified social program for its members. "Something for everyone," appears to be the motto. The activities include bowling, social and square dancing, Christmas and Halloween parties for children. This list barely touches the sur-

face. The clubhouse is open every day except Sunday.

Although Kingsport's growth has been phenomenal by comparison with surrounding towns, it is still a mere infant. Its great potential for further development is unlimited.

Just as the town continues to advance, so will the other infant; Kingsport Aerie 3141. The same contagious enthusiasm which pervades the atmosphere accounts for the wonderful progress made by both.

I'm glad we found Kingsport and the Eagles. Our lives have been enriched by the association.

Symbol of Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the House an event which took place on May 1 in my native city of Trenton. While Communists were paying homage to their gods, Marx and Lenin, the Trenton Trust Co. to commemorate its 75th anniversary paid tribute to the free enterprise system. The person who conceived this program was the President and Chairman of the Board of the Trenton Trust Co., Mrs. Mary G. Roebling, whose remarkable career might very well serve as a symbol of enterprise. Indeed, this was precisely the title selected by the New York Times for a profile of Mrs. Roebling which appeared in its May 2 edition.

The article follows:

SYMBOL OF ENTERPRISE

TRENTON, May 1.—Mary Gindhart Roebling met recently with Trenton business executives to discuss plans for entertaining a visiting Ambassador. The conferees exchanged pleasantries over a few cocktails and departed. An aid turned to Mrs. Roebling and reminded her that the plans had not been discussed. She produced notes in her own hand. "Here are the plans we were going to decide upon," she said. "I just forgot to bring them up."

This ability to dominate without being domineering has played no small part in elevating Mrs. Roebling from an obscure secretary and clerk to prominence in finance.

At 30, she became the first woman to head a major bank, the Trenton Trust Co. Now, 26 years later, she is also chairman and is the first woman governor of the American Stock Exchange.

That she induced two Governors and nationally known leaders in industry, labor and education to participate in a symposium here today on the "Survival of Free Eenterprise in America" surprised no one.

DYNAMIC, PERSUASIVE

Possessed of a dynamic and persuasive personality and a seemingly stoic determination to succeed, she is plagued rarely by failure or fatigue. She seldom retires before midnight and arises at 7 a.m.

Frequently, she will even wake up at 2 a.m. and spend 2 hours or more answering correspondence before dozing off. She has refused to take a nap since she was 14 months old, says her 84-year-old mother.

Mrs. Roebling was born in West Collingswood in 1907, the daughter of Isaac D. Gindhart, a retired telephone company executive who, at 85, has just written and published a book for children. Her ancestors, of Swedish and Swiss stock, settled in South Jersey in 1638.

Mrs. Roebling attended public school in Haddonfield and Moorestown and was enrolled in New York University when, at 19, she married Hugh D. Graham. A widow by 1930, she went to work in a Philadelphia brokerage house and spent her evenings studying merchandising and business administration at the University of Pennsylvania.

In August 1933, after a short courtship, she married Siegfried Roebling, banker and grandson of the builder of the Brooklyn Bridge. When, 3 years later, she again found herself a widow, and she replaced her late husband as a director of the Trenton Trust and within 12 months was appointed its president.

Since then, she has increased the deposits of her bank from $17 million to $109,217,694, raised two children, served as a director of more than 25 corporations and headed an equal number of civic, charitable, and educational groups. She also has engaged in an extensive social life, traveled widely and found time for prolific reading, theater and opera attendance, and art collecting.

Among her paintings are two Picassos. At present, she is collecting the works of notable American painters and plans to donate them to the new State Cultural Center now under construction here.

She delights in giving parties, caring little whether her guests are clerks or royalty as long as they are "interesting."

Mrs. Roebling is a gourmet and a moderate drinker with a preference for Dubonnet.

She is fond of clothes and always appears conservative but well-dressed. Despite her success in finance, she has never been accused of being smug.

When a Negro congregation here invited her to a Christmas party designed to raise money for a new church, she put a $100 bill on the Christmas tree and induced the other guests to trim the tree similarly.

Four years ago she built a 6-room town house next to her bank. The motif of the interior is that of Versailles during the reign of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette.

The door and bathroom fixtures are gold-plated, the sinks are marble and their bowls hand-painted. The walls are covered with velvet tapestry. A marble patio is decorated with Roman statuary and there also is a 20- by 55-foot heated indoor swimming pool.

Mrs. Roebling also has a temper, she manages to control well. When she loses it, a close friend emphasized today, "You had better duck."

Anxious to be a career woman since she was in pigtails, Mrs. Roebling concedes that she was really "frightened" when presented with assuming control of the Trenton Trust Co.

"It was the greatest challenge I ever faced, but all the officers and directors of the bank were most cooperative," she said. "I learned one thing from that experience which I have never forgotten: no person ever does anything alone."

Gaps in Postal Fraud Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently when the Post Office Department moves administratively against a firm or individual accused of using the mails for fraudulent purposes, it can obtain a court order detaining, for at least a temporary period, all mail addressed to that business. But if a criminal action is instituted instead of an administrative one, the firm can meanwhile go right on with the same racket, fleecing new victims, until the criminal case is finally disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, a resident of Missouri recently complained to me that a New Jersey firm offering to sell a variety of products by mail at substantial discount, was continuing to solicit him for further business after he had previously been defrauded by the firm's failure to ship the goods he had ordered and paid for, and after the firm had already been indicted.

The firm was later convicted and apparently is in bankruptcy. But, according to a report I have on this matter from the Post Office Department, it had continued its operations for some months after its indictment and during that period "losses were incurred by other victims of the scheme."

AFTER AN INDICTMENT FOR POSTAL FRAUD

The Missourian who called this matter to my attention wrote to me as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: I would like to call to your attention a major loophole in the postal laws relating to the use of the mails to defraud. Because of this loophole, many consumers, including myself, have been defrauded by a corporation in New Jersey. The Factory Supply Co. sent ——— catalogs showing merchandise which would be sold at approximately wholesale prices. They insisted on payment in advance. The company, however, did not deliver the merchandise which was ordered and paid for. It has been indicted for using the mails to defraud and its trial, once postponed, is now coming up.

The most amazing thing is that the company still continues in business, still continues to defraud the consumers, and is trying to expand its operations. I have been told that the postal authorities are powerless under existing laws to stop this firm or its officers from using the mails. A short time ago I received another mailing from the company. They asked me to help them get more customers for a fee.

I suggest that the postal laws be amended so that once a company is indicted for using the mails to defraud, it and its officers are denied the use of the mails, unless all funds are impounded by a Federal officer or court-appointed receiver.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

COMPANY SUBSEQUENTLY CONVICTED

Mr. Speaker, because this gentleman does not live in my district, or in the St. Louis area, but resides many miles away in a different part of the State, I had to put his letter aside for a week or so until the press of work for my own district eased a bit and I had the time to pursue the point he raised about the need for additional legislation. Subsequently, I wrote to the Postmaster General for comments on the gentleman's suggestion, and received the following reply from the Department:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1963.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter

of March 7, 1963, concerning the complaint of ——— against Factory Supply Co., of Paterson, N.J. (19630–F and 22815–F).

We have had previous correspondence from ——— and he has been advised of the status of the case and of our position in the matter. In the investigation of alleged fraudulent use of the mails, our primary purpose is to determine the facts and present them to U.S. attorneys for consideration of prosecution. In certain instances, where prosecution is not feasible, action is recommended to deprive offenders further use of the mails. This is the extent of our authority.

The evidence concerning Factory Supply Co. was turned over to the U.S. attorney in the usual manner. Naturally, as the prosecutor, any further proceedings are in his hands and he decides what course of action should be pursued. In this particular case he obtained a grand jury indictment charging mail fraud, fraud by wire, illegal use of fictitious names, and conspiracy. Trial began at Burlington, Vt., on February 12, 1963, and we have just received word that the jury returned a guilty verdict today. Sentencing has been deferred to a later date.

You may be assured that every possible effort is made by the Post Office Department to rid the mails of all unlawful activity, and your interest in submitting this matter for our attention is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. MONTAGUE,
Chief Inspector.

IS LEGISLATION NEEDED?

Mr. Speaker, I then sent the following inquiry to the Postmaster General:

MARCH 19, 1963.

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAY: Recently I sent you a copy of a letter from ——— commenting on his experience with the Factory Supply Company and making a suggestion for a change in the law to close what he said was a loophole.

I have now received a reply from the Chief Postal Inspector, Mr. H. B. Montague, reporting on some of the facts in the Factory Supply Co. case. I had read about the guilty verdict in this case and I congratulate the department but I am still interested in the proposal ——— made that companies which have been indicted or convicted for using the mails to defraud, be denied further use of the mails "unless all funds received are impounded by a Federal officer or court-appointed receiver".

——— was, of course, incensed over being victimized by this company but the point he raised in writing to me was that even after the firm was indicted it continued to send out mailings in pursuit of the same conspiracy for which they were indicted. Since this is a question of whether changes are needed in the postal laws, I am writing to you rather than to the Chief Inspector.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

POST OFFICE CONSIDERING ASKING FOR STRONGER LAWS

Mr. Speaker, I received a further report from the Post Office Department on this matter, dated April 9, 1963, from the General Counsel, Louis J. Doyle, indicating that stronger laws may be requested. After forwarding this information to the Missourian who had written to me originally about this case, I requested his permission to place all of this material before the Congress through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He has asked that I do not divulge his name, and I am complying with that request. The General Counsel wrote me as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1963.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: Your letter of March 19, 1963, addressed to the Postmaster General, concerning the complaint of ———, ——— Missouri, respecting an unsatisfactory transaction had by him through the mails with the Factory Supply Co., Bloomfield, N.J., has been referred to me for attention.

——— has indicated to you that legislation should be enacted which would require the impounding of all funds sent through the mails to concerns whose promoters are indicted for mail fraud.

It appears that ——— is aware that the promoters of the Factory Supply Co. were recently convicted of fraudulent use of the mails in connection with the scheme in which he was one of the victims. Despite the fact that the indictment in this case was returned on June 27, 1962, the mail order business continued for some months thereafter and losses were incurred by other victims of the scheme. Between the date of the indictment and the date of conviction, however, the business was placed in bankruptcy; its mail order activities were discontinued at the time the bankruptcy proceedings were initiated.

An indictment is not a final adjudication of the charges therein but constitutes simply a charge that the grand jury believes probable cause exists that the law has been violated. A person indicted for mail fraud is presumed to be innocent until convicted after a trial. In many instances charges of fraud are not established upon a trial. If funds being sent to such a business were impounded during the time between indictment and acquittal, which often runs for many months and in some instances over a year, a legitimate business could be completely destroyed by the suggested legislation.

Under 39 U.S.C. 4007 provision is made for application to the appropriate U.S. District Court for an order detaining for a temporary period mail addressed to business houses against which administrative action under 39 U.S.C. 4005 has been instituted. However, this remedy may be followed only in preparation for or during the pendency of administrative postal fraud proceedings under 39 U.S.C. 4005. In the Factory Supply Co. case the decision was reached by responsible officials of the department that the evidence in this matter appropriately should be presented for action under relevant penal statutes rather than for consideration of possible action under the administrative remedy provided in 39 U.S.C. 4005. At the present time this department is studying the possibility of increasing the effectiveness of its administrative remedy in the suppression of fraudulent enterprises. As you are perhaps aware, the department does not have power to subpena witnesses in this type of proceeding, and is often faced with a difficult burden growing out of the necessity of establishing an intent to deceive upon the part of the promoter of a particular enterprise. It is anticipated that the department's studies will lead to the formulation of recommendations is the near future for legislative amendment which will strengthen administrative remedies for the suppression of fraudulent enterprises.

This Department appreciates very much the interest expressed by you and ——— in this matter. I can assure you that the department will continue to exert every effort to protect patrons of this service from being victimized by the operation of illegal schemes through the mails.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS J. DOYLE,
General Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, whether this incident indicates the need for further legislation to tighten our postal laws to protect the public from continuing frauds committed by persons or firms even while they are already being prosecuted is a question I would ask the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider.

It was my feeling that the exchange of correspondence in this particular case would be helpful to the committees having jurisdiction over such legislation, and for that reason I have received permission to place this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Property Owners' Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a portion of my remarks the "Property Owners' Bill of Rights" which is supported by the San Diego Realty Board:

PROPERTY OWNERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

In 1789, the people of America were fearful that Government might restrict their freedom. The first Congress of the United States, in that year, proposed a Bill of Rights:

The Bill of Rights, essentially, tells the Government what it cannot do. The statements comprise the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The Bill of Rights has had a profound impact upon the history of the World.

Forty million immigrants gave up everything to come to this new land, seeking something promised here—and only here. Many counrties have abundant natural resources, vast vacant lands and climate as good as America.

They came here for the promise of security, the promise of freedom, for the precious right to live as free men with equal opportunity for all.

In July of 1868, a new guarantee of freedom was ratified. Freedom for the slave race was its purpose. But its guarantees were for the equal protection of all.

This new guarantee of freedom is the 14th amendment. It reads, in part, as follows:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the laws."

The vital importance of these Federal laws was reemphasized in a recent statement of the Chief Justice, U.S. Supreme Court, in which he urged the retention of "government of laws in preference to a government of men."

Today, the rights and freedoms of the individual American property owner are being eroded. A renewed Bill of Rights to protect the American property owner is needed.

It is self-evident that the erosion of these special freedoms may destroy the free enterprising individual American.

It is our solemn belief that the individual American property owner must be allowed, under law, to retain:

1. The right of privacy.
2. The right to choose his own friends.
3. The right to own and operate property according to his own dictates.
4. The right to occupy, administer, and dispose of property without legal interference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience.
5. The right to equal rights of all in the enjoyment of property without interference by any laws giving special privilege to any group or groups.
6. The right to maintain congenial surroundings for tenants.
7. The right to contract with a real estate broker or other legal representative of his choice and to authorize him to act for him according to his instructions.
8. The right to determine the acceptability and desirability of any prospective buyer of his property.
9. The right of all Americans to choose congenial tenants in any properties they own—to maintain the stability and security of their income. These property owners should not be obligated to require their tenants to accept each other indiscriminately.
10. The right to enjoy the freedom to embrace, reject, deal or not deal with others.

Loss of these rights diminishes personal liberty and creates a springboard for further erosion of liberty.

Some New Year's Resolutions on Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of urgency that I call the attention of the House to a noteworthy address delivered on May 1 by the distinguished Deputy Attorney General Joseph F. Dolan before the Law Day dinner sponsored by the Oneida County Bar Association of New York. In this address, Mr. Dolan reminded us that all citizens have duties as well as rights under a system of government which operates by the rule of law. More particularly, he called attention to three proposed constitutional amendments being circulated throughout the legislatures of the several States—amendments, which if adopted, by the requisite number of these States would profoundly alter the fundamental law of the land, our Federal Constitution. Mr. Dolan makes the point that a number of States have already adopted one or more of these amendments with little or no public debate or discussion. He makes the additional point that those of us in the legal profession have a primary obligation to concern ourselves with these proposed amendments and to alert and inform our fellow citizens as to the far-reaching changes they would invoke. I therefore commend to you Mr. Dolan's address:

SOME NEW YEAR'S RESOLUTIONS ON LAW DAY

(Remarks of Assistant Deputy Attorney General Joseph F. Dolan)

The 1st of May is a traditional holiday. Long before it was established as Law Day in the United States, long before it was celebrated as a worker's holiday by labor and socialist groups, long before the advent of either the United States or the Soviet Union, back during the Middle Ages, May 1 was the occasion of certain customary observances. People in those days celebrated May Day with Maypoles, garlands, and May baskets. But May 1 as then celebrated was more than that: it was the occasion for welcoming the spring, the start of the new growing season.

It was a time for discarding the vestiges of winter. It was a time for putting one's house in order. Everything that could be, was cleaned and polished to remove the winter's grime. The rushes which served as rugs were thrown out, and the floor was swept clean.

In view of the traditional meaning, it seems particularly appropriate citizens and members of the legal profession use May Day as the occasion to take stock—to reevaluate our relationship to the law under which we live, to consider May Day as a sort of New Year's Day, the beginning of a new year in which we can further develop our relationship with the law.

The most useful function served by making resolutions at the start of a new year is that they serve to twinge the conscience. And perhaps a review of our relationship with the law may show some new areas in which good resolution can be made. Law Day is certainly a proper occasion for such action; for it is the occasion on which the bond between the citizens and the law is commemorated.

In the original draft of the Massachusetts constitution, John Adams spoke of "a government of laws, and not of men," and this concept is central to our system of government. But citizens often appear to be more concerned with their rights under the law than with their duties. Law Day is a most appropriate time to acknowledge these duties, to examine them, and to plan ways in which they can be better fulfilled. Joseph de Maistre said that "Every nation has the government that it deserves."

What kind of government do we deserve? The answer lies in how well we have lived up to our duties as citizens and as members of the legal profession.

As citizens, we have the duty to support the law. This involves more than voting, the payment of taxes and the observance of the prohibitions imposed upon us by criminal laws. It means that responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of law in the community must be assumed by the citizens.

For example, those eligible for jury duty, have the obligation to serve when called upon to do so. Trial by a jury of one's peers has been called the cornerstone of our legal system. Yet many Americans are reluctant to serve as jurors. They are too busy: they are unwilling to accept the inconvenience, the possible financial loss, or other hardship which jury service might entail. They seek to be excused, which requests are all too frequently granted. No matter how the excuse is rationalized, such a person has, in effect, failed to assume his responsibilities as a citizen. Yet how many lawyers, approached by a friend or client who asks advice on how to avoid jury duty, reply by explaining the obligation, rather than how it can be avoided?

A second unpopular duty of citizenship is the duty to volunteer as a witness whenever the citizen has unprivileged knowledge of the facts involved in a case. To fulfill this obligation he must be willing to "become involved", to expose himself to unwanted publicity, to place himself in a position where he may be called upon to testify and be subjected to cross examination, to submit to inconvenience and unpleasantness. In certain cases, he must also be willing to withstand fear—fear of reprisal which could endanger himself or his family, or fear of economic or social sanctions which could result when the case involves the passions or prejudices of the community. Such considerations should not be, but often are sufficient to cause some citizens to fail to fulfill their obligation to become a witness.

Those of us who are lawyers have additional responsibilities beyond the duties which we have as citizens. We have, of course, the duty to represent and advise our clients adequately and ethically. But we have other obligations as well which we owe to the community in which we live, and to the profession of which we are a member. We have the duty to inform the public regarding matters of law. This is not satisfied simply by advising our clients regarding their legal rights when they come to us. The public as a whole should be made cognizant of its rights and obligations under the law, and the lawyers should do the job.

One aspect of this obligation is the duty to advise and educate the public regarding important changes in the law which are under consideration. Too frequently in such situations, lawyers remain silent—both as individuals and as a group. Here too the duty can be explained and illuminated by example.

At present there is a movement underway to amend the Constitution of the United States in several fundamental respects.

Three proposed constitutional amendments have been approved by the Council of State Governments, and are now under consideration in State legislatures. The sponsors are attempting to force Congress to call a constitutional convention by the application of the legislatures in two-thirds of the States. The legislatures in 10 States have approved two of the proposals and taken the recommended action by passing a joint resolution addressed to Congress, while the third has received such support in three States, yet the proposed amendments have received practically no public discussion.

The first of these amendments would overrule the *Baker* v. *Carr* apportionment decision of the Supreme Court. The proposed amendment provides that nothing in the Constitution "shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature," and that the Federal courts shall be denied jurisdiction to try any suits "relating to the apportionment of representatives."

It can be argued that if this amendment were adopted, a State could choose to apportion its legislature on a basis other than population or area. One State might choose to retrict its legislature so that only real property owners might vote, or be members. Another State might choose to take the right to vote away from the Negro. A proponent of the amendment has said that such power is granted by the amendment. These are fundamental changes, and should not be within the grasp of the States until the Nation has made a deliberate and considered decision on the question. This amendment has been approved by the legislatures in the States of Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

The second proposed constitutional amendment would allow the States themselves to amend the Constitution without the intervention of Congress. Article V of the Constitution would be amended so that the Constitution could be amended thereafter by the action of two-thirds of the States, if they proposed an amendment which was then accepted by three-fourths of the States. Thus, the entire character of our system of

government could be changed without any need for any action whatsoever by any national body. The Presidency could be junked in favor of a troika, the Congress abolished or radically altered, without any need for congressional approval.

Further, one scholar has estimated that the facts of present day distribution of urban-rural political power are such that State legislators representing only 15 percent of the population of the United States would have the power to amend the Constitution if this proposal were adopted. This amendment has been approved by the legislatures of Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming.

The third of these amendments would provide for a Court of the Union comprised of the chief justices of each of the supreme courts of the 50 States. This Court of the Union would have the power to review and reverse U.S. Supreme Court decisions in cases involving Federal-State relations.

Each State would have one vote on the court. Controversies between small States interests and the interest of the population of the larger States might well be decided on a basis that would be harmful to a State like New York. This amendment has been approved by the State legislatures in Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming.

These proposed amendments to the Constitution should be known to the public, and understood by the public. Lawyers have the primary obligation to inform the public in matters like this. By their training and experience, they are best qualified to understand these amendments, and their implications to our present structure of Federal Government. It is their duty to study and then to speak, to acquaint the citizens who will be affected by these proposed changes of the pros and cons of the situation, so that the final decision will be the result of action by an informed public.

Learned Hand once said that "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it."

Liberty must be understood, cherished, argued, and defended by all the people if it is to be preserved in our land. That liberty will be preserved only if the lawyers are quick to see when it is in peril, courageous enough to defend it, and strong enough to lead the public to an understanding of the blessings it secures to ourselves and our posterity.

Unfair Treatment of American Fighting Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, those Members interested in seeing that those American servicemen called to hazardous combat duty receive fair treatment will be interested in an editorial published recently by Army Times. In its editorial, Army Times pointed out that 11,000 American military men are now engaged in assisting Vietnamese forces. So far 31 have been killed and hundreds wounded.

Despite the hazards of this service, it is proposed that the provision for extra pay for duty subject to hostile fire be dropped, even though this provision will currently cost only about $2 million per year. Our American fighting men deserve better treatment, particularly since we are spending more than one-half billion dollars on incentive and hazardous duty pay for large numbers of individuals not subject to hostile fire and, in many instances, not subject to the dangers of the Vietnam situation. Our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] has announced he expects to offer an amendment to restore the provision for pay for duty subject to hostile fire and I expect to support this amendment.

I believe that Members who share this view will be interested in the Army Times editorial which follows:

COMBAT PAY

Mounting U.S. casualties in Vietnam provide grim evidence that 11,000 American military men now "advising and training" South Vietnamese forces are in the middle of a long, tough, dirty war.

There are undoubtedly good reasons for the lack of news on our combat activities there. But the result is that a lot of complacent folks at home apparently believe that our forces there are performing nothing but noncombat tasks.

The statistics tell a different story: 31 dead and more than a hundred wounded in "actions by hostile forces," as the Pentagon puts it. Furthermore, there is nothing temporary about Vietnam. Army Chief of Staff Gen. Earle Wheeler predicts U.S. forces will be there for at least 3 years. It is likely that 50,000 Americans will see service in the strife-torn southeast Asian nation.

Despite the difficult status of our fighting men in Vietnam, there has been little grumbling. These well-trained and highly motivated troops know why they are in the jungles; they understand the importance of checking Communist guerrilla expansion.

At times, however, they must find it difficult to understand the attitude of their own Government, which has been slow in recognizing the combat character of our operations in Vietnam and similar situations.

The Defense Department has proposed $55-a-month across-the-board combat pay for men in such activities. This is a very modest amount, yet there is talk that even it may be dropped from the military pay bill in the interests of economy. Let's hope that wiser heads prevail.

The Polish Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Poland today has become only a name on a map. Its people have few rights and no freedom. Dominated by the Soviet Union, they live out their bleak lives in fear and under tyrannical conditions. Yet, there remains the hope that one day Poland will take its place among the nations of the world, free from the stigma of being called a Soviet satellite.

The Polish people, to keep alive the spirit of freedom, recall their glorious past, when Poland was an independent Republic. They also recall the Constitution of 1791 which gave the first rights to the common man, a document embodying the principles of democracy and nationalism. Although Poland was dismembered by its neighbors soon after the Constitution was promulgated, May 3 became a recognized anniversary, to be regarded with reverence.

Since those remaining in Poland are unable to commemorate this important day, and since this Constitution is based partly on our American Constitution, it is only right that we, too, should honor this anniversary. Let us extend the heartfelt hope that the Polish people will soon be able to enjoy once more the democratic principles which, since 1791, have become their inherent right.

It was a sad day for the United States when, instead of going on into Berlin we backtracked and ultimately surrendered huge chunks of territory and free peoples to F.D.R.'s "Uncle Joe." Poland should be free. We should help it to become free. I hope that the day will come within my lifetime when there once again will be free and independent Poland at the council tables of the world.

The Danger Is Clear and Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond has raised some interesting points in his recent article, "The Danger Is Clear and Present," that appeared in the Washington Post. In addition to his comments on Castro's Cuba, Mr. Drummond points out that Haiti, another Latin American country just 40 miles from Cuba, could be another Red dominated country if our policy of forcing Russia out of this hemisphere is not strengthened. Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Drummond for his observations and under unanimous consent I place this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read it.

The article follows:

THE DANGER IS CLEAR AND PRESENT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

What will it take to persuade the Kennedy administration that the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba is the U.S. Government's first order of business.

If the Kremlin acquires another satellite in Latin America from which to operate, will this convince the President that the Soviet forces in the Western Hemisphere constitute a "clear and present" danger which must be soon removed?

I raise this question because a second Latin American country is evidently just yearning to be embraced. This is the little Batista-type dictatorship of Francois Duvalier in Haiti which is showing every sign of reaching out to Khrushchev and Castro in the hope they can save it from the disillusion and discontent of his own people.

Trying to perpetuate his regime beyond its constitutional end this month, Mr. Duvalier is apparently desperate enough to take the risk of inviting in the Soviet-Castro Communists.

If this should happen, what would be the response of those who view the Soviet presence in Cuba as a secondary concern? No doubt some would argue that the danger is not increased, but is divided between two countries; that the more the Soviets take over, the more Castro's image will be impaired elsewhere, and that if we will only keep quiet the Soviet troops would go away.

I suspect most Americans are not so wishful or so timid. Furthermore, the prospect that the desperate Duvalier will throw his country into the embrace of Soviet-dominated Cuba is no imaginary nightmare.

The foreign minister of the Dominican Republic, Andrews Freites, has informed a peace mission of the Organization of American States he has information showing the Haitian President has already offered military bases to Castro.

Such a disclosure is not surprising since there is already evidence Duvalier has been maintaining secret contacts with the Haitian Communists and simultaneously making public overtures to Czechoslovakian and other Soviet bloc Communists abroad.

No doubt the Haitian dictator, who has tried to rewrite his nation's constitution in order to perpetuate his regime with a semblance of legality, believes he can "borrow" enough Communist force from Castro to keep him in power but not enough to allow the Soviet-Castro forces to take over his government.

It doesn't work that way. Communists don't help keep non-Communists in office, as the events in Laos grimly prove. This is why the revelation that Duvalier hopes to save himself of offering a base for the Khrushchev-Castro forces can hardly fail to send a chill down the spine of every official in Washington.

It seems to me the premise of the administration is that because of other cold war issues (such as Berlin and Laos) we dare not make the removal of Soviet troops a top priority or to accept the risks of action. I believe the opposite is nearer the truth, that if we don't deal decisively with the Soviet presence in Cuba, we will thereby be set back everywhere else in the cold war.

How often and how rightly it has been said that unless the United States stands resolutely against the encroachment of the Soviet Union on West Berlin, the whole Atlantic Alliance will decay and crumble. I believe it is equally true unless we soon turn back the Soviet military encroachment in the Western Hemisphere, we will be undermining the Western position elsewhere as well as in Latin America.

We can't separate Cuba from the rest of our world position and leave the Soviet presence there unresolved. Once the Kennedy administration makes this decision, it will find the means to implement it. And it will have the massive support of the American people.

Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 29, 1963, issue of the Light, San Antonio, Tex., entitled "Retirement Pay," is worth the consideration of all Members of the House prior to the vote tomorrow on the military pay bill:

RETIREMENT PAY

There is likely to be a lively debate in Congress when the military pay bill comes to the floor of the House.

The outcome will affect many of San Antonio's retired military men, for the hottest issue is recomputation of pay for those who retired before June 1, 1958.

Recomputation has been rejected by the House Armed Services Committee, but two California Republican members, BOB WILSON and CHARLES GUBSER, have written a strong and persuasive dissent.

The heart of the dispute is whether retirement pay should reflect active duty pay. Those who retired before June 1, 1958, now receive arbitrary cost-of-living increases instead.

Representatives WILSON and GUBSER wrote:

"For more than 100 years, it has been traditional that retired military pay should be based on active duty pay.

"We believe it is out of character for the U.S. Government to make a promise and then refuse to keep it. We do not believe that budgetary considerations can replace morality.

"Former President Eisenhower urged Congress to correct the mistake it made in 1958, and on May 12, 1960, the House unanimously passed H.R. 11318 which would allow those retired after June 1, 1958, to recompute on the basis of the 1958 act.

"President Kennedy committed himself to the principle of recomputation in his campaign of 1960 and Defense Secretary McNamara recommended that the bill now before you allow recomputation on the basis of the 1958 act.

"Additionally, Subcommittee No. 1, after weeks of hearings on this bill, accepted the principle of recomputation and reported it to the full committee.

"While we admit that the Department of Defense proposal and the subcommittee recommendation fall short of retaining the traditional concept of recomputation for the future, they at least overcame the wide discrepancy in retirement pay between those who retired May 31, 1958, and those who retired on the following day."

The Californians point out that retired pay should not be compared with, or confused with, civil service pensions.

If you insist on a comparison, they add, then retired pay "is not more of a drain on the Nation's future revenues, is not as generous, and has been earned by the serviceman through the acceptance of considerably lower rates of pay."

Representatives WILSON and GUBSER sum up by saying:

"For the sake of $32 million, a vital tradition has been destroyed and a solemn commitment has been violated.

"This $32 million cost would decrease each year as the numbers of those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, would deplete. It would eventually disappear as an annual cost."

We concur.

Peanuts for Boiling

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which we are now discussing is one that I introduced to extend for 2 years the definition of peanuts which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The purpose of this legislation is to permit farmers who want to plant peanuts for boiling purposes to do so, without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments. To give the technical definition of this exemption, let me say that this definiton of peanuts excludes from the provisions of acreage allotments and marketing quotas any peanuts which are marketed before drying or removal of moisture—either by natural or by artificial means—for consumption exclusively, as boiled peanuts.

We have had this legislation in effect since 1957. I introduced the first legislation in this regard and similar legislation was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. An exemption for boiled peanuts was first enacted in 1957 and was applicable to the 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops. Subsequently, the exemption was extended for the 1960 and 1961 crops. More recently, the exemption was continued for the 1962 and 1963 crops of peanuts. The Department of Agriculture reported favorably on this legislation, and recommended that the exemption be made permanent. I am in thorough agreement with the Department of Agriculture, but our committee felt that to extend the exemption for another 2-year period would be more desirable so we could constantly be on the alert to see if the program were in any way harmful to the regular peanut program.

In this connection, may I point out that last year there were planted for boiling, approximately 3,000 acres of peanuts, primarily concentrated in five States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi. There is a total acreage of peanuts of approximately 1,560,000 acres. It can be seen from this insignificant amount of peanuts planted for boiling compared to the total acreage that there has not developed any great program for boiling peanuts—but let me say that it is a healthful little industry. There are dozens of farmers who plant peanuts for boiling purposes in my district, and in other areas of the Peanut Belt. In Florida, I know of several little factories that can these peanuts for boiling—one in Belleview; one in Live Oak, and I believe one in either Tampa or Jacksonville. The boiled peanut, Mr. Speaker, is a vegetable, and has an entirely different taste from peanuts used for other purposes. It has proved not to be a competitor for the markets of other peanuts. We are hoping that we can continue to establish a definite market for boiled peanuts, and I believe that passage of this legislation will help this small, but healthy, industry continue to have a modest growth.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Family Farms of our House Committee on Agriculture, I feel that the little industry that has been developed as a result of this boiled peanut legislation, is an interesting factor in showing what can be done by private initiative. Here

is a program that supplements other income of the small farmer, and it does not impose upon the farmer the regulations of some of the other farming programs. I sincerely believe that this legislation should get the unanimous support of the House.

May I point out this bill was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and unanimously reported by the full committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So we have arrived at the time when a peanut is not a peanut; is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This kind of peanut is a vegetable.

Mr. GROSS. What does it taste like when it is boiled?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would be delighted to have the gentleman taste some, but I am sorry I do not have this can opened at the moment. But, immediately after this discussion, and I mean this quite sincerely, if we can find a can opener, we will open up this can of boiled peanuts. I know my colleague will enjoy the taste of them. They taste entirely different from peanuts that are salted.

Mr. GROSS. What does a peanut look like when it is boiled?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is boiled in the hull in a salty solution. If we can get a can opener, we will open the can now and show the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Can they be used for fishbait? Would they make good fishbait or something like that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have not tried that, I do not know, sir. But let me emphasize the fact that this peanut program has no support price and is entirely out of the Government regulations. I feel sure it has been a very helpful little program for many of our farmers.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is one bill dealing with agricultural products in the South that did not take a trip through the rose garden? Can we rely on that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir, it did not take a trip through the rose garden.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The boiled peanut is one product that is quite different, delicious, and nutritious. I should like to satisfy the curiosity of our friend, the gentleman from Iowa, and any others who want to know what a fine product we offer in these boiled peanuts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will they grow hair?

Mr. MATTHEWS. They have not grown hair yet.

Mr. SIKES. The answer should be obvious. I was raised on them. That is the only thing I can say boiled peanuts are deficient in. They will not grow hair.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa, if it were not in violation of the good conscience, that I know we all have, I might even be tempted to say that it would grow hair, but I do not think it will.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, speaking more seriously, the gentleman from Florida is rendering a fine service in bringing this bill to the floor. The legislation is needed. It interferes with no marketing program. In fact the acreage is so small that an attempt to provide controls would be a costly and ludicrous thing. The bill helps the little grower who is producing just a few peanuts for a specialty product; is that not correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely right. I might point out that many of our farmers, our colored citizens, especially, take advantage of this legislation. Here is a chance to pass a bill—and I know it is not of earth-shaking importance—to help a lot of little people make a living.

Mr. SIKES. That is the whole purpose of the bill. It does not interfere with any marketing program. The volume is not sufficient to justify inclusion in such a program. The boiled peanut is a very fine product and the bill helps the little people who produce this product, and help to make a livelihood for themselves by so doing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my beloved colleague.

Mr. HAYS. I want to help the gentleman all I can, but you should have kept that can closed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, if we could but undo some of the things we have done, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the able chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries whose people plant some of these peanuts, and I am sure enjoy them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the peanut program. I notice in the report that these peanuts are grown in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and Mississippi.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, while they may be grown primarily in those States, this product is not confined exclusively to those areas.

Mr. BONNER. Yes, that is what I wanted to ask the gentleman. Can any State that desires to plant as many of these peanuts as they desire to plant do so?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The answer is yes, but, of course, in two years if the program gets out of hand, the legislation may not be extended.

Mr. BONNER. May I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida of whom I am very fond and for whom I have the highest respect, when the peanut program was lifted during World War II for the purpose of producing oil for the war effort, the States of North Carolina and Virginia had an understanding that should quotas be reinvoked that Virginia would not get less than so many acres nor would North Carolina get less than so many acres. But in the interim there was a vast acreage of peanuts planted in certain States, and when the program came back in these peanuts planted in the war effort were given credit for the reallotments of acreage. The State of Virginia lost a tremendous amount of acreage, likewise the State of North Carolina. That is why I rise here to ask and be certain about this matter. These peanuts, I understand, move in interstate commerce. It is not localized at all. It would be an interstate product.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It has been, I will say to the gentleman, for years, and I want to assure him this has nothing to do with acreage allotments. Let me emphasize again there are 1,560,000 acres under acreage allotment. There are 3,000 acres planted for boiling peanuts.

Mr. BONNER. I remember a distinguished gentleman in this House, who was very active on the Agriculture Committee, when we lifted acreage allotments on peanuts, he said on the floor of the House:

Listen to me, boys; listen to me; we want to get all the gadgets out of the peanut program.

I objected at that time to giving that gadget protecting certain acreage for North Carolina and Virginia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does the gentleman want North Carolina excluded from the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Let me finish my statement to show you why I am interested. We cut that gadget out. As I say, and as I said before, Virginia lost a lot of acreage, and so did North Carolina. I wanted this to be a matter of record, whether North Carolina plants them, Virginia, or Mississippi, or who else plants them, this will not eventually come in as a recognized acreage that is setting up quotas in the various States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I agree with the gentleman, and I appreciate his interest in that point. It will not have anything to do with acreage allotments.

Mr. BONNER. There are plants in Virginia and North Carolina that can peanuts at the present time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not sure.

Mr. BONNER. In your own State you can grow all of the peanuts you want to and send them to a factory to be put into cans of this type?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman much longer because I have only a short time and there are five or six more Members who want to speak.

Let me say to the gentleman, during the life of this legislation of course that can happen. There is no limitation on acreage for boiled peanuts. If this legislation is not good legislation, in 2 years, I will not offer it, and the gentleman can help to defeat it, if it is offered.

Mr. BONNER. I will say to the gentleman it is good legislation. I would like to know what supervision there is and how these peanuts are harvested, if they are machine harvested, and how

quickly they are taken to the processing plants.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The best definition of the way they are harvested is pointed out in the record, which says that the peanuts are marketed before drying or removal of moisture by natural or artificial means. They pull up the vines and they handpick the peanuts. That is the way they are handled.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Only by United Leadership Can Cuban Crisis Be Solved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in the following editorial, Mr. Mason C. Taylor, the distinguished editor of both the Pulitzer Prize winning Utica Daily Press and Utica Observer-Dispatch calls for a new bipartisan unity of purpose with respect to the Cuban threat. Furthermore, he cites the need for a more forthright and frank disclosure of foreign policy facts to the American people. In addition, he suggests that Members of Congress can play an important role in providing leadership.

I commend this editorial to the thoughtful consideration of the House:

[From the Utica Daily Press, Apr. 27, 1963]

ONLY BY UNITED LEADERSHIP CAN CUBAN CRISIS BE SOLVED

(By Mason C. Taylor)

It was just 4 years ago Wednesday of last week that Fidel Castro told a capacity throng of editors and their guests in Washington's Hotel Statler ballroom that one of his major objectives in Cuba was to ward off communism.

It was 2 years ago that President Kennedy appeared before the same editors just after the Bay-of-Pigs fiasco and said that there was a limit to U.S. patience and restraint in dealing with Communist penetration of Cuba.

Last week, the specters of the puppet Castro and his Soviet masters still remained in the Statler ballroom as the American Society of Newspaper Editors gathered once again to hear over a 3-day period some of the topmost leaders in government and politics. For it was Cuba, rather than Laos, space exploration, or the state of the economy that provoked the most serious discussion and interest.

Senator KEATING, of Rochester, charged that the administration was as puzzled, bewildered, and uncertain as the American people on how to deal with Castro and the Communist takeover. He claimed that more Russians have gone in Cuba than have come out, and that the Navy has orders not to search small vessels moving in Cuban and Caribbean waters at night. He urged a return to the bipartisanship of the Roosevelt-Vandenberg era for the development of a long-term, consistent program to dislodge the Soviets.

In his speech to the editors the next day, the President for some strange reason chose the domestic economy as his topic, but he did answer questions about Cuba.

In his answers, he reiterated the resolve not to permit troops to move from Cuba to other countries, or to tolerate use of Soviet troops against Cubans. He said again that under present conditions, he was opposed to an invasion or a blockade. He declared that in the light of our worldwide responsibilities, he believed present policy, which includes attempts to isolate Cuba, was the right one.

But it was former Vice President Nixon who got the greatest applause with his proposal of a new freedom doctrine for the Americas, with open support for all Communist-controlled regimes, including Cuban exiles, and "whatever action is necessary" to force removal of the Soviet beachhead in Cuba.

Mr. Nixon derided the idea that anything is to be gained by treating Khrushchev gently, or that things may get better if we wait awhile. The Communists, he said, do not hesitate to say that their goal is world conquest, or that they will aid revolutionary, Communist-type movements anywhere in the world. We should answer that our goal is nothing less than a free Russia, a free Eastern Europe, and a free China, he said. Only such a goal—deeply believed in, selflessly worked for was worthy of a great people and capable of blunting the Communist offensive and regaining the initiative for the cause of freedom, Mr. Nixon declared.

These speeches and some others at the convention made headlines across the Nation. Our guess is that the sum total of their effect may well be to add to public dissatisfaction with what is being done or not being done to resolve the Cuban crisis.

With trouble breaking out in Laos, with Berlin a potential trouble spot, the President faces a dilemma in deciding how far to go and where. While the final decisions are his, assorted members of the Kennedy team, State Department advisers and McNamara and company share in the discussions that precede decisions—when made.

These are all great minds, but are they enough? These are critical times. When you consider, in this nuclear age, the consequences of wrong moves or wrong decisions, the dangers perhaps are greater than at any time in our history.

It is no time for partisan sniping, or for angry resentment by administration spokesmen to honest questionings and sincere criticism. It is, rather, a time for a true spirit of bipartisanship such as has not existed since World War II.

In this era of televised public events and press conferences, the managed "image" of those in high office, plus an excess of legislative bickering, the role and stature of Congress have diminished these last few years. The voices of leadership or potential leadership are drowned in the cacophony of hero worship to which the public has become addicted.

This should not be. As the elected representatives of the people, members of Congress have a role that should not be minimized. There should be, as Senator Keating has said, better communication between the executive branch and the Congress. This is the first and necessary step toward bipartisan unity of purpose, and one which should be initiated by the President. Another is a more candid disclosure of facts to the American people.

With united leadership, united responsibility and united purpose a firm policy inevitably will emerge that can represent the will and determination of the American people—a determination against which none can prevail.

How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of Handicapped Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a prize-winning essay written by Galen Bollinger of Caldwell, Idaho, on the subject of "Ability Counts." The essay deals with the accomplishments of handicapped workers and the benefits their activities bring to a community. The contest was sponsored by the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, and the Idaho State AFL-CIO, and Mr. Bollinger won first prize. He was awarded a cash prize and a trip to Washington, D.C., and will arrive tomorrow. His essay will be of interest to all who believe in hiring the handicapped.

The essay follows:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Galen Bollinger, Caldwell High School)

A college professor stands in one place for an entire hour to give a lecture to a group of excited premedical students. Standing in a row, some girls proudly play their flutes in our school band. A telephone rings, and a voice reminds the listener of approaching activities of a club. Three laughing boys with magazines under their arms walk out of a small, clean building, and a block away one of their fathers has just purchased some fish flies for the weekend trip. An excavating machine noisily takes huge bites of earth so that water will run to new farmland. Many beautifully designed decorations and place cards are on a Christmas dinner table around which finely dressed ladies and gentlemen are seated. With a portable television in his hand, a smiling man walks out of a small shop. What resources have produced these happy, busy activities? To a great extent the abilities of handicapped workers in my community have brought about these events.

A community is a reservoir of the talents and abilities of its people. As the community needs additional abilities, this supply is utilized. In my community handicapped workers have contributed much to our reserve of abilities.

Industry hires several handicapped workers. Some blind men sack seed corn at our large seed company, and a few deaf or crippled workers construct excellent fish flies in a local factory.

On main street a crippled mute with cerebral palsy successfully operates a newsstand. In nearby towns a cab dispatcher, a radio and television repairman, a shoe repairman, secretaries, and typists maintain highly productive lives despite severe handicaps. Another man prepares tape recordings for a radio station.

The many-sided life of a college professor has led scores of college students into medical careers and biological vocations. Though crippled for life by polio, this biologist, artist, and lecturer is a highly respected personage of the community.

One young man paralyzed below his waist operates an excavating machine that digs new irrigation and sewer ditches. The work

he does inspires those around him to strive to do better. Other handicapped workers in my community encourage able-bodied persons in a similar manner.

The rehabilitation of several patients has been aided by the pictures painted by a former chief of police of our town, whose body was badly paralyzed by a sniper's bullet. He also narrates a weekly radio program that gives the public a better understanding of law enforcement.

A demand is growing for the seashell decorated bottles and placecards made by a polio-crippled mother and flute teacher. She does telephone contact work for various organizations, and the club members greatly appreciate her work as a club historian.

The handicapped have helped themselves and others through carpentry and construction of various devices. One man has built several exercising aids for those that are hospitalized or bedridden in rest homes.

Outstanding poems and books have been written by two crippled people in this community. One young lady is working on her second book of poetry, and the man at the newsstand is writing his third book.

The crafts and hobbies of the handicapped have provided many homes with rugs, pictures, picture frames, etchings, leatherwork, ceramics, plastic articles, and seasonal decorations. These are not products bought from sympathy but products of high quality that are often sold in competition with factory manufactured articles.

Physically handicapped mothers and fathers have been responsible for some of the happy, reputable families in our community. They are to be commended for doing well a task that too many ablebodied parents have done poorly.

It becomes increasingly apparent that handicapped workers are benefiting my community in as many innumerable ways as other groups of workers. Through the gradual acceptance of handicapped workers by employers and the public, many of the physically handicapped are beginning to live full and productive lives by forgetting what they can't do and doing what they can.

Stubborn Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post, April 28, 1963:

STUBBORN INEQUITY

Once again, an effort is being made to delete from the laws a retirement pay provision that penalizes every officer who left active duty before the 1958 military pay bill went into effect. Before 1958, there was a century-old tradition of relating retirement benefits to active duty pay. But the military pay bill provided for 6 percent increases for officers who retired before June 1, 1958 and retained the traditional system only for those who subsequently left the service. It would be a simple matter—costing at most $30 million—to correct the injustice, as the Department of Defense has urged.

Yet in the pending military pay legislation, Congress again fails to remedy the defect. By a 19 to 13 vote, the full House Armed Services Committee rejected the unanimous subcommittee recommendation for removing the discriminatory feature. "This bill contains a major inconsistency," a minority of the full committee pointed out. "While purporting to encourage competent members of our Armed Forces to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service."

These sentences sum the matter up. Surely the House will amend the bill when it comes up on the floor, and thereby point the way to Senate adoption of a similar corrective. This legislative wrong has been a reproach to the country for altogether too long.

Tribute to James L. McDevitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of James L. McDevitt, director of the AFL–CIO's Committee on Political Education, in Oklahoma City on March 19, was a deep loss to many people in different walks of life. Because I believe my colleagues will want to know more about the life of this fine, unassuming man who worked consistently and effectively to make the voice of the working man heard in this country, I call attention to the April issue of the Plasterer and Cement Mason, in which Mr. McDevitt's life was memorialized.

The article follows:

[From the Plasterer and Cement Mason, April 1963]

PASSING OF JAMES L. MCDEVITT LEAVES VOID IN RANKS OF LABOR

James L. McDevitt, vice president and executive board member of the O.P. and C.M.I.A., who died March 19 in Oklahoma City following a cerebral hemorrhage, was an outstanding labor leader at the local, State, and National levels.

As the director of the Committee on Political Education, Jim's particular union affiliation perhaps was not important to the large and varied groups of people he met all over the country, but his O.P. and C.M.I.A. membership always remained important to Jim. And O.P. and C.M.I.A. members everywhere were glad and proud that he was a member of their union.

Jim had gone to Oklahoma City to preside over one of a series of COPE regional conferences. He suffered a stroke on the morning of March 19 and another late that afternoon. He died the following morning.

Jim McDevitt was born in Philadelphia on Nov. 3, 1898, the son and grandson of plasterers. His grandfather, Charles McDevitt, came to this country from Ireland in 1849, at the age of 12 and settled in south Philadelphia. He was apprenticed out as a plasterer and in 1873 helped to found the Operative Plasterers' Mutual Protective Association. Charles had two sons, John and William, and both became plasterers and trade unionists. Jim was one of the five children of William McDevitt.

In 1923, when Jim became a candidate for recording secretary of local No. 8, it was said jokingly that his family vote was enough to elect him. He had been apprenticed in 1916, but his apprenticeship was interrupted by World War I. He enlisted in the Army in 1918, saw service in France and was honorably discharged in July 1919. He resumed his apprenticeship and became a journeyman plasterer in July 1920.

After being elected recording secretary of local No. 8, he went on to become president and business representative. It was during these days that he first met up with President Leonard, then business agent of local No. 31, Pittsburgh, and Secretary-Treasurer John J. Hauck, then business agent of local No. 592, Philadelphia. In 1928, he was elected president of the Philadelphia Building Trades Council.

In 1938, when AFL leaders in Pennsylvania needed someone to hold together a State federation badly split, they turned to McDevitt, who was then only 40 years old.

McDevitt's first years as State federation president were stormy, and the federation was so impoverished by the split in labor that McDevitt continued on the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review so that he could forego his salary as federation president.

In 1940, during the third term campaign of President Roosevelt, McDevitt's voice was one of the most powerful and persuasive raised in support of Roosevelt in Pennsylvania.

In 1947, the Pennsylvania State Federation established a permanent Committee on Political Action. Its purpose was to put the federation's political activities on an effective and continuing basis. The first test came in the 1948 elections. The committee set out to reach the federation's 700,000 membership. It sponsored mass meetings, bought time on radio stations and space in newspapers and published quantities of its own literature to get its message across. McDevitt predicted that the liberal-labor vote in Pennsylvania would defeat 10 Congressmen who had voted for Taft-Hartley. Experienced reporters covering the campaign thought he was talking through his hat, but the returns showed that 11, not 10, Taft-Hartley Congressmen were defeated in Pennsylvania.

McDevitt once said that he grew up "more or less a Democrat because in Republican Philadelphia it was the only thing a sincere trade unionist could be." Nevertheless, he could commend Republicans who had been fair to labor and criticized Democrats when they menaced labor's interests. He once commended Republican Gov. Edward Martin for a "glorious triumph" and he once told President Truman he was emulating the dictators when he asked for a "draft labor" law.

Expressing, once, the political philosophy of COPE, he said, "We believe that the well-being, the security, the freedom from economic fear and the dignity of each person should be the first concern of each legislator whether it be in the State capitals or Washington."

In his years in Pennsylvania, McDevitt served on many State agencies under appointment by the Governor. In 1948, he and President Edward J. Leonard (then vice president) were designated by the U.S. Secretary of Labor as representatives of all labor in the United States at the World Safety Conference of the International Labor Organization, held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Jim McDevitt's activities in the fight against intolerance are reflected in the positions he had held on such groups as the executive committee of the State Council for Fair Employment Practices, the American Council for Christians and Jews, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Trade Council for Palestine.

McDevitt was named a vice president of the O.P. & C.M.I.A. in 1954 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of James M. Myles, who also had been a prominent citizen of

Pennsylvania. In 1959, President Leonard appointed McDevitt to the general executive board. Jim rendered many services to the international association, not the least of which were given in his capacity as chairman of the constitution committee at international conventions. He took this post following the death of Vice President John Brennan, and his ready grasp of issues and command of parliamentary procedures made him a tower of strength during conventions.

Over the years, a lot of eminent people went out of their way to say nice things about Jim McDevitt. Here are some quotes:

"Jim McDevitt has proven himself a labor-statesman who seeks to advance both the interests of organized labor and the community in which they work."—WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator, Oregon.

"I have known Jim McDevitt ever since the days when I was serving in the State senate, and I have long been indebted to him for his ready ear, his sound counsel, his devotion to humanitarian ideals, and his eloquent presentation of labor's point of view."—George M. Leader, former Governor of Pennsylvania.

"Jim McDevitt is a man of character, integrity, knowledge and ability. For many years it has been by great privilege to be intimately acquainted with him and like others who have come within range of his influence, I have admiration and affection for him."—James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman, National Democratic Committee.

"Even more impressive than his fierce dedication to the cause of labor, has been his unselfish devotion to the struggle for human rights and civic betterment."—Richardson Dilworth, mayor, city of Philadelphia.

"Since I am a card carrying member of the BMPIU, we have much in common. I have watched Jim McDevitt grow from a mechanic of the trowel trade to the high position he now enjoys. This has been accomplished only by his dedication to the labor movement and his fair dealing with industry over the years."—John B. Kelly, prominent Philadelphia builder.

"It has been my good fortune to know some of the 'top' men of the world. * * * Jim McDevitt ranks with the best of them."—George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania and U.S. Ambassador.

"He has always been constructive. He is held in esteem and respect by all who have been privileged to work with him."—Dr. George W. Taylor, former Chairman, National War Labor Board, and well-known arbitrator.

"Jim McDevitt has stood for the ideals of good government, justice and rights of the average American citizen."—JOSEPH S. CLARK, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania.

Forge of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New York JOHN LINDSAY, has written an excellent review of Neil MacNeil's "Forge of Democracy: the House of Representatives," a highly regarded study of this body.

Indicative of the tremendous respect for the opinion of Mr. LINDSAY is the fact that the New York Herald Tribune and their board of editors placed his review on the front page of their recent Sunday edition. This respect, Mr. Speaker, so pronounced throughout the United States, is a great tribute to our Member and it is also a tribute to the "Trib" that they decided to place his review in such an auspicious position.

In this harried world of bombastic best sellers and fragmented reviews, Mr. LINDSAY has managed to catch the flavor of the MacNeill book.

According to JOHN LINDSAY:

The constant problem of representative government is to find the middle ground between chaos at one extreme and tyranny at the other. To the freeman, extremes offer little choice. The paralysis of an uncontrollable factionalism is no more palatable than the conformity imposed by an unrestrained majority.

No one, Mr. Speaker, has said more in shorter space, and we can be proud that JOHN LINDSAY is a Member of this body at the present time. He can articulate the great issues that confront us, and he can lead by word and example. Let us hope that someday, Mr. LINDSAY will bring his considerable talent to the task of a book on the House. In the meantime, I am honored to place his review in the RECORD. In fact, it is more than a review, it is an excellent essay in itself. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his review from the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, May 5.

The article follows:

BETWEEN CHAOS AND TYRANNY, THE HOUSE

("Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives," by Neil MacNeil. 496 pp. New York: David McKay Co. $6.75)

(By JOHN V. LINDSAY)

"No one pretends that democracy is perfect or allwise," Winston Churchill once remarked. "Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all other forms that have been tried from time to time."

The average visitor to the galleries of the U.S. House of Representatives is appalled at its appearance of disorganized trivia, irrelevance, "bunk" (the word was coined in the House), and at the endless and aimless comings and goings. To the average political scientist, the imperfections of the institution are manifest. They stick out like bumps. In fact, they are democracy's imperfections.

Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, takes on different shapes and colors according to the viewpoint. To the executive branch, from the single purpose movers in the political echelons, convinced of the rectitude of their own course, to the streams of careerists who fill to brimming the Federal Establishment from 9 to 5 the house on the hill is a brooding omnipresence, hostile, immovable, incomprehensive—half asleep, yet ready to spring. The executive branch spends 10 months of the year looking forward to the 2 when Congress is out of town, and yet neither branch can function without the other. They move in relation to each other; they learn to measure the distance between themselves and to respect each other's powers. The separation of these powers becomes very real and very important to the practitioner.

To political scientists and columnists, the House is a slow, crawling crustacean, excumbered by fossils, feuds and bad habits. But to the late Sam Rayburn, member of the House for half a century and Speaker for 2 decades, the House was "the highest theater that anyone plays in upon this earth today."

In the midst of the current spate of verbiage about the Congress, about its role in a modern world society, about its habits and practices, Neil MacNeil's book on the House of Representatives is as welcome as spring after winter. Thoroughly researched, with bibliography and index, MacNeil's study of this enormously complex institution is a good journalist's accurate report of what the House is really all about. The author, for all his familiarity with the House's imperfections, has a high regard, even an affection, for the institution. While he knows that real power in the House is in the hands of a small group of party elders, he is optimistic about the House's ability to adjust itself to the times. He understands Congress' antennae, which are more sensitive than many people and most political scientists think. He is aware that, for all its sluggishness and faults, Congress for almost two centuries has made those delicate adjustments that have enabled all Americans to live together under its rule. It is indeed remarkable that a country so young, diverse and energetic could have progressed so far with only one violent upheaval.

The constant problem of representative government is to find the middle ground between chaos at one extreme and tyranny at the other. To the free man, extremes offer little choice. The paralysis of an uncontrollable factionalism is no more palatable than the conformity imposed by an unrestrained majority. MacNeil sees the role of the House in holding the middle ground. "The genius * * * of the men who established the American system of government," he writes, "was to devise * * * government in which democracy was restrained from its own excesses. Here, singularly, the House of Representatives has played a unique and extraordinary role."

By connecting events to personalities, the author has captured the high drama of the House, the moments when great issues have given rise to violent passions. For a good part of the 19th century, there was more than one way of settling the matter at hand. Members speaking on the floor under the cloak of constitutional immunity frequently announced that they were prepared to back their words "here and elsewhere,"—that is, with pistols. MacNeil gives a vivid account of House bloodshed and of lesser forms of brawling both on and off the floor.

In more recent years, the weapons have been confined to verbal assaults and tactical use of the parliamentary rules. We are reminded that the rules are not to be slighted. They are foil, mace, and cannon in the hands of experts. Based largely on Jefferson's manual, which in turn was based on the rules of the British House of Commons, the rules have been used by skillful Parliamentarians to alter the course of history. It is small wonder that some of the greatest House clashes have been brought on by changes in the rules themselves. The names of the antagonists in these encounters are recorded in history: Henry Clay, John Quincy Adams, Thomas Reed, Joe Cannon, George Norris, Howard W. Smith, Sam Rayburn, Charles Halleck. The author takes us through the back rooms during some of these struggles; he concludes with an invaluable reconstruction of the monumental Rules Committee battle of 1961 in which Rayburn staked both his reputation and his final mark in history. The author translates history into living people in his account of the two hundred years' war between House and Senate, a battle for supremacy that saw one of its fiercest skirmishes in the 87th Congress, 1961–62.

If the book is a bit disjointed and repetitious, so is the House. The works of George Galloway apart, no outside account of Congress till now has touched the pulse of the House. Through long personal contact in the corridors, speakers' lounge and press gallery,

Neil MacNeil has measured the heartbeat of the place. He takes the reader through the back rooms—Rayburn's "Board of Education," HALLECK's "clinic"—which are pulse points of the inner life, points of interest not usually mentioned by the guide services. Repeatedly, he refers to "the mood of the House," its "temper," "the mystique of the House's inner life." As the author clearly had the respect of Rayburn, Speaker Sam's recorded observations ring true. "You can't really say how you lead," said the man who was Speaker twice as long as any one else in history. "You feel your way, receptive to those rollowing waves of sentiment. And if a man can't see and hear and feel, why then, of course, he's lost."

The study of parliamentary institutions is the study of man's unending struggle to attain freedom. Neil MacNeil's book on the U.S. House of Representatives is a solid contribution to that study. It is good to have it from a man who knows what he is talking about.

Health Care for the Aged: How the Aged Pay Their Medical Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of very important and revealing information about the financial ability of our senior citizens to meet their medical costs was put in testimony in the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on the King-Anderson bill of the last Congress. One of the best indicators which the Committee was given was the payment record of the elderly who had been hospitalized. In most cases it was shown that the payment record of the elderly was better than that of the other age groups in our country.

Recently I received from the Johnson County Medical Society of Johnson County, Ind., a breakdown on the payment record of elderly patients in that county. It is significant information and I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to share it with my colleagues. At the same time, I should like to call attention to the various reports which appeared on this same subject in the Ways and Means Committee hearings on the King-Anderson bill. Reference is made by State to the page numbers of the four-volume printed hearings: Arizona, pages 2069–2072; Delaware, pages 1220–1221; Indiana, pages 2078–2083; Minnesota, page 442; Montana, page 581; New Mexico, page 2101; and Vermont, pages 1567–1568.

I am happy that this further information has been provided on the important question of health care for the aged.

The statistical data, and the covering letter which accompanied it, follow:

JOHNSON COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Franklin, Ind., April 1, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: We believe you should have these facts before you reach a decision on the King-Anderson or any other medicare bill that might come before Congress. This study covers a community of 51,000 people with average annual spendable income of $1,845 per person, or a median family income of $6,236, so the findings should be significant.

The medical staff of the Johnson County Memorial Hospital, Franklin, Ind., and the members of the Johnson County Medical Society were of the opinion that their over-age-65 patients had much less difficulty paying for their medical care than did the younger age groups.

Mr. George Goshorn, superintendent of the hospital, made a detailed analysis of the account records of every patient hospitalized during a 6-month period. The results of this survey are attached. They can be summarized as follows:

(1) Citizens over 65 were hospitalized more frequently than those under 65, 160 per 1,000 compared to 102 per 1,000. Their average stay was longer, average cost being $381 compared to $205 for the under-age-65 group. Seventy-nine percent of the cases had insurance coverage which paid 82.6 percent of their cost. Fourteen percent were able to pay from savings. Existing welfare an old-age assistance funds took care of those having actual financial need.

(2) This hospital had no real financial problem with over-age-65 patients, since only .2 percent of their total hospitalization cost remains unpaid. Our collection problem is in the 14–40 age group. For deliveries alone in this group, 19 percent of the cases have totally or partially unpaid accounts, representing 11 percent of the total delivery charge.

The survey proves that the over-age-65 group can pay their own medical expenses, and that present welfare facilities are adequate to care for the medically indigent. We believe that any medical plan financed by social security is not only unnecessary, but would create a hardship for the younger wage earners who already have difficulty meeting their bills and taxes.

Very truly yours,

HUGH K. ANDREWS, M.D.,
President, Johnson County Medical Society.

JOHN M. MACHLEDT, M.D.,
President of Medical Staff, Johnson County Memorial Hospital.

STATISTSCAL DATA OF JOHNSON COUNTY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, FRANKLIN, IND.

Total dismissals of patients over 65 years old from June 1 through November 30, 1962: 375 patients (averaging 75+ years old); total cost $143,046.11. Average per case $381.46; highest total bill $3,467.70; lowest total bill $30.85; 14 had bills over $1,000; 24 had bills under $100.

Two hundred and fifty-three covered by Blue Cross totaling $85,221.97; 64.4 percent of cases, 59.6 percent of cost; average Blue Cross payment $336.85; 224 paid personally in addition to Blue Cross coverage total of $15,853.19; average personal portion $70.77.

Forty-six covered by commercial insurance totaling $10,002.92; 12.3 percent of cases, 7 percent of cost; average commercial insurance payment $217.45; 39 paid personally in addition to commercial insurance coverage total of $4,136.92; average personal portion $106.07.

Eighteen paid by welfare totaling $4,578.10; 4.8 percent of cases, 3.2 percent of cost; average welfare payment $254.34; 4 welfare cases also covered by Blue Cross totaling $1,514.60; average Blue Cross payment of welfare cases $378.65.

Three paid by OAA totaling $805.90; .8 percent of cases, 56 percent of cost; average OAA case $268.63; 1 OAA case also covered by Blue Cross in amount of $88.35; 2 paid personally in addition to OAA in amount of $38.90.

Fifty-five no coverage—personally paid totaling $19,956.88; 14.7 percent of cases, 13.9 percent of cost; average personal case $362.85.

Largest individual account paid by Blue Cross. $2,799.90; commercial insurance, $474.40; welfare, $599.45; OAA, $559.40; personal, $2,061.25.

Three reported uncollectible totaling $785.55; 0.5 percent of total cost ($348.80 of this has been collected leaving $336.75 uncollected); 0.2 percent of total. Total percent of cost covered by all insurance, welfare and OAA, 72 percent; percent of cost paid by individuals, 28 percent.

Sweeping CD Under the Rug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and distinguished colleague the Honorable SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts, has brought to my attention an excellent recent editorial which appeared in the Berkshire Eagle, a major newspaper in Representative CONTE's home city. I want to congratulate the editors of the Berkshire Eagle, for they have presented the basic argument which every American should understand, and further have stated a position which is identical to mine.

Because I believe all Members will find this editorial of interest, it follows:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Apr. 23, 1963]

SWEEPING CD UNDER THE RUG

At a press conference last summer President Kennedy summed up the civil defense problem pretty effectively in two sentences. "When the skies are clear," he said, "no one is interested. Then when the clouds come—after all, we have no assurance that they will not come—everyone suddenly wants to find out why more has not been done about it."

At the moment, the skies are relatively clear, at least to the exetnt that we haven't had a full-blown crisis for almost 6 months. So 2 weeks ago the House felt free to knock down the Defense Department's plea for a $61.9 million supplementary appropriation to complete the program of designating and stockpiling public fallout shelters for some 70 million Americans.

It was a foolish decision, made in the name of false economy at the behest of the House Appropriations Committee. If the decision is allowed to stand it will not only bring to a halt a minimal civil defense program which Congress authorized last year but will also enmesh our whole CD effort in further paralyzing uncertainty.

The House action would be understandable if it had been based upon an honest conviction that defense against the effects of nuclear weapons is impossible and that it is dangerous to continue a program which might encourage the public to believe that civilization as we know it could survive an allout war.

But this wasn't the argument heard in the House. The Representatives who killed the appropriation weren't saying that the only sound civil defense lies in avoiding war. Most of them, in fact, are the same representatives who consistently argue and vote for even bigger military outlays than the administration wants. The $61.9 million which they consider too much for CD is approximately the sum that we are currently

spending every 12 hours, every day in the year, to maintain our military posture.

Quite possibly our CD experts are optimistic in estimating that a minimal shelter program might make the difference between 30 percent and 60 percent casualties, between total chaos and a measure of national survival. Obviously no one can forecast with any certainty the outcome of a disaster whose gruesome outlines can only be dimly perceived.

Yet the fact remains that as long as our foreign policy is predicated upon the threat of massive retaliation, as long as our thinking accepts the idea that we must be prepared to go to the brink of disaster when necessary, then it is fatalistic nonsense to ignore civil defense. War today is insanity, but to talk glibly of preparing for war without preparing for its consequences is insanity compounded.

Fortunately there is at least a fair chance that the CD appropriation will receive better treatment in the Senate, and that the House will therefore have an opportunity to reconsider its decision in conference. But it will require an allout effort by the President to achieve this end, and it will require an expression of real concern from a public which has been altogether too inclined to rationalize inaction on the ostrich principle that because nuclear war is unthinkable it won't and can't happen.

Francis Harrison Pierpont, Forgotten West Virginia Native Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, because this is West Virginia's centennial year, a contest was held as part of the celebration for the best poem composed to commemorate the occasion. Many were submitted, but among those which did not make the deadline was one composed by Mr. L. Warren Wamsley of Walker, W. Va.

Mr. Wamsley laments the fact that our first Governor, Francis Harrison Pierpont, has been so woefully neglected, and uses him as the theme for the following which I respectfully ask to have inserted in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

NATIVE SON

Forgotten, neglected loyal native son.
Rugged courage, possessed this one—
Armed with cause, justice of right—
Noble character, in purpose of will.
Citizen leader, a guiding light—
Inspired the people, cause to fight.
Sought no glory, that cause to blight.

Heart of boldness, power and might—
Aroused the spirit, then in plight.
Raised the banner, a sparkle of light
Rugged mountaineers, pledged to fight.
Invincible courage, oneness of will—
Soon it echoed from valley to hill.
Only loyal sons to hearts call thrill—
Native courage that must linger still.

Pride in our being, love of State—
Immortal son whose hand held fate.
Enshrined in hearts 'twas never late
Rallied his people for cause, no hate.
Pledged his future for principle at stake
Oneness of unity that purpose made great.
No personal glory, for ere must he wait?
True West Virginian, creator of State.

Soviet Religious Persecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am setting forth below, for the benefit of the Members, the resolution adopted in the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on April 29, 1963, relating to the persecution of religious people by the Government of the Soviet Union.

This resolution was sponsored by the bipartisan leadership of the senate, including the following former colleagues of mine in the general assembly: Hon. Israel Stiefel, Hon. Charles R. Weiner, Hon. Martin Silvert, Hon. James S. Berger, and Hon. Benjamin R. Donolow.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA APRIL 29, 1963

"Whereas the persistent enmity to religion of the Government of the Soviet Union is a matter of historical record; and

"Whereas within the narrow framework of permissible religious practices, discrimination against synagogues and against Jewish worshipers afflicts the devout Jews of Russia; and

"Whereas Jewish congregations of the U.S.S.R. are forbidden to organize a central body and are not allowed contacts with Jewish religious groups elsewhere; and

"Whereas Yiddish language institutions and the other instruments of Yiddish culture which were destroyed in the Stalin era have not been restored; and

"Whereas 46 leading Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox clergymen of the United States have appealed to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to end discriminations against Jews, their religion and their culture; and

"Whereas both the United States and the Soviet Union have subscribed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and

"Whereas Article 18 of that Declaration declares that 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance; and

"Whereas the State Department of the United States has on other occasions protested the infliction of such injustices upon minority groups in Russia and other lands: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Department of State be hereby respectfully memorialized to request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States restate the position of the United States in oppositfon to these acts of discrimination against Jewish citizens and that he instruct the United States delegation to the United Nations to make known the sentiments expressed in this resolution in every possible manner; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to the Legislatures of the States in the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to indicate that the people of the United States deplore the antireligious attitude of the Soviet Union and the mistreatment of its Jewish subjects."

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution 44, introduced by Senators Israel Stiefel, Charles R. Weiner, Martin Silvert, James S. Berger and Benjamin R. Donolow and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the twenty-ninth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

MARK GRUEL, Jr.,
Secretary of the Senate.

When an Eagle Went to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, "Old Abe," the famous Civil War Eagle which went into battle with the 8th Wisconsin Regiment, is well remembered in the Ninth Congressional District, for he was raised near Jim Falls in Chippewa County, and joined up at the city of Eau Claire, then a small village alive with men going to war. The colorful career of "Old Abe" is detailed in an article written by E. Jay Ritter for the Wisconsin Agriculturist, Racine, Wis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have this story printed in the RECORD.

"OLD ABE" AND THE 8TH WISCONSIN

(By E. J. Ritter)

In the spring of 1861, Chief Sky, a Chippewa Indian living in the northern wilds of Wisconsin, captured an eagle's nest. To make sure of his prize he cut the tree down, and caught the eaglets as they were sliding from the nest to run and hide in the grass. One of the eaglets died. The chief took the other home and built a nest in a tree close by his wigwam. The eaglet was as big as a hen, covered with soft brown down.

The red children were delighted with their new pet, and as soon as it got acquainted, the eagle liked to sit down in the grass and see them play with the dogs. But Chief Sky was poor, and he had to sell it to a white man for a bushel of corn.

The white man brought the eagle to Eau Claire; a little village alive with men going to the war.

"Here's a recruit," said the man.

"An eagle, an eagle!" shouted the soldiers, "let him enlist."

"OLD ABE" JOINS UP

Sure enough, he was sworn into the service with ribbons of red, white, and blue around his neck.

On a perch surmounted by stars and stripes, the company took him to Madison, the capital of the State. As they marched into Camp Randall, with colors flying, drums beating, and the people cheering, the eagle seized the flag in his beak and spread his wings, his bright eye kindling with the spirit of the scene.

Shouts rent the air—"The bird of Columbia! The eagle of freedom forever!" The State made him a new perch, the boys named him "Old Abe," and the regiment, the 8th Wisconsin, was henceforth called "the Eagle regiment."

AN ADVENTUROUS BIRD

On the march he was carried at the head of the company, and everywhere was greeted with delight. At St. Louis, a gentleman offered $500 for it, and another his farm. However, the boys had no notion of parting with their bird. It was above all price—an emblem of battle and of victory.

It would be impossible to relate all the droll adventures of the bird through its 3 years of service—flights in the air, fights, and its race with the men.

When the regiment was in summer quarters at Clear Creek in Dixie, it was allowed to run at large, and every morning went to the river half a mile off, where it splashed and played in the water, faithfully returning to camp when it had enough.

Once rations got low, and for 2 days Abe had nothing to eat. Hard-tack he objected to, fasting was disagreeable, and Tom, his bearer, could not get beyond the pickets to a farmyard. At last, pushing his way to the colonel's tent, he pleaded for poor Abe. The colonel gave him a pass, and Tom got him an excellent dinner.

MARCHED WITH SHERMAN

Abe was in 20 battles, besides many skirmishes. He was at the seige of Vicksburg and the storming of Corinth. He marched with Sherman up the Red River. The whiz of bullets and the scream of shells were his delight. As the battle grew hot and hotter, he would flap his wings and mingle his wildest notes with the noise around him.

He was very fond of music, especially Yankee Doodle and Old John Brown. Upon parade he always gave heed to "Attention." With his eye on the commander, he would listen and obey orders, noting time accurately. After parade he would put off his soldierly air, flap his wings, and make himself at home. The rebels called him "Yankee Buzzard," "Old Owl," and other hard names, but his eagle nature was quite above noticing it.

LOST ONE FEATHER

The Confederate General Price gave orders to his men to be sure and capture the eagle of the 8th Wisconsin, for he would rather have it than a dozen battle flags. But for all that he scarcely lost a feather—only one from his right wing. His tail-feathers were once cropped by a bullet.

At last the Civil War came to an end, and the brave Wisconsin 8th, with their live eagle and torn and riddled flags, were welcomed back to Madison. They went out a thousand strong, and returned a little band, scarred, and toil-worn, having fought and won.

And what of the soldier bird? In the name of his gallant veterans, Captain Wolf presented him to the State. Governor Lewis accepted the illustrious gift, and ample quarters were provided for him in the beautiful Statehouse grounds.

Old Abe was invited to attend the great fair at Chicago. An enterprising gentleman had colored photographs made of the old hero, and sold $16,700 worth for the benefit of the poor and sick soldiers.

The great American eagle had done his part.

Sensible Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, inadvertently an editorial from the Boston Record American entitled "Sensible Foreign Aid" was omitted from the extension of my remarks of the above date when printed on page A2658 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix for May 1, 1963, concerning the National Recognition Award presented by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to the Associated Industries of Massachusetts for its unique tools for freedom program.

This editorial follows:

SENSIBLE FOREIGN AID

The Associated Industries of Massachusetts has just won a signal honor. It has received the National Recognition Award from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for its tools for freedom program, a private enterprise people-to-people project which was launched here a year ago.

Under this program, Massachusetts manufacturers, and some in other States, contribute outdated but still usable tools, machinery and equipment to technical schools in the developing nations of Asia, Latin America and Africa.

So far, more than 66 tons of tools for freedom have been shipped from Boston to 24 schools in 11 countries. Donations are continuing and much more machinery and equipment is awaiting shipment. The need is great because some 350 vocational schools in 26 underdeveloped countries of the free world are seeking this assistance.

This is a sensible and effective foreign aid program and the recognition Associated Industries of Massachusetts has earned for fostering and developing it is well deserved.

Cooperation of Government and Livestock Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, for those of us vitally interested in the welfare of the livestock industry, every step toward increasing the spirit of cooperation between the industry and the Government is noted with satisfaction.

The Oregon Cattleman magazine's editorial page, featured a recent speech by John Carver, Assistant Secretary of Interior, to the National Advisory Board Council to the Bureau of Land Management, which provides important evidence of continued cooperative efforts on both sides.

I insert the speech under leave to extend and revise my remarks:

[From the Oregon Cattleman, May 1963]

COOPERATION OF GOVERNMENT AND LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

(By Lyle Liggett, director, public relations, American National Cattlemen's Association)

The following talk of John Carver, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, as read to the meeting of the National Advisory Board Council to the Bureau of Land Management deserves further consideration.

Because some misunderstanding has developed over the increase in fees for grazing on certain of our Nation's public lands, we find it gratifying that an official of the Federal Department involved has taken the trouble to help set the record straight.

We also are impressed that he states so well what all the shouting was about: free people in a free society using the processes of debate to establish the fact that not all peoples or problems are alike. Some news media and elements in our modern society seem to have forgotten that some industries still enjoy old-fashioned "town meeting" debates over issues. And when it's all over, the participants retain their respect for each other and the final decision.

Perhaps overlooked in all the fun and headlines has been the tremendous accomplishment of ranchers and Federal range specialists in improving the ranges. Many millions have and are being spent in cooperative efforts. Countless more millions of ranchers' own dollars are spent each year. This is the main story yet to be told.

It also seems only fair to point out that statistics have been cited to indicate that "while 20 percent of the ranges are improving, 80 percent remain static or are declining." More pertinent would be those same statistics stated thusly: "Twenty percent of our ranges are declining, 60 percent are static and the remaining 20 percent are improving." This does not make ranchers complacent or alleviate the sincere alarm for the condition of our Nation's resources, but it does present a more realistic appraisal and foundation for a mutual attack. Following several years of severe drought, we have some reason to be relieved that even 80 percent is "static" or improving.

REMARKS BY JOHN A. CARVER, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 11, 1963

Chairman Hughes, and members of the council, this message of greeting will be read to you. I apologize for such presumptiousness. But I know that very few in this room will conclude that I am unconcerned about your proceedings today. We have spent too many hours together the last 2 years for that.

Although I am not with you, I sense similarities between this meeting and one I attended with you in October 1961 at Salt Lake City. The taut and tense atmosphere which prevailed there was a symptom of a belief, shared by many, that the continuance of the council itself hung in the balance.

We had a choice to make. I've never had any reason to regret the choice I made for a strong, constructive and proud council.

Eighteen months ago the crisis was over the procedures and regulations governing the operation of the council, and its constituent State and district councils. Today's choice, if my analysis is correct, is not concerned with how we work together, but with whether we can continue to work together at all.

Divisive forces are testing our ability—on both sides—to keep our attention on the conservation job to be done, and to resist the forces which tempt us to a sterile and pointless dialogue of invectiveness.

The music of praise is especially sweet to the ears of Government administrators. They hear it seldom enough. The Department is hearing some of it now—some of the editorials from around the country credit us with a great victory over the unanimous selfishness of the livestock industry.

I happen to know, as you do, that this is simply not accurate. But how easy it would be to forget the facts, to accept the premises in the accolades, to reduce the complexity of public land management to the false simplicity of resistance to the livestock industry.

The livestock industry did not resist the increase in fees. Some of its members did; some of the members of this council did.

But since when did a minority of dissent get the right to frame the terms of the controversy?

The livestock industry which uses the public land under the terms of the Taylor Graz-

ing Act, as represented at this meeting today, so far as I am concerned has acted with complete responsibility.

I think we are in agreement on many things. For example, no one reasonably should expect you to like to have your fees raised. Fee setting is a governmental function committed to the Secretary of the Interior. But you were consulted, and you participated in the decisionmaking process.

We also agree that many issues are a great deal more important. As I have had occasion to tell some of you, and many of the Senators and Representatives from your States, we will not permit the heat of the recently concluded controversy to obscure the fact that an intensive review of many of our procedures is in order.

The climate for such review ought to be the constructive one that marked our year-long efforts on the fee question. I see no reason why we cannot come a great deal closer to common understanding of grazing capacity, scheduling of reductions or increases in permitted use, procedures for review of administrative actions, appellate procedures, and the whole complex of law, regulation, and exercise of sound judgment at the local level.

We will get at these issues, I pledge, in continuing adherence to a principle I announced to the House Interior Committee a month ago—that a decent conservation job on the public's lands is possible only with the cooperation of those who share in its use. I said then that the consumptive users who have a legitimate right to be on the public land must be considered as valuable and necessary allies in achieving the kind of total conservation effort which must be mobilized if we are to turn upward the graph of the condition of public lands—to prevent waste.

The task demands our best efforts, freed from either intellectual or emotional hobbles. The temptation to regard each other as adversaries, rather than allies, will continue to be very great—on both sides.

It is my hope to be with you before the meeting ends. In the meantime you have my best wishes.

Tax Chaos Threatens 140,000 Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Tax Chaos Threatens 140,000 Jobs":

TAX CHAOS THREATENS 140,000 JOBS

CRITICAL CONSEQUENCES MULTIPLYING RAPIDLY

New Federal tax rules on expense account spending, overzealous interpretation of them by officials, conflicting statements and misunderstanding have created a situation in the hospitality industry that may reach the proportions of a catastrophe unless action is taken quickly to remedy and clarify it.

Already the situation has produced:

Reductions of from 10 to 55 percent in food service sales.

A drop of 4 to 28 percent in hotel and motel room occupancy.

Cuts of 10 to 30 percent in convention attendance and 10 to 25 percent in future bookings.

A 20-percent slash in the demand for beef by restaurants and hotels.

Lessened demand for coffee and other basic supplies used to feed business guests.

By the end of the year, consequences will include:

Elimination of $666 million in restaurant sales, about a third of normal expense account spending, half of which goes to workers in wages.

Certain failure for several hundred formerly successful restaurant and hotels.

And an addition to already record unemployment rolls of 140,000 men and women whose jobs will be wiped out by these failures and by sharp reductions in other operations.

These are facts and figures—not estimates or guesses but hard statements determined by surveys of the hospitality industry conducted by the hospitality group of magazines, the National Restaurant Association, the American Motor Hotel Association and the American Hotel and Motel Association—which have resulted from the nationwide fear and confusion produced among businessmen and companies by the new expense account tax legislation and the interpretation of the new law by the Internal Revenue Service.

Business and industry, fearful of running afoul of the new law, have cut back business trips and expense account entertaining by their salesmen and sales and manufacturing officials.

Employees of these companies, afraid various expenditures will not be allowed, have cut back further in many cases.

WIVES LEFT AT HOME; THEATERS, SHOPS HIT

Wives, formerly taken to meetings, have been left at home, reducing double occupancy of rooms with a consequent reduction in the room rental rate, halving the meals consumed in restaurants and hotel dining rooms and at banquets by the double attendance and eliminating thousands of dollars spent by them in the retail stores of every big convention city.

Harsh statements by the Government on enforcement of the new rules started the action that is swiftly rolling into a catastrophe.

A lack of understanding on the part of the businessmen affected hastened it along.

Failure to remedy it quickly may complete it.

Besides the results mentioned:

The entertainment business—theaters, night clubs—is hurting.

With a lessened demand for beef, cattle growers are being hit.

Farmers, with a lessened demand for raw foods by hotels and restaurants, will be hurt.

Investors in thousands of operations will see their investments wiped out by failures or devalued by profit margins critically reduced by loss of business due to the tax legislation.

While Treasury officials say the new rules aren't as harsh as the public seems to think, many people apparently do not want to be bothered by all the recordkeeping the tax collectors apparently now require to support expense account deductions.

What was intended to be a move to end expense account living may result in the loss of more revenue through loss of taxable income, failures of business and loss of jobs than will be gained by the new legislation.

A survey by the Hospitality Group of Magazines of restaurants catering to the businessman and hotels and motor hotels where many conventions and meetings are normally held showed the figures cited on the opening page of this article. Excerpts from many of the replies will be found on other pages.

A survey of 387 restaurants in 40 cities across the country by the National Restaurant Association shows that business in January and February was 16.4 percent below the same 2 months of 1962 and that employment in these restaurants was down 11 percent—or 22,000 jobs based on a 1962 payroll of 200,000 in these operations. Dinner business was down by a third.

The average restaurant check was lower, and waiters reported that tips were smaller. There were also more single guests because of wives left at home.

A drop of $666 million in 1963 restaurant revenue is seen by the National Restaurant Association as a result of the cutback in expense account spending, with half of this amount representing wages that normally go to restaurant workers.

Proof that the drop in restaurant revenue is due to curbs on business spending is provided by operations such as those in Kansas City where a restaurant operator owns a coffee shop and an expense account restaurant across the street. With the same location, same weather, same management, there was a 20-percent difference in the performance in January.

Select Restaurants and Hotels of Washington which handles credit charges for over 50 restaurants in that State reported a drop of 15 percent in business as a result of the new tax legislation and uncertainty regarding it.

A survey by the Restaurant Association of Maryland in the Baltimore area indicated a 14- to 22-percent drop in gross business representing a $190,000 loss, precipitating a substantial layoff and further aggravating an already bad unemployment problem in that area.

With considerable business lost due to the new restriction, a well-known Washington, D.C., restaurant reported guest checks for food and liquor off 40 percent among those business people still patronizing the operation. Total sales were reported down from 50 to 55 percent.

At the peak of the winter season in Florida, a famous Fort Lauderdale restaurant reported sales down 4.4 percent in January, 7.5 percent in February, and 12 percent for the first 4 days in March.

A Chicago restaurant which has experienced spiraling sales since 1952 stated that business the past 60 days was down 10 percent.

Lowest January sales in 5 years were reported from a San Francisco restaurant.

MAY CLOSE NIGHT CLUB; END $20,000 PAYROLL

With better entertainment features, business in a well-known supper room of a Dallas hotel was off by 50 percent since January 1 with a consequent drop in employment. As a result, this hotel said it may wipe out its night club operation, abolishing a union payroll of $20,000 per month.

With local business up 7 percent, a San Francisco hotel noted that convention attendance and occupancy declined 30 percent, due in a great measure to wives not attending the meetings. Convention bookings also were down, food sales dropped 20 percent and beverage sales dropped 11 percent.

In Boston, one of the city's large hotels reported food sales for the first 2 months of 1963 down $50,300, including $47,604 in banquet business; convention occupancy 8,765 nights compared with 10,205 in 1962 and total occupancy 60.4 percent compared with 66.48 percent a year ago.

DISASTER AHEAD FOR MUSICIANS, WAITRESSES

Layoffs of musicians, growing each day, may reach disastrous proportions as reduced volume forces the closing of food rooms where they provided live background music or live entertainment, and other rooms are forced to reduce the size of musical groups to meet lower income. Adding to the gravity of the situation are the cancellations of many private parties where music was used.

Typical of the situation: Three musicians and a performer laid off by one large New York City hotel with elimination of music and entertainment in one food room, with two more musicians laid off with cut in

orchestra from six to four in another room. Musical trio dismissed at another hotel where food and liquor sales dropped $10,000 a month and an even greater drop expected. Eight men in two bands on dismissal notice since March 3 in one well-known restaurant. Nightly entertainment reduced from daily to two nights a week at one hotel, from daily to one night per week at a restaurant; eight men on notice at another hotel; orchestra cut from 16 to 8 at one hotel and from 14 to 10 at another; music eliminated at eight restaurants employing 25 musicians.

Layoffs of waiters and waitresses as a result of the new rulings are growing greater, unions admit. In Chicago alone, 1,000 waiters have been laid off since the first of the year, according to a survey of 98 restaurants there. Other cities are reporting similar situations on varying scales.

More than 15,000 maids, busboys, porters, etc., and 7,000 food service workers will lose their jobs in the motel industry if the trend continues, according to S. Cooper Dawson, Jr., president of the American Motor Hotel Association, based on a survey of 8 key States and chain and referral organizations. Totals for the overall lodging industry have been estimated at 60,000 jobless by the end of the year.

One referral group, representing 690 motels with over 34,000 rooms, reported a drop of 13.2 percent in room sales for the first 50 days of 1963, Mr. Dawson said.

Cut backs in purchases by steakhouses and restaurants serving prime ribs have been felt by meat purveyors in the institutional field. A typical restaurant ordering 30 to 40 prime ribs now orders 25 to 30 at the most, one meathouse reported. Similar cases are reported by others.

LOWER PRICES AHEAD, CATTLE FEEDERS WARNED

Cattle feeders were warned by one big meat company in a half page ad recently in the Drovers Journal that, with cattle prices already down, there may be a further decline of 20 percent unless they join in stopping the destruction of the market for prime meat by the new expense account rules.

Conflicting statements on the tax situation are blamed for much of the confusion and fear that has hurt business in the hospitality industry. Lack of final clarification of such substantive measures as what is deductible and what is not, and defining such broad terms as "lavish" and "extravagant" entertainment is also responsible.

To eliminate some of the fear and confusion among potential business customers, individual restaurants and restaurant associations, spearheaded by the National Restaurant Association, have opened an educational drive based on the placing of small booklets and table tents in front of customers emphasizing that business meals are still deductible. The same message is provided in stuffers for envelopes mailed to customers.

Protests also have been made to congressional leaders regarding interpretations of the law that it is felt do not accurately reflect the intent of Congress when it passed the legislation.

Modification of some of the restrictions imposed last year by Congress on the tax deductibility of business entertainment and travel expenses or at least on the rigid interpretation of the law by the Internal Revenue Service was indicated early in March after a closed door meeting of the Senate Finance Committee and Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Mortimer Caplin, and restaurant, hotel and motel operators can help bring this about by making committee members and their Congressmen and Senators aware of the vital necessity of taking such action.

Senator SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, declared at the meeting, it is reported, that the Internal Revenue Service has gone far beyond congressional intent by:

1. Requiring the keeping of receipts for any single travel or entertainment expense exceeding $25.

2. Requiring "meticulous records" to document a business discussion preceding or following entertainment to make the expenditure tax deductible.

3. Requiring a description of the type of entertainment provided.

4. Requiring a listing of the names of persons entertained.

5. Establishing that an employee in some instances would have to pay taxes on his reimbursements for travel and entertainment costs that aren't allowed by Internal Revenue Service.

CLAIMS REGULATIONS BADLY MISUNDERSTOOD

To these statements, Mr. Caplin contended that the recordkeeping regulations are badly misunderstood. He claimed that:

1. A businessman's records do not necessarily have to contain the names of persons entertained if those names are of a confidential nature.

2. Exceptions will be allowed in the case of receipts that are difficult to obtain even where the expenditure exceeds $25.

3. A great deal of time need not be devoted by the taxpayer to maintaining minimum records.

With Congress indicating action of some sort or another, the act imposing new restrictions on business travel expeses and business spending for entertainment is not yet a closed matter, and action by every operator, individual, and company concerned with the hospitality industry will play an essential factor in achieving a fair understanding with which restaurants and hotels catering to the business executive can continue to survive.

Make your Congressman and Senator aware of what the restrictions and harsh interpretation of them is costing you.

Make every member of the Senate Finance Committee aware of it.

Make every member of the House Ways and Means Committee also aware of it.

Join with your local, State and national associations in making their objections as loud and vocal as possible.

A MARCH ON WASHINGTON

To personally emphasize to Congressmen and Senators the need for enacting a more equitable expense account law, a march on Washington has been scheduled for the week of April 7 by the National Restaurant Association, with labor leaders and heads of other business and industry affected by the rules urged to join in.

MISLEADING STATEMENTS A CAUSE

The confusing and misleading statements on the expense account law are already beginning to have a detrimental effect on the Nation's economy. Misinformation regarding the law has hurt business in many areas of the country. This has already forced workers to be laid off, thereby adding to the Nation's serious unemployment situation.

Although the new regulations on expense accounts are just taking effect, surveys we have taken of leading restaurants in major cities on the east coast, South, Middle West, and west coast report that January business is down due to confusion over the new law. This decrease in restaurant business has forced layoffs in many areas. Actually, the increase in unemployment in the restaurant industry is only a small segment of the overall problem. There are 1,600,000 employees in the restaurant industry, making it the fourth largest industry in the Nation.

Directly supplying the needs of the restaurant industry are many other workers in the raising, processing, distribution, and preparation of quality fruits, vegetables, meats, bakery goods, dairy products, as well as all types of supplies and equipment used in the restaurant industry. A substantial reduction in the volume of business in restaurants not only forces layoffs in this industry but causes a chain reaction which has a direct impact on employment in all related areas of the food-service industry. This adds to the already serious problem of employment throughout the Nation.

One of the great traditions which has helped the growth of American industry is the informal business meal whereby a businessman uses the friendliness of a restaurant meal to create good will which may ultimately help his business. This good will entertaining is normally done in the better restaurants. These establishments pay top prices for the premium quality of meat and other foods they serve. A substantial reduction in the volume of foods (meat and produce) used in these restaurants causes disruption in the entire marketing structure and pricing schedules of all foods. Eventually, this hurts every consumer as well as the farmers, ranchers, meatpackers, and food processors.

It is clearly evident from the record in both the House and the Senate that Congress did not intend for the new income tax law to cause severe dislocations in the Nation's economic progress, but misleading statements and confusion concerning the law are already having a detrimental effect on business and causing unemployment in many areas.

HENRY MONTAGUE,
President, National Restaurant Association.

TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND TO LOSE MOTEL JOBS

A drop of 16.3 percent in room, food and beverage sales in motels is reported for the first 2 months of this year as compared to January and February sales a year ago.

This sales lag is directly attributable to curtailment of expense account spending, and if this trend continues, more than 22,000 employees in the motel industry will lose their jobs as a result of decreased sales. About 7,000 of these are food service workers and about 15,000 are maids, bus boys, porters, etc.

Our findings come from a survey just made in eight key States and from chain and referral organizations and trade magazines covering the United States.

One referral group, representing 690 motels with over 34,000 rooms reported an across-the-board drop of 12.3 percent in room sales for the first 50 days of 1963 with curtailment of expense account spending as the principal cause. Surveys within the States of California, Arizona, Nevada, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, and Minnesota boosted the total for loss of business during January and February to an average of 16.3 percent.

The National Restaurant Association has reported that 80,000 workers in public restaurants stand to lose their jobs if sales do not increase. With 22,000 employees affected in motels alone, it is reasonable to expect that at least a total of 60,000 people face unemployment in the lodging industry, which, combined with the restaurant total, adds to about 140,000 jobs that would be jeopardized in the combined food service and lodging industries.

Our reports show that there is confusion, misunderstanding and apprehension on the part of businessmen and executives as to what types and amounts of expense accounts are tax deductible. This confusion is responsible for much of the drop in sales and must be cleared up before normal business can be expected.

S. COOPER DAWSON, Jr.
President, American Motor Hotel Association.

Kerr-Mills Is Welfare Case Factory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by our beloved and distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, for the Senior Citizens News, entitled "Kerr-Mills Is Welfare Case Factory."

Mr. JOHNSTON's comments appeared in the April 1963, issue.

The article follows:

KERR-MILLS IS WELFARE CASE FACTORY

(By Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina)

No domestic issue arose in the last election which caused more confusion for voters than did hospital insurance for the aged under social security. The hospital insurance program was maligned, attacked, distorted, and misrepresented as no other issue has ever been. Charges were made that the hospital insurance proposal would dictate to the patient what doctor he could use. This is not true. There are no provisions in the bill providing funds for payment of doctors nor is there any language telling a patient what doctor to use. The proposal merely provides insurance for people 65 and older which pays for hospital and nursing type care.

In South Carolina there are about 150,000 people 65 years of age and over. Under the Kerr-Mills law, two-thirds of the aged in South Carolina are indigent. Others are merely poor. Indigents include couples with under $2,000 a year income and people living alone with under $1,200 a year income. It is because the aged have such small incomes and such large medical costs that the King-Anderson bill is needed, and would more adequately meet the needs of our people.

Some of the literature put out by Scalpel (the South Carolina affiliate of the American Medical Political Action Committee) charged that the cost of the hospital insurance proposal would double social security taxes. The truth is the social security taxes from employee and employer would be raised only one-fourth of 1 percent each, and the base on which he would pay the tax would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200. This increase in earnings base would not only pay toward hospital insurance but also would provide a very important increase in cash monthly benefits for many of today's workers. In dollars and cents the increase to pay for health insurance in taxes proposed would be $12 a year for an employee earning $4,800 and less on smaller earnings. The contributions for health insurance can be kept so small because employers match the employee contributions and because the contributions are made over the 40 or so years of a working lifetime with benefits being paid only during the many fewer years of old age.

The King-Anderson proposal would pay for good care for everyone over 65 participating, as compared to the Kerr-Mills program in South Carolina which provided benefits for only 587 people last December. Under Kerr-Mills someone who works and saves a little is told to go elsewhere for medical assistance. An aged person with life insurance worth $1,500 gets no help. A person with savings of $600 gets no help. If a man cashes in his insurance and spends his savings to the point where he can get help under Kerr-Mills, how long will it be before he is knocking on the door for every type of welfare relief?

The Kerr-Mills bill is a factory for welfare cases and the King-Anderson bill is a preventive for welfare cases. The King-Anderson bill encourages people to build up their savings and pensions and attempt to work a little after retirement if they can. As with any insurance plan, an insured aged person would automatically be qualified for benefits if he got sick, even if he had some resources. Working and saving is what our system depends upon and the King-Anderson bill works well with this system.

It has been charged that hospital insurance is socialism and that supporters of medicare want socialism instead of democracy. I take a back seat to no one when it comes to supporting our free enterprise system. However, I can say that there are some who are so short-sighted as to place our free enterprise system in jeopardy by refusing to meet the challenge of the times with sensible legislation. The hospital insurance program meets this challenge by paying for the care of our aged without making welfare cases out of them. The quickest way to a welfare state is putting people on the welfare rolls, and this is what Kerr-Mills bill will do to our old people. The King-Anderson bill on the other hand asks people to contribute, to pay toward and to earn their benefits. That's the American way.

Supporters of the Kerr-Mills bill should admit that recipients cannot go to their own doctor but have to go to a clinic to get care. They should admit that no care at all is provided for a sick person at home, and that not over forty days a year of hospital care or ninety days of nursing home care is provided. They should also admit the aged have to be investigated practically like a police state where bank accounts are checked, deposit boxes opened, life insurance examined, possibilities of employment looked into. They should also admit thousands and thousands of dollars are wasted on these investigations, $202,000 in fiscal year 1962—$37 a case.

In contrast, the King-Anderson bill is insurance. It would spend only 3 percent of benefits on administration. If you are a member of the program and 65 you get the benefits. Under this bill a person applying for hospital insurance under social security knows he has participated and paid from his earnings and is entitled to the benefits. The only examination he will have to meet is the medical one when he enters the hospital.

I intend to do as I said in my campaign for reelection, and throughout my political career—to do and to vote to do what is best for our State, our people, and our Nation. On the issue of hospital insurance for the aged under social security versus the Kerr-Mills bill, I intend, as in the past, to support and work toward a hospital insurance program for the aged such as that contained in the King-Anderson bill.

Loans for Higher Education—A Private Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the importance to our country's future of higher education for our young people has been given frequent recognition both within and outside of government circles. There is no question that the training which we give those who will lead America in the future—leaders in business, government, education, religion, art, the sciences, indeed in every field—will be instrumental in setting the course of our Nation's future.

One important element in this training is providing the financing for those who need help to pay the mounting costs of a college education. There is a long history of financial help given students through the institutions which they attend and, in some instances, outside organizations willing to help. In recent years the Federal Government has moved into this area filling some of the assistance gaps which had been found to exist—I note especially the loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act which, in my opinion, make a truly significant step forward in promoting greater educational opportunity in this country.

My purpose in speaking today is to call attention to a new development in educational aid for needy students, a private loan program—United Student Air funds. The idea behind USA funds, and making available to students without other means of financing their higher education a total of $500 million in loan funds. The idea behind USA Funds, and the progress that has been made in putting that idea to work, is contained in an article in the April 20 issue of Business Week. I might note in connection with this program that efforts of this scope within the private sector of our society, aimed at plugging the gaps between scholarships and other help from the educational institutions themselves, conventional loans, and education financed by the student or his parents. Development of this source of loan funds—or rather, the development of this loan guarantee procedure—would permit the Federal Government to phase out of its role in this field.

The Business Week article follows:

FINANCIAL LEVER BOOSTS STUDENT AID

"Financing a college education," says Richard C. Cornuelle, director of United Student Aid Funds, Inc., "is getting more and more these days like buying an automobile. You borrow the funds, use them to get through college, and take the usual 36 months to pay off your debt."

There's no gainsaying the rising cost of a college education; in many cases these costs have more than doubled in the last 8 years. There is no doubt, either, of the growing necessity for a college education in almost any phase of white-collar employment.

In the face of these two pressures, at least 1 million students out of today's college population of some 4.1 million are getting all or a substantial part of their college education on credit. For the greatest number of these the money comes from loans their parents obtain directly from banks and finance companies.

To meet the needs of the considerable residue of students who cannot get their financing this way, the Federal Government, through its student aid program, helps out by passing money to the colleges and letting them, in turn, parcel out the funds to needy students. Last year alone, it's estimated,

more than 200,000 college students borrowed from these funds. Many colleges also have their own reserves of student aid funds. And several State governments have aid programs.

Most of these schemes operate on a straight dollar-for-dollar basis; the dollar that's in the kitty is no more than the dollar available for lending.

BLEND

Now a new private agency has entered the field with a formula for financing student loans that neatly blends the broad approach of philanthropy with the down-to-earth methods of financial leverage.

President Kennedy, in his message to Congress on education, proposed establishment of a new Federal group that would have similar leverage power in guaranteeing loans to needy students. Though this has been made a part of Kennedy's omnibus education bill, there is a strong chance that Congress will not act on the proposal this year.

In the meantime, United Student Aid Funds, Inc., which began as a pilot operation in Indiana in 1961, has now started to function in more than 34 States, and by this spring will probably be virtually nationwide. The few other student aid funds that work on a similar basis are limited to a single State, sometimes to a single college. Together, these cover only about 20 percent of the potential national need for student aid funds. So United Student Aid Funds aims to cover the remaining 80 percent.

The new fund was set up with a grant of $2 million (now increased to $2.5 million) from the William Volker Fund, a California philanthropy. From other grants it has assets totaling $3¼ million. It has signed agreements with most of the commercial banks in the States in which it operates.

These agreements allow the fund to guarantee the loans that banks make to students. But they also allow the fund to keep in its reserves only 8 percent of the value of the loans that it guarantees. Thus, United Student Aid Funds today could back over $40 million worth of loans to students.

MATCHED MONEY

At present, though, guarantees do not come to much more than one-sixth of that figure. The reason for this lies in a second major condition: The colleges whose students use these funds must themselves match money put up by United Student Aid Funds. For each college that wants to participate in the program, United Student Aid Funds sets up an account, matches its dollars with those of the college.

The cash from colleges is beginning to roll in; 400 college accounts are on the books, and new ones are being set up at the rate of 25 a month. Each contains at least $1,000 worth of college money plus $1,000 of United Student Aid Funds. That generates enough for each colleges' students to borrow $25,000. The University of Pennsylvania, for instance, has put in $20,000; with matching funds plus leverage it can now back $500,000 worth of student loans.

"One rule is that the student has to show a need for the money and an inability to get it from conventional sources," says Director Cornuelle. "We couldn't make our agreement with the banks without that rule, otherwise we'd clearly be taking conventional loan business away from the banks. The result is that most—the vast majority, in fact—of the almost 14,000 individual loans we have so far guaranteed have been made to students whose parents' family income was around $6,000 a year or less."

The banks insisted on this rule because they lend to students at a nonprofit rate. True, the agreements let them charge a simple interest rate of 6 percent on the money they lend. But this, says Cornuelle, has been thoroughly established as only enough to cover the cost of the paperwork.

Indeed, he points out that 6-percent charge got a close investigation from the Treasury Department, which had to make sure that no profit was involved anywhere along the line before it would agree to list United Student Aid funds as a nonprofit organization.

EXPANDING

Now that the plan is operating on a broad base, Cornuelle and his aids are seeking to add heavily to the program's capital. The ultimate goal—for which there is no fixed timetable—is to build up United Student Aid funds until it has the capacity to back a total of $500 million in loans. That would require $40 million in capital: $20 million put up by the colleges and $20 million by the fund.

For the fund itself, Cornuelle hopes to get $12 billion in grants from other foundations—and $8 million from corporations. To this end he has lately been seeking money from large companies, and he has already announced one major success: the grant of $100,000 from Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

Will he get all the rest? Cornuelle thinks so. He explains: "Large corporations these days are giving about $80 million a year in aid to education. We're asking for 10 percent of that—and because of the way the fund is organized, we're asking for a single grant, not a continuing, yearly series of them."

Of course, the colleges, too, have to put up $20 million if the goal is to be reached. Cornuelle believes that self-interest will prompt them to do so. True, they do have substantial student aid funds to draw on through the Federal Government's existing program, which in some respects offers students more generous terms than the United Students Aid Funds' scheme.

But the colleges themselves must administer the Federal program. And, says Cornuelle, college administrators are generally not experts in collecting repayments. Says he: "They don't like the prospect of having to dun their alumni for repayments."

Much more decisive, though, is the leverage offered by the new fund.

REPAYMENTS

In theory, a borrower could remain a student all his life and never repay, for the fund's rules are that repayments need not begin until after a borrower has finished his graduate education. He would not, though, get away with a great deal of cash because loans are limited to $1,000 a year during the last undergraduate 3 years.

In fact, Cornuelle anticipates little if any trouble with repayments. A scheme set up along somewhat similar lines, which has been operating for the last 5 years in Massachusetts, has set a clear record: Only one-third of 1 percent of its borrowers have defaulted.

Resolution for Ratification of the Genocide Convention by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh, recently held a meeting where they joined in solemn commemoration of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. In the spirit of that occasion, a resolution was unanimously adopted urging ratification of the Genocide Convention.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION FOR RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES

On the occasion of the observance of the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the slaughterers of millions of defenseless human beings, we call on President Kennedy to urge the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention, at the current session, thus joining the 64 nations of the world, the 58 organizations in the United States, and the millions of decent citizens of this country who endorse its aims of preventing repetition of mass murder of a people. This subject has been languishing so long in the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that it has become a blot on the reputation of the United States.

Passage of the Genocide Convention by the Senate of the United States would associate this country with an international pledge that horror of the kind perpetrated by the Nazis may never again be permitted. We urge that this occasion be converted from an act of heartbreaking recollection into a positive and meaningful basis for defining and protecting the basic human right of survival.

Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as many of you may know, Peter W. Rodino III, son of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey's 10th District, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., more than a year ago inaugurated a program of letter writing between the young people of the Soviet Union and other Communist dominated countries and the young citizens of the United States. The project is called the Little-People-to-Little-People program.

During the past year, this program, conceived by young Peter Rodino, has gained endorsement and major support of many organizations throughout the United States and as a result, continues to grow and attract greater interest.

Considering the potential of the program, especially in the years to come, I know that we all will do our utmost to assist its progress. The youngsters that are being brought together today, through the medium of letterwriting, are the statesmen, the businessmen, the leaders in all fields in their nations tomorrow. The understanding, the rapport that they will enjoy as they negotiate across the tables of international conferences will have stemmed from the mutual knowledge and respect gained through Peter W. Rodino, III's Little-People-to-Little-People program.

The latest public recognition and praise for young Peter's efforts comes from the Governor of our State, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, who has proclaimed the week of October 20 to 26, 1963 as Little-People-to-Little-People Week. I would like at this time to read

into the RECORD the text of Governor Hughes' proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Peter W. Rodino III, of Newark, the son of the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., Member of Congress from the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey has displayed unusual and inspirational interest in the cause of world peace and international good will; and

Whereas this distinguished young American has on two occasions written to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev with requests that the Premier cease the testing of atomic bombs for the good of mankind and provide the names of Russian children with whom young Americans might correspond to promote peace among nations; and

Whereas despite the inaction of the Soviet Premier on both requests, young Peter W. Rodino III, has overcome any initial discouragement and has been the driving force in the formation of a little-people-to-little-people program; and

Whereas it is hoped that little ambassadors participating in this program will correspond with each other in all parts of the world to promote greater understanding and harmony among all nations; and

Whereas the voices of children can speak with the utmost sincerity in this great cause; and

Whereas this program was inspired by the statement of President John F. Kennedy: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country";

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby commend Peter W. Rodino III for his valuable contributions to the cause of world peace and do hereby declare the week of October 20–26, 1963, as Little-People-to-Little-People Week in New Jersey and urge all of our citizens, especially our young people, to participate in this program in every way possible so that one day all men everywhere may enjoy the freedom and liberty which we cherish as citizens of the United States.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Jersey, this 15th day of April in the year of Our Lord 1963, and in the independence of the United States, 187th.

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

By the Governor:

ROBERT J. BURKHARDT,
Secretary of State.

Youth Conservation Corps Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of the membership the following editorials that recently appeared in the Newark News and Newark Star Ledger, respectively, with respect to our unemployed youth. These editorials point up the urgent need for a youth employment opportunities program so that our young people can receive training and job experience and hope for the future. We are all aware of the magnitude of the problem. The time for action is now before the problem with all its attendant evils grows even more serious. I again urge early floor consideration of the Youth Conservation Corps legislation as reported by the Education and Labor Committee.

The editorials read as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Apr. 26, 1963]

AIDING YOUNG JOBLESS

After more than a year of intensive study, the President's Committee on Youth Employment has submitted its report. It urges immediate action to combat the growing problem of unemployed, out-of-school youth. It calls for new and more stimulating policies for education and training, guidance, employment opportunities and economic growth. It declares that schools must do a better job in preparing youth for employment and that private enterprise has a major responsibility for employing youth.

The bleak national situation depicted in the report and the remedial steps found to be needed parallel almost directly the findings of the Newark Youth Career Development Center and other local projects as shown in the series of articles on "Wasted Youth" published by the News last month.

The presidential report indicates the plight of the 10,000 in Newark is a faithful reflection of the national problem. And it is one more demonstration of the wisdom of Newark's selection for a federally financed youth center project. Whatever comes out of the Newark experiment will be of significance nationally.

As a result of the last year's efforts, Newark now understands its problem and where improvement in policies and attitudes should be made. There is one drawback, however. Improvements have been too slow in coming. Perhaps the new report will provide a needed stimulus.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger, Apr. 27, 1963]

OUR IDLE YOUTH

A bleak picture of the employment situation for the Nation's youth has been drawn by the President's Committee on Youth Employment.

One of the grimmer statistics was that last year between 600,000 and 800,000 persons in the 16–21 age group were out of school and out of jobs.

And the prospects are even more dismal when one considers that, at a time when education and training are a necessity in these days of automation, one out of three students drops out of high school before graduation. And dropouts experience the most difficulty in getting jobs.

In a grim assessment of the employment situation for the Nation's young people, the Committee reached this conclusion:

"To hundreds of thousands of boys and girls between 16 and 21, the problem is immediate and desperate. One out of nine who are out of school and in the labor force is jobless.

"Among these are tomorrow's castoffs and chronic dependents, those who will live in poverty of body and mind, and who will bring up their children in their own image."

The problem is, naturally, more aggravated for youths of minority groups. They face, the Committee said, "even more cause for frustration, defeat, and resentment."

On the State and local level, youth affairs commissions should be established to review and study employment possibilities for young people. Apprentice training must be expanded under Federal supervision, with an eye on future needs. Unions must reexamine hiring and training practices along with employers.

Schools must institute crash programs to aid inadequately educated out-of-work youngsters, teaching them reading, writing, and the use of figures.

And a Federal program should be put into operation as soon as possible for urban and conservation employment and training of youth. This program, costing $100 million a year, would be limited to 3 years until long-range plans can be enacted.

It is obvious that any program of this magnitude will be costly. But even vast expenditures now would be well worth the price to insure a future of hope and promise for the disillusioned.

Trotting Backwards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the economy in my area of the country would really trot forward if we would reject a Government dam at Trotters Shoals.

The urgent need now is for jobs, payrolls, and opportunity; free enterprise taxes for hospitals, schools, teachers salaries and not additional tax burdens. Let us get the economy moving with the most dynamic economic force the world has ever known—free enterprise Americanism.

The following newsletter by my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, JOHN BYRNES, to his constituents, points out the utter absurdity of a Government dam at Trotters Shoals:

TROTTING BACKWARDS

JOBS

One of the Nation's most pressing problems is unemployment. Over 4 million persons are listed as unemployed; the unemployment rate in March was higher than it was a year ago. The administration wants to spend more money, establish new crops, build more public works, make more loans, establish more Federal agencies—all in the hope of cutting the unemployment rate. Everyone shares in that hope. But, much of the New Frontier's program will not create lasting jobs because it ignores the basic process by which jobs are made.

STORY

The story of job creation—the process through which this country has prospered and grown—was graphically told to a congressional committee by a businessman last week. He was an executive of Mead Paper Corp., an old and respected Ohio paper manufacturer, which has 40 operations in 17 States, employing 17,000 men and women. Here is a condensed version of his testimony.

HISTORY

Mead is a successful papermaker. It got that way through risk-taking investment, skilled workers, aggressive management and the long and hard development of a market for its products. It is in business for profit; it is on the alert for expansion opportunities whenever it feels market conditions warrant such expansion.

PLANS

Looking ahead, Mead, after careful investigation, in 1956 bought 1,000 acres for a new plant site on the Savannah River in South Carolina. Since then, it has spent $1 million for timberlands and has committed an additional $2 million in leaseholds. It hopes soon to build a plant on the site.

EFFECT

If it does, the construction of the mill, paper machine and power plant to produce 800 tons of product daily will require an

initial investment of $40 million. For 2 years 1,400 men would be employed in construction, earning $10 million. New capital investment, creating new construction jobs, would be required every year thereafter at an estimated figure of $10 million annually. When finished, the plant would employ 600 to 650 people, at an annual payroll of close to $5 million. In addition, the mill would consume 400,000 to 450,000 cords of pulpwood annually, putting to work some 2,500 men on farms and woodlots nearby.

OTHER

But this is only the beginning. To feed, house, clothe, educate, transport, and provide medical care, haircuts, legal advice, trash collection and the hundreds of other services humans need would employ additional hundreds of people. Freight movements from the plant, averaging 18,000 carloads a year, would create other jobs. State and local tax collectors would receive an estimated $500,000 a year, and the Federal Government would collect about $3,300,000. Moreover, since the plant would use local, renewable resources, the value of land and property around the mill would increase in value.

REQUEST

This is the kind of sound economic growth which produces lasting jobs, and you may wonder why this man was appearing before Congress. Was he asking for a Federal grant or loan? Was he supporting a new bureau or corps? Did he want a public project? No, none of these. He simply told the committee that the plant couldn't be built in South Carolina if the Federal Government went ahead with its plan to spend $78 million to build a power dam which would flood out the company's plant site.

The Positive in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Continews, the house publication of Continental Grain Co., recently urged editorially that we "Accentuate the Positive" in the field of agriculture. The editorial, which appeared in the Spring 1963 issue of the publication, pointed to the strength of our agriculture, the strength which has created our problems in that sector of our economy. I believe this editorial helps put perspective to our agricultural problems and for that reason under unanimous consent I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

ACCENTUATE THE POSITIVE

At the very beginning of World War II, the U.S. Government asked the agricultural industry to go all out to produce food for America and its allies around the world.

Its magnificient success is a matter of public record. Soon after the war ended, however, a complex—and yet unanswered—question was raised: "How do you turn it off?"

Three different administrations have grappled with the problem by attempting to legislate effective controls over agricultural production. Each has been remarkably unsuccessful. And, along the way, agriculture, a highly efficient and complex machine has been demeaned. Today, a preponderance of Americans readily recognize the problems of agriculture, but too few are conversant with its significant contributions to America's strenth and well-being. By and large, agriculture today is generally correlated with negative associations: controls, waste, supports, surpluses, subsidies, parities—and others, unfortunately, even graft and scandal.

Some of these bad associations have certainly rubbed offl on the grain trade. There continues to be a great lack of public understanding as to our contribution and function. Everyone of us should make it his personal responsibility to communicate, whenever and wherever possible, the positive aspects of American agriculture, such as its contributions to our high level of nutrition; its effect on our balance-of-payments position; its role in helping feed a hungry world; its contributions to improving the economies of friendly nations—and other positive achievements of the most efficient, most successful agricultural system the world has ever known. The storing, merchandising, transporting, handling, and exporting of grain are a very important part of this system.

Our industry is one of the oldest and most honorable in the world. We fulfill a vital service to Americans and to the world. This point was well made by Michel Fribourg in a recent speech in New Orleans. "We are in business to render a service at a profit. We must continuously find new ways of providing our services more efficiently, and at less cost. We are the link between the farmers and the food consumers. We must see to it that the majority of the farmers get an equitable income, and that the consumers pay as little as possible for their products. I believe prices determined in free competitive markets to be an essential element in the development of free grain exchanges, and in the expansion of international trade. I believe no system has been evolved that can replace advantageously the basic laws of supply and demand. * * *" We in the grain industry would do well to keep these thoughts in mind.

Military Pay "Half Loaf"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 3, 1963, issue of the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, entitled "Military Pay 'Half Loaf,'" is worth the consideration of all Members of the House prior to the vote tomorrow on the military pay bill:

MILITARY PAY "HALF LOAF"

Sometimes "a half loaf is better than none." Often, though, this unctuous saying is used as an excuse for not coming through with a merited whole loaf.

Such seems to be the case in the military pay bill reported out by the House Armed Services Committee, due for debate any day now.

As reported, the bill is a half loaf in two respects:

The average 14.3 percent increase for officers and 12.6 percent for enlisted personnel are far less than those recomended by a House subcommittee after long and careful study.

Provisions to increase the retirement pay of career personnel who retired before June, 1958, to equalize this with the pay of men retiring since that date, are grossly inequitable.

Congress' attitude toward military pay is both incomprehensible and costly to the Nation.

The lawmakers unhesitatingly vote nearly every penny requested by the Defense Department for military hardware—and even try to thrust sums upon the Pentagon it doesn't want. But when it comes to paying for the highly skilled men needed to operate the technological weapons of modern warfare, Capitol Hill inevitably acts like a sweatshop proprietor.

The folly of this is that the armed services every year lose thousands of expensively trained men to better paying jobs in private industry, thus not only always keeping our defense at less than its maximum efficiency but also costing far more in training programs than a fair pay scale would entail.

The stinginess in respect to our older retired personnel is inexcusable. It is both amoral and unjust.

Career military men are given to understand—it is part of the inducement to keep them in the service—that any time after retirement that the pay of retired personnel is increased, those already retired will receive equal benefits.

Congress has been welshing on this commitment ever since the last military pay bill was passed 5 years ago. Surely there are enough men of conscience in the House and Senate to see to it that the United States does not dishonor its word to those who have honorably devoted their lives to the Nation's defense.

Applause and Regret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News carried an excellent editorial today which I am sure reflects the sentiments of all the Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle. I feel certain my colleagues will agree that we all were distressed to learn that our colleague, ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, plans to retire from Congress next year.

Our only consolation can rest in the fact that perhaps Mr. THOMAS will reconsider this decision between now and next year so that not only we here in Congress, but the American people and, yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of the entire free world, can benefit from his sound judgment and profound leadership which he has brought to this Chamber.

I have been particularly impressed with Mr. THOMAS because when I came here as a freshman 5 years ago, there were any number of occasions when he would take time out from a very busy schedule to brief me on the intricacies of the appropriations measures which he was steering through the House.

Many of my colleagues I am sure have also found in him a very sincere and helpful adviser, who somehow always finds time to answer questions from his colleagues on the important legislation which he brings to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

APPLAUSE AND REGRET

The country will be the loser when Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas,

retires from Congress next year, as he has just announced he will.

He's a working lawmaker, who for years has burned the midnight oil to cram information about the budget into his quick mind, so he could spot where the waste was and work to eliminate it.

For the last several years Representative THOMAS has directed ably the House Appropriations subcommittee that handles the multi-billion-dollar money bill for dozens of independent agencies, including such immense ones as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Veterans' Administration. He is chairman, also, of the other appropriations subcommittee that handles the bill carrying supplemental allocations to all agencies of Government.

Representative THOMAS is a budget cutter and proud of it.

Retirement must have been a hard decision. Men don't like to give up such positions of power as Representative THOMAS holds, nor such friendships and associations as he has created over the years.

But he figures he's earned a rest, seeing as how he has served 26 years in the House, is 65, and has had three serious operations. It is hard to argue with that, but he will be missed. Men of his caliber and industry come few and far between.

No Age Limit on Bravery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, Steven Mark Leisz, the 12-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Leisz of Turtle Lake, Wis., received a citation for bravery from Wisconsin Governor John Reynolds. Steven was honored for his heroism in diverting the attention of an angry bull to save his grandfather from further attack by the animal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article about Steven which was printed in the April 25, 1963, Turtle Lake Times:

TURTLE LAKE YOUTH HONORED BY GOVERNOR

MADISON, WIS.—Citations were presented Saturday to a Turtle Lake, Wis., boy and seven other Wisconsin youths for their bravery and public service. The awards were made at the 8th annual Governor's Conference on Children and Youth.

Three were recommended to the U.S. Attorney General as recipients of Young American Awards. They are Steven Mark Leisz, 12, Turtle Lake; Jean Ann deMasters, 17, Sheboygan, and Brian McCormick, 15, Milwaukee.

Steven was cited for his act of bravery last July 9 in diverting the attention of an angry bull to save his grandfather from further attack by the animal. He also was presented the Boy Scouts of America National Court of Honor award last month for the same act.

Citations also were presented to Patricia Fratt, 18, Oshkosh; Ann Astel, Jefferson; Bill Griffin, Benton; Terry Scheid, Fort Atkinson, and Charles Quertel; 19, rural Mosinee.

The awards were presented by a representative of Gov. John Reynolds, who was unable to appear personally because of illness.

Miss DeMasters was named for public service through her work in civic organizations. McCormack was cited for bravery when he put out into Lake Michigan in a small boat during a storm to rescue two men clinging to an overturned boat.

To cap off the honors bestowed upon Steven Leisz, the Chippewa Valley Council Boy Scouts of America have sent out invitations for the annual Appreciation Dinner on Saturday, May 11, 1963, at 6:42 p.m. at the New North High School in Eau Claire.

The highlight of the evening will be the presentation of three National Life Saving Awards to two Scouts and one leader from the Blue Hills district. The Turtle Lake youth is one of the boys to be honored.

The Turtle Lake Lions Club, who sponsor the Scouts here have asked all who would like to attend this event to contact Scoutmaster Harvey McCann or Rodney Becker.

The featured guest speaker will be William Harrison Fetridge, national vice president of the Boy Scouts of America.

The climax of the evening will be the recognition of three great local Scouters, and their induction into the Silver Beaver Honor Roll. There will also be presentations of round up neckerchiefs to over 100 unit leaders, and in addition, the Presidential Trophy will be presented for the first time.

Steve is 12 years old and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Leisz of Turtle Lake.

South Carolina General Assembly Pays Tribute to Springs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith an article from the Chester Reporter, Chester, S.C., of May 1, 1963:

SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY PAYS TRIBUTE TO SPRINGS

The South Carolina General Assembly interrupted its business last week to pay an unusual tribute to the Springs Cotton Mills. Both the senate and the house voted unanimous approval of a resolution introduced by the delegations from Lancaster, Chester, and York Counties recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Springs organization and expressing the appreciation of the general assembly and the people of South Carolina for its unmatched progress during the years since 1888.

The text of the concurrent resolution follows in full:

"EXPRESSING THE APPRECIATION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TO THE SPRINGS CO. FOR ITS OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION TO LANCASTER COUNTY, THE IMMEDIATE AREA AND TO THE ENTIRE STATE

"Whereas the Springs Cotton Mills, which are located in Lancaster County, is a South Carolina born organization which has grown in South Carolina and which has its entire production facilities in South Carolina, serve as an outstanding example of southern initiative and thrift; and

"Whereas the Springs Mills had a humble beginning when in 1888 in the town of Fort Mill, it went into production with 200 looms, no spinning and little capital; and

"Whereas, the Springs Co. now operates 850,000 spindles, 18,500 looms, and 350 sewing machines, and employs 12,500 persons in 8 major plants in South Carolina who are recipients of an annual payroll of approximately $48 million with a magnanimous plan for recreation, retirement and old age security; and

"Whereas profits shared with employees in 1962, in addition to their paychecks, totaled $4,250,486; and

"Whereas, the company has invested an estimated $59 million in the last 10 years for expansion and new equipment to increase the efficiency of operation and to improve the overall working conditions under which the many employees labor; and

"Whereas, the Springs Cotton Mills is the world's largest producer of exclusively cotton cloth and its employees in 1962 turned out more than 500 million linear yards of finished cloth, enough to weave more than 430,000 miles of 80-square standard goods—a ribbon of cloth 39 inches wide and stretching around the earth more than 17 times;

"Whereas the Springs Medical Department, staffed by 4 full-time physicians and 15 full-time registered nurses, operates 6 medical clinics for employees and, in 1962, provided free influenza immunization shots for employees and free cancer detection examinations for female employees; and

"Whereas the Springs cafeteria system operates 13 cafeterias for employees and served 4,374,421 customers during 1962; and

"Whereas the general assembly has learned that the annual State taxes of the Springs Co. now actually account for 10 percent of the total revenue of the State and ranks first in South Carolina as an industrial taxpayer; and

"Whereas to encourage art, the Springs Cotton Mills annual conducts the Springs Art Contest and Show, which in 1962 attracted 545 entries from a total of 102 communities in the 2 Carolinas, with winning paintings viewed by thousands of persons throughout the 2 States and in New York City; and

"Whereas the Springs Cotton Mills now ranks as one of the leading textile companies in the world, with annual sales of nearly $200 million and with 29,000 different products sold throughout the Nation and in more than 50 foreign countries; and

"Whereas the general assembly believes that such a contribution should not be without recognition and further realizes that this industry not only furnishes the employees and their families a ready source of profitable and pleasant livelihood, but also is a great financial asset and source of pride to all the people of Lancaster County, the immediate area, and to the rest of the State at large; and

"Whereas the general assembly believes that it is most fitting that an expression of recognition and appreciation be extended to the Springs Co. for the major part that it has played in the industrial development of the State and its contributions to humanity through its many philanthropic acts, all of which have created a better life for thousands of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring*, That the general assembly, representing the poeple of the State, hereby expresses its deep appreciation to the Springs Co. for the many years of successful operation of its cotton mills in the State, and for its great contribution to all the people of South Carolina in general and more particularly to those of the immediate area where the company is located, and the general assembly desires to congratulate the Springs Co. upon its progress and to wish for it continued success for years to come; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Springs Co. in Lancaster."

What Is the Real Reason?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau has adopted an adamant posture of opposition to the proposed wheat program to be voted on by the farmers of America on May 21.

In an excellent editorial the East Oregonian, the largest daily paper in eastern Oregon, asked, "What is the real reason for the American Farm Bureau stand?" This question has occurred to many of those who are seriously concerned with the plight of the wheat farmer.

I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under leave to extend and revise my remarks:

[From the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, Apr. 23, 1963]

WHAT IS THE REAL REASON?

Wheatgrowers who have been attempting for many years to get the Congress to permit them to produce and market wheat under a two-price plan have had to face constant opposition from the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Now that wheatgrowers are to be given the opportunity to accept or reject the two-price plan (at a referendum election on May 21) the opposition of AFB leaders to the plan has reached a new level of volume.

Through all of this it has been difficult to get down to the real reason behind the AFB opposition. The AFB leaders insist that the two-price plan would exercise such stern governmental controls over wheat farmers that they would virtually lose all freedom of decision. Yet, the two-price plan is no more rigid in its requirements than other production and marketing programs for wheat have demanded of growers, so this AFB argument hardly is valid.

Is it because the AFB has so many members that are corngrowers that its leaders oppose the two-price plan which might make it possible for wheat to be on a par with corn as animal feed? The AFB leaders never have admitted that this was the reason. What is the real reason? Certainly what they have said thus far can't be the real reason.

A newspaper whose editors know agriculture far better than most editors recently took a look at what the American Farm Bureau Federation leaders were saying about the two-price plan for wheat and came to some interesting conclusions. This is what the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, published in the heart of AFB country, recently said on this subject:

"The Farm Bureau is conducting a major drive to defeat the new wheat program which will go into effect in 1964 if two-thirds of the growers vote in favor of it in a referendum in June of this year. The Bureau says the basic issue is 'whether the farms of America are to be managed by farmers or by a governmental bureaucracy.' It says a favorable vote would 'give a great boost' to the administration's efforts to expand 'supply management' to other commodities, but a 'no' vote would be interpreted as a sign farmers do not want additional compulsory supply management programs.

"This view of the wheat referendum seems unduly apocalyptic.

"If farmers vote for the program, they will not be committing themselves to it for all time to come, but only for the 1964 wheat crop. If the program proved in practice to be as bad as the Farm Bureau says it is, surely this would be apparent to farmers, and they could reject the progrm on the next vote. And Congress could change it. What farmers are voting for in this referendum is not a new direction for all farm programs, as the Farm Bureau says, but a trial of a new plan for wheat.

"The Farm Bureau is sounding dire warnings about the wheat 'controls' which Charles B. Shuman, president of the organization, says are the 'tightest, most restrictive ever proposed for any farm crop.' That is extreme language, and it is careless language. Many kinds of controls have been proposed since 1920. The wheat controls are no tighter than those which have been in effect for tobacco and cotton for years and are not as tight as the controls for sugar. The Farm Bureau consistently backs these programs.

"If two-thirds of the farmers vote in favor of the program, every wheatgrower will be required to comply with his acreage allotment. He can grow as much wheat as he is able to grow on the allotted acres, but he will receive the full support (about $2 a bushel) only on a number of bushels to be determined as his share of the national supply used for domestic food consumption plus a portion of exports.

"There are no more controls on the farmer than in the case of any crop where mandatory acreage allotments are in effect, as they have been in wheat for years. The main difference in the new program is that the price support will be a 'two-price' deal: The grain not eligible for the top price support (probably about one-seventh of production) will receive a lower support comparable to feed grain supports, about $1.25 a bushel. Growers also will get a land-retirement payment for acres taken out of wheat.

"The Farm Bureau correctly says that this new program will result in some decline, probably small, in the total net income received by wheatgrowers (but not in average income, because the number of growers is dropping). The two-price support plan results in a lower blend price support for wheat.

"But rejection of the new plan would mean a much larger drop in wheat income. Price supports for all wheat produced would drop to 50 percent of parity, about $1.25 a bushel.

"It is hard to see how the Farm Bureau leaders can get so wrought up about 'compulsion' and 'dictatorial controls' which do not go into effect unless two-thirds of the producers vote to accept them. What the Government is saying is that, if two-thirds of the producers favor the controls, then everyone who chooses to grow wheat will have to go along. Every business has regulations, governmental or private.

"It seems not unreasonable that the Government ask farmers to cooperate in limiting production if they want a guaranteed price for their product. If they don't want to comply with acreage allotments in return for a higher price, well, that settles that. But it isn't an issue of Government management of farms, nor is it setting the course of farm policy forevermore."

That, in plain language, is what the May 21 referendum on the two-price plan is all about. No amount of nitpicking at technicalities, as some AFB people have persisted in doing, will remove or in any way alter the basic issue which the Des Moines Register has so accurately and clearly stated.

We think the time is long overdue for the leaders of a great farm organization, the Nation's largest, to come out in the open with the real reason for their opposition to the two-price plan. They have for too long talked around it.

New Wheat Allotments Depreciate Pennsylvania's Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery in my opposition to certain phases of the so-called farm programs.

My State agricultural economy is made up of family-type farms. As such, the State of Pennsylvania sometimes suffers more by so-called farm aid legislation than it benefits.

Such appears to be the case in feed grains and now we find again a depreciation in Pennsylvania farm income by the new wheat allotments.

Farmers in Pennsylvania have just taken another reduction in their wheat allotments, even though the Soft Red Winter wheat grown here remains in demand.

Figures recently released by the USDA show that Pennsylvania wheat acreage allotment has been reduced 64,872 acres for the 1964 crop to 458,368 acres. This is a 12.4-percent reduction while the national average reduction is 10 percent and wheat States such as Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Oregon, and Washington were reduced less than 10 percent. These are the States that contribute largely to the national wheat surplus.

Pennsylvania has had its acreage allotment cut by 32 percent—249,401 acres—between 1939 and 1963 while the national allotment remained the same.

If the 1964 wheat program should pass in the May 21 referendum, this will mean a decrease in farmer income of approximately $10,500,000 and at the same time cause wheat to be imported into Pennsylvania for our bakeries. Pennsylvania ranks first in the number of bakeries in the United States and first in the manufacture of pretzels. Soft Red Winter wheat is in demand for this local industry.

Recently Pennsylvania farmers asked a number of questions relative to the wheat certificate program. They have provided answers and I believe it will give their side of the picture if printed for general use:

1. Is it the job of ASC committees to take part in determining farm programs?

Answer. No. ASC committees were established to administer farm programs; not to sell a Government program to farmers.

2. Will I be prevented from growing up to 15 acres, like I do now, if I have an allotment of less than 15 acres?

Answer. Yes. The 15-acre exemption is eliminated under the certificate program. Your allotment is your absolute maximum.

3. If I do not have an allotment and want to grow wheat for sale, feed, or straw in 1965, will I be permitted?

Answer. No, unless you can obtain another farmer's allotment.

4. Every few years I raise up to 30 acres of wheat to feed my chickens. Can I do this under the certificate plan?

Answer. No. You will be given a base but it will not be as much as 30 acres.

5. With over 80 percent of the wheat surplus in the Western States, why are we in Pennsylvania being cut the same percentage as those with the surplus?

Answer. This is the politics of it.

6. We market our wheat with a local miller and he wants all the wheat I can grow. Why should I be prevented from growing all the wheat I can market?

Answer. This is a good question. Your miller is now buying wheat from Pennsylvania farmers and if the supply is cut he will buy wheat from Canada or elsewhere.

7. It looks to me as if the higher my yield the lower my blend price because I must sell a greater amount at $1.30.

Answer. True. A farmer with the county normal yield will receive $2 per bushel for about 80 percent of his wheat. A farmer who is 15–20 bushels per acre above the county average will receive $2 per bushel for only 60 to 65 percent of his wheat.

8. Is it true that the certificate plan will control both the acres I plant and the bushels I may sell for domestic purposes?

Answer. Yes.

9. Is there any other Government program that controls the amount a farmer may sell?

Answer. No.

10. If all of my wheat is of a high quality may I sell it at the $2 price?

Answer. No; only the amount for which you have certificates.

11. If the certificate program reduces the amount sold below the demand won't I receive more than $2 per bushel for my certificate wheat?

Answer. Unlikely. Millers may use the $1.30 feed wheat for milling purposes providing they pay the Government 70 cents (the difference between $1.30 and $2).

12. I have done some figuring and it looks to me as if I will have less income from my wheat in 1964 from what I had in 1962.

Answer. True. There is no possible way for a Pennsylvania farmer to receive as much income in 1964 as he did in 1962, even if the referendum passes.

13. Is the normal yield my average yield or based on the average yield of all wheat growers in my county?

Answer. Normal yield is based on average yield of all wheat growers in your county.

14. What happens if I do not sign up for the program and it passes?

Answer. You will have a marketing quota and must sell all of your wheat at $1.30.

15. I understand that the law permits the Secretary to cut my acreage by as much as 30 percent. Is this true?

Answer. Yes. For 1964 the cut will be 10 percent but the law permits a cut of up to 30 percent which could happen to you in 1965.

16. Explain how my income will be cut.

Answer. The amount sold times price minus expenses equals your net income. Under the certificate plan, the amount you can sell is cut; the average price you will receive is cut; and your per unit cost of production and harvest are increased. The result is less net farm income.

Mr. Speaker, in May 21, the U.S. Department of Agriculture will conduct a most important referendum among the Nation's wheat farmers. This referendum provides wheat producers with responsibility for making one of the most important decisions ever made by a group of agricultural producers with respect to the future direction of American agriculture.

While one does not think of Pennsylvania as being an important wheat-producing State, this referendum has serious implications, not only to wheat people, but to all the farmers in my State and in other areas. The real issue in this referendum is not the phony one of "$2 versus $1" wheat, but rather whether Government supply-management is going to be the future way of life for the American farmer.

Only wheat is directly involved in this particular referendum and only wheat producers can vote, but all farmers, consumers, and taxpayers will be affected by the outcome.

Wheat producers have been voting for Government programs in a more or less routine fashion for several years. Past programs have carried controls of a sort, but there were numerous exceptions and limitations. So, wheat producers have not really had to face up to the full implications of going down the supply-management road to a licensed and regimented agriculture. But the situation is different this year.

The multiple-price certificate plan being submitted to producers this year includes the tightest, most binding Government controls ever seriously considered for any farm commodity. In addition to providing much stricter acreage allotments than growers have experienced over recent years and a new type of marketing quota, the administration's plan provides for diverted-acre controls and cross compliance. It also would give the Secretary of Agriculture vast powers to regulate all handlers, processors, and distributors of wheat from the farm to the ultimate consumer.

How Pennsylvania farmers vote may decide the referendum in the United States. All wheat farmers with an allotment of 15 acres or more are automatically eligible to vote. In the past there has been an exemption of 15 acres for those who wanted to plant that much and not receive price supports. In addition, a farmer could grow 30 acres providing he used it all for feed on his own farm. Under the 1962 act these exemptions have been eliminated. As a result, for the first time the farmers with less than 15 acres can vote if they agree to participate in the program. In 1961 there were 79,000 Pennsylvania farms with wheat allotments of less than 15 acres. This large potential number of voters could well be the deciding factor in the referendum.

One of my reasons for discussing this question is due to the fact that the 15-acre wheat farmers will have the opportunity to vote for the first time. Under the proposed provisions of the referendum any of these small wheat farmers who want to vote in the referendum must indicate their desire to do so 7 days prior to the referendum date. They must register at the county ASC office before May 14. This means if one of the 15-acre wheat farmers wants to vote "no" in the referendum and therefore preserve his right to grow whatever amount of wheat he chooses, it will be necessary for him to sign up to participate.

I recognize among some wheat farmers the requirement that they sign up to participate in order to vote may cause some of them to be reluctant to vote. However, I hope that all these small wheat growers will sign up to participate and vote in the referendum since every vote will be important.

In recent weeks letters and conversations with farmers from Pennsylvania indicate that the Secretary of Agriculture, who is responsible for conducting the referendum, has thrown the full resources of his Department into a large campaign for a "yes" vote. The Secretary claims that the referendum offers producers a choice between $1 and $2 per bushel for their wheat; that defeat of his control scheme would lead to trade wars and chaos in the international market. These claims are serious exaggerations designed to panic wheat producers rather than an objective analysis of the situation.

Defeat of the wheat certificate plan would not terminate all Government wheat programs. Furthermore, the Congress would still have both the power and the responsibility to deal with any problems that might arise. The Secretary's claim that Congress would not act is nothing more than a scare tactic. There is no reason to believe that the Congress would abdicate its responsibility. Defeat of the Secretary's control scheme would open the way for the enactment of a sound and constructive solution to the surplus wheat problem.

I have also been very much concerned about the role of the Agricultural Stabilization committeemen in this referendum. The Agricultural Stabilization committeemen, according to the law, have the responsibility to assist in carrying out the administration of any agricultural laws that might be enacted. Their role is essentially one of administering and seeing that the agricultural laws passed by the Congress are carried out and properly understood by farmers. Theirs is not the role of a propaganda or a sales agency. I have been very much distressed by reports that indicate that the Agricultural Stabilization committeemen have become propaganda agents for the Secretary of Agriculture in the forthcoming wheat referendum.

I urge that the Agricultural Stabilization committeemen return to their historic role as the people who must administer the various farm programs rather than that of being active propaganda salesmen for Secretary Freeman. Unless this is done, they will have lost the confidence of farmers and the general public as to what their real responsibility is in agriculture.

One of my reasons for discussing this wheat referendum is that most of the agricultural producers in my district whether they grow wheat or other commodities have felt rather strongly for some time that the Government should reduce its role in agriculture. The wheat referendum to be held in May provides not only the farmers in my district, but farmers all over the country who produce wheat, the opportunity to express their point of view on this important question. I am hopeful that the referendum will be defeated so that we avoid the spreading of supply-management to other agricultural commodities such as dairy, poultry and livestock.

Justice for the Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 3, 1963, issue of the Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer, entitled "Justice for the Retired," is worth the consideration of all Members of the House prior to the vote tomorrow on the military pay bill:

JUSTICE FOR THE RETIRED

Inequity in the pay of retired officers should be corrected, in the name of justice, by the present session of Congress by amending the military pay bill to give officers retired before 1958 the same increase in pay granted those retiring after 1958.

For more than a hundred years it has been traditional that retired pay be geared to active duty pay, to be increased whenever active duty pay was increased.

But when Congress raised the pay of active duty officers in 1958 the law provided that officers retiring on and after June 1, 1958, receive 75 percent of the active duty pay raise while those who had retired before June 1, 1958, receive only 6 percent of the increase.

The matter is of more than a little importance to the Fayetteville area where a growing number of retired officers are making their permanent homes by reason of the proximity of the Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base facilities.

The difference between 75 and 6 percent of the increase is not immaterial. It amounts to enough dollars to create something of an economical discrepency in the income of officers who retired within just 1 day of each other.

And quite ironically it hits the hardest a category of rather senior officers who saw active duty in both the World Wars.

Perhaps more importantly the business of arbitrarily giving a sustantial increase to one group of officers and a rather minor increase to another runs counter to the spirit of the contract entered into between the Government and its career soldiers, that after they retire their retired pay shall be revised upward as active duty pay is revised upward.

Error of Congress in 1958 of not revising all retired pay upward at the same rate amounts to something in the nature of a breach of contract on the part of the Government toward a group of military men whose duty has been long, arduous and faithful.

Correction of the error, it has been estimated, will cost the Government about $32 million a year, substantially less than firing an astronaut around the world for a few hours.

And it will not be a continuing expense because a great many of the officers affected are reaching a time in life when they may not look forward to a long span of years before they go on the "long roll."

In the meantime there is the thought that even though retired they are still technically in the service, subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and subject in emergency to be recalled to active duty.

A government which has demanded so much from its officers and which seeks to promote a military esprit designed to encourage young men to make an honorable career of the military service should take great pains to feed all from the same spoon.

University of Massachusetts Celebrates 100 Years of Outstanding Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the University of Massachusetts recently celebrated 100 years of outstanding service to the academic community of the Commonwealth and Nation.

This progressive and growing institution at Amherst has established a record that could well be emulated by other colleges and universities across the land.

Under the determined leadership of a distinguished political scientist, John W. Lederle, this great university continues to flourish.

Two recent articles, both written in conjunction with the 100-year celebration, dramatically describe the growth and distinction of this university.

One of them, by the noted curator of the Nieman foundation at Harvard University, Louis M. Lyons, is a capsule summary of the past 50 years. Mr. Lyons' beautiful prose and capacity to autobiographically reminisce results in a very memorable article. I am certain that many of my colleagues will enjoy reading his article.

The other, an editorial from the Greenfield, Mass. Recorder-Gazette, entitled "100 Years Younger" is also excellent commentary on the university.

Both articles, the one by Mr. Lyons from the Boston, Mass., Sunday Globe of April 28, 1963 and the editorial of Wednesday, May 1, 1963, deserve wide reading.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Apr. 28, 1963]

AN ALUMNUS LOOKS BACK 50 YEARS

(By Louis M. Lyons, Curator, Nieman Foundation, Harvard University)

Fifty years ago, when a boy on a small Plymouth County farm, I told my high school principal I wanted to take examinations for the Massachusetts Agricultural College, he looked it up and reported, "You know, it's all agriculture." He had gone to New Hampshire State, which even than had a broader curriculum. With Connecticut, it was to move faster to a full State University, with quickened legislative support.

The Aggie college at Amherst was then a long way from Boston, with its complex of colleges, and from the legislative source of its support. It was thought of largely as a college for western Massachusetts boys, and not thought of at all for girls. One girl started in my class of about 150 boys, and we picked up two more along the way. There was no special program for women. They had to be as agricultural as the rest.

But even then the college was less limited than my principal thought from the catalog. For President Kenyon L. Butterfield had found a way to broaden its base. Wherever he could tack on "agricultural" or "rural" to a course, it would pass the legislature, which in those days held the illusion it was the role of an agricultural college to restore the abandoned farms where experience had shown there wasn't a living to be made.

So we had agricultural economics, agricultural education, agricultural engineering, rural journalism and rural sociology. The last, as I recall, Butterfield developed himself. It was at least a gesture toward revitalizing the rural community. You couldn't do much with music in those terms, though I have often thought that if they had labeled it folk music they might have squeaked out more than the one course. Butterfield, within the limits allowed him, aimed at a college of food supply and food industry, for an industrial State, and the present occupations of many alumni testify to the validity of that concept.

But had it been even as limited as my principal thought, I would not have been deterred. For my family was among the many who had become infatuated with the back-to-the-land movement stimulated by Theodore Roosevelt and such then popular books as "Three Acres and Liberty."

Our 30 sandy acres made a skimpy living from poultry. But it was liberty, and to a boy from the suburbs everything about the farm and country life was fascinating. I could even make the Norwell High baseball team, because they had to have someone in right field; and running 4 miles to school when I missed the barge by being late with the milking qualified me later for varsity cross country.

No boy had ever gone to college, they told me, from that three-teacher high school. The boys dropped out to work in the woods and the girls went to Bridgewater Normal. But with only two in my Latin class, I never dared skip either half of the homework. It prepared me for college.

The natural momentum of my excitement about the farm focused on the college with a visit by the new country agricultural agent to our district. I wanted to go to his college.

This desire was spreading among boys of families disillusioned with city life. The college body was changing. Soon most students came from the Boston end of the State. The transition to State College and then University was inevitable in an industrial State. By the time my brother Henry was graduated, in 1920, the New York Telephone Co., recruited him and half a dozen classmates as traffic engineers.

But through my time, Aggie stuck to its agricultural last. Its flexibility came chiefly through the sciences related to agriculture. The veterinary course produced some good veterinarians; but it proved also a basic pre-med course.

Agronomy, organic chemistry, plant pathology, entomology had practical application for the minority who had farms to work, But for the rest they led to research jobs in the bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, the State experiment stations and extension services, to teaching, and to commercial jobs with the feed and fertilizer and insecticide companies. Many of my time have become leaders in all those fields.

Landscape architecture was an early development on the campus at Amherst. It combine horticulture, engineering and art. Floriculture was another of our fine arts. My roommate was a floriculture major. He became an insurance man for lack of capital.

Capital was what most of us were notably short of. Free tuition was what made the college possible for most of us. Money was scarce in the fall of 1914. It was a depression year, though we didn't know the term.

Even at the official rate of 15 cents an hour, student employment wasn't available to

freshmen, and waiters' jobs were reserved for the varsity.

You could sometimes get Saturday jobs weeding onions or washing windows; and when the weather came right for stripping tobacco, whole squads of us would take off from classes to earn $1.50 a day.

But a room was $1.50 a week and you could get a double order of mashed potatoes at the college cafeteria for 6 cents, breakfast of muffins and oatmeal for 8 cents. There were always apples, and a box of food from home; or sometimes $5 in a letter—when they had it to spare—would eke out suppers of bread and cheese and bologna.

I still have a tiny account book of my expenditures that year, $243.50. Next year I got a job and a room in the experiment station, running the addressograph machine for farmers' bulletins. The hourly pay went up to 20 cents. College was easy from then on.

Junior year I could eat at the training table with the track team. Our farm boys made rugged teams and they made sturdy citizens. Our agricultural graduates of that time made a corps of the progressive farmers of the State developers of farm cooperatives, leaders in community affairs, and some of them county agents, some school principals, some businessmen, some in the legislature and other public service.

The old college was a seedbed of good solid citizenship. They'd all learned how to make a useful living, exploiting the land and not other people. The salt of the earth for my money, as I've known them down the years.

The college in 1914 was a glorious place to be. To a lad from the scrublands of Plymouth County, the broad sweep of the Connecticut Valley, its fertile fields, its lovely woods (we still had the chestnuts) made it indeed "the fairest intervale."

The campus was spacious, spreading around a pond out to open fields and up through a wooded hillside, with the college forest on Mt. Tobey, a few miles north. Oh, forestry was another career field, popular in my day. The college had space to grow and it has grown magnificently. It still has space, the envy of the city colleges, hemmed in by traffic and urban land costs. It is the site of the future.

But even in its earliest days the Agricultural College had stature. Its earliest work in science won acclaim from Agassiz. Its very first class won a crew race over Harvard and Brown on the Connecticut River. The victorious 1870 shell still hung in the old Social Union 45 years later.

The core curriculum required of sophomores in my day included physics, zoology, and agronomy, taught by three formidable scientists and known as the toughest courses in college. The cultural side was undoubtedly limited, for what stands out as the most civilizing influence I encountered was a French course under Alexander MacKimmie. But a great teacher can make of any course an inspiration.

Ray Torrey in a course in botany opened the world of science and thought to boys from small high schools, broadened and deepened their lives.

Literature was scant. But Dean Edward M. Lewis, later president, lectured on Browning with unforgettable eloquence. He also batted out flies to the baseball team.

Frank Prentice Rand and Walter Prince taught English, coached dramatics and guided student publications with an enthusiasm worth a battery. They have the batteries now in all those fields and are getting increased legislative support, which came later and less than in our neighbor States.

For the college was long overshadowed by the historic concentration of private colleges in Massachusetts and was limited by conservative State policy until after the Second World War. Then two forces joined for expansion. The GI bill brought a host of mature students who could not be denied, which required using Fort Devens as a temporary annex.

This emergency led Governor Tobin to ask President James B. Conant of Harvard to head a committee to plan a program for the university. It was Conant who charted its larger role and convinced the legislature. I sat in on some of that with him and know how much the University of Massachusetts owes to this vigorous supporter of public education.

The future of our university is what we make it in Massachusetts. It should be great. The State needs it. It must be as strong in all fields as any comparable institution, to graduate people adequate for any task of useful pursuit in our modern society. Nothing less will serve.

It will have to take much of the pressure for rapid growth that our rising college population impose. To do this without diluting its strength calls for toughness of administration. For its standards will count more in Massachusetts than those of our great private institutions of national reach. These standards should be applied also to the whole group of our State colleges (formerly normal schools) so that a Massachusetts college diploma will have full value, wherever granted.

The University of Connecticut had branches in the principal cities to make higher education accessible throughout the State. The University of California has half a dozen campuses. Michigan, Iowa, Tennessee are among the States that each have two great State universities.

The University of Massachusetts, as it grows to meet the needs of the State, should coordinate all the publicly supported institutions of higher learning into one system that will insure the full values of education in each and a full range of educational needs.

The university will inevitably develop as a center of research to meet the special needs of Massachusetts. It should swiftly develop a communications center around an educational television station. Its extension service in agriculture makes a ready nucleus for educational extension of every sort out to the smallest community.

The needs of public service call for the utmost effort in everything that concerns politics and public life, through education, planning, conference, organization, leadership. The whole range of adult education invites imaginative development.

There's a wide field for informal seminars and nondegree offerings that adults can attend for longer or shorter periods to strengthen their own professional work. Examples are to be found at Rutgers in journalism, at Harvard in several fields, at M.I.T. and a few other places. But there's exceedingly little of it and a great chance for it.

With adequate support and leadership, the university in its second century can and should be a vitalizing force for every institution and community in Massachusetts.

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette, May 1, 1963]

ONE HUNDRED YEARS YOUNGER

The University of Massachusetts is 100 years younger than it was in 1863; younger, in fact, than it ever has been and younger than anyone could have conceived when its charter was granted.

The university is young, not only in appearance but also in spirit, management and point of view. This institution observing its centennial year has become younger in the past decade than it has been in all the 90 years preceding.

Youth at the University of Massachusetts is manifested in so many phases of college life that it would be difficult to single out any particular aspect as characteristic.

There are far more new, elegant, practical and impressive new buildings at the university today than at any time since it was founded. There are more students roaming the campus, occupying desks and participating in university advantages than even the most optimistic eye could foresee in 1863. There are more courses, a greater variety of talents and better facilities offered today than in all of the 100 years past.

Youth, however, is typified by the view of the future. The University of Massachusetts is engaged in a program of expansion which will place it at the head of similar institutions all over the country. And it won't take long to achieve this goal. Already it has become a community in itself.

Buildings do not a college make, however, and the true quality of institutions of this type is measured in terms of the product. The university in its earlier years was known primarily for its agricultural interests and the young farmers it turned out. Massachusetts Aggie was the old familiar cliché of that earlier era. Now it dispenses farming techniques along with science, engineering, the arts and the latest in every phase of contemporary and future prosperity.

The year 2063 is destined to produce many more changes in university life, needs and equipment. There will be structures dwarfing those of 1963. There will be courses which today have not even been imagined. It may be teaching youngsters how to cultivate the moon or how to set up factories on Mars. There will be two, three, or four times the number of students. The university more than likely will have branches in the four corners of the State and spill over into neighboring towns of Leverett, Hadley, and make Amherst virtually a city with sessions over the 12 months of every year.

A century is a short time in the life of an institution, but happy birthday and a prosperous and progressive 100 years to come.

Combat Pay Is Right in Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, from a marine I received this morning the following brief but eloquent note:

Combat pay should not be taken away from the infantryman. Fliers get extra pay for doing their duty—other servicemen get hazardous duty pay for doing their job. I think sitting in a foxhole and being shot at is just as hazardous, don't you?

In a more formal manner I heard yesterday from the Department of Maryland Veterans of Foreign Wars as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENNETT: On behalf of our department officers, and 14,000 members in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, we wish to inform you that we are very much in support of additional combat pay for the military forces.

It is respectfully requested that when H.R. 5555 is brought up for consideration in the House, that you support an amendment that is expected to be offered to have combat pay be restored to this bill.

This is a "key objective" in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and we sincerely hope that you will give assistance to having this amendment restored, as we know it will benefit our comrades-in-

arms who are maintaining the peace in this 17th year of the cold war.

Respectfully,

CHARLES A. KREATCHMAN,
Quartermaster/Adjutant.

Hostile fire pay, otherwise called combat pay, was paid to personnel in front line combat units in World War II and in the Korean war as a result of congressional action. Men in the U.S. armed services are dying and being wounded today in combat for our country. When the Department of Defense asked Congress this year to put combat pay in the pay bill now before us it said:

While combat is, of course, the basic purpose of a military establishment, the fact remains that the actual hazards and hardships of combat are currently experienced by a small percentage of the Armed Forces.

In approving $55 per month to be paid, under strict regulations, the Department said:

It is, of course, impossible for the Government to compensate adequately for this kind of sacrifice or potential sacrifice, but it would give a token recognition of the special role being played by such personnel.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Special Subcommittee on Military Pay of the House Armed Services Committee approved this request.

The total annual extra pay for specified performances in the Military Establishment in addition to usual duty totals $632,486,960, as shown in the report of the committee on H.R. 5555. The record shows that the cost of combatp ay is estimated to be in the neighborhood only of $1 or $2 million annually, depending on the tightness of the regulations.

The committee in the Department of Defense which did the basic studies for this proposal made these conclusions:

(a) To provide special pay to individuals assigned to duties in which they are subject to the hazards and discomforts of combat is feasible, desirable, and consistent with the policy in the military service of awarding extra compensation for extra hazardous duties.

(b) Combat duty pay should be both an award for performing a hazardous and disagreeable duty and tangible recognition of performance of a necessary and sometimes heroic service. As such, payment should be rigidly administered and restricted to those individuals normally subjected to the hazards and discomforts of combat. Properly administered, it would improve the morale and effectiveness of the individuals assigned to duties in combat or quasi-combat conditions.

(c) It is impossible to assay the degree of risk one assumes when in a combat situation, or to equate the risk with monetary compensation. However, considering that Congress evaluated and approved $45 per month 10 years ago, and that other hazardous duties authorize minimum payments of $55 per month, that $55 would be a proper amount.

(d) There is no discernible difference in the exposure to hazard and hardship experienced by officers and enlisted men, and therefore the additional pay awarded for combat duty should be equal.

(e) We have in the military service today, have had for most of the time since the Korean war, and will likely continue to have individuals performing duty under combat conditions suffering all the hazards and discomforts of such duty.

(f) The combat pay bill of 1952, while still on the statutes, is not operative because it applies only to units engaged in the Korean war.

Although this hostile fire pay is not restricted to infantry this is where the chief impact will be felt. And so it should be. When the infantryman is committed to action he knows that he will be there until the issue is decided one way or another or until he is killed, seriously wounded, or breaks mentally from the strain. Casualty data indicates that at the end of the first 100 days in combat—not necessarily consecutive—one-half of his friends with whom he entered combat will be missing in action, in a hospital, or dead. At the end of 200 days in combat, 93 percent of his buddies will be gone. For all practical purposes, 200 days in front line combat as an infantryman amounts to either a death sentence or a future as a mentally or physically handicapped man.

Opposition to IATA Transatlantic Fare Rises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 1, 1963, I issued a statement supporting the Civil Aeronautics Board's opposition to the attempt by the International Air Transport Association—IATA—to impose a 5-percent increase on jet economy round-trip fares for transatlantic air passengers and all Pacific services. Under leave to etxend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this statement, which follows:

I heartily endorse the Civil Aeronautics Board's determination that the 5-percent transatlantic round-trip fare increase now sought by IATA is not in the public interest. I support the CAB's steadfast opposition to the efforts of IATA to force such an increase upon transatlantic air passengers.

The proposed fare increase does not make business sense with transatlantic jets flying half empty.

Furthermore, American citizens from a majority of the transatlantic air passengers, although U.S.-flag airlines now carry only about one-third of this traffic. Accordingly, such a transatlantic fare increase would take money from the pockets of American passengers and place the lion's share in the hands of foreign airlines.

I am fortified in this view by the statement, reported in today's New York Times, of Sir William Hildred, director general of IATA, who called for lower airline fares, which, he emphasized, would bring more passengers flocking to the jet airliners and make the operation of these planes profitable.

I welcome Sir William's latest statement, which is a far cry from the position he took during the 1956 hearings on the airlines industry before the Antitrust Subcommittee.

"The Antitrust Subcommittee's report of April 5, 1957, chronicles the struggles of the CAB to obtain reasonable, cost-justified international airline fares against the stubborn opposition of IATA. The subcommittee's report concluded:

"From the Board's own description of its experience over a decade of IATA ratemaking it is manifest that resulting rates are * * * unwarrantedly high."

The Antitrust Subcommittee's 1957 report on the airlines industry further concluded that Congress should empower the CAB to regulate international airline fares to the same extent as domestic fares.

I am gratified to note that the statement on international air transport policy approved by President Kennedy only last week, likewise endorsed such legislation. The White House statement on international air transport policy expressly states:

"To provide for more effective governmental influence on rates, Congress should adopt legislation which would give the Civil Aeronautics Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to control rates in international air transport to and from the United States."

This recommendation mirrors the proposals of the Antitrust Subcommittee's 1957 airlines industry report which concluded:

"The committee accordingly joins with the Board, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Air Coordinating Committee in endorsing the grant of legislative authority to the CAB to control the fares, rates, rules, and practices of U.S. carriers applicable to the transportation to and from the United States to the same extent that the Board now has power to act with respect to fares, rates, rules and practices in domestic transportation. The committee also endorses their recommendation that the Board receive greater legislative authorization to control the fares, rates, rules and practices of foreign air carriers applicable to transportation to and from the United States."

It is gratifying, therefore, to find the CAB protecting the public interest and forfending against the imposition by IATA, an international airline cartel, of air-fare increases which make no sense economically at a time of overcapacity, and which would in effect tax American transatlantic air passengers largely for the benefit of foreign airlines.

Steuben Society of America Urges Establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Steuben Society of America has long been interested in the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. Recently the society's legislative committee, consisting of Robert F. Holoch, chairman of the Steuben Society's National Public Affairs Committee, and Julius E. Mayer and George Wilkens, members of the National Council of the Steuben Society of America, prepared a brief in support of the Steuben Society's position. I include the full text of that brief:

NATIONAL COUNCIL,
STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y.

To the Congress of the United States of America, House of Representatives and U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

GENTLEMEN: For many years, the Steuben Society of America has promoted and recom-

mended the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs similar to the three military academies we already have, namely, the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, and the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs.

In the platform of this society for 1962–64, it was recommended that we advocate the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy and our society's monthly newspaper, the Steuben News, has recommended annually the establishment of such an Academy and has enlightened its members as to the advantages of such an institution for the training of men and women for work in all phases of our foreign affairs.

This society has noted that the President of the United States has recommended and Members of the Congress have also introduced bills again in 1963 for the establishment of such an Academy and many Members of the Congress have concurred in such action.

Our great country has failed in the past to encourage and develop men and women for the purpose of training them as specialists in the foreign service field while many of our adversaries and friends throughout the world have, on the other hand, given their citizens intensive training in the field of foreign affairs. There have been established in our country various private institutions of learning which have tried to supplement such a program but the time has already passed when our National Government should undertake this most important project. A training in foreign affairs is just as important as the training of men in the Armed Forces. The future leaders of our foreign services should have their basic preparation in such an Academy.

Such an Academy should be established and developed by the Federal Government under such policies as Congress should direct. It is felt, however, that the Academy should be headed by a Chancellor who will direct, with the advice of a Board of Trustees or Directors composed of learned citizens, the curriculum and the training to be given to such an institution. Our country is deeply involved in maintaining peace and security of all the people of the world. Those who handle foreign affairs, especially in an advisory capacity, or otherwise, should make this their life's work and this needed training at such an Academy, as has been suggested not only by the President of the United States but by various Members of the Congress, would give to these individuals a background and educational understanding which would enable our Federal Government to staff its agencies handling those matters with competently trained and devoted individuals. Public servants working in the field of foreign service must, of necessity, have a very broad background as they become involved in programs in almost every field of national interest.

A National Academy of Foreign Affairs will result in the establishment of a first-rate institution which can grant these citizens who are most qualified to work in this field to receive the best possible training.

The Steuben Society of America urges the passage of such a bill, which will contain the proviso that the Chancellor of the said Academy be given directions only as to the policies of the said Academy by the Congress but that the curriculum and actual studies and phases of training of said Academy be left to its Board of Directors or Trustees and its Chancellor. The said Academy should be left free from any influence from any department of our Federal Government so that we can develop a corps of public servants in the foreign service second to none.

We pray that the Congress will take immediate action toward the passage of such an important piece of legislation.

Very truly yours,

OTTO HEERLEIN,
National Chairman.

Why Leave Out the Fighting Soldier?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 5555, which provides increases in pay for members of the Armed Forces, includes provisions for special and incentive pay for hazardous duty for hundreds of thousands of individuals at an annual cost of $632,486,960. Despite the fact that the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill included extra pay for duty subject to hostile fire, this provision has been dropped from the reported bill.

I am including with these remarks a list of the types of duty which receive extra pay, the amount of the pay is shown, and a comparison of the Department of Defense proposal, H.R. 4696—the bill reported by the Rivers subcommittee, and H.R. 5555—the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee, is included. It is incredible that all of the special and hazardous duty pay categories were retained in H.R. 5555 except the small group of men subjected to hostile fire currently serving in southeast Asia.

An amendment is to be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to correct this inequitable situation and I believe that Members can readily see the extent of this gross injustice by reviewing the comparative chart which appears below:

INCENTIVE PAY FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY [1]

Entitlement	Current (dollars per monthly)	DOD proposal (H.R. 3006)	H.R. 4696	H.R. 5555
a. Parachute duty:				
Officer	110	Retain	Retain	Retain.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
b. Demolition duty:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
c. Flight duty (see enclosure): Crew member.		do	do	Do.
d. Flight duty (noncrew):				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
e. Thermal stress duty:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
f. Low pressure:				
Officer	110	Retain and add "high" pressure.	Retain and add "high" pressure.	Retain and add "high" pressure.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
g. Submarine duty (see enclosure 1)		Retain	Retain	Retain.
h. Leprosy:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
i. Glider flight duty:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
j. Human acceleration:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	110	do	do	Do.
SPECIAL PAY				
a. Sea and foreign duty (enlisted only):				
E-9	$22.50	Eliminate	$22.50	$22.50.
E-8	22.50	do	$22.50	$22.50.
E-7	22.50	do	$22.50	$22.50.
E-6	20.00	do	$20	$20.
E-5	16.00	do	$16	$16.
E-4	13.00	do	$13	$13.
E-3	9.00	do	$9	$9.
E-2	8.00	do	$8	$8.
E-1	8.00	do	$8	$8.
b. Medical and dental (officer):				
(1) Less than 2 years active duty.	100	Retain	Retain	Retain.
(2) 2 to 6 years active duty	150	do	do	Do.
(3) 6 to 10 years active duty	200	do	do	Do.
(4) Over 10 years active duty	250	do	do	Do.
c. Veterinarians (officers)	100	do	do	Do.
d. Diving duty:				
Officer	100	do	do	Do.
Enlisted:				
Master diver	100	do	do	Do.
1st class diver	80	do	do	Do.
Salvage diver	65	do	do	Do.
2d class diver	55	do	do	Do.
e. Proficiency pay (enlisted only):				
P-1	30	do	do	Do.
P-2	60	do	do	Do.
f. Unusual responsibility: [2]				
Colonel	150	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate.
Lieutenant colonel	100	do	do	Do.
Major	50	do	do	Do.
Captain	50	do	do	Do.
g. Reenlistment bonus		do	Retain	Retain.
h. Career incentive	None	$500 to $2,400 dependent upon criticality of skill and as determined by Secretary of Defense.	Eliminate	Eliminate.
i. Duty subject to hostile fire	[3] None	$55	Retain	Do.

[1] Currently, a member is entitled, if otherwise qualified, to only one incentive pay for hazardous duty; H.R. 3006 and H.R. 4696 will authorize a maximum of two incentive pays for hazardous duty.
[2] Not implemented.
[3] Combat Duty Pay Act of 1962 authorized $45 per month for service in Korea.

College President Warns of the Danger of Federal Funds for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to higher education by no means holds a universal appeal to college educators.

Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., recently gave a speech in Chicago in which he warned educators interested in academic freedom of the dependence on Federal money.

The day may come when faculty members, at the mercy of Federal funds, will support the political party which promises them the largest amount of money regardless of other partisan differences.

Dr. Howard's speech "Stampede to Disaster," was reprinted in the April issue of Commerce. Excerpts are given here:

EXCERPTS FROM "STAMPEDE TO DISASTER"

We have witnessed overly hasty action in American agriculture, when the Federal Government without fully understanding the mechanism of our agricultural system, plunged into a program of remedies that has had such extraordinarily adverse consequences that nobody really knows how to undo or amend the cure and bring the patient back to health.

Now we are being rushed into ill-advised remedies for education which violate the nature and neutralize the vitality of the educational system that has ably served this country's needs under circumstances the most various.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

Now let us examine some of the reasons which underlie the traditional rejection of the Federal Government as the means of support for education. In the first place as the Federal Government becomes the largest single source of funds for college after college, and there are a number already in this category, the institution becomes beholden to the Government. This is not a chimera born of a doctrainaire distrust of Government. Recently I wrote to the president of a large well-known university inviting him to join a group of college presidents in making known the arguments against the ever-growing Federal subsidies of education. He replied that although he was in full agreement with our position that the subsidies are not in the long-range best interests of the colleges or the country, his own university was now so dependent upon funds from Washington that he could not exercise his rights as a citizen on this issue without jeopardizing the university he served.

Think about that answer, if you will. The mere flow of the money has silenced the opposition. This loss of freedom on the part of those who depend on Government for their income was the reason for refusing suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Let us protect the Federal aid programs ahead, not too many years the way things are going, to the time when all colleges and universities will receive the largest part of their budget from the United States Treasury. Is it possible that all faculty members in that day will feel some obligation to vote for whichever party promises the largest amount of additional educational subsidies regardless of other partisan differences? This is not an unlikely result. Political freedom is sacrificed by those who depend upon Government resources. Can we afford to sacrifice the political freedom of the whole academic community?

Money is a good servant but a dangerous master. The reason that it is so difficult to justify Federal aid to education is that except for the few who admit to a philosophical commitment to the centralization of the services of society, the only justification for Federal aid is money, and the awkward, ugly fact is that the Federal Government is far more prodigal with its funds than are other sources.

If only the proponents of Federal aid would come right out and state this fact we could face the issue head on and measure what the easy money buys against what we must sacrifice in order to obtain it from Washington.

It is undeniable that our increasingly technical society requires an increasingly skilled and knowledgeable population and to accomplish this end a larger part of the gross national product must be invested in education.

The issue is whether this urgent objective is to be achieved through congressional action—which forces the people to pay more for education and at the same time diminishes the diversity and circumscribes the creativity of the separate colleges—or whether the Nation can be persuaded to provide the necessary funds through the traditional sources and thus preserve the freedom and the strength of American education.

The latter course takes hard work. Fundraising is often a frustrating and thankless task, but no priceless asset is earned or retained without labor and sacrifice.

I cannot believe that my colleagues in college administration would so readily forfeit the full potential of their respective institutions, nor would shirk the task of local financing if they fully realized what was at stake. As black as their financial future may appear to them, it cannot be the reason for abandoning integrity. The course of educational statesmanship is to protect the greatest creative potential and the greatest institutional individuality. I don't believe that course lies via the Federal Treasury.

The college executives and the officers of government who may have a part through their silent or vocal support of Federal subsidy will have to answer to history for the consequences of their work.

Pay for Old Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 5, 1963, issue of the Washington Sunday Star, entitled "Pay for Old Soldiers," is worth the consideration of all Members of the House prior to the vote tomorrow on the military pay bill.

PAY FOR OLD SOLDIERS

Until 4 years ago, military retirement pay was based on active duty pay scales for each rank. The 1958 Pay Act, which sharply adjusted active duty rates, ditched the traditional retirement formula, and allowed those who had turned in their uniforms before the passage of the act only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase. Those who retired later, of course, started from the higher base of their active duty pay—creating a double standard which was inequitable to the older soldiers.

Now, in its new pay bill, the House Armed Services Committee has voted to perpetuate that injustice by refusing to permit the old retirees to recompute their retirement on the basis of the 1958 pay rates. This action flies in the face of a strong recommendation to the contrary by the Defense Department. It overturns a unanimous action of its own subcommittee. Finally, it constitutes an out-and-out reversal of policy by the full committee itself, which waged a strong fight and actually won House approval for the recomputation provision in 1960. Its report attempts to justify this latest action on the basis of excessive cost.

This was not a valid argument in 1958. It was not valid in 1960, when the House action was thwarted by a recalcitrant Senate. And it has no validity today—as a means of avoiding equal treatment. The issue involved is whether there should be a uniform rate for all retirees. We think there should be.

Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the General Subcommittee on Labor, on the vital problem of discrimination in employment, in which I urged the committee to take favorable action on legislation under consideration which would provide complete coverage and assure equal employment opportunity to all citizens of our country. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the General Subcommittee on Labor, you have under consideration legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. I am gratified to have the opportunity to speak on this legislation; in January of this year, I reintroduced my bill—H.R. 330—a "Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act" and I have introduced such legislation ever since coming to Congress.

In my opinion, civil rights and equality of opportunity in employment are the most vital issues which we face on the home front today, and inasmuch as the Emancipation Proclamation was signed 100 years ago, it is high time that we stop being laggards and that we proceed, with alacrity, to do the job that should have been done generations ago.

The malicious, destructive, discriminatory practices which now abound in all fields of employment throughout our country, affecting millions of our people, must be brought to an abrupt halt. We must not continue to ignore the terrible degradation suffered by those who are victims of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national ancestry, for this angush is visited upon their children and continues on and on. All hope is killed in the very young; they know that although they have a high degree of intelligence, are ambitious and industrious, there is no point in pursuing higher education or looking for jobs which we commensurate with their abilities; they are not given such jobs, they know that they will be denied advancements to which they are entitled in any jobs they hold, because

they are of a minority group. We must also keep in mind that discrimination is directed against not only Negroes, but against Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Orientals, American Indians, as well as others, in our land.

The problems of joblessness and juvenile delinquency go hand in hand, and the evils of discrimination are major factors in minority group joblessness. In one of our most sadly blighted areas in New York which has a predominantly nonwhite population, the percentage of high school dropouts by graduation times runs from 33 to 60 percent. These young children leave school, in most instances, not because their parents wish them to go to work, but because their motives have been destroyed and the will to advance deadened by the malignancy of discrimination; the denial of hope for equality, for advancement, and for equality of opportunity has taken its toll.

When discrimination in employment is prevalent, the blight spreads to all other facets of the community; increased juvenile delinquency and crime result. Ever-increasing taxes are imposed to meet ever-increasing welfare assistance costs.

This is a national problem and it must be solved by national policies and laws. Many States have already enacted fair employment practices and laws, the great State of New York among them. However, the problem is so complex and overwhelming that Federal action is necessary in order to help the 100 million people not now protected by State laws, and to meet other complexities of the situation.

We owe it to ourselves and to our Nation to eliminate the treacherous practices of discrimination in employment and other fields; the prestige of our Nation is at stake. How can we, in good conscience, promote the ideals of democracy throughout the world, when such evil conditions flourish here at home and when so many of our people are denied the rights guaranteed them under our Constitution? How can we close our eyes to the sickness of despair suffered by millions of the youth of our Nation? How long will we continue to allow discrimination to undermine the foundations of our Government and the economic structure of our country? Those who would continue to impose discrimination and foster cruel prejudices must be saved from their sins against humanity; we must halt their evil ways which are having such a dastardly effect upon our entire Nation and which cause grave concern to all right-thinking Americans who deplore the cruelties inflicted upon their fellow man.

Congress must discharge its responsibility and pass strong, effective legislation which will provide complete coverage and assure equal employment opportunity to all citizens of our country.

How the Combat Pay Amendment Will Be Implemented by Department Regulations; and the Cost Compared With Other Special Pay Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A2749 there is a discussion of the combat pay amendment which will be submitted on H.R. 5555, the military pay bill. The amendment properly leaves some details for departmental regulations, as has been the case in World War II and Korean war provisions for such pay.

Anyone who urges that administrative difficulties create an obstacle to combat or hostile fire pay is simply misinformed. There are no administrative difficulties; and the best proof of that is that, despite years of experience with such legislation in World War II and the Korean war, there have been no administrative difficulties at all. The broad grant of administrative regulation could correct any that might arise; but in view of past extended experience there is no reason to anticipate any difficulties at all.

The Army, which has requested combat—or hostile fire—pay would be chiefly concerned with the benefits involved in this legislation; and under date of March 19, Secretary of the Army Cyrus Vance has written as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: The following information regarding the provisions of H.R. 4696, authorizing pay for members of a uniformed service who are subject to hostile fire, is submitted in accordance with our conversation of March 18.

In the event of enactment, regulations governing this type of pay will be promulgated by the Secretary of Defense, the purpose of which will be to control the entitlement. The Department of Defense presently contemplates that such regulations will require that a member must be assigned to and physically present with his unit not less than 6 days of the month in order to qualify; that the mission of the unit itself must be such that it is subject to hostile fire, or the member must be acting as an adviser with an allied unit subject to such fire. Such unit will be not larger than a brigade, combat command, regiment, group or other similar organization of comparable level. These are similar to the limitations imposed by regulations during the Korean war.

Administration of implementing regulations will be closely supervised by the Army to prevent abuses.

It is estimated that under existing conditions between 1,500 and 2,000 Army personnel would qualify for this pay under the criteria outlined above at an annual cost of about $1 million.

Sincerely,

CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army.

Also on March 29 Assistant Secretary of Defense—for Manpower—Norman Paul wrote as follows concerning the annual cost under regulations which now only await the passage of this legislation to be established:

In reply to your letter of March 25, 1963, the following information is submitted regarding the annual cost of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire contained in H.R. 4696.

The Department of Defense would delegate to the unified commanders the authority to designate the units whose members will be entitled to the special pay. However, based on the criteria tentatively established by the Department of Defense and the conditions of cold war existing today, the services have estimated that the number of men qualifying and the annual cost would be as follows:

	Number of men	Annual cost
Army	1,500-2,000	$990,000-$1,320,000
Navy	52	34,320
Marine Corps	538	355,080
Air Force	150	99,000
Total		1,478,400- 1,808,400

Mr. Speaker, I include here the policies which have been established by the Department of Defense for hostile fire pay:

PROPOSED POLICY GUIDANCE TO ADMINISTER SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE

(1) This special pay is to be authorized during periods of (formal hostilities or) "cold war" in which the United States may be engaged, and to members who are serving with units of the U.S. uniformed services; and also under "cold war" conditions to members who are assigned, attached, supporting, or serving with units of friendly foreign forces that are engaged in armed conflict.

(2) Entitlement will be limited to members of the U.S. forces serving in Vietnam, and to such other places as may later be designated by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) Personnel must be assigned duty: (a) subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines, or (b) in an area in which they are in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines. Personnel entitled to this special pay must be physically present and a member of, attached to, supporting, advising or assisting a combat unit not larger than a brigade, combat command, regiment, group or other similar organization of comparable level. Entitlement also includes personnel assigned or attached to: an aircraft including reconnaissance aircrews subjected to imminent danger of hostile fire in the course of an operation; a vessel including a minesweeper while in imminent danger of being subjected to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines, or a minesweeper while actually engaged in sweeping enemy mines.

(4) A member is entitled to this special pay at the rate of $55 per month if associated as a regular member with a combat unit under the conditions stated in (3) above for a period of not less than 6 days of the month, not necessarily consecutive; or 1 or more days during the month included within a period of not less than 6 consecutive days beginning in the preceding month.

(5) Notwithstanding the conditions in (4) above, a member is entitled to this special pay for any month in which he is entitled to basic pay and in which he was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

(6) Entitlement to this special pay will continue for not more than 3 additional months in the cases of personnel hospitalized because of a wound or injury received by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine or other hostile action.

(7) A member may not be paid more than one special pay for duty subject to hostile fire for any month. A member may be paid this special pay in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

(8) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

(9) The unified commander will designate units and detachments entitled to this spe-

College President Warns of the Danger of Federal Funds for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to higher education by no means holds a universal appeal to college educators.

Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., recently gave a speech in Chicago in which he warned educators interested in academic freedom of the dependence on Federal money.

The day may come when faculty members, at the mercy of Federal funds, will support the political party which promises them the largest amount of money regardless of other partisan differences.

Dr. Howard's speech "Stampede to Disaster," was reprinted in the April issue of Commerce. Excerpts are given here:

EXCERPTS FROM "STAMPEDE TO DISASTER"

We have witnessed overly hasty action in American agriculture, when the Federal Government without fully understanding the mechanism of our agricultural system, plunged into a program of remedies that has had such extraordinarily adverse consequences that nobody really knows how to undo or amend the cure and bring the patient back to health.

Now we are being rushed into ill-advised remedies for education which violate the nature and neutralize the vitality of the educational system that has ably served this country's needs under circumstances the most various.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

Now let us examine some of the reasons which underlie the traditional rejection of the Federal Government as the means of support for education. In the first place as the Federal Government becomes the largest single source of funds for college after college, and there are a number already in this category, the institution becomes beholden to the Government. This is not a chimera born of a doctrainaire distrust of Government. Recently I wrote to the president of a large well-known university inviting him to join a group of college presidents in making known the arguments against the ever-growing Federal subsidies of education. He replied that although he was in full agreement with our position that the subsidies are not in the long-range best interests of the colleges or the country, his own university was now so dependent upon funds from Washington that he could not exercise his rights as a citizen on this issue without jeopardizing the university he served.

Think about that answer, if you will. The mere flow of the money has silenced the opposition. This loss of freedom on the part of those who depend on Government for their income was the reason for refusing suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Let us protect the Federal aid programs ahead, not too many years the way things are going, to the time when all colleges and universities will receive the largest part of their budget from the United States Treasury. Is it possible that all faculty members in that day will feel some obligation to vote for whichever party promises the largest amount of additional educational subsidies regardless of other partisan differences? This is not an unlikely result. Political freedom is sacrificed by those who depend upon Government resources. Can we afford to sacrifice the political freedom of the whole academic community?

Money is a good servant but a dangerous master. The reason that it is so difficult to justify Federal aid to education is that except for the few who admit to a philosophical commitment to the centralization of the services of society, the only justification for Federal aid is money, and the awkward, ugly fact is that the Federal Government is far more prodigal with its funds than are other sources.

If only the proponents of Federal aid would come right out and state this fact we could face the issue head on and measure what the easy money buys against what we must sacrifice in order to obtain it from Washington.

It is undeniable that our increasingly technical society requires an increasingly skilled and knowledgeable population and to accomplish this end a larger part of the gross national product must be invested in education.

The issue is whether this urgent objective is to be achieved through congressional action—which forces the people to pay more for education and at the same time diminishes the diversity and circumscribes the creativity of the separate colleges—or whether the Nation can be persuaded to provide the necessary funds through the traditional sources and thus preserve the freedom and the strength of American education.

The latter course takes hard work. Fundraising is often a frustrating and thankless task, but no priceless asset is earned or retained without labor and sacrifice.

I cannot believe that my colleagues in college administration would so readily forfeit the full potential of their respective institutions, nor would shirk the task of local financing if they fully realized what was at stake. As black as their financial future may appear to them, it cannot be the reason for abandoning integrity. The course of educational statesmanship is to protect the greatest creative potential and the greatest institutional individuality. I don't believe that course lies via the Federal Treasury.

The college executives and the officers of government who may have a part through their silent or vocal support of Federal subsidy will have to answer to history for the consequences of their work.

Pay for Old Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 5, 1963, issue of the Washington Sunday Star, entitled "Pay for Old Soldiers," is worth the consideration of all Members of the House prior to the vote tomorrow on the military pay bill.

PAY FOR OLD SOLDIERS

Until 4 years ago, military retirement pay was based on active duty pay scales for each rank. The 1958 Pay Act, which sharply adjusted active duty rates, ditched the traditional retirement formula, and allowed those who had turned in their uniforms before the passage of the act only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase. Those who retired later, of course, started from the higher base of their active duty pay—creating a double standard which was inequitable to the older soldiers.

Now, in its new pay bill, the House Armed Services Committee has voted to perpetuate that injustice by refusing to permit the old retirees to recompute their retirement on the basis of the 1958 pay rates. This action flies in the face of a strong recommendation to the contrary by the Defense Department. It overturns a unanimous action of its own subcommittee. Finally, it constitutes an out-and-out reversal of policy by the full committee itself, which waged a strong fight and actually won House approval for the recomputation provision in 1960. Its report attempts to justify this latest action on the basis of excessive cost.

This was not a valid argument in 1958. It was not valid in 1960, when the House action was thwarted by a recalcitrant Senate. And it has no validity today—as a means of avoiding equal treatment. The issue involved is whether there should be a uniform rate for all retirees. We think there should be.

Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the General Subcommittee on Labor, on the vital problem of discrimination in employment, in which I urged the committee to take favorable action on legislation under consideration which would provide complete coverage and assure equal employment opportunity to all citizens of our country. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the General Subcommittee on Labor, you have under consideration legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. I am gratified to have the opportunity to speak on this legislation; in January of this year, I reintroduced my bill—H.R. 330—a "Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act" and I have introduced such legislation ever since coming to Congress.

In my opinion, civil rights and equality of opportunity in employment are the most vital issues which we face on the home front today, and inasmuch as the Emancipation Proclamation was signed 100 years ago, it is high time that we stop being laggards and that we proceed, with alacrity, to do the job that should have been done generations ago.

The malicious, destructive, discriminatory practices which now abound in all fields of employment throughout our country, affecting millions of our people, must be brought to an abrupt halt. We must not continue to ignore the terrible degradation suffered by those who are victims of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national ancestry, for this angush is visited upon their children and continues on and on. All hope is killed in the very young; they know that although they have a high degree of intelligence, are ambitious and industrious, there is no point in pursuing higher education or looking for jobs which we commensurate with their abilities; they are not given such jobs, they know that they will be denied advancements to which they are entitled in any jobs they hold, because

they are of a minority group. We must also keep in mind that discrimination is directed against not only Negroes, but against Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Orientals, American Indians, as well as others, in our land.

The problems of joblessness and juvenile delinquency go hand in hand, and the evils of discrimination are major factors in minority group joblessness. In one of our most sadly blighted areas in New York which has a predominantly nonwhite population, the percentage of high school dropouts by graduation times runs from 33 to 60 percent. These young children leave school, in most instances, not because their parents wish them to go to work, but because their motives have been destroyed and the will to advance deadened by the malignancy of discrimination; the denial of hope for equality, for advancement, and for equality of opportunity has taken its toll.

When discrimination in employment is prevalent, the blight spreads to all other facets of the community; increased juvenile delinquency and crime result. Ever-increasing taxes are imposed to meet ever-increasing welfare assistance costs.

This is a national problem and it must be solved by national policies and laws. Many States have already enacted fair employment practices and laws, the great State of New York among them. However, the problem is so complex and overwhelming that Federal action is necessary in order to help the 100 million people not now protected by State laws, and to meet other complexities of the situation.

We owe it to ourselves and to our Nation to eliminate the treacherous practices of discrimination in employment and other fields; the prestige of our Nation is at stake. How can we, in good conscience, promote the ideals of democracy throughout the world, when such evil conditions flourish here at home and when so many of our people are denied the rights guaranteed them under our Constitution? How can we close our eyes to the sickness of despair suffered by millions of the youth of our Nation? How long will we continue to allow discrimination to undermine the foundations of our Government and the economic structure of our country? Those who would continue to impose discrimination and foster cruel prejudices must be saved from their sins against humanity; we must halt their evil ways which are having such a dastardly effect upon our entire Nation and which cause grave concern to all right-thinking Americans who deplore the cruelties inflicted upon their fellow man.

Congress must discharge its responsibility and pass strong, effective legislation which will provide complete coverage and assure equal employment opportunity to all citizens of our country.

How the Combat Pay Amendment Will Be Implemented by Department Regulations; and the Cost Compared With Other Special Pay Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A2749 there is a discussion of the combat pay amendment which will be submitted on H.R. 5555, the military pay bill. The amendment properly leaves some details for departmental regulations, as has been the case in World War II and Korean war provisions for such pay.

Anyone who urges that administrative difficulties create an obstacle to combat or hostile fire pay is simply misinformed. There are no administrative difficulties; and the best proof of that is that, despite years of experience with such legislation in World War II and the Korean war, there have been no administrative difficulties at all. The broad grant of administrative regulation could correct any that might arise; but in view of past extended experience there is no reason to anticipate any difficulties at all.

The Army, which has requested combat—or hostile fire—pay would be chiefly concerned with the benefits involved in this legislation; and under date of March 19, Secretary of the Army Cyrus Vance has written as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: The following information regarding the provisions of H.R. 4696, authorizing pay for members of a uniformed service who are subject to hostile fire, is submitted in accordance with our conversation of March 18.

In the event of enactment, regulations governing this type of pay will be promulgated by the Secretary of Defense, the purpose of which will be to control the entitlement. The Department of Defense presently contemplates that such regulations will require that a member must be assigned to and physically present with his unit not less than 6 days of the month in order to qualify; that the mission of the unit itself must be such that it is subject to hostile fire, or the member must be acting as an adviser with an allied unit subject to such fire. Such unit will be not larger than a brigade, combat command, regiment, group or other similar organization of comparable level. These are similar to the limitations imposed by regulations during the Korean war.

Administration of implementing regulations will be closely supervised by the Army to prevent abuses.

It is estimated that under existing conditions between 1,500 and 2,000 Army personnel would qualify for this pay under the criteria outlined above at an annual cost of about $1 million.

Sincerely,

CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army.

Also on March 29 Assistant Secretary of Defense—for Manpower—Norman Paul wrote as follows concerning the annual cost under regulations which now only await the passage of this legislation to be established:

In reply to your letter of March 25, 1963, the following information is submitted regarding the annual cost of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire contained in H.R. 4696.

The Department of Defense would delegate to the unified commanders the authority to designate the units whose members will be entitled to the special pay. However, based on the criteria tentatively established by the Department of Defense and the conditions of cold war existing today, the services have estimated that the number of men qualifying and the annual cost would be as follows:

	Number of men	Annual cost
Army	1,500-2,000	$990,000-$1,320,000
Navy	52	34,320
Marine Corps	538	355,080
Air Force	150	99,000
Total		1,478,400- 1,808,400

Mr. Speaker, I include here the policies which have been established by the Department of Defense for hostile fire pay:

PROPOSED POLICY GUIDANCE TO ADMINISTER SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE

(1) This special pay is to be authorized during periods of (formal hostilities or) "cold war" in which the United States may be engaged, and to members who are serving with units of the U.S. uniformed services; and also under "cold war" conditions to members who are assigned, attached, supporting, or serving with units of friendly foreign forces that are engaged in armed conflict.

(2) Entitlement will be limited to members of the U.S. forces serving in Vietnam, and to such other places as may later be designated by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) Personnel must be assigned duty: (a) subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines, or (b) in an area in which they are in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines. Personnel entitled to this special pay must be physically present and a member of, attached to, supporting, advising or assisting a combat unit not larger than a brigade, combat command, regiment, group or other similar organization of comparable level. Entitlement also includes personnel assigned or attached to: an aircraft including reconnaissance aircrews subjected to imminent danger of hostile fire in the course of an operation; a vessel including a minesweeper while in imminent danger of being subjected to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines, or a minesweeper while actually engaged in sweeping enemy mines.

(4) A member is entitled to this special pay at the rate of $55 per month if associated as a regular member with a combat unit under the conditions stated in (3) above for a period of not less than 6 days of the month, not necessarily consecutive; or 1 or more days during the month included within a period of not less than 6 consecutive days beginning in the preceding month.

(5) Notwithstanding the conditions in (4) above, a member is entitled to this special pay for any month in which he is entitled to basic pay and in which he was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

(6) Entitlement to this special pay will continue for not more than 3 additional months in the cases of personnel hospitalized because of a wound or injury received by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine or other hostile action.

(7) A member may not be paid more than one special pay for duty subject to hostile fire for any month. A member may be paid this special pay in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

(8) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

(9) The unified commander will designate units and detachments entitled to this spe-

cial pay and review entitlements authorized to insure that such authorizations for all services are in keeping with restrictive policies stated herein.

Just today there was received the following letter from Col. Leo E. Benade, Task Force on Military Compensation, Department of Defense, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: The following information regarding special pay for duty subject to hostile fire is furnished in response to your telephone call of May 6, 1963.

The manner in which the Department of Defense intends to implement the legislation, if passed, was generally outlined in the letter to you from the Secretary of the Army dated March 19, 1963. I would add that in addition the Department of Defense would include as eligible for the special pay those members assigned or attached to an aircraft, including helicopters, subject to imminent danger of hostile fire in the course of an operation; and to a vessel in imminent danger of being subjected to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines. Under this criteria, at the present time, only members of units supporting the forces in Vietnam would qualify.

At the present time there are approximately 12,000 U.S. troops assigned to Vietnam, or about 5 percent of the Armed Forces strength. It is estimated that between 2,200 and 2,800 might qualify for this special pay. This estimate includes Air Force and Navy troops which were not included in the figures furnished you by the Secretary of the Army in his letter of March 19, 1963.

Helicopter pilots and other personnel authorized to receive flight pay might qualify for special pay for duty subject to hostile fire in addition to their flight pay. We believe such dual payments would be consistent with the purpose for which each payment was proposed. Flight pay is awarded both as an incentive pay to attract and retain high quality volunteers and as added compensation for the inherent risk of flying irrespective of where the flying is done. Hostile fire pay recognizes the additional hazard aircrew members are exposed to when flying over enemy-held territory. Passengers in the aircraft, of course, would be eligible only for hostile duty pay.

Since January 1, 1961, 82 U.S. military personnel have lost their lives in Vietnam, 33 by hostile fire and 49 by accidents and other causes. As a matter of information, the numbers of deaths in other hazardous duties are as follows:

(a) Pilots: 358 pilots were killed in aircraft accidents (including helicopters) in 1961; 362 in 1962.

(b) Submarines: The *Thresher* accident accounted for the only multiple loss of life in a submarine since the end of World War II.

(c) Parachute pay: The injury rate in parachute jumping ranges between 2 and 3 per 1,000 jumps; however, the Armed Forces experienced only 1 fatality in fiscal year 1960 and 1 fatality in fiscal year 1961.

(d) Other: Between the period 1951 and 1961 diving accidents accounted for 18 deaths. Altitude chambers accounted for 12 deaths in the same 10-year period.

The Army has suffered the greatest number of deaths and injuries in the Vietnam conflict just as in World War II and Korea. Of the 82 fatalities in Vietnam, 51 were Army troops, 22 Air Force, 6 Marine Corps, and 3 Navy.

Although no figures are available as to the number of men who received combat pay in the Korean war, at the time of passage of the Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 it was estimated that 160,000 would qualify.

As a matter of additional information, the number of battle deaths and other deaths in World War II and Korea, by service, are shown in the attached table.

I hope that this information will be useful to you. Your interest is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

LEO E. BENADE,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Director, Task Force on Military Compensation.

World War II

	Battle deaths		Other deaths		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Army [1]	234,874	80	83,400	73	318,274	79
Navy	36,950	13	25,664	23	62,614	15
Marine Corps	19,733	7	4,778	4	24,511	6
Total	291,557		113,842		405,399	

[1] Includes Army Air Corps.

Korea

	Battle deaths		Other deaths		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Army	27,704	82	9,429	46	37,133	69
Navy	458	1	4,043	20	4,501	8
Marine Corps	4,267	13	1,261	6	5,528	10
Air Force	1,200	4	5,884	28	7,084	13
Total	33,629		20,617		54,246	

Mr. Speaker, this matter is small in dollars, small in numbers of men involved but large in the moral responsibilities of our country—and large to the individuals involved and to their families. There are existing special pay programs which we already have which are tremendous in the amount of dollars involved and very substantial in the numbers of persons involved but which in no instance have a greater moral significance in the responsibilities of our country and in no way are more important to the individuals and families involved.

Under these other programs there have assuredly been administrative difficulties but these have not prevented us continuing such programs. For instance, in the case of flight pay we actually discourage and even prohibit some of the flight pay recipients from further performance of their original flight duties, on the theory that they will not ever have another military assignment in which their flight performance will be used and that qualifying flights are wasteful of the taxpayers' money. So administrative problems have certainly been met in some of these other pays but no one has suggested ending them. The proposed amendment does not allow permanent combat or hostile fire pay unless the hostile fire is actually experienced and unlike flight pay is not a status maintained after performance or ability to perform has ceased.

Please consider the following table which shows that these other pays now total annually $632,486,960. Contrast this with the only $1 or $2 million contemplated for the hostile fire amendment—and consider carefully what is actually required of the recipients:

Extra pay for certain performances in Department of Defense

Item	Criteria	Grade	Rate	Fiscal year 1964, DOD
1. INCENTIVE FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY				
(a) Parachute duty	1 jump qualifies for 3 months	Officers	$110.00	$32,334,000
	do	Enlisted men	55.00	
(b) Demolition duty	Actually perform such duty each month to qualify for that month.	Officers	110.00	1,457,660
	do	Enlisted men	55.00	
(c) Flight duty	4 hours each calendar month; 8 hours 2d month if requirement not met 1st month; 12 hours 3d month if requirement 1st and 2d month not met.	Crew: Officers and enlisted men.		295,342,340
	do	Noncrew:		
		Officers	110.00	
		Enlisted men	55.00	
(d) Thermal stress duty	Exposed as human test subjects in 1 or more experiments for that month.	Officers	110.00	9,736,000
	do	Enlisted men	55.00	

Extra pay for certain performances in Department of Defense—Continued

Item	Criteria	Grade	Rate	Fiscal year 1964, DOD
(e) High/low pressure				$788,000
(f) Submarine duty				20,846,000
2. SPECIAL PAY				
(a) Foreign and sea duty	Enlisted men only; for duty outside continental United States; no entitlement for duty in Hawaii or Alaska if resident. Includes temporary duty of 8 days or more.	E-9	$22.50	130,000,000
	do	E-8	22.50	
	do	E-7	22.50	
	do	E-6	20.00	
	do	E-5	16.00	
	do	E-4	13.00	
	do	E-3	9.00	
	do	E-2	8.00	
	do	E-1	8.00	
(b) Medical, dental, and veterinarians	Medical and dental: Regular Army on active duty before July 1, 1963; non-Regular Army who before July 1, 1963 enter on active duty for 1 year or more receive special pay as follows:			32,925,400
	(a) Completed less than 2 years' active duty		100	
	(b) Completed 2 or more years but less than 6 years' active duty.		150	
	(c) Completed 6 or more years but less than 10 years' active duty.		200	
	(d) Completed 10 or more years' active duty		250	
	Veterinarians: Regular Army and non-Regular Army who enter on active duty for 1 year or more prior to July 1, 1963.		100	
(c) Diving duty	Perform diving duty each month	Officers	110	2,911,200
	do	Enlisted men		
	do	Master	100	
	do	1st class	80	
	do	Salvage	65	
	do	2d class	55	
(d) Proficiency pay	Enlisted men only; when designated as possessing special proficiency in a military skill.	Private, 1st class	30	106,146,360
	do	Private, 2d class	60	
Total, special pay				271,982,960
Total, hazardous duty pay				360,504,000
Total				632,486,960

Mr. Speaker, there is one glaring omission that should be corrected in H.R. 5555. This is the fact that the bill excludes hostile fire pay or combat pay. Such pay was requested by the Army and by the Department of Defense and approved by the administration and the Bureau of the Budget. It was also approved by the subcommittee which actually studied this legislation, but it was removed by a close vote in the full committee. We should restore it to this legislation before it becomes law.

The Harris Trust & Savings Bank of Chicago Analyzes the Implications of the Proposed Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me today to call my colleagues' attention to a fine analysis of the President's proposal for a tax cut prepared by Mr. Herbert E. Neil, Jr., associate economist for the Harris Trust & Savings Bank in Chicago.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Neil draws a conclusion that a tax reduction at this time would indeed provide very impressive results for future growth of our economy.

The Harris Trust & Savings Bank is regarded as one of the most responsible financial institutions in the world. I solicit those who are participating in the debate regarding a tax cut at this time to read the impressive analysis prepared by Mr. Neil because certainly both the Harris Trust & Savings Bank and Mr. Neil have made a very significant contribution to a better understanding of this entire subject.

It is my hope that this analysis will help bring about early action on this very important legislation and that we will not delay this legislation in a long and bitter wrangle about the proposed reforms. I hope the Congress will have an opportunity to pass the tax reduction bill forthwith and then go into a lengthy analysis of the merits or demerits of the various reform proposals that have been suggested.

With an upswing in the economy, I feel confident that we can pass a tax reduction at this time and postpone the proposed reforms until they have had more thorough study by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Neil's excellent analysis follows:

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED TAX CUT

(By Herbert E. Neil, Jr.)

The President has recommended to Congress enactment of legislation which would reduce individual income tax rates from the current 20 to 91 percent range to 14 to 65 percent and corporate income tax rates from 52 to 47 percent. Total dollar value of these reductions at current levels of personal and corporate income would amount to $11 billion for individuals and $2.6 billion for corporations. Partially offsetting these tax reductions are proposals for adjustments in the present tax structure which would raise income tax liabilities of individuals by an estimated $3.3 billion at present income levels. The proposed tax revision is programed to take effect in three steps, spread over 1963, 1964, and 1965.

Individual income tax rates would be cut from the present 20 to 91 percent rates to 18.5 to 84.5 percent for 1963, 15.5 to 71.5 percent for 1964 and 14 to 65 percent for 1965 and subsequent years. A reduction in the current 18 percent withholding rate to 15.5 percent upon enactment of the tax program would increase personal disposal income by $6 billion on an annual rate basis. The President has proposed a second decrease in the withholding rate to 13.5 percent in mid-1964, further increasing after-tax income by $5 billion. Partially offsetting the lower rates asked for next year would be the $3.3 billion of adjustments in the tax structure proposed for 1964. For corporations, the President has suggested a reversal of the present 30 percent normal corporate tax rate on the initial $25,000 of corporate profits and 22 percent on profits in excess of $25,000, effective this year. The surtax rate would then be reduced to 28 percent in 1964 and 25 percent in 1965, bringing the tax rate on profits in excess of $25,000 down to 47 percent from the current 52 percent rate.

Tax reduction for both individuals and corporations is being recommended by the President in the face of anticipated deficits for fiscal 1963 and 1964. The administrative budget is expected to show an $8.8 billion deficit and the cash budget an $8.3 billion deficit in the current fiscal year. Even without a tax cut the administrative budget would be in the red by $9.2 billion in fiscal 1964. With tax reduction the official forecast for the administrative budget calls for a deficit of $11.9 billion in fiscal 1964, while the cash budget would run a deficit of $10.3 billion. The net revenue loss to the Government in fiscal 1964 would be less than the amount of the tax cut for individuals due to an acceleration in the schedule of tax collections from corporations with annual tax liabilities in excess of $100,000 and a recouping of part of the lost revenue from individuals as taxable incomes rise with economic expansion stimulated by tax reduction. A debate, centering in Congress, has thus ensued on the wisdom of planning such a large deficit through tax reduction.

This article will explore the tax reduction program from three aspects. First, is there a real need for general tax cuts at the present time? Second, will tax reduction ac-

complish the stated objectives of stepping up the growth of the economy, thereby providing increased job and investment opportunities? Finally, are there any adverse results to be expected from tax reduction? Discussion will focus on the overall economic impact of tax reduction, not the distribution of tax relief nor the particular reforms recommended by the President.

I. NEED FOR EXPANSIVE ACTION

Tax cuts are proposed to provide a stimulus to the economy. During the 9-year period, 1953–62, real gross national product increased at an annual rate of 2.7 percent per year compared with 4.8 percent between 1947 and 1953. An abnormally strong stimulus was provided in the immediate postwar period by first a backlog of private demands from World War II shortages and secondly, defense requirements associated with the Korean war. Economic growth dropped appreciably after the Korean war to an annual rate of 2.4 percent between 1953–57, as production reverted from a semiforced draft status to a more normal peacetime pace. Since economic resources were being fully utilized for the most part during these years the performance of the economy was generally considered satisfactory between 1953 and 1957. A slower rate of economic advance should have been expected after the high rate of the postwar period. However, the pace of economic expansion accelerated to only 3 percent per year between 1957 and 1962 although substantial unutilized resources were available for additional production.

During the last three quarters of 1961, following the mild 1960–61 recession, real GNP grew at a fast annual rate of 9.2 percent. While such a rapid advance would not be expected to continue over a long period of time, the pace of the initial recovery engendered optimism of a faster growth rate in the current expansion. Such hopes were quickly dashed by the slow 3.1 percent increase in real gross national product between the fourth quarters of 1961 and 1962. Moreover, the general expectation for 1963 is at best continuation of the 1962 rate of expansion with substantial unutilized resources.

The existence of significant unemployment of both labor and capital during the past 5 years suggests that the economy could expand faster if these resources were put to work. Unemployment of labor averaged 6 percent of the civilian labor force during the 5 years, 1958-1962. Two recession years, 1958 and 1961, with unemployment rates of 6.8 and 6.7 percent, respectively, raise the average. However, unemployment did not drop below 5.5 percent for any of the 3 prosperous years in this span. In early 1963 unemployment was running about 6 percent above the rate of a year earlier.

The last 15 years can conveniently be divided into three subperiods, 1947–53, 1953–57, and 1957–62, each with differing economic characteristics. The early postwar period was one of fast economic growth, 4.8 percent annual advances in gross national product, as the Nation made rapid forward strides in improving its efficiency. Plant and equipment spending was stepped up sharply following 15 years of reduced expenditures. Output per man-hour rose at above average rates due to the vastly improved capital which labor utilized in producing goods and services. The middle fifties, 1953–57, was a period of reduced economic growth, 2.4 percent annual increases in gross national product. A drop in the advance of output per man-hour from 4.2 percent for 1947–53 to a more normal annual rate of 2.7 percent largely accounts for the slower increase in gross national product. During most of the 1953-57 period unemployment was relatively low, indicating full utilization of the labor force. The final third of the postwar period, 1957–62, was characterized by a moderate rate of growth, 3 percent per year, slightly higher than 1953–57. Output per man-hour rose at an annual rate of 2.7 percent, similar to the gain in productivity of the previous 4 years. However, the recent period is distinct from the earlier periods in the substantial underutilization of economic resources. High unemployment, over 5 percent, continued throughout the period. Additionally, industry operated with considerably greater excess capacity between 1958 and 1962 than in the earlier 10 years. The Federal Reserve Board index of utilization of capacity in 17 basic industries did not exceed 80 percent in the past 5 years, compared with 86 percent in 1957 and higher in earlier years.

Underutilization of resources has thus been for the past 5 years and appears to continue to be the principal economic problem for the Nation in the next few years. Output is being forgone due to a lack of demand for goods and services. Hence, tax reduction is being recommended as a stimulus to increased spending, by means of which unemployment of men and machines would be lowered.

In addition to the favorable impact of tax reduction upon aggregate demand, lower marginal tax rates are likely to improve the operating efficiency of the economy. Incentives to work, save and invest would be encouraged, particularly among high-income taxpayers, at the expense of efforts directed toward minimizing taxes. Tax reduction may also have the effect of exerting a stricter control over Government spending since expenditures seem to quickly rise to meet or exceed revenues.

II. EFFECTIVENESS OF A TAX CUT

Tax cuts could be expected to provide a stimulus to the economy because individual recipients of the tax reduction would immediately receive increased purchasing power. Spending of their larger after-tax income by consumers would lead to higher incomes for the producers of the additional goods and services. These producers in turn are likely to increase their spending, leading to higher incomes. Thus, the tax reduction could be expected to have a cumulative effect on demand equal to a multiple of the initial cut. Although it is impossible to prove that consumers will spend a major portion of their increased disposable personal income following a tax cut, considerable historical evidence exists to suggest that consumption expenditures would rise significantly.

Taxes have been reduced twice since World War II, in 1948 and again in 1954. On both occasions reductions in Federal military spending were instrumental in leading to tax cuts. In contrast, the proposed tax reduction in 1963 would take place in the face of rising Federal expenditures. Taxes were reduced by $4.7 billion under the Revenue Act of 1948, passed by Congress in April 1948 but made retroactive to January 1, 1948. Disposable personal income was thus given two spurts, once in the second quarter of 1948 following congressional enactment of the law and then in early 1949 due to large refunds on taxes withheld at the higher rates in early 1948. As shown in table 1, individuals enjoyed a $9.3 billion rise in disposable personal income between the first and second quarters of 1948 due to rising income and a $2.4 billion reduction in tax liability. Personal saving rose sharply, absorbing $6.6 billion of the gain in disposable personal income; and $3 billion of the $5.9 billion third quarter rise in disposable personal income went to additional saving in the third quarter.

However, as the economy slipped into a recession in late 1948 and on into 1949, personal saving declined significantly. The $5.1 billion drop in personal income between the fourth quarter of 1948 and the first quarter of 1949 was tempered by a reduction of $1.9 billion in Federal tax liabilities. Tax cuts appear to have played a strong positive role in limiting the severity of the 1948–49 recession. Although personal income before taxes was reduced by $7.6 billion between the third quarters of 1948 and 1949, personal consumption expenditures actually increased by a nominal $300 million. Lower Federal tax liabilities and reduced personal saving accounted for the stability in consumer expenditures in the face of declining income. As the economy turned upward in the fourth quarter of 1949, consumer expenditures rose and personal saving fell further. Thus, in the seven quarters following tax reduction, Federal taxes on personal incomes declined $5 billion, disposable personal income increased $9.8 billion, and personal saving rose only $500 million. Although a significant portion of the 1948 tax cut was apparently saved by consumers in 1948, following very low saving in the previous year, individuals cut back their saving in 1949 and maintained their consumption as incomes declined. Tax savings thus appear to have been largely spent, but with a lag.

Tax reduction in 1954 also took place during a mild postwar recession. The excess profits tax was repealed, reducing corporate tax liabilities by $2 billion. Personal income taxes were lowered $3 billion on an annual basis, excise taxes were reduced $1 billion, and structural tax changes decreased liabilities by $1.4 billion. An increase in social security contributions of $1.3 billion partially offset the reductions, resulting in a net cut of $6.1 billion. Reduction of income taxes enabled consumers to increase their spending by a modest $1.4 billion between the fourth quarter of 1953 and the first quarter of 1954 despite a $2.3 billion decline in personal income before taxes. However, due to the tax cut disposable personal income actually rose $800 million in the initial quarter of 1954. Moreover, consumers apparently reduced their saving, rather than saving the tax reduction (see table 1). Although personal income was unchanged in the second quarter of 1954, due to the recession, consumption rose by $2.8 billion as saving fell by $2.7 billion.

TABLE I.—*Federal taxes, disposable personal income, and personal saving, 1948–49 and 4th quarter, 1953–55*

[In billions]

	1948				1949				1953	1954				1955			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Federal personal income taxes	$21.1	$18.7	$18.0	$18.2	$16.3	$16.2	$16.2	$16.1	$32.3	$29.1	$29.0	$29.1	$29.4	$30.6	$31.3	$31.9	$32.3
Disposable personal income	179.5	188.8	194.7	194.0	190.6	190.2	188.6	189.3	253.8	254.6	254.8	256.8	260.9	263.8	272.0	277.7	283.0
Personal consumption expenditures	174.7	177.5	180.2	180.8	179.0	181.1	180.5	184.0	232.3	233.7	236.5	238.7	243.2	249.4	254.3	260.9	263.3
Personal saving	4.8	11.4	14.4	13.2	11.6	9.1	8.1	5.3	21.6	21.0	18.3	18.0	17.7	14.4	17.8	16.8	19.8

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "U.S. Income and Output."

The recovery in individual incomes in late 1954 and 1955, following the recession, led to stepped up consumer spending. Personal saving remained at a fairly low level throughout 1955. Two years after the tax reduction, in the fourth quarter of 1955, personal saving was actually $1.8 billion lower than in the final quarter of 1953 before the tax cut despite an increase of $29.2 billion in disposable personal income. Moreover, the dollar total of personal saving was less in each of the eight quarters of 1954 and 1955 than in the last quarter of 1953.

Analysis of the effects of the two postwar reductions on consumer saving and spending recorded in the national income accounts indicates that the tax savings were largely spent on increased consumption. Following the 1948 tax cut the public stepped up its saving by a significant amount, but the saving rate was reduced in 1949 in order to maintain consumption as incomes declined during the recession. Economic recovery late in the year brought with it higher consumer outlays, suggesting a delayed positive effect of the 1948 tax reduction upon spending. A more direct connection between tax reduction and consumer spending is indicated by the 1954–55 data. Consumer outlays increased continuously during both years despite stability of incomes during the first half of 1954. Personal saving declined following the 1954 tax cut and remained at a reduced level for 2 years. Tax reduction in 1954 seems to have provided a strong stimulant to consumer spending, which paced the business recovery following the 1953–54 recession.

A possible explanation for the different timing of spending reaction to the tax cuts of 1948 and 1954 is indicated by monetary policy pursued during the two periods. The Federal Reserve followed a fairly restrictive monetary policy in 1948, increasing the discout rate twice during the year and also raising reserve requirements of the member banks. Member bank reserves, adjusted for reserve requirement changes, declined by nearly $400 million, or 3 percent, between January 1948 and January 1949. This action led to a decline of 2 percent, $2.2 billion, in the money supply (currency plus demand deposits) during this 12-month period. The reduction in the rate of personal saving in 1949 coincided with easier monetary policy, a lowering of reserve requirements and a 3-percent increase in member bank reserves between January 1949 and January 1950. Monetary policy thus appears to have initially offset the stimulating effect of tax reduction in 1948.

In contrast, monetary policy was expansive in 1954, reinforcing the favorable effect of tax reduction in that year. The discount rate was reduced twice during 1954, along with a lowering of reserve requirements. Member bank reserves, adjusted for the reserve requirement changes, were increased 5 percent between December 1953 and December 1954, resulting in a $3.5 billion, 2.7 percent growth in the money supply. For tax reduction to be fully effective in stimulating consumer spending quickly, as in 1954, monetary policy should also be expansive.

Personal saving, as reported in the national income accounts, is a measure of actual saving. Saving may be planned or unplanned, but the national income accounts make no distinction. Unemployed workers may involuntarily dissave in order to maintain their consumption in a recession. On the other hand, unexpected income gains may be involuntarily saved, particularly in a period of tight credit when business is investing heavily in new plant, equipment and inventories. Consequently, we can only infer from the data that consumer disposition to save rose in 1948 and declined in both 1949 and 1954.

Further insight into consumer spending and saving motivation can be secured by examining expenditure patterns of individuals and families in various income classes. Analysis is here directed at the behavior of separate consumer units rather than aggregative transactions provided in the national income accounts. Data from the Survey of Consumer Expenditures, 1960–61, taken in the cities of New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Boston, Atlanta, and Washington, D.C., have been combined by income groups in order to enlarge the small samples taken in each city. Although saving and the proportion of income saved rises rather consistently with income, consumption also goes up with income (table 2). Average propensities to consume exceed 100 percent for income classes below $5,000 and top 86 percent for income groups between $5,000 and $15,000. Marginal propensities to consume shown for each income class indicate the proportion of additional income which families could be expected to spend as they move up the income ladder. The implicit assumption is made that the families with changing incomes adjust their expenditures in correspondence with the typical spending pattern of their new income groups.

TABLE 2.—*Consumption by income classes in selected U.S. cities* [1]

Income	Number of families	Average money income after taxes	Average consumption	Average propensity to consume	Marginal propensity to consume
				Percent	*Percent*
Under $1,000	17	$698	$1,820	260.7	
$1,000 to $1,999	84	1,578	1,846	117.2	3.0
$2,000 to $2,999	102	2,503	2,758	110.2	98.6
$3,000 to $3,999	126	3,535	3,669	103.8	88.3
$4,000 to $4,999	152	4,521	4,657	103.0	100.2
$5,000 to $5,999	141	5,492	5,197	94.6	55.6
$6,000 to $7,499	198	6,752	6,364	94.3	92.6
$7,500 to $9,999	215	8,620	7,758	90.0	74.6
$10,000 to $14,999	97	11,725	10,185	86.9	78.2
$15,000 and over	40	21,941	13,647	62.2	33.9

[1] Data is combined for the 1960–61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Boston, Atlanta, and Washington, D.C.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Marginal propensities to consume for all income classes between $2,000 and $15,000 exceed 55 percent and average 84 percent. Marginal propensities of the low and high income classes shown in the table are biased downward. The very low marginal propensity to consume of the $1,000 to $1,999 income class reflects the high dissaving of the families with incomes under $1,000. Many of the very low income families are not permanent members of this income class, but rather have temporarily suffered business losses, extended sickness, or lengthy unemployment in a given year. Such families liquidate accumulated assets or borrow in order to maintain higher living standards in years of adversity. Additionally, the dollar values shown for the under $1,000 income class are subject to substantial sampling error due to the small size of the sample for this group. Only the highest income class has a low marginal propensity to consume, although a splitting of the open-ended class would probably indicate a much higher propensity to spend in the $15,000–$30,000 income class. Some high-income families are only temporarily in the over $15,000 income class, and so would be expected to save a high proportion of their income in a given year. Consumer survey data on consumption and saving thus suggest that families increase their outlays as they receive higher incomes, and consequently could be expected to spend most of any tax cuts.

National income data and surveys of consumer expenditures by income classes indicate that higher consumer spending has been associated with larger disposable personal income in the past. However, the question remains as to whether the economic situation of consumers today is such that they would save a tax cut rather than spend it, in contrast to their previous behavior in the face of rising incomes. Commercial bank time deposits, mutual savings bank time deposits, and savings and loan association shares all increased by record dollar amounts in 1962. A combined $27 billion gain in holdings of these three types of savings last year indicates a strong preference by a portion of the public for liquid assets. However, offsetting the increased saving in the form of liquid assets by some people was the large addition to consumer and mortgage debt by other individuals. It is also evident that some of the large dollar gains in liquid assets resulted from less consumer interest in the purchase of marketable government securities and corporate stock. Saving as a percent of disposable personal income was relatively low in 1962, 6.8 percent, a rate which exceeded only that of 1955 and 1960 in the past 12 years. Saving data would thus suggest that consumers are not likely to largely save a tax cut.

Consumer buying plans and attitudes also suggest that families are inclined to spend added receipts from tax reduction. Based upon separate consumer surveys taken in late 1962 by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan and the national industrial conference board, a larger percentage of households plan to purchase new cars in 1963 than had planned to buy cars in 1962 a year earlier. Intentions to buy homes have recently increased after some slippage earlier in 1962. Consumer attitudes also indicate a disposition to spend. Both surveys show year-end gains in the proportion of families with increases in income and in respondents reporting good business conditions.

III. DANGERS OF A TAX CUT

Evidence of consumer behavior strongly suggests that tax reduction would increase consumption and lead to a fuller utilization of the Nation's resources. However, possible adverse effects of a tax cut should be considered. The administration estimates that passage of its tax program, combined with planned expenditures for fiscal 1964, would result in a deficit of $10.3 billion in the cash budget, following an expected deficit of $8.3 billion in fiscal 1963. Revenue forecasts for fiscal 1964 are based upon estimates of $578 billion for gross national product, personal income of $459 billion and corporate profits before taxes of $53 billion in 1963. All of these measures of economic performance would show monetary gains of slightly over 4 percent between 1962 and 1963.

Despite the large planned deficit for fiscal 1964, the administration hopes to be able to balance the budget in several years because of increased revenue generated by the expected recovery in the economy. At present tax rates Federal revenues increase approxi-

mately $6 billion per year with rates of real growth of 4 percent per year.

The lower marginal tax rates proposed by the President for both individuals and corporations would generate additional revenue in the future of about $5 billion per year at a 4 percent rate of growth in economic activity. A balanced budget in fiscal 1966 is possible, but only if the economy is operating at close to full employment levels and there is no rise in Federal expenditures from the fiscal 1964 estimate. Either a gross national products of less than $650 billion in 1965, compared with $554 billion last year, or an increase in Federal outlays would postpone a balanced budget beyond fiscal 1966.

Inflation is often cited as the primary danger associated with large Government deficits, such as those envisaged for the next several years. Historically, hyperinflation has generally gone hand in hand with massive Government deficits. Big Government deficits during World War II unquestionably led to substantial price rises in the 1945–48 period. However, since 1950 the relationship between Federal deficits and inflation is not clear. Federal deficits and annual rates of price changes by calendar years are shown in table 3. All three annual increases in the gross national product price deflator in excess of 3 percent during the past 13 years occurred in years of Federal surpluses, 1951, 1956, and 1957. Wholesale prices also rose substantially in these 3 years while consumer prices increased 8 percent in 1951 and 3½ percent in 1957. The 4-percent annual increase in the wholesale price index in 1950 occurred while the budget was practically balanced. In contrast, all the price indexes rose less than 2 percent per year in 4 of the 5 years of largest deficits, 1953, 1959, 1961, and 1962. Moreover, there does not appear to be a lagged relation between deficits and price increases.

TABLE 3.—*Federal consolidated cash budgets and inflation, 1950–62*

Year	Federal cash surplus or deficit (−) (billions)	GNP price deflator (percent)	Percent changes in—	
			Consumer prices	Wholesale prices
1950	+$0.5	+1.5	+1.0	+4.0
1951	+1.2	+7.5	+8.0	+11.4
1952	−.6	+2.0	+2.2	−2.8
1953	−7.2	+.9	+.8	−1.4
1954	−1.1	+1.0	+.4	+.2
1955	−.7	+1.2	−.3	+.3
1956	+5.5	+3.4	+1.5	+3.2
1957	+1.2	+3.6	+3.5	+2.9
1958	−7.3	+2.2	+2.8	+1.4
1959	−8.0	+1.6	+.8	+.2
1960	+3.6	+1.6	+1.6	+.1
1961	−6.8	+1.2	+1.1	−.4
1962	−5.7	+1.4	+1.2	+.3

Sources: Treasury Department, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor.

Rates of utilization of economic resources show a much more direct relationship to price changes than does the budget position of the Federal Government. In 1951 the economy was working at a forced-draft rate because of the Korean War. Again in 1956 and early 1957, periods of rising prices, business was operating at close to full capacity. Little inflation, if any, has occurred since 1958, a period of substantial unemployed labor and plant. Wholesale prices are today at the same level as 5 years ago. The consumer price index has crept upward at an annual rate of 1.1 percent since 1958, but the index shows some upward bias. Not all quality improvements in goods and services are fully reflected in the calculated index. Inflation has thus not been a problem for the economy for the past 5 years and is unlikely to recur as long as the economy operates well below its potential. Large Federal deficits by themselves do not seem to generate inflation, based upon the evidence of the 1950's.

A more critical side effect of a tax cut which stimulates demand would be the encouraging of imports, thereby increasing the already troublesome deficit of $2.2 billion for 1962 in the U.S. balance of international payments. U.S. imports of goods and services are closely related to the level of income in this country, rising during an expansion and falling in a recession. A substantial expansion in gross national product to $650 billion in 1965 is likely to result in a $5–$6 billion rise in imports between 1962 and 1965. To maintain the 1962 $4.8 billion surplus balance on goods and services, exports of goods and services would also have to rise by $5–$6 billion during the next 3 years.

Although tax reduction would appear to further complicate the U.S. international balance-of-payments problem on current account, an improved performance of the U.S. economy such as that envisaged for 1965 could well bring about a sizable improvement in the capital account. More favorable profit prospects, consistent with an economy operating closer to its potential, would encourage American businesses to invest more heavily in domestic facilities rather than foreign plant. A faster pace of U.S. economic growth would also lead to an increased flow of foreign investment to this country, further reducing the net outflow of capital.

The most notable improvement in the capital account associated with a stronger U.S. economy could be expected to occur in the short-term sector. Because of higher short-term interest rates abroad and some concern with the long-term outlook for both the U.S. economy and the dollar, the net outflow of short-term capital and unrecorded transactions (presumably, largely short-term funds) amounted to $1.9 billion in 1960, $2.1 billion in 1961, and $1.5 billion in 1962. During the 1950's the United States enjoyed a modest net inflow of short-term capital, including unrecorded transactions. Improved confidence in the U.S. economy and higher interest rates in this country could be expected to lead to a restoration of the balance in the short-term capital account, eliminating up to $2 billion of the overall U.S. deficit on international account.

A crucial assumption in the prediction of a smaller international deficit is higher interest rates. An increase in interest rates can be expected to result from improved demand following tax reduction. Higher loan demand on the part of both consumers and business will put upward pressure on interest rates. Although the Federal Reserve can be expected to provide the commerical banks with some additional reserves, thereby increasing the supply of funds available, the net effect is likely to be higher interest rates. Tax reduction would thus ease the present problem of the Federal Reserve in meeting its conflicting objectives of stimulating the economy and improving the U.S. international balance of payments position. Additional loan demand would enable the Federal Reserve to supply the banks with more reserves through its purchase of Government securities but at the same time allow some increase in interest rates. Financing of a portion of the larger Federal deficit through Federal Reserve buying of Government securities will make the tax cut more effective in stimulating demand. Exclusive financing of the deficit through the public might well offset or at least minimize the favorable stimulus to demand provided by tax reduction. It thus appears that a monetary policy which can aid both the domestic economy and the country's international position is contingent upon favorable action by Congress in reducing taxes.

SUMMARY

Tax reduction has been recommended by the President as a device to increase consumer and business demand for goods and services in order to more fully utilize the economic resources of the Nation, thereby accelerating the lagging growth rate of the United States. Evidence from the effects of previous tax cuts since World War II, consumption-income relationships by income classes, and current buying plans of the public all suggest that consumers can be expected to spend their proposed tax saving. The tax cut will be more effective in stimulating aggregate demand if a portion of the enlarged Government debt is financed by the Federal Reserve System, thereby increasing the liquidity of the economy. Although the tax program will result in Federal deficits for at least fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965, the danger of inflation seems small due to the current high rate of unemployment and idle plant facilities. A faster rate of economic expansion may lead to an improved international balance of payments position for the United States through a sharp diminution in the outflow of capital. Finally, the tax reduction can be expected to provide an assist to monetary policy in meeting its twin objectives of insuring domestic growth and international confidence in the dollar.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.